WINIFRED L. RUTER

AMERICAN SCHOOL OF CLASSICAL STUDIES

ATHENS, GREECE

JUNE 10, 1934.

I am now engaged, as Fellow of the American School of Classical Studies at Athens, in writing a paper on the seating arrangements in the Theatre of Dionysus in Athens. The topic was suggested to me by Mr. Oscar Broneer. The following notes on the inscriptions on the ordinary theatre seats are submitted to the editor of the Corpus in accordance with a suggestion very kindly made by Mr. Sterling Dow of the American School. I wish to thank him for his interest.

The following notes are based on my personal observations of the inscriptions on the ordinary theatre seats in the Theatre of Dionysus in Athens. These observations are recorded on the accompanying transcription where I have set down, to scale, all those marks - and only those marks - which I am honestly convinced that I can see and of which I am equally sure that they are parts of inscriptions and not weather marks, flaws in the stone, or traces of uncounted generations of feet. I made my own observations before consulting the tables at the end of Volume III of the Corpus or the notes in the paper entitled "A Catalogue of the Inscriptions now on the South Slope of the Acropolis," by Mitchell and Ethel Levensohn.

When I used the Corpus for comparison of my results with those of earlier investigators I found the arrangement therein irritatingly inconvenient in several respects, and so to facilitate consultation I should suggest first of all that the inscriptions now listed on pages 86 and 87 of the Corpus be grouped under headings giving the cuneus in which they are to be found. Second, after each Corpus number, it would be helpful to find the number of the row and the stone or stones in the row. Third, wherever there are variant readings, they would be more accessible if included in the notes

on the inscriptions concerned. As to the tables in the back of the Corpus, they are in several cases incorrectly labeled as to row or block. I shall indicate the corrections as I discuss my readings of the individual inscriptions. If plates are to be included in the new edition of the Corpus, I suggest that a more conveniemt arrangement is that which I have followed, based on a schematized plan of each cuneus as observed from the orchestra. Here, too, I should label each inscription as to Corpus number, row, and block.

COMMENTARY ON READINGS

Cuneus I - Right

Corpus 313, Row 2, Block b. IG II² 5093

Ἱερεί̣ας Ἡλίου

This inscription is misleadingly labeled "a" in the Corpus tables. Also, it is inaccurately copied as to relative size and spacing of the letters, and as to their character. I believe my transcription corroborates Gelzer's suggestion that the inscription is entirely separate and distinct from the following (Corpus 314). Noteworthy also is the fact that the upper line is exactly centered, both on the block and in the row. Consequently it seems to me probable that an inscription, now vanished, originally existed to the left of 313, balancing 314.

Corpus 314, Row 2, Blocks b and c.

Διονύσου

The word Ἱερέως, discerned by Gelzer above Διονύσου has vanished completely. The fact that the Δ appears on the end of block b seems to me to indicate that some epithet of Dionysus followed his name on block c.

Corpus 315, Row 3, Blocks a b c d.

[Τ]ῶ[ι] ἱερῆ [ι Σ]ε[βαστῆς] Ἀν[τ]ωνίας

This reading accounts for the fragment of a letter which I see on block a before those recorded in the Corpus tables, and interprets the last letter visible on block b as ε . The latter is restored as θ in the Corpus but I see no reason why the right hand half of the letter should be completely worn away when that part of the stone is sheltered by its proximity to the base which is here set upon the seat blocks. Besides, I make out on the top of the letter what appears to be a little cross-bar, similar to those on the bottom of the ν and ι of block d. If this restoration be correct it fits in nicely with the inscription recorded in Corpus III 652, where Antonia's Latin title is rendered by Σεβαστή . And there too she has a priest - ἀρχιερεύς , however - rather than priestess. If however, the initial fragmentary letter does not belong to the rest of the inscription why not restore the latter as

Ἱερή[αι Σ]ε[βαστῆς] Ἀν[τ]ωνίας

rather than require the unusual term Θεά ?

Corpus 316, Row 4, Blocks a b c.

Ἱερήας Ἑστίας ἐπ' Ἀκροπόλει καὶ Λειβίας καὶ Ἰουλία

The final α of this inscription is so close to the end of the block that I do not believe a ς was ever squeezed in. The Corpus, however, records it on page 86, and without brackets, though it does not appear in the tables.

Corpus 317, Row 4, Block b.

