GREEK INSCRIPTIONS

THE ATHENIAN LAW CODE OF 411-401 B.C.

2. Several fragments of the Athenian Law Code of 411-401 B.C. have already been published. The purpose of the present article is to make available texts of the rest of the fragments discovered in the Agora. In this routine preliminary publication, the commentary is necessarily restricted to readings, since hardly anything else of significance could be written without involving a much larger study. I hope to treat the whole body of fragments and some related documents in a forthcoming book.¹


Of the preserved texts most, including all of those here published, are *fasti sacri*. Hitherto it has been known that part of the code was inscribed on an opisthographic wall 0.120 m. thick. We now learn from Fragment F (infra) that part of this wall was not inscribed on its ‘earlier’ side, i.e., the side inscribed with the Attic alphabet. To this thicker wall Fragments E and F and, as I shall hope to prove, *I.G.*, I³, 844-845 should be added. *Hesperia*, III, 1934, p. 46, no. 34 can be made, I think, to attest a second, thinner, opisthographic wall, of which Fragment C (infra) preserves both sides, and Fragments A, B, and probably D (infra) preserve the earlier side only. Both walls were of Pentelic marble.

Fragment A (Agora Inv. No. I 591) was found on March 20, 1933, in a Late Roman deposit in Section Z. The original bottom, which is worked smooth for contact, is preserved. Height, 0.054 m.; width, 0.082 m.; thickness, 0.052 m. Height of letters, 0.007 m.

Fragment B (Agora Inv. No. I 945) was found on June 10, 1933, in Section Z. No original surface except the inscribed face is preserved. Height, 0.10 m.; width, 0.109 m.; thickness, 0.06 m. Height of letters, 0.007 m.

Fragment C (Agora Inv. No. I 687 + 1026 a + 1026 b) was found in Section Z: 687 on April 19, 1933, in a Late Roman wall; 1026 a on June 26, 1933, in loose fill above the Great Drain; 1026 b on May 7, 1937, in a Late Roman disturbance of the classical floor of the Tholos. The original thickness is preserved. The three pieces joined: height, 0.197 m.; width, 0.26 m.; thickness, 0.095 m. Height of letters on both sides, 0.007 m.

¹ The comments of scholars on the texts here presented will be duly acknowledged (address S. Dow, Widener Library 690, Cambridge, Mass., U. S. A.).
Fragment D (Agora Inv. No. I 590) was found on the same day, and in the same place, as Fragment A. The bottom is preserved: it resembles that of Fragment A. Height, 0.073 m.; width, 0.077 m.; thickness, 0.047 m. Height of letters, 0.010 m.

Fragment E was found in the Agora before 1936. Exact data are not available at this writing. Height of letters, 0.007 m.

Fragment F (Agora Inv. No. I 4310) was found on December 2, 1936, in the demolition of a modern house in Section Φ. The original top (with a cutting for a clamp to join this slab to the next slab on the right) and the right side are preserved. The thickness also is original, the back having been left rough-picked. Height, 0.353 m.; width, 0.108 m.; thickness, 0.143 m. Height of large letters (line 49), 0.009 m.; of the other letters, 0.007 m.

THINNER WALL, EARLIER SIDE

Fragment A. The end of a column

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>5</th>
<th>[---]</th>
<th>[---]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>[---]</td>
<td>[---]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fragment B

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>5</th>
<th>[---]</th>
<th>[---]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>[---]</td>
<td>[---]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Fragment C. The ends of two columns

15 [-----------------]
[-----------------]ε
[-----------------]
[-----------------]
[-----------------]

20 [-----------------]ον
[-----------------]
[-----------------]ος
[-----------------]ος
[-----------------]ος

25 [-----------------] ν ἰδείαν
[-----------------] ν ἰδείαν
[-----------------] ν ἰδείαν
[-----------------] ν ἰδείαν

[deity ?] [victim] [κρι] τέν
[deity ?] [νεκατό ?] μβεν ἡμ[---]

[vacat] vacat

30 τ[-----------------]
[-----------------]ον
[-----------------]τμ.
[-----------------]εστε
[-----------------]τοντο

35 τὸς πολι[---]
[-----------------]
[-----------------]

ἐννέα ἄρ[χοντας ?] [vacat] [---]

No. 2. Fragment C, Earlier Side
Fragment D. The end of a column

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Line 40} & : \quad \text{天河} [\ldots]\ \\
\text{Line 39} & : \quad \text{天河} [\ldots]\ \\
\text{Line 37} & : \quad \text{天河} [\ldots]
\end{align*}
\]

No. 2. Fragment D

---

THICKER WALL, LATER SIDE

Fragment E

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Line 45} & : \quad \text{天河} [\ldots]\ \\
\text{Line 43} & : \quad \text{天河} [\ldots]\ \\
\text{Line 41} & : \quad \text{天河} [\ldots]\ \\
\text{Line 39} & : \quad \text{天河} [\ldots]
\end{align*}
\]

