

ROBERT A. MOYSEY

THREE FRAGMENTARY ATTIC INSCRIPTIONS

aus: Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik 78 (1989) 199–207

© Dr. Rudolf Habelt GmbH, Bonn



## THREE FRAGMENTARY ATTIC INSCRIPTIONS

The three fragmentary Attic inscriptions herein discussed are among more than 2,000 objects which comprise the David M. Robinson Memorial Collection of Greek and Roman antiquities in the University Museums at the University of Mississippi. Two have not been published previously and the text of the third was published without the benefit of a first-hand examination of the stone. Each of the inscriptions was acquired by Professor Robinson during his long and distinguished career. Unfortunately we have no indication of where or when they were obtained or found. We know only that they were part of his extensive collection at the time of his death in 1958 and were purchased for the Museums from the estate of his widow Helen Tudor Robinson.<sup>1</sup> The inscriptions range in date from the first half of the fifth century to the mid-fourth century B.C.

## 1. Fragment from a Water Basin (perirrhanterion)

Two fragments of white marble joined to form a segment of the rim of a large water basin or perirrhanterion. The fragments are broken along the join, at the sides and toward the interior of the basin. The outer edge is also damaged. The bottom and floor of the basin are polished smooth and there is no indication on the preserved floor of the basin of an area of picking.

Height, 0.04 m. (lip of inscribed rim), 0.08 m. (overall); width, 0.175 m.; thickness, 0.06 m.; diameter of basin, ca. 0.66 m.

Height of letters, 0.012-0.015 m., except nu 0.018 m.

University Museums Inv. No. 77.3.664.

ante a. 446 a.

---

<sup>1</sup> At the time of Professor Robinson's death, Professor W.H. Willis of Duke University was chairman of the Department of Classics at the University of Mississippi and was involved in the settling of his estate and the acquisition of objects willed to the University. Since none of Robinson's surviving papers at the University mention the inscriptions, Professor Willis was consulted to determine whether he could offer any information about their provenances or when and from whom they were acquired by Robinson. Willis wrote: "perhaps because he [Robinson] valued them most highly, he kept them sequestered and, so far as I can remember, never mentioned where or how he got them--information he rarely gave out in any case. Records of their acquisition, if they ever existed, would have been in his papers, most of which we were required to pack up and ship to his estate lawyer in Baltimore, who, we were told, later destroyed them... I should guess that he acquired most of them from private sources on his frequent visits to Greece and Turkey, virtually all of them before he came to Mississippi in 1948" (letter dated 17 March 1987). Robinson himself, in publishing a fragment of a prytany list which was in his collection (in S. Dow, *Prytaneis. A Study in the Inscriptions Honoring the Athenian Councillors*, *Hesperia Suppl. 1* (Athens 1937) no. 92, pp. 158-160), commented: "some years ago there came into my collection of antiquities in Baltimore through a dealer an inscription said to have been found in Athens" (p. 158). That fragment dated 124/3 B.C. is not among the inscriptions now in Mississippi. The significant information provided is the general manner in which Robinson acquired his antiquities.

]NOC:BO[

Taf.XII a,b

What may seem (in the photograph) to be the tip of a letter just along the edge of the basin's lip to the left of the nu is not in fact part of a letter. The mark is not deep enough to be part of a letter and is too close to the interior edge of the rim. It is merely an extraneous mark which looks misleadingly like an inscribed letter.

