

The Choregic Dedication of Leagros

Benjamin D. Meritt

THE DATE of the choregic dedication of Leagros¹ depends on the letter-forms employed in making the inscription and on the years of activity that may be assigned to Leagros the choregos and to Pantakles the dithyrambic poet. Let us consider Pantakles first. He is known from Antiphon's speech *Περὶ τοῦ χορευτοῦ* (§ 11) to have been didaskalos in a choregic contest in 420/19 B.C.² He was ridiculed by the comic poet Eupolis about 424/3 B.C. and again by Aristophanes in 406/5 B.C.³ The latter reference is taken by some⁴ to show that Pantakles was "alive and flourishing" as late as 405 B.C. This is not necessarily so. Eupolis and Aristophanes presumably had reference to the same incident. For Eupolis Pantakles was *σκαίος*, for Aristophanes he was *σκαϊότατος*. It may be thought that *πρώην* in Aristophanes argues a recent event; it need be only relatively recent and may indeed mean simply "a while ago." Since the dialogue between Aischylos and Dionysos in which the word was used took place in the Nether World it may be that in 406/5 Pantakles was dead. To the objection of Dionysos that Homer failed to benefit Pantakles by his instruction, Aischylos replied that he did, however, benefit many other brave men, in particular Lamachos. We know that Lamachos lost his life in Sicily in 414 B.C. The gaucherie of which Pantakles was guilty must have been a standing joke, but by 406/5 Aristophanes could no longer be cryptic about it, assuming that his audience would all understand; he had to explain exactly and in detail what it was that Pantakles did wrong, for the benefit, we may suppose, of those who did not know or did not remember.

So the literary evidence gives us Pantakles primarily in the late

¹ *Hesperia* 8 (1939) 48–50, no. 15.

² *Hesperia* 8 (1939) 50; H. B. Mattingly, *CQ* 16 (1966) 173 with n.2.

³ Th. Kock *CAFI* (Leipzig 1880) 338 (Eupolis, fr.296: *Παντακλῆς σκαίος*); *Ar. Ran.* 1036–8: *καὶ μὴν οὐ Παντακλέα γε | εἰδίδαξεν ὁμῶς τὸν σκαϊότατον· πρόην γοῦν, ἥνικ' ἐπεμπεν, | τὸ κράνος πρῶτον περιδησάμενος τὸν λόφον ἤμελλ' ἐπιδήσειν.* The scholiast on Aristophanes explains: *διαβάλλει τὸν Παντακλέα ὡς ἀμαθῆ ἐν τῷ σπλίζεσθαι*, and adds the reference to Eupolis: *μέμνηται δὲ τούτου καὶ Εὐπόλις ἐν Χρυσῶ γένει.*

⁴ E.g., Mattingly (*supra* n.2) 173.

20's of the fifth century: no earlier and not necessarily later. The epigraphical evidence includes an inscription now in the British School of Archaeology in Athens (IG I² 771), which is published in the *Corpus* as follows:

[Κεκροπίς *s.* Αἰγεῖς ἐνίκα – –]
 – *c*^a. 8 – ος Δοροθέο Ἀλαιεύ[ς ἐχορέγει]
 Παντακλῆς ἐδίδα[σκε].

As recorded in CIG 1037, nothing is shown as preserved after the initial *alpha* of Ἀλαιεύ[ς] in line 2 and after the name Παντακλῆς in line 3. In IG I 337, a kind of facsimile is published which purports to show in line 2 all of the demotic Ἀλαιεύ[ς] except the final *sigma*. But the alignment of letters is incorrect. The writing of this inscription is strictly *stoichedon*, the first *sigma* in line 2 coming over the *pi* in Pantakles, with the letters continuing regularly across the face of the stone. The last letter in line 2 falls over the second *delta* in ἐδίδα[σκε] and beyond this *epsilon*, no letter is preserved. Rangabé had the correct reading though not the correct disposition.⁵

The stone is now available for study.⁶ It shows that the traditional first line must be deleted, for the top of the stone is preserved above line 2. Line 2, therefore, becomes line 1, and line 3 becomes line 2. It is, in fact, the final line of the two-line inscription, which must be restored to read:

IG I² 771
 [χορευόντ]ος Δοροθέο Ἀλαιέ[ος· Αἰγεῖς ἐνίκα·]
 Παντακλῆς ἐδίδα[σκε].

