

## A FUNERARY EPIGRAM FROM LATOS IN CRETE

IN *Hesperia* 58, 1989, pp. 115–129, Martha W. Baldwin Bowsky has published two highly interesting funerary inscriptions of late Hellenistic date from *Λατώς πρὸς Καμάραι* in eastern Crete.<sup>1</sup> Both poems present delicate problems of interpretation and repay further study. This short note is concerned with the first (pp. 118–123), the text of which is the better preserved, so that most readings can be checked on the published photograph.

The grave monument on which this epigram is engraved was set up in honor of a *Κλητώνυμος Μναστοκλείος*, who, as the first editor convincingly argued, is in all probability identical with the person of the same name who served on the board of *κόσμοι* known from two inscriptions found at Latos (*ICr* I 16.26 and 32). His term of office has been plausibly dated to the year 116/15 B.C.<sup>2</sup> The epigram shows that Kletonymos was a man of considerable local importance, and a close analysis provides a better understanding of his role in the civic affairs of Latos. The text proposed by the first editor is the following:

Κλητώνυμος  
 Μναστοκλείος  
 χαίρει  
 εἰ Λίνδος Κλεόβ[ο]υλον ἐθρέψατο Σισυ[φί]δων δὲ  
 5 χθῶν [Π]ερί[ανδρον, ἄκρους ἐπὶ σοφῶν κανόν[as],  
 οὐ μέγα κάματος γὰρ ἐνέγκατο τόνδ[ε] σοφιστήν  
 ὄ[γ]δοον [ε]ὐμαθοῦς κοίρανον ἱστορίης,  
 πιστὸν ἔρ[εισ]μα νόνων Κλητώνυμον αἰνετὸν νῆα  
 Μναστ[οκ]λέους δὲν [ὁ] πᾶς δῆμος ἐπώκτισατο.  
 10 οὐ γὰρ [οὔν] ἥρωσ ἐν γήρῳ βίον ὡς δέ τις ἀστήρ  
 λάμψας ἐσβέσθη δαίμονος ἀκρισίαις  
 πατρίδα ῥυόμενος βουλαῖς· ἀγαθῇ δὲ προνοίᾳ  
 οἰκονόμοι δοξῆς κίονες ἐκράτεσαν.  
 τρισσοὺς γὰρ λίπε παιδᾶς εἰς. ἀρετῇ δὲ τὰ το[ύ]το[υ]  
 15 τείμια κηρύξει κῆν Ἀίδαο δόμοις.

Some of these readings and supplements are not entirely satisfactory.

In line 6, *κάματος*, which in the words of the editor herself (p. 119) “may not be the most predictable reading,” is certainly unacceptable, if only for metrical reasons: to make a correct hexameter, all three syllables need to be long. Furthermore, the close link (expressed by the particle *γάρ*) of this sentence with the preceding one, stating that Kleoboulos came

<sup>1</sup> Henceforth cited as Bowsky. I adopt this form of the nominative, as advocated by L. Bürchner, *RE* XII, i, 1924, s.v. *Latos*, cols. 974–977, rather than the *Λατώ* preferred by M. Guarducci (*ICr* I 16, p. 107) and other scholars in recent times, since I propose to read it in the text under discussion; see footnote 3 below.

<sup>2</sup> See the comments of M. Guarducci in *ICr* I 16.26 and “Appunti di cronologia cretese: la guerra del 114 av. Cr. fra Lato e Olunte,” *Epigraphica* 9, 1947, pp. 31–35 and Bowsky, p. 119 for further discussion.

from Lindos and Periander from Corinth, strongly suggests that it also began with information about the fatherland of the honorand, who is styled as “the Eighth Sage”. A careful examination of the photograph (with the help of a magnifying lens) reveals that the traces read by Bowsky as dotted mu should be read as ΙΛ; in addition, the two short horizontal strokes visible in the lower part of the omicron show that it is in fact an omega. We should therefore transcribe *καὶ Λατώσ*,<sup>3</sup> a metrically unexceptionable and quite predictable reading, for it provides the expected mention of Kletonymos’ birthplace.

