LEAGROΣ

I. Victor Statues of the Fifth Century in Athens

Among the Attic votive offerings of the sixth and fifth centuries there are dedications made by victorious athletes. The sixth century is represented by the capital of a Doric column which supported a bronze bowl, by fragmentary inscriptions on the lips of five bronze bowls, by an inscribed bronze discus, and by a stone jumping-weight with a dedicatory inscription. The inscription from Eleusis, I.G., I², 803, engraved on the lip of a marble basin is wrongly restored as referring to a victory in a gymnastic contest. We have no certain evidence of statues of athletes set up in that period on the Akropolis. It may be mentioned, however, that some of the statues of horses and horsemen and their inscribed bases, found on the Akropolis, could be understood as dedications of victors in the horse race. We may even suggest that the statue of Rhombos, the moschophoros, was a dedication of a victor who won an ox. Yet there is no certain evidence for these assumptions.

There are several instances which show clearly that in the first half of the fifth century the dedications of victor statues became popular in Athens. We recognize here the increasing Peloponnesian influence and we find just at the beginning of this period, about 500 B.C., the first examples of the use of the Peloponnesian bronze technique in Athens. At the same time we find Peloponnesian sculptors in Athens (this evidence is taken from the preserved artists’ signatures), and the development of the severe style in Attic art is partly due to the same influence. We may suggest that the statue of Hipparchos, son of Charmos, was a victor statue. This statue was melted down when Hipparchos was ostracised in 487/6 B.C. The στράτης ἀγμάς was set up not before that year. The following list contains inscriptions which presumably

1 Doric capital: I.G., I², 472; S.E.G., I, no. 8; W. Kroll, R. E., Suppl. IV, col. 16, 38 ff. Another bronze bowl was supported by the base with the inscription I.G., I², 464, but the preserved fragments of this inscription, coming from two different faces of the base, do not indicate that the dedication was made by an athlete after his victory. Bronze bowls: I.G., I², 401-404, 406. Bronze discus: I.G., I², 445; J. Jüthner, Jahreshefte, XXIX, 1935, pp. 32 ff. Jumping-weight: I.G., I², 802; Hampe and Jantzen, Jahrbuch, LI, 1937, Olympiabiericht, I, pp. 82 ff. For the whole group compare W. H. D. Rouse, Greek Votive Offerings, pp. 149 ff.


3 Payne and Young, Archaic Marble Sculpture, pls. 2 ff.; W. H. D. Rouse, Greek Votive Offerings, p. 151, note 11; A. Mommsen, Feste der Stadt Athen, pp. 98 f.; I.G., II², 2311, 72 ff.


belong to dedications made by victors in gymnastic contests (except for Nos. 2 and 8);¹ the dedications of victors in musical contests are here omitted.

1. Column with the dedicatory inscription of Kallias, son of Didymias, erected after a victory he won as a boy in the Great Panathenaia soon after or soon before 480 B.C.² It is a tempting assumption that his column bore one of the preserved marble statues, the so-called Kritios boy, which belongs to the same time and represents a young athlete. The Kritios boy, however, is not the only Kouros found on the Akropolis and we may assume that some of the other Kouroi also belonged to dedications made by victorious athletes (cf. Payne and Young, *Archaic Marble Sculpture*, pls. 97 ff.). For the political activity of Kallias see No. 5.

2. Bronze statue of Kallias, son of Hipponikos, the base of which is preserved with the inscription I.G., I², 607. This base has recently again been identified as belonging to the statue of Aphrodite dedicated by Kallias and made by Kalamis.³ We accept, however, the objections made by F. Studniczka.⁴ Furthermore we may suggest that the dedication was made by Kallias after his victories in the horse race in Olympia (Schol. Aristophanes, *Clouds*, 64). We know of several other victors in horse races who dedicated mere statues of themselves (e.g. Pausanias, VI, 1, 6 f.). If the monument could be dated prior to 480 B.C., we would understand why its existence is not recorded in our literary tradition.

