

FURTHER NOTES ON THE LANGUAGE OF THE PROSE INSCRIPTIONS OF HELLENISTIC ATHENS¹

I. MORPHOLOGY

(i) Declension

(A) τῶν ἱερειῶν: this form occurs in 1298. 13 (247/6).

ἀναγράφειν δὲ (sc. τὰ ὀνόματα) καὶ τῶν ἱερειῶν emended in *IG* to ἱερειῶν, but with the note 'hanc formam doricam defendere studet G. Fraenkel *Glotta* ii. 33'. Fraenkel argues that this form is the product of a conscious effort to avoid confusion and not 'ein blosser Schreibfehler für ἱερειῶν'. He points out that ἱερειῶν would have been pronounced in the same way as the masculine ἱερέων: further that ἱερέων could be written ἱερείων, through intrusive intervocalic iota, and that, by reverse process, ἱερειῶν could be written ἱερεῶν with omission of the intervocalic iota. Thus, in his opinion, ἱερειῶν stands in this inscription to avoid misunderstanding. For a similar replacement of a regular form by one not morphologically justified he compares Latin *deabus*, *filiabus*, where the forms in -is are reserved for the masculine.

Unless one accepts this 'experiment' as the explanation, there is admittedly no alternative but to have recourse to emendation. But the idea certainly did not catch on: cf., for example,

τοῦ ἱεροφάντου καὶ τῶν ἱερειῶν 949. 10 (165/4)

where the confusion—if any—would be the same.

On the other hand, Fraenkel might have bolstered his theory by appealing to other peculiarities of language in this particular inscription. At 1. 9 we find τϵ = 'also', and at 1. 18 the conjunction ἐπάν, of which I have found no other example in inscriptions of this period. Taken in conjunction with these it seems feasible to ascribe the form ἱερειῶν to the originality of the drafter of this Decretum Thiasotarum.

(B) Masculine Proper Nouns of the First Declension in -ias/-eas.² Although there are no peculiarities of inflexion to note here, it may be of interest to analyse in some detail the distribution of the suffixes -ias/-eas (figures in parentheses indicate number of examples):

(1) -ias only: Ἀγαθίας (1), Ἀγασίας (1), Ἀγνίας (4), Αἰνησίας (2), Αἰσχίας (1), Αἰσχρίας (1), Ἀμεινίας (5), Ἀμυνίας (1), Ἀρχίας (12), Αὐσίας (1), Αὐτίας (1), Γλανκίας (11), Γνωσίας (3), Γοργίας (3), Δαμασίας (1), Δεινίας (4), Δεξίας (1), Δορκίας (1), Ἑρμίας (12), Εὐθίας (3), Ἑγησίας (9), Ἑγίας (1), Θασίας (1), Θαυμασίας (1), Ἰππίας (4), Ἰσίας (1), Ἰσμηνίας (1), Καλλίας (33), Κιχησίας (1), Κλεινίας (1), Κτησίας (6), Λαμπρίας (1), Λαυσανίας (1), Λουσανίας (10), Λυσίας (15), Μειδίας (2), Μηνίας (1), Ναννίας (4), Ναυσίας (3), Νικησίας (1), Ξενίας (1), Οὐλίας (1), Οὐρίας (3), Πανσανίας (8), Πανσίας (4), Πλειστίας (2), Πολλίας (1),

¹ This is the fifth in a series of articles on the language of the prose inscriptions of Athens in the period 323–146 B.C. For information on the sources of these articles the reader is asked to consult *C.Q.* n.s. xiv (1964), 240 n. 2 and n. 5. Note that in the examples quoted all references are to *IG* ii²,

unless otherwise indicated. 'S' prefixed to a reference refers to *Supplementum Epigraphicum Graecum*; 'H' to *Hesperia* ('H.S.' = *Hesperia Supplement*).

² Cf. Meisterhans, *Grammatik der attischen Inschriften*³, p. 115.

Πραξίας (1), *Πυρρίας* (7), *Σιμίας* (5), *Σμικρίας* (2), *Σπουδίας* (2), *Στησίας* (2), *Σφοδρίας* (2), *Σωσίας* (5), *Τεισίας* (2), *Τελεσίας* (1), *Φαιδρίας* (3), *Φανίας* (8), *Χαβρίας* (2), *Χαρίας* (17).

(2) -*εας*: *Αινέας* (4), *Ανδρέας* (8), *Αριστέας* (3), *Αστέας* (1), *Δαμέας* (1), *Δημέας* (7), *Δρομέας* (4), *Ἐπαινέας* (1), *Εὐφρέας* (1), *Ζηνέας* (2), *Θρασέας* (1), *Κινέας* (7), *Κωμέας* (3), *Λυκέας* (2), *Ξενέας* (1),¹ *Παιδέας* (1), *Πασέας* (1), *Πρωτέας* (2), *Πυθέας* (5), *Τιμέας* (1), *Φιλέας* (8), *Φιλλέας* (1).

(3) -*ιας* and -*εας*: *Ἀγίας* (5) ~ *Ἀγέας* (2); *Κρατίας* (1) ~ *Κρατέας* (2); *Ματρίας* (2) ~ *Ματρέας* (1); *Μνασίας* (1) ~ *Μνασέας* (1); *Νικίας* (35) ~ *Νικέας* (2); *Πειθίας* (3) ~ *Πειθέας* (1); *Χαιρίας* (1) ~ *Χαιρέας* (7).

It is interesting to look further at those names which show both suffixes in the light of the evidence before 323 B.C. and after 146 B.C.:²

Before 323 B.C.	323-146 B.C.	After 146 B.C.
..	<i>Ἀγίας</i> (5) <i>Ἀγέας</i> (2)	<i>Ἀγίας</i> (1)
..	<i>Κρατίας</i> (1) <i>Κρατέας</i> (2)	..
..	<i>Ματρίας</i> (2) <i>Ματρέας</i> (1)	<i>Ματρέας</i> (1)
..	<i>Μνασίας</i> (1) <i>Μνασέας</i> (1)	<i>Μνασίας</i> (1) <i>Μνασέας</i> (5)
<i>Νικέας</i> (3) otherwise <i>Νικίας</i>	<i>Νικίας</i> (35) <i>Νικέας</i> (2)	always <i>Νικίας</i>
always <i>Πειθίας</i>	<i>Πειθίας</i> (3) <i>Πειθέας</i> (1)	..
<i>Χαιρίας</i> (2) <i>Χαιρέας</i> (3)	<i>Χαιρίας</i> (1) <i>Χαιρέας</i> (7)	<i>Χαιρίας</i> (1) <i>Χαιρέας</i> (3)

Note also that the evidence before 323 B.C. and after 146 B.C. sometimes conflicts with the clear-cut division into -*ιας*/-*εας* shown in the lists given above. There are the following contradictions:

Before 323 B.C.	323-146 B.C.	After 146 B.C.
<i>Ἀνδρίας</i> (1) <i>Ἀνδρέας</i> (1)	<i>Ἀνδρέας</i> (8)	<i>Ἀνδρέας</i> (2)
<i>Αὐτέας</i> (1)	<i>Αὐτίας</i> (1)	..
<i>Καλλέας</i> (4) otherwise <i>Καλλίας</i>	<i>Καλλίας</i> (33)	<i>Καλλίας</i> (8)
<i>Πρωτίας</i> (3) <i>Πρωτέας</i> (2)	<i>Πρωτέας</i> (2)	<i>Πρωτέας</i> (1)
<i>Τιμίας</i> (1)	<i>Τιμέας</i> (1)	..

