

A DECREE OF THEMISTOKLES FROM TROIZEN¹

MARBLE stele (Fig. 1), broken at the bottom, worn on the left side, and slightly chipped on the right side, with the surface on the left severely damaged. The cymation at the top, 0.055 m. high, is broken.

Height, 0.595 m.; width, 0.34 m. at the top, 0.35 m. at line 2, 0.375 m. at the bottom; thickness, 0.065 m. at the top, 0.085 m. at the bottom.

Height of letters, 0.007 m.-0.009 m. in lines 2-3, 0.005 m.-0.007 m. in lines 4-48.

E.M. 13330.

In line 1 I restore [*θεοί*]. I thought at first that traces of the word, at least of the last three letters of it, were still visible on the photograph, and the marks which I interpreted as letters may be seen in Figure 1. But a colleague in Athens who has examined the stone reports that no traces of the word are now to be seen. I believe that, even if not read, it should be restored, and I assume that the letters were cut where the surface is lost at the left or perhaps on the moulding above the inscribed surface proper. One notes that there was ample room beneath the moulding for the inscription of this line. The letters of lines 2 and 3 are spaced farther apart than those of the rest of the inscription. From line 4 on there is a stoichedon pattern of 42 letters (*ca.* 0.0075 m. for each letter), except that lines 38-41 have 43 letter-spaces. In lines 13 and 33, also, the final *iota* is an extra stoichos. In line 16 the *IK* of *καὶ* *Ko* at the end share a single letter-space, followed by a small *omikron*. In line 44 the final *iota* occupies an extra space (probably also in line 46) and the preceding *IO* share a single space. There are faint guide lines. Occasionally the cross-bar of *alpha* was omitted or cut so lightly as to be no longer visible, e.g., the final *alphas* in lines 22 and 30.

The letter-forms are of the late fourth century B.C.: *theta*, *omikron*, and *omega*

¹ The inscription was examined by the writer in the summer of 1959, at which time it was in a collection of inscriptions and minor antiquities housed first in a *kapheneion* in the village of Troizen and later transferred to the old school house. It has now (June, 1960) been moved to the Epigraphical Museum in Athens. I make grateful acknowledgment to Professor John Papademetriou, Director of Antiquities, for his kind permission to publish the inscription, and to the Trustees of the Bollingen Foundation whose assistance made possible my trip to Greece. I have had the privilege of unstinted advice and encouragement from Spyridon Marinatos, B. D. Meritt, A. E. Raubitschek, H. T. Wade-Gery, and other members of the Institute for Advanced Study and of Princeton University, to all of whom I am most grateful. All that I print has benefited greatly from their comments and suggestions, though this does not mean that they are in agreement on all points. It is also a pleasure to thank my patient friends and colleagues of Philadelphia for much fruitful discussion. Eugene Vanderpool in Athens has helped in more ways than I can mention. I would note that, although the text presented here is as full and accurate as I have been able to make it, more can probably be won by continued work with the stone.

small; middle bar of *epsilon* slightly shorter; *phi* and *psi* slightly taller; the free ends of strokes slightly thickened. Cf. J. Kirchner, *Imagines Inscriptionum Atticarum*², Berlin, 1948, No. 62 (*I.G.*, II², 244; 337/6 B.C.) and No. 70 (*I.G.*, II², 494; 303/2 B.C.); *I.G.*, IV², 1, Tab. 6, No. 103 (Epidauros, 340-330 B.C.).

As to the provenience of the stone, it is said to have been brought into the village of Troizen (Damala) recently by Christos Phourniades of Poros from the *perivolion* of a certain Anargyros Titires near by, but is thought by the villagers to have been found by Legrand in the course of his excavations at the ruined church of Haghia Soteira. It is likely enough that it came from the church, which was the source of a number of inscriptions (*I.G.*, IV, 762, 774, 782, 784, 787, 788, 789, 791, 794, 795, 797, 820), but it seems unlikely that Legrand, who explored the vicinity of the church in 1893 and was a conscientious collector of inscriptions, found and neglected it.² Haghia Soteira was thought by Welter to be near the north side of the ancient agora where, following Pausanias' description (II, 31), he placed the stoa of the Athenian women and the precinct of Apollo Thearios,³ both of which are reasonable locations for the erection of the stone: the stoa since it contained statues of women and children who had sought refuge in Troizen in 480 B.C., and the precinct of Apollo Thearios since it is mentioned in a number of inscriptions as the place where inscriptions are to be set up.⁴ No systematic excavation of the agora area has as yet been undertaken.

[θεοί]

ἔδοξ[εν] τῇ βουλῇ καὶ τῷ δήμῳ

Θεμισ[τοκλ]ῆς Νεοκλέους Φρεάρριος εἶπεν

ΣΤΟΙΧ. 42 τῇ[μ] μὲν πό[λιν] παρακ[ατ]αθέσθαι τῇ Ἀθηναίᾳ τῇ Ἀθηναίῳ

5 μ[μεδεο]ύ[σῃ] κ[αὶ τοῖς ἄλλ]οις θεοῖς ἅ[π]ασιν φυλάττει

ν κα[ὶ] ἅμ[ύνειν τὸν βάρβ]αρ[ον] ὑπὲρ τῆς χώρας Ἀθηναίου

[ς δὲ αὐτοὺς καὶ τοὺς ξένους] τοὺς οἰκοῦντας Ἀθήνησι

[τὰ τέκ]ν[α καὶ τὰς γυναῖκας] ἐ[ἰς] Τροιζῆνα καταθέσθαι

[.....²¹.....] 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 ἀκροπόλει

[ι μένειν φυλάττοντας τὰ τῶ]ν θεῶν τοὺς δὲ ἄλλους Ἀθη

[ναίους ἅπαντας καὶ τοὺς ξέ]νους τοὺς ἡβώντας εἰσβαί

νειν ἐ[ἰς τὰς ἐτοιμασθείσας] διακοσίας ναῦς καὶ ἀμύ

² For Legrand's trial trenches at Haghia Soteira in 1893, see *B.C.H.*, XXIX, 1905, pp. 285-287.

³ See G. Welter, *Troizen und Kalaureia*, Berlin, 1941, pp. 16-19, pl. 2 (I see no justification for Welter's assertion [p. 17] that the statues in the stoa were really votive dedications to Artemis Soteira) and E. Meyer, P. W., *R.E.*, s.v. Troizen, col. 629.

⁴ Cf. *I.G.*, IV, 748, lines 13-16 (Dittenberger, *Sylloge*³, 162), and 755, lines 9-11; *Jahreshefte*, XI, 1908, p. 71, line 3, and p. 72, lines 5-6. Pausanias said it was the oldest shrine of the city and that it was founded by Pittheus (II, 31, 6).

- 15 νεο[θαι] τ[ὸμ βάρβαρον ὑπὲρ τῆς] ἐλευθερίας τῆς τε ἑαν
 τῶν [καὶ τῶν ἄλλων Ἑλλήνων] μετὰ Λακεδαιμονίων καὶ Κο
 ριν[θίων καὶ Αἰγινητῶν] καὶ τῶν ἄλλων τῶμ βουλομένων
 [ν] κοινοῦ[νῆσειν τοῦ κινδύνου] καταστήσαι δὲ καὶ τριη
 [ρ]ά[ρχους διακοσίους ἕνα ἐπὶ] τὴν ναὺν ἐκάστην τοὺς [σ]
 20 τρατη[γ]οὺ[ς καταρχομένο]υς αὐ[ρ]ιον ἡμέραι ἐκ τῶν κ[εκ]
 τημέν[ων οὐσία]ν [πατρῷ]αν Ἀθ[ή]νησι καὶ οἷς ἅμ παῖδ[ες]
 ὦσι [γ]νή[σιοι μὴ πρεσβύτερο]υς πεντήκοντα ἐτῶν κα[ὶ ἐ]
 πικλ[ηρώσαι αὐτοῖ]ς [τὰς] ν[α]ύς· ^{vv} καταλέξει δὲ καὶ ἐπ[ι]
 βάτας [εἰ]κ[οσιν ἐπὶ τὴν] ναὺν ἐκ τῶν ὑπὲρ εἴκοσιν ἔτη [γ]
 25 εγονότω[ν μέχρι τριάκ]οντα ἐτῶν καὶ τοξότας τέτταρ
 ας· δια[νέμειν δὲ καὶ τὰς ἄλλας ὑ]πηρεσίας ἐπὶ τὰς ναὺς ὅτ
 αμπερ κ[αὶ τοὺς τριηράρ]χους ἐπικληρώσιν· ἀναγράψα
 ι δὲ κα[ὶ τὰ πληρώματα τῶν] ν[εῶν] τοὺς στρατηγούς εἰς λ
 ευκώ[ματα τοὺς μὲν Ἀ]θηνα[ί]ο[υ]ς ἐκ τῶν ληξιαρχικῶν γρ
 30 αμματεῖ[ων τοὺς] δὲ ξ[έν]ους ἐκ τῶν ἀπογεγραμμένων πα
 [ρ]ά τῶι [πολε]μ[άρχ]ῳ[ι] ἀναγράφειν δὲ νέμοντας κατὰ τάξ
 εἰς [ἕσας διακοσίας π]ά[ν]τα τὸν ἀριθμὸν καὶ ἐπιγράψα
 ι [τ]ῇι [τάξει] ἐ[κ]άστη τῆς τρ[ι]ήρους τοῦνομα καὶ τοῦ τρι
 ηράρχου καὶ τ[ῆς ὑ]πηρε[σί]ας ὅπως ἂν εἰδῶσιν εἰς ὅποι
 35 αν τριήρη [ἐμ]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 ναὺς τὴμ βουλὴν
 Lines 38-41 καὶ τ[ο]ῦστρατηγού[ς θύ]σαντας ἀρεστήριον τῶι Διὶ τῶι
 have an Παγκρατεῖ κ[αὶ] τῇι Ἀθηνᾷ καὶ τῇι Νίκηι καὶ τῶι Ποσει
 extra 40 δῶνι τῶι Ἀσφα[λε]ίῳ· ^{vv} ἐπειδὴν δὲ πεπληρωμένοι ὦσιν
 stoichos αἱ νῆες τα[ῖς] μὲν ἑκατὸν αὐτῶν βοηθεῖν ἐπὶ τὸ Ἀρτεμῖς
 [ι]ον τὸ Εὐβοικὸν ταῖς δὲ ἑκατὸν αὐτῶν περὶ τὴν Σαλαμ
 ῖνα καὶ τὴν ἄλλην Ἀπτικήν ναυλοχεῖν καὶ φυλάττειν
 τὴν χώραν· ὅπως δ' ἂν καὶ ὁμονοοῦντες ἅπαντες Ἀθηναῖοι
 45 ἀμύνωνται τὸμ βάρβαρον τοὺς μὲν μεθεστηκότας τὰ [δ]
 [έκα] ἔτη ἀπιέναι εἰς Σαλαμῖνα καὶ μένειν αὐτοῦ [μέχρι]
 [ἂν ὅτου τι τῶι δήμ]ῳι δόξῃ περὶ αὐτῶν τοὺς δὲ [ἀτίμου]
 [ς - - - - -] traces [- - - - -]

TRANSLATION

The Gods.

Resolved by the Council and the People on the motion of Themistokles, son of Neokles, of the deme Phrearrhoi: to entrust the city to Athena the Mistress of Athens and to



FIG. 1. E.M. 13330.

Photograph by Alison Frantz

all the other gods to guard and defend from the Barbarian for the sake of the land. The Athenians themselves and the foreigners who live in Athens are to remove their women and children to Troizen . . . the *archegetes* of the land. . . . The old men and the movable possessions are to be removed to Salamis. The treasurers and the priestesses are to remain on the acropolis protecting the possessions of the gods.

All the other Athenians and foreigners of military age are to embark on the 200 ships that lie ready and defend against the Barbarian for the sake of their own freedom and that of the rest of the Greeks, along with the Lakedaimonians, the Corinthians, the Aiginetans, and all others who wish to share the danger.

The generals are to appoint, starting tomorrow, 200 trierarchs, one to a ship, from among those who have ancestral land in Athens and legitimate children and who are not older than fifty; to these men the ships are to be assigned by lot. They are also to enlist marines, 20 to a ship, from men between the ages of twenty and thirty, and four archers to a ship. They are also to assign the petty officers to the ships at the same time that they allot the trierarchs. The generals are also to write up the names of the crews of the ships on white boards, taking the names of the Athenians from the lexiarchic registers, the foreigners from those registered with the polemarch. They are to write up the names assigning the whole number to 200 equal divisions and to write above each division the name of the trireme and trierarch and the names of the petty officers so that each division may know on which trireme it is to embark. When all the divisions have been composed and allotted to the triremes, the Council and the generals are to complete the manning of the 200 ships, after sacrificing a placatory offering to Zeus the Almighty, Athena, Victory, and Poseidon the Securer.

When the manning of the ships has been completed, with one hundred of them they are to meet the enemy at Artemision in Euboia, and with the other hundred of them they are to lie off Salamis and the rest of Attika and keep guard over the land.

