

ALAN S. HENRY

MISCELLANEA EPIGRAPHICA

aus: Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik 108 (1995) 72–76

© Dr. Rudolf Habelt GmbH, Bonn

## MISCELLANEA EPIGRAPHICA

The following discussions constitute a *parergon* to a wider-ranging analysis of the so-called 'hortatory intention',<sup>1</sup> which I hope to publish in due course. They all demonstrate the importance in the sphere of restoration of a thorough knowledge not only of the variety of formulations exhibited by Athenian inscriptions but also of the basics of Greek itself.

I. *Hesperia* 47.274/5.5 (c. 333 B.C.)<sup>2</sup>

In his *Addenda* to *The Athenian Agora*, Vol. xv, *Inscriptions: The Athenian Councillors* John Traill publishes *inter alia* a new prytani decree and catalogue of the tribe Leontis. The provisions for the publication of the decree conclude with an incitement to others to emulate the treasurer here honoured because he does and says what is best for the People. The relevant lines (vv.29-30) are restored by Traill as follows:<sup>3</sup>

ὅπως ἂν ἐφάμιλλοι ᾧσι] καὶ οἱ ἄλλοι λέγειν  
[καὶ πράττειν τὰ ἄριστα τῶι δήμῳ εἰδότη]εσ ὅτι χάριτασ ἀξίασ  
ἀπολήψονται παρὰ [τῆσ] βρο[υ]λ[ῆ]σ κα(ῖ) πρυ[τάνεων]

This restoration is, however, certainly incorrect. Although ἐφάμιλλον ἦι + infinitive - "in order that it may be an object of contention to ...." - is frequently encountered,<sup>4</sup> the personal use of ἐφάμιλλοσ + infinitive in the sense "engage in rivalry to do ..." does not occur. The *mot juste* for this type of encouragement is φιλοτιμῶνται, and this must be substituted here.

In line 30, where it is unlikely that the article is absent with πρυτάνεων, an examination of Plate 73 leads me to believe that the letters read by Traill as ΠΡΥ are, in fact, IT followed by traces of Ω and Ν.

I would therefore restore as follows:

ὅπως ἂν φιλοτιμῶνται] καὶ οἱ ἄλλοι λέγειν  
[καὶ πράττειν τὰ ἄριστα τῶι δήμῳ εἰδότη]εσ ὅτι χάριτασ ἀξίασ  
ἀπολήψονται παρὰ [τῆσ] βρο[υ]λ[ῆ]σ καὶ τῶν [πρυτάνεων].

<sup>1</sup> As in so many other respects I am indebted to Geoffrey Woodhead for the felicitous coinage of the expression 'hortatory intention' to cover, as he puts it in his forthcoming volume of *The Athenian Agora: vol. xvi The Decrees*, formulae "indicating the wider purpose of the inscription in the general sense of encouraging others to emulate the honorand or to publicize the community's readiness to show gratitude to those who serve it well."

<sup>2</sup> See also *SEG* 28.52.

<sup>3</sup> Although the decree is inscribed stoichedon 27, in the last three lines (28-30) the stoichedon pattern is abandoned altogether.

<sup>4</sup> Cf. e.g., *I.G.* ii<sup>2</sup> 847.33-36 (215/14):

ὅπως ἂν  
οὖν ἐφάμιλλον εἶ τοῖσ φιλοτιμουμένοι[σ]  
εἰδόσιν ὅτι χάριτασ ἀξίασ κομιοῦντα[ι ὦν]  
ἂν εὐεργετήσων.

Cf. *I.G.* ii<sup>2</sup> 509.7-11 (*post* 307/6 B.C.)

ὅπως ἄν κα[ὶ οἱ ἄλλοι ἅπαντες]  
 φιλοτιμῶνται ἄρχειν κατὰ τοῦ[τ νόμους καὶ ὑπὲρ τῆς]  
 δημοκρατίας ἐθέλωσι πάντα π]ράττειν εἰδότες ὅτι  
 χάριτας ἀπολήψονται παρὰ τ[οῦ δήμου ἀξίας τῶν εὐ]-  
 εργετημάτων·

II. *I.G.* ii<sup>2</sup> 652 = D75 (*paullo post* 286/5 B.C.)<sup>5</sup>

In my epigraphical youth some thirty years ago<sup>6</sup> I sought *inter alia* to explain away as a mason's error the unparalleled word-order ὅπως οὖν ἄν in line 14 of the decree in favour of Aischron son of Proxenos of Delphi.<sup>7</sup> I had not then been aware that the reading on the stone actually *was* the normal ὅπως ἄν οὖν.<sup>8</sup>

