

Tekmeria

Vol 9 (2008)

γεγενῆσθαι. μνηύεται οὖν ἀπὸ μετοίκων τέ τινων καὶ ἀκο-
 λούθων περὶ μὲν τῶν Ἑρμῶν οὐδέν, ἄλλων δὲ ἀγαλμάτων
 περικοπὰς τινες πρότερον ὑπὸ νεωτέρων μετὰ παιδιᾶς καὶ
 οἶνου γεγενημένους εἶναι φησὶν. οἱ δὲ τῶν Ἑρμῶν ἀγάλματα
 οἰκλαῖς ἐφ' ὕβρει· ὧν καὶ τὸν Ἀλκιβιάδην ἐπητιώντο. καὶ
 αὐτὰ ὑπολαμβάνοντες οἱ μάλιστα τῷ Ἀλκιβιάδῃ ἀχθόμενοι
 ἐμποδῶν ὅτι σφίσι μὴ αὐτοῖς τοῦ δήμου βεβαίως προεστάναι,
 καὶ νομίσαντες, εἰ αὐτὸν ἐξελάσειαν, πρῶτοι ἂν εἶναι, ἐμεγά-
 λυνον καὶ ἐβόαον ἐπὶ δήμῳ ἀταλῦσαι τὰ τε μυστικὰ καὶ
 ἢ τῶν Ἑρμῶν ἀγάλματα. οἱ δὲ τῶν Ἑρμῶν ἀγάλματα εἶναι αὐτῶν ὅτι οὐ
 μετ' ἐκείνου ἐπράχθη, ἐπιλέγοντες τεκμήρια τὴν ἄλλην αὐτοῦ
 ἐς τὰ ἐπιτηδεύματα οὐ δημοτικὴν παρανομίαν. ὁ δ' ἐν τε
 τῷ παρόντι πρὸς τὸν Ἑρμῶν ἀγάλματι καὶ ἐτοῖμος ἦν
 πρὶν ἐκπλεῖν ἀπὸ τῆς πόλεως, καὶ ἐπὶ τῷ Ἑρμῶν ἀγάλματι
 γὰρ καὶ τὰ τῆς παρανομίας ἐπεμαρτύρητο, καὶ εἰ μὲν τούτων
 τι εἴργαστο, δίκην δοῦναι, εἰ δ' ἀπολυθείη, ἄρχειν. καὶ
 ἐπεμαρτύρητο μὴ ἀπόντος περὶ αὐτοῦ διαβολὰς ἀποδέχεσθαι,
 ἀλλ' ἤδη ἀποκτείνειν, εἰ δ' ἀπολυθείη, καὶ ὅτι σωφρονέστερον εἴη
 μὴ μετὰ τοιαύτης αἰτίας, πρὶν διαγνώσι, πέμπειν αὐτὸν ἐπὶ
 τοσοῦτ' ὅσον στρατεύματι. οἱ δ' ἐχθροὶ δεδιότες τό τε στράτευμα
 μὴ εὖνουν ἔχρη, ἦν ἤδη ἀγωνίζεσθαι, ὅ τε δῆμος μὴ μαλα-
 κίζεται θεραπεύων ὅτι δι' ἐκείνον οἱ τ' Ἀργεῖοι ξυνεστράτευον
 καὶ τῶν Μαντινέων τινές, ἀπέτρεπον καὶ ἀπέσπευδον, ἄλλους
 ῥήτορας ἐνιέντες οἱ ἔλεον αὐτὸν, μὲν πλεῖν αὐτὸν καὶ μὴ
 κατασχεῖν τὴν ἀναγωγὴν, ἐλθόντα δὲ κρίνεσθαι ἐν ἡμέραις
 ῥηταῖς, βουλόμενοι ἐκ μείζονος διαβολῆς, ἦν ἐμελλον ῥῶον
 αὐτοῦ ἀπόντος ποριεῖν, μετάπεμπτον κομισθέντα αὐτὸν ἀγω-
 νίσασθαι. καὶ ἔδοξε πλεῖν τὸν Ἀλκιβιάδην.
 Μετὰ δὲ ταῦτα θέρους μεσοῦντος ἤδη ἡ ἀναγωγὴ ἐγένετο

