

# EPHEBIC INSCRIPTIONS FROM ATHENS

## ADDENDA AND CORRIGENDA

**D**URING THE COURSE of a study of hands in Attic inscriptions of 229 to 86 B.C., I have discovered, among other things, an association and a join of epigraphical fragments found in the Athenian Agora.<sup>1</sup>

### AGORA I 560 AND I 6127

These two previously published fragments may be recognized from their lettering, moldings, marble, and texts as belonging to the same ephebic inscription. The first was published by B. D. Meritt in *Hesperia* 36, 1967, pp. 65–66 and the second, also by Meritt, in *Hesperia* 30, 1961, p. 224. Each contains part of the opening lines of the inscription. Inventory number I 560 should be placed directly to the right of I 6127. Looking at line 2, the gap between the fragments at that point is about eight or nine letter spaces. The space left for the day date in line 1 then will be five or six letters in length. The only correction of readings worthy of note is that the final two letters of line 1 in the publication of I 560 should be in square brackets; nu is the last letter preserved.

The demotic of the chairman in line 3 is the same as that preserved in *Kerameikos* III A3, pp. 2–3,<sup>2</sup> a prytany decree of the year of Hipparchos (119/8).<sup>3</sup> This fact, the month of passage, Boedromion, and the major meeting of the assembly all make it certain that this ephebic decree was passed at the same session as the prytany decree. It is therefore now possible to restore the first two lines of the ephebic inscription as follows (for the rest of the text see Meritt's version in *Hesperia* volumes 30 and 36 cited above):

a. 119/8 a.

NON-ΣΤΟΙΧ. ca. 113

- 1 [ἐπὶ Ἰππάρχου ἄρχοντος ἐπὶ τῆς Κεκροπίδος τρίτης πρυτανείας ἢ Μοσχίων  
Μοσχίανος Παιανιεύς ἐγρα]μμάτευεν· Βοηδρομιῶ[νος ἐνάτει] ἴσταμέν[ου τε]-
- 2 [τάρτει τῆς πρυτανείας· ἐκκλησία κυρία ἐν τῷ θεάτρῳ· τῶν προέδρων ἐπεψήφισεν  
-ca. 10- Ὀλυμπίχου Κ]ειριάδης καὶ συμπρ[όεδροι· ἔδο]ξεν τεῖ β[ουλῆ]

One surprising fact should be noted, namely the unusual thickness of Agora I 6127. The preserved thickness, which is *not* original, is 0.29 m. One of the largest known ephebic inscriptions, Agora I 286,<sup>4</sup> is by comparison merely 0.175 m. thick. I 6127 also preserves a

<sup>1</sup> The opportunity to work in the ideal surroundings at the Institute for Advanced Study has been of inestimable benefit to this research.

<sup>2</sup> Republished by J. S. Traill, "Greek Inscriptions from the Athenian Agora," *Hesperia* 47, 1978, (pp. 269–331), p. 286.

<sup>3</sup> I owe thanks to Christian Habicht for calling this to my attention.

<sup>4</sup> Published by O. W. Reinmuth, *Hesperia* 24, 1955, pp. 220–239.

significant part of the pediment, thus showing that it was a freestanding stele. This inscription honoring the ephebes of the year 120/19 was, the conclusion must be, a very substantial monument indeed. I have not been able to identify any other fragments of it.

*IG II*<sup>2</sup>, 1006 + AGORA I 6310

*IG II*<sup>2</sup>, 1006 has benefited from a number of additions and improvements in recent years: see especially those of Meritt (*Hesperia* 17, 1948, pp. 23–25 and *Hesperia* 26, 1957, p. 211), Mitsos (Ἄρχ'Εφ 1950–1951, p. 45 and 1961, pp. 201–202), and Reinmuth (*Hesperia* 30, 1961, p. 17 and *Hesperia* 41, 1972, pp. 185–191). The last is a complete re-edition of the register occasioned by a major join. Despite all this attention, one fragment which does not belong has continued to be included in the stele. This is fragment *i*" in Koehler's edition (*IG II*, 471); it contains letters which have been published as the ends of lines 123 and 124 of column III and all of lines 121 to 125 of column IV.<sup>5</sup> The fragment was first published by Koehler. His drawing, *IG II*, p. 274, misrepresents the spacing and placement of the letters. Meritt observed in *Hesperia* for 1957 that "the reading [of line 121 of column IV] is not correct, for the stone cannot be so placed as to allow the beginning and end of this name to come together." Mitsos (Ἄρχ'Εφ 1961, pp. 201–202) also noted the difficulty with the vertical spacing, and Reinmuth in his 1972 article in *Hesperia* acted on these observations and moved the fragment down.

