

JOHN S. TRAILL

Comments on Several New Inscriptions from the Athenian Agora and Panakton

This article is dedicated to the memory of David Jordan, a friend of more than a half century, who devoted a significant part of his academic career to the study of inscriptions on lead curse tablets found in the Agora Excavations, studies he subsequently published in *Hesperia*. Several new Agora inscriptions from recent issues of *Hesperia* invite epigraphical and prosopographical commentary which I supply in the following notes. Some of this material, in abbreviated form, has been included in *Persons of Ancient Athens* Vol. 23, *Addenda and Corrigenda* III, published in May 2021.¹

The article *Recent Excavations in the Athenian Agora, 2013-2019* in *Hesperia* 89 (2020) 593-657 by John McK. Camp and Brian Martens contains several new inscriptions, 632-644.

1. One of them is a shield monument reused as a cover slab over the north channel of the Eridanos River and bears the text Πυρραλεὺς | Πύρρου | Γαργήττιος, 632 (= Agora I 7666). The lettering, especially the lower curving bar of alpha, suggests a date around the middle of the third century BCE. The patronym is a common Attic name having 76 occurrences, and an additional 3 with single rho, in *PAA*, though none is attested in Gargettos. The name Pyrraleus, in contrast, is extremely rare having hitherto a single attestation in Attic prosopography (*PAA* 796125), a comic actor who was victorious at the Lenaia around 300 BCE (*IG* II² 2325.203, in which the first letter of Pyrraleus has been restored = Stefanos 2183). The extreme rarity of the name combined with the relative dates of the two inscriptions suggests that the two references refer to the same individual.

2. In the same article, 642, the authors present a provisional text of a fragment of a list of prytaneis from the phyle Leontis (= Agora I 7650). The date may be 335/4 if the name of the archon Euainetos, indicated by the letters [...]Θ[...]ΑΙΝΕΤΟΥ[- -] can be restored in the first line of the heading. The reading, however, of theta 4 letters in front of alpha, if correct, is an obstacle to restoring the normal formula [ἐπὶ Εὐ]αίνετου [ἀρχοντος]. The preserved text is from the left column of what was very probably a normal three-column prytany roster.

3. Immediately under the two-line heading appear the demotic of Phrearrhoi (Φρέαρροι) and 8 lines of names, the first 3 with enough text to show that patronyms were supplied. The first name, Themistokles son of Polyarchos, is the most important of the names listed here. He, now *PAA* 502627 *add.*, belongs to the renowned family of Themistokles son of Neokles of Phrearrhoi treated in Davies' *APF* 6669. The father, Polyarchos, *PAA* 777643 *add.*, who throws light on a long-standing problem in

1. For help in the formatting of this article for *Γραμματεῖον* I am grateful to my colleague of many years on the ATHENIANS Project, Philippa Matheson.

the stemma of this famous Athenian family, is a welcome addition to Attic prosopography. Pausanias 1, 37.1 speaks of a tomb of Θεμιστοκλῆς Πολιάρχου, τρίτος ἀπόγονος Θεμιστοκλέους τοῦ Ξέρξηι καὶ Μήδοις ἐναντία ναυμαχήσαντος, a reference which has hitherto been the sole evidence for a son of the famous Themistokles named Poliarchos whose very existence had been questioned by scholars (see discussion in *APF* 6669 VI 218). Because of this homonymous descendant we now have confirmatory evidence for a Polyarchos son of Themistokles (I) and can correct the orthography in the text of Pausanias from iota (Poliarchos) to upsilon (Polyarchos). The old entry of *PAA* 776905 should now be emended as recorded in *PAA* 23, 416-417.

4. The line following Themistokles Polyarchou has been read and restored as [Δημ]όστρατος Ἄτο[...]. Although the names Nikostratos (*PAA* 718825, dated II *a.*) and Philostratos (*PAA* 944120, dated 117/6) are attested in Phrearrhioi, and there are a dozen other names that might be restored which are not attested in this deme, the most likely restoration is Demonstratos because of the possible identification with the father of a person manumitted *c.* 320 *a.* (*PAA* 319740). The patronym reading of ΑΤΟ- is unlikely, as no Attic name commences in those letters. In contrast, many common names begin with the letters ΑΠΟ-.

