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PREFACE

This book has developed out of a study of three inscriptions (Nos. 24, 31, and 32) which were found in the American Excavations of the Ancient Athenian Agora, and which were entrusted to me for publication. These documents throw new light upon the Athenian Gerusia, for which I am here presenting the evidence and the comparative material as far as I have succeeded in isolating it.

In the majority of places where gerusiae appear, no certain indication of the institution's character has survived. I have wished to avoid confusing the reader with a great deal of really irrelevant matter, and yet I have wanted to make the comparative material as complete as possible. So I have included not all the possibilities but all those texts where in my opinion a certain indication or probability exists that they deal with an institution of this specialized character. It has been difficult to draw the line. Some readers might have preferred to eliminate some of the organizations on which we have focused our attention, such as the Gerusiae at Thessalonica or at Tralles or at Apamea; and others may have felt that still more should have been included, like the Gerusiae at Sidyma, at Acmonia, and at Nicaea. Still, the essential evidence is here presented, and the reader should not forget that various degrees of probability exist for the character of the institution in the different localities represented in this collection.

Grateful acknowledgments are here made to many scholars with whom I have had the privilege of discussing my problems, in the first place to B. D. Meritt, W. L. Westermann, and K. Kourouniotes; also to E. Schweigert, M. MacLaren, and H. A. Thompson. B. D. Meritt has read the book in manuscript and proof and has aided in the establishment of texts and translations. Ch. Edson most generously placed his readings of the stones from Thessalonica at my disposal. O. Walter and O. Gottwald procured for me from the Austrian Archaeological Institute in Vienna tracings of unpublished copies of Carian inscriptions. B. Ashmole and Miss Louise Dickey patiently checked readings for me in the British Museum. That an investigation was at all possible is due to the combined efforts of my former colleagues of the Agora staff, in the first place to the Managing Committee of the American School of Classical Studies at Athens under the presidency of E. Capps, to the Field Director T. L. Shear, to the wonderful cataloguing department under the management of Lucy Talcott, to the excavators and to the rest. To all these scholars I publicly tend my warmest thanks.

Any work like this is based on the contributions of many scholars, but in regard to the previous publications which have prepared the way for me three great debts call
for special acknowledgment to the following: (1) F. Poland's list of gerusiae and of the documents attesting them, \textit{Geschichte des Griechischen Vereinswesens} (1909), pp. 577-587; (2) the splendid Austrian publications of the epigraphical material found in the excavations at Ephesus; (3) Ch. Picard's studies of the Ephesian Gerusia and of related problems in his monumental work \textit{Éphèse et Claros} (1922).

Finally, I express my appreciation to my wife for having photographed some of the more inaccessible inscriptions, for aiding with the index, and for other services.

\textbf{New York,}
\textbf{February 1, 1941}

\textbf{James H. Oliver}
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PART I

HISTORY
CHAPTER I

THE ATHENIAN GERUSIA

The archon Marcus Ulpius Eubiotus Leurus of the deme Gargettus, a man of consular rank, received for his great benefactions to the Athenians, approximately in the reign of Severus Alexander, lavish testimony of the city's gratitude. Along with other honors his fellow citizens voted to erect his statue at public expense both in the Prytaneum and in the synhedrion of the Sacred Gerusia. An inscription was to accompany each of the two statues, and of these two inscriptions several fragments have been found in the American Excavations of the Ancient Athenian Agora and are published here as Nos. 31 and 32 in Part II, where we have collected all documents in which mention occurs of the Sacred Gerusia or of its members (γέρωντες, γερων-σιασταὶ, or πρεσβύτεροι). The two texts are in duplicates; No. 31 preserves a sizable portion of the probuleuma of the Council and a large section also of the decree of the Demos, which is couched in much the same language. The services rendered by Ulpius Eubiotus are gratefully enumerated in these decrees and also in other inscriptions on privately or publicly erected statue bases. First, he had saved the city in the course of a grain famine by making enormous contributions both of his own supplies and of money for the purchase of additional supplies. Secondly, he had taken upon himself voluntarily the expense and labor of serving as agonothete at the Panathenaic festival.

That his benefactions should be acknowledged through the erection of his statue and through the inscription of the decrees in the Prytaneum seems natural enough, but the synhedrion of the Sacred Gerusia, a locality which indeed is mentioned in no other Athenian inscription, does not constitute such an obvious place for a memorial to a public benefactor. Considered by itself, the choice might have been due to an accident, but a connection would normally be assumed between the two services which the man rendered and the two localities where the honorary decrees were recorded in stone below the man’s portrait. Therefore, it seems probable that the synhedrion of the Sacred Gerusia was selected because of the second service of Ulpius Eubiotus, namely, the voluntary ἀγωνοθέσια of the Panathenaic festival, and it would follow that the Sacred Gerusia probably had a special interest in the arrangements for the Panathenaic festival.

The Sacred Gerusia is an institution about which at Athens we have been hitherto very poorly informed. Casual references occur in other documents, but the most significant sources now available for the study of its character and purpose are a
series of imperial letters on the affairs of this institution. First, there is *I.G.*, II², 1108, to which the American excavations in the Athenian Agora have added several important fragments, so that we now dispose of a considerable text. It is only through the new fragments that we learn that this inscription concerned the Gerusia at all. Secondly, there is in the Epigraphical Museum a small, previously unpublished fragment of another plaque or stele; and thirdly, there is *I.G.*, II², 1112. The three inscriptions are here presented in Part II as Nos. 24, 25, and 26.

The first plaque, No. 24, contains at least three letters which we designate as I, II, and III. No. 25, engraved by the same workman ¹ using the same arrangement and the same quality of marble, preserves part of one epistle, which may be called Letter IV. It probably belonged to a series which followed immediately upon No. 24. What we may call the third plaque, No. 26, seems to preserve three letters which we conveniently, but inaccurately, designate as V, VI, and VII.

The uniformity of the lettering and the neat arrangement reveal that, although years may have elapsed between the arrival of the first and the arrival of the third of these imperial letters, the documents which make up No. 24 were all engraved on their plaque at the same time. No. 26 presents a similar uniformity, and again we recognize that several letters were inscribed at one time. It is perhaps conceivable that the two stones were prepared simultaneously and that a few of the later communications which emerged from the imperial chancery were by design engraved in larger characters on the third plaque to stand out more prominently, but probably the marked difference in the lettering and thickness of the two stones results from the accident that the commissions were assigned to the lapidaries on different occasions.

Letters I, II, and III are from the jointly reigning emperors Marcus Aurelius and Commodus. The date of the second letter cannot be later than 179 A.D. because of the phrase in line 20 ἀντοκράτωρ τὸ ἀν> among the titles of Marcus Aurelius. It falls after January 1, 179 because Commodus is already consul for the second time. The first letter is presumably earlier than the second. Since, however, Commodus has the title Σέβαστός and also the titles ἄνθυπατος and πατήρ πατρίδος, according to the restoration which the length of the lacuna imposes upon us, the first letter cannot be earlier than the year 177. The date of the third letter falls after the tenth imperial salutation which Marcus Aurelius received in the year 179, and the death of the emperor on March 17, 180 provides a *terminus ante quem*.

Letters V, VI, and VII cannot be as accurately dated by themselves, because the heading with the imperial titles is altogether lacking in [Letter] V and is represented by only a small section in the case of Letters VI and VII, where, however, the imperial titles of either Commodus or Caracalla might be restored. In my opinion the

¹ The very simple square letters of this hand are quite distinctive. They appear also in *I.G.*, II², 1794 and 4509.
reign of Caracalla may be eliminated, because the series on No. 26 continues the series on No. 24 and must be closely connected with it in time. On the basis of the lettering alone, Kirchner preferred to assign the third plaque to the reign of Commodus.

The imperial letters, accordingly, were published in batches. The first group obviously was engraved before Commodus, who died December 31, 192 A.D., suffered the damnatio memoriae, because the emperor's name was later erased and then inserted again. I surmise that it was engraved not long after 179 A.D., so that two other steles were necessary for the communications during the time that Commodus ruled alone. It is important to notice that the citation at the top of No. 24, Ἐπώνυμος Κλ Διδυάνχος, does not give the date of publication by the year of the eponymous archon of Athens. Claudius the daduchus,² a very prominent Athenian of this period, did indeed serve as archon of Athens sometime between 187/8 and 200 A.D.,³ but here the title would have to read ἀρχων with or without a specification. The title Ἐπώνυμος ⁴ occurs frequently in Athens on prytany catalogues and on other dedications ⁵ erected by Athenian tribes. The latter officer, although he may have been also the priest of the eponymous hero of the tribe, was essentially a patron or benefactor who gave financial aid to the prytanes in the performance of their duties. An inscription outside Athens has illuminated considerably the position of a corporation's eponymus. The decree of the Sarapiasts at Thasos, I.G., XII, 8, suppl., no. 365, shows clearly that the eponymus was not the priest or the administrator but a patron who really bought the honorary position and whose name stood in first place on all official documents of the society.

Claudius the daduchus must have stood in some such position to the Gerusia, to which he obviously belonged. He probably assisted them financially in the performance of their duties. The eponymate of Claudius the daduchus in no way connects the date of publication of No. 24 with the Athenian archonship of the same man, and it does not, therefore, assist us in arriving at a known terminus post quem for the letters engraved on Nos. 25 and 26.

Since we have now established with sufficient accuracy the date of these imperial communications to or about the public corporation called the Gerusia of the Athenians, we examine them as to content. Letter I deals with several disconnected problems. The first of these concerns those who cut down timber on certain estates (χωρία) of which the Gerusia has the management. Another problem on which the emperors express themselves concerns the ius scribendi φήν. This recalls the φήν used in the service of the gods as also in the imperial cult, and the duties of the υμνηδοί or

---

² His family tree is drawn up by J. Kirchner in the commentary on I.G., Π², 3609.
³ P. Graindor, Chronologie des archontes Athéniens sous l'empire (1922), p. 211.
⁴ The earliest case appears in I.G., Π², 1764 (138/9 A.D.).
⁵ Compare the herm with the portrait of Moerogènes, published by T. L. Shear, Hesperia, V (1936), pp. 16-17: Μοραγήνης Δρο μοκλέους ἐκ Κοιλης Ἐπώνυμος τῆς Τιπποθμίδος φιλῆς.
THE SACRED GERUSIA

θεσμοθέωτοι, whose connection with the imperial cult is well known. Here again the Gerusia appears to have a particular interest in the conduct of religious festivals.

In line 15 the emperors discuss the appointment of the archon (sc. τῆς γερουσίας). The Gerusia appears to be still in an incipient state, where such fundamental questions of organization and function have yet to be settled. General policies are being formulated, and in line 20 (initio) we see the conclusion of some phrase like “as was granted to the Gerusiae at . . . and . . .”

 Twice in the letter the emperors refer the Elders to the imperial procurator Caelius Quadratus. Significantly these references appear in the passage concerning the estates (χωρία); and near the conclusion the emperors have something further to say as to how they intend henceforth to select the procurator.

Letter II, which after the salutation begins Ἑκοπερῖον τοῖς γραμματίσιν ὑμῶν ἐντυχόντες κτλ., constitutes demonstrably a rescript. The Gerusia, therefore, had not submitted a libellus, but as a public body it had sent the emperors an epistula. This deduction as to the status of the corporation is justifiable in view of the evidence assembled by U. Wilcken, “Zu den Kaiserreskripten,” Hermes, LV (1920), pp. 1-42.

The Letter begins with an obscure passage concerning purchases made for the synhedrion by the emperors in order to supply free distributions. This may well refer to distributions at religious festivals, but I cannot confidently restore the passage. The next section of the Letter, however, can be reconstructed. To an offer on the part of the Gerusia to make gold or silver images of them and their consorts, the emperors reply that they would prefer it if the Elders made the portraits of bronze, preferably busts of uniform and moderate size such as could easily be used at the religious gatherings and transported wherever needed. Again we have the feeling that the Gerusia is concerned with the arrangements for religious festivals. Finally, the emperors, perhaps in regard to other questions, remind the Elders as in Letter I that the imperial procurator is the competent authority to advise and instruct them in their problems.

Letter III, although not addressed to the Gerusia itself (see line 50), discusses their affairs. The preamble may have ended with the words Ἀθηναίων τῇ πόλει. The sadly mutilated condition of the document renders a satisfactory analysis of its contents impossible, but the phrase νευρομοσμέναι ἡμέραι and the reference to white raiment suggest that the conduct of religious festivals was one of the subjects upon which the emperors pronounced their views. The buleuteria in the city (line 51) may have been mentioned as possible meeting places suitable to the Gerusia or to the celebrants.


7 We use this expression to indicate the members of a gerusia.
[Letter] V may not be an epistle at all, but if it really is so, we cannot prove either that it came from the emperor, or that it was directed to the Gerusia, although the association with the two following epistles certainly indicates its connection with the affairs of the Gerusia. With so little preserved we cannot even make a reasonable conjecture as to the subject matter.

Letter VI seems to deal with a tax on oil (τρίτην τοῦ ἐλαιοῦ), although even this is not certain. At the conclusion we may read [οὖν (e.g., ἐλαι[ον]υ or σιτ[ον]υ). These two considerations suggest vaguely that the epistle concerned financial matters. But the hopelessly mutilated Letter VII again fails to enlighten us even to this extent.

The question as to the purpose of this very important corporation, which for years enjoyed the attention of the Roman chancery, is best approached negatively. Although the Gerusia was a public body it had not been created as another legislative body to replace the Council of the Areopagus or the Council of the Five Hundred, for we know from a multitude of epigraphical sources that the old political institutions continued to function in the time of the Antonines as they had since the reorganization effected by Hadrian.

From the series of imperial letters, however, it appears that the Athenian Gerusia in the reign of Marcus Aurelius and Commodus was indeed a public body, one newly established with the encouragement of the Roman government; secondly, that it displayed a particular interest in the conduct of religious festivals and concomitantly in the apparatus of the imperial cult; thirdly, that it had charge of certain estates and seems to have had other financial interests; and lastly, that at least in certain questions, perhaps in ordinary questions of financial policy, the imperial procurator, the fiscal officer attached to the senatorial province of Achaea, was the competent authority to assist or to guide it. On the basis, accordingly, of what evidence we have, the supposition arises that the Gerusia had been created primarily to arrange for, or to assist in arranging for, the celebration of certain festivals. How many festivals were concerned we cannot say, but the evidence of No. 31 seems to connect the Gerusia at least with the celebration of the Panathenaea. The same inscription gives no indication that there was in this case any connection with the imperial cult, whereas the imperial cult does at other times receive attention from the Gerusia, as we know from No. 24; but in No. 24 it is quite possible to interpret the presence of apparatus of the imperial cult as being merely supplementary to the rest of the ceremonies and apparatus. It is well known that a tendency existed throughout the eastern part of the empire to graft the imperial cult on to that of the chief deities in the various local communities. That in Letter II the emperors decline the symbols of divine honors for themselves confirms the opinion that where the imperial cult does enter it is indeed merely supplementary. The images of the emperors are to be carried in religious festivals actually celebrated in honor of the old gods.
If we now examine some of the other Athenian documents which mention the Gerusia (the pertinent texts are collected in Part II), we can add to our previous observations. One inscription (No. 23) honors a distinguished official of the Eleusinian cult, Memmius ἐπὶ βωμῷ, among other things because he had gone on an embassy to the emperors to discuss (the establishment of) a gerusia. This embassy is specially singled out as an example of the supreme importance of the several missions on which he had been sent. Another inscription (No. 27) had been erected by the Gerusia itself in honor of Prosdectus, an archon of the corporation. The Athenian Gerusia in this utterance of its own members uses the expression ἱερᾶς γερουσία at both points where it refers to itself; so the adjective ἱερά is obviously not a mere compliment bestowed upon the Gerusia by respectful outsiders, but belongs to the official appellation and expresses the essential character of the organization. Another base, furthermore, No. 28, seems to have been erected by the Sacred Gerusia in honor of an otherwise unknown personage. Both these two bases erected by the Gerusia itself were found in Eleusis. An archon of the Gerusia, Prosdectus, who is honored on the first of these, was also archon of the great and sacred Eleusinian gens of the Ceryces. Furthermore, the statue of Prosdectus was probably erected by a member of the Eleusinian gens of the Eumolpidae, namely Atticus son of Eudoxus of the deme Sphettus, called ὁ Εὐμολπίδης in I.G., II², 3659. Atticus was obviously a member of the Sacred Gerusia. Similarly Claudius Leonides, whose name appears at the top of the first plaque with the imperial Letters, as if he were the archon of the Gerusia, belonged to the family out of whom the Eleusinian δασδοίχου were appointed. Membership in the Gerusia, moreover, was indicated with the title ἱερὸς γέρων after a name in No. 30, a prytany catalogue, and in the dedication at the head of another prytany catalogue (No. 29) a distinguished Athenian is praised also as a ἱερὸς γέρων.

The fact that for long the only evidence attesting the existence of this Gerusia was that of the Eleusinian bases led scholars to conceive of it at first as a purely Eleusinian institution at the famous sanctuary. The great Eleusinian families were, indeed, intimately connected with it both at its foundation and in its subsequent history, and the Gerusia did constitute a corporation professedly sacred in character. But the insufficiency of the evidence here quite naturally created a false impression. In the ceremonial and economic management of the Eleusinian sanctuary the Gerusia had not replaced the Eumolpidae. In I.G., II², 1078, dated about 210 A.D., which is the decree restoring the celebration of the Mysteries to its former splendor, no mention

---

8 This fact was recognized by E. Neubauer, Archäologische Zeitung, XXXIV (1877), p. 69, but needlessly disputed by J. Toepffer, Attische Genealogie (Berlin, 1889), p. 212. The Sacred Gerusia would not have been able to ask so aristocratic a person as a member of the Eumolpidae to look after the erection of the statue, if he were not a member of the Gerusia.

9 Compare Kirchner’s commentary on I.G., II², 3609.

10 See, for example, F. Lenormant in Daremberg-Saglio’s Dictionnaire des antiquités, III (1899), p. 171.
of the Gerusia occurs, while the hierophant and the archon and *gens* of the Eumolpidae are designated as the authorities in charge. The fact that the cost of the stele was to be defrayed by the treasurer of the *gens* of the Eumolpidae suggests that the Eumolpidae were still organized with a view toward the economic management of the sanctuary. Much more significant, however, is our knowledge from *I.G.*, II2, 1110 that Commodus, when sole emperor, condescended to accept the post of archon of the Eumolpidae as a liturgy to be performed in return for the favors which he acknowledged he had formerly received at Eleusis. The economic burden of the Eleusinian cult still fell chiefly on the Eumolpidae.

Furthermore, the Gerusia was not a local Eleusinian but an Athenian corporation. Not only did the emperors address it as the Gerusia of the Athenians, but it had its chief office in the city in or near the Agora. The duplicates, Nos. 31 and 32, were to be set up respectively in the synhedrion of the Sacred Gerusia and in the Prytaneum, and all the fragments of both copies except for one piece of unknown provenience were found in the American Excavations. The fragments of the three plaques with the imperial letters seem to have come either from the Agora or from the Acropolis and its slopes, whither like many another document they may have been transported from the Agora as material for the building operations of the Frankish and Turkish periods.

These reflections suggest that the Eleusinian dignitaries were prominent in the organization and guidance of the Gerusia, not because the Gerusia concerned the Eleusinian sanctuary but because the Eleusinian dignitaries and their relatives were among the most prominent Athenians. The Gerusia may have stood behind even all the chief cults of Attica, but the only evidence we have indicates a concern for the Panathenaic Festival, i.e., for the cult of Athena Polias alone or with the imperial family concomitant, and nothing else.

It is not to be expected that this institution, new to Athens in the time of Marcus Aurelius, was a fresh invention of the Age of the Antonines without a previous history and without parallels. If Memmius went on an embassy concerning the establishment of a gerusia, an organization which served as a model for the Gerusia at Athens had been operating somewhere else under the same name, for the word *gerusia* as the title of a board functioning in the religious and financial sphere is not self-explanatory. In fact we have already remarked a reference to other gerusiae in the first imperial letter. Therefore, we must comprehend why this corporation was designated a gerusia, in order that we may be in a position to trace its descent and better to understand its character by a comparison with the functions of Sacred Gerusiae located in other parts of the Roman world.

From the dawn of Greek history corporations called gerusiae abounded in the ancient world. Among the vast multitude known from the records, the majority fall into two large groups, which from their ethnic and geographical association have
been described, not inappropriately, as the Dorian on the one hand and as the Ionian or Asiatic on the other. The Dorian gerusia, such as we find at Sparta and Cyrene, was a political body which took a fundamental part in the routine business of governing the state. The Asiatic gerusia, such as we find at Sardis, was a social organization of the elder citizens, private or semi-private in character, corresponding to the organizations of ephebes and νέοι. Since the homonymous organization at Athens neither regulated the routine business of the state nor had a private social character, it clearly differed from the majority of gerusiae. For this the inscriptions of Ephesus are quite illuminating. Some of them date from the second century after Christ, and they reveal a splendid parallel in a public body called the γερουσία which supervised certain business affairs of a sacred category and which had a close association with the cult of Artemis and of the emperor. But at Ephesus the history of this organization as a body operating essentially in the religious and financial sphere can be traced back long before the period of Marcus Aurelius and Commodus. From this it appears that the peculiar type of gerusia created at Athens was not a new invention with an old name in the Age of the Antonines. To understand the innovation at Athens we should, therefore, examine the history and development of the Ephesian precursor.

Such a gerusia also is the πο[λειτουχ]ια γερουσία of the ρο[τούραρος γεροντος], recently reported and described by the late Anton von Premerstein, "Alexandrinische Geronten vor Kaiser Gaius. Ein neues Brückstück der sogenannten Alexandrinischen Märtyrer-Akten," Mitteilungen aus der Papyrus-­russammlung der Giessener Universitätsbibliothek, V, 1939.
CHAPTER II

THE PROBLEM OF THE CHARACTER AND ORIGIN OF THE
EPHESIAN GERUSIA

If we turn to the modern literature concerning the Ephesian Gerusia, we are plunged into an old controversy, for gerusiae particularly abounded in the cities of western and northwestern Asia Minor, of Thrace and of the neighboring islands, and it was tempting to believe that these geographically near and contemporary gerusiae had some relationship of type one to another, at least originally. The evidence is chiefly epigraphical, and it has given rise to a protracted and somewhat muddled discussion concerning the character of the institution. In a survey of the modern literature one might well begin with Tittmann who, as far back as 1822, on the basis of comparatively scanty material, conjectured that the Asiatic gerusia was concerned with sacred affairs; but today we know that this was not primarily so in the majority of cases. Boeckh, on the basis of somewhat more material, went far wide of the mark in suggesting that it was a subdivision of the City Council like the prytanes at Athens. G. Perrot—and it redounds to his credit—recognized that the character of the gerusia, as revealed in those documents discovered up to 1860, was not the same in all the towns of Asia Minor, and although he advanced with reserve some mistaken theories, he at least invested the Gerusia of Prusias ad Hypium with the character of a sacred college. This conclusion was not far from the mark.

About 1870, as more and more pertinent inscriptions became known, there arose a keener interest in the Asiatic gerusia, and a controversy about its character began. Discarding as superficial Perrot’s suggestion that it was not always the same body from town to town, modern scholars sought to find a common basis for all Asiatic gerusiae. C. Curtius with his attention directed chiefly upon the inscriptions of Ephesus saw vaguely that the Ephesian Gerusia, as revealed in the documents, was some sort of public governmental organization, and he drew a dangerous but not unnatural generalization that the gerusiae in all the towns of Asia Minor had much the same character. Waddington, on the other hand, had his attention directed toward quite a different set of inscriptions. Commenting on a text from Erythrae, he pointed

1 Griechische Staatsverfassungen (Leipzig, 1822), p. 480.
2 C.I.G., II (1843), ad 2811.
3 Exploration archéologique de la Galatie et de la Bithynie (Paris, Didot, 1862), I, p. 36.
4 Hermes, IV (1870), p. 224 f.
5 Le Bas-Waddington, Voyage archéologique, III (1870-1872), Explication des inscriptions, no. 53.
out that the Erythraean Gerusia was a social organization of the older men comparable to the organization of the νέοι. Since this seemed to be the case at Erythrae and at many other places, he made the generalization that it was so in all the cities of Asia Minor. Thus, the scholars of the period were confronted with two antithetical explanations of the institution’s fundamental character.

The first study of the problem, based on a systematic investigation of all the new available material, appeared in J. Menadier’s dissertation, Qua condicione Ephesii usi sint inde ab Asia in formam provinciae redacta (Berlin, 1880), pp. 48-63. He not only read over carefully the documents which dealt with the Gerusia of Roman Ephesus, but he also put together a list of all known gerusiae with mention of the documents in which they are recorded. Directly or indirectly the list compiled by Menadier has served as a starting point for all subsequent students of the problem. Whereas Curtius saw only vaguely that the Ephesian Gerusia had a public governmental character and imagined it as something like the Areopagus at Athens, Menadier achieved a clearer vision of the organization at Ephesus and recognized that it operated essentially in the religious sphere. Dismissing as improbable Perrot’s suggestion that the gerusia could be one thing in one town and something else in the next, with the support of some rather fragile arguments he claimed for all Asiatic gerusiae the governmental character exhibited by the Gerusia at Ephesus. He argued, moreover, that its authority had not always been restricted to the religious field. He reminded his readers that information of the greatest importance for the history of the gerusia lay in a passage of Strabo (XIV, 1, 21), who speaks of Ephesus in the time of Lysimachus:

\[
\text{ἐν τῷ ἔποιεῖ} \text{τά δή χρήστα τα Εἰρήνης καὶ πόλις καὶ πόλεως πάντα.}
\]

The interpretation of this passage which prevailed before Menadier’s discussion may be conveyed by quoting from Droysen’s inclusion among the changes wrought by Lysimachus: ⁶ “ein ernannter Rath und mit ihm die sogenannten Epikleten traten an die Stelle der früheren Demokratie.” Menadier in his objections to Droysen’s view could point to the inscription here reproduced as No. 1, which is dated precisely in the time of Lysimachus, for it clearly shows the Gerusia and the εἵπικληπτοι already operating and reveals that the Council and Demos had not been deprived of all their political power. He, therefore, explained the words of Strabo as indicating approximately that Lysimachus had given to the Gerusia the ultimate and highest authority in the administration of state affairs, but that most of the routine business continued to be transacted as formerly by the Council and Demos. He attributed to Lysimachus the very creation of these gerusiae—not only at Ephesus, but in all the other cities of the realm. Thereby Menadier, as we shall see, in correcting one error fell into another. Strabo does not say that Lysimachus created the Gerusia. On the contrary, he says rather that a καταγραφομένη γερουσία

⁶ Geschichte des Hellenismus, 2nd ed. (Gotha, 1878), II, p. 294.
was already there, and that in the time of Lysimachus the so-called ἐπίκλητοι were associated with them, and that this joint board assumed control. Lysimachus or his agents, indeed, assigned vast powers to the Gerusia at Ephesus, but it is rash to conclude that he founded the Gerusia at Ephesus, although it is possible that a corporation of this name and of the ordinary social character did not happen to exist at Ephesus and that he first suggested its enrollment on a familiar model. Furthermore, whether Lysimachus did or did not found the Gerusia at Ephesus, there is not the slightest reason to conjecture that he founded the gerusiae in the other cities.

Menadier’s interpretation did not long go undisputed. Th. Mommsen\(^7\) adopted Waddington’s explanation and defended it vigorously. He did not dispute the interpretation given by Menadier to Strabo’s words in regard to the Gerusia, but he maintained that the Ephesian Gerusia in the time of Lysimachus was something exceptional which did not continue into Roman times and that it had nothing to do with the problem, for the Gerusia created by Lysimachus was not properly an Asiatic gerusia at all. At Sardis it was clearly a social organization for the recreation of older citizens and it centered around a gymnasium. It had its gymnasiarch just as the νέοι had their gymnasiarch. This, accordingly, in Roman times was the character of the gerusia everywhere (including Ephesus).

However, Menadier did receive the support of D. G. Hogarth\(^8\) and of E. L. Hicks.\(^9\) The latter rejected as unlikely Mommsen’s contention that the Ephesian Gerusia in the time of Lysimachus had nothing to do with any other, and he maintained that the Ephesian Gerusia of Roman times was the direct descendant of that which Lysimachus had known. But Hicks differed from Menadier in one respect. Whereas Menadier attributed to the Gerusia in the time of Lysimachus power in the political as well as in the religious sphere, Hicks admitted its influence only over the sacred affairs. Lysimachus, according to Hicks, organized the Gerusia in order to curtail the power of the priests and to take the control of the great wealth of the Artemisium out of their hands. Mommsen’s view was accepted by F. Cumont,\(^10\) O. Liermann,\(^11\) and W. M. Ramsay.\(^12\) Cumont added, however, that these social organizations had a way of turning into political clubs. Both Cumont and Ramsay reminded the reader correctly that the position and wealth of the type of older citizens who would constitute the Gerusia in any city would lend to the Gerusia a great prestige, so that it might even usurp a political power to which it was not entitled.

---

\(^7\) Römische Geschichte (Berlin, 1885), V, p. 326, note 1.
\(^9\) B.M.I., III (1890), pp. 74-78, where Hogarth’s article is cited (despite the printing date).
\(^12\) Cities and Bishoprics of Phrygia, I, 1 (Oxford, 1895), pp. 110-114.
Isidore Lévy \(^{13}\) sought to reconcile the two main theories. He accepted Menadier’s erroneous deduction that the gerusia was first established by Lysimachus at Ephesus and he reasoned that the institution gradually spread from Ephesus to the other towns of Asia Minor. Furthermore, he rightly followed Hicks in assigning to the original Ephesian Gerusia of Lysimachus the control over the various financial operations of the Artemisium. In Lévy’s opinion the gerusia had gradually degenerated from a public to a private organization, to the social gerusia which Mommsen had recognized throughout the other cities of Roman Asia. This is approximately the interpretation adopted by Poland.\(^{14}\) Lévy started his theory from a wrong premise and concluded by reconstructing the development in a way which is the very reverse of the truth.

A few years after the publication of Lévy’s article the question about the Ephesian Gerusia in the time of Lysimachus occupied W. Hünerwadel in his dissertation, *Forschungen zur Geschichte des Königs Lysimachus von Thrakien* (Zurich, 1900), pp. 118-123. In regard to the passage in Strabo concerning Ephesus under Lysimachus, \(\eta\nu\ \delta\varepsilon\ \gamma\varepsilon\varepsilon\rho\nu\sigma\iota\alpha\iota\ \kappa\alpha\tau\alpha\gamma\alpha\rho\gamma\alpha\rho\omicron\delta\nu\varepsilon\nu\iota\\), \(\tau\omicron\upsilon\upsilon\iota\sigma\iota\ \delta\varepsilon\ \sigma\nu\nu\hbox{\varepsilon}\sigma\script{\varepsilon}\nu\sigma\nu\\ \omega\omicron\iota\ \kappa\alpha\omicron\lambda\omicron\upsilon\omicron\nu\iota\\), he rejected Menadier’s interpretation that Lysimachus had created the joint board, for he considered it more likely that Lysimachus, dissatisfied with the democracy, had placed this, a pre-existing board of temple officials, in charge of the whole government after 285/4 B.C., but that this arrangement, of which the inscriptions do not give us any example, did not survive for long. The first inscription supposedly showed that the board already existed in 302 but did not have all the power which Strabo seemed to imply. Thus Hünerwadel corrected Menadier’s unwarranted deduction from Strabo that Lysimachus had created the Gerusia at Ephesus, but his theory about the previous character of the institution did not explain how the Gerusia at Ephesus could have been so different from all other bodies or almost all other bodies of the same designation in the neighborhood.

Much new material appeared among the numerous inscriptions uncovered during the Austrian excavations at Ephesus, and of these documents the most important were published by R. Heberdey in *Forschungen in Ephesos*, II (1912). The picture, however, was still far from clear, and as late as 1913 M. San Nicolò \(^{15}\) had to admit that the investigations of so many keen students had not yet led to any definite results.

Up to this point the evidence by and large indicated that the best known and earliest known gerusia, that of Hellenistic Ephesus, functioned as a governmental institution in economic affairs at the sanctuary, whereas the majority of Asiatic gerusiae were merely social organizations of respected elder citizens. Mommsen and Lévy alone recognized this distinction clearly and saw the necessity of explaining it.

\(^{13}\) *Rev. Ét. Gr.*, VIII (1895), pp. 231-250.


\(^{15}\) "Ägyptisches Vereinswesen zur Zeit der Ptolemäer und Römern," *Münchener Beiträge zur Papyrusforschung und antiken Rechtsgeschichte*, I (1913), pp. 40-42.
The heart of the problem should have been the question how these two types in the same neighborhood were related to each other. All of the interested scholars before Mommsen and many after him persisted in ignoring this difference instead of explaining how it came about. Mommsen affirmed that the two types were not related in origin, but this view, that the Ephesian Gerusia had no Asiatic connections, is improbable, just as it is unlikely that Lysimachus established at Ephesus something absolutely unique, as devoid of Macedonian antecedents as of Ionian affinities. Lévy argued that the governmental form was the original and that it degenerated everywhere into a merely social organization. Recent discoveries, however, have disclosed that the Ephesian Gerusia even in Roman times concerned itself with the management of business affairs and remained a public corporation; so not a single shred of real evidence confirms the hypothesis of Lévy. V. Chapot, who judiciously admitted the existence of great differences among the various gerusiae, advanced the opinion, to our view not really penetrating, that the Ephesian Gerusia later was merely allowed greater prominence than the others because it was under the eye of the Roman proconsul, there resident.

Reporting the discovery of much new material at Ephesus, we approach the conclusion of this review. Hüberwadel had already persuaded many readers that the Gerusia at Ephesus predated the reforms of Lysimachus. P. Roussel, going still further than Cumont and Ramsay, intimated that just as a political body to govern the island arose out of the gymnasium at Delos, so the Asiatic public type of gerusia had arisen from the social type which centered about a gymnasium. It remained, however, for Charles Picard to develop the idea and show how the change had come about. Presenting a fresh study of the Ephesian Gerusia in his monumental work Éphèse et Claros (1922), he adopted the view that the Ephesian Gerusia had begun as a social organization similar to the other Asiatic gerusiae and that Lysimachus had merely transformed it.

If, indeed, a Gerusia at Ephesus predated the reforms of Lysimachus, it could scarcely have been anything else in origin but an ordinary Asiatic Gerusia, actually or theoretically a social organization to which the most respected Greek citizens of Ephesus belonged and through which they enjoyed the amenities of a gymnasium. The fact that down into Roman times the first officer of that public board of sacred managers, the Ephesian Elders, was still called the gymnasiarch, points strikingly to the soundness of this deduction. The corresponding officer in Athens appears to have been designated as ἄρχων, because the Athenian Gerusia had not evolved out of an "Old Man’s Club" or Bürgerkasino and it was not stamped with an antiquated terminology left over from an earlier stage in its evolution.

18 Pp. 86-98.
19 Nos. 5 and 20.
CHAPTER III

THE EPHESIAN GERUSIA IN THE TIME OF LYSIMACHUS

A study of the Sacred Gerusia at Ephesus begins naturally with a view of the political and economic situation which called it into being.

When the Macedonians occupied northwestern Asia Minor, they found the economic structure of the country divided into three main parts: (1) the Greek cities, (2) the great sanctuaries, (3) the tribes and villages of the native population. The sanctuaries were more important than the cities from the social and economic point of view, for they frequently possessed enormous wealth and could exert a powerful influence. They were the chief lending agencies and the chief depositories on which the structure depended, and although they sometimes belonged to the territory of a city, they generally managed to maintain their independence of action because of a long tradition and because of respect for their religious character. The city had not secured over the wealth of such a sanctuary the control which, for example, the Athenians as early as the sixth century exerted over the treasury of Athena.

These immense reserves naturally attracted the attention of Lysimachus. Alexander in possession of the treasures of the Great King could better afford a generous policy, and he had left the Greek cities and sanctuaries generally free from taxation. For the Ephesian Artemis in particular the conquest of Alexander meant an increase of regular income, because the tribute which Ephesus formerly paid to the Persians was now assigned to the sanctuary. Antigonus Monophthalmus, to judge from our meagre sources of information, had continued the policy of Alexander. The change in the treatment of the Asiatic Greeks occurred under Lysimachus, who responded to economic pressure by departing from the generous policy of his predecessors, and who of all the Successors devoted also the most attention to the financial organization of his realm. He, for example, is the only διαδοχός of whose great treasuries we hear.

Of the latter, one which Philetaerus of Teos guarded for him became reputedly the origin of the fortunes of the Attalids. Another great treasury existed at Sardis. The fort at Tirizis near Anchialus (northern Thrace) served as γαζοφυλακείον for

1 See M. Rostovtzeff's essay on the economic policy of the Pergamene kings, Anatolian Studies Presented to Sir William Ramsay (Manchester, 1923), pp. 359-391.
2 Arrian, Anabasis, I, 17, 10.
3 Compare the liberal tone of his letter to Scepsis, an inscription published and discussed many times, as recently by C. B. Welles, Royal Correspondence in the Hellenistic Period (New Haven, 1934), pp. 3-12.
Lysimachus. Andreades concluded reasonably that there must have been two other treasuries: one in southern Thrace near Lysimachia, the royal residence, and a second in Macedonia annexed near the end of his reign. Possenti went so far as to conclude that Lysimachus had a separate treasury in every *strategia*. It is significant that Demetrius Poliorcetes, disparaging his three opponents, called Ptolemy *naíaρχος*, Seleucus *δελφάνταρχος*, and Lysimachus *γαζοφυλάξ*. The latter's avarice became proverbial because his interest in the financial organization of the realm impressed his enemies. In the opinion of Andreades, he, and he alone of all the Successors, displayed himself a great financier.

Lysimachus did not wish to plunder the venerable sanctuary of the Ephesian Artemis, nor did he wish to expropriate its property, but realizing its importance as a great economic institution and as a reserve in case of necessity, he desired to incorporate it into his realm. The priests who managed the sacred wealth hitherto had probably not been responsible to any other authority. The cult and the institutions of the sanctuary despite a certain superficial Hellenization like the adoption of the Greek tongue were still fundamentally oriental; and Alexander, far from interfering with the ancient arrangements, had courted the friendship of the Megabyzus, the eunuch high-priest of Artemis. By transferring the control to a dignified gerusia in which convened respected older citizens of Ephesus, Lysimachus could put an end to the independence of the priests in this important economic institution and at the same time he avoided offending the Ephesians to whose territory the sanctuary belonged. Henceforth, the religious and mundane affairs of the sanctuary were divided recognizably.

The priests suffered a loss of vast powers, but the establishment of the re-organized Gerusia as a dominating board of financial supervisors was by no means a confiscation of the sacred treasury, nor even a disguised one like the assignment of the *EKTY* to the cult of Arsinoe from the revenues of the Egyptian temples. Artemis retained her wealth.

Did Lysimachus merely hope that in their decisions the Elders would of their own nature follow a conservative course and look for guidance to him who created their power, or did he take precautions to restrict their liberty of action? The words

6 See Ch. Picard, *Éphèse et Claros* (1922), pp. 618-646 and especially pp. 626 f., on the slow growth of Greek influence over the sanctuaries.
7 B. P. Grenfell, *Revenue Laws of Ptolemy Philadelphus* (Oxford, 1896), p. 116: “It is hardly necessary to point out that the *EKTY* τῆς Φιλαδέλφων was collected and paid εἰς τὸ βασιλικὸν like any other tax. The θησία καὶ σπονδὴ was an ingenious but transparent fiction to cloak the disendowment of the temples.” For the *EKTY* used for secular payments in 250 B.C. compare W. L. Westermann and E. S. Hasenoehrl, *Zenon Papyri*, I (New York, Columbia University Press, 1934), 55.
of Strabo (XIV, 1, 21), ἢν δὲ γερουσία καταγραφομένη, τούτως δὲ συνήσαν οἱ ἐπίκλητοι καλοῦμενοι, καὶ διώκοντι πάντα, indicate that the new board which managed the finances of the sanctuary consisted not only of the old Gerusia but of certain other people who were “called in” to help them. The official title of the board is η γερουσία καὶ οἱ ἐπίκλητοι in inscription No. 1, which will presently appear to be from the first year of the board’s existence, and the same title appears in another inscription (No. 2) which cannot be far removed from No. 1 in date. It was, therefore, not quite the personnel of the old Gerusia that Lysimachus appointed to govern the sanctuary.

It would be highly gratifying if we knew more about the ἐπίκλητοι. With reference to No. 1 and to Strabo’s words about Ephesus the new Greek-English Lexicon gives the definition “committee of a council.” But they are not a sub-committee of the Gerusia, and we have no reason to think that they belonged to the βουλή. The phrase η γερουσία καὶ οἱ ἐπίκλητοι shows that the latter were distinct from the real Gerusia, and Picard, therefore, regards them as a separate college, founded by Lysimachus. So did Hüberwadel regard them as a separate college, but one previously existing and already connected with the Artemisium. To the best of our knowledge, however, no separate college of ἐπίκλητοι existed at Ephesus before this time. In fact I do not think that they were a separate college at all. They mark a stage only at the beginning of the history of the Sacred Gerusia without appearing further in the numerous later documents of Ephesus, and the participle in Strabo’s phrase, οἱ ἐπίκλητοι καλοῦμενοι, suggests rather something irregular. According to Bruno Keil, on the other hand, a political situation might force an oligarchical body to surrender some of its exclusiveness and to join with themselves certain outsiders, either as new members or as temporary associates to help deal with some particular matter. To describe this procedure (co-optation) at Athens, Aristotle used the verb ἐπεισκαλεῖν, and such co-opted associates, moreover, were called ἐσκλατοί at Rhegium and Syracuse. Bruno Keil reasoned that ἐπίκλητοι was the Ephesian designation for the same type of associates. This, however, was merely a conjecture. The fact remains that ἐσκλατοί and ἐπίκλητοι are two different words, and the conjecture itself, based on a false impression of the role of the Gerusia, has in my opinion nothing to recommend it. This very word ἐπίκλητοι, moreover, occurs in a Hellenistic document (Inscriptions de Delos, 1520), the decree of the Delian Society of Poseidoniasts from Berytus. Here in lines 36 and 48, with which the reader may compare Tod’s illuminating commentary, J.H.S., LIV (1934), p. 152, the word is used to indicate

8 Ephèse et Claros (1922), p. 93.
9 Forschungen zur Geschichte des Königs Lysimachus von Thrakien (Zurich, 1900), pp. 118-123.
11 The prefix is ι(κ)s, not ε(ι)s. Compare C. D. Buck, Introduction to the Study of Greek Dialects (Revised ed., Boston, 1928), p. 78.
those persons whom the honored benefactor might bring along to participate in the Society's celebration. In respect to the Society the benefactor occupied a position somewhat analogous to that occupied by Lysimachus in regard to the Ephesian Gerusia, and the word ἐπίκλητος or ἐπικαλεῖν would be equally correct in speaking about an oligarchical Gerusia and in speaking about a restricted social group like the Society.

The parallel in the decree of the Poseidoniasts from Berytus is particularly valuable because it illustrates Hellenistic usage of the word ἐπίκλητος. Plutarch (Quaest. conviv., VII, 6, 1) employs the word in a derived sense when he says, τὸ δὲ τῶν ἐπικλητῶν ἔθος οὐς νῦν σκιᾶς καλοῦσιν, οὐ κεκλημένους αὐτούς, ἀλλ' ὑπὸ τῶν κεκλημένων ἐπὶ τὸ δείπνον ἀγομένους, ἐξητείτο πόθεν ἔσχε τὴν ἁρχήν. The word ἐπίκλητος connoted an outsider who was more or less legitimately present but who had not been invited by the person or group of persons whose function he attended. His participation was due to the invitation or appointment of a third party.

Therefore I hazard the suggestion that the ἐπίκλητοι were special appointees of Lysimachus to advise and to restrain the Gerusia. This interpretation (experienced adviser) is not incompatible with another use of the word discernible among the Asiatic Greeks. Herodotus (VIII, 101 and IX, 42) speaks of privy councillors to the Persian king as ἐπίκλητοι,—advisers called in for a special purpose.

The ἐπίκλητοι, according to these uncertain indications, were new associates (temporary or permanent) of the old Gerusia, friends by whose appointment Lysimachus expected to influence the policy of the Gerusia in the exercise of its newly acquired powers. We have no information whether they became permanent members of the Gerusia or whether they failed to survive the power of Lysimachus at Ephesus. Their importance doubtless lay in their usefulness to Lysimachus, who by disguising the new board as the old Gerusia, created the impression that he had transferred the management of the sanctuary to the Greek citizens of Ephesus without doing so entirely. Although circumstances compelled Lysimachus to change the lenient financial policy of his rivals and predecessors, he was quite as anxious as they to strengthen his realm with the sympathy and co-operation of the Greeks, and the reorganization of the Artemisium represented, after all, one more step in the complete Hellenization of the sanctuary; but he was also, and even more, anxious to remove the economic supports of the realm from the control of irresponsible agencies. Since nothing comparable to the Amphictyonic Council existed at Ephesus, he created an approximation of one out of the highly respected local Gerusia; and the so-called ἐπίκλητοι, who were by him associated with the Elders, may have been like the non-Delphian Amphictyons, Macedonian delegates or delegates from other Greek towns, through whom Lysimachus could prevent a policy too independently Ephesian. On this, however, there is no evidence.

It is not known how Lysimachus treated the other great sanctuaries of Asia Minor. The institution of new boards to handle the sacred finances was probably
not uncommon, but there is no evidence so far that another body already existing for totally different purposes was reorganized to serve as a board of supervisors over the business affairs of a sanctuary in any other place but Ephesus. It is possible that to manage the sacred finances, bodies suitably called \textit{ier\'a syn\'edria} existed in the Hellenistic Period, although not necessarily from the time of Lysimachus, at other sanctuaries of Asia Minor. We know indeed from a Hellenistic inscription\textsuperscript{12} that there was a \textit{ier\'on syn\'edriou} at Colophon for the Clarian sanctuary, although we do not know anything about it. There was also a gerusia at Colophon,\textsuperscript{13} but we have not the slightest indication that at Colophon the gerusia constituted or provided the \textit{ier\'on syn\'edriou}. To the best of my knowledge none of the documents in which sacred gerusiae are reported elsewhere than at Ephesus can be proved to date before the Roman Period.\textsuperscript{14} Future discoveries may alter this conclusion, but at the present time the evidence strongly suggests that the one at Ephesus was in the Hellenistic Period the only gerusia supervising the business affairs of a sanctuary.

The exact date when the Gerusia at Ephesus first received control of the business affairs of the Artemisium is generally assumed to be 302 B.C., just after Prepelaus, general of Cassander, captured the city for Lysimachus. It would certainly not follow from the passage in Strabo (XIV, 1, 21) which relates that Lysimachus built the walls, moved the population, renamed the city Arsinoe and founded the power of the Gerusia, and which leaves the reader with the impression that all these things took place at the same time considerably later than 302 B.C. But the inscription No. 1 shows that the Gerusia and the \textit{epikl\'h}tou were already functioning in their new capacity when Prepelaus was in command, and Diodorus XX, 111 tells us that when Demetrius recaptured the city in the following year, he restored the ascendency of the party friendly to him.\textsuperscript{15} Changes may have been made by Lysimachus through the


\textsuperscript{13} A. Fontvrier, \textit{Mouvement et Bible de l'\'E)mageologique}, III (1880), p. 215 (Roman period).

\textsuperscript{14} Ch. Picard (\textit{P\'h\'ese et Claros}, pp. 92, 641) surmised that a sacred gerusia was of Macedonian times traditional near the great Ionian sanctuaries, and he cited besides the Ephesian organization two other examples, namely, at Teos and at Colophon. The evidence for Colophon we have just discussed and shown it to be insufficient. The evidence for Teos, likewise insufficient, occurs in \textit{C.I.G.}, 3080 (= \textit{Voyage Arch\'eologique}, III, 107). Here the phrase which caught Picard's attention, \textit{yepovataKa Xp\'\'a Tra}, refers to sums which had been willed to the Gerusia for its own purposes. Since no god is mentioned as the beneficiary of the legacy, it would be more natural to conclude that the Gerusia of Teos was one of the prevailing type of Asiatic social gerusiae. In any case, not only \textit{C.I.G.}, 3080 but also \textit{C.I.G.}, 3098 and 3112, in which the gerusia at Teos is also mentioned, date from the Roman Period.

\textsuperscript{15} Ο Δημήτριος παρασκευασμένος πόρια πρὸς τὴν παρακομίδη τῶν τε στρατιῶν καὶ τῆς ἀποσκευῆς ἀνήθη παντὶ τῷ στόλῳ καὶ κομμισθέω δὴ νῦσσον κατέπλευσεν εἰς Ἑφεσον. ἐκβιβάζας ἔτη τὴν δύναμιν καὶ στρατοπεδεύσας πλησίον τῶν τειχῶν ἡμύκεσαι τῆς πόλεως εἰς τῖν τοιχούχους ἀποκαταστήα τάξει καὶ τὴν μὲν ἕπος Πρεπέλαον τοῦ Ἀμμάδου στρατηγοῦ παρασκευάζειν φρουρῶν ἀφήκειν ὠπόστολον, ἵδιαν δὲ φυλακὴν εἰς τὴν ἄκραν καταστήᾳς παρῆλθεν εἰς Ἑλληστίον.
general Prepelaus when the latter entered the city in 302 B.C., but Diodorus does not mention any constitutional alterations. Since Strabo implies that the change in management occurred in 286 B.C., Prepelaus, despite our ignorance, may very easily have had command there once again. Lysimachus, probably supplying Prepelaus with explicit instructions regarding the main points, left it to his discretion to work out the details, for the inscription No. 1 shows that the Gerusia and the ἐπίκλητοι addressed themselves in their problems not directly to Lysimachus but to the general Prepelaus.

Only two inscriptions which mention the Gerusia at Ephesus have survived from the Hellenistic Period, while all the rest date from about the second century after Christ; these two inscriptions just mentioned (Nos. 1 and 2) belong to the very earliest years of the reorganized board of Elders and Associates, which Strabo tells us controlled everything in the time of Lysimachus,—the first stone in 302 B.C. or about 285, and the second not accurately dated. Therein the Council and Demos take action on recommendations of the Gerusia and Associates. The old interpretation of Strabo’s words (καὶ διώκουν πάντα), that the Gerusia and the ἐπίκλητοι had replaced the Council and Popular Assembly, has proved to be false (see p. 10). We cannot, however, disregard Strabo’s words, XIV, 1, 21, ἰδὶ γε γερουσία καταγραφομένη, τούτων δὲ συνήσαν ὁι ἐπίκλητοι καλούμενοι καὶ διωκών πάντα, and we cannot attach any meaning to the word πάντα except the obvious meaning “all the affairs of Ephesus.” Because Strabo has been speaking of the city and not of the sanctuary, we can hardly escape by interpreting πάντα to mean conveniently just the affairs of the sanctuary, which appear to have marked the boundaries of their legal competence; but nothing prevents us from explaining the universal power, which Strabo seems to attribute to them, as based not on their constitutional position in the city’s political administration, but on the personal prestige of the type of men who would have belonged to the Gerusia and would have been selected as its associated advisers, and likewise on the economic position of the board, which administered, at that time with complete independence of the popular vote, the mundane affairs of the great sanctuary, far the most important thing at Ephesus, the sacred “bank” on which the financial welfare of the city depended. The board was influential enough so that its expressed desires were doubtless carried out by the Council and Demos whenever the latter recognized an opportunity of obliging the Gerusia and Associates, as for example in the case of Euphronius (No. 1) and in the affair of the Boeotian flute-player (No. 2). Apparently the Ephesian Gerusia like the Amphictyonic Council at Delphi, because of the prestige of the sanctuary, overshadowed and dominated the institutions of the local city state.

Turning to the epigraphical documents to discover the type of thing in which the Gerusia and its Associates were engaged, we can begin with the first inscription, that dealing with the honors to Euphronius the Acarnanian. His services to the Gerusia and Associates consisted in collaborating with an embassy to Prepelaus,
general of Lysimachus since 302, and in helping to persuade the general to guarantee to the Artemisia its former privilege of keeping the standard weight and its former immunity from taxation. The question of the standard weight was most important to an institution which constantly made loans and received payments in gold and silver. The ancient city states and larger political units were prone to raise some ready cash, or to escape from pressing financial obligations, by debasing their currency or by lowering the standard weight of metal. They might, for example, borrow at par and repay with depreciated money. This expedient was eventually harmful or even ruinous to the state’s credit, but it might be profitable for the immediate present, and examples of its application are not wanting.\(^\text{16}\) Therefore the Gerusia and the Associates appear in our earliest document as the corporation in charge of the economic interests of the Artemisia. Their embassy to Prepelaus at the very beginning of their task sought and received from him and so from Lysimachus a charter, so to speak, which confirmed them in the enjoyment of the two fundamental conditions on which the workability of the investment office depended. The officer of Lysimachus promised to the Artemisia protection against disguised confiscation and gave the Gerusia and Associates the confidence necessary for business expansion or economic security.

The nature of the services rendered by the Boeotian flute-player, honored in the second inscription from Ephesus, is not stated, but since we know that the flute-players were engaged to perform at religious festivals, we may conjecture that he had contributed his services gratuitously or had distinguished himself in some way at the festival. The rest of our evidence dates from the Roman Period, and we postpone consideration of it until the next chapter. In the reign of Commodus, however, the Gerusia renewed the custom of performing certain sacrifices to Artemis as it had done in the good old days before its funds dwindled away (No. 12), and that probably meant in the first half of the third century B.C.

Thus the Hellenistic Gerusia as a governmental body appears only in matters concerning the Artemisia, and the grant of Ephesian citizenship to the benefactors required the vote of the Council and Demos. The recommendations of the Gerusia and Associates were communicated to the Council and Demos through the agency of temple boards. This would hardly have been the case if the Gerusia had constituted an oligarchical municipal corporation with constitutionally recognized ultimate authority over affairs of the whole city, as Menadier envisaged the relationship. The elders were not πρόβουλοι of the city of Ephesus, but independent governors of the sacred office for investing money and leasing estates of Artemis.

Finally, they seem even at the beginning to have concerned themselves with the conduct of religious festivals. They attended in some degree to the engagement of musical performers and probably to the performance of certain sacrifices.

After the disasters of the civil and foreign wars of Rome in the first century B.C., a new epoch began for the Artemisium as for the rest of Asia with the establishment of the principate. Augustus, who full-heartedly assisted the ancient shrines of the Hellenic world just as he strove hard to revive the old religious feeling of the Roman people, restored to the Ephesian Artemis an abundant income. The tranquillity of the times provided ample opportunity for the improvement of the temple finances, but the benefits conferred upon the sanctuary were more than balanced by the unwise or the unscrupulous policy of those who administered her affairs. In the time of the proconsul Paullus Fabius Persicus the sanctuary lacked the necessary funds for the care and arrangement of the dedications because the city authorities had been selling the priesthoods and assigning the revenues to the purchasers. The interesting things about this passage in the decree of Paullus Fabius Persicus (ca. 44 A.D.) are the absence of any reference to the Sacred Gerusia and the indication that the city exercised such a power over the sanctuary. The reference to the authorities reads τῶν ὁστὸς τοῦ κοινοῦ προϊσταμένων, and the interpretation of this as referring to the city and not to the Gerusia is assured by the words somewhat further on, ἐπεὶ τὴν ἀπόδοσιν τῶν χρημάτων δυσχέρει α τὴν πόλιν ἡ παντελῶς ἀδύνατον ο[ἰδα, ἔαν γ'] ἀριθμεῖν νῦν ἀνανάκτηται, ᾧ παρὰ τῶν ὀνομασμένων ἐλαβον, κτλ. It might be, of course, that the proconsul did not distinguish between the Gerusia and the other institutions of the city, and that the Gerusia was even now managing to some extent the worldly affairs of the sanctuary. On the other hand, the Ephesian law concerning the public and sacred debtors, S.I.G. 3, 742 (ca. 85 B.C.), had also made no reference to the Sacred Gerusia, whereas it would seem to have been unavoidable if the Gerusia played the independent part then which it did in the time of the Antonines.

Therefore, we must conclude not only that the sanctuary had declined in wealth in the Hellenistic period after Lysimachus, but also that the Gerusia had lost its independence in respect to the city, if it did not actually disappear for a while. If it

---

1 This fact is mentioned by the proconsul of Asia about 44 A.D. in a decree still partly preserved, of which an important new edition has recently been published by F. K. Dörner, Der Erlass des Statthalters von Asia Paullus Fabius Persicus (Dissertation, Greifswald, 1935). Additional suggestions are made by G. Klaffenbach, Deutsche Literaturzeitung, 3te Folge, VI (1935), pp. 413-416, and by A. Wilhelm, Glotta, XXV (1936), pp. 269-273, toward the restoration of the document.
still existed and even if it did not revert to its former private character but continued
to have an official part at the Artemisium, it had by no means the same control over
the sanctuary in the first centuries before and after Christ as it did in the time of
Lysimachus. Apart from Strabo’s observation concerning its earlier power, the first
datable reference to the Gerusia in the Roman Period occurs in No. 3, the donation of
Gaius Vibius Salutaris, who in 104 A.D. presented silver images, and with the promise
of an endowment assured a regular distribution of money to various public and sacred
and semi-private corporations. The Gerusia appears in the list after the Βουλή, and
the Elders will receive individually the same share as the Councillors. If Salutaris
dies before the final payment or the final arrangement is made, his heirs are obliged to
discharge the debt of 20,000 denarii (plus the interest which accrues up to the date of
settlement); and they are liable to the terms of execution according to contracts of
loan which are customary in the business of the Artemisium and with the Elders. The
dated inscriptions, accordingly, begin again in 104 A.D. and continue on into the reign
of Commodus (No. 12). Two of the undated inscriptions (Nos. 18 and 21) may well
be as late as the first half of the third century, but it cannot be proved that even these
come after the reign of Commodus. None of the undated inscriptions of the Roman
Period need antedate the reign of Trajan, and in their case no one on the basis of
the lettering suggests a date earlier than the end of the first century after Christ.

The end of the first century marks a turning point in the financial history of
the whole empire. The institution of the curator rei publicae dates from this period.
Throughout the East in general a more serious and frequent intervention, resulting in
a more thorough reorganization of city finances, began with the reign of Trajan, and
of this policy in a special case the correspondence of Pliny and Trajan provides the
most famous example. In some way and at some time together with these reforms
the old Ephesian Gerusia was revived or at least it recovered something of its inde-
pendence of the city authorities. In documents beginning with the reign of Hadrian
the Gerusia appears to be the object of the solicitous attention of the Roman
government.

Concerning the activity of the Gerusia in the second and third centuries after
Christ we have the following information:

First, it engaged in a vast business of lending money attested directly or indirectly
by the following passages. In speaking about the obligations of the heirs of Salutaris
to carry out the bequest in the event of his death before the settlement, No. 3
(104 A.D.) reads (lines 309-311): ὑποκεκαμένων αὐτῶν τῇ πράξει κατὰ τὰ ἱερὰ τῆς θεοῦ
καὶ τὰ παρὰ τοῖς πρεσβυτέροις ἐκδαυνικὰ ἔγγραφα. The whole letter of the emperor
Hadrian to the Gerusia, No. 7, deals with the smoothing out of financial difficulties
which arose chiefly because the heirs of people who had borrowed extensively from the
Gerusia had attempted to avoid repayment of the debt on the false grounds that they
too were technical creditors of the deceased rather than heirs legally liable for the
obligations of the deceased. No. 11, the letter of Marcus Aurelius and Lucius Verus to the temporary receiver (λογιστὴς) of the Gerusia, deals for one thing with the problems arising out of the confusion in which many debtors of the Gerusia paid over their money to a collecting agent not of the Gerusia but of the city, and for another thing it deals with the continual postponement of payment in debts owed to the Gerusia, in one case, apparently, for three generations. Lastly, in No. 20 Marcus Aurelius Agathopus, one time secretary and gymnasiarch of the Gerusia, thanks the goddess and the Fortune of the Gerusia that he had the strength to be honest while he held these posts.

The Gerusia, furthermore, seems to have been concerned also with the imperial cult. The evidence for this is to be found chiefly in No. 11, the letter of Marcus Aurelius and Lucius Verus to the temporary receiver (λογιστὴς) of the Gerusia. In the synhedrion of the latter institution were the silver statues of former emperors, the apparatus of the imperial cult. The receiver, who is trying to establish the Gerusia on a sound financial basis, has asked for permission to smelt down the old statues, especially those worn beyond recognition, and to remodel some of them into representations of Marcus Aurelius and Lucius Verus. He seems to have felt that the Gerusia would eventually have to put out money for silver statues of Marcus Aurelius and Lucius Verus, and that it might now economize for the future. In the bequest of Salutaris, furthermore, the Elders and the former Asiarchs together with some other indeterminable people form a single group, for whom the secretary of the Gerusia receives the money to be distributed and carries out the arrangements (No. 3, lines 231-246). The Asiarchs, league officers, were essentially priests of the imperial cult.

Then in the decree No. 12, the Gerusia itself applies a new source of income, recently uncovered by the general advocate, to finance an ancient custom of feasting and sacrificing, long abandoned for lack of means. The decree begins with references to the foundation of the city and to the building of the temple, all of which refers to the time of Lysimachus when the complete Hellenization of the Artemisium finally came about and the Gerusia enjoyed its days of power. The banquets and sacrifices are to be instituted anew, but now they are celebrated not to the glory of Artemis alone, but to that of the god emperor also.


