

GREEK INSCRIPTIONS

(PLATE 16)

A PAIR OF INVENTORIES

1. (Plate 16). Part of a stele of Pentelic marble broken away on three sides. The right margin and the back are preserved. Found on April 29, 1949, during the removal of the late Roman Wall east of the Panathenaic Way (O 8).¹

Height, 0.28 m.; width, 0.25 m.; thickness, 0.10 m.

Height of letters, 0.011-0.015 m.

Inv. No. I 6159 a.

Alterum saec. a.

NON-ΣΤΟΙΧ. *ca.* 34

[-----]
 [-----]υσα[-----]
 [— Διὶ Βουλαίῳ καὶ Ἀθηνᾷ Β]ουλαία κ[αὶ] Ἔστ
 [ία -----. Ἀγαθῇ τύχῃ δεδ]όχθαι τῶι δήμῳ
 [ωι ἐπικεχωρήσθαι -----]κίου Πειραιέως θ
 [υγατρὶ ποιήσασθαι τὴν ἀνάθε]σιν τῶν ἀργύρων 5
 [ν ----- ἐχόντων τὴν ἐ]πιγραφὴν καθότι πρ
 [ογέγραπται, ἵνα τούτων συντ]ελουμένων φανε
 [ρὰ φαίνεται ἢ πρὸς τοὺς κα]λῶς καὶ εὐνῶς διακ
 [ειμένους ἢ τῆς πόλεως] εὖνοια. ἀναγράψαι δὲ τὸ
 [ψήφισμα ἐν στήλ]ῃ καὶ ἀναθεῖναι ἐν τῷ βουλευ 10
 [τερίῳ ἀναγράψαν]τας κατ' εἶδος τὰς ὁλκάς
 [τῶν -----ω]ν παραδοθησομένων ἀργυ
 [ρὰ -----] δρ ΓΣ σκύφων ζεύγῃ
 [-----] τοῦ ζεύγους ΥΚΑ
 [-----]

Commentary

Lines 1-3 complete the considerations on which the decree was proposed. Line 2 apparently is a text of the inscription referred to in lines 6-7, i.e. the dedicatory inscription which was actually on the offerings. Numerous similar citations appear in the Delian Inventories (e.g. *I. Délos*, 396, lines 65, 68, etc.).

The epithet *boulaia* was given at Athens to Artemis, Athena, Demeter, Themis

¹ Its discovery was noted in *Hesperia*, XIX, 1950, p. 336. I would like to thank J. H. Oliver for his corrections and suggestions to my interpretation of this text.

and Hestia.² Since Hestia is named immediately after, and since Demeter and Themis are cited each only by a single literary source (Aelian, frag. 10 Herscher; Plutarch, *Reip. ger. praec.*, 802b), and since their presence would not be in keeping with the context, Artemis and Athena are the most likely. The cult of Artemis Boulaia flourished at Miletos³ and Athens.⁴ In the latter city she was, after Apollo, the second most common divinity among those receiving sacrifices from the prytaneis. There is evidence for an altar and cult of Artemis Boulaia in the vicinity of the Tholos,⁵ and in Roman times a cult of Livia as Artemis Boulaia was initiated, according to an inscription found in the vicinity of the Tholos and bouleuterion.⁶ The cult of Athena Boulaia thus far is unattested outside of Athens,⁷ and at Athens she appears only in the company of Zeus Boulaios. For the restoration of Athena and Zeus, see below.

Only the lowest portion of the vertical stroke of the tau of Hestia's name is preserved, but the letter spacing demands either tau or upsilon. Cults of Hestia were located in the prytaneion,⁸ where one of the rare statuettes of the goddess was kept, in the bouleuterion as Hestia Boulaia,⁹ as Hestia on the Acropolis (*I.G.*, II², 5096), and as Ἑστ[ία] Βω[μ]αίων (*I.G.*, II², 5102). No cult of Hestia has been found in the Tholos.¹⁰

In the formula introducing the resolution of the decree (line 3) occurs the only use of the iota adscript in the whole preserved text (cf. the datives in lines 2 and 10).

In line 4 the genitive of the demotic guarantees that the person concerned was female, supporting the restoration of θ[υγατρί]. The verb ἐπικεχωρήσθαι usually takes the dative case. For other examples of the civic government decreeing permission to dedicate, see the decrees honoring the maidens who wove the Panathenaic peplos (*I.G.*, II², 1034 and 1036), who sought permission to dedicate a silver phiale to Athena as a memorial of their reverence. Permission to set up a statue was commonly included in ephebic decrees and in the post-Sullan prytany decrees, and occurs in two other Athenian decrees (*I.G.*, II², 1012 and 1072). The priest of Asklepios sought permission before making repairs to the old temple of that god around 52/1 B.C. (*I.G.*, II², 1046).

² Jessen, *R.E.*, III, cols. 1019-1020, s.v. *Bulaios*.

³ M. P. Nilsson, *Geschichte der Griechischen Religion*, I³, Munich, 1967, p. 498.

⁴ *Ibid.*; R. E. Wycherley, *The Athenian Agora*, III, *The Literary and Epigraphical Testimony*, Princeton, 1957, pp. 55-57.

⁵ H. A. Thompson, *The Tholos of Athens and Its Predecessors* (*Hesperia*, Supplement IV), 1940, pp. 139-141.

