THIS report continues the presentation begun earlier this year (pp. 1-97, above) of inscriptions discovered in the Athenian Agora, and brings the systematic exploration of the inventory down about to No. 5020 out of a total of 6738. Several of the earlier exceptions are here accounted for, but many remain.

49 (Plate 50). Three fragments of Pentelic marble have so far been identified as belonging to a financial record of the latter part of the Fifth Century:

a. Fragment of a stele, with part of the original top preserved, found on May 13, 1937, in a late context on the north slope of the Acropolis east of the Late Roman Fortification (T-U 23-24).

Height, 0.128 m.; width, 0.09 m.; thickness, 0.09 m.
Height of letters, 0.008 m.
Inv. No. I 4859.

ΣΤΟΙΧ.

5 [---] παρα Ναχσί [---]
[---] ΤΧΗΗΗΓ[---]
[---] ΗΗΓΗΙΙΙ[---]
[---] ι παρα [---]

b. Fragment broken on all sides, discovered by Pittakys on August 10, 1857, in the Odeion of Herodes (Ἑφ. Ἀρχ., no. 3174), and published most recently as I.G., Ι, 324a.

Height, 0.10 m.; width, 0.07 m.; thickness, 0.10 m.
Height of letters, 0.007 m.

[---] ηναίος
[---] τέτερ
[---] νοτ
[---] η
[---] ζ

[---] Κα[ταναίοι -- -- -- --]
[---] ΔΔΑ[---]
[---] Σκε[λοι -- -- -- --]
[---] ΗΗΗΑ[---]
[---] ΡΕΓ[νοι -- -- -- --]
[---] ΡΧΓ[---]
[---] Σκε[λοι -- -- -- --]
In line 9 the reading in the Corpus is \( \pm \alpha \theta \) evaios, but the first visible letter is eta, not epsilon, and the word was not cut in rasura.\(^1\) In line 11 of the second column the initial letter was clearly rho, as I have verified it on the stone in Athens; Pittakys had read phi, and he read correctly \( \tau \delta \epsilon \) in line 10 of Col. I.

c. Fragment broken on all sides, found on May 21, 1935, in modern context over the north end of the Middle Stoa (O 13).

Height, 0.091 m.; width, 0.10 m.; thickness, 0.10 m.
Height of letters, 0.007 m.
Inv. No. I 2916.

\[ \Sigma \Theta I X. \]

\[
\begin{align*}
15 & [\text{vacat}]
\Delta \Xi[\text{vacat}]
\Theta[\text{vacat}]
\Lambda[\text{vacat}]
\Pi[\text{vacat}]
\Gamma[\text{vacat}]
\end{align*}
\]

\[ \text{hoi de } \Sigma \zeta \kappa e l o i \quad \text{and } \epsilon \pi \delta \sigma o n \]

The letter at the end of line 19 (after sigma) is too closely spaced for \( \Gamma \) or \( \Upsilon \). It may have been \( \Gamma, K, \) or \( \Gamma \).

These fragments are brought together by the identical character of their writing, though letters in Col. I of fragment \( b \) are carelessly cut, and by the similarity in texture of the marble. The lettering is quite like that of the Erechtheion accounts of 408/7 (I. G., I\(^2\), 374). Pittakys associated the fragment known to him with the Athenian expedition to Sicily in 415 B.C. (loc. cit.); Eduard Meyer thought of it as a continuation of the records of public audit (like I. G., I\(^3\), 324), made in 414 B.C. to cover the period from 418/7 to 415/4;\(^2\) E. Cavaignac dated it in 427/6 and counted the references to Sicily as applicable to the Athenian expedition of that year.\(^3\) He thought the writing quite similar to that of I. G., I\(^3\), 324 of 422/1 B.C. There is, indeed, this similarity, and about all that can be said of the date on the basis of the writing is that the inscription belongs to the time of the Peloponnesian War; but this is evident anyway from the content.

Except for the one name (if it is a name) in fragment \( b \), Col. I, line 9, all the

\(^{1}\) The reading was correctly given by Kirchhoff (from Koehler’s copy) in I. G., I, 541. Pittakys (op. cit.) claimed that the letters \( \eta \alpha \) were cut on a deeper surface of the stone (which is true), but the deeper surface was apparently due to a blemish on the stone before the inscription was cut, and the letters were simply written over the blemish with no erasure.

\(^{2}\) Forschungen zur alten Geschichte, II, p. 132.

\(^{3}\) Histoire financière d’Athènes, p. XXX.
names are those of Athenian allies in South Italy and Sicily. The amounts of money specified are large, and appropriate, I think, to the early days of the great Sicilian expedition of 415 B.C. But these sums were not sums raised in Athens; they were sums contributed in the field by Sicilian and Italian allies (e.g., παρὰ Ναξοῦ [ιον] in fragment a, line 1). Hence they are not sums on which interest was to be reckoned by the logistai and repaid (with the principal) to the treasurers of Athena, as was the case in I.G., I², 324. They seem rather to have been contributions from the allies, of which a record was kept and cut on stone in Athens.

It is well known that Athens expected financial help from her allies in the west, but it was not in the event as much as she had hoped nor as long sustained. At the very outset the money promised from Egesta was forthcoming only in part (Thuc., VI, 46, 1), amounting in fact to thirty talents. By 413 B.C. Nikias was writing to Athens in complaint that Naxos and Katane could help him no longer (Thuc., VII, 14, 2). The record, surely, does not belong to this later year, but should be associated with the beginning of the campaign, when Rhegion first served as a base and (though herself unwilling to take the field) may well have furnished money to the Athenian generals. In 415 B.C. the available money in Naxos and Katane, which latter concluded an alliance with Athens and became the Athenian base after Rhegion (Thuc., VI, 51, 2-3), had not as yet been drained away. The Athenians had succeeded in realizing 120 talents from the sale of Sikels captives taken at Hykkara in the late summer of 415 (an item which does not appear in this epigraphical text), and undoubtedly received some funds from the Sikels through whose territory they marched (Thuc., VI, 62, 3) from Egesta back to Katane in the autumn of the same year. Perhaps lines 9, 13, and 19, are in some way a reflection of the success of this march.

50 (Plate 50). The facing-block for a base of statues dedicated to Demeter and Kore. The principal fragment of the base was found on May 21, 1936, built into the wall of a stoa of the first century before Christ bordering the road which led north-westwards from the Market Square (E 3). This was published in Hesperia, VI, 1937, pp. 339-342, with illustrations and a drawing (front elevation and cross-section in Fig. 6).4 Many small fragments were found at the same time built into the wall of the modern drain which had destroyed the left side of the base. Some of these are shown in the early photographs (op. cit., p. 340), but others were added in November of 1938. These small fragments seemed at first to be uninscribed, and it was assumed that the left half of the base (on the face) had indeed remained blank. But as the fragments were assembled, and the monument reconstructed, it became clear that an inscription on the left half of the face balanced that on the right, giving a symmetrical text not unlike that of No. 51, below. A photograph of the reconstructed face

is shown in Plate 50, with the small fragments in position, and a revised drawing, to take the place of that published in 1937, is shown in Figure 1. The dimensions are:

Height, 0.674 m.; width of principal face, 1.35 m.; width of left face, 0.665 m.; thickness at the right end of the longer face, 0.24 m.; thickness of the block at the end of the shorter face, 0.357 m.
Height of letters: (in line 1) 0.019 m.; (in lines 2-4 and 8-12) 0.021 m.; (in lines 6 and 13), 0.009 m.
Inv. No. I 4165.

Both the long and the short exterior faces were finished; the ends and the interior faces were left rough. The top was finished with a claw-hammer except for a relieving surface along the edge. Well-cut mouldings ran along the top and bottom, at the top a cyma reversa over ovolo, at the bottom a torus (see Figs. 1 and 3). At the right end of the long side these mouldings carry around for a short distance and beyond them the surface is rough for setting into or against something. The preserved marble fragments could have served as facing for a poros core, and over the whole was probably laid a plinth to serve as the proper base for the statues.

ca. med. saec. IV a.

\[ \Delta \eta \mu \eta [\tau] \mu \ kai \ K \theta r i e \]
\[ \Sigma \pi o [\delta i a s] \]
\[ [- - - - - ] \]
\[ 'A \phi i [\nu a i o s] \]
\[ 5 \ vacat \]
\[ [- - ] \nu o [i] \kappa \lambda [\hat{\eta} \ s \ \epsilon p o \iota \sigma e n] \]
\[ vacat \]

\[ \Sigma p o n d i o u \ \gamma u n \eta \]
\[ \Pi r a \xi t e l \eta s \ \epsilon p o \iota \sigma e n \]

The small letters of line 6 were read by Clairève Grandjouan on November 7, 1953. Epigraphically, they are \( \lambda \xi \kappa \lambda \), with distances between centers measuring 0.016 m., 0.023 m., and 0.017 m. respectively. On the stone there is a break between the sigma and the kappa. If it be assumed that iota once stood in this interval, the distances between the letters (not measured on centers but measured as interspaces) are 0.007 m., 0.008 m., 0.008 m., and 0.009 m. respectively. On the whole, the spacing favors the restoration of iota where the stone is now broken. Such a restoration also aids in the interpretation, for the letters \([- - ] \nu o [i] \kappa \lambda [\hat{\eta} \ s] \) now become part of a proper name and form part of a single line beneath the main inscription on the left just as \( \Pi r a \xi t e l \eta s \ \epsilon p o \iota \sigma e n \) forms a single line beneath the main inscription on the right. This \([- - ] \nu o [i] \kappa \lambda [\hat{\eta} \ s] \), therefore, was either the dedicator of the whole monu-

\[ ^{5} \] The photograph does not yet include a small piece with the letters \( \mu \eta \) of \( \Delta \eta \mu \eta [\tau] \mu \) in line 1, which is, however, shown in the drawing.
ment (restoring \([- - ]\upsilon\sigma[i]\kappa\lambda[\hat{\eta}\varsigma\ \alpha\nu\varepsilon\theta\acute{e}ke\nu]\) or the sculptor who made the companion statue to that made by Praxiteles (restoring \([- - ]\upsilon\sigma[i]\kappa\lambda[\hat{\eta}\varsigma\ \epsilon\pi\omega\iota\hat{o}\nu\sigma\varepsilon\nu]\). The modesty of the letters, as well as their position, makes it most unlikely that \([- - ]\upsilon\sigma[i]\kappa\lambda[\hat{\eta}\varsigma]\) was the dedicator,\(^6\) while the same phenomena support strongly the idea that \([- - ]\upsilon\sigma[i]\kappa\lambda[\hat{\eta}\varsigma]\) was the sculptor, contemporary with Praxiteles, who executed the statue on the left side of the base.

![Diagram of the Base](image)

**Fig. 1. No. 50: Drawing of the Base.**

The larger letters of lines 2-4 are to be restored with the name of Kleiokrateia's husband. The demotic, for reasons of symmetry in the spacing of the names,\(^7\) was probably ['Αφιδ]δ[ναος] rather than [Δαι]δ[αλιδης], and indeed the name Spoudias is known in Aphidnai (Hesperia, IV, 1935, pp. 525-526, No. 39, lines 7-8) in the following century.

\(^6\) See, for example, the display in No. 51, below.

\(^7\) See the names on the right half of the face. The uninscribed surface to the left of the preserved delta in line 4 indicates an open spacing which would probably bring the final sigma of Δαιδαλιδης onto surface at the right which is uninscribed.
The prosopographical connection between this text and the forty-first oration of Demosthenes was noted by Shear, who made the necessary correction in the text of the oration (XLI, 3) for the demotic of Polyekto, from Θράσως to Τελθράσως. There is no indication in the oration to help in identifying the deme of Spoudias, who as husband of Kleiokrateia was defendant in the action. The excavators have seen a connection between this base with the statues that once stood upon it and the statues of Demeter, her daughter, and Iakchos reported by Pausanias (I, 2, 4) as standing in the temple of Demeter near the spot where the base was found. According to Pausanias these statues were designated as works of Praxiteles by an inscription on the wall of the temple written in Attic letters. I find it difficult to accept this connection, for the statues upon our base were portrait-statues (cf. also No. 51, below), and if the suggestion offered above for the restoration of line 6 is correct only one of them was the work of Praxiteles. The base may have been dedicated originally in the sanctuary of Demeter near which it was found, but the possibility must be kept in mind that it was originally in the Eleusinion, and that it had no connection of any kind with the lower sanctuary. The quite similar base published here as No. 51 surely belonged to the Eleusinion.

51 (Plate 51). A base for two statues, found on April 29, 1938, re-used in the wall of a building of late classical times antedating the Late Roman Fortification and in part overlaid by it (T 21). The base was in three main pieces, which were originally joined with clamps, as shown in Fig. 2. One of the smaller pieces was recovered from the same building in which the inscribed fragment had been re-used. The inscribed fragment has the following dimensions:

Height, 0.84 m.; width, 1.575 m.; thickness (at the left), 0.285 m.; thickness (at the right), 0.18 m.

8 Hesperia, VI, 1937, p. 341.
9 This correction is utilized in A. T. Murray's edition in the Loeb Classical Library: Πολυκτός γὰρ ἡ τοῦ Θράσους is changed to read Πολυκτός γὰρ ἡ τοῦ Τελθράσους.
11 Another large base with a dedication to Demeter and Kore (I.G., II°, 4025) has a disposition of text similar to that of our base. The signature of the artist Kephisos is below the name at the right side of the face and Marcadé remarks (Recueil des Signatures de Sculpteurs Grecs [Paris, 1953], I, 54): Kephisosot peut n'avoir exécuté que l'une des deux statues que supportait la base. The name (and perhaps an artist's signature) on the left side of I.G., II°, 4025, has been lost because of damage to the surface. Marcadé believes, as do I, that it was once inscribed. This base was found in 1875 near the Tower of the Winds; it probably stood originally in the Eleusinion.
Height of letters, 0.015 m.-0.02m. (lines 1-9), 0.01 m. (line 10). Inv. No. I 5407.

This monument was mentioned in *Hesperia*, VIII, 1939, p. 207, as evidence for the site of the Eleusinion. The stone, in its re-use, was laid with the inscribed surface uppermost, and most of the moulding from the top and bottom was chipped away. Numerous fragments of the upper moulding were found just west of the block itself, apparently where they fell when the stone was re-used, and good evidence that it was not far from its original location. The profile of this moulding may be seen in Figs. 2 and 3; the lower moulding remains largely lost.

*post med. saec. IV a.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Φυστεύς</th>
<th>Πεισυκράτεια</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Δημοποτίδου</td>
<td>5 Λάχωνος</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'Αχαρνεύς</td>
<td>'Αχαρνέως</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

12 See also R. E. Wycherley, *The Athenian Agora, III: Literary and Epigraphical Testimonia*, p. 83.
The stone has been worn almost smooth where the artist's signature occurs. This signature, very faint, was detected by Eugene Vanderpool early in May of 1949 and

The full name, including the ethnic, was deciphered with the use of a charcoal wash on January 16, 1955, and confirmed by a later examination, in which Evelyn Harrison also joined, on March 2, 1955. The letters do not show clearly in a photo-
graph, but such as they are they may perhaps be seen in the illustration on Plate 51. They are shown also in the drawing in Figure 2.

The dedicant, his mother and father, and his two grandfathers, as well as the sculptor, are hitherto unknown.

52 (Plate 52). Two fragments of Pentelic marble, belonging to the base of a dedication by the taxiarharchs. Fragment a was found on March 30, 1937, in the wall of a modern cellar east of the Late Roman Fortification (U 22); it is broken at the right only, though badly chipped, and preserves a corner of a tripod-base with a trace of a cutting on top and a contact surface below. Fragment b was found on April 27, 1939, in a wall of Turkish date west of the Late Roman Fortification (R 22); it is broken at both sides, but preserves the smooth lower surface and probably part of the original top, with one end of a rectangular cutting in the line of the break at the right. The back is not parallel to the front, but on both fragments the inscription is cut on the slightly concave face of the tripod-base.

a) Height, 0.20 m.; width, 0.225 m.; thickness (at the end), 0.098 m.
   Height of letters in line 1, 0.015 m.; in lines 2-7, 0.01 m.-0.012 m.
   Inv. No. I 4659 a.

b) Height, 0.20 m.; width, 0.16 m.; thickness, 0.23 m.
   Height of letters in line 1, 0.015 m.; in lines 2-7, 0.012 m.
   Inv. No. I 4659 b.

post med. saec. IV a.

ταξια[ρχοι οι ἐπὶ -- ----- ἄρχοντος Δήμητρι] καὶ Κ[ὅρη ἄνεθηκαν]

Ἐρεχθηόδος [Πανδιονίδος] [Ἀκαμαντίδος] [Κεκροπίδος] ος Α[αντίδος]
Δίατος [-----] [-----] [------] ης Λ[-----]
Παμβωτά[δης] [-----] [-----] [-----]ς Μ[αραθώνιος]
Αἰγηίδος [Λεωντίδος] [Οινηίδος] [Ἰπποθωντίδος]ς 'Αυ[τιχίδος]
Δημοφών [-----] [-----] [-----] Γ[-----]
Ἐρχείες [-----] [-----] [-----] Α[γιλεύς]

The character of the writing suggests a date in the second half of the fourth century. Neither Diaitos nor Demophon is otherwise known, and the name of the archon in line 1 is lost; so a more precise date is not possible. The place of discovery of this inscription, with the fact that it is a base which once bore a tripod dedicated to Demeter and Kore, is further evidence for the site of the Eleusinion, where the dedication was undoubtedly erected. See R. E. Wycherley, The Athenian Agora, III: Literary and Epigraphical Testimonia, pp. 74-85.
53 (Plate 52). Part of a sculptured stele of Pentelic marble, with the left side and possibly the back preserved, found on March 29, 1937, in a pit of Turkish date on the north slope of the Acropolis, below the Klepsydra (T 26).

Height, 0.277 m.; width, 0.283 m.; thickness, 0.095 m.
Height of letters, 0.009 m.
Inv. No. I 4663.

The writing is stoichedon with a vertical unit of 0.016 m. and a horizontal unit of 0.014 m. Above the inscribed surface is the lower left corner of a shallow relief: at the left the lower legs of a draped figure standing right; at the right, facing this figure, the front hoofs of a prancing animal and the booted foot of a second human figure.

\[
\text{init. saec. IV a.} \quad \Sigma \text{TOIX. 25}
\]

\[
[\varepsilon]\delta\xi\varepsilon\nu \tau\omicron\nu \beta\omicron\lambda[\upsilon] \iota \ [\kappa\alpha\iota \tau\omicron\nu \delta\acute{\eta} \mu\omicron\omicron\omicron\nu]
\]

\[
[\varepsilon] \varepsilon\chi\theta\omicron\nu\varsigma \ \dot{\epsilon}\rho\nu\tau\dot{\alpha} \nu[\epsilon\nu, \ldots \ldots]
\]

\[
[\ldots] \dot{\epsilon} \gamma\rho\alpha\mu\acute{\mu}\acute{\alpha} \tau\nu[\epsilon, \ldots \ldots] \ \dot{\epsilon}\pi\epsilon\sigma\tau\alpha\nu\]

\[
[\tau\epsilon,] \Gamma\nu\acute{\alpha} \theta\omicron\nu \ \dot{\epsilon}\pi\epsilon\nu \ [\ldots, 13 \ldots \ldots]
\]

\[
5 \ [\ldots] \alpha[\ldots] \dot{\omicron}\eta\nu \ \kappa\alpha\iota \ [\ldots \ldots \ldots \ldots]
\]

It is possible that the theta of \(\Theta[\varepsilon\omicron\iota]\) is preserved above the tau of line 1. I regard alpha in the third space of line 5 as certain, but I have no good suggestion for the letter which follows.

54 (Plate 52). Fragment of Pentelic marble, broken on all sides, found on May 19, 1937, in a context of Byzantine date over the Late Roman Fortification on the north slope of the Acropolis (T 26). There is a slight spring of a moulding immediately above the first line, almost carried away by the fracture of the stone. Below the last line is a rebate (for later use) which cuts into the letters a trifle.

Height, 0.11 m.; width, 0.07 m.; thickness (possibly original, with the back rough), 0.10 m.
Height of letters, 0.007 m.
Inv. No. I 4899.

\[a. \ 336 / 5 a. \quad \text{NON-\Sigma TOIX.}
\]

\[
[\dot{\epsilon} \pi\omicron] \theta\omicron\delta\omicron\nu[\lambda\omicron\nu \ \acute{\alpha} \rho\chi\omicron\nu\tau\omicron\upsilon \ \dot{\epsilon} \pi \ \tau\acute{\omicron}\nu \ [\ldots \ldots]
\]

\[
[\ldots \ldots] \varsigma \ \pi\omicron\nu\tau[\alpha\nu\epsilon\iota\alpha\varsigma \ \hat{\eta} \ [\ldots \ldots \ldots \ldots]
\]

\[
[\dot{\epsilon} \gamma\rho\alpha\mu\mu\acute{\alpha} \tau\nu[\epsilon\nu \ [\ldots \ldots \hat{\omicron}\nu\varsigma \ [\ldots \ldots \ldots \ldots]
\]

\[
[\ldots] \kappa\nu \ \dot{\epsilon}[\kappa\omicron\sigma\tau\acute{\epsilon} \ \tau\acute{\omicron}\nu \ \pi\omicron\nu\tau\alpha\nu\epsilon\iota\alpha\varsigma \ [\ldots \ldots]
\]

\[
[\ldots \ldots] \ [\ldots \ldots \ldots \ldots \ldots \ldots]
\]
The secretary of the year of Pythodelos is not known, but his full name is known to have had 19 letters (I.G., Π², 328).

55 (Plate 52). The right-hand front corner of a block of Hymettian marble, a string course of a dedicatory monument, found on April 27, 1937, in a terracotta drain in a house of late Roman date southeast of the Tholos (H 12). The top is finished as a good bearing surface, and near the preserved end has a shallow dowel cutting with lead in its bottom. The under side of the stone was picked toward the middle, and lightly drafted around the edges.

Height, 0.117 m.; width, 0.275 m.; thickness (not original), 0.244 m.
Height of letters, 0.015 m.
Inv. No. I 4781.

*post a. 307/6 a.*

[ἐπὶ — — — — ἀρχοντος [πρυτάνεις
[στεφανωθέντες ὑπὸ τῆς βουλῆς καὶ το]υ δήμου ἀνέθεσαν

The dedication was made by the prytaneis of Antigonis or Demetrias, whose name (to be restored in line 1) suffered damnatio after 201/0. The letter forms indicate a date for this inscription very soon after the creation of the Macedonian phylai, the formula of dedication being a variant of those used, e.g., in I.G., Π², 1750-1753.

There is obvious crowding of the letters at the end of line 2; hence one can hardly estimate from the restoration of this line how long a name should be supplied for the archon in line 1.

56 (Plate 53). Fragment of a stele of Hymettian marble, with part of the face, right side, and back (rough-picked) preserved, found on May 22, 1937, in a late context on the north slope of the Acropolis west of the Late Roman Fortification (T 23-24). The face shows almost vertical markings of a toothed chisel.

Height, 0.137 m.; width, 0.192 m.; thickness, 0.072 m.
Height of letters, 0.005 m.-0.006 m.
Inv. No. I 4906.

The inscription is stoichedon with a square chequer pattern in which the units measure 0.0116 m.

*ante fin. saec. IV a.*  

 ἡμ[... καὶ ἀναγράφῳ]
[αι τὸ ψῆφωσμα τὸν γραμματέα τὸν κατα]
The restoration in lines 1-2 presupposes that the scribe wrote merely τὸ ψῆφισμα (as, e.g., in I.G., Π², 448, line 26) instead of the normal τὸν τὸν ψῆφισμα. Other solutions to the epigraphical crux of these lines are possible: (1) to write — — ἕφισμα[ . . . ἐπιγραφή | δὲ τὸ ψῆφισμα — — ]; (2) to suppose that the full formula [ἐπιγραφή | δὲ τὸ ψῆφισμα — — ] was used, in which case the letters ἕφισμα might have been a dative, as, for example, in I.G., Π², 109b, line 24, but in this case the reading [— — — — ] ἕφισμα[ δὲ τὸ ψῆφισμα — — ] would be too long by one letter for a correct stoichedon spacing in line 1; (3) the letters ἕφισμα may have been an abbreviated ending of some patronymic or ethnic; (4) to assume, as is perhaps most probable, that the decree awards a crown and that the proclamation was to be made not only at the Dionysia but also [Παναθηναίων καὶ Ἑλεοννίων τοῖς γυμνικοῖς ἔφισμα[σων] (cf. e.g., I.G., Π², 851, line 11 as restored). It would suit the date better to restore the singular [Παναθηναίων (vel Διοννίων) — — τῷ ἔφισμα[ν]] (cf. e.g., I.G., Π², 555, line 6).

