GREEK INSCRIPTIONS

ACCOUNTS OF TREASURERS

52. There are here published several fragments which belong to the treasurers’ accounts of the last year of the Peloponnesian War (I.G., II², 1686). It has not been possible as yet to build any consecutive text with the aid of the new pieces, but some general observations may be made about their relative disposition.

The stone now published as I.G., II², 1686 is opisthographic, and the obverse and reverse, respectively, have been denoted by the letters A and B. Face A is represented by the two fragments a and b, but the back of b is broken away and does not appear in Face B. Although the spacing of the lines in this document is irregular, there is a tendency which may be observed on both faces to employ wider spacing at the top, and a much closer spacing near the bottom. With this characteristic of the stones in mind, one should probably place fragment b above fragment a in any attempted reconstruction of Face A.¹

One new piece from the Agora belongs with Face A, and is here listed as fragment c. The stone was found on June 3, 1935, in a disturbed fill of Byzantine date in Section II. It is of Pentelic marble, broken on all sides, and has the following measurements:

Height, 0.076 m.; width, 0.07 m.; thickness, 0.023 m.

Height of letters, 0.008 m.-0.009 m.²

Inv. No. I 2982 (cf. Dinsmoor, loc. cit.).

No. 52. Fragment c of Obverse

¹ So also Dinsmoor, Harv. Stud. Cl. Phil., Suppl. Vol. I, 1940, p. 171, who notes that an uninscribed space at the bottom of fragment a indicates that it belongs to the bottom of the stele.
² The height of letters for the fragments published in the Corpus is incorrectly reported as 0.007 m.
The spacing of lines is suitable for association with I.G., Π₂, 1686, lines 19-23, but I have found no satisfactory restorations. The reading suggested above for line 3 has been taken from I.G., Π₂, 1686, line 23, and the sums paid out in staters of Attic gold are appropriate also for association with this part of the inscription. In line 2, the restoration should probably be στα[τῆρας] rather than στα[τῆρες], because of the high probability that I.G., Π₂, 1687 (which exhibits the form στατῆρας) belongs also to this inscription. The hand in both texts is the same, and there is no greater variation in spacing than is observable within the text of I.G., Π₂, 1686 itself.3 In fact, throughout the text of I.G., Π₂, 1686 the accusative στατῆρας should perhaps be substituted in the restorations for στατηρες. If this is true, then the restoration in line 5 may be either [στατηρ]ας or [προτανεῖ]ας. These two possibilities, not to exclude others, are the first that suggest themselves.

A small fragment now preserved in the Epigraphical Museum at Athens (E.M. 3032; cf. Dinsmoor, loc. cit.) should also be assigned to this inscription, probably to Face A, and I list it here as fragment d. It is of Pentelic marble, and has the following measurements:

Height, 0.07 m.; width, 0.062 m.; thickness, 0.025 m.

Height of letters, 0.008 m.

\[
\text{IN} \quad \text{IIΕΟ} \quad \text{ΕΝΗΞ} \quad \phiιάλ]α \ \dot{δ}ργ[υρά \ \dot{δ}νο \quad \Delta
\]

No. 52. Fragment d of Obverse

The difficulty of restoration prevents its being united directly as part of I.G., Π₂, 1686, lines 3-7, but the reference to the silver bowls indicates that this is its approximate position. The fragment published by Broneer in Hesperia, IV, 1935, pp. 165-166, no. 26,4 and illustrated by him with a photograph which shows the letters clearly, must also be included here. His restorations will have to be modified, but I have been unable to find any definite place for this fragment in relation to the others. I list it merely as fragment e.

From the Agora, a fragment broken on all sides, and with the relatively wide spacing (four lines in five centimeters) of the upper part of the stele, may belong to

3 Cf. Ferguson, Treasurers of Athena, pp. 75-76, note 3. 4 Cf. Dinsmoor, loc. cit.
this same inscription. It was found in a late Roman fill in Section ZZ on May 16, 1939. I list it here as fragment f.

Height, 0.09 m.; width, 0.103 m.; thickness, 0.027 m.

Height of letters, 0.009 m.

Inv. No. I 2486 b.

\[\begin{array}{c}
\text{No. 52. Fragment } f \\
\end{array}\]

A small fragment found on February 22, 1935, in Section II of the Agora excavations belongs to Face B. It preserves its left margin, but is broken on all other sides. The measurements are as follows:

Height, 0.151 m.; width, 0.089 m.; thickness, 0.051 m.

Height of letters, 0.008 m.

Inv. No. I 2486 (cf. Dinsmoor, loc. cit.)

\[\begin{array}{c}
[\text{[εν]άτη κα[ι} \text{------}]
[\text{τρια[κοστή]} \text{------}]
[\text{ev} \text{ΗΔΔΔΔ} \text{------}]
[\text{ημεραι} \text{------}]
[\text{εμπτε[ι} \text{------}]
[\text{v τω[νο]} \text{------}]
[\text{ισμ[υ]} \text{------}]
[\text{ΟΗ} \text{------}]
\end{array}\]

\[\begin{array}{c}
[\text{vacat} \text{------}]
\end{array}\]
This fragment comes from the same margin of the stone as fragment a, and the close spacing of the letters shows that it should be placed below a in the reconstruction. I list it as fragment b of Face B.

The importance of this document as evidence for conditions in Athens in the last year of the war is set forth by Ferguson, *Treasurers of Athena*, pp. 77-84.

**HONORARY DECREE**

**53.** Fragment of Hymettian marble, with part of the smooth-dressed right side preserved, found on May 12, 1938, in Section Σ.

Height, 0.24 m.; width, 0.194 m.; thickness, 0.094 m.

Height of letters, *ca.* 0.006 m.

Inv. No. I 5439.

The inscription is written stoichedon. Ten lines occupy a vertical space on the stone of 0.125 m., and ten letters (measured on centres) occupy a horizontal space of 0.122 m.