5 It suffices for our purpose that the Asiarchs were closely connected with the imperial cult, and the relationship between the titles Asiarch and archiereus need not detain us here. Concerning the Asiarchs a discussion which takes into account all the chief ancient references, including the constitution of Valentinian, Valens, and Gratian, is that of L. R. Taylor apud F. J. Foakes Jackson and Kirsopp Lake, The Beginnings of Christianity, Part I, Volume V (London, Macmillan and Co., 1933), pp. 256-262, to which T. R. S. Broughton has kindly called my attention. Another recent discussion is that of A. Schenk von Stauffenberg, Die römische Kaisergeschichte bei Malalas (Stuttgart, W. Kohlhammer, 1931), pp. 422-434.
The other references to the Gerusia in the inscriptions of the second (and possibly the third) century are less illuminating. The bequest of Salutaris (Nos. 3 and 4) shows us the Gerusia as the recipient of benefactions along with the Council, the Demos and various corporations of the Artemisium and of the city. The money distribution to the Gerusia, almost as generous as that to the Council, went to as many as three hundred and nine persons chosen by lot, so that the total membership was probably larger. The Gerusia and the Council are mentioned as recipients of the donations of Titus Peducaeus Canax (No. 5), and again as the recipients of the donations of some unknown benefactor (No. 6). No. 10 honors one of the distinguished hymnodis of Artemis who is privileged to share in the money distributions of the Council, of the Gerusia, and of the gold bearers to the goddess. Sepulchral inscriptions like Nos. 13 and 17, which specify a sum for which the Gerusia can bring suit in case the grave is alienated or mutilated, indicate only that the Gerusia was a powerful corporation, capable of securing the condemnation of any offender. It does not mean that fines formerly payable to Artemis were now diverted to the Gerusia or even paid to the latter for the goddess. Similar monuments specify the Council, the imperial fiscus, or the most sacred rent office of the Artemisium as entitled to the damages in case of violation. The purpose of such specifications was not to benefit the corporation concerned but to secure the inviolability of the grave. The same meaning applies to the penalties against alteration of the bequest of Salutaris (No. 3). In Nos. 3 and 14 references occur to the Gerusia's own money. In No. 15 a Galatian honored by the League of the Galatians is mentioned as having been invested with the rank of an Elder (εχοντεια), but it does not follow that he belonged to the Ephesian Gerusia. In No. 18 a distinguished citizen, in his thank-offering to the goddess after the completion of several liturgies, identifies himself by tribe and thousand and as a full member of the Gerusia. In No. 21 among the honorable posts held by Marcus Aurelius Artemidorus and his son the position of Elder stands first. The importance of the Gerusia appears constantly. Its gymnasiarch Titus Peducaeus Canax (No. 5) was prytanis of Ephesus and priest of Rome and of the heroified Publius Servilius Isauricus (the long-departed victor over the Cilician pirates). But even more indicative may be counted the Roman interest expressed in several imperial letters (Nos. 7 and 11), and in the appointment, by the governor, of financial commissioners such as the cities obtained, namely, the "receivers" (λογιστai) mentioned in Nos. 7, 9, and 11.

It is nowhere stated how the Gerusia of the second century after Christ happened to be conducting such a flourishing business, the affairs of which, to judge from No. 3, lines 309-311, were in a sacred category. It was quite obviously not one of the ordinary type of Asiatic clubs for older men. The first impression might lead one to think that it inherited the control of the economic life of the sanctuary from the days of
Lysimachus, but as we have seen, the Gerusia had actually become extinct in the meanwhile or at least the control over the economic aspect of the sanctuary had passed out of its hand. It might, of course, have been revived during financial reforms of the emperor Trajan, whose interest in the economic stability of the eastern provinces has been impressed upon our minds through the correspondence of Pliny. This would have been quite in keeping with the policy of the Romans, who preferred to work through ancient forms into which they breathed a new spirit. The Areopagus was ruling Athens as in the days before the victory of Ephialtes, because the Romans restored it to a power for which it qualified in their view as being not only ancestral but oligarchical. It would have been altogether suitable to the taste and policy of the Age, if Trajan had substituted management by a revived Gerusia for the city's mis-management of the sanctuary, mismanagement of which the Roman government, as we have already pointed out, was well aware. The decree, No. 12, furthermore, shows that the Gerusia of the second century after Christ considered itself the child of the one which Lysimachus made great. Even if the name of Lysimachus has been restored in the decree, the Elders are clearly pointing back to the time when the city was founded anew and the affairs of Artemis were organized; so they traced their functional descent from that king's great Elders whose sphere was the supervision over the economic life of the Artemisium. Now we see the Elders of the second century conducting a great business of lending money, and we know that Ephesus had always been famous for the sacred depository and the business affairs of Artemis. A natural train of thought might lead us to conclude that the Gerusia indeed was once again managing the business affairs of Artemis; but the epigraphical and literary sources would not support this explanation.

For the business affairs of the goddess the Law concerning the Debtors, S.I.G.³, 742, although much earlier than the second century after Christ, is perhaps our natural point of departure. The goddess through her agents lent out money at interest (δοσα δὲ ἱερὰ δεδάνειται), and the goddess through her agents rented out parcels of land. The contracts for the latter were the ἱεραὶ μυσθώσεις of the same text, and the economic management of the ἱεραὶ μυσθώσεις surely belonged to the ἱερώτατον συνεδρίων τοῦ μυσθωτηρίου of the second and third centuries after Christ. There is, however, no direct evidence for identifying the ἱερὸν συνεδρίων τῆς γερουνίας with the ἱερώτατον συνεδρίων τοῦ μυσθωτηρίου. If one argued that the former had some kind of supervision over the latter, there would be no means either of proving or disproving the contention. Again, the contracts for loans or investments of the goddess's money are mentioned in No. 3 of 104 A.D. in speaking of the obligations of the heirs to carry out the bequest

⁶ Epistles, VIII, 24, in regard to Achaea; letters to and from Trajan in regard to Bithynia. ⁷ See R.M.I., III, 570 and 577. It was also called the ἱερώτατον μυσθωτηρίου (Jahreshefte, XXVI [1930], Beiblatt, pp. 14 f.).
of Salutaris in the event of his death before the settlement: ὑποκειμένων αὐτῶν τῇ πράξει κατὰ τὰ ἱερὰ τῆς θεοῦ καὶ τὰ παρὰ τοῖς πρεσβυτέροις ἐκδαυστικὰ ἐγγραφὰ. But here τὰ ἱερὰ τῆς θεοῦ ἐκδαυστικὰ ἐγγραφὰ are clearly distinguished from τὰ παρὰ τοῖς πρεσβυτέροις ἐκδαυστικὰ ἐγγραφὰ. The word πρεσβυτέροι is all over Asia synonymous with γερουσία. The distinction between the loan contracts of the goddess and those used in business with the Elders comes as a surprise, and perhaps the discrepancy is merely apparent. We may leave open the possibility that the Gerusia really was installed at the Artemisium to supervise once more the loans and other business affairs of Artemis. For this interpretation we might try to explain the phrase as distinguishing between business as conducted in the old way and as conducted even under a new management which in the year 104 A.D. would have been only recently established indeed. But the words quoted above seem to me to indicate rather that the functions of the newly revived Gerusia of the second century after Christ were not quite those of the Gerusia of Lysimachus. More simply expressed, the Gerusia of the Roman Period did not control the investments of Artemis, but after all no other document of the Roman Period directly indicates that it did.

By way of summary we repeat that the Ephesian Gerusia of the second century after Christ was a public corporation with an economic character. In one reference to the subject, however, its business operations, although in a sacred category, are distinguished from those of the rent office of the Artemisium. On the other hand, the decree of the synhedrion of the Gerusia seems definitely to derive it from the old Gerusia of the Lysimachean Period, an institution which did apparently control the economic life of the Artemisium. Furthermore, the decree of the synhedrion of the Gerusia shows that the Elders felt that they should arrange financially for the celebration of certain festivals of at least the city goddess Artemis, with whom the emperor might now be associated. This was recognized as one of their traditional duties temporarily suspended for lack of funds. I personally feel that the Gerusia of the Roman Period never recovered any control over the income of the sanctuary, revenues which now came through the rent office, but that the Gerusia had funds which enabled them to give a certain additional splendor to celebrations in honor of the goddess or to add to the number of such festivals. All that we can say about the purpose of the Gerusia on the basis of our fortuitously preserved information is that it existed to supply economic support to the cult of Artemis in the way of arrangements for certain festivals and that its connections with the imperial cult, which happen to bulk rather large in our sources, were due only to the situation that the imperial cult was concomitant to that of Artemis. At Ephesus as at Athens the imperial cult is secondary.

Since the Romans regarded religion as part of the state’s business, they tended to associate the worship of Rome and of the emperors with the worship of the chief
state deities in various regions of the empire. The close connection existing in many cities between the imperial cult on the one hand and the chief deity (particularly Artemis) on the other appears also from the way in which on coins and sculptured monuments neocories were indicated by a temple placed either on the head or in the hand of the goddess. An historical outline of the relations between the imperial cult and the sanctuary of the Ephesian Artemis is given by Ch. Picard, Ephèse et Claros (1922), pp. 660-676.


CHAPTER V

THE ESTABLISHMENT OF SACRED GERUSIAE
OUTSIDE OF EPHESUS

THE DURATION OF THE INSTITUTION

The striking similarity of the Sacred Gerusia of the Athenians to the Ephesian Gerusia, as it has appeared in Chapters I and IV, shows that the Athenian Gerusia was modeled to some extent on the famous and ancient Gerusia of the Ephesians, which in the Hellenistic Period had been unique. A more exact date for the establishment of the Athenian institution, which was being merely founded in the time of Marcus Aurelius, now remains to be determined. The first imperial letter to the Gerusia falls somewhere between 177 and 179 A.D. The Iobacchi inscription,\(^1\) in which reference to the Gerusia or to a projected Gerusia already occurs, must antedate the death of Herodes Atticus in 176 or 177.\(^2\) At the time of the first imperial letter, the Gerusia was still in an incipient stage and the correspondence with the emperors still concerned the appointment of officers and advisers. The establishment of the Athenian Gerusia, therefore, occurred not long before 177 A.D. or in that year at the very latest.

The Athenians had had a bitter experience a few years earlier. In the late summer of 170 A.D. the sanctuary of Eleusis was destroyed by an incursion of the Costoboci. These barbarians, leaving their home somewhat to the north of the Caucasus, had crossed the Black Sea, had raided the coast of Moesia, Thrace, Macedonia, and Phocis, and plundering a part of Attica, had threatened Athens itself.\(^3\) On hearing the news at Smyrna, Aelius Aristides in a single hour, it is said, wrote the Eleusinios, which despite its rhetorical flourish genuinely reflects the indignation that the destruction of the sanctuary provoked throughout the ancient world.

The sanctuary had to be rebuilt, the Mysteries re-established. A base at Eleusis\(^4\) praises the hierophant for having saved the rites for the fatherland. It was the same hierophant who later initiated the Emperor.

\(^1\) S.I.G.\(^3\), 1109 (quoted here in part as No. 22).
\(^2\) P. Graindor, Un milliardaire antique: Hérode Atticus et sa famille (Cairo, 1930), p. 130. (Recueil de travaux publiés par la Faculté des Lettres de l'Université égyptienne, Fasc. V.).
\(^3\) The evidence for the date and route of this incursion has been presented by A. von Premerstein, Klio, XII (1912), pp. 145-164. The date is no longer disputed, but it is still debated whether or not they came by sea. Compare H. M. D. Parker, A History of the Roman World from A.D. 138 to 337 (London, Methuen, 1935), p. 316, note 57.
\(^4\) I.G., II\(^2\), 3639.
Between 170 and 175 Marcus Aurelius was too much occupied with the barbarians to study the local institutions of the East with much attention, but in 175 the serious revolt of Avidius Cassius brought the emperor to Asia Minor, then to Syria and then to Athens; for he felt the need of re-establishing direct contact between the emperor and the cities of the East, inasmuch as the success of Avidius Cassius had demonstrated the desirability of a more direct supervision or a more immediate acquaintance. The emperor spent fifteen months in these journeys, and before he returned to Rome in November of 176 he stopped long enough at Athens to reorganize the "University" and to be initiated into the Eleusinian Mysteries. It seems likely in view of all this that the emperor himself introduced the Ephesian type of gerusia into Athens at this time (175-176 A.D.), when, improving conditions in the East, he visited first Ephesus and later Athens, and when in the latter civitas a general reconstruction and reorganization were probably still going on as a result of the incursion of the Costoboci, who had destroyed the sanctuary at Eleusis. The splendor of the old religious festivals may have diminished, especially at a time when the Athenians had been at enmity with Herodes Atticus. The funds available for religious celebrations must have been greatly curtailed.

The Athenian Gerusia did not, like its Ephesian model, engage in money-lending operations so far as we know. It presumably drew its revenues mainly from the estates mentioned in Letter I, over which the imperial procurator still kept a certain watch. We surmise that these estates came to the Gerusia, or even before the latter's inception, to the Athenians, through the generosity of an emperor, perhaps Marcus Aurelius himself, or perhaps Hadrian. It is worth observing in this regard that imperial estates in Attica and the activity of an imperial procurator in Attica are traceable somewhat previously in a mutilated document, which seems to be a decree in honor of Hadrian and is best consulted in Graindor's edition in Rev. Ét. Gr., XXXI (1918), pp. 227-237, where line 18 reads: ἵς ἐκ τῶν αὐτοῦ χωρίων παρέχει τῇ πόλις ὁ ἄγιος [εἰ], and line 20 might be interpreted: πρὸς τὴν οἰκείαν θρη[σκείαν].

But in Greece, Athens is not the only place which attracts our attention. Another new institution of a foreign character appears at the sanctuary of Asclepius at Hyetius (No. 33) of the time after the promulgation of the Constitutio Antoniniana. The document contains decrees of the Sacred Gerusia of the Savior Asclepius to record some gifts received and to publish a list of members and to provide for new elections. If an Elder dies, whichever son the Gerusia elects shall succeed him; if there are no sons, then the nearest relative shall take his place. The latter, however, on entering the corporation shall pay the Gerusia fifty denarii. Again, if the Gerusia elects a complete outsider, the new man is required to pay a hundred denarii on entry into

the corporation. The list of members, perhaps only the new ones, scarcely contained a dozen names. The gifts mentioned were two estates, one given to the Gerusia in return for the numerous and great benefactions of the god by Julius Aristeas, and the other by Aurelius Menecrates Eratonicus. The phrase ἐξαρίστατο διὰ τὸν θεοῦ τῇ γερουσίᾳ χωρείδιον shows that the Gerusia managed the estate for the god, and Hiller von Gaertringen 7 was quite right in comparing it with the ἱερὰ γερουσία mentioned on stones at Eleusis, except that it was an Athenian rather than an Eleusinian Gerusia that was mentioned in a misleading manner on the Eleusinian stones. There is, however, one marked difference in the institution at Hyettus. Whereas the Gerusiae at Athens and at Roman Ephesus were called officially the Gerusiae of the Athenians (Nos. 24 and 26) and of the Ephesians (No. 7) respectively, the institution at Hyettus is not called the Gerusia of the Hyettians but of the Savior Asclepius, and whereas the Gerusiae at Athens and at Roman Ephesus as yet cannot definitely be connected with the business affairs of the local deities, the institution at Hyettus obviously manages the estates of a deity and has no demonstrable connection with the imperial cult. In its conception the Sacred Gerusia of the Savior Asclepius at Hyettus stands closer than the Gerusiae of Roman Ephesus and Athens to the original type launched by Lysimachus.

The institution at Hyettus cannot have been an extraordinary survival of another Macedonian creation. So we conclude, not because of the silence of earlier documents, but because this type of gerusia was foreign to the Greek mainland. It can have been introduced when the Ephesian type of gerusia was being planted at Athens, that is to say about the year 176 A.D. under the influence of Marcus Aurelius. We have indeed an indication of a profound change at Hyettus at this time, if we accept the statement of Pausanias (IX, 24, 3), rejected by Bölte 8 as a loose, non-juristic expression, that Hyettus was only a village (κόμη), probably belonging to Orchomenus. Inscriptions of the time of Septimius Severus and Caracalla reveal an urban constitution at Hyettus. If Pausanias was speaking accurately—and I think we ought to accept his statement at its face value unless evidence to the contrary from the middle of the second century appears—then Hyettus became a city at some time between the visit of Pausanias in the third quarter of the second century and the reign of Septimius Severus.

On the other hand, I should not wish to exclude entirely the more remote possibility that the sanctuary of Asclepius at Hyettus underwent no real change but only assimilated its terminology to the old Ephesian terminology. There is some evidence for the existence of a board of managers called πρεσβεῖον at the sanctuary of Asclepius at Athens as early as the reign of Marcus Aurelius, 9 and such a board

7 Commentary on S.I.G., 1112. 8 Real-Enc., 17ter Halbband (1914), col. 92. 9 In a text to be published by J. H. Oliver, Transactions of the American Philological Association, LXXI (1940), p. 304.
may have been traditional at sanctuaries of Asclepius. Against this inference, however, may be set the absence of any such organization at Epidaurus. Moreover, in regard to the Athenian $\pi[\rho\varepsilon\sigma\beta\epsilon]\iota$s, who first appear under Marcus Aurelius, it could be argued that they too were established on an Ephesian model. Thus Athens would have a representative of each type, one organization (the $\pi[\rho\varepsilon\sigma\beta\epsilon]\iota$s of the Asclepieum) like the Gerusia of Hyettus on the model established by Lysimachus at Ephesus, and secondly its own Gerusia on the model of the homonymous organization at Roman Ephesus. The Athenian $\pi[\rho\varepsilon\sigma\beta\epsilon]\iota$s, however, until better attested, need not influence our discussion.

It is scarcely a coincidence that at Athens and at Hyettus these two corporations of a title strange in Central Greece should both call themselves $\iota\varepsilon\rho\alpha\iota\varsigma\gamma\varepsilon\rho\omicron\upsilon\sigma\omicron\varsigma\alpha\iota\alpha\varsigma$, employing a descriptive adjective, the positive form of which was not used in the locality as a colorless term of respect even for others, not to mention for one’s self. The adjective $\iota\varepsilon\rho\alpha\iota$ clearly defined the type of gerusia being established in both places. It was not to be the ordinary gerusia but a special type which operated in the economico-religious sphere, a type which we find long before this period only at Ephesus, where, however, it was never called the $\iota\varepsilon\rho\alpha\iota\gamma\varepsilon\rho\omicron\upsilon\sigma\omicron\varsigma\alpha\iota\alpha\varsigma$ but merely the $\gamma\varepsilon\rho\omicron\upsilon\sigma\omicron\varsigma\alpha$. At Ephesus the corporation had always been the Gerusia, whereas when this unique institution was copied elsewhere, the descriptive adjective was prefixed to the title in order to preclude a misunderstanding possible in new surroundings.

As a result then of our investigation into the character of the institutions at Athens and at Hyettus, we suggest that the expression $\iota\varepsilon\rho\alpha\iota\gamma\varepsilon\rho\omicron\upsilon\sigma\omicron\varsigma\alpha$, wherever it occurs in official language, probably refers to a gerusia of the economico-religious type, such as the three corporations which we have already considered.\footnote{For further discussion of this point see Chapter VI on the terminology.}

We must confess, however, that at Antiochia on the Maeander in Caria, where coins bear the legends $\iota\varepsilon\rho\alpha\iota\beta\omega\upsilon\kappa\eta$ and $\iota\varepsilon\rho\alpha\iota\gamma\varepsilon\rho\omicron\upsilon\sigma\omicron\varsigma\alpha$, it is difficult to concede any positive significance to the adjective, although, of course, no proof exists that the latter gerusia did not belong to the special type which here engages our interest. The criterion loses part of its value but it still indicates a probability.

Tentatively adopting this criterion, we turn first of all to Philippopolis where we have an inscription (No. 60) erected by the local Gerusia itself in honor of its advocate Tib. Claudius Pasinus, and dated by the name of the organization’s $\tau\alpha\mu\iota\varsigma$s. The inscription belongs to the second or third century after Christ, and it is particularly important because the organization styles itself $\hat{\eta}\iota\varepsilon\rho\alpha\iota\gamma\varepsilon\rho\omicron\upsilon\sigma\omicron\varsigma\alpha$, as the Athenian Gerusia does in No. 27. Therefore, the adjective $\iota\varepsilon\rho\alpha\iota$ is certainly not just a compliment from respectful outsiders at Philippopolis but appears as part of the official title of the organization. The existence of a special advocate of the Gerusia can be paralleled at Ephesus in No. 12. Also two sepulchral inscriptions of the second or third century
after Christ, one, No. 61, erected by Herennius Heraclianus, and the other, No. 62, erected by a certain Saturninus, both of whom are described as Philippopolitan Elders (γερουσιαστής), attest the existence of the organization but throw no light on its character. In No. 62 the Gerusia appears, furthermore, as one of the beneficiaries from fines stipulated for any possible violation or alienation of the monument.

Also, at Aenus the significant phrase ἵπα γερουσία meets us in a fragmentary sepulchral inscription (No. 63) as the title of one of the beneficiaries from possible fines. The inscription dates from the second or third century after Christ and gives us no further information about it. Two other documents of Aenus are so restored by Dumont and Homolle as to contain references to the Gerusia or to one of its members, but the readings are too uncertain or even improbable to be admitted as evidence.

But the phrase ἵπα γερουσία occurs in the extant inscriptions of Stratonicea in Caria and of its subject territory more frequently than in those of any other locality. Stratonicea controlled two very important sanctuaries: that of Panamarus or the Carian Zeus at Panamara and that of Hecate at Lagina.

From a recently discovered document (No. 41) which reads ἡ βουλὴ καὶ ὁ δήμος καὶ αἱ ἰεραὶ γερουσίαι ἐτίμησαν κτλ., it appears that more than one Sacred Gerusia existed at Stratonicea, and inasmuch as the tenure of office of an Elder could scarcely be a brief one—at Hyettus, for example, his appointment lasted until his death—the plural number cannot be explained as referring to several successive boards of Elders. Rather, the plural number indicates two or three Sacred Gerusiae for two or three great sanctuaries with their independent economic life. A good parallel to the plural number of gerusiae at Stratonicea occurs in Nos. 55 and 56 which mention two gerusiae of Thessalonica (vide infra).

Two other inscriptions of Stratonicea (the city) mention one or the other of

---

11 A. Dumont, Archives des missions scientifiques et litteraires, 3rd series, III (1876), p. 165, no. 104 a, and p. 166, no. 104 b. In the first inscription the word γερουσία was restored by Homolle in his republication of Dumont's article in Mélanges d'archéologie et d'épigraphie (Paris, 1892), p. 438, no. 104 a. Even if certain, this reference on a sepulchral monument would not contribute any further information. The second inscription is Christian, and a reference in it to the Gerusia would be very surprising. Dumont edited the fragment as follows:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{ΑΚΑ} & \quad \text{μύ[ήμης]} \quad \text{γερουσία}
\end{align*}
\]

Homolle, loc. cit., p. 438, commenting on no. 104 b, proposed treating the last word as an abbreviation: γερουσία (στής), a resolution which would be unacceptable even if the first three letters were known to be ΓΕΠ. I prefer to interpret the vestiges of the third line as part of a name or of a liturgical formula.


---
the local Gerusiae. From No. 46 it appears that the Demos, the Council, and one of the Sacred Gerusiae honored with a public burial a patriotic citizen named Pytheas Alexander, son of Aristippus. In No. 45 some unknown persons are praised for their patriotic acts, which included the feasting of the Sacred Gerusia. Although the same document further on reports other benefactions at the sanctuary of Hecate, we should not be justified in concluding that the Sacred Gerusia here mentioned was the one associated with the sanctuary at Lagina, but the indication points in that direction.

At Lagina itself six inscriptions have recorded the Sacred Gerusia. In No. 42 the Demos, the Council, and the Gerusia jointly honor Phanias who has three times voluntarily served as priest of Hecate. In No. 39 again the Demos, the Councils, and the Gerusia jointly honor the priest Myonides and his aunt; and the epigram appended states that Hecate has honored the two personages above other mortals and that the fatherland has taken a share in rewarding them. In No. 43 the Gerusia, with which again the Demos and Councils are associated in the restoration by Hatzfeld, honors a certain Agrippiana, who has served as key-bearer to the goddess. In No. 44 the Demos, the Councils, the Sacred Gerusia, and those who dwell in the sanctuary, jointly honor the priestess Ammion because of her piety toward the goddess and her attention to the pilgrims. In No. 35, the Demos, the Council, and the Gerusia jointly honor Ulpius Alexander Heraclitus and his wife Ammion for the brilliant manner in which they have performed the duties of priest and priestess. In No. 36, finally, the Demos, the Council, the Gerusia, and those who dwell in the sanctuary, jointly honor the volunteer priest Nicander and his wife the priestess and his daughter the key-bearer, who was serving for the second time.

At Panamara, where the temple of Zeus Panamarus, the other great sanctuary of the Stratonicean territory, was located, four inscriptions mention the Gerusia. In No. 47 Theophilus and his wife Tryphera, volunteer priest and priestess for two years, are cited for the brilliant performance of their liturgies. Among the services mentioned appears a reception which they gave to the Gerusia in the city, whereat they invited the Elders to carry food away with them. In No. 40 the Demos, the Councils, and the Gerusia jointly honor Marcus Sempronius Clemens, who seems to have flourished at the end of the second or the beginning of the third century, and who waived his inherited exemption and undertook numerous profane and sacred liturgies in a time of stress. In No. 38 the Council, the Demos, and the Gerusia jointly honor Hierocles, high priest of the imperial cult, and thrice priest of Zeus and of Hecate, priest at various other sanctuaries, and former incumbent of various public offices. One of his sons, who are honored with him, seems to have had a similar career and to have been a benefactor of the Gerusia. From No. 37 it appears that the Demos, the Council, and the Gerusia honored and buried publicly Aristippus son of Artemidorus who among many important services to the fatherland had served as gymnasiarch of the vēoi, as priest, and as ambassador to the emperors. In No. 34, finally, [Ariston] and his wife Dracontis, the priest and priestess—she has served
also at the sanctuary of Hecate—are cited for the splendid way in which they have discharged their duties; and they are praised as having made a donation to the Councillors and to the members of the Gerusia so that each of these dignitaries received three denarii.

From these not very illuminating references certain indications emerge. There were in Stratonicean territory not only three famous sanctuaries whither the pilgrims came in crowds, but at least two Sacred Gerusiae. Apart from the descriptive title ἱερὰ γερουσία, a connection between the Gerusiae and the sanctuaries appears from the special attention which the priests offer to the Gerusiae and from the not uncommon association of the Gerusiae with the political bodies of the city in expressions of gratitude toward the benefactors of the sanctuaries. The inscriptions of Stratonicea and of its territory make no reference to the functions of the Gerusiae, and these must be deduced on the analogy of the functions of Sacred Gerusiae in other localities.

The fact that the Gerusia was only sporadically associated with the political bodies of the city in expressions of gratitude toward the benefactors of the sanctuary and that the volunteer priests only occasionally gave receptions to the Gerusia, suggests again as at Ephesus and Athens that the local corporation’s role was limited to the financial support of certain festivals.

Since the imperial government first begins to display an interest in the institution at Ephesus, according to the evidence at our disposal, only in the time of Hadrian, and since the institution was being transplanted to the soil of Attica only in the reign of Marcus Aurelius, we are tempted to conclude that the establishment of Sacred Gerusiae on the peculiar Ephesian model in other localities probably belonged to the second century after Christ. With this deduction the evidence from Stratonicea and its territory does not stand in contradiction. On prosopographical grounds No. 40 appears to belong to the end of the second or the beginning of the third century after Christ, and No. 35 to the reign of Hadrian or of Antoninus Pius. In No. 34 the gentilicium Aelia establishes the reign of Hadrian as a terminus post quem. According to one scholar’s argument the bearer of that name had recently received the Roman citizenship, because an earlier inscription recalls her name without the gentilicium. If so, No. 34 becomes the earliest pertinent document datable in Stratonicean territory. An uncertain combination indicates for No. 38 a date after 160 A.D. If the priestess Ammion who appears in No. 44 is identical with the priestess Ammion of No. 35, the former inscription too finds a date somewhere in the reign of Hadrian or of Antoninus Pius. The use of a leaf for punctuation or decoration brings No. 46 down at least to the second century after Christ. In such a document as No. 37 the un-Roman name of Aristippus son of Artemidorus belongs to the period before the Constitutio Antoniniana. Since the phrase πρεσβεύσαντα πρὸς τοὺς Σεβαστούς seems to imply that some jointly ruling emperors had already taken office together, the latter inscription falls between the years 161 and 212 A.D. The other documents, some of which mention Roman names like Gaius, Julia, and Agrippiana, exhibit a general
resemblance to the style of these inscriptions, and they doubtless must also be assigned to the second or early third century after Christ.

The significant phrase ἵερᾶ γερουσία appears also in an inscription (No. 48) at Prusias ad Hypium in Bithynia. The document gives us the career of Domitius Aurelius Diogenianus Callicles, who has performed with distinction the duties of many public offices, and who has served as archon of the κοινόν of the Bithynian Greeks, is at the present time financial commissioner (λογιστής) of the Sacred Gerusia, and who has already been appointed as the next incumbent of the positions of first archon and priest and ἀγωνοθέτης of the Olympian Zeus. The numerous Aurelii, whose names appear in the catalogue of the phylarchs elected to serve in his archonship, indicate that the inscription belongs to the period after 212 A.D. The document possibly refers to a well-known Gerusia situated elsewhere, but in the absence of any positive indication to this effect, it is preferable to assume that the corporation was located in the territory of Prusias. No other reference to the Gerusia at Prusias has come to light, but the two facts that the institution was called a Sacred Gerusia and that it received a financial commissioner like the Ephesian Gerusia almost suffice to show that the institution at Prusias ad Hypium must be included in the group of gerusiae which functioned in the economico-religious sphere.13

Tralles had a gerusia frequently mentioned in the inscriptions of the first three centuries after Christ. It dates at least from the time of Augustus and exhibits the characteristics of the ordinary social type which centered about a gymnasium.14 For this reason I have not desired to include in Part II the majority of the inscriptions which deal with the Gerusia of Tralles. But in three inscriptions of the second or early third century after Christ the phrase τὸ ἵερὸν σύστημα τῆς γερουσίας constitutes a novelty sufficiently striking to justify the inclusion of these three documents as Nos. 49-51. In view of the date of these documents and in view of the establishment of Sacred Gerusiae in various places under the influence of Hadrian and the Antonines, it would not be surprising if the old social Gerusia of Tralles had now been invited to constitute, furnish, or assume the supervision over, a board of sacred finances. This appears to me the most likely interpretation of the phrase ἵερὸν σύστημα, with which the reader should compare the parallels in S.I.G.3, 742 and in T.A.M.,

13 I.G.R.R., III, 42, an inscription at another Bithynian town, Nicaea, possibly preserves a reference to a sacred gerusia, but although I have no objection to the restoration [ἡ ἵερα] γερουσία, the only word which would furnish a reason for so describing the Nicaean institution depends on a conjecture, and I choose to limit the scope of my essay to those cases where a higher degree of probability exists.

14 See the references collected by F. Poland, Geschichte des griechischen Vereinswesens (1909), p. 581. The inscription, B.C.H., X (1886), p. 516, no. 5, dates from the reign of Augustus: [Αὔτο]με[τοὶ] τῆς γερουσίας εἰς τὸν τυχόν σύντροφον καὶ τῆς γερουσίας εἰς τὴν τυχόν σύντροφον. For example, in an inscription of the first or second century after Christ, Papers of the American School of Classical Studies at Athens, I (1882-3, published in 1885), p. 96, no. II, the Council, the Demos, and the Gerusia unite to honor a man γυμνασίαν [ἡ] ἵερης γυμνασίας τῆς ζωῆς τροχής τοῖς ἱδίον καὶ θέτητα ἐκλεξαντας ἡμέρας, ζήσαντα σωφρόνοις καὶ κοσμίων. The three gymnasia, of course, were those of the Elders of the νεός, and of the ephebes.
II, 188, where the phrase obviously means a board managing sacred property. If our interpretation here were correct, it would mean that the social gerusiae like the societies of νεώτιον served the real interests of the Roman government on occasion, and we should perceive one more reason why all the gerusiae were so much in evidence precisely in the latter part of the second century. Furthermore, we could elucidate an inscription of the sole reign of Commodus, T. A. M., II, 175, which contains the Sidymean decree concerning the establishment there of a board of Elders and the enthusiastic letter of the proconsul, by pointing to the significant development at about this time in one of the old Asiatic social gerusiae. I should infer that the proconsul thought of the new corporation at Sidyma as a board consisting of the leading citizens and providing a group who might be asked to assume responsibility for the safer management of sacred estates. I have no way of knowing whether actually they ever were asked to assume the responsibility.

According to No. 52 the Gerusia of Apamea, like the Athenian, was founded as a result of an embassy to certain emperors, who in my opinion were probably Marcus Aurelius and Commodus. The corporation, mentioned in Nos. 52 and 53 from Apamea, seems to be a sacred Gerusia, chiefly because of the embassy to the emperors, and perhaps also because it used the services of a συνήγορος (No. 52) and called its presiding officer in No. 53 archon instead of gymnasiarch.

Some sort of a gerusia probably existed at Thessalonica as early as 221 A.D. (No. 54). A certain C. Julius Euphranticus is known to have set up two gerusiae (No. 55) and to have served as gerusiarch of two gerusiae (No. 56) at Thessalonica. According to Charles Edson, who has collected copies and studied all inscriptions of Thessalonica, the two honorary altars for Euphranticus might conceivably antedate by a few years 221 A.D. On stylistic grounds, however, Edson (per litteras) would prefer to assign them to the second quarter of the third century. If so, we should be dealing perhaps with three gerusiae, which may not have been all of the same type but which at least are not distinguished in the extant inscriptions. It is also possible to suppose that the two gerusiae were founded many years before the honorary altars were erected to Euphranticus, and that Thessalonica never had more than these two gerusiae. In either case we have a plural number. It is difficult to imagine two or three gerusiae of the social type in one locality, and the only parallel for the plural number occurs in the territory of Stratonicea where the corporations are actually designated as Sacred Gerusiae. I presume, therefore, that the two new gerusiae established by Euphranticus were of the special type which forms the subject of our study.

Around 250 A.D. a bereaved woman in the name of her son presented ten thousand Attic drachmas to a Gerusia for the city of Thessalonica (No. 58). A

---

similar donation to a Gerusia is mentioned on an inscription dated in 261 A.D. (No. 59). In both cases it is worded without the definite article, ἐις γερουσίαν, but there may have been now only one Gerusia at Thessalonica.

These indications amount to something, but they do not establish for the Thessalonian, Apamean, and Trallean Gerusiae an economico-religious character. As Sacred Gerusiae, however, we can point with certainty to those of Ephesus, Athens, and Hyettus, and, furthermore, with a very high degree of probability to the two or three Gerusiae of Stratonicea in Caria, to the one of Prusias ad Hypium in Bithynia, and to those of Philippopolis and Aenus in Thrace. The Sacred Gerusia mentioned in the inscription from Prusias might conceivably have been located elsewhere, but if so, it was sufficiently near and familiar not to require identification.

In this review we have raised far more problems than we have settled. The purpose of these Sacred Gerusiae, however, seems to have been to provide economic support for the more splendid celebration of one or more festivals, at least to judge from the Athenian and Ephesian material. The establishment of the Athenian Gerusia under imperial patronage after an embassy to the emperors, the control and usufruct of invested capital, and the general purpose of the Sacred Gerusia recall to mind a story which Malalas 16 (248 and 284) tells about Antioch. Without insisting on the connection I suggest that the policy of the Antonines which led to the foundation of special corporations called in some places Sacred Gerusiae is reflected also in the policy of Commodus toward the Olympic festival at Antioch.

In the reign of Augustus a certain Sosibius left to the city of the Antiochenes fifteen gold talents as a source of annual revenue so that every four years a multifarious spectacle might be celebrated of mimes, athletic contests, horse races, musical and tragic performances, and so forth. The city magistrates of Antioch did carry out the first spectacles, but afterwards, profiting themselves, they kept postponing the payment of the income. Later this corrupt practice was prohibited by the emperor Claudius, and the city magistrates together with the Antiochene κτήτορες bought from the Eleans certain privileges reserved for the great festival at Olympia, and they persuaded the κτήτορες, Demos, and priests to let them arrange for the celebration of Olympic games at Antioch. Having secured this permission they did so for a while. In the second century, however, Antioch was visited by several great disasters—fire, earthquake, war—on account of which the celebrations were temporarily omitted or more widely spaced. The city magistrates were using these pretexts in order to keep the revenues for themselves, until finally in the reign of Commodus the κτήτορες and citizens appealed directly to the emperor to place the investments under different management and to insure that the revenue would be used for the festivals. The emperor acceded to their request, and apparently issued very exact instructions.

The last dated inscription at Ephesus is from the reign of Commodus, but among those undated are two, Nos. 18 and 21, which because of the Aurelii, whose names appear in them, can with various degrees of probability be assigned to the period after the Constitution Antoniniana of the year 212 A.D. The same argument can be advanced to attest the existence of the Gerusiae at Hyettus and at Prusias ad Hypium after 212 A.D. No. 40 at Stratonicea belongs at the end of the second or the beginning of the third century after Christ on prosopographical evidence, whereas none of the pertinent texts from Stratonicea or its territory can be proved to postdate No. 40.

At Athens Nos. 29 and 30 can be dated shortly after 200 A.D. Still later than these inscriptions are the decrees preserved on Nos. 31 and 32 in honor of the archon Ulpius Eubiotus, whose year Kirchner located about 220 A.D. and Graindor located about the second quarter of the third century. Only two real indications of the date exist: (1) the father of Eubiotus also bore the gentilicium Ulpius in I.G., II², 3695, which establishes the Trajanic Period as a terminus post quem for the archon's father; (2) the priest of Apollo Patroös, Aelius Zenon, who erected for his patron, the archon Eubiotus, the statue base with I.G., II², 3697, is probably the homonymous ephebe of the catalogue I.G., II², 2193 of about 200 A.D. As we have already said, the archonship falls approximately in the reign of Severus Alexander. It might of course be argued that the decrees in honor of Eubiotus could have been passed at a time when the institution of the Gerusia no longer existed but when the expression "synhedron of the Gerusia" was still used to indicate the building in which the Elders formerly had been wont to assemble; for the decrees provide that a statue of the archon and an inscription relating to his benefactions be erected both in the synhedron of the Sacred Gerusia and in the Prytaneum, whereas the decrees do not otherwise mention the Gerusia or its members. On the other hand, it is considerably more probable that the Athenian Gerusia still functioned in the archonship of Ulpius Eubiotus; so at Athens, too, good evidence points to the continued existence of the institution in the period after the promulgation of the Constitution Antoniniana.

Two gerusiae which we have tentatively identified as Sacred Gerusiae were founded at Thessalonica approximately in the reign of Severus Alexander (222-235 A.D.), or even a few years earlier. In view of the turbulent times, it is unlikely that Sacred Gerusiae would have been established after the death of Severus Alexander. There is no indication, furthermore, that the two Gerusiae which Euphranticus established at Thessalonica were established with the particular encouragement of the imperial chancery, and until some evidence to the contrary appears, I prefer to believe that the Severi exhibited no great interest in the institution.

One Gerusia at Thessalonica is attested as late as 261 A.D., but in no other locality can we trace a Sacred Gerusia beyond the reign of Severus Alexander. The late corporation at Thessalonica is not certainly identifiable as a Sacred Gerusia, but if it was so, it probably became extinct within the next three decades and was among the last to disappear.
CHAPTER VI

TERMINOLOGY, OFFICERS, MEMBERS, ROMAN SUPERVISORS

We should naturally expect that the terminology for the Sacred Gerusiae would generally be much the same as that for the ordinary social type of gerusia in view of the origin of the Ephesian institution. It is quite legitimate in many cases to make comparisons without regard to the special purpose of the corporation, and the whole material, considered without distinction, has been treated, after Menadier, Lévy, and Chapot, by F. Poland, *Geschichte des griechischen Vereinswesens* (1909), pp. 98-102, except that further material has come to light in more recently discovered inscriptions. From time to time we have considered the evidence of other gerusiae, but particularly in this chapter we wish to restrict ourselves to a consideration of the usage in those seven territories, namely, Ephesus, Athens, Hyettus, Philippopolis, Aenus, Stratonicea, and Prusias, where we have sought to isolate a separate group of Sacred Gerusiae.

The Roman emperors in their letters call the Ephesian Gerusia Ἐφεσίων ἡ γερουσία (No. 7) or ἡ γερουσία τῶν Ἐφεσίων (No. 11); and they address the Athenian Gerusia as Ἀθηναίων γερουσία. From Hyettus, Stratonicea, and Prusias we have no evidence for the proper form of address.

Since we do not have the formula of sanction to the decree No. 12, we do not know what formal title the Ephesian Gerusia gave itself in this publication, although in the body of the decree it speaks informally of “our synhedrion” and of the γερουσία. But at least in No. 14, an honorary inscription on a monument erected by the Gerusia itself, the title used is nothing more than ἡ γερουσία. The Athenian Gerusia speaks of itself as ἡ ἱερὰ γερουσία (No. 27), and Athenian inscriptions (Nos. 28 and 31), one of which was not erected by the Gerusia, give it this title also. The Ephesian documents, Nos. 3, 4, 9, 18, and 21, refer to the φιλοσέβαστος γερουσία, but the inscriptions assign also to the Ephesian Council the attribute φιλοσέβαστος. At Hyettus the local institution calls itself formally ἡ ἱερὰ γερουσία τοῦ Σωτήρος Ἀσκληπιοῦ, a title striking on two accounts. In the first place, the Gerusia definitely associates itself with a particular sanctuary, of which obviously it has the economic management. It is not called the Gerusia of the Hyettians, and its laws are those of a private rather than of a municipal corporation. In other words it does not in its functions resemble the Gerusiae of Athens and of Roman Ephesus, still less the familiar social groups around a gymnasium, but it does resemble the old Ephesian Gerusia of the transformation effectuated by Lysimachus, as far as our limited evi-
dence permits us to discern the outlines of the older corporation. This leads me to suppose that the foundation, which presumably took place about the time of Marcus Aurelius, was a conscious archaism after the famous model. Since the churches and monasteries of the Middle Ages are sometimes functional descendants of this type of economic organization, it is interesting to note that often the word γέρων in the language of early Christian writers and always the Mediaeval words καλογέρων and καλόγερος have without reference to age the significance “monk.” In the second place the corporation at Hyettus calls itself a ἱερὰ γερουσία, like the institution at Athens. Similarly the two or three boards at Stratonicea were officially styled οἱ ἱεραὶ γερουσίαι.

The expression ἱερὰ γερουσία which we encounter at Athens, Hyettus, Philippopolis, Aenus, Stratonicea, and Prusias, never occurs at Ephesus even in inscriptions not erected by the Gerusia itself. As we have already remarked, the Ephesian Gerusia, passing through a long development, had always been the Gerusia to the Ephesians, and the adjective ἱερὰ was elsewhere used to distinguish a new creation of the Ephesian economic-religious type from the ordinary run of gerusiae.

While Perrot¹ had suggested that the adjective ἱερὰ indicated the religious character of the Gerusia at Prusias ad Hypium, Lévy² rejected the inference, saying that the word had lost all its positive significance and was to be found elsewhere applied to the Council, to the Ecclesia, and to various sorts of colleges. This is particularly true of the superlative degree of the adjective; but in monumental inscriptions examples of the same colorless use of the positive degree are exceedingly rare.³ I mean that the adjective ἱερός is generally used in its positive degree to indicate connection with a deity or with Rome and the emperor. Thus a phrase like ἱερὰ γράμματα referring to an emperor’s letter, occurs frequently enough, but ἱερὰ βουλή and ἱερὰ ἐκκλησία are not often found, and where such an expression does occur, it sometimes can be shown to indicate a special meeting to settle business primarily of a sacred category. On the other hand, the expression ἱερωτάτη βουλή, signifying nothing more than the “very honorable Council,” is perfectly familiar to all epigraphists.⁴

³ Such as the ἱερὰ φυλῆ τῶν σκυτέων in an inscription cited by Lévy (Μουσείων καὶ Βιβλιοθήκης τῆς Εἰσαγγελίας Σχολῆς, Volume A [1874], p. 131, No. v, would have been the correct reference). This was at Philadelphia in Phrygia, where the ἱερὰ φυλῆ τῶν ἔρωμοργῶν constituted another guild (for φυλῆ in this sense see F. Poland, Geschichte des griechischen Vereinswesens [Leipzig, 1909] p. 154). The positive occurs also in the title ἡ ἱερὰ θεμελική καὶ ξυστική σύνοδος (O. G. I. S., 713), but this has no connection with the argument because athletic associations were formed for religious purposes and stood under the protection of Heracles. Moreover, I suspect that even the guilds of Philadelphia were religious organizations connected with the service of a deity.

⁴ Lévy did not distinguish between the positive and superlative degrees of the adjective. Thus he cited Voyage Archéologique, III, 1620 and C.I.G., 2741 for examples of its use as an ornament to the word βουλή. Actually, in the former inscription the adjective is not ἱερὰ but ἱερωτάτη, and in the latter neither the positive nor even the colorless superlative occurs. For its use as descriptive
Therefore, it is proper to distinguish between the expression ἱερὰ γερουσία and the common phrase ἱεροτάτη γερουσία, frequently applied to the ordinary social type of gerusia and meaning nothing more than the "very honorable gerusia." According to parallels in ordinary epigraphical usage, the positive degree of the adjective in the phrase ἱερὰ γερουσία points strongly toward an institution connected with the cult of some deity. So far the term ἱερὰ γερουσία in any sort of inscription has never been found to apply to a gerusia of the indisputably social type. Conversely, the expression ἱεροτάτη γερουσία has never been found to designate a Sacred Gerusia. Still we realize that the positive form of the adjective appears to be purely ornamental in the legends of many contemporary coins of Asia Minor.

The members of the Gerusia are at Ephesus called γερουσιασταί (Nos. 8, 19, and 21) or πρεσβυτέροι (Nos. 3, 5, and 20); at Hyettus also they are called γερουσιασταί (No. 33), likewise at Philippopolis (Nos. 61 and 62). In the third letter Marcus Aurelius and Commodus refer to those at Athens as the γέρουντες, and in two other Athenian inscriptions (Nos. 29 and 30) the title ἱερὸς γέρων accompanies a man's name. The adjective is significant. From Aenus, Stratonicea, and Prusias we have no evidence, except that in No. 34 from Panamara in the territory of Stratonicea occurs the statement, ἐδωκαν καὶ τοῖς βουλευταῖς καὶ τοῖς μετέχοντι τῆς γερουσίας πρῶτοι ἢ ἄλλα γ. With the expression οἱ μετέχοντες τῆς γερουσίας may be compared the phrase in the decree of the Ephesian Gerusia, No. 12, οἱ μετέχοντες τοῦ συνεδρίου, and the phrase in another Ephesian inscription, οἱ μετέχοντες τοῦ ἱεροτάτου συνεδρίου (i.e., τοῦ μισθωτηρίου), and finally the phrase μετέχων καὶ τῆς φιλανθρωπίας τοῦ γερουσίας in No. 18, the Ephesian thank-offering of T. Fl. Asclepiodorus. They are the "partners," a term which very probably does mean the regular members. One might compare the use of the word μετέχοντες in Mithraic texts to indicate members fully initiated.

The μετέχοντες, accordingly, would not be identical with the νέμουντες. For the phrase ὑμνοῦσθαι βουλής γερουσίας χρυσοθόρων of the Ephesian document, No. 10, the best parallel occurs in a Hellenistic decree from Paphos recently published by W. H. Buckler (J.H.S., LV [1935], pp. 75-78). The inscription honors an engineer who was in charge perhaps of the ballistic engines. In lines 9-14 we read: ἄγειν δε' αὐτῷ καὶ ἠμέραν δι' αἰώνως τοὺς μὲν νέμουντας τὸ τάγμα τῶν πρεσβυτέρων ἀφετῶν θυσία-ζωτας ἐν παλαιᾷ τῆς Ἀφροδίτης, τοὺς δὲ τῶν νεωτέρων νέμουντας ἄγειν ἐν Πάφῳ θυσίαζωστας τῇ Λητοῖ. Buckler translates: "In his honour the Members of the Corps of the Senior Artillers shall forever observe a day with sacrifices in the Old City to Aphrodite, and the Members of the Corps of the Juniors with sacrifices at Paphos to
Leto.” The Senior and Junior “gunners” belonged to a common type of military club. These clubs, as Buckler explains, “evidently included, besides the regular ἀφέται, men who shared (οἱ νέμοντες) in the ‘corps’ (τάγμα) along with these experts. These men were, it would seem, the unskilled ‘privates,’ who helped the skilled ἀφέτης to set and train his ballista. For an association embracing both categories the cumbrous οἱ νέμοντες κτλ. could alone be a correct descriptive title.” Similarly in the inscription at Ephesus the person honored was a νέμων, an outsider connected with the enumerated societies in his capacity as ὑμιδῶς. As an official ὑμιδῶς of those three societies, he doubtless shared in some of their regular money distributions, perhaps in all, as J. Keil5 suggested on the analogy of the title δι[αγομ.]εὺς τῶν Σεβαστεύων χρημάτων, carried by a ὑμιδῶς in an inscription from Hypaepa. The distributions took place at festivals, where the ὑμιδῶς presumably collaborated.

Although the simple word γέρων for “member” has not yet been found as at Athens, the term πατρογέρων, which occurs at Ephesus in Nos. 12, 16, and 21, quite obviously means “hereditary member of the Gerusia” (thus the new Greek-English Lexicon), and the word γεροντεία in the Ephesian document No. 15 means “membership in the Gerusia” (thus again the Greek-English Lexicon).

The expression συνεδριον, which was used to indicate the Ephesian Gerusia in No. 12, the decree of that corporation (τῷ συνεδριον ἡμῶν), and in other inscriptions (e.g., No. 11), served also for the Athenian Gerusia (second imperial letter). But it is a very general term which was applied to almost any type of corporation. There may, however, have been a difference between the synhedrion as a group and the Gerusia as a group. The total Gerusia was so large that three hundred and nine recipients of a money distribution among them had to be chosen by lot (No. 3, lines 231-238). The number who actively supervised the finances may have been much smaller, and the terminology of the decree No. 12 does not exclude the interpretation that the synhedrion constituted this smaller group. If so, the phrase κοινῷ ἕγαγρα γερουσία ψηφίζεται stands in contrast to a vote of the synhedrion alone, and the term μετέχων τῆς γερουσίας is not the equivalent of the term μετέχων τοῦ συνεδρίου. But ordinarily the word συνεδριον used of a group indicates the group merely as being in formal assembly.

Another use of the word συνεδριον, attested both at Athens and at Ephesus, is of interest to us here. In writing to the “receiver” of the Ephesian Gerusia the emperors (No. 11) speak of the old statues as being ἐν τῷ συνεδρίῳ τούτῳ. At Athens the decree of the Council in honor of Ulpius Eubiotus (No. 31) specifies that his statue is to be erected ἐν τῷ συνεδρίῳ τῆς ἱερᾶς γερουσίας and in the Prytaneum. The synhedrion, therefore, can mean the place where the Gerusia keeps an office. Elsewhere the word γερουσία itself can refer to the building where the Elders con-

vene, but this usage is rare and not demonstrable for any of the communities where the Sacred Gerusiae appear.

That the city authorities, to whom the emperors seem to have written Letter III, were to assign to the Gerusia one of the buleuteria in the city as a synhedrion or as a special assembly place cannot be proved from the reference in No. 24, line 51, \[τῶν ἐν \] ἡ πόλει βολευτηρίων, but it may well have been so. On the other hand, it does not follow necessarily that the corporation always convened in its synhedrion. That the buleuterion at Eleusis was intended primarily for the city Council and not for the Gerusia could be demonstrated even before the discovery that the Gerusia convened at Athens.\(^7\)

The chief officer of the Gerusia at Ephesus in Nos. 5 and 20 is called the gymnasiarch, a title which points to the origin of the corporation in a social body gathering about a gymnasium. The corresponding officer in the newly founded Athenian Gerusia bore the title “archon” (Nos. 27 and 24, line 21). In what may have been Sacred Gerusiae at Thessalonica he was known as the gerusiarch (No. 56), and the title γερουσιάρχης was given to his wife (No. 57). A secretary (γραμματεύς) of the Ephesian Gerusia appears in No. 3, lines 232 and 243, and again in No. 20, where he describes himself as having been both secretary and gymnasiarch. This combination led Buckler and Robinson \(^8\) to suggest that the post of gymnasiarch and the post of secretary were regularly filled by the same man at Ephesus. The secretary at least constituted the eponymous officer of the institution (No. 12, line 28), and the secretary is named in No. 3, line 232, as the official representative of the Gerusia. The γραμματεύς τοῦ ἱερωτάτου συνεδρίου τοῦ μυσθητηρίου were thought to be the officers managing the estates of the Gerusia by C. Curtius,\(^9\) E. L. Hicks,\(^10\) and I. Lévy.\(^11\) In Chapter IV, on the contrary, we have distinguished between the Rent Office and the Gerusia and hence we must reject the identification. At Philippopolis the ταμίας was the eponymous officer of the Gerusia (No. 60).

Another officer or agent appears in No. 12. This decree of the Ephesian Gerusia from the reign of Commodus honors Nicomedes the καθολικός ἐκδικος τοῦ συνεδρίου ἡμῶν, who has recently uncovered a new source of revenue for the corporation to be expended not only for the cult of Artemis and the emperor but also for the delectation of the Elders. This officer seems to be a special financial commissioner and legal representative whom the synhedrion of the Gerusia itself has appointed without requesting the Roman government again to assign it in its difficulties a λογιστής. His work may have had similarities, as Picard suggested,\(^12\) with that of the λογιστής in

\(^{6}\) J. Menadier, *Qua condicione Ephesii usi sint inde ab Asia in formam provinciae redacta* (Berlin, 1880), p. 51.

\(^{7}\) O. Rubensohn, *Die Mysterienheiligtümer in Eleusis und Samothrake* (Berlin, 1892), pp. 81 f.

\(^{8}\) *A.J.A.*, XVIII (1914), p. 351.

\(^{9}\) *Hermes*, IV (1870), p. 203.

\(^{10}\) *B.M.I.*, III, p. 77.


\(^{12}\) *Éphèse et Claros* (1922), p. 95.
a previous reign, but his position was fundamentally different, because he was not appointed by the proconsul with the power of the Roman state behind his decisions. Finally it may be noted that he was a wealthy man and contributed out of his own pocket to the funds of the Gerusia, as did also the ἐπώνυμος of the Athenian corporation, whom we have already discussed on page 3. An ἐκδίκος appears also in connection with the Philippopolitan Gerusia (No. 60).

There is no evidence to indicate that membership in the Gerusia was a liturgy into which wealthy citizens were forced. On the contrary, when Nicomedes the general advocate of the Ephesian Gerusia had performed a service for the Elders and had even contributed money out of his own pocket for the benefit of the Gerusia (No. 12), he was rewarded by a decree proclaiming him and his sons members of the Gerusia. Similarly the Elders like the Councillors were frequently beneficiaries of money distributions of rather modest proportions. It constituted a large body in which membership was a distinction reserved apparently for the noblest and most respected citizens. At Hyettus membership was received through the invitation of the Gerusia itself with a tendency to pass the place on from father to son, and significantly they required that outsiders pay a fee upon entrance.

In the first two imperial letters the Athenian Elders are referred in their ordinary difficulties to the imperial procurator, about whose presence in Attica we have already commented in the last chapter. He looked after the interests of the fiscus and at least previously the imperial estates. In Letter I the emperors refer to an announcement explaining how they will henceforth select the procurator, presumably with the particular needs of the Athenian Elders in view.

The procurator may have been an interested party because of a connection between the imperial estates and those of the Athenian Gerusia. An obscure passage in No. 11, lines 31-32, can be so interpreted as to indicate that also the business affairs of the Ephesian Gerusia came somewhat under the category of the imperial household's private accounts, which were the province of the procurator, but whether this be right or not, the evidence shows that the fiscal service is far more closely connected with the Athenian Gerusia in 177 A.D. than it was with the Ephesian Gerusia in 162 A.D. Either the conception of fiscal interests had been extended in this direction, or the machinery of government operated differently in the two localities because the legal status of Ephesus, a town incorporated in the senatorial province of Asia, differed from that of Athens, a civitas libera, theoretically not subject to the administration of the proconsul who governed the senatorial province of Achaea. At Ephesus, however, it is quite clear that the Roman official who normally had the supervision over the affairs of the Gerusia was the proconsul. In extraordinary matters the Ephesian Elders might write to the emperor, as it appears from No. 7, but in the latter document itself the emperor refers them to the proconsul, who has, moreover, already dealt with other cases concerning the Gerusia. When the
financial affairs of the Ephesian Gerusia reach a state where they need to be reorganized, it is the proconsul of Asia who undertakes the reorganization by the appointment of a special commissioner (λογιστὴς) to examine their accounts, to collect the debts owed to them and to take measures for the improvement of their administration, as we learn from Nos. 7 and 11. Again, the commissioner who has been appointed by the proconsul is responsible to the latter and consults him in his difficulties just as the Gerusia consulted him. When the commissioner Ulpius Eurycles writes directly to the emperors he points out that he realizes that in ordinary matters he must turn to the proconsul for guidance, and in their reply the emperors are careful to remind him of it again (No. 11) in order that there should be no precedent. Decisions concerning the practice of the imperial cult require the imperial consent, but the other matters about which Ulpius Eurycles has written to the emperors, very important questions of financial policy, clearly do not. “That you who had been given by the proconsuls to the Gerusia of the Ephesians as financial commissioner,” write the emperors to him, “should have applied to them (the proconsuls) concerning your difficulties, you yourself well knew and wisely said so, and we have commented upon this point in order that people might not lightly refer to a precedent here. It is clear that the first matter which you communicated to us, namely, the question of the silver images, a matter requiring our consent indeed, has furnished you with an occasion for the other inquiries also.”

Many of the inquiries doubtless arose out of ordinary legal questions which ought to have been settled by the senatorial governor, or, where there was no senatorial governor, by the ranking imperial officer of the country. In the second century the emperor in his rescripts was constantly directing questioners to the competent officials in their own area. Whether he was speaking of Hadrian or of Antoninus Pius, Julian the great classical jurist attests the frequency of this instruction.13

The Roman government of the Antonines apparently was most anxious to assist the provincials in their local problems, but far from seeking to concentrate the authority in the central government, they were very much concerned that the business of the sacred gerusiae should not encumber the central office. Just as the emperors

13 Digest 1, 18, 8: Julianus libro primo digestorum: Saepe audivi Caesarem nostrum dicentem hac rescriptione “eum qui provinciae praeest adire potes” non imponi necessitatem proconsuli vel legato eius vel praesidi provinciae susciendi cognitionis, sed eum aestimare debere, ipse cognoscere an iudicem dare debat. [S. Solazzi, Archivio giuridico, XCVIII (1927), p. 4, note 3, conjectures that the phrase “eius vel praesidi provinciae” has been interpolated.] Compare also Digest 1, 18, 9: Callistratus libro primo de cognitionibus: Generaliter quotiens princeps ad praesides provinciarum remittit negotia per rescriptiones, veluti “eum qui provinciae praeest adire poteris,” vel cum hac adiectione “is aestimabit quid sit partium suarum,” non imponitur necessitas proconsuli vel legato susciendi cognitionis, quamvis non sit adiectum “is aestimabit quid sit partium suarum”; sed is aestimare debet, utrum ipse cognoscat an iudicem dare debat. [M. Wlassak, Zum Provinzialprozess (Vienna, 1919), p. 16, note 10, allows that the first word “generaliter” might have been interpolated.]
keep reminding the Ephesian Gerusia and its financial commissioner that the pro-
consul is the legally competent authority for their difficulties, so the emperors re-
peatedly remind the Athenian Gerusia that the imperial procurator is the legally 
competent authority for their problems. Since the proconsul of Achaea has not, 
technically, over the free city of Athens the authority which the proconsul of Asia 
exercises over Ephesus, or since the interests of the fiscus have been extended, the 
financial worries of the Athenian Gerusia do not concern him but belong to the ranking 
fiscal officer of the country, the imperial procurator.

Since the proconsul, when the affairs of the Ephesian Gerusia became seriously 
encumbered, appointed a commissioner to the Gerusia, we may conjecture that the 
procurator attached to Achaea might have done the same for the Athenian Gerusia 
under similar circumstances. To be sure, we have no evidence that it ever came to 
such a pass at Athens, but we can probably see references to such a possible con-
tingency. In the last paragraph of Letter I to the Athenian Elders, the emperors 
have been speaking of the procurator. There follows a short lacuna concluding with 
the words, “[If] you wish that such a person be provided, you will apply by letter to 
him” (ἐκε[ινῷ]). The pronoun ἐκεῖνῳ obviously refers to the procurator, and 
it is used instead of the pronoun αὐτῷ to avoid confusion with the other person 
(τοιοῦτον) who was last mentioned and whom I take to be the financial commissioner 
who could be provided if desired. Another possible reference to a commissioner who 
might be provided occurs in Letter III, τῷ γενησομένῳ λο[γιστῇ (?)].

It is important to notice that the financial commissioner was not assigned to the 
Ephesian Gerusia through the uninvited intervention of the Roman government. The 
Ephesian Elders, themselves, had appealed to the Emperor Hadrian for help (No. 7) 
and the emperor had instructed the proconsul to investigate and, if the situation was 
as the Elders represented, to give them someone who could straighten out their affairs. 
When the proconsul Cornelius Priscus presumably did so at the command of the 
Emperor Hadrian in 120 A.D. (No. 7), it established a precedent to be followed on 
other occasions thereafter. We might say that the Gerusia on such occasions passed 
into a temporary receivership. The first known of these financial commissioners 
seems to be a certain Aristocrates, son of Hierocles, of Ceramus (No. 9). The 
Ephesians gratefully recorded this office among the liturgies which Aristocrates had 
assumed. For the Ephesian corporation the only other financial commissioner whose 
name has survived was Ulpius Eurycles who in 162 or 163 A.D. had already been in 
office during the term of at least two proconsuls, as we learn from the opening words 
of the letter from the coregent emperors Marcus Aurelius and Lucius Verus. This was 
ot the last time in a busy life when Ulpius Eurycles received a public commission 
to reorganize finances, for he reappears in O.G.I.S., 509 as λογιστὴς of Aphrodisias 
during the reign of Commodus.

The Sacred Gerusia mentioned in No. 48 from Prusias ad Hypium sometime
after 212 A.D. received a financial commissioner in the person of a distinguished local patriot named Aurelius Diogenianus Callicles.

The same Greek word λογιστής, which designates the financial expert granted to a Gerusia, is used to describe the curator rei publicae, whom the paternalism of the Roman government in the second century appointed to help an economically embarrassed city straighten out its affairs. Practically it was the same type of work, and when Hadrian first directed that a λογιστής be assigned to the Ephesian Gerusia, he was extending to an important public body with serious financial responsibilities a system inaugurated for the cities by his predecessor Trajan. The cardinal document No. 11 shows that the Roman government invested such appointees with very considerable judicial as well as administrative authority.

It appears that the Gerusiae (both by themselves or through their “receivers” called λογισταί) were to consult the proconsul or procurator respectively in all the ordinary business for which guidance might be required, but in matters concerning the practice of the imperial cult they applied directly to the emperor. In No. 11 Marcus Aurelius and Lucius Verus recognize explicitly that the financial commissioner Ulpius Eurycles was acting properly in consulting them about the silver images of deceased emperors, but that he was acting irregularly in asking them for advice concerning the finances. Similarly in the first letter of Marcus Aurelius and Commodus to the Athenian Gerusia the emperors point to Quadratus as the competent official to handle questions concerning matters like the timber and the estates and like the furnishing of a man probably to serve as λογιστής, but in the passage about the ius scribendi ἐξουσία and a related matter, which probably likewise concerned the practice of the imperial cult, the emperors seem to approve of the Gerusia’s action in consulting them. Instead of directing the Gerusia to the procurator, they reply: ὀρθῶς δὲ ἐπουθήσατε καὶ ἔπιστε[Ἀλαντές ἠμῶν (?)].

