


Tekmeria

Vol 15 (2020)

(2019-2020)



Thessalonicensia. Notes on IG X 2.1s (2)

Elena Martín González, Klaus Hallof

doi: [10.12681/tekmeria.27556](https://doi.org/10.12681/tekmeria.27556)

Copyright © 2021, Elena Martín Gonzales, Klaus Hallof



This work is licensed under a [Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-ShareAlike 4.0](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-sa/4.0/).

To cite this article:

Martín González, E., & Hallof, K. (2020). Thessalonicensia. Notes on IG X 2.1s (2). *Tekmeria*, 15, 227–248. <https://doi.org/10.12681/tekmeria.27556>

ELENA MARTÍN GONZÁLEZ – KLAUS HALLOF

Thessalonicensia.
Notes on IG X 2.1s (2)

Almost fifty years after the publication of *Inscriptiones Graecae* X 2.1 by Charles Edson the long-awaited project of producing a supplement to the inscriptions from Thessaloniki has finally come to fruition. It is a two-volume publication: the first part, edited by Pantelis M. Nigdelis and published in 2017, comprises the new material from the city and its *territorium*;¹ the second part, edited by the late Despoina Diamantourou-Papakonstantinou, Elena Martín González and Klaus Hallof, which has just been released, constitutes a supplement to the 1023 inscriptions² published by Edson in 1972, with a complete revision of the texts and commentaries, bibliographical update, exhaustive indices of both *supplementa*, and images of all the inscriptions.

The IG volume edited by Edson was warmly welcomed by the academic community, but it also received a remarkably high number of reviews which highlighted its weaknesses.³ Edson's magnificent contribution to the history of Macedonian epigraphy, however, cannot be stressed enough, especially if we take into consideration the hard conditions in which he was compelled to collect and study the epigraphic material. The publication of his correspondence allows for a rare and precious insight into the long process of elaboration of the Thessaloniki corpus.⁴ It is impossible not to be moved by Edson's

1. IG X 2.1s (1). The catalogue of 631 new inscriptions (IG X 2.1s (1) 1042-1673, following Edson's numbering) includes the material discovered after 1960, but also older inscriptions missing in Edson's corpus (1045, 1050, 1051, 1056, 1085, 1088, 1122, 1165, 1169, 1172, 1182, 1302, 1329, 1417, 1419, 1430, 1479, 1488, 1493, 1497, 1499, 1501, 1511, 1519, 1525, 1532, 1582, 1589, 1594, 1595, 1618, 1655, 1657, 1670).

2. As Habicht accurately notices (1974, 485), lemmata 386, 518, 573, 764 are double (bis), while 857/858 are grouped under a single lemma.

3. Bingen 1973; Daux 1973; Peek 1973a, 1973b; Speidel 1973; Vickers 1973; Bradeen 1974; Edson, Daux 1974, 526-552; Habicht 1974; Robert 1974; Vickers 1974; Cormack 1975; Daux 1975; Mihailov 1975; Daux 1976. Cf. *BullEpigr* 1976, 358-455 and *SEG* 26, 733-770.

4. Nigdelis 2015a.

vivid account of the difficulties of his solitary fieldwork in a *terra incognita*, as Macedonia was, back in the early twentieth century, including the challenging collaboration with Greek archaeologists. His letters also reflect the short- and long- term effects that the consecutive wars had on the academic community; they offer an important testimony to the financial and bureaucratic burdens that he had to face from the time that –as an optimistic young scholar in his early thirties in 1936– he buoyantly signed a collaboration agreement with the Preussische Akademie der Wissenschaften to publish the entire epigraphic material of Macedonia, until the final completion of the Thessaloniki corpus more than thirty years later, near the end of his career and exhausted by the complexity of the task.

Edson's project was also affected by the political events of his time in an unusual dimension. Right after the agreement was signed, the then academic director of *Inscriptiones Graecae*, Ulrich Wilcken, was instructed by the Nazi Minister of Science Bernhard Rust to assign the elaboration of future *IG* volumes preferentially to “imperial citizens”. As an exception Edson was allowed to participate only under the condition that he would receive no money from the Akademie.⁵ Also, the conditions under which the Thessaloniki volume was concluded were similarly not optimal. Just before the publication, in 1972, the mentor of the volume, Günther Klaffenbach, died. Edson himself failed to keep the obligation of the 1936 contract to send all his squeezes and photographs to the Akademie, for the archive of *IG*, along with his manuscript.⁶ It was only in 1975-1976 that parcels with his material arrived separately to East Berlin, but by no means all of it. Thus, the indication *ect. phot.* (*ectypum, photographia*) in the corpus does not mean that squeezes and photographs of the specific inscription are preserved in the Berlin archive. Some inaccuracies and false readings would surely have been corrected by Klaffenbach during the printing process, which lasted six years (from 1965 to 1971), had he received the copies on time.

Already in 2000, a joint research project of *Inscriptiones Graecae*, the former KERA (now Section of Greek and Roman Antiquity of the Institute of Historical Research, NHRF) and the University of Thessaloniki, set as a goal the

5. See Nigdelis 2015a, 16-17 no. 6, with the answer from the Akademie in 18-21 no. 7, where emphasis is placed, though, in Edson's academic skills as the main reason for his election, and not on financial grounds.

