

# DOCUMENTS FROM KOURION: A REVIEW ARTICLE<sup>1</sup>

ROGER S. BAGNALL AND THOMAS DREW-BEAR

## PART 1: PRINCIPLES AND METHODS

THERE HAS NEVER been a corpus of Greek and Latin inscriptions from the island of Cyprus, although Olivier Masson's *Inscriptions chypriotes syllabiques* (Paris 1961) provided a near-corpus for the Greek syllabic texts. For more than thirty years the epigraphical world has looked to Terence Mitford, Reader in Archaeology in the University of St Andrews, with his now nearly four decades of study of Cyprus, to fill the lack of a collection. Mitford himself outlined his program for a corpus to the Second International Congress of Greek and Latin Epigraphy (1952), where he talked of his plans for a multi-volume publication to cover the inscriptions of the Archaic, Classical, Hellenistic, Roman, and Byzantine periods for the island.<sup>2</sup> This project seems to have been tacitly abandoned in favour of collections for individual cities; Kourion is the first to receive a "complete" corpus,<sup>3</sup> in a volume<sup>4</sup> which gathers all inscriptions of the city known to Mitford: those copied by earlier scholars or travellers, those found by Mitford himself, and above all those excavated by the University Museum of Philadelphia<sup>5</sup> and the Cypriot Department of Antiquities in campaigns before and after the Second World War. Several plans of the site and its monuments are provided for convenience in

<sup>1</sup>Many of the points raised in part 1 are substantiated more fully in part 2, in which the inscriptions are discussed (selectively) in numerical order. We have collaborated on the review as a whole, but primary responsibility for the discussions of most syllabic and Hellenistic texts rests with Bagnall and that for most Roman and late Roman documents with Drew-Bear.

<sup>2</sup>*Actes du deuxième congrès international d'épigraphie grecque et latine, 1952* (Paris 1953) 174. A separate volume was envisaged for Kafizin. Ten years later Mitford still declared that "publication of the new material [hundreds of syllabic inscriptions] forms the first part of a programme which I have recently undertaken at the behest of the British Academy" (*Akte des IV int. Kongresses für gr. und lat. Epigraphik, 1962* [Vienna 1964] 246). Cf. the hopes expressed by R. Flacelière and J. and L. Robert, *Bull.épigr.* 1938, 7 and 537; by L. Robert, *REG* 71 (1958) xviii; and by O. Masson, *BCH* 85 (1961) 569–570. Mitford's Corpus was to replace *IG*, 15, reserved for Cyprus but never realized (for the history and fate of this volume, see the account of G. Klaffenbach, *Actes II. congr.* 30).

<sup>3</sup>Mitford collected the Hellenistic inscriptions of Old Paphos in *BSA* 56 (1961) 1–41 (cf. J. and L. Robert, *Bull.épigr.* 1963, 300). The volume for Kourion was mentioned by Mitford in *AJA* 65 (1961) 93, n. 3; *BICS* Suppl. 10 (1961) 21; and *Minos* 7 (1961) 29, n. 14 as forthcoming.

<sup>4</sup>*The Inscriptions of Kourion* (Memoirs of the American Philosophical Society 83 [1971]); pp. xvii, 422.

<sup>5</sup>Not Princeton University as Mitford stated (twice) in *Aegyptus* 33 (1953) 83.

locating the find-spots of inscriptions.<sup>6</sup> The book is dated in 1971 and appeared during that year, but Mitford did not, it would seem, make any substantive changes to the manuscript, except for the syllabic section, after late 1961.<sup>7</sup> We are dealing, therefore, with a work already ten years out of date at its appearance and in which the commentaries on many documents have been rendered obsolete by the work of the last decade.<sup>8</sup>

#### A. SCOPE AND TOPOGRAPHY

The work opens with a brief introduction explaining its scope and method. The editor thus defines the range of the book (p. 1):

By "Kourion" I may say I here denote neither the classical kingdom nor the territory of the Hellenistic and Roman city, but the actual *polis* with its extensions and adjacent lands. These I bound quite arbitrarily on the west by the Symvoulos *argaki*, on the east by the Kouris river, inland by the latitude of the village of Sotira.

This policy is unjustified, and the "actual *polis*" a meaningless phrase. Mitford has stated elsewhere<sup>9</sup> that he is of the opinion that all the land in Cyprus in the Hellenistic and Roman periods was "divided out among its cities." He has, further, indicated what he believes to be the western boundary of the territory of Kourion as determined by milestones of the Roman period.<sup>10</sup> Since Kourion was certainly bounded in the north by the

<sup>6</sup>Mitford (p. viii) thanks Roger Edwards (cf. p. 403) for his plans 1-3, but gives no source for plans 4 and 5. The latter is the same as that published by Richard Stillwell, "Kourion: the theater" in *Proc PhilSoc* 105 (1961) 40, fig. 2, according to Stillwell prepared by Cristophis Polycarpou, the expedition architect. Mitford's plan 2 ("The Sanctuary of Apollo Hylates") is the same as that published by R. Scranton (below, note 24), 76.

<sup>7</sup>Cf. p. vii, n. 1; according to A. H. S. Megaw's report on "Archaeology in Cyprus" (*Arch.Rep.* 1958, 30), "While in Cyprus in September [1958], Mitford completed his report on the inscriptions discovered by the Curium expedition."

<sup>8</sup>A number of examples will be discussed below; see especially the section (1.B.5, below) on finds since 1961. In fact some parts of this book were put out of date already by other parts written at a different time. For example, on p. 44 one reads that "it cannot be said confidently that the city proper has produced as yet a single syllabic document," but Mitford's 218, first published in 1963, is a *stoichedon* syllabic inscription of 26 signs found on the Acropolis. On p. 128, Mitford states that the *temenos* of Perseutes, which produced the syllabic inscription 25, was "probably situated upon the Acropolis itself." The book is superseded by a publication of Mitford in 1966 on other points as well (see below 100-105 on the topography of Kourion, and on 90 concerning the date of the proconsulship of Felix Julianus).

<sup>9</sup>*Aegyptus* 33 (1953) 86.

<sup>10</sup>*JRS* 29 (1939) 194-197. The territory of Paphos was there shown to have extended at least as far east as the Rantidi upland, while that of Kourion extended as far west as the Paramali River. Since the Rantidi upland appeared to be the only intervening natural feature, Mitford concluded that it must have been the boundary between Kourion and Paphos. He repeated this theory in *Opus Arch* 6 (1950) 46, n. 3 and *BICS* Suppl. 10 (1961) 28; but discovery of a new milestone later led him to place the boundary further east at the gorge of the Pharkania river just west of Paramali: *AJA* 70 (1966) 94-95.

Troodos mountain complex and on the south by the Mediterranean, three of the four limits are known. It is therefore hard to see why an editor should avoid the question of the city's territory. Since the lands of a Greek city formed a unity with the more densely built-up urban center, they must be considered with it in any true corpus of the city's inscriptions.