There are 35 letters in line 1 and 17 letters in line 2. Line 2 is centered exactly below line 1 with 9 letter-spaces uninscribed before it and 9 letter-spaces uninscribed after it. The symmetry of the inscription means that the deme Halai belonged to the phyle Aigeis rather than to Kekropis, and I have restored the name Aigeis in line 1. Dorotheos was the choregos rather than the father of some unknown choregic son.

It is idle to speculate about who this Dorotheos was. But the lettering of the text may well belong to the 20's. In this I agree with the judgement of Mattingly. The *lambdas* have a sharp angle at the base

⁵ A. Rizo Rangabé, *Antiquités helléniques* I (Athens 1842) no. 55.

⁶ I am indebted to C. W. J. Eliot for a report from Athens upon it.

and a fairly long right stroke, something like the *lambdas* in the first few lines of IG 1² 25 (424/3). But the letter really reveals very little. I would agree with Mattingly that the *nu* is quite like that of D8 of 426/5 B.C.,⁷ but since its shape is also older (higher right-hand stroke) than the *nu* of IG I² 295 of 433/2 B.C. it could be dated, in my opinion, anywhere during the years from 433 to 420, both top and bottom dates being approximate. The *sigma* of IG I² 771 has all four strokes of the same length (0.015 m.) and is less thin than the *sigma* of D8, which usually extends both above and below the line and in which the two inner strokes are shorter than the top and bottom strokes (0.006 m. and 0.008 m. respectively).

One must note here also the probable existence of another inscription which named Pantakles as *διδάσκαλος* when the phyle Antiochis was victor in the competition. The evidence lies in the lemma *s.v.* Ἀτήνη in Stephanos of Byzantion as interpreted by A. Meineke (edition of 1849), who suggests [Ἀντιοχίς ἐν]κα Παντακλής [ἐδίδασκειν] (cf. SEG X, 323). But this is of no help toward the dating of Pantakles.

In publishing the new text from the Agora in 1939 I identified the Leagros who was choregos with the brother-in-law of Kallias (PA 9029) and made him “a relatively young man” about 440 B.C. This Leagros was the son of Glaukon, and Glaukon was born, presumably, between 500 and 490 B.C. Vases with the inscription Γλαύκων καλός, sometimes also with the added patronymic Λεάγρο, have been dated between 490 and 470.⁸ He then, in turn, could have been the father of his son Leagros about 465 B.C., and Leagros would have been old enough in 440 B.C. to be choregos for the dithyrambic contest won by the phyle Akamantis of which the dedication in *Hesperia* preserves the record. The “relatively young man” at that time may have been about 25 years old.⁹

A good many dates are known in the life of Glaukon when he was general, a colleague of Perikles (441/0, 439/8, 435/4, 433/2).¹⁰ The date

⁷ CQ 16 (1966) 175 n.4.

⁸ Mary H. Swindler, *Ancient Painting* (New Haven 1929) 177, dates them between 490 and 475. E. Langlotz, *Zur Zeitbestimmung der strengrotfigurigen Vasenmalerei und der gleichzeitigen Plastik* (Leipzig 1920) 117, gives the dates *ca.* 480–470. Miss G. M. A. Richter, *Attic Red-Figured Vases* (New Haven 1946) 93, claims that “Glaukon . . . may well have been a fair boy in 470; and this date fits the father Leagros whom we met as a fair boy in 510–500.” If we add for Glaukon 15 or 25 years from the median date shown by Langlotz, the date of his birth will be between 500 and 490 B.C.

⁹ See Mattingly, CQ 16 (1966) 173 n.5.

¹⁰ See Douglas MacDowell, *Andokides, On the Mysteries* (Oxford 1962) 146.

of his death is not known, but it may be assumed that his career was roughly contemporaneous with that of Perikles (*paullo post a. 500 a.—a. 429 a.*). His son Leagros belongs a generation later (*ca. a. 465 a.—ca. a. 395 a.*). Leagros' sister was the first wife of Kallias of Alopeke, grandson of the treaty-maker of 449 and 446 B.C. and son of Hipponikos, whose divorced wife married Perikles and bore him two sons, Xanthippos and Paralos. The sons of Perikles were old enough to be married and have children about the mid 30's;¹¹ hence born not long after 460,¹² and both younger than their half-brother Kallias, who was the son of Hipponikos by their mother's first marriage. The date of Kallias' birth must have been about 460 B.C.¹³ There is no evidence, so far as I can discover, in the speech of Andokides *On the Mysteries* to justify the assumption that Leagros was "at most five years older than himself and in any event junior to Kallias."¹⁴ His obligation to look after the orphaned daughters of the deceased Epilykos was binding on him because of the relationship he bore them, along with Andokides, and has nothing to do with his age, whether young or old.