More significantly, I also cast doubt on Koehler's restoration of the continuation of line 14, as printed by Kirchner in *I.G.*:

φ[ανεροὶ ὦσιν καὶ οἱ Ἀθηναῖοι]

For not only is the overall formulation unparalleled in this far from uncommon advertisement of the Athenian People's propensity to honour 'the good', but, in particular, the 'article with Ἀθηναῖοι is quite unacceptable.<sup>9</sup> Hence I ventured an alternative restoration along the lines φ[αίνονται καὶ ἡ βουλή καὶ ὁ δῆμος], although I now realise, *grâce à* Osborne, that Wilhelm had already anticipated me.<sup>10</sup>

Osborne, however, claims that this suggestion is impossible, since the top of a left upright stroke can be read in stoichos 17, just before the stone breaks off. The text which he prints, therefore, is essentially identical to that offered in *I.G.*, except that he also reads the alpha between the phi and the nu: thus

ὅπως ἄν οὖν φαγ[εροὶ ὦσιν καὶ οἱ Ἀθηναῖοι].

Maturity, however, still inclines me to reject this solution, principally because of the unparalleled οἱ Ἀθηναῖοι in such a clause. Given that in line 27 the letters TIM occupy only 2 stoichoi and the 'numerous crowding of letters in vv. 35-36'<sup>11</sup> it is more than likely that in

<sup>5</sup> The reference is to M.J.Osborne, *Naturalization in Athens*, Brussels: Paleis der Academien, vols. I (1981) and II (1982).

<sup>6</sup> See *CQ* 16 (1966) 291-297.

<sup>7</sup> See art.cit., p.293.

<sup>8</sup> *Lapidem non videram*. See now Osborne, op.cit., vol. I, p.163 (note on line 14).

<sup>9</sup> For the evidence see art.cit., pp.295-296.

<sup>10</sup> See Osborne, loc.cit. (note 8 above). (For the verb preceding the subject, unusual in these formulations, cf. *I.G.* ii<sup>2</sup> 682 64-66 (?259/8):

ὅπως ἄ  
 ν οὖν φαίνηται καὶ ὁ δῆμος τιμῶν τοὺς ἀγαθοὺς  
 ἄνδρας καὶ ἀξίους μνήμης

For the date of this inscription see my article in *Chiron* 22 (1992) 27-33.

<sup>11</sup> See Osborne loc.cit. (I note that in *I.G.* Kirchner informs us that in lines 35 ΠΟ (in ἀκροπόλει) and ΕΙ (in εἰ[ς]) are inscribed in 1 space, whereas Osborne appears to indicate the letters ΛΕΙ of ἀκροπόλει as 3 in 2 spaces. Neither does Osborne say anything of the apparent crowding in τῆι διοικη[σει].)

line 14 the 'top of a left upright stroke' is, in fact, the top of iota, not nu, cut to the left of the stoichos to allow it to be squeezed up with the following nu.

So read line 14 as follows:

λεία· ὅπως ἄν οὖν φαί[νωνται καὶ ἡ βουλή καὶ ὁ δῆμος[

This produces both a satisfactory text and an acceptable line of stoichedon 40.

### III. *I.G.* ii<sup>2</sup> 570 = D89

Osborne assigned this fragment to the period 262-229 B.C. on the basis of the 'presence' of the Single Officer and the absence of the *dokimasia* from the elements of the citizenship grant.<sup>12</sup> However, as I have recently argued,<sup>13</sup> the irregularities in the cutting of this basically stoichedon 38 text leave open the possibility of the restoration of the Plural Board. On the other hand, given that in the referral formula ἐπιούσαν (8 letters) is much less likely to be accommodated in the space available in line 8 than πρώτην (6 letters),<sup>14</sup> it may be that the date can be narrowed down to the first half of the third century B.C.<sup>15</sup>

However that may be, the restoration of lines 10-11

[...12.....]· ὅπως [δ' ἄν οὖν] ὑπό[μ]ν[η]μα τῆς ὑπὸ τ ν]

