

# A FRAGMENTARY INSCRIPTION FROM THE ATHENIAN AGORA PRAISING EPHEBES

(PLATE 89)

FRAGMENT of grayish white marble, inscribed face only preserved, found in a modern wall (N 6) on July 22, 1970.<sup>1</sup>

H. ca. 0.325 m.; W. 0.29 m.; Th. 0.134 m.; L.H. 0.006 m.

Agora Inv. No. I 7160

a. 264–260 a.

ΣΤΟΙΧ. 51

1 [.....<sup>23</sup>.....]IM[.....<sup>26</sup>.....]  
 [.....<sup>10</sup>.....]ΕΠΙΟΤ[... ἐν τῶι ἐν[ι]αυ[τῶι .....<sup>20</sup>.....]  
 [.....<sup>9</sup>.....κ]αὶ ἐαυτῶι καὶ τοῖς ΕΦΕΣ[.....<sup>22</sup>.....]  
 4 [.....<sup>11</sup>.....]ε καὶ τῆς τοῦ Μουσείου φ[υλακῆς .....<sup>15</sup>.....]  
 [.....<sup>12</sup>.....]ΙΣ ἀπόδειξιν καλῶς καὶ [.....<sup>20</sup>.....]  
 [.....<sup>13</sup>..... ἀγ]αθεῖ τύχει δεδόχθαι [τῆι βουλῆι τοὺς προέδρ]-  
 7 [ους οἱ ἂν λάχωσιν προ]εδρεύειν{εν} ἐν τῶι δ[ήμωι εἰς τὴν ἐπιούσαν]  
 [ἐκκλησίαν χρηματίσαι] περὶ τούτων· γνώμ[ην δὲ ξυμβάλλεσθαι τῆ]-  
 [ς βουλῆς εἰς τὸν δῆμον ὅτ]ι δοκεῖ τῆι βουλῆι[ι ὕ] ἐπαινέσαι τοὺς ἐφ]-  
 10 [ήβους τοὺς ἐπὶ .....<sup>9</sup>.....]υ [ἄρ]χοντος εὐτα[ξίας ἔνεκα καὶ φιλοτ]-  
 [μίας εἰς τὸν δῆμον καὶ στεφ]ανῶσαι ἕκαστ[ον αὐτῶν θαλλοῦ στεφ]-  
 [άνωι· ὕ]ἐπαινέσαι δὲ καὶ τὸν κ[ορμητῆν αὐτῶν .....<sup>16</sup>.....]  
 13 [.....<sup>13</sup>..... διότι ἀγαθός] ἀνὴρ διατετέλ[εκεν ὧν περὶ τὸν δῆ]-  
 [μον .....<sup>22</sup>.....]ΠΙΟΝ ὧς οἱ νό[μοι? .....<sup>14</sup>.....]  
 [ἐπαινέσαι δὲ καὶ τὸν παιδοτρί]βην αὐτῶ[ν Ἐρμόδωρον Ἐορτίου Ἀχ]-  
 16 [αρνέα ὕ] καὶ τὸν ἀκοντιστῆν Λυσι[κλῆν Ἀ]ντιπάτρου Συπαλήττιον]

The inscribed surface is heavily worn in places and covered with bits of mortar.

Line 1: Only the lower half of dotted iota is preserved.

Line 4: The initial letter is very worn but has roughly the shape of epsilon.

Line 7: Two extra letters were inadvertently inscribed. The cutter may have partially obliterated them, although evidence of erasure is not certain.

<sup>1</sup> I am much indebted to Professor T. Leslie Shear, Jr., Field Director of the American School Excavations of the Athenian Agora, for permission to study and publish this fragment and to the staff of the Stoa of Attalos and to John McK. Camp II, Resident Director of the Agora Excavations, for providing squeezes and photographs. I also owe thanks to Professors S. Dow, C. Habicht, and A. G. Woodhead, Dr. T. C. Loening, and Professor M. B. Walbank for helpful advice in the preparation of this fragment for publication.

