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PREFACE

Brocklesby Hall stands in the Brocklesby Park Estate in Lincolnshire. It is owned by Charles Pelham, Eighth Earl of Yarborough, who resides there with his family. It is the location of a significant collection of antiquities, consisting of the few pieces collected by Charles Anderson Pelham, First Lord Yarborough (1749-1823)¹ and the more substantial collection (including the inscriptions studied in this publication) collected by Sir Richard Worsley (1751-1805) and inherited through marriage by Charles Anderson Pelham, First Earl of (and Second Lord) Yarborough (1781-1846).² Worsley, who arranged the material at his private museum at Appuldurcombe on the Isle of Wight, is an important, but slightly neglected, figure in the history of British interest in Greek antiquities. A better understanding of his actions and motivations greatly enhances our picture of the world of British antiquarianism at the turn of the nineteenth century, before the landscape of British classical collections was so dramatically changed by the arrival in the United Kingdom of the material collected by Thomas Bruce, Seventh Earl of Elgin (1766-1841). Drawing upon new archival research, we have therefore dedicated more space in this paper than in some others in this series to tracing the history of the collection and the man who created it, attempting to set Worsley’s acquisition of Attic inscriptions in the wider context of his antiquarian and other interests, and exploring the ways in which his descendants responded to his legacy.

The collection now includes four Attic inscriptions, two of which are funerary monuments (2, 3), two dedications (1, 4). We have not been able to locate a fifth Attic inscription (a dedication: Appendix) which was previously held in the collection. These inscriptions have rarely been studied, and we hope that the findings which we present here will help to advance scholarly understanding of both the texts and the wider significance of these monuments. In particular we make a join between our 1 and fragments of a marble base discovered in the area of the Athenian Agora in 1981 and 1990 (Agora I 7515); the newly-associated inscriptions, we suggest, constitute a fresh piece of evidence for the commemoration of victory in the equestrian competition known as the anthippasia by two brothers.

Like the inscriptions at Chatsworth House (AIUK 7) and Broomhall (AIUK 8), those at Brocklesby are held in a private collection. Brocklesby Park is not usually open to the public, and we are therefore particularly grateful to the Eighth Earl for granting us permission to study this important collection of material, and to his staff (especially Joanne Brogden) for their patient help and kind hospitality during our visit.

Peter Higgs and Susan Walker provided very helpful insights into the more recent history of the Brocklesby collection. Many of the extant papers of the Worsley and

¹ On the First Lord Yarborough’s collection, see Michaelis, 93; Smith, Nollekens 12 (on Yarborough’s association with the Rome-based agent and sculptor Nollekens). Susan Walker informs us that some of the collection of Thomas Hope (1769-1831) went to Brocklesby Park from Deepdene; on this transfer see Waywell, 62-66.
² On the marriage in 1806 of Pelham to Worsley’s niece and heiress, Henrietta Simpson, see below.
Yarborough families are now held in the Lincolnshire County Archives; we are very grateful to the staff there for their assistance.

For the images we are grateful for the help of Lisa Schadow of the Archäologisches Institut of the University of Cologne; the photographer of the Brocklesby material was Mr Raoul Laev. Irene Vagionakis produced the combined image of the fragments of I on the basis of images provided by the Agora Excavations of the American School of Classical Studies at Athens. We are grateful to the Agora Excavations, in particular the Secretary and Registrar, Sylvie Dumont, and the Director, John McK. Camp II, for enabling autopsy of the Agora fragments in August 2020 and for discussion of our new association.

We would like also to record our gratitude to Christopher de Lisle, Pierre Juhel, Stephen Lambert, Michael Metcalfe, the other members of the AIO Advisory Board, and the two anonymous readers of this paper.
ABBREVIATIONS

In addition to the abbreviations listed at https://www.atticinscriptions.com/browse/bysource/ the following abbreviations are used in this volume:


Bieber: M. Bieber, “Archaeological Contributions to Roman Religion”, *Hesperia* 14, 1945, 270-77


Brookesby Catalogue: *Catalogue of the Pictures, Works of Art, Antiquities, Sculpture, Objects of Curiosity, &c, in the House at Brookesby Park, Lincolnshire* (1856)


Catalogue Raisonné: *A Catalogue Raisonné of the Principal Paintings, Sculptures, Drawings, &c., &c., at Appuldurcombe House, the Seat of the Rt. Hon. Sir R. Worsley, Bart.* (1804)

Chandler 1776: R. Chandler, *Travels in Greece. Or: an Account of a Tour Made at the Expense of the Society of Dilettanti*

Coltman 2006: V. Coltman, *Fabricating the Antique: Neoclassicism in Britain, 1760-1800*


Koumanoudes: S. Koumanoudes, *Ἀττικής Ἐπιγραφαὶ Ἐπιτύμβιοι* (1871)
Joret: C. Joret, *D’Ansse de Villaillon et l’hellénisme en France pendant le dernier tiers du XVIIe siècle* (1910)
Liddel and Low, “Two Megarian”: P. P. Liddel and P. A. Low, “Two Megarian Inscriptions at Brocklesby Park, Lincs., UK” (in preparation)
Michaelis: A. Michaelis, *Ancient Marbles in Great Britain* (1882)
*Museo Worsleiano*: Italian edition of the *Museum Worsleyanum*, with preface by G. Labus (1834)
Pittakis: K. S. Pittakis, *L’ancienne Athènes, ou La description des antiquités d’Athènes et de ses environs* (1835)
Reisch: E. Reisch, “ΑνθιππασGreek”，*Paulys Realencyclopädie der classischen Altertumswissenschaft* Band 1.2 (1894), 2378-79
Scharmer: H. Scharmer, Der Gelagerte Herakles (1971)
Schmaltz: B. Schmaltz, Untersuchungen zu den attischen Marmorlekythen (1970)
Smith, Catalogue: A. H. Smith, Catalogue of Antiquities in the Collection of the Earl of Yarborough at Brocklesby Park (1897)
Stafford: E. Stafford, Herakles (2012)
Wickens: J. M. Wickens, “The Archaeology and History of Cave Use in Attica, Greece, from Prehistoric through Late Roman Times”, PhD Indiana (1986)


The five Attic inscriptions we discuss in this AIUK volume are among the few to have been brought to the UK before 1800. They were all collected by Sir Richard Worsley (1751-1805), described by Michaelis (115) as “the first British traveller who brought home rich booty from Greece itself”. Worsley was a member of the British landed and titled elite. He was the son of Sir Thomas Worsley, sixth baronet, and succeeded to the baronetcy on his father’s death in September 1768. He was educated at Winchester College, and matriculated (but did not take a degree) at Corpus Christi College, Oxford. His early political career was promising: he served as Member of Parliament for Newport (Isle of Wight, the location of his family home) from 1774 to 1784, became a Privy Councillor in 1780, and was governor of the Isle of Wight from 1780 to 1782.

Worsley’s interest in both travelling and antiquities was of long standing. He first visited France and Italy as a teenager in 1765-67, and returned to Italy in 1769-70. In 1778 he became a member of the Society of Dilettanti; he was also a Fellow of the Society of Antiquaries and the Royal Society. In his Travel Journal (II 237), he explained his motivation for travelling to and studying other cultures in rather Herodotean terms: “Voyages are the most instructive school of man; it is in travelling that he can acquire a knowledge of his own species. It is by living with different Peoples, by studying their Customs, their Religions, their Government, that he has a term of Comparison to judge of the Manners, Religions, and Government of his own Country”. But it seems very likely that Worsley’s decision to undertake his longest journey in 1783-1788, and to study and collect antiquities along the way, was also prompted by his political and social ambitions, and above all by a desire to restore a reputation which had been seriously damaged by personal scandal. In 1782 it emerged that Worsley had “connived in an act of voyeurism on the Brocklesby marbles were not, however, the first Greek or Attic inscriptions to come to the UK. During the seventeenth century William Petty (d. 1639) travelled in the Aegean and collected marbles including inscriptions on behalf of Thomas Howard, Second Earl of Arundel (1586-1646). The Greek inscriptions he brought to Arundel House in 1627 included an Attic inscribed relief of Herakles dedicated to commemorate an ephebic victory in 158/9 AD, IG II 3 4, 420, and were the first ever to come to England (with the exception of “indigenous” Greek inscriptions, on which see IG XIV 2545-77). George Wheler (1651-1724) and James Dawkins (1722-1757) also collected Attic inscriptions. The activities of Petty, Wheler and Dawkins will be discussed in AIUK 11 (Ashmolean). The Sandwich marble was brought to the UK and donated to Trinity College, Cambridge, ca. 1739: see AIUK 3 (Fitzwilliam), pp. 1-2. Anthony Askew, who visited Athens in 1747, collected an inscribed ephebic monument in the shape of a shield (IG II² 2191) and the funerary monument for Xanthippos (IG V 1282bis), both of which are now at the British Museum (see AIUK 4.3B and 4.6). Richard Chandler’s stay in Athens in 1765-1766 resulted in the acquisition of a number of Attic inscriptions now in the British Museum: see AIUK 4.1 (British Museum. Cult Provisions), 1.

3 The Brocklesby marbles were not, however, the first Greek or Attic inscriptions to come to the UK. During the seventeenth century William Petty (d. 1639) travelled in the Aegean and collected marbles including inscriptions on behalf of Thomas Howard, Second Earl of Arundel (1586-1646). The Greek inscriptions he brought to Arundel House in 1627 included an Attic inscribed relief of Herakles dedicated to commemorate an ephebic victory in 158/9 AD, IG II 4, 420, and were the first ever to come to England (with the exception of “indigenous” Greek inscriptions, on which see IG XIV 2545-77). George Wheler (1651-1724) and James Dawkins (1722-1757) also collected Attic inscriptions. The activities of Petty, Wheler and Dawkins will be discussed in AIUK 11 (Ashmolean). The Sandwich marble was brought to the UK and donated to Trinity College, Cambridge, ca. 1739: see AIUK 3 (Fitzwilliam), pp. 1-2. Anthony Askew, who visited Athens in 1747, collected an inscribed ephebic monument in the shape of a shield (IG II² 2191) and the funerary monument for Xanthippos (IG V 1282bis), both of which are now at the British Museum (see AIUK 4.3B and 4.6). Richard Chandler’s stay in Athens in 1765-1766 resulted in the acquisition of a number of Attic inscriptions now in the British Museum: see AIUK 4.1 (British Museum. Cult Provisions), 1.

4 His life and career are helpfully summarised in the ODNB, s. n.

5 Worsley’s activities and motivations as a collector of antiquities are analysed by Guilding, 195-205.

by showing off his naked wife … to her lover when she was in a bath-house”. The incident became a national sensation, sufficiently notorious to become the subject of a Gillray cartoon. For Worsley, therefore, travelling to Europe and the Near-East provided an opportunity to escape from public life until the scandal had subsided; accumulating a remarkable collection of antiquities provided a means of becoming famous for more respectable reasons.

