

DANIEL J. GEAGAN

THE SARAPION MONUMENT AND THE QUEST FOR STATUS IN ROMAN ATHENS

aus: Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik 85 (1991) 145–165

© Dr. Rudolf Habelt GmbH, Bonn



## THE SARAPION MONUMENT AND THE QUEST FOR STATUS IN ROMAN ATHENS

In 1936 J. H. Oliver edited the texts of three sides of a choregic tripod base after a new fragment was found in the Athenian Agora.<sup>1</sup> J. Bakoules, the mender of the Agora Excavations, had assembled at the Epigraphical Museum the fragments, which for the most part had been found in the Asklepion. K. Kourouniotes, then Director of the Epigraphical Museum, identified the capping stone and called it to Oliver's attention. Despite previous editions of individual fragments and even small assemblages of fragments, Oliver's text,<sup>2</sup> which first assembled the majority of the currently known fragments and documented the relationship of the three sides as part of the same monument, is effectively the editio princeps and remains the basic text. New fragments have since been added to Face A by Oliver (1939) and to Face C by W. K. Pritchett (1938) and Oliver (1940), and P. Maas (1939) has reedited one document of Face A.

---

<sup>1</sup>Preparation of a text for inclusion in Athenian Agora XVIII, Inscriptions: Dedicatory Monuments and Correspondence with Roman Officials raised a number of questions about this monument and its contents. The preparation of Athenian Agora XVIII has been supported by grants from the Canada Council in 1975 and from the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada in 1979/80 and in 1987-1989. The supporting data on the relationship of monuments and cult sites was developed under the last of these grants. The monument itself is under reconstruction in Athens at the Epigraphical Museum, and the observations in this article are based upon the excellent photographs supplied with Oliver's publication of the monument in 1936. For assistance in other aspects gratitude is due to the successive directors of the Agora Excavations, Professors Homer A. Thompson and T. Leslie Shear, Jr. and to the director of the Epigraphical Museum in Athens D. Delmousoy. Versions of this paper have been presented to the Ancient Mediterranean Studies Group at McMaster University and to the annual meeting of the Association of Ancient Historians at Brown University in May of 1989.

<sup>2</sup>The following editions will be cited:

J. H. Oliver, *Hesperia* 5, 1936, pp. 91-122, especially 93-103, with photographs pp. 94-98 (Face A); especially 103-109 with photographs pp. 104-107 (Face B); especially pp. 109-122, with photographs pp. 110-112 (SEG 28,225) (Face C).

W. K. Pritchett, "A New Fragment of the Sarapion Monument," *AJP* 79, 1938, pp. 343-345 (Face B).

J. H. Oliver, "An Ancient Poem on the Duties of a Physician," *BullInstHistMedic* 7, 1939, pp. 315-320, (SEG 28,225) and P. L. Maas, *Ibid.* pp. 321-323 (Face A).

J. H. Oliver, "Paeonistae," *TAPA* 71, 1940, pp. 302-314, with a sketch fig. 2 (SEG 28,225) (Face B).

P. Amandry, "Trépieds d' Athènes: I. Dionysies," *BCH* 100, 1976, pp. 15-93, especially pp. 43-44.

Other works cited include:

K. Clinton, *The Sacred Officials of the Eleusinian Mysteries*, *TAPS* 64.3, 1974.

S. Follet, *Athènes au II<sup>e</sup> et au III<sup>e</sup> siècle*, Paris, 1976.

B. D. Meritt and J. S. Traill, *Athenian Agora XV*, Princeton, 1974.

C. P. Jones, "Three Foreigners in Attica," *Phoenix* 32, 1978, pp. 228-231.

Reexamination of the text has raised a number of questions about the multifarious nature of Face A and an anachronism in its text, about the conflict between the nature of the monument as the base for a tripod and a text suitable for a statue base, and about the suitability of a choregic monument as a votive offering to Asklepios. The answers will suggest that Face A actually represents two periods of use, that one family's quest for conversion of status in a cultural elite into status in the city's religious elite contributed to some of the anomalies and that attempts to prolong that status in a third and even fourth generation account for others.<sup>3</sup> The monument appears to have been set up much earlier than previously suggested, and the discovery of a choregic text indicates the occasion for its dedication. There is no evidence of the extent to which the family of Sarapion was able to actualize its status into political power, for active participation in civic politics is nowhere attested in the preserved evidence, but a marriage was accomplished into a family which had powerful connections throughout the empire.

#### TEXT OF FACE A.

Although changes to the text affect only a few lines, it seems advisable to include complete texts of Faces A and B for the readers' convenience. Maas' punctuation of lines 14-33 of Face A is reproduced.

#### Face A

inter a. 113-116 p., post a. 160 p.

[Σαραπίων]α Χολλείδην ) π[οιητήν - - - - ]

[ - - - καὶ φι]λόσοφον Στωϊκ[όν - - - - - ]

- 3 Κό) Στά[τιος Πυρφόρ]ος ἐξ Ἀκροπόλεως Χολλεί  
 δης ἰε[ρεὺς διὰ βίου τοῦ] θεοῦ τὸν αὐτοῦ πάππον  
 ἀνέθ[ηκεν καὶ τὸν παιᾶ]να αὐτοῦ ἀνέγραψεν  
 6 κα[θ' ὑπομνηματισμὸν Ἀρειοπ]αγειτῶν

<sup>3</sup>R. Fisher, *From Polis to Province: An Analysis of the Athenian Governing Class from 167/6 B.C. to A.D. 13/14*, Diss. McMaster, 1986, pp. 4-9, was able to isolate among the Athenian wealthy classes of the last centuries before Christ various specialized elites. The same characteristics hold true through Roman imperial times.