3. Bronze statue of Epicharinos as a hoplitodromos, a work of the artists Kritios and Nesioites (perhaps mentioned in I.G., II², 1500, 12). Though the inscription is mutilated, we may assume that it did not contain any reference to the fact that it was after a victory when Epicharinos dedicated the monument. A preserved bronze statuette gives us an impression of the statue of Kritios and Nesioites.⁵

4. Marble statue of Phayllos, from Kroton, who joined the Athenian navy in the battle of Salamis and who was όλυμπιονίκης(?) and three times victor in the

² I.G., I², 608 + 714; Jahreshefte, XXXI, 1938, Beiblatt, cols. 47 ff.
Isthmian games.\(^1\) The cutting on the top of the base, mentioned by H. G. Lolling, *Catalogue*, no. 212, is situated on the left end of the preserved upper surface, indicating that our fragment belongs to the right half of the base. Thus the restoration of the epigram (see note 9) is incorrect since it assumes the lack of only two letters on the left side. For marble statues of victors see W. W. Hyde, *Olympic Victor Monuments*, pp. 324 ff. Since Phayllos’ name occurs long before 480 b.c. as a lover-name on Attic vases (cf. R. Lullies, *R.E.*, XIX, col. 1904, 50 ff.), and as his dedication can be dated about 470 b.c., he must have spent a good deal of his life in Athens. The monument on the Akropolis was a private dedication made by Phayllos himself. The crew of the ship he lead in the battle of Salamis consisted of citizens of Kroton who resided at that time in Greece (Pausanias, X, 9, 2). Thus we may doubt whether the public dedication of Kroton in Delphi was erected in honor of Phayllos.\(^2\)

5. Statue of Kallias, son of Didymias, the famous pancratiaist. The inscription, published as *I.G.*, I\(^2\), 606, records his many victories, among them the one in the Panathenaic games for which he dedicated the statue mentioned above (No. 1). This second dedication can be dated about 445 b.c. and after this date he may have been ostracised.\(^3\) We may suggest that his ostracism took place in connection with Perikles’ successful fight against the opposition in 443 b.c.

6. Statue of a victor signed by the painter and sculptor Mikon. The inscription, published as *I.G.*, I\(^2\), 534, can be dated, in spite of the Ionic alphabet, prior to 440 b.c. We have, however, no certain evidence that this dedication was made by a victor. We know that Mikon was famous for his victor statues, but the dedicatory inscription has not yet been restored in a satisfactory way (cf. G. Lippold, *R.E.*, XV, cols. 1557 f.).

7. Statue of the son of Kallaischros who was twice victor in the Isthmian and Nemean games, *I.G.*, I\(^2\), 829. While the other monuments, listed above, are dedications made to the goddess Athena and were found on the Akropolis, this inscription is a dedication to the Twelve Gods and was found in Salamis.\(^4\) Though we have another inscription, found in Salamis, where the Twelve Gods are mentioned (*C.I.G.*, I, 452; other references in note 4), we may doubt whether this inscription does not belong to the sanctuary of these deities in the Agora in Athens. If the reading τοι δοδεκαθεοι is correct we may remember that the sanctuaries of the Twelve

---


Gods in Kos and Crete were called δωδεκάθεου. The assumption that I.G., I^1, 829 belongs to Athens, made already by F. Hiller, does not clash with the fact that an inscription containing a list of prizes given in a gymnastic contest, I.G., I^3, 846, was also found in Salamis. We may even suggest that this inscription, too, belongs to Athens and to the Panathenaic games.

The dedication of the son of Kallaischros was set up in the second half of the fifth century. Though the name Kallaischros occurs in several instances within the period, we may suggest that it was the famous Kritias, son of Kallaischros, who made the dedication to the Twelve Gods. His statue may have been removed after 403 B.C., and that could explain the fact that there were no victor statues in Lykourgos’ time in the Agora of Athens (In Leocratem, 51).