Worsley left England in 1783. He journeyed through Spain, Portugal, France, Italy and the Levant, and reached Greece in 1785, travelling first to Crete, and arriving in Athens on 9th May. He stayed in Athens for a week before embarking on a short tour of other sites in mainland Greece (including Eleusis, Megara, Corinth, Sparta and Nafplio). He returned to Athens in early June, and remained there for the rest of that month. In Athens, he stayed at the house of Gaspari, the French Vice-consul (now at Flessa 4, Plaka), “there being no Hotels or Houses of Accommodation for strangers”. During this stay, he made further visits to ancient sites in the city and in Attica (including Brauron, Marathon, and the marble quarries at Mount Pendeli), and supervised the “taking” of drawings of various sites. (Worsley’s artist was Willey Reveley, who travelled with him to Greece in 1785, and was despatched again by Worsley to make further drawings in 1788. But Worsley had also obtained – possibly not wholly legitimately – the drawings made by William Pars for Stuart and Revett’s expedition in the 1750s, which he seems to have used to guide his own explorations of Athens.)

Worsley kept a detailed travel journal, which includes extensive digressions on Athenian history, the ancient monuments which he saw, and the current condition and organisation of the city. The journal is very similar in style and subject-matter to Chandler’s Travels in Greece (1776), and also bears some resemblance to Spon and Wheler’s Journey into Greece (1682). In particular, it is striking that many of the Attic inscriptions which Worsley describes (and in some cases quotes in full, albeit in English translation) are ones which had also featured in these earlier works. These include the inscriptions on the choregic monuments of Thrasyllos and Lysikrates, the inscription on the monument of Philopappos, a prytany list located in the Hephaisteion, the Hadrianic oil price edict, and the inscriptions on the Arch of Hadrian. Worsley did not, however,

7 Guilding, 196.
8 “Sir Richard Worse-than-sly, exposing his wife’s bottom; - o fye!”’, 14th March 1782 (National Portrait Gallery, London: NPG D12980).
9 Worsley, Travel Journal, I 69.
10 Reveley: Catalogue Raisonné 3; Guilding, 209-10. Worsley’s use of Pars’ drawings: Guilding, 210, 213.
11 It seems quite likely that Worsley intended to publish his journal; certainly, it is written in a style which assumes an external audience. However, the manuscript volumes were captured by French privateers when being transported to England in 1800, and were not recovered until after Worsley’s death (this information is recorded in notes on the flyleaf of the journals, dating their recovery to 1806 (note on vol. 1) or 1805 (note on vol. 2)).
13 Worsley, Travel Journal, I 96; Spon and Wheler, 380-81; Chandler, 86.
14 Worsley, Travel Journal, I 101; Spon and Wheler, 386; Chandler, 72.
15 Worsley, Travel Journal, I 105; Spon and Wheler, 388-91.
completely restrict himself to familiar epigraphic territory. He describes his discovery, at Eleusis, of a statue base (which he did not acquire, because it was too heavy to move: Travel Journal, I 145). The journal includes an accurate transcription of the text, but this is not in Worsley’s hand (and, since it is pasted in to the journal, might have been produced at a later date); Worsley’s own summary of the contents of the inscription is misleading (“it gives an account of the Emperor Adrian being initiated into the Mysteries of Ceres”); the inscription is in fact a dedication of a statue of a hierophant (a daughter of Demetrios) who boasts herself to be the one who initiated the Emperor Hadrian to the Mysteries at Eleusis. More accurate, though, is his paraphrase of the content of the inscription honouring the priestess Asklepias, which he acquired at Megara (“for a small trifle”: Travel Journal, I 147). The journal does not mention any of the Athenian inscriptions which Worsley himself acquired, and which we discuss in this paper. Overall, the impression which emerges from the journal is of a traveller who is already – and perhaps self-consciously – following a defined agenda for visitors to Athens, and is aware of the “must-see” items in the city, but who is sometimes able to go beyond established routes and existing interpretations. Many of the inscriptions he described (and those which are published in the current edition) bore relief sculpture of considerable interest: as a collector, Worsley’s taste was clearly driven by the aesthetic appeal of sculpture as well as by an interest in classical literary references (see below).

After his stays in Athens in the spring and summer of 1785, Worsley continued his journey. He travelled through the Greek islands (Keos, Delos, Mykonos and Rhodes) to Egypt, Asia Minor, the Crimea and Russia, before returning, via Rome, to England. He reached England in 1788, after a voyage totalling (according to his own calculations) 18,300 miles. At or around this point the antiquities which he had collected on his journey were deposited in his family home, Appuldurcombe on the Isle of Wight. It is overwhelmingly likely that all of the inscriptions we discuss in this paper were acquired

16 Worsley, Travel Journal, I 111-12; Spon and Wheler 341; Chandler, 73.
17 The inscription (IG II 3575 = I Eleus. 454) is included (with illustration, and more accurate commentary) in Museum Worsleyanum, I 45-46. It was acquired by Choiseul-Gouffier (perhaps as a result of Worsley’s encounter with the French traveller and scholar Jean-Baptiste-Gaspard d’Anse de Villoison: see Joret, 288 and 292), and is now in the Louvre (Inv. no. Ma 187).
18 IG VII 113 (cf. Museum Worsleyanum, I 79-80). The Travel Journal (I 146) also mentions, but does not describe in detail “two ancient inscriptions” found in the ruins of fortifications near Megara; it is possible, but not certain, that one of these might be the Megarian funerary monument (IG VII 132) which is now in the Brocklesby collection. See below, n. 51.
19 Travel Journal, II 280-86.
20 The exact date (or method) of the transport of the collection from the Mediterranean to the United Kingdom is not recorded (as far as we have been able to discover). Dallaway, 359 n., reports that Worsley “brought [the sculptures] to Rome, where they were examined and described by that celebrated antiquary Abbate Ennio Quirino Visconte”. Dallaway does not give a date for this visit, but it seems reasonable to infer that it coincided with Worsley’s stay in Rome in 1787, on his return journey to England. It is known that the collection was on display in Appuldurcombe by 1790. In this year, Charles Townley visited the house and produced a brief hand-list of the collection of antiquities (and copies of antiquities) held there (British Museum TY 15/6).
on Worsley’s visits to Athens in 1785, but we should nevertheless note that his collecting career did not end at this point. In England, he acquired further antiquities from other British collectors, including Charles Townley and Gavin Hamilton. In 1793 he returned to Europe to take up the post of British envoy in Venice. Here, he took advantage of the opportunities afforded by his position to obtain a large number of ancient and post-ancient works, and to transport them to England as diplomatic baggage.  

Worsley came back to England in 1797. The following year he published the first volume of his Museum Worsleyanum, or a Collection of Antique Basso-Relievos, Bustos, Statues and Gems; with Views of Places in the Levant; a second volume followed in 1803. These were “probably the largest and most costly books to be issued by a private collector solely to publicize his own collection”. The volumes were written in both Italian and English in an attempt to maximise their impact (although Worsley also claimed that Italian was “best adapted for the explanation of monuments of art”: Museum Worsleyanum, I 2); and copies were distributed to Worsley’s associates and rivals in British political and antiquarian circles, including Lord Nelson, Pitt the Younger, Charles Townley and Richard Payne Knight. One copy was sent to the botanist Sir Joseph Banks and on Banks’ death was donated to the British Library. It seems likely that it was this copy which was consulted by Karl Ofried Müller (see below), who passed the details of the inscriptions in the collection (except 2) to Boeckh for inclusion in the first volume of CIG.

The publication was richly illustrated (with engravings based on the drawings of both Reveley and Pars), and included plates of all of the inscribed material, but some of its historical commentary is misleadingly speculative. For example, it attempts to identify those commemorated in 2 and 3 with famous literary authors (Museum Worsleyanum, I 29): the monument for Chairion (3) is implausibly claimed to belong to the fifth-century epic poet Choerilos of Samos; the monument for Moschos (2) is even less plausibly

21 This is strongly implied by Worsley’s comments in the preface to the Museum Worsleyanum (I 2: “Greek inscriptions collected at Athens, and in other parts of Greece”). Townley’s handlist (n. 20, above) explicitly mentions 1, 2 and 3; it is quite possible that the other two inscriptions discussed in this paper are included in the hand-list but cannot be identified from Townley’s rather cryptic descriptions.

22 Guilding, 198 (Townley), 200 (Hamilton).

23 Guilding, 200-1. A ship carrying a significant part of the collection was captured by the French in 1797, although Worsley was able to buy some of it back four years later.

24 The volume had been long-planned, and early fascicules were circulated in 1794: Guilding, 200.

25 Guilding, 201. (Smith, Catalogue, p. 4, n. 1, reports a rumour that the total cost of the publication was £27,000, but suggests that a more plausible figure, based on extant receipts, is £2887 4s). On Worsley’s motivations in producing such a publication, see Guilding, 197-201, who emphasises his desire to surpass the achievements of contemporary works such as Stuart and Revett’s Antiquities of Athens or Hamilton’s Antiquités étrusques, grecques, et romaines.

26 Our citations of the Museum Worsleyanum refer to the pagination of the more widely available 1824 printing.

27 Worsley kept (and bound into a volume) the letters of thanks he received from recipients of the work (Lincolnshire County Archives, 1-Worsley/31). Townley described it as “truly [sic] grand and beautiful”; Nelson wrote that “I really feel at a loss for words sufficiently expressive of my gratitude”. Other responses are summarised by Coltman 2006, 61-63.
associated with the (mythical) pre-Trojan War figure Mochos of Sidon, claimed by Strabo (16.2.24) to have been the inventor of atomic theory. Such claims and associations might seem ridiculous to the modern reader but should be seen as a strand of the competitive aspect of eighteenth-century collection habits; collectors were keen to raise the value of their antiquities by drawing links to the historical and mythological figures with whom they were familiar from their literary classical education. Yet it is clear that association with already well-known physical remains of Athens also possessed value: Worsley’s work even illustrated what the authors claimed was a tripod deriving from the choregic monument of Lysikrates (I 37).

The Museum Worsleyanum depicted not only those objects that Worsley had been able to bring to England, but also items which he had autopsied but left in situ, such as the inscribed base which he had discovered at Eleusis (see above) and other notable inscriptions such as the inscription on Hadrian’s Arch (Museum Worsleyanum, I 46).

Worsley claimed to have written the work himself, although he acknowledged the ‘assistance and friendship’ of the Abbé Ennio Quirino Visconti, President of the Museum Capitolinum in Rome (Museum Worsleyanum, I 2). This may be a misrepresentation of their respective contributions. Smith argues that ‘there is reason for thinking that this [acknowledgement] hardly represents the extent of Visconti’s share in the work’ (Smith, Catalogue, 3–4), observing that Visconti’s archaeological expertise made him better qualified than Worsley to produce the volume. The preface to the 1834 Italian printing of the Museum Worsleyanum likewise credits Visconti with the majority of the work, but tends to attribute its more egregiously erroneous suggestions to Worsley (Museo Worsleyano, iii–xxv). Other readers have been more willing to accept Worsley’s claims to be the book’s primary author. The ODNB, for example, concludes that Worsley was “a sensitive, informed man of taste, as much interested in the history and provenance of a work as in its aesthetic qualities”. Moreover, as we have already noted, Worsley’s travel journals suggest that he was both interested in and well-informed about the material legacy of antiquity, including the study of inscriptions, even if they do not give much evidence of independent epigraphic expertise. For the purposes of this paper, we reserve judgement on the question of authorship, and attribute the work to both Worsley and Visconti.