φειλείνου

The Levensohns have incorrectly copied both the Corpus reading and that in A.M. XIV, p. 321. The marks extant on the stone seem to me to favor the A.M. reading.

Corpus 318, Row 5, Blocks a b c. IG II² 5098

Ἐρσηφόροις β' χλόης Θέμιδος

I agree with the Levensohns in restoring χλόης on the basis of the marks on the stone, and also in regard to their suggestion that two separate divinities may be meant. But their statement that the priestesses also of Demeter Chloe and Ge Themis "had seats next to each other" is inaccurate, for Ge Themis is behind Demeter Chloe. Also I do not believe that their suggestion of an analogous separation in Corpus 323, Row 10, holds, for that in-

scription is all of a piece whereas here the word is in a different style of lettering from the rest of the inscription and so may belong to a different period, perhaps originally preceded by Ἱερῆας Δήμητρος for which there is room in the space now occupied by Ἐρσηφόροις β'.

Corpus 319, Row 6, Blocks a b c. IG II² 5099

[Ἐ]ρ[σ]ηφόροις β' [Ε]ἰλ[ε]ιθυία[ς] ἐν Ἀγρα[ις]

It is true, as the Levensohns point out, that the initial Ε of Εἰλειθυίας is completely invisible now. However, if we are to suppose the space sufficient for a ς between Εἰλειθυία and ἐν there is no reason why an ε may not have existed in both the first and the second syllables of Εἰλειθυίας. The tendency of this ς and ε curve to disappear may be noticed in the fact that since Gelzer's time it has been effaced in two places in the word Ἐρσηφόροις.

Corpus 320, Row 7, Blocks b and c.

Ὑμνητριῶν ὑς.....

This is all that we can consider definitely to be part of one inscription. The farther along on block c may belong, though the step-down is considerable, corresponding to the step-up after the ι in the first word.

Corpus 320, Row 7, Blocks a b c d. IG II² 5100

[Ἐ]ρ[θ]ηφ[ό]ροις [β' Εὐ]βούλ[ης] Ν[ύ]μφης

The vestiges of the letters through the η of Εὐβουλης have not to my knowledge been recorded by anyone before. In the tables at the end of the Corpus the μ of Νύμφης is incorrectly placed at the end of block c, whereas it occurs at the beginning of block d. I restore Εὐβούλης for the following reasons: From the marks on the stones βουλ seems certain. The cross stroke in the second letter on block c, ϵ , seems to belong to a different period from the curve. Following this letter is a vague trace, which may be what is left of a ς . The fact that the of Ὑμνητριῶν steps up abruptly seems to imply that the cutter was taking advantage of a stroke already on the stone - perhaps the vertical stroke of a υ

As to Eubule, compare Suidas, s.v. Λεωκόριον

This Heroum was a well known place in the time of Thucydides, who mentions that the tyrannicides put Hipparchus to death παρὰ τῷ Λεωκόρειον καλούμενον as he was marshalling there the Panathenaic procession.

Corpus 321, Row 8, Block a. IG II² 5101

Ὀλβίας ἱερήας

In my opinion, contrary to the Corpus, these two words belong together. Though the second steps down erratically and is on a smaller scale, the style of the lettering is the same, and quite different from that which follows in the same row.

Corpus 321, Row 8, Blocks b c d.

Καθ' [ὑπομνηματισ]μὸν [κα]ὶ κατὰ ψήφισμα Ἰουλίας τῆς ..θ.μα..κο[υ] θ[υγατρός].

The peculiar step-up-and-back of the inscription beginning with καί may be due to the fact that the first two words and the καί were added later, as Gelzer suggests. What I see on block d is clearly τῆς , but the following letters do not lend themselves to the restoration suggested by the Levensohns, namely Γερμανικοῦ . I have nothing to offer instead.

Corpus 322, Row 9, Blocks b and d.

I have nothing new to offer here.

Corpus 323, Row 10, Blocks a b c d e.

'Οληφορο[ῦς?] 'Αθηνᾶς Θέμιδος

I see faintly on the stone what may be a ς before 'Αθηνᾶς . In the table at the end of the Corpus the cross-bar of Θ in Θέμιδος is omitted, but it is still clearly visible. I have spoken about the character of the letters under Corpus 318.

Corpus 324, Row 11, Blocks a b c d e.