In order that all Athenians may be united in their defense against the Barbarian, those who have been sent into exile for ten years are to go to Salamis and to stay there until the People come to some decision about them, while those who have been deprived of citizen rights

We have here the text of the famous decree of Themistokles of 480 B.C. It was clearly referred to by Herodotos (VII, 144, 3): ⁵ ἔδοξέ τέ σφι μετὰ τὸ χρηστήριον βουλευομένοισι ἐπιόντα ἐπὶ τὴν Ἑλλάδα τὸν βάρβαρον δέκεσθαι τῇσι νηυσὶ πανδημεί, τῷ

⁵ See the commentary below on lines 5-6 and 17. That a formal decree was involved here was recognized by R. W. Macan, *Herodotus, the Seventh, Eighth, and Ninth Books*, London, 1908, *ad loc.*, but he did not identify it with the evacuation decree because of the early date and the failure to mention Salamis. I doubt, however, that Herodotos knew a text of the decree, and certainly not of the latter part.

θεῶ πειθομένους, ἅμα Ἑλλήνων τοῖσι βουλομένοισι; read in public by Aischines, along with the decree of Miltiades before Marathon and the Ephebic Oath (Demosthenes, XIX, 303 with scholia, and 311); quoted by Plutarch (*Themistocles*, 10, 4 [Teubner]): (Θεμιστοκλῆς) κρατήσας δὲ τῇ γνώμῃ ψήφισμα γράφει, τὴν μὲν πόλιν παρακαταθέσθαι τῇ Ἀθηνᾷ τῇ Ἀθηνῶν μεδεούσῃ, τοὺς δ' ἐν ἡλικίᾳ πάντας ἐμβαίνειν εἰς τὰς τριήρεις, παῖδας δὲ καὶ γυναῖκας καὶ ἀνδράποδα σῶζειν ἕκαστον ὡς ἂν δύνηται; quoted and paraphrased by Ailius Aristeides (XLVI, Vol. II, p. 256 Dindorf [hereafter referred to as Aristeides XLVI]; cf. scholia, Vol. III, p. 600): (Θεμιστοκλῆς) γράφει τὸ ψήφισμα τοῦτο, τὴν μὲν πόλιν παρακαταθέσθαι Ἀθηνᾷ Ἀθηνῶν μεδεούσῃ· παῖδας δὲ καὶ γυναῖκας εἰς Τροιζήνα ὑπεκθέσθαι, τοὺς δὲ πρεσβύτας εἰς Σαλαμίνα, τοὺς δ' ἄλλους ἐμβάντας εἰς τὰς τριήρεις ὑπὲρ τῆς ἐλευθερίας ἀγωνίζεσθαι, and again (XIII, Vol. I, pp. 225-226 Dindorf [hereafter referred to as Aristeides XIII]): συνειδότες ἕξωθεν οὔσαν τῇ πόλει τὴν φυλακὴν ψήφισμα ποιοῦνται, τὴν μὲν πόλιν ἐπιτρέψαι τῇ πολιούχῳ θεῶ, παῖδας δὲ καὶ γυναῖκας εἰς Τροιζήνα παρακαταθέσθαι, αὐτοὶ δὲ γυμνωθέντες τῶν περιττῶν προβαλέσθαι τὴν θάλατταν; and frequently alluded to and, as is now evident, echoed throughout ancient literature.⁶

⁶ The decree is also mentioned explicitly by Libanios, *Declamationes*, IX, 38, and clearly implied by Thucydides, I, 18, 2 (διανοηθέντες ἐκλιπεῖν τὴν πόλιν καὶ ἀνασκευασμένοι ἐς τὰς ναῦς ἐσβάντες ναυτικοὶ ἐγένοντο), and Cicero, *De Officiis*, III, 11, 48 (*statuerent*), as well as by the frequent references to Themistokles having persuaded the Athenians to leave the city: Aischines Socraticus, pp. 33-34 Krauss; Isokrates, XV, 233; Demosthenes, XVIII, 204; Cicero, *ad Atticum*, VII, 11, 3, and X, 8, 4; Nepos, *Themistocles*, 2, 7 (cf. scholia Bobiensia on Cicero, *Pro Sestio*, 141); Quintilian, IX, 2, 92; Frontinus, *Strategemata*, I, 3, 6; Plutarch, *Cimon*, 5, 2, and *Moralia*, 205 C (cf. *Pompeius*, 63, 2, and *Agesilai et Pompeii Comparatio*, 4, 2); Justin, II, 12, 13-16; St. John Chrysostom, *Homil. in S. Matth.*, 33, 4; Souda, s.v. ἀνέειλεν.

The whole operation is most commonly referred to by some form of the words of Thucydides ἐκλιπεῖν τὴν πόλιν (cf. Lysias, II, 33 and 40; Isokrates, VI, 43 and 83, XV, 233; Aischines Socraticus, pp. 33-34 Krauss; Demosthenes, VI, 11, and XVIII, 204; scholia on Demosthenes, XIX, 303; Philochoros, *Frag. Gr. Hist.*, III B, no. 328, *Frag.* 116 = Aristotle, *Frag.* 399 Rose; Pausanias, II, 31, 7; Cicero, Frontinus, Plutarch, Justin, and Souda, *loc. cit.*), but Quintilian's *nam Themistocles suassisse existimatur Atheniensibus, ut urbem apud deos deponerent, quia durum erat dicere, ut relinquerent* (IX, 2, 92) shows that the phrase did not occur in the decree and that the idea was expressed by the euphemism of the opening sentence.

Other ancient references to the decree will be cited in the commentary under the relevant lines of the inscription. See also the numerous references to the oracle of the "Wooden Walls," of Herodotos, VII, 141, 3-4, for which consult H. W. Parke and D. E. W. Wormell, *The Delphic Oracle*, Oxford, 1956, II, no. 95.

For discussion of the decree, see A. Bauer, *Themistokles*, Merseburg, 1881, pp. 130-131, who doubted that it was genuine (his claim, pp. 148-149, that Aristeides' citation derived from Plutarch is demonstrably incorrect); P. Krech, *De Crateri Ψηφισμάτων Συναγωγῇ*, Diss. Berlin, Greifswald, 1888, pp. 43-48; G. Busolt, *Gr. Geschichte*,² II, Gotha, 1895, p. 691, note 3; F. Jacoby, *Frag. Gr. Hist.*, III B, Suppl., pp. 81-82 (commenting on Kleidemos, *Frag.* 21) who believed that the passage in Herodotos required the assumption of a decree of the people but was doubtful that Themistokles was the proposer (and it must be admitted that the reference to him in our text is in fourth-

THE DATE OF THE DECREE

From lines 40-44 it is clear that the decree must have been passed before Artemision and Thermopylai, that is, well before mid-August of 480 B.C.; the arrangements described here would have taken some time to put into effect.⁷ Aristotle (*Ath. Pol.*, 22, 8) dates the recall of the ostracized to the archonship of Hypsichides, and even if our text is not that of the final amnesty decree (see the commentary on lines 44-48) it is necessarily prior to it and so again before mid-summer of 480 B.C. In Herodotos (VIII, 142, 3) the Spartans speak of the Athenians losing two harvests, which would put the beginning of their evacuation before mid-June.⁸

Themistokles' policy ever since his ship-building program was begun must always have been to emphasize a naval defense. According to Plutarch (*Themistocles*, 7, 1), even before the Tempe expedition ἐπεχείρει τοὺς πολίτας ἐμβιβάζειν εἰς τὰς τριήρεις, καὶ τὴν πόλιν ἐπειθεν ἐκλιπόντας ὡς προσωτάτῳ τῆς Ἑλλάδος ἀπαντᾶν τῷ βαρβάρῳ κατὰ θάλατταν.⁹ But since the people objected he led a large force with the Lakedaimonians to Tempe (cf. Herodotos, VII, 173; Diodoros, XI, 2, 5); this was while Xerxes was at Abydos (Herodotos, VII, 174), that is, in May.¹⁰ The Greeks returned from Thessaly to the Isthmus, where it was decided to defend Thermopylai and Artemision (Herodotos, VII, 175), a decision probably taken while Xerxes was at Doriskos on his way from Sestos to Therme (Diodoros, XI, 3, 9 and 4, 1), in June. The decision must have been reported by Themistokles and his colleagues to the Athenians and put into effect by them in this decree.¹¹ According to Plutarch

century form) and felt that the name of Nikagoras, the proposer of the Troizenian decree described after this decree in Plutarch (*Themistocles*, 10, 5) belonged to the Attic decree. Jules Labarbe, *La loi navale de Thémistocle*, Paris, 1957, pp. 135-136, has the fullest discussion; he preferred Plutarch's version to that of Aristides (*op. cit.*, pp. 135-136, note 3). Cobet, *Mnemosyne*, N.S. VI, 1878, p. 145, rightly saw that Aristides *melius quam Plutarchus verba Themistoclis nobis conservavit*. Furthermore, Aristides has all the items he quotes in the same order as in the decree, whereas Plutarch has the women and children come after the men of military age. Cicero and Nepos have different initial clauses, but thereafter their points come in the order of the decree.

⁷ On the chronology of Xerxes' march, see G. Busolt, *Jahrb. für cl. Phil.*, CXXXV, 1887, pp. 33 ff.; *idem*, *Gr. Geschichte*,² II, p. 673, note 9; J. A. R. Munro, *C.A.H.*, IV, p. 300 with note 1; Eduard Meyer, *Geschichte des Altertums*,³ IV, 1, Stuttgart, 1939, p. 352, note 1.

⁸ Noted by Munro, *J.H.S.*, XXII, 1902, p. 320, who thought the evacuation may have begun after the return from Tempe.

⁹ With προσωτάτῳ τῆς Ἑλλάδος compare the first oracle of Herodotos, VII, 140, 2: λιπὼν φεύγ' ἔσχατα γαίης | δώματα καὶ πόλιος τροχοειδέος ἄκρα κάρηνα. For the rest, cf. Herodotos' paraphrase of the decree (VII, 144, 3): τὸν βάρβαρον δέκεσθαι τῇσι νηυσὶ πανδημεί. Cf. also Labarbe, *La loi navale*, pp. 120-121.

¹⁰ Something of this early attempt to put his policy into effect may be reflected in Nepos, *Themistocles*, 3, 1, where, after having described the decree, Nepos goes on to say that this plan *pleris . . . civitatibus displicebat*, and so picked troops were sent to fight at Thermopylai with Leonidas. In any case, Nepos seems to have confused the Athenian and Hellenic deliberations.

¹¹ The decision is accurately summarized by Isokrates (IV, 90): διελόμενοι τὸν κίνδυνον, Λακεδαιμόνιοι μὲν εἰς Θερμοπύλας πρὸς τὸ πεζόν — —, οἱ δ' ἡμέτεροι πατέρες ἐπ' Ἀρτεμίσιον — —.

(*Themistocles*, 7, 2), the Athenians after Tempe were more inclined to agree with Themistokles "about the sea" and he was sent with ships to Artemision to guard the straits.

The decree must also have been subsequent to Apollo's second oracle, that of the "Wooden Walls" (Herodotos, VII, 141), on the basis of which Themistokles persuaded the Athenians to adopt a resolution which, though reported briefly, agrees with our decree (VII, 144, 3). Herodotos' chronology here is vague but some scholars had already, with good reason, put the oracle after Tempe and before Thermopylai.¹² Thus the evidence combines to show that the decree is to be dated after May and before July of 480 B.C., and most probably early in June.

The decision to evacuate Athens before Artemision and Thermopylai is at first sight surprising, since most literary sources have placed it after the battles, in fact confusing it with the proclamation (Herodotos, VIII, 41) which put these measures of the decree into full effect, and to which is due the "sauve-qui-peut" of Herodotos (*loc. cit.*) and Plutarch (*Themistocles*, 10, 4), for example,¹³ contrasting with the calm and deliberate provisions of the decree. Thucydides, in his incidental allusions to the evacuation, offers no indication of a precise date, and Lysias (II, 30), in words which recall lines 12-14 and 41-42 of this inscription, says that the Athenians took to their ships to meet the enemy at Artemision: 'Αθηναῖοι δ' οὕτω διακειμένης τῆς Ἑλλάδος αὐτοὶ μὲν εἰς τὰς ναῦς ἐμβάντες ἐπ' Ἀρτεμίσιον ἐβοήθησαν, Λακεδαιμόνιοι δὲ. . . . Thereafter only Nepos (*Themistocles*, 2, 6—3, 1) places the evacuation before Thermopylai, though he does not seem to have understood the situation.¹⁴

It is not difficult to see why the later date was preferred; it supported what may be called the Athenian myth of desertion, the view that the rest of the Greeks failed to fulfil an agreement to meet the enemy in Boiotia and so forced the Athenians to desperate measures,¹⁵ a view that modern scholars have often rejected.¹⁶ The later

¹² Cf. Amédée Hauvette, *Hérodote*, Paris, 1894, pp. 327-328; Munro, *J.H.S.*, XXII, 1902, p. 306, and *C.A.H.*, IV, p. 283; W. W. How and J. Wells, *Commentary on Herodotus*, Oxford, 1912, II, pp. 181-182. After Thermopylai: R. W. Macan, *Herodotus, the Seventh, Eighth, and Ninth Books*, II, p. 232; J. B. Bury, *Cl. Rev.*, X, 1896, p. 415. Since the oracle was probably closed during the three months of winter, the consultation will have had to be in the spring at the earliest (cf. Pierre Amandry, *La mantique apollinienne à Delphes*, Paris, 1950, p. 81).