The Museum Worsleyanum has become the most enduring part of Worsley’s legacy. But he also intended that Appuldurcombe should become a museum comparable with – indeed superior to – those of rival collectors such as Charles Townley in London or Henry Blundell in Lancashire. The house, “once the grandest [mansion] in the Isle of Wight,” had been the family seat since the early sixteenth century, but was substantially rebuilt and expanded by Worsley after his accession to the baronetcy in 1768. The Catalogue Raisonné of the Appuldurcombe collection, published in 1804, gives a sense of

28 A comparable example is E. D. Clarke’s claim that the funerary monument for Eukleidas of Hermione was that of the mathematician Euclid (see AIUK 3 (Fitzwilliam), p. 3).
29 On the date and context of Worsley’s collaboration with Visconti, see n. 20, above.
30 Guilding, 201-2.
31 Lloyd and Pevsner, 65.
32 Worsley’s building programme is briefly described in Appuldurcombe, 14-17.
the variety of Worsley’s collection, the way in which it was displayed in his house, and the manner in which the visitor was intended to appreciate it. At the start of their tour, in front of a “pictoresque View of Athens” by Henry Tresham (peopled with the politicians, poets and philosophers of the Classical period), visitors are steered towards a mode of engagement with the Greek past which will already be familiar to the reader of the Museum Worsleyanum: “It is impossible to view the remains of Athens without recollecting the eminent men who flourished in that celebrated city: an imagination but a little warmed can behold, can converse with these illustrious characters; and from this association of ideas results a great portion of classical enjoyment”; a quotation from Cicero’s De Legibus rounds off the introduction (Catalogue Raisonné, 2).

This “association of ideas” – the combination of material culture, ancient literature and art – continues through the rest of the display. In the “Athenian Room” (the second room on the visitors’ prescribed route) were displayed drawings of classical sites (including Athens, Rome and Troy); drawings of modern works of sculpture, Flemish and Italian paintings, and portraits of Worsley and other contemporary figures; “twelve antique Greek Gems”; free-standing works of Greek, Roman and Egyptian sculpture; and several “Basso Rielevos fixed in the walls”. This last category included the dedication depicting Herakles (our 4) and the funerary inscription for Moschos (2). The fragment of a dedication depicting a rider (1), the fragment of a funerary stele (3) and dedication to Pan and the Nymphs (Appendix) were displayed in a “Closet” in the “Colonnade Room”, a cabinet which was reserved for “bass reliefs and heads, chiefly fragments collected in different parts of the Levant”. Throughout, the Catalogue Raisonné draws attention to the rarity and value of the objects in the collection. In its account of ancient items, it also appeals regularly to Greek and Latin literary texts to illuminate and enliven its discussion. For example, the quality of a fragment of sculpture, claimed to be by Phidias, is summed up by a quotation from the Aeneid (VI 847-48). Some of the commentary on objects in the collection is closely based on that of the Museum Worsleyanum, but in some cases the (anonymous) author of this catalogue is more cautious in interpretation than the author(s) of the Museum. For example, they accept the Museum’s judgement that the Moschos commemorated in 2 cannot be “the author of the Idylliums, who was contemporary with Bion and Theocritus”, but reject its alternative (and, as we have already noted, impossible) suggestion that he might have been the “Moschus who, according to Strabo, lived before the war of Troy”.

Worsley died in 1805, and the house at Appuldurcombe, along with the collection of antiquities it contained, was inherited by his niece, Henrietta Simpson (d. 1813, aged 25). In 1806, Henrietta married Charles Pelham (1781-1846), later Second Lord and First

33 On the style of exhibition at Appuldurcombe, see also Waywell, 2007, 140.
34 Catalogue Raisonné, 4-11 (4 is described on p. 7).
35 Catalogue Raisonné, 13.
36 Catalogue Raisonné, 18.
37 “Excudent alii spirantia mollius aera / Credo equidem, vivos ducent de marmore vultus” (“Others, I can well believe, will forge more softly-breathing bronze and will draw out living faces from marble”): Catalogue Raisonné, 7 (describing the relief of “Jupiter and Minerva”, said by the Museum Worsleyanum (I 3) to have formed part of the Parthenon Frieze).
38 Catalogue Raisonné, 13.
Earl of Yarborough. (He succeeded to the title in 1823, and was created Earl of Yarborough in 1837.) Pelham divided his time between his ancestral estates at Brocklesby in Lincolnshire and his new holdings in the Isle of Wight. He seems mostly to have used Appuldurcombe as a convenient base for sailing at Cowes, although he did undertake some alterations to the house. Simpson and Pelham’s interest in the collection of antiquities is hard to gauge, and we have found little evidence that the house continued to function as a museum in this period (although K. O. Müller appears to have seen the material there in the summer of 1822). The house is mentioned in Waagen’s guide to English art collections, published in 1838, but Waagen’s description of its holdings is not based on autopsy (Waagen, 587); indeed, the fact that he singles out the (imaginary) tripod of the Lysikrates monument as being particularly worth seeing (Waagen, 589; for the monument, see above) suggests that his account derives from an uncritical reading of the Museum Worsleyanum rather than any more up-to-date or reliable source. Pelham did authorise the publication, in 1824, of a new printing of the Museum Worsleyanum, but this appears not to have been done entirely willingly, and certainly not at Pelham’s initiative. The original plates for the Museum had come into the hands of a London publisher, Septimus Prowett, who agreed to return or (Pelham’s preference) destroy the plates in exchange for permission to print 250 new copies of the work. Although, therefore, the new edition of the Museum was dedicated to Pelham, it seems that he was not particularly enthusiastic about its renewed circulation or increased accessibility.

On Pelham’s death in 1846, the estate passed to his son Charles Anderson Pelham, Second Earl of Yarborough (1809-1862). The Second Earl focussed his attention on making further improvements to the house and grounds at Brocklesby, and in 1855 decided to sell his property at Appuldurcombe. It was at this point, as Smith (Catalogue, 5) writes, that “the collections [from Appuldurcombe] were removed to Brocklesby, and united with a small series of antiquities which had been collected by the first Baron Yarborough” (1749-1823). The First Lord Yarborough had undertaken a Grand Tour in 1767, but there is no evidence that he travelled as far as Greece, and none of the original Yarborough elements in the collection appear to be Attic. A catalogue of the combined collection was published in 1856; it lists all of the Attic inscriptions which were recorded

---

39 Appuldurcombe, 27. Lloyd and Pevsner, 66, note that Pelham’s alterations created a “large library where works of art could be displayed”, but there is no evidence about which (if any) works were in fact displayed there.

40 See his letter to Boeckh dated 7th August 1822, in Briefwechsel zwischen August Boeckh und Karl Otfried Müller (1883), 88. Müller also referred to the collection in other published work: see his Kleine deutsche Schriften über Religion, Kunst, Sprache und Literatur, Leben und Geschichte des Altertums vol. 2 (1848), 558-59, and Handbuch der Archäologie der Kunst (1848), 356.

41 The negotiations are recorded in a series of letters, dated to October and November 1823, between Pelham and his agent Charles Heaton (Lincolnshire County Archive, Yarb/9/6). Prewitt’s initial proposal was that he would destroy the plates in exchange for a payment of £500; Pelham was unwilling to pay this much, and therefore allowed the publication of 250 copies as a compromise. It is unclear from the letters why Pelham wanted the plates to be destroyed, although it is suggested at one point that this had also been Richard Worsley’s intention. Cf. Colman 2006, 62, who suggests that the initiative for re-publication came from Pelham. Pelham eventually secured the return of the plates in 1828, paying £68 5s for them (Yarb/9/6).
at Appuldurcombe with the exception of the dedication to Pan and the Nymphs (discussed in the Appendix). Michaelis (no. 110) was unable to say where this dedication was. We therefore assume that it was either lost or disposed of at some point between 1805 and 1856; we have been unable to trace its current location.\footnote{An uninscribed grave stele of a girl holding a bird, acquired on Paros (\textit{Museum Worsleyanum}, I 35-36; cf. Michaelis no. 17 (pl.)), was sold to the Metropolitan Museum, New York in 1927 (NY Met 27.45). We have not located any other ancient items from the Worsley collection in other public collections.}

At Brocklesby, the four remaining Athenian inscriptions were displayed in the Orangery (Fig. 1), a building “in heavy Roman Doric”,\footnote{Pevsner and Harris, 200.} located to the north-west of the main house. The Orangery was constructed probably in the 1820s, as part of the First Lord Yarborough’s ambitious, but largely unrealised, plans to transform Brocklesby into a mansion comparable with Chatsworth.\footnote{\textit{Masterplan}, 10. The designs were drawn up by Jeffrey Wyatville in 1820-21; the First Lord Yarborough died before they could be implemented, but it is possible that the Orangery is based on his plans. (\textit{Masterplan}, 21, argues that it “bears the hand of Wyattville and compares in design and detail with the north entrance he designed for Chatsworth”.) Pevsner and Harris, 200 (followed by Pevsner, Harris and Antram, 189-90) attribute the Orangery to the architect Charles Tatham, and therefore associate it with an earlier phase of development carried out under his direction in 1807.} It is unclear whether it was intended from the outset that the Orangery would be a suitable location for Yarborough’s collection of antiquities, or whether it simply provided a convenient storage place when the Appuldurcombe collection arrived at Brocklesby in the mid 1850s.\footnote{A picture gallery (designed by Charles Tatham) was added to the house in 1807. A detailed account of this gallery was published in 1811; no antiquities are mentioned. At the time of Michaelis’ visit, one ancient item was kept in the South Library at Brocklesby: Michaelis no. 109.} The building, described as the “Sculpture Gallery” in the 1856 Catalogue, housed the larger pieces of sculpture from Worsley’s collection, together with some items (both ancient and non-ancient) which had been collected by the Earls of Yarborough; a selection of Pars’ drawings of ancient sites was also displayed here. Some of the reliefs were mounted on the walls of the Orangery. It may have been now that 2 (the funerary monument for Moschos), which had already been significantly cut down by the time it was drawn for the \textit{Museum Worsleyanum}, was further reshaped; the wooden frame in which our 4 (the dedication by Timaios) is currently mounted might also have been added at this point (though it is possible that the relief had already been framed in this way when it was displayed in Appuldurcombe). The collection (and the main house) was open to visitors once a week (provided that the family was not in residence).\footnote{Brocklesby Catalogue, Preface.}
have anything to add to Michaelis’ and Smith’s account of the inscriptions. Vermeule visited in 1953, “mainly to ascertain that most of the Yarborough and Worsley marbles seem to be in the sculpture Gallery behind the house”.\textsuperscript{47} In 1972 and 1974 the Cologne Forschungsarchiv für Antike Plastik undertook photographic campaigns in Brocklesby Park under the direction of Heinz Kähler and Hansgeorg Oehler (Oehler, 89); these images, now held in the Cologne institute, are the origin of the photographs of Brocklesby material in this publication.\textsuperscript{48} Shortly after the current Earl inherited the estate in 1991, the collection was visited by Susan Walker and Peter Higgs of the British Museum, at which point it was still housed in the Orangery. The collection was visited at the Orangery by G. B. Waywell at some point around the turn of the century with a view to inclusion in an as-yet unpublished volume of the Monumenta Romanae Artis series.\textsuperscript{49}