*Lines 9 and 12:* The unscripted spaces restored in these lines are suggested by the vertical alignment of the preserved letters; they are also characteristic of this cutter, who used blank spaces more than his contemporaries in order to set off visually clauses and proper names.<sup>2</sup>

*Line 12:* Just a small arc from the top of dotted omikron is visible.

*Line 13:* The top of dotted alpha and the left hasta and top of dotted lambda can be made out at the respective edges.

*Line 14:* The stone is much abraded in this area; except for the first, the dotted letters are almost certain. The first has the shape of pi from some angles, but I feel no confidence in the reading.

*Line 16:* The upper half of alpha appears; I can discern no certain trace of the crossbar, thus my dot.

Although this text continues to offer a number of puzzles, its main outlines are visible. Line 12 preserves a reference to the *kosmetes*, which indicates an ephebic text. Lines 6 to 9 contain a variant of the well-known probouleumatic formula and give the line length.

Ephebic texts dated to the years around 250 B.C. are quite rare. If the new fragment is excluded, there are five, two rather close to the date proposed for the present fragment (*IG II*<sup>2</sup>, 665 of 266/5 and 700 of 257/6), and three more removed (*IG II*<sup>2</sup>, 681 of 247/6, 766 of 241/0, and 787 of 236/5). The two earlier inscriptions provide some data for the language of ephebic decrees at this time. The decree of *IG II*<sup>2</sup>, 665 is virtually intact,<sup>3</sup> and that of 700 complete enough to determine its general outlines.<sup>4</sup> Each begins with praise of the ephebes for their obedience to their teachers and for their activities on behalf of the city. Following this general praise, the teachers are singled out for commendation. Although these decrees have two parts, they were inscribed as one and are quite short when compared to the elaborate decrees of a century later. The language is far from rigidly formulaic. The ephebes of 267/6 are praised for their military activities, particularly for their role in guarding Mouseion Hill, those of 258/7, it seems (the decree is very fragmentary at this point), for their cult activities (lines 13–16).

The present fragment is of the same type. It preserves part of the general praise of the ephebes (lines 2–5), then the probouleumatic formula (lines 6–9) followed (in quite fragmentary form) by clauses in which the *boule* praises and crowns the ephebes (lines 10–12), the *kosmetes* (lines 12–14), and the other instructors (lines 15–16 and following).

Line 3: The last four letters are extremely puzzling. The only parallel seems to be the even more fragmentary line 7b of *IG II*<sup>2</sup>, 766 (for this line see *Hesperia* 57, 1988, p. 318). The context in each place seems to suggest that the ephebes are being praised for their obedience. Perhaps  $\tau\omicron\iota\varsigma \epsilon\phi$  'ΕΣ[---] should be read.

Line 5 seems to contain a reference to the ephebes' public presentation of their year. Although I can adduce no exact parallel, see lines 17 and 18 of *IG II*<sup>2</sup>, 700 for a similar reference.

Lines 12 to 14 record praise for the *kosmetes*; lines 13 and 14 have no close parallel. Line 13 is similar to phrasing which is known in inscriptions of the late 4th century.

<sup>2</sup> He is the Cutter of *IG II*<sup>2</sup>, 788, identified in S. V. Tracy, "Two Attic Letter Cutters of the Third Century: 286/5–235/4 B.C.," *Hesperia* 57, 1988, pp. 311–322. For his habit of leaving blank spaces, see especially pp. 311 and 321.

<sup>3</sup> For some additions to this text, see *ibid.*, pp. 306–307.

<sup>4</sup> For a newer text see B. D. Meritt, "Greek Inscriptions," *Hesperia* 7, 1938 (pp. 77–146), pp. 110–112.