6. In particular, section b of the agreement, see Nigdelis 2015a, 11.

elaboration of a supplement to IG X 2.1, in order to solve the shortcomings of the original edition and give it a second life.⁷ As already mentioned, the supplement was designed to contain two parts: the first, edited by P. M. Nigdelis, containing the new inscriptions from Thessaloniki and its territory, and the second, edited by D. Papakonstantinou-Diamantourou, on the inscriptions published by Edson. Despite her best efforts, though, the delay in the publication of the first volume, mainly due to the continuous discovery of new material during the construction of the city subway, deprived D. Papakonstantinou-Diamantourou from reaping the fruits of her lifelong research. After her passing in 2014, the authors of the present paper undertook the compelling task of editing her 2006 manuscript. The need of including both the rich information on the new material of the city contained in the first volume, as well as the increasing bibliographical production on Thessalonican epigraphy of the last decades, along with the necessary examination of the inscriptions for the elaboration of the tables and the indices, made soon evident that revision and update of all the material *de novo* was urgently needed in order to complete the second volume, which has been finally published in 2021.

The new supplement, abbreviated as IG X 2.1s (2), was not conceived as a new edition of the Thessaloniki corpus but rather as a tool to correct, complete and update the original corpus edited by Edson, without superseding it. First and foremost, it enhances the 1972 edition by offering not only full illustrations of the inscriptions (77 tables replete with photographs, photographs of squeezes and drawings) but also a complete catalogue of concordances and exhaustive indices of both the old and new inscriptions from Thessaloniki, including an *Index Grammaticus* by Jaime Curbera. The description of the monuments and the reading of the inscriptions have been checked anew on photographs and squeezes, but the text has been re-edited only in cases of substantial corrections and new readings. Likewise, full description of the monument is provided only in cases where Edson did not carry out autopsy of the stones. Otherwise, the reader is to consult IG X 2.1s (2) along with Edson's edition.

Therefore, the entries of the supplement consist of *addenda* and *corrigenda* to the corresponding lemmata in Edson's edition. Preserving the disposition of the original edition, information regarding the monument's current location appears –where applicable– at the beginning of each entry. The lemmata

7. The plan and evolution of the project was described in detail by Papakonstantinou-Diamantourou, Nigdelis 2008 and Papakonstantinou-Diamantourou 2011.

continue with any available new data on the origin, discovery and fortune of the monument –as we shall see below in further detail– and revised description of its present state of preservation, including a more accurate description of the physical features of the stones, if pertinent. Next, a bibliographical update is provided, with the new editions and the publications that refer extensively to the text or the content of the inscription; older bibliography is also included, if missing in Edson’s edition. Following the bibliography and the reference to the corresponding table of illustrations are the critical apparatus, which includes new readings and corrections, and a succinct commentary on specific or general issues concerning the inscription.

Maybe the most problematic issue of the epigraphic material from Thessaloniki, and the one that tantalized Edson the most, was “the perfectly fantastic problem of provenience”, as he describes it in his report on the status of the corpus, sent to Klaffenbach in 1957, since less than ten per cent of the epigraphic material of the city available at that time was found *in situ*.⁸ For that reason, special effort has been devoted in the supplement to track down any piece of information about the circumstances in which the inscriptions were discovered, and their ulterior fate.⁹ As it turns out, Edson’s fears were justified,

8. Nigdelis 2015a, 190-191. Cf. also Edson’s detailed account (Edson, Daux 1974, 521-526).

9. The fourth volume of the catalogue of sculpture of the Archaeological Museum of Thessaloniki (*KTMΘ IV*), released as *IG X 2.1s (2)* was already in press, contains new information regarding the provenance of some of the inscriptions published by Edson, which we summarize here for the sake of completeness. *IG X 2.1 769 (KTMΘ IV 1044)* was transported to Thessaloniki from Pieria, as evidenced by a letter from the chief of the police department of Katerini to the Ephorate of Thessaloniki. For inscriptions *IG X 2.1 310, 312, 423, 739, 815 and 878* the corresponding lemmata in the inventory of the museum, reproduced in *KTMΘ IV* (see 1184, 1080, 1041, 982, 1151 and 1072, respectively), provide further information on the specific circumstances of their discovery within the city of Thessaloniki. In two lemmata (*IG X 2.1 377 and 399*), Edson offers details on their provenance missing in the museum’s inventory (*KTMΘ IV 1087 and 1057*); in the case of the former, however, they are probably incorrect, as stated in *KTMΘ IV*. The Thessalonican origin of *IG X 2.1 689 and 926 (KTMΘ IV 1074 and 1135 respectively)* is not questioned in *KTMΘ IV*, where, on the contrary, the validity of the information in the museum’s inventory regarding the discovery of *IG X 2.1 740 (KTMΘ IV 994)* is denied.

for some inscriptions included in the corpus do not actually belong to Thessaloniki. The most representative case is probably that of the inscriptions 44, 52, 273, 711, 716, 719, 732 and 972, which were conveniently marked with an asterisk, according to Edson's editing policy. He studied the stones in 1937 in the Archaeological Museum of Thessaloniki, but he lacked any information regarding their provenance. As is known now, all these inscriptions belong to the Rhaidestos collection, a collection of antiquities from Eastern Thrace that was transported to the museum in 1922 by refugees of the Asia Minor catastrophe.¹⁰ Following Edson's own hypothesis, inscriptions 676 and 908 have been included –if hesitantly– among the material from Pella by the editors of *I.Kato Maked. II*,¹¹ who were in position to confirm the non-Thessalonican origin of three more inscriptions of the corpus: 698 was discovered in Naoussa (ancient Mieza), as two documents of the then 11th General Directorate of Antiquities in Thessaloniki prove, while 1016-1017 must be attributed to the *territorium* of Allante, since they were found by A. Struck in Parthenio (then Tsouchalar), and not in Diabata (then Doudoular), as Edson claims.¹²