CHAPTER VII

CONCLUSIONS

To clarify and to co-ordinate what we have already discovered concerning the history of the Sacred Gerusia I here present an outline of its development, with which the evidence, I feel, does not stand in contradiction but which still requires confirmation through further discoveries.

At Ephesus before the time of Lysimachus, if a common type of social organization of the more respected Greek citizens, known as the Gerusia, assembled about a gymnasium, it had nothing to do officially with the famous and opulent sanctuary of Artemis. After the capture of Ephesus by the troops of Lysimachus, the supervision over the invested capital of the Artemisium was transferred to this pre-existing social gerusia or to such a gerusia then established at Ephesus on a model pre-existing elsewhere; but with the Gerusia were associated certain other persons at the will of Lysimachus. Thus the wealth of the sanctuary was removed from the control of irresponsible priests; and the Gerusia and its new associates, while not at all replacing the political corporations of Ephesus, rapidly secured a powerful influence over all the city, because the Elders enjoyed the support of Lysimachus and were independent in their management of the sacred investments on which the economic life of the city partly depended. After the death of Lysimachus, the city of Ephesus gradually assumed control over the sanctuary, either because the Gerusia was forced to depend upon the city for protection and support, or because the Gerusia was abolished, or because its sphere of influence was reduced, or even because it was removed from power at the sanctuary and reverted to its former private character. We have no further information about the Gerusia until it reappears in the time of Trajan. Then, however, it was again supervising investments which were distinct from, but treated like, those of Artemis.

An increase of importance appears for the first time in a document of the reign of Hadrian. The Ephesian Gerusia in its difficulties had appealed directly to the emperor, who then instructed the proconsul of Asia to send them a financial expert to disentangle their affairs. After this time we have evidence for a keen interest in the affairs of the Ephesian Gerusia on the part of the Roman imperial chancery. Similar institutions began to appear elsewhere, and in the case of the Athenian Gerusia, the only certainly parallel institution about whose foundation we have any knowledge, the establishment occurred after an embassy to the coregent emperors.
Marcus Aurelius and Commodus and was fostered by the imperial government. An accident has preserved fragments of at least six, probably seven, imperial letters on the affairs of the Athenian Gerusia alone.

A slight indication exists that at some time in the second century after Christ, at Tralles, one of the old social gerusiae had been called upon to constitute or provide a board for similar duties. If so, the encouragement and propagation of the social gerusia precisely at this time may have been connected with hopes or expectations of a development in this direction.

Shortly after 212 A.D. at Hyettus in Boeotia an organization calling itself the Sacred Gerusia emerges into view not as a municipal Gerusia of the Hyettians but as a managing board of temple estates unlike the corporations of Athens and of Roman Ephesus but rather similar to the Gerusia of Hellenistic Ephesus upon the transformation effected by Lysimachus. Believing the Hyettian institution to have been created partly on the old Ephesian model, we may figuratively represent the functional descent as follows:

```
Common type of social gerusia

Ephesian Gerusia as packed by Lysimachus
and invested with economic control of the Artemisium

Gerusiae like those of Roman Ephesus and Athens

Gerusiae like that of Hyettus
```

Thus there are two types of Sacred Gerusiae in the Roman Period, but the inadequacy of our information frequently prevents us from discriminating between them. It is, however, the municipal corporation, the type at Athens and at Roman Ephesus, which enjoyed the attention of the imperial government.

The keen interest which the imperial government displayed in Sacred Gerusiae from the time of Hadrian, and particularly under Marcus Aurelius, is to be interpreted in the light of the religious policy of Hadrian and the Antonines. In the writer’s opinion it is part of a general attempt to revitalize the spiritual values of the old Greek and Roman world. New strength and new life were to be infused into the ceremonies of the old gods, the ceremonies were not to lose their splendor and their powers of attraction for the urban population. Spiritual forces of a new and perhaps subversive character were gathering strength in the Roman Empire, and against them the enlightened government of Hadrian and the Antonines pursued a policy more subtle than that of open intolerance.¹

¹ Antoninus Pius and Marcus Aurelius were notoriously unsympathetic toward the Christians, whose persecution, accordingly, was not discouraged.
And since the distributions and gaiety of the festivals helped to keep the proletariat contented, these corporations, which guaranteed the regularity of the festivals, were stabilizing factors in the Roman East. The imperial government, which regarded the establishment of clubs with a jealous and suspicious eye, gave spontaneously its full support to this institution, wherein the membership, unlike that of the clubs, was drawn entirely from the aristocratic, conservative, heartily pro-Roman elements of the population.

At Stratonicea in Caria, a corporation called the Sacred Gerusia, probably an institution on an Ephesian model, seems to go back as far as the reign of Hadrian. The Sacred Gerusiae, at least in some places, seem to have lived on under all the Severi, on whose part, however, no special interest is attested; but no trace of the institution occurs after the reign of Severus Alexander, except at Thessalonica, where two gerusiae which can have had the special character of one or the other type were founded approximately in the latter's reign but apparently without the latter's co-operation, and survived as late as 261 A.D.
PART II

EPIGRAPHICAL TEXTS
CITIZENSHIP FOR EUPHRONIUS THE ACARNANIAN


285 B.C. ?

"Εδοξεν τῇ βουλήι καί τῷ δήμῳ: Ἰηρογείτων εἶπεν· περὶ δὲν οἱ νεωποίαι καὶ οἱ κούρητες κατασταθέντες διελέξθησαν

τῇ βουλήι καί τῷ ψήφισμα ἤρεγκαν τῇς γερουσίᾳς καὶ τῶν ἐπικλήτων ὑπὲρ Εὐφρονίου πολιτείας, δεδοχθαὶ τῇ βουλήι·

ἐπεδή Εὐφρόνιος Ἱηρομοίος Ἀκαρναίοις πρῶτερον τε εὖνοις ὅν καὶ πρόθυμοι διετέλει περὶ τοῦ δήμου τῶν Ἐφεσίων καὶ νῦν

ἀποσταλεῖσθαι προσβεβείας πρὸς Πρεπέλαυν ὑπὸ τῆς γερουσίας καὶ τῶν ἐπικλήτων ὑπὲρ τοῦ σταθμοῦ τοῦ ιεροῦ καὶ τῆς ἀτελεί·

5 ἀς τῇ θεώ, συνδιοίκησεν μετὰ τῆς προσβεβείας ὅπως ἢν ἡ ἀτέλ[ε]ια ὑπάρχῃ τῇ θεώ καὶ τὰ λοιπὰ ἐν ἀπασι καιροῖς διατελεῖ

χρήσιμος ἡν καὶ κοινῆτι τῶν δήμων καὶ ἱδία τοῖς ἐνυγγάνυσι τ[ὸ] μπολιτῶν· ἐγνώσθαι ἐπαινέσθαι τε Εὐφρόνιον εὐνοίας ἑκεν


10 ἔλαξε φυλῆν Ἐφεσίων, χωρίον τῆς Ἀργαδευς.

TRANSLATION

The Council and the People decreed. The proposal of Herogeiton:

In regard to the matters about which the appointed temple-wardens and the curetes discoursed before the Council, and brought a decree of the Gerusia and of the associated advisers in favor of citizenship for Euphronius, may the Council decree:

Since Euphronius, son of Hegemon, of Acaarnania, on former occasions has constantly displayed toward the Demos of the Ephesians a friendly and zealous attitude, and now also, when an embassy to Prepelaus was dispatched by the Gerusia and the associated advisers in behalf of the sacred weight and the right of the goddess
to be exempt from duty, he has helped to arrange matters so that the goddess does enjoy the exemption, and since in all other things on all occasions he is constantly helpful both to the Demos publicly and privately to any of the citizens who appeal to him: may it be decided to praise Euphronius for the good will which he has toward the sanctuary and the city, and to give him citizenship on an equal basis, to him and to his descendants, and to inscribe the grant of citizenship upon the sanctuary of Artemis, where also the other grants have been inscribed; furthermore, to assign him by lot to a tribe and to a thousand that all may know that the Demos of the Ephesians honors with the proper gifts those who render services to the sanctuary and to the city.

He was assigned by lot to the tribe of the Ephesians and to the thousand of the Argades.

HONORS FOR A BOEOTIAN FLUTE-PLAYER

2. Ephesus. E. L. Hicks, B.M.I., III (1890), No. 470.

285 B.C. ?

The Council and People decreed, the proposal of ...:

Whereas the temple-wardens have been brought before the Council in accord with the decree of the Gerusia and of the associated advisers in behalf of ... the flute-player: may the Council and People vote to honor the flute-player ..., son of Ismenodorus, the Boeotian, and to crown him with a gold crown and to proclaim it ———.

COMMENTARY

The restorations are due to Hicks.

Just as in document No. 1, which must be dated in 285 or 302 B.C., the Gerusia and the ἐπίκλητοι have first themselves voted on the matter and have then dispatched the
civil officers, the νεωποίαυ, to the Council with recommendation that the man be honored in such a manner. The procedure, therefore, indicates a date not very long after the reorganization of 286 or 302, discussed above on pp. 18 and 19.

Bequest of Gaius Vibius Salutaris


104 A.D.

Επὶ τὸν ἀνεω[ς]


Ποσειδεωνος ὡς ἱσταμένουν.

["Ε"] δοξε τῇ βουλῇ καὶ τῷ νεωκόρῳ δήμῳ φ[ι]λοσεβάστων.


[τ]ῇ[ς] [ἀγ]αθὴ ἄρῳ[ν] ἐνο[ὶ]ς ἄλλησθιν, ὡς καὶ τάς ἀπὸ τῆς τύχης ἐπὶ τὸ κρε[ῖς-]

[σου] προκοπάσ κοσμ[μ]εῖν τῇ[ν] ὅθων σεμνοτητι, εὔσεβῶν μὲν φιλοτεί-

20 μως] τῆ[ν] ἄρχηγετίν ποι[κ]λίαμι μὲν ἐπινοίᾳς ἐσπούδακεν περὶ τὴν θρησ-

[κεία[ν]υ], μεγαλοφόρῳ[ς] δὲ[ν] καθίερωσεσιν τὴν πόλιν κατὰ πάν τ[ῶν] ὑπη-

[κεν, προσ[έ]τι δὲ καὶ νῦν προσελθ]ῶν ὁν εἰς τὴν ἐκκλησίαν ὑπέσχετο το[ν] ἐννέα ἄ-


Νέρουα Τραία[νοῦ Καίσαρας Σ]εβαστοῦ, Γερμανικοῦ, Δ[ικαικοῦ, καὶ]

τῆς ἱεροτάτης[ς γυναικὸς ἀυτοῦ Πλαющееής καὶ τῆς ἱερ[άς συνκλήτου]

και τοῦ Ῥω[μαίων ἕπικοιν τάγμα]τος καὶ δῆμου, [τούτων δὲ χω]-

ρίς εἰκόν[ας δεκαπεντ' Ἐφεσίων] ν τῆν πόλιν προσ[ωποιούσας],


βεία[ς ...] στο[ν ...] νκ[

Traces of sixteen lines

[... ὑπὸ τῶν φυλάκων, συνεπιμελουμένων καὶ] δύο νε[οποι-]

ὡν [καὶ τοῦ σκηπτροῦ, φέρηται καὶ] αὐ τι[έρη]ται, διὰδ[εχομέ-]

50 νοῦν [καὶ συμπροσπεμπόντων τῶν] ἐφήβων [ἀ]πὸ τῆς Μ[αγνη-]

τικῆς [πύλης εἰς τὸ θέατρον καὶ] ἀπὸ τοῦ θεό[ῦ ἀτρού κατά]

τὸν αὐτ[ὸν τρόπον,] τῇ νο [ον] μηνία ἀρχ[ειρατικὸν]

ἐτούς [θυ]νυ[ί καὶ εἰ τ]αὶ β[α] [καθ' ἐκαστὸ]ν μὴναγ' α[θροισ]-

μένας ἱερ[ὰ τε καὶ] νομ[ίμος ἐκκλ]ησίας καὶ ἐν ταῖς τῶν]


[λων Ἐφεσος] ε[ἰ] ὑ [ν ἕφορταῖς ————]

5 lines missing

μοτε[ι——— τῶν δὲ χρημάτων τῶν καθε-]

ρωμέων [ν ὑπ' αὐ]τ[ο] ὑ ν Ἐφεσίων τῇ βουλῇ καὶ τῇ γερουσίᾳ

καὶ πολ[είται καὶ εἰ] φῆ[βοις καὶ παισὲν ὑπέσχετο αὐτὸς]

60 ἐκ τοῦ σ[——— ἐκδαυστής γενέσθαι]

— καὶ τ[ε]λεῖν τόκ[ον δραχμαίον] ἀσταραιόν

[δι]ποτῃ[ν] σπομέν[οι]ν κ ἀθ[έ] καστὸν ε' νιαστόν κα-

τά τὴν διάκεισαν αὐτοῦ τ[ῇ γεν]ν[it] ἐσ[i] ὑ ὑ τῆ]ς θεοῦ η[μέρα,]


70 [ὁ] μολογήσας ἀποδώσε[ι]ν τα ὕρματ[α] ἔαυντι τά [κα-]


[πο]σ ποι[ντα]μένων περὶ [δν] ἀπάντων διάταξεν ἐσίγη [ηπαμε-]


75 [βουλῆς καὶ τοῦ δήμου, καὶ νύ]ν τῆς ἐπαρχ[ε][κ]ειάς [ήγεμο]-

[νεόντως ὅς кράτιστος ἀν] ἧρ καὶ εὐργ[Ε] τῆς Ἀκο[ν]νίλλι-

[ος Πρόκλος, ὁ ἀνθόποτο]ς, καὶ Ἀρφάν[ο]ς Φλαουια-

νός, ὁ πρεσβυτής καὶ ἀντ[ε]στράτηγο [ς, ἂ] περιβλήτῳ

[τὴν φιλανθρωπία καὶ] φιλοστοργία ἐπὶ πινὰν ὄντες τὴν
80 τοῦ ἀνδρός[ς μεγαλοφυ]υχιαν, ὡς γνή[ς]τοι[ν] πολεύται ἡ
μῶν αὐτοῖ, κα[θ' ἀντημεὶ]ψαντο αὐτῶ[ι κ]αὶ δι' ἐπιστολῶν
[συ]τηδόμενο[ι ἀντ'] γραφαίν, ἐ[πεκέλ]ευσαν, ὥστε δι'
[αὐτῶ] ν εἰσεῖνε[vκεῖν π](epi τῶν) [καθθερο.jdbc] ὑπὸν αὐτο[ν].
δ[ε]ιδοχθ' αὐ Γ[άεων Οὐεί]βιον [Σαλοντάριον, ἀνδρά] ἐυθεῖα

85 [μεν] πρὸς[τοὺς θεούς]ς, εἰς δὲ τῇ[ν πολῖν φιλότειμον, τε-
σιν ἐν τῇ[ν] ἰερῷ τῆς Ἀρτέμιδος[ς καὶ ε]ὺ[ν τοῖς ἐπιστημοτάτοις
tόπως τῆς πόλεως, ἄναγχ[ρείσαι δὲ αὐ] τὸν καὶ χρυσῖν
cτεθάναι ἐν ταῖς ἀκκ[λήσιας ὡς σπουδὰ] λούντα καὶ φιλάρ-
90 τεμν[υ] τὴν δὲ παρατῇ[ρὴν τὸν προγ]εγραμμένον ἱε-
ρὸν ε̂ [ἵ]δὼν καὶ τὴν πρὸ κο[ποι][ν ἀπὸ τοῦ] ἰ' ἐροῦ εἰς τὸ θεά-
tρον καὶ τῇ[ν ἐκ τοῦ θεάτρου ε] [ς τ] ο ἰερὸν] τῆς Ἀρτέμιδος
μετακομβικὴν ποιήσαι κατὰ τὴν διάταξΙν κ' α[θ'] ἔκαστον [ἐ]-
tος [ἐκ τῶν νεοποίων δύο καὶ σκη[τ] τούχον καὶ τοῦ
95 φιλάκους

Seven lines missing

[-----------------] τῶν ναὸν τῆς Ἀρ[τέμιδος ---]
105 [-----------------] τ[ὸν καθηκόντω] ν . . . . . ]σι[ . . .]
[----------. Τὴν δὲ διάταξιν αὐ] τοῦ κυρίαν εἰνα[ι], ἀμετάθ]ητον,
[άκατάκτονον, ἀπαράλλακτον][ν] εἰς τῶν ἀπαντα χρό[νων].
["Εάν δὲ τις εἴτε ἵδωτόν ε] [το] αρχο[ν]υτο[ν ἐπιθήσ] φίση τ[� ψα-]
110 [άλλαξ̆, ἐστω ἀκουρον ἀπαν τὸ ἐκαυτὸν τῇ διατάξ[ει, δὲ το]νού-
[σας τι τούτων θ᾽ εἰσηγησά] με[ν]ς[ος ἀποτελεσάτω ε] [ς προ[ς]
[σαρας φύσικον ἀλλα] δηθη > Ἔ < Κ [αθάπερ οἱ κράτουσ] το[ι ἡ-]
[γεμώνεις Ἀκούλιος] Πρόκλου[ς, ὃ ἀντύπαστος, καὶ Ἀφράντ-]
115 [ος Φλάονανος, ὃς πρεσβεῖν] π [ἡς καὶ ἀντιστράτηγος, δι᾽ ἑ-]
[πιστοῦ] λῶν τὸ προγεγραμμένον πρόστειμον ἀμοιναν.
[Πρὸς δὲ] τὸ φαι[νεῖν γενέσθαι τὴν τε πρὸς τὴν πό-]
[λιν] με[γ] αγαλοφυ[ς] [ἰ[α]ν αὐτού καὶ τὴν πρὸς τὴν θέων ἐστεβειαν]
120 [τῆς βουλῆς καὶ τοῦ δήμου κεκυρωμενήν διά] ταξι[ν ἀνα] γραφ[ή-]
[ναι] [-----------------] θα[. . . ]σι[. . .]
[-----------------] ν' ἐν μὲν τῷ θεάτρῳ [ἐπὶ τῷ τῆς νοτιάς πα-]
[ρόδου τούχω] αὐτοῦ μαρμαρίνης. ἡ β[ούλεται αὐτός, ἐν δὲ]

125 τῷ Ἄρτεμι|στῳ ἐν τόπῳ ἑπταδέιῳ, φιλοτεί[μιας ένεκα] κἀ[ι]
[ἀρέτης·] καὶ περὶ τῆς [δ]'ιαμονῆς τῶν καθι[σμένων] ὑπ’ αὐ-
[τοῦ χρὸ] ἡμᾶτων τῆς τῇ τε βουλῇ καὶ τῇ γερο[νία καὶ πολείταις καὶ]
[ἐφή]βους ὑπέσχετο αὐτός κατὰ [τὴν διάταξιν τῷ ἑνεστῶτι]
[ἐπεὶ] ἐκδανιστῇς γενέσθαι [-----]

Two lines missing

[”Εδοξε τῇ βουλῇ καὶ τῶι νεωκ] ὁραὶ δήμῳς φιλοσ omega [βαστωι]
[γενέσθαι, καθοτί προγεγρ]ατται. vacat

Σέξτ[φ ’Αμπτός]

135 Σουνδουρανῳ τ[ο β] Μάρκω Ἀσινίῳ]
Μάρ[κ] κέλλῳ ὑπάτους, — — — 'Ιαν.]
[’Επὶ προπάνεως Τιβ. Κλ. ’Αυτοπάτρου ’Ιουλιανοῦ,]
[μηνὸς Ποσειδεόνιος . ισταμένου.]
Γάιος [Οὔεϊβιος, Γ. ιύσ. Οὐβενέτειν], Σαλούταριος διάτα-]

140 [ειν εἰφ] [φέρει τῇ Ἐφεσίων βουλῇ φιλοσεβάστῳ καὶ τῷ νεωκόρῳ]
[’Εφεσίῳ ν δήμῳ φιλοσεβάστῳ, περὶ ὄν καθέρωκεν ἐπὶ]
ταῖς ὑπ’ οἰκογενέμεναι οἰκονομιᾶς τῇ μεγίστῃ θεᾶ Ἐφεσία Ἄρ-
[τέμι δὶ καὶ τῷ νεωκόρῳ Ἐφεσίων δήμῳ φιλοσεβάστῳ καὶ]
[τῇ Ἐφ[ε]σίων βουλῇ] φιλοσεβάστῳ καὶ τῇ ’Εφεσίων γεροσθίᾳ]

145 [φ[ι]ολοσεβάστῳ καὶ τοῖς Εἰφ] Ἐφεσίων φυλαῖς καὶ τοῖς κατ’ ἐνιαυτῶν]
[’Εφεσίων ἐφήβωσι καὶ τοῖς θεολογοῖς καὶ ὑμνωδοῖς καὶ τοῖς νεο-
[ποίοις καὶ σκηπτούχοις καὶ τοῖς αἰεὶ ἐσομένοις Ἐφεσίων]
[παισίν καὶ παιδωνόμοις ἀπεικονισμάτων τῆς θεοῦ ἐννέα, ἐ-]
[νὸς μὲν χρυσέου, τῶν δὲ λοιπῶν ἄργυρεῖν, καὶ εἰκόνων ἄργυρεῖν]

150 [ἐκίσει καὶ δηραῖοι δισμυρίων, ἐφ’ ὧν] εἰκόνων ἄργυρεα τοῦ κυρίου]
[ἤμων Αὐτοκράτορος Καίσαρος Νέρου Τιαίανου] Σεβαστό[ο[υ, Γερ-
[μανκοῦ, Δακικοῦ, ὀλκῆς λειτρῶν .], οὐνκιῶν γ, καὶ εἰκόνων ἄργυρεά]
Πλω[τένυς Σεβαστῆς, ὠλ] κῆς λειτρῶν γ, νεοκορωύται πα[ρ’ αὐτῶν]

155 ἀποδοθῶσιν αἰ προδήλουμεν εἰκόνες τῶι Ἐφεσίων γραμμ[α]τεὶ ἐπὶ τοῦ]
[προγεγαμεμένωι σταθμοῖ] ἀπὸ τῶι κληρονόμων αὐτοῦ, ὥστε καὶ αὐ-
[τὰ τὰ ὄνομα[σ]θαι ἐν ταῖς ἐκκλησίαις ἐπάνω τῆς σε]<λ>ίδος τῆς βουλ[ῆς] μετὰ τῆς]
χρυσεά[ν] ’Αρ[τέ] μιδώς καὶ τῶν ἄλλων εἰκόνων. Ἀρτέμις δὲ χρυ[σοῦ] σέα, ὀλκῆς]
λειτρῶν τριῶν καὶ αἰ περὶ αὐτὴν ἀργυροῦ[ι] ἔλεγον τόις κατὰ λοι[πὰ ἐπίχρυσα],

160 ὀλκῆς λειτρῶν δύο, οὐκιῶν δέκα, γερμάματων πέντε, καὶ [ε]ἰκών ἄργυ-
[ρα τῇ[ς] ἑράς συνκλητοῦ, ὀλκῆς λειτρῶν δ, οὐκιῶν [ν] β, καὶ [ε]ἰκών ἄργυ-

126 τω[ι]. 127 χρὸ] ἡμᾶτων τῆ. 155 προδῆλουμεν. 157 αἰλίδως. 159 ἐλαφοῦ.
165 ρ[ος], ὅλκης θ ζ, καὶ εἰκών ἄργυρεὰ τοῦ δήμου τοῦ Ἡραιμίων, ὅλκης θ . , καὶ εἰκών ἄργυρεὰ τῆς φιλοσεβαστῆς γερουσίας, ὅλκης θ [ , τά καὶ αὐτὰ καθιερωμένα τῇ τῇ Ἀρτέμιδι καὶ τῇ Ἐφεσῶν γερουσίᾳ . Ὅμοιος καὶ ἄλλη Ἀρτέμις ἄργυρεὰ λαμπαδηφόρος, ἐῳμήρῃς .

170 καὶ εἰκών ἄργυρεὰ τοῦ ἱστικοῦ τάγματος, ὅλκης θ γ , ἀ[μούν]—
κίον, γραμμάτων [γ], καὶ ἄλλη εἰκών ἄργυρεὰ τῆς ἑφηβείας [ς , ὅλκης θ . , τά καὶ αὐτὰ καθιε[ρω]νυ[κία]ть τῇ τῇ Ἀρτέμιδι καὶ τοῖς κατ’ ἑναντόν ν οὐ .

175 [Θεό]ν Σεβαστοῦ, ὅλκης θ . ούκικών . γραμμάτων . καὶ εἰκών ἄργυρεὰ ψι—
[λῆς Σε]βαστῆς, ὅλκης θ . τά καὶ αὐτὰ καθιερωμένα τῇ τῇ Ἀρτέμιδι καὶ
[τοῖς αἰεὶ ἑισομένοις τοῖς πολείταις τῆς Σεβαστῆς φυλῆς . Ὅμοιος καὶ ἄλλη]


[καὶ εἰκών ἄργυρεὰ τοῦ φιλοσεβαστοῦ Ἐφεσῶν δήμου, ὅλκης θ . ,]

180 [καὶ εἰκών ἄργυρεὰ φυλῆς Ἑ]φ[εσών ὅλκης θ , τά καὶ αὐτὰ καθιερωμένα]

[τῇ τῇ Ἀρτέμιδι καὶ τοῖς αἰεὶ ἑισομένοις τοῖς πολείταις τῆς Ἐφεσῶν φυλῆς .]

[Ομοίως καὶ ἄλλη Ἀρτέμις ἄργυρεὰ [—— ——— ——— ——— ——— ——— ——— ——— ——— ——— ——— .]

185 [καὶ αὐτὰ καθιερωμένα τῇ τῇ Ἀρτέμιδι καὶ τοῖς αἰεὶ ἑισομένοις πολείταις]

[τῆς Καρπναίων φυλῆς . Ὅμοιος καὶ ἄλλη Ἀρτέμις ἄργυρεὰ λαμππ[δηφό—

[ρος . . . . . . , ὅλκης θ . καὶ εἰκών ἄργυρεὰ λυσιμάχου, ὅλκης θ γ ]ρ ρ , καὶ εἰκών]

[ἄργυρεὰ φυλῆς Τηρίων, ὅλκης θ . , τά καὶ αὐτὰ καθιερωμένα]ν τῇ τῇ Ἀρτέμιδι

[καὶ τοῖς αἰεὶ ἑισομένοις τοῖς πολείταις τῆς Τηρίων φυλῆς . Ὅμοιος καὶ ἄλλη Ἀρτ—

190 ὕπωμες ἄργυρεὰ ἔχουν]σα τῇ . . . . . φοιλῆς θ . ούκικὼν χ, ἤμισος γράμμα—

[τος, καὶ εἰκών ἄργυρεὰ Ε]φ[υπεράντρον, ὅλκης θ . καὶ εἰκών ἄργυρ[ε]α φυλῆς Ἐν—

[ωσόμων, ὅλκης θ γ ]ήμιοισι γράμμα—

[τος, τά καὶ αὐτὰ καθιερωμένα]ν τῇ τῇ Ἀρτέμιδι καὶ τοῖς αἰεὶ ἑισομένοις πολείταις τῆς Ἐνωσόμων ν φυλῆς .

[Ὅμοιος καὶ ἄλλη Ἀρτέμις ἄργυρεὰ λαμπαδηφόρος ——— ——— ——— ——— Ἐασταλι—

195 [σα , ὅλκης θ . ούκικών . καὶ εἰκών ἄργυρεὰ Πίωνος, ὅλκης θ . καὶ εἰκών]

[ἄργυρεὰ φυλῆς Βεμβεβεοιαίων ὅλκης θ . τά καὶ αὐτὰ καθιερωμένα τῇ τῇ Ἀ]ρτ—

[τεμίδι καὶ τοῖς αἰεὶ ἑισομένοις πολείταις τῆς Βεμβεβεοιαίων φυλῆς .]

[Ὁ δὲ προγεγραμμένος σταθμὸς τῶν ἐννέα ἀπεικονισμάτων ν τῆς θεί—

163 γραμμάτων . 190 Picard (Rev. de Phil., XXXVII, p. 93) τῷ ὁ[γο], A. J. Reinach (Rev. Ἐπιγρ., I, p. 232) τῷ τρομαίῳ.
[οὐ καὶ τῶν ἐκόστι εἴκόνων παρεστάθη Ἕφυμεν· νεὶ Ἕμων· [ον τοῦ Θεοφίλον] οὐ τῶι
[καὶ αὐτῶι οὐτηγγώι τῆς Ἐφεσίων πόλεως, δὶ·] ἀ τοῦ ζνι[οστάτου Ἐρμίου,] ἱεροῦ τῆς
[Ἀρτέμιδος, συμπαρακαμβάνοι]•[τ] ο[ς Μουναίου,] ἱεροῦ τ[ῆς Ἀρτέμιδος, τοῦ] ἐπὶ τῶν
[παραθηκῶν. Τά δὲ προγεγραμμέναι να ἀπεικονίζονται ἀποτιθέονται]ς κατὰ
[πάσαν νόμον ἐκκλ.] σοι[άι τι τῇ νέᾳ·] νουμή[ν]ιε ἐτοὺς ἀρτιερι[κοῦ ἐπιτελουμένης θυσίας] ἐν τῶι
[θεατρῶι ὑπὸ τῶι καὶ θηκόντων ἐπὶ τάς κατὰ σε-
[λίδας τεθειμένας] κ[αὶ ἐπιγεγραμμένας] θ[ῆς βάσις] 
[τα]ί[ς βάς[εις] ἀνὰ γ, ὡς ἡ ἐπι]ς τοὺς βα-
[θροὺς καὶ ή ἐν τῇ] διασπέραι βο[υλής, γεροντικικής] ἐφθα[σίας, ἔφθα[βειας καὶ φυλής]ς καθιε-
[ρωσις· μετὰ δὲ τῷ] λυθῆ[ν] αἰ τάς ἐκκλησίας]ς ἀποφθε[γμα]ς τὰ ἐπικοινωνος·
[ματὰ καὶ τοῖς ἐκοινώνεις] εἰς τὸ ἱερὸν τῆς Ἀρτέμιδος καὶ το[ῦ παραδιδοθείσον τῷ] πόλεως
[τῶν θυλάκων, συνεπιμελουμένων καὶ] τῶν νεο[ποιῶν καὶ τοῦ σκηπτούχου,]
[Μουσαίῳ, ἱεροῦ τῆς Ἀρτέμιδος ἐπὶ τῶν παρ][αθηκῶν· κω[ν, διαδεχομένων καὶ συμ]
[προπερτούν καὶ τῶν ἐφήβων ἀπὸ τῆς Μαγνησίας πόλεως] εἰς τὸ θέα.
[τρού καὶ ἀπὸ τοῦ θεατροῦ μέχρι τῆς Κορησσικῆς πόλεως] μετὰ τάς ἐπιτελουμένης
[πειάς. Ὡσαύτως δὲ γενέσθαι καὶ ἐν πάσῃ τοῖς γυμνικοῖς]ς ἀγώνιοικ
[ἐτεραὶ ὑπὸ τῆς βουλής καὶ τοῦ δήμου ἀριθμοῦσανταὶ ἡμέρας. Μηδὲν δὲ ἐξ ἐστω]
[μετουκομηθήσας] ή ἡ ἐπικοινώνευτα τῆς θεοῦ[ν] η [τάς εἰκόνας πρὸς τὸ]
[μετουκομομ广大群众] η ἡ ἀναχωνευθήσας ἡ ἠλλοιν· τοῖς τρόποις κακογρηγθήνιας ἐπὶ
[ὁ ποιήσας τοῖς τούτων υπεθύνων] ές έστω ἱεροσυλία καὶ ἀσέβεια καὶ οὐδὲν
[إرسال ο[υς ο[νέος ἐπιδεικνύον πρὸς τοὺς] προγεγραμμένους ἀπεικονισθή
[μασι καὶ εἰκόνων λειτουργίων] ῥια, ἐχον ν τόν περὶ τούτων ἐκδικίαν ἐπὶ ἀνά
[κη τοὺς ἐπιφανοὺς τῆς πόλεως] μ. ἤ τῶν δὲ καθιερωμένων ὑπὸ Σαλοντα-
[ρίων δήν. Β. μυρίων]υν σελέαρτες τόκοιν Σαλοντάριος δραχμαίων καθ' ἐκαστόν ἐν-
[αὐτοῦ] τά γενόμενα δημάρια χ' ἐν ὑκτάκοσια ἀφ' ὧν δώσας τῷ γραμμα-
[τεῖ τῆς β.]ουλής δημάρια τετράκοσια α παυτίκουτα, ὅπως ἐπιτελεῖ διακ' ὑμήν
[τοῖς] βουλευταίνειν εὲ τὸ ἱερὸν ἐν τῷ ποιῶν σύζευ· τῆς γενεω[σις] αὶ τῆς μεγίστης θεᾶς Ἀρ-
[τεμίδος]ς, ζητεῖν τότιν μινῶς θεάργης λευκοίς ἐκτῇ ἱσταμένου, γενομένης τῆς διανο-
[μῆς ταίτης]ς πέμπτης, διδοῦ ἐνός κάτω ἡ τῶν παρόντων δημαρίων ἑώς,
[μή ἐχον]τοσ ἐξουσιά οὐτὲ τό ἐπὶ τῆς διανομῆς ἀπὸντο δοῦναι, ἐπεὶ ἀποτελεῖ
[τω τῆ βουλής ὑπὲρ ἐκάστου ὁνόματος τοῦ μη παραγεμούν]ν καὶ λαβώνος
[προστείμων δὴν... Ἐναὶ δὲ μείλων γε]ιπ' ὑπηρετοῖς κόλλουξ, ὁστε
[οῖς πλεονάσεαι χαρεῖσθεν, ἐξέστ' ω καὶ [--- --- --- --- --- --- --- ---] α] ἀνά κύ[κλον] ν. Ομοίω[ς δῶ -]
[σει τῷ τοῦ συνεδρίου τῆς]ς γενουσια ἡ ἀρματείς καὶ ὄντι[ν]
[αιν]τοῦ ἐκαστοῦ ἀπὸ τοῦ προγεγραμμένου τοῖς δη[ν] τπ[β]
[ἀσταρία [θ, ὅπως ἐπιτελεῖ κλήρου τῆς] γενεσίων τῆς ἱερείας [τοῦ]
[ἡμέρας τοῦ τοῦ συνεδρίου μετέχουσι]ν εἰς αὖδρας τῆς [ἀνά δης. ἡ εἰς]
[213 άγγει. 216 κακογρηγθήνια ἐπι· 218 Heberdey ἡ θητοι πόλεως] ου τοῦ [τοῦ ἀρτεμίδος]Ν, Picard (Rev. de Phil., XXXVII, p. 93) τοῦ στρατηγοῦ τῆς πόλεως. 223 διατομηνι. 235 Heberdey τ [ἀνά.]
[δὲ μείζων ἢ ὁ γενόμενος κόλλυβος], ὥστε εἰς πλείον [νας]
[χωρεῖν, κληρώσει καὶ πλείους, ἐκ] ἀστοὺ τῶν λαχ[όν-]
[τῶν ἀνὰ δηνάριον ἐν λαμβάνον]τοις = Διδόσθ[ω δὲ καὶ]
[τούι . . . . . . . . τοῦ νεοκοροσίου παρά] Σα[λ] ουταρίῳ τ[ῳ καθερω-]

240 [κότι εἰς διανομὴν δη. κὲ ἀσ. θ καὶ τὸ] ἵσ 'Ἀσιαρχής [ασι] τοὺς
[ἀναγραφάμενοι δη. νὲ εἰς κλήρου] ἀνὰ [δηνάρια] καὶ θ[ῳ καὶ]
[τὰ εἰς τὴν θυσίαν ἀγοράσουν], τοῦ κλήρου γενομένου
[τῇ πέμπτῃ, μή ἔχοντος εἴ] ξουσιά<ν> τοῦ γραμματέου τῆς
[γερουσίας τὸς παρίειν τὴν δ]ιανομὴν ἡ ἀναγραφὴν μετὰ

245 [τῇ Σαλονταρίου τελευτῇ]ν = ἐπεὶ ἀποτευκών πρόστειμον
[τὸ ἐν τῇ διατάξει ὀριστ.]μένον = 'Ομοίως ἀπὸ τοῦ προγε-
[γραμμένον τόκον δύσκει κατ' εἶμαν τὸν ἐκ καστοῦν] καὶ τοῖς εἰς φυ-
[λάρχους ἀνὰ δη. ρικε, ὀπ[ι]ως εἶτε[τε]σει κλήρου τῆς προγεγραμ-
[μένης καθερωτευος τῆς] θεοῦ εἰς [ἐκαστῆς] φυλῆς εἰς ὑμᾶτα δι-

250 [ἀκόσια πεντηκόντα, λα]μβανόν[των τ]ῶν ληξομένων ἀσσαρία > θ
[καθ' ἔκαστον]. 'Εάν δὲ μείζων ἢ ὁ γενόμενος κόλλυβος, ὑπὸ
[τῶν φυλάρχων εξέστοι καὶ ἀλλοις πολ.] ἐίτες κληροῦσθαι,
[Ὁμοίως δώσει ἀπὸ τοῦ προγεγραμμένον] τόκον κατ' ἐπαντοῦ
[ἔκαστον τῷ ἐφηβάρχῳ δη. ρικὲς, ὀπ[ι]ως ἐπιτελῆ κλήρου

255 [τῶν κατ' ἐπαντοῦ δικτύων ἐφήβων τῇ γεγενίσῳ] τῆς Ἀρτέμιδος
[εἰς ὑμᾶτα διακόσια πεντηκόντα, λαμβανόν] των τῶν ληξο-
[μένων ἀνὰ ἀσσαρία θ, λαμβανέτω δὲ] ὁ ἐφηβάρχος χω-
[ρίς τούτων δΗ. Α. Ὁμοίως δώσει ἀπὸ τ]οῦ προγεγραμμέ-
[νου τόκου καὶ τῷ ἀρχερεί Ασίας τοῦ ἐν Ἐφέ] ὑν ναοῦ κοινοῦ

260 [τῶν Σεβαστῶν δΗ. κὸ ἀσ. ἦν] ἡμοῖς] κατ' ἐπανατοῦ ἐκασ-
[τοῦν, ὅπως εἴ] αὐτῶν τῇ γεγενίσῃ τῆς θεοῦ ἤμερα ἐπιτελεῖ
[κλήρῳ τῶν θεολόγων ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ τῇ Ἀρτέμιδος, λαμ-
[βανόντος ἐκάστου τῶν παρ' αὐτοῦ] ἀναγραφαμένων
[καὶ λαχώντων ἀνὰ δΗ. Β. ἥν ἦν, γεί]νομένης τῆς ἀνα-

265 [γραφῆς τῇ πέμπτῃ]. Ὁμοίως δῶσ[ε] ἀπὸ τοῦ προγεγραμ-
[μένου τόκου κατ'] ἐπανατοῦ ἐκαστοῦ τῇ ἱερείᾳ τῆς Ἀρτέμιδος
[καὶ τοῖς ὑμνηδοῖς τῆς θεοῦ τῇ γεγενίσῃ] τῇ Ἀρτέμιδος εἰς
[διανομὴν δηνάρια τῇ. Ὁμοίως δῶσ[ε] ἀπὸ τοῦ π[ρ]ογεγραμ-
[μένου τόκου κατὰ πάσαν νόμιμον ἅκκ] ἡ συν δυσ[ί] νεότου-
[οῖς καὶ σκηπτούχῳ ἁσ. δ. ήμοῖς, ὡςτε ὕπερ] εὐθέθαι ἐκ τοῦ προνόυ
[εἰς τὸ θέατρον τὰ ἀπεκοινώματα τη] τῇ θεοῦ καὶ τὰς εἰκόνας καὶ
[πάλιν ἀποφέρεσθαι ἐκ τοῦ θεάτρου] ν εἰς τὸν πρόνοιαν αὐθημε-
[ρόν μετὰ τῶν φυλάκων]. Ὁμοίως δ[ῶ]σει ἀπὸ τ]οῦ προγεγραμμέ-

240 Heberdey δΗ. κὲ ἀσ. δ. 241 Heberdey δΗ. νὲ εἰς κλήρου]. 241 ΙΑ. 243 εἴ ξουσιάΗ.
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275 [νον τόκου κατ' ἐνιαυτόν ἐκαστὸν καὶ τοῖς [π]αιδῶν[ό]μοις
[δη. ἢ ἄστ. ὦ ᾿Ημισὺν, ὅπως τῇ γενε[σίῳ τῆς θεοῦ ἥμερᾳ ἐπιτελε-
[σωσι κλήρου τῶν παίδων παῖν] τῶν εἰς ὀνόματα > μθ < λαμβανό-
[των τῶν λῃσμενῶν τούτῳ] τῇ ἥμερᾳ ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ τῆς Ἀρτέµιδος
[ἀνά ἀσ. ὡ ᾿Ημισὺν, λαμβανότων καὶ τῶν παιδωνόμων χωρίς
[τούτων ἀνὰ ἀσαρίμα θ. ὦ] μοίων δόσει ἀπὸ τοῦ προγέγορμ-
[μένου τόκου καθ’ ἐκαστὸν ἐν] γαμτόν τῷ τὰ καθάρσια ποιοῦντι παρε-
[--- --- --- --- --- --- --- ---] τὰ λοιπὰ = δῆ τριάκοντα = ὀστε κα-
[θαρίζειν ἐκάστοτε, ὁπόταν εἰς τῷ ἱερῷ ἀποφῆ] [ρητὶς τὰ ἀπεικο-
[νὸμα τῆς θεοῦ, πρὶν ἀποθείν] τι αὐτὰ εἰς τὸν πρόνοιον τῆς Ἀρτέ-
[μίδος. Ἔαν μὲν οὖν ἑτέρος τις κατ’] ἰδίαν π[ρ]οαίρεσιν ἀγοράσῃ
[τὴν κληρονομίαν ταύτην καὶ βοῦλ] ἡθῇ δίδοσθαι καθ’ ἐκαστὸν ἐνι-
[αυτὸν τὸν τόκον, διδότω ὁ ἀγοράζων τὰ προγεγορμέμενα > δῆ < χίλια
[ό]κτακο[ς] τῆς, μὴ ἐξεύν παρὰ τῇ ν ἀντάξειν εἰς[εν] εὐκεῖν μηθὲν
ἐλαστο[ν], [--- --- --- --- --- --- --- ---], α[λλὰ προσασφαλι[ζ] ομένον=
'Εαν δὲ τ[ις ἅγοράσῃ αὐτὴν, βοῦ] ληθῇ δὲ ἀποδοῦναι τάχε[ι] ὦν τὰ τῆς

290 καθερώ[σεως ἀρχαία ἀπαντᾷ], ἔξεσται αὐτῷ ἐπ’ ἀνάκη ληψομέ-
[νῳ τ[ῷ ἐπὶ τῶν χρημάτων] τῆς βουλῆς τὰ γενόμενα ὑπὲρ τῶν
καθερω[μένων τῇ βουλῇ] ἀρχαίον > δῆ < πεντακασχίλια =
[όμ[ο]ίος καὶ τ]ῳ τῷ ἐπὶ τῶν χρημάτων τῆς γεροσιάς τὰ γενόμενα
ὑπὲρ τῶν καθερωμέν[ν] τῇ γεροσιά > δῆ < τετρακ[ις] σχει-
[λια τετρακόσια πεντήκοντα = ὁμοίως καὶ τοῖς θεολόγοις
καὶ ὑμινδοῖς τὰ γενόμενα ὑπὲρ τῆς καθερώσεως ἀρχαίον
δῆ < διακόσιον[α] πεντήκοντα πέντε ὁμοίως τῷ γραμματεῖ
τῶν δήμον τὰ λοιπὰ γενόμενα τοῦ ἀρχαίον ὑπὲρ τῆς καθερώ-
σεως τῶν εἰς τοὺς πολείτας κλήρων καὶ ἐφήβων καὶ νεο-
ποιῶν καὶ σκηπτικῶν καὶ καθαρσίων > δῆ < μύρια διακόσια
ἐβδομήκοντα πέντε = ὅπως ἐκδανίζωσιν αὐτὰ ἐπὶ τόκῳ
ἀσαρίμαν δικαίωμα ἀργυρῶν αὐτάπτωτα < καὶ ἐπιτελή-
ται καθ’ ἐκαστὸν ἐνιαυτὸν ἀπὸ τοῦ τόκου τὰ διαιτησμέ-
να ἀνυπερθέτου, ὡς προγέγορπαται = 'Εαν δὲ πρὸ τοῦ ἢ < ἀπο-
δοῦναι > τά δισμύρια - δῆ < ἡ διατάξεσθαι (sic) ἀπὸ προσόδο-
χωρίων διδόσθαι τῶν τόκων αὐτῶν (sic) τελευτήσει
Σαλοντύριος, ὑποκείσθωσαν οἱ κληρονόμοι αὐτῶν τῇ εὐ-
λυτίζει τῶν καθερωμένων δῆ < δισμύριον = καὶ τοῖς ἑπα-
κολουθήσαν τόκους μέχρι τῆς εὐλυτίσεως, ὑποκεί-
μένων αὐτῶν τῇ πράξει κατά τὰ ἱερὰ τῆς θεοῦ < καὶ τὰ πα-
ρά τοῖς προσβιτέροις ἐκδανιστικά ἑνγραφα = 'Τπέσχετο

297 διακώνα.
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320 τετα[γ]μένα ἐπι τὸ γενόμενον πάρα ταύτα ἐστὶν ἀκυρον.


[Ἐπὶ πρωτὸν ἀνέως Ὕκθα]
[Κλαβαδίου Ἀντίταρτον ἡ Ἐσλειανοῦ]
[μυνός] Ποσειδέωνος.

[Ἀκούλλης Πρόκλος, ὃ λαμπρὸπατος Ἐφεσίς ὃ ἐπετεῖ ἐν ᾄχονυσιν ἃ δῆ[µ]ω,] χαϊρειν.

[Οὐείβιον Σαλοντάριον ὅντα] ἀυτῆς τῇ ἀλ[λ] ἑν πᾶσιν
[πολείτην ἀκριστον καὶ πρὸ] τερον ἐν πολλ[α] ὑμῶν ἡ ἑαυ-


345 γαλατηρετῶς εἰς τεμβήν ὑμῖν] τε ἐπιφανε[ν]τατής] καὶ μεγίσ-

της θεᾶς Ἀρτέμιδος καὶ το] ὡ ὁ[δ] ο[ν] [τῶν] Σεβασ] [τῶν] καὶ τῆς ὑμετέρας πόλεως, τοῖς δὲ πολείτας εἰς διάνυ[μα] καὶ κλῆ-
[ροις καθιέρωκε δην. δισμύρα, νομίζω καὶ ὑμᾶς], ἐφ’ ο[ἱς ἀ] δην πεποίηκεν ὑμεῖς καὶ νῦν ἐπαγγέλλεται ἀγαθοῖς, χρήναι τῇ τε [φιλοτεμία αὐτοῦ ἀνταποδοῦναι καὶ τῇ εὕμεν] εἰὰ ἃ πρὸς

312 Λ. 319 ἰν[ δ]][]ωμα. 325 Ἐβερδείη καὶ εἰς τοῦ Σε] βαστοῦ. 331 Γλως. 336 ἀρχιν.
350 [τεμήν αὐτοῦ ἑψήφιστε. Συνήδομαι δ’ ὑμεῖν εἰς τὸ ἔπαι ἥν γένα τε τὸν ἀνδρα καὶ ἄξιωσαί αὐτὸν δικαίας παρ’ ἡμεῖς] μαρτυρίας[πρὸς τὸ καὶ πλείονεις γενέσθαι τοὺς κατὰ τὰ] διώνατα προ-
[θυμομένους εἰς τὰ ὀμοία. Τὰ δὲ ὑπ’ αὐτοῦ καθεῖ] ρούμενα χρῆ-
[ματα καὶ τὰ ἀπεκοινώματα τῆς θεοῦ καὶ τὰ] εἰκόνας τῆς τις
355 [-----]...[-----]χει[-----]...[-----]αἰσ[-----]...[-----] εὐεισ[-----]...[-----]
[.]εὐθεια[-----]...[-----]χεισ[-----]...[-----]
[.]ε ὀὐδένα β’ [οὐλομαί νῦ] νὶ πρόσ[ψ υ ὀὐδὲν ὁῦτε παρευρέσει οὐ-
[δ’] εμῖ μετ’ αβαλεῖ ἡ π[αραλλά[ξει ταί τούν]
360 [ν] ὄ[ν] - εἰ δ’ ὑπ’ εἰς ἔπαι[χειρήσει ἡ λίσ[αι] η παραλλάξαι τι τούν]
[ν] φ’ ὑμῶ[ν διὰ τοῦ] ύπον τὸ[⌜τὸ ψηφίσματος κυρωθησομένων⌟]
[ἡ] ἐκ[⌜ηγ] ἡγασάθι τοιοῦτον[⌜πειρασεί, ὑποκείσθω εἰς προ-
[kerja] ὀσμήσαν τῆς κυρίας Ἀρτέμι[⌡ος δι] β’ μυρίους ε καὶ εἰς τὸν ἰε-
[ρ] ὀσμὼν φῶς χόρος ὄλοις δη[⌜ν διαμυρίους πετακτοχελίους καὶ]
[ἡ] δομί δὲ ἀυτῷ εἰς τὸ πᾶσιν [νῦν φανερῶν γενέ] [σθαι τῇ] ν[⌜v]
[τ] ε πρός τὴν θεον εὐσέβειαν [καὶ τὴν πρὸς τοὺς Σεβαστοῦ] [⌜s]
&’ Ἐρρωσθ’ [⌜e].
370 Ἐπὶ προτάνεως Τ[⌜ι] β. Κλ. Ἅντι[τ] μετ[⌜ου]
’Οὐλιανοῦ ν’ μηνός [Ποσειδεώνοις.]
’Αφράνιος Φλαιονιαῖος, [πρεσβευτῆς καὶ ἀντὶ] στρά[⌜γη]
γος, Ἔφεσιῶν ἀρχ[⌜ου]σι, βουλῆ, δήμαρχος ἔρευν.
Οὐδεῖς Σαλούταρ[⌜ιο]σ, ὁ δῖκτα τοὺς ἡμέαν, ἐγγενέστ’ τατο
375 [μ] ἐν ἐγ τοῦ ἅξιωμ[⌜ατοσ αὐτοῦ] ν ὑπάρχων ν, προσέτι δὲ κ[⌜αὶ τοῦ ἁρύς-
[τοῦ] ν θῆνοι [⌜σ ὅτι ἦ] ἄξιος ἐχ’[⌜ει διαθέσε] ὅσ, τῶν ὦκον-
[τάτων καὶ ἀ] ἀγκαίο[⌜τάτον] ν ὑμεῖν διεφθ’[⌜ἀ] νός ἐν πολλῶι
[ἐγνωρίσθη] τε καὶ τοῦ[⌜s] πλείστους ἐλάρ[⌜θανε ν, ὥς ἔχει πρὸς
[ὦμας εὐνοίας] τε καὶ προαρέστες ’ Νῦν [⌜δὲ ὡδ] η τὴν ἐαυτοῦ
[φαν’] εραν πάσιν[⌜πη] μένον, οἰκεῖοιν [⌜ἀμα καὶ οὖ] πρόπος τῷ
[ἐπισ] [⌜η] ημοτάτης ύμων πόλεως, εἴ]ς τε τε[⌜ημ] καὶ εὐσέβ[⌜ει] εἰαν τῇ] 5ς ἐπί-
385 φανερ[⌜τάς θέας Λ] ῥτῆ[⌜μ] ος καὶ τοῦ οἴκου Τ[⌜ῶν] Αὐτ’] οκρατο-
[ρον] ν δω[⌜ρ] σι καὶ χρηματόν ἀφιερώσει τ[⌜α] νῦν ν φιλοτ’ εμο-
[μετο] [⌜σε][⌜ν] οὶ υμεῖν τε περὶ τάνδρος [⌜ἐμοὶ τ] ἐξ[⌜ε] ὁσιων

365-6 Heberdey Σω[⌜η] δο(⌜ε) μ<⌜α> τ[⌜84 ΤΕΗΝ 387 -Τ ὀσων.}
[κ]χαρισμένου καὶ ἦδοντον, εἰ, ὃν ἐξανεπέτω τῶν φίλων
[τ]οῖς καὶ στέργω, παρ[ὰ] ύμειν ὀρθῶν μαρτυρίας καὶ τεμή[ς]

395 ἀξιοῦμενον. Περὶ μέντοι ὑπὲρ τοῦ νῦν κῆρυκ[ά] τῶν διατά-
ξεως καὶ τῶν ἀπεικονισμάτων τῆς θεοῦ καὶ τῶν εἰκόνων,
ὅπως αὐτοῖς δεῖσαι χρήσθαι καὶ εἰς τῆν τίμην οἰκονομίαν
ἀνδρά τεταχθαι, αὐτὸν τοῦ ἀνατιθῆ[να] εἰσήγη σοι ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν αὐτῶν κυριο-
θῆ τὰ δόξαντα, βούλομαι ταῦτα ἑισαγαγὸς ἐπί τῶν αὐτῶν ἀπαραλλάκτως ὑπὸ μηθεὸς μηθεῳμᾶν νῆσον <πνεύματος> τῷ παρεχθεῖσαν λυ-
όμενα ἡ μετατιθέμενα: Εἴ δὲ τοῖς πειραθέσι ὑπωσοῦν ἡ συν-
βουλευθαι τῷ τούτουν ἡ εἰσήγησασθαι: περὶ τῆς μετατῆθε<σε>

400 αὐτῷ νῦν ὑπὸ τοῦ καθεροῦντος καὶ ύμῶν αὐτῶν κυριο-
θῆ τὰ δόξαντα, βούλομαι ταῦτα ἑισαγαγὸς ἐπί τῶν αὐτῶν ἀπαραλλάκτως ὑπὸ μηθεὸς μηθεῳμᾶν νῆσον <πνεύματος> τῷ παρεχθεῖσαν λυ-

405 ώς καὶ μεταδοθῆς ἐν τῶν νῦν ὑπὸ τοῦ αὐτοῦ καὶ ύπὸ ὑ-
μῶν κυριοθησμένων τούτοις ἀνυπερβετέως βούλομαι

410 γερονισία — — — — ἀλλὰ δῆθ. δισμύρια πεινακ[α] ὑπάνθια,
καθὼς ἡ Ακούλλιος Πρόκλου, ὁ λαμπρότατος ἄν[θ]υπατος,
καὶ τρότερον διὰ τῆς ἀντέγραψεν πρὸς ύμᾶς ἐπὶ σταυλῆς
ἐπὶ εἰκότων καὶ ἄρασεν τὸ πρόστειμον. "Ε[πὶ] πρὸν ὑπάλλεως Τι. Β. Κλ. "Ἀντιπάτρα" Ροο Ιουλιανοῦ,

415 [μηνὸς Ποσειδεώνος.]
"Ε[δόξε τῇ Βουλῇ φιλοσεβάστω τῇ δικής ὑμῶν] τῆς ἀρτέμιδος τερας ἐσπεράσθαι πρὸς τῷ αὐτῷ τοῦ Πρόκλου ἀνθρώπου τοῦ ἰεροῦ, στρατηγοῦ τῆς πόλεως φιλοσεβάστω τοῦ κυρίου τῶν ἀγάλματος αὐτοῦ τῷ Β., καὶ τῷ ἀπεικονισματικῷ καὶ τῇ ἑκκλησίᾳ καὶ τοῖς ἀγάλμασι τῇ Βουλῇ φιλοσεβάστω τῷ κυρίῳ τῆς ἀρτέμιδος τερας αὐτοῦ τῆς πόλεως πρὸς τῷ αὐτῷ τῷ Β.

420 [φοροῦσιν τῇ θεῶ εἰρήνικον τῷ τῆς θεῶ εἰρήνικον τῷ τῆς θεῶ ἀγάλματος αὐτοῦ τῷ τῆς θεῶ εἰρήνικον τῷ τῆς θεῶ εἰρήνικον τῷ τῆς θεῶ εἰρήνικον τῷ τῆς θεῶ εἰρήνικον τῷ τῆς θεῶ εἰρήνικον τῷ τῆς θεῶ εἰρήνικον τῷ τῆς θεῶ εἰρήνικον τῷ τῆς θεῶ εἰρήνικον τῷ τῆς θεῶ εἰρήνικον τῷ τῆς θεῶ εἰρήνικον τῷ τῆς θεῶ εἰρήνικον τῷ τῆς θεῶ εἰρήνικον τῷ τῆς θεῶ εἰρήνικον τῷ τῆς θεῶ εἰρήνικον τῷ τῆς θεῶ εἰρήνικον τῷ τῆς θεῶ εἰρήνικον τῷ τῆς θεῶ εἰρήνικον τῷ τῆς θεῶ εἰρήνικον τῷ τῆς θεῶ εἰρήνικον τῷ τῆς θεῶ εἰρήνικον τῷ τῆς θεῶ εἰρήνικον τῷ τῆς θεῶ εἰρήνικον τῷ τῆς θεῶ εἰρήνικον τῷ τῆς θεῶ εἰρήνικον τῷ τῆς θεῶ εἰρήνικον τῷ τῆς θεῶ εἰρήνικον τῷ τῆς θεῶ εἰρήνικον τῷ τῆς θεῶ εἰρήνικον τῷ τῆς θεῶ εἰρήνικον τῷ τῆς θεῶ εἰρήνικον τῷ τῆς θεῶ εἰρήνικον τῷ τῆς θεῶ εἰρήνικον τῷ τῆς θεῶ εἰρήνικον τῷ τῆς θεῶ εἰρήνικον τῷ τῆς θεῶ εἰρήνικον τῷ τῆς θεῶ εἰρήνικον τῷ τῆς θεῶ εἰρήνικον τῷ τῆς θεῶ εἰρήνικον τῷ τῆς θεῶ εἰρήνικον τῷ τῆς θεῶ εἰρήνικον τῷ τῆς θεῶ εἰρήνικον τῷ τῆς θεῶ εἰρήνικον τῷ τῆς θεῶ εἰρήνικον τῷ τῆς θεῶ εἰρήνικον τῷ τῆς θεῶ εἰρήνικον τῷ τῆς θεῶ εἰρήνικον τῷ τῆς θεῶ εἰρήνικον τῷ τῆς θεῶ εἰρήνικον τῷ τῆς θεῶ εἰρήνικον τῷ τῆς
ἐφήβων ἀπὸ τῆς Μαγνητικῆς πύλης καὶ συνπροπενητῶν
μέχρι τῆς Κορησσικῆς πύλης = δεδ[χ]θαί τῇ βουλῇ φιλοσεβάστω καθότι προγέγραπται = Τιβ. Κλαύ. Πρωτέσιος Φρητωριανός, φιλοσέβαστος δεδογματ[ογ]ράμη = Μάρκος Κασέλλιος Μαρκιανός, φιλοσέβαστος [δε] δομαματογράμη. Τιβ. Κλαύ. Ἰουλιανός, φιλόστροφος, φιλοσέβαστος, ἀγνός, εὐσεβής =
430 ὁ γραμματέως τοῦ δήμου τοῦ β., ἔχαραξα. Ἐπὶ πρωτάπρος Τιβ. Κλ = Ἀντιπάπρου Ἰουλιανὸς,
= μηνὸς Ποσεδεώνος =
"Εδοξε τῇ βουλῇ φιλοσέβαστος περὶ δὲν ἐνεφάνισαν Τιβ. Κλ., Τιβ. Κλ. Ἀλεξάνδρου νῦν (οὐ), Κυρ. (εὖφ.), Ἰουλιανός, φιλόστροφος
καὶ φιλοσέβαστος, ἀγνός, εὐσεβὴς, γραμματέως τοῦ δήμου τοῦ β.,
καὶ οἱ στρατηγοὶ τῆς πόλεως φιλοσέβαστοι =
ἐπὶ οἱ χρυσοφόροι τῇ θεῷ = ἱερεῖς καὶ ἱερονεῖκαι ὑπεσχέντο (sic) φέρειν καὶ αὐτοὶ τῇ αὐτοκοινωνίᾳ τής καθερωθέντα ὑπὸ Οὐκεβίνου Σαλούταριον ἠτήσαντο τε τούτον
440 ἐν τῷ θεάτρῳ τῆς πρώτης σελίδας, ὅπου ἡ εἰκὼν τῆς Ὀμονυμοῦ, δεδόχθαι ἐξεν [ε] αὐτοῦ τῶν [τῶν] ὑπὸν, καθέξις δὲ πρὸς τὴν Ἑυσέβειαν αὐτοῦ λαύνουσαν = δεδόχθαι τῇ βουλῇ φιλοσέβαστῳ γενέσθαι = καθότι προγέγραπται =
Γ = Ἀνθίδιος Σιλουανός, φιλοσέβαστος, δεδοματογράμη. Νηρεύς Θεοφύλου, φιλοσέβαστος, δεδοματογράμη.
Σέξτω Ἀττικῷ = Σουμβουρανῷ = τῷ β., Μάρκῳ Ἀσινώρᾳ = Μάρκλῳ = ὑπάτῳ, πρὸ ἔτη ᾽Καλᾶν νῦν ὁ Ἴων Μαρτίων.
Ἐπὶ πρωτάπρος Τιβ. Κλαύδιον Ἀντιπάπρου Ἰουλιανοῦ,
= μηνὸς Ἀνθεστηρίωνος β., Σεβαστῆ =
Γάιος Οὐσίβιος = Γ. νῦν (οὐ), Ὀυσίφεντειν, Σαλούταριος, φιλάρτεμος καὶ φιλοκαίναρ = διάταξιν εἰσφέρει κατὰ τὸ προγεγυνὸς ψήφισμα, περὶ δὲν προσκαθιέρωσκε τῇ μεγίστῃ θεᾶ Ὑφεσία Ἀρτέμιδι καὶ τῇ φιλοσέβαστῳ = ἐπὶ τῆς ἐφεσίας βουλῆ
450 ἑφῆβων Τιβ. Κλαύδιον Ἀντιπάπρου Ἰουλιανοῦ,
= μηνὸς Ἀνθεστηρίωνος β., Σεβαστῆ =
Γάιος Οὐσίβιος = Γ. νῦν (οὐ), Ὀυσίφεντειν, Σαλούταριος, φιλάρτεμος καὶ φιλοκαίναρ = διάταξιν εἰσφέρει κατὰ τὸ προγεγυνὸς ψήφισμα, περὶ δὲν προσκαθιέρωσκε τῇ μεγίστῃ θεᾶ Ὑφεσία Ἀρτέμιδι καὶ τῇ φιλοσέβαστῳ = ἐπὶ τῆς ἐφεσίας βουλῆ
455 καὶ τῇ φιλοσέβαστῳ ἐν τῷ Ἐφεσίων γερονυσίᾳ καὶ τῷ οἶκῳ ρυσοφοροῦσι τῇ [θεοῦ Ἀρτέμιδος ἔρυμ] εὐσύν καὶ εὐρουνείκαις πρὸ τῶν πόλεως καὶ τῶν ἐσομένων Ἐφεσίων παισι καὶ θεσμοδοτοῖς ἐν τῷ Σεβαστῷ Ἐφεσίων βουλῆ
460 ὡς ἐν τῇ πρὸ τὰς ἡτοῖς αὐτῶν ἡσφαλίσται =, εἰκόνας ἀργυρίων δύο ἐπὶ τοῖς χρηματοδοτοῖς, ὡστε αὐτὰς εἶναι σὺν τοῖς
άπεικονίσμασιν τῆς θεοῦ ἀριθμῷ τριάκοντα καὶ μίαν,
καὶ ἀργυρίου ἄλλων δῆ. χειλῶν πεντακοσίων — ὥστε εἶναι
αὐτὰ σὺν τοῖς προκαθερμένοις δῆ. μύριοι χίλιοι
τακόσις — ἐφ᾽ ὧν εἰκών ἀργυρεῖα Ἀθηνᾶς Παμμοῦσον, ὄλκης
σὺν τῷ ἑπαργύρῳ τῆς βάσεως αὐτῆς λευτρῶν ἐπτά, ἡμιονω-
κίου — γραμμάτων ὀκτώ — ἡ καθιερωμένη τῆς τε Ἀρτέμιδι καὶ
τοῖς αἰεὶ ἑσομένοις Ἐφεσίων παῖ<σ>χαῖρε, τιθήται κατὰ πάσαν νό-

470 Ὀμοίως καὶ εἰκὼν ἄργυρεα Σεβασ-
τῆς Ὀμονοίας χρυσοφόρου, ὄλκης
σὺν τῷ ἑπαργύρῳ τῆς βάσεως αὐτῆς
λευτρῶν ἔξ, ἡ καθιερωμένη τῇ τε Ἀρτέ-
μιδι καὶ τοῖς α<ί>εὶ χρυσοφοροῦσιν ἑρευ-
475 σιν καὶ ἑρονείκαις πρὸ πό[λε] εἰς τίθεται (sic)
κατὰ πάσαν ἐκκλησίαν [ἐπάνῳ ὑ] ἡ σε-
λίδος, οὐ δὲ ἑρονείκαι καὶ θέξηνον —
Ὁ δὲ προγεγράφη[με] τοῖς τῶν εἰκό-
νων καὶ βάσει [ὡν π] αρεσταθῇ Ἐνυμένει Ἐν-

480 με[ν] σιν [το]ῦ Θεοφίλου, τῷ καὶ αὐτῷ στρατη-
γῷ τῆς Ἐφεσίων πόλεως, διὰ ἣν ὑγοστά-
τον Ἱρμίου, ἱεροῦ τῆς Ἀρτέμιδος συνπαρό-
πος καὶ συνπαραλμαβάνοντος Μουσάιον, ἣ [ἔρου]
τῆς Ἀρτέμιδος τοῦ ἐπὶ τῶν παραθηκῆς [ν].

