THE RESTORATION OF SANCTUARIES IN ATTICA:
I.G., II*, 1035

(Plates 45-49)

Despite the importance of this inscription for Attic topography it has received relatively little attention in the ninety years since its discovery, and a text has been essayed in print only twice. Its fragmentary condition has frustrated study; scholars concerned with it have usually devoted no more than a page or so to its exposition. Perhaps this study will make the document and the evidence it affords more accessible.

The three known fragments of the stele have been previously published, but for convenience I give their descriptions here.

A = EM 13280. Broken above, below, and at the left, but preserving the right edge and the thickness. Found in 1884 in a Turkish dry-wall south of the Propylaia on the Acropolis.

Height, 1.127 m.; width, 0.555 m.; thickness, 0.089-0.097 m.

B = EM 8134. Broken on all sides, but with the thickness preserved. First identified by Adolf Wilhelm in 1902; findspot unknown.

Height, 0.190 m.; width, 0.219 m.; thickness, 0.090 m.

C = EM 8135. Broken on all sides. First identified by Adolf Wilhelm in 1902; findspot unknown.

Height, 0.310 m.; width, 0.245 m.; thickness, 0.068 m.

1 This study, based on a new examination of the stone, was made possible by a fellowship at the American School of Classical Studies in Athens during 1969-1970. I wish to thank the following for the advice or assistance they provided in the course of the project: Joseph Breslin, Harry J. Carroll, Daniel J. Geagan, Thomas N. Hitzl, Benjamin D. Meritt, Marcellos T. Mitsos, James H. Oliver, Ronald S. Stroud, John S. Traill, and Eugene Vanderpool. I am indebted to the Trustees, Director, and staff of the American School of Classical Studies for the facilities they afforded me during 1969-1970, and to the Epigraphical Museum and its director Mme. Peppas-Delmosou, who offered me every courtesy. Especial thanks should go to Henry R. Immerwahr, who not only made available to me his own notes on this inscription, but provided numerous suggestions and continuing encouragement. Errors which remain are, of course, my own.

2 Texts: Chr. Tsountas, Ἐφ. Ἀπ., 1884, pp. 166-172 and 224; and Kirchner, I.G., II*, 1935 with Addendum. Reference to these articles hereafter will be by the editors' names, and in the body of the article. The only extended treatments of the inscription are W. Gurlitt, Über Pausanias, Graz, 1890, pp. 209-212, with pp. 213-222 passim and notes on pp. 238-243; John Day, An Economic History of Athens under Roman Domination, New York, 1942, pp. 146-151; and J. H. Oliver, A.J.P., XCIII, 1972, pp. 190-197.
Technical Data

Surface. The face and right edge of the stele were dressed with a toothed chisel, the marks of which are still quite distinct. The dressing was carried down to within about 0.16 m. of the (present) bottom edge of the slab; below that the surface is finished much more roughly, apparently with a more widely spaced toothed chisel. The treatment of the lower part of the stone suggests that it was set in a base.

The face of the slab displays three shallow holes. They are artificial, as the punchmarks in them show. The uppermost hole has three letters of the text inscribed within it. The middle hole, more than twice as deep as the upper one, was skipped over by the engraver of the text; thus it is certain that these holes antedate the inscribing of the decree. The third hole, which is in uninscribed surface, is probably equally ancient. The three holes are roughly in a line some 0.07 m. from the right edge of the stone.

On the right edge itself, some 0.083 m. from the lower end, is a hole 0.016 m. deep, considerably nearer the inscribed face than the back. This feature resembles a pry hole, and its lower edge is the sharper.

The back surface presents a curious appearance. Its upper half is very roughly picked; below this area the stone is quite smoothly dressed, more so than the inscribed face, and then the bottom 0.16 m. (as on the other face) is much rougher, even more so than the upper part of the back. The greatest thickness of stone is in the area where the back is smoothly finished. These facts suggest that the back was once smoothly dressed, and was later cut down.