Mitford is not, however, consistent in avoiding inscriptions from the city's territory, for his 28 was found at the village of Sotira, which falls within the arbitrary lines for the "actual *polis* with its extensions and adjacent lands," but which is nevertheless cited on page 6 as part of the *chora* of Kourion (cf. note 14 below). On the other hand, Mitford excluded from the present corpus another syllabic inscription published by himself<sup>11</sup> and interpreted as the epitaph of 'Ονασαγό(ρ)αυ. This was found at "Limnatis, a village some 16 km. to the N. of Episkopi;" concerning the topography Mitford commented (on p. 31 of his article):

Near the modern village are numerous opened tombs; while funerary *cippi* of Roman Imperial date [see below], together with roof-tiles and architectural fragments, indicate the presence of an ancient settlement of some importance, to be included within the kingdom of Curium. For the Limnatis stream is the chief tributary of the Kouris, river of Curium; while the name *Onasagoras*, very popular with the Arcado-Cyprian folk, is in itself an indication that the territory of Eteo-Cyprian Amathus did not extend so far to the West . . . So Limnatis may now be added to Sotira and Evdhimou as κῶμαι in the *χώρα* of late classical Curium.

It is extraordinary that an author, having thus published himself an inscription from what he recognized as the territory of a particular city, should then undertake the epigraphic corpus of that city and exclude this very document. It is also extraordinary that having to edit an alphabetic epitaph at this same city with the name Νάαρχος 'Ονησαγόρου (147), that scholar should fail even to refer for this name to his previous publication of the other epitaph from the city's territory—presumably because that epitaph is excluded for purposes of onomastic comparison by the fact that it was found outside the so-called actual *polis*.<sup>12</sup> One of the gravestones of Roman date at Limnatis mentioned here has been published by I. Nicolaou: "Ονασε χέρε χρεστέ.<sup>13</sup>

<sup>11</sup>*Minos* 7 (1961) 30–31, no. 11; *SEG* 20 (1964) 171.

<sup>12</sup>The lack of any reference to this epitaph, which attests at Kourion "the name *Onasagoras*, very popular with the Arcado-Cyprian folk" is especially regrettable in view of the fact that in his commentary on the name Νάαρχος 'Ονησαγόρου Mitford remarks (291, n. 2) that "For Νάαρχος we may compare the Dorian forms *vās*, *vān*, *vaós*, *vaí* etc.; and it may well be that our spelling preserves the Arcado-Cypriot noun, otherwise unknown to us." Would not a comparison of the syllabic text be relevant to this interpretation?

<sup>13</sup>*Rep. Dept. Ant. Cyprus* 1971, 71–72, no. 10, Pl. xxiv, 10. Nicolaou comments that "Names compounded with *Onasi-* are characteristically Cypriot and occur in the epigraphy of Cyprus in the Cypro-syllabic script since the archaic period"; but curiously

According to Mitford in 1971, then, the villages of Sotira,<sup>14</sup> Limnatis, and Evdhimou<sup>15</sup> are all located within the territory of Kourion (although inscriptions have been published from each of these places, *IKourion* includes only the text found in the first of these three villages). In 1966, however, Mitford himself published a mutilated Greek inscription on a milestone found at Evdhimou which also carries a Latin text attributed by Mitford to the emperor Jovian, and on the basis of these texts he concluded that Evdhimou belonged not to Kourion but to Paphos.<sup>16</sup> Thus the fruits of Mitford's own progress in Cypriot epigraphy up to 1966 are not used in this book published in 1971. For the most recent state of the question of the frontiers of Kourion, the reader must therefore turn to an article that appeared seven years ago rather than to *IKourion*; and the reader must discover by himself the very existence of this article, to which no reference is made anywhere in this book.

The roster of early travellers who visited Kourion and excavations that have taken place there (pp. 3–4) is brief and uninformative; it omits any account of the University Museum excavations that produced most of the inscriptions. The reader is left with occasional references to the inscriptions' discovery in the physical descriptions of the stones. This is not a satisfactory procedure. One must regret that the *testimonia* of ancient authors concerning Kourion were not assembled here (there is no indication that anyone else intends to do so);<sup>17</sup> and one regrets also the essential

---

she fails to refer either to the syllabic epitaph of Ὀυασαγό(ρ)αυ or to the alphabetic epitaph of Νάαρχος Ὀυησαγόρου, both exactly from Kourion.

<sup>14</sup>The text from Sotira is published in the corpus as 28; on p. 67 the editor calls it "the third syllabic inscription from the territory, as opposed to the city, of Kourion," and refers to the other two from Evdhimou and Limnatis. On p. 6 one reads again that syllabic texts from Sotira, Evdhimou, and Limnatis [sic] "are of significance as the sole representatives of the χώρα of Kourion." One's natural reaction is that under these conditions such texts should have been included in the corpus of Kourion; but in fact we shall see that Mitford no longer (1966) believes that the region of Evdhimou belonged to the city of Kourion.

<sup>15</sup>A syllabic inscription from Evdhimou was published by Mitford in *Minos* 7 (1961) 31, no. 17 and in *BICS* Suppl. 10 (1961) 28–29; it appeared a third time in *ΑῖΑ* 70 (1966) 94–95. In *Minos* Mitford asserted "that Evdhimou was in late Classical times Curian is virtually proved by a milestone, the 7th from that city, which until recent years lay at the neighbouring Paramali (*JGR* III, 968)."

<sup>16</sup>*ΑῖΑ* 70 (1966) 96–98, no. 2 (fig. 5 and Pl. 24); a few more Greek letters were read also on another milestone from the same place, pp. 90–91. Cf. *AEpigr* 1966 no. 488; *SEG* 23 (1968) 634.

<sup>17</sup>This omission is justified (p. 4) on the grounds that "it is a task primarily for the archaeologist, since the position of this city has never been in question." The editors of *La Carie* 2 had a different conception of a corpus; the literary *testimonia* are there assembled, e.g., for Tabai, despite the fact that the position of that city also has never been in question. A similar procedure was followed by M. Guarducci in her corpus of Crete. Refusal to collect *testimonia* for Kourion is particularly unfortunate because, in the eyes

bibliography that would allow one to form a picture of the city of Kourion as a whole, as it is revealed by evidence other than the inscriptions.<sup>18</sup> Since Mitford himself gives neither information on topography<sup>19</sup> nor any topographical photographs,<sup>20</sup> nor yet any photographs of the architectural monuments, the lack of a bibliography is crippling; it forces the reader to do for himself what the editor should have done for him.

It is obviously impracticable for us to give such an account here, but we think it necessary to indicate at least the outline of the history of the excavations at Kourion during the last forty years. They began in 1934 under the direction of Bert Hodge Hill and continued until the war with Hill, George H. McFadden,<sup>21</sup> and John Franklin Daniel<sup>22</sup> in charge. They were resumed several years after the war and continued until the death of McFadden in 1951 with some new staff supplementing the old, especially after Daniel's death in 1948. A number of preliminary reports were published in the *Bulletin of the University Museum and AFA*, as well as brief notices in yearly accounts of excavations in other journals. Mitford

---

of the excavators at least, the location of Kourion *was* in question. G. H. McFadden concluded that the mosaic inscription of Eustolios, 204, "definitely establishes the name of the city" (*UPMB* 7.2 [1938] 10); cf. J. F. Daniel, *UPMB* 7.3 (1939) 14: "In 1935 . . . chief activities were transferred to what has since been identified as Kourion." But in 1826 C. Vidua (*Inscr.ant.*, p. 36) noted that his inscription Pl. 31, no. 4 had been copied "*inter ruinas vetusti oppidi Curii*"; Mitford's account of early travellers (pp. 3-4) gives no indication of which scholar was responsible for the identification of the site, nor when this identification was first made.