The Inventory SEG XXVI 139, and the Athenian Asklepieion

J. MA

doi: [10.12681/tekmeria.212](https://doi.org/10.12681/tekmeria.212)

To cite this article:

MA, J. (2008). The Inventory SEG XXVI 139, and the Athenian Asklepieion. *Tekmeria*, 9, 7–16.
<https://doi.org/10.12681/tekmeria.212>

The Inventory *SEG XXVI 139*, and the Athenian Asklepion

From the Athenian Agora come two fragments, found at different times and associated on the basis of subject matter and lettering; they were published as the inventory of sculpture from a gymnasium by D. Clay, «A Gymnasium Inventory from the Athenian Agora», *Hesperia* 46 (1977) 259-67 (reproduced in *SEG XXVI 139*). Clay's text is as follows.

A

face a

[- - -] ΕΠΤ[. . c. 5. . .]

[- - -] τραγήματ[α]

[- - -] ὑπὸς Κεντα[ύρου^υ]

4 [- - -]ς Κουρήτες^υ

vacat

[- - -] γύναια δύο καὶ

[- - -]πιον Χάρητος

[- - -] καὶ Κωμωιδία

vacat

8 [- - -] ΛΛ . [. . . c. 7. . .] ΕΝΟ[- -]

face b

[. . . c. 6 . . .] Κ[- - - -]

[. . c. 5 . . .] ΙΟΝ[- - - -]

[. . .] ΤΗΣ[- - - -]

12 [. . .] ΙΟΥ[- - - -]

[. . .] ΣΧΑ[- - - -]

[. .] ΑΜΠ[- - - -]

[. .] ιον πρ[- - - -]

16 [. .] ΥΙΝ . [- - - -]

B

- [- - - - -]πρὸς τ[. .]
 [- - - - -]ν καὶ παι-
 [- - - - -]Ἀ]σκληπιός
 20 [- - - - -]ς καὶ Ὑγίεια
 [- - - - -]θ]εράπων
 [- - - - -] ἀπὸ τῶν
 [- - - - -]φ]αλακροῦ
 24 [- - - - -]υ Ἀσκληπιός
 [- - - - -]ϊκός καὶ
 [- - - - -]ον ἄλλος
 [- - - - -]ἐ]ν φαιῶ
 28 [- - - - -]ιτης
 [- - - - -]ον παι-
 [- - - - -]αι
 [- - - - -]
 32 [- - - - -]
 [- - - - -]
 [- - - - -] καὶ
 [- - - - -] Ἑρμῆς
 36 [- - - - -]κα]ῖ ἐν τεῖ ἄλλει
 [- - - - -]τη βαλβίδι
 [- - - - -]υς ἀνδριάς
 [- - - - -]ἔ]χων
 40 [- - - - -] ὑμηττία
 [- - - - -] ὑμήτιος
 [- - - - -]πε]ντελεικόν
 [- - - - -]ωι
 44 [- - - - -]ἐνη Ἑρμοκλέους
 [- - - - -] ἐξέδραι
 [- - - - -]ενος Ἄρτεμις
 [- - - - -] ἔχουσα
 48 [- - - - -] ποδήρη χιτῶνα
 [- - - - -] καθήμενον
 [- - - - -] ἐξέδραι
 [- - - - -]λιθοι Μοῦσαι
 52 [- - - - -]σιον Ἑρμοκλέους

[- - - -] ἀλάβαστρον
 [- - - -] Ἑρμαφρόδιτος
 [- - - - -] Ἄ]ρτεμις
 56 [- - - - -] πα[ρ]θένου
 [- - - - -] Τ]ιμαρχίδου
 [- - - - -] του
 [- - - - -] Εὖχ]ειρος
 60 [- - - - -] η ὕμητ[τία]

The arguments for identification are the mention of two architectural features associated with the gymnasium: first, the *balbis*, a word used for the grooved block at the starting-gate in the race track; second, the *exedras*, interpreted by Clay as lecture rooms. Clay would identify this gymnasium as the Ptolemaion: in support of this interpretation, line 14 could be restored λαμπ[άς], and refer to a torch, an object known from the section of the Delian inventory under Kallistratos that refers to the gymnasium.¹

Clay presents the names mentioned in the genitive as those of sculptors-Hermokles, Chares (both apparently Rhodians, and the latter none other than the sculptor of the Colossus of Rhodes), Eucheir, Timarchides.² S. Tracy has recognized the hand of the stonemason (the «Cutter of Agora I 6006»), hence confirming Clay's date;³ G. Despinis has used this text to discuss the chronology of the sculptors named Eucheir (noted in SEG XLV 183).

