

THE ELEUSINIAN ENDOWMENT

IN THE course of an investigation into Roman policy in respect to the protection of local endowments the author has been obliged to face a group of problems around one inscription found in the great sanctuary at Eleusis. The inscription contains more than one document concerning an endowment in support of the sanctuary. Who established the endowment, why, when, for what purpose and for how much are some of the problems which will be treated here, also the basic problems in regard to the establishment of the text. The source and character of the Roman declaration are problems to be relegated to the author's forthcoming study "Roman Declarations Protecting Greek Endowments."

We begin with the primary task of re-editing the inscription, partly from measurements and squeezes made for the author most kindly by the distinguished archaeologist and friend of all archaeologists, Eugene Vanderpool.

THE TEXT OF I.G., II² 1092

- | | | | | | |
|----|---|--|-----------------|---|---|
| 1 | [| <i>vacat</i> | Τὰ εἰς τὰς πανη |] | <i>vacat</i> γ[ύρ]εις θέ[ματα] <i>vacat</i> |
| | [| <i>vacat</i> | |] | <i>vacat</i> <i>vacat</i> |
| 2 | [| ----- τῶι σ]εμνοτάτ[ωι συν]εδρίωι | | | |
| | [| -----]λ[...]οσε[....]ηδη | | | |
| | [| -----]ει[. .]α Ξεν[ίωνος] τοῦ | | | |
| 5 | [| -----] καὶ Ἀσ[ι]αρ[χίαν?] ἄρξαν | | | |
| | [| ----- τῶ]ν Ἑλλ[ή]νω[ν τῶν ἰσ]αφι | | | |
| | [| κνουμένων -----] τειμη[.]α[.....]ενε | | | |
| | [| -----]λα]μπρὰς τὰς [.....]ρημα | | | |
| | [| -----]ις αὐτο[-----]τηρι | | | |
| 10 | [| -----]ς δὲ ταύτας [ἐφ' ἡμι]ολίαι | | | |
| | [| -----]ξέ]στω δανισθῆνα[ι καὶ τα]ύτας | | | |
| | [| -----] διὰ τῆς τοῦ σεμ[ν]οτάτου | | | |
| | [| συνεδρίου -----]οις ἀπετέθη τ[οῖ]ς ἱεροῖς | | | |
| | [| -----]?συναγόμε]νον τόκον καθ' ἕκαστον | | | |
| 15 | [| ἐνιαυτόν -----] δραχμὰ]ς δύο καὶ δέκα λαμπρὰς | | | |
| | [| -----]ν βουλευταῖς ἰς αὐτά | | | |
| | [| -----] ἐξηγουμένοις ἰ[ε]ρεῦ | | | |
| | [| σιν -----]α ὑπ[ο]τέτακτα[ι] | | | |
| | [| -----]τ[.....]ιασατ[.....] | | | |
| | | Lacuna of undetermined extent | | | |
| 20 | [| -----]αεισεχῶ | | | |

- [- - - - -]ιπλ[- ^{±7} -]γετονα
 [- - - - -]ες ιερείς συνηθ[- ^{±7} -]ε καὶ οἱ
 [- - - - -]λοι μ[. .]στιν ὑπιον [- ^{±7} -]ιλεγον
 [- - - - το[ῖς ποιουμέν[οις ἰ]ς ἱερᾶς τοσ[- ⁷ or ⁸ -]κ[. . .]
 25 [- - -]ενοι γέρας, μεθ' οὗς εἴ τ[ι πε]ριττεύοι κα[θάπερ τι] καὶ ἔπε
 [ρίττε]υσεν ἥδη, τοῦτο ἰς θυμιατηρ[ίω]ν κατασκευῇ[ν ἐξέστω] ἀφορί
 ζεσθ[α]ι διὰ τε τῆς τοῦ ἱεροφάντου καὶ τῆς τοῦ δαδούχ[ου ἐπιμελ]ίας, οἷς
 καὶ ἡ πᾶσα τῶν χρημάτων τούτων σωτηρία τε καὶ [ἀσφάλεια ἐ]πετρά
 πη πρὸς τὸ μηδενὶ μηδαμῶς ἐξείναι μ[ετα]κεινῇ[σαί τι τῶν ἐγ]κριθέν
 30 των ἅπαξ καὶ θεοῖς καθιερωμένων, ὅπ[ως καὶ ἐ]πε[κύρωσεν οὗ ἡ ἀπό]φ[α]
 σις ἐξηγέχθη πρὸς τὴν ἀπάντω[ν γνῶσιν - - - ^{nomen} - - - Σεβῆρος]
 Ἀπόφασις ^{vv} ἐπάρχ[ου]
 Σεβῆρος (εἶπεν)· τὴν μὲν φιλοτειμ[ίαν ἀποδέχομαι]
 καὶ αὐτὸς ἦν πρὸς τοῦ[ς] θεοὺς ἐ[πεδείξατο· εἰ δέ τις]
 35 παρακεινῆσαι τι τολμ[ή]σειεν τ[ῶν καθιερωθ]έντω[ν, ἐκ]
 δικηθήσεται τῷ ταμ[ιεῖ]ω διπλῇ [ὅσ' ἂν ἦ ἡ ἀξία π]αρά τοῦ τ[οῦ]
 το τολμήσαντος ὡς [ἐφ' ἰ]εροσυλί[αι ἐπιτειμίου] γιγνομένου·
 προνοήσονται δὲ το[ῦ ὅ]λου μάλισ[τα ὅ τε ἱεροφ]άντης καὶ ὁ
 δαδούχος πρὸς τὸ [μὴ σα]λευθῆν[αί ποτε τοῦ] το τὸ κεφά
 40 λαιον μήτε τὴν ποσότητα τῶν [καθιερωμέν]ων δηναρίῳ (ἐνὶ)
 μειωθῆναι, φανεροῦ ὅ[ν]τος ὅτι μ[ηδὲν αὐτοῖ]ς ἐστὶν ἀκίν
 δυνον ἑάν τι περιίδωσ[ι]ν τούτω[ν παρακεινο]ύμενον ^{vv}

Catalogue

- Ὅσοι τὴν τειμὴν νέμονται ταύτη[ν καὶ μὴ ὄντε]ς βουλευτι
 κῆς ἀξίας ^{vv} αὐτὸς Ξενίων διπλ[ήν· ἱερ(εὺς) Δ]αφνηφ(όρου) ἀπλη(ν)
 45 ἱεροφάντης διπλῇν ἱέρεια Κα[- - - - πλῆν] ἄρχων Ε[ῖ]
 δαδούχος διπλῇν ἱέρεια Μοι[ρῶν - πλ]ῆ(ν) μολπιδ(ῶν) ἀπ[λήν]
 ἀρχιερεὺς διπλῇν καὶ ὅσοι π[αῖδες^v] ἀφ' ἐσ[τίας]
 ἐξηγητῆς διπλῇν φαιδυντῆς [- - - - -]
 ἐξηγηταὶ τρεῖς διπλᾶς· Διὸς ἱερεὺ[ς - - - - -]
 50 ἱεροκῆρυξ διπλῇν Ἰαχχαγωγὸ[ς - - - - -]
 ἐπὶ βωμῷ διπλῇν βουζύγη[ς - - - - -]
 Ἀθηναῖς ἱέρεια διπλῇν πυρφόρο[ς - - - - -]
 Δήμητρος κ(αὶ) Κόρ(ης) διπλῇν παναγῆς [- - - - -]
 ἱεροφάντιδες δύο διπλᾶς ἱερεὺς θεο[ῦ καὶ θεᾶς - - - - -]
 55 vacat ἱερεὺς Τρ[ιπολέμου - - - - -]

vacat

1900, cols. 73-86, with a photograph; P. Foucart, "Les grands mystères d'Éleusis," *Mémoires de l'Académie des Inscriptions et Belles-Lettres*, XXXVII, 1900, pp. 72-74 (text only of lines 43 ff.); *idem*, *Les Mystères d'Éleusis* (Paris, 1914), pp. 221-224 (text of lines 43 ff.); B. Laum, *Stiftungen in der griechischen und römischen Antike* (Berlin, 1914), II, No. 196 with addenda on p. 211; J. Kirchner, *I.G.*, II² (1916), 1092; O. Kern, *R.E.*, XVI (1935), 1231-1236 *s.v.* *Mysterien* (text and discussion of lines 43 ff.).

