

TWO ATTIC EPIGRAMS

I. G., II², 4321. The stone on which this epigram was cut was seen by Pittakys in 1839 near the Propylaia.¹ Stephani searched in vain for it on the Acropolis in 1846, and then Pittakys discovered it again in 1850, this time west of the Parthenon. It was seen and copied in 1868 by Richard Schoene and at that time was resting upon the steps at the east end of the Parthenon.² The stone is now in the Epigraphical Museum in the Lower City where it bears the inventory number 8806.

The restoration of the text now published in the *editio minor* of the *Corpus* is that of Kaibel,³ with the exception of the beginning of line 2, which depends upon Loewy.⁴ The reading of the first line has presented serious difficulty, for the stone-cutter obviously made a mistake in inscribing the letters and then effected a correction by re-inscribing the beginning of the line with letters more closely spaced. The original text was not erased, and hence the present result shows a state of some confusion. A good picture is presented by the drawing in Loewy's publication, but he shows more at the very beginning of the line than is now discernible upon my very excellent squeeze.

One may make the following deductions with certainty: (a) The first line was originally cut in the true stoichedon pattern which characterizes the entire text; there were eight letters before the word ἀρετῆς. (b) When the correction was made, the first two letters of ἀρετῆς were re-inscribed to the right of their original positions and the tall vertical stroke at the end of a preceding word was cut in the space originally occupied by the alpha of ἀρετῆς. (c) The corrected text contained more letters than the original, and one must base his estimate of the number of extra letters upon his judgment of the nature of the error that had to be corrected.

I suggest as a solution to the epigraphical problem that the stonecutter wrote originally ΜΝΗΜΑΝΤΙ before ἀρετῆς, whereas, in fact, he should have written ΜΝΗΜΑΤΟΔΕΑΝΤΙ. The error is explicable on the assumption that he confused the final alpha of μνήμα with the initial alpha of ἀντί and so omitted five letters in the first draft. I take it that the vertical stroke now visible before ἀρετῆς is the final iota of ἀντί and tentatively I restore the beginning of the line as follows: [μνήμα τὸδε ἀντ]ὶ ἀρετῆς. It is not clear whether one should assume that the stonecutter invariably avoided elision, but in line 2 there is a clear example in the combination ὄδε ἀντόχθων. If elision is permissible in line 1, then the vertical stroke before ἀρετῆς may belong to the tau of ἀντ' and the opening words may have appeared as follows:

¹ Εφ. Ἀρχ., 1839, no. 171.

² Εφ. Ἀρχ., 1854, no. 2309; *Hermes*, V, 1871, pp. 308-309.

³ *Epigrammata Graeca*, no. 771.

⁴ *Inschriften Griechischer Bildhauer*, no. 62.

[*μνήμα τόδ' ἀν*]τ' ἀρετῆς. I am unable to determine whether the faint trace of a letter which appears on my squeeze above the delta in line 2 is part of an alpha. If it is, then it tends to confirm the shortened form of line 1.

Pittakys was not the first of modern scholars to see and copy this stone. It was seen also by Sir George Wheler during his visit to Athens in 1676, and Wheler's copy is now in his manuscript notes in the British Museum.⁵ Wheler describes the stone as being "prope Turrin," which accords well enough with the place of Pittakys' first discovery. In his notes Wheler has the stone between *I.G.*, II², 5206 and *I.G.*, II², 5818, the former being "in Epistylion portae 2^{ae} Castelli" and the latter being "prope templum Νίκης ἀπτόρου." Furthermore, Wheler saw the stone before the right half of it had been broken away; so the readings may now be taken from his text and do not have to depend upon restoration. Unfortunately, the top of the stone had been lost even in Wheler's time and he has left no record of line 1, but even on the preserved fragment parts of two letters still exist after ἀρετῆς. The first of these can only have been chi; the letter which follows it now exists as an upright vertical stroke properly spaced for rho, and I assume that these letters form the beginning of the name of the man whose valor was rewarded by the dedication. His name and the restoration at the end of the line must remain conjectural. The following is the text:

[*μνήμα τόδ' ἀν*]τ' ἀρετῆς Χρ[-----]
 [δῆμο]ς ὄδε ἀυτόχθων ἀντιθέο Κέκροπος·
 [τῶ]ι δὲ σὺ πλότον σῶιζε, θεά, τέρ<ε>ν' <ἔ>ν τε ὑγίαια[ι]
 αὐτῶι καὶ γενεᾷ δὸς βίον ἐκτελέσαι.
 Δημήτριος
 ἐπόησεν.

