# ATHENIAN AGORA INSCRIPTIONS CUT BY ONE MASON 

(Plate 61)

$T$HE fragments of inscriptions from the Athenian Agora here presented, with the exception of the last (No. 55), were cut by a mason whose dated work in Athens ranges from 106 to 96 b.c. They came to my attention during a search for examples of his work among the inscriptions stored in the basement of the Stoa of Attalos. In addition to the fragments discussed below (Nos. 51-54), ${ }^{1}$ I record here the other fragments from the Agora which may be assigned to him:

| Inventory Number | Publication |
| :---: | :---: |
| I 1773a | Sterling Dow, Prytaneis $=$ Hesperia , Suppl. I, pp. 161-162, No. 95 |
| I 1773b |  |
| I 1773c |  |
| I 4176 | Hesperia, XXVI, 1957, pp. 25-28, |
| I 6169 | including also I.G., $\mathrm{II}^{2}, 989$ |
| I 6171 |  |
| I 6648 |  |
| I 2945 | Hesperia, XXXVI, 1967, p. 235, No. 45 |
| I 5919 | Hesperia, XXXIII, 1964, pp. 193- |

A study of the work of this mason is now in progress. This article is intended as a preliminary report of the work in relation to the Agora fragments.

51 (Plate 61). Two fragments of Pentelic marble, of which fragment $a$ (I 3871a), broken on all sides, was found on March 27, 1936, in a late Roman context in a well on Kolonos Agoraios (C 12). Fragment $b$ is made up of two pieces, the upper of which (I 4026) was found on April 18, 1936, in a late Roman context west of the Stoa of Attalos (P8), and the lower of which (I 3871b) was found on April 27, 1936, in the same area and in a similar context. Fragment $b$ preserves the right side.

Although the two fragments do not join, the identical character of the lettering

[^0]and quality of the marble suggest, but do not prove, that they belong to the same stele. The " find data" somewhat discourage the identification. The fact that the height of the letters is identical in both proves little since nearly all public decrees inscribed by this mason have letters which are $c a .0 .007 \mathrm{~m}$. high. The first ten lines of fragment $a$ measure 0.1 m . vertically from the top of line 1 to the top of line 11 ; by contrast, the vertical distance in fragment $b$ from the top of line 20 to the top of line 30 measures 0.106 m . This provides a mechanical ground for doubting that the fragments can be aligned horizontally but is no basis for denying the possibility of their being from the same stele, for vertical disparities of a similar magnitude occur in different parts of I.G., $\mathrm{II}^{2}, 1028$, a large ephebic inscription cut by this mason. Since there is no compelling internal textual evidence which supports the identification, it seems preferable to treat the fragments separately and leave it an open question whether they belong to the same stele.

Fragment $a$ : height, 0.165 m. ; width, 0.125 m . ; thickness, 0.06 m . Height of letters, 0.007 m . Inv. No. I 3871a.
fin. saec. II $a . \quad$ NON-ETOIX.
uncertain number of lines missing

|  | $-------\beta] \epsilon \lambda \tau \iota \sigma \tau \eta[--------]$ |
| :---: | :---: |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
| 5 | [-------] $\dot{v} \pi \eta \rho \gamma \mu \dot{\nu} \nu \eta \dot{v} \phi^{\prime} \dot{\epsilon}[-------]$ |
|  | [--------] $\eta$ кє $\boldsymbol{\nu}$ тô̂s $\tau \in \nu$ [- |
|  | [---------] $\tau \grave{\alpha}$ кала̀ $\tau \grave{\partial} \nu$ [-------] |
|  |  |
|  | [---------] oi $\pi \in \rho \stackrel{\text { o }}{\sigma \chi \text { о }}$ [--------] |
| 10 |  |
|  | [-----------] $\nu \pi \rho$ ò $\nu$ o $\mu$ [-------] |
|  | [------------] $\pi \alpha \theta \epsilon i \nu \nu$ [------] |
|  | [------------]ovaıє[------] |
|  | ---------- $\left.{ }^{\text {a }}\right] \gamma \alpha \theta[\hat{\eta} \iota \tau$ v́x $\quad$ ı---- $]$ |
| 15 | --------]! [--------] |
|  | uncertain number of lines missing |

The subject matter is uncertain, but lines 3,10 , and 14 seem to reflect the language of a decree honoring some person or persons for services rendered throughout the year.