The restoration ἐν ἀκροπόλει in line 4 accords well with the fact that the stone was found on the north slope of the Acropolis, whence it had presumably fallen. The elision in line 7 finds a parallel, for example, in I.G., Π², 360, line 26.

57 (Plate 53). Part of a stele of Hymettian marble, with the right side and back preserved, found in a modern retaining wall east of the Late Roman Fortification on the north slope of the Acropolis (ca. S 23) on July 2, 1937.

Height, ca. 0.27 m.; width, ca. 0.245 m.; thickness, ca. 0.12 m. (the back rough). Height of letters, 0.008 m.
Inv. No. I 4991.

a. 217/6 a. NON-ΣΤΟΙΧ. 33-37

[— — — — — — εἰπεύν] ἐπ<ε>υδῆ Ἰερο[ — — — ]
[ἰερεῖα λαχοῦσα — — — ]!ΓΕΝΕΙ.ΟΥΛΑΜ[— αα5-α — ]
[— αα4 — εἰς τὸν ἐνισχυόν τὸν ἐπὶ Εὐάνδρου ἀρ][χοντος καλῶς καὶ εὔσφ]εβδῆς τὴν ἱερο[στύνη]
5 [ἐξήγαγεν καὶ τὰς θυσίας τὰς καθηκού[σας ἐξ]
[θυσία καὶ τὰ λουπτά] ἐφιλοτυμήθη[η ἐπ]τ[— — — ]
[— — — — — εἰπεύν] ειλήθη δὲ τῆς στ[ρώ]
It seems probable that this text is a decree in honor of a priestess of the Great Mother. Orgeones are mentioned in lines 9-10, and the restorations can be patterned much on the analogy of I.G., II², 1314 and 1315, of approximately the same date. There is a difficulty in line 2 which I have not been able to resolve. Another difficulty in line 10, where the letters on the stone are certain, can be resolved by reading and restoring the aorist active indicative of διανέμω as [διενέμησε]. The infinitive διανέμωσαι is quoted by Liddell and Scott from Didymos; hence this irregular form finds some support, and one may bear in mind that the decree is not an official Athenian record but an enactment by a group more than usually open to non-Attic influences.

The date of the archon Euandros in line 3 is that given by Dinsmoor in Hesperia, XXIII, 1954, p. 316.

58 (Plate 53). Fragment of a stele of Hymettian marble with the rough-picked top and part of the left side preserved, found on June 4, 1937, in a late Byzantine pithos on the north slope of Kolonos Agoraios (F 4).

Height, 0.16 m.; width, 0.175 m.; thickness, 0.06 m. Height of letters, 0.009 m. Inv. No. I 4933.

a. 178/7 a.

Φίλων ἄρχων ὑμᾶ [ετὰ Μενέδημον]
'Ἀλέξιων Σπευ [σίππου Ἀζηνεύς]
[Σ] ὧκράτης Σωγένου [ς Ἀζηνεύς]
[... ] ἀτης Ἀριστοκρ [άτους --- ---]
5 [οι τ] ἀν Αχαι [ἂν πρὸς τὸν δήμον]
[τὸν Ἀ] θηναίων [ἀπεσταλμένοι (?)]
[... ] χος Ἀντ [ἐγονεύς]
[... ] Ἀζώ [τιος]
[--- --- --- --- --- ---]

The archon Philon named in line 1 is dated in 178/7 B.C.¹³

Alexion son of Speusippos of Azenia of line 2 is identified as that envoy to Miletos in 196 B.C. (Dittenberger, Syll. ⁸, 588, lines 6-7) who helped to negotiate a recon-

¹³ Cf. Pritchett and Meritt, Chronology, p. xxviii; Meritt, Hesperia, XXVI, 1957, p. 94.
ciliation between Miletos and Magnesia. His name also appears in a list of contributors (I.G., II², 2332, lines 11-15) making payments not only for himself but for his wife Lysippe and his brother Speusippos. Now he appears in an important record touching relations between Athens and the Achaian League in 178/7. His father Speusippos was ephebos in the archonship of Antiphon (Hesperia, VII, 1938, p. 112, No. 20, line 57, now dated in 260/59 by Dinsmoor in Hesperia, XXIII, 1954, p. 314). Supposing Alexion the son to have been born about 240 B.C., one may reckon that he was about 44 years old when he went on his mission to Miletos and 72 years old when he was named in this present text of the archonship of Philon. A descendant of his, possibly a grandson, has been read into the text of I.G., II², 1006, IV, line 121, as an ephebos of the year 123/2 B.C. The name there is given as Ἀλεξίων [--- - - - o]υ Ἀζηνεῖς. This reading is not correct, for the stones cannot be so placed as to allow the beginning and end of this name to come together. Who [--- - - o]υ Ἀζηνεῖς was we do not know. Alexion in 123/2 may have been of Azenia, but this inscription is not evidence for it. The first letter of his patronymic is preserved as alpha: hence the name is to be read as Ἀλεξίων Ἀ[--- - - - -]. Sokrates son of Sogenes of line 3 was also possibly of Azenia, the father Sogenes being councillor in this very year (Hesperia, Suppl. I, p. 121, No. 64, line 94), though it should be noted that the names Sokrates and Sogenes occur together in a different family on an Attic grave monument from the Peiraeus (I.G., II², 6614: Σωγέν[ης] Σωκράτ[τους] Κυθήρ[ροις]). In line 5 the space for restoration at the left is suitable for 2½ letters (sc. [οι τ]ῶν Ἀχαί[ῶν]), while in line 6 the space at the left is suitable for 4 full letters (sc. [τῶν Ἀ]θηραῖων). The belief that these two lines are a kind of heading to introduce a group of Achaian names is favored by the discovery in line 8 of the ethnic Ἀζω[ν]. Stephanos says (s.v. Ἀζωτος): ἐστι καὶ ἄλλη πόλις Ἀζωτος Ἀχαίας. ὁ πολίτης Ἀζωτίος. The name before the ethnic can be restored with five letters. On the analogy of line 8 the name in line 7 should be read as [. . . .]χος, with ethnic Ἀντ[--- -] representing some other city in the Achaian League. The evident choice of ethnic is Ἀντ[ιγονέις], with reference to that Antigoneia which down to 222 B.C. was known as Mantinea. The nature of this document is still obscure, but the names of influential Athenians coupled with names of visiting Achaian suggest reference to the political situation of 178/7. Since the death of Philopoimen in 183 there had been in the Achaian League a growing faction of subservience to Rome, led principally by Kallikrates of

---

14 He and his sons erected a statue to Lysippe, the base of which is published as I.G., II², 4031. 15 Inasmuch as I hold that Kleomachos probably belongs to 260/59 (cf. Hesperia, XXVI, 1957, p. 97) I would date Antiphon rather in 259/8. 16 See P.W., R.E., s.v. Antigoneia 5. Stephanos has Ἀντιγόνεια: --- ἐστι καὶ πόλις Ἀρκαδίας, ἡ πρότερον Μαντίνεια.
Leontion, who was made much of by Rome and who in 179 effected the restoration of the Lakedaimonian and Messenian exiles (Polybios, XXIV, 8-10 [Loeb]). All through the first third of the century the loyalty of Athens to Rome had been nurtured without a break by the aristocratic democracy. This inscription may well have been an expression of their unity of view, possibly called for at this particular time by the death of Philip V and the accession of Perseus to the Macedonian throne. Though the reign of Perseus began with overtures for friendship with Rome, there could in fact be no friendship, and the relations between Macedonia and Rome deteriorated until the final catastrophe at Pydna in 168 B.C. (cf. Hesperia, V, 1936, pp. 429-430).

59 (Plate 53). Four joining fragments from the right side of a stele of Hymettian marble, of which the upper three (a), grouped as one, were found on April 7, 1937, in a modern cesspool southeast of the market square and east of the Late Roman Fortification (U 22), and the lower (b) was found on January 22, 1937, in the wall of a modern house south of the Eleusinion (T 22). Overall measurements are as follows:

- Height, 0.175 m.; width, 0.12 m.; thickness (not original), 0.052 m.
- Height of letters, 0.008 m. (O = 0.005 m.; Y = 0.012 m.).
- Inv. Nos. I 4685 (frag. a) and 4441 (frag. b).

a. 172/1 a.

\[
\begin{align*}
&[---] \\
&[---] \text{etc.} \\
&[---o] \text{etc.} \text{etc.} \\
5 \text{ etc.} & \text{etc.} \\
[\text{etc.}] & \text{etc.} \text{etc.} \\
& \text{etc.} \text{etc.} \text{etc.} \text{etc.} \\
10 \text{ etc.} & \text{etc.} \text{etc.} \text{etc.}
\end{align*}
\]

The generals praised are those of the archonship of Sosigenes (172/1). The hoplite-general is well-known.\(^{17}\) The general in charge of the fleet is not mentioned by Aristotle (\'Αθ. Πολ., 61), but there is evidence for the command as early as 316/5,\(^{18}\)


\(^{18}\) See I.G., II, 682, lines 4-5: πατὴρ δὲ Φαίδρου κεὶ[ροτονή]θες στρατηγὸς ὑπὸ τοῦ δήμου ἔπι τὸ ναυτικ[ὸν].
and it is known also later.\textsuperscript{19} Aristotle reported two generals for the Peiraeus and it is known from \textit{I.G.}, II\textsuperscript{2}, 2873 that there were three in the early first century. Hence I have restored the plural \textit{στρατηγοὺς} in line 11, where epigraphically the space seems to agree with a restoration slightly longer than that of line 9. The dedications by Argeios and to Argeios (\textit{I.G.}, II\textsuperscript{2}, 2872, 2952) refer to him alone as general for the Peiraeus, but do not exclude the possibility that he served with one or more colleagues.

The inscribed face of this stone was ruled with guide-lines for the letters of the text. It is worth mention that this same treatment of an inscribed surface appears in other documents of approximately the same date: (e.g.) \textit{I.G.}, II\textsuperscript{2}, 945 of 168/7; \textit{Hesperia}, Suppl. I, pp. 117-118 (No. 61) of ca. 180-160 B.C.; \textit{Hesperia}, XXVI, 1957, pp. 47-51 (No. 7) of 173/2-168/7. This was evidently a fashion, perhaps in one workshop, in the preparation of epigraphical stelai.

\textbf{60} (Plate 53). Fragment of Pentelic marble, broken on all sides and at the back, found on April 24, 1937, in a late Roman context southeast of the Tholos (H 12).

Height, 0.17 m.; width, 0.106 m.; thickness, 0.06 m.
Height of letters, 0.015 m. and 0.012 m.
Inv. No. I 4744.

\begin{verbatim}
\begin{verbatim}
a. 184/5 p. (?)  
[\textit{ἀγαθεὶ τόχει}]
[ἐπὶ ἄρχοντος Δημὶ]\textit{στρατά} [τοῦ ἐπὶ τῆς]
[\textit{έπι} πρωτανείας] ὀι πρωτάν [εἰς τῆς Δεον]
[\textit{τίδος φυλῆς τημ.}]\textit{ήσαντες} [ἐπονοῦς καὶ]
5 [τοὺς ἀσυτοὺς ἄν]\textit{γραψαν}
[\textit{ἐπώνυμος} — — — X]\textit{ολλείδη} [s]
[————] \textit{Εὐπ[υρίδαι]}
[—————] [——-]\textit{στ[—————]
[—————] [————— ————]}
\end{verbatim}
\end{verbatim}

This is a dedication by the prytaneis of Leontis, of a type characteristic of the late second century after Christ (cf., e.g., \textit{I.G.}, II\textsuperscript{2}, 1773, 1776). The name of the archon is partially preserved in line 2, and is probably (but not certainly) to be restored as Demostratos, known to have held this magistracy in 184/5.\textsuperscript{20}

\textbf{61} (Plate 56). Upper right corner of a stele of Pentelic marble, found on June 9, 1937, in a disturbed level southeast of the Tholos (G 12). A crowning ovolo moulding

\textsuperscript{19} E.g., \textit{I.G.}, II\textsuperscript{2}, 2336, lines 219, 255, 263 (early first century); \textit{I.G.}, II\textsuperscript{2}, 2987.

runs across the upper edge of the face of the stele; the top was flat and finished as a bearing surface.

Height, 0.142 m.; width, 0.125 m.; thickness, 0.068 m.
Height of letters, 0.01 m.
Inv. No. I 4945.

ante a. fere 138 p. NON-ΣΤΟΙΧ. ca. 46-48

[ἐπειδὴ οἱ πρωτάνεις τῆς Αιανίδου καὶ οἱ αἵ]σειτοι οἱ ἐπὶ
[-- -- ca. 8 -- ἄρχοντος πρόσωδον ποιησάμενοι ἀποφ]αίνουσιν
[τῇ βουλῇ τοῦ ἐστῶν ταμίαν καὶ τῶν ἀρχιερεά τῶν] Σεβαστῶν
[διὰ βίου Τιβ. Κλαύδιον Ἀττικόν Μαραθώνον τεθυκ]έναι τά
5 [σος τᾶς θυνίας τοῖς θεοῖς ἄς πάτροιν ἤν ἐν τῇ πρωτανε] ἵων ἁγά
[θῆ τύχῃ δεδόχθαι τῇ βουλῇ τὰ μὲν ἀγαθὰ δέχεσθαι τὰ ἐν τῷ οἷς ἐ]
[iεροῖς -- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -]

For the restorations, see Hesperia, Suppl. I, p. 186, No. 116 and p. 195, No. 121. The date of the inscription is probably in the early second century after Christ. If this is so, it probably falls within the time when Claudius Atticus was ἀρχιερεύς τῶν Σεβαστῶν διὰ βίου. His name, therefore, is to be restored in line 4. But he was both priest and treasurer, as he was also in Hesperia, Suppl. I, p. 195, No. 121, so that the name of his phyle, Aiantis, must also be restored in line 1. For the career of this Claudius Atticus, father of the sophist Herodes, see I.G., IIa, 3595, with stemma and commentary. The date of his death is the terminus ante quem for the inscription. See P. Graindor, Héroe Atticus (Cairo, 1930), pp. 19-38.

62 (Plate 57). Fragment of Pentelic marble, broken on all sides and at the back, found on June 10, 1937, in a late Roman context north of the Odeion (N 7).

Height, 0.333 m.; width, 0.369 m.; thickness, 0.138 m.
Height of letters, ca. 0.018 m. (lines 1-3); 0.009 m. (lines 14-25); 0.006 m. (lines 6-12).
Inv. No. I 4964.

ante fin. saec. ΠΙ p.

[--- --- τιμήσαντ]εσ [ἐαντούς]
[kαὶ τοὺς ἀσείτους] ἀνέγραψαν ἐν
3 [--- --- --- πρυτ]ανεία
[--- ---] ἐξ Οἰου
5 [--- ---] [γγ]αμματεύς βουλευτῶν 15
'Επίγονος Εὐκάρπου ἐν
Many of the prytaneis belong to well-known families of the second century. Salarios, so far as I know, is new to Attic prosopography, but is the Roman name Salarius. In line 20 Σωτήρ Ἰάκχου may be the son of that Ἰακχος Σωτήρος ἐξ Οι(ον) [I.G., Π², 2069, line 27] who was ephebos in the middle of the century. Granted the date, then [Π]λάτων of line 24 may be identified with that Πλάτων Ἀιθαλίδης [I.G., Π², 1806a, line 5] who was councillor also in 195/6 A.D. Epigonos son of Eukarpos (line 16) belongs to the family of the epheboi Eukarpos of Oion (I.G., Π², 2017, line 16) and Epigonos of Oion (I.G., Π², 2067, line 55). Tryphon of line 17 is related to the various men of this name mentioned in I.G., Π², 2103, line 66, in I.G., Π², 2483, line 14, and in I.G., Π², 2208, line 55, being perhaps identical with one of them who can be dated at approximately this same time.

The names from lines 6 to 12 are cut in smaller letters in a different hand (lunate sigma except in line 6) and are to be taken as additions, I think, for whatever reason, to the original list, which probably had a normal first column comparable to the second main column of which lines 14-25 have been preserved.

63. Block of Pentelic marble, which was originally the plinth of a statue, now set on one long side as part of a repair at the northwest corner of the basin of Klepsydra (T 27). At each end a pair of deep cuttings seem to have been used as dowel holes for the feet of a quadruped. The full original length of the block is not at present obtainable. Its sides were stippled, with a smooth band at the top. All edges are much worn. The inscription is a series of names, widely spaced, in a horizontal line close to the top of what is now the uppermost side. The inscription is not original on the block (C = sigma).

Height (original), ca. 0.25 m.; width (i. e. length), at least 2.10 m.; thickness (present height), ca. 1.08 m.

Height of letters, 0.01 m.-0.04 m.

21 For the date, see Hesperia, XVIII, 1949, pp. 18, 51-52.
Inv. No. I 4995.

\textit{aet. Rom.}

\[ [\ldots] \gamma\epsilon\iota\nu\sigma \quad \textit{Μενεκράτης} \quad \textit{Εὐπόρος} \quad \textit{Διονύσειος} \]

The readings given here were made in 1937. In 1954 I was not able either to study or to measure the text because of the water in Klepsydra.

64 (Plate 54). Upper right corner of a small stele of Pentelic marble, with an ovolo and fascia above the inscribed surface, found on April 21, 1937, in a mixed context between the porch of the Tholos and the propylon of the Bouleuterion (H 11).

Height, 0.103 m.; width, 0.10 m.; thickness, 0.045 m.

Height of letters, 0.005 m.

Inv. No. I 4743.

\textit{ca. a. 400} a.

\[ [\ldots] \nu\tau\omicron \kappa\upsilon\rho\omicron\omicron\upsilon\tau\omicron\epsilon \quad [\varsigma \quad [\ldots] \\Lambda\pi\epsilon\iota\nu\iota \quad [\ldots] \epsilon\iota\kappa\lambda\omicron\omicron \ \Upsilon \quad [\ldots] \alpha\mu\nu\sigma\omicron\omicron\omicron \ \varsigma \quad [\ldots] \rho\omicron\omicron \ \pi\epsilon \quad 5 \quad [\ldots] \nu\alpha\iota \quad [\ldots] \]

The significance of this text is obscure, but mention of the Areopagus and the use of the verb \kappa\upsilon\rho\omega\iota (cf. Aristotle, \textit{A\theta. Πολ.}, 59, 6) make it seem worthy of further study.

65 (Plate 55). A small pedimental funeral stele of Pentelic marble, broken at the bottom and at the upper left corner, found on April 24, 1937, in a modern wall in the area of the Eleusinion (T 20).

Height, 0.34 m.; width, 0.295 m.; thickness, 0.10 m.

Height of letters, 0.019 m.

Inv. No. I 4761.

\textit{saec. IV} a.

\[ [\ldots] \sigma\iota\alpha\iota \quad \epsilon\phi\epsilon\sigma\iota\nu\sigma \]

66 (Plate 55). Dedicatory statue base of Pentelic marble, broken at the left, with the back smooth and the bottom rough-picked, uncovered on May 10, 1937, built upside down in the west face of the Late Roman Fortification Wall south of the Eleusinion (T 21). The top and right side are not visible or available for study.

Height, 0.39 m.; width, 0.48 m.; thickness, 0.91 m.

Height of letters in lines 1-3, 0.022 m.; in line 4, 0.015 m.

Inv. No. I 4850.

\textit{saec. IV} a.

\[ [\tau\omicron\upsilon \theta\epsilon\omicron\omicron\upsilon \ \Lambda\alpha \kappa\rho\alpha\tau\epsilon\iota\delta\upsigma\varsigma \quad [- \quad 9 \quad \Pi\alpha\iota\nu\epsilon\omicron\upsilon\varsigma \quad [\alpha\nu\epsilon\theta\rho\kappa] \epsilon\nu \quad \textit{vacat} \quad [- \quad - \quad \epsilon\tau\omicron\omicron\upsilon] \upsilon\epsilon \]

The place of finding indicates that the dedication probably was set up in the Eleusinion.\textsuperscript{22} The disposition of the text must have been similar to that of \textit{I.G.}, \textit{II}², 4608.

67 (Plate 55). Fragment from a statue-base of Pentelic marble, found on April 13, 1937, in a modern wall over the Panathenaic Way, southwest of the Eleusinion (T 21). The block is broken at the left, and the back has been re-cut; but the right side, the smooth top, and the rough-picked bottom seem to be original surfaces. Part of the cutting for the base of a statue is preserved. The stone was re-used upside down as a doorsill.

\textsuperscript{22} For the Eleusinion see R. E. Wycherley, \textit{The Athenian Agora, III: Literary and Epigraphical Testimonia}, pp. 74-85.
Height, 0.26 m.; width, 0.43 m.; thickness, 0.18 m.
Height of letters, 0.015 m.
Inv. No. I 4714.

    ante med. saec. IV a.
    [− − − − −]ιδης επόησεν

68 (Plate 55). Grave stele of Pentelic marble, with the right side, the back (rough), and part of the face preserved, found on June 10, 1937, among collected marbles from the north slope of Kolonos Agoraioi.

Height, 0.145 m.; width, 0.145 m.; thickness, 0.082 m.
Height of letters, 0.012 m.
Inv. No. I 4953.

c. med. saec. IV a.
    [− ca. 3]νη[− − −]
    ['Αθ]φωκλέος
    ['Α]χαρνέως

The father was a member of the Council in 360/59 B.C. (I.G., Π2, 1745, line 48).

69 (Plate 55). Fragment of Pentelic marble, with part of the left side preserved, but otherwise broken, found on June 17, 1937, among collected marbles on the north side of Kolonos Agoraioi. A projecting band above the text has also been broken away.

Height, 0.095 m.; width, 0.115 m.; thickness, 0.052 m.
Height of letters, 0.01 m. (line 1), 0.007 m. (lines 2-4).
Inv. No. I 4973.

saec. IV a.
    [...]ως Τ[− − − − −]
    [Ει]φωκομής
    [B]ρούσελος [− − −]
    ['Α]ρεθιας Φ[− − −]
    [− − − − − − − − − − − − −]

This is a catalogue of the Prytaneis of Erechtheis. In line 3 I believe that the name must be Βούσελος, though the visible letters are Ρουσελος. One might take the rho for an incomplete beta and read <Βούσελος were it not for the indication given by line 4 that there was one letter still to be supplied before the rho. The letters in line 4 are Ρεθιας Φ, but there is no such name (so far as I am aware). The restoration should be ['Α]ρεθιας Φ[− − −]. The name in line 1 may belong to the archon or secretary of the year, but the arrangement is different from that of other such catalogues of the fourth century (e.g., I.G., Π2, 1740-1753).

70 (Plate 54). Dedicatory base of Pentelic marble, found on June 18, 1937, east of the Late Roman Fortification (T 24). Both corners of the inscribed face are broken, but the plinth, rectangular in shape, has a drafting at the base on all four sides, and at the top a very flat cavetto moulding also on all four sides. In the center of the top is a circular sinking for a small column, the butt of which remains in place, securely leaded. The circular socket is framed by a low moulding.

Height, 0.34 m. (of plinth, 0.195 m.); width, 0.65 m.; thickness, 0.65 m.
Height of letters, ca. 0.025 m.
Inv. No. I 4984.

med. saec. IV a.
    ['Ακαμα]ντίς ένίκ[α]
    [− ca. 11 − − −] Φιλιάδου Π[όριος]
    [έγνυμ]ασιάρχε

For other dedications of gymnasiarchs, see I.G., Π2, 3017-3024. For the sake of symmetry in the present text the phyle in line 1 can be restored only as Akamantis or Hippothontis, and the demotic in line 2 (beginning with gamma or pi) must have been short. The unique combination is with ['Ακαμα]ντίς as the phyle and Π[όριος] as the deme.

71 (Plate 54). Grave monument of Pentelic marble, preserved entire, found on May 14, 1937, in a late Roman context east of the north
end of the Odeion (O 9). This is a rectangular shaft, the lower three quarters of which have been left rough for insertion in the ground. The upper end is carefully finished on all four sides and on the top. The inscription is on the top.

Height, 0.41 m.; width, 0.14 m.; thickness, 0.11 m.
Height of letters, 0.011 m.-0.014 m.
Inv. No. I 4863.

Post med. saec. IV a.