The basic edition is that of Dragoumes in 'Εφ. 'Αρχ., 1900. P. Foucart's text of lines 43 ff. is the best for that section. Laum's text is valuable chiefly for notes contributed by A. Wilhelm, but since Laum was unacquainted with Foucart's study, his text of lines 43 ff. constituted a step backwards. Also Kirchner, by following Laum, overlooked the advance made by Foucart.

The text here presented is based on a study of the photographs which Dragoumes published and which are particularly praiseworthy in that Dragoumes took the trouble of arranging fragments in their relative positions, a service which facilitates another student's control. The readings have been checked, the lacunae have been remeasured, and the blank spaces reexamined.

There are a number of minor changes suggested by a new calculation as to the length of a lacuna or by a slightly different interpretation of the extant letters. The new restorations in lines 2-3, 6-7, 30, 32, 33, 36, 37, 41 and 43, however, alter the tone or character of the documents fundamentally.

Fragment A contains part of the upper right corner of the inscription. Fragment D, as Dragoumes explained, continues the sense of the upper lines of fragment C, although Dragoumes' calculations as to the distance separating the fragments at each line seem inaccurate after examination of the photograph. The restoration can be adjusted to fit the space, as I have attempted, but the fundamental determination of the relation between fragments C and D remains valid. Thus we have a text to the right of fragment C, and we know that fragments A and C do not overlap. Similarly the determination which Dragoumes made concerning the position of fragment E opposite lines 35 ff. remains valid. Hence we know that there was no room for fragment B to the right of fragment C, and that B must have followed fragment A or overlapped with it. But Dragoumes has not restored the sense between fragments B and A in a convincing manner.

The uncertainty remains concerning the position of fragment B which I thought of placing one line lower than previous editors have and of reading at lines 12-13 *διὰ τῆς τοῦ σεμ[ν]οτάτου* | *[συνεδρίου γνώμης προ]κυρωθε*[- - -]. Since, however, the sense connection cannot be reconstructed line after line with sufficient regularity to establish the relation beyond doubt, it is safer to leave fragment B out of the reconstructed text. This unmanageable fragment reads as follows:

— —]η[— —
 — — —]εἰνω[— — —
 — —]τῆς πε[— — —
 — — γιγν]ωσκέτω[— —
 — — — —]νος τῶν — — —
 — —]ἐκ τουπει[— —
 — —]είονα τὴν τ[— —
 — —]οκυρωθε[— — —
 — — —]οσεσινω[— —
 — — —]νωσ ἐλα[— — —
 — — — ἐ]πὶ τῶν ου[— — —
 — — —]κι ὑπερο[— — —

The inscription may be divided into four parts as follows: 1) the heading in line 1; 2) the main document in lines 2-31; 3) the *apophasis* or declaration of the Roman prefect (lines 32-43); 4) the catalogue of those who in addition to the Councillors were entitled to a single or double portion (lines 43 ff.).

THE MAIN DOCUMENT

The character of the main document, if indeed lines 2-31 do contain only one document, does not emerge from the scanty remains with clarity. Although the words visible in line 2 suggest to me the *σεμνότατον συνέδριον τῶν Ἀρεοπαγαιτῶν*, the traces of lines 2-4 do not contain anything quite like the prescript of the two extant *ὑπομνηματισμοί* of the Athenian Areopagus.¹ In line 2 *ἔδοξε* (or a participial form) *τῷ σ]εμνοτάτ[ωι συν]εδρίωι* is quite possible, however, and it is also possible that in the vacant area between lines 1 and 2 a brief heading, like the phrase in line 32, replaced a prescript.

Although we cannot determine the exact character of the document, we can determine, I believe, that it is not a decree of the *σεμνότατον συνέδριον τῶν Πανελλήνων*, an assembly which, from the date of its creation in the time of Hadrian, convened

¹ For dates and references see my article "On the Athenian Decrees for Ulpius Eubiotus," *Hesperia*, XX, 1951, pp. 350-352. In both cases the decree of the Areopagus follows and rewords a decree of the Council and Demos of the Athenians. In one case (A.D. 38) the *ὑπομνηματισμός* has the prescript, *Ἐπὶ Σεκούνδου ἄρχοντος καὶ ἱερέως Δρούσου ὑπάτου, μηνὸς Βοηδρομιῶνος πέμπτη ἀπιόντος· Ἀρείος πάγος ἐν Ἐλευσίει· λόγους ἐποιήσατο Τειμ[ο]σθένης Καλλιστομάχου Ἀναφλύστιος· ἔδοξε*. In the other case (ca. A.D. 230), the minutes, of which we have two copies, introduce the *ὑπομνηματισμός* with the words *καὶ τοῦ αὐτοῦ μηνὸς εἰ, γνώμην ἀγορεύσαντος Ἀνρ* [— — — — ἐν τῷ σεμνοτάτῳ σ]υνεδρί[ω τὴν τ]ῆς βουλῆς *vacat* ἐπηρώτησεν ὁ πρόεδρος *vacat* ἔδοξεν τῇ [ἐξ Ἀρείου πάγου βουλῇ. On the Areopagus in the Roman Period see above all B. Keil, *Beiträge zur Geschichte des Areopags* (= Ber. d. Sächs. Akad. d. Wiss., Phil.-hist. Kl., LXXI, 1919, Heft 8).

in Attica.² That was the identification made by Skias, the first editor, and rather uncritically taken over by his successors.³ The whole inscription concerns affairs which are not Hellenic but Athenian, an Eleusinian endowment to be managed by the hierophant and the daduchus. The purely Athenian background is obvious also from the catalogue of lines 43 ff. Skias does not seem to have remembered the synedrion of the Areopagus, which had the real management of Athenian affairs in the Roman Period, and his only reason for identifying the main document as a decree of the Panhellenes was a supposed reference to the Panhellenes in line 6, Πα]νελ λ[ή]νων[ν. But the three letters ΑΦΙ at the end of the line suggest rather that the visits of foreign Greeks to Eleusis formed the subject. One might compare Thucydides I, 95, κατηγορεῖτο . . . ὑπὸ τῶν Ἑλλήνων τῶν ἀφικνουμένων, or, better yet, *S.I.G.*,³ 1048 (fourth century B.C.), ἡ πανήγυρις τῶν εἰσαφικνο(ν)μένων Ἑλλήνων Ἐλευσίνადε,⁴ and *S.I.G.*,³ 456, πάντων τῶν ἀφικνουμένων πρὸς ἡμᾶς Ἑλλήνων (about 240 B.C.). Line 6, accordingly, far from containing a phrase which must be connected with the Panhellenes,⁵ contains a phrase similar to those just cited.⁶ The spelling in my tentative restoration of the passage has been made to conform with the spelling ἰς in lines 16 and 26 and with spatial requirements.