¹³ That the proclamation must have followed upon a decree was remarked by Macan (*op. cit.*) on Herodotos, VIII, 41. Busolt, *Gr. Geschichte*², II, p. 691, note 3, observed that the proclamation referred only to the families; the men were already on shipboard.

¹⁴ See note 10, above. The scholiast on Demosthenes, XIX, 303, in codd. A, R, dates the evacuation ὅτε τὰ ἐν Σαλαμῖνι καὶ ἐπ' Ἀρτεμίσῳ, by which he probably meant no more than to date it by Xerxes' invasion.

¹⁵ Cf. Herodotos, VIII, 40; Isokrates, IV, 93 ff.; Demosthenes, LX, 10; Plutarch, *Themistocles*, 9, 3-4 (προδοσία); Aristides, XLVI, Vol. II, p. 255 Dindorf.

¹⁶ Cf. Eduard Meyer, *Geschichte des Altertums*³, IV, 1, pp. 362-363; Munro, *J.H.S.*, XXII, 1902, p. 320 (*contra*: Macan, *op. cit.*, II, pp. 244-245, requiring a late date for the evacuation decision).

date also suited writers with a conservative bias; it permitted Aristotle (*Ath. Pol.*, 23, 1) to present a picture of the generals at their wits' end and the Areopagus stepping in to provide each man of the fleet with eight drachmas.¹⁷ As the details themselves were forgotten, the later date could be accepted without qualms since only the first part of the decree, through line 18, with its patriotic appeal, seems to have been generally known. As yet I have found no quotations from the rest of the decree beginning with the practical details of mobilization; knowledge of the amnesty may have been derived rather from the final decision of the people (cf. lines 46-47) embodied in a specific amnesty decree. Indeed, the earlier date, at variance with the prevailing tradition, together with the very detailed instruction on mobilization and the role of the trierarchs as fighting captains, in contrast to their later predominantly financial functions, are guarantees of the genuineness of our text.

The earlier date obviates a number of difficulties. Bury had objected to Plutarch's statement that all men of military age were to embark, partly on the ground that the ships would already have received their crews for Artemision and could not have taken on the rest of the population.¹⁸ Macan was unable to reconcile the clear implications of the resolution in Herodotos, VII, 144, 3, with the traditional date of the evacuation. These are no longer problems. Now we can also see that the Athenians' request that the Greeks put in at Salamis on withdrawing from Artemision (Herodotos, VIII, 40, 1) is in accord with the previous decision to use Salamis as their base. Again, the allusion to Salamis (and the silence on Artemision) in the "Wooden Walls" oracle will not prevent its being genuine while dating before Thermopylai but will reflect Delphi's recognition of Themistokles' policy.

This date for the decision to evacuate Athens shows that the agreement between Athens and Sparta was early and close, and that the choice of Salamis and the Isthmus as the main line of defense had been determined well in advance.¹⁹ Furthermore, the Athenian decision to send only half their fleet to Artemision, however it may have been modified in execution, shows that Artemision was no more intended to be an all-out effort than Thermopylai; both were to be delaying operations to give time for the building of the Isthmus wall and the rallying of naval units. It does not speak well

¹⁷ The tendentious confusion here of the time of the decree and of the time of the proclamation was observed by F. Jacoby, *Frag. Gr. Hist.*, III B, Suppl. Vol. II, p. 76.

¹⁸ *Cl. Rev.*, X, 1896, pp. 415-416.

¹⁹ Cf. Munro, *C.A.H.*, IV, p. 302 (cf. p. 280): "The positions at the Isthmus and Salamis had without doubt been determined from the first discussions of the plans of campaign." On the view that the Greek policy (originating with Themistokles) was to seek a decision by sea, see also Meyer, *Geschichte des Altertums*³, IV, 1, p. 351, and, most recently, H. Bengtson, *Griechische Geschichte*, Munich, 1950, p. 156; but we now see that for this purpose the straits of Artemision were not regarded as superior to those of Salamis. Thanks to the storm off Euboia the withdrawal from Artemision was effected safely. From Thermopylai the withdrawal was almost successful; planned withdrawal has always been a most difficult operation.

for the allies' estimate of Thebes. Salamis was not a last recourse forced upon Athens by the failure at Artemision and Thermopylai but the key to Themistokles' carefully considered plan. Later in the fifth century the long walls made Athens and Peiraeus another Salamis; Periklean Athens inherited from Themistokles, along with the naval basis for her democracy, his defensive strategy, and perhaps even the concept of a hundred-ship reserve.

THE DATE OF THE INSCRIPTION

The inscription itself can be dated to the latter half of the fourth century B.C. both by the forms of the letters and by the fourth-century Attic orthography.²⁰ The brief preamble and the style throughout are consistent with an early fifth-century original,²¹ but the patronymic and demotic of the proposer are evidently fourth-century additions.²² Whatever memorials of the Persian Wars the Troizenians may have had earlier, the immediate source of our inscription was an Attic text of the fourth century rather than a transcription of a fifth-century copy by the Troizenians themselves.²³ We must therefore look for a suitable occasion in the later fourth century either for the re-erection of the decree or for its first publication in Troizen.

²⁰ The *iota* of *Τροιζήνα* in line 8, as against the spelling *Τροξ*-, occurs sporadically in the fourth century B.C. (*I.G.*, IV, 727 A, line 2, from Hermione; Dittenberger, *Sylloge*³, 169, line 29, in a personal name at Iasos), but at Troizen itself the first examples are from the Empire (*I.G.*, IV, 796, 798, 1610; cf. coins of imperial date in *British Museum Catalogue of Greek Coins: Peloponnesus*, p. 167; E. Meyer, in P.W., *R.E.*, s.v. Troizen, cites Imhoof-Blumer, *Monnaies Grecques*, Amsterdam, 1883, p. 183, no. 150, for a coin of the third century B.C. with *iota* in the legend, but I see no evidence for the date). Attic inscriptions of the fourth and third centuries use only the form without *iota* (*I.G.*, II², 46, 1273, 1569, 1673, 2796). Possibly the *iota* here is a sign of a literary source for our text, for this is the only form found in papyri and manuscripts, though all, of course, are later in date (cf. the second-century B.C. papyrus of Hypereides, *In Athenogenem*, 31-33). On the whole subject, see Meyer, *op. cit.*, cols. 618-620; on the linguistic phenomenon, see E. Schwyzler, *Griechische Grammatik*, I, Munich, 1939, p. 276.

²¹ Cf. *I.G.*, I², 1, line 1 (*S.E.G.*, X, 1): *ἔδοχσεν τῷ δέμοι*. See also commentary on *κοινωνήσκειν* in line 18, below.

²² For the absence of patronymic and demotic, cf. *I.G.*, I², 16 (ca. 450 B.C.); 24, line 2 (ca. 448 B.C.); 26, line 4 (ca. 458 B.C.); cf. *S.E.G.*, XIII, 3); 39, line 2 (446/5 B.C.; *Athenian Tribute Lists*, II, p. 70, D17); *Athenian Tribute Lists*, II, p. 50, D7 (448/7 B.C.).

²³ It is conceivable that there had been a copy of the decree set up in connection with the stoa in the agora of Troizen containing statues of women and children who had found refuge in 480 B.C. (Pausanias, II, 31, 7). In that case the inscription may have been damaged or removed in some period of anti-Athenian feeling, such as was likely when the Athenians ravaged Troizenian territory in 425 B.C. (Thucydides, IV, 45, 2). For the history of Troizen, see E. Meyer, in P.W., *R.E.*, s.v. Troizen, cols. 636-646, and the "Fasti Troezenis" in G. Welter, *Troizen und Kalaureia*, pp. 53 ff.

As to the Attic text, in favor of a literary source is the fact that the decree did eventually enter the literary tradition and that the fourth-century Attidographers Kleidemnos and Phanodemnos were both used directly or indirectly by Plutarch for his life of Themistokles (10, 6 and 13, 1).

Events after the battle of Chaironeia very probably led to such an occasion. Before or immediately after the battle Athens had sent for help to a number of cities, including Troizen; Lykourgos (*In Leocratem*, 42) mentions Andros, Keos, and Epidauros as well. Shortly before the battle an Athenian metic, Athenogenes, left Athens, took refuge in Troizen, won citizenship, and established himself as the agent of Mnesias, a pro-Macedonian Argive.²⁴ Certain Troizenians, presumably anti-Macedonian pro-Athenian democrats, were forced into exile, came to Athens, and were admitted to Athenian citizenship (Hypereides, *In Athenogenem*, 29-33). According to Hypereides, the reason for their warm reception in Athens was the memory of Troizenian kindness more than 150 years ago, that is, their welcome of the Athenian refugees in 480 B.C. That welcome was made official in a decree proposed by Nikagoras which was described by Plutarch (*Themistocles*, 10, 5) immediately after his quotation from our present text.²⁵ It was probably this decree of Nikagoras which Hypereides had read out in court to remind the Athenians of the virtues of the Troizenians and, thus, of the villany of Athenogenes, who, he claimed, was responsible for the exile of the Troizenians.²⁶

The stirring texts of an heroic past were popular at this time and their sentiments

Kleidemos wrote about the distribution of money before embarkation in a version favorable to Themistokles (see the commentary on lines 37-38, below; cf. F. Jacoby, *Atthis*, Oxford, 1949, p. 75). Phanodemos' activities as "minister of public worship and education" to Lykourgos (Jacoby, *Frag. Gr. Hist.*, III B, Suppl. Vol. I, p. 172) would indicate an interest in such texts as this. (Since, however, his *Atthis* appears to have been later than 340 B.C., it cannot have been the source of Aischines' text read out in his pre-Macedonian phase [Demosthenes, XIX, 303]). Against a literary source is the apparent absence of all but the first eighteen lines from the literary tradition, though that could be due to an early excerpting of the text. Busolt, *Gr. Geschichte*², II, p. 691, note 3, thought of an *Atthis* as Plutarch's ultimate source; Krech, *op. cit.* (cf. note 6, above), pp. 43-48, argued for Krateros; as a source Ephoros is unlikely in view of the silence of Diodoros.

²⁴ Cf. Demosthenes, XVIII, 295, where he is called Mnaseas; Theopompos, *Frag. Gr. Hist.*, II B, no. 115, *Frag.* 231; G. Colin, in the Budé edition of Hypereides, Paris, 1946, p. 194, note 1.

²⁵ καὶ γὰρ τρέφειν ἐψηφίσαντο δημοσίᾳ, δύο ὀβολοὺς ἐκάστῳ διδόντες, καὶ τῆς ὁπώρας λαμβάνειν ἐξείναι τοὺς παῖδας πανταχόθεν, ἔτι δ' ὑπὲρ αὐτῶν διδασκάλοις τελείν μισθοὺς. τὸ δὲ ψήφισμα Νικαγόρας ἔγραψεν. This decree has been suspected by Bauer and Jacoby, *loc. cit.* (cf. note 6, above) and by Busolt, *Gr. Geschichte*², II, p. 692, note 1. Krech, *op. cit.*, pp. 47-48, made the interesting suggestion that the information about the decree of Nikagoras was included in an Athenian honorific decree.