S. Tracy, at line 60, read ὕμητ[τία]. Here are some other remarks on the text. Line 2, the [τ]ραγήματ[α] cannot be nibbles brought by the Kouretes to baby Zeus (Clay), since the word is separated from the Kouretes by the relief of a Centa[ur]. Perhaps a verb which described a damaged statue or image? Line 24, [πεντελε]ικός? Line 28, [λυχν]ίτης? But the word is never attested epigraphically, as opposed to Παρίου λίθου.⁴ So [ἄκτ]ίτης? (suggested to me by A. Matthaiou). Line 38, [χαλ-κ]οὺς ἀνδριάς? [e.g. δί]ππους? Line 51, [ἀκρό]λιθοι *vel* [διά]λιθοι Μοῦσαι?

1. Ptolemaion: S. Miller, «Architecture as Evidence for the Identity of the Early Polis», in M. Hansen (ed.), *Sources for the Ancient Greek City-State*, (Copenhagen 1995) 201-244. Delos inventories: J.-Ch. Moretti, «Les inventaires du gymnase de Délos», *BCH* 121 (1997) 125-51.

2. Clay, «Inventory» 265-6, J. Traill, «Eucheir Kropides: a Correction», *Hesperia* 46 (1977) 397.

3. S. Tracy *Attic Letter-cutters of 229 to 86 B.C.*, (Berkeley 1990) 150, 159.

4. Sara Aleshire, *The Athenian Asklepieion. The People, their Dedications, and the Inventories*, (Amsterdam 1989) Inv. I 9, III 5, 31, 36.

At line 6, we should restore [τύ]πιον, relief.⁵ «Relief of Chares»: as mentioned above, for Clay, Chares is the sculptor: the creator of the giant dedication at Rhodes apparently also cast metal votive reliefs in Athens. Such use of the genitive of authorship is known in literary discussion of sculpture. But there are no known artist's signatures on votive reliefs.⁶ In this inventory, it is more likely that the genitive denotes the dedicators. In lines 57 and 59, the genitive could be preceded by ἀνάθημα, a possibility Clay discounts without argument; though line 44 shows a genitive probably directly following the description of an image, there is no reason why variation in phrasing (and hence the irregular use of ἀνάθημα) should be precluded. The [Eu]cheir of line 59 is not necessarily the known sculptor of this name; other restorations are possible, such as (an object in) the hand of a statue, or a spatial indication such as [δεξιῶς χ]ειρὸς. As for line 6, the construction τύπος + genitive occurs in the later inventories of the Asklepieion, in the sense «dedication by...», which should also be understood here.⁷ At line 23, rather than an «image of a bald man»,⁸ the name of a dedicant, [Φ]αλάκρου, is likely. Could an anthroponym also be restored at line 3, rather than the Centaur? The name Κενταύβιος appears twice in Attica (*IG* II² 8801 and 9352?).⁹ At line 24, rather than the ending of a genitive masculine, we could restore the locative relative [ο]ῦ, to describe the subject of the image, [relief on which there is] Asklepios.¹⁰

The inventory seems to present us with a vivid picture of a lost world of images-the sculptural décor of an Athenian gymnasium during the Hellenistic period. Particularly notable is the mention of a (?) Centaur (Clay: a «four-footed philosopher» alluding to the educational mission of Cheiron?), the Kouretes (as a model for the armed dance, the *pyrriche*, of the ephebes?), [Tragedy and] Comedy (appropriate for the educational and cultural mission of the gymnasium), Asklepios and Hygieia (Clay: «quite at home in the gymnasium»), Hermes (one of the gymnasium deities), Artemis (more puzzling), the Muses (culture again), and, most strikingly of all, Hermaphroditos.

5. Clay, «Inventory» 264 n. 13; Aleshire, *Asklepieion* 318 (either technical term or synonym of τύπος, usually metal).

6. I owe this information to Carol Lawton; many votive reliefs are anepigraphical.

7. Aleshire, *Asklepieion* Inv. V. The genitive of the dedicant also in *Oropos* 324-5.

8. On this sort of expression, Aleshire, *Asklepieion* Inv. IV, 100, 103, 105, 107, also p. 238, always «relief of man / woman»).