- Λε[ωντῖς ἐνίκα <sup>vν</sup> Φο Μητρόδ]ωρος ἦρχε  
 [ vac. Σαραπίων (?) ἐχορήγει vac. ]  
 9 [ - - - - - ἠϋλει (?) - - - - ἐδίδασ]κεν  
     several lines missing  
 [ - - - - - ]ΙΝΕΓΕ[ - - - - - ]  
 [ - - - - - ]ΔΑΙ[ . . ]ΔΕΝ ἄθλα καὶ μο[ - - - - ]  
 12 Λ[ . ]Π[ - - - ]ΑΤΕΣΙΑ[ . . . ]ΟΣ ἀνδρομάχοι [ - - - - ]  
     vacat
- Ἔργα τάδε ἰατρ[οῦ· Παι]ώνια πρᾶτον ε[ - - - - ]  
 15 καὶ νόον ἰῆσθαι καὶ οἱ πρόπαρ ἢ τῷ ἀ[ρήγην]  
 μηδ' ἐσιδῆν θιγῆν τε παρῆξ καὶ θεσμά καὶ ὄρκ[ον].  
 καὶ δ' ἀρετᾶι ἀκέο[ι]το καὶ ἤθεσι, μὴ μὲν ἀτ[ε]υχή[ς]  
 18 κούρας τ' ἠδ' ἀλόχους ἐρατᾶ[ς] ἅτ' ἀρηγὸς ἀφάσ[σων]  
 στέρνα πόθωι χλιᾶοι ετε[ - 5-6- ]ς ἰ[η]τῆρος.  
 [τοῦνε]κα τοῖς ἀπόφαμι θε[όφροσιν ἠδ'] ἀβεβάλοις  
 21 [ - - 11-12 - - - ]ας τε γαμ[ - πα.8 - - ]ιητῆρες  
 [ - - - - - ο]ιο κα[ἰ] ὄργια μὴ [ταχ]ὺ λάθην  
 [ - - - - - ] αὐτά τοι ἀ[ρή]γει  
 24 [ . . . ]ασ[ - - - - - ]ς τέκος, ἀϋθ[ι] δὲ τέχνα.  
 [τ]οῖος μὲν [γνώμαν γεγ]αώς, θεὸς οἶα [σ]αωτήρ  
 δμῶων ἀκτ[ε]άνων [τ]ε καὶ ἀφνειῶν καὶ ἀνάκτων  
 27 ἴσος [ἔο]ι, πάντεσσι δ' ἀδελφεὸς [ο]ἶά τ' ἀρήγοι.  
 πάν[τες γὰρ πέλομε]ν κάσιες. τ[ῷ μ]ηδέ τιν' ἔχθοι  
 μηδ[ὲ φρεσὶ ζᾶλον κε]ῦθοι ἢ ὄ[γκον] ἀέξο[ι].  
 30 μὴ μ[ - - - - - ]μιν ηλ[ - - ]  
 αἰσχ[ - - - - - ] Ἰγυείας,  
 ἀλλὰ δ[ - - - - - ]ε[ . . ] τέχν[ - - ]  
 33 τοίως [ - - - - - ]αι ἦτορ.  
     vacat

vacat

36 Ἐπιμελη[τεύοντος τῆς πόλεως Κωπω]γί  
ο[υ] Μαξίμ[ου ἱεροκήρυκος - - - - ]

vacat

39 Ζα[κορεύοντος - - - - - ]

vacat

Ζαθ[ε - - - - - ]  
Παιάγ[ - - - - - ]  
42 ἐμᾶς Ἰ [ - - - - - ]  
μόλε θε[ - - - - - ]  
προγ[ - - - - - ]  
[ - - - - - ]

Fragment c (position uncertain, but within lines 10-33)

[ - - - - - ]Κ . [ - - - - - ]  
[ - - - - - ]ΘΟΝΕΩ[ - - - - - ]  
3 [ - - - - - ]ΤΕΡΑΙΧΡΕ[ - - - - - ]  
[ - - - - - ]ΥΣΙΔΕΜ[ - - - - - ]

Fragment d (uncertain position, but within lines 10-33)

[ - - - - - ]Ε[ - - - - - ]  
[ - - - - - ]ἀμόγω[ - - - - - ]  
3 [ - - - - - ]μελοι η[ - - - - - ]

Restorations made obsolete by the addition of new fragments are not reported here. Lines 1-6, see p.157 below. Lines 7-9, see p.152 below. Lines 10-12 Oliver (1936). Lines 14-33 Maas. Line 14 αἰ]ώνια, πρῶτον ἐ[λέγγειν Oliver (1936), ἐ[λέσθαι Keydell (1941). Line 16 μήδεσι δ' ἦν θιγέ[ωσι Oliver (1936). Line 17 [δὲ . . . ]σιμημενα τ[ε]ύχη Oliver (1936). Line 20 [τοῖς δ' ἐ]κᾶτοις, θε[οῖς τὰ ἐνόντ]α βεβάλοις Oliver (1936). Line 22 μύ[στο]ν λάθην Oliver (1936). Line 25 [γνώμων γεγ.] W. Theiler apud Maas. Line 28 τ[οῖς εἴ]δεσιν Oliver (1936). Lines 36-39 Oliver (1936), ἱεροκήρυκος - (?) Oliver (1973).

Oliver (1936, p. 93) recognized the "heterogeneous character" of the text not only of the whole monument, but even of Face A, which he likened to the Isyllus monument at Epidauros (IG IV<sup>2</sup> 128). He accepted the contemporaneity of the documents of the face. These documents of Face A were divided into several segments (p. 101): the preamble, inscribed two lines in the upper margin of the capping stone and the remainder on the shaft of the base (lines 1-7), "a mutilated inscription of uncertain character" (lines 9-13), a philosophical poem attributed to Glaukos (lines 14-33), the reference to the epimeletes (lines 36-39), and Sarapion's paian (lines 41-45).

Not only was the subject matter of the face diverse, but different portions of it were inscribed in letters of different sizes. The letters of the majority of the lines (1-6, 10-39) were 2.0 centimeters high. Those of the final lines (41 to the end) were almost half that size (1.1 centimeters). The largest letters (3.0 centimeters) belong to lines 7-9. The two preserved letters of line 39 were 2.3 centimeters high. The explanation for the differing sizes of the letters is not difficult to find. The masons adjusted the size of the letters so as to fill the whole width of the face. They did this not for each line, but for each coherent segment of text. In most segments a poetic meter or a formulaic character assure a relatively consistent length of line. Thus changes to letter height reinforce the perceived segmentation of the text.

Oliver, however, did not notice that the style of the lettering was not uniform. A number of small details, which can be seen in Oliver's photographs, mark out two distinctive styles. For convenience these can be designated style A and style B. Epsilons of style A have short central horizontal bars attached to the vertical, while those of style B float free of the vertical and frequently extend to the right beyond the ends of the upper and lower horizontal bars. The descending leg of triangular letters (alpha, delta, lambda) of style A are extended upward above the top of the presumed upper guide lines, while the triangular letters of style B terminate at the top in neat elbows, and remain within the presumed guidelines. The ends of the horizontal bar of pi extend left and right of the pair of vertical legs in style A, but are neatly truncated in style B. In style A the circle of the phi is the full height of the other letters, and the vertical bar rises above and below the presumed guide lines; in style B the entire letter remains within the guide lines, and the circle is either made smaller or is rendered as a

recumbent figure eight. The horizontal bars of sigma in style B are longer than those of style A, there is a tendency for the free end of the upper bar to be longer than that of the lower bar, while in style A the bars are of equal length. Lines 1-6 and 41-45 reflect style A and lines 7-39 reflect style B.<sup>4</sup> The alternations of size, style of lettering, and segment can be represented schematically.

	<u>lines</u>	<u>size</u>	<u>style</u>	<u>segment</u>
a.	1-6	0.020	A	"preamble"
b.	7-9	0.030	B	choregic
c.	10-12	0.020	"	unidentified
d.	14-33	"	"	philosophical poem
e.	36-39	0.023	"	citations
f.	41-45	0.011	A	paian

The letters of the unplaced fragments c. and d. reflect style B, their size would place them within lines 10-39.