⁶ J. H. Oliver, *Cl. Phil.*, LX, 1965, p. 179.

⁷ Wycherley, *op. cit.*, nos. 394, 422, 423; L. R. Farnell, *The Cults of the Greek States*, Oxford, 1909, I, p. 304; *I.G.*, II², 3543 and 5054.

⁸ Farnell, *op. cit.*, V, pp. 361, 369-370, no. 30.

⁹ Wycherley, *op. cit.*, p. 128. On Hestia Boulaia see J. and L. Robert, *Bull. Ép.*, 1961, nos. 826 and 538, where additional bibliography is given.

¹⁰ Thompson, *op. cit.*, p. 139.

For the restorations in line 5 compare *Hesperia*, XXXIII, 1964, no. 50, pp. 198-199; XVII, 1948, no. 13, pp. 29-30; *I.G.*, II², 1039, 1041, 1042, 1046.

The missing word in line 6 would have been descriptive of the items dedicated (*σκούφων*?). For the restorations compare *S.I.G.*³, 796 B, III, line 37; *Hesperia*, XVII, 1948, no. 13, pp. 29-30; S. Dow, *Prytaneis* (*Hesperia*, Supplement I), 1937, no. 101, pp. 170-171; no. 113, pp. 182-183; *I.G.*, II², 1043. For *προγέγραπται* (lines 6-7) see J. H. Oliver, *A.J.P.*, LXX, 1949, pp. 299-308 ([*καθ*]ὡς *προγέγραπται*). It is probable that line 2 preserves a portion of this inscription.

The restorations of lines 7-9 have no precise parallels, but the sense is reflected commonly in Athenian decrees and the suggested restorations fit the space available. The lambda which is the first preserved letter of line 8 is represented on the stone only by a slight trace of the right leg.

For civic deities and the bouleuterion (lines 10-11), see below. For the restoration of *ἀναγράφαν*]τας as a transitional word between a decree and an inventory, see *I.G.*, II², 120 and 1534, line 154.

The unrestored portion of line 12 ought to contain the generic word for the donations. This is not an annual inventory, but the inventory accompanying a gift. For similar see *I. Didyma*, 424 (= Pouilloux, *Choix*, no. 37), the gift of Seleukos I to the Temple of Apollo at Didyma, where the inventory is appended to the communication of Seleukos, or *Pergamon*, VIII, iii, 72, where an inventory follows the basic dedicatory text.

The accusative plural form (*ἀργυ*[*ρᾶ*], lines 12-13) is restored on the assumption that the inventory is divided into categories according to the materials from which the offerings were made.¹¹ In line 13 the abbreviation *δρ* ΓΣ (3,200 drachmai) represents a surprisingly large amount, considering that it indicates a weight of silver, and may well be the total value of a category of offering, or of a group of similar items whose weight is not given individually but as a total. The catalogue continues with a number of pairs of skyphoi, items not appearing very commonly in dedications.¹² The weight 421 drachmai is that of a single pair probably of the skyphoi cited just before. This is a rather respectable weight per skyphos, although it is not as great as that given by Antiochos or two of the Delian gifts.¹³

¹¹ For other examples see *B.C.H.*, LXXX, 1956, pp. 464, 476.

¹² The only other occurrence at Athens is in a will, *I.G.*, II², 2775. The published Delian Inventories account for around 20 entries, not including repeated references to the same dedication. Several of these entries refer to multiple items. Seleukos I included one in his dedication to Apollo at Didyma (*I. Didyma*, 424, lines 54-56). A Greek text from Naples (*I.G.R.R.*, I, 432) records the dedication of one to the phratry-gods of Kyme. *I.L.S.*, 3182, 3429, and 5429 record three other dedications from Italy.

¹³ Some comparative weights are as follows (the variations listed reflect differences in the sources):

There is no regard for syllabic division of words in the document. Although the letters are well formed, the style and spacing are not uniform.

The preserved portion of the inscription includes the end of the clause containing the considerations, portions of each line of the resolution, and portions of the opening lines of the inventory. The resolution indicates that it was "decided by the demos [to permit — — —], daughter of [— — —]kios of the Piraeus, [to make the dedication] of silver [— — — —, having the] inscription [given above, in order that when these] are accomplished, the good will [of the city toward those well] and benevolently disposed [might appear] clearly, and to inscribe the [decree on a stele] and set it up in the bouleu[terion, inscribing] by type the weights [of the — — — — —] which were given over." Then follows the inventory.

The dedication may have been made to one of three possible civic cult centers in Athens, if the divinities whom the preserved dedication names are criteria: the Tholos, the prytaneion, or the bouleuterion. The first, although it was sacred to Artemis Boulaia, had no cult of Hestia. The prytaneion had traditional cults of Hestia and of Pallas Athena (*Schol. to Aristides, Panathenaic Oration*, Dindorf III, p. 48, 8), but apparently without the epithet Boulaia. The bouleuterion, on the other hand, contained cults of Zeus Boulaios, Athena Boulaia and Hestia. Inventories tended to be set up in the vicinity of the items inventoried, and this inscription was to be set up in the bouleuterion. Several sources indicate the presence of items of value in this building; Pausanias¹⁴ notes the presence of cult statues, Photios a statue of Metragyrtes;¹⁵ inscriptions record that they were to be set up there, and several inscriptions record various dedications.¹⁶

I. Didyma, 424, single skyphos, 380 drachmai.

I. Délos, 1441, A, II, lines 30-31 = 1450, A, 148, five skyphoi, one of which is almost non-existent and two others incomplete, 472 (or 475) drachmai.

