

P. A. Hansen, DAA 374—375 and the Early Elegiac Epigram 195

thematic form was substituted. It is my belief that *διάκτορος* suffered the same fate.

Like *χρυσάορος*, *διάκτορος* gravitates to the space before the bucolic diaeresis. A formula similar in shape to *Ἀπόλλωνος χρυσάορον* did exist: *Ερμείας διακτόρου* (μ 390), cf. ο 319, *Aphr.* 147–8. If *διάκτορος* (genitive) once stood there, passage from one declension to the other would not be difficult, particularly if there were a line with scope for taking the epithet as agreeing with a noun in the nominative instead of in the genitive, especially if the true meaning and derivation of the epithet had been forgotten. In fact the epic tradition does preserve such a line:

Ζηνὸς ἐφημοσύνησι διάκτορος Ἀργειφόντης (*Aphr.* 213)

Here *διάκτορος* could well be ambiguous. Although I would not dare to suggest on this evidence that the epithet was originally peculiar to Zeus, it is eminently suitable for him in the meaning given for *διάκτωρ* by Hesychius.

References: C. D. Buck and W. Petersen, *A Reverse Index of Greek Nouns and Adjectives*, Chicago 1944; K. F. Ameis and C. Hentze's commentary on the Odyssey, Leipzig 1920; P. Chantraine, *Dictionnaire Étymologique de la langue grecque*, A–Δ, Paris 1968; J. Chittenden, 'Diaktoros Argeiphontes' *AJA* 52 (1948) 24–33; H. Frisk, *Griechisches Etymologisches Wörterbuch*, Heidelberg 1960–70; A. Hoekstra, *The Sub-Epic Stage of the Oral Tradition*, 1969; E. Risch, *Wortbildung der homerischen Sprache*, 2nd. ed. 1974; F. Sommer, *Zur Geschichte der griechischen Nominalkomposita* Abh. Bayr. Ak. d. Wiss. 27 (1948); O. Zumbach, *Neuerungen in der Sprache der homerischen Hymnen*, 1955.

DAA 374–375 and the Early Elegiac Epigram

By P. A. HANSEN, Oxford

While formally being a refutation of certain combinations of inscribed fragments from the Athenian Acropolis, the following pages discuss various points of general interest in connexion with early verse inscriptions. The most important is the chronology and earliest history of the elegiac epigram; other comments are concerned with phraseology and word order; the use of the dual; etc.

IG i². 739 and 740 were tentatively combined by A. E. Raubitschek in his DAA¹) to form one dedication, and, completing the restora-

¹) DAA = Dedications from the Athenian Acropolis (1949); other abbreviations are listed in e.g. L. H. Jeffery, *The Local Scripts of Archaic*

tions of his predecessors, Raubitschek gave the following texts *exempli gratia*:

DAA 374 [ὁ δεῖνα τόδ' ἄγαλμα Διὶ γλα[υκόπιδι κόρει]

DAA 375 [Καὶ ὁ δεῖνα ἐθέτεν Παλάδι τρι]τογε[ρεῖ]

In the following lines I hope to show that not only Raubitschek's tentative combination, but also the original combination of three inscribed and three uninscribed fragments into two dedicated items, suggested by Sauer in 1892²) and not since challenged, must be wrong.

All six fragments belong to the same type of dedication, viz. a marble basin with a rectangular top plate, supported in at least one case by female statuettes, and are therefore likely to be roughly contemporary. The remains of lettering on the fragments give very little basis for reasonably precise dating, but the monuments have been commonly dated in the first quarter of the sixth century. Richter dates to c. 580–570³). A slightly later date than the vulgate is given by Hemdorf⁴) who suggests the second quarter of the century. It remains in any case that no one is disputing that the fragments are of the first half of the sixth century.

According to Sauer's combination of the fragments, τρι]τογε[ρεῖ is the last word of DAA 375, since an uninscribed fragment excludes the possibility of anything following. Raubitschek pointed out but rejected the theoretical possibility of placing the fragment on the opposite side of the top plate, which would mean that τρι]τογε[ρεῖ had to be the first word of the inscription. Nothing can be adduced from archaic inscriptions in favour of the position of the word at the beginning of a line except the doubtful IG i².719 = DAA 115, which, even if it is correct that the word begins a verse⁵), is both much younger (c. 480?) and apparently of unusual phrasing; only the accusative in Hymn. Hom. 28.4 can be added to this from

Greece (1961) (= LSAG) or R. Meiggs and D. Lewis, A Selection of Greek Historical Inscriptions to the End of the Fifth Century B.C. (1969) (= ML). Add: LGVI = P. A. Hansen, A List of Greek Verse Inscriptions down to 400 B.C. (Opuscula Graecolatina iii, Copenhagen 1975).

²) AM xvii (1892) 41 and pl. 7.

