

A CORINTHIAN INSCRIPTION RECORDING HONORS AT ELIS FOR CORINTHIAN JUDGES

(PLATE 60)

A stone bearing thirteen lines of an Eleian decree in honor of Corinthian judges is one of the longest inscriptions that have so far come to light at Corinth from the period before 146 B.C.* The inscription, which belongs to the 2nd century, is interesting on three counts: 1) it preserves the names of fourteen Corinthians and one Eleian who are otherwise unknown; 2) it is the latest known decree of Elis to employ the local dialect; 3) it records, though without providing any significant details, a minor transaction within the Achaian League during the last half-century of Greek independence.

Corinth inv. no. I 2568. A slab of mottled bluish gray marble, broken off at the top, bottom, and right side. Preserved height 0.21 m., preserved width 0.225 m., thickness 0.085 m. to 0.10 m. The original thickness is preserved, though the stone is not dressed at the back. The left face is not vertical, but slants inward slightly as it rises; it also slants inward towards the back, making an acute angle with the front face.

Height of most letters 0.005 m., of omicron 0.003 m. Interspacing of lines 0.010 to 0.012 m.

- τ]αῖ καλοκα[γαθίαι--]
 δὲ καὶ τοῖρ δικασταῖρ διοικ[άσαντερ---]
 ἀξίωρ τᾶρ ἐγχειρισθείσαρ αὐτοῖρ πίστι[ο]ρ[--προξέ-]
 νοιρ καὶ εὐεργέταιρ τᾶρ πόλιορ Νικοκλῇ Δια[--ίπ-]
 5 πω Νικάτα[ν Χ]ωνίδα Πολύξενον Νικάνδ[ρον ^{vel} ρίδα---]
 Ἀντάν[δρ]ο[υ] Ἀρχεμαχίδα Φιλαίθω Μνασέα[ν---]
 Τιμοσθένη Ἀγαθανδρίδα Δικαίαιρχον Δαμ[---]
 .]δα Ἀρχέμαχον Πειθιδάμω Κο[ρι]νθίοιρ ^{vv}[---]
 καὶ πολιτεῖαν καὶ ἀτέλειαν καὶ ἀσφάλειαν]
 10 λοιπὰ τίμια ὅσα κ[α]ὶ τοῖρ ἄλλοιρ προξένοιρ κ[αὶ---]
 αὐ]τοῖρ καὶ ἐπὶ τὰ[ν κοι]νὰν ἐστῖαν τοῖρ ἄρχο[ντερ---]
]Λάδρομον τὸν ἐπιμε[λητὰν---]
 τ]ὸ ἱερὸν ἩΑΕ πάντα τ[---]

* I wish to thank Professor H. S. Robinson for reading an earlier draft of this article and suggesting several improvements.

Line 2, διοικ[άσαντες. There is a blank space equivalent to a single letter between O and the traces of IK.

Line 6, Ἀντάν[δρ]ο[υ]. This form of the genitive, rather than Ἀντάνδρω, is certain.

Line 13, τ]δ̄ ιερὸν ΗΑΕ πάντα τ[. The letters HAE seem clear in the photograph, and even clearer on a squeeze. But nu is possible as well as eta; for nus and etas are very much alike in this inscription; compare the frequent nus with the etas of Νικοκλῆ in line 4 and of Τιμοσθένη in line 7. So I have adopted the reading NAE in proposing a very tentative restoration.

FORM AND SETTING

The inscription, found in 1962, came to light in a Roman level during excavation of an area just west of the ancient city wall, at the point where the modern road passes the Roman villa published by T. L. Shear as *Corinth*, V, *The Roman Villa* (Cambridge, Mass., 1930). Adjoining the villa on the south were Roman remains of various dates; the inscription was recovered from foundation fill laid down in the time of Augustus. Since all other surviving decrees have emerged in or near the Agora, we may safely assume that our inscription reached this outlying site in a cartload of rubble which the Roman builders removed from the Agora; the site is in fact traversed by a much-used ancient road leading west from the city, probably the main highway to Sikyon.

The form of the stone is of some interest. The preserved edge at the left shows that the stone tapered as it rose. The original width near the bottom of the fragment will have been about 0.35 m.: the lines here were about 62 letters long, and 35 letters take about 0.20 m. The original width near the top of the fragment, where the lines were about 57 letters long, will have been about 0.32 m. The taper is thus about 0.015 m. on a side over a rise of about 0.19 m.—a very considerable taper, which indeed leaps to the eye in the photograph. The original height of the stone cannot be estimated, because the lost preamble, describing the services of the Corinthian judges, may have run to any length, and of course we do not know what came below our text. The preserved left side of the stone also tapers markedly towards the back. The back of the stone has been left undressed, and the surface is extremely rough and uneven.

Similar stones have appeared before at Corinth, and are published with photographs by B. D. Meritt, *Corinth*, VIII, i, *Greek Inscriptions, 1896-1927* (Cambridge, Mass., 1931) and by J. H. Kent, *Corinth*, VIII, iii, *Greek and Latin Inscriptions, 1926-1950* (Princeton, 1968). Kent no. 46b, which is almost identical to our inscription in respect of lettering, is another slab of bluish gray marble which exhibits all the peculiarities noted above—the taper towards the top and towards the back, the undressed back surface. Kent no. 46a (= Meritt no. 6) was probably akin, but is now broken on all sides. No other examples can be identified. Meritt no. 4, mentioned again below for its similar lettering, has a vertical left edge and no taper towards the back. It is obvious that our inscription and Kent no. 46b were meant to be set up

against a wall, perhaps inside a stoa, where the back of the stone would be hidden from view. The taper towards the back would further help to conceal the undressed surface by removing the back edge from direct light and from an observer's angle of vision.