301/0 B.C.  ΣΤΟΙΧ. 30

[ .......... 13 ....... εἶναι ἐν] ἑκά [καὶ φι]  
[λοσμίας τῆς εἰς τὴν βοῦ] ὑπῆρ καὶ τὸν [δ]  
[ἡμον τὸν Ἀθηναίων· ἑσά] νέσαι δὲ καὶ Ἰ  
[ .......... 17 ....... ] δεινίαις Ἐννετ  

5 [αἰόνα ....... 11 ....... ] ἐὰν καὶ τὰς ὑπηρεσ  
[ιας καὶ τοὺς στρατι] ὡτας τοὺς μετ’ αὐτ  
[ὤν οί .......... 12 ....... ] σαν τὴν ἐν Τορνέα  
[ι καὶ στεφανώσαι θα] λοῦστε στεφάνως· ἄν  
[αγαφαὶ δὲ τόδε το ψή] φισμα τὸν γραμμ  

10 [ατεά τὸν κατὰ πρυταν] εἰαν ἐν στή[λης]  
[ιδηνι καὶ στήσαι ἐν τι] ἐι αὐλει [τοῦ ....]  
[ .......... 10 ....... εἰς δὲ τή] ν ἀναγραφ[ἡ]  
[στήλης δούναι τὸν ἔξ] ἑστατὴν κα[τὶ τοῦ]  
[ς τριτταρχοῦν ὅ ΑΔ ὅ δραχμά] ἀσ. vacat

No. 53

The approximate date of the inscription may be inferred at once from the fact that the expense was borne by the exetastes and the trittyarchs (lines 12-14), for these officials appear in the decrees as disbursing officers only after the establishment of the military oligarchy of 301/0 B.C., and their last appearance is in a decree of
295/4 B.C. (I.G., II², 646). The history of these years, and of the tyranny of Lachares, has been much clarified by the new evidence of one of the papyri from Oxyrhynchus (A. S. Hunt, Oxyrhynchus Papyri, XVII, no. 2082), for which a full account has been given by Ferguson in Cl. Phil., XXIV, 1929, pp. 1-31. Lachares became “tyrant” in the year 300 B.C., about the time of the Dionysiac festival, and his usurpation of power was the culmination of the struggle precipitated by Charias’ action in seizing the acropolis. The papyrus states (Fr. 2) that Charias, Peithias, Lysandros, and Ameinias were condemned and put to death, though they had taken refuge in the temple of Athena. These men were the leaders of the defeated faction, and were doubtless all members of the college of generals in 301/0 B.C. Charias is named in the papyrus as (στρατηγός) ἐπὶ τῶν [ὁ] πλων and Lachares as (στρατηγός) δ [τῶ] ν ξέφων ήγούμε[ν]ος (Fr. 1).

Ameinias now appears again in our present inscription, where he receives, along with others, the praise of the Council and Demos of the Athenians for the successful prosecution of some military exploit. The inscription is so fragmentary that it does not itself specify what the expedition was, but there is evidence that crews of ships (line 5) and mercenaries (line 6) were involved, and that they also were praised. It is now evident that the inscription must be dated before the ill-fated seizure of the acropolis because of which Ameinias lost his life, for the praises voted to him here must have preceded that event.

The military expedition which may be inferred from the inscription is probably to be identified with the στρατία named in the papyrus (Fr. 1). This must be dated in the late summer of 301 B.C., and Ferguson claims for it the joint activity of the Argives and Athenians which led to the recovery of the Long Walls and the Peiraeus from the garrisons of Demetrios. The sequence of narrative in the papyrus shows that Charias and Lachares were already rivals when the campaign took place, but that it was only after the campaign that Charias forced the issue by seizing the acropolis. Ameinias, as general, took part in both ventures; for the first he received the praise of Athens, and for the second he lost his life.

It is evident from this new inscription that the exetastes and the trittarchs were exercising control over funds which in the period immediately preceding had been drawn upon by ὁ ἐπὶ τῇ διοκήσει, by the ταμίας τὸν δήμου, or by the ταμίας τῶν στρατιωτικῶν, even before Lachares achieved his “tyranny.” The new financial con-

---

5 Dinsmoor, Archons, p. 64.
6 See also Dinsmoor, Archons, pp. 389-390 (with references) and List, pp. 29-31.
8 Loc. cit., pp. 11, 15. These events of 301 B.C. are referred to in I.G., II², 774, b, 1-9, for the restoration of which see S.E.G., III, 98 (Wilhelm). De Sanctis brings this inscription to a later date and associates it with the downfall of Lachares (Riv. di Fil., XIV, 1936, pp. 141-144).
9 Kahrstedt, Untersuchungen zur Magistratur in Athen, p. 14, wishes to separate fragments.
control, essentially military rather than civilian, was not introduced by Lachares alone, but by the military party which came into power in 301/0 B.C. This military usurpa-
tion came as a reaction to the policies of Stratokles and other followers of Demetrios. The departure of Demetrios for Asia in 302 B.C. weakened his party in Athens, and after the defeat of Ipsos in the summer of 301 his prestige and influence were so slight that Athens, under new leaders, recovered the Long Walls and the Peiraeus and prepared to maintain its independence. The military basis for the newly won freedom is proved from the beginning by the appearance in this decree of the exetastes and the trittyarchs. The importance of the mercenary troops is further emphasized by the services they rendered, as recorded in line 6 of the present document, and by the fact that their paymaster, the exetastes, shared in the control of contingent funds. Lachares was general of the mercenaries but it was only after the settlement in his favor of the dispute between himself and his fellow generals that he became "tyrant" of the city.

Line 4: Chairman of the board of proedroi in one of the preserved decrees of 305/4 B.C. was [....] Αμεινίον ξυπέται(ιών). He was undoubtedly related to the Ameinias of the present text, either father or son.

Line 7: Tornea is apparently the name of a place otherwise unknown.

Lines 11-12: the restoration [ἐν τῷ] ἀείνη[.CopyToClipboard] τοῦ βουλευτηρίου] seems probable, but the place of finding of the fragment, small though it is, and the military character of its contents make a location for the stele [ἐν τῷ] ἀείνη [τοῦ ναοῦ τοῦ Ἀρέως] also a possible conjecture.

a and b of I.G., Π², 505 so that he may remove the ταμίας τοῦ δήμου from the year 302/1 B.C.: but see the comments by Ferguson in A.J.P., LIX, 1938, pp. 230-231; by Meritt in Hesperia, IX, 1940, p. 72 and ibid., X, 1941, p. 56; by Pritchett in Hesperia, IX, 1940, pp. 108-111, and ibid., X, 1941, pp. 271-272. Cf. also Kahrstedt in Hermes, LXCV, 1940, pp. 332-334. For the ταμίας τῶν στρατιωτικῶν see especially Schweigert, Hesperia, IX, 1940, pp. 349 and 351, and Pritchett and Meritt, Chronology, p. 43, note 41.

10 See Ferguson, Cl. Phil., XXIV, 1929, pp. 16-17.

11 Nor was this control by the exetastes and the trittyarchs terminated when Lachares lost his power in the spring of 295. They appear as disbursing agents in I.G., Π², 646, a decree of the archonship of Nikostratos (295/4 B.C.), though the stele on which they are recorded was paid for by the single officer of the administration. For this divided responsibility, see Dinsmoor, Archons, p. 64 (also De Sanctis, Riv. di Fil., XIV, 1936, p. 257).

12 The news of Ipsos probably did not reach Athens before the third prytany of 301/0, for Stratokles was still influential late in the second prytany (I.G., Π², 640). Cf. Beloch, Gr. Gesch., IV, 2, p. 245.

