AN ERETRIAN PROXENY DECREE
OF THE EARLY FIFTH CENTURY

In the Athenische Mitteilungen, LIX (1934), Dr. Werner Peek published, along with twenty-seven other inscriptions, the Eretrian proxeny decree which is the subject of this paper. His commentary is brief, and his restoration considerably different from that proposed below.

The inscription was brought to Eretria in 1934 by the museum guard from the farm of the brothers Πνευματικοῦ some five miles east of the town. The nearest village was called Μαγούλα by the guard, but appears on the maps as Κάτω Μέμουλα. The decree is cut on a block of Pentelic marble 32 cm. high (not the original height), 23.2 wide (original width), and 14 thick (original thickness). The top of the stone is preserved back of the surface in such a way as to show that there was ample room for one line above the first letters that remain, but not enough for two.

The letters are well cut, and clear where the surface of the stone has not been injured. Just below the middle of the text there is an erasure of some two lines above which the order is irregular, but below which it is στυχηδών. The letter forms (especially Μ, Ν, +, and Α) suggest a date in the first third of the fifth century, and the fact that the στυχηδών arrangement is not yet firmly established points to the same period.

Dr. Peek’s restoration is as follows:

[Name Τέλλωνίο Εθνι-]
[kon]τοι [καὶ τῶι [χούμ-]
[π]αραγενομέ[νοι]
κυψίων : Μεμοστ[ιδ-]

ος φυλης : ἐπιμεν[ι-]

ενοερές : Ἡεραῶν−
ος μὲνος : τετράδυ

1 This property belonged to the guard’s family, and he himself had known the stone for some eighteen years. He thought that it might have come originally from the ruins of an old church nearby, which I visited with him, but I could find no other certainly ancient blocks except a late grave stele—the sill-block of a little modern church—reading:

ΤΑΛΛΑΙΟΣ
ΘΕΟΜΝΗΣΤΟΥ

This inscription appears not to have been published hitherto.
The Eretrian Proxeny Decree

Photograph of the back of the squeeze reversed as in a mirror. For a photograph of the stone, see *Ath. Mitt.*, LIX (1934), pl. V
The Eretrian Proxyen Decree
Drawing
As this text differs considerably from the one proposed below, both in the readings and in the supplements, it must be commented on in some detail. Since noticing Dr. Peek's article I have been able to examine the stone again, and verify my readings.


Line 2. [χονμ-]. Peek restores only four letters here in spite of the fact that exactly the same space in the line below (line 3) is filled by five letters, three of them (M, N, and O), of the largest size. In lines 4, 5, 6, and 7 the same space is occupied by seven, six, five, and six letters respectively.

Line 4. Peek explains χυφίον as meaning "legal guardian" and as referring to the χοροφάλξια's brother.

Lines 8, 9, and 10. Peek's restoration of the rasura leaves only eight or nine letter-spaces for two names, which is a very improbably short allowance. Nor does his theory that the αδελφό was a "χοροφάλξια oder eine Dichterin . . ." who "hat sich später einmal mißliebig gemacht, und man hat ihren Namen getilgt"¹ explain why καὶ δναι was erased as well. I was unable to find any traces of the ροι which he reads—with hesitation—in the end of the rasura.

Line 11. Peek's reading is [T]ελλον[.]ο. But this name is not otherwise attested, the third letter is quite certainly iota, and the stone is so far preserved that the cross-bar of a tau should appear quite clearly. There is no trace of it.

Line 12. The final upsilon restored by Peek and necessary to the sense, must have been omitted by the stone-cutter. The available space after the alpha of και is exactly the same as after the final ο of line 11. In line 11 only two letters filled this space whereas in line 12 one would expect three—και [εδ-]. But the surface seems sufficiently preserved to show that the epsilon was not crowded back against the iota, and indeed the corner of this epsilon seems to be visible directly under the final ο of the line above. In short there is no room for the upsilon, and we have here either a case of careless

¹ He does not remark that it is surprising to find such a person publicly honoured at so early a date. His parallels are from the first century B.C. for the χοροφάλξια (S. I. G., 3 738) and from the end of the third century for the "Dichterin" (I.G., IX, 2, 62 and S. E. G., II, 263).
omission, or an example of that Ionic suppression of the \( v \) of \( ev \) before a vowel hitherto so doubtfully attested by inscriptions—the only clear example is 'Εαλχίοδες\(^1\) on one of the tablets from Styra.