In the early twenty-first century, in the context of a wide-ranging programme of restoration and remodelling at Brocklesby, the collection was moved into the main house; some of it is now displayed in the restored Entrance Hall.\textsuperscript{50}

\begin{figure}[h]
\centering
\includegraphics[width=\textwidth]{Orangery_Sculpture_Gallery_Brocklesby_ca_1972.jpg}
\caption{The Orangery / Sculpture Gallery at Brocklesby (ca. 1972). 1, 2, 3 and 4 are all on display. © Forschungsarchiv für Antike Plastik. Köln. Photograph no. FA1162-12.}
\end{figure}

\textsuperscript{47} Vermeule 1955, 131; cf. the slightly fuller account in Vermeule 1956, 324-25.
\textsuperscript{48} Lisa Schadow of the Archäologisches Institut of the Universität zu Köln informs us that a number of photographic campaigns were undertaken at Brocklesby in 1972 and 1974 under the direction of Kähler and Oehler. On the campaigns, see Remmy, 22-26. An image of 4 (the dedication by Timaios) was exhibited in a photographic exhibition in London, 3-9 September 1978 (XI International Congress of Classical Archaeology): see Oehler, Hand-list, 6-7 no. 2.
\textsuperscript{49} Waywell, 2007, 139.
\textsuperscript{50} Masterplan, 35.
2. THE PROVENANCE OF THE INSCRIPTIONS

Worsley travelled widely in Greece between late May and early July 1785.\(^{51}\) We know that he gained access to the Acropolis in June 1785 after offering a gift of a bale of cloth to the wife of the Disdar, the Governor of the Acropolis, and that he acquired some other (non-inscribed) items there (Travel Journal, I 202). The Museum Worsleyanum offers only passing references to the places of discovery of some of the antiquities it described (including our 1: the dedication by the sons of Polyaratos, 2: the funerary monument for Moschos, and 4: the dedication by Timaios); its precise descriptions of find-spots should not necessarily be taken at face value, especially since they are not always consistent with the accounts given in Worsley’s Travel Journal.\(^{52}\) However, there is no doubt about the Athenian provenance of the five inscriptions discussed in this paper.

The Museum Worsleyanum reports that 1 was “brought from … Athens”, but gives no more detail about its origin. However, as we show in our commentary on the inscription, our association of 1 with fragments of a base discovered in the late twentieth century suggests that it was originally set up in the Athenian Agora, an area of the city which we know from the Travel Journal that Worsley visited more than once (and which is relatively close to the residence of Gaspari in Plaka, where Worsley stayed when in Athens).

The Museum Worsleyanum is similarly unforthcoming about the provenance of 4, specifying only that it was discovered “at Athens” in 1785. No information at all is given for the provenance of 3 (the fragmentary funerary stele for Chairion). There seems to be no further evidence for the findspots of 3 or 4.

We can say slightly more about the origins of the two other inscriptions in the collection. The Museum Worsleyanum reports that 2 was discovered in Athens in 1785, “in the same place where are deposited the monuments described by Pausanias”, i.e. in the Kerameikos. The Kerameikos is an entirely plausible find-spot for this funerary inscription.

The 1804 Catalogue Raisonné states that the inscription discussed in the Appendix (the dedication to Pan and the Nymphs) was found “in the wall of the Acropolis at Athens” (18). Leake (482-83) offers a more precise provenance, suggesting that the relief was set up in the cave sanctuary to Aglauros on the slopes of the Acropolis. However, this claim does not seem to be based on any positive information about its find-spot; rather, it is an inference from the content of the inscription, as it was originally interpreted in the Museum Worsleyanum.

---

51 Non-Attic inscribed material at Brocklesby includes two pieces from Megara: IG VII 132 = Smith, Catalogue no. 65 = Michaelis 235 no. 65 = CAT 2.797 = Scholl no. 367; IG VII 113 = Smith, Catalogue, no. 63 = Michaelis 231 no. 26: see Liddel and Low, “Two Megarian”. Three ancient sculptures are adorned with Greek inscriptions added probably in modern times: Michaelis nos. 2 (Sophokles), 7 (Alcibiades) and 97 (Anacreon). We are unable to confirm the whereabouts of the dedication to Bacchus: IG XIV 975 = IGUR I 154 = Smith, Catalogue, no. 3. The most recent overview of the collection is that of Waywell, 2007, 139-42.

52 For example: the Travel Journal, I 146, reports that the statue of Asklepias (IG VII 113) was found “in front of one of the houses belonging to one of the principal Greeks of this place” [i.e. Megara]; the Museum Worsleyanum, I 79, claims that it was “dug out of some ruins” there.
3. THE INSCRIPTIONS

DEDICATION BY THE SONS OF POLYARATOS. Brocklesby Catalogue no. 53. Athens (probably area of Agora). Fragment of white marble depicting a bearded soldier wearing a knee-length belted chiton with Boiotian helmet and breastplate riding a horse with short-cropped mane towards the left; his left hand appears to hold the reins. The drawing in Museum Worsleyanum shows a moulding at the top edge, and smooth, apparently finished, edges on all other sides except the bottom left-hand corner; the photograph in Conze does not show the moulding. The piece is now broken on all sides except at the top-right corner; the flat edges of that corner are probably the result of later re-working. The back is not original. H. 0.16; w. 0.246; th. 0.202. Letters are generally clear and rectilinear, though upsilons are slightly curved; right hasta of pi is short. L. h. 0.0074 (omicron) - 0.0134 (sigma).

Eds. Museum Worsleyanum, I 15-16 (drawing); CIG I 580 (from Müller’s account of the description in the Museum Worsleyanum); Koumanoudes 206; Michaelis 234 no. 53; (IG II 1821); Smith, Catalogue, no. 53; Conze, II 1162 (ph.); (IG II² 5574).

Cf. Catalogue Raisonné, 18; Reinach p. 441, no. 3 (drawing); Langenfass-Vuduroglu no. 21; Woysch-Méautis no. 20 (ph.); Clairmont, CAT 1.362 (ph.); Scholl 321, no. 366 (ph.). Autopsy Liddel & Low 2019. Brocklesby Hall. Figs. 2, 3, 4, 5.

ca. 370-330 BC

\[ \text{ΕΝ} \] \[ - \text{Α} \] \[ \text{οκλής} \] \[ \text{Πολυαρά}\] \[ \text{το} \] \[ \text{Ἀλωπεκηθέν} \].

relief

Rest. \[ Ξ\] \[ οκλής \] Boeckh, Michaelis, Koumanoudes, Kirchner; \[ Αλωπεκηθέν\] \[ Πολυαρά\] \[ το\] Boeckh, Shear, Πολυαρά \[ το\] cf. IG II² 4, 251, l. 2 || 2' \[ Αλωπη\] \[ Κεκάθεν\] Boeckh, Michaelis, Koehler, Kirchner.

Michaelis (234) expressed reservations about the legibility of this inscription, commenting that its reading “cannot be completed with certainty” and adding that it was “much defaced”. A single letter A (first noted by Christopher de Lisle, personal comm.) can be discerned on the engraving of the fascia (just above the horse’s head) of the object printed in Museum Worsleyanum (Fig. 3); that moulding is now lost as a result of the reshaping of the stone, perhaps in the second half of the nineteenth century. The first two letters (EN) of the next line of the inscription, recorded on early illustrations of the stone, are also now lost (see Figs. 2, 3). However, the remainder of the extant inscription is clear and the reconstruction of the second line and of the final part of the first line is unproblematic: we have here the patronymic and demotic of the person named in this fragment. Boeckh,
followed by all other editors, restored the man’s name as [X]en[ο]kles, a very common Athenian name (the Athenian Onomasticon records 105 individuals bearing it). However, our view is that, as Stephen Lambert first suggested to us, the epsilon and nu are in fact the final letters of a demotic (Ἀλωπεκιθεν). This removes the awkwardness of the mid-name vacat above the head of the horse. But it also means that the name of the man commemorated here cannot securely be reconstructed, since -okles is an extremely common suffix in Greek personal names (the LPGN (ii) lists 171 names with this ending).
The Museum Worshyanum described the fragment as a “sepulchral marble”, a description followed by Boeckh in CIG. This classification is reflected in the inscription’s placement in subsequent volumes of IG, where it has always been included among the funerary inscriptions. However, Kirchner did note (in his comments in IG II²) that the monument’s genre was uncertain; Conze too raised the question of whether it might be a dedicatory rather than a funerary monument. Although the text (name, patronymic and demotic, with no extant dedicatory formula) and iconography of this fragment are indeed compatible with it being a funerary monument, we believe that Kirchner and Conze were right to raise the possibility of it being a dedication. More specifically, we suggest that the Brocklesby inscription should be associated with a dedicatory base from the Athenian Agora: IG II² 4, 251 (= Agora I 7515; Fig. 4). The Agora monument is made up of fragments (some joining, others not) which when reconstructed form a rectangular base with a cutting for a stele; the front and rear face of the base are decorated with a low relief depicting a mounted, galloping horseman. An inscribed part of the front face was found in June 1981 in a later fill in the North Byzantine complex in section BE 43 of the Agora excavations; nine further fragments of Agora I 7515 (including more of its front face and its inscribed left side) were discovered in June 1990 at section BZ 73 in the demolition of the SW wall of the N. Byzantine room. Inscriptions are partially preserved on the base’s front face and its left side and appear in IG II² 4, 251 with the following text (see below for our alternative restoration of the first line): Face A (front): [Ἀντι]ο̣χί̣δος φυ[λ՗ς] | Ἱεροφάνης Πολυαράτο Ἀλωπε [³] (³Of the tribe Antiochis. Hierophanes son of Polyaratos of Alopeke”); Face B (left side): [οἱ φυ]λ̣έται (³The tribesmen”).

53 Horses with riders are a theme of a number of Attic funerary monuments; the most famous (and grand) example is of course that of Dexileos (IG II² 6217), but the theme appears on simpler monuments too. Some of these represent a rider simply on a galloping horse (Clairmont, CAT 1.209, 1.429 (= IG II² 8370), 2.209a (IG II² 7151 = AIUK 4.6 (BM Funerary) forthcoming)); others show the horse trampling an enemy (CAT 2.130 (= IG II² 7716), 2.209 (= IG II² 6217), 2.213, 2.215, 2.412b, 3.430a (= IG II² 5391), or involved in battle against an upright enemy (Clairmont, CAT 2.214a). See also Conze nos. 1156-62; Agora XVIII 134-40; Langenfass-Vuduroglu nos.1-56; Woysch-Méautis nos. 1-64a. The presence of combat scenes (both cavalry and hoplite) on Athenian funerary sculpture is analysed by Osborne.
Our case for making the connection between the Agora and Brocklesby monuments is based in part on prosopography, and in part on their physical appearance. Shear (177-78; cf. SEG 53.232) identified the -okles of the Brocklesby inscription as the brother of the Hierophanes son of Polyaratos of Alopeke named on the Agora base. Shear’s proposal has been accepted by Byrne (Athenian Onomasticon, s.n. Ξενοκλῆς no. 34), and seems persuasive to us too. Polyaratos is not a particularly common name,
attested only 17 times in Athens, and these two inscriptions provide the only references to a Polyaratos from the deme Alopeke.