485 Ἔρε δὲ τῶν προσκαθιερωμένων δηναιῶν [ν χεὶ-
λὼν πεντακοσίων — τελέσει τόκον [Σαλω-
τάριος δραχμαίναν καὶ τῷ] έκαστον ἐν [ἰαντί]
τὰ γευόμενα δηνά [ρ] ια ῥέλ — [άφ᾽ δ᾽ ὄν ὁ σεί]
τῷ γραμματεῖ τῆς Ἐφεσίων βοῦ [λῆς δῆ. ἰε.]

490 ὅπως κλῆρον ἑπιτελῆ ἐκ τῶν [βουλευτῶν τῇ ἕ]
ἰσταμένου τοῦ Θαρηγηλίων [ὁς εἰς ὄνομα]
ἐμ ὡντοι τε οἱ λαχώντες θυσ[ἱαν ὑμύνωσοι]
τῇ Ἀρτέμιδι τῇ ἐκτή τοῦ [ὑ μηρόν, τῇ γενεσίῳ]
τῆς θεοῦ — ἀγοράζον [ν] τεσ [..... δῆ. εἰκοσί]

495 ἔπτα ἡμίσους — καὶ [τ]ὰ [λουπὰ δῆ. κε ἀσ. θ] ὑπανήγορον [ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ τῆς Ἀρτέμι-
δος ἐς τῆς Schedulers —

Lacuna of 21 lines including the next four

464-5 δῆ. μύριοι χίλιοι πεντακοσίων. 468 παιέι. 474 ατεί. 476 ἐκκλησιαν.

477 ἑρονείκαι.
'Ομοίως δώσει ἀπὸ τοῦ προγεγραμμένου τόκου

520 τοῖς παιδώνοις δὴ, ὦς ἀστ. δεκατρία ἡμισίν,

[ως επιτελώσι κλήρουν ἐκ τῶν παιδών πάν−]

τιμοθαυτεραὶ ἢμισίν—

525 ἔξερον τα τρία: οὕτω τε οἱ λαχώντες εὐξοῦνται

ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ τῆς 'Αρτέμιδος — — — — — γεὶ—

νομέων κατὰ ἀνα[---]—

530 ἔναν τινος τῶν λαχώντων [ἀνδρῶν ἢ παιδῶν ἢ]

τὰς θυσίας μὴ θύσων, μὴ εὐξὶ [ωνταί ἐν τῷ]

κόσμημα τῆς 'Αρτέμιδος, δή — ε.

'Ομοίως δώσει ἀπὸ τοῦ προγεγραμμένου [τόκου]

καὶ τοῖς θεσμοφόροις εἰς διανομήν. δὴ, ζ.,

ἀπὸ λαμβάνειν αὐτοὺς ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ τῆς 'Αρτέ—

535 μιδοῦς τῇ γενεσίῳ τῆς θεοῦ ἀνὰ ἀσσάρια· θ.

'Ομοίως δώσει ἀπὸ τοῦ προγεγραμμένου τόκου

καὶ τοῖς ἀκροβάταις τῆς θεοῦ εἰς διανομήν.

δὴ, ὦς ἀπὸ λαμβάνειν αὐτοὺς τῇ γενεσίῳ τῆς θ[ε] [ο] ν— ἀνὰ ἀσσάρια· δεκατρία ἡμισίν.

540 Πρὸς δὲ τὸ μένειν τὰ ἀπεικόνισματα πάντα

καθαρὰ ἐξέστο, ὡσάκις ἄν ἐνδέχεται,

ἐκμάσσασθαι γῆ ἄργυρωματικὴ ὑπὸ τοῦ

αἰεὶ ἐσομένου ἐπὶ τῶν παραθηκῶν, παρόν-

των δύο νεοποίων καὶ σκητητοῦχον.

545 ἐτέρα δὲ ὠλὴ μηδεμιά ἐκμάσσασθαι· καὶ

τὰ λοιπὰ ἃ δη < ὅκτω — δοθῆς ταῖς ἑκατον

ἐναντίων τῶν ἐπὶ τῶν παραθηκῶν εἰς τήν

ἐπιμέλειαν τῶν ἀπεικόνισμάτων· καὶ τῶν

ἀγορασμόν τῆς ἄργυρωματικῆς γῆς —

550 ἔκατον τριάκοντα πέντε — ὅστε ἀρξασθαι

τῇν φιλοτεμίαιν αὐτοῦ τῷ ἐνεστῶτι ἔτει

548 ἀπεικόνισματος.
In the prytany of Tiberius Claudius Antipater Julianus, on the sixth day of the month Poseideon, the Council and the emperor-loving Demos, honored with an emperor’s temple, decreed:

Concerning the things which Tiberius Claudius Julianus, son of Tiberius Claudius Alexander, of the tribe Quirina, patriotic and emperor-loving, upright, reverent, secretary of the Demos for the second time, and the emperor-loving generals of the city, report:

The men who exhibit a noble ambition to do things for the city and display in every way the affection of authentic citizens ought to receive honors in return, so that, on the one hand, those who have already benefited the city may come off well, and on the other, that it remain for those who so wish to contend for similar rewards. At the same time it is fitting that those who have striven earnestly to do honor to the most mighty goddess Artemis from whom the fairest things come to all, be appreciated in the city. Now Gaius Vibius Salutaris, a man of equestrian rank, distinguished for his family and for his personal worth, has been honored by our lord emperor with military commands and procuratorships. He is at once our fellow-citizen and member of the buleutic Council and has a good attitude, which he inherited from his father. In order to adorn with the dignity of his conduct the success that has come to him from Fortune, performing with a noble ambition to distinguish himself acts of reverence to the Archegetis, he has in the past with manifold designs greatly busied himself in behalf of the service, and with generous dedications honored the city as a whole, and now, in addition, coming to the Assembly, he has
promised to dedicate nine type-statues, namely, one of gold, in which there are also silver parts overlaid with gold, and eight other silver statues, and twenty silver images, namely, five first of all, of the following: our lord emperor Nerva Trajan Caesar Augustus Germanicus Dacicus, and his most revered consort Plotina, and the revered Senate, and the Romanorum Ordo Equester, and the Populus Romanus; then fifteen representing the city of the Ephesians as follows: the Demos, and the six tribes, and the Council, and the Gerusia, and the Ephebic Corporation.

That . . . by the guards, while two temple-wardens and the beadle assist in the care, be carried there and carried back, while the ephebes received them and escort the procession from the Magnesian Gate to the Theatre and from the Theatre in the same manner; and at the New Moon sacrifice of the archieratic year and in the twelve sacred and regular assembly meetings each month and on the festivals of the Sebasteia and Soteria and penteteric Great Ephesia . . . of the money dedicated by him to the Council of the Ephesians and to the Gerusia and citizens and ephebes and Boys he himself promised . . . to become the investor and to pay nine percent interest to be distributed each year according to his bequest on the birthday of the goddess, which is the sixth day of the month Thargelion, and he agreed that either he or his heirs would give the money to the city whenever it was wanted, and that the officers of each group would receive it. Concerning all these things having privately proposed a deed of gift, he has asked that it be ratified also by decree of the Council and Demos; and now, as being genuine fellow-citizens of ours themselves, the authorities of the province, namely the vir clarissimus and benefactor Aquilius Proculeus the proconsul, and Afranius Flavianus the legatus pro praetore, in terms of unsurpassable courtesy and affection recognizing the generosity of the man, have urged us, in what they replied to him and in what they wrote back in gratulatory letters, to introduce with their sanction the motion concerning his dedications.

That it be decreed:

That Gaius Vibius Salutaris a man reverent toward the gods and nobly ambitious to do things for the city be honored with the greatest distinctions and with the erection of statues both in the sanctuary of Artemis and at the most conspicuous points of the city; and that also with the award of a gold crown we proclaim him in the assemblies as one zealous and devoted to Artemis.

That every year according to the bequest two of the temple-wardens and the beadle and the guards . . . have the care of the aforementioned images and undertake the transportation for the public from the sanctuary to the Theatre and from the Theatre to the sanctuary of Artemis . . . the temple of Artemis . . . payments due . . .

That his bequest be valid, unchangeable by derogation or subrogation, unrescindable for all time.

If anyone either of the private citizens or of the officials put to a vote anything
contrary to the bequest about to be ratified by this decree or change anything, all the matter contrary to the bequest shall be invalid, and the person who carries out or proposes any of these things shall pay toward the adornment of our lady Artemis 25,000 denarii, and to the fiscus of our lord Caesar 25,000 denarii more, just as the most illustrious authorities, Aquillius Proculus the proconsul and Afranius Flavianus the legatus praetore, in their letters specified the aforementioned fine.

That in order that his generosity toward the city and his reverence toward the goddess may be apparent, the bequest composed by him and ratified by this decree of the Council and Demos be engraved . . . in the Theatre on its marble wall of the south Parodos wherever he wishes, and in the Artemisium at a suitable place, on account of his noble ambition and of his excellence; and concerning the permanence of the money given by him as an endowment, which he promised the Council and the Gerusia and the citizens and the ephebes to invest himself according to the bequest in the course of the present year . . .

The Council and the emperor-loving Demos, honored with the temple of an emperor, decree according to the foregoing, in the consulship of Sextus Attius Suburanus for the second time and Marcus Asinius Marcellus, January . . . in the prytany of Tiberius Claudius Antipater Julianus, on the . . . of the month Poseideon.

Gaius Vibius Salutaris, son of Gaius, of the tribe Oufentina, proposes to the emperor-loving Council of the Ephesians and to the emperor-loving Demos of the Ephesians, which has been honored with the temple of an emperor, a deed of gift concerning the things which on the conditions enumerated below he has dedicated to the most mighty Ephesian goddess Artemis and to the emperor-loving Demos, honored with the temple of an emperor, and to the emperor-loving Council of the Ephesians and to the emperor-loving Gerusia of the Ephesians and to the six tribes of the Ephesians and to the annual ephebes of the Ephesians and to the theologi and hymnodi and to the temple-wardens and beadles and to whosoever shall be the Boys of the Ephesians and paedonomi, namely nine type-statues of the goddess, one of gold and the rest of silver, and twenty silver images and 20,000 denarii—on the condition that a silver image of our lord emperor Caesar Nerva Trajan Augustus Germanicus Dacicus weighing . . . pounds, three ounces, and a silver image of Plotina Augusta, weighing three pounds, be deposited with Salutaris himself, the donor, and after the death of Salutaris the aforesaid images be given to the secretary of the Ephesians by his heirs at the aforementioned weight, in order that they be placed in the assembly meetings above the sector ¹ of the Council together with the gold statue of Artemis and the other images.

A gold Artemis weighing three pounds, and the two silver deer on either side of her and the rest overlaid with gold weighing two pounds, ten ounces and five scruples,

¹ A cuneiform section bound by two flights of steps and two passageways. See Heberdey, op. cit., p. 144.
and a *silver image* of the holy (= Roman) Senate weighing four pounds, two ounces, and a *silver image* of the emperor-loving and most revered Council of the Ephesians weighing four pounds, nine scruples,—the same dedicated to Artemis and to the emperor-loving Council of the Ephesians.

Likewise a silver Artemis the Torch-bearer, weighing seven pounds, and a silver image of the Populus Romanus weighing . . . pounds, and a silver image of the emperor-loving Gerusia, weighing . . . pounds,—the same dedicated to Artemis and to the Gerusia of the Ephesians.

Likewise another silver Artemis the Torch-bearer, resembling the one in the Exedra of the Ephebes and weighing seven pounds, five ounces, . . . scruples; and a silver image of the Ordo Equester, weighing three pounds, a half ounce, three scruples; and another silver image of the Ephebic Corporation, weighing . . . pounds,—the same dedicated to Artemis and to whosoever shall be citizens of the tribe Sebaste.

Likewise another silver Artemis holding a patera and weighing . . . pounds, . . . ounces, . . . scruples; and a silver image of the deified Augustus, weighing . . . pounds, . . . ounces, . . . scruples; and a silver image of the tribe Sebaste, weighing . . . pounds,—the same dedicated to Artemis and to whosoever shall be citizens of the tribe Sebaste.

Likewise another silver Artemis . . . in her hand and weighing . . . pounds, nine ounces; and a silver image of . . ., weighing . . . pounds; and a silver image of the tribe of the Carenaeans, weighing . . . pounds, . . . ounces, three scruples,—the same dedicated to Artemis and to whosoever shall be citizens of the tribe of the Carenaeans.

Likewise another silver Artemis the Torch-bearer . . . weighing . . . pounds; and a silver image of Lysimachus, weighing . . . pounds, three scruples; and a silver image of the tribe of the Teians, weighing . . . pounds,—the same dedicated to Artemis and to whosoever shall be citizens of the tribe of the Teians.

Likewise another silver Artemis holding the . . . and weighing . . . pounds, three ounces, and a half scruple; and a silver image of Evonymus, weighing . . . pounds; and a silver image of the tribe of the Evonymi, weighing three pounds, a half ounce, and . . . scruples,—the same dedicated to Artemis and to whosoever shall be citizens of the tribe of the Evonymi.

Likewise another silver Artemis the Torch-bearer —— Castalia (?), weighing . . . pounds, . . . ounces; and a silver image of Pion, weighing . . . pounds; and a silver image of the tribe of the Bembinaeans, weighing . . . pounds,—the same dedicated to Artemis and to whosoever shall be citizens of the tribe of the Bembinaeans.
The aforementioned weight of the nine type-statues of the goddess and of the twenty images was supplied to Eumenes son of Eumenes grandson of Theophilus, the same who is strategus of the city of the Ephesians, through the public weigher 200 Hermias, sacred slave of Artemis, while Musaeus, sacred slave of Artemis and custodian of the deposits, also received them.

Let the aforementioned statues during each regular assembly and at the sacrifice performed on the first day of the archieratic year be deposited in the Theatre in groups of three on the nine pedestals placed according to sectors and inscribed, as the dedication stipulated in the bequest, i.e., Council, Gerusia, Ephebic Corporation, tribe, be inscribed on the bases. After the meetings have been dismissed, let the statues and images be carried back to the sanctuary of Artemis and with the temple-wardens and the beadle sharing in the care, let them be handed over by the guards to Musaeus, sacred slave of Artemis, the same who is custodian of the deposits, while the ephebes receive and escort the procession from the Magnesian Gate to the Theatre and from the Theatre to the Coressian Gate with all splendor. Let it be just the same at all gymnastic games and on whatever other days may be appointed by the Council and the Demos.

Let it not be permitted to anyone to make changes in the administration either of the type-statues of the goddess or of the images with a view to changing their names, or smelting them over again, or injuring them in any other way. And let the person who does any of these things be subject to prosecution for temple-robbery and sacrilege; and let the same weight in the aforementioned type-statues and images, namely one hundred-eleven pounds, none the less be proved. The strategus of the city shall be obliged to undertake the prosecution concerning these things.

Salutaris, on the twenty thousand denarii given as an endowment by Salutaris, will pay nine percent interest each year, an amount of one thousand eight hundred denarii, in order that the latter may carry out a distribution to the Councillors in the sanctuary in the Pronaos on the birthday of the most mighty goddess Artemis, which is the sixth day of the month Thargelion, this distribution to take place on the fifth, one denarius being given to each man present, and the person in charge of the distribution not having the right to give to anyone absent; and if he does, he shall pay . . . denarii fine for each account where the man was not present but yet received. If the exchange is still more advantageous so as to furnish enough for more, let it be permitted . . . in turn.

Likewise, he will give each year from the aforementioned interest three hundred and eighty-two denarii, nine asses, to the secretary of the synhedrion of the Gerusia, in order that the latter on the birthday of the goddess may carry out a distribution by lot at one denarius apiece for the regular members of the Gerusia up to the number of three hundred and nine men. If the exchange is more advantageous, so as to furnish
enough for more, he will draw more lots, each of the winners to receive one denarius apiece. And let twenty-seven denarii, nine asses, be given for distribution to the . . . the same who take religious care <of the images> in the house of Salutaris the donor; and for those former Asiarchs who have registered, fifty-five denarii for a distribution by lot at eleven denarii apiece, with which they will purchase the supplies for the sacrifice, the distribution by lot to take place on the fifth and the secretary of the Gerusia not having the right to omit the distribution or the registration after the death of Salutaris; and if he does, he shall pay as fine the amount stipulated in the bequest.

Likewise, he will give each year from the aforementioned interest one hundred and twenty-five denarii apiece to the six phylarchs, so that of the aforesaid endowment of the goddess the latter may carry out a distribution by lot for as many as two hundred and fifty individuals out of each tribe, the winners to receive nine asses apiece. If the exchange is more advantageous, let it be permitted that lots for other citizens also be drawn by the phylarchs.

Likewise, he will give each year from the aforementioned interest one hundred and twenty-six denarii to the ephebarch, so that the latter may carry out a distribution by lot on the birthday of Artemis for as many as two hundred and fifty individuals of the annual ephebes, the winners to receive nine asses apiece; and apart from these let the ephebarch receive one denarius.

Likewise, he will give each year from the aforementioned interest twenty-four denarii, thirteen-and-a-half asses, to Asia's high-priest of the common temple of the Augusti in Ephesus, in order that from this sum the high-priest on the birthday of the goddess may carry out a distribution by lot among the theologi in the sanctuary of Artemis,—each of those who have first registered with him and have then won the lot to receive two denarii, thirteen-and-a-half asses apiece, the registration taking place on the fifth.

Likewise, he will give each year from the aforementioned interest eighteen denarii to the priestess of Artemis and to the hymnodi of the goddess for distribution on the birthday of the goddess.

Likewise, he will give each year from the aforementioned interest the remaining...
thirty denarii to the one who does the cleaning . . . so that the latter clean each time when the type-statues of the goddess are carried back to the sanctuary before they deposit them in the Pronaos of Artemis.

If anyone else buys this legacy in accordance with [the donor’s] own purpose and wishes that the interest be given each year, let the purchaser give regularly the aforementioned thousand-eight-hundred denarii. And it shall not be permitted to pay any smaller amount contrary to the bequest . . . but making it secure.

But if anyone buys the legacy and wishes to hand over earlier the sum total of the endowment, it will be permitted to him to hand it over to a person who will be under obligation to accept it, as follows: to the treasurer of the Council the five thousand denarii capital for the endowment of the Council; likewise to the treasurer of the Gerusia the four thousand four hundred and fifty denarii for the endowment of the Gerusia; likewise to the theologoi and hymnodai the two hundred and fifty-five denarii capital for the endowment; likewise to the secretary of the Demos the remaining ten thousand two hundred and seventy-five denarii capital for the endowment of distributions to the citizens by lot among ephebes and temple-wardens and beadles and for the endowment of cleanings: so that these receiving officials may lend out the same on good security at twelve-asses interest and that the arrangements specified in the bequest, as has been described above, may be executed without delay.

If Salutaris dies before he hands over the twenty thousand denarii or before he makes the arrangements that the interest on the sum be paid regularly from the revenue of his estates, let his heirs be liable for the discharge of the twenty thousand denarii given as an endowment and for the interest accruing up to the discharge; and let them be subject to the methods of collection according to the terms of contracts for loan applicable in the sacred affairs of the goddess and in business with the Elders.

In order that his benefaction might begin in the present year, Salutaris has promised to give one thousand eight hundred denarii for the aforementioned doles and lots on the birthday of the goddess.

Let it not be permitted to anyone, either archon or advocate or private citizen, to try to change or alter anything or to make different arrangements for the administration or to transfer by decree any of the statues or money or its revenue or to divert it to any other source of revenue or to any other expense or to do anything against the terms enumerated and ordained above. And if it so happens, let whatever has occurred contrary to these provisions be null and void. And whoever tries to do anything contrary to the bequest or to the articles decreed and ratified about the bequest by the Council and Demos, let him pay toward the adornment of the most mighty goddess Artemis twenty-five thousand denarii and to the fiscus of the emperor twenty-five thousand denarii more.

Let the aforementioned bequest be valid for all time in all particulars, as Aquillius Proculus the benefactor and proconsul, and Afranius Flavianus the most illustrious
I, Gaius Vibius Salutaris, son of Gaius, of the tribe Oufentina, proposed the deed of gift and made the aforesaid endowments and dedications.

In the prytany of Tiberius Claudius Antipater Julianus in the month of Poseideon, Aquillius Proculus vir clarissimus to the archons, Council, Demos of the Ephesians. Greetings.

Knowing both that Vibius Salutaris was in all other respects an excellent citizen and that he had previously furnished on many occasions numerous and extraordinary samples of his noble ambition to do things for the city, I used to number him among our closest friends, as was proper. Now, since he has elected to adorn the city magnificently with the greatest and most remarkable gifts to the honor of the most present and most mighty goddess Artemis and of the imperial family and of your city, and has given to the citizens endowments for doles and distributions by lot twenty-thousand denarii, I am of the opinion that on account of the good things he has already done for you and of those which he announces now, you ought indeed to give, in return for his goodwill and his noble ambition to do things, the rewards which you have voted in his honor. I congratulate you on having praised the man and on having deemed him worthy of a well-deserved testimonial of your appreciation in order that people who strive to the limit of their ability to do things like that, may be more numerous. The money given by him as an endowment and the type-statues of the goddess and the images . . . I want no one now in any way or under any pretext whatsoever to change or alter any of the arrangements prescribed by him. And if anyone attempts to rescind or to alter any of the arrangements ratified by you through this decree or tries to introduce such a motion, let him be liable for twenty-five-thousand denarii toward the adornment of our lady Artemis and for twenty-five-thousand denarii more to the most holy fiscus; and let everything contrary to the endowment be none the less null and void. May I congratulate him on the fact that his reverence toward the goddess and his goodwill toward the Augusti and toward the city in the Theatre now becomes obvious to all. Be well.

In the prytany of Tiberius Claudius Antipater Julianus, in the month Poseideon, Afranius Flavianus legatus pro praetore to the archons, Council, Demos of the Ephesians. Greetings.

Even if it has escaped the notice of the majority how much goodwill and devotion he has for you, it has been demonstrated in many instances that Vibius Salutaris, our very dear friend, who is most noble of rank and a man of excellent character besides, has shown himself from his attitude toward us a friend to be numbered among our closest and most indispensable. But now he has made clear to all the magnificent
affection which he has had for the city from the beginning, for he considers it a thing cognate and becoming to his own life and character that he adorn and exalt the sacred and public possessions of your city, the greatest and most distinguished, and he now displays a noble ambition to honor and to reverence the most mighty goddess Artemis and the imperial family by gifts and endowments. Therefore, I congratulate both you because of the man and myself equally because of you on testifying in reciprocation and on expressing appreciation and on rewarding him in your own behalf with suitable commendation. These acts, I think, are due from you in order that people with a like zeal may be more numerous, when this man is seen to meet with a fitting return. And it would be especially gratifying and pleasing to me, if I should perceive that the person whom of all my friends I particularly esteem and love, was among you deemed worthy of recognition and privilege. Concerning the bequest of the money and the goddess' type-statues and of the images, how it will be necessary to use them and what man will have to be assigned to each transaction, I think that it is reasonable that the donor himself propose and that you so decree. But when the articles are ratified both by the donor himself and by you, I want them to remain forever in the same terms without any subrogation, and I do not want them to be abrogated or changed through derogation by anyone on any pretext. If anyone should attempt to advise such a thing or to make a motion concerning a change or new application of the arrangements ratified by the donor and you, I want him to pay immediately a fine of twenty-five thousand denarii to the sanctuary of the most mighty goddess Artemis, and to the fiscus of our lord Caesar . . . twenty-five thousand denarii more, as Aquillius Procclus the most illustrious proconsul sanctioned and stipulated the fine previously in the letter through which he replied to you. Be well.

In the prytany of Tiberius Claudius Antipater Julianus in the month Poseideon, the emperor-loving Council decreed:

Concerning the things which Tiberius Claudius Julianus, son of Ti. Cl. Alexander, of the tribe Quirina, patriotic and emperor-loving, upright, reverent, secretary of the Demos for the second time, and the emperor-loving generals of the city, have reported:

In order that it may be permitted to the gold-bearers of the goddess to bring to the assemblies and the games the type-statues and images, dedicated by Gaius Vibius Salutaris, from the Pronaos of Artemis, while the temple-wardens share in the care and while the ephebes share in receiving them and in escorting the procession from the Magnesian to the Coressian Gate, let the emperor-loving Council decree, according as it has been set forth above.

I, Tiberius Claudius Prorhesius Fretorianus, emperor-loving, have responsibility for the way in which the decree has been drafted.

I, Marcus Caesellius Marcianus, emperor-loving, have responsibility for the way in which the decree has been drafted.
I, Tiberius Claudius Julianus, patriotic, emperor-loving, upright, reverent, the secretary of the Demos for the second time, had it engraved.

In the prytany of Tiberius Claudius Antipater Julianus, in the month Poseideon, the emperor-loving Council decreed:

Concerning the things which Tiberius Claudius Julianus, son of Tiberius Claudius Alexander, of the tribe Quirina, patriotic and emperor-loving, upright, reverent, secretary of the Demos for the second time, and the emperor-loving generals of the city reported:

Since the priests and sacred victors who are gold-bearers for the goddess, have promised to carry back and forth the statues dedicated by Vibius Salutaris and have asked as place in the Theatre the first sector, where the image of Concord stands, let it be decreed:

That they have the place and sit near the statue of Pietas, wearing white raiment.
Let the emperor-loving Council decree that it be, as has been described above.

I, Gaius Aufidius Silvanus, emperor-loving, have responsibility for the way in which the decree has been drafted.

I, Lucius Munatius Bassus, emperor-loving, have responsibility for the way in which the decree has been drafted.

I, Nereus son of Theophilus, emperor-loving, have responsibility for the way in which the decree has been drafted.

In the consulship of Sextus Attius Suburanus for the second time and of Marcus Asinius Marcellus, on the eighth day before the Calends of March. In the prytany of Tiberius Claudius Antipater Julianus, in the month Anthesterion, on the second and Augustan day.

Gaius Vibius Salutaris, son of Gaius, of the tribe Oufentina, Artemis-loving and Caesar-loving, proposes a bequest, according to the preceding decree about the things which he dedicated, to the most mighty goddess Ephesian Artemis, and to the emperor-loving Council of the Ephesians, and to the emperor-loving Gerusia of the Ephesians, and to the priests and victors for the city in sacred games, who are the gold-bearers of the goddess Artemis, and to whosoever shall be the Boys of the Ephesians and thesmodi of Asia's common temple of the Augusti at Ephesus, and to the toe-dancers of Artemis, on the conditions of right and penalty, as they have been secured in the previous bequest:

Two silver images overlaid with gold, so that together with the type-statues of the goddess they will be in number thirty-one.

And of silver one thousand five hundred denarii more, so that together with the previous endowment there will be twenty-one thousand five hundred denarii.

On condition that a silver image of Athena Pammousos, weighing with the silver covering of its base seven pounds, a half ounce, and eight scruples, the same
dedicated to Artemis and to whosoever shall be the Boys of the Ephesians, be placed at every regular assembly above the sector where the Boys sit.

Likewise that a silver image of the Concordia Augusta Chrysophorus, weighing with the silver covering of its base six pounds, the same dedicated to Artemis and to the priests and victors for the city in sacred games, whosoever shall be the gold-bearers, be placed at every regular assembly above the sector where the sacred victors sit.

The aforesaid weight of the images and their bases was furnished to Eumenes son of Eumenes grandson of Theophilus, the same who is strategus of the city of the Ephesians, through the public weigher Hermias, sacred slave of Artemis, while Musaeus, sacred slave of Artemis, custodian of the deposits, was also present and participated in receiving it.

For the supplementary endowment of one thousand five hundred denarii Salutaris will pay nine percent interest each year, namely the sum of one hundred and thirty-five denarii, from which he will give fifty-five denarii to the secretary of the Council of the Ephesians, in order that the latter may carry out a distribution by lot on the fifth of Thargelion for as many as five individuals out of all the Councillors. These, the winners, will make a sacrifice to Artemis on the sixth of the month, the birthday of the goddess, buying . . . for twenty-seven and a half denarii, and the remaining twenty-seven denarii, nine asses, they will spend in the sanctuary of Artemis on . . .

Likewise, he will give from the aforementioned interest six denarii, thirteen and a half asses to the gold-bearers and to the victors for the city in sacred games, in order that they may carry out a distribution by lot . . .

Likewise, he will give from the aforementioned interest fifteen denarii, thirteen and a half asses to the paedonomi, in order that they may carry out a distribution by lot among all the Boys on the birthday of the goddess to as many as sixty-three individuals. These, the winners, will pray in the sanctuary of Artemis . . .

If any of the winning men or Boys either do not perform their sacrifices or do not pray in the sanctuary as has been ordained, let them pay toward the adornment of Artemis five denarii.

Likewise, he will give from the aforementioned interest seven denarii for distribution to the thesmodi, in order that they may receive nine asses apiece in the sanctuary of Artemis on the birthday of the goddess.

Likewise, he will give from the aforementioned interest fifteen denarii for distribution to the toe-dancers of the goddess, in order that they may receive thirteen and a half asses apiece on the birthday of the goddess.

In order that the statues may all remain clean, let it be permitted, that as often as may be approved, they be rubbed with argyromatic earth \(^2\) in the presence of two

\(^2\) Some sort of silver polish, and not "earth for moulds for silver reliefs" (thus the Greek-English Lexicon). See Ch. Picard, Ephèse et Claros (1922), p. 247.
temple-wardens and a beadle by whoever happens to be custodian of the deposits, but not rubbed with any other material. And the remaining eight denarii will be given each year to the custodian of the deposits for the care of the statues and for the purchase of the argyromatic earth.

Salutaris has promised to give one hundred and thirty-five denarii, in order that his benefaction begin in the present year on the birthday of the goddess.

Let two of the temple-wardens and the sacred victors, beadle and guards carry the aforementioned images and those that were dedicated in the previous bequests and all the type-statues of the goddess from the Pronaos to the Theatre at every assembly and at the gymnastic games and on any other holidays to be ordained by the Council and Demos; and let them carry them back again to the sanctuary and deposit them, while the ephebes join in the reception from the Magnesian Gate and escort the procession after the assemblies as far as the Coressian Gate, just as the Council and Demos stipulated in the previous decrees.

**COMMENTARY**

The main difference between this text and Heberdey's lies in the introduction of the system of brackets agreed upon at Leyden and consequently in the removal of the brackets from a large number of mutilated letters. When one considers the length of the inscription, there are very few misreadings in Heberdey's text. I have been able to find only the following: omission of the second Τηβ. Κλ. in line 5, the numeral τ instead of τθ (or τε) in line 235, άνάγηκη instead of άνάγηκς in line 290, αει instead of αει in lines 468 and 543, λαμβάνεων instead of λανβάνεων in line 538, συνπροπεμπότων instead of συνπροπεμπότων in line 566. I find that he has miscalculated the length of lacunae in lines 121 and 325. Furthermore, I have retained the reading of the stone and rejected emendations by Heberdey in lines 366, 397, and 399. Wilhelm had already vindicated the stonecutter in the second of these cases. I do not find the first case troublesome, and the third έπει | αν I regard as scriptio plena for έπαν or έπεάν (Ionic).

The rule of syllabic division is violated only once (between lines 282 and 283). Since corrections by the stonecutter were actually made with the chisel, it is not likely that certain letters omitted by the stonecutter were, as Heberdey thought, later added in color. That the letters were first painted on and then carved, appears clearly.
from the errors in lines 216 and 442. Hence, the stonecutter occasionally confused Α and Δ and Α, Ο and Ω, Ν and Η, Γ and Τ, Ε and Σ.

The restorations are not as bold as they sometimes seem to be, because a great deal of repetition, which the reader may appreciate immediately by consulting the index, furnished considerable aid. The restorations are those supplied or taken over by Heberdey with a few exceptions. I have adopted a suggestion from Picard for line 220. Although the epistle of Aquillius Proculus like those of almost all Roman officials is composed in Attic Greek, the Ephesian decrees are composed in Koine. Therefore, I have substituted the form ἁρματον for Heberdey’s ἃττόν in line 218, and the form κριναίον for Heberdey’s κρέιπτον in lines 18-19 and 113. At eight places in the restoration I have substituted the form aλεί, which appears to be regular in the decrees of the inscription, for Heberdey’s aλε. I have added an insignificant restoration of my own in line 355, and in line 325 I have reworded Heberdey’s complement to make it conform to the space and letter traces. In line 107 for the restoration ἄμεταβλήτητον I have substituted ἀκατάλλητον as paralleling more closely the terminology in lines 401-403. In lines 409-410 I have rejected without substitution Heberdey’s surprising restoration; and I have also refrained from accepting the sums restored by Heberdey in lines 240-241. The reflections which determined my attitude in these two last cases are set forth below.

In lines 294-295 it is stated that in full payment a capital sum of 4450 denarii could be handed over to the secretary of the Gerusia. But in the next inscription, No. 4, this sum is given as 4250 denarii and is confirmed, as Heberdey points out, by the calculation in sesterces on No. 4. Because of his misreading of the numeral in line 235 Heberdey reckoned with a distribution to 300 instead of 309 Elders. If we follow Heberdey in accepting 4250 denarii instead of 4450 denarii as the capital sum which could be handed over to the secretary of the Gerusia in full payment, the interest amounted to 382½ denarii of which 309 (not 300) went to the Elders. Hence, only 73½ denarii are left for the Asiarchs and the other group. If it is true, as Heberdey argues from the mutilated remains of line 241, that the portion assigned to each Asiarch was 11 denarii, then the arithmetical exigencies of the demand for even numbers indicate that there must have been either three or six Asiarchs who were entitled to receive a share. If there were three Asiarchs, the subtraction of their 33 denarii would leave 40½ denarii for the other group, who accordingly would have been 9 individuals receiving 4½ denarii apiece, or 3 individuals receiving 13½ denarii apiece, or 27 individuals receiving 1½ denarii apiece. If, on the other hand, there were six Asiarchs, the subtraction of their 66 denarii would leave 7½ denarii for the other group, who accordingly would have been 15 individuals receiving ½ denarii apiece or 5 individuals receiving 1½ denarii apiece or 10 individuals receiv-

4 On these see page 23.
ing ¾ denarius apiece. The student, furthermore, must notice that Heberdey's argument that the Asiarchs received a portion of 11 denarii apiece depends on a doubtful reading and, worse yet, on a slight emendation in line 241. Otherwise on the analogy of proportions in other brackets we should be inclined to assume that the 73½ denarii were to be divided between 7 Asiarchs receiving 7 denarii apiece and 7 of the other group receiving 3½ denarii apiece; but we cannot find any confirmation for this division in the letters actually preserved.

The inscription presents seven documents concerning the bequest and the supplementary bequest of Gaius Vibius Salutaris in the year 104 A.D., for which the consuls are mentioned in lines 447 f., to the citizens of Ephesus and to the personnel of the Artemision. Of the latter the Megabyzus has disappeared, and a priestess, more in conformity with Hellenic and Roman ideals, has replaced the eunuch. The hymnodi are still there despite attempts to replace them with the gratuitous service of the ephebes in the previous century, and so are the very oriental toe-dancers who perform during the sacrifices. The νεστοιοί, beadle, and guards are old functionaries of the Artemision, but the sacred slave, ο ἐπὶ τῶν παραθηκῶν, identical with ο τὰ καθάρσια ποιῶν, is here mentioned for the first time.5

The χρυσοφορῶντες τῇ θεῷ ιερεῖς καὶ ιερονεῖκαι are in C.I.G., II, 2963c called οἱ τῶν χρυσῶν κόσμων βαστάζοντες τῆς μεγάλης θεᾶς Ἀρτέμιδος πρὸ πόλεως ιερεῖς καὶ ιερονεῖκαι. They actually carried the gold objects of the goddess, which is somewhat more than the right to wear gold ornaments of one's own at religious celebrations in honor of the goddess, a privilege for which Ad. Wilhelm has brought together the evidence in Jahreshefte, XII (1914), pp. 36-42. From No. 11 it appears that the gold-bearers formed a definite corporation at Ephesus. For the office compare also the phrase διὰ χρυσοφορήσαντα in an honorary inscription of Tralles, published by J. R. S. Sterrett, Papers of the American School of Classical Studies at Athens, I (1882-3), p. 108, No. X. It is probably the χρυσοφόροι who induced Salutaris to make the supplementary bequest.

The uneven sums of money are due to the fact that the larger amounts were calculated in sesterces and then converted. The nine percent interest is called τόκος δραχμαίος ἀσσαραιος or τόκος ἀσσαρίων δεκαδύο ἁργυρῶν, because it represents a rate of twelve silver asses a month per hundred denarii. The drachma contained twelve silver asses, and the denarius sixteen silver asses. The adjectives indicate a reference to the silver as distinct from the ordinary provincial bronze as, which had depreciated to a rate of eighteen to the denarius and was in danger of depreciating even further. A variation in the exchange had been forseen and provisions were made for the division of a surplus.

The purpose, character, and distribution of the bequest may be conveniently summarized in the following tables reproduced from Heberdey's commentary.

5 See Picard's treatment of the ritualistic and administrative side.
The twenty-nine statuettes of the main bequest are:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Representing</th>
<th>Dedicated to</th>
<th>Weight (ογκ.)</th>
<th>γράμ.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Ε(ικών)</td>
<td>Τραίανός</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Ε</td>
<td>Πλωτέινα</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Α(πεικόνισμα)</td>
<td>Αρτέμις χρυσά</td>
<td>3 + 2</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Ε</td>
<td>Ιερά σύνκλητος</td>
<td>Βουλή</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Ε</td>
<td>Βουλή 'Εφεσίων</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Α</td>
<td>Αρτέμις ἁγυρέα</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Ε</td>
<td>Δήμος Ρωμαίων</td>
<td>Γερονσία</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Ε</td>
<td>Γερονσία 'Εφεσίων</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Α</td>
<td>Αρτέμις ἁγυρέα</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Ε</td>
<td>'Ιππικόν τάγμα Ρωμαίων 'Εφηβοι</td>
<td>3 1/2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Ε</td>
<td>'Εφηβεία 'Εφεσίων</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Α</td>
<td>Αρτέμις ἁγυρέα</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Ε</td>
<td>Θεός Σεβαστός</td>
<td>Φυλή Σεβαστή</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Ε</td>
<td>Φυλή Σεβαστή</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Α</td>
<td>Αρτέμις ἁγυρέα</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Ε</td>
<td>Δήμος 'Εφεσίων</td>
<td>Φυλή 'Εφεσίων</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Ε</td>
<td>Φυλή 'Εφεσίων</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Α</td>
<td>Αρτέμις ἁγυρέα</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Ε</td>
<td>Φυλή Καρναίων</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Ε</td>
<td>Φυλή Καρναίων</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Α</td>
<td>Αρτέμις ἁγυρέα</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Ε</td>
<td>Λυσίμαχος</td>
<td>Φυλή Τηών</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Ε</td>
<td>Φυλή Τηών</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Α</td>
<td>Αρτέμις ἁγυρέα</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>3 1/2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Ε</td>
<td>Εὐώνυμος</td>
<td>Φυλή Εὐώνυμον</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Ε</td>
<td>Φυλή Εὐώνυμον</td>
<td>3 1/2</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Α</td>
<td>Αρτέμις ἁγυρέα</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Ε</td>
<td>Πών</td>
<td>Φυλή Βεμβειναίων</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Ε</td>
<td>Φυλή Βεμβειναίων</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The donations for which provision has been made in the main bequest are:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. βουλή</td>
<td>450</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>450</td>
<td>5000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2a. γερουσία</td>
<td>309</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>382½</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. ............</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>4250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Ἀσιαρχήσαντες</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. πολείται</td>
<td>6 × 250</td>
<td>½</td>
<td>750</td>
<td>8333½</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4a. ἐφηβοι</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>½</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>1400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. ἐφήβαρχος</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. θεολόγοι</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1½</td>
<td>24¾</td>
<td>275</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6a. ιερεία</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. ὑμνηδοῖ</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7a. νεοποιοῖ</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12 × ½</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>33½</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. σκηπτοῦχος</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12 × ½</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8a. παιδεῖς</td>
<td>7 × 7</td>
<td>¼</td>
<td>15¾</td>
<td>175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. παιδονόμοι</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>½</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. ὁ τὰ καθάρσια ποιῶν</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>333½</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>1800</strong></td>
<td><strong>20,000</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The two statuettes in the supplementary bequest are:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Representing</th>
<th>Dedicated to</th>
<th>Weight οὐγκ.</th>
<th>γράμ.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>30 Ἀθηνᾶ Πάμμουσος</td>
<td>παιδεῖς, παιδονόμοι, παιδευταί</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>½</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 Σεβαστὴ Ὠμόνοια χρυσοφόρος χρυσοφοροῦντες ἱερεῖς καὶ ἱερονεῖκαι</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Heberdey’s figures for 2 have been altered as explained above.
The donations for which provision has been made in the supplementary bequest are:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Beneficiary</th>
<th>Number of Recipients</th>
<th>Individual Portions</th>
<th>Total Interest</th>
<th>Capital Endowment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10. βουλή</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>55</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. γερονσία</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1 1/2</td>
<td>27 1/2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. χρυσοφορούντες ἱερεῖς καὶ ἱερονεῖκαι</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3 1/4</td>
<td>63 1/4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. παίδες</td>
<td>7 × 9</td>
<td>3/4</td>
<td>15 3/4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. θεσμῳδοί</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1/2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. ἄκροβάται</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>3/4</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. ὁ ἐπὶ τῶν παραθηκῶν</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>135</td>
<td>1500</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The penalty for altering the arrangements laid down by Salutaris was a heavy fine: 25,000 denarii to Artemis and 25,000 denarii to the imperial fiscus. This is stated once in lines 111-113, again in lines 323-325, and again by the proconsul in lines 362-364. The legatus pro praetore in lines 407-413 expressly confirms the penalty stipulated by the proconsul, but the passage cannot be completely restored with the bare statement of the known amount and of the known beneficiaries. Therefore, Heberdey used the three letters preserved at the beginning of line 410 as support for a restoration indicating a triple (instead of double) fine of 25,000 denarii to Artemis, to the imperial fiscus, and to the Gerusia. What the proconsul, however, really demanded, and what the Council and Demos finally decreed, was one fine of 25,000 denarii payable to Artemis and another fine of 25,000 denarii payable to the imperial fiscus. This, therefore, must have been the meaning of the legatus pro praetore, and we do not know how or even whether the Gerusia was mentioned by him.

The unsuccessful purpose of the fine was to make it impossible to alter the terms of the bequest, because the amounts due to the goddess and to the fiscus were so high and the interested parties so powerful. It meant rather that the two most irresistible executors at Ephesus, namely, the imperial procurator and the management of the Artemision, were associated to guarantee the inviolability of the arrangements. Probably no one expected that the fine would ever have to be collected, and so it is not legitimate to use the evidence of this unusual case to show, as Picard argues (Éphèse et Claros, pp. 73-74), that the Roman government was partly depriving Artemis of her revenue from the old fines.
**Base for Statues of Artemis, Rome, and the Gerusia**


- [Dianae Ephesiae]
- [et Ephesiorum gerusiae]

[C. V]ibius, C. f., Vof(entina), Salutaris, promag(ister) portu(um) provinc(iae) Siciliae, item promag(ister) frumenti mancipalis, praefec(tus)

cohor(tis) Asturum et Callaecorum, trib(unus) mil(itum) leg(ionis) XXII primigeniae p(iae) f(idelis), subprocurator provinc(iae) Mauretaniae Tingitanae, item provinc(iae) Belgicae, Dianam argenteam, item imagines argenteas duas, unus urbis Romanae et aliam gerusiae, sua pecunia fecit, ita ut omni ecclesia su[p]ra bases ponerentur, ob quarum dedicationem in sortition[em] gerusiae consecravit sestertia decem septem millia nummum.

TRANSLATION

To Artemis Ephesia and to the emperor-loving Gerusia of the Ephesians, Gaius Vibius Salutaris son of Gaius of the tribe Oufentina, <who has served as> chief contractor for the port dues in the province of Sicily, chief contractor for the public grain <of the province of Sicily>, prefect of the cohort of the Asturians and Gal-laecians, tribune of the Legio XXII Primigenia Pia Fidelis, subprocurator of the
province of Mauretania Tingitana, subprocurator of the province of Belgica, has caused to be made at his own expense a silver Artemis and also two silver images, namely, one of the ruling city Rome and another of the emperor-loving Gerusia, which he presented as a dedication in order that they might be placed at each assembly upon their bases, as is contained in the deed of gift. He also gave 4,250 denarii as an endowment for a distribution by lot to the Gerusia.

In the proconsulship of Gaius Aquillius Proculus. In the second secretaryship of Tiberius Claudius Julianus, emperor-loving and patriotic.

COMMENTARY

This inscription marks one of the nine bases mentioned in No. 3, line 205.

TITUS PEDUCAEUS CANAX


Trajanic Period

[Ἡ β]ουλή καὶ ὁ δήμος
ἐτέμησαν
Τίτον Πεδουκαίον Κάνακα
φιλοσέβαστον τὸν γυμνασίαρ
χον τὸν πρεσβυτέρων, πρυτα
νεύσαντα τῆς πόλεως καὶ ίερα
τεύσαντα τῆς Ῥώμης καὶ Ποπλι
οὐν Σερονειλίον Ἰσαυρικοῦ, ἐλαί

οθετήσαντα δὲ καὶ τῶν πολέων
τῶν τὸν ἐπιμαλόντα χρόνον
καὶ καθιερώσεις ποιησάμενον[ν]
[ἄργυροι]ν βουλὴν καὶ γερουσία
[τὴν τε]περὶ τὰ μυστήρια πλη
[ῥέστα]ς ποιησάμενον εἰσέβεβαιν,

15 [. . . δ]όμαν ἃγο αἰ καὶ τὸ ὑπὲρ τῶν
[θεωριή]ῶν ἀργύριου

TRANSLATION

The Council and the Demos honored Titus Peducaeus Canax, emperor-loving, gymnasiarch of the Elders. He served as prytanis of the city and as priest of Rome and of Publius Servilius Isauricus. Moreover, in the following year he supplied the citizens with oil for the bath and made money donations to the Council and to the Gerusia and he displayed most fully his piety in regard to the Mysteries, and he gave also the money for the public spectacles.

COMMENTARY

Keil restored the latter part of the inscription on the basis of a similar passage in an unedited document. He dated the lettering about the end of the first century after Christ. P. Servilius Isauricus, as Keil pointed out, is the heroified victor over the Cilician pirates.
HONORARY INSCRIPTION


\[\begin{array}{c}
\text{τημυ} \\
\text{Ἀρτέμιδος} \\
\text{ἀνδριάσιν} \\
\text{παντὶ [τῷ ἱδίῳ τῆς Θεός ὑμὸς κόσμῳ καὶ} \\
\text{καὶ ἐν τῷ στάδιῳ ἐν δεξιᾷ <βύς> σε} \\
\text{τῷ κατακερκάζοντι τοῖς [χώρας] \\
\text{λευκῷ λίθῳ καὶ τῇ εξεδ[ρ]ᾳ τῇ πρὸ τοῦ} \\
\text{ἔργου αὐτῶν. καθίερωσαν δὲ καὶ τῇ βουλ[ὴ]} \\
\text{ἀργυρίῳ ὅπως ἐκ τῆς προσόδου καὶ ὑμῶν} \\
\text{τῶν πρὸ τῶν τειμῶν αὐτῶν ἐν [τῇ] ἁγο[ρᾶ]ς λ[αμμ]} \\
\text{βάνωσ[ι]} \ διανομήν. ὁμοίως καὶ τῇ γερούν [ὡς] \\
\text{ὅπως λαμβάνοι[ν] ἐν τῷ σταδίῳ πρὸ τῶν} \\
\text{τειμῶν αὐτῶν διανομήν. καὶ ἐγ[ερήν δαπα] \\
\text{νήματος αὐτοῦ ἐξ ἐτέρου χρήμα [ατο]ς ὁμοίοι} \\
\text{καθίερωσαν αὐτοῖς. ἀνέθηκαν [δὲ] \\
\text{καὶ ἐν τῷ γυμνασίῳ Ἀσκληπι[ῶ σε]seller [νβω] \\
\text{Τυπνον σῶν παντὶ τῷ ἱδίῳ [κόσμῳ ---]} \\
\end{array}\]

--- statues with all the goddess’ appropriate apparatus and the pavement. These same persons, moreover, also constructed in the stadium on the right side two sectors together with the white stone wall which divides them into cunei and with the exedra in front of their part. And they gave an endowment of money to the Council in order that from the yearly revenue the Councillors might receive a donation in the market place over and above their honors,—and likewise to the Gerusia in order that the Elders might receive a donation in the stadium over and above their honors. And likewise they guaranteed to them the funds for this expense out of another piece of property. And together with all the proper apparatus they set up in the gymnasium a statue of Hypnus, altar-partner of Asclepius.

COMMENTARY

In line 5 where Le Bas’ copy gave ἀυτοῖς ἐπο and Wood’s copy ἀυτοῖς ἐπο... I have retained Waddington’s restoration ἐπο[ἐπαν] in
preference to Hort’s emendation $\xi[k]\dot{\sigma}[\mu\nu\nu\sigma\alpha\nu]$. In general Wood’s copy and Hort’s edition represent an improvement over Le Bas-Waddington. The letter forms and the ligatures as given by Le Bas suggest a date in the second century after Christ.

**LETTER OF HADRIAN TO THE GERUSIA**


120 A.D.

\[\begin{align*}
[\text{Αὐτοκράτωρ}] & \text{ Κα/[χερ]} \text{, θεοῦ Τραϊѵανοῦ Παρθικοῦ νιός,} \\
[\text{θεοῦ Νέρωνα ν}][\text{ιὼνός, Τραϊανὸς Ἀδριανὸς Σεβαστός,}] & \text{ μέγιστος, δημαρχικὴς ἐξουσίας τὸ δ,} \\
[\text{ἄ[παρ]}] & \text{ γ, Ἐφεσῶν τῇ γερουσίᾳ χαῖρειν.}
\end{align*}\]


10 τοῦ ψηφίσματος Κορνηλίων Πρεβσκοῦ τῷ κρατίστῳ ἀνθυπάτω, ἵνα, εἰ τι τοιοῦτον εἶχ, ἐπιλέξῃτα τινα ὃς κρινεῖ τε τὰμψισθητούμενα καὶ εἰσπράξει πάντα, ὡςα ἂν ὀφείλητα τῇ γερουσίᾳ τῶν ἄριστων ἦν Κασκέλλος Π[ο]ντικός, διὸ τὸ ἐφοδιών δοθήτω, εἰ γε μὴ


**TRANSLATION**

*Imperator Caesar Trajan Hadrian Augustus, son of the deified Trajan Parthicus, grandson of the deified Nerva, pontifex maximus, invested with the tribunician power for the fourth time, consul for the third time, to the Gerusia of the Ephesians, greetings.*

*Mettius* Modestus, the vir clarissimus, has done well in the decision to grant you your rights. And since you have shown that many people have appropriated money
belonging to you, inasmuch as holding estates of those who had borrowed from you, they deny that they are the heirs and assert that they themselves are also creditors,—I have sent the copy of your decree to Cornelius Priscus the most illustrious proconsul, in order that in any situation of this sort he may select someone to judge the disputed cases and may collect all the sums owed to the Gerusia. Cassellius Ponticus was the one who came on the embassy. The money for the journey is to be given to him, unless he promised to undertake the embassy gratis. Farewell. On the fifth day before the Kalends of October.

Secretary, Popilius Rutilius Bassus.

COMMENTARY

Wood restored the name of the proconsul at the beginning of line 5. In lines 5-6, where Curtius had restored τὰ δικ[ασθέντα | κατὰ] νείμας, the restoration τὰ δικ[αια | ἡμῖν κατὰ] νείμας was suggested by Hicks. The other restorations are due to the original editor.

It appears that a previous proconsul Mettius Modestus, known to us from other sources (Prosopographia Imperii Romani, II, p. 373, no. 404), had already rendered a decision favorable to the Gerusia. The wording of the imperial letter implies that the former case too concerned the financial credits of the Gerusia. The new question which has occasioned the embassy concerns the priority of rights among the creditors of the deceased debtors and possibly deliberate evasions of the law that the heirs are responsible for the debts attached to the estate which they inherit. The Gerusia has decided to appeal to the emperor for assistance, and probably a request for the appointment of a commissioner with the authority of the Roman government to investigate and to collect was included in the decree mentioned in line 10.

Claudius Bassus

8. Ephesus. E. L. Hicks, B.M.I., III (1890), no. 599.

Ἄγαθή Τύχη
Κλαύδιος
Βάσσος
γερονυσιαστής

This inscription, falsely included by Pappakonstantinou in his collection of texts from Tralles, was also published by A. E. Kontoleon, B.C.H., X (1886), p. 517, No. 8. Claudius Bassus is perhaps the same man who at the time of Hadrian appeared as ἀγωνοθέτης of the Νεμέσια in an inscription at Smyrna (I.G.R.R., IV, 1431).
Aristocrates


The emperor-loving Council of the city of the Ephesians, first and greatest, has set up a statue of . . . Aristocrates, the son of Hierocles, of Ceramus, arch-priest of Asia's temples in Ephesus and agonothete of the great Hadrianeia of the second quadriennium, who gave the . . . thousands of the high-priest's summa honoraria for the construction of the . . . and . . . thousands more for the . . ., who was given as financial commissioner to the emperor-loving Gerusia by the deified Hadrian, and who enjoyed the friendship too of the exalted Imperator Caesar Titus Aelius Hadrianus Antoninus Augustus Pius, . . . as soon as he had been given ten times to the Gerusia as financial commissioner ———
THE SACRED GERUSIA

COMMENTARY

The restorations are due to Boeckh except at the end of lines 16, 19, and 20 (Oliver). In line 10 Hütttl restores \( \tau[\circ ne\ o vel\ simile] \).

Concerning the arch-priests of Asia, who were in charge of the imperial cult, see Brandis' article in the Real-Encyclopädie, II, cols. 473-483. The arch-priest of the province had subordinates in Pergamum, Smyrna, Cyzicus, Sardis, and Ephesus, and these too were called arch-priests with a qualification designating the local character, as in the title of Aristocrates. But see also page 23, note 5.

I presume that the word [\( \lambda o\gamma\rho\iota\sigma\tau\eta ] \) is correctly supplied in lines 12-13. If so, the statement, although true, is technically inaccurate, because as we learn from No. 7, not the emperor, but the proconsul at the suggestion of the emperor, appointed the \( \lambda o\gamma\rho\iota\sigma\tau\eta \).

HONORARY INSCRIPTION


Second century after Christ

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{[} & \Odeina\ tou\ deinos] \\
to\mu\nu\rho\deltaου, \\
\iota\rho\omicron\kappa\omicron\nu\omicron\zeta\gamma\rhoam \\
mateus\ 'A\omicron\rho\omicron\nu\nu\epsilon\omicron\epsiloni\nu\omicron\omega, \\
\upsilon\mu\nu\rho\deltaος\ \upsilon\epsilon\mu\pi\tau\eta\ς \\
\betaου\upsilon\zeta\ς,\ \gammaε\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\upsilon\tauια\ς, \\
\chi\omicron\nu\sigma\omicron\phi\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\upsilon\nu\omicron\cdot \\
\text{10} & \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ Please note that this text may be subject to OCR errors or formatting issues that could affect the readability.
Artemis and of the emperors. In 44 A.D. the Roman government, which ever favored the gymnasia at the expense of the old local institutions, attempted to restrict the role of the hymnodi in the Artemision and in the imperial cult at Ephesus and brought about the substitution of gratuitous service by the ephebes for the costly service of the hymnodi. The latter, however, continued to enjoy great prestige, individual members occupied important offices, and the whole society was generously treated in the donation of Vibius Salutaris (No. 3), where the hymnodi of Artemis seem to be contrasted with the thesmodi of the Augusteum.

**LETTER OF MARCUS AURELIUS AND LUCIUS VERUS TO ULPNIUS EURYCLIES**

11. Ephesus. A fragment (a) with the first thirteen lines was published by R. Heberdey, Jahreshefte, I (1898), Beiblatt, p. 78. [R. Cagnat, Revue archéologique, 3rd series, XXXII (1898), p. 466, No. 67]. W. Dittenberger, Orientis Graeci Inscriptiones Selectae, II (1905), 508. Another fragment (d) with lines 41-47 was published by E. L. Hicks, B.M.I., III (1890), No. 497. The first complete publication of the whole inscription (five fragments) was that of R. Heberdey, Forschungen in Ephesos, II (1912) pp. 119-123, No. 23. See also Ch. Picard, Ephèse et Claros (1922), p. 436.

162 or 163

**a**

Αὐτοκράτωρ Καῖσαρ Ὀρθήλιος Ὀυτωνέινος
Σεβαστὸς καὶ Αὐτοκράτωρ Καῖσαρ Δούκιος Ὀρθήλιος Οὐήρος
Σεβαστὸς Ἀρμενικὸς, Ὀσλίπιο Ἐφυκλεὶ ἱερέων.