<sup>18</sup>Despite the editor's disclaimer on *testimonia*, he gives six brief passages ("without apology") "for the better understanding of our syllabic inscriptions." Three of these (1, 2, 6) have little obvious relevance to discussion of the syllabic texts. The "Selected Bibliography" (p. xv) includes many general works with little bearing on Kourion (those of Bechtel, Bengtson, Bevan, etc.) but omits *all* excavation reports and final publications for Kourion except J. H. Young and S. H. Young's report on the terracotta figurines. Not even Stillwell's final report on the theater (n. 6, above) or Scranton's on the sanctuary of Apollo (n. 24) is included. An interesting general account of the architectural and cultural history of the Sanctuary of Apollo is given by Scranton on his pp. 73-74; but one may dissent from his view that "the most luxurious phase of the sanctuary [under Trajan] proves to be not so much a devotion to the god of Hyle as an elaborate scheme for attracting and entertaining visitors—a calculated project to develop an economic resource for the region."

<sup>19</sup>For a different conception of the value of topographical study for the elucidation of Greek inscriptions, see the remarks of L. Robert, *Actes II. congr.* 11-12 (*Op.Min.Sel.* 3.1758-1759).

<sup>20</sup>Good photographs of the acropolis of Kourion and of the Sanctuary of Apollo are published by Masson, *Inscr. chyp. syll.* pl. I, nos. 3-5.

<sup>21</sup>On this scholar's contribution, cf. A. H. S. Megaw, *JHS* 74 (1954) 174 (report of McFadden's accidental death in a sailing accident).

<sup>22</sup>Whose portrait appears without explanation as the frontispiece to *IKourion*. Since Mitford nowhere tells his readers anything about Daniel, it may be of interest to note here that an obituary of this scholar may be found in *AFA* 52 (1948) 483-484.

notes some, but not all, of these publications in the lemmas of individual inscriptions of which notice or pictures appeared in the preliminary reports, although he does not report their readings or interpretations, which are often erroneous.<sup>23</sup>

Because of the untimely death of the principal excavators, there has been no single systematic final publication of the site; instead, the material to be published has been given to various scholars, some of whose reports have already appeared.<sup>24</sup> Kourion is as a result more fully published than many excavations. The scholars responsible for publication of different portions of the excavation material seem unfortunately to have worked in relative isolation, which has not improved the quality of the final results: thus a text as important as the dedicatory inscription of the Temple of Apollo is restored quite differently by Mitford (105) and by R. Scranton on pages 21–22 of his publication of the sanctuary architecture (note 24).

Some further excavation at the site was undertaken by A. H. S. Megaw, who cleared a Christian basilica in the late 1950's while he was Director of Antiquities,<sup>25</sup> but major work has resumed only since 1967 with the

<sup>23</sup>The articles in the *Bulletin of the University Museum (UPMB)* are the following: 5.4 (1935) 11–13 (McFadden on the excavation in general; the stratigraphy is described as "excellent"); *UPMB* 7.1 (1937) 15–18 (anon., on the Bamboula settlement of the Bronze Age); *UPMB* 7.2 (1938) 3–17 (McFadden and Daniel, on the basilica, the so-called Palace, and the Sanctuary of Apollo); *UPMB* 7.3 (1939) 14–21 (Daniel on Bamboula and an archaic tomb); *UPMB* 8.1 (1940) 3–14 (Daniel on the Achaeans at Kourion); *UPMB* 8.4 (1940) 22–28 (McFadden on the Sanctuary of Apollo); *UPMB* 13.3 (1948) 7–15 (Daniel on the history and plans of the excavation); *UPMB* 14.4 (1950) 14–37 (McFadden on the Apollo baths, DeCoursey Fales on the "Amusement Area"). Articles by Daniel in *AJA* 41 (1937) 56–85 (Late Cypriot tombs); *AJA* 42 (1938) 261–275 (Late Bronze Age settlement); *AJA* 43 (1939) 102–103 (inscribed pithos; a correction of the preceding article); by McFadden in *AJA* 55 (1951) 167–169 and 56 (1952) 128–129. Cf. also DeCoursey Fales in *AJA* 54 (1950) 129 and J. H. Young in *AJA* 52 (1948) 532. The excavators' remarks on the inscriptions that they mention are discussed below in our comments to 112, 123, 150, 201, 202, 203, 204, 205.

<sup>24</sup>Cf. now J. L. Benson, *Bamboula at Kourion: The Necropolis and the finds excavated by J. F. Daniel* (Philadelphia 1972), following his earlier article in *Berytus* 14 (1961) 37–51 on the Bronze Age pottery. Of the other such reports, Mitford refers (p. 1, n. 1) to D. H. Cox on the coins and J. L. Benson and O. Masson on the Cypro-Minoan inscriptions from Bamboula. On the theater, see the work of R. Stillwell, cited in n. 6 above. Mitford's bibliography (p. xv) lists the work of J. H. Young and S. H. Young on the terracotta figurines, but he nowhere refers to R. Scranton's publication of *The Architecture of the Sanctuary of Apollo Hylates at Kourion* (Trans.Amer.Philos.Soc. 57.5 [1967] 1–85). A general treatment of the site is available in the *Brief History and Description of Kourion* published by the Cypriot Department of Antiquities (1969). Stillwell (n. 6), pp. 37 and 69, offers some reservations about the conduct of the excavations, and Scranton (pp. 3, 44, 57, etc.) regrets their unfinished state.

<sup>25</sup>One finds traces of Megaw's activity in *IKourion*, as on pp. 364 and 369. See Megaw's report in *JHS* 77 (1957) 31 and the report of V. Karageorghis in *BCH* 84 (1960) 290–291.

excavation of a Roman villa, at some distance from the main part of the earlier Acropolis excavations, by the Department of Antiquities under M. C. Loulloupis.<sup>26</sup> An interesting product of the recent work is some fine polychrome inscribed mosaics, two of which have been published in 1968 (see below section 1.B.5); these are not registered by this corpus of 1971. Similarly many other inscriptions of Kourion published during the last ten years do not appear in this volume; they are discussed in the same section, below.

The same lack of curiosity about Kourion to which is due the summary or non-existent treatment of so many topics extends to the history of the city and to the cults of Kourion, in particular the celebrated cult of Apollo Hylates. A large number of the inscriptions in this volume pertain to the sanctuary of Apollo, but we are nowhere offered a discussion of the contribution that these inscriptions make, as a group, to our knowledge of the cult—a cult already the subject of a large bibliography which Mitford does not list or discuss.<sup>27</sup> Nor does he try to discuss the connections and differences between the cult of Apollo Hylates at Kourion and the same cult as it existed at other centres, notably Paphos and Dhrymou.<sup>28</sup>

#### B. THE EDITION OF TEXTS

We can now proceed to discuss in more detail the method followed in editing these texts and the characteristics of this corpus, examining what

<sup>26</sup>Reports have appeared on the recent Cypriot excavations in V. Karageorghis' annual *Chroniques* in *BCH* 92 (1968) 346–349; 93 (1969) 560–562; 94 (1970) 289–291; 95 (1971) 418–419; and 96 (1972) 1082–1083. The Service of Antiquities also completed clearing the stadium, which like the Christian basilica had been only partially excavated: cf. *BCH* 88 (1964) 369–371; 90 (1966) 386; a publication of the stadium was promised “sous peu” in 91 (1967) 358. Recent excavations of a basilica are discussed in *BCH* 96 (1972) 1082–1083.