In line 8 I regard *νόων* as a mere graphic error for *νόμων*, despite Bowsky’s explanation of it as a dialectical form. Apart from the consideration that such a “colloquialism” is quite unexpected in a poetical text, it has to be pointed out that the alleged “identical orthographic pattern” in line 13 is most probably a case of false word division (see below).

In line 9, the restoration [ἄ]πας rather than [ὁ] πᾶς seems preferable for stylistic reasons: it is more poetic, and, apart from that, the emphasis provided by the article is not really needed.

There are good reasons to reject the supplement [οὔν] in line 10, proposed by Bowsky because it “best fills the three letter spaces that are completely illegible after οὐ γάρ.”<sup>4</sup> The most obvious objection is again metrical: a creticus in the beginning of the hexameter is definitely unacceptable. From the point of view of syntax, the absence of a verb after γάρ is surprising, and the sequence *ἦρως ἐν γήραι βίον* remains obscure despite Bowsky’s effort to wring sense from it. A different restoration seems preferable: οὐ γάρ [ἐπλ]ῆρωσεν γήραι βίον<sup>5</sup> (for he did not fill up his life with old age). This assertion that Kletonymos did not reach old age receives eloquent support from the image evoked in the next clause, which suggests that he died when he was at the peak of his activity: *ὡς δέ τις ἀστῆρ | λάμπσας ἐσβέσθη δαίμονος ἀκρισίαις* (he glowed like a star, but was extinguished through the unfair judgment of a divine power<sup>6</sup>). The comparison to a passing star that glows for a short time and then suddenly disappears is not uncommon in grave epigrams for people who have died prematurely, as the examples cited by Bowsky herself (pp. 121–122) clearly indicate.<sup>7</sup>

Finally, in line 13 the reading *οἰκονόνοι δοξῆς* (obviously an error for *δόξης*) *κίονες* appears suspect. According to Bowsky the first word “can only be a variant of *οἰκονόμοι*: managers or administrators, almost certainly financial, of Lato.” She has, however, to admit

<sup>3</sup> The alpha of *καί* is visible on the photograph. The nominative *Λατώσ* would be a further attestation of the form with final sigma championed by Bürchner (footnote 1 above).

<sup>4</sup> Bowsky, p. 119; on p. 121, however, she expresses some doubt about its correctness.

<sup>5</sup> The construction of *πληρῶ* with dative and accusative is attested in poetic language; LSJ cites Euripides, *Herc. Fur.* 373: *πέυκαισιω . . . χέρας πληροῦντες*.

<sup>6</sup> That the *δαίμων* here is not meant to be Kletonymos’ personal *daimon*, as Bowsky translates, but rather an unnamed divine power by whose intervention he was prematurely deprived of life, is clear from the parallel she herself adduces (p. 122): W. Peek, *Griechische Vers-Inschriften*, I, *Grab-Epigramme*, Berlin 1955, no. 1298: *ἀκρισία δὲ Τύχης*. A comparable expression concludes a grave epigram of the 4th century B.C. from Piraeus for a nine-year-old child (Peek, *GV* I, no. 1118; A.-M. VÉrilhac, *Παῖδες ἄωροι. Poésie funéraire* I, Athens 1978, no. 169): *θνήσκω δυσξυνέτωι δαίμονι χρῆσάμενος*. See also the remarks of VÉrilhac, *op. cit.*, II, Athens 1982, pp. 185–190.

<sup>7</sup> For the appearance in grave epigrams for *ἄωροι* of the comparison of life to a glowing fire or star which is abruptly extinguished, see VÉrilhac, *op. cit.*, II, pp. 367–370.

that “[t]his group of subordinate officials is practically unknown from the inscriptions of Crete.” Furthermore, her assumption that *κίονες* is in apposition to *οἰκονόμοι* creates a problem with the construction of the verb *ἐκράτεσαν*, for which no object can be supplied. All these difficulties disappear if we adopt a different division of the words: *οἶκον δὲ οἱ δόξης κίονες ἐκράτεσαν*.<sup>8</sup> The meaning of the sentence becomes, then, quite clear: by an act of (favorable) divine providence (*ἀγαθῇ δὲ προνοίᾳ*<sup>9</sup>), the columns of good repute upheld<sup>10</sup> Kletonymos’ household (*δὲ* is, of course, the possessive pronoun) after his death. These “columns of good repute” are, as we are told in the next hexameter (the function of *γάρ* is clearly explanatory), the three sons he left behind. The comparison of the male children in a family to columns<sup>11</sup> that support the house is a literary *topos* already attested in Aischylos’ *Agamemnon*, lines 897–898. The *locus classicus* for the image is, however, Euripides’ *Iphigeneia in Tauris*, lines 44–58, in which Iphigeneia tells the audience her dream: her house was shaken to the ground, but one column remained standing, and blond hair grew out of its top. This column, according to her own interpretation, must be her brother Orestes (line 57): *στῦλοι γὰρ οἴκων παῖδες εἰσιν ἄρρενες*. This verse was often cited throughout antiquity,<sup>12</sup> and similar expressions are also to be found in modern Greek folk poetry.<sup>13</sup>