The main document concerns the allocation of the surplus, mentioned in lines 25 f., which has accrued from the income of an old endowment. To judge from lines 44 f., the purpose of the endowment was to provide gifts for Athenian Councillors, i. e. for members of the βουλὴ τῶν Πεντακοσίων. An incidental reference to the original purpose of the endowment occurs also in lines 15-16, where it appears that every Councillor—there is hardly room for, and certainly no trace of, a clause calling for a selection of recipients by lot—was to receive a sum of unworn [Attic drachmae], i. e. silver denarii. On analogies in *O.G.I.* 484 and *I.G.*, IV, 1946, A 10, the word λαμπράς in lines 8 and 15 was explained by Wilhelm *apud* Laum as referring to bright coins; the distributions were not to be made in worn out coins such as circulated at a discount.

² On the Panhellenion see M. N. Tod, *J. H. S.*, XLII, 1922, pp. 167-180.

³ Dragoumes, who rejected it in his first article, eventually accepted it in *Ἐφ. Ἀρχ.*, 1900.

⁴ Another inscription of the fourth century, *I.G.*, II², 310, a *lex sacra*, is too mutilated for recovery of the sense, but it may be cited for the same compound of our verb, —[ων εἰσαφικνου- μένων —. In the second century after Christ the word occurs, among other places, in Aelius Aristides, XX, Keil, 22: συνθύσαντες καὶ συνεορτάσαντες ἑαυτοῖς τε καὶ τοῖς εἰσαφικνουμένοις.

⁵ It was still connected with the Panhellenes by P. Graindor, *Athènes sous Hadrien* (Cairo, 1934), p. 105; by M. P. Nilsson, "Die eleusinische Religion," *Die Antike*, XVIII, 1942, p. 227, and *Geschichte der griechischen Religion*, II (Munich, 1950), p. 330; by E. Ziebarth, *R.E.*, XXXVI (1949), 583, s.v. Πανέλληνες. The attribution to the Panhellenes may well explain why this inscription and the important endowment which it attests are not even mentioned by J. A. O. Larsen, "Roman Greece" in Tenney Frank's *An Economic Survey of Ancient Rome*, IV (Baltimore, 1938), or by John Day, *An Economic History of Athens under Roman Domination* (New York, 1942).

⁶ Speaking of Eleusis, Aristides, XIII, Dindorf, p. 182, recalls αἱ παρὰ τῶν Ἑλλήνων ἀπαρχαὶ δεῦρ' ἀφικνούμεναι, but in line 5 of the Eleusinian inscription the photograph seems to exclude the reading ἀ[π]αρ[χ]άς.

From line 6 one infers that the distribution was to be made at a great festival, the Mysteries rather than the Greater Eleusinia, when visitors from all over Hellas flocked to Eleusis. The Xenion mentioned in line 44 at the head of the list is not necessarily the donor; he may be the living representative of a donor already deceased.

The surplus which had accumulated year after year had been lying idle. With possible ⁷ reference to proposals by Xenion, the main document gives permission for the reinvestment of the surplus (line 11). The increased income was to be used for increasing the number of recipients by including among the beneficiaries other persons of distinction who are precisely identified in the appended list (the word *ὑποτέτακται*, as in line 18, is frequently used in inscriptions and papyri to indicate another document appended below). The individual portion was to be twelve unworn [Attic drachmae] (line 15). If the analysis here submitted is correct, the main document calls for an outlay of at least 6,500 instead of 6,000 drachmae once every year. The amount 6,000 drachmae, being exactly one talent, is surely the amount provided as the total outlay in the original plan, and this warns us against interpreting a line in Fragment B *πλ[είονα τῇν τ[εμῆν* (Dragoumes) or *π[οσότητα* (Laum) as calling for an increase also in the amount of the individual portion.

The main document goes on to specify further that if ever another surplus arises, the money may be used for the purchase of new incense burners,⁸ but the hierophant and the daduchus are to make the arrangements, for they are the *certae personae*, who through appointment in the Roman *apophysis* are to be in charge and to keep watch that no alteration occur in respect to the endowment's terms (approved once and for all) or in respect to the amounts periodically applied to a previously mentioned religious purpose (i. e., the distributions at the festival). Then the Roman official's declaration is appended to establish the authority of the hierophant and daduchus.

Surely the word paired with *σωτηρία* in line 28 is not *χρεία* (so Dragoumes, Laum

⁷ If Xenion is mentioned in line 4 as Dragoumes thought, the corporation may have consulted with Xenion, and he may have given his consent to their specific proposals, perhaps after making general proposals of his own. But I am not convinced that there is any reference in line 4.

⁸ For ancient incense burners in general see K. Wigand, "Thymiateria," *Bonner Jahrbücher*, CXXII, 1912, pp. 1-97, especially pp. 42-92 for the Greek and Roman censers. A thymiaterion of about A.D. 150 is represented in a painting published by F. E. Brown, *The Excavations at Dura-Europus, Seventh and Eighth Seasons* (Yale University Press, 1939), pp. 158-163; and bronze thymiateria are mentioned in property returns of Egyptian temples (cf. E. H. Gilliam, *Yale Classical Studies*, X, 1947, pp. 208 f., 212 f. and 223). Probably the thymiateria envisaged for the Eleusinian sanctuary would be more like those represented on the Arch of the Argentarii at Rome (under Septimius Severus) and on the Arch of Trajan at Beneventum. See M. Pallotino, *L'Arco degli Argentari* (= *I Monumenti Romani a cura del R. Istituto di Studi Romani*, II, 1946, pp. 96-98). Such incense burners of Roman date were unlike the thymiateria used at Eleusis in the sixth and fifth centuries B.C., for which K. Kourouniotes, "Θυμιατήρια ἐν Ἐλευσίνι," *Classical Studies Presented to Edward Capps on his Seventieth Birthday* (Princeton, 1936), pp. 203-216, has published examples.

and Kirchner) but ἀσφάλεια, as in Dionysius of Halicarnassus X, 2 ὑπὲρ ἀσφαλείας τε καὶ σωτηρίας τῆς πόλεως ἐσκόπουν, Aelius Aristides, XIII, Dindorf, p. 244, and S.I.G.³ 569, 581, and 742, also in an Athenian inscription of about 15 B.C. published by B. D. Meritt, *Hesperia*, XVII, 1948, p. 41. The last two words of Demosthenes' oration *On the Crown* were σωτηρίαν ἀσφαλῆ (cf. also Cassius Dio, frag. 43, 2).

In lines 30-31 Dragoumes, followed by Laum and Kirchner, restored ὅπ[ως καὶ ὕ]πὸ [τοῦ ἐπάρχου ἢ ἀπό]φ[α]σ[ι]ς ἐξηνέχθη πρὸς τὴν ἀπάντω[ν γνώσιν, whereby the conjunction ὅπως improperly was made to introduce the verb ἐξηνέχθη. The sense to be supplied after the imperatives must be "just as the prefect ordered in his declaration." The appropriateness of the verb ἐπικυρώ is attested by its use in similar situations.⁹ The phrase πρὸς τὴν ἀπάντω[ν γνώσιν corresponds to the Latin formula *ad omnium notitiam*.

The author would hazard the suggestion that the main document contains a ruling by the Areopagus. The ruling concerns a detail for which the diataxis, the deed establishing in perpetuity the use of the endowment, did not provide specifically. The Areopagus in this case sat as a court, and it is well known from *I.G.*, II², 1103 and other documents that the Areopagus handled judicial business, while supervision over religious affairs had always been a function of the Areopagus. The difference of form which the reader notices between this document and the previously known decrees of the Areopagus is due partly to the circumstance that for the two previously known decrees the Areopagus sat, not as a court, but as a council. If the Areopagus formulated both ὑπομνηματισμοί and, as we know it did in the fourth century B.C.,¹⁰ ἀποφάσεις too, it is possible that what we have is an ἀπόφασις Ἀρειοπαγιδῶν. It could, indeed, have been so labeled between lines 1 and 2.