¹ This is one *Ξενέας* | ἐξ Οἴου 7004 (s. ii). Despite the Aeolic appearance of his name, he appears from his demotic to be Athenian.

Cf. the name *Μεννέας* in *Πάτρων* | *Μεννέου* | *Βερενικίδης* 5889 (s. i).

² Evidence presented in this article per-

(C) Compound Adjectives of the First and Second Declensions. To Meisterhans's list¹ of compound adjectives with a separate feminine form add

χάριτα]ς καταξίας 663. 32 (c. 286/5)
καταξίας χάριτας 1324. 24 (in. s. ii?)

(D) Meisterhans² sets 329 B.C. as the lower limit for the form δυοῖν. But cf.

ἐγ δυοῖν τετραγώνου 1682. 26 (285/4)

(ii) *Conjugation*

(A) Meisterhans³ indicates 300 B.C. as the *terminus post quem* for the augment η to the verbs βούλομαι, δύναμαι, μέλλω. But cf.

ὅτι ἡδύνα|[ντο 387. 14 (319/18)

(B) γέγονα/γεγένημαι:⁴

State:⁵ 36 examples of γέγονα, from 505. 12 (302/1) to H. xvi. 165. 64. 17 (161/0)

2 examples of γεγένημαι, viz.

συ[ν]ήσθη τ[ο]ῖς γεγενημένοις εὐτυχήμασι[ν] 654. 18–19 (285/4)
τὰ]ς γεγενημένας ὑπ' αὐτοῦ πράξ[εις 885. 12 (c. 200)

It should be noted that the active form is always used in the formulas

τὰ μὲν ἀγαθὰ δέχεσθαι ᾧ φασιν γεγονέναι ἐν τοῖς ἱεροῖς
τὰ μὲν ἀγαθὰ δέχεσθαι τὰ γεγονότα ἐν τοῖς ἱεροῖς
ἀπαγγέλλει γεγονέναι τὰ ἱερὰ καλά.

These formulaic examples account for 20 of the 36 examples.

Sub-unit:⁵ 7 examples of γέγονα, e.g.

ἀνὴρ ἀγαθὸς γέγονεν 1261. 30 (301/300)
τισιν τῶν ἀπογεγονότων 1327. 10 (178/7)

1 example of γεγένημαι, viz.

ἐπὶ κληρον ἐκ τῶν νόμων γεγενημένην 1165. 31 (300–250)

Although there appears to be no semantic distinction between the two forms, it may be noted that in the period under examination γεγένημαι occurs only in the participle. Contrast, however,

ἐπειδ[ὴ Πύρρο]ς ἀγαθὸς] γεγένηται 1141. 8–9. U (376/5)

(C) Dual and Plural of Aorist of τίθημι and δίδωμι: A detailed statement of the evidence will demonstrate that, although in the main Meisterhans's

taining to the periods before 323 B.C. and after 146 B.C. is offered merely as a rough point of comparison for the evidence of the Hellenistic period. It was culled from a rapid examination of the relevant epigraphical material, and is in no way to be considered as precise.

¹ Op. cit., p. 148, § 60. 3.

² Ibid., p. 157, § 62. 1.

³ Ibid., p. 169, § 64. 3.

⁴ Cf. ibid., pp. 192–3, 77. 9.

⁵ For the tripartite (state, sub-unit, private) classification of the evidence see C.Q. N.S. xvii (1967), 257 n. 2. (Hereinafter, except where the classification of an example is made clear by a sub-heading, 'state' inscriptions have no sign added to their numbering to denote them; 'sub-unit' inscriptions are denoted by 'U' written between the line number and date; 'private' inscriptions by 'P' in the same position.)

account¹ is correct, his statement 'Von 330–30 v. Chr. begegnen nur Formen mit Kappa' (p. 189) is quite misleading:

State: *τίθημι*: 2 examples without *κ*, viz.

<i>ἀ[νέ]θεσαν</i>	1485. 8–9 (307/6)
<i>ἀνέθεσαν</i>	1489. 16 (fin. s. iv)

3 examples with *κ*, viz.

<i>ἀνέθηκαν</i>	3424. 13 (fin. s. iv); 1534. B. 170 (247/6)
<i>ἀνέ]θηκαν</i>	H. xiii. 256. 11. 22 (c. 166)

δίδωμι: 8 examples without *κ*, viz.

<i>παρέδομεν</i>	1631. 173 (323/2); 1550. 13 (in. s. iii)
<i>παρέδοσαν</i>	1631. 414 and 416 (323/2)
<i>π]ροσπαρέδοσαν</i>	1472. 11 (321/20)
<i>προσπαρέδοσα[ν</i>	1469. 166 (320/19)
<i>παρέδοσα[ν</i>	1487. 93 (306/5)
<i>ἐ[δ]ομεν</i>	1491. 26 (306/5)

2 examples with *κ*, viz.

<i>ἐπέδωκαν</i>	847. 19 (215/14)
<i>ἔδωκαν</i>	992. 5 (s. ii)

This shows, with one exception, no example of the form without *κ* after the end of the fourth century.

Sub-unit: *τίθημι*: 4 examples without *κ*, viz.

<i>ἀνέθεσαν</i>	2973. 3 (s. iv/iii); S. xvii. 64. 2 (post 307/6); 2977. 1 (251/0?); 2355. 1 (s. iii?)
-----------------	---

9 examples with *κ*, viz.

<i>ἀνέθηκαν</i>	2971. 4 (c. 315/14); 1277. 13 (278/7); 3470. 8 (200–150); 2945. 3 (s. iii/ii); H. ix. 356. 50. 2 (181/0); S. xvii. 66. 6 (172/1); 2864. 1 (162/1); 3473. 9 (med. s. ii)
<i>συνανέθηκαν</i>	1299. 93 (paullo post 236/5)

δίδωμι: 2 examples without *κ*, viz.

<i>ἔδοσαν</i>	1278. 2 (273/2)
<i>ἐπέδοσαν</i>	H. iii. 44. 33. 7 (in. s. iii)

No example with *κ*.

This offers definite evidence for the form without *κ* after the end of the fourth century.

Private: *τίθημι*: 2 examples without *κ*, viz.

<i>[ἀ]νέθεσαν</i>	4442. 8 (post med. s. iii)
<i>ἀνέθεσαν</i>	4685. 1 (s. iii)

¹ Op. cit., pp. 188–9, § 76. 3.

6 examples with κ , viz.

$\alpha\acute{\nu}\epsilon\theta\eta\kappa\alpha\nu$ 4615. 4 (fin. s. iv); 4431. 1 (s. iv/iii); 3856. 2 (post med. s. iii);
3864. 4 (in, s. ii); 3781. 3 (ante med. s. ii); 3869. 4 (med. s. ii)
 $\delta\acute{\iota}\delta\omega\mu\iota$: no example.

Again two possible examples of the form without κ later than 300 B.C.

Thus Meisterhans's statement must be modified to show that, although the form with κ is indeed the *predominant* form in the period to which he refers, it by no means precludes the form without κ .