φιλίππης Μηδήου θυγατρός

The Corpus reading is complete and correct. The letters are somewhat heavier and more carefully cut than appears in the plate of the Corpus, where the θ of θυγατρός is incorrectly represented by ⊙ whereas it should appear thus Θ.

Corpus 325, Row 12, Blocks a b c.

Μεγίστης κα[τ]ὰ ψηφι[σ]μ[α]

The final α of κατά is not to be bracketed, since it appears on the stone. The same is true of the μ of ψήφισμα . Here again the letters are somewhat more carefully cut than appears in the Corpus plate.

Corpus 326, Row 13, Blocks c d e.

...ε Κεφαλῆθεν
Φαλήριος

The letter before κ is omitted in the Corpus. The

horizontal stroke may be accidental, and the letter actually ς , which would be more natural here as the last letter of a proper noun in the genitive, before the demotic.

Corpus 327, Row 14, Blocks a b.

Μεγ[ί]σ[της] κατ[ὰ] ψήφισμα

The Corpus reading here is correct. Since Gelzer's time the ι of Μεγίστης and the final α of κατά have been obliterated.

Corpus 328, Row 15, Blocks e f.

...ιοστρο{β φ

These two blocks appear to have been originally one stone. The beginning of block e and the end of block f are broken, while the opposite ends retain the original finished surface. And so perhaps the two blocks should be reversed and the inscription read as στρο{β φ...ιος.

Corpus 329, Row 20, Block a.

Ἱερέως Θε....

Corpus 330, Row 20, Block a.

Δαμα....

I cannot see the ΔΙΔ recorded on the Corpus plate as appearing at the end of this block. Also, the letters ιος and κ appear on fragments of blocks in

this row, but it is not at all clear to me that they are parts of this inscription.

Cuneus II - Right

Corpus 331, Row 2, Blocks a b.

Ἱεροφά[ν]τ[ου] [Ἀλ]εξ[άνδρου] K....

As can be seen in my table, the amount of space on the block after T favors the reading of Kumanudes and Keil. It is possible to insert in this space the ιδος suggested by Gelzer, but I do not think the cutter would have allowed so much space between his α and T had he four letters still to write after the T . As to Gelzer's objection that there is already a marble throne assigned to the Hierophant, in the first place, the name on the marble throne is unqualified, whereas here, from the style of the vestiges of Ἀλεξάνδρου I conclude that the two named belong together, and in the second place, this is not the solitary instance of such reduplication. We may compare with this the inscriptions on the marble throne (Corpus 265)

Ἱερέως Δήμου καὶ Χαρίτων καὶ Ῥωμης

and, in Cuneus Medius, Row 5, on the vertical face of the marble inserted in place of the poros blocks

Ἱε[ρέως] Δήμου Χαρίτων

Also compare Gelzer's own restoration of Corpus 360

[Ἀρτέμιδος K]ωλαινιδος

with the marble throne inscription (Corpus 275)

Ἱερέως Ἀρτέμιδος Κωλαινίδος

Corpus 332, Row 3, Blocks a b.

...αιρίτιδος ἀ[π?]ὸ

Of the two inscriptions above the second is later, superscribed over the first. In the Corpus reading the final ο of the second inscription is omitted and the first two letters of the first, ι , and κ , are likewise not to be seen. I do not understand the meaning of the note under the heading Corpus 332 "---et quae praeteres conspiciuntur in hoc lapide reliquiae (κα , α , κος)", for I see in the Corpus table no κα or α in addition to the ...αιρίτιδος ἀ Also note that there is space for at least five letters between κ and κ of the first inscription - contrary to the impression conveyed by the spacing in the Corpus table.

Corpus 333, Row 4, Block b.

Διώνης

The other letters which appear in the Corpus table are now gone.

Corpus 334, Row 5, Blocks a b c.

[Ἱ]ερέως θεᾶς Ῥώμης καὶ Σεβαστοῦ Καίσ[αρος]

This row is wrongly labeled Ordo VI in the Corpus table,

and consequently the following row is also incorrectly numbered. Also, in the note under the heading Corpus 334 the ϛ of Καίσαρος is bracketed whereas it is perfectly visible at the end of block c. The inscrip- is more heavily and carefully cut than appears in the Corpus table. The inscription seems to have been superscribed over an earlier one, for there is quite clearly a τ within the ω of Ῥώμης and here and there elsewhere faint traces of letters.

Corpus 335, Row 5, Blocks a b (rear depressed surface).