[οὖ δῆμου δεδομέ]νης δωρεᾶς ὑπά[ρχ]ηι αὐτῶι

is certainly erroneous.<sup>16</sup>

Manifestly, we do not want both δέ and οὖν. Nor is there any justification here for a resumptive οὖν; what is required is merely a connecting δέ,<sup>17</sup> introducing the provisions for the publication of the decree, as, e.g., *I.G.* ii<sup>2</sup> 653.50-52 (285/4):

ὅπως ἄν δέ καὶ ὑπόμνημα ἦι τῆς οἰκειό-

[τητος κ]αὶ τῶν δωρειῶν τῶν προκτιθεμένων αὐ-

[τῶι πρ]ὸς ταῖς ὑπαρχούσαις, τὸν γραμματέα κτλ.

and *I.G.* ii<sup>2</sup> 909.19-21. (c. 184 B.C.)<sup>18</sup>

ὅπως δ' ἄν καὶ ὑπό-

μνημα ὑπάρχει αὐτῶι περὶ τῆς πρὸς τὸν δῆμον εὐνοίας, ἀναγρά-  
ψαι κτλ.

<sup>12</sup> *Op.cit.*, vol. II, p. 178.

<sup>13</sup> In *Owls to Athens. Essays on Classical Subjects Presented to Sir Kenneth Dover*, ed. E.M.Craik, Oxford, 1990, p. 182. Cf. *SEG* 40.87 and 89.

<sup>14</sup> Cf. my remarks in *Owls*, pp. 183-186.

<sup>15</sup> In *SEG* 40.89 the fragment is given the wide dating '3rd cent. B.C.'

<sup>16</sup> I cite the text from the revised layout as given by Osborne in D89 (*op.cit.*, vol. I, pp. 188-189). ὑπά[ρχ]ηι is there wrongly accented.

<sup>17</sup> As is always the case when the ὑπόμνημα clause introduces the provisions for the publication of a decree.

<sup>18</sup> This text is assigned by Stephen Tracy to the hand (or *atelier*) of 'The Cutter of *I.G.* ii<sup>2</sup> 897', whose span of activity occupies the years 189/8 to 178/7. I have selected c. 184 B.C. merely as the mid-point of this range. See Stephen V.Tracy, *Attic Letter-Cutters of 229 to 86 B.C.*, UCP, 1990, p. 115, and cf. Osborne, *op.cit.*, vol. III (1983), p. 105.

The restoration ὅπως [δ' ἄν κα]ῖ in *I.G.* ii<sup>2</sup> 570 is therefore inescapable. Osborne's claim<sup>19</sup> that in stoichos 22 of line 10 'the diagonal cross stroke of the *nu* is visible' must be set against his own description of the state of the surface of the stone: 'the stone is very badly worn indeed, and the letters can only be made out with great difficulty.'<sup>20</sup> I suspect - not too uncharitably, I hope - that the original error in *I.G.*, οὖν, led Osborne to 'see' a trace of the desired letter.

There is the further problem of the unlikely *vacat* posited at the end of line 10 in order to bring the stoichedon tally up to 38. παρά, instead of ὑπό, would remedy the situation - and be grammatically feasible - but παρὰ τοῦ δήμου normally means 'from the people' in expressions of similar kind: cf. e.g., *I.G.* ii<sup>2</sup> 509.7-11 (*post* 307/6)

ὅπως ἄν κα[ῖ οἱ ἄλλοι ἅπαντες]  
φιλοτιμῶνται ἄρχειν κατὰ τοῦ[ς νόμους καὶ ὑπὲρ τῆς]  
δημοκρατίας ἐθέλωσι πάντα π[ράττειν εἰδότες ὅτι]  
χάριτας ἀπολήψονται παρὰ τ[οῦ δήμου ἀξία τῶν εὖ]-  
εργετημάτων·

To read ὑπὸ τοῦ]δήμου γεγενημέ]νης in *I.G.* ii<sup>2</sup> 570 could be paralleled by *I.G.* ii<sup>2</sup> 891.17-18 (188/7)

ἵνα δὲ καὶ ὑπόμνημα ὑπάρχηι τῶν γε{γε}γονότων  
[αὐτῶι ὑπὸ τοῦ δήμου φιλανθρώπων

but this would increase line 10 to 39 letters without offering the possibility within the restored section of combining two letters in one stoichos.

But, alternatively, could the iota and upsilon of κα]ῖ ὑπό[ have been squeezed together? If such a possibility can be entertained then one might venture the following restoration:

[ . . . . . ]· ὅπως [δ' ἄν κα]ῖ ὑπό[μ]ν[η]μα τῆς ὑπὸ τοῦ]  
[δήμου γεγενημέ]νης δωρεᾶς ὑπ[ά]ρχηι αὐτῶι.