The question of provenance of some monuments that came to light after the destruction of the Jewish cemetery of Thessaloniki during the Second World War is more complicated.¹³ As Robert had already pointed out,¹⁴ it is certain that some inscriptions were brought from Thasos and Philippi to be used as building material, so they were excluded from the Thessaloniki corpus by Edson.¹⁵ However, inscriptions 631 (preserved in the Archaeological

NB: IG X 2.1 711 appears inadvertently in *KTMΘ IV* 1028 as unpublished and of unknown provenance.

10. For the history of the Rhaidestos collection, see Adam-Veleni, Tsagaraki, Chatzini Nikolaou 2016, especially the chapter by Sverkos, Adam-Veleni, Tzanavari, 134-153, on the monuments of the collection preserved in the Archaeological Museum of Thessaloniki.

11. *I.Kato Maked. II* 500, 543.

12. *I.Kato Maked. II* 103, 583-584.

13. For this infamous chapter of the history of Thessaloniki, see Nigdelis 2015a, 393-399.

14. *BE* 1948, 102.

15. In three cases, however, Nigdelis convincingly argues that the attribution to Philippi is unjustified (*IG X 2.1s (1)* 1417, 1419, 1430). For the inscriptions of Philippi found in Thessaloniki, see now *I.Philippes II.1* pp. 375-378.

Museum of Thessaloniki) and 924 (now lost), which finally entered the corpus without information about their finding spot, most probably belong to the same category. Both were reported to have been seen “alicubi in urbe” before 1902 by the Thessalonian philologist Petros N. Papageorgiou and were later included by Photios Petsas in his study of the Latin inscriptions of Thessaloniki, where he assumed that they were part of the group of Latin inscriptions found in the Jewish cemetery,¹⁶ as Edson himself suspected for 924.¹⁷ New evidence supports this claim. First, as Nigdelis aptly remarks, Papageorgiou’s description of the findspot of the inscriptions was intentionally vague in the case of the Jewish cemetery, probably in order to avoid any conflict with the Jewish community.¹⁸ In addition, the rediscovery of inscription 631 has revealed that a Hebrew inscription was later added on the backside of the sarcophagus’ plaque, so its origin from the Jewish cemetery must be considered certain.

Concurrently, new information on the inscriptions’ discovery circumstances has confirmed that the asterisk is not necessary in several lemmata.¹⁹ Leaving aside those cases in which the onomastic or linguistic features of the text advocate, more or less conclusively, for a Thessalonian origin of the inscription,²⁰ we have now at our disposal precise details about the findspot of several inscriptions of the corpus, extracted by a wide range of sources,

16. See Petsas 1950-1951, 52-53, 61-62, 73-74 no. 17, not mentioned by Edson.

17. See now *I.Philippes* II.1 105 and 125.

18. Nigdelis 2011, 178.

19. On the contrary, the asterisk seems to be missing only in three inscriptions, whose Thessalonian origin cannot be ascertained (368, 1000, 1020).

20. To mention but a telling case, Robert’s observation (1974, 224 [OMS V 311]) that the recurring greeting formula in funerary inscriptions (χαῖρε καὶ σὺ, τίς ποτε εἶ, and its multiple variations) is a distinctive feature of the epigraphy of the city and a safe indicator of provenance, has been now reinforced by the numerous parallels in the new material (*IG X 2.1s* (1) 1051, 1088, 1108, 1128, 1130, 1136, 1176, 1183, 1354, 1358, 1359, 1658). The same formula has been convincingly restored by Kalaitzi (2016, 93-94, 227 no. 129) in a fragmentary inscription in a funerary stele of unknown provenance preserved in the Louvre Museum, which gives further support to the hypothesis that the stele originates from Thessaloniki, as also seems to suggest the Hebrew inscription dating to the 1676, carved on the back (Hamiaux 1998, 127-128 no. 134). On the Jewish cemetery of Thessaloniki, see 231 n. 13.

mainly the new material published in the first part of the supplement, the archive of the Museum of Thessaloniki and the Ephorate, and early publications, such as the diverse articles of the aforementioned Papageorgiou on the antiquities of the city, which were hardly accessible at Edson's times.²¹ An unexpected source of information, though, was provided by a group of squeezes and copies of inscriptions sent to the Berlin-Brandenburg Academy of Sciences and Humanities by Noè Morton, an Italian engineer and antiquarian who participated in the construction of the railway in the 70's of the nineteenth century.²² In the dossier preserved in the *Inscriptiones Graecae* archive²³ there are drawings of IG X 2.1 292, 454, 456 and 462, accompanied by short notes where Morton wrote down that he saw all these inscriptions in Porta Calamaria or Cassandreotica, the gate in the Eastern side of the city, at the end of the present Egnatia Odos, during the excavations of 1873-1874.²⁴ Although his transcription of the texts and the drawing of the monuments are not always precise (see **figs. 1-2**), his dossier constitutes a precious source of information. His note attached to the corresponding squeeze verifies, for instance, that inscription 911 does not actually come from Thessaloniki, but from Titov Velez.