I. Délos, 313, line 76, two skyphoi and a rhyton, 2413 drachmai.

I. Délos, 1403, Ab, I, line 64 = 1423, Aa (col. I), lines 1-3 = 1429, B, I, lines 25-33 = 1432, Ab, II, lines 4-10 = 1441, A, II, lines 50-58 = 1449, Aab, II, lines 131-137 = 1450, A, 155-159, two incomplete skyphoi, the one 842 (or 880) drachmai, the other 904 drachmai.

I. Délos, 1417, A, I, 54-55 = 1442, B, line 24 = 1444, Ba, line 3 = probably 1443, C, line 113 = probably 1425, III, line 7, one skyphion, 96 drachmai, 5 oboloi, and another, 99 (or 98) drachmai, 5 oboloi.

I. Délos, 1417, A, I, lines 90-91 = 1426, B, I, line 7, one skyphion, 91 drachmai, 5 oboloi.

I. Délos, 1432, Ab, II, line 37 = 1441, A, II, line 77 = 1450, A, line 168, one skyphion, 86 drachmai (no. 1429, B, I, 64 has 96 drachmai).

All translations of numbers are made according to the tables in M. Guarducci, *Epigrafi greca*, I, Rome, 1967, pp. 417-425.

¹⁴ I, 3, 5 = Wycherley, *op. cit.*, no. 402.

¹⁵ *S.v. μητραγύρτης* = Wycherley, *op. cit.*, no. 487.

¹⁶ *I.G.*, II², 1048-1050 = Wycherley, *op. cit.*, nos. 417, 418; *Hesperia*, XII, 1943, pp. 64-66, no. 17 = Wycherley, *op. cit.*, no. 431.

There are no immediate criteria for assigning a date to the document. The one name is too poorly preserved and the letters might occur anywhere in the first two centuries before Christ. The size of the gift argues for a period of relative prosperity. The most eloquent indications of such a period are the records of the Delphic Pythaïds and the elaborate ephebic lists¹⁷ in the last third of the second century B.C. A period of political stability provided the secure atmosphere in which a citizen might make such offerings.¹⁸

2. (Plate 16). Fragment of a stele of Pentelic marble. The face and right edge alone of the original surface are preserved, although the corner between them has been chipped away. Found on February 13, 1963, in the demolition of a modern house fronting on Asteroskopeion Street (I-J 15).

Height, 0.184 m.; width, 0.14 m.; thickness, 0.06 m.

Height of letters, 0.012-0.013 m.

Inv. No. I 6159 b.

<i>saec. I a. (?)</i>	NON-ΣΤΟΙΧ.
[-----]	
[----- ἀργ]υροῦ ἄωτο[ν -]	
[-----] Διονύσῳ τῷ	
[-----] ἀν ἀργυροῦ [- -]	3
[----- Βρο]μίῳ καὶ τῷ [ι - -]	
[----- εἰς ἀργυρᾶ [ς - -]	
<i>vacat</i>	
<i>vacat</i>	

Commentary

For the most part only the lower parts of the letters in line 1 are preserved. The restoration is made on the basis of line 3, below, where an object inventoried is in the accusative and the material in the genitive. Of the dotted letters in the first word, the spacing restricts the possible readings of the second upsilon to tau, upsilon or gamma. The alpha in the second word could also be read as lambda. The dative cases in the second and fourth lines must be the texts of dedications inscribed on the objects inventoried.¹⁹ In line four only the right vertical stroke of the mu is preserved, but the restoration in line two supports Bromios.

¹⁷ For commentary on the prosperity of Athens at this period see J. Day, *An Economic History of Athens under Roman Domination*, New York, 1942, pp. 109-113, 116-117. For the Delphic Pythaïds see *Fouilles de Delphes*, III, ii, Paris, 1909-1913, pp. 11-58, nos. 2-53. For the ephebic decrees see *I.G.*, II², 1006-1009, 1011; see also *S.E.G.*, XVI, 101; XIX, 108; XXI, 470, 474, 476, 477, 479, 480, 482, 483.

¹⁸ W. S. Ferguson, *Hellenistic Athens*, London, 1911, pp. 415-419; S. Accame, *Il Dominio romano in Grecia*, Rome, 1946, p. 165.

¹⁹ See above, p. 96.

The basic character of the lettering and the nature of the text might mislead one to assume that this is another fragment of the same stele from which no. 1 came. Several particulars argue against this conclusion. No. 1 apparently has the major divisions of the inventory by material, while this piece specifies the material for each item. The lettering of this document is more regular than that of no. 1. The letter shapes differ in several minor details, most strikingly in the use of the broken-barred alpha in no. 1 and the straight-barred here, and in differences in the size of omicron and theta relative to the other letters. Grammatically no. 1 generally does not use iota adscript except in a single formulaic expression, while it occurs regularly here.

The reading of line 2 and the restoration of line 4 suggest that the inventory belongs to a shrine of Dionysos.