II. SYNTAX

(i) *The Verbal Aspects*¹

(A) Imperfective and Aorist Aspects:

(1) Relation between Imperfect and Aorist

In a typical preamble of a State Decree we find the following distribution of tenses:

$\eta\iota\ \delta\ \delta\epsilon\iota\nu\alpha\ \epsilon\gamma\gamma\alpha\mu\mu\acute{\alpha}\tau\epsilon\upsilon\epsilon\nu$
 $\tau\omega\nu\ \pi\rho\acute{o}\epsilon\delta\rho\omega\nu\ \epsilon\pi\epsilon\psi\eta\phi\iota\zeta\epsilon\nu\ \delta\ \delta\epsilon\iota\nu\alpha$
 $\epsilon\delta\omicron\zeta\epsilon\nu\ \tau\omega\iota\ \delta\eta\mu\omega\iota$
 $\delta\ \delta\epsilon\iota\nu\alpha\ \epsilon\acute{\iota}\pi\epsilon\nu$

The reason for the Aorist in the last two is quite straightforward, i.e. a single past action, 'it was resolved by the People', 'X. made the proposal'. Equally straightforward is the Imperfect of the first example, 'X. was the secretary'. But what are we to make of $\epsilon\pi\epsilon\psi\eta\phi\iota\zeta\epsilon\nu$? There may be a tentative or inceptive notion behind the Imperfect, but probably we should look for the explanation primarily in the fact that in the earlier preambles this item was in the form $\delta\ \delta\epsilon\iota\nu\alpha\ \epsilon\pi\epsilon\sigma\tau\acute{\alpha}\tau\epsilon\iota$, 'X. was chairman'. So, in this later version, 'of the proedroi X. put the matter to the vote', not only is the action considered but also the office of the agent.

Cf. one of these earlier prescripts: (I.G. i². 94 (418/17))
 $\theta\epsilon\omicron\iota$.

$[\epsilon]\delta\omicron\chi\sigma\epsilon\nu\ \tau\epsilon\iota\ \beta\omicron\lambda\epsilon\iota\ \kappa\alpha\iota\ \tau\omicron\iota\ \delta\acute{\epsilon}\mu\omicron\iota\ \Pi\alpha\nu\delta\iota\omicron\nu\iota\varsigma\ \epsilon\pi\rho\nu\tau\acute{\alpha}\nu\epsilon\upsilon\epsilon,\ \text{A}\rho\iota\sigma\tau\acute{o}\chi\iota[\sigma]\epsilon\nu\omicron\varsigma$
 $\epsilon\gamma\gamma\alpha\mu\mu\acute{\alpha}\tau\epsilon\upsilon\epsilon,\ \text{A}\nu\tau\iota\omicron\chi\acute{\iota}\delta\epsilon\varsigma\ \epsilon\pi\epsilon\sigma\tau\acute{\alpha}\tau\epsilon\iota,\ \text{A}\nu\tau\iota\phi\acute{o}\nu\ \epsilon\rho\chi\epsilon,\ \text{A}\delta\acute{o}\sigma\iota\omega[\varsigma\ \epsilon]\acute{\iota}\pi\epsilon.$

Here we see a list of Imperfects describing the function of their respective subjects. Cf. also the heading of a typical choregic monument, where we find an identical use of the imperfect: e.g. 3079. 1-4 (282/1):

$\delta\ \delta\eta\mu\omicron\varsigma\ \epsilon[\chi\omicron]\rho[\acute{\eta}\gamma]\epsilon\iota,\ \text{N}\iota\kappa\acute{\iota}\alpha\varsigma\ \acute{\eta}\rho\chi\epsilon.$
 $\acute{\alpha}\gamma\omega\nu\omicron\theta\acute{\epsilon}\tau[\eta\varsigma\ \Gamma\Lambda]\alpha\psi\kappa\omega[\nu\ \text{'E}]\tau\epsilon\omicron\kappa\lambda\acute{\epsilon}\omicron\upsilon\varsigma\ \text{A}\iota\theta\alpha\lambda\acute{\iota}\delta\eta\varsigma.$
 $\text{A}\epsilon\omega\nu\tau\iota\varsigma\ [\acute{\alpha}\nu]\delta\rho\omega\nu\ \acute{\epsilon}\nu\acute{\iota}\kappa\alpha,\ \text{'I}\pi\omicron\kappa\kappa\lambda\acute{\eta}\varsigma\ \text{B}\omicron\upsilon\acute{\omega}\tau\iota\omicron\varsigma$
 $\eta\psi\lambda\epsilon\iota,\ \Theta[\epsilon\omicron\delta]\omega\rho\acute{\iota}\delta\eta\varsigma\ \text{B}\omicron\upsilon\acute{\omega}\tau\iota\omicron\varsigma\ \acute{\epsilon}\delta\acute{\iota}\delta\alpha\sigma\kappa\epsilon.$

(2) Relation between Present and Aorist

(a) The Infinitive: the Present and Aorist infinitives do not in themselves mark differences of time, but only differences in the character of the action—except in Indirect Speech, with which I am not here concerned. The Aorist infinitive

¹ Cf. Meisterhans, *op. cit.*, pp. 240-7.

marks the action as occurring, the Present marks the action as not completed, as going on, repeated or attempted.

This distinction is particularly clear in the following formulaic imperatival infinitives:

(i) Aorist: the following imperatival infinitives are always Aorist—with a very few, and easily explainable, exceptions which I note in passing—and refer to a single action: *ἐπαινέσαι, καλέσαι ἐπὶ δεῖπνον, στεφανῶσαι, γράψασθαι φύλης καὶ δήμου καὶ φρατρίας, ἀναγορεύσαι / ἀνειπεῖν, τοὺς δὲ πρυτάνεις δοῦναι περὶ αὐτοῦ τὴν ψῆφον, τοὺς προέδρους . . . προσαγαγεῖν αὐτὸν πρὸς τὸν δῆμον καὶ χρηματίζειν, δοῦναι δὲ αὐτῷ καὶ σίτησιν, καὶ ἄλλο ἀγαθὸν εὐρέσθαι, χειροτονεῖν τὸν δῆμον . . . ἄνδρας, ἀναγράψαι δὲ τόδε τὸ ψήφισμα, καὶ στήσαι ἐν ἀκροπόλει, εἰς δὲ τὴν ἀναγραφὴν τῆς στήλης δοῦναι / μερίσαι.*

Exceptions with Present infinitive:

στεφανοῦν | δὲ καὶ εἰς τὸν ἔπειτα χρόνον κατ' ἐνιαυτὸν καθ' ἐκάστην θυσίαν καὶ ἀναγορεύειν | τὸν στέφανον αὐτῆς τοὺς ἐπιμελητάς.

1314. 18–21. U (213/12)

στεφανοῦν δὲ καὶ εἰς τὸν ἔπειτα χρόνον ταῖς θυσίαις καὶ ἀναγο|ρεύειν τὸν στέφανον αὐτῆς.

1315. 23–5. U (211/10)

These clearly refer to repeated actions and so the Present is employed. Cf. also

*ἀναγράφ|ειν δὲ καὶ τῶν ἐπεισιόντων συνθιασωτῶν | τὰ ὀνόματα ἐπὶ ἀνὰ κατα-
βάλῳσιν τὸ ἐπιβάλλο|[ν] αὐτοῖς τοῦ ὑπάρχοντος ἀργυρίου κατὰ τὸ|[ν] δ[μον]
ἐν τῷ ἐράνῳ.*

1298. 16–20. U (247/6)

(ii) Present: the following are always Present:

γνώμην δὲ ξυμβάλλεσθαι τῆς βουλῆς

Here one might expect the Aorist for the single action of conveying the Council's decision to the People. Presumably the Present is used to indicate the tentative nature of the suggestion.

ὑπάρχειν δ' αὐτῷ καὶ ἔγκτησιν οἰκίας κτλ.