RESTORATION

The inscription is easily recognized as a decree honoring the Corinthian judges listed in lines 4-8. The name of the state that issued the decree does not appear in the surviving lines, but the dialect points unmistakably to Elis. The dialect is fully discussed below; two points of orthography may be mentioned here. Firstly, the accusative plurals of the first and second declension, identical in form to the datives, have been distinctively accented wherever the conventional accent of the two cases differs: e. g. in line 2, *τοῖρ δικάσταῖρ* instead of *τοῖρ δικάσταῖρ*.¹ Secondly, initial psilosis has been indicated throughout, e. g. in line 10, *ῶσα*, though the evidence for this phenomenon in Eleian does not reach beyond the Archaic period.²

The dialectal coloring is confined to inflection, and the vocabulary and style of our decree follow the standard pattern of Hellenistic protocol. It is fairly simple, therefore, to supply the missing words in the preserved portion of the text. Reassurance can be found in a completely preserved Eleian decree honoring Damokrates of Tenedos (*I.v.O.*, no. 39),³ which is close in date to our inscription and exhibits the same superficial use of dialect. Less helpful is *I.v.O.*, no. 52 = *S.I.G.*³, 683, lines 3-28, an Eleian decree of ca. 140 B.C. honoring ambassadors from Messene; this document was drafted in the Doric koine.

As the photograph will show, the left-hand edge of the stone remains intact; lines 1-11 are complete or nearly so on this side. Because the formulas employed in lines 1-3 and 8-10 are variable only within certain limits, it is clear that the length of line in our inscription was approximately 60 letters. But the stone tapered markedly as it rose. Accordingly the lines will increase in length towards the bottom. As restored here, lines 1-2 have 57 letters, lines 3 and 8-9 have 59, line 10 has 64, line 11 has 60, and lines 12-13 have 62. It must be remembered that letter size and spacing vary (the first 28 letters of line 4 taking up the same space as the first 25 of line 5), and that the right-hand margin was certainly not regular; therefore the

¹ W. Dittenberger and K. Purgold in *Olympia V, Inschriften von Olympia*, reprinted Amsterdam, 1966 (*I.v. O.*), consistently accented these accusatives as datives, on the grounds that the identity of form bespeaks a lack of discrimination between the two cases (see their note on *I.v.O.*, no. 2 at col. 6). But this view of the phenomenon has not convinced most linguists; see F. Kiechle, *Röm. Mitt.* 101, 1960, pp. 348 and also 362-365.

² See Dittenberger and Purgold at *I.v.O.*, col. 80, commenting on the form *καθῶρ* in *I.v.O.*, 39.

³ This inscription also appears as Collitz and Bechtel, *Sammlung der Griechischen Dialekt-Inschriften*, no. 1172; Schwyzler, *Dialectorum Graecarum Exempla Epigraphica Potiora*, Leipzig, 1923, no. 425; C. Buck, *Greek Dialects*, Chicago, 1955, no. 66.

are regularly inscribed on bronze. The absence of a divine name in the genitive after τ]δ̄ ἱερόν (e. g. τῷ Διὶ τῷ Ὀλυμπίῳ, as in *I.v.O.*, no. 39, line 32) is most surprising. Did the stonecutter omit the name for lack of space?

Line 13, (ῖ)γα --- διαμένη. Similar phrases occur in two Delphic documents of this period: *S.I.G.*³, no. 565, lines 13-14 (a Delphic decree from the closing years of the 3rd century B.C.) and *S.I.G.*³, no. 598, lines 12-13, an Amphiktyonic decree of the year 194; the phrase is partly restored).

EPIGRAPHICAL DATING

The lettering provides a general indication of date. The most striking features are the neat, wide interspacing of lines and the small, perfunctory letters cut with rough strokes and varying somewhat in size and shape. Many letters have serifs which are especially visible on the rhos of lines 3 and 4. Some alphas have a broken bar (e. g. the second alpha of καλοκα[γαθίαι in line 1 and the second alpha of ἀσφάλειαν in line 9); others plainly do not. The serifs and the broken-bar alphas point to a date in the late 3rd or the first half of the 2nd century B.C.⁴

All the features mentioned recur on two or three other Corinthian stones known to Meritt and Kent. Closest are Kent nos. 46a (= Meritt no. 6) and 46b, which in my opinion are fragments of separate inscriptions.⁵ The letters in the two fragments are slightly larger than ours; the measurement 0.007 m. given by both Meritt and Kent is however a maximum. The interspacing of lines in Kent no. 46a is 0.009 to 0.010 m., in 46b, 0.010 to 0.014 m. The shape of the letters and the quality of the strokes resemble ours in all respects: there are serifs and broken-bar alphas, the latter more consistently executed (or more often discernible) because of the larger letter size. Meritt no. 4 also deserves to be compared. The letters are about the same size as in Kent nos. 46a and 46b, but the strokes are finer and surer, giving a much cleaner appearance. The interspacing of lines is narrower, 0.007 to 0.009 m. Finials and broken-bar alphas are conspicuous for the most part; but a few alphas, as in lines 10, 11, and 12, have been carelessly made with a single cross stroke.

Kent nos. 46a and 46b and Meritt no. 4 are all fragments of dikastic decrees,

⁴ See W. Larfeld, *Griechische Epigraphik*, Munich, 1914, pp. 269-70.