The two styles of lettering may represent merely the work of alternating masons<sup>5</sup> or that the text is the product of two separate periods of inscribing.<sup>6</sup> Typological incongruities suggest that text was inscribed on two separate occasions. Chronological considerations will confirm this conclusion.

The "preamble" reads like a text identifying a person who is portrayed by a statue or portrait (see below), and it would be difficult to interpret these lines in any other fashion. The name and titles of Sarapion (lines 1-2) are inscribed in the accusative case. The same case identifies him with the grandfather whom Quintus Sta[tius] (line 3) "se[t] up" (line 5). The verb ἀνέθ[ηκεν] followed by the accusative of a person's name indicates that a statue or other representation of that person was dedicated, presumably to the divinity of the sanctuary. The physical characteristics of the monument, however, identify it as the base for a

<sup>4</sup>Because so few letters are preserved after line 35 and because the photographs become more shadowed near the bottom of the stone, only limited comparison of lines 41-45 was possible. The possibility for comparisons is limited in lines 7-9.

<sup>5</sup>For another example see D. J. Geagan, *The Athenian Constitution After Sulla*, *Hesperia Supplement* 12, 1967, pp. 163-186, especially p. 181.

<sup>6</sup>As for example the subscriptions for the Pythais to Delphi: S. V. Tracy, *IG II<sup>2</sup> 2336 Contributors of First Fruits for the Pythais*, *Beiträge zur Klassischen Philologie* 139, 1982.



tripod. Oliver<sup>7</sup> observed that "the monument, with slightly concave sides, originally consisted of a large triangular base surmounted by an overlapping triangular cap which supported a tripod, not centred on the monument but located toward the front as appears from the cuttings on the stone." The overlapping capping stone showed on its upper surface near the front of the one preserved radiating spine the cutting apparently to anchor a bronze tripod. The custom of using three sided bases to display tripods took hold at Athens beginning in the late Hellenistic times.<sup>8</sup> With few exceptions the dedication of a tripod at Athens was associated with a victory in the choral contests on honor of Dionysos in the Dionysia or Thargelia.<sup>9</sup> The testimony of a neighboring monument (IG II<sup>2</sup> 3704, lines 15-17) in the Asklepieion indicates that Sarapion's tripod was still on display in the third century after Christ, four generations removed from the Sarapion who is named in the "preamble" of this text.

#### THE DEDICATION OF THE MONUMENT

Oliver (1936, p. 93; 1939, p. 317) recognized the choregic nature of the monument and a reference in the text of lines 7-9 to a victory in a literary or musical contest, either Dionysiac or in honor of Asklepios.<sup>10</sup> He did not relate the nature of the monument to the text of lines 7-9, nor did he note the conflict between the choregic nature of the monument and the statue (1939, p. 317) for which the "preamble" called. Plutarch (Quaest. conviv. 628 a-b) recalls Sarapion's choregic victory<sup>11</sup> when he describes a banquet in which the conversation turned to a particular philotimia, to wit the agonothesia of the exiled king of Commagene, Philopappos, who was choregos for each of the tribal choruses. The chorus, which Sarapion had drilled (διατάξας), from Leontis, Sarapion's own tribe, was the winner. The agonothesia of Philopappos has led to the mistaken association of this occasion with another tripod base (IG II<sup>2</sup> 3112) from the Theater of Dionysos,<sup>12</sup> which records that

<sup>7</sup>1936, p. 91. See Amandry (1976), p. 43, fig. 23 for a cross section of the monument. He did not examine the cutting for the foot of the tripod.

<sup>8</sup>Amandry (1976), pp. 42-44, who cites four examples from imperial times, pp. 42-44.

<sup>9</sup>For bases associated with the latter festival see P. Amandry, "Trépieds d' Athènes. II. Thargelies," BCH 101, 1977, pp. 165-220. Exceptions to the association with Dionysiac choral contests include IG II<sup>2</sup> 2814, an offering made by hieropoioi (see Amandry, 1976, pp. 24-27) and a monument commemorating the anthippasia (Hesperia 43, 1974, p. 313, no. 2).

<sup>10</sup>IG II<sup>2</sup> 3120 offers evidence for games to Asklepios; see now SEG 29, 166.

<sup>11</sup>Sarapion was a friend of Plutarch, identified as a poet (quaest. conv. 628a-b) and Stoic philosopher (de Pyth. or. 400b). He is discussed by Jones, pp. 228-231.

<sup>12</sup>See D. J. Geagan, The Athenian Constitution After Sulla, Hesperia Supplement 12, 1967, p. 137, for details.

Philopappos was agonothetes, while Moiragenes and Boulon, the sons of Moiragenes, were didaskalos and choregos respectively. There is no reason to believe that Philopappos undertook the choregic beneficence only once. The larger letter-size suggests that lines 7-9 are a coherent segment of text and that their letter count would be relatively short. The preserved traces, particularly the imperfect indicative of the verb ἄρχειν in the formula of eponymity, recall the text of choregic monuments from the Dionysia or Thargelia of the fifth or early fourth century B.C. The name of the victorious tribe can be restored at the beginning of line 7. One possible restoration might read:<sup>13</sup>

7    Λε[ωντὶς ἐνίκα    <sup>vv</sup>    Φο Μητρόδ]ωρος ἦρχε  
       [vac.        Σαραπίων (?) ἐχορήγει<sup>vac.</sup>] <sup>vvvv</sup>  
 9    [ - - - - ἠύλει (?) - - - - ἐδίδασ]κεν

Lines 7-9 Geagan. Line 7 Λε[ύκιος Διονυσόδ]ωρος Oliver (1936), Λε[ - - - Διονυσόδ]ωρος Oliver (1949), Λε[ύκοις Μέμμιος - - - - ]ωρος (AD 127/8) Follet apud Jones, p. 231, note 58.

The four preserved uninscribed spaces at the end of line 8 suggest either an uninscribed line or a short line. The name of Sarapion as choregos or that of Philopappos as agonothetes (see below) might be restored. The beginning of line 9 is missing, but the length of the expected formulae is compatible with the suggested length of line, and the termination is consistent with a formulaic element of choregic texts. If Sarapion were not cited in line 8, his name and title as choregos could be restored at the beginning of line 9 instead of the citation of the auletes, or he might have been cited as didaskalos (Cf. IG II<sup>2</sup> 3112) at the end of the line. If Sarapion were actually named in line 8, the name of Philopappos could have been cited either in a missing fourth line of this segment or in the passage ending in lines 10-12 (segment c., see below).

