

AN ARCHAIC INSCRIPTION FROM ATTICA

(PLATES 39–40)

IN June, 1939, Miss L. H. Jeffery discovered an archaic poros inscription outside a stable in southwest Attica, “about half-way between Anavysos and Phoinike.” Since there was no vehicle available at the time to transport the stone to Athens, a transcription and squeeze were made and the inscription was photographed and measured on the spot. Miss Jeffery subsequently published the photographs and a study of the inscription based on her field observations.¹ But the stone itself was not recovered, for a decade of war intervened and during that time the inscription was moved from the place where Miss Jeffery saw it.

A number of questions arose regarding the inscription in the years that followed its first publication, some of which could not be answered in the absence of the stone. Suggested restorations, for example, could not be tested except by recourse to a photograph. Even Miss Jeffery has recently had second thoughts concerning what letters can actually be read.² There was also the problem of how it was displayed, since a boustrophedon inscription occurs on one narrow face and a list of names on a wide face.

The inscription was rediscovered by the authors on March 6, 1968. It was lying once again outside a stable, but this time to the south of the modern village of Anavyssos near the Church of Aghios Georgios, about four or five kilometers from the spot where it had originally been seen. The man who lived in the house near by said that the stone had been in a load of top soil that he had brought years ago from “someplace else.” The inscription had been broken into two parts during its years of drifting. Fortunately, the greatest damage was done to areas in which the letters appear very clearly in the photographs published by Miss Jeffery. The inscription was removed to the Ephoria in Athens where it was mended by Spyros Spyropoulos of the Agora staff.

A republication of the two inscribed faces of the monument seems desirable since there has been an opportunity to examine the stone closely and at some length. The drawings on Plate 40 represent all the lines on the stone that, in our view, belong to letters.

¹ “A Sixth-Century Poros Inscription from Attica,” *B.S.A.*, XXXIX, 1938-1939, pp. 90-93. Cf. *S.E.G.*, X, 326. We are grateful to Professors Benjamin D. Meritt and Eugene Vanderpool for many helpful suggestions.

² “The Inscribed Gravestones of Attica,” *B.S.A.*, LVII, 1962, p. 143. Cf. *S.E.G.*, XXI, 147.

DESCRIPTION ³

The poros block is approximately rectangular and is inscribed on two adjacent faces (Pl. 39, a), the narrower of which, following Miss Jeffery's designations, will be referred to as Face A (Pl. 39, b) and the wider as Face B (Pl. 39, c). The letters were deeply cut. The two faces opposite the inscribed faces were as smoothly finished as those bearing the inscriptions. The stone was pitted and the edges worn smooth by the time of its discovery in 1939, and it has suffered considerably since then. The jagged break is near the middle of the stone and two letters that were visible earlier on Face A (ΟΣ) have entirely disappeared. Three letters in lines 1, 3, and 4 on Face B were damaged by the break but none was obliterated. Both inscribed faces were covered with whitewash at some time during the 19 years of its wandering. Much of the whitewash has now worn away, but the patches remaining have proved to be very resistant to attempts at cleaning. The right side of Face A is badly damaged and many of the letters at the left edge of Face B have disappeared.

MEASUREMENTS ⁴

Face A (Pl. 39, b) : H. 0.185-0.19 m. Face B (Pl. 39, c) : Max. W. 0.64 (0.62) m.⁵ H. 0.392-0.409 m.

| | FACE A | FACE B |
|--------------------------------|----------------|----------------|
| H. of letters | 0.04-0.062 m. | 0.034-0.078 m. |
| W. of letters (excluding iota) | 0.026-0.053 m. | 0.026-0.055 m. |
| Space between letters | 0.006-0.016 m. | 0.007-0.02 m. |
| Space between lines | 0.03-0.053 m. | 0.007-0.021 m. |

READINGS

Face A (Pl. 40) : boustrophedon

Ἰόνιχος Μάνι[δο] →
[ς] ἡ[ι]δρύσατο ←

Face B (Pl. 40) :

ἡερακλείδες
ἄρχοντες
[Ἀρί]σταρχος
Δεμοκλῆς
[Σ]πινθέρ
[Εὔ]τυχος

³ The excellent photographs of the stone published in the *editio princeps* (pl. 29) should also be consulted for this study. The new photographs published here were taken by Mr. Eugene Vanderpool, Jr.

⁴ The following represent maximum and minimum measurements.

⁵ The 2 cm. difference between the present width and that recorded by Miss Jeffery in 1939 (p. 90) can be accounted for by the repair of the break. The lower measurement, of course, is the more meaningful.

COMMENTARY

Miss Jeffery has shown that the inscriptions date to about the middle of the 6th century B.C.⁶

Face A. The restoration involves the length of Face A and is based on the following considerations.

The small "ends" of the block (i.e., the left and right ends from the inscribed faces) are rather more battered than the other faces, but the end to the left of Face B, at any rate, seems originally to have been cut and not merely broken. We can be sure that Face B was inscribed after the block was cut to its present (approximate) size. The beginnings of all lines, except (apparently) the first, at the left edge of the stone and the end of line 1 at the right edge, with large blank spaces between the right edge and the last letters of lines 2-6, would be most improbable coincidences if the stone had been cut or broken on *both* ends after Face B was inscribed.

