

THE ENTRANCE TO THE AREOPAGUS

ONE of the places where Eukrates' law against tyranny (337/6) was to be set up on a stele of stone was described in the text of the decree itself as ἐπὶ τῆς εἰσόδου τῆς εἰς Ἀρειον Πάγον τῆς εἰς τὸ βουλευτήριον εἰσιόντι, which I have translated "by the entrance into the Areopagos, that entrance, namely, near where one goes into the Bouleuterion."¹ I believe that this translation is inexact, and, more particularly, that I should not have used the word "near." Whether εἰς τὸ βουλευτήριον depends on τῆς alone, or on εἰσιόντι, or, by a construction ἀπὸ κοινοῦ, on them both, I am not so sure. The examples cited by Kühner-Gerth to illustrate this use of the dative participle do not show any instance in which the participle follows a repetition of an earlier demonstrative.² If the definition is read quite literally, it means "by the entrance, the one into the Areopagos, the one into the Bouleuterion, as one goes in."

If the final word εἰσιόντι is taken alone, and εἰς τὸ βουλευτήριον depends on the preceding τῆς, the syntactical arrangement of the sentence offers no problem. One may be puzzled by the double definition of the entrance, but the answer to that vexing question lies in the nature of Athenian topography and is a matter of interpretation rather than of translation. One may be puzzled also by the use of εἰσιόντι alone. So used, it is superfluous after the very precise ἐπὶ τῆς εἰσόδου. Perhaps Eukrates wished to make it beyond any question certain that the stele was put outside the entrance to the Areopagos, so that it would be by the entrance "as one went in." But it remains, in this usage, tautological. Had the stele been put inside the entrance, so that one saw it only when coming out, or by looking back when coming in, then the εἴσοδος would have been in fact an ἔξοδος and one would have expected it to be so called.

I interpreted the participle εἰσιόντι with εἰς τὸ βουλευτήριον in my first translation of this passage. But this leaves τῆς unexplained,³ and it makes two entrances, at least by implication: one, that into the Areopagos; and the other, that for a man entering the Bouleuterion, this latter used to give a point of reference for the former. This doubling of the entrances seems to me illogical, and is my principal reason—perhaps even more than the syntax—for writing this additional note on the text.

Even if, by a kind of ἀπὸ κοινοῦ, the verb εἰσιόντι should share with preceding τῆς a logical context in thought with εἰς τὸ βουλευτήριον, I believe that there was never here under consideration more than one entrance. It was the entrance into the Areopagos, and likewise it was the entrance into the Bouleuterion. The topographical problem remains unsolved, for this tells nothing about the location either of the Areopagos or of the Bouleuterion, except that they had a common entrance.⁴

BENJAMIN D. MERITT

INSTITUTE FOR ADVANCED STUDY

¹ *Hesperia*, XXI, 1952, pp. 355-359.

² *Ausführliche Grammatik*, II, 1, pp. 423-424.

³ A difficulty upon which C. Bradford Welles has also commented to me (by letter).

⁴ See also *Hesperia*, XXII, 1953, pp. 51-53.