Ἀ[φροδίτ]η[ς] ἐ[π]ιτραγίας

I see enough of the initial A to warrant its being taken out of the brackets. The π should be bracketed in the Corpus note, since the letter does not appear in the Corpus table.

Corpus 336, Row 5, Blocks b c (rear depressed surface).

Ἀρτέμιδος Οἰναίας

Corpus 337, Row 5, Block c (rear depressed surface).

Δήμητρος Ἀχ[αίας]

Corpus 338, Row 6, Blocks a b.

Κανηφόροις γ' ἀπὸ Παλλαδί[ου]

Corpus 339, Row 8, Blocks b c.

[Ἀφροδίτης] Κωλιάδ[ος κ]α[ί]

The spacing in the Corpus table is incorrect. The block labeled d is really part of c. Also, the first α on the block there labeled d does not appear actually on the stone. I believe that the restored καί serves to connect Ἀφροδίτης Κωλιάδος with Ἀθηνᾶς Ἠετιώνης of Corpus 340, and that on the grounds both of spacing and of style of lettering these are to be considered parts of a single inscription. I see traces of a large α over the first α of block c, evidence of another inscription of a different period on the block.

Corpus 340, Row 8, Block c.

Ἀθηνᾶς Ἠε[τιώνης]

(See notes on Corpus 339)

Corpus 341, Row 8, Blocks b c d.

[κ]ατὰ ψήφισμα Λαμιδίου
Γ.....μ.....ηας

The first letter of block d, represented as α in the Corpus table, is really a μ. These inscriptions may possibly not be separate, since the letters on block d are similar in size and style to those in the word Λαμιδίου. These differ in both respects from the letters in κατὰ ψήφισμα.

Corpus 342, Row 10, Blocks a c d.

Ἀλκίας Ἀ[ττικοῦ ?]
Ἀλκίας [κατὰ ψήφισμα καὶ καθ' ὑπο-
μνηματ]ισμ [ὸν]

As the Levensohns have also noted, the Corpus reading omits entirely the first of these two inscriptions. Moreover, what appears as καια in the Corpus table is really the monogram which I have represented as accurately as possiblein my table. The word ψήφισμα no longer appears on block c. I use the Corpus reading for my restoration. I see clearly an (on block d, so that it should be removed from the brackets. Also, what appears as ζ in the Corpus plate may perfectly well be a σ . The other instances of the letter in this inscription are lunate, it is true, but the latter part of the inscription may be reused. We may suppose that to Alcia was assigned at first only the first half of the row, the rest already belonging to someone else, κατὰ ψήφισμα καὶ καθ' ὑπομνημ. For a similar variation in type of σ and explanation based on difference in period, compare Cuneus I - Right, Row 5

Ἐρεχθηΐδος β' χιλιοστὴς θέμιδος

Corpus 343, Row 11, Blocks b c d.

Λαδαμήας τῆ[ς] Μη[δήου]

Corpus 344, Row 12, Block b.

Λαμιδίο[υ] [κατὰ ψήφισμα]

Corpus 345, Row 13, Block b.

['Ιερέας] Κλεα[ρίδ]τ[η]ς

Corpus 346, Row 14, Block b.

'Ιερέως Διονύ[σου]

----------, Row 15, Block b.

...α..αιπο....

This fragment is omitted in the Corpus.

Cuneus III - Right

Corpus 347, Row 2, Block a.

Στεφα[νηφόρου]

Corpus 348, Row 2, Blocks b c.

['Υμ]νητριων φιλιδίου

My reading varies in several respects from that in the Corpus plate. What is there represented as the initial α on block b is considerably closer to the edge of the stone. I see no sign of a cross-bar, and the bottom of the first stroke looks as if it may perfectly well be the point of juncture of the two middle strokes

of a μ , the first half of the letter appearing on block a, which is now broken at this end. The wide spacing between the ν and the η , and between the η and the τ , I explain as due to the fact that the very bad flaws - ruts - now at these points in the stone were there at the time the inscription was cut. The vestiges of a κ appearing in the Corpus plate in conjunction with the ν , and of a letter immediately following, and of a ρ attached to the η I take to be the remains of an earlier inscription, cut before these flaws in the block had become so bad due to weathering as to necessitate skipping over them.

IG II² 5129

Corpus 349, Row 3, Blocks a b c.