THE PREFECT'S APOPHASIS

The commencement of the second document is plainly marked. It was not noticed by Dragoumes, Laum and Kirchner that also the end of the second document is marked with two blank spaces in line 42.


The Prefect's Declaration

Severus said: "I too approve the act of generosity which he has displayed in respect to the gods. If anyone should dare to alter any of the consecrated arrangements, property of twice the value shall be vindicated to the fiscus from the person



⁹ See for example *T.A.M.*, II, 905, V E; line 3 of the inscription published by L. Robert, *Études anatoliennes* (Paris, 1937), pp. 423 ff.; and *Forschungen in Ephesos*, II, No. 27 (= *Hesperia*, Suppl. VI [1941], No. 3), line 74.


¹⁰ See U. Kahrstedt, "Untersuchungen zu athenischen Behörden," *Klio*, XXX, 1937, pp. 10-33, especially p. 30.


who has so dared, a penalty being levied as for sacrilegium. It is especially understood that the hierophant and the daduchus shall have complete charge in order that this capital investment be never endangered and in order that the amount of the consecrated interest be never reduced by a single denarius. For it is clear that for them nothing remains safe if they overlook any alteration of the terms."

The hitherto unexplained ligature  of line 33 has been carried over into the inscription from the scribal usage of Roman governmental offices, where it meant *dixit*. Four examples ought to suffice:

1) SYRIA. P. Roussel and F. De Visscher, *Syria*, XXIII, 1942-1943, pp. 176-194 with a photograph of column II on Plate IX. The inscription (found at Dmeir) reproduces the *commentarii* in which the minutes of a trial before Caracalla at Antioch were recorded. The text consists of a heading and of a running account in Latin with phrases such as *Lollianus (dixit)* and *Antoninus Aug(ustus) (dixit)* to introduce the discussion and speeches, which are recorded in Greek in the exact words of the speakers; abbreviations although extensive are limited to the Latin framework and are perfectly clear in the context.

2) SYRIA. P. Roussel and F. De Visscher, *Syria*, XXIII, 1942-1943, pp. 194-200 with a photograph on Plate X. The inscription (found at Dmeir) records the minutes of a trial concerning xoana before a Roman judge. The speeches are in Greek and the running account in Latin. The usual forms at Dmeir (1 and 2) are  and .

3) ROME. *C.I.L.*, VI, 266 (A.D. 244). Decisions of three successive *praefecti vigilum* in a case concerning *fullones* are cited: *Florianus (dixit)*, *Modesstinus (dixit)*, *Restitutianus (dixit)*. In August 1948 H. T. Rowell kindly examined the upper part of the inscription in the Capitoline Museum. At lines 17 and 19, according to his note, the ligature appeared as  with a line sloping upward from the hasta and extending beyond the curved stroke.

4) EGYPT. P. Collart, *Les Papyrus Bouriant* (Paris, 1926), No. 20. The papyrus contains the minutes of a trial before the *juridicus* of Alexandria after A.D. 350. The speeches are recorded in Greek, but the running account is in Latin with phrases like *Gennadius (dixit)* and *Nonna (dixit)*. On page 87 Collart refers to the ligature as .

The Latin examples of statements introduced by a name and by the word *dixit* in abbreviation were drawn from *commentarii* of Roman officials. It was used also in reporting the official's final decision in the case he was judging. The usage of the Greek equivalent *εἶπεν* is no different. In the *commentarii* of *P. Lond.* 2565 recording

a trial before the prefect of Egypt *ca.* A.D. 250¹¹ the expression *εἶπ(εν)* constantly recurs, and it is always abbreviated, even when used of the prefect's announcement of his *apophasis*. In the extract which in *P. Ryl.* 75 is labeled as from the *commentarii* of the prefect Munatius Felix for A.D. 150, a decision is introduced with the words *Μουνάτιος εἶπεν*. In *B.G.U.*, 19, lines 4-5, a decision by a *iudex datus* of the year A.D. 135 is introduced by the phrase *Μένανδρος ὁ κριτὴς τοῖς διαδικαζομένοις εἶπεν*. In fact the usage of the word *εἶπεν* to express the announcement of the *apophasis* by a Roman magistrate or by a *iudex datus* is very common.¹²

Lines 33-42, accordingly, would seem to contain an extract from a prefect's *commentarii*. Comparison with the inscription at Dmeir and the naturalness of the language suggest that the *apophasis* was originally delivered in Greek¹³ just as we have it, but that the heading of the section in the *commentarii* and the running account, to which the words *Σεβήρος (εἶπεν)* belong, may have been in a much abbreviated Latin. The extract contains no description of the benefaction or its recipients, no reference to the name of the donor, to the person or persons who asked for the *apophasis*, because all this information was stated in the heading and in the record of preceding discussion. The Athenians have had only the record of his final decision reproduced from the prefect's *commentarii*; on the inscription the case to which it refers is abundantly clear from the main document. The words *Ἀπόφασις ἐπάρχ[ου ...]* in line 32 are not from the *commentarii* but constitute a heading of an ancient type in which the absence of articles provides no evidence for translation from the Latin.¹⁴

If, as at Dmeir, the running account was in Latin, the Eleusinian stonecutter or whoever prepared the copy from which he worked may have transliterated the name, where instead the reader was supposed to read in Latin *Severus (dixit)*; or the abbreviation had achieved an independent existence of its own like the abbreviation

¹¹ T. C. Skeat and E. P. Wegener, "A Trial before the Prefect of Egypt Appius Sabinus *c.* 250 A.D.," *Journal of Egyptian Archaeology*, XXI, 1935, pp. 224-247 with photograph of column II.

¹² Cf. *B.G.U.*, 114 (A.D. 117); *B.G.U.*, 1085 (middle of second century after Christ), *P. Strassb.* 22 (A.D. 207). R. Taubenschlag, *The Law of Greco-Roman Egypt in the Light of the Papyri* (New York, 1944), p. 397.

¹³ Of the prefect's *ἀπόφασις* the version published at Eleusis ought to be the authoritative text, and it flows along in a kind of legal *koine* more smoothly than would a translation from Latin. The Roman governors of Greek provinces used the Greek language in their epistles, edicts and decrees. The emperors certainly used the Greek language in their letters to Greek cities and probably in those edicts intended for *propositio* in Greek cities alone. See J. Stroux and L. Wenger, *Die Augustus-Inschrift auf dem Marktplatz von Kyrene* (= Abh. der Bayerischen Akad. der Wiss., phil.-hist. Kl., XXXIV, 2, 1928, pp. 19-25.

¹⁴ Let the reader consult the index of *S.I.G.*³ under the words *συνθήκαι* and *συμμαχία*. Examples from Athens of the Classical Period are e.g. [Χρ]υθῆκαι Ἐρμονέον καὶ Ἀθηναῖο[ν], *Hesperia*, II, 1933, p. 494: Ὁρκος ἐφήβων, M. N. Tod, *A Selection of Greek Historical Inscriptions*, II, 204. From Egypt we have Ἀπογραφὴ ἀρχώ[ων] and πρᾶξις τελῶν in the Revenue Laws of Ptolemy Philadelphus, cols. 14 and 15.

for centurion, which Greeks might read as *ἐκατοντάρχης*, or like the ubiquitous abbreviation for denarii.