Fragment $b$ : height, 0.222 m . ; width, 0.055 m ; thickness, 0.07 m . Height of letters, 0.007 m .
Inv. Nos. I $4026+3871 \mathrm{~b}$.
fin. saec. II $a$.
NON-ETOIX.
uncertain number of lines missing

uncertain number of lines missing
Gold or a gold crown may be mentioned in line 17, but the remains are too scanty for any certain restorations.

52 (Plate 61). This fragment (I 717), first published in Hesperia, XV, 1946, pp. 225-226, No. 53, joins the register of names in I.G., $\mathrm{II}^{2}, 1028$, and with improved readings gives the names of the epheboi of the archonship of Echekrates (102/1) in lines 109-113 of Col. I in that inscription. The epheboi were praised in the archonship of Medeios (101/0) :

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \Sigma \omega \tau a[---------------] \\
& { }^{`} \mathrm{H} \lambda \iota o ́ \delta \omega[\rho o s----------] \\
& 110 \text { Novนท́ขıo[s-------------- }]
\end{aligned}
$$

 $[\mathrm{K} \lambda] \epsilon \operatorname{có}^{\rho} \rho a \tau[\mathrm{o}] \mathrm{s} \Delta \iota o v v \sigma i o[v \Lambda a \mu] \pi \tau \rho \epsilon v^{\prime} \mathrm{s}$

Line 108. The reading of tau in place of the phi of the original publication is
 the eligible names in Attic prosopography.

Line 112. The reading of the undotted tau for the sigma of the earlier edition is based on a horizontal stroke plus a serif located under the middle of the horizontal, correctly positioned for a serif at the bottom of a vertical stroke. The letter could not be sigma, for this mason cut sigmas with slanting top and bottom strokes. The homonymous Klearatos of I.G., $\mathrm{II}^{2}, 1711$ (P.A., 8468) is doubtless a relative.
53 (Plate 61). Fragment of Pentelic marble, broken on all sides, found in a modern context north of the Odeion (L 8) on March 20, 1936.

Height, 0.05 m .; width, 0.077 m . ; thickness, 0.045 m .
Height of letters, 0.007 m .
Inv. No. I 3810.
This fragment also joins I.G., $\mathrm{II}^{2}, 1028$, at line 154 of Col. II, which may be revised to read:

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { wreath }
\end{aligned}
$$

$\tau \eta \nu]$
wureath

The new fragment enables the determination that the word $\dot{a} \phi \dot{\epsilon} \tau \eta \nu$ was inscribed on two lines and not centered over the crown in line 155 as the Corpus has it.

54 (Plate 61). Fragment of a stele of Pentelic marble, broken on all sides, found in a late wall southeast of the Market Square, west of the Panathenaic Way (Q-S 1720), on January 9, 1938. This belongs to the long important list of offerings for the Delian Pythais, I.G., $\mathrm{II}^{2}, 2336 .^{2}$

Height, 0.117 m ; width, 0.172 m .; thickness, 0.122 m .
Height of letters, $c a .0 .008 \mathrm{~m}$.
Inv. No. I 5045.
${ }^{2}$ This text has been republished by Sterling Dow in Harv. Stud. Cl. Phil., LI, 1940, pp. 111124. References here throughout and in the following number (No. 55) are to Dow's edition and to his numbering of the lines.

The fragment was recognized by me and joined to the main stele, where it comprises parts of lines 78-86. These may now be read as follows:

$$
a .102 / 1 a .
$$

## NON-ETOIX.

|  <br>  |
| :---: |
|  |  |

$80 \mathrm{~K} a \lambda \lambda i ́[a s]{ }^{v v}{ }^{\text {' }} \mathrm{A} \theta \mu \rho \boldsymbol{\varphi}$ [ $\epsilon$ '́s $i \in \rho \epsilon \overline{\mathrm{v}} \mathrm{s} \Delta \omega\left[\nu v{ }^{\prime}\right] \sigma o v \Theta \epsilon o ́ \delta o \tau[o s----$
 $\mathrm{H}]$ [ ${ }^{\square}$



Line 78. A very small segment of a horizontal stroke, which is distinct from omega, appears at the edge of the break and is the basis for the dotted epsilon. The presence of the demotic here indicates that the entries in line 77 . were rather lengthy.

The organization of line 78, viz., that it is divided between two separate entries, is unparalleled in the other parts of this stele which are inscribed by this mason (Dow's Hand B), but the probable reading of the demotic here and the spacing of line 79 virtually assure it.

