Greek Romans and Roman Greeks

Studies in Cultural Interaction

Edited by Erik Nis Ostenfeld

with the assistance of

Karin Blomqvist and Lisa Nevett



AARHUS UNIVERSITY PRESS

(p. 70)

THREE CASES OF GREEK / LATIN IMBALANCE IN ROMAN SYRACUSE*

Kalle Korhonen
Institutum Romanum Finlandiae, Rome

1. Introduction

The purpose of this paper is to examine the use of Greek and Latin in certain groups of epigraphic material from Roman Syracuse. The material consists of three groups of funerary inscriptions, first, those of the early Imperial period from the whole city, second, those from the catacomb of Vigna Cassia, and third, the epitaphs that belong to the transition between Antiquity and the Middle Ages, found in the area of Villa Landolina. I will be looking for phenomena of contact and interference and will try to determine the way in which we should interpret certain imbalances present in the material.

The presence of Latin in Syracuse properly begins with the settlement of a colony by Augustus, which must have caused a change in the population structure. On the level of the written sources, however, the traces of colonists are not numerous. The general nature of the epigraphic material is quite different from that of the big cities in Italy or in the younger provinces, because inscriptions which document municipal life are almost completely lacking. Among almost 1300 published inscriptions from Roman Syracuse, the majority, 80%, are in Greek, but the handful of honorary and building inscriptions are mostly in Latin.[1] In this paper, I will concentrate on the rich material of funerary inscriptions, which raises interesting questions concerning language use.

As inscribed tombstones belong to a relatively formal domain of language use, the language choice in them does not tend to be arbitrary. Their language was chosen with attention to the conventions of the family or of the reference group to which the family belonged, because the language choice was not regulated by laws in this period. It is not reasonable to assume *a priori* that the home language of the family was chosen, because, in a bilingual city, the prestige of the languages had an important effect on this choice, too. But was

|| Syracuse a bilingual city? The lack of bilingual funerary inscriptions in Syracuse is remarkable: even if the term "bilingual" is used in the widest sense, i. e. an inscription that contains a Greek and a Latin part, regardless of whether one part should be the translation of the other, this term can still be applied in only one uncertain case.[2] It is also interesting that there are no texts written in the alphabet of the other language, which are abundant in Rome. This will be one of the problems discussed.

2. Epitaphs of the early Imperial period

As I mentioned, the presence of a Latin-speaking population should begin to leave traces in the early Imperial period, when the Roman colony was founded. First, some words on dating. Dating a Greek funerary inscription from Syracuse is not easy in general, but fortunately we often know the archaeological context and do not have to rely solely on palaeographic, onomastic or other criteria.[3] Furthermore, the material becomes more abundant only in Imperial times, and it is only in few instances that the dating of an inscription remains completely uncertain. However, within the periods "early Imperial" and "late Imperial – Christian" the dating often remains vague.

Here, I would like to point out some features which can throw light on the contact between the Greek and the Latin epigraphic cultures in Syracuse. The first of these concerns the persons mentioned in the inscriptions. The late hellenistic funerary inscriptions from Syracuse indicate only the name of the deceased person in the nominative or genitive form, sometimes with filiation.[4] The persons who have set up the inscription, i. e., the dedicators of the epitaph, are not recorded. Their names remain absent from the Greek inscriptions throughout the Roman period. This characteristic connects Syracuse to some regions of the Greek East, say Greece proper, Syria and Egypt, where it was customary to omit the names of the dedicators.[5] But in two other important cities of Eastern Sicily, especially in Catania, and to some extent in Messina, the names of these are often recorded.[6]

The problem with Catania and Messina is the scanty material from the pre-Roman period, on the basis of which it is difficult to determine whether recording the dedicators' names was introduced during the Roman period, or whether it continued an older tradition. In Naples, the mention of the dedicators seems to be introduced during the Imperial period.[7] In Syracuse, even in cases in which it is necessary to mention two persons in the same epitaph and there is a relationship between these two, the form "Name$_1$ in dative (+ attribute) + Name$_2$ in nominative" (or reversed order) is seldom used.[8] There is, in fact, only one small and distinct || group of epitaphs in which a form of this kind is attested.[9] In the Latin texts, the dedicators are often mentioned.

As a result, we can say that Syracusan epigraphic culture does not change in this respect during Roman Imperial times. Another feature which separates the Greek funerary inscriptions of Syracuse from those of Catania and Messina, is the use of the phrase Θεοῖς Καταχθονίοις. Borrowed from Latin epigraphy (= *Dis Manibus*) during the Imperial period, it often stands at the beginning of Greek epitaphs, either entire or abbreviated Θ K. This feature is rare in Syracuse.