<sup>27</sup>Curious remarks on the meaning of the cult title Hylates may be found on pp. 72–73 of Scranton's publication of the sanctuary architecture (n. 24, above); neither Scranton nor Mitford knows the remarks concerning this cult by O. Masson, “Cultes indigènes, cultes grecs et cultes orientaux à Chypre” in *Éléments orientaux dans la religion grecque ancienne* (Paris 1960) 135.

<sup>28</sup>In this respect as in others, the present work stands in sorry contrast to the catholic interests and full bibliography in Masson's near-corpus of syllabic inscriptions. On the other sanctuaries of Hylates, O. Masson gives an account and bibliography in some detail: the sanctuary at New Paphos is treated on pp. 96–99, where two syllabic inscriptions from it are published, and on p. 394, where Masson presents a reasoned rejection of conclusions reached by Mitford in studying one of these inscriptions in *BICS* 7 (1960) 1–10. K. Nicolaou describes this sanctuary in *New Paphos, an Archaeological Guide* (1967) 6. Masson also (pp. 264–265) considers the unexcavated sanctuary at Chytroi, from which two dedications to Apollo Hylates are known, and the one at Dhrymou (inland between Ktima and Polis), pp. 138 ff., with the inscriptions, pp. 140–144. Masson discusses the sanctuary at Kourion on pp. 190–191 with a brief history of excavations there and a bibliography.

constitutes a proper edition of an inscription and in what respects *IKourion* falls far short of what is not only desirable but necessary.

### 1. Layout

The photographs are conveniently placed together with the texts rather than at the end of the book, and the abundance of illustration is on the whole very helpful. The typographical layout, on the other hand, is a distinct detriment to clarity. The physical description of the stones is in large type and occupies an inordinate amount of space, while the lemmas are printed in small type so that they resemble footnotes and are hard to read; the type sizes chosen thus reverse what the relative importance of these elements demands.<sup>29</sup> The detailed notes on readings of individual letters, instead of being printed in small type after the text, are mixed into the commentary and printed in the same size. The placement of the footnotes at the end of the discussion of each inscription is regrettable and confusing; the bottom of the page would have been a much preferable location. Finally, it is unfortunate that the running heads are not more specific; an indication of the class of inscription being headed would have been useful.<sup>30</sup>

### 2. The Elements of the Edition

The titles of the inscriptions are no more coherent or accurate.<sup>31</sup> They are all too frequently not a simple description of the type of document, as they should be, but a wordy restatement of the commentary. A striking example from the Roman period is **116**, in which the title reads "A construction or reconstruction in the area of the theater, from monies sanctioned by a proconsul." The basis of this title is seven letters which are gratuitously restored:

[- - - ἐκ τῶν προσκε]κριμ[ένων]  
[ὕπδ - - - - ] ἀνθ[υπάτου]

<sup>29</sup>Exactly the opposite procedure was adopted by the Roberts in *La Carie 2* (cf. p. 14), as in their other works.

<sup>30</sup>The running heads indicate only the period: syllabic, Hellenistic, "Roman Imperial," and "early Byzantine." The designation "Roman Imperial Inscriptions" is a misnomer; these are inscriptions from the period of the Roman Empire, but only a few of them are concerned with "imperial" affairs. For the classification of the so-called Byzantine documents, see below on **201-205**, etc. It is also regrettable that for the documents of which the commentary occupies several pages, the number of the document studied is not given at the top of each page.

<sup>31</sup>The first syllabic text shows misunderstanding of the nature of titles: "Modern reproductions of two golden bracelets of Etevandros, King of Paphos." Mitford's text differs in no way from that of his predecessors who read the original bracelets (stolen in 1887); it is therefore unreasonable to imply that the modern reproductions are a document in themselves.



The title of **117** is another example of the same type.<sup>32</sup>

The titles end with the date, for which, more often than not, Mitford relies on letter forms, frequently assigned to a precise year; the dangers of this procedure will be clear from the detailed examination of several texts.<sup>33</sup> But Mitford is willing to reject his own palaeographical considerations on occasion if his interpretation seems to demand it; in **1**, his desire to place an inscribed bowl around 673 B.C. leads him to reject his conclusion that the letter forms favour a date more than a century later (p. 9). In **16**, the commentary gives the probable date as sixth century B.C., with seventh century a less likely alternative (p. 43). In the heading, however, the date is "seventh century B.C."

The next entry in the edition of each text is the place of finding and present location of the stone or other object. Even this section is not without occasional problems.<sup>34</sup> The find-spot of each fragment from the excavations of the University Museum is indicated by references to a grid superimposed upon a plan of the site.<sup>35</sup> But almost none of the inscriptions was found *in situ* where it had originally been erected (notable exceptions are **108**, the dedication of the two exedras in the name of Trajan, and of course the mosaic inscriptions **201–208**).

Circumstances of discovery and the physical state of the inscribed object form the next section of the edition of each text. Some of the information on the discovery, such as who saw the stone and where, might better be incorporated into a more critical and explanatory lemma (see below). The physical description is generally rather full, but there are

<sup>32</sup>"An Emperor erects a column in the Sanctuary of Apollo. Second century A.D. (?)." The surviving text: **AP** (the *alpha* of which should be dotted, as only a small part of it survives). Similarly: **36**, "A Lex Sacra?," of which 24 complete or damaged letters and only two complete words (*τό, τοῖς*) survive. We do not understand how the speculations in the commentary (p. 84) deserve to be enshrined in the title.

<sup>33</sup>On the difficulty of dating inscriptions uniquely according to the forms of their letters see L. Robert, *Hellenica* 2.16, with convincing examples.

<sup>34</sup>For **149**, the information given is "Limassol; Collection N. K. Lanitis." If one reads further, however, the description of the stone includes the following: "copied by S. Menardos [before 1910] in a shop in Limassol but subsequently in possession of N. K. Lanitis. Not seen by any other authority, this stone was said to have been found at Kourion." A correct entry, then, would have been "Location unknown; formerly in the collection of N. K. Lanitis, Limassol." Many texts, of which **52** is typical, are reported as being "at Episkopi, in the Sanctuary of Apollo." Properly speaking, the sanctuary is not at Episkopi any more than it is at Yerakarka or Mersinoudhia, two other neighbouring villages; the sanctuary is in fact over 3 km. distant from the village of Episkopi.

<sup>35</sup>Cf. however the note by G. R. Edwards on p. 403: these references "represent equations between numerous working grid systems employed by the excavators and the overall grid systems finally adopted for publication. The accuracy of these references is thus oftentimes [in precisely which cases?] to be regarded as shaded."

often indications that the information has not been assimilated and utilized.<sup>36</sup>

The letter forms drawn by Mitford in this section are not infrequently different from those clearly visible on the photographs (and are, indeed, quite unnecessary when the photographs are legible). In 64, for example, the reader may verify that Mitford's nu, omicron, second pi, and omega are significantly different from those in the photograph.<sup>37</sup> In 67, much the same thing is true: the drawn delta, theta and omicron are too small, while the rho leans in quite the opposite direction. Given this editor's penchant for exact dating by letter forms, such inaccuracy is bound to be damaging.

