

# HEALING DEITIES ON PENTELIKON

STERLING DOW

*To the Memory of  
William and Mary Wallace*

## *Contents*

**P**HOENIX 32 (1978) pages 231–234, photograph 233 (= IG 2<sup>2</sup> 4531),  
a Dedication to [Asklepios], [Hygieia], and [Tel]esphoros . . . page 313

Previous Editions . . . page 314

### The Monument

Finding and Loss 314; Dimensions 314; Condition and History 315;  
Mouldings 315; Use 315; Lettering and Date 315

TEXTS 318; Readings 320

Deities and Dedicators . . . 321

Asklepios Soter . . . 321

Aristeides . . . 322

P. Aelius [Aristei]des at Epidauros? (IG 4 1<sup>2</sup> 577) . . . 324

The Dedicator's Name . . . 325

Telesphoros in Athenai (IG 2<sup>2</sup> 2127, 2227) . . . 325

Philisteides Philisteidou Peiraieus . . . 326

A Dedication in Athenai to Asklepios Soter (IG 2<sup>2</sup> 4516) . . . 326

The Cult on Pentelikon . . . 327.

IN *Phoenix* 32 (1978), CHRISTOPHER P. JONES WROTE ON “Three Foreigners in Attica.” Julius Nicanor (222–228) is known from a series of inscriptions, of which the texts are accepted, and Serapion the Stoic (228–231) also is known from several inscriptions, not reëdited, as well as from Plutarch, and from Stobaeus. These pages must seem to everyone, as (though without minute examination) they do to me, to be excellent: certainly future studies of Nicanor and Serapion will start from here. In the third study (231–234), which is based on a new edition by Jones of a single inscription, IG 2<sup>2</sup> 4531, an inscription lost and theretofore never studied, the famous Rhetor Aelius Aristeides is restored. The rescue of the dedication from near-oblivion is itself cause for gratitude, not less because it seems still to need epigraphical help.

It may be useful at the outset to have a summary description of the monument IG 2<sup>2</sup> 4531. It was a rectangular pedestal, preserved to its full height. The material doubtless was Pentelic marble. The surfaces were much battered and gashed, but clearly the lettering was good, and the

mouldings, at top and bottom, were tall and elaborate. When first set up, with the white marble fresh and gleaming, the letters painted red (? at that time red may or may not have been usual), the mouldings painted in a variety of colors and patterns, and the whole surmounted (one would like to imagine) by a bronze statue of half-life-size, the dedication must have been a handsome feature in a mountain shrine which otherwise, it too, is lost.

*Previous Editions.* W. Wrede made the photograph, but apparently no text, in 1927. W. Peek sent the photograph to J. Kirchner with a text by himself but evidently without seeing the inscription. The inscription is, or was, on Mt. Pentelikon; no scholar except Wrede is known to have seen it. There is no squeeze. The Peek-Kirchner edition, *IG* 2<sup>2</sup> 4531 of 1935, was the first and was the only one before Jones. Kirchner gives Peek the credit for the restorations, but for his own edition, at the suggestion of S. Follet, Jones added to Kirchner's text a new first line. This second edition is *Phoenix* 32 (1978) 231-234; text on 232; plate (Wrede's photograph) 233. The texts of Kirchner and of Jones are reproduced below on page 318. These publications of a brief inscription are interesting as showing how many improvements in details may need to be made by use of a more painstaking epigraphical technique.

#### THE MONUMENT

*Finding and Loss.* Evidently Wrede reported that in 1927 the inscription was "ad 'Αγ. 'Ηλίαν prope monasterium Penteli" (*IG* 2<sup>2</sup> 4531). Wrede's photograph shows that it was standing in the clear. When I visited the (remains of the) monastery in 1934, I did not see it, but I made no careful search for inscriptions; the inscription had not been published and I knew nothing of it. Jones reports that Malcolm B. Wallace searched for it in vain before the *Phoenix* 1978 article was published.

*Dimensions.* Wrede did not provide a description, but for the photograph merely left his wooden meter-stick, unfolded to the extent of 0.32 m., on top of the block. Edges and surface were much abraded, but otherwise the block seems to have preserved its original dimensions. As best they can be calculated from the photograph, the dimensions were: height, ca 0.72 m.; width at the top and bottom, ca 0.30; thickness, presumably about the same. It was a pedestal of medium-small size. Height of regular letters, ca 0.033 m.

Malcolm B. Wallace has suggested that the dimensions were in Roman feet: width, 1 foot; thickness, also 1 foot (?); height, 2 1/2 feet; mouldings, 1/2 foot; letters, 1/12 foot. It is likely that in ordering the monument, the donor specified dimensions; or that, for a bronze statuette of a given size, the masons would provide a base which had standard measurements.

