SOME ATHENIAN EPIGRAMS FROM THE PERSIAN WARS *

IT IS a remarkable fact that we know little about the graves of the Athenians who fell in the Persian Wars. Tradition tells us that the dead of Marathon were buried in the very plain where the battle had been fought [1] and that the graves of the fallen at Plataea could be seen even in the time of Pausanias κατὰ τὴν ἔσοδον μάλιστα τὴν ἐς Πλάταιαν.[2] But we hear nothing about the men slain or drowned at Artemision (though the Athenians afterwards made a dedication to Artemis Προσηῴα[3]), at Salamis (though the epitaph of the Corinthian grave was found on the island[4]), at Mykale. This fact, remarkable as it is, becomes perplexing only by a belief in the πάτριος νόμος of Thucydides who declares that the Athenians 'always' buried τοὺς ἐκ τῶν πολέμων in the public cemetery ἐπὶ τοῦ καλλίστου προαστείου τῆς πόλεως, and made an exception only for the men of Marathon: ἐκείνων δὲ διαπρεπῆ τὴν ἀρετὴν κρίναντες αὐτοῦ καὶ τὸν τάφον ἐποίησαν.[5] When one realizes that down to 465/4 B.C. the Athenians followed the general Greek custom and buried their fallen αὐτοῦ τῇ περ ἔπεσον on the battlefield wherever that was,[6] one ceases to wonder that the enu-

* The first part of this paper, in the main, was read to the Oxford Philological Society on June 18, 1943. For a revision of the English style I am indebted in the first part to Mr. M. Platnauer of Brasenose College (Oxford) and in the second part to Mr. J. M. Todd of Stowe School (Buckingham).

[1] Thucydides, II, 34, 5; Pausanias, I, 29, 4; 32, 3. Herodotus, who gives the number of the slain as 192 (6, 117, 1) and is obviously informed in detail (6, 114), is silent about their burial; and the excavations at the *Soros* did not yield entirely what we should like to have.

[2] Pausanias, IX, 2, 5: τοῖς μὲν οὖν λοιποῖς ἐστιν Ἕλλησι μνῆμα κοινόν, Λακεδαιμονίων δὲ καὶ Ἀθηναίων τοῖς πεσοῦσιν ἰδίᾳ τέ εἰσιν οἱ τάφοι, καὶ ἐλεγεῖά ἐστι Σιμωνίδου γεγραμμένα ἐπ' αὐτοῖς. Herodotus, IX, 85: Λακεδαιμόνιοι μὲν τριξὰς ἐποιήσαντο θήκας. . . . Τεγεῆται δὲ χωρὶς πάντας (ἔθαψαν add. **d**) ἀλέας, καὶ Ἀθηναῖοι τοὺς ἑωυτῶν ὁμοῦ (τ. ἑ. ὁ. om. **d**), καὶ Μεγαρέες τε καὶ Φλειάσιοι τοὺς ὑπὸ τῆς ἵππου διαφθαρέντας. The number of the Athenian slain was 52 (Herodotus, IX, 70, 5), πάντες ἐκ τῆς Αἰαντίδος φυλῆς, ὥς φησι Κλείδημος, ἀγωνισαμένης ἄριστα κτλ. (Plutarch, *Aristides*, 19, 6). Accordingly there was only one stele which probably was not preserved any more when Pausanias visited Plataea. But the grave will have been restored and adorned with the epitaph by " Simonides " (see note 11).

[3] Plutarch, *Themistocles*, 8, 4-6 (*De Herod. mal.*, 34, p. 867 F) quoting from one of the στῆλαι the " Simonidean " epigram Παντοδαπῶν ἀνδρῶν γενεάς (135 Bgk⁴ = 109 Diehl), which is neither an epitaph nor a " monument of the fallen " (Hiller von Gaertringen, *Gr. Hist. Epigr.* [1926], no. 14), nor does it " mark a battle-site and honour the living not the dead " (Wade-Gery, *J.H.S.*, LIII, 1933, p. 73); it is a dedicatory inscription (see Wilamowitz, *Griech. Lesebuch*, II, 1, p. 103), though it certainly is occupied for its greater part with the exploits of the combatants, whether living or dead.

[4] *I.G.*, I², 927 = Geffcken, *Griech. Epigr.* (1916), no. 96; Hiller, 20; Tod, *Greek Hist. Inscr.* (1933), no. 16.

[5] Thucydides, II, 34, 5; Pausanias, I, 29, 4.

[6] The proof for this thesis will be given in my paper " Patrios Nomos," (*J.H.S.*, LXIV, 1945; not yet published).

meration of warrior-graves in the Kerameikos, as preserved by Pausanias,[7] does not contain the heroes of the Great War.

Much more curious is the scarcity, one might even say the almost complete absence of Athenian epitaphs for the fallen in those glorious battles, while we have quite a number of official, semi-official, and even private dedications.[8] Though the graves were dispersed over Greece proper and the coasts of Asia Minor, one would expect that the places were marked by stelai and epigrammata set up by their grateful countrymen in order to keep alive the memory of the heroes who had given their lives for the liberty of Greece and for the liberation of their kinsmen overseas. Though the πάτριος νόμος, which provided a burial in the public cemetery and adorned the graves with στῆλαι τὰ ὀνόματα καὶ τὸν δῆμον ἑκάστου λέγουσαι, came into existence not before 465/4, and though the addition of a poetical epitaph was never an indispensable part of the tomb, we are surprised by this early scarcity. Other Greek states which we are accustomed to regard as much less literate than Athens did honour their dead, at least those of the Great War, by epitaphs. It is sufficient to refer to the most famous examples, the Spartan epigram at Thermopylae which literary tradition has preserved for us,[9] and to the epitaph of the Corinthians on Salamis preserved on the stone and in an enlarged form by literary tradition.[10] For Athens the fact, though

---

[7] I, 29, 4-14.

[8] For Marathon note especially the second, posthumous, epigram *I.G.*, I², 609 (see Hiller, 10, and *Gnomon*, XII, 1936, p. 293; Tod, 13; Kirchner, *Imagines Inscr. Att.* [1935], no. 17) engraved on a dedication made before the battle by the polemarch Kallimachos. We do not know how long before; for the lettering see Wilhelm², p. 111, and Loewy, pp. 3 ff. (no. 19); W. B. Dinsmoor in *Studies in the History of Culture* (1942), p. 201. Hiller's supplement ἄν[γελον ἀθ]ανάτων in the first epigram is brilliant; he might have referred not to *Hymn. Hom.*, 4, 3 alone, but also to the dominant conception of Hermes in the fifth century in Athens and elsewhere (Pherekydes, *F. Gr. Hist.*, 3 F 130; Hellanikos, *ibid.*, 4 F 19). Raubitschek, *A.J.A.*, XLIV, 1940, pp. 53 ff., who tries to prove that the dedication was not a Hermes but the Nike 690 Schrader, ought to have shown first that it *was* a dedication for the victory, which (*pace* Wilhelm) I am unable to believe. His idea of a " dedication of Kallimachos, erected in his name by the Demos " (*loc. cit.*, p. 56) is strange and in my opinion impossible, nor was the second inscription engraved by " the Athenians " (Hiller, *Hermes*, LIV, 1919, p. 215; *I.G., loc. cit.*). It was perhaps added by his son, as U. Koehler, *Hermes*, XXXI, 1896, pp. 150 ff. suggested, regarding the whole monument as posthumous. I have not much doubt that the posthumous addition indicates a clash of aspirations after the battle, as to whom the victory was due: that seems to be implied in the wording [Καλλίμαχος πολέ]μαρχος Ἀθηναίων τὸν ἀγῶνα / τὸν Μή[δων τε καὶ] Ἑλλήνων ὤ[ρινε μέγιστον] / παισὶν Ἀθηναίων Μα[ραθῶνος ἀνὰ κλυτὸν ἄλσος]. The mention of the office is for me a final proof that the second epigram *was* an addition. The whole inscription becomes understandable if one realizes that the posthumous epigram enlarges on the name in the dedicatory epigram; one can almost call it a foot-note: " it was Kallimachos who as polemarch," etc.

[9] Herodotus, VIII, 228, 2 (Geffcken 105; Hiller 16). Heinze (note 13 *infra*) in a short and lucid commentary recognized the style of the military report in ἀγγέλλειν and ῥήμασι, misunderstood as νομίμοις by Lycurgus, *In Leocrat.*, 109 and others. To trace this expression back to Tyrtaios (Friedlaender, *Stud. It.*, N.S. XV, 1938, pp. 99 ff.) is, to say the least, superfluous.

[10] See note 4.

seldom realized even now, is so apparent [11] that in 1913 Wilamowitz remarked on it
in passing,[12] and in 1915 Richard Heinze stated it clearly, formally, and uncon-
ditionally: " the Athenian fallen of Marathon, of Salamis, of Plataiai did not share
this honour. I believe we may assert this simply because such inscriptions are not
handed down; no doubt they would have been preserved till the time when the epi-
grams from the stones were collected into books, and then they would have been
farther preserved in the literary tradition," or at least not all of them would have
disappeared.[13] If the case is as Heinze stated it, I am unable to offer an explanation; [14]
but I shall not therefore try to refute his thesis, which seems to be in substantial
accordance with the facts. True, there is one exception to his rule: the epigram in
the *Anthologia Planudea* ascribed to Simonides and referred by Schneidewin to the
victory over the Chalcidians in 506 B.C.

$$\Delta ίρφυος\ \dot{\epsilon}δμήθημεν\ \dot{υ}πό\ πτυχί,\ σῆμα\ δ'\ \dot{\epsilon}φ'\ \dot{η}μῖν$$
$$\dot{\epsilon}γγύθεν\ Εὐρίπου\ δημοσίᾳ\ κέχυται.^{15}$$

[11] The alleged epitaphs for the men who fell at Marathon and Plataea are hardly even dubious
and certainly not contemporary. The epitaph for the Athenians (?) at Plataea is mentioned but
not quoted by Pausanias (see note 2). It is most certainly not *Anth. Pal.*, VII, 257 (see note
107 *infra*), nor is there sufficient reason for the assumption that Pausanias had in mind *Anth. Pal.*,
VII, 253 (Simonides 100 Bgk[4]; 118 D), Εἰ τὸ καλῶς θνῄσκειν. This epitaph is referred εἰς τοὺς μετὰ
Λεωνίδου πεσόντας by *Anth. Pal.*, Schol. Aristides, III, 154, Ddf, and obviously by Aristides himself
(*Panath.*, 132) ; but it is probably an Athenian epigram, perhaps from the Kerameikos (Preger,
Inscr. Graec. Metr., 8), for private persons in Athens imitated it (*I.G.*, II², 2724). It is therefore
earlier than *ca.* 250 B.C., but certainly not earlier than the fourth century (Geffcken, 113; Fried-
laender, p. 120), though Hiller, 31 referred it to Plataea. For the epitaph of the Μαραθωνομάχαι
quoted by Lycurgus, see note 17.

[12] *Sappho und Simonides* (1913), p. 144, note 1, " wahrscheinlich ist nicht einmal der auftrag
eines epigrammes für den σωρός in Marathon, denn erst der friedhof im Kerameikos erzeugt diese
offizielle poesie."

[13] *Neue Jahrbücher*, XXXV, 1915, pp. 1 ff., in an address given on the Winckelmann com-
memoration day of the Leipzig Archaeological Seminary. Of course, the assertion obtains only
for " the first and most glorious years " of the Persian Wars. In Heinze's opinion " halten ver-
mutungen, dies und das andere ' simonideische ' epigramm auf die schlacht von Plataiai oder gar
auf kämpfe, die noch vor die Perserkriege fallen, zu beziehen, näherer prüfung nicht stand." (But
see my pp. 159 f.). Heinze did not mention either the Lycurgus epigram, p. 160 *infra*, or the two
Marathon epigrams from the Agora, and he did not take into account the sack of Athens in
480/79 B.C. They do not, in fact, weaken the point he made. It is rather surprising that Friedlaender
did not even mention this important observation, but begins his remarks on epigrams from the
" early Persian period " with another (in my opinion rather doubtful) thesis: Die kanonische form
des epigramms auf den Polyandria von 480 ist das monodistichon. Dieser satz gilt nicht für Athen,
ausserhalb Athens aber streng.

[14] What Heinze, p. 4, says is neither an explanation nor is it logic: Aus den Perserkriegen
dagegen haben wir grabepigramme der gefallenen von Sparta, vom Peloponnes, von Korinth, von
Megara, also von dorischen städten. Ist das zufall? Oder sollen wir darin eine wirkung spar-
tanischer auffassung sehen, die den tod in der schlacht so hoch stellte, dass er allein das recht gab,
den namen des verstorbenen auf das grabmal zu setzen und so dauerndem gedächtnis zu erhalten?

[15] *Anth. Plan.*, 26 (Simonid. 89 Bgk[4] = 87 Diehl). The addition of a second distich,—οὐκ

I have personally not the least doubt that it is a genuine epitaph from the stele on the grave; but of course this opinion does not admit of irrefutable proof, as the epigram is preserved only in the literary tradition, and as Herodotus, though he records the epigram of the dedication on the Acropolis made for the victory, does not know or at least does not record the epitaph.[16] Then there is at least one epigram for the Marathonomachai

$$\text{Ἑλλήνων προμαχοῦντες Ἀθηναῖοι Μαραθῶνι}$$
$$\text{χρυσοφόρων Μήδων ἐστόρεσαν δύναμιν}$$

quoted as such by the orator Lycurgus side by side with the Spartan epitaph at Thermopylae: but whether or not it was ever engraved on a stone, and whether or not it is a fifth-century poem (strictly contemporary it is not), it is certainly not an epitaph, and even in Lycurgan times it can hardly have stood on a stele at the Soros in the Marathonian plain.[17] There is in fact no reliable witness for a contemporary epitaph at the Soros,[18] though (let us add at once) there is a tradition, whether

ἀδικῶς· ἐρατὴν γὰρ ἀπωλέσαμεν νεότητα / τρηχείαν πολέμου δεξάμενοι νεφέλην, explaining the word δη-μοσίᾳ,—recognized by Schneidewin and universally accepted, is almost proof positive for the genuineness of the first. Nobody in a later age would have invented a δημοσίᾳ, and the signal honour of a public grave suits the time: the battle was the first military feat of the new democratic army and the poetical epitaph was a new device (cf. below, p. 177) which is stressed purposefully by δημοσίᾳ. The objection of Wilamowitz (Hiller 9, " wegen des angegebenen kampfplatzes ") is shaky: the Corinthian epitaph from Salamis furnishes a sufficient parallel, and the Peisistratos epigram I.G., I² , 761 (note 62 infra) an even better one, not to mention later cases as, e.g., the second epigram for Chaeronea (Hiller 74).

[16] Herodotus, V, 77; I.G., I², 394. See Hiller 9, 51; Tod, 12, 43.

[17] In Leocrat., 108: οἱ μὲν γὰρ πρόγονοι τοὺς βαρβάρους ἐνίκησαν, οἳ πρῶτοι τῆς Ἀττικῆς ἐπέβησαν . . . Λακεδαιμόνιοι δ' ἐν Θερμοπύλαις παραταξάμενοι, ταῖς μὲν τύχαις οὐχ ὁμοίαις ἐχρήσαντο, τῇ δ' ἀνδρείᾳ πολὺ πάντων διήνεγκαν. (109) τοιγαροῦν ἐπὶ τοῖς ὁρίοις τοῦ βίου μαρτύρια ἔστιν ἰδεῖν τῆς ἀρετῆς αὐτῶν ἀναγεγραμ-μένα ἀληθῆ πρὸς ἅπαντας τοὺς Ἕλληνας, ἐκείνοις μὲν, ὦ ξεῖν' . . . πειθόμενοι νομίμοις, τοῖς δ' ὑμετέροις προγόνοις, Ἑλλήνων . . . δύναμιν. The epigram is clearly not an epitaph (see below, pp. 171 ff.), nor can it have stood on the mound at Marathon, because it does not refer to the list of names which adorned the grave (note 64 infra); but it is obvious from the context as well as from the com-parison that Lycurgus palms it off on his hearers as an epitaph. It seems evident to me that he omits the site of the tomb on purpose, using the vague and rather curious expression ἐν τοῖς ὁρίοις τοῦ βίου. The conjecture of Wurm ἐπὶ τοῖς ἡρίοις [τοῦ βίου], accepted by Blass and others, is wrong, and Oliver[1], p. 489 seems to have misunderstood the design of the orator. I leave to the archaeolo-gists to decide whether the epigram stood under the painting in the Stoa Poikile, as first suggested by Goettling Ges. Abh., II ⟨1859⟩, pp. 150 ff. Suidas s. v. Ποικίλη certainly does not say it " plainly," and the scholiast on Aristides, Or., 28, 63 (II 159 Ddf) calls it ἐπίγραμμα εἰς στήλην Περικλέους. Aristides himself evidently regards Simonides as its author, and Diehl is justified in printing it as Simonides 88, but ought not to have placed it among the " Epigrammata sepulchralia aetatis Simoni-deae." As to its time, Ἑλλήνων προμαχοῦντες would be possible even in 490 B.C.; Friedlaender, p. 98, is at once refuted by the first of the new Marathon epigrams (see p. 177). Ephoros possibly knew and quoted it, at least if in the changed pentameter ἔκτειναν Μήδων εἴκοσι μυριάδας we prefer (with Boas, De epigr. Simonid. [1905], pp. 92 ff., who refers to the ducenta milia in Justin. 2, 9, 20) εἴκοσι (Schol. Aristid.; Suidas) to the ἐννέα of Aristides.

[18] See below, p. 176.

reliable or not, about a competition between Aeschylus and Simonides for an epitaph. It is the well-known passage in the Life of Aeschylus: ἀπῆρε δὲ ὡς Ἱέρωνα, κατά τινας μὲν ὑπὸ Ἀθηναίων κατασπουδασθεὶς καὶ ἡσσηθεὶς νέῳ ὄντι Σοφοκλεῖ, κατὰ δὲ ἐνίους ἐν τῷ εἰς τοὺς ἐν Μαραθῶνι τεθνηκότας ἐλεγείῳ ἡσσηθεὶς Σιμωνίδῃ· τὸ γὰρ ἐλεγεῖον πολὺ τῆς περὶ τὸ συμπαθὲς λεπτότητος μετέχειν θέλει, ὃ τοῦ Αἰσχύλου, ὡς ἔφαμεν, ἐστὶν ἀλλότριον. This notice (to which we will have to come back) brings us directly to the first part of our paper—the two epigrams on (let us speak cautiously so as not to prejudice the issue) the men or the battle of Marathon.

I. THE EPIGRAMS ON THE BATTLE OF MARATHON

I almost regret that I have decided on discussing them. For though by a stroke of good fortune the American excavators in 1932 found another fragment of the stone which was at once ably published and commented upon by James H. Oliver,[19] and though the new find made a notable addition to the miserable remains known since 1855,[20] even now there is not one complete line on the stone, and the *disiecti membra poetae* allow only of experimental restoration.[21] Small wonder that the his-

[19] *Hesperia*, II, 1933, pp. 480 ff. (quoted as Oliver[1]). Bibliography (see also M. N. Tod, *J.H.S.*, LV, 1935, p. 184; LVII, 1937, p. 175): Oliver, *A.J.P.*, LVI, 1935, pp. 193 ff. (Oliver[2]); *Hesperia*, V, 1936, pp. 225 ff. (Oliver[3]); *A.J.A.*, XLIV, 1940, pp. 483 f. (Oliver[4]). J. L. Myres, *Antiquity*, VIII, 1934, pp. 176 ff. (a summary of Oliver[1]). A. Wilhelm, *Anzeiger Ak. Wien*, Ph.-hist. Kl., LXXI, 1934, no. 10, pp. 89 ff. (Wilhelm[2]). Hiller von Gaertringen, *Hermes*, LXIX, 1934, pp. 204 ff. (Hiller[3]); *Gnomon*, XII, 1936, pp. 293 f. (Hiller[4]). Peek, *Hermes*, LXIX, 1934, pp. 339 ff.; Maas-Wickert, *ibid.*, LXX, 1935, pp. 235 ff. Joh. Kirchner, *Imagines Inscr. Att.* (1935), tab. 9, no. 18. C. M. Bowra, *Greek Lyric Poetry* (1936), pp. 355 ff. A. S. Arvanitopulos, Ἑλλην. Ἐπιγραφική (1937), p. 118. E. Loewy, *Sb. Akad. Wien*, CCXVI, 1937, *Abh.* 4, pp. 6 ff. Friedlaender, *Studi It.*, N.S. XV, 1938, p. 93, note 2. Raubitschek, *A.J.A.*, XLIV, 1940, pp. 53 ff.

[20] Published first by A. R. Rangabé, *Antiquités Helléniques*, II (1855), p. 597, no. 784b. Short bibliography: *I.G.*, I, 333 (Suppl. p. 40); *I.G.*, I², (1924), 763 (Hiller[1]); Kaibel, *Epigr. Gr.*, 749; Roberts, *Introd. to Greek Epigraphy*, I, 64; Roberts-Gardner, 177; E. Hoffmann, *Syll. Epigr. Graec.*, 266; Geffcken, *Griech. Epigramme* (1916), 65; Hiller von Gaertringen, *Histor. Griech. Epigramme* (1926), 11 (Hiller[2]). A. Kirchhoff, *Monatsber. Akad. Berl.* (1869), pp. 412 ff.; Michaelis, *Ath. Mitt.*, II, 1877, p. 92; Winter, *Arch. Jahrb.*, VIII, 1893, p. 152, note 13; A. Wilhelm, *Ath. Mitt.*, XXIII, 1898, pp. 487 ff. (Wilhelm[1]); Bormann, *Festschr. Gomperz* (1902), pp. 474 ff.; *Jahresh. Oesterr. Inst. Arch.*, VI, 1903, pp. 241 ff.; L. Weber, *Philol.*, LXXVI, 1920, pp. 60 ff.

[21] Before the discovery of the new fragment and sometimes even after it, the main mistake consisted in basing attempts to restore the text on allegedly similar poems, particularly on the Eion and the Eurymedon epigrams. Even Kirchhoff's excellent restitution (followed by almost all editors) of the second epigram [ἦ μάλα δὴ κεῖνοι ταλακάρδιοι] and [μαρνάμενοι δ' ἐσάωσαν Ἀθηναίας πολυβούλ]ο(υ) ἄστυ proved wrong in the wording. In fact, nobody could guess at ἦν ἄρα τοῖσζ' ἀδαμ- and ἀγχίαλον πρῆσαι. I am far from preaching a sterile scepticism, though (a question of method) a poem is no decree. But to put into the text a line of which only the last letter is preserved (and that letter being doubtful) is misleading, and the consequences of such high-handed proceeding have again and again proved dangerous. For forty-one years (*Das Marmor Parium*, 1904) I have tried to persuade classical scholars to print major supplements in brevier.

torical problems raised by the poems cannot be solved with a reasonable degree of certainty. At least I cannot solve them. It is rather unpleasant when one feels compelled to remain almost wholly in the sphere of negative statements, contradicting and refuting the fundamental assumptions of the new *editio princeps* and many opinions put forward by the scholars who commented on it, returning partly to the old propositions of Kirchhoff and Adolf Wilhelm who had far less to go upon than we have now. There is also a personal handicap. I am no archaeologist and may not venture to pronounce on the theories concerning the reconstruction of the monument to which the epigrams belong,[22] and though I do not think that this point matters very much, it is inhibitory. I must needs confine myself to the task of putting the problems fully and methodically. Those problems are (1) the subject matter of the two poems, (2) their text, (3) the nature of the poems and of the monument which they adorned, (4) the authorship of the epigrams.

I shall first give the text of the epigrams with a fairly ample *apparatus criticus*, following it up with Wilhelm's restitution which (though of course not certain in every single point [23]) seems to me to be exceptionally brilliant and has the additional

---

[22] See p. 170.