Fragments of many perirrhantaria have been found in the Athenian Agora and on the Akropolis.<sup>2</sup> While we do not know the provenance of the Robinson fragments, the letter forms and similarity in material and size to known Attic perirrhantaria strongly suggest that the fragments came from Attica.<sup>3</sup> The slanting nu, three-bar sigma, double-triangle beta and three-dot punctuation mark indicate a date prior to the mid-fifth century B.C.<sup>4</sup> Raubitschek (p.370) dates all but four of the Akropolis basins to the period 530-480 B.C. The other four may date after 480 B.C. Thompson (p.143) dates two of the Agora basins before, and one after, 480 B.C. The curve of the outer edge of the fragments allows us to restore the diameter of the basin as ca. 0.66 m. The fifty basins known from the Akropolis range in diameter from ca. 0.65 to ca. 1.20 m.<sup>5</sup> The three basins found in the Agora have diameters of 0.66 to 0.76 m.<sup>6</sup> The remaining portion of the floor of the Robinson basin indicates that it was shallow and the profile is similar to, but not precisely the same as, Raubitschek p.371, no.365, which may date after 480 B.C. The profile and dimensions of our fragments do not indicate a possible association of the Robinson fragments with any of the basins from the Akropolis. The diameter (ca. 0.66 m.) and the lip (0.04 m.) dimensions are similar to Raubitschek no's 334, 349 and 353; but the profiles of those basins with similar dimensions are different from the profile of the Robinson fragments. Likewise, the profile of the Robinson fragments is not like those of any of the three Agora basins published by Thompson nor are the dimensions precisely the same, so our fragments cannot come from any of the three.

The inscription faces outward as does the inscription on the majority of the basins studied by Raubitschek and the three-dot punctuation is also paralleled in basins from the

---

<sup>2</sup> H.A.Thompson, *Hesperia* Suppl. 4 (Princeton 1940) pp.142-143; A.E.Raubitschek, *Dedications from the Athenian Akropolis* (Cambridge, Mass. 1949) pp.370-402 and SEG 32 (1982) no's 21 & 22. On the subject of perirrhantaria, see L.Ziehen, *RE* 19 (1937) cols. 856-857; H.Kenner, "Das Luterion im Kult" *Jahresheft des österreichischen Archäologischen Instituts* 29 (1935) pp.135-139; R.Ginouvés, *Balaneutike, recherches sur le bain dans l'antiquité grecque*, *Bibliothèque des Ecoles françaises d'Athènes et de Rome* 200 (Paris 1962) pp.84-88, 299-310; and M.D.Fullerton, *Hesperia* 55 (1986) 207ff.

<sup>3</sup> Other perirrhantaria have been found in Delos, Aegina, Chios, Lindos, Amyklai, Pompeii and Sicily, but most do not have inscriptions. See Ginouvès (above, n.2) pp.84-88.

<sup>4</sup> R.Meiggs, "The Dating of Fifth-Century Attic Inscriptions" *JHS* 86 (1966) pp.91-92. Only two of the three dots of the punctuation are now fully preserved, but a portion of the third dot is discernible at the edge of the break. This third dot aligns with the bottom of the line of letters.

<sup>5</sup> Raubitschek (above, n.2) p.370.

<sup>6</sup> Thompson (above, n.2) p.143.

Akropolis.<sup>7</sup> No certain restoration of the text of the inscription is possible. voc may represent the conclusion of the name of the donor in the nominative case or of a patronymic in the genitive case.<sup>8</sup> Bo might represent the beginning of a patronymic, the demotic Βοτάδες, an ethnic (Βοιοτός or Βοσπορίτες) or a word like βολευτές.<sup>9</sup> Another possible restoration is [Ἀπόλλο]νος· βο[μός].<sup>10</sup>

## 2. IG I<sup>3</sup> 236 b (Law Code of Nikomachos?)

A fragment of a white marble stele whose left side is preserved, but broken at the top, bottom and right. The back has been thinned in modern times as indicated by its bright white color. The inscribed face has weathered to the golden reddish patina which is characteristic of Pentelic marble. A hole (0.075 m. in diameter) in the back may indicate that the stone was once used as a threshold into which a pivot hole was cut for a door. The posthole is now only 0.005 m. deep, but was no doubt deeper before the stone was thinned. The posthole has weathered to the same patina as the inscribed surface, contrasting markedly with the whiteness of the surrounding marble.

Height, 0.182 m.; width, 0.158 m.; thickness, 0.033 m.

Height of letters, 0.008-0.009 m.; stoichedon ca. 107?. horizontal checker 0.0138 m., vertical checker 0.01 m.