A LAW CODE OF THE FIRST CENTURY B. C.

3. (Plate 16). Two joining and one non-joining fragments of a stele of Pentelic marble.

a. Two joined fragments preserving a portion of the left margin. It is broken away on all other sides. Found on January 31, 1935 in a modern context west of the East Stoa (O 13).

Height, 0.37 m.; width, 0.25 m.; thickness, 0.08 m.

Height of letters, 0.01 m.

Inv. No. I 2351.

b. A small chip, broken away on all sides and behind. Found on March 19, 1934 in a late context over the south porch of the New Bouleuterion (F 10).

Height, 0.09 m.; width, 0.05 m.; thickness, 0.08 m.

Height of letters, 0.01 m.

Inv. No. I 1619.

84/3 B.C.

NON-ΣΤΟΙΧ. ca. 46

- a. [Ἀγαθῇ τύχῃ τῆς βουλῆς καὶ τοῦ δήμου τοῦ Ἀθηναίων ἐπὶ τοῦ δαίνοσ]
 [ἄρχ]οντ[ος ἐπὶ τῆς ----- πρυτανείας ἡ ----- Δημη]
 [τρ]ίον Ἀνα[καίεος ἐγραμμάτευεν ----- month and day -----]
 [ἐ]κτι καὶ εἰκ[οστῇ τῆς πρυτανείας ἐκκλησία ἐν -----]
 ἡ μεταχθείσα [ἐκ ----- τῶν προέδρων ἐπεψήφισεν]
 5 Νέων Δωροθέο[υ ----- καὶ συμπρόεδροι ἔδοξεν τῷ δήμῳ]
 Δημέας Δημέ[ου Ἀζηνιεύς εἶπεν ἐπειδὴ ὁ δῆμος ὁ Ἀθηναίων ?]
 ἐν δημοκρατίαι κ[ατά τε τοὺς νόμους πολιτευόμενος καὶ ὑπὸ ?]
 τῶν κλήρω καὶ χε[ιροτονίαι αἰρεθέντων ἀρχόντων κληθεῖς ?]
 καὶ χάριν διδόμεν[ος -----]

- 10 τὰς δὲ κληρωτὰς [ἐφ'] οἷς ησ[-----]
 τινες δὲ διὰ κακοτ[ρό]πων πα[λαιὸι νόμοι ? -----]
 τοὺς προαιρουμέν[ο]υς συνδ[ίκους ----- εἰς τὸ]
 ἐξ[ῆ]ς συνβαίνει κοινῆς καὶ εκ[-----]
 να[ι ε] ὕνους κατὰ τ[ὸ] ὅμοιον περὶ τ[----- ἔξ]εσ[]
 15 τιν παῶσιν Ἀθηνα[ί]οις ἤδη ποτὲ [----- τῶν νόμων τῶν προγε]
 γρ<α>μμένων π[ρ]όγοιαν. *vacat* Ἀ[γαθῇ τύχη· δεδόχθαι τῶι δήμῳ]
 [τὰ] μὲν προνενομοθετημέν[α ----- ὑπὸ τῆς βουλῆς τῆς]
 [ἐν Ἀ]ρείῳ πάγῳ κύρια εἶναι. *vac.* [-----]
 [...] δ' ἐξεῖναι το[ῖς] ἄλλοις Ἀ[θηναίοις -----]
 20 [....]αι τὰς κληρ[ω]τὰς ἀρχά[ς ----- ὅστις ἂν ζητεῖ ?]
 [ἀλλό] ποτε οἶν τρό[π]ον καταλ[ῆ]σαι τοὺς κειμένους νόμους εἶναι ?]
 [ἄτιμο]ν καὶ ἐπάρατον· *vacat* ο[-----]
 [.....]τι κληρωτὴ τινα [-----]
 [-----]ρτ. [...]Ιην[-----]
 [-----]

Line 16: The stonecutter omitted the alpha.

- b. [-----]
 [-----]το[-----]
 [-----]τενα[-----]
 [-----]διδι[-----]
 [-----]των[-----]
 [-----]ιπ[-----]
 [-----]

The formulae of the preamble indicate the approximate length of line.²⁰ The opening phrase of the line restored above line 1 is based upon *I.G.*, II², 1043 and *Hesperia*, XVII, 1948, p. 30, no. 14. The suggested length of line restricts the restorations of the number of the prytany and of the name of the prytanizing tribe in line 1 and of the date in line 2 to very brief entries. For the restoration of the demotic of the secretary see below. Although there is no conclusive evidence, it is preferable to restore the decree as an action of the demos.²¹ To change the meeting

²⁰ Prof. B. D. Meritt has offered valuable assistance in the restorations of the heading and in the precise dating of this document.

²¹ There are two nomothetic documents which proved useful in understanding this text. In the first, the psephisma of Teisamenos (Andokides, I, 83-84), a decree of the demos providing for nomothetic activity in 403/2, final action on proposed changes to the law code seems not to have been in the hands of the ekklesia, but in those of the boule and the five hundred nomothetai chosen by their fellow demesmen. In the other, the provision for the epicheirotomia of the laws (Demos-thenes, XXIV, 20-23), the ekklesia is the final approving body for each nomothetic function. The very different circumstances of 86-83 B.C. (see below for the date) would make it quite possible that

place of the ekklesia was not uncommon. Frequently in the second century before Christ the meeting scheduled for the Peiraeus was transferred to the theater.²² There is a sole example of a changed meeting place for the boule.²³ The extraordinary nature of this decree might well warrant the selection of a historically significant meeting place or simply a larger meeting place.