The text of the epigram should, accordingly, be as follows:

Εἰ Λίνδος Κλεόβ[ο]υλον ἐθρέψατο, Σισυ[φι]δῶν δὲ  
 5 χθῶν [Π]ερί[αν]δρον, ἄκρους ἐπτὰ σοφῶν κανόν[ας],  
 οὐ μέγα· καὶ Λατῶς γὰρ ἐνέγκατο τόνδ[ε] σοφιστήν·  
 ὄ[γ]δοον [ε]ὐμαθοῦς κοίρανον ἱστορίας,  
 πιστὸν ἔρ[εισ]μα νό<μ>ων, Κλητώνυμον αἰνετὸν υἱά  
 Μναστ[οκ]λέους δὲν [ἄ]πας δῆμος ἐπωκτίσατο·  
 10 οὐ γὰρ [ἐπλ]ήρωσεν γήραι βίον, ὡς δέ τις ἀστῆρ  
 λάμψας ἐσβέσθη δαίμονος ἀκρισίαις  
 πατρίδα ρυόμενος βουλαῖς. ἀγαθῇ δὲ προνοία  
 οἶκον δὲ οἱ δόξης κίονες ἐκράτεσαν·  
 τρισσοὺς γὰρ λίπε παῖδας εὐοὺς. ἀρετῇ δὲ τὰ το[ύ]το[υ]  
 15 τείμια κηρύξει κῆν Ἀίδαο δόμοις.

<sup>8</sup> This is clearly a variant of the form *ἐκράτησαν* used here for metrical reasons.

<sup>9</sup> The word *πρόνοια* is already used in Classical Greek to denote divine providence: LSJ, *s.v.*, II, 2, citing Xenophon, *Mem.* 1.4.6.

<sup>10</sup> The verb *κρατῶ* is used here in the meaning “hold up, support”, which is particularly common from Hellenistic times onward; see LSJ, *s.v.*, IV, 3.

<sup>11</sup> The word normally used is *στῦλος*; the metaphorical use of *κίων* is rarer: cf. *Anthologia Palatina* 7.441 [Archilochos]; D. L. Page (*Further Greek Epigrams*, Cambridge 1981, p. 148) compares Pindar, *Ol.* 2.81 and Peek, *GV I* (footnote 6 above), no. 1286 (Miletos, 2nd century B.C.).

<sup>12</sup> Menander, *Monost.* 720; Artemidoros, *Onir.* 2.10 (almost certainly depending on Euripides); Stobaeus, *Flor.* 77.3 (Meineke).

<sup>13</sup> An example from Crete is cited by M. Z. Kopidakis, *Hellenika* 35, 1984, p. 375. I would like to thank Professor Kopidakis for a useful discussion of the subject.

The unknown poet stresses the wisdom of Kletonymos by comparing him to the legendary Seven Sages and considering him as their equal. References to these “wise men”, as well as flattering comments about a person’s being the Eighth Sage, are not uncommon in epigrammatic poetry.<sup>14</sup> This example is, however, peculiar in that Kleoboulos and Perianther receive specific mention as “the highest models of the Seven Sages.” This choice, as Boswky rightly remarks (p. 119), can hardly be accidental. It is certainly no coincidence that, among the seven, these two were the only tyrants. Our poet obviously wanted to underline the fact that Kletonymos was not just a man of great learning and wisdom but also an able statesman. The idea that the Seven Sages were wise lawgivers and successful politicians rather than exponents of the *vita contemplativa* was widespread in Hellenistic times and can be traced back to Dikaiarchos in the early 3rd century B.C.<sup>15</sup>