⁵ The difference in the interspacing of the lines surely forbids us to associate the two fragments. (The variations within each fragment which I record—0.009 to 0.010 m. for no. 46a and 0.010 to 0.014 m. for 46b—are not progressive from line to line, but occur between the same lines, according to the shape and size of the letters.) When I inspected the stones in the Corinth Museum in 1963, I dismissed the apparent affinity for this reason and because the stones are not quite the same in color and texture. It should be noted too that no. 46a is 0.071 m. thick and no. 46b is 0.09 m. thick, though this disparity would not by itself prove them separate; witness the uneven thickness of our inscription. It is clear that both fragments derive from dikastic decrees, which generally follow a set pattern; but now that several such decrees are known from this period even within the meager repertory of Corinthian inscriptions, there is no good reason to lump the two fragments together. The restorations (partly due to Woodward) which Kent incorporated are venturesome beyond the norm; in particular Argos has no right to intrude. And the supplement proposed in no. 46b, lines 3-4, is unacceptable in point of idiom: see L. Robert, *Rev. Et. Gr.* 79, 1966, p. 738.

like ours. None can be dated on internal evidence, but opinions based on the letter forms favor the 2nd century. Kent no. 46a was assigned by Meritt to "the late third or early second century B.C." Although Kent does not offer a date for nos. 46a and 46b, the 2nd century seems indicated by the place which they occupy in his chronological series. Meritt no. 4 belongs to "about the middle of the second century B.C."

On this showing our inscription can be dated to the late 3rd or the first half of the 2nd century B.C.; an earlier date is ruled out by the broken-bar alphas which our inscription shares, though in lesser measure, with Kent nos. 46a and 46b and Meritt no. 4.

NAMES AND PERSONS

The Corinthian judges listed in lines 4-8 originally numbered 13, with as many fathers, making a total of 26 names. Only 14 names can now be read. None of these Corinthians is otherwise known.

Νικοκλή Δία[--- (line 4). Νικοκλῆς *Korinthier*, entered in W. Pape and G. Benseler, *Wörterbuch der griechischen Eigennamen*, Braunschweig, 1875, with a reference to M. Meier, *Commentatio epigraphica in indice scholarum*, Halle, 1851-2, no. 10, is a figment, for the text in question, *I.G.*, II², no. 791, frag. d, line 23 = *Hesperia* 11, 1942, p. 291, actually names Φι[λ]οκλῆς Κορίν. As for Δία[, there are several possibilities, but none seems to be attested at Corinth.

Νικάτα[ν Χ]ωνίδα (line 5). I have restored the father's name thus because Βιωνίδας and Διωνίδας are unexampled. Χιωνίδας is not uncommon, and Νίκιππος Χιωνίδα stood surety for a manumission at Amphissa in the 1st century after Christ (*I.G.*, IX 1², 3, no. 754, line 6). If Δ]ωνίδα were deemed possible, Δίων Νικάτα, who appears among the Ἀχαιοὶ καὶ σύννοικοι in the Epidaurian *polyandria* of 146 B.C. (*I.G.*, IV² 1, no. 28, line 73), might conceivably be canvassed as a son of our Nikatas.

Πολύξενον Νικάνδ[ρον ^{vel} ρίδα (line 5). The names Nikander and Nikandridas are both attested for other Corinthians, Polyxenos is not. Νίκανδρος Ἀσκληπιάδο[ν] Κορίνθιος was granted citizenship at Miletos in ca. 200 B.C. (*Milet* I, 3, p. 215: Delphinion no. 78). For Nikandridas I rely on the report of V. Chr. Petrakos, Ὁ Ὀρωπὸς καὶ τὸ Ἱερὸν τοῦ Ἀμφιαράου, Athens, 1968, p. 162, no. 7. In describing the important statue base which appears as no. 23 on his plan (p. 145) and carries the decrees *I.G.*, VII, nos. 357-370, 389-391 (mostly of the 2nd century B.C.), Petrakos gives the name of the Corinthian honored in no. 367 as Νικανδρίδης Νικοδάμων. The text in *I.G.*, VII shows only a blank space equivalent to 7 letters before]Νικοδάμων Κορίνθιος.

Ἀντάν[δρ]ο[ν] (line 6). No Corinthian of this name appears elsewhere.

Ἀρχεμαχίδαν Φιλαίθω (line 6). These names are not otherwise attested at Corinth.

Μνασέα[ν] (line 6). Not otherwise attested at Corinth.

Τιμοσθένη Ἀγαθανδρίδα (line 7). The name Timosthenes is borne by other Corinthians. Τιμοσθένης Τιμύλλον of Corinth witnessed the repayment of a loan at Epidaurus ca. 221/0 (*I.G.*, IV² 1, no. 42, line 25). A statue base at Corinth, dating from the late 3rd century, honors Καφισοτέλης Τιμοσθένεος (Meritt no. 60). As for Agathandridas, it is just possible that the Corinthian who won the boy's foot race at Olympia in 472 B.C. was so called: the reading of *Ox. Pap.*, II, no. 222 (= Pack² 2188), line 27 is given as]ανδρίδας Κορίνθιος παιδ στάδιον, and for the doubtful letter either tau or gamma or sigma is suggested; given this range, perhaps Ἀγα]θανδρίδας might be mooted too.

Δικαίαρχον Δαμ[--- (line 7). The name Dikaiarchos is not otherwise attested at Corinth.

Ἀρχέμαχον Πειθιδάμω (line 8). These names are not otherwise attested at Corinth.