Overall, the complete revision of the original edition, through photographs and squeezes, along with the relevant information now at our disposal and the bibliographical update, results in an amended edition of the complete corpus. In what follows we will present a selection of some of the most noteworthy new readings and interpretations included in the new supplement.

21. His most relevant publications for the study of the inscriptions of the city have been conveniently compiled and edited by Nigdelis 2015b, who had previously published his correspondence (Nigdelis 2004). For the new information regarding individual inscriptions, see Nigdelis 2002, 2011.

22. Premerstein, Vulič 1903, 1-2.

23. There are also squeezes of IG X 2.1 292, 453, 454, 456, 460, 461, 464, 515, 911. Moreover, his dossier includes drawings of inscriptions from Stobi (*I.Stobi* 36 and 78) and Titov Velez (Dimitsas, *Makedonia* 308).

24. The magnitude of the works in the port and Eastern walls of the city and the fatal consequences they had for the abundant monuments there unearthed are further described by L. M. O. Duchesne and M. Bayet (see Nigdelis 2015a, 338-340 no. 12).

IG X 2.1 4

In the honorific decree of 95 BC, in which the *neoi* honor the gymnasiarch Παράμονος Ἀντιγόνου, it is stated that the honorand did not only fulfill his duty of providing oil for the anointment, ἀλλὰ τ[ὸν] | χρόνον τῆς ἀρχῆς (ca. 15 letters) τιθεῖς τὸ ἄλε[ιμμα δι]ατε<τέ>λεκεν (ll. 14-16). In his edition, Edson limited himself to reproducing the traces of the missing letters in l. 15 and to include Klaffenbach's restoration ἀ[προφ]ασί[στω]ς π[ᾶ]σι in the apparatus criticus, while Peek,²⁵ reading from the photograph published in tabula II of the volume, proposed the highly incomprehensible restoration ἀρ<ί>στης <έ>λαίας. The revision of Edson's squeezes has revealed the correct reading: δις τῆς ἡμέρας. [K. Hallof]

IG X 2.1 131 (fig. 3)

Edson, who edited the inscription for the first time in the corpus, restored the dating formula after the priest and *agonothetes* of Augustus in l. 2 (as in IG X 2.1 132), after Nero's reign in l. 3 (as in IG X 2.1 130), and left unrestored the missing text in ll. 4-9, despite the remarkable repetition of the term *ύίωνοῦ* therein.

Edson edited the text as follows:

[[-----]] K
 [ἐπι ἱερέως καὶ ἀγωνοθέτου Αὐτοκράτορος Καίσαρος θεοῦ υἱ]οῦ θεοῦ [Σ]εβα[στοῦ]
 [-----, Νέρωνος δὲ Κλαυδίου Καίσαρος θεοῦ Κλα]υδίου υἱοῦ Γερμανικ[οῦ],
 [----- Καί]σαρο[ς] υἱωνοῦ Τιβε[ρίου]
 [----- Καί]σαρος [Σε]βαστοῦ υἱων[οῦ]
 -----ΙΩ[.] υἱωνοῦ -----
 -----ΑΙ / ----- ἱερέω[ς] -----
 -----ΤΟ . [--- Αὐ]τοκρα[τ]-----
 [-----] εἰ]τους · ε-
intervallum 0,04
 -----ΑΗ-----
 -----ΙΕΡΗ-----
 -----C I-----

Based on Greek and Latin parallels, Matthäus Heil proposed the recognition of Nero's filiation.

25. Peek 1973a, 199.

Accordingly, the traces of letters described by Edson reconcile with the complete titlature of the emperor in the genitive case:

[. .][Νέρωνος] Κλ[αυ]-
 [δί]ου, θεοῦ [Σ]εβα[στοῦ]
 [Κλα]υδίου υἱοῦ, Γερμανικ[οῦ]
 [Καί]σαρο[ς] υἱωνοῦ, Τιβε[ρίου]
 5 [Καί]σαρος [Σε]βαστοῦ υἱων[οῦ]
 [υἱοῦ, θεοῦ Σεβαστοῦ] υἱων[οῦ] υἱωνοῦ,
 [Καί]σαρος Σεβ[ασ]τοῦ Γερμανικοῦ, ἀρ]χιερέως
 [μεγίστου, δημαρχικῆς ἐ]ξουσί[ας τὸ ., αὐ]τοκράτ[τορος τὸ .],
 [-----] ἔ]τους · θ[-----]
intervallum 0,04
 10 -----AH-----
 -----IEPH-----
 -----CI-----

Remarkably, Nero’s filiation follows the Latin model,²⁶ which is also attest-
 ed in Macedonia,²⁷ and generations are rendered in Greek as follows:

f(ilius)	υἱός
n(epos)	υἱωνός
pron(epos)	υἱωνοῦ υἱός
abn(epos)	υἱωνοῦ υἱωνός

This terminology is highly unique and does not correspond to the subse-
 quent obligatory terminology for adoptive emperors υἱός - υἱωνός - ἔκγονος -
 ἀπόγονος (e.g. IG VII 77). I could not find any parallel for the use of υἱωνοῦ υἱός
 and υἱωνοῦ υἱωνός as “great-grandson” and “great-great-grandson” respec-
 tively,²⁸ nor any similar inventive attempt to translate the terms *pronepos* and
abnepos.

