

DAVID WHITEHEAD

THE LAMPADEPHOROI OF AIANTIS AGAIN

aus: Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik 87 (1991) 42–44

© Dr. Rudolf Habelt GmbH, Bonn

## THE LAMPADEPHOROI OF AIANTIS AGAIN

In ZPE 83 (1990) pp.149-182, with plate IV, Dr. N.V. Sekunda proffers a persuasive case for questioning the received interpretation and (thus) restoration of IG II<sup>2</sup> 1250. As conceived by Koehler, with only minor modifications by Hiller and Kirchner, this partially-preserved, mid-fourth-century Attic decree in honour of a gymnasiarch of the Aiantid tribe was passed by the lampadephoroi of the tribe, their names appended. Given the (when seriously contemplated) improbability of lampadephoroi as a decree-enacting body, Sekunda argues that they are mentioned in the document as part of its substance rather than as its source. The decree is, rather, a tribal decree of Aiantis as a whole. Sekunda further suggests, in respect of the two columns of names inscribed below the decree itself, that only the left-hand column (of ten names) lists the lampadephoroi in question, the three names to its right being the name, patronymic and demotic of the honorand.

These are valuable and, in my opinion, convincing observations at the general level to which they are addressed, and Sekunda insists several times that if their basic thrust is accepted he is unconcerned to press the case for his detailed restorations. He would concede, though, the merit of adopting better ones if they can be contrived; and to an extent I believe they can.

Leaving aside the columns of names, Sekunda's proposed text runs as follows:

[Θ            ε            ο            ί.]  
 [Ἔδοξεν τῆι Αἰαντίδι φυλῆι. Ἐπὶ ...c. 12-13... ἄρχοντος.]  
 [Ξε]νοφῶν<sup>1</sup> εἶπεν· ἐ[πειδὴ ἐνίκα τὰ Ἡφαίστια τοῖς λαμπαδη]-  
 [φό]ροις, ἐπαινέ[σαι Ἐπίς(?)τρατον Τρεμπόνος<sup>2</sup> Ῥαμνούσιον]  
 5 [τ]ὸν γυμνασίαρχο[ν καὶ στεφανῶσαι αὐτὸν θαλλοῦ στεφά]-  
 νωι ὅτι ἐστὶν ἀνὴρ [ἀγαθὸς δὲ καὶ φιλότιμος ἀεὶ περὶ τὴν]  
 Αἰαντίδα φυλὴν ε[ὐνοίασ ἔνεκα καὶ ἀρετῆς τῆς πρὸς τοὺς]  
 φοιτῶντας ὅταν οἱ νεανίσκοι γυμνάζωνται. ἀναγράψαι δὲ]  
 τόδε τὸ ψήφισμα εἰς δὲ τὴν στήλην δοῦναι τῶι γυμνασιαρ]-  
 10 χῶντι τοῖς φυλέτ[αις ὅτι ἂν δόξει. ἀναγράψαι δὲ τὰ ὄνομα]-  
 τα τῶν λαμπαδη[φόρων.]

The line numbers are in all instances two higher than those of the Corpus, as a result of Sekunda's postulation of two missing lines above the first one (semi-)preserved on the stone. This, as he explains, is physically feasible and I find no fault with it. Certainly, if his line 3 is restored in the way proposed, a preceding enactment-formula is called for. As

<sup>1</sup> By a slip of transliteration Sekunda (p.162) prints [Χε]νοφῶν.

<sup>2</sup> At pp.162 and (twice) 167 Sekunda prints Τρεμπόνου; the correct genitive - correct within the terms of his own new reading, at any rate - is given on p.163.

regards the nine lines of which parts are extant (and for which I follow Sekunda's numbering here), the lynch-pin is line 5. For this Koehler's original restoration is beyond challenge and provides the guide to the length (44 letters, three of them iotas) of the inscription's non-stoichedon lines. Where difficulties arise is with the five lines which follow it. The surviving portion of line 10 is enigmatic in the extreme and I cannot pretend to improve on Sekunda's endeavours to make sense of it.<sup>3</sup> Lines 6-8 may be another matter. Here I propose the following:

6 ναι ὅτι ἐστὶν ἀνὴρ [ἀγαθὸς καὶ ἐπιμελεῖται τῶν περὶ τὴν]  
 7 Αἰαντίδα φυλὴν κ[αὶ περὶ τοὺς νέους τοὺς εἰς γυμνάσιον]  
 8 φοιτῶντας ὅταν φ[ρουρᾶς (vel φ[υλακῆς) ἀπαλλάττωνται. ἀναγράψαι δὲ]  
 Commentary