Πατρόκλεα

Dimensions of the upper, finished, part of the stone are: height, 0.10 m.; width, 0.11 m.; thickness, 0.083 m.

72 (Plate 54). Lower left corner of a mortgage-stone of Hymettian marble, found on April 10, 1937, in a context of the third century B.C. in a cistern on the south slope of Kolonos Agoraion (B 14:6). The rough-picked back is preserved, though much worn; the left and lower edges are bevelled.

Height, 0.11 m.; width, 0.15 m.; thickness, 0.046 m.
Height of letters, 0.013 m.
Inv. No. I 4698.

Ante fin. saec. IV a.

[---]ος
[---]αν
προικα [---]
'Αγαθόρχο[ν 'Αλωτε]
5 κέως θυγ[ατρι vac.]

Vacat

Alternatively, the restoration of the demotic in lines 4-5 might be [Θημα]κέως. There is an erasure of one letter space at the beginning of line 3. For examples of dower mortgage-stones, see I.G., II², 2659-2683. Here the name of the daughter of Agatharchos must have stood at the end of line 3.

73 (Plate 56). Part of a stele of Pentelic marble, preserving the back (dressed smooth) and right side (with anathyrosis), found on March 31, 1937, among marbles collected between the Stoa of Attalos and the Panathenaic Way.

Height, 0.155 m.; width, 0.216 m.; thickness, 0.157 m.
Height of letters: in line 1, 0.019 m.; in line 2, 0.015 m.; in lines 3-4, 0.007 m.
Inv. No. I 4673.

Fin. saec. III a.

[---]ος
[---]ιαν
[---]τον ικ Κοιλης
[---]ιαν

Vacat

The reading of the initial letter in line 1 is uncertain, and the nature of the monument is not clear. Philotades of Phyle is probably to be identified with the polemarch of 228/7.23 The two Athenians here named both belonged to the phyle Demetrias. The text must be dated before the dissolution of the Macedonian phylai at the end of the third century, and is itself added evidence for the fact that part of Phyle (normally of Oineis) belonged to Demetrias during the lifetime of that phyle.24

74 (Plate 55). Fragment of Hymettian marble, with part of the left side and back (smooth) preserved, found on May 18, 1937, in a late Roman context between the Stoa of Attalos and the Odeion (O 10).

Height, 0.083 m.; width, 0.163 m.; thickness, 0.056 m.

23 Cf. Hesperia, IX, p. 76, where the reading Φιλωτάδης is in error (taken over from Hesperia, II, Plate XIV, line 13) for Φιλωτάδης.
24 See Hesperia, IX, p. 75.
Height of letters (in lines 1-2), 0.012 m.;
(in line 3), 0.015 m.
Inv. No. I 4908.

ca. a. 200 a.

[...ονο[---[---]---]

Ταχτασ [- - - - - - -]

Στρ[- - - - - - - - -]

The surface on which the inscription was cut
once bore an earlier text, now largely erased,
of Hellenistic date. What is now the left edge
of the stone was the right edge in this period
of earlier use. Ends of three lines can still be
seen, apparently of a list of names, in letters
0.008 m. high:

[---[-[---]---]ος
[---[-[-]---]ος
[---[-[---]---]ν

75 (Plate 54). Fragment of Hymettian mar-
ble, broken on all sides, found on May 8, 1935,
in a late context east of the Odeion (N 11).

Height, 0.145 m.; width, 0.13 m.; thickness,
0.035 m.
Inv. No. I 2861.

ca. a. 185/4 a.

[---[-[-[---]---]---]

[---[-[-[---]---]---]

[ Τμοχής ΠΙολυκέους Θερίκιο[---]

5 [---[-[-[---]---]---]

[---[-[-[---]---]---]

[---[-[-[---]---]---]

[---[-[-[---]---]---]

These names belong to a list of epheboi
appended to a decree honoring the epheboi and
their officers, like I.G., Π², 787 or 901. Indeed,
it seems quite possible that this fragment is part
of the same stone with I.G., Π², 901. A date in
the early part of the second century (i.e., after
201 B.C.) is indicated by the fact that the dene
Poros, which had belonged to Demetrias from
307/6 to 201,²⁸ is again in the phyle of Ak-
mantis. The character of the writing and the
spacing of letters of the two pieces are, in my
opinion, sufficiently alike to allow them to be-
long together.

The ephebos of line 4 was probably Timokles
(P.A., 13734), or perhaps his brother (P.A.,
13620). Both were sculptors, as was their
father before them (P.A., 11992, with stemma).
The father Polykles had been made proxenos
by the Aitolians in 210/09 B.C. (I.G., IX², 1,
No. 29, line 17; cf. Addenda). The patronymic
in line 8 may have been ['Ηρα]κλεωδύρον.

76 (Plate 56). The left half of a herm of
Pentelic marble, broken at top and bottom and
cut down the right side, found on April 26,
1937, in the cellar stairs of a modern house east
of the Panathenaic Way, southwest of the Eleu-
sinion (T 20).

Height, 0.90 m.; width, 0.15 m.; thickness,
0.23 m.
Inv. No. I 4796.

ca. a. 21 p.

Δεωγ[δην δα]

δουξή[σαντα]

'Αρτεμ[ίδος]

G. A. Stamires discovered that this is the
same stone as that seen by Pittakys (Εφ. 'Αρχ,
no. 2480) in the Church of Hypapanti, and sub-
sequently lost. Koehler published it as I.G.,
III, 990.

The Leonides who as dadouchos was honored
by Artemidoros with this herm is without doubt
that Tib. Kl. Leonides of the well-known family
of Melite who is known to have been dadouchos
about 21 A.D. The stemma of the family is

²⁸ Cf. Hesperia, IX, 1940, pp. 75, 80.
given by Kirchner in his commentary on I.G., II*, 2342.

The modeling about the neck of the herm shows that the post-classical cutting, for which the drill-holes may still be seen, must have split the stone from top to bottom into two approximately equal halves. The right-hand side, so far as I am aware, has not been re-discovered.

77 (Plate 56). Fragment of Pentelic marble, broken on all sides, representing a shield in relief on which the inscription is cut, found on June 19, 1937, in a late Roman context in a cistern on the north slope of Kolonos Agoraïos (G 5:2).

Height, 0.13 m.; width, 0.82 m.; thickness, 0.04 m.
Height of letters, ca. 0.009 m.
Inv. No. I 4975.

a. 138-161 ρ.

Ἀττω[κράτωρ]
"Ἀδριανο[ῦ]
"Ἀντων[ος]
Εὐσεβὴ[ς]

78. Statue base of Pentelic marble, found face down in the Late Roman Fortification (T 20/21) on May 26, 1937. There are mouldings about the top and bottom, the top ones carried around the two sides, the bottom ones in a simplified form about the left side but not the right. The back is rough-picked. There are cuttings in the top for a bronze statue with iron dowels that held the heels still partly preserved imbedded in lead. There is a shallow bedding for the right foot (ca. 0.17 m. by 0.10 m.); there is no bedding, but only a scratched line, for the left foot.

Height, 1.25 m.; width, 0.615 m.; thickness, 0.63 m.
Height of letters, 0.035 m.-0.045 m. except in line 5 (0.022 m.).

Inv. No. I 4922.

a. 157 ρ.

Κειβεκα Βάρμαρον
υπατον
"Ημώδης 'Αττικοῦ
Μαραθώνος
5 ὁ φίλος
ψηφιακὸν
τῆς πόλεως

A photograph is published in Hesperia, VII, 1938, p. 328, with an identification of Civica Barbarus as that M. Ceionius Civica Barbarus who was consul at Rome in 157 A.D. Herodes, who calls himself his friend (ὁ φίλος was added as an afterthought to the text between lines 4 and 6), erected the statue.26

79 (Plate 57). Columnar grave monument of Hymettian marble, with the top broken away, found on March 24, 1936, outside the area of the Agora, over a grave of Roman date in a section of the ancient cemetery north of the Kerameikos.

Height, 0.62 m.; diameter, 0.29 m.
Height of letters, 0.03 m.
Inv. No. I 4868.

aet. Rom.

"Ἀντίκ[ισ]α
"Ἀριστονος
"Ἀντικ[ος]
γυνή

There is not room to restore both sigmas in "Ἀντίκ[ισ]α in line 1. In line 3 the word "Ἀντίκ[ος] was first written, and then written over correctly.

80 (Plate 56). Fragment of Pentelic marble, broken on all sides, found on May 7, 1937, in the foundation of a house of Roman date southeast of the Tholos (G-H 12).

26 For this friendship cf. P. Graindor, Hérode Atticus, pp. 157-158, who protests rightly against the “emendation” of Barbarus to Varus in Philostratus, Vitae Sophistarum, I, 25, 15.
GREEK INSCRIPTIONS

Height, 0.10 m.; width, 0.20 m.; thickness, 0.035 m.
Height of letters, 0.009 m.
Inv. No. I 4789.

_aet. Rom._

vacat

[- --] γιάς Σφήττιος
[- -- Ἄλ] ἕξανδρος Παλληνεύς
[- --] Ῥος Γαργάττιος
5 [- -- --] vacat

The names are not arranged according to phylai, and their significance is uncertain. Perhaps they represent ἀδείσια at the end of a ptytan catalogue, like (e.g.) the names of _I.G._, II², 1775, lines 43-45.

81 (Plate 56). Small dedicatory base of Hymettian marble, with parts of the top, left side, face, and bottom preserved, found in a Byzantine wall over the western end of the Temple of Ares (J 8) on May 25, 1937. In the top is a segment of a shallow cutting, roughly circular, _ca._ 0.018 m. deep.

Height, 0.081 m.; width, 0.139 m.; thickness, 0.105 m.
Height of letters, _ca._ 0.013 m.
Inv. No. I 4918.

_aet. Rom._

Βαύλων Ἀρ[--- _ca.6 --] Παλ
ληνεύς Μ[ηρίδ Θεόν]
ἐν τῷ ἔπ[--- _ca.8 -- -- --]
ἀρχοντ[ος ἐναντῶ]

The restoration Μ[οψαώς] (cf. _I.G._, II², 2994) is probably too short for the space available at the end of line 2, as this is determined by the restoration at the end of line 4.

82 (Plate 57). Part of a pedimental funeral stele of Pentelic marble, broken at both sides and at the bottom, but with the back and part of the raking cornice at the top preserved, found on April 21, 1937, in a building of the modern bazaar west of the Stoa of Attalos.

Height, 0.432 m.; width, 0.333 m.; thickness, 0.155 m.
Height of letters, 0.016 m.
Inv. No. I 4776.

_aet. Rom._

[- -- -- --] Πάλλα Ζωίλο[ν]
[- -- -- --] Ἰφιστάδον θην[άτη]

The low relief below the inscribed band shows a sistrum, presumably held by Paula, who is thus identified as a priestess of Isis. The inscription on the left half of the stele has been lost, as has also the figure below it which must have balanced Paula in the sculptured relief.

83 (Plate 57). The inscription now published as _I.G._, II², 12936, was brought in to the excavations in 1937 and given Agora Inventory Number I 4970.

_Benjamin D. Meritt_

INSTITUTE FOR ADVANCED STUDY

ATHENS AND STYMPHALOS

84 (Plate 58). Opisthographic fragment of Pentelic marble, broken on all sides except the left of Face A (the right of Face B), where the original edge is preserved, found in November of 1934 among marbles collected in the south central part of the Market Square.
Height, 0.372 m.; width, 0.310 m.; thickness, 0.147 m.
Height of letters (on Face A), 0.006 m.
Inv. No. I 2025.

Face A

ca. a. 368 a.  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Height, 0.372 m.; width, 0.310 m.; thickness, 0.147 m.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Inv. No. I 2025.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Face B</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Height of letters (on Face A), 0.006 m.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Inv. No. I 2025.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Height, 0.372 m.; width, 0.310 m.; thickness, 0.147 m.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Inv. No. I 2025.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Face B</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Height of letters (on Face A), 0.006 m.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Inv. No. I 2025.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Height, 0.372 m.; width, 0.310 m.; thickness, 0.147 m.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Inv. No. I 2025.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Face B</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Height of letters (on Face A), 0.006 m.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Inv. No. I 2025.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
On Face A the reading at the end of line 14 is possibly \( \text{AYO} \), while on Face B line 4 might be \([- - - ] \text{I} \Gamma \Omega \Sigma \text{Δ} \text{Υ} \text{Σ} \text{T} \ldots \). In line 21 of the same face an upsilon may follow the epsilon, and the nu of line 23 might be a pi. A pivot hole for a door has been cut into Face B, destroying much of lines 5-9 (see photograph): both faces have been worn very smooth, and Face B is barely legible even in that small part in which traces of letters are still to be seen.

The lettering of Face B is smaller than that of Face A, and the fragment is clearly yet another component of \( I.G., \ II^3, 144 \), the scattered pieces of which have recently been discussed by G. A. Stamires.\(^1\) The Agora fragment makes no join with any of the other pieces, which themselves have not permitted any reconstruction of the monument or the text, but from the content it seems to come from the same general area as fragment \( a \) (E.M. 7098) even though no direct relationship between the two fragments can be plausibly established.

The chief importance of the new fragment is that at last it provides the evidence of the city with which the Athenians made these obviously substantial and comprehensive arrangements. Stymphalos or the Stymphalians are mentioned three times, while in line 12 appear traces of the \( \text{δ} \text{αμιουργοί} \), who were the principal Stymphalian magistrates.\(^2\) New light is thus thrown on the almost total darkness which covers the relationship between Stymphalos and Athens in the fourth century. Stymphalos was small, and it was not to be expected that, by itself, it would cut much of a historical figure. Its fortunes were linked with those of the rest of Arkadia both during the period of Spartan supremacy and, after Leuktra, when Epameinondas inspired the formation of the Arkadian League, as a permanent support of Thebes' anti-Spartan interests in the Peloponnnesos. That Stymphalos was a member of the league from its inception has been reasonably supposed by Bölte (P.W., \( R.E., \ s.v. \) Stymphalos), and is what one would expect.

It was not until 366 that the Athenians entered into alliance with the Arkadians.\(^3\) In 370/69, to preserve the balance of power, they had accepted Spartan overtures

\(^1\) Πολέμων, \( V, 1952/5 \), pp. 154-157; cf. \( S.E.G., \ XV, 91 \).

\(^2\) \( I.G., \ V, 2 \), 356 lines 5-6, 357 lines 74 and 181.

\(^3\) Xenophon, \( Hellenica, \ VII, 4, 2 \).
and sent Iphikrates to their support against Epameinondas and his allies in the Peloponnesos. To this campaign should probably be assigned the story quoted by Strabo from Eratosthenes of a stratagem unsuccessfully used by Iphikrates against Stymphalos. It is possible that the present document belongs to the period of rapprochement between Athens and Arkadia in the succeeding years, and a date between 368 and 364 would conform to the epigraphical considerations. A connection with the Corinthian War and Athens' Peloponnesian intervention at the time seems too early for it, and Sparta's revived control of her League thereafter appears to exclude the possibility of attributing it to any date within the 'eighties or 'seventies of the fourth century.

So far as one can tell, this is the record not of any political or military alliance but of a bilateral commercial agreement and of arrangements regarding the legal standing of the nationals of either contracting party when in the territory of the other: it may be referred to as a matter of συμβολαί rather than συμμαχία, a word which Stamires in fact restored in line 10 of fragment aA. References to money (as fines or sureties?) recur, as do others to ξενοδίκαι. Cases of murder seem to be in question on fragment k, debts and the exactions thereof on i, and perhaps also on bA. The fragments i and k belong, it is true, to a second document on the reverse of the stele, and it may be suggested that this second agreement was on similar lines to that on the main face, perhaps being concluded with another Peloponnesian or even Arkadian city. Since they were treaties concerned with intercity commerce and private rights, they would indeed be a matter for conclusion between the individual cities and Athens, and not the business of the Arkadian League as such.

Two other documents may be set beside this Atheno-Stymphalian treaty. One, newly discovered and apparently concerned with a Kretan city, with particular reference to arrangements between Athens and Knossos, is considered for the first time below (No. 86). The other is I.G., II², 46, a treaty between Athens and Troizen, which offers striking similarities to the inscription under discussion. It also is composed of what Stamires has called ἀθλια λείψανα σπουδαίαι ἐπιγραφής, and is opisthographic, with the lettering on the main face, as in I.G., II², 144, slightly earlier in

---

4 Strabo, VIII, 8, 4: διὸ δὴ καὶ Ἰφικράτης, πολιορκοῦντα τὸν Στύμφαλον καὶ μηδὲν περαίνοντα, ἐπιχειρήσας τὴν κατίδωσιν (τοῦ Ἐρασίου) ἀποφέξαι, στόγγον ποιούσι γαμίζον πολλοῖς, παύσασθαι δὲ διοσημίας γενομένης. Iphikrates was in Arkadia during the Corinthian War (Xenophon, Hellenica, IV, 4, 16) in 392 and the Stymphalian exploit recounted by Strabo might be placed there. But since in 369 Arkadia was, in view of its pro-Theban alinement, a principal target for attack, it is more tempting to date it to the post-Leuktra period. For general accounts of Iphikrates' campaign on that occasion see Xenophon, Hellenica, VI, 5, 49-52; Diodorus, XV, 63, 2, and 65, 6; Cornelius Nepos, Iphocrates, II, 5. The record of Polyainos, Strategemata, III, 9, 28, probably refers to the same campaign.

5 Adolf Wilhelm is expressly quoted (in I.G. ad loc.) as having observed that the omegas of this inscription in particular closely resemble those of I.G., II², 105 (of which I.G., II², 523 also forms part; cf. Hesperia, VII, 1938, p. 627), datable to 368/7.
appearance than that on the reverse. The contents reflect much of the wording of I.G., II², 144. Here again appear ἡμιοδίκαι, references to death, damage, punishment, and sums of money, and to the overall similarity of content may be compared the size and comprehensiveness of both documents. I.G., II², 46 is discussed further below (No. 85), since additional fragments of it have come to light, where it is suggested that it might be dated just after the formation of the Second Athenian Confederacy; if this suggestion is valid, it and its related documents may add new evidence for Athenian foreign relations in this period of revived Athenian power in the Aegean.

The names so far won of cities with which Athens had these συμβολαί are Knossos, Stymphalos, and Troizen; to these may be tentatively added a second Kretan City and the cities on the reverse of the Stymphalian and Troizenian stelai, both of which may well have been Peloponnesian. I have argued elsewhere ⁶ that soon after the Confederacy was founded Athens expanded its scope and instituted a new grade of alliance, in which the allies were more loosely bound to Athens and were not members of the Confederacy. It may now be suggested that the expansion of Athenian influence and the development of Athenian foreign policy took place also on a third level, with a series of bilateral agreements relating to trade and private rights. It may be that this was a useful means of fostering good relations with cities which did not need or wish to have any closer political compact with Athens, and apparently none of those so far named did so, save in so far as Stymphalos subscribed to the Atheno-Arkadian treaty of 366.⁷ There was perhaps a fair number of συμβολαί of this kind, of various dates between the formation of the Confederacy and the Social War, that with Troizen being one of the earliest. The goodwill generated by their negotiation and agreement could have been regarded as a useful aim of Athenian diplomacy, and served as an additional support for the new league and the new military alliances on which the Athenians laid the foundation of their revived hegemony.

ATHENS AND TROIZEN

85 (Plates 58-59). It was mentioned above, in connection with the commercial treaty between Athens and Stymphalos (I.G., II², 144), that I.G., II², 46, governing relations between Athens and Troizen, appears to be a document of the same type, it too being opisthographic and obviously a long and comprehensive inscription, with some of its phraseology echoed in the Stymphalian fragments. Two new pieces of

⁶ In a forthcoming article in A.J.A.

⁷ The Keans and probably the Naxians were in a different case (I.G., II², 111 and 179). The συμβολαί with them were occasioned, certainly in the case of Keos and probably also in that of Naxos, by defection from and subsequent re-entry into the Confederacy, in which they had been members of long standing.
I.G., IIª, 46, have come to light in the Agora, and it seems convenient to publish them here in the general context of symbolai-documents.8

Two fragments of Pentelic marble, both broken on all sides but each making a direct join with the other, found in a context dating from late Hellenistic to early Roman times in the vicinity of the Klepsydra (T 26), the upper fragment on June 3, 1938, and the lower on June 18, 1937.

Height (of combined fragments), 0.25 m.; width, 0.14 m.; thickness, 0.112 m.
Height of letters, 0.007 m.-0.008 m.
Inv. No. I 4985.

ca. a. 375 a.                  ΣΤΟΙΧ.
[---] N[---]                      [---]
[---] eifh[---] στο καὶ [---]       [---]
[---] πρ(?) ]ο[---] é[o[---]          [---]
[---] η[---] δ[---] τ[---]             [---]
5 [---] o[---] én[---] αρ[---] χοντ[---] [---]
[---] α[---] δ[---] [---]              [---]
[---] ν, é[---] τ[---] α[---]           [---]
[---] ]σ[---] ιν[---] τ[---]           [---]
[---] απ[---] ο[---] αλ ν[---]         [---]
10 [---] ν πόλεως απ[---]            [---]
[---] νιος ]Δ[---] ην[---]             [---]
[---] καὶ πρόσο[---] άν[---]           [---]
[---] χ]ιλ[---] μ[---]                [---]
[---] η. α[---] άφ[---]                [---]

Fragment of the same inscription, also broken on all sides, found on March 22, 1938, on the north slope of the Acropolis in a context of the second and third centuries after Christ.

Height, 0.067 m.; width, 0.09 m.; thickness, 0.06 m.
Height of letters, ca. 0.008 m.
Inv. No. I 5351.

ΣΤΟΙΧ.
[---] ωτ[---]                    [---]
[---] αγο?] ραστην epsilon[---]   [---]
[---] χιλ[---] δραχμες [---]       [---]

traces

8 For an improved reading of fragment a (Face A) see S.E.G., XIII, 38.
These two pieces may be designated as q and r, to continue the lettered series of the fragments of I.G., II², 46, and both belong to the back (side B) of the stele. The erasures in lines 5 and 6 of fragment q, the extent of which cannot be estimated, recall that on fragment c (line 50 of Face A) and the similar rasura on fragment a (line 4 of Face B), in both of which, as in line 5 of fragment q, the nine archons appear to be involved. Line 50 of Face A may be restored as [ēv]νεὶ ἀπ[χοντ -- -] and line 4 of Face B as [--- ἐνεὶ ἀρχα]ντας [---]. The nine archons, with the same elision, appeared also on the Stymphalian document, and the duties prescribed for them evidently formed a regular feature of this type of symbolai.

Neither q nor r is free from carelessness on the part of the engraver. Α for Α occurs three times (q line 9 [twice] and r line 3), while in q line 11 ll is written for Η.

Restoration seems little in point in either fragment, and neither new piece makes a join with any of the existing fragments already published. The name of the city with which the agreement was made may be concealed in q line 11, where the first four extant letters could represent the termination of a plural ethnic: [--- Τροξι]νος would be an attractive suggestion were it not that the Troizenians figure on the front face of the stele, and it may be that the document on the reverse of it referred to some other state. For the same reason the Corpus restoration ἐν δὲ Τ[ροξι]να [---] on fragment f (line 14 of Face B), if this fragment belongs to the reverse of the stele and not, as Koehler thought, to the front face, ought to be viewed with scepticism.

This inscription has no secure date, but has been thought on general grounds, propter scripturae rationem, to belong to the early part of the fourth century before Christ, and is classed among inscriptions of a date earlier than 378 B.C. in the Corpus. It was, however, suggested earlier that commercial treaties, or symbolai, of this type may have been a feature of the revival of Athenian influence in the Aegean area, of which the Second Confederacy was the most striking and important product. If, besides undertaking full-scale alliances either within or outside the machinery of the Confederacy, Athens also made a series of agreements, non-military in scope and application, regulating her affairs with cities which wished for a friendly but not close association with her, Troizen seems well placed to have made such an agreement at an early stage. That with Stymphalos, discussed above (No. 84), and that with certain cities of Crete, to which we shall come (No. 86), belong later in time but were an extension of what could well have begun on Athens' own doorstep, so to speak. This treaty with Troizen on Face A of I.G., II², 46, and its counterpart with an unknown city⁹ on the reverse of the same stele, perhaps marked the beginning of a

---

⁹ Another city in the Argolid or the Northern Peloponnesos would seem to be a suitable candidate, but this must be balanced against the still-powerful Spartan influence in that area. There is, however, no necessary restriction to this region, and the city in question may be sought anywhere in Greece to which Athenian interests were being carried in the initial impetus of the new Confederacy and the expeditions organized under its auspices.
new and vigorous phase in Athenian foreign policy, in which a threefold approach, offering a choice of League membership, looser military symmachia, or purely commercial agreement, was adapted to the needs and wishes of the various cities. The initial emphasis of the Confederacy was to a large extent that of avoiding past abuses and accommodating the organization to the susceptibilities of the participants. The symbolai-agreements both in themselves and in the detail in which they were obviously worked out seem to reflect a similar attitude on the part of the Athenians towards cities not within the new League. It may therefore be suggested that this treaty is to be dated not before 378 but a little after it. The argument from the letter-forms, while undoubtedly demanding an early date, would not be inconsistent with an attribution to 375 or thereabouts.

