ATHENS AND TROIZEN

THERE is a little to add on the difficult document, I.G., II², 46, to which Woodhead ¹ 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 [– – ἐνε’ ἀρχ]οντας [– ] 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 [[ἐνε’ ἀρχο]ντας] ἐσ Tp[oζηνα] and the line above ρ, 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

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 a1, line 3, suggests that the stele had a width of 0.850 m. Fragment a1 is of course from the bottom of the stone, with the first two lines probably forming part of a name-list, since fragment b1 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:

b1: line 32, θόντος; line 35, perhaps ἐπιτίμων ἐτοι; line 36, ἀποδεκτευμένη; line 42, τῶν ν.  

aA: line 10, δραχμᾶς; line 12, ἑκατὸν δραχμᾶς; line 15, ὀφθαλμὸν ε[ ]; line after 22, with Mitsos (Studies Presented to D. M. Robinson, II, p. 349) ]τοῦ.  

In the combined group, b, d, m (as printed by Woodhead, op. cit., p. 228): line 9, γοῦν; line 15, [...]ἐκτυφλόν; line 18, [...] βάδυνατον δι[ ]. In line 19, the problems raised by Woodhead (p. 229 note 11) can be resolved by observing that the offending μυ is quite unlike any other on the stone and is best regarded as a μυ of which the fourth stroke has not been cut. Read [...]τουτο[ μ]υ[ ὅ]. Line 20, the last letter is ταυ; 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, οιωναυ.  

e: line 62, presumably εν σανίστην λευκων[ωμένων]; line 63, Ἀθηρησιο[ μ]εν ἐν τῶι θε[σμοθετείου]; line 64, η[ δικής ε[ ]; line 65, the readings are as given in the Editio Minor, but I suspect a scribal error and a reference to ἀπενεαντισμός.  

p: line 41, τῶν θηλείων[ν].  

In the new fragment q, [νπ]δικός ἐστιν[τω – –] seems most likely in line 3, and, since so many crossbars are omitted in this inscription, I prefer Αθηρησιο[ μ]<σ>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
kappa, above line 75. In line 78, there are several other possibilities besides [T]ίμων. In line 83, an initial sigma is clear, and [‘Αρι]στόδ[ημος] is far too short. We need something like [‘Ηφαι]στόδ[ημος]. After line 83, there is an erasure, and below that [. . . . . ]ερ [. . . . . ]

a1: 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 μυ 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 ἐκ [άοτ –].

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., ΠΙ, 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.
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