The proposer's name has been restored (line 6) as that of a member of the family of the deme Azenia.²⁴ An elder Demeas (patronymic unknown) was attested as mint magistrate in 125/4 and 107/6 B.C. He may also have been the epimelete of the Peiraeus in 102/1 B.C.²⁵ A later generation provided an archon around 20 B.C. The span of over a century between the last reference to the earlier generation and the first reference to the later generation suggests an unattested additional generation between the two. The earlier attested Demeas would have been associated with the oligarchic movement of 103/2,²⁶ while the younger seems to have had democratic associates.²⁷

The considerations begin in line 6. The uninscribed area in line 16 is probably where the actual provisions of the decree begin. The unusual nature of the document makes restoration only tentative. Those given here reflect the editor's understanding of the document. The series of three participial constructions in lines 6-9 is suggested by the participle following a conjunction in line 9. The idea of "giving thanks" (line 9) and the phrase "in demokratia" suggested the demos as the noun modified.

In line 7 the meaning of demokratia is probably the broader one common from Hellenistic times, being a synonym for republican government in general and for the *patrios politeia*, as opposed to oligarchic or autocratic forms.²⁸ It referred clearly to the internal organization of the state, although the dependence of democratic government upon eleutheria or autonomia frequently caused it to be used as including

the boule was the final decreeing body. The change of meeting place accords better with a session of the ekklesia (see below).

²² Probably in 188/7 (*I.G.*, II², 893), in 176/5 (*Hesperia*, XXVI, 1957, p. 71), in 131/0 (*I.G.*, II², 977), and probably in an undetermined year in the last half of the second century (*Hesperia*, XXVI, 1957, pp. 77-78, no. 23). For a summary of attested meeting places see W. A. McDonald, *The Political Meeting Places of the Greeks*, Baltimore, 1943, pp. 44-61.

²³ *I.G.*, II², 1043. For a suggested motive see D. J. Geagan, *The Athenian Constitution after Sulla* (*Hesperia*, Supplement XII), 1967, p. 77 and McDonald, *op. cit.*, pp. 146-147. McDonald summarizes the attested meeting places on pp. 131-147.

²⁴ See O. W. Reinmuth, *B.C.H.*, XC, 1966, pp. 96-97 for pertinent bibliography.

²⁵ S. Dow, *H.S.C.P.*, LI, 1940, p. 117; the demotic 'Αλαϊεύς cannot be excluded completely; see *I.G.*, II², 2445 of around 140 B.C. and *I.G.*, II², 5471.

²⁶ Ferguson, *op. cit.*, p. 436.

²⁷ Reinmuth, *op. cit.*, p. 97, who points out his connection with Apolexis, son of Philokrates, of Oion.

²⁸ J. A. O. Larsen, *Cl. Phil.*, XL, 1945, pp. 88-89; A. Fuks, *The Ancestral Constitution*, London, 1953, p. 49, note 18.

the meaning of these latter two words.²⁹ In line 7 other likely restorations might be κ[αὶ ἐλευθερίαι or another such word.³⁰

The second of the series of participles refers to a group of magistrates, here restored as summoning the demos. The preserved portion of line 8 suggests two possible interpretations: it might refer to the grouped lesser magistrates—*ἄρχοντες οἱ κληρωτοὶ καὶ οἱ χειροτονητοί*,³¹ or it may be a reference to the process by which Solon was said to have archons selected.³² The failure to repeat the article and the prominence of the phrase within the document argue against the former. The traditional distinction between allotment as a democratic principle and election as oligarchic needs no additional discussion, nor is the dependability of the tradition attributing this process to Solon a matter of concern. What is important is that it had become a part of the oligarchic *patrios politeia* in the late fifth century B.C., and that the name of Solon was attached to it. Solon and Drakon were considered at Athens to be the authors of laws generally in use before the revision of the late fifth century and were considered the source of Athenian ancestral law, whether or not there had been later modification.³³ The appearance here of this method of selection would argue an

