

A SELECTION OF
GREEK
HISTORICAL
INSCRIPTIONS

TO THE END OF
THE FIFTH CENTURY B.C.

EDITED BY
RUSSELL MEIGGS
AND
DAVID LEWIS

OXFORD
AT THE CLARENDON PRESS

1969

Oxford University Press, Ely House, London W. 1

GLASGOW NEW YORK TORONTO MELBOURNE WELLINGTON
CAPE TOWN SALISBURY IBADAN NAIROBI LUSAKA ADDIS ABABA
BOMBAY CALCUTTA MADRAS KARACHI LAHORE DACCA
KUALA LUMPUR SINGAPORE HONG KONG TOKYO

© OXFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS 1969

PRINTED IN GREAT BRITAIN
AT THE UNIVERSITY PRESS, OXFORD
BY VIVIAN RIDLER
PRINTER TO THE UNIVERSITY

PREFACE

Marcus Niebuhr Tod's *Greek Historical Inscriptions*, first published in 1933 and reprinted, with a useful appendix to cover the interval, in 1947, has proved an indispensable companion to Greek historians and epigraphists. It is now out of print and the Delegates of the Oxford University Press have invited us, as they invited Tod when Hicks and Hill's *Manual of Greek Historical Inscriptions* went out of print, to write a fresh work on the same general lines.

How much we owe to Tod will be at once apparent to those who come to know both books. We have preserved Tod's title, and we are glad to follow the form of the *lemma* which he evolved. Like him we have in mind primarily the needs of university students but in selecting our bibliographies we have not ignored the interests of our colleagues at home and abroad. Though this book is in no sense a new edition of Tod's work we have not hesitated to take advantage of his generosity and have even repeated whole paragraphs from his commentaries. It was a very great pleasure to us as well as to him when in 1967 he was awarded by our university the Hon. D.Litt. that his great contribution to Greek epigraphy has so richly deserved.

While in most matters we have followed Tod's principles, in one important respect our practice has been different. Tod followed the precedent of Hicks and Hill and in transcribing epigraphic texts in a literary form wrote *βουλή* in place of *βολέ* and *ὅπως* in place of *λόπος*. This method admittedly has the advantage of making the texts easier to read, but it can also lead to serious misuse; for in restoration the literary form obscures the number of letters that the space demands. We have therefore followed the general modern practice of maintaining epigraphic usage and preserving the layout of the original. We have also modified the form of Tod's indexes.

The main reason why a new book rather than a new edition is now needed is the impressive accumulation of new inscriptions,

from the Athenian Agora, the Acropolis, and many other scattered sources: no less than eleven of our inscriptions have been discovered since 1933. To make way for this new material we have reluctantly had to displace many inscriptions from Tod's selection. This task, however, has been made easier by the comprehensive publication of *The Athenian Tribute Lists* by Meritt, Wade-Gery, and McGregor; in view of the accessibility of these texts (in Vol. II) we have reduced our own selection to small samples from the lists. The new inscriptions mark the main difference between the two books, but even in the inscriptions that remain from Tod's selection there are many changes, some due to the discovery of new fragments, others to the improvements reached by a further generation of study.

In the preparation of this book we have appreciated the help of many good friends at home and abroad. In the Epigraphic Museum the successive directors, M. Mitsos and Mme D. Peppa Delmousou, gave us every facility that we could wish and more than once adjudicated on doubtful readings. The generous hospitality of the Institute for Advanced Study at Princeton in the year 1964-5 gave Lewis unique opportunities to do work of this kind. There and from there Professor Meritt, under whom we both took our first steps in Greek epigraphy, kept us in continuous touch with his own work, and answered a number of our queries from stones or squeezes. Professor Bean checked for us the text of the Serpent Column in Istanbul. Eugene Vanderpool sent us an up-to-date list of ostraka, though the most recent discoveries of ostraka from the Kerameikos could not be included. He also considerably helped our work in the Agora and was always ready to answer our questions. D. W. Bradeen, J. K. Davies, K. J. Dover, W. G. Forrest, P. M. Fraser, P. J. Rhodes, R. S. Stroud, W. E. Thompson, H. T. Wade-Gery, and A. M. Woodward have also generously put their readings and views at our disposal before publication. In Oxford Miss Jeffery has modestly but firmly saved us from some serious mistakes and, sharing the unlovable task of proof reading, has helped us to reduce our misprints. Professor Andrewes has always been ready with sensible advice or statesmanlike arbitration. To these scholars

and many others we are deeply grateful. We should also compliment one another, for we have found a surprising measure of agreement and our few differences of opinion have never escalated.

In the last two years we have gained an increasing respect for the patience and skill of the composers and readers in the University Press. It is right that they should have a position of emphasis in this record of our debts.

R. M.
D. M. L.

Oxford, August 1968

CONTENTS

(Numbers in parentheses are those of Tod's edition)

	Note on Transcriptions	xiii
	Abbreviations	xvi
1	'Nestor's Cup': 750-700 B.C.	1
2	Law on the Constitution: Dreros, 650-600 B.C.	2
3	Glaukos Friend of Archilochos: 625-600 B.C.	3
4	Cenotaph of a Corcyraean Proxenos: (?) 625-600 B.C.	4
5	The Foundation of Cyrene: late seventh century B.C.	5
6	The Athenian Archon-List.	9
7 (4)	Greek Mercenaries in Egyptian Service: 591 B.C.	12
8 (1)	Law from Chios: 575-550 B.C.	14
9	Aristis, Son of Pheidon at Nemea: c. 560 B.C.	17
10	Treaty between Sybaris and the Serdaioi: (?) 550-525 B.C.	18
11 (8)	Dedication of Pisistratus, Son of Hippias: c. 521 B.C.	19
12 (10)	Letter of Darius: 522-486 B.C.	20
13	A Lokrian Community settles New Territory: (?) 525-500 B.C.	22
14 (11)	Athenian Decree concerning Salamis: (?) late sixth century B.C.	25
15 (12 and 43)	Athenian Victory over Boeotia and Chalkis: c. 506 B.C.	28
16 (7)	Dedication of Aiakes of Samos: c. 500 B.C.	30
17 (5)	Alliance between Eleans and Heraeans: c. 500 B.C.	31
18 (13)	Memorial of Kallimachos: 490 B.C.	33
19 (14)	Athenian Thank-offering for Marathon: 490 B.C.	35

20 (24)	Law of the East Lokrians relative to their Colony at Naupaktos: (?) 500-475 B.C.	35
21 (15 and 45)	Ostracism at Athens: 487-417 B.C.	40
22	A Spartan Dedication: (?) 490-480 B.C.	47
23	The Decree of Themistocles: 480 B.C.	48
24 (16)	Epitaph of the Corinthians who died at Salamis: 480 B.C.	52
25 (18)	Dedication of the Athenian Portico at Delphi: (?) 479 B.C.	53
26	Athenian Epigrams on the Persian Wars.	54
27 (19)	Greek Thank-offering for Victories in the Persian War: 479-8 B.C.	57
28 (17)	Gelo's Thank-offering for Himera: after 480 B.C.	60
29 (22)	Hiero's Victory at Kyme: 474 B.C.	62
30 (23)	Public Imprecations at Teos: c. 470 B.C.	62
31 (32)	Athenian Relations with Phaselis: 469-450 B.C.	66
32 (25)	Halicarnassian Law concerning disputed Property: (?) 465-450 B.C.	69
33 (26)	Casualty-list of the Erechtheid Tribe: 460 or 459 B.C.	73
34	Samians fight in Egypt: 460-454 B.C.	76
35 (28)	Argives killed at Tanagra: (?) 458 B.C.	77
36 (27)	Thank-offering for the Victory of Tanagra: (?) 458 B.C.	78
37 (31)	Alliance of Athens with Egesta: (?) 458-7 B.C.	80
38 (37)	Victory of Selinus: fifth century B.C.	82
39 (30)	Athenian Tribute: 454-3 to 432-1 B.C.	83
40 (29)	Regulations for Erythrai: (?) 453-2 B.C.	89
41 (36)	Civil Laws of Gortyn: about 450 B.C.	94
42 (33)	Relations between Argos, Knossos, and Tylissos: about 450 B.C.	99
43 (35)	Political Expulsions from Miletus: between 470 and 440 B.C.	105

44 (40)	Appointment of a Priestess and building of a Temple of Athena Nike: (?) 450-445 B.C.	107
45 (67)	Athenian Decree enforcing the use of Athenian Coins, Weights, and Measures: (?) <i>c.</i> 450-446 B.C.	111
46	Tightening-up of Tribute Payment: (?) 447 B.C.	117
47	Athenian Treaty with Kolophon: (?) 447-6 B.C.	121
48 (48)	Athenian Casualty-list: (?) 447 B.C.	125
49 (44)	Athenian Colony at Brea: <i>c.</i> 445 B.C.	128
50 (38)	Athenian Tribute quota-lists of the Second Assessment Period: 449-446 B.C.	133
51 (41)	Athenian Expedition to Megaris: 446 B.C.	137
52 (42)	Athenian Relations with Chalkis: 446-5 B.C.	138
53	Accounts of Nemesis of Rhamnous: <i>c.</i> 450-440 B.C.	144
54 (47)	Accounts of Pheidias' Statue of Athena: 447-438 B.C.	146
55 (50)	Expenses of the Samian War: 440 and 439 B.C.	149
56	Athenian Treaty with Samos: 439-8 B.C.	151
57 (49)	Victory of Taras over Thurii: soon after 440 B.C.	154
58 (51)	Financial Decrees moved by Kallias: 434-3 B.C.	154
59 (52)	Building-accounts of the Parthenon: 434-3 B.C.	162
60 (53)	Building-accounts of the Propylaia: 434-3 B.C.	165
61 (55)	Expenses of the Squadrons sent to Corcyra: 433 B.C.	167
62 (54)	Accounts of the Delian Temples: 434-432 B.C.	169
63 (58)	Alliance between Athens and Rhegion: 433-2 B.C.	171
64 (57)	Alliance between Athens and Leontinoi: 433-2 B.C.	175
65 (61)	Athenian Relations with Methone and Macedon: 430 B.C. and later.	176
66 (60)	Resettlement of Potidaea: 429 B.C.	181
67 (62)	Contributions to the Spartan War-fund: (?) about 427 B.C.	181
68	Appointment of Tribute Collectors: 426 B.C.	184
69 (66)	Reassessment of the Tribute of the Athenian Empire: 425-4 B.C.	188

70	Athens honours Herakleides of Klazomenai: 424-3 B.C.	201
71 (73)	Decree concerning the Priestess of Athena Nike: 424-3 B.C.	204
72 (64)	Loans to the Athenian State from the Sacred Treasuries: 426-5 to 423-2 B.C.	205
73 (74)	Athenian Decree regulating the Offering of First-fruits at Eleusis: (?) c. 422 B.C.	217
74 (65)	Thank-offering of the Messenians and Naupaktians: about 421 B.C.	223
75	Athenian Tribute quota-list: (?) 418-17 B.C.	225
76 (70)	Inventory of Treasures in the Hekatompedos: 418-17 B.C.	227
77 (75)	Payments from Athena's Treasury for public purposes: 418-414 B.C.	229
78 (77)	Decrees relating to the Sicilian Expedition: 415 B.C.	236
79 (79 and 80)	Confiscated Property of the Hermokopidai: 414 B.C.	240
80	An Oligarchic Decree: 411 B.C.	247
81 (81)	Expenditure of the Treasurers of Athena: 411 B.C.	250
82 (82)	Eretria revolts from Athens: 411 B.C.	251
83	Rewards for Informers at Thasos: (?) 411-409 B.C.	252
84 (83)	Expenditure of the Treasurers of Athena: 410-9 B.C.	255
85 (86)	Phrynichus' Assassins honoured: 409 B.C.	260
86 (87)	Republication of Draco's Law of Homicide: 409-8 B.C.	264
87 (88)	Athens ratifies a Treaty with Selymbria: 407 B.C.	267
88 (89)	Athenian Treaty with the Klazomenians at Daphnus: 407 B.C.	270
89 (84)	Athens honours Neapolis in Thrace: 409-407 B.C.	271
90 (90)	Athens honours Oiniades: 408-7 B.C.	275
91 (91)	Athens honours Archelaos of Macedon: 407-6 B.C.	277
92	Athens and Carthage: 406 B.C.	280
93 (93)	Monument of a Lycian Dynast: late fifth century B.C.	282

94 (96) Athens honours the Samians: 405 B.C.	283
95 (94 and 95) Thank-offering for the Victory of Aigospotamoi: 405 B.C.	287
Athenian Archons 500-403 B.C.	291
Index . I Proper names	292
II Subjects	301
III Words and phrases	304
IV Other inscriptions referred to	308

NOTE ON TRANSCRIPTIONS

- [] enclose letters which we believe to have once stood in the text, but which are now lost.
- () enclose letters which complete words abbreviated by the stone-cutter.
- < > enclose letters accidentally omitted by the stone-cutter or letters which we think should stand in place of letters wrongly cut by him.
- { } enclose superfluous letters added by the stone-cutter.
- [[]] enclose letters or spaces deliberately erased in antiquity.
- α* A dot placed under a letter indicates that there are traces on the stone compatible with the letter which we print, which would not, in isolation, dictate the reading of that letter.
- represent lost or illegible letters for which we suggest no restoration, equal in number to the number of dots. We number groups of more than four dots.
- - - represent an uncertain number of lost or illegible letters.
- v* represents a vacant letter-space.
- vacat* indicates that the remainder of the line was left vacant.
- | in texts not laid out in conformity with the layout of the stone indicates the beginning of a fresh line on the stone.
- ← indicate the direction in which lines of boustrophedon or retrograde texts were cut.

: : :: always represent punctuation-marks of the original text. All other forms of punctuation represent modern interpretation, and it should also be remembered that virtually all word-division is also modern. *h* represents an aspirate sign in the original text. Apart from it, all aspiration and accentuation in our transcriptions is interpretative, designed to direct the reader to the Attic form with which he will be familiar; it is not intended to express any view whatever about the correct aspiration and accentuation in individual dialects, and some of it is positively misleading in this respect.

References are given to assist the reader with the conventions of non-Attic alphabets, but a few notes on the Attic alphabet are given here. The Attic alphabet lacked the double consonants, ξ, ψ, which it represented by χσ, φσ. It also lacked eta and omega, employing Η

(eta in Ionic) as an aspirate sign, and therefore represented their sounds by epsilon and omikron. As a matter of spelling-convention rather than of alphabet, persisting after the Ionic alphabet came to be used in Athens, epsilon was also used to represent some sounds which we write epsilon-iota and omikron was also used to represent some sounds which we write omikron-upsilon. Strictly, the use of the single letter should have been confined to sounds resulting from the contraction or compensatory lengthening for the loss of a consonant of original short [e] or [o], e.g. *νέεσθε* → *νεῖσθε* → *νέσθε* (Attic spelling), *μισθόοντα* → *μισθοῦντα* → *μισθόντα* (Attic spelling), *εῖναι* → *εῖναι* → *εῖναι* (Attic spelling), *ἐλθόνσαν* → *ἐλθοῦσαν* → *ἐλθόσαν* (Attic spelling), and the spelling *ει ου* reserved for diphthongs, e.g. *τεῖχος*, *Σπουδίας*, but practice is not infrequently erratic. See W. S. Allen, *Vox Graeca*, 67-9, 72 f.

Numbers and coinage. The Attic system of numerals (Tod, *BSA* xviii (1911-12), 100 f., xxxvii (1936-7), 237 f.) was acrophonic, the symbol being taken from the first letter of the word represented, e.g. Γ (*πέντε*) = 5, H (*ἑκατον*) = 100. Some intermediate symbols were constructed by a combination of two others, e.g. P or P (50) is a combination of Γ and Δ . Complex numerals were produced by aggregation, the largest always appearing first. The basic system is therefore:

I = 1	P = 6	H = 100
II = 2	Δ = 10	$\text{H}\Delta$ = 110
III = 3	$\Delta\Delta$ = 20	HP = 150
IIII = 4	P = 50	HH = 200
P = 5	$\text{P}\Delta$ = 60	P = 500
PH = 600	P = 50,000	
X = 1,000	$\text{P}\text{M}\text{M}\text{P}\text{X}\text{X}\text{X}\text{P}\text{H}\text{P}\Delta\Delta\Delta\Delta\text{P}$ = 78,696	
XH = 1,100		
P = 5,000		
M = 10,000		

These numbers always represent cardinals, not ordinals.

When the system is applied to the Athenian system of coinage and weights:

6 obols = 1 drachma
100 drachmai = 1 mna
60 mnai or 6,000 drachmai = 1 talent,

certain modifications take place. The basic numerical system is understood to represent drachmai—in terms of coinage, silver drachmai—so that P can mean 50 dr. as well as 50, but the unit (1 drachma) is written I , I being reserved for the obol. There are signs for sub-

divisions of the obol, C = $\frac{1}{2}$ ob., D or T (*τεταρτημόριον*) = $\frac{1}{4}$ ob., and for the talent, T, and this last is also capable of combination: P = 5 T., A = 10 T., B = 50 T., H = 100 T., M = 500 T., X = 1,000 T. Hence X X M H H H H B A A A A P T B H H B Δ Δ Δ Γ Γ Γ Γ Γ Γ Γ C = 2,896 T. 5,789 dr. $3\frac{3}{4}$ ob.

The influence of the numerical system or possibly of working with the abacus can produce a way of writing out sums in full which seems strange at first sight (see no. 72, ll. 103-5).

Weights and non-Attic currency which need to be expressed in staters can also be expressed by combination, e.g. H H Δ Δ Δ Δ P Σ Σ Σ (p. 232) = 248 st.

ABBREVIATIONS

<i>Abh. Berl.</i>	<i>Abhandlungen der Preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften: philosophisch-historische Klasse.</i>
<i>AFD</i>	B. D. Meritt, <i>Athenian Financial Documents of the Fifth Century</i> , Ann Arbor, 1932.
<i>AJA</i>	<i>American Journal of Archaeology.</i>
<i>AJP</i>	<i>American Journal of Philology.</i>
<i>ALG³</i>	<i>Anthologia Lyrica Graeca</i> (3rd edition), edited by E. Diehl, Leipzig, 1949-52.
<i>Am. J. Sem. Lang.</i>	<i>American Journal of Semitic Languages.</i>
<i>Ant. Class.</i>	<i>Antiquité Classique.</i>
<i>Arch. Anz.</i>	<i>Archäologischer Anzeiger: Beiblatt zum Jahrbuch der archäologischen Instituts.</i>
<i>Ἀρχ. Δελτ.</i>	<i>Ἀρχαιολογικὸν Δελτίον.</i>
<i>Ἀρχ. Ἐφ.</i>	<i>Ἀρχαιολογικὴ Ἐφημερίς.</i>
<i>Arch. für Religionsw.</i>	<i>Archiv für Religionswissenschaft.</i>
<i>Ath. Mitt.</i>	<i>Mitteilungen des deutschen archäologischen Instituts: Athenische Abteilung.</i>
<i>ATL</i>	<i>The Athenian Tribute Lists</i> by B. D. Meritt, H. T. Wade-Gery, M. F. McGregor. 4 vols. Cambridge, Mass., 1939-53.
Austin	R. P. Austin, <i>The Stoichedon Style in Greek Inscriptions</i> , Oxford, 1938.
<i>BCH</i>	<i>Bulletin de correspondance hellénique.</i>
Bechtel, G. D.	F. Bechtel, <i>Die griechischen Dialekte</i> , Berlin, 1921-4.
<i>Berl. Phil. Woch.</i>	<i>Berliner philologische Wochenschrift.</i>
Binnebössel	R. E. Binnebössel, <i>Studien zu den attischen Urkundenreliefs des 5. und 4. Jahrhunderts</i> , Kalderkirchen, 1932.
<i>BMC</i>	<i>A Catalogue of the Greek Coins in the British Museum.</i> London, 1873-1927.
<i>BMI</i>	<i>The Collection of Ancient Greek Inscriptions in the British Museum</i> , 1874-1916.
<i>BSA</i>	<i>Annual of the British School at Athens.</i>
Buck	C. D. Buck, <i>The Greek Dialects</i> , Chicago, 1955.
Busolt, Gr. St.	G. Busolt, <i>Griechische Staatskunde</i> , in I. von Müller's <i>Handbuch der Altertumswissenschaft</i> , (3rd edition), Munich, 1920-6.
<i>CAH</i>	<i>The Cambridge Ancient History</i> , Cambridge, 1923- .
<i>Cal. Publ. Class. Arch.</i>	<i>California Publications in Classical Archaeology.</i>
Cavaignac, <i>Études</i>	E. Cavaignac, <i>Études sur l'histoire financière d'Athènes au V^e siècle</i> , Paris, 1908.
<i>CIG</i>	<i>Corpus Inscriptionum Graecarum</i> , 4 vols. 1828-77.
<i>Class. Jour.</i>	<i>Classical Journal.</i>
<i>CP</i>	<i>Classical Philology.</i>

CQ	<i>Classical Quarterly.</i>
CR	<i>Classical Review.</i>
CRAI	<i>Comptes rendus de l'Académie des Inscriptions et Belles-Lettres.</i>
DAA	A. E. Raubitschek, <i>Dedications from the Athenian Akropolis</i> , Cambridge, Mass., 1949.
DAT	B. D. Meritt, <i>Documents on Athenian Tribute</i> , Cambridge, Mass., 1937.
<i>Deutsche Lit.-zeit.</i>	<i>Deutsche Literaturzeitung.</i>
DGE	E. Schwyzer, <i>Dialectorum Graecarum exempla epigraphica potiora</i> (the 3rd edition of P. Cauer's <i>Delectus Inscriptionum Graecarum propter dialectum memorabilium</i>), Leipzig, 1923.
DM	<i>Mitteilungen des deutschen archäologischen Instituts</i> , 1948-53.
<i>Dokl. Ak. Nauk, Ser. B.</i>	<i>Dokladi Akademii Nauk, Series B.</i>
<i>Ehrenberg Studies</i>	<i>Ancient Society and Institutions: Studies presented to Victor Ehrenberg on his 75th birthday</i> , Oxford, 1966.
EM	Epigraphic Museum, Athens.
<i>Eng. Hist. Rev.</i>	<i>English Historical Review.</i>
FD	<i>Fouilles de Delphes</i> , Paris, 1909- .
Ferguson, <i>Treasurers</i>	W. S. Ferguson, <i>The Treasurers of Athena</i> , Harvard, 1932.
FGH	F. Jacoby, <i>Die Fragmente der griechischen Historiker</i> , Berlin and Leyden, 1923- .
Friedländer	<i>Greek Inscriptions in Verse, from the Beginnings to the Persian Wars</i> by Paul Friedländer with the collaboration of Herbert B. Hoffleit, Berkeley, 1948.
GD	F. Bechtel, <i>Die griechischen Dialekte</i> , Berlin, 1921-4.
GDI	<i>Sammlung der griechischen Dialekt-Inschriften</i> , ed. H. Collitz, F. Bechtel, O. Hoffmann, Göttingen, 1884-1915.
Geffcken	J. Geffcken, <i>Griechische Epigramme</i> , Heidelberg, 1916.
GG	<i>Griechische Geschichte.</i>
GGA	<i>Göttingische gelehrte Anzeigen.</i>
<i>Gk. Rom. Byz. Stud.</i>	<i>Greek, Roman and Byzantine Studies.</i>
Gomme, <i>HCT</i>	A. W. Gomme, <i>A Historical Commentary on Thucydides</i> , Oxford, 1945-56.
<i>Gött. Nachr.</i>	<i>Nachrichten von der Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen: philologisch-historische Klasse.</i>
GVI	W. Peek, <i>Griechische Vers-Inschriften</i> (Vol. I), Berlin, 1955.
<i>Harv. Stud.</i>	<i>Harvard Studies in Classical Philology.</i>
Head, <i>H. N.</i>	B. V. Head, <i>Historia Numorum</i> (2nd edition), Oxford, 1911.
<i>Hesp.</i>	<i>Hesperia.</i>
<i>H. Gr. Ep.</i>	F. Hiller von Gaertringen, <i>Historische griechische Epigramme</i> , Bonn, 1926.

- Hicks–Hill E. L. Hicks and G. F. Hill, *A Manual of Greek Historical Inscriptions*, Oxford, 1901.
- Hill, *Sources*² G. F. Hill, *Sources for Greek History* (revised edition), 1951.
- Hist.* *Historia*, *Zeitschrift für Alte Geschichte* 1950–
- Historia* *Historia, Studi storici per l'antichità classica* (1927–35).
- IC* *Inscriptiones Creticae*, 4 vols. 1935–50, edited by Margarita Guarducci.
- IG* *Inscriptiones Graecae*, Berlin, 1893–
- IGA* H. Roehl, *Inscriptiones Graecae antiquissimae praeter Atticas in Attica repertas*, Berlin, 1882.
- IIA* J. Kirchner, *Imagines Inscriptionum Atticarum* (2nd edition, edited by G. Klaffenbach, 1948).
- IJG* R. Dareste, B. Haussoullier, T. Reinach, *Recueil des inscriptions juridiques grecques*, Paris, 1891–1904.
- Imag.* H. Roehl, *Imagines inscriptionum Graecarum antiquissimarum* (3rd edition), Berlin, 1907.
- Jahresh.* *Jahreshefte des österreichischen archäologischen Institutes in Wien.*
- JHS* *Journal of Hellenic Studies.*
- JRIBA* *Journal of the Royal Institute of British Architects.*
- Judeich, *Topographie*² W. Judeich, *Topographie von Athen* (2nd edition), Munich, 1931.
- Kahrstedt, *Staatsgebiet* U. Kahrstedt, *Staatsgebiet und Staatsangehörige in Athen*, Stuttgart, 1934.
- Kahrstedt, *Untersuchungen* U. Kahrstedt, *Untersuchungen zur Magistratur in Athen*, Stuttgart, 1936.
- Kern C. Kern, *Inscriptiones Graecae*, Bonn, 1913.
- Le Bas–Wadd. P. Le Bas and W. H. Waddington, *Voyage archéologique en Grèce et en Asie Mineure, 1843–1844 . . .* (6 vols., Paris, 1853–70).
- LGS* I. von Prott and L. Ziehen, *Leges Graecorum sacrae et titulis collectae*, Leipzig, 1896–1906.
- LSAG* L. H. Jeffery, *The Local Scripts of Archaic Greece* Oxford, 1961.
- Marcadé, *Signatures* J. Marcadé, *Recueil des signatures des sculpteurs grecs*, Paris, 1953– .
- Meritt, *AFD* B. D. Meritt, *Athenian Financial Documents of the Fifth Century*, Ann Arbor, 1932.
- Meritt, *Calendar* B. D. Meritt, *The Athenian Calendar in the Fifth Century*, Cambridge, Mass., 1928.
- Meritt, *Year* B. D. Meritt, *The Athenian Year* (Sather Classical Lectures, 32), Berkeley, 1961.
- Meyer, *Forsch.* E. Meyer, *Forschungen zur alten Geschichte*, Halle, 1892–9.
- Michel C. Michel, *Recueil d'inscriptions grecques*, Paris–Brussels, 1900–27.
- Moretti L. Moretti, *Iscrizioni agonistiche greche*, Rome, 1953.

- Neue Jahrb.*
Num. Chron.
PA
Pal. Soc. Facs.

Phil.
Phil. Woch.
Pouilloux
Proc. Afr. Class. Ass.
Proc. Mass. Hist. Soc.
RA
RE

REA
REG
Rend. Linc.

Rend. Pont. Acc.
Rev. Num.
Rev. Phil.
RF
Rh. Mus.
RIDA
SEG
SIG

Sitz. Berl.

Sitz. Wien

Solmsen

Staatsverträge

Stud. It. Fil.
TAM
TAPA
Verh. d. Kon. Ned. Ak.
v. Wet.
Wade-Gery, Essays

Wien Anz.

Wilhelm, Beitr.
- Neue Jahrbücher für das klassische Altertum.*
Numismatic Chronicle.
 J. Kirchner, *Prosopographia Attica*, Berlin, 1901-3.
The Palaeographical Society: Facsimiles of Manuscripts and Inscriptions.
Philologus.
Philologische Wochenschrift.
 Jean Pouilloux, *Choix d'inscriptions grecques*, Paris, 1960.
Proceedings of the African Classical Associations.
Proceedings of the Massachusetts History Society.
Revue archéologique.
 Pauly-Wissowa-Kroll, *Real-Encyclopädie der klassischen Altertumswissenschaft*, Stuttgart, 1894-
Revue des études anciennes.
Revue des études grecques.
Rendiconti della Classe di Scienze morali, storiche, e filologiche dell'Accademia dei Lincei.
Rendiconti della Pontificia accademia romana di archeologia.
Revue numismatique.
Revue de philologie, de littérature et d'histoire anciennes.
Rivista di filologia e di istruzione classica.
Rheinisches Museum für Philologie.
Revue internationale des droits de l'antiquité.
Supplementum Epigraphicum Graecum.
 Dittenberger, *Sylloge Inscriptionum Graecarum* (3rd edition), Leipzig, 1915-24.
Sitzungsberichte der Preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften: philosophisch-historische Klasse.
Sitzungsberichte der Akademie der Wissenschaften in Wien: philosophisch-historische Klasse.
 F. Solmsen, *Inscriptiones Graecae ad illustrandas dialectos selectae* (4th edition by E. Fraenkel), Leipzig, 1930.
 H. Bengtson, *Die Verträge der griechisch-römischen Welt*, vol. II, Munich and Berlin, 1962.
Studi italiani di filologia classica.
Tituli Asiae Minoris, Vienna, 1901- .
Transactions of the American Philological Association.
Verhandelingen der Koninklijke Nederlandsche Academie van Wetenschappen.
 H. T. Wade-Gery, *Essays in Greek History*, Oxford, 1958.
Anzeiger der philosophisch-historischen Klasse der Akademie der Wissenschaften in Wien.
 A. Wilhelm, *Beiträge zur griechischen Inschriftenkunde*, Vienna, 1909.

‘Nestor’s Cup’: 750–700 B.C.

Graffito on a Geometric skyphos (East Greek) from a grave in Ischia (Pithekoussai).

Euboean writing, retrograde, with punctuation. Phot.: *Rend. Linc.* 1955, 215–34, Pl. i–iv (whence *LSAG*, Pl. 47); *REA* lxvii (1965) Pl. xvi–xvii.

Buchner and Russo, *Rend. Linc.*, loc. cit.; Woodhead, *SEG* xiv. 604; Page, *CR* vi (1956) 95–7; Hampe, *Gymnasium*, lxiii (1956) 36–8; Picard, *RA* xlix (1957) 82 f.; Manganaro, *Siculorum Gymnasium*, xii (1959) 71–3; Webster, *Glotta*, xxxviii (1959) 253 f.; Guarducci, *Rend. Linc.* 1961, 3–7; *LSAG* 43–5, 235 f.; Carpenter, *AJP* lxxxiv (1963) 83–5; Metzger, *REA* lxvii (1965) 301–5.

Νέστορος: ε[2–3]ι: εὔποτ[ον]: ποτέρω[ν:] ←
ὁς δ’ ἄ(ν) τῶδε π[ι]ε[σι]: ποτερί[ο]: ἀντίκα κένον ←
ἡμέρ[ος]: ἡαίρ]έσει: κάλλιστε[φά]γο: Ἀφροδίτης. ←

l. 1: ε[ρρο]ι, ε[ίκο]ι, ε[ίκε]ι Buchner–Russo; ε[στα]ι, δ[θλο]ν Woodhead; ε[ν τ]ι Page; ε[ν το]ι Manganaro; μ[έ]ν Guarducci; ε[ιμ]ι Webster, Jeffery, which seems most reasonable. In l. 2, Page believes the space to require ποτέρω[ον]. To the left of l. 2 are traces of two letters, interpreted rightly by Guarducci and Jeffery as a false start on *Νέστορος*.

The earliest of Greek colonies in the west (Str. v. 4. 9, p. 247) has produced this, the longest eighth-century Greek inscription (Carpenter’s view that the inscription is sixth century is not compatible with the archaeological context in which it was found, and is clearly refuted by Metzger). As was to be expected, the letters are closely related to Euboean, and help to confirm the origin of the Etruscan alphabet and, eventually, our own from Euboean Kyme (cf. *LSAG* 236 f.; Guarducci, *Rend. Linc.* 1964, 3–10). The continuous retrograde is virtually unique in a Greek text (*LSAG* 43–5), though we would allow more weight in explaining it to closeness to Phoenician origins than does Jeffery, who attributes it to a desire to separate the verses clearly. That ll. 2–3 are hexameters is clear; l. 1 has been variously interpreted as a rough iambic trimeter, prose, or a trochaic trimeter catalectic (Guarducci).

Interpretations are divided between (a) the belief that a distinction is being drawn between the famous cup of Nestor (*Iliad* xi. 632–7) and this one, and (b) the belief that this cup is posing as Nestor’s cup (so Webster). Unless, by a remarkable coincidence, the owner of this cup was really named Nestor, we have here evidence for knowledge of the eighth century of this item in the epic repertoire. In any case,

Picard is right to comment on the contrast between the literary sophistication and the artistic poverty exhibited by the verses and the cup. For the light thrown on the development of epic technique, see Notopoulos, *Hesp.* xxix (1960) 195 f.

2

Law on the Constitution: Dreros, 650-600 B.C.

Block of grey schist from the wall of the temple of Apollo Delphinios at Dreros; now in the Dreros Museum.

Archaic Cretan letters. Ll. 1-3 boustrophedon, l. 4 retrograde. Vertical strokes are used as punctuation, and X at the beginning of l. 4 marks a new clause (*LSAG* 311, no. 1a, with drawing and partial photograph, Pl. 59. 1a).

Demargne and van Effenterre, *BCH* lxi (1937) 333-48, lxii (1938) 194-5; Guarducci, *RF* lxxvii (1939) 20-2; Ehrenberg, *CQ* xxxvii (1943) 14-18; Willetts, *Aristocratic Society in Ancient Crete*, 106, 167-9; Buck 116.

θιός ολοιον (*sic*). ἄδ' ἔφαδε | πόλι· | ἐπεὶ κα κοσμήσει, | δέκα φετίον
τὸν ἄ- ←
φτόν | μὴ κόσμεν· | αἰ δὲ κοσμησίε, | ὄ[π]ε δικακσίε, | ἀφτόν ὀπήλεν |
διπλεῖ κάφτόν →
ἄκρηστον | ἦμεν, | ἄς δόοι, | κῶτι κοσμησίε | μηδὲν ἦμην. *vacat* ←
X ὁμόται δὲ | κόσμος | κοὶ δάμιοι | κοὶ | ἕκατι | οἶ τᾶς πόλ[ιο]ς *vacat* ←

The crux of the inscription lies in the first two words. The first editors, thinking them intended as an insertion in l. 2, read κάφτόν θιοσόλοιον ἄκρηστον ἦμεν, assuming an asyndeton and that θιοσόλοιον might mean 'cursed'. Buck followed them in their placing, but read θιός ὄλοι ὄν, 'may God destroy him' as an interjection. Guarducci rightly showed that the words were inscribed before l. 2 and belong to the beginning of l. 1 as an invocation, but felt difficulty about the comparative ὄλοῖον against the more normal θεός ἀγαθός. Her suggestion ὄλόιος, however, is not borne out by the photograph, and she seems to have abandoned it (*Epigraphia Graeca*, i. 187 f.).

'May God be kind (?). The city has thus decided; when a man has been *kosmos*, the same man shall not be *kosmos* again for ten years. If he does act as *kosmos*, whatever judgements he gives, he shall owe double, and he shall lose his rights to office, as long as he lives, and whatever he does as *kosmos* shall be nothing. The swearers shall be the *kosmos* (i.e. the body of *kosmoî*) and the *damioi* and the twenty of the city.'

This may be the earliest surviving Greek law on stone, and is certainly the earliest which has survived complete. It is one of a group of eight, one in Eteocretan, from the same temple.

The ratification formula with its use of *πόλις* against the normal Cretan ethnic may reasonably be claimed as an early piece of evidence for the concept of the *polis*. The word does not appear elsewhere epigraphically until the late sixth century (Kyzikos, Thasos, Arkesine, Poseidonia (see no. 10)). We have no means of telling whether the word implies the participation of the assembly, as Willetts claims, or merely the authority of the city's officials (Ehrenberg).

The law forbids the repeated tenure of the office of *kosmos*, presumably, as elsewhere in Crete, the chief magistracy, before ten years have elapsed. The provision is paralleled at Gortyn (*IC* iv. 14, *g-p*, 2, *τρι[δ]ν Φετίον τὸν ἀφτὸν μὴ ροσμῆν, δέκα μὲν γνόμονας, πέντε [δὲ κο]ενίος*, sixth century), and it had generally been explained there by the need to make a break in the financial and legal immunity of a magistrate. The length of time which has to elapse in Dreros, however, suggests strongly that the motive was rather to limit the possibilities of using the office as a stepping-stone to tyranny (the first editors) or to bolster the power of an individual family (Ehrenberg, Willetts). How severe the penalty involved was depends on whether *ἄκρηστος* implies total deprivation of civic rights or deprivation merely of the right to hold certain magistracies. Dispute over the implications of the word involves the interpretation of the phrase *χρηστοὺς ποιεῖν* in the archaic treaty between Sparta and Tegea (Plutarch, *Greek Questions*, 5, Ehrenberg, *op. cit.*, Jacoby *CQ* xxxviii (1944) 15-16).

The list of those who swear the oath, presumably every year, includes two unknown offices. The *δάμιοι* have been generally identified with the Gortynian *τίται* as financial supervisors. 'The twenty of the city' have been identified as a committee of the assembly (Willetts), a committee of the council (the first editors), the council itself (Ehrenberg). The last seems the most probable.

3

Glaukos Friend of Archilochos: 625-600 B.C.

A marble block set in a stepped poros base, perhaps an altar rather than a cenotaph, found in the Agora in Thasos; now in Thasos Museum.

Parian letters (C = β; Ω = ο, ου; O = ω; Ξ = η), boustrophedon. (see *LSAG* 300-1, no. 61). Phot.: *BCH* lxxix (1955) 76, Fig. 1 and Pl. iii; *LSAG*, Pl. 58. 61; Pouilloux and Dunant, *Recherches sur l'histoire et les cultes de Thasos*, ii, Pl. liv.

BCH lxxix 75-86, 348-51 (*GVI* 51a; *SEG* xiv. 565+); *LSAG*, loc. cit.

Γλαῦρο εἰμὶ μνη-	→
μα τῷ Λεπτίνεω· ἔ-	←
θεσαν δέ με οἱ Βρέντ-	→
εω παῖδες.	←

Thasos, colonized from Paros at the end of the eighth or beginning of the seventh century (Pouilloux, *Recherches sur l'histoire et les cultes de Thasos*, i. 22 ff.), retained the alphabet of the mother city and close links with her; Archilochos was active there in the middle of the seventh century (Jacoby, *CQ* xxxv (1941) 97–109). Among the addressees of his poems was Glaukos, son of Leptines (*ALG*³, frs. 13, 56, 59, 68; 51, IV A), whose prominence in Thasos is attested by the dedication of this μνημα in the Agora, hardly long before 600 B.C. and perhaps some time after his death, an action which recalls the honours paid to founders of colonies (cf., e.g., Thuc. v. 11. 1). We do not think the text metrical (cf. *Entretiens Hardt*, x. 216, 218).

4

Cenotaph of a Corcyraean Proxenos: (?) 625–600 B.C.

On a cylindrical limestone cenotaph at *Καστράδες*, a suburb of Corcyra town (Crome, *Mnemosynon Theodor Wiegand*, 52, with Pl. 17–18).

Corinthian alphabet, in one continuous retrograde line round the monument. A lozenge marked the place where the reader had to start. Punctuation marks the ends of lines. Facs.: *IGA* 342; *IG* ix. 1. 867; *Imag.* 47. 26.

IG ix. 1. 867+; *DGE* 133 (1); Frisk, *Eranos*, xxix (1931) 31 f.; Friedländer 26; Buck 93; *GVI.* 42; *LSAG* 232, no. 9.

♦ *ἠνιοῦ Τλασίαφο Μενεκράτεος τόδε σᾶμα:*
Οἰανθέος γενεάν, τόδε δ' αὐτοῖ δᾶμος ἐποίει:
ἔς γὰρ πρόξενφος δάμου φίλος· ἀλλ' ἐνὶ πόντοι [:]
ὄλετο, δαμόσιον δὲ καρὸν [.]ο[-----]:
 5 *Πραξιμένες δ' αὐτοῖ γ[αία]ς ἀπὸ πατρίδος ἐνθὸν:*
σὺν δάμ[ο]ι τόδε σᾶμα κασιγνέτιοι πονέθει:

The missing letter in l. 4 seems to have been pi or rho: *πρ[τὶ πάντας ἀφίκε]* Hoffman; *πρ[τὶ πάντας ἠίκανε]* Peek; *πρ[λις ἄδε κέκαδε]* Edmonds; *πρ[λλοῖσι φύτευσε]* Friedländer; *ῥό[θιον πόρε κῦμα]* Frisk.

Corcyra used the Corinthian alphabet, though Syracuse, founded in the same year, did not (*contra*, Guarducci, *Κώκαλος* x-xi (1964–5)

465 ff.). The date is approximate, from the pottery found in the tomb. The epigram has a fascinating tension between its Homeric echoes and the political circumstances of a new age, δᾶμος or a form of it four times repeated, and above all the πρόξενος, the earliest known to us. Menekrates was presumably normally resident at Oianthea in Ozolian Lokris, and he may owe this monument to dying near Corcyra.

For δημόσιον κακόν (l. 4) cf. Solon 3. 26. ἐνθόν (l. 5) = ἐλθών; πονέθει (l. 6) is transitive.

5

The Foundation of Cyrene: late seventh century B.C.

Marble stele from Cyrene; now in the museum there. Cutting in the top for a relief (?), now lost.

Fourth-century lettering, not stoichedon; ll. 1, 23 are larger. Phot.: *Abh. Berlin*, 1925, no. 5, Pl. ii. 2; *RF* lvi (1928) Pl. x-xii.

SEG ix. 3+; Chamoux, *Cyrene sous la monarchie des Battiades*, 105-11; Wilhelm, *Griech. Inschr. Rechtlichen Inhalts*, 5-7; Graham, *JHS* lxxx (1960) 94-111; Jeffery, *Hist.* x (1961) 139-47; Seibert, *Metropolis und Apoikie*, 9-67; Graham, *Colony and Mother City in Ancient Greece*, 27, 40, 224-6; Oliver, *Gk. Rom. Byz. Stud.* vii (1966) 25-9.

θεός. τύχα ἀγαθά.

Δᾶμις Βαθυκλεῦς ἦιπε· περὶ ὧν λέγοντι τοὶ Θηραῖοι [ι]
 Κλευδάμας Εὐθυκλεῦς, ὅπως ἂ πόλις ὀρθῶται καὶ ὁ δ[α]-
 μος εὐτυχῆι ὁ Κυραναίων, ἀποδόμεν τοῖς Θηραίοις τ-
 5 ἀμ πολιτήϊαν κατὰ τὰ πάτρια, τὰ οἱ πρόγονοι ἐποιήσαν-
 το, οἳ τε Κυράναγ κα[τῶ]ικιξαν Θήραθε καὶ οἳ ἐν Θήραι [μέ]-
 νοντες, καθὼς Ἀπόλλων ἔδωκε Βάττωι καὶ τοῖς Θηρ[αί]-
 οῖς τοῖς κατοικίξασι Κυράναν εὐτυχὲν ἐμμένοντας το[ῖς]
 ὀρκίοις, τὰ οἱ πρόγονοι ἐποιήσαντο αὐτοὶ ποτ' αὐτός, ὅκα
 10 τὰν ἀποικίαν ἀπέστελλον κατὰ τὰν ἐπίταξιν τῷ Ἀπό[λ]-
 λωνος τῷ Ἀρχαγέτα· ἀγαθαὶ τύχαι, δεδόχθαι τῷ δάμω[ι],
 καταμείγαι Θηραίοις ἴσαμ πολιτήϊαν καὶ ἐγ Κυράναι κ[α]-
 τὰ αὐτά· ποιέισθαι δὲ πάντας Θηραίους τὸς ἐπιδημέ[ον]-
 τας ἐγ Κυράναι τὸν αὐτὸν ὄρκον ὄμπερ τοῖ ἄλλοι ποτ-
 15 ἐ διώρκωσαν· καὶ καταστᾶμεν ἐς φυλὰν καὶ πάτραν ἐς θε
 ἐννηᾶ ἐταιρήας. καταγράφεν δὲ τόδε τὸ ψάφισμα ἐν στάλ[αν]
 λυγδίναν, θέμεν τὰν στάλαν ἐς τὸ ἱερόν πατρῶιον τῷ

- Ἀπόλλωνος τῷ Πυθίῳ, καταγράφεν καὶ τὸ ὄρκιον ἐς τὰν στάλ[αν],
τὸ οἱ οἰκιστῆρες ἐποίησαντο καταπλεύσαντες Λιβύανδε [σὺ]-
20 μ Βάττωι Θήραθεν Κυράνανδε. τό κα ἀνάλωμα τὸ δέμη ἐς τ[ὸν λ]-
αὼν ἢ ἐς τὰγ καταγραφάν, οἱ ἐπιστάντες ἐπὶ τὸς ἀπολόγος [κο]-
μισάσθων ἀπὸ τῶν Ἀπόλλωνος προσόδων. *vacat*
Ὁρκιον τῶν οἰκιστῆρων.
[ἔ]δοξε τῆι ἐκκλησίαι· ἐπεὶ Ἀπόλλων αὐτομάτιξεν Β[άτ]-
25 τωι καὶ Θηραίοις ἀποι[κίξαι] Κυράναν, ὀριστὸν δοκεῖ Θη[ραί]-
[ο]ις ἀποπέμπεν ἐς τὰν [Λιβ]ύαν Βάττομ μὲν ἀρχαγέτα[ν]
[τ]ε καὶ βασιλῆα, εταίρους δὲ τοὺς Θηραίους πλέν· ἐπὶ τῆι ἴσα[ι κ]-
αὶ τῆι ὁμοίαι πλέν κατὰ τὸν οἶκον, υἰὸν δὲ ἓνα καταλ[έ]-
γεσθαί ΤΟΣΔΕΕΛΙΘ c. 10 καὶ τοὺς ἡβῶντας καὶ τῶν [ἄλ]-
30 [λ]ων Θηραίων ἐλευθέρους . . . 6 . . . πλέν. αἱ μὲν δὲ κα κατέχ[ων]-
τι τὰν οἰκισίαν οἱ ἄποικοι, τῶν οἰκείων τὸγ καταπλέον[τα]
ὑστερον εἰς Λιβύαν καὶ πολιτίας καὶ τιμᾶμ πεδέχ[εν]
καὶ γὰς τὰς ἀδεσπότω ἀπολαγχάνεν. αἱ δὲ κα μὴ κατ[έχ]-
ωντι τὰν οἰκισίαν μηδὲ οἱ Θηραιοί μιν δυνῶνται ἐπικου[ρέ]-
35 ν, ἀλλὰ ἀνάγκαι ἀχθῶντι ἔτη ἐπὶ πέντε, ἐκ τὰς γὰς ἀπίμ[εν]
ἀδιέως Θήρανδε ἐπὶ τὰ αὐτῶγ χρήματα καὶ ἡμεμ πολιάτ-
ας. ὁ δὲ κα μὴ λῆμ πλέν ἀποστελλοίσας τὰς πόλιος, θανά[σι]-
μος τένται καὶ τὰ χρήματα ἔστω αὐτοῦ δαμόσια. ὁ δὲ ἀπ-
οδεκόμενος ἢ ἀδήμιζων ἢ πατῆρ υἰὸν ἢ ἀδελφεὸς ἀδελ-
40 φεὸν παισεῖται ἄπερ ὁ μὴ λέων πλέν. ἐπὶ τούτοις ὄρκια ἐπ-
οιήσαντο οἳ τε αὐτεῖ μένοντες καὶ οἱ πλέοντες οἰκίζοντε-
ς καὶ ἀρὰς ἐποίησαντο τὸς ταῦτα παρβεῶντας καὶ μὴ ἐμ-
μένοντας ἢ τῶν ἐλ Λιβύαι οἰκεόντων ἢ τῶν αὐτεῖ μεν-
όντων. κηρίνος πλάσσαντες κολοσσὸς κατέκαιον ἐπα-
45 ρεώμενοι πάντες συνενθόντες καὶ ἄνδρες καὶ γυναῖκ-
ες καὶ παῖδες καὶ παιδίσκαι· τὸμ μὴ ἐμμένοντα τούτοις
τοῖς ὄρκίοις ἀλλὰ παρβεῶντα καταλείβεσθαί νιν καὶ κα-
ταρρὲν ὥσπερ τὸς κολοσσός, καὶ αὐτὸν καὶ γόνον καὶ χρή-
ματα, τοῖς δὲ ἐμμένοισιν τούτοις τοῖς ὄρκίοις καὶ τοῖς
50 πλείοσι ἐλ Λιβύαν κ[αὶ] τ[οῖς μέ]νοισι ἐν Θήραι ἡμεν πολλ-
ὰ καὶ ἀγαθὰ καὶ αὐ[τοῖς καὶ γό]νοισι.

Our text, like other recent texts, depends heavily on Oliverio, *RF* lvi (1928) 224 f., but, since he read letters not seen by others before or since, some caution is necessary. We have had the benefit of notes by P. M. Fraser

and have underlined readings of importance which depend solely on Oliverio; these should probably rank higher than mere restorations (cf. Fraser, *Berytus*, xii (1956-8) 120 ff.). L. 11 [$\tau\omega$ ἐν Δελφοῖς] Ferri; l. 12, *καταγεῖμαι* Wilamowitz; l. 20, *Θήραθεν* is a new reading by Fraser. Various suggestions have been made for ll. 28-30: *καταλ[έ]γεσθαι τ[ε] ἀπὸ τῶν χώρων ἀπάντων* τοὺς ἡβῶντας, καὶ τῶν [ἄλ|λ]ων Θηραίων ἐλευθέρους, [ὄ κα λῆι,] πλὴν Oliverio; *καταλ[έ]γεσθαι τ[ῶ] οἴκῳ ἐκάστῳ, πλὴν δὲ* τοὺς ἡβῶντας Wilhelm; *καταλ[έ]γεσθαι τῶ[ν] δὲ ἀστῶν πλὴν (vel περιοίκων) ἑκατὸν* τοὺς ἡβῶντας καὶ τῶν [ἄλ|λ?]ων Θηραίων ἐλευθέρους [ἑκατὸν] πλὴν Jeffery; see also Oliver's solution, with a new emendation of Herodotus; we print Fraser's readings, inconsistent with them all. L. 33, ἀδ[ά]στῳ Wilamowitz.

The inscription before us was divided by those responsible for its publication into two parts (see ll. 16-18 and the headings); at first sight we may be tempted further to subdivide the second part.

I (ll. 2-22): This is a fourth-century decree of Cyrene, replying to a request made by representatives of Thera (*Κλευδάμας* in l. 3 is apparently their leader), granting equal citizenship to Theraean residents in Cyrene in accordance with the arrangements made by their respective ancestors at the time of the founding of Cyrene, and ordering the publication of this decree and the original agreement (*ὄρκιον* is best translated thus, since the actual words of the oath are not reported). For phratries in Cyrene (l. 15) cf. Arist. *Pol.* 1319^b 22-4; *Hetaireiai* (l. 16) are a less widespread phenomenon in Greek political organization, being largely confined otherwise to Crete and Thera (Chamoux, op. cit. 214).

IIa (ll. 23-40): This is the original agreement, purporting to be a decree of the *ἐκκλησία* of Thera. The formulae in ll. 24-5 are surprising (Wilamowitz thought incredible) for seventh-century Thera, but compare the prescript of No. 2 (see Graham, *JHS* lxxx (1960) 104 f.). The decree, in response to a spontaneous declaration of Apollo (for *αὐτομάτιξεν*, see Parke, *JHS* lxxxii (1962) 145 f.), orders the dispatch to Libya of Battos as 'founder' (for *ἀρχαγέταν* see Jeffery, op. cit. 144) and king, and fixes the method by which the colonists are to be selected. The difficulties of the reading obscure this method, but it is agreed that it presents a strong similarity to the report of Herodotus (iv. 153): *Θηραίοισι δὲ ἕαδε ἀδελφεόν τε ἀπ' ἀδελφεοῦ (ἀδελφεῶν Legrand) πέμπειν πάλῳ λαχόντα καὶ ἀπὸ τῶν χώρων ἀπάντων ἐπὶ ἑόντων ἀνδρας (ἄνδρας <σ') = διακοσίους Cobet), εἶναι δὲ σφῆων καὶ ἡγεμόνα καὶ βασιλέα Βάττον*, at least in the demand for representation by families. For *ἐπὶ τῆι ἴσαι καὶ τῆι ὁμοίαι* (ll. 27-8) cf. Graham, *JHS* lxxx (1960) 108, who shows that this is a standard phrase for colonial foundations at least from the middle of the fifth century. Ll. 30-3, the only clause on which the fourth-century Theraeans were relying, guarantee rights in Libya for later arrivals from Thera.

Ll. 33-7 prescribe the terms on which the colonists may return to Thera (cf. No. 20, 6-10). Ll. 37-40 lay down the penalties against evasion (for *θανάσιμος* cf. *SEG* ix. 1. 53, Cyrene, late fourth century, the only parallel; *τένται* = *τέλεται* = *ἔσεται* (Buck, p. 65) and is also Cyrenaean).

IIb (ll. 40-51); the *ἀραί*: This section, though also apparently part of the *ῥρκιον*, is couched in the form of a prose narrative, not dependent on *ἔδοξε τῶι ἐκκλησίῳι* in l. 24. The only parallel we know for such an abrupt transition (leaving aside such phenomena as lists of ambassadors and oath-takers) is Tod, vol. ii, no. 204, where a similar transition occurs at l. 46, again to describe an *ἀρά*, and again with no indication of a change of type of content within the one general heading. Leaving aside the general problems of authenticity and transmission for the moment, we would suppose that details of a noteworthy *ἀρά* were not infrequently transmitted along with the document it reinforced; cf. perhaps Aeschin. ii. 115, iii. 110 on the Amphictyonic oath, and Arist. *ἄθ. Πολ.* 23. 5 on the covenant of the Delian League. The *ἀρά* is indeed noteworthy: the community here 'reinforces the magical potency of the curse with a magical act, identical with the practice of what we regard as anti-social black magic and directed at a prospective individual or individuals (including naturally their descendants). Such a proceeding is altogether different from the symbolic acts which often accompany an oath' (Nock, *Arch. für Religionsw.* xxiv (1926) 172 f.). (*παρβεώντας*, l. 42, cf. l. 47 = *παραβαίνοντας*.)

Until 1960 the *ῥρκιον* was regarded as more or less apocryphal. There were difficulties in this view. The document, though it has close parallels to what Herodotus gives as the version of Thera, seems clearly independent of Herodotus and shows no signs of being constructed from his account. The alternative, to suppose the existence of a literary invention on which Herodotus and this document both drew, has seemed to run counter to the influential view of Jacoby (e.g. *Atthis*, 189, 199-202) that local history started later than Herodotus. Graham and Miss Jeffery, in simultaneously reopening the question, have argued for the possibility that we have here a genuine document which has had some later re-editing. If this is so, we are faced with a problem of distinguishing between authenticity of form and authenticity of content similar to that which we meet in the Decree of Themistocles (No. 23). That there is nothing which can be seriously objected to in the content has long been recognized. At the most, one might doubt that the original document can have actually named Cyrene as the destination of the colony (l. 25), and many scholars have doubted that Battos was named Battos (l. 26) before arriving at his destination. There are, however, many doubtful points about the form of the decree and the language (see Graham, *JHS* lxxx (1960)

103-9, for a detailed investigation); we incline to doubt whether it can be proved that they are all due to a single preparation for publication in the fourth century, and prefer to assume a long and complex moulding of a genuine original within the tradition of Thera. We would not care to make precise the elements of oral and written transmission in this tradition, but we are sure that we are dealing with a situation to which our standards of literal authenticity are inappropriate, and think it not unsafe to assume that we have before us genuine elements of what was said and done in seventh-century Thera.

For a translation of II see Graham, *Colony and Mother City*, 225 f.

6

The Athenian Archon-List

Four fragments of Pentelic marble found in the Agora at Athens; now in the Agora Museum.

Developed Attic writing, stoichedon. Phot.: (frag. *c* only) *Hesp.* viii (1939) 60; (all) *Hesp.* xxxii (1963) Pl. 58-9.

Meritt, *Hesp.* viii (1939) 59-65 (frag. *c*); Dinsmoor, *Studies in the History of Culture*, 197; Roussel, *RA* xviii (1941) 209-13; Guarducci, *Annuario*, n.s. iii-v (1941-3), 121-2; Cadoux, *JHS* lxviii (1948), 77-9, 109-12; Jacoby, *Atthis*, 171-6; Alexander, *Class. Jour.* liv (1958-9) 307-14; Thompson, *Class. Jour.* lv (1959-60) 217-20; Eliot and McGregor, *Phoenix*, xiv (1960) 27-35; Bradeen, *Hesp.* xxxii (1963) 187-208 (three new fragments).

<i>a</i>	<i>b</i>	
	Col. i	Col. ii
[...] \[--	[-----] <i>v</i>	K[-----]
[Κυ]φσελο[s]	[-----] <i>v v</i>	Φα[-----]
[Τε]λεκλε[--	[-----] <i>v v</i>	Τε[-----]
[Φιλ]όμβ[ροτος?] (595-	[-----] <i>v</i>	Ἐρχ[σικλείδες] (548-
----- 4)	5[.....c.12.....]s	Θεσ[-----] 7)
	-----	Φ[ο]ρ[-----]

<i>c</i>		
[Ὀν]ετο[ρίδες] (527-6)		
[ἡ]ιπία[s] (526-5)		
[Κ]λεισθέν[ες] (525-4)		

	[M]ιλτιάδης	(524-3)		<i>d</i>	
5	[Ka]λλιάδης	(523-2)	[Φαίν]ιπ[πος]?		(490-89)
	[. . 5 . . .]στρατ[ος]	(522-1)	[Ἄρ]ιστ[εῖδης]?		(489-8)
	-----			<i>vacat</i>	

a 1 the letter was alpha, gamma, or nu.

Meritt in publishing fragment *c* had little doubt that the appearance of names prominent in the sixth century on a stone carved *c.* 425 suggested that he was dealing with an inscribed archon-list. The doubts raised by Alexander were adequately dealt with by Thompson and Eliot and McGregor, and should now be laid to rest by the new fragments.

Since no traces of the back or sides are preserved, we can hardly do more than guess about the nature of the monument. Bradeen has argued that it was a stele, with the names arranged in four columns, sixty-five names to a column, beginning with Kreon in 683-2 and ending with Isarchos in 424-3. (Miller, *Klio* xxxvii (1959) 49-52, before the discovery of the new fragments, had argued for 426-5 as the date of the inscription, on rather shaky grounds.) This arrangement has the attraction of allowing the five letters at the bottom of a column on fragment *d* to fit into the names of known archons. Whatever the uncertainties of Bradeen's arrangement, the appearance on fragment *b* of a column to the left of names belonging to the 540s makes it impossible to arrive at a satisfactory arrangement if the list began with Solon, as might be assumed, e.g. from Plato, *Hipp. Maj.* 285 e, and leaves Kreon (683-2) as the only possible start.

Fragment *a* is placed by argument from the name of Kypselos (see below). The latest dates available for its four names before the likely date of his death happen to fit the restoration of]ομβ[as Φιλ]όμβ[ροτος, archon 595-4 (Cadoux, *op. cit.* 92). Earlier placings for the fragment would be possible. Fragment *b* is placed by the near-certainty that 'Ερχ[is Erxikleides, 548-7 (Paus. x. 5. 13), fragment *c* by the known archonship of Miltiades in 524-3 (Dion. Hal., *AR* vii. 3. 1). Fragment *d* is more uncertain, but the coincidence with the known archons of 490-89 and 489-8 is attractive.

We have no means of telling what material lay behind this late fifth-century publication of the archon-list, and how far it reflects an older document. Jacoby, laying stress on the apparent absence of patronymics, felt that the text on stone was in some sense an excerpt. The absence of any historical notes is also remarkable. We find it hard, however, to believe that the list contained nothing but names. There must have been some additional information about the archonship itself, at any rate, and we do not doubt that the two ἀναρχίαι and

other difficulties of the 580s (Arist. *Ἀθ. Πολ.* 13. 1-2) were in some way recorded, a probability which weakens the tidiness of Bradeen's reconstruction.

Nor can we be confident about the occasion for the setting up of this list. It is possible, as Bradeen suggests, that it indicates an awakening of antiquarian interest. We are close in time to the activity of Hippias of Elis and of Hellanikos, but in default of all indication as to who was responsible we can only speculate.

For us these fragments give valuable new information about the names of archons in the sixth century, and some comment on individuals is necessary. The appearance of *Κύ]φσελο[ς* (a 2) necessitates a reconsideration of the stemma of the Philaidai. (For earlier reconstructions see Hignett, *History of the Athenian Constitution*, 328-9, and the works cited there, Hammond, *CQ* vi (1956) 113-29. See now Bradeen, *op. cit.* 193-7, 206-8.) This Kypselos will be the father of the Miltiades who first went out to the Chersonese (*Hdt.* vi. 34 ff.). It no longer seems attractive to identify him with the Hippokleides who appears in Marcellinus, *Vit. Thuc.* 3, as Miltiades' father, for that Hippokleides must have appeared in the archon-list under 566-5 (Cadoux, *op. cit.* 104), and we doubt whether Marcellinus' confused and corrupt text can be used as evidence for anything. There has never been any doubt that this Kypselos was grandson of the Corinthian tyrant of that name, and we should think that his appearance as archon in 597 at the latest is decisive against attempts (most recently Will, *Korinthiaka*, 363-440) to lower the traditional dating of the tyranny at Corinth.

Fragment *c* has, since its discovery, been most fruitful for the study of the policy of the sons and successors of Pisistratus (see, e.g., Andrewes, *The Greek Tyrants*, 109-11). τὰ δὲ ἄλλα αὐτῇ ἢ πόλις τοῖς πρὶν κειμένοις νόμοις ἐχρῆτο, πλὴν καθ' ὅσον αἰεὶ τινα ἐπεμέλοντο σφῶν αὐτῶν ἐν ταῖς ἀρχαῖς εἶναι (*Thuc.* vi. 54. 6). We can now see how the archonship was used for control and conciliation. Pisistratus died in the archonship of Philoneos, 528-7 (*Arist. Ἀθ. Πολ.* 17. 1). He may already have nominated Onetorides as archon for 527-6. (The alternative restoration Ὀν]έτο[ρ is ruled out by a study of the *καλός*-names on Athenian vases; Onetorides is associated with Exekias and other painters of the 540s, Onetor with the Edinburgh Painter and other painters of the last decade of the century. See Beazley, *ABV* 671 f.) Onetorides presumably comes from the rich but rarely conspicuous of Melite, a city-deme (*PA* 11459-73). In 526-5 comes *s* himself; in 525-4 Cleisthenes (Guarducci's *Π]λεισθέν[ες* is obable), the head of the Alkmeonids and later lawgiver, the spectacular gain from this inscription, since the literary evidence suggested that the Alkmeonids were in continuous exile from

the Battle of Pallene to the fall of the tyranny. In 524-3 comes Miltiades, heir to the position of the Philaids, and his archonship gives body to Herodotus' assertion that the tyrants treated him well (vi. 39. 1; see Wade-Gery, *Essays in Greek History*, 155-70). In 523-2 comes Kalliades, whose name is too common for his family to be identified. The tempting restoration for 522-1 is Πεισί]στρατ[ος, the son of Hippias. We do know he was archon under the tyranny (Thuc. vi. 54. 6-7), and all the evidence for the Altar of the Twelve Gods, built by him as archon, suggests 522-1 as a likely date (Crosby, *Hesp.*, Suppl. viii. 99-100). Were it not for the difficulties raised by the lettering of No. 11, no one would doubt that the restoration was correct.

7 (4)

Greek Mercenaries in Egyptian Service:

591 B.C.

Scratched on the left leg of a colossal statue of Rameses II before the great temple of Abu Simbel in Nubia; *g* is below the knee of a second colossus.

Bernard and Masson, *REG* lxx (1957) 1-20, with facs.+ replaces all earlier texts; *LSAG* 38, 48 (but the letters are not 'over a foot high', they are never more than 9 cm.), 314, 340, 348, 355.

- (a) Bernard-Masson 1. Doric dialect, but mainly Ionic script, though $\sigma = \sigma$, $\sigma\upsilon$, ω ; koppa is present, the aspirate absent, $\Xi = \eta$, three-bar sigma.

βασιλέος ἐλθόντος ἐς Ἐλεφαντίναν Ψαματίχο,
 ταῦτα ἔγραψαν τοὶ σὺν Ψαμματίχοι τῷ Θεοκλῶς
 ἔπλεον, ἦλθον δὲ Κέρκιος κατύπερθε, υἱς ὁ πόταμος
 ἀνίη· ἀλογλῶσος δ' ἦχε Ποτασιμτο, Αἰγυπτίος δὲ Ἀμασις·

5 ἔγραφε δ' ἀμὲ Ἄρχον Ἀμοιβίχου καὶ Πέλερος Οὐδάμο.

- (b) Bernard-Masson 2. Ionic: $\text{H} = \eta$, three-bar sigma.

Ἐλεσίβιος ὁ Τήϊος.

- (c) Bernard-Masson 4. Presumably Rhodian script: $\Xi = \eta$ and the aspirate.

Τήλεφός μ' ἔγραφε ἡο Ἰαλύσιο[s].

- (d) Bernard-Masson 5.

Πύθον Ἀμοιβίχου.

(e) Bernard–Masson 6; four-bar sigma.

[- - - -] καὶ
Κρίθις ἔγρα(ψ)αν ἐμ[έ].

The psi was omitted.

(f) Bernard–Masson 6 *bis* (not seen by them). Ionic script, but $\omicron = \omega$; three-bar sigma: koppa.

Πάβις ὁ Φολοφόνιος
σὺν Ψαμματᾶ.

(g) Bernard–Masson 2. Boustrophedon. $\omicron = \omega$; $\Theta =$ the aspirate, $\Theta\epsilon$ apparently = η ; three-bar sigma; $\chi\sigma = \xi$; the shapes of psi and chi in the last word are strange for Rhodian.

Ἀναχσάνορ ε[. . . .] ἡο Ἰαλύσιος ἡόκα βασιλ- →
εὺς ἦλασε τὸν στράτον τὸ πρᾶτον [- - -] Ψαμάτιχος. ←

1. 1. ἐ[βάδις], doubtfully, B–M. In 1. 2 they read, but do not draw, Ἄμασις ἡάμα after τὸ πρᾶτον. Fraser (*JEA* xlv (1958) 108 f.) suggests that Ποτασιμτο ἡάμα might be preferable.

(a) ‘When King Psammetichos came to Elephantine, those who sailed with Psammetichos son of Theokles wrote this; and they came above Kerkis as far as the river allowed; and Potasimto had command of those of foreign speech and Amasis of the Egyptians; and Archon the son of Amoibichos wrote us and Peleqos the son of Eudamos.’

The king mentioned here is Psamtik II (the *Ψάμμυς* of Herodotus). His expedition to Ethiopia (Hdt. ii. 161) has fairly full documentation from Egyptian sources, and is fully discussed by Sauneron and Yoyotte, *BIFAO* 1 (1952) 157–207 (some further evidence on Potasimto in Yoyotte, *Chr. d’Ég.* xxviii (1953) 101–6). In their view the expedition reached the Fourth and perhaps the Fifth Cataract, though Préaux (*Chr. d’Ég.* xxxii (1957) 291) is inclined to maintain the traditional view that it went no further than the Second Cataract. Note that the king came only as far as Elephantine (*a* 1).

Jeffery suggests that the Greeks with no ethnics may be second- or third-generation descendants of earlier settlers, and that this may account for the mixed nature of their script; this must in any case be true of Psammetichós, son of Theokles (*a* 2), presumably named after Psamtik I. With ἀλογλόσος (*a* 4) cf. Hdt. ii. 154 πρῶτοι οὔτοι ἐν Αἰγύπτῳ ἀλλόγλωσσοι κατοικίσθησαν and *IG* xii. 3. 328. 20. For the singular form ἔγραφε cf., for example, Thuc. i. 51. 4 ἦρχε Γλαύκων τε ὁ Λεάγρου καὶ Ἄνδοκίδης ὁ Λεωγόρου. Archon (*a* 5) and Python (*d*) are presumably brothers. In (*f*) Πάβις may be shortened for Πάμβις or Πάμβιος, and Ψαμματᾶ for Ψαμματίχῳ.

8 (1)

Law from Chios: 575-550 B.C.

Upper part of a stele of reddish trachyte, with a cutting for a crowning member, found near Tholopotami in southern Chios; now in the Archaeological Museum at Istanbul.

Ionic alphabet (open eta, crossed theta, koppa), boustrophedon on all four sides, inscribed vertically on the front, right side and left side, horizontally on the back. Punctuation on front and right side only. Phot. and facs.: *Nordionische Steine* (*Abh. Berl.* 1909), 69 f., Pl. 2; *BSA* li (1956) 158 and Pl. 43 (whence *LSAG*, Pl. 65. 41). See *LSAG* 336 f.

Jeffery, *BSA* li 157-67+; Larsen, *CP* xliiv (1949) 170-2; Wade-Gery, *Essays in Greek History*, 198 f.; Oliver, *AJP* lxxx (1959) 296-301.

Front (A)

- [- - -]κατης: 'Ιστίης δῆμο →
 ῥήτρας: φυλάσσω[ν - - -] ←
 [- - -]ον: ηρει: ἤμ μὲν δημαρ-
 χῶν: ἢ βασιλεύων: δεκασ[θῆι(?) - - -]
 5 [- - -]ς 'Ιστίης ἀποδότω δημα-
 ρχέων: ἐξπρήξαι: τὸν ἐ[ξεταστήν(?) - - -]
 [- - -]εν δῆμο κεκλημένο
 αλοιαι τιμῆ διπλησ[ίη - - -]
 [- - -]ν ὄσσην παραλοιω[.]

Right side (B)

- [. c. 3. .]ην δ' ἠκκλητος δι[κη - -] →
 [- - -] ἦν δὲ ἀδικῆται: παρὰ ←
 δημάρχωι: στατήρ[as - - -]

Back (C)

- ἐκκαλέσθω ἐς →
 βολὴν τὴν δημ- ←
 οσίην· τῆι τρίτηι
 ἐξ 'Εβδομαίων
 5 βολὴ ἀγερέσθ-
 ω ἢ δημοσίη ἐ-
 πιθώϊος λεκτ-

ἡ πεντήρουτ' ἀπ-
 ὀ φυλῆς· τὰ τ' ἄλ[λ]-
 10 α πρησέτω τὰ δή-
 μο καὶ δικά[ς δ]-
 [ρό]σαι ἄν ἔκκλ-
 ητοι γένων[τ]-
 [αί] τὸ μῆνός π-
 15 άσας ἐπι[...]
 [. . . 4. . .]σεεβ[. . . 3. . .]
 [- - - -]

Left side (D)

[- - - - Ἄ]ρτεμισιῶνος →
 [- - -]ων ὄρκια ἐπι- →
 ταμνέτω ῥῶ[μνύτω (?) - -] ←
 [- - - β]ασιλευσίν· *vacat*

Jeffery's re-examination of the text is now fundamental, and there can be little doubt that her arrangement of the order of the sides is the right one. It also seems reasonably certain that we have only one text, since any distinction based on the character of the script and the abandonment of punctuation would mean that a new text began with the beginning of C, which seems textually improbable. The main uncertainty that remains is the order of the lines in B, Jeffery and Oliver preferring to read them from left to right, whereas Wade-Gery slightly prefers the older arrangement from right to left. On any view, the principal difficulty is caused by the breaking of the stone, which entails that, after every second line on the three faces with vertical inscriptions, there is a lacuna of uncertain length. Oliver takes the view that relatively little is missing and suggests continuous restorations, but some of these are very compressed in language, and it is in our judgement unsafe to assume that much less than half the stele is missing.

- A 1-3. [τῶν ἱερῶν ἐνε]κα: τῆς Ἰστίης δήμο | ῥήτρας: φυλάσσω[ν: - - - -]ον: ἡ (ἐ)ρεῖ, 'As for property sacred to Hestia, (the official) shall constantly observe rhetras of the demos and shall give an order that such and such be sacred by separately citing the rhetra which will so declare', Oliver, comparing ἡ (ἐ)κκλητος or ἡ (ἐ)κκλήτος in B 1. But Jeffery tells us that her facsimile is correct and not her transcript.
4. δεκασ[θῆμι, 'accepts bribes', Jeffery; δεκάσ[ημι, 'levies a tithe' (an unattested sense), Oliver.
- 4-5. τῶι ἱερεῖ τῆς Ἰστίης Nachmannson; [x στατήρας ἱερός τῆς Ἰστίης Forrest; [τάπιδέ]κατα τῆς Ἰστίης Oliver.
- 6-8. τὸν ἐ[ξ]εταστήν, or ἐ[πι]στατήν Jeffery; τὸν ἐ[ξ]εταστή|ν ἔμπροσθ]εν δήμο κεκλημένο Oliver. Jeffery, followed by Oliver, ends a sentence after κεκλημένο, though there is no space or preserved punctuation, and takes

ἀλοῖαι as a new heading, suggesting the meaning 'assaults' (Oliver prefers 'convictions'). Wade-Gery believes he can see traces of alpha under the eta of τιμή, and thinks that αἱ τιμαί was originally intended, that τιμαί was corrected to τιμή, but αἱ was left uncorrected; he would read [ὁ ἐκκαλεόμενος ἤμ μὲν δῆμο κεκλημένο ἀλοῖ, (ῆ) τιμή διπλησ[ίη, 'if he appeal and lose his appeal before the assembled people, the fine is doubled'.

- 8-9. ἀλοῖαι, τιμή διπλησ[ίη· ἐξ ἐρήμο | δ' ἐξπρήσσε]ν ὄσσην παρ' ἀλοῖω[ν, 'Convictions: *proena dupli*. After a case lost by default, always exact a penalty as large as that which arises from convictions', Oliver. The choice in this complex situation is between an unattested word and the assumption of a partially corrected error.
- B 1-2. [βολ]ῆν δ' ἧ (ἐ)κκλητός δε[κάσει δημο]σίην εἶναι, 'The council which judges appeals shall be a people's council', Oliver; ἧν δ' ῆ (ἐ)κκλητός δε[κ]κη Jeffery. Wade-Gery, reversing the order of B 1-3, suggests ἧν δὲ ἀδικῆται: παρα[χωρ]ῆι δ' ῆ (ἐ)κκλητός δε[κ]κη, 'if he be suffering wrong, and the judgement appealed against be (consequently) put aside'.
- D. The *vacat* in l. 1 and the failure to continue the boustrophedon indicate that a new clause begins with l. 2. Ll. 3-4 ρώ[μνυέτω ἐν τοῖς β]ασιλευσιν Oliver.

The stele has a small, normal taper, and Wilamowitz was mistaken in referring to it as a pyramid or κύρβις. Miss Jeffery has also, by bringing down the date from *c.* 600, reduced the part which this stone played for fifty years in discussions of Ionia's political advancement (cf. Mazzarino, *Fra Oriente e Occidente* 233-41). What we have is sufficiently remarkable, a view into a political organization where we have side by side βασιλεῖς (perhaps, as at Athens, the βασιλεύς plus the φυλοβασιλεῖς) and δήμαρχοι, whether they be high officials, like the archon at Athens, or officials specifically created to represent the δῆμος; and where we have a βουλή δημοσίη, which from the very formulation of its name must be a second council to supplement the aristocratic council, and which hears appeals, is elective, and meets regularly on the ninth day of each month to carry on the business of the δῆμος and to hear all cases which have come up on appeal in the last month. The power of the δῆμος, however widely or narrowly the term is to be interpreted, has become considerable by the time of this document, and there seems little reason to follow Oliver in believing that the popular council is now being appointed for the first time. The existence of this popular council has generally been thought to lend some support to the existence of Solon's Council of the Four Hundred at Athens (Arist. *Ἀθ. Πολ.* 8. 4; Plut. *Sol.* 19. 1), but its relevance has been denied by Hignett (*History of the Athenian Constitution*, 95). How great the power of the δῆμος in regard to appeals in fact is, we cannot determine because of the break in C 15. It has been generally thought that it is the council which determines the appeals, but Wade-Gery believes, somewhat improbably it seems to us, that the

council only acts probouleutically in preparing the appeals for the δῆμος.

Faces A and B are likely to remain difficult to interpret. On Miss Jeffery's view of the text, the only point which would be at all clear would be the provision for the fining of officials who are bribed (A 3-6); a provision about assaults (?) would follow (A 8-9); Wade-Gery takes these clauses together. Oliver, on the other hand, taking A 1-7 together, regards them as a single edict about the administration of the property of Hestia. Miss Jeffery and Oliver, agreeing about the order of lines in B, differ as to whether *παρὰ δημάρχῳ* should be taken with *ἀδικῆται* 'if he has been wronged in the demarch's court' (Jeffery) or with *στατήρ[ας]* '[he shall deposit so many] staters with the demarch' (Oliver). Wade-Gery, with his different arrangement of B, takes B 3 as the continuation of Face A, and lets B 1-2 lead into C. Face C is relatively straightforward, dealing with the procedure of appeal and the organization of the *βουλή δημοσίη*. A new section on oath-taking begins with D 2.

Some minor points call for notice. *Ἰστῆ* (A 1, 5) seems rather more likely to be the goddess than the public hearth. Although the oldest occurrence of *ρήτρῃ* (A 2) has the meaning 'covenant' (*Od.* xiv. 393, cf. No. 17), the prevalent later meaning is, as here, 'enactment' (Wade-Gery, *Essays in Greek History*, 62-4): the fact that nearly all uses of the word are in the Peloponnese or Peloponnesian colonies makes its appearance here more noteworthy (but see No. 83. 13). The *Ἑβδομαῖα* (C 4) was a festival held in honour of Apollo on the seventh day of each month (cf. *SIG* 57. 6, 21). *ἐπιθώϊος* (C 6-7) should probably be taken actively, 'with power to inflict penalties', rather than passively, 'subject to a fine (for non-attendance)'. We do not know the number of tribes in archaic Chios (C 8-9).

One last doubt should be mentioned. Forrest tells us that he knows no other use of red trachyte for an inscription on Chios and suggests the possibility that the inscription originated in neighbouring Erythrae on the mainland.

9

Aristis, Son of Pheidon at Nemea: c. 560 B.C.

Shallow poros block with cuttings for a dedication, from the *gymnasion* by the Temple of Zeus at Nemea; now in the *apotheke* there.

Kleonaean script (see *LSAG* 144 f., 147 f.), boustrophedon. Phot.: *AJA* xxxi (1927) 432, Fig. 10; *Hesp.* xxxv (1966) Pl. 77; phot. and facs.: *LSAG*, Pl. 24.

Blegen, *AJA* xxxi. 432 f.; Peek, *Arch. 'Eph.* 1931 103 f.; McGregor, *TAPA* lxxii (1941) 275; Friedländer 103; Buck 97; Moretti, 3; Bradeen, *Hesp.* xxxv (1966) 320.

Ἀρίστις με ἀνέθ- →
 ηκε Δι Φρονίου Φά- ←
 νακτι πανκράτιο-
 ν νιρόν τετράκις
 5 ἐν Νεμέαι Φείδο-
 νος Φιῶς τῷ Κλεο-
 ναίῳ.

This is one of the earliest surviving agonistic dedications. Jerome's version of Eusebius places the founding or refounding of the Nemean games in 573. If we allow Aristis the minimum time, he cannot have won his fourth victory in this trieteric festival earlier than 567, and the lettering does not suggest a much later date.

Kleonai was for long periods the patron of the Nemean games (cf. Pind. *Nem.* x. 42, iv. 17, *Hyp. Schol.* Pind. *Nem.*). Some interest attaches to the name Pheidon, appearing at a date where Herodotus (vi. 127), certainly wrongly, puts the great Pheidon. McGregor suggests that Leokedes, son of Pheidon in Herodotus, was son of Pheidon of Kleonai (cf. Huxley, *BCH* lxxxii (1958) 600 f.). Other combinations are perhaps possible, but there are clearly some attractions in seeing here a descendant of the Argive royal house in exile in Kleonai.

Down to *Νεμέαι*, the text is intended for an elegiac couplet; we do not share the view of Guarducci (*Epigrafia Greca*, i. 238-48) that the rest is an 'iambic pentapody'.

10

Treaty between Sybaris and the Serdaioi:

(?) 550-525 B.C.

Bronze plate with nail-holes top and bottom, found at Olympia, probably from the Sybarite Treasury. Now in the Olympia Museum.

Achaean colonial script (for which see *LSAG* 248-51). Phot.: *VII Olympia-Bericht*, Pl. 86. 2; *Rend. Linc.* (see below) Pl. i.

Kunze, *VII Olympia-Bericht*, 207-10; *Staatsverträge* 120; Zancani Montuoro, *Rend. Linc. Ser.* viii, xvii (1962) 11-18; Guarducci, *ibid.* 199-210; Calderone, *Helikon*, iii (1963) 219-58 (see *REG* lxxix (1966) 380 f.).

ἀρμόχθεν οἱ Συβαρί-
 ται κ' οἱ σύνμαχοι κ' οἱ

Σερδαῖοι ἐπὶ φιλότατ-
 ι πιστᾶι κ' ἀδόλοι ἀε-
 5 ἴδιον· πρόξενοι ὁ Ζε-
 ὑς κ' Ὀπόλον κ' ἄλλοι θ-
 εοὶ καὶ πόλις Ποσειδα-
 νία.

'The Sybarites and their allies and the Serdaioi made an agreement for friendship faithful and without guile for ever. Guarantors, Zeus, Apollo, and the other gods and the city Poseidonia.'

This is among the earliest, if it is not the earliest, of all preserved Greek treaties, and the only known epigraphical document of Sybaris, destroyed in 510. It shows Sybaris at the head of an alliance (cf. Strabo vi. 1. 13, p. 263). The other parties to the treaty, the Serdaioi, are unknown to literary sources. Kunze rightly associates them with a series of coins with the legend ΜΕΡ sometimes wrongly attributed to Sergention in Sicily (*BM Italy*, 395; *HN*² 169; Panvini Rosati, *Rend. Linc. Ser.* viii, xvii (1962) 278-85). The indications of the coins and this treaty are that they are an Achaean colony of south Italy. The hypothesis of Zancani Montuoro that the Sardinians are here referred to has been rebutted by Guarducci.

This treaty is by far the oldest surviving made 'for ever' (cf. Nos. 63, 64, and contrast No. 17). For this sense of *πρόξενοι* cf. Hesych. *πρόξενος*· *προστάτης* and *IG* xiv. 636. The guarantee offered by the gods was strengthened by the setting up of the treaty at Olympia. The function of Poseidonia is hard to determine; it is interesting that, though a colony of Sybaris, it appears to be outside her alliance.

11 (8)

Dedication of Pisistratus, Son of Hippias:

c. 521 B.C.

Two fragments of a sculptured marble cornice (Boardman, *Antiq. Journ.* xxxix. 206 f.), found in 1877 near the Ilissos; now in EM.

Late archaic Attic letters, *LSAG* 75, 78 (37). Phot.: *IIA* 12; Kern 12; facs.: *LSAG*, Pl. 4. 37.

IG i². 761; Meritt, *Hesp.* viii (1939) 62-5; Dinsmoor, *Studies in the History of Culture* (1942), 195-8; *DAA* pp. 449 f.; *SEG* x. 318; *LSAG* 75.

Μνῆμα τόδε ἡὲς ἀρχῆς Πεισίστ[ρατος ἠιππίο ἠ]υῖος
 θέκεν Ἀπόλλωνος Πυθ[ί]ο ἐν τεμένει.

Thucydides (vi. 54. 6) records that the grandson of the tyrant Pisistratus, to commemorate his archonship, dedicated the Altar of the Twelve Gods in the Agora and of Apollo in the Pythion. He quotes the inscription on the latter and adds: *ἔτι καὶ νῦν δῆλόν ἐστιν ἀμυδροῖς γράμμασι λέγον τάδε*. The epithet *ἀμυδροῖς* is surprising, since the letters are still clear; it almost certainly refers to the disappearance of the paint with which the letters had been filled. The elegance and comparative maturity of the letters have led some scholars to date the inscription to the early fifth century (Raubitschek, *DAA* p. 450; Meritt, *Hesp.* viii. 62). But Pisistratus cannot have been allowed to stay in Athens after the expulsion of his father Hippias in 510. He was archon before 510 and almost certainly in 522-1 (see No. 6); the altar must have been dedicated in or soon after his archonship. Dinsmoor's compromise (*op. cit.*), dating the inscription considerably later than the altar, is not needed. It is true that many later inscriptions (e.g. No. 18) have more archaic letters, and the straight bar of the alpha is surprising, but the early forms of theta and chi are used (⊕, +). We need only believe that Pisistratus chose a craftsman who was ahead of most of his contemporaries. The same hand can be seen in a dedication at the Ptoion sanctuary in Boeotia, by a Hipparchus, almost certainly the brother of Hippias (*BCH* xlv (1920) 237 ff., *Hesp.* viii. 65 n. 1).

12 (10)

Letter of Darius: 522-486 B.C.

On a marble corner-block from a wall found at Deirmendjik, on the road from Magnesia on the Maeander to Tralles; now in the Louvre. The side of the stone has traces of two other inscriptions.

'Letter-forms of the first half of the second century A.D.' (Kern).

Cousin and Deschamps, *BCH* xiii (1889) 529-42; *SIG* 22; Wilamowitz, *Griech. Lesebuch, Erläuterungen*, 252 f.; Olmstead, *Am. J. Sem. Lang.* xlix (1933) 156-9; van den Hout, *Mnemosyne*, ii (1949) 144-52; Schehl, *AJA* liv (1950) 265 (summary of an unpublished article).

βασιλεὺς [βα]σιλέ-
ων Δαρείος ὁ Ὑσ-
τάσπεω Γαδάται
δούλωι τάδε λέγει[ι].

5 πυνθάνομαί σε τῶν
ἐμῶν ἐπιταγμάτων

οὐ κατὰ πάντα πει-
 θαρχεῖν· ὅτι μὲν γὰρ [ρ]
 [τ]ῆν ἐμὴν ἐκπονεῖς
 10 [γ]ῆν, τοὺς πέραν Εὐ-
 [φ]ράτου καρποὺς ἐπ[ι]
 τὰ κάτω τῆς Ἀσίας μέ-
 [ρ]η καταφυτεύων, ἐπαι-
 [ν]ῶ σὴν πρόθεσιν καὶ
 15 [δ]ιὰ ταῦτά σοι κείσεται
 μεγάλη χάρις ἐμ βασι-
 λέως οἴκω· ὅτι δὲ τὴν
 ὑπὲρ θεῶν μου διάθε-
 σιν ἀφανίζεις, δώσω
 20 σοι μὴ μεταβαλομένωι
 πείραν ἡδικη[μέ]νου θυ-
 μοῦ· φυτουργοὺς γὰρ
 [ι]εροὺς Ἀπόλλ[ω]νος φό-
 ρον ἔπρασσες καὶ χώραν
 25 [σ]καπανεύειν βέβηλον ἐπ[έ]-
 τασσες, ἀγνοῶν ἐμῶν
 προγόνων εἰς τὸν θεὸν
 [ν]οῦν, ὃς Πέρσαις εἶπε
 [πᾶ]σαν ἀτρέκε[ι]αν καὶ τη.

- - -

The authenticity of this document has been denied by Beloch (*GG* ii². 2. 154 f.) for bad reasons, and is seriously doubted by van den Hout, but has generally been accepted. Though some of the points alleged in its support are invalid (*πειθαρχεῖν* with the genitive, l. 6, is not necessarily a trace of an original Ionic text, for it is a normal *κοινή* construction), it seems clear that the original was not in Greek and there is nothing incredible about the content.

Gadatas (the name recurs in Xen. *Cyrop.* v. 3. 10 ff.) seems to have been satrap of the Ionian province (*Hdt.* iii. 90; Meyer, *Entstehung des Judentums*, 19, prefers to see in him a more junior official, like Asaph in Nehemiah ii. 8) and may well have resided at Magnesia, as did Oroites (*Hdt.* iii. 122). Darius praises him for cultivating in western Asia Minor the fruit trees of Syria ('Beyond the River' is the normal Achaemenid phrase for this satrapy), but threatens him with punishment for levying a tax from the sacred gardeners of Apollo (for whom

perhaps see Paus. x. 32. 6 and the numismatic evidence collected by Schehl) and ordering them to till profane soil, regardless of the attitude shown to the god by the Achaemenid kings (for Persian religious toleration see *CAH* iv. 187 f.). The attention paid by the Persian kings to the cultivation of trees and crops in their empire is emphasized in Xen. *Oec.* iv. 8; see also Poseidonios (*FGH* 87 F 68) in Ath. i. 28d. The phrases βασιλεύς βασιλέων (l. 1) and τάδε λέγει (l. 4; cf. Rudberg, *Eranos*, xi (1913) 175 f. and van den Hout), as well as the term δοῦλος applied to a satrap (l. 4), agree with the usage of Darius as shown in the Behistun inscription: with the phrase used in ll. 15-17 compare Thuc. i. 129. 3 κείσεται σοι εὐεργεσία ἐν τῷ ἡμετέρῳ οἴκῳ ἐς αἰεὶ ἀνάγραπτος, Hdt. viii. 85. 3, and Esther vi. 1, 2.

13

A Lokrian Community settles New Territory:

(?) 525-500 B.C.

A bronze plaque with nail-holes at the corners, said by different informants to have come from Psoriani in Aetolia or the neighbourhood of Naupaktos; now in the National Museum at Athens.

Script of the Ozolian Lokrians (see *LSAG* 104 f.), boustrophedon. Phot.: *Ἀρχ.* 'Εφ 1924, Pl. 3; *LSAG*, Pl. 14.

Papadakis, *Ἀρχ.* 'Εφ. 1924, 119-41; Wilamowitz, *Sitzb. Berl.* (1927) 7-17; Luria, *Dokl. Ak. Nauk.*, Ser. B (1927) 216-18; Meillet, *Rev. Phil.* liv (1928) 185-90; Pezopoulos, *Πολέμων*, i (1929) 97-105; Chatzes, *Ἀρχ.* 'Εφ. 1927-8, 181-5; Solmsen, 46; Lerat, *Les Locriens de l'Ouest*, i. 53 f.; ii. 9 f.; Nilsson, *Hist.* iii (1954) 270-3; Buck 59; Georgacas, *CP* li (1956) 249-51; *LSAG* 105 f. (Lokris 2); Graham, *Colony and Mother City in Ancient Greece*, 56 f., 65; Vatin, *BCH* lxxxvii (1963) 1-19; Asheri, *J. Jur. Pap.* xv (1965) 313-28; Larsen, *Greek Federal States*, 54.

(Obverse)

- (A) τεθμὸς ὄδε περὶ τᾶς γᾶς βέβαιος ἔστο κατ τὸν →
 ἀνδαιθμὸν πλακὸς Ὑλίας καὶ Λισκαρίας καὶ τὸν ἀ- ←
 ποτόμον καὶ τὸν δαμοσίον. ἐπινομία δ' ἔστο γο-
 νεύσιν καὶ παιδί· αἱ δὲ μὲ παῖς εἶε, κόρα· αἱ δὲ μὲ κόρα εἶε,
 5 ἀδελφεδι· αἱ δὲ μὲ ἀδελφεὸ(ς) εἶε, ἀνχιστέδαν ἐπινεμέσθο κατ τὸ
 δίκαιον· αἱ δὲ μὲ, τοῖ ἐπινόμοι ΟΙΙΟΝ, ἡό τι δὲ κα φυτεύσεται,
 ἄσυλος εἶστο. αἱ μὲ πολέμοι ἀνανκαζομένοις δόξξαι ἀ-
 νδράσιν ηενὶ κέκατὸν ἀριστίνδαν τοῖ πλέθει ἀνδρας δια-
 κατίος μείστον ἀξξιομάχος ἐπιφοίκος ἐφάγεσθαι, ἡόστ-

- 10 ις δὲ δαιθμὸν ἐνφέροι ἔψᾶφον διαφέροι ἐν πρείγαι ἔ'ν πόλι ἔ
 'ν ἀποκλεσίαι ἔστάσιw ποιέοι περὶ γαδαισίας, αὐτὸς μὲ-
 ν φερρέτο καὶ γενεὰ ἅματα πάντα, χρέματα δὲ δαμευόσθον
 καὶ Φοικία κατασκαπτέσθo κατ τὸν ἀνδρεφονικὸν τετθμ-
 ὄν. ὁ δὲ τετθμὸς ἰαρός ἔστο τῷ Ἀπόλλωνος τῷ Πυθίῳ καὶ τῶν σιγγ-
 15 [άον· ἔμεν δὲ τῷ τα]ῦτα παρβαίνοντι ἐξξόλειαν αὐτῶι καὶ γενεᾷ
 καὶ πα-
 μάτῃσιw, τῶι δ' εὐσεβέοντι ἡίλαος ἔσσο. ἁ δὲ γ[ὰ τὸ μὲν ἔμισον]

(Reverse)

- (C) κομίζοιεν, ἀξιοδότας ἔστο τὰν αὐτῶ οἰτιwι χρέιζοι. →
 vacat

(A continued)

τὸν ὑπαπροσθιδίον ἔστο, τὸ δ' ἔμισον τῶν ἐπιΦοίκον ἔσ- →
 το. vacat

vacat ←

(A continued? Larger letters)

τὸς δὲ κοίλος μὸρος διαδόντο: ἀλλαγὰ δὲ βέβαιω- →
 s ἔστο, ἀλαζέσθo δὲ ἀντὶ τῶ ἀρχῶ. ←

vacat

B (upside-down)

[αὶ δὲ τοὶ] δαμιοργοὶ κερδαίνοιεν ἄλλο →

τὸν γεγραμένον, ἠιαρόντο Ἀπόλλο- ←

νος: Ἐχέτο ἄγαλμα δι' ἐννέα φετ-

έον καὶ μὲ ποτιγράψαι κέρδος.

Papadakis, followed by Jeffery, abandoned the enigmatic letters in l. 6 as an erasure, and regarded text C as an omitted line to be added at this point. The text would then run αὶ δὲ μὲ τοὶ ἐπινόμοι κομίζοιεν, ἀξιοδότας ἔστο τὰν αὐτῶ οἰτιwι χρέιζοι, 'If the heirs do not take the property, (the owner) shall have the right to bestow his property on whomsoever he wishes.' This view is not inherently probable, and Wilamowitz showed that there were some orthographic reasons to detach text C from text A. Yet the alternative is to regard both text B and text C as parts of separate laws, of which text C certainly and text B probably are continuations of texts on other plaques, and this cannot be said to be an easy view either. Nor is it easy to construct any hypothesis to explain at what stage in the plaque's history it was firmly nailed to a wall so that only one side was visible. The enigmatic letters remain a problem: ὄμ[όρ]ον (Wilamowitz), ὄμδν (= ὄμοίωv) (Pezopoulos), rest on a false reading; ὄμ)οίον (Buck) requires the assumption of an error; δι ἰόν (sc. ἔστι = ᾗ καθήκει, Pezopoulos), οἶον (= οἶων, 'from among whomsoever', Georgacas) are not convincing. In l. 2 πλακὸς Ἰλίας

(Pezopoulos), *Πλακὸς ὑλίας* (Wilamowitz). In ll. 10-11 *ἐν πρείγαι, ἐν πόλι, ἐν ἀποκλησίαι* is equally possible; *ἐν Πόλι* (cf. Thuc. iii. 101) Chatzes. In l. 15 [*ἔμην*] Wilamowitz, [*ἔμην δέ*] Jeffery. The version of B here followed is that of Wilamowitz; we do not understand the alternative *ἡιαρὸν το Ἀπόλλο|νος ἐχέτο ἄγαλμα*, 'If the demiouργοι gain anything other than the amounts prescribed, it shall be held sacred to Apollo as an offering for a period of nine years, and one shall not enter it in addition as profit.'

Text A: 'This law concerning the land shall be in force for the partition of the plain of Hyla and Liskara, both the separate lots and the public. The right of pasturage shall belong to parents and to the son; if there is no son, to the daughter; if there is no daughter, to the brother; if there is no brother, by relationship let a man pasture according to the law; if not, to the one who pastures . . . (?) [Vatin argues, by no means implausibly, that the words *ἐπινομία, ἐπινεμέσθο, ἐπινομος*, simply refer to inheritance and not to pasturage at all.] Whatever a man plants, he shall be immune from its seizure. Unless under the pressure of war a majority of 101 men chosen from the best citizens decide to bring in at least 200 fighting-men as additional settlers, whoever [the *δέ* is apodotic] proposes a division or puts it to a vote in the council of elders or in the city or in the select-men or makes civil strife about the division of land, he himself and his family shall be accursed for all time, his property shall be confiscated and his house demolished just as under the law about murder. This law shall be sacred to Pythian Apollo and the gods who dwell with him; on the person who transgresses it may there be destruction, on him and his family and his possessions, but may (the god) be kindly to him who observes it. The land shall belong, half to the previous settlers, half to the additional settlers.' There follows an addition: 'Let them distribute the valley portions. Exchange shall be valid, but the exchange shall take place before the magistrate.'

Text C: '(If/when) they receive(?), one shall be entitled to give his share to whomever he wishes.'

Text B: 'If the demiouργοι gain more than the amount prescribed, let them dedicate a statue to Apollo Echetos at the end of nine years, and the money shall not be counted as a gain' (i.e. to the state treasury).

The topographic problems of this text are unlikely to be satisfactorily settled. The view of Chatzes which attributes the text to the town of Polis (cf. Keramopoulos, *Ἀρχ. Ἐφ.* (1927-8) 209 f.) is not easily reconcilable with either of the find-spots reported, and essentially rests on the mistaken belief that the *Ἰαῖοι* of Thuc. iii. 101 are attested only there and can be emended to *Ἰλίοι* (cf. l. 2). This is not so; see Lerat, *op. cit.* i. 31 f., 53 f. Lerat, on the other hand, wishes (ii. 9 f.) to regard the text as Aetolian, for dialect reasons, and to accept the find-spot of Psoriani. It is clear, however, that the alphabet

is Ozolian Lokrian and not Aetolian. This does not rule out Psoriani, for the Lokrians may be contemplating a settlement across the Aetolian border, but Naupaktos is clearly much more likely, since the plaque was dedicated to Apollo (l. 14) and there was an Apollonion in Naupaktos (Thuc. ii. 91. 1). (So Papadakis; Jeffery's suggestion that the colony of No. 20 is the additional settlement contemplated in ll. 7-9 is attractive but not cogent.)

Whatever the community was, it has well-defined inheritance-laws (ll. 5-6); if the whole of ll. 11-13 applies to its homicide-law and not merely the confiscation of property and the destruction of the house, it has in theory progressed beyond the blood-feud; it has a council, a popular assembly, and something between the two in its ἀποκλησία (but see Schwahn, *Wien. Stud.* xlviii (1930) 141-9), though it may confide some business to a body selected aristocratically (l. 8); its magistrates include δαμοργοί (see Murakawa, *Hist.* vi (1957) 390) and an ἀρχός. They are not new settlers; they are an old community extending their interests into a new area.

It has generally been assumed that the new area was being divided into κλήροι, and Wilamowitz, for example, held that the particulars of the division had already been determined and perhaps inscribed on another plaque now lost. This has been challenged by Nilsson, who claims that it is primarily pasturage which is in question and that flocks and herds are no respecters of boundaries. He holds that the division contemplated is that of the pasture-land from the rest of the community's territory. He does not give an account of τῶν ἀποτόμων καὶ τῶν δαμοσίων, which are probably best interpreted as sacred precincts (cf. τέμενος, from the same root) and public property, and it is hard to see how he would explain the division of the territory with the new settlers, which certainly seems to be contemplated in ll. 16 ff. But his account needs serious consideration, particularly what he has to say about ll. 6-7, which he claims as the first known example of the rights gained by ἐμφύτευσις, very frequent in later Greek history.

The parallels with No. 49, extending to the formulae of l. 10, are of some interest.

14 (11)

Athenian Decree concerning Salamis:

(?) late sixth century B.C.

Seven fragments of a marble stele from the Acropolis. The stele tapers upwards and the lines of the text read vertically downward; now in EM.

Archaic Attic letters, including ⊕ and †. Ll. 1-6 stoichedon 35; in ll. 7-12 the letters are more widely spaced. Phot.: *IIA* 13; Austin, Pl. 4. Facs. restored: *Hesp.* x (1941) 305. New frag.: *Hesp.* vii (1938) 265.

IG i². 1; *SEG* x. 1; Wilhelm, *Sitzb. Wien*, 217. 5 (1939) 5-11; Kahrstedt, *Staatsgebiet* 359-62; Schweigert (new frag.), *Hesp.* vii (1938) 264; Meritt, *Hesp.* x (1941) 301-7; Wade-Gery, *CQ* xl (1946) 101-4; Guarducci, *RF* lxxvi (1948) 238-43; Bartsos, *Ἀθηνᾶ*, lxxv (1961) 201-9; Luria, *Kadmos*, iii (1964) 88-107.

ἔδοχσεν τῶι δέμοι· τ[ὸς ἐ Σ]αλαμ[ῖνι κλερόχος]
οἰκὲν ἐὰ Σαλαμῖνι [...5...]λεν [...7.... Ἀθένε]-
σι τελέν καὶ στραπ[εύεσθ]αι; τ[ὰ δ' ἐ Σαλαμῖνι μ]-
ἐ μι[σθ]όν, ἐὰ μὲ οἰκ[...7....]ο[.μισθόμενο. : ἐὰ]-
5 ν δὲ μισθοῖ, ἀποτί[νεν τὸ μισθόμενον καὶ τὸ μ]-
ισθόντα ἡεκάτερο[ν.....19.....]
ἐς δεμόσιο[ν]: ἐσπράτεν δὲ τὸν ἄ]-
ρχο[ν]τα, ἐὰν [δὲ μέ, εὐθ]ύ[ν]εσθαι: τ]-
ἀ δὲ [ἡ]όπλα π[αρέχεσθ]α[ι αὐτὸς: τ]-
10 ριά[κ]οντα: δρ[αχμὸν:] ἡο[πλισμένο]-
ν δὲ [τ]ὸν ἄρχοντ[α τὰ ἡόπλα κρίν]-
εν: [ἐπ]ὶ τῆς β[ο]λέ[ς]c. II.....]

l. 1: κλερόχος Luria; οἰκόντας Wilhelm; ἈθENAῖος Meritt; τ[ὸν... ἈθENAῖον Wade-Gery. l. 2: αἰεὶ π[λὲν [ἡότι δεῖ Ἀθένε]]σι Meritt; καὶ τε]λέν [ἡά ἐστὶν ἀστοῖ]]σι τελέν Wade-Gery; καὶ τε]λέν [καθάπερ Ἀθένε]]σι τελέν Guarducci. l. 4: ἐὰ μὲ οἰκ[εῖος ἐι ἡ]ο [μισθόμενος Wade-Gery; ἐὰ μὲ οἰκ[δοσι καὶ ἡ]ο[ι μισθόμενοι Meritt. l. 6: [τὸ τριπλάσιον τὸ μισθὸ] Tod; [δεκάτεν τὸ μισθόματος] Wade-Gery. ll. 7-8: [χουλέγεν δὲ τὸν ἄ]]ρχο[ν]τα, ἐὰν [τι δέος ἡ]υ[πάρχει] Wade-Gery. l. 12: [ταῦτ' ἐγνόσθε] Meritt; [ὁ δεῖνα εἶπε] Wade-Gery; ἐπ]ὶ τῆς β[ο]λέ[κλεος ἀρχῆς] Luria, Roussel.

This is the earliest Athenian decree to survive. It concerns the status and obligations of men living on Salamis, but the keyword at the end of the first line is lost: ἈθENAῖος, κλερόχος, οἰκόντας equally fit the space available, but the clauses that follow make better sense if they refer to Athenians rather than natives (οἰκόντας). With Kahrstedt and others we believe that the decree concerns cleruchs recently settled on the island. The direct evidence for a cleruchy on Salamis is slight: a scholiast on Pindar, *Nem.* ii. 19, in honour of Timodemus of Acharnai, says that there is no agreed explanation of the reference to Ajax in the poem, but some think that Timodemus was one of the Athenian cleruchs established on Salamis. It is likely that though born in Athens he was brought up on Salamis. It is only a guess that

Timodemos was a cleruch, but the cleruchy itself is not questioned by the scholiast or his sources. There is also a reference to Salamis in a decree that dates from 386, just after the Peace of Antalkidas, when Athens was allowed to resume control over Lemnos through cleruchs: *IG* ii². 30, Frag. b, l. 4,]ναι μήτε μισθῶσαι πλήν - -. l. 6,] γῆν τὸς κλερόχος κα[- -. l. 7, καθάπ]ερ τοῖς ἐς Σαλαμ[ίνα. This might be a reference back to regulations dating from Athens' first cleruchy. Hammond (following Macan, *Herodotus*, ad loc.) attractively identifies as cleruchs the force that Aristides landed on Psyttaleia at the battle of Salamis, described by Herodotus (viii. 95) as γένος ἔοντες Ἀθηναῖοι (*JHS* lxxvi (1956) 48).

The conditions laid down in the decree are: 1 (ll. 1-3): The cleruch must pay taxes and give military service to Athens. 2 (ll. 3-8): He must not lease his land on Salamis except to a ?kinsman (l. 4 οἰκ[εῖος], Wade-Gery). 3 (ll. 8-12): He must provide his own arms to the value of 30 dr. and the Athenian governor (cf. Arist. *Ἄθ. Πολ.* 54. 8, κληροῦσι δὲ καὶ ἐς Σαλαμίνα ἄρχοντα) shall have some responsibility (either for approving his arms or of mobilizing cleruchs in an emergency).

The main evidence for the date of this important decree lies in the letter forms and the arrangement of the text. The stoichedon character of ll. 1-6 shows an early stage in the development of the style, which by 485-4 was mature in Athens (*IG* i². 3/4, Austin, 8). The letter forms might be found at any time between c. 520 and c. 480. They are probably cut by the same craftsman as a dedication on the Acropolis of a statue by Hegias (Raubitschek, *DAA* p. 94), who is presumably the teacher of Pheidias. This does not, however, compel a date after 490, and, if Salamis is the first Athenian cleruchy, the decree should be dated before the cleruchy sent to Chalkis after the Athenian victory of 506 (*Hdt.* v. 77. 2). The period immediately following the reforms of Cleisthenes offers a good context. Athens had broken with Sparta; it would have been a sound precaution to establish a permanent garrison on the island which Megara, with Spartan support, might attempt to recover.

The Boule is not mentioned in the opening formula, but was very probably referred to in the last line. No firm constitutional inferences, however, can be drawn, for the standard developed form of the preamble (ἔδοχσεν τῆι βολῆι καὶ τῶι δέμοι) was not reached for more than a generation after Cleisthenes (cf. *IG* i². 3/4; 5). Luria infers a pre-Cleisthenic date from prescript and postscript, Raubitschek a later date than ours from letter forms.

Wilhelm, *Beiträge* 240 n. 5, asserts that alternate lines of this text were coloured red and blue.

15 (12 and 43)

Athenian Victory over Boeotia and Chalkis:

c. 506 B.C.

A. Block of dark Eleusinian limestone, found north-east of the Propylaea (? in the sanctuary of Artemis of Brauron, *IG* i². 394); now in EM.

Archaic Attic letters, not stoichedon. Phot.: *DAA* 168; *LSAG* Pl. 4. 43. *IG* i². 394; *DAA* 168; *LSAG* 78 (43).

[*Δεσμῶδι ἐν ἀχνύεντι σιδερέοι ἔσβεσαν ἡύβρι*]
παίδε[ς] Ἀθηναίων ἔργμασιν ἐμ πολέμο]
 [*ἔθνεα Βοιωτῶν καὶ Χαλκιδέων δαμάσαντες*]:
τῶν ἡίππος δεκά[τεν Πάλλαδι τάσδ' ἔθεσαν].

B. Four fragments from a base of Pentelic marble, found 'on the Acropolis'; now in EM.

Attic letters, ζ , Λ , ρ . Stoichedon. Phot.: *DAA* 173. *IG* i². 394; *DAA* 173.

[*ἔθνεα Βοιωτῶν καὶ Χαλκιδέων δαμά[σαν]*]
[παίδ]ε[ς] Ἀθηναίων ἔργμα[σιν ἐμ πολέμο]
 [*δεσμῶδι ἐν ἀχνύεντι σιδερέοι ἔσβε[σαν]*]
[τ]ῶν ἡίππος δεκά[τεν Πάλλαδι τάσδ' ἔθεσαν].

The manuscripts of Herodotus have *ἀχλυόεντι*, *ἀχθυθέντι*, *ἀχθυθέντι*. None of these words can be restored unless one of the iotas shared a stoichos with another letter. The surviving lettering does not encourage this.

In c. 506 Cleomenes, expelled by the new democracy from Athens, led a Peloponnesian army into Attica to coincide with an invasion from the north by Boeotia and Chalkis. Opposition from Corinth and his fellow king, Demaratos, led to the withdrawal of Cleomenes; the Athenians defeated both Boeotians and Chalkidians on the same day. Seven hundred Boeotians and an unknown number of Chalkidians were taken prisoner and later ransomed for 2 minae each. The Athenians commemorated the victories by setting up a chariot with a tithe of the ransom money and hanging up the prisoners' chains. Herodotus, who records these events, himself saw the monuments, and copied the epigram (*Hdt.* v. 77).

Fragments of the base he saw have been found on the Acropolis (B), but also part of another base (A) with the same lines. The letters of this second base are markedly earlier and the two hexameters are transposed. We can safely infer that the original monument was destroyed or carried off by the Persians in 480, and that a replica was put up later, presumably when the early victory seemed topical. The

association has commonly been thought to be with the crushing of the Euboean revolt in 446, but we share Hauvette's preference (*Hérodote*, 47 ff.), more fully argued by Raubitschek (*DAA* 173), for the battle of Oenophyta (c. 457). The emphasis on Boeotia would ring very hollow after the Athenian defeat at Koroneia, and the letter forms (especially alpha with sloping bar) are more appropriate to the earlier date.

The siting of the monument remains very controversial. Pausanias (i. 28. 2) implies that when he visited the Acropolis the chariot was near Pheidias' great bronze statue of Athena, and a rock-cutting that would fit the monument can still be seen by the cutting for the base of the Promachos (Stevens, *Hesp.* v (1936) 506). Herodotus' description is not easy to reconcile with Pausanias. In his day τὸ δὲ (the chariot) ἀριστερῆς χειρὸς ἔστηκε πρῶτα ἐσιόντι ἐς τὰ προπύλαια τὰ ἐν τῇ ἀκροπόλει, and this suggests that the chariot was then within or immediately outside the entrance to the Acropolis, almost certainly before Mnesikles began his great building in 437. The fetters, however, were some distance away, 'hanging on walls scorched by the fire raised by the Mede, opposite the megaron that is turned towards the west'. There is general agreement that the old temple (discovered by Doerpfeld) is here referred to; the chains were near the Promachos. It is tempting to see in this separation of chariot and chains the explanation for the transposition of the two hexameters, but an equally simple explanation is equally valid. The chains signified the capture and ransom of prisoners, from which the cost of the memorial was met; this was irrelevant to the battle of Oenophyta, when it was appropriate that the main emphasis should be on the victory over the Boeotians. Attempts have been made to reconcile Herodotus with the evidence of Pausanias, by understanding the Propylaea as the area between the main entrance and the smaller entrance to the court in front of the Parthenon's west face (L. Weber, *Phil. Woch.* liii (1933) 331-6) or this entrance itself (for the site see *Hesp.* v (1936) 445; Holland, *AJA* xxviii (1924) 402; Raubitschek, *DAA* 173). This is not the natural meaning of Herodotus. By τὰ προπύλαια τὰ ἐν τῇ ἀκροπόλει he should mean the main entrance, and had the chariot stood next to the Promachos, surely Herodotus would have described its site by reference to the statue. We therefore prefer to accept the more complex hypothesis of a double move. The chariot was originally sited where Pausanias indicates (and the surviving block was found near this site). It was destroyed or carried off in 480 and when it was restored after Oenophyta it was set up outside the pre-Mnesikleian Propylaea. Later it was returned to the original site, either when Mnesikles' Propylaea were built or much later, in the Hellenistic or early Roman period (Stevens, *Hesp.* v (1936) 505; Judeich, *Topographie*², 236-9).

16 (7)

Dedication of Aiakes of Samos: c. 500 B.C.

Marble statue of a seated figure (possibly Hera, but there is no agreement about the sex) from the Samian Heraion. The inscription is engraved on the left side of the chair. Tigani Museum.

Ionic letters, with legless rho and upsilon, dotted theta and straight-barred alpha. Stoichedon, with slight irregularities at the end of the line (Austin, 13-15; note the tendency to stoichedon already manifest in the earlier Samian inscription, *DM* vi (1953) 15-20, with Pl. 3). Punctuation does not occupy a space. Phot.: *Ath. Mitt.* xxxi (1906) 152 f.; Kern 7; Buschor, *Altsamische Standbilder*, Abb. 141-3.

Curtius, *Ath. Mitt.* xxxi (1906) 151-85; *SIG* 10 (but cf. 20); *DGE* 714; Schede, *Abh. Berl.* 1929, no. 3, 22; Buschor, *Altsamische Standbilder*, 40-2; White, *JHS* lxxiv (1954) 38; *LSAG* 330 (Samos 13); Homann-Wedeking, *Arch. 'Eph.*, 1953-4, ii. 187 f.; Barron, *CQ* xiv (1964) 218 f., with 214 n. 4.

Αεάκης ἀνέθηκεν
 ὁ Βρύχωνος: ὅς τῆι
 Ἡρῆι: τὴν σύλην: ἔ-
 πρησεν: κατὰ τὴν
 5 ἐπίστασιν.

1. 2: *Βρύχωνος* (cf. *Βρυχωνίδας IG* v. 387) is correct (*Arch. 'Eph.* 1924, 64 n. 1), not *Βρύσωνος*.

Since Herodotus (ii. 182, iii. 39, etc.) gives the name of the father of the tyrant Polykrates as Aiakes, it is not surprising that there has always been a strong temptation to identify him with the dedicator of this inscription and date the dedication about 540, before Polykrates came to power. Epigraphists since Pomtow (*SIG* 20) have always found this date impossibly early for the forms of theta and alpha and for the stoichedon style; see, in particular, Klaffenbach, *DM* vi (1953) 16, n. 5. Although Jeffery, *LSAG* 330, dates 525-520, she herself sees the closest parallel to the lettering in a Milesian inscription of very shortly before 494, and is unduly influenced by an early dating for the statue. The early date for the statue has been maintained by Buschor, though there are strong indications that he was influenced by the identification of Aiakes, and by Homann-Wedeking, but the statue itself has been dated in the last third of the century by Richter (*Archaic Greek Art*, 168), and at the end of the century by Schede, Johnson (*CP* xli (1946) 189), Lippold (*Griechische Plastik*, 58), and Rumpf (Gercke-Norden, *Einleitung*, ii⁴. 3. 25), Rumpf at least confessedly influenced by the inscription.

The compromise view, first propounded by Pomtow, that the statue was early, but the inscription late, added by the later Aiakes, son of Syloson, tyrant of Samos in the early fifth century (Hdt. iv. 138, vi. 13, 14, 22, 25) has always won a certain amount of favour and was still held by White, but we agree with Barron that the weight of the probabilities is for dating the whole dedication about 500 and detaching this Aiakes from the direct tyrant line. The considerable body of evidence deployed by White, Homann-Wedeking, and Barron for believing in a powerful Samian tyranny before Polykrates, whether under Aiakes (White), Syloson the elder (Homann-Wedeking), or an elder Polykrates (believed by Barron to be the real name of the father of the Herodotean Polykrates), is not much affected.

σύλη (the root recurs in the name Συλοσῶν, which appears twice in the tyrant-house (Polyaen. vi. 45; Hdt. iii. 39, etc.)) occurs in the singular only here, though it is a plausible emendation in *FGH* 544 F 3, again in a Samian context. The connotation of the root is clearly 'officially recognized seizure', which might of course appear to the victims as simple piracy: for sixth-century Samian depredations compare Hdt. iii. 47. Aiakes as ἐπιστάτης (it is not clear whether this is a general word or a name for a particular office) exercises some state function in connection with the booty. Whether he exacted it (from πρᾶπτω) or sold it (from πέρνημι; Barron's view, but he has misunderstood Hdt. i. 70. 3) must remain uncertain. That 'he was committing piracy for Hera in the time of his presidency' (Bilabel, *Neue Heidelb. Jahrb.* 1934, 133) or burning the booty (from πύμπρημι, Bannier, *Berl. Phil. Woch.* xxxvi (1916) 646) seems less likely. For the use of κατὰ cf. *I. Priene* 60. 14.

For public recognition of piracy compare Livy's statement about the Liparaeans, *mos erat civitatis velut publico latrocinio partam praedam dividere* (v. 28), and for a covenant regulating the right of seizure see Tod, vol. i, no. 34.

17 (5)

Alliance between Eleans and Heraeans: c. 500 B.C.

A bronze tablet found at Olympia in 1813, with nail-holes at the top corners; now in the British Museum.

Archaic Elean alphabet (for which see *LSAG* 206 f., 216 f.). Phot.: *I* 42. 6; Guarducci, *Epigrafia Greca*, i. 202 fig. 69.
+; *DGE* 413; Buck 62; *Staatsverträge* 110+; *LSAG* 219, no. 6.

ἃ Φράτρα τοῖρ Φαλείοις: καὶ τοῖς Ἐρ-
Φαίοις: συμμαχία κ' ἕα ἑκατὸν Φέτεα:

ἄρχοι δέ κα τοῖ: αἰ δέ τι δέοι: αἴτε Φέπος αἴτε F-
 ἄργον: συνέαν κ' ἀλάλοις: τά τ' ἄλ(α) καὶ πὰ-
 5 ρ πολέμο: αἰ δέ μὰ συνέαν: τάλαντόν κ'
 ἄργύρο: ἀποτίνοιαν: τῶι Δι' Ὀλυμπίοι: τοῖ κα-
 δαλεμένοι: λατρείομενον: αἰ δέ τιρ τὰ γ-
 ράφεα: ταῖ καδαλέοιτο: αἴτε Φέτας αἴτε τ-
 ελεστά: αἴτε δᾶμος: ἐν τέπιαροι κ' ἐνεχ-
 10 οῖτο τῶι ἴναυτ' ἔγραμένοι.

The alpha in l. 4 was omitted.

'This is the covenant between the Eleans and the Heraeans. There shall be an alliance for a hundred years, and this (year) shall be the first; and if anything is needed, either word or deed, they shall stand by each other in all matters and especially in war; and if they stand not by each other, those who do the wrong shall pay a talent of silver to Olympian Zeus to be used in his service. And if anyone injures this writing, whether private man or magistrate or community, he shall be liable to the sacred fine herein written.'

For the Elean dialect, see Bechtel, *GD* ii. 827 ff., Buck, pp. 159 f. εἶα, *συνέαν* (ll. 2, 4, 5) = Attic εἴη, *συνείεν. τοῖ, ταῖ* (ll. 3, 8) = *τοδί, ταδί* (τόδε, τάδε). *πὰρ* (l. 4) = *περὶ* (Günther, *Indog. Forsch.* xx (1906-7) 139). *καδαλεμένοι, καδαλέοιτο* (ll. 6-7, 8) = *καταδηλούμενοι, καταδηλοῖτο*. *Φέτας* survives in Arcadian prose until the first century B.C. (*IG* v. 2. 20). *ἐπίαροι* (= *ἐφιέρωι*) (l. 9) seems to mean 'fine' rather than 'curse' here. For *Φράτρα* cf. No. 8.

Jeffery, by confining her investigations to the allied alphabets of Elis, Arcadia, and Laconia and avoiding the remoter parallels by which this text has sometimes been dated, has lowered its date substantially. Arguments as to whether it should predate or postdate 572, the traditional date at which the Eleans finally wrested from the Pisatans the control of Olympia and its festival (*Paus.* vi. 22. 2), now seem beside the point. The circumstances in which Elis made this alliance with Heraea of western Arcadia must remain unknown. Heraea, to judge by its coins (Head, *HN*² 447), was not unimportant at this date, and there is no trace of subordination in the terms of the treaty.

The alliance was for a hundred years, beginning with 'this year'. The indefiniteness may perhaps be due to the fact that a century's alliance was regarded as practically unlimited (Keil, *Εἰρήνη*, 8) and therefore its starting-point need not be precisely dated. It therefore differs in form rather than in practice from No. 10. The more surprising feature, when we compare it with that text, is the absence of oaths and divine sanctions. Olympian Zeus will gain from a breach

of the treaty, but he will not enforce it. Cf. Thuc. v. 31. 2, but by that time Olympian Zeus is practically functioning as the Elean sacred treasury, which does not seem to be the case here.