University Museums Inv. No. 77.3.688 = IG I<sup>3</sup> 236 b.

a. 410-404 a.

CTOIX. ca. 107?

Taf. XIII a

5 ἡ δραχμῆ[ς] ἰν[ ] - - - - - ἐχ]-  
 ζέτο τῆι βολ[ῆ]ι - - - - - ἡόκαπερ ἐν τῶι νόμοι γέ]-  
 γραπται· ηελό[γ]τον δὲ - - - - -]-  
 ζαν ἡῆς νόμος [ - - - - - ἐνδεικ]-  
 5 νύντον τῆι βο[λ]ῆι - - - - - ]-  
 ονος <h>εγῆται ε[ - - - - - τύχ]-  
 ει ἀγαθῆι κατ[ - - - - -]-  
 ι ἡόπερ ἡόταν[ - - - - - ]-  
 10 ς, ἐπειδὴν δὲ α[ - - - - - τριερά]-  
 ρχο χυνεγορ[ - - - - - ]-  
 ἐνγραφαμεν[ - - - - - δρ]-  
 αχμάς ἐ χύλ[ινα - - - - -]-  
 ΕΔΕΕ

<sup>7</sup> Raubitschek (above, n.2) p.370 and for three-dot punctuation marks, cf. Raubitschek no's. 336, 337, 342, 345, 347, 360, 364 and 370. The nu in the Mississippi fragment is very like the nu on Raubitschek no. 346.

<sup>8</sup> Bernhard Hansen, Rückläufiges Wörterbuch der griechischen Eigennamen (Berlin 1957) pp.264-276.

<sup>9</sup> For names beginning with Bo, see J.Kirchner, Prosopographia Attica (Berlin 1901-3) no's. 2883-2926.

<sup>10</sup> I owe this suggestion to Professor A.J.Heisserer.

Line 1. In the last stoichos, only the left hasta of the nu is clearly visible. The crossbar and bottom of the right hasta are faint.

Line 2. In the first stoichos, a faint trace of the bottom stroke of a sigma can be seen.

Line 3. A faint trace of the top loop of the rho is visible in the second stoichos.

Line 4. A trace of the bottom half of the sigma can be seen. Lewis read only the bottom of a central hasta in the seventh stoichos, but the left hasta, crossstroke and the upper portion of the right hasta of a nu are clearly apparent on the stone.

Line 5. The upper left corner and the bottom of the central hasta of the epsilon appear in the second stoichos.

Line 10. Only the left hasta of the rho is apparent at the edge of the break at the right.

Line 11. A trace of the left hasta and the diagonal of a nu can be seen in the last preserved stoichos.

Line 12. In the final stoichos only the upper part of the left stroke of the lambda survives.

Line 13. A trace of the horizontal stroke of the delta rules out the lambda which Lewis read. A portion of the middle horizontal stroke of an epsilon is visible in the fourth stoichos.

#### Commentary

Line 1. As Lewis noted, the form of the dative is characteristic of early Attic Greek; however, it is found at least as late as 418/7 and has been restored by Lewis in IG I<sup>3</sup> 105 dated ca. 409.<sup>11</sup> Its appearance here, in itself, does not seem a strong argument for assuming the original law code was copied letter for letter.

Line 2. The phrase [ἐχ]κέτο τῆι βολ[ῆι] has a parallel in IG I<sup>3</sup> 236a, line 4, where we read ἐχκέτο τῶι τριεράρχοι.

Line 3. *ἔλο* may begin an aorist participle of αἰρέω, e.g. *ἔλο[ντες δὲ]*, but it seems more likely to be an imperative form, *ἔλο[ντων δὲ...]*, of which one finds numerous parallels in Attic inscriptions.<sup>12</sup> For a clause ending in *ἔγραπται* (partially restored) followed by an imperative plus *δὲ*, see M.N.Tod, *A Selection of Greek Historical Inscriptions II* (Oxford 1948) no.201, lines 15-16, an example from Mytiline dated 324 B.C. A partially restored Attic parallel is suggested in IG II<sup>2</sup> 1128, lines 6-7; cf. II<sup>2</sup> 1073, line 6.