[23] Oliver, who is at pains to point that out (Oliver[3], pp. 232 f., *idem*[4], p. 483, cf. below, p. 174), seems to me to do scant justice to it. On the other hand Raubitschek (p. 56 "an almost certain restoration") sounds perhaps a little too emphatic, though I am inclined to agree with him, at least as far as the sense is concerned. All supplements of Wilhelm pursue (so it seems to me) the right course, and the antithesis of πεζοί with 'Ασίδος ἵππος in the first, and of αἰχμή with τοξοφόροι in the second epigram I regard as particularly happy inspirations. In the discussion before the Oxford Philological Society Paul Maas strongly objected to Wilhelm's restoration of I, 3-4: he declared to be impossible the *accusativus cum infinitivo* in what Wilhelm obviously and in my opinion rightly took as a clause denoting the consequence of the ἔχειν. I do not see the force of this argument: the well-known fact that epic poetry has almost no example for the consecutive ὥστε, but often uses the simple infinitive, cannot prevent a pre-classical epigrammatist from forming a sentence in the manner proposed by Wilhelm. Pre-classical poetry is not bound by the rules of classical prose syntax, nor are we bound to reject a construction for which we cannot adduce an exact parallel—if the sentence is understandable. Eduard Fraenkel refers me to Aeschylus, *Ag.*, 479 ff. τίς ὧδε παιδνὸς ἢ φρενῶν κεκομμένος, / φλογὸς παραγγέλμασιν / νέοις πυρωθέντα καρδίαν ἔπειτ' / ἀλλαγᾷ λόγου καμεῖν, where πυρωθέντα instead of ὥστε πυρωθείς is also unique and (from the viewpoint of classical syntax) much more difficult. One might also refer to the use of the *acc. c. inf.* after πρίν from the time of *Il.* N 172 on, if the dependent clause has its own subject (see Kuehner-Gerth[3], II, 2, p. 457). I do not think that anybody could misunderstand I, 3-4, as restored by Wilhelm: it is a simple and a beautiful conclusion, similar in thought to II 3-4. Maas connects ἔσχον 'Ελλάδα and understands "stopped Hellas from seeing the day of enslavement." This means that the whole hexameter I, 3 has to be filled with the subject to ἔσχον. As Maas's supplement of the subject (πεζοί τε καὶ ὠκυπόδων ἀπὸ πώλων) is factually impossible because the *Athenians* at Marathon did *not* fight on horseback (see pp. 168 f.), his opinion is for me a perfect example of straining at a gnat and swallowing a camel—or rather a whole body of Athenian cavalry. If Maas is to insist on the syntactical point, he ought to state at the same time that the epigram(s) cannot refer to Marathon, which till now he has not; nor should I be prepared in the face of the facts duly set out above to admit this disastrous but unavoidable consequence. I prefer to admit the syntactical uniqueness which does not create an obscurity for the willing reader. There also is no valid objection to

(if negative) merit of not laying itself open to a *prima facie* refutation of its supplements.

a) THE STONE

<div align="right">στοιχ.</div>

    (x)   (11)

I ανδρον τονδ αρετε — — — αιει — — — ρ — — —

                (x-1)   (3)

εσχον γαρ πεζοι τε — — — — ν : hελλα – επασαν δουλιο — —

<div align="right">non στοιχ.</div>

II εν αρα τοισζ αδαμ — — — hοτ αιχμεν στεσαμ προσθε πυλον αν — —

ανχιαλομ πρεσαι ρ — — — ǫ(?) αστυ βιαι Περσον κλιναμενο — —

1 ΑΙΕΙ ι . . . . . . Ν . . Ρ *I.G.*[2] (non αἰεί, e.g. κατ]ὰ τετρ [απολ . .]ν Hiller[1]) ; ΑΙΕΙ vel ΑΙΕΤ Oliver[1] (qui primum I certum esse et signum, quo in linea 2 finis hexametri indicatur, litteras ΑΙΕΙ certe non statim sequi adseverat; infimam eius signi partem supra secundum λ dispexisse sibi visus est Peek; " I still fail to see any trace of the punctuation . . . and the surface is partly preserved here " Oliver[2]) ; ΑΙΕΙ " so gut wie sicher " Wilhelm. ἀρετῆ[ς λάμφσει κλέος ἄφθιτον] αἰεί Wilhelm, (Peek) ; ἀρετὲ [σχέσει κλέος ἄφθιτον] Bowra; ἀρετὲ [διαείδεται ἔχσοχος] αἰεί Arv (anitopulos). ΠΕΡΣΟ dispexisse sibi visus est Meritt; " the Ρ is quite clear. I think I can see the Ε and the Σ, but I am quite uncertain about the word " Oliver[1]; " mir scheint Περσῶν völlig unmöglich, ich kann nach wiederholtem studium des steins nur Ν////Ρ erkennen " Peek; " it is probably best to retain the clearly visible Ρ and disregard the hypothetical letters " Oliver[2]. [εὔτολμοι Πε]ρ[σῶν ηοὶ στόρεσαν δύναμιν] Wilhelm; [ἀντίον ηοὶ] Περσῶν [ἐν Μαραθῶνι θάνον] Bowra; [Μέδον ηοὶ τὸ πά]ρ[ος τὸν στόλον ἐστόρεσαν] Arv.

2 πεζοὶ τὲ[ν βαρβαρόφονον ἀντὲ]ν Meritt, Wade-Gery; πεζοί τε [καὶ ὀκυπόρον ἐπὶ νεδ]ν (= *Anth. Pal.*, VII, 258) Hiller[3]; τε [καὶ ὀκυπόδον ἐπὶ πόλο]ν Maas; τὲ[ν ἄλκιμον Ἀσίδος ηίππο]ν Wilhelm; τὲ[ν βάρβαρον Ἀσίδα ηίππο]ν Arv. Ἑλλά[δα μ]ὲ Kaibel. δούλιο[ν ἔμαρ ἰδὲν] Kirchhoff; δούλιο[ν ἔμαρ ηελὲν] Arv.

3 ΤΟΙΣΖΑΔΑΜ Oliver; ΤΟΙΣ(Τ)ΑΔΑ(Μ) Arv. (ὁ χαράκτης ἔγραψε ΤΟΙΣΤ · κατόπιν ἐπειράθη νὰ μεταβάλῃ τὸ Τ εἰς Δ, οὗ ἐχάραξε τὴν κάτω κεραίαν καὶ τὸ κάτω ἥμισυ τῆς ἀριστερᾶς· ἀποσχισθέντος ὅμως τοῦ λίθου, ἀφῆκεν οὕτως, ὥστε ἔλαβεν ἔμφασιν Ζ) ; τοῖς ζαδαμ[όσι (vel ζαδάμοις) — μέγα κῦδος] Oliver[1]; τοῖσζ' ἀδάμ[αντι πεφραγμένον ἔτορ] Hiller[3] et Maas; τοῖσζ' ἀδάμ[αντος ἐνὶ φρεσὶ θυμός] Wilhelm, Maas (qui de hac supplementi via omnino dubitans proposuit τοῖσζ' ἀδάμ[αντος ἔσο κέαρ, ηοί ρά] ποτ' αἰχμέν contra lapidem, in quo primae litterae vestigia excludunt Π, indicant Η vel Ι, testantibus Oliver, Wade-Gery, Meritt, Peek) ; ἀδάμ[ας ἐν στέθεσι θυμός] ηότ' Meritt; τοῖσ(τ') ἀδά[μαστον ἐνὶ φρεσὶ θάρσος h]ότ' Arv. ΑΝ: " fuit aut ΑΝ aut ΑΜ aut ΑΓ " *I.G.*[2]; " the angle at which the first stroke of the last letter stands seems less suitable to a gamma than to a nu " Oliver; ἀγ[ρὸ ἐπ' ἐσχατιᾶς] Kirchhoff; ἀν[τία μυρίασιν] Wilhelm[1]; ἀν[τία τοξοφόρον?] Wilhelm[2]; ἀν[τιβίος ἔσχον(?)] vel ἀν[τία ἰσταμένον (μαιομένον, ἐπεσσυμένον)] vel ἀγ[ρον ἐπεσσυμένοις] Peek probante Oliver[2]; ἄν[δρες ἀρείθοοι] (= *I.G.*, I[2], p. 277, 78) Maas; ἀν[τία δυσμενέον] Arv.

4 Ρ — — — Ο " either Ρ or Β " Oliver[1]; " ich halte nach wiederholter prüfung Β für nahezu ausgeschlossen " Peek; litterae Ο vestigia in fine hexametri dispexisse sibi visus est Rangabé (cf. Peek, pp. 340 ff.), dubitavit Wilhelm, omisit (et certe nunc nihil in lapide) Oliver[1]. Ῥ[υσιπτόλιος μεμαότον] Hiller[3], Meritt; ῥ[ύσαντο δὲ Τριτογενείας] vel [τεσ (καὶ) πολυβόλ]ο Peek; β[αθυχαιτάον μεμαότον] dub. Maas; β[ολευσαμένον δ' ἐσάοσαν] Wilhelm; β[αινόντον σον δ' ἀπέδοκαν] Arv.; ῥ[α τὸ Κέκροπος οὐκ ἐπέτρεφσαν] dub. Wade-Gery (cf. *Il.*, Β, 310; Φ 472 f.). κλιναμενο[ι δύναμιν] Kirchhoff; κλιναμενο[ι στρατιάν] Wilhelm.

Wilhelm's restoration of II, 3-4: the δέ in the fourth place is justified because the words ἀγχίαλον πρῆσαι β[ουλευσαμένων] ἄστυ form one notion. But this supplement is of course highly conjectural.

b) Wilhelm's Restoration

I   Ἀνδρῶν τῶνδ' ἀρετῆ[ς λάμψει κλέος ἄφθιτον] αἰεί,
    [εὔτολμοι Πε]ρ[σῶν οἳ στόρεσαν δύναμιν] ·
  ἔσχον γὰρ πεζοὶ τὴ[ν ἄλκιμον Ἀσίδος ἵππο]ν,
    Ἑλλά[δα μ]ὴ πᾶσαν δούλιο[ν ἦμαρ ἰδεῖν].

II   Ἦν ἄρα τοῖσζ' ἀδάμ[αντος ἐνὶ φρεσὶ θυμός], ὅτ' αἰχμὴν
    στῆσαμ πρόσθε πυλῶν ἀν[τία τοξοφόρων(?)] ·
  ἀγχίαλομ πρῆσαι β[ουλευσαμένων δ' ἐσάωσαν]
    ἄστυ, βίᾳ Περσῶν κλινάμενο[ι στρατιάν].

1.

The two epigrams are engraved on a block of Pentelic marble in two parallel bands, the second lying somewhat deeper, as it had to be smoothed on an already rough-picked portion of the stone.[24] There are four lines, each of which contains an elegiac distich; the first two engraved στοιχηδόν by a hand which Wilhelm declared to be the hand of the engraver of the Hekatompedon inscription *I.G.*, I², 3-4 from 485/4 B.C.,[25] so that there cannot be much doubt that the monument was erected in the year of the victory 490/89 B.C. The third and fourth lines which are not written στοιχηδόν are by " a different and inferior hand, but in characters that could not have been chronologically far separated from the first, if at all." [26]

[24] For an accurate description of the stone and an explanation of " the process through which it passed to arrive at this peculiarity of arrangement " see Oliver¹, pp. 480 ff., quoting Doerpfeld and Wilhelm, *Ath. Mitt.*, XXIII, p. 490. Against the incomprehensible statement of Hiller³, p. 206 (cf. *idem*⁴, p. 294) that the second epigram " stands *in rasura*, as was seen long ago " see Peek, p. 339, and Oliver², p. 194. Oliver¹, p. 484 gives also a useful transcript, distinguishing the old or right-side fragment E.M. 6739, which was found in the courtyard of a private house " in via Hadriani vici Πλάκα ad arcis radices orientales," and the new left-side one Agora Inv. No. 3536 I 303, " found in the wall of a modern house, 636/17, in section Θ, on December 8, 1932." Preserved now top, bottom and left side; " the block is broken away at the right side and the back." The stone was, according to Oliver, " slightly more than one metre wide," and we have now " approximately two thirds of the original front."

[25] The exact year rests on Kirchhoff's supplement of *I.G.*, I², 4, 26-27, ἐπ]ὶ Φι[λοκράτους ἄρχοντ]ος, and Wilhelm², pp. 108 ff. has maintained it against Luria, *Hermes*, LXII, 1927, pp. 272 ff., who relegates the decree to the time before Kleisthenes, but gives it as a possibility that for some reason it was published (republished?) some decades after its enactment. What matters for us is the difference in the lettering between the first and the second epigram (see also Kirchner, *Imagines*, no. 18). The situation would become precarious if Loewy, pp. 3 ff. were right in suggesting a republication in the age of Kimon " and not in its earliest years." I cannot judge this suggestion for myself, but his argumentation does not appear to be convincing at all.

[26] Oliver¹, p. 484. *Ibid.*, p. 486, " inscribed later, but as far as the lettering is concerned it might have been engraved simultaneously." *Idem*², p. 194, " the script displays less finish because of a less skilful stone-cutter, and probably also because of the difficulty of working on a monument already *in situ*." *Idem*⁴, p. 483, " a different but contemporary hand." This disposes of Hiller⁴.

Perhaps this fact, in which experienced epigraphists seem to concur, is in itself a sufficient foundation for the first of three (or four) conclusions, about none of which there can be (in my opinion) a reasonable doubt. Both epigrams (this is the first conclusion) refer to the same time and (let us express it cautiously for the moment) to the same group of events, a Persian war which did not lead to a sack of Athens. That at least is abundantly clear from the third verse of the second epigram, however one restores the lost second half of this verse. It is further evident from αἰχμὴν στῆσαν πρόσθε πυλῶν (words to which I shall come back soon) in the second epigram (thank God for the second) that it refers to a land-battle alone; and as the battle was fought outside the city gates, it can have been no other but the battle of Marathon.[27] This at once makes extremely improbable the latest opinion of Hiller [28] who by supplying [καὶ ὠκυπόρων ἐπὶ νηῶ]ν in the third line of the first epigram refers this poem to an event later than Marathon, viz., the two battles of Salamis and Plataea. His only reason is a historical one in which he himself does not seem to put implicit confidence, that at Marathon the fight was " doch zunächst nur " about Athens, while at Salamis and Plataea the liberty of all Greece was at stake.[29] This argument seems to me to be a good example of the frequent confusion between the historical views held by us with those held by the contemporaries of the event—or, for that matter, by an ancient poet or historian.[30] I do not mean to say that Hiller's interpretation is not arguable in itself; I only assert that—as the first epigram pre-

---

[27] The wording does not suit a battle outside Athenian territory, whether it be Thermopylae (even if an Athenian contingent had been there) or Plataea. There is no need for a refutation of the old thesis of Bormann who referred the second epigram to these two battles. Hiller who seems to accept it in *I.G.*[2] did not take it seriously either a few years before (*Hermes*, LIV, 1913, p. 215) or two years later ([2] no. 11). As to Friedlaender, p. 93, note 2 I am not sure that I understand his meaning (see note 29 *infra*).

[28] Hiller[3], p. 205 f.; *idem*[4], p. 294. Following up his erroneous statement that the second epigram stood *in rasura* (see note 24) he explained the alleged sequence Xerxes War, Marathon War by the rather wild assumption that the second epigram has replaced an older one praising Themistokles (*idem*[3], p. 206), and *idem*[4], p. 294 embellished this assumption by simply stating that the substitute was " added by Kimon." He has obviously (like many scholars) an exaggerated notion of Kimon's importance for the development of the Agora, and he disregards the most likely probability that the monument had been demolished in 480/79 B.C. (see p. 178).

[29] Another reason is adumbrated by Maas, p. 234, and Friedlaender, p. 93, note 2. The former asserts without more ado that " neben πεζοί τε eine zweite waffengattung gefordert ist," but does not draw from this assertion the same inference as Hiller. The latter—who does not choose to commit himself as to the time and subject-matter of the two poems, thinking it even possible that the second one refers to an earlier event—calls the alternative supplement τὴ[ν] unsatisfactory " because of the definite article." I am at a loss to understand this sweeping statement: Wilhelm's supplement, whether or not it hits the bull's eye—and I think it is perfect as far as the sense is concerned (see note 23)—shows an easy way out of the dilemma. In any case, it is a question of supplement, not an argument.

[30] Though the case is somewhat different from that envisaged by Wade-Gery, *J.H.S.*, LIII, 1933, p. 71, it seems desirable to refer the reader to his methodologically important remarks.

cedes an epigram admittedly referring to Marathon, and as there is no reasonable explanation for the rather absurd suggestion that some time after Plataea some one added to an epigram on Salamis and Plataea another one praising the men of Marathon—we have to take the poem as it stands, inferring from its wording the view held by contemporary Athens about the importance of their unaided victory: the Athenians, in fact, believed that by this victory they had saved not only their own city alone, but the liberty of Greece proper from the common enemy who already held in bondage the Greeks in Asia Minor. We need not discuss whether this point of view was right, or was not, a purely Athenian conceit overestimating their heroic deed: *that* is a historical question pure and simple. What matters to us is that the first epigram shows the Athenians of 490 B.C. holding an opinion which is repeatedly, though not explicitly, expressed by Herodotus as to the true aim of the expedition of Darius.[31] This statement will become even more important later on, because it may furnish an explanation for the much more curious fact that there are two epigrams on the stone and that the second one was added when the base was already in situ.[32]

Having made sure that both epigrams relate to the Persian expedition of 490 B.C., we can at once take a further step and state the second fact: both epigrams refer not only to the same series of events, they plainly refer to one and the same event, viz., *the* battle of Marathon. The suggestion of Paul Maas—espoused by Arvanitopulos and Raubitschek—that the second epigram should be connected with the second position which according to Herodotus[33] the Athenians took up at the Herakleion in Kynosarges after their victory in the plain of Marathon, does not seem to be admissible.[34] The negative reason: it does not explain why the second epigram was added later. The positive reason (which in my opinion clinches the matter): the suggestion rests on a wrong interpretation of πρόσθε πυλῶν, which is chosen not to

---

[31] Herodotus, VI, 48 f., 94.   [32] See p. 177.   [33] VI, 116.

[34] It is in my opinion sheer prejudice when Maas asserts " da zwischen αἰχμὴν στῆσαν und κλινάμενοι kein raum für einen zweiten indikativ bleibt, von dem κλινάμενοι abhängen könnte, muss die handlung, die στῆσαν bezeichnet, zeitlich der des κλίνασθαι δύναμιν folgen." Kirchhoff had supplied ἐσάωσαν in the third line; A. Wilhelm had accepted this supplement; Peek had proposed ῥύσαντο, and Wade-Gery now suggests οὐκ ἐπέτρεψαν. If Maas proposes another supplement in which he himself does not believe, he seems to be moving in a vicious circle. His further suggestion that the Athenians had erected a victory monument also in the Kynosarges does not seem convincing. If this had been so, the second epigram would have been engraved on the second monument. But as, according to Herodotus, there was no fight and no victory at the site of the second Athenian position, and as there had been only one battle in the Marathonian plain, there was not the least reason for a second victory monument, let alone the fact that the " first " one was either in the Agora or on the Akropolis and would have covered the military actions from beginning to the end. I therefore do not think it necessary to demolish the elaborate structure which Raubitschek erected on the precarious base of Maas' supplement of the second epigram. The assumption that the passage in the *Wasps* (see note 37) " contains a description of the events in Phaleron as well as a description of the battle at Marathon " (Raubitschek, p. 59, note 4 quoting Crosby, *Class. Studies Capps*, p. 75) seems to me to be extremely doubtful.

indicate a position near the city, but obviously to honour the men who did not cower behind their walls awaiting the attack of the enemy, but boldly sallied forth to give battle in the open field—how near to or how far from the city is a matter of indifference.[35] What mattered at that time was the fact that the Athenians did not repeat the mistake of the Eretrians, as the Persians had expected them to do;[36] and the poet in praising their heroic resolve is surely in touch with contemporary feeling.[37] I submit that we are justified in using our imagination to explain a topical poem: we are even bound to try to enter into the feelings of the people when they saw the whole manhood of their town marching out to meet the enemy; they well knew what was at stake for them. The contemporary feeling is preserved in Herodotus, VI, 112 who was perhaps no scholar but a real historian: πρῶτοι μὲν γὰρ Ἑλλήνων πάντων τῶν ἡμεῖς ἴδμεν δρόμῳ ἐς πολεμίους ἐχρήσαντο, πρῶτοι δὲ ἀνέσχοντο ἐσθῆτά τε Μηδικὴν ὁρῶντες καὶ τοὺς ἄνδρας ταύτην ἐσθημένους· τέως δὲ ἦν τοῖσι Ἕλλησι καὶ τὸ οὔνομα τὸ Μήδων φόβος ἀκοῦσαι.

The third and fourth facts concerning the character of the monument and its position are intimately connected, and the latter is fairly simple, though obscured by modern discussion. The epigrams, though they do not expressly say so (nor do we expect them to, since their site indicated it) must have belonged to a publicly erected

---

[35] See also Wilhelm[2] who discusses the alternatives, while Oliver[4], p. 484 " does not feel that the poet's words must be taken literally " (cf. p. 174). Ἀγχίαλον must be connected with ἄστυ; the hyperbaton does not contradict this connexion while the connexion with πύλων in the preceding line is methodologically and stylistically out of the question. The epithet is a poetical one and hardly surprising, as Athens (compared with Thebes or Sparta) is a coastal town (see, e.g., Xenophon, *Hell.*, VII, 1, 1 ff.), even if not founded ἐπ᾽ αὐτοῖς τοῖς αἰγιαλοῖς. The whole of Attica was regarded and its name etymologized as ἀκτή. In any case, the notion is vivid and as near to the facts as all expressions in these poems (see below, pp. 184 f.). I submit that the poet has chosen it from the viewpoint of the Athenians as well as from that of the Persian generals, for both of whom the town was near enough to the coast to be attacked from the sea. Πρόσθε πυλῶν needs no justification, but on account of an objection made in the discussion I refer to *Il.*, M, 143 αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ δὴ τεῖχος ἐπεσσυμένους ἐνόησαν / Τρῶας, ἀτὰρ Δαναῶν γένετο ἰαχή τε φόβος τε, / ἐκ δὲ τὼ ἀΐξαντε πυλάων πρόσθε μαχέσθην. There may well be " a collateral notion of defence " here (and one may also find it in the epigram, though I do not believe that the poet thought of it); but again it does not matter how far from the gates they fought. In any case, they fought " outside the gates " for the protection of the walls or rather the camp, as they fought at Marathon for the protection of the town.

[36] Herodotus, VI, 101, 2; 102.

[37] The feeling behind these words may be gauged from the second Potidaea epigram (*I.G.*, I², 945) ἐχθρῶν δ᾽ οἱ μὲν ἔχουσι τάφου μέρος, οἱ δὲ φυγόντες / τεῖχος πιστοτάτην ἐλπίδ᾽ ἔθεντο βίου, as the temper of the men shines forth from the manner of their attack, as described by Herodotus (VI, 112) πρῶτοι μὲν γὰρ Ἑλλήνων πάντων τῶν ἡμεῖς ἴδμεν δρόμῳ ἐς πολεμίους ἐχρήσαντο. This and what follows is what the Athenians told Herodotus: they certainly had not forgotten the battle. The manner in which *Wasps*, 1071 ff. describe it, though the wording is obviously determined by the masks of the chorus, reminds us of the second epigram (which Aristophanes did not know) not only in v. 1078/9 ἡνίκ᾽ ἦλθ᾽ ὁ βάρβαρος / τῷ κάπνῳ τύφων ἅπασαν τὴν πόλιν καὶ πυρπολῶν and perhaps in the contrast ἐκδραμόντες ξὺν δορί, ξὺν ἀσπίδι—ὑπὸ τῶν τοξευμάτων, but also in the intense local feeling of the description.

monument; for the site was, as we infer from the places where the fragments were found, either the Agora or the Akropolis. The opposition of Oliver rests exclusively on his conviction that the monument was a cenotaph and that consequently it must have its place in the Kerameikos.[38] But before proceeding to discuss the question of its character (which forms our third problem) we must turn for a moment to the text.

2.

As I have given a very full *apparatus criticus*, discussing the most important supplements in notes 23, 29, 34, and as (I am sorry to say) I myself have no new supplements or suggestions to offer, I can be quite short here, confining myself to the third line of the first epigram.[39] Against the really brilliant proposal of Wilhelm ἔσχον γὰρ πεζοὶ τὴ[ν ἄλκιμον Ἀσίδος ἵππο]ν, where the appearance of the Persian cavalry, so much talked about in ancient sources and modern histories, perfectly explains the obvious stress laid on πεζοί (as in II τοξοφόρων gives a perfect contrast to the equally stressed αἰχμὴν στῆσαν [40]), the alternatives cut a rather sorry figure. Hiller's πεζοί τε [καὶ ὠκυπόρων ἐπὶ νηῶ]ν, taken from the Eurymedon epigram, falls to the ground as soon as the relation of the first epigram to the battle of Marathon is established: there were no Athenian ships at Marathon. Nor was there Athenian cavalry. I believe that we can dismiss the supplement of Maas πεζοί τε [καὶ ὠκυπόδων ἐπὶ πώλω]ν [41] with the simple quotation of Herodotus, VI, 112, 2 οἱ δὲ Πέρσαι ὁρῶντες

[38] Cf. Oliver[3], pp. 225, 228. His alternative *idem*[2], p. 199, " on the Akropolis or in the public cemetery," comes rather as a surprise. Oliver is followed by Bowra, Raubitschek, and Arvanitopulos. The last named professes a most accurate knowledge of the site of the monument on the strength of his wrong interpretation of Pausanias, I, 29, 3-4: Πιθανῶς εἶδεν αὐτὸ ὁ Παυσανίας, κτλ.

[39] As to the first distich of the second epigram it is distressing to see how Maas, after having found the same (and almost certainly right) supplement as Wilhelm—ἀδάμ[αντος ἐνὶ φρεσὶ θυμός]— tries to overthrow it by all sorts of fine distinctions and subtle arguments, as, e.g., " statt des temporalsatzes erwartet man einen relativsatz: der dauernde charakter der kämpfer, nicht ihr seelischer zustand während einer tat soll gepriesen werden." The relative clause is frequent enough (cf. note 67) ; but this is no reason to dictate to the poet of 490 B.C. He as yet does not know the hackneyed phrasing of later epigrams, but expresses what he and his contemporaries felt when seeing the men marching out after the decision had been taken to meet the enemy in the open (see above, pp. 166 f.). As to the whole distich it seems sufficient to quote the opinion of M. N. Tod, *J.H.S.*, LVII, p. 175, " the suggested alternatives are inadmissible." For v. 7 the right restoration has perhaps not yet been found.

[40] Wilhelm put an interrogation mark to τοξοφόρων, but it is one of the two distinctive epithets for the Persians everywhere. For the ἱππομάχοι see note 42; for τοξοφόροι, e.g., the dedication of the Corinthian courtezans Hiller, 29, the perhaps genuine Eurymedon epitaph *Anth. Pal.*, VII, 258 (Hiller, 42) with the opposite αἰχμηταί for the Athenians, the Hellenistic (?) poem *Anth. Pal.*, VII, 443 (Simonid. 116 Diehl) also for the Eurymedon.

[41] Πῶλοι in an epigram and for cavalry horses is rather surprising, but ἵπποι would not scan. The parallels adduced by Maas—and there are many more after *Iliad*, B 382 ff., and 554: κοσμῆσαι ἵππους τε καὶ ἀνέρας ἀσπιδιώτας—all have ἵπποι, and this is the word one expects, if it were necessary to understand TE as τε.