13 I.G., Π², 796; for the date see Hesperia, V, 1936, pp. 201-205.

14 For the location of the temple of Ares in the age of Pausanius, see Shear, Hesperia, VII, 1938, pp. 320-322. The original position of the temple, which had been moved and rebuilt when Pausanius saw it, was presumably not far away. See Dinsmoor, Hesperia, IX, 1940, pp. 1-52.
THE ARCHONSHIP OF NIKIAS

54. Fragment of Pentelic marble with the left side preserved, and with the spring of a moulding at the top, found on October 17, 1939, in a modern wall on the north slope of the acropolis.

Height, 0.20 m.; width, 0.10 m.; thickness, 0.13 m.
Height of letters, 0.01 m.
Inv. No. I 5886.

The inscription is stoichedon. Five lines occupy a vertical space of 0.101 m., and three letters (measured on centres) occupy a horizontal space of ca. 0.06 m.

296/5 B.C. ΣΤΟΙΧ. 33

έπι Ν[ικίων ἀρχοντος τοῦ υστέρου ἐπὶ τῆς]
Αἰγε[ίδος δευτέρας πρυτανείας ἕι 'Αντικ]
ῥάτη[ς Κρατίων Ἀλεξίεως ἕγραμμάτευν·]
'Ελαφ[ὴ βολῶνος . . . . . . . μετ' εἰκάδας· τῶν]
5 προεδ[ρῶν ἐπελήφυξεν . . . . . .] 10
ος ['Ρ]α[μοῦσιος καὶ συμπρόεδροι . . . . .]

The formula of date in line 1 is slightly different from that of the two other known decrees of this year, I.G., Π II, 644 and 645 (έπι Νικίων ἀρχοντος υστέρου), but evidently it refers, just as they do, to the latter part of the year for which Nikias was archon. The change in government presumably came after the fall of Lachares at about the time of the Dionysiac festival of 295. This date within the year has been inferred from the equation between month and prytany in I.G., Π II, 644 (Μουνισιόν 16 = Prytany IV, 7), and is now confirmed by the fact that some date in Elaphebolion, possibly near the end of the month, fell in the second prytany. The restoration δευτέρας in line 2 seems certain.

15 The text of line 1 might be made to agree precisely with that of I.G., Π II, 644 and 645 by assuming a dittography like that which appears on the stone in Hesperia, IX, 1940, no. 15: ἐπὶ Εὐθέων ἀρχοντος, but such restoration is not to be recommended. It should be noted that the restoration ἐπὶ Ν[ικίων ἀρχοντος τοῦ δευτέρου] is also possible. This would imply that Nikias was archon twice within the same year, but the best interpretation of the other evidence is that he held one archonship, divided into two parts. See Kirchner’s note on I.G., Π II, 644; Dinsmoor, Archons, pp. 70, 389; Dinsmoor, List, pp. 30-31.
16 Cf. Dinsmoor, Archons, pp. 389-390; List, p. 29, note 27, and p. 31. See commentary on No. 53, above.
A DECREES OF ORGEONES

55. Inscribed stele of Hymettian marble, found April 28, 1934, on the Areopagos. The stone is broken at the bottom and at the upper corners, but the back and parts of the original sides and top are preserved.

Height, 0.293 m.; width, 0.315 m.; thickness, 0.082 m.

Height of letters, 0.007 m.

Inv. No. I 1906.

Ten lines occupy a vertical space on the stone of 0.14 m. The inscription is not stoichedon.
Early Third Century B.C.

[Δυσίας Περί] ἀνδρον Πλωθεύς ε[ἰπεν· ἀγαθεῖ τύχει]·
[δεδόχθαι τ]ούς δ[ὶ]ρ[γ]εόσιν· ὅπως ἀν δ[ὶ] ατηρήσαι τῶν
[θυσίων η κοινωνία ε]ἰς τὸν ἀπαντά χρόνον τῶν κοιν.
[ν]ῶν τῶν πρὸς τοὺς Καλλιφανοὺς καὶ τῶ[ι τοῦ ἦρως Ἐ]

5 χέλον ἀναγράφασται τοὺς ὀφείλοντάς [σι τε εἰς κοιν]·
νονίαν ἐν στῆλει λιθίνη στήσας παρὰ τ[ῶν βωμῶν]
ἐν τῶι ἱερῷ τὰ τε κεφάλαια καὶ τῶν τόκον [ν ὀπόσον]
ἀν ἔχει ἐκαστὸς· ἀναγράφαι δὲ καὶ τὰ ψηφίσματα
τὰ ἀρχαῖα εἰς τὴν στήλην· ἐπιμεληθήσαί δὲ [ἦ . . . .]·

10 να τῆς ἀναγραφῆς καὶ τῆς στάσεως τῆς στήλης κ[αὶ λο]γ
γίς [α] σηκι δ[ὶ] αν ἐν ταῖς ἀνάλωσις τῶν κοινών. vacat
ἔδοξεν τοὺς ὀργεύναι· τὸν ἐστιάτορα θέουν τὴν [θυσί]
αν μνησών [Ἐκαταβασίων ἐβδόμει καὶ ὅγδει ἔτ[ι δ]]
ἐκα· θέουν δὲ τεῖ πρώτει ταῖς ἠρώναις χοῖρον τῶν δὲ [ἂ]·

15 [φ]ῶν ἱερείων τέλεον καὶ τράπεζαν παρατιθέναι, τεὶ δ[ὲ]
[ὑστερ]ὰ τῶι ἱερῶν ἱερείων τέλεον· λογίζεσθαι δὲ δ[ὶ]τά ἀν
[ἀναλώσεις]· ἀνάλωσιν καὶ μὴ πλέον τῆς προσόδου· [ν]
[ἐμείν] δὲ τὰ κρέα τοῖς {οῖς} ὀργεύσει τοῖς παροῦντι καὶ τοῖς
[ὑοῖς τῆν] εἰς ἡμίσειαν καὶ ταῖς γυναιξί ταῖς τῶν ὀργεῶν [ν]

20 [ο]ν μετ’ αὐ[τοῖς] ταῖς ἐλευθερίαις τῆν ἱσταῖν καὶ ταῖς θυγ[α]·
[τράσι τῆ]ν εἰς ἡμί[σ]ειαν καὶ ἀκολούθησι μαῖά τῆν εἰς ἡμ[ὶ]
[τα]ν· παραδοὺναι δὲ τ[ῶ]ι ἀνδρὶ τῆς γυναικὸς τὴν με
[ vidsa. vacat ] vacat
[ἔδοξεν τοὺς ὀργεύσων· τὸν ἐστιά]τορα τῶν ἐπιγενομέν[ν]·