It has been suggested that the attacks on Leagros in the late 90's of the fourth century by the comic poet Plato (fr.64) do not "suggest a man of over seventy."¹⁵ This is what Plato wrote:

οὐχ ὄρας ὄτι
ὁ μὲν Λέαγρος, Γλαύκωνος ὦν μεγάλου γένους,
ἀβελτεροκόκκυξ ἡλίθιος περιέρχεται,
σικυοῦ πέπονος εὐνουχίου κνήμας ἔχων;

I would urge that these lines do suggest a man of over seventy, a man, surely, in extreme old age. As Th. Kock remarks,¹⁶ "σικυὸς εὐνουχίας opponitur σπερματία, seminum inanis pleno." An impotent old man, far past his prime, is clearly indicated. And a date for Leagros' birth about 465 B.C. is again confirmed. Neither because of the poet Pantakles nor because of the choregos Leagros is there any

¹¹ See Meritt, Wade-Gery, McGregor, *Athenian Tribute Lists II* (Cambridge [Mass.] 1949) 74, D19 lines 13–14; III (1950) 328. For the marriage of Xanthippos, see Plu. *Pericles* 36.2–6. The children presumably did not survive, since nothing further is known of them.

¹² Kirchner, *PA* 11811, gives the marriage of their mother to Perikles as about 453 B.C.

¹³ This is earlier by ten years than the date suggested by MacDowell (*supra* n.10) 10, and five years earlier than that suggested by Mattingly (*supra* n.2) 173.

¹⁴ Mattingly, *op.cit.* 173.

¹⁵ Mattingly, *ibidem*.

¹⁶ *CAF I*, p.618 (Plato fr.64).

reason to date the dedication in *Hesperia* later than the date to which it was assigned in 1939 on the basis of its letter-forms alone. We do not have to date the victory of Leagros (and Akamantis) about 425 B.C.¹⁷

There remains the evidence of the script of the monument itself. The *nu* not only has sloping side-strokes; it is also old-fashioned in that the right lateral stroke is shorter than the left, and in that it meets the diagonal about half way up the height of the line.¹⁸ This is a form of *nu* which occurs in the Athenian regulations for Erythrai of 451/0 (not always, but sometimes), as may be seen in the photograph of IG I² 11, published in *ATL* II (1949) pl. III, and in the Athenian Tribute Quota Lists rather generally down to about 446 B.C. (with variations, of course), where a year by year development in letter-forms may be observed.¹⁹ The *rho* with tail indicates the same early date.

Mattingly claims that the decree for the founding of the Athenian colony at Brea²⁰ shares crucial letter-forms with the choregic dedication. The *rho* with tail and the *nu* (sometimes) are much alike. *Omikron* is without the central dot in the decree, and the other letters which the two texts have in common are non-committal. But whatever similarity exists merely indicates that both texts, on the basis of their letter-forms, belong in the 440's. There is no excuse for bringing either the decree or the dedication down to 426/5 B.C.²¹

Other evidences for the late date of the colony to Brea are illusory. The text of Thucydides 1.61.4 should not be emended to read ἐς Βρέαν rather than ἐς Βέροιαν. Beroia is a known Macedonian city, on the land route from Pydna to Strepsa, along which it affords the lowest easy crossing of the Haliakmon river. It is irksome to find the old guesses repeated. Charles Edson's study of Strepsa (Thuc. 1.61.4) leaves no doubt of the correct readings and of the correct interpretation of Athenian military movements as described by them in

¹⁷ This was the *terminus ante quem non* set by Mattingly, *op.cit.* 175, which I here dispute.