δρόμῳ ἐπιόντας παρεσκευάζοντο ὡς δεξόμενοι, μανίην τε τοῖσι Ἀθηναίοισι ἐπέφερον καὶ πάγχυ ὀλεθρίην, ὀρῶντες αὐτοὺς ἐόντας ὀλίγους, καὶ τούτους δρόμῳ ἐπειγομένους οὔτε ἵππου ὑπαρχούσης σφι οὔτε τοξευμάτων.[42]

3.

So far our course has been fairly clear; now we get into troubled waters. The problem of the nature of the epigrams and of the monument which they adorned (both questions are again intimately connected) is a very intricate one, though Oliver himself is so sure of the facts of the case that he entitles his commentary " An Epigram of Simonides " and begins it without more ado with the following words: " The stone is the fragment of a cenotaph, erected at Athens, to commemorate the men who had fallen in the battle of Marathon." From the title it clearly appears that his starting-point is the story in the *Vita* of Aeschylus mentioned above, and in the course of the interpretation it becomes abundantly clear that his second argument for determining " the true character of the monument," is the use of the demonstrative pronoun in both epigrams, which in his opinion demands a list of names accompanying the epigrams.[43] The provenance of the stone [44] of course tells against this, though Oliver is entitled to reply that " the fragments were easily transportable." We shall soon see what are the real objections to this main thesis dominating Oliver's whole interpretation which makes him insensitive to any other idea and impatient of any supplement which does not seem to fit it, or rather to the whole question of supplements. Against him Wilhelm[2] carefully argued the old *communis opinio*, and Maas stated it with his usual laconism, adducing what he too calls " the verbatim agreement " of II 1 with the beginning of *the* Eion epigram: " Therefore," he concludes, " both epigrams belong to monuments which were erected in the Agora in honour of surviving victors." As in the second part of this paper I shall have to deal at length with the hypothesis of a close relation between the Marathon and the Eion epigrams, it may be sufficient for the moment to state bluntly that the alleged relation

---

[42] Wickert concludes his rather bewildering array of suggestions and possibilities with this compromise: " accordingly on the one hand the *communis opinio* (viz., that the Athenians in 490 B.C. had no regular cavalry) remains valid, on the other hand and from the stand-point of the historian there *may be no objection* [my italics] to the supplement proposed by Maas." But if the *communis opinio* is right, the supplement is wrong—there is no half-way house. After Busolt-Swoboda *Staatskunde*, p. 824, note 1, and Kromeyer-Veith, *Heerwesen* (1928), pp. 42, 45, I need not probe deeper into the factual question. Sufficient to say that wherever in the Persian Wars horsemen are mentioned the Persian cavalry is meant. Besides Herodotus I shall quote just one epigram— Simonides 120 D on Thermopylae: πλείστων δὴ τόξων τε καὶ ὠκυπόδων σθένος ἵππων / Μηδείων ἀνδρῶν δεξάμενοι πολέμῳ. That holds good also for the popular belief of the inhabitants of the Marathonian plain who heard ἀνὰ πᾶσαν νύκτα καὶ ἵππων χρεμετιζόντων καὶ ἀνδρῶν μαχομένων at the Soros (Pausanias, I, 32, 4).

[43] Oliver[1], p. 487; *idem*[2], pp. 194 f.; *idem*[3], p. 232.

[44] See notes 24, 38.

does not exist, that there is no *verbatim* agreement, and that in any case words of praise like ἦν ἄρα τοῖσζ᾽ ἀδάμαντος ἐνὶ φρεσὶ θυμός or ἦν ἄρα κἀκεῖνοι ταλακάρδιοι suit the fallen heroes as well as, if not better than, the surviving victors. As Oliver has given no proof for his opinion and as his critics seem to use a wrong argument, the question must be taken up *de integro*.

To begin with a purely negative statement: there is no certain conclusion to be drawn from the text of the epigrams such as it is (I shall have to come back to this), nor from the position of the monument in the Agora which, though probable, is not certain, nor finally (and here I feel my own insufficience keenly) from the supposed form of the monument to which the slab or block (which is all we have and which may have been a base, for it is broken away at the back) belonged. Leo Weber [45] who did not trouble much about the archaeological side called it " remains of a herm from the Agora," and regarded this Herm as part of a row of Herms on a common base, commemorating the great victories of Marathon, Salamis, Plataea, Eion—evolving in fact a sort of *Berlin Siegesallee* in ancient Athens from the Eion Herms, which are the only victory Herms in the Agora of which we or ancient tradition know. [46] The idea of a Herm has been taken up by Wilhelm, [47] but opposed by Oliver [48] who declares Wilhelm's reconstruction to be " impossible, because it contradicts the archaeological evidence." He himself—acting consistently from his starting-point, the " cenotaph," and comparing the Pythagoras monument in the Eridanos cemetery near the Dipylon [49]—postulates " a marble stele, inscribed with the names of the fallen, set in a marble base." He sharply rejected [50] also the extension of his theory made by Raubitschek who on the strength of a " faint cutting on the upper surface of the base " (which in his opinion can only belong to the second epigram) postulated a second

---

[45] *Philol.*, LXXIV, 1917, pp. 274, 278 ff.; LXXVI, 1920, pp. 60 ff.

[46] The reconstruction falls to the ground as soon as one severs the tie between the Marathon and the Eion Epigrams. But there are other objections: the Marathon monument was most probably destroyed in 480/79 B.C. (see p. 178); and the setting up of Kimon's Herms was a special and even a unique case (see Part II). The tradition about them expressly excludes other victory Herms; for Aischines goes on speaking of Miltiades in connexion with the picture in the Stoa Poikile, and Plutarch knows of a demand for a victory crown (θαλλοῦ στέφανος) which was defeated in the Assembly where Sophanes of Dekelea spoke against it. Of course this anecdote is valueless, but one thing emerges clearly: nobody knew of other victory Herms, and those for Salamis, Plataea, and later battles could not have disappeared completely. Weber's whole argumentation is quite fanciful, a qualified and perhaps less harmful (if less brilliant) *réchauffée* of Domaszewski's thesis concerning the Kimon Herms. The suggestion of Wilhelm[2], pp. 107 f., that the Marathon epigrams were ἐπιγράμματα ἐν τοῖς Ἑρμαῖς is arguable (see Part II), but an appeal to Demosthenes, XX, 112 ἀλλ᾽ ἀγαπητῶς ἐπιγράμματος ἐν τοῖς Ἑρμαῖς ἔτυχον does not help: the orator is simply generalizing the one known case of Kimon and his colleagues.

[47] Wilhelm[2], pp. 102 ff.

[48] Oliver[3], pp. 225 ff.

[49] *I.G.*, I[2], 1034 from the middle of the fifth century. There is one obvious difference between the two monuments: the Pythagoras monument is a private one, though the epitaph emphasizes that the Demos by decree permitted the burial and gave the site for the grave.

[50] Oliver[4].

smaller stele for the names of the men who fell when the Persians tried to disembark at Phaleron. As Raubitschek inferred this " fight in Phaleron " from the second epigram, and as the inference is quite obviously wrong,[51] the archaeological inference from the alleged faint cutting must needs be wrong too. So we shall not trouble here whether there was a cutting, and if there was, whether it would help us to form an idea of the monument.[52]

Whatever the nature of the monument was,[53] it does not help with the interpretation of the epigrams nor, conversely, do the epigrams help us to reconstruct the monument.[54] This result is somewhat discouraging, and perhaps the reader will find me still more discouraging when I go on to make another seemingly negative point, which nevertheless is important, as it clears the air and brings us directly to the true problem of the monument. If we cannot say as yet with any assurance what the monument was, we can at least say quite definitely what it was not: *it was not a cenotaph*. The opinion of Oliver is wrong; and in refuting it one need scarcely touch on the general question of the creation and use of the public cemetery in the Kerameikos.[55] Nevertheless, in disproving it we had better distinguish the stylistic, so to speak, from the factual side of the question.

1) As far as the preservation of the epigrams allows us to judge their character,

---

[51] See above, pp. 166 f.

[52] Oliver[4], p. 483, " my own re-examination confirms the existence of the cutting, although it neither proves nor disproves its connection with the ancient form of the monument."

[53] If it was not a grave (we shall come back to this question) it must have been a public dedication. Its dedicatory inscription I will not try to reconstruct, but it was probably in prose and cast into a form which made it evident to whom τῶνδε and τοῖσδε refer. The Pythagoras monument has a prose inscription, even if it consists only of the name pure and simple which was inscribed in large letters on the upper part of the stele, while the epigram is engraved on the base. With ἐνθάδ’ ’Αθηναῖοι Πυθαγόρην ἔθεσαν it clearly indicates that the monument stands on the site of the tomb of the man named; the Marathon epigrams do not. One might try to develop a prose inscription for the Marathon monument from the contemporary dedication in Delphi which was restored in the late second century B.C. ’Αθηνα[ῖοι ’Απόλλωνι Πυθί]ῳ ἀκρ[οθίνια τῆς Μαραθῶνι μάχης ἀνέθεσαν] ἀ[πὸ Μήδων (?)] (Syll.³, 23; Tod, 14). About the relation between prose and poetical inscriptions on the same monument see Schwartz *Hermes*, XXXV, 1900, pp. 121 f.

[54] Epigrams which become fully understandable only from the monument or, conversely, epigrams from which we must infer the nature of the monument and (as far as possible) its details are not rare. Besides τάδε in the Eion poem (see Part II; Wilhelm², p. 97; there was no need for Wade-Gery, *J.H.S.*, LIII, p. 95, note 17, to trouble, and I do not quite understand his opinion), see, e. g., the dedication of Kallimachos (Hiller, 10 I; *supra*, note 8), the Harmodios-Aristogeiton inscription (Friedlaender, pp. 89 ff.), the first Potidaea epigram (Wade-Gery, *loc. cit.*, p. 78), the epitaph of Xanthippe, a descendant of Periandros (*Anth. Pal.*, XIII, 26 = Simonid. 86 D; Wilamowitz, *Sappho u. Simonid.*, p. 216), the Midas monument Χαλκῆ παρθένος εἰμί (L. Weber, *Hermes*, LII, 1917, pp. 536 ff.). I cannot take up the question here.

[55] See above, p. 157. Oliver (cf. note 76) did not realize that these questions bear on the problem of the Marathon epigrams. But even the current opinion (which I think is wrong) now dates the laying-out of a public burying ground for the men who fell in war to 475 B.C., fifteen years after the battle of Marathon.

they are certainly not epitaphs. Epitaphs, into whatever form they are cast, seldom (if ever) leave any doubt that they *are* epitaphs.[56] As it is neither possible nor necessary for our present object to outline the history of the funeral epigram we may be satisfied with distinguishing the two main forms of public epitaphs in the fifth century. The first form puts the obituary into the mouths of the fallen themselves who generally indicate the place where they fell or where they are buried, either by name—Δίρφυος ἐδμήθημεν ὑπὸ πτυχί, σῆμα δ' ἐφ' ἡμῖν / ἐγγύθεν Εὐρίπου δημοσίᾳ κέχυται in the oldest Athenian epitaph from 506 B.C.; ᾿Ω ξεῖν' εὔνδρόν ποκ' ἐναίομες ἄστυ Κορίνθου· / νῦν δ' ἀμὲ Αἴαντος νᾶσος ἔχει Σαλαμίς, the Corinthians in 480/79 B.C.[57]—or by a simple and sufficient τῇδε: ᾿Ω ξεῖν' ἀγγέλλειν Λακεδαιμονίοις ὅτι τῇδε κείμεθα.[58] In the second form the burying community speaks in pride (῎Ανδρες τοί ποτ' ἔναιον ὑπὸ κροτάφοις Ἑλικῶνος / λήματι τῶν αὐχεῖ Θεσπιὰς εὐρύχορος[59]), grief (Τούσδε ποθεῖ φθιμένους ὑπὲρ Ἑλλάδος ἀντία Μήδων / μητρόπολις Λοκρῶν εὐθυνόμων ᾿Οπόεις[60]), or, more generally,

---

[56] This holds good even when, as in the Kerameikos epitaphs, the list of names precedes or follows, a circumstance which in itself ought to be sufficient to indicate the nature of the monument, quite apart from the fact that its site is in the public cemetery. Therefore, when an epigram preserved only in literary tradition leaves us in doubt, the presumption is against its funeral character. This observation ought to weigh very heavily in the interpretation of the Cyprus epigram ᾿Εξ οὗ γ' Εὐρώπην which Ephoros (Diod., XI, 62) explicitly described as the subscription of a votive offering for Apollo made from the booty. Modern opinion is divided, though most scholars from K. W. Krueger (*Hist.-philol. Studien*, I [1836], pp. 64 ff.) to Friedlaender, pp. 102 ff., regard it as an epitaph. The majority vote is founded exclusively on the οἵδε which, significantly enough, stands in the beginning of the fifth line and the second part of the poem. That does not justify the use which Domaszewski made of the second part, but it goes a long way to explain it, as it explains the criticism of Ed. Schwartz, *Hermes*, XXXV, 1900, pp. 117 ff., and the reserve of Wilamowitz, *Hellenist. Dichtung*, I (1924), p. 127, note 4. There is, in fact, " no comparable poem on a public monument " (as Wilamowitz has it)—if we decline to compare it with its unpretentious prototype, the Marathon epigram.

[57] See further, e.g., the epigram ᾿Ακμᾶς ἑστηκυῖαν on the " cenotaph " for all (?) Corinthians who fell in the Xerxes war (Geffcken, 108; Hiller, 22), which in my opinion was erected after war broke out between Athens and Corinth in 461 B.C. (the epigram with its alleged expansion in Aristides, *Or.*, XLIX, 66 needs a new treatment). The similar monument for the Megarians, Hiller, 30 (see Wade-Gery, *J.H.S.*, LIII, pp. 95 ff.; Friedlaender, p. 120, note 1), may belong in the same time, but is perhaps even later; see also the Athenian epitaph *Anth. Pal.*, VII, 253 (cf. note 11).

[58] Cf. also, though they are no epitaphs, Μυριάσιν ποτὲ τῇδε for all Peloponnesians who fought at Thermopylae, Herodotus, VII, 228, 1 (Geffcken, 106; Hiller, 15; cf. Wade-Gery, *loc. cit.*, p. 72) and the Athenian Παντοδαπῶν ἀνδρῶν γενεάς at Artemision (see note 3).

[59] Steph. Byz., *s. v.* Θέσπεια (Hiller, 19), which Friedlaender, p. 94 f., regards as complete. That may well be, though in other respects I have grave doubts about his treatment of the distich.

[60] Strabo, IX, 4, 2 (Hiller, 18). Ποθεῖ is the conjecture of Meineke for ποτέ in the Mss. which Friedlaender, pp. 95 ff., tries to defend. The case (and Friedlaender's treatment of it) is in some respects similar to that of Hiller, 19 (note 59). I cannot take up the question here: from the time of Kallinos 1 ποθεῖν is the solemn word for the feeling of the survivors, whether a whole community or a private person, about the men fallen in battle, but the change proposed by Meineke is not an easy one, nor is it easy to find the substance for a whole (missing) distich. Perhaps I had better have quoted in the text the third Potidaea epigram, ῎Ανδρας μὲν πόλις ἥδε ποθεῖ καὶ δῆ[μος ᾿Ερεχθοῦς].

in praise (Οἵδε παρ' Εὐρυμέδοντά ποτ' ἀγλαὸν ὤλεσαν ἥβην [61]). Less formal are the first two epitaphs for the men of Potidaea: Ἀθάνατόν με θα[νοῦσι πολῖται σῆμ' ἀνέθηκαν] and Αἰθὴρ μὲν ψυχὰς ὑπεδέξατο, σώμ[ατα δὲ χθών]. One may call this a third form: the development is obvious, and the comparison with what perhaps was the prototype, Simonides' private epitaph Μνῆμα τόδε κλεινοῖο Μεγιστία κτλ., is interesting.[62] In the second form the demonstrative οἵδε furnishes the usual and natural reference to the occupants of the tomb;[63] and this seems to have been the regular though not the only form for the public epitaphs in the Kerameikos, because here the list of the fallen is the prior and the essential feature, while a poetical epitaph is an extra which is not indispensable, though in course of time it becomes more and more frequent.[64] From the use of οἵδε we can often infer that a list preceded or followed, but the inference is never quite certain, and in any case the observation that in the Kerameikos and elsewhere οἵδε often refers to a list does not permit of a simple inversion: the use of the demonstrative is never *proof* of the existence of a list on the same monument;[65] there remains always the alternative that the demonstrative refers either to the epigram itself or to the dedicatory prose inscription on the monument.[66] The former appears to be the case in the Marathon inscriptions where in the second epigram the reference to the τοῖσδε sentence is preserved in the temporal clause

[61] *Anth. Pal.*, VII, 258 (Hiller, 42). See also Euripides in Plutarch, *Nik.*, 17, οἵδε Συρακοσίους (Geffcken, 117; Hiller, 55). For a special body of men see, e.g., Χαίρετε ἀριστῆες, Hiller, 47, and for an individual, Simonides in Herodotus, VII, 228, 3, Μνῆμα τόδε κλεινοῖο Μεγιστία.

[62] As, on the other hand, is the comparison with the inscription on the votive offering of the younger Peisistratos in Thucydides, VI, 54, 6 (*I.G.*, I², 761), which perhaps should now be dated in 522/1 B.C.: Μνῆμα τόδ' ἧς ἀρχῆς Πεισίστρατος, Ἱππίου υἱός, / θῆκεν Ἀπόλλωνος Πυθίου ἐν τεμένει. See also the Herms of Hipparchos (Hiller, 6), and for the other form the dedication of Megakles on the Ptoion Φοίβου μέν εἰμ' ἄγαλμα (Hiller, 4) and Καλλίμαχος μ' ἀνέθηκεν (Hiller, 10 I).

[63] See, e.g., the Locrian epitaph at Thermopylae, Τούσδε ποθεῖ φθιμένους (note 60), and Τῶνδε δι' ἀνθρώπων ἀρετήν for Tegea (Hiller, 39). By its very nature the demonstrative usually stands at the beginning of the epitaph (see, e.g., the Eurymedon, Hellespont, and Chaeronea epigrams, Hiller, 42, 52, 73, the first one being the prototype), as it does also in the inscription of the votive offering of the Corinthian courtezans Αἴδ' ὑπὲρ Ἑλλάνων (Hiller, 29).

[64] Pausanias, I, 29, 4, in the description of the Kerameikos correctly mentions only the στῆλαι τὰ ὀνόματα καὶ τὸν δῆμον ἑκάστου λέγουσαι (more accurately I, 32, 3, for the Soros, στῆλαι τὰ ὀνόματα τῶν ἀποθανόντων κατὰ φυλὰς ἑκάστων ἔχουσαι), which were on *all* graves, though he knows and quotes epitaphs for *some* of them. The casualty list at the Soros was probably the first Athenian list of this kind (cf. pp. 176 f.). There seems to exist a presumption (perhaps derived from the private grave, which, of course, always gave the name of the man buried in it) that the list was a regular feature of the public grave always and everywhere. That is not so. It is a regular feature at Athens after 464 B.C. But there was apparently no list on the grave of the Corinthians in Salamis (Hiller, 20), and I believe there was none for the Spartans at Thermopylae (against Wilamowitz, *Sappho und Simonid.*, p. 201, note 1). There is no οἵδε in these two epitaphs, nor is there in the Thespian epitaph (Hiller, 19) or on the " cenotaphs " of the Corinthians and Megarians who died in the Xerxes War (Hiller, 22, 30; cf. note 57).

[65] For the Cyprus epigram, where οἵδε begins the second part of the poem, see note 56.

[66] See pp. 171, 177 and for the inference from the epigram to the monument note 54.

beginning with ὅτε, and where in the first Wilhelm supplied a perfectly suitable relative clause to the τῶνδε sentence with Περσῶν οἳ στόρεσαν δύναμιν.[67] Whether the second element is also present, viz., a prose dedication giving the name of the battle or rather of the enemy, we are not now able to decide.[68] This being so the choice lies between an epitaph in praise of the fallen, or an epigram in praise of the survivors, or better, of the men that fought at Marathon,[69] and can be decided only from the text. In the text, miserably lacerated as it is, there is not one word which points to an epitaph, and only Bowra (who evidently recognized how much depended on this fact) has proposed a supplement which makes an epitaph out of the praise of the combatants. If Oliver regarded the monument as a cenotaph, it was up to him to find such supplements.[70] It does not help to make light of those given by Wilhelm and others, declaring them to be " mere possibilities," which they certainly are. It is a mistake of method to claim this undeniable fact as proof for his thesis;[71] and it is wrong, in face of the constant and indispensable features of an epitaph, to declare that in Wilhelm's supplements, if right, there was " nothing incompatible with his own thesis." He himself is apparently not happy about this and other objections, since finally he tries to minimize the clear distinction between the two different types of epigram: " I, however, feel that a poet might not have been so exact as Wilhelm." [72] In my opinion his position becomes at once untenable if we turn to the factual side of the question, which we can dispatch in a few words.

2) It is a fact, undeniable and never denied, guaranteed by Thucydides and the learned author of Pausanias, and for that matter sufficiently confirmed by archaeology,

---

[67] Of course, the relative clause is the more frequent one: e.g., epitaph of Megistias (Hiller, 17), Tegea (Hiller, 39), the knights of 431 (Hiller, 47), the first and the third of the Potidaea epigrams (Hiller, 53), the monuments for the victors of Eion and the men of Phyle (Hiller, 34, 61). But the Eurymedon epigram (Hiller, 42) has the participle μαρνάμενοι Μήδων· τοξοφόρων προμάχοις (cf. Hiller, 52, and the Chaeronea epigram, Hiller, 73), and the second Potidaea epigram has an independent sentence Ποτειδαίας δ' ἀμφὶ πύλας ἐλύθεν (cf. I.G., I², 943 σφετέραν δ' εὐκλέϊσαν πατρίδα). There is no canon. As to the use of a temporal ὅτε in the first Marathon epigram see note 39. No clause at all is necessary when there is no οἵδε (and no list): epitaph of the Corinthians (Hiller, 20) and generally in dedicatory inscriptions: Καλλίμαχος πολέμαρχος Ἀθηναίων τὸν ἀγῶνα . . . ὤρινε (Hiller, 10, II; ibid., 7-9, 14). Different is the case of the epigram of the Corinthian courtezans which begins with αἵδε and was probably followed by a list of names: Αἵδ' ὑπὲρ Ἑλλάνων . . . ἐστάθεν εὐχόμεναι Κύπριδι δαιμονία· οὐ γὰρ . . . ἐμήδετο δῖ' Ἀφροδίτα κτλ.

[68] See pp. 171 f., 177.

[69] There is no third possibility. It is unthinkable that the survivors praised the slain, which Oliver³, p. 233, seems to regard as the last expedient (if I understand him rightly). His alternative seems to be derived from Wade-Gery's explanation of οἵδε in the Cyprus epigram.

[70] Where he ought to have tried to do so (Oliver¹, pp. 487 f.), he turns aside with a reference to I.G., I², 943, which really cannot be said " to closely resemble in type " the Marathon epigrams, and to calculations of the size of the stele and whether it could have accommodated 202 names.

[71] Raubitschek, p. 57, note 1 simply follows suite.

[72] Cf. note 35.

that the men of Marathon were *not* buried in the Kerameikos, but, on account of their surpassing ἀρετή, on the battlefield itself; and we further know from Pausanias [73] that this grave already had the distinguishing feature of the later Kerameikos graves— στῆλαι τὰ ὀνόματα τῶν ἀποθανόντων κατὰ φυλὰς ἑκάστων ἔχουσαι. This grave was without any doubt contemporary, and the cult of the heroes, performed by the polemarch, took place at the Soros.[74] The custom of burying those who fell in war in the Kerameikos did not yet exist in 490 B.C.; most probably there had not even been single cases of public burial there; [75] and this custom is the *conditio sine qua non* for Oliver's whole thesis.[76] In 490 B.C. it would have been a singular honour for the fallen of Marathon if they had been buried in the Kerameikos, or even in the city, as protecting heroes; at that time burial on the battlefield was the customary thing, *and the singular honour consisted in the list of names on, and the yearly cult at the grave.* All these facts need no discussion, nor could I give the proofs here. But there is no need for any sort of proof. For wherever and however the Athenians buried their heroes, even in an age when the old and simple faith was on the decline, it is inconceivable that they could have buried them at two places at the same time, and called one of the graves a cenotaph,[77] while a monument, whether erected at the same time

[73] I, 32, 3 (cf. note 64).

[74] About the calendar date and the connexion of the cult at the Soros with the general festival of the Dead see my paper " Patrios Nomos " (*J.H.S.*, LXIV, 1945). It seems to be a simple mistake that Pausanias I, 32, 4 ascribes the cult to " the Marathonians."

[75] The oldest grave mentioned by Pausanias (I, 29, 7)—’Αθηναίων οἳ πρὶν ἢ στρατεῦσαι τὸν Μῆδον ἐπολέμησαν πρὸς Αἰγινήτας—is generally dated in 487 B.C.

[76] If Oliver had realized this, he would not have written (Oliver[1], p. 488) : "Of course there would have been also in Athens a monument for the dead heroes, and in the stone with the epigram⟨s⟩ we have now discovered part of it." There is no " of course," though Wilamowitz arrived at the " cenotaphs " in the Kerameikos for the dead of the Xerxes War in the same manner. A *monument* at Athens may be extremely probable *a priori*, but it could not be a *cenotaph*, and one is somewhat surprised that Oliver does not use his favorite term here. Accidentally it appears, as he goes on with the assertion that to this " monument . . . could be attached the worship of the great dead (Heroenkult) *in the usual place* [my italics] and . . . on the Akropolis or together with the other monuments of the public cemetery [it] would constantly hold before the eyes of the Athenians the memory of those patriots who had given their lives for the city." One is again surprised and tempted to combine this opinion with the avoidance of the term " cenotaph," that suddenly the Akropolis turns up as an alternative site (note 38). The hard facts are that *the usual place* for the cult of the dead is the grave, and at least on the Akropolis there can be no grave (not even of Kekrops and Erechtheus, though afterwards their cult-places came to be regarded as such), and that the Kerameikos was not yet taken into use as a public cemetery.