8. Bronze four-horse chariot dedicated by Pronapes, son of Pronapides, after more than three victories, among them one each in the Nemean, Isthmian, and Panathenaic games. The letter forms of the inscription illustrated by N. Kyparissis, Δελτ. Ἠρώη, XI, 1927/28, p. 133, no. 8, fig. 6, indicate that the monument belongs to the fifth century. The two preserved names are the first part of a pentameter, since there is uninscribed space on the left side of the inscription, and we may assume that the dedicatory inscription consisted only of a pentameter (cf. I.G., I^2, 661 and p. 205; Aristotle, Ἀθ. Πολ., 7, 4). The preserved slab has anathyrosis on the back and on the right lateral face. The anathyrosis on the right lateral face and the four dowel-holes on the top can be seen on two photographs which show the slab still built in the north part of the west door of the Parthenon (cf. N. Balanos, Les Monuments de l’Acropole, pls. 140a and 141b; the piece in question is the fourth large slab from the top). The four dowel-holes on the top belong to the front hoofs of two bronze horses. Thus we may assume that the whole base consisted of six slabs, two on the smaller front face, three on the lateral faces. The left front slab is preserved. A similar base, consisting of six slabs, bore the δούρος ἵππος, dedicated by Chairedemos, son of Euangelos (cf. G. P. Stevens, Hesperia, V, 1936, pp. 460 f., fig. 14). The front length of our base can be restored to three meters. Thus the size of the chariot was the same as that of the chariot dedicated by the Athenians after their victory over the Boeotians and Chalkidians at the end of the sixth century and renewed in 446 B.C.

1 Paton and Hicks, Inscriptions of Cos, no. 43; A. Maiuri, Nuova Sillogle Epigráfica di Rodi e Cos, p. 141; M. Guarducci, Inscriptiones Creticae, I, pp. 69 ff., no. 13.
2 I.G., II^2, 3123. This monument is included in our list because of its historical significance and because it is the only chariot, so far known, which was dedicated by a victor and set up on the Akropolis.
3 To the inscription, I.G., I^3, 394 I, belongs the fragment E. M. 12410. The site where this monument was located has been determined by L. B. Holland, A.J.A., XXVIII, 1924, pp. 77 and 402, and L. Weber, Phil. Woch., LIII, 1933, cols. 331 f. The propylon itself was reconstructed in drawings by G. P. Stevens, Hesperia, V, 1936, pp. 474 ff. (cf. R. Stillwell, A.J.A., XLII, 1938, pp. 432 f.) ; Stevens also discussed the chariot problem on pp. 504 ff. of the same paper.
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For the name Pronapes, N. Kyfarissi has already referred to I.G., I², 400 Ia, a public dedication made by the Knights when Lakedaimonios, Xenophon, and Pronapes were their generals. The preserved base bore the statues of a horse and of a man standing beside the horse (cf. C. Anti, Bulletino Communale, XLVII, 1921, pp. 90 ff.). The monument was set up presumably in 446 B.C., and if it was ever moved and put on one of the west antae of the Propylaea, that evidently did not happen in the fifth century since the antae were not built to support statues. The general of the Knights in 446 B.C., Pronapes, may be identical with the dedicant Pronapes, son of Pronapides. The name is rare and both were Knights. I.G., I², 400 Ia shows the Ionic eta which also occurs in I.G., II², 3123; for the earlier letter forms of I.G., I², 400 Ia we may compare the Koronea epigrams. Furthermore it was perhaps the same Pronapes, son of Pronapides, successful general and victor in several chariot races, who was between 468 and 466 B.C. one of the accusers of Themistokles. He is mentioned together with Leobotes and Lysandros in the eighth letter of Themistokles (G. Nisseling, De Themistoclis epistolis, pp. 40 ff.), and we may assume that the author of this letter had his knowledge from Krateros (U. Kahrstedt, R.E., V A, col. 1694, 11 ff.). The full name was Pronapes, son of Pronapides, Prasieus, and this name as well as all the other evidence indicates that he belonged to the aristocracy (cf. K. Mras, Wiener Studien, LV, 1937, pp. 78 ff.). He was born before 490 B.C., and his first political activity may have been the accusation of Themistokles. He was Knight and victor in several chariot races. In 446 B.C. he served as general of the Knights together with Lakedaimonios, son of Kimon, and his dedication on the Akropolis may be dated about 435 B.C. We know of still another bearer of the name Pronapes in the fifth century (J. Kirchner, P.A., 12251), and it may be suggested that our Pronapes was identical with the father of Amyntias whom we know from allusions in comedy. These passages together with the scholia give us a picture of the personality of Amyntias which, though not favourable, agrees with the impression we obtain from the life of Pronapes, provided we realize that his son was an impoverished aristocrat still proud of his noble birth. Of this kind of nobleman Aristophanes made more fun than of any class in Athens, save the radical democrats.

