

# GREEK INSCRIPTIONS

## TRAGEDIES PRESENTED AT THE LENAIA OF 364/3 B.C.

(PLATE 62)

THE Διδασκαλῖαι, the inscribed lists of plays performed at the City Dionysia and Lenaia, are an important source of information concerning the Attic theater; preserving as they do the names of poets, plays, and leading actors in yearly entries, they are particularly useful when literary sources fail.<sup>1</sup> A new fragment of this interesting series has recently come to light in the excavations of the Athenian Agora.<sup>2</sup>

8 (Plate 62, a). Fragment of Hymettian marble, broken all around and at the back, found on June 18, 1970, built into a modern cellar wall on the north slope of the Areopagus (P 20-21).

Height, 0.16 m.; width, 0.15 m.; preserved thickness, 0.105 m.

Height of letters, 0.004-0.008 m.

Inv. No. I 7151

	[ὕπε:] Ἡφαι[στίων]	NON-ΣΤΟΙΧ.
	[Νι]κόμαχος [τρί:]	
	Ἀμνμώνη T [— —]	
	<u>ὕπε</u>	
	<u>ὑπο:</u> Ἡφαιστίω[ν ἐνίκα]	5
	ἐπὶ Τιμοκράτου[ς — — —]	a. 364/3 a.
[— —]ι	Ὀινοπίωνι Ἑκα[— —]	
[— —]ις	ὕπε: Ἀρηξίς	
	Θεοδωρίδης δεύ:	
	Μηδείαι Φαέθοντ[ι]	10
[— —]νος	ὕπε: Ἀνδροσθέ[νης]	
	Κλεαίνετος τ[ρί:]	
	Ἵψιπύλῃ Φ[— —]	

<sup>1</sup> *I.G.*, II<sup>2</sup>, 2319-2323. A. Pickard-Cambridge (revised by J. Gould and D. M. Lewis), *The Dramatic Festivals of Athens*<sup>2</sup>, 1968, pp. 25-42, 72-73, 107-111, for the most recent comprehensive discussions of both the Lenaia and the Διδασκαλῖαι.

<sup>2</sup> I am indebted to Professor T. L. Shear, Jr., Director of the Agora Excavations, for his guidance as well as permission to work on the stone. I have profited from discussions with Professors R. Stroud, B. D. Meritt, A. Boegehold, and D. M. Lewis, as well as from correspondence with Professor B. Snell; I am grateful to all of them for their help. I am indebted to Eugene Vanderpool, Jr. for the photograph of I 7151.

	$\overline{\upsilon\pi\epsilon}$ : Ἱππαρ[χος]	
[- -]στημι	$\overline{\upsilon\pi\omicron}$ : Ἀρηξ[ις ἐνίκα]	15
[- - -]ιαι	$\overline{\epsilon\pi\iota}$ Χαρικ[λείδου - - -]	a. 363/2 a.

## EPIGRAPHICAL COMMENTARY

The ends of the words in the column to the left are too fragmentary to permit restoration.<sup>3</sup>

Line 1: Hephaistion is restored on the basis of line 5.

Line 2: Nikomachos seems virtually certain. The lower part of the K is visible, and though the inscription is non-stoichedon, the beginnings of the lines are carefully aligned, permitting only two or even one and a half letters before the K. Almost certainly, the notation [τρί:] appeared to the right of the name.<sup>4</sup>

Line 4: For some reason not readily apparent, the name here has been omitted.

Line 7: Ἑκα[- -] should perhaps be restored Ἑκάβη, though other restorations are possible.<sup>5</sup>

Line 16: Charikleides follows Timokrates in the archon lists and can be restored with certainty.

The surface and lettering of the stone are very fresh. The lettering is similar to that of the other fragments of the *Διδασκαλῖαι* and is consistent with a date in the early third century B.C.; Reisch suggested long ago that the *Διδασκαλῖαι* were drawn up and inscribed on the inner walls of a building dedicated by the agonothetes in the year 279/8 B.C.<sup>6</sup> Though the exact location of this building is unknown, most of the inscribed fragments were found on the south slopes of the acropolis, and it must surely have stood in the vicinity of the theater of Dionysos.

