

THE FIRST STELE OF THE HEKATOMPEDON INVENTORIES

IN a previous article in this journal I proposed the hypothesis that the First Stele of the Hekatompedon inventories¹ was originally opisthographic. Subsequently, when eleven fragments of this stele were placed in plaster in the Epigraphical Museum,² it became possible to examine its reverse face thoroughly and to see clearly the architectural features of the stone. When a group of epigraphists first looked at the newly reconstructed stele,³ it was not clear whether there had ever been any writing on the reverse. The back of only two fragments can be seen; the other, thinner fragments are immersed in the plaster. The upper fragment, which has been dressed, has traces of several possible letters plus chisel marks at regular intervals, suggesting the bottom of several lines of letters.⁴ On the other hand, the lower fragment, *IG* i. 147-50a, is considerably thicker and rough-picked,⁵ and even the upper fragment has several gouges which may have been caused by a chisel. Thus one might suppose that the upper portion of the stone was originally inscribed and that the lower part was left rough-picked. However, a much more probable solution emerges from a consideration of the re-use of the stone.

Both this stele and one from the parallel series of Pronaos inventories⁶ have clearly been accorded the very same treatment. A mason has removed the original left and right edges and in their place has prepared a simple moulding on each side, which Professor Vanderpool says is Byzantine. This is best seen on the Pronaos stone, where the new edges run perpendicularly to the front face to a depth of 43 mm, then turn outward at 90° for 2 or 3 mm, and finally turn again at an angle of 235-240°. That is, the new edges run first perpendicularly, then parallel, to the front face, before veering away from it.⁷

The very same treatment appears on the left edge of the upper half of the

¹ *CQ* N.S. xvi (1966), 286-90. What I call the front of the stone contains eight inventories, *IG* i². 256-63, for the years 434/3-427/6. The reverse contained, on my hypothesis, the inventories for 426/5-423/2, which are now lost.

² These eleven fragments are *IG* i. 141-4 b-c, *IG* i. 147-50 a-b, *IG* i. supp., pp. 26 and 130, three fragments published by A. M. Woodward, *JHS* xxxi (1911), 35-40, and *SEG* x. 193-4.

³ My colleagues in this examination were Professors Malcolm McGregor, D. W. Bradeen, who had supervised the construction of the stele, and Donald Laing, whose own studies of the re-use of inscriptions first drew my attention to this important facet of epigraphy. They do not necessarily share the views which I finally formed about the nature of this inscription. Professor Eugene Vanderpool examined the mouldings of the stones for me.

⁴ The dimensions of this fragment, *IG* i. supp., p. 130, are *alt.* 0.36 m, *lat.* 0.325 m, *cr.* 0.154 m. This stone preserves the original top of the stele.

⁵ The position of this fragment in the rear face of the stele extends from 0.65 m from the top to 0.88 m from the top. This fragment is 0.15 m wide and 0.175 m thick.

⁶ What I call the front face contains four inventories, *IG* i. 121-4 = *IG* i². 236-9. The reverse face also contains four inventories, *IG* i. 125-8 = *IG* i². 244-7.

⁷ The new edges probably came to points at the plane of the rear face, but they have been blunted in an irregular fashion now. The right-angle cuttings have also been damaged and appear as little more than a raised edge toward the bottom of the stele. For a drawing of a very similar moulding cf. Anastasios K. Orlandos, 'Η *Ενλόστεγος Παλαιοχριστιανική Βασιλική τῆς Μεσογειακῆς Λεκάνης*, ii. 377, n. 8.

Hekatompodon stele.¹ Since the only known fragment from the right edge, *IG* i. 141-4a, cannot now be located,² we cannot actually see the moulding there, but there is virtual proof of its existence. The new cutting removed four letter-spaces plus the margin from the front surface of one side of the Pronaos stone.³ To judge from an apograph of *IG* i. 141-4a, it has been broken or cut uniformly along its right edge, and exactly five letter-spaces have been lost.⁴

It is unlikely that the entire Hekatompodon stele ever bore this moulding, for we should not expect a mason to take the trouble to prepare such a moulding on both sides and still leave part of the back in such a ragged state as we have in *IG* i. 147-50a. Since the text of this fragment begins in line 30 of the stele, and since the moulding appears as far down the stele as line 27,⁵ the division between the finished and unfinished parts of the stone must fall between these two lines. There is also evidence that in fact the stone was split horizontally at about this point. A. M. Woodward long ago identified another fragment of this stele, the text of which also ended in line 27, and discovered that it joined a fragment from the lower half of the stone, *IG* i. supp., p. 26: 'Several cmm. in from the front surface a projection from the lower edge of my fragment with a flat lower surface rested exactly on a corresponding surface on the stone below, though some twelve centimetres of the inscribed face are missing at this point.'⁶ Thus it would appear that a mason broke the stone in two just below line 27 and carved mouldings on both edges of the upper portion.⁷

When prepared for re-use the stones, then, had the following dimensions:

	<i>Hekatompodon</i>	<i>Pronaos</i>
Height ⁸	c. 0.60 m	c. 1.60 m
Thickness of stone	0.154 m	0.156 m
Width of new front face	c. 0.6125 m	0.62 m
New left edge:		
Length of perpendicular edge	0.040 m	0.043 m
Angle of flange	235°	240°
Letter-spaces lost	12 + margin	4 + margin

¹ Here, too, the right-angle cutting is largely worn away, and the point of the moulding has been completely broken off.