It is no coincidence that the one other abbreviation in the *apophasis*, namely the numeral $\bar{\Gamma}$ at the end of line 40, has no perfect parallel in Attic inscriptions.¹⁵ An explanation that an old symbol for "one" has here been taken over from the ancient acrophonic system of numerals would not enlist the support of M. N. Tod, our chief authority on Greek numerals. It looks as if also this symbol, the well known Latin abbreviation for "one," reflects Roman secretarial usage.

In lines 33-34 Dragoumes (followed by Laum and Kirchner) restored *τὴν μὲν φιλοτειμ[ίαν καὶ τὴν εὐσέβειαν οἶδα] | καὶ αὐτὸς ἦν πρὸς τοῦ[ς] θεοῦς ἔ[χοντες διατελεῖτε]*. The first objection to the old restoration is the false concept that the document was an epistle. It is not an epistle; the use of the second person is out of place, and the word *φιλοτειμία* concerns the donor's benefaction, not the noble ambition of the corporation. In the second century after Christ the word *φιλοτιμία* was commonly employed to indicate the visible result of the attitude. In the Athenian inscription *I.G.*, II², 3592, of A.D. 168 it is used in the plural. The word indicated a public treat of any kind, achieved through a large expenditure of private means.¹⁶ The prefect's *apophasis* had to contain here a reference to the endowment for the rest of the document to have a bearing. The second objection to the old restoration is that the length exceeds the available space.

The sense of the prefect's opening words *τὴν μὲν φιλοτειμ[ίαν verb] καὶ αὐτὸς ἦν πρὸς τοῦ[ς] θεοῦς ε[verb]* may be understood by comparison with the opening words of the legate's declaration at Rhodiapolis in his letter to the Lyciarch: ¹⁷ *Ὁπρομόαν Ἀπο[λλω]νίου δις τοῦ Καλλιάρχου καὶ αὐτὸς ἀ[πο]δέχομαι ἐπὶ τῇ φιλοτειμῇ ἦν πρὸς τὸ λα[μ]πρότατον ἔθνος ὑμῶν ἐπεδείξατο*. The verb here is *ἀποδέχομαι* construed with the accusative of the person. But *ἀποδέχομαι* can be construed also with the accusative of the thing. In his discussion of the word A. Wilhelm ¹⁸ cites *I.G.*, II², 1343 (36 B.C.), *ἐφ' οἷς ἅπασιν ἡ σύνοδος ἀποδεξαμένη τὴν ἐκτένειαν καὶ φιλοτιμίαν αὐτοῦ ὁμοθυμαδὸν προεβάλετο τοὺς εἰσείσοντας αὐτοῖς τὰς καθηκούσας τιμὰς*, and a decree of Iasos in honor of Caninius ¹⁹ (approximately Hadrianic), *ἐφ' οἷς πᾶσιν ἡ βουλὴ καὶ ὁ δῆμος ἀποδεχό-*

¹⁵ See M. N. Tod's masterly article, "The Alphabetic Numeral System in Attica," *B.S.A.*, XLV, 1950, pp. 126-139, especially the comment on p. 138.

¹⁶ It might even be a gladiatorial exhibition: cf. L. Robert, *Les gladiateurs dans l'orient grec* (Paris, 1940), p. 278. For *φιλοτιμία* in the sense "endowment" cf. the Vibius Salutaris inscription, lines 311-313 and 550. On *φιλοτιμία* "the desire to make a good showing before men" in liberalities to gods and their temples see A. D. Nock, "Religious Attitudes of the Ancient Greeks," *Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society*, LXXXV, 1942, pp. 479 f.

¹⁷ *T.A.M.*, II, 905, V, E.

¹⁸ *Wiener Anzeiger*, LXV, 1922, pp. 129-136.

¹⁹ *Neue Beiträge*, IV (= *Sitzungsberichte Wien*, 179, 1917, 6te Abh.), pp. 43 ff.

μενοι αὐτοῦ τὸ περὶ τὴν πατρίδα λαμπρὸν καὶ φιλότειμον ἔκρουναν τιμηθῆναι αὐτὸν ταῖς καλλίσταις καὶ μεγίσταις τειμαῖς πάσαις.

Accordingly we restore the prefect's commendation, τὴν μὲν φιλοτειμ[ίαν ἀποδέχομαι] καὶ αὐτὸς ἦν πρὸς τοῦ[ς] θεοὺς ἐ[πεδείξατο]. A similar beginning (ἀποδεχόμεθα) occurs in the second declaration from Oxyrhynchus.²⁰ Finally the word ἀπεδεξάμην is used by the proconsul of Achaia in the letter to the Gytheates²¹ when he refers to the declaration protecting the endowment of Claudius Atticus. These parallel documents will be treated elsewhere.

In line 36 the curious verb δικηθήσεται, adopted as a reading by previous editors, left two letters unaccounted for at the end of line 35, but the verb may be restored confidently as ἐκ]δικηθήσεται on the basis of the phrase ἔχοντος τὴν περὶ τούτων ἐκδικίαν ἐπ' ἀνάν[κῃ . . . , in line 219 of the Ephesian inscription concerning the endowment of Vibius Salutaris,²² and because of the frequency of the verb in references to prosecution in the sanctions of sepulchral inscriptions of Asia Minor.²³

The word ἐξεδικήθη²⁴ occurs as the glossator's literal translation of the Latin phrase *vindicatus es* in one of the popular stories which arose probably soon after Hadrian's death and are known commonly as *Divi Hadriani Sententiae et Epistulae*. The meaning in the Eleusinian document may, I believe, be rendered into Latin as *vindicabitur*, and for the turn of the phrase one may compare Codex Iustiniani, XI, 43, 10: *proscriptionis titulo subiacebit, et fisci viribus vindicabitur*. The verb was commonly used in connection with the fiscus,²⁵ e. g. by Callistratus (*Dig.*, XLIX, 14, 3), *ut . . . fisco vindicaretur* and *fisco vindicari*. There are many parallels in the *Codex Theodosiani*. Thus we have a well known formula which makes Dragoumes' restoration διπλῇ[ν εἰσπράξαι impossible in line 36. The infinitive is out of place. The formula requires a reference to property.

In line 37 what Dragoumes restored, ὥς [ἐφ' ἰ]εροσυλί[αι τούτου] γιγνομένου, does not fill out the space or give a satisfactory sense. The missing word seems to be ἐπιτεμίου (or ἐπιτείμουν). An inscription republished by R. Herzog, *Hist. Zeitschr.*, CXXV, 1922, p. 222, contains a similar reference to a penalty for violation of *asylia* granted to Cos by the emperor ἐπιτί]μιον ἔστω τὰς ἀσε[βείας τὰς εἰς τὸν] Σεβαστόν.

²⁰ *Oxyrhynchus Papyri*, IV, 705, line 59.

²¹ *I.G.*, V (1), 1147.

²² *Forschungen in Ephesos*, II, No. 27 = *Hesperia*, Suppl. VI (1941), No. 3.

²³ H. Stemler, *Die griechischen Grabinschriften Kleinasiens* (Diss., Strassburg, 1909), pp. 67-69.

²⁴ *Corpus Glossariorum Latinorum*, III (ed. Götz), p. 32, line 11. On this collection see G. Götz, *Index Scholarum Hibernarum*. . . . (Jena, 1893), pp. iii-viii. Incidentally the phrase ἀποφάσ(ε)ι ἐπάρχων in another of these stories concerning Hadrian (*Corpus Gloss. Lat.*, III, p. 33, line 10) affords a weak parallel for line 33 of the Eleusinian inscription.