²⁹ M. Holleaux, *Études d'épigraphie et d'histoire grécque*, III, 1942, p. 153, note 1 (but compare IV, 1952, p. 327, note 1) believed that in one inscription at least *demokratia* was the equivalent of *autonomia*, which frequently accompanies it in epigraphical sources. *Autonomia* or *eleutheria* indicates the absence of external influence maintaining an unwelcome form of government, usually oligarchic or autocratic. In one group of inscriptions *demokratia* appears alone and clearly refers to the internal political structure of a state or league (*I.G.*, II², 509, 646, 657, 971, 1062; *S.I.G.*³, 283, lines 4 ff.; 360, line 14; 398, lines 28 ff.; 581, lines 14 and 68; 665, line 17; *O.G.I.S.*, 218; 229, line 67; *T.A.M.*, II, 1, 582; III, 1, 2, lines 9-11; Pouilloux, *Choix*, no. 32, pp. 121-124). Another group presents it in a context with *eleutheria* or *autonomia*, but in such a way that the distinction can be seen (Le Bas-Waddington, III, 1536; *S.I.G.*³, 323; *O.G.I.S.*, 222, line 17; *Milet*, I, 3, no. 123; *I. Creticae*, I, viii, 9, lines 4-6; IV, 176; and particularly *S.I.G.*³, 613, lines 2 ff., where *ἔθνη* may be *αὐτόνομα*, but it is reserved for *πόλεις* to be *δημοκρατούμεναι*). Thus the coupling of *demokratia* with *eleutheria* or *autonomia* is not redundant (*I.G.*, II², 559, 682; XII, 59; *S.I.G.*³, 591, lines 34 and 74; 613, lines 18 ff.; *O.G.I.S.*, 237; 229, lines 10 f. and 64 ff.; *Labraunda*, III, i, 1, no. 8, line 14; *I. Didyma*, 358; *Milet*, I, 3, 150, line 84), although it could be unnecessary when the state of *demokratia* was understood as being able to exist only in a condition of *eleutheria* or *autonomia* (*S.I.G.*³, 613, lines 2 ff., cited above; *I.G.U.R.*, I, 5, where *κομισάμενον τὴν πάτριον δημ[ο]κρατίαν* is translated *restituere in maiorum leibert[atem]*; *I.G.*, II², 448 opposes *demokratia* to *douleia*. See also *I.G.*, XII, Suppl., 270; *S.I.G.*³, 810; *O.G.I.S.*, 234, line 21; *T.A.M.*, II, 3, 900; *Labraunda*, III, i, 1, no. 3, lines 29-31; *I. Pergamon*, I-II, 250, 413; *I. Priene*, 44, line 15; Charitonides, *Αἱ Ἐπιγραφαὶ τῆς Δέσβου, συμπλήρωμα*, Athens, 1968, pp. 6-7, no. 6).

³⁰ Κατὰ τοὺς νόμους: *I.G.*, II², 448, line 62; 509, line 9; *S.I.G.*³, 323; *I. Pergamon*, II, 413; *T.A.M.*, II, 1, 582. κατὰ τὰ πάτρια: Andokides, I, 83. *Isonomia*: *O.G.I.S.*, 229, line 67. *Homonoia*: *I.G.*, II², 672; *S.I.G.*³, 398, line 27; 665, line 18. For *eleutheria* or *autonomia*, see note 29, above.

³¹ For example, Aristotle, *Ath. Pol.*, 55; *S.I.G.*³, 589, lines 37-38; Aischines, III, 29.

³² Aristotle, *Ath. Pol.*, 8, 1; See R. J. Buck, "The Reforms of 487 B.C. in the Selection of Archons," *Cl. Phil.*, LX, 1965, pp. 96-101.

³³ In 403/2, in the interval after the expulsion of the thirty tyrants, the democratic party decided to use τοῖς Σόλωνος νόμοις καὶ τοῖς Δράκοντος θεσμοῖς (Andokides, I, 81 and 83. See the com-

oligarchic form of government, although it is possible that party platforms had altered in the course of the alternations in government since the fifth century; this method might appear very democratic after a strict oligarchy.

The third in the series of participles (line 9) expresses the gratitude of the demos, but the identity of the recipient is lost. Two possibilities suggest themselves: the agency who was responsible for restoring democracy, or the agency who had made revisions to the laws, i.e. the boule of the Areopagus (see lines 16-18 below). The opening of the resolutions clearly indicates that this decree actually promulgated new laws. Line 12 reflects its nomothetic nature. Although syndikoi normally were advocates in court or a board of five men chosen to represent the interest of the polis in legal cases, among the provisions for the epicheirotomia of the laws under the constitution of 403/2 B.C.³⁴ a board of five syndikoi had the duty of defending existing nomoi against proposed change or repeal. These conclusions suggest the restoration of line 11 as the motivation for the constitutional alterations (of the alpha, the last preserved letter, only the lower tip of the left-hand stroke is preserved). Line 10 still is not clear. The feminine gender and the parallel in line 20 demand the restoration of ἀρχάς, but it is not clear precisely where it should be restored. One might envision a special board charged with temporary administration of the city until the revision of the laws was ready, and then with the custody of the written copy until it should be approved.³⁵ The prepositional phrase would probably refer to the duties with which the board was charged.³⁶

Lines 13-16 possibly contain a sentiment roughly to the effect "since for the future it accords with the common and [----- weal that all of the citizens remain] well disposed on terms of equality with regard to [the laws --- it is] now possible for all Athenians to exercise consideration [of those laws which have been pre]-published." It was characteristic of the constitution of 403/2 to permit any citizen access to the nomothetai. According to the decree of Teisamenos (Andokides, I, 83-84) the first board of nomothetai were to post their nomoi before the eponymoi for public reading, and, once the nomoi had been handed over to the boule, any citizen

mentaries of D. MacDowell, *Andokides "On the Mysteries,"* Oxford, 1962, Appendix H, pp. 194-199, who cites bibliography, and C. Hignett, *A History of the Athenian Constitution*, Oxford, 1952, Appendix I, pp. 299-305).

³⁴ Demosthenes, XXIV, 20-23. See V. Kahrstedt, *R.E.*, IV, 1932, cols. 1331-1332, *s.v.* σύνδικος and Busolt-Swoboda, II, 1926, pp. 1011.