ὑπάρχειν δ' αὐτῷ καὶ τὴν πατρικὴν προξενίαν καὶ τοῖς ἐκγόνοις

Here *ὑπάρχειν* = *εἶναι*, the usual word in expressions of this type. The Infinitive is Present to denote the continuance of the action.

τὰ μὲν ἀγαθὰ δέχεσθαι

There may be a tentative quality about this infinitive, and there may also be the idea behind it that reference is made not only to the formal act of accepting the blessings resulting from the sacrifices but to the resultant state of having or enjoying these blessings.

(iii) Aorist and Present: some expressions use both tenses, but it is clear from the examples that the distinction is between single and repeated or continued action:

*τῆς [δ] ἐπὶ τῇ [σ] ἐως τοῦ [σ] | τεφάνου καὶ τῆς ἀναγορεύσεω[s] | [ἐ]πιμεληθῆναι
τοὺς ἐπὶ τῇ δι[ο] | [ι] κήσει 654. 43–6 (285/4)
τῆς δ] ἐπὶ ἀναγραφῆς ἐπιμεληθῆναι τὸν ταμίαν 1316. 22. U (272/1).*

Contrast:

ἐπιμελεῖσθαι δὲ καὶ τῶν ἐγγόνων τῶν Εὐφρονος [τὴν] | βουλὴν τὴν αἰὲ βουλευούσαν
καὶ τοὺς στρατηγο[ὺς] 448. 74-5 (318/17)
τῆς δὲ ἀναγορεύσεως | τοῦ στεφάνου ἐπιμελεῖσθαι τοὺς ἄρχοντας | τοὺς αἰὲ
καθισταμένους ἐξ ἑκατέρου τοῦ γένους 1235. 18-20. U (c. 248/7)
κατανεῖμαι δ' αὐ[τ]ο[ῖ]ς καὶ θ[έ]αν τὸν ἀρχιτέκτο|να εἰς τὰ Διονύσ[τ]α τὰ
Πειραιῖκά 456. b. 32-3 (307/6)

Contrast:

τὸν δι' ἐ ἀρχιτέκτονα κατανέμειν αὐτοῖς | τὴν θ[έ]αν αἰὲ οὐ ἂν καὶ τοῖς στρατη[γ]οῖς
κατανέμῃται 500. 33-6 (302/1)

And cf.

καὶ δοῦναι αὐτῶι | ἀτέλειαν καὶ νέμει|ν αὐτῶι κρέα ἐν τοῖς | ἱεροῖς οἷς ἂν θύωσ[τ]ιν
1204. 11-15. U (fin. s. iv).

(iv) Examples of non-formulaic¹ imperatival infinitives have the characteristic form of the formulas quoted above and show the same distinction between Present and Aorist:

Aorist:

ἐλέσθα[τ] δὲ καὶ δημόσιον τὸν ἀντι|γραφόμενον 839. 42-3 (221/20)
θῆσαι δὲ τῶι θε|ῶι ἄρεστήριον ἀπὸ πέντε καὶ δέκα δρα|χμῶν ibid. 45-7
καταστῆσαι [δ] ἐ τοὺς ὀργεῶνας ζάκορον τεῖ θεῶι διὰ [βίου] | Μητροδώραν
1328. 39-40. U (175/4)

Present:

δίδοσθαι δὲ αὐτῶι | καὶ πολίτειαν 850. 14-15 (197/6)

The distinction between δοῦναι αὐτῶι ἀτέλειαν above and δίδοσθαι δὲ αὐτῶι καὶ πολίτειαν here must depend on whether the idea of the grant or of the continuing state of ἀτέλεια and πολίτεια is uppermost in the mind of the writer. In this latter example δίδοσθαι equals little more than εἶναι/ὑπάρχειν.

Lastly cf.

τοὺς ἀστυνό|μους τοὺς αἰὲ λαχόντας, ὅταν ᾗ | ἡ πομπὴ τῇ Ἀφροδίτῃ τεῖ
Πανδῆ|μωι, παρασκευάζειν εἰς κάθαρσι|ν | τοῦ ἱεροῦ περιστερεὰν καὶ
περιαλε[ῖ]||[ψα]ι τοὺς βωμοὺς καὶ πιττώσαι τὰς [δ]||[ροφὰς] καὶ λούσαι τὰ ἔδη.
659. 20-6 (283/2)

where we might have expected all the infinitives to be Present, as referring to duties to be performed on various repeated occasions.

(b) The Imperative: there is the same distinction between Present and Aorist:

καὶ δότω εἰς ἀ|ναγραφὴν 556. 10 (c. 305)
στε|φανωσάτω αὐτὸν ὁ δῆμ[ος] ibid. 12
ἀ|ναγραφάτωσαν δὲ καὶ τὸν στέφανον ἐπὶ τοῦ ἀν|αθήματος

Present:

ἐπανακαζόντων | δὲ καὶ τοὺς τὸν [χ]οῦν κατα[βε]βληκότας εἰς τὰς ὁδ[ο]ὺς
ταύτας [ἀ]ναι[ρ]εῖν τ[ρ]όπῳ ὅ|τῳ ἂν ἐπίσταν[τ]αι. 380. 25-8 (320/19)
κα[ῖ] καλεῖται αὐτὸν [ὁ δῆμαρχος ὁ ἀε]|| δημαρχῶν εἰς τὴν [προεδρίαν
1194. 14-15. U (c. 300)

¹ By 'non-formulaic' I mean examples which occur only once.

Cf.

καὶ τὸν ἱερέα τὸν αἰὶ λαχόν|[τ]α καὶ ὄντα ὅταν θύσωσιν οἱ θιασῶτα[ι]|[κ]αὶ
 σπουδᾶς ποιήσωνται, στεφανούτω | ὁ ἱερεὺς Σωτήριχον θαλλοῦ στεφάνωι | καὶ
 ἀνειπάτω 1273. 13-17. U (281/0)

In this example one expects the accusative to be followed by an imperatival infinitive, but the intervening words have caused the construction to shift to an imperative with the subject repeated (in the nominative, of course). There is no distinction between the Present στεφανούτω and the Aorist ἀνειπάτω. The latter is in the Aorist simply because it has no corresponding imperfective aspect.

(c) The Subjunctive:

(i) Final Clauses:

Aorist:

ὅπως ἀ|ν ἡ ἀγορὰ . . . | . . . ὀμαλισθεῖ 380. 8-10 (320/19)

Cf. optative (only ex.)

ἐπραττεν π|ρὸς τε τοὺς στρατηγούς καὶ τὸν δῆ|[μ]ον ὅπως φυλακὴ ἱκανὴ ἔλθοι
 Ἐλευ|[σῖ]νᾶδε 1193. 6-9. U (fin. s. iv)

Present:

ὅπως ἂν καὶ οἱ ἄλλ[οι πάντε]|[ς] φιλοτιμῶνται ποεῖν ἀγ[αθὸν
 H. ix. 345. 44. 40-1 (319/18)

ὅπως ἂν οὖν ὁ δῆμος ἐμ πᾶν|τὶ καιρῶι μεμνημένος φαίνεται
 H. iv. 525. 39. 25-6 (226/5)

ὅπως ἔχωσιν ἀπὸ τῆς προσόδου θύειν τῶι θεῶι
 1325. 23. U (185/4)

Aorist and Present:

ὅπως ἂν διαμένει ὁ δῆμ|ος ἐλεύθερος ὦν καὶ τὸν Πειραιᾶ κομίσσεται καὶ τὰ |
 φρούρια τὴν ταχίστην 657. 34-6 (283/2)

Here διαμένει refers to the continued state of ἐλευθερία, κομίσσεται to the act of recovering Piraeus and the garrison.