25 [ο]ν ————————————————————————————————————

The decree belongs to the early years of the third century, and was passed on
the motion of Lysias, son of Periandros, of Plotheia. The orator is probably to be
identified as the father of Περί[ἀν]δρος Δυσι[ὶ]ν (Πλωθεύς) who was one of the
prytaneis of the tribe Aigeis in 256/5 B.C.17 Apparently the purpose of the decree
was to provide for a perpetual community of sacrifices between two religious groups,
one whose locale was near the property of Kalliphanes, and the other an association
whose hero was Echelos. Reference may be made to line 11 for the restoration of
the word κοινών in lines 3-4. The restoration of the word κοινωνία in line 3 finds
some support, if not complete justification, in the appearance of the word κοινών
in lines 5-6. It signifies a community of interest, but is never used in the same sense
as κοινών (cf. line 11).18 The fact that the community of interest in this instance

17 P.A., 11799. Cf. Dow., Hesperia, Suppl. I, no. 10 (= I.G., Πλωθεύς) who was one of the
prytaneis of the tribe Aigeis in 256/5 B.C. Apparently the purpose of the decree
was to provide for a perpetual community of sacrifices between two religious groups,
one whose locale was near the property of Kalliphanes, and the other an association
whose hero was Echelos. Reference may be made to line 11 for the restoration of
the word κοινών in lines 3-4. The restoration of the word κοινωνία in line 3 finds
some support, if not complete justification, in the appearance of the word κοινών
in lines 5-6. It signifies a community of interest, but is never used in the same sense
as κοινών (cf. line 11). The fact that the community of interest in this instance

18 Poland, Geschichte des griechischen Vereinswesens, p. 164, note.
concerned sacrifices is revealed by the text of the decree inscribed in lines 12-23. The restoration \( \theta νσι\omegaν \) in line 3 has been made by inference from the directions for sacrifice \( \theta ν\epsilon\upsilon \tau\eta \) \( \theta νσι\alphaν \) and \( \theta ν\epsilon\upsilon \) in lines 12-13 and 14.

The hero Echelos (lines 4-5) gave his name to the district \( \'\varepsilon\chi\ell\iota\delta\upsilon \), which is now identified near New Phaleron by the discovery of a group of related monuments, one of which shows in relief a representation of Echelos above which his name is inscribed.\(^{19}\) This is the so-called Echelos-Basile relief, and is usually interpreted as depicting the rape of Basile by Echelos. The hero is driving a four-horse chariot, holding the reins in his right hand and supporting with his left arm the not unwilling victim of his capture. Above their heads is the inscription \( \varepsilon\chi\ell\alpha\upsilon\omega\iota\alpha\sigma\iota\lambda\eta \). When the stone was first found Kavvadias reported the discovery and read the names as \( \varepsilon\chi\ell\alpha\upsilon\omega\iota\nu\) and \( \iota\alpha\sigma\iota\lambda\eta \), though he later accepted Lolling’s suggestion that the maiden’s name was \( \beta\alpha\alpha\iota\lambda\eta \).\(^{20}\) This emended reading has been generally accepted, though some have recognized the epigraphical difficulty involved. A good photograph made soon after the monument was found appears in \( \varepsilon\phi\). \( \alpha\rho\chi\iota\), 1893, plate 9. The supposed beta exists only as a vertical stroke, spaced so close to the alpha which follows that it is difficult to suppose it was ever intended by the stonemounter as beta.\(^{21}\)

\(^{19}\) This group is recently discussed by Otto Walter, \( \alpha\rho\chi\iota\). \( \varepsilon\phi\), 1937, pp. 97-119. For the inscription, see \( I.G., \) II\(^2\), 4546.

\(^{20}\) \( \varepsilon\phi\). \( \alpha\rho\chi\iota\), 1893, pp. 109-110 and 129-146.

\(^{21}\) See the photograph of the inscription here published.
this (loc. cit., p. 113, note 3) though he thought that one could see between the upright and the alpha “Kratzer, die mit einem B vereinigt werden könnten.” I think one must admit, if he wishes to read the name as Βασίλης, that the supposed scratches, too faint to register in a photograph where all the other strokes are bold and distinct, are not sufficient evidence for the emendation; if the reading Βασίλης is desired, then one must assume candidly that the stonecutter inscribed a clear and properly spaced iota instead of what might have been at best an ill-spaced beta. With this interpretation the epigraphical rendering should be <B>ασίλης.

There has been some suggestion that an error here would not be surprising, in view of errors in the other inscriptions on this relief, like the two unnecessary iotas in the name of Hermes and the unnecessary rough breathing.\(^{22}\) The rough breathing should not in any case be called an error, for in the early fourth century such an aspirate was frequently used,\(^{23}\) and might appear even when eta was employed later in the same word.\(^{24}\)

But, in Walter’s opinion, one might claim the aspirate in heμής to be by a different hand from the one which cut the true reading Εμής. This same different (and earlier) hand, according to him, was responsible for the unnecessary iota between rho and nu and for the unnecessary stroke to the left of the aspirate.

It would be a delusion to explain the problem of this name by seeking refuge in the assumption of an earlier unfinished inscription which could conveniently remove all troublesome elements. The stonecutter probably intended from the beginning to cut ΗΕΡΜΗΣ. Possibly he began too far to the left, and the first unnecessary “iota” is the relic of this miscalculation. His second attempt was perhaps too far to the right, and the second superfluous “iota” is probably the relic of this second attempt.\(^{25}\) Neither mark was erased, and the true inscription entirely disregards them both. This explanation may not be the only one possible, but the fact is that these chance strokes should not be called “iotas” if they were never intended as such and if they have no more value than misplaced and meaningless marks. As finally cut, the name heμής exhibits no error which can be used as an analogous argument for probable error in 'Ιασίλη at the other end of the stone.

To associate Echelos with Basile on epigraphical evidence of this character seems to me hazardous. Walter (loc. cit., p. 113) has suggested again the possibility of reading the name as it is written: 'Ιασίλη, interpreting this as a feminine form of 'Ιάσιλος < 'Ιασίλας. The full masculine form (Pape-Benseler, Wörterbuch, s.v.) is analogous to the known Attic name Ιασίδημος (P.A., 7422), and this interpretation of the name 'Ιασίλη here finds some confirmation in the similar etymology of 'Εχελος.

\(^{22}\) See Walter, loc. cit., p. 113; Broneer, supra, p. 138, note 38.
\(^{23}\) As in numerous ὕποι-scriptions.
\(^{24}\) See the form heλής in Hesperia, VIII, 1939, p. 77, no. 24.
\(^{25}\) A photograph may be seen in 'Αρχ. Εφ., 1937, p. 112.
< 'Εχέλαως. The hero was "Ruler of the People," and the heroine was "Healer of the People." 26 One will note further that there is no mention of Βασίλη in our present text and no lacuna where her name may be supplied. Her known associations in Attica are with Kodros and Neleus in a sanctuary below the theatre of Dionysos (I.G., II2, 94), and not with Echelos in Phaleron or on the north slope of the Areopagos where this inscription was found. It is perhaps significant that a heroine who was named as eponym in one cult, together with Kodros and Neleus, does not appear as eponym (if one wishes to posit the association) in the cult of Echelos.