Line 6. Lewis' *ἔγεται* does not make sense. The stonecutter seems to have omitted a rough breathing. (Letters were also omitted in lines 7 and 9 of IG I<sup>3</sup> 236 fragment a). The present subjunctive form <h>*ἔγεται* from ἡγέομαι might make sense in this context. If this surmise is correct, *οvoc* may be the ending of the subject of the verb and we might restore [--]οvoc (<h>*ἔγεται ἐπὶ τὸς δικαστὰς* --). See C.D.Buck and W.Petersen, *A Reverse Index of Greek Nouns and Adjectives* (Chicago 1939) pp.279-280 for a full list of possible nouns ending in *-οvoc*.

<sup>11</sup> IG I<sup>3</sup> 84, lines 10 and 20. [δραχμῆς]iv restored by Lewis in IG I<sup>3</sup> 105, lines 59-60, is dated later, ca. 409. For earlier examples, see IG I<sup>3</sup> 4b, line 17; 6c, line 30; 34, line 37; and 41, line 92.

<sup>12</sup> Cf. IG I<sup>3</sup> 34, line 22; 68, line 53; 78, line 22; 82, line 36; 104, line 26 and 123, line 15.

Line 7. For parallel uses of [τύχ]ει ἀγαθῆι, see IG I<sup>3</sup> 40, line 40; 93, lines 3 and 26 where the phrase twice marks the beginning of an addendum to an earlier decree. Cf. IG II<sup>2</sup> 407, line 11; 487, line 13; 655, line 16; 663, line 10; 668, line 5; 674, line 18; 698, line 19; 721, line 5; 841, line 9; 844, line 60; 931, line 11; 949, line 12; 980, line 6; 1217, line 11; 1264, line 11.

Line 8. There is no parallel use of ἵπτερ in IG I<sup>3</sup>, but it does appear in [Dem.] 47.31 and IG II<sup>2</sup> 4842 and 11267. ἵπταν is found frequently in fifth-century Athenian legal documents - e.g. IG I<sup>3</sup> 68, line 42; 78, line 24; 89, lines 5 and 58.

Line 10. χουεγορ may have been a participial form of the verb συνηγορέω "to plead a case", possibly the genitive χουεγορ[ὀ]ντος] modifying the noun [τριερά]ρχο. The nouns συνήγορος (cf. IG II<sup>2</sup> 1183, line 14; 1237, line 32; 1251, lines 10-11) and συνηγορία (cf. IG II<sup>2</sup> 3629, line 7 and 3704, line 13) are found on stones dated to the fourth century B.C. and second century A.D. respectively. This phrase carries the theme of the naval regulations and provisions for legal redress which seems to tie the fragment to IG I<sup>3</sup> 236a. There are, however, other remotely possible restorations - a form of συναγορεύω or συναγοράζω (cf. IG II<sup>2</sup> 903, line 12).

Line 11. ἐνγραφαμεν[---] seems to refer to the person or persons indicted.

Line 12. By analogy to an account of the ἐπιμεληταὶ τῶν νεωρίων dated 330/29 (IG II<sup>2</sup> 1627, line 439), ἐ χύλ[ινα] seems the most likely of many possible restorations. Lewis also suggests this phrase may be a reference to timber for shipbuilding ("fortasse pro pecuniis pendendis materies navibus apta accipienda est").

In transcribing this fragment for the third edition of IG I, D.M.Lewis had only a description of the stone, a squeeze and a photograph. The stone is not easy to read owing to its poor state of preservation and therefore is easily subject to misinterpretation in small details. Careful examination of the stone, aided by squeezes and a photograph, has made it possible to correct the text in five instances.<sup>13</sup> Lewis' association of this fragment with the earlier side of the opisthographic stele of the Law Code of Nikomachos (Agora Inv. No. I 727 = IG I<sup>3</sup> 236a) is likely to be correct, but is not demonstrable with certainty. There are some differences between the two stones which are worth noting. The stoichedon checker dimensions and letter height are consistent with the large fragment first published by Oliver. However, there are differences in the forms of the letters Φ and Κ. In the Robinson fragment the phis have large round loops, while the loops of the phi in Agora I 727 are more flat. The kappas in Agora I 727 tend to have a distinctly more acute angle between the intersecting crossstrokes (κ), while the kappas on the Robinson fragment have a wider, more "normal" angle between their crossstrokes (κ). These differences are, however, insufficient to prove that the Robinson fragment should not be associated with Agora I 727. The task of reinscribing the law code was so large that one would not expect it to have been undertaken

