

ON THE ATHENIAN DECREES FOR ULPUS EUBIOTUS

(PLATE 101 a)

I

IN *The Sacred Gerusia* (= *Hesperia*, Supplement VI, 1941), Nos. 31 and 32, the writer published fragments of two inscribed copies of decrees passed by Athenian public corporations in honor of their benefactor, the consular M. Ulpus Eubiotus Leurus. The decrees were dated to about the second quarter of the third century after Christ on prosopographical evidence and to about the reign of Alexander Severus by mention of the Sacred Gerusia which would seem to have ended in the time of Maximinus Thrax. The small fragment labeled Fragment *a* of No. 31 should have been given as Fragment *b* of No. 32 because it belongs in a section corresponding to the part of No. 31 labeled lines 24-33, which gains accordingly in comprehensibility. The fragment should read as follows with those letters underlined which appear in No. 31:

[εἰσκαλείσθαι δὲ αὐτὸν καὶ εἰς τὸ θέατρον διὰ τῶν πρυτάνεων αἰεὶ ἐπὶ προεδρίᾳ καὶ
κοινωνίᾳ θυσιῶν καὶ σπ] ονδῶ[ν τῶν ἔν τε πομπαῖς πάσαις καὶ ἐκκλησίαις γεινομένων αὐτόν
τε καὶ τοὺς παῖδας αὐτοῦ τοὺς κρ Οὐλ Τεισαμενὸν καὶ Πουπήνιον Μάξιμον· μετεῖν[αι δὲ
αὐτ[ῶ τε καὶ τοῖς παισὶν αὐτοῦ τῶν αἰσιπειῶν καθάπερ τῷ ἱεροφάντῃ καὶ — — — — —
τῶν γεινομένων ἔκ τε τῆς πόλεως καὶ τῶν ὑπὸ] φιλοτε[ιμίας — — — — — ιας ὅτε βούλοιτο,
καὶ εἰ βούλοιτο, ἑαυτὸν καθιέντος] προγραφε[— — — — — λαμπρότητα ὃ καὶ τὴν διὰ τὰς
Ἀθήνησιν πολιτείας ἀμοιβὴν — — — — — κύριον δὲ εἶναι τόδε τὸ δόγμα εἰς τὸν ἅπαντα χρόνον
καὶ τὰς εἰς τὸν λαμπρότατον ὑπατικὸν τειμᾶς — — —]ι μετὰ τ[— — — — — ἐξηγηταῖς κα]
μάντε[σι καὶ τοῖς ἐφ' ἱερᾶς διατάξεως ὡσανύτως ὃ πρόεδρος ὃ “ ὅτῳ δοκεῖ κύριον εἶναι
τ]οῦτον τὸ[ν νόμον κατὰ τὰ ἀνεγνωσμένα ὃ ἀράτω τὴν χεῖρα ” ὃ πάντες ἐπήραν ὃ “ καὶ ὅτῳ
μή ” ὃ οὐδεὶς ἐπήρεν ὃ ἔδοξεν τῷ δήμῳ ^{vacat} καὶ τοῦ αὐτοῦ μηνὸς εἰ, γνώμην ἀγορεύσαντος
Ἀὐρ — — — — — ἐν τῷ σεμνοτάτῳ σ]υνεδρί[φ τὴν τῆς βουλῆς ^{vacat} ἐπηρώτησεν ὃ πρόεδρος
^{vacat} ἔδοξ]εν τῇ [ἐξ Ἀρείου πάγου βουλῇ, κτλ.

At the end of the corresponding passage of No. 31 the writer in the *editio princeps* after much hesitation erroneously restored ἔδοξεν τῷ δήμῳ, because believing that a passage in lines 39-40 had to be reconstructed καθάπερ ἡ βου[λῃ περὶ το[ύτων προ]ε-βουλεύσατο, he thought that the first document was a probuleuma. The data can of

course be interpreted as ἡ τῶν Φ βου]λῇ and ἐβουλευσατο with some three-letter word—he can think of several—in front of the verb. That the second decree is a ὑπομνηματισμός of the Areopagus appears also from line 56 where the technical term ὑπομνηματίσαι is used.