The existence of a place named Εχέλιδαι, localized now by the discovery of the Echelos-Iasile relief, gives evidence for a cult and sanctuary of Echelos near Phaleron (Walter, op. cit., p. 112). The new inscription was found in the city, and a sanctuary (line 7: εν τωι ἱερωι) with an altar (line 6: [βωμόν] restored) should be sought probably not far from the place of its discovery. There is no reason to claim the new site for Echelos rather than for the orgeoines who carried out sacrifices, as we learn from this decree, in common with the Κοῦνων named in his honor.

The chthonic nature of the Echelos cult has been emphasized by Bloch (Riv. di Fil., XIII, 1935, pp. 317-331). In spite of the fact that much of his argument was concerned with Basile, whose cult we prefer not to associate with that of Echelos, the case for Echelos is strong, and his chthonic character is further emphasized by the discovery that a band of orgeoines celebrated religious rites in his name, and that a pig was the sacrifice offered to the ηρωϊναι. The interpretation of the Echelos-Iasile relief remains a problem, but even granted the chthonic nature of the cult, I believe that Walter has advanced arguments of some weight against the Echelos-Iasile = Hades-Persephone equation (loc. cit., p. 114 and note 4). His alternative suggestion is that the scene represents the myth of the initiation of chariot-racing at the Panathenaic games (loc. cit., pp. 118-119).

I have found no title to supply the lacuna at the end of line 9, and suggest that the reading may involve a proper name which ends with the letters nu alpha at the beginning of line 10. 27

The "ancient decrees" of the orgeoines (lines 8-9: τὰ ψη[φίσματα] τὰ ἄρχαια) were inscribed in lines 12 ff. The first may be restored in its entirety, but of the second only part of one line is preserved. Lines 17-23 provide for the distribution of the

26 The etymology of the name Εχέλαως is fully discussed by H. Bloch, Riv. di Fil., XIII, 1935, pp. 318-320.

meat at the sacrifices. All orgeones present were to receive a full share and their sons a half share. The wives of the male orgeones were to have an equal share with the women who were orgeones of their own right, and the daughters of orgeones were to receive a half share. A half share was also to be allowed to one female attendant. If the suggested restoration in line 22 is correct, the wife’s share was to be given in the division to her husband.

CONTRIBUTIONS FOR THE SAFETY OF ATHENS

56. The decree published as I.G., II², 791 is augmented by two new pieces of Hymettian marble. The larger fragment (e) was found on February 24, 1937, in Section N; the smaller fragment (f) was found on February 25, 1938, in Section AA.

e: Height, 0.336 m.; width, 0.155 m.; thickness, 0.077 m.
Height of letters, 0.004 m.; in lines 30-33, 0.006 m.
Inv. No. I 4536 a.

The right side is partly preserved, but the other sides are broken. The surface is badly worn. This fragment joins the right side of I.G., II², 791, fragments b and c.

f: Height, 0.236 m.; width, 0.201 m.; thickness, 0.065 m.
Height of letters, 0.004 m.
Inv. No. I 4536 b.

Part of the left margin is preserved. This fragment joins fragment d of I.G., II², 791, at the bottom of the stele.

The following transcript shows the changes in the text of I.G., II², 791 necessitated by the discovery of the new fragments. For the demotic of the secretary’s name in line 4 see Pritchett and Meritt, Chronology of Hellenistic Athens, pp. 28-31, and for the spelling $\epsilon[\pi\epsilon\nu\rho\iota\mu\omicron\sigma\epsilon\nu]$ in line 6 cf. ibid., p. 30. The date 247/6 B.C. for the archon Diomedon is now advocated by Pritchett and Meritt, op. cit., passim. The orator Kallistratos son of Telesinos of Erchia appears also in 243/2 as sponsor of a decree to honor the agoranomoi of 244/3 B.C. (op. cit., pp. 23-26).

28 The primary meaning of $\acute{\alpha}l\epsilon\nu\theta\rho\pi\omicron\upsilon$ here in line 20 seems to be “independent”; the dative form depends on $\iota\rho\alpha\iota\alpha\iota\nu$.

29 For $\mu\epsilon[\rho\delta\alpha]$ in lines 22-23 cf. Poland, Geschichte des griechischen Vereinswesens, p. 258.
No. 56. Fragment e, Joining Fragments b and c of I.G., ΙΙ², 791
No. 56. Fragment f, Joining Fragment d of I.G., II², 791
I.G., Π², 791

ΣΤΟΙΧ. 48

247/6 B.C.

Τὰ μιᾶς στρατιῶν [τίκαν] νῦν

Εὐρπυμωνίς Διος Μικῆς Νυνίος [Κηφισάκης Αριστοφάνου 'Αριστοφάνου Ἀγαρότης ἐγγόματη]

5 [τε]νέεν Ἑλαφρήθη οὖν ἔνει καὶ νέα ἐμ [βολήμω, δευτέρα τῇ]

[ὑ]πνυρακίας ἐκκλησίας τῶν προέδρων ἐπεφέσιοζεν Καλλίστου

[τρ]ατος Τελεσίουν Ἑρχείς [ὑς καὶ σμ] [πρόεδροι] ἐδεξιν τοῖς δήμων.

[Θέ]όμησις Τιμοκλέους Μαραθώνιος εἶπε [ν · ὅπως ἀν χρημάτων]

10 [π]ορισθέντων ἔχει ὁ ταμίας μερίζεται [δειμοίμα, ίνα κατὰ τῷ]

[ν]κατάλοιπον χρόνον τοῦ ἔναντίον συνκ [ομοιοθάνων οῖς ἐκ γῆς]