26. E.g. CIL III 346 (INikaia 13): *Nero Claudius divi Claudi filius Germanici Caesaris nepos Ti. Caesaris Aug. pronepos divi Aug. abnepos Caesar Augustus Germanicus*.

27. *ILJug II 425* (AE 2013, 1384) from Isar – Marvinci.

28. υἱωνός alone is attested in the Nero’s title in IG V 1 1450 (Messene, 55 AD): Νέρω-
 να Κλαύδιον, θεοῦ Κλαυδίου υἱόν, Τιθερίου Καίσαρος Σεβαστοῦ καὶ Γερμανικοῦ Καίσαρος
 ἔγγονον, θεοῦ Σεβαστοῦ υἱωνόν, Καίσαρα Σεβαστὸν Γερμανικόν.

At the end of the prescript, the exact date is partially preserved: εἴτους · θ[– –].²⁹ Following the model of IG X 2.1, 131, ll. 1-5 (61/2 AD), where there is a triple dating (year 93 of the Actian era, year 7 of Nero's reign, and year 209 of the provincial era),³⁰ there are three possibilities for our inscription:

- Nero's reign year: year 2 (θ') = 55/6, or year 12 (θ[ι']) = 65/6;
- Provincial era: year 202 (θ[σ']) = 54/5, or year 212 (θ[ισ']) = 64/5;
- Actian era: year 92 (θ[ρ']) = 60/1.

In the case of the earliest possible dating, that of the year 54/5 (εἴτους θ[σ']), l. 8 should be restored without indication of iteration, i.e. δημαρχικῆς ἐξουσι[ίας, αὐ]τοκρά[τορος].

The text continues on the stone after a blank space of 4 centimeters but only a few letters survive. In l. 10, θου]λῆ (read by Edson as AH) can be restored, which evokes the introductory formula of a letter (e.g. ἄρχουσι, θου]λῆ, [δήμω χαιρεῖν]) and at the beginning of the same line there is, indeed, enough space to restore some of Nero's names (Νέρων Κλαύδιος Καῖσαρ Σεβαστὸς Γερμανικός). If this is the case, though, it remains unsolved to which element of the text the genitive relates.

At the beginning of the inscription, before the *rasura* with the name of the Caesar, there is no space for more than two letters. Thus, [εἴτους [Νέρωνος] is too long, as are [παρὰ and [ὑπὸ. Most probably some kind of headline is to be restored, like in Syll.³ 810 (Rhodes, 55 AD), ἐπιστολὰ ἀποσταλείσα ὑπὸ Νέρωνος | Κλαυδίου Καίσαρος Πεταγειτνίου κζ'. But even if one accepts a restoration such as [ἐκ [Νέρωνος] κτλ. ... αὐ]τοκρά[τορος τὸ .] | [ἐπιστολῆς, ἀποσταλείσης ... (date) ... εἴτους · θ[– –] in ll. 1-9, the detailed titulature would be expected to appear at the beginning of the letter and not in the preamble with the reference to the sender of the letter. [K. Hallof]

IG X 2.1 261

The reading of this important yet fragmentary inscription has been notably

29. Edson read: εἴτους · ε[– –]. The number could have been E, were it not for the fact that the other *epsilon* of the text present always an angular vertical hasta, so it might probably be a B whose rounded edges are broken away.

30. [εἴτους ·]γρ' · Σεβαστοῦ, | [Νέρωνος] δὲ Κλαυδίου | [Καίσαρος] Σεβαστοῦ Γερμα[νικοῦ · ἐβδόμου ·] τοῦ καὶ · θσ'.

improved by P. M. Nigdelis.³¹ There is a point, though, for which Edson's squeeze provides a new interesting reading: in l. 6, on the name of the association whose finances are dealt with in the text. There, where Edson read only isolated letters, Nigdelis recognizes the term Ἐριφιαστῶν and connects the name of the association with the epiclesis of Dionysos Ἐρίφιος attested in Hesychius. However, τῶν κρυφιαστῶν (with ligature N-K) can be clearly read on the stone. The term κρυφιαστῆς describes an interpreter of hidden things (κρυφαῖα), but the interpretation as 'interpreter of dreams' can be deduced from the only context in which it is attested, in Aquilas' Greek translation of *Genesis* 41, 8 and 24, where it refers to the wise Egyptian *magi* who were called to interpret the Pharaoh's dream. In the other Greek translations, the same term appears as ἐξηγηταί i.e. μάγοι.³² Thus, the *somniorum interpretes* had an association in Thessaloniki, hitherto unknown. Interestingly, a certain Matris prides himself in his funerary epigram (IG X 2.1s (1) 1117, second-third century AD) on being δνειροφόντης καὶ καλῶν ἐπίσκοπος ἄστρων, "dream interpreter and observer of lucky stars". [K. Hallof]

IG X 2.1 264

The short epigraphic lemma in Edson's corpus does not reflect the relevance acquired by the monument where the inscription was built, the stoa of the Idols or Incantadas (Μαγεμένεες or the Enchanted Ones), which constitutes now one of the landmarks of the city.³³ The recent discussion on the architectural features, location and date³⁴ was prompted by the discovery of a new fragment of the monument (the upper part of a pillar preserving part of the head and wing of a Nike) during excavation work in the center of Thessaloniki in 1997.³⁵ In addition, the exhaustive study of the remaining fragments, preserved in the Louvre Museum since its removal from Thessaloniki by Emmanuel Miller in 1864, has contributed greatly to the expansion of our knowledge regarding

31. Nigdelis 2010, 39 no. 14 (SEG 60, 662).

32. Field 1875, 58, 59.

33. For the modern history of the monument, including the folk tale of Alexander the Great's lover and her companions turning into stone, from which its Sephardic name stems, see Salomon, Galiniki 2018.