Since Amyntias was appointed delegate to Thessaly he must have had some connection with Kleon and his party (E. Meyer, Gesch. d. Alterthums, IV, pp. 366 ff.).


mission to Pharsalos was a failure and we may suppose that it belongs to the year 424 B.C. when the Penestai in Thessaly were unable to stop Brasidas on his way to Thrace.\(^1\) The scholiast to Clouds, 31 asserts that his proper name was not Amyndias but Ameinias, and Aristophanes changed the name because of a law forbidding mockery of the archon in comedy. Whether or not we believe in the existence of this law the identity of Amyndias, son of Pronapes, with the archon of 423/2 B.C. has so far not been accepted.\(^2\) Yet to suppose that the scholiast invented the whole story is not likely and it would fit very well into the career of Amyndias.\(^3\) We may add that the pronunciations of æ and ù in the later fifth century in Athens were much alike.\(^4\)

II. Leagros

We should bear in mind these examples of dedications made by victorious athletes in Athens in approaching the proper subject of this paper, the dedication of Leagros, son of Glaukon, to the Twelve Gods set up outside of their temenos in the Agora of Athens.\(^5\)

The question what kind of statue was dedicated by Leagros has not yet been discussed. We have still another dedication to the Twelve Gods (No. 7 in our list) which was made by a victorious athlete, perhaps by the aristocrat Kallias, son of Kallaischros. We have already discussed the possibility that, though found in Salamis, it was once part of a monument which stood in the Agora of Athens. We obtain, in any case, from this inscription evidence that victor statues were dedicated to the Twelve Gods. It may be suggested that another dedication to the Twelve Gods, I.G., II\(^2\), 4564, was set up by a victor as indicated by the crown which was engraved

---


\(^3\) J. Beloch, *Gr. Gesch.*, II\(^2\), 2, p. 390, in his archon list accepted Amyndias as the archon eponymous of the year 423/2 B.C.


\(^5\) T. L. Shear, *Hesperia*, IV, 1935, pp. 355 ff.; B. D. Meritt, *Hesperia*, V, 1936, pp. 358 f., no. 2. I am indebted to Professor T. L. Shear for giving me the opportunity to use the part of the excavator's diary which concerns the sanctuary of the Twelve Gods.

below the inscription. The assumption, however, that this base bore a victor statue would clash with the assertion of Lykourgos (In Leocratem, 51) that no victor statues stand in the Agora of Athens. Furthermore, the significance which the cult of the Twelve Gods obtained in Olympia (O. Weinreich in Roscher, Myth. Lex., VI, cols. 781 ff.) shows clearly enough that these deities were connected with the gymnastic contests. N. Gardiner, Greek Athletic Sports, p. 74, referred to a passage in Herodotos (II, 7) recording the distance from the altar of the Twelve Gods in Athens to Olympia; there is, however, an inscription preserved, I.G., II², 2640, which indicates the distance from the altar of the deities in Athens to the harbor.

It seems, therefore, safe to suggest that Leagros’ dedication to the Twelve Gods was a victor statue set up after a victory he won in one of the panhellenic games, perhaps in the Panathenaia. The inscription itself does not indicate that it belongs to a victor monument, but we find the same omission in Nos. 2 and 3 of our list and in K. Purgold, Inschriften von Olympia, no. 143. We may assume either that such omission was customary in this early time or, as is probable, that the statue itself sufficiently indicated the purpose of the dedication. This interpretation is certainly right for the statue of Epicharinos and for the chariot set up by Gelon, and it can also be applied, as we shall see, to the statue of Leagros.