5. In line 6 ([Κόρ]οιβος Θρασχ[...]) Stroibos might also be restored instead of Koroibos, but the latter is more common in Attic prosopography by a ratio of 10 to 4. For the patronym there is no Attic name commencing in ΘΡΑΣΧ-, but there are many beginning with ΘΡΑΣΥ- including a Thrasykles Phrearrhios who was an epebe 328-322 *a.* (*PAA* 319740).

6. Finally, in line 9 [?]ΟΣΡΕΙΔ- is an unattested sequence of letters for an Attic name, with the rho the letter most out of context. Common Attic names like Poseidippos and Poseidonios would fit the preserved letters and spacing without the rho.

In the article *Inscriptions From Panakton* in a subsequent issue of *Hesperia* 90 (2021) 281-337 Mark Munn has published 6 important inscriptions discovered at Panakton in an extremely well researched and documented article. The second of the new texts, 294-313, Dedication to the Dioskouroi by the epebes of Hippothontis, offers a tantalizing problem in the restoration of the heading which is essential for the dating of the document.

Here are the 2 lines of the heading from 295:

[Ἴπποθω]ντίδος [ἔφηβοι οἱ ἐπί] Κ[- -10-11- -]
[ἄρχο]ντος Δι<δ>ς ὅ Κ[ο]ύροις ἀ[νέ]θε[σαν]

In the photograph and the careful drawing on 296 the final sigma of the first word in line 1 appears about a half letter-space to the right of the final sigma of the second word in line 2, and the partially preserved kappa in line 1 appears directly over the theta in line 2. Between the sigma and kappa in line 1 in the restoration given here there are 11 letters, 3 of which are iotas. In the space between the sigma and theta in line 2 we count a half space for the relative position of sigma compared with the sigma above, then an unscripted space, then 10 letters including 1 iota before we reach the theta just mentioned. Sterling Dow in his *Introduction to Writing* graduate course in Greek epigraphy, taught us in calculating spacing in non-stoichedon inscriptions to count iota as a half-letter. An examination of the photograph and drawing on 296 shows that this rule was observed by the cutter of Panakton 1991-350; iota throughout occupies a half letter-space. With this observation in mind the space in line

1 between the sigma and kappa, calculating 3 iotas as half spaces in the restoration, comprises a total of 9 and a half full letter-spaces. The spacing in line 2 between sigma and theta, allowing for a half space for the single iota in *Kouros* totals 11 full letter-spaces. Obviously, by this calculation the restoration in line 1 is a letter and a half too short, and the partially preserved kappa (or chi) will not be the first letter of an archon's name, but the third letter with one of the first two restored letters an iota. Accordingly, the archon will not be Ktesikles 334/3, Kephisophon 329/8, or Kephisodoros 323/2, as proposed on 306-310, but rather Nikokrates 333/2² or Niketes 332/1. The latter is preferable to the former on the grounds that the kosmetes in the archonship of Nikokrates was a man from Acharnai (*PAA* 114280, with reference to O. W. Reinmuth, *The Ephebic Inscriptions of the Fourth Century B.C.*, Leiden 1971, 21, no. 8.11 and 26, no. 9.13) whereas the kosmetes in the Panakton ephebic dedication, Ktesikles, belongs to the deme of Kopros (295, Wreath 3). The archon Niketes, accordingly, should be restored in line 1 as follows:

[ἵπποθω]ντῖδος [ἔφηβοι οἱ ἐπὶ Νι]κ[ήτου]

It may be noted in the restoration proposed here line 2 terminated directly below line 1 and both finished a number of letter-spaces short of what would be the maximum possible length of the line permitted by the calculated width of the stone and assumed for line 1 by the *editor princeps* of the inscription. One can only speculate the reason for such a disposition of text. It may be the decision of the letter-cutter not to divide the word APXONTOS, which was too long by one or two letters for the space at the end of line 1 and required placement of those letters awkwardly at the beginning of the second line, but instead to leave the end of line 1 blank and inscribe the whole word APXONTOS at the beginning of line 2. An accompanying decision to create two lines of exactly equal length may have prompted the letter-cutter to leave the vacant space between ΔΙΟΣ and ΚΟΥΡΟΣ near the middle of line 2.

In conclusion, it is useful to have the precise date of 332/1 for this inscription.

2. In *Hyperboreus* 22 (2016) 265 note 10 S. V. Tracy rejected the attribution of a preliminary text of this inscription to the year of Nikokrates, but offered no alternative.