*Condition and History.* The front surface, with the lettering, was well preserved in the middle of its right side. Two vertical gashes, caused by water-wear, and lesser striations had damaged the upper left parts of the front surface. The main gash was phenomenally wide and deep. The block must have lain where the lower right side of the front was kept dry and protected, while for centuries every shower, or perhaps some rill of perpetually running water, gouged out the left middle. It looks as if some human tried to extend the cleft at the top, so as to split the whole block, but in any case it held together. Finally someone, for some reason, set it up where in 1927 Wrede found it. It is plausible to guess that Wrede stood it up there himself. Originally the monument would have had a base, but the photograph shows none. Probably Wrede found none.

*The Mouldings,* of course intended to make the pedestal impressive, were massive: ca 0.15 m. in height at the top, and also ca 0.15 m. at the bottom. Battered as they are, a detailed analysis would be difficult, but it can be stated positively that the mouldings are correct for top and bottom: the whole had not been inverted, as often happened in Late Roman times, for re-use.

*Use.* There are no data on the treatment of the top surface. Kirchner calls the monument an *ara*, but it may be doubted whether this was Wrede's judgement; apparently he left no description whatever, and we know nothing of the top or of any other surface except the front. Kirchner, who did not take much interest in such things, perhaps thought it might do for incense. *If* it were an altar, and if C. G. Yavis, *Greek Altars* (St. Louis, Missouri 1949) were consulted, apparently it would fall into the category "Rectangular Monolithic Altars: Flat-Topped" (154-160). But Yavis has none that are really similar. Instead, the present monument is a regular pedestal for a dedication, like hundreds of others. Possibly it held a small statue, and if so, possibly one of medium costliness, scil. bronze.

*Lettering and Date.* For dating Athenian inscriptions, J. Kirchner used a set of his own criteria, never (I think) reduced to writing. On the whole they were vague criteria. For the present inscription he put "ss. II/III p.," which could mean roughly ca 200. It was the only effort at dating the inscription.

For tabulations serving to date Athenian letters in the Roman period, there is W. Larfeld, *Handbuch der attischen Inschriften*<sup>2</sup> 2.2 (Leipzig 1902) 481-506. The only other such tables are from a remote place, but the common assumption is probably correct, that letter styles tended to be similar all over the Greek East. For this reason, and although they are based on somewhat limited material, there is great value in the excellent

tables to be found in C. H. Kraeling, ed., *Gerasa, City of the Decapolis* (New Haven, Conn. 1938): C. B. Welles, "The Inscriptions," 358–365, with plates 95–138. With the author's kind permission, I have had valuable help also from a seminar paper of 1970 by David F. Grose.

Collections of photographs are P. Graindor, *Album d'inscriptions antiques d'époque impériale* (Gand 1924) which despite its poor photographs, often of squeezes also poor, is very useful; and J. Kirchner-G. Klaffenbach, *Imagines Inscriptionum Atticarum*<sup>2</sup> (Berlin 1948).

For public inscriptions, ligatures are used only in the Roman period (L. Threaght, *The Grammar of Attic Inscriptions* 1 [Berlin and New York 1980] pages 107–110). On their use within those centuries, no study has collected them or found chronological limits; Kirchner usually did not record them. W. Larfeld, *Handbuch* 1.2 (1902), tabulates 65 forms of ligature and states that the great majority of occurrences are after Hadrian (pages 513–515). He cites no occurrences of Η, which is no. 36 in his table. In general ligatures are rare: in Kirchner-Klaffenbach *Imag. Inscr. Att.*<sup>2</sup> the only one I have noticed is in IG 2<sup>2</sup> 2245 of the A.D. 260s: plate 54 no. 147, ends of two lines. Grose says ligatures date from the time of Hadrian or later. For ligatures and other traits of inscriptions s. III p., see L. Robert on a Jewish inscription at Nikomedia, *Hellenica* 12–13 (1960) 387 and plate XIII.

Yet to be recognized in the handbooks is the use of small letters, usually only one or two, at the ends of lines where space is short, as a device for getting the last letters inscribed. The alternative, nearly always avoided, was to curtail the word. I cannot provide a history, but examples are in IG 2<sup>2</sup> 3287 of A.D. 125 (Graindor no. 44); IG 2<sup>2</sup> 1102 of 131/2 (Graindor no. 50); IG 2<sup>2</sup> 3688 of init. s. III p. (*Imag. Inscr. Att.*<sup>2</sup> plate 52 no. 144). The practice began long before the present inscription.