In line 12 Λάδρομον is the Eleian official charged with posting the decree. This rare name is not otherwise attested at Elis, although its two elements occur in other Eleian names. Λάδοκος is known from several inscriptions of the late 1st century B.C. (*I.v.O.*, no. 61, line 12 and nos. 289-291: probably the same man throughout). Νικόδρομος appears in two texts (*I.v.O.*, no. 39, line 37, the decree for Damokrates of Tenedos, and no. 194, of the 1st century B.C.).

DIALECT

The language of the decree is the Eleian dialect, which until recently was known solely from inscriptions found at Olympia. An Eleian decree appears among the *Asylierkunden* of Kos published in 1952 (*S.E.G.*, XII, no. 371, lines 32-40); and another example of the dialect, published in 1968, comes from the Arkadian town of Alipheira (*S.E.G.*, XXV, no. 448). The most striking feature of the dialect is "rhotacism," the use of rho in place of final sigma. In certain other respects Eleian resembles both Aiolic and Northwest Greek.⁶ Yet the dialect does not seem entirely self-consistent throughout its recorded history—from the early 6th century onwards—and as a result its character and range have been the subject of controversy.⁷ It must be said at once that our inscription does little by itself to clarify

⁶ For the present purpose it will do no harm to use the familiar term "Aiolic," although W. F. Wyatt has convincingly shown that this term, like other elements of the traditional classification of Greek dialects, obscures the true facts of linguistic development ("The Prehistory of the Greek Dialects," *T.A.P.A.*, 101, 1970, pp. 557-632); by his account Lesbian, Thessalian, and Boiotian are "separate entities" emerging from "low-class Northern Greek." Elsewhere he argues that "Aiolisms" occurring in Eleian and other Peloponnesian dialects are in fact archaisms that originate with the first Greek settlers of the Peloponnesos and persist only in a few backwaters ("The Aeolic Substrate in the Peloponnesos," *A.J.P.*, 94, 1973, pp. 37-46).

⁷ A full discussion, with references to earlier studies, may be found in F. Kiechle, "Das Verhältnis von Elis, Triphylien und der Pisatis im Spiegel der Dialektunterschiede," *Röm. Mitt.*, 103,

the issues. Not a single new and distinctive form occurs; verb forms, which would be most helpful, are missing altogether.

The Eleian traits presented by our inscription may be listed as follows. Rhotacism: e. g. line 3, ἀξίωρ τὰρ ἐγχειρισθείσαρ αὐτοῖρ πίστι[ο]ρ. Aiolic accusative plurals in the first and second declensions: line 2, τοῖρ δικασταίρ; lines 3-4, προξέ]/νοιρ καὶ ἐνεργέταιρ; line 8, Κ[ορ]ωθίοιρ; line 11, αὐ]τοῖρ and τοῖρ ἄρχο[ντερ. In line 2, διοικ[άσαντερ and in line 11, ἄρχο[ντερ the Aiolic accusative plurals of the third declension have been restored after the analogy of *I.v.O.*, no. 39, lines 8 and 16. The following Eleian traits also belong to the Northwest Greek and the Doric koine. Alpha for eta: e. g. line 3, τὰρ ἐγχειρισθείσαρ; line 4, Νικάτα[ν. Genitive singular of first declension nouns in —α: e. g. line 5, Χ]ιωνίδα. Genitive singular of the second declension in —ω: line 6, Φιλαίθω; line 8, Πειθιδάμω. In line 13, ἐ(ν) for εἰς will be another Northwest Greek form, if the proposed articulation is right.

Unlike *I.v.O.*, no. 39 our fragment preserves, apart from the accusative plurals in —αιρ and —οιρ, no specifically Aiolic feature (of course the genitives in —α and —ω noticed above are shared by Aiolic). Our inscription also differs from *I.v.O.*, no. 39, from *S.E.G.*, XXV, no. 448, and from earlier Eleian inscriptions in admitting forms of the Attic koine:⁸ line 6, Ἀντάν[δρ]ο[ν] instead of Ἀντάνδρω; line 10, ὄσα instead of ὄσσα (as in *I.v.O.*, no. 39, line 20); line 13, ἱερὸν instead of ἱαρόν (as in *I.v.O.*, no. 39, line 30 and *S.E.G.*, XXV, no. 448, line 13). These lapses might be blamed on the Corinthian stonecutter, who at this period often inscribed documents in the Attic koine (though decrees of Corinth itself were seemingly framed in the Doric koine);⁹ or they may have already appeared in the Eleian exemplar which was sent to Corinth.

The Alipheira text, dating from the second half of the 3rd century B.C., needs to be considered here. A. K. Orlandos, who published the text,¹⁰ described it as a decree of Alipheira; and it is so registered by Woodhead in *S.E.G.* (XXV, no. 448). This view, for which no justification is offered, would complicate still further the problems connected with the Eleian dialect and would also obscure the origin of our decree. The range of the Eleian dialect—or of its various elements, if the language of certain Eleian texts is in fact an amalgam—has always been taken to be Hollow Elis, Pisatis, and Triphylia. No one has ever suggested that Eleian was spoken in Kynouria, the region along the upper Alpheios to which Alipheira belongs; and indeed there is ample evidence that the towns of Kynouria were Arkadian in speech and outlook. Other texts published by Orlandos prove as much for Alipheira itself. *S.E.G.*, XXV, no. 447, also assignable to the later 3rd century B.C., is undoubtedly a

1960, pp. 366-366. But Kiechle's conclusions, as we shall see below, are not easy to accept.

⁸ I exclude victory monuments from the reckoning; see footnote 19 below.

⁹ See R. S. Stroud, *Hesperia* 41, 1972, pp. 199-200.