<sup>13</sup> Cf. lines 2, 3, 4, 11 and 13 with the same lines in IG I<sup>3</sup> 236b.

by one stonecutter alone and letter forms may, in any case, vary even when formed by the same stonecutter. The Robinson fragment is too small and, for that reason, preserves too few examples of each letter, to make definitive arguments based only on the letter forms.

More significant is the fact that the stone itself is different in texture and weathering.<sup>14</sup> The Robinson fragment may not be a fragment of Agora I 727 itself. There is clearly no possibility of a join between the two. The Robinson fragment has had a different subsequent history. For instance, there is no indication in the Mississippi fragment of the water damage or deep pittings which are mentioned by Dow in *Hesperia* 30 (1961) p.62. The absence in the Mississippi fragment of the Agora stele's silvery mica veins (first reported by Dow pp.61-62) is also noteworthy. Of course, the Robinson fragment is comparatively small and different parts of a large marble stele can vary in character, but the differences noted above suggest that the Robinson fragment may come from an adjoining stele on which the naval regulations may have been continued from Agora I 727.

The Mississippi fragment preserves no more than eleven letters per line. That fact coupled with the unique character of the subject matter preclude all but obvious restorations. We do not have enough parallel examples to make possible restorations anything more than speculation. The subject matter of the lines preserved on the fragment does seem to deal with naval regulations as do the more extensively preserved lines of fragment a. However, unlike the text of fragment a, we find no extensive similarities between our text and [Dem.] 47 (cf. Oliver pp.16-19).

The date 410-404 is established by Andokides (1.83-84) and Lysias (30.2-14); cf. Oliver pp.7-8; C.Hignett, *A History of the Athenian Constitution* (Oxford 1952) pp.17-27, 300-305, 375-378 and T.L.Shear, Jr., *Hesperia* 40 (1971) pp.243ff. The letter forms of the Robinson fragments are consistent with the period indicated by the literary evidence.

### 3. Fragment from a Dedication

A fragment of white marble whose left edge is preserved in part (as indicated by examination under ultraviolet light), but otherwise the stone has been uniformly claw-chiselled all around in recent years (the claw-chiselled areas glow brightly in ultraviolet light). The inscribed surface is broken at the left and right; and the top and bottom edges, together with all corners, have been damaged. The back is claw-chiselled so that no portion of the original back remains and it is impossible to determine how thick the stone may have been originally. The stone was apparently reduced to its present size to make it more easily portable and/or saleable.

Height, 0.09 m.; width, 0.209 m.; thickness, 0.033 m.

---

<sup>14</sup> The observations about the physical nature of Agora I 727 are based on a first-hand examination of the stele in the basement of the Stoa of Attalos during the summer of 1981. Compare the comments of J.H.Oliver, *Hesperia* 4 (1935) pp.5-9; S.Dow, *Hesperia* 10 (1941) pp.31-37 and *Hesperia* 30 (1961) pp.58-73, esp. 61-63.



Height of letters, 0.008-0.010 m. (lines 1-3), 0.006-0.009 m. (lines 4-5), 0.005-0.007 m. (line 6); lines 1-3 stoichedon 15, horizontal checker 0.018 m., vertical checker 0.012 m.; lines 4-6 stoichedon 20, horizontal checker 0.013 m., vertical checker 0.009 m.

University Museums Inv. No. 77.3.663

ca. med. s. IV a.

