TWO ATTIC EPIGRAMS

I. I.G., ΠF, 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 stonecutter 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 stochedon 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 MNHMANTIC before ἀρετῆς, whereas, in fact, he should have written MNHMATODEANTIC. The error is explicable on the assumption that he confused the final alpha of μημα 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: [μημα τόδε ἀντ] 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 δε αὐτόχθον. 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 Eph. Ἄρχης, 1839, no. 171.
2 Eph. Ἄρχης, 1854, no. 2309; Hermes, V, 1871, pp. 308-309.
3 Epigrammata Graeca, no. 771.
4 Inschriften Griechischer Bildhauer, no. 62.
[μνημα τοδ' αν] τι αρετης. 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 Turrim," which accords well enough with the place of Pittakys' first discovery. In his notes Wheler has the stone between I.G., \(\Pi^2\), 5206 and I.G., \(\Pi^2\), 5818, the former being "in Epistylo portae 2\(\circ\) Castelli" and the latter being "prope templum Νίκης απτέρου." 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 αρετης. 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:

\[
[\text{\[\text{μνημα τοδ'} \alpha ν\]τι \text{αρετης Χρ[---]}\]}
\]

[\(\text{δημο}\)\(\text{ς οδε αυτόχθων αντιθεο \text{Κέκροπος}'}\]
\[\text{\[\tau\]ι \delta ε συ πλωτο αυθε, \text{θεα, τερενυν' \text{ενυεια}i}]\]

\[\text{αυτω και γενεαι δος βιων \text{εκτελεσαι}}\]

\[\text{\textit{Δημητριος}}\]

\[\text{\textit{εποησε}}\]

At the end of line 3 Wheler's copy has περηνητευγιεια; at the beginning of line 4 αυτωνκαλγεια; and in line 6 επωισεν. 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 [\(\tau\)ι\(\delta\) ε συ πλωτο αυθε, \(\text{θεα, τερενυν' \text{ενυεια}i}]\(\text{αυτω και γενεαι δος βιων \text{εκτελεσαι}}\). We arrived at this version after long correspondence in which many variants were considered, among them being readings which involved the change of περηνη to ενυεια or to \text{τερ[\(\epsilon\)ην].}\(^6\) But the phrase \text{ενυεια} 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[\(\epsilon\)ην might be interpreted as an accusative feminine from τερην, τερεια, τερεν. That this is not impossible is shown by the known genitive τερενης in \textit{Anth. Gr.}, IX, 430, and by the grammarian's note on Alcaeus, 161: \(\text{απο τοιτον \thetaηλικον τερενη, τερενης}---\). (Cf. Cramer's \textit{Anecdota Graeca} from Oxford as quoted in \textit{Lyra Graeca}, I [Loeb Classics], \textit{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.” In the usage desired the phrase ἐν ὑγείᾳ can be supported by a reference to Plato, Laws, 734 B: ὑπερβάλλον δὲ ἡδονὰι μὲν λύπας ἐν ὑγείᾳ, 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 ὅδε, 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

άχρινθέν τόδε δῶρον ὑπὲρ τάφον ἐσατο μήτηρ
παϊδί φάνου[ς] δόλγου πάμπαν ἀποφθείμενον.
οὐνομα δ’ ἐστι ——

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: αὐχρινθεντοδω | ρονυπερτα-

ϕοινεσα | τομηηρπαϊδίφανον | οιλυγνπαμπαπανονε | μενον β’ ονυμαδεστι.

Attention should be called to the form ἄχρινθέν, 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 ἄχρινθέν in two other manuscripts (A, B) of the same passage. The text has been emended in Herodotos either to ἄχρινοεν (Hecker) or ἄχλυνοεν (Hude). The same may be done here, if one wishes to achieve a form recognized in Liddell and Scott. The main lexicon has neither ἄχρινθέν nor ἄχρινοεν, though ἄχρινοεν has been restored in the Addenda and in I.G., Τ', 394, the epigraphical original of the epigram preserved by Herodotos. I owe to Wade-Gery the suggestion that a new form ἀποφθείμενον may possibly be inferred for the end of line 2.
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7 Our text shows here a case of elision, although the scriptio plena is attested in both lines 2 and 3: ὅδε αὐχρινθθων καὶ ἒν ὑγείᾳ[α]. 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 (ἂντί being written in full before ἀμεῖσα). The spelling εποίεσαν in line 6, instead of ἐποίσαν, 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.