Δήμ[η]τρος Χλόη[ς ἱερέ]ας

The ς in Δήμητρος is still visible on the stone, and should be removed from the brackets. Also, I take the final ας appearing in my table to belong to this inscription. Gelzer suggests that Διοφάντου was superscribed. However, the faintness of the lettering compared with the firm strokes of Χλόης inclines me to believe that Διοφάντου is earlier. I see also faint traces of an α at the end of block a, which may represent an inscription of a different period, since it seems to align with neither of the two above.

Corpus 350, Row 4, Blocks a b.

Ἱερίας Γῆς Θ[ε]μιδος

Corpus 351, Row 5, Blocks b c d. IG II² 5131

Ὑμνητρίας ...α... Πειθοῦς
[Ἱερ]ίας Κου[ρ]οτρόφου Δή[μητρος]

On the basis of the very inaccurate rendition in the Corpus plate, these inscriptions are incorrectly restored as parts of a single inscription in the Corpus. As a matter of fact, I see at least three different hands on the blocks in this row. The α on block c and Πειθοῦς on block d are certainly not cut by the same hand as that which inscribed Ὑμνητρίας. However, the latter is so well cut and preserved that I am at a loss to understand why the name of the divinity is completely eradicated. I see therefore two possibilities: 1) The name of the divinity may have preceded Ὑμνητρίας, on block a, which is now worn and broken. This word order would be unusual, though paralleled by Ὀλβίας ἱερήας. In this case α and Πειθοῦς would form an entirely separate inscription; 2) Two workmen may have been employed to cut theinscription. I do not think it possible that the name of another divinity following Ὑμνητρίας on block c or block d could have been erased for the substitution of α (block c) and Πειθοῦς

(block d) because of the presence of the inscription

Ἱερίας Κουροτρόφου Δήμητρος

which I take to be earlier, since the latter part of Ὑμνητρίας seems to be written over the first part of the word ἱερίας . My reading of this earlier inscription is considerably different from that in the Corpus plate. On block b I see vestiges of letters after the final ς of Ὑμνητρίας. On block c I read ιας , not νυς . After this ς I see Κο and parts of two additional letters. The α before ...τρόφος most assuredly is not part of this inscription.

Corpus 352, Row 6, Block b.

Θ[εσμ]οφόρου

Corpus 353, Row 6, Blocks c d.

...αι....

Ἱε[ρ]ήας Οἰνάνθη[ς]

I agree that the Levensohns in considering the space between Οἰν... and ...άνθης as due to flaws in the stone, for between ο and ν the letter is certainly ι not η . Also compare the spacing in Corpus 348 Row 2 Ὑμνητριῶν , where flaws in the stone likewise occur.

Corpus 354, Row 7, Blocks a d. IG II² 5134

Μητρὸς [Θεῶν]

I follow here the reading in the Corpus plate, though hesitatingly. The space on block a after Μητρός is rather small for the four letters which appear on the plate as if inscribed on the same block. Also, the letters elsewhere in the Corpus plates of these theatre seat inscriptions are carelessly enough represented to lead me to suspect that Θεῶν may have been Θεσμ , and the inscription originally

[Δή]μητρος Θεσμ[οφόρου]

especially since the divinity, with the same epithet, is assigned a place in the row immediately below this. Such repetition is frequent in the theatre seat assignments.

Corpus 355, Row 8, Block a.

μ..

I do not see either Δαπων or Δανιων as rendered in the Corpus.

Corpus 356, Row 8, Block b.

[Δ]ήμητ[ρος Θεσ]μο[φόρου]

I believe that the fragments of letters I see at the end of this block, the space between τ of Δήμητρος and the μ here, and the space on block c before Μοιρῶν all confirm my restoration. And we have also the

proximity of the same name - which occurs in the two preceding rows. I do not see the traces of Θεσμοφόρου reported by the Levensohns, but they may have been obliterated within the last two years.

Corpus 357, Row 8, Block c. IG II² 5137

Μοιρῶν

----------, Row 9, Block c.

. . . ταψαφ. . .

This inscription is omitted in the Corpus. May one restore [κα]τὰ ψάφ[ισμα]?

Corpus 358, Row 10, Blocks a b.

Μεγίσ[της] κατὰ [ψήφισμα]

κατά is still visible and should be removed from the brackets. ψήφισμα I can no longer see.

Corpus 359, Row 11, Block a.