³) G. M. A. Richter, Korai (1968) no. 74 (= DAA 375), dating on the basis of statuettes. There is some odd confusion in the reference to the inscription: the completely superseded reference is to one of the fragments of DAA 374, in addition to which for CIG read CIA or IG.

⁴) Hemdorf, AM lxxxix (1974) 60.

⁵) Here I follow Peek, Wissenschaftliche Zeitschrift Halle iii (1953/54) 384.

archaic literature. In archaic inscriptions the word is used exclusively in dedications from the Athenian Acropolis, and, with the above exception, only in the phrase *Παλλάδι τριτογενεῖ*, which is found at the beginning (DAA 35, 66, 227, 235) or end (DAA 133 and 372) of a verse. As, in addition, the form *τριτογενεῖαι* is completely unknown in early inscriptions, it follows that our word can only be the end of a pentameter according to Sauer's combination of fragments. Whether his combination is accepted or not, the length of the uninscribed areas on the ornamented fragments suggests that it was not customary to inscribe more than one verse on these top plates. Thus we have two inscriptions of which one lacks a verb, while the other consists of one pentameter; the former is unprecedented, and the latter can be supported by only three reasonably certain instances from the period down to 400 B.C., of which the earliest is Attic but from the very end of the sixth century⁶). Because of the apparently highly exceptional form of both the inscriptions, Raubitschek suggested that each formed half of an elegiac distich, and that Sauer's two basins were in fact a pair. But: (1) I do not think that there is any evidence that basins were habitually (or even frequently) dedicated and displayed in pairs. (2) There is only one early instance of one dedicatory inscription distributed over two items, viz. IG i².802 where an inscription continued from one halter to the other (pace Wilamowitz on Eur. HF 155, whose explanation is wrongly accepted by LSJ s. v. *οὐνεκα* I.2), and this is hardly a case in point since two halteres form a pair in a way which is not at all paralleled by two votive basins, both in their function as athletic tools and in the way in which it is possible to display them⁷). (3) When it comes to the specific combination of DAA 374 and 375, 'the two monuments are not exactly the same size, nor do they show the same decoration', a fact which I, contrary to Raubitschek, consider very damaging

⁶) IG i². 990 = GVI 63 (Athens, c. 510–500?); IG xiv. 665 = LSAG pl. 50.7 = LGVI 413 (Poseidonia, c. 470); GVI 928 = LGVI 186 (Panticapaeum, end of 5th c.). For some extremely uncertain instances see DAA 174 with further references.

⁷) The halter is mentioned by Raubitschek together with another alleged parallel, viz. the monument to Cleobis and Biton; in this instance too, one might maintain that the two halves of the monument were complementary in a way quite different from two basins; but this does not even arise since there is no particular reason to believe that the inscriptions on that monument did in any way form a unit. See LSAG 154–156.

indeed to the combination. (4) The dual form of the verb is not normally found in early verse inscriptions, which either use the plural or avoid the issue. There are only two exceptions to this rule in inscriptions earlier than 400 B.C. One is the recherché literary exercise dividing the name Aristogeiton between two verses, which is ascribed to Simonides and is now known to be a genuine inscription⁸). The other is an elaborate Attic epitaph commonly dated to the decade 440–430, but very much in the style of the fourth century⁹). In DAA 162 (= IG i².708 = Friedländer 122.d) Raubitschek wrongly substituted ἐθ[ε]τεν for the universally accepted δ[ε]νά[τε]ν. The attitude to the dual adopted by writers of lapidary epigrams is underlined by the fact that the dual is found repeatedly in prose in the Acropolis dedications (e.g. the sculptors' inscription of IG i².530 = DAA 121). (5) The first verb is never placed immediately before the diaeresis of the pentameter in dedications down to 400 B.C.¹⁰) This can hardly be coincidence, since there are six instances (four Attic) of the verb at the beginning of the pentameter and three (one Attic) of the verb in the second half¹¹). (6) An elegiac distich which begins with a name and then

⁸) The former of the two elegiac distichs is quoted by Hephaestion 4.6 (= Simonides 131 Bergk, 76 Diehl), whereas the ends of both distichs are preserved on a fragment found by Meritt in the Agora (Hesperia v [1935] 355–358 = Friedländer 150 = SEG x. 320). Before Meritt's find Wilamowitz wrongly but very justifiably wrote: 'Das ist keine Inschrift . . .; wir haben offenbar einen Trinkspruch in elegischer Form' (Sappho und Simonides [1913] 211). The fragment is indisputably of either the late sixth or the early fifth century, and it is of no great relevance here that there is no general agreement whether it comes from the original monument of 510 or the renovation of 477.

