University of Groningen

Unseen and Unharmd

Kuin, Inger N. I.

Published in:
The Classical Quarterly

DOI:
[10.1017/S000983881700060X](https://doi.org/10.1017/S000983881700060X)

IMPORTANT NOTE: You are advised to consult the publisher's version (publisher's PDF) if you wish to cite from it. Please check the document version below.

Document Version
Publisher's PDF, also known as Version of record

Publication date:
2017

[Link to publication in University of Groningen/UMCG research database](#)

Citation for published version (APA):

Kuin, I. N. I. (2017). Unseen and Unharmd: A Case Study in Understanding Opisthographic Epitaphs. *The Classical Quarterly*, 67(2), 573-582. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S000983881700060X>

Copyright

Other than for strictly personal use, it is not permitted to download or to forward/distribute the text or part of it without the consent of the author(s) and/or copyright holder(s), unless the work is under an open content license (like Creative Commons).

The publication may also be distributed here under the terms of Article 25fa of the Dutch Copyright Act, indicated by the "Taverne" license. More information can be found on the University of Groningen website: <https://www.rug.nl/library/open-access/self-archiving-pure/taverne-amendment>.

Take-down policy

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact us providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

Downloaded from the University of Groningen/UMCG research database (Pure): <http://www.rug.nl/research/portal>. For technical reasons the number of authors shown on this cover page is limited to 10 maximum.

UNSEEN AND UNHARMED: A CASE STUDY IN UNDERSTANDING OPISTHOGRAPHIC EPITAPHS*

Opisthographic inscriptions have not received much attention from scholars. One particular practice, the reuse of an inscribed stone for a new inscription, has been studied well,¹ but opisthographic inscriptions that cannot be explained as reuse remain understudied. In this article a case study of the double-sided inscriptions in one collection, the epigraphy holdings of the New York University Classics Department, will demonstrate that the existing explanations for opisthographic inscriptions showing no evidence of reuse are unsatisfactory.

Ivan Di Stefano Manzella, to the best of my knowledge the only scholar to date who has systematically studied opisthographic inscriptions, lists three possible circumstances (other than recycling) that would lead to a stone being inscribed on both sides. One possibility is that the customer is dissatisfied with the initial inscription because of an error or an omission and orders the stonecutter to use the other side of the stone for an improved version. Alternatively, the stonecutter himself is dissatisfied and decides to use the other side of the stone for a second try, or, thirdly, he might have used one side of the stone to cut a draft version.² Regarding this last possibility, it is worth noting that it would be much easier for a stonecutter to produce a draft on papyrus, a wax tablet or an *ostrakon*. If he were to use the back of the stone for a draft version, it seems that he would continuously have to flip the stone to check the draft and the final version against each other. The first two explanations offered by Di Stefano Manzella likewise fall short in accounting for non-reused double-sided inscriptions, as the detailed study of just a small number of opisthographic epitaphs will show.

The New York University (= NYU) Classics Department houses over forty Roman epitaphs. Most of them probably come from the Porta Salaria necropolis north of Rome. The collection was published in 2014.³ Of these epitaphs four are inscribed on both sides of the stone, even though they would have been fixed against a wall *in situ*,

* I want to thank Michael Peachin, Elizabeth Meyer, Angelos Chaniotis, Kaja Harter-Uibopuu, Scott DiGiulio and Daniel Hoyer for their help and advice during my research for this article, and CQ's anonymous referee for their valuable suggestions.

¹ It was fairly common for epitaphs to be dislodged and re-appropriated; see e.g. M. Carroll, *Spirits of the Dead. Roman Funerary Commemoration in Western Europe* (Oxford, 2006), 83–5. For examples, see e.g. J. Bodel, 'Thirteen Latin funerary inscriptions at Harvard University', *AJA* 96 (1992), 71–100, nos. 13a and 13b; S.L. Tuck, *Latin Inscriptions in the Kelsey Museum* (Ann Arbor, 2005), nos. 63, 87, 173, 265. The practice is not limited to Latin epigraphy: The Metropolitan Museum in New York, for instance, owns a reused opisthographic Egyptian tombstone from the Fatimid and Ayyubid periods respectively (2010.225).