Line 79. Two rather worn marks appear here on the stele and were read by Dow as dotted alpha and gamma. The unexpectedly large interlinear space between lines 79 and 80 on the new fragment now shows that they are too low to be parts of letters in this line; therefore, the tentative restoration $\dot{\alpha} \gamma \boldsymbol{\gamma}$ [o $\rho$ avó $\mu o \iota$ ? - -] is to be rejected. The appearance in these lines of the official $\dot{\delta} \dot{\epsilon} \pi i \grave{\imath} \tau \grave{\eta} \nu \delta \eta \mu \sigma \sigma i a \nu \tau \rho a ́ \pi \epsilon \zeta \alpha \nu \tau \eta े \nu$ $\dot{\epsilon} \nu \Delta \dot{\eta} \lambda \omega \iota$ invalidates Dow's restoration of it in line 64. By the process of elimination one may now restore there with certainty [iepev̀s 'A $\pi o ́ \lambda \lambda \omega \nu o s] ~ \dot{\epsilon} \nu \Delta \hat{\eta} \lambda \omega \omega$.

Line 80. Kallias of Athmonon is unknown elsewhere.

 $\dot{\epsilon} \nu \iota a v \tau \hat{\omega} \iota-] ~(I n s c$. Délos, 1886). The gamma is dotted because only the serif and a small part of the vertical stroke remain.

Line 83. The omega is printed in pointed brackets, for the letter is incomplete. The mason omitted the left horizontal; compare the omega in the line above.

Lines 85-86. Despite the aid of the new fragment the names elude us. The restoration of the demotic in line 86 is based on the clear reading of gamma, for the stone extends down sufficiently to reveal a middle horizontal if the letter were epsilon.

What appears in the photograph as a middle horizontal in the second (dotted) gamma is, in reality, a shadow cast by a break in the stone.
55 (Plate 61). Fragment of Pentelic marble, broken on all sides, found in a late wall southeast of the Market Square, west of the Panathenaic Way (Q-S 17-20), on January 5, 1938.

Height, 0.152 m . ; width, 0.171 m .; thickness, 0.101 m .
Height of letters, 0.007 m . (line 231) and 0.01 m . (lines 232-236).
Inv. No. I 5044.
This fragment and its join with I.G., $\mathrm{II}^{2}, 2336$, in lines 230-237, were called to my attention by B. D. Meritt (per litteras). The variation in letter-size is at least partly the result of a change in workman. Neither of the hands which appear in this fragment is identical with that of the mason who inscribed the preceding fragment (No. 54). Dow's text clearly indicates the frequent change of hand in this inscription.


Line 230. The lower part of a slanting stroke with serif, which is located above the omega of line 231, is the ground for the dotted mu.

Line 231. Dow's undotted pi (dotted tau in the present text) seems incorrect. The remains of the letter present difficulties: at the top of the letter-space there appears part of a horizontal; it is met, in turn, by two slanting strokes coming from below which form an apex at the point where they meet the horizontal. Of the latter, the right slants out until it meets the side of the omikron and is, I think, a mis-stroke made by the mason while inscribing the omikron. The left does not conform to the shape of pi, since it is slanting. If it is a letter-stroke rather than a mark at the edge of the break it could be a serif. In any case, the horizontal is clear, and the vertical strokes which were interpreted as part of pi do not conform to the shape of pi or any other letter. The dotted tau is, therefore, read on the basis of the horizontal. [ $\Lambda] \epsilon \epsilon^{-}-$


Line 233. The alpha is crowded in between rho and tau, indicating that the

 (cf. Insc. Délos, 1878).

Line 235. No priest of Apollo on Delos $\dot{\epsilon} \xi$ Ő̌ov is attested elsewhere. Dow read the last letter of this line as undotted sigma on the basis of the clear slanting stroke at the edge of the break at this point on the stele. Since the mason of these lines inscribed sigmas with parallel top and bottom strokes the letter cannot be sigma. Upsilon is the only letter possible.

Line 237. Just at the line of break a horizontal stroke appears, under the omega and nu of $\tau \hat{\omega} \nu$ in line 236. This is the basis for the dotted tau. On the authority of Insc. Délos, 1878, it is possible to restore this and the following name.
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[^0]:    ${ }^{1}$ The numbering of the Agora fragments here follows in continuation after that of the preceding article by Meritt.