The difficulty of distinguishing between the two faces of this stele, mentioned above in connection with fragment f, prompts me to add that several years ago Meritt had a communication from Eugene Schweigert saying that three fragments had been joined together. Of these fragments two, b and d, had previously been attributed to the front face of the stele, but the third, m, had been regarded as part of the reverse face. It seems appropriate to include here the record of these joins (see Plate 59), and to publish the text of this part of the stone as now reconstituted. The left edge of fragment b is preserved, and the lines are numbered according to the publication in the Corpus. It will be noted that the position of the extant letters in line 15 appears hitherto to have been falsely reported.  

ΣΤΟΙΧ.

10 πρωτη [-----------------]
   Γ[-----------------]
   ν δε ξενοδ[ικ ------------]
   κων έκατον [---------------- δ]
   φειλέτων οδ [στις δ' αν------------]
   ὀσονπερ ο αι [-----------------]
   [. ]ια έκτυφ[όςη ------------]
   ι δέκα [μ]νά[σ -------------- ε]
   [π]ιγνύτων [κ]αί [-----------------]
   [κα]ι ἀδύνατον δι[-----------------]
   [..α?]πο τονής καὶ ε[-----------------]
   20 [.....]αν ἀποκόψῃ γ[-----------------]
   [.....8]ώντων [-----------------]
   [.....11]κρε[-----------------]

10 The three stones are numbered in the Epigraphical Museum as follows: b = E.M. 7102, d = E.M. 7105, and m = E.M. 7113. The difference in the horizontal letter-spacing of Face A and Face B is very slight. On Face A five lines measure ca. 0.06 m., on Face B 0.073 m.
In the *Corpus* fragment *b* is brought into relation with fragment *a*, but it does not seem necessary to reproduce here the restorations there offered, which, except in line 15, remain unaffected by the new joins. The whole section appears to be concerned with physical injuries which the citizen of one city might inflict on a citizen of the other; varieties of injury seem to be expressed in some detail, together with the procedure and penalties to which their infliction is to give rise. The amount of damages was apparently carefully proportioned to the injury inflicted, and once again brings into relief the comprehensiveness of this type of document and the *minutiae* into which it entered.11

ATHENS AND CRETE

86 (Plate 58). A thin fragment of a stele of Pentelic marble, broken on all sides and at the back, found on June 24, 1935, in a modern context in the central area of the Market Square (L 9).

Height, 0.20 m.; width, 0.18 m.; thickness, 0.028 m.

Height of letters, 0.005 m.-0.006 m.

Inv. No. I 3055.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>med. saec. IV a.</th>
<th>ΣΤΟΙΧ.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[-------------]MH[-------------]</td>
<td><img src="" alt="Greek inscription on page 229" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[-------------]ωλλ[-------------]</td>
<td><img src="" alt="Greek inscription on page 229" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[-------------]ένν]ε' ἀρχο[ντ-------]</td>
<td><img src="" alt="Greek inscription on page 229" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[-------------]αι αὐτήμε[------]</td>
<td><img src="" alt="Greek inscription on page 229" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 [-------------]κ]ρίναντες Κυ[δωνιατ (?)------]</td>
<td><img src="" alt="Greek inscription on page 229" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[-------------]α και είσαγ[γελλάντων-----]</td>
<td><img src="" alt="Greek inscription on page 229" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[-------------]το]ι δικαση[ρίων ὦ δὲ πολέμαρχος (?) τών]</td>
<td><img src="" alt="Greek inscription on page 229" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[διαδικασιών ἔπι]μελέσθω καθάπ[ερ τοῖς Κυνσίοις------]</td>
<td><img src="" alt="Greek inscription on page 229" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[-------------]οι έ]ννε' ἀρχοντες 'Αθή[νησι------]</td>
<td><img src="" alt="Greek inscription on page 229" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 [-------------]τῶ]ν δικόν καθάπετ τα[ῖς τῶν Κυνσίων δίκαιος]</td>
<td><img src="" alt="Greek inscription on page 229" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[-------------]παρόν]τοι 'Αθήνησον μετο[ὐκίο δὲ ἀτέλειαν τοῖς]</td>
<td><img src="" alt="Greek inscription on page 229" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[-------------]οι διδο[σθαι καθάπερ Κυνσό[ίοις------]</td>
<td><img src="" alt="Greek inscription on page 229" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[-------------]η[θ]η υπό τὸ πρῶ ῶ[-------------]</td>
<td><img src="" alt="Greek inscription on page 229" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[-------------]έν]εχέτω ἐν [τη αὐτής ζημίαι------]</td>
<td><img src="" alt="Greek inscription on page 229" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 [-------------]τὴν δι[-------------]</td>
<td><img src="" alt="Greek inscription on page 229" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[-------------]παρόν]τοι ἐγ Κυ[ῳσῶι------]</td>
<td><img src="" alt="Greek inscription on page 229" /></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

11 The phrase in line 19 seems strange, but there is no doubt of the reading on fragment *d*. Kirchner in *I.G.*, Π II read [-- δ]πὸ τὸ νησ[-- --], which cannot now stand; [-- ἦ]πὸ τοῖς or [-- ἀ]ποτοιχία might be possibilities, to be connected perhaps with ἰστότονα in *I.G.*, Π II, 1672, line 66. But I leave it to others to make of it what they wish and what they can.
So little of this text is preserved that restoration may hardly be attempted, and no formula or set phraseology survives to enable the length of line to be determined with any accuracy. If the suggestion in lines 7-8 is acceptable, the inscription was some 46 letters wide, and this may be confirmed by the phraseology of lines 11-12, if this is correctly interpreted. For the elision ἐννε' ἄρχοντες in lines 3 and 9 compare line 5 of the fragment of I.G., II², 46, discussed above (p. 227). In line 10 τὰ[ς and δίκας may also be suggested.

The fragment seems to belong to a further record of συμβολαί between Athens and an unknown city, the terms of which are similar to a compact already made between Athens and Knossos. Provision is made for judgment in cases involving Athenians and citizens of the other contracting city, some being heard perhaps there and some at Athens (down to line 11). Possibly the inhabitants of the city were exempted from the metic tax while in Athens (lines 11-12), but in cases of misdeed they would be accorded the same status and treatment as metics (lines 13-14?); the same arrangements may have held good, mutatis mutandis, for Athenians resident in the contracting city (line 16). The inscription may have concluded with the necessary oaths.

As a συμβολαί-record this document belongs to the group discussed above, and may be dated to the same period, though late in it—perhaps to the early 350's. It postulates the existence of a similar treaty between Athens and Knossos, and perhaps the possibility of references to the terms of that enabled the present agreement to be expressed more concisely. The only other known connection between Athens and Knossos at this period is reflected in an inventory-list (I.G., II², 1443, col. II, line 121), where a crown given by the Knossians to Athens is catalogued among the treasures in the Parthenon. The list belongs to 345/4 B.C., so that the good relations of which the gift was an expression had been cemented before that date—possibly at much the same time as the present arrangements, based on a treaty with Knossos, were made by Athens with another city.

It is tempting to suggest that this other city was, like Knossos, a city of Crete, and line 5 offers the very tenuous but plausible hypothesis that it was Kydonia. Kydonia had been an object of interest to Athens in the fifth century (Thuc., II, 85, 5), and if the Athenians were concerned to improve their relations with the Kretans they might well have looked to Kydonia again as a desirable point d'appui.⁴³

---

³² Cf. I.G., I², 19 and 20.

⁴³ On relations between Kydonia and Lyttos ca. 343 B.C. see Diodoros, XVI, 62-3. The letters − − ΩΛΛ − in line 3 of this inscription might be restored as [τ]άλ Λ[ντίων], but, unless some
Since the original back of this fragment is not preserved, it is impossible to say if the stele was, like those of the συμβολάι already discussed, opisthographic; if it was so, this piece may well come from the reverse of the Knossian record itself. At any rate, meagre as it is, it serves to provide at least a little evidence for Athenian foreign policy in the middle of the fourth century and its extension in a direction unnoticed and almost unsuspected hitherto.

ATHENS AND SIFHNOS

87 (Plate 59). There is a further fragment among the inscriptions from the Agora which may be connected with this series of symbolai-documents. It is not in itself a commercial treaty of the type already discussed, but it appears to contemplate action under the terms of one, and, fragmentary as it is, it seems appropriate to restore it along these lines and to include it here.

Fragment of Pentelic marble, with the surface badly worn, found on April 27, 1938 among marbles collected near the south end of the Stoa of Attalos. The left side and rough-picked back are preserved. At the top of the stone is the lower left-hand corner of a recessed panel containing an elegantly cut relief, showing the lower part of a seated draped figure with the right foot extended.

Height, 0.267 m.; width, 0.168 m.; thickness, 0.073 m.
Height of letters, 0.007 m.-0.01 m.
Inv. No. I 5410.


Θ ε [o ι].

'Ενάτης πρυτανείς [ας, ἕκτην καὶ τρ] icycle [οζεν τη βολη και τ]

κύκλῳτην: έδ[οζεν τη βολη και τ]

κόμμα δὲ[ου] τ[ε[ν μέν τάς γραφῆς πε]

5 πι ἀδικίας [κατὰ τὰς συμβολάς ἐκ]

α[τ]τ[ε[μωθι Ἀθηναίως καὶ Σιφνίωι]

σ [ἀδόλως καὶ ........10 ..............]

[..........................26]

[.....5.....]τ[... Ἀθηναίων δὲ τὸν δήμου]

10 [τ]δ[ν] Σιφνίων [μὴ κτένεν ἀνεν τὸ]

δῆμο το Ἀθηναίων [μὴ διώκεν]

δῶς δ' ἀμ μηδὲς ἀποθ[άνη Ἀθηναί]

[ο]ν ἄκρυτος, ἀντιο[....12 ...........]

........ ΤΙΝ ————

dispute were being expressly referred to Athenian arbitration, the introduction of the Lyttnians would hardly seem in point. However, this may have been so, and the possibility is perhaps worth mentioning.
The smoothness of the inscribed surface makes the details of the text hard to recover. The width of the stele is conditioned not only by the phraseology of the preamble but also by the spacing of the introductory Θεοί and the relief sculpture above it. Stelai with reliefs in this form were popular between 410 and the middle of the fourth century, and the bulk of the examples discussed by R. Binneboessels fall within these limits. A seated figure is frequently balanced by one or two standing figures, and this would suggest that, since we have here the whole width of the seated figure, roughly half of the width of this stele is preserved. It is also noticeable that the majority of stelai carrying reliefs of this type contain between 25 and 35 letters per line. The suggested width would be further confirmed if, as seems to be the case, the epsilon of the superscription is to be seen in the worn space above the ντ of πρωτατη[ε].

The truncated presept is unusual and noteworthy. The name of the archon and secretary, and perhaps also that of the phyle in prytany, probably appeared, inscribed in larger letters, above the relief. The separation particularly of the archon's name, and its inscription in larger characters, was a device especially favored at this period, which made an artistically pleasing contrast with the smaller lettering of the rest of the inscription and gave the stone an emphasis which it otherwise would lack. I. G., II², 164 seems to have given this information on the pediment and architrave surmounting the stele. I. G., II², 14 and 27 are further examples of inscriptions the beginnings of which are preserved but which lack the usual presept. These both contain the text of alliances, in the one case with the Boiotians and in the other with the Kerkyraians, and it is possible that in these instances the proposal to make or accept the treaty would carry the normal presept, but that the treaties themselves, inscribed as independent documents sui generis, were set up without the customary formulae. In the present case we have not a total absence of presept but an unusual and abbreviated one: it may be suggested that, because this involved current and temporary action under a definitive agreement inscribed elsewhere, less formality needed to be expended upon it; but the presence of the relief sculpture argues that it was not regarded as an ephemeral document to be inscribed and set up cheaply.

The particular processes of law which are to be instituted are, if the suggested restoration is acceptable, to take place in accordance with the already standing symbolai by which both parties are bound: [ἐκ]α[τ]ε[ποθ] in lines 5-6 reflects the appearance of the same word in line 1 of No. 84 above. The Siphnian demos is not, by itself, to put to death or undertake the prosecution of any Athenian without the involvement of the Athenian people, and special provisions are to be made to ensure that no Athenian is visited with the death penalty without due process or trial.

The characteristics of the stele suggest that it should be dated to the second

14 Studien zu den attischen Urkundenreliefs (1932).
quarter of the fourth century before Christ, in the later 360's or the 350's.\(^\text{15}\) The Siphnians were members of the Second Athenian Confederacy, which they seem to have joined in 373,\(^\text{16}\) and as such they would not belong to the category of those states discussed earlier who entered into symbolai-agreements with the Athenians but had no closer ties with them. Keos and Naxos, however, which were also members of the Confederacy, did enter into symbolai, of a different character, in consequence of revolt in the late 360's,\(^\text{17}\) and it is possible that Siphnos is now to be included in the same group. It lies in the same general area, and could well have been implicated in the same troubles. If this is so, it would help to explain not only the provision of a symbolai-agreement at all but also the rider which we have here, envisaging punitive action in which Athenian citizens seem likely to have been involved. At all events, the intervention of the Athenian demos, justified though it seems to be, reflects in some measure the gradual conversion of the Second Confederacy, like the First, into an arche rather than the intended coalition on an equal basis, and would be appropriately placed in the years preceding the Social War, at the time of the Kean and Naxian troubles. It is, however, not to be excluded that we have here to do with the aftermath of the Social War itself, although this seems the less likely hypothesis. At all events, the new fragment adds a little more detail to the history of Athenian foreign policy in the fourth century, on which this whole group of inscriptions, unpromising as they might initially appear, has collectively thrown a new and interesting light.

88 (Plate 59). Boundary stone of poros, with the original top, back, and sides preserved, found on November 6, 1937, in the wall of a modern house south of the market square (P 21).

Height, 0.249 m.; width, 0.195 m.; thickness, 0.123 m.
Height of letters, 0.027 m.
Inv. No. I 5084.

\textit{saec. V/IV a.}

\textit{hópo[s]}
\textit{μνήμ}
\textit{aρος}

For this general type of boundary marker see \textit{I.G.}, II\(^2\), 2527-2553. The use of \(\mathrm{H}\) to represent both the aspirate and eta lends support to the restoration in \textit{I.G.}, I\(^3\), 906 (== \textit{I.G.}, II\(^3\), 2552; cf. W. Peek, \textit{Ath. Mitt.}, LXVII, 1942, p. 33, No. 33), where the \(\mathrm{H}\) at the beginning of \textit{hópos} is restored. Initial \(\mathrm{H}\) in this particular word may have been slow to disappear from texts otherwise using the Ionic alphabet, or at least have given rise to confusion; cf. \textit{S.E.G.}, XIII, 236.

89 (Plate 59). A flat rectangular block of Hymettian marble, of which the top, bottom, and right side are preserved, found on October 15, 1937, in the wall of a modern house south-

\(^\text{15}\) By the 350's one would hardly expect the use of \(\mathrm{O}\) for \(\mathrm{OY}\) to survive so markedly, and on these grounds an earlier date seems more plausible. But the \(\mathrm{E}\) for \(\mathrm{El}\) in line 12 suggests an engraver of the old school at work, and it is impossible to draw any hard and fast argument for this year or that from these points of style and expression.

\(^\text{16}\) \textit{I.G.}, II\(^2\), 43, line 126. For the date see the article cited in note 6 on page 225.

\(^\text{17}\) \textit{I.G.}, II\(^2\), 111 and 179. See above, page 225, note 7.
east of the Market Square and west of the Panathenaic Way (P 21). The inscription is in a single line, between broad bands of irregular toothed chiselling.

Height, 0.149 m.; width, 0.324 m.; thickness, 0.530 m.

Height of letters, 0.012 m.
Inv. No. I 5054.

init. saec. IV a.

Βολης ἐς Ἄρειον πάγο

The writing is rather roughly done, and climbs from the horizontal as it proceeds. Some attempt, erased by the chiselling, seems to have been previously made to write the dedication. The word βολης can be seen upside down below the successful inscription, the sigma falling under the lambda of the dedication and the beta below the xi. Other uncertain remains can be seen on the same level further to the right, an upright stroke below the pi of Ἄρειον πάγο, and an angled letter, possibly epsilon, below the gamma.

This appears to be the earliest epigraphic mention of the Council of the Areopagus, dedications by which are more familiar in a later age (I.G., II², 2803-2807). There is no indication of the character of the dedication, and the roughness of the execution is surprising.

90 (Plate 59). Upper part of a grave stele of Pentelic marble, with the top, sides, and back preserved, but broken below and with damage to the edges all round, found on December 16, 1937, in the wall of a modern house southeast of the Market Square and west of the Panathenaic Way (R 18).

Height, 0.215 m.; width, 0.312 m.; thickness, 0.119 m.

Height of letters, 0.02 m.
Inv. No. I 5042.

post med. saec. IV a.

Εἰδίππη Πιω[. . . .]

Ἄγνωστον

91 (Plate 60). Fragment from the upper part of a grave stele of Hymettian marble, found on December 8, 1937, in the wall of a modern house south of the Market Square (Q 18). The back and sides are preserved. Below line 3 of the inscription are carved two rosettes.

Height, 0.293 m.; width, 0.405 m.; thickness, 0.129 m.
Height of letters, 0.017 m.
Inv. No. I 5156.

fin. saec. IV a.

[Φι]λοχάρης

Ἄντιφάτορ[ν]

Ὁ θ θ θ ν

[- - - - -] ἄρον

5 [- - - - - -]

In line 4 [δ διὰν Φιλοχ] ἄρον is a possible supplement.

Philochares of Oa is named as a priest of Asklepios in I.G., II², 1534.4, line 105, but no patronymic is given. His priesthood has been dated to 310/09, and on the assumption that he died soon afterwards this grave stele could be his. Although the surface of the stone is badly worn, the wedge-shaped ends of some of the strokes of the letters belong to the new fashion, introduced in the last third of the fourth century, which was the forerunner of apex writing.

92 (Plate 60). Fragment from the center of the upper part of a pedimental grave monument

18 The reference to [ἡ] βολης ἐς Ἄρειον πάγον in I.G., I, 38a, given in Liddell and Scott, Lexicon, is long out of date. The suggestion was already abandoned in I.G., I, 66, and the improved reading in A.T.L. (I and II), D7, eliminated the possibility altogether. I.G., II², 1421 (vid. line 95) seems later in date than the new dedication.
of Pentelic marble, found on October 26, 1937, in the wall of a modern house south of the Market Square (N 19). Part of the top of the pediment is preserved; the fragment is otherwise broken all round. Below the pediment is a wide cornice divided into three fasciae, with the inscription on the topmost and lowermost of the three. The main part of the stele carried sculpture in high relief, of which only the very battered remains of a head survive.

Height, 0.226 m.; width, 0.103 m.; thickness, 0.129 m.
Height of letters, 0.009 m.
Inv. No. I 5066.

\textit{saec. IV a.}

\[- \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \Quad
ion adds one more to the handful of Samians whose presence at Athens is attested by inscriptions: this evidence extends from the fifth to the second century B.C., however, and one might well expect it to be more extensive, since Athens was no doubt a regular venue for Samian merchants at all periods.

Corpus Christi College, Cambridge

95 (Plate 61). Fragment of a monument of Hymettian marble, found on December 27, 1949, among stones gathered in the north central section of the Agora, many of which came from the north end of the Long Late Roman Wall. Part of the smooth right side is preserved, but the stone is otherwise broken. Below the inscription is part of an engraved crown.

Height, 0.29 m.; width, 0.185 m.; thickness, 0.13 m.
Height of letters, ca. 0.007 m.
Inv. No. I 6254.

Akamantis

med. saec. IV a. (ca. a. 340)

[Προσπάλτιοι ?]

[--- --- : --- ---] vou
[--- --- : X] αιρεστράτ[ου]
[--- --- : Θ] εοφάντον

5 [--- --- ---] s : Δυσανίου
[---- ----] είθης : 'Αρχίνου

[Θορίκ] ιοι

[Σμί ] κυθος : 'Επτέλους
[Θ] ουκριτίδης : Καλλίου

10 Διονύ<σ>ιος : Καλλιάδου
[Ο] ιαξ : Πηδαλίωνος
[Ε] ύκλείδης : Ευθίον
['Αν] τιγένης : Ξενωνίδου

[Πο] μιοι

15 [Μ] γησοκλής : Πυθοκλέους
[Θ] ράσων : Νικοστράτου
[---- ----] ρατος : Μελανώτου

[γραμματεύς τής βουλής καὶ τοῦ δῆμου Φίλιππος : 'Αντιφήμου Εἰρ[εσί(δῆς)]

Line 10: ιΟΝΥΚΙΟΣ lapis.

This list of names is from a dedication in honor of prytaneis (cf. Raubitschek, Dedications, p. 191). The writing, the use of punctuation, the regular presence of final sigma in the genitives contemporaneously with the use of ΟΥ and not simple Ο at the
end of genitives, and the prosopography all indicate a date about the middle of the fourth century before Christ. The prosopographical data on lines 8, 9, and 18 point to a date near 340 B.C. From lines 8 and 9, also, it may be concluded that the men named in lines 8-13 belonged to Thorikos, and consequently that the phyle honored was Akamantis.\(^1\)

Lines 2-6: If one scrutinizes the names in these lines for a clue to the deme of Akamantis to which they belonged, he finds the following evidence, not taking into account Thorikos (already pre-empted for lines 7-13):

The name Chairestratos occurs once in Hagnous (P.A., 15155), where Μύννος Χαίρεστράτος Ἀγνούςίον, a girl, is mentioned on a sepulchral relief of the middle of the fourth century B.C.\(^2\) It occurs once in Eiresidai (P.A., 15160), where Χαίρεστράτος Χαρμένο

The name Theophantos is found in Prospalta where Θεόφαντος Θεαγενίδου Προσπάλτιος (P.A., 7089) is in a list of orgeones at the end of the fourth or beginning of the third century B.C.\(^4\) But an equally possible name for line 4 in the present text is Kleophantos, known in the deme Kerameikos from the appearance of Κλεόφαντος Κλεάνδρου ἐκ Κεραμείων on a rectangular bronze tablet.\(^5\)

The name Lysianias occurs, apart from Thorikos which is of course excluded, in Sphettos: Λυσανίας Σφήττος (P.A., 9324) was father of Aischines the Socratic. It occurs also in Prospalta: [— — αν αν — Λ]υσανίον [Προσπάλτιος was prytanis in 327/6 B.C.\(^6\) It occurs again in Kephale: [Λυσανίας Λυσικλέους] Κεφαλή was registrant

---

\(^1\) Weight has been given to the full name in line 9, so that the other names occurring in other demes (viz., demes with demotic ending in — — ως) have been disregarded: for example, Εὐθίας Φυλάσιος, Ἀντιγένης Φυλάσιος, etc.

\(^2\) I.G., \(\Pi^2\), 5273. Above the head of the woman, mother of Mynnion, I distinguish on the squeeze and on the photograph in A. Conze, Die attischen Grabreliefs, No. 896 (Plate 176), the end of the mother's name: [— — — —]η. For another example of the name in Hagnous, see Hesperia, Index I-X, s.v. χαρμές χαρμεσ (τράτου) (‘Αγνούςίος ?), but see also the objections raised by W. K. Pritchett, A.J.A., LXVI, 1952, pp. 164-165 with notes 16-17.

\(^3\) Hesperia, VI, 1937, p. 455, No. 5, lines 18-19.

\(^4\) I.G., \(\Pi^2\), 2355, line 8. For the date, see Chr. Petrou-Anagnas, Ελληνικά, VIII, 1935, p. 227.