Second, we note that the iconography of the two monuments is strikingly similar. Both depict a cavalryman, wearing a Boiotian-style helmet,\(^{54}\) riding to the left on a rearing horse; the depictions of the two horses, particularly their braided manes, are closely comparable.\(^{55}\) In both monuments, the inscription runs above the relief. The letter-forms of the two monuments are very similar, especially pi, rho and upsilon; the letter heights of the Brocklesby fragment and those of the second line of the front face of the Agora fragment are also almost identical.

Furthermore, the dimensions of the fragments make the identification plausible. Because the Brocklesby fragment has been so extensively cut down at the rear and top, we cannot be certain of its original dimensions. But we note that the preserved height of the Brocklesby fragment (0.16 m) is compatible with the height of the sculptured relief area on the front face of the Agora pieces (ca. 0.19 m). Moreover, if the illustration in the *Museum Worsleyanum* is accurate, then the Brocklesby fragment, like the Agora monument (featuring a fascia with a flattened ovolo moulding beneath it), originally bore a moulding on its top edge. We propose, therefore, that the Brocklesby piece derived from a now-lost portion to the right of the preserved front face of the Agora monument, and (as noted above) that the epsilon and nu which were once present on the left side of the Brocklesby fragment belong to the final word (the demotic Ἀλωπεκῆθεν of the Agora monument: see Fig. 5).\(^{56}\) We suggest also that the A visible on the engraving of the fascia (just above the horse’s head) of the object printed in *Museum Worsleyanum* continues the heading which appears on the fascia of the Agora fragment.

The combined text is as follows:

*Face A (front)*

[Ἀντι]οχίδος φύ[λαρχοι] ᾧ[νέθεσαν]
Περοφάνης Πολυαράτο Ἀλωπε[κῆθεν]. [-ca.-]οκλής Πολυαρά[το] Ἀλωπεκῇ[θεν].

*relief*

1 Liddel and Low, following a suggestion of Matthaiou, cf. *IG II*¹ 4, 249; φυ[λῆς] previous eds.

---

\(^{54}\) The Boiotian-style helmet was adopted by Athenian cavalrymen in the fourth century BC: see Alexandri. We are grateful to Pierre Juhel for advice on this point.

\(^{55}\) As Grossman notes, the relief sculpture on *Agora* XXXV 136 (discovered in the southern part of the Agora excavations, to the north of the Areopagos) depicting a mounted soldier mounted on a horse with short-cropped mane (no inscription preserved) is very similar to that of the Brocklesby fragment (and by extension, we would add, to that of the Agora dedication). There are two other reliefs representing riders at Brocklesby (Michaelis nos. 16, 42), but their preserved dimensions suggest that they should not be associated with this monument.

\(^{56}\) We undertook autopsy of these fragments at the Agora Museum in August 2020.
The tribal commanders of Antiochis dedicated this.
Hierophanes son of Polyaratos of Alopeke. -okles son of Polyaratos
of Alopeke

Face B (left side)
[οἱ φυ]λαται

The tribesmen.

As Angelos Matthaiou points out to us, the restoration φύ[λαρχοι] ἀνέθεσαν at the top of Face A is paralleled in IG II³ 4, 249, in which cavalry commanders (hipparchoi) and tribal commanders (phylarchoi) made a joint dedication ([ἵππαρχοι καὶ φύ[λαρχοι ἀνέθεσαν, l. 1). As he also notes, an alternative would be φυ[λαρχόντες ἐνίκων], cf. IG II³ 4, 252, but this is not consistent with the recorded trace of the letter Α in the Museum Worsleyanum drawing (Fig. 3).

We follow Curbera’s suggestion (in his discussion of the Agora fragments in IG II³) that this monument was a commemoration of victory in the anthippasia contest, a mock battle staged between tribal contingents of the Athenian cavalry.57 A connection with the anthippasia is supported by the iconography of the monument, which is very similar to that of the so-called “Bryaxis monument”, a dedication set up in the north-west end of the Agora (perhaps close to the hipparcheion, the headquarters of the cavalry) by Demainetos of Paiania and his two sons, Demeas and Demosthenes, commemorating their victories in this competition (IG II³ 4, 252). A number of other inscriptions, dating from the mid-fourth to the mid-third centuries, commemorate victories in this contest (e.g., IG II³ 379, Agora XVI 203, IG II³ 4, 263, IG II³ 4, 265, IG II³ 4, 528).58 These inscriptions show that the contest was staged at the Great Panathenaia and at the Athenian Olympieia.59 If we are right to connect our monument with the anthippasia, then it is impossible to know whether it commemorates a victory (or victories) won at the Panathenaia or at the Olympieia.

The fact that there was clearly a tribal element to the achievement being commemorated in our dedication is also consistent with what is known of the anthippasia: Xenophon’s Hipparchikos (3.11-13) describes the contest as a “mock fight when the tribes

---

57 Other contexts are possible: cavalrymen could be honoured for various reasons (for providing food or equipment for their men, for example, or simply for performing their duties well: Camp, 31).
58 IG II³ 4, 243, 249, 253 (+ 254 and 432; see Bardani, 114-19), 255 (see Bardani, 106-10) and 261 are also thought to be monuments commemorating anthippasia victories, although in these cases the competition is not named in the extant text. On the evidence (including the epigraphic evidence) for the competition, see Reisch; Vanderpool; Bugh, 59-60; Camp, 28-33.
59 It has been suggested (Reisch, 2379) that the anthippasia was originally associated only with the Panathenaia, and was added to the Olympieia at a later date (the earliest reference to the anthippasia being staged at the Olympieia appears in IG II³ 4, 265, a tribal dedication of the late-fourth or early-third century). It is equally possible, however, that the competition was part of both festivals from an earlier date (Bugh, 59, argues that it formed part of both festivals from the fifth century onwards).
pursue and escape from one another at the gallop in two squadrons of five tribes, each side led by its *hipparχ*”. It is usually assumed that victory was awarded to a single tribe, although the process by which this was determined is obscure. Monuments commemorating victory in the competition typically focus on the contributions of the commanders of tribal contingents, sometimes as a direct celebration of their successful leadership (as is the case with *IG II² 4, 252*, the Bryaxis monument) and sometimes to mark an honour awarded to them by their tribe or by the Athenian *demos* in recognition of their achievement (e.g. *IG II² 4, 528*, a dedication principally commemorating the *agonothesia* of Glaukon of Aithalaidai, but also recording crowns awarded for his victories at the *anthippasia* and other honours). Enough survives of our monument to suggest that the tribesmen (the *[φυ]λέται* of the left face of the Agora fragment) played some role in its creation; we cannot know exactly what this was, but one possibility is that they had voted an honour to the two sons of Polyaratos (a process perhaps also visible in Agora XVI 203, a decree possibly of a tribe honouring a phylarch for victory in the *anthippasia*). The base may have been intended to support a tripod awarded as a victory prize (cf. Bardani, 119).

The focus of our monument seems to have been the two brothers, -okles and Hierophanes. Dedications made jointly by brothers, which might be viewed as expressions of family harmony and filial solidarity, are attested in other inscribed monuments of the fourth century BC and later. The Bryaxis monument (*IG II² 4, 252*) provides a direct parallel for the commemoration of victory at the *anthippasia* by two brothers who were both phylarchs (Demeas and Demosthenes, sons of Demainetos), together with their father. According to the *Ath. Pol.* (61.4-5), each tribe elected only one phylarch, who served for a whole year: it is possible, therefore, that the Bryaxis monument commemorates victories won in more than one year; the same might also be true for our monument. An alternative plausible scenario is that both the Bryaxis monument and our monument commemorate the occasion of the sharing of the role between two brothers.

The Brocklesby inscription and the Agora dedication constitute the entirety of the evidence for this family. Their association with the cavalry indicates that they were part of the Athenian socio-economic elite, and as both brothers held the office of *phylarch*, this would suggest an even higher level of social and/or political prominence: the phylarchy was an elected office, and one which (according to the Old Oligarch) was typically held by the elite rather than the masses ([Xen.] *Ath. Pol.* 1.3).

The scale and quality of this dedication further supports the view that the sons of Polyaratos were wealthy and prominent members of their tribe – and indeed that they wished to advertise this fact, as well as the services which they had performed for the tribe.

---

60 For examples of dedications made jointly by brothers, see Parker, *Polytheism*, 48. Generally, on dedications made by family members see Humphreys, 408-13; Löhr collects and discusses many further examples.

61 A possible example of two brothers sharing a liturgical role is *IG II² 4, 518* and *519* (the brothers Xenokles and Androkles of Sphettos holding the *agonothesia* in 307/6 BC or shortly after, possibly, but not certainly, in the same year). The shared holding of liturgical offices between brothers was common in the Roman period: see *IG II²* 1996 II. 10-11, *IG II²* 2068 (gymnasiarchs) and *IG II²* 2193, *IG II²* 2199 (*agonotheTai*).
and the city. The monument would have been conspicuous in form: a cutting in the upper surface of the base reveals that it would originally have held a rectangular pillar (Shear, 178), perhaps supporting the prize won in the contest. The fragments of the Agora dedication were found in Byzantine buildings near the Painted Stoa (see above, and Camp, 31 no. 45); it is likely that the monument originally stood somewhere in this north-western area of the agora, which was closely connected with the activity of horsemen and seems to have been a popular place for members of the cavalry class to advertise and celebrate their achievements.62

The Agora fragments have been dated to the middle of the fourth century on stylistic grounds (particularly on the basis of their similarity to the reliefs of the Bryaxis monument,63 which is firmly dated to the mid-fourth century on the basis of prosopography: Davies, APF pp. 102-4); this is consistent with Kirchner’s suggested fourth-century date for the Brocklesby fragment. The genitive singular in –o also points to a date no later than the second third of the fourth century; this form becomes very uncommon after 350, and cannot be safely identified in any private Athenian inscription later than ca. 330 (Threatte, I 258).

62 Camp, 33, 38 (noting that the association might have been strengthened by the presence of the hipparcheion in this north-western part of the Agora). See now Bardani, 113-14, emphasising that the Panathenaic Way entered the agora at this point; Athenaeus 402f reports that Mnesimachos in his Hippotrophos claims that the tribal-commanders (phylarchoi) spent their time at the Herms in the agora and that a certain Phaidon trained his pupils to mount and dismount their horses there.

63 Shear, 178.
FUNERARY MONUMENT FOR MOSCHOS. Brocklesby Catalogue no. 67. Athens, probably Kerameikos (Museum Worsleyanum, I 29). Slice of white marble, representing, in low relief, an elderly bearded male, followed by a small figure wearing a tunic. The man clasps the hand of a seated figure in dexiosis; this figure is only partially preserved (the right hand, knees and feet are extant, along with the front leg of the klinos). H. 0.265; w. 0.167; th. 0.208-0.44. The front face is convex; smooth on all sides and at the rear, a result of modern re-shaping. The inscription is above and to the right of the head of the bearded male. Lettering is squat, spaced out, and slightly curved. L. h. 0.0068 (omicron) - 0.0125 (mu).

Eds. Museum Worsleyanum, I 29-30 (drawing); Michaelis, 235 no. 67; (IG II 3976); Conze, I 367 (drawing); Smith, Catalogue no. 67; (IG II² 12178).


cia. 400-320 BCΜόσχος.

relief

Σ and Χ are depicted as fully preserved in the drawing in the Museum Worsleyanum; only the lower parts of the letters are now extant.

