

TWO NOTES ON ATHENIAN EPIGRAMS

I

F JACOBY'S discussion (*Hesperia*, XIV, 1945, p. 158, note 8) of the fragmentarily preserved epigram published as *I.G.*, I², 609 is based on the assumption that the second line was engraved later than the first line. A study of the monument, or even of the photographs illustrated by Kirchner, makes it clear, however, that the two lines of the inscription were engraved at the same time. The column itself has a very roughly picked surface except for the two well-finished flutings which carry the inscription. There is no doubt that these flutings were made in order to receive the inscription. Since two flutings were cut, there also must have been from the very beginning two lines of inscription. It is generally agreed that the second line refers to the battle of Marathon, and the whole epigram must therefore have been engraved after this event took place. The monument to which the epigram belongs may therefore properly be called "a dedication for the victory"; Jacoby questioned this statement. It is, however, quite possible that this dedication was made by the son of the polemarch rather than by the people of Athens. Jacoby's interpretation of the second line as "a foot-note" seems to be based on the restoration of the beginning of this line. In Hiller's text as well as in Wilhelm's, the third hexameter begins either with an entirely new sentence (Hiller) or with a relative clause (Wilhelm). Meritt pointed out to me long ago that it is possible to restore at the beginning of the second line [εὐχσάμενος πολέ]μαρχος. This text may require a different restoration of the end of the fourth hexameter, but otherwise it provides a close link between the two lines of the inscription.

II

Jacoby rejected (*loc. cit.*, pp. 166-167), perhaps rightly, the suggestion that the second Marathon epigram honored those Athenians who were killed in an otherwise unattested engagement at Phaleron. It is difficult, however, to agree with his statement (p. 171) that "the archaeological inference from the alleged faint cutting must needs be wrong too." Here again, disagreement among the epigraphists has led Jacoby to disregard epigraphical evidence. Oliver's reconstruction of the monument is still the best offered so far, and the existence of the cutting cannot be denied; its connection with the second epigram should not have been rejected by Jacoby without further study of the monument. His modest admission of ignorance in these matters is used by him to good advantage.

Perhaps the men whose names were engraved on the second stele and who were honored by the second epigram fought in the battle of Marathon as associates of the Athenians. They may have been the Plataians and the Athenian slaves whose names were engraved on a separate stele in Marathon (Pausanias, I, 32, 3: ἕτερος [τάφος] Πλαταιέωσι Βοιωτῶν καὶ δούλοις).¹ This interpretation would throw an interesting light on the meaning of the second epigram; see Jacoby, *loc. cit.*, pp. 177-178.

ANTONY E. RAUBITSCHKEK

YALE COLLEGE

¹ J. A. Notopoulos who discussed the tomb of the slaves who fell at Marathon (*A.J.P.*, LXII, 1941, pp. 352-354) could have added a reference to Pausanias, I, 29, 7: ἦν δὲ ἄρα καὶ δῆμον δίκαιον βούλευμα, εἰ δὴ καὶ Ἀθηναῖοι μετέδωσαν δούλοις δημοσίᾳ ταφῆναι καὶ τὰ ὀνόματα ἐγγραφῆναι στήλῃ.