Lettering. The letters, done in non-stoichedon style, are of two sizes. Fragment B and lines 00-3 of Fragment A have letters 0.009 m. high, while the remainder of the text is done in letters of 0.007 m. or slightly less. The lines are separated by 0.003 to 0.005 m. The work is not quite so neat as it appears at first, for the rounded letters are rather awkwardly done, and carelessness is evident in the forming of the lambdas.

Relationship of the Fragments. The size of the lettering establishes that Fragment B is part of the former of two decrees on the stone, and so belongs above Fragment A. Fragment C joins A solidly at two points and so permits the nineteen letters on its surface to be related to the main body of the text. The join was made in 1973 by Mme. Peppas-Delmousou, Director of the Epigraphical Museum in Athens.

Dimensions of the Stone. No line of text is preserved entire, but an estimate of the total width of the stele may still be made. In fact, three such estimates have been put forward; I shall treat two of them here and reserve the most recent one (J. H. Oliver’s) for the later part of this article.³

³ See page 221.
Chr. Tsountas, who found the stone, believed it was originally some 0.963 m. wide, a view which rested entirely on suggested restorations of lines 15 and 16 as 142 and 144 letters long respectively. Since his lines are not based on known formulaic expressions, he probably intended them to be only suggestions; but I believe he was not far from correct. 4

Henry R. Immerwahr 5 got a wider stone from the following line of reasoning: lines 28 and 29 both end in uninscribed spaces of 0.296 and 0.464 m. respectively, and so may have been centered. Further, the final sentence there may have ended Μητρόδωρος Ξένωνος Φιλάσιος ὥμουν ἀποκαταστήσειν, with the last word standing alone in the center of line 29. The length of this one word (0.105 m.), taken with the existing space of 0.464 m. which follows it, could then be added to an assumed blank of the same size to the left of the word to obtain the entire width of the stone. This line of reasoning produces a width of 1.033 m. There are, however, two problems with this view. First, the final syllable on the stone is -σευ, not -σευν. The restoration offered by Immerwahr must therefore assume a stonecutter’s error. This is by no means impossible (see line 37) but is not inherently probable. Second, the view rests on the premise that the previous sentence ended at the end of line 27, leaving the whole of line 28 for a centered entry. But the evidence now shows that that sentence does run into line 28; see the commentary. For these reasons I have not adopted Immerwahr’s reading.

I believe the width can be obtained from line 3. Tsountas 6 restored the -ναί at the left side of the stone as [μη τετραπημένα]ναί, and was followed in this by Kirchner in the I. G. text. A rather better restoration would be [τῶν ψῆφον αἱ πλήρεις αἰς ἐδόκει τὴν ἔγγερμένην γνώμην κυρίαν εἴ]ναί, a phrasing which appears in two contemporary inscriptions, one of which even shows the same archaic acrophonic numeral system seen in our inscription. 7 It can be further asserted that this sentence began

4 His restorations: δημοτε[λή ἤπαρχε ἀναγράφει ἐν στήλαιν δυνών τῶν ταμίαν τῆς ἱερᾶς διατάξεως καὶ ἀναφέ]ναι κ.τ.λ. (line 15); and Ἰ[Ἀθηναῖ τῆς Σωτηρίας ἀπομείνατο δὲ αὖτὰ τῶν στρατηγῶν Μητρόδωρον μετὰ τοῦ βασι]λέως κ.τ.λ. (line 16). Since line 16 has 77 letters in a preserved width of 0.515 m., 144 letters would occupy about 0.963 m.
5 In his unpublished notes, which he graciously made available to me.
7 The texts are:

Note the virtually exact correspondence between these two texts (only the δὲ is omitted from the second), and the agreement between them and the preserved portion of line 3 in our inscription. Meritt dates both inscriptions (in the article cited in this note, p. 68) as “after 38 B.C.”
at the left edge of the stone, since the line is set off from the text above by an unusually wide space. Now line 3 so restored would be 98 letters long, but there are blanks of ca. 1½, 1½, 2 and 3 spaces, and the occurrence of Ꝕ twice adds another space. This gives a line of 107 normal letters, which would occupy a space of 1.05 m., the width of the stele. Finally, a stone 1.05 m. wide would accommodate an average line of 157 to 165 characters of the size used for the second decree and the catalogue. These considerations suggest that Tsountas was close in conjecturing a line length of 144 letters, and that Immerwahr was essentially correct.