Although this new fragment does not join, the formula, which varies from list to list, would seem to indicate that it is part of the same series as *I.G.*, II<sup>2</sup>, 2319, the list of tragedies performed at the City Lenaia.<sup>7</sup> Dated by the archon Timokrates, it preserves the complete entry for the year 364/3 B.C. and parts of both the pre-

<sup>3</sup> I am at a loss to explain the ends of the words to the left of lines 15 and 16 if, as seems likely, the last three letters of line 16 are *ιαι*. Line 15 quite clearly is the dative ending of the title of a play and one would expect the following line to contain the name of an actor in the nominative, not another dative. Perhaps the easiest and most reasonable explanation is to assume that the two plays entered here had exceptionally long titles and required two lines. I am indebted to Professor B. Snell for his suggestions on this problem.

<sup>4</sup> It is possible, though unlikely, that only two poets competed in 365/4 B.C., in which case one would expect the notation *δεύ*.

<sup>5</sup> Ἑκάλη, Ἑκάτη, or some compound beginning with *εκατόν*. If Ἑκάβη is to be restored, then perhaps the play is to be associated with fragment no. 30 in D. L. Page, *Greek Literary Papyri*, 1950, pp. 162-167.

<sup>6</sup> E. Reisch, "Urkunden dramatischer Aufführungen in Athen," *Zeits. öst. Gymnasien*, LVIII, 1907, pp. 289-315. See also A. Wilhelm, *Urkunden dramatischer Aufführungen in Athen*, Vienna, 1906, pp. 89-116. The dedicatory inscription used is *I.G.*, II<sup>2</sup>, 2853.

<sup>7</sup> Regrettably *I.G.*, II<sup>2</sup>, 2319, column II, has been lost since publication.

ceding and following years, listing the poets in order of success, the plays, and the protagonists. The yearly entry is followed by a separate entry recording the winning actor.

The name of the winning poet, now missing, was originally inscribed on the same line as that of the archon.<sup>8</sup> The names of the poets finishing second and third are designated by the notation *δεύ* and *τρί* respectively. The name of each poet is followed by the titles of the two plays he entered.<sup>9</sup> This in turn is followed by the notation *ὑπε* (*ὑπεκρίνετο*) and the name of the protagonist. At the end of the yearly entry the winning actor is recorded, preceded by the abbreviation *ὑπο* (*ὑποκριτής*).

The entry of 364/3 B.C. is of interest in that three poets competed, whereas in the years 420/19 and 419/8 only two poets entered. It would appear that there was a change in policy between 418 and 364, but not enough of either list is preserved to preclude the possibility of some sort of anomaly.<sup>10</sup>

Of the names preserved on the new piece, several are known, several not:

#### POETS

*Νικόμαχος* (line 2) seems to be heretofore unknown.<sup>11</sup>

*Θεοδωρίδης* (line 9) is heretofore unknown.

*Κλαίνετος* (line 12) is a known poet, of whose works only two small fragments have survived, preserved in the writings of Stobaeus.<sup>12</sup>

#### PLAYS

The names of five plays are preserved and three others (lines 3, 7 and 13) have been lost. Though the specific versions of the plays listed are all unknown, Amymone, Medea, Phaethon, and Hypsipyle are all favorite mythological subjects and fragments of versions by other poets survive.<sup>13</sup>

<sup>8</sup> The evidence for this is *I.G.*, II<sup>2</sup>, 2319, line 84, where the initial Σ of the poet's name is preserved. Cf. also line 59.

<sup>9</sup> The Agora fragment is broken along the right edge and the unusual number of two plays (with no satyr play) is given in *I.G.*, II<sup>2</sup>, 2319, column II.

<sup>10</sup> For example, only two poets competing in 419 and 418 perhaps reflects a curtailment of the festival during the Peloponnesian War not rectified during the Peace of Nikias.

<sup>11</sup> A possible identification, however, exists. In the *Suda Lexicon* under the heading *Νικόμαχος* is the following entry: *Νικόμαχος, Ἀθηναῖος, τραγικός. ὃς Εὐριπίδην παραδόξως καὶ Θεόγγιν ἐνίκησε. τῶν δραμάτων ἐστὶν αὐτοῦ Οἰδίπους.* Theognis' career can be put with certainty in the latter part of the fifth century; he was one of the Thirty (Lysias, XII, 6 ff.; Xenophon, *Hellenika*, II, 3, 2). If the word "unexpectedly" (*παραδόξως*) can be interpreted to suggest that Nikomachos was surprisingly young at the time of his victory over Euripides, it could be argued that he beat Euripides and Theognis in about 410-406, at the start of his career, and was still active some forty-five years later in 365/4 B.C., when he placed third at the Lenaia. This would require a long, but not impossible, career for Nikomachos. Euripides himself was active for forty-nine years.