παρν. . .

The vestiges of letters remaining do not look to me like those recorded in the Corpus. The Levensohns guess φ or υ between α and ν. My conjecture is ρ.

Corpus 360, Row 12, Block c.

[Κο]λαινιδ[ο]ς ?

or

Σπαλαρνίδης

The latter reading seems more probable to me, since

the letters appear to be all of one period.

Corpus 361, Row 13, Block 1.

Ἱερη[ας].....

Corpus 362, Row 14, Block a.

Ἰου...

The second inscription in this row, as it appears in the Corpus plate, I was not able to see on the stone.

Corpus 363, Row 16, Block ?

This inscription is invisible to me. However, since ενραμ appears in the Corpus plate, the μ should be taken out of the brackets in the note under this inscription.

Corpus 364, Row 17, Blocks a b c.

Ἀντιόχου

Cuneus IV - Right

Corpus 365, Row 4, Blocks a b c d.

Ἱερίας Ἐϭ[τ]ίας [Ῥ]ωμαίων

The Ρ of Ῥωμαιων has entirely disappeared, but the ω of this word is still clear enough to warrant its being removed from the brackets in the Corpus note.

---------- Row 5, Blocks b d.

‘. . . . . [κ?]αζ. . .

This fragment is omitted in the Corpus, and the following row incorrectly labeled Ordo V in the plate.

Corpus 366, Row 6, Blocks b c d.

[Ἀρτ]έμιδος ἐν αἰφ. . . . . [δᾳ]δ[ο]φόρου ἐμ Πειρ [αιεῖ]

My reading of block b yields the same result, ...εμιδος as the Levensohns' reading. However, the vestiges after ἐν on block c warrant by no means the Corpus restoration ἄστει . What appears to me to be a φ may have been a ρ , so that the Levensohns' reading is possible. On block d, I see the cross-bar of the first ε , omitted in the Corpus, and also the ι following the second ε .

Corpus 367, Row 7, Blocks c d.

....αιδους

The restoration of Ἱερείᾳ in the Corpus note is incorrect. The final ι is evident, but the vestige read as α is too far away from this ι . This might be explained as due to a flaw in the stone, but the first of the two strokes is too nearly vertical for it to be likely that this letter was an α . Furthermore, I am inclined to think that we have not the name Hades here but rather the end of some other name. According to Pausanias (6.25.2) Ἀνθρώπων δὲ ὧν

Ἴομεν μόνοι τιμῶσιν Ἄιδην Ἠλεῖοι.

Corpus 368, Row 8, Blocks b c d e.

[Ἀφροδίτη]ς ἐπιτρα[γ]ί Ἥρας ἐλλιμενίας [Ἡ]βης....ραγί[ας]
[ας]

The vestiges on block d are entirely omitted in the Corpus. The Levensohns see only ιc , but I find clear traces of β and what is obviously an η following (see my table). The position on the stone of these letters and their style, together with their proximity to the name of the goddess in the row above, lead me to restore the inscription as Ἥβης . I agree with the Levensohns in considering the Corpus restoration Λευκοθεας Σωτήρας impossible on the basis of the existing traces of letters. My conjecture is that the two blocks d and e were originally inscribed Ἀφροδίτης ἐπιτραγίας , that she was later shifted to the beginning of the row, the last two letters before Ἥρας having to be squeezed in above or below, and block d then being ascribed to Hebe, who had already been seated in the row above.

Corpus 369, Row 9, Blocks b c d.

[Ἱερ]ε[ας Ἀφρ]ο[δίτ]ης Πανδή[μ]ο[υ Νύμφ]ης

I think it probable that there are vestiges of two separate inscriptions on block b. Of the one I have

made the above restoration. Of the other I can see clearly only

ι . θ . ο . η .

Corpus 370, Row 9, Block e.

Ἥβης

Corpus 371, Row 10, Blocks c e.

Δειπ[ν]οφόρο[ις κατὰ ψήφισμα καὶ καθ' ὑπομνη]μ
[ατ]ισμ[όν]
. . . ενο . . .

