

ATHENS AND TROIZEN

THERE is a little to add on the difficult document, *I.G.*, II², 46, to which Woodhead¹ has added two new fragments and of which he has recorded Schweigert's important joins on Face A. I was able to assemble all the fragments, including the new ones, except *l*, in Athens in 1954, and, thanks to the kindness of Vanderpool who has sent squeezes of the new fragments, the Ashmolean Museum now possesses a complete set of squeezes, including *aA*, which was not available to Woodhead.

I fully agree with Woodhead on the difficulty of determining to which face the fragments belong. Spacing is an uncertain guide, since it is clear that no rigid chequer was drawn on either face. I rest my attributions on the fact that two hands are clearly at work. The fragments which I attribute to Face A have a much smaller, neater appearance. This is due not so much to any difference in the vertical size of the letters as to the absence of the tendency, persistent in the letters of Face B, to sprawl out sideways. In addition, there is the tendency to double-cutting. Not absent entirely from Face A, where it is particularly marked on fragment *b*, although it has been eliminated from the joining lower fragments *d* and *m*, it never there reaches the ugliness of its appearance on Face B, where there are *deltas*, *kappas* and *upsilons* of which all strokes have definitely been cut twice. The difference between the hands is to be observed most clearly on fragment *aB*, where the whole fragment is in the Face B hand except line 4, where the Face A hand has cut [— ἐννέ' ἄρχ]οῦρας [—] in an erasure. The same thing has happened on fragment *i*, where the single sigma which survives in line 22 is in the Face A hand. Using this guide, I would attribute all fragments to Face A, except *aB*, *i* and *f*. In *f* the double-cutting is under better control, but, despite Koehler's original attribution, I am confident, with Kirchner, that the general character of the hand assigns it to Face B. I see no trace of the Face B hand in the new Agora fragments *q* and *r*, and therefore think that they should be assigned to Face A provisionally, until and unless new evidence shows that the Face A hand worked on Face B in other places than the erasures. My only doubts are about *l*, which I have not seen and of which my squeeze is not very good, but I believe that this too belongs to Face A.

A little more may be said about the erasures, since any progress with the document will depend on aligning them correctly. Besides those recorded in the Editio Minor for *c*, line 50, *k*, line 24, *l*, line 3, *i*, line 22, *aB*, line 4, and by Woodhead in the new fragment *q*, lines 5-6, I add *n*, line 73, where I read [[ἐννέ' ἄρχο]ῦρας] ἐς Τρ[οζήνα] and the line above *p*, line 40, where there is an erasure in which nothing has been cut. I am sure Woodhead is right to say that many of these are probably connected with the

¹ *Hesperia*, XXVI, 1957, pp. 225-229, No. 85.

nine archons, but there is another which cannot be so connected, in the name-list, fragment *o*, below line 83.

To Woodhead's warning against excessive restoration, I would add the probability that Face A had nearly 90 letters to the line, since the likely restoration of the title in *a*¹, line 3, suggests that the stele had a width of 0.850 m. Fragment *a*¹ is of course from the bottom of the stone, with the first two lines probably forming part of a name-list, since fragment *b*¹ clearly preserves the top of the stone and shows that there was no prescript.

My observations of the actual stone in fact lead to an abandonment of restorations already made. One would naturally assume from the Editio Minor that Hiller had actually joined *aA* and *g*, but in fact they do not join, and the restorations made on the basis of this conjunction must be dropped. It still seems likely that the text of *aA* can be brought into some kind of relation with the joining fragments, *b*, *d*, *m*.

A few points on readings and restorations:

Face A:

*b*¹: line 32,]θόντος; line 35, perhaps ἐπ]ιτίμωι ἐπιω; line 36,]ν ἀποδκτεν //; line 42, ιτων ν.

aA: line 10, δρα]χμὰς; line 12, [ἐκατὸ]ν δραχμ[ὰς]; line 15, [ὀφθ]αλμὸν ε[]; line after 22, with Mitsos (*Studies Presented to D. M. Robinson*, II, p. 349)]ιτων.

In the combined group, *b*, *d*, *m* (as printed by Woodhead, *op. cit.*, p. 228): line 9, γμω; line 15, [.]εα ἐκτυφλ[; line 18, [. .]ν ἀδύνατον δι[. In line 19, the problems raised by Woodhead (p. 229 note 11) can be resolved by observing that the offending *nu* is quite unlike any other on the stone and is best regarded as a *mu* of which the fourth stroke has not been cut. Read [. . ᾶ]ποτο<μ>ῆς. Line 20, the last letter is *tau*; line 22, κκε.

g: line 17, apparently ΑΣΑΓ.

k: above the *eta* of line 23, an *iota* or *tau*; below the first *omega* of line 30, a *sigma*.

h: line 7, αιωναυ.

e: line 62, presumably [ἐν σανίσ]ι λελευκ[ωμένας]; line 63, [Ἐθνήγησι μὲ]ν ἐν τῶι θε[σμοθετείωι]; line 64, [τ]ῆς δίκης ε[; line 65, the readings are as given in the Editio Minor, but I suspect a scribal error and a reference to ἀπειναντισμός.

p: line 41, [τῶ]ν θηλειῶ[ν].

In the new fragment *q*, [ὕπ]όδικος ἔσ[τω --] seems most likely in line 3, and, since so many crossbars are omitted in this inscription, I prefer [Ἐθνη]ν<α>ίων μ[in line 13.

The name-list, fragment *o* (E. M. 63), has a clear left-hand edge, and will have stood towards the bottom of Face A. There was at least one name, beginning with

καρρα, above line 75. In line 78, there are several other possibilities besides [Τ]ίμων. In line 83, an initial *sigma* is clear, and [Ἄρυ]στόδ[ημος] is far too short. We need something like [Ἡφαι]στόδ[ημος]. After line 83, there is an erasure, and below that [...⁵⁻⁶...]εμ[.

*a*¹: line 1, τω seems certain.

Face B:

aB: line 1, I prefer θε.

i: line 22, there is a clear *iota* at the end of the erasure; line 25, *sigma* is the last letter of the line, as is *nu* in line 26, and the restorations must be carried over into the next lines. In line 29, there is a misprint in the Editio Minor. The line runs [χ]ίλια δὲ ὑπὲρ ἑκ|[άστ -].

I have said that the hand of Face A can be seen at work on Face B. This would not in itself prove that the two faces were parts of the same document. Woodhead suggests that there are two documents and that Face B is an agreement with an unknown city. But there is a clear reference to Troizen in line 27 of fragment *i*, which certainly belongs to Face B, and, since we have no evidence that any other city is referred to on Face B and no reason to assume that Troizen is referred to on Face B purely as a precedent for the agreement with the unknown city, I feel that the probabilities at the moment are that both faces of the stele are concerned with Troizen.

Lastly, the date. Woodhead argues with conviction for an increase in the number of agreements of this type after the foundation of the Second Athenian Confederacy. If our stele belongs here, a suitable date would be 368/7, when Troizen crowned both the boule and the demos of Athens (*I.G.*, II², 1425, lines 227-231). But Wilhelm's view was that the letter-forms pointed to a date round 400, and, although I can think of no closely similar stones which can be precisely dated, I should still prefer to think this stone fifteen or twenty years earlier than 375.

DAVID M. LEWIS

CHRIST CHURCH, OXFORD