[κ]αρποῖ μετὰ ἀσφαλείας ἀγαθεῖται τῇ δοξή τῇ βουλήν τῷ

[τ]όνος λαχάνων προέδρους εἰς τὴν ἐπιούς ἐν ἐκκλησίαν χρήμ

[a]ῖται περὶ τούτων, γνωρίσιν ἐξ ξυμβάλλει [σ]θαί τῆς βουλῆς, ὅτι

15 δοκεῖ τῇ βουλῆι τοῖς βουλωμένους τῷ [τά] πολιτῶν καὶ τῶν ἄλ

λων τῶν ὀικονόμων ἐν τῇ πόλει ἑπιδιόνοι[να] εἰς τὴν σωτηρία

ν τῆς πόλεως καὶ τὴν φυλακὴν τῆς χώρας εἰ [ν] τῶν δήμων ἡ ἐν τῇ β

ουλεὶ ἡ πρὸς τοὺς στράτηγος ἄρχον μέχρι τοῦ Μο

υνικώνων. μη ἐξέστω δὲ μηθεὶς ἐπιδοῦσαι [ί] πλέον ἼΗ δραχμῶν

μηδ ἐλάσσων Ἐνιᾶ εἰναι δὲ τοὺς ἐπιδοῦσι [ν καὶ κουϊὶ καὶ ἱδία

ἐπαινεθῆναι καὶ τιμηθῆναι ὑπὸ τοῦ δήμου καθότι ἂν ἐὰν ἁξίη

ος ἐκαλοστὸς αὐτῶν τοῦ δ η] μον ἀναγράφαι τό


ει κα[ί] στήσαι ἐν τῇ ἀγορᾷ ὅπως ἂν φανερ[α] ἡ ἀπασία ἡ φιλοτ

25 μία τῶν βουλωμένων ἐνεργεῖται τῷ δήμο[ν] τοῦ ἱερά[ν] τὸ ἐδ ἑνάλωμα τὸ

γενόμενον εἰς τῇ στήλῃ καὶ τὴν [ναγ]ραφήν τῶν ὀνόμα

ων μερίσει τῷ ἐπί τῷ δοικήσει. τοῦ δὲ ψήφο[φ] ἱσμα τὸ ἑδή

περὶ πόρου χρημάτων ἐστὶν στρατιωτικῷ [ν, ἂπαν] εἰναι εἰς φυ

λακνή τῆς χωράς.

vacat

30 Οἶδε ἐπέδωκαν εἰς τῇ πόλει τῇ Σωτήριν [πῆ] ρίσκαν τὴν κατὰ [τὸ]

λέως καὶ τῆς φυλακῆς τῆς [χειρ] ὅρασ καὶ τοῦ δῆμος

Psi φι σμα τοῦ δῆμοῦ ὄν.

Ἀντιφῶν Ἑρχείς ΗΗ Δρακοντίδης Ἑρχείς ΗΗ [---]κλή[σ Σ]φήτ [---]

Εὐρυκλέιδης Κήφις ΗΗ 'Αριστοφάνων Ἑρχείς ΗΗ [.....]όμαχος Οῆθ [---]

35 Μικών Κήφις ΗΗ Ίεροκλής Σουνίς ΗΗ [.....]δοτος 'Αχαρ [---]

[Δ]ρομᾶς Ἑρχείς ΗΗ Μικών Θρασίτης ΗΗ [......]δῆς Πρ [---]

[Δε]κλῆς Ἑρχείς ΗΗ Σπουδίας Τειρέα ΗΗ ὑπὲρ αὐτοῦ καὶ [τοῦ νόμσ]

--- --- --- [.....]ορος Θημάκ ΗΗ ...... ΩΔΩ [--- ---]

--- --- --- [.....]ρας Ἀφίδ ΗΗ [.....]κλής 'Αζη[ν ---]

40 --- --- --- --- --- --- Εἱρέας ΗΗ 'Α[ντ]φάτης [--- ---]
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Text</th>
<th>Transliteration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td></td>
<td>[--- - ek K] oíl H[Θ]</td>
<td>[ . . . ] wopos [--- ---]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>lacina</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[---]</td>
<td>[---] wúndhs Kolwn [---]</td>
<td>Τ - - - - - -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[---]</td>
<td>[---] áptov kal tov oud H</td>
<td>Δν - - - - - -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[---]</td>
<td>[---] Ζημων 'Alaieús H</td>
<td>Θε - - - - - -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[---]</td>
<td>[---] αθο H</td>
<td>Κα - - - - - -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[---]</td>
<td>[---] Δουνιας Κηφισε H</td>
<td>Φιλ - - - - - -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[---]</td>
<td>[---] Στράτιον Σφήττ H</td>
<td>Δι - - - - - -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>[---]</td>
<td>Παυσίμαχος έκ Kol H</td>
<td>Κτ - - - - - -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[---]</td>
<td>Παυσίας Παιαν H</td>
<td>Δ - - - - - -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[---]</td>
<td>[---] [---] H</td>
<td>'Ιρερ - - - - - -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[---]</td>
<td>[---] [---] H</td>
<td>Τιμ - - - - - -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>[---]</td>
<td>Εξεν [ο] ν 'Ασκληπιάδου H</td>
<td>Τι [μ - - - - - -]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[---]</td>
<td>[---] Αρσταγόρας έκ Kol H</td>
<td>Φυλάσιος [H] H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[---]</td>
<td>[---] 'Ασκληπιάδη [ς Σ] évo H</td>
<td>Αλκ - - - - - -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[---]</td>
<td>[---] [---] H</td>
<td>'Αρχανδρος 'Ελευσών H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[---]</td>
<td>[---] [---] H</td>
<td>Ευδια H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[---]</td>
<td>[---] Κηφισοφ [ον 'Αθ] μον H</td>
<td>Δημ - - - - - -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[---]</td>
<td>[---] [---] H</td>
<td>Φείδ - - - - - -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[---]</td>
<td>[---] [---] H</td>
<td>Διογ - - - - - -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[---]</td>
<td>[---] [---] H</td>
<td>Φιλ - - - - - -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[---]</td>
<td>[---] [---] H</td>
<td>Πνύθο - - - - - -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>[---]</td>
<td>[---] Αλη [ο] Κορύν H</td>
<td>'Αμοι - - - - - -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[---]</td>
<td>[---] [---] H</td>
<td>'Αριστ - - - - - -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[---]</td>
<td>[---] [---] H</td>
<td>'Επι [φ] [ι] [νης - - - - - -]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[---]</td>
<td>[---] [---] H</td>
<td>Πραξιτ [έλης Τιμάρχου]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>[---]</td>
<td>[---] Θυμοχάρης Σφήττη H</td>
<td>Εύρεσ [ίδης - - - - - -]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[---]</td>
<td>[---] [---] H</td>
<td>Θουκρ [υτ - - - - - -]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[---]</td>
<td>[---] [---] H</td>
<td>Δωρίων - - - - - -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[---]</td>
<td>[---] [---] H</td>
<td>Δαχάρ [ης - - - - - -]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[---]</td>
<td>[---] [---] H</td>
<td>Σεμίας Δ - - - - - -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>[---]</td>
<td>[---] Φυλάταις Αρμάτρ H</td>
<td>Θεόν [ι] [στο - - - - - -]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[---]</td>
<td>[---] Θεόπους Αίγηλ H</td>
<td>[Ν] μοιμά [χ - - - - - -]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[---]</td>
<td>[---] [---] H</td>
<td>νατ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[---]</td>
<td>[---] [---] H</td>
<td>Η</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Among the new names of contributors to the national defense named in fragment f, Nikeratos of Phyla may be identified (a) with the ephebos (P.A., 10745) Νικήρατος Νικηράτου (Φλυεύς) of the archonship of Menekles (269/8 B.C.), or (b) with [Νι]κήρατος Ενβ[--] (Φλυεύς) whose name appears in a list from the third century. Lysiades of Oion belongs to the same family with the two Athenians (P.A., 2656 and 2657) who bore the name Άστυνομος Λυσιάδου Ἐξ Οιοῦ (grandfather and grandson?) and may have been the son of the younger.