9. The name is probably a variant on the Anatolian name Kendebes: L. Zgusta, *Kleinasiatische Personennamen*, (Prague 1964) no. 576. Both examples in Athens belong to non-Athenians.

10. Aleshire, *Asklepieion* 120, Inv. III 15, and IV 133.

This picture can be placed besides other sources for images in the gymnasium, epigraphical and archaeological, from Delos, Eretria, and Melos (where dedicatory herms and, remarkably, the famous «Vénus de Milo» come from the gymnasium).¹¹ But is the inventory found in the Athenian Agora really a gymnasium inventory ?

At line 27, Clay takes [ἐ]ν φαίδι to mean (possibly) some type of stone. A statue «in» dark-grey stone ? For this use of ἐν to describe the material of an image, Zenob. *Proverb.* 4.80, Κέλμης ἐν σιδήρῳ (discussed in Marion Müller-Dufeu, *La sculpture grecque: sources épigraphiques et littéraires* (Paris 2002) 33). Or a statue «on top of (a base of) dark-grey stone» ? This expression would have to be added to the many expressions to describe ways in which dedications are presented: e.g. ἐμ πλαισίῳ, ἐν πλινθείῳ, ἐν θήκη...¹²

The restoration is not satisfactory. Better to restore [ἐν *vel* πρὸς τῷ νυ]ν-φαίδι, «in/by the Nymphaion». The term here cannot describe a monumental fountain, a meaning which only appears from the first century AD onwards;¹³ the earlier meaning is a spring (often in a natural setting such as a cave), or a shrine of the Nymphs. The cults of the Nymphs in Attica, and in Athens specifically, are well known: apart from a shrine in the Peiraieus, there were shrines at the following locations: on the Hill of the Nymphs; to the north-west of the Akropolis (probably at the site of the Klepsydra fountain: *IG I*³ 1063); on the banks of the river Ilissos; and on the «middle terrace» west of the Asklepieion, on the southern side of the Akropolis. To these should be added the shrine of Nymphe, a deity linked with bridal ceremonies, also on the southern flank of the Akropolis.¹⁴

11. Delos: Moretti, «Inventaires». Eretria: Elena Mango, *Das Gymnasium* (Eretria 13, Gollion 2003). Melos: Rachel Kousser, «Creating the Past: the Vénus de Milo and the Hellenistic Reception of Classical Greece», *AJA* 109 (2005) 227-50. Generally, R. van den Hoff, «Ornamenta γυμνασιώδη ? Delos und Pergamon als Beispielfälle der Skulpturenausstattung hellenistischer Gymnasien», in D. Kah, P. Scholz (eds.), *Das hellenistische Gymnasium*, (Berlin 2004, 373-405) notably 391-2 on images of gods in the gymnasium (using the inventory published by Clay).

12. Moretti, «Inventaires» 130. φαίδις is not attested as a descriptive term in the architectural vocabulary recensend in 'Α. 'Ορλάνδος, 'Ι. Τραυλός, *Λεξικὸν Ἀρχαίων Ἀρχιτεκτονικῶν ὄρων*, (Athens 1986).

13. S. Settis, «“Esedra” e “ninfeo” nella terminologia architettonica del mondo romano. Dall'età repubblicana alla tarda antichità», *ANRW* 1.4 (1973) 661-746.

14. Jennifer Larson, *Greek Nymphs: Myth, Cult, Lore*, (Oxford 2001) 111-2, 126-31.

Because of the mention of images of Asklepios and Hygieia, fragment B, at least, likely concerns the Asklepieion, specifically the area conventionally known as the middle terrace.¹⁵ The cult of the Nymphs is known from the fifth century onwards, by votive reliefs;¹⁶ it was certainly linked to the spring in this area.¹⁷ This spring, or at least the spring house, fell in disuse (water for the shrine of Asklepios was provided by a spring behind the Doric stoa), but the cult of the Nymphs is attested, alongside others, in the western area, from a triple altar found there (first century BC):¹⁸

Ἑρμοῦ.

Νυμφῶν.