On block e I see traces of letters both before and after ζ , and taking spacing and size and style of lettering into account I make the above restoration. For ζ compare Corpus 342. I do not think that Gelzer's suggestion of ἐν Ὀσχοφορίοις deserves mention in the Corpus. In the first place, the three letters are too far from Δειπνοφόροις, and in the second place, what is the logical connection between the two terms? The Δειπνοφόροι carried meat offerings for Cecrops and his daughters Pandrosus, Herse, and Aglaurus. (Cf. Isae. ap. Poll. 6. 102). On the other hand, τὰ Ὀσχοφόρια was the name given to one day of the Athenian festival Σκιρα , when processions carried branches from the temple of Dionysus to that of Athena Scirus. (Cf. Philochor. 44; Plut. Thes. 22, etc.)

Corpus 372, Row 11, Blocks b c d.

Κουροτρόφου ἐξ Ἀγλαύρου Δήμητρος

Since Δημητρος appears clearly on the stone I do not understand why this misspelling is not retained in the Corpus note on the inscription. Also, as appears in my table, the size and style of the lettering in this name are much closer to these characteristics in the rest of the inscription than is shown in the Corpus plate.

Corpus 373, Row 12, Blocks a b c.

[Δήμητρος] Κουροτρόφου Ἀ[χ]α[ίας]

Corpus 374, Row 12, Block d.

Ἥβης

Corpus 375, Row 13, Blocks b c.

Δήμητρ[ος φ]ρ[εα]ρόο[υ]

Corpus 376, Row 14, Block b.

Ἱερήας Λητοῦς καὶ Ἀρ[τέμιδος]
φλαουΐα[ς?] Ν...

I do not see any horizontal bar in the last letter of the second inscription here, and the first stroke being horizontal I take the letter to be rather ν than δ

Cuneus V - Right

Corpus 377, Row 2, Block a.

...μεν..{θ ε

There are traces of a letter before the μ in this inscription, and of two letters following the ν . These traces may belong to an earlier inscription, but I do not think the evidence strong enough to warrant a capital M as appears in the Corpus text.

----------, Row 3, Blocks a c.

Ποσ[ειδωνιος]

This inscription is omitted in the text of the Corpus. Block b is very worn, but there are faint traces of letters in the places where one would expect to find Block c is longer than the two preceding and so would naturally take four letters of the name. Actually, I see faint traces of what may be the diagonal stroke of the ν , and of the final (lunate) ς , and also vague vestiges of a letter before and one after the ν

Corpus 378, Row 4, Block a.

Ζακόρου Δι[οκλέους]
Ἱερ...

In connection with my restoration of the name Διοκλέους compare Lysias 6.54, where he mentions Diocles the son of Zacorus, the Hierophant. The theatre seat may have been assigned to a descendant of this man. The second inscription on this block is omitted for someunknown

reason from the Corpus text, though it appears in the plate.

Corpus 379, Row 5, Block b.

...τηρι̣δ...
...ντ...νας

The row is incorrectly labeled Ordo VI in the Corpus plate. The restoration given in the Corpus may be correct. The vestiges are too worn, however, for me to corroborate it, particularly in the case of the second inscription.

----------, Row 6, Block c.

...ο̣ι̣ο...

Omitted in the Corpus.

----------, Row 7, Block c.

.ο.ν

This fragment, of which I see the traces of four letters, is labeled 379, illogically, in the Corpus plate.

Corpus 380, Row 8

I can see no traces of this inscription.

Corpus 381, Row 10, Block a.

Λει̣β[ί]ας

There is no question but that Gelzer is right here, since I see traces of the diphthong ει between Λ and β.

Corpus 382, Row 11, Block c.

...κ[ρ]ά[τ]ας

Corpus 383, Row 14, Blocks c d (?).

α·{α λ ·{ι ας ν

I do not see any traces of a diagonal stroke on the first letter on block d. It may have been there, but the vertical stroke on block c is too far from the end of the block for it to have formed part of this letter. Consequently I do not believe the Corpus restoration Ἀθανᾶς possible here.

----------, Row 15. Two blocks in middle of row.

...νω ...

This fragment is also illogically numbered, here 383, in the Corpus plate.

Corpus 384, Row 17. Three easternmost blocks.

..Θ[ε]οξένας

This row is incorrectly labeled Ordo XVI in the Corpus plate.

Cuneus VI - Right

----------, Row 2, Blocks a b c.

Β(?).....Θ[ε]ανώ

is my restoration here.

----------, Row 3, Block c.

...τ...

----------, Row 4, Blocks b c.

..αμ..{λ α μ

----------, Row 5, Blocks b c.

...Λ...

...υ...