³⁵ In 403/2 a board of twenty was chosen (Andokides, I, 81) to administer the city after the expulsion of the thirty. The first board of nomothetai, those chosen by the council, after publishing the new law code on wooden tablets, were to hand it over *ταῖς ἀρχαῖς* so that it could be considered by the allotted boule and the second board of 500 nomothetai chosen by their demesmen (*ibid.*, 83-84).

³⁶ The change in gender can be explained as *constructio ad sensum*. See Meisterhans-Schwyzler, *Grammatik der Attischen Inschriften*³, Berlin, 1900, p. 197, note 1609 and Kühner-Gerth, *Ausführliche Grammatik der griechischen Sprache*, II, i, p. 55, c.

could bring his suggestions to that body. Likewise in the provisions for epicheirotomia of the laws, citizens were permitted to post their suggestions regarding changes to the laws at the eponymoi before a certain date (Demosthenes, XXIV, 20-23). In the decree here under discussion there is no indication of the degree or manner of comment by the ordinary citizen. In view of the suggested occasion for the decree (see below), he may have had no influence other than voting his approval.

The actual resolutions begin with line 16. First and basic is the acceptance of the code proposed by the boule of the Areopagus, whose function appears to have paralleled that of the first board of nomothetai appointed by the boule in 403/2 (Andokides, I, 83). The break after this resolution probably indicates a change of subject. As in Teisamenos' psephisma,³⁷ there seem to be provisions for preserving the laws. In lines 19 and 20 there is a provision whereby it is permitted to any Athenian either to serve among or to consult with the allotted magistrates. If they did have a function in the nomothesia, this may represent a mechanism for amending the laws, although it would appear far different from the epicheirotomia practiced after 403/2. Lines 20-22 have been restored as providing for the punishment of those guilty of using irregular means to unmake the laws.³⁸

The new subject following the break in line 22 cannot be determined. It is likely that ἀρχή should be restored with κληρωτή (line 23).

The attempt to associate this document with given historical events must be tentative because of the relatively poor sources for the period of time within which it can have occurred. To associate the language of the document with the program of a given faction requires the use of parallels far removed in time. The letter forms might fall anywhere from the early second century before Christ down to the time of Augustus. It may be of assistance to survey the constitutional crises at Athens during this period. W. S. Ferguson³⁹ has gathered the evidence for a change in 103/2 B.C., when a more oligarchic constitution was put into effect. Characteristics of this change were substitution of election for allotment in the selection of archons, repeal of the prohibition against repeated archonships, and substitution of bouleutic

³⁷ Andokides, I, 84, where the council of the Areopagus was given charge of guarding the laws.

³⁸ Ἀτιμία was the traditional penalty for attempting to establish tyranny (*Ath. Pol.*, 16, 10), and it was later applied to those who would overthrow the democracy. See M. Ostwald, *T.A.P.A.*, LXXXVI, 1955, pp. 104-114. Καταλύω is the standard word for overthrowing a system of government, whether it be called demokratia (Pouilloux, *Choix*, no. 32, pp. 121-124; *S.I.G.*³, 360, line 14; *O.G.I.S.*, 218, lines 19 ff.; *T.A.M.*, III, 1, 2, lines 14-15) or merely the laws (*T.A.M.*, III, 1, 2, lines 14-15).

³⁹ "The Oligarchic Revolution at Athens of the Year 103/2 B.C.," *Klio*, IV, 1904, pp. 1-17; "Researches in Athenian and Delian Documents, III," *Klio*, IX, 1909, pp. 323-324; *Hellenistic Athens*, London, 1911, pp. 427-430. See also Busolt-Swoboda, *Griechische Staatskunde*, II³, 1926, p. 935; Day, *op. cit.*, pp. 109-113; M. Thompson, *The New Style Silver Coinage of Athens*, New York, 1961, p. 408. S. Accame, *op. cit.*, pp. 165-167, on the other hand, views the changes as an evolution toward forms more acceptable to the Romans.

for judicial audit for magistrates. In 89/8, under the influence of Mithridates of Pontus, Athenion used democratic appeal to install a tyrannical regime⁴⁰ which was overthrown by Sulla in 86 B.C. Appian reports that Sulla *καὶ νόμους ἔθηκεν ἅπασιν ἀγχοῦ τῶν πρόσθεν αὐτοῖς ὑπὸ Ῥωμαίων ὀρισθέντων*.⁴¹ The changes which Sulla seems to have made included a prohibition against repeated service as archon and a broadening of the competence of the boule. Evidence also exists for a democratic revival in the last half of the first century before Christ in connection with Caesar's victory over Pompey.⁴² This endured until Antony restored the aristocracy in 38/7 B.C.

The document provides the name of Demeas, son of Demeas, probably a member of the family of the deme Azenia. The elder of the two attested men might well have participated in the events of 103/2. If he is of the oligarchic party (see above), it is unlikely that his name would occur during the revolution inspired by Mithridates, but he could well be called upon as a surviving elder statesman to make proposals in behalf of Sulla's reordering. The rise of the popular party which accompanied Caesar's rise to power probably would not coincide with either of the attested generations, but it would seem that the family handed the same name from father to son, so that it would not be difficult to insert a generation hitherto unattested. The democratic political associations of the younger of the attested members of the family would probably have excluded him from association with the aristocratic movement under Antony. The prosopographical evidence can do little more than support the conclusions reached from the tenor of the items within the decree.