²⁶ On the identification of the decree which Hypereides had read I follow Colin, *op. cit.*, p. 215, note 3. E. Meyer, in P.W., *R.E.*, s.v. Troizen, col. 642, seems to identify the decree with one passed by the Troizenians in answer to the Athenian appeal of 338 B.C., and Szanto, *Archaeologisch-epigraphische Mitteilungen*, XX, 1897, p. 43 (whose article is altogether misconceived) thinks it impossible that it could have been the decree of Nikagoras. But, aside from the good parallels for the current use of old decrees, it is hard to understand Hypereides' words in any other way: (32) ἀπομνημονεύσαντες τὴν εὐεργεσίαν τὴν πρὸς τὸν βάρβαρον δι' ἐτῶν πλείονων [ἢ πε]ντήκοντα καὶ ἑκατόν, καὶ οἰόμενοι [δεῖν] τοὺς ἐν τοῖς κινδύνοις ὑμῖν χρησίμους [γεν]ομένους, τούτους ἀτυχοῦν[as π]ερι[σθῆναι] ὑφ' ἡμῶν. — — — (33) καὶ ταῦτα ὅτι ἀληθῆ λέ[γω, ἀνα]γνώσεται ὑμῖν — — — τὸ τῶν [Τροιζηνίω]ν ψήφισμα ὃ ἐψηφίσαντ[ο τῇ πόλει τῇ ὑμ]ετέρᾳ, δι' ὃ ὑμεῖς αὐτοὺς [ὑπεδέξασθε] καὶ πολίτας ἐποιήσασθε (the restorations are those accepted by Colin).

much in the air: Lykourgos had read out the text of the Ephebic Oath and the oath of the Greeks at Plataia (*In Leocratem*, 77 and 81) and both were inscribed on a single stone in the fourth century by the deme of Acharnai.²⁷ Aischines had read out the decree of Miltiades before Marathon, and our present decree of Themistokles, as well as the Ephebic Oath (Demosthenes, XIX, 303 and 311), probably about the time of the embassy to Megalopolis (348 B.C.) before he adopted a conciliatory policy toward Philip. Usually it was the anti-Macedonian party which sought to revive the spirit of the Persian Wars and to equate the Macedonians with the Barbarians.²⁸

It may, therefore, be suggested that the publication of the Themistokles decree was effected by the pro-Athenian anti-Macedonian exiles, themselves Athenian citizens and beneficiaries of Athenian hospitality, when they returned eventually to Troizen. The preserved proportions of the stele permit us to suppose that originally it carried one or more texts below this (it is not likely that much of the decree has been lost after the provision for the exiles), perhaps the Athenian decree granting citizenship to the exiles, or the Troizenian decree of Nikagoras of 480 B.C.²⁹

It is not clear when the exiles returned. At the time of Hypereides' speech against Athenogenes they were still in exile in Athens. The speech is usually dated shortly after 330 B.C. on the basis of the reference to Troizenian kindness during the Persian Wars "more than 150 years ago" (*In Athenogenem*, 32).³⁰ Sometime after 330 B.C., but at the latest by the autumn of 324 B.C. when Alexander's edict at Olympia required the reception of exiles, the Troizenian exiles must have returned (Diodoros, XVII, 109, 1; XVIII, 8; etc.). Demosthenes found a friendly welcome and much good will towards Athens in Troizen where he first went, on escaping from Athens early in 323 B.C. (*Epistulae*, 2, 18-19; cf. Plutarch, *Demosthenes*, 26, 3-5).³¹ While he

²⁷ Louis Robert, *Études épigraphiques et philologiques*, Paris, 1938, pp. 296-316 (see now Georges Daux, "Serments Amphictioniques et Serment de Platées," in *Studies presented to David M. Robinson*, II, edited by George E. Mylonas and Doris Raymond, St. Louis, Missouri, 1953, pp. 775-782). Cf. the late fourth-century copy of the Marathon epigrams published by Meritt in *The Aegean and the Near East; Studies presented to Hetty Goldman*, edited by Saul S. Weinberg, Locust Valley, N. Y., 1956, pp. 268-280. On the subject of patriotic texts, see Robert, *op. cit.*, p. 316.

²⁸ Cf. Demosthenes, III, 17 and 24; XIX, 311-313. See also VI, 11, and IX, 41-45, where he cites the inscription condemning Arthmios of Zelea for being a Persian agent in the fifth century.

²⁹ Compare the dimensions of the stele from Acharnai with the two oaths (note 27, above) and the Athenian law on tyranny of 337 B.C. (*Hesperia*, XXI, 1952, p. 355), allowing for the reliefs on both of them. With the Athenian decree for the Troizenians may be compared the contemporary decree for exiled Akarnanians, *I.G.*, II², 237.

³⁰ Cf. F. Blass, *Die attische Beredsamkeit*², III, 2, Leipzig, 1898, p. 85; Colin, *op. cit.*, p. 197.

³¹ The second epistle has a good chance of being genuine and there is nothing exceptionable in its historical data. Cf. Blass, *op. cit.*, III, 1, Leipzig, 1893, pp. 439-455; C. D. Adams, *Cl. Phil.*, XII, 1917, pp. 292-294; J. A. Goldstein, *The Letters of Demosthenes*, Diss. Columbia (Univ. Microfilms), 1959, pp. 123 ff., 153 ff., 344. Hagnonides, son of Nikoxenos, who was also exiled as a result of the Harpalos affair, spent his exile in the Peloponnesos (Plutarch, *Phocion*, 29, 2), and was honored by Troizen; see Werner Peek, *Ath. Mitt.*, LXVII, 1942, p. 41, on *I.G.*, II², 2796.

was there it is possible that a decree was moved in his honor, censuring Athens for condemning him and recalling her to her former ideals, on the suggestion of which Demosthenes tells us that he discreetly kept his peace.³² This too could have provided the pro-Athenians with an opportunity to publish the decree of Themistokles as an earlier champion of Greek liberty ill served by his city.

Later, in 323 B.C., the cities of the Akte joined Athens in the "Lamian" War (Diodoros, XVIII, 11, 2), which the Greeks called the "Hellenic" War, and for which the Athenians in their decree of mobilization explicitly recalled their actions in the Persian Wars.³³ The atmosphere in an allied city would again have been favorable to the publication of a decree of 480 B.C. However, once Antipater took control of the Peloponnesos after the battle of Krannon in 322 B.C. and Demosthenes had committed suicide on near-by Kalaureia (Plutarch, *Demosthenes*, 28-30, etc.), we can hardly conceive of the publication of such an inflammatory document.

In sum, after the return of the exiles sometime after 330 B.C. (at the latest by autumn of 324 B.C.) and before the summer of 322 B.C. the political situation and the sentiments of the Troizenians were most favorable to the erection of this stone. During this span of years there may have been more than one occasion suitable for such a gesture.

COMMENTARY

Lines 4-5. See Plutarch, *Themistocles*, 10, 4: τὴν μὲν πόλιν παρακαταθέσθαι τῇ Ἀθηνᾷ τῇ Ἀθηναίων μεδεούσῃ (Ἀθηναίων Reiske, Ἀθηναίων codd., Ἀθηναίων Sintenis); Aristeides XLVI: τὴν μὲν πόλιν παρακαταθέσθαι Ἀθηνᾷ Ἀθηναίων μεδεούσῃ (with τῇ twice omitted; cf. XIII and scholia, Vol. III, p. 600, no doubt derived from Aristeides' own quotation). For the verb παρακαταθέσθαι referring to the women and children, see Aristeides XIII and Souda, s.v. ἀνέλεν. For the other gods see Quintilian, IX, 2, 92: *apud deos deponerent*; Aristeides XLVI: τοῦ θαρρεῖν τοῖς θεοῖς.³⁴ See, in general, Lykourgos, *In Leocratem*, 1: εὐχομαι γὰρ τῇ Ἀθηνᾷ καὶ τοῖς ἄλλοις θεοῖς καὶ τοῖς ἥρωσι τοῖς κατὰ τὴν πόλιν καὶ τὴν χώραν ἰδρυμένοις.

³² Demosthenes, *Epistulae*, 2, 19: ἐν τε ταύτῃ τινῶν, ὡς ἐμοὶ χαριζομένων, ἐπιτιμᾶν ὑμῖν τι πειρωμένων τῇ κατ' ἐμὴ ἀγνοίᾳ, ἐγὼ πάσαν εὐφημίαν, ὥσπερ ἐμοὶ προσήκε, παρειχόμεν. ἐξ ὧν καὶ μάλιστα νομίζω πάντας ἀγασθέντας μου δημοσίᾳ τιμῆσαι.

³³ Diodoros, XVIII, 10; note especially: (3) ἐκπέμψαι δὲ καὶ πρέσβεις τοὺς ἐπελευσομένους τὰς Ἑλληνίδας πόλεις καὶ διδάξοντας ὅτι καὶ πρότερον μὲν ὁ δῆμος, τὴν Ἑλλάδα πάσαν κοινὴν εἶναι πατρίδα κρίνων τῶν Ἑλλήνων, τοὺς ἐπὶ δουλείᾳ στρατευσαμένους βαρβάρους ἡμύνατο κατὰ θάλασσαν καὶ νῦν οἴεται δεῖν ὑπὲρ τῆς κοινῆς τῶν Ἑλλήνων σωτηρίας καὶ σώμασι καὶ χρήμασι καὶ ναυσὶ προκινδυνεύειν.

³⁴ The mention of the other gods shows that the city was not committed to the power of a particular image or shrine, and so nullifies Rumpf's argument (*Jahrb.*, LI, 1936, p. 68) that the Athena here was not the Polias whose image was preserved and so evidently rescued from the acropolis but another Athena not on the acropolis. On the need to distinguish titles from particular images, see C. J. Herrington, *Athena Parthenos and Athena Polias*, Manchester, 1955, pp. 11, 14.

The form of Athena's title is of epic origin and suggests an oracular or literary source (from a hexameter, as Sintenis pointed out in his edition of Plutarch, *Themistocles*, Leipzig, 1851; from Solon's Salamis (?), cf. Frag. 2, line 7 Diehl: ἵομεν ἐς Σαλαμῖνα μαχησόμενοι περὶ νήσον). It is the most emphatically national of her epithets—others may have an Athena Polias but only Athenians have an Ἀθηνᾶ Ἀθηνῶν μεδέουσα—and it is this quality that accounts for its use here and by the Athenian cleruchy in Samos (*horoi* of her land, between 439 and 404 B.C.: *C.I.G.*, II, 2246; *S.E.G.*, I, 375 and 376 = *Ath. Mitt.*, XLIV, 1919, p. 3, nos. 1 and 2; perhaps also Paton and Hicks, *Inscriptions of Cos*, no. 148). It is used also in an Athenian decree of the early fourth century which thanks the Eteokarpathians for the gift of a cypress tree for the temple of "Athens' Athena" (Dittenberger, *Sylloge*,³ 129; *I.G.*, XII, 1, 977; Tod, *Gr. Hist. Inscr.*, II, no. 110). The title is alluded to by Aristophanes (*Equites*, 584-585): ὑπερφερούσης μεδέουσα χώρας, and (*ibid.*, 763-764): τῇ μὲν δεσποίνῃ Ἀθηναίᾳ, τῇ τῆς πόλεως μεδεύσῃ εὐχομαι, probably in reference to its application to her in times of national crisis (cf. *ibid.*, line 594: εἴπερ ποτέ, καὶ νῦν) and perhaps specifically to this decree.³⁵

Line 6. In the second space, close to the N, is a vertical hasta, and in the third space a triangular letter. In the fifth space is the right-hand tip and in the sixth space the left-hand tip of a diagonal letter (to judge by my photograph, M rather than A or Λ). In space 19 is the upper right-hand segment of, probably, a triangular letter and in space 20 the upper part of P or B.

I take the subject of the active ἀμύνειν . . . τῆς χώρας to be the same as the subject of φυλάττειν, i. e. the gods, whereas men fighting in their own behalf are the subject of the middle ἀμύνεσθαι of lines 14-15 and 45. For the sake of the land in which they are worshipped the gods are to protect the city left undefended by men. That the gods did in fact repulse the enemy is stated in Herodotos, VIII, 109, 3, and Aischylos, *Persae*, 347. Possibly, however, ἀμύνειν is parallel to παρακαταθέσθαι and the Athenians are the subject; cf. the active ἀμυνῶ δὲ καὶ ὑπὲρ ἱερῶν καὶ ὁσίων in lines 8-9 of the Ephebic Oath (see note 27, above).

Line 8. A number of illustrative passages can be cited: Aristeides XLVI: παῖδας δὲ καὶ γυναικας εἰς Τροιζῆνα ὑπεκθέσθαι (παρακαταθέσθαι in Aristeides XIII; cf. XLVI, Vol. II, p. 279, and scholia, Vol. III, p. 600); Herodotos, VIII, 41, 1: μετὰ δὲ τὴν ἄπιξιν κήρυγμα ἐποίησαντο, Ἀθηναίων τῇ τις δύναται σώζειν τέκνα τε καὶ τοὺς οἰκέτας.

³⁵ So F. von Duhn, *Ath. Mitt.*, XLVI, 1921, pp. 70-75, who regards the decree as the source of its later use by the Athenians and believes that the decree was set up after the Persian Wars near the old temple of Athena on the acropolis. The restoration of the title in *I.G.*, I², 14, line 5, is to be eliminated (cf. *Athenian Tribute Lists*, II, p. 68, D 15, line 14). For μεδέων, μεδέουσα with a place name elsewhere, cf. Dittenberger, *Sylloge*³, 210 (Apatouron, Aphrodite) and 1044, lines 7-8 (Telemessos, Apollo).