Now I turn to the idiosyncratic features of Syracusan epigraphy. The Greek epitaphs of the early Roman period contain examples of the expression that is very common everywhere in Greek world, namely "[Name in the vocative] χρηστὲ/-ὰ/-ὴ χαῖρε."[10] However, another laudatory epithet is soon added, and the resulting pair, χρηστὸς καὶ ἄμεμπτος, becomes the characteristic feature of epitaphs from eastern Sicily. These can be in the acclamatory form "[Name in the vocative] χρηστὲ (-ὰ/-ὴ) καὶ ἄμεμπτε χαῖρε.", in some cases followed by the age,

or in the indicative form, in which the age is always recorded: "[Name in the nominative] χρηστὸς (-ὰ/-ὴ) καὶ ἄμεμπτος ἔζησεν ἔτη κτλ.". The expression seems to have originated in Syracuse, where it is especially attested, appearing in more than 50% of the relevant material.[11] It was also in use elsewhere in south-eastern Sicily, and in Catania.[12]. An inscription containing this pair of attributes can, in almost every case, be classified as pagan, even though some exceptions are known.[13] The pair is very rare outside Sicily, and can indicate the Sicilian origin of the dedicator or of the epitaph.[14] When the burials in the catacombs begin, the use of this particular pair of epithets normally ends.

In the Latin funerary inscriptions of the early Imperial period, the following form can be used: "Name (vocative) *pie/-a, salve* (or *have*)", sometimes with an indication of age.[15] In Latin inscriptions from elsewhere, the type of acclamation with the final *salve* or *(h)ave* is attested mainly in the late Republican – early Imperial period, in the form "Name (nominative) (or vocative), *salve*."[16] Furthermore, the epithet *pius -a* is not at all uncommon. But the combination "Name (vocative) *pie/-a, salve*" is only attested in Syracuse, Catania and Centuripe,[17] and in the period before ca. 150.[18] It has been suggested that the Latin phrase shows the influence of the Greek tradition.[19] *Pie salve* corresponds in form exactly to χρηστὲ χαῖρε, but not in content, as χρηστός does not mean *pius*. The Latin for χρηστός would be *commodus* or *utilis*; the Greek for *pius* was εὐσεβής.[20] Anyway, it seems to me reasonably clear that the Latin epigraphic culture has been influenced by the Greek one here. The Latin-writing persons have not translated the phrase, but used an attribute more familiar to

|| them. On the other hand, there is no Latin phrase that would correspond to χρηστὸς καὶ ἄμεμπτος. The reason may be that the contact between the epigraphic cultures was stronger at an earlier period, but questions of prestige may also have played a part here.

There are, in fact, some examples of influence in the opposite direction. An interesting example of this is *IG* 14.45,[21] Βουλκακία / Τερεντία, / εὐσεβὴς / καὶ ἀγαθή, / ἔζησεν ἔτη / μ'. There is another text with εὐσεβῆ χαῖρ[ε ---].[22] Vulcacia Terentia seems to have been a woman of some wealth,[23] and a plausible explanation for the phraseology of her epitaph may be the need for distinction. After all, χρηστὸς καὶ ἄμεμπτος is attested in even the most modest epitaphs of the pre-Christian period: it seems that anybody who could afford an inscribed gravestone could also afford one with χρηστὸς καὶ ἄμεμπτος. Furthermore, εὐσεβὴς καὶ ἀγαθή translates the Latin pair of epithets *pia et bona* and is rare in Greek epigraphy.[24]

But if Vulcacia Terentia's family wanted distinction, why did they not use Latin in her epitaph? As far as I can see, the answer to this question is in the different prestige of Greek and Latin in different kinds of written documents. For a local notable of the first centuries AD, Greek remained an appreciated cultural language, which could be used in funerary epigrams, as well as in prose epitaphs. Trying to describe the situation in sociolinguistic terms, one could, at this phase, say that in the domain of funerary epigraphy, neither Greek nor Latin was the H(igh) variant, but the distinction between H(igh) and L(ow) depended on the linguistic form. There were other means, too, which could be used in showing a higher social position, namely the form

of the monument.