Neither Elis nor Heraea was a city at this date; they still dwelt *κατὰ κώμας* (Strabo, viii. 3. 2, p. 337).

18 (13)

Memorial of Kallimachos: 490 B.C.

Eight fragments of an Ionic marble column found on the Acropolis; now in EM.

Archaic Attic letters: Φ, Θ (= phi), Ρ, †. Phot.: *IIA* 18; *BSA* xlv (1950), Pl. 10, 11.

IG i². 609; Hampl, *Die Antike*, xv (1939) 168-74; Raubitschek, *AJA* xlv (1940) 53-9; *DAI* 13; Shefton, *BSA* xlv (1950) 140-64, xlvii (1952) 278; Fraenkel, *Eranos*, xlix (1951) 63 f.

[Καλίμαχος μ' ἀν]έθεκεν Ἀφιδναίῳ[ς] τὰθναίαι:
 ἄν[γελον ἀθ]ανάτον ἡοὶ Ὀ[λύμπια δόματ'] ἔχουσιν, |
 [...8.... πολέ]μαρχο[ς] Ἀθηναίων τὸν ἀγῶνα:
 τὸν Μα[ραθῶν.... ἡ]ελενονο[.....ΙΙ.....:]
 5 παισὶν Ἀθηναίων μν[.....2Ι.....]

1. 3: [*ἡοστέσας* (= *ὄς* (σ)τέσας) πολέ]μαρχος Shefton. 1. 4: τὸν Μα[ραθῶν]όθεν ἡ]ελεν, ὃν ὄ[λεσε θόριος Ἄρες] Fraenkel; τὸν Μα[ραθῶν]ι πρὸ ἡ]ελ(λ)έρον δ[νομ' ε]στεφάνοσεν: Shefton. 1. 5: We regard ν' after μ as probable rather than certain. μν[έμεν δ' ἀρετῆς κατέλειπεν] Shefton; μν[έμεν πένθος τε λιπόντα] Fraenkel.

Before 1940 all that was known of this monument was an Ionic column of which eight inscribed fragments were preserved, whose relative position was secure. The column was rough-picked all round but two flutings were cut to carry five hexameters (the first only quasi-metrical) in two lines. The first two verses seemed to record a dedication by Kallimachos of Aphidna. The three hexameters of the second line were more difficult to interpret; they seemed to refer to the services of the polemarch Kallimachos at Marathon, but Kallimachos died in the battle (Hdt. vi. 109, 114; cf. *PA* 8008) and dead men do not make dedications. One solution was that he had vowed the offering before the battle and that his vow was fulfilled on his behalf after his death; but in such cases two verbs are normally used for two people.

εὔξατο of the man who died and ἀνέθηκε of the man who carried out his vow. Hiller in *IG* i² therefore separated the two lines, the first recording a dedication by Kallimachos in his lifetime, the second added after his death in battle. Hiller assumed that the dedication was a figure of Hermes, but in 1940 Raubitschek (art. cit.) reported his discovery that the figure of a winged woman found on the Acropolis, and believed to be a Nike, fitted an Ionic capital which had the same diameter where it would have joined the shaft as the Ionic column bearing the Kallimachos inscription. The messenger of the gods is no longer Hermes, but Nike, or, perhaps more probably, Iris.

A further considerable advance was made when Shefton demonstrated that the two lines were contemporary and corrected two readings (in ll. 4 and 5). To explain away a dead man's dedication he inferred that the dedication was made by Kallimachos in his lifetime, and the inscription cut probably on the base of the column; after his death it was copied on the column in two flutings cut for the purpose and supplemented with a proud reference to Marathon. This, Shefton suggests, may have been intended to emphasize Kallimachos' role in the battle against the pretensions of Miltiades and his friends. To avoid the assumption of a secondary inscription Raubitschek suggests (*apud* Shefton, *BSA* xlv 164):

[τόνδε (surely a slip for τένδε) με δέμος] ἔθηκεν Ἀφιδναίο[ν] τὰθυναίαι :
 ἄν[γελον ἀθ]ανάτον, οἱ Ὀ[λύμπια δόματα] ἔχουσιν.
 [Καλίμαχος πολέ]μαρχος Ἀθηναίων τὸν ἀγῶνα :
 τὸν Μα[ραθῶνι πρὸ ἡ]ελένον ὄν[ομαστὸν ἔθηκεν :]
 παισὶν Ἀθηναίων μν[ῆμα λιπὸν ἀρετῆς].

This reconstruction solves one major problem, but it creates more. Epigraphically it satisfies the requirements of the stone, stylistically it is unacceptable. These are not the verses of an early fifth-century poet or craftsman, composed in honour of one of the most distinguished Athenians of his day, for a dedication on the Acropolis; nor (a less serious matter) do we know from literature or inscription of any similar honour paid by a deme to one of its members. Shefton's hypothesis of an original inscription before Marathon on the base and a second added after the battle is strengthened by the cutting of two flutes only, whereas all other inscribed columns known to us are either plain or fluted all round (*DAA*, pp. 3-60). Inscriptions, however, on bases of column dedications are very rare, and we may doubt whether the original inscription would have been repeated. It may be less difficult, in spite of the objection noted above, to believe that the dedication was vowed by Kallimachos before the battle and made on his behalf after his death.

19 (14)

Athenian Thank-offering for Marathon: 490 B.C.

On eight fragments of a long limestone base built against the front of the south wall of the Athenian Treasury at Delphi.

Attic alphabet, with ζ. The letters now seen are not earlier than the third century, but they copy the form of the original letters, some of which were deciphered by Keramopoulos (*Αρχ. Έφ.* 1911, 162 ff.). Phot.: *FD* iii. 2, Pl. 1.

SIG 23b.

Ἀθηναῖοι τ[ὸ]ι Ἀπόλλων[ι ἀπὸ Μῆδ]ον ἀκ[ροθ]ύνια
τῆς Μαραθ[ὸ]νι μ[άχης].

Pausanias (x. 11. 5 with Frazer, *Pausanias*, v. 279 ff. and Hitzig and Blümner, *Pausanias*, iii. 697 ff.) says that the Athenian Treasury was built ἀπὸ τῶν ἐς Μαραθῶνα ἀποβάντων ὁμοῦ Δάτιδι, and the French excavators have agreed with him, referring the inscription to Treasury and base (G. Colin, *FD* iii. 2, no. 1). The bonding of the base with the Treasury, however, suggests that it was added later; the Treasury was more probably built between 506 and 490 (Pomtow, *RE*, Suppl. iv. 1280 ff.; Dinsmoor, *Studies in the History of Culture* (1942) 187-9). De La Coste-Messelière (*FD* iv. 4) thinks that the sculpture of the Treasury confirms Pausanias. E. B. Harrison (*The Athenian Agora*, vol. xi, *Archaic and Archaistic Sculpture*, 9-11, prefers a date in the 90s for the Treasury.

20 (24)

Law of the Eastern Lokrians relative to their
Colony at Naupaktos: (?) 500-475 B.C.

Bronze plaque, engraved on both sides, found at Galaxidi (Chaleion, cf. l. 47; see Lerat, *Les Locriens de l'Ouest*, i. 198-209); now in the British Museum.

Script of the Ozolian Lokrians (*LSAG* 104 f.); unlike No. 13, it has koppa, but it is not engraved boustrophedon; the lines are separated by faint guide-lines. Phot.: *BMI* iv, p. 119. Facs.: *Imag.* 92. 1.

SIG 47, *BMI* 954+; *DGE* 362; Solmsen 44; Buck 57. (The best commentaries are still Meyer, *Forsch.* i. 291-305; Meister, *Ber. d. sächs. Gesell. d. Wiss. zu Leipzig, phil.-hist. Kl.*, 1895, 272-334.) Cf. Busolt, *GG* iii. 300; Bannier, *Berl. Phil. Woch.* xviii (1898) 862 f., xxxvi (1916) 956 f.; B. Keil, *Indog. Forsch.* xxxvi (1915-16) 236-42; Bechtel, *Gött. Nachr.* 1918, 397-400; Oldfather in *RE* xiii. 1240 ff.; Kent, *The Textual Criticism of Inscriptions*, 17 f.; Schulze, *Ζ. vergl. Spr.* lvii (1929-30) 297; O'Neill, *Ancient Corinth*, 250 f.; Lerat, op. cit. ii. 29-31; Schick, *RF* lxxxiii (1955) 377 f.; *LSAG* 106 (Lokris); Graham, *Colony and Mother City in Ancient Greece*, 40-60, 226-8; Larsen, *ek Federal States*, 45-58.

Front

- ἐν Ναύπακτον: κα τῶνδε: ἡα ἴπιφοικία.: Λορρόν τῶν: ἠυποκναμιδίον: ἐπ-
 εἰ κα Ναυπάκτιος: γένεται,: Ναυπάκτιον ἔοντα,: ἡόπο ξένον: ὄσια
 λανχάν-
 ειν: καὶ θύειν: ἐξείμην: ἐπιτυχόντα,: αἴ κα δειλεται,: αἴ κα δειλεται,:
 θύειν καὶ λ-
 ανχάνειν: κέ δάμο κέ ροιάνον: αὐτὸν καὶ τὸ γένος: κατ' αἴφει: τέλος
 το-
 5 ὕς: ἐπιφοίκους Λορρόν: τῶν ἠυποκναμιδίον: μὲ φάρειν: ἐν Λορροῖς τοῖ-
 s ἠυποκναμιδίους: φρίν κ' αὐ τις Λορρός γένεται τῶν ἠυποκναμιδίον: αἴ
 δειλετ' ἀνχορεῖν, καταλείπον: τὰ ἐν τῷ ἰστίαι παῖδα ἡεβατὰν ἔ' δελφεόν,
 : ἐξ-
 εἰμην ἄνευ ἐνετερίον: αἴ κα ἠυπ' ἀνάγκας ἀπελάονται: ἐ Ναυπάκτο: Λορ-
 ροὶ τοῖ ἠυποκναμιδίοι,: ἐξείμην ἀνχορεῖν,: ἡόπο Φέκαστος ἐν, ἄνευ ἐ-
 10 νετερίον.: τέλος μὲ φάρειν μεδὲν: ἡότι μὲ μετὰ Λορρόν τῶν Φεσπαρί-
 ον.: Α: ἔνορρον τοῖς ἐπιφοίροις ἐν Ναύπακτον: μὲ ἴποστᾶμεν: ἀπ'
 ἴΟ(πο)ντίον
 τέκναι καὶ μαχανᾶι: μεδεμιᾶι: Φερόντας. τὸν ἡόρκον ἐξείμην: αἴ κα δει-
 λονται,: ἐπάγεν μετὰ τριάροντα Φέτα: ἀπὸ τῷ ἡόρρο ἡεκατὸν ἄνδρας ἴΟ-
 ποντίοις: Ναυπακτίον καὶ Ναυπακτίοις ἴΟποντίοις: Β: ἡόσστις κα
 λιποτελέε-
 15 ι ἐγ Ναυπάκτο: τῶν ἐπιφοιρόν,: ἀπὸ Λορρόν εἰμην: ἔντε κ' ἀποτεῖσει:
 τὰ νό-
 μια Ναυπακτίοις: Γ: αἴ κα μὲ γένος ἐν τῷ ἰστίαι: ἔι ἔ' χεπάμον: τῶν ἐπι-
 φοιρόν: ἔι ἐν Ναυπακτῷ, Λορρόν: τῶν ἠυποκναμιδίον: τὸν ἐπάνχισ-
 τον: κρατεῖν, Λορρόν ἡόπο κ' ἔι,: αὐτὸν ἰόντα, αἴ κ' ἀνὲρ ἔι ἔ παῖς,:
 τριδὸν
 μεδὸν: αἴ δὲ μέ, τοῖς Ναυπακτίοις: νομίους χρῆσται: Δ: ἐ Ναυπακτὸ
 ἀνχορέ-
 20 οντα: ἐν Λορροῖς τοῖς ἠυποκναμιδίους: ἐν Ναυπάκτοι: καρῦξαι ἐν τὰ-
 γορᾶι,: κέν Λορροῖς τοῖς ἠυποκναμιδίους: ἐν τῷ πόλι, ἡὸ κ' ἔι,:
 καρῦξαι ἐν
 τὰγορᾶι: Ε: Περροθαρῖαν: καὶ Μυσαχέον: ἐπεὶ κα Ναυπάκτι(ὸς τις):
 γένετα-
 ι,: αὐτὸς καὶ τὰ χρέματα: τὲν Ναυπάκτοι: τοῖς ἐν Ναυπάκτοι χρῆσται,:
 τὰ δ' ἐν Λορροῖς τοῖς ἠυποκναμιδίους: χρέματα τοῖς ἠυποκναμιδί-
 25 οις:

Back

νομίους χρεῖσται, ἡόπος ἅ πόλις Φεκάστον νομίζει: Λορρόν τὸν ἠυποκνα-
 αμιδίον: αἷ τις ἠυπὸ τὸν νομίον τὸν ἐπίφοιον: ἀνχορέει Περροθαριαῖ-
 ν καὶ Μυσαχέον: τοῖς αὐτὸν νομίους: χρεῖσται: κατὰ πόλιν Φεκάστους.
 F: αἷ κ' ἀδελφεοὶ ἔοντι: τὸ ἕν Ναύπακτον Φοικέοντος: ἡόπος καὶ Λορρό-
 30 ν: τὸν ἠυποκναμιδίον: Φεκάστον νόμος ἔστί, αἷ κ' ἀποθάνει τὸν χ-
 ρεμάτων κρατεῖν: τὸν ἐπίφοικον, τὸ κατιρόμενον κρατεῖν: Γ:
 τοὺς ἐπίφοίρους: ἐν Ναύπακτον: τὰν δίκαν πρόδιρον: ἠαρέσται πὸ
 τοὺς δ-
 ικαστῆρας, ἡαρέσται: καὶ δόμεν: ἐν Ὀπόεντι κατὰ Φέος αὐταμαρόν.:
 Λορ-
 ρὸν τὸν ἠυποκναμιδίον: προστάταν καταστᾶσαι: τὸν Λορρόν τὸπιφ-
 35 οῖροι: καὶ τὸν ἐπίφοιον τῷ Λορρόνι, ἡοίτινές κα ἕπιατῆς ἔντιμοι ες: Η:
 ἡόσ-
 τις κ' ἀπολίπει: πατᾶρα καὶ τὸ μέρος: τὸν χρεμάτων τῷ πατρί, ἕπει κ'
 ἀπογένεται, ἕξείμεν ἀπολαχεῖν: τὸν ἐπίφοιον: ἐν Ναύπακτον.
 : Θ: ἡόσστις: κα τὰ Φεφαδερότα: διαφθειρεί: τέχνηαι καὶ μαχανᾶι: κα-
 ἱ μιᾶι, ἡότι κα μὲ ἀνφοτάρους: δοκέει, ἡοποντίον τε χιλίον: πλέθ-
 40 αι καὶ Ναυπακτίον: τὸν ἐπίφοιον πλέθαι, ἕτιμον εἶμεν: καὶ χρε-
 ματα παματοφαγεῖσται: τὸνκαλειμένοι: τὰν δίκαν: δόμεν τὸν ἄρ-
 χόν, ἕν τριάροντ' ἀμάραις: δόμεν, αἷ κα τριάροντ' ἀμάραι: λείποντ-
 αι τᾶς ἀρχᾶς: αἷ κα μὲ δίδοι: τῷ ἐνκαλειμένοι: τὰν δίκαν, ἕτιμ-
 45 ον εἶμεν: καὶ χρέματα παματοφαγεῖσται, τὸ μέρος μετὰ Φο-
 ικιατᾶν: διομόσαι ἡόρρον: τὸν νόμιον: ἐν ὕδριαν: τὰν ψάφιξ-
 ξιν εἶμεν: καὶ τὸ θέθμιον: τοῖς ἠυποκναμιδίους Λορροῖς: ταὺ-
 τὰ τέλεον εἶμεν: Χαλειέοις: τοῖς σὺν Ἄντιφάται: Φοικέταις.

This statute (θέθμιον, l. 46) defines the future relationship between those of the Eastern Lokrians who are going as colonists (ἐπίφοιοι) to Naupaktos in Western (or Ozolian) Lokris and their mother people. The East Lokrians are here called Ὑποκνημίδιοι, from the mountain-range Κνημῆς which traverses their territory: elsewhere they are also named Ἐπικνημίδιοι, or Ὀπούντιοι, from the town of Opus, which formed their political (ll. 11, 13, 14, 39) and judicial (l. 33) centre (cf. Oldfather in *RE* xiii. 1157-62, Larsen, op. cit.).

The date of the law is certainly earlier than the seizure of Naupaktos by Athens *Λοκρῶν τῶν Ὀζολῶν ἐχόντων* c. 460 and its settlement by Mes-senians (Thuc. i. 103. 3); how much earlier, we cannot be sure. The law shows the normal desire to keep the colony up to strength (ll. 6-8)

and a general provision against ἀπόστασις by the colonists from their mother city (ll. 11-12), but these are not sufficient grounds to impute imperialist motives to the East Lokrians. At least the West Lokrian community of Chaleion shared in the venture (l. 47); alphabet and find-spot show that we have a copy made for Chaleion.

The text, which has no preamble and bears no date, consists of an opening section followed by nine paragraphs bearing the letters A to ⊕ in succession. A fairly close translation will probably prove the most useful form of commentary; Graham's recent work will give further help.

For the dialect see Bechtel, *GD* ii. 3-44, and Buck, pp. 157-9, 250 f.

'The colony (shall go) to Naupaktos (ἐν = ἐς) on these terms (κα τῶνδε = κατ τῶνδε = κατὰ τὰδε). The Lokrian of the Hypoknemidians [cf. l. 6], after having become a Naupaktian, being a Naupaktian, may have civil rights and sacrifice as a ξένος, if he wishes [Meister and Graham prefer ὅπο ξένον ὁσία 'where it is right for foreigners' which has some advantages; against Graham, 49 ff., we prefer the view that these are rights in Lokris, not in Naupaktos; how could Lokris prescribe for Naupaktos?]; if he wishes, he shall sacrifice and participate both in a commune and in societies, he and his family for ever [but as a ξένος, presumably]. The colonists of the Hypoknemidian Lokrians shall pay no tax among the Hypoknemidian Lokrians until any one of them again becomes a Hypoknemidian Lokrian. If he desire to return [sc. to East Lokris] leaving in his home an adult son or brother, he may do so without (payment of) entry-fees. If the Hypoknemidian Lokrians are driven out perforce from Naupaktos, they may return, each to his own home, without (payment of) entry fees. They shall pay no tax save in common with the Western Lokrians.

I. The colonists to Naupaktos (are) under oath not to break away from the Opuntians of their own will on any pretext or by any device whatsoever. Thirty years after the (original) oath it shall be lawful, if they desire, for a hundred men of the Naupaktians to administer the oath to the Opuntians, and the Opuntians to the Naupaktians.

II. If any of the colonists leave Naupaktos without paying his taxes, he shall be (shut out) from the Lokrians until he has paid his lawful debts to the Naupaktians.

III. If there be no (member of the) family in the home or heir among the colonists of the Hypoknemidian Lokrians at Naupaktos, the next of kin among the Lokrians, whencesoever he be, shall take possession, going in person, whether he be man or boy, within three months; otherwise, the Naupaktian laws shall be observed.

IV. Anyone returning from Naupaktos to the Hypoknemidian Lokrians shall make proclamation in the market-place at Naupaktos,

and among the Hypoknemidian Lokrians in the market-place in the city whence he comes.

V. When any of the Perkothariai and Mysacheis becomes a Naupaktian [the P. and M. are evidently two clans or castes, possibly sacerdotal (if the names are connected with *περικαθαίρειν* and *μύσος ἀκείσθαι*), standing in East Lokris on a different legal footing from the other citizens], he and his property at Naupaktos shall be subject to the laws at Naupaktos [we should have enough respect for the inscription's own punctuation not to punctuate after *αὐτός*, even though we might expect *αὐτόν*], but his property among the Hypoknemidian Lokrians shall be subject to the Hypoknemidian laws, as the law stands in the city of the Hypoknemidian Lokrians in each case. If any of the Perkothariai and Mysacheis return under the laws governing the colonists [i.e. under §§ II, IV, *supra*], each one shall be subject to his own laws in his several city [i.e. their special privileges, which disappeared while they were at Naupaktos, shall again become operative on their return to East Lokris].

VI. If there are brothers of the man who goes to live in Naupaktos, according to the laws of the Hypoknemidian Lokrians in each several case, if (a brother) dies, the colonist shall take possession of the property, take possession of his due share.

VII. The colonists to Naupaktos shall have precedence in legal suits before the judges, shall bring and submit to suits at Opus on the same day [the general sense cannot be affected whatever *κατὰ Φέος*, which we have suppressed, may mean; no suggested meaning is entirely convincing]. Whoever are in office for the year shall appoint a *prostates* from the Hypoknemidian Lokrians, one of the Lokrians for the colonist, one of the colonists for the Lokrian. [No interpretation of this sentence can be certain. That adopted here requires replacing *ες*, which cannot be right, by *ἔονται*, and the assumption of an afterthought. The first thought will have been to provide for an official who would represent the colonist in court at Opus, just as a metic had to be represented at Athens; a later thought provides reciprocity at Naupaktos. Other less probable solutions need not be considered.]

VIII. Whoever leaves behind a father and his share of his property to his father, when (his father) passes away, the colonist to Naupaktos may recover his portion.

IX. Whoever subverts these decisions on any pretext or by any device whatsoever, save so far as is resolved by both parties, the assembly of the Opuntian Thousand and the assembly of the Naupaktian colonists, he shall be without rights and his property shall be confiscated. The magistrate shall grant the trial to the accuser, grant it within thirty days, if thirty days of his magistracy are left. If he does not grant the trial to the accuser, he shall be without rights and his

property shall be confiscated, the estate together with the slaves. The judges shall swear the legal oath. The votes shall be cast into an urn.

And the statute for the Hypoknemidian Lokrians shall be valid in the same way for the Chaleian settlers under Antiphatas.'

21 (15 and 45)

Ostracism at Athens: 487-417 B.C.

Aristotle (*Ἀθ. Πολ.* 22) appears to date the first ostracism, that of Hipparchos, son of Charmos of Kollytos, to 487, and that of Megakles, son of Hippokrates of Alopeke, to 486. Since he goes on ἐπὶ μὲν οὖν ἔτη τρία τοὺς τῶν τυράννων φίλους ὠστράκιζον, ὧν χάριν ὁ νόμος ἐτέθη, μετὰ δὲ ταῦτα τῷ τετάρτῳ ἔτει καὶ τῶν ἄλλων εἴ τις δοκοίη μείζων μεθίσταντο· καὶ πρῶτος ὠστρακίσθη τῶν ἀπῳθεν τῆς τυραννίδος Ξάνθιππος ὁ Ἀρίφρονος (Pericles' father), we must assume another ostracism of an unnamed tyrannophile in 485 before Xanthippos' ostracism in 484. He appears to place Aristides' ostracism in 482. Other ostracisms in the literary evidence which seem to have been important were those of Themistocles (475-470), Kimon (461?), Thucydides son of Melesias (443), and Hyperbolos (417; Woodhead, *Hesp.* xviii (1949) 78-83, and McGregor, *Phoenix* xix (1965) 43-6, prefer 416, Raubitschek, *Phoenix* ix (1955) 122-6, prefers 415).

The literary evidence is now supported by 1,658 ostraka, 1,238 from the Agora excavations, the rest mostly from the German excavations in the Kerameikos. Their contribution to our knowledge has been far-reaching, though it is not evenly spread throughout the period, since the Persian sack of Athens provided archaeologically more favourable conditions for the survival of votes cast before 480. Leaving aside for our purposes the evidence they provide for the development of the script and spelling of the private Athenian citizen (the institution in itself presupposes widespread literacy, and we have hardly enough evidence to refine that presupposition), we may group that contribution under the following, overlapping, heads:

1. The literary evidence had not led us to expect the size of the 'scatter vote' for persons either totally unknown to us or unexpected in this context. For the period 487-480 we appear to have votes for about twenty-five men besides those known to have been ostracized. Pre-eminent among these is Kallixenos, son of Aristonymos of Xypete, unknown from literary sources, but shown by his Sicyonian patronymic (Hdt. vi. 126) and one ostrakon reading, [Ἀλκ]μεων[ιδόν | Καλ]λίχσεν[ος | Ἄρ]ιστο[νύμο, to be an Alkmeonid, descendant of the marriage

between Megakles and Agariste of Sicyon; the table below shows him second only to Themistocles in his total of preserved ostraka (for the evidence on him, see Stamires and Vanderpool, *Hesp.* xix (1950) 376-90). Another unknown Alkmeonid in the 480s is 'Ιπποκράτες Ἀλκμεονίδο Ἄλοπεκέθεν; the guess that 'Ιπποκράτες Ἀναχσιλέο is another Alkmeonid (see, e.g., Raubitschek, *DAA* pp. 339 f.) lacks cogency. None of the other unknowns can yet be given such importance, but among those known persons whose connection with ostracism had been unknown we may single out Melanthios, commander of the Athenian expedition to Ionia in 498 (Hdt. v. 97, if he is *Μελάνθιος Φαλάνθο*, *Hesp.* Suppl. viii. 400 f.), [*Ἄνδο*]κιδες [*Λεογ*]όρο (cf. No. 51) and [*Τεί*]σανδρος [*Ἐ*]πιλύκο (cf. Andoc. i. 117), the two grandfathers of the orator Andocides (*Ath. Mitt.* xl (1915) 16 f.), *Κλειππίδες Δεινίο Ἀχαρνεύς*, general in 428 (Thuc. iii. 3; *Ath. Mitt.* xl. 12-16) and 'Ιπποκλ[ἔς] | *Μενίππ[ο]*, general in 413 (Thuc. viii. 13; *Keramikos*, iii. 86).

The range of voting thus illustrated weakens the doubts that some scholars have felt about some ostracisms which had seemed to be of improbable persons and inadequately attested. Three such ostracisms are those of Damon or Damonides (Arist. *Ἄθ. Πολ.* 27. 4; Plut. *Per.* 4, *Nik.* 6, *Arist.* 1; Raubitschek, *Class. et Med.* xvi (1955) 78-83), Menon (Hesych. s.v. *Μενωνίδαί*, fully discussed by Raubitschek, *Hesp.* xxiv (1955) 286-9), and of Kallias, son of Didymias ([Andoc.] iv. 32). All these have been doubted, all of them are now represented by ostraka, which proves at the minimum that some people thought ostracism appropriate for them.

2. New information about known persons consists firstly of new data about their patronymic or demotic. For example, Themistocles' associate Abronichos (Hdt. viii. 21; Thuc. i. 91. 3) is shown to come from Lamptrai (*CR* vi (1956) 199 f.), an out-of-town statesman like Themistocles himself. (The view has been held, e.g. by Koerte, *Ath. Mitt.* xlvii (1922) 6 f., that ostraka are more likely to give the demotic of *novi homines* and omit it for nobles. As the evidence increases, it seems better to say that, at any rate for a generation after Cleisthenes, country-demotics came more readily to mind as a means of identification than the names of the new, artificial town-demes; cf. Raubitschek, *Actes du deuxième congrès international d'épigraphie grecque et latine*, 67-9.) A previously unknown patronymic may reveal unsuspected relationships. The outstanding example here is that of the demagogue Kleophon, where the literary evidence is united on his low social status and foreign birth (*PA* 8638). His ostraka show, firstly, that he was prominent enough to be a 'candidate' at the last ostracism, five to seven years earlier than his first appearance in literature, and, secondly, that he was son of a Kleippides of Acharnai. This makes it highly probable

that he was son of the general of 428 (see above) and 'candidate' of 443 (see below), and forces modification of ideas about his social status (Vanderpool, *Hesp.* xxi (1952) 114 f., xxxvii (1968) 120; for a likely brother, Philinos, see Raubitschek, *Hesp.* xxiii (1954) 68-71).

Even more interesting are the rare instances where the voter felt the need to add something to the name of his 'candidate'. This might be purely descriptive; *Εὐχαρίδην θεσμο(θέτην) | Εὐχάρος* (*Ath. Mitt.* xl (1915) 17; note the accusative and the Ionic *eta*) serves no other purpose. The ostrakon quoted above, identifying Kallixenos as an Alkmeonid, may have both descriptive and pejorative motives. These last come out more strongly elsewhere. On one sherd (*Hesp.* xix (1950) 378 f., 389 f.) the restoration [*Καλλίχσενος | [ho pr]οδότες* seems inevitable, and this makes *Μένον | ἐκκ προ[δοτ]ῶν* tempting on *Kerameikos*, iii. 71-2 (*Hesp.* xix 379 n., xxiv 288 f.). [- - -]s ἄτιμ[ος] (*Hesp.* xix. 379, 390) may be more imprecatory than pejorative. More complex problems are raised by two pieces which on the face of them accuse Aristides of pro-Persian leanings and harshness to suppliants. As restored by Raubitschek (*Charites: Studien zur Altertumswissenschaft*, ed. K. Schauenburg, pp. 240-2) they run *Ἀριστ[είδεν] | τὸν Δά[τριδος] | ἀδελφ[όν]* and [*Ἀριστείδες | ho Λυσιμ]άχο | [hὸς τὸ]s ηικέτας | ἀπέοσ]εϛ*.

Pride of place among these texts goes to a kylix-foot found on the western slope of the Areopagus, incised with an elegiac couplet in two concentric circles (Raubitschek, *AJA* li (1947) 257-61; Broneer, *ibid.* lii. 341-3; Schweigert, *ibid.* liii. 266-8; Wilhelm, *Wien. Anz.* 1949, 237).

*Χσάνθ[ιππον τόδε] φεσὶν ἀλειτερόν πρυτάνειον
τῶστρακ[ον Ἀρρί]φρονος παῖδα μά[λ]ιστ' ἀδίκην.*

[*κατά]φεισιν* Raubitschek, Broneer, Schweigert; [*τόδε*] Wilhelm. *ἀλειτερόν* Raubitschek, Broneer; *ἀλειτέρον* (= *ἀλιτήριον*) Schweigert; *ἀλειτερόν* Wilhelm. *πρυτανεῖον* Raubitschek, Broneer; *πρυτάνειον* (= *πρυτάνειων*) Schweigert, Wilhelm.

Tempting though it was to suggest that *ἀλειτερόν* was accusative and that Xanthippos had acquired the Alkmeonid curse through his marriage, neither 'the cursed Xanthippos wrongs the sacred hearth' (Raubitschek) nor 'wrongs the Prytaneion (by his excessive claims to public entertainment)' (Broneer) were really satisfactory. Schweigert's solution 'a curse to the leaders, doing most wrong' does not run easily, and we prefer Wilhelm's solution: 'This ostrakon says that Xanthippos son of Ariphton does most wrong of all the cursed leaders.'

3. So far we have been dealing with contributions of a type not essentially different from that of those made by inscriptions on stone or bronze. Many of the contributions made by ostraka, however, are

more peculiarly 'archaeological', making their point by their context rather than by their individual evidence.

The ostracism of the elder Alcibiades (Lys. xiv. 39, [Andoc.] iv. 34) used to be placed in the blank year 485 (see above; Carcopino, *L'ostracisme athénien*², 145-8; Hatzfeld, *Alcibiade*, 13-15). Against this we can now muster the negative fact that no ostrakon attributable to him has appeared in the large number of ostraka sealed in Persian debris, and the positive facts that, of the six ostraka which are attributable to him, two are from kylikes of the second quarter of the century and one of these is in a sealed deposit of that quarter-century (Vanderpool, *Hesp.* xxi (1952) 1-8). This and the patronymic, Kleinias, necessitate a rewriting of the stemma of the family and an abandonment of 485 as a date for the ostracism, whatever the ultimate fate of Vanderpool's suggestion of 460 as the exact date.

Light on the organization of an ostracism is thrown by a group of 191 ostraka, all designed for use against Themistocles, found in a well on the north slope of the Acropolis (Broneer, *Hesp.* vii (1938) 228-41). The types of pottery represented are so few that we are entitled to suggest that most of the pieces had formed part of a potter's stock. More striking still, it can be seen that the sherds were inscribed by only fourteen different hands. We have here the work of a *hetairia*, preparing votes for voters too illiterate or too lazy to do the job themselves, though the group presents such uniformity that it is highly improbable that it was ever used. Archaeologically, it seems slightly more likely that the sherds were prepared for an ostracism in the late 480s than for the final successful campaign against Themistocles.

The kind of evidence we should most like to have would be sealed deposits of ostraka, of which one could say with confidence that they all came from one ostrakophoria, with no intrusive evidence, earlier or later, and large enough in number to be statistically significant. We should then have some clear idea of who the principal candidates were in any particular year. Such evidence is still in very short supply. We list those deposits which may be helpful.

A (*Hesp.* xv (1946) 265 ff., esp. 271-5 = Hands, *JHS* lxxix (1959) 77 Group E). This deposit from a rock-cut shaft does not represent a single deposit, but is stratified and sealed. Lowest in the shaft, from 9 to 8.45 m. down, were three ostraka of Μεγακλῆς Ἴπποκράτος. Also at 8.45 m. was a sherd probably of [ἡ]ππάρχος Χά[ρ]μ[ο], and another of Βουτ[αλίου] | Ἐπ[-] (Μαραθώνιος). At 8 m. there were two votes for ποκράτες Ἀναχσιλέο, at 7.40 m. two for Kallixenos. At 6 m. there were three sherds of Hipparchos, Themistocles, Aristides, and [ἡ]πποκράτες Ἰκμεονίδο. At 5 and 4.50 m. there were two more sherds of Aristides. All these were sealed by Persian debris. If we except the second Hipparchos sherd, which must have reached the shaft rather late,

the stratification coheres with Aristotle's account and suggests that Boutalion and Hippokrates son of Anaxileos were candidates early in the decade, Themistocles, Aristides, and Hippokrates son of Alkmeonides rather later. The evidence for Kallixenos is inconclusive.

In the remaining pre-Persian deposits the names of Themistocles, Aristides, Kallixenos, and Hippokrates son of Alkmeonides are dominant. The excavators of the Agora have held (e.g. *Hesp.* Suppl. iv. 33 n.) that this is because the ostraka of 482 were still lying about when the Persians came. Hands (loc. cit.), rightly in our opinion, suggests that some of these deposits may belong to a vote in 483, unrecorded because the required number of votes was not cast and no one was ostracized. Statistically, our deposits B and C seem distinguishable from our D, E, F.

B (*Hesp.* ix (1940) 301-2, Suppl. viii. 395, Hands Group A (modified figures)). This apparently coherent deposit is distributed as follows: Themistocles 65, Kallixenos 43, Hippokrates son of Alkmeonides 43, Aristides 2, miscellaneous 5, uncertain 6.

C (*Hesp.* xvii (1948) 193 f., Hands Group B (modified figures)). This large group did not settle till c. 415 and there was ample time for both earlier and later pieces to have intruded. But the ostraka seem to be a coherent unit, and, with reservations, may be treated as such. The distribution is: Themistocles 172, Kallixenos 165, Hippokrates son of Alkmeonides 48, Aristides 5, miscellaneous (eight different names) 20, uncertain about 80.

D (*Hesp.* Suppl. iv. 33, Hands Group C). A closed deposit, distributed: Themistocles 18, Kallixenos 9, Hippokrates son of Alkmeonides 7, Aristides 5.

E (unpublished, Hands Group D). Distribution: Themistocles 23, Kallixenos 4, Hippokrates son of Alkmeonides 2, Aristides 18.

F (*Hesp.* xxiii (1954) 54, Hands Group F). Distribution: Themistocles 2, Kallixenos 9, Hippokrates son of Alkmeonides 3, Aristides 3.

Even in deposits D, E, F, Aristides is nowhere in a majority. This may be a by-product of the fact that they are smaller and less statistically significant than B, C, but if we take B and C on one hand and D, E, and F on the other, there does seem to be a noticeable shift of votes away from the Alkmeonids, Kallixenos and Hippokrates, against Aristides.

G Of the deposits after 480, the excavators of the Kerameikos seem reluctant to attribute any unity to a group found in 1932 which included 64 votes against Kimon and 80 against Menon (*Kerameikos*, iii. 51-83). It does include at least one obviously intrusive piece, against Phaiax, but we see no obvious reason to deny that the bulk of the Kimon and Menon ostraka belong to the same year, or, necessarily, to affirm that that year has to be the year of Kimon's ostracism.

H (*Ath. Mitt.* xl (1915) 7-20; Carcopino, op. cit. 80 f., 88). This deposit seems a unit. Distribution: Thucydides son of Melesias 11, Kleippides 24, miscellaneous (Andocides, Teisandros, Eucharides) 3, uncertain 5. The ostrakon of Damon son of Damonides (*Ath. Mitt.* xl. 20 f.) was not found in this deposit. Brueckner, in publishing this group, suggested a date between Kimon's death in 449 and the ostracism of Thucydides in 443, at which Pericles and not Kleippides must have been his principal opponent. The view was refined by Rosenberg (*Neue Jahrb.* xviii (1915) 205-12), who explained the absence of votes against Pericles by an agreement among the conservatives to concentrate against Kleippides, say in 445. This view has its attractions, but it is clearly vulnerable to suggestions that the absence of Pericles is due to the smallness of the sample or to the removal of votes against him for separate counting. Koerte (*Ath. Mitt.* xlvii (1922) 1-5) saw no reason to doubt that the deposit belonged to the ostracism of 443.

Vanderpool, *Hesp.* Suppl. viii. 408-11, gave a list of known ostraka with select bibliography to 1946, which had to be supplemented by *Hesp.* xvii (1948) 194 for the large finds of 1947. We owe to Vanderpool's generosity the revised summary list we print here. Through his bibliography and the articles cited above, most published photographs and drawings should be traceable; see also *IIA* Pl. 12, 16. For discussions of ostracism in the light of reasonably up-to-date knowledge of the ostraka, Raubitschek, *Actes du deuxième congrès international d'épigraphie grecque et latine*, 61-74 (= *Class. Journ.* xlvi (1952-3) 113-22), and Hands, *JHS* lxxix (1959) 69-79 stand more or less alone.

As we go to press, news reaches us of very large finds of ostraka in the Kerameikos, continuing those reported in *Archaeological Reports for 1965-66*, p. 5. We are told that they provide, for example, clear evidence that Themistocles was a candidate in 486.

KNOWN OSTRAKA

	<i>Agora</i>	<i>Else- where</i>	<i>Total</i>
Abronichos (Lysikleous) Lamptreus	4	0	4
Acharnion Xypetaion	3	0	3
Alkibiades Kleiniou Skambonides (the elder)	7	1	8
Alkibiades Kleiniou Skambonides (the younger)	3	0	3
[Ando]kides [Leog]orou	0	1	1
Archenos Philoxenou	1	0	1
Arist- Charop-	1	0	1
Arista- Timo-	1	0	1
Aristeides Lysimachou Alopekethen	61	0	61
Boutalion Ep- Marathionios	7	0	7
Charias Paianieus	1	0	1

	<i>Agora</i>	<i>Else- where</i>	<i>Total</i>
Charias Ph- -dou	1	0	1
Damon Damonidou	0	1	1
Dieitrephes Euthoinou (<i>Hesp.</i> xxxvii. 118 f.)	3	0	3
Dionysios -onou	3	0	3
Eratyllos Kattariou	3	0	3
Eret[rieus]	1	0	1
Eucharides Eucharous Thesmo(thetes)	0	1	1
Eukrates	1	0	1
Eupolis Thoraieus	1	0	1
Gnathon Echekleous	0	1	1
Habron Patrokleous Marathonios	11	0	11
Hierokl- Herma-	1	0	1
Hipparchos Charmou (Kollyteus)	11	0	11
Hippokles Menippou	2	1	3
Hippokrates Alkmeonidou Alopekethen	123	2	125
Hippokrates Anaxileo	8	2	10
Hippokrates (uncertain which)	21	0	21
Hyperbolos Antiphanous (Perithoides)	2	0	2
Kallias Didymiou	3	0	3
Kallias Kratiou	2	1	3
Kallixenos Aristonymou Xypetaion	262	1	263
Kimon Miltiadou (Lakiades)	4	67	71
Kleiboulos Nikodemou	2	0	2
Kleippides Deiniou Acharneus	0	25	25
Kleophon Kleippidou Acharneus	3	0	3
Kritias Leaidou	2	0	2
Kydrakles Timokratous Kriothen	17	2	19
Laispodias ek Koiles	1	0	1
Megakles Hippokratous Alopekethen	12	3	15
Melanthios Phalanthou	3	0	3
Menestratos	0	1	1
Menon Menekleidou Gargettios	4	80	84
Onomastos Konthyleus	1	0	1
Panaitios Agrylethen	1	0	1
Perikles Xanthippou (Cholargeus)	2	0	2
Phaiax Erasistratou Acharneus	3	1	4
Phalanthos Spintharou	1	0	1
Phileas Derketou	1	0	1
Phileriphos	0	1	1
Philinos Kleippidou (Acharneus)	1	0	1
Philippos	0	1	1
Polytimos Prasi(eus)	0	1	1
Sokrates Anagyrasios	1	0	1
[Sp]intharos Eu[boulou Probalinthios?]	1	0	1
[Tei]sandros [E]pilykou	0	1	1
Themistokles Neokleous Phrearrhios	373	195	568

	Agora	Else- where	Total
Theotimos Kleainou	0	1	1
Thrasylkes	1	0	1
Thukydides Melesiou (Alopekethen)	1	13	14
Xanthippos Arriphronos (Cholargeus)	15	2	17
Fragments	240	14	254
	<u>1,238</u>	<u>420</u>	<u>1,658</u>

22

A Spartan Dedication: (?) 490-480 B.C.

A hollow cylindrical base of Laconian stone, found in the Altis at Olympia; now in the Olympia Museum.

In one line, Laconian alphabet. Phot. and facs.: *JHS* lxix (1949) 27, 29. *SEG* xi. 1203a+; Jeffery, *JHS* lxix. 26-30; Buck 68; *LSAG* 196, no. 49+.

[δέξ]ο Φάν[α]ξ Κρονίδα{ι} Ζεῦ Ὀλύμπιε καλὸν ἄγαλμα
 λιλέφο[ι θυ]μδι τοῖ(λ) Λακεδαιμονίοις.

τοῦ ναοῦ δέ ἐστιν ἐν δεξιᾷ τοῦ μεγάλου Ζεὺς πρὸς ἀνατολὰς ἡλίου, μέγεθος μὲν δωδέκα ποδῶν, ἀνάθημα δὲ λέγουσιν εἶναι Λακεδαιμονίων, ἡνίκα ἀποσταῖσι Μεσσηνίοις δεύτερα τότε ἐς πόλεμον κατέστησαν. ἔπεστι δὲ καὶ ἐλεγείον ἐπ' αὐτῷ,

δέξο ἀναξ Κρονίδα Ζεῦ Ὀλύμπιε καλὸν ἄγαλμα
 ἰλάω θυμῷ τοῖς Λακεδαιμονίοις. (Paus. v. 24. 3)

That this monument in fact refers to the Second Messenian War of the seventh century is out of the question, and it has generally been attributed to the Helot Revolt which started in 465. There is hardly enough comparative material in the first half of the fifth century to make a firm date for the lettering possible, though in some respects it looks more archaic than one would expect *c.* 460. However, the nature of the base suggests that the statue was not anthropomorphic, but a human head and arms surmounting a circular core sheathed in bronze, inserted directly into the base. This seems impossibly archaic for *c.* 460, but just possible *c.* 488. Jeffery, therefore, followed by Wallace (*JHS* lxxiv (1954) 32-5) and Huxley (*Early Sparta*, 88), would add this base to the scattered evidence (Plato, *Laws* iii. 692 d, 698 d-e; Strabo, viii. 4. 10, p. 362; Paus. iv. 23. 5-10) for Spartan trouble in Messenia around 490. Den Boer, on the other hand (*Hist.* v (1956) 168-74), regards a Messenian revolt at this date as a historical fiction. It must be noted that the epigram does not mention Messenia and Pausanias' information may be unreliable (cf. Pearson, *Hist.* xi (1962) 421 n. 56).

23

The Decree of Themistocles: 480 B.C.

A marble stele, found near the church of Hagia Soteira at Damala (Troizen); now in EM.

Third-century lettering, ll. 4-47 stoichedon 42 (ll. 38-41, 43). Phot.: *Hesp.* xxix (1960) 200 (enlargement of part of ll. 30-5, *ibid.* xxxi. 413). All non-textual criteria for dating the stele are discussed by Dow, *AJA* lxvi (1962) 353-68.

Editio princeps: Jameson, *Hesp.* xxix (1960), 198-223; a new text incorporating suggestions by others, Jameson, *ibid.* xxxi (1962), 310-15. Critical bibliography: Dow, *Classical World*, lv. 105-8; Chambers, *Philologus* cxi (1967) 166-9. We confine ourselves to recommending as an introduction to the problems involved: Habicht, *Hermes*, lxxxix (1961) 1-35; Amandry, *Bull. de la Faculté des Lettres de Strasbourg*, xxxviii (1961) 413-35; Hignett, *Xerxes' Invasion of Greece*, 458-68; Burn, *Persia and the Greeks*, 364-77 (hostile to authenticity); the *editio princeps*; Berve, *Sitzb. Münch.* 1961, no. 3, 1-50; Jameson, *Hist.* xii (1963) 385-404; Meritt, (*Lectures in Memory of L. T. Semple*, i. 119-32 (favourable).

[θεοί.]

ἔδοξ[εν] τῆι βουλῆι καὶ τῶι δήμῳ·

Θεμισ[τοκλ]ῆς Νεοκλέους Φρεάρριος εἶπεν·

- τῆ[μ] μὲν πόλιν παρ[ακατ]αθέσθαι τῆι Ἀθηναί τῆι Ἀθηνῶ-
 5 μ [μυδεο]ύ[σῃ] κ[αὶ τοῖς ἄλλ]οις θεοῖς ἅπασιν φυλάττει-
 ν κα[ὶ] ἀμ[ύ]νειν τὸμ βάρβαρ[ο]ν ὑπὲρ τῆς χώρας· Ἀθηναίου-
 [ς δ' ἅπ]α[ντας καὶ τοὺς ξένο]υς τοὺς οἰκοῦντας Ἀθήνησι
 [τὰ τέκν]α καὶ τὰς γυναῖκ[α]ς εἰ[ς] Τροιζήνα καταθέσθαι
 τ[.....20.....] τοῦ ἀρχηγέτου τῆς χώρας· τ-
 10 [οὺς δὲ πρεσβύτας καὶ τὰ] κτήματα εἰς Σαλαμίνα καταθ-
 έ[σ]θ[αι]· τοὺς δὲ ταμίας καὶ τ[ὰς] ἱερέας ἐν τῆι ἀκροπόλε-
 [ι μένειν φυλάττοντας τὰ τῶ]ν θεῶν· τοὺς δὲ ἄλλους Ἀθη-
 [ναίους ἅπαντας καὶ τοὺς ξέ]νους τοὺς ἡβῶντας εἰσβαί-
 νειν εἰ[ς] τὰς ἐτοιμασθ[ε]ί[σ]α[ς] διακοσίας ναῦς καὶ ἀμύ-
 15 νεσ[θαι] τ[ὸμ] βάρβαρον ὑπὲρ τῆ[ς] ἐλευθερίας τῆς τε ἑαυ-
 τῶν [καὶ τῶν ἄλλων Ἑλλήνων] μετὰ Λακεδαιμονίων καὶ Κο-
 ρινθίων καὶ Αἰγινήτων] καὶ τῶν ἄλλων τῶμ βουλομένων-
 [ν] κοιων[ήσῃ]ν τοῦ κινδύνου· καταστῆσαι δὲ καὶ τριη-
 [ρ]ά[ρχους] διακοσίους ἕνα ἐπὶ τὴν ναῦν ἐκάστην τοὺς [σ]-
 20 τρατη[γ]οῦ[ς] ἀρχομένους τ[ῆ]ι αὔριον ἡμέραι ἐκ τῶν κ[εκ]-
 τημέν[ω]ν γ[ῆ]ν τ[ε] καὶ οἰκί[αν] Ἀθ[ῆ]νησι καὶ οἷς ἀμ παῖδ[ε]ς]

ὦσι γνή[σιοι μὴ πρεσβυτέρο]υς πενήκοντα ἐτῶν κα[ὶ ἐ]-
 πικλ[ηρώσαι αὐτ]οῖς [τ]ὰς ναῦς· ὅ ν καταλέξει δὲ καὶ ἐπ[ι]-
 βάτας [δ]έκα [ἐφ' ἐκάστη]ν ναῦν ἐκ τῶν ὑπὲρ εἴκοσιν ἔτη [γ]-
 25 εγονότω[ν μέχρι τριά]κοντα ἐτῶν καὶ τοξότας τέττα-
 ρα· δια[κληρώσαι δὲ κ]αὶ τὰς ὑπηρεσίας ἐπὶ τὰς ναῦς ὅτ-
 αμπερ κ[αὶ τοὺς τριηράρ]χους ἐπικληρώσιν· ἀναγράψα-
 ι δὲ κα[ὶ τοὺς ἄλλους κατὰ] ναῦν τοὺς στρατηγούς εἰς λ-
 ευκώ[ματα, τοὺς μὲν Ἀ]θηναίους ἐκ τῶν ληξιαρχικῶν γρ-
 30 αμματεί[ων, τοὺς] δὲ ξ[έν]ους ἐκ τῶν ἀπογεγραμμένων πα-
 [ρ]ὰ τῶι [πολε]μ[άρχ]ω[ι·] ἀναγράφειν δὲ νέμοντας κατὰ τάξ-
 εις [ε]ἰς διακοσίας ἄ[ν]ὰ ἑκατὸν ἀριθμὸν καὶ ἐπιγράψα-
 ι τῆ[ι] [τάξ]ει ἐκάστη τῆς τριήρους τὸ ὄνομα καὶ τοῦ τρι-
 35 ηράρχου καὶ τῆς ὑπηρε[σί]ας ὅπως ἂν εἰδῶσιν εἰς ὁποί-
 αν τριήρη ἐ[μ]βήσεται ἢ [τ]άξις ἐ[κ]άστη· ἐπειδὴν δὲ νεμη-
 θῶσιν ἅπα[σ]αι αἱ τάξεις καὶ ἐπικληρωθῶσι ταῖς τριή-
 ρεσι, πληροῦν ἅ[π]άσας τὰς διακοσίας ναῦς τῆμ βουλήν
 καὶ τ[ο]ῦ στρατηγού[ς θύ]σαντας ἀρεστήριον τῶι Διὶ τῶι
 Παγκρατεῖ καὶ τῆι Ἀθηνᾶι καὶ τῆι Νίκῃ καὶ τῶι Ποσει-
 40 δῶνι τῶι Ἀσφα[λ]είωι· ὅ ν ἐπειδὴν δὲ πεπληρωμένοι ὦσιν
 αἱ νῆες, τα[ῖ]ς μὲν ἑκατὸν αὐτῶν βοηθεῖν ἐπὶ τὸ Ἄρτεμιό[σ]-
 [ι]ον τῷ Εὐβοϊκόν, ταῖς δὲ ἑκατὸν αὐτῶν περὶ τὴν Σαλαμ-
 ῖνα καὶ τὴν ἄλλην Ἀττικὴν ναυλοχεῖν καὶ φυλάττειν
 τὴν χώραν· ὅπως δ' ἂν καὶ ὁμοροοῦντες ἅπαντες Ἀθηναῖοι
 45 ἀμύνωνται τὸμ βάρβαρον, τοὺς μὲν μεθεστηκότας τὰ [δ]-
 [έκα] ἔτη ἀπέναι εἰς Σαλαμίνα καὶ μένειν αὐτοὺς ἐ[κ]-
 [ε]ἰ ἔως ἂν τι τῶι δήμ]ωι δόξῃ περὶ αὐτῶν· τοὺς δὲ [ἀτίμου]-
 [ς - - - - -] traces [- - - - -]

Jameson's second text is the basis of ours, but we have taken into account Hardy and Pritchett, *BSA* lix (1964) 30-1, and further unpublished notes by Jameson. The stone has suffered damage on the left, but some of the restorations are assured by quotations in Plutarch and Aristides. In l. 7 δ' ἅπαντας was Habicht's restoration, which now seems to fit the traces better than Jameson's [ς δὲ α]ὐτ[οὺς]. For l. 9 Meritt suggests [προστάτου ὄντος Πιθέως], Habicht [εἰς παραθήκην τοῦ Θεσέως or Πιθέως]. (Hardy and Pritchett read the first letter as tau or zeta and Jameson accepts this.) In l. 28 ναῦτας (Woodhead, Stroud) is also possible. For l. 32 see Meritt, *Hesp.* xxxi (1962) 413. In l. 34 τῆς seems more likely than τ[ὰ]ς. In ll. 38-9 Amandry suggests τῶι Διὶ (καὶ) τῶι Παγκρατεῖ καὶ τῆι Ἀθηνᾶι {καὶ} τῆι Νίκῃ, and Meritt concurs in excising the second καὶ.

In 348 Aeschines was reciting the decree of Themistocles (Dem. xix. 303), and, whatever the precise date at which the text before us was put on stone, it is not seriously maintained that it differed greatly from his recitation, though one might doubt whether he went much further than our l. 18. The question is to what extent the text current in 348 represents what Themistocles may have said in 480. Extreme positions seem to us untenable. At an absolute minimum, an adherent of the view that we have a documentary reproduction of a decree of Themistocles will concede that editing has added Themistocles' patronymic and demotic in l. 3, elements not found in Attic documents much before 350, and eliminated the Attic spelling *Ἀθηναίαι* in ll. 4, 39. Those who hold the view that the decree was composed shortly before 348 by Aeschines or another surely cannot be maintaining that it was fabricated without any regard to the source-material available, taking that phrase in its widest sense. Between these two positions, the possibilities seem to us to form a continuum without a sharp dividing-line; no very wide gap, for example, seems to separate the treatments of Burn and Meritt, cited above as representatives of divergent views. To disregard the historical kernel of the decree altogether on the ground that it is irreconcilable with the narrative of Herodotus seems to us to assume what needs to be proved, even if it were not clear that the most irreconcilable of the assumed divergences depend on the proposition that what was decreed was done, a proposition not self-evidently true. (Consider, for instance, the situation which would arise if the first decree of No. 78 were preserved complete, to be matched with a narrative slightly less explicit than that of Thucydides about the prehistory of the organization of the Sicilian Expedition.)

Ll. 4-12 order the evacuation of Attica except the Acropolis. The cult-title *τῇι Ἀθηνῶν μεδεούσῃ* can be criticized as inappropriate and more normally used of Athena Polias looked at from outside Athens (cf. Preuner, *Ath. Mitt.* xlix (1924) 31-4), but Ar. *Knights* 763 perhaps defends it. *βάρβαρον* (ll. 6, 15, 45) is less dignified than the references to 'the Mede' usual in the period (cf. Nos. 24, 26), but, if Themistocles was being dignified, later paraphrases may have been less so, and cf. Thuc. i. 96. 1. *ἐν τῇι ἀκροπόλει* is an apparent anachronism for the Old Attic *ἐν πόλει* (cf. Thuc. ii. 15 and *CQ* xi (1961) 62); it can be accounted for by editing or a desire to avoid *πόλις* in a different sense from that in l. 4.

Ll. 12-18 order the mobilization of the fleet for the joint war of liberation. These lines have been accused of fourth-century rhetoric, but cf. Hdt. v. 64. 2, vii. 144. 3, 178. 2.

Ll. 18-35 contain the detailed provisions for mobilization (see Jameson, *Hist.* xii (1963) 385-404). They have been charged with

being too detailed and redolent of fourth-century practice. We do not feel that these charges have been made out. We confess to surprise that the qualifications for the trierarchs in ll. 21-2 contain no reference to the Solonian property-classes, but Habicht's view that there were no bastards in Athens before Pericles' citizenship-law of 451-0 (Arist. *Ἄθ. Πολ.* 26. 4) seems to rest on a misunderstanding. The charge that ten ἐπιβάται is an impossibly small number for an Athenian fleet in 480, based on Hdt. vi. 15. 1, vii. 184. 2, Thuc. i. 49. 1, is substantially neutralized by Thuc. i. 14. 3, Plut. *Cimon* 12. 2. Some doubt attaches to the ὑπηρεσίαι (l. 26); in the classical period this word covers the specialist officers (cf. Richardson, *CQ* xxxvii (1943) 55-61, Lewis, *CQ* n.s. xi (1961) 64) and excludes the ἐπιβάται. Jameson rightly argues that, if this is the case here, provision is made for the selection of the ἐπιβάται, but not their assignment to ships, and for the assignment of the specialists, but not for their selection; he therefore concludes that here the ὑπηρεσίαι are the marines and archers, an unparalleled use, impossible for a fourth-century forger. It might, we suppose, be argued that the conclusion from the normal sense of the word is that the details of the mobilization are not logically worked out, thus betraying the hand of a forger; this seems less convincing. The ληξιαρχικὰ γραμματεῖα (ll. 29-30) are deme-registers; Habicht's belief that *thetes* were not listed on them in 480 is refuted by Meritt. Ll. 31-5 are very difficult, and have been read and interpreted variously. If the readings given here are right, which seems probable, we see no escape from the conclusion that the aim is to provide a minimum of 100 rowers for each trireme. The normal was 200 (cf. Hdt. viii. 17); is it really credible that a forger's desire for verisimilitude would be so strong as to reconstruct a procedure calculated to put as many ships to sea as possible rather than simply use the normal number?

Ll. 35-45 order the manning of the fleet after preliminary sacrifice, and outline a basic strategic plan by which 100 ships are to move to Artemision and 100 will remain near Salamis and Attica. Various doubts can be raised about the gods named in ll. 38-40, and there may be some misplacing of the καί's. Pankrates is certainly normally a hero distinct from Zeus, but cf. Aesch. *Eum.* 917-20. Nike is generally Athena Nike, but compare the oracle in Hdt. viii. 77. For Poseidon Asphaleios, cf. Ar. *Ach.* 682. Herodotus' account gives us the final disposition of forces at Artemision as 147 Athenian ships (20 manned by Chalkis; viii. 1. 2), reinforced later by another 53 (viii. 14. 1).

Ll. 44 ff. order those ostracized, perhaps already back in Athens, to Salamis and may have passed on to considering other exiles (cf. *Andoc.* i. 77).

Relatively few of the points of detail which have been raised against

the decree have turned out to be decisive, but this is of course not the whole story. It can hardly be denied that the whole document runs more smoothly than other official documents of the period (cf. Amandry, *op. cit.* 416 f.) and that it is relatively free from hiatus (*CQ* xi (1961) 66). What importance is to be attached to this turns on the type of transmission which has to be assumed for the period 480–348, and on this our ignorance is nearly absolute. Against this superficial fluency it may be argued that ll. 41–3 are remarkably inelegant, and that it is surprising that a forger failed to call metics metics (ll. 7, 30) or the ostracized ostracized (ll. 45–6). (These seem to be the surviving points from an attempt to show that there was ‘no reason to suspect forgery. There are too many traces of official and archaic language’, Lewis, *CQ* xi. 61–6.)

This is not the place to discuss the allied strategy of the year 480, but a few points may be made. If our decree is a unit, it must be placed between the failure of the expedition to Tempe and the manning of the Artemision–Thermopylae position, which seems in any case to be the context of *Hdt.* vii. 144. 3: ἔδοξέ τέ σφι μετὰ τὸ χρηστήριον βουλευομένοισι ἐπιόντα ἐπὶ τὴν Ἑλλάδα τὸν βάρβαρον δέκεσθαι τῆσι νηυσὶ πανδημεί, τῷ θεῷ πειθομένους, ἅμα Ἑλλήνων τοῖσι βουλομένοισι. That the evacuation of civilians is ordered so early is not necessarily incompatible with the fact that, according to Herodotus, it happened later, nor is it entirely surprising that, at the time of the decree, Athens was not yet prepared to commit all her forces to Artemision. That our decree already has Salamis in view as a fleet-station (ll. 42–3) raises no problems other than those already caused by the appearance of Salamis in the closing lines of the second Delphic oracle to Athens (*Hdt.* vii. 141).

24 (16)

Epitaph of the Corinthians who died at Salamis:

480 B.C.

Marble block found at Ambelaki on the island of Salamis; now in EM.

Archaic Corinthian alphabet. Phot.: Kern 9; *LSAG*, Pl. 21. 29.

IG i². 927; *LSAG* 129, 132 (29); Carpenter, *AJA* lxxvii (1963) 209; Boegehold, *Gk. Rom. Byz. Stud.* vi (1965) 179–86.

[Ὁ ξένε, εὐλυδρ]όν ποκ' ἐναίομες ἄστν Φορίνθο,

[νὸν δ' ἡμὲ Αἴα]γτος [νᾶσος ἔχει Σαλαμῖς].

[ἐνθάδε Φοινίσσας νᾶας καὶ Πέρσας ἡελόντες]

[καὶ Μέδους ἡιρὰν ἡελλάδα ῥυσάμεθα].

Other letters have been added later. Four letters above letters 14–18 in l. 1 seem to be idle copying of the original letter-forms; there are also two letters, barely visible, just below letters 14 and 15 of l. 1.

In the Athenian version of the battle of Salamis, according to Herodotus (viii. 94), the Corinthian contingent fled as soon as battle was joined and returned only when the battle was won. Herodotus, however, knows that the Corinthian version was very different, and the rest of Greece, he says, agreed with them. Plutarch (*de Mal. Hdt.* 39), in attacking Herodotus, says that the Athenians allowed the Corinthians to bury their dead on Salamis and he quotes this epitaph. Together with [Dio Chrysostom], xxxvii. 18, he adds a second couplet:

Ἐνθάδε Φοινίσσας νῆας καὶ Πέρσας ἐλόντες
καὶ Μήδους, ἱερὰν Ἑλλάδα ῥυσάμεθα.

l. 1. [Dio] has *ῥεῖα δὲ*. l. 2. *ῥυσάμεθα* Jacobs; *Ἑλλάδ' ἰδρυσάμεθα* [Dio.]

Rhys Carpenter, emphasizing the archaic character of the writing and the absence of the second couplet, attributed this epitaph to Corinthians who may have helped Megara in the fighting against Athens for Salamis in Solon's time, *c.* 600. He also thinks that the lettering is Megarian. These last lines do not survive on the stone and it was generally held that they derived from a literary tradition. Boegehold, however, in a thorough examination of the stone, points out that a hollow has been worn where two additional lines could have been inscribed. We follow his text, but in l. 4 we prefer *ῥυσάμεθα* to his *ῥηνόμεθα*. The epigram is attributed by [Dio] to Simonides; it is at least Simonidean. The triangular tailless rho, which led Rhys Carpenter to infer that the lettering was Megarian, is amply illustrated in Corinth (Boegehold, 181, n. 7).

25 (18)

Dedication of the Athenian Portico at Delphi:

(?) 479 B.C.

On the highest of the three steps of the stylobate of the Athenian Portico at Delphi, built on the north side of the Sacred Way against the polygonal wall that supports the terrace of the temple of Apollo.

Attic letters including ⊕, ζ. Phot.: *FD* ii (as below), Pl. 23. Facs.: *Imag.* 73 (23).

SIG 29; Pomtow, *Rh. Mus.* xlix (1894) 627–9; Amandry, *FD* ii, *-La Colonne des Naxiens et le Portique des Athéniens*, 37–121.

Ἀθηναῖοι ἀνέθεσαν τὴν στοὰν καὶ τὰ ἡόπλ[α κ]αὶ τὰ κροτέρια ἠελόντες
τὸν πολε[μίου]ν.

Pausanias (x. 11. 6) associates the portico with Phormio's victories in the Corinthian Gulf in 429, and an inscription which he saw listed the allies who fought with Sparta, and also specified a sacrifice to Theseus and Poseidon at Rhion. In the portico he saw ships' prows and bronze shields. The inscription that survives, however, has letter forms that should not be later than 470, and might be as early as 510.

Until recently it was assumed that the *hόπλα* of the inscription were arms, and the Athenian victory commemorated was thought to be either over the Bocotians and Chalkidians (c. 506) or the Aeginetans (between 500 and 480), or over the Persians at Salamis. Amandry (op. cit.) has suggested that the *hόπλα* are cables from the Persian bridges over the Hellespont, and that the *ἀκροτέρια* are from the ships that formed the bridges; he emphasizes the suitability of the portico's design for this purpose. His attractive hypothesis is not quite compelling. Would *ἐλόντες* be the right word for the recovery of the cables which had been taken to Kardias when the bridges broke up, and were handed over to the Greeks at Sestos (Hdt. ix. 115)? Would the Mede not be called a Mede? If cables had been dedicated at Delphi, would they not have been a joint-dedication by the Greeks? The letter-forms have been used as evidence for both high and low dates. They are not decisive, but no other surviving Athenian public inscription, which can be dated, has ⊕ after 490.

26

Athenian Epigrams on the Persian Wars

Two fragments of a base; the right-hand one found in Hadrian Street to the north-east of the Acropolis, the left-hand one in the Agora, both in modern houses, so that no conclusion can be drawn about their original situation; both now in the Agora Museum. The dressing of the left edge, closely corresponding to that of the front, rules out Wilhelm's theory (*Anz. Wien.*, 1934, 105 f.) that the texts are to be read vertically downwards (Oliver, *Hesp.* v (1936) 228). The right-hand fragment has traces of a cutting in the top; if it is original, it must be at least one of a pair. These cuttings have been attributed to stelai (Raubitschek, *AJA* xlv (1940) 56-9) and to herms (Meritt in *The Aegean and the Near East, Studies Presented to Hetty Goldman*, 274 f.); the relevance of the cutting to the original form of the monument has been doubted (Oliver, *AJA* xlv. 483 f.; Amandry, in *Θεωρία, Festschrift für W.-H. Schuchhardt*, 8, n. 18).

There are two inscriptions. The first, on the original smooth band which ran round the face of the base, is stoichedon, with punctuation marks of three dotted circles, and is certainly by the same stone-cutter as *IG* i². 3-4 (485-4 B.C.). Later, a new panel was smoothed in the stippled area

below the upper band to receive the second, non-stoichedon inscription. Our general impression of the letter-forms is that the two inscriptions might be as much as fifteen years apart, but they could be virtually contemporary. Phot.: *Hesp.* ii (1933) 481-2, *IIA* 19.

Work on the document falls into three phases. The first phase, before the publication of the left-hand fragment by Oliver (*Hesp.* ii (1933) 480-94), is now of little importance. Of the second phase, Jacoby, *Hesp.* xiv (1945) 161-85, gives a useful bibliography and *apparatus criticus*, to which add: *SEG* x. 404; Vollgraff, *Mélanges Grégoire*, i. 621-4; Gomme, *HCT* ii. 98-9; Peek, *Studies Presented to D. M. Robinson*, ii. 305-12. The third phase opened with Meritt, *The Aegean and the Near East* (v. *sup.*), 268-80, in which he published what is almost certainly a fourth-century copy of the first epigram. Thereafter add: Peek, *Hermes*, lxxxviii (1960) 494-8; Amandry, *Θεωρία* (v. *sup.*), 1-8; Pritchett, *Marathon* (*Cal. Publ. Class. Arch.* iv), 160-8 (these three simultaneous and independent of each other); Meritt, *AJP* lxxxiii (1962) 294-8.

I ἀνδρῶν τῶνδ' ἀρετε[....9.....ος ἄφθιτον] αἰεῖ[!]
 | [■][....8....]ν[.]ρ[....9..... νέμωσι θεοί:] |
 ἔσχον γὰρ πεζοί τε [καὶ ὀκνύορον ἐπὶ νεῶν]
 ἡλλά[δα μ] ἐ πᾶσαν δούλιο[ν ἔμαρ ἰδέν:] |

II ἐν ἄρα τοῖσζ' ἀδαμ[α - - - - -] ἥοτ' αἰχμὲν
 στῆσαμ πρόσθε πυλῶν ἀν[- - - - -] |
 ἀνχίαλομ πρῆσαι ρ[- - - - -] |
 ἄστυ βίαι Περσῶν κλινάμενο[ι - - -]. |

I. The fourth-century copy (v. *sup.*) has:

]ος ἄφθι[- - -]
]νέμωσι θεοί·
]ὀκνύορων ἐπὶ νηῶν
]ον ἤμαρ ἰδεῖν.

By fixing the text of the second hexameter, it determines the length of the lacuna in the first hexameter, showing earlier suggestions to be two letters too long; of current suggestions, we would prefer ἀρετέ[ς ἔσται κλέος (Peek) to ἀρετέ [δόχσει κλέος or λάμφσει φάος (Meritt), but it raises difficulties in the fourth-century text, maintained by Meritt to be substantially stoichedon. Readings in the first pentameter have been recently disputed (Pritchett, *AJP* lxxxv (1964) 50-5, Meritt, *ibid.* 417). Whether there is a vertical in the first space or not, and the balance of opinion is in its favour, we agree with Peek and Meritt that the punctuation mark before it does not take a letter-space and that there were nine, not eight, letters before the nu. The nu and the rho may be taken as certain; between them Meritt reads an epsilon, denied by Pritchett and which we cannot confirm. After the rho, Meritt, but not Pritchett, sees traces of the bottom of gamma or chi; we incline to agree. The only current restoration which fits the traces is ἡ[οῖς κᾶν εἰ]ν ἔργ[οις ἐσθλὰ νέμωσι θεοί] (Meritt), 'No matter to whom in

deeds of war the gods may grant success'; we would prefer a clause with the sense 'as long as'; that exactly nine letters are missing after the rho depends on the fourth-century text's being stoichedon.

II. τοῖσζ' = τοῖσσδε. Nu is preferable to gamma at the end of the first pentameter, rho to beta at the end of the second hexameter, but neither reading is quite certain. To Jacoby's apparatus, and his preference for Wilhelm's text:

ἐν ἄρα τοῖσζ' ἀδάμ[αντος ἐνὶ φρεσὶ θυμός], ἥοτ' αἰχμὲν
στέσαμ πρόσθε πυλὸν ἀγ[τία τοχσοφόρον.]
ἀγχίαλομ πρέσαι β[ολευσαμένον δ' ἔσάοσαν]
ἄστν, βίαι Περσὸν κλινάμενο[ι στρατιάν.]

we add:

ἐν ἄρα τοῖσζ' ἀδάμ[ας ἐν στέθει θυμός], ἥοτ' αἰχμὲν
στέσαμ πρόσθε πυλὸν ἀγ[τία μυριάσιν,]
ἀγχίαλομ πρέσαι β[ολευσαμένον ἐρικυδές]
ἄστν βίαι Περσὸν κλινάμενο[ι στρατιάν.] (Meritt),

and:

ἐν ἄρα τοῖσζ' ἀδάμ[αντος ἐνὶ φρεσὶν ἔτορ], ἥοτ' αἰχμὲν
στέσαμ πρόσθε πυλὸν ἀγ[τία δυσμενέσιν]
ἀγχίαλομ πρέσαι β[ολευσαμένοις καὶ ἔσοσαν]
ἄστν, βίαι Περσὸν κλινάμενο[ι δύνάμν.] (Peek).

That the second epigram refers to a campaign in which the Athenians fought by land and saved the city from burning, i.e. Marathon, has been agreed by all save Gomme, and the connection of thought which he would have suggested to support his view that Salamis was referred to is not very clear to us. πρόσθε πυλὸν is no serious obstacle to this view, if we take it to indicate the contrast between the Athenians' conduct and that of the Eretrians who stayed within their walls (Hdt. vi. 101) rather than a precise indication of place; the Maas-Raubitschek theory that the epigram refers to a skirmish at Phaleron or Kynosarges in 490, not mentioned by Herodotus, has not found support.

One would naturally expect two epigrams on the same stone to refer to the same thing, and the dominant view in the second phase of work was that the first epigram also referred to Marathon. Hiller and Gomme were virtually the only exceptions. Hiller's suggested restoration of ὀκυπόρον ἐπὶ νεὸν after *Anth. Pal.* vii. 258, and his objection (not a very good one) that it could not have been asserted that Marathon saved all Greece from slavery (*Hermes*, lxi (1934) 204-6), were rejected with something very near contempt. The fourth-century copy shows that Hiller's restoration was right and strongly implies that his attribution was also right. Meritt still defends Marathon, but his interpretation of ὀκυπόρον ἐπὶ νεὸν as referring to the fight by the ships (Hdt. vi. 113-15) is very difficult. Pritchett and Amandry come out

firmly for Salamis (Pritchett's comparison with Aeschylus' *Persae* for the emphasis placed on the Athenian hoplite-engagement on Psyttaleia is particularly valuable), and, although Peek prefers to refer the text to all the operations of 480-79, this is largely because he wants to keep *SEG* xiii. 34 [- - - - - πρῶτοι τε καὶ ἡ[ιππέες - - - - - | - - - - -]ο νέσοι[- - -] as a text specifically about Salamis. It must then be held that to an epigram and a monument concerned with Salamis, an epigram about Marathon was later added, perhaps, as Amandry suggests, at the instigation of Cimon, son of the victor of Marathon and opponent of Themistokles.

The nature of the monument must remain uncertain. Oliver's view that τὸνδ' and τοῖσζ' referred specifically to the dead and his reconstruction of a cenotaph with a stele carrying lists of names now look very unattractive, since it is impossible to restore any reference to any deaths in the epigrams. It may well be that we have a monument parallel to the herm-monument set up for Eion (Aeschines iii. 183 ff., Plut. *Cimon* 7; Jacoby, *Hesp.* xiv. 185-211), but we still have very little to go on.

27 (19)

Greek Thank-offering for Victories in the Persian War: 479-8 B.C.

Engraved on the 'Serpent-Column', for which see commentary below. The bibliography of the monument as a whole is extensive, but unsatisfactory. For the surviving base at Delphi see Bourguet, *Les Ruines de Delphes*, 160-2, with Figs. 49-50; Pomtow, *RE*, Suppl. iv. 1406 f. For the monument as a whole see in particular Furtwängler, *Sitzb. München*, 1904, 413-17; Luckenbach, *Olympia und Delphi*, 54-7; Reisch, *RE* v. 1688 f.; Studniczka, *Zum plattäischen Weihgeschenk in Delphi* (Leipzig 1928); S. Casson, *Preliminary Report upon the Excavations carried out in the Hippodrome of Constantinople in 1927*, 12-14, with Fig. 17. One of the snakes' heads survives in the Istanbul Museum (Devambez, *Grands Bronzes du musée de Stamboul*, pp. 9-12, with Pl. ii).

Phocian, i.e. Delphic, alphabet (not Laconian; see Carpenter, *AJA* xlix (1945) 455 f.). Facs.: *Imag.* 101. 16 (whence *LSAG* Pl. 13 (part)).

SIG 31+; *DGE* 11; Buck 69; von Domaszewski, *Sitzb. Heidelberg*, 1920, 5. 4-8; Tosti, *Historia*, vii (1933) 433-9; Giannelli, *Atene e Roma*, xxxvi (1934) 103 f.; Larsen, *CP* xxxix (1944) 151, 154; *ATL* iii. 95-100; Papanтониου, *Πλάτων* vi (1954) 322-30; Cozzoli, *Ann. Univ. Napoli*, iv (1954) 2-24; *Staatsverträge* 130+.

- Coil* 1 το[ἶδε τὸν]
πόλεμον [ἐ]-
πολ[έ]μεον·
- 2 Λακεδ[αιμόνιοι]
Ἀθαναῖο[ι]
Κορίνθιοι
- 3 Τεγεᾶ[ται]
Σικυόν[ιο]ι
Αἰγινᾶται
- 4 Μεγαρῆς
Ἐπιδαύριοι
Ἐρχομένοι
- 5 Φλειάσιοι
Τροζάνιοι
Ἑρμιονῆς
- 6 Τιρύνθιοι
Πλαταιῆς
Θεσπιῆς
- 7 Μυκανῆς
Κεῖοι
Μάλιοι
Τένιοι
- 8 Νάξιοι
Ἑρετριῆς
Χαλκιδῆς
- 9 Στυρῆς
Φαλείοι
Ποτειδαῖται
- 10 Λευκάδιοι
Φανακτοριῆς
Κύθιοι
Σίφνιοι
- 11 Ἀμπρακιῶται
Λεπρεᾶται

We have numbered the inscribed coils only. For Coil 1 we follow the reading of Fabricius, supported by Jones, *Preliminary Report*, 43, and confirmed for us by Professor G. E. Bean in the essential point that ἐ[|πολ[έ]μεον and not Ἄ[|πόλ[λονι stands in l. 3; Meister, *Wien. Stud.* lxx (1957) 232 f., proposes το[ῖδε τὸν | Μέδον]. From squeezes made for us by Professor Bean, we are fairly confident that the intrusive name on coil 7 was Τένιοι, cut later, as has been generally thought, and not Μυκανῆς, the odd name geographically. More surprisingly, we find that the four names on coil 10 are not to be explained, with von Domaszewski, by the later intrusion of Κύθιοι and Σίφιοι into a list of Corinthian dependencies, but simply by the later addition of Σίφιοι, presumably placed here, rather than on coil 11, in order to group it with Κύθιοι.

After their victory at Plataea the allies dedicated thank-offerings to Apollo at Delphi, to Zeus at Olympia, and to Poseidon at the Isthmus (Hdt. ix. 81). The offering to Apollo took the form of a golden tripod resting upon a bronze column, about 6 m. high, representing three intertwined serpents (Herodotus thought it was one serpent with three heads). The tripod was melted down by the Phocians during their occupation of Delphi in the Third Sacred War (Paus. x. 13-19), but the column remained at Delphi until it was transported by Constantine to Constantinople, where it still stands in the ancient Hippodrome (*Atmaidan*), though the heads of the serpents dropped off, apparently by metal-fatigue, on 20 October 1700. The history of the monument is traced in *IGA* 70, where the relevant passages from ancient authors are quoted in full; Ménage, *Anatolian Studies* xiv (1964) 169-73, gives some Turkish sources.

The total number of states commemorated is thirty-one (cf. Plut. *Them.* 20. 3): Pausanias (v. 23) records twenty-seven names as engraved on the offering at Olympia, but the list was probably the same there as at Delphi, and the four omissions (Thespieae, Eretria, Leukas, and Siphnos) may be due to the negligence of the traveller or of some copyist. It is clear that the list does not refer exclusively to the battle of Plataea, though the monument was dedicated from the booty there captured, for the island-states took no part in that battle; it is best to follow the title in referring it to the whole of the Great Persian War (cf. [Dem.] lxx. 97, which attributes it to Plataea and Salamis) down to Plataea but not including the campaign of Mykale, which brought in new allies. Von Domaszewski and *ATL* have attempted to sort the names into three groups, Spartan allies, Athenian allies, and Corinthian allies, an attempt which helps to illuminate the structure of the Hellenic alliance (for some qualifications, see Brunt, *Hist.* ii (1953) 146-8), but which cannot be carried through rigorously. Of the states mentioned by Herodotus as participating in the war, Kroton (viii. 47), Pale in Kephallenia (ix. 28, 31), Seriphos (viii. 46, 48) and

the Opuntian Lokrians (vii. 203, 207; viii. 1-2) are unaccountably absent. Mantinea was presumably omitted because, though 500 Mantineans joined Leonidas at Thermopylae, they retired before the final struggle there (vii. 202, 222) and the Mantinean force arrived too late for the battle of Plataea (ix. 77); it is true that the Eleans, who do appear, arrived even later (*ibid.*), but their control of Olympia perhaps won them special consideration. The Tenians were added to the list later (see critical note); their inclusion was in recognition of the service rendered to the Greek cause by a Tenian trireme (*Hdt.* viii. 82. 1). We now find that this is also true for the Siphnians (see critical note); presumably the Athenians supported their claim, though not the precisely equivalent claim of Seriphos (perhaps cf. *Plat. Rep.* i. 329 e).

It is uncertain where Pausanias engraved the boastful epigram

Ἑλλήνων ἀρχηγὸς ἐπεὶ στρατὸν ὤλεσε Μήδων
Παυσανίας Φοίβῳ μνήμ' ἀνέθηκε τόδε

(*Thuc.* i. 132, [*Dem.*] lix. 97, *Plut. De mal.* *Hdt.* xlii, *Suidas* s.v. *Παυσανίας*; in *Anth. Pal.* vi. 197 it appears in Doric, perhaps rightly, and in the first person, certainly wrongly), which the Spartans promptly erased (*Thuc.*, loc. cit.; see now *Fornara, Philologus* cxi (1967) 291-4). Perhaps it was inscribed on the uppermost of the three circular limestone steps which formed the base of the monument. *Diodorus* (xi. 33) gives as an alleged replacement

Ἑλλάδος εὐρυχόρου σωτῆρες τόνδ' ἀνέθηκαν
δουλοσύνης στυγεράς ῥυσάμενοι πόλις,

but we doubt whether this couplet was composed soon after the battle, and have no great conviction that it was ever inscribed on the monument at all.

28 (17)

Gelo's Thank-offering for Himera: after 480 B.C.

A limestone tripod-base, north-east of the temple of Apollo at Delphi, at the head of the Sacred Way.

Syracusan alphabet in ll. 1-3, a mixed alphabet (Syracusan with Ionic delta and gamma?) in ll. 4-5 (*LSAG* 266, *Western Colonies* 6, against *Buck, CP* viii (1913) 137). Phot.: *Marcadé, Signatures*, i, Pl. iii. Facs.: *LSAG*, Pl. 51.

SIG 34+; Wilamowitz, *Gött. Nachr.* 1897, 313 ff.; Taccone, *Atti Torino* xli. 795 ff.; Pomtow-Schober, *RE Suppl.* v. 80 f.; *DGE* 144 (1); Marcadé, *Signatures*, i. 9; Pouilloux, *Choix*, 43.

Γέλον ὁ Δεινομέν[εος]

ἀνέθεκε τὸπόλλονι

Συραρόσιος.

τὸν: τρίποδα: καὶ τὸν: Νίκεν: ἐργάσατο

5 Βίον: Διοδόρο: υἱὸς: Μιλέσιος.

Diodorus (xi. 26. 7, probably following Timaeus) tells us that Gelo dedicated to Apollo at Delphi a golden tripod of sixteen talents' weight as a thank-offering for his victory at Himera in 480. Athenaeus (vi. 231 f) cites Phainias of Eresos and Theopompus (*FGH* 115 F 193) as stating that the Pythian sanctuary was adorned by Gelo and Hiero, τοῦ μὲν τρίποδα καὶ Νίκην χρυσοῦ πεποιημένα ἀναθέντος καθ' οὓς χρόνους Ξέρξης ἐπεστράτευε τῇ Ἑλλάδι, τοῦ δ' Ἰέρωνος τὰ ὅμοια. Further tripod-offerings by their brothers are perhaps attested by the couplet

φημί Γέλων', Ἰέρωνα, Πολύζηλον, Θρασύβουλον,
παῖδας Δεινομένους, τοὺς τρίποδας θεμέναι

(Schol. Pind. *Pyth.* i. 152; cf. Suidas s.v. *Δαρετίου*, *Anth. Pal.* vi. 214). Bacchylides (iii. 17 ff.) reminds Hieron in 468 of his offerings at Delphi:

λάμπει δ' ὑπὸ μαρμαρυγαῖς ὁ χρυσοῦς
ὑψιδαιδάλτων τριπόδων σταθέντων
πάροιθε ναοῦ.

At least Hiero's base can also be identified (*SIG* 35 c; *RE Suppl.* v. 81-4; Courby, *FD* ii, *La Terrasse du Temple*, 249-54); in all probability it celebrated his victory at Kyme (cf. No. 29).

Whether this dedication was completed before Gelon's death in 478 cannot be certainly affirmed. In the event, even if not in intention, it formed a pendant to the golden tripod dedicated by the Spartans and their allies for their victory over the Persians (No. 27), and Gelo, representing himself as a private citizen without title (cf. Berve, *Robinson Studies*, ii. 547), asserted that his victory over Carthage was as important to Apollo and to Greece as that victory.

Bion, the Milesian metal-worker and sculptor, is distinguished by Diogenes Laertius (iv. 58) from an earlier namesake mentioned by Hipponax, who was a native of Chios or Clazomenai.

29 (22)

Hiero's Victory at Kyme: 474 B.C.

Etruscan bronze helmet, discovered at Olympia in 1817; presented to the British Museum in 1823 by King George IV.

Archaic Syracusan letters, *LSAG* 275 (7). Phot.: *LSAG*, Pl. 51. 7; Guarducci, *Epigrafiá Greca*, i. 346 fig. 175. Facs.: *Olympia*, v. 249.

SIG 35 Ba; *BMI* 1155; *Olympia*, v. 249.

ἡἰάρον ὁ Δεινομένεος
καὶ τοὶ Συρακόσιοι
τῶι Διὶ Τυράνῳ ἀπὸ Κύμας.

In the late sixth century the Carthaginians and Etruscans were co-operating against the Greeks of the west. Gelo's crushing defeat of the Carthaginians at Himera was followed in 474 by Hiero's great naval victory over the Etruscans who were attacking Kyme. He dedicated part of the spoils at Olympia and at Delphi, but the latter were lost by shipwreck (*SIG* 35 Bb). A second Etruscan helmet was found in the River Alpheios in 1959 (*BCH* lxxxiv (1960) 721) with a slightly different third line: τῶι Διὶ Τυρρανῶν ἀπὸ Κύ[μας]. Our example has been generally thought to be metrical, two choriambic dimeters followed by a paroemiac (Wilamowitz, *Griechische Verskunst*, 381 f.). Daux, in reporting the second helmet, suggested that the seemingly poetic Τυράνῳ of l. 3 (= Τυρρανά; Attic, Τυρσηνά) might be a mistake for Τυρρανῶν; it is not a natural mistake to make.

30 (23)

Public Imprecations at Teos: c. 470 B.C.

Two fragments from one or two stelai found in a cemetery at Araka near the site of Teos; copied by Sherard in 1709 and 1716 and by Lisle in 1716, and first edited by Chishull in 1728 (*Antiquitates Asiaticae*, 96 ff.). A alone was rediscovered and copied by P. Le Bas in 1844, but is now lost (Le Bas-Wadd. iii. 59).

Developed Ionic letters, except mu; the text is divided by cola (:) into words or words-with-conjunction-and-preposition. The letter T is found in early inscriptions in several east Greek cities. It is used for xi and double sigma and was probably borrowed from the Phrygian (*AJA* lxvi (1962)

405, n. 5) or possibly the Carian alphabet. It has not yet been found, apart from the numeral system, after 450 (*LSAG* 38 f.). Facs.: *IGA* 497.

CIG 3044; *IGA* 497; *SIG* 37, 38; *DGE* 710; *Bannier, Rh. Mus.* lxxiv (1925) 285-8; *Buck* 3.

A

- Ὅστις: φάρμακα: δηλητή-
 ρια: ποιοῖ: ἐπὶ Τηίοισι-
 ν: τὸ ξυνὸν: ἢ ἐπ' ἰδιώτηι, : κ-
 ἐνον: ἀπόλλυσθαι: καὶ α-
 5 ὑτὸν: καὶ γένος: τὸ κένο:
 ὅστις: ἐς γῆν: τὴν Τηίην: κ-
 ωλύοι: σῦτον: ἐσάγεσθαι:
 ἢ τέχνηι: ἢ μηχανῆι: ἢ κατ-
 ἂ θάλασσαν: ἢ κατ' ἠπειρο-
 10 ν: ἢ ἐσαχθέντα: ἀνωθεοίη, :
 ἀπόλλυσθαι: καὶ αὐτ-
 ὸν: καὶ γένος: τὸ κένο.

B

- απονοσ --
 ξύοι: ἐν αὐτῶι --
 ὅστις: Τηίων: ε[ὐθ]ύνωι
 ἢ αἰσυ[μ]νήτηι: . . . ηι: ἢ
 5 ἐπανισταίτο: . . . 6 . . .
 . . 5 . . . : ἀπόλλυσθαι: καὶ
 αὐτὸν: καὶ γένος: τὸ κείν-
 ο: ὅστις: τὸ λοιπὸ: αἰσυμ-
 νῶ(ν): ἐν Τέωι: ἢ γῆι τῆι Τη-
 10 ίηι: σσαν: κ. σα. . . τ-
 ἐνει[. . 3-4. .] αρον: να[-- εἶδ]-
 ὠς: προδο[ίη. . .] τῆ[ν] πό-
 λ[ιν καὶ γῆν] τὴν Τηί-
 ὶων: ἢ τὸ[ς] ἄνδρας[: ἐν ν]-
 15 ἡσωι: ἢ θα[λάσσηι:] τὸ
 μετέ[πειτ' : ἢ τὸ] ἐν
 Ἄρο[ίηι: περιπό[λιον: ἢ τδ]
 λοιπὸ: προδο[ίη: ἢ κίξαι]-
 λλεύοι: ἢ κίξάλλας: ὑπο-

- 20 δέχοιτο: ἢ ληίζοιτο: ἢ λ-
 ηιστὰς: ὑποδέχοιτο: εἰ-
 δὼς: ἐκ γῆς: τῆς Τηίης: ἢ [θ]-
 ἀλάΤης: φέροντας: ἢ [τι κ]-
 ακὸν: βολεύοι: περὶ Τ[ηί]
 25 ων: τὸ ξυνοῶ: εἰδὼς: ἢ π[ρὸς]
 Ἑλληνας: ἢ πρὸς βαρβάρο-
 υς: ἀπόλλυσθαι: καὶ αὐ-
 τὸν: καὶ γένος: τὸ κένο:
 οὔτινες τιμοχέοντες:
 30 τὴν ἐπαρῆν: μὴ ποιήσεα-
 ν: ἐπὶ Δυνάμει: καθημέν-
 ο τῶ γῶνος: Ἄνθεστηρίο-
 ισιν: καὶ Ἑρακλείοισιν:
 καὶ Δίοισιν: ἐν τῇ παρῆ-
 35 ι: ἔχεσθαι: ὅς ἂν ταστήλ-
 ας: ἐν ἧσιν ἡ παρῆ: γέγρα-
 απται: ἢ κατὰξει: ἢ φοιν-
 κήια: ἐκκόψε[ι:] ἢ ἀφανέ-
 ας ποιήσει: κένον ἀπόλ-
 40 λυσθαι: καὶ αὐτὸν: καὶ γ-
 ἔνος [τὸ κένο].

A. 10–11. Roehl and all subsequent editors add (after ἀνωθεοίη) κέν|ον, from Le Bas. The word was not in the early copies (CIG 3044) and would make the line three letters longer than any other line.

B. Bannier suggests in ll. 3–6 ὅστις Τηίτων ἐ[ὐθ]ύνωι | ἢ αἰσυ[μ]νήτηι [βοηθ]ῆι ἢ | ἐπανισταίτο ἢ δι[αδέ]||χεται, and in ll. 8–12 ὅστις τὸ λοιπὸ αἰσυμ|νώι ἐν Τέωι ἢ γῆι τῆι Τη|ίηι [ἢ πλε]οσαν κ[δ]σα[ν] ἐσ|τ|ένοι [κυδ]άρον να[ὐν εἰδ]||ὼς προδο[ίη].

When, after the fall of Sardis, Cyrus' general Harpagus was reducing the Greek cities on the coast, the Teians abandoned their city and settled at Abdera in Thrace. According to Strabo (xiv. i. 30, p. 644) some of them returned later and there were said to be seventeen triremes from Teos at Lade (Hdt. vi. 8). Teos appears regularly in the Athenian tribute-quota lists and was probably an original member of the Athenian Alliance of 478–7. These fragments record curses to be publicly pronounced each year by certain magistrates (B. 29–35) on those who endanger the interests of the community. ταστήλ|ας (B. 35) shows that more than one stele was used.

The text of A is complete. Curses are invoked against:

- (a) poisoners (1-5); ξυβόν = κοινόν, accusative of respect;
- (b) those who prevent the import of corn or re-export it when it has been imported (6-12). Since the curses are to be renewed on three occasions each year (B. 29-34) the clause reflects not an extraordinary famine but a permanent dependence on imported corn, which may have encouraged the establishment of the Teian colony Phanagorea in the Euxine.

The text of B. 1-18 is very uncertain. The stone was probably very badly worn and the copies are unsatisfactory. Nothing can be made of the first two lines and it is idle to speculate what offenders are covered; nor can we restore the standard formula of A. 11 f., B. 27 f., 39-41. In ll. 5-6 copies differ: one suggests, after ἐπανισταίτο:, τ[ῶ]ι αἰ|[συμ]νήτηι, which would indicate the restoration in l. 4 of a verb such as [ξυβί]ηι. The offence in this case would be collusion with the chief magistrates or revolt against the *aisymnetes*. The alternative copy suggests ἢ δι[αμά]χηται. The offence in this case would be opposition to the magistrates, and in l. 4 it would be necessary to restore another magistrate or officer, such as [κρίτ]ηι. In ll. 8-28 a number of offences are grouped together, and the intention seems to be to check abuse of power by the *αἰσυμνήτης*. The *αἰσυμνήτης* is described by Aristotle as a αἰρετὴ τυραννίς (*Pol.* 1285^a31), but, since he is here (l. 3) co-ordinate with the εὐθνος, he is more probably a regular magistrate, as he is at Miletus (*SIG* 57. 1). In ll. 10 f. [ἀποκ]τ|ένει[ε has been restored, a warning against arbitrary execution. Then follows the betrayal of city, suburb, or citizens, the encouragement of brigands or pirates, the deliberate misleading of the community in its relations with Greeks or barbarians (presumably Persians are intended). Provision is next made for the public pronouncing of the curse at the Anthesteria, and at the festivals of Herakles and Zeus by οἱ τιμουχέοντες (29), who are almost certainly not office-holders in general but τιμοῦχοι, who are found later at Teos, as in *SIG* 578. 60 (second century B.C.), performing a similar function: ἀναγγελλέτωσαν δὲ οἱ ἐκάστοτε γινόμενοι τιμοῦχοι πρὸς τῇ ἀρᾷ. For other appearances of the title at Teos and elsewhere, see Gottlieb, *Timuchen* (*Sitzb. Heidelberg* 1967). In l. 31 ἐπὶ Δυνάμει, 'by the statue of Dynamis', cf. *SIG* 57. 29, rather than ἐπὶ δυνάμει, 'to the best of their power'. Finally (ll. 35-41) the curse will apply to anyone who breaks these stelai, cuts out the letters, or makes them unreadable. For φοινικήια (ll. 37 f.) = letters, reflecting the Phoenician origin of the Greek alphabet, see *Hdt.* v. 58. ἀφανέας (ll. 38 f.): letters would be regarded as unreadable if the red paint were removed; cf. Thucydides' ἀμυδροῖς γράμμασι (vi. 54. 7) of the letters on the altar of Pisistratus (No. 11).

The date we can only guess from letter forms and content. All the letters except mu seem to have their developed form, which would almost certainly rule out a date earlier than 500: the letters together with the form of punctuation suggest the first half of the fifth century. The content would be less appropriate to a time when Teos was firmly controlled by Persia. It would suit the re-establishment of independence after the battle of Mykale, or a date not much later.

For other examples of public imprecations see Ziebarth, *Hermes* xxx (1895) 57-70, and, for a good discussion of their implications, cf. Vallois, *BCH* xxxviii (1914) 256-71 (commenting on a Delian inscription).

31 (32)

Athenian Relations with Phaselis: 469-450 B.C.

A marble stele, once in the monastery of St. John the Baptist on Mount Hymettus; now in EM.

Ionic writing, stoichedon 22. Phot.: *Αρχ. Έφ.* 1922, 63.

IG i². 16+; Photiades, *Αρχ. Έφ.* 1922, 62-5, 79; Wilhelm, *Sitzb. Wien*, ccxvii (5), 60 f.; Hopper, *JHS* lxiii (1943) 39-45; Hignett, *History of the Athenian Constitution*, 397; Wade-Gery, *Essays*, 180-92; *Staatsverträge* 149+; De Ste Croix, *CQ* xi (1961) 100-8; Sealey, *CP* lix (1964) 16-17; Mattingly, *Proc. Afr. Class. Ass.* vii (1964) 37-9; Seager, *Hist.* xv (1966) 508 f.

[ἔδο]ξεν τῆι βολῆι καὶ τῶι δ[ῆ]-
 [μωι, Ἀ]καμαντῖς [ἐ]πρυτάνευε,
 [.]γράφισπος ἐγραμμάτευε, Νε-
 [...]δης ἐπεστάτει, Λέω[ν ε]ῖ-
 5 [πε· τοῖ]ς Φασηλίταις τὸ ψ[ήφ]ι-
 [σμα ἀν]αγράψαι· ὃ τι ἄμ με[ν] Ἄθ-
 [ῆνησι ξ]υ[μβ]όλαιον γένηται
 [πρὸς Φ]ασηλιτ[ῶ]ν τινα, Ἀθή[ν]η-
 [σι τὰς δ]ίκας γίνεσθαι παρ-
 10 [ἃ τῶι πο]λεμάρχωι, καθάπερ Χ-
 [ίους, καὶ] ἄλλοθι μηδὲ ἄμδ· τῶ-
 [ν δὲ ἄλλω]ν ἀπὸ ξυμβολῶν κατ-
 [ἃ τὰς ὅσας] ξυμβολὰς πρὸς Φα-
 [σηλίτας] τὰς δίκας ἐν[α]. τὰς
 15 [...7....]το[ς] ἀφελῆν. εἰάν δέ τ-
 [ις ἄλλη τῶ]ν ἀρχῶν δέξηται δ-

[ἴκην κατὰ] Φασηλίτων τινὸς
 [...8...., ε]ἰ μὲν καταδικάσ-
 [ει, ἡ καταδικ]ῆ ἄκυρος ἔστω. ἐ-
 20 [ὰν δέ τις παραβ]α[ί]νγη τὰ ἐψη-
 [φισμένα, ὀφ]ε[λέτ]ω μυρίας δ[ρ]-
 [αχμὰς ἱερ]ὰς τῆι Ἀθηναίαι· τ-
 [ὸ δὲ ψήφισ]μα τό[δε] ἀναγραφά-
 [τω ὁ γραμμ]ατεὺς ὁ τῆς βολῆς
 25 [ἔστέ]λημι λιθί]νγη καὶ καταθ-
 [έτω ἐμ πό]λει τ[έ]λεσει τοῖς τῶ-
 [ν Φασηλίτων.] *vacat*
vacat

The older restorations are fully discussed by Hopper. Wade-Gery's text is mostly followed here. In ll. 3-4 [^oἸγάζουπιπος or [^MἸγάζουπιπος; Wade-Gery suggests *Νε*[λῶνί]δης, but the division *ἐγραμμάτευεν, Ε*[...δης is also possible. (^E[πιμή]δης Leonardos; ^E[πιμή]δης Hiller, perhaps by a slip.) In l. 13 for *ὄσας* (Banner) cf. No. 94, l. 18; *πρὶν* (Koehler), *Χίῶν* (Sauppe). In l. 15 no alternative to Dittenberger's [δὲ ἐκκλή]το[ς] has yet been found. In l. 18 we would put [παρὰ τόδε] (Photiades), [Ἀθήνησιν] (Wilhelm), [παρόντος] (Kirchner), in that order of probability.

The Ionic lettering, no doubt reflecting the fact that the Phaselites paid for the stone themselves (ll. 26-7; cf. Nos. 47. 38, 52. 60, 87. 36(?), 89. 43, and *BSA* xlix (1954) 23), misled nineteenth-century editors into dating the decree in the fourth century, until Wilhelm pointed out that the letters themselves were characteristic of the mid-fifth century. (Mattingly's attempt to date it 425-4 because of its short datives is unconvincing.) Phaselis, on the coast of Lycia, not far from the frontier of Pamphylia, by the mediation of the Chians (cf. l. 10) entered the Delian League just before the battle of the Eurymedon (Plut. *Cimon* 12. 3-4). Its merchants carried on a vigorous trade alike with the ports of the Levant and with Greece (cf. Thuc. ii. 69) and were still well known at Athens in the fourth century ([Dem.] xxxv. 1 ff., though the *ex parte* denunciations of their shiftiness and chicanery need not perhaps be taken too seriously).

The inscription occupies a central place in discussions both of interstate juridical relations and of the history of the Athenian courts. The main provision is clearly that of ll. 6-11. Though interpretations of it based on translating *ξυμβόλαιον* as 'contract' still survive, roughly giving the meaning that breach of contracts made at Athens must be tried at Athens, Hopper and De Ste Croix rightly argue for a broader meaning, 'cause of action'. The subsidiary doubt is whether the

emphasis in ll. 8-10 lies on Ἀθήνησι, or παρὰ τῷ πολεμάρχῳ, or both. It is agreed that a privilege must be involved here, since Chios, one of Athens' most important allies, is cited as a model. The apparent emphasis on the repeated Ἀθήνησι has caused difficulty, since compelling a distant ally to come to Athens does not look like a privilege, but Seager shows that, in cases arising at Athens, which are the only ones in question, no real hardship would arise. The emphasis on Ἀθήνησι, then, can be accepted as genuine and a formalization of procedure, but the positive privilege must lie in παρὰ τῷ πολεμάρχῳ, always the Athenian court for favoured aliens, perhaps because they needed no special representation there (Wade-Gery), perhaps because of its speed (De Ste Croix) (cf. also Kahrstedt, *Staatsgebiet*, 281). Translate, then, 'Whatever cause of action arises at Athens involving a Phaselite, the case shall be tried at Athens, in the polemarch's court, just as for the Chians, and nowhere else; other cases shall be tried on treaty terms according to the existing treaty with Phaselis.' For δίκαι ἀπὸ ξυμβολῶν see the passages collected in Hill, *Sources*², Index III. 6. 3 and the articles of Hopper and De Ste Croix.

To this last provision ll. 14-15 make some qualification, extremely obscure even with Dittenberger's restoration. There follow provisions against the breach of the privilege conferred, and the usual publication formula. The important point here lies in the word καταδικάσ[ει. Wade-Gery argues from it, with some subsidiary support from παρὰ τῷ πολεμάρχῳ in ll. 9-10, which he thinks slightly more likely to mean 'at the polemarch's tribunal' than 'in the polemarch's court', that in this inscription Athenian magistrates are still actually giving judgement themselves rather than merely acting as presiding magistrates on the classical pattern, the first evidence for which is perhaps the part played by Athena in the trial in the *Eumenides* (458 B.C.). (Sealey denies this inference from καταδικάσ[ει, citing Plato, *Laws* xii. 958 c, but the whole stress on the magistrate here seems against him.)

In Wade-Gery's view the change by which the magistrates lost this power must have been part of the reforms of Ephialtes, and accordingly he dates the decree between 469 and 462. Hignett had in fact taken the same point earlier, but saw no reason to attribute the reform to Ephialtes, though he admitted that it could not be more than a very few years later. This argument for dating the decree seems sound. It must take precedence over, though it is not necessarily incompatible with, the argument that the full classical decree-prescript of ll. 1-5 presupposes a reorganization of the Council by Ephialtes, a reorganization which has no literary support, and, in our judgement, no particular intrinsic probability (Haggard, *TAPA* lvii (1926) xxxi f.; Kahrstedt, *Klio*, xxxiii (1940) 10). The argument of Oliver

(*Hesp.* ii (1933) 496 f.) that the decree is to be dated *c.* 450 on the identification of its proposer Leon with the [Λ]έων who proposed *SEG* x. 15 (Hill, *Sources*², B 29, *Staatsverträge*, 150, hardly more closely datable than 460-450) carries little weight. That the decree is later than the entry of Phaselis into the League seems certain, but we see no reason to deny that the earlier agreement of l. 13 could have been of longer standing; *συμβολαί* do not presuppose alliance.

32 (25)

Halicarnassian Law concerning disputed Property: (?) 465-450 B.C.

A marble stele, copied at Halicarnassus (Budrum) by the Earl of Charlemont in 1749. Later it was cut in half vertically to be used for the jambs of a window, and in the process two to four letters were lost from the middle of each line. There was another inscription on the right-hand side of the stele, but only a few letters are legible. Rediscovered by Sir Charles Newton, the stele is now in the British Museum.

Ionic letters. Τ is used for σσ in ll. 2, 6, 16 and probably in 7; for this letter sampi see introduction to No. 30. It is probably going out of use in Halicarnassus; contrast l. 2 with l. 41. Ο has a dot in the centre, as has Ω in ll. 41-5. To distinguish it from Ο the dot in theta may have been coloured. Phot.: *Pal. Soc. Facs.*, Series 2, Pl. 62; facs.: *Imag.* 23. 14. Facs. of Charlemont's copy, *BMI* iv, p. 50.

BMI 886 (iv, p. 49); *SIG* 45; Ruehl, *Philol.* xli (1882) 54-71; Valeton, *Mnem.* xxxvi (1908) 289-334, xxxvii (1909) 60-6; *DGE* 744; Buck 2.

τάδε ὁ σύλλο[γ]ος ἐβουλευσατο
 ὁ Ἁλικαρνατέ[ω]ν καὶ Σαλμακι-
 τέων καὶ Λύγδαμος ἐν τῇ ἱερῇ[ι]
 ἀγορῇ, μῆνος Ἑρμαιῶνος πέμ-
 5 πτηι ἰσταμένο, ἐπὶ Λέοντος πρυ-
 ταν[εύου]τος τῷ ὉαΤαΤιος κα-
 [ι] Σα[ρυΤ]ώλλο τῷ Θεκυῖλω νε-
 [ωπ]οί[ο, πρ]ὸς μνήμονας· μὴ παρ[α]-
 δίδο[σθαι] μῆτε γῆν μῆτε οἰκ[ί]-
 10 [α] τοῖς μνήμοσιν ἐπὶ Ἀπολλω-
 νίδεω τῷ Λυγδάμιος μνημονε-

ύοντος καὶ Παναμῖω τῷ Κασβώ-
 λλιος καὶ Σαλμακίτεων μνη-
 μονευόντων Μεγαβάτεω τῷ Ἀ-
 15 φυάσιος καὶ Φορμίωνος τῷ Π[α]-
 ννάτιος. ἦν δέ τις θέλημι δικάζε-
 σθαι περὶ γῆς ἢ οἰκίων, ἐπικαλ[έ]-
 τω ἐν ὀκτωκαίδεκα μηνσὶν ἀπ' ὅτ[ε]
 ὁ ἄδος ἐγένετο· νόμωι δὲ κατάπ[ε]-
 20 ρ νῦν ὀρκῶ{ι}σ(α)ι τὸς δικαστάς· ὁ τ[ι]
 ἂν οἱ μνήμονες εἰδέωσιν, τοῦτο
 καρτερόν ἐναι. ἦν δέ τις ὕστερον
 ἐπικαλῆι τούτο τῷ χρόνω τῶν
 ὀκτωκαίδεκα μηνῶν, ὄρκον ἐναι τ-
 25 ῶι νεμομένωι τὴν γῆν ἢ τὰ οἰκ-
 [ί]α, ὄρκον δὲ τὸς δικαστάς ἡμί-
 [ε]κτον δεξαμένος· τὸν δὲ ὄρκον εἰ-
 [ν]αι παρεόντος τῷ ἐνεστηκότος. κ-
 αρτερός δ' εἶναι γῆς καὶ οἰκίων οἵτινες
 30 τότ' εἶχον ὅτε Ἀπολλωνίδης καὶ Πανα-
 μύης ἐμνημόνευον, εἰ μὴ ὕστερο-
 ν ἀπεπέρασαν. τὸν νόμον τοῦτον
 ἦν τις θέλημι συγχέαι ἢ προθῆτα-
 [ι] ψῆφον ὥστε μὴ εἶναι τὸν νόμο-
 35 ν τοῦτον, τὰ ἔοντα αὐτῷ πεπρήσθω
 καὶ τῷ πόλλωνος εἶναι ἱερά καὶ α-
 ὑτὸν φεύγεν αἰεὶ· ἦν δὲ μὴ ἦι αὐτ-
 ῶι ἄξια δέκα στατήρων, αὐτὸν [π]-
 επρῆσθαι ἐπ' ἐξαγωγῆι καὶ μη[δ]-
 40 αμὰ κάθοδον εἶναι ἐς Ἀλικαρν-
 ησσόν. Ἀλικαρνασσέων δὲ τῶς σ-
 υμπάντων τούτωι ἐλεύθερον εἶ[ε]-
 ναι, ὅς ἂν ταῦτα μὴ παραβαίνηι κατό-
 περ τὰ ὄρκια ἔταμον καὶ ὡς γέγραπτ-
 45 αι ἐν τῷ Ἀπολλω[νί]ωι, ἐπικαλέν.

1. 7: Ὁκευῖλω is a possible alternative (*Berl. Phil. Woch.* viii. 1469). In ll. 8–10, many editors prefer οἱ[ο τ]ὸς μνήμονας μὴ παρα|διδό[ναι] μήτε γῆν...; but after οἱ Charlemont marked three letter-spaces and the space

on the stone requires them. Hirschfeld rightly insisted on *παρα*|*δίδο*[*σθαι*]; three letters only would be too widely spaced. l. 18: At the end of the line there is room for only one missing letter. l. 19: *ἄδος*, from *ἀνδάνω*, equivalent to Latin *placitum*. l. 20: On the stone $\Theta\rho\kappa\Omega|\Sigma\dots\Sigma$; Charlemont, $\Theta\rho\kappa\Theta|\Sigma|\tau\Theta\Sigma$. Hirschfeld and Bannier read *ὀρκῶ*{*ι*}*σι*; with Dittenberger, Tod, and most editors we prefer *ὀρκῶ*{*ι*}*σ(α)ι*. l. 22: *καρτερόν* = *κύριον*; the more normal sense in l. 29, *καρτερὸς γῆς*.

This measure, variously called *βούλευμα* (l. 1), *ἄδος* (l. 19), *νόμος* (l. 32), provides a change, temporary or permanent, in legal procedure concerning property disputes. The first clause provides that no land or houses shall be handed over to a board of *mnemones* in the year of Apollonides, who presumably are either about to enter or have just entered office. Existing procedure, however, in which the *mnemones* play a decisive part, may be used for a period of eighteen months, and in these cases the jurors are to take an oath that 'what the *mnemones* know shall be binding'. When the eighteen months have expired those who held the property in the year of Apollonides are to be regarded as the legal owners, and if their title is disputed they are only required to substantiate their claim by an oath. Strong penalties are laid down against anyone who by constitutional or unconstitutional methods tries to reverse this law, and any Halicarnassian who abides by this law may bring a case, according to oath taken and agreements recorded in the temple of Apollo.

The law was passed by the 'joint meeting of citizens from Halicarnassus and Salmakis, together with Lygdamis'. Salmakis was probably a Carian settlement subsequently merged in Halicarnassus, but at the time of this document each of the two communities had its own officers. Together, however, they were *Ἁλικαρνασσεῖς οἱ σύμπαντες* (l. 41). Suidas (s.v. *Ἡρόδοτος*) says that Lygdamis was grandson of the colourful Artemisia who commanded a small contingent in Xerxes' fleet at Salamis. Herodotus, who opposed Lygdamis, had to leave Halicarnassus in exile, and his uncle, the epic poet Panyassis, was put to death. Later Herodotus helped to expel the tyrant, but he fell out of favour and joined the Athenian colony of Thurii (established in 443). It is naturally tempting to associate our inscription with these events, and this was even easier when *ἄδος* (l. 19) was thought to be part of *καθόδος*. The Lygdamis of the prescript was clearly the tyrant of Herodotus' day, and he could also be the father of Apollonides the *mnemon* (l. 10); Panyassis, the father of Phormio, another *mnemon* (ll. 15 f.), could be Herodotus' uncle, giving representation to supporters and opponents of tyranny in the office. Various inferences were drawn on such assumptions: that the law reflected the pending expulsion of Lygdamis, that it gave substance to an amnesty, that it marked the defeat of his opponents by Lygdamis.

Ruehl emphasized the weaknesses of some of these assumptions. Panyassis was a common name in Halicarnassus (cf. *SIG* 46), nor was Lygdamis rare. There was nothing, he thought, in the inscription to suggest a settlement after political crisis. The law referred not to any special category of property but to all property. Ruehl's conclusion, supported by Dittenberger (*SIG* 45), is not persuasive. If a permanent change of procedure is intended, eliminating the role of the *mnemones* in property disputes, why is provision made for one year only, and why is there such emphasis on penalties for any attempt to reverse the law? Valeton seems nearer the mark in inferring that opponents of Lygdamis have gone into exile and that their properties left ownerless are in the hands of the *mnemones*. This law is to discourage any attempt to recover their lands. The main function of *mnemones* according to Aristotle (*Pol.* 1321^b39) was to act as registrars, but *παράδοσθαι* in ll. 8-9 cannot mean merely the handing over of details for registration; it is reasonable to believe that in certain circumstances they had charge of ownerless property. On any interpretation the phrasing of the decree is obscure: 'the circumstances were too well known to the legislators to call for precise and detailed formulation' (Tod).

Only an approximate date can be given. It has been widely held that the tyranny must have ended not later than 454, for *Ἀλικαρνασσεῖς* are recorded in the tribute-quota list of 454-3. This entry, however, is not necessarily inconsistent with Lygdamis' being in control, nor should we regard tyranny as being incompatible with membership of the Athenian alliance (two Carian tyrants, Tymnes and Pigres, are specifically named, *ATL* i. 446). Lygdamis' accession also is difficult to date. If Artemisia's son was too young to command at Salamis (*Hdt.* vii. 99. 1), her grandson could hardly have become tyrant before 460. More probably Suidas is wrong and Lygdamis was either nephew or son.

Though the immediate historical context must remain uncertain, several interesting inferences are secure. The Ionic script discredits Suidas' statement that Herodotus adopted the Ionic dialect in Samos, and the proper names show that there was a strong admixture of Carian blood in Halicarnassus. Megabates son of Aphyasis (ll. 14 f.) suggests personal links with Persians. It was easier for Herodotus than for most Greeks to be *φιλοβάρβαρος*.

33 (26)

Casualty-list of the Erechtheid Tribe:

460 or 459 B.C.

Marble stele (the 'Nointel Marble') from Athens; now in the Louvre.

Attic letters, ΒΦΡΣΥ. Ll. 62-70 are added in another hand: Ρ 62, 66; Ρ 68, 69; V 64; Υ 65, 68. Φρῦνος (ΦΡΣ) is added in a hand different from that of l. 67. Ll. 127-9, which are inscribed in larger letters than the rest, form a single entry. Stoichedon. Facs.: *IG* i. 433 (not completely reliable).

IG i². 929.

Ἔ ρ ε χ θ ε ἰ δ ο ς

ἦοῖδε : ἐν τῷ : πολέμοι : ἀπέθανον : ἐν Κύπροι : ἐν Αἰγ[ύ]-
πτοι : ἐν Φοινίκει [:] ἐν Ἀλιεῦσιν [:] ἐν Αἰγίνει : Μεγαροῖ

τ δ α ὕ τ δ ἐ ν ι α υ τ δ

5	[σ]τ[ρα]τεγῶν Φ[...]χος Π[αντ]αλέον Πολύστρατος [Δρ]ακοντίδες	75	Φάνυλλος Χ[. .]μιος Ε[ὕγ]είτον Ἄλ[κ]ιππος Λυ[σ]ίκλες	130	Ἄκρυπτος Τιμοκράτες Ἀρχέλας Εὐθυκράτες Πατροκλείδε[s]
10	..μόστ[ρ]ατος ..μέας ..κλείδες ..κράτες [Χα]ιρέδεμος	80	Κέ[λ]ευσος Εὐ[θ]ύδεμος Δίκαιος Φιλ[ἔ]νος Καλλικλῆς	135	Ἄλκμεονίδες Γλαύκων Δεμόνικος Ἀναχσίδορος Γλαύκων
15	..εσίας ..έσανδρος [Λυ]κόφρον [Α]πολλόδορος Ἀριστοτέλες	85	Ναυσικλῆς Τ[ι]μεσίθεος [Μν]εσιγένης Π[ο]λυκλῆς Ἄλ[ε]χσίας	140	Προκλῆς Ἄντιφῶν Ἀναχσίλα[s] Ἀρχέπολι[s] Καλλέας
20	[Π]ροτίας Δράκαλος Μεχανίον Φιλιστίδες Τιμογένης	90	Ἀμύδριππος Ἀπολλόδορος Γοργίας Νόθαρχος Παρμον[ί]δες	145	Θαλίαρχο[s] Φιλόνιχο[s] Εὐκλείδε[s] Διόδωρος Νίκαρχος
25	Χαρίσανδρος		Βάκων	150	Ἐπιτέλες

	[Μ]ενέκλες	Πίθον	Κύβον
	[Μ]ελάνοπος	Λυσίας	Χ[α]ιρίας
	Κλεόνβροτος	Σόστρατος	Δεμέτριος
	Ἀριστοκλείδης	95 Φιλίνος	Ἀρκεσίλας
30	Θοκυδίδες	Φίλαιθος	155 Εὐθόινος
	Εὐθύδεμος	Φιλέταιρος	Δεμέτριος
	[Κ]αλλικράτες	Σοτέλες	Γόργον
	Ἀφσέφες	Λυσίας	Στράτ[ο]ν
	[Ἀ]ριστειδές	100 Ἀριστογένες	Ἄριστ[ο]φάνε[ς]
35	[Φ]ιλόδεμος	Φιλίνος	160 Γλαύκον
	[Κ]εφ[ι]σόδοτος	Διότιμος	Φυσ[ο]νίδες
	[Σ]όφιλος	Καλλονίδες	ἡαγ[ν]όδεμος
	[Ἀ]ντιμένες	Καλλίχσενος	Διο[κ]λῆς
	[Ἐ]παίνετος	105 Δεινίας	Φανόστρατο[ς]
40	Ἐργαῖος	Σμίκυθος	165 Εὐμένιος
	Διογένης	Τιμόδεμος	Θε[ό]δορος
	Φρῦνος	Λῦσις	[Εὐρ]ύλεος
	Κτεσιάδης	Ἀκεσίας	[Κέ]ρδον
	Κόροιβος	110 Ἐπιχάρες	[Ἐπ]ιχάρες
45	[Κ]ράτυλλος	ἱερόνυμος	170 Ε[ὑ]δοχος
	[Σ]υνφέρμιος	Ἀνασσίλας	Π[ο]λύζελος
	[Ν]ικίας	Χαιρίας	Γ[λ]αυκίας
	Λυσικλείδης	ἠερακλείδης	Ἐπιγένης
	Φρούραρχος	115 Ἀγασικλῆς	Ἀντιχάρες
50	Χαρ[ί]σ[ανδ]ρος	Ἀλκῆς	175 Φιλιστιδε[ς]
	Ἵ[Ο]λυμ[πι]άρατος	Κεφισόδοτος	Ἀμφικλειδ[ες]
	Σ[...]ος	Καλλικλῆς	Φρούρος
	Μνε[σ]ίφιλος	Κεφισόδορος	Τίτον
	Σοσίας	120 Νομένιος	Εὐβιος
55	Ἀρχῖνος	Χσενόφιλος	180 Καλλίβ[ι]ος
	Λυκῖνος	ἠνιπέριβιος	Σμίκρο[ς]
	Καλλίας	ἡάγνον	Νεαῖος
	Μνεσιγένης	Πολύχσενος	Ἐργοτέ[λες]
	Σίκον	125 Ἐρχσιμένες	Φοκίον
60	Ἀμφικέδες	Νίκον	185 Ἄραιθ[ος]
	Χσένυλλος	<i>vacat</i>	<i>vacat</i>
	<i>vacat</i>		

	στρατηγός:	ἐν Αἰγύπτῳ
	ἡπποδάμας	
	Εὐθύμαχος:	Τελένικος
65	Εὐμέλος:	μάντις
	Ἄνδρσοθένης	
	τοχσόται: Φρῶνος	
	Ταῦρος	
	Θεόδωρος	
70	Ἀλεχσίμαχος	

ll. 5-6: Bradeen suggests [σ]τ[ρα]τεγόν | φ[ύλαρ]χος, a phylarch who died while acting as general. The restoration generally accepted in l. 6 is Φ[ρῶνι]-χος; Φ[ύλαρ]χος is also possible.

Normally the casualties of all ten tribes are inscribed on the same stele or on a series of adjoining stelai with a common title (*Hesp.* xxxiii (1964) 26). This exceptional record of a single tribe is probably due to the exceptional number of its casualties, emphasized in the heading (τὸ αὐτὸ ἐμιαυτῷ); as in other casualty lists, the period covered is almost certainly the campaigning season rather than the archon's year. At this time the Athenians were fighting on two fronts, against the Persians and against the Peloponnesians. The last three engagements are recorded in chronological order (cf. *Thuc.* i. 105); it is a reasonable inference that this applies also to the first three, but it would be less safe to assume that all six engagements were in true sequence. The date is controversial, but the most likely year for fighting to occur successively in Cyprus, Egypt, and Phoenicia is the first year of Athens' support of the Egyptian revolt led by Inaros. Thucydides tells us that the Athenians had already dispatched 200 ships to Cyprus when they accepted Inaros' appeal for help. The Athenians then left Cyprus and proceeded to Egypt (*Thuc.* i. 104. 2: ἦλθον ἀπολιπόντες τὴν Κύπρον). No literary source mentions fighting in Phoenicia at this time, but if, as many think, the main part of the fleet returned from Egypt after winning control of the Nile, a raid on Phoenicia is easy to accept. If the main fleet stayed in Egypt, the raid on Phoenicia could have been made by a small detachment. Accepting 454, the year of the transference of the treasury from Delos to Athens, as the year of the final disaster in Egypt, the first year will be 460, or possibly 459 (for discussions of the chronology see *ATL* iii. 174 f.; P. Salmon, *La Politique égyptienne d'Athènes*, 156 ff.).