Philopappos' death between A.D. 114 and 116<sup>14</sup> provides a terminus ante quem for the initial period of the Sarapion Monument. Line 7 provides part of the name of an archon. Restorations based on the names of known archons could include either [Ἄνν(τος) Πυθό]δωρος (A.D. 85-95) or [Φο(ύλβιος) Μητρό]δωρος (113/4-124/5).<sup>15</sup> The

<sup>13</sup>Although Oliver's original (1936, pp. 100-101) restoration of line 7 was later retracted, neither the length of the lacuna nor the assumption that the archon's name filled the whole line have been reconsidered. Measurements taken on Oliver's excellent photographs suggest a lacuna of 17, and not 12, letters.

<sup>14</sup>Follet, p. 32 and note 4.

<sup>15</sup>Follet, pp. 507-512.

probable limits of Sarapion's active career limit the possibilities probably to the second of these. If this restoration is correct the date of the choregic victory of Sarapion and of the archonship of Metrodoros<sup>16</sup> can be narrowed down to between A.D. 113 and 116.

The style of the lettering, style B, offers no difficulty to dating the monument in the early second century. The style also associates this segment with the three segments which follow and separates these segments from the first and last segment on the monument. Why was the Asklepieion chosen as a site for the monument?

#### WHY THE ASKLEPIEION?

The provenience of the majority of the fragments and internal textual evidence (see below) locate the Sarapion monument within the Asklepieion. Despite the proximity of the Theater of Dionysos, the Asklepieion would be an unusual location for a choregic monument, as Oliver (1936, p. 93) must have recognized when he suggested that Sarapion had been victorious in "a literary contest to the greater honor and glory of the Savior God." Out of 112 examples<sup>17</sup> which I have been able to identify, only three other choregic monuments might be associated with the Asklepieion: 1) Amandry (1976, pp. 58-60, see also pp. 62-63) reports finding IG II<sup>2</sup> 3081, an agonothetic monument commemorating a victory in the contest ἀνδρῶν, là ou il a été trouvé au pied du mur de soutènement de la cavea du théâtre de Dionysos at the east end of the Asklepieion. The companion monument, however, recalling the victory in the contest παίδ[ων] (IG II<sup>2</sup> 3082), was found on the Acropolis. The most likely original location of the monuments would have been above the seating of the Theatre. One base apparently fell down into the Asklepieion and the other found its way up to the Acropolis. 2) Three fragments found ad Asklepieum built into a Medieval wall (IG II<sup>2</sup> 3117 and SEG 30,132) bear a poetic passage with words reminiscent of choregic monuments of the Roman period. A tenuously based restoration suggested an association with games for Antinoos, who could be at home in a sanctuary of Asklepios. This monument, however, had been moved for use in the wall. 3) A fragment of Ionic epistyle<sup>18</sup> which bore the names of Asklepios, Hygeia and Augustus Caesar received an

<sup>16</sup>Publius Fulvius Metrodoros is also known to have been a *país ἀφ' ἐστίας* from a statue base (SEG 29,173).

<sup>17</sup>No provenience is recorded for 22. The Python to the southeast of the Acropolis accounts for 15 monuments celebrating victories in the Thargelia, eight can be placed between the Olympieion and the Theatre of Dionysos, twelve have been found in or above the Theatre of Dionysos, another three along the remaining parts of the south slope of the Acropolis, three on the west slope, twenty in the area of the Agora, and nine on the Acropolis itself.

<sup>18</sup>IG II<sup>2</sup> 3120. See most recently S. Walker, BSA 74,1979, p. 243-244.

additional text at the end of the second century after Christ or early in the third to recall a victory in the chorus. Presumably the tripod was set up atop an earlier architectural monument which was still in use. The victor's tripod was dedicated specifically to Asklepios, according to the new text. This is the only other choregic monument which can be sited in the Asklepieion.<sup>19</sup>

From its foundation in the fourth century B.C. the cult of Asklepios came under political control unlike the prestigious Eleusinian cult, which remained in the hands of a narrow religious elite. The priest of Asklepios, for example, was chosen annually, and the office rotated among the Kleisthenic tribes in the same way as did the archonship. The annual priest was cited for eponymy in documents set up in the sanctuary. Some manifestations of the nature of the cult changed under Roman rule. By the reign of Augustus, for example, lifelong (*διὰ βίου*) priests begin to appear in the formula for eponymy.<sup>20</sup> During the first century after Christ the prominence of the *zakoros* grows, and he came to replace the priest in the citation for eponymy (see below for references). Despite the changes the monuments continue to show democratic elements, especially when contrasted with the elite image of the Eleusinian cult. Dedicators in the Asklepieion generally take little interest in family and ancestry; in fact patronymics and demotics are often lacking. One elite group, however, the cultural, including both citizens and non-citizens, figures more prominently in the Asklepieion than it does elsewhere in the city. The precinct houses statues and herms honoring or involving physicians (IG II<sup>2</sup> 3798, 3799, 3808, possibly 3809, 4513), philosophers (IG II<sup>2</sup> probably 3801 and 3803, 3810, probably 3989, 4073), sophists/rhetors (IG II<sup>2</sup> 3806, 3812, possibly 3889), teachers (IG II<sup>2</sup> 3804, 4073), and a *syngrapheus* (IG II<sup>2</sup> 3806). This is precisely the group to which Sarapion and some of his descendants belonged. Jones suggests that Sarapion, like his dinner companions Plutarch and Philopappos, may not have been an Athenian by birth. Sarapion's descendants ironically became involved in reshaping the appearance of the cult to resemble that of the exclusive Eleusinian cult (see below).

---

<sup>19</sup>Each Athenian sanctuary attracted particular types of votive offerings. The profile of the Asklepieion is instructive. Out of 230 texts from the IG II<sup>2</sup> found in (in Asklepieio) or in close proximity to the Asklepieion (*ad Asklepieum*) or in neighboring areas when the monuments appear to have come from the sanctuary, the following types occur in descending order of frequency: bases (73 examples) for statues or for votive offerings, relief sculpture including *naiskoi* (52) portraying either parts of the body, the divinity as a snake, or anthropomorphic scenes involving the divinity and other figures (21), and herms (14). The number of inscribed epistyle blocks suggests that architectural offerings were common. Poetic texts, particularly *paian*s, or catalogues of names usually were inscribed on steles: A scattering of monuments are described in different terms, but the numbers of examples of each is insignificant. The catalogue of *paianistai* inscribed on Face B of the Sarapion Monument is especially notable for the fact that it was inscribed within the sketched outline of a pedimented stele (see below).

<sup>20</sup>IG II<sup>2</sup> 3120, 3176 are early examples. Reference to an allotted priest (IG II<sup>2</sup> 3579) may indicate the continued tradition also of an annual priest.

Sanctuaries appear to have been the most desirable locations for monuments at Athens, if the frequency of monuments found in sanctuaries as opposed to secular locations is any indicator. Different sanctuaries were appropriate for different kinds of monuments, and some sanctuaries, like the Eleusinion were more exclusive than others. The Asklepieion was relatively open, and its traditions had been in a state of change. Sarapion apparently had credentials for access to the Asklepieion, even if he proposed to set up an unusual kind of monument.