\(^5\) B. Theophaneides, Ἀρχ., Ἡθ., 1939/1941 (published 1948), παρ., p. 17, no. 5. A preliminary announcement was made by Y. Béquignon, B.C.H., LIV, 1930, p. 452, where the name is given erroneously as Κλωφαντος. A. A. Papagianopoulos-Palaio, in an oral communication to me before the publication by Theophaneides and without knowing of the announcement by Béquignon, called the tablet a tessera iudicialis. If this be so, its date is of the fourth century, before the year 330 B.C.; cf. A. Körte, Ath. Mitt., XXI, 1896, pp. 452-453.

\(^6\) Hesperia, Suppl. I, p. 31, No. 1, line 50. The reading of S. Dow, the first editor, was [— — αν —] ΑΠΙΟΥ. A. E. Raubitschek, in Hesperia, Index I-X, s.v. Απιας, understood this as [— — αν —] ΑΠΙΟΥ. On the other hand, W. Peek, Ath. Mitt., LXVII, 1942 (issued in 1951), p. 162,
of a mine ca. 350/49-345/4 B.C.\(^7\) and Δυσανίας Δυσυκλέως Κέφα was registerant and lessee of a mine in 342/1 B.C.\(^8\) Finally, the name is found in Poros: Δυσανίας Δαξε-μούρο Πόριος is in a sepulchral inscription from the Peiraeus of the fifth century before Christ.\(^9\)

The name Archinos occurs once in Prospalta: 'Αρχιέδημος 'Αρχίνο[ν Προ]σπαλτα, a trierarch, was recorded in a naval document of about 336/5-331/0 B.C.\(^{10}\)

While Hagnous, Eiresidai, Kephale, and Poros are represented by one name each, and Sphettos by two, there are from Prospalta three names: Lysanias, Archinos, and the characteristic Theophantos.\(^{11}\) Most of these names are close in date to the time of the list. The small deme Eiresidai is otherwise improbable because of the number of the Prytaneis (5+). For the same reason Poros is improbable, and it is excluded anyway since I recognize it in lines 14-17. It seems reasonable, therefore, to select Prospalta for the demotic of the lines under discussion. Probably the number of the Prytaneis was five, as in I.G., \(\Pi^2\), 1700, lines 113-122 (335/4 B.C.) and in Hesperia, Suppl. I, p. 31, No. 1, lines 49-54 (327/6 B.C.).\(^{12}\)

Theophantos son of Theagenides was probably a relative of our Prytanis, while Archidemos son of Archinos and [---\(\alpha\)---] son of Lysanias were probably brothers of [---\(\pi\)---]εἰθης 'Αρχίνος and of [---\(\alpha\)---]Δυσανίον respectively.

An onomatological study of the preserved traces in line 6, taken in combination with the requirements of space, shows that the name was probably [---\(\pi\)---]εἰθης, or even, more exactly, [Φιλον]εἰθης. I have not made the restoration because of possible uncertainty about the count of letters.\(^{13}\) Of a number of names ending in [---\(\pi\)---]εἰθης and satisfying here the number of missing letters only Philopeithes is so far known from Prospalta. It has been reported on a stele (I.G., \(\Pi^2\), 7309) from the middle of

No. 335, suggested the reading 'Αγίον. A study of the squeeze and of Dow's photograph has led me to the above reading.

\(^{7}\) Hesperia, XIX, 1950, pp. 228-229, No. 13, lines 46-47.

\(^{8}\) I.G., \(\Pi^2\), 1582, lines 76-77 and 82-83. For the date see Margaret Crosby, Hesperia, XIX, 1950, p. 200.

\(^{9}\) I.G., \(\Pi^2\), 1018.

\(^{10}\) I.G., \(\Pi^2\), 1624, line 87.

\(^{11}\) I have not taken into account the second example of Chairestratos from Hagnous, but Kleophantos in the Kerameikos is disturbing. If one accepts it, Theophantos cannot be counted, and so Prospalta will be (numerically) no more likely than Sphettos.

\(^{12}\) See the commentary on Thorikos, below. Cf. A. W. Gomme, The Population of Athens, p. 60.

\(^{13}\) I disregard here the name Philopeithes, taken to be an assimilated form of Philopeithes, the sole evidence for which is the patronymic on a tessera iudicialis (I.G., \(\Pi^2\), 1897) which can also be expanded as Φιλοφεί(δου). Indeed, this was the opinion of the first editor W. Vischer, Epigraphische und archäologische Kleinigkeiten (Basel, 1871), pp. 14-15, No. 1 (= Kleine Schriften, Leipzig, 1878, p. 286, No. 1). Actually, his first publication was in Verein schweiz. Gymnasiallehrer in Solothurn (1866) [non vidi].
the fourth century B.C., above line 1 according to the copy of Moustoxydes, or below line 5 according to the copy of Pittakys.\(^\text{14}\)

Line 8: The only possible restoration is \([\Sigma\mu\text{i}]\kappa\nu\text{thos} : \text{Επιτέλους}, and it happens that both these names occur elsewhere in Thorikos.\(^\text{15}\) One Smikythos of Thorikos is mentioned twice as owner of property at Laurelion after the middle of the fourth century (about 338/7 B.C. \(\text{[?]}\)).\(^\text{16}\) Epiteles of Thorikos is also mentioned twice as trierarch in the naval record of 323/2 B.C.\(^\text{17}\) In fact, it seems that this Smikythos was the same as the prytanis, and that Epiteles the trierarch was his son bearing the name of his grandfather.

Lines 9-10: Thokkritides son of Kallias is to be identified with \(\Theta\omicron\upsilon\kappa\nu\rho\kappa\tau\iota\varsigma\delta\iota\varsigma\) Ὑφρίκων, γραμματεύς ἐπιστατῶν Ἐλευσινόθεν in 332/1-329/8 B.C. (I.G., II\(^2\), 1544, line 10).\(^\text{18}\) The ubiquitous name Dionysios appears of course already in Thorikos, as elsewhere, and one must be cautious in drawing prosopographical conclusions from it. An official honored by a decree of 304/3 B.C. is called Καλλιπτέι[\(\delta\iota\varsigma\)] διονυσίου Θορ[\(\iota\kappa\iota\)ς (I.G., II\(^2\), 488, line 10), and his brother is believed to be Καλλικρά[\(\tau\iota\varsigma\)] διονυσί[\(\iota\nu\)ς Θορίκως, known from a funerary inscription found west of

\(^\text{14}\) Both copies are now in the Academy in Berlin. See the commentary by Kirchner, ad loc. The stone now consists of three fragments, of which that at the upper right corner has presumably been added recently. It shows an additional rosette placed symmetrically with that mentioned in the Corpus and preserves the two final letters of line 1 which have been hitherto restored. The name is clearly Ἐιδηνίδης. The inventory numbers in the Epigraphical Museum are 10728 + 10729. The upper part of the stele, which possibly carried the name of Philopeithes, is missing. Both the ancient and the modern texts on this stone were published by D. G. Kampouroglous, Δί παλαιά Ἀθήναι (Athens, 1922), p. 111.

\(^\text{15}\) The name Miskythos (which would be too short anyway) has been known to be non-Attic since U. Koehler, in I.G., II, 870, corrected Fourmont’s copy to Πολύζενος \(\langle\Sigma\gamma\mu\kappa\text{tho} \rangle\) (I.G., II\(^2\), 1747, line 43). He also, in Rh. Mus., XXXIX, 1884, p. 300, note 2 (cf. P.A., 10197, 12798) corrected Μίκθος Σπαλλήντος in Diogenes Laertios, VII, 12, to Σμίκθος Σπαλλήντων. Herbert Long kindly informs me that the three best manuscripts of Diogenes (B, F, and P) have the reading Μίκθος “without the slightest trace of correction or erasure.” Yet in my opinion that does not mean that it is the correct form of the name. On the other hand, the names Σμικάθης, Σμικοβίων, and Σμίκεθος are, as is known, very well attested; see, e.g., Kirchner, P.A., 12764-12798, 12766a, Sundwall, N.P.A., p. 152; I.G., II\(^2\), 1590a (lines 4 and 9), 5293, 7277; Άρχ. Έφ., 1918, p. 75, No. 95, line 38; I.G., I\(^2\), p. 320; A. E. Raubitschek, Dedications from the Athenian Akropolis, p. 531; Hesperia, XXVI, 1957, p. 13, No. S5, line 14. A foreign tie may be indicated by the form [M]\(\upsilon\kappa\iota\thetap\iota\eta\), restored by Raubitschek, op. cit., p. 321, No. 298, in order to let each line of an inscription begin with a complete word, and apparently accepted by W. Peek, Wissenschaftliche Zeitschrift der Martin-Luther-Universität Halle-Wittenberg III, 1954, p. 387. All previous editors had restored Σμικάθης.

\(^\text{16}\) Hesperia, XIX, 1950, p. 222, No. 9, line 13, and ibid., p. 265, No. 20, line 50.

\(^\text{17}\) I.G., II\(^2\), 1631, lines 609 and 614.

\(^\text{18}\) The family is known. See the stemma \(\text{apud}\) Kirchner, P.A., 7866, and Kirchner’s comment on I.G., II\(^2\), 1925, line 18. His arrangements depend on the accuracy of the statement in P.A., 7865: οὐκ Κάλλιας (I) Θορίκιος διαμητήσατι οἱμ α. 329/8 sexagenarius esset, Calliam tituli navalis non eundem, sed filium Calliae I esse dixerim.
Laureion (I.G., II², 6225). The date of the inscription is unknown. However, in view of the first part of the compound name, not only is the connection reasonable, but the further assumption may be made that our present prytanis was the father. Kirchner does not mention Tod’s opinion (loc. cit.) that perhaps the ephebos of I.G., II², 478, Col. III, line 84, was the son of Kallippides. If he was, the name should be restored [Kal]άμαξος Καλ[η][πιδον] Θορίκιος. But the restoration of the patronymic as Καλ[η][κράτους] is equally possible. Thourkritides and Dionysios of lines 9-10 were cousins.

The relation between Kallikrates, as mentioned above, and that Καλλικράτης Θορίκιος of the sepulchral inscription I.G., II², 6239, is not known. This latter text was known until recently only from a copy made by Spon: Πραξειλῆς Εὐφρονίου, γόνω δὲ Καλλικράτου Θορικίου. Meritt added the demotic Θορίκιος after the patronymic Εὐφρονίου from a manuscript copy by Francis Vernon. He reported further that this demotic appears also in the manuscript of Spon’s fellow-traveler G. Wheler (No. CXXI in the original — No. 346 in the modern numeration) except that Wheler wrote, erroneously, Θορικίου. The stone was seen in the same place with I.G., II², 5388 and 7293. Wheler’s note for all three is: in horto Hussened Bey, prope Monasterium Hagio asomato, in columnis. Vernon, who lacks I.G., II², 7293, notes: at Bryssi Ussein, beys gard(e)n. Spon’s topographical indication for I.G., II², 5388 and 6239 is: A ATHENES, Au jardin d’Hussein Bey, while for I.G., II², 7293 it is: HORS D’ATHENES, Dans une Chapelle de S. George proche le Monastere Aso-mato. The last was seen and copied also by Fourmont in ecclesia parva super Illisum sita. These indications lead to the small church of St. Nicholas, also called the church of St. George, which is recorded as being in the enclosure of Ριζάρειος Σχολή; cf. A. K. Orlandos, Ευρετήριον τῶν μεσαίων και μεμεμών τῆς Ἑλλάδος, vol. I, fasc. 3, p. 128, No. 2; Chrysostomos A. Papadopoulos, Ιστορία τῆς Ριζαρείου Ἐκκλησιαστικῆς Σχολῆς (Athens, 1919), p. 5.

19 Kirchner leaves the patronymic without restoration. He overlooked the legitimate and practically certain restoration of M. N. Tod, B.S.A., IX, 1902/3, p. 170, whom Sundwall follows in N.P.A., p. 105.
20 Hesperia, Suppl. VIII, p. 227.
21 I use the photostatic copy of his manuscript at the Institute for Advanced Study; cf. A. E. Raubitschek, Hesperia, XII, 1943, p. 43 with note 100. Wheler gives one more copy of I.G., II², 7293 under No. XLVI (= 271) with the note ibid. (= Athenis).
22 I use the photostatic copy of Vernon’s diary at the Institute for Advanced Study; cf. B. D. Meritt, Hesperia, XVI, 1947, p. 55, Hesperia, Suppl. VIII, p. 213. In Vernon’s copy of I.G., II², 5388, the patronymic is given fully (ἩΡΩΔΟΤΟΥ) as it was read later by Velsen, although in Velsen’s time the first letter was preserved only in part. I think that the suspicion of Koumanoudes (not mentioned by the editors of the Corpus) that this inscription is the same as I.G., II², 5387, still deserves attention, but the matter needs further examination.
The term *columna* used by Wheler means *columella* as is shown by cases in which the monuments as described have been preserved; and one would come to the same conclusion from the disposition of the lines in all three monuments. That means that they are of a date later than the end of the fourth century B.C. In *I.G.*, II^2, 6239, which concerns us here, one can notice, in particular, besides the case of adoption (a feature commoner in middle Hellenistic times and thereafter), the omission of iota *adscriptum* in the word γόνω, and the fact that in Vernon's manuscript one alpha (that in the first line) has the cross-bar broken. All these indications suggest a date not before the second century B.C. with the possibility that this Kallikrates may be connected with Καλλικράτης Καλλικράτος Θορίκως who was flutist in the years 178/7-161/0.  

Kirchner has assigned to a date within the fourth century B.C. a funerary urn from the Peiraeus with the inscription Διονυσίου ΑΥΤΕ| Θορίκως (*I.G.*, II^2, 6219). This Dionysios may have no connection with the prytanis. The family presumably included also Καλλιστρατος Θορίκως (*P.A.*, 8168) and Καλλιφάνης Διυσίου Θορίκως (*P.A.*, 8221). This latter makes a link with the well-known family of Dexileos whose stemma is given under *I.G.*, II^2, 6217. In later times, about 100 B.C., the name Dionysios recurs in the family of the artist Polykles of Thorikos.

Line 11: The only name hitherto known in Attic prosopography which suits the preserved letters is Φαίαξ, but it is too long by one letter and hence inadmissible. The only non-Athenian name known to me which appears elsewhere in Attica and which conforms to the epigraphical requirements is Ψιαξ, a name borne by a painter of

---

24 He was unknown at the time Kirchner published his *Prosopographia Attica*, but now his name appears or is restored in a dozen prytany decrees which are enumerated above on pp. 41-42. In that list the dates given to some of these documents were not made to conform to the latest determinations, and some corrections, which I take this opportunity to acknowledge, must be made: items b and c are of the same year, which falls between 176/5 and 170/69; the upper limit of the date in item e (and item e of p. 41) is now 173/2 (year of the archon Alexis); the date of items j and k is 164/3 B.C. (cf. p. 74, above). Thus the lower limit in the date of item e is 161/0 and the career of Kallikrates is limited, so far as is known, to the years 178/7-161/0, while that of the herald Philokles of Trinemea is extended to the attested years 173/2-166/5 (or 162/1 unattested). The year 161/0 constitutes now a *terminus post quem* for the prytany decree published in *Hesperia*, IX, 1940, pp. 122-126, No. 25.

25 Additional information is now given in the inscription published by A. D. Keramopoulos, *'Αρχ., 'Εφ.*, 1934/5, παρ., p. 16.

the last quarter of the sixth century. Its use by a citizen of the fourth century would seem to me highly problematical. The correct restoration, I believe, is [O]iaξ, a name known elsewhere in Tanagra (I.G., VII, 1287). According to Bechtl, it is derived from the name of the hero Oiax, but certainly in the mind of its users there must always have been a feeling for its original meaning tiller or (metaphorically) helm of government. This connection is echoed in the name of the father Πηδαλίων which is derived from πηδάλιον, a rudder. Presumably these men belonged to a family that dealt with ships or perhaps with political affairs. Pedalion also is new in Attic prosopography, and, indeed, is known at all only from a lemma of Suidas (Souda) (Π 1495 Adler): Πηδαλίωνος, δομη κύρων. The source of Suidas, according to Adler, was the unpublished Lexicon Ambrosianum (639) or rather their common source. The existence of the name in these lexica shows that it was mentioned by some orator or other classical author not now preserved. On the other hand, the genitive probably indicates that its bearer was father of the main figure in the primary source. Taking into account the rarity of the name and the date of our present text, I identify the two men who bore the name as members of the same family and consider it even highly probable that they should be identified with each other.

The quota of names from Thorikos is the same (6) as in Hesperia, Suppl. I, p. 31, No. 1, lines 69-74 (327/6 B.C.).

Lines 14-17: The demotic in line 14 should be short, and those that come under consideration are Ειπειοκέ, Ἐρμειοκέ, Σφίττιοκέ, and especially Πόριοκέ. The spacing, when compared with the position of the demotic [Θορίκ]ίο in line 7, is strongly in favor of Πόριοκέ, the choice being made virtually certain by the existence on the edge of the stone of part of the rounding of rho. The reading should be [Πό]ριοκέ. This was confirmed by Meritt during his study of the stone in Athens in the spring of 1955.

A Νικόστρατος [Γ]ύγητος: Πόριοκέ is known from a sepulchral inscription of the middle of the fourth century before Christ, but the name Nikostratos is too common to allow a conclusion about his relationship to the prytais. The demotic of Νικόστρατος Θραυμάχου (P.A., 11013) is not known. Nor (for comparison with line 17) do we know the exact demotic of Μελάνωπος, Θεσπιοδόρο Π[−−] (P.A., 9793) of I.G., Π, 1666.

Line 18: The traces of letters after the patronymic in this final line show that

29 It has not been recorded by Bechtl, op. cit., and it is the only name derived from πηδάλιον.
30 I.G., Π, 7250. On the squeeze I distinguish the mark of punctuation between the patronymic and the demotic. The date of the inscription can hardly be before the middle of the century.
31 See Kirchner's commentary, ad loc.
the name recorded was not that of a prytanis, but rather that of the secretary.\textsuperscript{32} The title, in older times, was γραμματεύς τῆς βουλῆς καὶ τῶν δήμων, and later γραμματεύς τῆς βουλῆς καὶ τοῦ δήμου. Enough of the first letter of the name is preserved to show that it was lambda; hence the name was [Κάλ]λιππος or [Φί]λιππος. In the year 338/7 B.C. the secretary in I.G., \textsuperscript{1}I, 237, line 2, was Φ[ιλίππος ᾿Αντιφ. . . . . . . . . . . \textsuperscript{13}]. and in I.G., \textsuperscript{1}I, 238, lines 5-6, Φ[ιλίππος ᾿Αντιφ[ . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . \textsuperscript{9}]. Ferguson attempted to restore Φ[ιλίππος ᾿Αντιφ[ ᾿Ωντος Εἰπείαίος] by comparison with I.G., \textsuperscript{1}I, 587, where the orator—then thought to be the secretary—was [[-- -- -- -- Εἰ]τείαίος], and he supplemented the restoration with the common name of Antiphon.\textsuperscript{33} The demotic had to be of Akamantis, as was demanded by the secretary cycle. Adolf Wilhelm declared himself against this restoration and indeed against any association with I.G., \textsuperscript{1}I, 587.\textsuperscript{34} The name of the secretary was therefore taken over by Kirchner into I.G., \textsuperscript{1}I, 237 and 238 without further supplement. One will note that there is a discrepancy in the sum of the missing letters in these two inscriptions (13 as against 12), though they are both written στοιχεῖων.\textsuperscript{35}

In the present text the demotic begins with Εἰρ and thereafter a partially preserved P can be fairly well made out. The restoration is Εἰρ[εσί(δής)] abbreviated because of space. One Φιλίππος Εἰρ[εσίδής] was epistates in the year 368/7 B.C. (I.G., \textsuperscript{1}I, 104, lines 8-9), possibly a relative of the secretary here. I suggest that the secretaries of 338/7 and of our text were the same man, and restore Φ[ίλιππος ᾿Αντιφήμου Εἰρεσίδής] in I.G., \textsuperscript{1}I, 237, and Φ[ιλίππος ᾿Αντιφήμον βιοῦ βιρεσίδης] in I.G., \textsuperscript{1}I, 238, with some two letters in the demotic occupying only one space.\textsuperscript{36}

In I.G., \textsuperscript{1}I, 2753, the restoration is now given as [Κάλ]λιπποι ᾿Ε[ρ]οία\?δει, with a note that the demotic may have been Ε[ερεσίδ]δει. It is also possible to restore the name as [Φί]λιπποι, and perhaps to identify him with the secretary of our text.

This inscription is the first instance in which the secretary at the end of the register of prytaneis belonged to the same phyle with the prytaneis. But this is a matter of coincidence.\textsuperscript{37}

96 (Plate 61). Fragment of a stele of Hymettian marble, with part of the left side and rough-picked back preserved, but otherwise broken, found on July 26, 1949.

\textsuperscript{32} Parallels for such an addition at the end of a prytany list exist in I.G., \textsuperscript{1}I, 1740 lines 53-54, 1747 lines 33-34, 1750 lines 50-53, and especially 1751 line 62 which has the same arrangement as the present text.


\textsuperscript{34} Jahreshefte, X, 1907, pp. 32-34.

\textsuperscript{35} Minor irregularities do occur, however, in both texts.

\textsuperscript{36} Cf. I.G., \textsuperscript{1}I, 238, lines 2 and 4, for similar crowding.

\textsuperscript{37} For the secretary, see M. Brillant, Les secrétaires Athéniens (Paris, 1911), pp. 109-125.
among marbles collected east of the Panathenaic Way, some of which came from the Long Late Roman Wall.

Height, 0.26 m.; width, 0.21 m.; thickness, 0.085 m.
Height of letters, 0.006 m.
Inv. No. I 6218.

The fragment is part of the same stele with Hesperia, Suppl. I, pp. 89-91, No. 40, republished with a new fragment by B. D. Meritt in Hesperia, XVII, 1948, pp. 14-16, No. 6. It makes possible the reading and restoration of lines 41-52 of this latter publication as follows:

a. 203/2 a. non-ΣΤΟΙΧ. ca. 49
41 [ἐπαινέσαι τὸν ταμίαν Κάλλιππον] Φιλωτίδο[μ] Ὄθηθεν εὐδεβείας ἐνε
[κα τῆς] εἰς τὸ [ὑς θεός καὶ φιλος] ἰμίας τῆς εἰς τοῦ [ς] φυλέτας
[καὶ τὸ] ὑς ἰμίατον [ς ἐπαινέσα] ἐνε καὶ τὸν γραμματέα Κάλλιππον [ Phi ]
[K] ουτίδον Ὅθηθεν ἐπαίν [ἐσαὶ δὲ] καὶ τὸν ἱερὰ τοῦ ἐπωνύμου Ἀντί
[v] 45 [νοι] Ἀχαρνέα καὶ τὸν γ[ραμματέ] α τῆς βουλῆς καὶ τοῦ δήμου Σώσιππον
[Φ] ἰμια καὶ τὸν ὑπὸ γραμματέα Π] ρωτομένην Εὐτείαν καὶ τὸν κήρυκα
[τῆς] βουλῆς καὶ τ[οῦ δήμου Εὐκ] λην Βερενεκίδην καὶ τὸν αὐλητὴν Νε
[φα] νων ἀνὰ [γράφαι dē tōde τὸ ψήφι] σμα τὸν γραμματέα τὸν κατὰ πρυ
50 [τα] ει] αν [ἐν στήλει λιθίνει καὶ στή] σαι ἐν τῶι πρυτανικῶι εἰς δὲ
[τὴν ἀναγραφὴν καὶ τὴν ποιήσου τῆς] στήλης μερίσαι τὸν ἐπὶ τεῖ
[διουκήσει τὸ γενόμενον ἀνάλωμα].

It appears from the new fragment that the treasurer and the secretary have the same name: Kallippos, son of Philistides, of Oe. The question arises whether they are the same person. A similar case occurs in a prytany decree (ca. 160/59-150 B.C.) published by W. K. Pritchett in Hesperia, IX, 1940, pp. 122-126, No. 25. There the answer is clear: The secretary Philocrates son of Philocrates of Dekeleia is the son of the homonymous treasurer, as is shown by the two successive names Philocrates in the register of the prytaneis.97 Parts of the names depend on restorations, but the restorations are certain.

Another case occurs in the decrees of 193/2 B.C., published by Pritchett and Meritt in Chronology, pp. 111-113. There two of the citations bear the same name: Zoilos of Sphettos (in the second citation partly restored). The editors interpreted this as another example of father and son being treasurer and secretary respectively. However, A. E. Raubitschek, in the Index of Hesperia (Vols. I-IX), s.v. Ζωῖλος

σφήττιος, united both names in one entry and assumed their identity. The interpretation remains in doubt.