What none of these scholars heeded sufficiently was the vertical spacing on this small fragment. The interlines, four in number, range from 0.007 to 0.009 m., a large interline for this type of inscription in this period. The interlines between names in the rest of the preserved register vary, but they never exceed 0.004 m. and are frequently less. This difference in vertical spacing makes it very unlikely that this piece is correctly attributed to this stele.<sup>6</sup> The lettering too is not the same. There are three well-preserved omegas on *i*". All have finials on both sides of the "crow's foot" or "inverted V" variety; the cutter of *IG II*<sup>2</sup>, 1006 inscribes omega consistently with straight finials which terminate in serifs of the straight-line variety. One, or both, of these serifs can be omitted. The hands differ; the vertical spacing differs. Fragment *i*" does not belong to this inscription.

Meritt originally published Agora I 6310 in *Hesperia* 30, 1961, pp. 224–225. He recognized it as part of a register of ephebes but, because of the presence of *i*" in *IG II*<sup>2</sup>, 1006, was prevented from seeing that it belonged there. I 6310 joins at lines 119–121 of column IV (Reinmuth lines 192–194). It does not join any of the other fragments. It does, however, provide the demotics of the ephebes from Oineis and Kekropis in column III. I provide a new text of the columns affected, columns III and IV (the letters on the joining fragment are printed larger and in boldface). For convenience, I use the line numbering of *IG II*<sup>2</sup>.

<sup>5</sup> Reinmuth in his *Hesperia* article of 1972 refers to this fragment as "free floating fragment *a*." The line numbers in his edition are 175 to 176 and 198 to 202.

<sup>6</sup> The interlinear spacing can be seen clearly on plate 30 of *Hesperia* for 1972.

Col. III	Col. IV
107 Θρασύβ[ουλος]----- Καλλισ[-----] Ἄπολλω[ν]-----]	[Γ]άιος Γαίου Πειραιεύς Ἄριστοτέλης Ἀφροδισίου Πειραι[εύς] Ἄθηναγόρας Ἀθηναγόρου Πειραι[εύς]
110 Μ[ῆ]νις Ἡ[-----] [. . .]κλ[-----] Διο[-----]s	Σωσιφάνης Κρινολάου Ἀμαξαντε[ύς] Εὐθύκριτος Θεαινέτου Ἀχερδούσι[ος] Εὐβου[λος] Ἀγαθάνακτος Ἐλαιούσι[ος]
113 Καλ[-----] [-----] [-----]	Στρατόνικος Στρατονίκου Ἀμαξαν[τεύς] Εὐθίας Ἀντιμένου Ἀμαξαντε[ύς] Θεόφημος Πρωτογένου Ἀμαξαν[τεύς]
116 [-----]os [Οἰνείδος] [-----]	Δημήτριος Νικοδήμου Ἀμαξαντε[ύς] Θεόφιλος Ἱερωνύμου Ἀζηγιεύς Δωρόθεος Δωροθέου Ἐροιάδης Ἄπολλωνύμος Ἀπολλωνύμου Ἐλαιούσιος
119 [-----]Ἀχα]ρνεύς [-----]Φ]υλάσιος [Κεκροπί]δος	Δῖος Σωσάνδρου Ἀζηγιεύς Πύρρος Πύρρ[ο]ν Ἀζηγιεύς Ἄλέξανδρο[s] -----]
122 [-----]ρος Ἐπικίδης [-----]νον Δαιδαλίδης [-----]ρον Ἀλαιεύς	Αἶαν[τίδος] Νίκανδρος [-----] Μελίτων Μ[-----] Διονύσιος Δ[-----]
125 [Ἐπιγ]ένης [----]ου Μελιτεύς Διδώρος Δ[----]ν Μελιτεύς Διον[ύ]σιο[s] -----]ους Ξυπεταιών	Πρώταρχο[s] -----] Ἄλέξανδ[ρος] -----]
128 Τιμογέ[ν]ης [----]Συπ]αλήττιο[s] Διοκλῆς Ἀγαθ[-----] Λάχης Διονυσίου [-----]	Missing: 8 names and the rubric of Antiochis
131 Εὐρύβιος Μείδων[ος]----] Γάιος Μαάρκου Μελ[ιτεύς] Πασικράτης Ἀγαθοκλ[έους] ----]	
134 Ἴπ[π]ορθωντ[ίδος] Ἄροπος Ἀφροδισίου Ἀζηγιεύς Ξενόδικος Λυσιμ[άχου] ----]	
137 Ἴπποκλος Διογένου Κει[ριάδης]	

Line 110 (III). Reinmuth (his line 159) read Καλλισ[---] here. This was not an improvement over Kirchner's more accurate Μ . . . ις. The proper name Μῆνις is an all but certain restoration.