<sup>12</sup> Stobaeus, *Florilegium*, 79, 5 and 99, 2.

<sup>13</sup> A. Nauck, *Tragicorum Graecorum Fragmenta* (Supplement by B. Snell), Hildesheim, 1964,

Oinopion, on the other hand, is heretofore unknown as a tragic theme. Presumably the play dealt with the early king of Chios of that name, a legendary figure reputed to be the son of Dionysos.<sup>14</sup>

#### ACTORS

Ἡφαιστίων (lines 1 and 5) is heretofore unknown. If, as in the following year, three poets competed in 365/4 B.C., it would appear that the actor fared better than his plays, winning the actor's prize while the plays took second place.<sup>15</sup>

Ἀρηξίς (lines 8 and 15), winner in 364/3 B.C., is heretofore unknown.

Ἀνδροσθένης (line 11) appears in *I.G.*, II<sup>2</sup>, 2325 (line 265), the list of winning actors at the Lenaia (Plate 62, b). The exact date of his victory is unknown, though it must come somewhere *ca.* 370 B.C. (*infra*).

Ἱππάρχος (line 14) is probably to be associated with Hipparchos Athmoneus (*P.A.*, no. 7599) who appears in Demosthenes, XLIX (*Neaera*), sections 26 and 28 to give testimony that he had hired Neaera as a courtesan while in Corinth. This same Hipparchos appears also in *I.G.*, II<sup>2</sup>, 2325 (line 263; Plate 62, b) where he is listed as having won six times at the Lenaia.

#### *I.G.*, II<sup>2</sup>, 2325 (Plate 62, b)

The new Agora fragment has considerable bearing on our understanding of *I.G.*, II<sup>2</sup>, 2325, an inscribed Ionic epistyle generally believed to be part of the same building on which the *Διδασκαλῖαι* were carved. On it are eight lists recording the names of successful poets and actors in comedy and tragedy in both the Dionysia and the Lenaia. As we have seen, both Androstenes and Hipparchos, unsuccessful in 364/3 B.C., appear on the list for actors as having won at the Lenaia on other occasions, Androstenes once (line 265) and Hipparchos six times (line 263). The two other actors listed in the new Agora fragment, Hephaistion and Arexis, do not appear on the list as presently restored, and place must be found for them as it is now clear that both were successful at the Lenaia. As it turns out, they fit in rather nicely.

Line 269 is restored in the editio minor as [Ἀριστ]ίων. As this is the only occurrence of this man's name as an actor in the fourth century, the restoration is clearly conjectural.<sup>16</sup> Far more likely is the name [Ἡφαιστ]ίων, who is now well

Amymone, pp. 6-7; Medea, pp. 729, 775, 798, 807, 825, 838; Phaethon, p. 599; Hypsipyle, pp. 79, 594.

<sup>14</sup> K. Keyssner, "Oinopion," *R.E.*, XVII, part 2, 1937, columns 2272-2275. Apollonios Rhodios, III, 996; Apollodoros, I, 4, 3; Diodoros Siculus V, 79, 1 and 84, 3; Pausanias, VII, 4, 8 and 5, 13.

<sup>15</sup> A parallel situation occurred in 419/18 B.C.: Kallippides, *I.G.*, II<sup>2</sup>, 2319, lines 82-83.

<sup>16</sup> For Aristion see J. B. O'Connor, *Chapters in the History of Actors and Acting in Ancient Greece*, Chicago, 1908, p. 82, no. 60; also B. Snell, "Zu den Urkunden dramatischer Aufführungen," *Gött. Nachr.*, 1966, no. 2, pp. 21-27, where line 34 of *I.G.*, II<sup>2</sup>, 2325 is restored Ἀρι[στίων] as a victor in the Dionysia.

attested as a victor at the Lenaia in this period.<sup>17</sup> Furthermore, the name Hephaistion fits the available space far more satisfactorily than Aristion, which is somewhat too short. The name is followed by the notation for a single victory, which we now know took place in 365/4 B.C.

In the line above (line 268) is the entry [.ca.5.]s. It is tempting to insert the name of our other victor, Arexis, in this slot. It is reasonable chronologically, and the name fits well in the space available on the stone. If this restoration is correct, then it must be his second Lenaia victory which we have recorded for 364/3 B.C. in the Agora fragment.