5 Ὡτὸ μὲν ὑπ’ ἀνθυπάτων δοθήντα σε τῇ γερουσίᾳ τῶν Ἐφεσίων
λογιστὴν ἕκενοις ἔδει, περὶ δὲ ἡπόρεις, ἀναφέρειν, αὐτὸς τὲ εὐγνω-
μάνοις ἐπικύρωσαι ἐπιστάμενος, καὶ ἡμεῖς διὰ τοῦτο ἐπεμνήσθημεν,
ὡς μὴ ῥαδίως ἀνάγεσθαι τινας τὸ παραδείγματι. Ὁ δὲ πρῶτον ἦμιν ἐκοίνωσας,
τὸ περὶ τῶν ἀργυρῶν εἰκόνων, πράγμα ὡς ἀληθῶς τῆς ἡμετέρας συνχωρήσε-

10

ὁσι] προσδεδόμενον, δὴ λόγῳ ἐστὶ σου καὶ τὸν εἰς τὰς ἄλλας ἐρωτήσεις ἀφορμὴν συμβε-
[βλη]μένον. Τὰς οὖν εἰκόνας τῶν αὐτοκρατόρων, ἃς ἀποκείσθαι λέγεις ἐν τῷ συνε-
[δρίῳ] τούτῳ παλαιάς, εἰς μὲν λόγῳ πάσας δοκιμάζομεν φυλαχθῆναι τοῖς ὀνόμασι, ἐφ’ ὁ
[ὁ]ς γέγονεν αὐτῶν ἐκάστη, εἰς δὲ ἡμετέρους χαρακτήρας μηδέν τι τῆς ἕλιης ἐκείσις

15 ἄλλας εἰς ἠμᾶς μετ’ αὐθα[λλα] μένας ἀνασχοίμεθα· ἀλλὰ δοσι μ[ὲν αὐτῶν—ca. 12—]κα. 15—]
[—ca. 15—] ἐξουσις τὰς μορφᾶς, κἂν ὄσον γνωρίζετο [θεί τῶν προσώπων τοὺς χά-
[ρατήρας, ταύτας καὶ] δος παρέστη λελογισμένοις, ὡς τοῖς αὐτ[οῖς δὲ] φυλαχθῆναι ὀνό-
[μαν] ἐφ’ ὁς γεγονόται· περὶ δὲ τῶν ὀφθαλῶν ἄγαν συνθετηρα[μένοι, ὡς ἀναφέρεις, καὶ]
[συνεδρίαν] μορφὴν ἔτι ψευδών δυναμένοι τάχα μὲν ἄν καὶ [τοῦτον ἐκ τῶν ἐπὶ τοῖς βά-

20 [θρομ ἐπιγραφῶν, τ] ἄχα δ’ ἄν καὶ ἐκ βιβλίων, εἰ τινὰ ἔστι τὸ σ’ [υπερδήθω ὀφθη...]
THE SACRED GERUSIA

[--- ca. 14 ---] τὰ ὄνομα μετα συνπορεθείς, ἀστή τοῦ [τοῦ προγεγονότος, μᾶλλον τὴν]
υας. [τε] μὴν ἀναπαυθήναι [δὴ πρὸς τῆς ἀνάρχου] ἐξήσεως ἐξαφανισθήναι τῶν
εἰκόνων. Τῇ δὲ χανεύεισε πρῶτον μέν σὲ παρὰ τυχ[--- 24-26 ---]
ταλαμβάνῃ τοῦ μέτρον τῆς λογοτεχνίας. ἀλλ’ ἔπειδὴ [--- 26-28 ---]

ύπρεθος καὶ τὸ συγχωρήθηκαί διεπράζετο παρ’ ἡμῶν [--- 25-27 ---]
πραξθῆναι ἐπειτὰ καὶ ἄλλους πρὸς τοῦ σοὶ μάλιστα ἄνεος [--- 20-22 ---] οὐς δὲν
ὁ κράτιστος ἀνθύπατος ἐίτε ἐξ αὐτῆς τῆς ἱερουσαίας εἰ[τε] ἐξ ἀπάντων τῶν πολει-
tῶν δοκιμάσῃ. ναςὰ Τὸ δὲ κατὰ Σατορενέοις τῶν δημόσ[--- 16-18 ---]

δν παρὰ τῶν χρεωτῶν τοῦ συνεδρίου πολλά κεκομίσαθα λέγεις [χρήματα, μὴ προσηκοῦ-

ς] τής εἰσπράξεως, τοιούτων ἑστῶν. Εἰ μὲν γὰρ τι εἰσηγήκης, ὃν ἄτι[e[η]θη, οὐδὲ ἄλλα
παρὰ τούτῳ ἐγὼ διάφορον, ὅτι οὐχ, φ καὶ προσήκηκεν, ἔδοσαν οἱ δώτες, οἷον τι καὶ ὃ [ἐπίπροσθος ἡ-
μῶν ἐν τοῖς ἱδίοις τῆς ἁμητέρας οἰκίας λογομοιοῦ προσέταξεν φυλάσσεται θαν, ἄρξει τού
βλάσπηται τίνα κατὰ τὴν τῶν προσώπων ἐναλλαγήν τῶν ἀπελθόσων, [τοῖς οὔδε]
μᾶζ ξημία παρηκολούθησαν. Εἰ δὲ κακεῖνοι δεδώκασιν, φι καὶ προσήκηκεν ἢν, κ[αὶ ὁ ἀπολα-

βὼν ἠφάνισεν τὰ κο[μποθήτην, τότε] εἰ μὲν τι εὑρίσκοιτο ἱδίον ἢ ἑξών ἢ καταλε[οιών]
ἐκεῖνος, τῇ δὴ προσά[γονεμενον πε]κοὐλιον, τούτῳ συμβέβαιναν τῶν ὕστερως. [εἰ δὲ]
καὶ ὁ ὁς ὑπὲρ τὴν [δύν] ἀρμ ῥη [ἐκεὶ]νον προσδέη τῇ γερουσίᾳ τῶν εἰσπράξεων [ὁν ἤ-

τ’ αὐτοῦ καὶ κατεχεῖ[ν] μένον, εὐγενῶς μ]ων ὁ κράτιστος ἀνθύπατος γενέσας [θω δ]ιὰς [κόμε-

νος ὑπὸ σοῦ, πρὸς οὐ[ν] μᾶς ἐπανελθε[ν] ν σε δεὶ τῶν ἑκείνων καταβεβληκτώς, [διακρίνων]

καὶ ἐκ τοῦ χρόνον [ν τοῦ μ]εταταξεῖ διεληλυθότος καὶ τῶν [ἐξ]ίων τοῦ τρόπον [--- ---]

[--- 16---] τετευκός ἀποδεικνύει, παρασταὶ[--- ---]

[--- 12---] ἀνέκειν γείων κελευσθήκαι τά κακῶς ἀποδο[θέντα --- 14-16 ---]

[--- 16---] ἢ δόσιμ. ναςάτι όδε δε[συχείχεις] ἀναβολάς τά [ν] χρεών - 11-13 ---

[--- 17---] ν ὁ πάππος αὐτοῦ Σαββέινος, ὡς φης, ἐν[--- ---]

[--- 17---] τῶν τίωνα, σχεδὸν ἀνακαίνοι ποιούσι καὶ σοὶ τῷ χρ[--- 16-18 ---]

[--- 17---] τὸ συνχωρεῖ· ὡστε χαῖραι αἱδὰ πολλῆς ἀν[--- 16-18 ---]

[--- 17---] σωρ’ ὑποτε, ἐπειδὰν αὐτοὶ τινες αἰτίαιν

[... ] σωτ[α] τοὺς βλαττομένους [--- ca. 45 ---]

[συ]ρόλον συνεδρίου κοιν [--- ca. 45 ---] προ-

[--- 50---] σιέναι τῷ κρ[α] τίστῳ ἀνθυπά[τῃ τῷ]

[---] ν. Καὶ γὰρ τοῦ τὸ σκέμμ[α] [--- 44 ---]

[... ] ναφοράν, ὡς λέγεις, ἐπὶ τούς [--- ca. 44 ---]

[--- 52---] τῶν ἑνχωροῦντος ἐπεὶ εἰς παραπ[--- ca. 44 ---]

[--- 51---] ρησιν αὐτῶν ἑκείνον, τί ἄλλο [--- ca. 42 ---] γε-

[--- 54---] ρουθία τὸν δὲ ἀνθύπατον καὶ ἄ[--- ca. 44 ---]

[--- 55---] ροον ἑνχωρῆν ἑκαστὰ ἑξευρέιν [--- ca. 44 ---]

ο. Τὰς μένοι καὶ ἀπὸ τούτων αὐτ[--- ca. 44 ---]

οὐ μόνον κατὰ τάξιν ἐστὶ τὸ προ[--- ca. 44 ---] προ-

ιωσι, ἀλλὰ καὶ πρὸς τήν τῶν [--- ca. 45 ---]

[--- 60---] προσώπῳ τούς καὶ μᾶλλον ἐπ[--- ca. 46 ---]

μαθεῖν ἑνγόθεν δν[--- ---] "Ερρωσο"
Imperator Caesar Marcus Aurelius Antoninus Augustus and Imperator Caesar Lucius Aurelius Verus Augustus Armeniacus to Ulpius Eurycles, greetings.

That you who had been given by the proconsuls to the Gerusia of the Ephesians as financial commissioner should have reported to them (the proconsuls) concerning your difficulties, you yourself well knew and wisely said so, and we have commented upon this point in order that people might not lightly refer to a precedent here. The first question in your communication to us, the question of the silver images, has obviously furnished you with the occasion for the other inquiries, and it is a matter which requires our permission indeed. In regard then to the images of the emperors, old images which you say are stored in this synhedrion, in brief we think that all of them should be preserved under the names under which each of them came into existence, and that none of that material should be altered into representations of ourselves. For we who are in no particular way eager to accept our own honors, would still less willingly put up with those of others altered to represent ourselves. But it has occurred also to you after considering the matter that as many of them . . . as retain the outlines enough for the features to be recognized, ought to be preserved under the same names under which they came into existence. In regard, moreover, to those so exceedingly battered as you report and no longer capable of exhibiting any outline, even their identifications might perhaps be supplied from inscriptions on the bases, or perhaps even from inventories, if there are any in this synhedrion . . . so that the honor might be renewed for our predecessors rather than disappear through the melting down of the images. And at the smelting first you . . . of the record of the accounting office. But since . . . you began and brought it about that it was permitted by us . . . and others . . . whom the most illustrious proconsul might approve either from the Gerusia itself or from the whole citizen body.

And concerning Saturninus the public slave . . . who you say collected from the debtors of the synhedrion a great deal of money, when it was not his business to collect it, the case is as follows: If he has brought in any such collection, it would simply mean that those who paid have paid to the wrong person (against which our procurator warned them in reference to the private accounts of our household) without anyone being harmed by the confusion in the persons who have collected; then no injury has followed. But in the case that those people have paid to the wrong person and the recipient has made away with the sums collected: If, on the one hand, it is found that he either holds any such an amount or has bequeathed it, the so-called peculium, you ought to attach all this; if, on the other hand, even so a part of the sum collected by him for the Gerusia and retained by him still surpasses his assets, then the most illustrious proconsul, informed by you, shall be the judge which ones of those who have paid to the aforesaid you must approach again, . . . from the time that has meanwhile elapsed and from the deserts of <a man's> character . . .
having paid, produces proof, would present ... order to bring again the sums that were wrongly paid ... at the payment.

The continual postponements of the debts ... his grandfather Sabinus, as you say, ... make it almost necessary for you also ... to concede. For as great respect ... thus, whenever some of them ... cause ... the injured parties ... of the whole synhedrion ... approach the most excellent proconsul ... and this question ... recourse, as you say, to the ... Farewell.

COMMENTARY

The restorations are taken over from Heberdey's text except that I have substituted in lines 31-32 the phrase [ἐπίτροπος ἡ]μῶν for the phrase [κράτιστος ἧγε]μῶν, in line 40 the word [ἀ]ξίων for [αἰ]τίων, which is too long, and in line 61 the word ἔρρωσο for the phrase ἐδοθῇ κτλ.

The document contains a rescript of Marcus Aurelius and Lucius Verus to the Roman financial commissioner (λογιστής) of the Ephesian Gerusia, M. Ulpian Apuleius Eurycles, who is known from other inscriptions (cited by Heberdey) to have been λογιστής (curator rei publicae) at Aphrodisias and to have been in the reign of Commodus for the second time priest of the imperial cult at Smyrna.

For the imperial reluctance toward letting the Gerusia turn the old silver images into representations of themselves, the living rulers, the reader should compare the correspondence of the imperial chancery on the question of gold and silver images in other reigns, as is set forth below in the commentary on No. 24. The silver images constituted necessary apparatus of the imperial cult. On the reference to the proconsuls, see pages 44-47.

From the remark in line 10 we learn that besides the matter of the images at least two other questions of policy formed the subject of the auditor's inquiry and received the attention of the emperors in this letter. A vacant space on the stone marks the transition to a second paragraph, in which the emperors consider the case of the public slave Saturninus, who without any authority collected money owed to the Gerusia. It was the public slave's duty to collect for the city, and those who had given him the money owed to the synhedrion of the Gerusia had done so because he was a recognized government agent.

Another vacant space in the middle of line 43 indicates the beginning of a third paragraph, regarding the continual postponement of debts owed to the Gerusia. The reference in line 44 presumably concerns a case where payment has been successfully evaded by two generations of debtors.

DECREE OF THE GERUSIA

Α.Δ. 180-192

'Αγαθή — Τύχη

[Περὶ δὲν . . . . . . . . . . εἰσφέρει. Ἐν μὲν τοῖς ἄ] νωθὲν ὑπὸ τὸν οἰκισμὸν τῆς πόλεως
[χρόνον Δυνάμειαν τὸν βασιλέα, κύριον]}
[γεγονότα τῆς πόλεως πραγμάτων, τὰ μὲν ἄλλα] πάντα περὶ τε μνημειών καὶ
θυσίων [καὶ τοῦ συνεδρίου ἡμῶν άριστα δια-]
[kεκοσμηκέναι πάση εὐσεβεία τε καὶ φιλαγγα]θία ἰδρυσάμενον δὲ καὶ νεκ καὶ ἄγαλμα
Σωτέρα [ας 'Αρτέμιδος έν -- διατετα-]

5 [χενάι τοὺς] μετέχοντα τοῦ συν[νεδρίου πάν]τας ἐκ τῶν κοινῶν τῆς γεροντίας
χρημάτων ἐκ[στον -- Sum of money λαβόντας εὐωχεῖαν καὶ]
[θύει] τῇ θεώ· διαμειναντος δ[ὲ τοῦ ἔθους ε]ν πλεῖστον διὰ τινα ἐκδιαν χρημάτων
ἔτεσιν [ὑστέροις ημέλησθαι· νῦν δὲ εὐρεθέντων διὰ]

[Τιβ. Κλ. (?) ] Νεικομήδος, τοῦ καθὸ [λικοῦ ἐκδίκου] ν τοῦ συνεδρίου ἡμῶν, τῆς αὐτοῦ
ἐπιμελείας ε[ν αἵρετοι παρασχόντος παράδειγμα, πόρων]
τῇ τε προκαθήγεσιν [ὁν] τῆς πόλεως ἡμῶν θεά· 'Αρτέμιδι καὶ τῷ με-]
Κομμόθυος 'Ἀντωνείψ [Σέβαστῳ Εὐσεβεί Εὐνυχεῖ τὰς κατ' ἐτος θυ-

10 [σιά]ς ὑπὲρ τῆς αἰωνίου διαμονῆς [αὐτοῦ, ὡστε, εξί] ὡν μὴ ἔλατον (sic) ἀναλίσκειν
eis tēn eυoχiān 'Αττικῶν — Number ἐκ τῶν ὑπὸ τοῦ Νεικομῆδους]
dηλωμένων πόρων, ἐκακον τὸ ν παρώντα εἰς τὸ ἀνάλογο τοῦ δείπνου ἔξωθεν καὶ έκ
tēs τ[ου Νεικομήδους φιλοσεικάς λαβὲιν]
'Ατπικὴν μιᾶν· διὰ τοῦτο ἐδοξέζει τ[oς συνεδρο]ς κυρώσαι καὶ νομοθετήσαι εἰσαι
dia τούδε τ[ου ψηφίσματοις· Τύχη 'Αγαθὴ τῆν γεροντίαν εἰ-
ς τὸ διηγέσες φυλάσσεσθαι (sic) τῇ ν ἐπὶ τῇ προ]γεγραμμένη εὐσεβεῖα νομοθετῶν ὡς
α]ίνοινόις δὲ τοὺς συνεδρίους εἰσαίε·
φυλάσσ[εω] καὶ ἐπιτελεῖν τὰ π[ερὶ τὰ δείπνα] προσφιλοτιμομένου τοῦ ἐκδίκου ἐσ-
tῇ ν δαπάνην. Τὸν δε —

15 προν ἐως · ὡς · ἐν μὲν τοῖς δὲ [ίστοις λαμ. παδουχε[ξ] γ, ἐν δὲ ταῖς κατακλίσεων
cate ———— τοὺς συνεδρίους μετα-]
λαυβάνειν τῇς εὐωχίας. Εἰ ποτ[ὲ δὲ μὴ παρ]εἰσὶν ἔτεροι πόροι, ἐπὶ ταῖς ὄμοιας
εὐωχίας καὶ θυσίας ἐπιτελεῖ, τὸν δὲ ————
ἀπὸ τοῦ τῶν προσὸδ[ων κολλύβου προσθή]τικον ποιεῖσθαι[α] τοῖς προπόρχουσιν
πῶροι [καὶ τὴν δαπάνην τῆς θυσίας. Τοῖς δὲ πολεί-]
tais διανομᾶς γε[νίεθαι πάσας κατὰ τόδε τὸ] ψήφισμα ἐν τοῖς περὶ τοῦ ναὸν τῆς
Σωτέρας [ας 'Αρτέμιδος οἶκους. 'Εσωράθειν δὲ καὶ]
κατὰ [τὰ προεκκυρωμένα ψηφίσματα ἐκά] του έτους τῆν Σε[β] αστὴν τοῦ δωδεκ[ά] του
μην[δὲ τοὺς πολείτας· ἐν δὲ τοῖς]

20 γε[νεθλίως τοῦ θεοῦ Αὐτοκράτορος, τῶν Ἑθε]σίων γερόντων ἄριθμο[ν μ. ἐτῶν
—————]
Concerning the things which . . . proposes:

In those years at the beginning right after the foundation of the city Lysimachus the king, having acquired supreme authority over the affairs of the city, made an excellent arrangement of all the other things concerning the Mysteries and the sacrifices and concerning our synhedrion with all reverence and love of goodness, and erecting both the temple and the cult statue of Artemis the Savior . . . he ordered that all those who belonged to the synhedrion should receive individually . . . from the common funds of the Gerusia to feast and to sacrifice to the goddess. And after this custom had lasted for a long, long time, it was neglected in later years because of a shortage of funds. Now however since sufficient means have been raised again through Tiberius Claudius Nicomedes, the general advocate of our synhedrion, who has thus furnished an extraordinary example of his good care, the Gerusia has returned to its ancient custom of reverencing and sacrificing both to the guide of our city, divine Artemis, and to our supreme lord and most visible god Imperator Caesar Marcus Aurelius Commodus Antoninus Augustus Pius Felix, the annual sacrifices for his perpetual preservation, so that it is now possible to expend for the banquet a sum not less than . . . Attic drachmas from the funds proclaimed by Nicomedes, and for each one attending to receive the sum for the banquet and one Attic drachma besides out of the munificence of Nicomedes.

Therefore the members have resolved to ratify and to ordain forever through the following decree:
To Good Fortune. That the Gerusia preserve as permanent the legislation in the case of the aforesaid act of reverence. Likewise that the members always preserve and discharge the duties connected with the banquets, toward the expense of which the advocate is munificently making an additional contribution. That the . . . arrange for a torch procession to take place at the banquets and for the members of the synhedrion to share in the feast . . . at the ritual repasts. That if at any time other funds are not available, they carry out the banquets and sacrifices on the same scale, while the . . . supplements the available funds for the expenses of the sacrifice out of the revenue from the exchange. That all distributions to the citizens take place according to this decree in the halls about the temple of the Savior Artemis. That the citizens celebrate each year, in accord with the previously ratified decrees, the Augustan day of the twelfth month, and that on the birthday of the god emperor, among the Ephesian Elders in number no fewer than . . . a distribution by lot ———

(Lacuna of Several Lines)

—— no one having authority, neither archon nor private citizen nor advocate, to alter the articles hereby decreed. Concerning this the whole Gerusia together has put a curse on anyone who tries to alter the arrangements and has decreed that he be indictable on charges both of impiety and of sacrilege. Moreover they have also rendered him indictable on a charge of . . . . That they praise Nicomedes and his sons, and proclaim them patrogerontes. Moreover it has been decreed that the annual . . . on the board, and that <on each occasion> he give the principal, that which has just been discovered, to whomsoever the whole Gerusia together appoint . . . reverence . . .

In the time when . . . was secretary of the Elders.

COMMENTARY

The reference to Commodus as sole emperor dates the inscription between 180 and 192 A.D.

The document contains a decree of the Gerusia, re-establishing old religious festivities which had formerly been celebrated by the Gerusia but which had fallen into disuse through lack of funds. It contains, moreover, specifications regarding the management of the festivities and of the funds which provide for them. By comparing a passage in Strabo (XIV, 1, 20) Ch. Picard has shown that the celebration is that of the Mysteries of Solmissus and Ortygia, for which the reader may consult the same author's work Éphèse et Claros (1922), pp. 287-302. For a reference to the renewal of the Mysteries at this time see also J. Keil, Forschungen in Ephesos, III (1923), p. 144, No. 59, a dedication in honor of a priestess: ἀνανεωσάμενην πάντα τὰ μνητήρια τῆς θεοῦ καὶ καταστήσασαν τῷ ἀρχαίῳ ἔθει.
The restorations are very uncertain. The text is that of Heberdey with the following additions or substitutions: By Picard, line 16, θυσίας ἐπιτελεῖν; line 17, [ἰς τὴν δαπάνην τῆς θυσίας. Τοῖς δὲ πολεῖ] ταῖς; line 18, [Ἀρτέμιδος οἴκους]; line 19, τὰ προκεκυρωμένα ψηφίσματα, and τοὺς πολείτας· ἐν δὲ τοῖς]. By me, line 1, [Περὶ ὅν; line 20, τοῦ θεοῦ Αὐτοκράτορος, τῶν Ἐφε] σίων; line 24, υἱός).

In line 16 the title of the officer who in a shortage was to supply the additional funds constitutes an important matter of interpretation. Heberdey restored hesitantly τὸν ἐπὶ τῶν χρημάτων, who would have been the treasurer of the Gerusia. Although the very existence of this title cannot be proved, Heberdey not unreasonably deduced it from the remains of lines 291 and 293 in No. 3. Picard, on the other hand, restored τὸν γραμματέα τοῦ δήμου, who was not an officer of the Gerusia at all. But the officer, whose title occupied part of the lacuna, might well have been even the secretary of the Gerusia (cf. No. 3, lines 231-238).

With hesitation I have accepted Picard’s restoration πολεῖ] ταῖς in line 18. The noun γερουσιασ] ταῖς deserves consideration as a possibility; but since the analogous words σύνεδρου, γέρωντες, and πρεσβύτεροι all occur in this same inscription, it is a less attractive restoration.

SEPULCHRAL INSCRIPTION


A. Atinnius November
Novellia<e> Pyrallidi
Cojugi suae carissimae
fecit sibi ea

5 Κλαύδια Μάγνα
Tiberiōn Κλαύδιον
Διογνήτου γυνῆ

10 Ὑσ ἄν ταῦτα τὰ γράμματα ἐκκόψῃ ἥ
ματα ἀλλότρων ὡστὰ βάλη
ὑπεύθυνος ἐστώ τῇ

15 γερουσιας καὶ τοῖς ταμίαις τῆς
πόλεως καὶ ὑπὸ 
εἰς ἑσθεν ἐτή λή, μῆνες ὑπάρχουσα

TRANSLATION

Aulus Atinnius November made this for himself and his most dear wife Novella Pyrallis.

Claudia Magna wife of Tiberius Claudius Diognetus for her own mother. Whoever excises these letters or deposits here bones of anyone else shall be liable to the Gerusia for the sum of 250 denarii, and to the treasurers of the city for the sum of 250 denarii. She lived thirty-eight years, two months, four hours.
TIB. CLAUDIUS SECUNDUS


**Age of the Antonines**

Ti. Claudio Secundo

viatori tribunic[io]

accenso velato, lictori curiato, gerusia h[o]

noris caussa — sua [pecunia]

"Η γερουσία ἐτείμησεν

Τι. Κλαυδίον Σεκοῦνδ[ον]

οἰνάτορα τριβούνικ[ην]

ἀκκηρυσον οὐήλατον,

λεῖκτορα κουρίατον,

ἐκ τῶν ἰδίων.

**TRANSLATION**

Out of its own funds the Gerusia has honored Tiberius Claudius Secundus, ‹who has served as› tribune’s apparitor, a lightly covered supernumerary soldier, and a lictor at the curiate assembly.

**BASE FOR THE STATUE OF A GALATIAN**

15. EPHESUS. E. L. Hicks, B.M.I., III (1890), No. 558. W. Dittenberger, Orientis Graeci Inscriptiones Selectae, II (1905), 534.

**Trajanic Period or later**

[−−−−−−−−]ότορα Νήφο

[ντος, τιμηθέντα γ]εροντεία,

[καὶ−−−−−ʼΑδρ]ατόργος

[το κοινὸν τῶν Γ]αλατῶν

[εὐνοίας καὶ] καλοκὰ

[γαθίας ἐνεκα τῇ]ς εἰς

[αὐτό]. vacat

**TRANSLATION**

The League of the Galatians honors . . . otor, son of Nepho, distinguished with the office of Elder, and . . . of Adiatorix, because of their favorable attitude and noble conduct toward it.

**COMMENTARY**

The restoration [τιμηθέντα γ]εροντεία [καὶ] was suggested by Dittenberger; the other restorations are due to the original editor. Dittenberger would date the inscription in the second century after Christ because of the ligature between nu and eta in line 1. This inscription is included in our collection because it was found at Ephesus; but in our opinion it was not the Ephesian Gerusia to which this Galatian belonged.
List of Names


\[-\] Κλαύδιος Θεόφιλος
\[-\] Κλαύδιος Ρούφος
vacat
\[-\] Νουμέριος Γερελλανός
\[-\] ὑψεῖνος καὶ ίερεύς
patroγέρων
vacat
\[-\] Κυρείνας Σατορνείνος φιλορώματος

Commentary

Other names have been added in a later hand. Hicks suggests that it is a list of νεοποιοί and that this or another title may have been inscribed at the top of the stele.

Sepulchral Inscription


Τὸ μνημεῖον ἐστὶ
Ποπλίας Ἐδουλεία<ς> Βηρύλας καὶ
tὰ τέκνα αὐτῆς· ζώσων.
καὶ τοῦ συνβίον αὐτῆς Μενᾶν

10 ἡ γερουσία *καὶ*

Translation

This is the tomb of Publia Julia Beryla and her children (still alive), and of her husband Menander (still alive) and of his son Talus (still alive) and of the latter’s wife Roscilia Eutychia. If anyone sells this tomb, he shall pay to the Gerusia 5,000 denarii.

T. Fl. Asclepiodorus

emperor-loving, volunteer temple-warden, having together with my brother Diodgenes performed the office with public spirit.

To Good Fortune

I thank thee, Lady Artemis, I, Titus Flavius Asclepiodorus, volunteer temple-warden, who have served on the two occasions as ἐσοσήν with piety and public spirit together with Flavia Phoebe my daughter and with Aurelius Epagathus my colleague on the monthly committee, and who have served on the two occasions as chief of the night watch all at my own expense, and who am a regular member of the emperor-loving Gerusia, a citizen of the tribe Antoniana and of the Thousand of the Paianieis.

COMMENTARY

The annually elected temple-wardens, as Oikonomos explains, formed a board, two members of which assumed charge each month and were called σύμμηνοι.

The two ἐσοσηνία represent, according to Picard and to the Greek-English Lexicon, two terms in the office of ἐσοσήν. According to Oikonomos, on the other hand, they represent two familiar occasions on which the person who for that year undertook the liturgy would be called upon to undertake much trouble and expense. The latter explanation seems to me obviously preferable. At this period the ἐσοσήνες, who by Pausanias (VIII, 13, 1) are called ἰστιάτορες, were chiefly managers of the commissariat at the festival of the Artemision, and there appear to have been two great festivals, one in the month Thargelion and one in the month Artemision.⁹ In

⁹ Oikonomos would admit another explanation of the two ἐσοσηνία. One ἐσοσηνία may have pertained to Artemis, and the other to the emperor. Compare No. 12. This I find a less satisfactory explanation.
the same manner Oikonomos explains the phrase αἱ δύο νυκτοφυλακαί. The incumbent of the office had to provide for the maintenance of order at the nocturnal celebrations of the two great festivals. Asclepiodorus, therefore, had undertaken along with the office of temple-warden two closely associated liturgies.

In lines 22-23 Oikonomos emended the name of the tribe to read Ἀντωνίου, but see No. 46, line 56.

Lines 1-7 probably contain the conclusion of another thank-offering, whether or not by Asclepiodorus.

**Favonia Flacilla**


Φαβωνία Φλάκκυλλα πρύτανις καὶ γυμνασίαρχος, ἢ ἀρχιέρεια εὐχαριστῶ νας. Ἑτσία Βουλαία καὶ Δήμητρι καὶ Δήμητρος κόρη καὶ Πυρὶ ἀφθάρτῳ καὶ Ἀπόλλωνι Κλαρίῳ καὶ Σώπολι καὶ πᾶσιν τοῖς θεοῖς, _DLL_

5 ὀλοκληρώσατόν με μετὰ τού συμβίον μου Ἀκακίου καὶ τῶν τέκνων μου καὶ τῶν ἀνθρώπων μου τὸν ἐναντίον ἐκτελέσασαν τὰ μυστήρια πάντα εὐπανχώς ἀποκατέστησαν. Οἴδε ἐκουρήθησαν·

10 Εὐάνδρις γεροντιστής,

Περγείνης φιλοσέβ(αστος), γραμματεύς,

Ἀμνιτῖανὸς φιλοσέβ(αστος), Φάβ(ιος) Κυριακὸς ἐστιούχος,

Φαβ(η) Ζωσίμη(ν) καλαθηφόρος,

μαντηλάριοι: Δαμώ, Πρείσκυλλα,

15 Νουκείχις, Δουκιανή. Εὐπανχώς.

**TRANSLATION**

I, Favonia Flacilla, prytanis and gymnasiarch, the high priestess, render thanks to Hestia of the Council and to Demeter and to Demeter’s daughter and to Everlasting Fire and to Clarian Apollo and to Sopolis and to all the gods, because happily they restored me safe and sound with my husband Acacius and my children and my people after I had performed all the mysteries for a year.

M. AUR. AGATHOPUS


Second or Third Century after Christ

![Inscription Image](image-url)

TRANSLATION

--- while ... Saturninus was sacred herald, ... of the Elders, ---

To Good Fortune. I, Marcus Aurelius Agathopus, give thanks to the god and to our Lady, the Savior, and to the Fortune of the Gerusia, that I have kept faith to the Gerusia, together with all my people, while I was secretary and gymnasiarch.

Farewell.

COMMENTARY

As Hicks points out, the fact that the inscription was found in the Theatre suggests that the god mentioned in line 6 was Dionysus. The chief officer of the Gerusia is the gymnasiarch. Picard remarks that the inscription does not prove that Agathopus had been gymnasiarch of the Gerusia at Ephesus. But it must refer to the Ephesian Gerusia because the stone came from Ephesus and the text gives the reader no indication that it was not the important local institution. Marcus Aurelius Agathopus is known from another inscription, *B.M.I.*, III, No. 596, a dedication: ['Αρτέμιδι] ἔπηκὼ, καὶ [τοίς Σεβαστοῖς] | καὶ τῇ τύχῃ τῆς πόλεως, διὸ τί θρέψας ἔμων Μ. Ἄυρ. ['Αγαθόπονος ὁ πρῶτος εὐσεβεῖς καὶ τῇ συμβίω ὥστε καὶ ἔκγονος καὶ ἔστησεν ἱπτησίας.

M. AUR. ARTEMIDORUS

TRANSLATION

To Good Fortune. The son of Attalus, Marcus Aurelius Artemidorus, emperor-loving Elder, temple-warden, upright agoranome, honored minister. And the son of Artemidorus, Marcus Aurelius . . ., himself Elder like his father, temple-warden, . . ., Olympic victor . .

FROM THE IOBACCHI INSCRIPTION

22. ATHENS. The inscription is most conveniently accessible in S.I.G.3, 1109, and is dated shortly before 178 A.D. For a translation and further references see M. N. Tod, Sidelights on Greek History (Oxford, 1932), pp. 85-96.

TRANSLATION

Whoever of the Iobacchi receives a legacy or a distinction or a command shall entertain the Iobacchi with a drink-offering worthy of the event, i.e., a wedding, a birth, presentation of a child at the Choes festival, a son’s enrollment among the ephebes, grant of citizenship, appointment as wand-bearer, appointment as councillor, presidency of the games, appointment as Panhellene, appointment as Elder, appointment as thesmothete, appointment to any magistracy, appointment to a college of sacrificers, appointment as police-magistrate, recognition as victor in the sacred games, and whatever happens to make one a more important Iobacchus.
I presume that the word ἐφηβείας refers to an ἐφηβεία in the member’s family, just as the word γεννήσεως refers, not to the member’s own birth, but to that of his child.

MEMMIUS


177-180 A.D.

Ἡ πόλις
Δ · Μέμμιον ἐπὶ βωμῷ Θορίκουν
τὸν ἀπὸ δαδούχων καὶ ἄρχωντων
καὶ στρατηγῶν καὶ ἀγωνοθετῶν,
5 τὸν καὶ αὐτὸν μετὰ τῶν ἀλλῶν ἄρχων
καὶ λιτουργῶν· ἀρξάντα τὴν ἐπώ
νυμον ἁρχήν καὶ στρατηγὸν ἐπὶ τὰ
ὅπλα καὶ ἐπιμελητὴν γυμνασιαρχίας
θεοῦ Ἀδριανοῦ καὶ ἀγωνοθέτην τρίς,
10 προσβεβητὴν τε πολλάκις περὶ τῶν με
γίστων: ἐν οἷς καὶ περὶ γερουσίας μὴ
σαίντα παρόντος θεοῦ Ἀδριανοῦ,
μνῆσαι ταῦτα θεοῦ Δούκιον Οὐήρον
Ἀρμενιακὸν Παρθικόν καὶ αὐτοκράτορας
15 Μ · Αὐρήλιον Ἀντωνίνου καὶ Μ · Αὐρήλιον
Κόμμῳδον Γερμανικὸς Σαρματικοῦς,
[λ]ιτουργήσαντα τοῦθεοῦ ἐτέσι ΝΦ, τὸν
[ἀ]πὸ ἁρχιερέων τὸν φιλόπατρον.

TRANSLATION

The city honors Lucius Memmius of the deme Thoricus, Priest at the Altar, descended from Torch-bearers, archons, strategi, and agonothetes, and himself, with the other offices and liturgies, having served as eponymous archon and as hoplite general and as epimelete of the deified Hadrian’s gymnasiarchy and thrice as agonothete and frequently as ambassador on the most important missions, among which was also that concerning a gerusia; having initiated in the presence of the deified Hadrian; having initiated the deified Lucius Verus Armeniacus Parthicus and the emperors Marcus Aurelius Antoninus and Marcus Aurelius Commodus Germanici Sarmatici; having served as minister to the two goddesses for fifty-six years; the ex-high-priest; the patriot.
Graindor explains the phrase "epimelete of the deified Hadrian's gymnasiarchy" in the following manner. The emperor Hadrian apparently left an endowment to take care of the gymnasiarchy in those years when no one rich enough was found to assume the expense of the office. When the cost was defrayed out of the revenue provided by Hadrian, the incumbent was known as the epimelete.

**The First Stele with Imperial Letters**

24. Athens. The pedimental top, some fragments without edge, and a large piece from the left side of this plaque of Pentelic marble have been preserved. The original height of the plaque is unknown, but my restoration calls for an original width of about 0.91 m. The thickness varies between 0.06 m. (at the left edge) and 0.072 m. (somewhat to the left of a vertical axis through the exact center). The letters in the body of the inscription are 0.007 m., and those on the pedimental top are 0.008 m. high. The back has a rough finish, and the fragment from the left side exhibits a margin 0.035 m. wide upon which the first letter of each epistle and of each preamble encroaches.

Of these fragments E. M. 9495 was first published in the year 1878 by Dittenberger as I.G., III, Add., 39a from a copy by F. von Duhn. In 1916 Kirchner re-edited this fragment as I.G., II², 1108 with some not very fortunate restorations by A. von Premerstein. Four pieces from the Agora, namely, those with inventory numbers I 64a, I 60, I 10a, I 27, were published by B. D. Meritt (Hesperia, II [1933], pp. 165-169), who pointed out their connection with E. M. 9495. The rest of the fragments are here presented for the first time.

For the sake of clarity I re-letter all the disconnected pieces.

Fragment a. The pedimental top is broken away below. It was found in the excavations of the Agora on May 25, 1933 in the walls of a late pit in Section Z.

Height, 0.205 m.; width, 0.36 m.

The gable is surmounted by an acroterion; in the middle of the pediment is still preserved the upper half of an inscribed circle with a diameter of 0.13 m. The attribution to I.G., II², 1108 despite the difference in the height of the letters (v. supra) seems warranted because this fragment exhibits the same quality of Pentelic marble, the same working of the back, the same gritty finish of the inscribed surface, and the same peculiarity whereby the thickest part of the stone falls not along a line at center from top to bottom of the plaque, but somewhat to the left of center.

Fragment b. To make up this piece five fragments join as one, which is broken away above, below and at the right, but which preserves the left edge.

Height, 0.66 m.; width, 0.535 m.

The constituent parts are as follows: E. M. 9495 (the original I.G., II², 1108) found on the South Slope of the Acropolis; Agora Inv. No. I 64, consisting of two pieces of which the first was found on July 5, 1931 in a Late Roman fill of Section E and published by Meritt, loc. cit., and the second of which, a large unpublished piece from the left edge, was found on March 18, 1934 in a Byzantine wall of Section Θ; Agora Inv. No. I 815, consisting of two pieces found on May 16, 1933 in Section Z, one in a late fill and the other in a modern foundation, both unpublished.

Fragment c. The back is preserved, but the stone is broken away on all sides. It was found in the excavations of the Agora on July 13, 1931 in a Late Roman fill in Section E.

Height, 0.26 m.; width, 0.19 m.
Inv. No. I 60 (＝ Meritt, fragment b) .
Fragment d. The back and the left side are preserved, but the stone is broken away above, below, and at the right. It was found in the excavations of the Agora on December 8, 1935 in a modern house in Section T.

Height, 0.184 m.; width, 0.173 m.

Fragment e. This piece is broken away at the back and on all sides. It was found in the excavations of the Agora on June 4, 1931 in Section E.

Height, 0.17 m.; width, 0.115 m.
Inv. No. I 10a (= Meritt, fragment e).

Fragment f. This piece is broken away at the back and on all sides. It was found in the excavations of the Agora on June 12, 1931 in Section A.

Height, 0.06 m.; width, 0.06 m.
Inv. No. I 27 (= Meritt, fragment d).

No. 24. Fragment a

'Επώνυμος
Κλ δαδούχος,
Κλ Λεωνίδου
[ἀρχοντος τὸ]
5 [τῆς ιερᾶς]
[γεροντίας]

About four lines missing
Διώκτης Καὶ [ἵσαρ θεοῦ Ἀντωνίνου Εὐσεβείου ύσς, θεοῦ Οὐήρου Παρθικοῦ ἀδελφός, θεοῦ Ἀδριανοῦ νυνός, θεοῦ Τραϊανοῦ]

Παρθικοῦ ἔγγος, θεοῦ Νέρονα ἄπογονος, Μάρκος Αὐρήλιος Ἀντωνίνος Σεβαστὸς Γερμανικὸς Σαρματικός, ἄρχιερεὺς]

10 

μέγιστος, δημαρχικής κῆς ἐξ' ο[ν]ισία τὸ --, αὐτοκράτωρ τὸ --, ὑπατὸς τὸ ἴγ', πατὴρ πατρίδος· καὶ Αὐτοκράτωρ Καῖσαρ Δούκις Αὐρήλιος]

Κόμμοδος Σεβαστὸς Αὐτοκράτορος Ἀ[ντωνίνος Σεβαστὸς ύσς, θεοῦ Εὐσεβείου νυνός, θεοῦ Ἀδριανοῦ ἔγγονος, θεοῦ Τραϊανοῦ Παρβῆ]

καὶ θεοῦ Νέρονα ἄπογονος, Γερμανικὸς Σαρματικός, δημαρχικής ἔξουσίας τὸ --, αὐτο-

κράτωρ τὸ --, ὑπατὸς τὸ --, πατὴρ πατρίδος,

ἀνθύπατος, Ἀθηναίων γερουσία vacat [χαίρειν vacat]

Περὶ μὲν τῶν τὴν ὑλὴν ἐκκό [πα]τον ἐκ τῶν χωρ [ yahoo -- ] υπατὸς τὸ ἴγ', πατὴρ πατρίδος· καὶ Αὐτοκράτωρ Καῖ-

σαρ Δούκις [Αὐρήλιος Κόμμοδος Σεβαστὸς, Ἀὐτό]

κράτορος Ἀντωνίνος νοῦ Σεβαστὸς ύσς, θεοῦ Εὐσεβείου νυνός, θεοῦ Ἀδριανοῦ ἔγγονος, θεοῦ Τραϊανοῦ Παρβῆ καὶ θεοῦ Νέρονα ἄπογονος.

γονος, Γερμανικὸς Σα [ῥμ] ατικός, δημα[ρχικής ἔξουσίας] ο[φ] τὸ [ό δ', αὐτοκράτωρ τὸ β', ὑπατὸς τὸ β', πατὴρ πατρίδος, ἀνθύπατος, Ἀθη]

ναών γερουσία vacat χαίρειν vacat

30 Ἡσθήμεν τοῖς γ[ρ] ἀμμα [ς] ὑμῶν ἐνυχώντες, ἐπεὶ καὶ τοῖς ἀ[-------------] ἀνάδρον επὶ τὴν τῶν [-------------]

περ ἐωνήμεθα τῷ σὺ [ν] ἐδρίσ φρός τὴν χορηγίαν τῶν διανο [μο], [-------------] [-------------] α 

diastάχατοι ἐπεστειλαμ [εν -- - εί]

χρήν προσείσθη " τὰς μὲν ὅπως ἔκοψας ἃς ἠμῶν τ' αὐτόν καὶ [τῶν ἠμῶν γυναικῶν] ν ποιήσασα 

θαι βεβούλησθε χ[ρυσάς ἤ ἀργυράς, ἦ] 

tε μάλιστ' ε[πι] τῆς ἠμὲν [τὰ] ἔρα γνώμης συνιέντες βουλέθε χα [λαίσ εἰκόνων ἄρκεί] σθαι, 

δῆλον δ' ὡς ποιήσατο ἀ[νδριάντοις οἴους]
κοινότε[ρο]ν οἱ πολλο[ί] προτομασια καλοῦντον, καὶ συνιμέτρουσεν [αὐτὰς ἐκτελέστετε τὰς τέταρτας ἄρσες ὡς ράδιον εἴ[ναι ἐν ταῖς ἀπορταῖς]


δὲ ἐπὶ τούτοις ἐναι τὸ [ἐπί] στῆμα τῶν ἡμετέρων ὄνομάτων [τῆς εἰς ἡμᾶς εὐνοίας ἔνεκα προσεύμενα, ἥδεω [σ ἀποδεχόμενοι τοι]

αὐτ’ ἀλλὰ τὰ θεία) καὶ τὰ δο[κ]οῦντα ἐπίθεσθαν ὑκνιτεῖτε ἐν ἀπ [ασι καιροίς· διὸ καὶ νῦν ὑμεῖν εὐγνωμόνως ἐμ[παινίζομεν πονήσα]


40 [Ἀντοκράτωρ Καίσαρ, θε[οῦ Ἀ]οιονίνον ὕσ, θεοῦ Οὐήρου Παρθικο[ῦ Μεγίστου ἄδειφό]ς, θεοῦ Τραίανοῦ Π[αρθικοῦ έγγονος, θεοῦ Νέρουα]


[_, αὐτοκράτωρ τὸ] δὲ[κατον], ὅπατος τὸ ὑγ', πατὴρ πατρίδος, [ἀνθυπατος· καὶ Ἀυτο-κ]ράτωρ Καίσ[αρ Λούκιος Αὐρήλιος Κόμμοδος]

[Σεβαστός, Αὐτοκράτορος 'Αν]τωνίνον Σεβαστοῦ ὕσ, θεο[ῦ Εὐσεβείου νιόνος, θεοῦ Ὠ]μίανο[ῦ έγγονος, θεοῦ Τραίανοῦ Παρθικοῦ καὶ]

[θεοῦ Νέρουα ἀπόγονος, Γερμανικ[ὸς Σαρματι[κὸς, δημ]αρχικής εξουσίας τὸ ὑγ', αὐτο]κράτωρ τῷ ὑγ', ὅπατος τὸ βη', πατηρ πατρίδος, ἀνθύ]

45 [πατος, ---------------] vacat χαίρειν vacat

[---------------]υτο, προσέστω δὲ ὃ τῆς γεροντίας ---------------]

[---------------]ν δὲ παράδειγμα τῶν Ὀθηρα [ὑμών ---------------]

[---------------]ε, χρήσιθω δὲ ἐσήπτη λευκῇ εὖ[---------------]

[---------------]ς νεομιμητέραις ἡμέρας κ[---------------]

[---------------]φορούσιν υμεῖν οἱ γέροντες τ[---------------]

[---------------]τῶν ἐν] τῇ πόλει βο[ὐλευθερών ἐτ[---------------]

[---------------]ω καὶ προσκεκάμενο[ς [---------------]

[---------------]το]ὺς νόμους καὶ ἄν διο[---------------]

[---------------]τῷ γενησεμένῳ λο[γιστῇ] ---------------]

[---------------]νεκος ἐπειδή κ[---------------]

[---------------]ω πυθανο[---------------]

[---------------]σιων πρ[---------------]

[---------------]σειτ[---------------]

[---------------]γράφε[ψ] ---------------]

[---------------]ειταβ[---------------]

[---------------]ντα[---------------]

[---------------]---] ---------------]

lacuna
The inscription contains a series of imperial letters. The first step toward an interpretation consists in locating the various fragments in respect to each other. The position of fragment c, which has part of the imperial titles of a preamble to an epistle both at the top and at the bottom, constitutes the main problem. Meritt formerly located it in respect to I 64 sixteen lines higher than I have done. But that involved him in really insurmountable difficulties with the restoration of the imperial titles; and as to the content of the letter below his first preamble, he was unable to establish any connection between the two pieces which he placed as parts of one continuous text. Meritt arranged the two pieces I 64 and I 60 (my fragment c) as if they contained parts of the preamble and text of the same letter, chiefly because in each case he had
an epistle of ten lines of text below the imperial titles of a similar preamble. With the
discovery of new pieces, however, we have one more epistle with ten lines of text
below the imperial titles of a preamble, and we are therefore invited to assign fragment
c to a later epistle by locating fragment c sixteen lines below the position assigned
to it by Meritt. By so doing we can, I believe, establish in regard to the body of the
letter a connection of sense between fragment c and its new companion in a horizontal
plane; and furthermore, a continuous line of cleavage, which the reader must examine
in the photograph (see p. 110), greatly corroborates our assignment of fragment c
to the new position.

On the other hand, it must be admitted that the difficulties with the restoration of
the imperial titles have not all been resolved merely through the new arrangement.
Examining the first preamble of which part is preserved on fragment c, we find that
the new arrangement clears up all the difficulties in four lines, but that in one line the
restoration is perfectly adapted to the space only when we assume that the reference to
Hadrian among the ancestors of Marcus Aurelius (βεβο̱δ 'Αδριανο̱ν νίσονός) has been
omitted through somebody's error. This hypothesis is not really bold, for the space
occupied by ten letters in one line closely approximates the space occupied by ten
letters in another, and therefore a comparison between the preserved letters of this
preamble and the preserved letters of the preamble to the preceding epistle actually
reveal that a whole phrase must have fallen out of the first line of the preamble here
under immediate consideration. Examining the second preamble of which part has
been preserved on fragment c, we find that the new arrangement clears up many diffi-
culties, but that again we must assume that the reference to Hadrian among the
ancestors of Marcus Aurelius has been omitted through somebody's error. Besides,
two consecutive lines of this preamble appear to be three or four letters short at the
right side of the stone. We can perhaps explain away this anomaly by assuming that
the lines were here shortened by the presence of some decorative feature such as the
leaf which the reader may see on a stone from the third century after Christ in the

In recapitulation, the view here taken is that the continuous line of cleavage and
the connection of sense from one fragment to the other determine as correct, despite
certain minor irregularities, the new position which we have assigned to fragment c,
even as against a position somewhere in the lost portion below. On this assumption
we make our calculations as to the width of the stone (0.91 m.) and as to the distance
which separates the top of the plaque from the rest of the main fragments. The piece
from the top, fragment a, carries part of a circle which must be either tangent to or
not far above the horizontal line dividing the pediment from the rest of the plaque.
Viewed architecturally, the monument is a type of inscription common in the second
and third centuries after Christ, particularly familiar from the series of ephebic
catalogues. P. Graindor, *Album des inscriptions attiques de l'époque imperiale* (Ghent,
(1924), Plate XL, publishes a photograph of a similar but less elegantly engraved monument containing a letter of Hadrian to the Athenians.

Only about four lines of text seem to have been lost at the top of the plaque below the pediment. Because four or five lines could scarcely have accommodated another imperial letter and because the lettering in line 7 appears to be slightly larger than that below, we may assume that a preamble to the whole series rather than another epistle occupied the opening lines. Accordingly, we refer to the epistle which begins in line 8 as the first Letter of the document. A second Letter begins in line 24 and a third in line 40. The first two are addressed to the Gerusia itself while the third concerns it.

The position of fragments d, e, and f cannot be determined. It is not uncommon for a stele to be about twice as high as it is wide, and if it had been so in this case, almost half of the original inscription would have fallen below the section which ends with fragment c.

The circle at the top of the inscription contained an acknowledgment to the eponymus (see pages 3 and 44) and in the genitive a dating by the contemporary officer of the Gerusia, who was either the archon or the secretary. From a genealogical tree which Kirchner drew up in the commentary to I.G., II², 3609, it appears that Claudius Leonides was the uncle or else a previously unreported relative, but not the father, of Claudius the daduchus, and that they belonged to a family for generations most active in the public and religious life of Athens.

The chronological problems of the inscription have been discussed above on pages 2-3, the relation between the imperial procurator (ἐπιρρόπος) and the Gerusia has been considered on pages 44-46, and the λογιστής, who appears to be mentioned in lines 23 and 52-54, has already occupied our attention on pages 44-47.

The second letter, the only one preserved to any adequate degree, constitutes an imperial rescript concerning questions raised in an epistle from the Gerusia, as the opening words reveal. The reply begins graciously: Ἡσθημεν τοῖς γ[ρ]άμμα[σ]ιν ἰμὸν ἐντυχόντως. This introductory phrase, accompanied by a reference to one matter set forth in the original letter of the Gerusia, parallels the Latin expression, libenter cognovi litteris vestris.¹⁰

¹⁰ The following examples of the formula are taken from the letters of Trajan to Pliny:

36: Et solvisse vos cum provincialibus dis immortalibus vota pro mea salute et nuncupasse, libenter, mi Secunde carissime, cognovi ex litteris tuis.
36: Quanta religione et laetitia commilitones cum provincialibus te praeuente diem imperii mei celebraverint, libenter, mi Secunde carissime, cognovi litteris tuis.
101: Solvisse vota dis immortalibus te praeuente pro mea incolumitate commilitones cum provincialibus laetissimo consensu et in futurum nuncupasse, libenter, mi Secunde carissime, cognovi litteris tuis.
103: Diem imperii mei debita laetitia et religione commilitonibus et provincialibus praeuente te celebratum, libenter cognovi litteris tuis.
The first paragraph of Letter II concerns the donations to be distributed and ends with the vacant space after the word προσέγραψε in line 31. A second paragraph begins with the words τὰς μὲν οὖν εἰκόνας and concerns the images which the Elders have offered to the emperors. It appears from line 32 that there is a choice between one type of images and another. If we make the rather inviting restoration χα[λκαῖς εἰκόσιν ὀρκεῖ]σθαι, the choice is chiefly one of material, and is settled presumably in line 37. Not only does the restoration χ[ρυσᾶς ἦ ἄργυρᾶς] conform well to the preserved text and fit the size of the lacuna at the end of line 31, but the tone of the whole reply strongly confirms it.

As interpreted and restored by me, accordingly, the passage reads as follows:

"Then in regard to the images which you have wanted to make of ourselves and of our consorts in gold or silver, or best of all, if understanding from our own proposal, you are willing to content yourselves with images of bronze, it is clear that you will make statues such as the many more commonly call ψυχαῖς (busts), and you will execute them on a moderate scale, the four of equal size, so that it will be easy on your holidays at every gathering to transport them wherever you may wish on every occasion, as for example to the popular assemblies. And as for the bases, we permit the placing of our names upon these because of your good will toward us, for we gladly accept such honors but on all occasions we avoid the divine and those which seem to provoke envy. Therefore, also now we gratefully instruct you to make only bronze images, that this would be more pleasing to us. As for the other persons, Caelius Quadratus our procurator, who is being instructed by them, will inform you of their decision."

The question whether the emperors will accept statues in precious metals appears in our records repeatedly, because acceptance of gold statues, which from Hellenistic times had belonged essentially among the ἱεροτοι τιμαί, was tantamount to an acceptance of divine honors. Consequently, as Scott has pointed out, almost every Roman emperor of the first two centuries had felt himself called upon, at one time or another, to define a policy and to state publicly whether he would forbid or permit portraits of himself in precious metals. With the exception of the four tyrants, Caligula, Nero, Domitian and Commodus, none permitted gold statues. A few silver images erected in an emperor's lifetime are recorded in the documents, but silver statues shared the connotation of the gold ones, and with the exception of the four tyrants the emperors of the first two centuries preferred to avoid them.

The reference to the transportation of images (line 35) becomes more readily intelligible when we compare the donation which Vibius Salutaris made at Ephesus (104 A.D.). In one of the decrees of this long document (No. 3, lines 419-425) the

---

11 Faustina had already died in 176, but she continued to be honored after her death.
Ephesian Council ordains that “it be permitted to the χρυσοφοροῦντες [to carry] from the first room of Artemis to the assembly meetings (ἐκκλησίαι) and to the games the type-statues (ἀπεικονισματα) and the images (ἰκόνες) which have been dedicated by Gaius Vibius Salutaris, that also the νεοτοι shall associate themselves in this charge, that the ephebes, too, shall join in transporting the images from the Magnesian Gate and shall escort the procession as far as the Coressian Gate.” References to the procession occur in the inscription also in other places where the text is not so well preserved.  

At lines 30-31 in the rescript after the word προσείμεθα the emperors formulate in a phrase their general policy in regard to honors. We can restore the meaning. We remember that Claudius accepted with pleasure (ἡδέως προσεδέξάμην) reasonable honors from the Alexandrians, but he rejected the excessive.  

This is the imperial policy which would have been followed by Marcus Aurelius. Furthermore, Claudius deprecated the appointment of a high-priest to him and the erection of temples with the remark, “I do not wish to be offensive to my contemporaries and I hold that sacred fanes and the like have by all ages been attributed only to the gods as peculiar honors.” Excessive honors are proper for the gods alone and they provoke hostility when they are given to men. Excessive honors, in other words, are θεία καὶ ἐπίφθονα. In the beginning of line 31 of our document, after we restore the necessary adversative, the lacuna becomes very small indeed, and it is filled exactly by the restoration τὰ θεία.

The wording [θεία] καὶ ἐπίφθονα δο[κ]ντα of the rescript to the Gerusia recalls strikingly the phrase in the edict 16 where Germanicus after his political error in

13 In the theatre, where the popular assembly met at Ephesus, special places were reserved for these images, which made an important contribution to the solemnity of the occasion. It is decreed (lines 468-469) that one “be placed at every regular assembly meeting above the bench where the παιδες sit,” and (lines 475-477) that another “be placed at every regular assembly meeting [above the] bench where the ἱερονείκου sit.” Likewise in lines 157-158 it is stipulated that certain of them are “to be placed during the assembly meetings above the bench of the Council together with the gold statue of Artemis and the other images.”

In a much mutilated passage (lines 202-209), which on the analogy of parallel passages can be restored with some confidence, it is stipulated that the ἀπεικονισματα are to be placed upon “the nine bases (θ βάσεως) which are inscribed and [arranged] according to rows,” and that when the assembly meetings are over, the statues and images are to be returned to the sanctuary of Artemis. Of these nine bases eight have actually been found in the theatre at Ephesus, and one also for the supplementary donation. They are published in the Forschungen in Ephesos, II, no. 28. As No. 4 we have reprinted the text of the first of these. Each base recorded that C. Vibius Salutaris had had the images made, ita ut omni ecclesia supra bases ponerentur.


15 The policy began with Augustus as was recognized by L. R. Taylor, Transactions of the American Philological Association, LX, 1929, pp. 87-101.

distributing the grain at Alexandria deprecates the divine acclamations of the populace: τὴν μὲν ἑννοιαν ὑμῶν, ἦν αἰεὶ ἐπιθείκνυσθε ὅταν με [ε]ἰδητε, ἀποδέχομαι, τὰς δὲ ἐπιφθόνους ἐμοὶ καὶ ἱσόθενες ἐκφωνήσεις εὖ <ἀ>παντὸς παρατούμαι, κτλ. Excessive honors are ἵσοθεν καὶ ἐπιφθόνα. In his article on the Germanicus papyrus U. Wilcken has cited another parallel from Pseudo-Callisthenes, II, 22, 12. Rhodogune and Stateira have written to Alexander that they had planned divine honors for him. Alexander replies: 17 παρατούμαι τὰς ἱσόθενες τιμάς· ἵσω γὰρ ἄνθρωπος φθαρτὸς γεγένημαι καὶ εὐλαβοῦμαι τὸ τουτόν· κἀκεῖνον γὰρ φέρει τὸν περὶ ψυχῆς. ἐπαινῶ δὲ καὶ δέχομαι ὑμῶν τὸ φρόνημα, κτλ.

The same reserve and an intimation of the same motives appear in the answer of Tiberius to the Gytheates who had offered divine honors to Livia and to him. "Decimus Turranius Nicanor," replied Tiberius, "sent by you as ambassador to me and to my mother, delivered your letter in which were recorded the laws which you have passed for worship of my father and for honor to us. I commend you for these things. I presume that it is fitting both for all mankind in general and for your city in particular to maintain divine honors in return for the greatness of my father’s benefactions to the whole world. But I myself am content with more moderate (μετρωτέραις) and human (ἁνθρωπείοις) honors. As for my mother, she will reply to you when she learns from you what decision you have made concerning the honors to her." Although opinions may differ as to the sincerity of the emperor’s protestations, it cannot be denied that his words revealed the feeling that the honors decreed by the Gytheates were θεία καὶ ἐπίφθονα, and that, as such, these honors ought to be refused by the emperor. He does not actually say that he will not accept them because he has established for himself a general rule never to accept the θεία and ἐπίφθονα, but he does say that he will rest content with the ἁνθρωπεία and μετρωτέρα. The expression employed by Tiberius lacks the force of the other and may not have convinced the Gytheates, who, as some would deduce from the rest of the inscription at Gythium, promptly associated him with Livia and Augustus and treated him as a god, but it amounts to the same thing.

The tone, however, in which Marcus Aurelius and Commodus discuss the proposed honors is both sincere and exact. They state precisely what they will gratefully accept and what they do not want generally. This is the policy which we meet in the pp. 48-65 has contributed a most important discussion of the passage here quoted from the second edict. The whole terminology has just been restudied by M. P. Charlesworth, "The Refusal of Divine Honours, an Augustan Formula," Papers of the British School at Rome, XV, 1939, pp. 1-10, where I find one more parallel (not however from an emperor), I.G.R.R., IV, 1302: τὰς μὲν ἐπιφθόνους καὶ θείας καὶ τοὺς ἱσόθενες ἐκφωνήσεις . . . τείμαν παρατίθεμα.

17 Historia Alexandri Magni (W. Kroll’s edition, 1926), I, p. 97. On this passage compare M. P. Charlesworth, Papers of the British School at Rome, XV, 1939, pp. 7 f. The Alexander Romance is usually dated to the second century of our era, and it attributes to Alexander something that he of course never said.
famous letter of Claudius to the Alexandrians. Claudius thanked them for the honors which they had offered him, enumerated each honor one after the other, and in each case he said whether he accepted it or rejected it. The divine honors he deprecated. He gave exact instructions that a gold statue of the Pax Augusta Claudiana be rededicated to the goddess Roma. The Alexandrians, therefore, knew clearly on the basis of this unambiguous, sincere refusal, and they acquiesced. The Athenians, too, are left in no doubt, nor do we hear that they have made any gold images of Marcus Aurelius. But as Tiberius left it to Livia to make her own reply in regard to the honors offered to her, so here the emperors speak only for themselves and for their consorts.

Not only modesty suggested the advice in regard to the bronze προτοραλι. Consideration also for the strained finances of the municipalities probably contributed to a development of the attitude expressed in the imperial rescript, for by enabling the Athenians to employ these convenient busts and to transport them wherever needed, the emperors relieved them of the obligation to erect a number of costly statues. Marcus Aurelius, indeed, seems to have been particularly anxious to alleviate the financial burdens which custom imposed upon the cities in the form of an excessive outlay for honors, spectacles, and other luxuries. An inscription of 176/7 A.D., from Italica in Baetica reveals the beneficent intervention of the emperors to reduce the sums expended on gladiatorial exhibitions. The fiscus renounced its share of the proceeds, and the municipalities themselves curtailed the allotment. The orator, whose speech is recorded in the latter inscription, thanks the emperors, qui salutaribus remedis, fisci ratione post habita, labentem civitatum statum et praecipitantes iam in ruinas principalium viorum fortuna(s) restituerunt.

In regard to the honors offered by the provincials the moderate and considerate policy of the older emperor, as we meet it again in this letter, to the Athenian Elders, offers a striking contrast to the attitude which his son displayed in the next few years. Commodus like Caligula, Nero and Domitian, aspired to divine honors in his own lifetime, accepted gold images and delighted in τα δοκούντα ἐπίφθονα, so emphatically rejected in this very letter. His association in the title lends a note of irony.

Not long afterwards Dio Cassius writing his Roman history with the reigns of Marcus Aurelius and Commodus still fresh in his mind, could look back over the first two centuries of the principate. It is interesting to consider a rhetorical speech which he put in the mouth of Maecenas. The latter is urging Octavian to accept the
empire but advises him to refuse with it unusual honors. "You must," he says, "depend upon your good deeds to provide for you any additional splendour. And you should never permit gold or silver images of yourself to be made, for they are not only costly but also invite destruction and last only a brief time; but rather by your benefactions fashion other images in the hearts of your people, images which will never tarnish or perish. Neither should you ever permit the raising of a temple to you; for the expenditure of vast sums of money on such objects is sheer waste. This money would better be used for necessary objects; for wealth which is really wealth is gathered, not so much by getting largely as by saving largely. Then, again, from temples comes no enhancement of one's glory. For it is ἀπερή that raises many men to the level of the gods, and no man ever became a god by popular vote. Hence if you are upright as a man and honourable as a ruler, the whole earth will be your hallowed precinct, all cities your temples, and all men your statues, since within their thoughts you will ever be enshrined and glorified." 22

THE SECOND STELE WITH AN IMPERIAL LETTER

25. ATHENS. This inscription, previously unpublished, consists of two fragments of Pentelic marble. Fragment a is broken away all around and at the back. It is now in the Epigraphical Museum at Athens and bears the inventory number E. M. 2763. The catalogue records that it was brought from the Acropolis Museum. Ten letters horizontally occupy the same space on this fragment as ten letters horizontally do on No. 24. Moreover, the height and character of the letters are the same as on No. 24 and the titles of Commodus are most easily restored with a line of about 100 letters as on No. 24. Thirteen lines of this fragment, however, occupy the space of fifteen lines of No. 24.

a: Height, 0.24 m.; width, 0.177 m.; thickness, 0.065 m.
   Height of Letters, 0.007 m.

A second small fragment, broken away above, below and at the sides, but preserving part of the back, was found June 14, 1933 in a late fill in Section Z of the American excavations of the Agora.

b: Height, 0.17 m.; width, 0.12 m.; thickness, 0.086 m.
   Height of letters, 0.007 m.
   Inv. No. I 964.


COMMENTARY

The few remains of lines 1 and 2, of which I have restored exempli gratia merely enough to indicate the character, belong to the imperial titles of Commodus. The remains of line 2 lend themselves to the restoration Σα]ρμα[τικός as well as Γε]-ρμα[νικός. Those of line 1, by themselves, might be considered as belonging to a title followed by a numeral ]ς τό [−, but such a restoration would involve us in serious
spatial difficulties with the arrangement of the other titles. As it is, we can easily restore either the genitive or the nominative of the word Σεβαστός. The genitive, however, would commit us to a date before the death of Marcus Aurelius.