⁹) IG ii/iii². 3. 2. 12147 = GVI 95. The date is that of H. Diepolder, Die attischen Grabreliefs des 5. und 4. Jahrhunderts v. Chr. (1931) 12f. H. K. Süsserott, Griechische Plastik des 4. Jahrhunderts vor Christus (1938) 105f., dates to c. 390, and this dating of the relief might seem more in accordance with the content of the epigram than Diepolder's dating.

¹⁰) IG xii. 5. 215 = DGE 771 = Friedländer 144 = LSAG pl. 56. 34 does not alter this statement since the verb is there preceded by a participle. IG xii. 5. 611 (with Suppl. p. 116) = Friedländer 148 = LSAG pl. 57. 46 is a precisely analogous case. Once the unwarranted although universally accepted assumption that line division and verse end *must* coincide is given up, the beginning of the first pentameter can be restored (in Cean orthography) from IG xii. 5. 215 without a moment's hesitation: [ἡβ[ε]σ[τ]ῆ[ρ]ος σ[τ]ῆ[ρ]ος.

¹¹) Respectively IG i². 471 (DAA 64), 573 (DAA 148), 761, 826; IG xii. Suppl. 675 with Add. p. 218; IG xii. 8. 356 (LGVI 204, 211, 322, 331, 337, 433) and DAA 107; IG vii. 1794; DGE 209 = LSAG pl. 62. 29 (LGVI 264,

adds the second name plus the verb at the beginning of the pentameter, is very hard to believe in. (7) I do not believe a restoration which meets the objections of (4)–(6) above and creates no new problems can be found. (8) Last but not least, whether one adopts the commonly accepted dating in the first quarter of the sixth century or prefers, with Hemdorf, the second quarter, an elegiac distich in a dedication would have been most unusual at the time when our basins were dedicated. A dedication from Sybaris¹²), dated by Guarducci to the first decades of the sixth century or possibly the end of the seventh, ends in something with a certain similarity to a pentameter (*τὰ θάναι ἀφ' ἑθλον εὐξάμενος δεκάταν*), but the whole inscription is so totally erratic in regard to form that it seems that the author was not contemplating specific metres but simply using at random phrases smacking of poetry; but whatever one thinks of the author's intention, the inscription cannot reasonably be drawn into the reconstruction of the history of the early elegiac epigram. The graffito ending in *με]γάλης ἀντὶ φιλημ[οσύνης* from the Samian Heraeum¹³) has not so far been satisfactorily explained. The phrasing makes a dedication impossible, while the inscribed object combined with the place of finding makes an epitaph equally unacceptable¹⁴). I am inclined to think that we have a quotation, and if this is right, the inscription is not relevant to the present enquiry. Leaving these freaks aside, we find that elegiac inscriptions begin around 560 with the sudden emergence of Attic

345, 437). I record here, without offering an explanation, that the pattern for epitaphs is quite different: from the sixth century there are three Attic instances of the verb immediately before the diaeresis (SEG xxv. 59 [LGVI 48], xxii. 79 [LGVI 59], x. 440 = GVI 161; one could with some justification add IG i². 982 = GVI 1223) and one Attic instance from the end of the fifth century (IG ii/iii², 3. 2. 8464 = GVI 167).

¹²) Rend. Lincei 1965, 392–395 = M. Guarducci, *Epigrafia greca* i (1967) 110 = J. Ebert, *Griechische Epigramme auf Sieger an gymnischen und hippischen Agonen* (1972), addendum p. 251.

¹³) LSAG pl. 63. 1 (c. 650–600?) = LGVI 474; republished with two additional fragments, which do not advance our understanding of the inscription, by Walter-Karydi, *Samos* vi. 1 (1973) 179 (c. 600).

¹⁴) For a somewhat far-fetched (although not impossible) explanation by Peek see *Wissenschaftliche Zeitschrift Halle* iv (1954/55) 231 (whence my LGVI). A restoration by Dunst, *AM* lxxxvii (1972) 145f., of one of the new fragments based on Peek's interpretation is unacceptable whether one accepts Peek's view or not. I hope to return to this interesting inscription on some other occasion and shall in any case discuss it briefly in my forthcoming critical edition of the inscriptions listed in LGVI.

verse epitaphs¹⁵). Among dedications, an inscription from Cleonae, dated c. 560?, is a lone and not very pretty swallow, consisting of a borrowed hexameter, an uninspired pentameter, and the four words *Φείδονος Φηιὸς τῷ Κλεοναίῳ*¹⁶). Otherwise we have to come down to the last quarter of the sixth century for inscriptions in elegiac distichs. It is thus apparent that it would be more than hazardous to posit an Acropolis dedication consisting of an elegiac couplet from before the middle of the sixth century. One is left with only one possible answer: the surviving word cannot have been the end of a pentameter, but must be part of the beginning of a hexameter: *Παλάδι τριτογενεῖ*. It follows that Sauer's combination of the inscribed fragment with the ornamented, uninscribed fragments assigned to the same basin must be rejected. A second hexameter beginning with *Παλάδι τριτογενεῖ* following upon *Διὸς γλαυρόπιδι ῥόρει* is of course even more improbable than if *Παλάδι τριτογενεῖ* had been at the end of a pentameter. There would also remain some awkwardness about the verb being so late in the dedication. However, when the fragment is no longer considered part of a pentameter, there is no longer any reason whatever to try to combine the inscription with any other inscription.