The width and thickness of the slab correspond strikingly with the dimensions of the flank metopes of the Hekatompedon. W. B. Dinsmoor’s system makes these metopes, 36 of them, 1.01 m. wide in their exposed area; the actual width of the stone then ought to be 1.05 m. Thickness of the metopes varied from 0.07 to 0.10 m., and the backs are rough-picked like our stone; their height was ca. 1.40 m. A number of fragments of these metopes survive, notably the three still to be seen in a revetment at the corner of the Propylaia, and the two which bear the famous Hekatompedon inscription.

8 In line 2, 52 letters occupy 0.51 m. This 1.05 m. is also the minimum needed if line 29 is to be centered.

9 Line 16 has 77 letters in a space of 0.515 m. Thus one may calculate \( \frac{77}{0.515} = \frac{157}{1.05} \) letters. But as the stonecutter worked his letters grew smaller. Line 27 has 81 letters in 0.515 m.; therefore, \( \frac{81}{0.515} = \frac{165}{1.05} \).

10 For these metopes and the attempts to reconstruct the Hekatompedon on paper, see Theodor Wiegand, Die archäische Poros-Architektur der Akropolis zu Athen, Leipzig, 1904; Rudolf Heberdey, Altattische Porosskulptur, Vienna, 1919; W. H. Schuchhardt, “Die Sima des Alten Athenatempels der Akropolis,” Ath. Mitt., LX/LXI, 1935-36, pp. 1-111; and William B. Dinsmoor, A.J.A., LI, 1947, pp. 109-151. In this article I refer to the Hekatompedon as Dinsmoor described it. He dates its construction to ca. 570 B.C. on stylistic grounds, and claims it was dedicated in 566 (p. 10 and note 12). It was demolished in 488 B.C., he believes, to make way for the Older Parthenon (pp. 117-118).

11 Dinsmoor (op. cit. [note 10], pp. 142-143) gives only the exposed width, but Heberdey (op. cit. [note 10], pp. 138-139) and Schuchhardt (op. cit. [note 10], p. 85) both assume approximately 0.04 m. difference between actual and exposed widths of these metopes. The amount of flexibility to be found here is seen in the fact that Dinsmoor assumes variations of up to 0.02 m. in the widths of the individual metopes (p. 143).

12 Wiegand, op. cit. (note 10), p. 110. The present back of our stone, however, seems once to have been smooth. See above, p. 208.

13 The revetment was part of the old Propylon; Dinsmoor, op. cit. (note 10), p. 148. The Hekatompedon inscription is I.G., I, 3-4. For the bibliography, cf. F. Sokolowski, Lois sacrées des cités grecques, Paris, 1962, pp. 4-6. There is some confusion in the type of marble used for the metopes. Hiller von Gaertringen in I.G. calls the Hekatompedon inscription Parian marble; John Travlos, in Bildlexikon zur Topographie des Antiken Athen, Tübingen, 1971, p. 258, says the Hekatompedon metopes are island marble; Wiegand (op. cit. [note 10], p. 12) says the metopes in the revetment are Hymettos marble, but emphasizes that distinctions among various marbles are
So close a correspondence in size could be coincidental, but I suggest that it is not. Our stone may well have been one of these metopes; therefore to the calculated width of 1.05 m. I add an assumed height of 1.40 m. to obtain the original dimensions of the slab.\textsuperscript{14} If this view is correct, the stone came first to the Acropolis as a metope for the Hekatontpedon in the second quarter of the sixth century; upon the destruction of that temple nearly a century later it was put to some unknown use, perhaps again architectural.\textsuperscript{15} Then in Augustan times it became the vehicle for \textit{I.G.}, \textit{II}\textsuperscript{2}, 1035.