**Line 13.** Peek restores \( [\chi]\alpha\tau\tau[\acute{\alpha}p\varepsilon]\xi \dot{\alpha}l\dot{e}l\dot{e}f\dot{h} \varepsilon[\iota]\dot{\varepsilon}[\epsilon\iota\tau\epsilon\iota]\). Close examination has convinced me that the first word is \( \kappa\alpha\iota \) and that the \( \iota \) is certain, although there is an injury to the stone which makes it very easy to mistake the letter for a \( \tau \). The restoration \( [\chi]\alpha\tau\tau[\acute{\alpha}p\varepsilon]\xi \) is one letter too long and is consequently impossible in this \( \sigma\iota\omicron \chi\omicron \rho\omicron \dot{\alpha}v\dot{o}n \) section of the inscription—it was doubtless made on the supposed analogy of line 12. In any case the form \( \kappa\alpha\tau\tau\acute{\alpha}p\varepsilon \) never occurs in Ionic, and \( \kappa\alpha\tau\acute{\alpha}p\varepsilon \)\(^2\) only in East Ionic, never in the Western Ionic of Euboea, which was characterized by the retention of the rough breathing. \( \kappa\alpha\tau\acute{\alpha}p\varepsilon \) occurs in the Eretrian decree honouring Herakleitos of Tarentum (ca. 360), *I.G.*, XII, 9, 187, 17.

**Line 14.** I could find no least trace either of the \( \alpha l\rho \) or of the \( \tau \) which Peek hesitantly reads in \( \varepsilon[\iota]\dot{\varepsilon}[\epsilon\iota\tau\epsilon\iota] \).

Finally \( \dot{\alpha}l\dot{e}l\dot{e}f\dot{h} \) could surely not be used without the article in the phrase \( \kappa\alpha\tau\acute{\alpha}p\varepsilon \ \dot{\alpha}l\dot{e}l\dot{e}f\dot{h} \ \alpha i\tau\epsilon\iota\epsilon\iota\iota \).

The following is the restoration which I wish to propose instead:\(^3\)

\[
[\dot{\delta}\dot{o}\chi\sigma\varepsilon\nu : \tau\dot{\varepsilon} \beta\dot{o} - ] \\
[\lambda\dot{\varepsilon}] : \kappa\alpha\iota \tau\dot{o}i [\dot{\delta}m\muoi] \\
[\pi] \omega\alpha\gamma\epsilon\nu\omicron\omicron[\nu\omicron] \\
\chi\upsilon\omicron\omicron : \check{M}\epsilon\kappa\iota\sigma\sigma\iota[\dot{i}\dot{\beta} - ] \\
\circ\gamma \varphi\upsilon\delta\dot{\varepsilon}_s : [\dot{\delta}] \pi\iota\mu\dot{e}\dot{\varepsilon}[\iota - ] \\
\varepsilon\nu\omicron\varphi\delta\dot{\varepsilon}_s : [H]\dot{\varepsilon}\varphi\alpha\gamma\nu - \\
\circ\gamma \mu\dot{\varepsilon}_\nu : \tau\tau\beta\dot{\alpha}d\dot{i} \\
[\dot{\delta}] \pi\iota \ \delta\epsilon\kappa\a : [\dot{\iota} \dot{A}[\iota\iota\iota\iota - ] \\
[\dot{\alpha}l\dot{\varepsilon}_\nu \ \chi\iota\iota\iota\iota\iota\iota] : [\pi - ] \\
[\rho\chi\sigma\varepsilon\nu\nu] : [\dot{\iota} \dot{A}\dot{\iota}\dot{r} - ] \\
\sigma\iota\dot{\varepsilon}_\nu \ \chi\iota\iota\iota\iota\iota \ \iota - \\
\rho\chi\sigma\varepsilon\nu\nu : \kappa\alpha \iota \circ\iota[\dot{i} - ] \\
\varepsilon\gamma\epsilon\tau\dot{\varepsilon}\nu : \kappa\alpha \ \tau[\circ\nu?] \\
\dot{e} \ \dot{\alpha}l\dot{e}l\dot{e}f\dot{h}[\dot{\circ} \ \alpha\nu\nu\nu] \\
\nu c a t \ \alpha r ? \\
\]