[77] The example adduced by Oliver[1], p. 488, does not help. If the Corinthians really erected a " cenotaph " on the Isthmos, they probably did so at a time considerably later than the Xerxes War (see note 57), and they had good reason for it, as their dead lay in now hostile territory—Salamis and Plataea. That holds good also for the Megarians. Not to leave any loop-hole: even if there were several epitaphs for the men who fell at Chaeronea, there is not a shade of probability in Hiller's suggestion that the one quoted by Demosthenes Οἵδε πάτρας μὲν ἕκας σφετέρας " was set up in Chaeronea."

or later on, of course does not clash with a grave of honour, wherever it was situated. If the Athenians in 490 B.C. wished for a commemorative monument for Marathon in the town itself, and we now know that they did, a victory monument was indicated, and for such a monument there was only one form possible in this age—a votive offering to a god or the gods.

Perhaps it is as well to sum up now, for what remains of our four problems may be discussed in a sort of appendix. We have got three negative facts two of which are certain and one as good as certain, and of the two which are certain the second one will become important for the second part of this paper: (1) the monument to which the two epigrams belong was not a cenotaph, and the epigrams are not epitaphs;[78] (2) neither the monument nor the epigrams are connected with others of the same *genre*: there was no " *Siegesallee* " in Athens; (3) there was no epitaph on the Soros at Marathon.[79] This, by the process of elimination, leaves us with one positive fact: as the monument in Athens was surely a public one, *it was set up to commemorate the victory and in praise of the victors.*[80] We cannot decide, and it does not matter much, once the Kerameikos as an alternative site is excluded, whether the " War Memorial " was erected in the Agora or on the Akropolis, where the dedicatory monument for another important victory, that of 506 B.C., stood. But we can confidently state that the celebration of this battle (which saved, if not the existence, at least the liberty and autonomy of democratic Athens) is *the true precedent for the steps taken by the State after the battle of Marathon.* As far as monuments are concerned[81] they were threefold for both victories: a public grave for the fallen on the battlefield, a " War-Memorial " in the centre of the town, and a dedication to the god

[78] There is no " consequently," as the second statement is not logically inferred from the first, but both are proved independently from each other.

[79] For this fact which is in accordance with the almost complete absence of older Athenian epitaphs mentioned above, p. 158, I do not trust the silence of Pausanias I, 32, 3 (as Oliver[1], p. 489 does) nor for that matter the silence of Herodotus; but I do trust the reasoning of Oliver and of his predecessors that, if there had been a poetical epitaph we should find it either in one of the authors of the fourth century (Lycurgus for choice; see p. 160) or at least in one of the later collections.

[80] It may be worth mentioning already here that the epigrams praise the combatants without mentioning the ἡγεμόνες, polemarch, or strategoi. This is an important difference from the Eion poem which seems to be unique in this respect. Consequently it would be imprudent to look for a special reason—jealousy between the ἡγεμόνες. Jealousies there certainly were: the posthumous epigram on the votive offering of Kallimachos seems to me to imply them clearly enough (see note 8). Miltiades regarded the battle as his victory, and his son seems to have tried his utmost to make the State acknowledge this claim. I have not much doubt that it was his influence which got Miltiades a place alongside the polemarch in the great battle-piece in the Stoa Poikile (Pausanias, I, 15, 3).

[81] That is leaving out of account all things not immediately referring to the battle, such as the annual sacrifice to Artemis, the introduction of a cult of Pan, and, of course, later commemorative monuments, as, e.g., the picture in the Stoa Poikile.

in Delphi.[82] In the execution of the first two monuments there are some differences which, though not vital, are nevertheless important, as they clearly show that the victory at Marathon had impressed public feeling even more than the victory at the Euripos—a fact which will surprise nobody. In 506 B.C. for the first time the Athenians gave their fallen a public burial, of course on the battlefield, but with an epitaph praising their valour; [83] in 490 B.C. a new device was found to honour the fallen—a stele listing their names and a yearly cult-ceremony at the tomb, the former enabling (so to speak) the ritual performance of the cult which demanded a knowledge of the names of the heroes. There was no poetical epitaph this time: it had not yet become a custom, and the list of names seemed sufficient, as it certainly was the greater honour. The monument in the town shows a similar increase in the appreciation of the martial exploit: in 506 B.C. it took the usual form of a votive offering with an epigram commemorating its reason; in 490 B.C. also a votive offering was made which was apparently more modest and less costly as the war probably had not yielded great booty. We cannot guess its nature, and therefore I have used the convenient term War Memorial: but it can hardly be doubted that it bore a dedicatory inscription which must have contained the name of the dedicating community and the reason for the offering. It is a grievous gap in our knowledge, the only one which really matters, that we do not know in what form the dedication had been cast. In any case, in 490 B.C. the praise of the men to whose valour the dedication was due, was detached from the dedicatory inscription, made independent of it, and therefore much more impressive. The only curious fact is that the praise was expressed not by one epigram but by two, and (even more curious) that the second one was inscribed somewhat later when the base was already *in situ*.[84] Perhaps this curious fact allows of a rather simple explanation. There is an obvious difference in the point of view taken by the two epigrams—the first and earlier one estimating the consequence of the valour of the Athenians for the whole of Greece,[85] the second and later one putting Athens in the foreground and stressing the fact that by this valour the town itself was saved from destruction. It appears at least arguable that the general view taken by the (first?) poet did not satisfy public feeling and raised adverse comment on a poem which seemingly had forgotten the

---

[82] It is outside my province to try to date the Athenian Treasury at Delphi which Pausanias, X, 11, 5 asserts was built ἀπὸ τῶν ἐς Μαραθῶνα ἀποβάντων ὁμοῦ Δάτιδι. From the historical stand-point I am convinced that the date given by Wilamowitz, *Ar. u. Ath.*, II, pp. 287 f. is the right one. For the archaeological question see Langlotz *Zur Zeitbestimmung, etc.* (1920), pp. 69 f., quoting Studniczka, *Jahrb.*, XI, 1896, p. 265.

[83] See above, pp. 159 f.

[84] See p. 164. This is an obvious difference from the three Potidaea epigrams, the two (? see note 77) for the dead of Chaeronea, and possibly also the epigrams at Tegea (*I.G.*, V, 2, 173); this does not favour an explanation founded on these and other parallels.

[85] See above, p. 165. It may be worth mentioning that the epigram for the polemarch Kallimachos also speaks of τὸν ἀγῶνα τὸν Μή[δων τε καὶ] Ἑλλήνων (see note 107). I refrain (not very willingly) from speculations on the party constellation in Athens at the time of the battle.

main point, the saving of Athens from the fate of Eretria. There may even have been some political antagonism against the " Panhellenic " view-point of the first epigram. In any case, the authorities complied with public feeling and caused the second epigram to be inscribed subsequently.[86]

The fate of the two monuments for the Euripos and the Marathon victories was different, though apparently both were more or less damaged in the sack of Athens. The Euripos monument was restored probably in 445 B.C., when Perikles, in connection with the buildings on the Akropolis, wished to commemorate his own subjugation of Chalkis and other recalcitrant Euboean cities;[87] the Marathon monument was not restored, as we infer from the fact that its epigrams were unknown to the antiquarians[88] who in the fourth century began to collect Ἐπιγράμματα Ἀττικά, to use the title of one of Philochoros' antiquarian books. That is not surprising, for restorations of public monuments, as opposed to buildings, were apparently the exception, not the rule. Moreover, in spite of the pride the Athenians always took in their achievement at Marathon, it may well be that for the moment the older victory was overshadowed by the glorious exploits of the Great War, though very soon political antagonism and the growing hostility in conservative circles against the Themistoclean naval policy found pleasure in reminding the people of the feat of the Μαραθωνομάχαι. Even some personal jealousy may have come into play, though I am not inclined to

[86] This is, of course, meant only as an attempt to explain reasonably the external facts which are not disputed, as well as the reasons which made the authorities accede to the demand of a second epigram. I do not regard Hiller's suggestion (note 28) as reasonable, and I hope that nobody will suggest that the partisans of the vanquished competitor engraved the second epigram secretly by night and without due authority; neither Boule nor Assembly would have overlooked an act which amounted to a sacrilege. My explanation is not very different from the one given by Oliver[1], p. 493; but it is not saddled with a belief in the story about a competition between Simonides and Aeschylus. Consequently I do not speak with the confidence of Oliver (see below, pp. 179 ff.), though I disapprove of the somewhat lame scepticism of Peek, pp. 342 f. Wilhelm[2] too did not discuss the authorship question (though, p. 102, he makes it clear that he objects strongly to Oliver's opinion), and he explicitly refrains from asking after the reason for the addition of a second poem (p. 107). The theories of Weber, pp. 64 f. (the second epigram added after 480/79 B.C.) and Hiller[3-4] (second epigram added by Kimon after 476/5) will not detain us any more; nor will the theory of Arvanitopulos who on the strength of his reading ΤΟΙ϶Τ or ΤΟΙ϶Δ instead of ΤΟΙ϶Ι makes Aeschylus persuade the Athenians νὰ τιμήσωσιν ὁπωσδήποτε καὶ τοὺς ἐπιζήσαντας Μαραθωνομάχους, ἔστω καὶ ἐν δευτέρᾳ μοίρᾳ.

[87] Busolt, Gr. G.[2], II, p. 443, note 4; Hiller, 51; Tod, 43.

[88] Oliver[1], pp. 486, 490; idem[2], p. 201. This is a convincing reason which almost amounts to a positive proof, and it disposes of the hypothesis of a republication (note 25). The Lycurgus epigram (note 17) shows no influence of our Marathon epigrams, nor does in my opinion the Tegea epitaph Anth. Pal., VII, 512 = Simonides 122 D, of still uncertain date, but in any case before ca. 460 B.C. There is a certain similarity not with the first but with both Marathon epigrams in the concept: τῶνδε δι' ἀνθρώπων ἀρετὰν οὐχ ἵκετο κάπνος / αἰθέρα δαιομένας εὐρυχόρου Τεγέας. But there is no similarity in the wording, and, of course, the Tegea epitaph does not help to define the literary type of the Marathon epigrams.

believe in the suggestions brought forward.[89] If the restoration had been or had
become a party question, it is hardly plausible to assume that a motion to restore the
Marathon monument could have been defeated in the Assembly. Rather there was
nobody who moved the restoration, because there seemed to be no crying need for it:
the battle was painted in the Stoa Poikile, and the memory of it was kept fresh by the
State cult at the grave in the Marathonian plain, the performance of which followed
(in my opinion at least) closely on the general festival of the Dead on the fifth of
Boëdromion, on which day (again in my opinion) the polemarch every year performed
the ἀγὼν ἐπιτάφιος and offered sacrifices τοῖς τετελευτηκόσιν ἐν τῷ πολέμῳ.

4.

Now for the " appendix " or our fourth and last problem concerning the author-
ship of the two epigrams which in my opinion has already lost much of the importance
which Oliver attached to it.[90] He again begins with a rash thesis (and I have not much
doubt that it is, in fact, the nucleus of his whole commentary) " fortunately we know
who was the author of the epigram on the men who fell at Marathon: the information
is preserved for us in the Life of Aeschylus "; and he concludes with the assertion
that " in view of all this there exists, if not absolute certainty, at least the greatest
likelihood that we have the epigram of Aeschylus below that of Simonides. The
likelihood is so great that it amounts in our opinion to a demonstration."

To take first things first: the biographer obviously speaks of an epitaph when
saying τὸ εἰς τοὺς ἐν Μαραθῶνι τεθνηκότας ἐλεγεῖον.[91] If the epigrams are no epitaphs

---

[89] Oliver[2], p. 201.

[90] In his *editio princeps* he devotes as many pages to the discussion of the authorship question
as to the text, the photographs, and all other questions arising from the text taken together. Wilhelm
(note 86) went the opposite way, and, in my opinion, he did right.

[91] As we cannot very well begin with assuming a confusion of terms in the notice which serves
as foundation of Oliver's theory, we must state that τὸ ἐλεγεῖον definitely does not mean " elegy " but
is either a metrical term (for the elegiac distich) or an " epigram "; and if the epigram is engraved
on a tomb (as is the case here) it means " epitaph." There is no need for a circumstantial demon-
stration nor for a detailed discussion of the evidence or of the later terminology; that would take
up much space without being in any way pertinent. Let us be content with one example: the first
author who signed an epigram with his name—the rather indifferent poet who in 405/4 B.C. wrote
the two distichs for the statue of Lysander at Delphi—did it with the words Ἐκ Σάμου ἀμφιρύτου
τεῦξ᾽ ἐλεγεῖον Ἴων (Bourguet, *Fouilles de Delphes*, III, 1, 50; Pomtow, *Syll.*[3], 115; Geffcken, 97;
Hiller, 58; Tod, 95). It was probably the same poet who in the second epigram for the Spartan
admiral Arakos used the plural [ἐνηέσι(?) τοῖσ]δ᾽ ἐλεγείοι[ς τὰν Ἀράκου κ]ρηπῖδ᾽ ἐστεφάνωσ[ε], which
linguistically is also correct. It is definitely wrong (apparently a confusion with what we know of
the greater poems written by Simonides and Aeschylus on single battles of the Persian Wars; see
note 101), when, e. g., Wilamowitz, *Sapph. u. Simonid.*, pp. 143 f. (who renders the notice of the
Vita with " die Athener schrieben nach der schlacht bei Marathon eine konkurrenz um eine elegie
aus ") and W. Schmid, *Gr. Lit.*, I, 1 (1929), p. 509; I, 2 (1934), p. 187 (who states that there is
nothing known from other sources about an " Elegieenagon, der allenfalls bei dem jahresfest für

the story at once loses its point. It is not necessary to discuss the whole question of Simonides the epigrammatist,[92] nor to put the same question for Aeschylus;[93] and it does not seem much use to speak in detail about the style and the language of their epigrams in view of what we know, or rather of what we do not know, of the two poets as authors of epigrams and particularly in view of the fact that there is so little preserved at least of the alleged Simonidean poem, and what is preserved is so colourless that it cannot serve as a foundation for stylistic judgment at all.[94] In any case, as the epigrams praise the valour of the combatants, all of them, whether surviving or not, we really cannot expect to find in them what the biographer calls τὴν περὶ τὸ συμπαθὲς λεπτότητα and what Oliver in fact finds here, as " the epigram," in his opinion, " exhibits the characteristic which the ancients recognized as the particular Simonidean quality: a deep emotional effect achieved without recourse to pretentious language,—τὸ οἰκτίζεσθαι μὴ μεγαλοπρεπῶς ἀλλὰ συμπαθητικῶς." [95] This is the πρῶτον ψεῦδος in Oliver's assignation of the two epigrams to, and their distribution between the two poets. It is the first, and it is the main error: for quite apart from the fact that we have only one certain Simonidean epigram (the epitaph for Megistias), apart too from the bad state of preservation of the alleged Simonidean epigram for the men

die gefallenen in Marathon denkbar wäre ") speak without ado always about an " elegy." Oliver evades the question by using indiscriminately the two terms " elegy " and " epigram," and Peek, pp. 342 f. evidently did not grasp it at all. But Bowra, p. 355, rightly says " an epigram."

[92] I do not think that Oliver[1], pp. 491 f. has perceptibly weakened the position of Wilamowitz, Sapph. u. Simonid., pp. 192 f., which is securely founded on the " überlieferungsgeschichte " of the epigrams. It seems to me that Oliver moves in a sort of vicious circle; his appeal to Geffcken, Griech. Lit.-Gesch., I (1926), ch. 11 is not justified.

[93] Oliver[1], p. 493, states that the Marathon epigram " is the only known epigram of the poet, for Wilamowitz [Aesch. Trag., p. 11] is probably right in declaring the famous epitaph to be in the spirit but not by the hand of the poet, and the other which has survived under his name in the Palatine Anthology, can hardly be genuine. The fragment, No. 4 Diehl, may not be from an epigram of Aeschylus at all." There is some confusion in this statement: F 4 is quoted by Plutarch without the title of the book; as it is a pentameter it comes from the Ἐλεγεῖαι from which Theophrastos quoted F 2 Κυανέη καὶ τούσδε. Oliver apparently thinks of F 2 = Anth. Pal., VII, 255, which Wade-Gery, J.H.S., LIII, p. 75 " would be glad to keep for Aischylos and a real occasion." I do not see a sufficient reason to athetize it; but to whomsoever it belongs, it is neither an epigram (Wilamowitz, Diehl, Weber [Hermes, LII, pp. 541 ff.]) nor an " epitaph " (Wade-Gery), but a fragment from an elegy. If there existed any authentic epigrams of Aeschylus, they stood in the book entitled Ἐλεγεῖαι; the title Ἐπιγράμματα in Diehl is not guaranteed by ancient evidence.

[94] Oliver[1], pp. 490 f. adduces some other reasons which are either wrong or not convincing: " the word ἀρετή appears in the new Simonidean sense " (this is certainly wrong) ; the similarity in structure with the epigram on Megistias (which begins with Μνῆμα τόδε!) ; " the concern for . . . ἐλευθερία . . . and the consciousness of pan-Hellenic unity, which recur so often in the Simonidea" (cf. pp. 177 f.).

[95] Oliver[1], p. 491, quoting Dionys. Hal., De imit., II, 2, 6. I am not sure whether he is well advised to change παθητικῶς to ⟨συμ⟩παθητικῶς. But I am quite sure that Dionysius in comparing the style of Pindar with the style of Simonides is speaking of the Θρῆνοι, not of the later book entitled Ἐπιγράμματα.

of Marathon (which is not an epitaph at all), to try to demonstrate the Simonidean
origin of an epigram, let alone its εἶδος, from a quality which according to ancient
judgment was the distinctive feature of his dirges does not appear to me to make for
a convincing demonstration. In view of all this it is hardly necessary to discuss at all
the value of the notice in the *Vita*, which Wilamowitz [96] called " uncontrollable and
strange," while for Oliver [97] it is " *clearly* [my italics] a famous old story used to
motivate a later event." I am not inclined to put any trust in it. In the first instance
it is not one story, but two, both used to explain one and the same fact, the Sicilian
journey of Aeschylus. This alone ought to be almost sufficient to stamp the two
explanations as conjectures of a sort of which fourth-century Literary History
furnishes almost innumerable examples—stories meant to explain either an event in
the life of a writer (the fact itself being seldom in dispute), or (even more frequently)
an allusion to some event in his work. The first alternative that Aeschylus left Athens
ἡσσηθεὶς νέῳ ὄντι Σοφοκλεῖ nobody seems to have taken seriously; the second one that
the competition was in 490 B.C. between him and Simonides is hardly less absurd.
It now comes into favour solely and exclusively because it seems to open a way for
determining the authorship of the epigrams. The assumption that at least the com-
petition between the two poets should be regarded as a historical fact calls for rather
a lot of auxiliary expedients: e.g., as the stone is inscribed with two laudatory rather
than two funeral epigrams and as it is certain that there was no epitaph on the mound
at Marathon,[98] we have to assume in the very first place a confusion by the literary
historian who first told the story of the competition; and this assumption is (to say
the least) not plausible because the story in the *Vita* rests on the theory that the elegiac
distich was originally a funeral metre—*versibus impariter iunctis querimonia primum,
e. q. s.* We have further to assume that the Athenians in 490 B.C. arranged a com-
petition for the best epigram. This assumption is not *a priori* impossible; for sixty
years later we find three epigrams on the tomb of the Athenians killed at Potidaea,
and M. N. Tod [99] made the rather attractive suggestion that these were " perhaps the
prize-winners in a competition." The grave difficulty in the case of the Marathon
epigrams is that the Athenians did *not* inscribe the poems of three prize-winners, but
(at least at first) only one, and then of course the victorious one: that is what the
stone shows (the epigraphical fact is not disputed), and that is what the story
implies—else, why should Aeschylus leave Athens in dudgeon? In fact, the stone
bears a second epigram which was added later and which (in Oliver's opinion) is that
of the vanquished competitor. If we accede to his explanation that " probably on
reflection the judges decided that the epigram of Aeschylus also deserved to be en-
graved on the monument, and a few days later sent another stone-cutter to make the
second band," we ask again what becomes of Aeschylus' reason for leaving Athens

[96] *Sapph. u. Simonid.*, p. 143.   [98] See p. 176.
[97] Oliver[1], p. 489.   [99] *Greek Hist. Inscr.*, no. 59.

after the authorities had given him satisfaction? It is this connexion with an undis-
puted fact in the Life of Aeschylus which proves the real stumbling block for anybody
who starts from the story in the Life, or for that matter for anybody who tries to
combine the story with what we know about Aeschylus' life. Here, in the opinion of
the present writer, the hypothesis, already discredited by the fact that the epigrams
on the stone are not funeral but laudatory, breaks down a second time and finally.
We have to chose between the facts attested by the stone and the story in the *Vita*;
for obviously the author of the story did not know of the fact that the epigram of
Aeschylus was also inscribed on the stone, a fact which makes his explanation if not
impossible, at least extremely improbable. I think the choice is no choice: really and
truly, the honour of a fourth-century literary historian is not worth this host of
plausible, improbable, and partly even conflicting assumptions. If at least we could
get rid of the initial confusion between epigram and epitaph which in my opinion at
once discredits the whole story, one might stretch a point and concede an oral tradition
about a contest between Aeschylus and Simonides, perhaps even for the Marathon
epigrams—a tradition which (I should then suggest) belonged primarily to the Life
of Simonides about whom a great number of stories and anecdotes of every description
were current.[100] But as it seems to be impossible to get rid of this confusion because
the whole story is intimately connected with a theory concerning the funeral elegy,
I am afraid the literary historian did *not* have at his disposal " a famous old story "
orally transmitted which he used in order to explain rather stupidly an event in the
life of Aeschylus; but (judging from his chronological mistake, which stamps the man
as a quite irresponsible scholar, surely not a rarity in the fourth century) he invented
the story on the strength of his knowledge that both Aeschylus and Simonides had
written elegies, real elegies, not epitaphs, about single events of the Persian Wars.[101]

---

[100] Even then it cannot have been more than a floating anecdote, otherwise the writer of the
Vita would have quoted the two epitaphs (or epigrams for that matter). But obviously he did not
know them, and that is not surprising, as neither the epigrams nor the monument survived the sack
of Athens (see p. 178).

[101] I must needs be quite brief here, though our tradition bristles with difficulties which would,
I believe, repay closer examination. For Aeschylus (whose Ἐλεγεῖαι are quoted by Theophrastos)
Plutarch, *Quaest. conv.*, I, 10, 3, p. 628 D-E, Καὶ τὸ δεξιὸν κέρας Αἰαντίδαις τῆς ἐν Μαραθῶνι παρατάξεως
ἀποδοθῆναι, ταῖς Αἰσχύλου † τὴν μεθορίαν † ἐλεγείαις πιστούμενος, ἠγωνισμένου τὴν μάχην ἐκείνην ἐπιφανῶς
attests an elegiac poem precisely about the battle of Marathon, though the corruption of its title
is not healed and seems to be incurable. There may have been others, and F 2 Diehl, if it is
Aeschylean at all (note 93), belonged perhaps to a more comprehensive poem about the Xerxes War.
The battle of Salamis he put on the stage. As the prototype for this narrative elegy we may regard
Mimnermos' Μάχη Σμυρναίων πρὸς Γύγην τε καὶ Λυδούς (see Jacoby, *Hermes*, LIII, 1918, pp. 286 ff.) ;
as to the length of the single poems one may think of Solon's Salamis elegy which consisted of a
hundred verses (Plutarch, *Solon*, 8, 1). For Simonides we may almost speak of a mass production
of such poems, choral as well as elegiac. The three distichs quoted by Plutarch, *De Herod. mal.*, 42,
p. 872 D, probably derive from a narrative elegy (εἰς τὰς πράξεις ἐκείνας ἐλεγεῖα γράφων ἱστόρηκεν) about
the battle of Plataea; the poem did certainly not deal with the Corinthians alone and was most

I am sorry to have used up so much space for the rejection of an average anecdote of no value whatever, but, because of the touching faith which sometimes even learned men and good scholars manifest in regard to the most obvious vagaries of our ancient colleagues of the pre-scientific age, and further because as yet nobody has taken much trouble to assess the value of this particular vagary, I thought it necessary to prevent as far as possible that next year the anecdote crops up again and obstructs the understanding of the two epigrams.

The two epigrams, I need hardly say, are extremely valuable for historical reasons which I have already tried to explain in passing. I will not enlarge on this, and I will touch only lightly on a question of principle: is it really necessary that historically valuable epigrams and official inscriptions on public monuments must needs have been ordered from famous authors, and must we really go on asking whether Simonides was at Athens in 490 B.C. or in the next year? [102] Nobody, I believe, has tried to find out who composed the Eurymedon or the Cyprus epigrams, or others from the warrior-graves in the Kerameikos; nobody has seriously asked who were the authors of the three Potidaea epigrams two of which are preserved almost intact, and each of which appears to have a quite distinct character; I venture to assert that nobody would have tried to identify the authors of the Marathon epigrams if it had not been for that fourth-century story. If one of the Marathon epigrams had been composed by Aeschylus we should be justified in assuming that it would have been included in the book Ἐλεγεῖαι known to Theophrastos,[103] and then not only would a scholar of the fourth or third century certainly have quoted it in the Life, it would further have gained admission into the collections of epigrams. As this is not the case, both epigrams being completely unknown in Antiquity, we are dependent on the internal evidence of style, if we think it necessary to put the question of authorship at all. There, too, I cannot agree with Oliver [104] who states that " the evidence of the language on

probably not written for Corinth. There certainly existed others; but I cannot comment here on the principal witness, Suidas s. v. Σιμωνίδης Λεωπρέπους· καὶ γέγραπται αὐτῷ Δωρίδι διαλέκτῳ ἡ Καμβύσου καὶ Δαρείου βασιλεία, καὶ Ξέρξου ναυμαχία [καὶ ἡ ἐπ᾽ Ἀρτεμισίῳ ναυμαχία (del. Gutschmid)] δι᾽ ἐλεγείας, ἡ δ᾽ ἐν Σαλαμῖνι μελικῶς· Θρῆνοι· Ἐγκώμια· Ἐπιγράμματα· Παιᾶνες καὶ τραγῳδίαι· καὶ ἄλλα. See about the passage W. Schmid, Gesch. d. griech. Lit., I, 1 (1929), p. 509, and Bowra, Greek Lyric Poetry (1936), pp. 358 ff.