The list includes two generals (ll. 5-6, 63). Hippodamas may have succeeded Ph[ryni]chos in the summer, or they may have been elected together (double representation of a tribe being not uncommon later;

Hignett, *Athenian Constitution*, 348–53). Ph[ryni]chos is described as *στρατηγῶν* rather than *στρατηγός*, which is unexpected. It may be that he had an acting command though not formally general for the year. A better suggestion is that *στρατηγῶν* is genitive (Bannier, *Berl. Phil. Woch.* xxxvii. 351). There is one seer (ll. 128–9), four citizen archers (ll. 67–70: see Wernicke, *Hermes*, xxvi (1891) 71) and 170 others.

These men died *ἐν τῷ πολέμῳ*. In a casualty list of the forties, men were listed as dying *ἐν τοῖς ἄλλοις πολέμοις*, a number of separate wars (No. 48). Did the Athenians consider or want others to consider that the campaigns in Egypt and in Greece were both parts of a single war, in which they were fighting the Peloponnesians to defend themselves against the stab in the back while they championed Greeks against barbarians?

For the Athenian casualty-lists see A. Brueckner, *Ath. Mitt.* xxxv (1910) 183 ff.; Bradeen, *Hesp.* xxxiii (1964) 16–62.

34

Samians fight in Egypt: 460–454 B.C.

White marble block, apparently a statue-base, found in the Heraion at Samos, and now in the excavation-house there.

Developed Ionic letters, not stoichedon. Phot.: *Klio* xxxii (1939) 290, whence *LSAG*, Pl. 63. 21.

Peek, *Klio* xxxii (1939) 289–306; *LSAG* 331, no. 21; Kienitz, *Die politische Geschichte Ägyptens*, 72; Salmon, *La Politique égyptienne d'Athènes*, 149 f.

[...] ἔργο πολλοὶ [---- traces ----]
 [Μέμ]φιός ἀμφ' ἐρατῆς νηυσὶν ἔθηκ[ε μάχην]
 [θο]ῦρος Ἄρης Μήδων τε καὶ Ἑλλήν[ων, Σάμιοι δὲ]
 [νῆ]ας Φοινίκων πέντε τε καὶ δ[έκ' ἔλον·]
 5 [...] Ἑγησα[γ]όρην Ζωϊλότο καὶ [---]
 ----- traces -----

The traces in l. 1 are consistent with Peek's preferred restoration [τὸδ'] ἔργο πολλοὶ πᾶρα [μάρ]τυρε[ς, εὖτ' ἐπὶ Νείλῳ]. l. 5: [ἀλλ'] Peek.

Peek argues convincingly that this inscription is of the middle of the fifth century and that the only likely location for a Samian victory over Phoenician ships which will fit the beginning of l. 2 is Memphis,

attested by Thuc. i. 104. 2 (καὶ ἀναπλεύσαντες ἀπὸ θαλάσσης ἐς τὸν Νεῖλον τοῦ τε ποταμοῦ κρατοῦντες καὶ τῆς Μέμφιδος τῶν δύο μερῶν πρὸς τὸ τρίτον μέρος ὃ καλεῖται Λευκὸν τεῖχος ἐπολέμου) as a centre of the operations of Athens' Egyptian expedition. A sea-fight in the early stages of the expedition is attested by Ktesias, 63 (Gilmore): ἐνίκησεν Ἰναρος καὶ κατὰ θάλατταν, Χαριτιμίδου εὐδοκιμήσαντος, ὃς τῶν ἐξ Ἀθηνῶν τετταράκοντα νεῶν ἐχρημάτιζε ναύαρχος, καὶ πεντήκοντα Περσῶν νῆες, αἱ μὲν εἰκόσι αὐτοῖς ἀνδράσιν ἐλήφθησαν, αἱ δὲ τριάκοντα διεφθάρησαν. If the reference to Memphis is sound, the battle recorded in our epigram would have been actually on the Nile (τοῦ τε ποταμοῦ κρατοῦντες, Thuc.) and Peek may be right to explain the fact that Ktesias has lower numbers for the Greek fleet than Thucydides' implied 200 ships by supposing that not all the force had sailed up the Nile, even if it had all left Cyprus. The question of the size of the Athenian force in Egypt and its losses has often been discussed, most recently by Salmon, *op. cit.* 151-8. Kienitz is doubtful about this interpretation of the inscription and Salmon refuses to accept it, but we see no other occasion for our text which is remotely probable. There certainly were Athenian allies on the expedition (Thuc., *loc. cit.*). Though they were here still fighting against the Persian Empire, and not against Greeks as in No. 36, the League was sharing the varied strains of Athens' commitments.

We cannot be sure of Hegesagoras' part in the epigram. Peek's suggestion that he played a particularly glorious role in the battle and was portrayed by a statue, as his countryman Maiandrios seems to have been for his services at Eurymedon (Hill, *Sources*², B 123), is at least fairly probable. Ζωῖλλοτος is a known Samian name, here allowed to cut across the metre.

35 (28)

Argives killed at Tanagra: (?) 458 B.C.

Fourteen marble fragments from a pedimental stele: *a* and *b* were found on the Acropolis, *f*, *g*, *h*, *i*, *j*, *k*, *l*, and *n* in the Agora, *m* in the Kerameikos. *a*, *b*, *d*, and *f-n* are in EM, *c* in the British Museum, *e* in private possession in Athens.

Early Argive writing (see *LSAG* 164, Argos, 30), stoichedon except the epigram. Photographs of *a-f*, *i*, *m* in *Kerameikos*, iii, Pl. 10-11; of *c*, *f-l*, in *Hesp.* xiv (1945) 139-43; of *n* in *Hesp.* xxi (1952) Pl. 89. Facsimile of the upper part in *Hesp.* xxi, 354 (whence *LSAG*, Pl. 29, 30).

Meritt, *Hesp.* xiv. 134-47+; *Hesp.* xxi. 351-5; *GVI* 15.

n

Ἀργε[ίων·]

[τοι]δ' ἔθ[ανον Ταν]άγραι Λακ[εδαίμο]-
[νίον ὑπο]ῖ χερσ[ί], πένθο[ς δ' ἔ]τλασα-

		a		d		
	35	[.]έτριος	70	[...7....]ος	Ἄνη[- -]	[·:οια]ῖρασππ ἠδ[ε]μ σπλ α
		[Ἄ]ριστίον		-----	Θε[- -]	
5		[Σ]φενδονίου		-----	Ε[.]λ[.]ς	
		[Ἀ]κκίος		-----	115 Φοῖνιξ c	
		φαναξίλας		-----	[Φ]αλέας	
		[Δ]έρκετος	75	-----	[Β]ράχας	
	40	[Ἐ]χέμενες		-----	Τελέστας	
		[..5....]ις		-----	Δαμοφάνες	
		lacuna		[- -]ος	120 Θυμάρες	
			80	-----	g Δαϊκλῆς	
				[- -]ς	Σύλιχος	
				lacuna	Δέρκετος	
					Λυφοδόρκας	
					125 Κλέον	
					Κρατιάδας	
					[Α]ισχύλος	
					[Εὐ]αρχί[δ]ος	
					lacuna	

We print here only those fragments of which the relation to the top is certain.

Among the Athenian allies who fought at Tanagra were a thousand Argives (Thuc. i. 107. 5). Those of them who fell in the battle were buried in the Kerameikos (Paus. i. 29. 8). Earlier editors assigned some or all of these fragments to the Cleonaeans who accompanied them and were buried separately (Paus. i. 29. 7), but Meritt has shown that we have here a single stele, commemorating the Argives who fell, perhaps up to 400 in number, listed by the four Argive tribes (l. 3), and cut by a stone-cutter who miscalculated the space available for the epigram. For πένθο[ς δ' ἔ]τλασαν cf. Pind. *Isthm.* vii. 51, perhaps said of the Thebans who fell in this same battle.

36 (27)

Thank-offering for the Victory of Tanagra:
(?) 458 B.C.

Three contiguous fragments of a marble stele found at Olympia; now in the Olympia Museum.

Corinthian letters, *LSAG* 129 f., 132 (38). Phot.: *LSAG*, Pl. 21. 38, Guarducci, *Epigrafiā Greca*, i. 470 fig. 243; facs.: *Imag.* 44. 11.

Ol. v. 253; Heiberg, *Hermes* xlvī (1911) 458–60; Hitzig–Blümner, *Pausanias*, ii. 321; Guarducci, *Rend. Pont. Acc.* xii. 125–32, *Epigrafiā Greca*, i. 469–72.

[Ναὸς μὲν φιάλαν χρυσέα]ν ἔχει, ἐγ δὲ [Τανάγρας]
[τοὶ Λακεδαιμόνιοι συμ]μαχία τ' ἀν[έθεν]
[δῶρον ἀπ' Ἀργείων καὶ Ἄθα]ναίων καὶ [Ἰάνων],
[τὰν δεκάταν νίκας εἶν]εκα τοῦ πο[λέμου].

5 ----- Κορ[ινθ]ι -----
----- ρ -----

After speaking of the Nike and the akroteria which crowned the eastern pediment of the temple of Zeus at Olympia (cf. No. 74), Pausanias proceeds: ὑπὸ δὲ τῆς Νίκης τὸ ἄγαλμα ἀσπίς ἀνάκειται χρυσῇ, Μέδουσαν τὴν Γοργόνα ἔχουσα ἐπειργασμένην. τὸ ἐπίγραμμα δὲ τὸ ἐπὶ τῇ ἀσπίδι τοὺς τε ἀναθέντας δηλοῖ καὶ καθ' ἣντινα αἰτίαν ἀνέθεσαν. λέγει γὰρ δὴ οὕτω . . . (v. 10. 4). The fragments can be restored from Pausanias' text, but there are differences. Pausanias has in l. 4 the Doric genitive τῶ πολέμῳ where our text, in Corinthian script, has the *ou* diphthong; and Pausanias does not quote the last two lines of our text. The easiest explanation is that there were two inscriptions, one 'on the ἀσπίς' (a much more natural translation of ἐπὶ τῇ ἀσπίδι than 'relating to', accepted by Tod), which was set up over the pediment, the other on a free-standing stele. The ἀσπίς was a gilded convex shield with apotropaic Medusa's head, bowl-like in form and so sometimes called φιάλη (for this interchange see Athenaeus, x. 433c). The relevance of the last two lines is not clear. There is not room for a list of Sparta's allies, and the fact that the surviving text is in Corinthian, whereas the text on the shield which Pausanias copied presumably was not, should be significant. Heiberg suggested that there was a contrast between the general dedication by the alliance of a gold bowl within the temple and a Corinthian dedication of a gilded shield on the temple. This might be a tenable hypothesis if Pausanias had not apparently seen only a four-line epigram. Guarducci is more persuasive in regarding the shield as the general dedication and inferring a separate dedication also by the Corinthians.

Argives fought with Athens at Tanagra (see No. 35). The Ionians of the epigram are contingents from Athens' allies (Thuc. i. 107. 5: καὶ τῶν ἄλλων ξυμμάχων ὡς ἕκαστοι).

37 (31)

Alliance of Athens with Egesta: (?) 458-7 B.C.

Two fragments of a marble stele found on the Acropolis; now in EM.

Developed Attic letters except ζ , R. Stoichedon 48, but the letters of the title in l. 1 are larger than the rest. Phot.: *Hesp.* xvii (1948) Pl. 24 (larger fragment); *TAPA* lxxv (1944) 13, *Κώκαλος* vi (1960) Pl. 17-18 (smaller frag.).

IG i². 19, with 20, ll. 1, 2; Raubitschek, *TAPA* lxxv (1944) 10-12; Woodhead, *Hesp.* xvii (1948) 59 f.; *Staatsverträge* 139; E. Roos, *Opuscula Atheniensia*, iv (1962) 8-29; Mattingly, *Hist.* xii (1963) 267 f.

- a [φιλία καὶ χουνμαχία Ἀθηναίων καὶ] Ἐγεσταί[ον]
 [ἔδοχσεν τῆι βολῆι καὶ τ]δ[ι δέμοι, ...6...ἰς] ἐ[π]ρυτάνευε, [...]
 [- - - ἐγραμμάτευε, - - -]ο[...ἐπεστάτε, ἁβρ]ον ἔρχε, Ἀρ[χέ]δε-
 [μος εἶπε·.....32.....] ταὐτὸ / [...]
- 5 [.....19.....]ιο[.....18.....]α [hoίτινες]
 [ἔχσορκόσοσι ἀφικόμενοι ἐς Ἐγεσταν ἠελέσθα]ι τὸ[ν] δ[ἔ]μον δέ-
 [κα ἄνδρας αὐτίκα μάλα· περ]ι δὲ τ]ο...π.. [h]ιερὰ ἡόσομ[περ..]
 [.....19.....]ὸν ἡό[ρ]κ[ο]ν ὀμνύ[γα]ι. ἡόπ[ο]ς δ' ἂν ὀμό[σοσ]-
 [ιν ἡάπαντες, ἡοι στρατ]εγοὶ ἐπιμελεθέν[τον παρ]αγγ[ελ..5...]
- 10 [.....14.....μετὰ τ]ὸν ἡο[ρ]κοτὸν ἡόπ[ο]ς...]ς Ἐγ[ε]σταί[ο].]
 [.....11.....τὸ δὲ φσε]φισμα τόδε καὶ τὸν [ἡόρ]κ[ο]ν ἀνα[γρ]άφσα]-
 [ι ἐστέλει λιθίνει ἐμ π]όλει τὸν γραμματέα τῆς βολῆς· [ἡοι δὲ π]-
 [ολεται ἀπομισθοσάντ]ον· ἡο[ι] δὲ κολακρέται δό[ν]το[ν] τὸ ἀργύρ]-
 [ιον· καλέσαι δὲ καὶ ἐπ]ι χσένια τὲν πρεσβείαν τὸν Ἐ[γ]εσταίων]
- 15 [ἐς πρυτανεῖον ἐς τὸν] νομιζόμενον χρόνον. ν Εὐφε[μος εἶπε· τὰ]
 [μὲν ἄλλα καθάπερ τῆι β]ολῆι· το δὲ λοιπὸν ἐπειδὰν π[ρέσβες ἔλ]-
 [θοσιν ἀπ' Ἐγεσταίων ἡο κ]έρυχς προσαγ[έ]το.....15.....]
 [.....22.....τὸ]ς π[ρέσβες - - ο]ι π[ρυτάνες
lacuna
- b [πρέσβες] Ἐγεσταί[ον ἡο]ιδε τὸν ἡόρκον ὀμοσαν.....12.....]
 [...7....]ικίνο Ἀπ[.....34.....]
vacat

The larger fragment, the surface of which is extremely worn, gives the main part of a decree concerning alliance with Egesta, and the beginning of an amendment. A smaller fragment, previously thought to be from a different stele, was shown by Raubitschek in 1943 to belong: it gives parts of the names of Egestan envoys and, below a

vacant space, the beginning of another decree concerning Halikyai (*Hesp.* xii (1943) 18 n. 29; more fully in *TAPA* lxxv (1944) 10-12; Woodhead, *Hesp.* xvii (1948) 59 f.; Manni Piraino, *Κώκαλος* vi (1960) 58-70), in a different and later hand.

The details of the Egesta decree cannot be recovered, but provision is almost certainly made for the exchange of oaths, and for the setting up of a stele on the Acropolis recording 'this decree and the oath' (cf. No. 52, ll. 57-8). The amendment starts before the terms of the oath are given; they were probably recorded separately, on another stele, or after the end of the decree and before the envoys' names.

The date of Athens' alliance with Egesta is controversial, depending on the restoration of an archon's name which ends in *ON* (l. 3). Until recently 454-3, when Ariston was archon, was generally accepted; for under that year Diodorus (xi. 86. 2) records a war in which Egesta was engaged. The text is unsatisfactory and has been emended to refer to a war between Egesta allied with Halikyai and Selinus: *κατὰ δὲ τὴν Σικελίαν Ἐγεσταίοις καὶ Ἀλικυαίοις* (for mss. *Λιλυβαίοις, Λιλυβαίταις*) *ἐνέστη πόλεμος (πρὸς Σελευοντίους)*. Raubitschek, however, in 1944 (*TAPA* lxxv, 10 n. 3), recalling Köhler's tentative report of a curving stroke before omicron, and noting on his squeeze a vertical stroke in the preceding space, restored *ἡάβρον*. These readings were challenged by Pritchett (*AJA* lix (1955) 58 f.), who found no trace of a curving stroke and claimed that the vertical stroke was wrongly placed to be part of beta, and was more probably not part of a letter. Meritt supported Raubitschek's interpretation of the vertical (*BCH* lxxxviii (1964) 413-15). Meanwhile Mattingly (*Hist.* xii (1963) 268 f.) had advocated an entirely different context, restoring *Ἄντ]ιφόν*, archon of 418-17, shortly before the great expedition against Syracuse, which was partly instigated by Egesta. We have not been able to confirm a curving stroke, and we still feel doubtful whether the vertical is part of a letter. Of the three dates we would rule out 418-17, because we know of no dated ξ after 445, and no *R* after 438-7 (Meiggs, *JHS* lxxxvi (1966) 92). It is also unlikely that Thucydides would have failed to mention it in his introduction to the Sicilian expedition, had Egesta exchanged oaths with Athens so recently. Diodorus' evidence for the dates of battles is not reliable, and even if Egesta became involved in 454-3 this would not be inconsistent with the making of an alliance with Athens four years earlier. On broad historical grounds Athens is more likely to have accepted commitments in Sicily in the early fifties, when the war against the Peloponnesians and the Egyptian expedition were running strongly in her favour, than in 454-3 when the Athenian and allied forces in Egypt, if not already overwhelmed, had at least been driven from Memphis and blockaded on Prosopitis. We prefer *ἡάβρον*. Athens'

motives in making an alliance so early with Egesta can only be guessed. It may have been merely the dynamism of over-confidence, seizing opportunities whenever they appeared; perhaps Athens was interested in Sicilian corn, to enter the market for herself, or to deny it to the Peloponnese (cf. later, in 427, Thuc. iii. 86. 4: *βουλόμενοι δὲ μήτε σῖτον ἐς τὴν Πελοπόννησον ἄγεσθαι αὐτόθεν*). For this purpose the Ionian cities of east Sicily would have been more important. Athens may have made alliances with them at about the same time (but we would not date the alliances with Rhegion and Leontinoi of Nos. 63 and 64 as early as the fifties).

Roos, while accepting a date in the fifties for the decree, argues that it was not an alliance but a mere treaty of friendship, and that Egesta did not become an ally of Athens until she appealed to the Athenian Assembly in 415. We know of no such limited agreements from the fifth century, and the heading seems to require the restoration of *χρυσμαχία*.

38 (37)

Victory of Selinus: fifth century B.C.

On a block of reddish limestone from Temple G at Selinus; now in the Palermo Museum.

Local alphabet, not stoichedon. Phots. and facs.: Calder, op. *infra* cit., Pl. 1-3.

Calder, *The Inscription from Temple G at Selinus* (Greek, Roman and Byzantine Monographs, no. 4) +, *Gk. Rom. Byz. Stud.* v (1964) 113-19.

[δι]ὰ τὸς θεὸς τό[σ]δε νικῶντι τοὶ Σελινό[τιοι.]
 [δι]ὰ τὸν Δία νικῶμες καὶ διὰ τὸν Φόβον [καὶ]
 δ[ιὰ] Ἡερακλέα καὶ δι' Ἀπόλλωνα καὶ διὰ Π[ο]τ[τ]-
 ε[ιδᾶ]να καὶ διὰ Τυνδαρίδας καὶ δι' Ἀθ[α]-
 5 ναίαν καὶ διὰ Μαλοφόρον καὶ διὰ Πασι[κ]-
 ρά[τ]ειαν καὶ διὰ τὸς ἄλλος θεός, διὰ δ[ὲ] Δία
 μάλιστα. φιλία[ς] δὲ γενομένας ἐν χ[ρ]υσ-
 έο[ι] ἐλά[σ]αντα[ς καὶ] ὀνύματα ταῦτα κολ-
 άψαντ[ας εἰς] τὸ Ἀ[π]ολλόνιον καθθέμε-
 10 ν, τὸ Διό[ς 2-3]γράφ[ψ]αντες. τὸ δὲ χρυσίον
 ἐξέκ[οντα τα]λάντων [ἔ]μεν.

l. 10: Though Calder prints and discusses *ἐνγράφ[ψ]αντες*, comparison of his p. 17 shows that *προγράφ[ψ]αντες* (Holm-Benndorf) is equally possible.

The occasion of this inscription cannot be fixed. Epigraphically, any date between *c.* 460 and the destruction of Selinus in 409 might be accommodated, and the popularity, before Calder, of a date *c.* 450 has rested on the attraction of importing Selinus into the war of Diod. xi. 86. 2, on which see the commentary to No. 37. Calder hesitantly suggests the defeat of the Athenian expedition in 413 as the cause for the celebration.

The inscription falls into two halves. In ll. 1-7 the gods responsible for Selinus' victory are named. Phobos is best regarded as the war-god of Selinus rather than specifically thought of as the son of Ares. *Μαλοφόρος*, probably the Apple-bringer rather than the Sheep-bringer, is Demeter, one of the principal deities of Selinus' ultimate mother city Megara. The position of *Πασικράτεια* suggests that she is the Selinuntine Persephone. Calder argues, to us, at any rate, unconvincingly, that ll. 2-7 are in choriambic dimeters and form a 'Zeus-song'.

Ll. 7-11 with their infinitives have generally been taken as an extract from a decree; we doubt if the possibility of an oracle can be completely excluded. Now that peace has come, something is to be beaten out in gold, and the names of the gods are to be inscribed (properly 'pecked', 'put in in dots') on it, and it is to be put in the Apollonion (Temple G itself?); the 'Zeus-song' is to be written up (Calder) *or* the name of Zeus is to be written first (Holm). The gold object is to be of 60 talents. Calder argues that the object was probably to weigh 60 talents and, chiefly from the usage of *ἐλά[σα]ντα[ς]*, that it should be a shield; others have preferred a statue or statues or a gold plate. A solid gold shield weighing 60 talents would have been a dedication as costly as Pheidias' Athena Parthenos (No. 54) and we find it a shade unlikely. Other interpretations are possible, and we slightly prefer Schubring's view (*Arch. Zeitung*, i (1873) 102 f.) by which 60 talents would be the cost in silver of the gold object (see Woodward, *JHS* lxxxvi (1966) 297).

39 (30)

Athenian Tribute: 454-3 to 432-1 B.C.

When in 478-7 the grand alliance was formed under Athenian leadership, the sacred island of Delos was chosen as the centre for league meetings and the payment of tribute. In 454 the league treasury was moved to Athens, and in and from 454-3 the allies were required to bring their tribute to Athens. There it was received by the *hellenotamiai* (an Athenian board from the first) under the general control

of the Boule. From the tribute a sixtieth of each city's payment was reserved for Athena (these first-fruits may until 454 have been paid to Delian Apollo), and the *hellenotamiai* had to submit their list of these *aparchai* to the public auditors and then have them inscribed and publicly displayed. The procedure is summarized in the heading of the first list, which is considerably fuller than its successors: [ἡαῖδε ἀπαρχαὶ τῆι θεοῖ παρεδέχθησαν παρ]ὰ τῶν ἑλλ[ενο]ταμιῶν κοῖ[ς . . . 7 . . . | . . . ἐγραμμάτευε καὶ τοῖς λογιστῆσι τοῖς] τριάκο[ντα ἀπ]εφάνθησαν [ἀπὸ τῶ φό]ρο ἡὸν ἡαι πόλεις ἀπέγαγον ἐπὶ Ἀρίστονος] ἄρχοντος Ἀ[θεν]αίοις μὲν ἂ[πὸ τῶ ταλ|άντο].

The heading of the second list is reduced to a single line, merely giving the name of the secretary, the number of the list in the series, and a reference to the thirty (auditors): [ἐπὶ τῆς ἄρχῆς τῆ]ς δευτέρ[α]ς ἡεῖ Λ[έον ἐγραμμάτευε: τοῖς τριάκοντα]. The third heading follows the second (and τοῖς τριάκοντα is preserved), but in the fourth and subsequent lists the thirty drop out, and the deme of the secretary to the *hellenotamiai* is added.

The form of the lists is also gradually standardized. In the first list the *aparche* follows the name of the city, separated from it by a colon (:); in the second list the figures precede the name but are not carefully aligned; in the third and subsequent lists the first figures of the *aparchai* are in line, presenting a much tidier pattern. The lists of the first fifteen years were inscribed on a large block of marble (3·663 m. × 1·109 m. × 0·385 m.), with a slight downward taper of the stele on the obverse and reverse faces. The first list is set out in six columns, and for the only year in the series a summary is added, on the right side; the second list has seven columns on the obverse, but three further columns are added on the right side. All subsequent lists are confined to a single side. The first six lists are inscribed on the obverse, the next list completes the right side; the reverse is next used for five lists, and the last two lists are on the left side. Pritchett has maintained, on the evidence of the surface of the top, that there was a crowning member on the stele (*Hist.* xii (1964) 120-34). At first he thought that there might have been a relief which would have provided room on the back for a tribute list. When he was able to examine the evidence more closely, he modified his views considerably, but still thought that there was a finial on top (*Gk. Rom. Byz. Stud.* vii (1966) 123-7, viii (1967) 113-19). We do not find the evidence convincing and are inclined, following Meritt (*Hesp.* xxxv (1966) 134-40), to believe that the first stele had no crowning member. From 438-7 a second and smaller stele is used for the lists down to 432-1. Subsequent lists seem to have been inscribed on separate stelai.

The cities are usually expressed by the ethnic (e.g. *Κυμαῖοι*, *Ἀκάνθιοι*), more rarely by the place-name (e.g. *Περκόττε*, *Τυρόδιζα*),

and very occasionally the name of the local ruler is given (e.g. *Kāpes hōn Týmnes āρχει, Πίκρες Συαν[γελεύς*: further examples in *ATL* i. 446). Sometimes a group of states unite in a single payment (for *syntelies* see *ATL* i. 446-9).

For the first eight years there is rarely any sustained geographical order, but in some lists it may be possible to distinguish late payers. It cannot be coincidence that the first nine names preserved in the second list are Carian cities, none of which is found in the surviving fragments of the first year (and the first nine names, which are not preserved, were also probably Carian). We can accept the inference that these payments were collected from defaulters by an Athenian task-force and represent payments which should have been made in 454-3 (*ATL* iii. 7-9). Significantly the letter-forms of the first column differ from those of the rest of the list. Similarly in the fifth list (450-49) the last column seems to be composed, mainly at least, of late payments and complements of incomplete payments (see No. 50). In the list of 446-5 there is a tendency towards geographical grouping, but this is less pronounced in the two following years. In the list of 443-2, however, and in all subsequent lists the cities are grouped under district headings: *Ἰονικός, ἡελλεσπόντιος, ἐπὶ Θράκιες* (sometimes *ἀπὸ Θράκιες* or *Θραικικός*), *Καρικός, Νεσιοτικός*; but soon, probably from 438, the Ionian and Carian districts are merged under the heading *Ἰονικός*.

The pseudo-Xenophontic oligarchic pamphlet tells us that tribute was normally reassessed at four-year intervals ([Xen.] *Ἄθ. Πολ.* 3. 5). This is confirmed by the lists that survive. It is clear from changes in tributes that there were assessments in 450, 446, 434, and these were years of the Great Panathenaia (see also No. 69, ll. 26-33); only one extraordinary assessment is known before the Peloponnesian War, in 443-2. It has been suggested that this assessment was brought forward a year to clear the decks for a specially grand celebration of the great Panathenaia in 442 (*ATL* iii. 306); it is more probable that 443 was a year of reorganization. It is the first year in which the cities are listed under district headings, though this is not a major matter; it is more significant that for the first time an assistant secretary is recorded in the heading, and the same man remains in office for a second year, suggesting that there is more work than usual for the *hellenotamiai*. There is also another new feature in the list of 443-2, which is more permanent. The name and deme of one of the *hellenotamiai* is included; he may be the chairman of the board. In all this there is perhaps a hint of some financial reorganization following the ostracism of Thucydides son of Melesias. According to Plutarch (*Per.* 14), in the last phase of their political struggle Thucydides was attacking Pericles for his extravagant wasting of the city's finances. And at some time in or near the forties a whole board of *hellenotamiai* was

condemned to death on a charge that subsequently proved groundless (Antiphon, v. 69).

Within an assessment period changes in tribute were made only in exceptional circumstances, as, for instance, when land was taken for Athenian settlers in the Chersonese and the tribute of the peninsula was reduced from 18 T. to less than 2 T. But in assessment years all tributes were reviewed in the light of economic and political conditions, and the extent of revision varied considerably. In 450 there is a significant pattern only in the islands, where there were 6 reductions, only 1 increase. In 446 the islands were unchanged; in the four other districts there were at least 25 reductions, only 2 (possibly 3) increases. The general pattern suggests a policy of concessions by Athens after the dangerous crisis of 446, when a decisive defeat by the Boeotians at Koroneia was followed by the revolt of Megara and Euboea and a Peloponnesian invasion. In the thirties the Athenian mood seems to stiffen. In 439 for the first year payments of *ἐπιφορά* are recorded, something in addition to the normal tribute, and possibly to be explained as the interest charged for late payments (*ATL* i. 450-3, but see Eddy, *AJP* lxxxix (1968) 129-43). Eight cities are concerned in 439, and entries appear in the following years. But too little of the lists down to 434-3 is preserved to estimate the number of payments; in the list of 433-2, which has few gaps, there are only two cases.

In 433 two new headings appear at the end of the list. Eleven cities are described as *πόλεις αὐταὶ φόρον ταχσάμεναι*, and only three have been previously recorded, as *ἄτακτοι*. They are all small states; seven of them in the Thraceward area, Kallipolis in the Chersonese, the Eteokarpathians of the island of Karpathos and the small islands of Amorgos and Kasos. The inclusion of these cities has by some been thought to be the result of *apotaxis*, the separation of small communities from larger, but for this there is no evidence and some of the small states are not near any important neighbours on whom they might be dependent. The natural translation of the heading is 'cities who got their own assessment'. Formally they themselves determined what they should pay, but this is not inconsistent with the gentleness of pressure. The second category are described as *πόλεις ἡς ἰοὶ ἰδιόται ἐνέγραψαν φόρον φέρειν*. There are thirteen of them, and they too are small and unimportant cities; the individuals who enrolled them are more probably members of the cities than Athenians. That these two groups of new members were not freely joining the empire through good will towards Athens is strongly suggested by their record later. When war broke out few of them continued to pay. (For a detailed discussion, F. A. Lepper, *JHS* lxxxii (1962) 25-55.)

These two groups added twenty-four cities to the empire, but

financially they were of little significance: together they contributed less than 6 T. This is a useful warning that the count of the number of states in each list can be misleading if pressed too hard. 140 states may produce more tribute than 160, and when the total jumps by 10 it may mean no more than that two or three *syntelies* have been broken up into their constituent parts. Some broad conclusions, however, can be drawn. The average length of the lists of the first period is the shortest of all those for the pre-war periods, and the first list is the shortest of all; the relative shortness of these lists of the late fifties seems largely to be accounted for by the absence of many of the islands which are later included. Two explanations are possible. The more commonly held view is that most of the islands were contributing ships down to 450 (*ATL* iii. 267 f., based on West, *Am. Hist. Rev.* xxxv (1929-30) 267-75). The alternative view is that the shortness of these lists, especially the first, reflects the reaction of the allies to the disaster in Egypt and the transfer of the league's centre from Delos to Athens, which the islanders may have resented more than others (Nesselhauf, *Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der delisch-attischen Symmachie*, 12; Meiggs, *JHS* lxxiii (1943) 31-3, *Harv. Stud.* lxxvii (1963) 6-9). The striking fluctuation in numbers during the second period from 450 to 446 must also be significant; but these lists raise special problems which will be separately discussed (No. 50).

While from a count of lines we can know, at least approximately, the number of cities contributing each year, it is much more difficult to estimate the total amount of tribute received by Athens. No list is completely preserved and in the lists of the middle thirties only a few names survive. In some of the lists of the forties, however, there are not many large gaps, and other evidence provides a rough control. Thucydides leads us to expect totals rising by 431 to 600 T., from an original assessment of 460 T. (ii. 13. 3: *θαρσεῖν τε ἐκέλευε προσιόντων μὲν ἑξακοσίων ταλάντων ὡς ἐπὶ τὸ πολὺ φόρου κατ' ἐνιαυτὸν ἀπὸ τῶν συμμάχων*: original assessment, i. 96. 2). On the other hand, Tod's estimate for 443-2 is 349 T. 1,140 dr., or, if Thasos is restored in that year in place of Serme, 379 T. 640 dr.; and for 433-2, 388 T. 390 dr. Sufficient survives of these two lists to give confidence that in such estimates the margin of error must be less than 20 T. Two other pieces of evidence need to be taken into account. In the first year, 454-3, the total of the year's *aparchai* is recorded and separate figures are given for silver and electrum. However, the surface of the stone is very badly worn and the text is insecure; our own observations do not agree entirely either with *ATL* or with Pritchett, *Gk. Rom. Byz. Stud.* vii (1966) 127-9. See now McGregor, *ibid.* viii (1967) 103-12. The basis for assessing the amount of electrum is inadequate, but several figures of the silver total survive: [τῶ] ἀργυρίο: [κεφάλαιον

ἐν][. .]XXHHHΔΔ[. There are two possible restorations for the two first figures [ϞΤ] or [ϞΧ]. The first gives a total of 383 talents paid in silver, the second 333 talents, and to these figures must be added the electrum total, almost certainly not exceeding the equivalent of 30 T. of silver. There may also be a rather better clue to the tribute total for 443 in the Parthenon building-account for 444-3 (*IG* i². 342. 36). In the record of receipts the payment to the commissioners by the treasurers of Athena is followed by a payment by the *hellenotamiai*; on the analogy of the Propylaia accounts (see No. 60) this payment probably represents the *aparchai* of the year: [...]XXϞHϞΔΔΓ||||. The vital first figures are missing, but if this does represent the *aparchai* we can be reasonably certain that the total tribute was not less than 300 T., giving an *aparchai* total of 30,000 dr. The first three figures will be MMM; for the fourth, M, Ϟ, X are all formally possible, giving tribute totals of 426+T., 376+T., and 336+T. Of these the most likely is 376+T. It is very doubtful whether the tribute in any year before 433 exceeded 400 T., and when revolt broke out in Chalkidike in 432, more than 20 talents a year were lost. These figures cannot easily be reconciled with the strict meaning of Thucydides' words. The easiest solution is to assume that Thucydides was using *φόρος* in an extended sense to include payments that were not strictly tribute, such as the annual indemnity from Samos; such reconciliation would be still easier if, as *ATL* (iii. 132) suggests might be the case, *φόρον* is an editor's addition or a gloss, and not written by Thucydides.

Of the first stele 180 fragments have been found; of the second, 73. The earliest stages in their reconstruction are reflected in *IG* i. 226-72 (Kirchhoff, 1873). Important studies by Busolt (*Phil.* xli (1882) 652-718), Pedrolì (in Beloch's *Studi di storia antica*, i. 101-207), Larfeld (*Handbuch der griech. Epigraphik*, ii (1898) 20-43), Wilhelm (*Wien. Anz.* 1909, 41-58), and others contributed to much improved texts in *IG* i². 191-231 (Hiller von Gaertringen, 1924). In the following ten years more impressive advances were made in a number of detailed studies by West and Meritt, and revised texts were published by them in *SEG* v (1931). On West's untimely death in 1936 Meritt was joined by Wade-Gery and McGregor, and their combined views are set out in the four volumes of *The Athenian Tribute Lists* (1939-53). The first volume analyses, with ample illustration, the evidence of the fragments and revises the texts of *SEG* v, adding some relevant decrees. It also includes a register giving the tribute record of all cities whose names have survived, and a gazetteer in which the evidence for their sites is discussed. In vol. ii the texts of the tribute-lists are reprinted with improvements, together with an expanded collection of related texts. The history derived from them provides the main substance of vol. iii; vol. iv, in addition to indexes, includes a general bibliography. Among reviews, see Dow, *TAPA* lxxii (1941) 70-84; Klaffenbach, *Deutsche Lit. Zeit.* lxxi (1950) 33-7; Meiggs,

Eng. Hist. Rev. lv (1940) 104-6, *CR* lxiv (1950) 33-7, lxvi (1952) 97-100; Pritchett, *CP* xlvii (1952) 261-3.

Of other general studies, Nesselhauf, *Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der delisch-attischen Symmachie* (*Klio*, Beiheft xxx (1933)) is still valuable; Schwahn, s.v. *φόρος*, in *RE* zw. r. xx. 1 (1941) 545-644, is interesting but unreliable. A tabular record of the tribute from 453 to 431 is given in Hill, *Sources*², 403-26.

We give an extract from the last three columns (the best-preserved) of the first list, ll. 5-12 from the text in *ATL*:

IV	V
<p>[Μαρ]ονῖται: ΗΠ^Α [Λί]νδιοι: Π^ΑΗΗΗΔΔΔΔΓ^Α [Οί]ναῖοι ἐν Ἴ- κάροι: ΗΔΔΔΤΤΤ *Ἔσσιοι: Η Νεάνδρεια: ΔΔΔΤΤΤ[] Λαμπόνεια: ΔΓ^ΑΤ []</p>	<p>5 <i>ἡαβ[δερί]ται: ΧΗΗΠ^ΑΔΔΔΓ^Α </i> <i>ἽΟλύνθ[ιοι]: Σκα-</i> <i>βλαῖο[ι: Ἄσ]σε-</i> <i>ρῖται: Η[Η^ΑΔΓ^Α]Τ </i> <i>Σερμυλ[ιῆς]: Π^ΑΗΗΠ^ΑΔΔΤΤ</i> 10 <i>Μεκυπερ[να]ῖοι vacat</i> <i>Στόλιοι: Π[ολ]ι-</i> <i>χνῖται: ΗΗΔ[Δ]ΔΤ </i></p>

VI

- 5 *Ναρ[ι]σ[βαρῆς: ΔΓ^ΑΤ|||]*
Μυδ[ο]νῆς[: ΔΔΓ^Α]
Κια[ν]οί: Δ[Γ^ΑΤ|||]
Ἄρτακενο[ί: ΔΔΔΤΤΤ||]
Νεάπολις
10 *[ἐ]ν]Θ[ράικει: ΔΓ^ΑΤ|||]*
Βερύσιοι ὑπὸ
τῆι Ἰδει: ΔΓ^ΑΤ|||

In col. iv the five cities are in the following districts: Thrace, Caria, Ionia, Ionia (but once in the Hellespont), Hellespont. The eight of col. v are all in Thrace. In col. vi the order is Caria, Caria, Hellespont, Hellespont, Thrace, Hellespont.

40 (29)

Regulations for Erythrai: (?) 453-2 B.C.

A marble stele copied by ?Fauvel on the Acropolis, near the Erechtheum; now lost.

Early Attic letters, ΒΡΘΣ. Facs.: *CIG*, *ATL* ii. 38.

CIG i, addenda 73b, p. 891; *IG* i². 10; Highby, *Klio* Beiheft xxxvi (1936); Schaefer, *Hermes* lxxi (1936) 129-50; de Sanctis, *RF* lxv (1937) 299-309; Kolbe, *Hermes* lxxiii (1938) 249-68; Meiggs, *JHS* lxiii (1943) 21-33; Meritt, *Hesp.* xv (1946) 246-9; *ATL* ii. D 10.

- [ἔδοχσεν τῷ βολεῖ καὶ τῷ δέμοι - - - - - ἐπρυτάνευε - - - - -]
 [...] ἐπεστάτε, Δ[...] [- - - - - 'Ερ]-
 [υθραί]ος ἀπάγει σ[ί]το[ν] ἐς Παναθέναια τὰ μεγά[λα] ἄ[χ]σιον μὲ δ[ι]-
 [λέζον]ος ἔ τριῶν μνῶν καὶ ν[έ]μ[ε]ν 'Ερυθραῖον [τ]ο[ί]ς παρδοσι
 5 [- - - - -] ἡεροπο[ί]ος - - - - - ἔαν δὲ ἀπαγ[—
 [- - - - -] ἄχσι[ον] ἐ τριῶν μν[ῶν] κατὰ τὰ [...] εν[- - - - -] ἀπρί(α)σθαι σί[το]-
 [ν - - - - -] τὸν [δὲ δέ]μον - - - - -
 - - - - - τῷ βολομένοι 'Ερυθραῖον. [ἀ]π-
 [ὀ κ]υάμο δ[έ] βολὲν [έ]ναι ε[ἴ]κο[σ]ι καὶ [ἡ]έκατον ἄνδρας· τὸν δὲ
 10 [- - - - -] ἐν τῷ βολεῖ καὶ [μὲ χ]σέ[ν]ον ἔναι βολε[ύ]εν
 [μ]ε[δ]᾽ ὄλεζον ἔ τρι[ά]κοντα ἔτε γεγονό[τ]α· δίοχσιν δ' ἔναι [κατ]-
 [ὰ τ]ο[ν] ἐλε[γ]θέν[τ]ο[ν]. βολεύεν δὲ μὲ ἐντ[ὸ]ς τεττάρων ἐ[ἴ]των - - - -
 κναμεύσαι δ[έ] καὶ κατασ[τ]ῆσαι [τ]ὲν μὲν ν[ύ]ν βολὲν [τ]ὸς [ἐπισκ]-
 [ό]πος καὶ [τὸν] φρ[ό]ραρχον, τὸ δὲ λοιπὸν τὲν βολὲν καὶ τὸν [φρῶρ]-
 15 αρχον, μὲ ὄλε[ζ]ον ἔ τρι[ά]κοντα ἐμ[έ]ρας π[ρ]ὶν ἔχσιναί [τὲν βολ]-
 ἐν· ὀμνύναι [δὲ Δ]ία καὶ Ἀπό[λ]λο καὶ Δέμε[τρα] ἐπαρομένο[ς] ἐχσό[-
 [λ]ειαν ἐφ[ι]ορκῶσι - - - - κ[αὶ] παι[σ]ῖν ἐχσό[λ]εια[ν] - - - - -]
 [- - - -] κατὰ [ἡ]ιερῶν [- - - -] τ[έ]ν δὲ βολὲν μὲ ὄλ[ε]ζον [κ]ατα[καί]-
 [εν - - - - -] ἔαν δὲ μέ, ἔναι ζεμιῶσαι [χι]λ[ί]α[σ]ι δρα[χ]μῆσ[ι]-
 20 [ι - - - - -] τὸν δέμον κατακαίεν μὲ ὄλεζον·
 ὀμν[ύ]ναι [δὲ τά]δε [τὲν] βολὲν· βολεύσο ἄν [δύ]νο[μ]α[ί] ἄριστ[α κα]-
 [ί] δ[ι]κα[ί]οτα[τα] 'Ερυθραῖον τῷ πλέθει καὶ Ἀθηναίων καὶ τῶν [χσ]-
 [ν]μά[χ]ον [κ]αὶ οὐκ [ἀποσ]τέσομαι Ἀθηναίων τῷ π[λ]έθος οὐδὲ [τ]-
 [ὸν] χσνυμάχον τῶν Ἀθηναίων οὐτ' αὐτὸς ἐγὼ ο[ὐ]τ' ἄλλοι π[ε]ίσομ[αι]
 25 [οὐ]δ[έ] - - - - - οὐτ' αὐτὸς ἐγὼ οὐτ' ἄλλοι π[ε]ίσομαι - - - - -]
 [- - - -] τὸν φ[υ]γάδον [κατ]αδέχομαι οὐδ[έ] ἡένα οὐτ[- - - - -]
 [ἄλλοι π[ε]ίσο[μ]α[ί] τῶν ἐς Μέδος φε[ν]υγόντων ἄνευ τῆ[ς] βολ[ῆ]ς τῆ[ς]
 [Ἀθ]εναίων καὶ τῷ [δέ]μο [ο]ὐδὲ τῶν μενόντων ἐχσελό [ἀ]ν[ε]υ τῆ[ς] β[ο]-
 [λῆ]ς τῆ[ς] Ἀθηναίων καὶ [τῷ] δέμο· ἔαν δὲ τ[ί]ς ἀποκτ[έ]νι[ε] 'Ερυθρα[-
 30 [ί]ος ἡέτερον 'Ερ[υ]θρ[α]ῖον τεθ[ν]άτο ἔαν [γν]οσθῆι [- - - - -]
 [- - - -] γ[ν]οσθῆι φευγέτο [ἡ]άπασ[αν] τῆ[ν] Ἀθηναίων χσνυμαχ[ί]· κ[-
 [αὶ τ]ὰ χρέματα δεμόσια ἔσ[τ]ο 'Ερυθραῖον· ἔαν δὲ [τ]ίς [- - - - -]
 [- - - -] το[ί]ς τυράννοις [- - - -] 'Ερυθραῖον καὶ [- - - - -]
 [- - - -] τεθνάτο [- - - -] παῖδες [ἡ]οι ἐχσ ἐκέν[ο] - - - - -]
 35 [- - - - -] οὐ παῖδες [ἡ]οι ἐχσ [ἐ]κέν[ο] - - - - -]
 [- - - -] 'Ερυθραῖον καὶ [- - - -] Ἀθηναίων [- - - - -] τὰ δὲ χρέματα[-
 [- - - -] κατα[θ]έντ[ι]ς

ll. 37-46 are too uncertain to be restored.

All texts are based on Boeckh's publication in *CIG* of a copy probably made by Fauvel; both the stone and the original copy are now lost. Since the copy sometimes omitted letters and occasionally gave more letters than can have been on the stone, no precise figure is given for the number of letter-spaces available where no restoration is offered. Letters are dotted where the letter given by Fauvel could be mistaken for the letter that the sense seems to require. For a more adventurous restoration of the text see *ATL* D 10. 1. 2: $\Lambda[\nu\sigma\iota]κ[ρ\acute{\alpha}\tau\epsilon\varsigma \acute{\epsilon}\rho\chi\epsilon \gamma\nu\acute{\omicron}\mu\epsilon \tau\acute{\omicron}\nu \chi\omicron\nu\gamma\gamma\rho\alpha\phi\acute{\epsilon}\omicron\nu]$ Meritt. For alternatives see below. In the regulations for Miletus of 450-49 (D 11) the formula is $[\tau\acute{\alpha}\delta\epsilon \eta\omicron\iota \chi]σ\upsilon\nu\gamma\gamma\rho\alpha[\phi\acute{\epsilon}\varsigma \chi\omicron\nu\nu\acute{\epsilon}\gamma\rho\alpha\phi\sigma\alpha\nu]$. It would be a little surprising to find the shortened formula so early. 1. 3: Though Boeckh noted that σ and τ in $\sigma[\acute{\iota}]τ\omicron\nu$ were marked as uncertain in the copy, other restorations depart much further from the copy. Probably the Erythraians were required to bring corn to the Great Panathenaia. ll. 9 f.: $\tau\acute{\omicron}\nu \delta\acute{\epsilon} κ[\nu\alpha]μ\epsilon[\iota]υ\theta\acute{\epsilon}\nu\tau\alpha \acute{\epsilon}\lambda[\acute{\epsilon}]γ\chi\chi\epsilon\nu$ *ATL*; one would expect $\delta\omicron\kappa\omicron\mu\acute{\iota}\acute{\alpha}\acute{\zeta}\epsilon\nu$. Neither is close to the copy which has $\tau\omicron\nu\upsilon\Delta\epsilon\omicron\circ[\]\dots\upsilon\omicron\epsilon\Nu\acute{\epsilon}\varsigma\acute{\alpha}\omicron\epsilon.\omicron\epsilon.\omicron\Nu$. ll. 13 f.: The copy has $\Lambda\dots|\circ\circ\circ\varsigma$, but we accept $[\acute{\epsilon}\pi\iota\sigma\kappa]|\acute{\omicron}[\pi]ος$, because these officials are concerned with the appointment of the first Boule but not of its successors. As contrasted with $\acute{\alpha}\rho\chi\omicron\nu\tau\epsilon\varsigma$ and $\phi\rho\omicron\upsilon\rho\alpha\rho\chi\omicron\iota$, $\acute{\epsilon}\pi\iota\sigma\kappa\omicron\upsilon\pi\omicron\iota$ are travelling commissioners who help to deal with constitutional issues; they do not remain in the cities they visit (see Hill, *Sources*², Index, p. 356: Busolt, *Gr. St.* 1355). 1. 17: The copy indicates 14 letter-spaces after $\epsilon\omicron\circ(= \epsilon\circ\phi)$. ll. 17 f.: $\tau\acute{\omicron}\delta\]\nu \delta\acute{\epsilon} \eta\acute{\omicron}\delta[\rho]κ\omicron\nu \acute{\omicron}[\mu\nu\acute{\nu}]ν\alpha\iota] \kappa\alpha\tau\acute{\alpha} [\eta]ι\epsilon\rho\acute{\omicron}\nu [\kappa]α\iota\omicron\mu\acute{\epsilon}\nu\omicron\nu$; *IG* i², *ATL*. 1. 20: $\kappa\alpha\iota \eta[\]\acute{\omicron}[\tau]αν \eta\omicron \delta\acute{\epsilon}\mu\omicron\varsigma \acute{\omicron}\mu\nu\acute{\nu}\epsilon\iota$ *ATL*. This restoration keeps close to the copy, but to introduce the people's oath so indirectly would be odd. See below. ll. 32 f.: $\acute{\epsilon}\alpha\nu \delta\acute{\epsilon} \tau\iota\varsigma [\eta\alpha]λ\acute{\omicron}\delta[\iota] \pi\rho\omicron|\delta\iota\delta[\omicron]\varsigma \tau\omicron[\acute{\iota}]\varsigma \tau\upsilon\rho\acute{\alpha}\nu\nu\omicron\iota\varsigma \tau\acute{\epsilon}\mu \pi\acute{\omicron}\lambda[\iota\nu \tau]έν \Upsilon\rho\upsilon\theta\rho\alpha\iota[\omicron]\nu$ *IG* i², *ATL*. This seems to be required by the sense, but the copy has, after $\tau\upsilon\rho\acute{\alpha}\nu\nu\omicron\iota\varsigma$, $\tau\epsilon\mu\Nu\alpha\mathcal{M}.\omicron\varsigma$.

It is clear that Fauvel found the stone very difficult to read, but he recorded what he thought he saw and not what he thought he ought to see. The opening and closing sections of his text make no sense and attempts at detailed restoration are unprofitable. The central section was apparently much less worn; Fauvel's text is intelligible and needs considerably less modification.

All that can safely be said of the opening section (ll. 2-8) is that it concerns the obligations of Erythrai to the Great Panathenaia. In the early forties Athens required all members of the Delian League to bring standard offerings of cow and panoply to this greatest of Athenian festivals (No. 46, ll. 41 f., but the date is disputed). The Erythraian regulations are less simple and represent an early stage in the conversion of an Athenian into an Empire festival. The central section (ll. 8-29) lays down the main terms of the political settlement. A democratic council is to be installed on the Athenian model; the number, 120, is considerably smaller than Athens' 500, and, while an Athenian could serve only twice, it seems that the Erythraian was only

debarred from being a member twice within four years. The first new democratic council is to be installed by the Athenian *ἐπίσκοποι* in co-operation with the *φρούραρχος* (garrison commander); in future by the *φρούραρχος* acting with the outgoing council. Councillors on entering office are required to take an oath of loyalty to the new Erythraian democracy, to the Athenian democracy, and to the allies of Athens, and there are to be no more political expulsions or restorations without the authority of Athens. Those who may not be restored are 'those who have taken refuge with the Medes' (l. 27), and later there is probably a warning against 'betraying the city to the tyrants' (l. 33). We infer that Athens has forcibly intervened to expel a small medizing faction, and set up a democracy. She has installed a garrison which will remain to safeguard the settlement and protect Erythrai from medizers. The following section (ll. 29 ff.) opens with the provision that murder shall be punished by death, but these cases are not, as later, subject to Athenian control, and if an Erythraian is exiled he is automatically outlawed from all cities of the Athenian alliance. Any attempt to betray the city to the tyrants also incurs the death penalty. In the last five lines restorations become increasingly insecure.

Modern discussion of this important decree was reopened by Highby's detailed re-examination of its text, date, and historical significance. Highby, in contrast to most earlier commentators, emphasized the implied friendliness of Athens, the reality of the Persian menace, and the degree of independence left to Erythrai in contrast with later Athenian settlements with other cities. He concluded that the decree marked the original entry of Erythrai into the Delian League when Athens drove out a medizing faction and liberated the town, probably in the sixties. Highby was right in pointing the contrast with later settlements (note that the Delian League is still called a *χωννμαχίς* or *χωννμαχία* (l. 31), not yet *πόλεις ἡδὲν Ἀθηναῖοι ἄρχουσι*); but had Erythrai been outside the league up to this point, the decree would have opened with a declaration of alliance. The more natural interpretation is that Erythrai had temporarily revolted from the league and had been restored to loyalty by Athenian armed intervention.

A proper appreciation of the decree's significance depends on its date. From the letter-forms as printed in *CIG* the date cannot be more narrowly set than *c.* 470-450. A more precise date, however, can be given if certain assumptions are accepted. Two independent fragments in London and Athens (*IG* i². 11, 12/13a) also concern an Athenian settlement with Erythrai. The first mentions *ἐπίσκοποι* and *φρούραρχος* and deals with legal cases whose nature is not clear; the second contains an oath of loyalty to Athens and her allies and marks the close of a decree. These two fragments, whose letter-forms and spacing are very similar, probably come from the same stele (Meiggs, *op. cit.*,

p. 34, accepted by Meritt, *Hesp.* xv (1946) 246-9). Their letter-forms suggest a date not earlier than 460 and not later than 445. They can be restored to give a stoichedon line of forty-seven letters, which without undue strain can be applied also to the lost inscription. It is a tempting economy with Meritt to regard these two fragments as part of the same decree that Fauvel copied. Meritt finds the essential link in l. 20 of Fauvel's text, where he restores: [καὶ ἡ]δ[τ]αν ἡο δέμος ὀμνύει τὸν δέμον κατακαίειν μὲ ὄλεζον; the oath of the Athens fragment will be the people's oath to which this line refers. Meritt further restores in the prescript an archon's name, Α[νσι]κ[ράτες ἔρχε], so dating the document in 453-2. This date would provide an admirable historical context. The tribute-lists suggest that Erythrai was not paying tribute in 453-2, since Boutheia, which is normally listed with the other small cities of the Erythraian peninsula, paid separately, and considerably more than her normal payment. We can accept the conclusion of *ATL* (i. 487) that Boutheia remained loyal while Erythrai revolted. The tribute-lists illustrate similar trouble at Miletus at this same time. Miletus, almost certainly absent from the list of 454-3, is paying again in 452-1. An Athenian force could have recovered both Erythrai and Miletus in the summer of 452.

The main issues are not, however, settled beyond dispute, for there are serious difficulties in linking the two surviving fragments with Fauvel's stone: (1) The form of rho in *CIG* is consistently R; in the surviving fragments it is consistently P. In *CIG* there is sometimes confusion between R and P, but no instance of P being printed as R. There is also some confirmation from Fauvel's text that the *CIG* form is correct; Fauvel's .IEKON of l. 18 probably reflects HIERON. (2) If the oath of the Athens fragment (*IG* i². 12/13a) is an oath to be taken by the people in addition to the council's-oath, it should be directly introduced. In Meritt's text the first mention of it is 'and when the people takes its oath' (l. 20). These two fragments may therefore be from a separate decree, and their datable letter-forms will not necessarily help towards the dating of Fauvel's decree. There would remain only the restored archon's name, and *Λυσανίας* (466-5) would fit equally well the vertical stroke that survives. Nor is an archon's name essential or even normal in fifth-century inscriptions before the Peace of Nicias. Such a restoration as Α[έον] ε[ἶπε] is also possible. We prefer to think that Athens had to intervene more than once at Erythrai, as at Miletus, and that the surviving fragments are later than Fauvel's decree and reflect a tightening up—towards the end of the fifties; in which case the lost decree might be from the early fifties or even earlier; or the lost decree might be from 453-2 and the surviving fragments from 450-49, when Athens intervened for a second time at Miletus (*ATL* ii. D 11).

Four further fragments (*IG* i². 12/13b + *Hesp.* xiv. 82-3) have been in the past associated with *IG* i². 11 and 12/13a, but were rejected by Meritt, *Hesp.* xv. 246-7, since their thicknesses were different. We are doubtful whether the thicknesses are original; these fragments need further consideration.

41 (36)

Civil Laws of Gortyn: about 450 B.C.

Twelve columns engraved on the inner surface of a circular wall, which supported the cavea of a theatre constructed about the first century B.C. or later: the wall had previously formed part of a much earlier building. One detached fragment in the Louvre, the rest *in situ* at ancient Gortyn.

Archaic Cretan writing, boustrophedon. The columns follow in sequence from right to left. Digamma (*F*) is in use, but not koppa: κ serves for κ and χ, π for π and φ, κσ for ξ; there is no aspirate sign. Full photos. and facs.: *IC* iv. 72, Willetts, *The Law Code of Gortyn*.

IC iv. 72+ (Guarducci) and Willetts, *op. cit.* (1967), are fundamental with full translation and commentary. Other important editions are Bücheler and Zitelmann (*Rh. Mus.* xl (1885) suppl.); *IJG* i. 352 ff.; Köhler and Ziebarth (1912); Buck 117. An elementary introduction to the Code as a whole, G. Smith, *Acta Congressus Madvigiani*, i. 235-49. English translations: Merriam, *AJA* i (1885) 324-39, ii (1886) 24-37 (whence Botsford and Sihler, *Hellenic Civilization*, 275-88); Roby, *Law Quarterly Review*, ii (1886) 135 ff. See also Willetts, *Aristocratic Society in Ancient Crete*, *passim*; Diamond, *Primitive Law*, 54 f., 303, 309, 364-7.

We republish one section only (iv. 23-vi. 1).

Col. iv. 23: τὸν πατέρα τῶν | τέκνον καὶ τῶν κρεμάτων κ||αρτερὸν ἔμεν
τὰδ δαίσιος | καὶ τὰν ματέρα τῶν φῶν αὐ|τᾶς κρεμάτων. ἄς κα δόοντι, |
30 μὲ ἐπάνανκον ἔμεν δατέ|θθαι. αἱ δέ τις ἀταθείε, ἀποδ||άτταθθαι τοῖ
ἀταμένοι ἀ|ι ἔγρατται. ἔ δέ κ' ἀποθάνει τις, |(σ)τέγαις μὲν τὰς ἐν πόλι
35 κ' ἀ|τι κ' ἐν ταῖς (σ)τέγαις ἐνέι, αἱ|ς κα μὲ Φοικεὺς ἐνΦοικεῖ ἐπ||ὶ κόραι
Φοικίον, καὶ τὰ πρόβατα κα|ι καρταῖποδα, ἀ κα μὲ Φοικέος εἶ, | ἐπὶ τοῖς
υἰάσι ἔμεν, τὰ δ' ἀλ|λα κρέματα πάντα δατέθθαι|ι καλῶς καὶ λανκάνεν
40 τὸς μ||έν υἰύς, ὁπόττοι κ' ἴοντι, δύ|ο μοῖρανς Φέκαστον, τὰδ δ|ἐ
θυγατέρανς, ὁπότται κ' ἴον|τι, μίαν μοῖραν Φεκάσταν. δ|ατέθ[θ]αι δὲ
45 καὶ τὰ ματρῶια, ἔ || κ' ἀποθά[νε]ι, ἀιπερ τὰ [πατρῶ]ι' | ἔγ[ρατ]ται. αἱ
δὲ κρέματα μὲ εἴ|ε, στέγα δέ, λακὲν τὰθ θ[υ]γατέ|ρας ἀι ἔγρατται.
50 *vacat* αἱ δὲ κα λε|ι ὁ πατέρ δοὸς ἰὸν δόμεν τᾶ||ι ὀπυιομένοι, δότο κατὰ
τ|ὰ ἔγραμμένα, πλίονα δὲ μέ. *vacat* | ὅτεῖαι δὲ πρόθθ' ἔδοκε ἔ ἐπέσ|πενσε,

ταῦτ' ἔκεν, ἄλλα δὲ μὲ | ἔτι τῶν π[α]τροί[ο]ν [κ]ρέ[ματ'] | Col. v:
 ἀπολαν[κά]νεν. γυνὰ ὁ[τ]εία κ[ρ]έματα μὲ ἔκει ἔ [πα]τροδὸ δό[ν]τος ἔ
 5 ἀ[δ]ελπιῶ ἔ ἐπισπέν|σαντος ἔ ἀπολά[κ]ονσα ἀ|| ὄκ' ὁ Αἰθ[α]λεὺς
 (σ)ταρτὸς ἐκόσ|μιον οἱ σὺν Κύ[λ]λοι, ταύτ|ας μὲν ἀπολανκάνεν, ταῖ|δ
 δὲ πρόθηα μὲ ἔ[ν]δικον ἔμεν.
 10 *Leaf* ἔ κ' ἀποθάνει ἀνὲρ ἔ γυν|ιά, αἱ μὲν κ' ἔι τέκνα ἔ ἐς τέ|κνον
 τέκνα ἔ ἐς τούτον τέ|κνα, τούτος ἔκε[ν] τὰ κρέμα|τα. *palms* αἱ δὲ κα
 15 μέτις ἔι τούτο|ν, ἀ[[α]]δελπιοὶ δὲ τῷ ἀποθανόν||τος κ' ἐκς ἀδε[λ]πιδὸν
 τέκν|α ἔ ἐς τούτον τέκνα, τούτ|ος ἔκεν τὰ κρέματα. *palms* αἱ δὲ κα | μέτις
 20 ἔι τούτον, ἀδευπιαὶ δ|ὲ τῷ ἀποθανόντος κ' ἐς ταυτ||ᾶν τέκνα ἔ ἐς τῶν
 τέκνον τέ|κνα, τούτος ἔκεν τὰ κρέμα|τα. *palms* αἱ δὲ κα μέτις ἔι τούτον, |
 25 οἷς κ' ἐπιβάλλει ὅπῳ κ' ἔι τὰ κρ|έματα, τούτος ἀναιλέθηα||. *palms* αἱ
 δὲ μὲ εἶεν ἐπιβάλλοντε|ς τᾶς Φοικίας, οὔτινές κ' | ἴοντι ὁ κλᾶρος τούτους
 ἔ|κεν τὰ κρέματα. *vacat*
 30 αἱ δὲ κ' οἱ | ἐπιβάλλοντες οἱ μὲν λεί||οντι δατέθθαι τὰ κρέματ|α οἱ δὲ
 μέ, δικάκσαι τὸν δι|καστὰν ἐπὶ τοῖλ λείονσι δ|ατέθθαι ἔμεν τὰ κρέματα
 35 π|άντα πρὶν κα δάττονται. *vacat* || αἱ δὲ κα δικάκσαντος τῷ δι|καστᾶ
 κάρτει ἐνσεῖει ἔ ἀ|γει ἔ πέρει, δέκα στατέραν|ς καταστασεῖ καὶ τὸ
 40 κρέ|ος διπλεῖ. *vacat* τνατὸν δὲ καὶ καρ||πῷ καὶ φέμας κ' ἀντιδέμας κ' |
 ἐπιπολαῖον κρεμάτων αἷ κα μ|ὲ λείοντι δατέθ[θ]θαι, τῶ|ν δ|[ικαστ]ᾶν
 45 ὁμνύντα κρίνα|ι πορτὶ τὰ μολιόμενα. *vacat* [α]ἰ [δ]||έ κα κρέματα δατιό-
 μενοι| μὲ συγγιγνόςκοντι ἀν|πὶ τὰν δαῖσιν, ὄνεν τὰ κρέμ|ατα κ' ὅς κα
 50 πλείστον διδ|οὶ ἀποδόμενοι, τὰν τιμᾶν || δια[λ]ακόντων τὰν ἐπαβο|λὰν
 φέκαστος. *palms* δατιομέ|νοιδ δὲ κρέματα μαίτυρα|νς παρέμεν δρομέανς
 ἐλε|υθέρους τρίνς ἔ πλίανς. | Col. vi: θυγατρὶ ἔ διδοῖ, κατὰ τὰ αὐτ|ά.

For the Cretan dialect the standard works on Greek dialects may be consulted (e.g. Buck, pp. 169–72), together with J. Brause, *Lautlehre der kretischen Dialekte*. For the language of the Code cf. Schick, *RF* lxxxiii (1955) 373–6.

We find frequent references in antiquity to the publication of laws by means of their inscription upon tablets or on the walls of public buildings (Wilhelm, *Beitr.* 264–71), but this is the best example of their preservation to our times in this form. Not that we have before us a complete and ordered code, comparable to that of Hammurabi or of the XII Tables. The 'Code' of Gortyn is rather the result of a revision, more or less thoroughgoing and systematic, of earlier laws by the Gortynian legislative body, in which some important questions are dealt with only cursorily, while others are wholly neglected. It

contains frequent references to previously existing law, the knowledge and practice of which is throughout assumed.

Crete was famous for its early laws and lawgivers, and in this respect Gortyn had a specially high reputation (cf. Strabo, x. 4. 17, p. 481). The site is rich in other legal texts, both earlier than (*IC* iv. 1-71) and nearly contemporary with (*IC* iv. 73-140) the 'Code'. No fifth-century Cretan inscriptions are at all firmly dated, and attempts to date this text tend to be subjective. Guarducci (*RF* lxvi (1938) 264-73) has argued for the years 480-460; this is probably a little too early (Shoe, *Profiles of Greek Mouldings*, i. 18, Pl. 8. 5; Carpenter, *AJA* xxxvii (1933) 24; Kirsten, *Die Insel Kreta im fünften und vierten Jahrhundert*, 44).

The following translation may help the understanding of this difficult text:

'The father shall have power over the division of the property among the children, and the mother over that of her property. As long as they live, they have no obligation to divide it; but if one (of the children) is fined, a division shall be made for the one who has been fined, as is written. But if a man dies, the houses in the city and whatever is in the houses, unless they are occupied by a serf living on the land, and the sheep and the cattle, which do not belong to a serf, shall belong to the sons, and the other property shall be fairly divided and the sons, as many as there are, shall take two shares each, and the daughters, as many as there are, one share each. The mother's property too, if she dies, shall be divided in the same way as is prescribed for the father's property. But if there is no property but a house, the daughters shall take their share as is prescribed. If a father while alive wishes to make a gift (to a daughter) on marriage, let him give it, as is prescribed, but no more. To whatever woman a gift was made or promised before (this legislation), she shall keep it, but take no further share (of the inheritance). A woman who has no property, either by gift or by promise of a father or brother, or by inheritance, at the time when the *startos* of the Aithaleis, Kullos and the others, were *kosmoi*, they shall take their share, but there shall be no proceedings against those (who received property) before.

'If a man or woman dies, if there are children or children's children or their children, these shall have the property. But if there are none of these, but brothers of the dead or children of the brothers or their children, these shall have the property. But if there are none of these, but sisters of the dead or their children or their children's children, these shall have the property. But if there are none of these, the next relations, from wherever the property descends, shall have the property. But if there are no relations of the family, those who are the *kleros*, they shall have the property.

'If of the heirs [*ἐπιβάλλοντες* is here used more generally than in v. 25], some wish to divide the property and others do not, the *dikastes* shall rule that the property be managed by those who wish to divide until it is divided. If, after the *dikastes* has made his ruling, anyone enters on the property by force or leads any thing off or takes it, he shall pay ten staters and double the value of the object. And for living things, fruits, clothing, ornaments and furniture, if they do not want to divide them, the *dikastes* having sworn shall judge the contentions advanced. And if in dividing property they do not agree about the division, they shall sell the property to whoever offers most to buy it and each one shall take the proper share of the price. When they are dividing property, there shall be present three or more witnesses of age and free. If a man makes a gift to a daughter, the same shall apply.'

It is sometimes held (see, e.g. Woodhouse, *Solon the Liberator*, 77) that *κρέματα* in this text does not include land, which remains a possession of the family group rather than of an individual. This can hardly be so. v. 39-47 seems to make a distinction between other property and real property, and other passages (e.g. ii. 48-50, viii. 42-4) make it clear that *κρέματα* are capable of producing *καρπός* and undergoing *Φεργασία*. See Ruschenbusch, *Acta Congressus Madvigiani*, i. 250.

Father and mother remain in control of their property while they live; note that the woman's property is not merged with her husband's. The general principle (see vi. 2-11) is that the child cannot incur claims on what is his father's property, but this is qualified in iv. 29-31 by the provision that an heir's future share can be used to pay a fine. Otherwise the parent has complete control of the division of his property. Even the paying of dowries is optional while he lives (iv. 48-51).

The general lines of succession to the dead are clear. There is no trace of wills. The property is divided into two sections, one of which goes only to the sons, while the other falls to be divided among the sons and daughters. The first section is apparently limited by the fact that serfs and property associated with them have to go with the main share of the property. It would seem clear that only town houses belong to the first section, and not even those if they have some connection with the serfs and hence with the rural estate. On the Cretan *Φουκίεες* see Finley, *RIDA* vii (1960) 168-72; Lotze, *Μεταξὺ ἐλευθέρων καὶ δούλων*, 4-25. On iv. 31-7 see also Willetts, *Klio* xxxix (1961) 45-7; we cannot, however, accept his view that the town houses are referred to, but not their contents, and the contents of country houses, but not the houses themselves. For the proportions of sons' and daughters' shares cf. Ephorus *FGH* 70 F 149, *ap.* Strabo, x. 4. 20, p. 482: *φερνή δ' ἐστίν, ἂν ἀδελφοὶ ὦσι, τὸ ἡμῖσι τῆς τοῦ ἀδελφοῦ μερίδος.*

Even if there is no rural property, the daughters get some share (iv. 46–8). The contrast between Gortyn and Athens, where daughters got nothing of right, if there were sons, and were only vehicles for transmitting the property, if there were not, is notable. Women have had property before this law (iv. 52–v. 9), even by inheritance (v. 4). That no legal proceedings are allowed against those who have already acquired their property (v. 7–9) suggests that they may have acquired more than this law allows, and the provision forbidding dowries larger than the legal share of inheritance (iv. 46–8) certainly suggests a tendency to restrict female control of property. However, it should be noted that it is hard to find any trace of such growing restriction in the treatment of the heiress (vii. 15–ix. 24), who by Athenian standards is very generously treated.

The order of succession (v. 9–28) is rather more simple, on the surface, than that of classical Athens. In Athens, of course, there is an absolute priority for the males in any particular remove; father and mother, here not mentioned at all, rank between children and brothers, and there is a sharp distinction between ἀδελφοὶ ὀμοπάτριοι and ὀμομήτριοι. The further relationships are more closely defined than in Gortyn, where we are left in total darkness as to whether the ἐπιβάλλοντες are only of the paternal family or on both sides. Nor does Gortyn tell us whether grandchildren, for example, receive *per stirpes* or as individuals. Notice that succession moves only three steps from the deceased. It might be tempting to say that this is accidental or that great-great-grandchildren are an unlikely contingency, but it is not obvious why the deceased is more likely to possess great-grandchildren than his brother or sister, and there are many parallels from other societies where close kinship is only thought to extend so far. The most difficult part of this section is the last (v. 25–8). Most editors have punctuated after ἐπιβάλλοντες and translated τᾶς Φοικίας οἴτινές κ' ἴοντι ὁ κλᾶρος as 'those who form the inheritance of the house', sc. the serfs. We find it very hard to believe that the serfs inherit the estate in any circumstances, and prefer to follow de Sanctis (*Storia dei Greci*, i. 508) and Guarducci in seeing some reference here to other free families connected with that of the deceased in the property-pattern of the land by kinship or neighbourhood. (So also Lotze, *op. cit.* 12–14, but he denies that κρέματα includes land.)

A few words on legal procedure. The importance of witnesses is marked throughout the 'Code', but in this section they only appear at the division of an estate or at the logically connected occasion of the bestowal of a dowry (v. 51–vi. 2). Decisions are made in three ways. The first two are automatic, following directly from the application of the law to the facts. Either there is a fine, expressed in the

future indicative (e.g. v. 38) or the *dikastes*, of whose method of appointment we know nothing, faced with clear facts, is said to *δικάσσει* (v. 31). In a more complex situation, he has to use his own judgement, first swearing (that he will do so honestly), *ὀμνύντα κρίναι* (v. 43-4). See Diamond, *op. cit.* 364-7.

The *kosmoi*, the best-known Cretan magistrates, appear only at v. 3-6, and merely as a date. We cannot see any reason to support the view of Willetts (*Aristocratic Society*, 98 f.) that the $\delta\kappa'$ clause dates previous legislation, and it seems to us much more likely that it dates the legislation before us. Dates by *kosmoi* sometimes just give the names of the *kosmoi* or their principal member. At Gortyn they are more often in the form *ἐπὶ τῶν Δυμάν[ων κ]ορμιόντων τῶν σὺν Καρταϊδάμῃ τῷ Ὀνυμάρ[χῳ]* (*IC iv.* 182. 21-2). The form we find here is unique, though it may have recurred at *IC iv.* 142. 2. There is a clear inference that at Gortyn at this time the *kosmoi* of one year all came from a single group, no doubt with rotation between groups; this cannot always have been so, since it makes nonsense of the regulation *IC iv.* 14, *g-p*, 2 (quoted above, p. 3). Hesychius defines *σταρτοί* as *αἱ τάξεις τοῦ πλήθους*, and it is doubtless a form of *στρατός*. If we translate it roughly as 'clan', there is no more difficulty in saying that such and such a clan were *kosmoi* than in the Attic *Αἰαντὶς ἐπρυτάνευε*, where only fifty members of the whole tribe are in fact concerned. This apparently straightforward conclusion does not, however, easily fit *IC iv.* 80. 4-7, on which see Guarducci (*ad loc.*, and *Historia ix* (1935) 443-5) and Willetts (*op. cit.* 111-13).

42 (33)

Relations between Argos, Knossos, and Tylissos: about 450 B.C.

(A) The most substantial, with top and bottom preserved, of five fragments of poros from the boundary wall of a temenos of Artemis at Tylissos; now in the Heraklion Museum. (B) Two joining fragments of a stele of greyish limestone found at Argos; now in the Argos Museum.

(A) Argive letters (cf. No. 35) with both earlier and later forms than B, in three columns, each stoichedon 22, save in l. 22 which has 23 letters. (B) Argive letters, stoichedon 37, with some irregularities in ll. 42-8. The lettering of both seems slightly later than that of No. 35; koppa has disappeared. There is some difference of lettering in B, l. 43 ff.: √ is replaced by Υ from l. 43; omicron loses its central dot and ⊕ becomes Φ

from the middle of l. 44. See *LSAG* 165 (Argos 39). Photos. of (A): *Αρχ. Έφ.* 1914, 94-8; *IC* i. 307. Of (B): *BCH* xxxvii (1913) Pl. iv; Vollgraff (below) Pl. i-ii.

Vollgraff, 'Le Decret d'Argos relatif à un pacte entre Knossos et Tyliossos' (*Verh. d. Kon. Ned. Ak. v. Wet., afd. Let.*, n.s. li. 2) +; Buck 85 (B); *Staatsverträge* 147-8+; *LSAG*, loc. cit.; Graham, *Colony and Mother City in Ancient Greece*, 154-60, 235-44.

A

- Col. i [...ἰαρά παρ]εχόντο τοὶ πα-
 [ρά τῶν Ἀργεῖ]ον, δέρματα δὲ φ-
 [ερόσθο ἡοι Κν]όηιοι. πρὸ Ταυ-
 [ροφονίον θύε]ν ἐν Τυλισδί F-
 5 [άρνα... 6..., ἀμ]νὰν δὲ καὶ δι-
 [..... 11.....]. σπονδὰς νεοτ-
 [έρας] μὲ τιθέσθαι μεδατέρο-
 [υς, αἰ] μὲ συνδοκοῖ τῷ πλέθε-
 [ι, συνβ]άλλεσθαι δὲ τὰν τρίτ-
 10 [αν αἰσ]αν τὸς Ἀργεῖος τὰν ψά-
 [φον· καῖ] τινὰς τῶν εὐμενέου
 Col. ii δυσμενέας τιθείμεθα καὶ τ-
 δὸν δυσμενέου εὐμενέας, μὲ θ-
 έσθαι, αἰ μὲ συνδοκοῖ τῷ πλ-
 15 έθει, συνβάλλεσθαι δὲ τὸνς
 ἐκ Τυλισδὸ τὰν ψάφον τὰν τρί-
 ταν αἰσαν. αἰ δὲ μάχα γένοιτ-
 ο μὲ παρέντον τῶν ἀτέρου, σπ-
 ονδὰς θέσθο 'ν τῷ δεομένο-
 20 ι πέντε ἀμέρανς. αἰ στρατήα
 ἐνο[ιείε] ἐνς τὰν γὰν τὰν Κνο-
 [χίαν, [Τυλισίονς] ὀφελὲν παντ-
 Col. iii ι σθένει [... 10..... σίτον]
 παρεχόν[το ἡοι Κνόηιοι τοῖ]-
 25 ς Ἀργεῖο[ις Κνοηοῖ, τοῖ δ' Ἀργ]-
 εῖοι τοῖ[ς ἐν Τυλισδί.. 5...]
 ιεν στρα[τήαν τριάκοντα ἀμ]-
 εράν· αἰ δ[έ..... 14.....]
 ίμεν τὰν [... 15.....]
 30 ς. κέν Τυλ[ισδί..... 11.....]

ε κα Φαρθ[.....Ι5.....]
 -πάγεσθα[ι.....Ι4.....]
 να. αἴ κ' ἔνθ[.....Ι4.....]

B

- νες[.....Ι0.....]
 [.....23.....] τὸν χθ[ρον τῶ]ν Ἀ[χ]α-
 [ρναίων τῶι Τυλισίοι ἐξέμ]εν ξύλλεσθαι πλὰ[ν] τ-
 [ὰ μέρε τὰ Κνωσίον συν]τέλλοντα ἐνς πόλιν. ἡὸ τ[ι]
 5 [δέ κα ἐκ δυσμενέ]ον ἠέλομες συναυφότεροι, δα[σ]-
 [μῶι τὸν κὰτ γ]ᾶν τὸ τρίτον μέρος ἔχεν πάντον, τ[δ]-
 [ν δὲ κὰτ] θάλασαν τὰ ἠέμισα ἔχεν πάντον· τὰν δὲ [δ]-
 [εκ]άταν τὸνς Κνωσίονς ἔχεν, ἡὸ τί χ' ἔλομες κοι[ν]-
 [ᾶ]ι· τὸν δὲ φαλύρον τὰ μὲν καλλ[ι]στεία Πυθόδε ἀπ[ά]-
 10 γεν κοινᾶ ἀμφοτέρων, τὰ δ' ἄλλα τῶι [Ἄρει Κνωσ]-
 οἰ ἀντιθέμεν κοινᾶ ἀμφοτέρων. ἐξ[αγογὰν δ' εἶ]-
 μεν Κνωσόθεν ἐνς Τυλισὸν κέκ Τυλι[σὸ Κνωσόνδ]-
 ε· α[ἴ] δὲ πέρανδε ἐξάγοι, τελίτο ἡόσσα[περ ἡοι Κν]-
 15 ι Ποσειδᾶνι τῶι ἐν Ἰυτῶι τὸν Κνωσί[ν] ἰαρέα θύ]-
 εν. τᾶι ἠέραι ἐν Ἐραίοι θύεν βὸν θέλει[αν ἀμφοτ]-
 έρον[s κ]οινᾶι, θύεν δὲ πρὸ Φακινθ[ίον....8....]
 .κο[...]κ[-----

two lines lost

- 21 [.....Ι4.....]ανοντο[.....Ι4.....]πρ[α]-
 τομενίαν ἄγεν κατὰ ταῦτ[ὰ κατὰ τὸ δόγμα] τὸ ἀμ[φ]-
 οτέρων. χρέματα δὲ μὲ ἵπιπασκέσθο ἡὸ Κνωσί[σ]
 ἐν Τυλισοῖ, ἡὸ δὲ Τυλίσιος ἐν Κνωσδο ἡὸ χρέιζ[σ]-
 25 ν. μὲ δὲ χόρας ἀποτάμνεσθαι μεδατέρωνς μεδ' ἄ[π]-
 ανσαν ἀφαιρῖσθαι. δροι τᾶς γᾶς· ἡυδὸν ὄρος καὶ Α-
 ἰετοὶ κάρταμίτιον καὶ τὸ τῶ Ἄρχῶ τέμενος κα[ἴ]
 ἡὸ ποταμὸς κὲλ Λευκόπορον κἀγάθιοι, ἡᾶι ἡύδο-
 ρ ρεῖ τῶμβριον, καὶ Λᾶος. ἡῖ κα τῶι Μαχανεῖ θύομ-
 30 ες τὸνς Φεξέκοντα τελέονς ὄφως, καὶ τᾶι ἡ(έ)ραι
 τὸ σκέλος Φεκάστο διδόμεν τῶ θύματος. αἴ δὲ συ-
 μπλέονες πόλιες ἐκ πολεμίον ἔλοιεν χρέματα,
 ἡόπαι συγνοῖεν ἡοι Κνωσίοι καὶ τοῖ Ἄργεῖοι,

35 *houito emen. toi Apei kai taphroditai ton Knosio-*
on iareá thuen, pheren de to skelos Fekásto. ton A-
rxon ton tēmenos ēchen ton Achárnai. tois thounoi
ξēnia paréchen ton Knosíous, tonis d' Argeíous
toi choroí. en Tyliisoi ai ka kalēi ho Knosios pr-
 40 *eosgeán, hēpeσthai hōpni ka déetai, kai ch Tyliis-*
ios, ton Knosíon katá taútá. ai de me doien ξēni-
a, bolá epagēto rútion déka statēron autika ē-
pi kósmos, kēn Tyliisoi katá taútá ho Knosios. v
ha stála ēssota ēpi Melánta basileús. aFreteu-
 45 *ε Luokotádas hulleús. v aliaiái ēdoxe tai ton v*
iaron. v a(Freteue) v bolās v Arχίστρατος Luokofronídas.
toi Tyliisioi poi tan stálan poiγraψánσtho táde.
ai tis afiknouito Tyliisíon enis Argos, katá taútá
σφiv ēsto hāiper Knosíous. vacat
vacat

A. Vollgraff suggests *hermāi, am]nán de kai di[[domen Dairai* for ll. 5–6. In l. 23 he has *kat to dúnaton*, which is two letters too long. In ll. 25–6 he suggests *σιταρ]]kēn*, but the first letter of 26 is a certain iota. For 28 ff. he suggests *ai d[é k' áποστήλοντι, ap]]ímen tan [στρατήαν ep' oíkon]]s. kēn Tyliisoi kat taútá. hē d]]é ka farθ[aiái dFiv thúomen, a]]πάγεσθα[i kai tápóλλοι Fár]]va. ai k' ēnθ[ei tis Knosíon en]s "Argos,]*

B. l. 9: The iota was omitted. In l. 30 we should perhaps allow the Θ to stand for *he*, rather than say that epsilon was omitted. In l. 38 most texts have punctuation after, rather than before, *en Tyliisoi*. Ll. 46–7 both have two extra letters in the margin.

We have omitted four small fragments from Tyliisos. One of them, Vollgraff's (I), may be restored as the prescript of an Argive decree, and Vollgraff claims that his (III) overlaps with the text of *B*, ll. 34–5. This last is by no means certain (see Jeffery, *LSAG*, loc. cit.), and formal proof is therefore lacking that these texts really form part of a single document, of which copies were set up in both Argos and Tyliisos. Some difficulty may also be felt about the letter-forms of the Tyliissian copy. Nevertheless, though it might be possible to construct a scheme of events by which on two occasions fairly close in date Argos intervened in the affairs of Knossos and Tyliisos, there is no hint in the documents that they reflect different circumstances, and it seems highly probable that the two texts belong together.

A. (1–6). The representatives from the Argives shall provide the sacrifice, and the Knossians shall receive the skins. Before the Taurophonia, sacrifice in Tyliisos a sheep (to Hermes?) and give (?) a lamb

(to Daira?). (7-20). Neither party shall make any new treaty, save with the assent of the federal assembly, and the Argives shall cast the third part of the votes. And if we make any friend an enemy and any enemy a friend, we shall not do so, save with the assent of the federal assembly, and the representatives from Tyliossos shall cast the third part of the votes. But if a battle takes place with the other party not present, it shall be lawful to make a truce in necessity for five days. (21-8). If any army enters the land of the Knossians, the Tyliossians shall help (*ὀφελεῖν* = *ὠφελεῖν*; cf. Thuc. v. 23. 1) with all their strength as far as possible. The Knossians shall provide food for the Argives at Knossos, but the Argives for forces at Tyliossos. An army shall be fed (?) for thirty days.' These provisions for the conduct of joint expeditions seem to continue at least as far as l. 30.

B. '(2-4). The Tyliossian may pillage (*ξύλλεσθαι* = *σκύλλεσθαι*) the territory of the Acharnaeans [cf. l. 36, perhaps the modern Archanes, south of Knossos], except those parts which belong to the city of the Knossians. (4-11). Whatever we both together take from the enemy, (the Tyliossian) shall in a division take a third of all which is taken by land, and half of everything which is taken by sea, and the Knossians shall keep the tithe of whatever we take jointly; and of the spoils [*φαλῦρον* is probably not an engraver's error, but a by-form of *λαφύρον* produced by metathesis] both shall send the finest jointly to Delphi, and the rest both shall dedicate jointly to Ares at Knossos. (11-14). There shall be export from Knossos to Tyliossos and from Tyliossos to Knossos; but if any (Tyliossian) export goods beyond, he shall pay as much as the Knossians pay; and goods from Tyliossos may be exported whither he may desire. (14-17). The priest of the Knossians [cf. l. 34] shall sacrifice to Poseidon at Iytos [perhaps the modern Mt. Iuktas]; both shall sacrifice jointly a cow to Hera in the Heraion [the famous Argive Heraion is more probable than a Cretan temple] and they shall sacrifice before the Hyakinthia ----- (21-3). They shall keep the first day of the month at the same time according to the decision of both. (23-5). The Knossian may not possess real property (*ἐνπιπάσκομαι* = *ἐγκτάομαι*) at Tyliossos, but the Tyliossian who wishes (may do so) at Knossos. (25-9). Neither party shall cut off any of the land or take it all away. The boundaries of the land: Swine's Mount and the Eagles and the Artemision and the precinct of Archos and the river [perhaps the Platyperama], and to Leukoporos and Agathoia following the course of the rainwater [cf. *ἄ ὕδωρ ῥεῖ*, *GDI* 5016. 12, 5075. 51, etc.; *ὡς ὑδάτων ῥοαί*, *Inscr. Priene*, 37. 107] and Laos. (29-31). When we sacrifice to Machanëus [see *RE* xiv. 141 f. and Vollgraff ad loc., who identifies Machaneus with Castor] the sixty full-grown rams, to Hera too shall be given the leg of each victim. (31-4). If several cities together capture property

from the enemy, as the Knossians and Argives agree, so shall it be. (34-5). The priest of the Knossians shall sacrifice to Ares and Aphrodite, and shall receive the leg of each victim [Ares and Aphrodite are linked in many Cretan documents, and also at Argos; Paus. ii. 25. 1]. (35-8). Archos shall keep the precinct at Acharna; the Knossians shall provide gifts to the sacrificers, and the Argives to the chorus. (38-42). If the Knossian calls for an embassy in Tylissos, it shall follow wherever he wishes, and if the Tylissian (call the Knossian), the Knossian shall follow likewise. [Vollgraff regards this as machinery for emending the arrangements between Knossos and Tylissos, and takes the next sentence closely with it, but the usual view, which makes the clause bind both parties to support the embassies of the other, is probably preferable.] If they should not offer hospitality, let the Council forthwith impose a fine [for *ῥύτιον* see Wilhelm, *Jahresh.* xiv (1911) 197 ff.] of ten staters on the *kosmoi*, and the Knossian similarly at Tylissos. (43-4). The stele was erected (*ἔσστα* = *ἐστάθη*) when Melantas was king [Vollgraff's attempt to identify him with Meltas, last king of Argos according to Paus. ii. 19. 2, is certainly wrong; he is a mere eponymous official] and Lykotadas of the tribe Hylleis was in office [despite Amandry, *Hesp.* xxi (1952) 217, Lykotadas is a personal name here and not a phratry; see Wörrle, *Untersuchungen zur Verfassungsgeschichte von Argos* (Diss. Erlangen, 1964), 19 n. 41, 50 n. 26]. (44-8). Resolved by the assembly concerned with sacred business; Archistratos of the Lykophronid phratry was president of the Council; let the Tylissians add to the stele these words: if any Tylissian comes to Argos, he shall have the same rights as the Knossians.'

The situation here envisaged is complex, but the text seems to imply a federal structure in which Argos, Knossos, Tylissos, and perhaps other states (see especially *B*, 31-2) are linked, in which physical intervention by Argos in Crete is thought possible (*A*, 24-6), and within which special arrangements are made to govern the relations of Knossos and Tylissos, many of them clearly designed to protect the position of Tylissos against her stronger neighbour. These arrangements seem to incorporate the result of previous negotiations between Knossos and Tylissos themselves, to judge by the frequent use of the first person. The alternative view, proposed by Kahrstedt (*Klio*, xxxiv (1941) 72-91) and followed by Gschnitzer (*Abhängige Orte*, 44-7) by which we have here a treaty between Argos and Knossos, in which Tylissos only appears as a dependency of Argos, seems to us nearly impossible. It makes better sense of *B*, 4-7, where the Argives become the subject of the verbs *ἔχεν*, but creates confusion everywhere else. It is satisfactorily refuted by Graham, 239-44, but we do not find his own statement of the position entirely convincing, since he puts the reason for Argive intervention almost entirely on her unattested,

though quite likely, position as mother city of these Cretan states, and plays down the indications of a federal structure.

The text is later than No. 35, but not by much, and it seems safe to put this remarkable extension of Argive interests around the year 450 or a little earlier.

The language is Argive in both texts, in fact more Argive in the Tyliissian than in the Argive text, for in *A* Argive intervocalic *h* is preserved even in *Κνόηιοι*, while *B* has *Κνόσιοι* throughout and the Cretan *hoi* in l. 33 to go with it; for the Argive dialect see Bechtel, *GD* ii. 437 ff., Buck, pp. 162-4.

43 (35)

Political Expulsions from Miletus:
between 470 and 440 B.C.

On a marble base, which once bore a stele, found *in situ* in the North Market at Miletus.

Ionic letters, stoichedon 44, but blank spaces are left at the end of lines or final letters are inscribed on the right-hand side of the base in order that each line may end with a word or the preposition of a compound verb. Phot.: *Milet* i. 6. 101.

SIG 58; *Milet*, i. 6. 100-4; Glotz, *CRAI* 1906, 511-29; Meiggs, *JHS* lxxiii (1943) 26; Barron, *JHS* lxxxii (1962) 1-6.

- [.....Ι5.....σ.....τ]ὸ[. Ν]υμφαρήτο καὶ Ἄλκι[μον]
 [καὶ Κ]ρεσφόντην [τό]ς) Στρατώνακτος φεύγειν τὴν ἐπ' αἴμ[ατ]ι
 [φυγῆν] καὶ αὐτὸς [κα]ὶ ἐγγόνος, καὶ ὃς ἂν τινα τούτῳ κατα[α]-
 [κτείνε]ι, ἑκατὸν [στ]ατήρας αὐτῷ γενέσθαι ἀπὸ τῶν
 5 [χρημά]των τῶν Νυμ[φαρή]το· τὸς δ' ἐπιμηνίος, ἐπ' ὧν ἂν ἔλθωσι|ι
 [οἱ κατα]κτείναντες, ἀποδοῦναι τὸ ἀργύριον· ἦν δὲ μὴ, αὐτὸ|[ς]
 [ὀφέ]ιλεν. ἦν δὲ ἡ πόλι[ς] ἐ[γ]κρατ(ῆ)ς γένηται, κατακτεῖναι
 [αὐ]τὸς τὸς ἐπιμηνίος [ἐ]π' ὧν ἂν λαφθέωσιν· ἦν δὲ μὴ κατα-
 [κτ]είνοσιν, ὀφείλεν ἕ[κ]αστον πεγτήκοντα στατήρας.
 10 τὸν δὲ ἐπιμήνιον, ἦν μὴ προθῆι, ἑκατὸν στατήρας ὀφείλε[ν]
 καὶ τὴν ἐσιδῶσαν ἐπιμηνήην αἰὲ ποιῆν κατὰ τὸ ψήφισμα·
 ἦν δὲ μὴ, τὴν αὐτὴν θωιῆν ὀφείλεν.

In l. 1 either τ]ὸν or τ]ὸς. In l. 2 [τό]ν and in 7 ἐ]γκρατές are errors by the mason.

In this Milesian decree three men (and perhaps more) and their descendants are outlawed. A price is put on their heads, and if they are captured the ἐπιμήνιοι in office are to put them to death or pay heavy fines. The surviving inscription is on a base which originally supported a stele. Twenty letters are missing at the beginning of the first line, but this gives insufficient room for the preamble to the decree, which probably therefore began on the stele. Since such a division of the text is extremely awkward it is reasonable to infer that the stele was already inscribed when this decree was passed, and that our decree was added because it was of the same nature.

Most interpretations derive from an ingenious analysis by Glotz (op. cit.). He pointed out that the inclusion of the descendants in the sentence showed that the crime was treason, and he interpreted the monument in the light of a passage from Nicolaus of Damascus (*FGH* 90 F 53), which echoed some of the phrases of our decree. The passage describes the events in Miletus leading to the overthrow of the Neleids, apparently at the end of the monarchy. Glotz, noting that Alkimos and Kresphontes are good Neleid names, suggested that the original inscription on the stele recorded an expulsion of the Neleids in the sixth century, and that in a similar situation when Neleids were again expelled in the fifth century the record was inscribed on the same stele. Glotz associated the expulsion with the Athenian decree of 450-49 providing for the closer control of Miletus by a board of five Athenian officials (*ATL* ii. D 11). He assumed that this decree marked the imposition of democracy by Athens, when their attempt to work with oligarchs, alluded to by the Old Oligarch ([Xen.] *Ἄθ. Πολ.* 3. 11), had failed. Recent discussion has modified this picture of Athenian relations with Miletus. The Athenian decree of 450-49 implies that Athens still wishes to co-operate with a Milesian oligarchy (Meiggs, *JHS* lxxiii (1943) 27), and the tribute-lists may suggest a date for its later suppression. Barron has shown that Neleids were in office in 450-49 and in 446-5 (op. cit.) and he reinforces the view developed by A. J. Earp (*Phoenix* viii (1954) 142-7) that Miletus was in revolt from 446 to 443 (when she does not appear in any fragment of the tribute-lists). The Milesian expulsion decree in their view should follow the suppression of the oligarchy in 443 or 442.

This dating depends largely on the inference by Glotz that the Milesian decree recorded the expulsion of the Neleids. The evidence barely justifies the conclusion. We do not know how many names preceded those that survive, but since (a) 100 staters are to be paid to anyone who kills any of the persons named, and the property of Nympharetos will apparently suffice, and (b) room has to be left on the stele for an earlier inscription, it is unlikely that the text was long. Not enough Neleid names can be identified to speak of a Neleid

oligarchy in control. Nor need this decree mark the final suppression of oligarchy. The fact that rewards are to be paid from the property of Nympharetos implies that he is only recently dead, probably killed in political *stasis*. In an Athenian decree laying down regulations for Erythrai (No. 40, l. 33) a penalty is specified for anyone who is found betraying the city to 'the tyrants' (τοῖς τυράννοις) and these are probably to be identified with those who have taken refuge with the Medes (τὸν ἐς] Μέδος φεγγό[ντο]ν, l. 27). Nympharetos and Stratonax may (perhaps with a few others) have been 'the tyrants' in Miletus; they may have been killed or expelled when Athens first intervened, probably in 452. The final suppression of the oligarchy would probably have been accompanied by more sweeping expulsions. It is also doubtful whether this Milesian decree reflects a democracy of the Athenian pattern. A Milesian decree of 380-79 has a prescript in the Athenian mould with Epistates, and Prytany with Athenian tribal name (Wiegand, *Sitzb. Berl.* 1901, 911). It is likely that this Athenian model was introduced before Athens collapsed, and the natural context is the suppression of oligarchy. But in our decree ἐπιμήνιοι seem to fulfil the function of Prytany. The word is used in that sense in an early fifth-century inscription from Eretria (*IG* xii, suppl. 549, Μεκισστ[ίδ]ος φυλᾶς: ἐπιμεν[ε]οῦρες), but it is also used for religious officials (*RE*, s.v. ἐπιμήνιοι) and this might be the meaning here. Rehm considered that the letter-forms suggested a date 'fairly early in the fifth century' (*Arch. Anz.* 1906, 16); we share this view, but there are too few dated fifth-century inscriptions from Ionia to rely on letter-forms. It would be wise to exclude neither the forties nor the sixties.

44 (40)

Appointment of a Priestess and building of a Temple
of Athena Nike: (?) 450-445 B.C.

Marble stele found on the north slope of the Acropolis, with a cutting for another stone on top closely fitted by scarf joint. A second decree is on the back (No. 71); now in EM.

Developed Attic letters except ζ. Stoichedon 29. Phot.: Kern 14; *Αρχ. Έφ.* 1897, Pl. 11; Guarducci, *Epigrafia Greca*, i. 141 fig. 32.

Kabbadias, *Αρχ. Έφ.* 1897, 174-94; *SIG* 63; *IG* i². 24; Welter, *Jahrb., Anz.* liv (1939) 1-22; Schlaifer, *Harv. Stud.* li (1940) 257-60; Meritt, *Hesp.* x (1941) 307-15; Papademetriou, *Αρχ. Έφ.* 1948/9, 146-53; Mattingly, *Hist.* x (1961) 169 f.; Meritt and Wade-Gery, *JHS* lxxxiii (1963) 109-11.

- [.....18.....τῶ]ι [δέ]μο[ι ...]
 [.....17.....]α'κος εἶπε· [τῆι]
 [Ἀθηναίαι τῆι Νί]κει *ἡέρεαν ἡέ ἄγ[...]*
 [.....12.....] ἔχς *Ἀθηναίον ἡαπα[σῶ]-*
 5 [ν καθίστα]σθαι καὶ τὸ *ἡιερόν θυροῦσα-*
ι καθότι ἂν Καλλικράτες χουγγράφσ-
ει· ἀπομισθῶσαι δὲ τὸς πολετὰς ἐπὶ τ-
ἔς Λεοντίδος πρυτανείας· φέρειν δὲ τ-
ὲν ἡέρεαν πεντέκοντα δραχμὰς καὶ
 10 *τὰ σκέλε καὶ τὰ δέρματα φέρειν τὼν δε-*
μοσίων· νεὸν δὲ οἰκοδομέσαι καθότι
ἂν Καλλικράτες χουγγράφσει καὶ βο-
μὸν λίθινον.
ἡεστιαῖος εἶπε· τρεῖς ἄνδρας ἡελέσθ-
 15 *αι ἐγ βολῆς· τούτος δὲ μετ[ᾶ] Καλλικρά-*
[το]ς χουγγράφσαντας ἐπ[ιδειχσαι τῆ]-
[ι βολ]ῆι καθότι ἀπομ[ισθοθέσεται...]
 [.....]ει τος[- - - - -]
 - - - - -

Meritt infers that the main decree was inscribed on the upper stone and that the lower stone which survives carried amendments (see below), of which one starts on the upper stone [τὸς δὲ πρυτάνες χρεμ- and continues on the lower stone (II. 1 f.) [ατίσαι περὶ τούτου ἐν τῶ]ι [δέ]μο[ι ἐν τ]ῆι πρότει ἡέδραι ν Γλ]αυκος εἶπε. 1. 2: Possible alternatives for the proposer's name are Πατ]αικός and Φαλ]αικός. II. 3-5: The epitaph of the first priestess (*SEG* xii. 80, see below) shows that she was appointed by lot: ἡέ ἄ[ν δι]ᾶ βίῳ ἡιεράτα]ι ἔχς Ἀθηναίον ἡαπα[σῶ]ν κληρόσα]σθαι Papademetriou; ἡέ ἄγ [κλ]ερομένε λάχε]ι ἔχς Ἀθηναίον ἡαπα[σῶ]ν καθίστα]σθαι Meritt and Wade-Gery.

The surviving text provides for (a) the appointment for life, by lot, of a priestess of Athena Nike, and all Athenian women are to be eligible (it is to be a democratic priesthood, not confined to an aristocratic family as so many of the traditional priesthoods had been); (b) the construction of a door for Nike's *ἡιερόν* according to Kallikrates' design, and the placing of the contract; (c) the payment to the priestess of an annual salary of 50 dr., together with the legs and hides from public sacrifices; (d) the building of a temple to be designed by Kallikrates and an altar of stone (marble). An amendment (though the normal amendment formula, τὰ μὲν ἄλλα καθάπερ, is omitted) was carried by Hestiaios, ensuring a more democratic pro-

cedure. Three members of the Boule are to be elected to co-operate with the architect in drawing up the specification for the contract (for the door), and they are to submit their recommendations to the Boule.

These terms are clear on the stone, but the date and context are uncertain. The three-barred sigma without other early letter-forms points to a date between *c.* 450 and 445 (Meiggs, *JHS* lxxxvi (1966) 92), but the Ionic temple of Nike was not built on the bastion flanking the entrance to the Acropolis on its south side until the twenties (Dinsmoor, *The Architecture of Ancient Greece*³ (1950) 185 f.), when work on the Propylaia had been broken off. Before the bastion and temple were dismantled in 1936 there were still some who maintained that the temple was built before the Propylaia; this position is no longer tenable (G. Welter, *Jahrb.* liv (1939), *Anz.* 1-22). There might be more specific evidence for the date if Dinsmoor and others are right in attributing *IG* i². 111 to the beginning of the building of the temple, and if the *epistates* of that decree, Σμίκυθος, is to be identified with the *epistates* of *IG* i². 60, which concerns the settlement with Mytilene after her revolt in 427. The last three letters correspond, but the number of letters is not known. Even if this evidence is dismissed a date in the twenties is probably right. Mattingly, distrusting the letter-form criterion, dates our decree to the twenties in order to associate it directly with the actual building of the temple. In support he emphasizes that we now know that the first priestess died towards the end of the fifth century (for her epitaph see J. Papademetriou, *Αρχ. Έφ.*, 1948/9, 146; *SEG* xii. 80) which, he thinks, makes her appointment in the early forties very unlikely. The purely epigraphic evidence for the date of the epitaph would not necessarily point to the last years of the century. The widespread intrusion of Ionic letters, though extremely rare in public inscriptions before the last decade of the fifth century, is not uncommon earlier in private inscriptions, and the lettering would not be out of place as early as 430 (phot.: *BSA* 1 (1955) 2). The identification, however, of Myrrhine, Nike's first priestess, with the Myrrhine of Aristophanes' *Lysistrata*, suggested by Papademetriou, and further elaborated by Lewis in *BSA* 1 (1955) 1-7, has been generally accepted, and requires a date for her death after 411 when the play was produced. But, as Meritt and Wade-Gery have pointed out (*JHS* lxxxiii (1963) 110, where other objections also are given to Mattingly's dating), the priestess of Hera at Argos, who served for 56½ years (Thuc. ii. 2. 1 and iv. 133), makes a tenure of some 45 years for the first priestess of Nike acceptable (an even longer period of office, 64 years, is attributed to Lysimache, priestess of Athena, by the elder Pliny, *NH* xxxiv. 76, Lewis *BSA* 1. 4-6). The early date for the decree is easier to accept if we associate the decision to build a temple to Athena Nike with the end of the fighting against

Persia and a Peace of Kallias. This is at least a reasonable inference if the scenes on the north and south sides of the frieze depict, as is generally thought, fighting between Greeks and Persians. This interpretation seemed more compelling when it was thought that the mover of the decree was Hipponikos, son of Kallias (*IG* i². 24. 4; *ἡπιπὸν*ικος), but Dinsmoor and West made it clear that the traces on the stones were incompatible with the restoration (*Hesp.* Suppl. v. 159, n. 337). It may also be significant that in a later decree, almost certainly concerned with the temple, the allies as well as the Athenians are allowed a hearing (*IG* i². 88. 9-11: ἐ δὲ βολὴ μὲ ἀ[πολαμβανέτο πλὴν | ἐὰ]ν κ[ρι]θῆι περὶ τοῦ]το πρ[ό]τ[ερον ὑπὸ τῶν βολο]μέ]νο[ν Ἄ]θηναί[ον] καὶ τῶν χουμ[μάχων - -]). It seems unlikely that the allies would be encouraged to express proposals concerning a temple or sanctuary with which they had no concern. If Nike's temple was particularly associated with the end of fighting against Persia it would be sound Athenian policy or propaganda to give them a hearing.

There is a further complication. If the decree began on the lower stone there is room in the first two lines, before the speaker's name, for only one of the three normal elements of a prescript (prytany, secretary, president). If this is the beginning of a decree the two missing elements should be on a separate stone. There was, indeed, another stone fitted to our surviving stone by a splice or scarf-joint, sloping down towards the back, designed to provide as close a fit as possible. Dinsmoor argued that this joint was quite unsuited to receive the bottom moulding of an *akroterion* or relief, such as might crown a decree (*AJA* xxvii (1923) 319), and Meritt pointed out that the top line comes too close to the top of the stone to be the beginning of the inscription, but that the distance is exactly one-half of the normal interspace between lines (*Hesp.* x (1941) 312). His conclusion was that the decree began at the top of the upper stone, running on to the third line of the lower stone, where the first amendment began. Subsequently, with Wade-Gery, he argued that such an important amendment presupposes a substantive decree of major importance. 'Its main subject-matter was almost surely the architectural reorganization of the western approach to the Acropolis' (*JHS* lxxxiii (1963) 109), and the delay between plan and execution was to be explained by a conflict of interest involving the south-west wing of the Propylaia and the precinct of Athena Nike, which led to a very considerable alteration in the original plan of the Propylaia. This is an exciting hypothesis, but there are difficulties. On any interpretation the decree concerns matters of considerable importance. Why should the mason have chosen to set out his inscription on two stones carefully jointed together rather than on a single stele? He begins the 'second' amendment (l. 16) on a new line; why does he begin the 'first' and

more important one in the middle of a line? Would one understand from the wording or the order of clauses that the building of a temple was highly controversial? If the amendment represents religious forces protesting against the secular, would they have chosen Kallikrates, who seems to have been deeply committed to Periclean building policies? He supervised the building of the middle long wall (Plut., *Per.* 13. 7), was entrusted with strengthening the security of the Acropolis against runaway slaves and footpads (*IG* i². 44), and collaborated with Iktinos on the Parthenon.

It is perhaps less difficult to believe that the upper stone carried a relief and the name of the prytany and the secretary. Normally when the secretary's name was recorded above a decree it was also included in the text of the decree itself, but the Chalkis decree is an exception (No. 52). Above that decree and another affixed on its left was an upper stone, probably with a relief and the name of the *γραμματεὺς*; no secretary is recorded below in the text of the decree. In a decree of 410-09 (*IG* i². 109 = *ATL* ii. D 9) both secretary and tribal prytany are recorded above the decree. For the closeness of the first line to the top of the stone cf. *IG* i². 81, below a relief (phot.: *AM* xix (1894) Pl. 7).

Perhaps too little attention has been paid to the actual terms of the decree and the order in which they are formulated. The first injunction is not to build a temple, but to appoint a priestess in a democratic manner. The second is to provide a door for τὸ ἱερόν, whether that be the whole precinct or the 'Cimonian' shrine below the actual temple. Provision is made for the leasing of the contract for this work, and then for the payment of the priestess. It is only after this that the temple is mentioned, and the emphasis on providing a doorway for the ἱερόν surely implies that the temple will not be built until later.

45 (67)

Athenian Decree enforcing the use of Athenian Coins, Weights, and Measures: (?) 450-446 B.C.

Seven fragments: two of local limestone from Syme, one each of marble from Aphytis, Cos, and Siphnos. One of marble was copied at Smyrna and is now lost; another was recently identified in Odessa Museum (*SEG* xxi. 18).

All fragments in Ionic script except the Cos fragment, which has developed Attic letters except ζ. Phot.: *ATL* ii, Pl. 5, 6, 7; of the Cos fragment, also *BCH* lxxxix (1965) 438-9.

ATL ii. D 14, with full bibliography (1949); Tod, *JHS* lxix (1949) 104 f.;

E. S. G. Robinson, *Hesp. Suppl.* viii (1949) 324-40; Cavaignac, *Rev. Num.* xv (1953) 1-7; Mattingly, *Hist.* x (1961) 148-69, *Proc. Afr. Class. Ass.* vii (1964) 48, *CQ* xvi (1966) 187-90; Meritt and Wade-Gery, *JHS* lxxxii (1962) 67-74; Meritt, *Gk. Rom. Byz. Stud.* viii (1967) 126-9.

[(1) -----]ολε[- ----- c. 27 -----]αι τὰ γ[
----- c. 19 ----- ἄρχ]οντε[ς ἐν ταῖς π]όλεσι ἢ ἄρ[χοντες
----- c. 22 ----- (2) οἱ] δὲ ἑλληνοταμ[ίαι -----
c. 24 ----- ἀ]ναγραφόντων· ἐὰ[ν δὲ μὴ -----
π]όλεων τινος, ἔσα[γέτω ὁ βουλόμενος αὐτίκα μάλα εἰς τ]ὴν ἡλιαίαν τὴν
τῶ[ν θεσμοθετῶν τοὺς ἡδικηκότας· οἱ] δὲ θεσμοθέ[τ]αι πέ[νθ] ἡμερῶν
δό[ντων] [δικὰς τοῖς φήν]ασι ἕκαστον. (3) ἐὰν δὲ [ἄλλος ἔξω τ]ῶν ἀρχόν-
[των ἐν τ]αῖς πόλεσι μὴ ποιῆι κα[τὰ τὰ ἐψηφισ]μένα ἢ τῶν [πολι]τῶν
ἢ τῶν ξένων, [ἄτ]ιμ[ος ἔστω καὶ τὰ χρή]ματα [αὐτοῦ] δημόσια [ἔσ]τω
καὶ τῆς θεοῦ τ[ὸ ἐπιδέκατον]. (4) καὶ εἰ μ[ὴ] εἰσι[ν] ἄρχοντες Ἀθηναῖον,
ἔ[πιτελεσάντων] ὅσα ἐν τῶι ψ[ηφίσματι] οἱ ἄρχοντε[ς οἱ ἐκάστης τῆς
πόλεως· καὶ] ἐὰμ μὴ ποιῶσι κατὰ τ[ὰ ἐψηφισ]μένα, ἔστω κατὰ τῶν
ἀρχόντων τούτων περὶ [ἀτιμίας] δίωξις Ἀθήνησι. (5) ἐν δὲ τῶι ἀργυρο-
κοπίῳ τὸ ἀργύ[ριον δεξαμένους κόψαι μὴ ἔλ]αττον ἢ ἡμισυ καὶ ἀ[- -
----- c. 29 -----]ι αἱ πόλεις· πράτ[εσθαι] δὲ αἰετὸς τοὺς
ἐπιστάτας τρεῖς] δραχμὰς ἀπὸ τῆς μν[ᾶς]· τὸ δὲ ἄλλο ἡμισυ. . 5 . . . μηνῶν
κατ]αλλάττειν ἢ ἐνόχο[υς εἶναι] ----- c. 12 ----- (6) ὁ δὲ ἄν
περιγ[ύγνηται] ἀργυρίο[υ τοῦ πεπραγμένου] κόψαι καὶ ἀποδό[σθαι] ἢ τοῖς
στρατ[ηγού]σι ἢ τοῖς ----- c. 15 ----- (7) ἐπε[ιδὰν] δὲ ἀπο-
δοθῆι, [- ----- c. 29 -----]αι καὶ τῶι Ἡφαίσ[τῳ] -----
c. 14 ----- (8) καὶ ἐάν τι]ς εἴπ[η] ἢ ἐπιψηφίση περὶ τούτων ἐξεῖναι
ξενικῶι νομίσμα]τι χρῆσθαι ἢ δανε[ίσειν], ἀπογραφέσθω αὐτίκα μάλα
πρὸς] τοὺς ἑνδεκα· οἱ δ[ὲ] ἑνδεκα θαν]άτωι ζ[ημιωσάντων]· ἐὰν] δὲ ἀμφι-
σβητῆι, εἰσ[αγαγόντων] εἰς τὸ δικαστήρι]ον· (9) κήρυκας δὲ ἐλέσθαι
τὸ[ν δῆμον] -- c. 25 -- τὰ ἐψηφισμ]ένα, ἕνα μὲν ἐπὶ Νή[σους], ἕνα δὲ
ἐπὶ Ἰωνίαν, ἕνα δὲ ἐφ' Ἑλλήσπο]ντον, ἕν[α] δὲ ἐπὶ τὰ ἐπὶ Θραίκης·
το[ύτοις] δὲ τὴν πορείαν ἐκάστῳ συγγράψαντες οἱ στρατηγοὶ ἀ]ποστει-
λάν[των]· εἰ δὲ μὴ, καθ' ἕνα ἕκαστον εὐθυ]νόσθωμ [μ]υρ[ίαις] δραχμαῖς·
(10) καταθεῖ]ναι δὲ τὸ ψήφισμα τ[όδε] τοὺς ἄ]ρχοντα[ς τ]οῦ[ς] ἐ[ν] ταῖς
πόλεσιν [ἀναγράψαντες ἐν στη]λίηι λιθίνῃ ἐν τῇ ἀγορᾷ τῆ[ς πό]λεως
[ἐκάστης] καὶ τοὺς ἐπιστ[άτας] ἔμπροσθεν] τοῦ ἀργυροκοπίου· ταῦτα δὲ
ἐπ[ιτελέσαι] Ἀθηναῖους, ἐ]ὰμ μὴ αὐτοὶ βούλωνται· (11) δεηθῆναι δὲ
αὐτῶ[ν] τὸν κήρυκα τὸν ἰόντα ὅσα [κ]ελεύου[σιν] Ἀθηναῖοι· (12) προσγρά-

ψαι δὲ πρὸς τὸν ὄρκον [τ]ὸν τῆς βουλῆς τὸν γραμματέα τὸν τῆς [βουλῆς εἰς τὸ λοιπὸν τα]δί· ἕαν τις κόπτη νόμισ[μα] ἀργυρίου ἐν ταῖς πό[λεσι κ]αὶ μὴ χρῆται νομ[ίσμασιν τοῖς Ἀθηναί]ων ἢ σταθμοῖς ἢ μέτρ[οις, ἀλλὰ ξενικοῖς νομίσμασι]ν καὶ μέτροις καὶ σταθμοῖς, [τιμωρήσομαι κα]ὶ ζ[ημιώσω κατὰ τὸ πρότε]ρον ψήφισμα ὃ Κλέαρχ[ος εἶπεν· (13) ἐξεῖναι δὲ καὶ ὁτωιοῦν ἀποδιδόν]αι τὸ ξενικὸν ἀργύριον [ὃ ἂν ἔχη καὶ καταλλάττειν κατὰ ταῦτά ὃ]ταμ βούληται· τὴν δὲ πό[λιν ἀνταποδοῦναι αὐτῷ νόμισμα ἡμεδαπὸν·] αὐτὸν δὲ τὰ [έ]αυτοῦ ἕκαστ[ον κομίζειν Ἀθήναζε καὶ θεῖναι εἰς τὸ ἀργυ]ροκόπιον· (14) ο[ἱ] δὲ ἐπιστάτ[αι ἅπαντα τὰ παρ' ἐκάστων ἀποδοθέντα ἀνα]γράψαντες κατα[θέντων στήλην λιθίνην ἔμπροσθεν τοῦ ἀργυροκο]πίου σκοπεῖν τῷ βου[λομένῳ· ἀνα]γραφάντων δὲ καὶ ξύμπαν τὸ νόμισμα τὸ ξενικόν, χω[ρὶς τὸ τε ἀργύριον καὶ τὸ χρυσίον, καὶ ξύμπαν τὸ ἡμεδαπὸ]ν ἀργύρι[ον -----].

This composite text follows, with minor exceptions, *ATL*, though some restorations we have confined to our notes. In (8) we accept Tod's criticism (*JHS* lxix (1949) 104 f.) of *ATL*'s ἐπιψηφίση περ[ὶ τούτων, ὅτι ἔστι and adopt his alternative. In (14) we have included Tod's suggestion in place of *ATL*'s ἀναγράψαντες καταθέντων παρὰ τὴν στήλην. In (2) *ATL* has οἱ] δὲ ἑλληνοταμ[ῖαι τὰ ἀργυροκόπια ἐν ταῖς πόλεσι ἀ]ναγραφόντων· ἐὰ[ν δὲ μὴ ὀρθῶς ἀναγραφῆι τὸ ἐκ τῶν π]όλεων τινός, in (5) μὴ ἔλ[αττον ἢ ἡμισυ καὶ ἀ]ποδόσθαι ὡς ἂν νόμισμα ἱκανὸν ἔχωσι] αἱ πόλεις. For the minting fee πέντε] δραχμᾶς is also possible, but seems too high. (6) στρατ[ηγῶις ἢ τοῖς ἀποδέκταις εὐθύς *ATL*. (7) [ψηφίσασθαι καὶ περὶ τῶν τῆι Ἀθηναί]αι καὶ τῷ Ἑφαισ[τῶι ὀφειλομένων] *ATL*. (9) κήρυκας δὲ ἐλέσθαι τὸν δῆμον καὶ πέμψαι εἰς τὰς πόλεις κατὰ τὰ ἐψηφισ]μένα *ATL*; [ἀπαγγέλλοντας οὐ ἀπαγγελοῦντας τὰ ἐψηφισ]μένα, Tod.

The decree requires all members of the Athenian Alliance to use Athenian coins, weights, and measures. Independent silver coinages are banned and local mints closed; electrum issues are not mentioned, and Kyzikene staters remained plentiful and popular. In the clauses that survive no exceptions are made. It is generally assumed that the decree would not apply to Chios, Lesbos, and Samos, which might still regard themselves as autonomous, but there is no firm evidence (see below). Responsibility for carrying out the decree is to rest with Athenian officials in the cities (ἀρχοντες τῶν Ἀθηναίων), and if there are none, with local officials (4). The masters of the mint at Athens are to convert foreign currencies, belonging to states or individuals, into Attic coin, and a minting fee (? 3 drachmae in the mina) is probably specified (5). Heralds are to be sent to the various districts of

the empire under the supervision of the generals to report the decisions of the Assembly, and every city is to set up a copy of the decree in its Agora; at Athens a copy is to be set up in front of the mint. The importance attached to the decree is shown by the heavy penalties threatened against the executive if they fail to carry out instructions, the specification of summary arrest and death for anyone who proposes the repeal of the decree, and, above all, by the inclusion of a special clause in the Bouleutic oath. In future every member of the Boule must bind himself by oath to take action against and punish any offenders against the decree 'as prescribed by the earlier decree moved by Klearchos'.

While the main lines of the decree are firmly established, many details are uncertain. We do not know the precise terms of exchange (5). Hephaistos, and probably with him Athena, are mentioned in a context which we do not understand (7). If the *ATL* restoration is sound and a vote is to be taken about debts to these gods, we do not know when they were incurred. The duty laid on the *hellenotamiai* in (2) may not be, as restored, the drawing up of a list of local mints. Nor can we identify 'the former decree of Klearchos' (12). We cannot, with *ATL* ii. 67, believe that the words refer to our decree on the ground that 'for the future swearer the decree would be "earlier" than his oath'; such a superfluous addition of *πρότερον* would be very un-Greek. It is probably, but not necessarily, to be inferred that the present decree was also moved by Klearchos, and the subject of the former decree is probably related to the present decree rather than to a different subject. It may have set out the main lines of policy, to be followed by these detailed elaborations.

More important is the uncertainty of date. When Tod published his text in 1933, scholars' views ranged between 430 and 415. Aristophanes clearly parodied the decree in a passage of his *Birds* (1040 f.), in which the decree-monger offers for sale among his 'new laws': *χρησθαι Νεφελοκοκκυγιάς τοῖσδε τοῖς (τοῖς αὐτοῖς Cobet) μέτροισι καὶ σταθμοῖσι καὶ ψηφίσμασι* (Bergk unnecessarily wished to emend to *νομίσμασι*) *καθάπερ Ὀλοφύξιοι*. A date not far from 414 when the play was produced seemed to be required. It was also widely thought that the imperialistic tone of the decree reflected the spirit of Cleon and his associates. Hiller thought that this dating suited the scripts of the various fragments, and this too was the opinion of D. M. Robinson when he published a new fragment from Aphytis in 1935 (*AJP* lvi (1935) 149-54). The broad consensus, however, was badly shaken when in 1938 Segre published a small new fragment from Cos (*Clara Rhodos*, ix (1938) 151-78). Previous fragments had been in Ionic; the new text from Dorian Cos was in Attic letters and, according to Segre, on Pentelic marble. Since the decree seemed to provide for the setting

up of copies by the Athenians in cities that were recalcitrant (10), it was reasonable to infer that the Cos copy had been cut at Athens and could be dated by comparison with dated Athenian documents. The crucial letter-form was the early three-barred sigma (Ϛ), which, by a generally accepted criterion, had become obsolete by 445. Segre did not hesitate to date the decree in the early forties.