² I. Di Stefano Manzella, *Mestiere di Epigrafista: Guida alla Schedatura del Materiale Epigrafico Lapideo* (Rome, 1987), 201–2; cf. Carroll (n. 1), 118–19, on errors and opisthography. Examples may be found in H. Thylander, *Inscriptions du Port d'Ostie* (Lund, 1952), nos. A263, A263a.

³ M. Peachin (ed.), *Greek and Latin Inscriptions at New York University* (Rome, 2014), 1–10.

thus hiding one of the inscribed surfaces from view. Three of the NYU opisthographs (nos. 4, 28 and 29) are inscribed for the same person on both sides. One of them, no. 33, may have been reused for a different person, since the inscription in the back is too fragmentary to determine who its dedicatee was.⁴ In what follows I will test the existing explanations for opisthography by taking a closer look at the three NYU epitaphs that were inscribed twice for the same individual.

NYU inscription no. 28 is a gravestone for a freedwoman named Mutia Chreste. The small rectangular shape of the stone (14.5 cm × 35.5 cm) strongly suggests that it was used as a columbarium marker. The text of the inscription is the same on both sides:

Mutia ☉ (Gaiae) l(iberta)
Chreste

(This monument is for) Mutia Chreste, the freedwoman of a woman.⁵

This inscription has been dated to the second century C.E., based on the style of the lettering and the popularity of the name Chreste in that period.⁶ Columbarium markers such as this are typically attached to the wall of the columbarium, under the niche for the urn, hiding the back from view.⁷ This is confirmed in this case by the presence of nails, which also seem to indicate which was intended as the front side of the stone, and which as the back (see [figs. 1a](#) and [1b](#)).⁸

On Mutia's stone no omission or error in either version of the text could have caused the customer to desire a second inscription. Although the reverse 'c' is round on the

FIGURE 1a: Epitaph for Mutia Chreste, recto.

⁴ I.N.I. Kuin, 'Grave monument of Pudens', in M. Peachin (ed.), *Greek and Latin Inscriptions at New York University* (Rome, 2014), 94–6. See n. 1 above on reuse.

⁵ All translations follow the editions in Peachin (n. 3).

⁶ I.N.I. Kuin, 'Grave monument of Mutia Chreste', in M. Peachin (ed.), *Greek and Latin Inscriptions at New York University* (Rome, 2014), 84–5; cf. H. Solin, *Die griechischen Personennamen in Rom. Ein Namenbuch* (Berlin, 2003²), 2.1006–9.

⁷ J.M.C. Toynbee, *Death and Burial in the Roman World* (Ithaca, 1971), 71, 113–15; cf. W. Eck, 'Römische Grabinschriften: Aussageabsicht und Aussagefähigkeit im funerären Kontext', in H. von Hesberg and P. Zanker (edd.), *Römische Gräberstrassen: Selbstdarstellung, Status, Standard* (Munich, 1987), 61–83, at 62, 65.

⁸ Kuin (n. 4), 84 designates the two sides in the opposite way. [Figure 1a](#) clearly shows, however, that the nailheads have been chiselled off on the recto, allowing the stone to be pulled down from the wall. Examples of other columbarium markers attached with nails are: *CIL* 6.33493, *CIL* 6.33396, *CIL* 6.33534 and no. 99 in H.L. Wilson, 'Latin inscriptions at the Johns Hopkins University VII', *AJPh* 33 (1912), 168–85.

FIGURE 1b: Epitaph for Mutia Chreste, verso.

recto and has a sharp wedge shape on the verso, this would seem to be too slight an imperfection to justify the trouble and expense of an entire new inscription. The writing on both sides of Mutia's stone is comparable in style and quality, with a simple border framing both inscriptions. In sum, the Mutia inscription cannot easily be explained by Di Stefano Manzella's account.

On NYU epitaph no. 4 the inscriptions both on the front and on the back are practically identical in content but quite different in appearance (figs. 2a and 2b):

front: Porcia Donata fecit
Primigen[io] Caesaris ser(uo)
plumario magnario, coniu(gi)
[carissimo. u]ixit ann(os) XL.

back: [Porcia] Donata
[fecit Pr]imigenio
Caesaris plumario
magnario
5 coniugi carissi-
mo. u(ixit) a(nnos) XL.