Among the few letters that are preserved, the triangular ones, alpha and delta, have an upward and leftward projection of the right hasta, but this, and the deeply curved bar of the alphas, merely exclude the writing from earlier than the Julio-Claudian period. Most of the other letters are regular: E, M, and Σ are square. Phi, fully developed, with a round body and a tall vertical, is found in all periods of the Empire. The square sigma □ in ligature, and still more the small omega, partially preserved but apparently W, are late, i.e., s. II p. or later, but they too do not establish a date. Only the one diamond-shaped omikron ϐ (line 4, with the odd mixed form in line 6) is a true rarity. It does not appear at all in Larfeld's and Welles's tables, but Grose recognized it. Occurrences in only three Athenian inscriptions are known to me: IG 2<sup>2</sup> 2055 of A.D. 148/9 (*Imag. Inscr. Att.*<sup>2</sup> plate 49 no. 136 = Graindor plate 48 no. 59); *Hesperia* 11 (1942) 59 no. 25 of A.D. 180–192; and a third dated only "R. Imp."

The present letters are in Welles's "Revived Square Alphabet" (table

page 364, discussion 360 and 365). In this table, all but one of the (15) inscriptions have sigma as  $\Sigma$ ; one inscription, of A.D. 191 or 190, has both  $\Sigma$  and  $\Sigma$ . Omega varies, sometimes being lunate, sometimes being made with straight lines, and the sides being parallel. Other letters agree well enough with those of *IG* 2<sup>2</sup> 4531, but at Gerasa there is only one diamond-shaped omikron: it is in inscription no. 16, of init. s. III p. In Gerasa tall phi's are rare. As a whole, the Revived Square Alphabet is known earlier and is said by Welles to have been in regular use from the last quarter of s. II p. on; but the dated inscriptions tabulated on his page 364 are all of A.D. 190–212.

The foregoing evidence, taken together, makes it clear that the inscription cannot be earlier than ca 100 B.C. and may be as late as init. s. III p. The mixture of forms suggests a break-down of the Classical lettering of s. II p., so that a date one decade or two before A.D. 200, or a decade or two after, seems plausible. This fits with the date of the probable dedicator (*infra* 326).

(See texts and transcription 318–319)

## TEXTS OF THE DEDICATION

IG II<sup>2</sup> 4531, complete (xerox)

**4531** Ad Ἀρ. Ἡλείαν prope monasterium Penteli. Ara  
supra l. 0.30. Litt. Ἀ Ε Δ Σ Φ. Imaginem photogr.  
misit Peek.

s. II/III p. [ΥΓΙΕΙΑ] καὶ  
[ΤΕΛΕΣ]ΦΟΡ[ω]  
[ΑΡΙ]ΣΤΕΙΔΗΣ  
ΕΥ[Ξ]ΑΜΕΝΟΣ.

Suppl. Peek.

*Phoenix* 1978. 232

[Ἀσκληπιῶ καὶ]  
[Υγ(ι)εία] κα[i]  
[Τελε]σφόρ[ω]  
4 [Ἀρι]στείδης  
εὐ[ξ]άμενος.

## The Present Study

A.D. ca 200

Between the crowning moulding and line 1,  
a blank space ca 0.03 m. high

Non-stoikhedon  
ca 8 full letters

1 [Ἀσκληπιῶ]  
2 [Σωτήρι καὶ]  
3 [Υγίεια] κα[i\*]  
4 [Τελ]εσφόρῳ  
5 Φ[ιλι]στείδης  
6 εὐξάμενος

Between line 6 and the base moulding,  
a blank space ca 0.12 m. high

## Transcription

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8

1 [Α Σ Κ Λ Η Π Ι Ω]

2 [Σ Ω Τ Η Ρ Ι Κ Α Ι]

3 [Υ Γ Ι Ε Ι Α] Κ Α [Ι]

4 [Τ Ε Λ] Ε Σ Φ Ο Ρ Ω

5 Φ [Ι Λ Ι] Σ Τ Ε Ι Δ Η

6 Ε Υ Ξ Α Μ Ε Ν Ο Σ

## Readings

From the photograph, Jones confirmed Telesphoros by reading the sigma, which is positive, in line 4. In the photograph, reproduced at *Phoenix* 32 (1978) 233, I was able to detect traces of other new letters. All three first letters of line 6 (line 6 as numbered above) can be seen in the published photograph, which is lithoprinted on the regular stock but even so is well reproduced. Just above these three letters, in line 5, some trace of the letter crucial for Aristеides (or some other dedicator) ought to show. But no published version of a photograph, having been through this process, which is quadruple, can be expected to show every faintest trace of letters. The Deutsches Archaeologisches Institut kindly supplied me a new glossy print (negative, Athen: Attika 142). In lines 1–3, where something new might have been expected, I have failed to discover any positive stroke, but lower down, among a few other new traces, the crucial phi in line 5 (see below) is welcome, though it has to be dotted.