The lemmas, the next feature of each edition, are not constructed on "genetic" principles, which would enable the reader to distinguish between editions based on autopsy of the stone and those which depend on previously published texts. This may be accomplished easily—but is not here—and with clarity by the use of parentheses to enclose an edition or editions that depend upon the text which is cited immediately before them. Furthermore, discussions which treat only a particular aspect or passage of a document without reproducing the entire text should be registered in a separate part of the lemma, preceded by the notation "cf." and accompanied by an indication of the topic discussed; such indications are precious and indeed essential because they direct the reader interested in a particular point immediately to the works in which he will find that point discussed, rather than compelling him to search through the writings of every scholar who happens to have mentioned, extensively or in passing, the document in question.<sup>38</sup> Mitford's failure to follow such procedures is often damaging; for examples see our discussions of 84 and others below.

<sup>36</sup>About 4, a silver bowl with a syllabic inscription, Mitford says (p. 16) "Carefully incised in the outer zone are eleven signs from 0.001 to 0.002 m. in height, clear, neat, and seemingly complete, from the quality of their engraving and the position they occupy apparently contemporaneous with the decoration of the bowl." But on p. 18 he remarks, "We shall, however, find cause to question the suggestion that the inscription is (as Gjerstad argued) contemporaneous with the manufacture of the vessel." In n. 4, he pursues this line further: "Gjerstad argues that the inscription, not discussed by him as such, is contemporaneous with the manufacture of the bowl since it occupies a gap in a decorative panel which he believes was left for its reception. The gap to the left of the flying goose is, however, if not inevitable, at least natural, since the legs of the bird cannot be shown symmetrically." One wonders at the lack of connection between the various parts of the discussion.

<sup>37</sup>The nu in the photograph has a diagonal joining the right-hand vertical stroke just below the half-way point of the vertical. The omicron is not significantly smaller than the other letters. There is no pi with the right-hand vertical half the length of the left. The centre stroke of uncial omega comes up almost to the height of the side strokes.

<sup>38</sup>Cf. the remarks of J. and L. Robert cited below in discussing 84.

The volume is illustrated with numerous photographs; every inscription not now lost is shown, usually in a photograph of the stone. In cases where the stone is too damaged to yield a useful photograph, squeezes are sometimes shown. Squeezes are also used in some cases without any apparent reason, as in **100**, where five of the fragments are photographed from a squeeze and the sixth is photographed directly from the stone.

The photographs, although generally useful and well made, are not without their problems. A significant number of them are not clear enough to allow verification of readings; one would expect that in dealing with excavation material better photographs might have been taken. For example, the photograph of **41**, an important Ptolemaic statue base, is too small to be read and quite unclear; it is impossible to verify on it some of the very dubious readings. For **50** there is not only a photograph but also a drawing of the stone, "to show the arrangement of dowel holes;" the utility of this drawing is not apparent, since the dowel holes are well illustrated by the photograph itself (which seems to have been taken for that purpose); the inscription, on the other hand, is nearly illegible. Equally inadequate is the photograph of **92**, an honorific inscription of the Roman period, which is represented by a faint and folded squeeze. Not a single letter is visible on the photograph of **152**.

Another problem, in a book largely made up of small fragments, is the lack of scale in a large majority of the photographs. A prime example is **44**, a base supposedly made up of four fragments; of these (*c*), at the extreme right on page 97 (the photograph of it is upside down), appears to us not to belong to the inscription, but without a scale it is impossible to verify accurately letter sizes. The same problem recurs throughout the book: one cannot accurately judge the association or dissociation of fragments.

### 3. *Treatment of Texts*

It is the texts of the inscriptions that constitute the core of any epigraphical corpus; if they are good, they can do much to compensate for inadequacies in other areas. The Greek texts of this volume, however, are unreliable and hard to use. The editor disregards the generally accepted (with good reason) convention of placing iota subscript below eta and omega when iota is not written adscript, and he nowhere explains his omission.<sup>39</sup> In **14**, **15**, and **21**, the lack of iota subscript is detrimental to the usefulness of the text.<sup>40</sup> In **88**, only the Roman date tells us that we

<sup>39</sup>Cf. *La Carie* 2.12: "Il est nécessaire de souscrire l'*iota* dans la transcription, lorsque la pierre ne le porte pas, d'abord pour que le texte soit lisible comme un texte littéraire, et parce que, dans certains cas, ce détail fournit à lui seul une interprétation."

<sup>40</sup>The texts of **14** and **15** give τῷ θεῷ and that of **21** θεῷ Ἀγαλῖω. Previous editors have considered these words as datives, and the unwary reader, knowing that Mitford omits iota subscript, might conclude that he too considered these datives. But not so: "the case is not the dative, but the genitive."

are not dealing with genitives. There is no defense for this contribution to unclarity.<sup>41</sup>

Also the punctuation is not beyond reproach. Twice in decrees we are treated to periods in places where they interrupt the normal sentence structure: 34.18 and 32.4.<sup>42</sup> In another case, mispunctuation reveals a misunderstanding of the contents of the inscription.<sup>43</sup>

A more serious fault in this volume is the practice of printing as probable, and even certain, letters that cannot be verified on the photographs and in many cases appear not to exist at all. We cannot possibly list here all of the inscriptions in which invisible letters are read without justification or uncertain letters printed without dots. Compare the clear statement of correct method set forth by S. Dow, *Conventions in Editing* (Durham, N.C., 1969), 6:

A subscript dot should be placed under any letter of which a stroke or strokes are clear, but do not suffice to determine what the letter would be in isolation . . . The context in which a letter occurs should not be considered in determining whether or not the letter should be dotted.

An example of this practice from the Hellenistic period is 40, "Base of a statue of Kallikrates, son of Boiskos?" The text is in reality three small fragments.<sup>44</sup> Fragment *a* has two lines; the first contains a lambda followed by the lower left part of either alpha or lambda. Line two has alpha followed by pi or gamma. The second fragment contains the lower right part of one letter and the lower left of another, both either alpha, lambda, or in the case of the left hand one, kappa. Fragment *c* reads TH. From these is composed the text Κᾱλλ[ικρά]τη[ν ? | Βοῖσκου] ? | 'Απ[όλλωνι]. Fully half of the letters are only partly preserved (and pi is not dotted). On the basis of four letters, then, Mitford reads the remaining four and reconstructs the entire document. It is, of course, not impossible that this was the base of a statue of Kallikrates, but the remains in no way justify putting this interpretation into the text.

<sup>41</sup>In *Hellenica* 13.293, n. 1, L. Robert exposes a similar confusion and concludes: "Cela peut d'ailleurs montrer quelle équivoque on introduit gratuitement dans les transcriptions quand on refuse de se servir de l'*iota* souscrit." Cf. now also *Bull.épigr.* 1971, 535.

<sup>42</sup>In 34.18, there is a full stop at the end of the considerations (ἐπειδή) clause, just before δεδόχθαι, which is wrongly capitalized. In 32.4, the effect is even stranger, since the period comes after [οἱ ἄρχοντες εἶπ]αν and before the considerations, thus putting what the archons said in a different sentence from the fact that they said it. Cf. J. and L. Robert, *Bull.épigr.* 1949, 1: full stops are out of place in the interior of a decree because the infinitives all depend on δεδόχθαι, ἔδοξεν, or εἶπεν.

<sup>43</sup>In 111.

<sup>44</sup>One fragment, *b*, was excavated by the University Museum but subsequently lost. On p. 88, the drawing of this fragment is placed to the right of that of *a*, whereas according to the text it must join at the left.