3. Vigna Cassia

The cemetery area known as Vigna Cassia (or "ex Vigna Cassia") includes catacomb A ("Catacomb of Marcia") and the catacomb of S. Diego ("Cimitero Maggiore") which are interconnected, as well as the adjacent catacomb of S. Maria Gesù. The catacomb of S. Maria Gesù, the use of which began in the early third century, is the oldest of the three; S. Diego was opened around 250; and the catacomb of Marcia, approximately half a century later.[25]

Soon after the burials in the catacombs began, Christianity was generally adopted, and some changes took place in the style of the funerary inscriptions. However, the dedicators remained absent from the epitaphs,[26] and family relations were seldom expressed. The attributes given to the deceased changed: the pair χρηστὸς καὶ ἄμεμπτος was replaced by ὁ / ἡ καλῆς μνήμης or ὁ / ἡ μακαρίας μνήμης, but the epithets were not used as frequently as before. The epitaphs normally consist of the following elements:

|| (A) the name of the deceased in nominative case, possibly with attributes;
(B) the phrase ἐνθάδε κεῖται which practically always indicates Christian context in the prose epitaphs of Syracuse;
(C) the indication of age;
(D) the date of death (often with the verb τελευτᾶν).[27]
A sentence consisting of A and B is a very common composition, and ABC, ABD and ABCD are well attested (with variable order of A and B). A variant focuses on the date of death; in it, the verb "to die" begins the whole epitaph, and the noun phrase containing the name follows before the date. There are two other significant types, but they are much less common than those consisting of the elements listed above.[28]

The Greek-Latin imbalance reaches its peak in the catacombs of Vigna Cassia. There, the inscriptions number approximately 300, out of which twenty are in Latin (7%).[29] The inscriptions which contain only the name of the deceased are common. These names have been carved on the plaster near the grave or on marble plates. Even if the graffiti generally lack christograms and other Christian symbols which are more common on the marble plates,[30] their use continues in all of the cemeteries. Therefore they seem to have been the alternative of the lowest or poorest social stratum who still could afford a written epitaph. This lower social class begins only now to be represented in funerary inscriptions.[31] Earlier, it had been necessary to buy at least an inscribed marble plate from a stonecutter to produce a permanent funerary inscription, even if χρηστὸς καὶ ἄμεμπτος was included in the price. Now, instead of using marble, which had to be imported, and a professional stonecutter, one could resort to someone who was able to write a name on wet plaster. In Vigna Cassia, the Latin texts are very rare in the group of the name-only epitaphs.[32] Two explanations can be given for this: 1) that in the early period, Greek was used in the

catacomb regardless of the mother tongue of the deceased; the few Latin texts would be explained as epitaphs of foreigners; 2) that Greek was the language of more than 90% of the deceased, and every family used the mother tongue of its members in epitaphs. But is it even possible for us to show that one or the other theory is correct?

In Rome, the proportion of Greek texts was highest among the earliest Christian inscriptions. A fundamental reason for the extensive use of Greek is that it could be used as the in-group language in catacombs, whereas the cemeteries of the early Imperial times were under the open sky, in a much more public space. There, it was more convenient to use the common out-group language, Latin, in prose epitaphs.[33] In Syracuse, the situation in early Imperial times was different, and it has been discussed above. In the catacomb

|| burials, however, the circumstances in the two cities may have been more similar, with language choice based on in-group preferences.

One way of approaching the issue is through onomastics. We can look at the distribution of Greek and Latin names in the various groups of epitaphs. In Christian inscriptions, the people in the more Latin-speaking areas tend to use Latin names, and Greek names are in a minority.[34] Compared with the cities of the Greek East, the proportion of Latin names in Early Christian inscriptions is greater in Syracuse. There are about 55 graffiti epitaphs from Vigna Cassia, and the language of the name can be determined in 45 cases. The largest group are the texts from the Marcia catacomb, and about three fifths of the names are in Latin. In the other parts of the catacomb, Greek names are more common than Latin. In the catacomb as a whole, Greek names are slightly in the majority. In the marble slab group from Vigna Cassia, the majority held by Greek names is clearer.[35] Indeed, Latin names seem to become more common during the third century in this group of epitaphs. This may be due to the increasing number of Latin speakers, who possibly had to use the services of persons writing in Greek, as there were none writing in Latin available.[36] However, one can note that, among the rare cases of filiation, some parents with Greek names have given their children one of the Latin names that spread from North Africa to the other parts of the Mediterranean during the Christian era.[37] A similar phenomenon, namely that parents with Greek *cognomina* tend to give Latin *cognomina* to their children, is attested in Rome and in Ostia in earlier Imperial times.[38] There, prestige factors were certainly relevant, and they must have played a role in Syracuse, too, but they had a small influence on the language choice in epitaphs.