ὅπως ἂν δὲ καὶ τὰ Χαλκεῖα θύσωσιν . . . | . . . καὶ ἔχει καλῶς καὶ εὐσεβῶς τῇ
 βουλεῖ καὶ τῶι δήμωι τὰ π[ρὸς τοὺς] | [θεοὺς] 674. 16-18 (273/2)

Here θύσωσιν refers to the act of sacrifice, ἔχει to the continued state of well-being with regard to things divine.

(ii) Indefinite Clauses: here the Aorist subjunctive marks the action as occurring before the action of the principal clause: e.g.

ἐπε[ιδὼ]ν δ' ἐπισκευα|σθεῖ το[ῦ] ἀγορανομ[ί]ο[υ] ἃ ἐνδε|ῖται . . . | . . . , τὰ λο[ι]πὰ
 χρήμ[ατα κατ]α[βᾶ]λλειν α|ὐτοὺς 380. 28 ff. (320/19)
 ὅπως ἂν εἰ πᾶσιν φαν|ερὸν . . . ὅτι <τι>μηθήσονται κατ' ἀξίαν ἕκαστος ὦν ἂν
 εὐεργετή|σει τοὺς θιασώτας 1271. 18-21. U (299/8)
 ὅτι δ' ἂν ἀνάλ|ωμα γένηται λογίσασθαι τεῖ φ[υλ]ῇ 1163. 26-8. U (284/3)

The Present, as usual, marks the action as being repeated or continued : e.g.

ἐπαναγκαζόντων | δὲ καὶ τοὺς τὸν [χ]οῦν κατα[βε]βληκότας ἐ|ς τὰς ὁδ[ο]ὺς
ταύτας [ἀ]ναι[ρ]εῖν τ[ρ]όπῳ ὅ|τωι ἂν ἐπίστων[τα]ι. 380. 25-8 (320/19)
ὅταν δὲ | θύωσιν οἱ ὀργεῶνες τῷ ἥρωι τοῦ Βο|ηδρομιῶνος, παρέχειν Διόγνητον
2499. 24-6. U (306/5)

Expressions of the sort 'wherever/whatever he wishes' are in the Present, presumably because the wish will continue even after it has been implemented : e.g.

εἰκόνα στ|ῆσαι ἑαυτοῦ χαλκῇν ἐφ' ἑ|ππ|ου ἐν ἀγορᾷ ὅπου ἄμ βούλη|ται
450. b. 8-11 (314/13)
τὸ δὲ ἀνάθ|ημα ἀναθεῖναι ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ οὗ ἂν βο|ύληται
1263. 25-7. U (300/299)

There may also be the distinction of 'wanting' as opposed to 'deciding' : cf.

καὶ ἔσ|την|εν ἐν τῷ τεμένει τοῦ Δήμου καὶ τῶν Χαρίτων βουλευθέντο[s] | [καὶ
αὐτοῦ 1236. 5-6. U (ante med. s. ii)

where the Aorist participle carries this latter meaning.

(iii) Conditional Clauses :

1. Conditions referring to the future (protasis ἐάν+subj., apodosis usually future indic.) : e.g.

ἐὰν δέ που δεί|ηται 463. 43 (307/6)
καὶ ἂν τι ἐγ|λείπει, ἀντεμβαλεῖ καὶ παραδώσει | τὸν αὐτὸν ἀριθμόν
2499. 16-18. U (306/5)

Cf.

ἐὰν δέ τις εἰσφορὰ γ|[ι]γνηται ἀπὸ τῶν χωρίων τοῦ τιμῆματος, τοὺς δημότας
ἐ|[ι]σφέρειν 2498. 7-9. U (321/0)
ἐὰν δέ τις | εἰσφορὰ γί|νηται ἀπὸ τοῦ τιμῆματος, | τοῖς ὀργεῶσιν εἶναι.
2499. 37-9. U (306/5)

2. Aorist subjunctive referring to time prior to the main verb : e.g.

ὁ δὴμ[ο]ς ὁ Ἀθηναίων, ἐάν τις εὖ ποιήσει αὐτὸν οὐ μόνον αὐτ[ο]ὺς τοὺς ποιήσαντας
ἀλλὰ καὶ τοὺς τῶν εὐεργετῶν παῖ|δας οἷεται δεῖν τιμᾶν
448. 81-4 (318/17)
ἐ[ἂ]ν δέ τι πτωματίσει μέχρι τοῦ λιθολογῆματ|[ο]ς . . .], παρέξει
463. 47-8 (307/6)

(B) Future Aspect :

(1) Indicative: occurs especially in building contracts, e.g.

καὶ σφηνώσει σφηνὸν 463. 44 (307/6)
[κ]αὶ κεραμώσει Λακων[ι]κ[ῶ]ι κεράμωι
ibid. 69

leases, e.g.

[κ]αὶ σκάψει | τὰς ἀμπέλους δις κατ[ὰ πα]σ[ῶν] τῶν ὥρων· σ|[π]ερεῖ δὲ τῆς
γῆς σίτωι τὴν ἡμίσειαν, τῇ[s] δὲ ἀργοῦ ὅσπρεύσει
1241. 20-4. U (300/299)

final clauses with ὅστις, e.g.

χειροτονήσαι δὲ τὸν δῆ|μον ἥδη τρεῖς ἄνδρας ἐξ Ἀθηναίων οὔτινες | ἐπιμελήσονται
τῆς τε ποιήσεως τῆς εἰκόνης 682. 84-6 (c. 256/5)

(2) Infinitive: occurs after verbs of swearing, promising, undertaking, etc.

ὁμ|νύω . . . |[. . . ἐ]μ[μ]ενεῖν ἐν τεῖ συμμαχίαι 687. 54-5 (265/4)
ἀνεδέξατο καθιεῖν[H. vii. 120. 23. 13 (250/49)
ἀπαγγ[έλ]|λεται . . . | . . . ἄξιον ἑαυτὸν παρέξειν 1299. 14-17 (paullo post 236/5)
ὑπομεμένηκεν τὴν ταμειάν εἰς τὸν |[μ]ε]τὰ ταῦτα χρόνον διεξάξειν καὶ ἐπαν-
[ξ]ήσειν τὴν |[σύν]ο]δον 1326. 37-9. U (176/5)

(3) Participle: can be used to express purpose: e.g.

ἀπέστειλεν τὸν υἱὸν α|υτοῦ Δημήτριον ἐλευθερώσο[ν]τα 498. b. 16-17 (303/2)
ἐξέπεμπε|[ν] τοὺς τε ἐπιλέκτους καὶ τοὺς ἱππεῖς συναγωνιουμέν|[ους] ὑπὲρ τῆς
κοινῆς σωτηρίας 680. 11-13 (249/8)
ἐλέσθα[ι] δὲ καὶ δημόσιον τὸν ἀντι|γραφόμενον 839. 42-3 (221/0)

(C) Perfective Aspect:

(1) Indicative: frequent in ἐπειδή-clauses side by side with the Aorist, both denoting a past action: e.g.