\textbf{Text}\textsuperscript{16}

I have retained the line numbers used by Tsountas and Kirchner in their respective texts, even though this has necessitated the insertion of lines 0 and 00 and of line 2a to complete the sentence of line 2.

\textit{ca. a. 10/9–3/2 a.}

\textbf{NON-ΣΤΟΙΧ.}

\textbf{Fragment B}

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{[---]σφωσ \delta \ kαθιέρωσεν \ διὰ \ [----]} \\
\text{[---]γ [κα]ι τῶν \ ταμευσάτων \ τ[----]} \\
\text{[---]ήθηναυ Τής \ ἀποκαταστά[σεως \ ---]} \\
\text{[----] θεών \ τινος \ ἡ \ ἡρώων \ υπ[----]} \\
\text{5 \[-----μένη \ καὶ \ εἶ \ τῶν \ κατὰ \ τὸ \ τ[--]} \\
\text{[-----]ι τῶν \ θεῶν \ καὶ \ τῶν \ [ἡρώων \ ----]} \\
\text{[----------] προνοη[θ \ ----------]} \\
\text{[----------]ρού[----------]}
\end{align*}
\]

\textbf{Fragments A and C}

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{00 \[-----]στ[-------------]} \\
\text{0 \[----]σ \ldots \ πρ[-------------]λια[-------------]}
\end{align*}
\]

not clear-cut ones. Yet it is generally agreed (Dinsmoor, \textit{op. cit.} [note 10], p. 138; G. P. Stevens, \textit{Hesperia}, XV, 1946, p. 81) that these metopes belong together. Therefore I think it is not impossible that \textit{I.G.}, \textit{II}\textsuperscript{2}, 1035 also comes from that set.

\textsuperscript{14} These dimensions are unusual, but by no means impossible for a free-standing stele. Compare \textit{I.G.}, \textit{I}\textsuperscript{2}, 950 (photo, D. W. Bradeen, \textit{Hesperia}, XXXIII, 1964, pl. 7, no. 13), which is 1.545 m. high, 0.80 m. wide and 0.08 m. thick, and has no sign of attachments; and the decree \textit{I.G.}, \textit{II}\textsuperscript{2}, 1081, 1085, 1116 and Agora I 4853, assembled by J. H. Oliver, \textit{Hesperia}, X, 1941, pp. 85-90, a stele restored as over 1.0 m. high, \textit{ca.} 0.80 m. wide and 0.08-0.10 m. thick.

\textsuperscript{15} The “pry hole,” the holes in the face of the stone, and the picking of an originally smooth back surface all point to at least one other use before the stone was inscribed as we now have it. It cannot have been part of the revetment of the old Propylion, however; the slabs used there had their edges chamfered. See Dinsmoor, \textit{op. cit.} (note 10), p. 119.

\textsuperscript{16} Letters underlined in the text are ones read as certain by Kirchner or Tsountas but which I could not see. For the appearance of the restored text see Plate 49.
1 [---] μοιον αὐτῶν [---] ἤνιον [---] σοσθαί τοῖς ἀποδ. 