Porcia Donata dedicated this for Primigenius, a slave of the emperor, (chief?) embroiderer, her dearest husband. He lived for forty years.

The inscription has been dated to the first or second century C.E.⁹ The small size of the stone (33 cm × 27 cm) suggests that this is another columbarium marker, and from the nail holes we can tell that the stone was indeed fixed to a wall, as one would expect. The side that, judging by the nail holes, probably faced out was cut with cursive letters, a practice fairly rare for Latin tombstones.¹⁰ The other side was cut with capital letters. A single ornamental border frames the text in the back, and the front has a double

⁹ S. Kidd, 'Grave monument of Primigenius', in M. Peachin (ed.), *Greek and Latin Inscriptions at New York University* (Rome, 2014), 26–8.

¹⁰ Cursive writing is usually found on writing tablets, potsherds and papyri; L. Keppie, *Understanding Roman Inscriptions* (Baltimore, 1991), 18. Kidd (n. 9), 26 designates the two sides in the opposite way (as with no. 28; see n. 8 above). Figure 2a, however, shows clearly that the nailheads have been chiselled off on the recto; to reinstall the stone with the verso facing out clamps (not nails) might have been used.

ornamental border. Lastly, the text on the back is upside down with respect to the front-side text.

Aside from the different styles of writing, the word *ser(uo)* is missing from the inscription on the back. This may be explained by the fact that capitals take up more space; the omission does not affect the meaning. There is a possibility that Primigenius' wife had the stone inscribed in cursives initially, and that after some time it was decided that a regular inscription with capital letters would be better. If the inscription was taken down, re-inscribed and turned around at this point, on account of dissatisfaction with the initial inscription, it would fit with the first explanation for opisthography offered by Di Stefano Manzella. The appearance of the nail holes, however, does not support this scenario: there is no sign of the inscription with regular capitals ever having faced out (see n. 10). It seems, then, more likely that Porcia Donata, like Mutia, had the epitaph inscribed on both sides intentionally, and that Primigenius' stone is another example of unexplained opisthography.

FIGURE 2a: Epitaph for Primigenius, recto.

FIGURE 2b: Epitaph for Primigenius, verso.

On stone no. 29, in contrast to our examples so far, the texts inscribed on the two sides are quite different in content (figs. 3a and 3b). One side contains the full epitaph, while the other side, which for reasons I explain below was probably the back, holds only the name of the deceased, written in full just as on the front. The front reads:

Dis Manibus
M(arcus) Octavius Diadumenus
fecit sibi et suis libertis liber-
tabusque posterisque eorum
5 h(oc) m(onumentum) h(eredem) n(on) sequetur
neque ueniet neque con-
cedere ulli neq(ue) de nomine
exeat.
in fr(onte) p(edes) XVII in agr(o) p(edes) XXXXVII.

To the divine shades. Marcus Octavius Diadumenus dedicated (this monument) for himself and his (family), for his freedmen and his freedwomen, and for their descendants. This monument shall not go over to an heir, nor shall it be sold nor turned over to anyone,¹¹ nor shall it pass from the family name. (The plot is) 17 feet wide, 47 feet deep.

This epitaph of moderate size (47 cm × 42.5 cm) was likely attached to the wall above the entrance either of a mausoleum or of a walled burial site, or to a standing base in the centre of a burial site marked off by *cippi*. Clear indications for this are the specification of the plot size, and the stipulations on who may be included in the burial complex.¹² Because the inscription provides this information, this side was probably the front. However, in the absence of nail holes (the stone was perhaps fastened with clamps), it is difficult to determine for certain which side faced out. The epitaph has been dated to the second half of the first century C.E., based on the use of *Dis Manibus* and on the letter style.¹³