² According to Meritt, *AJP* lix (1938), 500-1, the stone was in the Cabinet de Médailles of the Bibliothèque Nationale in 1925, but on my visit in 1968 the authorities could not locate it.

³ Cf. *IG* i², 236.

⁴ The apograph in the *Editio Maior* is based on that of Raoul-Rochette, which Boeckh published as *CIG* 137. As in numerous other fifth-century inventories spaces were left uninscribed at the end of several lines in *IG* i², 256, but lines 1 and 4 certainly contained sixty-seven spaces (cf. *IG* i², p. 303), and the Paris fragment breaks off after the sixty-second space.

⁵ The moulding appears on a fragment containing parts of lines 24-7, which Broneer published in *Hesperia*, ii (1933), 375.

⁶ *JHS* xxxi (1911), 38-9. Unfortunately, there is no record of precisely how far downward the projection extended. Bradeen (*per ep.*) confirms the join but he would describe the surfaces, not as flat, but as 'one a little concave, the other convex'.

⁷ According to Woodward, *JHS* xxxi (1911), 39, there is 'a vertical split practically from the top to the bottom of the original stele, which was clearly made before the horizontal split [just below line 27], for it continues in exactly the same line through both halves of the slab'. This reasoning does not seem cogent to me. Since stones tend to fracture along lines of structural weakness, the vertical breakage may be later than the horizontal, just as my interpretation would require.

⁸ The Pronaos stele was probably not much taller than its present height of 1.59 m.

New right edge:

Length of perpendicular edge	?	0.043 m
Angle of flange	?	235°
Letter-spaces lost	5	10

All these dimensions can be measured with reasonable accuracy except the width of the front face of the Hekatompedon stele, which has to be calculated. The first line of text on this stone originally ran [τάδε παρέδοσαν] *ἡαι τέτταρες ἀρχαί, ἡαὶ [ἐδί]δοσαν τὸν λόγον ἐκ Π[α]ναθηναίων ἐ[ς Πανα-]*,¹ but the mason has cut away *τάδε παρέδοσαν* on the left and *ς Πανα* on the right, leaving forty-nine letters. The horizontal stoichedon pattern here is 0.0125 m, giving us 0.6125 m for the whole.

From the identity of the mouldings and from the size of the stones we can be sure that the two were reworked for the same purpose, perhaps for use in one of the churches on the Acropolis. Surely they were not used in an erect position. More likely they were laid face down.² Possibly they may have been cemented together to form an altar slab,³ some 2.20 m long (1.60 m + 0.60 m) and 0.62 m wide, or they may have been used separately as window-sills.⁴

We can draw some conclusions about the suitability of the original dimensions of the stones for the mason's new purpose. The Pronaos stele was of the correct height and thickness, but the Hekatompedon stele was too thick and too long. Thus he probably broke it in two and he certainly cut the upper half down to match the other slab in thickness and dressed its rear face. Both stones were too wide for the mason's purpose, so he cut away a section (five to eight letter-spaces) from each side. Finally he prepared his moulding on either side, resulting in the loss of an additional four or five letters at either end.

We are now in a position to explain the present condition of the reverse of the stone. Surely it was the Byzantine mason, not the classical mason, who was responsible for the back of the upper portion of the stele. It was he who dressed it and left the rows of horizontal strokes which we see today. Perhaps the gouges in the upper half are also his, the result of his preliminary reduction of the stone to the size he wanted.

The explanation of the present condition of the lower half of the stone is much less certain. It is possible, on the one hand, that the Hekatompedon stele was originally inscribed only on one face and that the back had been left rough-picked. In that case the mason simply broke the stone in half and discarded the lower portion. The gouges in that half would, then, date from the fifth century. Alternatively, in the event that the stone was originally

¹ *IG* i². 256, line 1.

² The original top of the Pronaos stele has been cut in such a way that it is no longer parallel to the ground but slopes downward from the original front face to the back face. This new cutting, presumably by the same mason who prepared the other mouldings, would be visible with the stone lying on its original front face.

³ The stele containing the Kallias Decrees was used as an altar slab; cf. Wade-Gery, *JHS* li (1931), 58.

⁴ In dealing with the re-use of an inscription we must be alert to the possibility that

the stone was re-used on several different occasions. At one time the Pronaos stele was certainly used as a door-sill. Its rear face is worn smooth on the right side from top to bottom, while on the left it has two pivot holes and signs of discoloration forming a semicircular pattern. (There is also a rectangular cutting in the upper left-hand corner.) On the front the face of the upper fragment, *IG* i. 121-4a is well preserved, but the face of the lower half, *IG* i. 121-4b, has been mutilated, perhaps by chisel blows. This mutilation presumably occurred after the stone was broken in two.

opisthographic the mason may have defaced the inscriptions on the reverse in the process of breaking the stone in half.¹ Since he wanted a stone some 0.60 m square, he may have drawn a line across the stele 60 cm from the top and struck it repeatedly just below the line to break it into two pieces. This would account for the gouges in the lower half of the stone.

The significance of all this for the original condition of the Hekatompedon stele is this: the rough-picking which we find on the back of this stone today may date either from the fifth century or from the reworking of the stone by a Byzantine mason. In the first case the stone could not have been opisthographic, but the latter alternative offers the possibility that the First Hekatompedon Stele was originally opisthographic and that the lettering of the reverse was intentionally removed.

University of California, Davis

WESLEY E. THOMPSON

¹ At first it seemed to me that the mason might have sawn the stone in half, but Bradeen says that it was fractured, not sawn, just below line 27.