[102] See Oliver², p. 199, who quotes Plutarch, Them., § 5 (sic) as proof that Simonides " dwelt in Athens after the battle of Marathon." I cannot find anything in ch. 5 which justifies the inference. Bowra, p. 355, moves in a vicious circle when he infers from our epigrams that " by 490 B.C. Simonides was certainly in Athens " (my italics).

[103] I quite agree with Wilamowitz, Sapph. u. Sim., pp. 210 f. in one sentence: " oder es war alles unter dem namen Ἐλεγεῖα zusammengefasst wie das für die alte zeit sich schickt." I am not sure that it fits Simonides. His Ἐπιγράμματα (if they are his) formed a separate book (Suidas, s. v.) which was certainly not collected by the poet himself, but a good deal later. The comparison with " Theognis "—who (be it said incidentally) was not an elegist, though the belief that he was is apparently ineradicable—seems to be rather misleading.

[104] Oliver¹, p. 492; idem², p. 200.

the stone points persuasively in the same direction. In sharp contrast to the simplicity of Simonidean style, the second elegy offers the elevated phraseology that we have learned to associate with the great tragic poet and that might be less sympathetically criticized for an inclination towards bombast." I am at a loss to understand how anybody can find " the language that [Aeschylus] employed for tragedy " in expressions like αἰχμὴν στῆσαι, πρόσθε πυλῶν, and ἀγχίαλον πρῆσαι.[105] They are partly poetical words, and the language is meant to be poetical, but they are quite simple, straightforward, and appropriate. It was Maas who proposed ὠκύποδες πῶλοι, ἄνδρες ἀρηίθοοι, and βαθυχαιτάων μεμαώτων, not one of which words is in the text and not one of which seems to me to be a plausible supplement. The new word in the beginning of the first line ζαδαμεῖν or ζαδαμάζειν, which to Oliver " has a tone at once suggestive of the luxuriant Aeschylean vocabulary," is his own creation which met with universal disapprobation and has at once disappeared from our texts to give place to the much simpler ἀδάμας.[106] My personal feeling is that nobody who is not prejudiced in favour of Aeschylus from the outset would find his style in the few words preserved of the second epigram, nor would anybody dare to find the style of Simonides in the miserable remains of the first one. As far as they permit of a definite opinion, it is home-grown wine, not the strong spirit of the tragic poet. Rather the contrary. The main merit of both poems (always as far as we are able to judge) consists in their being perfectly simple and direct, *in what I should like to term their matter-of-factness.* It appears in their treatment of the subject-matter which is distinguished by its nearness to the actual facts and by a great pride in the valour of the Athenian militia. This pride is nowise exaggerated, its wording might be said to be a simple and clear expression of the contemporary feeling about the supreme test of the spirit of the poet's country-

---

[105] For ἀγχίαλος see note 35. To find in αἰχμὴν στῆσαι the intimation of a victorious resistance is almost certainly wrong (so far I agree with Peek, p. 341). It may signify what it usually means in Homer: " statuo, sisto, colloco," " to set up," arraying men in battle-order (see Ebeling, *Lex. Hom.*, I, p. 603): e.g., B 525 οἱ μὲν Φωκήων στίχας ἵστασαν; Δ 298 πεζοὺς δ' ἐξόπισθε στῆσεν (coll. Xenophon, *Inst. Cyri*, VI, 3, 25: τελευταίους μέντοι στήσω τοὺς ἐπὶ πᾶσι καλουμένους); Π 199 αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ δὴ πάντας ἄμ' ἡγεμόνεσσι 'Αχιλλεὺς/ στῆσεν ἐὺ κρίνας; the same meaning Ζ 433 λαὸν δὲ στῆσον παρ' ἐρινεόν, ἔνθα μάλιστα/ ἀμβατός ἐστι πόλις. Then αἰχμή ought to be taken metaphorically for a " body of spear-bearers," as in Pindar, *O*, VII, 19, 'Αργείᾳ σὺν αἰχμᾷ (σὺν πλήθει 'Αργείων schol.) and Eurip., *Heraklid.*, 275, ἥξω δὲ πολλὴν "Αρηος 'Αργείων λαβὼν / πάγχαλκον αἰχμὴν δεῦρο κτλ. But as there are no generals mentioned, nobody who is arraying the men, it seems much more plausible to take as subject the men themselves who in Athenian epigrams are usually called παῖδες 'Αθηναίων and who here are praised as " those who had an ἀδάμας ἐν φρεσὶ θυμός," and to understand αἰχμήν (in spite of the singular) as their weapons, comparing, e.g., Kallinos 1, 9 ff., ἀλλά τις ἰθὺς ἴτω / ἔγχος ἀνασχόμενος καὶ ὑπ' ἀσπίδος ἄλκιμον ἦτορ / ἔλσας and the Sophoclean passage adduced by Peek (though it stands in a lyrical part) *Antig.*, 144 f., καθ' αὑτοῖν / δικρατεῖς λόγχας στήσαντε.

[106] Hesiod, *Op.*, 147 ἀλλ' ἀδάμαντος ἔσχον κρατερόφρονα θυμόν. It is the vocabulary of the epos, tempered by local idioms, which we expect in the epigrams, and particularly in the early ones and which (I submit) we find in the Marathon epigrams.

men.[107] In unpretentious language he puts forth what they did and what in his opinion their deed meant for Greece and Athens. These two epigrams showing vividly, but in sober language, the contemporary feeling for a great feat of arms and for the deliverance from a terrible danger, bear the stamp of sincerity and truth. This σωφροσύνη makes them in my opinion most valuable for assessing the attitude of mind and the spirit of the men who fought at Marathon, and of Athens itself in 490 B.C.

II. THE EION POEM [108]

a) THE WITNESSES

1) Aischines, *Ctes.*, 183: ἦσάν τινες, ὦ ἄνδρες Ἀθηναῖοι, κατὰ τοὺς τότε καιρούς, οἳ πολὺν πόνον ὑπομείναντες καὶ μεγάλους κινδύνους ἐπὶ τῷ Στρυμόνι ποταμῷ ἐνίκων μαχόμενοι Μήδους· οὗτοι δεῦρο ἀφικόμενοι τὸν δῆμον ᾔτησαν δωρεάν, καὶ ἔδωκεν αὐτοῖς ὁ δῆμος τιμὰς μεγάλας, ὡς τότ᾽ ἐδόκει, τρεῖς λιθίνους Ἑρμᾶς στῆσαι [ἐν τῇ
5 Στοᾷ τῶν Ἑρμῶν], ἐφ᾽ ᾧτε μὴ ἐπιγράφειν τὸ ὄνομα τὸ ἑαυτῶν, ἵνα μὴ τῶν στρατηγῶν, ἀλλὰ τοῦ δήμου δοκῇ εἶναι τὸ ἐπίγραμμα. (184) ὅτι δ᾽ ἀληθῆ λέγω, ἐξ αὐτῶν τῶν

---

[107] Incidentally it may be worth mentioning that the Athenian poet calls the enemies Πέρσαι, as Aeschylus does—Τάδε μὲν Περσῶν τῶν οἰχομένων / Ἑλλάδ᾽ εἰς αἶαν—not because it is an argument for his authorship but on account of the superstition that really old epigrams always speak of them as Μῆδοι (Wilamowitz, *Comment. grammat.*, IV [1889], p. 6), as in fact the epigram for the polemarch Kallimachos does. It is a great pity that in the first epigram we cannot restore Περσῶν with any degree of confidence: this would be a decisive argument against Simonides who used Μῆδοι in the one certain epigram we have of him (Herodotus, VII, 225 = Hiller, 17). I cannot argue here my opinion that the dedicatory inscription on the altar of Zeus Eleutherios in Plataea (Plutarch, *Aristides*, 19; *De Herod. mal.*, 42; Hiller, 26; Simonid., 107 Diehl) originally consisted of one distich only: Τόνδε ποθ᾽ Ἕλληνες Νίκης κράτει [ἔργῳ Ἄρηος / Πέρσας ἐξελάσαντες ἐλευθέρᾳ] Ἑλλάδι κοινὸν / ἱδρύσαντο Διὸς βωμὸν Ἐλευθερίου. The words in brackets derive from the enlarged version in *Anth. Pal.*, VI, 50 which is ascribed to Simonides. In the dedicatory inscription for Marathon at Delphi (*Syll.*³, 23; Tod, 14) one usually supplies [ἀπὸ Μέδ]ον, and the enemy is called Μῆδοι in the dedicatory epigram in the Artemision (Hiller, 14). Another Athenian epigram Παῖδες Ἀθηναίων Περσῶν στρατὸν ἐξολέσαντες (*Anth. Pal.*, VII, 257; Simonides, 119 D, which Weber, *Philologus*, LXXXIV, 1929, pp. 45 f. believes to have stood on the grave at Plataea) is most probably late and literary (see Preger, 274). But the problem asks for a special treatment.

[108] Editions: Bergk, *P. L. Gr.*⁴, III (1882), pp. 518 ff.; Preger, *Inscr. Gr. Metr.* (1891), no. 153; Wilamowitz, *Griech. Lesebuch*³, I, 1 (1903), p. 146, no. 14 (II, 1, p. 104); Hiller von Gaertringen, *I.G.*, I² (1924), p. 277, 36 ff.; *Hist. Griech. Epigramme* (1926), no. 34. The epigrams are not in the collections made by Geffcken and M. N. Tod, nor, of course, in Kaibel and Hoffmann. Discussed by C. W. Goettling, *Ges. Abh.*, II (1863), pp. 141 ff.; E. A. Richter, *Jahrb. f. klass. Philologie*, XCIII, 1866, pp. 30 ff.; E. Rosenberg, *ibid.*, CI, 1874, p. 530; A. Kirchhoff, *Hermes*, V, 1871, pp. 48 ff.; B. Schmidt, *Rh. Mus.*, XXXVI, 1881, pp. 1 ff.; Wilamowitz, *Ar. u. Ath.*, I, 1893, p. 155, note 59; Domaszewski, *Sb. Heidelberg*, 1914, no. 10, "Die Hermen der Agora zu Athen"; Leo Weber, *Philol.*, LXXIV (N. F. XXVIII), 1917, pp. 257 ff.; H. T. Wade-Gery, *J.H.S.*, LIII, 1933, pp. 74 f., 82 f., 93 ff.; E. Loewy, *Sb. Wien*, CCXVI, 1937, no. 4, pp. 25 ff.; Raubitschek, *Hesperia*, X, 1941, p. 295.

ποιημάτων γνώσεσθε· ἐπιγέγραπται γὰρ ἐπὶ μὲν τῷ πρώτῳ τῶν Ἑρμῶν (Ι) Ἦν ἄρα
κἀκεῖνοι . . . εὗρον ἀμηχανίην, ἐπὶ δὲ τῷ δευτέρῳ (ΙΙ) Ἡγεμόνεσσι δὲ μισθὸν . . .
μόχθον ἔχειν, (185) ἐπὶ δὲ τῷ τρίτῳ [ἐπιγέγραπται Ἑρμῇ] (ΙΙΙ) Ἔκ ποτε τῆσδε
10 πόλεος . . . καὶ ἠνορέης. ἔστι που τὸ τῶν στρατηγῶν ὄνομα; οὐδαμοῦ, ἀλλὰ τὸ τοῦ
δήμου. (186) Προέλθετε δὴ τῇ διανοίᾳ καὶ εἰς τὴν Στοὰν τὴν Ποικίλην· ἁπάντων
γὰρ ὑμῖν τῶν καλῶν ἔργων τὰ ὑπομνήματα ἐν τῇ ἀγορᾷ ἀνάκειται, κτλ.

     2) Plutarch, *Kimon*, 7, 2: πρῶτον μὲν οὖν αὐτοὺς μάχῃ τοὺς Πέρσας ἐνίκησε
[scil. ὁ Κίμων], καὶ κατέκλεισεν εἰς τὴν πόλιν [scil. τὴν Ἠιόνα]· ἔπειτα τοὺς ὑπὲρ
15 Στρυμόνα Θρᾷκας, ὅθεν αὐτοῖς ἐφοίτα σῖτος, ἀναστάτους ποιῶν καὶ τὴν χώραν παρα-
φυλάττων ἅπασαν, εἰς τοσαύτην ἀπορίαν τοὺς πολιορκουμένους κατέστησεν, ὥστε
Βόγην τὸν βασιλέως στρατηγὸν ἀπογνόντα τὰ πράγματα τῇ πόλει πῦρ ἐνεῖναι καὶ
συνδιαφθεῖραι μετὰ τῶν φίλων καὶ τῶν χρημάτων ἑαυτόν. (3) οὕτω δὲ λαβὼν τὴν
πόλιν ἄλλο μὲν οὐδὲν ἀξιόλογον ὠφελήθη, τῶν πλείστων τοῖς βαρβάροις συγκατα-
20 καέντων, τὴν δὲ χώραν εὐφυεστάτην οὖσαν καὶ καλλίστην οἰκῆσαι παρέδωκε τοῖς
Ἀθηναίοις. (4) καὶ τοὺς Ἑρμᾶς αὐτῷ τοὺς λιθίνους ὁ δῆμος ἀναθεῖναι συνεχώρησεν,
ὧν ἐπιγέγραπται τῷ μὲν πρώτῳ (Ι) Ἦν ἄρα κἀκεῖνοι . . . εὗρον ἀμηχανίην, (5) τῷ
δὲ δευτέρῳ (ΙΙ) Ἡγεμόνεσσι δὲ μισθὸν . . . δῆριν ἔχειν, (6) τῷ δὲ τρίτῳ (ΙΙΙ)
Ἔκ ποτε τῆσδε πόλεος . . . καὶ ἠνορέης. (8, 1) ταῦτα καίπερ οὐδαμοῦ τὸ Κίμωνος
25 ὄνομα δηλοῦντα τιμῆς ὑπερβολὴν ἔχειν ἐδόκει τοῖς τότ' ἀνθρώποις, κτλ.

2 πόνον ὑπ. χρόνον Β, ὑπ. χρόνον CV.   3 καὶ om. A.   4-5 τῶν Ἑρμῶν AP, τῇ τῶν Ἑρμῶν r,
[ἐν–Ἑρμῶν] Jac (cf. v. 9; § 187 ἐν τοίνυν τῷ μητρῴῳ [παρὰ τὸ βουλευτήριον], ubi glossema delevit
Bake).   5 τὸ ὄνομα τὸ AP (cf. v. 10/1), τὰ ὀνόματα τὰ r (tres fuisse ex Hermarum numero
apparet).   7 γνώσεσθε AP, εἴσεσθε r.   9 [   ] Blass.   13 [τοὺς Πέρσας]?   17 Βόγην (Hero-
dotus, VII, 107, 113) v Βούτην o   19 ἀξιόλογον Benseler, ἄξιον λόγου o.

b) The Poem

(III)   1   Ἔκ ποτε τῆσδε πόληος ἅμ' Ἀτρεΐδῃσι Μενεσθεὺς
           ἡγεῖτο ζάθεον Τρωϊκὸν ἐς πεδίον,
           ὃν ποθ' Ὅμηρος ἔφη Δαναῶν πύκα θωρηκτάων
    4   κοσμητῆρα μάχης ἔξοχον ὄντα μολεῖν.
    4a [οὕτως οὐδὲν ἀεικὲς Ἀθηναίοισι καλεῖσθαι
    4b κοσμηταῖς πολέμου τ' ἀμφὶ καὶ ἠνορέης].

(I)   5   ἦν ἄρα κἀκεῖνοι ταλακάρδιοι, οἵ ποτε Μήδων
           παισὶν ἐπ' Ἠιόνι, Στρυμόνος ἀμφὶ ῥοάς,
           λιμόν τ' αἴθωνα κρυερόν τ' ἐπάγοντες Ἄρηα
    8   πρῶτοι δυσμενέων εὗρον ἀμηχανίην.

(II)   9   ἡγεμόνεσσι δὲ μισθὸν Ἀθηναῖοι τάδ' ἔδωκαν
           ἀντ' εὐεργεσίης καὶ μεγάλων ἀγαθῶν·

μᾶλλόν τις τάδ᾽ ἰδὼν καὶ ἐπεσσομένων ἐθελήσει
12   ἀμφὶ περὶ ξυνοῖς πράγμασι δῆριν ἔχειν.

1-4b (iii) ante I transpos. Goettling, Ed. Richter; 4a-b seclusit A. Weidner.   2 ἐς πεδίον
Plut, ἂμ πεδίον (ἐς π. hK1P) Aesch.   3 θωρηκτάων Plut, χαλκοχιτώνων (θωρ. supra versum ghm,
περ φρονεόντων a) Aesch.   4 ὄντα Plut, ἄνδρα Aesch.   4a-b addita sunt ab eo qui ordinem
versuum consulto mutavit.   4b κοσμηταῖς Plut, κοσμητὰς Aesch.   τ᾽ om. Aesch. AP(?).   7 κρυερόν
Plut, κρατερόν Aesch.   9 ἔδωκαν Aesch., ἐπέδωκαν Plut.   10 μεγάλων ἀγαθῶν Plut, μεγάλης ἀρετῆς
χάριτος
(μ. ἀμοιβῆς a) Aesch.   12 ἀμφὶ (χαίρων add. A) ξυνοῖσι πράγμασι μόχθον (πόνον a) ἔχειν Aesch.;
πράγμασι Plut Aesch, πρήγμασι Kirchhoff.

This poem—for a poem it is, not a series of three epigrams—which is preserved
by the quotations in Aischines' *Ctesiphontea* and in Plutarch's *Life of Kimon* [109] I have
decided to discuss in the second part of my paper mainly because general opinion has
brought it into intimate connection with the second Marathon epigram. Kirchhoff
most ingeniously supplied the then truly miserable remains of this epigram from what
our tradition terms the first Eion epigram, and his supplement [ἦ μάλα δὴ κεῖνοι
ταλακάρδιοι, οἵ ῥα τ]ότ᾽ αἰχμὴν στῆσαν πρόσθε πυλῶν received a rather splendid con-
firmation from the second find which gave us as its true beginning ἦν ἄρα τοῖσζ᾽
ἀδάμ[αντος ἐνὶ φρεσὶ θυμός]. On this supplement Weber built up an Athenian

[109] The two witnesses agree in the order of the epigrams which I believe one can prove to be
wrong, and therefore they derive ultimately from the same source, probably the speech made by
the orator Leptines in 356 B.C. (see pp. 195 ff.); for as far as we know the epigrams were quoted
neither by a grammarian nor by a historian, nor do we find them in a collection (see below). It is
no use to suggest Ephoros as the common source for Aischines and Plutarch (as Boas did), or
Krateros (B. Schmidt, p. 6), or the rhetorical historiographers (Weber, pp. 267, 281 f.). There
is a general agreement that the text of Plutarch is the better one. In my opinion *all* readings of
Aischines are inferior (besides an unimportant scribe's error in line 9); those which matter will
be mentioned in the proper place (p. 197; note 180). The wide-spread belief that the quotation
in the text of Aischines derives from the Scholia (Rosenberg; B. Schmidt; Preger; Domaszewski;
Loewy) is most certainly wrong; a simple look into the text is sufficient, there is no need of an
elaborate refutation. The sweeping scepticism which tried to drive out from the text of the orators
all, or almost all quotations is a thing of the past; scholars have learned to distinguish not only
between different speeches, but also between laws and decrees on the one hand, and poetical quota-
tions on the other. Aischines apparently quoted from memory (note 137), which accounts for the
extreme banality of his readings. It is what we expect of him; there is a vast difference between
him and Lycurgus. The further suggestion (Wade-Gery, p. 89, note 76, and p. 94) that Plutarch
is following Hypereides (note 143) does not admit of proof, and does not seem to me to be plausible.
I submit that Plutarch followed a Hellenistic Life of Kimon, such as, e.g., the author epitomized
by Nepos. The biographer, probably a writer of the third century B.C., either looked up the primary
source (Leptines), or (which seems to be less plausible because of the order of the epigrams)
he corrected the text given by Aischines from the Herms. Neither Aischines nor Plutarch took
their quotation from a book-collection; if that had been the case we would find the epigrams in
one of the extant collections, and then most probably attributed to Simonides. About book-
collections of epigraphic verses see note 138.

Siegesallee in the Agora,[110] which also became a current opinion, though not commanding absolute unanimity, for Hiller von Gaertringen at least persisted in printing the three epigrams in the order III, I, II, which was first seriously proposed by Richter in 1866. I will say at once that this is a plain and unescapable alternative: one has to choose between changing the traditional sequence of the so-called epigrams and maintaining the alleged connexion with the Marathon epigrams. There is no third way, though there are some wrong tracks, one of which must attract our attention for a moment.

There is or was indeed one heretic who did not believe in one of the two official and conflicting creeds, but preached a new one—Alfred von Domaszewski, the historian of Heidelberg, well-known also in other respects for his heterodoxies. Since his treatment has won the qualified approval of Wade-Gery, and more too seem inclined to accept at least some of his theses,[111] I feel bound to give the outlines of his opinion. It is not an easy thing to do because Domaszewski, starting with a detailed discussion of the description of the Agora as given by Pausanias, which he deemed necessary in order " to shed light on the importance of the Hermai," and having thereby laid what he regarded as a secure foundation for pronouncing judgment on the Eion epigrams and reconstructing the monument which they adorned, charged through our stock of Athenian fifth-century epigrams and their traditional setting, not to put too fine a point on it, like the proverbial bull through the china shop. For reasons to be stated later on [112] I feel justified in leaving aside the first and greater part of his paper which deals with the topographical and political conditions. I shall confine myself to a succinct enumeration of his main points, commenting upon them (as far as necessary) in the foot-notes, because I sincerely hope that nobody will wish to return to them after I have presented my own interpretation of the poem and assessed the value of the traditional setting in which it is preserved.

Domaszewski tries to persuade us (1) that Aischines did not quote the " epigrams," but that they were intruded into his text from the Scholia which are also the source of Plutarch.[113] (2) That of the three epigrams only the first one Ἦν ἄρα

---

[110] Domaszewski restored in its place a Kimon monument in the Stoa of Zeus. Loewy's " Feldherrn- oder Ruhmeshalle für Perserkriege " is a cross between the hypotheses of his two predecessors; I do not think it necessary to go into the details of his equally fanciful restoration of the Hall.

[111] Uxkull-Gyllenband, *Plutarch und die Gr. Biographie* (1927), pp. 35 ff., followed his teacher. Oliver, *Hesperia*, V, 1936, pp. 233 f. (if I understand him rightly) and Loewy (note 110) sided with Domaszewski and Wade-Gery respectively; and even Wilamowitz, *Hell. Dichtung*, I (1924), p. 127, note 4 (who already in *Griech. Lesebuch*, I, 1, p. 146, spoke of the epigrams as being engraved " auf den pfeilern einer halle des athenischen marktes ") seems to be under the influence of the former. See further notes 119 and 128. There is a danger of Domaszewski's opinion becoming a second *vulgata*.

[112] Pages 193 f.

[113] See note 109.

κἀκεῖνοι ταλακάρδιοι is genuine, the two others being literary accretions.[114] (3) That consequently, as there were three Herms, we have to hunt up the epigrams which stood on the remaining two.[115] (4) That " the site and the analogy of the Strymon epigram show that these poems can only have referred to victories reported by Kimon over the Persians; *for* Kimon had gained two still more glorious victories, the victory at the Eurymedon while living, and in death the victory at Cyprus." [116] (5) That we find the two missing epigrams in the poem which Diodoros tells us was inscribed on the votive offering which the Athenians dedicated after the battle at the Eurymedon: Ἐξ οὗ γ' Εὐρώπην Ἀσίας δίχα πόντος ἔνειμε. This poem in Domaszewski's opinion is neither coherent nor dedicatory; it is joined together out of two independent epigrams, the first four lines referring to the Eurymedon battle, the latter four οἴδε γὰρ ἐν Κύπρῳ to the victories in Cyprus.[117] (6) That of these epigrams the first one Ἐξ οὗ

[114] His objections to the two epigrams are superficial and will be refuted incidentally by an interpretation of the whole poem which I shall begin with a statement of the very real difficulties in all three epigrams pp. 198 ff. It is quite in Domaszewski's manner to appeal to a fact now universally recognized that literary accretions to epigraphic poems are not rare, but forgetting to ask if the epigrams in question show any of the symptoms by which we recognize such a literary expansion. It is further characteristic for him to lay the blame for the forgery on Aischines himself, who, " quoting from memory," mentioned one battle and three Herms and thus almost compelled somebody to make up the deficiency, forgetting that a page before he had asserted that Aischines did not quote any epigram at all, so that there was no deficiency to make up. Finally (p. 20) he springs another surprise on us, suddenly treating the first two lines of the " second " epigram as genuine.