Line 111 (III). Reinmuth (his line 160) read Ἡρακλῆς. I can discern only the indistinct shapes of kappa and lambda.

Line 112 (III). Reinmuth omitted the final letter. Kirchner placed it at the end of line 113. It appears almost exactly on the same horizontal line as Euboulos in column IV, line 112.

Line 113 (III). After lambda Reinmuth read dotted chi; the inscribed surface appears to be gone where chi should be.

*Line 116 (III)*. Reinmuth omitted the final letters. Kirchner placed them at the end of his line 116. They occur exactly opposite and on line with Demetrios son of Nikodemus of Hamaxanteia, line 116 of column IV.

*Line 125 (III)*. Epigenes of Melite comes from a well-known family. See *PA* 4812 and 4813 and the *stemma*. The space for the patronymic in this line cannot be determined until it is possible to bring the stones together in Athens. It appears, however, to be longer than two letter spaces; the restoration of Dios (*PA* 4337) as his father seems unlikely.

*Line 128 (III)*. Merely the tops of the dotted letters are visible along the break.

*Line 133 (III)*. The apex of dotted alpha is clearly preserved. Reinmuth read  $\Sigma\omega\sigma\kappa\rho\acute{\alpha}\tau\eta\varsigma$ .

*Line 134 (III)*. The bottom of the first vertical of dotted pi is preserved. Only the tops of the other dotted letters are visible.

*Line 135 (III)*. Reinmuth (his line 177) read the last four letters of the patronymic and the first letter of the demotic. Kirchner did not see these letters, nor are they preserved on the squeezes available to me.

*Line 136 (III)*. Reinmuth again reports more letters than can in fact be seen.

*Line 123 (IV)*. The initial vertical of dotted nu appears along the break.

*Line 128 (IV)*. Just the tops of the dotted letters are legible above the break.

A new edition of this entire register is needed with updated line numberings. I do not attempt it here because I do not have access to the stones and because the squeezes available to me are not entirely adequate at crucial points. Reinmuth's edition in *Hesperia* 41, 1972, as the foregoing will have indicated, is unsatisfactory on a number of grounds, but most especially because he failed to give an accurate indication of the column lengths. This is not an unfair criticism because he had, with his join of *IG II*<sup>2</sup> 1031, the opportunity for the first time to measure the vertical space from the first line of the register to the top of the crowns. He could therefore have easily determined that the columns had room for about thirty-three names, if there were no tribal rubrics inscribed. There are, or rather, originally were, twenty-eight or twenty-nine names in each column. Seven names are lost in column I and about ten in column II.

It is profitable to consider the enrollment patterns as revealed by several roughly contemporary inscriptions which are either reasonably complete (as in the present case) or about which we have an exact indication of the enrollment from the text. The ephebes of 123/2, the present text, numbered in all about 127, 113 citizens and 14 foreigners. The class of 128/7, in contrast, numbered 107 (line 89 of Agora I 286 published in *Hesperia* 24, 1955, pp. 220–239; no breakdown of citizens and foreigners is possible), that of 119/8 had 141 members (*IG II*<sup>2</sup>, 1008, line 55), 124 citizens and 17 foreigners. Almost twenty years later the class of 102/1 also numbered 141 members (*IG II*<sup>2</sup>, 1028 as published in *Hesperia* Suppl. XV, pp. 32–40), 101 citizens and 40 foreigners. The steady increase in overall enrollment through the 20's is noteworthy, as is the increase in foreign participation throughout the quarter century.<sup>7</sup>

STEPHEN V. TRACY

THE INSTITUTE FOR ADVANCED STUDY  
Princeton, NJ 08543-0631

<sup>7</sup> See also O. W. Reinmuth, *The Foreigners in the Athenian Ephebeia*, Lincoln, Nebraska 1929, pp. 15–18; this study, inaccurate in places and now outdated, is still a useful starting place.