**Lines 1, 2, and 3.** In these three lines \( \pi\alpha\gamma\epsilon\nu\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron \) at least seems certain, and gives a line of thirteen letters as in line 6. Most of the lines, however, have fourteen letters,

---


2. E.g. at Priene and Halicarnassus, and in Herodotus.

3. Throughout my work on this inscription I have had the valuable privilege of discussing doubtful points with Mr. Sterling Dow of the American School at Athens.
and as the extant part of line 2 contains almost a full letter more than the corresponding section of line 3, line 2 in all probability originally contained the regular fourteen letters. The preserved letters suggest the common introductory formula ἕδοσεν τῷ βολῆι καὶ τῷ δήμῳ which fits the space well with twelve letters in line 1 and fourteen in line 2. There is a vertical mark on the stone just above the καπρά of καὶ, which is probably the bottom of the + but seemed hardly certain enough to be included in the text. The fact that line 1 has only twelve letters is to be accounted for by its greater proportion of wide letters, and by the interpunct which is probably to be restored after ἕδοσεν.2 Elsewhere in the first half of this inscription the interpuncts follow I or 5—the two smallest letters—and crowd the letters which follow in such a way as not to increase the length of the line at all. But in line 1 the interpunct follows N, the widest of all the letters, and precedes T whose centimetre-long cross-bar could not be interfered with. It is probable, therefore, that it took a whole space, like the interpuncts of the second half, which also follow m's.

Perhaps, as Kinch suggests,3 the fact that the βολή alone is mentioned in the Hegelochos proxeny decree of 411 (I.G., XII, 9, 187) shows that Eretria, newly freed from Athenian domination, was at that date an oligarchy, but in any case the mention here of both βολή and δήμος shows certainly what has hitherto been assumed without proof, that in the early fifth century the city was a democracy.4

**Line 3.** There are no exact parallels for δήμοι παραγγειλόντων κυρίας, “the demos being in regular session,” but that is not strange considering the date of the inscription—the phrase must have been the early Eretrian equivalent in some sense of the later Athenian ἐκλησία κυρία.

---

1 In the first and irregular part of this inscription, the size of the individual letters has a definite influence on the number in a line. E, I, and 5 are regularly half a centimetre or less in width, while Ω, Δ, M, and Ν, are from 1.1 to 1.7 centimetres wide. Line 4 with seven small letters as against three large ones has a total of fifteen. Line 6, with only four small letters and three large ones, has thirteen. In line 1 there are five small to four large, and a total of twelve plus the interpunct.

2 Inscriptions with both interpuncts and introductory formula:

1. Salamin Decree. I.G., I², 1. Tod, 11 (Late 6th cent.).
   1. ἕδοσεν τῷ δήμῳ [——]
   11. ἀρχο[πτα ἀρχεῖ ἑδοσε
   12. ἐν: [κτ] tες β[——]


   1. ἑδοσεν [tα το βαλει] κεα [τ]δεμοι: [——

These three deeree are apparently the only available parallels.