It is unfortunate enough that this manufactured text figures in this volume for the use of the unwary. What is worse is that the inflated and unjustified historical conclusions drawn from it will no doubt find their way into standard works. Mitford alleges that this is a dedication to Apollo; that the honorand's name is in line 1; that this is Kallikrates the Ptolemaic admiral; that the dedicant was the city of Kourion; that this is the earliest statue-base surviving from that city. None of these conclusions has any basis in fact; all are figments of the imagination, based on a text without any real support.

The printing of unreal letters is thus closely linked to unjustified restorations. Mitford habitually refers to these restorations as being *exempli gratia*, but the proper meaning of the term is thus defined by L. Robert:<sup>45</sup>

On ne peut vraiment proposer un supplément *exempli gratia* que lorsqu'une analyse précise a dégagé avec sûreté le sens et la construction de la phrase disparue et qu'on laisse le choix seulement entre diverses tournures de même sens. Sinon, la restitution n'est pas *exempli gratia*, mais elle est incertaine et, souvent, arbitraire, n'excluant pas la possibilité de restitutions dont le sens et la construction seraient entièrement différents.

It is precisely the problem of arbitrary supplements of this sort that we encounter in this corpus. Mitford himself says of his syllabic texts, "Several, indeed, of my interpretations are frankly conjectural—as, for example, in nos. 6 and 19—and I shall be surprised if they win any acceptance. They are little more than *agents provocateurs*, designed to disrupt the complacency which for so long has discredited [?] syllabic studies" (p. 2). One is astonished at this spectacle of a scholar proposing interpretations in which he has himself no confidence. As for the end which these speculations are meant to attain, the response is given in these words of L. Robert:<sup>46</sup> "Un de nos anciens confrères, mort en 1848, Letronne, disait ce mot toujours actuel et que nous ne saurions trop répéter à nos élèves: 'Il ne s'agit pas de remuer la science, mais de la faire avancer'." The fundamentally erroneous approach by the editor to the interpretation and restoration of damaged texts vitiates much of the book. Part 2 of this article furnishes examples of the effects of such methods.

A deficiency added to such unfounded restorations is the virtual absence of a critical apparatus. Only rarely are previous readings cited, and then it is often to assault them. In many of the latter cases Mitford himself is at fault. This is true especially of the syllabic inscriptions.<sup>47</sup> In the

<sup>45</sup>*Hellenica* 3.12.

<sup>46</sup>*CRAI* (1955) 219 (*Op.Min.Sel.* 1.600). Robert cited Letronne at the end of an article demolishing another "revolutionary" and "disrupting" approach to epigraphy.

<sup>47</sup>In commenting on 2, Mitford says (p. 13), "editors hitherto have been easily contented with 'Ι(μ)περόπω τὰ γὰρ although this is both hard to justify and does violence in

Hellenistic honorary decree 34, first copied by Waddington, lack of an apparatus is also damaging. Comparison of this text with that of Waddington shows differences in sixteen of twenty-eight lines, on four of which Mitford comments. Many of these differences are not determinable on the photograph of the squeeze. We cannot provide here the complete apparatus omitted in *IKourion*, but a few of the more divergent readings may be recorded.<sup>48</sup> The effect of these omissions is that the reader has no idea in what way the study of the stone has been advanced—as in fact it has on some points. Mitford himself expresses (pp. 108, 157) his high opinion of Waddington's accuracy in copying texts, and one is in doubtful cases sometimes hesitant to accept Mitford's readings, especially when they are not verifiable on his photograph.

#### 4. *The Concordance*

The Concordance of Publications on pages 397–398 was compiled with regrettable negligence. Numerous omissions have been noted in the course of studying the book; here we may point out that none of the approximately twenty-five syllabic inscriptions of Kourion published by Mitford in *BICS* Suppl. 10 (1961) 17–30 is registered by the Concordance of this edition. All but the first and last of this group of texts were copied into *SEG* 20 (1964),<sup>49</sup> but this edition too is omitted from the present Concordance.<sup>50</sup> While it is obviously not possible for us to furnish here the complete and exact concordance which is indispensable to a

---

particular to signs 4 and 5." The reader who consults his n. 3, however, discovers that "previous editors" do not include O. Masson: "quoted by Masson, only to be rejected (p. 194)." Mitford goes on to say of Masson, "he himself is content to offer as alternative A. pe. ro. ? ? ?—but in his *addenda* on p. 398 and in *BCH loc. cit.* *Κυπροθάλευ(ς)* is accepted without reservation." In fact, Masson was far from content with his text: "L'ensemble demeure inexpliqué" (*Inscr. chyp. syll.*, p. 195). And in his *addenda*, Masson calls *Κυπροθάλευ(ς)* "très séduisante": not the same thing as acceptance without reservation. Given the lack of a critical apparatus, the reader is dependent on the commentary to do justice to previous editors on matters great and small; it does not do so. Cf. below, part 2 on 5, 18, and 19.

<sup>48</sup>Mitford's text differs from Waddington's notably in lines 5, 6, 8, 12, 16, 21, and 23. In some of these (5, 21, perhaps 23) Mitford appears from the photograph to be correct; in others one cannot judge. In line 8, Mitford prints the following text at the edge of the preserved portion: *του]ς*. Waddington read *ΟΤΣ*. Two letters that Mitford claims to have restored, therefore, were evidently visible when Waddington read the stone, whether or not they are now. In line 12, Waddington had a nu; Mitford prints an iota outside brackets; there is no discussion. Mitford fails to note in his text the *vacat* of two lines, between his lines 18 and 19, which separates the considerations from the formula of resolution, nor does he note that the end of line 18 does not reach the right margin but is separated from it by a *vacat* of ca 8 letters.

<sup>49</sup>Why these two inscriptions only were omitted from *SEG* is obscure.

<sup>50</sup>The Concordance has only a single reference to the *SEG*. Nor is Mitford's article in *AJA* 65 (1961) included in the Concordance.

proper corpus, it may be of use to provide a list of the documents of Kourion republished in that volume of *SEG* together with their numbers in the present work.<sup>51</sup> Without repeating the observations made in part 2, we note that a random check reveals that LeBas-Waddington 2820, registered in the Concordance as **119** in the present collection, is in fact **121**; there is no reference in the Concordance to L. Robert, *Collection Froehner* 1 (Paris 1936) 60 (the *editio princeps* of half of **139**); there is likewise no reference to R. Wuensch, *Defixionum Tabellae Atticae* (CIA 2.3), who re-edited with commentary and textual ameliorations notably **127**, **130**, and **132**; again the Concordance fails to register *SEG* 16 (1959) 790, an edition of **126** (mentioned in the lemma to that document), as well as *SEG* 23 (1968) 630, an edition of **218** (not mentioned in that lemma), etc. All of the inscriptions in mosaic are listed among the unpublished texts, although (we shall see) photographs and texts of **205**, for example, were already published in *UPMB*, *AJA*, and *BCH* (all of these publications are omitted from this Concordance). None of the editions of inscriptions of Kourion which appeared in R. Stillwell's final publication of the theater or R. Scranton's final publication of the Sanctuary of Apollo is registered in the Concordance, nor does the Concordance note a single one of the publications of inscriptions in the excavators' preliminary reports in *UPMB* (some, but by no means all, of these publications are mentioned in the lemmas of the individual texts).<sup>52</sup>