The name Ionichos, which, as Miss Jeffery pointed out, is known in Attica and elsewhere, begins on Face A near the edge of the stone (corresponding to the right side of Face B; see Pl. 39, a). To restore an omicron before the iota, as Miss Jeffery does, in order to make the name Oionichos is an unnecessary prosopographical hypothesis and requires another unlikely (though admittedly possible) coincidence: that the break carried away one letter of a name, leaving behind another, no less acceptable name to confuse us. To restore more than omicron, and lengthen Face A further, would require either an inordinate amount of blank space on Face B, or another list of names and, thereby, a multiplication of hypotheses. But if Face A *was* much longer, it is very likely that the boustrophedon inscription would have been spaced in such a way that more letters would have been placed in the second line than is the case.

We should note here also that the two inscriptions cannot be far apart in date, to judge from letter-forms. Indeed, there is enough similarity to suppose a single hand at work on both inscriptions.⁷ The likelihood is that both inscriptions are contemporary and were no longer than the present size of the block indicates.

The genitive patronymic Μάνιδος would derive from a nominative Μάνις, a name that appears in an Erechtheion building inscription (*I.G.*, I², 373, line 150).⁸ Μανίας is also a possible nominative, but the only example of the name as a masculine nominative in an inscription involves a restoration, [Μ]ανίας.⁹ Two other examples of Manias

⁶ *B.S.A.*, XXXIX, 1938-1939, p. 91; LVII, 1962, p. 143.

⁷ The most noticeable difference involves the size of the omicron. Examples are of small size on Face B and large on Face A (Pl. 40).

⁸ We are indebted to Professor Meritt for several observations regarding Μάνις, Μανίας and related names. Cf. W. Pape (G. Benseler), *Wörterbuch der griechischen Eigennamen*, s.v. Μάνις.

⁹ Athenian Agora I 6144; Meritt, *Hesperia*, XXXIII, 1964, p. 170, No. 24, where [Φ]ανίας is also given as a possible reading.

in Attic inscriptions are *I.G.*, II², 10892, where it is a feminine genitive, and perhaps in W. Peek, *Ath. Mitt.*, LXVII, 1942, p. 117, No. 240. The latter involves the restoration Μαν[ία]s and may also be a feminine genitive.¹⁰

It is interesting to note in connection with our restoration of the genitive Μάνιδος that Miss Jeffery detected traces of a sigma before the *heta*, though she later suggested that it could have been an iota.¹¹ We were unable to see any letter(s) before *heta*. In any case, if our conclusions about the size of the block and the relative dates of the inscription are correct, her μᾶν[έθεκε | κα]ί cannot be restored without substantially reducing the size of (only) the missing letters and crowding them closely together.¹² The proposed restoration will fit the space.

Face B. The first letter of line 1 begins 0.171 m. from the left edge of the block, but all the other lines (as restored) begin *ca.* 0.02 m. from the edge. Miss Jeffery suggested that the space in line 1 might have contained a short name such as Ion or the final letters of a longer word.¹³ If the inscription is complete, as we believe, the latter alternative becomes impossible, but a short name (and Ion would fit into the space) could be restored. The stone is badly worn here and no definite trace of any letter could be found. Another possibility is that Herakleides was the only word in the line and was indented to set off the name from the heading and list in lines 2-6.

The reading ἄρχοντες in line 2 has been suggested by Miss Jeffery as a possibility in her reconsideration of the inscription in 1962. Our new examination of the stone has confirmed the reading. Miss Jeffery also transferred her support from (X)σενοκλῆς to Δεμοκλῆς in line 4, which reading is now definite.

No new Attic examples of the unusual name Spinther have appeared, but a related form, Σπίνθαρος, is found in an Athenian bouleutai list of the 320's B.C.¹⁴ It is of some interest that a Demokles appears in line 138 of the same inscription. Another Spintharos, father of Phalanthos, is known in the 6th century B.C.,¹⁵ and Spinther, or Spintharas, is the name of an Argive who died at Tanagra in 458 B.C.¹⁶

¹⁰ Cf. Pape, *op. cit.*, s.v. Μανία,—ίας.

¹¹ *B.S.A.*, LVII, 1962, p. 143. The deep grooves above the *heta* and restored iota (Pl. 39, b) are stone damage.

¹² Miss Jeffery realized that the crowding would be extreme and suggested in her article of 1962 that Μαν— might, after all, be a genitive patronymic. We would add that the letter following nu is not epsilon, but iota.

¹³ *Ibid.* The vertical line so noticeable to the left of the *heta* in our Pl. 39, a, is a later scratch that continues around the edge of the block to Face A.

¹⁴ S. Charitonides, "The First Half of a Bouleutai List of the Fourth Century B.C.," *Hesperia*, XXX, 1961, p. 32, line 102.