Thus the difficulties in respect to the public procedure disappear, and the honors seem to be handled like the consolation in the case of T. Statilius Lamprias, where the inscription contains two consolatory decrees, one by the Areopagus (first on the stone), and the other by the Council and Demos of the Athenians.¹ The decree of the Areopagus followed in time and paralleled in language the decree of the Council and Demos. Analogously, in the case of Eubiotus the decree of the Areopagus is worded much like, but not exactly like, the decree of the Council, which it follows in time.

Nor is there any difference in the role of the Demos. In the case of the decrees concerning the death of T. Statilius Lamprias the earlier decree was labeled a decree of the Council and Demos. The *dogma* of the Council had been read in the Ecclesia and there ratified by the Demos. As to the case of Ulpius Eubiotus, it is expressly stated in another inscription, *I.G.*, II², 3699, that the honor of a statue was granted δόγματι τοῦ σεμνο[τά]του συνεδ[ρί]ου καὶ τῆς πόλεως συνπάσης. Reference to the entire

¹ *I.G.*, IV² (1), 82 = *S.I.G.*³, 796. The inscription is dated by B. Keil *Beiträge zur Geschichte des Areopags*, p. 3 (= *Berichte über die Verhandlungen der Sächsischen Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Leipzig, Phil.-hist. Kl., Band 71, 1919, Heft 8*), in the time of Nero, but “vers l’époque de Claude” on a stronger argument by P. Graindor, *Chronologie des archontes athéniens sous l’empire*, No. 41 *bis* on pp. 71-74 and 309 (= *Mémoires publiés par la Classe des lettres et des sciences morales et politiques de l’Académie royale de Belgique, Collection in quarto, Deuxième Série, VIII, 1921*). The secretary of that year came from the tribe Aiantis (X), and if one is justified in rotating the secretary cycle back from A.D. 117/8 (*I.G.*, II², 1072), the year of the archon Secundus might best be identified as A.D. 38/9; and the reference to troubled times, it seems to me, may best be interpreted as a reference to the last years of Tiberius. Also E. Groag, *Die römischen Reichsbeamten von Achaia bis auf Diokletian* (= *Akad. d. Wiss. in Wien, Schriften der Balkankommission, Antiquarische Abt., IX, 1939*), pp. 29 f., note 115, although he saw in the reference to troubled times those of Caligula, accepted Graindor’s (and Mommsen’s) date. The other view, recently defended by H. Dessau, *Gesch. d. röm. Kaiserzeit*, II (Berlin, 1930), p. 544 and A. Momigliano, *J.R.S.*, XXXIV, 1944, pp. 115 f., that the reference to the new freedom is a reference to Nero’s declaration of freedom at the Isthmian Games in the late autumn of A.D. 67, breaks down, among other reasons, because of evidence from the cycle of Athenian secretaries. The year seems to be 38/9 or 50/1 or 62/3 or 74/5, and only the first of these will do. Disturbances which occurred at Athens late in the reign of Augustus and which are attested by Eusebius, St. Jerome, Georgius Syncellus, Orosius, and Paulus Diaconus (see P. Graindor, *Athènes sous Auguste*, pp. 41-45, who erroneously argues against them from the silence of Tacitus, as if Tacitus had a stenographic record of what Cn. Piso said to the Athenians in A.D. 18, and as if Tacitus would have felt obliged to repeat references no longer easily comprehensible to a Roman public) strongly suggest a break in the secretary cycle late in the reign of Augustus, but no similar disturbances suggest a break between the time of Claudius and that of Trajan. In the writer’s opinion these disturbances and the agreement of the early date for *S.I.G.*³, 796 with a projection of the cycles from the Trajanic Period are for anyone reconstructing the Athenian secretary cycles of the first century after Christ the two most important factors to be considered.

polis, as B. Keil² pointed out, is a reference to cooperation between Council and Ecclesia.