¹⁰ A. K. Orlandos, *Ἡ ἀρκαδικὴ Ἀλίφεира καὶ τὰ μνημεῖα τῆς*, Athens, 1968, pp. 151-157, no. 2.

decree of Alipheira (the stone is displayed in the sanctuary of Athena on the acropolis of Alipheira, and certain fines are paid to Athena); the language is a local Arkadian dialect.¹¹ A somewhat later document, though very fragmentary, also exhibits a number of Arkadian forms (*S.E.G.*, XXV, no. 449, lines 6, 10, 11, 22).

Moreover, the document in Eleian contains clear indications that it did not originate in Alipheira. The phrase ἐ]ν Ἀλιφείραι, rather than ἐν τῷ πόλει, occurs in the body of the document (line 15). Lines 13-15 seem to require the people of Alipheira to swear obedience to the terms of a settlement which is imposed from without. In line 16 the same oath is to be sworn by others—whether by another body within Alipheira or by another city is not clear; nor is the origin of Aristodamos and Kallistratos (lines 1, 2, 8), whose contention has been adjudicated by the decree. In lines 12-13 the people of Alipheira were directed to set up a copy of the decree in the sanctuary of Athena: e. g. τὰρ δὲ στάλαρ τ[ὰν ἀνάθεσιν τοῖς Ἀλιφείρειρ ποιήαντω ἐ]ν τῷ ἱερῷ τὰρ Ἀθά]ναρ.¹² The position of this clause is another sign that the people of Alipheira were not the authors of the decree; for in civic decrees dealing with internal affairs the provisions for posting the text always come at the end.

S.E.G., XXV, no. 448 is most naturally interpreted as a decree of Elis regulating matters in Alipheira—or possibly matters between Alipheira and a neighboring city. Although Alipheira was Arkadian, it belonged to Elis from ca. 244, when it was handed over by Lydiades tyrant of Megalopolis (Polybius, IV, 77, 10, with Walbank's note, *A Historical Commentary on Polybius* I, Oxford, 1957, p. 531), down to 219 B.C., when it was seized by Philip V (Polybius, IV, 78, 3-13). The lettering of the Alipheira inscription suits this period. Now line 3 appears to say that the decision of a certain city shall be binding: this city will be Elis or some other place empowered by Elis to arbitrate—certainly not Alipheira, as Orlandos and Woodhead have it. A restoration of lines 3-5, which in view of the problematic text can only be very tentative,¹³ might run as follows: — — — κύρια ἡμῶν τὰ δεδ[ο]γμ[ε]να τὰρ πόλιος τὰρ τ[ὴν] Ἀλείων· ὅπως δὲ παραδοθῶν,] το[ῖς] δαμιοργοῖς

¹¹ The more notable Arkadian forms are studied by G.-J.-M.-J. de Riele, "Contributions épigraphiques à la connaissance du grec ancien," *Mnemosyne*, n. s. 21, 1968, pp. 337-346.

¹² τὰρ δὲ στάλαρ can only be the genitive singular. The accent printed by Orlandos and Woodhead, τὰρ δὲ στάλαρ, suggests the accusative plural, but no such form occurs in Eleian. In line 9, again, μναῖρ (Orlandos and Woodhead) should be accented μναίρ, unless the view is taken that dative and accusative plural were indistinguishable in Eleian (see footnote 1 above); Orlandos is wrong in any case to argue that ἀποτειάτω can be construed with the dative. Likewise in line 6 ταῖρ ἐξ ἀρχῶν γενομέναιρ should be accented ταίρ κτλ. as the subject or predicate of ἡμῶν.

¹³ Neither margin has survived and the length of the lines is unknown. (Orlandos proceeds as if the left-hand margin were secure, but as Woodhead observes, the photograph, fig. 105 on p. 152, proves him wrong.) The stone, which was examined and photographed by Orlandos in 1935 under difficult conditions, has since disappeared, and the text remains both fragmentary and uncertain: many of the readings reported by Orlandos make no sense at all. Unless the stone is recovered, it is unlikely that our understanding of the text will ever advance very far.

ἐπιμέ[λε]σθα[ι¹⁴...ἐ]λομένο[ι]ρ ἄνδ[ρ]ερ --- κατὰ τάδε ἔκρ]ινεν τὸ δικαστήριον τὸ τᾶρ πόλιος τῶ[ν Ἀλείων ---.

There can be no reasonable doubt, then, that this inscription reproduces a decree of Elis. We now have four documents of the middle Hellenistic period exhibiting the Eleian dialect—the bronze tablet from Olympia (*I.v.O.*, no. 39), and the stones from Kos (*S.E.G.*, XII, no. 371, lines 32-40), from Alipheira (*S.E.G.*, XXV, no. 448), and from Corinth. *S.E.G.*, XII, no. 371 is securely dated to the year 242 B.C. As we have seen, *S.E.G.*, XXV, no. 448 belongs to the second half of the 3rd century, more precisely to the years between *ca.* 244 and 219 B.C. The Corinthian inscription is dated by the lettering to the late 3rd or the first half of the 2nd century and for historical reasons (to be examined later) must be placed after 191 B.C. The date of *I.v.O.*, no. 39, the decree for Damokrates of Tenedos, probably falls just a few years earlier. Current opinion assigns the text to the general span of the later 3rd and the earlier 2nd century.¹⁵ But the date can be narrowed considerably.