ἐνθαῦτα οἱ μὲν πλείστοι ἐς Τροίηνα ἀπέστειλαν, οἱ δὲ ἐς Αἴγιαναν, οἱ δὲ ἐς Σαλαμίνα (cf. VIII, 60: Σαλαμὶς περιγίνεται, ἐς τὴν ἡμῖν ὑπέκκειται τέκνα τε καὶ γυναῖκες); Souda, s.v. ἀνείλεν: — — — καὶ τὰ γένη Τροιζηνίοις καὶ Αἰγινήταις παρακαταθέσθαι; Plutarch, *Themistocles*, 10, 4: κυρωθέντος δὲ τοῦ ψηφίσματος οἱ πλείστοι τῶν Ἀθηναίων ὑπεξέθεντο γενεὰς (Madvig; γονεὰς codd.) καὶ γυναῖκας εἰς Τροίηνα (cf. Thucydides, I, 89, 3: ὅθεν ὑπεξέθεντο παῖδας καὶ γυναῖκας καὶ τὴν περιούσαν κατασκευήν); Cicero, *De Officiis*, III, 11, 48: *coniugibus et liberis Troezenae depositis*; Nepos, *Themistocles*, 2, 8: *omnia quae moveri poterant partim Salamina, partim Troezena deportant*; Frontinus, *Strategemata*, I, 3, 6: *auctor fuit eis liberos et coniuges in Troezena et in alias urbes amandandi*; Pomponius Mela, II, 49; *Troezenii fide societatis Atticae inlustres* (cf. Hypereides, *In Athenogenem*, 32 [quoted in note 26 above]); Pausanias, II, 31, 7: κεῖνται δὲ ἐν στοᾷ τῆς ἀγορᾶς γυναῖκες λίθου καὶ αὐταὶ καὶ οἱ παῖδες, εἰσὶ δὲ ἄς Ἀθηναῖοι Τροιζηνίοις γυναῖκας καὶ τέκνα ἔδωκαν σώζειν; Justin, II, 12, 16: *coniuges liberosque cum pretiosissimis rebus abditis insulis relictæ urbe demandant*.

It is evident that in the actual evacuation many were sent to Aigina and Salamis as well as to Troizen, and some writers speak only of Salamis: Lysias, II, 34: ὑπεκθέμενοι δὲ παῖδας καὶ γυναῖκας καὶ μητέρας εἰς Σαλαμίνα; Isokrates, IV, 96: παραλαβόντας ἅπαντα τὸν ὄχλον τὸν ἐκ τῆς πόλεως εἰς τὴν ἐχομένην νῆσον ἐξέπλευσαν; Aischines Socraticus (p. 34 Krauss): εἰς Σαλαμίνα ἔφυγον; Lykourgos, *In Leocratem*, 68: καὶ γὰρ οἱ πρόγονοί ποθ' ὑμῶν τὴν πόλιν καταλιπόντες, ὅτε πρὸς Ξέρξην ἐπολέμουν, εἰς Σαλαμίνα διέβησαν; Diodoros, XI, 13, 4 (cf. also XI, 28, 5, for 479 B.C.): τέκνα καὶ γυναῖκας τῶν τε ἄλλων χρησίμων ὅσα δυνατὸν ἦν εἰς τὰς ναῦς ἐνθέντες διεκόμισαν εἰς Σαλαμίνα. See also Philochoros in *Frag. Gr. Hist.*, III B, No. 328, *Frag.* 116; Ktesias, *ibid.*, III C, No. 688, *Frag.* 13, § 30; Plutarch, *Aristides*, 10, 7; scholion on Aristophanes, *Equites*, 1040; scholia on Demosthenes, XIX, 303. Pausanias may be right when he says that not many Athenians did in fact get to Troizen. Salamis served as civil as well as military headquarters; the Council continued to function there (cf. the incident of Lykides in 479 B.C. in Herodotos, IX, 4-5), as did the Assembly too, if one may judge by lines 46-47 of our decree. See the commentary on lines 9-10 below.

Line 9. Is the ἀρχηγέτης a god³⁶ or a hero,³⁷ and of Troizen or Attika? If a god and

³⁶ Apollo Archegetes, as a god of colonies, is relevant to neither Troizen nor Athens; but cf. Phintys (in Stobaios, *Florilegium*, LXXIV, 61 [Vol. III, p. 86]): τῷ ἀρχαγέτᾳ θεῷ τῆς πόλιος; Hesychios, s.v. ἀρχαγέται· ἥρωες ἐπώνυμοι τῶν φυλῶν, ἢ θεοὶ ἐν Ἀθήναις. The feminine ἀρχηγέτις seems to be used only of goddesses; cf. especially Athena Archegetis, e.g., in Aristophanes, *Lysistrata*, 642; Plutarch, *Alcibiades*, 2, 6; *I.G.*, II², 674 (τῆς πόλεως), 3474. It was also used most frequently of Artemis Leukophryene at Magnesia, e.g., Dittenberger, *Sylloge*³, 695, lines 18-19 (Otto Kern, *Die Inschriften von Magnesia*, No. 100): τῇ ἀρχηγέτιδι τῆς πόλεως Ἀρτέμιδι Λευκοφρυηνῇ; Kern, *op. cit.*, No. 37, line 10 (in an Attic decree): τεῖ ἀρχηγέτιδι τῆς πόλεως αὐτῶν Ἀρτέμιδι Λευκοφρυηνῇ (cf. also No. 41, line 6; No. 52, lines 11-12; etc.), which should perhaps make us wary of seeing a Troizenian figure in our decree without more exact description.

³⁷ E.g., Xenophon, *Hellenica*, VI, 3, 6, and VII, 3, 12, or simply as Archegetes, in Pausanias, X,

of Troizen, he was Poseidon and we could read, e.g., [ὡς ἰκέτας τοῦ Ποσειδῶνος]. But the further definition, "of the land," may favor a hero, and the founding hero of Troizen, as was pointed out to me by Spyridon Marinatos, was Pittheus (cf. *I.G.*, IV, 787, 798); we might then read [φυλάττοντος *vel* ἐκδεχομένου τοῦ Πιθέως]. With the latter, "receiving them (from Athena)," one could recall the notion of the gods and heroes of a land receiving an army back after they have sent it forth (Aischylos, *Agamemnon*, 516-517; Xenophon, *Cyropaedia*, I, 1, 1).³⁸ But other possibilities suggest themselves.

If the ἀρχηγέτης is Attic, we should think of Erechtheus, rather than of Poseidon or Poseidon Erechtheus, as the paredros of Athena Ἀρχηγέτις and eponym of the Erechtheidai, a name used of the Athenians as a whole (cf. *Iliad*, B 547; *Odyssey*, η 81; Herodotos, V, 82, 3, and VIII, 55 [the temple of Erechtheus, which must be the temple that contained the old statue of Athena, later replaced by the Erechtheion]; *I.G.*, II², 3474, line 1: Παλλὰς Ἐρεχθειδᾶν ἀρχαγ[έτι], the dedication of a priestess of Athena Polias).³⁹ In the classical period Erechtheus fades before Theseus and becomes only one of the ten ἀρχηγέται of the phylai, but there can be no question of his early importance. Perhaps, then, the restoration should be [ἡγησαμένου τοῦ Ἐρεχθέως], and one may bear in mind Themistokles' dramatic use of the failure of the sacred snake of the acropolis to eat the honey-cake in order to induce the Athenians to leave the city (Herodotos, VIII, 41, 3: τῆς θεοῦ ἀπολελοιπυίης τὴν ἀκρόπολιν; Plutarch, *Themistocles*, 10, 2: ἡ θεὸς ὑφηγουμένη πρὸς τὴν θάλασσαν αὐτοῖς). In favor of Theseus, however, is his connection with Troizen, and one might restore, e.g., [συμπέμποντος τοῦ Θησέως].

Lines 9-10. Aristeides XLVI has the phrase τοὺς δὲ πρεσβύτας εἰς Σαλαμῖνα, and the scholion (Vol. III, p. 600) reads αὐτοὺς δὲ ἐξελεῖν εἰς Σαλαμῖνα; see the commentary on

4, 10, and Dittenberger, *Sylloge*³, 1024, line 40 (Mykonos). Beside the Attic archegetai from whom the heroes of the ten phylai were chosen (Aristotle, *Ath. Pol.*, 21, 6; cf. Hesychios, *s.v.* ἀρχηγέται) we hear of a ἥρωα ἀρχηγέτης at Rhamnous (*S.E.G.*, XIII, 26; *I.G.*, II², 2849), and an Archegetes alone (?) is mentioned in the *fasti* from Marathon (*I.G.*, I², 190, line 24). The Archegetes in a group of Eleusinian figures in the *Fasti* of Nikomachos is identified with Iacchos by James Oliver in *Hesperia*, IV, 1935, p. 21, line 67, and p. 27.

³⁸ It is possible that Πιθέως could be spelled Πιθέως, for there is evidence of fluctuation in the spelling of words from this stem (see Felix Solmsen, *Rh. Mus.*, LIII, 1898, pp. 138-143; E. Meyer, in P.W., *R.E.*, *s.v.* Troizen, col. 638). Perhaps, then, the restoration could be [ὑποδεχομένου τοῦ Πιθέως]; the verb ὑποδέχεσθαι was used of the Troizenian welcome for the Athenians in 480 by Plutarch (*Themistocles*, 10, 5) and of the Athenian welcome of the Troizenians after 338 B.C. by Hypereides (*In Athenogenem*, 32).

³⁹ For possible traces of the title ἀρχηγέτης used of a hero of the whole land of Attika, see the oracle in Demosthenes, XLIII, 66 (Parke and Wormell, *The Delphic Oracle*, II, no. 283; cf. Demosthenes, XXI, 52 = Parke and Wormell, *op. cit.*, no. 282), the archegetes in *I.G.*, I², 190, line 24, if he is not Marathonian (cf. Zeus Tropaios in line 9), and *I.G.*, I², 38 (where the context is lost).

line 8 for the city as a whole moving to Salamis. The *πρεσβύται* were the men over fifty (not *ἡβώντες*; cf. lines 13 and 22), the *πρεσβυτάτους* of Thucydides, II, 13, 7 (cf. Lykourgos, *In Leocratem*, 39). With them were probably included those unfit for front-line service (cf. A. W. Gomme, *The Population of Athens*, Oxford, 1933, pp. 3 ff.; *J.H.S.*, LXXIX, 1959, pp. 61-68), all of whom were capable of home-guard duty in times of emergency. From among these men and disembarked marines (see the comment on lines 23-26, below) Aristеides must have found his hoplites for the attack on Psyttaieia (Herodotos, VIII, 95: *παραλαβὼν πολλοὺς τῶν ὀπλιτέων οἱ παρετετάχατο παρὰ τὴν ἀκτὴν τῆς Σαλαμίνης χώρας, γένος ἔοντες Ἀθηναῖοι*; Plutarch, *Aristides*, 9, 1: *τοὺς προθυμοτάτους καὶ μαχιμωτάτους τῶν πολιτῶν*). Aristеides (XIII, Vol. I, pp. 229-230 Dindorf) says explicitly that they were *πρεσβύται* but that is probably a surmise from his excerpt of the decree.

For *κτήματα* see Herodotos, VIII, 41, 1: *τέκνα τε καὶ τοὺς οἰκέτας*; Thucydides, I, 89, 3: *ὅθεν ὑπεξέθεντο παῖδας καὶ γυναῖκας καὶ τὴν περιούσαν κατασκευὴν*; Plutarch, *Themistocles*, 10, 4: *παῖδας δὲ καὶ γυναῖκας καὶ ἀνδράποδα σῶζειν ἕκαστον ὡς ἂν δύνηται*; Diodoros, XI, 13, 4: *τέκνα καὶ γυναῖκας τῶν τε ἄλλων χρησίμων ὅσα δυνατὸν ἦν εἰς τὰς ναὺς ἐνθέντες διεκόμισαν εἰς Σαλαμῖνα*; Nepos, *Themistocles*, 2, 8: *omnia quae moveri poterant*; Justin, II, 12, 17: *coniuges liberosque cum pretiosissimis rebus*. See also (for 431 B.C.) Thucydides II, 14: *ἐσεκομίζοντο ἐκ τῶν ἀγρῶν παῖδας καὶ γυναῖκας καὶ τὴν ἄλλην κατασκευὴν ἧ κατ' οἶκον ἐχρῶντο, καὶ αὐτῶν τῶν οἰκιῶν καθαιροῦντες τὴν ξύλῳσιν· πρόβατα δὲ καὶ ὑποζύγια ἐς τὴν Εὐβοίαν διεπέμψαντο καὶ ἐς τὰς νήσους τὰς ἐπικειμένας*. In the fourth century *I.G.*, II², 410 (Dittenberger, *Sylloge*³, 289), lines 15-16, may be cited for sacrifices made for the health and safety of the Council and Demos of the Athenians *καὶ παίδων καὶ γυναικῶν καὶ τῶν ἄλλων κτημάτων*.