The new dating has met with considerable opposition. Tod (*JHS* lxi (1949) 105) urged a later date, even if not later than 439, and pointed out that the early sigma was also found on Samian *Horoi* usually associated with the Samian revolt of 440-39 (but see Barron, *JHS* lxxxiv (1964) 35-48). Cavaignac (*Rev. Num.* xv (1953) 1 ff.) argued for a return to the later date primarily on historical grounds; Athens had not, he thought, reached such open imperialism in the forties. Mattingly (*Hist.* x. 148-69) made the decree a launching pad for a wide-spreading attack on dating by letter-forms, and proposed sharply revised dates for several important decrees hitherto dated before 445 on these grounds. Pritchett (*BCH* lxxxvii (1963) 20-3) suggested a compromise that might, he hoped, be acceptable to epigraphists and historians. If the marble was an island marble and not Pentelic, and if the cutter had come from Athens to Cos in the forties and stayed there, he might have used the forms with which he was familiar when he left Athens. The rigorous examination of the stone with samples from various different quarries by a highly experienced Greek mineralogist has in fact revealed that the marble was almost certainly not Pentelic (A. N. Georgiades and W. K. Pritchett, *BCH* lxxxix (1965) 400-40). On the present evidence, though the marble is not securely identified (Georgiades, followed by Pritchett, thinks that it is probably Parian), it is perhaps more likely to have been inscribed in Cos than in Athens. But why should a mason, whether Coan or Athenian, working in Cos use an Attic sigma that had been obsolete for more than twenty years, when none of his other letters suggests that he was old-fashioned? The epigraphic argument may be a little weakened, but it remains strong.

The coins themselves may ultimately give the decisive answer, but at present the numismatic evidence is as ambiguous as the epigraphic. Already by 1913, when Gardner surveyed the coinage of the Athenian empire, it was clear that most of the islands, apart from Samos, Chios, and Lesbos, though they minted freely in the sixth century, had closed their mints by, or soon after, 450 (and in 1913 no one suggested that Athens had tried to enforce the use of her own coins on all the allies as early as that). In the other districts of the empire the evidence was much more obscure; in Asia Minor there seemed little evidence of independent minting after the Persian wars, but the big towns of Thrace, Abdera, Maroneia, and Ainos seemed to have minted freely

without any obvious sign of a break (P. Gardner, *JHS* xxxiii (1913) 147-88). When E. S. G. Robinson carried out a similar review in 1949, the Cos fragment had been found and the question Robinson set out to answer was: 'Is the evidence of the coins compatible with the early date (c. 449) that the Cos fragment seems to demand for the Coinage decree?' (*Hesp.*, Suppl. viii (1949) 324-40). He had more coins to work from than Gardner, and thirty years of numismatic research and controversy had led to many modifications. He concluded that the coins tended to support the early date, though they also showed how difficult the decree was to enforce. But this conclusion cannot be pressed too far, for the evidence is inadequate. Before expecting a more decisive answer from the numismatists we need considerably more dated hoards. Style alone in such small-scale designs is a vulnerable criterion, as the coinage of Samos illustrates.

Barron, by a detailed examination of die-links, has put the study of Samian silver coinage on much firmer foundations. The coins that most concern us are the series marked with letters from Β to Ξ, each letter almost certainly covering a year, and the whole series extending, therefore, over fifteen years. For Gardner this series probably began in 428. When the Samian revolt was crushed in 439 Athens will have imposed a democracy, but by 412 the oligarchs are in power (Thuc. viii. 21). Gardner inferred that the democracy was overthrown in 428, when the Mytilenean oligarchs revolted, and that the lettered series represented a period of oligarchy (op. cit. 160 f.). Robinson, without discussing the political implications, inferred that the series started rather earlier, 'surprisingly soon after the crushing of the revolt'. Barron's more detailed argument is more convincing; with him we believe that the lettered series lasted from 454 to 439 and represented an oligarchic interlude in Samos. But in accepting the early date for the Coinage decree Barron is basing his argument on other factors than the coins. The dating of this series from 454 to 439 is quite compatible with the later dating of the Coinage decree. It does not help us to date the Coinage decree, nor help us to decide whether the so-called autonomous allies were excluded from its provisions, though Barron infers from the language of the decree, and particularly of the Bouleutic oath, that no exceptions were made. (Barron, *The Silver Coins of Samos* (1966) 50-93.)

Finally Chios. It has long been realized that Chios minted freely through most at any rate of the fifth century, and at some point changed from a coinage consisting only of dekadrachms, drachms, and tetrobols to one of tetradrachms, drachms, and smaller fractions. Stylistically, there is a clear break between the two issues, and in the interval between them must be placed a unique electrum stater in

Berlin. Boardman has dated this stater from the form of its bulbous-necked amphora to the middle of the fifth century (*BSA* liii-liv (1958-9) 308, with 300 n. 3). The Chian coins included in the inventory of the Other Gods for 429-8 (*IG* i². 310. 112-13) are from the new silver issue (Barron, op. cit. 86). It is a reasonable hypothesis that the electrum stater is the Chian reaction to a ban on silver issues other than Athenian, and that later (perhaps after the Samian revolt) the Athenians allowed Chios to resume minting.

46

Tightening-up of Tribute Payment:

(?) 447 B.C.

Four fragments of a marble stele; three in EM, one in the British Museum.

Attic letters, stoichedon 23 (ll. 1-14), 40 (ll. 15-77). In the right top corner a rectangle is reserved, perhaps for a painting (cf. *IG* ii². 2496, which has a relief in this position). Photos.: *ATL* i. 121 f. (frs. 1, 2, 3); *ATL* ii, Pl. 2 (frs. 1 and 4); *DAT* 44 (fr. 1), 46 (fr. 2), 48 (fr. 3).

IG i². 66; *DAT* 43-60; Woodward *JHS* lviii (1938) 108 f.; Raubitschek, *AJP* lxi (1940) 477-9; Meritt, *Epigraphica Attica* (1940) 38; Hill and Meritt, *Hesp.* xiii (1944) 1-15; Wade-Gery, *Hesp.* xiv (1945) 216 f., 226-8; *ATL* ii. D 7; Mattingly, *Hist.* x (1961) 150-69; Meritt and Wade-Gery, *JHS* lxxxii (1962) 67-74; Meiggs, *Harv. Stud.* lxvii (1963) 22; Mattingly, *CQ* xvi (1966) 188 f.; Meiggs, *JHS* lxxxvi (1966) 97.

Θεοί

ἔδοχσεν τῆι βολ[ῆι καὶ τῶι] δέ-
 μοι, Οἰνέϊς ἐπρυ[τάνευε, Σπ]ου-
 διάς ἐγραμμάτε[νε...β...]
 5 ἐπεστάτε, Κλενί[ας εἶπε· τῆ]μ β-
 ολὲν καὶ τὸς ἀρχ[οντας ἐν] τέσ-
 ι πόλεσι καὶ τὸς [ἐπισκό]πος ἐ-
 πιμέλεσθαι ἡπό[ος ἂν χσ]υλλέ-
 γεται ἡο φόρος κ[ατὰ τὸ ἔ]τος ἡ-
 10 ἕκαστον καὶ ἀπά[γεται] Ἀθένα-
 ζε· χσύμβολα δὲ π[οιέσα]σθαι π-
 ρὸς τὰς πόλεις, ἡό[πος ἄ]μ μὲ ἐχσ-
 εἰ ἀδικῆν τοῖς ἀ[πάγο]σι τὸμ φ-

- ὄρον· γράφασα δ[ἐ] ἡε] πόλις ἐς
 15 γραμματεῖον τὸ[μ φό]ρον, ἰόντιν' ἂν ἀποπέμπει, σεμε-
 ναμένε τῷ συμβ[όλο]ι ἀποπεμπέτο Ἀθέναζε· τὸς δὲ ἀ-
 πάγοντας ἀποδο[να] τὸ γραμματεῖον ἐν τῷ βολεῖ ἀ-
 ναγνῶναι ἡόταμ[πε]ρ τὸμ φόρον ἀποδιδῶσι· ἡοι δὲ πρ-
 υτάνες μετὰ Διο[νύ]σια ἐκκλησίαν ποιεσάντων τοῖ-
 20 ς ἡελλενοταμία[σι ἀ]ποδείχσαι Ἀθηναίους τὸμ πόλ-
 εον τὰς ἀποδόσα[ς τὸμ φόρον ἐ]ντελέ καὶ τὰς ἑλλιπό-
 σας χορίς, ἡόσαι [ἂν 9 Ἀθ]εναίος δὲ ἡελομέ-
 νος ἄνδρας τέττ[αρα] ἀποπέμπεν ἐπὶ τὰς πόλες ἀντ-
 ιγραφοσμένους τ[ὸμ φόρον τὸν ἀποδοθέντα κα] ἰ ἀπαι-
 25 τέσοντας τὸμ μὲ [ἀποδοθέντα παρὰ τὸν ἑλλιποσ]δῶν, τ-
 ὀ μὲν δύο πλέν ἐπ[ὶ] τὰς ἐπὶ Νέσον καὶ ἐπ' Ἰονίας ἐπὶ τ-
 ριέρους ταχείας, [τὸ δὲ δύο ἐπὶ τὰς ἐφ' Ἑλλεσπόντο κα]-
 ἰ ἐπὶ Θράικες· ἐ[σάγεν δὲ ταῦτα τὸς πρυτάνες ἐς τὲμ]
 βολὲν καὶ ἐς τὸ[ν δέμον εὐθύ]ς μετὰ Διονύσια καὶ βο]-
 30 λεύεσθαι περὶ τ[ούτον χσυνεχὸς ἡέος ἂν διαπραχθ]-
 εῖ· ἂν δὲ τις Ἀθ[εναίος ἔ] χσύμμαχος ἀδικεῖ περὶ τὸ]-
 ν φόρον ἡὸν δεῖ [τὰς πόλες γραφσάσας ἐς γραμματεῖ]-
 ον τοῖς ἀπάγοσ[ιν ἀποπέμπεν Ἀθέναζε, ἔ]στο αὐτὸν γ]-
 ράφεσθαι πρὸς [τὸς πρυτάνες τῷ β]ολομένο[ι Ἀθена]-
 35 ἰον καὶ τὸν χσ[υμμάχον· ἡοι δὲ πρυτάν]ες ἔσαγ[όντων]
 ἐς τὲμ βολὲν [τὲν γραφὲν ἡέν τι]ς ἂγ γράφεσται[ι ἔ] εὐθ]-
 νῆσθο δόρο[ν χιλίαισι δραχμ]ῆσο[ι ἡ]έκαστος· [ἡὸ δ' ἂν]
 καταγῶδι ἡ[ε] βολέ, μὲ τιμᾶν αὐτ]ῶι κυρία ἔστο [ἀλλ' ἐ]σ]-
 φερέτο ἐς τ[ὲν ἐλιαίαν εὐθύ]ς· ὅταν δὲ δόχσει [ἀδικῆ]-
 40 ν, γνόμας πο[ιέσθον ἡοι πρυ]τάνες ἡό τι ἂν δοκ[εῖ αὐτ]-
 ὀμ παθῆν ἔ ἀ[ποτεῖσαι· καὶ ἐ]άν τις περὶ τὲν ἀπα[γογῆ]-
 ν τῆς βοὸς ἔ [τῆς πανηοπλία]ς ἀδικεῖ, τὰς γραφὰ[ς ἐ]να]-
 ἰ κατ' αὐτὸ κ[αὶ τὲν ζεμίαν κ]ατὰ ταῦτά· τὸς δὲ [ἡελλεν]-
 ο[ταμίας ἀναγράφσαντας ἐ]ς πινάκιον λελ[ευκομέν]-
 45 [ον ἀποφαίνεν καὶ τὲν τάχσι]ν τὸ φόρο καὶ [τὰς πόλες]
 [ἡόσαι ἂν ἀποδοσιν ἐντελέ κα] ἰ ἀπογ[ράφεν . . . 7 . . .]

c. 10 lines lost

[. 24 τὲμ] βολὲν τὲν ἐσι[δο]-
 [αν περὶ τὸν ἀπαγόντων τὸμ φόρον· ἡ]όσοι δὲ τὸν ἀπα[γ]-
 [όντων Ἀθέναζε ἐς τὸ πινάκιον ἀν]αγεγράφεται ὀφέ-

- 60 [λοντες.....18.....ἐπ]ιδείχσαι τῶι δέμ-
 [οι.....20.....ἐὰν δ]έ τις τῶμ πόλεον ἀ-
 [μφισβετῆι περὶ τῶ φόρο τῆς ἀποδ]όσεος, φάσκοσα ἀπ-
 [οδεδοκέναι.....16.....]θαι τὸ κοινὸν τῆς
 [πόλεος.....20.....]ας τὰς πόλες καὶ τ-
- 65 [.....20.....γράφει]θαι δὲ μὲ ἐχσέναι
 [.....25.....]τος ὀφελέτο ἡο γρ-
 [αφσάμενος.....17.....] τὲν δὲ γραφὲν ἔνα-
 [ι πρὸς τὸν πολέμαρχον μὲνὶ Γαμε]λιῶνι· ἐὰν δὲ τις ἀ-
 [μφισβετῆι.....17.....] κλέσες, ἡε βολὲ βο-
- 70 [λευσαμένε.....17.....] ἔσαγόντων δὲ ἡοι
 [ἔσαγογῆς ἐς τὲν ἐλαιαίαν τὸς Ἄθε]ναίοις τὸμ φόρον
 [ὀφελόντας ἡεχσῆς κατὰ τὸμ πίνα]κα τῆς μενύσεος· ἐ-
 [.....21..... τῶ νέο] φόρο καὶ τῶ περυσ-
 [ινῶ.....12.....τὲν δὲ βολὲν π]ροβολεύσασαν ἐχ-
- 75 [σενεγκέν.....18.....] πέρι τῆι ἡυστερα-
 [αίαι ἐς τὸν δέμον.....12.....τ]ῆς ἡαιρέσεος χρε-
 [ματίσαι -----] vacat.

l. 22: ἔλλιπόσιν R. G. Thomas, τινες ὄσιν *ATL*. l. 24: τὸν ἀποδοθέντα A. Griffin, τῆσι ἀποδόσεσι *ATL*. l. 37: We prefer χιλίαισι το μυρίασι (*ATL*), cf. No. 69. 30. l. 40: πο[ιέσθον P. J. Rhodes (cf. Thuc. iii. 36. 2), πο[ιόντων *ATL*. l. 57: [...9.... χρεματίσαι δὲ καὶ τέμ] βολὲν *ATL*. l. 60: ὀφέ[[λοντες ἐν τῆι βολῆι τέμ βολὲν ἐπ]ιδείχσαι *ATL*. l. 61: [οι κατὰ τὲν πόλιν ἡεκάσταν *ATL*. ll. 66-7: τῶ δὲ γραφέν]τος ὀφελέτο ἡο γρ|[αφσάμενος τὲν τιμὲν ἐὰν φεύγει] *ATL*.

The fluctuations in the number of cities in the annual quota lists, and the recurrence of incomplete and double payments in the early forties show that Athens could not rely on receiving every year all the tribute that was due to her. This decree is an attempt to improve discipline, and the measures approved by the Assembly are to be the responsibility of the Boule, with the co-operation of Athenian officials overseas—travelling commissioners (ἐπίσκοποι) and resident officials (ἄρχοντες), both of whom are found in other decrees of the fifties and forties (No. 40, *ATL* ii. D 11).

1 (11-18): Identification-seals are to be agreed with each city so that the couriers shall have no opportunity to defraud. The amount of tribute is to be recorded on a sealed tablet before dispatch, so that the money actually handed over by the carrier may be checked against the record. We infer that previously some cities, credited with

only partial payments, had protested that the balance must have been lost in transit. 2 (18-22): An Assembly is to be convened after the Dionysia (when the tribute was due, Schol. Ar. *Ach.* 504) to hear a report from the *hellenotamiai* on the response by the cities. 3 (22-31): The Assembly will then each year elect four men to travel in pairs and give receipts to the cities that have paid, and demand their tribute from defaulters. 4 (31-41): Offenders against this decree, Athenian or ally, may be prosecuted by any Athenian or ally. The case shall be brought before the Boule by the prytany on duty, but the Boule has no authority to decide the penalty. After a preliminary hearing it must send the case, with a recommendation, to a popular court. 5 (41-3): At this point there is an unexpected digression. If anyone commits an offence in regard to the dispatch of cow and panoply, the procedure and penalty shall follow the same line. We infer from the concise phrasing that this subject is topical and that Athens' allies have only recently been required to send these offerings to the great Panathenaia. After this interruption provision is made for the publication on a whitened tablet of the tribute record, but the details are lost and there follows a gap in the text. The remaining fragment preserves an average of only twelve letters from a forty-letter line, an inadequate basis for restoration.

This decree has a strongly imperial flavour; its date is important but controversial. Until recently a date in the early twenties was generally accepted, for it seemed to be closely related to, and a precursor of, a decree moved by Kleonymos in 426, providing for the appointment of tribute collectors in the allied cities (No. 68). Moreover, the imperial tone was thought to fit a period when Cleon and those like him were becoming increasingly influential in Athenian politics. Woodward, however, suggested that epigraphically the interval between the two decrees might be substantial (*JHS* lviii. 108 f.) and in 1939 Raubitschek proposed a date in the forties, on the strength of letter-forms (*AJP* lxi (1940) 477 f.); but it is doubtful whether his redating would have received much encouragement had not a large new fragment been published in 1944 (Hill and Meritt, *Hesp.* xiii (1944) 1-15). It was this fragment which revealed the mover's name, and the best-known Kleinias (not a common name) was the father of Alcibiades, who died at the battle of Koroneia in 447 or 446. Wade-Gery suggested that 447 would in fact prove a very suitable date, coming between the short tribute list of 447, with its absentees and part-payments, and the long list of 446, recording complements for the previous year as well as the current year (*Hesp.* xiv (1945) 226-8), but this interpretation of the tribute lists has been abandoned in *ATL* iii. 59 f. Neither of these arguments is decisive. We know too little about the many prominent Athenians to feel confident in the

identification of this Kleinias; and if the lists of the early twenties were better preserved we might find ample evidence of partial payments in them. Many historians still feel that the tone is too imperialistic for the forties (Mattingly, *Hist.* x. 187 f.).

The only objective argument is provided by the letter-forms. Raubitschek emphasized the angle at which the loop of the rho closes against the vertical, and the curved lines of upsilon, as signs of an early date. Similar rhos may be found into and beyond the twenties, but, with very rare exceptions indeed, curved upsilons are not found after 430 (Meiggs *JHS* lxxxvi (1966) 97 n. 43). Epigraphically the twenties are too late, but the thirties cannot be ruled out. The main attractions of 447 are still the mover's name, the evidence of the quota lists (see p. 135), and the temper of the years following the Peace of Kallias (Meiggs, *Harv. Stud.* lxxvii (1963) 1 ff.). The spirit of Kleinias' decree strongly resembles that of the Coinage decree, and for that decree also we accept a date in the early forties (No. 45). To them we add the decree alluded to by Kleinias, which required not only Athenian colonies but all her allies to bring standard offerings of cow and panoply to the Great Panathenaia (ll. 41 f.). Erythrai had earlier been required to bring offerings to the Great Panathenaia (No. 40), but Erythrai could be regarded as a colony of Athens, and the offerings were not yet standardized.

Previously the earliest record of this obligation on all allies was in the short decree that was carried after the Assessment decree of 425 (No. 69, ll. 55-8). Thoudippos, who had proposed the assessment, later proposed that all the cities assessed should bring a cow and panoply to the Great Panathenaia and [escort them in the procession like colonists]. Mattingly (*Hist.* x (1961) 153) regards this as the decree referred to by Kleinias and would date the Kleinias decree shortly afterwards. If, however, Thoudippos' decree marked the introduction of the policy we should expect a longer formulation; his short decree is more intelligible if he was merely extending an existing obligation to cities which were being assessed for the first time, or after a long interval (see Meritt and Wade-Gery, op. cit.).

47

Athenian Treaty with Kolophon: (?) 447-6 B.C.

Four fragments, of which two join, from a marble stele; now in EM.

A poor script strongly influenced by Ionic (paid for by the Kolophonians, ll. 38 f.) The aspirate is consistently dropped, of the Ionic double letters

psi certainly (37, 40) and xi almost certainly (53, where ἐχσόλες for ἐξόλες would give too long a line) are used, but not eta or omega. The letter-forms are inconsistent rather than evidence of two hands. For dating ζ is the most significant. Non-stoichedon 39-42. Phot.: *ATL* ii, Pl. 8; Hondius, *Novae Inscriptiones Atticae*, Pl. 2 and 3 (frags. 2, 3, 4); facs. frag. 2, p. 8.

IG i². 14/15; Hondius, *NIA* (1925) 7-21; Schaefer, *Hermes*, lxxi (1936) 136 f. = *Probleme der Alten Geschichte*, 19 f.; Kolbe, *Hermes*, lxxiii (1938) 256-9; *ATL* ii. D 15, iii, pp. 282-4; Mattingly, *Hist.* x (1961) 175, xii (1963) 266; *Staatsverträge* 145; Meiggs, *Harv. Stud.* lxxvii (1963) 26 f.; Meritt and Wade-Gery, *JHS* lxxxiii (1963) 102 f.; Mattingly, *Ehrenberg Studies*, 210-12.

- [ἔδοξεν τῆι βολῆι καὶ τῶι δέμοι...7...ἐπρυτάνει]-
 [υε...8...ἐγ]ρα[μμάτευε, -- ἐπεστάτε -----]
 [...]ς εἶπε· Κ[ο]λ[ο]φο[ν] -----]
 5 [...7...]σ[--- | ...]ες Ἀθ[ε]να[--- || ...]ον[...]
 αὐτο[--- | ...]αι δὲ ταῦτα π[--- | ...]ς ἄλλες πόλει[ος ---]
 .Κ[ο]λ[ο]φόνιοι πο[--- | lacuna
 10 [.....15.....]αι Τριποτίοι ε[---]
 [...8...ψέφ]ισμα γίνεται, ὅς [---]
 [..5...ἐν τούτ]οι τῶι χρόνῳ δε[---]
 [...9...Κο]λοφονίον καὶ τῶν[---]
 [.....10.....] Ἀθηνῶν μεδεόσ[ες ---]
 15 [.....10.....]α δ' ἐκένο τῶι ε[---]
 [.....10.....] Κολοφονίον π[---]
 [.....11.....] δὲ γίνεται ἐπ[---]
 [..5...Ἀθην]αῖοι ἐὰν μέ τις αὐ[το ---]
 [...8...] οἱ δ' αἰρεθέντες πέλ[ντε οἰκισταὶ οἱ ἐς Κο]-
 20 [λοφῶνα τ]ά τ' ἐπιφισμένα φρα[ζόντων τέσι πόλεσι κα]-
 [ι ἐπιμελ]εθέντων, ὅπως ἂν [---]
 [οἱ οἰκέτ]ορες μετὰ τῶ δέ[μο ---]
 [...7...] ἱερῶν τῶν παρ' α[ντοῖς· τῶν δὲ αἰρεθέντων λα]-
 [μβανέτο] ἕκαστος τῆς ἐμ[έρας ἐκάστες ἐς ἐφόδια δρ]-
 25 [αχμέν· τὸ] δὲ ἀργύριον ὄφε[λόντων Κολοφόνιοι καὶ Λ]-
 [εβέδιο]ι καὶ Διοσιρίται κ[---]
 [...6... Κ]ολοφονίον μ[--- | ...γέν]εται ὁ [τ]ι ἂν δι[καιον ---]
 30 -- | ...6... μ[.]ε[.] ἐκαστο[--- || ...6...] ὅταν δὲ γέ[νεται ---]
 ...τὰ δ' νόματα [--- | ... το]ῖς δὲ Κ[ολοφονίοις ---]
 358...]οι[--- | lacuna [...6...]οι[--- | Κολοφ]όνι
 αρο[--- | ...]νας λε[---]

- [τὸ] δὲ ψέφισμ[α τόδε καὶ τὸν ὄρκον ἀναγραφίσατο ὁ γραμ]-
 [μα]τεὺς ὁ τῆς β[ολῆς ἐστέλει λιθίνει ἐμ πόλει τέλει]-
 [ι τ]οῖς Κολοφο[γίον· Κολοφῶνι δὲ ταῦτα καὶ τὸν ὄρκ]-
 40 [ον] ἀναγράψαν[τες ἐστέλει λιθίνει οἱ ἐς Κολοφῶνα]
 οἰκισταὶ κατα[- - - - -]
 οἰονομοσ[- - - - - ἐ]-
 ρῶ καὶ βολεύσο [ὅ τι ἂν δύνομαι καλὸν καὶ ἀγαθὸν πε]-
 ρὶ τὸν δῆμον τ[ὸν Ἀθηναίων. 21.]
 45 [ο]ν καὶ οὐκ ἀποστ[έσομαι τῷ δέμῳ τῷ Ἀθηναίων οὔτε]
 [λ]όγοι οὔτ' ἔργ[οι οὔτ' αὐτὸς ἐγὼ οὔτ' ἄλλοι πείσομαι]
 [κ]αὶ φιλέσο τὸ[ν δῆμον τὸν Ἀθηναίων καὶ οὐκ αὐτομο]-
 [λ]έσο καὶ δεμο[- - - - - 24-6 - - - - - οὔτ' α]-
 ὑτὸς ἐγὼ οὔτ' ἄ[λλοι πείσομαι - - - - -]
 50 μενος πόλιν ο[- - - - - ὄρκ]-
 ον ἀλεθῆ [τ]αῦτ[α - - - - - νὲ τὸν]
 [Δ]ία καὶ τὸν Ἄπο[λλο καὶ τὴν Δέμετρα, καὶ εἰ μὲν ταῦτ]-
 [α] παραβ[α]ίνουμι[ι ἐξόλες εἶεν καὶ αὐτὸς ἐγὼ καὶ τὸ γ]-
 [έ]νος τὸ ἐμὸν [ἐς τὸν ἅπαντα χρόνον, εὐορκῶντι δὲ εἶε]
 55 μοι πο[λ]λὰ καὶ [ἀγαθὰ].

1. 14: Ἀθενὼν μεδεόσ[ες is to be preferred to *ATL's* Ἀθενὼν μεδὲ ὄσ[ες. For the cult of Ἀθηνὰ Ἀθηνῶν μεδέουσα see Barron, *JHS* lxxxiv (1964) 35-48; for other examples Hill, *Sources*², p. 319, and p. 50, here. II. 41-3: κατὰ [τάδε Κολοφονίος ὁμόσαι, καθ' ἃ Κολοφ]||ονίον ὁ νόμος [κελεύει κατὰ ἱερὸν καιομένον κατε]ρῶ καὶ βολεύσο Kolbe; κατα[θέντων ἐν ἀγορᾷ τέλεισ τοῖς Κολοφ]||ονίον [ον]: ὁμοσ[άντων δὲ Κολοφόνιοι τάδε· δράσο καὶ ἐ]||ρῶ καὶ βολεύσο *ATL*. I. 44: For the main clause of the oath see below. I. 48: δέμο[ν οὐ καταλύσο τὸν Κολοφονίον. . .] is perhaps to be preferred to *ATL's* δεμο[κρατίαν οὐ καταλύσο Κολοφῶνι. . . . II. 49-51: οὔτ' ἐς ἄλλην ἀφιστά]||μενος πόλιν ο[ὔτ' αὐτόθι στασιάζον, κατὰ δὲ τὸν ὄρκ]||ον ἀλεθε [τ]αῦτ[α ἐμπεδέσο ἀδόλος καὶ ἀβλαβὸς *ATL*.

The clear traces of oath formulae show that this inscription belongs to the series including Erythrai (No. 40), Chalkis (No. 52), and Samos (No. 56) that record Athenian settlements with cities which have revolted and been recovered. Letter-forms suggest a date near the mid century, and before 445, for the older sigma (Ϻ) is retained while all other letters, though poorly inscribed, are in the developed style. From the tribute-quota lists we know that Kolophon was at least outwardly loyal in the late fifties, for her tribute payment is preserved in all four years of the first period. No record, however, survives in any of the three comparatively well-preserved lists of the second

period (449-446). It is at least probable that this decree dates from 447-6 (*ATL*).

The first fragment comes from the opening of the decree, but so little is preserved in its nine lines that even their general sense is beyond the range of rational guessing. The second fragment is little better, but there are tantalizing clues. The small neighbouring cities of Dios Hieron and very probably Lebedos are mentioned (ll. 25 f.). In l. 19 there may be a reference to *οικισταί* (*οἱ δ' αἰρεθέντες πέ[ντε οικισταί οἱ ἐς Κο|λοφώνα*]); they are certainly mentioned in l. 41. These *οικισταί* should be men sent out from Athens to establish a settlement, and perhaps the settlers are mentioned in l. 22 (*[οἱ οἰκέτ]ορες*). Was this to be a colony of Athenians at or near Kolophon? This is the view of the authors of *ATL*, who point to the reductions in the tribute of Kolophon, Lebedos, and perhaps Dios Hieron (for which there is no evidence in the assessment period 446-443). They further think that Athens adopted a policy of planting colonies in Ionia to compensate for the withdrawal of garrisons, which in their view Athens undertook to remove by the terms of the Peace of Kallias. By restoring the inscription on a dedication from the Acropolis, *τῆς ἀποι[κίας] τῆς ἐς Ἐρ[ύθρας]*, a close parallel to Kolophon is found in Erythrai (*ATL* iii. 282-4): 'the lowered quotas of Erythrai and of its neighbour Hairai justify the assumption that there was a colony in the southern part of the Erythraian peninsula.' This case is not compelling. There is clear evidence of a reduction in the tribute assessment of Hairai from 3 T. to 1 T. in 446, but no evidence of a reduction at Erythrai. In the second period she was required to pay 9 T. on behalf of the peninsula; in 446 Erythrai was assessed at 7 T., but the small states normally in her syntely paid separately. Polichna paid 4,000 dr., Elaius 100 dr.; Boutheia, Pteleus, and Sidus may well have paid 1 T. 900 dr. between them. For the Erythraians the argument that we hear nothing in our literary sources of Athenian colonies or cleruchies in Ionia carries little weight; but the detailed narrative in Thucydides of the troubles at Kolophon and Notion in the early years of the Archidamian War is difficult to reconcile with Athenian colonization. Had an Athenian settlement been established at or near Kolophon as recently as 447 or 446 there should be some trace of it in Thucydides (iii. 34). The colony which made the dedication on the Acropolis could be Eretria, and the settlement implied by the *οικισταί* sent to Kolophon could have resembled the settlement of Kolophonian refugees at Notion which Athens established when fresh trouble broke out at Kolophon in 430-427 (Thuc. iii. 34. 4: *καὶ ὕστερον Ἀθηναῖοι οἰκιστὰς πέμψαντες κατὰ τοὺς ἑαυτῶν νόμους κατ᾽οκίσαν τὸ Νότιον, ξυναγαγόντες πάντας ἐκ τῶν πόλεων, εἰ πού τις ἦν Κολοφώνων*).

The remaining two fragments, which join, provide glimpses of the oath to be taken by the Kolophonians, but one of the most important questions remains in doubt. *ATL* restores the oath of loyalty to include the allies as well as the Athenians: (ll. 42-6) δράσο καὶ ἐ|ρῶ καὶ βολεύσο [ὅ τι ἂν δύνομαι καλὸν καὶ ἀγαθὸν πε|ρὶ τὸν δῆμον τ[ὸν Ἀθηναίων καὶ περὶ τὸς ξυμμάχος αὐτ|δ]ν καὶ οὐκ ἀποστ[έρομαι τὸ δέμο τὸ Ἀθηναίων οὔτε | λ]όγοι οὔτε ἔργ[οι οὔτ' αὐτὸς ἐγὼ - - -]. This text is vulnerable. If the allies were mentioned in the positive clause they should, as in the Erythrai oath (No. 40, l. 24) and in the Samian oath (No. 56, l. 19) also be mentioned in the negative clause, and there is no room for οὔτε τὸν ξυμμάχον here. Nor in ll. 44 f. is [περὶ τὸς ξυμμάχος αὐτ|δ]ν persuasive; we should expect περὶ τὸς ξυμμάχος τὸς Ἀθηναίων as in the Erythraian and Samian oaths. Kolbe's restoration, which omits the allies but includes with the Athenian demos the demos of Kolophon, is perhaps to be preferred (*Hermes*, lxxiii (1938) 257): περὶ τὸν δέμον τ[ὸν Κολοφονίων καὶ τὸν δέμον τὸν Ἀθηναί|ο]ν, though the Athenian demos should precede the demos of Kolophon, and the forty-three letters required would make this longer than any other line. The same gods are invoked for the Kolophonian oath (l. 52) as for the Erythraian oath (No. 40, l. 16).

Mattingly's invitation (*Hist.* x (1961) 175) to refer the decree to the situation at Kolophon and Notion in the early years of the Archidamian War described by Thucydides should be rejected. The three-barred sigma remains a strong argument against such a late date (Meiggs, *JHS* lxxxvi (1966) 92). Moreover, in this decree Athens seems to control Kolophon, and the record of Kolophonian tribute shows that this control was maintained into the thirties. When Athens settled Kolophonians at Notion in 427 she did not control Kolophon (see also Meritt and Wade-Gery, *JHS* lxxxiii (1963) 102 f.; Meiggs, *Harv. Stud.* lxxvii (1963) 26 f.).

IG i². 34, an unrelated fragment referring to a settlement (συνθέκα[ς, l. 8) also concerns Kolophon and has ς; on the back (*IG* i². 35) is a later decree (Σ), implying good relations with Athens.

48 (48)

Athenian Casualty-list: (?) 447 B.C.

Marble stele; now in EM.

Developed Attic letters; ll. 15, 18, 19, 35, 36, 67, 72 (*Ἀρχέπολις*), and perhaps the epigram (45-8) seem to be later additions. The need for space for such additions had been foreseen (Dow, *Harv. Stud.* liii (1942) 97).

Phot.: A. Conze, *Die attischen Grabreliefs*, 1427, Pl. 293A. Facs.: Kirchhoff, *Hermes*, xvii (1882), folded at end of vol.

IG i². 943; Kirchhoff, op. cit. 623-30; Meiggs, *Harv. Stud.* lxvii (1963) 17 f.

	Col. i		Col. ii
	ἐγ Χερρονέσοι		ἐμ Βυζαντίοι
	Ἀθηναίων: ἠοῖδε	50	Ἀθηναίων: ἠοῖδ[ε]
	ἀπέθανον·		ἀπέθανον
	Ἐπιτέλες: στρατηγός		Ἐρεχθείδος
5	Ἐρεχθείδος		Νικόστρατος
	Πυθόδωρος		Φιλόκομος
	Ἀριστόδικος		
	Τέλεφος	55	Αἰγεῖδος
	Πυθόδωρος		Χίονις
10	Αἰγεῖδος		Πανδιονίδος
	Ἐπιχάρης		Φιλιστίδες
	Μνεσίφιλος		
	Φαιδιμίδες		Λεοντίδος
	Λάχης	60	Λυσίμαχος
15	Νικόφιλος		Ἀκαμαντίδος
	Πανδιονίδος		Καλλισθένης
	Λυσικλῆς		
	Λεοντίδος		Οἰνεῖδος
	Χαιρῆς		Κάλλιππος
20	Οἰνεῖδος	65	Κεκροπίδος
	Ῥοδοκλῆς		Κνίφον
	Εὐρύβοτος		Δεμοτέλες
	Πολίτες		ἠπποθοντίδος
	Ἐροκλείδες		ἡάισον
25	Κεκροπίδος	70	Αἰαντίδος
	Ἀρίσταρχος		Νικόδεμος
	Καρυστόνικος		
	Θεόμνεστος		Ἄντιοχίδος
	Ἀρίσταρχος		Φανίας

	Col. i		Col. ii
30	<i>Εὐκράτες</i> <i>Νικόμαχος</i>		
	<i>ἵπποθοντίδος</i> <i>Σοτελίδες</i> <i>Ποσειδῖππος</i>		<i>Πανδιονίδος</i> 75 <i>Σιμωνίδες</i> <i>Διοχύλος</i> <i>Ἀρχέπολις</i> <i>Σμικρίων</i> <i>Χαροπίδες</i> <i>Ναχσιάδες</i>
35	<i>Αἰαντίδος</i> <i>Δίφιλος</i>		80 <i>Λεοντίδος</i> <i>Φίλον</i> <i>Εὐδεμος</i> <i>Ἀκαμαντίδος</i> <i>Πρόταρχος</i>
	<i>Ἄντιοχίδος</i> <i>Κράτον</i> <i>Ἄντικράτες</i>		85 <i>Κεκροπίδος</i> <i>Χαιρίας</i> <i>Ἀστυνάχης</i> <i>Λυσίστρατος</i> <i>ἵπποθοντίδος</i>
40	<i>Εὐδοχσος</i>		90 <i>Τιμόνοθος</i> <i>Ἄντιφάνες</i> <i>Αἰαντίδος</i> <i>Κλένοθος</i> <i>Φίλιος</i>
	<i>hoίδε: ἐν τοῖς ἄλλοις</i> <i>πολέμοις: ἀπέθανον</i>		95 <i>Καλλικλῆς</i> <i>Ἐλευθεράθην</i> <i>Σεμιχίδες</i>
	<i>Ἐρεχθείδος</i> <i>Λυσανίας</i>		
45	<i>hoίδε παρ' ἡελλέσποντον ἀπόλεσαν ἀγλαὸν ἠέβεν</i> <i>βαρνάμενοι, σφετέραν δ' εὐκλείσαμ πατρίδα</i> <i>ἡόστ' ἐχθρὸς στενάχεμ πολέμο θέρος ἐκκομίσαντας,</i> <i>αὐτοῖς δ' ἀθάνατον μνῆμ' ἀρετῆς ἔθεσαν.</i>		

The casualties of a single year are here listed according to the areas in which they fought, in the Chersonese (ll. 1-40), Byzantium (ll. 49-73), and 'the other wars' (ll. 41-4, 74-97), and below the lists, running across the stele, is an epigram commemorating those who died by the Hellespont. In each area the names are listed under their tribal headings, arranged in the official order of the tribes. Note that Eleutherai (l. 96), listed last, fell outside the tribal organization, though part of Attica. In laying out his text the mason left extra space in each tribal entry, apparently anticipating that more names would be reported. There are indeed additions in a later hand (cf. No. 33), and it seems that when he originally designed his layout he did not expect his third list, which is very much more crowded. It was probably also not in the mind of the man who composed the epigram. The verses could cover Byzantium as well as the Chersonese, but hardly 'the other wars'.

Kirchhoff dated this list to the last phase of the Peloponnesian War, on the ground that only in that period did we know of important fighting in the area of the Hellespont: he assumed that the epigram was relevant to all three lists and that 'the other wars' must also all be in or near the Hellespont. This assumption was unwarranted, and it is now generally agreed that the letters and general style of the inscription must be substantially earlier. The name *Καρυστόνικος* (i. 27) must have been chosen to commemorate the conquest of *Karystos* c. 472; by 412 such a man would be very unlikely to be on active service. *Ναχσιάδες* (i. 75) has similarly been associated with the reduction of *Naxos* (c. 467), but such a name would be appropriate at any date in a family that had links with *Naxos*. More recently 440 or 439, when *Byzantium* joined *Samos* in revolt, has been generally accepted (e.g. *Tod*, p. 102). It is, however, almost inconceivable that in either of the two years of the *Samian* revolt *Samos* should be included among 'the other wars', with fewer casualties than *Byzantium* or the *Chersonese*. We therefore prefer 447, when *Pericles* led an expedition to protect the *Chersonese* from *Thracian* invaders and resettle it with *Athenians* (*Plut. Per.* 19. 1). The date is inferred from the tribute lists, *ATL* iii. 289 f. The casualties at *Byzantium* (ἐμ *Βυζαντίοι* need not mean inside the town, cf. *IG* i². 949. 40, 44, 50, 52) will have been in fighting *Thracians* threatening the town or in crushing a revolt. The 'other wars' will be minor actions carried out by small task forces at various points in the *Aegean*, where there was probably widespread discontent against *Athens* in the years immediately following the *Peace of Kallias*.

It is not clear why *Epiteles*, general, is not included within his tribal list, unless, perhaps, it is to emphasize that the generals were not merely commanders of tribal contingents. If, however, he is to be identified with *Epiteles*, son of *Soinautes*, who made a dedication of a marble basin on the *Acropolis* near the mid century (*DAA* 384), his tribe in fact is *Erechtheis*. Another *Epiteles*, also from *Erechtheis*, was killed in the year when the tribe lost men on six battlefields (No. 33, l. 150).

49 (44)

Athenian Colony at *Brea*: c. 445 B.C.

Two fragments of a marble stele found in the *Erechtheum*; now in *EM*. The stone was cut in half before being reworked as two column-bases in the *Byzantine* period (cf. *Paton, The Erechtheum*, 497-500). Text B was inscribed on the right-hand side of the top half, the inscribed face of which was

deleted, but which had room for thirty-eight lines, a maximum figure which is probably an over-estimate, since there could well have been a more widely spaced prescript. A third small fragment, with eleven letters only in four lines, found in the Agora, still retains its left edge, which the two main fragments have lost in reworking, and now does not join (*Hesp.* xiv (1945) 86 f., xxi (1952) 380); we omit it here.

Developed Attic letters, except R. A stoichedon 35, B stoichedon 17. Phot.: *Hesp.* xiv (1945) 88 (squeeze of A).

IG i². 45; Wilhelm, *Sitz. Wien.* 217. 5 (1939) 11-17; Meritt, *Hesp.* x (1941) 317-19; Woodhead, *CQ* ii (1952) 57-62; Mattingly, *CQ* xvi (1966) 172-86.

30-35 lines missing

A (face)

-ε πρὸς ἡὲν ἂν φα[ίνει ἔ]
 [γράφεται, ἐσ]αγέτο. ἂν δὲ ἐσάγει ἐνεχ[...5...]
 [...7....] ἡο φένας ἔ ἡο γραφσάμενος. πο[...5...]
 [...6...]ν αὐτοῖς παρασχόντων ἡοι ἀπ[οικιστ]-
 5 [αἰ καλλ]ιερεῖσαι ἡνπὲρ τῆς ἀποικίας, [ἡοπόσα]
 [ἂν αὐτο]ῖς δοκεῖ. γεονόμος δὲ ἡελέσθ[αι δέκα]
 [ἄνδρας,] ἔνα ἐχ φυλῆς· ἡοῦτοι δὲ νεμάντ[ον τὲν]
 [γέν. Δεμ]οκκλείδεν δὲ καταστῆσαι τὲν ἀ[ποικί]-
 [αν αὐτο]κράτορα, καθότι ἂν δύνεται ἄ[ριστα. τ]-
 10 [ὰ δὲ τεμ]ένε τὰ ἐχσειρεμένα ἔαν καθά[περ ἐστ]-
 [ί, καὶ ἄλ]λα μὲ τεμενίζεν. βοῦν δὲ καὶ π[ανἡοπλ]-
 [ίαν ἀπά]γεν ἐς Παναθῆναια τὰ μεγάλ[α καὶ ἐς Δ]-
 [ιονύσι]α φαλλόν. ἂν δὲ τις ἐπιστρα[τεύει ἐπ]-
 [ὶ τὲν γέ]ν τὲν τῶν ἀποίκων, βοεθῆν τὰ[ς πόλες ἡ]-
 15 [ος ὄχσ]ύτατα κατὰ τὰς χσυγγραφὰς ἡα[ὶ ἐπι. .]
 [...6...]το γραμματεύοντος ἐγένον[το περὶ τ]-
 [ὸν πόλε]ον τῶν ἐπὶ Θράικες. γράφσαι δ[ὲ ταῦτα]
 [ἐν στέλ]ει καὶ καταθῆναι ἐμ πόλει· πα[ρασχόν]-
 [τον δὲ τ]ὲν στέλεν ἡοι ἄποικοι σφῶν α[ὐτῶν τέ]-
 20 [λεσιν. ἐ]ἂν δὲ τις ἐπιφσεφίξει παρὰ τέ[ν στέλ]-
 [εν ἔ ῥρέ]τορ ἀγορεύει ἔ προσκαλέσθ[αι ἐγγερ]-
 [εἰ ἀφαι]ρῆσθαι ἔ λύνει τι τῶν ἡεφσεφι[σμένον],
 [ἄτιμον] ἔναι αὐτὸν καὶ παῖδας τὸς ἐχ[ς ἐκένο]
 [καὶ τὰ χ]ρέματα δεμόσια ἔναι καὶ τῆς [θεῶ τὸ ἐ]-
 25 [πιδέκα]τον, ἔὰμ μέ τι αὐτοῖ ἡοι ἄποικ[οι. . .]
 [...δῆ]ονται: ἡόσοι δ' ἂν γράφσοντα[ι ἐποικ]-
 [έσεν τῶ]ν στρατιοτῶν, ἐπειδὰν ἡέκοσ[ι Ἀθῆνα]-

- [ζε, τριά]κοντα ἔμερον ἐμ Βρέαι ἔναι ἐπ[οικέσ]-
 [οντας. ἐ]χσάγεν δὲ τὲν ἀποικίαν τριάκ[οντα ἐ]-
 30 [μερον. Α]ισχίνεν δὲ ἀκολουθῶντα ἀπο[διδόνα]-
 [ι τὰ χρέ]ματα. *vacat*

B (side)

- [Φ]αντοκλῆς εἶπε· περὶ
 [μ]ὲν τῆς ἐς Βρέαν ἀποι-
 [κ]ίας καθάπερ Δεμοκλ-
 35 [ε]ίδες εἶπε· Φαντοκλέ-
 [α] δὲ προσαγαγὲν τὲν Ἐ-
 [ρ]εχθείδα πρυτανεία-
 [ν] πρὸς τὲν βολὲν ἐν τῆ-
 [ι] πρότει ἡέδραι· ἐς δὲ
 40 [Β]ρέαν ἐχ θετῶν καὶ ζε-
 [υ]γιτῶν ἰέναι τὸς ἀπο-
 [ι]κος.

l. 1: *he* δὲ ἀρχ[έ] Wilhelm. ll. 2-3 ἐνέχ[υρα ἄχ|σια θέτο] *ho* φένας Wilhelm; ἐνεχ[υραζέ|το αὐτόν] *IG* i². ll. 3-4: We prefer Meritt's πό[ρον δ' ἐ]ς θυσία]ν to π(ρ)ό[βατα ἐ]ς θυσία]ν which Wilhelm proposed in place of πο[ίμνια | δὲ αἰγῶ]ν (*IG* i²). l. 15: We prefer ἐπὶ. . . [. . .]το γραμματεῦ-
 οντος (with name only of secretary) to ἐπὶ. . . [. . .]πρό]το γραμματεῦντος.
 l. 20: *IG* i² restored [στέλ]λεν ἔ ρέ]τορ to avoid Kirchhoff's ρηέ]τορ; the
 spelling ρρέ]τορ creates no problem. ll. 25-6: περὶ? | σφῶν δέ]ονται *IG* i²;
 ?*heav* | τοῖς δέ]ονται. Much of B (ll. 31-7 and part of 38) has now been lost.

We know of more than a dozen settlements, colonies, and cleruchies sent out by Athens in the fifth century, and of most of them we know when they were sent, where they were sent, and, in outline, how they fared. It is a strange irony that the only settlement for which we have good contemporary evidence is the colony of Brea, whose date and site are uncertain and which for us has no history. Apart from this decree it is mentioned for certain only by Stephanus of Byzantium (*Βρέα, πόλις (Θράκης), εἰς ἣν ἀποικίαν ἐστεύλαντο Ἀθηναῖοι. . .*), by Hesychius (*Βρέα· Κρατίνος μέμνηται τῆς εἰς Βρέαν ἀποικίας. . .*) and by Theognostos (Cramer, *Anecdota Graeca Oxon.* ii. 102).

The opening lines (c. 30-35) will have included more than the decision to establish the colony and the number of settlers. After three fragmentary lines relating to legal procedure, our text continues:

1 (3-6). [The cost of the] sacrifice on behalf of the colony is to be provided by the ἀποικισταί, who are apparently the adjutants of the

οίκιστής, and may correspond to the ten men sent to Thurii: τοὺς εἰς Θούριον πεμφθέντας ἐπὶ τὸ κτίσαι αὐτήν. ἐπέμφθησαν δὲ δέκα ἄνδρες (Schol. Ar. *Clouds* 332). The word does not occur elsewhere.

2 (6-8). Ten γεωνόμοι are to be elected, one from each tribe, to allocate the land; cf. Phryn. *Praep. Soph.*, p. 57 (ed. de Borries): γεωνόμης μὲν ὁ διανεμῶν ἐν ταῖς ἀποικίαις ἐκάστῳ τὸν κλῆρον, γεωμέτρης δὲ ὁ μετρῶν τοὺς κλήρους.

3 (8-9). Demokleides is to establish the colony at his discretion, without further reference to the authorities at home.

4 (9-11). The sites reserved for the gods are to remain reserved, but their number is not to be increased. (These reservations are much more likely to be sites chosen for the gods of the new community than native cult places preceding the colony.)

5 (11-13). The colonists are to send a cow and panoply to the Great Panathenaia in the mother city, and a phallos to the Dionysia. That a cow and not a bull was to be sent, in spite of Schol. Ar. *Clouds* 386 (ἐν τοῖς Παναθηναίοις πᾶσαι αἱ ὑπὸ τῶν Ἀθηναίων ἀποικισθεῖσαι πόλεις βοῦν τυθησόμενον ἔπεμπον), we now know from No. 46, ll. 41-2. For these offerings see p. 121.

6 (13-17). If the colonists' land is attacked, the cities (of the district) are to come to their aid as sharply as possible according to the agreements concerning the cities of the Thraceward district carried when [e.g. Demostratos] was secretary (of the Boule, probably in the current year). The χσυγγραφαί would have been based on recommendations by a commission (cf. *ATL* ii. D 11; τάδε ἡοι χ]συγγρα[φῆς χουνέγραψαν].

7 (17-20). This decree is to be inscribed and set up on the Acropolis at the expense of the colonists.

8 (20-6). Anyone who proposes the reversal of the decree, or any modification of any of its clauses shall with his children lose the rights of a citizen and his property shall be confiscated, unless the colonists themselves have some request to make for themselves.

9 (26-9). Any troops who enrol in the colony when they return to Athens must arrive in Brea within thirty days.

10 (29-31). The colony is to be led out within thirty days and Aeschines shall go with the colonists and give them their money (cf. Libanius on Athenian cleruchs: ἐλάβανον πεμπόμενοι ὄπλα τ' ἐκ τοῦ δημοσίου καὶ ἐφόδιον, *Arg. Dem.* viii).

It is extremely unlikely that the first thirty lines of our text come from an amendment. Demokleides presumably moved the decree in the Assembly and proposed autocratic powers for himself. The form of the amendment (not having τὰ μὲν ἄλλα καθάπερ τεῖ βολέει) strongly suggests that the decree was not based on a *probouleuma*. There may have been differences of opinion in the Boule; it is even possible that

Demokleides was not himself a member. He is perhaps to be identified with the mover of an amendment in *IG* i². 152 (? after 430), and might be the general from Aegeis in 439–8 (No. 56, l. 28, Δεμ-[οκλείδης]), but many other restorations are there possible.

Phantokles moved an amendment to Demokleides' decree, by which he was guaranteed access to the Boule; he is to be introduced by the prytany of Erechtheis, which, since the name of the next prytany is not known until the very end of the prytany, or, by elimination, in the ninth prytany, will either be the tenth or the current prytany. Perhaps Phantokles had made a long speech implying strong suspicions, and was told that such details did not involve principles and were better dealt with by the Boule. He also had it explicitly established that the colonists should be drawn from the two lowest classes. We infer that the decree of Demokleides either did not restrict membership at all, or, less probably, confined it to the zeugitai or the thetes; and since στρατιῶται (l. 27) are to be included it would have been the thetes who were excluded.

The only clues to the date are the mention of the colony by Cratinus (though he covers a long span); the form of the rho (Ρ), which is not uncommon near the middle of the century, but has not been found in any dated inscription known to us after 438–7 (see Meiggs, *JHS* lxxxvi (1966) 92); and the coincidence with fighting just terminated. On epigraphic grounds the decree, to take extreme limits, should fall between 450 and 430; Mattingly's suggested dating in the tenth prytany of 426–5 should therefore (apart from other weaknesses in his argument) be ruled out (*Hist.* xii (1963) 258–61). Woodhead's dating c. 438 is epigraphically acceptable but we cannot accept his site. Following Bergk he emends the text of Thuc. i. 61. 4 from Βέροϊαν to Βρέαν. The colony of Brea, he thinks, was established between Therme and Strepsa as a barrier against any encroachment by Perdikkas into Chalkidike from the north-west. When it proved ineffective the colonists were perhaps absorbed by Potidaea, after it had been occupied by Athens in 429. Edson, however, has given good reasons for retaining Βέροϊαν (*CP* 1 (1955) 169–90; but see Alexander, *AJP* lxxxiii (1962) 265–86). We prefer the more traditional association with Plutarch's 1,000 settlers sent out to live with the Bisaltai (*Pericles*, 11. 5), a tribe that bordered on Argilos. Supporting evidence may perhaps be seen in the reduction at the assessment in 446 of Argilos' tribute, and the trouble that preceded the foundation, giving rise to the χονγγραφαί of our decree (l. 15), may be reflected in the payment by Abdera in 446 of one talent of her tribute to Eion at the mouth of the Strymon, List 8, col. i. 105: Η ἐς [Ἐ]ίωνα ἡαβδερῖ. The military expedition, from which the troops, eligible for inclusion in the colony, are expected to return, will be the reduction of Euboea in

446 (see also *ATL* iii. 287 f.). The most likely date for the colony is 446–5; Brea may have been abandoned when the strategically more valuable Amphipolis was founded in 437–6.

50 (38)

Athenian Tribute quota-lists of the Second Assessment Period: 449–446 B.C.

The tribute lists of this period are the most interesting and controversial of the series. Until 1933 there seemed to be no special problem. The first list of the 450 assessment, 450–49, was numbered and secure; below it, at the bottom of the front face of the stele, was an unnumbered list: ἐπὶ τῆ[s] ἀρχῆ[s] ἡ[εἰ] Μενέρ[ιμο]s ἐγραμμάτευε Λαμ[πρεύ]s, contrasted with ἐπὶ τῆ[s] ἀρχῆ[s] τῆ[s] πέμπτες ἡ[εἰ] - - - of the list above. This list was assumed to be the list of 449–8 and the next year was thought to follow at the top of the right side face; it was a very short list indeed. Below it a much longer list was assumed to be the list of 447–6 and its prescript was restored as the eighth year. The top list on the back of the stele was for 446–5, the ninth, though only two letters of its prescript were thought to survive. Below it, clearly numbered, was the tenth list, for 445–4.

In 1933 Wade-Gery published a fragment hitherto overlooked (*BSA* xxxiii. 101). It joined a fragment from the top of the right face, and the result of this discovery was to dissolve the seventh list. What had been the prescript of this list was shown to be part of a summary of the *aparchai* received in the first year; the list of cities was seen to be a continuation of the second list. There were now three lists for four years and ample scope for speculation. The potential clues were not many:

1. The list below that of 450–49 was not numbered.
2. The number of the following list had to be restored. Meritt at first argued that ὀγδόες, the eighth year (447–6) was the only possible restoration (*DAT* 67 f.). Gomme and Dow, we think, were right in insisting that epigraphically, since the text was not strictly stoichedon, either *ἑβδόμες* or *ὀγδόες* was possible (Gomme, *CR* liv (1940) 65–9; Dow, *CP* xxxviii (1943) 20–7); and *ἑβδόμες* invited a more probable restoration for the secretary's name; *ὀγδόες* compelled the very rare *Διοδῆς*; *ἑβδόμες* allowed the very common *Διόδωρος* or *Διόδωτος*.
3. The list on the right face included payments which completed partial payments in the list at the bottom of the front face; it also

closely followed the order of cities in that list. It is virtually certain that it records the payments of the year immediately following.

4. The ninth list begins some distance below the top of the stele. No fragment has been identified from the area above it.

Those who thought that a missing list was out of the question had to believe that the space at the top of the reverse of the stele was occupied by a very short list containing not more than seventy cities (the next lowest number known being 140 in 453). The list would even be a little shorter if, as has been suggested by Lewis (*BSA* xlix (1954) 25-9), the letters assumed to be part of the prescript of list 9 belong to cities (McGregor, *Phoenix*, xvi (1962) 267 f., favours *ATL*; Pritchett, *Hist.* xiii (1964) 132 f., *AJA* lxviii (1964) 400 f. with Pl. 128 A, inclines towards Lewis's suggestion). If list 8 came above list 9 the list on the right face could conveniently be the seventh, and the number will have been omitted from the sixth list by a careless accident. Historically the reconstruction makes sense—a short list in 449-8, followed by a tightening-up of collection in 448-7; and then a large-scale withholding of tribute as a reaction to the defeat of Athens at Koroneia and the crisis of 446. There are, however, two serious objections. The complete absence of fragments from the assumed list of 447-6 would be very surprising. Tribute-list fragments are easy to identify; there is no area of corresponding size on either of the first two stelai from which no fragment survives. One would also expect a sensationally short list in 447-6 to be reflected in the list of 446-5, but list 9 is a very normal list, suggesting neither strain nor pressure.

Those who accepted the force of this argument and inferred that one year's record was missing were divided in choice between 449-8 and 447-6. A gap for the latter year could mean that the collection was so poor that it was decided not to inscribe it (Gomme, *CR* liv (1940) 66), or (much less probably) that Athens, faced with the crisis which followed Koroneia, gave up her claim for the year (Accame, *RF* lxvi (1938) 413). Wade-Gery (*Hesp.* xiv (1945) 212-15), followed by *ATL* (iii. 281), believing firmly in a Peace of Kallias in 449, interpreted the missing list as a moratorium for 449-8 while Pericles invited the Greeks to a congress at Athens in order to discuss the new situation arising from the peace. When Sparta led the way in holding aloof, the congress was not held and tribute was reimposed.

A new element was introduced into the argument when Pritchett maintained that the 'missing' list was probably inscribed on the back of a block which crowned the stele. We do not believe that there was such a block (see p. 84). Even if there were, it is not likely to have been more than a small architectural feature. The complete absence of fragments from the top of the stele would still be difficult to explain.

We prefer to believe that no list of cities was inscribed for 449-8, and that this is why no numeral was inscribed for the list at the bottom of the obverse; we are, however, doubtful whether Pericles would have taken the risk of remitting tribute even temporarily. It is possible, as Meritt once suggested (*The Greek Political Experience* (Studies in Honor of W. K. Prentice), 53; cf. Gomme, *CR* liv (1940) 67), though later he changed his mind, that the entire tribute of the year was given to some particular project. Athena Nike, for whom a temple was voted at about this time (see No. 44), would have been a suitable recipient.

The main difference between the lists of the second and the first assessment periods is the evidence in the second of partial and complementary payments. It used to be thought that the list of 450-49 had some twenty more paying cities than any of the four lists of the first period, and various explanations, such as the conversion in 450 of ship contributions to tribute, were found. A closer analysis in *ATL* (iii. 30-2) makes it highly probable that there was no significant increase in tribute-payers; the list was much larger because it included many cities whose tribute was paid in two instalments. The last column of the list in fact seems to be composed of complementary payments and late payments. In list 7 (of *ATL*) the number of cities has fallen by some 15, from *c.* 165 to 150, and several payments are incomplete. Above the last nine names in the list was a separate heading, of which only one letter survives. These were probably cities who paid late in the year: *M*[ετὰ Διονύσια]. Complements for the partial payments of list 7 are included in list 8 and the explanation is controversial. *ATL* (iii. 59 f.) believe that these complements were levied by generals on campaign before the tribute was sent to Athens. The money was paid early in 447, but it was not reported by the generals until they returned to Athens after midsummer 447 and was therefore recorded by the next year's board of *hellenotamiai*. This seems an exceedingly unbusinesslike procedure. Why should generals, when there were ample reserves at home, finance their forces from small levies at numerous points? Wade-Gery's earlier view is to be preferred, that partial payments are a sign of discontent (*Hesp.* xiv. 226-8; Meiggs, *Harv. Stud.* lxxvii (1963) 16-18). Wade-Gery tentatively explained the considerable improvement in collection by the decree of Kleinias, which was designed to check abuses connected with tribute. The dating of this decree in 447 between lists 7 and 8, though by no means certain, remains an attractive hypothesis (see No. 46). The long list of 447-6 will then be a witness to the successful emergence of Athens from a period of acute crisis. In 446 a new assessment was made and a large number of tributes were reduced (p. 86). Having regained firm control of her empire after a period of strain Athens was wise to make concessions.

Prescripts of Lists [7 and 8]

[7]. [ἐπ]ὶ τῆς ἀρχῆς ἡῖνι Μενέτ[ιμο]ς: ἐγγρα[μμάτ]ευε Λαμ[ππρεύς]
 [8]. ἐπὶ τῆς ἀρχῆς τῆς—ες] | ἡῖνι Διοδ[—ἐγραμμάτευε] | [ΙΙ]αιονί[δης]

[7] col. iv. 9-17

[ΗΗΔΔΔ]ΔΓΓΓ Θάσιοι
 [- -]||| Ἀβυδενοί
 [Π]Η Ἐρετριῆς
 [ΔΓΓΓ]||| Βρ[υ]νχειῆς
 [ΗΗ]Η [Σίφν]ιοι
 ΔΓΓΓ[|||] [Διδ]υμοτε(ι)χ[ίται]
 ΔΓΓΓΓ [Ἰάτα]ι
 ΠΗΗΠΔΔΔΔ||| [Τορο]ναῖοι
 Δ[Δ]ΔΔΓΓΓ [Δαρδ]ανῆς

[8] col. i. 94-101

ΠΓΓΓΓ Θάσιοι
 ΠΔΔΓΓ Κυζικεῖ[νοι]
 ΔΔΔΓΓ Ἐφαισα[τιῆς]
 ΔΔΔΓΓΓΓ Λιμν(α)ῖοι
 [.]ΔΔ||| Ἀβυδενοί
 ΠΓΓΓΓ Δαρδα[νῆς]
 Π Ἐλαιό[σι]οι:
 ΓΓΓΓ Σιγυεῖ[ῆ]ς:

The restored quota of Thasos in list 7 (246 dr.), with the payment in list 8 (54 dr.), together represent the normal Thasian quota before 446, 300 dr. from a tribute of 3 T. Similarly the payments of Dardanos here recorded (46 dr. in list 7, 54 in list 8) together represent the normal quota of 100 dr. from a tribute of 1 T.

[7] col. i. 2-15

[ΔΓΓΓ]||| Ναρ[ισβα]ρ[ῆς]
 [..?..]ΓΓΓΓ Τενέδιοι
 [ΓΓΓΓ]|| Γε[ντ]ῖνοι
 [ΔΓΓ]Γ||| Σ[ταγ]ιρίτα[ι]
 [ΗΠ] [Κερα]μῆς
 [ΠΗΗΗΗ] [Καμι]ρῆς
 [ΗΗ] [χαλικ]αρν[άσσ]ιοι
 [Η] [Μυρι]ναῖοι
 [Η] [Μεκυπερ]ναῖοι
 [ΔΔΔ]ΓΓΓΓ Π[ι]λαδασῆς
 [Η] [Πεδα]σῆς
 [Π]ΗΗΗΗ [Κυμ]αῖοι
 [Δ]ΓΓΓ||| [Πιτα]ναῖοι
 ΔΓΓΓ||| Γρυ[ναι]ῆς

[8] col. i. 4-17

[Δ]ΓΓ||| Ναρ[ισβα]ρῆς
 [Η]ΠΠΔΔΔΓΓ[ΓΓΓ] Τενέδιοι
 [Δ]ΓΓ||| Σταγί[ρι]ται
 Γ[ΓΓ]Γ|| Γεντῖ[ν]ιοι
 ΗΠ Κεραμ[ῆ]ς
 ΠΗΗΗΗ Καμι[ρ]ῆς
 ΗΗ χαλικαρνάσσιοι
 Η Μυριναῖοι
 Η Μεκυπερναῖοι
 [Δ]ΔΔΓΓΓΓ Πιλαδασῆς
 Η Πεδα[σ]ῆς
 [Π]ΗΗΗΗ Κυμαῖοι
 [Δ]ΓΓΓ||| Πιταναῖοι
 [Δ]ΓΓΓ||| Γρυναιῆς

The order of the cities in these two lists corresponds so closely that the restorations in list 7, even when no trace of figure or name survives, are justified.

51 (41)

Athenian Expedition to Megaris: 446 B.C.

Found by Fauvel among the graves near the Acharnian Gate of Athens. The main fragment, most of which has been erased with a claw-chisel, is in the EM; a chip from the left-hand edge, found in the American excavations of the Agora, in the area of Fauvel's house, has now also been transferred there.

Ionic letters of the third quarter of the fifth century, not stoichedon.

IG i². 1085+; Allen, *Pap. Am. School*, iv (1885-6) 100; Peek, *Ath. Mitt.* lxxvii (1942) 83, no. 138; Gomme, *HCT* i. 340; *SEG* x. 411+.

μνήμα τ[όδ' ἐστ' ἐ]πὶ σάματι κείμενον ἀνδρὸς ἀρίστο.
 Πυθίων | ἐγ Μεγάρων(ν) δαιώσας ἑπτὰ μ(ἐ)ν ἄνδρας,
 ἑπτὰ δὲ ἀπορρή(ξ)ας λόγχας ἐνὶ σώματι ἐκείνων
 εἴλετο τὰν ἀρετὰν πατέρα εὐκ|λείζων ἐνὶ δήμῳ.
 5 οὗτος ἀνήρ, ὃς ἔ(σ)ωισεν Ἀθηναίων τρ[ί]ες φυλάς
 ἐκ Παγᾶν ἀγαγὼν διὰ Βοιωτῶν ἐς Ἀθήνας,
 εὐκ|λεισ' Ἀνδοκίδαν δισχιλοῖς ἀνδραπόδοισιν.
 οὐδέ(δε)να | πημάνας ἐπιχθονίων ἀνθρώπων
 ἐς Αἶδα κατέβα πᾶσιν μα|καριστὸς ἰδέσθαι.
 10 φυλαὶ αἰδ' εἰσίν· Πανδιονίς, Κεκρ|οπίς, Ἄντιοχίς.

l. 1: σάματι Fauvel, σώματι Bekker. l. 2: The nu of *Μεγάρων* and the epsilon of *μέν* were omitted. *δαίξας* Koehler, but the reading of Fauvel and Koumanudes seems correct. l. 3: *ἀπορρήσας* seems to have been on the stone. l. 5: The first sigma of *ἔσωισεν* was omitted. l. 7: *εὐκλεισ'* Allen, *εὐκλείσ'* *vulgo*.

Like many other inscriptions in Ionic lettering, this suffered from early attempts to give it a context in the fourth century. Koehler, however, was surely right to place the circumstances described in 446 (*Hermes*, xxiv (1889) 92-100; Beloch, *Hermes*, xxiv. 479; Busolt, *GG* iii. 426; *CAH* v. 89; Beloch gives no reasons for his doubts, *GG* ii². 1. 182). The text supports Diodorus (xii. 5) in his statement that the Athenians reacted to the revolt of Megara (Thuc. i. 114) by sending a force into the Megarid, and not merely by returning from Euboea to Athens, as Thucydides implies; and adds the detail that the force consisted of three tribal regiments under the command of Andokides (for whom see p. 41). The need for Pythion's guidance must have been caused by the northward march to Eleusis of the Spartan king Pleistoanax. For the route followed see Hammond, *BSA* xlix (1954)

113. A garrison evidently remained in Pegai, for it was in Athenian hands at the conclusion of the Thirty Years' Peace (Thuc. i. 115. 1, iv. 21. 3).

52 (42)

Athenian Relations with Chalkis: 446–5 B.C.

A marble stele found built into the south wall of the Acropolis: now in the Acropolis Museum. Cuttings show that another stone was affixed on the left and that the two were surmounted by a third stone, probably adorned with a relief and bearing the name of the *γραμματεὺς* the omission of which is otherwise remarkable.

Attic letters (but in l. 77 H = η), stoichedon 32, except in ll. 1, 2. P and R, L and Λ, N and Ν, Σ. Phot.: *ATL* ii, Pl. 10.

Foucart, *RA* xxxiii (1877) 242–62; *SIG* 64; *IG* i². 39; E. Meyer, *Forsch.* ii. 141–8; *ATL* ii. D 17 and iii. 297; Mattingly, *JHS* lxxxii (1961) 124–32, *Ehrenberg Studies*, 201 f.

- ἔδοχσεν τέ[ι β]ολῆι καὶ τῷ δέμοι, Ἀντιοχίς ἐ[πρυτ]-
 άνευε, Δρακ[ον]τίδες ἐπεστάτε, Διόγνητος εἶπε·
 κατὰ τὰδε τὸν ἡόρκον ὁμόσαι Ἄθναίον τ-
 ἐν βολὲν καὶ τὸς δικαστάς· οὐκ ἔχσελὸ Χα-
 5 λκιδέας ἐχ Χαλκίδος οὐδὲ τὲν πόλιν ἀνά-
 στατον ποέσο οὐδὲ ιδιότεν οὐδένα ἀτιμ-
 ὄσο οὐδὲ φυγῆι ζεμιόσο οὐδὲ χσυλλέφσο-
 μαι οὐδὲ ἀποκτενὸ οὐδὲ χρέματα ἀφαιρέ-
 σομαι ἀκρίτο οὐδενὸς ἄνευ τὸ δέμο τὸ Ἄθ-
 10 ναίον, οὐδ' ἐπιψεφιδὸ κατὰ ἀπροσκέτο
 οὔτε κατὰ τὸ κοινὸ οὔτε κατὰ ιδιότο οὐδ-
 ἐ ἐνός, καὶ πρεσβείαν ἐλθόσαν προσάχσο
 πρὸς βολὲν καὶ δέμον δέκα ἔμερῶν ἡόταν
 πρυτανεύο κατὰ τὸ δυνατόν. ταῦτα δὲ ἐμπ-
 15 [ε]δόσο Χαλκιδεῦσω πειθομένοις τῷ δέ-
 [μ]οι τῷ Ἄθναίον. ἡορκῶσαι δὲ πρεσβεία-
 [ν] ἐλθόσαν ἐχ Χαλκίδος μετὰ τὸν ἡορκοτῶ-
 ν Ἄθναίος καὶ ἀπογράψαι τὸς ὁμόσαντ-
 ας. ἡόπος δ' ἂν [ὀ]μόσοσιν ἡάπαντες, ἐπιμελ-
 20 ὄσθον ἡοι στ[ρ]ατεγοί. *vacat*
 κατὰ τὰδε Χαλκιδέας ὁμόσαι· οὐκ ἀπο[σ]τέ-

σομαι ἀπὸ τῷ [δ]έμῳ τῷ Ἀθηναίῳ οὔτε τέ[χ]ν-
 εἰ οὔτε μηχανεῖ οὐδεμίᾳ οὐδ' ἔπει οὐδὲ
 ἔργοι οὐδὲ τῷ ἀφισταμένοι πείσομαι, κ-
 25 αὶ ἐὰν ἀφιστῆι τις κατερὸ Ἀθηναίοισι, κ-
 αὶ τὸν φόρον ἠυποτελῶ Ἀθηναίοισιν, ἢ ὃν
 ἂν πείθῃ Ἀθηναίος, καὶ χσύμμαχος ἔσομα-
 ι ἡοῖος ἂν δύνομαι ἄριστος καὶ δικαιοῦ-
 30 ο καὶ ἀμυνῶ, ἐὰν τις ἀδικεῖ τὸν δέμον τὸν
 Ἀθηναίον, καὶ πείσομαι τῷ δέμῳ τῷ Ἀθ-
 εναίῳ. ὁμόσαι δὲ Χαλκιδέον τὸς ἠεβδοντ-
 ας ἡάπαντας· ἡὸς δ' ἂμ μὲ ὁμόσει, ἄτιμον αὐτ-
 ὸν εἶναι καὶ τὰ χρέματα αὐτῷ δεμόσια καὶ
 35 τῷ Διὸς τῷ Ὀλυμπίῳ τὸ ἐπιδέκατον ἠιερό-
 ν ἔστο τὸν χρεμάτων. ἡορκῶσαι δὲ πρεσβε-
 ῖαν Ἀθηναίον ἐλθῶσαν ἐς Χαλκίδα μετὰ τ-
 ὸν ἡορκοτῶν ἐν Χαλκίδι καὶ ἀπογράφ-
 σαι τὸς ὁμόσαντας Χαλκιδέον.

vacat

40 Ἀντικλῆς εἶπε· ἀγαθῆι τύχει τῷ Ἀθηναί-
 ὸν ποῆσθαι τὸν ἡόρκον Ἀθηναίος καὶ Χαλ-
 κιδέας, καθάπερ Ἐρετριεῦσι ἐφσεφίσατ-
 ο ἡὸ δέμος ἡὸ Ἀθηναίον· ἡόπος δ' ἂν τάχιστ-
 α γίγνεται, ἐπιμελόσθον ἡὸι στρατεγοί.
 45 ἡὸίτινες δὲ ἐχσορκόσοσι ἀφικόμενοι ἐ-
 ς Χαλκίδα, ἐλέσθαι τὸν δέμον πέντε ἀνδρ-
 ας αὐτίκα μάλα. περὶ δὲ τὸν ἡομέρον ἀποκ-
 ρίνασθαι Χαλκιδεῦσιν, ἡότι νῦμ μὲν Ἀθε-
 ναίοις δοκεῖ εἶαν κατὰ τὰ ἐφσεφισμένα· ἡ-
 50 ὸταν δὲ δοκεῖ βολευσάμενοι ποῆσοσι τέ-
 ν διαλλα[γ]έν, καθότι ἂν δοκεῖ ἐπιτέδειο-
 ν εἶναι Ἀθηναίοις καὶ Χαλκιδεῦσιν. τὸς δ-
 ἐ χσένος τὸς ἐν Χαλκίδι, ἡόσοι οἰκῶντες
 μὲ τελῶσιν Ἀθῆναζε, καὶ εἴ τοι δέδοται ἡ-
 55 ὑπὸ τῷ δέμῳ τῷ Ἀθηναίῳ ἀτέλεια, τὸς δὲ ἄ-
 ἡλλος τελέν ἐς Χαλκίδα, καθάπερ ἡὸι ἄλλο-
 ι Χαλκιδέες. τὸ δὲ φσέφισμα τόδε καὶ τὸν

ἡόρκον ἀναγράφουσι, Ἀθένεσι μὲν τὸν γρα-
μμ[α]τέα τῆς βολῆς ἐστέλει λιθίνει καὶ κ-
 60 *αταθῆναι ἐς πόλιν τέλεσι τοῖς Χαλκιδέ-*
ον, ἐν δὲ Χαλκίδι ἐν τοῖς ἱεροῖς τοῖς Διὸς τῷ
Ὀλυμπίῳ ἡε βολῆ Χαλκιδέον ἀναγράφουσα-
α καταθέτο. ταῦτα μὲν φσεφίσασθαι Χαλκ-
ιδεῦσιν. υυυυ τὰ δὲ ἱερὰ τὰ ἐκ τῶν χρεσμ-
 65 *ῶν ἠυπὲρ Εὐβοίας θῦσαι ὅς τάχιστα μετὰ*
ἱεροκλέος τρεῖς ἄνδρας, ἡὸς ἂν ἔλεται ἡ-
ε βολῆ σφῶν αὐτῶν· ἡόπος δ' ἂν τάχιστα τυθ-
εῖ, ἡοι στρατεγοὶ συνεπιμελόσθον καὶ τ-
ὸ ἀργύριον ἐς ταῦτα [π]αρεχόντων. υααατ
 70 *Ἀρχέστρατο[ς] εἶπε· τὰ μὲν ἄλλα καθάπερ Ἀ-*
ντικλῆς· τὰς δὲ εὐθύνας Χαλκιδεῦσι κατ-
ὰ σφῶν αὐτῶν ἔναι ἐν Χαλκίδι καθάπερ Ἀθ-
ένεσιν Ἀθηναίοις πλὴν φυγῆς καὶ θανάτ-
ο καὶ ἀτιμίας· περὶ δὲ τούτων ἔφεσιν ἔνα-
 75 *ι Ἀθέναζε ἐς τὴν ἐλιαίαν τὴν τῶν θεσμοθ-*
ετῶν κατὰ τὸ φσεφίσμα τῷ δέμῳ· περὶ δὲ φυ-
λακῆς Εὐβοίας τὸς στρατηγὸς ἐπιμέλεσ-
θαι ἡὸς ἂν δύνονται ἄριστα, ἡόπος ἂν ἔχε-
ι ἡὸς βέλτιστα Ἀθηναίοις.

80

ἡόρκος

Euboea, which had been encouraged to revolt by the decisive defeat of the Athenians at Koroneia, was recovered by Athens in the late summer of 446. The Hestiaiians had put to death the crew of an Athenian ship and received no mercy; their city was destroyed and they were forced to evacuate. The rest of the island came to terms (Thuc. i. 114. 3: *τὴν μὲν ἄλλην ὁμολογία κατεστήσαντο*). This stele concerns the settlement with Chalkis; it does not, however, record the main terms which will have been set out in a decree on the stele which was originally attached to the left. Our stele refers to this earlier decree and is a corollary to it: *τὰ ἐφσεφισμένα* l. 49, possibly *τὸ φσεφίσμα* in l. 76 (but see below), and the article in *τὸν ἡόρκον* of l. 3. It contains the oaths to be taken at Athens and Chalkis and a decree which answers representations made by the Chalkidians for a reconsideration of some of the terms of the settlement. The tone is polite but very firm.

The Athenian oath (3-16) is to be taken by the members of the

Boule and the full panel of 6,000 jurors. They undertake, so long as Chalkis remains obedient, not to treat Chalkis like Hestiaia but to preserve the city. They will not have recourse to martial law but will follow the normal processes of justice, and any deputation coming from Chalkis will be given a hearing by the Boule and Assembly. These are no generous concessions, and in the Chalkidian oath of loyalty and obedience which follows (21-32) the status of Chalkis as the subject of an imperial power is made explicit. In the declaration of loyalty there is no mention of Athens' allies as in the Council's oath at Erythrai (No. 40, ll. 23 f.) and perhaps in the Kolophonian oath (No. 47, l. 44), and the declaration has to be more comprehensive: 22-4, *οὔτε τέχνει οὔτε μηχανέει οὐδεμιᾶι, οὐδ' ἔπει οὐδὲ ἔργοι;* in Kolophon's oath, ll. 45-6, *οὔτε λόγοι οὔτ' ἔργοι* without further qualification. More serious is the undertaking, found here for the first time, to denounce to Athens any attempt to stir up revolt (25). The Chalkidians also have to promise to pay to the Athenians *φόρον . . . ἡὸν ἂν πείθο Ἀθηναίος* (26 f.). This might mean one of two things: either that Chalkis at each assessment would be able to make representations about her assessment (according to the procedure set out in the assessment decree of 425, No. 69) and then pay regularly; or the reference might be to the new assessment to be made after the crushing of the revolt. No figure survives for Chalkis in the lists of 445-443. Before the revolt she was required to pay 5 T. (*ATL* i, p. 36); after it she pays only 3 T. (the name is restored in 441 and 439; both figure and name survive in 432 and 429). For *τὸν φόρον ἡὸν ἂν πείθο* cf. Thuc. i. 101. 3, of the Thasians after they had capitulated in 463: *χρήματά τε ὅσα ἔδει ἀποδοῦναι αὐτίκα ταξάμενοι καὶ τὸ λοιπὸν φέρειν*. Chalkis must also promise help to the Athenian demos if it is attacked, and must obey the Athenian demos; the emphasis throughout is not on Athens but more specifically on the Athenian demos. The importance still attached to such oaths as these is reflected in the provision for making lists of those who swear, 6,500 in Athens, and in Chalkis all adult males (18, 38 f.).

A vacant space is left below the oaths and the arrangements for administering them. There follows a decree, moved by Antikles, returning chilly answers to Chalkidian pleas for concessions, and it was presumably passed at the same meeting of the Assembly as the oaths, for there is no prescript with the names of prytany and secretary. So far as the hostages are concerned, for the present, matters will rest according to the decision already taken by Athens, but when the time is ripe the Athenians will make the *διαλλαγέ* after joint consultation (see below). Athens has no intention to prevent Chalkis' collecting taxes from foreign residents, but she must still insist on exemption for those who, while living at Chalkis, pay dues to Athens,

and any to whom Athens has granted exemption from dues (52-7, but the interpretation is controversial; see below). Antikles' decree closes with a public recognition of oracles (64-9): 'The sacrifices required by the oracles are to be carried out as soon as possible by Hierokles and three members to be elected from the Boule; and the generals are to give any help that is needed and provide the money.' Antikles has not covered all the ground; Archestratos, in an amendment, confirms the rulings already given about judicial control (ll. 71-6). While Chalkis may continue to decide in her own courts the normal run of cases, those which involve the major penalties of exile, death, or loss of rights are to be subject to appeal to Athens. Finally Archestratos requires the generals to take such measures as are necessary for the security of Euboea.

Within this well-preserved text several points are obscure or controversial. l. 4: The oath at Athens is to be taken by the Boule and jurors. Do they represent the whole people, or merely themselves? Probably the latter, for they are the two most vital organs of control, and the Assembly itself must remain unfettered (so Meyer, loc. cit. 144 f.). Note that not every clause of the oath is appropriate to both categories. ll. 4 ff.: οὐκ ἔχσελδ Χαλκιδέας . . . This clause is not impossible to reconcile with Plutarch's statement (*Per.* 23. 4) that the *hippobotai* were driven out. The expulsion of those who were naturally most opposed to Athenian domination could have been taken immediately after the end of fighting; the oaths were part of a settlement that was formulated later. Probably the primary intention is to assure Chalkis that she will not be treated like Hestiaia. Neither this passage nor any other on the stele can be safely used as an argument for or against an Athenian cleruchy at this time. ll. 12-14: The promise to give a hearing to any deputation from Chalkis could be of practical value; [Xen.] *Ἀθ. Πολ.* 3. 1 emphasizes the delays and difficulties of foreigners' getting an audience in Athens. l. 42: We now know, from the identification of a large fragment, that the oath imposed on Eretria was identical with the Chalkidian (Schweigert, *Hesp.* vi (1937) 317-19; *ATL* ii. D 16). l. 51: τὲν διαλλαγὴν is usually taken as 'arrangement', which does not adequately explain the article. Y. Garland, *BCH* lxxxix (1965) 332-8, basing his argument on André Aymard's studies of the problems of hostages in the ancient world, plausibly suggests that the Chalkidians, having failed to secure the release of their hostages, are pleading that the hostages should later on be changed; the Athenians undertake to negotiate the change when they think that the right time has come. ll. 52-7: τὸς δὲ χσένος . . . Though this clause may not be strictly grammatical the meaning is clear. Tod translates: 'But the aliens at Chalcis, save those who, resident there, pay taxes to Athens and any one who has received from

the Athenian people a grant of exemption, shall in all other cases pay taxes to Chalcis as do also the Chalcidians.' *ATL* iii. 295-7 revives the view, once widely held, that the ξένοι are Athenian cleruchs settled on the land of the expelled *hippobotai* in the Lelantine plain. Meyer's arguments against this thesis (op. cit. 146 f.) are still compelling. An Athenian decree would not call Athenians ξένοι; they would be either *Ἀθηναῖοι* or *κλέροχοι*; nor could the Chalcidians have expected to receive dues from Athenian cleruchs. The reference is surely to non-Athenians. l. 71: *εὐθύνας* here clearly means punishments in general rather than the examination of magistrates at the end of their year of office (as held by Gomme in *HCT* i. 342); Athens would not wish her control to be limited to magistrates; discontented oligarchs in particular had to be watched. Control by Athens is exercised by specifying the penalty rather than the nature of the offence, for the latter would provide an easy means of evasion (see G. E. M. de Ste Croix, *CQ* xi (1961) 270). l. 74: *ἔφεσις* has sometimes been taken to mean compulsory reference in the first instance (e.g. Gomme, *HCT* i. 342). Attic usage, however, is consistent: *ἔφεσις* and *ἐπίημι* always imply a second hearing. Tod refers to *SIG* 921. 30, 38, 96, 101; Arist. *Ἀθ. Πολ.* 9. 1, 45. 2, etc. (see also Wade-Gery, *Essays* (1958) 192-5). Since no qualification is added, appeal should be open to both prosecution and defence. Athens needed to ensure not only that friends of Athens were not condemned as a result of national prejudice but also that anti-Athenian elements were not wrongly acquitted. l. 76, *κατὰ τὸ φσέφισμα τὸ δέμο* might refer either to the decree which detailed the main settlement with Chalcis (equivalent to *κατὰ τὰ ἐφσεφισμένα* of l. 49), or to a general decree concerning jurisdiction in the empire.

Some of the Athenians named on this stone may be identifiable. Drakontides, who presided over the Assembly, may be the general of 433-2 (No. 61, l. 20; *PA* 4551); Antikles (l. 40) may be the general of 440-39 (Thuc. i. 117. 2; *PA* 1051) or the Antikles who was first assistant secretary and then secretary of the Parthenon Commission (see p. 164; *PA* 1052). Hierokles (l. 66) is almost certainly *ὁ χρησιμολόγος οὐξ Ὀρεοῦ* of Ar. *Peace* 1047 (cf. Eupolis fr. 212, Kock i, p. 316 = Edmonds I, p. 389: *Ἱερόκλεες βέλτιστε χρησιμωδῶν ἀναξ*), *PA* 7473. Perhaps he served in the field as a *μάντις* and was given a holding at Oreus, which replaced Hestiaia and was populated from Athens.

Mattingly (*JHS* lxxxi (1961) 124-32) has revived a view that had some currency in the nineteenth century. He argues that this settlement with Chalcis follows the expedition to Euboea in 424-3, recorded by Philochorus (*FGH* 328 F 130) according to a scholiast on Aristophanes (*Wasps* 718). The Athenians named fit better, he thinks,

into the twenties than the forties; he points out close parallels between passages on this stele and decrees of the twenties, and argues that the imperial attitude displayed by Athens suggests Cleon rather than Pericles. Some of his individual points are attractive, but two objections are decisive. (1) R, which occurs commonly with P on this stele, is not infrequent near the mid century; we know of no example later than 438-7 (Meiggs, *JHS* lxxxvi (1966) 92, 94). (2) The terms of the decree imply a major upheaval, after which Athens imposed stringent terms on Chalkis and Eretria. This would cause no surprise after the crushing of the serious revolt of 446, but a large-scale campaign in 423 would be very difficult to accept. Thucydides' silence would be very puzzling indeed.

53

Accounts of Nemesis of Rhamnous: c. 450-440 B.C.

Marble stele found at Rhamnous; now in EM.

Letter forms vary: ζ (I); ξ (II-V). ∨ (I, III, IV); Υ (II). Rho and phi have the developed forms (Ρ, Φ) consistently. Ionic Η and Ω in II, IV, V. τοῖσι in I; τοῖς in III (ἱεροποιούς in V). Phot.: *Ἀρχ. Ἐφ.* 1934-5, 128.

Stavropoulos, *Ἀρχ. Ἐφ.* 1934-5, 128-32; Wilhelm, *Jahresh.* xxxii (1940) 200-14; M. I. Finley, *Studies in Land and Credit in Ancient Athens*, 284 f.; Pouilloux, *La Forteresse de Rhamnonte* (1954), no. 35, pp. 147-50.

I	Ἐπ' Αὐτοκλειδ-
	ο δεμαρχόντο-
	ς: τὸ τῆς Νεμέσ-
	εος ἀργυρίου: κ-
5	εφάλαι{ }ον: τὸ π-
	αρά τοῖσι τὰς
	διακοσίας δρ-
	αχμὰς ὀφέλοσι
	ΜΜΜΡ:ΧΧ: τὸ δὲ ᾠ-
10	λλο ἀργυρίου: τ-
	ὸ τῆς Νεμέσεο-
	ς: κεφάλαιον: Μ
	ΧΧΡΗΗΔΔΠΤΤΤ
	ΤΙΙΙ.

- II 15 Ἐπὶ Μνησιπτολέμ-
ο ἄρχοντος κεφάλ-
αιον παντός τὸ ἱε-
ρὸ ἀργυρίο: $\text{F}^{\text{X}}\text{H}$
 $\text{HH}^{\text{F}}\Delta\Delta\Delta\Delta\Gamma\text{F}\text{F}\text{I}\text{I}\text{I}\text{I}$.
- III 20 Ἐπὶ Ναυσιμένος ἄρχον-
τος κεφάλαιον τὸ ἱ-
ερὸ ἀργυρίο τὸ πα-
ρὰ τοῖς τὰς διακοσί-
ας ἔχοσι: $\text{M}\text{M}\text{M}^{\text{F}}\text{X}\text{X}$
25 τὸ δ' ἄλλο: $\text{M}\text{X}^{\text{F}}\text{HH}\Delta\Delta\text{F}\text{F}\text{F}$
II.
- IV Ἐπ' Εὐαινέτο ἄρχον-
τος κεφάλαιον τρι-
ακοσιοδράχμων
30 $\text{M}\text{X}\text{X}\text{X}^{\text{F}}$: παντός δὲ
 $\text{F}^{\text{F}}\text{F}^{\text{F}}\text{HH}\Delta\text{F}\text{F}\text{I}$.
- V Ἐπὶ Δημοφάνος δημάρ-
χο παρὰ ἱεροποιοῖς κε-
φάλαιον: $\text{F}^{\text{F}}\text{HH}\Gamma\text{F}\text{I}\text{I}\text{I}\text{I}$
35 τριακοσιοδράχμων
 $\text{M}\text{X}\text{X}\text{X}\text{X}\text{HHHH}$: διακοσι-
οδράχμων: $\text{M}\text{M}\text{M}^{\text{F}}\text{X}\text{X}$
παντός: $\text{F}^{\text{F}}\text{X}^{\text{F}}\text{H}\Gamma\text{F}\text{I}\text{I}\text{I}\text{I}$.

On this stele are recorded annual accounts of the financial resources, in reserve or on loan, of the cult of Nemesis of Rhamnous. Five years, probably consecutive, are covered in a single column and dated by the demarch. The deme of Rhamnous was on the coast of Attica, north-east of Athens, in a rather isolated situation, and the central settlement, including the temple of Nemesis, was strongly fortified (Pouilloux, op. cit.).

These accounts are an extreme example of the unsystematic character of most Greek records. There are three different forms of the dating formula. Whereas the first two accounts give the total on loan and the balance in hand, the third gives only the combined total. When in the fourth year a new form of loan is recorded, the older form is not specified but merely included in a grand total. The *ἱεροποιοί* who are in control of finances are mentioned only in the last year, and there are other minor anomalies.

It was normal for Greek temples to lend their money at interest. The fullest illustration comes from Delos (No. 62); on the other hand, the large-scale lending of Athena's reserve to finance the Peloponnesian War (No. 72) seems to have been an exceptional measure, and, as a loan to the state rather than to individuals, stands on rather a different footing. The loans from the money of Nemesis do not, on the face of it, appear to vary according to the need of the borrower, but are in standard sums, 200 and 300 dr. Finley has doubted this interpretation of *τοῖσι τὰς διακοσίας δραχμὰς ὀφέλοσι* (I = *τοῖς τὰς διακοσίας ἔχουσι* in III) on the ground that the number of borrowers (185) would be too large. But, as Pouilloux points out (*op. cit.* 149), one man might 'take up several shares'; the cult of Nemesis at Rhamnous was also of more than local importance. The temple that was built for her not long after 440 was very probably by the same architect as the temples of Hephaistos and Ares at Athens (the temple of Ares was probably originally at Acharnai, and only moved to Athens in the Augustan period), and of Poseidon at Sounion (Dinsmoor, *Hesp.* ix (1940) 1-52, esp. 47; Plommer, *BSA* xlv (1950) 66-109). These accounts, to judge from their letter-forms, were probably earlier than this temple; if Nemesis' own resources were of the order of 9-10 T. (l. 38), the temple will have needed some subvention.

Nemesis of Rhamnous is not listed in the surviving fragments from the inventory of the 'other gods' set up in 428 (*IG* i². 310), nor is she among the 'other gods' from whom money was borrowed in 423-2 (No. 72). It is virtually certain that her treasures were not moved when the treasures of the temples of Attica and the lower city were concentrated for security on the Acropolis shortly before the Peloponnesian War (No. 58). They were considered safe within the strong walls of Rhamnous.

54 (47)

Accounts of Pheidias' Statue of Athena:

447-438 B.C.

A: 440-39 B.C.

Upper portions of two marble stelai, found on the Acropolis; now in EM. The stelai were uniform in cross-section (28 × 11 cm.) and probably also in height, but 1, never used, lacks the cutting for a T-clamp visible on 2.

Developed Attic writing: 1 not stoichedon, 2 stoichedon. Photos.: Austin, Pl. 8; (2 only) *BCH* xci (1967) 69.

IG i². 355, 355a+; Austin, 62 f.; Donnay, *BCH* xci. 68-71.

(1)		θεοί: Ἀθηνᾶ: Τύχε
		Κιχέσιππος: ἔγραμμά-
		τευε: ἀγάλματος: ἐπι-
		στάτεσι: Μυρρινόσιος
5		λέμμα: παρὰ <i>vacat</i>
		<i>vacat</i>
(2)		Κιχέσιππος ἐγ[ρ]-
		αμμάτευε: ἀγάλ[μ]-
		ατος: ἐπιστάτε[σ]-
		ι: Μυρρινόσιος: λ-
5		ἔμμα: παρὰ ταμιδ-
	Η	ν: ἡοῖς Δεμόστρα-
		τος: ἔγραμμάτευ-
		ε: Χουπεταόν: ταμ-
		ῖαι: Κτεσίον: Στ[ρ]-
10		οσίας: Ἀντιφάτ[ε]-
		ς: Μέανδρος: Θ[υμ]-
		οχάρες: Σμόκορ[δ]-
		ος: Φειδελεῖδ[εσ.]
		<i>vacat</i>
	⊠⊠⊠⊠	χρύσιον: ἐονέθ-
15	⊠ΤΤΧ	ε, σταθμὸν: ⊠ΤΧ⊠Η
	ΧΧΧ⊠	τιμὲ τούτο ΔΓΓΓΓΓ
	Η⊠ΓΓ	<i>vacat</i>
		<i>vacat</i>
	ΤΤ⊠Η	ἐλέφας ἐονέθε
	ΗΔΔΔ	<i>vacat</i>
20	ΔΓΓΓ	<i>vacat</i>

A 1 was rejected and uncompleted, perhaps because the contractors had stipulated for a stoichedon text (Austin), perhaps also because the stonemason realized he had left no room for a column of figures (Meritt, *CP* xxxiv (1939) 384). For the end of l. 16 Dinsmoor (*AJA* xvii (1913) 76) suggested ΔΓΓΓΓΓ[C], but the reading seems clear, though Donnay makes the last figure Γ.

B. 438 B.C.

Two joining fragments of a marble stele, preserving the left edge and top.

Developed Attic writing, save for R, stoichedon. Facs.: *Άρχ.* 'Εφ. 1937. 509. Phot.: Cavaignac, *Études*, xlix, Fig. 12, *BCH* xci. 72.

IG i². 354+; Dinsmoor, *Άρχ.* 'Εφ. 1937, 507-11; Donnay, *op. cit.*, 71-5.

	ἐπιστά[ται - - - - -]
	τάδε ἔλ[αβον - - - - - ἀργ]-
	ύριον <i>vacat</i> [<i>vacat</i> - - - - -]
	[[Ⓜ] ηηηη [- - - - -]]
5	[[Ⓜ] ΔΔ [- - - - -]]
	<hr/>
	χρυσί[ο - - - - -]
	ετο: ΗΗ[- - - - -]
	Κάλλα[ισχρος - - - - - ἀνέ]-
	θεκεν [- - - - -]
	<hr/>
10	ἀναλό[ματα - - - - -]
	.ηη[- - - - -]
	[[Ⓜ] ΔΔ [- - - - -]]
	<hr/>
	ἀπεργα[σία - - - - -]
	[[Ⓜ] ΗΗ[[Ⓜ] ΔΔ[- - - - -]]
	<hr/>
15	κατάβλ[εμα - - - - -]
	△△△[- - - - -]
	ΗΗΗ[- - - - -]
	<hr/>
	χρυσιο [- - - - - ἀγά]-
	[λ]ματι π[- - - - -]

Dinsmoor restores ll. 1-12 ἐπιστά[ται ἀγάλματος χρυσοῦ] | τάδε ἔλ[αβον παρὰ ταμιδῶν ἀργ]|ύριον *vacat* | [[Ⓜ]ηηηη[ηη△△△△[Ⓜ]ΤΤ]]|[Ⓜ]ΔΔ[- - -] | χρυσί[ο δὲ σταθμὸν περιεγέν]|ετο: ΗΗ[...τὸ ἀναθέματος ἡδὲ]| Κάλλα-α[ισχρος Ἀφιδναῖος ἀνέ]|θεκεν [*vacat*] | ἀναλό[ματα *vacat*] | [[Ⓜ]ηηηηηη[Ⓜ]ΧΧΧΧΗΗ]|[Ⓜ]ΔΔ and l. 18 χρυσί[ο περιτμήματα τῶι ἀγά]-. See Donnay.

The ἄγαλμα in question (called ἄγαλμα χρυσοῦν in *IG* i². 358 and χρυσοτὸν ἄγαλμα *ibid.* 359) is Pheidias' chryselephantine statue of Athena, the cult-image of the Parthenon. Philochorus (quoted by the scholiast on *Ar. Peace* 605) states that, in 438-7 (reading Θεοδώρου for the scholiast's Πυθοδώρου), τὸ ἄγαλμα τὸ χρυσοῦν τῆς Ἀθηνᾶς ἐστάθη εἰς τὸν νεὼν τὸν μέγαν, ἔχον χρυσοῦ σθαθμὸν ταλάντων μδ' (44), Περικλέους ἐπιστατοῦντος, Φειδίου δὲ ποιήσαντος (*FGH* 328 F 121; cf. *Thuc.* ii. 13. 5, who gives the weight of gold as 40 T., *Diod.* xii. 39, who gives it as 50 T., *Plut. Per.* 13).

This weight of gold suggests that the statue cost at least 616 T., and, if Dinsmoor is right, as he surely must be, in identifying our B as the final summation of all the accounts, the total cost was between 700 and 1,000 T. The arrangement of the extant accounts has been discussed by Meritt, *AFD* 30-41, Dinsmoor, *Harv. Stud.*, Suppl. i. 158-65, and Donnay. Factors which they have not taken into account lead us to prefer the following arrangement, which Lewis will justify elsewhere: *IG* i². 360, 447-6(?); *IG* i². 361, 446-5; *IG* i². 359, 444-3; *Hesp.* xxx (1961) 262, no. 74, 443-2 or 441-0; *IG* i². 358, 442-1; *IG* i². 355, 440-39; *IG* i². 356, 439-8; *IG* i². 354, 438. (*IG* i². 357 and 362 do not belong to the series.) In these documents all receipts come from the treasurers of Athena, the largest annual receipt yet known is for 160 T., no payment except for gold and ivory has yet been identified, and there is as yet no trace of money being carried from year to year. The *ἐπιστάται* spent what they received. In our text A they received 100 T. from the treasurers, of whom only seven are named, paid 87 T. 4,652 dr. 5 ob. for gold weighing 6 T. 1,618 dr. 1 ob. (giving the ratio of gold to silver as 14:1; cf. No. 59, ll. 21-3) and 2 T. 743 dr. for ivory; the account then breaks off.

55 (50)

Expenses of the Samian War: 440 and 439 B.C.

Two fragments of a marble stele, found on the Acropolis; now in EM.

Developed Attic writing, stoichedon 65 (?). Phot.: Meritt, *AFD* 43.

IG i². 293+; Meritt, *AFD* 42-8 (with a 93-letter line), *AJP* lv (1934) 365-6 (with a 64-letter line).

..5...εκ-----

....εσε-----

...σοσι-----

...Φρεά[ρριος-----

5 ΗΑΑΑΤΤΤΤ[------

Ἀθηναῖοι ἀ[νέλοσαν ἐπὶ Τιμοκλέος καὶ ἐπὶ Μορυχίδο ἀρχόντων Ἀθηναί-
οισι, ἐς τὸν]

πρὸς Σαμίω[ς πόλεμον τάδε· τάδε ἐν τοῖν δυοῖν ἐτοῖν ἦοι ταμίαι
παρέδοσ]α[ν τὸν τῆς]

Ἀθηναίας Π[ολιάδος στρατηγοῖσι τοῖς πρὸς Σαμίος· ἀνάλομα παρὰ
ταμ]ιδὸν ἐ[κ πόλεο]-

ς, ἡοῖς Φυρό[μαχος ἐγραμμάτευεν, ἐπὶ τῆς βολῆς, ἠεῖ..... 12.....

πρῶτ]ος ἐ[γραμμά]-

10 τευε· ταμίαι[ι..... 45

Εὐ]βο[λίδες ἐ]-

χς Οἴο Νανσ[-.....-]

ΠΠΠΠΠΠΠΠΠΠ[-.....-]

παρὰ ταμιῶν ἐκ πόλεος, ἡοῖς Δεμόστρατος ἐγραμμάτευεν, ἐπὶ τῆς
βολῆς, ἠεῖ Ἐπιχαρ]-

ἴνος Περαι[εὺς πρῶτος ἐγραμμάτευε, στρατηγοῖσι τοῖς πρὸς Σαμίος
ἀνάλομα δεύτ]-

15 ερον· ἡοῖδε [ταμίαι ἔσαν -.....-]

Ἄφιδναῖος[-.....-]

ΠΠΠΠΠΠΠΠΠΠ[-.....-]

χσύμπαντο[ς κεφάλαιον τὸ ἐς Βυζαντίος καὶ ἐς Σαμίος ἀναλόματος - -]

ϠΠΠΠΠΠΠΠΠΠ[-.....-]

The small fragment, first assigned to this inscription by Meritt, *AJA* xxxviii (1934) 69, is here placed in ll. 7-10, after an unpublished suggestion by Wade-Gery.

The restorations, and even the line-length, must be considered very uncertain. The starting-point for Meritt's revisions was his conviction that the secretary of the treasurers for 440-39 was not Phyromachos (l. 9), but Demonstratos (l. 13), and this observation, based on the accounts of the gold and ivory statue (No. 54), still seems good.

But we should not lose sight of another possibility. It is conceivable that ll. 1-5 represent the end of the account of the conciliar year 441-0, and that ll. 6-17 record two payments made during the conciliar year 440-39, made by different boards of treasurers because Hekatombaion 28, the end of the treasurers' year of office, fell between them (cf. No. 61). We retain the outlines of Meritt's solution largely because we do not readily see how our alternative can be expressed in lines long enough to accommodate reasonably full boards of treasurers in ll. 10-11, 15-16.

L. 7 of this text leaves no doubt that we are dealing with events of the year 440, when Samos, which, with Chios and Lesbos, still contributed ships rather than money, challenged the right of Athens to intervene in her war with Miletus. Pericles seems to have thought that political intervention in Samos would settle the matter (Thuc. i. 115. 2-3), but his actions provoked a revolt in which Byzantium joined, and the Samians won some initial successes before the deployment of Athens' full resources settled the matter (see No. 56).

The first three sums of money on this stele (ll. 5, 12, 17) add up to

the fourth (l. 19). On Meritt's reconstruction of the text, ll. 1-5 give the expense, 128 T. +, of the subjugation of Byzantium, and ll. 6-17 give the expense of the war against Samos, 368 T. + in 441-0 and 908 T. + in 440-39. The total of these last, 1,276 T. +, corresponds well enough with the figure of 1,200 T. for the cost of the war given by Nepos (*Timoth.* 1), and probably to be restored in Isocrates (xv. 111, reading ἀπὸ διακοσίων [γεῶν] καὶ χιλίων ταλάντων) and Diodorus (xii. 28, reading (χιλίων) διακοσίων).

Several points of importance are here raised about Athenian financial history. The inscription appears only to give the amounts spent on the war by the treasurers of Athena out of their reserves. Did the Athenians spend a proportion or all of their current revenue as well? Does the fact that Athena's money was called on imply that there was no other reserve, whether in the hands of the *hellenotamiai* or in the Athenian δημόσιον? This is the view, for example of G. H. Stevenson, *JHS* xliv (1924) 1 ff., followed by *ATL* iii. 337, but it is denied by Gomme, *Hist.* ii (1953) 16 f., *HCT* ii. 31-2. It is part of the general thesis of the authors of *ATL* (iii. 118-31, 338; Meritt, *Hesp.* xxiii (1954) 185-93) to support the reading in Thucydides ii. 13. 3, ὑπαρχόντων δὲ ἐν τῇ ἀκροπόλει αἰεὶ ποτε ἀργυρίου ἐπισήμου ἑξακισχιλίων ταλάντων. Is this implication of a steady balance compatible with the heavy drain shown by this inscription? This, too, is denied by Gomme, *HCT* ii. 30. Finally, there is the question of the Samian indemnity. According to Thucydides (i. 117. 3) the Samians agreed χρήματα τὰ ἀναλωθέντα ταξάμενοι κατὰ χρόνους ἀποδοῦναι. Epigraphical evidence which may refer to these repayments is collected in Hill, *Sources*², 306-7 (see also No. 68 here). The view of *ATL* (iii. 334-5) is that the indemnity was paid off in annual instalments of 50 T., and that the 26th and possibly last instalment was paid in 414-13. Gomme argues (*Hist.* ii. 18-19, *HCT* ii. 33) that the indemnity could have been and was paid off before 431.

56

Athenian Treaty with Samos: 439-8 B.C.

Four fragments of a marble stele, only two of which join, found on the Acropolis; now in EM.

Developed Attic letters. Stoichedon 35. Phot.: *AFD* 51-3; *ATL* ii, Pl. 11.

IG i². 50; Wade-Gery, *CP* xxvi (1931) 309-13; Meritt, *AFD* 48-56; *ATL* ii. D 18; *Staatsverträge* 159.

a — ο — | — απι — | — ικε — | — Λεμνο — | — ι καθάπ[ερ — |
 — οι κατα — | — Πελο]ποννησ — | — δὲ ἐν τῆ[ι — | — φοι δὲ
 κα[— | — χρόνον ὑπα — | — α]ὐτὸς Ἄθεν — | — α]ὐτόν: ἡοσ —
 | — ν ἀποδ — | — σ — |

lacuna

15 [------ δρ]-
 [άσο καὶ ἐρὸ καὶ βολεύσο τῶι δέμοι τῶι Ἀθена]-
 b [Ἴον ἡό τι ἂν δύνομαι καλὸν κ]αὶ ἀ[γ]αθόν, [οὐδὲ ἀ]-
 [ποστέσομαι ἀπὸ τῶ δέμο τῶ Ἀ]θенаίον οὔτε λ[ό]-
 [γοι οὔτε ἔργοι οὔτε ἀπὸ τῶν] χυμμαχον τῶν Ἀ-
 20 [θенаίον, καὶ ἔσομαι πιστὸς τ]ῶι δέμοι τῶι Ἀθ-
 [енаίον· Ἀθенаίος δ' ὁμόσαι· δρ]άσο καὶ ἐρὸ καὶ
 [βολεύσο καλὸν τῶι δέμοι τῶι] Σαμίον ἡό τι ἂν
 [δύνομαι καὶ ἐπιμελέσομαι Σα]μίον κατὰ ἡὰ [.]
 [.....25.....] Ἀθенаίον [..]
 25 [.....26.....] κρατε[....]
 [------] λ[...6...]

lacuna

c [στ]ρατεγ[οὶ ὄμνον τὸν ἡόρκον: Σοκράτες Ἐρε]-
 χθεῖδος: Δεμ[------ Αἰγεῖδος: ----- Πα]-
 νδιονίδος: Χ[.....10..... Λεοντίδος: Περικλ]-
 30 ἔς: Γλαύκον Ἀ[καμαντίδος: Καλλ]ί[σ]στρατος Οἰ]-
 d γεῖδος: Χ[σε]νοφὸν Κεκροπιδ]ος: Τλεμπ[όλεμος]
 [Αἰαντίδος: Ἄντιοχίδο]ς: βολὲ ἔρχε [....]
 [.....16..... πρὸτ]ος ἐγραμμάτευε Ῥα-
 [μνόςσιος *vacat*] *vacat*

ll. 23-6: ἐπιμελέσομαι Σα]μίον κατὰ ἡὰ [h][ομολόγησαν ἡοι στρατεγοὶ ἡοι] Ἀθенаίον [κα][ἰ ἡοι ἄρχοντες ἡοι Σαμίον· Καλλι]κράτε[ς εἶπ][ε *ATL*. *ATL* infers a lacuna of 14 lines after l. 26, but this is based on the assumed tapering of the stele. It is, however, doubtful whether the back of the stele, from which the inference is made, is original. For l. 28 see below. ll. 32-3: Lolling reported *ω* after ἔρχε. τῶ[ν ἐ]νιαυτὸν ἡότε (Meritt *AFD*) satisfies the traces but is unconvincing. ἡό[τε (*IG* i², *ATL* ii) requires a patronymic or an improbably long name. *ATL* iv. x suggests Ἀθ[εν]αίους ἡεἰ
 8

After a stubborn resistance Samos surrendered in the ninth month. Thucydides records the main penalties imposed: the Samians had to pull down their walls, surrender their fleet, and repay the cost of the operations in instalments (Thuc. i. 117. 3). The future relations

between Athens and Samos had also to be defined; these fragments give part of a decree in which they were recorded.

Not more than seven letters from a probable 35 survive in any of the 14 lines of the first fragment, an inadequate basis for restoration. Lemnos, where the original Samian hostages were deposited, is mentioned (l. 4) and, almost certainly, the Peloponnesians (l. 7, *Πελο]πον-νεσ[—*). This recalls the Corinthian claim in Thucydides to have opposed intervention when the Peloponnesian League met to discuss help for Samos (Thuc. i. 40. 5). The second fragment contains what survives of the oaths to be taken by Samos and Athens, and by comparison with other oaths the general sense at least can be restored. The most striking feature is the apparent generosity of Athens, especially when compared with her attitude to Chalkis in 446-5 (No. 52). The oath of loyalty is once again, as at Erythrai, to the allies as well as the Athenians. More important, whereas the Athenian oath to Chalkis merely repudiates the use of force, there is a positive undertaking to look after the interests of the Samian demos. Athens (and perhaps we could say Pericles) seems to have decided that the wisest policy was to pin her faith on a democratic government at Samos; this perhaps helps to explain why the Samian democrats remained faithful to the bitter end.

The last two fragments come from a list of the ten generals who took the oath. Sokrates was general from Erechtheis in 441-0 (Androton, *FGH* 324 F 38). For Aegeis Wade-Gery suggested *Δεμ[οκλείδες]*, who established the colony of Brea (No. 49), but names with this beginning are very common. Wade-Gery's full restoration of the line, however, neatly fills the space: *Δεμ[οκλείδες Αἰγείδος : Φορμίον Πα]νδιονίδος*. If correct it would confirm that Phormio not only had an estate in Paiania (Paus. i. 23. 10) but was also registered in Paiania's tribe, Pandionis. This in turn would mean that Pericles' tribe was not the only one to have two representatives on the generals' board in this period: on at least two occasions (440-39 and 430-29) Phormio and Hagnon will both have represented Pandionis. But other restorations are possible. Lewis suggests *Καλλίας (Καλλιάδο)*, who died in 432 while general at the siege of Potidaea (Thuc. i. 61. 1, 63. 3); a Kallias, son of Kalliades, of the tribe Pandionis is attested in the late fourth century (for this suggestion and the problem of double representation, see Lewis *JHS* lxxxi (1961) 118-23). Glaukon (son of Leagros) represented Akamantis together with Pericles in 441-0 and 433-2 (see table in Hill, *Sources*², pp. 401-3). Wade-Gery suggests for the general from Oineis *Καλλ]ῆ[στρατος*, who was on the board in 441-0, but the surviving part of a letter might be from tau. For Antiochis (l. 32) Andrewes and Lewis suggest *Λέον*, who may have represented the tribe in taking the oath to the Peace of Nikias (*JHS*

lxxvii (1957) 179). Since the revolt of Samos began in 441-0 and the siege ended in the ninth month (Thuc. I. 117. 3) and the record of expenditure covers only two years (No. 55), we should expect these generals to be the board of 440-39. They do not, however, include some of the generals of that year known from Thucydides; this must be the board of 439-8.

57 (49)

Victory of Taras over Thurii: soon after 440 B.C.

On three of the four faces of a bronze spear-butt, found at Olympia; now in Berlin. There are two others with the same text (*Olympia* v. 255-6) still at Olympia.

Laconian-Tarentine writing (see *LSAG* 279) avoiding curved strokes. Facs.: *LSAG*, Pl. 53. (Phot. of *Olympia* v. 256, *Olympische Forschungen*, I, Pl. 63 b.)

SIG 61+; *DGE* 58; *LSAG* 282 (Taras 10).

σκῦλα ἀπὸ Θουρίων Ταραν-
τῖνοι ἀνέθεκαν Διὶ Ὀλυ-
μπίοι δεκάταν.

The foundation of Thurii (for the form of the name see Tod, *Γέρας Κεραμοπούλλου*, 197-205) in 443 was followed by a long and bitter struggle with Taras for the possession of the territory and town of Siris. After about ten years it was agreed *συνοικῆσαι μὲν κοινῇ, τὴν δ' ἀποικίαν κριθῆναι Ταραντίνων* (Strabo vi. I. 14, p. 264 = Antiochus *FGH* 555 F 11). The dedication of these spear-butts doubtless commemorates the Tarentine success. See further Grote, pt. 2, ch. 47; Beloch, *GG* ii². I. 199-201; Busolt, *GG* iii. 529-37; Meyer, *GA* iv. 20 ff.; Meloni, *Rend. Linc.* v (1950), 574 ff.

58 (51)

Financial Decrees moved by Kallias: 434-3 B.C.

A marble stele of which a portion at the foot has been cut away. Face A is otherwise complete, and since, when the stone was later used as an altar-piece in the Attic village Charvati, it was laid face down, the text is well preserved. Face B has suffered considerably. Its margins have been decorated with a Christian design at the cost of 9-10 letters at the beginning and end of each line; the two ends have been bevelled, involving the loss

of a line at the top and the bottom; and a channel has been cut down the centre removing 5-7 letters; also the surface of ll. 2-16 is very worn; now in the Louvre.

A and B are by different hands. Both have developed Attic letters, stoichedon 54(A), 51(B). The use of the aspirate is inconsistent in both (A 4 *há* : A 5 *ǎ*; A 22 *καθ' ἕκαστον* : A 23 *ἐκάστοι*. B 8 [ο]ί : B 27 *η[ο]ι*). Phot.: of A and B, *ATL* i. 210 f.; A and B with facs. of B, *JHS* li (1931) Pl. 1-3.

IG i². 91, 92; Kolbe, *Thukydides im Lichte der Urkunden* (1930) 50-91 (= *Sitzb. Berl.* 1927, 319 ff.; 1929, 273 ff.); Wade-Gery, *JHS* li (1931) 57-85; Meritt *AJP* lv (1934) 263-74; West, *AJA* xxxviii (1934) 389-407; S. Accame, *RF* lxiii (1935) 468-96; Dinsmoor *AJA* li (1947) 127-40; Wade-Gery and Meritt, *Hesp.* xvi (1947) 279-86; Mattingly, *Proc. Afr. Class. Ass.* vii (1964) 35-55.

A

[ἔδ]οχσεν τῷ βολῆι καὶ τῷ δέμοι, Κεκροπίς ἐπρυτάνευε, Μνεσίθεος ἐ-
 [γ]ραμματεύε, Εὐπίθεος ἐπεστάτε, Καλλίας εἶπε· ἀποδοῦναι τοῖς θεοῖς
 [τ]ὰ χρέματα τὰ ὀφελόμενα, ἐπειδὴ τῷ Ἀθηναίαι τὰ τρισχίλια τάλαντ-
 [α] ἀνερένεγκται ἐς πόλιν, ἡὰ ἐφσέφιστο, νομίματος ἡμεδαπῶ. ἀποδι-
 5 [δ]όναι δὲ ἀπὸ τῶν χρεμάτων, ἃ ἐς ἀπόδοσιν ἔστιν τοῖς θεοῖς ἐφσεφισμ-
 [έ]να, τὰ τε παρὰ τοῖς ἔλλενοταμίαις ὄντα νῦν καὶ τάλλα ἃ ἔστι τούτων
 [τῶ]ν χρεμάτων, καὶ τὰ ἐκ τῆς δεκάτης ἐπειδὴν πραθεῖ. λογισάσθων δὲ ἡ-
 [οι λ]ογισταὶ ἡοι τριάκοντα ἡοίπερ νῦν τὰ ὀφελόμενα τοῖς θεοῖς ἀκρ-
 [ιβῶ]ς, συναγωγῆς δὲ τῶν λογιστῶν ἐ βολῆ αὐτοκράτορ ἔστο. ἀποδόντων
 10 [δε τ]ὰ χρέματα ἡοι πρυτάνες μετὰ τῆς βολῆς καὶ ἐχσαλειφόντων ἐπει-
 [δὴν] ἀποδοῦναι, ζετέσαντες τὰ τε πινάκια καὶ τὰ γραμματεῖα καὶ ἐὰμ π-
 [ο ἄλ]λοθι εἰ γεγραμμένα. ἀποφαιόντων δὲ τὰ γεγραμμένα ἡοι τε ἡιερ-
 [ἔς κ]αὶ ἡοι ἡιεροποιοὶ καὶ εἴ τις ἄλλος οἶδεν. ταμίαις δὲ ἀποκναμεύε-
 [ν το]ύτων τῶν χρεμάτων ἡόταμπερ τὰς ἄλλας ἀρχάς, καθάπερ τὸς τῶν ἡι-
 15 [ερῶ]ν τῶν τῆς Ἀθηναίας. ἡοῦτοι δὲ ταμιενόντων ἐμ πόλει ἐν τῷ Ὀπισθ-
 [οδό]μοι τὰ τῶν θεῶν χρέματα ἡόσα δυνατὸν καὶ ὅσιον, καὶ συνανοιγόν-
 των καὶ συγκλειόντων τὰς θύρας τῷ Ὀπισθοδόμο καὶ συσσεμινούσθων
 τοῖς τῶν τῆς Ἀθηναίας ταμίαις. παρὰ δὲ τῶν νῦν ταμιῶν καὶ τῶν ἐπισ-
 20 τατῶν καὶ τῶν ἡιεροποιοῶν τῶν ἐν τοῖς ἡιεροῖς, ἡοι νῦν διαχερίζο[σι]-
 ν, ἀπαριθμεσάσθων καὶ ἀποστεσάσθων τὰ χρέματα ἐναντίον τῆς βολ[ῆ]-
 [ς] ἐμ πόλει, καὶ παραδεχσάσθων ἡοι ταμίαι ἡοι λαχόντες παρὰ τῶν νῦν
 ἀρχόντων καὶ ἐν στέλει ἀναγραφσάντων μιᾷ ἅπαντα καθ' ἕκαστόν τε
 τῶν θεῶν τὰ χρέματα ἡοπόσα ἔστιν ἐκάστοι καὶ συμπάντων κεφάλαιο-
 ν, χωρὶς τό τε ἀργύριον καὶ τὸ χρυσίον. καὶ τὸ λοιπὸν ἀναγραφόντων ἡ-
 25 οὶ αἰεὶ ταμίαι ἐς στέλεν καὶ λόγον διδόντων τῶν τε ὄντων χρεμάτων

καὶ τὸν προσιόντον τοῖς θεοῖς καὶ εἴαν τι ἀ[π]αναλίσκεται κατὰ τὸν ἐνιαυτόν, πρὸς τὸς λογιστάς, καὶ εὐθύνας διδόντον. καὶ ἐκ Παναθηναίων ἐς Παναθήναια τὸν λόγον διδόντον, καθάπερ ἦοι τὰ τῆς Ἀθηναίας τ[α]μειούντες. τὰς δὲ στέλας, ἐν αἷς ἂν ἀναγράφουσι τὰ χρέματα τὰ ἱερ-
 30 [ἀ, θέ]ντον ἐμ πόλει ἦοι ταμίαι. ἐπειδὴν δὲ ἀποδομένα εἶ τοῖς θεοῖς [τὰ χρ]έματα, ἐς τὸ νεόριον καὶ τὰ τεῖχε τοῖς περιδοσι χρεῖσθαι χρέμασ-
 [ιν-----]

B

[ἔδοχσεν τῷ βολεῖ καὶ τῷ δέμοι, Κεκροπίς ἐπρυτάνευε, Μνεσίθε]-
 [ος ἐγραμμάτευε, Ε]ὔπ[ε]ίθεος [ἐπεστάτε, Κ]αλλίας εἶπ[ε]· ΙΙ]
 [. . . 5 . . . τὰ λίθινα καὶ τὰς Νί[κ]ας τὰς χρυσᾶς καὶ τὰ Προ[πύλαια]]
 [. . . 9] ἐθεῖ παντελὸς [. . . 7] σει χρεῖσθαι ἀπ[ο] ΙΙ]
 5 [. . . 9] κατὰ τὰ ἐφσεφί[σ]μένα, καὶ τὴν ἀκρόπολιν [. ΙΟ]
 [. . . 9] ργμένα καὶ ἐπι[σκευά]ζεν δέκα τάλαντα ἀ[ναλίσκοντα]-
 [ς τὸ ἐνιαυτ]ὸν ἑκάστον ἡέος [ἂν] θεῖ καὶ ἐπισκευα[σθεῖ] ἡος κάλ]-
 [λιστα· συνε]πιστατόντ[ον] δ' ἐ τῷ ἔρ[γ]οι [ο]ί ταμίαι καὶ [οί ἐπιστάτα]-
 10 [τος δὲ ἐπιμ]ελέσ[θο] μετὰ τῶν ἐπιστ[α]τῶν ἡόπος ἄριστ[α καὶ εὐτελέ]-
 [στατα . . . 5 . . .] ἔσεται ἡ ἀκρ[όπολις] καὶ ἐπισκευασθέ[σεται] τὰ δεό]-
 [μενα· τοῖς δ]ὲ ἄλλοις χρέμα[σιν τοῖ]ς τῆς Ἀθηναίας το[ῖς τε νῦν] δσι]-
 [ν ἐμ πόλει κ]αὶ ἡάτ' ἂν τ[ὸ] λο[ιπὸν] ἂν ἀφέρεται μὲ χρεῖσ[θ]α[ι
 μεδὲ ἀπα]-
 [ναλίσκεν ἀ]π' αὐτὸν ἐ[ς] ἄλλο μ[εδὲν ἔ] ἐς ταῦτα ἡνὲρ μν[ο]ρί[α]σ
 δραχμὰ]-
 15 [ς ἔ] ἐς ἐπισκ[ευὲν] εἴαν τι δέει[· ἐς ἄλλ]ο δὲ μεδὲν χρεῖσ[θ]α[ι τοῖς χρέμα]-
 [σιν εἰ μὲ τ]ὴν ἄδειαν φσεφ[ί]σεται ὁ δῆμος καθάπερ ἐ[ἰ] μ φσεφίσειτ]-
 [αι περὶ ἐσφ]ορᾶς· εἴαν δὲ τις [εἶπει ἔ] ἐπιφσεφί[σ]σει μὲ ἐ[φσεφισμένε]-
 [ς πο τῆς ἀδει]ας χρεῖσθαι το[ῖς χρέμ]ασιν τοῖ[ς] τῆς Ἀθε[ναίας ἐνεχέ]-
 [σθο τοῖς ἀ]γροῖς ἡοῖσπερ εἴαν τι ἐσ[φ]έρεν εἶπει ἔ[πιφ]σεφίσει· θε]-
 20 [οῖς δὲ πᾶσ]μ κατατιθέναι κ[ατὰ τὸ]ν ἐνιαυτὸν τὰ ἑκά[στοι] ὀφελό]-
 [μενα παρὰ τ]οῖς ταμίαισι τὸν [τῆς Ἀθ]εναίας τὸς ἔλλενο[ταμίαις· ἐπε]-
 [ιδὴν δ' ἀπὸ] τ[ὸ]ν διακοσίον τα[λάντο]ν ἡὰ ἐς ἀπόδοσιν ἐφ[σεφίσατο ἡ]-
 [ο δῆμος τοῖ]ς ἄλλοις θεοῖς ἀ[ποδοθ]εῖ τὰ ὀφελόμενα, τα[μειύεσθο τ]-
 [ὰ μὲν τῆς Ἀθ]εναίας χρέματα [ἐν τῷ] ἐπὶ δεξιά τὸ Ὀπισ[θοδόμο], τὰ
 25 [ἐ τὸν ἄλλον θ]εὸν ἐν τῷ ἐπ' ἄρ[ιστερ]ά.