Just as with Primigenius' and Mutia's stones, the inscription on the back of stone no. 29 cannot be considered 'wrong'. Rather, it reiterates the dedication in the front by repeating the dedicatee's name in large letters. The shorter inscription did not serve as a draft: the quality of the writing is high and there is an elaborate border framing the text. One might perhaps suggest that the stonecutter started out with large letters on the back and, once he realized the inscription would not fit, started over on the other side; or, alternatively, that Diadumenus first wanted only his name but then changed his mind and had the longer inscription cut. In my view neither scenario is very likely. The former requires a level of incompetency on the part of the stonecutter incongruous with the quality of the inscriptions. The latter requires that Diadumenus altered his plans for his burial completely in a short time span, which seems improbable too. Instead, it seems quite possible that Diadumenus, also, had his epitaph inscribed on two sides intentionally.¹⁴

¹¹ *neque concedere ulli* probably rests on a mistake; it is not formulaic and it is even unusual; *concederet* or *concedet* must have been meant: cf. I.N.I. Kuin, 'Grave monument of M. Octavius Diadumenus', in M. Peachin (ed.), *Greek and Latin Inscriptions at New York University* (Rome, 2014), 86–8.

¹² Eck (n. 7), 61–2. The plot is unusually large; on plot sizes at Rome, see Eck (n. 7), 63–4, 82; Bodel (n. 1), 80 n. 53.

¹³ Kuin (n. 11), 88.

¹⁴ An excellent *comparandum* for Diadumenus' inscription is *AE* 1985, 199, where the (likely) verso lists only the dedicatees, while the recto also lists the dedicator and the people to be included in the burial site; cf. Kuin (n. 11), 88.

FIGURE 3a: Epitaph for M. Octavius Diadumenus, recto.

FIGURE 3b: Epitaph for M. Octavius Diadumenus, verso.

The collection of inscriptions at NYU, then, contains three opisthographs that cannot easily be explained by Di Stefano Manzella's account. Rather, it seems likely that those who ordered the opisthographic epitaphs did so intentionally. What, though, were their intentions? I suggest that the dedicators of these epitaphs wanted to protect the inscribed record of their beloved by having it inscribed twice. Romans were often concerned about the possibility of their graves being tampered with, either through physical damage or through a transfer of the burial site to someone else's ownership.¹⁵ Physical damage to the inscription could occur through reuse,¹⁶ vandalism,¹⁷ natural decay¹⁸ or targeted mutilation.¹⁹ Dedicators tried to ward off these various risks by inscribing the common formula *huic* (or *hoc*) *monumento dolus malus abesto*, abbreviated as *HMDMA*.²⁰ The dedicator of NYU stone no. 29 specifically tried to prevent the second type of interference, the transfer of a burial site to someone else's ownership, as is evident from lines 5 through 8 of his epitaph. This kind of formula was probably used to prevent the plot from being sold,²¹ given the evidence we have for sales, transfers, sharing and re-appropriations of burial sites.²² It is clear, then, that Romans were quite fearful of interference with burial sites and were eager to (attempt to) counter it.

Having a two-sided epitaph could serve to protect the text: the inscription on the back reiterates the one on the front; once the stone is installed, this version of the inscription is sealed by being fixed against a wall, and protected. The hidden inscription in the back guarantees that the funerary record will be preserved even if someone, for whatever reason, scratches out the name on the front or if the inscription wears out. Additionally, inscribing the text on the back also protects the stone against reuse, by making it exceedingly unattractive: to re-appropriate an opisthograph one would have to scratch out one of the two inscriptions completely and make the surface smooth again before inscribing the new dedication.

The strategy of doubling the funerary inscription in order to protect it is reminiscent of two types of non-funerary Latin documents. Military diplomas, made available to (auxiliary) troops after they had fulfilled their service, consist of pairs of hinged bronze

¹⁵ Toynbee (n. 7), 76; cf. Carroll (n. 1), 79–85.

¹⁶ See n. 1 above.

¹⁷ On reckless behaviour of gravesite visitors, see e.g. Petron. *Sat.* 112; Mart. 3.93.15, 1.34.8; cf. Toynbee (n. 7), 50–2; Keppie (n. 10), 98–101; Carroll (n. 1), 83.