ἐπει|δὴ δὲ οἱ πρυτάνεις τὰς τε θυσίας ἔθυσαν ἀπάσα[s] | ὅσαι καθήκον ἐν τεῖ
πρυτανεῖαι καλῶς καὶ φι|λοτίμως· ἐπιμεμέληνται δὲ καὶ τῆς συνλογῆς | τῆς τε
βουλῆς καὶ τοῦ δήμου καὶ τῶν ἄλλων ἀπά[ν]των ὧν αὐτοῖς προσέταττον κτλ.
H.S. i. 74. 29. 16 ff. (228/7)

Contrast:

ἐπειδὴ δὲ οἱ πρυ[τ]άνεις τὰς τε θυσίας ἔθυσαν ἀπάσας ὅσαι καθήκον ἐν τεῖ
πρυτανεῖαι καλῶς καὶ φιλοτίμως, ἐπεμε|[λή]θησαν δὲ κτλ.
H.S. i. 120. 64. 8 ff. (178/7)

(2) In 1534. A (292/1), among numerous examples of the Aorist ἀνέθηκεν, there is one example of the Perfect, viz.

τύπος ἐμ|πλασιῶι, ἐνι γυ[νῇ] προ]σευχομέ[νῃ], ὃν ἀνατέθηκεν Ἀ[ρ]ιστονίκη
ibid. 76

Presumably simply an error.

(ii) Sepulchral Formulas

I offer here an analysis of the formulas of private sepulchral inscriptions. In *IG* these are divided into four classes, viz. Athenian Citizens, *ισοτελεῖς*, Foreigners, and *Homines Originis Incertae*. While adhering to these divisions to some extent, I propose to examine the formulas employed under two main headings: (1) formulas without χαῖρε or χρηστός; (2) formulas with χαῖρε or χρηστός.¹

¹ In the examples quoted the following abbreviations have been employed: 'Ath' = Athenians; 'Nath' = non-Athenians; 'Iso' = *ισοτελεῖς*. An asterisk placed after a formula indicates that I have found only one

instance of it in the period under examination. It must be stressed, however, that this does not imply that instances do not exist outside that period.

(1) Formulas without *χαῖρε* or *χρηστός*:

TYPE 1: A. son of B. from C.

(a) stock formulation is A. (son) of B. from C., e.g.

Προκλείδης | Φιλοκλέους | Ἀγγελήθην 5238 (fin. s. iii?)
Ἀγάθων | Ἀγάθωνο[s] | Ἀγ[κυρα]ν[ός] 7884 (post 317/16)

Cf.

Κριτόδημος | Κρίτωνος | ἰσοτελής 7871 (s. iii)

(b) almost as common is A. from C., e.g.

15 exx. of Ath. e.g. *Σώστρατος | Ἀλωπεκῆθεν* 5578 (s. iii/ii)

94 exx. of NAth. e.g. *Μνήμων | Ἀνκυρείτης* 7921 (s. iii/ii)

Cf. 7 exx. of Iso. e.g. *Ἀγάθων | ἰσοτελής* 7862 (s. ii)

(c) A. (adopted son) of B. from C., and by birth (son) of D.*

Φιλῖνος | Διοφάντου | Πειραιεύς, | γόνυι δὲ | Ἀριστομένον
 7194 (post fin. s. iv)

(d) A. (son) of B. from C. profession.*

Μηνόδοτος | Ἑστιαίου | Σφήττιος | κωμωιδός 7524 (post fin. s. iv)

(e) A. from C. profession.*

Δη[μέας] | Βουτάδης | παιδαγωγ[γός] S. xvi. 190 (s. iii/ii)

(f) A. from C. from D.*

Μικύλλος | Ἀχαιὸς | ἐξ Αἰγᾶς 8404 (in. s. iii)

Cf. A. (son) of B. from C. from D.*

Θαρριάδας | Φρονήμονος | Κρής Ὀάξιος 9087 (s. iii)

(g) A. (son) of B.: 15 exx., e.g.

Ἀλέξανδρος | Ποσειδίππου 10,627/8 (s. ii)

(h) A. of B. profession (B.'s) son.*

Θράσιππος | Θρασίππου | ἀρτοκόπου | υἱός 11,681 (post fin. s. iv)

(i) A. Very common, e.g.

Ἀγάθων 10,554 (paullo ante 317)

(j) (Tomb) of A.*

Νικάνδρου 12,249 (fin. s. iv)

TYPE 2: X. daughter of Y. from Z.

(a) stock formulation is X. of Y. from Z. daughter. Note that Z. agrees in case with Y. E.g.

Φιλοκράτεια | Ἀγαθοκλέους | Αἰξωνέως | θυγάτηρ 5447 (s. iii/ii)
Χαιρεστράτη | Διονυσίου | Ἀλεξανδρέως | θυγάτηρ 8036 (s. iii/ii)

(b) X. of Y. daughter from Z. Note that Z. agrees with X.

Only 1 ex. of Ath. viz.

[Φ]εῖδυλλα | Φιλίνου θυγάτηρ | Ἀνκυλήθεν 5257 (s. iii)

3 exx. of NAth., e.g.

Ματε[.]α | *῾Οαδαίου* | *θυγάτηρ* | *Δαρδανίς* 8476 (s. ii)

Cf. X. from Z. of Y. daughter.*

Φιλίστα | *Μιλησία* | *Διοδώρου* | *θυγάτηρ* S. xiv. 218 (c. 200)

(c) X. of Y. daughter. 12 exx., e.g.

Ἀρκεσώ | *Καλιστράτου* (sic) | *θυγάτηρ* 10,818 (s. ii)

(d) X. of Y. from Z. daughter, and sister of A. from C.*

Ξεν- - | *Τιμ-* - | *Κο[θωκίδου]* | *θυγ[άτηρ]*, | *ἀδελφ[ῆ δ]᾽* | *Δημοφίλου* | *Κοθωκίδου*
6479 (s. iii)

As in (a) Z. agrees with Y., so here A. agrees with C.

Cf. X. of Y. sister*

Νανὰς | *Κολύζωνος* | *ἀδελφή* 12,228 (s. iii)

(e) X. (daughter) of Y. from Z.

8 exx. of Ath., in which Z. agrees with Y., e.g.

Ἀρχαρέτη | *Νικοδρόμου* | *Εἰρεσίδου* 5994 (s. iii)

91 exx. of NAth., in which Z. agrees with X., e.g.

Ἀσκληπιάς | *Μήνου* | *Ἀγκυρανή* 7894 (post fin. s. iv)

Cf. one ex. of NAth., in which Z. agrees with Y., viz.

Σωτηρίς | *Εὐανγέ<λ>ου* | *Ἀντιοχέως* 8301 (post fin. s. iv)

(f) X. from Z. (daughter) of Y.* Note that Z. agrees with X.

Ζωπύρα | *Κορινθία* | *Ἀλκιμάχου* 9068 (s. ii)

(g) X. (daughter) of Y. from Z. from Za.* Note that Z agrees with X.

Λεοφρονίς | *Ἡροστράτου* | *Μυησία* ἐξ *Ἰωνίας* 9973 (c. 300)

(h) X. (praenomen, nomen) (daughter) of Y. from Z. cognomen.*

Τερτία | *Μαικία* | *Ποπλίου* *Ῥωμαία* | *Διοδώρα* 10,157 (s. ii)

(i) X. (daughter) of Y. 18 exx., e.g.

Ἀρέθουσα | *Ἰωνος* 10,735 (post fin. s. iv)

(j) X. from Z. 72 exx., e.g.

Σώτιον | *Ἀτραμυτηνῆ* 7945 (c. s. ii)

(k) X. profession. Two exx., viz.

Νουμηνίς | *τίτθη* 12,330 (s. iii/ii)
Ξυνέτ[η] | *τίτθη* 12,681 (s. ii)

(l) X. Very common: e.g.