In all, in Vigna Cassia we have the interplay of too many factors with unknown significance. The question I posed was "does the proportion of Greek and Latin epitaphs reflect the proportion of the language groups buried therein?" The answer is affirmative, but only to a certain extent, as Greek may have been chosen for the sake of convenience in communication.

4. Villa Landolina

The inscriptions found in the excavations of the 1940's in the hypogeic tombs in Villa Landolina, where the Museum of Syracuse is now located, were a surprising discovery. The late Roman inscriptions of Syracuse had, so far, been mostly in Greek, and this was a group of Latin funerary inscriptions of persons with almost exclusively Latin names, carved with large letters on extensive limestone plates.[39] An earlier hypogeum was used for their graves, which were cut

|| into the floor of the tomb chamber. Epitaphs which belong to a similar type had been found earlier in the vicinity and elsewhere in the city.[40]

Earlier, A. Ferrua had estimated that the actual linguistic Romanization of Eastern Sicily took place from the 6th century on, when the Latin-speaking elite was replaced by Greeks from the East, and became part of the common people.[41] When these texts were found, he felt that this theory was further corroborated.[42] This was a curious theory, based on what actually followed rather than on any reasonable sociological reasoning. Another, more prudent interpretation was given by S. Borsari who, referring to the peculiarity of the diction and the limited area of findings, argued that the persons mentioned were a group of Latin speakers distinct from the rest of the Syracusan population.[43] Ferrua and Manganaro referred to the absence of Greek inscriptions from the same period. Here, we run into the common problem of this field of studies: the general level of literacy. Are there any possibilities for us to know how common it has been, in a given period, to include a written epitaph next to a grave? One could simply say that the Greek-speaking parts of the population were not able to purchase a written epitaph, or had given up the habit of using a written epitaph. It is important to look at the rest of the written material from the same period.

No study has presented any specific criteria for dating the inscriptions from Villa Landolina. Therefore, the datings given vary greatly: Manganaro proposes the ostrogothic period (last quarter of the 5th century – 535); Bernabò Brea, the 6th century;[44] A. Silvagni, "per i caratteri paleografici e stilistici", considered 7th century more probable than 6th;[45] Ferrua went even further, and suggested "secolo VIII circa", when publishing an apparently similar Syracusan text.[46] Here, the great differences from the earlier tradition seem to be the reason for the late dating.[47] It is true that the stonecutting is very different from the other Syracusan inscriptions, but some parallels can be found elsewhere. The writing material has had an effect on the handwriting, making the letters wider than usual, because a lot of space was available.[48] It seems to me that even if the letter forms are not very consistent, two hands can be distinguished: the more experienced "hand A", with straight lines and *apices* in the letters,[49] and the less practised "hand B".[50] In determining the overall dating, many factors can be relevant: all the inscriptions have *A*'s with the broken bar; the *D*'s of hand A are slightly triangular, of the type that is common in the 6th century. The *V*'s are in the Villa Landolina inscriptions always capital. Giving an accurate dating is beyond my competence, but 8th century seems improbable,[51] and 6th or 7th century more likely.

The funerary formulae attested are (1) "(cross) + *memoria* + [name in genitive] + [profession etc.]" (nn. 1, 3, 4, 6, 9); (2) "(cross) *hic e[st* (?)*]* + [name in uncertain case] +

[profession]" (n. 2); (3) "(cross) + *sepultura* + [name in geni-
|| tive]" (n. 5).[52] None of these is attested outside Syracuse in Sicily. Type (1) seems to have been especially common in the area of Mauretania Caesariensis from the 3rd century on.[53] However, it is attested also in the catacomb of S. Giovanni.[54] Furthermore, an example of a Greek counterpart has survived; it may come from S. Giovanni, as well.[55] The stones in S. Giovanni clearly belong to the catacomb context, as they are smaller marble or limestone plates and, in physical appearance, similar to the other inscriptions there. The use of large slabs of local limestone in the hypogea might mean that the availability of marble had diminished. Because of this, the period immediately before the Byzantine conquest might be a good guess, when trade connections to the east may have been weaker than before and afterwards. In any case, at this period it was easier to find slabs of limestone than those of marble to cover an entire tomb.