3 Exploration Archéologique de Rhodes, 3ème Rapport, 1905, p. 46.

4 Cf. Arist. Pol. 1306a 35: καὶ τῶν ἐν ἔρετρω διὰ λαγώραν τῶν ἐπίπεδον διάγορας κατέλαον ἐκσκήθεις πρὸς γάμον. But there is no indication of date. Gilbert, referring to a quite inconclusive passage in Herodotus, assumed that the change predated the Persian wars (“Nach Her. 6. 100, 101 scheint 490 in Eretria Demokratie geherrscht zu haben.” Handb. der Griech. Staatsalterthümer, II, p. 67, n. 1), and Newman, commenting on the statement in the Politics, repeats his opinion without comment. The conjecture may well be right, but there is still no proof.
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Lines 4 and 5. Next, clearly, comes the name of a tribe in the genitive, followed by ἑπιμην. eunphes. Remembering that intervocalic rhotacism¹ was an Eretrian characteristic, there is no difficulty in recognising the word ἑπιμηνευόντως. The verb appears first at Delphi in 345/4 (S. I. G., 3 241.90) and is always used in the sense of “to be an ἑπιμηνής”—once with τής ἐκκλησίας added (at Istropolis, in the first century B.C., S. I. G., 3 708.6). ἑπιμηνής first occurs, ca. 450 B.C., in the Milesian law against tyrants (S. I. G., 3 58.4 and 8, and Tod, 35), where Wilamowitz’s note is “Atticorum πρωτάνεις,” and where the context shows that the ἑπιμηνής in question must be a panel of the democratic government, in office for a month. Whether, as was apparently the case here in Eretria, the members of the monthly committee all belonged to the same tribe does not appear. ἑπιμηνεύω is not a common verb—though not exactly rare—and it is interesting to find it occurring again at Eretria, some two hundred years later, when eight ἑπιμηνεύοντες whose office is somewhat obscure (Papadakis considers that they are the same as the πρόβοσκελι and equates them with the Attic πρωτανεύοντες), appear beside the archon and the scribe in the preamble of a third-century ephebic list.² They may well represent a survival of the same political institution, in a doubtless considerably modified form.

This certain instance of rhotacism is interesting as being a little earlier than any of the other known examples. Indeed Smyth says (op. cit., § 331): “We may place the introduction of rhotacism in Euboia in the middle of the fifth century before Christ.”³ It must now be put perhaps fifty years earlier.

Line 4. The name of the tribe is clearly Μηχιστις.⁴ This name occurs in Euboia in three other places: (a) As the name of the mountain, Μάχιστος,⁵ about the identification of which there is some doubt. (b) As the name of a deme of Histiaia (I. G., XII, 9, 1189.31 and 32) in the late second century; Geyer⁶ reasonably conjectures that this deme was on the slopes of Makistos, on the analogy of other Euboean towns which take their

¹ Plato attributes final rhotacism to the Eretrians—ὁδοθ’ οὖν ὑπὶ ἐπὶ τῷ αὐτῷ ἡμείς μὲν φαμεν σκληρότατος Ἡρακλῆς de σκληρότατος. (Cratylus, 434ε)—but there have hitherto been no examples in the inscriptions. Cf. Smyth, The Greek Dialects: Ionic, § 332. But see note on line 14, and compare Buck, Greek Dialects, § 97, note a, who cites ἐπὶῶ ἐν (intervocalic) = I.G., XII, 9, 189.
² Ἄφ. Ἀκτ., 1915, p. 171.
³ There is no example of rhotacism in the tablets from Styra (vi–v cent.).
⁴ The doubling of the first sigma is a common enough device to show that the letter was pronounced with each syllable—cf. Buck, Greek Dialects, § 89, and Smyth, op. cit., § 374. Numerous examples might be cited, e.g., an early inscription from Karystos, I. G., XII, 9, 41—[Ἀ]βισσομένες; and the word ἵσπιταιας in the text of the treaty concluded about 400 B.C. between Eretria and Histiaia, I. G., XII, 9, 188. For the form of the genitive cf. Buck, op. cit., § 109, 5: “A transfer” (i.e. from the -ις, -ισς, -ι, -ιν declension) “to the type -ις, -δις, as frequently in Attic, is characteristic of Euboian proper names in -ις, as Ἀμισόριδος.”
⁵ Aeschylus, Agamemnon, 289:


The passage occurs in the description of the beacon chain announcing the fall of Troy. The long α of other dialects appears in Ionic, of course, as η.
names from the mountains on which they stand. If this connection is justified it fixes
Mt. Makistos in the northern half of the island, and lends weight to the usual identification
of it with Kandili.¹ And (c) as a personal name in a third-century Eretrian list of
soldiers—I.G., XII, 9, 245 a₈₉: Αἰσχοτίδης Μηκιστοδώρου Δες. All of these names may
find their common source in the name of some local Euboean hero—perhaps that Mekisteus
who, according to some,² was one of the Seven against Thebes, and whose connection
with Euboea has already been suggested.³

Line 6. The next two phrases clearly give the date, by month and day. The monun
'Ἡραῖον'⁴ is not otherwise attested for Eretria, but occurs in Tenos—which was once
under Eretrian sway⁵ and which shows parallels to three of the other four known
Eretrian months⁶—as well as at various places in Asia Minor. Hera had a festival as
well as a month at Eretria (I.G., XII, 9, 189₉₇).