²⁵ For the character of the fiscus see most recently Hugh Last, "The Fiscus: a Note," *J. R. S.*, XXXIV, 1944, pp. 51-59, and A. H. M. Jones, "The Aerarium and the Fiscus," *J. R. S.*, XL, 1950, pp. 22-29.

Herzog restored ἐνθύμιον, but a glance through the index of *S.I.G.*³ suggests that the word is ἐπιτίμιον. With the restorations of lines 36 and 37 compare also *S.I.G.*³, 736, lines 81 f., and compare the phrase καὶ ἐπίτιμον τὸ ἴσον in the Dura parchment.²⁶ The same word is used in a law concerning the orderly conduct of the Mysteries.²⁷

According to my (new) interpretation with the *apophasis* ending in line 42, the clause of lines 41-42 must still refer to the hierophant and daduchus, whereas Dragoumes restored φανεροῦ ὃ[ν]τος ὅτι μ[ηδαμῶ]ς ἐστὶν ἀκίνδυνον, ἐάν τι περιῖδωσ[ι]ν τοῦτῳ[ν μετακείνο]ύμενον (παρακείνο]ύμενον, Laum and Kirchner) | ὅσοι τὴν τειμήν, κτλ. To this restoration I have another objection, that the word μ[ηδαμῶ]ς is at least three letters too short to fill the lacuna.

THE CATALOGUE

“Those entitled to this honor even though not of buleutic rank are:”

The demonstrative ταύτη[ν] refers the reader back to lines 16-18, where an individual portion of twelve unworn drachmae was assigned to the five hundred Councillors, with whom certain others, listed below, were to be associated. For the thought and the verb Lucian, *Deorum Concilium*, 3, διανομὰς νέμονται. The double portion had been a privilege of the Spartan kings and was familiar at all periods of Greek history as a mark of special honor.²⁸

The restorations καὶ μὴ ὄντε]ς in line 43 and ἱερ(εὺς) in line 44 are new. In line 43 Dragoumes had restored τῆς μερίδο]ς, a redundancy retained by Laum and Kirchner.

The old resolution δαφνηφ(όρος) in line 44 may be correct, but an official Bearer of the Bays is attested nowhere else. The phrase καὶ ὅσοι π[αῖδες] ἀφ' ἐσ[τίας], restored by Foucart, begins slightly to the right of the alignment of Column II and extends to the right edge of Column III: it should be treated as part of Column III. In the list of officials entitled to public maintenance (*aiseitōi*) which appeared at the end of prytany catalogues of the second century after Christ, four Eleusinian officials are recorded and recorded in the same order, hierophant, daduchus, sacred herald, altar priest. This, the official order of precedence, may be observed also at least in the most important first column of the Eleusinian catalogue. The order of arrangement then is essentially one of precedence, and as such the catalogue is of extraordinary interest. The precedence is a precedence within groups. Xenion is in a class by himself. Then comes the first group.

²⁶ Franz Cumont, *Rev. de phil.*, XLVIII, 1924, pp. 97-111 and *Fouilles de Doura-Europos* (1922-23), Paris, 1926, pp. 286-296.

²⁷ *Hesperia* X, 1941, p. 67 (Athens, first century B.C.).

²⁸ See H. C. Youtie, “The Kline of Sarapis,” *Harvard Theological Review*, XLI, 1948, pp. 9-29, especially 21-22.

The first group is:

1. Hierophant
2. Daduchus
3. High Priest of the Imperial Cult.
4. The single Exegete
- 5-7. The three Exegetes
8. Sacred Herald
9. Altar Priest.

The ancient glory, the oecumenical reputation, and the continued, nay increased popularity of the Eleusinian Mysteries, which they more particularly represented, assured the hierophant and daduchus, who were probably the most respected priests of the entire Greek world, the first position in the Eleusinian catalogue. Immediately after them comes the high priest, who, Foucart inferred, had by this time achieved a position as religious leader of the city.²⁹

Then come the exegetes, divided into two types.³⁰ They are followed by the sacred herald and the altar priest, who with the hierophant and the daduchus are the chief officials representing the sanctuary.

The second group, a solid group of priestesses in order of rank, begins in Column I and overflows into Column II:

10. Priestess of Athena
11. Priestess of Demeter and Kore
- 12-13. The two Hierophantids
14. Priestess of Ka[— —] ³¹
15. Priestess of the Fates

Athena Polias is the most important Athenian deity, the protectress of the city, and her priestess, by whom dedications on the Acropolis are often dated, outranks every other priestess. In the catalogue she follows the four great Eleusinian priests, the high priest and the exegetes. After her comes the priestess of Demeter and Kore, who had always been the foremost female official at Eleusis. In recent years two other female officials, the Hierophantid of Demeter and the Hierophantid of the Younger Goddess,³² had become very prominent,—female counterparts of the hiero-

²⁹ For the high priest see J. H. Oliver, *The Athenian Expounders of the Sacred and Ancestral Law* (Baltimore, 1950), Ch. VI.

³⁰ For the exegetes see Oliver, *ibid.*, Ch. IV and *passim*.

³¹ Dragoumes restored the name as that of Kaustis, Foucart at first as that of Kalliste. In the photograph the reading Καλ[ίστης] seems quite possible, but Kalliste used to be served by a priest, about whom see *Hesperia*, X, 1941, pp. 242-243.

³² See M. P. Nilsson, *Archiv für Religionsw.*, XXXII, 1935, p. 81.

phant and the daduchus. Though they still follow the priestess of Demeter and Kore in order of rank, they too belong to the group in Column I entitled to a double portion as a mark of special honor, a preference contrasting with the arrangement in the Theater of Dionysus, where no priestess occupies a marble chair of the first six rows.

After an interruption a new group appear:

16. Cleanser of the Statues of the Goddesses ³³
17. Priest of Zeus
18. Conductor of Iacchos
19. Buzyges

Then a group of Eleusinian dignitaries:

20. Bearer of the Fire ³⁴
21. Herald All-Hallowed
22. Priest of the God and of the Goddess ³⁵
23. Priest of Triptolemus
24. Priest of Apollo Daphnephorus
25. Archon of the Eumolpidae ³⁶

The list breaks off after one more entry:

26. Children initiated ἀφ' ἐστίας in behalf of the city. ³⁷

³³ Mentioned in a sacral inscription of about 510-480 B.C. (L. H. Jeffery, *Hesperia*, XVII, 1948, pp. 92 f.) and in a decree of ca. A.D. 220 (*I.G.*, II², 1078).

³⁴ There were two priests known as Bearers of the Fire. One, the πυρφόρος ἐξ Ἀκροπόλεως, sat in the sixth row on the left in the Theater of Dionysus (*I.G.*, II², 5046). The other appears in the early Augustan decree in honor of the daduchus Themistocles (first published by I. Chr. Threpsiades, *apud* K. Kourouniotes, *Ἑλεουσινιακά*, I [1932], pp. 223-236; a second edition by P. Roussel, *Mélanges Bidez* [1934], pp. 819-834) as ὁ πυρφόρος καὶ ἱερεὺς τῶν Χαρίτων καὶ τῆς Ἀρτέμιδος τῆς Ἐπιπυργιδίας. The incumbent was a member of the Ceryces, and his great importance is indicated by his position in the list of Ceryces who proposed the honors for the daduchus Themistocles, for he comes after the Altar Priest and before the Sacred Herald and the Herald All-Hallowed. In the Theater of Dionysus he had a front row chair (*I.G.*, II², 5050). There can be no doubt that he is the πυρφόρος remembered in Xenion's endowment. He is mentioned also by Pollux, I, 35. In *I.G.*, II², 4816 he is called πυρφόρος τοῖν θεοῖν. See also Kern, *R.E.*, XVI, 1233.

