

ALAN S. HENRY

MISCELLANEA EPIGRAPHICA

aus: Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik 110 (1996) 301–305

© Dr. Rudolf Habelt GmbH, Bonn

MISCELLANEA EPIGRAPHICA*

The following discussions constitute a *parergon* to a wider-ranging analysis of the so-called ‘hortatory intention’,¹ 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.)²

In his *Addenda* to *The Athenian Agora*, Vol. xv, *Inscriptions: The Athenian Councillors* John Traill publishes *inter alia* a new prytany 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:³

ὅπως ἂν ἐφάμιλλοι ᾦσι] καὶ οἱ ἄλλοι λέγειν
[καὶ πράττειν τὰ ἄριστα τῶι δήμῳ εἰδότη]εσ ὅτι χάριτας ἀξία
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,⁴ 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 most unlikely that the article is absent with πρυτάνεων, an examination of Plate 73 leads me to believe that the letters read by Traill as ΠΠΥ are, in fact, IT followed by traces of Ω and Ν.

I would therefore restore as follows:

* Editor’s note: The following article was published in *ZPE* 108 (1995) 72–76. Due to a most unfortunate combination of mishaps the author’s corrections had gone unnoticed. This is a reprint of this article in corrected form. We would like to offer our sincere apologies.

¹ 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.”

² See also *SEG* 28.52.

³ Although the decree is inscribed stoichedon 27, in the last three lines (28–30) the stoichedon pattern is abandoned altogether.

⁴ Cf. e.g., *I.G.* ii² 847.33–36 (215/14):

ὅπως ἂν
οὖν ἐφάμιλλον εἶ τοῖς φιλοτιμουμένοι[ς]
εἰδόσιν ὅτι χάριτας ἀξία κομιοῦντα[ι ᾦν]
ἂν εὐεργετήσωσιν.

ὅπως ἄν φιλοτιμῶνται] καὶ οἱ ἄλλοι λέγειν
[καὶ πράττειν τὰ ἄριστα τῶι δήμῳ εἰδότη]ε_ς ὅτι χάριτας ἀξίας
ἀπολήψονται παρὰ [τῆς] β[ο]λ[η]ῆ[ς] καὶ τῶν [πρυτάνεων].

Cf. *I.G.* ii² 509.7–11 (*post* 307/6 B.C.)

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

II. *I.G.* ii² 652 = D75 (*paullo post* 286/5 B.C.)⁵

In my epigraphical youth some thirty years ago⁶ 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.⁷ I had not then been aware that the reading on the stone actually *was* the normal ὅπως ἄν οὖν.⁸

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 ὄσιν καὶ οἱ Ἄθηναῖοι]

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 Ἄθηναῖοι is quite unacceptable.⁹ 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.¹⁰

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 φαν[εροὶ ὄσιν καὶ οἱ Ἄθηναῖοι].

Maturity, however, still inclines me to reject this solution, principally because of the unparalleled οἱ Ἄθηναῖοι in such a clause. Given that in line 27 the letters TIM occupy only

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

⁶ See *CQ* 16 (1966) 291–297.

⁷ See art.cit., p.293.

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

⁹ For the evidence see art.cit., pp.295–296.

¹⁰ See Osborne, loc.cit. (note 8 above). (For the verb preceding the subject, unusual in these formulations, cf. *I.G.* ii² 682.64–66 (?259/8):

ὅπως ἄ
ν οὖν φαίνεται 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.

2 stoichoi and the ‘numerous crowding of letters in vv. 35–36’,¹¹ it is more than likely that in 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 βουλὴ καὶ ὁ δῆμος]

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

III. *I.G.* ii² 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.¹² However, as I have recently argued,¹³ 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),¹⁴ it may be that the date can be narrowed down to the first half of the third century B.C.¹⁵

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

[.¹².]· ὅπως [δ’ ἄν οὖν]γ ὑπό[μ]ν[η]μα τῆς ὑπὸ τ ν]
[οὐ δήμου δεδομέ]νης δωρεᾶς ὑπά[ρχ]ηι αὐτῶι

is certainly erroneous.¹⁶

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,¹⁷ introducing the provisions for the publication of the decree, as, e.g., *I.G.* ii² 653.50–52 (285/4):