¹⁸ E.g. Mart. 1.88, Auson. *Epit.* 32; cf. M. Carroll, 'Memoria and damnatio memoriae. Preserving and erasing identities in Roman funerary commemoration', in M. Carroll and J. Rempel (edd.), *Living Through the Dead. Burial and Commemoration in the Classical World* (Oxford, 2011), 65–90, at 71.

¹⁹ *damnatio memoriae* did not only befall those (formerly) in power: H. Flower, *The Art of Forgetting: Disgrace and Oblivion in Roman Political Culture* (Chapel Hill, NC, 2006), 10–11; cf. Carroll (n. 18), 80; V. Closs, 'Grave monument of L. Gellius Felix', in M. Peachin (ed.), *Greek and Latin Inscriptions at New York University* (Rome, 2014), 53–4. On *damnatio memoriae* (a modern term) as such, see E. Varner, *Mutilation and Transformation. Damnatio Memoriae and Roman Imperial Portraiture* (Leiden, Boston, 2004), with comments on the term at 2 and n. 5.

²⁰ A.E. Gordon, *Illustrated Introduction to Latin Epigraphy* (Berkeley, CA, 1983), 145.

²¹ F. de Visscher, *Le Droit des Tombeaux Romains* (Milan, 1963), 103–27; contra, C.C. Mierow, 'Hoc monumentum heredes non sequitur – an interpretation', *TAPhA* 65 (1934), 163–77, who interprets Gaius' definition of *res religiosae* (*Inst.* 2.1–9) to mean that tombs are exempt from inheritance and commercial transactions.

²² Toynbee (n. 7), 76–80; cf. Carroll (n. 1), 102–5; B.E. Borg, *Crisis and Ambition: Tombs and Burial Customs in Third-Century CE Rome* (Oxford, 2013), 146–60.

folding tablets. They served as proof of the rewards of service. The text was inscribed on the two inner sides, as well as on the outside of the upper tablet, and the two tablets were sealed together.²³ Secondly, on double documents used for legal acts in the Roman East the text was written twice on one side of a papyrus. The first text was rolled up and fastened with string; the second text remained visible, and the names of the sealers were written perpendicularly on the back.²⁴ In both cases a text is written twice, one of the texts being hidden from view and sealed. If someone tampers with the first text, the second text can easily be unsealed, and the information may thus be verified.

Unlike in the case of double documents or military diplomas, opisthographic funerary monuments would have to be violated, and significantly so, for the second text to become legible. This raises several questions. Once an epitaph is dislodged, and a potential reuser has abandoned the idea of using it because it is opisthographic, can it still serve as a funerary monument? The disappointed potential reuser might reinstall the stone, especially since they could well be related to the dedicatee,²⁵ but what if this did not happen? Though dedicators and dedicatees of course prefer the epitaph to be in place, it could perhaps still partly fulfil its function: the record of the deceased is preserved, and re-appropriation has been prevented. Alternatively, what if the inscription in the front is damaged or wears out? The second inscription on the back would be *there*, but it would not be visible. We might ask, then, if there could be any value for a Roman in an unharmed but unseen funerary inscription; and if so, why?

I suggest that this question should be answered affirmatively, if only because the dedicators undertook the trouble and expense of ordering a second inscription, knowing that it would be invisible once installed. The question of *why* an unseen inscription could still be meaningful is more difficult. Part of the answer may lie in the phenomenon of 'symbolic epigraphy'. This is inscribed writing of which the primary function is not transmitting information, precisely because it could not be read or was not read. Mary Beard has used the term 'symbolic epigraphy' in her interpretation of the Arval Acta inscribed by the Arval Brotherhood, which, she argues, were likely not used or read at all: the activity of the writing was part of the ritual, not a record of it.²⁶ Beard later also analysed individual votive inscriptions deposited at temples as symbolic writing,²⁷ while other scholars have applied the concept to realms as varied as

²³ Examples may be found in e.g. P. Roxan and M. Holder, *Roman Military Diplomas* (London, 2003), 4.593–6, no. 315; cf. W. Eck and A. Pangerl, 'Neue Militärdiplome für Auxiliärtruppen verschiedener Provinzen', *ZPE* 196 (2015), 199–210.