[115] For curiously enough the same man who with one stroke of his pen rejects the whole story as told by Aischines and Plutarch about the reward for the generals who ἐπὶ τῷ Στρυμόνι ἐνίκων μαχόμενοι Μήδους and with it a goodly part of Aischines' text, implicitly believes in the *three* Herms. They are his sheet-anchor, or the foundation stone for the new monument he *reconstructed.*

[116] The italics are mine and (I submit) need no justification: from the standpoint of logic the argument is a monster. I have quoted verbally, lest any one accuse me of slandering or ridiculing its author.

[117] Of course, Domaszewski does not explain (if one is not prepared to take the few words on p. 17 as an explanation) how the two different epigrams became one (Wade-Gery, pp. 82 ff. does, and has made an arguable thesis from the wild flight of his predecessor's imagination). Nor does Domaszewski ask who combined them before the time of Ephoros, our main (though not our only) authority for the poem. Ephoros referred it erroneously to the battle of the Eurymedon, and his mistake was corrected and elucidated by Ed. Meyer and Schwartz long ago; Domaszewski did not care for an explanation. Wade-Gery's supposition (pp. 93 ff.) of a book-collection, which then must also have been used by Ephoros, and which would answer all three questions, seems to me to be untenable (see note 138); the error which he ascribes to the collector is hardly credible in view of the nature of the monument, as reconstructed by Domaszewski. After having given a wrong *terminus ante* for the Eurymedon part of the poem (p. 17) Domaszewski is content to change οἴδε γάρ to οἴδε καί (p. 18, note 90) and then to distribute the two poems—one of which has no indication where the battle was fought which it purports to praise, while the other two give the battle-sites quite accurately—on the different parts of his alleged Kimon monument. For a refutation of his treatment, it may be sufficient to refer to Friedlaender, *Studi It.*, N. S. XV, 1938, pp. 102 ff., and Peek, *Athen. Stud. Ferguson* (*H.S.C.P.*, Suppl. I [1940]), pp. 102 ff., though there is

γ᾽ Εὐρώπην was contemporaneous and engraved on a Herm which was set up *in* the newly built Hall of Zeus. This Herm (he asserts) was originally *not* meant as a victory monument, and as the epigram does not indicate the nature of the ἔργον or its place, it must have referred to and have become understandable from a " bauinschrift " which he reconstructed as ᾿Αθηναῖοι ἀνέθεσαν Διὶ τὴν Στοὰν ἀπὸ Μήδων / ᾿Επ᾽ Εὐρυμέδοντι πεζομαχίαν καὶ ναυμαχίαν νικήσαντες. (7) That " after the death of Kimon when his life-work could be surveyed," the Athenians added two further Herms, praising by their epigrams Kimon's first victory and his last over the national enemy, the capture of Eion (῏Ην ἄρα κἀκεῖνοι ταλακάρδιοι) and the battle of Cyprus (οἵδε καὶ ἐν Κύπρῳ), thus changing also the character of the first Herm (᾿Εξ οὗ γ᾽ Εὐρώπην) into a victory monument. For the three Herms stood (as he further asserts) on the same bathron, and their three epigrams celebrated " the creation of the Athenian naval empire, due to the victories of Kimon." [118] (8) Finally Domaszewski delineates the whole monument, as it looked in 449 B.C.: (I) The " bauinschrift "; (II-IV) the bathron with the three Herms and their epigrams; (V) the " dedication by the Demos," consisting of the first two lines of the second Aischines epigram ῾Ηγεμόνεσσι δὲ μισθὸν ᾿Αθηναῖοι τάδ᾽ ἔδωκαν ἀντ᾽ εὐεργεσίης καὶ μεγάλης ἀρετῆς.

room for further treatment of the alleged Eurymedon poem as well as for the epigrams which are really meant for this battle (*Anth. Pal.*, VII, 258, 443). The ἤπειρος argument of Wade-Gery is in my opinion sufficiently answered by Peek, but the οἵδε argument is not. It seems impossible, in view of the nature of a victory monument, to see with Wade-Gery in οἵδε " a sentimental fiction," and in referring it to the dead (rather than to the generals, which is equally wrong [see p. 204]) he unconsciously knocks the bottom out of the whole hypothesis of Domaszewski. I believe that οἵδε in the Cyprus poem has its parallel in the οἵδε of the Marathon epigrams: in both cases we have to assume a dedicatory inscription in prose (see above, pp. 171 ff.; 177). On the other hand the Eion poem throws some light also on the Cyprus poem: both are unique. But uniqueness is no reason for doubting the authenticity (against Wilamowitz, note 4); it simply calls for an explanation which seems to be even more obvious than for the Eion poem (see below, pp. 209 ff.).

[118] Points 6-8 present us with perhaps the wildest jumble of unfounded and improbable assertions in the paper. Domaszewski ought to have given parallels for three Herms on one base, for Herms in a Hall, for an inscription on a monument standing inside a Hall but referring to a *bauinschrift* on its outside. Above all, he ought to have thought and told us about the (historical or rather) politic situation in 449 B.C. Who was it who moved this spectacular honour for Kimon? And if it was an honour for Kimon after his death, why not only was his name omitted but even avoided by the constant use of different plurals (ἐκεῖνοι, οἵδε, ἄνδρες, ἡγεμόνες)? Was this a compromise between Perikles and the conservative party? At least, the absence of the name (or names) does away with the suggestion (not yet made) that the monument was a private dedication by the new and very active conservative party, set up in a spirit of opposition against the peace of Kallias. Whatever the answer to these and other questions, ἐν τῇ Στοᾷ τῶν ῾Ερμῶν can only mean ' *in* the Hall ' (Domaszewski, Wade-Gery [pp. 87 f.], Loewy), not " in front of the Hall," as Weber, p. 278 contends. He does not give any parallel, and there is no such " *sprachgebrauch*." For the difference see, e.g., Pausanias I, 17, 2, πρὸς δὲ τῷ γυμνασίῳ Θησέως ἐστὶν ἱερόν . . . ἐγγέγραπται δὲ ἐν τῷ τοῦ Θησέως ἱερῷ. It does not matter whether the words were written by Aischines or derived from the Scholia, or whether they are factually right or wrong; till the contrary is proved, we have to assume that a scholiast knew Greek, even if he made a factual mistake.

These are the main theses which Wade-Gery, very much alive to Domaszewski's " brilliant and dangerous method of hypothesis . . . seldom better exemplified " than in this paper, characterizes as " a series rather of suggestions than of proofs," but suggestions " of some importance not only for literature and history, but also for the topography of that part of the Kerameikos now being excavated." [119] If he further opines—without examining the points enumerated above in detail, but adding a foot-note which contains some rather considerable restrictions [120]—that " much [of it] seems to me to be most probably true," I submit that he was enticed in the first line by the fact that one of Domaszewski's alleged results (the erection of the monument as envisaged by him after the death of Kimon about thirty years after the siege of Eion) fell in with one of his own results. For starting from an altogether different proposition and a general observation which is most important for the interpretation of any poetical text,[121] he came to the conclusion that " no one who reads this poem [the four lines beginning with Ἦν ἄρα] with attention can doubt that, at the moment when the poet writes, the battle of Eion lies in the past, and is seen as the beginning of a process which has since been carried further: that, in fact, these verses are written after the battles of the Eurymedon and perhaps after Kimon's death." [122] Now, while I cannot even try to take Domaszewski's hypothesis seriously, for reasons sufficiently (or so I believe) indicated in the foot-notes, the stress laid by Wade-Gery on the use of ποτέ in what we may term for the time being the Strymon epigram seems to be so well-founded that I could not contradict him without going into the whole of his argument, a course which would divert us too far from our own task. So I will say provisionally that I wholly agree with his general principle: we have to be most cautious against " the mesmeric effects of ritual poetry " and must not let ourselves be seduced by it to " accept things which the poet cannot have intended." On the other hand, I am not convinced that he has succeeded in establishing a law govern-ing the use of ποτέ, and if in the present case I believe his inference as to the time of the composition of the Strymon epigram to be wrong, my reasons for it will become apparent later,[123] and not till I have interpreted the three alleged epigrams, shall I be able to propose an alternative explanation of the use of the word, which (together with Wade-Gery's own doubts as to Domaszewski's method and results) will perhaps tempt him to reconsider his position. For there is an inherent weak-

[119] Page 83. Swoboda, *R.E.*, XI (1922), col. 443 also is rather sympathetic, calling it a " bestechende beweisführung," which, nevertheless, he cannot accept, because " poems on public monuments could not be falsified."

[120] Page 83, note 50. The note unfortunately is very laconic, but the extent of the disagreement is apparently considerable, and (I submit) the single items bear at least partly on the plausibility of the hypothesis as a whole. For another grave disagreement in the interpretation of the texts see note 117.

[121] See p. 165, note 30.   [122] *Loc. cit.*, p. 74.   [123] See below, pp. 206 ff.

ness in the opinions of all scholars who either believe in the traditional sequence of
the three Eion epigrams, as quoted by Aischines and Plutarch, or who, while re-
jecting II and III as literary forgeries, believe the genuine Strymon epigram to have
been the first of a series of poems praising the three principal victories of Kimon.
The weakness is this: *an epigram beginning with ἦν ἄρα κἀκεῖνοι cannot have stood
alone; there must have been at least one other poem to which the καί refers.* This
obvious fact caused Kirchhoff to supply the Marathon epigram from the Eion
epigram, and it is the sole foundation for Weber's *Siegesallee*—expedients which are
precluded at once, if the Marathon monument did not exist any more when the Eion
epigrams were inscribed upon the Hermai.[124] Domaszewski overlooked this obvious
fact as he overlooked many others which stood in the way of his fantastical restoration
of a Kimon monument in the Hall of Zeus; Wade-Gery, as well alive to this difficulty
as to others in the hypothesis, states succinctly: " κἀκεῖνοι in line 1, because the victors
of Eion are being compared with the later victors." This explanation he seems to
regard as self-evident, for he does not give a parallel, but a paraphrase " they too were
brave who once first found out how to break the enemy's resource." [125] This para-
phrase in my opinion only serves to stress an explanation of the καί which seems
to me definitely impossible; for καί, though a small word, has the same right to be
taken seriously, and in accordance with its natural meaning, as ποτέ.

But there is a second point in Wade-Gery's otherwise rather biased treatment
of the Eion epigrams which is important in itself and, at the same time, makes possible
a discussion of them which is at once methodical, positive, and complete, viz., the
moralizing use which the Attic orators make of the epigrams.[126] This point I should
like to take up following from the start the course which it suggests. I shall begin
with the tradition which comprises the epigrams as well as the monument they adorned,
and examine it carefully and without *parti pris*; I shall deal with the whole of the
evidence, which for me is not the least bit weakened by the vagaries of Domaszewski.
I take it that nobody will deny the necessity of such an unbiased examination, or, if
the examination should reveal any difficulty in the tradition, dispute that we have first
to state clearly what the difficulty is, and then try and remove it with the least possible
amount of violence. It is only if a simple remedy does not help (and there is one which
in my opinion is very simple indeed and perfectly effective) that we have either to
resign or to have recourse to more violent means. So, as in the treatment of the
Marathon epigrams, I shall put the problems which we have to answer as fully and
methodically as possible. The task is much easier here, because the text of the epigrams
is complete [127] and their character as laudatory not in doubt; nor is the character of

---

[124] Above, pp. 170 f. This reason is sufficient; it does not matter whether or not the Marathon
monument was a Herm.

[125] *Loc. cit.*, pages 74, 87, 94.

[126] I am not quite happy about the term " moralizing "; perhaps one ought to prefer " political."
But the argument has a moralizing flavour; so the term may serve its turn.

[127] About its variants see note 109.

the monument questionable in so far as not even Domaszewski has given vent to any doubt about the existence of the three Herms. On the contrary, the three Herms are almost the only datum which he accepts and uses as a corner-stone for his edifice. What my task amounts to is therefore simply this: (1) I shall have to speak about the site of the Eion monument, and incidentally, how its inscription found its way into literary tradition; (2) I shall then have to interpret this inscription. If the interpretation finds favour, well and good; if not, *operam et oleum perdidi*.

1.

About the site I intend to be very short, though this question too is now in a considerable muddle.[128] I do not see any reason why, in describing Athens, we should borrow from Berlin and Munich: there was no *Siegesallee* in Athens, nor was there a *Feldherrnhalle*. No use to be lengthy about buildings with which modern scholars adorned the ancient town. No need even to discuss the exact topographical meaning of the local term οἱ Ἑρμαῖ.[129] It seems sufficient for our purpose to take over bodily the short and clear description preserved verbally in the lexicon of Harpokration *s. v.* Ἑρμαῖ from a late but apparently trustworthy guide-book written by Menekles of Barka after the middle of the second century B.C. and revised by a certain Kallikrates before 87/6 B.C.:[130] ἀπὸ γὰρ τῆς Ποικίλης καὶ τῆς τοῦ βασιλέως στοᾶς εἰσὶν οἱ Ἑρμαῖ καλούμενοι· διὰ γὰρ τὸ πολλοὺς κεῖσθαι καὶ ὑπὸ ἰδιωτῶν καὶ ἀρχόντων ταύτην τὴν προσηγορίαν εἰληφέναι συμβέβηκεν. With this general description we combine our oldest witness for the Eion Herms, Demosthenes in the speech against Leptines (§ 112) from the year 354 B.C.:[131] ἔστι τοίνυν τις πρόχειρος λόγος, ὡς ἄρα καὶ παρ' ἡμῖν ἐπὶ τῶν προγόνων πόλλ' ἀγάθ' εἰργασμένοι τινὲς οὐδενὸς ἠξιοῦντο τοιούτου, ἀλλ' ἀγαπητῶς ἐπιγράμματος ἐν τοῖς Ἑρμαῖς ἔτυχον· καὶ ἴσως τοῦθ' ὑμῖν ἀναγνώσεται τοὐπίγραμμα. Using as he does the local term οἱ Ἑρμαῖ, his words definitely exclude the assumption that the " Kimon Herms " stood in the Hall of Zeus. The evidence

---

[128] Even the sober Judeich, *Topogr.²*, p. 73 (cf. pp. 369, 336, 339) tells us that " Kimon got permission in 475 B.C. to set up and inscribe Herms in the Hall of Herms, which, perhaps, he himself had dedicated." As usual since Herodotus (VII, 107) and Plutarch the colleagues of Kimon are forgotten (see notes 140, 187), though the inscription has the plural ἡγεμόνες; and as usual the share of Kimon in the rebuilding of the city is recklessly exaggerated: there is not the least evidence for the opinion that " mit dem inneren ausbau der stadt im grossen begann aber erst Kimon in der mitte der siebziger jahre." What Kimon really did, anybody can read in Plutarch, *Kimon*, 13, 6-7.

[129] This is the starting point of Domaszewski who begins with accompanying Pausanias on his tour (above, p. 188). In fact, Pausanias does not mention " The Herms " as a specific area in the Agora, though he repeatedly comments on the Herms as being a special Athenian form (I, 19, 2; 24, 3; cf. III, 33, 3).

[130] This seems the most plausible explanation of the quotations Μενεκλῆς ἢ Καλλικράτης (thrice, K. ἢ M. once) ἐν τῶι Περὶ Ἀθηνῶν: see *R.E.*, X, col. 1638, no. 9; *F. Gr. Hist.*, 270. For the passage quoted above from Harpokr. *s. v.* Ἑρμαῖ see note 134.

[131] A. Schaefer, *Demosth.*, I, pp. 353 ff. (² 415 ff.); Blass, *Att. Beredsamkeit²*, III, 1, pp. 264 ff.

is formal and unambiguous; both statements made by Domaszewski about the Herms are equally wrong: the general one about the peculiar character of the Herms in the Agora which in his opinion were not only dedications made exclusively " by the Demos, not by officials and even less by private persons," but also sacrificial places (*opfer-stätten*, ἱερά),[132] and the special one that " the famous Herms of generals were of a wholly different character, although the form of the honour conferred on them was determined by the votive offerings in the Agora." [133] There is not the least doubt that the Herms of Kimon and his colleagues to which Demosthenes alludes stood in the Agora among other Herms which together formed the spot on the market called οἱ Ἑρμαῖ. It is the Demosthenes passage which in the first instance justifies my excluding the words ἐν τῇ στοᾷ τῶν Ἑρμῶν from the text of Aischines, whether or not

[132] Page 10, allegedly as a result of his general investigation concerning the site of the Herms in the Agora and their nature. In fact, the second part of the assertion rests on an interpretation of Thucydides, VI, 27, 1 which is incomprehensible to me: if Domaszewski is " surprised that Thukydides seemingly does not mention the Herms in the Agora," he probably misunderstood ἐν τῇ πόλει which means the town as opposed to the country-side (χώρα). If he concludes from καὶ ἐν ἰδίοις προθύροις καὶ ἐν ἱεροῖς that ἐν ἱεροῖς " means just the Herms in the Agora " he overlooks (1) the fact that the words stand in a short digression about the custom of setting up Herms peculiar to the Athenians, and about their form (cf. Herodotus, II, 51); (2) that ἱεροῖς is an adjective: the Herms *are not* ἱερά, they stand in (or before) the front-doors of private houses and temples. The first part of the assertion is a curious inference—for in Domaszewski's opinion the Kimon Herms did not stand in the Agora at all and were of a different character—from the story that " even the generals of the heroic age were permitted to set up Herms only once as the highest sort of honour and yet without inscribing their names." The foot-note which infers the public character of the Herms from the fact " that they stand *in solo publico* " seems self-evident, but, in fact, simply shifts the problem. Of course, nobody could set up a Herm on public ground without permission being given by the Boule or (and) the Demos, as nobody could build a Hall or whatever else in the Agora without due authority, at least after the power of the archons was considerably restricted. Nevertheless, even in the fifth century a building may be called, and is often called in popular language after the man who functioned as ἐπιστάτης, or was connected with it in some other official capacity: see, e.g., the Πεισιανάκτειος Στοά, τὸ Μητι⟨ό⟩χου (*sc.* δικαστήριον), οὕτω κληθὲν ἀπὸ ἀρχιτέκτονος Μητι⟨ό⟩χου (Pollux, 8, 121), τὸ Κάλλ⟨ε⟩ιον (*ibid.*, cf. note 134). But equally of course, the inference that all Herms therefore are public dedications is not only illogical, but wrong: the Andokides Herm, for example, was certainly not set up by an ancestor of his, but neither was it set up by the Demos. It was set up by one of the phylai (Aigeïs, Andokides, 1, 62; Plutarch, *Nik.*, 13, 3). We do not know whether this phyle had a special reason for it or whether all phylai had their Herms, but they must not be confused with the Eponymoi. Herms dedicated by private persons are attested by Menekles-Kallikrates. He also attests dedications made by officials (ἄρχοντες), and there may have been many of them made by real archons before 480/79 (or 487/6). Most of them were destroyed by the Persians, but the Ἀγοραῖος Ἑρμῆς set up by the archon Kebris before 496/5 (Hesych. *s. v.*) may have been one of them: he survived the catastrophe.

[133] In making this assertion Domaszewski conveniently overlooked the testimony of Demosthenes, because he only thought of the " Stoa of the Herms " interpolated into the text of Aischines. It is very easy to explain why in 476/5 B.C. the generals set up Herms in the Agora (see note 163); it would be much less (if at all) understandable why they put up a Herm in the Hall of Zeus, if the Hall itself was built, as Domaszewski believes, as a thank-offering for the victory at the Eurymedon.

one of the Halls (we really need not ask here which) was called in popular language " the Hall of Herms." [134] But it is also Aischines himself who having dealt extensively with the Herms goes on with these words: προέλθετε δὴ τῇ διανοίᾳ καὶ εἰς τὴν στοὰν τὴν Ποικίλην· ἁπάντων γὰρ ὑμῖν τῶν καλῶν ἔργων τὰ ὑπομνήματα ἐν τῇ ἀγορᾷ ἀνάκειται. For him and his hearers or readers a Ἑρμᾶς στῆσαι was amply sufficient for indicating the site; not even Plutarch deems it necessary to indicate it more precisely. But for a later commentator the text cried for a foot-note, such as we find in the Scholia on Demosthenes, and in writing it he mixed up " the Herms " with the " Hall of Herms " which he knew from a speech of Antiphon's. Not the poems, as Domaszewski and others believe, but the topographical statement derives from the Scholia. The truth is not, that the former are partly forgeries,[135] but that the latter is due to an error.

Incidentally the passage of Demosthenes, short as it is, furnishes us with a more accurate notion of the way in which the so-called epigrams became what Wade-Gery aptly calls " an orator's τόπος." I quite agree that " no one will suggest that Aischines copied the poems straightway from the stone." [136] I go even farther, and say that he did not even quote them from memory, though one would expect that he had often seen and perhaps even read them on the monument. This I do not infer from the variants which exist between the quotations by Aischines and Plutarch,[137] nor because

---

[134] To discuss the question of the Halls in the Agora would take us too far afield. It would also be useless till the American excavation is finished and the excavators have stated their final opinion (see Shear and Stillwell, *Hesperia*, II, pp. 107 ff., 133 ff.; IV, p. 354; Meritt, *ibid.*, V, pp. 416 f.; Wycherley, *J.H.S.*, LX, 1940, p. 95; M. Bieber, *A.J.A.*, XLV, 1941, p. 552, note 24); and finally it is not pertinent for our problem. The evidence for a Στοὰ Ἑρμῶν consists of (1) the words now in the text of Aischines; (2) the second scholion on Demosthenes, XX, 112, ἐν τοῖς Ἑρμαῖς] τρεῖς ἦσαν Ἀθήνησιν Στοαί· ἡ μὲν βασίλειος, ἡ δὲ τῶν Ἑρμῶν, ἡ δὲ Πεισιάνακτος ἀπὸ Πεισιάνακτος τοῦ κτίσαντος· αὕτη δὲ γραφέντων ἐν αὐτῇ τῶν ἐν Μαραθῶνι καὶ ἄλλων τινῶν Ποικίλη ἐκλήθη; (3) a passage in Antiphon: Harpokr. *s. v.* Ἑρμαῖ (after the quotation from Menekles-Kallikrates) ὅτι δὲ καὶ Ἑρμῶν Στοά τις ἐλέγετο δεδήλωκε καὶ Ἀντιφῶν ἐν τῷ Πρὸς Νικοκλέα· ὅτι δὲ ἐκαλοῦντο καὶ Ἱππάρχειοι Ἑρμαῖ κτλ. The Mss. have Θρα(ι)κῶν, but the context demands Sluiter's change to Ἑρμῶν (see Wade-Gery, p. 89). It is clear (1) that Harpokration had only one testimony for this Hall, viz., Antiphon's mention of it. Neither Xenophon (*Hipparch.* 3, 2) nor Demosthenes nor Menekles mentions a " Hall of Herms," they all said οἱ Ἑρμαῖ; (2) that Harpokration's authority found the Στοὰ Ἑρμῶν neither in Aischines nor in Hypereides. Both orators spoke of some Herms (probably both of the " Kimon Herms "), and the lexicographer (whom the first scholion on Demosthenes, XX, 112 epitomizes) *localizes* them by quoting the passage from Menekles-Kallikrates. He then states that there was also a Hall of Herms, quoting for it Antiphon. He does *not* identify οἱ Ἑρμαῖ and the Στοὰ Ἑρμῶν. Surprising only that he did not quote Demosthenes for the local term οἱ Ἑρμαῖ, which is different from the general lemma Ἑρμαῖ and from the Ἱππάρχειοι Ἑρμαῖ. The Menekles passage is, in fact, more apt to illustrate Demosthenes than Aischines who uses the general term λιθίνους Ἑρμᾶς στῆσαι.

[135] For a slight restriction see below, pp. 200 f.

[136] If the order of the epigrams as given by Aischines is wrong (as I shall argue below), the assumption that Aischines did not look up the inscription is proved.

[137] As Weber, p. 267 (cf. p. 256, note 2, and p. 264) does. Modern scholars often forget that

" epigraphic verses circulated in book-form long before Aischines wrote "[138]—an assumption which is neither proved nor plausible; in fact the question when the first collection of epigrams was made, is not pertinent here at all. Nor am I influenced by the wide-spread dislike felt for Aischines, who certainly is neither a great nor a likeable man, though he is not quite so black as he is painted. The simple and sufficient reason is that (to say it with Wade-Gery) " these particular poems had been used earlier to point the same moral." This is manifest from the fact that Demosthenes does not *quote* " the epigram," but in the course of his argumentation alludes to its use as a πρόχειρος λόγος.[139] His argument does not consist in a general description of the customs prevalent at Athens in the age of the πρόγονοι. Far from it. He obviously refers to a special case which is, in fact, the story told in detail by Aischines, who did not find his details in Demosthenes, but probably did find them in the speech against which the speech of Demosthenes is directed. Demosthenes, and Aischines after him, speak about " certain men " who, though they had greatly benefited their country, did not receive a special or excessive honour, but simply an epigram on one

most ancient quotations are made from memory with the exception, of course, of those made by professional grammarians.