CTOIX. 15-20

Taf. XIII b

[ἐπαι]νεθέντες κα[ὶ - - - ]  
 [δικαι]οσύνης ἔνεκα ν  
 [Ἄλωπε]κῆς *vacat* δ  
 [ . . . . ]ρατης Φιλίωνος νν  
 5 [ . . . . ]ρατης Νικηκίου ννν  
 [Καλλί]στρατος Κτήρωνο[ς]

Lines 4-6. Restoration of line 6 makes it clear that the names in lines 4-6 were inscribed in a column which was indented one stoichos.

Line 6. Only the upper tip of the left hasta of the eta is preserved.

#### Commentary

Line 1. The restoration [ἐπαι]νεθέντες proposed here is found on other fourth-century Attic stones. IG II<sup>2</sup> 2832, a dedication dated 344/3 B.C. provides the best parallel text: ἱεροποιοὶ ἀνέθεσαν τῶι Θεεῖ οἱ ἐπὶ Λυκίσκου ἄρχοντος ἐπαινεθέντες καὶ στεφανωθέντες ὑπὸ τοῦ δήμου τοῦ Ἀθηναί[ων] δικαιοσύνης ἔνεκα. Since the right edge of our stone has been chiselled away, it is uncertain whether the κα[ὶ] on our stone was followed by στεφανοθέντες κτλ. Cf. also IG II<sup>2</sup> 2844 (wholly restored), another dedication (dated post med. s. IV a.). In that example a single honorand of the Athenian demos and the prytaneis of Hippothontis, made a dedication to the goddesses at Eleusis. The aorist active infinitive, ἐπαινέσαι, is found far more frequently than the participial form used here. The IBYCUS computer found nearly 600 instances of the infinitive form's use in IG I<sup>3</sup> and II/III<sup>2</sup>, while the participle is found in only three instances and two of those were totally restored.

Line 2. [δικαι]οσύνης seems a better restoration than [σωφρ]οσύνης, but we cannot be certain. Cf. IG II<sup>2</sup> 478, line 10; 1699, line 2 and 2832, line 3 (quoted above). If the stoichedon pattern were not scrupulously observed (and in line 5, where the letters ΝΙΚΗΚΙΟ do not align precisely with the stoichoi of line 4 above, it is not observed), the letters ΔΙΚΑΙ could have been squeezed into the first four stoichoi of line 2. This arrangement would avoid the unlikely split between the initial delta (at the end of line 1) and the rest of the word (at the beginning of line 2). IBYCUS found 98 instances of the use of δικαιοσύνης with ἔνεκα and only five instances of σωφροσύνης in the same context in Attic inscriptions. σωφροσύνης appears more commonly on tombstones and in ephebic inscriptions of the Hellenistic period.

Line 3. The most likely restoration is a deme heading before the list of names-- [Ἄλωπε]κῆς. This restoration is made more attractive if, as D.M.Lewis suggested (see

below, n.15), the demotic of Kallistratos Ktesonos is indeed Alopekethen rather than Ankulethen. This form of the deme heading (Ἀλοποκῆς) suggests a date prior to ca. 321 B.C. since IG II<sup>2</sup> 2407 = Agora 15, no. 55, dated in or about that year has the form [Ἀλωπ]εκῆθεν (line 32) which is consistently used in the Hellenistic and Roman periods. Ἀλωπεκῆς is the form used until at least 334/3 B.C. (see IG II<sup>2</sup> 1750, line 54 = Agora 15, no. 44, line 49).