²⁴ E. Meyer, *Legitimacy and Law in the Roman World: Tabulae in Roman Belief and Practice* (Cambridge, 2004), 188–91.

²⁵ As e.g. at Bodel (n. 1), nos. 13a and 13b.

²⁶ M. Beard, 'Writing and ritual: a study of diversity and expansion in the Arval Acta', *PBSR* 53 (1985), 114–62; cf. J. Scheid, 'Rituel et écriture à Rome', in A.M. Blondeau and K. Schipper (edd.), *Essais sur le rituel* (Leuven, Paris, 1990), 2.1–15; J. Rüpke, 'Acta aut agenda: relations of script and performance', in A. Barchiesi, J. Rüpke and S. Stephens (edd.), *Rituals in Ink: A Conference on Religion and Literary Production in Ancient Rome Held at Stanford University in February 2002* (Stuttgart, 2004), 23–43.

²⁷ M. Beard, 'Writing and religion: ancient literacy and the function of the written word in Roman religion', in J.H. Humphrey (ed.), *Literacy in the Roman World (Journal of Roman Archaeology Supplementary Series 3)* (Ann Arbor, 1991), 35–58, at 44–8.

Athenian decrees,²⁸ Delian temple inventories,²⁹ an Ephesian foundation³⁰ and Roman legal documents.³¹ Unseen texts that (were thought to) perform actions in an even stronger sense are *defixiones*, or curse tablets: pieces of lead that were inscribed with a curse, rolled up and (often) fastened with a nail.³² The force of a curse was thought to increase by repetition.³³

Funerary inscriptions are of course a different kind of document from the religious, legal and magical inscriptions that have been interpreted using the notion of symbolic writing. None the less, the small sample of the opisthographic funerary inscriptions at NYU does show affinity with these examples of symbolic epigraphy in a few respects. First, the symbolic texts were unseen or unread, just as the double-sided funerary inscriptions (if the rectos had become illegible). Second, both groups of texts were inscribed with some purpose in mind. Third, just as in the case of curse tablets, those who ordered the columbarium markers of Primigenius and Mutia repeated the inscriptions and fastened them with nails; Diadumenus' *HMHNS* formula, like a curse, tries to bring about what it prescribes.³⁴ Romans could attribute a certain power to the inscribed word beyond its informational value, and I suggest that stones 4, 28 and 29 were inscribed on both sides partly because even an unseen funerary inscription was thought to exert some function in the world. Remains of the palace of Sargon II at Dur-Sharrukin show that in antiquity this attitude to inscriptions was not the prerogative of the Romans alone: the back of a wall slab carries a text praising the gods and celebrating the foundation of the city.³⁵ The text was clearly not meant for human eyes but carefully inscribed none the less.

My study of a small and almost random set of double-sided non-reused epitaphs shows that funerary opisthography was more complex than the existing literature suggests. By comparing the NYU opisthographs to examples of symbolic epigraphy I have attempted to sketch one possible avenue for further research. However, in

²⁸ R. Osborne, 'Inscribing performance', in S. Goldhill and R. Osborne (edd.), *Performance Culture and Athenian Democracy* (Cambridge, 1999), 341–58.

²⁹ T. Linders, 'Inscriptions and orality', *SO* 67 (1992), 27–40.

³⁰ G.M. Rogers, *The Sacred Identity of Ephesos: Foundation Myths of a Roman City* (London and New York, 1991), 20–4.

³¹ C. Williamson, 'Monuments of bronze: Roman legal documents on bronze tablets', *CA* 6 (1987), 160–83; cf. W. Harris, *Ancient Literacy* (Cambridge, MA, 1989), 166; P. Culham, 'Archives and alternatives in Republican Rome', *CPh* 84 (1989), 100–15; A. Lintott, *The Constitution of the Roman Republic* (Oxford, 1999), 3; contra, R. Haensch, 'Statthalterarchiv', *ZRG RA* 109 (1992), 209–317, at 212–13; M. Bats, 'Les débuts de l'information politique officielle à Rome au premier siècle avant J.C.', in C. Nicolet (ed.), *La mémoire perdue. À la recherche des archives oubliées, publiques et privées, de la Rome antique* (Paris, 1994), 19–43.