In my view, the point made by Borsari is valid. I think that the proper interpretation of the Villa Landolina inscriptions from the point of view of linguistic balance is that they are the epitaphs of a certain Latin-speaking group, who probably had immigrated from North Africa. Most of the Syracusan cemeteries which were in use in this period have left us only material which does not belong to the study of literacy, and this often has been forgotten when the linguistic conditions have been discussed. The number of the speakers of Latin in Syracuse very probably had increased, but what was more important, the level of literacy had fallen, and funerary epitaphs had become rarer.

Bibliography

AE = L'année épigraphique. Paris: Presses universitaires de France.
CIL = Corpus inscriptionum Latinarum. Berolini.
EE = Ephemeris epigraphica. Berolini: Institutum archaeologicum Germanicum.
ICUR = Inscriptiones Christianae urbis Romae septimo saeculo antiquiores. Nova series. In civitate Vaticana.
IG = Inscriptiones Graecae. Berolini
IGUR = L. Moretti, *Inscriptiones Graecae urbis Romae* 1-4 (Studi pubblicati dall'Istituto italiano per la storia antica 17, 22, 28, 47), Roma 1968-1990: Istituto italiano per la storia antica.
NSc = Notizie degli scavi di antichità. Roma: Accademia dei Lincei.
SEG = Supplementum epigraphicum Graecum. Amsterdam: J. C. Gieben

Agnello, S. L. 1950. "Christiana-Byzantina Siciliae II", *Nuovo Didaskaleion* 4, 55-66.
Agnello, S. L. 1956. "Lavori di sistemazione nelle catacombe siracusane di Vigna Cassia", *Archivio storico siracusano* 2, 45-64.
Agnello, S. L. 1958. "Problemi di datazione delle catacombe di Siracusa", in *Scritti in onore di Guido Libertini*, Firenze: L. S. Olschki, 65-82.
Agnello, S. L. 1960. "Iscrizioni cemeteriali inedite di Siracusa", *Rivista di archeologia cristiana* 36, 19-42.
Agnello, S. L. 1963. "Ancora sull'iscrizione messinese di Ulpio Niceforo", *Cronache di*

archeologia e di storia dell'arte 2, 79-83.
Borsari, S. 1963. *Il monachesimo bizantino nella Sicilia e nell'Italia meridionale prenormanne*, Napoli: Istituto italiano per gli studi storici in Napoli.
Calbi, A. et al. (eds.) 1993, *L'epigrafia del villaggio* (Epigrafia e antichità 12), Faenza: Lega.
Ferrua, A. 1940. "Due pseudoepigrafi cristiane di Siracusa", *Rivista di archeologia cristiana* 17, 276-78.
Ferrua, A. 1941. "Epigrafia sicula pagana e cristiana", *Rivista di archeologia cristiana* 18, 151-243.
Ferrua, A. 1942. "Dal greco al volgare", *Civiltà cattolica* 93.1, 207-16.
Ferrua, A. 1946-47. "Florilegio d'iscrizioni paleocristiane di Sicilia", *Rendiconti della Pontificia accademia romana di archeologia* 22, 227-39.
Ferrua, A. 1974. Review of M. T. Manni Piraino, *Iscrizioni greche lapidarie del museo di Palermo* (Palermo 1973), *Rivista di archeologia cristiana* 50, 431-33.
Ferrua, A. 1989. *Note e giunte alle iscrizioni cristiane antiche della Sicilia* (Sussidi allo studio delle antichità cristiane 9), Città del Vaticano: Pontificio Istituto di archeologia cristiana.
Février, P. A. 1964. "Remarques sur les inscriptions funéraires datées de Maurétanie Césarienne Orientale (IIe–Ve siècle)", *Mélanges de l'Ecole française de Rome. Antiquité* 76, 105-72.
Fontana, M. J. et al. (eds.) 1980. Φιλίας χάριν. *Miscellanea di studi classici in onore di Eugenio Manni* 1-7, Roma: Giorgio Bretschneider.
Forni, G. 1980. "Sicilia Romana tributim discripta", in Fontana et al. 1980, 949-61.
Führer, J. 1897. *Forschungen zur Sicilia sotterranea*, München: Königliche bayerische Akademie der Wissenschaften. (Distributed both in *Abhandlungen der königlichen bayerischen Akademie der Wissenschaften*, class 1, vol. 20.3, 673-862, and as a separate volume with independent page numbering.)
Gentili, G. V. 1961. "Nuovi elementi di epigrafia siracusana", *Archivio storico siracusano* 7, 5-25.
Gray, N. 1948. "The Paleography of Latin Inscriptions in the Eigth, Ninth and Tenth Centuries in Italy", *Papers of the British School in Rome* 16, 38-171.
Griesheimer, M. 1996. "Nouvelles inscriptions funéraires de la catacombe Saint-Jean", *Rivista di archeologia cristiana* 72, 115-32.
Kaimio, J. 1979. *The Romans and the Greek Language* (Commentationes humanarum litterarum 64), Helsinki: Societas scientiarum Fennica.
Kajanto, I. 1963a. *Onomastic Studies in the Early Christian Inscriptions of Rome and Carthage* (Acta Instituti Romani Finlandiae 2.1), Helsinki: Institutum Romanum Finlandiae.
Kajanto, I. 1963b. *A Study of the Greek Epitaphs of Rome* (Acta Instituti Romani Finlandiae 2.3), Helsinki: Institutum Romanum Finlandiae.
Leiwo, M. 1994. *Neapolitana* (Commentationes humanarum litterarum 102), Helsinki: Societas scientiarum Fennica.
Manganaro, G. 1962. "Graffiti e iscrizioni funerarie della Sicilia Orientale", *Helikon* 2, 485-501.
Manganaro, G. 1993. "Greco nei *pagi* e latino nelle città della Sicilia 'romana' tra I e VI sec. d.C.", in Calbi et al. 1993, 543-94.
Orsi, P. 1918. "Gli scavi intorno a l'Athenaion di Siracusa", *Monumenti antichi pubblicati dall'Accademia dei Lincei* 25, 353-754.
Pace, B. 1949. *Arte e civiltà della Sicilia antica* 4, Roma – Napoli – Città di Castello: S. A. Editrice Dante Alighieri.
Schiavo, D. (ed.) 1756. *Memorie per servire alla storia letteraria di Sicilia* 1, Palermo.
Sgarlata, M. 1993 [1996], *La raccolta epigrafica e l'epistolario archeologico di Cesare Gaetani*