Lines 11-12. Herodotos (VIII, 51, 2) tells of those whom the Persians found on the acropolis: *καὶ αἰρέουσι ἔρημον τὸ ἄστυ, καὶ τινὰς ὀλίγους εὐρίσκουσι τῶν Ἀθηναίων ἐν τῷ ἱρῷ ἔοντας, ταμίας τε τοῦ ἱεροῦ καὶ πένητας ἀνθρώπους, οἱ φραξάμενοι τὴν ἀκρόπολιν θύρησί τε καὶ ξύλοισι ἡμύνοντο τοὺς ἐπιόντας, ἅμα μὲν ὑπ' ἀσθενείης βίον οὐκ ἐκχωρήσαντες ἐς Σαλαμῖνα, πρὸς δὲ καὶ αὐτοὶ δοκέοντες ἐξευρηκέναι τὸ μαντήιον τὸ ἢ Πυθίῃ σφι ἔχρησε, τὸ ξύλινον τέχος ἀνάλωτον ἔσεσθαι· αὐτὸ δὲ τοῦτο εἶναι τὸ κρησφύγετον κατὰ τὸ μαντήιον καὶ οὐ τὰς νέας*. All were killed (Herodotos, VIII, 53, 2), though Ktesias says (*Frag. Gr. Hist.*, III C, No. 688, *Frag.* 13, § 30): *ἐν αὐτῇ (τῇ ἀκροπόλει) γὰρ ἔτι τινὲς ὑπολειφθέντες ἐμάχοντο. τέλος κακείνων νυκτὶ φυγόντων, κακείνην συνέφλεξαν*. Only Nepos (*Themistocles*, 2, 8) seems close to the sense of the decree: *arcem sacerdotibus paucisque maioribus natu ac sacra procuranda tradunt reliquum oppidum relinquunt* (cf. scholia Bobiensia on Cicero, *Pro Sestio*, 141: *maiores natu in arce relinquerentur*; on the sense of *sacra procuranda* cf. Cicero, *In Verrem*, II, 5, 36: *mihi sacrarum sedium procuracionem, mihi totam urbem tuendam esse commissam*; and for the

maiores natu cf. also Herodotos, VII, 142, 1, for some of the older men who disagreed with Themistokles' interpretation of the oracle).⁴⁰

For treasurers and priestesses on the acropolis in 485/4 B.C. see *I.G.*, I², 4. The "possessions of the gods" probably included money, dedications, and buildings. That the proper discharge of this duty involved the removal of some objects is not excluded by the language. In the event, it seems that the treasurers stayed with the less movable and less holy offerings, while the priestesses fled with the sacred objects (see the discussion of the sacrifice in the commentary on lines 38-40 below). On the whole the measure may be seen as a concession on the part of Themistokles to those who put their trust in the acropolis.

Lines 12-14. There are many references to the manning of the triremes: Aristeides XLVI: τοὺς δ' ἄλλους ἐμβάντας εἰς τὰς τριήρεις; Plutarch, *Themistocles*, 10, 4: τοὺς δ' ἐν ἡλικίᾳ πάντας ἐμβαίνειν εἰς τὰς τριήρεις; Herodotos, VII, 144, 3: τὸν βάρβαρον δέκεσθαι τῇσι νηυσὶ πανδημεῖ; Thucydides, I, 73, 4: ἐσβάντες ἐς τὰς ναὺς πανδημεῖ ἐν Σαλαμῖνι ξυνναυμαχήσαι. On ἐσβάντες ἐς τὰς ναὺς at Thucydides, I, 74, 2, Arnold Gomme remarks (*Commentary on Thucydides*, I, p. 235) that "it became a very trite phrase on Athenian lips . . . it marks the turning-point in Athenian history." The phrase recurs in one form or another in most of the references to the evacuation and Salamis (cf. Lysias, II, 30 [before Artemision]; Demosthenes, XVIII, 204; Cicero, *De Officiis*, III, 11, 48; Justin, II, 12, 17). One should also note Xenophon's account of the muster before Arginousai (*Hellenica*, I, 6, 24): ἐψηφίσαντο βοηθεῖν ναυσὶν ἑκατὸν καὶ δέκα εἰσβιβάζοντες τοὺς ἐν ἡλικίᾳ ὄντας ἅπαντας καὶ δούλους καὶ ἐλευθέρους.

The service of metics at Plataia (and also at Salamis?) seems to be mentioned by Hypereides, *In Athenogenem*, 30 (cf. the note in Colin's edition, Paris, 1946, *ad loc.*). In general, reference may be made to Thucydides: (I, 143, 1) ἐσβάντων αὐτῶν τε καὶ μετοίκων; (III, 16, 1) ἐσβάντες αὐτοὶ τε . . . καὶ οἱ μέτοικοι [428 B.C.]; (IV, 90, 1) ἀναστῆσας Ἀθηναίους πανδημεῖ, αὐτοὺς καὶ τοὺς μετοίκους καὶ ξένων ὅσοι παρήσαν [in preparation for Delion].

No exception is made for hoplites or cavalry (cf. Plutarch, *Cimon*, 5, 2-3, though Kimon and his friends seem to have expected hoplite service on shipboard). Many knights served at Arginousai (Xenophon, *Hellenica*, I, 6, 24). For hoplites as rowers, see Gomme's note on Thucydides, III, 16, 1 (*Commentary on Thucydides*, II, p. 271); and for Themistokles' policy for hoplites, see Gomme's note (*op. cit.*, I, pp. 266-267) on Thucydides, I, 93, 6.

⁴⁰ A passage in Plutarch's *Themistocles* (10, 9: καίτοι πολλοὶ [πολὸν Fuhr] μὲν οἱ διὰ γῆρας ὑπολειπόμενοι τῶν πολιτῶν ἔλεον εἶχον) might suggest that men over military age were simply left behind, but Plutarch does not distinguish between the manning of the ships for Artemision and the final evacuation.

Line 14. According to Herodotos (VIII, 61, 2) Themistokles, in the debate at Salamis, based a telling argument on the 200 ships: *ἐωυτοῖσι τε ἐδήλου λόγῳ ὡς εἴη πόλις καὶ γῇ μέζων ἢ περ ἐκείνοισι, ἔστ' ἂν διηκόσiai νέες σφι ἔωσι πεπληρωμένοι* (the number was set at 180 in the enumeration at VIII, 44, 1, after the fighting at Artemision). Plutarch (*Themistocles*, 11, 5), with reference to the same debate, has also preserved mention of the 200 ships: *αἱ διακόσiai τριήρεις αἱ νῦν μὲν ὑμῖν παρεστᾶσι βοηθοὶ σφύζεσθαι δι' αὐτῶν βουλομένοις*. See Demosthenes, XIV, 29, and XVIII, 238; Justin, II, 12, 12 (for the ships built on Themistokles' advice).

Lines 15-16. The fight for freedom is mentioned by a number of writers: Aristeides XLVI: *ὑπὲρ τῆς ἐλευθερίας ἀγωνίζεσθαι* (cf. XIII: *ὑπὲρ τῆς τῶν ἄλλων σωτηρίας*; XXXII, Vol. I, p. 607: *ὑπὲρ τῆς τῶν Ἑλλήνων ἐλευθερίας*); Cicero, *De Officiis*, III, 11, 48: *libertatemque Graeciae classe defenderent*; Isokrates, VI, 83: *ὑπὲρ τῆς τῶν ἄλλων ἐλευθερίας*. See also Demosthenes, XVIII, 204, 208, 238, and Lykourgos, *In Leocratem*, 42, 70 (and for Chaironeia, *ibid.*, 47, 48, 50). Diodoros (XI, 3, 3) reports the decision of the allies at the Isthmus: *ἐκπέμψαι πρέσβεις τοὺς παρακαλέσοντας συναγωνίζεσθαι περὶ τῆς κοινῆς ἐλευθερίας*. Compare the decree for the Lamian War as given by Diodoros (XVIII, 10, 3, quoted in note 33, above).

Line 17. On the reconciliation of the Aiginetans and the Athenians, see Herodotos, VII, 145, 1. See also Plutarch, *Themistocles*, 6, 5; Souda, *s.v.* ἀνείλεν.

Lines 17-18. This passage appears in Herodotos' account of the decree (VII, 144, 3): *ἄμα Ἑλλήνων τοῖσι βουλομένοισι* (cf. VII, 178, 2 [the oracle of the winds]: *πρῶτα μὲν Ἑλλήνων τοῖσι βουλομένοισι εἶναι ἐλευθέροισι ἐξήγγειλαν τὰ χρησθέντα αὐτοῖσι*). See also Plutarch, *Themistocles*, 11, 5, as quoted in the commentary on line 14, above.

Line 18. The closest parallel to our passage on "sharing the danger" is found in Isokrates, VI, 43: *ἐκλιπόντες δὲ τὴν χώραν καὶ πατρίδα μὲν τὴν ἐλευθερίαν νομίσαντες κοινωνήσαντες δὲ τῶν κινδύνων ἡμῖν*. But see also Andokides, I, 107; Isokrates, IV, 90 and 97. On the future infinitive with verbs of wishing, a favorite usage with Thucydides, see W. W. Goodwin, *Syntax of the Moods and Tenses of the Greek Verb*, Boston, 1890, p. 36.

Lines 18-19. The generals continued to appoint the trierarchs (Aristophanes, *Equites*, 912-918; Demosthenes, XXXV, 48, and XXXIX, 8; Aristotle, *Ath. Pol.*, 61, 1).

Lines 20-22. Deinarchos, *In Demosthenem*, 71, gives the qualifications for general and speaker in the assembly: *τοὺς μὲν νόμους προλέγειν . . . παιδοποιεῖσθαι κατὰ τοὺς νόμους, γῆν ἐντὸς ὅρων κεκτῆσθαι, πάσας τὰς δικαίας πίστει παρακαταθέμενον, οὕτως ἀξιῶν προεστάναι τοῦ δήμου· σὲ δὲ τὴν μὲν πατρώαν γῆν πεπρακέναι — —*. In his account

of the “Drakonian” constitution, Aristotle (*Ath. Pol.*, 4, 2) names the qualifications for generals and hipparchs: property of a value of not less than 100 minas, καὶ παῖδας ἐκ γαμετῆς γυναικὸς γνησίους ὑπὲρ δέκα ἔτη γεγονότας. Herodotos (VII, 205, 1) says of Leonidas at Thermopylai ἐπιλεξάμενος ἄνδρας τε τοὺς κατεστεωτάς τριηκοσίους καὶ τοῖσι ἐτύγχανον παῖδες ἔόντες, which commentators (e.g., Stein, How and Wells) generally explain as showing a desire that families should not become extinct. However, our decree and the funeral oration of Perikles (Thuc., II, 44, 3: οὐ γὰρ οἶόν τε ἴσον τι ἢ δίκαιον βουλευέσθαι οἷ ἂν μὴ καὶ παῖδας ἐκ τοῦ ὁμοίου παραβαλλόμενοι κινδυνεύουσιν) show a feeling that positions of great responsibility should go to those with the greater stake in the future of the city. Compare the reproach of childlessness made against Epaminondas (Nepos, *Epaminondas*, 5, 5).

Lines 23-26. Plutarch (*Themistocles*, 14, 2) gives the number of marines and archers on each ship at the battle of Salamis: τῶν δ' Ἀπτικῶν (νεῶν) ἑκατὸν ὀγδοήκοντα τὸ πλῆθος οὐσῶν ἐκάστη τοὺς ἀπὸ καταστρώματος μαχομένους ὀκτωκαίδεκα εἶχεν, ὧν τοξόται τέσσαρες ἦσαν, οἱ λοιποὶ δ' ὀπλῖται. The number of ships was not taken from this decree, but from an actual account of the battle (cf. Herodotos, VIII, 44, 1). The number of archers is the same, but the initial figure (as planned) for marines was evidently reduced by six per ship after experience at Artemision. Ten was the standard number in the later fifth century (e.g., Thucydides, III, 95, 2), but before the development of naval tactics the number was higher (cf. Thucydides I, 49, 1, and Gomme's note [*Commentary on Thucydides*, I, p. 122] on Thucydides, I, 13, 2).

In the phrase [εἴ]κ[οσιν ἐπὶ τὴν] γαῖν the article is anaphoric, referring back to ναῦν in line 19, and the restoration is preferable to [δέ]κ[α ἐφ' ἐκάστην] γαῖν because of the consistent use of the article with ἕκαστος and its noun in this decree (lines 19, 33, 35). Epigraphically, ἕκαστος with the noun alone begins to be found in the late fourth century (cf. Meisterhans-Schwyzler, *Grammatik der attischen Inschriften*,³ Berlin, 1900, p. 232). Earlier exceptional omissions of the article occur in expressions of time, e.g., *ἑκάστο με[νός]* in *I.G.*, I², 6, line 125 (but note *τὸ μύστο ἑκάστο*, etc., consistently in the same text), and *ἐκάστου ἔτους* in the *lex sacra* in Xenophon, *Anabasis*, V, 3, 12.

Line 25. The archers were Athenians, not Cretan mercenaries; cf. *I.G.*, I², 79, line 3, and Gomme's note (*op. cit.*, II, p. 41) on Thucydides, II, 13, 8.

Line 26. The staff of ship's officers, or rather, in rank, the petty officers, are the ὑπηρεσία (cf. line 34). In *I.G.*, II², 1951 (*S.E.G.*, X, 356, probably of 406 B.C.) after τριήραρχοι and ἐπιβάται the third category without rubric included κυβερνήτης, κελευστής, πεντηκόνταρχος, αὐλητής, ναυπηγός, and πρωιράτης. In [Xenophon], *Ath. Pol.*, 1, 2, ἄλλη ὑπηρεσία is opposed to the κυβερνήτης and in Lysias, XXI, 10, to the

πλήρωμα. In Thucydides, I, 143, 1, the κυβερνήται are separate from the ἄλλη ὑπηρεσία; in *I.G.*, I², 98, line 22 (Tod, *Gr. Hist. Inscr.*, I², no. 77) the κυβερνήται on the one hand and the ναῦται on the other are opposed to the ἄλλη ὑπηρεσία. See U. Koehler, *Ath. Mitt.*, VIII, 1883, p. 179; G. Busolt, *Gr. Staatskunde*, I, Munich, 1920, pp. 574-575.