### 5. *Finds since 1961*

We have pointed out that although this book was published in 1971 it dates in fact from a decade earlier. During the ten years between the completion of this corpus and its publication a certain number of inscriptions have been found at Kourion, hardly any of which is included. One of these may be of importance for the cults of Kourion: found at the site of the Sanctuary of Demeter and Kore, it is a small jug with the syllabic inscription τῶ θεῶ (genitive).<sup>53</sup> V. Karageorghis has suggested this hypothesis: "Des inscriptions identiques sont déjà connues à Kourion, provenant du temple d'Apollon Hylatès [Mitford's **14** and **15**]; le petit

<sup>51</sup>*SEG* 20 (1964) 148 is *IKourion* **14**; 149: **14–15**; 150: **18**; 151: **19**; 152: **21**; 153: **22**; 154: **23**; 155: **24**; 156: **25**; 157: **85**; 158: **90**; 159: **6**; 160: **7**; 161: **8**; 162: **9**; 163: **10**; 164: **11**; 165: **12**; 166: **13**; 167: **5**; 168: **2**; 169: **3**; 170: **4**; 171: arbitrarily omitted from *IKourion*, cf. below.

<sup>52</sup>For example, the text of the late stele 112 with inscriptions of welcome, benediction, and farewell, said in the lemma and again in the Concordance to be "unpublished," was in fact given by Scranton (n. 24, above), 46; in the preliminary report by McFadden, *UPMB* 7.2 (1938) 11, the reading reported is entirely false (again in McFadden's translation on p. 12): ΤΕΜΕΝΟΣ ΑΠΟΛΛΩΝ(ΟΣ) "Sanctuary of Apollo," in place of Mitford's correct [Εἰλε]ως ὑμῶν [Ἀπ]όλλων.

<sup>53</sup>V. Karageorghis, *BCH* 89 (1965) 245 and fig. 21; *SEG* 23 (1968) 633.

sanctuaire qui a fourni la nouvelle inscription renfermait peut-être une chapelle consacrée à Apollon?" Another syllabic inscription found in the coastal plain to the southeast of Kourion was read by O. Masson as *ti-ma-ko-ra-se*, i.e. Τιμαγόρας;<sup>54</sup> the name is already attested at Kourion by two alphabetic inscriptions (both of the latter refer to the same person), Mitford's 62 and 63. Finally, there exists also a stele with a relief and a fragmentary inscription in the syllabic and Phoenician alphabets.<sup>55</sup>

From the Hellenistic period comes a metrical epitaph found during the restoration of the theater:<sup>56</sup> Τῖδς Ἀριστάρχου Πολέμων τριέτης λίπεν ἡμαρ.

Among the inscriptions of the Roman period are a number of small fragments, unfortunately published as in *I Kourion*. Note for instance a fragment of a plaque "found early in 1963 at Curium during levelling operations on the site of the touristic pavillion":<sup>57</sup>

Αὐτοκράτο[ρα Καίσαρα Δομιτιανὸν<sup>58</sup> Σεβαστόν,  
θεοῦ υἱόν, [Γερμανικόν, δημαρχικῆς ἐξουσίας τὸ]  
τέταρτον, [ἀρχιερέα μέγιστον, αὐτοκράτορα]  
τὸ ἑβδόμο[ν, ὕπατον τὸ δέκατον, πατέρα πατρίδος,  
ὁ δῆμος ν[ὸ ν. (?)<sup>59</sup> Κουριέων τὸν αὐτοῦ σωτῆρα καὶ] 4  
εὐε[ργέτην καὶ πάτρωνα.]

The editor comments: "Guided by the partly existing εὐε[ργέτην] we restore *exempli gratia*." In place of the restoration [σωτῆρα καὶ] | εὐε[ργέτην καὶ πάτρωνα], *SEG* (which has no comment at all) offers [πάτρωνα καὶ] | εὐε[ργέτην]; but already the longer restoration left the last line uncentred, and the restoration proposed in *SEG* leaves it even more unbalanced.<sup>60</sup>

<sup>54</sup>*BCH* 90 (1966) 339 and fig. 94; in *SEG* 25 (1971) 1098 this inscription is assigned the date "s. IV ante."

<sup>55</sup>V. Karageorghis, *BCH* 94 (1970) 226–231 and fig. 80.

<sup>56</sup>V. Karageorghis, *BCH* 88 (1964) 334 and fig. 67 (J. and L. Robert, *Bull. épigr.* 1965, 449); I. Nicolaou, *Rep. Dept. Ant. Cyprus* 1964, 203, no. 15 and Pl. xx, 15 (*SEG* 23 [1968] 632). The correct interpretation was provided by the Roberts (and by Nicolaou), rectifying an error of Karageorghis: "le fils d'Aristarchos, Polémon, a quitté le jour à l'âge de trois ans."

<sup>57</sup>I. Nicolaou, *Rep. Dept. Ant. Cyprus* 1964, 203–205, no. 16 and Pl. xx, 16; *SEG* 23 (1968) 631.

<sup>58</sup>In *SEG* the relative position of the second and third words in this line is reversed, without any explanation or indication that the text of the *editio princeps* is not being followed.

<sup>59</sup>In *SEG* the question mark is displaced to follow *Κουριέων*. Since this fragment was found at Kourion, there can obviously be no question as to the identity of the *δῆμος*; what happened is that the editors of *SEG* misunderstood Nicolaou's reason for inserting the question mark, which was presumably to express doubt (with reason) about her restoration of a blank space on either side of the article *ὁ*.

<sup>60</sup>The editors of *SEG* placed the beginning of line 6 in their text further to the right than did Nicolaou (whose placement of the letters is fully confirmed by the photograph),



Naturally other restorations may be suggested, but it is not useful to print such supplements unsupported by parallels, in a text of which so little is preserved.<sup>61</sup>

Another fragment “found on the Curium beach,” broken on all sides except the left and preserving two or three letters in each of the four lines, was restored (“*exempli gratia*”) as the dedication of a public building by the emperor Hadrian.<sup>62</sup> This arbitrary<sup>63</sup> and unjustifiable<sup>64</sup> restoration was copied in full by *SEG* 25 (1971) 1095, without the notation *exempli gratia* which is there reserved only for the buildings imagined by Nicolaou: [τὰς στοάς].<sup>65</sup> A third fragment “probably from Curium. Found unrecorded in the Episcopi Museum stores” preserves only the letters Μ. Αὐρ. Nicolaou hesitates between Severus Alexander and Marcus Aurelius but prefers the former.<sup>66</sup> If an emperor is indeed concerned, one wonders why Caracalla and Commodus are excluded from consideration. A scrap with

in order to make their shorter restoration (set forth without a question mark or any sign of doubt) appear more plausible.

<sup>61</sup>In fact there is no way of determining the length of the lines, which depends entirely upon the selection made among an emperor's names and titles. In *AJA* 65 (1961) 102–103, no. 6, Mitford published a defaced inscription of New Paphos restored as honoring Domitian with names and titles in different order and with the additional title [τιμητοῦ διηγεκοῦς]. In general more restraint should be exercised in the restoration of this sort of fragment.

<sup>62</sup>*Rep. Dept. Ant. Cyprus* 1965, 129, no. 20 and Pl. xvi, 20.