2 [---] ἀποδόσεως τοῦ ἐπὶ τοὺς ὅπλε[ι] ταῖς [στρατηγ]οῦ [τ] ἀ τούτων πραττόμε- 

3 [τῶν ψήφων αἱ πλήρεις, αἱς ἐδόκει τὴν ἐγφερομένην γνώμην κυρίαν εἴ] [ναί ἒ [XXX Ἑ Ἑ Ἑ Ἑ Δ] ἀ[τ θερπημεναί, ἀ[ἰς οὐκ ἐδόκει] Ἑ [Π] ὑπ] [ἐδοξεῖ τῶν ἅμων] ---- εἰπεὶ ἐπειδὴ ὁ δῆμος ἐφήστωται περὶ τῶν ἱερῶν] καὶ τεμενῶν ὅπως ἀποκατασταθή το[ι] τε σοι καὶ τοὺς ἤρωσιν, ὧν ἐξ ἄρχής ὑπῆρχε καὶ τοῦ ἁ- 

4 [μοι --- καὶ πρέπει ὑπὸ τῶν ἀρχόντων τὸ ἔργον] ἐπὶ τελος ἀχθῆναι κ[αὶ τ] ἀ λοπά τα δια[τείν]οντα πρὸς τε εὐσέβειαν καὶ τὴν τῶν ἱερῶν καὶ τεμε- 

5 [τῶν θεραπείαν διαμένεις ---] δεδόχθαι τῶν ἅμων τῶν [μὲν] ἐπὶ τοὺς [ὁπλεί] τὰς στρατηγὸν Μητρόδωρον Ἑβένωνος Φυλάσιον 

6 [ἐχειν ἐπιμέλειαν περὶ τῶν ἱερῶν καὶ τεμενῶν, ὅσα τε ὑπὸ τοῦ δῆμου πρὸς τάς τῶν θεῶν καὶ τῶν ἥρων θυσίας] καὶ τεμάς ἀνέιται τοῖς ὑπ’ αὐτοῦ π[ροε]ψήφισμένοις ἀκολουθοῦσα καὶ ὅσα ἀποκαθίστησεν πρὸς 

7 [εὐσέβειαν] τα δὲ ἱερα καὶ τεμένη εἶναι τῶν θεῶν καὶ τῶν ἥρων ὧν ἐξ ἄρχης ὑπῆρχε· καὶ μὴ ἐξεῖναι εἰς τὸν μετὰ τ] αῦτα χλ[ρονὸν ἀ] θοδοσθαί τι τῶν ἱερῶν τεμενῶν κατὰ μηδένα τρόπον, μηδὲ ὄνησασθαι μη- 

8 [δὲ ἀποτίμημα ἡ δόρων λαβεῖν· εἰ δὲ μή, εἰναι φάσων πρὸς τὸν βασιλέα τῶν βουλο- 

9 [μένου, καὶ τὸν βασιλέα γράφειν] κ[α]τ' [τ][ν] ἀποδομένων γραφὰς ἀσέβειας [κ] αἰ ὀφίλειν τῇ Ἀθηναῖ τὸ χρήμα ὅσον ἀπέδωντο· 

10 [----- ἀκολούθως τοῖς] κιμ[εν]οις νόμοις· ἐπεί δὲ πάτριοι ἐστὶν ἐν μηδενὶ 

1[--- ἀκολούθως τοῖς] κιμ[εν]οις νόμοις· ἐπεί δὲ πάτριοι ἐστὶν ἐν μηδενὶ 

12 [θνήσκειν] [---] οὺς [ι] διωτικῶν γεγονοῦν κτήσεων ἀπαρατήρητον αὐτῶν 

13 [τὴν χρήσιν γεγενήθη, τῶν μὲν ἐξή] [---] τὸν δὲ ἐπὶ τοὺς ὀπλείας στρατηγὸν Μητρόδωρον Ἑβένωνος μετὰ 

14 [Κλεομένους Μαραθωνίων κατὰ δ] ὁ ἐξηγητής κελεύει ποιεῖσθαι ἐν πάσης τοῖς ἱεροῖς 