I have already noted (Hesperia, VII, 1938, p. 113) that Antiphon of Erchia, known from the old fragment (line 33), should be identified as the archon of 258/7 B.C. (date not certain; cf. Pritchett and Meritt, op. cit., p. xx).

In line 60 Κηφι[σ ---] and in line 72 Δωρίνω stand in rasura.

A DEDICATION

57. Upper part of a small dedicatory column of Pentelic marble. The larger fragment was found on January 28, 1935, near the surface in Section N; the smaller fragment was found on March 12, 1937, in Section Σ.

Height, 0.08 m.; estimated original diameter, 0.39 m.

Height of letters, 0.005 m.

Inv. No. I 2334.

The inscription is not stoichedon; three lines occupy on the stone a vertical span of 0.028 m. In the top is a rectangular cutting, apparently a dowel-hole, 0.012 m. in depth.

No. 57

208/7 B.C. (??)

[᾿Αθη]νάων οἱ πλεόντες ἐν ταῖς φυλακῖσιν τρ[ι]ήμιλίαις καὶ Ο[ι]---
[ἐπ Ὁγ]όλον ἄρχοντος ἦ Άνδροκλῆς Νεοκλείδου Δαμπ[τ][εύς]---
[---] vacat καὶ οἱ τρήραρχοι vacat [---]
[---]ο[. Φ]νεύς ἦ Ἀγνοκράτ[ης] Ν[᾿Δ]γ[ν]οθέου ---

5 [---] vacat

Cf. Hesperia, VII, 1938, p. 134, for the date of Menekles; also Pritchett-Meritt, op. cit., p. xix.

Cf. Hesperia, III, 1934, no. 50.
At the end of line 1 the last preserved vertical stroke may represent iota, but Γ, H, N, Π, and P are also possible. Enough of the surface is preserved after the stroke to render K unlikely.

The archonship of Ankylos has been dated tentatively by Dinsmoor in 208/7 B.C. 32 A date after the creation of the tribe Ptolemais is certain, for a decree of his year, published by Dow, 33 was proposed by the orator [Ξ]ενοφῶν Εὐφάντου Βερενικίδης. Mention of the deme Berenikidai precludes an earlier year. Dow has also called attention to the characteristic late third century script of the decree, which is much more significant for a determination of date than the script of the present dedication, and to the fact that Ξενοφῶν Βερενικίδης is known from another inscription which must be dated soon after 211/0 B.C. (I.G., Π², 1304, line 52: Ξ[ε]νοφῶν Βερενικίδης). It may be noted also that the calendar equation in the decree favors a year during the period of the thirteen tribes 34 and so before the end of the third century.

The name of Androkles, son of Neokleides, of Lamptrai appears in line 2. In the archonship of Polyeuuktos 35 one of the epheboi of the tribe Erechtheis was Androkles, son of Neokles, of Lamptrai (I.G., Π², 681, line 20). These men were obviously from the same family and approximately contemporaries. In any family where there was a Neokles there might of course be also a Neokleides; it is possible that in one of the two instances here cited the patronymic has been incorrectly given, but this would imply an error in the epigraphical record.

PRAISE OF A HIEROPHANTES

58. Three fragments of Hymettian marble. Fragments a and c, which join, were found on January 18 and March 3, 1937, in Section ΘΘ; fragment b was found subsequently on September 12, 1938, in the wall of a modern house in Section BB.

a + c: Height, 0.42 m.; width, 0.315 m.; thickness, 0.19 m. at the top, 0.162 m. below the mouldings.
Height of letters, 0.006 m.-0.007 m.
Inv. No. I 4389.

b: Height, 0.20 m.; width, 0.175 m.; thickness, 0.112 m. (not original).
Height of letters, 0.006 m.-0.007 m.
Inv. No. I 5556.

The inscription is not stoichedon, but so far as can be determined the lines end in complete words or syllables. Ten lines occupy a vertical space of 0.11 m. Some letters still retain traces of red coloring matter.

33 Hesperia, Suppl. I, no. 38.
34 Dow, op. cit., p. 88.
No. 58. Fragments $a + c$
148/7 B.C. NON-S'TOIX.

The date of the inscription is given by the name of the archon Lysiades, who must be assigned to some year between 166 and 147 B.C. Ferguson prefers the year 148/7 to the earlier suggestion of Dinsmoor that he be placed in 159/8 B.C., and this date has been adopted by Pritchett and Meritt. The name Lysiades appears also in a Delian inscription (Inscriptions of Delos, no. 1505) and in an Athenian catalogue of hieropoioi for the festival of the Ptolemaia (I.G., II2, 1938). The present text throws little new light on the problem of a more exact definition of his year, though the lapse of sacrifices (lines 17-18) because of troubled times may be interpreted as a reference to the lean years before Delos was awarded to Athens by the Romans.

The inscription is a decree of the genos of the Eumolpidai (cf. line 14), honoring one of their number who had been appointed hierophantes. Presumably the stele was...
erected in the Eleusinion, which was located near the place where the fragments were discovered. The day of the assembly is given both κατὰ θεῶν and κατ’ ἄρχοντα, though in the reverse of the usual order. Such dates are known in several years of the second century, but their calendar significance is not yet clear. In this instance the sixteenth κατὰ θεῶν is equated with the fifth κατ’ ἄρχοντα.

The orator Amynomachos, son of Eukles, of Halai, was probably a younger brother of the hierophantes, Aristokles of Perithoidai, in whose honor the decree was passed. Both men are listed in a catalogue of contributors from the archonship of Hermogenes (183/2 B.C.), the same year in which Aristokles became hierophantes (line 7). Aristokles paid not only for himself, but καὶ ὑπὲρ τοῦ ύστερον Ἑυκλῆς Ἐυκλέως Ἀλαίος. Kirchner’s note (P.A., 1881) reads: Erat nimirum Amynomachus frater uterinus Aristoclis, adoptione in familiam civis eiusdem Halaeensis receptus. From our present text it is clear that the adoptive father was Eukles, possibly a descendant of Eukles, son of Eukleides, of Halai, of the fourth century (P.A., 5715). The father of our present Eukles is doubtless to be identified as that Ἐυκλῆς Ἐυκλέως Ἀλαὶος who was ephebos in 258/7 B.C. in the archonship of Antiphon. His son would then have been of mature years when he adopted the young Amynomachos early in the second century. The family tie thus indicated between Eukles and Aristokles is also manifest in the fact that Aristokles named his own son Eukles (I.G., II², 961, line 21; I.G., II², 2332, line 50).

Amynomachos, who was taken into the family at Halai, and who in the archonship of Lysiades proposed this decree honoring Aristokles, was himself hierophantes at a later date, and his name appears with this title on a dedication found at Eleusis

---

For the site of the Eleusinion, cf. Shear, Hesperia, VIII, 1939, pp. 207-211; IX, 1940, p. 268.