For convenience, I include the new restoration of lines 263-270 of *I.G.*, II<sup>2</sup>, 2325 alongside that of the editio minor.<sup>18</sup>

	<i>Editio Minor</i>		<i>Revised</i>
	Ἱππαρχος Π		Ἱππαρχος Π
	Ἀμεινίας		Ἀμεινίας
265	[Ἀν]δροσθένης	265	[Ἀν]δροσθένης
	[Νεο]πτόλεμος		[Νεο]πτόλεμος
	[Θεττ]αλός		[...]λλος
	[. . . .]s		[Ἀρηξι]s
	[Ἀριστ]ίων		[Ἡφαισ]τίων
270	[. . . .]άδης	270	[. . . .]άδης

The correct identification of Hephaistion in line 269 is of considerable importance for the chronology of *I.G.*, II<sup>2</sup>, 2325. The stone provides a simple list of names followed by a notation recording the number of their victories. Each name appears only once, in chronological order of the actor's first victory, making precise dating difficult. (We learn, for example, that Hipparchos won six times, but we have no way of knowing whether his victories came in successive years or were spread over a long period of time.) This is true throughout the list, which until now has had virtually no fixed dates for the fourth century. The restoration of Hephaistion, however, leads to firmer ground. On line 269 it is noted that he won a single victory which, on the basis of the new Agora fragment, can now be placed with certainty in the year 365/4 B.C., and so provides the first secure date in the chronology of the list.

<sup>17</sup> That Hephaistion should appear somewhere in this section of *I.G.*, II<sup>2</sup>, 2325 is further suggested by the appearance of both Hipparchos and Androsthenes in this column (lines 263 and 265).

<sup>18</sup> It will be noted that for line 267 I have [...]λλος || whereas the Corpus text reads [Θεττ]αλός ||. It is clear from the photograph (Plate 62, b) and even clearer from squeezes and the stone itself that the first legible letter is a lambda and not an alpha. To be sure, the omission of the cross-bar on an A is one of the easiest mistakes a stone cutter can make and I have no strong objections to the restoration of Thetталos' name; I would merely point out that the restoration as given in the editio minor is not as straightforward as it seems.

One ramification of this precise dating of *I.G.*, II<sup>2</sup>, 2325 concerns our knowledge of the career of at least one other actor. In line 266 Neoptolemos is listed as having won only once at the Lenaia. With the precise date for Hephaistion in 365/4 B.C., it is now clear that Neoptolemos' single victory cannot date any later than 368/7 B.C., considerably earlier than had previously been supposed.<sup>19</sup> His floruit seems to have been in the 340's, for he competed in the Dionysia in 341 and 340, winning in 341 B.C.,<sup>20</sup> some twenty-five to thirty years after his Lenaia victory. In short, highly successful in the 340's, Neoptolemos won a single Lenaia victory and that at a surprisingly early stage in his career. On the basis of this information, it can perhaps be argued that by the 360's the Lenaia had come to be something of a second-rate festival, a training ground for young actors who, upon gaining some success, moved on to more attractive fields.<sup>21</sup>

JOHN McK. CAMP, II

AMERICAN SCHOOL OF CLASSICAL STUDIES  
ATHENIAN AGORA EXCAVATIONS

<sup>19</sup> O'Connor, *op. cit.*, pp. 119-121, no. 359.

<sup>20</sup> *I.G.*, II<sup>2</sup>, 2320.

<sup>21</sup> I am indebted to D. M. Lewis for this suggestion. It should be noted that this theory is more compelling if one accepts the restoration of Thettalos in line 267 of *I.G.*, II<sup>2</sup>, 2325 (see note 18). His career then becomes almost an exact parallel to that of Neoptolemos, with only two Lenaia victories at a surprisingly early date (*ca.* 367/6 B.C.) and a Dionysia victory in 340 B.C., some 26 years later; O'Connor, *op. cit.*, p. 103, no. 239; also *I.G.*, II<sup>2</sup>, 2320 and *I.G.*, II<sup>2</sup>, 2318, line 282.



No. 8.



I.G., II<sup>2</sup>, 2325 = E.M. 8203

JOHN MCK. CAMP: GREEK INSCRIPTIONS: TRAGEDIES PRESENTED AT THE LENAIA OF 364/3 B.C.