It seems significant too that Kletonymos is praised as a master of history (line 7: *ἐνμαθοῦς*<sup>16</sup> *κοίρανον ἱστορίας*). It is obvious that historical inquiry is regarded here as an activity particularly befitting a statesman, whom it provides with useful knowledge that enhances his judgment.<sup>17</sup> This utilitarian view is accepted by no less a historian than Polybios.<sup>18</sup>

The importance of Kletonymos to his country was, however, mainly due to his political activity. He is hailed as a “reliable upholder of the laws” (line 8: *πιστὸν ἔρ[εισ]μανό<μ>ων*), an expression which does not necessarily imply more than his success as a *κόσμος*.<sup>19</sup> On the other hand, the most important praise he receives is that his advice was crucial in saving his fatherland (line 12: *πατρίδα ῥυόμενος βουλαῖς*). This expression clearly alludes to specific events and could well indicate that he played an important part in bringing about the settlement of the conflict between Latos and Olous, the treaty for which was negotiated and implemented during and immediately after his kosmate.<sup>20</sup> Since the participle *ῥυόμενος* is in the present tense, and therefore certainly expresses simultaneity (compare Bowsky’s translation), it seems probable that his premature death occurred while he was still active as a counselor or negotiator.

<sup>14</sup> See the examples cited by Bowsky, p. 120.

<sup>15</sup> See the excellent account of B. Snell, *Leben und Meinungen der Sieben Weisen*, 4th ed., Munich 1971, pp. 78–87, where all the relevant sources are cited.

<sup>16</sup> This adjective is certainly used in a passive sense, but it does not seem to have the usual meaning “easily learned” (LSJ, *s.v.*). I therefore prefer to translate it: “good (or useful) to learn”. Bowsky’s translation indicates that she sees here a hypallage, but *ἐνμαθής* can hardly mean “learned”.

<sup>17</sup> For the high value set on historical knowledge, see A. Chaniotis, *Historie und Historiker in den griechischen Inschriften*, Wiesbaden 1988, pp. 314–317, commenting on an epigram from Epidauros in honor of a Φίλιππος Ἀριστείδου Περγάμιος (IG IV 1<sup>2</sup>, 687; cited after Kaibel by Bowsky, p. 121).

<sup>18</sup> See K. Sacks, *Polybios on the Writing of History*, Berkeley/Los Angeles/London 1981, *passim*, esp. pp. 122–144.

<sup>19</sup> Bowsky (p. 121) sees in this accolade a possible allusion to a specific event, the negotiation of the treaty that ended the war between Latos and neighboring Olous. Her comments seem to me more appropriate for the beginning of line 12; see below.

<sup>20</sup> For the date of the conflict and its settlement, see Guarducci, 1947 (footnote 2 above) and Bowsky, p. 121, with references.

There is probably also epigraphic evidence about his sons, who, as the epigram implies, went on to serve their country as had their father. It is possible, but by no means certain, that one of them was the Polytimos son of Kletonymos who appears as secretary to the board of *kosmoi* of 114/13 or 113/12 (*ICr* I 22.2).<sup>21</sup> Much more likely (and to my mind almost certain) is the identification of Αἰχμαιοσ(?) Κλητωνύμου, whose name was recognized by Peek in a grave epigram of the late 2nd or early 1st century B.C. from Latos,<sup>22</sup> with one of the honorand's sons: he is praised as the worthy son of a famous and highly esteemed father.

EMMANUEL VOUTIRAS

UNIVERSITY OF THESSALONIKI  
Department of Archaeology and History of Art  
540 06 Thessaloniki, Greece

<sup>21</sup> The uncertainty is stressed by the fact that the name Polytimos appears to have been common at Latos: see *ICr* I 16.31–34. Furthermore, it is very probable that a Kletonymos son of Polytimos (who could then well be the father of the Polytimos in question) was *kosmos* on that same board.

<sup>22</sup> W. Peek, "Kretische Vers-Inschriften II," *ArchCl* 29, 1977 (pp. 64–85), pp. 64–66, who doubts (with no good reason) whether this is the son of the Kletonymos of this epigram; cf. Bowsky, p. 119.