34. See Sève, Weber 2013, with previous bibliography.

35. Lioutas, Mandaki 1997, 374-376, fig. 3.

the original colonnade.³⁶ For the building inscription especially relevant is the publication of a hitherto unknown drawing of the monument by Louis-Sébastien Fauvel (**fig. 4**),³⁷ which provides a further copy of the text and confirms Edson’s edition, based on Nicholas Revett’s drawing, the only available copy of the inscription at his time.³⁸ [E. Martín González]

IG X 2.1 269 (fig. 5)

Edson’s edition of the remains of the monumental letters in the first line of the 22 cm high and 2.5 m long epistyle needs to be corrected. L. 2 informs us that a τετράστυλλον has been erected at “her” expense (ἐκ τῶν ἐκεῖνης), according to her plans and instructions (καθὼς διετά[ξατο, correctly restored by L. Robert). The name of the woman in question is obviously to be restored in l. 1, but Edson’s – λία Διονυσία Κορνηλία does not conform to the *tria nomina* system. It seems preferable, then, to interpret one of the names as a dative. I propose the following reading and restoration for the name and for the remaining traces of the stone, for which no interpretation has been offered until now:

– – Κορνη]λία ἧ Διονυσία ἧ Κορνηλία [ἧ] Ἰουκούνδη ἧ τῆ πατρῶ[νίσση – –.

Hence, Cornelia Iucunda commissioned the monument and covered the expenses, while [Corne]lia³⁹ Dionysia had the monument made, perhaps after her patroness’ death. Edson had already suggested “fortasse de monumento sepulcrali agitur”. [K. Hallof]

36. Laugier, Sève 2011.

37. Laugier, Sève 2011, 577, fig. 120. For a detailed account of the antiquarian activities of Fauvel, see Zambon 2010, and for the consul’s journeys to Macedonia, see Paschidis 2019, 116, with previous bibliography. During his visit to Thessaloniki, before 1792, Fauvel also copied inscriptions 126 (BnF, Estampes, Gb 15 Fol., f. 37, no. 75), 518 (BnF, Estampes, Gb 15 d (ex SNR-3 Fauvel), (inscriptions) f. 558 v°) and 593 (BnF, Estampes, Gb 15 Fol., f. 37, no. 75), while in the case of inscription 518 he was responsible for sending it from Thessaloniki to France, where it became part of the collection of antiquities of count Choiseul-Gouffier, before it joined the Louvre collection in 1818. Cf. A. Zambon, *Le musée Fauvel* nos 1345, 1405, 1419 (<http://www.fauvel.free.fr>) (last accessed 4/06/2021).

38. Revett’s drawing was first published in Stuart, Revett 1794, 55 tab. II.

39. It is quite probable that Dionysia had the same *gentilicium* as her patroness.

IG X 2.1 746 (fig. 6)

A most fitting name for the available space and traces in ll. 2-3 is Γάλειτ[τ]α, attested in inscriptions from Asia Minor of the same period,⁴⁰ while the correct reading of the *nomen* in l. 1 is [Π]ρεῖ{Λ}μα. As for the form ἐποίη in l. 6, which was rendered as ἔποιε (!) by Edson and later emended into ἐποίη<ι> or ἐπό<ει> by Mihailov,⁴¹ it actually needs no correction, since it is yet another example of the tendency to a closed articulation of the mid vowels /e/ and /o/, well attested in Macedonian inscriptions of the late imperial period.⁴² [E. Martín González]

IG X 2.1 886 (fig. 7)

The revision of the photograph and the squeeze has offered the complete reading of the first two lines of the text, inscribed in the upper part the stele: πρὸς τὸ Ὅσιν | καὶ τὸ Δίκην. This is the third invocation to Hosios and Dikaios from Thessaloniki, since there are two more testimonies among the new funerary inscriptions of the city: IG X 2.1s (1) 1362 and 1470.⁴³

In all three cases, the invocation to the personification of divine and human law is accompanied by two raised hands with open palms in relief, a frequent motif in the funerary iconography of Thessaloniki.⁴⁴ Although the possibility of an invocation for protection of the tomb against potential violators cannot be excluded,⁴⁵ both the epiclesis to Hosios and Dikaios and the depiction of raised palms most probably serve as a plea for divine vengeance in the case of premature, unnatural death, as it does in similar funerary monuments, mainly from Asia Minor.⁴⁶ [E. Martín González]

40. See LGPN Va, s.v. Γάλιττα.

41. Mihailov 1975, 51; cf. SEG 26, 759.

42. On this phonetic phenomenon, see *IKato Maked.* II pp. 819-820, with further examples in n. 4. The form ἐποίη occurs in a contemporary inscription from Epirus (Hammond 1967, 736 no. 13).