16 [στάνοντος θύμα τοῦ ταμία τά] πάτριο νόμμα] ἀναγράφαι δὲ τὸν ταμίαν 

17 [τῆς ἱεράς διατάξεως εἰς στῆλας λιθίνας 

18 [δυὸν τάδε τα ψηφίσματα περὶ τ] ν ἱερῶν κ] αἰ τεμενῶν [καὶ τ] ἀποκαταστα- 

19 [θέντα ἱερα καὶ τεμενή καὶ ἐκ των δημοτε- 


21 [Δί τῶν Σωτήρ καὶ τῇ] Ἰ [---] Αθηναί τῇ Σωτείραι ἀπομισθῶσαν δὲ αὐτὰ τῶν ἐπὶ τοὺς ὀπλέας στρατηγὸν Μητρό- 


23 [καὶ ἀναγράφαι εἰς στήλης τά τε τῶν μεμ- 

24 [στωμένων οὐναμα καὶ δόσον ἑκαστος ἐμισθώσατο καὶ ἀναθείναι ἐν ---- τὸ δὲ]

25 [---]
DIATATÉXWOS TOUS KATHESTAMÉ-

[NOUS ------] IERÁ K[AI π]PONOSOgéONOV [OTPΩS MΗ AI TÔW]N ÁNÁKTHTHÉXTON IERÓWN
KAI TÉMÉWON MOIΣOΣEIS KAI AI TÔN
TÔN PEPARAPÉMON VN STO PARAΓYNOV Ó TÂMÔN TΗS

MÉ[ΝΩ]N KATÁ TÀNTA: TΩ DE ORH TΩN DΗMÔSÌA KAI TΆS DΗMÔTELĒ[I]S
[ESXHATIAS ------ DΗ] MΗΤΡΟΣ KAI KÔRΗΣ... WΩ... EΙ Σ... PÅSVN: EΙ Δ[T]Ι NYES
ÝPERBÂNTSES TOUS IEROUS ÔRÒUS ÊPERGAYAN-
[TO TΗN IERÁN GΗN ------] V... TΩN... NÀSTHMα... SΤHÒN [EIS T]ΗΝ ÊPIΣKHEÌN TΟÚ [ÊN
ÊEL]NÝTÎN IERÔN ÔMÔWOS DÊ KAI TΩN ANE-
[ΜÉNOW ------] S MÊT[Á] TΩN... IERÉA... EVO. AÛTÎHÊ ARΧÎVUROLOGÔUSA ÆPARCHHÒN...
... AÎN ÄPO TΩN KAPRÎWÔN TΗΣ THEÔI KAI T[---]

TÔN IDÔTÔN ÊKONTÔN TΗN EΞ AUT[AR-]

UN 'ΑT [TÀLÒN B] ASULÉWOS EIS TΗN ASFRAIΛÀN TΗS
[PÔLEWOS ------ ÎPΩS TÀ IERÁ TÔN IERÔWN KAI] TÊM[EWN TÀ T] EPOLILÊNIN[ÊNA PR]ÔS
ÆIMENHHEOΣ TÔN D[Ê]XÎN TÔN Ê[ÊMOU ÂMETÀ] KÎNHTA DÍAMÎNTHT, ÔMÎNÎEIN TÔN AEI L[A-]
[CHÔNTA STÓRATHÎA ÊPÎ TOUS ÔPÎLÊTAS: ------ DIAT ΗΡÉHÞÎAI [TÀ ÂP] OIKASTÁSTHEÎN [TA
[ÔΣÎROΣ TOUÒN, ÔMÎNÎEIN TÔN AEI LÂXONTA STÔRATHÎA ÊPÎ TOUS ÔPÎLÊTAS DÎAΣÎRHÞÎAI
[VACAT TADB D] HÌMOS ÂPO KAT[ÊSTH]ΣE].