[*χοπόσα δὲ τῶν*] *χρεμάτων τῶν* [*ἡμερῶν*] *ἄστατά ἐστιν ἐ* *ἀν*[*ἀριθμετα* *ἡ*]-
 [*οι ταμίαι*] *ἡ*[*οι*] *νῦν μετὰ τῶν τε*[*ττάρου*] *ν* *ἀρχῶν* *καὶ ἐ* *δίδο*[*σαν τὸν λόγ*]-
 [*ον τὸν ἐκ Πα*] *ραθηναίων ἐς Παρ*[*αθένα*] *μα* *χοπόσα μέγ* *χρυ*[*σᾶ ἐστιν αὐ*]-
 [*τῶν ἐ ἀργυρᾶ*] *ἔ* *ὑπάργυρα* *στε*[*σάντων, τὰ δ*] *ἔ* *ἄλλ*[*α ἀριθμεσάντων...*]

B. ll. 2-3 [*ἐκποιῆν τὰ γὰ*] *λματα τὰ λί*[*θινα*] *ATL*; [*ἐκποιῆσαι τὰ βάρη*] *τὰ*
λί[*θινα*] *Gomme, Mattingly.* ll. 3-4: [*καὶ ἐ*] *πειδὰν ποι*[*εθεῖ*] *παντελῶς*
IG *i*²; [*ἡέος*] *δὲ ἂν ἐκποι*[*εθεῖ*] *ATL*; [*ἡόπο*] *ς δ' ἂν ἐκποι*[*εθεῖ*] *Wilhelm.*
 ll. 4-6: [*διασκέφ*] *σει χρῆσθαι ἀπ*[*αναλίσκοντα*] *ς ἐς τὸ δέον* . . . *καὶ τὸν ἀκρό*-
πολι [*ἡέρχαι*] *ἡός*[*α*] *μέ ἐστι* *ἡε*[*ργμένα...*], l. 7: *ἡέος* [*ἂν ἡερχ*] *θῆι...*,
 ll. 10-11: *ἡόπος* *ἄριστ*[*α*] *καὶ ἀσφαλ*[*έστατα*] *ἡερχθ*[*έσεται*] *Wilhelm.*
 ll. 4-6: [*ἀπαναλό*] *σει χρῆσθαι ἀπ*[*ὸ τῶν χρεμάτο*] *ν* *Ἀθηναίας*] *κατὰ τὰ*
ἔ *φσεφι*[*σμένα*], *καὶ τὸν ἀκρόπολι* [*νέμεν πλὴν εἰ*] *μέ τὰ ἐ* *χσε*[*ργμένα*],
 l. 7: *ἡέος* [*ἂν νεμε*] *θῆι*, ll. 10-11: *ἡόπος* *ἄριστ*[*α*] *καὶ εὐτελέ*[*στατα*]
νεμεθ[*έσεται*] *ATL.*

Few decrees of the fifth century have provoked more continuous controversy than these two important financial decrees. The margin of error, however, was considerably reduced when in 1931 Wade-Gery (*JHS* li (1931) 57-85) demonstrated that both decrees, though cut by different hands, were almost certainly moved by the same man at the same meeting of the Assembly.

The content of A is secure apart from its end, which has been cut away. 1 (2-7). Now that the 3,000 T. voted by the Assembly have been brought up to Athena on the Acropolis the state is to repay its debts to the other gods, as already voted, from the money held by and due to the *hellenotamiai*. 2 (7-13). The public auditors now in office are to check the debts under the supervision of the Boule, after any records of the debts that priests or other temple officers hold have been presented, and the *prytaneis* are to hand over the money. 3 (13-18). Treasurers of these other gods are to be selected by lot at the normal election times and they are to keep the treasures in the *Opisthodomos*, sharing responsibility for security with the treasurers of Athena. 4 (18-27). These treasurers are to take over the treasures of the other gods and record on a stele to be set up on the Acropolis a regular inventory each year, listing the property of each god separately, together with the income and expenditure of the year. 5 (27-30). Like the treasurers of Athena their year of office is to begin on the day of the Panathenaia (*Hekatombaion* 28, Athena's day). 6 (30-31). When the debts have been repaid to the other gods, any money left over is to be used on the dockyard and walls.

The detail of B is much less certain. 1 (2-3). The opening clause refers to the golden Victories and the *Pro[pylaia]*, but no convincing restorations have been found. 2 (3-12). There follows provision for

supplementary work on the Acropolis, perhaps concerned primarily with security (see Wilhelm's restorations above) at a cost of 10 T. a year. The architect (of the Propylaia) is to make the plan and the work is to be supervised by the treasurers (of Athena) and the commissioners (of the Propylaia). 3 (12-19). Apart from this expenditure no sum above 10,000 dr. may be drawn from Athena's reserve without a special sanction. 4 (19-25). [? The *hellenotamiai* are to deposit in the course of the year the moneys due to the other gods (as they become available; later in the year they will be handed over to the treasurers of the other gods).] When these debts have been repaid from the 200 T. voted by the people, Athena's treasury is to be on the right of the Opisthodomos, that of the other gods on the left. 5 (26-9). The treasurers of Athena are to complete the weighing and counting of Athena's treasure with the co-operation of the four boards of the past Panathenaic period [and presumably they are to publish inventories].

The historical interpretation of these texts depends largely on their date. They come after the beginning of the Propylaia (mentioned almost certainly in B 3 and 9), in a year of the Great Panathenaia (B 27), before the election of the treasurers of the other gods, and almost certainly before the outbreak of war (for the treasures of the other gods have only just been centralized). The Propylaia were begun in 437-6 (*IG* i². 363); the first record of treasurers of the other gods comes from an inventory of 429-8 which refers to the previous year's board (*IG* i². 310); inventories of Athena's treasures begin in 434-3 (*IG* i². 232). There is little doubt that Kallias moved his decrees in 434-3. We may perhaps be a little more precise and suggest that it was after the Great Panathenaia of 434 (B 27) and shortly before the elections (? in the spring) of 433 (A 14). If this date is approximately right these decrees precede Athens' acceptance of Corcyra's appeal for help against Corinth in the summer of 433. Thucydides says that the ten ships sent by Athens, to be followed by a second squadron of twenty, sailed soon after the Assembly's decision (i. 45. 1: οὐ πολὺ ὕστερον). The payments by the treasurers of Athena for the two squadrons were made in the first prytany of 433-2, not earlier than 1 July (No. 61). The decrees of Kallias confirm Thucydides' judgement that when Athens made her defensive alliance with Corcyra the people had already been convinced that war with the Peloponnese was imminent: ἐδόκει γὰρ ὁ πρὸς Πελοποννησίου πόλεμος καὶ ὡς ἔσεσθαι αὐτοῖς (Thuc. i. 44. 2). Decree A of Kallias shows that the decision had already been taken to concentrate the treasures of the temples of the rural demes and the lower city for security on the Acropolis (A 18-22). Such a drastic step would not have been taken had not the Assembly been persuaded that there was a serious risk of

war. (Had Pericles at this stage said that he 'already saw war approaching from the Peloponnese' (Plut. *Per.* 8. 7)?)

The decrees also provide important evidence for the reconstruction of the history of Athenian finance during the Periclean period, but in this field it is much easier to ask the questions than to answer them. When were the debts of the other gods incurred? Some at least not recently, because a search has to be made for the records (A 11-13); perhaps in the first Peloponnesian War, perhaps even as early as the Persian Wars? How are we to interpret the 3,000 T.? As the main payments for buildings and expeditions in the forties and early thirties had been made by the treasurers of Athena (Nos. 54, 55, 59, 60), it is extremely unlikely that there was in 433 any large reserve in a public treasury below the Acropolis (*pace* Gomme, *HCT* ii. 31). We should not, therefore, think of a single transfer in 433, but of a series of instalments paid over several years. Are we to identify the 200 T. of B 22 with these instalments? This is suggested by *ATL* (iii. 326-8; see also *Hesp.* xxvi (1957) 182-8); the authors believe that, following the Peace of Kallias, it was resolved, in view of the heavy expenditure contemplated on rebuilding, to set aside 200 T. each year: 'from 448 the estimated reserves, at the rate of 200 T. a year, were being contributed systematically to the chest of the treasurers of Athena.' The last payment was made in 434-3 and so the 200 T. of 433-2 were available for the other gods. This simple solution is most attractive and should perhaps be accepted; but logically it would be easier to believe that the decision to pay 3,000 T. to Athena was taken in 443 as part of a financial reorganization consequent on the ostracism of Thucydides, son of Melesias. It is also possible that the 200 T. of B is not the repetition of what has been an annual payment. It is a little strange, if it was known that the annual reserve of 200 T. was to be used, that the sum from which the debts are to be repaid should be expressed in A 6-7 in such a cumbersome way. It is not impossible that the figure was first introduced as a second (now lost) amendment in A, intended perhaps to set a limit to the amount that should be repaid. For a reconstruction of Athenian financial history, based partly on these decrees, see *ATL* iii. 118-32; Gomme, *Hist.* ii (1953) 44-63 (summarized in *HCT* ii. 26-33).

Against a general consensus in favour of 434-3 Mattingly has revived arguments used by Beloch and others for a later date. Beloch advocated the period of the Peace of Nikias, but these years were excluded when it was realized that a board of ten treasurers of the other gods was attested for 421-0 (*IG* i². 370. 7-9); Mattingly proposes 422-1, a date which Wade-Gery once supported, though he later withdrew his support in favour of 434-3 (*JHS* liii (1933) 135).

Mattingly, like Beloch, stresses the use of the later form of the first declension dative plural in A: *ἠελλενοταμίαις, ταμίαις, αἰς* in ll. 6, 18, 28, though B 21 has *ταμίαισι*. Wade-Gery, reviewing the evidence systematically, concluded that the change began about 422 and was complete about 418. He noted, however, that the later form was used in two tribute lists assigned to the early years of the Archidamian War. These two lists Meritt then dated to 429 and 425; the revised view of *ATL* assigns them to 429 and 428 (lists 25 and 26). Mattingly still holds to the dates he proposed in 1961, 426 and 425 (*Hist.* x (1961) 166 ff. and *CQ* xi (1961) 155-60; answered by Meritt and Wade-Gery in *JHS* lxxxii (1962) 73 f.). 'Thus there is, I believe, good reason for claiming that the form *-αις* first appears epigraphically in spring 426. From then on we have a fairly continuous series.' Meiggs hopes to support Meritt's revised dating elsewhere; these two lists form an adequate bridge. Mattingly also follows Beloch in appealing to the absence of any recorded vote of *ἄδεια* until after the Peace of Nicias. B 12-19 had enacted that for any expenditure from Athena's reserve over 10,000 dr. a preliminary vote of *ἄδεια* was to be recorded. In the borrowings from Athena in 433 for the Corcyra expedition (No. 61) there is no record of such a vote; it is first found in the accounts of Athena's treasurers for 418-17 (No. 77, l. 15). This needs explanation, but if it marks the first application of the restriction imposed by decree B, why is it not applied in the earlier payments of 418-17? Mattingly also appeals to the isolated definition of a payment made from Athena's funds in 425-4 as *ἐχς Ὀπισθοδόμο* (No. 72, l. 20). He argues that before 422-1 only part of Athena's reserve was kept in the Opisthodomos, and that it was only when the 3,000 T. were handed over to her that all her funds were concentrated there. It would still remain extremely odd that only one payment should be so specified. But the decisive argument against Mattingly remains the argument used by Kolbe against Beloch. The inventory of the other gods' treasurers for 429-8 (*IG* i². 310) shows them well established in office; only five are listed. This may reflect deaths from the plague, but even in No. 54 only seven treasurers of Athena are listed. Nor does Mattingly satisfactorily explain why only 200 T. were set aside to repay the 766 T. known from the report of the logistai (No. 72) to be owing to the other gods in 422. For the two important decrees of Kallias 434-3 may be regarded as a firm date. Their mover is probably the son of Kalliades, general in 433-2, for whom see pp. 153, 173.

There remain other obscurities:

1 (6-7). The debts of the other gods are to be repaid from moneys now in the hands of the *hellenotamiai* καὶ τὰλλα ἃ ἔστι τούτων | [τὸ]ν χρεμάτων, καὶ τὰ ἐκ τῆς δεκάτης ἐπειδὴν πραθεῖ. The first two sources

may be tribute received and tribute still to come, but other imperial moneys might also be included (*φόρος* would more probably have been used if only tribute were concerned). We do not know the source or scope of the *δεκάτη*. Antiphon used the word *δεκατευταί* in his speech against the general Demosthenes (Harpokration s.v.) but that does not carry us further. Mattingly accepts identification with the *δεκάτη* imposed in 410 by Alcibiades at Chrysopolis on merchantmen sailing out of the Euxine (Xen. *Hell.* i. 1. 22), but Polybius (iv. 44. 4) implies that Alcibiades was the first to impose the tax; we consider also that a 10 per cent tax, compared with the normal 2 or 2½ per cent import duty, is exceptionally high and would be barely explicable in peace-time. Tod alternatively suggests that it might be a charge of 10 per cent on the produce of state lands in the occupation of private citizens, but such a source would be a very odd companion to funds handled by the *hellenotamiai*. The problem remains unsolved.

2. The identification of the Opisthodomos (A 15-17) is uncertain. We prefer to follow those who think that it was the western end of the Doerpfeld temple.

3. The annual date of the election of magistrates (A 14) is not recorded. The generals were elected in the first prytany after the sixth that was favourable (Arist. *Ἄθ. Πολ.* 44. 4). It seems likely that the elections of the archons and other magistrates were held at roughly the same time. There will at least have been a significant interval, as at Rome, between election and entry to office in midsummer (to allow for *δοκιμασία*).

4. In A 18-19 *παρὰ δὲ τῶν νῦν ταμιῶν* refers to the local treasurers of the temples. The distinction is between the local officers now responsible and the state officials who will be responsible after centralization.

5. The golden Nikai of B 3 are statues of a standard form, derived from the Nike on the hand of Pheidias' Parthenos, weighing 2 T. Those referred to here were probably the first of the series and are possibly to be identified with those recorded in a fragment from the Agora (Schweigert, *Hesp.* ix (1940) 309). For a detailed discussion of these golden Nikai see D. B. Thompson, *Hesp.* xiii (1944) 173-209.

6. (B 19). The first *εἰσφορά* known to us was levied in 428 (Thuc. iii. 19. 1); Thucydides says of it *τότε πρῶτον*, but he is probably implying only that it was the first of many during the war. There may be a reference to *εἰσφορά* in a decree concerning Hestiaia, c. 445-435 (*IG* i². 42. 22 f.).

59 (52)

Building-accounts of the Parthenon:

434-3 B.C.

On the right-hand side of a marble stele, originally set up on the Acropolis; now in EM.

Developed Attic letters. Slightly irregular stoichedon, Austin, 61 f. Phot.: ll. 1-9 (squeeze), Cavaignac, *Études*, iv, Fig. 18.

IG i². 352; Dinsmoor *AJA* xvii (1913) 53-80, xxv (1921) 233-45. Cf. A. H. Smith, *JRIBA* xxxiv (1926) 131 f.; A. Burford, 'Parthenos and Parthenon' (*Greece & Rome*, Suppl. to vol. x) 23-35.

- τοῖς ἐπιστάτεσι, ἰοῖς
 Ἀντικλῆς ἐγραμμάτευ[ε],
 ἐπὶ τῆς τετάρτης καὶ δε-
 κάτης βολῆς, ἡεὶ Μετα-
 5 γένες πρῶτος ἐγραμμ-
 άτευε, ἐπὶ Κράτετος ἀρχ-
 οντος Ἀθηναίοισιν,
 λέμματα τῷ ἐνιαυτῷ
 τοῦτο τάδε·
- 10 ΧΗΗΗ περιγενόμενον
 Η^ΑΔΔ μὲν ἐκ τῷ προτέρῳ
 ἐνιαυτῷ
-
- Ⓜ^ΑⓂ^Α χρυσὸ στατῆρες
 [ξξξξ] [Λαμφο]ακενοί
- 15 Ⓜ^ΑⓂ^ΑⓂ^Αξξ [χρυσὸ] στατῆρες
 ἡέκτε: Κ[υζικεν]οί
-
- πα[ρὰ ταμι]δὸν [ἡοὶ τὰ]
 ΜΜ^Α: τῆς θεῷ [ἐτ]αμίει[ον],
 ἡοῖς Κράτες ἐγρ[α]-
 20 μμάτευε Λαμπτρε[ύς]
-
- ΧΗΗΗ χρυσίῳ πραθέ[ντος]
 Ⓜ^ΑΔΔⓂ^ΑⓂ^Α σταθμὸν Ⓜ^ΑΔΔΔ[Δ]Ⓜ^Α[Ⓜ^ΑⓂ^Α]
 τιμὲ τοῦτο

25 ΧΗΗΗ ἐλέφαντος [πρα]θ[έν]-
 ΠΙΠΠ τος σταθμό[ν Τ]ΤΤ
 ΠΔ: τιμὲ τ[ούτο]

ἀναλόμα[τ]α

[...]ΗΗ: ὄνεμάτο[ν]
 [- -]ΤΤΙ:

μισθομ[άτον]

30 ΧΠ[ΗΗ] h]υπορ[γοῖς Πεντελεῖ]-
 ΗΗΔ[Δ] σι καὶ λίθος ἀνατιθ]-
 ΠΤΠ ξ[σι ἐπὶ τὰ κύκλα]

ΜΠΧΗΗ ἀγ[αλματοπο]ιοῖς
 ΗΠΔΔΔ ἐνα[ιετίον μι]σθός
 ΔΤΤ

35 [Χ]ΠΗΗΗ καταμ[ενίο]ις
 [...]ΔΤΠΠ
 [- - -] περ]ιε[γέν]ετο
 [- - -] τὸ ἐνιαυτ]δ τού[το]
 [ξξξξ] χρυσὸ στατῆρες
 [ξξξξ] Λαμφσακενοί
 40 [ξξξξ] χρυσὸ στατῆρες
 [ἑέκτε:] Κυζικενοί

The change in the number of Lampsakene staters (ll. 14, 39) arises from a new fragment to be added by Woodward to *IG* i². 340. L. 22 has a new reading confirming Dinsmoor's restoration (*AJA* xvii (1913) 75). We have given l. 25 the minimum restoration, which even so makes ivory three times cheaper than in fourth-century Delphi (*FD* iii. 5. 25. 5); no doubt the *epistatai* were selling off waste. There is no line vacant after l. 29. The restoration of the figure in l. 30 is new, replacing ΧΧ[- -]; we see the bottom of a vertical, not a diagonal, in the second space. The two-line figure in l. 35 is partly new.

When the Assembly decided to build a new temple for Athena Parthenos the application of democratic principles to public building was already firmly established. The essential features of the Parthenion accounts are anticipated in the accounts of the Promachos (*SEG* x. 243), and of another unknown public work which was spread over eight years (*IG* i². 335).

A board of annually changing commissioners with its own secretary was elected by the people for each project. They were responsible for general supervision and for the keeping of accounts, which had to be inscribed and exposed to scrutiny, normally on the Acropolis. The first Parthenon account covers 447-6, the last 433-2. The accounts of these fifteen years were recorded year by year on the four sides of a marble stele, the first six lists in three columns on the obverse, followed by seven lists on the reverse; the fourteenth year was added on the right side, and the final year on the left side.

The accounts for 434-3 are the best preserved and their form is typical. The heading gives the date, by the number in the series, the first secretary of the Boule, and the archon (the names of the commissioners, recorded down to 438-7, are no longer given). Antikles, the secretary, had been assistant secretary to the board since 443-2 (possibly from the commencement; but the restoration of the name in *IG* i². 340, l. 39 (446-5) is very doubtful, and it is probably significant that in 443-2 an assistant secretary was first recorded for the *hellenotamiai* (list 12, l. 36)). Antikles became secretary, without an assistant, from 436-5 to the end, and is perhaps to be identified with the mover of a decree concerning Chalkis in 446-5 (No. 52, l. 40). The accounts begin with the balance inherited from the previous year, only 1,470 dr. of silver and a supply of Lampsakene and Kyzikene electrum staters which had remained untouched since they were given to the first year's board. Presumably contractors and workmen wanted their wages in good Attic coin; electrum might be more difficult to change. Next follows the year's income of the board. As usual the main grant comes from Athena's treasurers, but this year it is little more than 4 T., as the work is nearing its end. Roughly the same amount is realized by the sale of surplus gold (the ratio to silver is 14:1). The year's expenses are divided between purchases, monthly salaries (for architects, commissioners, and their secretaries), day wages for men working in the Pentelic marble-quarries and loading the marble on to wagons (*τὰ κύκλα*, restored from *IG* i². 350, l. 47, are probably little more than platforms on wheels, corresponding to our bolster wagons), and pay to sculptors working on the figures of the pediments. The accounts close with the year's surplus in silver and electrum.

Plutarch in a colourful passage of his *Pericles* (12. 2) implies that the Parthenon and its great chryselephantine cult-statue were paid for from the allies' tribute. This cannot be proved from the accounts, but the fact that the main paymasters seem to be the treasurers of Athena and that by the time of the Peloponnesian War Athens' main reserve is in the keeping of Athena, *ιερά χρήματα*, gives some support to Plutarch. In the same context Plutarch speaks of 'thousand-talent temples', encouraging estimates. R. S. Stanier, in the most

detailed calculations known to us (*JHS* lxxiii (1953) 68-76), has applied the known costs of the various operations in the building of the fourth-century temple of Asklepios at Epidaurus to the Parthenon. Making allowances for the difference between limestone and marble, and for the fall in the value of money, Stanier estimates the cost at just under 470 T. In his calculations, however, there are too many uncertain factors in the comparison, insufficient allowance is made for wastage in the very stringent selection of the finest-quality marble, and the language of Plutarch implies a considerably higher figure. In two widely separated years, 447-6 and 442-1, a balance of more than 33 talents was handed over by the commissioners of the year to their successors (*IG* i². 340, l. 41; 345, l. 9: $\frac{\Delta\Delta}{\text{MM}}$ — ? —): such figures are not easy to reconcile with a total of less than 500 T. Heliodoros (*ap.* Harpocration, s.v. *Προπύλαια ταῦτα*) recorded the cost of the Propylaia as 2,000 T. (see Keaney, *Hist.* xvii (1968) 507 f.). Stanier's figures are sufficient to show that this is quite unacceptable, but it is a credible figure (as Cavaignac suggested in *Études*, 102 f.) for the combined cost of the Parthenon, the cult-statue, and the Propylaia, allowing some 700-800 T. for the Parthenon.

60 (53)

Building-accounts of the Propylaia:

434-3 B.C.

Two fragments from the back of a marble stele, originally on the Acropolis; now in EM. The stele has rough patches; like the building, it was never finished.

Developed Attic letters. Slightly irregular stoichedon, Austin 63.
IG i². 366.

[θεοί: Ἄ]θENAÍA [: Τύχε]

[ἐπὶ τῆς τετ]άρτες ἀρχῆς, ἡῖ Διογέ[νες ἐ]γρ[αμμάτευε]

[....9....], ἐπὶ τῆς βολῆς, ἡῖ Μετα[γένες] πρ[ότος ἐγραμ]-

[μάτευε, ἐπι]στάται: Ἀρί[στυλ]λος Μ[ελιτεύς], Μ₁[....8....]

5 [....8....]ς, Δίκτυς Κο[ι]λεύ[ς], Τιμ[όστρατος] Κε[...7....]

[....8.... Θ]οραϊεύς· τούτοις λ[έμματα τ]ὸ ἐνια[υτὸ τὰδε]·

]HHHΔΠΤΤΤΤ παρὰ τὸμ πρ[οτέρον ἐ]πιστατ[ὸν, hois]

Ἐπικλῆς ἐγρα[μμάτευ]ε Θορική[ιος].

παρὰ ταμιῶν, ho[ι τὰ τῆ]ς θεῶ ἐτα[μίειον],

10 --- hois Κράτες ἐγρ[αμμά]τε[υ]ε Λαμπ[τρεύς].

[π]αρά ἡλλενοταμ[ιδόν, ἡ]οῖς Προτόγ[ικος]
 --- [ἔγραμ]μάτευε Κερ[αμ]ῦς, τὸ χουμ[μαχ]-
 [ικὸ φόρο μ]νᾶ ἀπὸ τὸ [τα]λάντο.
 [παρὰ ταμ]ιδόν ἡεφα[ισ]τικὸ ἀπὸ Λ[αυ]ρ[είο]
 15 --- . . . 8 . . . ο. το[. . τ]ὸμ πέντε μ[ε]ρῶ[ν].
 [παρὰ ἡλλενοταμιδὸν ἀ]πὸ στρατιᾶς ΤΙ[. . .]
 --- ----- σιππο Ἄγρυλῆθε[ν]
 ----- πα]ρὰ Τιμοσθέν[ος]

In 438-7 Pheidias' great statue of Athena in the Parthenon was dedicated (see No. 54), and now that the temple was nearing completion the main labour force could be transferred to Mnesikles' Propylaea. The first year's accounts cover 437-6, the last 433-2. Presumably the work was then abandoned owing to the imminence of war; it was never completed. The accounts follow the same general pattern as those of the Parthenon, but with minor differences. In the heading of each year Athena and Fortune are invoked (extant only for 437-6 and 434-3); the dating prescript omits the archon's name (as did the early years of the Parthenon accounts). The mina in the talent contributed by the *hellenotamiai* represents Athena's *aparche*; before the Propylaea were begun it was probably paid to the Parthenon (a payment by the *hellenotamiai* in 444-3 (*IG* i². 342. 36) has been plausibly restored as the *aparche* on a tribute of 376 T. 4,550 dr., No. 39, p. 88). The *hellenotamiai* in 434-3 made a second contribution (ll. 16-18), paralleled also in 435-4 and 433-2. These payments probably represent money in hand from grants allocated for routine patrols by small forces (*ATL* iii. 329-32, proposing for ll. 16-18: [ἀ]πὸ στρατιᾶς τ(ἐ)[ς μετὰ . . . σ. 6 . . . παρὰ . . . σ. 4 . . .]σίππο Ἄγρυλῆθε[ν]. The missing names would be those of the general in charge of the expedition and the *hellenotamias* who made the transaction.). A contribution from a Laurium mine was also made to the Parthenon commissioners in 439-8, and possibly in other years also.

The figures that survive from the Propylaea accounts throw less light than those of the Parthenon on the scale of expenditure. The volume of marble is considerably smaller and there was less need for precious materials, but in any estimate of cost the particularly fine quality of the marble needs emphasis. It is significant that when Demosthenes refers with pride to the Periclean buildings he mentions the Propylaea first (Dem. xxii. 13: οἱ τὰ Προπύλαια καὶ τὸν Παρθενῶν οἰκοδομήσαντες ἐκεῖνοι), not because it was grander than the Parthenon, but because it was grander in relation to its function. Grandeur in a temple need cause no surprise. Such magnificence in a secular building was a splendid extravagance.

61 (55)

Expenses of the Squadrons sent to Corcyra:

433 B.C.

Marble stele, found on the Acropolis; now in EM.

Developed Attic alphabet. The aspirate is not used in ἐμέραι (ll. 11, 22). Stoichedon, but the syllabic division of the words is observed. Phot.: *AJA* xxxiii (1929) 399, Meritt, *AFD* 70. Facs.: *ibid.* 71.

IG i². 295+; J. Johnson, *AJA* xxxiii. 398-400; Meritt, *AFD* 68-71; Oguse, *BCH* lix (1935) 416-20.

- [Ἀθηναῖοι ἀνέλ]οσαν ἐς Κόρκυρα[ν τάδε· ἐπὶ Ἀ]-
 [φσεύδος ἄρχο]ντος καὶ ἐπὶ τῆς βολῆς ἠεὶ Κρ[ι]-
 [τιάδες Φαένο] Τειθράσιος πρῶτος ἐγραμμά-
 [τευε, ταμίαι ἠ]ιερὸν χρεμάτων τῆς Ἀθηναία[ς]
 5 [...δ...ἐκ Κερ]αμέων καὶ χουνάρχοντες, ἠοῖς
 [Κράτες Ναύ]πυονος Λαμπτρεὺς ἐγραμμάτευε,
 [παρέδοσα]ν στρατηγοῖς ἐς Κόρκυραν τοῖς
 [πρότοις ἐκ]πλέοσι Λακεδαιμονίοι Λακιά-
 [δει, Προτέαι] Αἰχσονεῖ, Διοτίμοι Εὐδονυμεῖ
 10 [ἐπὶ τῆς Αἰαν]τίδος πρυτανείας πρότες πρυ-
 [τανευόσες, τ]ρῆς καὶ δέκα ἐμέραι ἐσελελυ-
 [θῆναι ἔσαν, ♀♀] ♀♂ *vacat*
 [ἐπὶ Ἀφσεύδος] ἄρχοντος καὶ ἐπὶ τῆς βολῆς
 [ἠεὶ Κριτιάδες] Φαένο Τειθράσιος πρῶτος ἐ-
 15 [γραμμάτευε, τα]μίαι ἠιερὸν χρεμάτων τῆς Ἀ-
 [θηναίας Προνά]π[ες] Ἐρχιεὺς καὶ χουνάρχον-
 [τες, ἠοῖς Εὐθίας Αἰ]σχρονος Ἀναφλύστιος
 [ἐγραμμάτευε, παρ]έδοσαν στρατηγοῖς ἐς Κόρ-
 [κυραν τοῖς δευτέρ]οις ἐκπλέοσι Γλαύκωνι
 20 [ἐκ Κεραμέων, Μεταγ]ένει Κοιλεῖ, Δρακοντί-
 [δει Θοραιεῖ ἐπὶ τῆς] Αἰαντίδος πρυτανείας
 [πρότες πρυτανευόσε]ς τῷ τελευτ[αίαι ἐμέ]-
 [ραι τῆς πρυτανείας ♀] *vacat*

The new restoration in l. 16 is derived from a new fragment added to *IG* i². 232-3 by W. E. Thompson, *Hesp.* xxxiv (1965) 32.

This stele only contained the payments made by the treasurers of

Athena to the two squadrons sent to Corcyra in the summer of 433, a first squadron of ten ships (Thuc. i. 45) and a reinforcing squadron of twenty ships (Thuc. i. 50-1). If any other payments, e.g. for Macedon, were made in 433-2, they were recorded on another stele, now lost.

The restoration *πρότες* in l. 22 is almost certain and carries with it *Αἰαν]τίδος* in l. 10. The alternatives are to read *τρίτες*, *ὀγδόες*, or *ἐνάτες* in l. 22 and *Λεων]τίδος* in l. 10, but in that case the interval between the departures of the two squadrons will have been nearly three months at the least and the whole winter at the most, which is not compatible with Thucydides' narrative. On these facts, it is now agreed that the battle of Sybota was fought in August 433 (Hubbell, *CP* xxiv (1929) 218 f.; Jacoby, *Gött. Nachr.* 1929, 16 f. (= *Abhandlungen zur Griechischen Geschichtschreibung*, 222); Kolbe, *Thukydides im Licht der Urkunden*, 30 f.; Gomme *HCT* i. 196 f.).

The alternative to ⲠⲠⲓⲓⲓⲓⲓⲓ in l. 12 is ⲠⲠⲓⲓⲓⲓⲓⲓ , but 66 T. seems an improbably large sum; as the amount recorded in l. 23 occupied only one space, Ⲡ is an almost certain restoration.

The boards of treasurers making the payments (ll. 4-6, 15-18) differ because the Panathenaia, at which the treasurers laid down office, falls between the two payments.

The names of the generals in command of the first squadron are the same on the stone as in Thucydides (i. 45), though the latter follows his usual practice of using the patronymic in place of the demotic. But with regard to the reinforcing generals (ll. 19-21) there is a marked discrepancy, for Thucydides speaks of *αἱ εἴκοσι νῆες . . . ὧν ἤρχε Γλαύκων τε ὁ Λεάγρου καὶ Ἄνδοκίδης ὁ Λεωγόρου* (i. 51. 4), while the stone names Glaukon, Metagenes (for the restoration see Müller-Strübing, *Aristophanes u. die hist. Kritik*, 600), and a Drakon or Drakontides. Whether Thucydides himself was at fault or an early copyist we cannot determine: the manuscripts are unanimous and Pseudo-Plutarch evidently had the same text (*Vit. X Orat.* 834 c). The best explanation is probably that of Stahl (*Rh. Mus.* xl (1885) 439), that this Drakontides was son of Leogoras of the deme of Thorai (*RE* v. 1663 f., *PA* 4551) and might therefore be confused with Andocides son of Leogoras *Κυδαθηναίεύς*, who had been *στρατηγός* in 441-0 (Androtion *FGH* 324 F 38). If that is right, this Drakontides may well have been the *ἐπιστάτης* from the tribe Antiochis of No. 52, l. 2, and have taken part later in the attack on Pericles (Plut. *Per.* 32. 3), but he must be distinguished from his namesake of Aphidna, who figures among the Thirty Tyrants (Arist. *Ἠθ. Πολ.* 34. 3, Xen. *Hell.* ii. 3. 2). For the difficulty in general and the principles of historical criticism involved see Gomme, *HCT* i. 31, 85, 188-90.

62 (54)

Accounts of the Delian Temples: 434-432 B.C.

Fragment of a marble stele, the left side preserved, found in Athens, now lost.

Ionic letters: the numerals are slightly larger than the remaining letters. Only ll. 1-6 stoichedon.

IG i². 377+; Kahrstedt, *Gött. Nachr.* 1931, 182-3; West, *AJA* xxxviii (1934) 1-9; Meritt, *Hesp.* v (1936) 378-80; *SEG* x 303+.

.α

Διοφ[

Ξανθῆς

Βολακλῆς

Δημοθαλῆς

Ἀναξιδῆμος

5

[-----παρ]ὰ Δηλίων ὀφελόντ[--

[-----]εγένετο καὶ αἱ παρα[-----]

[. . . c. 4. . κεφάλαιον ἀργυρίου] σύμπαν $\text{P}^{\text{M}} \text{P}^{\text{M}} \text{H H H H} \Delta$ [-----]

10 [. c. 17.]σιον τὸ βαλανεῖον ὤρισαν τ[-----]

[. c. 8. ὠϊκοδ]όμησαν, τὴν Ῥήνειαν ὤρισαν αὐ[-----]

[. c. 11.] ἐδάνεισαν $\text{P}^{\text{T}} \text{T T T T} \Delta \Delta$: ἐπίδει[κάτοις τόκοις πέντε ἔτη, ὥστε ἀπο]-[διδόσαι τὸ]ς δανεισαμένοις $\text{P}^{\text{T}} \text{T T T X X X} \Delta$ [$\Delta \Delta$ τό τε ἀρχαῖον καὶ τὸς τόκος ὧν]

[ἐδα]νείσαντο. χρόνος ἄρχει Μεταγειτυῶν μῆν Ἀθῆν[ησιν ἄρχοντος Ἀψεύδος],

15 [ἐν] Δήλῳ δὲ Βουφονιῶν μῆν ἄρχοντος Εὐπτέρος. [τὴν γῆν τὴν ἐν Δήλῳ τὴν]

[ἐ]εράν ἐμίσθωσαν καὶ τὸς κήπος καὶ τὰς οἰκίας καὶ [. . . c. 4. . δέκα ἔτη. χρόνος ἄρ]-

[χ]ει Ποσιδηῶν μῆν Ἀθῆνῃσι ἄρχοντος Κράττηος, ἐ[ν Δήλῳ δὲ Δηναίων μ]-

[ῆ]ν ἄρχοντος Εὐπτέρος, ὥστε ἀποδιδόσαι τῆμ μίσθωσ[ιν ἀπάντων τούτων τὸς με]-

[μ]ισθωμένοις κατὰ τὰς ξυγγραφάς. μισθώσεως κεφ[άλαιον τὸ μὲν πρῶτο ἔτος]

20 ΠΗΗΔΠΤ : τῶν δὲ ἄλλων ἐτῶν: ΠΗΗΗ[...c. 7...τὴν γῆν τὴν ἐν
Ῥηναί]-
 αι τὴν ἱερὰν ἐμισθῶσαν δέκα ἔτη. χρόνος [ἄρχει -----]
 μὴν ἄρχοντος Ἀψεύδος, ἐν Δήλῳ Ἱερὸς [μὴν ἄρχοντος -----]
 ρο, ὥστε ἀποδιδόναι τὸν μεμισθωμέ[νον τὸ ἔτος ἐκάστο τῆμ μίσθ]-
 ωσιν: ΤΧΗΔ: τὴν θάλατταν τὴν πο[- -----]
 25 ..4..τὴν ἐν Ῥηναίαι ἐμισθῶσαν δέκα [ἔτη] -----]

The loss of the stone and attested variations of spacing make it impossible to be confident about the length of lines. But it is unlikely that the gap in l. 16 can have been much longer than *τᾶλλα*. We have preferred *τὸ ἔτος ἐκάστο* to the traditional *ἐκάστο τὸ ἔτος* in l. 23. For the chronological restorations, see below.

Accounts of the administration of Delos in the periods of Athenian hegemony in the fifth and fourth centuries have been found at both Athens and Delos (cf. Tod, vol. ii, no. 125). This, the earliest of the series, lacks its heading, and we cannot tell by what board it was set up, though the dating by Athenian as well as Delian archons indicates that it was at least partly Athenian. The board dealt not only with property on Delos, which, though not tribute-paying, clearly from its archon retains the framework of a state, but also with property on Rheneia, which did pay tribute as a distinct unit. Whether it already possessed the title of *Ἀμφικτύονες*, when it first came into existence or acquired Athenian members we do not know. We have no other evidence between the removal of the treasury of the Delian league to Athens in 454 and the winter of 426-5, when the Athenians purified the whole island. In the following spring they organized a quadrennial festival there with musical, gymnastic, and equestrian contests (Thuc. iii. 104: cf. Stengel, *RE* iv. 2433 ff.). Early in 422 they expelled all the Delians from the island (Thuc. v. 1, Diod. xii. 73), but in 421 they allowed them to return, at the behest of the Delphic oracle, after the conclusion of the Peace of Nicias (Thuc. v. 32. 1, Diod. xii. 77). In 410-09 we find the sanctuary in the control of four Athenian *Ἀμφικτύονες* with some Delian *νεωκόροι* in a subordinate capacity, but in 408-7 the accounts were drawn up jointly by Athenian *Ἀμφικτύονες* and Delian ἐπι[ίσκο]σοι, perhaps as a result of some measure of conciliation (Coupry, *BCH* lxi (1937) 364-79). After the fall of Athens the Spartans temporarily freed Delos (cf. Tod, vol. ii, no. 99; new fragment, *Inscriptions de Délos*, 88).

The text before us falls into seven sections: (a) the end of a list of names, probably Delians rather than Athenians, officials or debtors

(we cannot tell whether this was the only column of names) (ll. 1-6); (b) a mutilated clause apparently dealing with the recovery of debts amounting to 55,410 + dr. = 9 T. 1,410 dr. (ll. 7-9); (c) a statement about building and demarcation of sacred property (ll. 10-11); (d) the record of a loan of 9 T. 20 dr., slightly less than the amount recovered under (b), for five years at 10 per cent interest (ll. 12-15) (it is interesting that Apollo's money was invested in loans in a way in which Athena's never was); (e) a lease of temple property in [Delos for ten years] (ll. 15-20); (f) a lease of sacred land in Rheneia for ten years at an annual rent of 1 T. 1,110 dr. (the annual tribute of Rheneia was 300 dr.) (ll. 20-4); (g) a lease of fishing rights on Rheneia for ten years (ll. 24-5). The *θάλαττα* is probably a pond or lagoon rather than the open sea (cf. Strabo xiv. 1. 26, p. 642 for sacred ponds; and for a parallel lease of a *λίμνη* see Pleket, *Epigraphica*, i, no. 40, A. 35).

The correspondences between the Athenian and Delian calendar have given some trouble, which has no clear solution and is slightly complicated by the fact that the Delian year ran, roughly, from winter solstice to winter solstice, whereas the Athenian, equally roughly, ran from summer solstice to summer solstice. Since the Delian Bouphonion normally corresponded with the Athenian Boedromion, it is clear that the equation in ll. 14-15 shows the Delian calendar one month in advance of the Athenian. West has shown that the loan of ll. 12-15 follows rather than precedes the lease of ll. 15-20, and rightly restores *Ἀψεύδος* in l. 14 and *Ἀθηναίων* in l. 17. The correct restoration of l. 21 remains a puzzle. West, restoring *χρόνος* [*ἄρχει Ἀθήνησιν Γαμηλιών*], argued that 433-2 was an ordinary year at Athens. Meritt, restoring *χρόνος* [*ἄρχει ἐμβόλιμος Ποσειδηιών*], argued that this inscription offered no obstacle to the belief he has always held, on other grounds, that 433-2, the year traditionally associated with Meton's calendar reforms, was an intercalary year at Athens.

63 (58)

Alliance between Athens and Rhegion:

433-2 B.C.

Marble stele broken at left and bottom; now in the British Museum.

Attic letters. The original prescript has been erased and a longer text by a different hand substituted, involving an extra line and the closer spacing of the letters. There is very little difference in the letter-forms of

the two hands. They could be, but need not be, contemporary. Stoichedon 34 (ll. 1-8), 33 (from l. 9). Phot.: Austin, Pl. 6.

Bauer, *Klio*, xv (1918) 188-91; *IG* i². 51; Accame, *RF* lxxiii (1935) 73-5; Gomme, *HCT* i. 198; Meritt, *CQ* xl (1946) 85-91; Accame, *RF* lxxx (1952) 127-35; *Staatsverträge* 162; Mattingly, *Hist.* xii (1963) 272.

[θεοί: πρέσβες ἐκ 'Ρεγίο η]οὶ τὸν χουμμαχίαν
 [ἐποέσαντο καὶ τὸν ἡόρκ]ον Κλέανδρος Χσεν-
 [.....19.....]τίνο, Σιλενὸς Φόκο,
 [.....14..... ἐπὶ Ἀφ]σεύδος ἄρχοντος κ-
 5 [αὶ τὲς βολές ἡεὶ Κριτιά]δες πρῶτος ἐγραμμ-
 [άτευε υν ἔδοχσεν τῆι βο]λῆι καὶ τῶι δέμοι, Ἀ-
 [καμαντῖς ἐπρυτάνευε, Χ]αρίας ἐγραμμάτευ-
 [ε, Τιμόχσενος ἐπεστάτ]ε, Καλλι-*vaca*
 [ας εἶπε· χουμμαχίαν εἶν]αι Ἀθηναίους καὶ
 10 ['Ρεγίνοις· τὸν δὲ ἡόρκο]ν ὁμοσάντων Ἀθηνα-
 [ῖοι ἡίνα εἰ ἡάπαντα πι]στὰ καὶ ἄδολα καὶ ἡ-
 [απλᾶ παρ' Ἀθηναίων ἐς αἰ]δῖον 'Ρεγίνοις, κα-
 [τὰ τάδε ὁμνύντες· χούμ]μαχοι ἐσόμεθα πισ-
 [τοὶ καὶ δίκαιοι καὶ ἰσ]χυροὶ καὶ ἀβλαβῆς
 15 [ἐς αἰδῖον 'Ρεγίνοις καὶ] ὀφελέσομεν εἰ[άν τ]-
 [ο δέονται -----]

At the end of l. 8 there are ten unfilled letter-spaces. It is virtually certain that the mason has left out *γραμματεὺς* from l. 4 (cf. its inclusion in the Leontinoi treaty, No. 64, ll. 6-7). He chose to leave two spaces vacant between prescript and decree rather than have them at the end, as in the Leontinoi treaty.

In the year of Apseudes, 433-2, Leontinoi and Rhegion each sent four envoys to Athens, and at the same meeting of the Assembly both cities were accepted by Athens into alliance. Very little is preserved of the texts of the agreements: provision is made for the Athenians to take an oath, and, after Meritt's rigorous examination of the stones, we can be almost certain that the alliance with Rhegion at least, and probably with both cities, was agreed for all time: ἐς αἰδῖον in l. 12, where previous editors had accepted Ἀθεν]αίων, a reading determined by assumed sense; the delta is clear and had been reported long ago. The approach to Athens by Rhegion and Leontinoi in 433-2 is easy to understand. When Athens openly decided to intervene in Corcyra in the summer of 433 it must have been clear to the Greek world that war between Athens and the Peloponnesian

League might be imminent. Against this background the Ionian cities of Sicily might well fear that Syracuse would take advantage of Athens' preoccupation to try to swallow them. That Sicily was closely watching the mainland is confirmed by Thucydides' statement that when war broke out Sparta sent for aid to Sicily, 'to those who had chosen the Spartan side', with a demand for ships (Thuc. ii. 7. 2: τοῖς τὰ κείνων ἐλομένοις).

There is, however, a major complication. As Bauer first pointed out (op. cit.) the prescripts of both decrees are inscribed on erasures, replacing prescripts that were a little shorter. The two decrees are cut by different hands, and in the Leontinoi decree at least the main text is by a different hand from that of the prescript. The evidence of Thucydides has also to be taken into account. He tells us (iii. 86. 3) that in 427 Leontinoi and her allies sent to Athens for help *κατὰ παλαιὰν ξυμμαχίαν*. The inference has been generally accepted (e.g. by Bauer, Tod, and Meritt) that the 433-2 agreements represented a renewal of alliances made earlier, and that the lettering of the texts confined possible dates to the forties (c. 448, Meritt; after 446, Tod and others). These alliances of the forties were renewed, it was thought, in 433-2, and the record of the renewal was provided by changing the original prescript to give the new date and the names of the envoys. The proposer was a Kallias, and the authors of *ATL* suggest that this was the author not of the renewal but of the original treaties, Kallias son of Hipponikos, who negotiated peace with Persia in 449 and with Sparta in 446 (iii. 277). In this they were following the suggestion made by Wade-Gery (*Essays*, 206) that when the Persian Peace of Kallias was renewed in 424-3 the record of the original terms remained, but the prescript was erased and a new one substituted in Ionic letters (so deceiving Theopompus).

Lewis has pointed out that it seems unlikely that 'the prescript of an Athenian decree can have a live archon, a live grammateus, a live epistates, living ambassadors, and a dead proposer' (*JHS* lxxxi (1961) 118, n. 8). The Kallias of 433-2 was probably the son of Kalliades who died at the siege of Potidaea and may have already proposed the two surviving financial decrees of 434-3 (No. 58). Others have found more radical objections. Accame (in the fuller statement of his views in *RF* lxxx (1952) 127-35) suggested that the text of the Leontinoi treaty dated back to the fifties, reflecting Athenian alliances with the Ionian cities of east Sicily at the same time as an alliance was made with Egesta in the west (No. 37). The old stone was retained and the prescript erased because there was a relief on a second stone above the inscription. The new preamble was, he thinks, cut by the same mason who cut and then recut the Rhegion prescript. The text of the Rhegion treaty, however, according to Accame, is of

the same date, and probably cut by the same mason as the second prescript. An erasure was necessary because he had made two mistakes. He had omitted οἱ τὴν χυμμαχίαν ἐποιέσαντο καὶ τὸν ἥρκον (thirty-seven letters), and he had inscribed the Leontinoi ambassadors instead of the four from Rhegion, which would have been two letters longer. So Accame explains the difference of thirty-nine letters between the new and the old prescripts. This is a neat solution, but one cannot believe that a mason could make two such mistakes. Accame, however, has rightly emphasized an important point which is often ignored. There is no doubt that the text of the Leontinoi alliance looks substantially earlier than that of the prescript. While the latter has letter-forms that are typical of the thirties, the text of the alliance has the V-shaped upsilon which is increasingly rare after 450, and a nu in which the second and third strokes are considerably shorter than the first. On the other hand, as Meritt points out: 'so far as the general character of the lettering can determine, the later prescripts in the erasures may well be the work of one man' (*CQ* xl. 86). This is probably not the mason who cut the text of the Rhegion alliance, for there are small but significant differences in the letters; but there is so little difference that they could be close contemporaries.

Mattingly attempted a simpler solution. He argued that it was uncommon to include the archon's name in the prescript before the Peace of Nicias, and that the elaborate date formula was not included in the texts of 433-2, which were not renewals, but the original alliances. 'For some reason their prescripts were re-inscribed in the 420's, presumably to give greater chronological precision by adding the name of the archon and the first secretary of Council.' This simple explanation cannot be accepted as it stands. The change would have added fifty-eight letters, whereas the number actually added was thirty-nine (for a detailed analysis of the prescripts see Meritt, *op. cit.* 85 f.).

It is doubtful whether the language of Thucydides quoted above (*κατὰ παλαιὰν χυμμαχίαν*) is a decisive argument for regarding the decrees of 433-2 as renewals of older alliances, for *παλαιός* in Thucydides covers a wide range and sometimes seems to refer to short periods (as in iii. 13. 1 and iv. 79. 2, both quoted by Mattingly). We may also agree that the implied procedure is extremely anomalous; what we should expect is a short note below the original text recording the renewal, or a new short record on a separate stone. But the established view that these two inscriptions record renewals of alliances made in the forties should be accepted, unless and until a solution is found which both satisfies 'common sense' and adequately explains the changes in the number of letters in the two prescripts.

The alliances were 'for ever'. This was once thought to be a de-

velopment of the fourth century, but Meritt draws attention to Hermokrates' speech to the Sicilians at Gela: *καὶ αὐτοὶ μάλιστα μὲν ἐς αἰδίον ξυμβῶμεν* (Thuc. iv. 63. 1), and the conception is now known to go much further back (see No. 10).

One of the Rhegine envoys, Silenos, died at Athens and was publicly buried, *IG* ii². 5220:

εὐρύχοροί ποτ' ἔθαιψαν Ἀθῆναι τόνδε τὸν ἄνδρα
 ἐλθόντ' ἐκ πάτρας δεῦρ' ἐπὶ συμμαχίαν·
 ἔστι δὲ Σιληνὸς παῖς Φώκο, τόμ ποτ' ἔθρειψεν
 Ῥήγιον εὐδαιμον φῶτα δι[κ]αιότατον.

Despite the Ionic letters, there is no real ground for supposing this text to have been set up later.

64 (57)

Alliance between Athens and Leontinoi:

433-2 B.C.

The upper part of a marble stele found between the Theatre of Herodes and the Theatre of Dionysos; now in EM.

As in the record of the alliance with Rhegion the original prescript has been erased and a longer text substituted, involving an extra line and the closer spacing of the letters. There is a marked difference between the two hands; the original text has ρ , υ (but Σ). Stoichedon 18 (1-15), 17 (16-32).

IG i². 52; *Staatsverträge* 63; see No. 63.

[θ]εοί: πρέσβες ἐγ Λεον[τ]-
 ίνον ἠοὶ τὲγ χσυμμαχί-
 αν ἐποέσαντο καὶ τὸν ἡ-
 ὄρκον Τιμένορ Ἀγαθοκ-
 5 λέος, Σῶσις Γλαυκίῳ, Γέ-
 λον Ἐχσεκέστο, γραμμα-
 τεὺς Θεότιμος Ταυρίσ-
 κο ἐπ' Ἀφσεύδος ἄρχοντ-
 ος καὶ τὲς βολῆς ἠεὶ Κρ-
 10 ιτιάδες ἐγραμμάτενε,
 ἔδοχσεν τῆι βολῆι καὶ
 τῶι δέμοι, Ἀκαμαντὶς ἐ-

πρυτάνευε, Χαρίας ἐγρ-
 αμμάτευε, Τιμόχσενος
 15 ἐπεστάτε, Καλλίας ἐ- νν
 ἴπε· τὲμ μὲν χουμμαχία-
 ν εἶναι Ἀθηναίοις καὶ
 Λεοντίνοις καὶ τὸν ὄ[ρ]-
 κογ δῶναι καὶ δέχσασ-
 20 [θαι. ὀμόσ]αι δὲ Ἀθηναί-
 [ος τάδε· σύ]νμα[χ]οι ἐσόμ-
 [εθα Λεοντ]ίν[οις αἰ]διο-
 [ι ἀδόλος κ]αὶ [ἀβλα]βῶς·
 [Λεοντίνο]ς ὄ[μῶς ὀ]μόσ-
 25 [αι· σὺν]μαχοι ἐσόμ[ε]θα
 [Ἀθηναίοις αἰ]διοὶ ἀδό-
 [λος καὶ ἀβλαβῶς· π]ερὶ
 -----μπο
 -----ενα
 30 -----δες
 -----σθ
 -----οτ

In the prescript *πρῶτος* is omitted in l. 10, probably deliberately; its inclusion would have entailed either a second extra line or squeezing an extra letter into four of the lines. See No. 63 and commentary.

65 (61)

Athenian Relations with Methone and Macedon: 430 B.C. and later

A marble stele, broken at the bottom, found in the Theatre of Dionysos. Above the inscription is a relief (upper part missing) showing Athena seated, holding out her hand to a standing figure in a short *chiton*, behind whom stands a hound (Binnebössel, no. 3); now in EM.

Attic letters, but Ionic gamma in l. 51 and eta in ll. 41, 52; the aspirate is frequently dropped. Stoichedon 41. Phot.: Kern 15, *ATL* ii. Pl. 1.

SIG 75; *IG* i². 57; West, *AJA* xxix (1925) 440-4; *ATL* ii. D 3-6, iii. 133 ff.; Mattingly, *CQ* xi (1961) 154-65, xvi (1966) 183.

Μεθοναίον ἐκ Πιερ[ίας]

[Φ]αίνιππος Φρυνίχο ἔγραμμάτ[ευε]

[ἔδ]οχσεν τῆι βολῆι καὶ τῶι δέμοι, Ἐρεχθεῖς ἐπρ[υτάν]-

[ευε], Σκόπας ἔγραμμάτευε, Τιμονίδες ἐπεστάτε, Δ[ιοπ]-

5 [εἰ]θες εἶπε δι[α]χειροτονῆσαι τὸν δῆμον αὐτίκ[α πρὸ]-

[ς Μ]εθοναίος εἶτε φόρον δοκεῖ τάττειν τὸν δῆμον[υ αὐτ]-

[ίκ]α μάλα ἔ ἐχ[σ]αρκῆν αὐτοῖς τελῆν ἡόσον τῆι θε[ο]ῖ ἀπ[ο]-

[ὸ τ]ὸ φόρο ἐγίγγετο ἡὸν τοῖς προτέροις Παν[αθ]ε[ναί]οι-

[ς] ἔτετάχατο φέρειν, τῷ δὲ ἄλλο ἀτελῆς ἕνα[ι· τὸν δὲ ὀφ]-

10 [ει]λεμάτων ἢ γεγράφαται τῶι δημοσίοι τ[ὸ]ι τὸν Ἄθε-

[να]ί[ο]ι Μ[ε]θοναῖοι ὀφείλοντες, εἰ δὲ ἐπιτ[έ]δειοι Ἄ-

[θε]ναίοις ὅσπερ τε νῦν καὶ ἔτι ἀμείνος, ἐπι[χο]ρῆν ἀπ[ο]-

[ὄτ]αχσιν περὶ τῆς πράξεος Ἀθηναίος, καὶ εἰ ἀν[τι]κοινὸ-

[ν] φσέφισμά τι περὶ τὸν ὀφειλεμάτων τὸν ἐν τῆ[ι]σι σα-

15 [ν]ίσι γίγγεται μεδὲν προσήκετό Μ[ε]θοναί[ο]ις ἐὰμ μ[ε]-

[ἐ]χ[ο]ρίς γίγγεται φσέφισμα περὶ Μ[ε]θοναίων· π[ρ]έσβε-

[ς δ]ὲ τρῆς πέμψαι ἡυπὲρ πεντέκοντα ἔτε γεγον[ό]τας

[ἡ]ο[ς] Περδίκκα[ν], εἶπεν δὲ Περδίκκαὶ ἡότι δοκεῖ[ν] δίκαι-

[ο]ν ἔνα εἶναι Μ[ε]θοναίος τῆι θαλάττει χρῆσθαι μεδὲ

20 [ἐ]χ[ο]ῖναι ἡορίσασθαι, καὶ εἶναι εἰσεμπορεύεσθ[αι καθ]-

[ἀπε]ρ[ὸ] τῆος εἶ[ς] τῆν χόραν καὶ μέτε ἀδικῆν μ[ε]τε [ἀ]δικέσ-

[θαι] μεδὲ στρα[τ]ιαν διὰ τῆς χόρας τῆς Μ[ε]θ[ο]ναίων [διά]-

[γεν] ἀκόντομ [Με]θοναίων, καὶ ἐὰμ μὲν ὁμολ[ο]γῶσιν [ἡε]κ-

[άτερ]οι χσ[υ]μβι[βα]σάντων ἡοι πρέσβες, εἰ δὲ μέ, [πρεσ]-

25 [βεί]αν ἐκάτ[ερ]ο[ι] πεμπόντων ἐς Διονύσια, τέλος [ἔ]χον-

[τας] περὶ ἡ[ὸ]ν ἀν[τι]διαφ[ε]ρονται, πρὸς τὴν βολῆν κα[ὶ] τὸν

[δῆ]μον· εἰ[π]ῆν δὲ [Π]ερδίκκαὶ ἡότι εἶναι ἡοι στρατι[ὸ]ται

[ἡοι] ἐμ[ὲ] Ποτειδ[ά]αι ἐπαινοῖσι γνόμας ἀγαθὰς ἡέ[χ]οσσι

[περὶ] αὐτὸ Ἀθε[ν]αῖοι. ἐχειροτόνεσεν ἡο δῆμος [Μεθον]-

30 [αί]ο[ς] τελῆν ἡ[ὸ]σον τῆι θεοῖ ἀπὸ τὸ φόρο ἐγίγγε[το] ἡὸν

[τοῖ]ς προτέροις Παναθηναίοις ἔτετάχατο φ[ε]ρειν, τῷ

[δὲ] ἄλλο ἀτελῆς ἔ[ν]αι. ν[ῦ]ν ἔδοχσεν τῆι βολῆι καὶ [τῶι δῆμ]-

[οι, ἡ] ἡιπποθο[ν]τις ἐ[π]ρυτάνευε, Μεγακλείδες [ἐ]γραμμά-

[τευ]ε, Ν[ικ]ο[κ]ο[ύ] . . . 5 . . . ἐ[π]εστάτε, Κλεόνυμος εἶπε· Μ[ε]θοναί-

35 [οις] εἶν[αι] ἐχ[ο]σα[γ]ογῆν ἐν Βυζαντίο σίτο μέχ[ρ]ι . . . α-

[κισχ]ιλίον μεδίμνον τῷ ἑναυτὸ ἐκάστο, ἡοι [δὲ] ἔλλε-

[σπ]οντοφύλακες μέτε αὐτοῖ κολούοντων ἐχσάγεν μ[ε]τ-

- [ε ἄλ]λον ἔοντον κολύεν, ἔ εὐθυνέσθον μυρίασι δρ[αχ]-
 [μῆισ]ιν ἕκαστος· γραφσαμένος δὲ πρὸς τὸς ἔλλεσπ[ον]-
 40 [το]φύλακας ἔχσάγε[ν] μεχρὶ τῷ τεταγμένῳ· ἀζέμιος [δὲ]
 [ἔσ]το καὶ ἐ ναῦς ἐ ἔχσάγοσα· ἡὸ τι δ' ἂν κοινὸν φσηφ[ισμ]-
 [α π]ερὶ τῶν χσμμάχο[ν] φσεφίζονται Ἀθηναῖοι πε[ρὶ β]-
 [οε]θείας ἔ ἄ[λ]λο τι προ[σ]τάττο[ν]τες τέσι πόλεσι ἔ [περ]-
 [ὶ σ]φῶν [ἔ] περὶ τῶν πόλεον, ἡὸ τι ἂν ὀνομαστὶ περὶ τ[ῆς π]-
 45 [όλε]ος τῆ[ς] Μεθοναίων φσεφίζονται τοῦτο προσέ[κεν]
 [αὐτοῖ]ς, τ[ᾶ] δὲ ἄλλα μέ, ἀλλὰ φυλάττοντες τὴν σφετ[έρα]-
 [ν αὐτῶν] ἐν τῷ τεταγμένοι ὄντον· ἡὰ δὲ ἠνπὸ Περδ[ίκε]-
 [ο ἀδικέσ]θαί φασι βουλεύσασθαι Ἀθηναῖος ἡὸ τι ἂν δο-
 [κ]εῖ [ἀγαθ]ὸν εἶναι περὶ Μεθοναίων ἐπειδὰν ἀπαν[τέσ]-
 50 [ο]σι εἰς τὸν δέμον ἡοι πρέσβες [ἡ]οι παρὰ Περδίκκο [οἷ τ]-
 ε μετ[ὰ Πλ]ειστίο οἷ[χ]όμενοι καὶ ἡοι μετὰ Λεογό[ρο· τῆ]-
 [σ]ι δὲ [ἄλλ]εσι πόλε[σι χ]ρηματίσαι ἐπειδὰν ἐσέλ[θει εἰ]
 [π]ρυ[ταν]εῖα ἐ δευ[τέρα] μετὰ τὰς ἐν τῷ νεορίοι εἰ[δρας]
 [ε]ῖθ[ὺς] ἐκκλεσίαν [πο]έσαντες· συν[ε]χὸς δὲ ποῦν τ[ᾶς ἐκ]-
 55 [ε]ἰ εἰ[δρα]ς ἔος ἂν δι[απρ]αχθεῖ, ἄλλο δὲ προχρεμα[τίσαι]
 [το]ῦ[το]ν μεδὲν ἔὰμ μέ τι οἱ στρατε[γ]οὶ δέοντα[ι. ν ἔδοχ]-
 [σεν τῆ] βολῆι καὶ τῷ δέμοι, Κεκροτὶς ἐπρυ[τάνευε,]-
 [...6...]εσ ἐγραμμάτε[ν]ε, ἡ[ε]ροκλείδες ἐ[πεστάτε,]-
 [...6...] εἶπε· ἐπειδὲ εἰ[.....24.....]
 60 [...Ἄθ]εναι[.....29.....]

lacuna

[ἔδοχσεν τῆ βολῆι καὶ τῷ δέμοι, Ἀκαμαντὶς ἐπρυτά]-
 [νευε, Φαίνιππος ἐγραμμάτευε.]

Ll. 10–11: Early copies read the third letter in l. 11 as Η which is impossible; Boeckh, whom we follow, restored iota, *ATL* i, p. 212 preferred τ[ὸν ἀπειτε|μέ]ρομ.

This stele was inscribed when Phainippos was secretary, in 423 (Thuc. iv. 118. 11), but it records a series of decrees concerning Methone, the first of which probably dates from 430 (see below). The first two decrees are very well preserved. Of the third only part of the prescript survives; the final decree (it is unlikely that there were more than four) is completely lost. The publication together of these decrees is an interesting reminder that the common provision for leasing the contract and setting up a stele is not a mere formality; even important decrees concerning relations with other states could remain in the archives unpublished.

Methone was an Eretrian colony on the west shore of the Thermaic gulf. No record survives of any tribute payment before the Peloponnesian War, but the name can and probably should be restored in 432-1 (list 23. II. 67). Methone's main importance to Athens lay in her usefulness as a base, military and diplomatic, in an area that was dominated by Macedon. These decrees record privileges granted to reward and ensure her loyalty.

In the first decree (ll. 3-32) we have, 1 (5-9): The Assembly is asked to decide at the present meeting whether Methone should be formally reassessed, or whether she should be required to pay only the *aparche* (of 1/60th) on her current assessment. A note is added at the end of the decree (29-32) that the people granted this privilege, and in list 26 Methone is recorded as paying 300 dr. under the heading *ἡαῖδε τῶν πόλεων αὐτῆ[ν] | τὲν ἀπα[ρ]χὲν ἀπέγαγον* (26. II. 51 f., probably to be restored also in 25. II. 33). 2 (9-16): Her debts to Athens (probably but not necessarily unpaid tribute) will be specially considered, and no general decree about debts shall apply to Methone, unless she is specifically mentioned. 3 (16-29): Three envoys are to be sent to Perdikkas requiring him not to restrict Methone's freedom of movement by sea or land (*εἰσεμπορεύεσθαι . . . ἐς τὲν χῶρον* (ll. 20 f.), referring to Methone's trade with the interior), and not to take his forces through Methone's territory without her agreement. If the envoys cannot reconcile Perdikkas and Methone, they should both be asked to send plenipotentiaries to Athens at the time of the Dionysia to state their cases before Boule and Assembly. Perdikkas is reminded that Athenian troops at Potidaea are watching him.

Various dates between 430 and 426 have been given to this decree, and the decision rests on the dating of tribute list 26. We accept the dating of this list in 429-8, reflecting with list 25 (430-29) the assessment of 430. We also follow *ATL* (iii. 133-7) in associating the decree with the assessment of late summer 430. The reference to the former Panathenaia (l. 31) is then a reference from one Great Panathenaia to the last, from 430 to 434. Athenian troops are still besieging Potidaea, which fell in the winter of 430-29 (in ll. 27 f. *ἡοι στρατιῶται ἡοι ἐμ Ποτειδ[ά]αι* could mean an Athenian garrison in Potidaea when Athenian settlers had occupied the town; but more probably settlers would have been expected to defend themselves and they are called *ἔποικοι* in *ATL* ii. D 21. 9; cf. No. 66). In 429-8, and probably in 430-29, Methone pays only the *aparche*. She will probably have been brought into the Athenian empire in 434, and the occasion may have been the change of Athenian policy in the Thraceward area. Athens had, probably early in the thirties, formed an alliance with Perdikkas (see *ATL* iii. 313, n. 61 for the attractive hypothesis that *IG*¹. 71 should be identified with this alliance). Perdikkas would reasonably resent the incorporation of

Methone in the Athenian empire, and Methone was in an uncomfortable position. When, however, Athens appeared in strength Perdikkas came to terms again, in 431 (Thuc. ii. 29. 6); but, though formally reconciled, he remained hostile and secretly sent support to anti-Athenian forces in the north-west in 429 (Thuc. ii. 80. 7). Athens makes diplomatic protests on Methone's behalf, but is clearly anxious to avoid an open break.

The second decree (ll. 32-56) was passed in the first prytany of 426-5 (for the date see No. 72, l. 5). For Kleonymos, who moved, probably in the same year, a decree tightening up the collection of tribute (No. 68), see p. 188. 1 (ll. 34-41): Methone may import annually a limited quantity of corn from Byzantium, but must give notice to the *hellespontophylakes*. This is the only clear record of Athenian officers' controlling the shipping through the Hellespont, but they may be implied in the payments recorded in the tribute list of 429-8, and restored in that of 430-29 (lists 26, 25) by two communities in the Chersonese: [π]όλις αἰ[δ]ε ἀρχαῖς | [ἐδ]οσαν τὸν φόρον (26. I. 10, 25. III. 66). Possibly the establishment of special officers at this key-point on the corn-route was a war-measure; apart from helping to ensure Athenian supplies it gave her a useful hold over allies who depended for their corn on imports. A similar privilege is recorded for Aphytis (ATL ii. D 21. 1-6), also during the Archidamian War. It seems that reserve stocks, under Athenian control, were stored at Byzantium (l. 35). 2 (ll. 41-7): Any general decrees requiring from the cities (possibly only those of the Thraceward area) military assistance or any other service shall not apply to Methone unless she is specially named. She will be playing her proper part if she safeguards her own territory (for ἐν τοῖ τεταγμένοι ὄντων cf. Xen. *Cyrop.* vi. 2. 37; *IG* ii². 116. 48). 3 (ll. 47-51): Methone's complaints against Perdikkas will be considered when the two embassies sent to Macedon report to the people. 4 (ll. 51-6): The other cities' affairs are to be discussed in the next prytany immediately after the sessions in the dockyard, and their business is to have priority unless the generals have other urgent business. This is perhaps a reference back to ll. 41-7, and may refer to special arrangements that are contemplated for the better security of the Thraceward area (Mattingly, *CQ* xi (1961) 161 f. Compare τὰς χουγγραφὰς . . . περὶ τὸν πόλεον τὸν ἐπὶ Θράκιες at the time of the colonization of Brea, No. 49, ll. 15 ff.).

Mattingly has argued in favour of a later date for the first Methone decree, which he would place in 427-6 (loc. cit. 154-65). This has the advantage of shortening the interval between the first and second decrees, but the case depends on the redating, which we do not accept, of tribute lists 25 and 26 to 426-5 and 427-6 respectively.

66 (60)

Resettlement of Potidaea: 429 B.C.

Marble base with large cutting on top, probably for a relief, found east of the Propylaia; now in EM.

Developed Attic writing, not stoichedon. Drawing: *DAA* p. 329.

DAA 306+.

ἑποίκων
ἐς Ποτειδαίαν

In the winter of 430–29 Potidaea capitulated after a siege of about two and a half years and its inhabitants evacuated the town; thereafter the Athenians ἐποίκους ἔπεμψαν ἐαυτῶν ἐς τὴν Ποτειδαίαν καὶ κατώκισαν (Thuc. ii. 70. 4); Diodorus (xii. 46. 7) gives the number of the colonists as a thousand. This dedication falls into a group of dedications made by departing colonists, for which see *DAA* p. 325. The dedicants agree with Thucydides in describing themselves as ἑποικοί. In the view of the authors of *ATL* (iii. 285) ‘apoikoi and epoikoi are the same, differing only in meaning as do our own words “emigrant” and “immigrant”, and reflecting merely the point of view from which the writer envisaged the process of colonization: either from the mother city or to the new location’, but Thucydides does also use ἀποικοί in a similar context (v. 116) and these colonists are still described as [τ]οῖς ἐποίκοι[s] τ[οῖς] ἐμ Ποτειδαία[ι], even after arriving at their destination (*ATL* ii. D 21. 9). For a full discussion see Ehrenberg, *CP* xlvii (1952) 143 f. (= *Polis und Imperium*, 245 f.). There are attractions in his view that ἑποικοί here may mean ‘additional settlers’, sent out to supplement the city’s depleted population, but there is no support other than the prefix for the belief that there was any population left to supplement.

67 (62)

Contributions to the Spartan War-fund:

(?) about 427 B.C.

A mutilated stele of grey marble above the door of the church of St. Basil, about 11 km. south of Sparta on the Gytheion road, perhaps originally from the shrine of Athena Chalkioikos on the Acropolis at Sparta.

Spartan alphabet (see *LSAG* 197 (Sparta 55)). Facs. of ll. 1-10 in *IG* v (1). 1.

CIG 1511; Fränkel, *Rh. Mus.* lvii (1902) 534-43; *IG* v (1). 1+; *SIG* 84; *DGE* 13; Adcock, *Mélanges Glotz*, 1-6.

Front

- [----- τοῖς Λακ]εδαιμονίο[ις..]λο[. .]
 [----- ακα]τίος δαρι(κ)ός. Ε....Α[.....]
 [----- τοῖς Λ]ακεδαιμονίοις ποτ[τ]ὸν
 [πόλεμον ἐν]ῆα μνᾶς καὶ δέκα στατῆρας.
 5 [ἔδοκε τοῖς Λακ]εδαιμονίοις Λυ(κ)εῖδα ἠνιός
 [-----]ος Ὀλέ[νι]ος [ἔ]δο[κε τοῖς Λακε]-
 [δαιμονίοις] ποττὸν πόλεμον τριερεΓ.ΧΜ..
 [--- ἀργυρί]ο μνᾶς δύο καὶ τριάκοντα. [ἔδον]
 [-----] τὸν Χίον τοὶ φίλοι τοὶ τὸν [- -]
 10 [-----] στατῆρας Αἰγιναίος. [ἔδον τοὶ]
 [----- τοῖ]ς Λακεδαιμονίοις ποττὸν [πό]-
 [λεμον μεδίμνος] τ[ε]τρακινχ[ε]λίος καὶ ἄλλος
 [μεδίμνος τετρ]ακινχελίος καὶ ἀσταφίδος
 [----- τάλ]αντα.
 15 [-----] ἠ[νι]ὸς [ἔ]δ[ο]κε τ[οῖς Λακεδαιμο]-
 [νίοις ---] πολλὰ καὶ δαρικόσ δκτακατ[ίος]
 [- - καὶ ἀργ]υρίο τρία τάλαντα.
 [-----] ἔ[δο]ν ποττὸν πόλεμον
 [ἀργυρίο τάλ]αντον τριάκοντα μνᾶς [καὶ]
 20 [- - - - τ]ρισχελίος μεδίμνος καὶ [ἄλλος]
 [μεδίμνος - -]κοντα καὶ ἀρ[γ]υρί[ο] Φεξέ[κοντα]
 [μνᾶς. ἔδον τ]οὶ Ἐφέσιοι τοῖς Λακεδαιμ[ο]-
 [νίοις ποττὸ]ν πόλεμον χελίο[υ]ς δαρ[ικὸς].

Side

- ἔδον τοὶ Μά-
 λιοι τοῖς
 Λακεδαί-
 μονίοις
 5 ἀργυρίο
 Φίκατι
 μνᾶς.
 ἔδοκε ΜΟ-

ΛΟΚΡΟΣ τοῖς

10 Λακεδαιμο-
νίους τάλαν-
τα α ἀργυρίο.
ἔδον τοῖ
Μάλιοι

15 τοῖς
[Λ]ακεδαι-
μονίο[ις]
- - -

Another fragment, from the precinct of Athena Chalkioikos (*BSA* xiv (1907-8) 135 f., *IG* v (1). 219), is added by Jeffery, *LSAG* 197, who reads: [- - - τ]οὶ Ἄπελλ[- - - | - - ἔδον τοῖς Λακεδ]αιμονίο[ις - - | - -] καλλοσι [- - - | - - ὀδεῖνα] ἔδοκε [ποττὸν πόλεμον? - - - | - -] ἔδον ποτ[τὸν πόλεμον - - | - -]ενερε[- - | - -]θαι ἀρ[γυρίο? - -

We are dependent on Fourmont's copy except for ll. 1-10, and even they have suffered since he read them. Although Fränkel claimed to see *einige Schatten von Buchstaben* below l. 10 on the only face of the stone now visible, we can see nothing of ll. 11-23 on our squeezes and are puzzled about the original layout of the inscription. l. 2: There have been a variety of readings. Fourmont read ΕΦΕΙ..ΑΛ.ΨΟΙ, Fränkel read and restored ἐφέξε [Κ]αλ[λίμα]χος ἀραι, Wilamowitz suggested Ἐχε[μμ]ᾶ λ[ό]χο[ς] ἔδοκε. In l. 5 Fourmont read Λυρεῖδα. In l. 6 Ὀλέ[ρι]ος would also be possible. In l. 7 Boeckh suggested τριέρε[σι] and Dittenberger τριέρε[σι] μ[ισθόν]. In l. 9 τοῖ τὸν [Λακεδαιμονίων?] is the reading attested by Fourmont and Fränkel; Kolbe emended to ποττὸν [πό]λεμον]. We cannot confirm either reading. Side, ll. 8-9: Μόλο(β)ρος Boeckh (cf. Thuc. iv. 8. 9); Μό[λον] Λοκρός Wilamowitz. l. 12 seems clearly corrupt, but it cannot be determined whether the fault is Fourmont's (reading τάλαντων) or the stonecutter's.

Peloponnesian financial weakness was noted by Pericles (Thuc. i. 141. 3) and admitted by Archidamos (i. 80. 4) and the Corinthians (i. 121. 3). One means of remedying it was to receive extraordinary contributions in cash and kind, and these are here recorded. For a similar text, see Tod, vol. ii, no. 160. The gifts include money in Aeginetan staters, darics, and perhaps other currencies; some contribute food, corn, or raisins. One gift may have been earmarked for pay to trireme crews, the remainder are merely 'for the war'.

Possible donations by Spartans themselves, individually or as a group (Front, l. 2; Side, ll. 8-9), are very far from certain. An individual foreigner certainly appears in Front, l. 6, apparently from Olenos in Achaëa. A pro-Spartan party appears in Front, l. 9, translating

'the friends (of Sparta) among the Chians', and foreign states appear, Ephesus (Front, l. 22) and Melos (Side, ll. 1-7, 13 ff.).

The dating of the inscription has varied. The appearance of Melos rules out a date between 416 and 404, and the probable reference to triremes in Front, l. 7, suggests a date earlier than the loss of the Spartan fleet at Pylos in 425 (Thuc. iv. 23. 1), though Kahrstedt (*Gr. Staatsrecht*, i. 32, 336) assigns the text to 424-416. A date between 431 and 425 has therefore been most popular, perhaps exactly in 427, when Alkidas put in at Ephesus (Thuc. iii. 32. 2). A pro-Spartan party in Chios would explain Athenian suspicions of Chios in winter 425-4 (Thuc. iv. 51). This date has been argued for by Adcock and supported by Jeffery (*LSAG*, loc. cit.) from a consideration of the lettering, and the argument seems satisfying to Meiggs. The implications for relations between Melos, Sparta, and Athens have often been noted (see, e.g., de Ste Croix, *Hist.* iii (1954-5) 13).

On the other hand, Fränkel and Meyer (*Theopomps Hellenika*, 266) preferred the last years of the Decellean War, with Melos making a thank-offering for her restoration by Lysander (Xen. *Hell.* ii. 2. 9). Lewis is tempted to go a stage further. He thinks the argument from the lettering indecisive, and would draw attention to the various sums contributed in darics (Front, ll. 2, 16, 23), which he thinks unlikely to have been so widespread during the Archidamian War. Might not the inscription belong to 396-5, when Ephesus was Agesilaus' base (Xen. *Hell.* iii. 4)?

68

Appointment of Tribute Collectors: 426 B.C.

Thirteen fragments of a marble stele, the last of which, giving the ends of ll. 21-33, was only recently found, from on or near the Acropolis; now in EM. Above the inscription was a relief, the small surviving part of which shows jars and sacks in which the tribute was carried (Binnebössel, no. 4).

Attic letters, stoichedon 36. Phot. of fragments 1-11: *DAT* 4-12 (with Pl. 1, drawing), *ATL* i. 123-6; of fr. 12: *ATL* ii. Pl. 5; of fr. 13: *AJP* lxxxviii (1967) 32, Pl. i; of reconstructed stele: *ibid.*, Pl. ii.

IG i². 65; Meritt, *DAT* 3-42; Dow, *AJA* xlii (1938) 602 f.; Raubitschek, *AJP* lxi (1940) 475-9; *ATL* ii. D 8; Meritt, *AJP* lxxxviii (1967) 29-32.

[--- 5 OR 6 ---]εμα[----- c. 11 -----]ς υυ

φόρ[ο]

ἔδοχε[ν] τῆι βολῆι καὶ τ[ῶι δέμωι], Κεκροπὶς ἐπ-

5 ρυτάνε[ν]ε, Πολέμαρχος [ἐγραμμά]τευε, *Όνασος ἐ-
 πεστάτ[ε, Κ]λεόνυμ[ος εἶπε· ἠοπόσ]αι πόλεις φόρο-
 ν φέροσ[ι ἄθ]ενα[ίοις ἡαιρέσθον] ἐν ἐκάστει τῆ-
 [ι] πόλει [φόρο ἐγλογέας ἠόπος ἄν] ἡεκασταχόθε-
 [ν ἄθε]ν[αίοις σύμπας ἐγλέγεται] ἠο [φόρος] ἔ ἠυπ-
 [εὐθυνοὶ δσι ἠοὶ ἐγλογῆς - - -]

lacuna

10 [- - - - -] ἐπ-
 [ἀναγκες ?.....Ι3.....τὸν πρυτανείαν] ἡέτ-
 [ις ἄν πρυτα]νεύε[ι.....Ι0.....μετὰ τὰ] Διονύσ-
 [ια· καὶ ἀναγ]νῶνα[ι ἐν τῷ δέμοι τὰς πό]λεις ἡαίτ-
 [ινες ἄν ἀπο]δοσι τ[ὸν φόρον καὶ αἴτιν]ες μὲ ἀπο-
 15 [δοσιν καὶ ἡ]αίτιν[ες ἄν κατὰ μέρε· ἐ]πὶ δὲ τὰς ὀφ-
 [ελόσας πέ]μπεν πέ[ντε ἄνδρας ἡίνα] ἐσπράχσων-
 [ται τὸν φ]όρον· ἀναγ[ραφόντων δὲ ἠοὶ ἐλλ]ενοτα-
 [μ]ῖαι ἐς σανίδι τὰς [πόλεις τὰς ἐλλιπό]σας τὸ φό-
 [ρ]ο καὶ τὸν ἀπαγόντ[ον....9.....κα]ὶ τιθέναι
 20 [ἡ]εκάστοτε πρόσθε[ν....9.....ἐ]στο δὲ καὶ Σα-
 μίοις καὶ Θεραίοι[ς....8....]σ[.][.][σ[....]||[.τ]-
 ὄν χρεμάτων δν τε χ[....8....]εν τῆς αἰρέσεος
 [τ]ὸν ἀνδρὸν καὶ εἴ τ[ις ἄλλ]ε πόλις ἐτάξατο χρ-
 [έ]ματα ἀπάγεν ἄθην[αζε· τ]ὸ δὲ φσέφισμα τόδε ἐσ-
 25 [τέ]λει ἡε Κεκροπ[ί]ς πρυτα]νεία θέτο ἐμ πόλει: Π
 [...]κριτος εἶπε· τ[ὰ μὲν ἄλλ]α καθάπερ Κλεόνυμ-
 [ος, ἡ]όπος δὲ ἄρι[στα καὶ ῥρα]ῖστα οἴσοσι ἄθENA-
 [ίοι τ]ὸν πόλεμ[ον, τάδε πρὸς] τὸν δέμον ἐκφέρεν
 [ἐκκλε]σίαιγ [δὲ χσυνάγεν ἐ]οθινέν: ἔδοχσεν τέ
 30 [βολῆ] καὶ τῷ δέμοι, Κεκρ[ο]πίς ἐπρυτάνευε, Πο-
 [λέμαρχος ἐγραμμά]τευε, ἡ]υγυαίνον ἐπεστάτε,
 [...9.....εἶπε· τὰ μὲν ἄλλ]α κατὰ τὸ πρότερο[ν]
 [φσέφισμα,.....Ι4.....]ματα εστονδ[....]

lacuna

35 [...Ι2.....] - [...23.....]
 [...Ι2.....]θα[.....22.....]
 [.]Ν[.] < [...7.....]ανε[.....2Ι.....]
 ξειεο[.]Λ[.]ι πλερ[...6...τ. ν δὲ...ν ἐπ]ιμελ-
 ετὰς αἰρέσθαι τὸ[ν ἄλλον δικὸν τὸν περὶ] τὸν ἄ-

- 40 θενάιον χρεμάτον κ[ατὰ τὸ . . . 9 . . . φ]σέφισ-
 μα καὶ τὸν στρατεγὸν [ἡένα τάττειν παρέ]ζεσθα-
 ι ἡόταν περί τινος τὸν [πόλεον δίκη δικάζετα]-
 ι. ἔαν δέ τις κακοτεχνῆι [ἡόπος μὲ κύριον ἔστα]-
 ι τὸ φσέφισμα τὸ τῷ φόρο [ἔ ἡόπος μὲ ἀπαχθέσεται]-
 αι ἡο φόρος Ἀθέναζε γρά[φεισθαι προδοσίας αὐ]-
 45 τὸν τὸν ἐκ ταύτες τῆς πό[λεος τὸν βολόμενον π]-
 ρὸς τὸς ἐπιμελετάς· ἡο[ι δὲ ἐπιμελεταὶ ἔσαγῶ]-
 ντον ἔμμενα ἐς τὸ δικαστέριον ἐπειδὰν ἡοι κ]-
 λετέρης ἔκοσι· δι[πλο]ῖ δὲ [ὄντον ἡοι κλετέρες]
 ἔ κατὰ ἡὸν γράφεισθαί τις β[όλο]ιτο· ἔαν δέ το κα]-
 50 ταγνῶι τὸ [δικ]αστέριον τι[μῶν ὃ τι χρέ αὐτὸν π]-
 αθῆν ἔ ἀ[π]οτεῖσαι· τὸς δὲ κέ[ρυκας ἡόσοι ἄν τιν]-
 ες [δ]σι ὃς ἄν ἡοι πρυτάνες με[τὰ τῆς βολῆς ἡέλο]-
 [ντα]ι πέμψαι ἐς τὰς πόλεις ἐπὶ τῆς Κεκροπίδο]-
 [ς πρ]υτανείας ἡόπος ἄν αἰρε[θῶσι ἡοι ἄνδρες ἡ]-
 55 [οι] τὸν φόρον ἐγλέχουσιν καὶ ἀναγραφῶσι ἐν]
 [τῷ]ι βουλευτερίοι· τὲν δὲ στέλ[εν ἡοι πολεταὶ ἀ]-
 [πο]μυθοσάντων. *vacat*
 [φ]όρο ἐγλο[γῆς τῷ]
 [πα]ρὰ τὸν πό[λεον]

One small unplaced fragment with eight letters on three lines is omitted here.

ll. 10–11: [. τοῖς δὲ ἔλληνοταμίαις ἐκκλεισίαν ποιῆν] ἐπ[ὶ ἀνάγκης
 περὶ τὸν πόλεον Meritt. 1. 12: [δέκα ἔμερον] Meritt, *DAT*; [δέκα ἡεμέραις
 μετὰ] Διονύσια Mattingly (*Hist.* x (1961) 152 n. 22); [εἴκοσι ἔμερον μετὰ]
 Διονύσια Meritt; perhaps [χρεματίζεν] or [ἐς τὸν δέμον]. 1. 13: Despite
 the aorist infinitive, we prefer our text to Meritt's [ἐς δὲ κοί]νῶν ἀ[ποφαινόσθου
 ἡαι πό]λες. 1. 14: [τὰ ὀνόματα] Wilhelm; [τὸ ἔλλιπὸν] Dow (*AJA* xlii
 (1938) 603). 1. 20: [τῷ Μετροίῳ] Meritt, *DAT*; [τῷ βέματος] or [τὸν ἡερόου]
ATL. ll. 20–2: Meritt suggests tentatively [ἐ]στο δὲ καὶ Σα[μίοις καὶ
 Θεραίοι]ς ἡομοῖον φ]σ[έ]φ[ι]σ[μ]α π[ερ]ι[τ]ὸν χρεμάτον ὃν τε χ[ρ]ε ποῆν πλ[η]ν;
 we do not feel confident about the traces in l. 20, and print only what we
 are sure of; all Meritt's readings are at least possible. 1. 26: Π[ι]ν[υθό]κριτος
 or Π[ι]ν[ολύ]κριτος. 1. 28: [ταῦτα εἰς] gives less satisfactory spelling; [γνό-
 μεν ἐς] Meritt. 1. 29: Alternatively, [ἐκκλε]σίαν [ποέσαντας ἡε]οθινῶν
 (sc. τὸς πρυτάνεις) Meritt. 1. 32: [Κλεόνυμος] Meritt. 1. 48: For the
 practice of requiring two witnesses to a summons see [Dem.] xl. 28.

The decree of Kleinias (No. 46) marks an earlier attempt to tighten up tribute collection. This decree, moved by Kleonymos, has a similar objective and uses similar language. The problem that Kleinias

attempted to resolve was the leaking of tribute between dispatch by the ally and receipt by Athens; Kleonymos is concerned to ensure that the full tribute should be collected in the cities. The solution approved by the Assembly was the appointment of individual collectors in each city, and, though the text has to be restored (ll. 8–9), it seems clear that these collectors would be held personally responsible. It was once widely thought that they were Athenian, but Antiphon's statement quoted from his speech concerning the tribute of Samothrace is explicit: *ἡρέθησαν γὰρ ἐκλογῆς παρ' ἡμῖν οἷς πλείστα ἐδόκει χρήματα εἶναι* (frag. 52, Thalheim). This decree puts the matter beyond doubt.

Collectors are to be appointed in each city [and in the gap between the first and second fragment we may assume that their functions and responsibilities were defined]. There follow (10–25), as in the Kleinias decree, procedures to ensure that the new measure will be effective. An Assembly is to be convened every year after the Dionysia (when tribute should normally be paid) for the *hellenotamiai* to make a report on the year's response of the cities (10–15). Five men are to be sent each year to exact tribute from defaulters, and the *hellenotamiai* are to put up lists of defaulters, and of payers, on wooden boards in front of [the Metroon, the platform, or the statues of the tribal heroes in the Agora] (15–20). The decree is then applied with certain modifications to (or, on Meritt's view, instructions are given to promote a similar decree about) payments by Samos, Thera, and other cities (with similar obligations) which are not tribute payments (20–4). In the case of Samos these are probably instalments of her war indemnity (see p. 151). Meritt (*DAT* 36 f.) plausibly suggests that an indemnity was also imposed on Thera when she was brought into the empire in 431 or 430 (recorded in the list of 429–8, *ATL*, list 26. III. 22, probably to be restored in the list of 430–29, list 25. II. 24). Thera differs from Samos in paying tribute as well as indemnity. The decree is to be set up on the Acropolis by the prytany now in office (ll. 24 f.). A short rider follows, demanding another meeting of the Assembly on the next morning; the intention of the proposer was probably to ensure that the decree of Kleonymos was carried out effectively; some details may have been disputed.

A second decree is then recorded, presumably passed at the meeting required by the rider to the first decree. It may have been proposed by Kleonymos, for his name fills the space and he proposed another decree on the same day (*SEG* x. 73). The early lines are lost; what survives is concerned primarily with the judicial arrangements required to make the original decree effective. Anyone guilty of obstructing the 'tribute decree' (requiring the allies to appoint collectors) may be prosecuted by anyone from the city concerned. The case

is to be reported to the *ἐπιμεληταί* (cf. *ATL* ii. D 11. 42) who are to take it to a heliastic court at Athens within a month from the return of the *κλητῆρες* (summoners), and the court is to decide the penalty (37–51). The heralds to be appointed by the *prytaneis* acting with the Boule are to be sent during the present prytany, so that collectors may be appointed and their names recorded in the Council House (51–6). The first decree had merely instructed the *prytaneis* to set up the decree on the Acropolis; formal provision is now made for the *poletai* to make the contract (56 f.). The larger letters of the two lines below the decree signify the title (cf. *hórkos* in No. 52).

The Kleonymos responsible for this decree is almost certainly to be identified with the Kleonymos who moved a decree in favour of Methone in the first prytany of 426–5 (No. 65, l. 34). It is probable that he was a member of the Boule in this year and that our decree should be dated in the second prytany of 426–5 (cf. No. 72, l. 6). We cannot, however, prove that he moved it as a probouleuma, for the only certain sign of a probouleuma in the fifth century is the amendment formula *τὰ μὲν ἄλλα καθάπερ τῆι βολεῖ*, which Meritt restored before l. 10 in *DAT* and *ATL*, but which he has abandoned now that the new fragment has confirmed Wilhelm's restoration in l. 26: *τ[ὰ μὲν ἄλ]λα καθάπερ Κλεόνυμ[ος]*; it is not, however, certain that *τὰ μὲν ἄλλα καθάπερ ὁ δεῖνα* was never used to amend a probouleuma. Kleonymos is one of Aristophanes' favourite targets, a coward, glutton, and liar (for references see *PA* 8680, i. 580). His politics were probably those of Cleon (see especially *Wasps*, 592 f.), and his decrees show that he deserves more serious consideration than Aristophanes' gibes would suggest.

The tribute collectors may have provided a precedent for the appointment of collectors of first-fruits in the cities for the Eleusinian Mysteries (No. 73).

69 (66)

Reassessment of the Tribute of the Athenian Empire:

425–4 B.C.

Forty-three fragments of a marble stele, now in EM, reconstructed with plaster.

Developed Attic letters. Stoichedon 70. Phot.: *The Athenian Assessment of 425 B.C.* (Meritt and West), 3–31; *ATL* i. 107–17.

IG i². 63; Meritt and West, *The Athenian Assessment of 425 B.C.*; McGregor, *TAPA* lxvi (1935) 146–64; Meritt and Wade-Gery, *AJP* lvii (1936)

377-94; *ATL* i. A 9; Meritt, *Epigraphica Attica* (1940), 131-8; *ATL* ii. A 9; Dow, *TAPA* lxxii (1941) 70-84; Béquignon and Will, *RA* xxxv (1950) 5-34; Gomme, *HCT* iii. 500-4 (1956).

Θ [ε ο ί]

τά[χοι]ς [φ]ό[ρο]

- ἔδοχσεν τῆ[ι βολέι καὶ τῶι δέμοι, . . . ντίς] ἐπρ[υτάνευε, . . .] λον ἔγρα[μ-
μάτευε, . . . 7 . . . ἐπε]-
στάτε, Θόδι[ππος εἶπε· πέμφσαι κέρυκας] ἐκ τῶν [. . . 8 . . . ἡὸς] ἄν
5 χερο[τονέσει *he* βολὲ ἐς τὰ]-
ς πόλες δύο [μὲν ἐπ' Ἴονίαν καὶ Καρίαν] δύο δὲ ἐ[πὶ Θράικεν δύο δ] ἐ
ἐπὶ Ν[έσος δύο δὲ ἐφ' Ἑλλάσπ]-
οντον· *ho*ῦτ[οι δὲ ἀνειπόντον ἐν τῶι] κοινῶι *h*[εκάστες τῆς πόλ]ξος πα[ρῆναι
πρέσβες τῶ *Mai*]-
μακτεριδῶν[ος μενός· II ἐ]σαγογέα[ς . . . 9 τούτ]ος δὲ
[*he*λέσθαι καὶ γραμμα]-
τέα καὶ χσυ[γγραμματέα . . . 9]ον· *he* δὲ β[ολὲ 12]
σθο[. . . . 10 δέκα ἄνδ]-
10 ρας· *ho*ῦτοι [δὲ τὰς πόλες πέντε ἔμερ]ῶν ἀφ' ἐς ἄ[ν
32 ἔ τ]
ἐς ἑμέρας *h*[εκάστες χιλίας δραχμὰς] *h*έκαστ[ος ἀποτεισάτο· τὸς δὲ
τάκτας *ho*ρκοσάντον *h*]-
oi *ho*ρκοτα[ὶ τῆι αὐτῆι ἑμέραι ἐπειδὴν] τυγχ[άνουσιν *hαιρεθέντες* ἔ ὄφελέτο
*h*έκαστος τῆ]-
ν αὐτὴν ζεμ[ίαν· τῶν δὲ διαδικασιῶν *hoi*] ἐσ[α]γ[ογῆς ἐπ]ιμ[ε]λ[όσθον *peri*
τῶ φόρο ἐπειδὰμ φσε]-
φίσεται *ho* [δέμος· ἐσαγογέον δὲ *ho* λα]χὸν κα[ὶ ἡ]ο πολέμαρ[χος ἀνακρι-
νάντον τὰς δίκας ἐν τ]-
15 *ei* ἐλκίαι [καθάπερ τὰς δίκας τὰς ἄλ]λας τῶ[ν ἐ]λκιστῶν· ἐ[ὰν δὲ
. 18 τῆσι]
πόλεσ[ι] κατ[ὰ τὰς δ]ια[δικασίας εὐθ]υ[νέσθω μ]υ[ρίασι] δραχ[μῆσι] κατὰ
τὸν νόμον *h*έκαστος αὐ]-
τῶν· *hoi* δὲ [. . .]θῆτα[ὶ δικαστέριον] νέον κα[θ]ιστάντων χ[ιλίος] δικαστάς·
τὸ δὲ φόρο, ἐπειδ]-
ἐ ὀλέζον ἐγ[ένε]το, τὰς [νῦν τάχες χσ]ὺν τῆι [βο]λῆι χσυντα[χσάντων
καθάπερ ἐπὶ τῆς τελευτ]-
αίας ἀρχῆς [πρὸς] μέρος[*ς* *hαπάσας* τῶ *II*]οσιδε[ἰὸ]νος μενός· χ[ρεματι-
ζόντων δὲ καὶ *ho*σεμέραι]

- [ἀ]πὸ νομενί[ας κα]τὰ τ[αὐτὰ ἡίνα ταχθ]έ[ι] ἡο φό[ρ]ος ἐν τῷ Πο[σι-
 20 [α] χρεματι[ζέτο κ]αὶ χ[συνεχῶς ἡίνα τ]ἀ[χσ]ες γ[έ]νονται ἐὰμ [μέ τι
 ἄλλο φσεφί]ζεται ἡο δέμο[ς]· τ-
 [ὄ]ν δὲ φόρο[ν ὀλέζ]ο μὲ π[ό]λει νῦν ταχσάντ[ον μ]ε[δε]μιᾶ ἔ ἡο[πόσον
 πρὸ τῷ ἐτύγχανον ἀπάγ]ουτ-
 [ες] ἐὰμ μέ τ[ις φαίν]ετα[ι ἀπορία ἡόστε ὅ]ες τ[έ]ς χόρας ἀδυ[νάτο μὲ
 πλείο ἀπάγεν· τένδε] δὲ τ[έ]-
 [ν γ]νόμεν [καὶ τὸ φσέ]φ[ισμα τόδε καὶ τὸμ φ]όρο[ν] ἡὸς ἂν ταχθ[έ]ι τῷ
 πόλει ἡεκάσται ἀνα]γρά[φσ]-
 [ας] ἡο γρ[αμματεὺς τῆς βολῆς ἐν δυοῖν στ]έλα[ι]ν λιθίνοι [καταθέτο
 25 [ρ]ίοι τῷ δὲ ἐμ πόλει· ἀπομισθοσάντων δὲ] ἡο[ι] πολεταί, τ[ὸ δὲ ἀργύριον
 παρασχόντων] ἡοι κ[ο]-
 λακρέτ[αι· τὸ δὲ λοιπὸν ἀποφαίνεν τέσι π]όλ[ε]σι περὶ τῷ φ[ό]ρο πρὸ τῷ
 Παναθηναίον τ]ὸμ με[γ]-
 ἄλον· ἐσ[ά]γεν δὲ τῷ πρυτανείαν ἡέτις ἂν τυ[γ]χάνει πρυτ[ανεύουσα τὰς
 τάχσες κατὰ Π]αναθ[έ]-
 ναια· [ἐὰν δὲ ἡοι πρυτάνες μὲ τότε ἐσάγο]σι ἐ[ς] τὸν δέμον κ[αὶ τῷ
 βολῆν καὶ τὸ δικαστ]έριον
 περὶ τῷ φ[ό]ρο μεδὲ εὐθύς χρεματίζουσι ἐ]πὶ σ[φ]ῶν αὐτῶν, ὀφ[έ]λεν ἡεκατὸν
 30 [ι Ἀ]θηνα[ίαι ἡέκαστον τῷμ π]ρ[υτανέον κ]αὶ τῷ[ι] δεμοσίοι ἡεκατὸν καὶ
 εὐθύνεσθαι χιλί]ασι
 [δρα]χμῆ[σι ἡέκαστον τῷμ πρ]υτ[ανέον, κα]ὶ ἐάν τις ἄλλος δι[δ]δοι φσεφον
 τῆ]σι [πό]λεσι μ[ὲ] ἔναι τ-
 [ὰς] τάχσ[ες κατὰ Π]α[ναθ]ένα[ια τὰ μ]εγάλα ἐπὶ τῆς πρυτανεί[ας ἡέτις
 ἂν πρ]ότε [πρυτ]ανεύει, ἄτ-
 [ι]μος ἔσ[το καὶ] τὰ χ[ρέ]ματα αὐτῷ δ[ε]μοσί]α ἔσ[το] καὶ τῆς θεῶ [τὸ
 ἐπιδέκατ]ρον· ἐχ[σενε]γκέτο δὲ τ-
 αὐτα ἐς [τὸν] δέμον [...β...]
 35 [ις π]ρ[υτ]ανεί[α ἐπάναγκες ἐπειδὰν ἡέκει
 ἡε] στρα[τιὰ] ἐς τρίτην ἐ-
 μέραν [πρῶτ]ον μετ[ὰ τὰ ἡιε]ρά· ἐ[ὰν] δὲ [μὲ] διαπ[ρ]αχθῆ ἐν ταύ[τει
 χρεματίζ]εν πε[ρὶ] τοῦτο πρῶ[τ]-
 30 [ον τῷ] ἡυσ[τε]ραία[ι χσυνε]χῶς [ἡέ]ος [ἂν] διαπ[ρ]αχθῆ ἐπὶ τῆ[ς] . . . 8
 . . .]ς πρυτανείας· ἐὰν δ[ὲ] μ-
 ἐ ἔχσεν[έ]γκοσι ἐς [τὸν] δέμ[ον] ἔ [μὲ] διαπ[ρ]αχ[σ]ο[σι] ἐπὶ σφῶν αὐτῶν,
 εὐθύν]εσθαι μυρίασι δρα[χμῆ]-

σιν *ἡέ[καστ]ος τὸμ [πρυτάν]εον [φό]ρο[ν ἦος] διακολύον ἐπιδ[όνα]ι ἐς
 τὰς στρα[τι]άς· τὸς δ[ὲ] ἐς δι-
 κας *πρ[οσκε]κλεμέ[ν]ος ἀχθ[ῆ]να[ι] ἡ[υ]π[ὸ] τῶν* *δεμοσίων κτετέ[ρον] ἡίνα*
ἡ[ε] βολ[ῆ] ἐδικά[σει] εὐθύς ἐ-
 40 *ὰμ μὲ δ[ῖ]ρθός] δοκοῶ[σι] διακο[ν]ε[ν]· τὰς δ[ὲ] πορ[εί]ας τοῖς κέρυχ[σι] τοῖς*
ἰδοσι χουγγράφσαι κατὰ τ[ο]
ον ἡόρ[κον] τὸς τάκ[τας] ἡέ[ος] τ[ὸ] πο[ρ]ε[υθέσ]ον[τα] ἡίνα μὲ αὐ[....]
... 14. ἡοι δὲ κέρυκες]
τὰς τά[χ]ο[ς] ἐς τῆσι π[ό]λεσι ἐπ[α]ναγ[κα]σθέντ[ο]ν ἡό[πο] ἀν δοκῆ[ι]
... 17. ἡό τι δὲ πε-
ρὶ τῶν [τ]άχσεων κα[ι] τῷ φσεφίσμα[το]ς τῆσι π[ό]λεσι χρέ λέγ[εσθαι]
περὶ τούτο τὸν δέμον φσε[φ]
ἰζεσθ[α]ι καὶ ἐάν τ[ι] ἄλλο ἐσάγοσι] ἡ[οι] πρυτάνες πε[ρὶ] τῷ δ[έ]οντος·
ἡόπος δὲ ἀν τὸμ φόρον] ἀπά-
 45 *[γ]οσιν [ἡ]αι πόλεις [ἐπιμελέσθον ἡοι στρατηγοὶ εὐθύ]ς ἡότ[αν] χουντάχσει*
ἡε βολῆ τ[ῆ]ν τάχσι-
[ν τῷ] φό[ρο] ἡίνα ἐ[ἶ] τῷ δέμοι ἀργύριον ἡικανὸν ἐς τὸμ] π[ό]λεμον· τὸς
δὲ στρατηγός] χρεῖσθαι π-
[ε]ρὶ τῷ φόρο κατα[σκέφσει καθ' ἕκαστον ἐνιαυτὸν ἔχσετ]ά[σαντας] κατὰ
γῆν κα[ὶ] θάλατταν πρ-
[ὄ]τον π[ό]σα δει ἔ[ἵ]ς τὰς στρα[τι]ὰς ἔ[ἵ]ς ἄλλο τι ἀναλίσκεν· ἐν δὲ τῆ
ἡέδραι τ[ῆ]ς βολῆς τῆ προ-
[τει] περὶ τ[ὸ] ὑτο α[ἰ]εὶ δίκ[ας] [ἐσαγόντον] ἀνευ τῆς ἐλιαίας καὶ τ[ῶ]ν ἄλλον
δικαστερίον ἐὰμ μ-
 50 *[ὲ] δικαστῶν] πρὸ[τον] δικα[σά]ντον ἐσάγεν φσεφίζεται ἡο] δέμ[ος]· τοῖς*
δὲ κέρυχσι τοῖς ἰδοσι τ-
[ὸ]μ μίσθον] ἀποδ[όντον] ἡο[ι] κ[ο]λακρέται.... 9. εἶπ[ε]· τὰ μὲ[ν] ἄλλα
καθάπερ τῆ βολῆ· τὰς
[δὲ] τάχσες] ἡόσαι [ἀν] κατ[ὰ] π[ό]λιν. 13. τὸς πρ[υ]τάνε[ς] ἡοι
ἀν τότε τυγχάνοσι πρυτ-
[ανέου]ντ[ες] καὶ τὸ[ν] γρα]μμ[α]τέα τῆς βολῆς... 7. ... ἐς τ[ὸ] δικαστέριον
ἡόταν περὶ τῶν τάχσ-
[ε]ον ἐ[ἶ] ἡόπος ἀν α[ὐ]τὰς ἀ[ν]θ[ομολογόνται] ἡοι δικαστ[α]ί ν[ε] ἔδοχ[εν] τῆ
βολῆ καὶ τῷ δέμοι, Α-
 55 *[ἰ]γεῖς ἐ]πρυτάνε[υ]ε, Φίλ]ιπ[πος] ἐγραμμάτευε, ... 7. ...]ορος ἐπεσ[τάτε],*
Θόδιππος εἶπε· ἡοπός
[ε]σι πό]λεσι φόρος [ἐτάχ]θ[ε] ἐπὶ τ[ῆ]ς [βολῆς] ἡῆ Πλειστ[ί]ας πρῶτος
*[ἐ]γρα]μμάτευε ἐπὶ Στρατοκ-**

[λέος] ἄρχοντος βῶ[ν καὶ πανήοπ]λ[ίαν ἀπάγεν ἐς Παναθ]έναια τὰ
 με[γάλα] ἡπασίας· πεμπόντων
 δ[ὲ ἐν] τῷ πομπῆι [καθάπερ ἄποι]κ[οιυυυ κατὰ τὰδε ἔτα]χσεν τὸμ φό[ρον
 τῆ]σι πόλεσιν ἡε βολ[ῆ]
 ἡεἰ [Πλ]ειστίας π[ρότος ἐγγραμμ]ά[τευε ΙΙ ἐ]πὶ Στρατο-
 κλ[έος ἄ]ρχοντος ἐπὶ [τῶ]ν [ἔσ]-
 60 αγωγ[έον] ἡοῖς Κα[. . . . 8 οἱ 10 . . . ἐγρ]α[μμάτευε . . . 9 οἱ 7 . . .]ς.

Our text is based on the revision of Meritt and West's original text in *ATL* ii. 40 f.; but at some points we agree with Béquignon and Will (*RA* xxxv (1950) 5 ff.) in preferring the earlier restorations of *ATL* i. 154 f. l. 4: πέμφσαι κέρυκας] ἐκ τῶν [μισθοτόν *ATL* ii; ἐκ τῶν [βουλευτόν *ATL* i, BW. Neither satisfies. Heralds form a professional class and would not be members of the Boule; μισθοτοί is very unflattering, roughly corresponding to 'hireling' (see Gomme, *HCT* iii. 502 n. 1). l. 7: κυμαῖσαι δὲ ἐ]σαγογέα[ς τριάκοντα *ATL* ii; ἡε δὲ βολὲ καὶ ἐ]σαγογέα[ς κλεροσάτο *ATL* i, BW. l. 8: χου[γγραμματέα ἐ]χσ ἡαπάντ]ον *ATL* i and ii; ἐκ σφῶν αὐ]τῶν BW: ἐ δὲ β[ολὲ τὸν φόρον ἡελέ]σθο [ἡοὶ τάχσοσι δέκα *ATL*. l. 9: ἀφ' ἐς ἄ]ν ἡαιρεθέντες τυγχάνοσι ἐγγραψάντων] *ATL* i, BW; ἀφ' ἐς ἄ]ν ἡαιρεθῶσι ὁμομοκότες ἀναγραφάντων] *ATL* ii. l. 12: ἡοἱ ἐ]ρ[α]χ[ογῆς ἐ]πιμ[ε]λεθέντων τῶ φόρο καθάπερ ἂν φσε]φίσεται ἡο [δέμος *ATL* ii; we follow *ATL* i, BW. l. 13: ἐπάναγκες δὲ ἡο ἄ]ρχον κα[ὶ ἡ]ο πολέμαρ[χος χσνδεχέσθον τὰς δίκας] *ATL* i; ἡούτοι δὲ καὶ ἡο ἄ]ρχον κα[ὶ ἡ]ο πολέμαρ[χος ἀνακρινάντων] *ATL* ii. The restoration in the text is an improvement in *ATL* iv, p. ix, on a suggestion by BW. ll. 14 f.: ἐ[ὰν δὲ ἡοι τάκται μὲ τάττοσι τῆσι] | πόλεσι *ATL* ii; ἐ[ὰν δὲ μὲ εὐθὺς χρεματίζοσι τῆσι] | πόλεσι *ATL* i, BW. l. 16: [νομο]θέτα[ι neatly fills the space, but the responsibility of establishing a new court does not seem appropriate to νομοθέται (nor is the office otherwise known at Athens until the last years of the century). We should expect the *thesmothetai* to have been appointed. Perhaps they were, and the mason left a letter out, ? θε(σ)μο]θέτα[ι. l. 18: φθίνοντος τῶ Π]οσιδε[ἰῶ]νος μενός· χ[ρεματίζεν δὲ περὶ τῶ φόρο εὐθὺς *ATL* i, BW. l. 20: χ[συνεχῆς *ATL*. l. 28: κ[αὶ μὲ φσεφίζονται δικαστ]ῆριον *ATL* ii; κ[αὶ τὲμ βολὲν καὶ τὸ δικαστ]ῆριον *ATL* i, BW. l. 30: Ἄ]θENA[ῖαι τῆι Νίκει τὸν γρ]αμματέα *ATL* i, BW. ll. 34 and 36: For the tribe name see below. ll. 38 f.: We follow Bannier, *ATL* i, BW.; τὸς δ[ὲ κέρυ]κας π[ροσσε]κλεμέ[νος ἀχθ]ῆνα[ι *ATL* ii. l. 41: ἡίνα μὲ αὐ]τοὶ ἄτακτοὶ ἰοσι *ATL* ii; ἡίνα μὲ αὐ]τοτελεῆς ἀπίοσιν *ATL* i, BW. l. 42: ἡό]πο ἂν δοκέ[ι τοῖς ἄρχοσι ἀνειπῆν *ATL* ii; ἡό]πο ἂν δοκέ[ι τῶι δέμοι ἀποφαίνεν *ATL* i, BW. l. 53: δελδοσαι ἐς τ]ὸ δικαστῆριον *ATL* ii; ἐφίεναι ἐς τ]ὸ δικαστῆριον *ATL* i, BW, but this is the language of appeal. ἐσφῆρην would be more appropriate. l. 59: καὶ ἡε ἐλῖαία ἐ]πὶ Στρατοκλ[έος BW following Schöll. The space, however, is almost certainly to be filled by a demotic, both here and in the following line.

Though more than half of this decree is missing, and though much of the detail depends on restoration that is far from secure, the length

of the line is known and the main provisions are clear. The Athenians order a new assessment. Ten assessors are to be selected by the Boule and sworn in, and must draw up within five days the list of cities to be assessed. Heralds are to be sent out, two to each of the four districts of the empire, to announce the assessment and to require the cities to send representatives to Athens in Maimakterion (November-December). A new jury court of 1,000 is to be set up and *eisagogeis* are to be appointed to be responsible for the hearing of tribute cases. The court for hearing these cases shall be in session throughout Posideion (January-February) and must complete its work by the end of the month. The main work of assessment is theirs; the final responsibility is shared by the Boule. The decree also looks forward. In future there must be a reassessment every four years at the time of the great Panathenaia and the *prytaneis* in office at the time will be held responsible and heavily fined if this is not done. There is also a clause (46-50) probably allowing for individual changes of assessment in years when there was no general assessment. (Some controversial details will be discussed below.)

The main purpose of the decree is to raise money for the war: 'they shall not assess a smaller tribute for any city than it was previously paying, unless owing to the poverty of the territory they cannot pay more' (21-2, as restored). Below the decree the cities were listed with their new assessments and there is no doubt that this instruction dominated proceedings in Posideion. At the foot of the list the grand total was recorded, but the first letter is missing. The tribute demanded from the empire was either 960-1,000 T. or 1,460-1,500 T. (see p. 199). By 1935 sufficient evidence had accumulated to make the higher figure inevitable. Two district totals in large part survive. The Hellespontine district, whose assessment before the war was not more than 85 T., is now required to pay between 250 and 300 T. (𐀀𐀀𐀀[- -]); the Thracian district's total is raised from c. 130 T. to between 310 and 350 T. (𐀀𐀀𐀀[- -]); and the island district, complete or nearly complete, though the total is not preserved, is required to pay at least 160 T. in place of a pre-war c. 60 T. (omitting Aegina, occupied by Athens since 431 and no longer paying tribute). The minimum combined total for these three districts is 720 T., which, if the lower total were right, would leave a maximum of 280 T. for the Ionian/Carian district, and two new groups of cities, the Aktaian cities opposite Lesbos on the mainland and cities in the Euxine, which together were assessed at not less than 80 T. A balance of c. 200 T. only is left for Ionia/Caria, whose assessment before the war was not less than 150 T. Existing figures in this district show, as we should expect, that Ionia/Caria was not given such singular concessions; Kaunos for instance is raised from a pre-war $\frac{1}{2}$ T. to 10 T., Pedasos from 2 to

3 T., Syme from 1,800 dr. to 3 T. The grand total must have been more than 1,460 T.

This great increase was achieved mainly by a revolutionary revision in which very few states were unaffected; most had their tributes doubled or trebled, but the wide variety in proportional increase shows that, as the decree requires, cases were individually considered. The list also contained many names that had not appeared for a very long time, such as minor Carian cities which lapsed in the forties; we may infer that all cities which had ever paid were listed. Other states were included that are not known to have been assessed before. Melos is the most conspicuous example, required to pay 15 T., though it was neutral at the beginning of the war (Thuc. ii. 9. 4), resisted Athenian aggression successfully in 426 (Thuc. iii. 91. 1-3), and fought for independence in 416. There is also, at the end of the list, a substantial group of cities in the Euxine. No tribute payment for the Euxine is recorded in the pre-war lists, but it is possible that they were included in the assessment of 428. The Aktaian cities, listed after the Hellespontine district, had been taken by Athens from Mytilene in 427 (Thuc. iii. 50. 4), and were probably specially assessed then. In the thirties the number of cities recorded in the annual lists of *aparchai* never exceeded 175. In 425 not less than 380 and possibly more than 400 were assessed.

The assessment of 425 was in more respects than its scale extraordinary. It was not in a Great Panathenaic year, and it was introduced so late that representatives could not be expected to come to Athens from the cities until the winter (Maimakterion). Some special explanation is required, and most scholars have attributed the assessment to the influence of Cleon. Gomme (*HCT* iii. 500 ff.) has emphasized that for this there is no positive evidence; the silence of Thucydides, he thinks, and even more of Aristophanes, who in 424 made Cleon a central figure in his *Knights*, is barely consistent with this view. The indirect arguments, however, remain very strong indeed. Whatever the precise date of the decree, it was passed within three months of Cleon's spectacular success on Sphacteria, when his reputation at Athens was at its height (he was still popular enough to be elected general in 424). If Meritt and Wade-Gery are right (*AJP* lvii (1936) 377-94), the influence of Cleon's capture of the Spartans was direct and immediate, but their thesis raises difficulties. In the middle of the decree (l. 34), a prytany with six letters assuming that *hε* before it was spelt with the aspirate (Oineis or Aegeis) is required to bring 'this business' before the *ekklesia* and carry it through before the end of its period of office, under threat of heavy penalties; but for the prytany under which the decree was in fact passed (l. 3) seven and not six letter-spaces are available, Leontis or Aiantis. Though

there is no explicit record preserved in our sources, it is virtually certain that the order of prytanies was not established at the beginning of the year and that the name of the next prytany was unknown, except by elimination in the ninth, until the end of its predecessor's term (Ferguson, *The Athenian Secretaries*, 19-27; Brillant, *Les Secrétaires Athéniens*, 23 f.). The business was to be brought before the *ekklesia* on the second day after the [return] of the expedition (34-5). Since the terms of reference imply that the prytany will be nearing the end of its term when the business is submitted to the *ekklesia*, Meritt and Wade-Gery infer that the introduction of the decree was delayed beyond the second prytany into the third. This delay they explain by Cleon's movements. They suggest that the probouleuma was drafted in the Boule immediately the news of the surrender reached Athens, but that Cleon took longer than had been expected in returning home. When the fighting was done there was less need for haste and, though he fulfilled his promise by returning to Athens within twenty days, they were three or four days out in their calculation. This is a possible explanation, but not in itself probable, and there is a further objection. If this reconstruction is right, a stele was set up on the Acropolis which said that the members of the [Oineis] prytany would be very heavily fined if they did not do what it was already known they had not done (ll. 34-8).