Αἰγυπία 10,596 a (s. iv/iii)

It is clear that in the case of Athenians Z. always agrees with Y., whereas in the case of Foreigners Z. always agrees with X. (with one exception, quoted in (b) above).

TYPE 3: X. wife of Y. from Z.

(a) stock formulation is X. of Y. from Z. wife. Note that Z. always agrees with Y.

31 exx. of Ath., e.g.

Φιλίττιον | Παυσίου | Ἀγρυλέως | γυνή 5295 (in. s. ii)

Two exx. of NAth. viz.

Ῥράκλ[εια] | Τιμοθ[έου] | Ἀγκυ[ρανοῦ] | γυν[ή] 7904 (post fin. s. iv)
Εὐτυχ[ίς] | Μενάνδρου | Κυρηναίου | γυνή 9131 (s. iii)

(b) X. from Z. of Y. wife. Note that Z. agrees with X.

5 exx. of NAth., e.g.

Σωτηρ[ίς] | Αἰνία, | Κεφαλίου[νος] | γυν[ή] 7984 (s. ii)

(c) X. from Z. of Y. from Z. wife.

5 exx. of NAth., e.g.

Ἀρχὼ | Αἰτωλά, | Στράτου | Αἰτωλοῦ | γυνή 7987 (s. ii)

(d) X. of Y. ἰσοτελοῦς wife.* (Cf. (a) above).

Κίτιον | Μένωνος | ἰσοτελοῦ[ς] | γυνή S. XVI. 204 (s. ii)

(e) X. of Y. wife.

15 exx., e.g.

Βοίδιον | Μενεμάχου | γυνή 10,970 (s. iv/iii)

As in Type 2, in the case of Athenians Z. always agrees with Y., while in the case of foreigners Z. usually agrees with X.

TYPE 4: X. daughter of Y. from Z., wife of A. from C.

(a) both 'wife, and 'daughter' expressed:

(i) stock formulation is X. of Y. from Z. daughter, of A. from C. wife. Note that Z. agrees with Y, and compare Type 2(a) and Type 3(a) for the word order.

35 exx. of Ath., e.g.

Ἀντίκλεια | Ἑρμαφίλου | Ἀμαξαντέως | θυγάτηρ, | Ἀλεξάνδρου | Κηττίου |
γυνή 5587 (s. iii/ii)

3 exx. of NAth., e.g.

Δαμοτί[μα] | Νικάρχων[ος] | Ἑλατέως | θυγάτηρ, | Ἀρίστωνος | Ἑλ[α]τέ[ως] |
[γυνή] 8482 (s. ii)

(ii) X. of Y. from Z. wife, of A. from C. daughter.* Note that Z. agrees with Y.

Χρυσίου | Ὀλυμπιόδωρου | Ἀναφλυστιίου | γυνή, | Ὑπεράνθου Ἀχαρνέως |
θυγάτηρ 5685 (in. s. iii)

(iii) X. of Y. daughter, of A. from C. wife.

8 exx. of Ath., e.g.

Δ . . . ὦ | Δαμοξένου | θυγάτηρ, | Ἰθμονίκου | Βερενικίδου | γυνή
5872 (s. ii)

(iv) X. of Y. from Z. daughter, and wife of A. Note that Z. agrees with Y.

2 exx. of Ath., viz.

Χαριτῶ Διογνήτου | Θοραιέως θυγάτηρ, | [γυ]νὴ δὲ Φαιδρίου
6215 (paullo ante 317/16)
Νικομάχη | Τεισάνδρο[v] | Παιανιέω[s] | θυγάτηρ, | γυνή δ[ἐ] | [Ἀ]ριστο-
7074 (s. ii)

(v) X. of Y. from Z. daughter, of A. wife. Note that Z. agrees with Y.

2 exx. of Ath., viz.

Παραμόνα | Ἐπιχάρου | Ἰκαριέως | θυγάτηρ, | Εὐκλείδου | γυνή
6284 (s. iii/ii)
Εὐκολίνη | Ἀριστογείτονος | Ἀφιδναίου θυγάτηρ, | Δικαιογένους γυνή
6569 (fin. s. iv)

2 exx. of NAth., viz.

Ἀπολλωνία | Ἀπολλωνίδου | Αἰγινήτου | θυγάτηρ, | Ἀσκληπιάδου | γυνή
7951 (s. ii)
[Ἀ]ριστόκλεια [Αἰσχυρίω]vos Κορινθίο[v] | [θυ]γάτ[ηρ, Φίλω]vos γυνή
9052. 4-5 (in. s. ii)

(vi) X. of Y. from Z. daughter, wife of A. from C.* Note that Z. agrees with Y.

Ἀριστοκράτεια | Φιλοκύδου | Συβρίδου | θυγάτηρ, | γυνή | Κηφισοδώρου |
Παιανιέως
7474 (s. ii)

(vii) X. from Z. of Y. daughter, of A. wife.* Note that Z. agrees with X.

Σίμων | Αἰγινήτης | Ἑρμαίου | θυγάτηρ, | Ἑρμίππου | γυνή
7966 (post fin. s. iv)

(viii) X. of Y. wife, of A. daughter.*

Ἰσοδίκη: Χάριου | γυνή: Ἑρασίππ[ου] | θυγάτηρ
11,746 (s. iii/ii)

(ix) X. of Y. daughter, wife of A.*

Παρθέν[ιον] | Κερκίωνο[s] | θυγάτηρ[ρ], | γυνή | Χαρύν[ου] 12,417 (fin. s. iv)

In all these examples Z. agrees with Y., except when 'X. from Z.' come together. However, all but two of the examples in which Z. occurs are Athenian.

(b) 'daughter' understood:

(i) X. (daughter) of Y., of A. from C. wife.

4 exx. of Ath., e.g.

Κλεαρίστη | Δημητρίου, | Πεμπτίου | Ἀτηνέως | γυνή
5703 (s. iii)

Only 1 ex. of NAth., viz.

Εὐπορία | Θέσπιδος, | Ἀριστομένου | Λαοδικέως | γυνή 9174 (post fin. s. iv)

(ii) X. (daughter) of Y. from Z., of A. from C. wife. Note that Z. agrees with Y. in the example of Ath., whereas Z. agrees with X. in all the examples of NAth.

Only 1 ex. of Ath., viz.

Κλ[εῶ] | Κλέων{ε}ος | Αἰξωνέως, | Φανοκ<λ>έους | Λευκονοέως | γυνή
5434 (s. iii)

22 exx. of N^{Ath.}, e.g.

Μέθη | Διονυσίου | Ανδρία, | Εὐνόμου | Συπαληττίου | γυνή 8092 (s. ii)

Cf. also:

Παρθένιον | Ἀριστείδου | Λάκαινα, | Φανοκλέους | Εἰτταίου γυνή | ποθεινή
9152 (s. iii)

(iii) X. (daughter) of Y. from Z., of A. (son) of B. from C. wife. Note that Z. agrees with Y. Only two exx., one of Ath., and one of N^{Ath.}:

Ἀριστομάχη Βοιωτοῦ Μελιτέως, | Φόινικος τοῦ Κλεάνδρου Ὁῦθεν γυνή
6831 (fin. s. iv)

Σωσικράτεια | Σωπίωνος | Πλαταιέως, | Φιλίνου | τοῦ Μενεκράτου | Παιανιέως
γυνή 10,097 (s. iii/ii)

(iv) X. (daughter) of Y., and wife of A. from C.*

Ε[ὕπ]ο[ρί]α | -βίου, | γυνή δὲ | Εὐμαρείδου | ἐξ Οἴου 6992 (post fin. s. iv)

(v) X. (daughter) of Y. from Z., of A. wife. Note that Z. agrees with X.
5 exx. of N^{Ath.}, e.g.