The new print, magnified, seems to reveal small letters on the left-hand part of the cavetto at the top, as if -]⏚ΔΑ[- were inscribed there. Definitely they will not make part of ἀγαθῇ τύχῃ. None of the original inscription would have been inscribed there. On abraded surfaces, seeming but false traces can often be found, though less convincing than these. The present traces may be a graffito.

Line 1. A rectilinear omega, if that was its shape (as in line 4), would occupy 1 1/2 spaces. Whatever its shape, the letters of the principal deity's name would naturally have been spread out to fill the line. In *IG* 2<sup>2</sup> 4516 line 6, Ἀσκληπιῖ (infra), Philisteides omitted iota "subscript," as in the present inscription lines [3] and 4.

Line 2. On the epithet, see infra. The use of καί twice in succession is not very graceful, but *IG* 2<sup>2</sup> 4701 has five deities connected by καί, four times repeated.

Line 3. In the previous edition, *Phoenix* 32 (1978) 232 line 2, the first iota is enclosed in parentheses [Ὶγ(ι)εία] used by the editor to indicate that the deity's name may have lacked this iota. It was a good point to raise, because Hygieia is one of the most notable words often contracted. This is made clear in L. Threatte, *Gram. Att. Inscr.* 1 416–418, who finds that before A.D. 100, the uncontracted form Ὶγεία is about as frequent as the contracted, but after A.D. 100 the contracted form Ὶγεία is the more frequent. In the present line, contraction would leave room for iota "subscript," but it was lacking, evidently, in lines [1] (as in *IG* 2<sup>2</sup> 4516, infra) and 4, and the previous editions were right in omitting it here. Usage varied: L. Threatte, *Gram.* 1 (362–) 364–365. With a final iota omitted, the ample room in the present line strongly recommends a first iota.

Line 4. On the glossy photograph, the top and bottom, both dim, of the



second epsilon can be detected. At the end, the first upright of a small straight-line omega is visible—small, so as to fit into the space. There would seem to have been no room for a final iota.

Line 5. On the *nomen*, see below. Of the letters IAI nothing remains, and on the glossy print, magnified, I cannot make out any traces of the circular part of the phi, which in line 4 is clear and well-rounded. But in line 5 two dark vertical lines, none too clear but in precisely the correct position, give the tall upward extension and part of the lower. There are however other dark lines, and the phi cannot be claimed as positive. At the end of the line, space being limited, the final sigma is of the “square” shape suitable for being in ligature Η. The other sigmas (lines 4, 5, 6) are four-barred, but at this time (A.D. ca 200) of lowered standards in lettering, the occurrence of both shapes in one inscription is not unusual.

Line 6. On the glossy photograph, traces of all three horizontals in the xi can be detected. Of the final sigma, which is small (space again) and four-barred, the two upper strokes are partly preserved.

In the area where a seventh line, if any, would have been inscribed, the photograph shows a broad white band, as if lichens had obliterated, or rather concealed, a whole line of letters, but I cannot find any letters. Probably none should be expected: a small monument like this would not have a sculptor’s signature, nor would a monument on Pentelikon be dated by a Hiereus.

#### DEITIES AND DEDICATORS

*Asklepios Soter*. It might seem likely to have happened that, for whatever reason, such as a dream or other sign, or such as a special devotion, dedications would be made to Hygieia alone, without Asklepios. In Attike there are, however, only two dedications to Hygieia alone: *IG* 2<sup>2</sup> 4360, in a verse, ante med. s. IV a., and 4539, undated but apparently of aet. Imperat., and grammatically odd. Neither mentions another deity. There is no dedication at Athenai to Hygieia and Telesphoros without Asklepios (but at Epidauros, Jones notes two dedications to Hygieia and Telesphoros jointly without Askelepios, *IG* 4 1<sup>2</sup> 562, 570). On the other hand, in dozens of instances, in all periods, Asklepios and Hygieia, always in that order, are together. In the present inscription, the restoration of Asklepios, suggested by S. Follet and adopted by Jones (page 232 note 62), would seem to be mandatory.