Moschos

The fragmentary nature of this object makes secure identification of its original form difficult. The convex nature of the front face suggests that the piece derived from a rounded stone vessel. Indeed, the Catalogue Raisonné of the Appuldurcombe collection thought that it was “evidently the fragment of a stella [sic] or short column” (13). Michaelis, more plausibly, described it as a “fragment of a sepulchral vase” – that is, part of a free-standing stone lekythos, an object commonly used to mark grave sites in Athens and Attica, and regularly decorated with reliefs. It is possible alternatively that the fragment may originally have been part of a stone loutrophoros or loutrophoros relief stele, though we know nothing of Moschos’ life which would support the view that this would have been an appropriate motif for his funerary marker. The object has been further damaged (or re-shaped) since its original acquisition: the drawing in the Museum Worsleyanum (Fig. 7) depicts the stone as extending below the field of the relief; this portion of the stone is no longer extant (see Fig. 6), and part of the top of the monument

64 Agora XXXV, pp. 23-24 offers a useful survey of the development of this form of grave marker, with references to the (34) examples found in the excavations of the Athenian Agora; cf. also AIUK 3 (Fitzwilliam), no. 4; AIUK 7 (Chatsworth), no. 1. Further examples are collected in the studies of Schmaltz and Proukakis.

65 The loutrophoros motif is often (but not always) an indication that the deceased had died unmarried; see AIUK 3 (Fitzwilliam), no. 5, AIUK 6 (Leeds City Museum), no. 1 (with fig. 1), AIUK 12 (Great North Museum: Hancock), no. 1.
has also been lost. (Conze’s drawing reveals that this damage had already occurred by the late nineteenth century.)

*Fig. 6. 2. © Forschungsarchiv für Antike Plastik. Köln. Photograph no. FA968-08.*
Fig. 7. 2. Engraving from the Museum Worsleyanum (Heidelberg University Library, C 3140 A FOL RES:1).
It seems safe to assume that the bearded figure was the deceased, Moschos, identified by the inscription above his head. The small figure following on is presumably a slave, and his presence may well have acted as a marker of status; there are many other examples of Attic funerary sculpture in which an elderly man is depicted with a slave attendant (see Clairmont, *CAT* 6, p. 151). The identity of the seated figure is less clear, particularly since its gender is uncertain. Michaelis and Smith identified it as female. Conze included the inscription in his set of monuments depicting “seated females”, but expressed reservations about this categorisation, noting that the visible clothing does not obviously signify male or female gender. We share Conze’s misgivings, and would add that what is visible of the figure’s pose (crossed feet, hand raised from the lap for *dexiosis*) is equally ambiguous in terms of indicating gender: both male and female figures are depicted using both of these poses.\(^6^6^\) One of the anonymous readers of this paper helpfully observes that the absence of vertical folds of an undergarment below the hem of the himation (as usually seen on seated females) suggests that the figure is male.

The gesture of *dexiosis* is commonplace on Athenian funerary markers, and typically indicates an intimate connection, unbroken in spite of death, between the two figures engaged in it.\(^6^7^\) If the seated figure is female, then it would be reasonable to infer that she was Moschos’ wife; we find a very similar scene (a male in *dexiosis* with a seated female, with a young slave following the male) in a marble loutrophoros from mid fourth-century Brauron (Kokula L 99 = *IG* II\(^2^\) 6109 = Clairmont, *CAT* 2.819). However, it is also possible that the *dexiosis* was between two male figures. When older men are standing in *dexiosis* with a seated male, the seated figure is usually another older man; we could compare, for example, Clairmont, *CAT* 2.293b, an inscribed marble loutrophoros depicting two older men in *dexiosis*, perhaps brothers or cousins.\(^6^8^\) In this case, therefore, the seated figure might have been Moschos’ brother.

Moschos is a very common name in Athens (the *Athenian Onomasticon* lists 82 examples, of which 9 are foreign residents); we cannot therefore identify the individual commemorated on this monument. The fact that Moschos is not given a demotic need not indicate that he was not an Athenian citizen: although the use of demotic (and patronymic) did become more common on Athenian citizen grave markers in the fourth century BC,\(^6^9^\) it was never a universal practice. If it were the case, as is plausible, that this object was set up within a family *peribolos*, it is likely that other inscribed objects would have clarified Moschos’ patronymic, demotic, and other familial relationships.

\(^6^6^\) We are grateful to Robert Pitt for these observations, based on his work on the corpus of Attic funerary sculpture in the British Museum.

\(^6^7^\) For memorials with *dexiosis* representations, see Clairmont, *CAT* 6 Index, s.v. “Dexiosis” p. 99.

\(^6^8^\) For another example of two older men in *dexiosis*, see *IG* II\(^2^\) 12802 (= Clairmont, *CAT* 2.280), *IG* II\(^2^\) 8829 (= Clairmont, *CAT* 2.351c) and Clairmont, *CAT* 2.360c. Numerous other examples of grave monuments depicting a standing and a seated male are listed in Clairmont, *CAT* 6, Index C 2.4, C 2.41 (pp. 12-13).

\(^6^9^\) For discussion of the phenomenon, see Meyer, 111.
Kirchner suggested a fourth-century date for the monument, which is consistent with the style of lettering and relief. The monument must derive from the period before the funerary reforms of Demetrios of Phaleron. The poor state of preservation of the monument and its lettering does not allow for any greater precision.
FRAGMENT OF FUNERARY STELE OF CHAIRION. Brocklesby Catalogue no. 13. Findspot unknown (cf. sect. 2). Upper-left fragment of a naïskos stele, preserving the head and upper torso of a bearded male figure wearing a mantle, sculpted in high relief. Complete at top and rear; broken on all other sides. The inscription appears on the architrave, above which are three antefixes. There is a small circular cutting (dowel-hole?) in the top surface. Original back. H. 0.34; w. 0.22; max. th. 0.125. Rectilinear and well-spaced letters; lightly cut; alpha with slightly angled bar; mu with slightly curved strokes. L. h. 0.0157 (chi) - 0.018 (mu).

Eds. Museum Worsleyanum, I 29-30; CIG I 734 (from Müller’s account of the description in the Museum Worsleyanum); Koumanoudes 2249; (IG III 3426); Michaelis p. 228 no. 13; Smith, Catalogue no.13; Conze, III 1260 (ph.); (IG II² 13044).

Cf. Catalogue Raisonné, 18; Reinach p. 439, no. 5 (drawing); Clairmont, CAT 3 p. 384 n. 3 (with ph. under 3.453a). Autopsy Liddel & Low 2019. Brocklesby Hall. Figs. 8, 9, 10.

4th cent. BC  Χαιρίων Μυ — —.

relief

Χαιρίων Μτ(ήσιος?) Boeckh, Koumanoudes, Dittenberger; Μυ− Conze, Kirchner; Μικυλίωνος Clairmont (CAT 3, p. 384 n. 3).

Chairion son of My−(?)

Clairmont’s very tentative discussion (CAT 3 p. 384 n. 3 on IG II² 5452) of the possibility of restoring here Χαιρίων Μτ[κυλίωνος] is based on an attestation of that name from the early-mid fourth-century funerary monument IG II² 5452, lines 1-2, Χαιρίων Μικυλίωνος : Αἰξω(νεός). However, autopsy of the monument confirms that the final visible letter cannot be an iota. There are traces of an inscribed upper-left diagonal stroke which are compatible with either a nu or an upsilon (though the lack of visible preceding vertical makes an upsilon more likely). We might expect a patronymic after Χαιρίων, but it is impossible to pin down what this would have been: the Athenian Onomasticon lists approximately 34 male names beginning with Μυ− and ca. 52 male names beginning with Μν−. Χαιρίων is a moderately common name: the Athenian Onomasticon lists 29 examples, but none is associated with a father or son whose name begins with Μν− or Μυ−. In short, therefore, we cannot make any progress in identifying the man commemorated on this monument.
Fig. 8. 3. © Forschungsarchiv für Antike Plastik. Köln. Photograph no. FA967-08.
Given that only the top left-hand part of this monument is preserved,\(^7\) it is impossible to tell with certainty how many figures were originally represented. As one of the anonymous reviewers of this paper points out, however, Chairion’s position on the far left of the naïskos with the right side of his body in front of the pilaster points to him being part of a multi-figure scene (cf. Clairmont, *CAT* 3.383c, 3.387, 3.398, 3.404a, 3.409). His slightly downturned head suggests that he may have originally been in *dexiosis* with another figure. It is quite possible that the cutting in the top surface was for the attachment of a separately-carved finial, perhaps of a Siren.\(^7\)

Kirchner suggested that the stele predates the reforms of Demetrios of 317 BC, but maintained that the inscription was written up in the second century BC. Conze and Smith take the view that this is a fragment of a fourth-century funerary stele which was re-used in the Roman period.\(^7\) However, the lettering lacks features, such as apices, which would suggest a later date, and the forms are paralleled in classical funerary monuments. For the slightly tilted horizontal bar of the alpha, compare *Agora* XXXV 73 of the third quarter of the fourth century BC; for the slightly curved stokes of the mu and shape of the omega, compare *Agora* XVII 280 of the fourth century, *SEG* 28.440 = *CAT* 3.384 (mu only) of the fourth century, *IG II\(^2\)* 11808 = *CAT* 228 and *IG II\(^2\)* 7963 = *CAT* 2.321 (omega only) of the fifth or fourth century. The onomastic data do not help determine the date of the inscription: according to the *Athenian Onomasticon*, Χαίριων is associated with 12 distinct individuals of the fourth century and with 4 (excluding the subject of this monument) of the second century BC. There is no sign of erasure of a previous inscription. We suggest, therefore, that the inscription is contemporary with the rest of this fourth-century monument; there is no reason to believe that the monument was re-used in a later period.

---

\(^7\) Three antefixes are extant, but it is impossible to tell from these the width of the original monument: for a funerary monument with five original antefixes, see *IG II\(^2\)* 11114 (= Clairmont, *CAT* 1.220); for an example with seven, see *IG II\(^2\)* 8464 (= Clairmont, *CAT* 1.202).

\(^7\) We owe this suggestion to one of the anonymous reviewers, who observes that while naïskoi with a row of antefixes are relatively uncommon, some have a Siren finial: see *CAT* 1.855, 1.862.

\(^7\) Such re-use of funerary monuments is relatively well-attested: see Pologiorgi; Schmalz and Salta.
Fig. 10. 3. Engraving from the Museum Worsleyanum (Heidelberg University Library, C 3140 A FOL RES:1).
DEDICATION BY TIMAIOS OF HERAKLEIA. Brocklesby Catalogue 28. “Found in Athens in the year 1785” (Museum Worsleyanum, I 11). Marble plaque representing in relief Herakles on a lion-skin with a stemmed wine-cup (skyphos) in his right hand and a wine-skin in his left; to his left are a quiver (hanging in a tree) and club. Herakles is lying on his left side with his right leg bent over across the left ankle. Between the lion’s paws there are representations of fruit (grapes, pomegranates) and cakes. Genitals damaged or deliberately defaced (cf. AIUK 11 (Ashmolean), no. 7). As Smith noted, the relief is “considerably restored, the head, left arm with wine-skin, and lion’s nose being new”; there are modern plaster repairs to the lower left and right hand corners; the relief is mounted in a wooden frame. H. 0.34; w. 0.435 (dimensions of visible part of the relief); th. (including wooden frame) 0.08. The inscription is beneath the sculpted panel. Letters are neat, square, and evenly-spaced; there are small serifs on most letters, and a more elaborate serif at the tip of the alphas. There are faint traces of a guide-line below the start of line 1. L. h. 0.008; interv. 0.015.