The participation of the Demos actually emerges from the above presented reconstruction of fragment *a*. Whereas the *dogma* of the Council is mentioned first, somewhat further on we encounter a reference to a rogation, a proposal to the people, ὅτω δοκεῖ κύριον εἶναι τ[οῦτον τ[ὸν νόμον, κτλ., for the change from neuter to masculine can be explained, I think, on the assumption that the word νόμος is being significantly substituted for δόγμα. If so, it means "rogation" as in Plutarch, *Ti. Gracchus*, X, 1; Appian, *Bel. civ.*, I, 12; and Dionysius Hal., X, 4, etc.

Accordingly, between the decree of the Council and the ὑπομνηματισμός of the Areopagus the inscription had a brief passage recording the vote of the Ecclesia in ratification of the decree of the Council. Another case of a passage recording subsequent ratification by the Demos (the Chalcidian) of an honorary decree occurs in a contemporary document from near-by Chalcis S.I.G.³, 898, a parallel of unusual satisfaction because like our inscription it speaks of an ἀμοιβή for the services rendered and of extending grateful treatment also to the sons of the benefactor. The inscription from Chalcis concludes, Δ ἡ μ ο υ· ὁ στρατηγὸς τὸ β' Νόουιος Λυσανίας εἶπεν· "καλῶς ποιεῖτε ἀμειβόμενοι τοὺς ἀγαθοὺς ἄνδρας, καὶ μὴ εἰς αὐτοὺς μόνους τὰς τιμὰς ἀλλὰ καὶ εἰς τοὺς παῖδας μετατιθέντες· μόνως γὰρ οὕτως καὶ τοὺς ἄλλους ἐπὶ πολλοῖς προτρέπομεν. ἔφθακεν οὖν ταῦτα ἐψηφίσθαι καὶ τῇ βουλῇ· εἰ καὶ ὑμῖν δοκεῖ, ἀράτω τὴν χεῖρα." ἐβ(όησεν) ὁ δ(ῆμος)· "δοκεῖ." ἔδοξεν.

It is of less importance but still of some interest that the evidence from the fragment of which we have just presented a reconstruction establishes the restoration καὶ σ[πον|δῶν in No. 31, lines 23-24, where the extent of the lacuna had been overestimated by two-and-a-half letter spaces. With faith the sigma can actually be discerned on the squeeze though not in the photograph. Thus a common formula emerges.

The reconstruction here offered presupposes one variation of text. Whereas the small fragment reads in its second line μετεῖν]αι δὲ αὐτ[ῶ, No. 31 reads μετεῖναί τε αὐτῶ. It was this above all that deceived the writer as to the position of the fragment, but two copies of the edict of Tib. Julius Alexander, both engraved at Hibis,³ and two copies of an imperial letter, both engraved at Ephesus,⁴ present similar discrepancies.

II

On p. 126 of *The Sacred Gerusia* the inscription published previously as I.G., II², 1064 was identified as a fragment *d* of this text (No. 31). Since the surface of the

² *Op. cit.*, p. 31.

³ The Metropolitan Museum of Art, Egyptian Expedition, XIV, Nos. 3 and 4.

⁴ *Forschungen in Ephesos*, II, No. 24 and *Jahreshefte*, XXVII, 1932, Beiblatt, 21 f.

stone had disintegrated, the identification could not be verified at the time (1940 and 1941) because Kirchner's squeeze could not be consulted. In December 1949, however, the author wrote to Günther Klaffenbach, who with courtesy and remarkable generosity dispatched the valuable squeeze, so that it becomes possible for the author to verify his conjecture, control the reading and present the photograph on Plate 101a.

The author, who has so much more to go on, finds that Kirchner made an excellent reading of the difficult inscription *I.G.*, II², 1064. A few slight corrections for the author's own text ⁵ have emerged: α]ὐτῷ τε κα[ὶ] το[ῖς κ]ρ π[α]ισ[ὶ]ν καὶ, line 45; θυσιῶν καὶ σπονδ]ῶν, line 46; τηλικαῦτα [τ]οι[αῦτα, line 47; γεινομένω[ν ἐκ] τῆς πό[λεως, line 48; [κ]αθιέν[τος, line 49; [πο]λιτε[ίας, line 50; ὑπομνηματίσαι [δὲ, line 56.