Other views therefore must be seriously considered. If in the two places (3 and 34) different tribes are indeed mentioned, then it is possible that the tribe of l. 3 is Leontis Pryt. II, followed by Oineis Pryt. III in l. 34, and that the decree was passed on the last day of Leontis when it was known that Oineis was to follow. This, however, though formally possible, perhaps relies too much on coincidence. An alternative is to believe that in l. 34 the mason wrote $\epsilon\acute{\lambda}\epsilon\acute{\omicron}\nu\tau\iota\varsigma$, though the aspirate is not dropped elsewhere in this inscription. This possibility, however, is strengthened if in l. 36 we restore, instead of $\epsilon\pi\iota\ \tau\acute{\epsilon}\lambda\iota\varsigma\ \epsilon\iota\pi\epsilon\mu\acute{\epsilon}\nu\epsilon\varsigma\ \pi\upsilon\tau\alpha\upsilon\epsilon\iota\alpha\varsigma$, which we do not think can mean 'the said prytany', $\epsilon\pi\iota\ \tau\acute{\epsilon}\lambda\iota\varsigma\ \Lambda\epsilon\omicron\nu\tau\acute{\iota}\delta\omicron\varsigma\ \pi\upsilon\tau\alpha\upsilon\epsilon\iota\alpha\varsigma$, the more normal formulation.

If this cardinal point in the argument of Meritt and Wade-Gery is questioned we may also question the close association of the decree with Cleon's success at Sphacteria. An alternative has been urged by McGregor, who argued that the evidence pointed to Nikias' expedition against Corinth (*TAPA* 1935, 146 ff.). Though some of his arguments were convincingly refuted by Meritt and Wade-Gery, his case is worth restating in a revised form. Meritt and Wade-Gery's case rests primarily on the time-table that they have reconstructed from Thucydides; if, however, we follow Gomme (*HCT* iii. 478, 719), we shall prefer McGregor's conclusion. There is roughly a month's

difference between the two time-tables, and the main reason for the discrepancy lies in the interpretation of Thucydides' indications of time at the beginning of Book IV. It is generally agreed that in the first year of the war the Spartans invaded Attica towards the end of May, when the corn was ripe (τοῦ σίτου ἀκμάζοντος, Thuc. ii. 19. 1). In 425 they invaded at roughly the same time as the Syracusans attacked Messene (ἐπιγιγνομένου θέρους περὶ σίτου ἐκβολήν, when the corn was in the ear, Thuc. iv. 1. 1). When the Spartans hastily withdrew from Attica, Thucydides says that a severe shortage of food was a contributory factor; for they had invaded early and the corn was still green (ἀμα δὲ πρῶ ἔσβαλόντες καὶ τοῦ σίτου ἐτι χλωροῦ ὄντος ἐσπάνιζον τροφῆς τοῖς πολλοῖς, Thuc. iv. 6. 1). Meritt and Wade-Gery hold that 'early' is to be taken with reference to the condition of the grain, rather than to dates by civil calendar or Julian reckoning. The Spartans invaded, they think, at roughly the normal date. Gomme is more probably right in holding that the invasion was earlier in the calendar than usual. The comparison of Thuc. iv. 2. 1 with iv. 1. 1 supports him. There is one further gain if we accept Gomme's timetable in which Cleon brings his Spartan prisoners to Athens at the end of July or the beginning of August. McGregor argued that the second decree of Thoudippos, which required all the allies included in the assessment to bring standard offerings to the Great Panathenaia, and which was passed when Aegeis was prytany, must have been later than Posideion, during which month appeals against assessments were to be heard in the special court established by the main decree. It was therefore later than Prytany IV, and the six-lettered tribe that the report of the *logistai* requires for the fourth prytany (No. 72. 18-19) must be Oineis, which should be restored in our decree at l. 34. This is the most natural way to understand the aorist in the second decree, *ἠοπός*[εσι πό]λεσι φόρος [ἐτάχ]θ[ε]; neither of the alternatives suggested by Meritt and Wade-Gery is convincing. Certainly the clause *might* refer to the preliminary assessment by the *τάκται*, which could be complete within a week of the decree, but it is much more likely to refer to the final assessment confirmed by the Boule after appeals have been heard. The alternative explanation—that ἐτάχθε is an epistolary aorist, 'used in relation to the time when the duties named in the main verb must be performed', is even less attractive. But though we believe that the expedition referred to in the main decree is more probably that of Nikias than that of Cleon, the date is still sufficiently near to Cleon's spectacular triumph to justify the belief that his political followers were primarily responsible for it.

The association with the followers of Cleon may also be reflected in the tone of the decree, for this is perhaps the strongest decree that

has survived from the fifth century. The executive is threatened with penalties at every turn, in a manner reminiscent of, but more intensive than, the Coinage decree (No. 45) and the decree of Kleinias (No. 46). The polemical tone of most of the clauses presupposes opposition, and a strong determination to override it. This is the bullying tone that gives Aristophanes so much scope in the *Knights*. It may also be relevant to emphasize that the sequence of clauses is extremely unsystematic; one has the impression that the text was drafted by an inexperienced man. Wade-Gery and Meritt have pointed out (op. cit. 392 n. 36) that in Speech IX of Isaeus there is a Cleon, son of Thoudippos, of the right age to be the son of our Thoudippos. His suggestion that Thoudippos may have married a daughter of Cleon and named one of his sons after his father-in-law is attractive, for Thoudippos is a rare name.

Some of the details of the assessment procedure outlined in the decree remain uncertain, and not only because there are many gaps in our text; Athenian decrees are considerably less precise than Roman, and much that we should like to know is taken for granted and not specified. The first provision of the decree is that heralds should be sent out to the cities of the empire requiring them to send representatives to Athens in Maimakterion. Much later in the decree it is laid down that the heralds are to announce in the cities 'the making of the assessments' (τὰς τὰ[χσ]ες, meaning the news that there is to be an assessment, not the assessment fixed for each city, cf. ll. 31 f.), and the demos is to prescribe by vote what the heralds are to say about the assessment (a strongly democratic feature; one would have thought that the Boule would have been better suited). We infer that representatives are to come to Athens from all cities on the assessors' list, and not only those who wish to appeal against their assessment. Meanwhile, at Athens the ten assessors would first have drawn up their list of cities and then (though this is not specified in the decree) assigned assessments to each, based presumably on the rough knowledge that was available in the Boule of the cities' resources and on the general injunction to increase the figures. The cities' representatives, hearing at Athens what was proposed, had the right of appeal to a special court of 1,000. A similar court, but of 1,500, is recorded in the quota-list of 429 (Lepper, *JHS* lxxxii (1962) 33 f. suggests that the heading in question refers not to the current assessment of 430 but to 434). It would be interesting to know when the Athenians introduced the principle of appeal against assessment to an Athenian court. It is not likely to have been in force while tribute was paid to Delos, nor immediately after the transfer of the treasury from Delos to Athens in 454. The assessment of 450 is a possible context, especially if peace was made with Persia in that year. Perhaps,

however, 446 is a more likely date, when Athens, after the shocks of Koroneia and the revolts of Euboea and Megara, was prepared to make concessions to retain her hold over her 'allies' (see p. 86). This may be what is meant when the Chalkidians, after the crushing of their revolt in 446, are required to include in their oath: *καὶ τὸν φόρον ὑποτελεῖ Ἀθηναίοισιν, ἢ ἂν πείθο Ἀθηναίος* (No. 52, ll. 25-7). The decree does not make it clear that only appeal cases go to court, but common sense demands it, and the use of the term *διαδικασίαι* implies a decision between two claims, in this case the assessments proposed by the Athenian *taktai* and the allies' counter-proposals (for the view that all tribute went before the Heliaia, see BW, pp. 14 f.). When the assessment has been finally approved by the Boule, the generals, according to reasonable restoration, are to be at once responsible for seeing that the cities bring their tribute; it is interesting to note that Thucydides records the activities of a squadron of *νήες ἀργυρολόγοι* operating in the winter of 425-4 and the summer of 424 (Thuc. iv. 50. 1, 75).

Of the next clause, the penultimate of the decree, very little is preserved. It seems to provide for extraordinary assessments of individual cities by the Boule in the light of an annual review by the generals of the anticipated military and naval expenses of the year. The procedure in these extraordinary assessments is to be simple. No *taktai*, *eisagogeis*, or special court are to be appointed; the work will be confined to the Boule unless the Assembly votes that these assessments should go first before a popular court. After a short clause dealing with the pay of the heralds a rider is added, the sense of which is controversial (ll. 51-7). It seems to be laid down that certain assessments are to be referred to the court in order that the jurors may concur. According to *ATL* (iii. 76) 'assessments which have been decided after appeal and which the Boule includes in its final list must be reported back to the court. Previously (ll. 14-16) the *taktai* have been ordered to make such assessments in accordance with the decisions of the court. The rider now gives to the court the opportunity to see that its decisions have been carried out by the *taktai*.' We think it more probable that the rider refers to the extraordinary assessments of the penultimate clause. It is a democratic insistence that the Boule shall not have the final word; their recommendations must be submitted to the popular court for their approval.

A second and substantially later decree, proposed also by Thoudippos, prescribes that all the cities that have been assessed are to bring cow and panoply to the Great Panathenaia. This requirement has been thought, by Mattingly (*Hist.* x (1961) 153) and others, to be an innovation, referred to soon after by the decree of Kleinias (No. 46, ll. 41 f.), which is primarily concerned with the tightening

up of tribute collection. In our commentary on that decree we have given reason for dating it before the Peloponnesian War, and probably in the forties. The instruction in the assessment decree of 425 is better interpreted as the application of a current rule to *all* the cities on the assessment list, including many who have either never paid tribute before, or not paid for many years.

Below the decree the cities with their new assessments are listed in four columns. The districts are in a new order (Islands, Ionia-Caria, Hellespont, Thrace) and include two headings not found before. The Aktaian cities, added as an appendix to the Hellespont (col. iii. ll. 124 ff.) are on the mainland opposite Lesbos, and were taken by Athens from Mytilene when her revolt was crushed in 427 (Thuc. iii. 50. 3). No Euxine names (here an appendix to Thrace) have survived from any earlier list, but the evidence for the years from 428 to 425 is negligible; they may have been incorporated in 428. Each district list is followed by a district total, and the grand total is recorded at the bottom of the stele. There is a margin of error in calculating the number of cities now assessed. We can only roughly estimate the number of cities occupying two lines; more important, the gaps between the districts cannot be securely determined. The *ATL* text assumes eight uninscribed lines after the island total, and two other substantial gaps, after the Ionian district and after the Aktaian cities, which immediately follow the Hellespontine total. The main reason is the difficulty otherwise of filling out the Aktaian appendix. Dow, however, emphasizes that the normal practice in tribute quota-lists is to leave no such gap, and we are inclined to follow him (Dow, *TAPA* lxxii (1941) 70-84; see also *ATL* ii. 43 n.). The *ATL* text allows for *c.* 380 cities; if Dow is right, there could be up to 410. In either case there are considerably more names than the 341 otherwise known (though in no single year, so far as we know, had the number of cities recorded as paying exceeded 190).

We give the district totals, the island district, and an extract from the Ionian-Carian panel.

ἡ[ελλεσποντίο φόρο

κεφ[άλαιον]

⊃⊃⊃[- - -

Phot.: *ATL* i. 115, fig. 164.

[Θραικίῳ φόρο]

[κεφάλαιον]: ⊃⊃⊃⊃[-

Phot.: *ATL* i. 116, fig. 167.

[κεφάλαιον] [τ]ῶ χούμπαντος: [×]⊃⊃⊃⊃⊃⊃[- -

Phot.: *ATL* i. 117, fig. 170.

From col. i.

	<i>Νεσιοτικὸς φόρο[ς]</i>	
	ΑΑΑ Πάρι[ο]ι	(18)
	ΑΒ Νάχσ[ιο]ι	(6½)
	ΑΒ Άνδρ[ιοι]	(6)
65	ΑΒ Μέλιο[ι]	—
	ΒΤΤΤΤ Σίφνι[οι]	(3)
	ΑΒ Έρετρι[ῆς]	(3)
	Β Θεραί[οι]	—
	Α Κεῖο[ι]	(4)
70	Β Καρύσ[τιοι]	(5)
	Α Χαλκι[δῆς]	(3)
	ΒΤ Κύθνι[οι]	(3)
	Α Τέν[ι]ο[ι]	(2)
	ΤΤ Στ[υ]ρῆς	(1)
75	[ΤΤ] Μ[υ]κόνι[οι]	(1)
	[ΤΤ] [Σ]ερίφιρ[ι]	(1)
	[Τ] Ἰῆται	(3,000 dr.)
	[Τ] <i>vacat</i> Διῆς	(2,000 dr.)
	Τ Ἄθηνῖται	(2,000 dr.)
80	Τ Σύριοι	(1,500 dr.)
	ΧΧ Γρυγχῆς	(1,000 dr.)
	Χ Ῥεναιῆς	(300 dr.)
	ΧΧ Διακρῆς ἀπ[ὸ]	(800 dr.)
	Χαλκιδέον	
85	Χ Ἄναφαῖοι	—
	<i>vacat</i> Κερία Δ	—
	ΧΧ Φολέγανδρος	—
	ΗΗΗ Βέλβινα	—
	Χ Κίμολος	—
90	Χ Σικινέται	—
	Η Ποσιδεῖον	—
	ἐν Εὐβοίαι	
	ΤΧΧ Διά[κρ]ιοι	—
	ἐν Ε[ὐ]βοία[ι]	
95	<i>vacat</i> [ἡ]εφ[αι]στ[ί]ε[ς]	
	ΤΤΤΤ [ἡ]ο[ι] ἐν Λέμνοι	(3)
	[<i>vacat</i>] [Μυριναῖοι]	(1½)
	[Τ] [Ἰμβριοι]	(1)
	[Νεσιοτικὸς φόρο]	
100	[κεφάλαιον]	
	[ΗΒΑΤΤΤΤΗΗΗΗΔ]	

Figures in brackets after the city-name are from the assessments of the thirties, and are in talents, except where stated.

From the Ionian-Carian panel, col. ii, ll. 138-57

	X	<i>Καρυα</i> [υδῆς]	(500 dr.)
	𐀀	<i>Βρυκόντιοι</i>	(500 dr.)
140	X	<i>Ταρβανῆς</i>	(?)
	X	<i>Μύνδιοι</i>	(500 dr.)
		<i>παρὰ Τέρμερα</i>	
	𐀀𐀁	<i>Ἐδριῆς Ἰμεσσῆς</i>	
		<i>Κυρομές</i>	
145	𐀂𐀂	<i>Τέλος</i>	—
	𐀂𐀂	<i>Κελένδερις</i>	—
	XXXX	<i>Ἰτύρα</i>	—
	XXX	<i>Σύμε</i>	(1,800 dr.)
	XXX	<i>Π(ε)δ(α)σῆς</i>	(?)
150	XX	<i>ἠυδαιῆς</i>	
	H	<i>Ἐλαιόσιοι</i>	(100 dr.)
		<i>Ἐρυθραίων</i>	
	[—]	[Ἰ]ερά παρὰ	—
		[Σι]θυμέας	
155	[—]	[Κρυε]ς	(2,000 dr.)
	[—]	[Ἀσπεν]δος	—
		[ἐμ Πάμφ]υλῖαι	

Of these cities, *Πεδασῆς*, *ἠυδαιῆς*, *Ἰμεσσῆς* are not recorded on any fragments of the quota-lists after 446. Of the joint payers, *Ἐδριῆς* are not recorded earlier. *Ἰμεσσῆς* had in the first two periods paid 1,200 dr.; *Κυρομές* (more commonly *Ἰρομές*) paid 2,500 dr. before 438. Among those enrolled for the first known time Kelen-deris (l. 146) and Aspendos (l. 156) are east of the Chelidonian Isles, a region generally regarded as in the Persian sphere.

70

Athens honours Herakleides of Klazomenai:

424-3 B.C.

The lower part of a marble stele, found on the Acropolis; now in EM.

Ionic letters of the early fourth century, stoichedon 31. Phot.: Pečírka, *The Formula for the Grant of Enktesis in Attic Inscriptions* (Prague, 1966), Pl. 1.

IG ii². 8; Foucart, *BCH* xii (1888) 163-9; Köhler, *Hermes*, xxvii (1892) 68-78; West, *AJP* lvi (1935) 72; Wade-Gery, *Essays*, 208; Stockton, *Hist.* viii (1959) 74-9; Pečírka, *op. cit.*, 22-5.

- ψηφισμα τόδε κ]-
 [αὶ τὸ πρότερον γενόμενον Ἡρακλείδῃ]
 ἀναγράψαι τὸν [γραμματέα τῆς βολῆς κα]-
 ἰ θέναι ἐν πόλει.
- ἔδοξεν τῇ βολῇ κ[αὶ τῶι δήμῳ... 6...]
 ..s ἐπρυτάνευεν, Σ[... ἐγραμμάτευεν],
- 5 [N]εοκλείδης ἐπεστ[άτει,..... 12.....]
 [εἰ]πεν· Ἡρακλείδην [τὸν Κλαζομένιον ἀν]-
 [αγρ]άψαι τὸν γραμμ[ατέα τῆς βολῆς πρόξ]-
 [ενο]ν καὶ εὐεργέτη[ν καθότι ἀν τῶι δήμῳ]-
 [ι δο]κῆι καὶ θέναι ἐ[ν πόλει, ἐπειδὴ εὖ ἐπ]-
 10 [όησ]εν τὰς Ἀθηναίω[ν πρεσβείας καὶ ἐν π]-
 [ᾶσι ᾶ]νήρ ἐστι ἀγαθ[ὸς εἰς τὸν δῆμον τὸν]
 [Ἀθη]ναίων. Θεοκυδίδη[s εἶπε· τὰ μὲν ἄλλα κ]-
 [αθά]περ τῇ βολῇ· ἐπ[ειδὴ δὲ οἱ πρέσβες]
 [οἱ π]αρὰ βασιλέως ἤκ[οντες ἀγγέλοισι Ἡ]-
 15 [ρακ]λείδην συμπράτ[τεν ἑαυτοῖς προθύ]-
 [μωσ] ἔς τε τὰσπονδὰς [τὰς πρὸς βασιλέα εἶ]-
 [ς τε ᾶ]λλο ὅ τι ἐπαγγέ[λειαν, ἐναὶ Ἡρακλε]-
 [ίδῃ] γῆς ἔγκτησιν κα[ὶ οἰκίας Ἀθήνησι]-
 [ν καὶ ᾶ]τέλειαν καθάπ[ερ τοῖς ἄλλοις πρ]-
 20 [οξένο]ις· καὶ ἑάμ πο βια[ίωι θανάτωι ἀπο]-
 [θάνῃ, ἐναὶ π]ερὶ αὐτῷ τ[ῆν τιμορίαν καθ]-
 [ἄπερ..... 10.....]N^Γ[

We have added letters to 3, 12, 13, 16, 20, 22. ll. 20-1: We follow Wilhelm, *Sitzb. Wien.* ccxvii, 5, 23 f. In 21-2 [καθ|ἄπερ Ἀθηναίοις ἀ]γα-
 χ[έγραπται would fit, but is unparalleled.

At the top of the stone there survive a few letters from the end of a decree, and below, separated by a space, a second decree honouring Herakleides, who is to have the title of *proxenos* and benefactor for his services to Athens. A rider mentions the King of Persia, a treaty, and probably envoys. The lettering suggests the early fourth century, and Foucart identified this Herakleides with Herakleides of Byzantium, who was similarly honoured for helping Thrasybulus in 389 to recover Byzantium (Dem. xx. 58); the treaty was the King's Peace of 387. Köhler more convincingly advocated Herakleides of Klazomenai, who was elected general by the Athenians (Plat. *Ion* 541 d) and was

also responsible for raising Assembly pay from 2 to 3 obols (Arist. *Ἀθ. Πολ.* 41); appropriately he was nicknamed “ὁ βασιλεύς” (ibid.). The treaty he identified with Andocides’ treaty of friendship with Persia negotiated by an embassy in which his uncle Epilykos served (Andoc. iii. 29). Herakleides was honoured for services rendered to the Athenian envoys. The fourth-century lettering Köhler explained as a copy of a fifth-century decree destroyed by the Thirty (cf. Tod, vol. ii, no. 98), added to a later decree perhaps conferring citizenship. Köhler’s conclusions were considerably strengthened by Wade-Gery’s further identifications. Andocides’ uncle Epilykos could be the first secretary of the Boule in 424-3; the president of the Assembly that voted the decree was probably Neokleides, secretary of Aegeis in 424-3, and the mover of the rider, Thucydides, treasurer of Athena in the same year (*Essays* 207 f.). A treaty with Darius, in his first year, towards the end of 424-3 made good historical sense.

In the course of a strong attack on the Peace of Kallias, D. Stockton has revived Foucart’s identification with Herakleides of Byzantium (*Hist.* viii (1959) 74 ff.), but there remain decisive objections: (1) In l. 6 the ethnic has to be added after the name; τὸν Κλαζομένιον gives precisely the number of letters required. Stockton suggests τὸν ἐκ Βυζαντίου, which must be rejected because the cutter uses ο for ου in *Θοκυδίδ[ης]*, in l. 12, and would almost certainly have inscribed τὸν Βυζάντιον. (2) Realizing that the Athenians were extremely unlikely to reward anyone for helping to secure the King’s Peace, which was a humiliation to them, Stockton suggests that the king in question might have been either Seuthes or Medokos, but no Thracian king would be called βασιλεύς without qualification: βασιλεύς, standing alone, must mean the Persian King. (3) Demosthenes says that Herakleides of Byzantium was voted the title of πρόξενος and εὐεργέτης and given complete ἀτελεία. These honours are recorded in our decree, but with them also is γῆς ἔγκτησις (see p. 263), which is not mentioned by Demosthenes.

Raubitschek, while accepting the treaty, dates it, and with it our decree, in 415 (*Gk. Rom. Byz. Stud.*, v (1964) 156); his hypothesis seems to us insufficiently strong to outweigh the evidence collected by Wade-Gery (see also Andrewes, *Hist.* x (1961) 3, n. 6).

71 (73)

Decree concerning the Priestess of Athena Nike:

424-3 B.C.

On the reverse of the stele which bears No. 44 (q.v.); now in EM.

ll. 1-6 (to *κες*) have developed Attic letters; the remainder, by a different hand, Ionic. Stoichedon 23. Phot.: *Ἀρχ. Ἐφ.* 1897, Pl. 2; Kern 14.

IG i². 25; Meritt, *AJP* lvi (1935) 71; Wade-Gery, *Essays*, 209; Mattingly, *Hist.* x (1961) 169-71; Meritt and Wade-Gery, *JHS* lxxxiii (1963) 110 f.

ἔδοχσεν τῆι βολῆι καὶ τῶι δέ-
μοι, Αἰγείς ἐπρυτάνευε, Νεοκ-
λείδες ἐγραμμάτευε, Ἀγνόδε-
μος ἐπεστάτε, Καλλίας εἶπε· τ-
5 εἰ *ἕρεαι* τῆς Ἀθηνάας τῆς Νί-
κες [[^α]] πεντήκοντα δραχμὰς τὰ-
ς γεγραμμένας ἐν τῆι στήλ[ηι]
ἀποδιδόναι τὸς κωλακρ[έτας],
οἱ ἂν κωλακρετῶσι τῶ Θ[αργηλ]-
10 [ἰῶ]νος μηνός, τῆι ἱερ[έαι τῆς Ἀ]-
[θην]αίας τῆς Νίκης[ς....8....]

In l. 6 the first hand inscribed ^α, which was subsequently erased; the second hand spelt out the figure. For the punctuation in ll. 9-10 see Wilhelm, *Sitzb. Wien.* 217. 5 (1939) 63 f.

The earlier decree on the front face of the stone had specified that the priestess was to receive 50 dr. (a year). It seems that, if she was appointed in the early forties, as the earlier decree required (No. 44), her salary had not yet been paid or had been paid irregularly, or by different officials. Meritt and Wade-Gery (op. cit. 111) think it more probable that Myrrhine had been paid regularly from the beginning. 'The new decree plans something new about the cult (we can only guess what) and it begins with a recapitulation about something that will not be altered by the innovation.' This is a formally possible but rather forced interpretation. For Mattingly, who dates the earlier decree c. 427, there is no difficulty: 'As it [the temple] was being finished certain details about the priestess' salary were formally settled.' Still believing in the early forties as the context of the first decree we infer either that Myrrhine, for reasons we do not understand, had not yet been paid, or that she had been paid at a different

time of the year. We also doubt whether the original text continued substantially further; on the front face the extant text has already reached an amendment, which does not seem to be of major importance.

‘It [sc. the second decree] is doubtless consequent on the news of the treaty, being a renewal of *IG* i². 24 which itself was doubtless consequent on the news of the treaty with Artaxerxes’ (Wade-Gery, *Essays* 209). This may be too confident, but the conjunction of treaty and decree is probably not coincidence. Kallias, the mover, may be the grandson of the Kallias who led the Athenian peace embassy to Susa in 450 or 449 (*PA* 7826).

The date is given by the secretary Neokleides (see No. 70, and Wade-Gery, *Essays* 308 f.).

72 (64)

Loans to the Athenian State from the
Sacred Treasuries:

426-5 to 423-2 B.C.

Eighteen fragments, of which two are uninscribed, of a white marble stele, found on the Acropolis; now in EM, with the exception of *h* (ll. 108-23), which is lost. Reworking has removed four letter-spaces on the left and five or six on the right, and left bevelled edges.

Developed Attic writing, stoichedon; some irregularities must be assumed, but their extent and reason are in dispute. The aspirate sign is always omitted in the words *ἑμέρα*, *ἕκαστος*, and *ἐνδέκα*. Phot. of *d*, *i-p*: Meritt, *Calendar*, 6-24; of *q*: *Hesp.* iv (1935) 159; of parts of *b*: Pritchett, *Ancient Athenian Calendars*, Pl. 20, and *Hesp.* xxxiv, Pl. 57; of parts of *e* and *k*: *AJP* lxxxv (1964) 40. Facs. of all fragments except *q*: Meritt, *Calendar*, Pl. i; *AFD* Pl. xii.

Textual bibliography: *IG* i². 324+, 306. Modern study starts with Meritt, *The Athenian Calendar in the Fifth Century*. Meritt, *AFD* 128-51; Broneer, *Hesp.* iv (1935) 158 f. (fragment *q*); Meritt, *CQ* xl (1946) 60-4; *SEG* x. 227+; Pritchett and Neugebauer, *Calendars of Athens*, 94-105; Meritt, *Athenian Year*, 60-71; Pritchett, *Ancient Athenian Calendars on Stone* (Univ. Calif. Publ. Class. Arch. iv) 270-3, 290-312. Lang, *Hesp.* xxxiii (1964) 146-67; Pritchett, *Hesp.* xxxiv (1965) 131-47; Lang (with Meritt), *Hesp.* xxxiv (1965) 224-47; Lang and Meritt, *CQ* xviii (1968) 84-94.

[τάδε ἐλογίσαν]το ἦοι λογιστα[ὶ ἐν τοῖς τέτ]ταρσιν ἔτεσιν ἐκ Παναθηναίων
 ἐς [Παναθέναια ὄφελ]-
 [όμενα· τάδε ἦο]ι ταμίαι παρέδοσ[αν Ἄνδρο]κλῆς Φλυεύς καὶ χσυν-
 ἄρχοντες ἡελλ[ενοταμίαις...]

- [.....IO.....]εἰ καὶ χουνάρχουσι[ν στρατ]εγοῖς ἡπποκράτει Χολαργεῖ
καὶ χου[νάρχουσιν ἐπὶ τῆς]
[Κεκροπίδο]ς πρυτανείας δευτέ[ρας πρυ]τανευούσες, τέτταρες ἑμέραι
ἔσαν ἔσελ[ελυθυῖαι, ἐπὶ τῆ]-
5 [ς βολῆς ἡῆι] Μεγακλείδης πρῶτο[ς ἔγραμμ]μάτευε, ἐπὶ Εὐθύνο ἀρχοντος,
ἄ· τῶκος τ[ούτοις ἐγένετο]
[ϞϞϞϞϞΔΔ]ΔΔΓϞ; ὡ δευτέρα δόσις ἐπ[ὶ τῆς Κ]εκροπίδος δευτέρας
πρυτανευούσες, λοι[παὶ ἔσαν ἡεπτὰ ἐ]-
[μέραι] τῆι πρυτανεῖαι, Ϟ· τῶκος τ[ούτον ὡ] ΤΤΧϞϞϞϞϞϞΔΔ ὡ τρίτε
δόσις ἐπὶ τῆς Παν[διονίδος πρυτα]-
[νείας] τετάρτες πρυ[τ]ανευούσες, [ἔσελελ]υθυῖας πέντε ἑμέρας τῆς
πρυτανείας, ἄ[ἄϞΤΤΤϞϞϞϞΔ|||C· τ]-
[όκος τ]ούτον ὡ ΤΧϞϞϞΔΓϞϞϞϞ|| ὡ τ[ετάρτ]ε δόσις ἐπὶ τῆς Ἀκα-
μαντίδος πρυτανεῖα[ς ὀγδόες πρυταν]-
10 [ευόσ]ες, πέντε ἑμέρας ἔσελελυθ[ύας τῆ]ς πρυτανείας, ἄ· ἄ· ἄ· ἄ· [Τ]ΤΤΤ
ΧΧΧ· τῶκος τούτο[ν ὡ] ΤΧΧΧΧϞϞϞϞϞϞ
[πέμπ]τε δόσις ἐπὶ τῆς Ἀκαμαν[τίδος πρ]υτανείας ὀγδόες πρυτανευούσες
ἔσελελ[υθυῖας δέκα ἐμέ]-
[ρας τ]ῆς πρυτανείας, Ϟ· τῶκος τ[ούτον ὡ]ΤΤΤϞϞϞϞϞϞΔΔΔΔ ὡ
ἡέκτη δόσις ἐπὶ τῆς Ἐρε[χθείδος πρυταν]-
[είας] δεκάτες πρυτανευούσε[ς, ἔσελελ]υθυῖας ἡεπτὰ ἑμέρας τῆς πρυτα-
νείας, ἄ· Ϟ· [ΤΤΧΧΧ· τῶκος τού]-
[τοις] ἐγένετο ΧΧΧΧϞϞΔΔϞϞ(Ϟ)|| || ὡ κεφ[άλαιον τῷ ἀρχαίῳ ἀνα-
λόματος ἐπὶ τῆς Ἄνδρ[οκλέος ἀρχῆς κα]-
15 [ὶ χου]ναρχόντον ϞϞϞϞϞϞϞϞϞϞϞϞϞϞϞϞ[Δ|||C ὡ τ]όκο κεφάλαιον τῷ ἀργυρίῳ
τῷ ἀναλοθέντ[ι ἐπὶ τῆς Ἄνδροκ]-
[λέος] ἀρχῆς καὶ χουναρχόντο[ν ἄΤΗ]ϞΔΔΔΔΓϞϞϞϞ ϞϞϞϞϞ
τάδε παρέδοσαν ἡοι τα[μίαι Φοκιάδες ἐ]-
[χς Οἶ]ο καὶ χουναρχόντες, ἐπὶ Σ[τρα]τοκλέος ἀρχοντος καὶ ἐπὶ τῆς
βολῆς ἡῆι Πλ[ειστίας πρῶτος ὡ]
[ἔγραμμ]μάτευε, στρατεγοῖς περ[ὶ Πε]λοπόννησον Δε[μ]οσθένει Ἀλκι-
σθένος Αἰφιδ[ναῖοι, ἐπὶ τῆς ...]-
[εἶδος] πρυτανείας τετάρτες [πρυτα]νευούσες, τρίτει ἐ[μέ]ραι τῆς πρυτα-
νείας ἔσ[ελελυθυῖας, ἐχς]
20 [Ὁπισθ]οδόμο ἄ· ἄ· τῶκος τούτο[ις ἐγέν]ετο ϞϞϞϞϞϞϞΔ ὡ ἡετέρα
δόσις στρατεγοῖς [Νικίαι Νικεράτ]-
[ο Κυδα]ντίδει καὶ χουνάρχο[σιν ἐπὶ] τῆς Πανδιονίδος πρυτανείας ἑνάτες
πρυτ[ανευούσες, πέμπτ]-

- [ει καὶ] δεκάτει ἐμέραι τῆς π[ρυταν]είας ἐσελελυθυίας, ἠ· τόκος τούτοις
 ἐγένε[το ΤΤΧΧΧ^ΠΗΗΗ υυ]
 [κεφάλ]αιον τῷ ἀρχαίῳ ἀναλόμ[ατος] ἐπὶ τῆς Φοκιάδο ἀρχῆς καὶ
 χσυναρχόντων ἠ[ΔΔΔ υ τόκο κεφάλαι]-
 [ιον τῷ ἀ]ργυρίῳ τῷ ἀναλοθ[έντι] ἐπὶ τῆς Φοκιάδο ἀρχῆς καὶ χσυναρ-
 χόντων Τ[ΤΤΧΧΧ^ΠΗΗΔ υυυυ]
 25 [τάδε παρέδ]οσαν ἡοι ταμίαι Θ[οκυ]δίδες Ἀχερδόσιος καὶ χσυνάρχοντες,
 ἐπὶ Ἴσ[άρχο] ἄρχοντος κα-
 [ὶ ἐπὶ τῆς βολῆς] ἡ[εἰ] Ἐπί[λ]υ[κος] [πρῶ]τος ἐγραμμάτευε, ἡελλενοταμίαις
 ἡένους Δ[.....Ι4.....]
 [...6...καὶ χσυνάρχουσι καὶ νέοις] Χαροπίδει Σκα[μβ]ονίδει καὶ
 χσυνάρχουσι [ἐπὶ τῆς ἡιπποθον]-
 [τίδος πρυτανείας πρότες πρυταν]ευόσες, ἡέκτει καὶ εἰκοστῇ τῆς
 πρυτανεί[ας,.....Ι2.....]
 [..ΔΔΔΤΤ^Π^ΠΗΗΗΗ^ΠΔΔΔ^ΠΗΗ· τόκος το]ύτοις ἐγένετο ΧΧΧΧ
^ΠΗ^ΠΔ^ΠΓ^ΠΙ^ΠΙ^Π υ δευτέρα δ[όσις ἐπὶ τῆς ..5...]
 30 [.....2Ι.....πρυταν]ευόσες, δωδεκάτει τῆς πρυτανείας
 ΔΔΤΤΤ[.....Ι5.....]
 [.....2Ι.....τρίτε δ]όσις ἐπὶ τῆς Ἐρεχθεΐδος πρυτανείας
 ἡε[.....Ι6.....]
 [.....26.....]ΗΗ· τόκος τούτοις ἐγένετο ^ΠΗΔΔΔ
 ΗΗΙC υ τε[τάρτε δόσις ἐπὶ τῆς]
 [Ἀκαμαντίδος πρυτανείας ὀγδόες] πρυτανευόσες, τριακοστῇ τῆς πρυτα-
 ν[είας Η· τόκος...7...]
 [.....Ι7.....κεφάλαιον] τῷ ἀρχαίῳ ἀναλόματος ἐπὶ τῆς
 Θεοκυδίδο [ἀρχῆς καὶ χσυναρχόν]-
 35 [τον ἠ^ΠΔΤΤΤ υ κεφάλαιον τόκο τῷ] ἀργυρίῳ τῷ ἀναλοθέντι ἐπὶ τῆς
 Θεοκυδ[ίδο ἀρχῆς καὶ χσυναρ]-
 [χόντων ΤΤ^ΠΗΗΔ9.....τάδε παρ]έδοσαν ἡοι ταμίαι Τιμοκλῆς
 Εἰτεαῖος κ[αὶ χσυνάρχοντες, ἐπὶ]
 [Ἀμενίῳ ἄρχοντος καὶ ἐπὶ τῆς βολ]ῆς ἡεἰ Δεμέτριος Κολλυτεὺς πρῶτος
 ἐγρ[αμμάτευε,9.....]
 [.....22.....:.....Μυρρ]υνοσίοι καὶ χσυνάρχουσι ἐπὶ τῆς
 Ἀκαμα[ντίδος πρυτανείας υυ]
 [πρότες πρυτανευόσες δωδεκάτε]ι τῆς πρυτανείας ^Π^ΠΤΤΤΤΧΧΧΧ^Π
 ΗΗΔΔ τό[κος τούτοις ἐγένετον]
 40 [ΧΧΧΧΗΗΔΔΔΔΗΗΗΗΙΙΙΙ υ δευτέρ]α δόσις ἐπὶ τῆς Πανδιονίδος
 πρυτανεί[ας τρίτες πρυτανευυυ]-

- [όσες, δωδεκάτει τῆς πρυτανείας] ΤΤ^Π^Π. τόκος τούτοις ἐγένετο
 Η^ΠΔ^ΠΤ^ΠΤ^Π|||^Π[| υ τρίτε δόσι]ς [ἐπὶ τῆ υ]-
 [ς...6...ίδος πρυτανείας τετάρ]τες πρυτανευόσες, τετάρτει τῆς
 πρυτα[νείας, παρὰ] Σαμ[ίον ΔΤ υ]
 [ΧΧΧΗΗΗ· τόκος τούτοις ἐγένετο] ^ΠΠ^ΠΔ^ΠΔ^ΠΤ^Π| υ τετάρτε δόσις ἐπὶ
 τῆς Αἴαντ[ίδος πρυτ]ανεί[ας ὀγδό]-
 [ες πρυτανευόσες, τετάρτει καὶ] εἰκοστῆι τῆς πρυτανείας Η· τόκος
 τούτο[ις ἐγέν]ετο Χ^ΠΗ[Ηυυυ]
 45 [πέμπτε δόσις ἐπὶ τῆς Λεοντίδο]ς πρυτανείας δεκάτες πρυτανευόσες
 τ[εῖ τρίτ]ει τῆς πρ[υτανεί]-
 [ας Δ^ΠΤ^ΠΤ^ΠΗΔ^ΠΤ^Π||C· τόκος τούτον] ΗΔ^ΠΤ^Π||C υ κεφάλαιον τῷ
 ἀρχαίῳ ἀναλό[ματος] ἐπὶ τῆς Τι[μοκλέο]-
 [ς ἀρχῆς καὶ χουναρχόντον Η^ΠΔ^ΠΔ^ΠΤ^ΠΧ^ΠΗΔ^ΠΔ^ΠΔ^ΠΤ^Π||C υ κεφά]-
 λαιον τόκο τ[οῖς ἀ]ναλοθέσι χρ[έμασι υ]
 [ἐπὶ τῆς Τιμοκλέος ἀρχῆς καὶ χου]ναρχόντον Τ^ΠΗ^ΠΗ^ΠΔ^ΠΤ^Π||C υ κεφά-
 λαι[ον ἀν]αλόματος χσύ[μπαντ- υ]
 [ος Ἀθην]αίας ἐν τοῖ[ς] τέ[τταρσιν ἔ]τεσιν ἐκ Παναθηναίων ἐς Παν-
 αθέν[αια ³Π^ΠΠ^ΠΔ^ΠΔ^ΠΤ^ΠΧ[ΗΗ^ΠΤ^ΠΤ^Π]] υ
 50 [κεφά]λαιον τόκο χσύμπαν[τος Ἀθε]ναίας ἐν τοῖς τέτταρσιν ἔτεσιν
 ἐ[κ Παν]αθηναίων ἐς Πα[ναθέν- υ]
 [αια Δ^ΠΤ^ΠΤ^ΠΤ^ΠΧΧΧ^ΠΗ^ΠΗ^ΠΗ^ΠΗ^ΠΔ^ΠΔ^ΠΠ[...5... τάδε] Ἀθηναίας Νίκες
 ἐ[πὶ τῆςΙΟ.....]ς πρυτανείας [...6...]
 [...πρ]υτανευόσες, τετάρτε[ι τῆς πρυτα]νείας Τιμοκ[λῆς Εἰτεαῖος καὶ
 χσυν]άρχοντες πα[ρέδοσα]-
 [ν ^ΠΤ· τόκος] τούτοις ἐ[γ]ένετο Η[- - - -] vacat
 [τάδε ἐλογίσα]ντο [ἡοι] λογιστ[αὶ ὀφελόμ]εν[α τοῖς ἄλλοις θεοῖς ἐν τοῖς
 τέττ]αρσιν ἔτ[εσιν ἐκ Παν]-
 55 [αθηναίων ἐς Παναθέν]αια. [τάδε παρέδοσ]αν ἡ[οι ταμίαι τῶν ἄλλον θεῶν
 Γόργ]ωμος Οἰνείδο Ἴκαρι]-
 [εὺς καὶ χσυνάρχοντες ἐκ τῶν ἐκάστο χ]ρεμάτο[ν ἐπὶ Ἀμενί]ο ἄρχοντος
 στρατ]εγοῖ[ς.....ΙΙ.....]
 [...8...., ἐπὶ τῆς βολῆς ἡῆι Δεμέτ]ρι[ος πρῶτ]ος ἐγραμμάτευε, ἐπὶ τῆς
 Ἀκαμαντ]ίδ[ος πρυτανείας]
 [πρότες πρυτανευόσες, ἑκατομβαιδ]νος ὀγ[δόει φθίνοντος, πέμπτει καὶ
 εἰκοστῆι τῆς πρυτανε]-
 [ίας ἐξ Ὀπισθοδόμο. υ Ἄρ]τέμι[δος Ἄγρ]οτέρα[ς.....
 ..40.....]

- 60 [.....18....., τό]κος τ[ούτο ΗΗ]Η^ΑΔ[.....
 ..42.....]
 [.....29.....]Η, τό]κος τούτο.....18...
] ^ΑΗ^ΑΔΔ [.....12.....]
 [.....17..... Ποσειδόν]ος ἐπὶ Σο[υνίοι ^ΑΧΧ.....10.....,
 τόκ]ος τούτο ΗΗΗ^ΑΔΔ[....9.....]
 [.....21....., τόκο]ς τούτο [...6... Ἀρτέμιδος Μονι-
 χί]⟨α⟩σι ΤΧΧΧ^ΑΗ^ΑΙC, τό]κος τούτο
 [.....52.....] ΗΗΔΔ
 ΓΗΙ, τόκο]ς το]ύτ[ο...6...]
- 65 [..4..]ο Χ^ΑΗΗΗΗ^ΑΔΔΓΗΙ[.....36.....
 ...] ΔΗΗΗΗΙ[.....] τόκο]ς το]ύτ[ο...5...]
 [..4..]ΙC. Ἀφροδίτες ἐν ἡιπολυ[τείοι24.....]
 ΗΗΗΙ[.....]ΙC ὡς Μοσ[ὸν ^Α....., τόκο]-
 [ς τού]το ΓΗΙ ὡς Ἀπόλλωνος Ζοστέ[ρος.....21.....
 Ἄδρασ]τείας ^ΑΔΔΔΔΓΗ, τ[όκος τούτο Η]
 [Βενδ]ίδος ^ΑΔΔΔΔΓΗ, τόκος τού]το Η29.....
] ΙC). ὡς Ἀπόλλων[ος....8...]
 [..4..] τούτο τόκος ΓΗΗΗ ὡς [.....36.....
 ..] ἡερακλέος ἐν [Κυνοσάργε]-
- 70 [ι ΔΔ, τ]ούτο τόκος ΙC ὡς ἡε[.....22.....Δεμ]οφόντος
 [...6...], τόκος τούτ[ο...9...]
 [Ἀθена]ί[ας ἐπὶ] Παλλ[ενίδι Τ^ΑΗΗ.....11....., τόκο]ς τούτο ΗΔΔ
 ΓΗΗΗΗΙ[.....]ΙC). ὡς Ἀπόλλο[νος....8...]
 [.....20..... Ἀρτέμιδος Βραυρονία]ς ΧΗΗΗ^ΑΔΔΔΔΓ
 Η[.....] τόκος τούτο Δ[ΓΗ.....9.....]
 [.....9.....]ΧΗΔ[.....24.....Ἄθ]εναίης ἐπὶ Παλλα-
 δίοι Δεριονέοι [^ΑΗΗΗ^Α..5...]
 [τόκος το]ύτο ΔΗ[.....11.....Χ]^ΑΗ[Η.....8....., τό]κος τούτο
 ΔΔC ὡς Ποσειδόνος Καλαυρε[άτο..5...]
- 75 [τόκο]ς τούτο [..4.. κεφάλαιον τ]ὸ ἀ[ρχαίο ἀναλό]ματος τὸν ἄλλον θεὸν
 τῆς πρότες [δ]όσοο]ς τῆς ἐπὶ
 [Γοργ]οίνο [ἄρχοντος ἄ]ϕϕ^ΑΗΗ^ΑΗΗ^ΑΗ^ΑΔΔΔΔ ὡς κεφά]λαιον τόκο
 τούτοι τῷ ἀναλόματι ΧΧΗΔΔ[...7...]
 [δευτ]έρ[αν δόσιν παρέδωσαν] ἡοι τα[μίαι τὸν ἄ]λλον θεὸν Γόργουινος
 Οἰνείδο Ἰκαριεύς [καὶ χων]-
 [ἄρχοντες καθ' ἕκαστον θεὸν] ἀπὸ τῶν χρεμάτων] ἐπὶ τῆς Λεοντίδος
 πρυτανείας δεκάτε]ς πρυταν]-

- [ευόσες, Σκιροφοριῶνος ὄγ]δοίει φθ[ίνοντος, εἰ]κοστῆι τῆς πρυτανείας *Ἀρτέμιδος Ἄγρ[οτέρας]*
- 80 [TTTTX^ϞHHHH^Ϟ, τόκος τούτο] ΔΗΗΗ^Ϟ|||C *ἔν Ἀφροδί*τες ἐν
Κέποις TT^ϞH^ϞΔΔΓ^Ϟ, τόκος τούτο Π^ϞΗ^Ϟ|||C
[.....16.....XX^ϞH^Ϟ]HHΔΔΔΔ[.5... ,τούτο]τόκος Η^Ϟ|||C) *ἔν*
Διονύσο HHH^ϞΠ^ϞΗ^Ϟ, τόκος το[ύτο] C *ἔν*
[.....19....., τ]όκος το[ύτο].. *Ποσε*ιδῶνος ἐπὶ Σουνίῳ
TTTTX^ϞΔΔΓ^ϞΗ^Ϟ|||C, τό[κος τού]-
[το ΔΗΗΗ^Ϟ|||C) *ἔν* ..5... ΧΧ]ΧΧ^ϞHHΔΔ[ΔΔΓ^ϞΗΗ^Ϟ|||], τ]όκος
τούτο Η^Ϟ|||C *ἔν Ἀρτέμιδος Μονιχία*[ι...6...]
[.....17.....]Η^Ϟ||| *ἔν Θεσέ*[ς ^ϞHHHHΠ^ϞΗ^Ϟ|||]|||C, τόκος τούτο
|||C) *ἔν ἡλυσῶ* HHHHH^ϞΗ^Ϟ, τόκ[ος τούτο]
- 85 [IC.....I4....., τ]όκος τού[το] . *ἔν ἡφαίσ*το ΤΧ^ϞHHΔΔΔΔΓ^Ϟ
Η^ϞΗ^Ϟ, τόκος τούτο Η^ϞΗ^Ϟ|||C *ἔν Ἀφ*[ροδίτε]-
[ς ἐν ἡππολυτείοι...]Η^Ϟ|||, τόκο[ς τούτο] ..5... *ἔν Μοσῶν* ²ΔΔΗ, τόκος
τούτο IC) *ἔν θεῶ* χσενικῶ [.5...]
[.....I3....., τόκο]ς τούτ[ο]... *ἔν ἡερακλέ*ος ἐν *Κυῖο*σάργει
^ϞΔΔΔ, τόκος τούτο C *ἔν Δεμο*[φῶντο]-
[ς17.....] *ἔν Ἀθε*[ναίας ἐπὶ Παλλ]ενίδι ΧΧΧHHHHΔΓ^Ϟ
Η^ϞΗ^Ϟ, τόκος τούτο Η^Ϟ|||C) *ἔν Ἀ*[πόλλο]-
[νος.....I5.....τ]όκο[ς]...6... *ἔν Ἀρτέ*μιδος *Βραυρονίας* HHH
^ϞΗ^ϞΗ^Ϟ|||C, τόκος τούτο IC) *ἔν* ...]
- 90 [.....34.....] *ἔν Ἀθε*ναίας ἐπὶ Παλλα-
δίοι Η^ϞΗ^ϞIC, τόκος τούτ[ο] ..4..
[.....30.....HΔΔΔ]ΔΗΗΗ^Ϟ|||, τόκος τούτο
C *ἔν Μετρ*ὸς ἐν Ἄγρας HH[...6...]
[.....35.....]Η^ϞΗ^Ϟ, τούτο τόκος C *ἔν Ἀθε*-
ναίας *Ζοστερίας* Η[...7...]
[.....30.....HHHH]ΔΔΓ^ϞΗ^Ϟ, τόκος τούτο IC
*ἔν κεφ*άλαιον τῷ ἀρχ[αίῳ ἀνα]-
[λόματος τῶν ἄλλον θεῶν τῆς δευ]τέρ[ας δόσε]ος ἐπὶ *Γοργοῖ*νο ἀρχοντος
ἔν ϜϜTTTT^Ϟ^ϞHHHH[^ϞΔΔΔΔ]-
- 95 [Γ^ϞΗ^ϞΗ^Ϟ *ἔν κεφ*άλαιον τόκο τού]τοι [τῶι ἀργ]υρίοι ^ϞΔΔΔΗ^ϞΗ^Ϟ
*ἔν κεφ*άλαιον ἀναλόματος τῷ ἀ[ρχαίῳ]
[ἐπὶ *Γοργοῖ*νο ἀρχοντος *ἔν* ϜΤΤ]ΤΤ^Ϟ^ϞHHHH[^ϞΔΔΔΓ^ϞΗ^ϞΗ^Ϟ *ἔν*
*ἔν κεφ*άλαιον τόκο χσύμπαντος το[ύτοι]
[τῶι ἀργυρίοι ΧΧHH - -] *vacat*

[τάδε ἐλογίσαντο ἡοι λογιστ]αῖ ἐν τ[οῖς τέτ]ταρσιν ἔτεσιν τόκον τοῖς τῆς
θεῷ ἢ ἡοι πρό[τεροι]

[λογισταὶ λελογισμένα παρέ]δοσαν [ἐν τοῖς ἡε]πτὰ ἔτεσιν τόκον τετρα-
κισχιλίους ταλά[ντοις]

100 [ταλάντοι τετρακισχιλίας]ς πεντα[κοσίαις εἴ]κοσι δυοῖν δραγμαῖν·
τούτοις τόκος ἐγέ[νετο]

[H P F F F F P X P H H Δ F F F III] *vacat*

[τόκον ἐλογίσαντο τοῖς ἄλ]λοις θεο[ῖς ἐν τοῖς τέ]τταρσιν ἔτεσιν ἢ ἡ
ἡοι πρότεροι λογι[σταῖ]

[λελογισμένα παρέδοσαν ἐ]ν τοῖς ἡεπ[τὰ ἔτεσιν πέ]ντακοσίους ταλάντοις
διακοσίους τ[αλάντ]-

[οὖς ἡεχσέκοντα ταλάντοι]ς ἡέχσ ταλ[άντοις χιλί]αις ἐνενέκοντα δραγμαῖς
πέντε δραχ[μαῖς]

105 [τέτταρσιν δραγμαῖς ἐν τοῖ]ς τέτταρσ[ιν ἔτεσιν Δ]ΔΔΔΤΤΧΧΗΗΗΔΔ
ΔΓ F F F II C *vacat*

[τόκον ἐλογίσαντο καὶ τοῖ]ς Ἀθηναία[ς τῆς Νίκες ἐ]ν τοῖς τέτταρσιν
ἔτεσιν ἢ ἡοι πρότ[εροι]

[λογισταὶ λελογισμένα π]αρέδοσαν ἐ[ν τοῖς ἡεπτὰ] ἔτεσιν εἴκοσι ταλάν-
τοις δυοῖν ταλ[άντοι]-

[ἰν τρισχιλίαις ἐνενέκον]τα δραχμ[αῖς] ὀκτὸ [δραχ]μαῖς δυοῖν ὀβολοῖν
Τ P P Δ Δ Δ Δ F F F III *vacat*

[τόκον ἐλογίσαντο τοῖς τῷ] ἡερμῷ ἐν [τοῖ]ς τέτ[ταρσιν] ἔτεσιν ἢ ἡοι
πρότεροι λογισταὶ λ[ελογι]-

110 [σμένα παρέδοσαν ἐν τοῖς ἡε]π[τὰ ἔ]τ[εσιν] ταλάν[τοις] τετρακοσίαις
ἐνενέκοντα δραγμαῖς [. . 5 . . .]

[- - - ΗΗΗΔΓ F - -] *vacat*

[Ἀθηναίας Νίκες ἀρχαῖον ὀφέλοσιν ἐν] ἔνδεκα ἔτεσιν: <ΔΔ> P T T T X X
X P Δ Δ Δ Δ Γ F F F II *vacat*

[Ἀθηναίαι Νίκει τόκος ἐγένετο: P . . .] Δ Δ Δ F II C *vacat*

[Ἀθηναίας Πολιάδος ἐν ἔνδεκα ἔτεσιν] τὸ ἀρχαῖον [ὀ]φέλοσιν: ξ ξ ξ ξ
P H H Δ Δ Δ Δ P T T T P P H [H P Δ Δ Γ]

115 [Ἀθηναίας Πολιάδος τόκος ἐγένετο ἐν] ἔνδεκα ἔτεσ[ιν]: ξ H H Δ Δ Δ Δ
T T T X X X P H H H F F F *vacat*

[ἐν ἔνδεκα ἔτεσιν Ἀθηναίας Νίκες καὶ] Πολιάδος: [ξ ξ ξ ξ] P H H
P <Δ> Δ P T T X X X H H [H Δ Δ F F F II]

[ἐν ἔνδεκα ἔτεσιν κεφάλαιον τῷ Πολιά]δος καὶ Νίκ[ε]ς τόκο: ξ H H
Δ Δ Δ Δ P T T T [- - -]

[- - - - *vacat*] *vacat*

[τοῖς ἄλλοις θεοῖς ἀναλόματος τῷ ἀρχ]αίο ἐν ἔνδεκα [ἔτεσιν κεφάλαιον :
 Π Η Η Η Η Δ Δ Τ Χ Π Δ Δ Δ Γ Τ Τ]

120 [τοῖς ἄλλοις θεοῖς τόκο χσύμπαντος ἐ]ν ἔνδεκα ἔτεσ[ιν κεφάλαιον :
 - - - - -]

[- - - - *vacat*] *vacat*

[ἀρχαίον χσύμπαν ἐν ἔνδεκα ἔτεσιν ἀπ]ασι τοῖς θε[οῖς : Π Π Π Δ Δ Δ
 Δ Π Τ Τ Τ Τ Χ Χ Χ Π Η Η Η Η - -]

[τόκο χσύμπαντος ἀπασι τοῖς θεοῖς ἐ]ν ἔνδεκα ἔτεσ[ιν κεφάλαιον :
 - - - - -]

[- - - -] *vacat*

The reconstruction of the text in Meritt, *Calendar*, 'a veritable triumph of acumen and industry' (Tod), remains fundamental to Pritchett and Lang, despite their divergent approaches, and to this slightly more conservative text. In l. 8 the restoration of the total is, as the record stands, necessary, and follows from the year-total of l. 15 and the quadrennium-total of l. 49; it is not, however, in conformity with the interest recorded in l. 9, which seems to have been calculated on a sum 2,000 dr. smaller. (Lang, *Hesp.* xxxiv (1965) 227-9, suggests recasting these items on the assumption that the interest figure in l. 46 was wrongly added into the total for 423-2 (l. 47), but that this error was not transferred to the total for the quadrennium (l. 49) or for the eleven years (ll. 114, 116, 122). The true total for 423-2 would then be 192 T. 1,520 dr., and the quadrennium total should be assumed to have stood on the stone as Π] Η Η Η Δ Δ Δ Δ Δ Δ Π Τ Τ Χ [Η Π Δ Δ Δ Γ]. The total for 426-5 will then have been Η Η Η Π Δ Τ Π Π Η [Π Δ Γ] (l. 15), and the payment in l. 8 Δ [Δ Π Τ Τ Τ Π Π Η Π Δ Γ], the interest again being calculated on a figure too small by 2,000 dr.) In l. 10 ἐσελευθ[υίας] is a possible alternative. The restorations in ll. 10 and 14 are interlocking. The spacing justifies Lang's correction in l. 14; Meritt wrote Τ Χ Χ Χ Χ Π Η Η Η in l. 10 and Χ Χ Χ Χ Η Π Δ Δ Τ Η [] in l. 14. In ll. 18-19 the alternatives are Αἰγεῖδος and Οἰνεῖδος; Οἰνεῖδος would be eliminated, if it held the second prytany this year as ATL's view of No. 69 demands (see pp. 194 f.). In ll. 21-2 Pritchett (*Calendars of Athens*, 102) prefers ὀγδού|ει and Τ Τ Χ Χ Χ Π Η Η Δ Δ Δ Δ, with slight crowding at the end of l. 22. This seems a shade less satisfactory (cf. Meritt, *Athenian Year*, 68). The uncertainty has repercussions: it affects the total of interest in Year 2 (l. 24) and thus that in Year 3 (l. 36; cf. l. 51), with consequences on the dates of individual payments in Year 3. Meritt wrote πέμπτ|ει, but Τ Τ Χ Χ Χ Π Η Η Π Δ, with appropriate consequences; this is only a possibility if Year 2 had 368 days (see commentary). The same applies to ll. 28-9, where Meritt read [στρατεγοῖς ἐς | τὰ ἐπὶ Θράικες Δ Δ Δ Τ Τ Τ Π Π]. We follow Pritchett and Lang (1964) on the figure; Pritchett suggests ἐχς Ὀπισθοδόμε|μο before it. Meritt and Lang now prefer [ἐχς Ὀπισθοδόμε|ο Δ Δ Δ Τ Τ Π Π Η Η Η Η Π Δ Δ Δ Τ Τ Π Π]. In l. 30 the prytany was the third (Meritt, Pritchett) or

the fourth (Lang); in view of the uncertainty, we suppress the restorations. In l. 31 the prytany was the sixth (Lang) or seventh (Meritt, Pritchett). Again we suppress the restorations, which in this case involve a difference of reading. Though the last figure of the payment has always been read as Η since Rangabé and Ross (cf. Meritt, *Calendar*, 27, *Hesp.* xxxiv (1965) 236-9), Pritchett has argued for the possibility of ΙΙ (*Ancient Athenian Calendars*, 270-3). In ll. 33-4 the figure to be restored is close to 1½ T., but there is some doubt about the introductory formula, and we prefer to make no restoration. In l. 36 our partial restoration depends on following Lang in ll. 21-2; if one follows Pritchett there, this figure must be 60 dr. higher. For ll. 37-8 Wade-Gery (*CQ* xxiv (1930) 33-9) suggested [στρατεγου]ῖς ἐπὶ Ἰονίας (or ἐς Σκίονεν) Εὐρυμέδοντι], and has been followed, with variations, by Meritt and Lang; see, however, Gomme, *HCT* iii. 627 f., Lewis, *JHS* lxxxix (1961) 119. In ll. 40-1 the first interest figure may be ½ ob. smaller and the second ½ ob. larger. Ll. 41-2: if one fills out l. 41 τῆς, as would seem more natural, 11 letters are left for the tribe in prytany, yet the two possibilities, Ἀκαμαντίδος and Πανδιονίδος, are already accounted for (ll. 38-40). To explain the break τῆς, Lang follows a suggestion of Meritt that the edge of the stone was damaged in ll. 37-51, and the irregularities of line-ending which seem to be necessary are thereby explained. The situation is complicated by the tempting possibility that the payment of ll. 51-3 belongs to the same day, but there again the tribe has 11 letters. Pritchett prefers to assume that a 10-letter tribe was written in 11 spaces in l. 42, as Meritt had already assumed for l. 52. Lang (1964) discounted l. 52 and wrote [Πανδιονίδος] and [τρίων|τες] there. There are perhaps still other possibilities. The wrong tribe-name may have been written in error (cf. *IG* ii². 1672. 1, 37 and *BSA* xlix (1954) 32), or we might write [ΙC υυ τρίτε δό]σ[ις ἐπὶ τ|ῆς. . 5. . . ἰδος]. In l. 42 πρὸς Σαμ[ίος] is epigraphically possible. For ll. 46-9 see above on l. 8. Ll. 51-3: see on ll. 41-2; the uncertainty of date makes the interest uncertain. The figure in l. 51 is underlined on the stone. In ll. 55-6 Meritt (*AFD* 132) restores Νικίαι καὶ χσ|υνάρχουσι, comparing Thuc. iv. 129. 2. In l. 58 the restoration of the date by month is sound, despite Pritchett, *AJP* lxxxv (1964) 46-8. For the demonstration that the payments were outstanding for 342 days see Lang (1965) 231-4. In l. 63 we prefer our reading to Meritt's Μονιχί[α]ς (Γ)Γ, as requiring the assumption of less error, but the crossbar was certainly omitted from the alpha, and where there is one error, there may well be two (cf. l. 83). In l. 79 the theta has been lost since it was seen by Rangabé and Velsen, and the phi never received its vertical; however, the doubts about reading and restoration expressed by Pritchett (*AJP* lxxxv (1964) 40-50) are unjustified (cf. Meritt, *AJP* lxxxv (1964) 412-16). New restorations in ll. 91, 93 are by Pritchett (*Ancient Athenian Calendars*, 306). For ll. 98-123 we have in general followed Meritt, *CQ* xl (1946) 60-4 and Meritt and Lang (1968), though one cannot place conviction in the literal accuracy of the summation-formulae and we have not made the changes in ll. 114, 116, 122 which follow from their revised view of the true total for 423-2. In l. 105 we prefer our restoration to Kubicki's π|έντε ὀβολοῖς τόκον and Meritt's τέτταρσιν ὀβολοῖς, as giving a more accurate calculation; we have

made consequential minor changes in ll. 110-11, 119, 122. In ll. 112 and 116 the vertical stroke of Δ is three times omitted; more seriously, it appears that in l. 112 the Γ is a mistake for \square , committed by the auditors themselves and transferred to the totals in l. 116 and (doubtless) in 122 (cf. Meritt, *Calendar*, 49 f.). There is a minor difficulty about the text of l. 113, where the stone is lost; Meritt and Lang now prefer Dodwell's reading $\Delta \Delta \Delta \Gamma$ ||C to that of Gell printed here.

This text falls into the following sections:

I. Ll. 1-2. Heading of the whole document, which was drawn up by the *λογισταί*, for whom cf. Nos. 39, 58.

II. Ll. 2-51. Loans from Athena Polias in four successive 'conciliar' years, with interest reckoned to the close of the quadrennium.

Lines	Year	Number of loans	Total loans	Interest due
2-16	426-5	6	261 T. 5,610 $\frac{7}{12}$ dr.	11 T. 199 $\frac{1}{8}$ dr.
16-24	425-4	2	130 T.	[3 T. 3,710 dr.]
25-36	424-3	4	163 T.	[2 T. 5,210+ dr.]
36-48	423-2	5	192 T. 1,642 $\frac{5}{12}$ dr.	1 T. 813 $\frac{1}{4}$ dr.
48-51	Quadrennium	17	747 T. 1,253 dr.	18 T. 3,935+ dr.

III. Ll. 51-3. Loan in 423-2 from Athena Nike, 6 T.; interest 100+ dr.

IV. Ll. 54-97. Two loans in 423-2 from the Other Gods, amounting to 54 T. 5,988 dr.; interest, over 2,200 dr. The share of each individual god is recorded, together with the interest due in respect of it. The order of the gods is the same in both loans (Meritt, *Calendar*, 22).

V. Ll. 98-111. Interest due for the quadrennium, 426-5 to 423-2, on loans made during the years 433-426.

Lines	Lender	Loan	Interest
98-101	Athena Polias	4,001 T. 4,522 dr.	[195 T. 1,713 $\frac{1}{2}$ dr.]
102-5	Other Gods	766 T. 1,09[9] dr.	37 T. 2,338 $\frac{5}{12}$ dr.
106-8	Athena Nike	22 T. 3,098 $\frac{1}{2}$ dr.	1 T. 592 $\frac{5}{8}$ dr.
109-11	Hermes	1 T. 490(?+) dr.	[316 (?+) dr.]

VI. Ll. 112-23. Totals for eleven years, 433-2 to 423-2.

Lines	Lender	Loan	Interest
112-13	Athena Nike	28 T. 3,548 $\frac{1}{2}$ dr.*	At least 5 T. 311 $\frac{5}{12}$ dr.
114-15	Athena Polias	4,748 T. 5,775 dr.	1,243 T. 3,804 dr.
116-17	Nike and Polias	4,777 T. 3,323 $\frac{1}{2}$ dr.*	1,248-1,250 T.
119-20	Other Gods	821 T. 1,08[7] dr.	?
122-3	Grand total	5,599 T. 4,900(?) dr.*	?

The asterisked items are all 450 dr. too high; see end of critical note. As the funds of Hermes were apparently administered by the treasurers of Athena and not by those of the Other Gods (*IG* i². 301. 12, 69; cf. Wade-Gery, *Num. Chron.* 1930, 37), we may suppose that the loan from Hermes was not reckoned with those from the Other Gods, but was included in the grand total.

In these accounts the following points call for notice.

1. Interest is reckoned at the rate of one drachma *per diem* for 5 T. i.e. slightly over $1\frac{1}{5}$ per cent per annum. One must not, however, expect all calculations to work out completely accurately. Meritt and Pritchett have assumed various forms of fractional approximation to account for minor divergences; Miss Lang has made a promising start in showing how the calculations could have been made with an abacus, which is *a priori* most probable. The charging of interest is more probably to be attributed to normal practice or piety than interpreted as a means of restraint (against Gomme, *HCT* ii. 435). The interest is very small; before this quadrennium it seems to have been five times as high (Wade-Gery, *CR* xlv (1930) 163-5; West, *TAPA* lxi (1930) 234 f.).

2. The accounts are based on the 'conciliar' year, a year approximating to the solar year and beginning somewhere near the summer solstice. The four years of our quadrennium, it is agreed, comprised 1,464 days. Meritt long maintained that the four years could not have had precisely 366 days each. This was denied by Pritchett and Neugebauer, and Lang has also found it possible to make restorations on a basis of equal years. However, the argument of Meritt (*Athenian Year*, 202-7) that some conciliar years between 422 and 411 did not have 366 days still seems powerful. These conciliar years were divided into ten prytanies of 37 or 36 days. Pritchett and Neugebauer have, comparing Arist. *Æth.* Πολ. 43. 2, maintained that the first six prytanies always had 37 days and the last four 36; Meritt and Lang have argued against this view. Two other types of year must be distinguished: the civil or 'festival' year beginning on Hekatombaion 1, lunar in character, with 12 or 13 months of 29 or 30 days; and the year which ran 'from Panathenaia to Panathenaia' (ll. 1, 54), i.e. from Hekatombaion 28 in one festival year to Hekatombaion 27 in the next; this was the term of office of the treasurers of Athena and the treasurers of the Other Gods (No. 58A, l. 28) and probably of the *hellenotamiai*. Athenian terminology is, however, loose; our quadrennium, though really comprising the conciliar years 426-422, is sometimes equated with the corresponding Panathenaic quadrennium (ll. 1, 49, 50), and the archon-years are equated with the conciliar years (e.g. ll. 5, 17, 25, 37). Less readily intelligible to us is the way in which loans appear to be attributed to the treasurers who held

office for the greater part of a conciliar year, even though they fell before the Panathenaia and should have been made by their predecessors (ll. 25-9, 55-9), but the fact seems inescapable.

3. The dates of the loans here registered are expressed in terms of the conciliar year, i.e. by the name of the tribe in prytany, its number in the year, and the day of the prytany. Only in the records of the Other Gods is the date by the festival calendar added (ll. 58, 79; cf. Notopoulos, *AJP* lxxvi (1945) 411-14, who explains this as a concession to rural conservatism, and No. 81).

4. Only in a few cases is the purpose of the loan expressly indicated in this record. Hippokrates and his colleagues (l. 3) received 20 T. in the late summer of 426, possibly for an invasion of Megaris (cf. Thuc. iv. 66); the old view that it can be inferred that Hippokrates was in some sense 'chairman' of the board of generals is untenable (Dover, *JHS* lxxx (1960) 66; Lewis, *JHS* lxxxii (1961) 120). In the autumn of 425 a sum of 30 T. was paid *στρατεγοῦς* [is this an error for *στρατηγοῦ*?] *περὶ Πελοπόννησον Δεμοσθένει* (l. 18), probably for the consolidation of the position at Pylos. Some precision, now lost, was added in ll. 28-9, 37-8; these may relate to the destination of the loan or to its source (cf. *ἔχσ* | *Ῥπισθ*] *οδόμο*, ll. 19-20, and [*παρὰ*] *Σαμ[ίον]*, l. 42, for which cf. Nos. 68, l. 21 and 77, l. 18. Other associations of loans with operations recorded by Thucydides may be guessed at (cf. Wade-Gery, *CQ* xxiv (1930) 33-9 for the year 423). We call attention to the important notes by Gomme, *HCT* ii. 433-6, iii. 487 f., 504 f., 592 f., 627 f., 630.

5. One group of payments calls for special comment. Every spring during the quadrennium the treasurers of Athena paid out 100 T. (ll. 12, 22, 33, 44). These payments should roughly coincide with the Dionysia, the time of the year when tribute came in (No. 39) and when one would expect the *hellenotamiai* to be in no need of loans. It was held by Gomme (*HCT* ii. 433 f.) that this undermined what would seem to be the obvious and natural view of Athenian war finance, that the Athenians spent all their income as it came in, and only borrowed from the gods the amount necessary to make up the deficit, i.e. that total Athenian expenditure was simply the sum of the total Athenian income (whatever that was) and the loans before us. He was led to develop a theory by which the Athenians will have spent only a previously earmarked part of the tribute directly, and paid the remainder into Athena's treasury, borrowing it again when necessary and charging themselves with interest on it. This view seems to us untenable. Our inscription has no trace of repayments, which these payments to Athena would surely have been, and one would expect these 100 T. payments to be less regular in amount and date and later in the campaigning season. We prefer the simple view,

supposing only that Athena regularly made a token 100 T. contribution to the war at the beginning of the campaigning season.

6. We learn from ll. 98-111 that in the years 433-426 the Athenians had borrowed over 4,001 T. from Athena Polias and over 766 T. from the Other Gods, besides 24 T. or so from Athena Nike and Hermes. Simple division by seven will tell us that the average annual drain on the reserve in this period ran well over three times higher than in the quadrennium 426-422, but we can go a stage further than that. Inspection of the interest figure in l. 115 shows that the weight of the borrowing must be placed before the midpoint of the seven years, and mainly in the years 432-429 (West, *TAPA* lxi (1930) 234-6; *ATL* iii. 341-4). We give *ATL*'s table of loans for 433-422, without claiming literal accuracy for it.

433-2	76 T. (Cf. No. 61)	427-6	100 T.
432-1	1,145	426-5	261
431-0	1,370 (Cf. <i>SEG</i> x. 226)	425-4	130
430-29	1,300	424-3	163
429-8	600	423-2	253
428-7	200		

Some uncertainty is introduced by the loss of the interest figure for the Other Gods. The computation assumes that the reduction of interest (see above) was precisely at the beginning of 426-5; if it was earlier, the weight of the loans must be pushed back further still. The financial worries referred to in Thuc. ii. 70. 2, iii. 19. 1 are thus amply attested.

The evidence for the drain on the reserve can be pursued with greater uncertainties into an investigation of the size of the reserve at various times, and in particular at the Peace of Nicias, which lies beyond our immediate scope. *ATL* iii. 326-48 and Gomme, *HCT* iii. 687-9 will be found the most helpful introductions to the problems.

73 (74)

Athenian Decree regulating the Offering of First-fruits at Eleusis: (?) c. 422 B.C.

Complete marble stele found near the church of S. Zacharias at Eleusis, and a small fragment of the Athenian copy (cf. lines 51-2) found in the Plaka area north of the Acropolis; both now in EM.

Developed Attic writing, stoichedon (fifty letters to the line, with occasional irregularities); the aspirate sign is omitted eight times (lines 3, 15, 18, 20, 24, 31, 32, 47). Phot. of the Athens fragment: *Jahresh.* vi (1903) 10.

LGS ii. 4+; IG i². 76+; SEG x. 110+; Guillon, BCH lxxxvi (1962) 467-75.

[Τιμο]τέλ[ε]ς Ἀχαρνε[ύς] ἐγραμμάτευε.

- [ἔδοχο]εν τῆι βολῆι καὶ τοῖι δέμοι, Κεκροπίς ἐπρυτάνευε, Τιμοτέ-
 [λες] ἐγραμμάτευε, Κυκνέας ἐπεστάτε· τάδε οἱ χυγγραφῆς χουνέ-
 [γρ]αφσαν· ἀπάρχεσθαι τοῖν θεοῖν τῷ καρπῷ κατὰ τὰ πάτρια καὶ τέ-
 5 ν μαντείαν τὲν ἐγ Δελφῶν Ἀθηναῖος ἀπὸ τῶν ἑκατὸν μεδίμνον [κ]-
 ριθὼν μὲ ἔλαττον ἢ ἑκτέα, πυρῶν δὲ ἀπὸ τῶν ἑκατὸν μεδίμνον μ-
 ἐ ἔλαττον ἡμιέκτεον· ἐὰν δὲ τις πλείω καρπὸν ποιῆι ἢ τ[οσοῦτο]-
 ν ἢ ὀλείζο, κατὰ τὸν αὐτὸν λόγον ἀπάρχεσθαι. ἐγλέγεν δὲ [τὸς δ]εμ-
 ἄρχος κατὰ τὸς δέμος καὶ παραδιδόναι τοῖς ἱεροποιοῖς τοῖς
 10 Ἐλευσινόθεν Ἐλευσινιάδε. οἰκοδομέσαι δὲ σιρὸς τρῆς Ἐλευσίν-
 ι κατὰ τὰ πάτρια ἡπόπο ἂν δοκῆι τοῖς ἱεροποιοῖς καὶ τοῖι ἀρ[χ]ιτ-
 ἐκτονι ἐπιτέδειον ἔναι ἀπὸ τῷ ἀργυρίῳ τῷ τοῖν θεοῖν. τὸ[ν δὲ κα]-
 ρπὸν ἐνθαυθοῖ ἐμβάλλεν ἡὼν ἂν παραλάβοσι παρὰ τῶν δεμάρ[χων],
 ἀπάρχεσθαι δὲ καὶ τὸς χυμμάχος κατὰ ταυτά. τὰς δὲ πόλες [ἐγ]λ[ο]-
 15 γέας ἡελέσθαι τῷ καρπῷ, καθότι ἂν δοκῆι αὐτέσει ἄριστα ὁ καρπῷ-
 [ς] ἐγλεγέσεσθαι· ἐπειδὰν δὲ ἐγλεχθῆι, ἀποπεμφσάντων Ἀθέναζε·
 τὸς δὲ ἀγαγόντας παραδιδόναι τοῖς ἱεροποιοῖς τοῖς Ἐλευσι-
 νόθεν Ἐλευσινιάδε· ἐ[ὰ]ν δὲ μὲ παραδέχονται πέντε ἡμερῶν νυυυ
 ἐπειδὰν ἐπαγγελεῖ, παραδιδόντων τῶν ἐκ τῆς πόλεος ἡόθεν ἂν [ἐ]-
 20 [ι] ὁ κα[ρπ]ός, εὐθυνόσθον ἡοι ἱεροποιοῖ χιλίαισιν ν δραχμῆσι [ἡ]-
 [έκασ]τος· καὶ παρὰ τῶν δεμάρχων κατὰ ταυτά παραδέχεσθαι. [κέρ]υ-
 [κα]ς δὲ ἡελομένε ἡε βολῆ πεμφσάτο ἐς τὰς πόλες ἀ[γ]γέλλον[τ]ας [τὰ]
 [νῦν] ἡεφσεφισμένα τοῖι δέμοι, τὸ μὲν νῦν ἔναι ἡος τάχιστα, τὸ δὲ [λ]-
 25 οιοπὸν ἡόταν δοκῆι αὐτέι. κελευέτο δὲ καὶ ἡο ἡεροφάντες καὶ [ὁ]
 δαιδῶχος μυστερίοις ἀπάρχεσθαι τὸς ἡέλλενας τῷ καρπῷ κατὰ
 τὰ πάτρια καὶ τὲν μαντείαν τὲν ἐγ Δελφῶν. ἀναγράψαντες δὲ ἐ[μ]
 πινακίοι τὸ μέτρον τῷ καρπῷ τῷ τε παρὰ τῶν δεμάρχων κατὰ τὸ[ν δ]-
 [ἐ]μον ἡέκαστον καὶ τῷ παρὰ τῶν πόλεων κατὰ τὲν πόλιν ἡεκάσ[τεν]
 [κ]αταθέντων ἔν τε τοῖι Ἐλευσινίοι Ἐλευσίνι καὶ ἐν τοῖι βολ[ευν]ε-
 30 [ρ]ίοι. ἐπαγγέλλεν δὲ τὲν βολὲν καὶ τέσει ἄλλεσι πόλεσιν [τ]ῆ[σι] ἡε-
 [λ]ληνικῆσιν ἀπάσεσι, ἡόποι ἂν δοκῆι αὐτέι δυνατὸν ἔναι, λ[έγο]ν-
 τας μὲν κατὰ ἡὰ Ἀθηναῖοι ἀπάρχονται καὶ οἱ χσύμμαχοι, ἐκέ[νοι]-
 [ς] δὲ μὲ ἐπιτάττοντας, κελεύοντας δὲ ἀπάρχεσθαι, ἐὰν βόλονται,
 [κ]ατὰ τὰ πάτρια καὶ τὲν μαντείαν τὲν ἐγ Δελφῶν. παραδέχεσθαι δ-
 35 ἔ καὶ παρὰ τούτων τῶν πόλεων ἐὰν τις ἀπάγει τὸς ἡεροποιοὺς κα-

τὰ ταῦτά. θύεν δὲ ἀπὸ μὲν τῷ πελανῷ καθότι ἂν Εὐμολπίδαι [έχσθε]-
 [γδ]νται, τρίττοιαν δὲ βόαρχον χρυσόκερον τοῖν θεοῖν ἑκα[τέρ]-
 [αι ᾶ]πὸ τῶν κριθῶν καὶ τῶν πυρῶν καὶ τῷ Τριπτολέμοι καὶ τῷ [θε]-
 οῖ καὶ τῷ θεᾷ καὶ τῷ Εὐβόλοι ἱερεῖον ἑκάστοι τέλεον καὶ
 40 τῷ Ἀθηναίαι βῶν χρυσόκερον· τὰς δὲ ἄλλας κριθὰς καὶ πυρὸς ἀπ-
 οδομένους τὸς ἱεροποιῶς μετὰ τῆς βολῆς ἀναθέματα ἀνατιθέν-
 αι τοῖν θεοῖν, ποιεσαμένους ἡάττ' ἂν τῷ δέμοι τῷ Ἀθηναίων δοκέ-
 ι, καὶ ἐπιγράφειν τοῖς ἀναθέμασιν, ἡότι ἀπὸ τῷ καρπῷ τῆς ἀπαρχῆ-
 ς ἀνεθέθε, καὶ ἑλλένον τὸν ἀπαρχόμενον· [τοῖ]ς δὲ ταῦτα ποιῶσι
 45 πολλὰ ἀγαθὰ εἶναι καὶ εὐκαρπῖαν καὶ πολυκαρπία[ν, ἡοῖ]τινες ἂν
 [μ]ε ἀδικῶσι Ἀθηναῖος μεδὲ τὸν πόλιν τὸν Ἀθηναῖον μεδὲ τὸ θεό. ν

[Λ]άμπων εἶπε· τὰ μὲν ἄλλα καθάπερ αἱ χυγγραφαὶ τῆς ἀπαρχῆς τῷ
 καρπῷ τοῖν θεοῖν· τὰς δὲ χυγγραφὰς καὶ τὸ φσέφισμα τόδε ἀναγ-
 ραφσάτο ἡο γραμματεὺς ἡο τῆς βολῆς ἐν στέλαιν δυοῖν λιθῖναι-
 50 ν καὶ καταθέτο τὸν μὲν Ἐλευσῖνι ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ, τὸν δὲ ἑτέραν [ἐ]-
 μ πόλει· ἡοι δὲ πολεται ἀπομισθοσάντων τὸ στέλα· ἡοι δὲ κολ[ακρ]-
 ἔται δόντων τὸ ἀργύριον. ταῦτα μὲν πε[ρ]ὶ τῆς ἀπαρχῆς τῷ καρ[π]ῷ [τ]-
 οῖν θεοῖν ἀναγράφαι ἐς τὸ στέλ[α], μένα δὲ :::: ἐμβάλλειν ἑκατονβ-
 αιῶνα τὸν νέον ἄρχοντα. τὸν δὲ βασ[ι]λέα ἡορίσαι τὰ ἱερὰ τὰ ἐν τ[ῷ]-
 55 ι Πελαργικῷ, καὶ τὸ λοιπὸν μὲ ἐνῆιδρῦεσθαι βομὸς ἐν τῷ Πελα-
 ργικῷ ἄνευ τῆς βολῆς καὶ τῷ δέμο, μεδὲ τὸς λίθος τέμνειν ἐκ τῷ [Π]-
 ελαργικῷ, μεδὲ γέν ἐχσάγειν μεδὲ λίθος. ἐὰν δὲ τις παραβαίνει ν
 τ::: οὔτων τι, ἀποτινέτο πεντακοσίας δραχμάς, ἐσαγγελλέτο δὲ ἡ-
 60 [ο] βασιλεὺς ἐς τὸν βολέν. περὶ δὲ τῷ ἐλαίῳ ἀπαρχῆς χυγγράφ-
 σας Λάμπων ἐπιδειχσάτο τῷ βολῆι ἐπὶ τῆς ἐνάτης πρυτανείας·
 ἡε δὲ βολῆ ἐς τὸν δέμον ἐχσενενκέτο ἐπάναγκες.

It is generally held that at the close of line 18 the engraver wrote *ἔπει* and then deleted the letters when he realized that he had repeated them at the beginning of line 19; we see no trace of erasure on the stone; the Athenian copy does not seem to have had these four extra letter-spaces. The punctuation marks in ll. 53 and 58 seem to cover erasures. The Athenian copy has parts of ll. 15–21; it can be shown also to have had fifty letters to the line; it had *εὐθνήσθον* in l. 20 and must have had some other minor discrepancies (Wilhelm, *Jahresh.* vi. 13 f.).

However complete a text may be, its full importance may be impossible to determine, if we cannot date it. This is a frustrating example.

The prescript is normal, save that the motion had been formulated by a body of *ξυγγραφεῖς* (l. 3) and could be described as *αἱ ξυγγραφαί* (l. 47). Such drafts, normally on complicated matters, could be confided to an individual (ll. 59–61, *Andoc. i. 96*), but were normally produced by a committee. The earliest known example is from 450–49 (*ATL ii. D 11*; Hill, *Sources*², B 30), the best-known *ξυγγραφεῖς* are those of 411 (*Thuc. viii. 67*; *Arist. Ἀθ. Πολ. 29. 2, 30. 1*); cf. also No. 49, l. 15; *ATL ii. D 9. 8*; Swoboda, *Rh. Mus.* xlv (1890) 302 f.; Busolt, *Gr. St.* 459 ff.; Hignett, *History of the Athenian Constitution*, 242.

All Athenian farmers must set aside not less than $\frac{1}{800}$ of their barley and $\frac{1}{1200}$ of their wheat to be collected and delivered at Eleusis by their respective demarchs 'in accordance with ancestral custom and the oracle from Delphi' (ll. 4–10). For the ratio of barley to wheat in Attic agriculture, see Jardé, *Les céréales dans l'antiquité grecque*, 36 ff. The *ἱεροποιοὶ οἱ Ἐλευσινόθεν* (ll. 9, 17) are to be distinguished from the ten *ἱεροποιοὶ οἱ κατ' ἐνιαυτόν* (No. 84, l. 6; *Arist. Ἀθ. Πολ. 54. 7*). They are the older board of Eleusinian officials (cf. Hill, *Sources*², B 8 (*SEG x. 6*), l. 120), who were gradually replaced by the *ἐπιστάται Ἐλευσινόθεν* first appointed c. 450 (Hill, *Sources*², B 41 (*SEG x. 24*); see *JHS lxxxiii* (1963) 111–14 for the date), but who make no appearance in our text.

The first-fruits are to be stored in *σιροί* (ll. 10–13). The word is normally used of underground granaries, which hardly seem likely here; for the nature and position of the Eleusinian *σιροί* see Noack, *Eleusis*, 193–201.

Similar first-fruits shall be collected by *ἐκλογεῖς* in all the allied cities and delivered at Eleusis to the *ἱεροποιοί*, who must accept them without delay (ll. 14–21) and keep an official record of the offering made by each several deme and city (ll. 26–30). The clause (ll. 21–4) providing for the prompt notification of the allies seems misplaced, while that (ll. 24–6) relating to a Panhellenic invitation would be more appropriately inserted in the following section. Laqueur (*Epigraphische Untersuchungen*, 98–101) attributes this disorder to amendments made to the original *ξυγγραφαί* in the course of debate, but his attempt to dismember the decree is sufficiently answered by Billheimer (*AJA xxxvi* (1932) 471–3) and the incoherence is probably rightly attributed by Guillon to committee-work (op. cit. 470, n. 1). The *ἐκλογεῖς τοῦ καρποῦ* (ll. 14–15) in the allied cities are parallel to the *ἐκλογεῖς τοῦ φόρου* whose appointment was ordered in 426 by No. 68. Dittenberger proposed to read *καὶ Ἐλευσῖνι* for *Ἐλευσῖνι καὶ* in l. 29, to make the text refer to the Eleusinion at Athens; the text has been most recently defended by Rubensohn, *Jahrb.* lxx (1955) 11–16.

All other Greek cities shall, so far as possible, be invited to make similar offerings (ll. 30–6). Here too, as in the exhortation of the

ἱεροφάντης and the δαδοῦχος (ll. 24-6), appeal is made to ancestral custom and the Delphic oracle. Isocrates (iv. 31) speaks of ἀπαρχαὶ τοῦ σίτου as annually offered by most cities, and of the Pythia as ordering defaulters to comply with the practice.

Ll. 36-44 order the disposal of the first-fruits thus deposited at Eleusis for sacrifices and votive offerings. The πελανός (l. 36) is flour made from the choicest corn, both wheat and barley (*LGS* ii, pp. 25 f.; Stengel, *Opferbräuche*, 66-72). The γένος of the Eumolpidae (ll. 36-7) enjoyed the hereditary and exclusive right of ἐξήγησις at Eleusis (Jacoby, *Atthis*, 26 f. and *passim*). The τρίττοια βόαρχος (l. 37; cf. *IG* i². 5. 5, 844 B 6) was a sacrifice of three victims, of which the first was a bull (*LGS* ii, p. 10). The God and the Goddess (ll. 38 f.) are generally identified with Plouton and Persephone (Farnell, *Cults of the Greek States*, iii. 136 ff.); for Euboulos (Eubouleus) see Frazer's *Pausanias*, ii. 118, and Jessen in *RE* vi. 864-9.

Ll. 44-6 invoke blessing and prosperity on those who thus honour the Eleusinian goddess and act fairly towards Athens.

Ll. 47-61 comprise a rider moved by Lampon, certainly the noted prophet whose activity extended at least from 443, when he took a leading part in the foundation of Thurii (Wade-Gery, *Essays*, 257), until 414 (*Ar. Birds* 521, 988). He was the first Athenian signatory of the Peace of Nikias and the alliance with Sparta which followed (*Thuc.* v. 19. 2, 24. 1). He is called ἐξηγητής by Eupolis (*F* 297 K.) and by the scholiast on *Ar. Clouds* 332. The rider provides:

(a) For the publication of the decree in two copies (ll. 47-53).

(b) That the archon of the next year shall intercalate a second Hekatombaion (ll. 53-4). Usually the month duplicated in an intercalary year was Posideion, but we know of a doubling of Gamelion (*IG* ii². 1487. 54) and of Anthesterion (*ibid.* 844. 33). Here Hekatombaion, the first month of the Attic civil year, is duplicated, presumably in order to give longer notice of the date at which first-fruits must be delivered at Eleusis, probably (though this is not expressly stated) during the Eleusinia in the month Boedromion.

(c) That the sanctuaries in the Pelargikon shall be delimited, the erection of unauthorized altars there prevented, and the removal of stones or earth therefrom stopped (ll. 54-9). For the delimitation of sacred precincts cf. *IG* i². 94. 7, τὸς ὀριστὰς ἐπιπέμψαι ὀρίσαι τὰ ἱερὰ ταῦτα. For the Pelargikon as a hunting-ground for stones or earth see Pollux, viii. 101 and Lucian, *Pisc.* 47. Thucydides (ii. 17. 1) contrasts it with the Acropolis, the Eleusinion, and εἴ τι ἄλλο βεβαίως κληστόν ἦν.

(d) That Lampon shall draft a regulation regarding the first-fruits of olive oil and lay it before the Council, which must perforce submit it to the Assembly (ll. 59-61).

The course of the discussion about the date is well summarized by Guarducci (*RF* lxxxix (1961) 283-95), though her own solution, spring 424, is quite impossible (Meritt, *Classical World*, lvi (1962) 39-41). The first editors were influenced by the Panhellenic tone of the decree in associating it with Pericles' Congress decree (Plut. *Per.* 17) and placing it in the 440s (so, last, Cloché, *L'antiquité classique*, xiv (1945) 102 f.). A variant of this view, placing the main decree in the 440s and Lampon's amendment and the publication of the whole at the time of the Peace of Nicias (Will, *REG* lxi (1948) 1-18), should not have survived J. and L. Robert's destruction of it (*REG* lxii (1949) 102 f.), but cf. Accame, *RF* lxxxiii (1955) 153-63. Recent discussion has leant heavily on Wilhelm's view of the letter-forms (*Jahresh.* vi. 15, *Wien. Anz.* 1922, 45), though his comparison with documents of 420 and 415 has received more notice than his comparison with No. 61 of 432. The strongest epigraphic argument for a late date, 422-415, lies in the frequent omission of the aspirate, but we are not convinced that a date even as early as 435 is formally impossible. Objective, internal arguments are hard to come by. As we have seen, Lampon's career is too long to be helpful. The extant accounts of the moneys received by the Eleusinian ἐπιστάται from the ἱεροποιοί in 422-1 to 419-18 ἀπὸ τῶ σίτο τῆς ἀπαρχῆς (*IG* i². 311; cf. *SEG* x. 211 for undatable, more complex parallels) do suggest a *terminus ante quem*; Ziehen (*LGS*, loc. cit.; see also Mattingly, *Proc. Afr. Class. Ass.* vii (1964), 53-5) has argued for 423-2, Guillon (op. cit.) for 422-1. However, they are not quite conclusive, since the amounts they record are small, and cannot be said to disprove Körte's dating (in Noack, *Eleusis*, 313-17) to the spring of 418 or Dinsmoor's dating (*Archons of Athens*, 338-40, supported by Meritt, *AFD* 172, n. 3) to the spring of 415, both times when one might hold that the ambition of Alcibiades led the Athenians to adopt grandiose schemes. The best argument would lie in the discovery of a year with the peculiar calendar-scheme ordered in ll. 53-4. The relative attractions of 423-2 and 422-1 as dates for the decree then turn on whether 422-1 was an intercalary year, as Meritt used to hold (*Calendar*, 101-4; *Athenian Year*, 218), or ordinary, as was maintained by McGregor (*AJP* lix (1938) 145-68), now joined by Meritt (*Phoenix* xxi (1967) 88 f.). The next intercalary year was probably 419-18, but it can be excluded here as the intercalary year ordered by the decree because its second month was not a second Hekatombaion, but Metageitnion (Antiphon vi. 44; for the date, see most recently Meritt, *Year*, 210-12). It is hard to make Körte's date fit any plausible pattern of intercalary years, and it has lost popularity for that reason. Dinsmoor's date can certainly be made to fit, but his key argument, that Kekropis held the eighth prytany both in this decree

and in 416-15, relies on restorations of No. 77, ll. 47, 49, which are by no means certain. We should not be in the least surprised if new discoveries assigned the decree to, say, 435, though the passage of Thucydides quoted above offers some evidence against a date before the Peloponnesian War.

This decree was not in operation as such in the fourth century, having been replaced at a date unknown by a law of Chairemonides to which an amendment was passed in 353-2 (*IG* ii². 140). The accounts of the receipts from the ἀπαρχαί for 329-8 survive, arranged by the ten Attic tribes and outlying Athenian possessions, and distinguishing wheat and barley (*IG* ii². 1672. 263-96). The survival or revival of the custom in the age of Hadrian is attested by two dedications (*IG* ii². 2956-7), the second of which reads οἱ ἐπὶ Φλαουίου Ἀμφικλέους ἄρχοντος Πανέλληνες ἐκ τῆς τοῦ Δημητρίου καρποῦ ἀπαρχῆς (but not, as is sometimes said, by Aelius Aristides, *Eleus.*, p. 417, *Panath.*, pp. 167 f., ed. Dindorf, who is referring to the past).

74 (65)

Thank-offering of the Messenians and Naupaktians:

c. 421 B.C.

Near the foot of the lofty triangular basis of Parian marble which supported the Nike of Paionios at Olympia (for which see, for example, Lullies, *Griechische Plastik*, no. 176, p. 61). Discovered in 1875 near the south-east corner of the temple of Zeus; now in the Olympia Museum.

Ll. 1-2 in an unidentified alphabet (generally Ionic, but with three-bar sigma), ll. 3-4 Ionic, much smaller. For the arrangement of the letters see Harder, *Jahrb.* lviii (1943) 128 f. (= *Kleine Schriften*, 120 f.). Phot.: Berve, *Das neue Bild der Antike*, Fig. 5, opp. p. 97; Harder, *Kleine Schriften*, abb. 56. (The facsimiles, e.g. *LSAG*, Pl. 71. 33, wrongly show four-bar sigma in l. 1.)

SIG 80+; Buck, *CP* viii (1913), 137; *DGE* 65; Pomtow, *Jahrb.* xxxvii (1922) 81; Harder, *Festschrift B. Schweitzer*, 192-201 (= *Kleine Schriften* 125-36).

Μεσσήνιοι καὶ Ναυπάκτιοι ἀνέθεν Διὶ
 Ὀλυμπίῳ δεκάταν ἀπὸ τῶμ πολεμίῳν.
 Παιώνιος ἐποίησε Μενδαῖος,
 καὶ τὰ κρωτήρια ποιῶν ἐπὶ τὸν ναὸν ἐνίκα.

Pausanias says (v. 26. 1) that the Messenians who had been settled by the Athenians at Naupaktos erected a statue of Nike at Olympia

to commemorate, in his view, their war with Acarnania and Oiniadai (c. 455; cf. Paus. iv. 25), but that they themselves connected it with the aid they had rendered to the Athenians at Sphakteria in 425 (cf. Thuc. iv. 9. 1, 36. 1, 41. 2), explaining the use of the indeterminate phrase ἀπὸ τῶν πολεμίων as due to fear of the Spartans.

Pausanias' own view is unlikely epigraphically and the Nike itself cannot possibly be so early. The Messenian view gives the right approximate date, but their inference from ἀπὸ τῶν πολεμίων can hardly have been more than a bad guess, since such phrases occur not infrequently on early dedications (cf., e.g., No. 25). It seems best to refer the dedication to all the Messenian operations in support of the Athenians during the Archidamian War (so Frazer, *Pausanias*, iii. 643 ff.; cf. also Hitzig-Blümner, *Pausanias*, ii. 442 f.).

For a very similar parallel monument at Delphi, of which the inscription is only very badly preserved, see Pomtow, *SIG* 81, *Jahrb.* xxxvii. 55-112; *RE* Suppl. iv. 1308 ff.; Colin, *FD* iii. iv. 1-5, 163-5; Courby, *FD* ii, *La Terrasse du Temple*, 297-302.

The Athenians also, it may be noted, dedicated two statues of Nike about the same time on the Acropolis, one [ἀπὸ] Ἀμπρακιωτῶν κα[ὶ τῆ]ς ἐν [“Ὀλπαις στρατι]ᾶς καὶ τῶν ἐπαν[αστ]άντ[ων τῶι δήμωι τ]ῶι Κερκυραίων [καὶ ἀπ’] Ἀν[ακτοριῶν] (*IG* ii². 403, *SIG* 264), and the other ἐς μνήμην τῶν ἐν τῇ Σφακτηρίᾳ (Paus. iv. 36. 6).

L. 1 shows that the Messenians, settled in Naupaktos under Athenian auspices at the close of the Helot Revolt (Thuc. i. 103. 3), combined with some of the previous inhabitants of the town, for whom see No. 20. (See now Mastrokostas, *Ἀρχ. Δελτ.* xix. 2 (1964) 295.)

The dedication, both at Olympia and at Delphi, is in the Doric dialect. The artist's signature and note are in Ionic and Attic, save for the word ναόν. Harder's comments on the relationship of the two inscriptions are of interest. The view that Paionios was a native not of the well-known Mende on the peninsula of Pallene but of an Ionian city of that name north of Ainos in Thrace (Paus. v. 27. 12), though accepted by Jeffery, *LSAG* 365, rests on the belief that Ionic was not the alphabet of Chalcidic Mende, which, on her showing (*ibid.* 363), seems unlikely; we do not believe in Pausanias' second Mende. L. 4, as Harder has shown, is not, as Pomtow thought, a slightly later addition to the original inscription. Paionios' success in a competition for designing the ἀκρωτήρια must refer to the bronze-gilt Nike which crowned the temple pediment and the λεβήτες at its extremities (Paus. v. 10. 4); Pausanias must have misunderstood the word ἀκρωτήρια when he attributed the sculptures in the eastern pediment to Paionios (v. 10. 8). They can hardly be by him. See Ashmole and Yalouris, *Olympia; The Sculptures of the Temple of Zeus*, 8.

75

Athenian Tribute quota-list:

(?) 418-17 B.C.

Four fragments of a marble stele, with no joins. The position of three is established, and the approximate position of the fourth; now in EM.

Developed Attic letters; in two of four instances the aspirate is dropped. Stoichedon 50 (prescript). Photos. of frags. 1 and 3: *Hesp.* viii (1939) 54; frag. 2: *ATL* i. 100 f.; frag. 4: *Hesp.* xvii (1948), Pl. 8 and *ATL* ii. 37.

ATL i, list 33; Meritt, *Hesp.* viii (1939) 54-9; *AJP* lxii (1941) 10; *Hesp.* xvii (1948) 31 f.; *ATL* ii, list 33; *ATL* iii (1950) 357; Meiggs, *CR* lxiv (1950) 63 f.; Mattingly, *Proc. Afr. Class. Ass.* vii (1964) 47.

[ἐπὶ τῆς βολῆς ἐι...7.... Ἀ]φιδναῖος πρῶτ[ος ἐγγραμμάτευε, ἐρχε]
 [δὲ Ἀθηναίοις Ἀντιφῶν Σκ]αμβονίδες ἐπὶ τῆ[ς ἑβδόμης καὶ τρια]-
 [κοστῆς ἀρχῆς ἐλλενοταμί]αι ἔσαν τοῖς Ἀντ[.....16.....]
 [.....16..... Περγ]ασῆθεν Μνεσίθεο[ς Ἀραφένιος...6...]
 5 [.....16..... Εὐπυ]ρίδες Αἰσχίνες Π[εραιοῖδες...7....]
 [Θυμαῖτ]άδε[ς Ἐργοκλῆς Βεσ]αειύς *vacat*
 [πόλες ἢ]αἰδε[ἀπέδοσαν ἀπα]ρχὴν τῆι θεδι μνά[ν ἀπ]ὸ τῷ ταλάντ[ο υν]

	I	II	
	Νεσιοτ[ικός]	ἠελλε[σ]πόντιο[ς]	
	----- Ἀναφ[αῖοι]	Η Σι[γε]ιῆς	
10	----- Θερα[ῖοι]	XX Κυ[ζι]κενοί	10
	----- Σερίφ[ιοι]	[Ἄ]Δ[Γ]Τ[Ι]Ι[Ι][Ἄρτα]κενοί	
	----- Ἴετα[ῖ]	-----[....]οί	
	----- Τένιο[ῖ]	[Βυσβ]ικενοί	
	----- Σίφνιο[ῖ]	[Προκ]ονέσιοι	
15	----- Ἄνδριο[ῖ]	[Παρια]νοί	15
	[ΔΓΤΙ] Σικινῆ[ται]	[Χαλχεδ]όνιοι	
	----- Κύθνιοι		

lacuna

lacuna

[- - - - -]	[.]ε[- - - - -]
[ΗἌΔΓΤΙ]	Χε[ρρονεσι]ται
	ἀπ'[Ἄγορᾶς]
[- - - - -]υν	Κ[αλλιπολι]ται

Col. ii. 12. *ATL* restore [Κιαν]οί; [Ἀζει]οί is also possible.

The style of the preamble is very close to list 34 (421-0), and two archons near to the Peace of Nikias have the required number of letters, Ἀλκαῖος in 422-1 and Ἀντιφῶν in 418-17. The date is important for the light it may throw on Athenian assessment policy. Meritt has wavered between the two dates and in *ATL* decided on 422-1, largely influenced by the scale of the few tributes that have been preserved. Sigeum, which before the war paid only 1,000 dr., now pays 1 T. Kyzikos now pays 20 T.; before the war she paid 9 T. Such figures are barely reconcilable with the established view that the final list of the assessment following 425 was not drawn up until peace had been made in the spring of 421, and that this assessment reflected the conciliatory mood of the peace terms. The foundation of the view is a substantial article by West published in 1925 (*AJA* xxix (1925) 135-51). West thought that this was a necessary conclusion from the figures that survived, combined with arguments from probability. His conclusion that the peace assessment could reasonably be regarded as a return to Aristides was accepted in *ATL* (iii. 347 ff.), but there are serious objections: (1) The assessment decree of 425 (No. 69, ll. 26-33) had threatened severe penalties if any Great Panathenaia passed without a new assessment; at the time of the festival in 422 there was no good reason for postponement. The year's armistice made in spring 423 had not led to peace, Mende and Scione had revolted after the armistice had been agreed, and by the end of the summer Cleon was again militant and was himself to lead an expedition to recover Amphipolis. This was no time for a soft assessment. (2) The Hellespontine total for this assessment is in part preserved, but the crucial first figure is missing; the total must be either c. 96 T. or c. 196 T. If, as in the Hellespontine total of 425 which was 250 + T. (see p. 199), the numeral is indented one letter-space the restoration would give c. 196 T.: [v h] | ◊ ◊ ◊ ◊ ◊ ◊ ◊ ◊ ◊ ◊ ◊ ◊ ◊ (phot.: *ATL* i, Figs. 164 and 173). Epigraphically this is to be preferred. (3) List 33 is better placed in 418-17 than in 422-1 (as in *ATL*): (a) the last *hellenotamias* in the prescript of list 33, presumably of the last tribe in the official list, Antiochis, is [... . 11]αιεύς; Ἐργοκλῆς Βεσ]αιεύς, *hellenotamias* in 418-17 (No. 77, l. 10) precisely fills the gap. (b) If we restore the archon of 422-1 we have to assume syllabic division at the end of l. 2: τριαυυ|κόστεις, and this in the fifth century is very rare indeed; the numeral required for 418-17, ἡεβδόμες, exactly fills the space. (c) The first secretary of the Boule in list 33 was from the deme Aphidna; the first secretary of 418-17 is also from Aphidna (*IG* i². 370. 14). It is true that in one case the name has seven letters, in the other apparently only six, but that is not a fatal objection. In list 33 we can restore εἰ rather than ἡεἰ (*ATL*), although *hois* is used in l. 3; there is a good parallel in No. 58, which has *há* in l. 4, but *ǎ* in

l. 5; similarly No. 84 has *ἔλλενοταμίαις* in l. 10, but *ἡλλενοταμίαις* in l. 11.

On this evidence we prefer to date list 33 in 418-17, reflecting the assessment of 418 rather than 425; and since such little evidence as we have, together with the comparative failure of Athenian policies, suggests that the 418 assessment was probably close to its predecessor, we think that the Hellespontine figures of the list confirm our restoration of the Hellespontine total there. Several figures from the two assessments that follow 425 do show a return to pre-war levels or near, but our evidence is mainly from the island district and the islands on whom Athens probably depended, more than on the rest of the empire, for her crews may have been more favourably treated than the other districts. And even in the islands there are exceptions (see *ATL* iii. 348 f. for a table of all the figures preserved from the period of the Peace of Nikias). Kythnos was raised from pre-war 3 T. to 6 T. in 425, and was still assessed at 6 T. in 418; Ceos, assessed at 10 T. in 425, was reduced to 6 T. in 418, but before the war she had paid only 4 T. Similarly Naxos at 9 T. was paying less than in 425 (15 T.), but more than pre-war ($6\frac{2}{3}$ T.). We hold that the new assessment after 425 was completed in 422, that its main feature was a moderate scaling down of 425 figures, many of which had probably proved in practice too high to collect, a reduction of the total from 1,460+T. to perhaps rather less than 1,000 T.

Meritt and McGregor (*Phoenix* xxi (1967) 85 f.) now accept this dating, and produce further arguments for it.

76 (70)

Inventory of Treasures in the Hekatompedos:

418-17 B.C.

On two halves of a marble stele, found on the Acropolis; one is now in the British Museum, the other in the Cabinet des Médailles of the Bibliothèque Nationale.

Developed Attic writing, stoichedon 71. Phot. (Paris fragment): Robert, *Collection Froehner*, Pl. xlvihi.

IG i². 268+; Meritt, *AJP* lix (1938) 501.

τάδε παρέδοσαν ἡαι τέτταρες ἀρχαί, ἡα[ὶ ἐδίδοσαν τὸν λόγον· ἐκ
*Παναθηναίων ἐς Πανα]θ[έ]να]-
 ια, τοῖς ταμίαις Πυθοδόροι ἡαλαιεῖ [καὶ χουνάρχοσι, οἷς Φορμίον
 Ἀριστίονος Κ]υδαθηνα[ι]-*

εὐς ἐγραμμάτευε· *hoi* δὲ ταμίαι, *hois* Φο[ρμίο]ν Ἀ[ριστίωνος Κυδαθε-
 ναιεὺς ἐγραμμάτε]νε, π[α]-
 ρέδοσαν τοῖς ταμίαις Ἀνασικράτει Λα[μπ]τρε[ῖ καὶ χσνάρχοσιν
 (οῖς) Εὐχσενος Εὐφάνο]ς Προσ-
 5 πάλτιος ἐγραμμάτευεν, ἐν τῷ νεδί τῷ ἡ[εκατ]ομπέδ[οι· φιάλαι χρυσαῖ]||,
 σταθμὸν τούτ]ον ΧΧ[^Ρ
 ΔΔΔΔΤΤΤΤ. κόρε χρυσῆ ἐπὶ στέλες, ἄσταθ[μος. ἀποραντέριον ἀργυ-
 ρὸν, ἄσταθμον. στεφά]νο χρυ-
 σὸ]||, σταθμὸν τούτοις ^ΡΔΔΔ. σ[τ]έφανος χρ[υσο]ς, ἡ]ὸν ἐ Νίκε
 ἔχει, σταθμὸν τούτο ^ΡΔ. φιάλ]αι ἀρ[γ]-
 υραῖ Γ||, σταθμὸν τούτον ^ΡΗΗ[Η.] καρχέσιον ἀργυρὸν, σταθμὸν τούτο
 ΗΗ. καρχέσιον ἀργυ]ρὸν Δ[ι]-
 ος Πολιδος, σταθμὸν τούτο ΗΗ. στέφανος [χρυσος, σταθμὸν τούτο . . .
 ΤΤΤ||. στεφά]νε χρ[υ]σῆ, σταθ-
 10 μὸν ταύτες ^ΡΔΤΤΤ. στέφανοι χρυσοῖ]||], σ[ταθμὸν τούτον ΗΔΔΔ
 Γ||. στέφανος χρυσο]ς, σταθμὸν τ-
 ούτο ΔΠΤΤΤ||]. χρυσίδε]], σταθμὸν τούτοι[ν ΗΗ^ΡΔΔΔΔΤΤΤ||].
 χρυσίς, σταθμὸν] ταύ[τε]ς ΗΔΔΔΠΤΤΤ||].
 χρυσίς, σταθμὸν ταύτες ΗΔΠΤΤΤΤ. στέφ[ανος χρυσο]ς, σταθ[μ]ὸν τούτο
 ΔΔΠΤ||]. ἀρ[γ]υρίς, σταθμὸν
 ταύτες Η^ΡΔΔΔΔΤΤ. θυμιατέριον ἀργυρὸν, σταθμὸν τούτο Χ. ἐπέ-
 τεια ἐπεγέ]νετο· [στ]έ[φα]νος χρ[ρ]-
 υσο]ς, σταθμὸν τούτο ΧΗΗ^Ρ. στέφανος χρ[υσο]ς, σταθμὸν τούτο. . .
 15 [ο]ύτο ΔΔΔΠ.

We have had help from a text prepared by W. E. Thompson.

The stones presumably join, but the right-hand (London) half is badly worn. We have abandoned some letters in l. 1, which rest only on Visconti's observation. Either the stonemason omitted something in l. 4, presumably *oīs*, or we should read *συνάρχοσι hoīs* (Thompson); conformity in spelling with l. 2 is not possible.

The lists which the second Kallias Decree (No. 58 B, ll. 25 ff.) ordered the treasurers of Athena to draw up began in 434-3, and were organized in three series, for the Pronaos, the Hekatompedos, and the Parthenon, i.e. for the porch, east cella, and west cella of the building we call the Parthenon (for the term *ὁ ναὸς ὁ Ἐκατόμπεδος* and its origin see Doerpfeld, *Ath. Mitt.* vi (1881) 297-302; Dinsmoor, *AJA* li (1947) 123 ff.). Though these *traditiones* or inventories were

drawn up annually and ἐκ Παναθηναίων ἐς Παναθήναια refers to the annual term of each board, the four boards of the expiring quadrennium seem to have co-operated in setting up their inventories at the time of the Great Panathenaia. The stele before us carried on one side the inventories of the years 422-418 and on the other those of the years 418-414.

Of the objects before us only two gold *phialai*, the golden *kore* on a stele, and the ἀπορανήριον were in the Hekatompedos in 434. The rest represent an accumulation which, except in the first three years of the Archidamian War, seems to have been remarkably steady. The 'gold crown, which the Nike has' (l. 7) is listed more fully later (e.g. in *IG* ii². 1386. 12-14, 401-400 B.C.) as στέφανος χρυσός, ὃν ἡ Νίκη ἔχει ἐπὶ τῆς κεφαλῆς ἢ ἐπὶ τῆς χειρὸς τὸ ἀγάλματος τὸ χρυσοῦ, i.e. the chryselephantine Athena of Pheidias (cf. No. 54), and was first listed in 428-7, but the Nike itself is not inventoried before the end of the Peloponnesian War. It is noteworthy that among the additions of this year (ἐπέτεια) there appears the most valuable single item, a gold crown weighing 1,250 dr. This was dedicated by cleruchs (Ferguson, *Treasurers*, 50 n. 1, 52), apparently celebrating the Great Panathenaia of 418, the first true peace-time Great Panathenaia for sixteen years, with a particularly splendid offering.

For Pericles (Thuc. ii. 13. 4) the sacred treasures represented an iron reserve. The objects listed here, assuming a 12:1 gold-silver ratio, were worth little more than 10 T., and insignificant beside the eight gold Nikai weighing 2 T. apiece (i.e. worth 192 T.) which seem to have existed at this time (Woodward, *Ἀρχ. Ἐφ.* 1937, 159 ff.; Thompson, *Hesp.* xiii (1944) 173-209). Nevertheless, few of them (the *καρχήσιον* of Zeus Polieus is a notable exception) survived the melting operations of the end of the war. See, in general, Ferguson, *Treasurers*, 85-103.

77 (75)

Payments from Athena's Treasury for public purposes: 418-414 B.C.

Six fragments of a marble stele, found on the Acropolis; now in EM, save one (containing the left-hand portions of ll. 63-81) in the British Museum.

Developed Attic writing, stoichedon (with slight irregularities): in the first three years the normal line has eighty-five letters, in the fourth year ninety-six. There is some inconsistency in the use of the aspirate, and *χωνάρχοντες* (-οσι) does not always have initial chi. Phot. and facs.: *AJA* xxxiv (1930) 126 ff.; Meritt, *AFD* 124-9 and Pl. xiii.

- [εν 18.....]δει Ἀντοκλεῖ Ἀναφλ[υστίοι .. not more
than 20 ..] *vacat*
- [ἐπὶ τῆς Πανδιονίδος ἐνά]τες πρυτανευόσες τ[ρίτει καὶ δεκάτει ημεραί
τῆς π]ρυτανείας παρέδομεν τὸ ἐχο-
[άμο κατὰ τὸν ἐνιαυτὸν ἐ]πελθόντος ἑλληνοτ[αμίαις Ἐργοκλεῖ
Ἀριστείδο Βεσ]αϊεὶ καὶ χουνάρχοσι καὶ παρ-
20 [ἔδροι ἔλλ]ενο[ταμιῶν ἠ]εροκλεῖ Ἀρχεστράτο [Ἀθμονεῖ.. ἡοῦτοι δὲ
ἔδοσαν στρα]τ[ρα]γεοῖς Νικίαι Νικεράτ-
[ο Κυδαντ]ίδει Καλ[λίστρ]άτοι Ἐμπέδο ἡοῦθεν Κ[. . not more than
26 ..] *vacat*
- [Κε]φάλα[ι]ον ἀναλ[όματος τὸ] ἐπὶ τῆς
417- [ἀ]ρχῆς [ϜϞϩΧϞΗΗΗ[....8....]]] *vacat*
16 B.C. Ἀθηναῖοι ἀνέλοσαν ἐ[πὶ Εὐφέμο ἄρ]χοντος καὶ [ἐπὶ τῆς βολῆς ἠῆι
....9..... πρ]ῶτος ἐγραμμάτευε, ταμίαι ἠε-
25 ρὸν χρεμάτων τῆς Ἀ[θηναίας Ἀναχαικράτες Λαμπτρεὺς καὶ χουν-
άρχοντες ἡοῖς] Εὐχσενος Εὐφάνος Προσπάλτ-
ιος ἐγραμμάτευε π[αρέδομεν 28..... στρα-
τεγοῖς ἐς] τὰ ἐπὶ Θράικες κα[ῖ] Ἰόνι Χ-
αρικλέος Παιανι[εῖ ἐπὶ τῆς ... εἶδος ... 6... πρυτανευόσες καὶ ἡμεραί
δευτέ]ραι καὶ εἰκοστῇ τῆς πρυτα-
νείας [φ]σεφισαμέν[ο τὸ δέμο τὴν ἄδειαν .. not more than 32 ..]
vacat
- ἐπὶ τῆς Αἰαντίδο[ς ... 6... πρυτανευόσες παρέδομεν στρατεγοῖς ἐς
Μέλον Τεισι]αί Τεισιμάχο Κεφαλῆθεν υ
30 Κλεομέδει Λυκο[μέδος Φλυεῖ 18..... τῆς πρυτανείας
ψεφισαμέν]ο τὸ δέμο τὴν ἄδειαν Ἡ υυυυ
ἐπὶ τῆς Ἀντιοχί[δος . 2-3 ..άτες πρυτανευόσες ἑλληνοταμίαις
παρέδομεν 7-8]οι Α[ν]ρίδων Τιμάχοι Παλ-
λενεῖ καὶ στρα[τεγοῖς ἐς Μέλον Τεισί]αί Τεισιμάχο Κεφαλῆθεν Κλεομέδει
Λυκομέδ]ος Φλυεῖ τρίτει καὶ δεκ-
άτ[ε]ι τῆ]ς [πρυτανείας φσεφισαμένο τὸ δέμο τὴν ἄδειαν .. not more
than 22 ..] *vacat*
- [κεφάλαιον ἀναλόματος τὸ] ἐ[πὶ τῆς
35 [ἀ]ρχῆς -----] *vacat*
- 416- [Ἀθηναῖοι ἀνέλοσαν ἐπὶ Ἀρμινέστο ἄρ]χοντος καὶ ἐπὶ τῆς βολῆς ἠῆι
15 B.C. Ἀρ...6... πρῶτος] ἐγραμμάτευε ταμίαι [ἠ-]
[ιερὸν χρεμάτων τῆς Ἀθηναίας Δεχσίθεος Φυλάσιος καὶ χουνάρχοντες
ἡοῖς Λυσικλῆς Δ]ρακοντίδο Βατῆθ[εν]

[ἐγραμμάτευε61.....
.....] Παλλενῆι [...5...]

lacuna of unknown length

46 [.....13.....]ΔΔ *vacat*

[ἐπὶ τῆς Κεκρο]πίδος [... .. 69
.....]

[.....11.....]ονει [... ..45.....
.....]οι [... ..23.....]

[ἐπὶ τῆς Κεκρο]πίδος [... ..37.....
ἡμέραι] τῆς πρυτανεί[ς στρατε]γο[ῖς Ἄλ]-

50 [κιβιάδει Κλειν]ί[ο Σκαμβονίδει Λαμάχοι Χσενοφάνος ἠοῦθεν Νικίαι
Ν]ικεράτο Κυδαντίδει καὶ παρέδρο[ῖς]

[.....55.....]††††
vacat

[ἐπὶ τῆς36.....*ἡμέραι* στρ]ατεγοῖς
ἐς Σικελίαν Ἀλκιβιάδει Λαμάχο[ι]

[Νικίαι καὶ38..... Ἄντ]ιμάχοι
ἡερμείοι ♠[♠]♠ *vacat*

[ἐπὶ τῆς36.....*ἡμέρα*]ι στρατεγοῖς
ἐς Σικελ[ί]αν Ἀλκιβιάδει Λαμάχοι

55 [Νικίαι καὶ38.....] Ἄντιμάχοι
ἡερμείοι ♠ΤΤΤΤΧ[.]ΗΗΗ *vacat*

[ἐπὶ τῆς36..... *ἡμέρ*]αι στρα-
τεγοῖς ἐς Σικελίαν Ἀλκιβιάδει Λαμάχο[ι]

[Νικίαι καὶ38.....] Ἄντιμάχοι
ἡερμείοι χρυσίο Κυ[ζ]ικενό στατῆρ-

[as44.....]††††||C *vacat*

[κεφάλαιον ἀναλόμα]τος τὸ ἐπὶ τῆς

60 [ἀρχῆς11.....]ΔΠ†||| *vacat*

415-
14B.C.