An exemplar of the decree is to be delivered to Tenedos by Eleian *thearoi* bound for Miletos and the festival Didymeia (lines 33-38). A festival which drew delegates from Elis can only be the quadrennial Didymeia, first mentioned in a Milesian decree of 200/199 (*S.I.G.*³, no. 577, lines 69-71); the future celebration envisaged in *I.v.O.*, no. 39 may well be the first quadrennial event.¹⁶ At any rate another Milesian decree which is perhaps slightly later records the decision to invite Greeks everywhere to take part (*S.I.G.*³, no. 590, lines 22-23); such an invitation must have been issued before Elis sent *thearoi*. Now the decree for Damokrates of Tenedos describes the mission of the *thearoi* with some particularity, and we may suspect that this is the original Eleian response to the invitation. And the decade after 200 provides a very plausible setting for the decree, which is an instrument of Eleian foreign policy; although Damokrates of Tenedos was an Olympic victor (lines 6-7; cf. Pausanias, VI, 17, 1 and Aelian, *Miscellaneous Stories* IV, 15), he and his father are praised mainly for their services to the city of Elis and its citizens (especially in lines 14-15). Now Tenedos was almost certainly among the states that went over to Antiochos during his naval campaign of 197 B.C.¹⁷ The ties between Elis and Tenedos were very likely

¹⁴ I. e. ἐπιμέλεσθαι.

¹⁵ It was formerly placed in the first half of the 3rd century (Dittenberger and Purgold on *I.v.O.*, no. 39, col. 79; Wilhelm, *Beiträge zur Griechischen Inschriftenkunde*, Vienna, 1909, p. 20). For the later date see Wilhelm, *Jahresh.* 17, 1914, p. 23; Hiller on *S.I.G.*³, no. 590, note 1; Kiechle, *Röm. Mitt.* 103, 1960, p. 362, note 82; J. and L. Robert, *Rev. Et. Gr.* 75, 1962, p. 162.

¹⁶ The earliest agonistic inscription to mention a victory at the Didymeia is dated roughly to the middle of the 2nd century (Moretti, *Iscrizioni Agonistiche Greche*, Rome, 1953, no. 49).

¹⁷ Our sources speak of scattered conquests as far as Abydos and the Chersonese (Livy XXXIII, 38, 1-7; Jerome, *Commentary on Daniel* 11, 15-18 = Porphyry in Jacoby, *F. Gr.H.*, no. 260, F 46-47); Jerome includes "many islands." In fact all the large islands from Rhodes to Lesbos escaped his reach, as well as a few coastal cities. The extent of Antiochos' success is discussed by E. Bickerman, *Rev. Et. Gr.* 50, 1937, pp. 236-239, and by H. H. Schmitt, *Untersuchungen*

formed during the later 190's, when the Eleians and their allies the Aitolians turned eastward to counter the advance of the Achaian League under Roman auspices.¹⁸ On the most natural reading of events the years following the Roman evacuation of Greece, from 194 to 191 B.C., will have seen the decree for Damokrates.

Taken together, the four Eleian documents from Kos, Alipheira, Olympia, and Corinth show that the speech of Elis in the middle Hellenistic period still retained strong idiosyncrasies of pronunciation and inflection.¹⁹ No doubt the grammar and the vocabulary of local speakers were also peculiar, but they have left no trace in these documents, which are drawn up in the conventional style of Hellenistic protocol. That the specifically Aiolic features of Eleian are more prominent in *I.v.O.*, no. 39 than in the other three texts is surely accidental; the Koan text is short, the other two are very fragmentary, and half the Corinthian text consists of a string of names. In respect of date *I.v.O.*, no. 39 comes after the decrees from Kos and Alipheira, and before the decree from Corinth, if the arguments urged above are correct; if not, it must be close in date to at least one of the other documents. Thus there is no reason to think that the dialect of *I.v.O.*, no. 39 is not entirely typical. These considerations suggest that the view of the Eleian dialect propounded a few years ago by F. Kiechle is in fact misguided.

Kiechle held that in *I.v.O.*, no. 39, and even more in an Eleian amnesty decree of the mid-4th century (Schwyzer, *op. cit.* [footnote 3 above], no. 424),²⁰ the Eleian

zur Geschichte Antiochos' des Grossen und seiner Zeit, Wiesbaden, 1964, pp. 278-285. There is no direct evidence concerning Tenedos, and Schmitt concludes that its fate is "quite unknown." But since Tenedos lay closest to Antiochos' base of operations at Abydos and to his bridgehead in Thrace, it seems inconceivable that he left the island unsecured.

¹⁸ It is quite possible that Miletos too came to favor Antiochos, who made Ephesos his headquarters in 197. True, in 196 Miletos and Magnesia accepted Rhodian mediation in their territorial dispute (*S.I.G.*³, no. 588), but dealings with Antiochos were not excluded either then or later. The statue of Damokrates at Olympia was made by a certain Dionysikles of Miletos (Pausanias, VI, 17, 1) who is otherwise unknown.

¹⁹ The only other Eleian decree surviving from the Hellenistic period is *I.v.O.*, no. 52 = *S.I.G.*³, no. 683, lines 3-28, of about 140 B.C., which concerns the award of the *ager Dentheliates* to Messene. The decree is drafted in the Doric (not the Northwest Greek) koine, but this need not mean that the Eleian dialect was now wholly given up for official purposes (so Dittenberger and Purgold at *I.v.O.*, col. 79 and Kiechle at p. 352), since there were special reasons for using the koine here. The Eleian decree is only part of the record of the award that was posted at Olympia; it is followed by a letter from Miletos (lines 29-40) and then by the Milesian account of the award (lines 41-70), both drafted in the Attic koine. The whole series was inscribed on the pedestal of the Messenian Victory, of which the original dedication, also inscribed on the pedestal, is half in Doric and half in Ionic (Meiggs and Lewis, *A Selection of Greek Historical Inscriptions*, Oxford, 1969, no. 74.) *I.v.O.*, no. 179, a monument honoring an Eleian victor of 216 B.C. and containing the form Ἡλείος (cf. nos. 180, 189, and many subsequent bases from the 2nd and 1st centuries B.C.), was also adduced by Dittenberger and Purgold as evidence for the disuse of the dialect; but this category of inscription should not be so interpreted.