#### THE FIRST PERIOD OF USE OF FACE A

Face A is the result of two separate inscribings. Initially the Sarapion monument was a choregic monument. It commemorated a victory of the tribe Leontis on an occasion when Philopappos paid the expenses for all of the competing choruses and when Sarapion had trained the victorious chorus. Associated with this occasion was the choregic text (segment b), an unidentified passage (segment c), the philosophical poem on the duties of a physician (segment d), and a pair of citations (segment e). Typical choregic monuments of the Roman period at Athens are apt to include the elements of a traditional choregic text,<sup>21</sup> an epigram celebrating the victory,<sup>22</sup> and sometimes an additional piece of text of varied nature.<sup>23</sup>

The unidentified passage (segment c) is fragmentary, but one preserved word is clearly poetic (ἀνδρομάχοι), and the reference to ἄθλα may suggest a context involving contests; the format of other monuments suggests that this might be an epigram celebrating the victory. The three lines preserve only the termination of the poem, because the stone is broken away above them. The citations (segment e) are not appropriate to choregic monuments, but they are commonly found on monuments set up in the sanctuary of Asklepios. Oliver restored them correctly in 1936; he added ἱεροκήρυκος - (?) to line 37 in 1973.

36 Ἐπιμελη[τεύοντος τῆς πόλεως Κωπω]γί  
ο[υ] Μαξίμ[ου ἱεροκήρυκος Ἀγνουσίου]

<sup>21</sup>IG II<sup>2</sup> 3112, 3114, 3115 (SEG 30,130), 3116 (SEG 30,134), SEG 29,165 (SEG 30,161), 32,247, Agora Inv. I 292, Agora Inv. I 2711.

<sup>22</sup>IG II<sup>2</sup> 3113 (SEG 30,129), 3114, 3115 (SEG 30,130), 3116 (SEG 30,134), 3117 (SEG 30,132), 3118 (SEG 30,133), SEG 29,165 (SEG 30,161), Agora Inv. I 6848.

<sup>23</sup>IG II<sup>2</sup> 3112, 3114.

vacat

39 Ζα[κορεύοντος - - - - - ]

Citations of the zakoros are common on monuments set up in the Asklepieion during the Roman period.<sup>24</sup> An epimeletes is cited in three other dedicatory texts from the Asklepieion (IG II<sup>2</sup> 3187, 3798, 4481). In all three cases he is Coponius Maximus, the man who is cited in this text. The full title epimeletes of the city appears in a citation on a prytany document.<sup>25</sup> His authority is indicative of the continued importance of public authority in the administration of the Asklepieion. J.H. Oliver believed that the epimeletes maintained oversight of the city's sacred domains.<sup>26</sup> If questions were raised about the appropriateness of locating the monument in the Asklepieion, citations of the zakoros of the sanctuary and of the epimeletes of the city, who may have been the most powerful man in Athens, provided significant "clout."<sup>27</sup>

Segment d, a long philosophical or didactic poem is foreign to choregic monuments. Although the monuments in the Asklepieion are notable for providing the grandest display of poetry of any sanctuary in Athens, the nature and subject of this poem are unusual also in this context. Its medical subject matter, however, would make it relevant to the sanctuary of a healing god. Its inclusion may offer the means of integrating the monument into the sanctuary of Asklepios.<sup>28</sup> It also enhances the status of Sarapion, for it brings together medicine with poetry and philosophy.<sup>29</sup>

<sup>24</sup>IG II<sup>2</sup> 3187, 3804, 3805, 3962, 3963, 3964, 4073 (and the hypozakoros), 4477, 4481, 4486, 4487, 4769. The zakoros also appears as dedicator: IG II<sup>2</sup> 3187, 3189, 4466, 4514, 4770. He is portrayed: IG II<sup>2</sup> 3664, 3798, 3799, 3815, 4521a.

<sup>25</sup>Athenian Agora XV, p. 240, no. 313, lines 16-17.

<sup>26</sup>"Imperial Commissioners in Achaia," GRBS 14,1973, pp. 389-405, and 17,1976, pp. 369-370. For Coponius Maximus see also Clinton, p. 78. Follet, pp. 170-173. He became hierokeryx "sometime before 117/8" (Clinton); he probably bore the priestly title at the time of Sarapion's choregic liturgy, and this title can be restored tentatively.

<sup>27</sup>This word is borrowed from Ramsay MacMullen, AJP 107,1986, p. 512.

<sup>28</sup>R. Flacelière "Le poète stoïcien Sarapion d' Athènes, ami de Plutarque," REG 64,1951, pp. 325-327 has found in the poem on the ἔργα of a physician the same literary qualities as Plutarch attributes to Sarapion.

<sup>29</sup>G. Bowersock, Greek Sophists in the Roman Empire, Oxford, 1969, pp. 67-68 cites Sarapion specifically when he alludes to the combinations of healer and rhetor, healer and philosopher or healer and poet as powerful elements in the competition for status.

## THE STATUE AND PAIAN

The two segments inscribed in style A apparently were added to the monument at a later date, one of them (segment a) was tightly fitted in at the top of the monument with the first two lines overlapping onto the capping stone, and the other (segment f) was appended in the uninscribed area in the lower portion of the face. The continuous prose text of lines 1-6, the "preamble" (segment a) is given below, following Oliver's version, but restorations attributable to previous editors and variant restorations are noted in the apparatus.

[Σαραπίων]α Χολλείδην > π[οιητήν - - - - ]  
 [ - - - καὶ Φι]λόσοφον Στωϊκ[όν - - - - - ]  
 3 Κό) Στά[τιος Πυρφόρ]ος ἐξ Ἀκροπόλεως Χολλεί  
 δης ἰε[ρεὺς διὰ βίου τοῦ] θεοῦ τὸν αὐτοῦ πάππον  
 ἀνέθ[ηκεν καὶ τὸν παιᾶ]να αὐτοῦ ἀνέγραψεν  
 6 κα[θ' ὑπομνηματισμὸν Ἀρειοπ]αγειτῶν

Line 1, *init.* Kirchner. Lines 1-2 π[οιητήν cum adjectivo aut ποιητήν καὶ ῥήτορα Oliver (1949) citing (1936). Follet apud Jones, p. 230, note 55, believes that lines 1 and 2 may not be restored properly and that Sarapion's formula may have included the tria nomina. Line 3 Dittenberger. Line 4 Geagan, ἰε[ρεὺς Σωτήρος] Oliver (1936), ἰε[ρὸν εἶναι τοῦ] (1949). Line 5 and 6 Graindor. Line 5 παιᾶ]να Graindor, ποίη]μα Oliver (1949).