See Pritchett and Meritt, Chronology, p. v. Double dating occurs in the following years: 196/5: Hesperia, V, 1936, no. 15; 179/8: Hesperia, V, 1936, no. 16; 166/5: I.G., II², 946, 947; 155/4: Hesperia, X, 1941, no. 25; 122/1: I.G., II², 1004, 1006.

Pyanopsion 5 was the day of the Proerōsia; cf. Deubner, Attische Feste, p. 68.

I.G., II², 2332, lines 49-52; the date of the document is given in line 119.

Hesperia, VII, 1938, no. 20, line 53; for the date, see Pritchett and Meritt, Chronology, p. xx.
(I.G., Π², 3469). The squeeze in the collection of the Institute for Advanced Study in Princeton shows clearly that the reading of this dedication must be

\[ \text{Ierofán[της] 'Ampnómáx[ος]
Eúklé[ous 'All]aiéús.} \]

In lines 8-11 the significant words needed to yield the sense of the passage are missing from the stone. The verb επίδε[δόναι] in line 11 suggests επιδόσεις, such as were made from time to time in case of emergency. One such list from the year of Hermogenes is preserved (I.G., Π², 2332) though its connection with the present text, if any, is not clear. A measurement across the stone shows that there was space in line 1 for only about 33 letters; hence the complete restoration must be οἰδὲ ἐπὶ ἑδωκαὶ 'Ερμογένουν ἄρχ[οντος], and there is no space for the restoration of any phrase to specify the purpose of the contributions. It is noteworthy that the name 'Αριστοκλῆς Περθ[οί]δης appears in this list (line 49) without the title of Hierophantes. Perhaps he had not yet been chosen when the contributions were made.\(^{43}\)

The lines from 11 to 17 record the zeal of Aristokles in collecting the εἰσαγώγεια and in inscribing the records of them on stone. These records must have covered more than one year, for apparently he proposed more than one decree (ψηφίσματα[α] in line 15) to insure their inscription, and set them up on more than one stele of stone (ἐν στή[λαις λιθίναις] in line 16 is preferable to ἐν στή[λαι λιθίνηι] for reasons of space). The εἰσαγώγεια must be fees of initiation, which the hierophant was under obligation to exact.\(^{44}\) That these initiation fees were collected according to the decree of Philonastes, about which we are otherwise uninformed, and according to the other decrees of the Demos shows that they were not concerned with the genos of the Eumolpidai alone; they must have been the initiation fees for the Eleusinian mysteries, and as such they were a proper subject for legislation by the Demos.* The name Φιλον[αύτ]ου in line 12 is partly restored, and some other supplement may be possible. However, I note that there is room in the lacuna between the two fragments of stone for three full letters, and that in the genitive form Φιλον[είκ]ου (the only other appropriate name listed in Kirchner’s *Prosporphographia Attica*) part of the kappa should appear on the right-hand fragment.

We do not know who proposed the decree now published as I.G., Ι², 6, and I do

---

\(^{43}\) One might not expect to find at this time the title 'Ierofán[της] supplanting the name, though this practice had commenced as early as the end of the third century. Yet the title might have been added if Aristokles were already holding the priesthood. Cf. Foucart, *Les Mystères d’Éleusis*, p. 175.

\(^{44}\) An inscription from Cos has the form εἰσαγώγον, which is translated by Van Herwerden, *Lexicon Graecum suppletorium et dialecticum*, s. v., as *pretium introductionis* (Ditt., Syll.², 1106, lines 52-56: εἰσαγώγον δι διδάσκω δι κα γένηται παιδίου, ο[ι] μέτετα τῶν ἱερῶν, χο[ι]ρον, ἱερά, λιβανωτόν, σπονδάν, στέφανον).

not suggest the name of Philonautes for it, but this inscription gives the earliest epigraphical record so far preserved of initiation fees which the μύσται were obliged to pay (lines 88 ff.). The principal fragment of I.G., I², 6, which is now in London, is reported to have been found near the so-called Theseum. It probably stood in the Eleusinion, near where several small fragments that belong with it have been found recently in the Agora excavations.

In line 18 the restoration [δι’ ἐτ]ῶν [π]λειόνων may be compared with Fouilles de Delphes, III, 2, no. 47, lines 4-5: ψα[φι]ξαμένον τοῦ δάμου τοῦ Ἀθηναί[ών] πέμπειν τάν Πυθαίδα ποθ’ ἀμέ δι’ ἄτων πλειόνων; I.G., II², 1006, lines 34-36: καταπάλτην λιθο-
βόλον ἕνα τῶν ἄρ[χαῖων] ἐκ τῶν ἱδίων ἑθερά[πευσαν καὶ τὰ ἐλλείπουν]τα προσκατα-
σκευάσαντες ἀνενεώσαντο διὰ πλειόνων ἐτ[ῶν] τῆν τε χρήσιν τοῦ ὀργάνον [καὶ μάθησιν]. The meaning is “after a lapse of some years”; cf. Boethius, Die Pythaïs, pp. 65-66.

In lines 19-20, for [πρόσοδον ποιησ]ἀμενοὶ πρὸς τὴν βουλήν, followed by some form of the verb ἐμφανιζω, cf. e.g., Ditt., Syll.², 706, 718, 756 (I.G., II², 1012, 1034, 1046).

**ADDENDA**

59. A decree of the archonship of Chairephon was discovered in the excavations of the Agora in 1931. The text was given a preliminary publication in Hesperia, II, 1933, pp. 160-161, where a drawing was published, with restorations, to show the disposition of letters upon the stone. The name of the orator was read as: Ὀ-ο[. ]ος Νίκωω[ς -- -- --].

It has since been possible to decipher more of the orator’s name. The reading is almost certainly [---]ὀδότος, a word which can be readily expanded either as [Δ]όδοτος or as [Θε]ὀδότος. When this restoration is made it becomes apparent that the division of lines must be recorded in a manner different from that represented in the drawing. The verb ἐπειθηφιζεν in lines 4-5 must be restored with all but the last syllable in line 4 (ἐπειθηφιζεν) so as to make room at the commencement of line 5 for the two additional letters which must be restored at the beginning of the orator’s name. In this way, the principle of syllabic division at the ends of lines may be observed but the lines themselves are lengthened by approximately two letter-spaces.

There are other advantages in this disposition, for it is now possible to preserve correct syllabic division at the end of line 3 by restoring the complete name of the month Βοηδρομιώνος. This in turn leaves two spaces to be filled by restoration at the beginning of line 4, so the date within the month should be restored not as the 10th but rather as the 11th or 12th. The calendar equation of the year may now be read; Boedromion 11 = Prytany III, 15. The year was an ordinary year in the period of

⁴⁵ See also Pringsheim, Archäologische Beiträge zur Geschichte des eleusinischen Kults, pp. 38-41.