No. 2. Fragment E. From Marked Squeeze
Fragment F. The top of a column


50  [. . δ]εκατ[ηι]
    [έκ ἧ] νέων [-----]
    [. ] ο[-----]
    [. .] το[-----]
    [. .] ντ[-----]

55  Κορο[τρόφωι-----]
    [. .] τ[-----]
    [. .] α[-----]
    [Δ] ιε Νε[ανια]

[-----]

60  [. .] ρι[-----]
    [τ] ὄν [ν[-----]
    [. ] ε[-----]
    [. .] σκ[-----]
    [. .] α[-----]

65  [. .] ε[.] [-----]
    [. .] ντ[-----]
    [. .] νδ[-----]
    [. .] γ[-----]

70  [. .] μ[-----]
    [-----]
    [-----]
THINNER WALL, LATER SIDE

Fragment C. Ends of two columns

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>75</th>
<th>[---] [---] [−−−−−−−−−−−−−−]</th>
<th>75</th>
<th>[---] [---] [−−−−−−−−−−−−−−]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>[−−−−−−−−−−−−−−ν]</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>[−−−−−−−−−−−−−−ν]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>[−−−−−−−−−−−−−−κ]ρυτη χοως</td>
<td>ΔΓ</td>
<td>[−−−−−−−−−−−−−−ΔΓ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>[−−−−−−−−−−−−−−νι]</td>
<td></td>
<td>[−−−−−−−−−−−−−−νι]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>[−−−−−−−−−−−−−−νητο]</td>
<td></td>
<td>[−−−−−−−−−−−−−−νητο]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[vacat] vacat</td>
<td></td>
<td>[vacat] vacat</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

No. 2. Fragment C, Later Side

READINGS

Fragment A. Line 2. For other small omicrons cut by the same mason, see Fragment B. No interlinear punctuation followed this line, hence the restoration
oult to relate this line to line 3: one possible parallel is lines 7-8, which evidently
prescribe two victims to the deity named in line 6 or earlier. But clearly line 2 did
not read ᾠ[ν]; the lower curve of the beta is partly visible on a squeeze, and the name
of some deity should probably be restored, as also in line 3.

Fragment B. Line 7. After lines 7 and 13 the surface of the stone where inter-
linear punctuation (if any) would have been inscribed is broken away as indicated.
Line 9. The numeral for one drachma is fairly clear in part on a squeeze, but an
amount of the form — — ΦC is unlikely. Line 10. The numeral for one drachma, of
which one dubious trace is preserved, may be correct, since a one-obol sign, if it
occupied this space, ought to appear. No interlinear punctuation following line 12
can be read. The appearance of the squeeze suggests that a groove of this sort was
inscribed and then erased. Line 13. The traces will fit no other letter.

Fragment C. The gap between lines 24 and 36 is eleven spaces, as indicated.
Line 26. The surface of the stone is damaged after the pi. No letter can be read,
and none excluded, in this area.

Fragment E. Line 47. Part of theta, omicron, or omega.

Fragment F. There is difficulty in the reading of almost every line, but the
limits of the column are definitely fixed by line 55. Apart from line 59, it seems
impossible to tell in which lines numerals occurred. Line 49. The reading and restora-
tion must be reserved for the later study. Line 50. [ἐνδ]εκάτ[ην] or [δωδ]εκάτ[ην],
rather than ἔκατ[ην], because of the following line, which is evidently of the form
which in this Calendar follows a date. Line 52. This line has been read as Ἄπολ-
[λοντι], but two photographs seem to make the alpha in the fourth space certain.
The third letter is surely omicron or theta. The second may be pi, ιι, or possibly epsilon
slightly misplaced, =. Line 53. The third letter may be gamma. Line 54. Probably
κροτ——. Line 56. The second letter may be iota. Line 57. The second letter
may be tau. Line 61. Possibly (cf. line 51) [ἐκ τ]ὼν ν[——]. Line 62. [Μ]ἐλι[χων]
or [μ]έλι[τος]; or the third letter may be alpha, suggesting [P]έλιοι; or faint oval
traces in the first space may give θέλι or θέλι[——], or again Ρέλιοι. Line 63. The
second letter may be epsilon; thus, although an omicron (or theta) might be read
in the first space, ο[ι]ς κ[ροτ——] seems excluded. Careful cleaning may eventually
reveal the fifth letter. Line 64. The fourth letter is iota, or less probably phi. Line
66. The third letter may be iota; the fourth is gamma or pi. Line 67. The first letter
may be pi. Line 68. The first letter may be omicron or theta. Lines 69-71. The
traces are very uncertain.

Fragment C. Numerals precede their items in all other fragments. The large
gap after the numerals, and the careless lettering, suggest that here the numerals may
have followed. Line 78. The first "preserved" letter appears to be represented by a
stroke which would belong most naturally to a chi, but might be part of an upsilon.
A second mark makes eta or iota bare possibilities.
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