Lines 29-30. Hitherto the earliest reference to the ληξιαρχικὰ γραμματεῖα has been *I.G.*, I², 79, line 6. For the polemarch's responsibility for the metics, see Aristotle, *Ath. Pol.*, 58, 2-3. This would seem to have its origin in their military service.

Lines 31-32. For τάξις of a contingent forming a ship's crew, see Aischylos, *Persae*, 381-382: τάξις δὲ τάξιν παρεκάλει νεῶς μακρᾶς, πλέουσι δ' ὡς ἕκαστος ἦν τεταγμένος.⁴¹

Lines 32-35. The lists in *I.G.*, II², 1951 (*S.E.G.*, X, 356) give a good idea of the lists on the whitened tablets (without the ships' names), since they are probably copies of the full complements of ships that went down with almost complete loss in 406 B.C. (cf. Xenophon, *Hellenica*, I, 6, 34; A. Körte, *Phil. Woch.*, LII, 1932, nos. 35/38, cols. 83-88).

Line 33. For ships' names, see *I.G.*, II², 1604*, and the other naval inscriptions that follow in *I.G.*, II²; F. Miltner in P.W., *R.E.*, s.v. Seewesen (Suppl. V, 1931), cols. 947-952; L. Robert, *Collection Froehner*, I, *Inscriptions Grecques*, Paris, 1936, p. 2, with note 1; Kurt Schmidt, *Die Namen der attischen Kriegsschiffe*, Diss. Leipzig, 1931.

Lines 37-38. The verb πληροῦν refers not only to providing the ships with their complements (πληρώματα) but to the whole process of getting ships and crews ready for duty at sea. See Xenophon, *Hellenica*, I, 6, 24: πληρώσαντες τὰς δέκα καὶ ἑκατὸν ἐν τριάκοντα ἡμέραις ἀπῆραν, and also VI, 2, 12 and 14 (on Timotheos' difficulties). Later we know that the Council had general responsibility for naval matters and supervised the manning and despatch of ships.⁴² The general who had charge of the fleet once it had sailed was charged with the duties inherent in the meaning of πληροῦν (see the passages from Book VI of Xenophon's *Hellenica* to which reference has just

⁴¹ The scholiast on Aristophanes, *Ranae*, 1074, speaks of the three ranks of rowers on a trireme as τάξεις (cf. W. W. Tarn, *J.H.S.*, XXV, 1905, p. 142, note 14), but these would have no effect on the problem of assigning the population to the 200 ships.

⁴² See *I.G.*, I², 105, lines 16-18 (Tod, *Gr. Hist. Inscr.*², I, no. 91; cf. B. D. Meritt, in *Classical Studies presented to Edward Capps*, Princeton, 1936, pp. 249-250): [- - τὴν βολὴν ἐπιμ.] ἐλ[ε]θῆναι λόπος [ἀν σταλῶσιν ἡος τάχισ]τα Ἀθήναζε καὶ π[ε]ροθῶσι - - -]; *I.G.*, II², 1629, lines 242-271 (Tod, *Gr. Hist. Inscr.*, II, no. 200; Dittenberger, *Sylloge*³, 305). The Council, together with the demarchs, prepared the κατάλογοι of crews and the despatch of ships in a decree paraphrased in Demosthenes, I, 6. See also Busolt-Swoboda, *Griechische Staatskunde*, II, Munich, 1926, pp. 890, 1032, 1049-1050.

been made). This responsibility was also financial, and here we must suppose that the generals and Council were already authorized to expend whatever sums were available for defense. It is in this context that the conflicting stories of Aristotle and of Kleidemos on the provision of eight drachmas for each man of the fleet should be seen (*Ath. Pol.*, 23, 1;⁴³ *Frag. Gr. Hist.*, III B, no. 323, Frag. 21⁴⁴ *apud* Plutarch, *Themistocles*, 10, 6). According to our decree the generals, including Themistokles, and the Council would have been responsible for ration money (*συντηρέσιον*) and pay (*μισθός*), if any, for the fleet. Both literary accounts agree that public funds failed (cf. also Plutarch, *Themistocles*, 7, 6, for the difficulties of the trierarch Architeles at Artemision). Kleidemos redeems Themistokles from the charge that the generals were helpless at the time of the proclamation with an improbable anecdote. Some scholars have reconciled the two accounts by supposing that Themistokles, as an Areopagite, got the Areopagus to supply funds.⁴⁵ Busolt claimed that the Areopagus at this time had supervision over the sacred treasury and could use it in an emergency.⁴⁶ However that may be, we know from Herodotos (VIII, 17) that Kleinias, Alkibiades' father, paid for his crew out of his own pocket and provided his own ship at Artemision (cf. Plutarch, *Alcibiades*, 1, 2). Other rich men may not have gone so far as to provide their own ships but would certainly have contributed from their own funds to make up the sum needed to keep the ships at sea, as we know trierarchs did in later times (cf. Thucydides, VI, 31, 3; Isokrates, XVIII, 60; Demosthenes, LI, 6). In this way we may well believe that the Areopagites, still the richest group in Athens, if not the Areopagus as such, contributed vitally to the preparations and added to their own reputation. The date is complicated by the usual confusion between the decree and the proclamation, but the circumstances (the preparation of the fleet) point to a time before Artemision.

Lines 38-40. For the *ἀρεστήριον* see Hesychios, *s.v.* *ἀρέσασθαι*, *ιλάσασθαι*, *ἀρεστὸν ποιῆσαι*; also *s.v.* *ἀρεστήριον*, *ιερεῖον*, καὶ *θύμα*; Herodotos, VII, 141, 3 (the oracle of

⁴³ μετὰ δὲ τὰ Μηδικὰ πάλιν ἴσχυεν ἡ ἐν Ἀρείῳ πάγῃ βουλὴ καὶ διώκει τὴν πόλιν, οὐδενὶ δόγματι λαβοῦσα τὴν ἡγεμονίαν ἀλλὰ διὰ τὸ γενέσθαι τῆς περὶ Σαλαμῖνα ναυμαχίας αἰτία. τῶν γὰρ στρατηγῶν ἐξαπορησάντων τοῖς πράγμασι καὶ κηρυξάντων σφῆξιν ἕκαστον ἑαυτόν, πορίσασα δραχμὰς ἑκάστῳ ὅκτω διέδωκε καὶ ἐνεβίβασεν εἰς τὰς ναῦς (cf. Aristotle, *Politica*, 1304 A, 20-21).

⁴⁴ οὐκ ὄντων δὲ δημοσίων χρημάτων τοῖς Ἀθηναίοις, Ἀριστοτέλης μὲν φησι τὴν ἐξ Ἀρείου πάγου βουλήν πορίσασαν ὅκτω δραχμὰς ἑκάστῳ τῶν στρατενομένων αἰτιωτάτην γενέσθαι τοῦ πληρωθῆναι τὰς τριήρεις, Κλείδημος δὲ καὶ τοῦτο τοῦ Θεμιστοκλέους ποιεῖται στρατήγημα. καταβαινόντων γὰρ εἰς Πειραιᾶ τῶν Ἀθηναίων, φησὶν ἀπολέσθαι τὸ Γοργόγειον ἀπὸ τῆς θεοῦ τοῦ ἀγάλματος· τὸν οὖν Θεμιστοκλέα προσποιούμενον ζητεῖν καὶ διερευνῶμενον ἅπαντα χρημάτων ἀνευρίσκειν πλῆθος ἐν ταῖς ἀποσκευαῖς ἀποκεκρυμμένον, ὃν εἰς μέσον κομισθέντων εὐπορήσαι τοὺς ἐμβαίνοντας εἰς τὰς ναῦς ἐφοδίων.

⁴⁵ E.g., Jules Labarbe, *La loi navale de Thémistocle*, p. 136.

⁴⁶ *Gr. Geschichte*², II, p. 691, note 3; denied by G. De Sanctis, *Atthis*², Turin, 1912, p. 381. N.G.L. Hammond, *History of Greece*, Oxford, 1959, p. 238, paints a picture of the rôle of the Areopagus in the evacuation that goes altogether beyond the evidence.

the "Wooden Walls"): οὐ δύναται Παλλὰς Δί' Ὀλύμπιον ἐξιλάσασθαι; Xenophon, *Oeconomicus*, V, 19: πρὸ τῶν πολεμικῶν πράξεων ἐξαρεσκομένους τοὺς θεοὺς (cf. *ibid.*, V, 3: θεοὺς ἐξαρέσκεσθαι θύοντας). It may be that the hostility of Zeus as described by the oracle required this placatory sacrifice. In other Attic inscriptions, however, the ἀρεστήριον has a special purpose. See F. Jacoby, *Atthis*, p. 238, note 12: "The offering of the ἀρεστήριον after (or before: Aischin. 3. 116?) alterations were made in sacred buildings, cult statues, votive gifts, etc., certainly is an early and established custom, even though our evidence does not begin until the fourth century." The examples are: *I.G.*, II², 403, lines 18-20 (Jacoby, *Atthis*, p. 8, A 2; ca. 350-320 B.C., made on instructions from an exegete); *I.G.*, II², 204, lines 57-60 (restored, 352/1 B.C.); *I.G.*, II², 839, lines 45-47 and 82 (221/0 B.C.); *I.G.*, II², 841, line 16 (second century B.C.); *I.G.*, II², 1035, lines 12-14 (Jacoby, *Atthis*, p. 9, A 3; first century B.C. The sacrificers are the στρατηγὸς ἐπὶ τοὺς ὀπλείτας and the βασιλεύς). See also Dionysios of Halikarnassos, I, 67, 2, for θυσίαι ἀρεστήριοι on bringing back the ancestral gods from Alba Longa to Lavinium. In view of this technical usage, it is possible that removal of the most sacred objects of the city was contemplated.

There is evidence that this, in fact, was done:

(1) The ancient *xoanon* of Athena survived the war, and had presumably been carried away, probably to Salamis; Kleidemos, *Frag. Gr. Hist.*, III B, No. 323, Frag. 21, mentions the loss of the gorgoneion from the statue at the time of the manning of the ships. (2) Herodotos (VIII, 64, 2; 83, 2; 84, 2; cf. V, 80, 2) tells of the images of the Aiakidai being sent for from Aigina before the battle, and the Spartan kings regularly carried the Tyndaridai with them on campaign (Herodotos, V, 75, 2). The sacred images would protect as well as be protected. (3) Hypereides, in his emergency decree after Chaironeia, proposed ἱερὰ δὲ καὶ παῖδας καὶ γυναῖκας εἰς τὸν Πειραιᾶ ἀποθέσθαι (cf. [Plutarch], *Vitae X Oratorum*, 849A). The anti-Macedonians were consciously attempting to recover the spirit of the Persian Wars (see the discussion of the date of the inscription, above) and sending the women and children to the Peiraeus can only be preparatory to shipping them overseas, as in 480 B.C. The location of the small states to which Athens had appealed (Lykourgos, *In Leocratem*, 42), including Troizen, suggests that they were to be places of refuge. It follows that Hypereides had precedent for sending away the sacred objects as well. In any case we seem to have something stronger than the usual vows and sacrifices before a battle or a campaign.⁴⁷

⁴⁷ Cf. Aischylos, *Septem*, 264-280; Xenophon, *Anabasis*, III, 2, 12, and Aristophanes, *Equites*, 660-661 with scholia (Kallimachos the polemarch to Artemis Agrotera before Marathon); Plutarch, *Aristides*, 11, 3 (vows and sacrifices to Zeus, Hera of Kithairon, Pan, the Sphragitides Nymphs, and the seven Archegetai before Plataia); Thucydides, VI, 32, 1-2 (the εἰχαὶ νομιζόμεναι before the departure of the Sicilian expedition); Demosthenes, XVIII, 184 (from a decree before the

Line 39. For Zeus the Almighty see Hesychios, *s.v.* παγκρατής· Ζεύς· Ἀθηναῖοι. Otherwise the epithet seems to be literary: Aischylos, *Septem*, 255: ὦ παγκρατὲς Ζεῦ, appealed to by the chorus in terror of the enemy (cf. lines 116-117); *Idem*, *Eumenides*, 916 ff. (a passage with a strong patriotic tinge), *Supplices*, 816 (cf. also *Prometheus*, 389, 526); Euripides, *Frag.* 431 Nauck²; Aristophanes, *Thesmophoriazousae*, 368-369 (where the preceding prayer invokes his help against, among others, those who bring on the Medes). After the war it was as Eleutherios, Soter, and Tropaïos that he received thanks.⁴⁸ Zeus Soter, Athena, and Nike are grouped in this order as recipients of sacrifice in Demosthenes, *Prooemia*, LIV.