Eds. Museum Worsleyanum, I 11-12 (drawing); CIG I 473 (from Müller’s account of the description in the Museum Worsleyanum); Michaelis, 231 no. 28 (IG II 1607; IG II² 4952; Schörner, pp. 287, 558, no. 236 = R35 (ph.); IG II³ 4, 1168); Smith, Catalogue no. 28.

Cf. Catalogue Raisonné, 7; Dallaway 362 no. 27; Loewy, 61-62 (ph.); Reinach p. 438, no. 2; Bieber, 273 no. 4; Scharmer, 34-35 no. 44; Oehler, Hand-list, 6-7 no. 2; Oehler, 47 (ph.); LIMC IV (1988), Herakles n. 1050 (ph.); Waywell, 2007, 142. Autopsy Liddel & Low 2019. Brocklesby Hall, Entrance Hall. Figs. 11-14.

Imperial period

relief

Τίμαιος Ἡρακλεώτης
θῆκα τῆς στῆλης

1–2 Τίμαιος Ἡρακλεώτης καὶ — — Ἡρακλεώτης

I, Timaios … from Herakleia,

have set up the [stele?] for Herakles (?) … from illness

It used to be thought that this was a dedication by two men from Herakleia, but Hallof’s recent interpretation of it as made by one man, Timaios of Herakleia, to Herakles, makes much better sense of the fragmentarily preserved text. Since many places across the Greek world (from Sicily in the West to Pontos in the East) are named Herakleia⁷³ and use the

⁷³ The Hansen and Nielsen Inventory (1280) counts ten of them in the Archaic and Classical period alone.
ethnic Ἠρακλεώτης, we cannot be certain from where in the Greek world the dedicant(s) derived.  

In the relief-panel above the inscription, there is a representation of Herakles reclining and holding a stemmed wine-cup and a wine-skin. The scene is reminiscent of that at the end of Pindar’s _First Nemean Ode_ where Herakles, in return for his great labours, was said to be allotted tranquility (hesuchia) in a blissful home where he would receive Hebe as his wife and would celebrate his wedding feast with Zeus (Nemean 1.69-75). The theme of the reclining Herakles is reproduced from the end of the fourth century BC and later in sculpture, on terracottas, coins, gems and paintings. It was popular in the Hellenistic period and into the early imperial age. Wolf suggests that the style of the reclining Herakles was influenced by images of Dionysos reclining and may have been inspired by the figure of Dionysos on the east pediment of the Parthenon; but as Lawton points out, “there are too many variants, even among the early votive reliefs, to trace them to a single source”. Over the course of the imperial period the image became a symbol of prosperity, health and sometimes repose after success: another reclining Herakles on a dedication from Attica celebrates an ephebic victory at Eleusis (IG II3 4, 420 = AIUK 11 (Ashmolean), no. 7). Herakles is frequently depicted holding a stemmed wine-cup in his right hand and a wine-skin in his left; the club, quiver and lion-skin recall his labours (cf. AIUK 11 (Ashmolean), no. 7, Commentary). There are variations in the iconography of this theme: in other representations Herakles has a club over his shoulder or a bow in his hand; sometimes he reclines at a table: see LIMC IV (1988), 777-79. The pose of the fleshy Herakles in the Brocklesby votive is similar to an inscribed dedication to Isis from Hellenistic Thebes (IG VII 2483 = Scharmer 32 (ph.) = LIMC IV (1988) Herakles, no. 1051).

74 See Byrne, _FRA_, 72-92 for foreign residents of Athens labelled with the ethnic Ἠρακλεώτης and cognates.

75 The theme has been explored in detail by Loewy, Bieber, 272-74 and Scharmer; cf. Palagia LIMC IV (1988), 777-79. For some fourth-century examples of reclining Herakleis, see Agora XXXVIII, p. 84 n. 19; see Agora XXXVIII nos. 85-87 for examples of the theme in votive reliefs from the Athenian Agora.

76 Bieber, 272-77; Scharmer; Schörner, 43-45. For unnamed reclining heroes in Athenian inscribed votive relief panels, see IG II3 4, 1190-91, 1193-95, 1197-1202, 1219.

77 Agora XXXVIII, p. 84; cf. Scharmer. For the view that the reclining figure was inspired by an original painting, see Loewy; for the view that it was based on a statue, see Bieber 272-77; Palagia, _LIMC_ IV (1988), 777.
Michaelis, followed by Smith, suggested that νόσου at the end of the inscription indicates that the dedication was made in thanks for recovery from an illness. A parallel for this would be Kirchner’s interpretation of IG II² 4538 (now IG II³ 4, 873) as a dedication (dated to the 1st-3rd century AD) made to Asklepios in recognition of an intervention which saved an individual ἐκ] μεγάλη<ς> νόσο<υ>.78 Herakles at Athens was regarded as a healer and a protector,79 and it is therefore quite plausible that Timaios could have sought assistance from Herakles as a healer. Indeed, there is evidence for the curative aspect of the hero going back to the fifth century BC.80 In the late fifth century the Athenians established a sanctuary of Herakles Alexikakos (“Warder-off of evil”) at

---

78 Curbera’s edition of this inscription, IG II³ 4, 873, prints ἐκ] μεγάλη<ς> νόσο<υ> only in the apparatus.
79 *Agora* XXXVIII, pp. 81-83.
80 For the association between Herakles and Asklepios, see Sophokles, *Philoktetes* 1437-38, where Herakles sends Asklepios to Troy to heal Philoktetes; cf. Salowey 2015, 377. Two private dedications of the fourth century BC made by Lysistrata “on behalf of her children” and by Malthake “on behalf of the Thracian woman” (respectively IG II³ 4, 1159 and 1162) appear also to be thank-offerings made in return for Herakles’ healing activity. For the cult of Herakles the healer in the Peloponnese, see Salowey 2002. Kearns, 35-36 emphasises his role in caring for children.
Melite probably in response to plague;\textsuperscript{81} the same cult is attested on a fourth-century dedication from Piraeus (\textit{IG II}\textsuperscript{3} 4, 1155). Moreover, it has been suggested, on the basis of later sources, that Herakles 	extit{Menytes} (“the one who informs [the patient of the nature/cause of his disease?]”: \textit{LSJ} s.v. II) was worshipped in Athens as a healing deity at the Asklepieion.\textsuperscript{82} However, we need not assume that Timaios had been healed by Herakles; alternatively, it might be that, having recovered from an illness, he made a dedication at Athens to the eponymous hero of his home city.\textsuperscript{83}

We know nothing about the provenance of this dedication other than that it was found in Athens. Although no substantial remains of any sanctuary of Herakles survive, numerous places of cult worship of Herakles are attested around Athens and Attica, including in the city at Diomeia and Kynosarges and in Attica at Acharnai, Eleious, Eleusis, Marathon and Porthmos probably at Piraeus.\textsuperscript{84} Therefore, while it is likely that this piece derives originally from the city of Athens, we cannot identify precisely where it was originally set up.\textsuperscript{85}

\textsuperscript{81} Cult at Melite: see Woodford 1976; van Straten, 88-89; Salowey 2002, 171-72; Lalonde, 86-93 suggests that Herakles-worship at Melite was located within a sanctuary of Zeus on the Hill of the Nymphs, southwest of the Agora; Harrison locates the Herakles cult to the north of this sanctuary.

\textsuperscript{82} Van Straten, 87. For a relief from the south slope of the Acropolis depicting Herakles with anatomical votives which suggest a connection to the Asklepieion, see Kearns, 35 and \textit{Agora} XXXVIII, p. 83 with notes 14 and 15. For the cult of Herakles 	extit{Menytes}, see \textit{Agora} XXXVIII, p. 83 n. 14; cf. \textit{IG II}\textsuperscript{3} 4, 1158-60. Supposedly the cult was founded by Sophokles in response to a dream: \textit{Life of Sophokles}, 12.

\textsuperscript{83} For a possible parallel in the shape of a dedication made by a man from Herakleia (or whose father was called Herakles) to Herakles (and Hermes) see \textit{IG II}\textsuperscript{3} 4, 423.

\textsuperscript{84} On Herakles cults in Athens and Attica, see Parker, \textit{Polytheism}, 472-73; Jourdain-Annequin, 355-59 (with map of cult sites in Attica); Lambert, “Two Documents”, 79-82; Woodford; Verbanck-Piérard; Jameson; Stafford, 176-80. Acharnai: \textit{IG} II\textsuperscript{3} 4, 1166 with Paus. 1.31.6; Alopeke: Lambert, “Two Documents”, 79-80; Diomeia: Parker, \textit{Polytheism}, 472-73; Eleious: \textit{AIO} 505 line 12; Eleusis: \textit{I Eleusis} 85; Kynosarges: Parker, \textit{Polytheism}, 473, \textit{IG I}\textsuperscript{3} 369 lines 69, 87; Marathon: Parker, \textit{Polytheism}, 473, \textit{IG I}\textsuperscript{3} 3 line 2, \textit{SEG} 50.168 line 19, \textit{SEG} 51.48; Melite (see above, note 81); Porthmos at Piraeus: \textit{RO} 37 lines 10-11 and 16 with Lohmann, \textit{ZPE} 132, 2000, 91-102 and \textit{RO} p. 192.

\textsuperscript{85} Of the 14 known private inscribed dedications to Herakles (\textit{IG II}\textsuperscript{3} 4, 1155-68), only four are attested to have been discovered outside the city of Athens (one of which is said to have come from Piraeus: \textit{IG II}\textsuperscript{3} 4, 1155); seven of them have a provenance within the city, of which two derive from the south slope of the Acropolis (1157, 1159) and two from the Agora (1156, 1162). A dedication of \textit{eranistai} to [He]rak[les] was discovered in the area of Laurion; \textit{IG II}\textsuperscript{3} 4, 634.
Fig. 12. 4. Detail of left hand side of the inscribed area.

Fig. 13. 4. Detail of right hand side of the inscribed area.

Fig. 14. 4. Engraving from the Museum Worsleyanum (Heidelberg University Library, C 3140 A FOL RES:1).
APPENDIX. DEDICATION TO PAN AND THE NYMPHS. Athens; perhaps the Acropolis. Rectangular tablet with sculpture in relief; upper-right hand corner is missing, and there is damage at the bottom. Edwards (514) reports (on the basis of the drawing in Museum Worsleyanum) the traces of a tenon. In the centre of the representation is a bearded male in chiton and chlamys, walking towards the left, followed by three females. The first of the females passes behind a rough stone altar. On the extreme right is a large bearded head, on a stack of three rocks; on the left hand side is a group of six worshippers (represented in a smaller scale) including a child with a ram; above them, in the clouds or among rocks, is a deity (turned in profile to the left) with goat’s legs holding in his right hand a small cornucopia, and in his left a syrinx. At the top, the undulating frame apparently intends to resemble a cave. The inscription is carved on the lower frame of the relief.