43. For the cult of Hosios and Dikaios, see Ricl 1991, 1992a, 1992b, 2008, with previous bibliography.

44. See IG X 2.1 307, 375, 425, 471, 489, 538, 805, 886 and IG X 2.1s (1) 1118, 1248, 1345, 1362, 1470.

45. See Nigdelis, *Ep. Thessalonikeia* I 406-408 and II 81-83.

46. See Graf 2007, 145-150, with early bibliography, and with discussion of the meaning of the raised palms in the funerary inscriptions from Thessaloniki at 146-147.

IG X 2.1 993 (fig. 8)

The revision of the squeezes of the three fragments of a sarcophagus, now lost, resulted in the correction of Edson's reading of the last line of fragment C, from the rather unorthodox ὑπαρχῦσαι to the poetical verb ταρχῦσαι, which confirms that the inscription was a funerary epigram. In his Notebooks, the collection of transcriptions and copies of the monuments deposited at the Institute for Advanced Study in Princeton, under no. 470, Edson had copied the text correctly. [E. Martín González]

Elena Martín González
National Hellenic Research Foundation (Athens)
egonzalez@eie.gr

Klaus Hallof
Berlin-Brandenburgische Akademie der Wissenschaften (Berlin)
hallof@bbaw.de

Summary

The present paper constitutes an introduction to the second volume of the supplement to *Inscriptiones Graecae* X 2.1, which has just been published. After a brief overview of the history of the epigraphic corpus of Thessaloniki, a description of the structure and content of the new volume is offered, with a focus on the new evidence regarding the provenance of the monuments. In the second part of the paper, each author presents a selection of the new readings and interpretations which the complete revision of Ch. Edson's edition has provided.

Abbreviations-Bibliography

References to corpora and epigraphic editions according to: GrEpiAbbr (List of Abbreviations of Editions and Works of Reference for Alphabetic Greek Epigraphy, <https://www.aiegl.org/grepiabbr.html>).

- Adam-Veleni, P., Tsagaraki, Eu., Chatzinikolaou, K. (eds.) 2016. *Παιδεστός - Θεσσαλονίκη. Αρχαιότητες σ' ένα ταξίδι προσφυγιάς*. Thessaloniki.
- Bingen, J. 1973. Review of *IG X 2.1*, in *AC* 42.1, 335-336.
- Bradeen, D.W. 1974. Review of *IG X 2.1*, in *CW* 68.3, 183-184.
- Cormack, M.R. 1975. Review of *IG X 2.1*, in *CR* 25.1, 130-132.
- Daux, G. 1973. "Compléments et corrections aux Inscriptions Thessalonicae", *BCH* 97, 585-599.
- Daux, G. 1975. "En marge des inscriptions de Thessalonique", *BCH* 99, 173-183.
- Daux, G. 1976. "Notes de lecture", *BCH* 100, 213-225, 227.
- Daux, G., Edson, Ch. 1974. "*IG X 2.1: Prolegomena, Epilegomena*", *BCH* 98, 526-552.
- Field, F. 1875. *Originis Hexaplorum quae supersunt*. Vol. I. Oxford.
- Graf, F. 2007. "Untimely Death, Witchcraft, and Divine Vengeance", *ZPE* 162, 139-150.
- Habicht, Chr. 1974. Review of *IG X 2.1*, in *Gnomon* 46, 484-492.
- Hamiaux, M. 1998. *Les sculptures grecques II. La période hellénistique (III^e-I^{er} siècles avant J.-C.)*. Paris.
- Hammond, N.G.L. 1967. *Epirus*. Oxford.
- Kalaitzi, M. 2016. *Figured Tombstones from Macedonia, Fifth-First Century BC* (Oxford Monographs on Classical Archaeology). Oxford.
- ΚΓΜΘ IV = Stefanidou-Tiveriou, Th., Voutiras, Emm. (eds.) 2020. *Κατάλογος γλυπτών του αρχαιολογικού μουσείου Θεσσαλονίκης*. Vol. IV. Thessaloniki.
- Lioutas, A., Mandaki, M. 1997. "Τρία σημαντικά αρχαιολογικά ευρήματα της εντός τειχών Θεσσαλονίκης", *AEMTh* 11, 365-378.
- Laugier, L., Sève, M. 2011. "Colonnade de l'Incantada", in Descamps-Lequime, S. (ed.), *Au Royaume d'Alexandre le Grand. La Macédoine antique*. Paris, 576-588.
- Mihailov, G. 1975. Review of *IG X 2.1*, in *CPh* 70, 47-56.
- Nigdelis, P.M. 2002. "Habent sua fata lapides. Ξεχασμένες δημοσιεύσεις του Πέτρου Ν. Παπαγεωργίου για τις ἐπιγραφές τῆς Θεσσαλονίκης καὶ τῆς Ἔδεσσας", *Τεκμήρια* 7, 85-106.
- Nigdelis, P.M. 2004. *Πέτρου Ν. Παπαγεωργίου τοῦ Θεσσαλονικέως ἀλληλογραφία*