#### IV. *Hesperia* 32.15-16.14<sup>21</sup>

Woodhead<sup>22</sup> retains Meritt's original text of lines 5-8 of this inscription, now dated *c.* 170:<sup>23</sup>

ὅ]πως οὖν ἐφάμ[ιλλον]  
[ῆ]ι τοῖς ἑαυτοῦς φιλοτιμουμ]ένοις εἰς τὰς κοι[νὰ]ς  
[χ]ρεῖας παρέχεσθαι εἰδόσιν ὅ]τι χάριτας ἀξία[ς]  
[κομιοῦνται ὧν ἄν εὐεργε]τήσωσιν·

However, ἑαυτός, which must be constructed with παρέχεσθαι, sits somewhat uncomfortably between τοῖς and φιλοτιμουμένοις, and must surely be wrong. The text indeed

<sup>19</sup> *Op.cit.*, vol. I, p. 189

<sup>20</sup> *Op.cit.*, p. 188.

<sup>21</sup> See also *SEG* 21.419.

<sup>22</sup> *The Athenian Agora: vol. xvi* (see note 1 above) no. 285.

<sup>23</sup> The mid-point in the span of activity of "The Cutter of I 247", to whose considerable *oeuvre* our text (with its inventory no. Ag. I 6843) is assigned by Stephen Tracy: see *Attic Letter Cutters of 229 to 86 B.C.*, pp. 99-109.

appears to be an unsuccessful amalgam of several common - and individually acceptable - elements. Thus, for example, we find in *I.G.* ii<sup>2</sup> 641.23-25 (299/8)

ὅπως ἂν ὡς πλείστοι φιλο-  
τιμῶνται χρεῖαν παρέχεσθαι ἐ-  
[π]ὶ τὰ συνφέροντα τῷ δήμῳ·

and Meritt himself cited *I.G.* ii<sup>2</sup> 847.33-36 (215/14)

ὅπως ἂν  
οὖν ἐφάμιλλον εἰ τοῖς φιλοτιμουμένοι[ς]  
εἰδόντι ὅτι χάριτας ἀξίας κομιοῦντα[ι ὧν]  
ἂν εὐεργετήσωσιν

and *I.G.* ii<sup>2</sup> 1329.19-22 (175/4)<sup>24</sup>

ἵνα οὖν  
ἐφάμιλλον ἦ τοῖς ἀεὶ φιλοτιμουμένοις, εἰδότες ὅ-  
τι χάριτας ἀξίας κομιοῦνται ὧν ἂν εὐεργετέω-  
σιν

But none of these will quite justify the reconstruction in the text under review.

I suggest that we may better restore along the following lines:

ὅ]πως οὖν ἐφά[μιλλον]  
[ἦ] ἀπασιν τοῖς φιλοτιμουμ]ένοις εἰς τὰς κοι[νὰ]ς  
[χρεῖας εὐεργετεῖν εἰδόντι ὅ]τι κτλ.

"so, in order that it may be an object of contention to all those who show patriotic zeal towards the common needs to do good deeds in the knowledge that..."

For φιλοτιμεῖσθαι εἰς cf. *I.G.* ii<sup>2</sup> 338.21-24 (333/2):

ὅπ-  
ως ἂν καὶ οἱ ἄλλοι οἱ ἀεὶ χειροτονούμενοι ἐ-  
πὶ τὰς κρήνας φιλοτιμῶνται ἕκαστοι εἰς τὸ-  
ν δήμον.

and for εὐεργετεῖν used absolutely cf. *I.G.* ii<sup>2</sup> 786.15-17 (c. 215)<sup>25</sup>

ὅπως ἂν οὖν ἐφάμιλλον εἰ[ς] εὐεργετε[ῖν πᾶσιν εἰδό]-  
σιν ὅτι καὶ ὁ δῆμος, καθάπερ αὐτῷ]ι πάτριόν ἐστιν, ἀπο]-  
δῶκει τὴν προσήκουσαν ἐκάστο[ις χάριν

<sup>24</sup> Though not a state decree but a document of *orgeones*.

<sup>25</sup> The mid-point in the span of activity of 'The Cutter of *I.G.* ii<sup>2</sup> 1706'. See Tracy, *op.cit.*, pp. 44-54.