Line 8. There is, curiously, no trace of the first letter—epsilon—although the surface
seems to be well enough preserved to show it if it had been engraved.

Lines 8, 9, and 10. Here the text is interrupted by a neat erasure—an erasure so
smooth and shallow as to be hardly noticeable, and yet so thorough that no trace of
the original letters can be discovered in it. It comes just where one would expect to
find the orator's name, which does not occur elsewhere in the text—a curious omission
in so full a preamble. One is tempted also to supply εἰνα in the space thus available,
for the second part of the inscription lacks a verb. But why should the name of the
orator, and the word εἰνα, have been erased? And are not 29 or 30 letter-spaces too

¹ An identification rejected by Peek, who does not, however, notice this argument. In commenting
on Μηκιστοτ[ίδ]ος ιφίλις I have, for the sake of completeness, to some extent repeated Peek.
² Apollodorus, III, 6, 3: τινῆς δὲ Τιθάνα μὲν καὶ Πολυνείαν οὔ καταμεθόδοσθαι, συγκαταλέγοντες δὲ τοῖς
ἐπὶ τὰ Ἐπέοξων Ἰριαῖς καὶ Μηκιστείας.
³ "Erscheint M. in dieser Sage als Argiver, so ist seine ursprüngliche Heimat vermutlich zu suchen
in Euboea." Tambornino in Pauly-Wissowa, Realenc., s.v.
⁴ The spelling Βεραῖον is natural enough, for the loss of the ε of οι before a vowel is very frequent
in all three branches of Ionic—v. Smyth, op. cit., § 209. Cf. 'Ηρᾶος in the Eretrian "Decretum de Arte-
misii" (4th century), I.G., XII, 9, 189₉₇.
⁵ Strabo, X, ch. 448.
⁶ The known months of Tenos and of Eretria are the following:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tenos</th>
<th>Eretria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Απελλαίων</td>
<td>'Ηραῖον</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Ηραιών</td>
<td>'Ηραῖον</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Βοορούνον</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. [Κενονούνον?]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Απατονηρίον</td>
<td>Απατονηρίον</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Ποιδίων</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. [Αγναιών?]</td>
<td>Αγναιών</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Ανθετηρίων</td>
<td>Ανθετηρίων</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Ατεμισιών</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. [Τυρφεών?]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Θαργηλίων</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. 'Ελειθυσίων</td>
<td>'Ιπιών</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
much for such a supplement at a date when orators invariably appeared without either patronymic or demotic? Moreover, so neat a rasura is very unlikely to have been due to spite, or even to official damnatio memoriae, of which there are, in any case, no instances until much later; a mistake on the part of the stone-cutter would seem a more reasonable explanation of it. The most painstaking search for traces of the original letters reveals only one stroke—the first, which is oblique as in alpha or delta. And there is certainly a clear trace of a punctuation sign above the sigma of Ἀριστοτέλευς.

Perhaps when he had finished engraving the date, the stone-cutter accidentally skipped the name of the orator, and εἶναι, and had cut:

Ἀριστοτε
ἐλευν Χειλόνιο : π
φόμενον

(29 letters counting the first interpunct as one) before realising his mistake and deciding to erase the letters.1 Then, lacking the tools for final smoothing, or feeling that Aristotle's name should be written clearly on the true surface, he2 continues from the end of his rasura, leaving it to be filled—more or less incompletely—by the name of the orator and the necessary εἶναι.3 The rasura was never filled. This solution of the problem is, of course, only a conjecture, but it is simple, and it fulfills the conditions.

Line 11. Χειλόνιο—The name Χειλώνιος does not appear to occur elsewhere, although Χείλων is common, and the termination -ώνιος occurs occasionally—e.g. Ἀπολλώνιος, Παωώνιος, Τελαμώνιος, etc. The surface is badly injured in the first letter-space, but it is perhaps possible to see the horizontal cross-bar of the chi.

Line 12. (v). See the commentary on Peek's restoration of the line.