Lines 39-40. Asphaleios was a universal epithet of Poseidon (Pausanias, VII, 21, 7). Its use in Aristophanes, *Acharnenses*, 682, is comic. Here it is used of the god of the sea rather than of earthquakes. Cf. Preller-Robert, *Griechische Mythologie*,⁴ I, Berlin, 1894, pp. 572, 582-584.

Lines 41-44. For βοηθεῖν in the sense of *adversus hostes concurrere*, see Isokrates, IV, 87 (of the Athenians at Marathon); Thucydides, II, 94, 2; etc. See also Lysias, II, 30: Ἀθηναῖοι δ' οὕτω διακειμένης τῆς Ἑλλάδος αὐτοὶ μὲν εἰς τὰς ναῦς ἐμβάντες ἐπ' Ἀρτεμῖσιον ἐβοήθησαν, Λακεδαιμόνιοι δὲ καὶ τῶν συμμάχων ἔνιοι εἰς Θερμοπύλας ἀπήντησαν.

The new information must inevitably affect our thinking on the vexed question of the numbers engaged at Artemision and Salamis, though it must be remembered that the decree embodies the plan before the event and is not an account of what actually happened. On the Athenian contingent at Artemision, see Herodotos, VIII, 1, who mentions 127 ships (these do not include the 20 furnished to Chalkis) and VIII, 14, 1, where he mentions a reinforcement—or so, at least, it is usually understood—of 53 ships. Isokrates (IV, 90) has ἐξήκοντα τριήρεις πληρώσαντες; Diodoros (XI, 12, 4) alleges 140 out of 280. On the problems, see especially W. W. Tarn, *J.H.S.*, XXVIII, 1908, pp. 202-233; Jules Labarbe, *B.C.H.*, LXXVI, 1952, pp. 384-441; *Idem*, *La loi navale de Thémistocle*, Paris, 1957. Note that περὶ . . . τὴν ἄλλην Ἀττικὴν ναυλοχεῖν can include the east coast of Attika and the southern entrance of the Euboian straits for the protection of which Bury assigned the second Athenian contingent of

launching of ships: εἰξαμένους καὶ θύσαντας τοῖς θεοῖς καὶ ἥρωσι τοῖς κατέχουσι τὴν πόλιν καὶ τὴν χώραν τὴν Ἀθηναίων).

⁴⁸ For Plataia see Plutarch, *Aristides*, 21; Strabo, IX, p. 412; Pausanias, IX, 2, 5; scholion on Pindar, *Olympian Odes*, VII, 154. For Athens see R. E. Wycherley, *The Athenian Agora*, III, *Literary and Epigraphical Testimonia*, Princeton, 1957, pp. 25-30. The *tropaion* and *temenos* on Salamis belonged to Zeus (Timotheos, *Persae*, 210; *I.G.*, II², 1006, lines 8-9, 1008, lines 17-18, 1028, lines 24-28 [cf. *I.G.*, I², 190, line 9: Marathon or Salamis ?]). On παγκρατής, F. R. Walton calls my attention to the relevant discussion in Wolfgang Kiefner, *Der religiöse Allbegriff des Aischylos*, Diss. Tübingen, 1959.

53 ships (*B.S.A.*, II, 1895/6, p. 89). On the Aiginetan reserves see also Herodotos, VIII, 46, 1: *τῇσι μὲν τὴν ἐωντῶν ἐφύλασσον*.⁴⁹

Lines 44-48. As a note on *ὁμονοοῦντες* one may recall that Andokides (I, 108) emphasized Athenian success after amnesty and victory in the Persian Wars *διὰ τὸ ἀλλήλοις ὁμονοεῖν*. He also described the deliberations for amnesty after Aigospotamoi (I, 73: *ἐβουλευσασθε περὶ ὁμονοίας*) and its consummation (I, 76: *πίστιν ἀλλήλοις περὶ ὁμονοίας δοῦναι ἐν ἀκροπόλει*). Lysias (XXV, 27) says of the amnesty in 404 B.C.: *τοὺς μὲν φεύγοντας κατεδέξασθε, τοὺς δ' ἀτίμους ἐπιτίμους ἐποιήσατε, τοῖς δ' ἄλλοις περὶ ὁμονοίας ὅρκους ὤμνυτε*; and Demosthenes (XXVI, 11) quotes from a decree proposed by Hypereides after Chaironeia: *εἶναι τοὺς ἀτίμους ἐπιτίμους, ἵν' ὁμονοοῦντες ἅπαντες ὑπὲρ τῆς ἐλευθερίας προθύμως ἀγωνίζωνται*. Aristeides (XLVI, Vol. II, p. 248 Dindorf) describes the political activity of Themistokles, abroad and at home, in these words: *πρῶτον μὲν γε τοὺς πολέμους τοὺς συνεστῶτας τότε ἐν τῇ Ἑλλάδι καὶ τὰς πρὸς ἀλλήλους διαφορὰς καὶ στάσεις ἔπαυσεν ἀπάντων, καὶ ἓνα μὲν πόλεμον τὸν πρὸς τοὺς βαρβάρους, αὐτοὺς δὲ φίλους καὶ συγγενεῖς, ἔπεισεν ἡγήσασθαι ἔπειθ' ὅσοι τῶν πολιτῶν μεθειστήκεσαν, τούτους καταγαγεῖν συνεβούλευσεν Ἀθηναίοις, ἐν οἷς καὶ τῶν διαφόρων τινὲς ἦσαν αὐτῷ, τὴν αὐτὴν γνώμην ἔν τε τοῖς Ἑλληνικοῖς καὶ τοῖς κατὰ τὴν πόλιν σῶζων*.

What characterized the ostracized among exiles was the limited period of their exile (cf. Aristotle, *Politica*, 1284 A, 21-22: *μεθίστασαν ἐκ τῆς πόλεως χρόνους ὥρισμένους*; Plutarch, *Themistocles*, 11, 1: *τοῖς ἐπὶ χρόνον* [Cobet; *χρόνῳ* codd.] *μεθειστώσιν*).

The recall of the ostracized is mentioned by Andokides (I, 107; cf. 77), Aristotle (*Ath. Pol.*, 22, 8), Nepos (*Aristides*, 1, 5), Plutarch (*Themistocles*, 11, 1 and *Aristides*, 8, 1), and Aristeides (XLVI, Vol. II, p. 248 Dindorf [quoted just above]); all but Andokides and Aristeides (the rhetorician) specify Aristeides (the Just), who is named also by the scholiast on Aristeides (Vol. III, p. 593 Dindorf). Aristeides alone is mentioned in Demosthenes, XXVI, 6, and his return from Aigina to Salamis is described by Herodotos (VIII, 79; cf. Aristodemos, *Frag. Gr. Hist.*, II A, no. 104, Frag. 1 [1, 4]) without reference to an actual recall.

Andokides adds to the recall of political exiles the restoration of political rights (*ἐγνώσαν τοὺς τε φεύγοντας καταδέξασθαι καὶ τοὺς ἀτίμους ἐπιτίμους ποιῆσαι*); such restoration was the mark of a general amnesty and is found in the sources for four of the six known Athenian amnesties.⁵⁰ In the decree of Patrokleides of 404 B.C.,

⁴⁹ It is doubtful that Ktesias' statement (*Frag. Gr. Hist.*, III C, no. 688, Frag. 13, § 30) that on the approach of Xerxes the Athenians manned 110 ships and sailed to Salamis is based on accurate knowledge.

The concept of a reserve force of 100 ships is found in Perikles' defense policy (Thucydides, II, 24, 2). Cf. Andokides, III, 7, and Thucydides, III, 17, 2, though it is uncertain what, if any, relationship the *ἐξάιρετοι τριήρεις* had to those ships that *τὴν τε γὰρ Ἀττικὴν καὶ Εὐβοίαν καὶ Σαλαμίνα ἐκατὸν ἐφύλασσον* (430 or 428 B.C., or spurious?).

⁵⁰ See also Plutarch (*Solon*, 19, 4) for the amnesty of Solon; Andokides (I, 73), Xenophon

quoted by Andokides (I, 77-79), there followed a list of exceptions to the amnesty, and these too recur in the other amnesties.⁵¹ It seems likely, therefore, that we should read, e.g., τοὺς δὲ [ἀτίμους ἐπιτίμους εἶναι — —], and suppose that a list of exceptions, with particular reference to the Peisistratids, followed.

However, the recall of the exiles in our decree was not considered final. It required a further decision of the people, presumably on Salamis, whither, according to Herodotos, Aristides returned.⁵² It may be that decision, embodied in a decree also proposed by Themistokles (cf. Plutarch, *Themistocles*, 11, 1), which was known in antiquity, for, as has been pointed out, our decree does not seem to have been generally known beyond line 18, and the amnesty is not associated with the evacuation decree.

Certain phrases, also, in Plutarch and in Andokides suggest provisions that do not seem to be embodied in our decree and that were probably included in the final decree: Plutarch (*Themistocles*, 11, 1): πράττειν καὶ λέγειν τὰ βέλτιστα τῇ Ἑλλάδι μετὰ τῶν ἄλλων πολιτῶν [cf. ὥστε λέγειν ἐξεῖναι in the decree of Patrokleides quoted by Andokides (I, 77)]; Andokides (I, 107) δόντες ἀλλήλοις πίστεις καὶ ὅρκους μεγάλους [cf. Andokides, I, 76, in his introduction of the decree of Patrokleides, and Lysias, XXV, 27].⁵³

The date of the recall of the exiles is given by Aristotle, *Ath. Pol.*, 22, 8, as in the archonship of Hypsichides, i.e., 481/0 B.C. Plutarch, *Themistocles*, 11, 1, speaks of Xerxes marching through Thessaly and Boiotia at the time, but places it in his narrative after the evacuation and before the battle of Salamis.⁵⁴

The tentative approach to the problem of the exiles, rather less generous than one might have expected from patriotic allusions, is one further piece of evidence to confirm the authenticity of our text. Had we only the first eighteen lines which found their way into the literary and didactic tradition, it would have been not unreasonable

(*Hellenica*, II, 2, 11), and Lysias (XXV, 27) for the amnesty after Aigospotamoi; Demosthenes (XXVI, 11) and Lykourgos (*In Leocratem*, 41) for the amnesty after Chaironeia.

⁵¹ Cf. Plutarch, *Solon*, 19, 4; Μαρκελλίνου Βίος Θουκυδίδου, 32 (assigned to 404 B.C., after the surrender to Lysander, by J. M. Stahl, *Rh. Mus.*, XXXIX, 1884, pp. 458-465): πλὴν τῶν Πεισιστρατιδῶν.

⁵² The story of Xanthippos' dog in Philochoros (*Frag. Gr. Hist.*, III B, no. 328, *Frag.* 116) shows Xanthippos participating in the evacuation of Attika. This may be after the proclamation, which would then be dated after the final decision.

⁵³ The phrase τοὺς ἀτίμους ἐπιτίμους may well have been used in both decrees. I agree with C. Hignett, *A History of the Athenian Constitution*, Oxford, 1952, pp. 163-164, that a change in the future conditions of residence for men ostracized, as described by Aristotle (*Ath. Pol.*, 22, 8), is hardly conceivable in this crisis.

⁵⁴ Nepos (*Aristides*, 2, 1) speaks of Aristides not yet released from his *poena* at the time of Salamis, which is impossible if he commanded the troops used against Psyttaleia, and which conflicts directly with Aristotle. Andokides (I, 107) puts the recall before Marathon rather than Salamis; cf. A. E. Raubitschek, *Rh. Mus.*, XCVIII, 1955, p. 259, note 2.

to suspect them of being the creation of the antiquarian enthusiasm of Lykourgan Athens. But it is too much to suppose that any antiquarian forger could be responsible for all the following points: trierarchs chosen for qualities of command rather than wealth, a larger number of marines than were used even fifty years later and disagreeing also with the numbers for the battle of Salamis itself, the term *τάξις* of a contingent forming a crew (only in Aischylos, writing of Salamis), the careful spelling out of the practical details of mobilization, the epithet *Παγκρατῆς* of Zeus (most prominent in the contemporary Aischylos), the early date of the decree which destroys the Athenian claim of having been forced to abandon the city by the Peloponnesian failure to fight in Boiotia, the cautious commitment of only half the fleet to Artemision, and finally the gradual rapprochement with the exiles. What the history of the decree may have been between its passage and its publication in Troizen over 150 years later we can only guess, but we know too little to deny that it could have survived. Very likely we owe to the historical sense of the Greeks themselves, and to their desire at a time when freedom seemed once again in peril to recapture the spirit of the great struggles of the past, both the form of this text and our very knowledge of what may justly be called the clearest new light on the Persian Wars.

MICHAEL H. JAMESON

UNIVERSITY OF PENNSYLVANIA

Reprints of this article are available at \$1.00 from the Publications Committee, American School of Classical Studies at Athens, c/o Institute for Advanced Study, Princeton, New Jersey.