The mention of the guarding of Mouseion Hill in line 4 provides the best textual evidence for the date of this fragment. Mouseion Hill and its fortification overlooking the civic center of Athens played, it is apparent, an important role in the Chremonidean War. The war ended during the archonship of Antipatros in the year 262/1 with the placement of a garrison on the Hill by Antigonos.<sup>5</sup> The ephebes of the archonship of Menekles, five years earlier in 267/6, were praised especially for following orders concerning the guarding of the Mouseion (*IG II*<sup>2</sup>, 665, line 12). The parallel reference on the new fragment points strongly to the events of the War.

The chronology of the War has been the subject of controversy. The discussion has centered specifically upon whether the archon Peithidemos dates to the year 268/7 or to 265/4. Near the beginning of his archonship the Athenians formed an alliance with the Spartans and Ptolemy; it is preserved as *IG II*<sup>2</sup>, 686 + 687. Heinen, in a full discussion of this alliance,<sup>6</sup> argues that the alliance is better placed at the beginning of the War or, at the very least, before hostilities had progressed too far. Since *IG II*<sup>2</sup>, 665, praising the ephebes of 267/6, describes the city as gripped by war (*πο[λέμο]ν κα[τ'ἐ]χοντος τὴν πόλιν* in line 8) and commends the cadets for their guard duty in the city center on the Mouseion, Heinen concludes that both the alliance and Peithidemos should be assigned to 268/7. Meritt, the main recent proponent of the later date,<sup>7</sup> responds by contending that the cycles of the priests of Asklepios require a date of 265/4 for Peithidemos. His argument rests on the reading and interpretation of one of the inventories from the Asklepieion, specifically line 145 of *IG II*<sup>2</sup>, 1534B, as containing the name of the archon Peithidemos; only the initial pi, be it noted, is securely preserved. S. B. Aleshire shows in her study of the inventories of Asklepios that this interpretation is incorrect, that this line contains no reference to the archon Peithidemos.<sup>8</sup> There is now, therefore, no real objection to Heinen's date, and I believe it to be correct. Hostilities will have been brewing for some time, and it is very likely that the ephebes were used for guard duty during 268/7 as they were in the following year. This service probably continued throughout the War, i.e., down to, and perhaps including, 262/1.

A date for this text during the Chremonidean War, therefore, seems most probable on the basis of the mention of guarding the Mouseion; it must be admitted, however, that guard duty by the ephebes on the Hill may have been a regular part of their training in the years from 287 down to the War. In 287 the garrison of King Demetrios was dislodged from the Mouseion.<sup>9</sup> From that time until the end of the Chremonidean War, Athens was free of Macedonian control.<sup>10</sup> The Hill apparently became a symbol of that freedom, and it would

<sup>5</sup> Apollodoros, fragment 44 (*FGrHist* 2 B, p. 1032, no. 44).

<sup>6</sup> H. Heinen, *Untersuchungen zur hellenistischen Geschichte des 3. Jahrhunderts v. Chr.* (*Historia*, Einzelschriften 20), Wiesbaden 1972, pp. 115–117.

<sup>7</sup> B. D. Meritt, "Mid-Third-Century Athenian Archons," *Hesperia* 50, 1981 (pp. 78–99), pp. 83–84.

<sup>8</sup> S. B. Aleshire, *The Athenian Asklepieion: The People, Their Dedications, and the Inventories*, Gieben 1989, pp. 250 (inventory V, line 5), 293–301.

<sup>9</sup> The reference in the citizenship decree for Strombichos, passed in the winter of 266/5 and set up in two copies (*IG II*<sup>2</sup>, 666 and 667), to his activities in the siege of the hill refer to the events of the year 287.

<sup>10</sup> C. Habicht, *Untersuchungen zur politischen Geschichte Athens im 3. Jahrhundert v. Chr.* (*Vestigia* 30), Munich 1979, pp. 68–75.

have been an important symbolic, as well as practical, place for the ephebes to train. We must await further evidence, however, to know whether in fact the ephebes did guard duty on the Mouseion before the War. It is also remotely possible, although unlikely, that the Hill continued to play a role in the training of ephebes after the Macedonian takeover.