³⁵ For the God and the Goddess as Pluto and Persephone see M. Nilsson, *Archiv für Religionsw.*, XXXII, 1935, p. 81. For the view that they are pre-Hellenic deities who live on without names see O. Kern, *Die Antike*, VI, 1930, p. 310.

³⁶ The correct restoration was made by Foucart. Only one letter has been lost at the end of line 45. O. Kern offers no evidence in support of his strange assertion that Foucart's restoration is "ganz unmöglich" (*R.E.*, XVI, 1233).

³⁷ More recent discussions of the παῖς μνηθεὶς ἀφ' ἐστίας are those of P. Foucart, *Les Mystères d'Éleusis* (Paris, 1914), pp. 278-279; L. Deubner, *Attische Feste* (Berlin, 1932), p. 74; O. Kern, *R.E.* XVI, 1236; G. Méautis, *Revue des études anciennes*, XXXIX, 1937, pp. 105-107. Méautis, denying that the phrase ἀφ' ἐστίας has anything to do with the public hearth in the Prytaneum, interprets it to mean "at the commencement of the initiation ceremonies" on the analogy of the

The beneficiaries are, except for Xenion himself and the archon of the Eumolpidae and the children initiated ἀφ' ἐστίας, all of them important priests and priestesses probably with important roles during the season of the Mysteries.

It was probably the Areopagus which gave permission for entering the name or title of each beneficiary on what I have interpreted as a supplementary list of special beneficiaries, a list connected with new arrangements for utilizing an old surplus. The proposals may have originated with the hierophant and the daduchus, but the final list and particularly the order were determined—perhaps after negotiations with Xenion—by the corporation which issued the main document, a corporation which I infer to be the Areopagus. The first entry, “Xenion himself,” which can hardly be a citation from the donor’s own words, supports the theory of a supplementary list. In thus allocating the additional revenue and in selecting certain particular beneficiaries, the Areopagus was presumably acting in the spirit of the donor’s intentions.

THE DATE AND THE DONOR

Dragoumes³⁸ preferred to date the inscription to the period A.D. 138-180 but did not present his reasons. Presumably the lettering and the background of prosperity seemed to indicate that period. Dragoumes, however, presented as a second possibility the reign of Septimius Severus, whose name might, he thought, be that in line 33. Foucart,³⁹ followed by Graindor⁴⁰ and Kern,⁴¹ referred to the document as an inscription of the Severan Period. Discarding reference to the feeble argument from the name Severus but retaining the conclusion based upon it, Persson⁴² and Jacoby^{42a} refer to the document as an inscription of the third century. Laum⁴³ without explanation

proverb ἀφ' ἐστίας ἀρχεσθαι, where the phrase ἀφ' ἐστίας means “from the beginning”: the eupatrid child is initiated in behalf of all and the honor of being selected is just as great in Méautis’ interpretation as in Foucart’s. For Attic portraits of the Roman Period which appear to represent παῖδες ἀφ' ἐστίας see K. Kourouniotes, *Ἀρχ. Δελτ.*, VIII, 1925, pp. 155-162, and H. A. Thompson, *Hesperia*, XVII, 1948, p. 179.

³⁸ *Εφ. Ἀρχ.*, 1900, col. 84.

³⁹ *Les Grands Mystères d'Éleusis* (Paris, 1900), pp. 72-74, and *Les Mystères d'Éleusis* (Paris, 1914), p. 240.

⁴⁰ P. Graindor, *Musée Belge*, XVI, 1912, p. 84; *Un milliardaire antique: Hérode Atticus et sa famille* (Cairo, 1930), p. 70, note 7.

⁴¹ O. Kern, *R. E.*, XVI, 1233.

⁴² A. W. Persson, *Die Exegeten und Delphi*, p. 38 (= *Lunds Universitets Årsskrift*, N.F., Avd. 1, Bd. 14, 1918, Nr. 22).

^{42a} F. Jacoby, *Atthis* (Oxford, 1949), p. 11, A. 18, and p. 26. But on p. 399 he says “later than A.D. 131;” obviously the starting point of this more vague date, the foundation of the Panhellenion, is an inference from an erroneous restoration of line 6.

⁴³ B. Laum, *Stiftungen*, II, 18.

calls it an inscription of the second century, and Nilsson⁴⁴ (with equal reticence) an inscription of the Hadrianic Period.

The date of the inscription must be recovered from the two personal names mentioned in the document. These are that of the prefect Severus and that of Xenion. The former name is too common for preliminary identification, but even if it were uncommon, there would be no reason to connect it with the emperor Septimius Severus. Since the document is labeled ἀπόφασις ἐπάρχ[ου], the Severus from whom the instrument emanates is obviously no emperor.

Reference to Xenion, however, opens up possibilities. There were not many wealthy enough to leave so generous a donation. In view of the abundant documentation for Roman Athens, the family, if it were an Athenian family, would be conspicuous because its wealth would have compelled it to participate in various liturgies. But this is not the case. The name Xenion, so read by Dragoumes whereas Skias had rendered it Ξεν<ο>φῶν, is very rare and caused the Greek editors many doubts. No example of this name occurs in the index to the *editio maior* of *I.G.*, III, nor in the epigraphical index to the first ten volumes of *Hesperia*. Nevertheless the name does occur in one Attic inscription, which in *I.G.*, II², 3676 reads as follows:

[— — — —]
[τὸ]ν ἀφ' ἐστ[ίας]
Φλαῖ Ξενίωνα
Μαραθώνιον
τὸν κράτιστο[ν]
5 [πύκ]την ὁ φίλο[ς]

The basis for this or any text is the drawing made by Max Fränkel when he rediscovered this wandering stone at Aegina.⁴⁵ The main difference between Fränkel's text and that of Kirchner is the restoration at the beginning of line 5, where Fränkel, who bracketed dubious letters, restored [μύσ]τ[η]ν. Kirchner had no real parallel for the phrase κράτιστον πύκτην. The word κράτιστος is surely a predicate of rank which might apply to a member of the equestrian or of the senatorial order. It does not suggest an athlete. Fränkel's restoration, by which the word κράτιστος does receive recognition as a predicate of rank, is still unconvincing, for the predicate would be out of place as a modifier of a word like μύστης. However, Fränkel's drawing reveals that the stone is broken away below so that in line 5 most of the eta and the bottom of Fränkel's tau have disappeared. Fränkel (and Kirchner) overlooked that what remains of the first visible letter in line 5 could belong equally well to a zeta.⁴⁶ Further-

⁴⁴ M. P. Nilsson, *Die Antike*, XVIII, 1942, p. 228.

⁴⁵ M. Fränkel, "Epigraphisches aus Aegina," *Abhandlungen d. Preuss. Akad. d. Wiss. Berlin*, 1897, Anhang, p. 17, no. 28.

⁴⁶ In Attic inscriptions the letter zeta even in the second century after Christ was often of the

more the zeta or tau is located below but slightly to the right of the kappa in line 4, a position which indicates the loss of slightly more than three ordinary letters at the beginning of line 5. The conditions are much better satisfied by the reading [$\Phi\lambda\alpha'$] $\text{Ζηνοφίλο}[\nu]$ (or $\text{Ζηνόφιλο}[\varsigma]$), which would represent the name of Xenion's father.