Εὐημερίς | Δημητρίου | Ἑρακλεῶτις, | Ἀπολλωνίου | γυνή 8649 (s. iii)

(vi) X. (daughter) of Y., of A. wife.*

Διόνη | Τηλίου, | Νικήτου | γυνή 11,160 (s. ii)

We see that all the Athenian examples have Z. agreeing with Y. Foreigners have Z. agreeing with X., except in the example quoted in (iii).

(c) 'wife' understood:

(i) X. of Y. from Z. daughter and (wife) of A.*

Εὐφαίνα | Ἀπελλικῶντος | ἐξ Οἴου | θυγάτηρ | καὶ Βεβαίου 6993 (s. iii/ii)

(ii) X. (wife) of Y., of A. daughter.*

Γλαῦκον | Πάριδος, | Λυσιμάχου | θυγάτηρ 11,003 (s. iii/ii)

(2) Formulas with χαῖρε or χρηστός:

First Group: Known Foreigners

TYPE 1:

(a) A. (son) of B. from C. χαῖρε.* A. and C. are in the vocative.

Μένανδρε | Μενάνδρου | Ἀμμανῖτα | χαῖρε 8075 (s. ii)

(b) A. (son) of B. from C. χαῖρε. A. and C. are in the nominative.

3 exx., e.g.

Μένης Καλλίου | Ἀργεῖος χαῖρε 8370 (c. fin. s. iv)

(c) A. from C. χαῖρε. 3 exx., e.g.

Ἑρακλείδης | Ἀντιοχεὺς | χαῖρε 8199 (post 317/16)

(d) A. (or A. and B.) from C. χρηστός. Only 2 exx., viz.

Ζωπυρίω[ν]. | Μορφῆς | Θράξ | χρηστός 8917 (s. iii)
Λεύκιος | Ῥωμαῖος | χρηστός 10,155 (c. s. ii)

TYPE 2:

(a) X. from Z. χαίρε.*

Σωτηρίς | Μεσσηνία | χαίρε 9344 (s. iii/ii)

(b) X. (daughter) of Y. from Z. χρηστή χαίρε.* Note that Z. agrees with X.

Φιλονμένη | Διονυσίου | Μιλησία χρησ[τή] | χαίρε 9924 (s. ii)

(c) X. from Z. χρηστή. 4 exx., e.g.

Εὐφροσύνη | Ἀμφιπολίτις | χρηστή 8082 (s. ii)

(d) X. from Z. profession χρηστή.*

Σωπάτρα | Μακέτα | τίτθη | χρηστή 9271 (s. iii)

TYPE 3:

(a) X. from Z. of Y. wife χαίρε.* Note that Z. agrees with X.

Ῥόδιον | Ἡρακλεῶτις, | Κτήσωνος γυνή. | χαίρε 8774 (s. iii/ii)

TYPE 4: no examples.

Second Group: Nationality Unknown

TYPE 1:

(a) A. (son) of B. χαίρε. 4 exx., e.g.

Βρόμιος | Βότρυος | χαίρε 10,984 (s. ii)

(b) A. χαίρε. 4 exx., e.g.

Θεόφιλος | χαίρε 11,666 (s. ii)

(c) A. χρηστός χαίρε.* A. is in the nominative.

Ἀπολλώνιος | χρηστός | χαίρε 10,731 (s. ii)

(d) A. χρηστὲ χαίρε.* A. is in the vocative.

Ἀττικὲ | χρηστὲ | χαίρε 10,902 (s. ii)

(e) A. χρηστός. 20 exx., e.g.

Ἀνδρικός | χρηστός 10,661 (c. s. ii)

(f) A. (son) of B. χρηστός. 4 exx., e.g.

Διονύσιος | Δημητρίου χρηστός 11,182 (s. ii)

TYPE 2:

(a) X. (daughter) of Y. χαίρε.*

Πύθιον | Μάνου | χαίρε 12,550 (s. iii)

(b) X. (daughter) of Y., A. (son) of B. χαίρετε.*

Θεοδότη | Δημητρίο[v], | Θεόφιλος | Μηνοδώρο[v] | χαίρετε 11,632 (s. ii)

(c) X. χαίρε. 3 exx., e.g.

Εὐπορία | χαίρε 11,456 (s. iii/ii)

(d) X. χρηστή χαίρε. Two exx., viz.

Δορκὰς | χρηστή | χαίρε 11,215 (s. ii)

Κτήσιον χρηστή | χαίρε 11,925 (s. ii)

(e) X. (daughter) of Y. *χρηστή*. Two exx., viz.

Μαλθάκη: *Μαγάδιδος* | *χρηστή* 12,026 (fin. s. iv)

Ἀπολλων[ία] | *Μενάνδ[ρου]* | *χρησ]τή* 10,724 (s. ii)

(f) X. *χρηστή*. (Cf. *TYPE 1* (e) of this Second Group above.) 20 exx., e.g.

Ἄδα | *χρηστή* 10,575 (c. s. ii)

(g) X. profession *χρηστή*.*

Πυρρίχη | *τροφός* | *χρηστή* 12,563 (c. fin. s. iv)

(h) X. *χρηστή* good profession.*

Σαννὼ | *χρηστή* | *ἀγαθὴ* | *κυκλίστρια* 12,583 (s. ii)

TYPES 3 and *4*: no examples.

N.B. 1: there are no known-Athenian sepulchral inscriptions which use *χαίρε* or *χρηστός*. Cf. Larfeld's comment:¹ 'Grabschriften mit *χαίρε* (nur von Fremden), nicht vor dem 3. Jh.; der attische Ursprung von iii². 1473² *Δημήτριε Διογένου Ἀθηναίε χαίρε* ist zweifelhaft.' And further:³ 'Niemals findet sich auf Grabsteinen attischer Bürger oder Bürgerinnen das seit etwa dem 3. Jh. ungemein häufige Epitheton *χρηστός*: vgl. Theophr. *Char.* 13: *καὶ προσεπιγράψαι, ὅτι οὗτοι πάντες χρηστοὶ ἦσαν* dagegen bei Fremden.' Cf. also the remark in *IG* 8199: 'Vox *χαίρε* mortuorum nominibus apposita tantummodo peregrinorum propria est. Cf. Gutscher *Att. Grabschriften* 1890, 24.'

2. There are 26 examples of formulas with *χαίρε*. Of these 16 are in the nominative, 2 in the vocative, and the case of the other 8 cannot be determined. The examples in the nominative cover the whole of the period under examination; the two examples in the vocative probably belong to the second century.

Finally, note the following facts concerning the agreement of the demotic and ethnic:

- (i) in *TYPE 1* the demotic and ethnic always agree with the deceased;
- (ii) in *TYPE 2* the demotic always agrees with the deceased's father; the ethnic usually with the deceased, but occasionally with her father;
- (iii) in *TYPE 3* the demotic always agrees with the deceased's husband; the ethnic usually with the deceased, but occasionally with her husband;
- (iv) in *TYPE 4* the same rules hold good as for *TYPES 2* and *3*.

University of New England, Armidale

ALAN S. HENRY

¹ *Handbuch der griechischen Epigraphik*, ii. 856.

² Now *IG* ii². 7861, q.v.

³ *Op. cit.*, p. 857.