III

The Council, in what is left of its decree in the two copies, assigns the following honors in the following order:

A. Precedented Honors

- 1) Praise for his benefactions which are enumerated.
- 2) Bronze statues of Ulpus Eubiotus and his two sons to be erected at public expense both in the Syneidion of the Sacred Gerusia and in the Prytaneum and to be accompanied by inscriptions.
- 3) Right of public maintenance for him and for his sons, in Tholos and Prytaneum, with additional honor of a double portion and of [a crown] at Games and Festal Assemblies.
- 4) Front seats at the said Games.
- 5) Occupiable by him or by one of his sons, a throne to be engraved with his name and to be placed in the Theatre of Dionysus, where the exegetes and manteis shall decide, with the resulting exemption from taxation and liturgy throughout Attica and the islands belonging to the Athenians.
- 6) Invitation by the prytaneis on each occasion, for him and for his sons, to the Dionysiac Games, with the honor of a front seat.

B. Unprecedented Honors. (Here is where the small fragment reconstructed above belongs.)

- 7) Invitation to the Theatre by the prytaneis on the occasion of every public procession and of every assembly meeting, for himself and his two sons, with the honor of a front seat and of a share in sacrifices and libations.

⁵ *The Sacred Gerusia*, p. 129.

8) Participation in the kind of public maintenance to which the hierophant [and the daduchus] were entitled, and in all distributions made out of state funds or out of private benevolence [to Athenian Councillors?]. (The phrases "when he so wishes and if he so wishes," etc., may belong to specifications concerning the modalities of sharing in certain of these distributions, or of passing his portion to another, but the sense is uncertain. The word *λαμπρότητα*, which suggests the brightness of unworn coins, e. g. *τὴν αὐτὴν ποσότητα καὶ λαμπρότητα*, may conclude this section.)

The honors listed as precedented honors are particularly interesting. The double portion was a perquisite of the Spartan kings and as a mark of special honor was common at all periods of Greek history.⁶ That a throne in the Theatre might be assigned to a benefactor is not new information, but that exemption from taxation and liturgy followed this grant automatically is new information, as also the administrative control by the exegetes and manteis, who at Athens corresponded to the Roman *sacerdotes publici*. The privilege of public maintenance in the Prytaneum is particularly well known from Attic literature and, among others, from a mutilated but illuminating inscription of the fifth century B.C. On the other hand, maintenance in the Tholos, while not entirely unattested,⁷ is certainly a striking privilege.

The question with the affirmative and negative votes recorded just before the vacant area which separates the proceedings in the Areopagus from the rest presumably refers to the rogation of the Demos, so that after the phrase *οὐδεὶς ἐπήρην* one should restore "ἔδοξεν τῷ δήμῳ. The minutes of the question and vote in the Council would have been engraved at the beginning of the decree as the minutes of the proceedings in the Areopagus are engraved at the beginning of the *ὑπομνηματισμός*.

The *ὑπομνηματισμός* of the Areopagus reproduces articles 1-8 without distinguishing between precedented and unprecedented honors and with transposition of the section concerning the throne and the resulting immunity from taxation and liturgy to a position near the end. Furthermore it appends an obscure section concerning a committee of distinguished Athenians who perhaps were to call upon Ulpius Eubiotus and bring him the news.

JAMES H. OLIVER

THE JOHNS HOPKINS UNIVERSITY

⁶ To the literature add now H. C. Youtie, "The Kline of Sarapis," *Harvard Theological Review*, XLI, 1948, pp. 9-29, especially pp. 21-22.

⁷ A name without a title may occasionally turn up in a list of *aiseitōi* at the end of a prytany catalogue. One might compare *Inscriptiones Creticae*, I, pp. 234-236, No. 3, where benefactors of Mallia receive the privilege of dining with the *kosmoi* (line 38).



I. G. II², 1064—*Hesperia*, Supplement VI, No. 31, Fragment d. Photograph (printed in reverse) of squeeze belonging to the Akademie der Wissenschaften in Berlin. Through the courtesy of Günther Klaffenbach.

J. H. OLIVER: ON THE ATHENIAN DECREES FOR ULPUS EUBIOTUS



MARGARET THOMPSON: A PTOLEMAIC BRONZE HOARD FROM CORINTH