²⁰ This text also appears in the collections of Solmsen and Fraenkel (*Inscriptiones Graecae ad Illustrandas Dialectos Selectae*, Leipzig, 1905, no. 53) and of Buck (*The Greek Dialects*, no. 65).

authorities consciously introduced "Aiolisms" in order to gratify Aiolic-speaking *perioikoi* in Triphylia and Pisatis.²¹ At the earlier date Kiechle linked this practice with a supposed *Integrierungspolitik* which the Eleians will have adopted after they could no longer control the southern districts by main force. The recurrence of Aiolic features a hundred and fifty years later in *I.v.O.*, no. 39 was an embarrassment to the theory: Kiechle stopped short of affirming that the "policy of integration" still prevailed; he spoke instead of "a kind of tribute to a common *Aiolertum*," which though chiefly addressed to Aiolians of the Peloponnesos was inspired in the first instance by recognition of Damokrates' Aiolian heritage in Tenedos. The new texts from Kos, Alipheira, and Corinth do not support such speculations;²² we may safely return to the natural supposition that all the dialectal features attested in Eleian documents early and late come from a single local dialect.

THE CIRCUMSTANCES

Our inscription is dated to the late 3rd or early 2nd century B.C. by the sporadic broken-bar alphas. The upper limit can be lowered to 191, the year in which Elis joined the Achaian League (Livy, XXXVI, 31, 1-3; 35, 7). Before this date Elis would not have invited or allowed Corinthian judges to settle her affairs, for Elis, the ally and pawn of Aitolia, consistently opposed the Achaian League. It is true that from 224 to 196 Corinth, though nominally attached to the Achaian League, was in fact dominated by the Macedonian garrison which occupied the citadel;²³ but ever since the Social War Elis and Aitolia had been equally hostile to Macedon. In 191 Elis did not enter the Achaian League without constraint: having first sided with Antiochos against the Romans, she retrieved her error by accepting the terms of the League before Flamininus arrived on the scene. Nonetheless Elis seems not to have suffered under the new dispensation. The League pressed its advantage against Messenia and Sparta, and the history of the following years is full of wrangling and bloodshed over the status of these two districts; but we hear nothing

The question of date is discussed by Kiechle, *Röm. Mitt.* 103, 1960, p. 353, note 59, who opts for the period 362-343 B.C.; but his assumption that the decree refers to exiled aristocrats is unwarranted.

²¹ Kiechle's treatment of Eleian is indeed open to objection on all essential points: he certainly exaggerates the incidence of "Aiolisms" in Schwyzler no. 424 and the contrast with earlier Eleian inscriptions (to reckon the suppression of intervocalic sigma as an Aiolic feature is downright perverse); and he does not at all succeed in proving either that the inhabitants of Hollow Elis on the one hand and of Pisatis and Triphylia on the other were sharply distinct in race and speech, or that the Northwest Greek elements in Eleian texts derive from the former and the Aiolic from the latter.

²² Despite Thucydides, IV, 42, 2, no one will assert that Corinthian judges were welcomed and honored at Elis because Corinth shared in "the common *Aiolertum*."

²³ As Briscoe remarks on Livy, XXXI, 22, 6 (*A Commentary on Livy Books XXXI-XXXIII*, Oxford, 1973, p. 116), the course of events shows that the Macedonians did exercise effective control over the city.

of trouble in Elis. On the contrary, such slender indications as we have suggest that Elis was specially favored. The League assembly held an extraordinary meeting at Elis in 189/8 (Livy, XXXVIII, 32, 3), and in 188/7 Philopoimen dispatched an important embassy to Rome under the leadership of a certain Nikodemos of Elis (Polybius, XXII, 3, 4; 7, 5). Now Elis at this period was a land of country squires whose numerous slaves and abundant stores made them practically self-sufficient on their great estates (Polybius, IV, 73, 6-8);²⁴ these conditions produced a stable oligarchy at a time when the rest of Greece was threatened with social upheaval, and the statesmen of the Achaian League must have welcomed the example and the influence of such a neighbor.

The issue which the Corinthians adjudicated to the satisfaction of Elis remains in the dark, since the preamble of our decree is entirely lost. It could have been an internal matter, or a quarrel between Elis and a neighboring state over contracts or boundaries. Polybius' description of the harmony and security of Eleian society may seem to tell against the first alternative; indeed the historian declares that the Eleians seldom go to law, apart from minor cases which are heard locally by circuit judges (IV, 73, 7-8). A territorial dispute with a neighbor is by far the likeliest reason for Corinthian arbitration. It is a fact that in the early 2nd century a number of cities on Elis' southern periphery gained their independence under the aegis of the Achaian League, and that Elis herself was enrolled in the League at about the same time; thus boundaries had to be drawn or redrawn throughout the area of Triphylia and western Arkadia. And actual boundary arbitrations, touching the cities of Lepreion, Heraia, and Alipheira, stand on record.