Lines 4-6. Recorded are the names of three Athenians, one of whom may be identified as a previously known citizen - Kallistratos Ktesonos Alopekethen. (Kallistratos' father Kteson was previously thought to belong to the deme Ankule, but has been shown by D.M.Lewis to belong to the deme Alopeke, a fact which our fragment seems to confirm).<sup>15</sup> The Kallistratos Ktesonos listed on the Robinson stone is probably from the same family and is probably the same Kallistratos Ktesonos known from a thiasotic catalogue (IG II<sup>2</sup> 2345, line 34) dated before the mid-fourth century B.C. The letter forms and the genitive form of the patronymic in line 5 suggest a date near the middle of the fourth century for this inscription also.<sup>16</sup> The other two honorands cannot be identified. The number of 10-letter names ending in -ρατης is too large to allow restoration.<sup>17</sup> The patronymics are not helpful in narrowing the choices since there are many men with the names Philion and Nikesias in fourth-century Athens, but none from the deme of Alopeke is known to be associated with a son whose name ended in -ρατης.<sup>18</sup>

This fragment seems to come from a dedicatory inscription similar to IG II<sup>2</sup> 2832. The dedicants had apparently been honored for their service in some public capacity, but the exact nature of that public service is not made clear in the preserved portion of the text. The most obvious guess is that the dedicants were prytaneis of the tribe Antiochis to which the demesmen of Alopeke belonged, however the phrasing used is different from the opening formula used in similar dedications by prytaneis.<sup>19</sup> If we knew precisely where the stone

<sup>15</sup> Kirchner (above, n.9) no. 8153, cf. no. 8905 for the stemma. See D.M.Lewis, "Notes on Attic Inscriptions (II)" *ABSA* 50 (1955) pp.13-14 for the change in the family's demotic.

<sup>16</sup> Cf. IG II<sup>2</sup> 1747 = Agora 15, no. 36, lines 3, 7, 11, 17, 18, 29 and 44 (dated 343/2 B.C.). B.D.Meritt and J.S.Traill in *The Athenian Agora 15* (Princeton 1974) note that the "transitional orthography [-o and -ou] ... suggests a date near the middle of the fourth century" (p.47). Leslie Threatte [*The Grammar of Attic Inscriptions I* (Berlin and N.Y. 1980) pp.242-256] observes that uses of -o for -ou are rare in state decrees after 350 and that examples of the new form -ou are much more frequent in the period 375/4-351/0 than in the period 403/2-376/5.

<sup>17</sup> Hansen (above, n.8) pp.170-171 lists 71 possibilities.

<sup>18</sup> For Philiones, see Kirchner (above, n.9) no's 14466a, 14467, 14469, 14471, 14474; IG II<sup>2</sup> 1582, line 96; 1698, line 8; 1742, lines 21, 46, 48; 2389, 2823, line 3 and 10789; *Hesperia* 33 (1964) p.55; 35 (1966) p.226, line 111; *Ἀρχ. Ἐφ.* (1955) Pl.1,1. For Nikesias, see Kirchner (above, n.9) no. 10748 and IG II<sup>2</sup> 956, lines 86-87+2316, lines 37-38+*Hesperia* 9 (1940) p.63, 8 col. III, lines 9-10.

<sup>19</sup> Meritt and Traill (above, n.16) no's. 19-55. For more detailed information about the different types of early prytany inscriptions, see Meritt and Traill p.2 and S.Dow, *Prytaneis* = *Hesperia Suppl.* 1 (1937) pp.1-30.

was found, we might be able to make a more educated guess as to the reason for the dedication, but unfortunately that information is now lost.<sup>20</sup>

University of Mississippi

Robert A.Moysey

---

<sup>20</sup> I would like to thank Lucy Turnbull and Rebecca Dubey of the University Museums for permission to publish these inscriptions and for their help in this endeavor. I also thank Ch.Habicht for permitting me to use the epigraphical library and squeeze collection at the Institute for Advanced Study, Princeton, T.L.Shear, Jr., Director of the Agora excavations, for enabling me to examine Agora I 727; and A.J.Heisserer for his many helpful suggestions and corrections of a previous draft. Finally, I gratefully acknowledge that the research for this article was aided by a grant from the Committee on Faculty Research of the University of Mississippi.



a)



b)

a), b) Perirrhanterion-Fragment mit Profilaufnahme (Universitäts-Museum Mississippi Inv.No. 77.3.664)





a)



b)

a) Inschrift (Universitäts-Museum Mississippi Inv.No. 77.3.688)  
b) Inschrift (Universitäts-Museum Mississippi Inv.No. 77.3.663)