The Third Stele with Imperial Letters

26. Athens. Two contiguous fragments of a plaque of Pentelic marble, 0.09 m. thick. The letters are 0.009 m. high. When joined together one above the other the two fragments form one piece, which is 0.43 m. high and 0.17 m. wide, but which does not preserve an original edge either above, below, or at the sides.

The upper piece was originally published by K. Pittakys, L’ancienne Athènes (Athens, 1835), p. 327. From Koehler’s copy it was republished by Dittenberger in 1878 as I.G., III, 43. The lower piece was first published by Dittenberger as I.G., III, 42 from Koehler’s copy. In 1916 Kirchner reedited the two joined together as I.G., II², 1112. Both fragments came from the Acropolis, the upper piece from the Pinacotheca and the lower piece from below the Propylaea.

No. 26. The Third Stele With Imperial Letters

[---] \( \eta \theta [\) ---]
[---] \( \nu \ kai [\) ---]
[---] \( \varepsilon \ \tau \omega n \ \delta r \omega n \) ---]
[---] \( \pi r o v \ \sigma \varphi \theta \alpha t a \ \sigma \) ---]
[---] \( \alpha n \ \delta r \acute{i}e n \) ---]
[---] \( \sigma \ kai \ \delta w \alpha \mu \) ---]
[---] \( \) ---]
[---] \( \kappa a i \ \Gamma a r g y l i o \) ---]

[Αὐτοκράτωρ Καῖσαρ θεοῦ Μάρκου Ἀντωνίνου υὸς, θεοῦ Ἀντωνίνου ὑπὸν Εὐσεβοῦν ὃς νῦνός, ---]
[---] \( \) ---]
[---] \( \) ---]
[---] \( \) ---]
[---] \( \) ---]
[---] \( \) ---]
[---] \( \) ---]

[Αὐτοκράτωρ Καῖσαρ θεοῦ Μάρκου Ἀντωνίνου υὸς, θεοῦ Ἀντωνίνου νύνου Εὐσεβοῦν ὃς νῦνός, ---]
[---] \( \) ---]
[---] \( \) ---]
[---] \( \) ---]
[---] \( \) ---]
[---] \( \) ---]
[---] \( \) ---]
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In the commentary on I.G., III, 42 Dittenberger asserted that the titles of both Commodus and Caracalla could be restored because of the phrase Γερμανίκος Μέγιστος (line 18), a title common to both of them. In the commentary on I.G., III, 43 he preferred to assign the letter to Caracalla because of parallels to the phrase θεοῦ Τιτουστίου Παρθικοῦ καὶ θεοῦ Νέρου Απόγονος among Latin titles of Caracalla; but we have this phrase also among the titles of Commodus in the imperial letters to the Athenian Gerusia. As Kirchner pointed out, the lettering is more suitable to the time of Commodus.

In lines 8-15 we have one epistle to the Gerusia and another from line 16 on. There is no proof that the remnants of lines 1-7 belong to another imperial epistle, for the two letters preserved in line 1 cannot be fitted into an ordinary preamble, and nothing remains of a final salutation εὐτυχεῖτε. Still it seems likely that the contents of lines 1-7 belong to another epistle of the series, and with the necessary reservation we may refer to it as [Letter] V. The two other epistles, therefore, become Letters VI and VII.

That Letter VII was addressed to the Gerusia has not been noticed by previous editors, because the first copyist read as epsilon the initial letter of the word γεροντία and the editors have reproduced his error.

**Prospectus**

No. 27. This fragment is the only piece now discoverable of the original monument ca. 200 A.D.

Δήμητρι καὶ Κόρης ἡ ἱερὰ γεροντία M. Ἀυρήλιον λιθοφόρον Πρώοδεκτον Πιστοκράτους Κεφαλήθειν προσβεύσαντα προῖκα, τιμηθέντα δὲ ύπὸ θεοῦ

Κομμόδου τῇ Ῥωμαίων πολιτείᾳ, ἀρξαντα τοῦ Κηρύκων γένους, ἀρξαν τὰ τῆς ἱερᾶς γεροντίας, εὐσεβείας ἑνεκά...

TRANSLATION

To Demeter and Kore the Sacred Gerusia because of his loyalty [dedicate the statue of] Marcus Aurelius Prosdectus, the Stone-bearer, son of Pistocrates, of the deme Cephale, who went on an embassy at his own expense, was honored by the deified Commodus with Roman citizenship, served as archon of the clan of the Ceryces, served as archon of the Sacred Gerusia.

Atticus, son of Eudoxus, of the deme Sphettus, had the statue made.

COMMENTARY

That the Stone-bearer, dignified with a special chair in the Theatre of Dionysus, performed some sort of priestly function in religious ceremonies, was first pointed out by W. Vischer, Neues schweizerisches Museum, III (1863), p. 58 (= Kleine Schriften [Leipzig, 1878], II, p. 367). See also the observations of P. Roussel, Mélanges Bidez (Brussels, 1934), pp. 824-827.

Atticus, son of Eudoxus, of the deme Sphettus, was ephebe about 169/70 (I.G., Π正常使用, 1820). He appears again in I.G., Π正常使用, 3659: κατὰ τὰ δόξαντα τῇ [ἐξ Ἀρεί]οι Πάγου βούλη Σεκούνδου Ἀτ[τικῶν] Εὐδό[ξ]ου Σφήττ[ου] τῶν Εὐμολπίδην. In our document the meaning of the word ἑποίησε constitutes the chief problem of interpretation. Spon assumed that Atticus was the sculptor; both Dittenberger and Graindor returned to this opinion,
after Boeckh, followed by Neubauer, Loewy and Toepffer, asserted that Atticus was not the sculptor but the man who saw to it that the statue was properly executed and erected.

**Menedemus**


\[- My|vēdēμ[vōn ---]\
\[- ---]os kai I[---]\
\[- ---] ή iep[α γερουσία]\
\[- ---]o[----------]

**Aelius Euphrosynus**

29. Athens. The dedication at the head of a prytany catalogue, most recently published as *I.G.*, II², 1817 and dated shortly after 200 A.D.


**Translation**

With the permission of the most revered Council of the Five Hundred the Prytanes of the tribe Antiochis set up (a statue of) the epistate Aelius Euphrosynus of the deme Pallene, the Sacred Elder, because of his goodwill and his beneficence to them.

**Primus**


\[ρων 17 [---]a Πρεῖμοις ἱερός γέ]

**Decrees Honoring Ulpius Eubiotus**

31. Athens. The following text is based on four new fragments of a stele of Pentelic marble and on Kirchner's copy of the inscription *I.G.*, II², 1064. The four new fragments, as also the fragment of a duplicate stele No. 32, were discovered in the American Excavations of the Agora. The provenience of the stone which once exhibited the inscription *I.G.*, II², 1064 is unknown. The stele was 0.81 m. wide and 0.095 m. thick, but of unknown height. The letters are 0.005 m.–0.006 m. high.
Fragment a was found on March 15, 1934 in a late fill over the Tholos. It preserves part of the smooth picked top of the block, but is otherwise broken away. Height, 0.11 m.; width, 0.045 m. Inv. No. I 1567 a.

Fragment b, the main piece, was found on December 21, 1935 in the wall of a modern well in Section Z. It preserves the back, a badly calcinated right side and part of the left side. It is broken away above and below. The inscription was reworked to serve as a cornice block. The surface at the left was cut away at the time of reworking, and the surface at the right has suffered severely from calcination. Height, 0.37 m.; width, 0.81 m. Inv. No. I 1567 b.

Fragment c was found on March 29, 1934 in the wall trench of the porch of the Tholos. Part of the left side with the bevelled edge is preserved. Height, 0.085 m.; width, 0.10 m. Inv. No. I 1719.

Fragment d has no history previous to its appearance in the Epigraphical Museum, where J. Kirchner copied it. It was published by Kirchner as I.G., II², 1064. He reported that part of the margin was preserved at the right, and that toward the right the stone was badly worn and the letters difficult to read. When I examined the stone in the spring of 1940, not a single letter nor even a stroke of a letter was any longer visible on its badly calcinated surface. The stone is broken away at the left, above and below, but the back is original. Height, 0.10 m.; width, 0.24 m. Inv. No. E[pigraphical] M[useum] 2648. The squeeze which Kirchner used I have not been able to consult.

Fragment e was found on March 24, 1934 in the fill over the Tholos floor. It is broken away all around and at the back. Height, 0.044 m.; width, 0.03 m. Inv. No. I 1650.

Letters underlined in the text occur in the duplicating text of No. 32.

Fragment a

[--------]ον δω[--------]
[--------]ι δή αυ[τ--------]
[--------]φιλοτε[ιμ--------]
[--------]προγραφ[--------]
5[--------]ι μετά τ[--------]
[--------]εξηγητ -- κα[ι μάντε[--------]
[--------]υτον το[--------]
[--------]σ' υνεδρ[--------]
[--------]εν τη[--------]
lacuna

Fragment b

10[ον] ἔδωκε πέντε καὶ ε[ξ]κοσὶ μυριάδας, ἐ[ν] δὲ [--------]
[-- καὶ τὴν Παναθήνα] αἰών ἀγωνοθεσίαν ἀντεπάγγελτον ὕποστάντα μεγα[--------]
[--------] κα[ς] δάπαξ ἀνυπέρβλητον τὴν περὶ τὴν πόλιν εὐνοιαν ἐπιδεικνύμενον
[-------] ἡν ἐξεδέξατο πα[ναθήνας ἐπ][--------]
[καὶ ἀνδριάντα αὐτῷ] ὑστοχαλκοῦν προῖκα στήναι ἐν τῷ συνεδρίῳ τῆς ἱερᾶς γερουσίας καὶ τῷ πρυτανείῳ. παραστάναι δὲ [στήλα λί]
[θῶν δῦο ἀναγεγραμμένα] ἡνα αὐτῷ κε τοὺς ἑπιγραμμοὺς αὐτὰ τῇ ἑσαέι μνήμη παραδώσουσιν. ύπάρχει δὲ αὐτῷ τε κ ἐκ τοῦ
[παισῶν αὐτοῦ τοῖς κρ.] Ὀὐήν > Τεισαμένῳ καὶ Ποινηνῷ Μάξιμῳ καὶ σείτησιν τὴν ἐν τῇ θόλῳ καὶ πρυτανείῳ ἐπὶ διωμορίᾳ [καὶ]
[στεφανον ἐν ἀγώσι καὶ] πανηγύρεσσι. ἀπονεμεῖσθαι τε αὐτῷ προεδρίαν ἐν τοῖς αὐτοῖς ἀγώσι. θρόνον τε ἐν τῷ θ[έαρφ.]
[κατὰ τὴν προνομιάν τῇ ἔν] δεδομένῃ αὐτῷ καὶ τοῖς παισῶν αὐτοῦ, τεθήναι καὶ ἐπιγραφήναι ἐκ τοῦ ὀνόματος αὐτοῦ[ν ἐν ἐ] ἐ
[πιτριδεῖω τόσῳ προκ]ρίτῳ ὑπὸ ἕξηγητὸν καὶ μάντευον, θ᾽ θρόνῳ ἐπομένην εἰληφέναι καὶ τὴν ἐν ταῖς ὀυσίαις στὰ[σὶ]
[ἀνευσφορίας αὐτῷ] τῇ καὶ τοῦς κρ παῖδας αὐτοῦ Ὀὐή Τεισαμένῳ καὶ Ποινηνῷ Μάξιμῳ, καὶ τὰ χρήματα αὐτῶν τελό[ν]
[ἀπολύσθαι ἐν τῇ] ἀποθητῇ ἐκ ταῖς ὑπηκοίοις νήσοις. μετέχειν δὲ καὶ εἰςκλήσεως εἰς τοὺς Διονυσιακοὺς ἀγῶ[νας]
[αὐτὸν τε καὶ τοὺς παῖ]ς αὐτοῦ τοὺς κρ Τεισαμένῳ καὶ Μάξιμῳ, ἢ ἦν μὲν καὶ ἐπὶ τῶν προγόνων ἡμῶν καὶ ἐδόκει[ν ἐ]
[ἐργεσίων εἶναι πρὸς] λόγον, ὑπῆρξεν δὲ τοῖς εἰῶν μὲν οὐχ ἦν δὲ ταῖς παρὰ τούτου πρὸς τὴν πόλιν εὐργεσίας διδ[οῦν έκ]
[τῶν ἴδιων. εἰσκαλέσα]θα πὼς αὐτὸν καὶ εἰς τὸ θέατρον διὰ τῶν προερήμων ἀεὶ ἐπὶ προεδρία καὶ κοινωνίᾳ θυσιῶν καὶ [κρεαν]
[μιῶν τῶν ἐν τῷ πομ]παῖς πάσαις καὶ ἐκκλησίαις γενομένων αὐτῶν τε καὶ τοὺς παῖδας αὐτοῦ τοὺς κρ Ὀὐή Τεισάμῳ [νόν καὶ]
[Ὀὐή Ποινήνος Μά]ξιμῳ. μετείκια τε αὐτῷ τε καὶ τοῖς παισῶν αὐτοῦ τῶν ἀυστερῶν[ν] καθὰπερ τῷ] ἰεροφάντη κ [αὶ ---]
[---------- μεν]ν ὑστοχωμένον ἐκ τῇ τῆς πόλεως καὶ τῶν ὑπὸ φιλοτείμ [ιας ------]
[----------]ιας ὑπὸ βούλιοτο, καὶ ἐπὶ βούλιοτο, ἐαυτοῦ καθήνος πρὸ[----------]
[----------]μπρόπητα τῇ καὶ τὴν διὰ τὰς ἀθήνην πολειτίας ἀμοβήθη τ[ν] κύ
[μιὸν δὲ εἶναι τόδε τῷ] δογμά εἰς τὸν ἀπαντά χρόνον καὶ τὰς εἰς τὸν λαμπρότα[τον ὑπατικὸν τιμᾶς]
[----------]εξήνη ἡταίς καὶ μάντευοι τοῖς ἐθ ἱερᾶς διαιτάξεως ὡς [αὐτῶς να] τὸ πρῶτος αυτός ὑστοχοῖ ποθεκῷ
[----------]εἰναι τὰ ἀνεγράμμα]σμένα ἀράτῳ τῆς χείρας οὔ παντες ἐπήρχαν οὔ καὶ ὡς [μή δοκεῖ κύρω εἶναι ἀράτῳ τῆς χείρας οὔ]
[----------]οις ἐπῆρξεν να] τοῦ αὐτοῦ μηρὸς οἷς γνώμην ἀγορεύοντας Λύρ [----------]
[----------]τῇ βουλῇ να] να τῆς ἐπηράτησεν ὑστοχοῖ πρῶτοι να τοῦ δῆμῳ
[----------]τὸ ἐπαύε
[----------]νὰ μὲν τὸν λαμπρὸ]τατον ὑπατικὸ τὸν ἑπόνυμον ἄρχοντά Μάρ Ὀὐή Εὐβίο[τον]
[----------]τοῦ Δεύρῳ Γαργήττων εὐρυγεγείςται ἱδία τε]
[----------]τοῦ πολείτας καὶ] κοινὴ τὴν πόλιν, καὶ διασωσάμενον αὐτὸν ἐν σπάνε [μεγάλῃ διὰ ἱεροπείτης σειτοικία ὑστοχοῖ ἐδοκε]
Fragment c

πέ[ντε καὶ εἴκοσι μν] μιάδας ἐκτὸς τῆς τῶν πυρῶν ἀφθονίας δὲν ἐν τῇ σειτ[ευνεία ἐπέδω-
κεν οὕτε παρασχῶν ἀντὶ σειτωνι]
κῶν [χρημάτων οὕτε τε] έμησάμενος χρήματα, καὶ ἀγωνοθετεῖν τῶν Πανύ[θηναισι
τῶν μεγάλων αὐτοπαγγελτόν υφιστάμε]
νον κα[λ ενθείμαν υπερβολῆν εἰονίας τῆς περὶ τὴν πατρίδα οὐδένι καταλε[ίποντα·
στήναι δὲ άνδριάστας ἐν τῷ συνεδρίω καὶ
τῷ προτ[ανεώ, καὶ στῆλας ἱδρύσθαι καὶ παρεστάναι τοὺς άνδριάσιν αὐτοῦ τῷ[ἵς ἐν
τῷ συνεδρίῳ καὶ προτανεώ καθάπερ ή βου]
40 λῇ περὶ το[ύτων προ] εβουλεύσατον τετεμήρισθαι [δὲ] αὐτῶν τέ καὶ τοὺς κρα παίδα[ς
αὐτοῦ Μᾶρο > Οιδ > Φιλ > Τεισαμενιν καὶ Ποντη[νί]
ον Μάξιμο[ν σειτήσε] ὅ[τι] τῇ ἐν θόλῳ καὶ τῇ ἐν τῷ προτανεώ ἐπὶ δημορία, καὶ ἐν
ἀ[γώσι καὶ πανηγύρεσι στεφάνῳ, προδρέου]
ἐν τῶν αὐτῶν [ἐν τοῖς α] υτοῖς ἁγίωσι καὶ τοὺς παιδάς αὐτοῦ τοὺς κρ. καὶ ἐν θεάτρῳ
Διον[υσίου -------------------------]ηπα[------------------------]
lacuna

Fragment d

[--------------------------]π [-- --]
45 [--------------------------] ατο τε κα[. . . . . . . ζ[ . . . ]] νκαι
[--------------------------] κοινωνία θυσιῶν καὶ κρεανομο[μ] ὄν τῶν ἐν τε πομπαίς [πά] σκα 
[--------------------------] [ἐκκλησίας γενομένων] μετείην δὲ αὐτῷ τε καὶ τοῖς παισὶν αὐτοῦ τῶν ἀσειτων τοι] ἀδε 
καὶ κηλικαῦτα ο[α τῷ ιεροφάντη]

[--------------------------] μεντων γενομένων [ν τ] ὄν [ἐκ] τῆς πό
[--------------------------] λεως καὶ τῶν ὑπὸ φιλοτεμίωσ δ---καὶ εὶ βούλοιτο εαυτον [καθ] 

50 [--------------------------] τη διὰ τὰς 'Αθηνήουν [πολει] τή[ας]
[--------------------------] ἀμοιβὴν δ---αὐτῷ τε καὶ τοῖς παισὶν αὐτοῦ τοῖς κρ Τε(σαμενφ)
[--------------------------] καὶ Μαξίμῳ ὅθρον τεθήναι καὶ ἐπιγραφήσῃ ἐν ἐπιγράφῃ 
[--------------------------] ὑπὸ εξηγητῶν καὶ μάντεων, φ[θρ] ὄνομ [ομεί] 
[--------------------------] ἐληφθέναι καὶ τῆν ἐν ταῖς οὐσίαις στάσιν ἀνευσφορίας [--------------------------] ἀς 
[--------------------------] εἰς τ] ὑν λαμπρότατον

[--------------------------] ωπατικῶν τεμάς [--------------------------] γε[γράφθαι] l [.....] πρότη μ[.....] το[-]
55 [--------------------------] τ] οὐς ἐθ' ἕι τ[ρας δ] διατάξεως τοὺς ν[-]
[--------------------------] [--------------------------] ε[έκι] σθαι [ἐκ, ὑπομηνυσίασ [σθαι δὲ[-]
[--------------------------] τῶν ἑρέα πυρφόρου ἐξ Ἀκροπόλ[e] ὑς Π[ό] Φά[βο] ν Λ[---]
[--------------------------] τ] σον Ἀπόλλωνος τὸ ἀξι[.....] μετ[-]
[--------------------------] [--------------------------] [--------------------------]
60 [--------------------------] πόλεως [--------------------------]
lacuna
. . . of which he gave two-hundred-fifty thousand . . . and as having voluntarily undertaken to serve as agonothete at the Panathenaic festival . . . as having displayed the goodwill which he inherited from his ancestors towards the city, a goodwill absolutely unsurpassable. § 2 That we erect without charge a bronze statue of them in the synhedrion of the Sacred Gerusia and in the Prytaneum, and that we place thereby two engraved plaques of stone which will hand on these things to posterity for everlasting memory. § 3 That there be constantly available to him and to his sons, the viri clarissimi Ulpius Tisamenus and Pupienus Maximus, both public maintenance (in both Tholos and Prytaneum with double portion) and a crown at the games and festal assemblies, and that a front seat be awarded to him at the same games. § 4 That a chair in the Theatre, according to the privilege granted to him and to his sons, be placed and engraved with his name at a suitable point wherever the interpreters and seers shall make a preliminary selection; and that both he and his sons, the viri clarissimi Ulpius Tisamenus and Pupienus Maximus, receive, as a perquisite of said chair, the status of tax-exemption in their estates and that their property be exempt from taxation in all Attica and in the subject isles. § 5 That both he and his sons, the viri clarissimi Tisamenus and Maximus, enjoy permanently an invitation to the Dionysiac games. The above honors were, on the one hand, customary in the time of our ancestors and seemed to be reasonable in return for benefactions, and on the other hand, they were available to people who gave of their own substance, with goodwill to be sure, but never on the same scale as the benefactions which accrued to the city from this man. § 6 That both he and his sons, the viri clarissimi Ulpius Tisamenus and Ulpius Pupienus Maximus, be called to the Theatre through the invitation of the Prytanes at all times with the privilege of a front seat and a share in the sacrifices and meat distributions whichever occur at all the religious processions and at the popular assemblies. § 7 That there be for him and for his sons a share in the aisitia just as for the hierophant . . . both of those which come from the city and of those which come from people who by a noble ambition . . . whenever he might wish, and if he so wished, employing himself . . . brilliance. And the public career at Athens . . . § 9 That this decree be valid for all time, and that the honors voted to the most illustrious consular . . . the interpreters and seers and those in charge of sacred finances . . .
been read should be valid." All raised their hands. "And raise the hand, whoever thinks they should not be valid." No one raised his hand.

And on the fifteenth day of the same month, on the motion of Aurelius . . . of the Council. The president put the question. The Demos decreed:

§ 1 That we praise the most illustrious consular, the eponymous archon, Marcus Ulpius Eubiotus Leurus, of the deme Gargettus, as having been a benefactor to the individual citizens privately and to the city publicly, and as having saved the city in a great famine by means of the grain money of which he gave altogether two-hundred-fifty thousand apart from the abundance of wheat of which he made an additional contribution in the grain famine without offering it in return for grain money or even reckoning its money value; and as undertaking voluntarily to serve as agonothete at the Great Panathenaea, and as having left to no one any possibility of surpassing his exhibition of goodwill toward the fatherland. § 2 That we place statues in the synhedrion and the Prytaneum, and that steles be set up and stand beside the statues in the synhedrion and Prytaneum, just as the Council has ordered in the probuleuma. § 3 That both he and his sons, the viri clarissimi Marcus Ulpius Flavius Tisamenus and Pupienus Maximus, be honored with public maintenance (in both Tholos and Prytaneum with double portion) and with a crown at the games and festal assemblies, and that both he and his sons, the viri clarissimi, have a front seat at the same games. § 4 That in the Theatre of Dionysus . . . with a share in the sacrifices and meat distributions which occur at all the religious processions and at the popular assemblies. § 6 That there be for him and for his sons a share in the aisitia on the same scale and quality as for the hierophant . . . both of those which come from people who by a noble ambition . . . and if he so wished employing himself . . . the public career at Athens . . . That for himself and for his sons, the viri clarissimi, Tisamenus and Maximus, a throne be placed and engraved at a suitable point wherever the interpreters and seers shall make a preliminary selection, and that they receive a status of tax-exemption in their estates as a perquisite of this chair . . . tribe the honors voted to the most illustrious consular . . . be engraved . . . first . . . those in charge of sacred finances . . . elect six and record . . . the priest who carries the fire from the Acropolis Publius Fabius A . . . of Apollo . . . the priest who carries the fire from the Acropolis . . .

COMMENTARY

The text reveals two decrees of similar but not identical wording in honor of a public benefactor, Marcus Ulpius Eubiotus Leurus from the deme Gargettus, a man of consular rank. With him in the honors are associated his two sons, Ulpius Tisamenus and Pupienus Maximus. Eubiotus had relieved the city in the course of a great famine with a contribution of supplies and with a cash donation for the purchase of more to the amount of 250,000 drachmas, as we know from a series of honorary
inscriptions published in *I.G.*, II², 3697-3700.²³ Aelius Zeno, who erected the base with *I.G.*, II², 3697, seems to have been the same man who appears as ephebe in *I.G.*, II², 2193 (*ca.* 200 A.D.). Therefore, Graindor ²⁴ dated the base in the second quarter of the third century, and Kirchner ²⁵ dated it about 220 A.D. The decrees, of course, are contemporary with the base.

The younger son, whose full name is given in *I.G.*, II², 3702 as Marcus Ulpius Pupenius Maximus, recalls the name of an emperor, who in 238 A.D. achieved a reign of ninety-nine days, namely, the senatorial choice Marcus Clodius Pupienus (or Pupenius) Maximus. The latter apparently came from the East. He was born about 164 A.D., and among the first posts of importance which he held in the course of a long public career was the proconsulship of Greece.²⁶ In his article on the emperor, Stein ²⁷ points out that we cannot tell whether any relationship existed between the Athenian family and the emperor. Although this is true, the similarity of the name and the social rank of the Athenian family at least invite speculation on the subject.

Besides mention of the Gerusia, the new document, here published, provides several other points of interest. It attests (line 20) the continued Athenian possession of certain islands. The complete evidence concerning the Athenian domain under the Roman Empire has been examined and interpreted with great acumen by P. Graindor, ²⁸ and the new document shows that Graindor was very wise in rejecting the current opinion that Septimius Severus had deprived Athens of its valuable islands. Another point emerges from the description of the immunity privilege as a perquisite of the chair in the Theatre (lines 18 and 52). Identifying inscriptions such as the one ordered for the chair of Eubiotus have been found on practically all the seats still preserved in the front rows of the Theatre of Dionysus at Athens. These inscriptions are published in *I.G.*, II², 5022-5164 and should include that of Eubiotus (*I.G.*, II², 3700). Almost all of them are not personal names but titles of sacred offices, the

²³ The editio minor of the Corpus presents six other inscriptions which honor members of the family, *I.G.*, II², 3695, 3696, 3701, 3702, 3703 and 4053. Of these, however, *I.G.*, II², 3696 and *I.G.*, II², 4053 represent respectively Graindor's and Prott's copy of the same inscription in honor of the mother of Eubiotus. Prott's measurements are correct for the width and thickness of the crowning moulding, whereas Graindor's measurements concern the inscribed part of the monument. Furthermore, I believe that Prott has estimated the number of missing letters accurately, and that Graindor, followed by Kirchner in *I.G.*, II², 3696, has restored too much. The inscription should read:

\[ Η \ πόλις > Φλ > "Αβρουν τήν \]
\[ [λαμπροτ.]α[τη]γ \ υπατικήν \]


²⁴ *Chronologie des archontes athéniens sous l'empire* (1922), pp. 283-284.


²⁶ *Prospopographia Imperii Romani*², II (1936), 1179.


²⁸ *Athènes sous Auguste* (Cairo, 1927), pp. 1-11.
incumbents of which must have undertaken costly liturgies for the city and who were perhaps deserving of some such accommodation as a release from all future taxes. These two decrees, however, bring the first indication that the city in seeking candidates for its sacred liturgies reinforced the piety or patriotism of its citizens by offers to reduce the economic burden; and so this inscription contributes a piece of evidence on the obscure subject of city finances in the period of the Severi.

In the decree of the Council one mutilated passage, of which the sense, however, is fairly recoverable, seems clearly to confirm honors or gifts already assigned to, or recommended for Ulpius Eubiotus by the interpreters, the seers and those in charge of the sacred διάταξις (line 30). The interpreters and seers, if not also those in charge of the sacred διάταξις, are mentioned near the beginning of the inscription in line 6, and the interpreters and seers again in the middle of the first decree in line 18 and of the second decree in line 52, where they seem to be authorized to select the location of his chair in the Theatre. Finally, those in charge of the sacred διάταξις are mentioned once more in line 55.

We are struck by the activity of these sacred officials. The general outlines of the part played at Athens by the interpreters, and by the seers, is already known. At least other references to them occur. But to the best of my knowledge the board οἱ ἔφοι ἱερᾶς διάταξιως appears for the first time in the Eubiotus inscription here under consideration. The essential thing is the meaning of the word διάταξις. The reader will find the evidence lucidly presented by H. Francotte, Les finances des cités grecques (Ligé-Paris, 1909), pp. 134-138. The διάταξις was the permanent arrangement in regard to the distribution of funds. At Delos the διάταξις recognized a division into a ἱερὰ κιβωτός and a δημοσία κιβωτός. I.G., II², 844 (ca. 200 B.C.) includes the provision γενόμενον ἀνάλογα κατὰ τὴν διάταξιν (line 67), which shows that this use of the word belonged also to the Athenian technical vocabulary. The διάταξις was not quite like the modern budget, which must be voted each year, but rather a permanent arrangement, which could be altered or abolished only through special legislation.

The plural board in charge of the sacred διάταξις recalls the single officer who appears in I.G., II², 1035, lines 16, 17, and 19, as the ταμίας τῆς ἱερᾶς διατάξεως. The date of I.G., II², 1035 has been variously located from the last quarter of the second century B.C. to the third quarter of the second century after Christ. Despite the impressive arguments of Paul Graindor and of John Day for assigning it to the second century after Christ or definitely to the reign of Hadrian, I am more inclined, because of the lettering, to date the inscription approximately in the reign of Augustus.

31 Classical Weekly, XXVI (1933), pp. 138-141.
Mention of the ταμίας τῆς ιερᾶς διατάξεως occurs also in I.G., Π², 3503, which Dow³² dates in the late forties or early thirties of the first century B.C. Therefore, we can probably say that the plural board in charge of the sacred διατάξεως was not a new creation connected with the foundation of the Gerusia, but an older Athenian institution, which in the first century B.C. functioned in the person of a single treasurer. While possible, there is no reason to think that the change from a single officer to a plural board accompanied the foundation of the Gerusia. The situation recalls the frequent alternation at Athens between the single officer (ὁ ἐπὶ τῇ διουκήσει) in periods of Macedonian supremacy and the plural board of the Administration (οἱ ἐπὶ τῇ διουκήσει) in periods of independence.³³ It would not be surprising to learn that the change from a treasurer of the sacred διατάξεως to a plural board in charge of the sacred διατάξεως belonged among the constitutional alterations in the reign of Hadrian.

The only approach to the duties of this new board lies in the study of the function of the ταμίας τῆς ιερᾶς διατάξεως at an earlier period. In I.G., Π², 1035 he provided the sacrificial animals. Part of the money for this purpose came to him from other official appointees whose title is not preserved. He was also associated with other officials (probably the hoplite-general and the basileus) in the granting of leases on sacred property. Sacred properties, furthermore, were sold occasionally by the hoplite-general or the treasurer: τῶν [π]εραμένων ὑπὸ στρατηγοῦ ἡ ταμία τῆς [ιερᾶς διατάξεως]. On the other hand, I.G., Π², 3503, where we have nothing but a citation of the ταμίας τῆς ιερᾶς διατάξεως at the end of a prytany decree, does not help us in our reconstruction.

The treasurer, therefore, appears to have been a purchasing and selling agent for the needs of the sanctuaries, and to have performed certain routine work in the granting of leases. Later the plural board in charge of the sacred διατάξεως probably performed essentially the same duties. Beyond a doubt they were closely connected with the Gerusia, but the relationship to be quite comprehensible needs further elucidation from new discoveries. They may have been responsible for the selection of the synhedrion of the Sacred Gerusia as the site of one of the statues granted to Eubiotus, and the only services which, in the recital of the latter’s benefactions, would have obviously concerned them were the voluntary acceptance and brilliant performance of the duties of agonothete at the Great Panathenaea.

A few observations suggest themselves concerning the interpreters and seers, who are cited (ἐξηγηταί καὶ μάντεις without article) in lines 6, 18, 30, and 52.

Ehrmann³⁴ distinguished between the use of the words ἐξηγητής and μάντεις or χρησμολόγος in the Attic dialect of the “good” period in such a way that ἐξηγητής

---

was to be understood as referring to the public interpreter in the official language, while μάντεις or χρησμολόγοι were all those who in a private capacity interpreted prodigies and oracles. The public colleges, accordingly, were called the ἔξηγηται. They were first of all the interpreters of sacred, and to a lesser extent, of profane law, and they were the proper guides in questions of ceremony. The text shows, however, that some μάντεις also enjoyed official recognition in the third century after Christ and formed probably one college with the ἔξηγηται, if indeed the expression ἔξηγηται καὶ μάντεις is not simply a more embracing term to cover all the activities of these sacred officials, usually designated as ἔξηγηται. Lampon, the friend of Pericles, was called sometimes ἔξηγητης and sometimes μάντις.\(^{35}\) The scholiast to Aristophanes, Clouds, 332 explains: Λάμπων ὁ μάντις ὁ ἔξηγητην ἐκλόγην. In any case the ἔξηγηται καὶ μάντεις were united as a single group in one inclusive phrase without article not only in the third century after Christ but even in the fourth century B.C. at Athens. Plato,\(^{36}\) speaking of the avenging of murder, writes: τῖνες δ’ εἶσον οἱ θεοὶ καὶ τίς ὁ τρόπος τῶν τουοῦτων δικών τῆς εἰσαγωγής ὑρθότατα πρὸς τὸ θεόν ἄν γεγυμένος ἐίη, νομοφύλακες μετ’ ἔξηγητῶν καὶ μάντεων καὶ τοῦ θεοῦ νομοθετησάμενοι, τὰς δίκας εἰσαγόντων ταύτας.

Line 14 of our inscription, where it is stated that two statues were to be erected at the state’s expense and were to be accompanied by marble blocks with explanatory inscriptions, informs us that our text existed in two marble copies. The large block which has been reused architecturally belongs to one of these copies, and the small fragment No. 32, containing slightly larger letters and a literal repetition in a section extending from lines 12 to 19 on the large piece, obviously belongs to the other copy. The fact that the same words fall below each other in the one copy as in the other shows that the blocks were very much alike not only in marble and in lettering, but also in size and in arrangement, as of course we should expect.

Turning to the restoration of the inscription, we can establish closely the length of the lines, as is pointed out in the note on the restoration at lines 14-15. Furthermore, the fact that fragment c from the left edge of the inscription can be placed securely in respect to the main piece, fragment b, enables us to divide the restoration properly between the end of one line and the beginning of another; and this fact, likewise, enables us to recognize what in view of the reworking of fragment b is by no means obvious, that the left and right edges of the main piece, fragment b, are at least approximately the original edges.

The first decree, of which the beginning has been lost, except perhaps for a small piece preserved in fragment a, covers the upper part of the large stone as far down as line 30. Lines 32 ff. belong to the second decree, and they reproduce closely the wording of the first. It is significant that the second decree refers to a probuleuma.

\(^{35}\) For examples see Ph. Ehrmann, op. cit., pp. 384-387. 

\(^{36}\) Laws, IX, 871 c.
The letters missing between those preserved on fragment c and those on fragment b in line 40 can be accurately gauged by comparison with the securely restored lacunae immediately above and below. With considerable confidence we can restore \( \betaου\) | \( \lambda\eta\) περί το[ύτων προ] \( \epsilonβουλεύσατο \). No decree of the Areopagus and not every decree of the Council constitutes a probuleuma, but only one submitted by the Council to the Ecclesia. At this period the Council, being independent of the Ecclesia, which had been deprived of all its real power, submitted a probuleuma only on those occasions when some special value was attached to a public demonstration of solidarity, as here in the expression of gratitude to a benefactor. The Areopagus, moreover, would scarcely take cognizance of a probuleuma of the Council isolated without its companion decree of the Ecclesia. Therefore, it appears that the second decree is that of the Ecclesia and takes cognizance of the probuleuma, which is the preceding decree.
Although the extant bases, which bear inscriptions honoring Ulpius Eubiotus, refer to an authorization granted by decree of the Areopagus, it would be wrong to conclude that one of the decrees in our inscription is that of the Areopagus, for these bases represented private dedications. Besides the above-mentioned reasons for identifying the two decrees as those of the Council and Demos, it was apparently much less common at Athens to publish on stone a detailed report of the proceedings in the Areopagus. The only decree of the latter body epigraphically preserved is on I.G., IV, 12, 83 at Epidaurus, and there, as the decree of the more important chamber, it is engraved above that of the Council. On the other hand, if the first decree on our inscription is the probuleuma implied by the wording of the second, it cannot be a decree of the Areopagus, which did not issue probuleumata.37

Moreover, the two dedications which are not of private origin, namely, the chair with I.G., II2, 3700 in honor of Eubiotus and his sons, and the base with I.G., II2, 3701 in honor of the son Tisamenus alone, are recorded as erected by the “city.” The word πόλις, as Bruno Keil pointed out,38 indicates the cooperation of Council and Ecclesia.

NOTES

Line 12: euνοιαν ἐπιδεικνύμενον ἦν ἐξεδέξατο τὰ [ῥὰ τῶν προγόνων]. The phrase παρὰ τῶν προγόνων may be restored on the analogy of similar passages, e.g.: διαφυλάττον οἱ τῆν euνοιαν ἦν οἱ πρόγονοι αὐτοῖς παρέδωσαν πρὸς τὸν Ἀθηναίων (I. G., II2, 237).

Lines 12-13: καὶ ἀνδριάντα αὐτῷ χαλκοῦ πορίκα στήναι. The restoration ἀνδριάντα is indicated by the masculine or neuter gender of the modifying adjective and by the use of the word ἀνδριάνον in the parallel section below in line 39.

Lines 13-14: παρεστάναι δὲ [οὐ]λὴν λιβίνα διὸ ἀναγεγραμμένα. A reference to steles may be safely assumed on the analogy of passages such as [σ]ῖλης τῆς παρεστώτης τῶν ἀγαλμάτων (S.J.G.², 1020) and on comparison with the phrase [σ]ῖλας ἱδρύσατε καὶ παρεστάναι in the parallel section below in line 39. The dual, obsolete in the ordinary Koine of this period, was still used occasionally at Athens (cf. Meisterschwyzer, Grammatik der Attischen Inschriften² [1900], pp. 201 f.), and it seems preferable to assume it here rather than to emend ἀναγεγραμμένα in this very line reveals the consciousness of an older style. The emperor Julian, moreover, was careful to use the dual in his letter to the Athenians.

Line 14: αἱ κε (read καὶ) τοῖς ἐπηγγεγραμμένοις αὐτὰ τῇ ἔσσει μνήμη παραδώσουσιν. Compare the phrase τοῖς ἐπηγγεγραμμένοις ἀείμνησσον in Hellenistic inscriptions, e.g., S.I.G.², 721 and Michel, 1016. A similar juxtaposition of dual and plural in reference to a pair occurs in an inscription of a.d. 21, C. B. Welles, Royal Correspondence in

the Hellenistic Period (New Haven, Yale University Press, 1934), No. 75, line 1: Ἀντιόχωι καὶ Φραάτει δήνων ἐν Σοῦσωι [τ]οῖς ἄρχουσι. It is common in classical prose.

Lines 14-15: αὐτῷ τε κ[αὶ τοῖς πασῶν αὐτοῦ τοῖς κρ[π]. This restoration (twenty and a half letters, iota being reckoned as occupying only half a letter space) corresponds to the fixed form in which the phrase with the names following occurs below in line 21, again in line 24, again in line 42 (without the names). A second version of the phrase, which is found below in line 19 and again in line 40, would omit the repetition of the article and read κ[αὶ τοῖς κρ πασῶν αὐτοῦ], a restoration of only seventeen letters, but the first form of the phrase is indicated and the second version is excluded here by considerations arising from a comparison with the lacuna between lines 20 and 21. The position of the letters preserved at the end of line 20 and at the beginning of line 21 suggests that the latter lacuna is about one and a half letters shorter than that between lines 14 and 15. The very least that must and can be restored between lines 20 and 21 is the words ἄγω[νας αὐτῶν τε καὶ τοὺς πα[ῖς], and for this lacuna, accordingly, we establish a minimum requirement of space for nineteen letters, hence a minimum requirement of space for about twenty and a half letters in the lacuna above between lines 14 and 15. To be sure, the stele is not engraved stotchedon, but ten letters in one line occupy about the same space as ten letters in another. The variation is never very much.

Lines 15-16: [καὶ στήφανον (ο[ρ Κήρυγμα)] ἐν ἄγῳ[νι κα]ῇ πανηγύρεσιν. The privilege of προεδρία, accord in the next article, is quite distinct. The other honor commonly bestowed at festivals was the proclamation, usually but not necessarily accompanied by the presentation of a crown. The words ἄγῳ[νι κα]ῇ were suggested by Meritt.

Lines 16-17: θρόνον τε ἐν τῷ θ[εάτρῳ κατὰ (ο[ρ διὰ)] τὴν προνομίαν τ ἦν δεδομένην. The certain restoration of the familiar phrase ἐν τῷ θεάτρῳ reduces the lacuna. That the noun θρόνον is to be construed not with the infinitive ἀπονεμήσθαι in line 16, but with the infinitives τεθήναι and ἐπιγραφῆναι in line 17, appears from the words with which the grant of another privilege in the following section begins: ἵθελον ἐπομένην ἐιληφῆναι κτλ. The missing noun modified by the word δεδομένην cannot, because of the phrase ἵθελον, be restored as referring to an additional object like a statue or painting. Therefore, the sense of the passage would seem to be that suggested in the text, whether or not we have recovered the actual wording. If we restore the highly suitable word προνομία, which was much in vogue in the first three centuries after Christ, we may compare Lucian, Abdicatus, 23: τοῖς ἵατροῖς καὶ δημοσίᾳ αἱ πόλεως τιμᾶς καὶ προεδρίας καὶ ἀτελείας καὶ προνομίας διδόσαι.

Lines 17-18: ἐν ἐπιτηδείῳ τόπῳ προκ[ρίτῳ ὑπὸ ἐξηγητῶν καὶ μάντεων. The formula ἐν τόπῳ ἐπιτηδείῳ is not the only phrase but certainly one of the most common formulae to be found in stipulations concerning the erection of inscriptions and of statues. Furthermore, seers and interpreters can scarcely have been brought into the matter for any other reason than to secure divine guidance. Now the Attic technical expres-
sion for choosing preliminary candidates from whom the authorities selected and inaugurated new officials, was προκρίνω (see references in the Greek-English Lexicon). Aristotle and Attic writers called such Athenian preliminary candidates, whose choice remained to be ratified, πρόκριτοι. Therefore, the letters ριτω, actually preserved, admit the restoration [προκ]ριτω υπέρ ἔξυγγητων καὶ μάντεων.

Lines 18-19: τὴν ἐν ταῖς οὐσίαις στά[σι]ν ἀνεισφορίας αὐτόν][ν τε καὶ τοὺς κρ ἖γιας. The word αὐτόν, part of the formula repeated in lines 17 and 40, may be restored with absolute certainty. There exists no temptation to emend <θ>νοιας, because the privilege of κοινωνία θυσίων, expressly accorded, is the subject of another section (line 23). Therefore the passage concerns his property (οὐσίαι), and the special privilege accorded in regard to a man’s wealth is immunity from taxation.

Lines 19-20: τὰ χρήματα αὐτῶν τελῶ[ν ἀπολύεσθαι ἐν τε ἀ]πάση τῇ Ἀττικῇ καὶ ταῖς ὑπηκοόις νόμοις. The phraseology of this passage constitutes merely a new variant of one of the commonest formulae, and the extent of the lacuna here can be measured against the extent of the lacuna which in the following line is to be restored with a formula.

Lines 20-21: ἀγῶ[νας αὐτῶν τε καὶ τοὺς παῖδας αὐτοῦ. For the reason why this version of the formula must be restored see the note (above) on lines 14-15.


Lines 22-23: διδοῦσιν ἐκ τῶν ἰδίων· εἰσοκαλεῖ θαυμ. The verb καλεῖσθαι or one of its compounds is supplied with certainty because it forms part of a familiar formula. The preceding words are restored merely from the sense of the passage.

Lines 23-24: κοινωνίᾳ θυσίων καὶ [κρανομών τῶν ἐν τε πολ]μαῖς πάσαις καὶ ἐκκλησίαις γενομένων. The words τῶν ἐν τε πολμαῖς may be restored on the analogy of the corresponding passage in line 46.

Lines 25-26: ἀνέγερτω[ν καθάπερ τῶ]ν ἱεροφαντή. In the lists of ἀνέγερτω which were customarily appended to the end of Athenian prytany catalogues of the second and third centuries after Christ, the hierophant is always recorded first.

Line 27: καθῆκτος, stone καθῆκτος.

Line 28: καὶ τὴν διὰ τὰς Ἀθηναῖας πολειτίας ἀμοιβή[ν], his Athenian public career. The word πολειτίας is here used in the same sense as in I.G., II2, 3625, which praises a man πολιτευόμενον[meon] πάσαν πολιτείαν[ν] ἄριστα. On the word πολιτεία see Ad. Wilhelm, Glotta, XIV (1925), pp. 78 ff.

Lines 29-30: There exists no real indication as to what stood in the lacuna, and whatever we might supply would be pure conjecture, e.g., τὰς εἰς τὸν λαμπρότα[τον ὑπατικῶν τειμὰς συναναγεγράφθαι]θα (compare the parallel passage in line 54) ἀς ἄν δόξῃ ἔξυγγη[ν]τεις καὶ μάντεωι καὶ τοῖς ἑρ ἴερᾶσι διατάξεωι ως[αὐτῶς.

Lines 30-31: [vacat ο πρόεδρος ο ὅτου δοκεὶ κύρια εἶναι τὰ ἄνεγερν][σμένα ο ἀράτω
THE SACRED GERUSIA

τὴν χείρα" πάντες ἔπήραν. The phrase has been restored on the analogy contained in S.I.G., 1109 (shortly before 178 A.D.), the decree of the Iobacchi, where the Athenian parliamentary procedure of that day is imitated: καὶ ἐπηρώτησεν ὁ πρόεδρος Ῥοῦφος Ἀφροδισίων. "монтаж докеи κύρια εἶναι τὰ ἀνεγωσμένα δόγματα καὶ ἐν στήλῃ ἀναγραφήναι, ἀράτω τὴν χείρα." πάντες ἔπηραν (lines 20-24). These are extracts from the minutes of the meeting at which the decree was passed. For other parallels see Wilhelm’s references, Beiträge zur griechischen Inschriftenkunde (Vienna, 1909), pp. 179 f.

Lines 31-32: “καὶ ὅτω [μὴ δοκεὶ κύρια εἶναι "ἀράτω τὴν χείρα"] ὁ προσθεὶς ἔπηρεν vacat]. For the negative vote ὅτω μὴ and the phrase ὁ προσθεὶς ἔπηρεν see I.G., II², 2090 (165/6 A.D.). The number of votes for and against a decree was frequently recorded on the stone. See Ad. Wilhelm, Neue Beiträge zur griechischen Inschriftenkunde, VI (1921), pp. 5-9 (Sitzungsber. Ak. Wien, CLXXXIII, 3. Abh.), and Louis Robert, Études Anatoliennes (Paris, 1937), p. 451.

Line 32: γνώμην ἀγορεύσαντος Ἀνρ [--]. This formula for recording the name of the proposer is not to be found elsewhere in Attic inscriptions, but it can be paralleled in an inscription of Anaphe, I.G., XII, 3, 247 (first century B.C.). The participle recalls the wording of the crier’s proclamation (τίς ἀγορεύειν βούλεται;) in the Athenian Assembly of the Classical Period.

Lines 35-36: ἐν σπάνε[ι μεγάλῃ διὰ χρήματα σειτωνικὰ δὲν ἀθρώως ἑδωκε] τέ[ντε καὶ ἐκκοσι ΜΝ]ριάδας. The restoration follows naturally from I.G., II², 3697, where Eubiotus is honored πάσης ἀρετῆς ἕνεκα καὶ τῆς περὶ τὴν πατρίδα φιλοτεμίας ἐν τε χρήμασι σιτωνικοῖς οἰς ἀθρῶς ἑδωκεν μυριάσι πέντε καὶ ἐκκοσι καὶ τροφαιὸς αἱς ἐν τῇ μεγάλῃ σπάνει παρέσχε. In the lacuna, obviously, we must restore a reference to the σιτωνικὰ χρήματα. The latter constituted the public fund from which grain was purchased for distribution to the citizens. The money was frequently invested, and the purchases were then made with the interest alone. As we know from an inscription published by W. H. Buckler, “A Charitable Foundation of A.D. 237,” J.H.S., LVII (1937), pp. 1-10, a citizen of Orcistus in Phrygia gave his native town two thousand and five hundred Attic drachmas with specific instructions how the money was to be used. One thousand was to be invested for the purpose of providing a return from which a small annual bread donation to the townspeople might be financed. The pertinent section in lines 16-21 reads: καὶ χειλὰ μὲν ἀπι[στὰσεσθι] τε καὶ καλεσθαὶ σειωτικὰ καὶ[ί δανίζεσθαι] αὐτὰ κατ’ ἐθῆ[ν], ἀπὸ δὲ τῶν προσ[ῶν κατ’ ἐτος δια]ρέμεσθαι τοῖς δημοταῖς καθ’ ἐκ[αστὸν ἄρτου λείτρ]αν μῖᾶν ή δοσὸν ὁμήρα τε[ταγμένα ὡ] γραμματεῖς διακο]νῆσαι. Buckler cites also C.I.G., 3422, where a certain Aurelius Hermippus of Philadelphia in Lydia is praised (among other reasons) ἀναθέτα τῇ πόλει τάξεων μὲν εἰς σε[τ] ῥυκοὐ χρήματα δηναρίων μυριάδας πέντε, δόντα εἰς ἔπισκεπήν τοῦ θεάτου τοῦ θεάτου διάρκημα μύρια, ποιησάμενον δὲ καὶ ἐπιδόσεις χρήματων τῇ τῆ γλυκυτάτῃ πατρίδι εἰς χρήματα σε[τ] ὑποκα δηναρίων μυριάδας πέντε. Compare also C.I.L., III, 6998 (Nacolia
in Phrygia, reign of Hadrian), where a donation is made on the condition *uti arbitratu Corneli... in et Corneli [H]oeci faeneretur ea pecunia et ex usuris q[uo conf]ectum fuerit, p[ro]ximo triennio in sitonicro tribuant, ut q[uo]d(q)[o]d annis possit e[o] frumentum comparari.

Lines 36-37: έκτός τῆς τῶν πυρῶν ἀφθονίας δὲν ἐν τῇ σειτ[ειν'δεία ἐπεδώκων οὔτε παρασχὼν ἀντὶ σειτων]κών [χρημάτων οὔτε τ]ειμησάμενος χρήματα. The sense of the passage is quite clear because I.G., Π1, 3697, after mentioning the cash donation of *εκτροπλαζνα to the amount of 250,000 drachmas, records a supplementary donation of supplies (προφαίσ αἰς ἐν τῇ μεγάλῃ στάντι παρέσχε), of which the value is not stated, probably because it was not known. The letters κών, which are preserved on fragment c and which must be accommodated in the lacuna, suggest the phrase σειτωνιών χρημάτων.

Lines 37-38: καὶ ἀγωνοθετεῖν τὸν Παρα[θηραίων τῶν μεγάλων αὐτεπάγγελτον ύψιστάμεν]νον. The phraseology of line 11 suggests the restoration. The article τῶν, however, points ahead to a qualifying adjective or phrase.

Lines 38-39: [στήναι δὲ ἀνδριάντας ἐν τῷ συνεδρίῳ καὶ] τῷ πρυτ[ανείῳ]. This restoration, which conforms closely to the available space, is warranted by the tenor of the parallel passage in line 13 and by the preserved letters of fragment c.

Line 40: ΄δὲ, stone ΑΕ.

Line 40: The names of the two sons are restored to fit the space in such a way that the elder is designated with both praenomen and gentilicium and the younger with neither. For the style see I.G., Π1, 3609: Τιβ θι Δημώστρατος καὶ Λεωνίδης οὐ ᾗδελφοι. Also in lines 15 and 19 the gentilicium is added to the name of the elder, but not to that of the younger brother.

Line 41: ἐπὶ δημοτικα. For the double portion as a mark of special honor see Herodotus, VI, 57; S.I.G.3, 1013 (Chios, fourth century B.c.); O.G.I.S., 78 (Methymna, third century B.c.); Plutarch, Lycurgus, 26, 8.

Lines 41-42: καὶ ἐν ᾧ[γὼν καὶ πανηγύρισεν στεφάνω, προεδρεύ]ῳ τε αὐτῶν [ἐν τοῖς α]υτοῖς ἀγώνων. For the restoration στεφάνῳ (or κηρύγματι) see the note on the parallel passage in line 16. The next passage obviously contains like line 16 a reference to the προεδρία. On fragment c we have part of the infinitive beginning the last line: εν. In the other six lines of fragment c we recognize that the stonecutter was preserving the syllabic division of words at the end of lines. Therefore, the phrases λαγχάνειν or μετέχειν προεδρίας and προκαθίζειν are eliminated as possibilities, and the verb προεδρεύειν alone remains available.

Lines 45-54: The restorations presented in this section are warranted by the analogy of the parallel passages in the first decree. For lines 45-46 compare line 24; for line 47 compare line 26; for line 48 compare line 27; for lines 50-51 compare line 18; and for lines 53-54 compare line 29.

Line 57: For the priest πυρφόρος εξ Ἀκροπόλεως, who appears to be mentioned again in line 59, see P. Graindor, Athènes sous Auguste (Cairo, 1927), p. 154.
32. Athens. This inscription, previously unpublished, constitutes a fragmentary duplicate of the preceding document. It has been inscribed by the same hand on a stele of Pentelic marble of the same quality and workmanship. The fragment, which preserves only the inscribed surface and is elsewhere broken away, was found on March 15, 1934 in a late fill in Section B of the American Excavations in the Agora.

Height, 0.088 m.; width, 0.069 m.; thickness, 0.062 m.
Height of Letters, 0.008 m.
Inv. No. I 1571 a.

The letters here underlined occur in the duplicate inscription No. 31, which appears to have had much the same arrangement, to judge from the position of the preserved letters.

For translation and commentary see the discussion of the preceding document.
Decrees of the Gerusia


The stele of white marble has been reused as part of a door jamb in a church, the ruins of which stand at the foot of the acropolis of Hyettus. The stone is broken away at the bottom; part of the top, the back and both sides have been preserved, but the left side is not exposed. Since Girard made his careful examination of the inscription, many letters have been lost by fracture. Letters no longer extant are underlined in the following text.

Height, 0.99 m.; width, 0.555 m.; thickness, 0.24 m.
Height of letters: on front, 0.015 m. except for line 1 (0.023 m.); on right side, 0.011-0.012 m.

No. 33. Front and Right Side Shown in Photographs Taken in 1939.
After 212 A.D.

'Αγα θῇ Τύχη

["Ε]δοξεῖν τῇ ἱερᾷ γερουσία τοῦ Σωτῆρος
["Α]σκληπιοῦ ἐν κοινῷ στήλην ἀναγγέλλων
[φ]ήμα, ἐν ἦ στήλῃ εἶναι τὰ ὑπογεγραμμέ[να].

5 [ά]ντι πολλῶν καὶ μεγάλων δὲν ἐνεργεῖ θῃ παρά τοῦ θεοῦ, ὁ μνήμης ἀρίστης
Ἰούλιος Ἀριστέας ἔχαριστα ὑδαί τοῦ θεοῦ τῇ γερουσίᾳ χωρείδουν ἡντιλά
ῥυμὸν ἐκτός, τόπῳ Σὺ, ὃ γείτονες ὃν ἡ μέν ἦνος Ἁὐρ· Ἁλάμος καὶ πρόστατον

10 δοὺς τῶν Ὀλμώνιος καὶ οἱ Νευκοστρᾶ
tου τοῦ Ζωτύρου κληρονόμοι, ἐπὶ τῷ
φυτεύον τοὺς γερουσιαστὰς καὶ ἔχει[ν]
αιῶν καὶ ἀναφαίρετον

15 Ὀμοίως ἐδοξεῖν κατὰ τὴν αὐτὴν ἐι[σ]

20 ἠγησιν ἀναγρ[α]φῆναι καὶ ἔτερον χρό
νον, ὃ ἐδοκεῖν τῇ ἱερᾷ γερουσία ὃ ἄξ[ι]


[σ] Ἰππόπος Θεόδωρος, ἀπὸ δὲ ἀρκτο[ν]
[κε]νὸν ἐδά[ν] ἔως τὸ καλούμενον Ἡλίω

30 [σ] Ἀρεός, ἐ[πί] τῷ καὶ αὐτὸ ἐξῆν τῆς γε
[ρο]ὐσιας αἰῶνον ἐν οἷς ὁ γερο[ν]

[sia]σταὶ εἰς Ἰαύρηλιον ἐν προο[τ]

[τ]ῆς Τεμυκράτης Χαρικλέους· Ἰούλ
[. . .] Ἁὐρ· Ἐπαφροδίτους Ἐπηστάς
tt

35 Ἐπαφροδίτους Μεγαστάν· Κόσμος Ἐ

παρανόπεδιον· Σωσίβιος Χαρικλέους,
Ἐπίκτητος Κόσμου· Ἔπικτητος Κόσμου· 

Ξουχήρ[. . .] Ἐπηστᾶς Η[τοῦ — — —]

[. . .]ο[———]
On right side of stone

To Good Fortune

The Sacred Gerusia of the Savior Asclepius decreed to engrave and set up in the common precinct a stele, on which there should be the following record:

In return for the many great benefactions which he has received from the god, Julius Aristeas of excellent fame has presented to the Gerusia through the god a small estate, Styphlarion, of eight jugera, in the locality Sys: its neighbors, on the east Aurelius Thalamus and the portico of Calliste’s heirs, on the north Aurelius Theodorus, on the west the heirs of Arescon the Holmonian, on the south Symphorus the Holmonian and the heirs of Nicostratus son of Zopyrus. On the condition that they cultivate it, the Elders are to enjoy eternal and inalienable possession of it.

It was likewise decreed in pursuance of the same motion to engrave still another gift which in return for a similar benefaction the distinguished Aurelius Menecrates Eratonianus has given to the Sacred Gerusia, to wit a vineyard in the locality Hipposboton, of six jugera: its neighbors, on the east the heirs of Epaphras, on the south Eubulas son of Phylax, on the west Philip son of Theodorus, on the north an empty lot called the Threshold-floor of Ares. With the understanding that this too is to be the eternal possession of the Gerusia.

The Elders are the following Aurelii: Timocrates son of Charicles (president), Julius Aurelius Eratopianus, Megistas son of Megistas, Epaphroditus son of Megistas, Cosmus son of Epaphroditus, Sosibius son of Charicles, Epictetus son of Cosmus, Menecrates son of Menecrates, — — —

So the Gerusia decreed: If anyone should complete whatever may be his human lot, whichever of his sons the Gerusia may select shall take his place; but if he has no sons, whichever next of kin will give to the Gerusia fifty denarii on entering. If any outsider is approved by the Gerusia, let him straightway bring into the Gerusia one hundred denarii. Recorded in the archonship of Aurelius Zopyrus son of Nicobulus, on the seventh day of the month Bucatius.

COMMENTARY

The important early reading is that of Girard. Lolling’s revision is also valuable as confirmatory evidence, although he missed a great many letters which are still extant. My edition is based on a fresh examination of the original, and except for one
passage, it brings only insignificant changes, as in the assignment of lost letters between the end of one line and the beginning of the following. Syllabic division seems to have been observed by the stonecutter, for lines 29/30 and 48/49 do not furnish any real exceptions. The passage chiefly affected is that in lines 41-44. I could still discern enough to confirm the disputed part of Girard’s and Lolling’s reading EITIΣTOΝΟΡΩ in line 41. The article is τό and not τῶ[n], for in this inscription the round omicron can never be confused with the square omega ω. In the following line Girard copied IN.NIΑNOLI.NTOYTOY. Lolling was unable to see all these traces. Again, however, I could discern the essential strokes ιAN OI, but I find that the first omicron of Girard’s reading τοῦτων is really an alpha. In any case Dittenberger’s reconstructions εί τις τόν άνω ν [δ]ρω[ν | τούτω]ν [άποθθάνων[ε[ν]] or δ]ρω[τ][π][π] [ο]ν ος[ε[ν]] or von Hiller’s εί τις τόν ν [α]θρω[ν][π][π] [ο]ν[ε[ν]] or τι[π][π] θάθαοιιοι[ε[ν]] do not conform to the actual traces. The idea, however, is correct. The phrase contains a euphemistic circumlocution to avoid mentioning death. The verb is άνω (= ανών).

For the word [τ]ῶν in line 43 Girard’s copy gives ΩΗΘ, while Lolling could see only the omega. For the word γεροῦ<σί>α in line 44 the stone gives ΓΕΡΟΥΑ.

AELIA TRYPHAENA DRAONTIS


[ΤΕΡΕΣ]---ΟΥΛΠΙΩΝ
[ΑΡΩΣΤΟΝ ΛΕΟΝΤΟΣ ΤΟΥ ΕΚΑΤΑΙΩΝ ΚΟ]
[ΦΙΛΟΠΑΤΡΙΣ] ΈΙΡΕΙΑ ΤΟ ΤΡΙΟΤΟν ΜΕ
[ΤΑ ΤΗΝ] ΆΡΧΙΕΡΩΤΩΝ ΚΑΙ ΚΛΕ[Ι]
5 [Δ]ΟΦΟΡΙΑΝ ΤΗΣ ΕΚΑΤΗΣ ΑΛΙΑ ΔΕ
[ΟΝΤΟΣ ΘΥΓΑΤΡΗ ΤΡΟΦΑΙΑΝ ΔΡΑ]
ΚΟΝΤΙΣ, ΠΛΗΡΩΣΑΝΤΕΣ ΠΑΝΤΑ
ΔΙ ΟΛΟΥ ΤΟΥ έΝΙΑΝΤΟΥ ΚΑΙ ΤΑ ΠΡΩΣ
ΤΟΥΣ ΘΕΟΥΣ ΕΥΣΕΒΒΟΣ ΚΑΙ ΤΑ ΠΡΩΣ
10 ΤΟΥΣ ΑΝΘΡΩΠΟΥΣ ΦΙΛΟΤΙΜΩΣ
ΚΑΙ ΠΛΗΝΩΣΩ, ΕΔΩΚΑΝ ΚΑΙ ΤΟΙΣ
ΒΟΥΛΕΥΤΑΙΣ ΚΑΙ ΤΟΙΣ ΜΕΤΗΧΟΝΤΗΣ
ΤΗΣ ΓΕΡΟΥΣΙΑΣ ΠΡΑ<Τ>ΟΙ ΆΝΑ ΑΥ<Γ>,
ΣΥΜΦΙΛΙΩΤΙΜΟΜΕΝΟΥΣ ΚΑΙ ΤΩΝ
15 ΤΕΧΝΩΝ ΑΥΤΩΝ ΟΥΛΠΙΩΝ ΑΡΙΟΥ
ΤΙΠΟΥΝ, ΑΡΙΩΝ, ΕΡΑΚΛΙΤΟΥ, ΑΜ[Μ]
ΑΣ, ΑΡΙΣΤΟΝ, ΚΑΙ ΤΟΥ ΑΘΕΛ[ΦΟΥ]
ΤΟΥ ΙΕΡΕΩΣ ΑΛΕΞΑΝΔΡΟΥ ΡΟΝ ΤΟΥ ΛΕ
ΟΝΤΟΣ ΤΟΥ ΕΚΑΤΑΙΩΝ ΚΟ], ΚΑΙ ΤΗΣ
20 ΜΗΤΡΟΣ ΤΗΣ ΙΕΡΕΙΑΣ ΔΡΑΚΟΝΤΙ
ΔΟΣ ΤΗΣ ΔΙΟΜΗΔΟΥΣ ΘΥ(ΓΑΡΡΟΣ) ΑΜΜΙΑΣ.
The priest Ulpius Ariston son of Leon the son of Hecataeus, patriot, of the deme Coliorga, and the priestess for the third time after the office of high priestess and after the post of keybearer to Hecate, Aelia Tryphaena Dracontis, daughter of Leon, fulfilling everything through all the year both in devotions toward the gods and in zealous care and in lavish generosity toward the pilgrims, were the first to make a donation of three denarii apiece to all members of the Council and to all regular members of the Gerusia. (The following relatives) helped them in their exhibition of public spirit: their children, the Ulpii Aristippus, Appius, Heraclitus, Ammia, Ariston; the brother of the priest, namely Alexander, son of Leon the son of Hecataeus of the deme Coliorga; the mother of the priestess, namely Dracontis Ammia daughter of Diomedes.