- (1880-1912) (Εταιρεία Μακεδονικών Σπουδών. Πραγματεΐαι. Σειρά Φιλολογική και Θεολογική 19). Thessaloniki.
- Nigdelis, P.M. 2010. "Voluntary Associations in Roman Thessalonikē: In Search of Identity and Support in a Cosmopolitan Society", in Nasrallah, L., Bakirtzis, Ch., Friesen, S.J. (eds.), *From Roman to Early Christian Thessalonikē. Studies in Religion and Archaeology* (Harvard Theological Studies 64). Cambridge, MA, 13-48.
- Nigdelis, P.M. 2011. "Μακεδονικά επιγραφικά ΙΙΙ (Θεσσαλονίκη)", *Τεκμήρια* 10, 121-184.
- Nigdelis, P.M. 2015a. *Γράμματα από τη Μακεδονία, γράμματα για τη Μακεδονία. Η αλληλογραφία του Charles Edson και το corpus των επιγραφών της Μακεδονίας* (Μακεδονικά Επιγραφικά 5). Thessaloniki.
- Nigdelis, P.M. 2015b. *Πέτρον Ν. Παπαγεωργίου. Έπιγραφικά Μελετήματα. Αρχαιότητα* (Μακεδονικά Επιγραφικά 2). Thessaloniki.
- Papakonstantinou-Diamantourou, D. 2011. "IG X 2.1 Συμπλήρωμα. Η πρόοδος των εργασιών 2001-2010", *Τεκμήρια* 10, 119-120.
- Papakonstantinou-Diamantourou, D., Nigdelis, P. 2008. "IG X 2.1 Συμπλήρωμα: Η πρόοδος των εργασιών", in Sverkos, E. (ed.), *Β' Πανελλήνιο Συνέδριο Επιγραφικής. Πρακτικά. Θεσσαλονίκη 24-25 Νοεμβρίου 2001*. Thessaloniki, 181-187.
- Paschidis, P. 2019. "Louis Fauvel and a Hellenistic Inscribed Relief from Edessa (EKM II 248), not Athens (IG II² 10910/1)", *ZPE* 212, 115-120.
- Peek, W. 1973a. "Zu den Inscriptiones Thessalonicae (IG X 2.1)", *Maia* 25, 198-203.
- Peek, W. 1973b. Review of IG X 2.1, in *DLZ* 94, 317-322.
- Petsas, Ph. 1950-1951. "Λατινικαὶ ἐπιγραφαὶ ἐκ Θεσσαλονίκης", *AEph* 89-90, 52-79.
- Ricl, M. 1991. "Hosios kai Dikaïos. Première partie : Catalogue des inscriptions", *EA* 18, 1-70.
- Ricl, M. 1992a. "Hosios kai Dikaïos. Seconde partie : Analyse", *EA* 19, 71-103.
- Ricl, M. 1992b. "Hosios kai Dikaïos. Nouveaux monuments", *EA* 20, 95-100.
- Ricl, M. 2008. "Newly Published and Unpublished Inscriptions for Hosios and Dikaïos and their Contribution to the Study of the Cult", in Winter, E. (ed.), *Vom Euphrat bis zum Bosporus. Kleinasien in der Antike. Festschrift für Elmar Schwertheim zum 65. Geburtstag* (Asia Minor Studien 65). Bonn, 563-579.
- Robert, L. 1974. "Les inscriptions de Thessalonique", *RPh* 48, 180-246 [repr. in *OMS* V 267-333].
- Salomon, E., Galiniki, S. 2018. "Las Incantadas of Salonica: Searching for 'Enchantment' in a City's Exiled Heritage", in Harloe, K., Momigliano,

- N., Farnoux, A. (eds.), *Hellenomania* (British School at Athens. Modern Greek and Byzantine Studies 5). London – New York, 271-310.
- Sève, M., Weber, P. 2013. “La colonnade des Incantadas à Thessalonique”, *RA*, 125-133.
- Speidel, M. 1973. Review of *IG X 2.1*, in *AJA* 77, 446-447.
- Stuart, J., Revett, N. 1794. *The Antiquities of Athens, Measured and Delineated*. Vol. III. London.
- Sverkos, E., Adam-Veleni, P., Tzanavari, K. 2016. “Από την ιστορία των μνημείων της Ανατολικής Θράκης”, in Adam-Veleni, P., Tsagaraki, Eu., Chatzinikolaou, K. (eds.), *Ραιδεστός - Θεσσαλονίκη. Αρχαιότητες σ' ένα ταξίδι προσφυγιάς*. Thessaloniki, 134-153.
- Vickers, M. 1973. “Epilegomena to *IG X*, II, 1”, *JHS* 93, 242-243.
- Vickers, M. 1974. “Correction”, *JHS* 94, 265.
- von Premerstein, A., Vulič, N. 1903. “Antike Denkmäler in Serbien und Makedonien”, *JÖAI* 6, Beibl. 1-60.
- Zambon, A. 2010. “Louis François Sébastien Fauvel, le consul antiquaire (1753-1838)”, in Ulbert, J., Prijac, L. (eds.), *Consuls et services consulaires au XIX^e siècle*. Hamburg, 139-156.



Fig. 1. Photograph of IG X 2.1 292 (Akademie archive)




Fig. 2. Drawing of IG X 2.1 292 by N. Morton (Akademie archive).



Fig. 3. Photograph of IG X 2.1 131 (KERA archive)




Fig. 4. Drawing of IG X 2.1 264 by L.-S. Fauvel
(after Laugier, Sève 2011, 577, fig. 120).



Fig. 5. Photograph of IG X 2.1 269 with Hallof's restoration of line 1 (KERA archive).



Fig. 6. Photograph of IG X 2.1 746 (KERA archive)



Fig. 7. Photograph of *IG X 2.1 886* (KERA archive)



Fig. 8. Photograph of *IG X 2.1 993* (Eirini Kalogridou, KERA archive).