Accordingly the stone records an inscription in honor of a Flavius Xenion who as a child representing the city of Athens was initiated (line 1) into the Eleusinian Mysteries. Flavius Xenion was a Roman citizen of the senatorial order; he had also Athenian citizenship with membership in the deme Marathon. His personal name and that of his father are Greek. The father's name Zenophilus is not so rare as the name Xenion, but it too is rare.

A wealthy Athenian family of Flavii from the deme Marathon is well known.⁴⁷ They were Eumolpidae; they were of equestrian rank, but the names Zenophilus and Xenion will not be found in the genealogical table. The silence of our documents is in this case more significant in view of the proud enumeration of distinguished relatives. One would expect, moreover, to find some trace of the names Zenophilus and Xenion at least in the numerous ephebic and prytany catalogues of Roman Athens, and since even here one does not find these names, the suspicion arises that Zenophilus may have been a wealthy foreigner who had received the grant of Athenian citizenship, accompanied, as often in this period, by adlection into the Eumolpidae.⁴⁸ Thus the boy could be chosen to represent the city as an Athenian from a eupatrid family. The inscription *I.G.*, II², 3686 reflects a parallel case of a child *mystes* from an alien family.

The Xenion associated with the establishment of the Eleusinian endowment and the *puer clarissimus* Flavius Xenion who was initiated as a eupatrid child representing the city of Athens were both intimately connected with the sanctuary at Eleusis, and this fact by itself certainly suggests an identification, which the rarity of the name corroborates.

A rich man named Flavius Xenion is attested outside of Attica, precisely from the Antonine Period to which Dragoumes preferred to assign the inscription at Eleusis.

A statue base at Gortyna in Crete, now available in *Inscriptiones Creticae*, IV, 300, reads as follows:

shape Γ . It will suffice to refer the reader to the photographs of three Athenian inscriptions of the period A.D. 146-168, published in *Hesperia*, XI, 1942, pp. 41, 51, and 53.

⁴⁷ *Commemorative Studies in Honor of Theodore Leslie Shear*, (= *Hesperia*, Suppl. VIII [1947]), opposite p. 248.

⁴⁸ For examples see the reference in the preceding footnote.

ON FRONT

Ἡ βουλὴ
καὶ ὁ δῆμος
τῶν Γορτυνίων
Τ. Φλα. Ξενίωνα
τὸν εὐεργέτην,
ἐπὶ πρωτοκόσ
μῳ Γαίῳ Τερρεντί
ῳ Σατορνείλῳ

ON RIGHT SIDE

Στη λογρα[φία διανομῶν]
τῶν κατὰ λε[ιφθειςῶν ἐπὶ]
κωδικίλλοις Φλ[α· Ξενίωνος]
ἡμερῶν 5^ο ἡ[vacat]

- 5 Πρὸ ἱα Καλανδ(ῶν) Μαΐων Ῥώμης γενεθλίῳ [vacat]
πρὸ ἁ Καλανδ(ῶν) Σεπτεμβρίων Κομόδου αὐ[τοκρ(άτορος) Σεβ(αστοῦ) γενεθλίῳ],
Νόναϊς Μαρτίαις κρατήσῃ Αὐτοκράτορος Ἀντ[ωνίνου θεοῦ]
Σεβ(αστοῦ) καὶ Δουκίλλης Σεβαστῆς γενεθλίῳ vacat
πρὸ ιῃ Καλανδ(ῶν) Ἰανουαρίων Δουκίου θεοῦ Σεβαστοῦ [γενεθλίῳ],
10 πρὸ ἱα Καλανδ(ῶν) Δεκεμβρίων Φλα. Ξενίωνος γεν[εθλίῳ],
Εἰδοῖς Ὀκτωβρίαις Λαμπριούς καὶ Ξενοφίλου γεν[εθλίῳ],
πρὸ ζ' Καλανδ(ῶν) Αὐγούστων Ζηνοφίλου γενεθλίῳ,
πρὸ α' Καλανδ(ῶν) Αὐγούστων Κλ. Μαρκελλείνης γε[νεθλίῳ].

Left side, missing.

The extreme rarity of the name Xenion, the gentilicium Flavius, and the wealth represented by both benefactions enable us to identify the Flavius Xenion at Eleusis with the Flavius Xenion at Gortyna.⁴⁹

The text on the right side of the base at Gortyna specifies days to be celebrated out of funds left by Xenion in his testament. They celebrate the *dies imperii* of Marcus Aurelius and the birthdays of members of the emperor's and of Xenion's own family. In line 12 the reappearance of the rare name Zenophilus, attested at Eleusis for Xenion's father, places the identification beyond doubt.

The celebrations concern eight birthdays. In order of importance the first four are those of Rome, the emperor Commodus, Lucilla and the deified Lucius Verus. Lucilla was the widow of Lucius Verus and a sister of Commodus, who shortly

⁴⁹ For the name Xenion see also *Inscriptiones Creticae*, III, p. 172, Nos. 25 and 26 (at Lebena, the port of Gortyna).

after A.D. 182 had her executed. Her downfall is the *terminus ante quem*. If, as I think, Margherita Guarducci's restoration of line 7 is correct, the *terminus post quem* is the death of Marcus Aurelius on 17 March 180; otherwise, the accession of Commodus on 27 November 176. Allowing a month for the news to reach Crete from Rome, we may say that the inscription at Gortyna and, hence, the death of Flavius Xenion are to be dated between A.D. 177 and 182.

The commemoration of the birthdays of Lucilla and even of Lucius Verus, who was now dead for many years but still unforgotten, has particular significance. The failure to mention Antoninus Pius and the long loyalty to Lucius Verus probably indicate that the career of Flavius Xenion blossomed under Lucius Verus, perhaps that Flavius Xenion stood close to the latter emperor during his sojourn in the East.

These then seem to be the main elements in the situation. Flavius Xenion, a wealthy Cretan friend of Lucius Verus, appeared as first beneficiary in a supplementary list of recipients of honorary portions, when the Areopagus decreed what to do with the surplus from the income of an old endowment established to provide distributions during the great festival at Eleusis. Among the priests and priestesses who constitute the supplementary list of recipients there are two other notations of portions for non-priests, namely the archon of the Eumolpidae and the children initiated ἀφ' ἐστίας. These circumstances can be explained by the following theory. The Cretan senator Flavius Zenophilus received Athenian citizenship and was assigned to the tribe Aeantis and to the deme Marathon. In addition, like certain other distinguished foreigners, he was adlected into the famous genos of the Eumolpidae. An even greater honor perhaps was the choice of his son as the eupatrid child to be initiated in behalf of the whole city ἀφ' ἐστίας, the eligibility being derived from the father's membership in the Eumolpidae. In appreciation of the treatment he received, Flavius Zenophilus set up an endowment in support of the great festival at Eleusis and provided in perpetuity presents for each member of the Athenian Council.

Since Flavius Xenion died between A.D. 177 and 182, the year A.D. 182 becomes a secure *terminus ante quem* for the decree of the Areopagus recorded in *I.G.*, II², 1092. The emperor's visit to Athens in A.D. 165, when Lucius Verus was initiated into the Mysteries and adlected into the Eumolpidae,⁵⁰ may have created for the Areopagus an opportunity to discuss the surplus with the senator Flavius Xenion, who appears to have been associated with Lucius Verus. Whether this is so or not, we shall not go far wrong in dating the decree of the Areopagus fairly close to A.D. 165. According to our reconstruction of the background, the original endowment and the prefect's declaration protecting it would date from the childhood of Flavius Xenion, perhaps about A.D. 135 or 140.

JAMES H. OLIVER

THE JOHNS HOPKINS UNIVERSITY

⁵⁰ *I.G.*, II², 3592.