conte della Torre (Seia 10), Palermo: Università degli studi di Palermo.
Silvagni, A. 1950. "Iscrizioni cristiane di Siracusa", *Rivista di archeologia cristiana* 26, 221-22.
Sinn, F. 1987. *Stadtrömische Marmorurnen* (Beiträge zur Erschließung hellenistischer und kaiserzeitlicher Skulptur und Architektur 8), Mainz am Rhein: Philipp von Zabern.
Solin, H. 1971. *Beiträge zur Kenntnis der griechischen Personennamen in Rom* 1 (Commentationes humanarum litterarum 48), Helsinki: Societas scientiarum Fennica.
Tod, M. N. 1951. "Laudatory Epithets in Greek Epitaphs", *Annual of the British School at Athens* 46, 182-90.
Wilson, R. J. A. 1990. *Sicily under the Roman Empire*, Warminster: Aris and Phillips.

Notes (p. 77)

---

* I am grateful to Dr. R. Amato and Dr. A. Curcio of the Soprintendenza per i beni archeologici, Syracuse, and especially to Dr. M. Sgarlata of the Ispettorato per le catacombe della Sicilia Orientale, Syracuse, for permission to study the archival and epigraphic material in Syracuse. My thanks are also due to Dr. Shane Butler who revised my English.