That the present text cannot be moved to a date before the War can be seen from the career of the man who served as *akontistes*. The restoration of Lysikles son of Antipatros of Sypalettos as the *akontistes* in line 16 seems certain. He was javelin instructor, apparently continuously, from 258/7 (*IG II*<sup>2</sup>, 700, lines 33–34) to 242/1 (*IG II*<sup>2</sup>, 766, line 17) and beyond.<sup>11</sup> Moreover, the *akontistes* in 267/6 was Philotheos of Lamptraï (*IG II*<sup>2</sup>, 665, lines 26–27). Lysikles, therefore, must have succeeded Philotheos during the course of the War. The present text thus dates after 267/6. Since the name of the archon in whose year these ephebes served ended with upsilon in the genitive case (line 10), the year 266/5, when Nikias Otryneus was archon, can be eliminated. This text then praises the ephebes of one of the years from 265/4 to the end of the War. The archons of these years are fairly well established:<sup>12</sup>

265/4 ?  
 264/3 Diognetos  
 263/2 Lykeas or Alkibiades  
 262/1 Antipatros

Only the name Lykeas can be ruled out as too short for the space available in line 10. Diognetos can be accommodated by restoring in lines 9 and 10 *τοὺς ἐφηβεύσαντας ἐπὶ . . .*<sup>8</sup> . . . *ἄρχοντος* in place of *τοὺς ἐφήβους τοὺς ἐπὶ κτλ.*

Lines 15–16: Hermodoros son of Heortios of Acharnai served as *paidotribes* continuously from 267/6 (*IG II*<sup>2</sup>, 665) to 242/1 (*IG II*<sup>2</sup>, 766); his name exactly suits the space here, and consequently the restoration seems beyond doubt.

The career of the cutter who inscribed this text, the Cutter of *IG II*<sup>2</sup>, 788, suits admirably a date of 264–260. His dates had previously been established as *ca.* 255 to 235/4 B.C.<sup>13</sup> Given the large number of inscriptions of 229 to 205 B.C. and the fact that his hand does not occur among them,<sup>14</sup> the lower date seems firm. His career could therefore have begun as early as 275 and should (apparently) now be moved back to the 260's. Note, however, that this cutter also inscribed three other ephebic texts, *IG II*<sup>2</sup>, 681 of 247/6, 766 of 241/0, and 787 of 236/5. The present fragment cannot be associated with any of them. If it were not for

<sup>11</sup> He is also attested as *akontistes* on Agora I 61 (*Hesperia* 2, 1933, p. 159) in company with Heortios of Acharnai as *paidotribes*. Heortios was himself an ephebe in 242/1 (*IG II*<sup>2</sup>, 766, line 37 [II]) and thus can scarcely have been *paidotribes* before 235.

It seems probable that the Lysikles in question is related to or identical with the Lysikles of Sypalettos who was priest of Asklepios *ca.* 260 B.C. (*IG II*<sup>2</sup>, 1534B, lines 204, 208).

<sup>12</sup> Meritt (footnote 7 above), p. 94.

<sup>13</sup> See Tracy (footnote 2 above), pp. 311–322.

<sup>14</sup> See S. V. Tracy, *Attic Letter-Cutters of 229 to 86 B.C.*, Berkeley, pp. 1, 41–81, 230–231, forthcoming 1990.

the (apparently explicit) reference to the Chremonidean War in line 4, the dates of the other ephebic texts by this hand and of the career of Lysikles the javelin instructor would tend to indicate a date for the new fragment later than the 260's.

STEPHEN V. TRACY

CENTER FOR EPIGRAPHICAL STUDIES  
Ohio State University  
Columbus, OH 43210



I 7160