Lines 13 and 14. ἀδέλφε... is not, in all probability, a feminine, but merely the Ionic form of ἀδελφός.4 On the analogy of other proxeny decrees, καὶ τὸς ἀδελφός αὐτῷ

---

1 Cf. the Oropos proxeny decree I.G., VII, 353 (3rd century). Line 8 reads:

[καὶ] ἀδελφὸς ἐγγυηθα[μ] καὶ ἀδελφόν καὶ ἀδελφόν καὶ ἀδελφόν
and Dittenberger remarks: "Vs. 8 quae lineis circumscripti, Lollingius in rasura rescripta esse testatur, quia isopolitiae mentio quadratarii neglegentia omissa fuisset."

2 It is possible that the inscription was finished by a different stone-cutter—perhaps as a result of this mistake. There are the following differences in the script above and below the erasure:

(a) The letters are arranged irregularly above, στομιζόνδν below.
(b) The interpuncts are crowded against the letters which they follow above, but have a whole space to themselves below.
(c) The one gamma above the erasure is written: Γ, the one below: Λ.
(d) Νυ above the erasure appears as Ν and as Ν; below it is always Ν (5 times).

The other letters are, however, as far as one can tell, exactly the same, and Mr. Sterling Dow, who has examined the squeeze, is convinced that both parts were engraved by the same man.

3 There are numerous examples in Attic inscriptions of rasuræ made to receive corrections which, for one reason or another, were never engraved.

4 In Homer the word appears in two forms only—ἀδελφός and ἀδελφεῖς. In Herodotus the only form is ἀδελφεῖς, which exhibits the complete declension with the ε before the ending. In Ionic inscrip-
would be expected here. But there is one letter-space too many between the τοῦ and the α of ἀδελφεῖς. We must consequently read either καὶ τοῦ ἀδελφεῖς or καὶ τοῦ ἀδελφεῖς (or ἀδελφοῖς), in which case we have here an example of the occasional appearance in early Ionic of monophthongal οῶ represented on the stone by οῦ instead of by the more usual ο. There seem to be only two parallel cases in Ionic inscriptions—τοῦ in line 13 of the decree of Amphipolis exiling Philo and Stratokles and βαρβάρος in line 27 of the well-known Tean public imprecations. The choice between these two readings would be easily made in favour of the dative were it not for the possibility that the next line was uninscribed.

q.—The faint but convincing ρό with which the line begins is interesting. It appears to be the only example on stone of the final rhotacism attributed by Plato and others to the Eretrians—cf. the note on p. 279.

Line 15 presents a difficult problem, for it appears to read . . . vacat. The ι and o are very doubtful, but the ιωτα is either a letter or a most deceptive scratch. In the fifth letter-space the surface is almost perfectly preserved, and it seems incredible that a letter could ever have been cut there. As, however, the inscription cannot be restored if it read either:

13 ἔγγετεν καὶ τ[οῦ] 13 ἔγγετεν καὶ τ[οῦ]
14 ἀδελφεῖς[οἰς . . . ] or 14 ἀδελφεῖς[οῖς αὐτῷ or οὐς αὐτῷ]
15 . . . vacat 15 . . . vacat

line 15 must have been either entirely uninscribed or else there must have been a letter in the fifth space. I do not think that in the present state of the stone it is possible to decide between these alternatives and the impossibility carries with it the impossibility of deciding between τοῦ ἀδελφοῖς and τοῦ ἀδελφεῖς (or -οῖς).

On the right hand side of the stone, reading down, and beginning 10 centimetres from the top is the following inscription:

1 καίδοξ
εἰποτε
ἐτονεχ
δῶ : τα
5 ιν : ταλ
vacat

Παγε : τ

ions the forms ἀδελφεῖς (Ionia 5th century, Collitz-Bechtel, Griechische Dialekt-Inschriften, 5571) and ἀδηλ[φε]οῖς are certainly attested (Delos 5th century, E. Schwzyzer, Dialectorum Graecarum Exempla Epigraphica Patiora, no. 782). ὡδελέους occurs in Archilochus: . . . ὡδελέους δ' ἀμφ' ὡδόνη' ἔχωμεν | πνεύμωνας (Hiller-Crusius, Anth. Lyr., Arch., 9 [55]).