ὅπως ἄν δὲ καὶ ὑπόμνημα ἦι τῆς οἰκειό-
[τητος κ]αὶ τῶν δωρειῶν τῶν προκτιθεμένων αὐ-
[τῶι πρ]ὸς ταῖς ὑπαρχούσαις, τὸν γραμματέα κτλ.

and *I.G.* ii² 909.19–21. (c. 184 B.C.)¹⁸

¹¹ See Osborne loc.cit. (I note that in *I.G.* Kirchner informs us that in line 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 διοικί[ς]ει.)

¹² Op.cit., vol. II, p. 178.

¹³ 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.

¹⁴ Cf. my remarks in *Owls*, pp. 183–186.

¹⁵ In *SEG* 40.89 the fragment is given the wide dating ‘3rd cent. B.C.’

¹⁶ 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.

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

¹⁸ This text is assigned by Stephen Tracy to the hand (or atelier) of ‘The Cutter of *I.G.* ii² 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.

ὅπως δ' ἄν καὶ ὑπό-
μνημα ὑπάρχει αὐτῷ περὶ τῆς πρὸς τὸν δῆμον εὐνοίας, ἀναγρά-
ψαι κτλ.

The restoration ὅπως [δ' ἄν κα]ῖ in *I.G.* ii² 570 is therefore inescapable. Osborne's claim¹⁹ 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.'²⁰ 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.* ii² 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 εὐ]-
εργετημάτων·

To read ὑπὸ τοῦ]δῆμου γεγενημέ]νης in *I.G.* ii² 570 could be paralleled by *I.G.* ii² 891.17–18 (188/7)

ἵνα δὲ καὶ ὑπόμνημα ὑπάρχει 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:

[.¹².]· ὅπως [δ' ἄν κα]ῖ ὑπό[μ]ν[η]μα τῆς ὑπὸ τοῦ]
[δῆμου γεγενημέ]νης δωρεᾶς ὑπ[ό]ρ[χη] αὐτῷ.

IV. *Hesperia* 32.15–16.14²¹

Woodhead²² retains Meritt's original text of lines 5–8 of this inscription, now dated *c.* 170:²³

ὅπως οὖν ἐφάμ[ιλλον]
[ῆ]ι τοῖς ἑαυτοῦς φιλοτιμουμ]ένοις εἰς τὰς κοι[νὰ]ς

¹⁹ *Op.cit.*, vol. I, p. 189.

²⁰ *Op.cit.*, p. 188.

²¹ See also *SEG* 21.419.

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

²³ 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.

[χρείας παρέχεσθαι εἰδόντι ὅτι χάριτας ἀξία[ς]
[κομιοῦνται ὧν ἂν εὐεργε]τήσων·

However, *ἑαυτούς*, which must be construed with *παρέχεσθαι*, sits somewhat uncomfortably between *τοῖς* and *φιλοτιμουμένοις*, and must surely be wrong. The text indeed appears to be an unsuccessful amalgam of several common – and individually acceptable – elements. Thus, for example, we find in *I.G.* ii² 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.* ii² 847.33–36 (215/14)

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

and *I.G.* ii² 1329.19–22 (175/4)²⁴

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

ὅπως οὖν ἐφά[μιλλον]
[ἦ] ἀπασιν τοῖς φιλοτιμουμ]ένοις εἰς τὰς κοι[νὰ]ς
[χρεῖας εὐεργετεῖν εἰδόντι ὅτι 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 *φιλοτιμείσθαι* εἰς cf. *I.G.* ii² 338.21–24 (333/2):

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

and for *εὐεργετεῖν* used absolutely cf. *I.G.* ii² 786.15–17 (c. 215)²⁵

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

²⁴ Though not a state decree but a document of *orgeones*.

²⁵ The mid-point in the span of activity of ‘The Cutter of *I.G.* ii² 1706’. See Tracy, *op.cit.*, pp. 44–54.