COMMENTARY

The text here given is not the whole inscription, for a section on another subject begins in line 22.

Concerning this family see B.C.H., LXI (1937), pp. 272-277 where Laumonier's arguments would call for a date in the reign of Hadrian. Because of the gentilicium Aelia it cannot be earlier.

The restoration [φιλόπατρις] (line 3) is mine; the rest were proposed by Deschamps and Cousin. The first two lines are reconstructed exempli gratia.

Another document of Panamara (B.C.H., XV [1891], pp. 192 f.) begins Ίερευς ἐν Ἡραίους Ἀλέξανδρος Λέωντος τοῦ Ἐκαταίου Κό [39] φιλόπατρις, and concludes συνφιλοδοξοῦντος καὶ τοῦ ἀδελφοῦ τοῦ ἱερεύως Οὐλπίου Ἀρίστωνος. The former name seemed to Deschamps and Cousin to reappear in our document, lines 18 and 19. Hence they suggested at the beginning Ίερευς ἐν Ἡραίους Οὐλπίος Ἀρίστων Λέωντος τοῦ Ἐκαταίου Κό. This restoration, however, ignores the low horizontal stroke as of a sigma visible in their facsimile just before the word Ίέρια (line 3). There can, of course, be no doubt that we are dealing with members of the same prominent family. We might, however, be tempted to balance the phrase τοῦ ἱερεύως Ἀλέξανδρου (line 18) against the phrase τῆς ἱερείας Νακοντίδος (lines 20-21), and thus call the brother not Ἀλέξανδρος Λέωντος τοῦ Ἐκαταίου Κό, but Λέων Ἐκαταίου Κό, who, accordingly, would not be identical with the priest of the aforesaid inscription but would be his father. This possibility seems unlikely in view of the distribution of the Roman gentilicia Αἰλιος and Οὐλπιος, and in view of the style of the aforesaid inscription.

[39] The demotic, printed Κό by the editors, appears as ΚΟ in the facsimile, and is confirmed by repetition below in line 10. Alexander's father-in-law, however, does have a demotic abbreviated as Κο.
ULPIUS ARISTON AND ULPIA AMMIonis

35. STRATONICEA. Found at Lagina. Szanto's unpublished copy (1894) is preserved in the Austrian Archaeological Institute at Vienna. Copied and published by J. Hatzfeld, B.C.H., XLIV (1920), p. 74, no. 5. Hatzfeld had access to a copy made by Chamonard in 1892.

To the left

[Στρατα]ονίκη Ἀρτεμιδώρου
tοῦ Ἐκατόμων Τατιάς Κω
κλιδοφοροῦ

To the right

5 ὁ δῆμος καὶ ἡ βουλὴ καὶ ἡ γερο[νία ἐτέιμησαν]
dιὰ ψηφισμάτων Μ. Ὑλπιον Ἀρίστωνος [ν]ήν [Κω]
reibυν' Ἀλέξανδρον Ἡράκλειον Κῶ καὶ Ὑλπίαν
[Διο]νυσσοκλέους θυγατέρα 'Αμμιον Κῶ ἱερατεύσαν
[ταῖς εὐσεβῶς καὶ φιλοτείμως, καὶ μετὰ τὰ λοιπὰ

10 τὰ ἀναλώματα καὶ τὰς ἐστιάσεις καὶ γυμνασιαρ
[χίας, ἄ]ς ἐτέλεσαν ἐν ταῖς [ἐπιστήμαις] ἡμέραις καὶ ἔφτασι
μοις [τῆς θεοῦ ἡμέραις, καὶ τὸ μυσθώσασθαι]
δι' ὀλοιν [τοῦ] ἐτοὺ [πάντα τὰ ἐπιδημησάντα ἀκροά]
ματα, καὶ τὸ συναλβέσθαι π[ᾲ τοῖς δεόμενοι]

15 κατασκεύασάντας ἐκ τῶν ἱδίων ἐντ[ελεῖς τὰς στοάς]
μετὰ τοῦ προτύπου τοῦ πρὸ τῆς εἰσόδου [καὶ τὴν πρόσ]
tῇ βιοτικῇ ἁγορᾶ στοὰν καὶ τὰ ἄλλα πάν[τα ἀξίως]
καὶ τῶν γονέων καὶ τῶν προγόνων.

TRANSLATION

Keybearer Stratonice Tatias from Coraea, daughter of Artemidorus who was the son of Hecatomnos.

The Demos and the Council and the Gerusia have honored by decrees Marcus Ulpius Alexander Heraclitus from Coliorga, of the tribe Quirina, son of Ariston, and have honored Ulpia Ammion from Coliorga, daughter of Dionysocles. They fulfilled the priesthood with pious zeal and with generosity; and after the other expenses and the banquets and the oil donations which they performed on holidays and festivals of the goddess, and after they had engaged all the visiting entertainers for a whole year and had lent a hand in all matters where help was needed, they built at their own expense the porticoes in perfect condition together with the propylon before the entrance, and also the portico on the market place for victuals, and they performed all the other things in a manner worthy of their parents and of their ancestors.
COMMENTARY

Unfortunately, when possible, I did not ask for a tracing of Szanto’s copy, still preserved at Vienna but now inaccessible because of the war. Hatzfeld represents lines 15-18 as beginning much further to the left than lines 5-14. The fracture would appear to leap suddenly in line 15 far to the left in a most unusual manner. This circumstance led B. D. Meritt to suggest per litteras that Hatzfeld’s arrangement is not strictly accurate and that lines 15-18 begin where also lines 4-14 begin. This seems very probable to me, and I have, therefore, adopted Meritt’s restorations for lines 15-17, where Hatzfeld restored τῇ ἱερᾷ οἰκίᾳ τὰς πρὶς στοάς (15), καὶ τὴν πρὸ τῆς οἰκίας τὴν πρὸς (16), and πᾶν τὰ τελέσαντα δὲξίως (17). All the other restorations, here adopted, are by Hatzfeld except for Στρατονική (1).

The chief obligation of the gymnasiarch was to supply the oil, and therefore the word γυμνασιαρχήω gradually shaded off into a synonym for ἐλαυνθέω. Thus we have the phrase γυμνασιαρχήσαντα ἐκ τῶν ἱδίων ἐπιρρύτῳ in no. 42. The noun γυμνασιαρχία (10-11) underwent a similar development. On the ἀκροάματα see L. Robert, Hermes, LXV (1930), p. 116.

On prosopographical evidence this inscription is dated approximately in the middle of the second century. See A. Laumonier, B.C.H., LXI (1937), pp. 273 f.

NICANDER

36. STRATONICEA. Found at Lagina. Szanto’s unpublished copy (1894) is preserved in the Austrian Archaeological Institute in Vienna. The inscription was copied and published by J. Hatzfeld, B.C.H., XLIV (1920), pp. 75-76, no. 6.


10 Ἰουλίας τῆς Νεκάνδρου Λῶν κλειδοφόρου τὸ δεύτερον.

TRANSLATION

The Demos and the Council and the Gerusia and those who dwell in the sanctuary have set up the statue of Nicander son of Menippus from Lobolda, voluntary priest, and the statue of the priestess . . . daughter of . . . who was the son of Dionysius.
from Coliorga and the statue of their daughter the keybearer Julia daughter of Nicander from Lobolda. They had all been honored with decrees by the Demos of the Nysaeans too. At the time when Julia daughter of Nicander from Lobolda was keybearer for the second time.

The Council and the Demos and those who dwell in the sanctuary honor the keybearer Zenonis Ammia daughter of the official physician Menippus. She performed piously her obligations toward the goddess and she treated all the citizens and foreign visitors generously.

COMMENTARY

The restorations are due to Hatzfeld.

ARIOSTIPPUS SON OF ARTEMIDORUS


A.D. 161-212

'Ο δῆμος
καὶ ἡ βουλὴ καὶ ἡ γερουσία ἐστι
εφάνωσεν καὶ ἔθαφεν δημοσίᾳ
'Αριστιππος Ἀρτεμιδώρου, ἂν

5 δρα ἁγαθὸν γενόμενον, γυμνα
σιαρχήσαντα τῶν νέων καὶ ἑρατεὺς
σαντα καὶ πρεσβευσάντα πρὸς
τοὺς Σεβαστοὺς — καὶ ἐν πολ
λοίς καὶ μεγάλοις εὐχρηστον

10 γενόμενον τῇ πατρίδι ἀμέ[μπτ]ως,
[ἀξιού] τοῦ γένους παρεσ[χημένον]
[αὐτόν

TRANSLATION

The Demos and the Council and the Gerusia crowned and buried publicly Aristippus son of Artemidorus. He was a good man, he served as gymnasiarch of the νέου and as priest, and he went on an embassy to the emperors, and in many very important matters he was of good service to the fatherland and irreproachable in his behavior. He displayed himself worthy of his clan.

COMMENTARY

The restorations are by Boeckh.
Hierocles


The Council and the Demos and the Gerusia honored Hierocles son of Panaetius and grandson of Thrason, from Hieracome, high priest of the Augusti, priest of Zeus Panamarus and of Hecate thrice (his daughter Appia Ada daughter of Hierocles being keybearer), priest of Zeus Chrysaorius, priest of Zeus Londargis, priest of Zeus Narasus, priest of Zeus . . ., gymnasiarch of the σέβαστων, gymnasiarch of the . . . twice. He gave the city money also for the grain fund. He performed the duties of public offices and of embassies. The Council, the Demos and the Gerusia honored also his sons . . . Thrason Leon, son of Hierocles, from Hieracome, priest of the Augusti, gymnasiarch

TRANSLATION

The Council and the Demos and the Gerusia honored Hierocles son of Panaetius and grandson of Thrason, from Hieracome, high priest of the Augusti, priest of Zeus Panamarus and of Hecate thrice (his daughter Appia Ada daughter of Hierocles being keybearer), priest of Zeus Chrysaorius, priest of Zeus Londargis, priest of Zeus Narasus, priest of Zeus . . ., gymnasiarch of the νέων, . . . twice. He gave the city money also for the grain fund. He performed the duties of public offices and of embassies. The Council, the Demos and the Gerusia honored also his sons . . . Thrason Leon, son of Hierocles, from Hieracome, priest of the Augusti, gymnasiarch
and priest of Zeus Panamarus, and Leon Thrason, son of Hierocles, from Hieracome, high priest of the Augusti, gymnasarch of the νεοι, priest of Zeus Chrysaorius. He . . . according to age the philosophers. He together with his father gave money for the erection of everlasting works, paying . . . denarii —.

COMMENTARY

The restorations are: by Pococke, 1 ὀ δῆ, τοίμη, 2 σαν; by Boeckh, 1 Ἡ βουλή καὶ, τίμη, 2 Ἴεροκλέα, 3 ἄρχιερέα, i, 4 ναμάρου καὶ, 6 ους, ἱερέ, 7 ος, i, 8 ος, 10 ὀ, 11 τα δὲ ἄρχας κ, 14 χον δὲ καὶ ἱερέ, 16 τὸν γυμνασιάρχου τῶν, ου, 17 καθ, 18 ἄργυριον δόντα, ῥωνίων ἐργών, 19 κατασκευήν, ῥιάδας, 20 ἴε, s; by Waddington, 5 σης; by Cousin, 3 ἴε, 5 τῆς θυγατρ, 6 Ἀδας, 12 καὶ τοὺς νιῶς, 13 οντα ἴε ἱερέα τῶ, 15 τα Ἴεροκλέους Θρασ; by Robert, 10 εἰς τὸ στί; by Oliver, 10 καὶ, 17 s.

Cousin restored part of the text on the analogy of a similar inscription, C.I.G., ΠΙ, 2721. In line 10 I have added the restoration καὶ because Robert's convincing proposal [ἐἰς τὸ στί] ὄνιν or [ἐἰς τὸ στί] ὄνιν does not seem to fill all the space.

Concerning this family see B.C.H., LXI (1937), pp. 269-271, where Laumonier designates the year 160 A.D. as the approximate time when at the age of 70 the father Hierocles, according to C.I.G., ΠΙ, 2721, went on an embassy to the emperor Antoninus Pius.


MYONIDES AND TRYPHAENA

39. STRATONICEA. Marble base found at Lagina. Hula's unpublished copy is preserved in the Austrian Archaeological Institute at Vienna. The inscription was copied and published by J. Hatzfeld, B.C.H., XLIV (1920), pp. 81-82, no. 14. Hatzfeld had access to another copy made by Chamonard in 1892.

Ο δήμος καὶ αἱ βουλαὶ καὶ η γερουσία

Ἡραίον ἱερέα Μυωνίδην ὄργιοφάντην,
πατροκασινήτην ἁλοχον σεμνήν τε Τρυφαίναν [ν].
ἡ δ' Ἐκάτη στέφασα βροτῶν τείμησε μάλιστα,
5 εἰκόσι ταῖσθε ἐγέραρε πατρὶς ἀναμῆς τεκέσσεσιν.

TRANSLATION

The Demos and the Councils and the Gerusia <honor> Myonides, priest at the Heraea, who initiates into the orgies, and his aunt and noble wife Tryphaena. Hecate, moreover, crowned them and so gave them greatest honor among mortals. With these statues the fatherland has honored them among its children.
COMMENTARY

At the beginning of line 4 the reading is uncertain. Hatzfeld published it ἱππικάτη and added that Chamonard read the first two letters ΗΔ. Hula’s copy gives ΗΔΕΕΚΑΤΗ. I have preferred to retain the delta clearly read by both early copyists independently.

The phrase ἡραίων ιερέα is equivalent to the expression ιερέα ἐν ἡραίων, for which see H. Oppermann, Zeus Panamaros (1924), pp. 38-77. His services to Hecate at Lagina had apparently occurred in the (or a) preceding year, whereas at the time of the inscription he was ιερατεύων ἐν ἡραίων for Zeus at Panamara.

Myonides appears to be a contemporary of Marcus Aurelius according to Lau- monier (B.C.H., LXI [1937], pp. 280-282).

MARCUS SEMPRONIUS CLEMENS


[Ὁ] δήμος καὶ αἱ βουλαὶ καὶ ἡ γέφ[ου]
σίᾳ ἐτήμησαν ταῖς μεγίσταις καὶ
ἐξαιρέτοις τεμαῖς Μάρκου Σεντρ
ὁν τοὺς Μάρκου ὑδυν Κλήμεντα, ἀνδρα ᾧ
5 ὁλογον καὶ ἀσύγκριτον, ἀτελεία καὶ ἀλει
τουργησία ἐκ γένους τετειμημέ
νον, ἑπαγγελλόμενον δὲ ἡρχι
ιερατεύκοτα τῶν Σεβαστῶν πλον
σίως, ιερατευκότα τοῦ Παναμά
10 ροῦ τετράκις, τὸ δίς ἐν ἡραίων
κατὰ πενταετηρίδα, ὅτε δὲ τὸ δεῦ
τερον ιεράτευν, ιερατευκότα καὶ
tῆς Ἐκάτης ἐν στενοχώροις καὶ
ροῖς, ιερατευκότα τῆς Ἐκάτης ὁμό
15 σε ὅτε καὶ τοῦ Παναμάρου τὸ βῆ, ιερὰ
tευκότα ἐνὶ ἔναντι Διὸς Χρυσαρεί
ον, Διὸς Ναράσου, Διὸς Δωδάργου, γεγυ
μνασιαρχηκτότα ἑπτάκις πλουσίως,
ἀγωνοθεύτα καὶ ἔναντι ἐκ τῶν
20 ἱδίων, εὐθηνιαρχηκτότα ἐν στενοχω
ῥῳ καρφῷ, ἐκάπροτον, πεπραταιν
κότα καὶ γεγραμματευκότα ἐν δυσ
cόλως, καὶ πεποηκότα πάντα ἐπὶ ὧφε
λία τῆς πόλεως, κατεσκευακότα ὑ
25 δραγωνία καὶ ὑδάτα εἰσαγεωμοχότα 
ἐἰς τὸ ἱερὸν τῆς Ἑκάτης, ἐν ὧν ἤρατεν 
ἐν χρύσῳ, κατεσκευαστὰ μαὸν ἐν τῷ 
περιστώφ τοῦ βουλευτηρίου σὺν τοῖς ἀγάλ 
μασιν ἐν παντὶ τῷ κόσμῳ, τεθικότα δὲ 
30 ἀγάλματα τὰ ἐν Παναμάρου καὶ ἐν Δαγείνου 
καὶ ἐν Κολιέργους. Περὶ πάντων ἐστὶν ψηφίσματα.

25 εἰσαγεωμοχότα γιὰ εἰσαγηγοχότα. 28 βουλευτηρίων.

TRANSLATION

The Demos and the Councils and the Gerusia honored with the greatest and 
exceptional honors Marcus Sempronius Clemens son of Marcus, a notable and incom-
parable man. By family right he had been honored with freedom from taxation and 
from liturgy. However, volunteering as high priest of the Augusti he performed the 
duties of the office without regard to expense. He served as priest of Zeus Panamarus 
four times, twice during the penteteric festival at the Heraea. When he was priest 
for the second time, he served as priest also of Hecate at a time of need. He served 
as priest of Hecate at the same time that he was priest of Zeus Panamarus for the 
second time. He served in one year as priest of Zeus Chrysaorius, priest of Zeus 
Narasus, priest of Zeus Londargus. He served as gymnasiarch seven times without 
regard to expense, as agonothete for a year at his own expense, as commissioner of 
food in a time of need, as decemprimus, as prytanis and as secretary at a difficult time, 
and he did everything for the benefit of the city. He built aqueducts and brought 
water to the sanctuary of Hecate, at the time that he was priest. He built a temple 
in the court of the Council House and gave also statues along with all the furnishings. 
He erected statues at Panamara, at Lagina and at Coliorga. Concerning everything 
are decrees.

COMMENTARY

Since the great-grandson of Sempronius Clemens is known to have lived at the 
beginning of the fourth century after Christ, the editors (loc. cit., p. 89) have located 
Sempronius Clemens himself at the end of the second or at the beginning of the third 
century after Christ. The chief services for which he is being honored (in the in-
scription) are concerned with the two great sanctuaries. The man’s services are 
enumerated in almost the same terms on other inscriptions which the editors have 
published together with this one.

The penteteric festival, celebrated in years when Sempronius Clemens served 
Zeus as ἱερεὺς ἐν Ἡραίοις (as contrasted with the alternate years when the priest was 
ἱερεύς ἐν Κομυρίοις), is identified by Oppermann (pp. 47-50) as the Ἐκατήσια, the most 
famous festival at Stratonicea, when the priest of Zeus at Panamara had an occasion
to display additional munificence. The Heraea were the festival of the Panamaran Hera, closely associated with the local god.

**Threptus Calpon**


\[\text{'H boulh kai o deimos kai ai ierai gevouzia etimhian kai ethaian xronoseous ste fainois Therpeton Meneostra} \]

\[5 \text{tov Kalptana Kwarat, mndenia lupsanta.} \]

**TRANSLATION**

The Council and the Demos and the Sacred Gerusiae have honored and buried with gold crowns Threptus Calpon, son of Menestratus, of Coraea. He never caused anyone any grief.

**COMMENTARY**

There are two sections of the Gerusia, because there are two sanctuaries, that of Hecate at Lagina and that of Zeus Panamarus at Panamara. *Kwarat* = *Kvaraiēa* demotic (Laumonier). The editor unfortunately has given no indication of the date, although he published it without either photograph or drawing.

**Phanias**

42. *Stratonicea*. Found at Lagina. Szanto’s unpublished copy (1894) is preserved at the Austrian Archaeological Institute at Vienna. The inscription was copied and published by J. Hatzfeld, *B.C.H.*, XLIV (1920), pp. 72-73, no. 3. Hatzfeld had access also to an earlier copy made by Chamonard (1892).

\[\text{8 etprou, Szanto; etprou, Hatzfeld; EPIHYTO, Chamonard.} \]

**TRANSLATION**

The Demos and the Council and the Gerusia have honored Phanias, son of Aristeas who was the son of Phanias, from Coliorga. He thrice fulfilled voluntarily...
the office of priest to the greatest goddess Hecate, and he served as gymnasiarch at
his own expense performing the obligations of the office in regard to the oil container,
announcing beforehand the amount of the oil, and he took care of the bronze gates.

COMMENTARY

Hatzfeld points out that Phanias is known from another inscription of the period
of the Roman Empire (B.C.H., XIV [1890], p. 368, no. 8).

The restorations are due to Hatzfeld except for those in line 3 and that at the
beginning of line 4. In regard to the latter compare No. 35.

AGRIPIANA

43. STRATONICEA. Found at Lagina. Copied and published by J. Hatzfeld, B.C.H., XLIV
(1920), p. 78, no. 9.

\[\text{\[O \delta\eta\muos kai ai\ 'boulaì kai \ ή \ ierá \ gerya[via kai oì \ é]v \ τῷ \ [iéròf] \ ka\]
\]
\[\text{\[tò nòv \ tέr]n \ kladofo\}
\]
\[\text{\[pròsìsan eισεβèsws mèv \] πròs \ τήν \ theòn,\}
\]
\[\text{\[filoteímwos \ dê \ πròs \ pán \]tas \ anòthròpous.\]
\]

TRANSLATION

The Demos and the Councils and the Gerusia honor . . . Agrippiana . . . who
served as keybearer with scrupulous piety toward the goddess and with generosity
toward all the pilgrims.

COMMENTARY

The restorations are those proposed by Hatzfeld.

AMMION APPION

44. STRATONICEA. Found at Lagina. Szanto’s unpublished copy (1894) is preserved in the
Austrian Archaeological Institute at Vienna. Published by J. Hatzfeld, B.C.H., XLIV
(1920), p. 77, no. 8.

\[\text{2 eικόσωe, Szanto; eικόσωv, Hatzfeld. Szanto’s copy shows a ligature \[\Pi \] in the phrase \[\text{ετείμησαν \ πολλάκις.}\]
\]
Translation

The Demos and the Councils and the Sacred Gerusia and those who dwell within the sanctuary have honored many times with portraits and busts on gilded shields and statues Ammion Appion daughter of Dionysocles. She served the goddess throughout the whole year and she gave zealous care to the faithful. Her fathers Dionysocles and Appius served as priests along with her.

Commentary

The existence of two fathers is comprehensible if Ammion was the real daughter of Appius and the adopted daughter of Dionysocles.

Unknown Benefactors


--- son of Aristeas, serving as gymnasiarchs in the year of the stephanephore Leon Aeneas son of Ariston, provided oil to be drawn from jars all day long and during most of the night. Moreover, they invited to a banquet also the aliens who dwell in the city and in the country, and they invited the Sacred Gerusia. Moreover, for all free men also they supplied oil to be drawn from jars at the traditional festivals, and oil similarly to be drawn from jars also in the sanctuary of Hecate at the time of her festival. Moreover, they invited to the refectory ---
Some of Waddington’s restorations were corrected and the others properly arranged by A. Wilhelm. Mention of the Gerusia occurs in lines 11-12, as Robert first observed.

**Pytheas Alexander**


\[\begin{align*}
\text{The Demos and the Council and the Sacred Gerusia have buried Pytheas Alexander, son of Aristippus, of Coliorga. His ancestors were distinguished and displayed zeal for the fatherland, and he himself from his earliest youth was patriotic.}
\end{align*}\]

**Commentary**

The lettering suggests a date in the second century after Christ. In line 2 the restoration \(\gamma[\text{erousia}]\) fits the space exactly and may be regarded as certain.

**Theophilus and Tryphera**

TRANSLATION

Voluntary priests for two years: Theophilus son of Theophilus of Hieracome and priestess Tryphera daughter of Gaius of the deme Coraea, opening the sacred refectory of the god to every class and age and to the out-of-town visitors with perfect willingness and sumptuousness, entertained also the Gerusia in the city with food to be carried away. Their sons, also, Theophilus and Theodorus, took an active part in all things in their zeal and in their devotion.

COMMENTARY

The document, a common type, which records the munificence with which the priest has performed the liturgy, is an inscription from the temple of Zeus Panamarus. The restorations are due to the original editors.

L. Robert, (Études Anatoliennes [Paris, 1937], pp. 555-561) has shown that Hieracome was the rich deme which had the sanctuary of Hecate at Lagina as its center.

DOMITIUS AURELIUS DIGENIANUS CALLICLES


After 212 A.D.

καὶ κοινόβο[υ]λ[ηρ]ον καὶ πολεογράφον
διὰ βιον [ου], ἀγορανομήσαντα ἐπιφάνο

5

[σ]υνδικήσαντα πιστῶς, γραμματεύσαντα ἐννόμως, ἐν πᾶσας
taῖς πολιτείαις ἐξητασμένον,
ἀρξάντα τοῦ κοινοῦ τῶν ἐν Βευθνίᾳ
Ελλήνων καὶ λογιστὴν τῆς ἱερ[ᾶς]

10

γερουσίας, ἀποδειγμένον εἰτυ-

χῶς πρῶτον ἀρχοντα καὶ ἵερεά καὶ
ἀγωνιθέτην Διῶς Ὀλυμπιόν Ἄ Δο[μ(ίον)]

Ἀδρήλιον Διογενιανὸν
Καλλικλέα

15

οἱ τῆς ὁμονοίας ἴημενοι εἰς

τῆν ἄρχην αὐτοῦ φύλαρχοι
Those who have been elected phylarchs of the united Prusias for his term honor Domitius Aurelius Diogenianus Callicles, who has fortunately been appointed first archon and priest and agonothete of the Olympian Zeus. Like his ancestors he is an honor-loving and patriotic advocate. He serves as decemprimus, as local senator, and as registrar appointed for life. As clerk of the market he performed his duties with distinction, as syndic faithfully, as secretary according to the law. He was approved in all his public offices. He served as archon of the League of Bithynian Greeks and as financial commissioner of the Sacred Gerusia.

COMMENTARY

The frequency of the name Aurelius shows that the document postdates the Constitutio Antoniniana of 212 A.D. The names of the tribes reflect honors paid to Augustus, Germanicus, Sabina (the wife of Hadrian), Faustina (probably the wife of Marcus Aurelius), Tiberius, Hadrian, Julius Caesar and Marcus Antonius. The phrase οἱ τῆς ὀμοσφεκτῆς ἥρμηνευοι φύλαρχοι, for which the inscriptions of Prusias provide numerous parallels, is explained by Koerte with comparison of the phrase οἱ ἐνηκεκριμένοι καὶ οἱ τῆν ἀγροκιαν κατοικοῦντες, used to describe classes of citizens at Prusias.
όµόνουα, according to his interpretation, came about through the reception (ἐγκρισις) τῶν τῆν ἀγροκίαιν κατοικοῦντων into the tribes.

Although the inscription itself follows the publication of the Constitutio Antoniniana, the connection of Diogenianus Callicles with the Gerusia may have begun and even terminated before that date.

Lucilia Laudice the High Priestess


[Ἡ] βούλη καὶ ὁ δῆµος καὶ τὸ ἱερὸν
σύστημα τῆς γεν.

Ligatures in lines 4, 7, 11, and 12 indicate a date no earlier than the second century after Christ.

Tiberius Claudius Pannychus


Translation

The Council and the Demos and the Gerusia’s sacred board have honored Lucilia Laudice, daughter of Gaius Lucilius, the high priestess on account of her family’s acts of public spirit.

Publius Aelius Bassus Chryseros who has served as stephanephore, as high priest and has performed the other offices and liturgies <has set up this statue of> his mother.

Commentary

Ligatures in lines 4, 7, and 12 indicate a date no earlier than the second century after Christ.
The Council and the Demos and the Gerusia's sacred board and the emperor-loving neoi and the Roman residents of Tralles have honored Tiberius Claudius Pannychus, son of Eutyches, the Coebilian. He has served as strategus of the night watch, as decemprimus, as treasurer, as investor of the capital, as curator of the <local> Romans; he has bought Egyptian corn as the public buyer, and he has labored additionally for the corn supply and given the public treasury 2527 denarii; he has served as temple-warden, as strategus, as clerk of the market, all with great public spirit; and he has also erected out of his own money the twelve marble tables with the twelve bases in the fish market.

Publius Titius Maevianus . . . <has set up the statue of> his friend.

COMMENTARY

The reference to the institution of the decemprimi shows that the inscription cannot be dated earlier than the second century after Christ.40

The restoration of line 1 is by Ruge on the analogy of No. 51. On the same analogy the word ἱερὸν has here been substituted for Boeckh's restoration φιλοσέβαστον in line 2. The first word of line 7 was reported as Κολυβιλον by Sherard. From its position after the patronymic I assume that this name refers to the man's deme, tribe or συγγένεια. The demes of Tralles are with one exception unknown, but the form Κοιβιλον aroused distrust in Boeckh, who suggested the emendation Κο<ρ>βιλον (not a demotic of course but the cognomen Corvinus). In line 23, furthermore, the horizontal line over the last letter and the absence of any indication of a lacuna afterwards as Sherard did give for line 17, indicate an abbreviation. Boeckh restored the name Cilo (Κ[ε]λον), which, however, would not have been abbreviated. The abbreviation recalls the demotic or phyletic of line 7. After the first letter of line 23, I have restored one letter, because Sherard's copy seems to indicate with the dot not a mark of punctuation missing above in lines 5 and 6 but a lacuna of one letter space. The other restorations and emendations are due to Boeckh.

Statue Base


\[\text{Ἡ βουλή καὶ ὁ δήμος καὶ τὸ ἱερὸν σύντημα τῆς γεροντίας καὶ οἱ φιλοσέβαστοι νέοι καὶ οἱ ἐν Τράλλησι} \]

[Ῥωμαῖοι ————]

TRANSLATION

The Council and the Demos and the Gerusia’s sacred board and the emperor-loving neoi and the Romans resident in Tralles have honored——

COMMENTARY

The document is very similar in type to No. 50 dated in the second or early third century after Christ.

L. Atilius Proculus


Οἱ γέροντες
ἐτίμησαν Λούκιον Ἀτίλιον
Δουκίον νιὸν Παλατίνα Πρόκλον
νεώτερον, ἵερα τῶν Σεβαστῶν,
5 φιλογέροντα καὶ φιλόπατρων,
πρεσβεύσαντα πρὸς τοὺς Σεβασ
tὸς δωρεὰ ὑπὲρ τῶν εἰς τὴν κτί
sων διαφερόντων, ἐν τε ταῖς λοιπαῖς
tῆς πόλεως καὶ τῆς γεροντίας
10 χρείας ἀγνώς καὶ δικαίως ἐκ προ
gόνων πολεμευόμενον, συνή
gορον τῆς γεροντίας.

TRANSLATION

The Elders have honored Lucius Atilius Proculus the Younger, son of Lucius, of the Palatine Tribe, priest of the Augusti, Elder-loving and fatherland-loving, having gone on an embassy at his own expense to the emperors in behalf of the matters concerning the foundation, and having in the other services of the city and of
the Gerusia filled the post after the manner of his ancestors with perfect honesty and justice,—the advocate of the Gerusia.

COMMENTARY

Ramsay, who noted the reference in lines 7 and 8 concerned the foundation of the Gerusia, presumed that Proculus was the son of a known personage from the middle of the first century after Christ because of the similarity of the names. He might, however, have been a more distant descendant. Since Ramsay presumed that the Σεβαστοί to whom Proculus went on an embassy were Vespasian and Titus, he arrived at the date 70-79 A.D. But Titus was not called Augustus during the life of his father. The Σεβαστοί are mentioned as if they were the familiar ones reigning at the time, and the inscription, therefore, cannot be dated before the joint reign of Marcus Aurelius and Lucius Verus at the earliest. In view, however, of the foundation of other gerusiae in the reign of Commodus, the Σεβαστοί are almost certain to have been the coregent emperors Marcus Aurelius and Commodus.

TIB. AELIUS SATURNINUS MARINIANUS


```
[Τὸ σὲ]μνὸ[τ]α[θ]ο[ν συνέδρι]
[o]ν τῶν γερ[ο]ν[τ]ων
[Τυβ]έριον Α[λ]ιον Σα
[το]νείν[o]ν Μαρει
[μι]νο[ν τὸν ἰδιον Σ]
[κτ]ιστην, ἕγγονον
```

TRANSLATION

The most revered synhedron of the Elders <has honored> Tiberius Aelius Saturninus Marinianus their benefactor, grandson of high-priests and relative of consuls.

Marcus Forbianus archon of the Elders attended to having the statue erected.

COMMENTARY

Ramsay dated the inscription "later" than No. 52. He assumed that Marinianus had performed some service for the Gerusia and had therefore ranked as κτίστης. The fact that he was a relative of consuls almost suffices to bring the inscription down into the second century, for senators began commonly to be chosen in the East only in the reign of Trajan.
M. CANINIUS DOCIMUS

54. THESSALONICA. S. Pelekides, 'Απὸ τὴν πολιτεία καὶ τὴν κοινωνία τῆς ἀρχαίας Θεσσαλονίκης (Salonica, 1934), p. 58, no. 10 (photograph). See also Ch. Edson, Harvard Studies in Classical Philology, LI (1940), pp. 135 f.

A.D. 221

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ἱ πατρίς</td>
<td>θεόν Φοίλ</td>
<td>ἐν τῷ γυνῷ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cymatium</td>
<td>βον καὶ</td>
<td>Σεῖβ. ἔτει</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Μ. Κανίνη</td>
<td>ἀγωνοῦ</td>
<td>[γε]ροντὶ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>οὐν Δόκι</td>
<td>θέτην</td>
<td>[--- ---]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>μον ἱερὴ</td>
<td>[[y ]]\ povc'ι</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TRANSLATION

The fatherland honors M. Caninius Docimus, priest of the deified Fulvus and president of the games in the 253rd Augustan year, gerusi —-

COMMENTARY

Edson has shown that the deified (Aurelius) Fulvus, worshipped at Thessalonica in the third century, was not Antoninus Pius himself but was M. Aurelius Fulvus Antoninus the son of Antoninus Pius and of Annia Galeria Faustina.

FIRST INSCRIPTION IN HONOR OF EUPHRANTICUS

55. THESSALONICA. P. N. Papageorgiou in a local newspaper 'Αλίθεα, Oct. 7, 1906, p. 1, no. 23. The text here presented is that of Charles Edson who will treat this and the following inscriptions in his forthcoming essay, Inscribed Honorary Altars of Thessalonica.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Δ·Β·Δ</td>
<td>σαντα γερουσίας</td>
<td>σαντα γερουσίας</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cymatium</td>
<td>δυο &lt; ἄνδρα</td>
<td>δυο &lt; ἄνδρα</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>·Γ· Ιουλ· Εὐφραντικὸν</td>
<td>Καλανδία τῶν γλυ</td>
<td>Καλανδία τῶν γλυ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>γυμνασιαρχήσαντα</td>
<td>κύτατον ἑαντῆς</td>
<td>κύτατον ἑαντῆς</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>πανδημίδι δί' ὅλον ἑ</td>
<td>ἀνδρα</td>
<td>ἀνδρα</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>τοὺς καὶ καταστή</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>[--- ---]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TRANSLATION

With the consent of the Council and Demos. Aurelia Calandia honors her most dear husband, C. Julius Euphranticus who supplied the oil to the whole people for a whole year and established two gerusiae.

COMMENTARY

On stylistic grounds Edson would date the inscription approximately in the second quarter of the third century after Christ.
SECOND INSCRIPTION IN HONOR OF EUPHRANTICUS


\[
\begin{align*}
& \text{cmatium} \\
& \tauνον \gammaυμναρσιαρ \\
& \chiον και \gammaερουσι \\
& \alphaρχην \gammaερουσι \\
& 5 \ \deltaυ \ \Gamma. \ \text{Ἰουλ}
\end{align*}
\]

TRANSLATION

With the consent of the Council and Demos. Aurelia Calandia <honors> her most dear husband, C. Julius Euphranticus the gymnasiarch and gerusiarch of two gerusiae.

FLAVIA CLAUDIA SILVANA


ca. 245-252 A.D.

\[
\begin{align*}
& \text{ἐυφραντικῶν} \\
& Αὐρηλία \ \text{Καλαν} \\
& δίᾳ τὸν \ \gammaυλικῦτα \\
& τὸν ἕαυτης \ \ἀνδρα \\
& \text{cmatium}
\end{align*}
\]

TRANSLATION

To Good Fortune. The Council and the Demos of the most illustrious metropolis and colony of the Thessalonians, which has received the distinction of a temple four times, to Flavia Claudia Silvana the most honorable high-priestess and wife of the gerusiarch, as a mark of honor and because of her good will. Farewell.

COMMENTARY

The restoration in line 11 is by Sp. Vases apud Pelekides, the others are by Papageorgiou. As in Nos. 19, 20, and 58 the phrase ευτυχῶσ is addressed to the readers. Compare No. 60: ευτυχείτε.
Aur. Statilius Theodorus called Hapsimachis


Middle of Third Century after Christ

\[
\begin{align*}
\Delta (\text{όγματι}) & \quad B (\text{ουλής}) \\
\text{cymatium} & \\
\text{Αὐρ(ήλιον) Στατείλιον} & \quad \text{πόλεως καὶ κολω} \\
\text{Θεόδωρον τὸν} & \quad \text{νείας} & \quad \text{Αὐρ. Ίσιδώρα} \\
καὶ Ἀψιμαχόν & \quad \text{ἡ μήτηρ εἰς παραμν} & \quad \text{ἂν ἐαυτῆς ἐπὶ} \\
5 & \quad \text{tv} & \quad \text{δοῦσα τῇ πόλει} \\
\text{τὸν ἀξιολογὸ} & \quad \text{ἐπ' ὀνόματος} & \quad \text{αὐτοῦ εἰς γερον} \\
\text{τατον ἀπὸ φρον} & \quad \text{σίαι Ἀττικᾶς} & \quad \text{μυρίας.} \\
\text{μενταρίων βον} & \quad 15 & \quad \text{εὐτυχῶς} \\
\text{λευτὴν νόμον} & \\
\text{τῆς λαμπρᾶς Θεσσα} & \\
10 & \text{λογικέων μήτρο} & \\
\end{align*}
\]

TRANSLATION

With the consent of the Council.

Aurelia Isidora, the mother <honors> Aurelius Statilius Theodorus called Hapsimachis, the very distinguished ex-frumentarius, who took his place as Councilman of the illustrious metropolis and colony of the Thessalonians according to the law. For her own consolation she presented in his name ten thousand Attic drachmas to the Gerusia for the city. Farewell.

Pontia Zosime


A.D. 261

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Κατὰ τὸ δόξαν τῇ κρατίστῃ βου} & \quad \text{δρας τῆς ἀξιολογώτατῆς} \\
\text{λῃ καὶ τῷ λαμπροτάτῳ δήμῳ} & \quad \text{ἀρχιερείας ἡ μήτηρ Ὀὐαλεία} \\
\text{τῆς Θεσσαλονίκειν} & \quad Ἀλεξάνδρα τιμῆς καὶ μνήμης ἐνεκα, \\
\text{μῆ τροπόλεως καὶ κολονείας} & \quad ἐπιδούσα καὶ ἔπ' ὁ \\
5 & \quad νόματι τῆς θυγα \\
\text{Ποντίαν Ζωσίμην θυγατέ} & \quad τρὸς ἵς γεροντιάν * μ(ύ)ρ(ία) \\
\text{ρα Ποντίου Εὐσαγγέλου} & \quad 15 & \quad ἔτους γῆς \\
\text{τοῦ κρατίστου καὶ ἀρχιερέ} & \\
\text{ως καὶ Ὀγαλείας Ἀλεξάν} & \\
\end{align*}
\]

TRANSLATION

According to the consent of the most distinguished Council and most illustrious Demos of the metropolis and colony of the Thessalonians.
Valeria Alexandra, the mother, to Pontia Zosime daughter of Pontius Evangelus vir egregius and high priest and of Valeria Alexandra the very worthy high priestess, in her honor and memory. She gave in the name of her daughter ten thousand denarii to the Gerusia.

In the 293rd <Augustan> year.

**TIB. CL. PASINUS**


\[\Delta αγάθη \ Τύχη\]

Τιβ. Κλαύδιον Πασίγιων Μονκιανοῦ

ἡ ἱερὰ γερουσία τῶν ἑαυτῆς ἐκδικοῦν.

ἐνυχεῖτε.

ταμεύοντος Γλαύκον Θάλλου

**TRANSLATION**

To Good Fortune.
The Sacred Gerusia <honors> its advocate Tib. Claudius Pasinus son of Mucianus.

Farewell.

In the term of the treasurer Glaucus Thallus.

**COMMENTARY**

In his index on page 137 Dumont interpreted the word ταμεύοντος as referring to the ῥαμίας of the Gerusia.

**HERENNIUS HERACLIANUS**


\[\varepsilonρέννιος \ Ήρακλιανὸς \ γερου\]

σιαστής Φιλιπποπολείτης ἐκ

τῶν ἱδίων ἑαυτῷ καὶ τῇ συμβί

ψ ἑαυτοῦ Κλεοπάτρας Ἀθηνοδώ

5 ρου κατεσκεύασε τὴν σο

ρὸν σὺν τῷ γράξ<δ>φ ἀνέξοδι

αστον. ὃς ἂν δὲ πωλήσει, δῶσι τῷ φί

σκῳ δηνάρια [-] 5잠
Herennius Heraclianus, a Philippopolitan Elder, has prepared out of his own funds, for himself and for his consort Cleopatra daughter of Theodorus, this coffin, never to be alienated, with its step. Whoever sells it, will pay . . . denarii to the fiscus.

The word γράδξ (stone ΠΡΑΛΩ) was restored by Mordtmann. It refers to the stepped base on which the sarcophagus rested. For parallels see Kalinka, *Antike Denkmäler in Bulgarien* (Vienna, 1906), no. 323 and commentary.

us Saturninus, Philippopolitan Elder, still living and of clear mind and memory, prepared the funerary shrine for the Δι Manes and the enclosed tomb for himself and for his consort . . . I ask that these monuments be inviolable and inalienable and that it be permitted to no one after my death . . . to deposit any other corpse in the tomb; and if any one do so, he shall pay as a fine to the heirs 2,500 denarii and to the Gerusia . . . denarii.

The emendations and tentative restorations are due to the original editor. His field copy gives ΦΙΛΙΠΠΟΠΟΠΟΛΕΙΣ in line 1 and ΜΒΦ and ΓΟΡΟΥ in line 5.
[... and if anyone else shall dare to open it or shall bury any one in it, he shall pay to the most excellent Council and to the Sacred Gerusia...]

**COMMENTARY**

The first three lines are here given as reported by the original editor, to whom also the restorations are due. I suspect lacunae at the beginning of the lines.
PART III

INDEXES
## INDEX OF INSCRIPTIONS STUDIED OR CORRECTED

Previously Unpublished in Whole or in Part

See above, nos. 24, 25, 31, 32.

### 'Ἀληθεία, a local newspaper of Salonica

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### Anzeiger der kaiserlichen Akademie der Wissenschaften in Wien, Phil.-hist. Klasse

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1893</td>
<td>XXX</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 'Ἀρχαιολογικὸν Δελτίον

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>VII</td>
<td>p. 113 and pp. 258-346</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Athenian Agora: Catalogue of the American Excavations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Inscription</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I 10</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I 27</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I 60</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I 64</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I 815</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I 864</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Athens: Catalogue of the Epigraphical Museum

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Inscription</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>283</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2648</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2763</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8187</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Berliner Philologische Wochenschrift

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1902</td>
<td>XXII</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Bulletin de Correspondance Hellénique

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1878</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1881</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1886</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1887</td>
<td>XI</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1888</td>
<td>XII</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1891</td>
<td>XV</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1893</td>
<td>XVII</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1894</td>
<td>XVIII</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1901</td>
<td>XXV</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1904</td>
<td>XXVIII</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1920</td>
<td>XLIV</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1920</td>
<td>XLIV</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1920</td>
<td>XLIV</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1920</td>
<td>XLIV</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1920</td>
<td>XLIV</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1920</td>
<td>XLIV</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1927</td>
<td>LI</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1934</td>
<td>LVIII</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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I, p. 29, no. LXXI .......................... 37

The Collection of Ancient Greek Inscriptions in the British Museum

| III 449 | 1 | III 573 | 16 |
| III 470 | 2 | III 575 | 21 |
| III 481 | 3 | III 587 | 20 |
| III 483 | 12 | III 599 | 8 |
| III 486 | 7 | III 604 | 10 |
| III 497 | 11 | III 636 | 13 |
| III 544 | 14 | III 648 | 17 |
| III 558 | 15 | IV, pp. 238-250 | 3 |


5589 ................................ 1

Corpus Inscriptionum Graecarum

| I 189 | 29 | II 2720 | 38 |
| I 399 | 27 | II 2724 | 37 |
| I 1755 | 33 | II 2930 | 50 |
| II 2050 | 61 | II 2987b | 9 |

| III, 2, 6078 | 14 | III, 4, 141954 | 4 |
| III, 2, 6087 | 13 |

W. Dittenberger, *Orientis Graeci Inscriptiones Selectae* (Leipzig, 1903-1905)

508 .................................. 11 | 534 ................................ 15

W. Dittenberger, *Sylloge Inscriptionum Graecarum*

First edition

| 134 | 1 | 284 | 7 |

Second edition

| 186 | 1 | 737 | 22 |
| 386 | 7 | 740 | 33 |
| 411 | 23 |

Third edition

| 353 | 1 | 1109 | 22 |
| 833 | 7 | 1112 | 33 |
| 872 | 23 |

A. Dumont, “Inscriptions et monuments figurés de la Thrace,” *Archives des missions scientifiques et littéraires*, 3rd series, III (1876), pp. 117-200. This article together with others by A.
INDEXES

Dumont was reproduced with the same numberings but with a few extra notes and transliterations by Th. Homolle in a book, *Mélanges d'archéologie et d'épigraphie* (Paris, 1892), pp. 307-581.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page Range</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>60, 104a (see p. 32, note 11).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57c</td>
<td>61, 104b (see p. 32, note 11).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>104</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Εφημερίς Ἀρχαιολογική*

1883, p. 77, no. 6. .......... 23

Forschungen in Ephesos, II (Vienna, 1912)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page Range</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>pp. 109-112, No. 20.</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pp. 119-123, No. 23.</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pp. 127-147, No. 27.</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pp. 147-149, No. 28.</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Hermes, Zeitschrift für classische Philologie

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Volume</th>
<th>Page Range</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IV (1870), pp. 178-181, no. 1.</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV (1870), pp. 198-201, no. 11.</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV (1870), pp. 205-206, no. 14.</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV (1870), pp. 206-207, no. 15.</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV (1870), pp. 209-210, no. 18.</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV (1870), p. 215, no. 29.</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Hesperia

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Volume</th>
<th>Page Range</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>II (1933), pp. 165-169, no. 10.</td>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

W. Hüttl, *Antoninus Pius*, II (Prague, 1933)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Volume</th>
<th>Page Range</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>II, pp. 308 f.</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Inscriptiones Graecae

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Edition</th>
<th>Page Range</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>III Add. 39a</td>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III 42</td>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III 43</td>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III 702</td>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III 851</td>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III 1062</td>
<td>29</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VII 2808</td>
<td>33</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II² 1064</td>
<td>31</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II² 1108</td>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Inscriptiones Graecae ad Res Romanas pertinentes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Edition</th>
<th>Page Range</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I 729</td>
<td>60</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I 735</td>
<td>61</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III 65</td>
<td>48</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Edition</th>
<th>Page Range</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IV 782</td>
<td>53</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV 783</td>
<td>52</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Jahreshefte des österreichischen archäologischen Institutes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Volume</th>
<th>Page Range</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I (1898), Beiblatt, p. 78.</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XVIII (1915), Beiblatt, pp. 281 f.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Journal of Philology

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Volume</th>
<th>Page Range</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>VII (1877), pp. 140-144</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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L. Lafoscade, *De epistulis (aliiisque titulis) imperatorum magistratuumve romanorum quae ab aetate Augusti usque ad Constantinum Graece scriptas lapides papyrive servaverunt* (Lille, 1902).

B. Laum, *Stiftungen in der griechischen und römischen Antike* (1914)

W. M. Leake, *Journal of a Tour in Asia Minor* (London, 1824)


E. Loewy, *Inscriften griechischer Bildhauer* (Leipzig, 1885)

Ch. Michel, *Recueil d'inscriptions grecques* 488 \(\ldots\) 1 1564 \(\ldots\) 22

Mitteilungen des deutschen archäologischen Instituts: Athenische Abteilung

XXI (1896), pp. 469-470, no. 1 \(\ldots\) 52

XXIV (1899), pp. 435-436, no. 26 \(\ldots\) 48


M. Pappakonstantinou, *Ai Τράλλες* (Athens, 1895)

S. Pelekides, *'Από τὴν πολιτεία καὶ τὴν κοινωνία τῆς Ἀρχαίας Θεσσαλονίκης, Salonica, 1934 (Παράρτημα τοῦ δευτέρου τόμου τῆς Ἐπιστημονικῆς Ἐπετηρίδος τῆς Φιλοσοφικῆς Σχολῆς, 1933).*


K. Pittakys, *L'ancienne Athènes* (Athens, 1835)

p. 327 \(\ldots\) 26
INDEXES


II, 7, p. 13, no. 12 ..................... 37 II, 7, p. 14, no. 14 ..................... 38


Γ 1a ................................ 27 Γ 30f ................................ 50
Γ 1b ................................ 28 Γ 30g ................................ 51
Γ 1c ................................ 29 Γ 35a ................................ 6
Γ 1d ................................ 33 Γ 35b ................................ 9
Γ 3 ................................ 33 Γ 35c ................................ 2
Γ 5 ................................ 59 Γ 35d ................................ 12
Γ 6a ................................ 63 Γ 35e ................................ 7
Γ 9a ................................ 60 Γ 35g (rejected).
Γ 9b ................................ 61 Γ 35i ................................ 16
Γ 9c ................................ 62 Γ 35k ................................ 21
Γ 24Da ................................ 39 Γ 35m ................................ 20
Γ 24Db ................................ 42 Γ 35n ................................ 8
Γ 24De ................................ 44 Γ 35o ................................ 13
Γ 24Dd ................................ 36 Γ 35p ................................ 17
Γ 25a ................................ 40 Γ 35q ................................ 11
Γ 25b ................................ 47 Γ 35r ................................ 4
Γ 25c ................................ 34 Γ 35s ................................ 1
Γ 25d ................................ 38 Γ 35t ................................ 15
Γ 25e ................................ 37 Γ 35x ................................ 12
Γ 25f ................................ 46 Γ 49 ................................ 48
Γ 30e ................................ 49


IV, p. 101 f ..................... 29


pp. 468-469, no. 305 .................... 52 pp. 469-470, no. 306 .................... 53

Revue Archéologique

2nd series, VII (1863), pp. 371-382 ...... 48 5th series XXIII (1926), p. 313, no. 15 .... 18
3rd series, XXXII (1898), p. 466, no. 67. 11

Revue des Études Grecques

XXXI (1918), pp. 227-237 (see p. 29).

J. Spon, *Voyage d'Italie, de Dalmatie, de Grèce et du Levant* (Lyons, 1678).

III, 2, pp. 141-142 ..................... 27

383 ........................................ 49

Supplementum Epigraphicum Graecum

IV 535 ..................................... 18


p. 429 ........................................ 27


Inscriptions from the Temple, 19 ........ 1
Inscriptions from the Great Theatre, 1... 3
Inscriptions from the Great Theatre, 4... 20
Inscriptions from the Great Theatre, 17.. 7
Inscriptions from Tombs, Sarcophagi, etc., 5 ........................................ 13
Inscriptions from the Great Theatre, 18.. 10
INDEXES TO THE INSCRIPTIONS OF PART II

The large numerals indicate the inscriptions in which the word occurs; the small numerals indicate the exact line of the inscription; brackets around a numeral or around a series of numerals indicate that at this point or points the word is not extant but has been supplied by the editor.

I. GERUSIA: OFFICERS AND TITLES

[γερουσία] 1 2; 2 4-5; 3 30, [63], 127, [144]; 166, 167, 206, 232, [235, 244], 293, [455]; 4 11, 18, 21; 5 12; 6 12; 7 4, 13; 9 14, 20; 10 6; 11 5, 27, 37, 54-55; 12 5, 8, [12], 23, [26]; 13 13; 14 7; 17 10; 18 22; 20 9-10, 11; 22 132; 23 11; 24 [6], 13, 21, 29, 46; 25 5; 26 11, [19]; 27 2, 10; [28 3]; 31 13; 33 2, 8, 21, 30-31, 40-41, 44, 47, 49, 50-51; 34 13; 35 5; 36 1; 37 2; 38 1, 20; 39 1; 40 1-2; 41 2; 42 5; 43 1; 44 1; [45 12; 46 2]; 47 12; 48 10; 49 3-4; 50 2-3; 51 2; 52 9, 12; 54 11; 58 17-18; 59 14; 60 3; 62 5; 63 7: γερουσία 1 4: γερουσία δύο 55 6-7; 56 4-5. See also [ιερά γερουσία]

γερουσιάρχης γερουσιών δύο 56 4-5

γερουσιάρχισσα (= wife of the gerusiararch) 57 10-11

γερουσιαστής 8 4; 21 4, 10-11; 33 17, 31-32; 61 1-2; 62 1

γέρων 12 20; 24 50; 29 6; 30; 52 1; 53 2, 12

γραμματεύς 3 243-244; 20 13: [ὁ τοῦ συνεδρίου τῆς γερουσίας γραμματεύς 3 232

II. KNOWN MEMBERS OF THE GERUSIA

APAMEA

[Ὑπάτος άρχων Αλλιος Ζαυνίνος Μαρέινα] νόσ 53 3-5

Λούκιος Ατλίος Λούκιον νόσ Παλατίνη Ρόκλος νεώτερος 52 2-4

Μάρκος Φορβιανός archon 53 10-11

ATHENS

Αλλιος Ευφρόσυνος Παληνεττός 29 4-5

'Αττικός Εὐθύττος Σφιτίτος 27 12

M. Αερίλλος λαβοθόρος Πρόσδεκτος Πυτακράτος

Κεφαλάθην archon of the Gerusia 27 2-4

Κλ. Λεωνίδας archon? of the Gerusia 24 3

Πρίμος 30

γυμνασίαρχος 5 4-5; 20 14

ἐκδίκος 12 [7], 14; 22, 60 3

ἐπώδημος 24 1

γερουσία 4 [2], 8, 9; 14 5

ιερά γερουσία [24 5-6]; 27 2, 10; [28 3]; 31 13; 33 2, 21; 44 1; [45 11-12]; 46 2; 48 9-10; 60 3; 63 7: ιεραί γερουσίαι 41 2

ιερόν σύντημα τῆς γερουσίας 49 2-4; 50 2-3; 51 1-2

ιερού γέρων 29 6; 30

λογιστής 9 [12-13], 20; 11 6; [24 54]; 48 9

μετέχων: οἱ μετέχοντες τοῦ συνεδρίου] 12 5; οἱ τοῦ συνεδρίου μετέχοντες [3 235]; μετέχων καὶ τῆς φιλοσφοβίας τοῦ γερουσιαστῆς 18 21; μετέχοντες τῆς γερουσίας 34 12

πατρογέρων 12 25; 16 6; 21 10

πρεσβύτερος 3 311; 5 5; [12 28]; 20 3

προστάτης 33 32-33 (Hyettus)

συνεδρίον [3 232, 235]; 11 11-12, [20], 29, 49; 12 [3], 5, 7; 24 31; 31 8, 13, [38, 39]; [53 1-2]

σύνεδρος [12 12, 13, 15]

συνήγαγωρ τῆς γερουσίας 52 11-12

σύστημα: see ιερὸν σύστημα τῆς γερουσίας

Ephesus

M. Άγ. 'Αρτεμιδόρος 'Αστάλον 21 2-3, 8-9

Ευάνδρος 19 10

Νικομήδης general advocate 12 7, [10, 11, 24]

Τίτος Πελουκαῖος Κάναξ gymnasiarch of the Elders 5 3

Πόσπλος 'Ρουτίλος Βάσσος eponymous officer? of the Gerusia 7 16

'Ρουφένος 16 5-6

T. Φλ. 'Ασκληπιάδωρος 18 10-11

Hyettus

Α. Άγ. Τυμπράτης Χαρικλείου 33 32-33

'Επαφρόδιτος Μεγιστά 33 35
THE SACRED GERUSIA

III. EMPERORS AND THEIR RELATIVES, KINGS

LYSIMACHUS

Antimachus [3 187; 12 2]

Nerva

Theo Néronas [7 2]; 24 [9], 12, [24, 27, 40, 44]; [26 9, 17]

Trajan

Avtokrator Neroi, Traianos Kaias Tsebastos Germaikos Dakikon 3 25-26, [151-152]
Theo Traianos Parthikos 7 1; 24 [8-9, 11-12, 24], 27, 40, [43]; 26 [9], 17

HADRIAN

Avtokrator Kaias, Theo Traianou Parthikou nivos, Theo Nérona vionos, Traianos 'Adrianos Tsebastos, arxieirois megystos, demarchikis euvnias to 8, ypatos to g 7 1-4
Theo 'Adrianos 9 13; 23 9, 12; 24 [8, 11, 27], 43

ANTONINUS PIUS

Avtokrator Kaias [Titos], Allos 'Adrianos 'Antoninnos Tsebastos Eudikhs 9 16-18
Theo 'Antoninos 24 24, 40
Theo 'Antoninos Eudikhs [24 8]; 26 8, 16
Theo Eudikhs 24 [11], 27, [43]

M. Aurelius Fulvus Antoninus

Theo Phoulhos 54 5-6

Lucius Verus

Avtokrator Kaias Louskos 'Afrilios Olyros Tsebastos 'Ariemakos 11 2-3
Theo Louskos Olyros 'Ariemakos Parthikos 23 13-14
Theo Olyros Parthikos 24 [8], 24, 40

Marcus Aurelius

Avtokrator Kaias Markos 'Afrilios 'Antoninos Tsebastos 11 1-2

Avtokrator M. Afrilios 'Antoninos Germaikos Sar- matikos 23 14-16

Avtokrator Ka[isar Theo 'Antoninos Evseboios nivos, Theo Olyron Parthikou adelphos, Theo 'Adrianou ivionos, Theo Traianou] Parthikou Ego[vos, Theo Nérona apogonos, Markos Afrilios 'Antoninos Tsebastos Germaikos Sarmatikos, arxieirois] megystos, demarchikos [euvnias to 8, avtokrator to 8, ypatos to g, patiria patrides] 24 8-10


Theo Markos 'Antoninos [26 8, 16]

Avtokrator 'Antoninos Tsebastos 24 11, 26-27, 43

COMMODUS

Avtokrator Kaias M. Ahr. Kommodos 'Antoninos [Tsebastos Eudikhs Euthikhs] 12 9
Avtokrator M. Afrilios Kommodos Germaikos Sarmatikos 23 14-16

INDEXES

IV. PROPER NAMES

'Αγαθή Τύχη 8 1; 12 1, [12] 18 8; 20 6; 21 1; 33 1; 57 1; 60 1

'Αγαθόπους Θεοφίλου 48 19 (Prusias ad Hyperm)

'Αγαθόπους: see M. Αἰρ. 'Αγαθόπους

'Αγριππαία 43 2 (Lagina)

'Αδα: see 'Ασπία 'Αδα

'Αδατώρ το a Galatian 15 3

'Αδριανέα 10 4: τα μεγάλα 'Αδριανεία τῆς δευτέρας πενταετηρίδος 9 6-7

'Αδριανή tribe at Prusias ad Hyperm 48 45

'Αθηναί Πάμμωνος 3 465

'Αθηνᾶ: 'Αθηνᾶν 31 28

'Αθηναίοι 24 13, [28-29] 47; 26 11, 19

'Αθη νόπορος father of Cleopatra and father-in-law of Herennius Heraclianus 61 4-5 (Philipopolis)

'Αίγυπτος 50 13-14

'Αίλια Λέωνς θυγάτηρ Τρύφανα Δρακοντίς 34 5-7 (Panamara)

II. Αίλιος Βάσισος Χρυσέριος son of Lucilia Luciana 49 11-12 (Tralles)

Αίλιος Εὐφρόνιος Παλληνην 29 4-5 (Athens)


Αἰνίας: see Λέων 'Αρίστωνος Αὐξα

'Ακάκιος 19 5 (Ephesus)

'Ακαρνάν 1 3

Γ. Ακούλλλος Πρόκλος proconsul of Asia 3 76-77, 114, 327, [336], [411] 4 23

'Ελιξάνδρα: see Οινεκλέρα 'Ελιξάνδρα

'Ελιξάνδρος: see Οινεκλέρα 'Ελιξάνδρος

'Ελιξάνδρος: see M. Ούλλη 'Αρίστωνος ιός Κυρείνη

'Ελιξάνδρος: 'Εράκλειτος Κό

'Ελιξάνδρος: see Πιθέας 'Αριστίππου 'Ελιξάνδρος Κό

'Α[λαν]: 'Αρεός a plot of land near Hyettus 33 29-30

'Αμμία: see Δρακοντίς 'Αμμία

'Αμμία: see Ζημίνη 'Αμμία

'Αμμία: see Οὐλπία 'Αμμία

'Αμμίων Διονυσιοκλέους 'Απφιόν 44 3 (Lagina)

'Αμμίων: see Οὐλπία Διονυσιοκλέους θυγάτηρ 'Αμμίων Κό

'Αμμινθίανος 19 12 (Ephesus)