A further evidence for this interpretation may be found in a vase painting (Fig. 1) which shows the dedication made by Leagros and contains the love-name Λέαγρος καλός. The platform upon which the young athlete stands cannot be understood as a βήμα, though there was no difference between the βήμα and the statue base either in vase painting or in reality. A βήμα is, however, no place for an athlete to stand. But obviously appropriate for an athlete are the ἀγάλματ' ἐπ' αὐτᾶς βαθμίδος ἐσταυρ. Therefore, the vase painting may be interpreted as representing the statue of a young victor, standing on a rectangular base, with a laurel crown on his head. His right foot is advanced; in his right hand he holds a javelin, in his left an aryballos and a sponge or a discus-bag. The similarity between this painting and the statue which must have stood on the Leagros base is obvious if we notice the preserved dowels and dowel-holes which indicate the posture of the statue (see the illustration in Hesperia, IV, 1935, p. 357, fig. 14). We may even suggest that the small hole near the left

---

1. The date given for this inscription by O. Weinreich in Roscher, Myth. Lex., VI, col. 845, 60 ff., is too late. Thus, the reference he gives for his interpretation of Tyche as the Thirteenth God is not valid. Cf. A. Greifenhagen, Röm. Mitt., LII, 1937, pp. 238 ff. Another dedication to the Twelve Gods, I.G., II², 2790, was found so far from the Agora that it can be doubted whether it actually belongs to this sanctuary of the deities.


3. It is also significant that none of the inscriptions listed above specifies the dedication as aparche or dekate; cf. Hampe and Jantzen, Jahrbuch, LII, 1937, Olympiabericht, I, pp. 79 f.

4. C.V.A., Baltimore, fasc. 2, III I, pls. 5 and 6, pp. 13 f.

5. Pindar, Nemean, V, 3 f.

6. The latter interpretation was given by K. McKnight Elderkin, Harv. Stud. Cl. Phil., XXXV, 1924, pp. 119 ff. Neither interpretation is satisfactory, but I cannot give any other.
Fig. 1. The Leagros Cup in Baltimore
front corner on the top of the base once received the end of the javelin held by the athlete in his right hand.

The bearded man standing in front of the statue has always been interpreted as a trainer.¹ This interpretation cannot be maintained if the scene is the Agora of Athens and not a gymnasium. The bearded man is crowned with an ivy wreath and this ornament is not in keeping with the interpretation of this figure as an instructor.² We have, however, the inscription both words of which begin near the head of the bearded man indicating that they refer to him. Leagros himself is standing before the statue which he dedicated to the Twelve Gods. The javelin in the right hand of the statue indicates that the victory was won in the pentathlon.³

If our interpretation of the vase painting on the cup in Baltimore is correct we may include it in E. Langlotz’s list of paintings which show Leagros in different states of his youth.⁴ Our vase painting is certainly earlier than the cup in Brussels. The cup in Baltimore was attributed to the Kiss-painter and dated ca. 500 B.C. The date, however, which was proposed for the inscription of the Leagros base is the decade 490-480 B.C.⁵ Yet Miss G. M. A. Richter with whom I had the opportunity to discuss the question told me that, “though stylistically the vase has been dated about 500 B.C., an absolute date as late as 490 B.C. would perhaps be possible if we suppose that the painter retained an old-fashioned style.”⁶ The date of the Leagros base must be discussed together with the date of the earlier structure of the precinct of the temenos since the base was set against the structure’s west face at a time when the early precinct was still standing. The date of the earlier building, as I was informed by the excavators, goes back to the sixth century. The second structure was erected when the statue was already removed, but it is dated still in the fifth century. Since the disappearance of the statue can be connected with the devastation of Athens by the Persians we can conclude that only the first structure belongs to the time before 480 B.C. This assumption explains the good preservation of the front face of the base, in comparison with the top which was worn when used as a floor.⁷ We also understand why the victory of Leagros, whose descendants were famous in the fifth century, is not recorded in our literary tradition.⁸ If the first structure is rightly