³² J. Gager, *Curse Tablets and Binding Spells from the Ancient World* (Oxford, 1992), 3–41, 226.

³³ J.H.M. Strubbe, 'Cursed be he that moves my bones', in C.A. Faraone and D. Obbink (edd.), *Magika Hiera. Ancient Greek Magic & Religion* (Oxford, 1991), 33–59; cf. C.A. Faraone, 'The agonistic context of early Greek binding spells', in C.A. Faraone and D. Obbink (edd.), *Magika Hiera. Ancient Greek Magic & Religion* (Oxford, 1991), 3–32, at 19.

³⁴ Some epitaphs contain curses targeting potential vandals: see Keppie (n. 10), 109; cf. Strubbe (n. 33), 33–59.

³⁵ D.D. Luckenbill, *Ancient Records of Assyria and Babylonia. Vol. 2: Historical Records of Assyria from Sargon to the End* (Chicago, 1927), 55–6, nos. 104–5.

order to formulate an alternative explanation of funerary opisthography as such, a large-scale survey of double-sided epitaphs will be required.³⁶ I hope that the present contribution might stimulate such research in the future.

Groningen University

INGER N.I. KUIN
n.i.kuin@rug.nl

³⁶ Opisthographs are not catalogued systematically. The Heidelberg Epigraphic Database uses several terms ('beidseitig', 'Opisthograph' and 'Opistograph'), and known opisthographs (e.g. *AE* 1985, 199; see n. 14 above) are not listed as such. The same is true for *CIL* (e.g. *CIL* 6.24999, *CIL* 6.33665), and there 'a' and 'b' numbers can refer to the two sides of opisthographic stones or to the fragments of a broken stone. I did a preliminary survey of two online epigraphic databases, but because of these issues the following numbers are probably too low. In the Epigraphic Database Heidelberg out of 24,340 epitaphs in total 41 are listed as opisthographs; of these, 22 are examples of reuse (*AE* 1968, 168; 1971, 299; 1978, 23; 1981, 110a, 344; 1983, 54, 98/128, 124; 1984, 147, 930; 1985, 485, 853, 859; 1987, 554, 700–1; 1988, 301; 2006, 1016; *CIL* 2².1342–3; *CIL* 3.2304/2569, 10020; *CIL* 6.19866, 41236/37061); another 14 are too fragmentary to rule out reuse (*AE* 1975, 109; 1985, 963; 1994, 1909; 1997, 1257; *CIL* 2².5.527/538, 5.1338–9; *CIL* 3.10236; *CIL* 6.41401/31947; *IL Jug* 3043, 3119; *IRC* 2.80; *IRC* 4(suppl.).324; *Salona* 4.117; *LIA* 287); none is the result of an error, leaving five possible examples of intentional funerary opisthography (*CIL* 2².5.364–5; *CIL* 3.2671/8653; *CIL* 6.12839 = *CIL* 10.2129; *IRC* 3.54–5; V. Beševliev, *Spätgriechische und spätlateinische Inschriften aus Bulgarien* [Berlin, 1964], 6–9, no. 7). In the database of the US Epigraphy Project out of 1,158 Latin epitaphs in total 31 are listed as opisthographs; of these, 17 are examples of reuse (KY.Lou.SAM.L.1929.17 331, 360, 363, 433, 490, 543, 564A–E, 592 and 647; MA.CAMB.HU.Sack.L.1932.56.129; MD.Balt.JHU.L.85; MI.AA.UM.KM.L 1446, 1534, 878, 949; OK.Norm.UO.SM.L.C47-48-8; CA.SF.SFSU.L.Tmp97.1.3. r.); 12 are too fragmentary to rule out reuse (KY.Lou.SAM.L.1929.17 493, 521, 625, 636, 710, 731, 737, 742, 801; MA.Well.WC.L.Tmp96.12.3; MI.AA.UM.KM.L 840; NY.NY.CU.Butl.L.3); one is an example of an error (MD.Balt.JHU.L.79); leaving one possible example of intentional funerary opisthography (MD.Balt.JHU.L.59).