30[------] EN TΩN EΠÎ ------ KÔMÎDÔUS ARΧÔNTOS ENIAÎT[Ô]I] MΗPRÔDÔROS ΞΕÎN[ÔNOS
ΦΥL]ΛÌS ÊSÎOS TÀDÎD ÔPOΣ KAT[ÊSTH]ΣE].
--- TÉMEVOS? TOY DEÎNÎA Σ OΛÎ WN ÂNÎKE TΗ] MΗ[ÎÂD]I KAI[ER]WÎN PRÔTÉRON
ÝT] [ÂUÔTÔ TØ] Ê KÎTÂSANTOS TΗN VNÎSOU
[------] ÎPÔΣ KÊITAI I] Â ARΧHÎA PÔLÎS I] [PR]ÔSÔN[I] MASAÎTEÎÀÀ KÎX[REIÀ
TÎMEV] I] XÌNÔS Ô KÂTHÆREΣE
PIERÔWN KAI POLÂVÎREWÔWN TÔN
[ÊN TΗΣ MÂXHÎE TELÊNOTHÁNTOV ------] ÊNÎOS KAI PRODÔTSAÎMÔNO[I] EN TÔY PRÔS
Μ[EGARÈAS] PRÔ TΗΣ VNÎSU POLÉMÔW: Ê KÎPÎN EN KΡ[---]

35 [------] ÎPÔΣ ARΧÎH]ΣEÎS KAI XORÊ[I] AI EIÎRO[NEO]... ENÎLÊN ....... PÔLÊI
TÒ LEYÔMÎNÎN ÊPO ΣÓLÎVNO[S]
[------] V TÒ EN 'ELAΦÎDÒROΣ Î... OÎΝTO ... MIÎN TÒ PÂRÀ TÒN PÂRÀ-
PLOU TÔN IERÔWN
[NEÎN ------] O PRÔS TΗΣ KALOUMÎNÎH T... ÂMA ....... N. "<HE>Τ<ÎW>-NÊIÀN EΞ ΗΣ AI IERÀI VAD[S]
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[-------] ἧρως ἀφαίρετο...ντα...10...σύμφωνα...ἀπαντὶ νέμει καὶ ἐλάξιον-
θατ.] νν[-------]φάνω...ν πρὸς τὴν...14... ὁ τροπὸς[οὔ] καταστὰ ἀπὸ τοῦ
στεφανώματος τῆς θεο[τά]
40 [-------]ο θύεω...12...α...11...φ ψιλὰ τὰ προσόντα τοῖς
Ἀσκληπιείωι τὰ ἀνθεῖν-
[τα]------- τ] ἡς πόλεως...8...τοῦ ά[γο]ντος ἐν τοῖς Πελοποννησιακοῖς
πολέμωι καὶ τὸ προσόν πο
[-------] Π[π]αιῶν παρ’ ἵππαις ταῖς π[ρ]ο[ς] τὴν Ἀκτήν...ψιλὰ [τὰ
π]ροσόντα τοῖς Διονυσίωι καὶ τὰ προσόντα
[-------] τὸ ἀρχαῖον βουλευτήριον...9 ψύκτρας τὰς πρὸς τ[ο]ίς νεωρίως τοῦ
λιμένος τοῦ ἐν Ζέαυ πρὸς τοῖς κλεί-
[θροσὲ]------- στρατήγων τὸ ἀρχαῖον...ψιλὸν τὸν
[λιμένι------- ἀπὸ τοῦ μέρους] τοῦ περικλειμένου τοῖς νεωρίως καὶ τοῖς Ἀφρο-
διστῶι καὶ ταῖς στοαῖς μέχρι τῶν κλείθρων...ψιλὰ τὰ
[-------] ἀπὸ τοῦ δύματος τοῦ ἀνατεθέντος ὑπὸ Μάγνου καὶ τὸ προσὸν ὑπαίθρων,
ὁποῦ τὸν καὶ

[μέτρα καὶ στάθμα κεῖται------- τέμενος τὸ π] ἀρὰ τὰ μακρὰ τίχῃ Ἀθηνᾶς Πολιάδος...ψιλὸν τὸν
[λιμένι------- ἀπὸ τοῦ μέρους] τοῦ περικλειμένου τοῖς νεωρίως καὶ τοῖς Ἀφρο-
διστῶι καὶ ταῖς στοαῖς μέχρι τῶν κλείθρων...ψιλὰ τὰ
[-------] ἀπὸ τοῦ δύματος τοῦ ἀνατεθέντος ὑπὸ Μάγνου καὶ τὸ προσὸν ὑπαίθρων,
ὁποῦ τὸν καὶ