1 For a good recent discussion of the public language use in this city, see Wilson 1990, 316. The problematic *SEG* 43.634 must be added to the documents. The numbers given here are my counts. All dates are AD.
2 The bilingual text: Ferrua 1989, 67 n. 260: [Ε]ΠΙΤΥΓΧΑ/ΝΟC ΑΒΕ (from the catacomb of S. Maria Gesù, datable to the 3rd century).
3 In *IG* 14 the uncertain cases are few, and the later publications are better documented. We cannot be sure of the origin of many inscriptions which came to the museum of Syracuse before the directorship of P. Orsi, which began in 1888; the origin is either unknown, or the old inventory gives false information.
|| **78**
4 The most important cemetery with inscriptions datable to the Hellenistic period is the one published by P. Orsi in *NSc* 1892, 354-65.
5 See, e. g., Kajanto 1963a, 18.
6 For Catania, see Ferrua 1941, 172; for Messina, *IG* 14.411, 414, and *NSc* 1942, 82-84.
7 Compare the epitaphs in Leiwo 1994, 60-86, 117-18 with ibid. 104-9.
8 Illuminating examples are *IG* 14.116 (corrected reading by Ferrua 1989, 45 n. 165): Τύνβος Εὐτυχίωνος ἀγορασίᾳ. ἔνθα κῖτε Ἰρήνα, ἡ σύνβιος αὐτοῦ, and *IG* 14.177 (corrected by Ferrua 1989, 47 n. 176): Ἐνθάδε κῖτε Τιμόθιος κὲ Ἰρήνα, ἡ τούτου σύνβιος, ἅμα καὶ Κρισκωνία, ἡ τούτων ποθητή, ζήσασα ἔτη πλῖον ἔλατον εἴκοσι, both from S. Giovanni.
9 *IG* 14.34 cf. Ferrua 1941, 197. It was found by the 18th-century archaeologist C. Gaetani in the vicinity of three other inscriptions that are also very particular in Syracuse, *IG* 14.23, 35 and 44. See Gaetani, in Schiavo 1756, part 5, 15; 60-62 and in Sgarlata 1993 [1996], 163.
10 *NSc* 1912, 299 (i) = 1915, 203 (ii); cf. Ferrua 1941, 214 n. 91; Agnello 1950, 64 n. 24.
11 The material consists of the pagan Greek funerary inscriptions from Syracuse, excluding the fragments of which it is impossible to say whether they had the pair of attributes or not.
12 E. g. *IG* 14.226 cf. Ferrua 1941, 198 (Akrai); *NSc* 1907, 485 (Modica); *SEG* 26.1117 (Rosolini); *NSc* 1912, 363 (Ragusa); the epitaph published by F. Cordano, "Iscrizioni dal territorio di Palagonia e Mineo", in *XI Congresso internazionale di Epigrafia greca e latina. Atti* 1, Rome 1999, 681-82 (Mineo); *IG* 14.254 (Licodia); *IG* 14.255*a* (S. Croce Camerina); *IG* 14.510, *NSc* 1915, 216 and *SEG* 44.762 (Catania).

[13] This criterion has been studied by Ferrua 1941, 180-210; cf. Ferrua 1974, 431-32. For the pair in the Christian context cf. Ferrua 1941, 202 n. 75; Theodule χρηστιανὴ καὶ ἄμεμπ[τ]ος (Ferrua 1941, 205, fig. 38); and the dated epitaph from the vicinity of Modica (year 396 or 402, *SEG* 36.852).

[14] As far as I know, it is attested in Rome twice, in *IGUR* 794 and in the Christian *ICUR* 17227 (= *IG* 14.1639). (Note that *IGUR* 646 is not from Rome, but from Syracuse, namely *IG* 14.36, republished by Ferrua 1941, 186, 198.) A difficult case is *SEG* 26.1855 (Egypt?).

[15] *CIL* 10.7129, 8314 and 8315; *EE* 8.694; *NSc* 1901, 344 (*piissime, salve* with long I in PIISSIME); *NSc* 1915, 206; *NSc* 1920, 317 fig. 10 (*pia, have*).

[16] Cf. Kajanto 1963a, 17-18. From Syracuse: Manganaro 1962, 499 n. 72; *NSc* 1901, 337; *NSc* 1912, 298 fig. 8.

[17] Catania: *CIL* 10.7082; Centuripe: *CIL* 10.7010 (*pius salve*). Note the curious *CIL* 10.7064 = *IG* 14.472 (see n. 20 below).

[18] I doubt F. Sinn's dating of *CIL* 10.8314 as "Hadrianisch (?)" (Sinn 1987, 221 n. 535), but will not go into detail here. *NSc* 1915, 206 is a more difficult case.

[19] This was argued (with reference to *EE* VIII 694) by G. Forni (1980, 960 n. 29).

[20] To take an example from epigraphy, in *CIL* 10.7064 = *IG* 14.472 (origin uncertain, but attributed to Catania with reason), in which the cognomen (?) *Pius* is translated with Εὐσεβής.
HS: ei ole cognomenin käännös vaan epiteetti. olen samaa mieltä

[21] Its surviving fragments are *IG* 14.59*a* (identified by Ferrua, 1940, 276-77) and Orsi

1918, 611 fig. 206. It has not been identified previously, but it was found in the area where *IG* 14.45 was last seen, and it is very probably a fragment of lines 1-2 of that inscription. (Note that *CIL* 10.7173 with an analogous wording is not from Sicily, see Ferrua 1940, 278).

[22] Gentili 1961, 21 n. 3.

[23] The arguments for this are 1) her name; 2) her monument as described by authors of the early modern age, cited in *IG*; 3) the fine lettering in the epitaph.

[24] Tod 1951, 185-86.