¹ See, however, the doubts expressed by P. Hartwig, Meisterschalen, p. 43.
² For instructors with wreaths see F. Hauser, Jahrbuch, X, 1895, p. 110; Robinson and Fluck, Greek Love-Names, pp. 169 f.
⁴ Zur Zeitbestimmung, pp. 48 ff.; Robinson and Fluck, Greek Love-Names, pp. 132 ff.; see the additions made by A. Rumpf, Gnomon, XIV, 1938, p. 456.
⁵ B. D. Meritt, Hesperia, V, 1936, p. 357: 490-480 B.C.; E. Löwy, Sitzungsber. Ak. Wien, 216, Abh. 4, 1937, p. 9; not long before the death of Leagros in 464 B.C.; Robinson and Fluck, Greek Love-Names, p. 134: about 485 B.C. It may be noted that the theta with a circle in the middle does not occur in the Hecatompedon and Marathon inscriptions as Robinson and Fluck assert. The Leagros inscription is not metrical, not even a bad hexameter, as the same authors suggest.
⁶ A similar answer was given me by Miss D. K. Hill.
⁷ Notice here the horizontal striation of the right and left vertical margins which occurs also on the base with the Marathon epigram; cf. J. H. Oliver, Hesperia, II, 1933, no. 11.
⁸ Cf. B. D. Meritt, Hesperia, VIII, 1939, no. 15.
assigned to the time before 480 B.C., it must have been a part of the parapet built around the altar dedicated by Peisistratos, son of Hippias, when he was archon eponymous. His archonship has generally been dated in some year immediately before 512/1, but new evidence suggests a date as late as 497/6 B.C. (B. D. Meritt, Hesperia, VIII, 1939, no. 21). There may have been, however, an earlier altar of the Twelve Gods on the same place, though the preserved structure belongs to the building of Peisistratos. Shortly after the building of the temenos of the Twelve Gods, Leagros must have made his dedication. We do not know whether there existed any connection between Leagros and the family of the tyrants, but, if so, it certainly was not close. We do not know anything of Leagros’ father, Glaukon. He was certainly not the Glaukon whom J. Kirchner, R.E., VII, col. 1402, 7 ff., put in the first place in his list of the bearers of this name. It is, however, remarkable that Leagros was elected general immediately after the trial of Themistokles which happened between 468 and 466 B.C. when the aristocratic influence again increased in Athens. On the other hand the author of the eighth letter of Themistokles assumes that Themistokles and Leagros were friends.

Soon after Leagros’ statue was dedicated it was illustrated on the cup now in Baltimore. The vase painting belongs, therefore, to the class of vases with representations of statues (K. Schefold, Jahrbuch, LII, 1937, pp. 30 ff.).

Our knowledge of Leagros’ life is increased. The celebration of his youth on the vase paintings of the late sixth century will now be understood as a result of his activity as an athlete, and the fact that he was allowed to set up his dedication by the altar of the Twelve Gods shows his political significance which led to his στρατηγία in 465/4 B.C.

Indeed almost all of the victor monuments which we have listed above were dedicated by men who took active part in political life. Now we understand the passage in Lykourgos (In Leocratem, 51) which states that, in contrast to other Greek cities, there were no victor statues in the Agora of Athens. Thus the statue of the pancratiast Autolykos, set up near the prytaneion, is said to have been erected long after his death in commemoration of his political merits (cf. G. Lippold, R.E., XII, cols. 1994 f.). We may understand all these victor statues as the forerunners of the honorary statues of the fourth century.

A. E. RAUBITSCHEK

1 An even earlier date was proposed by J. J. E. Hondius, Hermes, LVII, 1922, pp. 475 ff.; ca. 525 B.C.; F. Cornelius, Die Tyrannis in Athen, p. 10, note 1: before 514 B.C.; O. Kern, Die Religion der Griechen, III, p. 321: 523/2 B.C., or somewhat later.
5 A building which was far from the Greek Agora; cf. E. Vanderpool, Hesperia, IV, 1935, p. 470, note 4; W. Dörpfeld, Alt-Athen, I, p. 36.
6 Cf. W. H. D. Rouse, Greek Votive Offerings, p. 269.