'Ανθεστηρίων 3 450

'Αντιοχίς Athenian tribe 29 3

'Αντιπάτρος: see Τιβ. Κ. 'Αντιπάτρος Τουλιανός

'Αντωνίανη tribe at Epheus 18 22-23: tribe at Prusias ad Hyperm 48 56

'Απόλλων 31 58: 'Απόλλων Κάλαρος 19 3-4

'Απφία Τερηκλέους 'Αδα 38 5-6 (Panamara)

'Απφιόν: see 'Αμμίων Διονυσιοκλέους 'Απφιόν

'Απφίον: natural father of Ammion Appion 44 6 (Lagina)

'Απφιόν: see Οὐλπία 'Απφιόν

'Αργανδέος Ephesian Thousand 1 10

'Αρέσκιον 'Ολίμπιον 33 13

'Αργη Δ 33 30
"Αριστάς 45 1 (Stratonicea)
"Αριστάς: see Ἰωλίδος "Αριστάς
"Αριστάς Φανίου Ko father of Phanias 42 6 (Lagina)
"Αριστίππος Ἀρτεμιδώρου 37 4 (Stratonicea)
"Αριστίππος father of Pytheas Alexander 46 3 (Stratonicea)
"Αριστίππος: see Οθλίπος "Αριστίππος
"Αριστοκράτης Κεραμίτης son of Hierocles, high priest and Ἀξονᾶς of the Gerusia 9 2-4 (Ephesus)
"Αρίστων father of M. Ulpius Alexander Heraclitus 35 6
"Αρίστων: see Οθλίπος "Αρίστων
"Αρτεμιδώρος Ἐκατόμμενος Ko father of the keybearer [Strat]onice Tatias the keybearer 35 1-2 (Lagina)
"Αρτεμιδώρος father of Aristippus 37 4 (Stratonicea)
"Αρτεμιδώρος: see Μ. Ἀυρ. Ἀρτεμιδώρος
"Αρτεμιδώρος — 42 2-3 (Lagina)
"Αρτέμις 1 8; 3 13, 87, 92, 104, [112], 142-143, 138, 163, 164, 167, 168, 172, [173, 176, 178, 181, 182, 185, 186], 188, 189-190, [193, 194, 201, 208, 210], 224-225, 255, 262, 266, 267, 277, 283-284, 324, [345], 363, [385], 407, 422, 454, [456, 459], 467, 473-474, 482, 484, 493, [496-497], 526, 531, 534-535; 4 11, 17; 6 2; [12 4, 8, 18]; 18 10
"Αρτέμισιος 3 [125]
"Ασίς 3 [259], 458; 9 4-5
Μάρκος Ἀρίστιος Μέρκκελλος consul in 104 A.D. 3 135-136, 447-448
"Ασκληπιάδοτος father of Mark called Callistratus 48 21 (Prusias ad Hypium)
"Ασκληπιάδοτος: see Ἀυρ. Ἀσκληπιάδοτος
"Ασκληπιάδος: see Τ. Φλ. Ἀσκληπιάδος
"Ἀσκληπίος 6 17; 33 3
"Ἀστιοῦρες: ἀπείρη Ἀστιοῦρων καὶ Καλλακών 4 14
Λούκιος Ἀτλίσσον υἱὸς Παλατίνα Πρόκλου νεότερος priest of the Augusti 52 2-4 (Apamea)
"Ἀτταλός father of M. Αυρ. Artemidorus 21 3 (Ephesus)
"Ἀττικής 31 20
"Ἀττικός 12 [10], 12; 58 18
"Ἀττικός Εὐβότου Σφήττως 27 12 (Eleusis)
"Σέκτος Ἀττικοῦ Σουμπονιστής consul for second time in 104 A.D. 3 135-135, 447
Ἀψ. Σιδώρα 58 12 (Thessalonica)
Ἀφριλία Καλανία wife of C. Julius Euphranicus 55 7-8; 56 7-8 (Thessalonica)
Μ. Ἀψ. Ἀγαθόστου 20 7 (Ephesus)
Μ. Ἀψ. Ἀρτεμιδώρου Ἀττάνου 21 2-3, 8-9 (Ephesus)
Ἀψ. Ἀσκληπιάδοτος 48 27 (Prusias ad Hypium)
Ἀψ. Βαρβαριανός Βάρβαρος 48 48
Δμ. Ἀφρίλεος Διογενις Καλλικής archon of the κοινὸν τῶν ἐν Βιθυνίᾳ Ἑλληνῶν and λογιστής of the Sacred Gerusia 48 8-14
Ἀψ. Ἐπάγαθος 18 17 (Ephesus)
Ἀφρίλεος Ἐπίκτητος Κόσμου 33 37 (Hyettus)
Ἀψ. Ἐπίκτητος Εὐκράτους τοῦ Ἰουλιανοῦ 48 54-55 (Prusias ad Hypium)
Ἀψ. Ζωτυρός Νικόπολίου archon of Hyettus 33 51-52
Ἀψ. Θάλαμος 33 10 (Hyettus)
Ἀψ. Θεόδωρος 33 12 (Hyettus)
Ἀψ. Κορνίς Τεμοκράτους 48 58 (Prusias ad Hypium)
Μ. Ἀψ. Κορνουτανός Εὐκράτης 48 47-48 (Prusias ad Hypium)
Ἀφρίλεος Κόσμου Ἐπαφροδίτην 33 35-36 (Hyettus)
Ἀφρίλεος Μεγιστᾶς Μεγιστά 33 34 (Hyettus)
Ἀψ. Μενεκράτης Ἐρατονυσίως 33 22-23 (Hyettus)
Ἀφρίλεος Μενεκράτης Μενεκράτους 33 37 (Hyettus)
Ἀψ. Ὀλυμπίος Τεμοκράτους 48 57 (Prusias ad Hypium)
Ἀψ. Παπανός Παπανοῦ 48 30 (Prusias ad Hypium)
Ἀψ. Πολλανός Πολλάνου 48 29 (Prusias ad Hypium)
[Ἀψ. Πρω]καλλιανός 48 34 (Prusias ad Hypium)
Μ. Ἀφρίλεος λυθόφόρος Πρόσδεκτος Πιστοκράτους Κεφαλήθεν 27 2-4 (Eleusis)
Μάρκος Ἀψ. Ἀθεφεῖνος 48 50-51 (Prusias ad Hypium)
Ἀψ. Στατείλιος Θεόδωρος ὁ καὶ Ἀψιμαχῖς 58 2-1 (Thessalonica)
Ἀφρίλεος Σωσίβιος Χαρκλέως 33 36 (Hyettus)
Ἀψ. Τιμοκράτης Χαρκλέως 33 32-33 (Hyettus)
Ἀψ. Χρύσος Χρυσαννοῦ 48 23 (Prusias ad Hypium)
Γ. Ἀψίδιος Σιλουανὸς 3 444 (Ephesus)
INDEXES

'Αφράνιος Φλανιανός legatus pro praetore 3 77-78, [114-115], 328, 372

'Αψίριας: see Άνδρας Στατελλίος Θεόδωρος ὁ καὶ Άψιριας

Astures: cohors Asturum et Callaecorum 4 5
A. Atinius Noctivembris 13 1 (Ephesus)

Βαρβαριανός: see Άνδρας Βαρβαριανός Βάρβαρος

Βάσισος: see Πόσσλος Ρουντίλίος Βάσισος and Κλαύ-διος Βάσισος and Π. Αλίας Βάσισος Χρυσόρους

Βελούχη 4 17

Βερβετανίων Ephesian tribe [3 196]

Βηρίλια: see Ποσπίλια Ιουλία Βηρίλια

Βιζνία 48 8

Βοιώτιος 2 8

Βουκάτιον Hyettian month 33 53-54

Βούλαδα: see Εστία Βούλαδα

Βολική 4 6

Γ[Λ]άοις father of Tryphera 47 4 (Panamara)

Γαλάτης 15 4

Γαργύκτος Athenian demotic [31 34]

Γαργύλιος perhaps imperial procurator in Achaean 26 7 (Athens)

Γερσαλανός: see Νομήρειος Γερσαλανός

Γερμανική tribe at Prusias ad Hypium 48 24

Γλαύκος Θήλλος 60 5 (Philipoppolis)

Δαμάδ 19 14 (Ephesus)

Δημήτριος 19 2, 3; 27 1

Διογένης 18 7 (Ephesus)

Διογενίας Καλλικλεάνιος Μαρκιανός 48 42-43

(Prusias ad Hypium)

Διογένιας Καλλικλής: see Δομ. Αδρήλιος Διο-γενίας Καλλικλής

Διώγγνητος: see Τιμήριος Κλαύδιος Διώγγνητος

Διομήδης father of Dracostis Ammia 34 21

(Panamara)

Διονυσιακός ἄγων 31 20

Διονυσίας tribe at Prusias ad Hypium 48 35

Διονύσιος Κο 36 5 (Lagina)

Διονυσσοκλής adoptive father of Ammion Appion 44 3, 6 (Lagina)

Διονυσσοκλής father of Ulpia Ammion 35 8

Διώνυσος 31 42

Δόκιμος: see Μ.Κανίνος Δόκιμος

Δομιτιανός: see Τιμοκραταίος Δομιτιανός

Δρακοντίς: see Αλία Τριφάνα Δρακοντίς

Δρακοντίς Διομήδους θυ(γάτηρ) Ἰ'Αμιά 34 20-21

(Panamara)

Diana 4 1, 7

Εκατάος Κο father of Leon and grandfather of Ulpius Ariston and Alexander 34 2, 19

(Panamara)

Εκάττιος 34 5; 38 4; 39 4; 40 13, 14, 26; 42 7; 45 18

Εκατώτισα [45 19]

Εκατόμμυνος Κο father of Artemidorus and grand- father of [Strat]onice Tatias the keybearer 35 2 (Lagina)

Εκατόμμυνος Κο 42 3-4 (Lagina)

Ελλην: τὸ κοινὸν τῶν ἐν Βιθυνία Ἐλλήνων 48 8-9

Επάγαθος: see Άνδρας Επάγαθος

Επαφράς 33 26

Επαφρόδιτος Μεγιστά 33 35 (Hyettus)

Επαφρόδιτος father of Cosmus 33 35-36 (Hyettus)

Επίκτητος Κόσμου 33 37 (Hyettus)

Ε'πικ - father of . . . 33 38 (Hyettus)

Ερατωναίος: see Άνδρας Μενεκράτης Ἐρατωναίος and also Τοῦ (λιοὺς) Άνδρας Ερατωναίος

Ερέννιος Ἡρακλαίαν 61 1 (Philippopolis)

Ἐρμίας sacred slave at Artemision of Ephesus 3 [200], 482

Εστία Βούλαδα 19 2

Εὐάγγελος: see Πόντιος Εὐάγγελος

Εὐάνδρις 19 10 (Ephesus)

Εὐβίστος: see Μάρ. Οἰ. Εὐβίστος Λείρως Γαργήττος

Ἐβουλαζ Φύλακας 33 27 (Hyettus)

Εὐδοξος (Σφήντος) father of Atticus 27 12

(Eleusis)

Εὐκράτης Ἰουλιάνου father of Aur. Eucrates 48 54-55 (Prusias ad Hypium)

Εὐκράτης: see Άνδρας Εὐκράτης Αὐκράτης τοῦ Ἰου-λιανοῦ

Εὐκράτης: see Μ. Άνδρας Κορνουταίος Εὐκράτης

Εὐμένις Εὐμένειος τοῦ Θεοφίλου strategus of Ephesus 3 199-200, 479-480

Εὐρυκλῆς: see Οὐλπίος Εὐρυκλῆς

Εὐτύχης father of Tib. Cl. Pannychus 50 6 (Tralles)

Εὔναχα: see Ρωσκυλία Εὔναχα

Εὐφραντικός: see Γ. Ιουλίος Εὐφραντικός

Εὐφρόνιος Ἡγήμονος Ἀκαρναν 1 2, 3, 6

Εὐφρόσυνος: see Αίλους Εὐφρόσυνος
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Εὐώνυμος [3 191]

Εὐώνυμος Ephesian tribe 3 191-192, [193]

Ἐφέσιοι member of Ephesian tribe of the

Ἐφέσιοι 1-10; [3 181]

Ἐφέσιοι 1, 3, 9; [3 29, 56, 63, 140], 141, [142, 144, 145,

146, 147], 153, 156, 164, 167, [179, 180, 200], 336,

373, 453, 454, [455], 457, 468, 481, 489; 4 11; 7 4;

[9 22-23]; 11 5; [12 20]

Ἐφέσιοι [3 250, 458]; 9 5; 10 13

Εφεσιος [4 1, 2]

Ζευς Δενδράγος [38 6-7]; 40 17

Ζεὺς Νάρασος 38 7; 40 17

Ζευς Ὄλυμπος 48 12

Ζευς Χρυσάρωρος 38 6, 16; 40 16-17

Ζεὺς [---] 38 7-8

Ζηνών Σ' Αμία Μενίππου θυγάτηρ ἀρχιμάτρον 36

14-15 (Lagina)

Ζώπτωρ: see Λύρος Ζώπτωρ Νικοβοῖλον

Ζώπτωρ father of Νικόπτωρ 33 16 (Hyettus)

Ζώσιμη: see Ποντία Ζώσιμη and Φαβ. Ζώσιμη

Ἱγμᾶς (Ἀκραῖς), father of Ευφρόνιος 1 3

Ἡδός: see Παλλαίος Ηδός

Ἱάια 40 10: Ἱαίαν ieréa = ieréa ἐν Ἱαῖος 39 2

Ἱαῖος 39 2

Ἱαλκέλατος: see Μ. Οὐλίπιος Ἀρίστωνος νῦν Κυρέινος Ἀλέξιανός Ἱαλκέλατος Κό

Ἱαλκέλατος: see Οὐλίπιος Ἱαλκέλατος

Ἱαλκλανίος: see 'Ερένιος Ἱαλκλανίος

Ἱαγέιτων (Ἐφέσιοι) 1 1

Ὂδαμος: see Λύρος Θάλαμος

Γλαύκων θάλλος treasurer <of the Gerusia> 60 5 (Philippopolis)

Θαρτηλίων 3 69, 225, 491

Θάρδωρος: see Λύρος Στατήλων Θάρδωρος ὁ καὶ Ἀσί-μαχος and also Λύρος Θάρδωρος

Θάρδωρος son of the volunteer priest Theophilus and grandson of Theophilus 47 18 (Panama-

Θάρδωρος father of Philip 33 28 (Hyettus)

Θαῖος καταχθόνιος 62 2

Θαῖος father of Agathopus 48 19 (Prusias ad Hygium)

Θαῖος father of Eunomenes and grandfather of the Ephesian strategus Eunenes 3 [190], 480

Θαῖος [λός Θαῖος] Ἱαμ. 47 2-3 (Panama-

Θαῖος son of the volunteer priest Theophilus and grandson of Theophilus 47 17 (Panama-

[Θαῖος] λός father of Theophilus 47 3 (Panama-

Θαῖος: see also Κλαύδιος Θαῖος

Θεσαλονησίες 57 3-4; 58 9-10; 59 3

Θεσαλονησίες tribe ad Prusias Hygium 48 20

Θεσπεδίκος Athenian demotic 23 2

Θεσπεδίκος father of Panaetius and grandfather of Hierocles 38 2 (Panama)

Θράσον Ιεροκλέους Λέων Τε 38 12-13 (Panama)

Θράσον: see Λέων Ιεροκλέους Θράσον Τε

Θρᾶττος Μενεστράτου Κάλπων Κωραιεύς 41 4-5

(Stratonicea in Caria)

'Iάσων Ιάσωνος 48 40 (Prusias ad Hygium)

'Iεροκλής Παναττίου τοῦ Θράσονος Τε 38 2-3, 5-6, 13,

[15], 20 (Panama)

'Iεροκλῆς father of Aristocrates 9 2 (Ephesus)

'Iεροκλῆς: see Θράσον Ιεροκλέους Λέων Τε 38 2-3, 5-6, 13,

[15], 20 (Panama)

'Iεροκλῆς father of Aristocrates 9 2 (Ephesus)

'Iεροκλῆς: see Θράσον Ιεροκλέους Λέων Τε 38 2-3, 5-6, 13,

[15], 20 (Panama)

'Iεροκλῆς: see Απ. Κλ. 'Αντίπατρος 'Ιουλιανός and

Τι. Κλαύ. 'Ιουλιανός and Κουκουλίνος 'Ιουλιανός

'Iουλιανὸς 'Αριστέας 33 7 (Hyettus)

'Iουλιανὸς Α. 'Ιουλιανός Εὐρήμης οἱ Ἐρατοπιανοὶ 33 34-34

(Hyettus)

Γ. Ιουλιανὸς Εὐφρατικός 55 2; 56 6 (Thessalonica)

Τι. 'Ιουλιανὸς Ῥηγείος the Asiarch 10 11-12

(Ephesus)

'Iππόβοτον locality near Hyettus 33 24

'Iσαμπούκης 5 8

'Iσαμπόρα: see Λύρος Ισαμπόρα

'Iσαμπόρος Βασίλειος 2 8

Καλλίς Κονδράτος imperial procurator in

Achaea 24 15, 17, 39

Κάιππαρ: see Index III under names of emperors

Μάρκος Κασσίλλου Μαρκιανὸς 3 427-428 (Ephesus)

Καλλίπεδα 3 448; Κ 7 15

Ιουλιανία: see Λύρος Ιουλιανία

Καλλικλάσιος: see Ιουλιανίας Καλλικλάσιος Μαρκι-ανὸς
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Kaullklês: see Αθήνης Διογενικός Καλλικλῆς
Καλλίστη 33 11 (Hyettus)
Καλλίστρατος: see Μάρκος Ασκληπιοδότου δ και 
Καλλίστρατος
[Καλπ]ουριναύος Χρυσανός 48 36 (Prusias ad
Hypium)
Κάλτων: see Θρέπτος Μενεστράτου Κάλτων Κοραίες
Κάναξ: see Τίτος Πεδοκαίος Κάναξ
Μ. Κανίνος Δόκιμος 54 2-4 (Thessalonica)
Καρναίος Ephesian tribe [3 184, 186]
Κασκέλλος Πομηκός 7 14 (Ephesus)
Κασταλία 3 194
Κεραμίτης 9 4
Κεφαλήθει Athenian demotic 27 4
Κήρυκες Attic gens 27 0
Κλαδία: see Φλασία Κλαδία Σελβανή
Κλαδία Μάγκα wife of Tib. Cl. Diogenetus 13
5-7 (Ephesus)
Κλάδος δήδοχος 24 2 (Athens)
Τιβ. Κλ. 'Αλεξάνδρος, father of Τιβ. Κλ. [Πο- 
λαιόν], 3 5, [417], 434 (Ephesus)
Τιβ. Κλ. 'Αντίπατρος 'Ιουλιανός 3 2, [113], 333-334,
370-371, 414, 431, 449 (Ephesus)
Κλαμδός Βάσσας 8 2-3 (Ephesus)
Τιμίριος Κλαυτίδιος Δωγγήτος 13 6-7 (Ephesus)
Κλαυτίδος Θεόφιλος 16 1 (Ephesus)
Τιβ. Κλ. Πάνθικος Εντύχο Κόββος 50 5-7
(Tralles)
Τιβ. Κλαυτίος Πασίνου Μουκιανού 60 2 (Philip-
polis)
Τιβ. Κλαυτίος Πασίνου Μουκιανού 60 2 (Philip-
polis)
Τιβ. κλαυτίος Περεότιος Φρυγιανός 3 426-427
(Ephesus)
Κλαυτίδος 'Ρούφος 16 2 (Ephesus)
Τι. Κλαυτίδος Σεκούνδος 14 1-2, 8 (Ephesus)
Κλεοπάτρα 'Αθηνοδόρου wife of Herennius Hera-
clianus 61 4 (Philippopolis)
Κλήμεαν: see Μάρκος Συμπυρώνος Κλήμεαν
Κλων( ) cognomen or demotic 50 23-24
(Tralles)
Κοββολος or Κοββλος name or demotic aut simile
50 7 (Tralles)
Κολάργα village of the Carian Stratonicae 40 31
Κολιορεγες Stratonicean demotic Κο [34 2, 19];
35 7, 8; 36 5; 42 6; 46 4
Κόρη 19 3; 27 1
Κορνησικιαμή at Ephesus 3 [212], 425, 566-567
Κορίνθος: see Αθ. Κορίνθος Τεμποκράτος
Κορνήλιος Πρώσκος proconsul of Asia 7 10
Κοροναίας: see M. Αδρ. Κοροναίας ΘΕκρώτης
Κόσμος Επαφροδίτου 33 35-36 (Hyettus)
Κόσμος father of Epictetus 33 37 (Hyettus)
Κονταρίτας: see Καλλίστρος Κονταρίτας
Κωμούλιος Τουλιανός 48 32-33 (Prusias ad
Hypium)
Κυρείνα Roman tribe 16 8; 35 6-7: Κυρ 3 [5, 417],
434
Κυριακός: see Φαβ. Κυριακός
Κυραίες Stratonicean demotic 41 5: Κω 35 2;
42 4; 47 4
Callacci: cohors Asturum et Callaecorum [4 5]
Τι. Claudius Secundus 14 1-2, 8 (Ephesus)
Λάγκανα 40 30
Λαμίδην: see Λουκλία Λαμίδην θυγάτηρ
Λαμίδην
Λέον: see Μάρ. Ού. Ερμίωνος Λέωνος Γαργήττου
Λέων father of Aelia Tryphaena Dracoutis
(Panamara) 34 5-6
Λέων [Ατρίτον] Αναίνας 45 3-4 (Stratonicea)
Λέων 'Εκαταύη Κο father of Ulpius Aristotle
[34 2] and of Alexander 34 18-19 (Panamara)
Λέων Ιεροκλέους Θράσων Τε 38 14-15 [Panamara]
Λέων: see Θράσων Ιεροκλέους Λέων Τε
Λεονίδη: see Κλ. Λεονίδη
Λοβολίδιος Stratonicean demotic Λο 36 3, 7, 10
Λουκάνα 19 15 (Ephesus)
Λουκλία Λαμίδην θυγάτηρ Λαμίδην 49 5-7
(Tralles)
Γ. Λουκίλος 49 5-6 (Tralles)
Λυσίμαχος king of Thrace who reorganized
affairs of Ephesus [3 187; 12 2] (Ephesus)
Λύσιδαργος: see Ζεύς Λύσιδαργος
Μάγνα: see Κλαρίδια Μάγνα
Μαγνητική πύλη at Ephesus 3 [50-51, 211], 424, 564-
565
Μαρκοναῖος: see II. Τιτίος Μαρκοναῖος
Μάξιμος: see Οι. Πολυπῦρος Μάξιμος
Μαρκαναῖος: see Αλίας Σατορυνέας Μαρκαναῖος
Μάρκελλος: see Μάρκος Αιτίος Μάρκελλος
Μαρκαναῖος: see Διογεναῖος Καλλικλεαῖος Μαρκαναῖος
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Markianos: see Markos Kaiselios Markianos
Markos 'Asklpiosidioton o kai Kallistratos 48 21-22
(Prusias ad Hypium)
Maritis 3 448
Mauretanios Trygysta 4 16
Megaric tribe at Prusias ad Hypium 48 49
Megastas Megastas 33 34 (Hyettus)
Megastas father of Megistas 33 34; father of
Epaphroditus 33 35 (Hyettus)

A. M. Mermos epi baima Theokis 23 2 (Athens)
Mianarios 17 4-5 (Ephesus)
Mevedmos 28 1 (Ephesus)
Menekratios Menekratous 33 37 (Hyettus)
Menekratios: see A. Menekratios 'Epatonianos
Menestras father of Threptus Calpon 41 4-5
(Statronicea in Caria)

Meneptos father of Nicander 36 3 (Lagina)
Meneptos arximartos father of Zenonis Ammia
36 14-15 (Lagina)
Mettos Mestos proconsul of Asia 7 5
Mestos: see Mettio Mestos
Moukastos father of Trypis Cl. Pasinus 60 2
(Philippopolis)

A. Moukastos Basios 3 445 (Ephesus)
Mousasiai sacred slave of Artemis at Ephesus
3 [201, 210, 183]
[N]eptale Ke 42 4 (Lagina)
Mouvidhos 39 2 (Lagina)
Mauretanios Tingitana 4 6
Narasonos: see Zeis Narasonos

Nearchos Theocharos 3 446 (Ephesus)
Nephyos 15 1-2 (Ephesus)
Nikandritos Mennpetos Le 36 3, 7, 10 (Lagina)
Nikobouklos father of Aur. Zopryss 33 53 (Hyettus)
Nikosimos 12 7, [10, 11, 24] (Ephesus)
Nikostatos Zoipirous 33 15-16 (Hyettus)
Nikonanios 48 50 (Prusias ad Hypium)
Noumierios Ereklados 16 4 (Ephesus)

Novenis 19 15 (Ephesus)
Novaeis 36 8-9

Novellia Pyrallis wife of Atilius November 13 2
(Ephesus)

'Olumpos: see At. 'Olympos Teimokratous and
Zeis 'Olympos

Omanios 3 440, 471

Ovaleria 'Alexandros h thekoloygmenth arximartos wife
of Pontius Evangelus 59 8-9, 10-11 (Thessalonica)

Ovalerio 'Alexandros 48 53 (Prusias ad Hypium)

Gaioi Oibios, T. vioso, Olophanti, Zalontarios, Roman Knight, onetime subprocurator of
Mauretanios Tingitana, onetime subprocurator of Belgica, etc.; 3 14, [84, 139], 154, 220, 221,
239, [245], 307, 312, 331, [381], 374, 421-422, 439,
451, 486-487, 550; 4 3, 12 (Ephesus)

Ovalia 'Ammia daughter of Aelia Tryphaena
Dracontis 34 15-17 (Panamara)

Ovalia Dionsokleous thegathei 'Ammos Ko 35 7-8
(Ovalios) 'Alexandros Leontos tov 'Ekataion [Ko]
34 18-19 (Panamara)

M. Olyios 'Aristontos vios Kureina 'Alexandros
'Praktitos Ko 35 6-7 (Lagina)
Olyios 'Apfios son of Aelia Tryphaena Dracontis
34 15-16 (Panamara)

Olyios 'Aristontos son of Aelia Tryphaena
Dracontis 34 15-16 (Panamara)

Oul 'Aristontos Leontos tov 'Ekataio Ko [34 1-2]
(Panamara)

Olyios 'Aristontos son of Aelia Tryphaena Dracontis
34 15-17 (Panamara)

M. Oyl (pios) Ebdio [tov Leiros Gargaritos] consularis and Athenian archon 31 34

Olyios Eburnaklo logisthe of the Ephesian
Gerusia 11 3

Olyios 'Praktitos son of Aelia Tryphaena
Dracontis 34 15-16 (Panamara)

Oyl. Poutrikes Maimos son of Ulpius Eubiotus
31 15, 19, 21, 25, 40-41, 52; 32 15

Oyl. Tiramavos son of Ulpius Eubiotus 31 15, 19,
21, 24, [40, 51]

Olophanti Roman tribe 3 [139], 451; 4 12;

Olophanti 3 331

Panainois member of the Ephesian tribe of the
Panainois 18 23

Pallatina Roman tribe 5 3

Palleneis Athenian demotic 29 5

Panathena [31 11, 37]

Panaitios Theratos father of Hierocles 38 2
(Panamara)
INDEXES

Πανάμαρα 40 30
Πανάμαρος 38 3-4, 14; 40 9-10, 15
Πάτινχος: see Κλ. Πάτινχος Ἐθύη Κοῖβιλος
Παππαῖος father of Aurelius Papianus 48 30
(Prusias ad Hypium)
Πασίνους: see Τ.Β. Κλαύδιος Πασίνους
Τίττος Πεδοκαίος Κάνας 5 3 (Ephesus)
Περιγένις 19 11 (Ephesus)
Πιστοκράτης father of M. Aur. Prosdocetus 27 4
(Eleusis)
Πίων [3 195]
Πολλαίος: see Α. Πολλαίος Πολλάων
Πολλάων: see Α. Πολλαίος Πολλών
Ποντία Χοίρων Θυγάτηρ Ποντίων Ἐθύηλον τοῦ
κρατίστου καὶ ἀρχιρέως καὶ Οὐαλέριας Ἀλεξάνδρας
τῆς ἀξιολογοῦτάτης ἀρχιρείας 59 5-10 (Thessalonica)
Ποντικὸς: see Κασκέλλιος Ποντικὸς
Πόντιος Εθύηλον ὁ κρατίστος καὶ ἀρχιρέως 59 6-8
(Thessalonica)
Ποσείδιος 3 3, [138], 335, [371, 415], 432
Ποσείνιος: see Ο.Ι. Ποσείνιος Μάξιμος
Πρίμος Athenian prytanis 30
Πρέπειάς Cassander’s general 1 4
Πρέσκαλλα 19 14 (Ephesus)
Πρίμιγεια: λεγών κῆ Πρεμιγείας Πίως Φιδρίλας
4 15
Πρισκλιλιάος: see [Α. Πρις]κλιλιαος
Πρίσκις: see Κοριήλως Πρίσκις
Πρόκλος father of Chrysianus 48 37 (Prusias
ad Hypium)
Πρόκλος: see Ἀτλίος Πρόκλος and Ἀκούλλαος
Πρόκλος
Προσδεκτος: see Μ. Ἀδρίλιος λιθόφορος Πρόσδεκτος
Προσιαίας tribe at Prusias ad Hypium 48 41
Πρωρέσιος: see Τ.Β. Κλ. Πρωρέσιος Φρυγιανός
Πυθίας Ἀριστίππον Ἀλεξάνδρος Κό 46 3-4 (Stratonicea)
Πύρ ἄφθαρτον 19 3
Πολλαίος Ἡδός 48 18 (Prusias ad Hypium)
Pyrrallis 13 2 (Ephesus)
Primigenia: leg(io) XXII Primigenia p(ia)
f(idelis) 4 5
Ῥηγείνος: see Τ.Β. Ἰωά. Ῥηγείνος
Ἱππάλλος Ῥουθέλιος Βάσσος 7 16 (Ephesus)
Ῥουφέινος 16 5
Ῥουφέινος: see Μάρκος Αὐρ. Ῥουφέινος
Ῥούφος: see Κλαύδιος Ῥούφος
Ῥώμας 3 28, 165; 4 14; 27 7; 50 5, 12; [51 4]
Ῥώμη 4 18; 5 7
Ῥουσκίλλα Ἐθύηλα 17 7 (Ephesus)
Romana 4 7-8
Σαβεινιάντα tribe at Prusias ad Hypium 48 28
Σαβενιάος 11 44 (Ephesus)
Σαλοντάριος: see Ο.Ι. Σαλοντάριος Index IV
Σατορνίχος 62 1 (Philipppopolis)
Σατορνίχος 11 28 (Ephesus)
Σατορνίχος 16 8 (Ephesus)
Σατορνίχος 20 3 (Ephesus)
Σατορνίχος: see Α.Ι. Σατορνίχος Μαρεινᾶος
Σασαστεία 3 55
Σεβαστὴ Ephesian tribe 3 176, [177]
Σεβαστή (ἡμέρα) 3 450; 12 19
Σεβαστὴ Ὀμόνοια 3 470-471
Σεβαστὴ tribe at Prusias ad Hypium 48 17
Σεβαστὸν ἔτος: ἐν τῷ γίγνει Σεβ έτει 54 9-10 (Thessa-
lonica): ἔτεις γῆς 59 15 (Thessalonica)
Σεβαστὸς 3 175, [260], 325, [345], 367, [468]; 38 3, 13,
15-16; 40 8; 52 4. See also Ἀδριανός, Τραιανός.
Σεκόουδος: see Τ.Β. Κλαύδιος Σεκόουδος
Μάρκος Σεκτρώνιος Μάρκου υἱός Κλήμπρος 40 3-4
(Panamara)
Πάπλους Σεμουνείλος Ἱσαυρικός as hero 5 7-8
Σικελία 4 13
Σελβανίη: see Φλαβία Κλαύδια Σελβανίη
Σουβιανάος: see Σέζίτος "Ἀππίος Σουβιανάος
Στατίλιος: see Αὐρ. Στατίλιος Θεόδωρος ὁ καὶ
Ἁλίμαχος
Στράτη: ὁ ἁγίασμα τοῦ Ἐκατόμων Τατᾶς Κω
the keybearer 35 1-4 (Lagina)
Στρατήρας name of an estate near Hyettus
33 8-9
Σύμφωνος Ὀλμώνιος 33 15 (Hyettus)
Σῆς locality near Hyettus 33 9
Σφητίτουs Athenian demotic 27 12
Σώπολις 19 4
Σωσίβιος Χαρκλέους 33 36 (Hyettus)
Σώτειρα 20 8-9: Σώτειρα "Ἀρτέμις 12 4, 18
Σωτήρ Ἀκτιπησίος 33 2-3
Σωτήρια 3 55
Σαλταρία 4 3. See also Ο.Ι. Σαλοντάριος
Σικελία 4 4
Τάλος son of Menander 17 6 (Ephesus)
Τατᾶς: see [Στράτῃ] ὁ ἁγίασμα τοῦ Τατᾶς Κω
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Φανίας father of Aristeas and grandfather of Phanias 42 6 (Lagina)
Φανοπτανωνία tribe at Prusias ad Hypium 48 31
Φανόθεσιος Χρυσαγόρας 48 44 (Prusias ad Hypium)
Φιλάδελφος Χρυσαγόρας 48 36 (Lagina)
Φυλλαδήλφος Χρυσαγόρας 48 44 (Prusias ad Hypium)
Φυλακτηριδής 61 2; 62 1
Φυλακτηριδῆς Θεοδόρου 33 27-28 (Hyettus)
Φλαβία Κλαυδία Σιλβανή 57 7-8
Φλάκκιλλα: see Φλαβία Φλάκκιλλα
Φλαντιάρης: see 'Αφράνιος Φλαντιάρης
Τ. Φλ. 'Ασκληπιάδορος 18 10-11 (Ephesus)
Φλ. Φοίβη daughter of T. Fl. Asclepiodorus 18 15 (Ephesus)
Μάρκος Φορβίανος archon of the Gerusia 53 10-11 (Apamea)
Φοίβος (son of Antoninus Pius): ιερεύς Θεοῦ Φοίβου 54 4-6 (Thessalonica)
Φρητοριανός: see τ. Φλ. Πρωτέστος Φρητοριανός
Φύλαξ father of Βθβούλας 33 27 (Hyettus)
Χαρακής father of Αυρ. Τιμοκράτης 33 33 and of Σοσιβίου 33 36 (Hyettus)
Χάος 22 130
Χρυσαγόρας: see Ζεός Χρυσαγόρας
Χρυσάδης: see Π. Αίσας Βίστος Χρυσάδης
Χρυσαγόρας father of Aurelius Chrysus 48 23
(Prusias ad Hypium)
Χρυσαγόρας father of Philadelphus 48 44 (Prusias ad Hypium)
Χρυσαγόρας Πρόκλου 48 37 (Prusias ad Hypium)
Χρυσαγόρας: see Καλποτριανός Χρυσαγόρας
Χρήστος: see Άτρ. Χρήστος Χρυσαγόρας

This content downloaded by the authorized user from 192.168.52.61 on Tue, 4 Dec 2012 15:04:40 PM
All use subject to JSTOR Terms and Conditions
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INDEXES</th>
<th>189</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>áνατολή: see áνατολία</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>áιτέω 3 439</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>áιτία 11 47</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>áιων: δέ αἰωνος 10 11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>αἰώνιος 12 10,11]; 33 18, 31; [38 18]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ακατάλοιπος</td>
<td>3 107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ακκήρυσις αὐτός 14 10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ακρόμα [35 13-14]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ακροβάτης 3 459, 537</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ακτίνος 3 [110], 320, 365</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>αλατονομία 40 5-6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἀλφήδος 11 9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἀλάττοσ 3 [110], 316</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἀλλος 3 158, 168, 171, [173, 177, 182, 186], 189, [194, 216, 252], 325, 338, 364, 463; 9 11; 11 10, [15], 26, [30], 54; [12 3]; 23 5; 24 75; 35 17; 62 4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἀλλότριος 13 11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἀλλος 11 14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἀλοχος 39 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἀμα [3 12, 381]: ἀμα καὶ 9 19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἀμαβίθω 3 389</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἀμελέω [12 6]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἀμέμπτως 37 10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἀμετάθετος [3 106]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἀμετάπρατος 62 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἀμιλλάμα 3 12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἀμοβάλοις 3 9-10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἀμοβιθείς 3 392; 31 28, [51]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἀμπελοκός 33 24</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἀμφοβιτέω 7 12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἀναβολή 11 43</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἀναγγέλλω 2 10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἀναγγέλλω: ἀναγγυμένος [31 31]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἀναγκαίος 3 377; 11 45</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἀνάγκη 3 219-220, 290</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἀναγορέω 3 88</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἀναγραφή 3 344, [264-265]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἀναγράφω 1 7; [3 120-121]; 33 3-4, 20: ἀναγραφή-μένος 1 8; [31 14]: ἀναγραφαμένος 3 [341], 263</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἀνάγω 11 8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἀναλίσκω 12 10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἀνάλομα 3 319; 12 11; 35 10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἀναμάξ 39 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἀνανεώ 11 22</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἀναπληρῶ 25 16; 38 19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἀναστατεύομαι 3 86-87; 53 10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἀνατίθημι 3 398; 6 16; 50 19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἀνατολή 33 25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἀναφαίρετος 33 18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἀναφέρω 11 6, [18, 42]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἀναφορά 11 51-52</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἀναχώνινος 11 22</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἀναχώνινος [3 216]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἀνδριας 6 3; [24 33]; 31 [13, 38], 39; 44 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἀνασαφορία [31 19, 53]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἀνεξοδίαστος 61 6-7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἀνέχω 11 15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἀμή 3 8, 14-15, [76], 80, [84], 235, [351], 387, 398, [528]; 24 16, 30; 37 4-5; 40 4; 55 10; 56 9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἀνθρώπινος 33 41-42</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἀνθρώπος 19 6; 34 10; 43 5; 44 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἀνθύτατος 3 [77], 114, [328], 411; 4 23; 7 11; 11 5, 27, 38, 50, 55; 24 13, 26, [28, 42, 44-45]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἀνίστημι [9 23]; 29 6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἀνικός 47 4-5; [63 5]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἀνταμβείθω [3 81]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἀνταποδίδομαι [3 349]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἀντεπτρότοσ subprocurator 4 15-16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἀντί [31 21, 36]; 33 5, 42</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἀντίγραφον 7 9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἀντιγράφω [3 82, 412]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἀντιμηνόι 3 388</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἀντιστάτης 6 78, [115], 329, 372-373</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἀντίπερβλητος 3 78; 31 12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἀντιπερβλήτως 3 304, 406</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἀνω (= ἀνώ) 33 42</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἀνωθεν 12 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἄδια 3 15, 392</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἄδιας ἄδιας 24 16; 40 4-5: ἄδιολογόσ τότος [3 343]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἄδιας ἄδιας 33 21-22; 57 9; 58 5-6; 59 9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἄδιος 3 341; 11 40; 22 129; [37 11]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἄδιος 3 74, [351], 395; 62 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἄδιομα 3 375</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἄδιος [35 17]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἄδιος ἄδιος 3 402</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἄτατοικος [3 107]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἄτατοικος 3 402</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἄτεμι 3 227</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἄτεμις 24 [9], 12, 25, [27-28, 41, 44]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἄποδείκνυτα [3 9]; 11 41; 48 10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἄποδεικνυμαι [24 36]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἄποδεικνυμαι 3 [70, 155, 289, 304-305, 530; 11 42]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
INDEXES

γυμνάσιον 6 17
γυμνός 3 [213], 558
γυνή [3 27]; 13 7; 17 7; [24 32]
carus: carissima 13 3
causa 14 6
cohors 4 5
conuiux 13 3
consecro 4 9-10
curius 14 5
dezoschos 23 3; 24 2
danice 7 7-8
dapanton 3 496
dapany [12 14, 17]
dapanyama [6 14-15]
depuiiatymon 45 20
deipnon 12 11, [14, 15]; [45 9]; 47 13
dekakis 9 19
dekaproteino 50 9-10
dekaprotos 40 21; 48 8
dekyia: έν δέξια 6 6
dekyos 47 11
dekyteros 36 11; 40 11-12; [43 3]
dem: deisoi 3 397: dékmenoi [35 14]
depios 11 10; 24 33
delos 7 6; 11 7; 12 11; [24 39]
demarchios: démarchi ývovia 3 7; 24 10, [12, 25], 28, [41], 44
depios 1 1, 3, 6, 9; [21], 7; 3 4, 7, 28, 30, [75, 120], 132, [111, 143], 165, [179, 214], 298, 322, [337, 373], 418, 430, 435, 560, 568, 5 1; [31 33]; 35 5; 36 1, 8, 12; 37 1; 38 1; 39 1; 40 1; 41 1; 42 5; [43 1] 44 1; 46 1; 49 1-2; [50 1]; 51 1; 57 2; 59 2
depios Rovmion 4 13-14: Δ-Β-Δ 55 1; 56 1
demost 37 3
defiostos 11 28; [24 67-68]; 50 16
deparmon 3 [150], 222, 223, [238, 241, 268], 485, 488; 4 21; 61 8; θην 3 112, [221, 229, 254, 347]: δη 3 233, [235, 240, 241, 248, 258, 260, 264, 275], 281, 286, 292, 297, 300, 305, 308, 314, 324, 325, [363, 364], 408, [410], 463, 464, [489, 494, 495, 518, 520], 531, 533, 538, 540, 550; * 13 13, 15; 17 10; 33 47, 51; 38 19; 50 16; 59 14; [62 5]
diadêxochos 13 49-50, 210

diáthesis 3 18, [376]
diarméw 3 67
diakeiménos [12 3-4]
diakrínw [11 39]
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INDEXES</th>
<th>193</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>έκκόπτω 13 10; 24 14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>έκμάσω 3 543, 545</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>έκτελέω 18 12; 19 7; [24 34]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>έκτίθημι 24 22</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>έκτόσ 31 36</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>έλαιοθέτω 5 8-9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>έλαιον 26 12; 42 9; 45 [5], 12-13, 16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>έλάσσων 3 288; έλάττων 3 365; 12 10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>έλαφος 3 185</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>έλεύθερος 45 15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>έλκυστός 45 5, 13, [16-17]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>έμφανις: έμφανισότατος [12 9]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>έμφανιζο 3 5, 416, 423; [24 37]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>έμφαρμός [3 168]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>έμαλλάγη 11 33</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>έμαντός [3 110]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>έμποκέμαι 62 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>έμβεχται 3 541</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>έμδέω 25 12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>έμδεξες 21 7; 46 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ένεκα [15 6]; 24 36; 27 11; 29 7; 59 11: ένεκεν 1 6; 57 12-13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ένθάθα 4 24 35</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ένθάπτω 63 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>έναντός 3 67, [145], 173, 221-222, 247, 253, [255], 260, [266, 274], 280, 285-286, 303, [487], 547; 6 10-11; 19 7; 34 8; 40 16, 19; 44 4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ένίστημι: ένιστός 3 [128], 313, 552</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ένίνωμος 48 6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>έντυγχάνω 1 6; 24 30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>έξαρετος [12 7]; 40 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>έξαρέτω 3 393</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>έξαφανίζο [11 52]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>έξεδρα 3 169; 6 8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>έξεναι 3 [214, 230, 232, 287], 290, 315, 419, 541: έξενον [12 10]; 62 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>έξετάζω 48 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>έξευρίσκω 11 56</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>έξηργητίς 31 66, 18, [130, 52]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>έξουσία 3 297, 243; 7 3; [12 22]; [24 10, 12, 19-20, 25, 28, 41, 44]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>έφορτάζω [12 18]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>έφορτάσιμος 35 11-12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>έφορτή [3 56; 24 34; 45 14-15]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>έπαγγελιά: έκ έπαγγελιάς [36 4]; 42 7; [47 1-2]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>έπαγγέλλω [3 348]; 40 7; 42 8-9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>έπανέω 1 6; 2 7; [3 350; 12 24; 31 33-34]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>έπαύω 31 31, [32]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>έπασκολούθεω 3 308-309</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>έπανέρχομαι 11 39; [12 8]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>έπαράσσει 12 23</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>έπάργυρος 3 466, 472</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>έπαρχεια 3 75; 4 13, 16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>έπαρχος 4 14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>έπέι τά 3 399-400</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>έπειτα 11 26</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>έπέργον 50 14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>έπερατώα 31 33</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>έπεροφήμια 29 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>έπεβάλλω: τόν έπιβαλάντα χρόνον 5 10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>έπεγύνημα 31 14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>έπεγγυόνσκο [3 79]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>έπεγγύσμον 11 38</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>έπεγγύστης [11 20]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>έπεγγύστοφο 3 305; 31 17, [52]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>έπεδείκνυμι [3 218]; 31 12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>έπεδημέω [35 13]; 47 8-9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>έπεδιδομι [31 36]; 58 14-15; 59 12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>έπεικελεύω [3 82]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>έπεικηρόω 1 8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>έπείκλητος 1 2, 4; 2 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>έπεικυρόω 3 74, 322-333, 330, [413]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>έπειλέω 7 11; 24 22</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>έπειμάλεω 3 548; 12 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>έπειμέλεομαι 24 15-16; 53 9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>έπειμελήτης 23 8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>έπειμήσαλκο 11 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>έπέναια 3 20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>έπείρρυτον 42 8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>έπίσημος 3 87, [384]; [35 11]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>έπίσταμαι 11 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>έπιστάτης 29 4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>έπιστάλλω 24 18, 19, 23, 31</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>έπιστήμη [24 36]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>έπιστολή 3 81, 115-116, 329, 412</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>έπιστέλεω 3 [204], 223, [234, 248], 254, 261, 275-276. 302-303, 490, [518, 521]; 12 14, [16]; 18 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>έπιστήδειος 3 125; [31 17-18, 52]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>έπίτημος 25 13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>έπιτροπή 3 16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>έπιτροπός [11 31]; 24 15, 22, 39</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>έπειρα: έπειρανά: έπειρανίαν 3 344, 384-385</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>έπειρανός 48 4-5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>έπίθθονος 24 37</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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12, 24, 27, 40, 43, [44]; 33, 6, 8; 47, 6; [62, 2]:
common [3 85]; 12 9; 19 4; 34 9

theocheia 22 133
theosophos 3 457-459, 533
thor [5 16]

θήκη 62 2, 4
θόλος 31 15, 41

θησαυρεία 3 20-21. See also page 29.

θηρόσ 31 16, 18, [52]

θυσία 3 53, [204, 242], 492, 529; 12 3, [9-10, 16, 17];
31 23, [46]

θῶμ 3 [492], 529; 12 [6], 8
honor 14 5-6

hia 1 6; [3 74; 31 34]

hia 6 [4], 18; 11 32, 35; 13 8; 53 5: έκ τόν ιδιων
4 18; 14 12; 18 20; [31 22-23]; 35 15; 40 19-20;
42 8; 50 19-20; 61 3: κατ’ ιδιων προσαπεσεις
2 284

hia 3 108, 315-316; 12 26

hia 1 2; 31 39

hērithe 5 6-7; 35 8-9; 37 6-7; 40 9, 12, 14, 15-16,
26-27; 42 6

hērēma 3 266; 34 3, 20; 36 4; 47 3

hērēs 3 437, [456], 474-475; 16 5; 31 [57], 59; 34 [1],
18; 36 4; 38 3, 6, 7, [13, 14], 16; 39 2; 47 1;
48 11; 52 4; 54 4

hērōkerkhes 20 2

hērōkerkhes 10 3

hēron 1 7, 8, 9; 3 87, 91, [92, 205], 224, [262], 277, 282,
407, [496], 526, 530, 534, 563; 35 [2]; 13; 40 06;
[44 1]; 45 18

hēronikēs 3 437, 456, 475, 477, 517, 561; 22 134

hēros 1 4; 3 27, 54, 90-91, 161, 200, 201, [210], 310,
482, [483]: έρα γερονσια [24 5-6]; 27 2, 10; 28 3;
31 12; 33 2, 21; 41 2; 44 1; [45 11-12]; 46 2;
48 9-10; 60 3; 63 7: έρα διατάξεις 31 30, 55:
έραν άριστητήριον 47 5-6: έραν σύστημα τίς
γερονσια 49 2-4; 50 0-2; 51 1-2: έρός γέρων
29 6; 30: έρος τάτατος 3 27, [363-364]

hērosulía 3 217; 12 24

hērofántes 31 25, [57]

hikanos [12 8]

hōbaschos 22 127, 128-129, 135

hπτυκόν 3 15, [28], 170

hsta 31 22

hstos 24 34: ει ισούν 3 387: εφ’ ιση καὶ ομοίη 1 7

ίστημι 31 13, [38]; 32 13: ισταμένον 3 3, 69, [138],
253, 491

imago 4 7

ita 4 8

item 4 4, 6, 7

katapaxi 31 12

katharixw 3 [281-282]

katharís 3 541

katharón 3 280, 300

kathézomai 3 469, 477

kathikw 3 13, 105, [204]

kathikw 3 [23, 62-63, 70-71], 126, [141], 154, 163, 167,
172, [176, 180, 185, 188], 192, [196], 220, [239-240],
292, 294, 308, 317, 332, [347, 353], 400, 421, 438-
439, 467, 473, 4 19, 20; 6 9, 16

kathéreousis 3 21, [83], 206-207, [249], 290, 296, 298-299,
365; 5 11

kathikw 3 441

kathikw 3 51, [49]

kathisthimai 1 1; [2 2-3]; 12 24; 24 19; 55 5-6

katholikos 1 12 7

kaipós 1 5; [24 37]; 40 13-14, 21

kakoneuqéw 3 216

kakó 11 42

kalaathophorós 19 13

kalo 24 34; 33 29; [45 8, 19]

kalokagathia 15 5-6

kálos: κάλλιστος 3 13

katalallw 11 39

katakerkíw 6 7

kataklísws 12 15

kataleipto 11 35; [31 38]

katanémw [7 6]

katanaskewi 3 35 15; 40 24, 27; 61 5; [62 3]

katastasw 3 139

kátástropha 6 5

katastíthηmi 3 407-408, [563]; 62 4

kataxophónos 62 2

kakeó 7 8; 11 38

katoików 36 2, 13; 44 1-2; 45 9-10

kex [i 3 225

kelev 11 42

khnw 33 28-29

kleidôforos 35 3-4; 38 4-5; 43 3-4

kleidôforia 34 4-5

kleidôforos 36 7, 11, 13; [42 1]
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νέος 124. See νάος
νήσος 31 20
νομίζω 3 [347, 382], 399, 399; 24 49; [25 7]
νόμος 3 54, [203, 269], 468-469; 58 8
νομοθεσία 12 13
νομοθέτει 12 12
νόμος 24 53
νότιος [3 123]
νουμνία 3 59, 203
νυκτεριόν 50 8
νυκτοφυλακέω 18 18
νυκτοφυλακή' 18 19
νίν [1 3]; 3 [25, 342, 366], 379, 386, 405; [12 6; 24 37]; ννί [3 358]
ντε [45 7-8]
νυμμος 4 10
νέων [36 17; 45 11]; 47 9
οικείος 3 341, 376-377; 381. See also page 29.
οίκία 11 32
οίκισμός 12 2
οίκονομία 3 [142], 397
οίκος 3 345, 385; [12 18]
οίκνεό 24 37
ολκή [3 152, 153, 158], 160, 161, [162], 165, 166, 169,
170, [171], 174, [175, 176, 178, 179, 180, 183, 184,
187, 188, 190, 191, 192, 195, 196], 465, 471
ολοκληρώω 19 5
ολος: δι' ὀλου τόν ἐναυστόν 34 8: δι' ὀλου τοῦ ἑτούν:
35 13: δι' ὀλου ἑτοίνιου 55 4-5: δι' ἀλχο ἡμεράς 45 6: 
παρ' ὀλον τόν ἐναυστόν 44 4
'Ολυμπιονίκης 21 13
ὁμοιος 3 [333]; 12 16; 33 23-24: ἐφ' ἐσχα καὶ 
ὁμοῖος 1 7
ὁμοιος 3 164, 168, [173, 177, 182, 186], 189, [194],
231, 246, [253, 258, 265, 268, 273], 279, 293, 295, 297,
[391], 470, [516, 519], 532, 536; 6 12, [13-16]; 12 13;
33 19; 45 16
ὁμολογεώ 3 70
ὁμούος 48 15
ὁμοφέρο 40 14-15
ὁνομα 3 228, 249, [256], 276, [491, 524]; 11 12, [17-18,
21]; 24 36; 31 17; 62 5: ἐπ' ὀνόματος 58 16: ἐπ'
ὁνόματι 59 12-13
ὁπλων 23 8
ὁράω 3 394: έδώτα 1 9; έδών [3 341]
ὁργιοφάντης 39 2
ὁρðos 24 19
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σορός 61 5-6
σπάνις 31 35
στέφα 4 14
στουνά 22 129
στουνάξεως 3 12, 20, [89]
στάδιον 6 6, 13
σταθμός 1 4; 3 156, [198], 218, 478
στάσις [31 18, 53]
στενόχωρος 40 13, 20-21
στέργω 3 394
στεφανηφόρεω 49 12-13
στεφανηφόρος [45 3]
στέφανος 2 9-10; 3 89; [31 16, 41]; 41 3-4
στεφανίω 2 9; 37 2-3
στέφω 10 9; 39 4
στήλη 31 [13], 39; 33 3, 4
στοά 35 [16], 17
στοργή 3 0
στρατεία 3 15
στρατηγός 50 7-8, 17-18
στρατηγία 50 8-9
στρατηγός 3 7, [200, 220, 419], 436, 480-481; 23 4, 7
συγγενής 33 46; 53 8
σύγκλητος 3 [27], 161
συγχωρεόν 11 25, 46; 26 25
συγχωρήσας 11 9-10
συλλαμβάνω 35 14
συλλέγω 11 36
συμβάλλω 11 10-11
σύμβιος 17 4; 19 5; 61 3-4; 62 2
συμβουλέω 3 403-404
σύμβωμα [6 17-18]
σύμμετρος 24 34
σύμμηκτον 18 16-17
συμπαραλαμβάνω 3 [201], 423, 483, 563-564
συμπάρεμμ 3 482-483
συμπαράξεως 5 21
συμπορεύομαι 3 [50, 210-211], 424, 566
συμφιλοτιμούμαι 34 14; 47 14
συνάδελφος [6 8]
συνδικέω 48 5
συνδιοικέω 1 5
συνέδριον 3 17. See also Index I
σύνεδρος: see Index I
συντειμέλέωμαι 3 [48, 209], 422-423
συνεχής 11 43
συνήγορος 52 11-12
συνήδομαι 3 82, [350, 365-366, 387]
συνθεαίων 11 18
συνθυσία 22 134
συνπερατιέω 44 5
συντήμι 24 33
σύνοδος 24 35, 78; [31 24]
σύνολος 11 49
σύστημα 49 3; 50 2; 51 2
σύμφωνος 11 45
σεστεριτία 4 10
σορτίτιο 4 9
subprocurator 4 5-6
τάγμα 3 [28], 170
ταμίας 13 14
ταμείο 60 5
τάξις 3 15; 11 58; 22 128, 129
τάσιον 3 398
τάχα 11 19, 20
τάχιον 3 289
τέκνον 17 3; 19 6; 34 15; 47 16
τέκος 39 5
τελείταιον 3 306
τελειτη 3 154, [245]; [62 4]
τελέον 3 66, 221, 486; 35 11, [17]; [36 18]; 38 10-11;
49 15
τέλος 31 19
τετράκις 40 10; 57 6
τηλικοῦτος 31 47
τηρεώ 20 10-11
τίθημι 3 157, [205], 468, 475; 4 19; 22 128; 31 17,
[52]; 40 29; 45 [4-5], 12
τιμαίοι 1 9; 3 [13], 21-22, 85-86, 394; 5 2; 14 7; [15
2]; 27 6; 31 37, 40; [35 5]; 36 7-8; 38 [1-2], 11;
39 4; 40 2, 6-7; 41 2; 42 5; 44 2; 49 4; 50 5;
52 2
τιμή 3 [10], 86, [344, 345], 384, 394; 6 11, 14; 11 14,
[221]; 22 128; [31 29, 54]; 40 3; 57 11-12; 59 11
τίνος 11 41
τοίχεα 31 47
τοίχως [3 124]; 6 7
τόκος 3 66, 221, 223, [247], 253, [259, 266, 269, 274,
280, 286], 301, 303, 306, 309, 486, [516, 519, 532], 536
τολμαίο 63 4
τόπος 3 88, 125, 439, 441; [31 18, 52]; 33 9, 24
τότε [11 35]
τραπεζα 50 21-22
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τριβονικιος 14 9
τρίτη (tax ?) 26 12
τρόπος 3 [52], 216, 358; 11 40; 24 22
τυχάνω 3 [10], 340, 392; 22 136
τύχη 3 18; 47 7. See also Ἀγαθή Τύχη
tribunicius 14 3
trid (unus) 4 5
ὑδραγωγεῖον 40 24-25
ὑδρος 40 25
ὑδρος 3 5, 331, [417]; 4 12; 7 1; [12 24]; 17 6;
[21 9]; 33 43; [35 6; 37 12]; 40 4; 52 3:
ὑδρος 3 451: ὑδρος 24 8, 11, 24, 27, 40, 43; [26 8, 16]
ὑνών 7 2; [24 8, 11, 24, 27, 40, 43; 26 8, 16]
ὑζή 3 345; 11 13; 24 14
ὑμνόδος 3 [146, 267], 296; 10 2, 5
ὑπάρχω 1 5; 3 375; 11 25; 24 67; 31 14, 22; 46 10
ὑπατικος 31 [29], 34, [54]; 53 7-8
ὑπατος 3 [136], 448; [7 4]; 24 [10], 12, 26, 28, 42, [44]
ὑπερνάτος 3 331
ὑπερβολή 31 18
ὑπερθυνω [3 217]; 12 24; 13 12
ὑπήκοος 31 20
ὑπηχύσεωμα 3 22, [64], 128, 311, 437-438, 550; 7 15
ὑπογράφω [3 142]; [33 4
ὑπόκεμα 3 307, 309-310, [362]
ὑποκεματίζομαι 31 56
ὑπερτερός [12 6]
ὑψήσθημι [3 317]; 12 24; 13 12
velatus 14 4
viator tribunicius 14 3
φαινό 3 391; 11 19
φαινόρις 3 117, [366, 381]; 24 18
φάσκω: ου φάσκο 7 8
φέρω 3 [49, 270, 420], 438, 557: ήνεγκαν 1 2
φημί 11 44
φιάλη 3 174
φιλαγαθία [12 4]
φιλανθρωπία [3 79]
φιλάρτεμος 3 80-90, 451-452
φιλέω [9 14-15]
φιλογέφων 52 5
φιλοκαίσαρ 3 452
φιλόσπαρμος 3 6, 417, 429, 434; 4 24; 23 18; [34 3];
46 9-10; 52 5
φιλόσοφος 48 1-2
φιλορομαιος 16 8
φίλος 3 [342, 377], 393; 50 24: φίλτατος 3 374
φιλοσοβιστας 3 4, 6, 7-8, 132, [140, 141, 143, 144, 145],
162, [163-164], 166, [179, 416, 417-418, 419], 425-426,
427, 428, 429, 433, 435, 436, 443, 444, 445, 446, 454,
455; 4 11, 18, 24; 5 4; 9 13-14, 21; 18 2; [21-22];
21 3; 50 3; 51 3: φίλοσβιβός 19 11, 12
φιλόσοφος 38 17
φιλοστοργία 3 79, 380
φιλοτεχν [με̇] 31 3
φιλοτεχνομε̇μα 3 [386-387]; 44 4-5
φιλοτημία 3 125, 312, [340, 349], 552; [12 11]; 31 26,
[49]; 49 9-10
φιλοτέμους 3 8, 85; 46 6; 48 1
φιλοτέμους 3 19-20; 18 4, 14; 34 10; 35 9; [43 5];
50 18-19
φισκός 3 [113], 325, 364, [409]; 61 7-8
φρονεῖον: ξων και φρονεῖων 62 1
φροντίζω 24 18
φρονομαντάριος: ἀπὸ φρονομαντάριων 58 6-7
φιλάκλας 3 [48, 95, 209, 273], 562
φιλάρχος [3 247-248, 252]; 48 16
φιλάσσω 11 12, [17], 32; 12 13, 14
φιλή 1 8, 10; 3 [30, 145, 175-176, 177, 180, 181, 186,
188, 189], 191, 193, [196, 197, 206], 240; 29 4; 31
53; 48 17, 29, 24, 28, 31, 35, 38, 41, 45, 49, 52, 56:
φιλόσβιβος 18 22
φινεῖον 33 17
χαίρω: κεχαρισμένον 3 393; 24 38: χαίρειν 3 337, 373;
7 4; 11 4; 24 [13], 29, 45; [25 4; 26 11, 19]
χάλκεος, χάλκος [24 33, 38]; 31 13; 42 10
χαρακτήρ 11 13, [16-17]
χαράσσω 3 430
χαρίζωμαι 33 7
χείρ [3 182]; 31 31
χελάρχος tribune 4 14-15
χιλιαστής 1 9, 10: χι 18 23
χηρογία 24 31
χρόμωμα 3 19, 397; 24 48
χρεία 52 10
χρέος [11 43]
χρεώστης 7 9; 11 29
χρή [3 10]: χρή: 24 32: χρήναι 3 348
χρήμα 3 [62], 70, 127, 1291, 293, 353-354, 386], 395;
6 15; 7 7; [11 29]; 12 5, 6; 31 19, [35], 37
χρόνιος 1 6
χρόνος 3 [107], 326-327; 5 10; 11 40; [12 2]; 31 29;
40 27
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χρύσεος [2 9]; 3 23, 88, [149], 158; [24 32]; 41 3
χρυσοφορέω: χρυσοφοροῦστες 3 419-420, 437, 455-456, 474, [517]
χρυσοφόρος 3 471; 10 7
χώνευσις 11 23
χώρα [45 10-11]
χωρέω [3 230, 237]
χωρίδιον 33 8
χωρίον 3 306; 24 14, 16; 33 20-21
χωρίς [11 32]
ψηφίζω 3 322, [350], 399; [12 22, 23, 26]
ψήφισμα 1 2; 2 4; 3 74, [109, 119, 361], 453, 568;
7 10; 12 [12], 18, [19]; 35 6; 36 9; 40 31
ψδή 24 20
ώνεομαι 24 31
όρα 13 16
ώσσαύτως [3 213; 31 31]
ὡφέλεια: ἐπὶ ὡφελίᾳ τῆς πόλεως 40 23-24
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