There is however an epigraphical consideration. Peek and Kirchner evidently felt no compunction about beginning the inscription so far down on the flat surface that the blank space above was greater than the blank space beneath. Adding a line at the top, Jones has a five-line inscription more or less centered, i.e., with an equal blank space above and below. Bases and altars have never been properly studied, but regularly Greek

masons left no such space at the top. Usually they began their texts up near the moulding, with only a small space left blank above the first line. About the space left blank at the bottom, Greek masons did not care. Model examples are J. Kirchner-G. Klaffenbach, *Imag. Inscr. Att.*<sup>2</sup> nos. 143 and 144 of A.D. ca 200. There may be other seeming exceptions, but the only one I can cite as relevant, because it too is a pedestal, is Graindor, *Album* no. 46, which is *IG* 2<sup>2</sup> 3733 of A.D. 126/7. The rule of no blank space at the top is not absolute, but clearly on a small base like the present, the mason would want the inscription to be up as near eye-level as possible. Thus above the Peek-Kirchner line 1, not one line (such as the Jones-Follet [*Ἀσκληπιῶι καὶ*]), but two lines need to be restored. There is room for just two lines.

This fits with another epigraphical finding. In the present line 6, and in the partially preserved lines 3 and 4, the number of (full) letters is 8 1/4, 7, and 8 1/4 respectively. *ΑΣΚΛΗΠΙΩΚΑΙ*, 10 1/2 letters, would require such crowding that it is excluded. The restoration [*ΑΣΚΛΗΠΙΩ*] alone, 8 letters, need not be doubted. [*ΚΑΙ*] must stand in line 2; but that being so, no room is available for another deity before Hygieia. Line 2 must therefore contain either an epithet of Hygieia, which is improbable, or, probably, of Asklepios.

The epithets of Asklepios in Attike are mostly localizing, and none of these would be appropriate. The only epithet which need be considered is *Σωτήρι*. [*ΣΩΤΗΡΙΚΑΙ*], 8 1/2 full letters, fits. It had been used for Asklepios by Aristeides himself at Mitylene (references: Jones 232 n. 64); but if instead of the restoration [*Ari*]steides, that of [*Phili*]steides has to be preferred, *Σωτήρι* would suit him equally (*IG* 2<sup>2</sup> 4516, *infra*).

A different healing deity is barely worth mention. At Oropos and also at Rhamnous (*IG* 2<sup>2</sup> 4394, 4436, 4452), and so conceivably in-between, Amphiaraos is at home. Once in this present general period, he is coupled with Hygieia, *IG* 2<sup>2</sup> 4530 (which I have not seen). [*ΑΜΦΙΕΡΑΩ*] (reported as spelled thus in 4530), 8 letters, would fit. But until reason can be found to associate Telesphoros with him, Amphiaraos can be left aside.—On Amphiaraos in Athens, L. Robert, *Hellenica* 11/12 (Paris 1960) 195.

*Aristeides*. All by itself, the new reading of a phi, as the first letter in line 5, would be decisive if it could be demonstrated. Unhappily the strokes can be seen only on the glossy print and only under magnification. Leave it aside for the moment, therefore, and proceed with the other evidence.

The restoration of Aristeides has depended largely on the space available. The space would be reduced, and [*ΑΡΙ*] would fit, if the line were indented. Indentation—not just at the beginning, as here, but usually in order to center the line, i.e., with space left blank after the letters as well

as before them—is virtually unknown earlier, but is not uncommon in dedications of the Roman period. Random samples of last lines centered (which however I have not “controlled”) are *IG* 2<sup>2</sup> 2887, 2914, 2915, 2955, 3015, 3475, 3609, 4526, 4793.

Not in *IG* 2<sup>2</sup> 4531 (Kirchner’s text), but in the Jones text, both of lines 5 and 6 are indented. This is to accommodate the restoration in line 5, where, as Jones correctly saw, although Peek and Kirchner had not seen, [API] will not fill the space. Such an indentation, however, is so unusual (there would have to be a flaw in the stone, which is extremely rare) as to be excluded. In line 6, the first letter, epsilon, is preserved, and the strokes are indubitable, although dim in the photograph (*supra*), and it stands not far from the edge, at the normal margin. Thus in line 6 there was no indentation, and the assumption of indentation in line 5 is excluded.