¹⁸ See the photograph in *Hesperia* 8 (1939) 49. The strokes measure 0.017 m., 0.015 m., and 0.012 m., respectively. This is quite different from the *nu* with sloping side-strokes in the Attic decree of 425/4 published in *Hesperia* 14 (1945) 115-9 (photograph on p.117) with which Mattingly compares it (*CQ* 16 [1966] 176). Moreover, the comparandum in this case is in Ionic, not in Attic, script.

¹⁹ The photographs in *ATL* I (1939) should be consulted. The tailed *rho* occurs in the beautifully cut final accounting of the gold and ivory statue of Athena Parthenos (438/7 B.C.); see the drawing by W. B. Dinsmoor, *ArchEph* 1937, pl. facing p.508.

²⁰ IG I² 45. See the photographs of squeezes in *Hesperia* 14 (1945) 87, 88.

²¹ This is the date for the decree now advocated by Mattingly, *CQ* 16 (1966) 179.

432 B.C.²² Brea, epigraphically, geographically and historically, has nothing to do with Beroia; it was doubtless the Athenian colony in Bisaltia mentioned by Plutarch, and its effect on the tribute of neighbouring cities has been reflected in the tribute lists. This evidence is neglected by those who move the city elsewhere and date it twenty years later than 446.²³ The known generalship of Demokleides in 439/8²⁴ is entirely compatible with his having moved the decree for Brea and having been its founder in 447/6.²⁵ Why it should be “doubtful whether Demokleides was general as early as 446 B.C.”²⁶ remains to be explained, or why this is thought unlikely while it is “conceivable that he returned to the board as late as 426/5 B.C.”²⁷

The attempt to get so much into the 20's leads Mattingly to a reappraisal (not his first) of the Tribute Quota Lists between 430 and 425 B.C. and to the re-dating of other documents within this span of years. The attempt to rearrange the quota lists must be counted a failure, for reasons which should now be set forth.

By dating List 26 in 427/6 he can have the special rubric of cities that paid only the ἀπαρχή include Methone, to whom the privilege, in his opinion and on his dating, had just been granted by the so-called first Methone decree (D3).²⁸ Since he has List 25 follow List 26, the restoration of the same rubric there in col. II, lines 31–5, is presumably sound, with List 25 in 426/5. But if this arrangement is adopted one must abandon the very convincing argument that no ἐπιφορά was expected after the assessment of 430 and the equally convincing argument, based on the record of “last year's ἐπιφορά,” that List 25 belongs in 430/29 and List 26 in 429/8.²⁹

²² CP 50 (1955) 169–90, especially 183–4.

²³ Cf. ATL III (1950) 39 n.24, 50 n.43, 60–1, 285 n.47, 286 n.49, 287–8, 289, 299, 306.

²⁴ ATL II (1949) 73, D18 line 42.

²⁵ IG I² 45, lines 8, 34–5.

²⁶ Mattingly, *op.cit.* 172.

²⁷ Mattingly, *ibidem.*

²⁸ CQ 16 (1966) 183. The year 427/6 was finally hit upon by Mattingly for D3 and for List 26. It is confusing to find that he also dates the regulations for Methone and Poteidaia embodied in D3 in 426/5 (*op.cit.* 179 with n.3): “Early in 426/5 B.C. Athens drew up defence regulations, which embodied special protection for Poteidaia and Methone.” His epigraphical references for these regulations are to ATL II, D3 lines 18ff and to D4 lines 41ff and 47ff. The decree of D4, as is well known, was passed in the first prytany of 426/5 when Megakleides was secretary (cf. IG I² 324 line 5). Since D3 was earlier than D4, it must fall, of course, at least as early as 427/6. It is confusing also that he refers to the three Thracian payers of ἀπαρχή in List 25 (*op.cit.* 180 n.2) when he evidently means a reference to List 26.