[Ἀθηναῖοι ἀνέλοσαν ἐπὶ Χαρίο ἄρχοντος καὶ ἐπὶ τῆς βολῆς ἠεῖ .. 5...]*ἶδες*
πρῶτος ἐγραμμάτευε, ταμίαι ἱερῶν χρεμάτων ὑ

[τῆς Ἀθηναίας Λεοχάρης11..... καὶ χσυνάρχοντες ἠοῖς Τελέα]ς
Τελενίκο Περγασῆθεν ἐγραμμάτευε παρέδωσαν στρ-

[ατ]εγοῖς Τελεφόν[οι .. 5... καὶ χσυνάρχουσι καὶ ἡελλενοταμίαι καὶ]
παρέδροι Φερεκλείδει Πειραιεῖ φσεφισαμένο τὸ δέμ-

[ο] τὲν ἄδειαν ἐπὶ τῆς Αἰαντίδος τρι[τες πρυτανευόσες .. 6... *ἡεμ*]ῆραι
τῆς πρυτανείας ♠ΤΧΧΧ†[Η]Η†ΔΔΔΠ††|||C τε καὶ χρυσίο

65 Κυζικενό ἡἡΔΔΔΔΔΔξξξξ τιμὲ τούτον γίν[εται .. not more than
16 ..] *vacat*

ἡλληνοταμίαις καὶ παρέδροις ἔδανείσα[μεν.....15.....] Ἀριστοκράτει Εὐονυμῆ καὶ χουνάρχοσι $\text{P}^{\text{I}}\text{T}^{\text{I}}\text{T}^{\text{I}}\text{T}$, οὗτοι δ' ἔδοσαν ἀθλοθέταις ἐς Παναθῆναια Ἀμέμπτο[ι.....11.....καὶ] χουνάρχοσι ἐπὶ τῆς Ἐρεχθεΐδος δευτέρας πρυτανεύσεις εἰκοστῆι ἡμέραι τῆς πρυτανείας. *vacat*

ἐπὶ τῆς Κεκροπίδος τετάρτης πρυτανεύσεις ἡέ[κτει ἡμέραι τ]ῆς πρυτανείας ἡλληνοταμίαις καὶ παρέδροις Ἀριστοκράτει Εὐονυμῆ καὶ χουνάρχοσι στρατιόταις ἐ[μ Μέλοι ...7....] $\Delta\Delta$ *vacat*

ἐπὶ τῆς Ἀντιοχίδος ὀγδῶς πρυτανεύσεις δεκά[τει ἡμέραι τῆς] πρυτανείας ἡλληνοταμίαις καὶ παρέδροις Ἀριστοκρά[τ]ει Εὐονυμῆ καὶ χουνάρχοσι στρατιόταις ἐμ Μ[έλοι9.....] $\text{P}^{\text{I}}\Delta$ *vacat*

ἐπὶ τῆς Ἀντιοχίδος ὀγδῶς πρυτανεύσεις τρίτε[ι ἡμέραι τῆς πρυ]τανείας ἡλληνοταμίαις καὶ παρέδροις Ἀριστοκρά[τ]ει Εὐονυμῆ καὶ χουνάρχοσι $\text{H}^{\text{I}}\text{H}^{\text{I}}\text{H}^{\text{I}}$, οὗτοι δ' ἔδοσαν [τῆι ἐν Σικελίαι]σ]τρατιᾷ. *vacat*

5 ἐπὶ τῆς Ἀντιοχίδος ὀγδῶς πρυτανεύσεις εἰκοστῆι ἡμέραι τῆς πρυ]τανείας ἡλληνοταμίαις καὶ παρέδροις Ἀριστοκρά[τ]ει Εὐονυμῆ καὶ χουνάρχοσι ἐς τὰ(ς) ναῦς τὰς ἐς Σι[κελίαν ἐσκομισάσα]ς τὰ χρέματα $\text{T}^{\text{I}}\text{T}^{\text{I}}\text{T}^{\text{I}}\text{X}$ *vacat*

ἐπὶ τῆς Ἀντιοχίδος ὀγδῶς πρυτανεύσεις δευτέ[ραι ἡμέραι τῆς πρυ]τανεία[ς] ἡλληνοταμίαι καὶ παρέδροι Φιλομέ[λοι Μ]αραθονίοι καὶ στρατηγῶι ἐν τῷ Θερμαίῳ κόλπο[ι.....18.....καὶ τ]ῆι αὐτῆι ἡμέραι ἡλληνοταμίαι κ[αὶ παρ]έδροι Φιλομέλοι Μαραθονίοι καὶ στρατηγῶι ἐν Ἐφ[έσοι .. not more than 23 ..] *vacat*

80 κεφάλαιον ἀνα[λόματος τ]ὸ ἐπὶ τ[ῆς] ἀρχῆς $\text{H}^{\text{I}}\text{H}^{\text{I}}\text{H}^{\text{I}}\text{P}^{\text{I}}\text{T}^{\text{I}}\text{T}$ -----

vacat

We have followed the line-numbers of Meritt's *AFD* text to avoid confusion, but there is no means of determining the length of the lacuna. The new fragment (ll. 46-9 left) is certainly placed in relation to the left margin, but its vertical position is not certain. For the restorations in ll. 2, 25 cf. No. 76. 1. 6: καὶ εἰκοστῆι ἢ τριακοστῆι τῆς πρυτανείας; the argument in Meritt, *Calendar* 117, is not valid; ἥσπερ δῶναι τοῖς τριεράρχοις ἐς Ἄργυρος Dittenberger (ἐπὶ Ἄργυρος Tod, cf. I. 15), ἥσπερ δῶναι τριεράρχοις ἐπὶ Ἐἰόνος West-McCarthy; there must be a sum of money in the lacuna.

l. 7: Our restoration is perhaps preferable stylistically to εἰ[δοχσεν τῆι βολῆι καὶ τῶι δέμῳι . . .]ιϑ[. . . . 9 εἶπε· τὸ ἀργύριον τοῦτο παραδῶνα]ι (Meritt) or earlier suggestions. ll. 13-14: Meritt thinks a sum of money in silver preceded the reference to Kyzikene electrum and fills the first gap in l. 14 with a reference to *hektaí*; we judge it slightly more probable that more than one type of gold or electrum was referred to here (see also Bogaert, *Ant. Class.* xxxii (1963) 107 f.; W. E. Thompson, *Num. Chr.* 1963, 2 f.). l. 17: [Ἀλκιβιάδῃ Σκαμβόνι]δει Meritt, but other names might also fit. l. 18: Meritt rightly, despite Giffler's objections. ll. 18-19: τὸ ἐχς|[Σάμο κατὰ ἡομολογίαν ἀ]πελθόντος West, but see Tod, *AJP* lxxvii (1946) 333. l. 20: There is some error, and this seems psychologically more probable than . . . 5 . . . ἡοῦτοι δὲ ἔδοσαν] (στ)ρατεγοῖς. l. 21: The only known general beginning with K who is possible is Kleomedes (ll. 30, 32). l. 26: Can *παρέδροι* have dropped out before *Ῥίνονι* (Tod)? l. 27: *πρότες* or *τρίτες*, not *Αἰγεῖδος πρότες* (Giffler). l. 29: *ὀγδόες* or *ἐνάτες*. l. 31: *ἐνάτες* or *δεκάτες*. l. 36: Ἄρ . . . 6 . . . , the first two letters from *ATL* ii, list 39, l. 1. ll. 46-58: The restorations possible are very various; see below. In ll. 51, 53, 55, 57 Meritt restores *παρέδροις*, followed by name-demotic, name-demotic, occupying twenty-nine letters; Ferguson, regarding l. 51 as irrelevant, not altogether plausibly, restores in 53, 55, 57 τῶι ταμίαι τῶι χουμπλέοντι μετὰ τῆς στρατίας (? cf. No. 78 Second stele, frag. a, l. 10), and Kahrstedt has *παρέδροι τῶι συνεκπλέοντι κατὰ τὸ φσέφισμα* throughout (presumably a misprint for *χουνεκπλέοντι*). l. 76: The sigma was omitted.

This text records the payments made by the treasurers of Athena in the Panathenaic quadrennium 418-414. The word describing these payments is *παρέδομεν* or *παρέδοσαν* (l. 62), except in l. 66 where *ἔδανείσαμεν* is used, probably indicating an abnormal payment (Lewis, *Hesp.* xxviii (1959) 246, against Meyer, *Forschungen*, ii. 135, n. 1; for another explanation, see Davison, *JHS* lxxviii (1958) 31 f.); probably all the payments were technically loans. To five items the phrase *φσεφισαμένο τῶ δέμῳ τὲν ἄδειαν* is added (ll. 15, 28, 30, 33, 63); the second Kallias decree (No. 58, l. 16) tells us that this was to be routine procedure, and it is surprising that this is the first text which uses such a phrase (cf. p. 160), though we should not follow Ferguson (*Treasurers*, 162) in seeing in it a sign of protest by the *tamiai*. Ferguson believed that there was no room in our text for large payments by the *tamiai* for the Sicilian expedition, and held that the Athenians created a separate war fund after the Peace of Nikias, out of which major war expense could be met without borrowing from Athena (*Treasurers*, 159-62). There seems little ground for this view (see *ATL* iii. 354-8). The *πάρεδροι* frequently mentioned here are assessors or assistants of the *hellenotamiai*, save possibly in ll. 50 ff.

In 418-17 four payments were made, amounting in all to between 58 T. 1,829 dr. and 58 T. 1,996 dr. (1) The first (ll. 2-10) was originally intended for a squadron operating under Demosthenes, of whose

movements in summer 418 Thucydides tells us nothing, either off Argos or at the mouth of the Strymon (see critical notes); by a decree, part of which is quoted, the payment was transferred to Euthydemos (for whom see Thuc. v. 19, 24, vii. 16, 69, Plut. *Nic.* 20, Diod. xiii. 13) and others for Thracian operations of which Thucydides has nothing to say. (2) In the second prytany, close in time to the battle of Mantinea (Thuc. v. 57 ff.), Demosthenes does receive a payment (ll. 11-15), largely if not all in electrum, for operations off Argos, perhaps connected with the blockade of Epidaurus (Thuc. v. 75. 5; cf. *AJA* xxxii (1928) 350). (3) The third payment (ll. 16-17) has sometimes been used as evidence that Alcibiades, who was certainly not a general at the time of Mantinea (Thuc. v. 61. 2; Diod. xii. 79), was elected at a by-election later in the year (Wade-Gery, *CQ* xxiv (1930) 34 n. 2); the restoration is not certain, and we do not know who was the colleague of Autokles (general in 424-3, Thuc. iv. 53, 119) or what they were doing. (4) The fourth payment (ll. 18-21), in late spring 417, was to Nikias, Kallistratos (who fell in Sicily, Paus. vii. 16. 4, [Plut.] *Vit. X Orat.* 844b), and perhaps K[leomedes], presumably for Nikias' campaign to Chalkidike and Amphipolis (Thuc. v. 83-4); the money apparently came from Samos and has been used as evidence that Samos was still paying off her indemnity (see No. 55) as late as this (*ATL* iii. 334 f.).

In 417-16 three payments are recorded, the first (ll. 26-8) to one or two generals operating in Thrace and to Rhinon (for whom see Wade-Gery, *CQ* xxiv (1930) 35 n. 1), the second and third (ll. 29-33) to Teisias and Kleomedes for the Melian expedition (Thuc. v. 84).

The account for 416-15 is unfortunately the worst preserved. It is probably a false inference from the fact that Alcibiades, Lamachos, and Nikias were listed with demotics in ll. 49-50 only that this was the first of only four payments for the Sicilian expedition. There may have been more; certainly the two payments preserved in a relatively complete condition (ll. 52-3, 54-5) are for relatively small sums, 30 T. and 14 T. 1,000 dr. Nor are we in any better condition for the dates of the payments, the relation of which to the mutilation of the Hermae has been much discussed (West, *AJA* xxix. 3-16, xxxiii. 37-40; Meritt, *ibid.* xxxiv. 131-49; Dinsmoor, *Archons*, 337-41; Meritt, *AFD* 165-73, *Hesp.* iv (1935) 574 f.; Hatzfeld, *REG* l (1937) 293-303; Macdowell, *Andokides On the Mysteries*, 186-9); in our belief the inscription offers no certain fact to supplement the literary evidence, and the possibilities for restoration are too various to discuss here.

The record of 415-14 is much better preserved, and shows a total expenditure of between 353 and 355 T. (l. 81). The payments are not registered strictly in order of date, but according to the purposes

to which they are applied. Of Telephonos (l. 63) and of the operation conducted by him and his colleagues we know nothing. The 9 talents granted to the ἀθλοθέται for the Lesser Panathenaia of 415 (ll. 66-8) may represent a specially luxurious celebration after the troubles of the summer; we do not accept Davison's view (*JHS* lxxviii (1958) 32) that they are an advance payment for the Great Panathenaia of 414. The next two payments (ll. 69-72), in autumn 415 and spring 414, are apparently to an occupation-force in Melos. Then follow two items connected with the Sicilian expedition (ll. 73-6): 300 T. sent on Nikias' urgent appeal (Thuc. vi. 93. 4, 94. 4; Diod. xiii. 8), and 4 T. 2,000 dr. to defray the expenses of the squadron (consisting, according to Meritt's conjecture, of eight vessels) which took this money and a cavalry force to Sicily. As seventeen days elapsed between these two payments, Meritt thinks that the expenses of the squadron were not paid until after its return from the west, and therefore substitutes ἐσκομισάσα]ς for the διακομισάσα]ς of previous editors; however, the horse-transports may have taken seventeen days to prepare. Finally, two payments of unknown amount are made on the same day (ll. 77-9) in spring 414, one to a general in the Thermaic Gulf, possibly Euetion, who attacked Amphipolis in the summer (Thuc. vii. 9), the other to a general at Ephesos, presumably operating in support of Pissouthnes and Amorges (Meritt, *Hesp.* v (1936) 382; Andrewes, *Hist.* x (1961) 5).

The accounts of the Sicilian expedition were continued for the year 414-13 on the reverse of a large stele which already contained the accounts for 432-1 and probably 431-0 (see no. 81). For the text see Meritt, *AFD* 86-93. Connected with these texts is a fragmentary account assembled by Meritt, *Hesp.* xxvi (1957) 198-200, on which contributions to the campaign by Sicilian allies seem to have been recorded.

78 (77)

Decrees relating to the Sicilian Expedition:

415 B.C.

Eight fragments of at least two marble stelai (for fragment *g*, which has no preserved back, is thicker than fragment *c*, which has) found on the Acropolis; now in EM.

Developed Attic writing, stoichedon. The aspirate is rarely omitted.

IG i². 98, 99+; *SEG* x. 107+.

*First Stele (?)*Fragment *b*

[-----]γαν [....]ν[.....10.....]νι [....]οιο [..5...]
 [- διαχεροτονέσαι τὸν δέμ]ον αὐτίκα μάλα εἴτε δοκεῖ ἡένα στρατ[εγ]-
 [ὄν- ----- η]ελέσθαι τύχει ἀγαθῆι νυνὶ κοίτινε[ς] α-
 [-----]το[.] τὸς πολεμῖος ἡος ἂν δύνονται πλει-
 5 [στ-----]ροσθον δὲ καὶ τὸν χουμμάχον ἡοποσ-
 [----- π]όλες ἐς τέμ βολὲν τὲν Ἀθηναίον[ν]
 [----- η]εχσέκοντα νεδν ἡόταμπερ[...]
 [-----]αις ἄμ βόλοντ[αι....9.....]
 [-----]λλο [.....16.....]

Fragment *c*

[...] βολὲν καθότι ἄριστα κ[----- ἐά]-
 ν τε ἀπὸ τῷ τιμέματος δοκεῖ [----- ἐάν]
 τε τέμ πόλιν ἀναλδὸν ἡόσον α[----- τὰ]-
 5 s ἡεχσέκοντα ναῦς ἐὰμ προσ[-----]
 μενον εἰ ἐσφέρεν ἡόταν δεε[----- ἐκκ]-
 λείαν ποιεσάντων δέκα ἡε[μερὸν ----- π]-
 ἐρὶ ἄλλο μεδενὸς πρότερον [-----]
 ε ἐκκλεισίαν ποιῆν τὸς πρυτ[άνες -----]
 10 αι τοῖς στρατηγοῖς τὸν νεδν [-----]
 οἰς· περὶ δὲ τῷ ἔκπλο τὸν νεδν [----- ἐ]-
 πανορθόσθαι ἐν τῷ δέμοι ἡο[----- ἐ]-
 κκλεισίαν ποιόντων ἡόταν κε[-----]
 15 ον καὶ τῆς ἄλλης ἡυπερείας [-----]
 καὶ ἀργυρίο ἐς καλλιέρεσιω [-----]
 [.] ἡεχσακοσίον [καὶ] χιλίον [-----]

*Second Stele (?)*Fragment *a*

[ἔδοχσεν τῷ βολῆι καὶ τῷ δέμοι [- -----
 [.....20..... εἴ]πε· τύχει[ι ἀγαθῆι ---
 [.....22.....]μένας μισθ -----
 [.....21.....τ]ετταράκον[τα ----
 5 [.....19.....πελ]τάσαις χρ[-----

[.....22..... τ]οχσότας π[-----
 [.....23.....]δει ἐκ το[-----
 [.....21..... τ]έτταρας ὀβο[λός -----
 [.....17..... κυβε]ρνέτας δὲ καὶ [----
 10 [.....19..... τ]αμίαν δὲ χσυμπ[----
 [.....20.....] ἡε βολεὶ ἡόταμ με[----
 [.....16..... τοῖ]ς τριεράρχοις κα[----
 [.....21.....] τὸμ πολεμίον λ[----
 [.....21.....]λλον ἡότι αν[----

Fragments *d* and *g*

[-----]ιο [...5...]
 [-----]σοτοντ[.]
 [---]αι ἔ φρορῶσι τέ[μ πόλιν ἔ τέ]ν χόραν τ-
 [---]ν ἡὸς ἂν μὲ περιπο[λεί μεδὲ μ]ισθοφορῆ-
 5 [ι---]το πλὲν ἡοπόσοις [...7...ἡ]ε βολεὶ καὶ
 [-----]ἔ]νοχον ἔναι ζεμία[ι ...6...]αι μέτε τον
 [-----]πρ]υτάνες· λύσαι δὲ [...7...]αι τὸ φσέφι-
 [σμα --- τ]ὸ ἔκπλο τὸν ἔχσέ[κοντα νεδ]ν ἡέος ἂν ἡ
 [-----]ἔ]π' ἄλλο ἔργον με[δ' ἐπ' ἄ]λλεν σ]τρατιὰν
 10 [-----]τ]ρισχιλίον· ἐ[ἂν δέ τις εἴπει] ἔ ἐπιφσ-
 [εφίσει ---]ς ἔχσαιρ[.....14.....]ον μ[.]
 [-----]ογιτ[.....20.....]

*Unknown Stele*Fragment *e*

|||||ΙΙΟΣ[
]τῆι Ἀθενᾶι κ[
 στρα]τιόταις διανε[μ
]ξναι τὸν νεδν [
 5]ρχσοσι[

Fragment *f*

]τεγκ[...7...]
 ἡεκ]ατὸν τριέρε[ς .]
] πολέμοι ἡότι

]αστέσασθαι το
 5 ἐπιτ]έδειον ἔναι ἡ-
]αμ ποι χρεσ-
]ς ναυσὶν
 πρυ]τανε-
]ντ-
 - - -

Fragment *h*

]αν[
]ετο[
]ος χσυμμάχος α[
]ς κ[αὶ] τομ φορον [
 5]σθαι τ[
]ρε[
 - -

Less conservative texts have been current since Kirchhoff, but, since it is impossible to define the length of line more closely than 50–70 letters, we print no restoration. Our text is based, with very slight variations, on that prepared by K. J. Dover for the *Historical Commentary on Thucydides*, which he has generously placed at our disposal. The top of *a*, the right margins of *b*, *f*, and *g*, and the left margin of *c* are preserved. In *b* l. 3 εἴτε πλείους or εἴτε τρεῖς seems inevitable.

In the spring of 415 the Athenians, after hearing a report from the envoys they had sent to Egesta and from representatives of that city, resolved to dispatch a fleet of sixty vessels to Sicily under the command of Alcibiades, Nicias, and Lamachos as στρατηγοὶ ἀποκράτορες (Thuc. vi. 8. 2). Four days later (vi. 8. 3) another Assembly was held, to speed up the preparation of the fleet and vote any additional provision the generals might require. At it, Nicias, emphasizing the difficulties of the undertaking, estimated the force needed as not less than 100 ships (not including Athenian and allied transports), not less than 5,000 Athenian and allied hoplites, and a proportionate number of light troops (vi. 25. 2). The Assembly forthwith voted the generals full powers with regard to the size of the expedition and the whole voyage (vi. 26. 1). There were doubtless later Assemblies, one of which we hear of in Andoc. i. 11. The expedition eventually consisted of 136 ships (100 Athenian), 5,100 hoplites (2,200 Athenian), and 1,300 light-armed (vi. 43).

Of the fragments before us, *b* certainly refers to the first Assembly. It still regards the number of generals as an open question (ll. 2–3); that there was ever any possibility of entrusting the expedition to one

general is a matter on which the literary sources are silent. For the procedural formula used here, cf. No. 65, ll. 5 ff. Jones (*Athenian Democracy*, 112–14) regards such formulae as a sign that the decree was drafted in the Assembly, but we think it more likely that they are a sign of disagreement in the formulation of a probouleuma by the Council. Worth notice too is the language of l. 4, which seems to have been part of instructions stronger in language than anything in Thuc. vi. 8. 2.

Fragment *c* seems firstly (ll. 2–3) to be raising problems about the financing of the expedition, possibly on the lines of the distinction between public and private effort which runs through Thuc. vi. 31. 3–5, but there is no obvious parallel for the way in which *τίμημα* is used here. In ll. 4–12 the holding of further Assemblies, priority for their business, and the amendment of something are contemplated. The number of ships concerned is still sixty. We incline to attribute this text too to the first Assembly, looking forward to the second.

In fragment *a* we have reached a stage of detailed planning, with precise numbers, categories of light-armed, and pay. In l. 10 *τ]αμίαν* or *ἡλλενοτ]αμίαν* δὲ *χοσυμπ[λῆν* is a tempting restoration; he may perhaps be identified with Antimachos Ἐρμειος who appears beside the generals in No. 77, ll. 53, 55 (cf. Kahrstedt, *Untersuchungen zur Magistratur*, 125 n.).

In fragments *d* and *g* ll. 7–8 the revocation of a previous decree, presumably that of the first Assembly, is certainly in question. In l. 9 the diversion of certain resources elsewhere seems to be forbidden. L. 10 has generally been thought to define these resources as 3,000 T. (Ferguson, *Treasurers*, 160 f., *ATL* iii. 356 n. 40). It is tempting to interpret ll. 10–11 as a prohibition on touching the reserve fund of 1,000 T. established in 431 (Thuc. ii. 24. 1, viii. 15. 1).

79 (79 and 80)

Confiscated Property of the Hermokopidai:

414 B.C.

A

Excerpt from a stele of yellowish-grey marble, of which fifteen fragments survive, found in various places in Athens; now in EM and the Agora Museum.

The text was laid out in four columns (we give col. i only). There was no general heading, and the text must have been continued from another

stele. Developed Attic writing, partly stoichedon. Phot.: *Hesp.* xxii (1953) Pl. 67-9, 72.

Pritchett, *Hesp.* xxii (1953) 240-9+, xxv (1956) 276-81, xxx (1961) 23-5 (three new fragments).

			<i>6 lines lost</i>
	--	---	[...6...]ς
	--	---	[..5...]ε
	--	---	[παῖς Π]εισίστρατος Κάρ
10			[κεφάλαιον]ν Ἐφαιστοδόρο
			[....8....]†††††.
			[Ἀλκιβιάδο τ]ὸ Κλεινίῳ
			[Σκαμβονίδ]ο σκεύε τάδε ἐπρά[θ]ε·
	--	---	[...]τια
15	--	---	[χύτ]ρα χαλκῆ
	--	---	[χύτ]ρα χαλκῆ
	--	---	[χύτρ]α χαλκῆ
	--	---	[..5...]ς χαλκῶς
			<i>lacuna</i>
	--	.Δ --	. ---
20	[I]	ΔΓ†††	ἐπικαρπ[ι]α
			Θρία
	[I]	ΔΔ	ἐπικαρπία
			Ἀθμονοῖ.
			κεφάλαιον σὺν ἐπονίῳ[ις]
25			ΧΧΧΧ ^π ΗΗΔΔ†††††.
			Πολυστράτο τὸ Διο[δόρο]
			Ἀγκυλῆθεν·
	†††	ΗΗ††	Πίστος
	[†]	ΔΔΔΔ††	ἐπικαρπία Ἀγ-
30			κυλῆσι.
			κεφάλαιον σὺν ἐπονίῳ[ις]
			ΗΗΔΔΔΔΓ†††.
			Κεφισοδόρο μετοίκο ἐμ Περα[ιεῖ].
	††	Η ^π ΔΓ	Θραῖττα
35	†	ΗΔΔΔΓ	Θραῖττα
	[†]†	Η ^π ΔΔ	Θραῖξ
	††	ΗΗΔΔΔΔ	Σύρος

	[Γ]	ΗΓ	Κάρ
	††	ΗϠΔ†	ἡλλυριός
40	††	ΗΗΔΔ	Θραῖττα
	†	ΗΔΓ	Θραῖξ
	†	ΗΔΔΔΔ††††	Σκύθες
	†	ΗΔΔ†	ἡλλυριός
	††	ΗϠ†††	Κόλχος
45	††	ΗϠΔΔ††††	Κάρ παῖς
	†	ϠΔΔ††	Καρικόν παιδίον
	[Γ]†††	ΗΗΗ†	Σύρος
	[Γ]†	ΗϠ†	Μελιττ[ενός οἱ ενέ]
	†	ϠΔΔΔΓ . .	Λυδέ

Enough stone is preserved to the right of the lacuna to make it clear that the items listed were short ones. In l. 29 the figure restored for the sales-tax is certain, but represented an overcharge (Pritchett, *Hesp.* xxii, 229, 246). In l. 49 the figure is a new reading.

B

Eight joining fragments of white marble, found at various places in Athens; now in EM and the Agora Museum. Nine other fragments probably belong to the same stele.

Developed Attic writing, generally stoichedon, with considerable variations in spacing. Phot.: *Hesp.* viii (1939) 71, xxii, Pl. 78; *AJA* lvi (1952), Pl. 5.

Meritt, *Hesp.* viii (1939) 69-76+; Pritchett, *Hesp.* xxii (1953) 268-79, xxx (1961) 28 (another fragment).

50	--	---	[...] καὶ ἔ[γγο]να τούτον]. <i>vacat</i> <i>vacat</i>
			[Ἀδειμάν]το τῶ Λε[υκ]ολοφίδο Σκα[μβονίδο].
	--	..	ἀνὲρ [Ἄρ]ιστόμαχος
55			ἀγρός [ἐν] Θάσοι ἐν Ἰ[- -] καὶ οἰκ[ία].
	--	[...]ΗΗϠ	ἔπεστιν [πίθ]οι ἐν[- -] ἡγιῆς ΔΔ[. . σ]αθρο[ι - -] ἐπιθέμα[τα ἔχοντες].
60	--	[...]ΗϠΔΔΔ	οἶνο ἀμφο[ρῆ]ς [- - -] ϠϠΔΔΔΔ τρ[ῆ]ς χόε[ς].

			<i>vacat</i>
		[Π]αναϊτίο·	
65	--	[.]ΔΔ	οἶνο ἀμφορ[ἔ]ς Ἄττι[κῶ] καθαροῦ ΗΙΙΙΙ εἶ[π]τὰ χό[ε]ς
	[ΓΓΓ]	[Η]Η ^Α Δ	σμένε ἐν τῷ [ἄ]γρ[ῶ] τῷ ἐν Ἴσ[...6...]ΔΓ[- -]
	[Γ]	[Η]	βόε ἐρ[γά]τα δύο ἐν Ἄρ - -
	[Γ]	[^Α]ΔΔ	βόε [δύο]
70	--	---	β[ό]ε]ς τέτταρες καὶ μό[σχοι - -]
	--	---	πρόβατα ^Α ΔΔΔΙΙΙ
			καὶ ἔκγονα τούτων
	[ΓΓΓΓΙΙΙ]	[^Α ΗΗ]Δ	αἰγες ^Α ΔΓΙΙ καὶ ἔγγον[α τούτων].
			<i>vacat</i>
75		[Πολυστρά]το	τῷ Διοδόρῳ Ἄγκυλέος·
			οἰκία ἐγ ΚυδαθENAΙΟ[ι, εἰ πρόθυρον]
			τὸ δίκιον, εἰ γειτόν εἶ[στι τὸ ἱερὸν]
--		[...] ^Α	Ἀρτέμιδος τῆς Ἄθμων[όθεν]
			Ἄμαρυσίας
80		---	χόριον Ἄγκυλέσι νο[τόθεν]
			τὸ λόφο ἵνα τὸ ἱε[ρὸν - -]
			<i>3 lines vacant</i>
85		Νικίδ[ο τῷ]	Φοικί[δο Μ]ελι[έος]·
		Γ ^Α ΓΓ	ἐκχαλ[- - - -]
			<i>vacat</i>
		Εὐφιλέτο τῷ Τ[ιμοθέο ΚυδαθENAΙΕΟΣ]·	
		περὶ ἀμφοτέρα· οἰκ[ία - - -]	
90		ΔΓ Χ ^Α	ἀπ[- - - -]
			<i>2 lines vacant</i>
		Φερεκλέος τῷ Φε[ρεν]ικα[ί]ο Θεμακ[έ]ος[ς]·	
		περὶ ἀμφοτέρα· οἰκ[ία ἐ]μ Βατῆ[ι καὶ] χορίον	
95			<i>vacat</i>
			ἡέτ[ερον] χορίον [...]αλαν[- -]
			ετ[...5...] <i>vacat</i>
			χορί[ον π]αρὰ τὸ Πύθ[ιον.] Ο[.
			<i>vacat</i>
100	ΔΓΓ	ΧΗΗ	[ο]ικό[πε]δον [ἐ]λὺ [κ]αὶ χέρ[ρον]
			παρ[ὰ τὸ Π]ύθιον

105
 ἡτέ[ρον] χορίον παρὰ τ[ὸ]
 ἡερά[κλει]ον
 ὄργα[δος] τὸ ἡέμισυ τῆς εἴντος τῶ
 Πυθ[ίου υ κ]αὶ διανόμο τὸ ἀπὸ [τῶ ἡιερό]
 [τὸ δὲ ἄλλ]ο ἡέμισυ ἐγ Κυκάλει·
 τα[ῦτα ἐπ]ράθε συνλέβδεν ἡάπαν[τα].
 2 lines vacant

110
 μισθόσες ἡαῖδε κ[ατε]βλέθεσαν
 τὸν ἀσεβεσάντο[ν περι] τὸ θεό·
 Φαῖδρο τὸ Πυθο[κλέος] Μυρρινοσίο
 Π Δ ο[ικίας μ]ίσθοσις κατεβλέθε
 [γῆς Μυρρ]ιδωντι μίσθοσις
 115
 ΗΗΗΠ [κατεβλέ]θε
 ἐκ τὸν Ἀδειμ[άντο τὸ Λ]ευκολοφίδο Σκαμβονίδο
 ΧΠΗΔΔΔΤΤΙΙΙΙ [...7....]ΟΙ. ΡΞΞ
 ἐκ τὸν Ἀχσιόχ[ο τὸ Ἀλκιβιάδο Σ]καμβονίδ[ο]
 ΧΠΗΔΔΔΤΤΙΙΙΙ [- - - - -]
 120
 ΗΗΠ [- - - - -]
 ΗΠ ΔΤΤΙΙΙΙ [- - - - -]
 ἐκ [τὸν - - - - -]
 - - - - -

1. 57: ἐν[έα ἀμφορέον] Pritchett. 11. 60-5: These wine prices are discussed by Pritchett, *Hesp.* xxv (1956) 199-203; [Π] Δ Δ is very probable in l. 64. 1. 67: Ἰσθ[μῶι] edd., but the theta seems very uncertain. 11. 68-73: We follow Pritchett's suggestions (*Hesp.* xxv. 257-60), except for his [τούτων] at the end of l. 70. 1. 86: The current restoration is ἐκχαλ[κόματα]; perhaps ἐκ Χαλ[κίδος ἐπικαρπία vel sim. (*Ehrenberg Studies*, p. 191, n. 56). 11. 89, 94: περὶ ἀμφότερα was added later in both these lines. 1. 93: Φι[λοδ]ικα[ίο] (Raubitschek) is a more convincing name, but Φε[ι] is slightly more probable epigraphically. 1. 96: π[αρ]ὰ Λαν[or εἴν.]αλαν[. 1. 98. A new reading, which we cannot explain. 11. 104-5: τῆς εἴ[πι τῶι] Πυθ[ίου κ]αὶ (Meritt) fills the space but leaves the case of διανόμο unexplained. 11. 116-17: Traces of another column to the left.

Ἐν δὲ ταῖς Ἀττικαῖς στήλαις αἱ κείνται ἐν Ἐλευσίνοι, τὰ τῶν ἀσεβησάντων περὶ τῶ θεῶ δημοσία πραθέντα ἀναγέγραπται (Pollux, x. 97). The two excerpts given here come from a large number of fragments, assigned by Pritchett to ten or eleven stelai (whether Stele XI belongs to the series is doubtful) and published or republished by him, *Hesp.* xxii (1953) 225-99 (some additional fragments, *ibid.* xxx (1961) 23-9), supplemented by important commentaries by him and Amyx,

ibid. xxv (1956) 178–317, xxvii (1958) 163–310. The fragments were found over a wide area, but by far the largest number come from the south-east corner of the Agora, the site of the Eleusinion, for which see Wycherley, *The Athenian Agora: Testimonia*, 74–85. Nothing of the kind has been found at Eleusis, and we must either follow Boeckh in emending Pollux's text to Ἐλευσινίῳ, which is unlikely, since ἐν τῷ Ἐλευσινίῳ is the standard phrase, or assume a simple confusion in Pollux or his source (so Pippin, ibid. xxv. 324 f.).

The condemnation of the Hermokopidai and the confiscation of their property was placed by Philochorus in 415–14 (*FGH* 328 F 134). Pritchett's Stele X, certainly the latest of the series, can be dated to late winter 414–13 with virtual certainty, and references (A 20, 22, 29) to ἐπικαρπία, crops not yet harvested, show that Stelai I–II belong to a September. Pritchett, ibid. xxii. 232–4, thought this more likely to be September 414 than September 415, but it seems not unlikely that the whole process took a considerable time (Lewis, *Ehrenberg Studies*, 181 ff.).

Pollux's words and the place of exhibition of the stelai suggest that they were primarily thought of as exhibiting the property of those who had profaned the Mysteries (Pollux, B 111), but since this case was inextricably confused with the affair of the Hermokopidai and many of the accused were involved in both, our documents recognize the confusion, though perhaps the recognition was delayed, as the later addition of περὶ ἀμφότερα to B 89, 94 suggests (in Stele X, 13, however, τὸμ περὶ ἀμφότερα was inscribed from the first). See Lewis, op. cit. 187.

Of the thirty-three names given by Andocides, i. 12–18, as having been denounced for profaning the Mysteries, twelve have so far appeared on the stelai (two changes in Andocides' text, Νικιάδης for Νικιάδης and Οἰωνίας for Ἰωνίας in i. 13 must now be made). Of the twenty-two names given by him (i. 35, 67) for the mutilation of the Hermai, four have so far appeared. His lists appear then to be substantially accurate. Though Euphiletos, listed as περὶ ἀμφότερα here, B 89, and in Stele X, 13–14, does not appear in his list of those who profaned the Mysteries, he may well be included in τοὺς ἄλλους of And. i. 17 (see Pritchett, ibid. xxii. 230–2; Macdowell, *Andokides On The Mysteries*, 71 f.).

Of the names before us, Hephaistodoros (A 10) was denounced by Teukros (And. i. 15); Alcibiades (A 12–13) needs no comment here; Polystratos (A 26, B 75) was denounced by Andromachos and executed at an early stage in the proceedings (And. i. 13); Kephisodoros (A 33; we should perhaps consider restoring ἐμ Περα[λεὶ οἰκόντος], the normal designation of a metic) was denounced by Teukros (And. i. 15; Macdowell, op. cit. 211, suggests identifying him with the comic dramatist); Adeimantos (B 53, 116), a friend and fellow demesman of

Alcibiades, was denounced by Agariste and went into exile (And. i. 16), shared Alcibiades' rehabilitation, and became general in 407, but was not affected by his second fall, and survived to be general at Aigospotamoi and to be accused of contributing to that defeat by treachery (Xen. *Hell.* i. 4. 21, 7. 1, ii. 1. 30, 32; Lys. xiv. 38; *PA* 202); Panaitios (B 63) is presumably, since he lacks *περὶ ἀμφοτέρα*, the Panaitios denounced by Andromachos for the Mysteries (And. i. 13), and not the one denounced by Andocides himself for the Hermae (And. i. 52, 67, rightly distinguished by Macdowell, *op. cit.* 72; Pritchett apparently identifies them); Nikides (B 85) was denounced by Andromachos (And. i. 12-13); Euphiletos (B 89; see above) was denounced by Teukros and Andocides for the Hermae (And. i. 35, 51, 56, 61-4); Pherekles (B 93) was denounced by his own slave (And. i. 17) for having the Mysteries performed in his house in Themakos (apparently not listed in B 94 ff.) and also by Teukros for the Hermae (And. i. 35); Phaidros (B 112), denounced by Teukros (And. i. 15), is shown by the appearance of his full name in this text to be the friend of Socrates, after whom Plato's dialogue is named, and his later poverty (Lys. xix. 15) is now explained (cf. Hatzfeld, *REA* xli (1939) 313-18); Axiochos, also the eponym of a Socratic dialogue and uncle of Alcibiades (for the *stemma*, see Vanderpool, *Hesp.* xxi (1952) 6), was denounced by Agariste and went into exile (And. i. 16), returning to move the second decree of No. 89 and speak in the debate after Arginusai ([Plat.] *Axiochos* 369 a).

Even more important, however, than their political interest is the social and economic evidence that these texts provide. They throw some light on what possessions a fifth-century Athenian might have and what they were worth. The prices should be taken with some reserve, since they are the product of a forced sale, with perhaps some taint of impiety about the goods as well as the owners. The texts deserve study as a whole, and our excerpts are misleading to the extent that household utensils and furniture are relatively uncommon in them.

Real property. The scatter of land-holdings is interesting. A 20-4 shows an owner of crops both at Thria and Athmonon. Polystratos, besides land in his own deme of Ankyle (A 29, B 80), has a town house in Kudathenaion with a two-column porch (B 76). Adeimantos has a farm outside Attica altogether, in Thasos, fully equipped with storage-pithoi, sold as part of the farm (B 55 ff.; cf. Amyx, *Hesp.* xxvii (1958) 168-70. Other texts show property in Oropos, Euboea, and Abydos.); Pherekles, besides his house in his own deme of Themakos (And. i. 17), has a property at Bate and other miscellaneous lots (B 95 ff.); Phaidros was apparently not living in his own deme of Myrrhinous at all, but leasing his property there for 410 dr. (a year?

B 113-15; a town house of his may be referred to in Lys. xxxii. 14). Adeimantos and Axiochos seem each to have had an income from leases four times as great (B 116 ff.). For the various terms for real property in these texts, see Pritchett, *Hesp.* xxv. 261-9. For ἐλύ (B 100), cf. Hesych. εἰλύ· μέλαν, but there may be a connection with ἰλύς.

Slaves (*Hesp.* xxv. 276-81, xxx. 27). The total of slaves found in these texts is now 45. The largest single preserved holding is that of the metic Kephisodoros (A 34 ff.), who had at least 16; Adeimantos had at least 8 (Stele VI, 18 ff., 54 (= B 54 here), X, 3), Axiochos at least 7 (Stele X, 7, 9; *Hesp.* xxx. 26). Since these last two have more than one entry, it is unsafe to assume that Polystratos had only the one slave recorded in A 28. Twenty-four prices are preserved, averaging 170-80 dr. The median price is slightly lower, 157 dr., since the average is substantially increased by a Carian goldsmith and a Macedonian woman, who fetched 360 and 310 dr. (Stele II, 77 ff.), and the Syrian here (A 47). No variation in price between men and women or between nationalities can be detected, except that the two Syrians are high; Pritchett's view that παῖς and παιδίον here (A 45-6) denote children is hardly safe, since the words are regularly used of slaves of all ages. Of the 35 slaves whose origins can be ascertained, 12 are Thracian, 7 Carian, 3 Scythian, 3 οἰκογενεῖς, 2 Syrian, 2 Illyrian, with 1 each from Colchis, Lydia, Macedonia, Phrygia, Messenia, and Cappadocia (interpreting Μελιττ[, A 48, as referring to Melitene, rather than to Malta or the Illyrian island of Melite).

These documents were doubtless drawn up by the πωληταί, whose duties included that of selling confiscated property (Arist. *Ἠθ. Πολ.* 47. 2, 52. 1). The left-hand column records the ἐπάνιον on each sale, and the second column the price paid. The ἐπάνιον (A 24, 31) was not an exact 1 per cent, but determined by a scale on which, for example, for every amount from 100 dr. to 104 dr. 5 ob. the buyer paid 1 dr. 1 ob. additional tax (Pritchett, *Hesp.* xxii. 226-30). In the early fourth century a similar scale worked to a base of 2 per cent (Pritchett, *CP* li (1956) 100-2), but the tax was halved again later.

80

An Oligarchic Decree: 411 B.C.

Fragment of a marble stele, with the left edge preserved, found on the south slope of the Acropolis; now in EM.

Ionic script, stoichedon 30. The last four lines are in another, more deeply cut, hand. Phot.: *IIA* 44.

IG ii². 12+; Wilhelm, *Jahresh.* xxi/xxii (1922-4) 147; *IG* i². p. 297; Ferguson, *CP* xxi (1926) 73-4; Weston, *AJP* lxi (1940) 345-6, 356-7; Kahrstedt, *Klio*, xxxiii (1940) 12; Lenschau, *Rh. Mus.* xc (1941) 24-30; de Ste Croix, *Hist.* v (1956) 17-19.

- [...8....]ην[.....20.....]
 [...6...]ηι ην τε[.....18.....]
 [...6...]άτης Ἰκα[ριεύς ἐγραμμάτευεν.]
 [βολῆ]ς ἐπεστάτε[.....17.....]
 5 [...κ]αὶ μετ' αὐτὸ π[.....16.....]
 [.Ἐ]υπεταιῶν, Διωπ[.....16.....]
 [...] Κεφαλῆθεν, Καλ[.....16.....]
 [.Ἰ]ππομένης εἶπε· [.....16.....]
 10 στίωι, ἐπειδὴ πρόξ[ενός ἐστι Ἀθηναίω]-
 ν καὶ εὐεργέτης κ[αὶ εὖ ποεῖ ὃ τι δύνατ]-
 αι τὴν πόλιν τὴν Ἀθ[ηναίων καὶ τὴν...]
 στίων τὸ ψήφισμα τ[ὸ πρόψηφισμένον α]-
 ὑτῶι ἀναγράψαι ἐν σ[τήλῃ λιθίνῃ τὸ]-
 ν γραμματέα τῆς βολ[ῆς τὸν νῦν γραμμα]-
 15 τεύοντα καὶ καταθεῖν[αι ἐν πόλει. τὰ δὲ]
 χρήματα, ἃ ἐστὶν Πυθοφά[νει Ἀθήνησιν]
 ἢ ἄλλοθί πο ὧν Ἀθηναῖοι κ[ρατοσιν, καὶ]
 περὶ τῆς νεὼς ἃ λεγεί καὶ [περὶ τῶν χρη]-
 [μ]άτων, μὴ ἀδικέν μηδένα κ[αὶ ἀσυλίαν εἶ]-
 20 ναι αὐτῶι καὶ τοῖς χρήμα[σι αὐτὸ καὶ ἄ]-
 νίοντι καὶ ἀπίοντι. ταῦτ[α μὲν ἔστω ἐψ]-
 ηφισμένα ὄσης Ἀθηναῖοι [κρατόσι πᾶσ]-
 ιτοῖς Πυθοφάνος κατὰ τα[ῦτά· ὅπως δ' ἂν]
 ταῦτα γίγνηται, τοὺς στ[ρατηγὸς τὸς α]-
 25 [ἰ]εὶ στρατηγόντας ἐπιμ[έλεισθαι καὶ τ]-
 [ῆ]ν βολὴν τὴν αἰεὶ βολεύ[ουσαν. προσανα]-
 [γ]ράψαι δὲ καὶ τόδε τὸ ψή[φισμα ἐς τὴν α]-
 [ὑ]τὴν στήλῃν τὸ γ γραμμ[ατέα τῆς βολῆς.]
 υῦ ἐπὶ Ἀριστοκράτος ἄ[ρχοντος υυυυυ]
 30 [ἔδ]οξ[εν] τῆ[ι] β[ολ]ῆ[ι, Κεκρ[οπισ ἐπρυτάνε]-
 [νε, ...7.... ἐγρα]μμάτε[υεν, Ἀριστοκρά]-
 [της ἦρχε, ...7....]ς ἐπε[στάτε, - - - -]

L. 2: τ|ῆι γνώμ|ῆι ἦν Τε[ισάμενος εἶπεν vac.] Wilhelm; [ἔδοξεν|τῆι βολ|ῆι ἦν τε[ταρτῆ τῆς πρυτανείας] Lewis *op. de Ste Croix*. l. 4: Wilhelm. Restoring a name creates overwhelming difficulties. l. 5: π[ρόδρουον or π[ρόεδροι ἦσαν Wilhelm; π[ρυτάνες] or π[ρυτάνες ἦσαν Kahrstedt. ll. 8 and 11: That the honorand is from Karystos seems never to have been doubted, but τῆν τε Καρυ]στίων in ll. 11-12 is stylistically impossible and καὶ τῆν Καρυ]στίων (Wilhelm) is one letter too long. Epigraphical anomalies can be eliminated by restoring καὶ τῆν Φαι]στίων in ll. 11-12, and in l. 8 εἶπε[ν Πυθοφάνει τῶι Φαι]στίωι for the vulgate εἶπε: [Πυθοφάνει τῶι Καρυ]-στίωι. l. 15: [τὰ δέ] Leonardos, Lenschau; [ουου] Wilhelm. l. 18: [περὶ ἐμπολη]μάτων Wilamowitz. ll. 31-2: *our* restoration.

The decree itself (ll. 8-28) is regular enough. Pythophanes, presumably a merchant and already an Athenian *proxenos*, receives in return for his continued good services the inscription of a previous decree in his honour (presumably this stood higher up the stone and may end in ll. 1-2; the suggestion of Weston that *IG* ii². 73 is yet another decree for him is unconvincing) and security for his trading operations. The Athenian Empire is still in being (ll. 17, 22). The prescript, however, has no epigraphical parallel whatsoever. Wilhelm pointed out that there was space for five names in ll. 4-7, and, comparing *Arist. Ath. Pol.* 30. 4, κληροῦν δὲ τῆν βουλὴν τοὺς ἐννέα ἄρχοντας, τὰς δὲ χειροτονίας κρίνειν πέντε τοὺς λαχόντας ἐκ τῆς βουλῆς, καὶ ἐκ τούτων ἓνα κληροῦσθαι καθ' ἐκάστην ἡμέραν τὸν ἐπιψηφιοῦντα, attributed ll. 3-28 to the year 411. This is certainly right, but opinion remains divided as to whether the decree comes from the regime of the Four Hundred or that of the Five Thousand. Ferguson maintained the latter and it sustained him in his belief that *Ath. Pol.* 30 was not merely an advance programme but the actual constitution of the Five Thousand; the former view was advocated by Lenschau and de Ste Croix, who, accepting the restored reference to Karystos, pointed out that it was in revolt during the regime of the Five Thousand (*Thuc.* viii. 95. 7) and that the Four Hundred did have five *proedroi* (*Thuc.* viii. 67. 3), and the name suggests that they presided over as well as enrolled the Four Hundred. The placing of this decree is complicated by the problems of reconciling it with the other known decree of the period, [*Plut.*] *Vit. X Orat.* 833 d, ἔδοξεν τῆ βουλῆ, μιᾷ καὶ εἰκοστῇ τῆς πρυτανείας. Δημόνικος Ἀλωπεκῆθεν ἐγραμμάτευε, Φιλόστρατος Παλληνεὺς ἐπεστάτει, Ἄνδρων εἶπε, equally alien to the normal democratic formulae. Lewis's restoration of ll. 1-2 of this decree brings the two prescripts into line, but is probably wrong, in default of a parallel for his dating formula; it does, however, have the advantage of finding room for the clause ἔδοξεν τῆι βολῆι, the absence of which is otherwise surprising.

Ll. 29-32 start a further decree passed in 399-8, presumably

also for Pythophanes. The observation that they are in a second hand disposes of the argument that the fourth-century democracy would not have reinscribed a decree of the Four Hundred. For *ἔδοξεν τῆι βολῆι* without mention of the *δῆμος*, in this period, for simple renewals of earlier honours, cf. Tod, vol. ii, no. 98.

81 (81)

Expenditure of the Treasurers of Athena: 411 B.C.

On the left side of a stele, not yet fully reconstructed, on the front of which were the accounts of 432-1 (Meritt, *AFD* 80-3) and probably also of 431-0 (*ibid.* 84-5), and on the back the accounts of 414-13 (*ibid.* 88-9) and probably also of 413-12 and 412-11 (now only represented by *IG* i². 307). Below this text was almost certainly the account of 411-10 (under the regime of the Five Thousand), of which there survives only a very small unpublished fragment on the right-hand side of *IG* i². 307. All the fragments, save a tiny scrap of the accounts of 432-1 from the Agora (*Hesp.* xxx (1961) 241), are in EM.

Ionic letters, not stoichedon (cf. Austin 52 f.). Phot.: Meritt, *AFD* 91; facs.: *ibid.* Pl. i.

IG i². 298; Meritt, *AFD* 93; Ferguson, *Treasurers*, 145-6.

[Ἀθηναῖ]οι ἀνήλω[σαν ἐπὶ]
 [Μνασιλ]όχου ἄρχο[ντος]
vacat
 [ταμί]αι ἱερῶν χ[ρημάτ]-
 5 [ων τῆ]ς Ἀθηναία[ς Ἄσω]-
 [πόδω]ρος Κυδαθ[ηνα]-
 [ιεύς] καὶ συνάρχο[ντ]-
 [ες] οἷς Εὐάνδρος Ἐ[ρ]-
 [ι]θαλίωνος Εὐώννυμ-
 10 [ε]ὺς ἐ[γρ]αμμάτευεν
 παρέδοσαν ἑλληνο-
 ταμίαις Ἀντισθέν-
 ει Ἐρμείω καὶ συν-
 ἀρχοσιν ψηφισαμέ-
 15 νης τῆς βολῆς Ἐκατ-
 [ο]μβαιῶνος ἐνάτει

[φθί]νοντος ἀπὸ τῶν
 [χρημάτων] Ἀθηναίας
 [Πολιά]δος: 44^βΤΤΧΧ
 20 [.. 4-5..] ^βΔΔΤΤΤΤΙΙΙΙ τῆ-
 [ς Νίκης Ἀ]θηναίας ἀπὸ
 [.. c. 9 ..]ων ^βΗΔΔΔΔΔ

We follow Meritt's text, save in l. 22, where the last numeral was read by Lolling, apparently rightly, and the restoration [τῶν χρημάτων] (Lolling and Kirchhoff) would be unparalleled. Perhaps [τῶν ἐπετεί]ων; cf. ἐκ τῶν ἐπετείων in No. 84, l. 3.

This record dates from the rule of the Four Hundred in the summer of 411. Mnasilochos (l. 2; for the Doric form of the name, see Keil, *Hermes*, xxix (1894) 39 n. 1), one of their number, ἤρξεν . . . δίμηνον ἐπὶ Θεοπόμπου ἄρχοντος, ὃς ἤρξε τοὺς ἐπιλοίπους δέκα μῆνας (*Arist. Ἀθ. Πολ.* 33. 1); he reappears later as one of the Thirty (*Xen. Hell.* ii. 3. 2). The oligarchs use ψηφισαμένης τῆς βολῆς (l. 14) instead of the democratic ψηφισαμένο τῷ δέμῳ (No. 77 *passim* and No. 84, l. 3). They also date by month and day (ll. 15, 17) without reference to prytany, though they had prytanies of some sort (*Thuc.* viii. 70. 1): according to Meritt's reckoning 21st or 22nd Hekatombaion = 14 or 15 August 411 (*Athenian Year* 218). They use Ionic letters for the first time in these texts, perhaps on principle.

82 (82)

Eretria revolts from Athens: 411 B.C.

White marble stele, found at Eretria; now in the museum there.

Ionic writing, with angular β and Ϙ and dotted omikron (for the circular letters, see *BSA* lvii (1962) 3 n. 27). Ll. 2-10 stoichedon. Phot.: *IG* xii. 9, Pl. i (part).

IG xii. 9. 187 A+; *SIG* 105; *DGE* 804; Buck 13.

θεοί.

ἔδοξεν τῷ βουλῆι Ἡγέλοχον
 τὸν Ταραντῖνον πρόξενον εἶ-
 ναι καὶ εὐεργέτην καὶ αὐτὸν
 5 κ[α]ὶ παῖδας, καὶ σίτηριν εἶνα-

ι καὶ αὐτῶι καὶ παῖρῖν, ὅταν ἐ-
 [π]ιδημέωριν, καὶ ἀτελέην καὶ
 προεδρίην ἐς τὸς ἀγῶνας ὡς σ-
 υνελευθερώραντι τῆμ πόλιν
 10 ἀπ' Ἀθηνάων.

1. 2: All editions cited, save Buck, have βολῆι, wrongly.

The defeat of thirty-six Athenian ships under Thymochares by the Spartan admiral Agesandridas off Eretria in the summer of 411 was immediately followed by the revolt of that city (Thuc. viii. 95). Agesandridas' forty-two ships included some from Taras (Thuc. viii. 91. 2), and Hegelochos may have been in command of them. For the revolt and its background see Wallace, *The Euboian League and its Coinage*, 1-4. The omission of any reference to the δῆμος in 1. 2 (contrast *IG* xii, suppl. 549) suggests that Eretria was under an oligarchy when this decree was passed. Below this decree there stands on the stone a similar decree of later date in honour of another Tarentine (*SIG* 106), with the democratic formula ἔδοξεν τῆι βουλῆι καὶ τοῖι δέμοι.

The substitution of rho for intervocalic sigma is characteristic of Eretria and Oropos. Plato's assertion (*Crat.* 434 c) that the Eretrians substitute rho for final sigma has as yet no epigraphic support. See Buck, p. 57.

83

Rewards for Informers at Thasos:

(?) 411-409 B.C.

Block of white marble with raised edge round the inscription, found in the Agora at Thasos; now in the museum there.

Parian alphabet, but with Ξ , uniquely in this script. The letters of the second law are smaller and more closely spaced, but show no other difference from the first. Phot.: Pouilloux, *Recherches*, Pl. 13. 1; *LSAG*, Pl. 58.

Pouilloux, *Recherches sur l'histoire et les cultes de Thasos*, i. 139-62, no. 18; Salviat, *BCH* lxxii (1958) 212-15; Chamoux, *REG* lxxii (1959) 351-6; Pouilloux, *Choix*, 31; *LSAG* 303, no. 76; Pleket, *Hist.* xii (1963) 75-7.

I. ὃς ἂν ἐπανάστασιν βολεομένην ἐπὶ Θάσῳ κατείπηι καὶ φανῆι
 ἐόντα ἀληθέα, χιλίος στατήρ|ας ἐκ τῆς πόλεως ἰσχέτω· ἦν δὲ δόλος
 κατείπηι, καὶ ἐλεύθερος ἔστω· ἦμ πλέος ἢ εἰς κατείπωσι, | τριηκόσιοι
 κρινόντων δίκην δικάσαντες· ἦν δὲ τις τῶν μετεχόντων κατείπηι, τό τε

ἀργύριον | ἰσχέτω καὶ κατώμοτος κατ' αὐτὸ μὴ ἔστω μηδὲ δίκη μηδεμία
 5 μῆτε ἰρὴ μῆτε βεβήλη περὶ τότων || μηδὲ ἐν τῇ ἐπαρῇ ἔστω πλὴν ἐνός,
 τὸ πρῶτο βουλευσαντος· ἄρχει εἰνάτη ἀπιόντος Ἀπατοριῶνος, ἐπὶ
 Ἀκρύπτο, Ἀλεξιμάχο, Δεξιάδεω ἀρχόντων. |

II. ὃς ἂν ἐν τῆς ἀποικίῃσιν ἐπανάστασιν βουλευομένην κατείπει, ἢ
 προδιδόντα τὴν πόλιν Θασίων | τινὰ ἢ τῶν ἀποίκων, καὶ φανῆι ἐόντα
 ἀληθεῖα, διηκοσίος στατήρας ἐκ τῆς πόλεως ἰσχέτω· ἦν δὲ τὰ | χρήματα
 ἢ τὸ ἐπανισταμένο πλεονὸς ἄξια διηκοσίων στατήρων, τετρακοσίοι
 10 στατήρας ἐκ τῆς πόλεως || ἰσχέτω· ἂν δὲ δῶλος κατείπει, τό τε χρῆμα
 ἰσχέτω καὶ ἐλεύθερος ἔστω· ἦμ πλέος ἢ εἷς κατείπωσι, τριηκόσιοι |
 κρινόντων δίκην δικάσαντες· ἦν δὲ τις τῶν μετεχόντων κατείπει, τό
 τε ἀργύριον ἰσχέτω καὶ κατώμοτος | κατ' αὐτὸ μὴ ἔστω μηδὲ δίκη
 μηδεμία μῆτε ἰρὴ μῆτε βεβήλη περὶ τότων μηδὲ ἐν τῇ ἐπαρῇ ἔστω
 πλὴν ἐνός, τὸ | πρῶτο βουλευσαντος· ἄρχει τῇ ῥήτρῃ τρίτῃ ἰσταμένο
 Γαλαξιῶνος, ἐπὶ Φανοδίκῳ, Ἀντιφάνεος, Κτησίλλῳ | ἀρχόντων.

I. For information about a plot against Thasos, the city will pay 1,000 staters (the equivalent of 1,600 Attic drachmae). A slave will get his freedom as well. If there is more than one informer, 300 men will hear the issue and decide (their priority). [Chamoux infers from the aorist that this will be the court which has judged the conspirators, but this is not a necessary inference; in any case judging would have to precede decision.] If it is one of the conspirators who lays the information, he will get the money, no charge based on an oath, either religious or secular, may be brought against him, and he will be exempt from the curse incurred (for ἐπαρῆ cf. No. 30 and Tod, vol. ii, no. 191, l. 26), but this amnesty shall not apply to the initiator of the plot.

II. The second law extends the reward to plots formed in 'the colonies'. (It is possible that Neapolis, cf. No. 89, is included in this term.) The reward is here only 200 staters, unless the estate of the plotter is worth more, in which case the reward will be doubled, otherwise there is no essential difference in the formulae.

For encouraging informers against possible disturbance of the *status quo* cf. No. 52, l. 25. Abdera (*BCH* lxxvi-lxxvii (1942-3) 189, no. 3) provides the closest parallel for rewards for such information; rewards for prospective tyrant-slayers are attested at Athens (*Ar. Birds* 1074-5), Miletus (No. 43) and Ilios (*OGIS* 218).

Most of our parallels come from democracies ensuring their own safety. Pouilloux has argued that here we have documents of the Thasian oligarchy which came or returned to power in the summer of

411 (Thuc. viii. 64). He rightly notes that the lettering appears somewhat later than any other Thasian text in the Parian alphabet, and later than several texts in Ionic to which dates of 430-425 can be plausibly assigned; and suggests that the Parian alphabet was deliberately revived by the oligarchs, a phenomenon perhaps paralleled on the coins and amphora-stamps. He suspects that the absence of any reference to the need to preserve the *demos* or democracy indicates an oligarchic regime, an argument from silence which is perhaps stronger than Chamoux allows, but which is clearly not decisive. The argument to which he and Pleket attach most weight lies in the references to *τριηκόσιοι*. A law from much earlier in the century (Pouilloux, *op. cit.*, p. 37, no. 7, 7-8) has a similar reference: ἀπενγυάτω ὁ [κατειπῶν τῆ]ν ἀπεγγύην] παρὰ τριηκοσίοισιν κατὰπερ τῶν βιαίωμ. A text of the same period as ours (*IG* xii. 8. 263) listed men who had their property confiscated κατὰ τὸν ἄδον τῶν τριηκοσίων, 'according to the decision of the Three Hundred'. These included an Apemantos, and it has been generally and probably rightly held that sons of his are to be found at Athens, having been exiled from Thasos ἐπ' ἀπτικισμῶι and receiving proxeny and ἀτέλεια at Athens (see Tod, vol. ii, no. 98, with commentary). Pouilloux therefore argues that the Three Hundred was the oligarchic instrument of government early in the century, revived by the anti-Athenian oligarchs in 411. We can only agree with Chamoux that the absence of an article before *τριηκοσίοισιν* and *τριηκόσιοι* in the early law and in our text is fairly strong evidence against their referring to a fixed organ of government, and is much more consonant with the view that the size of the appropriate jury panel is being fixed. We are less sure that he is right in suggesting that *IG* xii. 8. 263, where we do find the article, can be explained away similarly; in the fourth century there certainly was a body called οἱ ἐξήκοντα καὶ τριηκόσιοι (*IG* xii. 8. 276, 3-5). However, the absence of the article does break Pouilloux's link between our text and the probably anti-Athenian board of *IG* xii. 8. 263, and there is much to be said for Chamoux's caution in refusing to date our text more closely than 430-400, though he has not convinced Pleket.

Pouilloux at first argued that the article was missing because the Three Hundred was not yet formally organized. This was just possible, though difficult, on his original chronology. Observing that Apatourion (l. 5) was an autumn month and Galaxion (l. 13) fell in the spring (see now for the Thasian calendar Salviat, *op. cit.*, pp. 216 f.), but that the boards of *archontes* were different in the two laws, he suggested that the change of *archontes* fell at the winter solstice and that the first law was of October 411, the second of March 410. Salviat has, however, now made it probable that Apatourion was the first month of the Thasian year, which means that the two laws, of different

years, must be at least seventeen months apart; Pouilloux's explanation of the absence of the article will not stand. The chronology of the Thasian oligarchy remains obscure; Pouilloux holds that it was continuous from summer 411 until Thrasybulos recovered Thasos for Athens in the summer of 407 (Xen. *Hell.* i. 4. 9; Diod. xiii. 72. 1-2), Chamoux that Thrasybulos had already interrupted it in winter 411-10. This is a question which turns entirely on whether Xen. *Hell.* i. 1. 12 implies a capture of Thasos by Thrasybulos, and whether ἐν Θάσῳ is the correct reading in Xen. *Hell.* i. 1. 32 (see also Andrewes, *JHS* lxxiii (1953) 6-8); the inscriptions as yet do not solve it.

The reward offered even in the first law is not large and the second law is markedly less generous; Pouilloux attributes this fact to the oligarchs' deteriorating finances.

84 (83)

Expenditure of the Treasurers of Athena:

410-9 B.C.

On the obverse of a marble stele, sometimes called the 'Choiseul Marble', brought from Athens to Paris by Choiseul-Gouffier; now in the Louvre. Above the inscription is a relief representing Athena armed, an olive-tree, and Erechtheus (phot.: *Ath. Mitt.* xxxv (1910) Pl. iv). The reverse has the accounts of 407-6 (see below). See Ferguson, *Treasurers*, 28 f.

Developed Attic writing (the aspirate is sometimes omitted), not stoicheion. Phot. and facs.: Meritt, *AFD*, Pl. ii-vi.

IG i². 304 A+; Meritt, *AFD* 62, 94-108; *SEG* x. 232+; Andrewes, *JHS* lxxiii (1953) 5 f.

Ἀθηναῖοι ἀνέλοσαν ἐπὶ Γλαυκίππο ἄρχοντος καὶ ἐπὶ τῆς βολῆς εἰ
Κλεγένης ἡλαλιεύς πρῶτ[ος]
ἐγραμμάτευε· ταμίαι ἱερῶν χρημάτων τῆς Ἀθηναίας Καλλίστρατος
Μαραθόνιος καὶ χουνάρχο[ν]-
τες παρέδοσαν ἐκ τῶν ἐπετείων φσεφισαμένο τῷ δέμῳ ἐπὶ τῆς Αἰαντίδος
πρότες πρυτανευόσες· ἡε[λλ]-
[ε]νοταμίαις παρεδόθη· Καλλιμάχοι ἡαγνοσίοι· Φρασιτελίδει Ἰκαριεῖ·
ἡίπποις σῖτος ἐδόθη· Ἀθηναίας Πολ[ιά]-
5 [δ]ος· ΤΤΤΧΧΧΗΗΔΔΔΠΓΓΓ· Νίκες· ΔΔΔΔΓΓΓ· ἐπὶ τῆς
Αἰγεῖδος δευτέρας πρυτανευόσες· ἀθλοθέταις παρεδ[ό]-
θε ἐς Παναθήναια τὰ μεγάλα· Φίλωνι Κυδαθηναιεῖ καὶ συνάρχουσιν
Ἀθηναίας Πολιάδος· ΠΧ· ἡιεροποιοῖς κατ' [ε]-

- νιαυτὸν : Διύλλοι ἡερχειὶ καὶ συνάρχουσιν ἐς τὸν ἑκατόμβην : ϞΗΔΓ
 ΓΓΓ : ἐπὶ τῆς Οἰνεΐδος τρίτες πρυταν[ε]-
 υόσες : ἡελλενοταμίαις παρεδόθε : Περικλεῖ Χολαργεῖ καὶ συνάρχουσιν :
 ἡίπποις σῖτος ἐδόθε : ΤΤϞΗΗΗΗΔΔ[.]
 ἕτερον τοῖς αὐτοῖς ἡελλενοταμίαις ἡίπποις σῖτος ἐδόθε : ΤΤϞΗΗΗΗ :
 ἕτερον τοῖς αὐτοῖς ἡελλενοταμία[ις]
 10 ἡέρμονι ἐδόθε ἄρχοντι ἐς Πύλον : ϞΓΓ : ἕτερον : τοῖς αὐτοῖς ἔλλενο-
 ταμίαις ἐς τὸν διοβελίαν : ΤΤ : ἐπὶ τῆς Ἀκ-
 αμαντίδος τετάρτες πρυτανευόσες : ἡελλενοταμίαις παρεδόθε : Περικλεῖ
 Χολαργεῖ καὶ συνάρχουσιν : σ[ι]-
 τος (ἡί)πποις ἐδόθε : ΤΤΤ : ἕτερον τοῖς αὐτοῖς ἡελλενοταμίαις ἐς τὸν
 διοβελίαν ἐδόθε : ϞΤΤΤΧΗΗΗϞΓ : ἐπὶ τ[ε]-
 ς Κεκροπίδος πέμπτες πρυτανευόσες : ἡελλενοταμίαις παρεδόθε :
 Περικλεῖ Χολαργεῖ καὶ συνάρχουσιν ἐ[ς]
 τὸν διοβελίαν : ΤΤΤΤΧΧΗΗ : ἐπὶ τῆς Λεοντίδος ἡέκτες πρυτανευόσες :
 τρίτει ἡμέραι τῆς πρυτανείας
 15 ἔλλενοταμίαις παρεδόθε : Διονυσίοι Κυδαθηναιεῖ καὶ συνάρχουσιν :
 ΧΗΗϞΔΔΔΓΓΓΓ : ἐνάτει τῆς πρυτανε[ι]-
 ας ἡελλενοταμίαις Θράσου Βουτάδει καὶ συνάρχουσιν : ΤΤΤΧϞΔΔΔ
 ΓΓΓΓ : ἡενδεκάτει τῆς πρυτανείας ἡε-
 λλενοταμίαις παρεδόθε Προχσένοι Ἀφιδναῖοι καὶ συνάρχουσιν στρατεγδι
 ἐχς Ἐρετρίας : Εὐκλείδει ἀνομολόγ-
 εμα : ΧΧΧϞΗΗΔΔΔΔΙΔ : τρίτει καὶ δεκάτει τῆς πρυτανείας ἡελλενο-
 ταμίαις Περικλεῖ Χολαργεῖ καὶ συνάρχουσιν : [.]
 ΧΧΧΧϞΗΗΗΗΓΓΓ : ὀγδόει καὶ εἰκοστῇ τῆς πρυτανείας : ἡελλενο-
 ταμίαις : Σπουδίαί Φλυεῖ καὶ συνάρχουσιν : ΤΤΧΧ[.]
 20 Η : τριακοστῇ τῆς πρυτανείας τὰ ἐχσάμο ἀνομολογήθε : ἡελλενοταμίαις :
 Ἀναϊτίοι Σφεττίοι καὶ παρέδροι [Π]-
 ολυαράτοι Χολαργεῖ : ϞϞΤΤΧ : ἐπὶ τῆς Ἀντιοχίδος ἐβδόμες πρυτανευό-
 σες : πέμπτει τῆς πρυτανείας παρεδ[ό]-
 θε Διονυσίοι Κυδαθηναιεῖ καὶ συνάρχουσιν ἐς τὸν διοβελίαν : Τ : ἐβδόμει
 τῆς πρυτανείας ἡελλενοταμίαις Θρ[ά]-
 σον Βουτάδει καὶ συνάρχουσιν ἐς τὸν διοβελίαν : ΤΧΗΗΔΔΔΓΓΓΙΔ :
 τῇ αὐτῇ ἡμέραι ἡελλενοταμίαις Φαλάνθοι [Ἀ]-
 λοπεκῆθεν καὶ συνάρχουσιν σῖτος ἡίπποις : ΤΤΤΤ : ἡέκτει καὶ δεκάτει
 τῆς πρυτανείας ἡελλενοταμίαις Προχσέ-
 25 νοι Ἀφιδναῖοι καὶ συνάρχουσιν : ΧϞΔΔΔΓΓΓΓΓΓΓΓ : τετάρτει καὶ εἰκοστῇ
 τῆς πρυτανείας ἡελλενοταμίαις Εὐπόλι[δι Ἀ]-

- φιδναίοι καὶ συνάρχουσιν : ϞΗΗΗΗ : ἑβδόμει καὶ εἰκοστῆι τῆς πρυτανείας
 ἑλληνοταμίαις Καλλίαι Εὐοννυμ[εῖ κ]-
 αὶ συνάρχουσιν : ΤΧΧϞϞΔΠΙΙΙΙϞ : ἐπὶ τῆς ἡυποθουτῖδος ὀγδόες
 πρυτανευόσες δωδεκάτει τῆς πρυτανείας : ἡελ[λενο]-
 ταμίαις παρεδόθε Προχσένοι Ἄφιδναίοι καὶ συνάρχουσιν : ΤΤΤϞΗΔΔ
 ΔΗΗΗΗΙΙΙΙ : τετάρτει καὶ εἰκοστῆι τῆς πρ[υτα]-
 νείας ἑλληνοταμίαις ἐδόθε Διονυσίοι Κυδαθηναιεῖ καὶ συνάρχουσιν :
 ΤΤΤΧΧΧΗΗΗΔΠΗΗΗϞ : ἡέκτει καὶ τριακοσ[τῆι]
 30 τῆς πρυτανείας ἑλληνοταμίαις ἐδόθε Θράσωνι Βουτάδει καὶ συνάρχουσιν :
 ΤΧΧΗΗΗΗΔΔΠΗΗΗΗΙΙΙ : ἐπὶ τῆς Ἐρεχθεῖδ[ος]
 ἐνάτες πρυτανευόσες δωδεκάτει τῆς πρυτανείας : ἑλληνοταμίαις ἐδόθε
 Προχσένοι Ἄφιδναίοι καὶ συνάρχουσιν [:]
 ΧΧΗϞΔΔΔΠΗΗΗΗ : τρίτει καὶ εἰκοστῆι τῆς πρυτανείας : ἑλληνο-
 ταμίαις ἐδόθε Διονυσίοι Κυδαθηναιεῖ καὶ συνάρχουσιν
 [.]ΤΤΤϞΗΗϞΔΔΔΗΗΗΗΙΙΙ : ἡέκτει καὶ τριακοστῆι τῆς πρυτανείας :
 ἑλληνοταμίαις ἐδόθε Θράσωνι Βουτάδει καὶ σ[υν]-
 [ἀ]ρχουσιν : ΤΤΧΧΧϞΗΗΗΗϞΙΙΙ : ἔκτει καὶ τριακοστῆι τῆς πρυτανείας
 τὰ ἐχσάμο ἀνομολογέσα[ντο ἡοι σύ]μμαχ[οι]
 35 [:το]ῖς στρατεγοῖς ἐς Σάμοι Δεχσικράτει Αἰγυλιεῖ : ♠♠ΤΧ : Πασιφῶντι
 Φρεαρρίοι : ϞΤ : Ἀριστοκρά[τει...8...]ι : Ϟ : Ε[...]
 [...] Εὐοννυμ[εῖ] : ϞΧΧΧϞΗΗΗϞΔΔΔΔΠΗ : Νικεράτοι Κυδαντῖδει
 τριεράρχοι : ΧΧΧ : Ἀριστοφάνει Ἄνα[φλυστῖοι τριε]ράρχ[οι]
 [...6... :] ἐπ[ὶ] τῆς Πανδιονῖδος δεκάτες πρυτανευόσες ἐνδεκάτει τῆς
 πρυτανείας ἔλλενο[ταμίαις ἐδόθε] Προ[χσ]-
 [ένοι Ἄφιδναίοι] καὶ συνάρχουσιν : ϞΗΗΗΗΔΔΔΔΗΗΗΗΙΙΙ : τρίτει καὶ
 εἰκοστῆι τῆς πρυτανείας ἡελλεν[οταμίαις ἐδόθε...]
 [...c. 14..καὶ συνάρχουσι]ν : ΤΤϞϞΔΔΔΔΙΙΙ : ἔκτει καὶ τρια-
 κοστῆι τῆς πρυτανείας ἡελ[λενοταμίαις ἐδόθε...]
 40 [...c. 19..καὶ συνάρχ]ουσιν : ϞΧΧΧΧϞΗϞΠΗΗΗΗΙΙΙ : υν κεφάλαιον
 ἀργυρίο σύμπαν ὁ Κ[αλλίστρατος Μαραθόνιος]
 [καὶ συνάρχοντες παρέδωσαν...c. 5...] vacat

In l. 12 the stone has |ΗΠΠΟ|Σ; the cutter joined the wrong pair of verticals. At the beginning of l. 33 Meritt (*BSA* xlvī (1951) 205 n. 5) now prefers a numeral to the [:] of his published text. This is surely right, but leaves l. 35 as the only possible example of punctuation at the beginning of a line, and we agree with Wade-Gery, *JHS* liii (1933) 136, that this is suspicious. Meritt's restoration of ll. 40-1 leaves so little space for the total figure that we should perhaps consider omitting the demotic. For ἐχσάμο in ll. 20, 34 see

Tod, *AJP* lxxvii (1946) 333. In l. 35 J. K. Davies suggests to us *Ἀριστοκρά[τει Τρινημέε]ϊ*; if he is rightly identified with the well-known Aristokrates, this is apparently the only demotic from his tribe which fits. In ll. 35-6 Bradeen (*Hesp.* xxxiii (1964) 49 n. 65) restores *E[ὕμ|άχου]*.

These accounts, practically complete, of the payments made in 410-9 by the treasurers of Athena are as usual based on the conciliar year. Since a change of *hellenotamiai* and the payments of ll. 5-7 indicate that the Panathenaia, celebrated on Hekatombaion 28, fell in the second prytany, we can infer, with Meritt, that at least some portion of the first prytany fell in the previous archon-year 411-10. If we compare the decree quoted by Andocides, i. 96-8, it becomes clear that the transition from the regime of the Five Thousand to full democracy took place within 411-10. (See also *TAPA* xciv (1964) 210 f.)

Meritt's analysis of the *hellenotamiai* listed here shows that the two mentioned in l. 4 belong to the Panathenaic year of 411-10. They remain undisturbed, and further evidence of the peacefulness of the restoration of democracy comes from an observation of the tribal affiliations of the other nine *hellenotamiai* of the document. Two pairs of them, Pericles and Anaitios from Akamantis, Proxenos and Eupolis from Aiantis, come from the same tribe, and Meritt is certainly right to deduce that the proposal recorded in Arist. *Ἀθ. Πολ.* 30. 2 to have twenty *hellenotamiai* was put into effect by the Five Thousand and maintained by the democracy. This conclusion is confirmed by the fact that the *kolakretai* (cf. Nos. 31, 69, 71, 73), who have no place in *Ἀθ. Πολ.* 30, disappear henceforth from our documents, their functions being performed by the *hellenotamiai*. (Meritt's interpretation is doubted by Kahrstedt, *GGA* cxcvii. 45-7, *Untersuchungen zur Magistratur*, 99-101, on which see Meritt, *AJP* lvi (1935) 319 f.; and by Pritchett, *BCH* lxxxviii (1964) 474-9.) We do not accept the view of *ATL* iii. 364 that the *kolakretai* were restored in 410, purely to pay juries. We see no reason why the *hellenotamiai*, whose accounts we do not have, should not have paid juries as they paid for the setting-up of stelai.

It would appear that all these payments were made *ἐκ τῶν ἐπετείων* (l. 3), from the annual income of Athena Polias and Athena Nike. Unless, surprisingly, there was a separate stele for payments from capital account, the conclusion would seem to follow that the restored democracy inherited an empty treasury. In the late summer signs of a firm hand on Athenian finances appear. Presumably at the Panathenaia, the normal time, the decision was taken to reimpose tribute to replace the 5 per cent tax levied since 414 (*Thuc.* vii. 28. 4) and we possess fragments of the assessment (*ATL* ii. A 13). From the third

prytany we have a fragment of a decree (*ATL* ii. D 9) which contemplates the repayment of the debt to Athena, i.e. the re-establishment of a capital reserve; what measures were taken we do not know, but there seems to have been more money available in 409-8. Counterbalancing this, our inscription shows in the third prytany the first of many payments for the *diobelía* (see below). See, in general, Ferguson, *Treasurers*, 33-7, *ATL* iii. 363-6.

The money passing through these accounts was at least 180 T., but it is unlikely that it was much more. The problem of determining what the money was spent on is not easy to resolve, since, except for isolated cases, the treasurers stopped recording the destination of the money after the fifth prytany. Andrewes suggests that the *hellenotamiai* came to have specialized functions, and that payments to Dionysios and Thrason are for the *diobelía*, and payments to Eukleides are for military purposes. Such an assumption would give a total of over 34 T. for the *diobelía*, over 6 T. for the Great Panathenaia, and over 22 T. for fodder for the horses, leaving all or nearly all the rest for military purposes.

In the three items described by the noun *ἀνομολόγημα*, or the verb *ἀνομολογεῖσθαι* (ll. 17, 20, 34), we seem to have pure book-transactions, in which the recipients took money that had been collected at Eretria or Samos directly and reported their use of what was in theory money due to the goddess. There seems no reason to see in τὰ ἐχσάμο (ll. 20, 34) anything but the importance of Samos as a base for operations; reference to Samos' debt from her revolt (cf. Nos. 55, 68, 72, 77) here seems unlikely. These accounts cover only Athens, Eretria, Pylos, and Samos, and Andrewes deduces that the Hellespont fleet under Alcibiades and Theramenes lay outside the Athenian financial system. The Samian collections may have been spent on Thrasyllus' Ionian expedition (*Xen. Hell.* i. 2. 1), the city's major effort of the year. The money at Eretria (l. 17) ought to be connected with an attempt to recover Euboea, in revolt from Athens (see Wallace, *The Euboian League and its Coinage*, 5 n. 13). Pylos (l. 10) was not recovered by the Spartans till the following year (*Diod.* xiii. 64). The entry in ll. 27-8 is to be identified with the payment to Oinobios in No. 89, l. 47.

Of the men mentioned here, Pericles (ll. 8, 11, 13, 18), is the son of Pericles and Aspasia, who received Athenian citizenship, was *στρατηγός* in 406, and was executed after the battle of Arginusae (*Plut. Per.* 37; *Xen. Hell.* i. 5. 16, 7. 2; Eupolis F. 98); Hermon (l. 10) had commanded the *περίπολοι* at Mounychia in 411 and joined the revolt against the Four Hundred (*Thuc.* viii. 92. 5); Proxenos (ll. 17, 24, 28, 31, 37) was a descendant of the tyrannicide Harmodios (*Isaeus* v. 46-7); Eukleides (l. 17) and Anaitios (l. 20) may be those of the name who appear among the Thirty (*Xen. Hell.* ii. 3. 2); Aristokrates

(l. 35) is generally identified with the son of Skellias (Thuc. viii. 89, 92; Arist. *Ἀθ. Πολ.* 33; Xen. *Hell.* i. 7. 2, 34); Pasiphon (l. 35) was killed shortly after this as ἀρχων τοῦ ναυτικοῦ (*Hesp.* xxxiii (1964) 44, 48); Nikeratos (l. 36), the son of Nikias, was one of the victims of the Thirty (Xen. *Hell.* ii. 3. 39; Lys. xviii. 6, xix. 47).

The δωβελία, which appears here as a major object of expenditure, is not to be identified either with the θεωρικόν (cf. Sandys on Arist. *Ἀθ. Πολ.* 28. 3) or with the pay for juries or the Assembly (Beloch, *Rh. Mus.* xxxix (1884) 239 ff.; *GG* ii². 1. 398). The most probable theory is that which sees in it a measure of poor relief instituted by the state during the closing years of the Peloponnesian War, when the loss of Euboea and the Spartan occupation of Decelea brought widespread ruin to Athenian citizens (Wilamowitz, *Ar. u. Ath.* ii. 212-16); it was, Aristotle tells us (*Ἀθ. Πολ.* 28. 3), introduced by Cleophon, and was administered in 406 by Archedemos, another popular leader (Xen. *Hell.* i. 7. 2). Beloch's objection (*GG*, loc. cit.) that such a system would involve an annual outlay of at least 240 T. is based on the assumption that every citizen could and did claim this dole, and this is probably untrue.

The following guide to the accounts of the treasurers for the rest of the war may be helpful. 409-8: *IG* i². 301; Wade-Gery, *Num. Chron.* 1930, 16-38, 333-4; Ferguson, *Treasurers* 16-37; Meritt, *AFD* 61-3; *SEG* x. 233. 408-7: lost. 407-6 (on the reverse of the stele before us): *IG* i². 304 B; Meritt, *AFD* 116-27; Tod, *GHI* 92; *SEG* x. 234; Pritchett, *Ancient Athenian Calendars on Stone*, 286-9; *BCH* lxxxviii (1964) 455-88 (with important new readings and suggesting, wrongly, we think, that it has parts of the accounts of 408-7 and 407-6), Meritt, *TAPA* xcv (1964) 204-12. 406-5: *IG* i². 305; *SEG* x. 235. 405-4; Meritt, *Hesp.* xi (1942) 275-8; Woodward, *ibid.* xxv (1956) 109-21. 404-3 (?): Woodward, *Hesp.* xxxii (1963) 144-55.

85 (86)

Phrynichus' Assassins honoured: 409 B.C.

Five joining fragments, and one placed by its text, of a marble stele, found on the Acropolis; now in EM.

Developed Attic writing, use of aspirate inconsistent. Ll. 3-47 stoichedon 36.

IG i². 110+.

I

[ἐπὶ Γλαυκί]ππο ἄ[ρ]χον[τ]ος.

[Λόβον ἐκ] Κεδὸν ἐγραμμάτευε.

[ἔδοχσεν τῷ] βολεὶ καὶ τῷ δέμῳ, ἡπποθοντῖ-

[ς ἐπρυτάνε]υε, Λόβον ἐγραμμάτευε, Φιλισιτίδε-

5 [ς ἐπεστάτε,] Γλαύκιππος ἔρχε· Ἐρασιπίδες εἶπ-

[ε· ἐπαινέσα]ι Θρασύβολον ὅς ὄντα ἄνδρα ἀγαθό-

[ν περὶ τὸν δέμ]ον τὸν Ἀθηναῖον καὶ πρόθυμον π-

[οιῆν ἡό τι δύνα]ται ἀγαθόν· καὶ ἀντὶ ἡὸν εὖ πεπο-

[ἴεκεν τὲν τε πόλιν] καὶ τὸν δέμ[ο]ν τὸν Ἀθηναῖο-

10 [ν στεφανῶσαι αὐτὸν χρυσοὶ στε]φάνοι, ποιῆσα-

[ι δὲ τὸν στέφανον ἀπὸ χιλίων δρ]αχμῶν· ἡοι [δὲ ἡ]-

[ελλενοταμίαι δόντον τὸ ἀργύρι]ον. καὶ [ἀνεπ]-

[ἔν τὸν κήρυκα Διονυσίον ἐν τῷ] ἀγῶνι ἡὸν ἡέν-

II

[εκα αὐτὸν ἡο δέμος ἐστεφάνοσ]ε· Διοκλῆς εἶπε·

15 [τὰ μὲν ἄλλα καθάπερ τῷ βολεὶ·] εἶναι δὲ Θρασύ-

[βολον Ἀθηναῖον, καὶ φυλῆς τε κ]αὶ φρατρίας ἡδ-

[ν ἂν βόλεται γράφσασθαι αὐτό]ν· καὶ τὰλλα τὰ ἐ-

[ψεφισμένα τῷ δέμῳ κύρια εἶ]ναι Θρασυβόλο-

[ι· εἶναι δὲ αὐτῷ εὐρίσκεσθαι π]αρὰ Ἀθηναῖον κ-

20 [αὶ ἄλλο ἡό τι ἂν δοκῆι ἀγαθόν π]ερὶ ἡὸν εὐεργέ-

[τεκεν τὸν δέμον τὸν Ἀθηναῖον.] καὶ ἀναγραφσά-

[το ἡο γραμματεὺς τὰ ἐψεφισμ]ένα· ἡελέσθαι δ-

[ε ἐγ βολῆς πέντε ἄνδρας αὐτῷ]κα μάλα, ἡοίτινε-

25 [ς δι]κάσοσι Θρασυβόλοι τὸ μέ]ρος τὸ γιγνόμεν-

[ον. τὸς [δὲ ἄλλος, ἡόσοι τότε εὖ ἐ]ποίησαν τὸν δέ-

[μον τὸν Ἀθε]ναῖον, 10]ιν καὶ Ἀγόρατο-

ν καὶ Κόμονα [καὶ . . . 6 . . .]ο[.]ο[. . . .] καὶ Σῆμον κα-

[ὶ Φιλῖνον κα[ὶ . . . 8 . . .]α, εὐεργέ[τα]ς [ἀ]ναγράφ-

[σαι ἐμ πόλε]ι ἐν στέλει λιθίνει τὸν γραμ[μα]τέ-

30 [α τῆς βολῆς. [καὶ ἔγκτεσι]ν εἶναι αὐτοῖς δμπερ

[Ἀθηναίοις, [καὶ γεπέδο]ν καὶ οἰκίας, καὶ οἰκεσ-

[ιν Ἀθένεσι, [καὶ ἐπιμέλ]εσθαι αὐτὸν τὲν βολῆν

[τὲν αἶε β[ο]λεούσαν κα]ὶ τὸς πρυτάνες, ἡόπος ἂ-

ν μὲ ἀδι[κόν]ται. τὲν δὲ σ]τέλεν ἀπομισθοσάντο-

35 [ν ἡοι πολεται ἐν τῷ βο]λῆι· τὸς δὲ ἡελλενοταμ-

[ίας δῶναι τὸ ἀργύριον]. ἐὰν δὲ δοκῆι αὐτὸς καὶ

[ἄλλο εὐρίσκεσθαι, τὲν] βολῆν προβολεύουσαν

III

[έχσενεγκέν ἐς τὸν δέμ]ον; Εὐδίκος εἶπε· τὰ μὲν
 [ἄλλα καθάπερ Διοκλῆς· περὶ] δὲ τὸν δοροδοκεσ-
 40 [άντον ἐπὶ τοῖ φσεφίσματι, ὃ ἐφσεφ[ι]σθε Ἄπολλ-
 [οδόροι, τὲν βολὲν βολεῦσ]αι ἐν τῷ πρότει ἡδέ-
 [ραι ἐν τοῖ βουλευτερί]οι, καὶ κολάζεν, τὸν [δ]ορο-
 [δοκεσάντον καταφσ]εφίζομένεν καὶ ἐς δικασ-
 [τέριον παραδιδόσα]ν, καθότι ἂν δοκεῖ αὐτέ[ι]· τ-
 45 [ὄς δὲ βολευτὰς τὸς] páροντας ἀποφαίνεν ἡά[ττ']
 [ἂν εἰδῶσιν, καὶ ἐάν] τις ἄλλο εἰδῆι περὶ τ[ού-]
 [τον· ἐχσῆναι δὲ καὶ] ιδιότει, ἐάν τις βόλετα[ι.υ]

vacat

The restorations are not all certain, and those adopted here often differ from those in *IG*. I. 9: βολέν is also possible. II. 12-13: καὶ [ἀνεπ|εῖν Διονυσίον τὸν ἐν ἄστει τοῖ] ἀγῶνι *IG*. I. 16: The normal fourth-century formula φυλῆς καὶ δέμο καὶ φρατρίας is two letters too long here and is not yet known in full in the fifth century. I. 23: [ἐ τὸν δέμον τρεῖς ἄνδρας Michel. I. 36: αὐτὸς = αὐτοῦς; ἐάν δὲ δοκεῖ αὐτὸς καὶ | [ἄλλο ἄχσιος ἀγάθο *IG*. I. 44: So Lipsius, *Attische Recht*, 184 n. 23; αὐτὸς ἐσάγε]ν *IG*. I. 45: páροντας imperfect, 'those who were present when the decree was initiated'; τ[ὸς δὲ πέντε ἄνδρας] páροντας Bannier (*B. Phil. Woch.* 1922, 835), *IG. Valeton, Hermes*, xliii (1908) 481 ff. has restorations of II. 42, 45 which transfer the investigation to the Areopagus.

The assassination of Phrynichus upon his return from a mission to Sparta in the autumn of 411 heralded the fall of the Four Hundred. Thucydides states (viii. 92) that he was struck down in the Agora near the Council House by one of the περίπολοι, who made his escape; his accomplice, an Argive, when caught and tortured, refused to divulge the names of the conspirators but maintained that they were numerous. Lysias says (xiii. 71): Φρύνιχῳ . . . κοινῇ Θρασύβουλος τε ὁ Καλυδώνιος καὶ Ἀπολλόδωρος ὁ Μεγαρεὺς ἐπεβούλευσαν· ἐπειδὴ δὲ ἐπετυχέτην αὐτῷ βαδίζοντι, ὁ μὲν Θρασύβουλος τύπτει τὸν Φρύνιχον καὶ καταβάλλει πατάξας, ὁ δὲ Ἀπολλόδωρος οὐχ ἤψατο, ἀλλ' ἐν τούτῳ κραυγὴ γίννεται καὶ ᾤχοντο φεύγοντες. By Lycurgus, eighty years later (*Leocr.* 112), the deed is unequivocally assigned to both Thrasyboulos and Apollodoros.

Lysias in the first years of the fourth century (xiii. 70-2) quotes two decrees to refute the claim of Agoratos (I. 26) to have killed Phrynichus and been made a citizen for it. The first, he says, made Thrasyboulos and Apollodoros citizens, but not Agoratos. Agoratos and others had got themselves put on the stele as εὐεργέται by paying money to an orator. He cited a second decree to prove that this assertion was true. It is not easy to reconcile these statements with the

decree before us. This was passed in the eighth prytany (cf. No. 84, l. 27) of Glaukippos' archonship, i.e. in the spring of 409, already some nineteen months after the assassination, and falls into three parts: (I) a proposal, originating probably in the Council (l. 15), by Erasinides, almost certainly the general executed after the battle of Arginusae in 406 (Xen. *Hell.* i. vi. 29, vii. 2, 34; Philochoros *FGH* 328 F 42), praising Thrasyboulos for his loyalty to the δῆμος, and granting him a golden crown to be proclaimed at the Dionysia, now, we may calculate, imminent (Meritt, *Calendar* 98 n. 1; Dinsmoor, *Archons*, 346 n. 6; Meritt, *AFD* 105 n. 3); (II) an amendment by Diokles, granting Thrasyboulos citizenship, the confirmation of privileges previously bestowed, a prospect of further benefits, and a share in some property or award; to seven or eight of his fellow conspirators, among them Agoratos, lesser honours and rights are awarded; (III) a second amendment by Eudikos orders an inquiry into the bribery alleged to have been used to secure a decree in favour of Apollodoros.

It does not seem that any part of our decree, except possibly ll. 25-30, corresponds with those quoted by Lysias. It is clear that some decree or decrees in favour of Thrasyboulos and Apollodoros have preceded ours. To save Lysias' credit, we must assume that the inquiry ordered in III rehabilitated Apollodoros' claims and resulted in his receiving the citizenship, and also that it cast some doubts on the claims of Agoratos and the minor conspirators. That the assumption is true at any rate as far as Apollodoros is concerned is perhaps supported by the fact (Lys. vii. 4) that Apollodoros received as a reward a plot of ground which had belonged to Peisander and retained it until shortly before the rule of the Thirty, as well as by his posthumous reputation attested by Lycurgus. It therefore seems unlikely that our decree represents the final state of the rewards for the assassination. As far as the true facts, as opposed to the official decision, are concerned, the variant story of Thucydides must be borne in mind.

The grant of ἐγκτησις (ll. 30-2), i.e. the right of a non-citizen to own real property in Attica, is among the earliest known (cf. No. 70). Fine (*Hesp.*, Suppl. ix. 204-5) argued from the circumstances of this affair that the privilege was originally necessarily linked with an actual grant of land as a reward for public services. The evidence certainly does not impose this view, which we think improbable. See J. and L. Robert, *REG* lxxv (1952) 141, and Pečírka, *Geras Thomson* (Prague, 1963), 193-201, who analyses the evidence about the origin of the privilege. See also Pečírka, *The Formula for the Grant of Enktesis in Attic Inscriptions*, 18-21.

86 (87)

Republication of Draco's Law of Homicide:

409-8 B.C.

Marble stele, formerly near the cathedral at Athens; now in EM.

Developed Attic script; the aspirate is omitted, except in ll. 11-26. Stoichedon 50, except ll. 1, 2, 10, 56, which are in larger letters.

IG i². 115+; Bonner and Smith, *The Administration of Justice from Homer to Aristotle*, i. 111-25+; Hignett, *History of the Athenian Constitution*, 305-11.

Διόγν[ε]τος Φρεάρριος ἐγγραμμάτε[νε].

Διοκλῆς ἔρχε.

ἔδοχσεν τῆι βουλῆι καὶ τῶι δέμοι, Ἀκα[μ]αντῖς ἐπ[ρ]υτάνευε, [Δ]ιό[γ]-
 νετος ἐγγραμμάτευε, Εὐθύδικος [ἐ]πεστάτε, [. . .]ε[. . .]φ[άνες εἶπε· τὸ[ν]
 5 Δράκοντος νόμον τὸμ περὶ τὸ φό[ν]ο ἀναγρα[φ]σά[ν]τον οἱ ἀναγραφῆ-
 ς τὸν νόμον παραλαβόντες παρὰ τὸ β[α]σ[ι]λέ[ος] με[τ]ὰ τὸ γραμμ[α]τέο-
 ς τῆς βουλῆς ἐστέλει λιθίνει καὶ κα[τ]α[θ]έντ[ον] πρόσθε[ν] τῆς στο-
 αῶς τῆς βασιλείας· οἱ δὲ πολεταὶ ἀπομ[σθο]σ[άν]τον κατὰ τὸν νόμο-
 ν· οἱ δὲ ἔλλενοταμίαι δόντον τὸ ἀρ[γ]ύ[ρ]ι[ον].

10 πρῶτος ἄχσον.

καὶ ἔαμ μὲ κ [π]ρονοί[α]ς [κ]τ[ένει] τίς τινα, φεύγ[ε]ν δ[ι]-
 κάζειν δὲ τὸς βασιλέας αἴτιο[ν] φό[ν]ο ε[.] 17. ε [β]ολ-
 εύσαντα· τὸς δὲ ἐφέτας διαγν[δ]ν[α]ι. [αἰδέσασθαι δ', ἔαμ μὲν πατέρ]ρ ἔ-
 ι ἔ ἀδελφός[ς] ἔ ἠυῆς, ἡάπαντ[α]ς, ἔ τὸν κο[λύ]οντα κρατῆν· ἔαν δὲ μὲ] ἡοῦ-
 15 τοι ὄσι, μέχρ' ἀνεφ[σι]ότετος καὶ [ἀνεφσίο, ἔαν ἡάπαντες αἰδέσ]α-
 θαι ἐθέλοσι, τὸν κο[λύ]ον[τα] κρατῆν· ἔαν δὲ τούτον μεδὲ ἡῆς ἔι, κτ[έ]-
 νει δὲ ἄκο[ν], γνόσι δὲ ἡο[ι] π[ε]ντ[έ]κοντα καὶ ἡῆς ἡοι ἐφέται ἄκοντ]α
 κτέναι, ἐσέσθ[ο]ν δὲ ἡ[οι] φ[ι]ράτορες, ἔαν ἐθέλοσι, δέκα· τούτος δ]ὲ ἡο-
 20 ον κτέ[ν]α[ν]τ[ε]ς ἐν τῷ[δε] τῶι θεσμῶι ἐνεχέσθον. προειπῆν δ]ὲ τῶι κ-
 τέγαν[τι] ἐν ἄ]γορ[ᾷ] μέχρ' ἀνεφσιότετος καὶ ἀνεφσιό· συνδιόκ]εν
 δὲ [κἀ]νεφσιός καὶ ἀνεφσιὸν παῖδας καὶ γαμβρὸς καὶ πενθερό]ς κ-
 αὶ φρ[ά]τ[ρο]ρ[α]ς 36. αἴτι-
 ος [ἔ]ι φό[νο] 26. τὸς πεντέκοντ]α καὶ
 25 ἡένα 42. φόνο
 ἡέλοσ]ι 35. ἔαν δ]ὲ [τ]ις τ-
 ὸ[ν] ἀν]δρ[οφόνον] κτένει ἔ αἴτιος ἔι φόνο, ἀπεχόμενον ἀγορᾷ]ς ἐφο-

ρί[α]ς κ[α]ὶ [ἄθλον καὶ ἱερὸν Ἀμφικτυονικὸν ὅσπερ τὸν Ἄθην]αῖον κ-
[τένα]ν[τα ἐν τοῖς αὐτοῖς ἐνέχεσθαι, διαγιγνώσκειν δὲ τὸς] ἐ[φ]έτα[ς].

The remainder is nearly illegible, except at the beginnings and ends of lines. ll. 30-1: τῆι ἐμεῖ|[α]πῆι (cf. Dem. xxiii. 28). ll. 33-4: ἄρχον]τα χε[ρ]ῶν ἀ[δίκων (cf. Plato, *Laws* ix. 869 c). ll. 34-5: τ]ὸν ἀδίκον κ|τέ[νει]. ll. 35-6: διαγιγνώσκ]ειν δὲ τὸς ἐ|[φ]έτ]ας. ll. 36-9:]εις ἔ ἐλεύθ[ε]ρ[ος] ξι κα[ὶ] ἐὰν ἄγοντα ἔ φέροντα βίαι ἀδικῶς εὐθύς] ἀμυνόμεν[ο]ς κτέ[νει] ν[ε]ποινῆ τεθνάσαι 20]ΣΕΧΟΝ-ΤΟΒ|ΙΑΝ . . 4 (cf. Dem. xxiii. 60). At l. 56 [δεύτ]ερος [ἄχσον] is distinguishable, and thereafter there are traces of four lines before the stele breaks off.

We owe our text to the generosity of R. S. Stroud, who will shortly republish the whole. Though the stone is extremely worn, substantial restorations are possible with the aid of documents contained in Demosthenes xxiii and xliii. In l. 4 at least four other names are possible besides the current [Χο]ε[νοφ]άνας. In l. 6 the current anachronistic restoration παρὰ τὸ κ[ατὰ πρυτανείαν γραμμ]ατέο[ς] is impossible. In l. 12 most texts have αἰτ[ι]θ[υ] φό[νο] ἔ [ἐάν τις αἰτιᾶται ἕος βου]λιεύσαντα, which seems difficult. Wolff, *Traditio* iv (1946) 71-8, argues for αἰτ[ι]θ[υ] φό[νο] ἔ [τὸν αὐτόχερα ἔ τὸν βου]λιεύσαντα, which seems right in principle, though not quite reconcilable with the new readings. For ll. 13-14, 16-20 cf. Dem. xliii. 57, where the order is different and ll. 14-16 are omitted. In l. 16 τὸν ἡδ[ε]ρον [ὀμόσαντας] is generally, but wrongly, read. For ll. 26-9 cf. Dem. xxiii. 37.

After the fall of the Four Hundred the Athenians embarked on a revision of their laws, and in our texts we find both *συγγραφείς*, presumably primarily concerned with the revision, and *ἀναγραφείς*, presumably primarily concerned with publication, though it is doubtful whether the distinction should be pressed too far. Among the latter was Nicomachos, of whom Lysias asserts that *προσταχθέν . . . αὐτῷ τεττάρων μηνῶν ἀναγράφαι τοὺς νόμους τοὺς Σόλωνος, ἀντὶ μὲν Σόλωνος αὐτὸν νομοθέτην κατέστησεν, ἀντὶ δὲ τεττάρων μηνῶν ἐξέτη τὴν ἀρχὴν ἐποιήσατο, καθ' ἑκάστην δὲ ἡμέραν ἀργύριον λαμβάνων τοὺς μὲν ἐνέγραφε, τοὺς δὲ ἐξήλειφεν* (xxx. 2; cf. 17, 25). Of this first stage we now have fairly copious epigraphical evidence; two stelai, that before us and *IG* 1². 114 (revised by Wade-Gery, *BSA* xxxiii (1932-3) 113-22; *νόμοι βουλευτικοί*), and the earlier sides, in Attic script, of several fragments of opisthographic walls or multiple stelai. At the restoration of the democracy in 403 Teisamenos carried a decree, *πολιτεύεσθαι Ἀθηναίους κατὰ τὰ πάτρια, νόμοις δὲ χρῆσθαι τοῖς Σόλωνος, καὶ μέτροις καὶ σταθμοῖς, χρῆσθαι δὲ καὶ τοῖς Δράκοντος θεσμοῖς, οἷσπερ ἐχρώμεθα ἐν τῷ πρόσθεν χρόνῳ* (Andoc. i. 83), and went on to order further revisions, represented for us by the later sides, inscribed in Ionic script, of the 'walls'.

For the growth of the epigraphic evidence, and for recent work on the two phases of the revision, see the bibliography by Dow, *Hist.* ix (1960) 292 f., to which add Dow, *Hesp.* xxx (1961) 38-53.

From the decree on our stele we learn that Draco's law of homicide was to be obtained from the *basileus*, though we do not know in what form he preserved it, and exhibited in front of the stoa named after his title (for which see Wycherley, *The Athenian Agora: Testimonia*, 21-5). For the exhibition of laws there see in particular Andoc. i. 82, Arist. *Ἀθ. Πολ.* 7. 1. The cost of the stele is to be met by the *hellenotamiai* (see p. 258).

Aristotle states that under Solon the Athenians *τοῖς Δράκοντος θεσμοῖς* (cf. l. 20 and Kahrstedt, *Klio*, xxxi (1938) 18 f.) *ἐπαύσαντο χρώμενοι πλὴν τῶν φονικῶν* (*Ἀθ. Πολ.* 7. 1; cf. Plut. *Solon* 17. 1). There would appear from our text to have been some further revision, since it seems to begin (l. 11) in the middle and has no reference to premeditated murder. Presumably, Draco's legislation on this had been repealed before 409, although in the fourth century all homicide laws, even those on premeditated murder, could still, probably loosely, be ascribed to Draco (Dem. xxiii. 51, cf. xx. 157-8; see Hignett, *op. cit.* 307). One may doubt whether changes were confined to simple omission.

Stroud's convincing reading [*δευτ*]ερος [*ἄχσον*] in l. 56 shows that Draco's laws on homicide were arranged and presumably originally inscribed on at least two *axones*. This would seem to imply that Draco's *axones* were distinct from Solon's in numbering, contrary to some recent opinion (Dow, *Proc. Mass. Hist. Soc.* lxxi (1953-7) 28 f.; Ruschenbusch, *Σόλωνος Νόμοι*, 27, 70-6). Harrison's ingenious explanation (*CQ* xi (1961) 3-5), by which *πρῶτος ἄχσον* would have referred, not to the text which follows, but to a separate text on voluntary homicide, appears to fall to the ground.

Whatever Draco's reputation, the text before us would seem to be largely devoted to ameliorating the plight of the involuntary homicide. The basic penalty is exile, after a pronouncement (on Wolff's interpretation) by the *βασιλεῖς* (l. 12; this term probably includes both the *ἄρχων βασιλεύς* and the *φυλοβασιλεῖς*), resting on a decision by the fifty-one *ἐφέται*. The homicide may, however, be pardoned by the unanimous vote of the nearest kinship-categories available, and this concession is retrospective (ll. 13-20; *ἑσέσθον* (l. 18) = 'admit', 'allow to enter Attica'). Even though ll. 21 ff. are concerned with prosecution, ll. 26-9 guarantee the exile some immunity by threatening the punishment of his murderer. The relevance of our text to these matters and the other evidence on them is discussed by Ruschenbusch, *Hist.* ix (1960) 129-54, and Macdowell, *Athenian Homicide Law in the Age of the Orators*, 117-25.

For the complex questions surrounding the Ephetai see Hignett, loc. cit., and MacDowell, op. cit. 48-57.

87 (88)

Athens ratifies a Treaty with Selymbria: 407 B.C.

Five fragments of a marble stele, found on the south slope of the Acropolis; now in EM. At the bottom, a semicircular stump for insertion into a base.

Attic writing, with frequent lapses into Ionic (Ω occurs three times, $\text{H} = \eta$ five times, with three other occasions where it is corrected to Ξ , $\Lambda = \lambda$ three times, $\text{L} = \gamma$ once (!; l. 34; cf. *Hesp.* xxii (1953) 265, l. 9). Inaccurate stoichedon (Austin, 51 ff.), with a basic 36-letter line.

IG i². 116+; *Staatsverträge* 207+.

- [..... 31.....]εροσα
 [..... 30.....]αι Ἀθην-
 [..... 30.....]εχσαγο
 [..... 31.....]γκ..ιε
 5 [..... 34.....]σε
 [..... 23.....]ελλ[...] Ἀθην...
 [..... 22..... κ]ατάλογον κατ..
 [..... 21..... ὀ]μέρος δὲ ἠὸς ἔχο[σ]-
 [ἠ] Ἀθηναῖοι ἀποδόναι, τὸ δὲ] λοιπὸν μὲ λαμβάν-
 10 [εν, καταστέσασθαι δὲ Σελυμ]βριανὸς τὲμ πολι-
 [τείαν αὐτονόμος τρόποι ἠ]ότοι ἂν ἐπίστοντ-
 [αι 17..... ὄφ]ελε τὸ κοινὸν τὸ Ση-
 [λυμβριανὸν ἐ ἰδιοτὸν τι]ς Σελυμβριανὸν τοι
 [..... 18.....] εἶ το [χ]ρέματα ἐδεδέμε-
 15 [υτο ἐ εἶ τις τῷ κοινῷ] ὄφελεν ἐ εἶ τις ἐτίμοτ-
 [ο 20.....] φεύγοσι Σελυμβριανὸν
 [..... 15.....]ος πολεμῖος δὲ καὶ φίλιος
 [..... 14.....] ἄ δὲ ἀπόλετο ἐν τῷ πολέμοι
 [χρέματα Ἀθηναί]ον ἐ τὸν συμμαχον ἐ εἶ τι ὄφελ-
 20 [όμενον ἐ παρακ]αταθέκεν ἔχοντός το ἔπραχσα-
 [ν οἱ ἄρχοντες,] μὴ ἔναι πρᾶχσιν πλήν γῆς καὶ οἰ-
 [κίας· ὅσα δὲ ἄ]λλα χσυμβόλαια προτὸ ἐν τοῖς ἰ-
 [διόταις πρ]ὸς τὸς ἰδιότας ἐ ἰδιώτει πρὸς τὸ κ-

- [οινὸν ἔκο]ινῶι πρὸς ἰδιότεν υ ἔάν τι ἄλλο γίγ-
 25 [νεται, δια]λύεμ π[ρ]ὸς ἀλλέλος· ὁ τι δ' ἂν ἀμφισβη-
 [τῶσι, δίκας] ἔναι ἀπὸ χουμβολῶν. τὰς δὲ χουνθέκ-
 [ας ἀναγράφ]σαντας ἔ[ς] στέλεν θέναι ἐς τὸ ἱερὸ-
 [ν τὸ ... 7....]ς. ὤμοσαν Ἀθηναίων οἱ στρατηγοὶ
 30 [καὶ οἱ τριέραρχ]οι καὶ ἦοι ἠοπλῖται καὶ εἷ τι-
 [ς ἄλλος Ἀθηναίων] παρῆν καὶ Σελυμβ[ρ]ιανοὶ π-
 [ά]ντε[ς. υ Ἀλ]κιβ[ιάδες] εἶπε· καθὰ χουνθένετο Σε-
 [λυμ]βρια[ν]οὶ πρ[ὸς Ἀθ]εναίος, κατὰ ταῦτα ποιῆν,
 καὶ καταθῆναι ἐν [πόλ]ει ἀναγράφσαντας τὸστ-
 35 [ρ]ατε(γ)ὸς [τ]ὰς συνθέ[κ]ας μετὰ τὸ γραμματέος τ-
 [ἔς] βολῆς [..... 18.....] ἐν στέλει λιθί-
 [ν]ει τέλεσι τοῖς αὐτῶν καὶ τὸ φσέφισμα τὸδε.
 [Ἀπο]λλοδόρον δὲ τὸν Ἐμπέδο ἐπαινέσαι καὶ ἀφέν-
 [α]ι αὐτὸν τῆς ὁμερέας καὶ [ἐ]χσαλεῖφσαι τὰ ὄνομα-
 [τα] τῶν ὀμέ[ρ]ον τῶν Σελυμβ[ρ]ιανῶν καὶ τῶν ἐγγυε-
 40 [τῶν α]ὐτῶν [α]ὔριον τὸν γραμμ[ματ]έα τῆς βολῆς [ὄ]πο
 [ἔσι ἀν]αγεγ[ρ]αμμένοι ἐναντίον τῶμ πρυτάνε-
 [ων· ...] ὀμ[α]χον δὲ τὸν Σελυμβ[ρ]ιανὸν ἀναγρά-
 [φσαι ἐν τ]ῆι [αὐ]τῆι στέλει πρόχσε[νον Ἀθ]εναίων·
 [ἔναι δὲ καὶ] Ἀπολλοδόροι τέμ προ[χσε]νίαν κα-
 45 [θάπερ τοῖ] πατρὶ αὐτῷ· τὸς δὲ πρέσβ[ες καὶ] Ἀπολ-
 [λόδορον κ]αλέσαι ἐς πρυτανεῖον ἐπ[ὶ χσέν]ια ἐ-
 [ς αὔριον.] *vacat*

Current restorations go back to Wilhelm *apud* Michel 1437. We do not find them all satisfactory, but the inaccuracy of the stoichedon makes attempts to replace them hazardous, and we prefer to interpret by commentary. We have in several places read rather more than earlier editors. I. 12: [δίκας δὲ ἔναι περὶ ὄν] and (II. 13–14) τοῖ[ς] πρόσθε ἐν τῆι πόλει ἔ], with a stop after ἐτίμοτο (= ἡτίμωτο) Wilhelm; this seems excessively vague and the sense will overlap with II. 22–5. II. 16–18: [κάθοδον δ' ἔναι τοῖς] φεύγοσι Σελυμβριανῶν | [ἐγομένους τὸς αὐτ]ὸς πολεμῖος δὲ καὶ φίλιος | [τοῖς ἐν τῆι πόλει] (Wilhelm). We would prefer νομίζουσιν, but do not understand the use of δέ. I. 24: τοῖ κοινῶι is three letters too long. I. 28: Ἀπόλλονο]ς is one letter too long. We have thought of Ἐρακλέος, but the coins (*BMC Thrace*, 170, nos. 2–4) which prompted the guess have been reassigned to Dikaia (*Num. Chr.* 1965, 3 f.). I. 35: Wilhelm's second thoughts (*Sitzb. Wien*, ccxvii (5) 89) were mistaken and have misled Bengtson. The readings on the stone are clear, and so is the erasure (Meritt, *Hesp.* x. 327 f.). Whether the stone-cutter erased καὶ τῶν Σελυμβριανῶν (Wilhelm), or καὶ τὸ φσέφισμα

τὸδε (Meritt), hardly matters. ll. 40-1: [ὁ]π[ό]σοι εἰσ]ἰ γει[ρ]αμμένοι Kirchhoff; we have no great confidence in our view. ll. 44-6. The last few letters of these lines are now lost.

Selymbria (the modern Silivri, on the north shore of the Propontis) appears in the tribute quota-lists from 451-0 to 430-29, normally as a fairly high payer (5 to 9 T.), but abnormally in 435-4 and 433-2 with a mere 900 dr., which probably indicates a sensitive border-line position between Athenian and Odrysian power (*ATL* iii. 310 ff.). By 410 it is in revolt from Athens, refusing to admit Alcibiades, but paying him a sum of money (*Xen. Hell.* i. 1. 21). In 408 (for the chronology here adopted, see Ferguson, *CAH* v. 483-5, *Treasurers*, 38-45) he recaptured the town, aided by treachery within, but showing great personal courage and powers of conciliation. His willingness to restrain his Thracian allies seems to have helped him, without bloodshed, to induce Selymbria to accept an Athenian garrison and pay him money (*Plut. Alc.* 30; *Xen. Hell.* i. 3. 10; *Diod.* xiii. 66. 4).

The conciliatory nature of the settlement appears more clearly in this document, which falls into two parts: (1) the settlement at the capitulation (1-31), of which the beginning is lost, (2) its ratification at Athens in 407 (31-47).

1. The settlement: (a) (8-10) restoration of hostages, perhaps from 410, and an undertaking to take none in future; (b) (10-12) a guarantee of Selymbrian autonomy; (c) (12-14), possibly, a cancellation of debts to the Athenian state; (d) (14-18), apparently, a general restitution of civil rights for the disenfranchised and exiles; (e) (18-22) an abandonment of Athenian and allied claims to property lost in Selymbria, except for real property; (f) (22-6) all other causes of dispute (not 'contracts'; see De Ste Croix, *CQ* xi (1961) 102) to be settled by agreement or, failing that, by *δίκαι ἀπὸ ξυμβολῶν* (cf. No. 31; Hopper, *JHS* lxxiii (1943) 47-8, argues that here, at any rate, there is evidence for such *ξυμβολαί* containing provisions for cases purely internal to one city, but the reference is more probably to individuals of the two states); (g) (26-8) provision for recording the settlement; (h) (28-31) record of the oaths taken by all Selymbrians and Athenians on the spot.

2. An Athenian decree, proposed by Alcibiades in 407, ratifies the settlement (cf. No. 88), orders its publication, apparently at the generals' expense (but, if Wilhelm was right in his guess about what was deleted, it could have been intended that the Selymbrians should pay), and the deletion of the names of the Selymbrian hostages and their sureties, and confers honours on individual Selymbrians.

For fuller discussion of the decree in its historical background see Hatzfeld, *Alcibiade*, 283-4; Andrewes, *JHS* lxxiii (1953) 8.

88 (89)

Athenian Treaty with the Clazomenians at Daphnus
407 B.C.

Two fragments of a marble stele found on the north slope of the Acropolis; now in EM.

Ionic writing, stoichedon 34. Phot. of upper fragment: *Ἀρχ. Ἐφ.* 1898, Pl. i.

The upper fragment: *IG* i². 117+; *SEG* x. 139+. Another fragment, *IG* ii¹. 99, was assigned to the stele by Wilhelm, *Ath. Mitt.* xxviii (1903) 446, but not republished; we do not feel entirely confident that he was right.

ἔδοξεν τῆι βολῆ[ι καὶ τῶ]ι δῆμ[ωι, . . . 6 . . . ις ἐ]-
 πρυτάνευε, Κράτη[s] ἐγραμμ[άτευε, Ἐπιγέ]ν-
 ης ἐπεστάτε, Ἀλκιβιάδης εἶπ[ε· τὰς ξυνθήκα]-
 s, ἃς ξυνέθεντο οἱ στρατηγοὶ [τοῖς οἰκίσασ]-
 5 ι Δαφνόντα, εἶναι αὐτοῖς κατὰ [τὰ ξυγκείμε]-
 να, ἐπειδὴ ἄνδρες ἐγένοντο ἀγ[αθοί, καὶ ἀνα]-
 γράψαι τὸν γραμμα[τέα τῆς βολῆς ἐν στήλῃι]
 λιθίνῃ ἐν [πόλει τὰς τε ξυνθήκας καὶ τὸ ψή]-
 [φισμα τόδε - - -

Wilhelm's fragment, preserving part of nine lines and of the right edge, may have mentioned Ἀλκιβιάδης, but nothing can be made of it. 1. 1: Ἐρεχθίς, Κεκροπίς, and Ἀντιοχίς are the possibilities. Ἐρεχθίς, which held office in the last prytany of 408-7 and the second of 407-6, is the most likely, but we do not know which tribe held office in the first prytany of 407-6. 1. 2: Κρατ is cut over six letter-spaces and ΕΠΙΓΕ[N] is faintly visible below it. The chances are high that the stone-cutter at first confused the names of the secretary and the *epistates*.

This decree, moved by Alcibiades on his return to Athens in the summer of 407, confirms the treaty made by the Athenian generals with the Clazomenians settled at Daphnus. It is thus a close parallel to No. 87.

In the early summer of 412 Alcibiades and Chalcideus brought about the defection of Clazomenae from Athens (*Thuc.* viii. 14. 3), but the city was soon recovered and the instigators of the revolt moved to Daphnus (*ibid.* 23. 6). Shortly afterwards Astyochox invited the Clazomenians to move to Daphnus themselves and adhere to Sparta, but his overtures were rejected and his subsequent attack proved fruitless (*ibid.* 31. 2-3). Clazomenae was still in alliance with Athens in

410 (Xen. *Hell.* i. i. 10-11) and in 407-6, when it was being attacked by exiles (Diod. xiii. 71. 1).

In what circumstances the Athenian generals came to make this treaty with the settlers at Daphnus, and whether there had been any change in the composition of the settlement, we have no means of telling. The exiles of 407-6 need not necessarily be the settlers at Daphnus. For further trouble at Clazomenae cf. Tod, vol. ii, no. 114, and commentary. For the topography of the area and the secessions see J. M. Cook, *Arch. 'Eφ.* 1953-4, ii. 149-57.

89 (84)

Athens honours Neapolis in Thrace:

409-407 B.C.

Eight fragments (of which one cannot be assigned to its position and is here omitted) of a marble stele, found in or on the south slope of the Acropolis; now in EM. Above the inscription is a partly preserved relief (Binnebössel, 38-40, no. 15. Phot.: Svoronos, *Ath. Nat. Mus.*, Pl. 204; *Jahrb.* xlii (1927) 70). Athena, her left arm resting on a shield, holds out her right hand. A similar relief over a mid fourth-century decree concerning Neapolis (Tod, vol. ii, No. 159; Svoronos, Pl. 107) shows that her hand was held out to a smaller figure representing the local goddess Parthenos (the name is inscribed above the figure on the later stele).

In the first decree, which is not stoichedon, the use of eta and the consistent dropping of the aspirate reflect Ionic influence; the only other Ionic form is Λ (lambda), once in l. 44. The second decree's letters are consistently Attic; *ou* is used for *o* consistently in the first decree, occasionally in the second; stoichedon 73. Phot.: *BSA* xlvi, Pl. 23.

IG i². 108; Wilhelm, *Sitzb. Wien* 217. 5 (1939) 91-6, no. xl; Meritt and Andrewes, *BSA* xlvi (1951) 200-9; Pouilloux, *Recherches sur l'histoire et les cultes de Thasos*, i. 155-60.

