THE EPITAPH OF M. JULIUS EUGENIUS, BISHOP OF LAODICEIA.

THIS important document, composed about A.D. 340–342, has been inserted by Dr. Erwin Preuschen in the new edition of his most useful *Analecta : Kürzere Texte zur Geschichte der alten Kirche und des Kanons*, pp. 149, 150. Unfortunately, he gives a text which is in several respects inexact and misleading; and, while he follows the arrangement in lines as on the sarcophagus throughout his first sixteen lines, and gives numbers accordingly, he neglects the arrangement in the last three (which he prints as four); and numbers the nineteen lines of the text as twenty-two. He also omits most of the scanty literature of the subject.[1]

When I wrote about this interesting memorial of the last great persecution, I had not seen the original stone. In April, 1909, we visited Ladik; my daughter made a drawing of the elaborately ornate surface, so as to show the exact situation of the lines and the way in which they are adapted to the ornamental details. Mr. Calder and I carefully verified the text and made some important corrections.

As Dr. Preuschen's text is intended for common use, it is important that it should be printed in an intelligible form. The errors in it arise partly from taking Mr. Calder's preliminary text without reading his commentary, and partly from pure error in reprinting that text.

The most serious fault in it is that he prints at the end *τὰ προ[γεγραμμένα] ταῦτα ἐπόιησα ἐπιγρ(ά)φιν ἐμὸν τῆς τε*

[1] Ramsay, EXPOSITOR, December, 1908, pp. 546 ff., and *Luke the Physician and other Studies in the History of Religion*, pp. 339–351.

ἐκ[δοχῆς] τοῦ γένους μου. This is a meaningless and impossible reading. The nature of the necessary correction is obvious to any epigraphist,[1] and appeared to me so convincing that I wasted no words on it beyond stating the cause of the corruption. There can be no doubt that the purpose of the construction was stated at this point in the epitaph; and the purpose was that the whole monument and property should be the grave of Eugenius and of certain others belonging to his family. This is beyond question to any one who is familiar with the epigraphic style of Asia Minor; but Dr. Preuschen's studies have not lain in this unimportant and remote corner of the great field of learning. Now the ε which follows after ἐπιγρ(ά)φιν is the last letter of a line; and I suggested that the eye of the scribe wandered on to a later ε, and thus he omitted certain letters, just as he omitted α in ἐπιγράφιν, and ς in ἁπλῶς: the original text then was ε(ἰς τύμβον ἐ)μὸν,[2] "to be the tomb of myself and of [certain other persons] belonging to my family."

When we saw the stone in April, 1909, it was evident at the first glance that at the beginning of the last line there is a gap (which Mr. Calder had not indicated in his copy), and that this gap had held about nine letters. There was no error of the engraver: the words which we had suggested to supply a supposed omission had been actually engraved on the stone, but were subsequently defaced. The restored text, as I printed it, was correct, except that square brackets (indicating a lacuna in the stone) should be substituted for curved parentheses.

Another even more important correction is in the same line. The restoration ἐκ[δοχῆς] is wrong: the letter following κ was certainly Λ, and not Δ. Also, the lacuna is slightly

[1] The exact words are, of course, uncertain, although the general meaning is indubitable.

[2] Calder in his commentary gives ἐπί instead of εἰς, but this misses the sense.

larger than we had allowed; and the letter O comes after the lacuna and before τοῦ.

The text then is ἐ[ις τύμβον ἐ]μὸν τῆς τε ἐκλ[ογῆς ἀπ]ὸ τοῦ γένους μου. This is an extremely interesting reading. The ἐκλογή is the collective noun indicating the whole body of ἐκλεκτοί, "all who are selected," "all the Elect." The expression ἐκλογῆς μέρος in Clement of Rome (*ad* Cor. xxix. 1) indicates (as Lightfoot points out) "the Christian people, the spiritual Israel, who under the new covenant have taken the place of the chosen people under the old; as 1 Peter ii. 9, ὑμεῖς δὲ γένος ἐκλεκτόν. . . . Thus μέρος ἐκλογῆς here is coextensive with οἱ ἐκλελεγμένοι ὑπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ in § 50[1] (compare § 64)."

Eugenius constructed the whole palisade and monument (πέλτα καὶ σορός) "to be the grave of me and of the Elect from my race." He belonged to a family some of whose members were still pagan; and he restricted the right of sharing this sepulchre to those members who were Christian. Similar regulations are found on Phrygian graves about the end of the third century and the early part of the fourth: in one case, the sepulchre of the five children (martyrs) who perished on the same day is declared to be common to the brethren (τὸ ἡρώιον κοινὸν τῶν ἀδελφῶν).[2]

The other correction which we made on the text is less important. The first name of the wife of Bishop Eugenius was not [Γ]Α, i.e., Gaia, but ΦΑ, i.e., Flavia. Her full name Flavia Julia Flaviana, indicates a person of high birth,

[1] Compare Harnack, *der erste Klemensbrief* in *Berlin. Akad. Sitzungsber.*, January 14, 1909, pp. 53–54, *die Christen . . . sind τὸ ἐκλογῆς μέρος und die ἁγία μερὶς* § 30, *erwählt aus der Völkerwelt* (§ 29).

[2] *Cities and Bishoprics of Phrygia*, ii. pp. 730–532. The five (martyrs) are called the children of the maker of the tomb: I take the maker to be the Bishop, and the five to be members of his congregation, his children according to the spirit.

which corresponds to the emphasis which the epitaph lays on the marriage.

Dr. Preuschen has other slight faults in the text which he prints. In line 4 he reads *Γa*, where he should have printed *Γ]a*,[1] and *στρατευσάμενος* for the correct (but ungrammatical) reading *στρατευσάμενον*. In line 16 he rejects my suggestion (*σὺν*) *καί*, and prints the impossible *καί*: the use of *σὺν καί* for simple *σύν* is frequent in the Phrygian and Anatolian Greek.[2] He may possibly be right in preferring Calder's ([λιψόμε]νος) to my [ἀρνούμε]νος, but I believe that the latter conjecture is in the right direction and that the one which he prefers is not. A careful reproduction by Calder of the epigraphic text will shortly appear in the German Journal *Klio*.

As the Analecta will be widely used, and probably pass into many editions, I trust that Dr. Preuschen will pardon me for making these criticisms, and also for suggesting that the remarkable little epitaph [3] dated in the time of the persecution by Decius, and the long epitaph dated under Maximin,[4] both commemorating champions of the anti-Christian reaction, might advantageously be added to his most useful book. I have gratefully to acknowledge his courtesy in sending it to me.

I may also use this opportunity to correct an error of interpretation which I have fallen into (along with Mr. Calder). M. Henri Grégoire has convinced me that *κεντήσεις* means "mosaics"; and it is an interesting point that in this

[1] The same error is found in Mr. Calder's text: the first letter is illegible, but the second is certain.

[2] It occurs also in Eusebius, as Calder points out in his commentary, and probably more widely.

[3] *Pauline and Other Studies*, p. 109. Reprinted recently by M. E. de Stoop with all the connected group of inscriptions, including the one mentioned in the following note.

[4] *Cities and Bishoprics of Phrygia*, ii. p. 566.

Laodicean Church, built 320–340 A.D., mosaics formed so important a feature of the equipment and decoration. It remains, of course, still true that there were doubtless screens used in this church, as in the contemporary one at Tyre. We have found several examples of screens represented on Christian gravestones of this same period and region.

W. M. RAMSAY.