There is a different case in the decrees of 140/39 B.C. published in Hesperia, XVII, 1948, pp. 17-22, No. 9. Here Euktimenos of Eitea is expressly called ταμίας καὶ γραμματεύς and there is only one Euktimenos in the register of the prytaneis. But he had two citations, one for each of his offices. Moreover, he was spokesman for both decrees. These peculiarities, duly commented upon by the editor, show that it was not impossible for one person to hold at the same time the offices of treasurer and of secretary.

Another case of double capacity, though of a different kind, appears in the prytany document I.G., II\(^{2}\), 678, where the treasurer of the prytaneis and the treasurer of the Boule are the same person. Nothing was added to specify that they were one person; but a special decree was inscribed below the two regular decrees and the mere name was enough to identify the man in his two capacities.

In I.G., II\(^{2}\), 848, republished in Hesperia, Suppl. I, pp. 81-85, No. 36, the orator made reference to the treasurer of the Boule as if he were a different person, though in fact orator and treasurer were one and the same.

In the present inscription there is no specification that the same person held both offices, but since the interpretation of father and son is here impossible the identity is probably to be presumed. More remote relationship, though possible, is unlikely. The two citations are normal, and reflect the dual capacity.

The priest Lysinos of Acharnai is otherwise unknown, but he belongs to the prytanizing phyle Oineis. This is one of the clear cases in the period between 229 and 169 B.C. when he does belong to the phyle honored by the decree.

The new fragment also shows that ὁ ᾠδίστευος, appearing at about this time in the first clause of the second decree, were mentioned also in the decree or resolution proper. The prytaneis were praised for their goodwill towards the φυλήταυ and the ᾠδίστευος.

Two of the citations can be restored. The resulting text in lines 26-29 (cf.

---

38 He correctly restored the name of the secretary at the end of line 25 in Dow’s publication (Hesperia, Suppl. I, pp. 95-96, No. 46).
39 As spokesman his name was given in full, including the patronymic.
42 This inscription must be added to the list of exceptions to the normal arrangement of prytany decrees, in that the second decree is here followed by citations instead of directly by the register of prytaneis. Cf. Dow, Hesperia, Suppl. I, p. 19, note 5.
44 Cf. Dow, Hesperia, Suppl. I, p. 22.
At the beginning of the preserved space in line 52 faint traces of letters can be detected. Similar traces of isolated letters can be distinguished on other uninscribed parts of the surface of the stone. This was probably a palimpsest stele on which at some earlier time a decree had been cut, now in 203/2 erased to make place for that at present preserved.

97 (Plate 62). Two opistographic fragments from a large stele of Pentelic marble, found on May 29, 1937, in a cistern west of the Tholos (G 11:2) in a context dating from the fifth century after Christ. The stele was finished horizontally across the top with an ovolo moulding on Face A and on the sides, which were roughly hammer-dressed. Face B, inscribed later, has text enclosed in a panel with a pedimental top worked in low relief.

Frag. a: height, 0.266 m.; width, 0.178 m.; thickness, 0.12 m.
Frag. b: height, 0.387 m.; width, 0.15 m.; thickness, 0.115 m.
Height of letters, 0.011 m. (on Face A) and ca. 0.01 m. (on Face B).
Inv. No. I 4913.

The stele was at some time carefully cut into small brick-like pieces of which these are two from the upper and lower right corners of Face A. Though apparently from the same large stele, the veins of impurities in the marble do not correspond closely, and (according to the report of the excavators) they must have been separated by a considerable interval. The restorations on Face A show that the breadth of the stele was divided into four parts, of which the last fourth has survived. Between the upper and lower fragments one “brick” is to be understood missing.

Face A

Kekropis

Frag. a a. 21/0 a. non-ΣΤΟΙΧ. ca. 57-64

[ἀγαθὴ τύχη τοῦ ἐπὶ τὰ ὀπλα στρατηγο]όντος Ἀντι [Σ]
[πάτρου τοῦ ] Φλυνώς τοῦ ’ Λ [ΣΥ]
[ἐπειδὴ οἱ πρυτάνεις τῆς Κεκροπίδος καὶ οἱ δέοιτοι οἱ ἐπὶ Ὄτο]λέξιος ἄρχοντος
[ἐπαινεσαντες καὶ στεφανώσαντες ἐμφανίζουσι τὸν ταμίαν δ]ν αὐτοί ἰλαντο ἔξ
5 [ἐαυτῶν ——— ——— ——— ——— καὶ ἀποφαίνοντι] τῷ βουλῆ τᾶς τε ὅ
[θυσίας τεθυκέναι τοῖς θεοῖς ἀπάσας τὰς καθηκούσας ἐν τῇ πρ]υτανείᾳ ἐκ τῶν ἰ
[διων ὑπὲρ τῆς βουλῆς καὶ τοῦ δῆμου τοῦ Ἀθηναίων καὶ παίδων καὶ] γυναικῶν καὶ τῶν
[φίλων καὶ συμμάχων, ἐπιμεληθησαι δὲ καὶ τῶν ἄλλων ἀπάν τῶν καὶ τῶν λουπῶν
[προνοεκέκαθαι (?). προσεσερέθαι δὲ καὶ πρὸς ἐατοῦς λαμπρὸς καὶ φιλαγάθως).
10 [---] ἕνεπ τοῦ ἀνεστράφθαι ἁξίως τῆς τε ἰδιάς
[μεγαλομερείας καὶ τῆς πρὸς τοὺς πρυτανεῖς εὐνοίας· καὶ διὰ τὰ οὐνταὺ παρακαλοῦσι
[οἱ πρυτανεῖς τὴν βουλὴν ἐπιχωρήσαι αὐτοῦ γραπτῆς ἰκόνος ἀνάθεσιν πουῃσασθαι ἐν
[τῷ βουλευτηρίῳ (?) καὶ ἐπιγράψαι τάδε· οἱ πρυτανεῖς τῆς Κεκροπίδος τὸν ἐφ'
[ἐατῶν ταμι] 15 [αν ---] (about 15 lines missing)

Frag. b

[---] [---] Σωσικράτης)
[---] 'Αλιαίς
[--- i] ου Νικόλαος)
20[---] Νικόφιων)
[---] Μελετέως
[---] Γναῖς
[---] Ποθείνος
[--- o] v 'Αθήναιος
25[--- o] v Δημητρίου

οἱ πρυτανεῖς
tὸν ἐπῶνυμον.
(in corona)
'Αρίω
τονα
Σωσιστ
ράτου 'Α
[θ] μονέα

Face B

Kekropis

Frag. a ca. a. 180 p.

ἀγαθῆ τ[υχῆ ἐπὶ ἄρχοντος ---] --- Δευκο

νοέως, [--- πρυτανείας, ὃ γραμματεῖς τῶν βουλευτῶν (?) τῆς Κεκροπίδος]

φυλῆς [--- τεμήσας τοὺς συνάρχοντας καὶ τοὺς]

ἀευσίτο[ν ὃς ἀνέγραψεν].

5 [---] (uncertain number of lines missing)
Frag. b [Μελετεῖς]
[- - - - - - - - - - - - -]
traces [- - - - - -]
Στράτων
10 vacat
vacat
vacat
γ. βοιλη [s - - - - - - -]
ἀντιγράφ [s - - - - - - -]
15 Φλ Πρόκλος [s - - - - - -]

Face A

Lines 1-15: The restorations have been made on the analogy of other post-Sullan prytany decrees. After the time of Sulla formulae were not so rigidly followed in prytany decrees. Hence, lines 10 and 11 have been left without restoration, and generally the restorations included in the text are at several points uncertain. The difficulties are increased because so much is lost. Normally, in line 14, one expects (in full) οἱ πρυτανεῖς τῆς Κεκροπίδου καὶ οἱ αδέιστοι οἱ ἐπὶ Ἀπολλύξιδος ἀρχόντως τὸν ἐφ' ἐστῶν ταμίαν. The verb ποιήσασθαι in the clause beginning with [καὶ διὰ τα] ὅτα παρακαλοῦσι and followed by the phrase [τὸν ἐφ] ἐστῶν ταμί[αν indicates a proposal of the prytaneis for erecting a statue of their treasurer, an honor characteristic of the time. This is the more probable because expenses for the sacrifices were expressly mentioned (lines 6-7) as having been provided by the treasurer from his own funds. An interpretation of ποιήσασθαι as referring to the concern (πρόνοια) of the Council for honors to the treasurer seems rather not in place. The reversed order of the infinitive and its object ([ἀνάθεσιν τον ποιήσασθαι) has no parallel, but one

45 To those collected by S. Dow, Hesperia, Suppl. I, Nos. 97, 101, 109, 111-116, 119-121, the following have been added, not counting fragments of lists or citations: Hesperia, XII, 1943, p. 56, No. 14; ibid., XVII, 1948, p. 29, No. 13, and p. 30, No. 14 (preamble of the older style). To these should also be added the fragments in Hesperia, XV, 1946, p. 226, No. 54, dated by Meritt ca. 100 b.c.; the preserved portions show that this decree is of the post-Sullan type. For the style, see the general remarks by Dow, op. cit., pp. 25-26.


47 On the significance of this and related matters see the recent article by W. M. Gross, “Clipeata imago und ἐκὼν ἐνσπλος” in the volume Convivium: Festgabe für Konrad Ziegler (Stuttgart, 1954), pp. 74-84.

48 In lines 8-9 one might suggest [ἐπιμεληθοῦσαι δὲ καὶ τῶν -- ca. 11 τῶν καὶ τῶν λοιπῶν | ἀπάντων καὶ καλλιεργήσαντα ἐν τοῖς ἱεροῖς ἀνεστράφθαι καλ]ός καὶ φιλαγάθως. One thus avoids two consecutive infinitives, but the adverb φιλαγάθως is less appropriate to omens during the offerings and to religious affairs than to a treasurer’s behavior toward his colleagues.
can mention their complete omission in *I.G.*, II², 1049, lines 6-7.⁴⁹ The omission of the phrase ἐν ὁπλῷ ἐπιχρύσῳ in this part of the decree is quite without parallel.

The lack of patronymic or demotic after the name of the archon indicates that he was not that Ἀπόλλης Φιλοκράτους Ὠδοῦ of ca. 8/7-2/1 B.C.⁵⁰ It was suggested by Graindor and accepted by some scholars that before this Apolexis there was only one archon bearing the same name.⁵¹ Dinsmoor (*Archons*, p. 293) claimed for him the year 20/19.⁵² Notopoulos, on the basis of the tribal cycles of the secretaries, fixes the date at 21/0 B.C.⁵³ Though I feel less confidence than Notopoulos about the year, I have accepted his date.

An argument against identifying the archon Apolexis of this text with him of ca. 8/7-2/1 B.C. lies in the mention of the priest Aristion son of Sosistratos of Athmonon (lines 38-42) and, even more, in the mention of the hoplite general Antipatros son of Antipatros of Phyla (lines 1-2).⁵⁴ It appears that at first some other formula for the title and the name of the general was inscribed in large letters in the first two lines, but that the whole (?) was erased and cut in a different form in order to avoid continuing the heading into the third line. Some of the erased letters can be distinguished at the ends of both lines.⁵⁵

The evidence about the career of Antipatros is given by Th. Chr. Sarikakis, *The Hoplite General in Athens* (Diss. Princeton, 1951), p. 41 (cf. pp. 26, 27). He does not accept Meritt’s suggestion for the restoration of *I.G.*, II², 3539⁵⁶ but holds to that made by Dittenberger and repeated by Kirchner [Ἀιολίωνα τ' Ἀντιπατρον Φιλάνεα τὸν ἐπὶ τοὺς ὀπλείτας στρατηγὸν τὸ ἔβδομον] with the date “a. 66 p. ut videtur” which Kirchner adopted from Graindor. Dittenberger had recognized in the person of Aiolion the ephes of *I.G.*, II², 1973, lines 8-10, an inscription which he assigned to the later years of the emperor Claudius (*I.G.*, III, 653), leaving the date of the generalship unspecified. But it would be difficult, or well-nigh impossible, for an

---

⁵⁰ Cf. Dow, *op. cit.*, p. 183. The patronymic is in *Fouilles de Delphes*, III, 2, No. 63; the demotic is in *I.G.*, II², 3505; both are in *I.G.*, II², 2997.
⁵⁴ If the restoration of his name is correct, as it appears to be. See the commentary on these persons, below.
⁵⁵ A. E. Raubitschek has expressed to me his belief that the first three lines, rather, were originally inscribed in letters of normal size, and that they constituted some kind of short preamble, which was erased to make way for the title and name of the hoplite-general. See below, p. 251.
⁵⁶ *Hesperia*, XVII, 1948, p. 41.
ephebos of a year ca. 50/1-52/3, as I.G., II², 1973 is now dated,\(^{57}\) to become general for the seventh time in the year 66 A.D. On the other hand, while accepting this date for I.G., II², 3539, Sarikakis doubts (op. cit., p. 37) the restoration of Aiolion’s name in another text, I.G., II², 3182, on which the date of I.G., II², 3539, is based.\(^{58}\) In fact, he prefers (op. cit., p. 76) to restore the name of the general Cl. Novius in I.G., II², 3182, and to date it before 61/2 A.D.\(^{59}\) Thus the only evidence that Aiolion son of Antipatros became hoplite general at all is in the restoration of I.G., II², 3539, which mentions a seventh generalship. I believe that Oliver's restoration and date for I.G., II², 3182, are correct and that now, knowing from Hesperia, XVII, 1948, p. 41, No. 29, that Antipatros’ generalships reached the number of seven, we should endorse the suggestion made without elaboration (and with reservation) by Meritt and restore in I.G., II², 3539 ['\(\text{Αντίπατρος \ Αντιπάτρων \ Φλυέωσ}\)≠έρεωσ, the archon of 45/6 A.D., became hoplite general. For his full name see Oliver, op. cit., p. 85, note 18.

Since the third generalship of Antipatros was ca. 29/8-22/1,\(^{61}\) and his fifth about 20 B.C.,\(^{62}\) the present generalship is either his fourth or his fifth, provided that Apolexis is correctly dated in 21/0.

In an attempt to restore the heading in lines 1-2, I have, among many versions, thought of [\(\text{ἐπὶ \ Απολλήνιος \ άρχοντος, στρατηγούντος} \ Αντιπάτρων \ Φλυέωσ\)≠έρεωσ].\(^{60}\)

---

\(^{57}\) Cf. J. Notopoulos, Hesperia, XVIII, 1949, pp. 25-26. Notopoulos also was confronted with this problem, and concluded, if the date of the ephic list be acceptable, that Aiolion entered upon the office of hoplite-general when approximately thirty years of age. Apart from the improbability that one could occupy at that time an office so high while still so young, Notopoulos implies that the seven generalships were continuous, in itself a circumstance most unlikely, especially in view of the assumed age of the incumbent.


\(^{59}\) In this he tacitly follows J. H. Oliver, The Athenian Expounders of the Sacred and Ancestral Law (Baltimore, 1950), pp. 81-83.

\(^{60}\) In the name of a man honored by a statue one must not expect the patronymic, if the father was homonymous with the son, to be represented by the symbol \(\). Admittedly, the text of I.G., II², 3539, as now restored, shows irregularities in the arrangements of space; but we do not know what other elements were added in the dedicatory text. I note that Finlay’s copy (see Dittenberger, in I.G., III, 653) gives the letters M and H as preserved at the ends of lines 2 and 3. Presumably the stone has suffered fracture at both sides since his time. A small piece broken from the left was cemented into place again in 1947 (Daphne Hereward per litteras). Aent the inscription in Hesperia, XVII, 1948, p. 41, No. 29, I note that line 3 should be written \(\text{ἐπὶ τῶν ὄπως} \ Ληστας καὶ προσομοθήκων [τῆς} \ Την]. The photograph shows that the stonecutter wrote \(\Lambda\) instead of \(\Lambda\). The article at the end of the line has already been added by J. and L. Robert, R.E.G., LXII, 1949, p. 107, No. 45. Finally, I note that I.G., II², 1071, in which Antipatros appears as orator, has been augmented by two new fragments from the Agora (Inv. Nos. I 2619 and 5334). This is re-published below (No. 98), and establishes the celebration of the birthday of Augustus. The irregularities in the text of I.G., II², 3539, can be easily avoided by putting the word \(\text{ἐνεκόλουθω}\) in the fourth line instead of at the end of the third line.

\(^{61}\) Hesperia, Suppl. I, p. 178, No. 110, line 22.

\(^{62}\) Hesperia, Suppl. I, p. 188, No. 116, line 80.
tori], which would fulfill the requirements of space (cf. I.G., II2, 1039, lines 1-2); but it has several disadvantages, viz., the name of the archon repeated in lines 1 and 3, the omission of the designation ἐπὶ τὰ ὀπλα or ἐπὶ τοὺς ὀπλείτας (a very real objection), and the numeral for the generalship appearing only after the name. Two of these disadvantages are obviated by the restoration suggested above, for which I am indebted to Raubitschek. And the connection of an invocation to Αγαθὴ Τύχη with the genitive of a name is found at least once at about this time and frequently thereafter.63

According to Dow, this archon Apolexis is perhaps the same person as [Ἀ]πόληξις ᾿Απελλικῶν τοῦ Θόου mentioned in a list of Leontis ca. 35 B.C. (I.G., II2, 2461, line 4),64 and known also as a representative of the genos of the Kerykes in this very year 21/0 B.C. (*Ελευσινακά, I, 1932, p. 225, line 21). His name appears as ᾿Απόληξις ᾿Εἰς Θόου in the ephiebic inscription I.G., II2, 1965, line 12, which can now be attributed to some year about 52/1-40 B.C. (when he was treasurer). This text is dated by Kirchner “fin. s. I a.,” following Graindor, Chronologie, p. 51, on the assumptions that Apolexis was identical with the archon of ca. 8/7-2/1 B.C. and that he was in office probably before his archonship. Dow, Hesperia, Suppl. I, p. 189, remarks that he was doubtless ταμίας τῶν στρατιωτικῶν. But Raubitschek informs me that I.G., II2, 1965, is to be associated with I.G., II2, 3730 (dated by Kirchner “med. s. I a.”), because of the probable identity of the paidotribes Μενίκος Κολωνίθηβεν with Μενίκος Φιλοκλέος Κολωνίθηβεν, orator in a decree of 52/1 B.C. (I.G., II2, 1046, line 7). The same paidotribes is mentioned in Hesperia, III, 1934, p. 39, No. 27, in the middle of the first century before Christ.65 Raubitschek also questions the reading in another text (I.G., II2, 1041, lines 30-31) and thinks that the name of the paidotribes traditionally given as [II]ε[-- --] should in reality be Με[νίκοι]. The inscription refers to epheboi and ephiebic officials of the archonship of Polycharmos, and is now dated in 45/4 (c.) B.C.66 Moreover, Raubitschek has identified the gymnasiarchos of I.G., II2, 3730, lines 7-8, Δεύκιος Σουννιός,67 with the ephebos of ca. 40 B.C., [Δ]εύκιος Δέ[κ]ιμον

63 E.g., ἀγαθὴ τύχη τοῦ Ξεβαστοῦ Καίσαρος in I.G., II2, 1069, of the end of the first century before Christ; ἀγαθὴ τύχη Νέρωνος [Κλαύδιον Καίσαρος] in I.G., II2, 1989 (ca. 53/4-66/7 A.D.); [ἀγαθὴ τύχη Νέρωνος] in I.G., II2, 1989 (ca. 53/4-66/7 A.D.); [ἀγαθὴ τύχη Νέρωνος] in I.G., II2, 1989 (ca. 53/4-66/7 A.D.);
65 See Raubitschek, Hesperia, Index I-X, s.v. A separate study of the evidence about Meniskos has been promised by Raubitschek, Studies in Roman Economic and Social History in Honor of Allan Chester Johnson (Princeton, 1951), p. 53, note 14.
66 W. B. Dinsmoor, Archons, p. 292. Koumanoudes had read as Πε[-- --] the name which Kirchner renders as [II]ε[-- -- --].
67 With Dumont and Dittenberger I restore I.G., II2, 3730, line 6, as τὸν γυμνασίαρχον; cf. I.G., II2, 1965, line 25: γυμνασίαρχον.
[Σ]ο[ν]νευ[σ], in I.G., Π², 1961, line 21, and finds a connection between the ephebos of I.G., Π², 1965, line 5, [Γάιο]ς Καστρίκως Ἀλέξανδρος, and Πώλλα Καστρικία Δέκμον θυγάτηρ, Ποπλίων Γρανίων γυνή, known from a sepulchral inscription which Kirchner dates in the first century before Christ (I.G., Π², 11826). I add one further item. Kirchner gives the name and demotic of the gymnasiarchos in I.G., Π², 1965, lines 26-27, as Σ[i]μωνα Ε[πωρί]δην[ν] (?). The reading of the name as Σύμωνα goes back to Koumanoudes, who expressly states that he copied the insertion “διὰ τάχους.” Markellos Mitsos (B.C.H., LXXIV, 1950, p. 218) read the name as Z[ή]νων[α]. When I studied this matter some years ago I was unable to confirm either reading from the squeeze, but Raubitschek has read Z[ή]νων[α] (as Mitsos) εκ Κοίλη[ς]. No such combination of name and demotic is supported by other prosopographical evidence. I think that we should read Τ'μωνα εκ Κοίλη[ς] and recognize in him the ephebos of the ephebic list mentioned above: Τ'μων Δίνειον εκ Κο[ί]λης (I.G., Π², 1961, line 44). It should be noticed there that he is first in the register of Hippothontis—an honorary position for the gymnasiarchos. In short, I agree with Raubitschek in connecting I.G., Π², 1965 and 3730, and dating them in the middle of the century. I recognize the persons crowned not as officials of the state but as epheboi. Further I express my belief that the lost ephebic list I.G., Π², 1961, is from the same year.

As archon, Apolexis is now mentioned in the following texts:

a. I.G., Π², 1040, lines 14, 24, 35.
b. I.G., Π², 1045, lines 2, 22; cf. Dow, Hesperia, Suppl. I, p. 183 (under No. 113).
c. I.G., Π², 1063, line 6.
d. I.G., Π², 2876.
e. Fouilles de Delphes, III, 2, No. 61, line 2; cf. G. Daux, Chronologie delphique, p. 75 N 20.
h. This present inscription.

The note of Kirchner that Δεύκιος Σουνιεύς of I.G., Π², 3730, is a descendant of Δεύκιος Θεοκλέους Σουνιεύς of the mid fourth century B.C. (P.A., 9057) is incorrect, for it was made without knowledge of the patronymic of I.G., Π², 1961, line 21. The one is Leukios and the other Lucius; cf. Dittenberger, Sylloge³, No. 913, note 1.

One should note the mixture of Athenians and foreigners among the epheboi of I.G., Π², 1965, as also in I.G., Π², 1961, unless perchance the confusion in the latter is due to the modern copyist. But there are obstacles, as, for example, the paidotribes in I.G., Π², 1961, whose name begins with alpha (line 77) instead of mu (Μειάκος). Perhaps one should restore Μέισκον Κολονήθεν, attributing the error to our copyist. The whole matter needs an independent study in connection with I.G., Π², 2463 (and 2461).
The new inscription does not give evidence for or against the accepted date for him, but the mention of Ariston (lines 38-42) excludes the early date formerly assigned, unless there was in reality another bearing the same name.

Line 27: Σωστικράτης. There is no evidence for the deme of Kekropis to which he and the missing names above him belonged. Phlya is excluded because at that time it had been transferred to Ptolemais.

Line 30: Νικοφων. His brother appears to be [---]ς Νικοφωντος 'Αλαιες (P.A., 11079) of Kekropis, ephebos in the archonship of Menandros in 38/7 B.C.\textsuperscript{70}

Lines 32-33: The list contains names with patronymics in one or two lines according to the space available. Since the remains in line 32 do not yield any known Athenian name, and since in the following line there is a clear nominative without the patronymic symbol ὕ, the name in line 32 may be the Roman praenomen Γναῖος. It is well known that in many instances persons with praenomen or gentilicia were not given patronymics in lists where with purely Greek names the father was regularly recorded. The Latin elements of the name were enough for identification of the family and the person.