First hand

[Θ		ε]		ο		[ι			
[N	ε	ο	[π	ο	λ	ι	τ	δ	[ν]
[τ	δ	μ	π	α	ρ	à	Θ	ά	σ [ο ν]

[έ]δοχσεν τῆι β[ο]υ[λῆι] καὶ τοῖι δήμοι, Λεοντίς ἐπρυτά[νευεν,]
5 Σιβυρτιάδ[ης ἐγρ]α μμάτευεν, Χαϊριμένης ἐπεστ[άτει, Γλ]-
αύκιππος ἥρχ[ε, . . .] θεος εἶπεν· [ἐπ]αινέσαι τοῖς Νεοπ[ολίταις]
παρὰ Θάσον [πρότον μ]ὲν [ὅτι ἄποικοι ὄντες Θασίου] [καὶ πολιο]-

ρκόμενοι [ὑπ' αὐτῶν] καὶ Πελο[πον]ησίον οὐκ ἠθ[έλησαν ἀ]-
 [πο]στήνα[ι ἀπ' Ἀθηναί]ον, ἀνδ[ρες δ' ἀ]γαθοὶ ἐγένε[ντο ἔς τε τῆ]-
 10 [ν στρα]τ[ιὰν καὶ τὸν δῆ]μον τ[ὸν Ἀθηναίων κα]ὶ το[ὺς χουμμά]-
 [χους - - - - - c. 13 - - - - -] ἠ [- - - - - c. 16 - - - - -] Ε[- - - - - c. 8 - - - -]

lacuna

[- - - - - c. 26 - - - - -] Ἀ]θηνα[ιο - - - - - c. 13 - - - - -]
 [- - - - - c. 27 - - - - -] χρήματα [- - - - - c. 11 - - - - -]
 [- - - - - c. 25 - - - - -] νηι Ἀθηναίων [- - - - - c. 9 - - - - -]
 [- - - - - c. 24 - - - - -] ασιω εἶναι Νεοπο[λιτ - - - c. 4 - - -]
 25 [- - - - - c. 22 - - - - -] ον καὶ χρῆσαι ΤΤΤΤΧΧ [- - - c. 7 - - -]
 [- - - - - c. 22 - - - - -] ον ἐδέοντο ὅπως ἂν ἔχο[σιν ἐς]
 [τὸν πόλεμον· - - - - - c. 8 - - - - -] πο]ιεῖσθαι αὐτοῖς ἐκ τῶν χρημ[άτων.]
 [- - - - - c. 10 - - - - -] τῆς Νέας Π]όλεος ἐκ τοῦ λίμενος, τοὺς ἐν [Θάσοι]
 [στρατηγὸς ἐκάστο τῷ ἐ]νιαυτῷ ὅς ἀφειληφότας παρὰ [σφδὸν γρα]-
 30 [φσαμένος ἕως ἂν ἐντελ]ῆ ἀποδοθῆ· ποιῆν δὲ ταῦτα ἔ[ος ἂν αὐ]-
 [τοῖς ὁ πόλεμος ἦ ἢ ὁ πρὸς] Θασίος· ὁ δὲ διδόσασιν [ἔ]ν Νεοπολιτ[-
 [αι - - - - - c. 11 - - - - -] καὶ βο[υ]λόμενοι καὶ ἐθελοντ[αὶ ἔ]δοσαν τοῖς]
 [ἐλληνοταμ]ίαις ΠΧΧΧΧΠΗΗΗ καὶ πρόθυμοὶ εἰσ[ι] ποιῆν ὅ τι δύν[-
 [ανται ἀγ]αθὸν αὐτοὶ ἐπαγγειλάμενοι καὶ λόγιοι καὶ ἔργοι ἐς τ[-
 35 [ῆν πόλ]ιν τὴν Ἀθηναίων, καὶ ἀντὶ τῆς εὐεργε[σίας ταύτης τὸ νῦ]-
 [ν εἶν]αι καὶ ἐν τῷ λοιπῷ χρόν[ῳ] παρ' Ἀθηνα[ίων - - - - - c. 12 - - - - -] αὐ]-
 [τ]οῖς ὅς ἀνδράσιω οὖσιν ἀγαθο[ῖ]ς καὶ τῆ[ν] πρόσοδον εἶναι αὐτ[-
 οῖς πρὸς τὴν βουλῆν καὶ τὸν δῆ[μ]ον π[ρό]τοις μετὰ τὰ ἱερά ὅς]
 εὐεργέταις οὖσιν Ἀθηναίων· το[ὺς δὲ πρέσβεις τὰ ὑπομνήμα]-
 40 τα τούτων ἃ οἱ Νεοπολίται ἔδοσαν πάντα παραδοῦναι τῷ γρ[-
 αμματεῖ τῆς βουλῆς χωρὶς μὲν [τὰ νῦν δεδομένα χωρὶς δὲ τὰλ]-
 λα, καὶ τὸ φσέφισμα τόδε ἀναγρά[φσας ὁ γραμματεὺς ὁ]
 τῆς βουλῆς ἐστήλη λιθίνῃ καταθ[έ]το ἐμ πόλει τέλεσι τοῖ[-
 ς Νεοπολιτῶν· ἐν δὲ Νέαι Πόλῃ αὐτοὶ [ἀναγράφσαντες καταθ]-
 45 ἐντον ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ τῆς Παρθένο ἐστήλ[ῃ] λιθίνῃ· καλέσαι δὲ καὶ]
 ἐπὶ χσένια τῆμ πρεσβείαν ἐς τὸ πρυτα[νεῖον ἐς αὔριον υυυυ]

Second hand

Οἰνοβίοι Δεκελεεὶ στρατεγοῖ ΤΤΤΠΗ[ΔΔΔΤΤΤΤΤΤΤΤΤ]

Third hand

Ἀχιόχοχος εἶπε : ἐπαινέσαι τοῖς Νεοπολίταις τοῖς ἀπὸ [Θράικες ἡσ
 δσιν ἀνδράσιν ἀγαθοῖς]

ἔς τε τὴν στρατιάν καὶ τὴν πόλιν τὴν Ἀθηναίων καὶ ἡότι ἐς Θάσον
 ἔστρατεύοντο χυμπολιор]-
 50 κέσοντες μετὰ Ἀθηναίων : καὶ ἡότι χουνναυμαχόντ[ες ἐνίκον] καὶ [κατὰ
 γέν χσυνεμάχον τὸν πά]-
 ντα χρόνον καὶ τὰ ἄλλα ἡότι εἶ ποιδσιν Ἀθηναίο[ς καὶ ἀντὶ τ]ούτον
 [. 16 παρὰ Ἀ]-
 θεναίων εἶναι αὐτοῖς καθῆάπερ ἐφσέφισται τ[οῖ δέμο]ι : [κα]ἰ ἡόπος ἀμ
 μ[ε ἀδικῶνται μεδὲν μέτ]-
 ε ὑπὸ ἰδιότο μέτε ὑπὸ κωνὸ πόλεος τὸς τε σ[τρατεγὸ]ς ἡοὶ ἄν ἡεκάστοτε
 ἀ[ρχοσι πάντας ἐπιμέ]-
 λεσθαι αὐτῶν ἡό τι ἄν δέονται : καὶ τὸς ἀρχ[ο]ν[τ]ας τοὺς Ἀθηναίων ἡοὶ
 55 ἄν ἡεκ[άστοτε. . . . 9.]
 ον τὴν πόλιν Νεοπολίτας φυλάττοντα[ς] καὶ προθύμος ὄντας ποιῆν
 ἡό τι ἄν [. 15.]
 καὶ νῦν ἡευρίσκεσθαι αὐτὸς παρὰ τ[ὸ δ]έμο τὸ Ἀθηναίων ἡό τι ἄν δοκεῖ
 ἀγαθ[ὸν 9. : περὶ]
 δὲ τῆς ἀπαρχῆς τῆι Παρθένου ἡ[έπερ κ]αὶ τέος ἐγίγνετο τῆι [θε]οῖ ἐν τῷ
 δέμο[ι πράχσαι πρὸς αὐ]-
 τὸς· ἐς δὲ τὸ φσέφισμα τὸ πρό[τερον ἐ]πανορθῶσαι τὸν γραμματεά
 τῆς βολῆς : κ[αὶ ἐς αὐτὸ μεταγρ]-
 [άφ]σαι ἀντὶ τῆς ἀποικί[ας τῆς Θασί]ον ἡότι συνδιεπολέμεσαν τὸν
 60 πόλεμον μ[ετὰ Ἀθηναίων : πρέ]-
 σβεσι δὲ . . .]αι : καὶ Π[. . . 7. . . . καὶ . . .]οφάντοι : ἐπαινέσαι ἡάτε νῦν
 λέγοσιν κ[αὶ πράττοσιν ἀγα]-
 [θὸν ἡυπὲρ Ἀθε]ν[αίων τὸ δέμο καὶ ἡότι] πρόθυμοὶ εἰσι ποιῆν ἡό τι
 δύνανται ἀ[γαθὸν ἐς τὴν στρα]-
 [τιάν καὶ τὴν πόλιν ἐς τὸ λοιπὸν καθῆά]περ τὸ πρότερον· καλέσαι
 δὲ καὶ ἐπὶ χ[σένια ἐς αὔριον ν]
 [. . . 7. . . . εἶπε : τὰ μὲν ἄλλα καθῆάπερ τῆι] βουλεῖ· τῆι δὲ Παρθένου
 ἐχσαιρέ[σθαι τὴν ἀπαρχὴν κα]-
 [θῆάπερ τὸ πρότερον 15. ἡο δ]έμος ε[ὔ]χσεται.

Our text follows, with very minor divergencies, that of Meritt and Andrewes. They corrected several readings that had been generally accepted, and in particular showed that in the second decree current texts had lines that were six letters too long.

The first decree praises the people of Neapolis for their support, military and financial, of Athens and her forces in the fighting against

Thasos and her Peloponnesian allies. They will receive the honour due for their services and have priority of access to the Athenian Boule and Assembly. [? Their envoys are to hand over the records of their gifts to the secretary.] This decree was passed in the sixth prytany of 410-9 (cf. No. 84, l. 14). The line following was added later. It records a payment to the Athenian general Oinobios, probably the man who is said to have carried the proposal for Thucydides' recall (Paus. i. 23. 9). The sum is identified by Meritt and Andrewes (p. 203) with a payment in the eighth prytany recorded in the accounts of Athena's treasurers for 410-9 (No. 84, l. 28).

The second decree praises Neapolis for her continued loyalty and implies that the war with Thasos is ended. The Neapolitans are promised protection by Athenian generals and Athenian officials [? resident in Neapolis]. Their representations about their Virgin Goddess are to be considered in the Assembly, and in a rider their request is granted (see below). The explicit reference to Neapolis as a colony of Thasos is to be erased from the first decree. Their envoys are praised and invited to public hospitality.

Neapolis (the modern thriving port of Kavalla) is on the Thracian coast opposite Thasos, commanding an easy route to the rich economic resources of the interior. She was probably closely controlled in her early history by her mother city Thasos (in the same way that Mytilene controlled the coastal cities of the mainland opposite Lesbos). When Thasos revolted from Athens in 465 her *ἐμπόρια* on the mainland were one of the causes of dispute (Thuc. i. 100. 2). The terms imposed by Athens when Thasos surrendered included the loss of control of her mainland colonies. Neapolis, not necessarily against her will, was incorporated in the Athenian Alliance and appears regularly in the tribute-lists with an assessment of only 2,000 dr. (perhaps kept low by Athens to ensure goodwill in an economically vital area). When after the Sicilian disaster Thasos revolted again, Neapolis showed her loyalty to Athens by active help in the struggle to regain control, and her hostility to Thasos may also be reflected in a contemporary Thasian decree (No. 83). Thasos was recovered by Thrasyboulos in 407 (Xen. *Hell.* 1. 4. 9; Diod. xiii. 72. 1), and it was probably in this year that Axiochos (presumably the uncle of Alcibiades; see p. 246) moved the second decree. He had been exiled in 414 for complicity in the desecration of the Mysteries (Andoc. i. 16; for his name in the sale-lists of confiscated property see No. 79). He probably returned with Alcibiades in 407.

In l. 7 the correction required by the second decree (ll. 58 f.) was made, and it involved a small consequent change in l. 8. The revisions were made with the lettering of the second decree: *παρὰ Θάσον* (*πρῶτον* μ) *ἐν ᾧ* *τυ*

συνδιεπο[λέμε]σαν τὸν πόλεμον μετὰ Ἀθηναίον[υ καὶ πολιο]ρκό-
 μνοι ὑπὸ Θασίων] καὶ Πελο[πον]ησίον οὐκ ἤθ[έ]λησαν ἀ[πο]στῆνα[ι].
 l. 25: The 4+ T. of this line seem to be a loan, and the 5+ T. of l. 33
 a gift. l. 54: ἄρχοντες τῶν Ἀθηναίων, political residents, often in charge
 of small garrisons, were widely distributed in the Athenian Empire (see
 Nos. 45, 46). Here the reference is probably to the Athenian official(s)
 at Neapolis rather than such officials throughout the empire (as Tod and
 others). l. 56: *ἡό τι ἂν δοκεῖ ἀγαθ[ὸν τῷ βολεῖ* Meritt and Andrewes;
ἀγαθ[ὸν ἡὸ δεόνται P. J. Rhodes. l. 64: *IG* i², widely accepted, has [ἐπειδὴν
ἡὸ κέρυχς εὐ]φρέμος ε[ῦ]χσεται, but there is no trace of φ on the stone. Meritt
 and Andrewes suggest *ἡέν ἂν Νεοπολιτῶν ἡὸ δ[έ]μος ε[ῦ]χσεται*. It is not
 certain what privilege the envoys of Neapolis were requesting for their
 Virgin. Tod inferred that τῷ [θε]δί in l. 57 referred to Athena and that
 Neapolis was asking that the *apharche* previously paid to Athena might now
 be paid to her own goddess. Meritt and Andrewes (p. 209) think that such
 a request would hardly be in keeping with the mutual goodwill manifest
 in the decree. Their alternative hypothesis that Neapolis was asking Athens
 to agree to the restoration of her first-fruits to the Virgin, which had lapsed
 in the emergency, is less satisfactory, for, as Dittenberger (*SIG* 107), quoting
 Kirchhoff, noted, that was a question which Neapolis could decide for
 herself. And on an Athenian inscription ἡ θεός should be Athena (cf. No. 45,
 clause 3). A goddess Parthenos, distinct from Athena, is also found at
 Halicarnassus (*SIG* 46. 3). For the remains of her Neapolis temple see
BCH lxxxvi (1962) 830-40, Ἄρχ. Δελτ. xvii B (1961/2) 235-8.

90 (90)

Athens honours Oiniades: 408-7 B.C.

A marble stele, found on the Acropolis; now in EM.

Ionic letters, stoichedon 23. Phot.: Kern 18; *IA* 41.

IG i². 118.

Θ ε ο ι
 ἔδοξεν τῇ βολῆι καὶ τῷ δήμ-
 ωι, Ἀντιοχίς ἐπρυτάνευε, Εὐκ-
 λείδης ἐγραμμάτευε, Ἴεροκλ-
 5 ἡς ἐπεστάτε, Εὐκτήμων ἦρχε· υ
 Διειτρέφης εἶπε· ἐπειδὴ ἀνή-
 ρ ἐστι ἀγαθὸς Οἰνιάδης ὁ Παλ-

αἰσκιάθιος περὶ τὴν πόλιν τ-
 ἣν Ἀθηναίων καὶ πρόθυμος πο-
 10 ἰέν ὃ τι δύναται ἀγαθόν, καὶ ε-
 ὕ ποιεῖ τὸν ἀφικνόμενον Ἀθη-
 ναίων ἐσκίαθον, ἐπαινέσαι τ-
 ε αὐτῶι καὶ ἀναγράψαι αὐτὸν
 πρόξενον καὶ εὐεργέτην Ἀθη-
 15 ναίων καὶ τὸς ἐκγόνους αὐτοῦ, κ-
 αὶ ὅπως ἂν μὴ ἀδικῆται ἐπιμέ-
 λεσθαι τὴν τε βολὴν τὴν αἰεὶ β-
 ολεύουσαν καὶ τοὺς στρατηγ-
 οὺς καὶ τὸν ἄρχοντα τὸν ἐν Σκι-
 20 άθωι ὃς ἂν ᾗ ἐκάστοτε· τὸ δὲ ψ-
 ήφισμα τόδε ἀναγράψαι τὸν γ-
 ραμματέα τῆς βολῆς ἐν στήλη-
 ι λιθίνῃ καὶ καταθέσθαι ἐμ π-
 ὄλει. καλέσαι δὲ αὐτὸν καὶ ἐπ-
 25 ἰ ξένια ἐς τὸ πρυτανεῖον ἐς α-
 ὕριον· ἢ Ἀντιχάρης εἶπε· τὰ μέ-
 γ ἄλλα καθάπερ τῇ βολῇ, ἐς δ-
 [ἐ τ]ῆγ γνώμην μεταγράψαι ἀντ-
 [ὶ τὸ “Σ]κιαθίῶ”, ὅπως ἂν ᾗ γεγρα-
 30 [μμένο]ν, “Οἰνιάδην τὸν Παλαισ-
 [κιάθιον”].

Though more than thirty fifth-century decrees conferring the title of *proxenos* or commending *proxenoi* have in part survived, this decree is the only completely preserved example. The title of *proxenos* was widely spread among Greek states and was useful for trading and political reasons. In return for the honorary title, and sometimes other privileges (see No. 70), the *proxenos* was expected to look after the interests of the city honouring him and its citizens. Skiathos, though a small island in the northern Sporades and thinly populated, had a good harbour which was important to Athenian ships sailing to and from Thrace and/or the Euxine. Oiniades, apart from his general loyalty to Athens, ‘helps Athenians who come to Skiathos’, an important qualification for the office. When the Athenian *episkopos* comes to keep a watchful eye on the establishment of Cloudduckoobury his first question is *ποῦ πρόξενος*; he needs to know what is going on,

and the local friends of Athens are the people to tell him (*Ar. Birds*, 1021). Oiniades is perhaps a little touchy; he wants to make it clear on the stone that he comes from the old town. The Boule in framing the probouleuma had not realized the subtle distinction; an Athenian friend has the necessary amendment carried in the Assembly. The change is made before the text is inscribed, but it is still made clear that an amendment was needed.

91 (91)

Athens honours Archelaos of Macedon:

407-6 B.C.

Two joining fragments of a marble stele, from the Acropolis; now in EM.

Attic letters, stoichedon 31. Phot.: *Jahresh.* xxi-xxii (1922-4) 123.

IG i². 105; Wilhelm, *Jahresh.* xxi-xxii (1924) 141; Meritt *AFD* 107-15; de Sanctis, *RF* lxiii (1935) 209; Meritt, *Class. Stud. presented to Edward Cahps*, 246-50.

[ἔδοχσεν τῆι βολῆι καὶ τῶ]ι δέμοι, Ἀκα[μα]-
 [ντις ἐπρυτάνευε, Φελ]λεύς [ἔγρ]αμ[μ]ά[τ]ευ-
 [ε, Ἀντιγένης ἐρχε, Σιβ]ύρτιο[ς ἐ]πεστά[τε,]
 [Ἀλκιβιάδες εἶπε· ἐς τ]ὲν πο[ί]ε[σιν τὸν [νε]-
 5 [ὄν δανεῖσαι τὸς στρα]τεγὸς τ[ὸ]ς μετὰ Π[ε]-
 [ρικλέος ἀργύριον παρ]ὰ τὸν ν[ῦ]ν ὄντων ἀ-
 [ποδεκτὸν τοῖς ναυπεγ]οῖς· ἡὸ δ' ἂν δανεί-
 [σοσιν, ἀποδόντων αὐτο]ῖς πάλιν ἡοι τρι-
 [εροποιοί· τὸς δὲ τεταγ]μένους πλὴν ἐπὶ τ-
 10 [ὲν πλέροσιν τὸν νεῶν ἡ]ος τάχιστα ἀποσ-
 [τελάντων ἡοι στρατεγ]οί· εἰ δὲ μέ, ἐσαγό-
 [σθον προδοσίας ἐς τὸ δ]ικαστέριον· ἡο[ι]
 [δὲ στρατέγοι περὶ τῶ μ]ε ἐθέλοντος ἀπι-
 [ῆναι ἐσαγόντων· τῆς δὲ] κομιδῆς τὸν νε[ῶ]-
 15 [ν, ἡὰς ἂν ἡοι ναυπεγοὶ ἐ]γ Μακεδονίας σ[τ]-
 [έλλοσι, τὲν βολὲν ἐπιμ]ελ[ε]θῆναι, ἡόπος
 [ἂν σταλδσιν ἡος τάχισ]τα Ἀθῆναζε καὶ πι-
 [λεροθδσι καὶ ἐπὶ Ἴονι]αν κομίζεται ἡε

[στρατιὰ φυλάχουσα φυ]λακὲν τὲν ἀρίστ-
 20 [εν· ἐὰν δέ τις μὲ ποέσει] κατὰ ταῦτα, ὀφέλ-
 [εν . . .ίας δραχμὰς αὐτὸ]ν ἱερὰς τῆι Ἀθ-
 [εναίαι· τῶι δὲ πρότοι ἐλθ]όντι καὶ κομ[ι]-
 [σαμένοι ναῦν δῶναι δορεὰν κ]αθά[περ ἔδ]-
 [οχσεν τῶι δέμοι· ἐπειδὲ δὲ Ἀρχέλαος καὶ]
 25 [νῦν καὶ ἐν τῶι πρόσθεν χρ]ό[ν]οι ἐσ[τὶν ἄν]-
 [ερ ἀγαθὸς περὶ ἈθENAί]ος τὸς τε ἐκπ[λεύ]-
 [σαντας ναυπηγὸς ἀνέλ]αβεν καὶ ἐς τὸ [. . .]
 [..... Ἰδ.....] ἀπέπεμφσεν κα[ὶ]
 [..... Ἰδ.....]ο στρατόπεδον κ-
 30 [αὶ ἔδοκεν αὐτοῖς χυ]λύα καὶ κοπέας καὶ
 [ἄλλα ἡόσον ἐδέοντο παρ'] αὐτὸ ἀγαθὰ, ἐπα-
 [ινέσαι Ἀρχέλαοι ἡος ὄν]τι ἀνδρὶ ἀγαθῶι
 [καὶ προθύμοι ποιῆν ἡό]τι δύνανται ἀγαθ-
 [όν, καὶ ἀνθ' ὃν εὐεργέτε]κεν τέν τε πόλιν
 35 [καὶ τὸν δέμον τὸν ἈθENAί]ον ἀναγράφσα-
 [ι αὐτὸν καὶ παῖδας προχσένο]ς καὶ ε[ὐερ]-
 [γέτας ἐμ πόλει ἐστέλει λιθίνει] κ[αὶ ἐπι]-
 [μέλεσθαι αὐτὸν -----]-

Ll. 11-12: ἐσαγό[ντων] ἡοι ἔνδεκα Mattingly, *Ehrenberg Studies*, 200.
 ll. 27-9: καὶ ἐς τὸ [νε]όριον τὸ ἐν . . . 9 ἀπέπεμφσεν κα[ὶ] | κατέστεισεν
 ἐς τὸ ἡαυτ]ὸ στρατόπεδον Meritt.

The last surviving lines of this decree include familiar formulae (cf. No. 90, ll. 6-15). In them a non-Athenian is being praised for services which are briefly described. The main clue lies in the reference to timber for oars (κοπέας, l. 30) which at once suggests Macedon, and since Macedon is mentioned earlier in the decree (l. 15) and the name Archelaos provides a restoration in l. 32 which precisely fills the available space, we may reasonably infer that Archelaos, King of Macedon, is receiving from Athens the titles πρόξενος καὶ εὐεργέτης. The Athenian fleet, especially after the loss of Amphipolis, depended primarily on Macedonian timber, and timber in Macedon was a royal monopoly. So Andocides can boast that in 411 he supplied oars to the Athenian fleet at Samos owing to his inherited friendship with Archelaos: ὄντος μοι Ἀρχελάου ξένου πατρικοῦ καὶ διδόντος τέμνεσθαί τε καὶ ἐξάγεσθαι ὁπόσους ἐβουλόμην (Andoc. ii. 11). Similarly Archelaos' predecessor, Perdikkas, in an alliance with Athens included in the terms of his oath: καὶ οὐδένα κο]πέας ἐχσάγεν ἕασο ἑὰμ μὲ Ἀθε[ναίους] (IG i². 71. 22 f.; SEG x. 86).

The details of the first part of the decree are considerably more uncertain and they depend in part on the date. It cannot be earlier than the accession of Archelaos (between 414 and 410; Beloch, *GG*² iii. 2. 55) but the only specific clue is the number of letters (9) available for the archon's name. In *IG. i*² Wilhelm's restoration of Theopompos, archon in 411-10, was accepted, but this date rested largely on the restoration of Pydna in l. 28, which seemed to associate the decree with the operations of Theramenes in 411-10. Theramenes helped the Macedonian army before Pydna (Diod. xiii. 49. 1; Xen. *Hell.* i. 1. 2); it was reasonable to infer help given by Archelaos to Athens. However, the prescript of this decree implies the restoration of full democracy, and, although it can be shown that the democracy was restored before the end of the archon-year 411-10, the democratic prytanies at the end of 411-10 were Aiantis and possibly part of Aigeis, not Akamantis (l. 1) (cf. No. 84; Andocides i. 96-8; Meritt, *AFD* 106-10). We follow Meritt in his restoration of *Ἀντιγένης*, epigraphically equally suitable, archon in 407-6.

Any restoration of the full text must be very hypothetical but in what survives, ἐγ Μακεδονίας (15), Ἀθέναζε (17), κομιδῆς τῶν νε- [?δ|ν] (14 f.), there is some support for Meritt's suggestion that the decree provides for the dispatch of shipwrights (*ναυπηγοί*, though the word has to be restored) to Macedon to build triremes and send them as quickly as possible to Athens, and to man them and dispatch them as quickly as possible to Ionia (restored). If Meritt's interpretation is correct the decree becomes considerably more interesting. The name of the proposer has ten letters, and though there are many ten-letter names it is tempting with Meritt (*Class. Stud. presented to Edward Capps*, 249) to restore *Ἀλκιβιάδες*. The decree would illustrate the boldness and originality of Alcibiades. From 410 to 407 he had swung the war, which had seemed lost at Syracuse, in Athens' favour, but the fleet was not strong enough to maintain decisive control of the sea. Athenian resources after the destruction of the fleet at Syracuse were severely strained and only small detachments of triremes could be sent from Athens to their base at Samos. In 406 the situation was again critical. Alcibiades had been dismissed and Conon was blockaded in Mytilene. Only substantial reinforcements could restore the position. In the summer of 406 no less than 110 ships were dispatched from Athens (Xen. *Hell.* i. 6. 24). Is this, in part at least, the result of the emergency measures that Alcibiades had taken in 407 by this decree? To import timber in large quantities when Athens no longer had secure control of the sea routes was dangerous; heavy timber cargoes, whether towed or carried on board would mean slow sailing, and slow-moving merchantmen would be very vulnerable. Did Alcibiades resolve the problem by having the much-needed triremes

built where the timber was cut in Macedon? New triremes would move fast and should be safe from attack.

Ll. 4-9 are important for the history of Athenian financial procedure. A mention of the *apodektai* seems fairly certain. These officials, said, probably wrongly, by Androtion (*FGH* 324 F 5) to have been instituted by Kleisthenes, make their first certain appearance in 417 (*IG* i². 94. 16-17). In the fourth century their function is to receive the state revenues and to distribute them to the various boards of magistrates in fixed, legally budgeted amounts (Jones, *Athenian Democracy*, 102 f.). It is not clear how far this system is already in operation here, but it seems that the *trieropoioi* have exhausted their vote and that a decree is necessary before the *apodektai* can advance the money against later repayment.

92

Athens and Carthage: 406 B.C.

Two fragments of a marble stele, one (a) found in the Nike-bastion; both now in EM.

Developed Attic writing, stoichedon (probably 36). Phot.: *Harv. Stud.*, Suppl. i. 248.

Meritt, *Harv. Stud.*, Suppl. i. 247-53; Luria, *Vestnik Drevnej Historii*, 1947, 3, 122-5; Stroheker, *Hist.* iii (1954) 163-71; *Staatsverträge* 208.

(a) [ἔδοχσεν τῆι βο]λλῆι κ[αὶ τῶι δέμοι, . . . c. 6. . ἔπρυ]-
 [τάνευε, . . . c. 6. .]ς Ἀφιδ[ναῖος ἐγραμμάτευε, . . .]
 [. 12.]ς ἔπεσ[τάτε, - - - εἶπε· - -]
 [. 11.]κανκα[. 19.]
 5 [. 12.]ονοτα[. 19.]
 [. 11.]ἀναγρά[φσαι δὲ Καρχεδονίος εἰ]-
 [εργέτας Ἀθνα]ῖον τὸν [γραμματέα τῆς βολῆς ἐ]-
 [μ πόλει ἐστέλ]ει λιθίν[ει· 16.]
 [. 11.] ἐς Σικελ[ίαν πέμψαι πρὸς στρα]-
 10 [τεγὸς Ἀννίβα]γ Γέσκου[ος καὶ Ἰμίλκωνα Ἄννου]-
 [ος. 9.]ς αὐτὸς [. 20.]
 [. 13.]τα[. 21.]

lacuna

(b) π]-
 [ρὸς στρατεγὸς Ἀννίβαγ Γέσκονος καὶ Ἰμ]ίλκο-

- 15 [να Ἄννωνος· ἐπαινέσαι δὲ καὶ τὸς κέρυκα]ς τὸς
 [Ἀθέναζε ἀφιγμένος ὅτι εἰσὶν ἄνδρες ἀγ]αθοὶ
 [περὶ τὸν δῆμον τὸν Ἀθηναίων· καλέσαι δὲ] καὶ ἐ-
 [πὶ χσένια ἐς τὸ πρυτανεῖον ἐς αὔριον νυ] vacat
 [. 29 Ἄνν]ίβας
 20 [. 34]υτ

Meritt suggests for ll. 3-6: [κέρυ|χσι μὲν, ὃς ἀφέ]καν Κα[ρχεδόνιοι, πρόσοδον ἐν]αι πρὸς τὸν δῆμ]ον, ὅτα[μπερ πρῶτον ἐκκλεσία κ|υρία γίνεται]. Luria prefers τὸς ἥκοντας for Καρχεδονίος in l. 6. ll. 8-9: [κέρυκας δὲ Ἀθηναί]ον αὐτίκα μάλα] Meritt. In l. 11 a trace after αὐτὸς may be the top of phi, which would make αἰτέσοντα]ς αὐτὸς φ[ιλίαν καὶ χουμμαχίαν not unattractive. In l. 19 we read an iota for the first time, which eliminates Meritt's σύμ]βασ[ις, and opens the way to his alternative [Καρχεδονίον οἶδε ὄμνου]ν τὸν ὄρκον]. Since there is some possibility that l. 14 duplicates ll. 10-11, Meritt suggests that an amendment formula has been lost.

It seems clear that Hannibal and Himilkon were both referred to in a context which has to do with Sicily. This seems to point clearly to the first half of 406, when they were together in Sicily (Diod. xiii. 80. 1-2) until Hannibal died before Akragas at the beginning of summer (ibid. xiii. 86. 3). The fact that both secretary and *epistates* were given their demotics (ll. 2-3) also points to the last years of the Peloponnesian War. It seems clear that Carthaginian representatives are present in Athens, and that Athenians are to go to Sicily. The only reason for supposing that any arrangement was ultimately arrived at lies in the apparent presence of Hannibal's name in a post-script.

Despite suggestions (Thuc. vi. 15. 2, 34. 2, 90. 2) that the Athenian expedition of 415 was aimed at Carthage as well as at Syracuse, it had in fact in 414 sent a trireme to Carthage *περὶ φιλίας* (Thuc. vi. 88. 6). Our sources give us no further information about relations between Athens and Carthage, but Stroheker has shown that Carthage adopted some of the Athenian methods of dividing Sicily against Syracuse, and her messengers, though they can hardly have expected any material help from Athens in 406, may well have been interested in her diplomatic support. That Athens should have grasped at any friend in this year, particularly one who was diverting the attention of Syracuse from the war in the Aegean, is not surprising. Luria calls attention to the possible relevance of Euripides, *Phoenissae*, from which Radermacher (*Neue Jahrb.* cli (1895) 236 f.) had already inferred Athenian interest in Carthaginian activities in this period.

93 (93)

Monument of a Lycian Dynast: late fifth century B.C.

On the northern face of the monolithic shaft of a limestone monument at Xanthus in Lycia, commonly called the 'Xanthian Stele'. The shaft supported a tomb-chamber with an elaborate frieze, crowned by a seated statue (Demargne, *Fouilles de Xanthos*, i. 79-105, with Pl. xxvi-xlii).

Ionic writing. Stoichedon, except at the ends of the longer lines. Iota does not always have its own space. Facs.: *TAM* i, p. 41.

TAM i. 44+; Hicks-Hill 56; Nachmanson, *HGI* 26; Geffcken 98; Hiller *H. Gr. Ep.* 56; König, *Die Stele von Xanthos*, i. 79-81.

- [έ]ξ οὐ τ' Εὐρώπην [Α]σίας δίχα πόν[τ]ος ἔνεμ[ε]ν,
 [ο]ὐδεῖς πω Λυκίων στήλην τοιάνδε ἀνέθηκ(ε)ν
 [δ]ώδεκα θεοῖς ἀνγορᾶς ἐν καθαρῶι τεμένει,
 [. . .]εων καὶ πολέμου μνήμα τόδε ἀθάν(α)τον.
 5 [. . .]ις ὄδε Ἀρπάγο υἱὸς ἀριστεύσας τὰ ἅπαντα
 [χε]ρσὶ πάλην Λυκίων τῶν τότε' ἐν ἡλικίαι,
 [πο]λλὰς δὲ ἀκροπόλεις σὺν Ἀθηναῖαι πτολιπόρθωι
 [π]έρσας συγγενέσιν δῶκε μέρος βασιλέας·
 ὦν χάριν ἀθάνατοῖ οἱ ἀπεμν(ή)σαντο δικαίαν.
 10 ἐπτά δὲ ὀπλίτας κτείνειν ἐν ἡμέραι Ἀρκάδας ἄνδρας,
 Ζηνὶ δὲ π(λ)έστα τροπαῖα β(ρ)οτῶν ἔ[στ]ησεν ἀπάν(τ)ων,
 καλλίστοις δ' ἔργοις Κα[ρ]ίκα γένος ἔστεφάνωσεν.

Letters are omitted in ll. 2, 4, 9, 11. A fault in the stone was avoided in l. 3. The normal restoration [νικ]έων in l. 4 requires that nu and iota were written in one space, but this seems unlikely at the beginning of the line.

The monument was both tomb and victory-memorial. The Greek inscription was a relatively trivial part of it, for it was preceded by a Lycian inscription of 138 lines on the southern and eastern faces and above it, and followed by another Lycian text, apparently in a different dialect, of 105 lines, below it and on the western face. The Lycian texts are not yet decipherable (see König, *Die Stele von Xanthos*; Meriggi, *Germanen und Indo-Germanen, Festschrift für Hermann Hirt*, ii. 277-81; Friedrich, *Entzifferung verschollener Schriften und Sprachen*², 86-90 = *Extinct Languages* 104-9), but certain names can be read in the text which precedes the Greek epigram: Spartans, Athenians, Ionians, Melesandros (who in 430-29 sailed to Caria and Lycia with six ships to collect money for the Athenians and to protect commerce, but was defeated and killed by the Lycians, Thuc. ii. 69),

Amorges (Thuc. viii. 5, 19, 28, 54), Darius and Artaxerxes, presumably Darius II (424-405) and Artaxerxes II (405-359), Hieramenes (Thuc. viii. 58), and Tissaphernes. All these names point to the last fifteen years of the fifth century, except that of Melesandros, and there is something to be said for the view of W. E. Thompson (*Hesp.* xxxvi (1967) 105 f.) that we should read the name Melesandros which appears in the Athenian expense-accounts for 414-13 (Meritt, *AFD* 88, l. 3) in the dative instead of the genitive and assume a second Athenian general of the name. This would considerably shorten the duration of the events described in the Lycian text. The Lycians were added to the Delian League by Cimon and still paid tribute in 446-5 (*ATL* ii, list 9, col. iii, 30), but probably fell away soon afterwards. The vigour of their native dynasty is best represented by their coins (for which see *B.M. Cat. Coins*, Lycia, xxv-xliv; Head, *HN*² 688-93; Babelon, *Traité*, ii. 172-343; Jenkins, *Num. Chr.* 1959, 32-41). The subject of this monument was named at the beginning of l. 5. [Κόρρ]ις was suggested by Imbert, *REG* vii (1894) 271, as representing the native name ↓ΛΡΧΕ, of whom a long series of coins exists. The dynasty is referred to as Κα[ρ]ίκα γένος in l. 12, and the Lycian equivalent appears both in the Lycian text here and on coins.

The dialect of the poem seems to be Attic; the poet, though not without vigour, had a memory better than his technique. L. 1 repeats the first line of an epigram (*Anth. Pal.* vii. 296, Diod. xi. 62) assigned (probably erroneously) to Simonides, which was associated in antiquity with the Battle of the Eurymedon (defended by Wade-Gery, *JHS* liii (1933) 82-6. Meyer, *Forsch.* ii. 94 preferred Cyprian Salamis); the τ' is meaningless in the new context. For l. 3 see Tritsch, *JHS* lxii (1942) 41 f.; Picard, *BSA* xlvi (1951) 137 f.; Martin, *Recherches sur l'agora grecque*, 169-74. τόδε in l. 4 refers to the monument in general, ὄδε in l. 5 to the crowning statue. For ll. 5-6 cf. Soph. *Trach.* 488; πάλην certainly means 'wrestling', and is not another form of βάλην or βαλλήν 'king' (Aesch. *Pers.* 657, Soph. fr. 472 Nauck). L. 7 recalls the Athena common on Lycian coins. In l. 8 βασιλέας = βασιλείας. For l. 9 cf. Hesiod, *Theog.* 503. L. 10 is curiously reminiscent of No. 51, ll. 2-3; the Arcadians may have been mercenaries in the service of Amorges or of the Spartans (Thuc. viii. 28. 4).

94 (96)

Athens honours the Samians: 405 B.C.

Four fragments of a marble stele, found on the Acropolis, now in the museum there. Above the inscription is a relief representing Athena and

Hera, the patron goddesses of Athens and Samos, standing with right hands clasped (Binnebössel, No. 22).

Ionic letters, stoichedon, but sometimes observing the syllabic division of words, 57–61. The letters of ll. 1–4 are much larger than the rest. ΑΕΘ are frequently inscribed ΛΞΟ. Phot.: *IIA* 19; Kern 19.

IG ii². 1; P. Foucart, *REA* i (1899) 181–99; *SIG* 116.

Κηφισοφῶν Παιανιεύς | ἐγραμμάτευε. |

Σαμίους ὅσοι μετὰ τῷ δήμῳ τῷ Ἀθηναίων ἐγένοντο.

- 5 ἔδοχσεν τῇ βολῆι καὶ τῷ δήμῳ, Κεκροπίς ἐπρυτάνευε, Πόλυμνις
 Εὐωνυμεύς
 ἐγραμμάτευε, Ἀλεξίας ἤρχε, Νικοφῶν Ἀθμονεύς ἐπεστάτει· γνώμη
 Κλεσόφο
 καὶ συνπρυτάνεον· ἐπαινέσαι τοῖς πρέσβεσι τοῖς Σαμίους τοῖς τε
 προτέρο-
 ις ἧκοσι καὶ τοῖς νῦν καὶ τῇ βολῆι καὶ τοῖς στρατηγοῖς καὶ τοῖς
 ἄλλοις
 Σαμίους ὅτι ἐσὶν ἄνδρες ἀγαθοὶ καὶ πρόθυμοι ποιῆν ὅ τι δύνανται
 ἀγαθόν,
 10 καὶ τὰ πεπραγμένα αὐτοῖς ὅτι δοκοῦσιν ὀρθῶς ποιῆσαι Ἀθηναίους
 καὶ Σαμί-
 οῖς· καὶ ἀντὶ ὧν εὖ πεποιήκασιν Ἀθηναίους καὶ νῦν περὶ πολλοῦ ποιῶνται
 καὶ
 ἐσηγόνται ἀγαθὰ· δεδόχθαι τῇ βολῆι καὶ τῷ δήμῳ, Σαμίους Ἀθηναίους
 εἶναι,
 πολιτευομένους ὅπως ἂν αὐτοὶ βόλωνται· καὶ ὅπως ταῦτα ἔσται ὡς
 ἐπιτηδειό-
 τата ἀμφοτέροις, καθάπερ αὐτοὶ λέγουσιν, ἐπειδὴν ἐρήμη γένηται, τότε
 περὶ
 15 τῶν ἄλλων κοινῇ βολεύεσθαι. τοῖς δὲ νόμοις χρῆσθαι τοῖς σφετέροις
 αὐτῶν
 αὐτονόμους ὄντας, καὶ τὰλλα ποιῆν κατὰ τὸς ὄρκους καὶ τὰς συνθήκας
 καθάπερ
 ξύνκειται Ἀθηναίους καὶ Σαμίους· καὶ περὶ τῶν ἐγκλημάτων ἃ ἄγ
 γίγνηται
 πρὸς ἀλλήλους διδόναι καὶ δέχεσθαι τὰς δίκας κατὰ τὰς συμβολὰς τὰς
 ὅσας.
 [ἐ]ὰν δέ τι ἀναγκαῖον γίγνηται διὰ τὸν πόλεμον καὶ πρότερον περὶ τῆς
 πολι-

- 20 [τ]είας, ὥσπερ αὐτοὶ λέγουσιν οἱ πρέσβες, πρὸς τὰ παρόντα βουλευομένους
ποιῆν
[ἦ]ι ἂν δοκῆι βέλτιστον εἶναι. περὶ δὲ τῆς ἐρήνης, ἕαγ γίγνηται, εἶναι
κατὰ ταῦτά
[κ]αθάπερ Ἀθηναίοις, καὶ τοῖς νῦν οἰκῶσιν Σάμον· εἰ δὲ πολεμῆν δέηι,
παρασκ-
[ε]υάζεσθαι αὐτὸς ὡς ἂν δύνωνται ἄριστα πράττοντας μετὰ τῶν
στρατηγῶν.
[εἰ] δὲ πρεσβείαν ποιπέμπωσιν Ἀθηναῖοι, συμπέμπειν καὶ τὸς
ἐξάμο παρόντας,
25 [εἰ] ντινα βόλωνται, καὶ συνβουλευέειν ὅ τι ἂν ἔχωσιν ἀγαθόν. ταῖς δὲ
τριήρεσι
[ταῖς] ὅσαις ἐς Σάμωι χρῆσθαι αὐτοῖς δοῦναι ἐπισκευασαμένοις καθότι
ἂν αὐ-
[τοῖς] δοκῆι· τὰ δὲ ὀνόματα τῶν τριηράρχων, ὧν ἦσαν αὐταὶ αἱ νῆες,
ἀπογράψαι
[τὸς πρέσ]βες τῶι γραμματεῖ τῆς βολῆς καὶ τοῖς στρατηγοῖς, καὶ
τούτων εἶ πό
[τί] ἐστι ὄφλημ]α γεγραμμένον ἐν τῶι δημοσίωι ὡς παρεληφόντων τὰς
τριήρες,
30 [ἅπαντα ἐξαλειψά]ντων οἱ νεωροὶ ἀπανταχόθεν, τὰ δὲ σκευῆ τῶι
δημοσίωι ἐσ-
[πραξάντων ὡς τάχιστα κα]ὶ ἐπαναγκασάντων ἀποδοῦναι τὸς ἔχοντας
τούτων
[τι ἐντελῆ· γνώμη Κλεσόφο καὶ] συνπρυτάνεον· τὰ μὲν ἄλλα καθάπερ
τῆι βολῆι,
[εἶναι δὲ τὴν δωρειὰν Σαμίων τοῖς ἦ]κοσιν, καθάπερ αὐτοὶ αἰτῶνται, καὶ
νῆμαι
[αὐτὸς αὐτίκα μάλα ἐς τὸς δῆμος καὶ τὰ]ς φυλὰς δέκαχα· καὶ τὴν
πορείαν παρα-
35 [σκευάσαι τοῖς πρέσβεσι τὸς στρατηγὸς ὡ]ς τάχιστα καὶ Εὐμάχωι
καὶ τοῖς
[ἄλλοις Σαμίοις πᾶσι τοῖς μετὰ Εὐμάχῳ ἦ]κοσι ἐπαινεῖσαι ὡς δοσιν
ἀνδράσιν
[ἀγαθοῖς περὶ τὸς Ἀθηναίους· καλέσαι δ' Εὐμ]αχον ἐ[πὶ] δειπνον ἐς τὸ
πρυτανέον
[ἐς αὐριον. ἀναγράψαι δὲ τὰ ἐψηφισμένα τ]ὸν γραμμ[ατέα τῆς βο]λῆς
μετὰ τῶν

[στρατηγῶν ἐσθήλι λιθίηη καὶ κατα]θῆναι ἐς πόλι[ν, τὸς δὲ
 ἑλλην]οταμίας
 40 [δῶναι τὸ ἀργύριον· ἀναγράψαι δ' ἐς Σά]μωι κατὰ ταῦτὰ τέ[λε]σι [τοῖς
 ἐκέ]νων.

The Samian oligarchy which revolted from Athens in 440 (Nos. 55, 56) was replaced by a democracy; but by 412 oligarchs were again in power (probably having taken advantage of Athenian failure at Syracuse). They hoped with Peloponnesian help to revolt from Athens but they were crushed by the Samian demos. Athens now conferred autonomy on the democracy (Thuc. viii. 21 with *IG* i². 101, revised by Lewis, *BSA* xlix (1954) 29–31), and Samos remained loyal even after the decisive disaster at Aigospotamoi in 405. In the uneasy interval between the destruction of the Athenian fleet and the capitulation of Athens the Athenians showed by this decree their gratitude to Samos:

1 (1–12). The Samian envoys now present and a previous embassy are praised, together with the generals and the people of Samos, for their loyalty.

2 (12–15). In recognition of their loyalty all Samians shall have Athenian citizenship, but their form of government shall be their own concern. When peace comes details can be discussed.

3 (15–18). Samos shall retain the autonomy granted by Athens in 412, and the judicial agreements shall remain without change.

4 (19–25). Samos and Athens shall act together about issues of war, peace, and negotiation.

5 (25–32). The Samians may use the Athenian triremes left at Samos (presumably by Conon and Philokles before Aigospotamoi, Diod. xiii. 104). The envoys are asked to send a list of the trierarchs to whom these ships were assigned. Any debts in their name shall be cancelled, but equipment must be collected.

A rider (31–40), perhaps following a speech in the Assembly by Eumachos, their leader, provides that the Samian envoys now in Athens shall have Athenian citizenship and shall be divided equally between the ten tribes by the archons (cf. Hdt. v. 69, emended by Lolling: δέκαχα δὲ καὶ τοὺς δήμους κατένειμε ἐς φυλὰς). Eumachos is invited to δέειπνον (37) as a citizen and not to ξένια, the normal hospitality for foreign envoys. Finally, instructions are given for the inscribing and display of the decree, the money to be provided by the *hellenotamiai*, who from 411 had absorbed the duties of the *kolakretai* (see No. 84). If a stele was set up at once it was destroyed under the Thirty, for the copy that survives was inscribed in 403–2 (when

Cephisophon was secretary). With it were two other decrees confirming and extending the privileges granted in 405 (Tod, vol. ii, No. 97).

The proposals in the decree were put before the Assembly by 'Kleisophos and his fellow *prutaneis*', a unique formula, to emphasize that the proposal was unanimous; they also moved the amendment to show that this too was non-controversial.

95 (94 and 95)

Thank-offering for the Victory of Aigospotamoi:

405 B.C.

On thirteen blocks of grey limestone with prints of the feet of bronze statues. Ten of the blocks were found at the south-east corner of the sacred precinct at Delphi, close to the main gate by which the Sacred Way enters it. Reconstruction in Pouilloux and Roux, *Énigmes à Delphes*, p. 57.

Ionic writing. Roughly stoichedon, except *c* (see Austin, 78). Facs.: *FD* iii. 1, pp. 30 ff. Photos. of *b*, *c*: *ibid.* Pl. ii. 1-2; of *b*: *BCH* xc. 432; of *a*: *BCH* lxxxiii (1959) 176; of the top of *b*: *BCH* xc. 436.

FD iii. 1. 50-68; *SIG* 115+; Pomtow, *RE* Suppl. iv. 1209-14; La Coste-Messelière, *BCH* lxxvii (1953) 182-9; Pouilloux and Roux, *op. cit.* 55-60; Bousquet, *BCH* xc (1966) 428-40.

Front Row

(a) - υυ - υυ]ον θεῶν ἱερὸν δάπεδον

Roux 58-9, thinks this stone, republished by Bousquet, *BCH* lxxxiii. 175 f., bore the statue of Castor.

(b) [Παῖ Διός, ὦ] Πολυδεῦ[κ]ες, Ἴων [καὶ τοῖσ]δ' ἐλεγείου[ς]

[λαϊνέαν] κρηπίδ' ἐστεφάνωσ[ε τεά]ν

[ἀρχὸς ἐπ]εῖ πρῶτος, πρότερο[ς δ' ἔ]τι τοῦδε ναυάρ[χου],

[ἔστας ἀγ]εμόνων Ἑλλάδος εὐρ[υχ]όρου.

This stone (cf. Hiller, *H. Gr. Ep.* 59) has always been assigned to Arakos, the nominal Spartan *nauarch* to whom Lysander served as *ἐπιστολεύς* (*Xen. Hell.* ii. 1. 7), but his statue stood in the back row (see below). Roux shows that the stone is too deep for the back row and, with new readings, suggests Polydeukes, comparing *Plut. Lys.* 12. 1 for the part played by the Dioskouroi in the victory. Bousquet proves this conclusion by reading [Πολυ]-δεύκας on the top of the stone, and improves the readings and restorations; we print his text.

(c) Geffcken 97; Hiller, *H. Gr. Ep.* 58; Méautis, *Acropole* i (1926) 196 ff.; J. U. Powell, *Aegyptus*, xiv (1934) 468-72; Friedländer, *Stud. It. Fil.* n.s. xv (1938) 108-10; Pouilloux, *Choix*, 46.

The lettering is probably of the second half of the fourth century, but see Bousquet, *BCH* lxxx (1956) 580 f., who thinks it could be as early as 400.

εἰκόνα ἔαν ἀνέθηκεν [ἐπ?] ἔργω τῷδε ὅτε νικῶν
 νασῑ θοαῖς πέρσεν Κε[κ]ροπιδᾶν δύναμιν
 Λύσανδρος, Λακεδαίμονα ἀπόρθητον στεφανῶσα[s]
 Ἑλλάδος ἀκρόπολ[ιν, κ]αλλίχορομ πατρίδα.
 5 ἐχσάμου ἀμφιρύτ[ου] τευξε̄ ἐλεγείων : Ἰων.

For ἐχσάμου, cf. Nos. 77, ll. 18–19; 84, ll. 20, 34.

Back Row

(d) [...]θιος
 [Λυσι]μαχίδαο
 [Βοιω]τῶν γ[αύαρχος.]

What form the name took is uncertain; the current restoration [Ἀριάν]θιος is one letter too long. Pausanias (see below) gives the name as Ἐριάνθης; Plut. *Lys.* 15. 3, has Ἐριάνθος; the scholiast on Dem. xix. 65 Ἐῴανθος; the identification with the Theban Boeotarch of 424 (Thuc. iv. 91, Ἀριανθίδου τοῦ Λυσιμαχίδου) seems highly probable. See also Ziegler, *Rh. Mus.* lxxvi (1927) 33.

(e), (f) (adjoining blocks)

Κ[ιμμ]έριος	Αἰαντίδης	Θεόπομπος
Πελάσγο	Παρθενίου	Λαπόμπου
Ἐφέσιος.	Μιλήσιος.	Μάλιος.
		Ἄλυπος ἐποίει.

(on the top of block (f),

Αἰαντίδης
 Παρθενίου
 Μιλήσιος.
 Τείσανδρος ἐποί[ησ]ε.)

The manuscripts of Pausanias give *Μίδιον* or *Μύνδειον* for Θεοπομπος' ethnic.

(g), (h) (adjoining blocks)

Α[ύτ]όνομος	Ἀπολλόδωρος
Σαμίου	Καλλιφώνος
Ἐρετριεύς	Τροζάνιος.

(i) [Κώμ]ων
 [...]ωνδα
 [Μεγα]ρεύς.

(j), (k) (adjoining blocks) (On the top of j Bousquet (*BCH* xc. 438) reads *Χα]λκιδευ[ς]*).

- - - -	- - - -
. . . . ρε - -	- - - -
<i>Κορίνθιος</i>	<i>Z[- - -]</i>

No Chalkidian appears in Pausanias' text; he names two Corinthians, Aristophantos and Pythodotos; La Coste-Messelière and Bousquet have argued that this is Pythodotos. The letter on block (k) has also been read as *Σ* and *T*. Pomtow suggests [*Κλεομήδης* | - - -] | *Σ[άμιος]* from Pausanias' list. This ignores the clue provided by a later inscription on the block (*FD* iii. 1. 68, corrected by Bousquet, *BCH* xc. 429 f.): *κώμα Λακεδαιμονίων Τυρίται βοῦς ἀνέθηκαν τῶι θεῶι Πυθίαν λάϊαν πεντήκοντα*. La Coste-Messelière argues that these later inscriptions (see below) are always related to the original inscription, that the block must have carried a Spartan admiral with a village-name inside Sparta, e.g. [*Ἐπικυδίδας* | *Λακεδαιμόνιος ἐκ*] | *Z[άρακος]*. Roux, accepting this argument and carrying it further, prefers to read the letter as *T* and restore *T[υρίτης]*; Daux and Bousquet (*BCH* xc. 285, 428) still maintain that the letter is *Z*.

(l) A block with the word *κᾶρυξ* on its top raises difficulties (particularly since Pausanias mentions no herald). The size of the block seems to assign it to the back row, but La Coste-Messelière has shown that the height of the statue must have corresponded to those of the front row.

(m) A block (*FD* iii. 4. 200) with a very mutilated epigram may also belong.

FD iii. 1. 69 does not belong to this monument (Pouilloux-Roux, *op. cit.* 47-50).

The Spartan triumph at Aigospotamoi in 405 was commemorated by the dedication of a large group of statues at Delphi, described by Pausanias (x. 9. 7-10; cf. *Plut. Lys.* 18). In the foreground stood the Dioskouroi, Zeus, Apollo, Artemis, and Poseidon crowning Lysander, beside whom were his seer and his pilot; behind them were twenty-eight portraits of *ναύαρχοι* who had engaged in the battle, with Arakos, the Spartan admiral at one end of the line and two Spartan squadron-commanders, Epikydidas and Eteonikos, at the other. The patina of the statues was later much admired (*Plut. de Pyth. Orac.* 2). The group was near the entrance of the Sacred Way, and Pausanias seems clearly to put it on the left of the path. However, two generations of scholars have, since the area was excavated, with very few exceptions, agreed on putting it on the right in a terraced enclosure and covered it with a variety of constructions (to the bibliography above add Daux, *Pausanias à Delphes*, 81-6). Roux (*op. cit.* 16-36, 53-5) has shown that this enclosure was Hellenistic, that Pausanias was right in putting the group on the left of the path, and that the statues were not covered.

The inscriptions illustrate the creation and after-life of a Delphic monument. Earliest in time come inscriptions which were not meant to be seen, but only to serve as a guide to those who set up the statues; (*f*), (*g*), (*h*), (*j*), and (*l*) have *Μιλήσιος*, *Ἐρετρι[εύς]*, *Τροζάνιος*, [*Χα*]λ-*κιδεύ[ς]*, and *κᾶρυξ* by the appropriate feet-marks. The inscriptions proper appeared on the side of the stones, facing the spectator: (*d*), (*e*), (*f*), (*g*), (*h*), (*i*), (*j*), (*k*); for some reason one of the inscriptions on block (*f*) was duplicated at the same time as the main inscription, with the addition of the sculptor's signature. The important question is the date of the epigrams; (*a*) and (*b*) were probably cut later and (*c*) was certainly, we would think, cut a good deal later than the monument was set up. Most scholars have been content to assume that they did form part of the original monument, but that (*c*) at any rate had for some reason to be recut sixty or seventy years later (Pomtow, *Ath. Mitt.* xxxi (1906) 556, who thinks (*e*) is in the same hand). Roux argues, on the other hand, that the epigrams are epideictic additions to the monument, and that they were not cut till the fourth century because they were not composed till the fourth century; we confess to some sympathy with this view. With the third century a new phase opens, and those connected in some way with the persons commemorated here begin to use vacant places on the stone for recording documents of their own. This is possibly the case with the text on (*k*) discussed above; it is certainly the case with a proxeny-decree, *Ἀλκιδάμαντι . . . ἰου τοῦ Πελάσγου Ἐφεσίωι*, inscribed on block (*e*) (*FD* iii. 1. 54), and another for *Θεοπόμπωι Εὐφόρβου Μαλ[ίωι]* inscribed on block (*f*) (*FD* iii. 1. 60). Cf. also *FD* iii. 1. 59.

ATHENIAN ARCHONS 500-403 B.C.

For earlier archons, see Cadoux, *JHS* lxviii (1948) and no. 6. For full references to support this list, see Cadoux, *ibid.*, for archons of 500-480, and Hill, *Sources*², 397-401 for archons of 480-403. Only the year in which the archon entered office is given: thus the archonship of Σμῦρος extended from the summer of 500 to that of 499, and so on.

500 Σμῦρος	467 Λυσίστρατος	433 Ἀψεύδης
499 ?	466 Λυσανίας	432 Πυθόδωρος
498 ?	465 Λυσίθεος	431 Εὐθύδημος
497 Ἀρχίας (CR xii (1962) 201)	464 Ἀρχεδημίδης	430 Ἀπολλόδωρος
496 Ἴππαρχος	463 Τληπόλεμος	429 Ἐπαμείνων
495 Φίλιππος	462 Κόνων	428 Διότιμος
494 Πυθόκριτος	461 Εὐθίππος	427 Εὐκλῆς
493 Θεμιστοκλῆς	460 Φρασκευκλῆς	426 Εὐθύνος
492 Διόγνητος	459 Φιλοκλῆς	425 Στρατοκλῆς
491 Ὑβριλίδης	458 Ἄβρων	424 Ἴσαρχος
490 Φαίμπιππος	457 Μνησιθείδης	423 Ἀμεινίας
489 Ἀριστείδης	456 Καλλίας	422 Ἀλκαῖος
488 Ἀγχίσις	455 Σωσίστρατος	421 Ἀριστίων
487 Τελεσίνοσ	454 Ἀρίστων	420 Ἀστίφιλος
486 ?	453 Λυσικράτης	419 Ἀρχίας
485 Φιλοκράτης	452 Χαιρεφάνης	418 Ἀντιφῶν
484 Λεώστρατος	451 Ἀντίδοτος	417 Εὐφῆμος
483 Νικόδημος	450 Εὐθύνος	416 Ἀρίμνηστος
482 ?	449 Πεδιεύς	415 Χαρίας
481 Ὑψιχιδῆς	448 Φίλισκος	414 Τείσανδρος
480 Καλλιάδης	447 Τιμαρχίδης	413 Κλεόκριτος
479 Σάνθιππος	446 Καλλίμαχος	412 Καλλίας Σκαμβωνίδης
478 Τιμοσθένης	445 Λυσιμαχίδης	411 { Μνασίλοχος (2 months) Θεόπομπος (10 months)
477 Ἀδείμαντος	444 Πραξιτέλης	
476 Φαίδων	443 Λυσανίας	
475 Δρομοκλείδης	442 Δίφιλος	
474 Ἀκεστοριδῆς	441 Τιμοκλῆς	410 Γλαύκιππος
473 Μένων	440 Μορυχίδης	409 Διοκλῆς
472 Χάρης	439 Γλαυκίνος	408 Εὐκτῆμων
471 Πραξιεργος	438 Θεόδωρος	407 Ἀντιγένης
470 Δημοσίων	437 Εὐθυμένης	406 Καλλίας Ἀγγελῆθεν
469 Ἀψεφίων	436 Λυσιμαχος	405 Ἀλεξίας
468 Θεαγευίδης	435 Ἀντιοχίδης	404 ἀναρχία (Πυθόδωρος)
	434 Κράτης	403 Εὐκλείδης

INDEX I

PROPER NAMES

Numbers refer to pages.

- Ἀβδηρίται*, 89.
Ἄβρων Πατροκλέους, 46, ? 80.
Ἄβρωνιχος, 41, 45.
Ἄβυδηνοί, 136.
Ἄγασικλῆς, 74.
Ἄγκύλη, 241, 243.
Ἄγνόδημος, 74; 204.
Ἄγων, 74.
Ἄγόρατος, 261.
Ἄδείμαντος, 242, 244, 245-7.
Ἄδραστία, 209.
Ἄθηνᾶ, 48 f., 147; —*Ἀθηνῶν μεδέουσα*, 48, 50, ? 122.
Ἀθηναία, 33, 82, 149, 155 f., 165, 190, 251, 255, 278; *Ζωστηρία*, 210; *Νίκη*, 108-11, 204, 208, 211, 251, 255; *ἐπὶ Παλλαδίῳ Δηριονείῳ*, 209; *ἐπὶ Παλληνίδι*, 209 f.; *Πολίας*, 149, 211, 251, 255; *πολίπορθος*, 282.
Ἀθηναῖοι, 28, 35, 49, 53, 58, 79, 80, 90, 108, 112-17, 118, 123, 138, 167, 176, 218 f., 267.
Ἀθηνῆται, 200.
Ἄθμονόθεν, 243; -*νοί*, 241.
Αἰάκης (*Ἀεάκης*), 30 f.
Αἰαντίδης, 288.
Αἴας, 52.
Αἴγινα, 73; -*ναῖοι* (*στατήρες*), 182; -*νάται*, 58; -*νήται*, 48.
Αἰγὸς ποταμοί, 287 f.
Αἴγυπτος, 73 f.; -*τιοι*, 12.
Ἄϊδας, 137.
Αἰετοί, 101.
Αἰθαλεύς, 95.
Αἰσχίνης, 130; 225.
Αἴσχυλος, 78; 127.
Αἴσων, 126.
Ἄκεσίας, 74.
Ἄκρυπτος, 73; 253.
Ἄλεξιάς, 73.
Ἄλεξιμαχος, 75; 253.
Ἄλιεῖς, 73.
Ἄλικαρνασσός, -*σεῖς*, 69-72; -*σιοι*, 136.
Ἄλκᾶς, 74.
Ἄλκιβιάδης (the elder), 43, 45; (the younger), 45, 232, 241, 268, 270, ? 277, 279.
Ἄλκιμος, 105.
Ἄλκιππος, 73.
Ἄλκισθένης, 78.
Ἄλκμεωνίδης, 46; 73; -*νῖδαι*, 46.
Ἄλυπος, 288.
Ἄμαρσῖας, 243.
Ἄμασις, 12.
Ἄμεμπτος, 233.
Ἄμοίβιχος, 12.
Ἄμπρακιώται, 58.
Ἄμύδριππος, 73.
Ἄμφικλήδης, 74.
Ἄμφικλείδης, 74.
Ἄμφικτύονες, 170.
Ἀναίτιος, 256.
Ἄνακτορεῖς, 58.
Ἀναξάνωρ, 13.
Ἀναξίδημος, 169.
Ἀναξίδωρος, 74.
Ἀναξικράτης, 228, 231.
Ἀναξίλας, 73; 74; 78.
Ἀναφαῖοι, 200.
Ἀναφλύστιος, 167.
Ἄνδοκίδης, 45, 137; 245 f.
Ἄνδριοι, 200.
Ἄνδροσθένης, 75.
Ἄνθεστήρια, 64.
Ἄννίβας, 280.
Ἄντικλῆς, 139, 162.
Ἄντικράτης, 127.
Ἄντιμαχος, 232, 240.
Ἄντιμένης, 74.
Ἄντιοχίς, 137.
Ἄντισθένης, 250.
Ἄντιφάνης, 127.
Ἄντιφάτης, 147.
Ἄντιφῶν, 73.
Ἄντιχάρης, 74.
Ἀξίοχος, 244, 246 f., 272-5.
Ἄπατουριών, 253.
Ἄπολλόδωρος, 73 (*bis*); 262 f.; 268; 288.

- Απόλλων, 19, 21, 61, 82, 123; Ζωστήρ, 209; Πύθιος, 19, 23.
 Απολλωνίδης, 69 f.
 Απολλώνιον, 70, 82.
 Αραιβος, 74.
 Άργος, -γείοι, 77 f., 79, 100-5, 230.
 Άρης, 76, 102.
 Άρίσταρχος, 126 (bis).
 Άριστείδης, ? 9, 40, 42 f., 226; 74.
 Άρίστις, 18.
 Άριστίων, 78.
 Άριστογένης, 74.
 Άριστόδικος, 126.
 Άριστοκλείδης, 74.
 Άριστοκράτης, 231.
 Άριστόμαχος, 242.
 Άριστοτέλης, 73.
 Άριστοφάνης, 74.
 Άρίστυλλος, 165.
 Άρκεσίλας, 74.
 Άρτακηνοί, 89, 225.
 Άρτεμις Άγροτέρα, 208 f.; Άθμονόθεν, 243; Βραυρωνία, 209 f.; Μουνιχία, 209 f.
 Άρτεμίσιον, 49.
 Άρτεμισιών, 15.
 Άρχέλας, 73; 277-9.
 Άρχέπολις, 73; 127.
 Άρχέστρατος, 140.
 Άρχηνος, 45.
 Άρχίνος, 74.
 Άρχός, 101.
 Άσία, 21, 282.
 ? Άσπενδος, 201.
 Άσσηρίται, 89.
 Άστυνάξ, 127.
 Άσωπόδαρος, 250.
 Άττική, 49; -κός, 243.
 Αυτόκλείδης, 144.
 Αυτόκλης, 231.
 Αυτόνομος, 288.
 Άφιδναίος, 33, 150.
 Άφροδίτη, 1, 102; ἐν Ίππολυτείῳ, 209, 210; ἐν Κήποις, 210.
 Άφύασις, 70.
 Άχάρνα, 102.
 Άψήφης, 74.
 Βαθυκλής, 5.
 Βάκων, 73.
 Βάτη, 243.
 Βάττος, 5 f.
 Βέλβινα, 200.
 Βένδις, 209.
 Βερύσιοι, 89.
 Βίων, 61.
 Βοιωτοί, 28 f., 137, 288.
 Βολακλής, 169.
 Βουταλίων, 43 f., 45.
 Βουφονίων, 169.
 Βράχας, 78.
 Βρέα, 129-33.
 Βρεντέας, 4.
 Βρυγχειής, 136, see Γρυγχιής.
 Βρουκόντιοι, 201.
 Βρύχων, 30.
 Βυζάντιον, 101, 126, 128, 150, 177.
 Γαδάτας, 20.
 Γαλαξιών, 253.
 Γαμηλιών, 119.
 Γέλων, 61; 175.
 Γεντίνοι, 136.
 Γέσκων, 280.
 Γλαυκίας, 74.
 Γλαυκος, 4.
 Γλαυκων, 73 (bis); 74; 152, 167.
 Γνάθων, 46.
 Γοργίαι, 73.
 Γόργονος, 208 f.
 Γόργων, 74.
 Γόρτυν, 94-9.
 Γρυγχιής, 200.
 Γρυνειής, 136.
 Δάμις, 5.
 Δαμοφάνης, 78.
 Δάμων, 41, 45, 46.
 Δαμωνίδης, 41.
 Δαρδανής, 136.
 Δαρείος, 20.
 Δάτις, 35, 42.
 Δαφνούς, 270 f.
 Δεινίας, 74.
 Δεινομένης, 61 f.
 Δέλφοι, 218.
 Δεξιόδης, 253.
 Δεξιθέος, 231.
 Δεξικράτης, 257.
 Δέρκετος, 78.
 Δήλιοι, 169.
 Δημήτηρ, 90, 123.
 Δημήτριος, 74 (bis); 207 f.
 Δημοθαλής, 169.
 Δημοκλείδης, 129 f., ?153.
 Δημόνικος, 74.
 Δημοσθένης, 206, 216, 230, 235.
 Δημοστρατος, 147, 150.
 Δημοτέλης, 126.

- Δημοφάνης, 145.
 Δημοφών, 209.
 Δία, 64.
 Διακρής ἀπὸ Χαλκιδέων, 200.
 Διάκριοι ἐν Εὐβοίᾳ, 200.
 Διδυμοτειχίται, 136.
 Διειτρέφης, (Εὐθόινου) 46; 275.
 Διῆς, 200.
 Δίκαιος, 73.
 Δίκτυς, 165.
 Διογένης, 74; 165.
 Διόγγητος, 138, 264.
 Διόδωρος, 61; 73.
 Διοκλῆς, 74; 261.
 Διονύσια, 118, 129, 135, 177, 185, 261.
 Διονύσιος, 46; 256 f.
 Διόνυσος, 210.
 Διοπειθῆς, 177.
 Διοσερίται, 122.
 Διότιμος, 74; 167.
 Δίυλλος, 256.
 Δίφιλος, 127.
 Δράκαλος, 73.
 Δρακοντίδης, 73; 138, 143, 167.
 Δράκων, 264 f.
 Δρῆρος, 2.
 Δύναμις, 13.
 Ἐβδομαῖα, 14.
 Ἐγεστα, -ταῖοι, 80-2.
 Ἐδριῆς, 201.
 Ἐκατομβαιῶν, 219, 250.
 Ἐκατόμπεδος, 227.
 Ἐλαιούσιοι, 136; (*Ερυθραίων), 201.
 Ἐλευθεράθεν, 127.
 Ἐλευσις, 218-23.
 Ἐλεφαντίνη, 12.
 Ἐλλάς, 53, 55, 60, 287, 288.
 Ἐλληνες, 60, 76, 218 f.
 Ἐλλήσποντος, 112, 118, 127, 189; -τιος, 199, 225.
 Ἐπαίνετος, 74.
 Ἐπιγένης, 74; 270.
 Ἐπιδαύριοι, 58.
 Ἐπικλῆς, 165.
 Ἐπίλυκος, 207.
 Ἐπιτέλης, 73; 126.
 Ἐπιχάρης, 74 (bis); 126.
 Ἐπιχάρινος, 150.
 Ἐρασινίδης, 261.
 Ἐράτυλλος, 46.
 Ἐργαῖος, 74.
 Ἐργοκλῆς, 225 f., 230 f.
 Ἐργοτέλης, 74.
 Ἐρέτρια, 142, 256; -εῖς, 58, 136, 139, 200.
 Ἐρετριεύς, ? 46, 288.
 Ἐρεχθίδης, 73, 152.
 Ἐρμαιῶν, 69.
 Ἐρμιονεῖς, 58.
 Ἐρμων, 256, 259.
 ? Ἐρξικλείδης, 9.
 Ἐρξιμένης, 74.
 Ἐρυθραῖοι, 90-4.
 Ἐρχιεύς, 167.
 Ἐρχομένιοι, 58.
 Ἐσπέριοι Λοκροί, 36.
 Ἐστιαῖος, 108.
 Εὐαίνετος, 145.
 Εὐάνδρος, 250.
 Εὐβίος, 74.
 Εὐβοία, 140, 200; -βοϊκός, 49.
 Εὐβουλίδης, 150.
 Εὐβουλος, 219.
 Εὐγείτων, 73.
 Εὐδαμος, 12.
 Εὐδημος, 127.
 Εὐδικος, 262.
 Εὐδοξος, 74; 127.
 Εὐθίας, 167.
 Εὐθόινος, 46; 74.
 Εὐθύδημος, 74; 230.
 Εὐθύδικος, 264.
 Εὐθυκλῆς, 5.
 Εὐθυκράτης, 73.
 Εὐθύμαχος, 75.
 Εὐκλείδης, 73; 275.
 Εὐκράτης, 46; 127.
 Εὐμαχος, 285.
 Εὐμένιος, 74.
 Εὐμηλος, 75.
 Εὐμολπίδαι, 219.
 Εὐξείνος, 228, 231; (Πόντος), 193 f.
 Εὐπέιθης, 155, ? 156.
 Εὐπολις, 46; 256.
 Εὐπέρης, 169.
 Εὐρύβοτος, 126.
 Εὐρύλεως, 74.
 Εὐρυμέδων, 213.
 Εὐρώπη, 282.
 Εὐφῆμιος, 80.
 Εὐφίλητος, 243, 246.
 Εὐφράτης, 21.
 Εὐχαρίδης, 42, 45, 46.
 Ἐφεσσος, 233, 236; -σιος, 182, 288.
 Φαλείοι, see Ἡλείοι.
 Φανακτοριῆς, 58.

- Φεσπάριοι Λοκροί, 36.
 Ζεύς, 19, 62, 82, 90, 123, 282, 289;
 Κρονίδης, 47; Κρονίων, 18; Ὀλύμ-
 πος, 32, 47, 139 f., 154, 223; Παγ-
 κράτης, 49; Πολιεύς, 228.
 Ζωίλωτος, 76 f.
 *Ηγέλοχος, 251.
 *Ηγησαγόρας, 76 f.
 *Ηίων, 132.
 *Ηλείοι, 31.
 *Ηρα, 30.
 *Ηραίοι, 31.
 *Ηραϊον, 101.
 *Ηράκλεια, 64.
 *Ηρακλείδης, 74; 202 f.
 *Ηρακλῆς, 82; ἐν Κυνοσάργει, 209 f.
 *Ηροκλείδης, 126.
 *Ησσιοι, 189.
 *Ηφαιστιεῖς, 136, 200.
 *Ηφαιστικόν, 166.
 *Ηφαιστόδωρος, 241, 245.
 *Ηφαιστος, 112, 210.
 Θαλίαρχος, 73.
 Θαργηλιών, 204.
 Θάσος, -σιοι, 136, 141, 242, 252-5,
 271-5.
 Θεμιστοκλῆς, 41, 43, 46, 48-52.
 Θεόδωρος, 74; 75.
 Θεοκλῆς, 12.
 Θεόμνηστος, 126.
 Θεόπομπος, 288.
 Θεότιμος, 47; 175.
 Θέρμαιος (κόλπος), 179, 233, 236.
 Θεσπείες, 58.
 Θήρα, 5-8; -ραῖοι, 185, 200.
 Θησεύς, 210.
 Θοραιεύς, 165, 167.
 Θορίκιος, 165.
 Θούδιππος, 189, 191, 197.
 Θουκυδίδης, 74; 202, 207; Μελησίου, 45,
 46.
 Θούριος, 154.
 Θράκη, 112, 118, 129, 189, 212, 230 f.,
 273; Θράκιος (φόρος), 199; Θράξ,
 241 f.; Θράττα, 241 f.
 Θρασύβουλος, 61; 261.
 Θρασυκλῆς, 46.
 Θράσων, 256 f.
 Θρία, 241.
 Θυμάρης, 78.
 Θυμοχάρης, 147.
 Ἰαλύσιος, 12 f.
 Ἰᾶται, 136; Ἰῆται, 200.
 Ἰερά παρὰ Σίδυμέας, 201.
 Ἰεροκλείδης, 178.
 Ἰεροκλῆς, 140, 143; 275.
 Ἰέρων, 61, 62.
 Ἰερώνυμος, 74.
 Ἰλισος, 210.
 Ἰλλύριος, 242.
 Ἰμβριοι, 200.
 Ἰμίλκων, 280.
 Ἰππαρχος Χάρμου, 40, 43, 46.
 Ἰππίας, 9, 19.
 Ἰπποδάμας, 75.
 Ἰπποκλῆς, 41, 46.
 Ἰπποκράτης Ἀλκμεωνίδου, 41, 43, 44,
 46; Ἀναξιλέω, 41, 43, 44, 46;
 Ἀρίφρονος, 206, 216.
 Ἰππομένης, 248.
 Ἰοτή, 14.
 Ἰτύρα, 201.
 Ἰυτός, 101.
 Ἴων, 287 f.
 Ἴωνία, 112, 118, 189, ? 277, 279;
 *Ιανες, 79.
 ? Κάλλαισχος, 148.
 Καλλέας, 73.
 ? Καλλιᾶδης, 10.
 Καλλίας Διδυμίου, 41, 46; ? Καλλιᾶδου,
 153, 155 f., 160, 172 f., 176; ? Ἰππο-
 νίκου, 204; 74; 257.
 Καλλίβιος, 74.
 Καλλικλῆς, 73; 74; 127.
 Καλλικράτης, 74; 108.
 Καλλίμαχος, 33; 255.
 Καλλιξενος, 40-6; 74.
 Κάλλιππος, 126.
 Καλλισθένης, 126.
 Καλλίστρατος, 231, 235; 255, 257.
 Καλλιφών, 288.
 Καλωνίδης, 74.
 Καμειρεῖς, 136.
 Κάρ, 241 f.; Καρία, 189.
 Καρίκας, 282.
 Καρυανδῆς, 201.
 Καρύστιοι, 200; 249.
 Καρυστόνικος, 126, 128.
 Καρχηδόνοι, 280 f.
 Κάσβαλλος, 70.
 Κεῖοι, 58, 200.
 Κεκροπίδαι, 288.
 Κεκροπίς, 137.
 Κελένδερις, 201.

- Κέλευσος, 73.
 Κεραμείς, 136.
 Κέρδων, 74.
 Κερία, 200.
 Κέρκις, 12.
 Κηφισόδοτος, 74 (*bis*).
 Κηφισόδωρος, 74; 241, 245.
 Κηφισοφῶν, 284.
 Κιανοί, 89.
 Κιμμέριος, 288.
 Κίμων, 200.
 Κίμων, 46.
 Κιχῆσιππος, 147.
 Κλαζομένιος, 202, 270 f.
 Κλέανδρος, 172.
 Κλέαρχος, 113.
 Κλείβουλος, 46.
 Κλειγένης, 255.
 Κλεινίας, 117.
 Κλείνοθος, 127.
 Κλειππίδης, 41, 46.
 ?Κλεισθένης, 9, 11.
 Κλείσοφος, 284 f.
 Κλεόμβροτος, 74.
 Κλεομήδης, 231.
 Κλεοφῶν, 46.
 Κλευδάμας, 5.
 Κλέων, 78; 194 ff.
 Κλεωναῖος, 18.
 Κλεώνυμος, 177, 185.
 Κνίφων, 126.
 Κνόσσοσ, -οιοι, 99-105.
 Κολοφῶν -νιος, 13, 121-5.
 Κόλχος, 242.
 Κομῶν, 261.
 Κόρινθος, 52; -θιοι, 48, 58, 79.
 Κορκύρα, 167.
 Κόροιβος, 74.
 Κράτης, 165, 167; 270.
 Κρατιάδας, 78.
 Κράτυλλος, 74.
 Κράτων, 127.
 Κρεσφόντης, 105.
 Κρήτη, 94-9.
 Κρίθις, 13.
 Κριτιάδης, 167, 172.
 Κριτίας, 46.
 Κρυῆς, 201.
 Κτησιάδης, 74.
 Κτήσιλλος, 253.
 Κτησιών, 147.
 Κύβων, 74.
 Κυδαθῆναιον, 243.
 Κυδροκλής, 46.
 Κυζικηνοί, 136, 225; (staters), 162 f.,
 230, 232.
 Κύθνιοι, 58, 79, 200.
 Κυκάλη, 244.
 Κυκνέας, 218.
 Κύλλος, 95.
 Κύμη, 62; -μαῖοι, 136.
 Κύπρος, 73, 193.
 Κυρήνη, -ναιοι, 5-8.
 Κυρωμῆς (? = Ὑρωμῆς), 201.
 Κύψελος, 9, 11.
 Κώμων, 288.
 Λαισποδίας, 46.
 Λακεδαιμόνιος, 167.
 Λακεδαίμων, 288; -μόνιοι, 47 f., 58, 77,
 79, 182.
 Λακιάδης, 167.
 Λάμαχος, 232.
 Λαμπρεύς, 162, 165.
 Λάμπων, 219.
 Λαμπώνεια, 89, 116.
 Λᾶος, 101.
 Λάπομος, 288.
 Λάχης, 126.
 Λεβέδιοι, 118.
 Λεόντιοι, 175 f.
 Λεπρεᾶται, 58.
 Λεπτινῆς, 4.
 Λευκάδιοι, 58.
 Λευκόπορος, 101.
 Λεωγόρας, 178.
 Λέων, 66, ? 84, ? 93.
 Λεωχάρης, 232.
 Λήμνος, 152 f.
 Λιβύη, 6.
 Λιμναῖοι, 136.
 Λίνδιοι, 89.
 Λισκαρία, 22.
 Λόβων, 261.
 Λοκροί, 36-40.
 Λύγδαμος, 69-72.
 Λύδη, 242.
 Λυκείδας, 182.
 Λυκίνος, 74; 78.
 Λύκιοι, 282 f.
 Λυκοδόρκας, 78.
 Λυκόφρων, 73.
 Λυκωτάδας, 102.
 Λύσανδρος, 288.
 Λυσανίας, 127.
 Λυσίας, 74 (*bis*).
 Λυσικλείδης, 74; 288.
 Λυσικλῆς, 73; 126; 231.

- Λυσιμαχίδης*, 288.
Λυσίμαχος, 126.
Λύσις, 74.
Λυσίστρατος, 127.
- Μαιμακτηριών*, 189.
Μακεδονία, 277-80.
Μαλόφορος, 82 f.
Μαραθών, 33, 35, 55 f.
Μαρωνίται, 89.
Μαχανεύς, 101.
Μεγαβάτης, 70.
Μεγακλείδης, 177, 206.
Μεγακλής, 40, 43, 46.
Μέγαρα, 73, 137; -εύς -εῖς, 58, 288.
Μέδουσα, 79.
Μεθωναῖοι, 177-80.
Μελάνθιος, 41, 46.
Μελάντας, 102.
Μελάνωπος, 74.
Μελιτεύς, 165.
Μελιττηνός, 242, 247.
 ? *Μέμφις*, 76.
Μένανδρος, 147.
Μενδαῖος, 223.
Μενεκλῆς, 74.
Μενεκράτης, 4.
Μενέστρατος, 133.
Μενέτιμος, 136.
Μένων, 41, 42, 44, 46.
Μεσσήνιοι, 223.
Μεταγειτνιών, 169.
Μεταγένης, 162, 165.
Μῆδοι, 35, 53, 60, 76.
Μηκυβερναῖοι, 89, 136.
Μῆλος, 231, 233, 235; -λιοι, 58, 182 f., 200, 288.
Μήτηρ ἐν Ἄγρας, 210.
Μηχανίων, 73.
Μίλητος, 105-7; -σιος, 61, 288
Μιλτιάδης, 10.
Μνησιγένης, 73; 74.
Μνησίθεος, 155 f., 225.
Μνησιπτόλεμος, 145.
Μνησίφιλος, 74; 126.
Μούσαι, 209 f.
Μυδονῆς, 89.
Μυκανεῖς, 58.
Μυκόνιοι, 200.
Μύνδιοι παρὰ Τέρμερα, 201.
Μυριναῖοι, 136, 200.
Μυρρινοῦς, 244.
Μυσαχεῖς, 36 f., 39.
- Ναξιάδης*, 127 f.
Νάξιοι, 58, 200.
Ναρισβαρῆς, 89, 136.
Ναύπακτος, 36-40; -τιοι, 223.
Ναυσικλῆς, 73.
Ναυσιμένης, 145.
Νεαῖος, 74.
Νεάνδρεια, 89.
Νεάπολις ἐν Θράκη, 89; *Νεοπολίται*, 271-5.
Νεμέα, 18.
Νέμεσις, 144.
Νεοκλείδης, 202, 204.
Νέστωρ, 1.
Νῆσοι, 112, 118, 189; *Νησιωτικός*, 200, 225.
Νίκαρχος, 73.
Νίκη, 49, 61, 204, 208, 211, 228, 251, 255 (see also *Ἄθηναία Νίκη*); *Νίκαι χρυσαῖ*, 156.
Νικήρατος, 257.
Νικίας, 74; 206, 213, 231 f.
Νικίδης, 243, 245.
Νικόδημος, 126.
Νικόμαχος, 127.
Νικόστρατος, 126.
Νικόφιλος, 126.
Νικοφών, 284.
Νίκων, 74.
Νόθαρχος, 73.
Νουμήμιος, 74.
Νυμφάρτος, 105.
- Ξάνθης*, 169.
Ξάνθηππος, 40, 42, 47.
Ξερόφιλος, 74.
 ? *Ξενοφών*, 152.
Ξένυλλος, 74.
- * *ὉαΤαΤις*, 69.
Οἰανθεῖς, 4.
Οἰναῖοι ἐν Ἰκάρῳ, 89.
Οἰνής, 117.
Οἰνιάδης, 275-7.
Οἰνόβιος, 272.
 * *Ὀλυμπιάρτος*, 74.
 * *Ὀλύμπιος*, 33.
 * *Ὀλύθιοι*, 89.
 * *Ὀνασος*, 185.
 ? * *Ὀνηγοριδης*, 9, 11.
 * *Ὀνόμαστος*, 46.
 * *Ὀπισθόδομος*, 155 f., 206, ? 208, 212.
 * *Ὀποῦς*, -οῦντιοι, 36-40.

- Πάβις*, 13.
Παιώνιος, 223.
Παλαισκιάβιος, 275-6.
Πάλλας, 28.
Παμφυλία, 201.
Παναθηναία, 156 f., 177, 205, 208, 227, 233; τὰ μεγάλα, 90, 120, 190, 192, 227, 229, 255.
Παναίτιος, 46; 243, 246.
Παναμύης, 70.
Πανδιονίς, 137.
Πανταλέων, 73.
Πανύασσις, 70.
Παρθένιος, 288.
Πάρθενος, 272 f., 275.
Πάριοι, 200.
Παρμονίδης, 73.
Πασικράτεια, 82 f.
Πασιφῶν, 257.
Πατροκλείδης, 73.
Πανσανίας, 60.
Πεδασῆς, 136, 201.
Πειραιεύς, 241.
Πεισίστρατος, ? 10, 19.
Πεισίστρατος Κάρ, 241.
Πελαργικόν, 219.
Πέλασγος, 288.
Πέλεκος, 12.
Πελοποννήσιοι, ? 152, 272.
Πεντέλησι, 163.
Περδίκκας, 177-80.
Περικλῆς Σανθίππου, 46, 152; *Περικλέους*, 256, 259, 277.
Περκοθαρία, 36-9.
Πέρσαι, 21, 55 f.
Πηγαί, 137.
Περία, 177.
Πίθων, 74.
Πίστος, 241.
Πιταναίοι, 136.
Πιτθεύς, 49.
Πλαδασῆς, 136.
Πλαταιῆς, 58.
Πλευστίας, 178, 191 f., 206.
Πολέμαρχος, 185, 192.
Πολίτης, 126.
Πολιχνίται, 89.
Πόλλιχος, 78.
Πολυάρατος, 256.
Πολυδεύκης, 287.
Πολύζηλος, 61; 74.
Πολυκλῆς, 73.
Πόλυμνις, 284.
Πολύξενος, 74.
Πολύστρατος, 73; 241, 243, 245 f.
Πολύτιμος, 46.
Ποσειδανία, 19.
Ποσειδίππος, 127.
Ποσειδων, 82, 101; *Καλαυρεάτης*, 209; ἐπὶ *Σουνίῳ*, 209 f.
Ποσιδεῖον ἐν Εὐβοίᾳ, 200.
Ποσιδεῶν, 169, 189 f.
Ποτασιμτο, 12.
Ποτειδαία, 177, 179, 181; -*δαιᾶται*, 58.
Προκλῆς, 73.
Προνάπης, 167.
Πρόξενος, 256 f.
Προπύλαια, 156, 165 1.
Πρώταρχος, 127.
Πρωτεάς, 167.
Πρωτίας, 73.
Πρωτόνικος, 166.
Πύθιον, 243 f.
Πυθίων, 137.
Πυθόδωρος, 126 (*bis*); 227, 230.
Πυθοφάνης, 248.
Πυθῶδε, 101.
Πύλος, 256.
Ῥαμονῶς, 144.
Ῥήγιον, 172-5.
Ῥήνεια, 169 f.; -*ναιῆς*, 200.
Ῥίνων, 231.
Ῥοδοκλῆς, 126.
Σάλαμος, 26 f., 48, 49, 51, 52, 53.
Σαλμακίται, 69-71.
Σάμιος, 288.
Σάμος, -*μιοι*, 76, 116, 149-54, 185, 208, 257, 284-7, 288.
Σαρύγγυλλος, 69.
Σελινούντιοι, 82.
Σερδαῖοι, 18.
Σερίφιοι, 60, 200.
Σερμυλῆς, 89.
Σηλυμβρίανοι, 267-9.
Σημιχίδης, 127.
Σιβυρτιάδης, 271.
Σιβύρτιος, 277.
Σιγευῆς, 136, 225.
Σικελία, 232 f., 236-40, 280 f.
Σικινῆται, 200, 225.
Σικυνώνιοι, 58.
Σίκων, 74.
Σιληνός, 172, 175.
Σῆμος, 261.
Σιμωνίδης, 127.
Σίφνιοι, 58, 200.

- Σκαβλαίοι, 89.
 Σκιαθος, -θιος, 276.
 Σκόπας, 177.
 Σκύθης, 242.
 Σμικρίων, 127.
 Σμίκρος, 74.
 Σμίκυθος, 74; 109.
 Σμόκορδος, 147.
 Σπίνθαρος, 46.
 Σπουδίας, 117, 256.
 Σταγυρίται, 136.
 Στράτων, 74.
 Στρατώνας, 105.
 Στρωσίας, 147.
 Στυρείς, 58, 200.
 Στώλιοι, 89.
 Συβαρίται, 18.
 Σύλιχος, 78.
 Σύμη, 201.
 Συμφέρμιος, 74.
 Συρακόσιος, 61 f.
 Σύρος, 241 f.; -ριοι, 200.
 Σφενδονίων, 78.
 Σωκράτης, 46.
 Σωσίας, 74.
 Σῶσις, 175.
 Σώστρατος, 74.
 Σωτέλης, 74.
 Σωτελίδης, 127.
 Σώφιλος, 74.

 Τανάγρα, 77, 79.
 Ταραντίνος, 154, 251.
 Ταρβανής, 201.
 Ταύρος, 75.
 Τεγεᾶται, 58.
 Τεϊσανδρος, 41, 45, 46; 288.
 Τεισίας, 231.
 Τελέας, 232.
 Τελένικος, 75.
 Τελέστας, 78.
 Τενέδιοι, 136.
 Τέως, 63-6; Τήϊος, 12, 63-6.
 Τήλεφος, 126.
 Τηλέφωνος, 232.
 Τήλος, 200.
 Τήνιοι, 58, 200.
 Τιμαρχος, 231.
 Τιμήνωρ, 175.
 Τιμησίθεος, 73.
 Τιμογένης, 73.
 Τιμόδημος, 74.
 Τιμοκλής, 207 f.
 Τιμοκράτης, 73.

 Τιμόνοθος, 127.
 Τιμόξενος, 172, 176.
 Τιμοσθένης, 166.
 Τιμόστρατος, 165.
 Τιμοτέλης, 218.
 Τιμωνίδης, 177.
 Τιρύνθιοι, 58.
 Τίτων, 74.
 Τλασίας, 4.
 Τλημπολέμος, 219.
 Τορωναίοι, 136.
 Τριπτόλεμος, 219.
 Τροίζην, 48, 101, 103, Τροζάνιος, 58, 288.
 Τύλισσος, 99-105.
 Τυνδαρίδαι, 82.
 Τυρανός, 62.
 Τύχη, 147, 165.

 Ύγαιώνων, 185.
 Ύδαιης, 201.
 Ύλια 22.
 Ύλλεύς, 78, 102.
 Ύμεσσής, 20.
 Ύπέρβιος, 74.
 Ύπέρβολος Αντιφάνους, 40, 46.
 Ύρωμής, 201.
 Ύσταάσπης, 20.

 Φαίαξ, 44, 46.
 Φαιδιμίδης, 126.
 Φαίδρος, 244, 246.
 Φαίνιππος, ? 9; 177.
 ?Φαίστιος, 249.
 Φάλανθος, 46, 256.
 Φαλέας, 78.
 Φανίας, 126.
 Φανόδικος, 253.
 Φανόστρατος, 74.
 Φαντοκλής, 130, 132.
 Φάνυλλος, 73.
 Φασηλίται, 66-9, 191.
 Φειδελείδης, 147.
 Φειδίας, 146-9.
 Φεΐδων, 18.
 Φελλεύς, 277.
 Φερεκλείδης, 232.
 Φερεκλής, 243, 246.
 Φίλαιθος, 74.
 Φιλέας, 46.
 Φιλέριφος, 46.
 Φιλέταυρος, 74.
 Φιλίνος, 42, 46; 73; 74; 261.
 Φίλιος, 127.
 Φίλιππος, 46; 191.

- Φιλισιτίδης, 73; 74; 126; 261.
 Φιλόδημος, 74.
 Φιλόκωμος, 126.
 ? Φιλόμβροτος, 9.
 Φιλόμηλος, 233.
 Φίλων, 127; 255.
 Φιλώνυχος, 73.
 Φλειάσιοι, 58.
 Φόβος, 82.
 Φοινίκη, 73; -κες, 76.
 Φοῖνιξ, 78.
 Φοίνισσος, 53.
 Φαλέγανδρος, 200.
 Φορμίων, 70; 227 f., 230.
 Φρασιτελίδης, 255.
 Φρούραρχος, 74.
 Φροῦρος, 74.
 Φρύνυχος, 73.
 Φρύνος, 74; 75.
 ? Φυρόμαχος, 150.
 Φυσωνίδης, 74.
- Φωκιάδης, 206 f.
 Φωκίων, 74.
- Χαιρέδημος, 73.
 Χαιρής, 126.
 Χαιρίας, 74 (*bis*); 127.
 Χαιριμένης, 271.
 Χαλείοι, 37, 38, 40.
 Χάλκις, -κιδεῖς, 28, 58, 138-44, 200.
 Χαρίας, 45; 46; 172, 176.
 Χαρίσανδρος, 73; 74.
 Χαροπίδης, 127; 207.
 Χερρόνησος, 126; Χερρονησίται ἀπ'
 Ἄγοράς, 225.
 Χίοι, ? 66, 182.
 Χίονις, 126.
- Ψαμμάτιχος, 12 f.; Ψαμματᾶς, 13.
- Ὠλένιος, 182.

INDEX II

SUBJECTS

Numbers, except where otherwise stated, refer to Inscriptions.

- Accounts: of Athena, 55, 61, 72, 77, 81, 84; of building, 54, 59, 60; of logistai, 72; of poletai, 79; of Spartans, 67; of temples, Delos, 62, Rhamnous, 53.
- Agriculture, 12, 13(?), 73, 79.
- Alphabets, non-Attic: Achaean colonial, 10; Argive, 35, 42; Corinthian, 4, 24, 36; Cretan, 2, 41; Delphic, 27; Elean, 17; Euboean, 1, 82; Ionic, 7, 8, 16, 30, 31, 32, 34, 43, 45, 51, 62, 70, 71, 74, 80, 81, 88, 90, 93, 94, 95; Kleonaeon, 9; Laconian, 22, 57, 67; Lokrian, 13, 20; Pario-Thasian, 3, 83; Rhodian, 7 *c*; Selinuntine, 38; Syracusan, 28, 29. Ionic letters in Attic, 47, 52, 53, 65, 71, 87, 89.
- Altars, 3, 11.
- Ambassadors and heralds, 5, 37, 42, 45, 46, 52, 63, 64, 65, 69, 70, 73, 92, 94.
- Amendments: of proposal by Council, 37, 69, 70, 85(?), 89, 90; of proposal by individual or a board, 49, 52, 68, 73, 85; other, 44, 52; uncertain, 92.
- Assembly and Council procedure: Athens, 14, 44, 45, 46, 49, 52, 58, 65, 68, 69, 73, 78, 85, 94; Erythrai, 40; Lokrians(?), 13.
- Athenian allies: Chalkis, 52; Clazomenians at Daphnus, 88; Eggesta, 37; Eretria, 52, 82; Erythrai, 40; Ionians, 36; Kolophon, 47; Leontinoi, 64; Methone, 65; Neapolis, 89; Rhegion, 63; Samos, 34, 56, 94; Selymbria, 87.
- cleruchies and colonies: Brea, 49; Chersonese(?), 48; Kolophon, 47; Potidaea, 65, 66; Salamis, 14; general, 69.
- coins, weights, measures, 45.
- finance, 55, 58, 59, 60, 61, 72, 77, 81, 84, 91.
- honours for foreigners, 70, 80, 85, 87, 90, 91, 94.
- Portico and Treasury at Delphi, 25, 19.
- relations with Carthage, 92; Macedonia, 65, 91; Persia, 40, 70, 77 (p. 236).
- Athletics, 9.
- Boustrophedon Inscriptions, 2, 3, 7, 8, 9.
- Bronze, Inscriptions on, 10, 13, 17, 20, 27, 29, 57.
- Building-records and Decrees: Athena Nike, 44; Athena Parthenos, 54; Parthenon, 59; Propylaia, 58, 60.
- Calendar-problems, 42, pp. 171, 215 f., 221 f., 254.
- Citizenship, 5, 85, 94.
- Coins, pp. 19, 32, 111 ff., 268, 283.
- Colonization and cleruchies: Brea, 49; Cyrene, 5; Kolophon, 47; Lokrians, 13, 20; Potidaea, 66; Salamis, 14.
- Corn and corn-supply, 30, 42, 65, 67, 73, 84.
- Curses, 5, 13, 30, 40, 47.
- Decrees, Argive, 42; Athenian, 14, 23, 31, 37, 40, 44, 45, 46, 47, 49, 52, 56, 58, 63, 64, 65, 68, 69, 70, 71, 73, 78, 80, 85, 86, 87, 88, 89, 90, 91, 92, 94; Eretrian, 82; Milesian, 43.
- Dedications, 9, 11, 15, 16, 18, 19, 22, 25, 26(?), 27, 28, 29, 34, 36, 38, 66, 74, 95.
- Dialects (not Attic, koine, or literary): Achaean, 10; Argive, 35, 42; Corinthian, 4, 9, 24, 36; Cretan, 2, 41; Cyrenaic, 5; Doric, 7 *a*, *c*; Elean, 17; Ionic, Central, 3, 83; Ionic, East, 7 *b*, *f*, 8, 16, 30, 32, 34, 43; Ionic, West, 1, 74, 82; Laconian, 22, 57, 67; Locrian, 13, 20; Messenian(?), 74; Phocian(?), 27, Rhodian, 7 *d*, *g*; Selinuntine, 38; Syracusan(?), 28, 29.
- Diobelia, 84.

- Exile and exiles, 20, 23, 32, 40, 43, 52, 86, 87.
- Graffiti, 7.
- Gravestones, *see* Tombs.
- Homicide, Law of, 13, 70, 86.
- Hospitality, 42; *and see* Index III, s.vv. *δέιπνον* and *ξένα*.
- Hostages, 15, 52, 87.
- Inscriptions and literary texts, 5, 11, 15, 22, 23, 24, 36, 86.
- and sculpture: 16, 18, 22, 93, 95.
- Inventory, 76; *see also* 58 B.
- Laws, Athens, 86; Chios, 8; Dreros, 2; Gortyn, 41; Halikarnassos, 32; Lokrians, 13, 20; Teos, 30; Thasos, 83.
- Leagues, Delian, 40; Hellenic, 27; Peloponnesian, 36; Sybarite, 10.
- Leases, 14, 62, 79.
- Legal Procedure: Athens, 31, 46, 52, 68, 69, 70, 94; Gortyn, 41; Halikarnassos, 32; Miletus, 43; Thasos, 83.
- Letter, 12.
- Letter-forms, pp. 20, 27, 30, 54, 66, 67, 81, 107, 115, 123, 137, 144 (*bis*), 174, 184, 222, 224, 254, 290.
- Lists, of ambassadors, 37, 63, 64; of archons, 6; of casualties; 33, 35, 48; of generals, 56.
- Lycian coins, language, script, 93.
- Mercenaries, 7.
- Museums (present location of inscriptions removed from their place of origin): Athens, 13, 23, 24, 53, 73; Berlin, 57; Heraklion, 42; Istanbul, 8; London, British Museum, 17, 20, 29, 32, 35, 46, 63, 76, 77; Odessa, 45; Palermo, 38; Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale, 76; Paris, Louvre, 12, 33, 41, 58, 84.
- Oaths, 5, 20, 32, 37, 40, 45, 47, 52, 56, 63, 64, 69, 87, 92(?).
- Oracles, 5, 38(?), 52, 73.
- Ostracism, 21, 23.
- Paint on inscriptions, pp. 20, 27, 65, 69.
- Piracy, 16.
- Prices, 54, 59, 79.
- Proxenoï and grants of proxenia, 4, 70, 80, 82, 87, 90, 91.
- Punishments and fines, 2, 8, 13, 14, 17, 20, 31, 40, 43, 45, 46, 49, 52, 58, 68, 70, 73, 79.
- Real property, 13, 32, 41, 42, 62, 70, 79, 85, 87.
- Reliefs, etc., 46, 65, 68, 84, 89, 94.
- Retrograde inscriptions, 1, 4.
- Revision of treaties, 52, 63, 64, 65, 89.
- Revolts and plots, 30, 40, 43, 47, 51, 52, 55, 56, 82, 83, 85.
- Sacrifices and offerings, 8, 20, 23, 40, 42, 46, 52, 69, 73, 76, 77, 78, 84.
- Ships and shipping, 4, 16, 23, 25, 34, 67, 77, 78, 80, 91, 94.
- Signatures, of sculptors, 28, 74; of poet, 95.
- Slaves, 41, 79, 83.
- Sources of inscriptions: Abu-Simbel, 7; Aetolia(?), 13; Aphytis, 45; Argos, 42; Athens, 6, 11, 14, 15, 18, 31, 33, 35, 37, 39, 40, 44, 46, 47, 48, 49, 50, 51, 52, 54, 55, 56, 58, 59, 60, 61, 62, 63, 64, 65, 66, 68, 69, 70, 71, 72, 73, 75, 76, 77, 78, 79, 80, 81, 84, 85, 86, 87, 88, 89, 90, 91, 92, 94; Chios, 8; Corcyra, 4; Cos, 45; Cyrene, 5; Deirmendjik, 12; Delphi, 19, 25, 27, 28, 95; Dreros, 2; Eleusis, 73; Eretria, 82; Galaxidi, 20; Gortyn, 41; Halikarnassos, 32; Ischia, 1; Istanbul, 27; Miletus, 43; Nemea, 9; Olympia, 10, 17, 22, 29, 36, 57, 74; Rhamnous, 53; Salamis, 24; Samos, 16, 34; Selinus, 38; Siphnos, 45; Smyrna, 45; Syme, 45; Teos, 30; Thasos, 3, 83; Troizen, 23; Tyllissos, 42; Xanthos, 93.
- Sparta, 22, 27, 36, 56(?), 67, 95.
- Stone, Types of, pp. 17, 114 f.
- Succession, Law of, 13, 41.
- Taxation, 20, 52, 58 (p. 161).
- Temple-funds, 53, 55, 58, 61, 62, 72, 73, 77, 81, 84.
- Tombs and cenotaphs, 3(?), 4, 24, 51, p. 175, 93.
- Trade, 65, 80.
- Treaties, 10, 17, 37, 40, 42, 47, 52, 56, 63, 64, 87, 88, 92(?).

- Tribute, quota-lists and assessments, 39, 50, pp. 179 f., 69, 75.
 — their evidence used, pp. 72, 75, 93, 106, 120, 123-5, 128, 132, 141, 179, 180, 187, 193 f., 269, 274, 283.
 — decrees concerning, 46, 52, 65, 68, 69.
 — aparche referred to, 60, 65.
 Tyranny and tyrants, 11, 16, 28, 29, 32, 40.
- Vase-inscriptions, 1, p. 11.
- Verse inscriptions, 1, 4, 9, 11, 15, 18, 21 (p. 42), 22, 24, 26, 29, 34, 35, 36, 48, 51, p. 175, 93, 95.
- Victory records, 15, 18, 19, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 34, 36, 38, 57, 95.
- Wages, 44, 59, 69, 71, 78.
- Wine, 79.
- Year, pp. 171, 215 f.; *see also* Calendar-problems.

INDEX III

WORDS AND PHRASES

This index contains a selection of words and phrases related to the political, religious, military, and economic life of the Greek states.

Numbers refer to pages.

- ἀγορά*, 36, 112, ? 264, 282; *ἱερά ἀγορά*, 69.
ἄδεια, 156, 230-4.
ἄδος, 70 f.
ἄζήμιος, 178.
ἄθλοθέται, 233, 236, 255.
ἄττιος, 19, 172, 175, 176.
αἰσυμνήτης, -νῶ, 63, 65.
ἄκρηστος, 2 f.
ἄλειτηρός, 42.
ἄλλόγλωσσος, 12 f.
ἄμυδρός, 20.
ἀναγραφεύς, 264 f.
ἀνθρομολογείσθαι, ? 191.
ἀνομολογείσθαι, -γῆμα, 256 f., 259.
ἄξων, 264, 266.
ἀπαρχή (φόρου), 84, 88, 177, 179, 225, ? 273; (κάρπου), 219; (ἐλαίου), 219; (σίτου), 222; ἀπάρχομαι, 219.
ἀποδέκται, 277, 280.
ἀποικία, 129, 253, 273; ἀποικισταί, 129 f.; ἀποικοί, 129, ? 192, 253, 271.
ἀποκλησία, 23, 25.
ἀποκναμεύω, ? 90, 155.
ἀπὸ στρατιάς, 166.
ἀπὸ τῶν πολεμίων, 223.
ἀρά, 6.
ἀριστίνδην, 22.
ἄρχη (archonship), 9-13, 19; (magistracy), 66, 105, 155; (year of office), 84, 225; αἱ τέτταρες ἀρχαὶ (ταμίαι τῆς θεοῦ), 157, 227.
ἀρχηγέτης, 6, 48.
ἀρχιτέκτων, 156.
ἀρχοντες (Athenian in allied cities), 112 f., 117, 119, 273, 275, 276.
ἄρχος, 23, 37, 102, 287.
ἄρχων (Athenian), 219; (Salamis), 26 f.; (Thasos), 253.
ἄσυλος, 22; -λία, ? 248.
ἀτέλεια, 139, 252; -λείς, 177.
ἀτιμία, 112, 140; ἀτιμος, 112, 129, 139.
ἀτιμῶν, 138, 267.
αὐτοκράτωρ, 129, 155, 239.
αὐτόνομος, ? 267, 284.
βασιλεύς (Persian), 20, 22, 202 f.; (Athenian), 219, 264, 266.
βουλευτήριον, 190, 218, ? 262.
βουλή (Athenian), addition to bouletic oath, 113; judicial functions, 118, 261; responsibilities in tribute assessment, 189-92; to take oath to Chalkis, 138; to control calculations of λογισταί, 155; to protect favoured foreigners, 248, 261, 276; to select heralds, 186; three βουλευταί to be elected to co-operate with architect, 108; required by ἐκκλησία to bring forward particular matters, 219, 261-2; required to hear an individual, 130; (Eretria), 251; (Erythrai), 90; β. δημοσίη, 14, 16.
βοῦς καὶ πανοπλία, ? 118, 129, ? 192.
γεωνόμος, 129.
γῆς ἔγκτησις, 202.
γνήσιος, 49.
γνώμη, ? 91, 177, 190, 276, 284 f.
γραμματεῖον, 118, 155.
δαδούχος, 218.
δᾶμος, 4 f., 32, 36.
δεῖπνον, 285.
δεκάτη, 79, 101, 154 f., 161, 223.
δέκαχα, 285.
δήμαρχος, -χῶν, 14, 16, 144 f., 218.
δημίουργος, 23.
δῆμος (deme), 218, 285.
δῆμος (people) (Athens), *passim*; (Chios), 14; (Koloophon), ? 125; (Samos), 152.
δημόσιον (τό), 26, 177, 190, 285.
δημόσιος, 14, 90, 108, 129, 139, 190 f.

- διαδικασία, 189.
 οἱ τὰς διακοσίας ἔχοντες (= οἱ τὰς διακοσίας δραχμὰς ὀφείλοντες), 145 f.
 διαλλαγή, 139, 142.
 δίκαι ἀπὸ ξυμβολῶν, 66, 68, 268, 284; ἔκκλητοι, 14 f., ? 66; δίκη ἰρή, βεβήλη, 253.
 δικασταί, 70, 138, 189.
 δικαστήριον, 186, 189, 191, 262, 277.
 διωβελία, 256, 260.

 ἔγκτησις (γῆς), 202; γηπέδων καὶ οἰκίας, 261.
 εἰσεμπορεύεσθαι, 177, 179.
 ἐκκαλεῖσθαι, 14.
 ἐκκλησία (Athens), 178, 185, 237; (Thera), 6 f.
 ἐκλογεῖς (φόρου), 185, 187; (κάρπου) 218; (ἐλαίου), 219; (σίτου) 222.
 ἔλληνοταμίαι receive and record tribute, 84, 185, 225; receive money from Neapolis, 272; funds of, 155; contribute to public works, 86, 166; administer grants from Athena's treasurers, 205, 207, 230-3, 250, 255-8; number increased to twenty, 258; inherit duties of κωλακρέται, 258, 261, 264, 286.
 ἔλλησποντοφύλακες, 177 f., 180.
 ἔλύ, 243, 247.
 ἔμμηνα, 186.
 ἔνδεκα, (οἱ), 186.
 ἐναντός, 73, 75, 156, 162, 165, 177, 256, 272.
 ἐνπιπάσκομαι, 101, 103.
 ἐξαγωγή, 70, 177.
 ἐξώλεια, 23.
 ἐπαράομαι, 6.
 ἐπαρή, 64, 253.
 ἐπέτεια, 255, 258.
 ἐπίαρον, 32.
 ἐπιβάτης, 49, 51.
 ἐπιφοικία, ἐπιφοικοί, 23, 36 f.; and see ἐποικοί.
 ἐπιθῶϊος, 14, 17.
 ἐπικαλεῖν, 70.
 ἐπικαρπία, 241, 245.
 ἐπιμεληταί, 186.
 ἐπιμήνιοι, 105, 107; -νίη, 105.
 ἐπίνομος, -μία, 22, 24.
 ἐπίσκοπος (Athenian), 90-2, 117; (Delian), 170.
 ἐπίστασις, 30 f.
 ἐπιστάται, 112 f., 147, 155, ? 156, 162, 165.
 ἐπιφορά, 86.
 ἐποικοί, 23, 36, 181; ἐποικεῖν, 130.
 ἐπώνιοι, 241, 247.
 ἐσαγωγεῖς, 189.
 ἐσφέρειν, 156, 237.
 ἔταιρεία, 5, 7; ἔταιροι, 6.
 εὐεργέτης, 261, 272; see also πρόξενος καὶ εὐεργέτης.
 εὐθῆναι (punishments), 140, 143; (examination), 156.
 εὐθῆνος, 63.
 εὐθύνω, 112, 178, 189 f., 218.
 ἔφεις, 141.
 ἐφέται, 264 f.

 φέτας, 32.
 φράτρα, see ρήτρα.

 ζευγίται, 130.

 ἡλίαια, ? 118, 140, 189.
 ἡλιασταί, 189.

 θεσμοῦθεται, 46, 112, 140, ? 189 with 192.
 θέσμος, 22 f., 36, 264 f.
 θῆτες, 130.
 θφιή, 105.

 ἱαρεύς, 102.
 ἱέρευς, 48, 108, 204; ἱερεύς, 48, 155.
 ἱερόν, 108, 111, 140, 243, 268, 272.
 ἱεροποιοί, 90, 145, 155, 218, 220, 255.

 κάθοδος, 70.
 καρτερός, 70, 90, 94.
 καταδικάζω, -δίκη, 67.
 καταμήνιος, 163.
 κῆρυξ, 112, 186, 189, 191, ? 281.
 κισιάλλης, -λεύω, 63.
 κλήρος, 95, 98.
 κλήτηρ, 186, 191.
 κοινόν, 267 f., 273.
 κόλοσος, 6.
 κόσμος, -μέω, 2 f., 95 f., 99, 102.
 κυβερνήτης, 238.
 κωλακρέται, 80, 190 f., 204, 219, 258.

 ληξιαρχικὰ γραμματεῖα, 49, 51.
 λιποτελέω, 36.
 λογισταί, 84, 155, 205-12.

 μαντεία, 218; μάντις, 74.
 μέτοικος, 241.

μήνυσις, 119.

μισθός, 163; μισθοφορέω, 238; μισθώω, 26, 169 f.; μίσθωσις, 169, 244.
μνήμων, -μονεύω, 69-72.

νομοθέτης, ? 189 with 192.
νόμος, 37, 70, 264, 284; νόμιμος, 36 f.

ξένια, 80, 102, 268, 276, 281.
ξένος, 36, 48 f., 112, 139; -νικός, 113, 210.
ξύλλεσθαι, 101, 103.
ξύν and compounds, *see* σύν.
ξυνόν, 63-65.

? οικήτορες, 122.
οίκισία, 6.
οίκισταί, 123 f.
οικιστήρες, 6.
ὄμηρος, 139, 267; -ρεία, 268.
ὄπλα, 53 f.
ὄπλιται, 268.
ὄρκος 5 f., 36 f., 70, 80, 113, 123, 138, 140, 152, 172, 175, 191, 284; ὀρκώω, 32, 70, 138, 189; ὀρκωταί, 138 f., 189, ? 281.

πανοπλία ? 118, ? 129, ? 192.
πάρεδρος, 230-3, 256.
πάτρα = φρατρία, 5, 7.
πέλτασται, 237.
πινακίον, 118, 155, 218.
πλήθα, 37; πλήθος, 22, 90, 99, 100.
πόλεις αὐταὶ φόρον ταξάμεναι, 86.
πόλεις ἀς οἱ ἰδιῶται ἐνέγραψαν φόρον φέρειν, 86.
πόλεις ὧν Ἀθηναῖοι ἄρχουσι, 92.
πόλεις ὧν Ἀθηναῖοι κρατοῦσι, 248.
αἶδε τῶν πόλεων αὐτὴν τὴν ἀπαρχὴν ἀπήγαγον, 179.
πολέμαρχος, 33, 66, 68, 189.
πόλις (= Acropolis), 67, 80, 185, 248.
πολιτεία (citizenship) 5 f.; (constitution), 267.
πρεσβεία, 80, 138 f., ? 202, 285; -βεις, 80, 172, 175, 177 f., 189, 268, 285.
πρόδικος, 37.
πρόξενος, 4, 19, 268, 277, — καὶ εὐεργέτης, 202, 248, 251, 276, 278; προξενία, 268.
προστάτας, 37.
πρυτανεία, 130, 178, 185, 219; πρυτάνεις, 118, 155, 185, 186, 190, 193, 238, 261, 284, 287.

πρυτανεῖον, 80, 268, 273, 288.
πωληταί, 80, 108, 186, 190, 247, 264.

ῥοινᾶνες, 36.

ρήτρα, 14 f., 17; φράτρα, 31; ῥήτρη, 253.
ρύτιον, 102, 104.

σάνις, 185.
σκύλα, 154.
στάρτος, 94, 96.
στατήρ, -ρες, 11, 70, 95, 102, 105, 252 f.; Αἰγυαῖοι, 182; Κυζικηνοί, 162-4; Λαμψακηνοί, 162-4.

στρατηγός, appointment of trierarchs, 48; attendance in court, 186; board of generals (439-8), 152-4; in casualty-lists, 73, 126; co-operation with γραμματεὺς τῆς βουλῆς, 268, 285; grants for campaigns, 149 f., 167, 206, 208, 217, 230-3, 256 f.; number of generals for Sicilian expedition discussed, 237, 239; protection of Neapolis, 273, of πρόξενοι, 248, 276; settlement with Selymbria, 268, with Daphnus 270; supervision of oaths, ? 80, 138 f., of public sacrifices, 146, of envoys, 285; tribute responsibilities, ? 191. Samian generals, 284.

ξυγγραφαί, 129, 131, 169, 219 f.; ξυγγ- 219.

ξυγγραφεύς, 218, 220; ξυγγράφω, 108, 191, 218 f.

σύλη, 30 f.

σύλλογος, 69.

ξύμβολα, 117.

ξύμβολαί, 66-8, 268 f.

ξύμμαχία, 79, 172-6; χσυμ- 31, 80; συμ- 79.

ξύμμαχος, 125, 172, 257; σύνμ- 18, 176; ξυμμαχικός, 114; ξυμμαχίς, 90.

σύμπαντες, 70.

συμπλέονες, 101.

συνανφότεροι, 101.

ξυνάρχοντες, 167, 205-8, 227 f., 230-3, 255; συν- 230, 250, 255-7.

συνέαν, 32.

ξυνθήκαι, 268, 270; συν- 284.

? τάκται, 189, 198.

ταμίαι (of Athena): ταμίαι, 147, 205-7; ταμίαι ἐκ πόλεως, 149; οἱ τὰ τῆς Ἀθηναίας ταμιεύοντες, 156, 162, 165; ταμίαι ἱερῶν χρημάτων τῆς Ἀθηναίας,

- 167, 230-2, 250, 255; annual expenditure (426-422), 205-17, (418-414), 230-3, (411) 250 f., (410-9) 255-7; audit, 156, 227; grants for public works: Parthenos, 147, Parthenon 162, Propylaia 165; for expeditions: 149 (Samos), 167 (Corcyra); inventories, 157, of the Hekatompedos (418-17), 227.
- ταμίαι (local officers of temples of Attica and lower city), 155, 161; ταμίαις (associated with Syracusan expedition), 324, 238.
- ταμίαι Ἡφαιστικῶν ἀπὸ Λαυρείου, 166.
- ταμίαι τῶν ἄλλων θεῶν, first elections, 155-7; make loans, 208-12.
- τάξις (ship's complement), 49; (assessment), 118, 189, 197.
- τελεστά, 32.
- τίμημα, 237, 240.
- τιμουχέω, 64 f.
- τοξότης, 73, 238.
- τριηκόσιοι (οἱ) in Thasos, 252-4.
- τριήραρχος, 48 f., 238, 257, ? 268, 285.
? τριηροποιοί, 277, 280.
- τρίττοια βόαρχος, 219, 221.
- ὑπηρεσία, 49, 51, 237.
- φάλλος, 129.
- φάρμακα δηλητήρια, 63.
- φεύγειν, 70, 90, 105, ? 264, 267; φυγή, 140.
- Φοινικήια, 64 f.
- φόρος, 84, 87, 117 f., 139, 166, 184-6, 189-92, 239.
- φράτορες, 264; φρατρία, 261.
- φρούραρχος, 90, 92.
- φυλοβασιλείς, 266.
- χρήματα, 6, 23, 33, 36, 90, 94 f., 97, 101, 129, 130, 138, 155-7, ? 251, 253, 267.
- χρήσμος, 140.
- ψάφιξις, 37.

INDEX IV

OTHER INSCRIPTIONS REFERRED TO

Numbers refer to pages.

- ATL* ii: D9, 111; D11, 93, 106, 131, 188; D16, 142; D21, 179 f.
BCH xliv (1920) 237 ff., 20.
DAA 384, 128.
FD iii. 1: 54, 290; 60, 290; 68, 289.
Hesp.: ix (1940) 309, 161; xi (1942) 275-8 + xxv (1956) 109-21, 260; xxxii (1963) 144-55, 260; xxxiii (1964) 44, 260.
IC iv: 14, 3, 99; 80, 99; 142, 99; 182, 99.
IG i²: 11+12/13a, 92 f.; 12/13b+
Hesp. xiv. 82 f., 94; 34/35, 125; 42, 161; 71, 179, 278; 81, 111; 88, 110; 94, 280; 101, 286; 114, 265; 152, 132; 232, 158; 301, 215, 260; 305, 260; 310, 117, 158, 160; 335, 163; 342, 88, 166; 370, 159; 949, 128.
 — ii²: 30, 27; 116, 180; 403, 224; 1386, 229; 5220, 175.
 — xii. 8: 263, 254; 276, 254.
 — xii. suppl.: 549, 107, 252.
Inscr. Délos 88, 170.
 Pouilloux, *Recherches sur l'histoire et les cultes de Thasos* i, no. 7, 254.
SEG: ix. 1, 8; x. 15, 69; x. 73, 187; x. 243, 163; xii. 80, 108 f.; xiii. 34, 57.
SIG: 81, 224; 578, 65.
Sitz. Berl. 1901. 911, 107.
 Tod, *GHI* i: 34, 31.
 — ii: 97, 287; 98, 250, 254; 99, 170; 114, 271; 125, 170; 159, 271; 160, 183; 204, 8.

Piérart, *BCH* cviii (1984) 172, discusses lines 8 and 31, and has a good discussion of the tribute-lists of the Archidamian War (cf. Bradeen-McGregor, *Studies* 20-23).

67. The fourth-century dating is accepted by Jeffery, *BSA* lxxxiii (1988) 179-81. An unpublished fragment refers to Aeginetans and shows that the Chian friends of the Spartans were in exile.

67 bis. No collection of fifth-century inscriptions can now be without the first inscribed classical Spartan treaty, first published by Peek in 1976 (*SEG* xxvi. 461, xxviii. 408, xxxii. 398; Cozzoli, *Scritti Treves* 67-76); we print a composite text, without textual commentary and with much hesitation.

[συνθῆκ]αι Αἰτολοῖς κ[αττάδε]
 [φιλία]ν καὶ ἡράναν ἔ[μεν ποτ]
 [Αἰτο]λος καὶ συμμα[χίαν . . 3-4 . .]
 [. . 3-4]νμονος μαν[τ . 1-2 . ἡεπο]-
 5 [μ]ένος ἡόπυι κα Λα[κεδαιμόνι]-
 [ο]ι ἡαγίονται καὶ κα[τὰ γὰν]
 [κ]αὶ καθάλαθαν, τ[ὸν αὐτὸν]
 φίλον καὶ τὸν αὐτ[ὸν ἐχθρὸν]
 ἔχοντες ἡόν περ [καὶ Λακε]-
 10 δαιμόνιοι. μεδὲ κ[ατάλυθιν]
 ποιῆθαι ἄνευ Λα[κεδαιμονίον]
 μεδενί, ἀνἡιέμς[ν δὲ μαχομένος]
 ἐπὶ ταύτὸν πόθ' ὁ Λ[ακεδαι]-
 μονίος. φεύγον[τας μὲ δεκέθο]-
 15 ἡαν κεκοινανεκ[ότας ἀδικε]-
 μάτον. αὐ δὲ τίς κα [ἐπὶ τὰν τὸν]
 Ἐρξαδιέον χόραν [στρατεύει]
 ἐπὶ πολέμοι, ἐπικο[ρῆν Λακεδαιμο]-
 νίος παντὶ σθένει[κα τὸ δύνατον.]
 20 αὐ δὲ τίς κα ἐπὶ τὰ[ν Λακεδαιμο]-
 νίον χόραν στρ[ατεύει ἐπὶ πολέ]-
 μοι, ἐπικορῆν Ἐ[ρξαδιῆς παντὶ]
 [σθένει κα τὸ δύνατον]

Although Peek contemplated a rather earlier dating, we see no reason why the lettering should be earlier than the earliest known diplomatic contacts between Sparta and Aetolia in 426 (Thuc. iii. 100). The surest result seems to be the confirmation of the view (de Ste. Croix, *Origins of the Peloponnesian War*, 108-10) that the alliance formula of lines 4-10 was the primitive formula of Spartan alliances; it had previously only been known in cases where defeated enemies were brought into the Peloponnesian League (X. *Hell.* ii. 2. 20, v. 3. 26). Onto this formula is grafted the much more modern formula (cf. Thuc. i. 44. 1) of lines 16-23. But no satisfactory restoration of line 4 has yet been found, and the relationship of the hitherto unknown Erxadiæis to the Aetolians remains uncertain.

69. Lines 30-1 are discussed by Lewis in ΦΟΡΟΣ . . . Meritt, 85-6.