At the end of line 3 Wheler's copy has *τερηνηντενγίαια*; at the beginning of line 4 *αυτωνκαιγενεα*; and in line 6 *εποιεσεν*. There is evidently a difficulty of some kind which must be resolved in Wheler's copy of line 3. I have adopted a suggestion of Paul Friedländer that eta was read here twice for epsilon, and that the correct text should be [τῶ]ι δὲ σὺ πλότον σῶιζε, θεά, τέρ<ε>ν' <ἔ>ν τε ὑγίαια[ι] αὐτῶι καὶ γενεᾷ δὸς βίον ἐκτελέσαι. We arrived at this version after long correspondence in which many variants were considered, among them being readings which involved the change of *τερηνην* to <εἰ>ρήνην or to *περ[έ]νην*.⁶ But the phrase ἐν ὑγίαιαι seems necessary at the end of line 3 to complete the meaning of line 4: "Grant to him and his family to finish

⁵ Add. MS. 35334, no. 227. I am indebted to the Trustees of the British Museum for permission to publish this item.

⁶ No satisfactory solution naming Wealth, Peace, and Health could be found. The form *περ<ε>νην* might be interpreted as an accusative feminine from *τέρην*, *τέρεινα*, *τέρεν*. That this is not impossible is shown by the known genitive *τερένης* in *Anth. Gr.*, IX, 430, and by the grammarian's note on Alcaeus, 161: ἀπὸ τούτου θηλυκὸν *τερένης*, *τερένης* ---. (Cf. Cramer's *Anecdota Graeca* from Oxford as quoted in *Lyra Graeca*, I [Loeb Classics], *ad loc.*).

their lives in health.” To take line 4 by itself not only involves a harsh asyndeton but conveys a prayer of doubtful taste: “Grant to him and his family to finish their lives.”⁷ In the usage desired the phrase ἐν ὑγίαιαι can be supported by a reference to Plato, *Laus*, 734 B: ὑπερβάλλουσι δὲ ἡδοναὶ μὲν λύπας ἐν ὑγίαια, λύπαι δὲ ἡδονὰς ἐν νόσοις. It is perhaps idle to speculate about the nature of the dedication, but one may imagine the figure of Demos crowning the hero. In my opinion the use of ὄδε, referring to the demos, shows that this figure was represented together with that of the hero honored.

2. The following text depends upon a copy from the notes of Sir George Wheler:⁸

ἀχνυθὲν τόδε δῶρον ὑπὲρ τάφον εἴσατο μήτηρ
 παιδί φάου[ς] ὀλίγου πάμπαν ἀπο<φθι>μένου·
 οὔνομα δ' ἔστι -----

One obvious error in Wheler's copy has been corrected. The following is his version with an indication also of his division of the lines: ἀχνυθεντοδεδα | ρονυπερτα-
 φουεισα | τομητηρπαιδιφαου | ολιγονπαμπαναπονε | μενου Ϝ ουνομαδεστι.

Attention should be called to the form ἀχνυθὲν, which appears clearly in Wheler's copy. It appears also in one of the manuscripts (C) of Herodotos, V, 77, 4 and may lie at the base of the reading ἀχνυθὲν in two other manuscripts (A, B) of the same passage. The text has been emended in Herodotos either to ἀχνυόεν (Hecker) or ἀχλυόεν (Hude). The same may be done here, if one wishes to achieve a form recognized in Liddell and Scott. The main lexicon has neither ἀχνυθὲν nor ἀχνυόεν, though ἀχλυόεν has been restored in the *Addenda* and in *I.G.*, I², 394, the epigraphical original of the epigram preserved by Herodotos. I owe to Wade-Gery the suggestion that a new form ἀπο<σβ>εμένου may possibly be inferred for the end of line 2.

BENJAMIN D. MERITT

INSTITUTE FOR ADVANCED STUDY

⁷ Our text shows here a case of elision, although the *scriptio plena* is attested in both lines 2 and 3: ὄδε ἀτόχθων and τε ὑγίαια[ι]. Such lack of regularity is not without parallel, as, for example, in Kaibel, *Epigrammata Graeca*, 39, 71, and 79. In line 1 the suggested elision may have been occasioned by the crowded spacing in the corrected text, whereas the original version probably did not show elision (ἀντί being written in full before ἀρετῆς). The spelling ἐποίεσεν in line 6, instead of ἐπόησεν, shows that Wheler elsewhere had difficulty with the confusion of epsilon and eta.

⁸ See footnote 5, above. The manuscript carries the inscription number 307, and Wheler states that he copied it “in aedibus Dni Benaldi.” I am indebted to Paul Friedländer again for helpful criticism of this text.