The name and titles of Sarapion (lines 1-2) are inscribed in the upper margin of the capping stone in the accusative case. They serve both as the first two lines of this segment and as a two-line heading for the whole text of Face A. Lines 3-5 are inscribed from margin to margin on the face of the base itself. The accusative case identifies the grandfather of Quintus Sta[tius] with Sarapion, whose statue or portrait Statius had set up (ἀνέθ[ηκεν]) and whose poem or paian he had had inscribed (ἀνέγραψεν). Line 6 citing the authorization for the inscription by the Areopagites was centred on the face. The similarity of the lettering of the "preamble" (segment a) to that of the poetic passage (segment f) which is the last document on the base supports the association between segment f and the poem or paian cited in segment a. Oliver (1936, p. 103) had already made the identification when he

recognized the passage as a paian from its diction and, following Graindor, restored line 5 as παιᾶ]να. A paian was an appropriate offering within the sanctuary of Asklepios.<sup>30</sup> Where could the portrait or statue have been located? Triangular bases were designed to display tripods; they were not suitable bases for statues.<sup>31</sup> The text of the statue base IG II<sup>2</sup> 3704, lines 14-17, παρ[ᾶ] τὸν κοινὸν πρόπαππον Κόιντον Στάτιον Σαραπίωνα, οὗ καὶ ὁ πλησίον οὗτος τρίπους, attests to the presence of both the statue and the tripod. Presumably the statue stood next to (παρ[ᾶ]) the later base, while the Sarapion monument with its tripod was less immediately adjacent (πλησίον). The family, therefore, must in actuality have been represented by three monuments in the Asklepieion.

#### THE CIRCUMSTANCES OF THE SECOND PHASE

Sarapion's grandson, Quintus Staius (Glaukos) of Cholleidai, who dedicated the statue, was deeply involved with the cult of Asklepios. Not only was he the [διὰ βίου] priest of the god, but he bore the title [Πυρφόρος] ἐξ Ἀκροπόλεως. He had served also as zakoros (IG II<sup>2</sup> 3804, 3805) before he became lifelong priest. There is however no way of establishing the dates at which he assumed any of these offices. During the last century before Christ numerous incumbents began to hold the priesthood as perennial. The reason is not clear, but it may involve willingness to benefit the cult financially, or it may be a question of incumbents using the title to accumulate status in imitation of other priesthoods which remained under the control of priestly families. The title of pyrphoros may offer more interest. All references to the firebearer from the Acropolis are associated with the Asklepieion. This official apparently supplied uncontaminated fire for sacrifice from the Acropolis. In the first century before Christ the function seems to have been combined with that of the kleidouchos,<sup>32</sup> but the prominence of the office, as attested by references to it in dedicatory inscriptions, is associated with only four or five incumbents of Roman imperial times.<sup>33</sup> The office appears to draw more prestige from the quality of the incumbents rather

<sup>30</sup>IG II<sup>2</sup> 4473, 4494, 4509, 4514, 4533.

<sup>31</sup>For an example, however, of a statue base superimposed on the triangular column capital see Amandry (1976) pp. 79-85.

<sup>32</sup>IG II<sup>2</sup> 1944, lines 16, 21-22, 31-32. There was a similar office at the shrine of the god at Epidauros: L. Robert, REG 79,1966, pp. 747-748. There was also a pyrphoros attached to the cult of Herakles of the Mesogeioi, IG II<sup>2</sup> 1247.

<sup>33</sup>Two are cited on this monument: Quintus Staius of Cholleidai and one of the Licinii Firmi (Face B), whose father or son also held it (see below). The fourth incumbent was named Peison, who apparently was archon in the 170's (IG II<sup>2</sup> 3640. See Follet p. 227). The office is cited twice in one copy of the decrees honoring Ulpius Eubiotos (SEG 30,82, lines 47 and 49). No complete name is preserved.



than the reverse, although the title is frequently noted when a name is cited in an inscription. Staius and Firmus were both notable men of letters. Staius Glaukos is the only incumbent known to have borne the office as hieronymous, and this appears to have been his personal pretension. One other pyrphoros figures prominently at Athens, that of the Eleusinian goddesses, which is the more widely attested,<sup>34</sup> and, because it can be cited as pyrphoros without qualifying phrases, it can be considered the more prominent.

Glaukos's pretensions show several interesting features. First by accumulating sacred offices he seems to be associating himself closely with the cult. His reference to his ancestor not only suggests an hereditary association, but also cloaks the grandson with the aura of his ancestor's learning. The dedication of the paian reinforces the effect. Glaukos also manipulates the perception of the cult. Citation of ancestral associations with the cult was a characteristic of monuments at Eleusis, where family was a significant factor. The custom of eponymity belonged to the Eleusinian priests, and the title of pyrphoros echoed an Eleusinian title. Lifelong tenure was also a feature of Eleusinian priesthoods; Glaukos, however, was not the first to be cited for lifelong tenure in the Asklepieion. Although the "preamble" purports to do honor to Sarapion, the principal recipient of honor was certainly Staius Glaukos. Although the addition of the paian made his offering suitable to the sanctuary, he still had the forethought to protect his endeavour with a confirmatory motion of the council of the Areopagus.

#### IG II<sup>2</sup> 3704

The fortunes of the family are probably best illustrated by still another monument (IG II<sup>2</sup> 3704) which was set up within the precinct of the Asklepieion. J. H. Oliver (1949, p. 247) has already commented upon it as "a notable example of the rhetor's art." That art was used to highlight the significant features of the family's genealogy in a manner paralleled probably only by texts from Eleusis. This base for a statue of Quintus Staius Themistokles of Cholleidai, set up by his relative Titus Flavius Glaukos of Marathon, identifies Themistokles as a former outstanding (ἐπιφανῶς)<sup>35</sup> kleidouchos of the god, and son of Q. Staius Glaukos of Cholleidai, who was the lifelong priest of the Savior god. The statue of Staius Themistokles was to stand παρ[ὰ] τὸν κοινὸν πρόπαππον, that is "beside (the statue of) our common great-grandfather," Quintus Staius Sarapion, "whose tripod stands near-by." Flavius Glaukos thus invokes a relationship to Staius Themistokles through

<sup>34</sup>Clinton, pp. 94-95.

<sup>35</sup>Presumably he spent more generously on the cult than was normally expected.

Sarapion. The text of this inscription apparently accounts for a cluster of three monuments, the tripod, the statue of Sarapion and the statue of Themistokles. It also established firmly the family's identity within the precinct of Asklepios with three office-holders over four generations. Despite Oliver's hesitation,<sup>36</sup> Q. Staius Sarapion can be recognized as Sarapion the great-grandfather.

Flavius Glaukos, who set the statue up, identifies himself not only as one-time *advocatus fisci*, but as ποιητῆς καὶ ῥήτωρ καὶ φιλόσοφος, echoing the description of Sarapion in lines 1-2 of the Sarapion monument. He belongs to a family which maintained strong credentials for membership in the cultural elite not only in the part of the family descended from Sarapion, but also in a part descended from Isaios, the teacher of Hadrian,<sup>37</sup> but which also belonged to the most prestigious faction of the religious elite through an association with the Eleusinian Myteries. Because Sarapion's nomen was lost, the connection must have been made through a female descendant.