Triphylia and Heraia, in Macedonian hands since 219 and 224 respectively, were yielded by Philip to the Achaian League in 199/8 (Livy, XXXII, 5, 4),²⁵ and this disposition was ratified by the Roman commissioners in 196 (Polybius, XVIII, 47, 10 and Livy, XXXIII, 34, 9). Alipheira, also held by Philip since 219, now passed to Megalopolis (Livy, XXXII, 5, 4-5);²⁶ but in 194/3 or shortly thereafter Philopoimen detached a number of Arkadian towns from Megalopolis and made them

²⁴ Polybius' digression on Eleian society and policy (IV, 73, 6-74, 8) is tied to events of the year 219/8, but his language leaves no doubt whatever that he is describing Elis as it was in his own day, before the Achaian War: see Walbank *ad loc.* (*A Historical Commentary on Polybius*, I, Oxford, 1957, pp. 525-526).

²⁵ Livy previously reported the restoration of Heraia and Triphylia to the Achaian League, and of Alipheira to Megalopolis, under the year 208 (XXVIII, 8, 6); but it is commonly agreed that at the earlier date Philip merely proposed or promised the restoration, and that Livy has misunderstood Polybius, his source: see Briscoe on Livy, XXXII, 5, 4-5 (*Commentary*, pp. 174-175).

²⁶ Mention of Megalopolis has dropped out of the transmitted text of Livy, which is impossible as it stands; Madvig's supplement *Triphylian Eleis* <*ademptam, Megalopolitis*> *Alipheran* or some thing very like it has been universally adopted. In any case Dittenberger and Purgold's view that after 219 Alipheira "did not again form an element of the Megalopolitan domain but was an independent community" (*I.v.O.*, col. 100) must rest on an oversight.

independent (Plutarch, *Philopoimen* XIII, 8),²⁷ and they appear to have included the principal communities of Kynouria, namely Alipheira, Gortys, and Thisoa: these three minted coins in the early 2nd century (B. V. Head, *Historia Numorum*, 2nd ed., Oxford, 1911, pp. 417-18), and Thisoa is found issuing decrees (*S.I.G.*³, no. 623). An inscription from Alipheira, almost certainly of this period (*S.E.G.*, XXV, no. 449), records the settlement, by judges of unknown origin, of a boundary dispute between Alipheira and Lepreion.²⁸ An arbitration between Alipheira and Heraia exists in *I.v.O.*, no. 48, of the first half of the 2nd century. None of this directly concerns Elis. Both Triphylia and Alipheira, however, had been Eleian possessions before 219, and so we may be sure that boundaries between Elis and the newly independent towns to the south were also adjusted by external arbitrators, doubtless under the general auspices of the Achaian League.²⁹ Here is the likeliest occasion for the Eleian decree found at Corinth.

NOEL ROBERTSON

BROCK UNIVERSITY

²⁷ Plutarch's indication of date is vague, merely showing that the measure followed Philopoimen's return from Crete in late 194 B.C. Hiller on *S.I.G.*³, no. 623 puts it in 189 and canvasses various opinions ranging from 194 to 188/7; R. M. Errington, *Philopoemen*, Oxford, 1969, pp. 90-91, prefers the months immediately after Philopoimen's return.

²⁸ The two fragments of this text were published by Orlandos, *Ἡ ἀρκαδικὴ Ἀλίφειρα καὶ τὰ μνημεῖα τῆς*, Athens, 1968, pp. 158-167, nos. 3, 4. Orlandos, followed by Woodhead in *S.E.G.*, dated the inscription to the later 3rd or earlier 2nd century; but the 3rd century can be ruled out. From the 240's down to 219 both Lepreion and Alipheira belonged to Elis, from 219 to 199/8 both belonged to Philip, and a border dispute between the two dependencies would not have been the subject of external arbitration. Nor does the brief period during which Alipheira was reincorporated in Megalopolis—from 199/8 to ca. 194/3—form a suitable context.

²⁹ *I.G.*, IV² 1, no. 71 = *S.I.G.*³, no. 471 (see further *S.E.G.*, XI, no. 402, XIII, nos. 251, 281, XXIII, no. 193) shows the Achaian League intervening at an earlier period, between 242/1 and 235/4, to settle a boundary dispute between two League cities, Epidauros and Corinth, through the offices of a third League city, Megara, which sent out a panel of 151 judges. *I.G.*, IV² 1, no. 72 is a similar document, surviving in fragmentary form: here the contending parties were Epidauros and Methana-Arsinoe, and the judges came from several League cities (11, according to a doubtful supplement), including Pellene, Aigion, and Thelphusa. The adjudication of another boundary dispute was recorded in an inscription, also of the second half of the 3rd century, set up at the League capital of Aigion, perhaps in the sanctuary of Zeus Hamarios (J. Bingen, "Inscriptions de Péloponnèse, 1: Arbitrage de frontière," *B.C.H.* 77, 1953, pp. 616-628). The judges were again very numerous, probably at least a hundred (the list in lines 7-31, as far as the stone goes, will have reached nearly this number and may have continued thereafter); some of the judges came from Dyme, and at least two other cities were represented. It should be remembered that the 13 Corinthians honored in our inscription may be only part of the panel sent to Elis; if judges from other cities sat on the same case, they will have been honored separately. The Thelphusian judges listed in *I.G.*, IV² 1, no. 72 B, lines 20-33, number 14; the stone breaks off at line 33, but there were probably not many more Thelphusians.



NOEL D. ROBERTSON: A CORINTHIAN INSCRIPTION RECORDING HONORS AT ELIS FOR CORINTHIAN JUDGES