Ἴσιδος.

Ἀφροδείτης.

Πανός.

The altar bearing this inscription is now displayed by the Asklepieion: it is a single block, with the three columns of writing distributed on three altars represented in low relief; the top is occupied by a roughed out depression joining the three altars. Three pre-existing cults within the Asklepieion were given a shared altar, on which, however, their distinctiveness was formally respected by the representation of three altars. One of these cults was that of the Nymphs; The [Ny]nphaion of fragment B could be associated with this cult. If this identification is correct, this inventory offers evidence for the continuity, or resurgence, of this cult, between the Classical period and the first century BC., namely in the late second century, when the cult apparently had its own shrine or cultic area within the precinct of the Asklepieion.

The iconographical elements of the inventory can be interpreted in the light

15. On the Athenian Asklepieion, Milena Melfi, *I Santuari di Asclepio in Grecia I*, (Rome 2007) 313-433.

16. For instance, A. Milchhöfer, «Nymphenrelief aus Athen», *AM* 5 (1880) 206-23; J. Travlos, *Pictorial Dictionary of Ancient Athens*, (London 1971) pl. 192-3 for illustrations; *IG II²* 4545, 4592; R. Parker, *Polytheism and Society at Athens*, (Oxford 2005) 47.

17. On this spring, *IG I³* 1098-9; Larson, *Nymphs* 111-12, 132-6; Melfi, *Asclepio* 323-4. 330-1 (part of fifth-century shrine already), 345, 347 (abandonment of spring in fourth-century already; Travlos, *Dictionary* 138, 171), 408. On the spring behind the third century stoa, see Melfi, *Asclepio* 341-3.

18. *IG II²* 4994 with L. Beschi, «Culti stranieri e fondazioni private nell'Atene Classica: alcuni casi», *ASAA* 80 (2002) 13-41, at 25-8. Aphrodite: 4729; 4769; Susan Walker, «A Sanctuary of Isis on the South Slope of the Athenian Acropolis», *ABSA* 74 (1979) 243-57.

of the identification proposed here. The mention of Hermes, line 35, would fit a votive relief to the Nymphs with Hermes. The Hermaphrodite of line 54 could have been a dedication to Hermes, Aphrodite, and Pan.¹⁹ Artemis, prominent in fragment B, appears in a Hellenistic dedication from the South Slope of the the Akropolis.²⁰ The bronze (?) statue of line 38 could be the bronze statue of Polykrates, mentioned in the inventories of Asklepios (Aleshire, *Asklepieion Inv.* III, 27, 51), on the western terrace rather than in the shrine itself. The *alabastron* of line 54 fits a shrine inventory better than a gymnasium; the previous line might be a *carchesion* (drinking vessel), *halusion* (necklace), or a golden object of some sort.

What of the *balbis* of line 37? Perhaps it is used here in a more general sense, simply as «low base», as in the Suda (βάσις ταπεινή, ἢ ἀφαιτηρία); another possibility is that it does indeed designate the starting block of a race course. A. Raubitschek postulated an archaic race track on the South Slope of the Akropolis. This has not been generally accepted; but if fragment B does concern the Asklepieion, the *balbis* could be a remains from Raubitschek's race track along the south side of the Akropolis, with its starting point later absorbed by the precinct of the Asklepieion, its blocks now lost, or unrecognized by excavators.²¹

The exedras of lines 45 and 50 are also intriguing. The word does not designate what epigraphists call exedras (bench-like bases for multiple statues),²² but,

19. In fact, a marble statue, of the famous «reclining Hermaphrodite» type, was discovered south of the Akropolis, «in the military hospital», i.e. the neo-classical Weiler Building in Makryianni (Ath. Nat. Mus. 261; findspot: Π. Καββαδίας, *Γλυπτὰ τοῦ ἐθνικοῦ Μουσείου. Κατάλογος περιγραφικός*, (Athens 1890-2) 211; *LIMC* s.v. Hermaphroditos); however, the statue does not have male genitalia, and is usually identified as a sleeping Maenad (N. Kaltsas, *Sculpture in the National Archaeological Museum, Athens* (Los Angeles 2002) no. 737 with earlier bibliography; dated to the second century AD); it could come from the Theatre of Dionysos.