²⁹ Cf. ATL I (1939) 196, 452; III (1950) 70. The regular tribute of Pygela was collected in 430/29 (List 25, col. I line 45) as was also ἐπιφορά which had been due the previous year

Moreover, the Athenians also granted to Aphytis some of the same privileges which they had previously granted to Methone.³⁰ At the end of the decree which made the grant (see n.30), just as for Methone at the end of D3, is the record of the privilege of paying the quota only from the tribute (D21 lines 17–8): ἔδοξεν [τῶι δήμωι] ἀποδιδόν[αι] Ἀφυταίος ἀπαρχὴν τῆι θεῶι I^ϛ δ]ραχμάς^v. There can be no reasonable doubt of the validity of the record or of the restored portion of the record. The significance of this provision must be recognized. The tribute of Aphytis had been three talents a year from 454/3 to 447/6, one talent a year from 446/5 to 439/8, and thereafter three talents a year again.³¹ Since the assessment of 428/7 was at a higher rate, assuredly, than that of 430/29, it is to be presumed that the tribute levied on Aphytis amounted to five talents, for the quota of which one numeral-space sufficed at the beginning of line 18.³² Aphytis appealed for relief, and was granted, like Methone, the privilege of paying the quota only. But Mattingly dates D21 in 426/5.³³ Since he also dates List 25 in the same year he must show Aphytis there in the rubric of cities that paid the ἀπαρχή only. This rubric is not preserved in List 25, though it is reasonably restored in col. II after the normal Thracian panel in what would otherwise be an exceptionally long and unexplained unscribed area on the stone before the beginning of the Island panel. But Aphytis cannot be restored in this special rubric, for the name appears elsewhere in the regular Thracian panel above (col. II line 10) showing a normal pre-428 total tribute of three talents: a *reductio ad absurdum* argument against the suggested rearrangement of the quota lists between 430 and 425 B.C. If Mattingly's further assumption is to be allowed, that D21 might even belong as late as 425/4, one has the anomaly of the grant of special privilege in the year of the great assessment of 425/4 (A9) when there were no rubrics

(List 25, col. I line 46). Since no current ἐπιφορά was collected one must assume that it was not expected. The formal collection of ἐπιφορά was abandoned with the assessment of 430. Current ἐπιφορά, as such, appears neither in List 25 nor in List 26. But List 25 is the first list after the reassessment and takes into account one payment of ἐπιφορά in arrears from the assessment period when the collection of ἐπιφορά was normal.

³⁰ ATL II (1949) 75, D21 lines 5–8.

³¹ Cf. ATL I (1939) 242.

³² The alternative is to believe that a special concession was already in the making for Aphytis, and that the figure at the beginning of line 18 was H (reminiscent of the years from 446/5 to 439/8) rather than I^ϛ.

³³ CQ 16 (1966) 179 with n.3: "D21 must surely be dated in 426/5 (after D4) or the next year."

of special privilege, and where Aphytis occurs in the regular Thracian panel in normal assessment with its neighbours.³⁴

The decree foreseen early in 426/5 (D4 lines 51–6), and for the debate on which a schedule was laid down for the second prytany of the year—the decree, indeed, which was to regulate in general the affairs of tribute in the cities of the empire—has been largely preserved in D8.³⁵ In fact, it is now known that D8 consisted of two decrees passed on successive days and both on motion of Kleonymos, as was also D4. But there was no new regulation for Methone, nor can such be assumed on the basis of D21 lines 5–8.³⁶ The regulations governing Methone cited in D21 were of some standing, not new, and they were quoted as the example on which the new covenant with Aphytis in 428/7 was to be modeled. They give no *terminus post quem* for D21, which, as we have just seen, cannot on any count be dated in 426/5. Mattingly and I are in agreement that List 27 of the quota lists belongs in 428/7.

With the basic fabric so frail, it is perhaps not needful to make a frontal attack on the superstructure or to investigate further the applicability of the testimonia which Mattingly gathers around his story of Athens in the Archidamian War: the Miletos decree (D11), the Coinage decree (D14), the decree of Kleinias (D7) and the Brea decree (*IG I² 45*). We perhaps have much yet to learn about epigraphical criteria, but the three-bar *sigma* and the tailed *rho* are hard to dislodge from mid-century, and better arguments than those recently put forward must be advanced before rewriting the history of the second half of the century, reshuffling the quota lists and dating down documents which belong a generation earlier.

INSTITUTE FOR ADVANCED STUDY

October, 1966

³⁴ *ATL II* (1949) 43, A9 col. iii line 168.

³⁵ *Cf. ATL I* (1939) 213. The text of D8 is published in *ATL II* (1949) 52–3, with a correction in *IV* (1953) ix–x, and with corrections and the addition of a new fragment in *AJP* 88 (1967) 29–32.

³⁶ As by Mattingly, *CQ* (1966) 179 n.3.