One Γν[αίος Κ]ορνοφίκιος 'Απο[λλό]νιος Μελιτεύς is known from a columnar grave monument with relief attributed by Kirchner to the first century after Christ.\textsuperscript{71}

Lines 34-35: 'Αθηναίος Δημητριόν. ['Αρ]τεμίδωρος 'Αθηναίον of Kekropis, prytanis ca. 29/8-22/1 B.C., was not related, for he was not from Melite.\textsuperscript{72} In later years there was an 'Αθηναίος Ευόδου Μελι(τεύς), ephebos in 163/4 A.D.\textsuperscript{73}

The ubiquitous name Demetrios has relatively few occurrences in Melite, and Δημητριός Μελιτεύς (P.A., 3426), father of Ευόδους Δημητρίου Μελιτεύς, is too early to have certain connection with our prytanis. In studying the family years ago I reconstructed its stemma in the following way:

\textsuperscript{70} I.G., II\textsuperscript{a}, 1043, col. II, line 100; cf. Dinsmoor, Archons, pp. 280, 284-286.

\textsuperscript{71} I.G., II\textsuperscript{a}, 6828. Kirchner has [Κ]ορνοφίκιος. Koumanoudes and Lolling both read [Κ]ορνοφίκιος, which appears also in the photograph given by Conze, Die attischen Grabreliefs, no. 1823, and plate 387.

\textsuperscript{72} Hesperia, Suppl. I, p. 180, No. 110, lines 49-50. For the name see Raubitschek, Hesperia, Index I-X, s.v. [Ε]στ[η]δ[ῶ]δος, [Α]θη[ναίος (Κεκροπίδος) and A. M. Woodward, J.H.S., LVIII, 1938, p. 111. The reading I have given was made by B. D. Meritt.

\textsuperscript{73} I.G., II\textsuperscript{a}, 2086, line 153. ['Αθ]ηναίος Εὖδος, ἀ[ντιγραψ[έ]υς in 180/1 A.D. (I.G., II\textsuperscript{a}, 1794, line 38; for the date see Hesperia, XVIII, 1949, pp. 19-20), is usually identified with 'Αθηναίος Εὐόδου 'Αχαρ(νίς), ephebos after the middle of the second century after Christ (I.G., II\textsuperscript{a}, 2278, line 7) and sophronistes in 190/1 or 191/2 (I.G., II\textsuperscript{a}, 2113, line 17). But he can equally well be identified with the ephebos from Melite.
Eὐθύδημος (I) in 409/8
P.A., 5571; I.G., II, 373, line 242;
cf. S.E.G., Χ, 276.

Δημήτριος
P.A., 3426; I.G., II, 1668, line 3;
I.G., II, 2825, line 7

Eὐθύδημος (II) in 347/6
P.A., 5566, (5568), 5572, 5573; I.G., II, 1668, line 3;
I.G., II, 2825, line 7; I.G., II, 2394, line 2;
(I.G., II, 1570, 1927, 2394, lines 3, 5)

Eὐθύδημος (I) in 340/39 (or 313/2) ca. 330
P.A., 5522 (?), 5540; I.G., II, 1927;
I.G., II, 2394, line 3; I.G., 1570, line 83 (?)

Eὐθύδημος (II) in 340/39 (or 313/2)
P.A., 5568; I.G., II, 2394, line 5

Eὐθύδημος (II) Μελιτεύς of 240/39 B.C. belongs to the same family, as does also (perhaps) Εὐθύδημος Εὐθυδί[κοι] Μελιτεύς of the middle of the fourth century.74 Ἡλιόρμος ὁ ἴσος τῶν Μελιτεύων (P.A., 6419) is recorded in I.G., II, 1009, col. III, line 83, as an ephesos in 117/6 B.C.; it is probable that the patronymic was Δημήτριος Κυφισοδώρος Μελιτεύς is known from a sepulchral inscription of the second or first century before Christ.75 At the time of our inscription (ca. a. 29/8-22/1 a.) a Δημήτριος Φιλίππου Μελιτεύς was prytanis.76 Another sepulchral inscription of the first century after Christ mentions Γερά κέρα Μελιτεύς[οι] γνηθή,77 and a similar text of the same century has been restored [Δημήτριος Ρω[ς Δημήτριος[ν] Μελι]-

tεύς(?).78 But it would be unwise to build prosopographical connections on the basis of such a common name.

Lines 38-42: In one sense the priest of the Eponymos is the most important man whose name is preserved in this document: Αρίστων Σωσιστράτου Αθηνονέως. He is already known as ιε[ρ]ᾶς Κέκρο[π]ος ca. a. 27/6-18/7 a. in I.G., II, 2338, line 9, and he has the same title (restored) in B.C.H., LI, 1927, p. 246, No. 1, line 3.79 In the former text, a list of the genos of Amynandridai, not only is he mentioned prominently as priest of the genos, but his name is also first in the register of the γεννήται of the phyle Attalos (line 70).

74 Hesperia, VI, 1937, pp. 445-446, no. 2 (A line 7 and B line 8).
75 P.A., 5428; I.G., II, 6847.
76 I.G., II, 6839a (p. 891).
77 Hesperia, Suppl. I, p. 180, No. 110, lines 76-77.
78 I.G., II, 6838.
79 I.G., II, 6839b (p. 892).
80 Cf. P. Graindor, Musée Belge, XXVII, 1923, p. 269, No. 84.
In 1937 Dow stated, on the basis of the evidence then available, that the priest of the Eponymos, beginning in 169/8 and continuing no doubt regularly thereafter, belonged to his proper phyle.\textsuperscript{81} I have already made some observations about the initial date.\textsuperscript{82} For the following period Pritchett has shown reason to believe that the Gargettian family of the priests Thrasippos and Kallias, although not members of the phyle Hippothontis, may have filled the priesthood for that phyle during a large part of the second quarter of the second century.\textsuperscript{83} He recognized Kallias in a citation \textsuperscript{84} in a prytany decree (\textit{ca. a.} 165/4-150 \textit{a.}) as priest of the Eponymos and assigned him to the family from Gargettos. Another similar case in which Θράσυππος Καλλίον Γαργήττιος of the same family served as priest for Hippothontis (\textit{a.} 135/4 \textit{a.}) has been reported by Meritt.\textsuperscript{85} I have already promised (above, p. 37, note 21) to examine elsewhere the text gained by combining \textit{Hesperia}, Suppl. I, No. 68 with No. 88 plus \textit{Hesperia}, X, 1941, p. 282, No. 77 (\textit{a.} 131/0 \textit{a.}) and to investigate the points pertaining to the present problem.

Apart from the Gargettian family, Dow's rule is violated in a prytany decree of 95/4 B.C. recently published by Meritt.\textsuperscript{86} The phyle honored was Kekropis, whereas the priest Δεκαλόπολις Παμβωτάδης belonged to Erechtheis. To these cases must now be added the present text where the "priest of the Eponymos" was from Athmonon (Attalis) while the phyle honored was Kekropis. But one should remember that Athmonon belonged to Kekropis before the creation of Attalis, and that Ariston was the priest of Kekrops. It appears that when the new phylai were created the duties pertaining to their cults remained in charge of the old families of priests; and the evidence should be re-examined under this prism.

The new text brings also welcome information on another problem. Schlaifer has tried to explain certain irregularities in the tribal affiliation of several eponymous priests by assuming that these priests held a gentilic priesthood, and he has suggested that some phylai had only a tribal priest while others had a gentilic as well as a tribal priest, basing his conjecture on the evidence concerning those priests of the phylai Hippothontis, Akamantis, and Kekropis known to him.\textsuperscript{87} His argument about Akamantis does not hold, because the priest in \textit{Hesperia}, IX, 1940, pp. 115-118, No. 23, did in fact belong to his proper phyle. Schlaifer himself (\textit{op. cit.}, pp. 248-249) had already cast great doubt on the earlier restoration, when, in \textit{Hesperia}, X, 1941, pp. 396-397, an interchange in the restorations of the titles of treasurer and of priest

\begin{footnotesize}
\textsuperscript{81} \textit{Hesperia}, Suppl. I, p. 16.
\textsuperscript{82} See above, pp. 40-41, note 36, and p. 245 with note 43.
\textsuperscript{83} \textit{Hesperia}, IX, 1940, p. 124.
\textsuperscript{86} \textit{Hesperia}, XVII, 1948, pp. 25-26, No. 12.
\end{footnotesize}
made by Pritchett showed the correct association. The whole question needs a comprehensive study in the light of the evidence now available.

Schlaifer had already concluded (op. cit., p. 254) that the phyle Kekropis had adopted the gentilic priesthood along with the sanctuary of Kekrops on the Acropolis, but there was no evidence heretofore to show that this priest held office also as priest of the Eponymos of the phyle Kekropis. This information is provided by the present text. By using the evidence about Ariston previously available and mentioned above one can deduce that he was priest of Kekrops for life and that he did not belong to the phyle Kekropis. Schlaifer, consequently, did not include him in his list of known priests of the Eponymos (op. cit., p. 251). The present text shows that he was priest of the Eponymos, the conclusion being that the tribal priesthood of Kekrops (originally belonging solely to Kekropis) was held by a gentilic priest (of a now different phyle) as late as the end of the first century before Christ.

A sepulchral inscription assigned to a date in Roman times and known from an old copy by Spon reads as follows: [- - - - - - 'Αθμο]νεύς. Χαρίεσσα  'Αρίστωνος ἐξ 'Αθμονέων. It is also in the manuscript of Spon's fellow-traveler Wheler (No. LXV = 290) with a different division of the lines: [- - - - - - 'Αθμο]νεύς. Χαρίεσσα  'Αρίστωνος ἐξ 'Αθμονέων. We cannot judge the date closely because of our ignorance of the shapes of the letters, and so cannot say whether Chariessa was the daughter of the priest. The genitive plural of the demotic shows that in any case the monument does not date from pre-Roman times. [- - - - - - 'Αθμο]νεύς was probably Chariessa's husband.

Kirchner felt confident that the persons named in a catalogue of uncertain nature of the mid fourth century B. C., and belonging to Kekropis (I.G., II², 2385, lines 4-74), were from Athmonon, but he made no suggestion for associating 'Ισοκράτης 'Αρίστωνος of line 45 (P.A., 7714) with the family of our priest. He may have been an ancestor.

In the prytany decrees collected by Dow the name of the hoplite general is found

---

88 See also my comments on pp. 36-37 (and note 20), above.
89 It was noticed some years ago by W. K. Pritchett, who communicated his observation to Raubitschek and to me.
90 I.G., II², 2338, lines 8 and 70; B.C.H., LI, 1927, p. 246, No. 1, lines 3-4.
91 I.G., II², 5357. For the division of lines in Spon's book, see J. H. Oliver, Hesperia, IV, 1935, p. 44.
92 See above, p. 240. Wheler's manuscript has the misspelling 'Αρίστωνος. The location of finding is given by Wheler as the same as that of I.G., II², 5669: in templo τῆς Παναγίας. But according to Spon (apud Boeckh) this latter was found apud ecclesiam Panagiae Camuchariae. It was in fact rediscovered in the church of Panagia Kapnikarea during the course of repairs about fifteen years ago and shown to me by G. Bakalakis. The stone is still beside the church. Spon's note that I.G., II², 5357, was found Athenis in ecclesia Panagiae Gorgopoiko is probably wrong.
93 I take this opportunity of noting that the underlined parts of lines 89-96 in I.G., II², 2385 are not lost, but are actually the fragment published as I.G., II², 2431.
94 Hesperia, Suppl. I (1937).
only in citations on the lower part of the stelai, above or below the register of the prytaneis, a type of mention which begins after Sulla and continues thereafter. He is prominently mentioned in the headings of the prytany lists of later Roman times, along with the eponymous archon, in a way which suggests that his own office partakes of the nature of an eponymous magistracy. The present document is the only one so far discovered in which the hoplite general is named above a prytany decree, an innovation which shows the increase in his prestige at about this time. Raubitschek suggests to me that this implies a change in the status of the hoplite general from simple connection with the Council to a position of such importance that he may be considered almost as chief of the prytaneis. Antipatros must have acquired considerable importance before his seventh generalship, and his prominent mention in this text may be due partly to his personal qualifications. He was spokesman for the decree establishing the celebration of the birthday of Augustus. This in itself shows close and friendly relations with Rome, and it is quite possible that he was the agent of the emperor in Athens. Moreover, the year of our text (21/0 B.C.) is the exact date which has been thought to mark in Athens a change in organization from a board of generals to one single general. Hence Antipatros is favored as having been the first hoplite general under the new system introduced by Augustus, preferred over Pammenes son of Zenon of Marathon (ca. a. 27/6-18/7 a.) who was considered as candidate because he was the first priest of Roma and Augustus.

Another innovation at this time concerns the title of the priest of the Eponymos. Oliver has rejected the old theory advanced by G. Gilbert and at first accepted by himself that the Eponymos may have been also the priest of the eponymous hero

---

95 His first appearance is shortly after 60 B.C. (Hesperia, Suppl. I, No. 98). Thereafter he is found about 40-30 B.C. (ibid., No. 105), about 29/8-22/1 B.C. (ibid., No. 110), and about 20 B.C. (ibid., No. 116).

96 I.G., II², 1774 ff. See, however, the discussion by Sarikakis, op. cit., pp. 19-21, and the evidence there cited. He asserts that the hoplite general did not become an eponymous magistrate at Athens. It is worth noting that the main topic of the present text is praise of the treasurer with the honor of an ἐκδών ἐν ὁπλαῖοι, i.e., it is the type of inscription which might explain the naming of the hoplite general as eponymous. Sarikakis, in his argument, erroneously calls I.G., XII, 8, No. 26, and S.G.D.I., 2089, decrees. I.G., II², 1039 is an (ephebic) decree.

97 On this decree, see below, pp. 260-265 (No. 98). W. B. Dinsmoor informs me that he believes there were two important Athenians named Antipatros at about this time, making two generations instead of one in the stemma of the family. He plans to discuss this in a forthcoming publication.


of the phyle and that the office of the Eponymos was created in or shortly before 130 A.D. On the other hand, Raubitschek has held that the first appearance of the Eponymos was in 135/6 A.D., and he has been inclined to identify the two offices in the post-Hadrianic period. But his conclusions have been tentative because of the fragmentary nature of the evidence.\textsuperscript{103} It is significant to find in this text as early as the Augustan period the title ἐπώνυμος, which can only be interpreted to mean ἱερεὺς τοῦ ἐπώνυμου. The term is unique in the prytany texts of the Hellenistic and Augustan eras.

These two innovations are additional confirmation of the fundamental changes in the Athenian constitution at the time of the principate of Augustus, and especially in or near the year 21 B.C.

Face B

In Roman times, when old stelai with prytany decrees were re-used for the inscription of prytany lists, it was the rule that the phyle should remain the same. For example, the stone with a prytany decree dating \textit{ca.} 50-40 B.C., and belonging to Hippothontis,\textsuperscript{104} was re-used \textit{ca.} 138/9-150 A.D. for a prytany list of the same phyle.\textsuperscript{105} Or again, a decree of Kekropis dating \textit{ca.} 29/8-22/1 B.C.\textsuperscript{106} was inscribed in 179/80 A.D. with a prytany list of the same phyle.\textsuperscript{107} In both cases stones obviously the property of the phylai\textsuperscript{108} had been used about two hundred years after the first inscriptions, by the same phylai, when financial (or other) conditions did not allow the erection of new stelai. These circumstances are different from those which controlled the erection of one original monument with two or more prytany lists (in the Roman period) inscribed in one, or nearly the same, year and belonging to different phylai. Our present text belongs to the former category, and I assume therefore that the list on Face B belonged, like that of Face A, to the phyle Kekropis.

Indeed, the first and second texts of our document are contemporaries, respectively, of those of Kekropis just mentioned in notes 106 and 107. There are other similarities, even in the brick-like dismemberment of the stele for its third use, but the fragments cannot belong all to the same stone, because demesmen of Melite are registered in both prytany texts. Nevertheless, I believe that our Face B is approximately contemporaneous with \textit{I.G.}, II\textsuperscript{3}, 1790, and I date it \textit{ca.} 180 A.D.\textsuperscript{109}

\textsuperscript{104} \textit{Hesperia}, XII, 1943, pp. 56-60, No. 14.
\textsuperscript{105} \textit{Hesperia}, XII, 1943, pp. 60-63, No. 15; for the date see J. A. Notopoulos, \textit{A.J.P.}, LXV, 1944, p. 165.
\textsuperscript{106} \textit{Hesperia}, Suppl. I, pp. 178-181, No. 110.
\textsuperscript{107} \textit{I.G.}, II\textsuperscript{3}, 1790; for the date see J. A. Notopoulos, \textit{A.J.P.}, LXIV, 1943, p. 55, note 29, and \textit{Hesperia}, XVIII, 1949, Table 1 (facing p. 22).
\textsuperscript{109} In line 25 of \textit{I.G.}, II\textsuperscript{3}, 1790, J. H. Oliver (as also Notopoulos) has read Ἐ[ν]δήμος Ἐρε
No archon of Roman times is known whose demotic was Δευκόνοεύς, sc. of the phyle Leontis, but the uncertainties are in general so great in any case that it is futile to attempt to fix the year in the cycles established by Notopoulos.

Because of the last trace of a letter in line 3 the restoration of the heading is adapted to that of I.G., II 2, 1775 (cf. I.G., II 3, 1821).

If the suggested date ca. 180 A.D. is correct, Fl(avius) Proklos of line 15 is probably the same as Φ[λ]άβιος Πρόκλος, who was ephebos in 165/6 A.D. One Φλ. Πρόκλος, with no demotic given, is mentioned in a catalogue of uncertain category ca. 140/1-143/4 A.D. A descendant of our Proklos may be that Φλά ᾽Προκλανός ᾽Πρ, of Kekropis who was ephebos ca. 232 A.D. He is followed in the inscription in which he appears by Φλά ᾽Μαρκιανός ᾽Πρ, probably his brother. In the years 168/9 and 169/70 one of the ἀδείστοι was the ἱεραίλης, Epigonos son of Proklos, of Peiraeus. But there is no way of telling whether our Proklos was ἱεραίλης or a son of Epigonos.

If this catalogue was, in fact, of the phyle Kekropis, as we have surmised, then Straton (line 9) was of Melite, the only deme of Kekropis in which the name is known to occur in Roman times. One “Ολυμπος Στράτωνος Μελί” was ephebos ca. 110-125 A.D. His son was Στράτων Όλυμπου Μελιτεύς, γραμματεύς βουλευτῶν in 174/5 A.D. Also to be ascribed to this deme is Διθάλης Στράτωνος of Kekropis, ephebos in 205/6 A.D., perhaps the son of the Straton of this text. For occurrences of the name

(A.J.A., XLV, 1941, p. 539). Kirchner had Ἐπε, influenced by Ἐρέν(ν)ιος of Pittakys and Dittenberger (not mentioned in Dittenberger’s Indices). If the name is a patronymic it must be restored either as Ἐπε[ινόιο -- -- ] or, more probably, as Ἐπε[ινατοί -- -- ], but neither restoration is satisfactory, the first being a gentilicium and the second a cognomen.

Dow, Hesperia, Suppl. I, p. 178, publishes a later Roman inscription cut on the lateral face of the stone and calls it “unpublished.” It was published at the same time as the two main faces of the stone by K. S. Pittakys, Ἐφ. Ἀρχ., No. 2294, and it was repeated by Dittenberger as I.G., III, 3912.

This deme never belonged to Antiochus. See R. Löper, Ath. Mitt., XVII, 1892, p. 426, note 1; J. Kirchner, I.G., II 3, 2067, comment on lines 177-178.

110 This deme never belonged to Antiochus. See R. Löper, Ath. Mitt., XVII, 1892, p. 426, note 1; J. Kirchner, I.G., II 3, 2067, comment on lines 177-178.


118 I.G., II 3, 2472, line 5.

144 I.G., II 3, 2237, line 134.

115 In this text the symbol ᾿ does not indicate only homonymity of the father, but is also a mark of abbreviation and punctuation; cf. Kirchner’s commentary ad loc. For the date of the inscription see J. A. Notopoulos, Hesperia, XVIII, 1949, p. 47.


118 I.G., II 3, 2019, line 15; cf. M. Mitsos, Ἀρχ. Ἐφ., 1950/1, p. 18, No. 2. [*Ο]Λυγος Λυσάβου Μελιτεύς of I.G., II 3, 6866, of the first, or (rather) second, century after Christ, belongs to the same family.


120 I.G., II 3, 2193, line 112; 2195, line 3. For the date cf. Notopoulos, op. cit., pp. 34-35. I.G., II 3, 2195, is a fragment from a copy of I.G., II 3, 2193. I observed some years ago that it is the fragment published by Oliver, Hesperia, XI, 1942, p. 79, No. 40, in the belief that it was hitherto.
Στράτων in Melite in the pre-Christian era, see I.G., II², 6869, 6870, 6875. In that earlier era the name occurs in the deme Epiclkaidai (I.G., II¹, 6058), perhaps in Aixone (I.G., II², 952, line 4), and if Dow’s reading is correct and his reasoning sound in Halai as well. Otherwise this last Straton also belongs to Melite.\textsuperscript{121}

98 (Plate 63). Two non-joining fragments of Pentelic marble (fragments b and c) which belong to the same inscription with I.G., II², 1071 (fragment a) but make no join with it. Fragment a was found in the Library of Hadrian and is now in the Epigraphical Museum (E.M. 5314). The writing is stoichedon, with a chequer pattern which measures 0.013 m. horizontally and 0.0166 m. vertically.\textsuperscript{122}

Fragment b was found on March 15, 1935, in a late wall east of the East Stoa (P 14). The right side and rough-picked back are preserved. Down the right side of the inscribed face a strip about 0.07 m. wide has been shaved off, with the loss of practically all traces of letters. A similar treatment at both upper corners of Fragment a confirms the connection between the two stones; apparently the cutting was done when the original stele was being prepared for re-use.

Height, 0.028 m.; width, 0.195 m.; thickness, 0.09 m.
Height of letters, 0.009 m.-0.011 m.
Inv. No. I 2619.

Fragment c was found on March 14, 1938, in a late context northeast of the Odeion (N 7). Its original inscribed face only is preserved.

Height, 0.10 m.; width, 0.066 m.; thickness, 0.052 m.
Height of letters, 0.009 m.-0.01 m.
Inv. No. I 5334.

\[\text{ΣΤΟΙΧ. 39}\]
\[a \quad 22/1 \quad a. \quad (?)\]
\[\begin{array}{l}
[\text{εδοξεν τη βουλην}] \quad \text{Αλαντις \, ε[πρωτάνεν, \ldots \, \varepsilon]} \\
[\gammaραμμάτευε, \ldots \, \text{ις \, επεστάτ[επί, \ldots \, \varepsilon ρήχει]} \\
[\text{\'Αντιπατρος \, ε'}}] \quad \text{\'Αντιπάτρου \, Φλ[ινις \, ειπε \, \varepsilon}]
\end{array}\]

unknown, and with erroneous restorations. I shall deal elsewhere with the whole group I.G., II², 2193-2196.

\textsuperscript{120} Hesperia, Suppl. I, p. 117, No. 61, line 6.

\textsuperscript{121} On Hesperia, Suppl. I, pp. 117-118, No. 61, see my remarks above, p. 39.

\textsuperscript{122} R. P. Austin, The Stoichedon Style in Greek Inscriptions (London, 1938), p. 36. Austin gives the height of letters as 0.01 m. (\textit{op. cit.}, p. 114); Kirchner’s measurement was 0.011 m. A photograph is published by Austin, \textit{op. cit.}, Plate 14. In my Plate 63 the photographs of No. 98, a and b, were made by the late G. Tzimas of the Museum staff. The photographs of the other fragments, as indeed all other photographs in this report, were made by Alison Frantz. The association of the three fragments of this text was noticed some years ago by A. E. Raubitschek, who has kindly given me his notes and suggestions for restoration and has encouraged this preliminary publication.
GREEK INSCRIPTIONS

5 [ὅποσα μὲν πράττεσθαι οὕτως δὴ[ἡμός Αὐτοκράτ.] [ορή Καῖσα]με Σεβαστοῦ πράττεσθαι [ι.....]
[.....]ων ταῖς ἐναὶς τιμαῖς Γ[.....]
[.....]ειτ ὑπὸ τὴν μὲν δωδεκάτη[Ἀθρομοῦ]
[ος Καῖσαρος] γενέθλιον ἐκτάζει[ν θυσίας καθά]

10 [περ τῶι Ἀπό]λλων τῆν ἐβδομήν ιερ [ἂν νομίζομεν]
[.....]ων εἰσὶ δημοτελεῖς Γ'[.....]
[.....]ο πορόντων μὲν [.....]
[.....]καθ]ἐρούντε[ς]
[.....]τοντας [.....]

lacuna

b

15 [.................]Σ[.....]Ε[ΤΑΣ]
[.....]βωμὸν [.....]
[.....]νον ἀλλ[.....]
[.....]διακ[.....]
[.....]
[.....]οντας[ο]τοσ[.....]