20. *IG* II² 4688 (found near the Theatre of Dionysos; early second century BC).

21. A. Raubitschek, «Wo war der erste Dromos der Panathenäen?», *Nikephoros* 5 (1992) 9; *contra*, Miller, «Architecture» 212 (adducing N. Platon, *AD* 20 (1965), *Chronika* 25-6). The area is that of the modern concrete walkway, leading to the Akropolis; in ancient times, the race track and spectator area would have been erased by later use and spatial reorganization.

22. On ancient terminology for what we call «exedras», Marie-Christine Hellmann, *Recherches sur le vocabulaire de l'architecture grecque d'après les inscriptions de Délos*, (Paris, 1992) 127, with literary examples of *hemikuklion*; to which add Michel 538 (with Ch. Habicht, «Notes on Inscriptions from Cyzicus», *EA* 38 (2005) 93-100, 94-5, on date), where the word *sunedrion* clearly designates a multi-statue, familial exedra.

as Marie-Christine Hellmann makes clear, notably on the basis of the Delian inventories, a hall or room, equipped with benches or a low platform for dining couches, often *in antis* or with a porch, for reunions or feasting, and sometimes used to store dedications.²³ This might describe the dining halls (fifth-century; complete with offset entrance) behind the Ionian stoa on the Western terrace, once identified as the *abaton* or *katagogeion* of the Asklepieion, an identification dispelled by Aleshire.²⁴ One difficulty is a group of akrolithic(?) Muses in one of these exedras or under the Ionian porch (line 51). Even so, a dedicatory inscription from the Asklepieion records the building of both an *oikos* and an *exedra* in the first century AD, making clear the presence of at least one *exedra* in the shrine.²⁵

What is to be made of fragment A? It probably also is a shrine inventory:²⁶ there might be a mention of an ἑσχάρα, (grill or portable altar) at line 13, a familiar object from other inventories; as mentioned above, perhaps λάμπας, line 14. I am not sure what to make of the two vacant lines, after 4 and 7. Fragment A might list dedications related to the theatre: the Kouretes and Comedy could be dedications by victorious choregoi and performers. This could be a list of dedications from the shrine of Dionysos Eleuthereus; in that case, if it belongs together with fragment B, the whole document might have been an inventory of dedications in the peri-

23. Hellmann, *Vocabulaire* 126-30 (interchangeability of *exedra*, *oikos*, *hestiatorion*). Parallel: *Inscr. Kourion* 108: Trajan pays for 5 exedras.

24. R. Martin, H. Metzger, «Recherches d'architecture et de topographie à l'Asklepieion d'Athènes», *BCH* 73 (1949) 316-35; R. Tomlinson, 1969. «Two Buildings in Sanctuaries of Asklepios», *JHS* 89 (1969) 106-117; Aleshire, *Asklepieion* 24-5, 28-30; Melfi, *Asclepio* 327-9, 348-50 (*hestiatorion* for ritual banquets).

25. *IG II²* 3174 (I thank Milena Melfi for this point).

26. However, fragment A, line 1 might read ΠΤΟ on Clay's photograph (I owe this point to Riet van Bremen), and could refer to the Ptolemaion, the gymnasium located near the now demolished church of Agios Demetrios Katephores, where Plaka turns to hill). Material from the Ptolemaion, architectural and epigraphical, was transported after antiquity to the area of the Asklepieion and the South Slope: Miller, «Architecture», 206; *IG II²* 3795-6, 3803-4, 3807, 3810, 3812 (bases of statues of educators), with M. and Ethel Levensohn, «Inscriptions on the South Slope of the Acropolis», *Hesperia* 16 (1947) 63-74; ὄρο[ς] γυμν[ασίου], quoted by Levensohn and Levensohn, p. 65, found on edge of Odeion of Herodes Atticus. However, this boundary-stone could be the same stone seen earlier in Koukaki, near Plateia Gargarettas: I. Threpsiadis, *Praktika* 1950, 65; it might come from the Kynosarges. None of this makes a compelling case for fragment A being from (or about) the Ptolemaion.