Despite the appearance of the word *demokratia* there is ample reason to associate the document with an oligarchic restoration, and above all with that after Sulla's invasion. The prominence of the boule of the Areopagus is significant. The important indications of its increased prominence at Athens occur after the changes of 103/2 B.C. and after the influence of Sulla.⁴³ To have entrusted a nomothetic commission to it in 103/2 B.C. might have been rash, considering that its members would have been office holders from the previous arrangement. Sulla, on the other hand, would have found in this council a body of experienced men whose sympathy would have belonged to the oligarchy under which they had held office, that is, the oligarchy in power before the advent of Mithridates.⁴⁴ Since the government of Athenion had

⁴⁰ Poseidonios in Athenaios, V, 48-51, pp. 212a ff.; Appian, *Mithridateios*, 28. See Ferguson, *Klio*, IV, pp. 14-17; *Hellenistic Athens*, pp. 441-447; Day, *op. cit.*, pp. 113-116; Accame, *op. cit.*, pp. 168-170.

⁴¹ *Mithridateios*, 39. For epigraphical evidence see Ferguson, *Klio*, IV, p. 17; *Hellenistic Athens*, pp. 454-457; Accame, *op. cit.*, pp. 171-174; Geagan, *op. cit.*, p. 5 and note 28.

⁴² Accame, *op. cit.*, pp. 174-176; Geagan, *op. cit.*, pp. 64-65; Reinmuth, *loc. cit.*, and *Hesperia*, XXXIV, 1965, pp. 255-272. If, as Geagan suggests, *I.G.*, II², 1047, belongs to this democratic revival it would be necessary to place the revolution at Athens shortly before the battle of Pharsalos.

⁴³ Geagan, *op. cit.*, p. 61.

⁴⁴ Thompson, *op. cit.*, p. 408, points out the continuity of magistrates.

quickly become tyrannical, any restoration to a republican or representative government could be called "democratic" in the sense in which the word was used in contemporary sources.⁴⁵ The combined use of election and allotment was an oligarchic proposal at the end of the fifth century, and its reappearance under Sulla could be coupled with his other reform in the selection of archons, the prohibition against repeated service.

If the tribal cycles of prytany secretaries actually continued to function through the first century along the lines proposed,⁴⁶ a firmer date for this decree can be determined. The demotic of the secretary can be restored as Ἄνα[γυράσιος (Erechtheis I), Ἄνα[καίεύς (Hippothontis IX), or Ἄνα[φλύστιος (Antiochis XI). The second would have fallen fortuitously in 84/3 B.C., just when Sulla returned from the East through Athens.⁴⁷

There would have been little fear that the proposals be rejected in a public assembly of a people whose memory included the devastation of Sulla's earlier visit. Indeed few of the opposition party could have been around to muster resistance. The genius of the document lies in the use of precedents running far back into Athenian history and in the dependence upon the prestige of the council of the Areopagus, the traditional defender of the laws.

DANIEL J. GEAGAN

DARTMOUTH COLLEGE

⁴⁵ See above, pp. 103-104 and note 29.

⁴⁶ J. A. Notopoulos, "Studies in the Chronology of Athens," *Hesperia*, XVIII, 1949, pp. 1-13. These conclusions must be accepted only with great caution. Between 95/4 B.C. and A.D. 117/8, a span of more than two centuries, there are only two independently dateable documents: *I.G.*, II², 1046 of 52/1 B.C. and *I.G.*, II², 1047 of 49/8 B.C. Neither of these fits into a regular cycle, nor could they both be part of a regular cycle. Notopoulos postulates a sortition cycle to explain them. Secondly because the cycle of 95/4 B.C. does not align with that attested from A.D. 117/8, Notopoulos has postulated a break in the cycle from 91/0 B.C. until 86/5 B.C. The dating of *Hesperia*, XVII, 1948, no. 14, p. 30 to 64/3 B.C. and of *I.G.*, II², 2876 to 21/0 is done on the basis of the reconstructed cycle of secretaries. Reinmuth, *op. cit.*, p. 95, rightly reassigns the latter of these to a different period of time, but places it in 46/5 B.C. erroneously, since this year would have occurred during the sortition cycle, and not during a regular cycle. Although it is likely that cycles continued to be used, to project absolute regularity over so long a period despite frequent political upheavals is at best a dangerous procedure. If the cycles actually did function as reconstructed by Notopoulos, the following refinement in his chronology might be suggested. If the decree here published represents the resumption of regular government at Athens, it may be that the cycles resume in 84/3 B.C., not 86/5; the break would then have occurred at the revolution of Athenion rather than at the dictatorship of Medeios. The historical factors involved in the decree here published tend to support Notopoulos' reconstruction.

⁴⁷ For discussion of Sulla's return and his activity in Athens see Ferguson, *Hellenistic Athens*, p. 454; A. E. Raubitschek, "Sylleia," *Studies in Roman Economic and Social History in Honor of Allan Chester Johnson*, Princeton, 1951, pp. 49-57; Thompson, *op. cit.*, p. 439.



No. 1



No. 2



No. 3