[138] Wade-Gery, p. 80, note 35, and pp. 88, 94, quoting " the evidence in *Glotta*, IX, p. 100." There is no evidence there; Geffcken explains a variant in the epigram on the Κυψελιδῶν ἀνάθημα by the supposition that Plato took the vulgate version from a book of epigrams, quoting on his part for the existence of such book-collections Reitzenstein, *R.E.*, VI, col. 79, and Wilamowitz, *Sapph. u. Simon.*, pp. 211 ff. In this single case the explanation may be plausible (the commentary *F. Gr. Hist.* on 266 F 5 is not full enough), but the whole question of book-collections of stone epigrams is far from simple. The first collection of Athenian epigrams, entitled Ἐπιγράμματα Ἀττικά, was made by Philochoros (Suidas *s. v.*). It is not at all sure that it contained only poetical inscriptions, but for chronological reasons it cannot have been used by Aischines, let alone Leptines. The reasons from which Weber (*Hermes*, LII, 1917, p. 540, note 1; *Philol.*, LXXIV, 1917, p. 256, note 2) assumes that " Athens knew such collections already at the end of the fifth century " are not at all convincing. There may have been an earlier collection for Corinth—*distinguendum est*, as the casuists say—and perhaps even for Megara (see Wade-Gery, p. 96). But there is a much simpler way for epigrams to become literary, viz., quotations in the pamphlets and local histories, the authors of which used the testimony of inscriptions, e.g., when polemizing against Herodotus, refuting Athenian claims, securing those of their own town, or even simply when narrating their history. For the use in polemics we can instance the pamphlet of King Pausanias Κατὰ τῶν Λυκούργου νόμων, in which he quoted Tyrtaios and oracles with a view to showing that the ephors were usurping powers which did not belong to them; for the use as simple historical testimonies we are able to cite, for example, the Thermopylae epitaphs in Herodotus or the " Eurymedon epigram " in Ephoros. On the same plane stands, e.g., the use which Kallisthenes made of Kallinos' elegies and Aristotle of Solon's poems. It is quite another question at what time amateurs or scholars began to collect epigrams and edit, e.g., a book of epigrams under the name of Simonides, which they probably did not do before the end of the fourth century B.C. Here the *true* problem arises whether they copied all the poems from the stones, or took at least part of them over from earlier publications. It is the same question which poses itself for the first collection of Athenian psephismata by Krateros, and the answer to it ought not to be (I submit) dogmatic.

[139] Wade-Gery, p. 94 understands " a favourite argument "; I think it means an obvious argument and sounds somewhat contemptuous.

of the many Herms. This epigram, as Aischines points out, did not even mention their names.[140] When Demosthenes characterizes these men as πόλλ' ἀγάθ' εἰργασμένοι he is evidently thinking of the so-called second epigram ἀντ' εὐεργεσίης καὶ μεγάλων ἀγαθῶν, thus incidentally confirming Plutarch's reading against Aischines' μεγάλης ἀρετῆς, and the verb ἔτυχον alludes to the particulars given by Aischines and Plutarch that these men δεῦρο ἀφικόμενοι τὸν δῆμον ἤτησαν δωρεάν, καὶ ἔδωκεν αὐτοῖς ὁ δῆμος τρεῖς λιθίνους Ἑρμᾶς στῆσαι. When he continues with καὶ ἴσως τοῦθ' ὑμῖν ἀνα-γνώσεται τοὐπίγραμμα, thus avoiding the quotation of the long poem which Aischines transcribes, I infer that the source which gave Aischines the story with the epigrams and Demosthenes the knowledge of them, was the same for both orators, viz., the speech which Leptines made in 356/5 B.C. to recommend his law Περὶ ἀτελείας.[141] I further infer that the arguments in favour of restricting the showering of honours upon men who had deserved well of their country are points from the same speech. Demosthenes successively refutes them after dealing at length with a whole series of honorary decrees and finally with the Solonian laws regulating the proceedings for moving a law—laws which in Demosthenes' opinion (§ 107) Leptines either had failed to notice or had not properly understood. It was Leptines who had instanced the rules observed in Thebes and Sparta [142] and who had claimed that the same rules had prevailed at Athens in her glorious past, ἐπὶ τῶν προγόνων, and who, to prove his assertion had told his hearers the story about the victors of Eion, reading out the three epigrams. We do not know whether he was the first, but it seems at least plausible that " the orator's τόπος " derives from his speech.[143] In any case, the story with the epigrams is being dated back now to the fifties of the fourth century. This suggestion which seems to me to be tantamount to a proof positive has also a certain bearing on the authenticity question: what might on an emergency be credible for

[140] It does not matter for us whether Demosthenes and Aischines knew or cared who these men were. Aischines evidently does not care: he tells his readers of the benefits because the epigram mentioned the river Strymon and Eion, and he does not give them the names because the epigram did not furnish them. Plutarch names Kimon, and in spite of the plural ἡγεμόνεσσι only Kimon; but his colleagues were forgotten (see notes 128, 187), or the general public took no great interest in them; Herodotus tells of Boges ὃς ἐπολιορκέετο ὑπὸ 'Αθηναίων καὶ Κίμωνος τοῦ Μιλτιάδου. The same in Ephoros (Diod., 11, 60 ff.). It is self-evident from Demosthenes' use of the local term that the inscription stood on a Herm or, as Aischines asserts, on three Herms, a fact which again he did not find in the Demosthenes passage. But one had better not translate " the inscription on the Herms " as Wade-Gery, pp. 88, 94 does.

[141] P.A., 9046; R.E., XII, col. 2072, no. 1. The full title of Demosthenes' speech is Περὶ τῆς ἀτελείας πρὸς Λεπτίνην.

[142] No reason to accuse Leptines of Λακωνισμός or to regard him as a special friend of Sparta, because in 369 B.C. he had recommended giving help to Sparta.

[143] Hypereides' speech Περὶ τῶν Εὐβούλου δωρεῶν, in which he probably was using " the same argument as Leptines and Aischines " (Wade-Gery, p. 89, note 76), is later: it was written after the death of Euboulos (Schol. Aischin., 2, 8), that is, after 339/8 B.C. (P.A., 5369).

Aischines, who had his speech published for reading,[144] seems to be incredible for
Leptines. There is not the least reason to believe that he took Athenian epigrams,
which anybody any day could read in the Agora, from a book of which we do not
know anything, and which almost certainly did not exist as early as that.[145] There is
even less reason to assume that he falsified them in the manner suggested by
Domaszewski;[146] in fact, this assumption seems to me to be simply absurd, because
the three " epigrams " were just what he needed for his purpose.[147] And finally, what
on earth induced him to give the wrong site for the monument, ἐν τοῖς Ἑρμαῖς instead
of the alleged Hall of Zeus? I find no possible answer to this question, and I assert
with the utmost confidence that our evidence is perfectly credible as far as it goes:
there were three " epigrams " on three Herms in the Agora, praising the generals
who had wrenched Eion from the Persians.

2.

Let us now turn from the story and the tradition to the poems themselves, as
they are quoted by Aischines probably from the speech of Leptines and by Plutarch
from a Hellenistic biographical source which may or may not derive from the same
speech—I believe it does, but it really does not matter so very much. We had better
begin with the difficulties with which their text, common to Aischines and Plutarch,
presents us, leaving aside the several single variants which, though not inconsiderable,
are unimportant to the main problem. I will enumerate these difficulties in due order:
(1) The first and by far the gravest is that the epigram which according to both our
witnesses stood on the first Herm, begins with a καί, and there is nothing to which
this καί can be referred.[148] (2) The second epigram which is intimately connected with
the first, as it contrasts the generals with their men, ends with what can and must
be termed a final conclusion: this monument is (to put it succinctly) erected for
posterity as a reminder and an exhortation. We can easily take the two epigrams
together; as one inscription they would make no difficulty at all, apart from the initial
καί; but it seems fairly impossible that anything could follow this poem, if the three
epigrams refer to the same event, as tradition tells us and as, at least provisionally,
we are bound to believe. (3) The third epigram, apart from its being impossible *as a
continuation* of lines 1-8, whether we view the thought, the purport, or the contents

[144] Though most probably for an Athenian public.
[145] See note 138.
[146] I refer again to the restriction pp. 200 f.
[147] See below, pp. 201 f.
[148] See pp. 191 f. An epigram can begin with ἄρα, though one had better not adduce the some-
what different case of Hesiod, *Op.*, 11, but not with καί: Aeschylus, *Anth. Pal.*, VII, 255 (F 2 Diehl),
Κυανέη καὶ τούσδε is certainly not an epigram (see note 93). We cannot take refuge here in the sug-
gestion that καί refers to other Herms either in the Agora or, for the matter of that, in the " Hall
of the Herms " (note 134): we have first to try to understand the traditional text before bringing
forward any such suggestion.

of the inscription as a whole, and not easily credible as *an independent inscription*,[149] presents us with a number of special difficulties: (*a*) it has its own conclusion, and a curiously logical one in the third distich beginning with οὕτως οὐδὲν ἀεικές which reminds us at once of literary amplifications of stone epigrams, e.g., the οὐκ ἀδίκως in the Euripos epigram;[150] (*b*) standing as it does as the last of the three poems for the victors of Eion, it does not mention or refer to this victory as the two others do; (*c*) the sequence of contemporary soldiers or generals and the leader in the Trojan War is unprecedented and (I venture to say) impossible; (*d*) from the purely stylistic viewpoint it is surprising and again unprecedented that of three epigrams of the same kind and written for the same event, adorning three Herms which together make up the monument, the first two consist of four, and the third of six lines; (*e*) the third distich, besides overstepping the due limit and containing a new conclusion which obviously does not apply to the whole poem but only to the last epigram, is faulty and poor in itself. The man who composed it drew its idea from the preceding four lines, transferring by means of a logical form to the Athenians what the composer of the four lines, aptly paraphrasing Homer's praise of Athens,[151] had ably and, in fact, perfectly expressed. In spite of the logical form which the third distichon affects, its reasoning is somewhat remarkable: Menestheus came to Troy according to Homer as a κοσμητὴς μάχης ἔξοχος, *therefore* it is nothing strange for the Athenians to be called κοσμηταὶ μάχης. At the best, and apart from its faulty logic, this is a banality, and nobody, I am sure, will call the three epigrams banal. That is not all: as the illogical and banal conclusion did not fill the distich, its composer added an ἀμφὶ καὶ ἠνορέης. It is difficult, if possible at all, to connect these words grammatically with κοσμηταί. There ought to have been another predicate referring to Ἀθηναίοισι, to which ἀμφὶ καὶ ἠνορέης might be suitably affixed, e. g., διδασκάλοις; but there was no room for it.

I believe the weight of these difficulties is overwhelming: the three epigrams cannot have stood on the Herms in the sequence in which they are quoted by Aischines and Plutarch, nor can the third epigram have had exactly the form which these two witnesses quote. In the face of this result our first task is to seek for an explanation which meets not one or two of the difficulties, but *all*, or, as in their totality they seem

[149] Something in the style of Ἀντ' εὐεργεσίης Ἀγαμέμνονα δῆσαν Ἀχαιοί which hardly can have stood on an Athenian Herm, though Menekles-Kallikrates (Harp. *s. v.* Ἑρμαῖ) seem to testify that it did. It is usually thought to be a parody which then refers to Kimon and the " second " epigram. Goettling (and Wade-Gery, p. 94) regarded the third " epigram " as the subscription of Polygnotos' Ilion painting in the Stoa Poikile. Of course, he could not explain how it came into the text of Aischines, and there is no need to refute his reconstruction of the Eion monument—*one* Herm with " the heads of the three generals " and engraved with the first two epigrams.

[150] Above, p. 159, and note 15.

[151] *Iliad*, B, 546 ff., where it is said of Menestheus τῷ οὔ πώ τις ὁμοῖος ἐπιχθόνιος γένετ' ἀνήρ / κοσμῆσαι ἵππους τε καὶ ἀνέρας ἀσπιδιώτας.

to be unsurmountable, to find a remedy which is at once simple and effective, and above all, which *explains* how the difficulties arose. If I am not mistaken, the task is easy, and I am not the first to take steps which lead in the right direction. The transposition of the third " epigram " from the end to the beginning, proposed as early as 1866, accepted by many scholars, and retained by some even after Weber,[152] is a first step which alone, of course, is not sufficient. We have to combine with it the seclusion of the third distich of the transposed " epigram " which was suggested a few years later by Weidner, but found no favour at all and is now completely forgotten.[153] Taken together these two changes remove all difficulties at once. But it is the explanation of how these things came to pass which does the trick. Of course, there is no simple textual corruption; nor is it plausible, it is even demonstrably wrong to explain the transposition, and only the transposition, as " an obvious error of the grammarian who transcribed the epigrams in the wrong order, because the three Herms stood in a triangular group." [154] However the three Herms were arranged, no grammarian in his senses would have begun his transcription with the καί epigram, if he saw (as he did) that the three epigrams referred to the same event. There is only one explanation for the state of things, but it is in my opinion a perfect one: *the explanation not from an error but from the purpose of the moralizing orator who first made use of the Eion epigrams.* I suggest that for him the obnoxious distich was the most important one, and I suggest further that it was of his own making. It drove home the moral which he wished to draw from the poem which did not give even the names of the generals, because it openly and clearly heaped all glory on " the Athenians " who had a right to be called κοσμηταὶ μάχης on account of what they had achieved at different times and under different leadership. The logical and prosaical conclusion οὕτως οὐδὲν ἀεικές shows the mental process of the orator. Of course, only the Menestheus epigram allowed of an addition, and, equally of course, he had to quote it in the last place; he simply could not conclude with the praise of the generals.

What I suggest amounts to a moderate forgery in the poem on the victory monu-

---

[152] See pp. 187 f. It was Goettling who first thought of the transposition, but rejected it in favour of a wild hypothesis (note 149). Weber detached the obnoxious distich from the three epigrams and printed it as a sort of general conclusion (p. 257; cf. pp. 266, 273 ff.).

[153] *Aischines, In Ctesiphontem oratio*, rec. explic. A. Weidner (Lipsiae, 1872). The exceptions he took were not at all wrong, nevertheless the *athetesis* is not even mentioned in the Aischines editions of Franke (1883) and Blass (1896) nor in the Plutarch of Lindskog (1914), nor in the collections of Bergk, Wilamowitz, and Hiller. It was unknown also to Weber, p. 275, note 7, and Wade-Gery, p. 95, note 97. I had expelled the distich long ago, and was a little sorry when I found that Weidner had preceded me. Preger's one objection, the use of the " Ionic " οὐδὲν ἀεικές is futile. It is an argument of Kirchhoff who used it to prove that the author of the epigram was an Ionian. Sufficient to quote Aeschylus, *Prom.*, 1042, πάσχειν δὲ κακῶς/ ἐχθρὸν ὑπ' ἐχθρῶν οὐδὲν ἀεικές; the passage justifies the use of the word in an Attic interpolation of the fourth century. Kirchhoff himself quotes Herodotus, III, 33, and VI, 98 for the syllogism. It is enough to read both passages to recognize that they cannot prove the distich to have been part of the original poem. At the utmost, one may infer that Leptines had read Herodotus; but I do not believe that the proof is sufficient.

[154] Preger, who even gives a sketch of the group.

ment. A forgery may suit a moralist ill (though there are many, many examples for it, as in the opinion of numerous moralists " the end justifies the means "), but it suits a politician perfectly, and Leptines was a politician. As the forgery was so moderate, the orator was tolerably sure that nobody would take the trouble to check the accuracy of his quotation: the epigrams as he quoted them sounded familiar, and that was enough for him. If there had been one or two cranks in the assembly who prided themselves on their antiquarian knowledge, he probably would not have cared at all.[155] And, perhaps, even we scholars for whom Ἀκρίβεια is the highest goddess ought to allow the practical orator a little liberty in adapting his material to his purposes. Leptines had no easy task. In the Athenian assembly he could not very well hold up as a model of behaviour Thebes or Sparta alone;[156] and as the question before the assembly was about granting honours and exemptions to individual persons, he had to find something from the glorious past of Athens herself. He had no use for prosaic honorary decrees with which Demosthenes, of course, made great play, because by their very nature they gave the name of the man who received civic honours. Nor could he make use of the many epitaphs which praise the παῖδες Ἀθηναίων, because they never mentioned the generals or other individuals,[157] even if they had paid with their lives in the battles inscribed on the stelai, and were themselves listed as στρατηγοί, μάντεις, or in some other capacity. As far as we know public laudatory epigrams for generals or other leaders of the people did not exist.[158] Nor again could he make use of the ancient victory monuments of which we know (and apparently there were not many more): for the Marathon epigrams were lost, and they as well as the Cyprus monument spoke of the dead and the surviving, the victors in their totality, simply as " these men " (οἵδε) again not mentioning the generals even by implication. It was a brain-wave, and he was probably overjoyed when he remembered the Eion epigrams which seem to have been unique in mentioning individual men.[159] They and they alone

[155] It is perhaps more surprising that no commentator did (cf. note 109). There is nothing in our tradition akin to the corrected text of the Κυψελιδῶν ἀνάθημα given by the grammarian Apollas (cf. note 138).

[156] Cf. p. 197.

[157] Neither did the funeral speeches, as far as we know them, before Hypereides and the Lamian War. They speak of the dead, their πρόγονοι and ἔκγονοι in comprehensive terms, just as the epitaphs do, and for that matter the other victory monuments: οἵδε, Ἀθηναῖοι, παῖδες Ἀθηναίων. If Pausanias, I, 29, 5 derives from a funeral speech, the names of the strategoi were added from a historical source.

[158] Nobody has taken seriously Hiller's suggestion that the Marathon monument formerly exhibited an epigram on Themistokles, and, of course, we do not find the name of Miltiades or even of the polemarch Kallimachos on the votive offering at Delphi (Syll.³, 23). In the 'sixties, Kimon was able to obtain many public honours for the memory of his father,—about the dedication of Miltiades and the eponymoi see Pomtow, Klio, VIII, pp. 84 ff.; also the painting in the Stoa Poikile?,—but no epigrams were inscribed comparable to those put up by Lysandros and other Spartan generals in 405/4 B.C. (Syll.³, 115; Tod, Greek Hist. Inscr., 95).

[159] R. Heinze, N. Jahrb., XXXV, 1915, p. 3, who mentioned the Eion poem only in passing, rightly called it " in jeder beziehung ungewöhnlich." See below, pp. 209 f.

suited his purpose exactly. *Their distinguishing feature was (and is) the mention of the generals who dedicated the monument, not the absence of their names*—the point on which Aischines and Plutarch, and of course Leptines, and by implication Demosthenes, dwelt at length. The orators of the fourth century were used to names and to special honours for generals; in 476/5 B.C. they would probably have given as much offence to the Athenians as the epigram of Pausanias on the victory monument of Plataea gave to the Spartans.[160] But we see at once why Leptines more than a century later stressed the absence of the names, and why he invented the story that the demos imposed on the generals demanding as reward for their services the condition that their names should not be inscribed.[161] Of course, Leptines did not trouble about the name of Menestheus: he was a hero mentioned as such by Homer whom the epigrammatist had been careful to quote, and he was therefore not to be treated as a contemporary general.

I feel fairly confident that we have solved the riddle of the three epigrams without rending asunder the tradition and throwing away the bleeding pieces or grafting them upon another body. We have acted, I submit, like a good doctor, cautiously reducing the dislocated joints and removing, with hardly any loss of blood, a noxious growth. But we have still to examine the poem as it stood on the stone. Let us give our hypothesis a trial, and if it stands it, we may, perhaps, claim that our treatment has been successful and that we can discharge the patient as sound in body and mind. This testing of the new poem will not take a long time. For it goes almost without saying that now we may securely speak not of a plurality of epigrams,[162] but of one poem whose three parts were evenly distributed on three Herms which most probably the three generals had offered to set up and pay for, either from their share in the

---

[160] Mr. J. M. Todd reminded me of this case. In fact, if τὸ μὲν οὖν ἐλεγεῖον οἱ Λακεδαιμόνιοι ἐξεκόλαψαν εὐθὺς τότε (Thucydides, I, 132), his first offence in the eyes of the ephors consisted in putting in his name instead of οἱ Λακεδαιμόνιοι as that of the victor over the Persians. They would have insisted on the erasure of the epigram even if they did not fear or had already received protests from the allies against the apparent slight of their contribution towards victory. The protests were probably the reason for inscribing ὀνομαστὶ τὰς πόλεις ὅσαι ξυγκαθελοῦσαι τὸν βάρβαρον ἔστησαν τὸ ἀνάθημα without a dedicatory epigram.

[161] Wade-Gery, pp. 74 f. called the condition " a childish tale," and the explanation given above is implicit in his criticism. But I am more interested in the positive side of the question. If Kimon had a say in the text of the inscription (and I think it probable that he had; see below, pp. 209 f.), he will himself have advised the poet to name no names, partly in deference to popular feeling (cf. note 160), but more perhaps because he had no mind to share the glory with his colleagues and to make their names immortal. In Athens, he knew, everybody would understand who was the real ἡγεμών; and as to Posterity, if he had imagination enough to think of it (which I rather doubt), he was reasonably sure that it would forget the others. In this belief he was not mistaken (note 140).

[162] As Wilamowitz, Ed. Meyer, and most scholars do. But R. Heinze (note 159) rightly speaks of a " langes gedicht, das man unter die Hermen setzte." So already Busolt, *Gr. G.*, III, 1, p. 101, and Preger, but for a wrong reason: τὸ ἐπίγραμμα in Demosthenes and Aischines (who immediately afterwards says τὰ ποιήματα) is a collective term, not meaning " the poem," but " the inscription."

booty or from their substance, in order to adorn the market place which had been devastated by the selfsame Persians a few years before.[163]

The first part of the poem, formerly the third " epigram " contains seemingly a mythical *paradeigma*,[164] which serves as the background for the historical feat of arms, thus raising the latter into the sphere dignified by Homer, whom the author quoted as lyric and elegiac poets sometimes did; it intimates that the recent exploit would have been worthy of being praised by Homer.[165] By thus putting on the same level the mythical and the historical event, the poet becomes in a way the forerunner of the Athenian λόγος ἐπιτάφιος. But there is a notable difference in that the funeral speech very soon developed as a distinctive feature a first part consisting of an enumeration of all claims to glory which the Athens of the kings had to show from their boasted autochthony onwards—the victories over Eumolpos with his Thracians and over the Amazons, the help given to the Seven against Thebes and to the descendants of Herakles, and finally the participation in the Trojan War. The Eion poet does not enumerate all these facts, he chooses from them the one Panhellenic title of Athens to glory which is also the one fact comparable with the historic event he is out to praise—a siege and occupation of a strongly defended town of the barbarians. Perhaps a mention of what is probably the oldest Athenian funeral speech will be illuminating—if it was indeed a speech, not an epitaph, and delivered at a real burial, not made for a cenotaph of the men who were slain at Drabeskos. Whatever it was, it did not enumerate indiscriminately all the achievements of Athens, but merely compared the historic expedition to Thrace with similar Athenian exploits in the past, the special expeditions sent overseas by Athens, excluding even the Panhellenic expedition to Troy.[166]

In the second part of the poem, formerly the first epigram, which begins with ἦν ἄρα κἀκεῖνοι, the καί now clearly refers to the men who went with Menestheus. We get rid—a negative but important result—of the alleged connexion between the Marathon epigrams and the Eion poem and all the hypotheses built on this connexion; for apart from the καί there is not a scrap of evidence for the *Siegesallee*, the *Ruhmeshalle*, or the Kimon monument in the Hall of Zeus; they all turn out to be

[163] These Herms were hardly meant to form the boundary of the restored Agora, as Wilamowitz believes, again exaggerating the share of Kimon in the restoration. But they may well have been the first Herms set up in the area later called οἱ Ἑρμαῖ (cf. note 132).

[164] The term is perhaps as unsuitable as " moralizing " (note 126), but provisionally it may serve (see below, pp. 207 f.).

[165] The use which Domaszewski, p. 15 made of the name of Menestheus is sufficiently bad, but the question of Loewy, p. 26 reveals an almost incredible lack of understanding: " und da die epigramme feldherren und taten der gegenwart gelten sollen, was soll hier der vorzeitliche anführer der Athener gegen Troja? "

[166] Pausanias, I, 29, 5: στρατὸν δὲ ἔξω τῆς Ἑλλάδος Ἀθηναῖοι τρίτον τοῦτον ἔστειλαν· Πριάμῳ μὲν γὰρ καὶ Τρωσὶ πάντες Ἕλληνες ἀπὸ κοινοῦ λόγου κατέστησαν ἐς πόλεμον, Ἀθηναῖοι δὲ ἰδίᾳ μετ' Ἰολάου τε ἐς Σαρδὼ καὶ δευτέραν ἐς τὴν νῦν Ἰωνίαν ἐστράτευσαν καὶ τρίτον δὴ τότε ἐς τὴν Θρᾴκην. Cf. *J.H.S.*, LXIV, 1945.

phantoms created by modern scholars who cannot or will not pay attention to the evidence. Again the comparison is an apt one, and the rare epithet ταλακάρδιοι for the men of Eion is not chosen at random. The main feature of the siege of Troy was its long duration, which it needed *endurance* to stand: the great speech of Odysseus in the second book of the Iliad [167] which prepares for the uninterrupted series of battles narrated by Homer is wholly concerned with this point of view, the temper of the men who are asked to stand it; with τλῆτε φίλοι he begins his impressive peroration. This in the opinion of the poet was also the quality of the men who besieged Eion; they too have proved their τλημοσύνη, were ταλακάρδιοι.[168] For, of course, the ἐκεῖνοι are the men, not the generals: [169] there is no doubt of that, as the next part of the poem begins with ἡγεμόνεσσι δέ. A severe logician might object to the sequence men—generals, because the *paradeigma* in line 1-4 only speaks of a leader of men, and a biased critic might further object to the factual contents of line 5-8, because they ascribe to the men what might as well, or better be ascribed to the generals—the means for reducing the Persians to extreme embarrassment. But, in fact, nobody can misunderstand the poet, and nobody but a spiteful athetizer will vituperate him, for everybody knows that Menestheus did not go single-handed to Troy, but as a leader of fifty ships and about five-thousand Athenian men, αὐτερέται καὶ μάχιμοι πάντες; [170] and the poet, with the speech of the Homeric Odysseus in his mind, had good reason to praise the endurance of the men which enabled the generals to carry out their plans. His conception shows that he had to take into account the strongly democratic trend of public opinion in Athens, and it is rather noteworthy that there is no outspoken praise of the generals at all, in the mention of whom the poem culminates: they got the reward, perhaps because they had asked for it, but the praise went to the men who

---

[167] B, 278-332. For its genuineness see *Sb. Berlin*, 1932, pp. 589 ff.