The first letter clearly preserved in line 5, which is the sigma, is above, but is centered very slightly to the right of, the center of the alpha in line 6. In line 6 the letters ΕΤΞ, with three inter-letters, occupy exactly as much space as ΣΤΕ in line 5. All these letters are fairly broad. Hence in line 5 the number of letters to be restored is three broad letters, or 3 1/2 letters, if some of the letters were narrow; that is, three (narrow) full letters plus iota, or two narrow full letters plus three iotas. In this inscription, rho is about half as wide as most of the letters; alpha is only slightly wider; and iota, as always, occupies little space. The present restoration [API], needing about two wide-letter spaces, certainly has to be ruled out. The question arises, Can some abbreviation, consisting of one wide letter, or one narrow letter plus iota, fill in the gap, and save Πόπλιος Αἴλιος Ἀριστείδης? The only possibility would be AI, and it is a fact that, *if* the spacing at the beginning of the line were the same as at the end of the line, then [AI API] could be restored, because the space available at the beginning of the line is the same as the space occupied at the end of the line by approximately the same number of letters, viz. ΕΙΑΗ. But spacing is sure to be tighter at the end of the line. Thus it is *only* if we judge by ΕΙΑΗ at the end of the line, and not by ΕΤΞ just beneath the beginning of the line, that [AI API] would be admissible. But certainly nothing longer could be thought of; not [AI Δ API].

In Athenai the usual abbreviation for Αἴλιος is taken to be AIA. Thus the index to *IG* 3, and the section on abbreviations in W. Larfeld, *Handbuch* 2 (1902) page 517, recognize only AIA. But Larfeld page 529 does give some instances of AI. If all the Epheboi inscriptions from Augustus to the end (*IG* 2<sup>2</sup> 2017–2291) be scanned, AI is found only six times: *IG* 2<sup>2</sup> 2102.95, 135; 2111/2.11, 55, 56; 2128.26—as against dozens of instances of AIA. But in all the six (exceptional) instances, AI is preceded by ἦ for Πό(πλιος). The earlier inscriptions often have AIA standing alone, but

in the Ephebic inscriptions AI never once stands alone. If we turn to the Prytaneis inscriptions, for some (odd?) reason the situation is different. The Traills' valuable index to *Agora* 15 (Princeton 1974), *The Athenian Councillors*, shows that 89 names begin with Αἴλιος, abbreviated or whole, whereas only 7 have Πόπλιος, whole or abbreviated, before Aelius. Among the 7 there is no AI, but among the 89 there are 12 instances of AI. The 12 instances are confined to six inscriptions, but they prove that in the present inscription, where space was limited, AI *could* have occurred. To this extent, [Αἰ 'Αρι]στείδης is saved for line 5. But the odds are strongly against a form which can be found in only a half-dozen out of the hundreds of Roman Imperial inscriptions. The restoration of Aristеides as the dedicator must, it seems—how deplorable!—be regarded as doubtful.

*P. Aelius [Aristei]des at Epidauros?* Another negative item, not entirely irrelevant, may be treated here. It has been conjectured that a dedication at Epidauros is by Ailios Aristеides. In the present inscription, the simple designation [ 'Αρι]στείδης was taken to be a proud vaunting of the assumption that everyone would know who Aristеides was (Jones 232). In the other dedications plausibly ascribed to him, Aristеides does appear thus. These dedications are in his home territory, Asia Minor, where he had made numerous dedications, and where he could expect that people would know who he was. Would people elsewhere know that "Aristеides" was the Rhetor? It seems doubtful: away from home, Aristеides would need to give more of his name. His teacher Herodes Attikos could put 'Ηρώδης | ἐνθάδε | περιεπάτει on a herm at Corinth (B. D. Meritt, *Corinth* 8 1 no. 85); but it was a portrait herm! Hence at Epidauros the full name would be nothing against C. A. Behr's suggestion (*Aelius Aristеides and the Sacred Tales* [Amsterdam 1968] 87 note 90) that IG 4 1<sup>2</sup> 577 be restored Π Αἴλιος [ 'Αριστι]δης. Jones, who cites this, rejects it. I have not seen the inscription but note that P. Kavvadias, in the editio princeps, *ArchEph* 1883 col. 85 no. 18, gives the spacing arranged so that the text, emended, would have to read

Π (Α)ΙΛΙΟ[ΣΑΡΙ]  
[ΣΤΙ]ΔΗΣΑΝΕ[ΘΗΚΕ]

an arrangement which is not plausible. In line 1 the actual Kavvadias reading was ΠΑΙΑΙΟ and he associated it with his no. 17 *ibid*:

ΠΟΠΑΙΑΙΟΝ  
ΓΗΓΛΟΝ

This no. 17 is now handsomely incorporated in IG 4 1<sup>2</sup> 688, but it seems as if the other inscription, IG 4 1<sup>2</sup> 577, could, as Kavvadias thought, contain one of the Poplilii. IG 4 1<sup>2</sup> 666 has another one at Epidauros.