...νθυ.γυ(?)...

Cuneus Medius

----------, Row 2, Block b.

Δ[ιο]ν[ύ]σου

I have not found mention anywhere of this inscription, which I discovered on the depressed footrest surface in front of this block, and directly behind the throne of the priest of Dionysus Eleuthereus.

Corpus 303, Row 2, Block c.

ηγ[ε (?)]. . . . νος
. . . . ν. .

I see faint traces of a second inscription below the one recorded in the Corpus.

Sup. Epig. Gr. no. 45, Vol. 1, Row 5. 16 II² 5029a

(a) Ἱερέω[ς]
Δημοκρατίας

(b) Ἱε[ρέως]
Δήμου
Χαρίτων

(c) [Ἱερ]έως
. . . . . ς

These inscriptions are to be found on two marble blocks inserted in this row to replace the poros, along the front vertical surface, just below the horizontal surface of the seat proper. In several respects I find the reading as published in the Supplementum inaccurate. First, I see no ς in Ἱερέως of inscription (a),

though this may have disappeared within the last few years. Second, inscription (b) is more fully preserved than appears in the Supplementum - ου of Δήμου and των of χαρίτων being visible on close scrutiny. These letters show that the inscription was so cut that the right and left margins of the rows are in alignment. Therefore I consider the καί restored between Δήμου and χαρίτων in the Supplementum entirely superfluous. In the third place, my reading of inscription (c) is quite different from that listed in the Supplementum. Finally, the note in the Supplementum states that four inscriptions, of which one has perished, were cut along this surface. The spacing of the inscriptions preserved seems to me to indicate that only the three extant were cut here. Inscription (b) occupies approximately equal space on the end of the first and the beginning of the second block. Also, when one examines the upper horizontal surface, toward the rear, two symmetrically placed nicks in the stone are visible, the one approximately 53 cm. after the last letter of inscription (a), the other approximately the same distance before the beginning of inscription (c).

Corpus 304, Row 11, Blocks ?

This inscription is no longer visible.

Corpus 305, Row 14, Blocks b c d e.

[Θ]εηκόλων

Cuneus I - Left

_____, Row 2, Block a.

A . . .
Βα[σιλέως]

The A is smaller and of a different style from the other two letters, and so I take it to be part of a different inscription. Βασιλέως I restore, although he is assigned a marble throne, on the analogy of Διονύσου , which appears directly behind the chair of the priest of Dionysus Eleuthereus. Here may the King Archon have sat at a different period - the location is not far from that assigned him from among the marble seats, namely, Cuneus II - Left.

_____, Row 3, Block a.

[Βασ]ιλέ[ως]

For the possible recurrence of the same ascription in successive or nearby rows we have evidence throughout these theatre seats.

Corpus 306, Row 11, Blocks ?

This inscription is not visible to me.

Corpus 307, Row 11, Blocks a b.

Λιθοκώπων Ο . . .

Here again, as in the case of Δήμητρος , why correct the spelling?

Corpus 308, Row 15, Block b.

...επα[ν]...

Here I see an ε before the letters recorded in the Corpus plate.

Cuneus II - Left

----------, Row 2, Blocks a b.

..μ... (a)

'Αριε.. (b)

{φ[ιλή]μονος
{'Ι[ερομνη]μονος (c)

Corpus 309, Row 3, Blocks a b.

ημ....

...αι...

I believe the style of lettering here is different enough to warrant the inscriptions being separated.

Corpus 310, Row 4, Blocks a b.

ΑΤΤΙΚΟ[Υ]

In the Corpus plate only 'ΑΤΤΙΚ is shown, yet in the text 'ΑΤΤΙΚΟῦ is given, without brackets around the final diphthong. I see the Ο on block b, but not the Υ.

----------, Row 15. Fourth block from the east.

..α ..

I find no mention elsewhere of this letter.

----------, Row 17. Fragment of block in middle of row.

..ν ..

Cuneus III - Left

----------, Row 2, Block a.

..α ..

I find no mention elsewhere of this letter.

Corpus 311, Row 3, Blocks ?

This inscription is not visible to me.

----------, Row 11, Blocks a c d e.

α.....ν.....α.....ν

Cuneus IV - Left

Corpus 312, Row 7, Blocks - the two easternmost.

Λα[δαμήας

Only Λα is visible now. The row is incorrectly labeled Ordo VIII in the Corpus plate.