acropolitan shrines. Fragment A could also concern the Asklepieion, like fragment B: the Asklepieion was associated with the City Dionysia (with a sacrifice to Asklepios), and a choregic dedication of the second century AD is preserved.²⁷ The proximity of the Asklepieion to the Theatre of Dionysos would explain the presence of theatre-related dedications.²⁸ However, the association of the two fragments is doubtful. A is inscribed on 2 adjacent faces, B on one face only; A concerns metal objects (reliefs, grill, torch), as opposed to the stone images in B.²⁹

Fragment B on its own offers a mid-late second century example of a documentary genre which otherwise seems characteristic of the Classical period, down to the fourth century and a little beyond. Three other second-century inventories are known: SEG XXXIV 95, from a shrine (Dionysos) and concentrating on metal offerings; and two second-century inventories for the shrine of Asklepios (Aleshire, *Asklepieion Inv.* VIII and IX). The latter is of particular interest, because it specifies «stone reliefs» among the dedications. In contrast, the Classical inventories, are devoted to temple treasure, i.e. metal dedications, mostly precious.

There are some apparent exceptions to the concentration on temple treasure. A small, fragmentary series of inventories from the Lykourgan period, IG II² 1498-1501, concerns bronze statues. The documents were identified by Diane Harris as a list of damaged statues «decommissioned» and melted down.³⁰ On Kos, a stele lists honorific statues which were melted down.³¹ Is this type of document comparable to the inventory of statues and reliefs of our fragment B? For instance, it could be a list of reliefs moved or stored because of building works within the precinct.

The roster of sculpture and images in fragment B offers a picture of the dedications in a shrine of the healing god- an epigraphical parallel to Herodas's

27. L. Deubner, *Attische Feste*, (Berlin 1932) 142; IG II² 3120.

28. Melfi, *Asclepio* 337 (on IG II² 354), 348; the stele bearing IG II² 347, a Lykourgan-era decree for a dramatist, was found (at least partly) in the Asklepieion. The second and third centuries AD saw an increase in choregic and Dionysiac dedications in the shrine, discussed in Melfi's survey.

29. Among the other texts of the cutter, identified by S. Tracy, possible candidates for association with B are IG II² 736 (shrines); Agora I. 1720, a fragment of a list of names (?), treated by S. Tracy, «Five Letter-Cutters of Hellenistic Athens (230-130 B. C.)», *Hesperia* 47 (1978) 244-268.

30. «Bronze Statues on the Athenian Acropolis: The Evidence of a Lycurgan Inventory», *AJA* 96 (1992) 637-52.

31. *Iscr. Cos* ED 230, with Chr. Habicht, «Neue Inschriften aus Kos», *ZPE* 112 (1996) 83-94 at p. 86.

fourth *Mimiamb*; except that the inventory includes dedications to a variety of deities. This is the setting for the world of marble images in the inventory: Hermes, Artemis, the Muses, Hermaphroditos— just as the single stone *IG II² 4994* assembled three altars for different deities. The diversity of images reflects the plurality of a «pagan» shrine.³²

Summary

This paper examines an inventory found in two fragments in the Athenian Agora, published as a single document by D. Clay, identified by its editor as the inventory of a gymnasium, and dated, on palaeographical grounds, to the later second century BC (*SEG XXVI 139*). This inventory would be comparable to a gymnasium inventory found on Delos. The identification shows us an Athenian gymnasium peopled with images of gods, notably Asklepios, and Hermaphrodite (!), works by named and known artists. But is the identification correct? In the second fragment, I propose seeing a mention of a [Ny]nphaion, and identify this shrine of the Nymphs with the shrine known to have stood in the precinct of the shrine of Asklepios in Athens town, on the south slope of the Akropolis. The second fragment at least seems to belong to an inventory of dedications in the Asklepieion. The mention of a «balbis» in this fragment has a topographical interest: rather than the starting line of a race track in a gymnasium, it might be a remnant of a disused archaic race track on the south slope of the Akropolis— a feature earlier, and controversially, postulated by Raubitschek. The first fragment published by D. Clay might not belong to the same document.

32. A version of this paper was presented to the Greek Epigraphy Workshop in Oxford. My thanks to the audience, especially to A. Chaniotis, P. Martzavou, M. Melfi (for expertise on the Asklepieion), R. Parker, S. Skaltsa (for expertise concerning gymnasia), R. van Bremen. Thanks also to C. Lawton, S. Tracy, A. Matthaiou. Responsibility for any mistakes or infelicities remains my own.