*The Dedicator's Name.* It might be expected that possibilities of restoring [- - -]στειδης would be numerous, but B. Hansen, *Rückwört.* 152, gives only Φιλι-, Θεμι-, 'Αρι-, and 'Αμφι-. 'Αρι- being highly doubtful, and mu occurring in two of the others, being a broad letter, among the four only ΦΙΑΙ would fit. If however the choice ought to be made from a wider field, and nomina in [- - -]στειδης ought to be considered, actually here too the choice is limited: add 'Ακε-, 'Ηκε-, 'Ηφαι- (ΕΤΝΟ would probably be too long). Of the eight (at most) nomina thus collected, the only ones in the index to *IG* 3 are 'Αριστ(ε)ιδης and Φιλιστ(ε)ιδης; and most are rare in, or absent from, *Kirchner, Prosopog. Att.* On these grounds there is a clear preference for [Φιλι]στειδης. The reading in line 5, independent (and actually made later), confirms it.

In the centuries before Augustus, Φιλιστίδης was a common name. *Prosopog. Att.* has 20 occurrences, in 11 Demes; *Agora* 15 has 18, in 14 Demes. But under Rome there were fewer: *IG* 3 has 10 men, in 5 Demes, but of the 10 men, no fewer than 4 are Peiraieis and, as inspection will suggest, all of one family. Moreover only one, *IG* 2<sup>2</sup> 2051.71, is known to have been an Ephebos. *Agora* 15 has only one Φιλιστίδης of Roman date (no. 242.15) and one Φιλιστείδης, a Peiraieus of s. II p. (no. 448). Hence if the present dedicator is to be identified with a known man, the choice is limited.

In general, the writing of ΕΙ for Ι began as early as Nero and reached parity A.D. ca 160 (Threatte, *Gram.* 1 199–202). 'Αριστείδης, whatever it proves for the present inquiry, is found before 350 B.C. (Threatte 1 372–373), and, in contrast to Φιλιστίδης, is normal throughout the Roman period. Thus the spelling Φιλιστείδης in the present inscription is of no help in identifying the man.

*Telesphoros in Athenai.* The dedicator was a man who could afford a dedication of at least medium value, which he made to Asklepios on Pentelikon, and he was at pains to designate Asklepios as Soter. These facts do not help much in identifying him. He was at pains also, in his very brief inscription, to include the deity Telesphoros. This fact is more helpful.

A late deity consciously created in Pergamon, Telesphoros was purported to be a son of Asklepios. It may well be that the plague in the time of Marcus Aurelius, as plagues do, stimulated the creation and the vogue of a new healing deity. But his vogue elsewhere and also in Athenai was limited. There are only three dedications: *IG* 2<sup>2</sup> 4541, brief, dated only "aetat. imperat.," uninformative except for the fact that it comes from the South Slope, scil. from the Asklepieion; the present dedication; and a remarkable, elaborate inscribed hymn, *IG* 2<sup>2</sup> 4533, for which opinion has favored, vaguely, the date s. III p., but it relates somehow to the plague.

The various healing deities of the Asklepios circle are invoked (not Aminos and Amphiaraos), and Aphrodite. Telesphoros is prominent. Two small statue groups are known: L. v. Sybel, *Katalog der Sculpturen zu Athen* (1881) nos. 1106 and 4479. In these Telesphoros is small, Aphrodite being the main figure. There are also terracotta figurines: references in the principal monograph on the cult, W. Deonna, *De Telesphore au 'moine bourru'* (Brussels 1955, Collection Latomus 21), 42 note 6 and 54 note 11. Most interesting is the use of Τελεσφόρος as a personal name—the deity's name unaltered—especially in the Ephebic class. In *IG* the nomen occurs ca 30 times.

These data do not by any means suggest a popular vogue, but rather a limited, mainly upper-class fad, as if Telesphoros were the pet of the Epheboi. This impression comes most strongly from a very small Ephebic stele, *IG* 2<sup>2</sup> 2127, preserving 23 lines out of perhaps 30, which states (lines 5–9) οἱ συνέφηβοι| τοῦ Τε[λεσ]φόρου σύνσ[τρεμμα]|ταρ[χήσαν]τες <ἐαυ[τοὺς] τιμή|σαντες [τ]ὸν θεὸν καὶ ἑαυτοὺς ἀνέγραψαν, and this is followed immediately (line 10) by the first name in the list, Τελεσφόρος Ἀσκληπιοῦ. The Arkhon of Athenai (not one of the Epheboi, serving as Arkhon of their group) is given in lines 1–2, Φιλιστείδης, Πειραιεύς. The year is A.D. 194/5–200/1 (S. Follet, *Athènes au II et au IIIe siècle* [Paris 1976] 82). The only other such mention has Θεὸς Τελεσφόρος again listed first, this time in a group of [Synephe]boi and Symbio[ta], *IG* 2<sup>2</sup> 2227.3 of A.D. 224/5–236/7 (date, Follet 239).