[25] See Agnello 1958, 69-75.

[26] The exceptions are: *SEG* 4.3, possibly also Agnello 1963, 82 (cf. Ferrua 1989, 63 n. 241), Ferrua 1989, 66 n. 254 and 84 n. 332.

[27] See also Ferrua 1941, 210-43.

[28] They are the τόπος type (τόπος followed by the name in genitive, meaning "N's grave"), and the μνήσθητι type, a wish that God would remember the dead person.

[29] The numbers are my own counts. I have excluded the texts which probably do not originally belong to the catacomb.

[30] Christian symbols are seldom used in the graffiti, but feature in about one third of the marble inscriptions. – The position of the painted epitaphs is not clear in the arrangement. They are a minority, and often contain a cross which precedes the name of the deceased. They may have represented a more luxurious alternative than a simple marble plate.

[31] This explanation was tentatively suggested and refuted for the city of Rome by J. Kaimio (1979, 172).

[32] They are Führer 1897, 103 [773] n. 1 and Agnello 1956, 53 and 60.

[33] Kaimio 1979, 173-74.

[34] See Kajanto 1963b, 57-59.

[35] Their distribution in the different sections of the catacomb is difficult (this concerns

particularly the texts published in *IG*), which is why I treat them here as a whole.

[36] B. Pace's suggestion (Pace 1949, 255-56), that the use of Greek was due to historical and religious reasons, is not plausible.

[37] The examples are not from Vigna Cassia, but from the catacomb of S. Giovanni: *IG* 14.88: father *Eusebius*, son *Bonifatius*; *IG* 14.177 (cf. Ferrua 1989, 47 n. 176): father *Timotheus*, mother *Irena*, daughter *Cresconia*, written Κρισ-. Compare also *IG* 14.156 (father *Hesperianus*, daughter *Urbica*).

[38] See Solin 1971, 133-35.

[39] *NSc* 1947, 189-91 nn. 1-6 and 9 (Latin); n. 7 (Greek letters, but illegible) = *AE* 1951, 175-179; corrections: Ferrua 1989, 89-90 nn. 344-348; Manganaro 1993, 584-87, photos in 565-67 (figs. 23-27).

[40] *NSc* 1907, 777 n. 43 (cf. Ferrua 1989, 31 n. 93a) and Ferrua 1989, 31 n. 93 (*NSc* 1907, 776 nn. 41 + 42) were found in the vicinity. Compare *CIL* 10.7169 and 7185 (cf. Ferrua 1989, 92 n. 358 and 93 n. 361)

[41] Ferrua 1942, 214-15.

|| **80**

[42] See Ferrua 1946-47, 238. He was supported by Manganaro 1993, 554, 584-87; cf. also the comment of the editor, L. Bernabò Brea, in *NSc* 1947, 192.

[43] Borsari 1963, 14 n. 18.

[44] *NSc* 1947, 191.

[45] Silvagni 1950, 221.

[46] Ferrua 1946-47, 238 n. 49 from the suburb of S. Lucia.

[47] Cf. Manganaro 1993, 587: "una rottura nella tradizione funeraria delle famiglie siracusane".

[48] An example of a similarly wide lettering is *AE* 1977, 204, dated in 506, from Cimitile in Campania.

[49] This is the stonecutter of the inscriptions nn. 3 and 5. Note also the form of *D* and the small *O*'s.

[50] Nn. 1, 2, 9 and possibly 6. See the forms of *M*, the big upper parts of *P* and *R*, the wide *V*'s. N. 4 may also be written by this person, as the *apices* have not been used in it; the *A* in n. 4 is different.

[51] See the tables of Gray 1948, 47-48, 56, 61-64, 80-81.

[52] The professions are *carpentarius,* possibly *praeceptor*, *medicus* and *figulus*.

[53] See Février 1964, 124.

[54] *NSc* 1895, 492 n. 185; Griesheimer 1996, 120-21 n. 5. *CIL* 10.7181 (cf. Ferrua 1989, 188) belongs to the group of large limestone plates, see Agnello 1960, 32 n. 28.

[55] *NSc* 1893, 298 n. 76 (cf. Ferrua 1989, 18 n. 27): + Μνιμῖον [---] / τα Θεοδο[ρ---] / οδόρου [---] (small limestone block, size 19 x 15 cm [Orsi, *NSc*]). It has been published many times among the inscriptions from S. Giovanni, because of the information given by the unreliable old inventory of the Syracuse museum (see n. 3 above).