Eds. Museum Worsleyanum, I 19-23 (drawing); Müller and Wieseler no. 555 (reproducing drawing); CIG I 469 (from Müller’s account of the description in the Museum Worsleyanum); (Pittakis 152; IG III 222; IG II 1528; IG II² 4886; IG II² 3 4886; IG II² 3 4, 1430 (reproducing drawing)).

Cf. Catalogue Raisonné, 18; Dallaway, p. 362 no. 30; Leake, 482-83; Müller, p. 44 no. 555 (drawing); Michaelis, 239-40 no. 110; Reinach p. 438, no. 4 (drawing); Feubel 35 no. 17; W. Peek, AM 67, 1942 [1951], 54-55 no. 87; Isler 30, 124, no. 8; Isler, LIMC I (1981) 23 no. 174; Edwards, 514-18 n. 28; van Straten 299 no. R 99 (reproducing drawing); Günntner 123, A 33. Not located. Fig. 15.

ca. 350-330 BC

Relief

[-i]ππο Φιλίπους ἀνέθηκεν.

[-i]ππο Boeckh, [Φιλί]ππου Pittakis (envisaging, in error, the full form of the genitive).

... son of –(i?)ppos of Phlya, dedicated (this).

This tablet, the current whereabouts of which are unknown, is attested only by way of the illustration published in the Museum Worsleyanum. All editions of the text and discussions of the relief – including the one we give below – are based on this depiction. As we have noted in the Introduction to this volume, although the Museum’s interpretation of inscribed monuments is sometimes fanciful, its representation of inscriptions and reliefs is generally accurate.

The interpretation of the Museum Worsleyanum of the main (lower) scene of this relief was that larger figures represented Kekrops and his three daughters, Aglauros, Pandrosos and Herse, at what was then thought to be the cave of Aglauros on the north slope of the Acropolis (see below, n. 97). However, it is more likely that it represents Hermes leading three Nymphs, and that the head at the right end is the personification of a fountain or river. Similar scenes are depicted on a large number of marble reliefs, dating from the late fifth century onwards, and found in Athens and elsewhere in the Greek
A particularly good comparandum for the Worsley relief is IG II³ 4, 1466, a dedication bearing the inscription “sacred to Hermes and the Nymphs and August Acheloos” which depicts the deity leading three Nymphs, with hands joined, behind a rupestral altar, away from a head of Acheloos. Nymphs are indeed usually depicted as a triad, and sometimes, as they are in the Worsley relief, standing, dancing or walking. Hermes, generally viewed as Pan’s father (Pl. Phdr. 263d), commonly appears with the Nymphs as their koryphaios (chorus-leader) despite being peripheral to their cult. The group of individuals on the left with raised right arms were probably worshippers; the smaller figure (perhaps a slave?) is leading a ram to sacrifice.

---

Fig. 15. Appendix. Engraving from the Museum Worsleyanum (Heidelberg University Library, C 3140 A FOL RES:1).

The identification of the elevated figure at the upper left of the scene is straightforward: the beard, pointed ears and goats’ legs indicate that it is Pan with syrinx

---

86 In his 1985 study, Edwards identified 112 Classical and Hellenistic examples of this type of votive (approximately 78 of which are from Athens). The earliest extant example dates to the last decade of the fifth century (IG I³ 955, found in the Athenian Asklepieion). For another Attic example in a UK collection, see IG II³ 4, 1468 (= AIUK 4.5 (BM Dedications)).

87 See, for instance, Lawton, Agora XXXVIII nos. 13 (= IG II³ 4, 1429), 60; IG II³ 4, 1435, 1437, 1439, 1442, 1445, 1448, 1468.

88 IG II³ 4, 1435, 1439, 1442, 1445, 1448, 1466; Boardman, LIMC VIII (1997), 935-36; on the relationship between Hermes, Pan and the cult of Nymphs, see Laferrière.

89 For worshippers depicted with raised arms on inscribed Athenian relief votives, see IG II³ 4, 1474, 1475, 1483.
There is no obvious mythological link between Pan and the Nymphs, but both were associated with (and worshipped at) cave sites. In Menander’s *Dyskolos*, Pan refers to the Nymphs who “share my shrine” (line 37), and at least nine caves in Athens and Attica can be linked with worship of Pan and the Nymphs. This spatial connection explains why they might also share votive offerings; it also reinforces and is reinforced by a belief that Pan and the Nymphs are united in their concern for rural and uncultivated spaces. Indeed, when the Athenians started to worship Pan after the Persian Wars (Hdt. 6.105), he quickly became associated with the Nymphs, Hermes and Acheloos, probably because they inhabited similar pastoral and rustic settings.

The bearded head on the far right of the scene is identified (on typological grounds) as the river-god Acheloos, the father of the Nymphs (Pl. *Phdr.* 263d). In the fifth and earlier fourth centuries, Acheloos was typically depicted as a bull with either a human head or face. However, from the middle of the fourth century, the characteristic depiction of the god becomes the one we see on this relief: a disembodied head or mask, always located at the border of the scene. This may well reflect the fact that Acheloos was worshipped in mask form; it is possible too (as Edwards argues) that both the depiction and the placement of the Acheloos mask are intended to signify his apotropaic power, keeping the Nymphs’ cave sanctuary safe from harm.

The exact findspot of this votive is not known for certain. The *Catalogue Raisonné*, 18 claims that it was “found in the wall of the Acropolis at Athens”, but this may be speculatively based on the interpretation of the *Museum Worsleyanum* (I 19) that the dedication represented a scene at “the cavern of Pan in the northern part of the Acropolis”. It was on the basis of this identification that Leake proposed the Cave of Aglauros as a probable findspot. The re-interpretation of the relief as a depiction of Hermes, Pan and the Nymphs removes the connection with the Cave of Aglauros, but a.

---

91 Wickens, I 169. For a map showing the caves of Pan around Attica, see Parker, *Polytheism*, 60-61. For more detailed discussion of the evidence in different periods, see Wickens, I 166-67 (Archaic period), 169-86 (Classical period), 197-200 (Hellenistic period).
92 Wickens notes (I 173) that the majority of these caves are not only in areas of pastureland (a suitable context for the goat-god Pan) but also associated with water sources (for which the Nymphs would be appropriate protectors).
93 As Lawton observes, “the Nymphs and Acheloos were regarded as the sources and guardians of the springs frequently found in or near caves”: *Agora* XXXVIII, p. 64; for the association between Pan, Hermes and Acheloos, see Larson, 96-98; on the introduction of the cult of Pan into Attica, see Borgeaud, 133-62; Parker, *Athenian Religion*, 163-68.
94 With human head: *IG* I 987 (= NM 2756); with human face: *Agora* XXXVIII no. 60. Further examples and discussion: Edwards, 66-67; *LIMC* I 1, s.v. “Acheloos” (esp. nos. 166-212 for depictions of Acheloos with nympha); Isler, 29-35.
96 Edwards, 67. For further examples of depictions of Acheloos as mask on votive reliefs, see the list in Isler, 114; for this iconography in other media, see Wrede 1928.
97 On the cave-sanctuary of Aglauros (which was originally thought to be located on the north slopes of the Acropolis, but is now identified with the cave on the Acropolis’ east face), see *Topographia* §1.27.
findspot on or near the Acropolis remains plausible; there is a cave now identified as a sanctuary to Pan and the Nymphs on the north slope of the Acropolis. However, inscribed dedications to Pan, the Nymphs and Hermes have been found at a number of locations in central Athens and at cave sites in surrounding areas. It has been suggested that niches within the caves were used to display votive plaques of this sort, but it is more likely that they were free-standing. It therefore seems likely that our relief originally stood in, or just outside, one of the many caves of Pan and the Nymphs in Athens or Attica.

The name and full patronymic of the dedicant (a male citizen of the deme of Phyla to the north of the city of Athens) cannot be recovered; a number of patronymics are possible (e.g. Ὁσίππος, Φιλίππος, Χρυσίππος), but no other demesmen of Phyla are attested with a name ending in -ιππος until Ὁσίππος of 202/1 BC (IG II² 1, 1177 lines 45, 63-65), who is too late to be identified as the dedicant of this monument. The inscribed name of the recipient of the dedication is also lost; however, given our identification of it as a gift to Pan and the Nymphs, it is likely that the Nymphs and perhaps Pan too were inscribed in the dative.

As Lawton (Agora XXXVIII, p. 68) observes, dedicators of Nymph reliefs occasionally reveal something about their motivations; sometimes they were inspired by prophecies or nympholepsy. Some devotees (like Archedamos of Thera, who made the shrine of the Nymphs at Vari: IG I³ 977-80) may have been social outsiders in some way. Others who made dedications to the Nymphs include the goat-herd Skyron (IG I³ 974), the washers (plynes) who made a dedication to the Nymphs and all the Gods (IG II³ 4, 635) and the parent Xenokrateia (IG II² 4548); these were apparently individuals of

---

98 On this cave, see Topografia §1.24. For a summary of the evidence for Caves of Pan and Nymphs in Athens and Attica, see Wickens, I 169; Parker, Polytheism, 60-61.
99 IG II² 4, 1426-4 (from city of Athens), 1466-69 (precise place of origin unknown). See Agora XXXVIII, pp. 65-67, discussing the findspots of dedications to the Nymphs, Pan, Hermes and Acheloos.
100 Inscribed votives from a cave on Mt. Pendeli: IG II² 4, 1435, 1436; from Hymettos: IG II² 4, 1437-42; from Parnitha: IG II² 4, 1443-62; from elsewhere in Attica: IG II² 4, 1463-65. Wickens, I 185-86, suggests that NM 3874, found near Ekali, might originate from one of the caves on the W. slopes of Pendeli, near Kephissia; NM 1445 from Eleusis can plausibly be linked with the cave sanctuary there. IG II² 1256 = Lawton no. 47, from Piraeus, is a decree of the orgeones of Bendis in honour of their epimeletai: in the top left-hand corner of its relief is depicted a cave within which are represented Hermes, the Nymphs and Pan; this is perhaps an allusion to the Nymphaion (IG II² 1283, line 18).
101 Travlos, 417, suggests that the niches inside the Cave of Pan on the Acropolis were used to hold votive reliefs; Edwards, 20-26 surveys the evidence, but is generally sceptical of the strength of the connection between known votives and cave niches (largely on the basis that the niches are the wrong size and shape for the reliefs). For a free-standing votive, see IG II² 4, 1436 (in which both the relief and its support are preserved).
102 “Ἄνυφρα”: IG II² 4, 1426, 1427, 1428, 1431, 1434, 1435, 1436, 1437, 1438, 1439; “Πλαὶ καὶ Νύφρα”: IG II² 4, 1445, 1455. Hermes is not usually named on such dedications: Laferrière, 31-33.
103 Connor, 162; Gaifman, 94.
104 Connor, 177-79; Larson, 14-20.
comfortable means from a range of different backgrounds. But we know nothing more about the dedicant of the Brocklesby relief.

Kirchner suggested a date of 400-350 BC for this monument, but Edwards (followed by Curbera) proposes 330-310 on the basis of the poses and drapery of the figures depicted in the relief. The use of –ο for –ου points to a date no later than ca. 350-330 BC (Threatte I 258).

---

105 For a view of the launderers of *IG II² 4, 635* as an association of individuals of mixed status undertaking a ritual function, see Lambert in AIO. On the Xenokrateia dedication, see Blok, emphasising its exceptional quality and likely cost.