*Philisteides Philisteidou Peiraiæus.* The Arkhon Philisteides of *IG* 2<sup>2</sup> 2127, dating their somewhat awkwardly-worded tribute, can hardly have been unaware of the unusual honors paid to the deity Telesphoros. He may have taken a part in this honoring. It seems altogether likely that it was this Philisteides who was the dedicator on Pentelikon.

Philisteides, Arkhon in some year A.D. 192/3–200/1, had a son Philisteides who was Ephebos in A.D. 195/6, and the (grand-)father was Arkhon in A.D. ca 163/4. Two or three other relatives, all of s. II p., are known. There is no stemma, but the family has been treated by S. Follet, *Ath. au II–III s.*, 260–261 and 400 (at top), and by J. S. Traill, who has recently published one of the most important testimonia, *Hesperia* 47 (1978) 322, no. 37, lines 19–20. It was among the most prominent Athenian families of the period. If the dedicator was one of them, and known to be a devotee of Telesphoros, he could appear without patronymic and demotic.

*A Dedication in Athenai to Asklepios Soter.* Hitherto not considered in relation to the present dedication, there is another six-line dedication, *IG* 2<sup>2</sup> 4516, found on the South Slope and no doubt originally set up in the

Asklepieion. It has been vaguely dated, by its discoverer (1926) P. Kastriotis, followed by J. Kirchner, "s. II p." The photograph *Praktika* 1926 (pub. 1929) 102 shows that the lettering is strongly lunate, which however by itself does not indicate any one period in the Empire, but the phi is definitely late, and so are the tall prolongations at the tops of the triangular letters (except that in line 2 the delta had to be shortened because of the tall phi above). The fact that the letters are shown as if incised on an altar, which itself is in relief within a tabula ansata, makes a late period certain. The mouldings have some resemblance to those on the present (Pentelikon) pedestal, IG 2<sup>2</sup> 4531. The text is clearly legible in the photograph (in line 3 however an interpunct has waited to be read):

IG 2<sup>2</sup> 4516

A.D. ca 200

1 Φιλιστεΐ  
2 δης Σέυ  
3 χήν· άν  
4 έθηκεν  
5 'Ασκληπ[ι]  
6 ώ Σωτήρ[ι]

The order of the items is different from that in the Pentelikon dedication. Hygieia and Telesphoros are absent, but then there was no room for them. On the other hand, it is a dedication of the same period, in six lines, on an altar-like object, to Asklepios. Asklepios is Soter. Philisteides, spelled thus, is an uncommon name (*supra*). No demotic. It may well be that the same Philisteides made both dedications.

*The Cult on Pentelikon.* It is almost unthinkable that a dedication like the present one would be set up in isolation, off somewhere by itself. The stone would make a building block, but there is small likelihood that, having been set up somewhere down in the plain, it was brought all the way up to the monastery. That *is* conceivable, or even a South Slope origin. More likely a cult place nearby on Pentelikon is to be inferred, and some day excavations may reveal a sanctuary where the chapel of Haghios Elias and the monastery were later established. If so, the sanctuary, remote, and perhaps established late, never had any great wealth of dedications. The present dedication may have been conspicuous.

But it was not so splendid that it was likely to enhance considerably the fame of its dedicator, and we can only conjecture a little more about him. In modern times, sufferers from tuberculosis used to go to hospitals on Pentelikon built for them. Perhaps Philisteides sought health in the cool summer air on Pentelikon. The dedication may have been a sincere act of piety. The fact that in both instances a dedication had been vowed

by Philisteides suggests, though it does not prove, that Asklepios has already seemed to be a savior. But the use of the strong epithet, and the fact that Philisteides made two dedications, imply that the illness was not slight.

Mountain sanctuaries in Attike await a full treatment. Pausanias (1.32.1) says that, on Parnes, Zeus had a statue and at least two altars; an early "popular" cult is known but not published. On Hymettos were a statue of Zeus and other cults; with altars to Zeus and Apollon. The most notable excavation of a mountain sanctuary is that of C. W. Blegen and R. S. Young, *A Sanctuary of Zeus on Mt. Hymettos* (*Hesp.* Suppl. XVI), largely published by M. K. Langdon. On Pentelikon there was a statue of Athena, and, also high up, a cave of the Nymphs, where Pan, Hermes, and doubtless others of their group received cult as early as s. IV. a., and probably earlier. For these matters see C. W. J. Eliot, *Princeton Encyclopedia* s.v., with references. None of these cults relates to the present inscription, which is welcome especially as the first trace of the major healing deity, Asklepios, on any of the three mountains.

HARVARD UNIVERSITY