3 Not Σ, as read by Peek.
It is in the same hand as the face inscription—the resemblance to the lower half is especially close—although the letters are perhaps slightly smaller; if the face inscription is complete at line 14 and the side inscription extended no farther, there could have been only about three letters more in each line, but there must of course have been more than that. The six lines fill all the available vertical space.

As the sums involved seem large for a gift, and as some god seems to receive a tithe, we are here, in all probability, dealing with a penalty, perhaps intended to protect the life of the new proxenos. One is tempted to compare the treaty between Eretria and Histiaia\(^1\) (ca. 400 B.C.) where lines 10–15 read:

\[
\text{διπότεροι δ’ ὧμ π’-
\text{αφαβαίνωφιν τὰς συνθήκας-
\text{ας ἀποτίνειν τὰ δέκα τάλα-
\text{αντα’ τῶν δὲ δέκα ταλάντων
\text{ν ὁ ἐπιδέκατον ἵπτον εἰ-
\text{ναι τοῦ Ἀπόλλωνος}}}
\]

and numerous other inscriptions\(^2\) containing similar provisions. Lines 4–5 might be restored somewhat as follows:

\[
\text{δῶν : τὰ[λαντα : ἀποτίνετο : τῶν δὲ δυνό-] ca. 30 spaces.}
\text{ἀν : ταλ[ἀντῶν τῷ θεώ τὸ ἐπιδέκατον]? ca. 30 spaces.}
\]

After line 5 there was left one line uninscribed, and the final line of the text of the lateral face thus stands by itself. It should probably be restored independently of what precedes, and I suggest

\[
\text{κατὰ : τὸ Ἀπόλλωνος (? ἡ στέλε ἔστο] ca. 28 spaces.}
\]

The stele was to be set up in a precinct and thus committed to divine protection. This was, in fact, not an unusual practice with proxeny decrees.

In conclusion, and to recapitulate the foregoing rather detailed discussion, this inscription is of special interest on several counts. It provides two new definite facts—the name of a tribe where none was known before, and the name of a fifth Eretrian month. And it is interesting to have evidence of tribal organisation at Eretria in the early fifth century. Of minor importance, perhaps, is the earlier date for the introduction of rhotacism into Eretria, and the provision of additional evidence for Mekisteus' connection with Euboea.

\(^1\) \text{I.G., XII, 9, 188.}

\(^2\) \text{E.g., I.G., XII, 8, 267, [χτ]ίλιοι στατήρες ὀρθιάτω ἱπτῶν τοῦ Ἀπόλλωνος . . . .}

\(^3\) These few recognizable words also strongly recall the mutilated fragments of a 6th century law against homicide, written in the Chalcidian dialect and script, from a Sicilian site, published in \text{Monumenti Antichi, XX, pp. 830ff.}
The inscription is, by about a quarter of a century, the earliest proxeny decree in existence,\(^1\) although it has been known that the institution of the \(\pi\rho\varphi\gamma\varepsilon\varphi\iota\alpha\) was at least as early as the beginning of the fifth century.\(^2\)

Its greatest interest, however, lies in the fact that it is the earliest Eretrian decree by more than fifty years, and in the occurrence of the formula \(\varepsilon\delta\omicron\chi\omicron\sigma\epsilon\nu\, \tau\epsilon\iota\upsilon\, \beta\omicron\lambda\omicron\upsilon\iota\upsilon\, \kappa\alpha\iota\upsilon\, \tau\omicron\iota\upsilon\, \delta\omicron\mu\omicron\upsilon\iota\), which may be taken as proof that at the date of publication Eretria was a democracy. We have thus a \textit{terminus ante quem} for the overthrow of the oligarchy by Diagoras.

\(^1\) The earliest proxeny decrees known hitherto are \textit{I.G.}, I\(^2\), 27, 28, and 36, all of which are to be dated about the middle of the 5th century. Cf. Monceaux, \textit{Les Proxénies Grecques}, p. 69.

\(^2\) See especially Herodotus, VIII, 136: \textit{Μαρσύνως... ἐπιμεψ ἐγγελον ἐς Ἀθήνας Ἀλεξανδρὸν τὸν Ἀμόντεω πυθόμενος δὴ πρὸς τίνα τέτοια καὶ ἐφεξής.}