¹⁵ E. Vanderpool, "Some Ostraka from the Athenian Agora," *Hesperia*, Supplement VIII, p. 402, No. 15. Vanderpool refers to two other men of that name in the 5th century B.C.: *I.G.*, I², 928, line 76; 950, line 102.

¹⁶ Cf. *S.E.G.*, X, 407, line 12.

ARCHONS τῶν γενῶν

An inscription of the 6th century B.C. recording the names of four archons can hardly be a list of locals who held that office in Athens. Attic demarchs, apparently, were sometimes referred to in inscriptions simply as archons. Such a substitution of titles seems to be the case in an inscription of the 5th century B.C. from Rhamnous.¹⁷ Demarch, however, seems to have been the customary title and a number of examples are known.¹⁸ The office of archon without descriptive prefix also existed in Attica for other organizations, such as the Mesogeioi (*I.G.*, II², 1244, line 6; 1245, lines 31-33; 1247, lines 28-29; 1248, line 3), and for the γένη. Probably there were archons for all the Attic γένη, but there are few mentions of them in extant inscriptions. Those of the Kerykes and Eumolpidai are referred to in *I.G.*, II², 1235, lines 19-20, 24 and 1236, line 19. Archons of the Salaminioi are known from two inscriptions from the Athenian Agora (Agora I 3244 and 3394).¹⁹

The brilliant discussion of the Salaminioi by William S. Ferguson included the hypothesis that the Salaminioi existed in two branches even before the reforms of Kleisthenes.²⁰ His arguments are persuasive, but supporting literary or epigraphical evidence has been lacking. The two inscriptions that served as the basis of his study both date to the 4th century B.C. One of the archons of the Salaminioi named in the first of the two inscriptions cited above (line 77) is Ἀρίσταρχος Δημοκλέους Ἀχαρ[νεύς]. There is far too little evidence for us to suggest that the 4th century Aristarchos and his father Demokles are related to two of our archons, especially since both names are relatively common in Attic prosopography. But considering the few names that can be assigned to the officials of any of the Attic γένη, the remarkable collocation on the new inscription of two names known to be prominent among the Heptaphylai of the Salaminioi deserves notice.

DISPLAY OF THE MONUMENT

There is no cutting on the block nor any weathering line to give a clue to the manner of display. The block does have a slight taper, so that Face B (Pl. 39, c) increases in height from left to right (the height is 0.392 m. at left; 0.403 m. just to right of break; 0.409 m. at right). The taper suggests that the block was set up in a base so that Face B was read from top to bottom and the boustrophedon inscription on

¹⁷ Jean Pouilloux, *La forteresse de Rhamnonte*, Paris, 1954, p. 147, No. 35 (*S.E.G.*, X, 210). The officials are demarchs in lines 1-3 and 32-33, but archons in lines 15-16, 20-21, 27-28.

¹⁸ Cf. Georg Busolt, *Griechische Staatskunde (Handbuch der Altertumswissenschaft)*, Munich, 1926, pp. 966-969.

¹⁹ William S. Ferguson, "The Salaminioi of Heptaphylai and Sounion," *Hesperia*, VII, 1938, pp. 1-74 (esp. pp. 42-47) with an "Additional Note on the Identification of the Property of the Salaminians at Sounion," by Homer A. Thompson, pp. 75-76.

²⁰ On the Salaminioi, cf. also John Howard Young, "Studies in South Attica, The Salaminioi at Porthmos," *Hesperia*, X, 1941, pp. 163-191.

Face A was read first up, then down. Such a display would present no great difficulty in reading, and another archaic, rectangular stele with three of its faces inscribed in boustrophedon offers an analogy, as Miss Jeffery observed.²¹

The taper is slight and may be meaningless. On the other hand, the block could not have been bedded on the face opposite Face A; the last name on Face B is carved too near the "bottom" for placement in any type of base. The other broad face, too, would be impossible as a resting surface. Only the two small ends are left as possible bottoms and the taper suggests, at least, that the one at the right of Face B is a more likely candidate. Its relatively battered appearance could be the result of its having been broken off from the part of the stone that had been set into a cutting in a base.

SUMMARY

The stele was erected about the middle of the sixth century by Ionichos, the son of Manis. It was set up to honor at least four men, presumably all from one locale, who had served as archons. The men honored had perhaps been archons of a *γένος*. Two of the names listed are the same as those of two men prominent among the Salaminioi nearly two centuries later. The name of another man, Herakleides, appears on the same face, but is distinctly set off from the heading and the list of names. He may be the official responsible for the carrying out of the decision to honor the other four men, or may even be one of the honorees, but not an archon (a priest of the *γένος*?).

JAMES WISEMAN
JOSEPH W. SHAW

UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS
AT AUSTIN
AMERICAN SCHOOL OF CLASSICAL STUDIES
ATHENS

²¹ *B.S.A.*, XXXIX, 1938-1939, pp. 92-93. On the inscription referred to, see A. E. Raubitschek, *Dedications from the Athenian Akropolis*, Cambridge, Massachusetts, 1949, pp. 353-356, No. 327.



a. S.E.G., X, 326



b. Face A



c. Face B