20 [...........]ἐξεταζ[.....]
[.....]ν[.....]
[.....]Ἀγωνισ]πύθο[ν.....]
[.....]ἐπιφανέσ]τατο[ν.....]
[.....]ο[ν]τε[....]

25 [.............]Θ[ΡΗΣ]
[.....]ΠΟ[.....]

lacuna

c

30 [...........]Ιος η[.....]
[.....]Ιο]ς παρ[.....]
[.....]τούς ε[.....]

lacuna

Line 15: perhaps ῬΤΑΣ. Line 27 fin.: either Η or Ρ.


The association of the fragments is proved by the lettering, the subject-matter, and the style of treatment for later use, but above all by the stoichedon lettering, which is the latest example from Athens and, except for an inscription from Oinoanda in Lykia, perhaps the latest in all Greece.\(^{123}\) It is not a survival of the stoichedon style but rather a revival with all the attendant formulae of decrees of the early fourth century before Christ.\(^{124}\)

Hiller von Gaertringen, at the time of Kirchner’s publication, had already recognized (commentary on *I.G.*, II\(^2\), 1071) that the inscription bestows honors on one of the emperors for the celebration of his birthday. Graindor, in his several studies, and after studying the stone in Athens, reached these conclusions: the emperor honored was Augustus; the twelfth day for the celebration of his birthday was in the Attic month Boedromion; the monthly birthday of Apollo on the seventh of that month perhaps coincided with the anniversary of the arrival of Augustus in Athens after the battle of Actium in 31 B.C.; the spokesman was Antipatros son of Antipatros of Phlya, known at about this time to have held repeatedly the office of hoplite-general; and the date of the document was not long after 27/6 B.C. His views were accepted by Shear and Day, and so far as concerns the date by Dow, Accame, and Sarikakis. Austin was not aware of Graindor’s results, and hence he followed Kirchner’s general dating, but he made the important observation that the inscription was cut in stoichedon pattern, a fact which had escaped Graindor’s attention and which makes many of his restorations untenable. In the text above, I have adapted his conclusions to a stoichedon line of 39 letters, with some improvements in the readings.

It is not my purpose here to discuss the institution of the celebration of the *natalis genuinus* and *natalis imperii* of the Roman emperors and of the members of their families, much less the beginnings in the Hellenistic period. This matter has been examined thoroughly by specialists in the field.\(^{125}\)

\(^{123}\) Austin, *op. cit.*, pp. 114, 117-118.

\(^{124}\) It is worth noting that similar archaistic lettering, though larger, was used in the dedicatory inscription on the temple of Roma and Augustus on the Acropolis (*I.G.*, II\(^2\), 3173).

The emperor's title Σεβάστος (line 5) shows that the decree was not passed before 27 B.C., in which year Augustus was given this name.\textsuperscript{126} Judging the *floruit* of Antipatros as he understood it,\textsuperscript{127} and judging that the Athenians would have been prompt to calm the wrath of Caesar after the battle of Actium, Graindor dated the decree as soon after 27/6 B.C. as he could. I prefer to bring it down to the eve of Augustus' second visit to Athens in the winter of 21/0 B.C. Considerable activity is attested at Athens in this later period. The temple of Roma and Augustus was constructed on the Acropolis between 27/6 and 18/7 B.C.\textsuperscript{128} The Roman Agora was started before 44 B.C. and was inaugurated in 11/0 or 10/9 B.C.,\textsuperscript{129} but the additional funds procured by Augustus for finishing it were probably given during his two later visits in 20 and 19 B.C.\textsuperscript{130} It is now believed that some of the lead *tesserae* used for the distribution of grain might belong in 20 B.C.\textsuperscript{131} Josephine Shear has demonstrated that Athens was one of the cities which were granted the privilege of issuing autonomous coinage in 27/6 B.C. or soon thereafter.\textsuperscript{132}

All this confessedly is not conclusive, but it indicates that an appropriate date for our text may be some years later than that which is earliest possible. Graindor had interpreted the *ἐνω τιμαί* of line 6 as meaning honors of the preceding year; but they can have been quite as well (lexicographically) honors given to Augustus in the past. Thus the argument that this decree must be as close as possible to 27/6 loses much of its force: the *ἐνω τιμαί* could have been honors by way of appeasement soon after Actium or even later, including, for example, the authorization for the temple of Roma and Augustus on the Acropolis. But the new visit of Augustus in 21 B.C. was an important event and an occasion for new honors. At that time Antipatros son of Antipatros of Phlya, the orator of the present decree, was hoplite general and at


\textsuperscript{127} See above, pp. 249-251, 257, for the evidence about Antipatros.

\textsuperscript{128} We do not know a more precise date. Cf. Graindor, \textit{Athènes sous Auguste}, p. 30; W. Judeich, \textit{Topographie von Athen} \textsuperscript{2} (1931), p. 256, note 5. See also below, p. 264. The temple of Augustus in Pergamon was begun in 29 B.C. and was ready ten years later (I.G.R.R.P., IV, 39; Graindor, \textit{op. cit.}, pp. 131, 150). The dedication of the monument for his son-in-law Agrippa has been attributed to the years between 23 and 13 B.C. (Graindor, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 49). Judeich (\textit{op. cit.}, p. 216) still holds to the old date \textit{ca}. 27 B.C. of Wachsmuth, with no reference to Graindor. Now it is believed to be contemporary with the construction of the *Agripleion* in the Agora and both are attributed to the year 16 or 14 B.C.; cf. H. A. Thompson, \textit{Hesperia}, XIX, 1950, p. 89.

\textsuperscript{129} Graindor, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 32, note 3; Judeich, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 371; Day, \textit{op. cit.}, pp. 130-131, note 60.

\textsuperscript{130} Graindor, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 32.

\textsuperscript{131} Graindor, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 118; Day, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 133, note 78.

the acme of his prestige. Among other reasons which Graindor advanced at first in favor of the date 26/5 B.C. was his reckoning that in that year the twelfth of Boedromion fell on September 24, i.e., very close to the birthday of Augustus on September 23, with allowance of an error of one or two days either way as is always possible in equating dates in the Greek and Roman calendars. Later he tacitly dropped this argument, and it should be emphasized, in any case, that the equation of dates must apply to the actual year of birth in 63 B.C. and that a recurrence of the equation was not essential to the establishment of a celebration about forty years later. The date of this decree must depend on evidence of a different kind.

The ties between Augustus and Apollo have been discussed by Graindor. It is known that according to one tradition Apollo's birthday was on the seventh of a month and that it was celebrated every month. So too the dies natalis of Augustus was celebrated every month as had been the custom earlier for Hellenistic kings and as was the custom later for other emperors and members of their families. The inference is that the Athenians also had by this decree, in some portion now lost, decided on monthly celebrations of the birthday of Augustus. But it is natural to suppose that the main celebration (line 7) was reserved for the anniversary date in Boedromion, which coincided with the anniversary of the restoration of the democracy in Athens by Thrasyboulos. Probably in this month too occurred the main celebration of the birthday of Apollo (called Boedromios) during the festival called Boedromia. The inscription from Mytilene gives an idea of the honors bestowed on Augustus on this occasion and of the arrangement of the decree: games, sacrifices, and offerings.

Line 5: For the use of πράττεωθαι in this formula Graindor refers to I.G., II², 1076, line 9 (now H.S.C.P., Suppl. I, 1940, pp. 528-529, line 9). Cf. also I.G., II², 1629, lines 173-175: ὀπως ἄν τὴν ταχύστατον πράττεωθαι τὰς δήμας.

---

138 I do not accept Graindor's suggestion that this decree is merely an amendment of an earlier one. On amendments generally, see A. Billheimer, A.J.A., XLII, 1938, pp. 456-485.
139 Reuvre belge de Philologie et d'Histoire, I, 1922, p. 439.
136 See also Taylor, op. cit., passim. There is now the special work of J. Gagé, Apollon Romain: Essai sur le culte d'Apollon et le developpement du "ritus Graecus" à Rome des origines à Auguste (Paris, 1955), pp. 479-682, but he makes no mention of this decree.
138 For monthly celebrations of the birthday of Augustus, see I.G., XII, 8, 58, line 21: [καὶ] τῇ γενέθλιῳ αὐτοῦ ἡμέρᾳ (Mytilene and other cities mentioned in lines 12-14); I.G.R.R.P., IV, 353b, lines 13-14: τῇ τοῦ Ξεβαστοῦ ἡμήνῃ γενεσίῳ (i.e., ἡμέρᾳ) (Pergamon).
141 I.G., XII, 8, 58 (cited in note 138); cf. also I.G., XII, Suppl., p. 13, No. 58.)
Line 10: The adjective δημοτελεῖς probably refers to sacrifices.

Line 22: Here I suspect mention of the ἄγων ἰσοπύθιος. The same adjective is used to describe the μεγάλα (ἱερὰ) Αἴγυπτεια in inscriptions from Thyateira. The games introduced in Athens were probably the Σεβαστοὶ ἥγϊνες mentioned in I.G., ΠΙ, 1069, line 7 (before 13/14 A.D.). They are mentioned a little later as (μεγάλα) Καισάρεια Σεβαστὰ in I.G., ΠΙ, 3531 and 3535.

Line 25: Either [πεντε]τρίς or [Σω]τηρὶ σ[— —].

The decree for Julia Domna (I.G., ΠΙ, 1076) is of particular interest for understanding the present inscription. The proposals in it, as summarized by Oliver, provide a useful illustration. These were sacrifices by the archons each year on her birthday to Agathe Tyche, inaugural offerings to her as Soteira and Polias, sacrifices by the polemarch with participation by the priestess of Athena Polias in these ceremonies, the setting up of a gold cult-statue of her in the Parthenon, a festival of Athena with full representation of officials and people as a mark of devotion to her, and finally the inscribing and erecting of the stele on the Acropolis. It should be noted that I.G., ΠΙ, 1076, is the amended version of the decree. A fragment of the original text has been found in the Agora, and is published by J. H. Oliver in Hesperia, X, 1941, pp. 84-85, No. 36.

99 (Plate 61). Base of Hymettian marble, removed from the face of the Late Roman Fortification Wall south of the Eleusinion (T 21) on June 3, 1938. Full dimensions are preserved, with edges and moulding chipped. A base-moulding runs the full length of the long right side, across the face, and returns a short distance on the left; a joining surface here (it and the back are very roughly dressed) shows that the block must have been the right wing or anta of a pi-shaped monument. The inscription is in one line near the bottom of the face.

Height, ca. 0.81 m.; width (just above the moulding), 0.575 m.; thickness, ca. 1.50 m.

Height of letters, 0.01 m.

Inv. No. I 5486.

142 I.G.R.R.P., 1261, 1265 (age of Septimius Severus); cf. 1251: ἱερὸν [ἀγών]α εἰσελαστικῶν Αἴγυπτει[λεων] ιοντον (age of Caracalla). One should note again the implied connection with Apollo. For the meaning of the adjective, see Dittenberger, Syllogē, 402, lines 13-16 with notes 7-9.

143 For the date see the note under I.G., ΠΙ, 1723.

144 About the middle of the first century after Christ (47/8 or 51/2 or 55/6 A.D.); cf. von Gerkan, Jahrbuch, LVI, 1941, p. 177.


146 The proposal θέου δὲ πάντας τοῖς κατ᾽ [τί]ς [ἐκαστον ἄρ]χονται Ἀγαθῆ[ι, Τύχῃ εἰ ἦ ιεροτάτη ημέραι Ίολία] Σεβαστη ἔγγεννητη] can perhaps be interpreted to mean that the annual archons who happened to be in office every year had to make sacrifices to Julia Domna on her birthday every month.
Two other signatures of Demetrios are known so far, and long discussion the second century before Christ has been accepted as his date. The Diomedes whose statue was made by Demetrios is now identified as Διομήδης Ὄληνδώρον ὘ληναῖος (I.G., IV², 1, 626) also known as Διομήδης Ὄληνδώρον Περγαμήνος (Dittenberger, Sylloge³, 1079, line 20). He is held to be the same as Διομήδης Ὄληνδώρον [v] in Fouilles de Delphes, III, 2, No. 49, line 33 (Dittenberger, Sylloge³, 728K). The specific year 106/5 B.C. has been given to this last text, thus fixing a more precise date for the activity of Demetrios within the century.

The name Μοσχίων Δημήτριος Πτελεάσιος is now known from a columnar grave monument of the first century before Christ (I.G., II³, 7323a, on p. 882). The coincidence of dates and the fact that the name Demetrios occurs in no other family of this small deme are indications that Moschion was a son of the sculptor. Another member of the family was probably that Δημήτριος Μοσχίωνος who participated in the Pythaid of 98/7 B.C. as κυκαμοστά (Fouilles de Delphes, III, 2, No. 48, line 19 = Dittenberger, Sylloge³, 711L).

An ancestor of the sculptor, one Δημήτριος Φίλωνος Πτελεάσιος (P.A., 3442) was ptytanis about 350 B.C. (I.G., II¹, 1746, line 35) and διαυτήρης in 325/4 B.C. (I.G., II², 1926, line 92). His tessera judicialis has survived (I.G., II³, 1886).

This same combination of the names Philon and Demetrios is found in the deme Pithos, where Φίλων Δημητρίου Πτελεάσιος (P.A., 14869) is known from a columnar grave monument of Hellenistic date (I.G., II², 7234). The only archaeologist who has seen the stone is Pittakys, who gave Π and Ξ as the shapes of its letters and noted that it was found εἰς τὰ ἀνυψώματα θεμέλια τοῦ νέου Βουλευτηρίου πρὸς τὸ βορειοανατολικὸν μέρος τοῦ Ἀθηνῶν (Ἐφ. Ἀρχ., No. 3353; published in 1858). This is the building on ὅδος Σταδίου, now called the Παλαιὰ Βουλή, and Pittakys’ note was correctly interpreted by S. A. Koumanoudes, Ἀττικῆς ἐπιγραφαὶ ἐπιτύβῳι (Athens,

147 E. Loewy, Inschriften griechischer Bildhauer, 238 (I.G., II³, 3782) and 237 (I.G., II³, 4257).
151 Klaffenbach, op. cit., p. 53, No. 40. For the date, see G. Daux, op. cit., p. 710; and for the year of Argeios, see S. Dow, H.S.C.P., LI, 1940, p. 113.
1871), No. 1044. It is worth noting that the building of the Council Chamber was commenced in 1832/3, and that Pittakys' publication was 25 years later. The inscriptions found during work on the building were published at the time by Pittakys himself (L'ancienne Athènes, Athens, 1835, pp. 486-488), by C. Wordsworth (Athens and Attica, London, 1836, p. 216, note 1), and by L. Ross (Die Demen von Attika, Halle, 1846, No. 104), but in no one of these publications was the inscription here under discussion included.

The names Philon and Demetrios appear together on another columnar grave monument (I.G., II¹, 13001): Φίλων | Δημητριδ. This also is known only from a copy by Pittakys, who writes (Εφ. 'Αρχ., No. 1935; published in 1853): Ηδρον αὐτῆν τὸ 1833 Σεπτεμβρίου 4 εἰς τὸ δυτικὸν τῆς Ἀκροπόλεως εἰς τὰ τότε ἐκεί σωζόμενα Τουρκικά μνημεία. I make three observations: (1) that it escaped the attention of Dittenberger (I.G., III, 3417) and of Kirchner (I.G., II¹, 13001) that the text had been previously published by Pittakys himself in L'ancienne Athènes, p. 300, as found near the entrance to the Acropolis; (2) that the text was repeated by A. R. Rangabé, Antiquités Helléniques, II (Athens, 1855), No. 1788 from Pittakys' first publication; and (3) that Koumanoudes has not included the text in his collection from any of the earlier publications or from the stone.

Pittakys has also published a similar text from a similar small columnar grave monument: Φίλων Δημητριδ. The similarity of text and of place of finding leaves no doubt that Pittakys here dealt with only one monument. It was found τὸ 1831 Ἰουλίου 6 παρὰ τὸ ἀρχαῖον Διοσκοūρειον καὶ Ἀγραυλευν, πρὸς τὴν ἐκεί Ἐκκλησίαν "τῆς Ἀγίας Ἑλένης." The inscription is now I.G., II¹, 8480. A noticeable phenomenon is the lack of patronymic, a peculiarity shared by the only other sepulchral inscription found in Attika which names a foreigner from Demetrias (I.G., II¹, 8479). On the other hand, the descriptions, the times of finding, and the topographical indications, if one considers the lack of exactitude not uncommon in Pittakys' notes, are all sufficient to identify I.G., II¹, 8480, and I.G., II¹, 13001.

In studying the habits of Pittakys I have found that in many cases he has repub-

155 Ross also contributed to Jahn's Archiv für Philologie und Pädagogik, II, 1833, p. 437, No. 4, and sent copies to the Academy in Berlin.
154 One may add to Paul Clement's note on I.G., I², 987 (Hesperia, XXIV, 1955, p. 8), that a poor copy was published by Pittakys, L'ancienne Athènes, p. 487. As is usual in this volume, it is difficult to distinguish likely restorations from actual readings.
156 L'ancienne Athènes, p. 151, and Εφ. 'Αρχ., No. 1869 (published in 1853).
157 For the church, see below, p. 268.
158 If one will trace back the bibliographical indications he will find all the publications except that by Rangabé, op. cit., No. 2445 (Εφ. 'Αρχ., No. 1869).
159 I find this identification already hinted in the pencilled notes in the copy of Rangabé's volume now at the Institute for Advanced Study.
lished inscriptions previously published by him without reference but making some tacit correction. This would indicate that Δημήτριον is the correct reading in the second line, favored also by the association of the names Δημήτριος and Φίλων. But one would naturally expect this, the easier reading, to appear in the earlier copies, and the parallel of I.G., II², 8479, favors Δημήτριεύς. The matter remains uncertain, and for the present I suggest that the correct text for I.G., II², 8480 (＝13001) is Φίλων | Δημήτρι[— —], the name in line 2 being either patronymic or ethnic. Any connection with the monument (also lost) now published as I.G., I², 7234, remains equally uncertain. One may perhaps consider, in relation to these documents, a somewhat similar fragment (now lost) published by Pittakys, L’ancienne Athènes, p. 268.

100 (Plate 63). Upper left corner of a grave monument of Pentelic marble, with pedimental top, found on November 1, 1938, during the demolition of a modern house southeast of the market square and west of the Penathenaic Way (Q 21).

Height, 0.22 m.; width, 0.265 m.; thickness, 0.106 m.
Height of letters, 0.156 m.
Inv. No. I 5596.

init. saec. III p.

Ἐπιγόνη Ἐπιτόρ[ου]  [----------]
ἐγ Μυρνοῦ[ν]  [----------]

The pediment shows that another name, probably that of Epigone’s husband, should be restored at the right.

This inscription was seen and copied by K. S. Pittakys, L’ancienne Athènes (Athens, 1835), p. 150, in a ruined church which was close to the sanctuary of Aglauros. August Mommsen, Athenae Christianae (Leipzig, 1868), p. 15, No. 1, identified this church with Ἄγιος Νικόλαος (No. 1 on his plate). Actually, it is the same church which Pittakys (Ἐφ. Ἀρχ., No. 1869) called Ἁγ. Ἐλένη, a name probably inferred by him, for in his book says that there he read “le nom de la belle Helène sur un piédestal qui probablement soutenait sa statue.”

Pittakys’ text runs: 

ΕΠΙΓΟΝΗΣΕΙΟΠΟΤΟΤΕ
ΕΚΜΠΙΝΟΝΤΝΩΝ

One should not suppose that in Pittakys’ time the inscription was preserved in better condition than it is today, for his habit in L’ancienne Athènes of restoring texts without indicating the restorations, except in rare cases, is well known. This is apparent here also in the erroneous ending of the demotic, perhaps the result of con-

160 Cf. Mommsen, op. cit., p. 81, note *, who was not able to locate it, and above, p. 267.
fusión con tales demóticos como ἐκ Μυρρινοῦτων, ἐς Ἀμαξαντέων, etc., and it is possible
that a typographical error has further muddled what Pittakys intended as ἐκ Μυρρινοῦτων. The text has been neglected by later editors and does not appear in Kou- manoudes, Ἀττικής ἐπιγραφαὶ ἐπιτύμβιων, or in either edition of the Corpus of Attic
inscriptions.¹⁶¹

Euporos, the father of Epigone, is possibly the same as Εὐπορος Διοκλέους ἐκ Μυρρινοῦτων (νοῦττης), ephebos in 163/4 (I.G., II², 2086, line 64). I think he is the son of Διοκλῆς Ἀλέξανδρου (ἐκ Μυρρινοῦτης), who was prytanis of Aigeis in 138/9 (I.G., II², 1765, line 36). This Diokles was preceded in the list of prytaneis by Ἀλέξανδρος Ἥλιοδώρου (ἐκ Μυρρινοῦτης), who apparently was a member of the same family, and who was (I believe) the father of Diokles serving as prytanis for a second time along with his son. It is not clear what his relationship is with the family of Ἀλέξανδρος Ἑρμείου (ἐκ Μυρρινοῦτης) who was prytanis in 182/3 (Hesperia, IV, 1935, p. 48, No. 11, line 46), though through him he is tied to the family of Ἑρμείος Ζωότιμον ἐκ Μυρρινοῦτης, ephebos in 169/70 (I.G., II², 2097, line 55). Earlier there was an Ἀλέξανδρος Μηνοδώρου (ἐκ Μυρρινοῦτης) zakoros of Aphrodite Hagne in Delos shortly after 118/7 B.C. (Insc. Délos, 2284, line 3, and 2260, line 9 [member of a
known family]); there was also an Ἀλέξανδρος Ἀγαθοκλέους ἐγ Μυρρινοῦτης, known from a columnar grave monument of the second or first century before Christ (I.G., II², 6912 A). These were perhaps ancestors of Alexandri of Roman times.

Surprisingly enough, Epigone does not appear as a feminine name of Athenians in Attica,¹⁶² except in I.G., II², 7588, where Boeckh’s emendation of the erroneous copies of Fourmont and Pococke has been accepted though Boeckh had himself expressed doubts.¹⁶³

I have pondered the possibility of identifying I.G., II², 7588, with the text published here, but various considerations militate against this interpretation.¹⁶⁴ Since the identification of the two monuments is not proved, and since Boeckh’s restoration

¹⁶¹ This is only one of a number of cases of neglect of inscriptions read by Pittakys, a neglect which dates back to the time of Le Bas. After systematic search I have been able to identify many inscriptions from L’ancienne Athènes which are not in the Corpus, or are in the Corpus without reference to Pittakys, or are published from Pittakys’ copies but considered lost while in fact the stones are in the Epigraphical Museum and have been published elsewhere in the Corpus under other numbers. I hope to deal with these texts at another time.

¹⁶² It was the name of women living in Athens, but of foreign origin: I.G., II², 9557, 9558 (Ἐπιγόνα), 9559, and 9749, all of Roman date.

¹⁶³ Koumanoudes, op. cit., No. 2830, rejected it, while Dittenberger, I.G., III, 2051, considered it almost certain.

¹⁶⁴ The place of finding noted by Fourmont (“Athenis prope Ecclesiam Sanctae Irenes”) is not important. The great obstacle to the identification is that neither Fourmont nor Pococke copied the second line, and that Fourmont represents in his drawing of the pediment an object which looks to be a cista of Isis and which is not on our monument (cf. A. Conze, Die attischen Grab-
reliefs, No. 2145).
[Ἑ]πυγόνη ἔξ' Τβ<α>[δως] is not satisfactory,¹⁶⁵ one might venture to read, tentatively, [Ἑ]πυγόνη ἔτ(δως)νΒ. Such an explanation is supported by the horizontal lines in Fourmont’s copy (ΠΙΓΩΝΗΤΥΒΒ), one for the abbreviation of the word ἔτων and the others for the numeral (unless these dashes are remains of a preceding line). Pococke’s copy has ΠΙΠΙΟΝΗΕΠΒΕ.¹⁶⁶ If the position of the demotic after the name be allowed, one might read [Ἑ]πυγόνη ἔξν<π>ε[ταύνων]. Admittedly, neither of these two suggested solutions for the text is wholly satisfactory.

George A. Stamires

Institute for Advanced Study

¹⁶⁵ One does not expect the demotic immediately after the name of the woman.
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