Let us return to DAA 374 and consider if we have to accept the a priori unlikely existence of a second verse on another (lost) basin. There are no standard lines in archaic epitaphs and very few in archaic dedications¹⁷), but it so happens that one of the very few is — — — μ' ἀνέθηκε Διὸς γλαυρόπιδι ῥόρει, which is found entire, or fragmentary with so much remaining that there is no reasonable doubt, in four very early dedications from the Athenian Acropolis¹⁸).

¹⁵) See the chronologically arranged sequence LGVI nos. 17 ff.

¹⁶) SEG xi. 290 = LSAG pl. 24. 5 = ML 9.

¹⁷) The same verse found in two inscriptions should not be described as a standard line rather than as a specific borrowing from one to the other, unless there are special reasons indicating its character as a standard line.

¹⁸) IG i². 468 (second inscription) = Graef-Langlotz ii. 1330 (where dated to c. 600); IG i². 466 = DAA 1 = LSAG pl. 2.13 (where dated 'c. 600–575?'); IG i². 468 (first inscription) = DAA p. 358 (c. 560?, Raubitschek, fere); IG i². 418 (cf. LGVI 297; the correct reading of what follows the name simply must be that of Bather, JHS xiii [1893] 128, rather than the unmetrical one found in Lolling-Wolters [no. xx] followed by IG i²; the unmetrical addition of two words at the end is hardly relevant to this. Dr. Jeffery kindly informs me that her reading which will appear in IG i³ under no. 544, although differing in a number of details, essentially agrees with Bather against Lolling-Wolters. — In my LGVI I have in a moment of mental abstraction lumped this and six other bronze dedications together

The only other instances in DAA of the phrase *γλαυρόπιδι ρόρει* are found in the single hexameters¹⁹⁾ following the lists of hieropoioi in DAA 326 and 327, but they lack *Διός* and are, in any case, not dedications but records²⁰⁾. On this background one is very surprised to see DAA 374, and when we add to this our unease about the existence of a second verse and bear in mind that the inscribed fragments do not join, and carry no distinctive ornamentation, we should not need to hesitate much in deciding that the overwhelming probability is in favour of separating the two fragments. One fragment would carry part of the standard line discussed above, the other might be restored e.g. [-∞- τός]δ' ἄγαλμ' [ἀνέθηκεν τὰθναίαι]²¹⁾.

In brief, the three inscribed and three ornamented, uninscribed fragments come from not less than four rectangular top plates of marble basins, and we have not the least reason to suspect that any of the dedications involved consisted of more than one basin carrying one hexameter²²⁾.

as of the last quarter of the sixth century; in fact, the presence of qoppa shows that it cannot be significantly later than the middle of the century). — Graef-Langlotz i. 391 = LSAG pp. 70 and 76 no. 6.c (where dated 'c. 625–600') only preserves remains of the last two words, and is therefore of no use in this connexion.

¹⁹⁾ The form of DAA 326 which has seven feet in DAA is improved by J. A. Davison, JHS lxxviii (1958) 30 note 11 = From Archilochus to Pindar 41 note 1. The form of the inscription is further improved by Gallavotti, Rend. Linc. xxxi (1976) 29, who lets Davison's *hoi* replace rather than follow *hieropoioi*.

²⁰⁾ Outside the Athenian Acropolis the phrase is completely unknown, at least down to 400 B.C.

²¹⁾ For *ἀνέθηκεν τὰθναίαι* at the end of a hexameter cf. IG i². 578 = DAA 25 and the hexameter of eight feet DAA 44 (the author either could not count or wanted to include too much in his hexameter; there is no such thing as a dactylic octameter, pace Friedländer [21.b] and others).

²²⁾ I am very grateful to Dr. L. H. Jeffery, who read my draft and made some valuable comments, including the corroboration mentioned in note 11, and to Professor A. E. Raubitschek, who attempted to inspect the fragments for me in Athens. As far as an inspection of all the relevant fragments at the same time is concerned, Professor Raubitschek informs me that this cannot be done in the foreseeable future, viz. 'till the new Museum is opened down town. I don't expect to be alive then, but you may be'. I have not felt that I should delay publication of the above comments indefinitely against the remote date when the inspection can be carried out. My reason for this decision is on the one hand that my observations are of importance for the earliest history of the elegiac epigram, and on the other hand that I am convinced that there is very little scope indeed for doubt about my main conclusion