Neither of the Statii of Cholleidai, Glaukos or Themistokles, are known to have had credentials in the cultural elite, except through their descent from Sarapion. Staius Glaukos, however, married a woman who through her Athenian ancestor Claudius Agrippinus (cos. ca. 154, arval brother 155) belonged to an international family complex with connections across the Empire.<sup>38</sup> His wife, Claudia Ammia, mother of Staius Themistokles, was, however, probably by adoption the daughter of Claudius Themistokles the Asiarch (PIR<sup>2</sup> C 1040). She claimed descent from philosophers, consulars and Asiarchs, representing, as Oliver (1949, p. 247) noted, "intellectual culture, ... distinction in government or international affairs, ... (and) distinction of wealth" or, in modern technical terminology, membership in governing elites and the non-governing elite of culture and wealth.<sup>39</sup> She was also a cousin of Flavius Glaukos (III) through her natural, but not her adoptive, father.<sup>40</sup> Thus she also was descended from the same Eleusinian family. The marriages do not seem to have brought documentable entry into Eleusinian circles to the Statii of Cholleidai, for the combination of nomen and demotic do not occur in Clinton's index. It is not clear to what extent the adoption or the relationship through the female line were factors which may have influenced this.

---

<sup>36</sup>1949. p. 244, fig. 1. He felt compelled to separate Sarapion the poet from Sarapion the pyrphoros because the poet lacked a nomen on Face A, line 1 of the Sarapion monument. C.P. Jones p. 230 observes that eminent literary figures were commonly cited by their cognomen alone. For Sarapion see most recently I.E. Stephanis, *Διονυσιακοὶ Τεχνίται*, Iraklio, 1988, p. 389, no. 2218.

<sup>37</sup>See J.H. Oliver, "Two Athenian Poets," *Hesperia Supplement VIII*, 1949, pp. 242-258.

<sup>38</sup>R. MacMullen, "Women's Power in the Principate," *Klio* 68, 1986, pp. 434-443, especially Fig. 1 on p. 438 and note 24 on page 441, reproduced in *Corruption and the Decline of Rome*, New Haven, 1988, fig. 15, facing p. 76.

<sup>39</sup>V. Pareto as cited in Travis, Gould and Kolb, *A Dictionary of the Social Sciences*, London, 1964, p. 234.

<sup>40</sup>See Oliver's stemmata, *Hesperia Supplement VIII*, fig. 2 facing p. 248.

FACE B: THE THIRD PERIOD OF THE SARAPION MONUMENT

A number of comments may be added with regard to the text of Face B, which was inscribed on the monument sometime in the first decade of the third century in the archonship of Munatius Themison.<sup>41</sup> These observations are concerned with the format in which the text of this side was presented, with the tribal affiliations of the individuals catalogued among the paianistai, and with the identification of certain of the individuals.

FACE B

inter a. 200-210 p.

	Ἄγαθῆι	Τύχηι	
	Ἐπὶ ἄρχοντος Μου[νατί]ου Θεμισωνο[ς Ἀζην]ιέως		
3	ἱερέ[ως δ]ιὰ βίου Φλ[αοῦ]ιου Ὀνησικράτου[ς Διομ]αιέως		
	Ζακ[ορεύοντος Εὐκαρπίδου] τοῦ Ἐκπά[γλου Βερεν]εικίδου		
	κλε[ιδουχοῦντος - - - - - ο]υ <u>NE</u>		
6	καν[ηφορούσης - - - - - ]		
	ὁ ὑπο[ζάκορος - - - - - ]		
	καὶ οἱ [ - - - - - ]		
9	ἀνέγ[ραψαν τὸν εἰς Κορωνίδα καὶ Ἀ]σκληπιῶν		
	π[αιᾶνα καὶ το]ῦς παιανιστάς      vacat		
	[Ἐρε]χθείδος	Πτολεμαίδος	
12	[ἱερεὺς Β]ουζύγης	33 Ὀγήσιμος ) Κυδαντίδη[ς]	
	[Γ. Μέμμι]ος Πτολεμαῖος	[Εὐτ]υχίδης ) Φλυεύς	
	[ . . . . . ]ος Κράτερο[ς]	vacat	
15	[ - - - - - ]	36 [Ἄκαμα]ντίδο[ς]	

<sup>41</sup>Follet, pp. 101-102. See also E. Karpetanopoulos, *ΑρχΔελτ* 26,1973, p. 308 and *ΑρχΕφ* 1972, pp. 157-158, nos. 27 and 27a.

- [ - - - - - ]  
 [ - - - - - ]  
 18 ἱερε[ὺς - - - - - ]  
 vac. [Αἰγηίδος vac.]  
 Φλα[ - - - - - ]  
 21 Φλα[ - - - - - ]  
 Φλα[ - - - - - ]  
 Φλα[ - - - - - ]  
 24 Πυ[ - - - - - ]  
 [ - - lacuna - - ]
- Fragment h.
- [ - - ]ιοῶξ[ - - - - - ]  
 27 [πυρ]φόρος ἐξ Ἄκρο[πόλεως]  
 Λικίννιος Φίρμος  
 περιηγητῆς καὶ ἱερε[ὺς]  
 30 [Διὸς Πολιέως Λικίν Φ[ίρμος]  
 [ - - - - - ]
- [ - - - - - ]φιλη[ - - - ]  
 [Εὖοδος ὁ κ]αὶ Ζώσιμ[ος]  
 39 [Σκύμνος] Στράτωνος  
 [ - - - - ]ν Διοφάντου  
 Ἄδριανίδος  
 42 [Αὐ]ήνιος Κε[ρεάλιος]  
 [ - - lacuna - - ]
- Fragment f.
- [ - - - - - ]εὺς  
 45 [ - - - - - ]εὺς  
 [ - - - - - ]  
 [ - - - - - ]  
 48 [ - - - - - ]  
 [ - - - - - ]  
 [ - - - - - ]ος  
 51 [ - - - - - ]ος ἱερεὺς  
 Ἡφαίστου  
 [ - - - - - ]  
 [ - - - - - ]  
 54 [ - - - - - ]  
 [ - - - - - ]  
 [- - - - - ] Μαραθῶ(νιος)  
 [ - - - - - ]  
 [ - - - - - ] Φίρμος  
 [ - - - - - ]

## Fragment i. (position uncertain)

- [Οὐλπι]ος Διον[ύσιος - - - ]  
 [ - - - - ]διος Ἐπιτυν[χάνων]

9 lines vacant

12            Σ . [ - - - - - ]  
                 [ - - - - - ]

Fragment k. (position uncertain)