[168] The *Aspis* (424) calls Herakles Διὸς ταλακάρδιος υἱός, and Bakchyl., F. 62 [τα]λακάρδιος is perhaps said of a contemporary man; I am not quite sure about the meaning of ἐγὼ ταλακάρδιος said by Oedipus of himself (Soph., *O.C.* 540). It is the Homeric τλήμων (e.g., τλήμων 'Οδυσσεύς Il., K, 231; τλήμονα θυμὸν ἔχων, E, 670), used in the same sense by Tyrtaios (F 9, 17/8 D αἰσχρῆς δὲ φυγῆς ἐπὶ πάγχυ λάθηται / ψυχὴν καὶ θυμὸν τλήμονα παρθέμενος) and Archilochos (7, 5 ff.: ἀλλὰ θεοὶ γὰρ ἀνηκέστοισι κακοῖσιν, / ὦ φίλ᾽, ἐπὶ κρατερὴν τλημοσύνην ἔθεσαν . . . ἀλλὰ τάχιστα / τλῆτε γυναικεῖον πένθος ἀπωσάμενοι); cf. also Pindar, *P.*, I, 48, ἐν πολέμοιο μάχαις τλάμονι ψυχᾷ παρέμεινε, and Aesch., *Ag.*, 1302, ἀλλ᾽ ἴσθι τλήμων οὖσ᾽ ἀπ᾽ εὐτόλμου φρενός (where again I am not quite sure about the sense). The Eion poet might have used some form of the verb τλῆναι, but the adjective (like the noun τλημοσύνη) had changed its meaning from " patient " (stout-hearted) to " miserable," perhaps in later epic poetry, as the *Delphic Hymn to Apollo*, 190 ff., contrasts θεῶν δῶρ᾽ ἄμβροτα ἠδ᾽ ἀνθρώπων / τλημοσύνας—to leave aside a development in another direction, the vituperative use, as not pertinent here. Best example now the Koroneia epigram Τλήμονες, οἷον ἀγῶνα μάχης τελέσαντες ἀέλπτου / ψυχὰς δαιμονίως ὠλέσατ᾽ ἐμ πολέμῳ. Further, e.g., Aeschylus, *Prom.* 614, τλῆμον Προμηθεῦ, τοῦ δίκην πάσχεις τάδε, Aristophanes, *Pax*, 723, and (in prose) Xenophon, *Anab.*, III, 1, 29.

[169] As Wilamowitz, Domaszewski, and others understood. The same holds good for the Cyprus poem (cf. note 117).

[170] Thucydides, I, 10.

had earned it for them—and personally, I do not think that Kimon would have wished his poet to have spoken otherwise.[171] But however this may be, with regard to the *form* in which the poet cast the praise of the men " who first found out how to break the enemy's resources," I do not think it necessary to stop here and explain at length the clear sense and the equally clear wording of this part which condenses admirably and in a manner truly poetical [172] the story told at some length in the account which

[171] Cf. note 161.

[172] As to the wording, the change of πρῶτοι to πρώτῳ (meaning Boges) by B. Schmidt (not to mention Bergk's awful πύργῳ) was justly rejected by Preger (" πρῶτοι εὗρον Graecorum tautologia ") and Wilamowitz (" wer den sprachgebrauch der Griechen kennt, ändert ein πρῶτοι εὗρον nicht "). No need for examples, their number is legion. But one may compare the Phyle epigram, Hiller, 61, Τούσδ' ἀρετῆς ἕνεκα στεφάνοις ἐγέραιρε παλαίχθων / δῆμος 'Αθηναίων, οἵ ποτε τοὺς ἀδίκοις / θεσμοῖς ἄρξαντας πόλεως πρῶτοι καταπαύειν / ἦρξαν, and the dedication made by the archons who in 395/4 (not 477/6 as Hiller, 32 has it) began to build the new walls of Athens: 'Αρξάμενοι πρῶτοι τειχίζειν οἵδ' ἀνέθηκαν / βουλῆς καὶ δήμου δόγμασι πειθόμενοι. This πρῶτοι *never* demands a δεύτεροι, the tautology or pleonasm stresses the notion of the verb (see also Kleinguenther Πρῶτος Εὑρετής, *Philol.*, Suppl. 26, 1, 1933, pp. 57 f.) ; not even the archons, who knew that others would go on with the work, thought of them and a possible dedication by them too; they simply stressed their claim to priority. There really is no doubt about the meaning of πρῶτοι εὗρον. The ingenious use which Wade-Gery, p. 74 made of it is linguistically untenable. Moreover his explanation " the ' process ' in question is the breaking of Persian *morale* " seems to me to have an intensely modern flavour and, perhaps, he felt this himself, as in *Athen. Stud. Ferguson* (*H.S.C.P.*, Suppl. I [1940]), pp. 152 ff. he avoids it, choosing descriptive terms which are much nearer to the simple words of Plutarch, *Kimon*, 13, 4 (= Kallisthenes, 124 F 16 Jac.), τοῦτο τὸ ἔργον οὕτως ἐταπείνωσε τὴν γνώμην τοῦ βασιλέως ὥστε συνθέσθαι τὴν περιβόητον εἰρήνην, κτλ. In any case, the breaking of Persian *morale* (" resource " or " hope ") did not begin with the occupation of Eion; no Greek poet could or would have said that, thus ignoring the great battles fought in 480 and 479 B.C. These battles broke Persian *morale*, if you like, and men like Boges and Maskames were honorable exceptions from the general defeatism. If the Eion poet had been fool enough to exaggerate in an altogether reckless manner the importance of Eion, he would have said so clearly; there were many possibilities to express a complete breakdown of the Persian spirit as well as of the Persian forces. He does not say that; he uses the word ἀμηχανίη which has not a vague and general meaning, but a quite definite and special one: the enemy was not morally broken, he was made *helpless*. It is an apt word, the *mot juste*, like ταλακάρδιοι for the event which the poet praises. Perhaps his words are untranslateable, but we can get their exact meaning by a paraphrase: " they *found a way* to create a situation from which the enemy could not extricate himself," as he could, though with great losses, at Salamis and Plataea. What the men of Eion did, was, in fact, something new in the history of warfare with the barbarians, comparable only with the fate of Troy: not a pitched battle, were it ever so victorious, but a siege which ended with the complete destruction of the enemy's force, because the beleaguerers left him no choice but either to surrender or to destroy himself. It was a feat of arms which brought honour to victors and vanquished alike, and which lived in the memory of the Athenians and not the Athenians alone, for Herodotus heard about Boges also from his " Persian friends." That was a εὕρημα in the Greek sense of the word which does not always mean what we call an invention, but very often signifies somebody who first did a thing. Of course, it is possible that later writers sought after a special εὕρημα meant here (Pausanias, VIII, 8, 9; Wilamowitz, *Ar. u. Ath.*, I, p. 155, note 69), but that does not affect the use which the poet made of the idiom. For those who like personal explanations— and I am quite prepared to admit that here such an explanation is justified—I will add that the poet may well have stressed the priority claim not (or not so much) for factual reasons, but to preconize

we have from Herodotus.[173]

But I am afraid I must now pause for a short discussion of the use of ποτέ not only in the first but also in the second part of the poem, though the doubling and even trebling of the word seems to me to show at once its meaning also in the second place. Of course, I quite accept as a principle of interpretation that a Greek author is usually saying precisely what he means to say; I have as little liking as Wade-Gery for disposing of a word which has a definite meaning by calling it a stop-gap, though I believe that here too one should always take into account " the mesmeric effect " of phrases and particularly of parts of verses coined by a famous poet. Even apart from this possibility [174] the principle itself is not so simple as it sounds: the drawback is that we have to infer the intention of the poet from the words he uses *and* the context in which he uses them; and neither may be in every case obvious. Now ποτέ means " at some time "; it is also used of " some unknown point of time "; and, of course, there always must be an interval betwen the writing of a poem and the event with which it is concerned. The interval is often an appreciably long one, and ποτέ then may be translated by " once upon a time," " long before." But this is by no means always the case: [175] there are vast differences as to the period covered by ποτέ—about half a thousand years or even seven centuries in the first part of the Eion poem, one year and a half (or at the utmost between two and three years) in the Phyle epigram, or (to give some examples from a period nearer the Eion poem) in the epitaph for the Spartans at Thermopylae, in the Simonidean poem for Megistias, and in the dedicatory epigram which the Athenians set up in the Artemision. Wade-Gery is at pains to explain why in the last mentioned cases the use of ποτέ for a relatively short period does not give offence,[176] and he may well be right. But his inference from the ποτέ in the " first " Eion epigram (and exclusively from this ποτέ) " that, in fact, the verses are written after the battle of the Eurymedon and perhaps after Kimon's

Kimon and his (aristocratic?) colleagues. We are entering in 476/5 B.C. the period of a conservative government (Aristotle, ᾽Αθ. Πολ., 23, 1), and it was the conservative general who had won this victory with the forces of the new League, while the *gloires* of the Xerxes War and even the foundation of the League rested with the " confounded democrats," Themistokles and Aristides.

[173] VII, 107.

[174] Or even probability, for I have little doubt that the Eion poet knew the one certainly Simonidean epigram which in 476/5 B.C. was brand-new and probably already famous. The end of an hexameter οἵ ποτε Μήδων followed in the pentameter by a geographical determination reminds us at once of the epitaph for the seer Megistias, ὅν ποτε Μῆδοι / Σπερχειὸν ποταμὸν κτεῖναν ἀμειψάμενοι, and who (though he well knew his impending fate) οὐκ ἔτλη Σπάρτης ἡγεμόνας προλιπεῖν. Not that he copied it or was diverted by it from his own path, but it was present to his mind, as Homer was. Wade-Gery, p. 73 rightly states that ποτέ in a genuine epitaph, referring to the circumstances of the death, is " exceptional." We may even regard it as " the *exceptio probans regulam* "; but can we disregard the literary influence of such an *exceptio* in one of the first examples for the use of the temporal particle?

[175] *Il.*, Θ, 108 where it is even used of the day before, and the fact remains if one athetizes the verse with Aristarchos, ὅτι τὸ ποτέ χρονικὴν ἔχει ἔμφασιν.

[176] See especially pp. 72 f.

death," is arguable only if this "epigram" is the only genuine one among the three quoted by Aischines and Plutarch—and this is certainly not the case, because it would compel us to refer the καί of κάκεῖνοι to the victors in later battles which, I submit, is manifestly impossible. Let us be quite clear about the state of things. We are of course not on unshakable ground for the Eion poem in so far as one cannot definitely refute an assertion that the monument was set up and the poem engraved a considerable time after 475 B.C., though the burden of proof rests with the scholars who vote for a late date, and so far they have failed to prove the likelihood of it.[177] On the other hand, the story told by Aischines and Plutarch cannot be regarded as proof incontrovertible that the monument was granted as soon as the generals, one of whom also brought home the relics of Theseus, returned from Thrace: it is the natural assumption, and just for that reason it may have been a wrong inference of Aischines,[178] or (as we had better say now) of Leptines. But we are justified in demanding proof that it *was* a wrong inference; at least, the late date ought to be made plausible. Till proof is brought forward or the plausibility made out, I venture to reverse the argument of Wade-Gery: no one who reads this poem with attention can doubt that it was written very soon after the events to which it refers, and the only event mentioned in it is the siege and occupation of Eion.

The long and the short of the matter is that, as soon as we make ourselves free of the baneful influence of Domaszewski's treatment of the tradition, all arguments which one could take seriously if there were only one genuine epigram, completely lose their force. And I am afraid even if the thesis of the one genuine epigram could be proved or made plausible, we should not restore the Kimon monument of Domaszewski, but would have to prefer Weber's *Siegesallee*. As things are, two points are fairly certain: we have *to start* with 475 B.C. as the probable date of the Eion monument, and we are fully justified in assuming that the Eion poet, whoever he was,[179] was quite able not only aptly to paraphrase Homer, but also to express his own ideas clearly and well. If therefore we disapprove of the explanation of ποτέ as a mere stop-gap, and if we disallow the claim that ποτέ *must* mean "long before," we have to try to show what the poet intended when he used ποτέ in dating not only a mythological event, but also the historical and contemporaneous one. Negatively it is evident that he did not aim at stressing the usual difference in time between the *paradeigma* and the event; otherwise he would have put into the second part of his poem a νῦν or a similar word indicating the contrast, and we cannot doubt that he would have been able to find his way to do so. Perhaps the usual manner of employing a

---

[177] I feel personally sure that the monument was granted and set up before the catastrophe which befell the first colonists. It seems that Schol. Aischin., 2, 31 are dating the catastrophe, not the occupation in 476/5 B.C. If that is so, the Herms were set up in the winter or the spring of Phaidon's year.

[178] As Wade-Gery, pp. 74 f. argues.

[179] See below, pp. 210 f.

paradeigma appeared commonplace to him, perhaps he did not regard the mention of Menestheus as a technical *paradeigma* at all. In any case, the doubling of ποτέ seems to show that he aimed at the exact contrary, not to stress the difference in time, but to abolish it, which means to abolish also the difference in the appreciation of the two facts, to put the Homeric and the contemporaneous event on the same level. Consequently we have to ascertain his standpoint in regarding the facts mentioned, to seek the common denominator for both events; and this is not difficult, as the poet indicates his standpoint with perfect lucidity in the third part and the last distich of *his* poem. The common denominator is Posterity: the succeeding generations when seeing the monument, shall and will be willing to contend for the good of the commonwealth with their forbears, the men who endured the siege of Troy and those who acted likewise at Eion.[180] For Posterity the difference in time between these two events is indifferent, both belong to the past, both are shining examples for the spirit of the Athenians, well fitted to fill their descendants with the same spirit and the wish to emulate τὴν τῶν προγόνων ἀρετήν. It is the same view-point which is noticeable in the funeral speeches, when the orator enumerates the men who died for their country from the beginning of Athenian history down to the dead of the present year, without making a distinction in value between them.[181] The men recently fallen and buried now enter at once the sacred companionship of the heroes of the past, they become at once models for their surviving contemporaries as well as for the succeeding generations. This idea, which is the main characteristic for the annual ceremony in the public cemetery, had become a *topos* in 432/1 B.C., and probably earlier; it was not yet a *topos* in 476/5. If there is a typical idea in the Eion poem, it derives from Homer and epic poetry. The Eion poet perceives his task as the epic poet does who has to tell of men and deeds which are to become models for Posterity, bad and good models; even his heroes think of posterity as the judge of their actions—αἰσχρὸν γὰρ τόδε γ᾽ ἐστὶ καὶ ἐσσομένοισι πυθέσθαι,[182] ὡς καὶ ὀπίσσω | ἀνθρώποισι πελώμεθ᾽ ἀοίδιμοι ἐσσομένοισι,[183]

---

[180] Incidentally we get a new proof for the superior quality of Plutarch's text: δῆριν ἔχειν is doubtless preferable to μόχθον ἔχειν which echoes πολὺν πόνον ὑπομείνειν in Aischines' prose. I think that the text above answers again Wade-Gery, pp. 76 f. and his important footnote 23: " to the long futurity of readers, ποτέ will qualify the whole story, unexceptionally if dully; for the poet it must refer to things which, at the moment at which he writes, have definitely receded into the past." The mind of the Eion poet *is* fixed on futurity—futurity pure and simple, not a long or a short one—for which the events which he mentions have receded into the past and have become models for posterity.

[181] They are certainly not depicting a ὁδὸς κάτω, while Thucydides, true to his general historical outlook, presents his readers with a ὁδὸς ἄνω.

[182] *Il.*, B, 119 (the book from which he took the idea of τλῆναι apparent in ταλακάρδιοι); *Od.*, φ, 255; ω, 433; cf. *Il.*, Γ, 287 = 460. For the preposition and posterity hearing of the past event cf. the famous epicene oracle Herod., VI, 77, 2: ὥς ποτέ τις ἐρέει καὶ ἐπεσσομένων ἀνθρώπων· / δεινὸς ὄφις τριέλικτος ἀπώλετο δουρὶ δαμασθείς. It may well have been known to the Eion poet. Cp. also *Il.*, H, 81 ff. (Wade-Gery, p. 77, note 23).

[183] *Il.*, Z, 357 f.; *Od.*, γ, 203 f.; θ, 579 f.

μὴ μὰν ἀσπουδί γε καὶ ἀκλειῶς ἀπολοίμην, | ἀλλὰ μέγα ῥέξας τι καὶ ἐσσομένοισι πυθέσ-
θαι.[184] Perhaps the later age shows in a discreet stressing of what they now call the
agonistic idea—ἀμφὶ περὶ ξυνοῖς πρήγμασι δῆριν ἔχειν.

In this third part of the poem, formerly the second epigram, which is a real and
suitable conclusion of the poem, we do not meet with any particular difficulty, for the
indefinite τάδε clearly refers to the monument as a whole with which the Demos
rewarded the victorious generals.[185] Its principal interest for us lies in its indicating
the conditions under which the Demos granted permission to them to set up the Herms
commemorating their victory. I do not mean here " the childish tale that the Demos
forbade the generals to mention their own names," as Wade-Gery has it, the invention
of the moralizing orator, as I prefer to call it less inimically, whose reasons I believe
I have sufficiently explained above.[186] I do not mean the story at all, or the question,
insoluble for us and hardly of the first importance, whether the poem confirms the
traditional story that the generals had asked for a reward, or whether the story was
evolved from the μισθὸν ἔδωκαν of the poem.[187] I mean the fact which emerges from
the poem, which cannot be doubted, and which is the historical testimony for the spirit
of, and the feelings in Athens in 476/5 B.C., as valuable as the Marathon epigrams
are for the spirit of 490/89 B.C.: [188] the Athenians were so proud and happy about
the victory which rightly appeared to them as a great achievement of their new and
own league, the promising beginning of the offensive war under their leadership for
the liberation of the European and Ionian Greeks, which moreover held out fair
prospects for an Athenian settlement in the rich and much coveted regions of Thrace,
that they accorded their generals an honour unheard-of till then and one which seems
to have remained unique.[189] If Domaszewski is surprised about this " exceptional

[184] *Il.*, X, 304 f.
[185] See note 54.
[186] See pp. 200 ff.
[187] Because of the vagueness of διδόναι, even when connected with μισθόν, it can mean " give "
or " permit." It really does not matter much, though of course we should like to know, whether
the honour was decreed spontaneously (even then there must have been a mover), or by the gentle
pressure of the friends of Kimon, or on the demand of Kimon and his colleagues. One ought not
to forget the colleagues, as Wilamowitz, Wade-Gery, p. 95, note 97, and most scholars do. Surely
it is the simplest explication for the three Herms, that there were three generals (cf. notes 128, 140).
[188] See above, p. 185.
[189] See pp. 201 f. No similar honour was granted for the battles of Salamis and Plataea
(cf. note 159), nor, for that matter, to the victors of Marathon. Probably Miltiades did not ask
for a special honour, nor had he any right to it; he had not been the commander of the army, as
the descendants of the polemarch Kallimachos are at pains to imply by the posthumous epigram
which they inscribed on his votive offering (note 8). What he asked for was, according to
Herodotus (VI, 132), the command of a great fleet for an unknown destination. After the sorry
issue of this expedition he could not set up a votive offering of whatever character. He died ἄτιμος,
and it was left to his son to vindicate the honour of the house; and I for one am quite prepared
to admit that the demand for a victory monument in 476/5 B.C. (see note 187) was his first step.
In any case, he had a hand in it.

honour for the single victory of the Strymon," [190] I regard his surprise as an example of the curious habit prevalent in a certain class of modern historians who are so clever that they either do not look at the evidence at all, or use it only with a view to show how clever they are, when they should instead " transfuse themselves into the spirit of the ages past." Let us rather state that these are still the times for devising new honours which though new are always moderate and therefore astonishing to the orators of the fourth century and their public—τιμὰς μεγάλας ὡς τότ᾽ ἐδόκει, as Aischines expresses it succinctly and much more happily than Plutarch with his ταῦτα καίπερ οὐδαμοῦ τὸ Κίμωνος ὄνομα δηλοῦντα τιμῆς ὑπερβολὴν ἔχειν ἐδόκει τοῖς τότ᾽ ἀνθρώποις. These are still the times in which the young democracy finds itself and becomes slowly conscious of its immense strength and of the devotion of its citizen-soldiers. It was the first two generations after the establishment of democracy which adorned the grave of the men who had died at the Euripos with a modest epigram of two lines,[191] which instituted a hero cult for the dead of Marathon inscribing their names on a stele at the grave,[192] and which set up a victory monument in the city for the men who had saved their town from destruction, again originally only in two lines, though they soon added a second epigram; it was the men of these generations who honoured the first generals because they had reported a resounding victory with the united troops of the new league, and who finally about 465/4 B.C. decreed a public burial in the Kerameikos for all citizens (and not only citizens) who had given their lives for Athens.

The authors of all these poems are unknown to us and were unknown to Antiquity, and I think we had better refrain from seeking after the name of the Eion poet, who probably was an Ionian, and perhaps a client of Kimon.[193] After the interpreation

---

[190] Loewy, pp. 25 f., asks an even more curious question: " wer konnte sich durch dieses epigramm einer Herme geehrt fühlen, wer es als lohn für seine verdienste ansehen? "

[191] Above, pp. 159 f., 177.

[192] Above, p. 177.

[193] If it was Ion of Chios, he contrasts favourably with his Samian namesake, who some seventy years later fulsomely praised Lysandros and other Spartan officers. But this suggestion of Kirchhoff is not at all a plausible one. It rests entirely on the wrong dating of the occupation of Eion in Ol. 77 (472/69). Ion came to Athens παντάπασιν μειράκιον (Plutarch, Kimon, 9, 1) and was invited to a dinner at which Kimon told an anecdote about a στρατήγημα τῶν ἰδίων ὡς σοφώτατον, concerning the distribution of the booty ἐκ Σηστοῦ καὶ Βυζαντίου. Apart from the question what that means, the story of the dinner is " ganz zeitlos überliefert " (Beloch, Gr. G.², II, 2, p. 187). It does not follow from the comparison which the guests make between Kimon and Themistokles that the latter was not yet banished (or rather ostracised). The terminus ante is 461/0 B.C., and we must assume not too short an interval between the event (whatever it was) and the dinner at which Kimon reviews his career as a general. I should say that the dinner took place between 475 and 465, and probably nearer to the latter year. That suits the few dates which we have for Ion quite well, but it seems most improbable that " the very young lad " was chosen by Kimon to furnish him and his colleagues with the inscription for a rather important public monument. There is nothing in the poem which recommends Ion, even if the objection of Wilamowitz (" Ion der freund des

of his poem I do not think it necessary to attempt a general assessment of its value, defending it against some ill-considered sneers. The poem, if compared with most " patriotic " poetry, is in my opinion a good one, provided that one reads what the poet wrote and not what Leptines made of it.[194] To this primary question I do not return: as I believe the restored poem has stood the test, I feel confident that the suggestion about Leptines tampering slightly with the original inscription is at least plausible, though personally I think even better of it. In any case, the fact remains that we have to choose between a perhaps brilliant hypothesis which for all its brilliancy is conspicuous by a hardly conceivable amount of disregard for and misstatement of the evidence, partly rebuilding the Athenian Agora and evolving from the " inner consciousness " a monument for Kimon which is historically and archaeologically (to put it mildly) a rather curious one; and on the other hand a simple critical operation of a nature not unusual in the tradition of stone-epigrams, an operation which is easily explained by the purpose of the man who introduced the epigram into literature. Personally I infinitely prefer the simple way of restoring the work of the poet. But perhaps I am biased, or—*crassa Minerva mihi 'st.*

F. Jacoby

Oxford University

abstrusen ") is of little value. The vague guesses of Bergk, *P.L.G.*[4], III, pp. 518 f.—Melanthios, Archelaos (see Plutarch, *Kimon*, 4), " rhapsodus aliquis ex Ionia oriundus velut Stesimbrotus Thasius "—are mere guesses. Kirchhoff and Bergk have both rejected Simonides: the chronological argument is valueless, as Simonides reported a victory at Athens in 477/6 b.c.; the stylistic argument is weak, as we know next to nothing of his epigrammatic style. From the dialect Kirchhoff has established the fact that the poet was an Ionian, though I would not dare to introduce a typically Ionian πρῆγμα into a poem destined to be engraved on a public monument. But the fact hardly helps to decide the question which we have said to be not decidable for us, whether the honour was granted or demanded—in any case a somewhat narrow alternative (see note 187). In the first case the Boule (or whoever controlled public inscriptions) may have commanded the epigram, but one may well imagine that the motion was accompanied by a copy of the contemplated inscription. If the generals were permitted to set up Herms and left a free hand, Kimon in agreement with his brother generals will have commanded the poem from a poet personally known to him. In any case, a dedication meant an inscription, and, apart from the uniqueness of the Eion case, we do not know whether there was anything like a censorship at Athens for inscriptions on votive offerings.

[194] It is short, well-poised, and to the point, and, as to its concept, it is surely not inferior to the Cyprus poem and most of the Kerameikos epitaphs. The language is simple and clear, never high-flown and never clumsy. The paraphrase of Homer is distinctly good, and the epithets are well-chosen: κρυερός is opposite to αἴθων and does not justify the assumption that the siege lasted into the winter (see Beloch, *Gr. Gesch.*[2], II, 2, p. 183). I am rather astonished how severe the critics are against the poet: Kirchhoff, p. 56, characterizes his poem " als die arbeit eines ziemlich mittelmässigen kopfes oder eines noch sehr jugendlichen anfängers "; R. Reitzenstein, *Epigramm und Skolion* (1893), p. 113, note 1 and Ed. Meyer, *Forsch.*, II (1899), pp. 12 f. are altogether scornful. Perhaps Wilamowitz comes nearest the truth: " Die gedichte [i. e., the Eion poem] . . . sind . . . ein unverächtliches denkmal der attischen poesie jener zeit, wenn sie auch kein grosser dichter gemacht hat. . . ." But it is not Attic, and I do not think that he did justice to the achievement of the poet.