Ussher), from παρακειμένων in the codd. rec. (only the mss. A and B are the true representatives of the tradition, see Steinmetz, vol. I, p. 60) up to M. Schmidt’s παρακείμενων or Naber’s ἤρέμων, perhaps we can find some help in Coray’s interpretation of the whole passage, convincingly advocated recently in this periodical by Professor G. J. de Vries (Mnem. Qu. S. XVII, 1964, 385/7), who confesses to be uncertain about the meaning of παρακείμενων: our κόλαξ, over-officiously, is anxious about the health of his host, and urges him to take some more of the excellent food, asks whether he is comfortable enough, etc. Παρακαλέων, I think, instead of παρακείμενων, does excellently fit in with this situation; apart from general use (παρακαλεῖν ἐπὶ, πρὸς, etc.), easily to be quoted from Theophrastus (Char. XI 7, XII 7) and elsewhere, there is a striking parallel of the absolute use of the participle in Ch. XX 10 καὶ ξενίζων δὲ δεῖξαι τὸν παράστον αὐτόν, ποῖος τις ἔστι, τῷ συνδειπνοῦντι καὶ παρακαλέων ἐπὶ τοῦ ποτηρίου εἶπεν, ὅτι τὸ τέρψων τοὺς παρόντας παρεσκεύαστακτῇ. The corruption of παρακαλέων into παρακείμενον is understandable by the frequent interchanging in minuscule writing of κ and μ, λ and ν, or even by wrong repetition of -μένων from ἐπισκευάσων in the line above.
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THE LEOKORION AND DYSKOLOS 173

In Mnemosyne 1964, 375-8, Mr. Colin Edmonson discussed the Leokorion, a famous but elusive Athenian shrine. I should like to add a footnote, mentioning what may be an additional relevant passage, Menander’s Dyskoslos, 173, where I would read τοῦ τῶν Δεσὶν ὁ δὲ τοῦ Λεών (the MS has ητούλω, with τῷ written above τοῦ; Lloyd-Jones 1) would prefer ἂ τοῦ λεώ; we need not concern ourselves with the slight textual difficulty at the beginning of the line). Professor T. B. L. Webster first suggested to me that is a proper name and we have a reference to the shrine of the eponymous hero Leos, τοῦ τῶν Λεώ (ἱεροῖν), father of the maidens sacrificed for the good of Athens 2).

Knemon is complaining, with characteristic exaggeration, that his door is a rendez-vous and his property is being invaded by all and sundry. The implication of “stoa” is clear—the public stoas, especially in the agora, were open to everyone. τοῦ τῶν λεώ is usually taken to mean a place where the people gather, but it is a strange expression to use in this sense. The question

1) In the Oxford Classical Text; this seems to me an even more curious expression than τοῦ τῶν Λεώ, which is what most editors read.

2) Subsequently I learnt through Mr. E. Handley that in Platon II (1959), 90, S. N. Koumanoudes had already briefly suggested reading τοῦ τῶν Λεώ, i.e. τοῦ Λεωκερεων (Mr. Handley’s edition of the Dyskoslos is about to appear, and he has kindly let me see his note on this passage). I doubt whether the shrine of Leos and the Leokorion should be equated outright (the inscription Ag. I 3068 quoted below implies that Leos had his own shrine), and I think τοῦ τῶν Λεώ is more apt; but in any case perhaps the present note will strengthen the case for some reference to Leos or his daughters.
is, can we regard "the shrine of Leos" as an obvious and familiar example of a much frequented place?

The Eponymous Heroes had individual shrines, as well as their row of bronze statues in the agora 1). These have been discussed by W. E. McLeod, in Hesperia 28 (1959), 125 ff. Some of them were on the Acropolis. In other cases, including that of Leos, nothing is known of the site. The shrine of Leos may well have been closely associated with that of his daughters, even if, as Edmonson and others think, the connection of Leos and Leokorion is purely aetiological and the original meaning of the name Leokorion was something different. And the Leokorion was a familiar Athenian landmark, in the agora, in a prominent position; the brawl between Ariston and Konon's son Ktesias (Demosthenes LIV 7-8) took place there (κατ' αὐτὸν ποὺς τὸ Λεωκόριον); Alkiphron (Epist. III 5,1) implies that hetairai were to be found near by, and Edmonson makes much of this association. The place was proverbially the haunt of down-and-outs 2). On a more solemn occasion, the Panathenaic procession passed by (Thucydides I 20,2; VI 57,1-3).

A dedication to Leos by the prytaneis of his tribe, IG II², 1742, was found in the mediaeval tower built on the south wing of the Propylaia. If it remained near its original place of dedication, then the shrine of Leos may have been at the western approach to the Acropolis, as was the shrine of Aphrodite Pandemos, περὶ τὴν ἀγαλμάταν ἄγαλμαν 3), and the shrine of Demeter Chloe, ὅσον τὰς σύμπεπτας κληρίζει γλυκυκλώναι (cf. Ἀθηνᾶς ἑταῖρας). This too was a conspicuous, familiar and frequented spot. But IG, II², 1742, may well have been taken there as building material from the agora (or indeed from anywhere in Athens). An ephebic dedication to Leos has actually been found in the agora, in the north-eastern sector. It is Ag. I, 3068 (Hesperia 9, 1940, 1).


2) Apostolios, Συνηγώγη παρομικών, X 53. Λεωκόριον οἰκεῖς ἐπὶ τῶν λυμμοτόντων.

For present purposes one need not be very precise about the location; but note that besides the suggested site on the north side (Mnemosyne, 1964, 375; cf. Agora III 113; GRBS, 2, 1959, 26) O. Broneer has recently detected a possible site further south, east of the Odeion; see Eph. Arch. 1960 (1961), 62. If one can trust Alkiphron and Apostolios about the more disreputable associations of the shrine, perhaps a site on the fringe of the agora is most appropriate. Professor H. A. Thompson has kindly allowed me to mention a theory which he has recently developed but not yet published, that the Leokorion was in the north-eastern quarter of the agora—a simple temenos was succeeded by a rectangular walled enclosure, and this, in the latter part of the fourth century, by a large square peristyle, which ultimately had to yield place to the Stoa of Attalos.

3) Ἑραπόκρατισμος Ἀροδίτης; Agora III, 224.

4) IG, II², 5006, line 3; this inscription, found south-west of the Nike bastion, gives a Delphic oracle concerning the shrine of Demeter Chloe. It is of Hadrianic date, but the oracle may be much earlier.