[ - - - ]N[ - - - ]  
[ - - - ]EΦ[ - - - ]  
3 [ - - - ]ON[ - - - ]  
[ - - - ]V V [ - - - ]  
[ - - - ]V E [ - - - ]  
6 [ - - - ]OP[ - - - ]  
[ - - - ]KA[ - - - ]  
[ - - - ]N[ - - - ]

Unless noted, the restorations are Oliver' s. Restorations rendered obsolete by newly added fragments are not cited. New restorations have been made at the end of line 3 and in lines 7, 13 and fragment i, line 1. Line 2, Μου[νατί]ου Graindor. Line 4 Εὐκαρπίδου] τοῦ Ἐκπά[γλου Pritchett (1938). Line 8 καὶ οἱ [πρέσβεις τοῦ ἐν ἄστει Ἀσκληπιείου] Oliver (1940). Line 9 ἀνέγ[ραψαν τὸν εἰς Κορωνίδα καὶ Ἀ]σκληπιῶν or even τὸν Σοφοκλέους εἰς Ἀ]σκληπιῶν Oliver (1940). Line 36 Kirchner. Line 27 Dittenberger. Line 30 Kirchner. Line 39 Follet, Athènes, p. 99.

Although he did not comment on it, Oliver represented in a drawing (1940, p. 307) and in photographs (1936, pp. 104-105) the fact that the inscription of Face B was displayed within an inscribed sketch of pedimental stele. A crown decorated the pediment, which was supported by columns with Corinthian capitals. A corner acroterion decorates the preserved left side of the roof. The text of the inscription is framed within the space between the columns, although the odd line runs over onto the column on the right. Because chronological incompatibility prevents any association between Face B and Face A, it must be presumed that the inscribers of Face B took advantage of an unscribed surface in a precinct already heavily crowded. Presumably Sarapion's descendants no longer had power or interest in protecting the monument. The character of the monument, however, caused

unease to the new inscribers, and so the sketched picture of the appropriate kind of stele acted as a compromise with their perception of propriety. Two sided steles were common within the Asklepieion; some bore the texts of paian and others the description of benefits conferred upon the sanctuary. They were also the normal vehicle for publishing catalogues of names.<sup>42</sup>

The catalogue of names is divided into two columns and each of these into tribal panels by indented headings. The official sequence of the tribes appears to have been followed. Representation among the tribes cannot have been equally distributed, and it is likely that certain tribes were not represented at all. The panel of names from Erechtheis (I) begins the first column. Line 18 either was uninscribed or held the indented name of a tribe, probably Aigeis (II). The Licinii Firmi, belonging to the deme Gargettos (Aigeis, II), indicate that fragment *h.* belongs lower down in the same column and under the same heading. The second column has in sequence the names of the tribes Ptolemais (V), Akamantis (VI), and Hadrianis (VII). The demotic of Marathon (Aiantis, XI) places fragment *f.* in the lower portion of this column. The first column would have included no more than four tribal panels, while four or more of the remaining nine would have filled the second column.

An earlier catalogue of paianistai<sup>43</sup> repeats several of the names. Oliver has already cited the cases of Onesimos, son of Onesimos, of Kydantides (line 33) and Avienus Cerialis (line 42). Others include:

G. Memmius Ptolemaios (line 13), whose abbreviated nomen Oliver resolves in the other catalogue as Γ(ά)(τος) Μέ(μμιος) (line 19); his deme, Lamptrai, belongs to Erechtheis. Μέ(μμιος) Πτολεμαῖος was an ephebos of Erechtheis in 196/7 - 200/1,<sup>44</sup> and presumably is descended from the homonymous paianistes of the earlier catalogue.

Eutychides, son of Eutychides, of Phlya (line 28) either is identical with Eutychides of the earlier catalogue (line 23) or is his son, although the same name occurs in the deme Akyaieis in an ephebic catalogue over half a century earlier.<sup>45</sup> He may be identical with the ephebic hyposophonistes of 199/200 - 207/8 and a prytanis of 189/90 - 208/9.<sup>46</sup>

The son of Straton (line 39) is probably Skymnos of Sphettos (line 25), as Follet suggests. Straton occurs as a name also in other demes of Akamantis, in Eiresidai, Hermos, and Cholargos, but the appearance of his name in the other catalogue tends to confirm the identification. He was also prytanis shortly after A.D. 212 and epistates of the prytaneis in a

<sup>42</sup>See for examples IG II<sup>2</sup> 2481 and 2963 (see now J.H. Oliver, 1940), both inscribed on monuments which Kirchner describes as tabulae.

<sup>43</sup>Oliver (1940), pp. 302-306; SEG 32,220:

<sup>44</sup>IG II<sup>2</sup> 2132, line 7, dated by Follet, p. 231.

<sup>45</sup>IG II<sup>2</sup> 2049, line 52, dated A.D. 142/3.

<sup>46</sup>IG II<sup>2</sup> 2203. Meritt and Traill, pp. 297-298, no. 416, line 18.

year not far removed.<sup>47</sup> Other members of the family would include Straton's son Attikos, ephebos in 184/5 (IG II<sup>2</sup> 2128, line 50) and three sons of a Straton of a later generation, Attikos, Zosimos and Straton, who were epheboi around 200/1 (IG II<sup>2</sup> 2207, lines 14-16); the first of these was hyposphronistes in 232/3 or 233/4.

Among the other paianistai, Euodos, also called Zosimos (line 38), was an ephebos of Akamantis in 196/7 - 200/1 (IG II<sup>2</sup> 2068, line 31). Diophantos' son (line 40) is probably descended from Diophantos, son of Diophantos, of Sphettos, prytanis in A.D. 167/8<sup>48</sup> and zakoros of Asklepios,<sup>49</sup> who composed a paian to the god and was cured of gout.

Oliver (1936, p. 109) recognized the two generations named Licinius Firmus (lines 28 and 30)<sup>50</sup> as the father and son pyrphoroi and rhetores recalled by an epigram in the Planudean Anthology (322). Licinius Firmus' name occurs in a pair of ephebic catalogues, both probably dateable to around A.D. 177/8.<sup>51</sup>

Ontario, McMaster University

Daniel J. Geagan

---

<sup>47</sup>Meritt and Traill, pp. 310-311, nos. 440-441. See Follet, pp. 98-99 and J.S. Traill, *Hesperia* 47,1978, p. 327 for the date.

<sup>48</sup>Meritt and Traill, pp. 270-271, no. 371, line 11.

<sup>49</sup>IG II<sup>2</sup> 4514.

<sup>50</sup>The Licinii Firmi of Gargettos probably are not to be confused with Firmus of Gargettos, hierophant in the mid-second century. See Clinton, pp. 31-32, and Follet, pp. 253-254.

<sup>51</sup>IG II<sup>2</sup> 2120 and SEG 12,123, both perhaps from the same year according to Follet, p. 229.