(I) Sekunda's ἀνὴρ [ἀγαθὸς δὲ καὶ φιλότιμος ἀεὶ περὶ τὴν] Αἰαντίδα φυλὴν contains the self-confessed filler ἀεὶ. More seriously his δέ, in this context, is simply not Greek (and τε would be unusual in a document of this period). A longer second adjective, to take up the space created by jettisoning δέ and ἀεὶ, is hard to come by, however. It is therefore preferable to assume that ἐστὶν ἀνὴρ [ἀγαθός is a sentiment complete in itself (compare, e.g., IG II<sup>2</sup> 110.13) and that it was followed by another phrase, introduced by καί + another finite verb, which began the elaboration of the honorand's services and qualities. In an ephebic context some cognate of ἐπιμέλεια seems a strong probability;<sup>4</sup> and for ἐπιμελεῖται τῶν περὶ a tribe - perhaps, indeed, Aiantis - compare Hesperia 15 (1946) 189 no.35.

(II) To follow περὶ τὴν] Αἰαντίδα φυλὴν Sekunda devises ε[ὐνοία ἐνεκα καὶ ἀρετῆς τῆς πρὸς τοὺς] φοιτῶντας. This is highly unlikely on several counts, chiefly:

(i) Eunoia as a quality attributed to a member of the decree-enacting body (tribe, deme, polis, or whatever) is not otherwise found before the Lykourgan period.

(ii) Arete as one of a pair of attributes is epigraphically ubiquitous; but it occupies first place in the pairing, not second.

In any event, though, Sekunda's whole approach to line 7 stems from the (undotted!) epsilon which he reads, as the fourteenth and last legible letter, in preference to Kirchner's dotted kappa. This he appreciates as a crucial change and he bases it on personal examination of the stone. In spurning it I cannot, I must emphasize, lay similar claim to autopsy. When, nevertheless, at my recent request, Christian Habicht kindly re-examined the Princeton squeeze he found that the traces both negative (i.e. the lack of any top or bottom horizontal) and positive decidedly favour the retention of kappa. That in turn prompts κ[αὶ περὶ to introduce, as often in these formulations, a more specific subset of beneficiaries; and for its

<sup>3</sup> That costs are mentioned in lines 9-10 is his crucial assumption; but like him I cannot see a way of avoiding it.

<sup>4</sup> See (e.g.) ?Aristot. Ath.Pol. 42.2, Dinarch. Phil.15, and, amongst plentiful honorific decrees, IG II<sup>2</sup> 665, 1159, 1189, SEG 23.78; cf. D.M.Lewis, CR 23 (1973) 256.

precise wording I have adapted an idea, suggested to me by Professor Habicht,<sup>5</sup> which understands φοιτῶνταϛ not (with Sekunda) absolutely but as dependent upon both an antecedent noun and an indication of location.

(III) Such a version of line 7 obviously arrogates to that line the explanatory function of Sekunda's line 8, ὅταν οἱ νεανίσκοι γυμνάζωται. More important, his reading, autoptic or not, must again be questioned. As Professor Habicht informs me, and as Sekunda's photograph only corroborates, the curved left-hand extremity of the fourteenth letter in line 8 is too small to be part of omicron. The letter is (dotted) φ. Thus, unless the thrust of my line 7 is altogether misdirected, the Aiantid νέοι have been frequenting the gymnasium ὅταν φ[.....c.19-20..... Formulaic phraseology offers no help here, but what I have suggested seems reasonable *exempli gratia*. Compare broadly Hdt.2.30.3 (τοῦϛ... Αἰγυπτίουϛ...ἀπέλυε οὐδεὶϛ τῆϛ φρουρῆϛ) and Aristoph.Ach.251 (στρατιᾶϛ ἀπαλλαχθέντα).

University of Manchester

David Whitehead

---

<sup>5</sup> His version had εἰς τὸ γυμνάσιον, which perhaps makes the line uncomfortably long. For the absence of an article cf. (e.g.) Plato Gorgias 456D, εἰς παλαιότεραν φοιτήσαϛ; Demosth. 39.23, εἰς Ἴπποθώντιδ' ἐφοῖτα φυλήν.