<sup>63</sup>The first letter in the last line, of which only the upper tip survives on the stone, is presented as an undotted alpha, though it could equally well be delta or lambda. In line 1 the editor has not seen that nu (of which “only the left upright and traces of the transversal stroke” are said to be visible) is in ligature with the following epsilon; in the same line rho, “almost certain,” should be dotted. According to *IKourion*, pp. 170 and 342, “ligature is hardly to be found in the epigraphy of Cyprus before Severan times”: if correct, this would invalidate the entire restoration. However in *Opus Arch* 6 (1950) 90 Mitford asserted a different view: citing an inscription of Cyprus, with ligature, dated to the first century of our era, he stated (p. 92) that the ligatures in another document “may point to the Hadrianic or early Antonine period.” In *IKourion* an observation concerning ligature constituted the editor's sole evidence for dating 193 to the “second century A.D.?” for he admits that “for the rest, this lettering has an early look, and might very well be late Julio-Claudian.”

<sup>64</sup>Line 2 has ten letters more than line 1 (which is entirely restored). It is curious practice to pay great attention to the shapes of individual letters and so little heed to the appearance of the entire inscription. Since the photograph of this fragment is quite legible, the reproduction of the letter forms in facsimile (fig. 12) is not useful: cf. J. and L. Robert, *Bull. épigr.* 1965, 443, on another article in this series and *Bull. épigr.* 1951, p. 209, on an article of Mitford with such facsimiles.

<sup>65</sup>It is not reasonable to present such a small fragment in an *editio princeps* with such arbitrary and extensive restorations; it is even more unfortunate that these restorations were transcribed into *SEG*. The absence of any commentary in the latter publication will lend to this text a semblance of authority, as though the restorations had been fully justified in the original edition.

<sup>66</sup>*Rep. Dept. Ant. Cyprus* 1970, 152, no. 7 and Pl. xxvii, 7.

a few letters in two lines, "found at Curium in a heap of stones from the excavations at the Curium basilica," preserves the Latin text —SIM—, "reservedly" restored *s Im[perator?]*.<sup>67</sup> Again one remarks the unfortunate effects of the epigraphical methods analysed above.<sup>68</sup> This Sebastomania extends even to the most minute scraps.<sup>69</sup> Thus in another fragment "found accidentally SE of the Curium basilica" this restoration is suggested:<sup>70</sup>

[τὸν δεῖνα τοῦ δέινος τὸ]ν γραμ-  
[ματέα τῆς πόλεως, τὸν πρεσβεύ]σαντα  
[τοῖς σεβαστοῖς (?) ἐκ τῶν ἰ]δίῳν

or as an alternative: [τὸν ἀγωνοθετή]σαντα [καλῶς ἐκ τῶν ἰ]δίῳν. These supplements are equally unjustifiable; for whereas the second would introduce into the epigraphy of Kourion mention of athletic institutions attested in this city by no other inscription, the first would make this secretary into an ambassador to emperors. In *SEG* 25 (1971) 1096 the second suggestion is tacitly suppressed and the preferred text is very inaccurately reproduced; no indication is given of these facts, and any reader would naturally believe the contrary, for the editors (among them T. B. Mitford) state: *Titulum hunc fere in modum redintegrandum esse censet editrix*: [- - τὸ]ν γραμ[ματέα τῆς πόλεως, πρεσβεύ]σαντα | [πρὸς τὸν (vel τοὺς) Σεβαστὸν (vel Σεβαστοὺς) ἐκ τῶν ἰ]δίῳν. In addition to the other changes, the question mark inserted in the first edition after the restoration of the emperors has here been omitted. Despite these confident ameliorations in *SEG*, there is no reason why a *γραμματεὺς* at Kourion should have been chosen to assume an embassy to the emperor(s), and in fact there is no reason to think that this inscription mentioning a *γραμματεὺς* concerned emperors at all. Those who are not determined to see emperors in every fragment may agree that it is sufficient to restore:<sup>71</sup>

<sup>67</sup>*Rep. Dept. Ant. Cyprus* 1966, 64, no. 13 and Pl. XIII, 13.

<sup>68</sup>Cf. the remarks of W. Kendrick Pritchett, *Ancient Athenian Calendars on Stone* (Univ. Calif. Publ. Class. Arch. 4.4 [1963]) 381: "This whole philosophy which says that a restoration is nothing more than 'epigraphically possible,' *exempli gratia* so to speak, has led us up the wrong alley. If we are going to put any restored text on the same line with preserved letters, it should be because we have become convinced that this is the only possible text and was originally so inscribed."

<sup>69</sup>Publishing (*Rep. Dept. Ant. Cyprus* 1969, 91, no. 20 and Pl. XVI, 20) a fragment "said to be found long ago in the theatre of Curium" on which she read [ἀ]ρίστ[ωι or ον], Nicolaou commented: "we are probably here concerned with an honorific inscription to an emperor." *Op. cit.* 92, no. 21 (Pl. XVI, 21) is a fragment with two certain letters, not worth publishing. Both of these scraps are reprinted in *SEG* 25 (1971) 1100.

<sup>70</sup>*Rep. Dept. Ant. Cyprus* 1967, 82-83, no. 7 and Pl. XVII, 4.

<sup>71</sup>In the first edition it was stated that "this document is reservedly dated to the 3rd cent. A.D. only by the strength of its lettering"; but in *SEG* the date assigned is "s. II/III

[ - - τὸ]ν γραμ-  
 [ματεύ]σαντα  
 [ἐκ τῶν ἐ]δίων

We have traced the inadequacy of this corpus in manifold aspects both of edition of texts and of understanding the life and institutions of ancient Kourion; errors of reading, restoration and interpretation have been corrected, and more will be discussed in part 2. Other reviewers will certainly find other points on which to comment. The traits of scholarship that underlie the book's deficiencies are clear: the failure to understand an editor's responsibility for accurate and unbiased presentation of the evidence; an insufficient knowledge of the work of other scholars and a persistent tendency to cite it erroneously; frequent absence of logic in the formulation of hypotheses without foundation. One further salient characteristic must be noted: Mitford shows no interest and little knowledge of evidence from outside Cyprus.<sup>72</sup>

(*To be continued*)

FLORIDA STATE UNIVERSITY, TALLAHASSEE  
 CENTER FOR HELLENIC STUDIES, WASHINGTON

---

*post.*" No grounds are given for this modification of the editor's opinion, nor can the reader of *SEG* know that there has been such a modification; the same is true, as we have seen, of the two suggested restorations.

<sup>72</sup>On the danger of such parochialism cf. L. Robert, *Actes II. congr.* 3 (*Op.Min.Sel.* 3. 1750): "Il est fréquent, il est naturel que tel épigraphiste, pour étudier à fond les inscriptions de tel pays, y consacre une grande partie de ses forces. Il est toujours dangereux d'y consacrer *toutes* ses forces et d'en faire comme un château-fort que des fossés profonds séparent du reste de l'épigraphie . . . il est indispensable, non point de publier sur d'autres domaines, mais en tout cas de s'y intéresser, de se tenir au courant, de lire beaucoup, d'avoir une curiosité insatiable; c'est ainsi que l'on peut éviter, dans la spécialité même, les faux-pas les plus pénibles."

Other reviews of *IKourion* are to be found in *CW* 65 (1972) 169; *AJA* 76 (1972) 332; and *AHR* 77 (1972) 491-492.