[-------] ἀφέσεις τὰς ἀπὸ τῶν ὑπάληγων τοῦ Παναθηναίκοι σταδίου καὶ τὰ ὑπὸ
[-------] τ] ἐμένος Ἀθηνᾶς [Δ] ἀμπτράτσι τὸ λεγόμενον Δορύκλεων...ψιλὸν τὸν
[-------] καθιερωθὲ] ἐν κατὰ χρησμῷ καὶ τὸν οἰκοδομηθέντα τῶν πρὸς τῶν
βομβω...ψιλὸν τὰκίθρων
[-------] ὅπον] πρὸ τῶν προβολῶν θύσωσιν ἢρωι Ἀρατηγώ...ψιλὸν Ἐυκλείας
[-------] καὶ Ἐδυναίας...

55 [-------] παλαίστραν...ψιλὸν οἰκίαι τὴν λεγομένην Κυρρήστου, ἣν ὁ δήμος προσ-
κατασκευ[ν]...

50 [-------] ἀρχαῖον πρὸς τόμηττοι καὶ τὰ προσόντα μέταλλα καὶ τὸ διόδιον τῆς
λιθωτομίας...

55 [-------] ἀναθέναι Δἰ [Ὀλυμπι] πίων καθότι καὶ πρότερον ἤν...ψιλὸν
[-------] ἑκατων τῆν πρὸς
[-------] πάσας καὶ παραδρομίδας...ψιλὸν τάφρων πάσας τὰς κύκλω τίχ[ο]ν...

Σαραπ-
[iεἰον-------]α...8...8 ἀφφώρισεν ἐν ἀστεί. ψιλὸν τὸν 0.035 m. ἀκρόδρυνα...ψιλὸν
[-------] ζευγῶν
[-------] λι[-------]
[-------] χ]αρίς[ψ] τέμενος Ἁ[βῆς]...ψιλὸν ὁρος τὸ πρὸς Τμηττώ...ψιλὸν ἐσχατιάν Δαμπ-
τράσι τῆν πρὸς [-------]
Fragment B

The lettering on this fragment is similar to Fragment A except for the fact that theta is shown Θ. The letters ΒΓΖΔΞΦΧΨ are not attested on it. The inconsistency of theta might be accidental, or might even mean that this is a fragment of the second copy of the decree, the one which was set up in Peiraeus (line 15). In any case it is not likely that this stone belongs to any other document; the similarities in language, marble, surface and letter size are too great to be dismissed.

Line 3: Here Wilhelm read ΔΕΚΑΙ; but ΘΗΝΑΙ is clearly visible on the stone and squeezes. Before theta is a possible eta, quite battered.

Line 8: Wilhelm read omicron and epsilon. First there appears the top third of a vertical stroke; then a full vertical with traces suggesting the loop of rho. Then there is the top half of a circular letter, not theta; based on its distance from the vertical following it, it is probably omicron. There follows the top half of a vertical, with the hint of the beginning of a diagonal near its top. I read a probable nu.

Fragment A

The drawing (Pl. 46) shows what I have been able to see on this major fragment itself and on squeezes; the commentary is confined to points on which my text differs significantly from the two previously published.

Lines 00-0: The traces in these lines were not recorded by Tsountas or Kirchner.

Line 9: The ninth letter from the end of the line is upsilon, not nu as printed in I.G.

Line 11: Near the end of the line Tsountas and Kirchner both restored γεγε[ν]θα. However, the letters are on the stone, inscribed in the shallow hole that mars the surface there. This is positive evidence that the hole antedates the inscribing of the stone.

Line 18: The lacuna προνοησομενον [---]ν was taken as eight spaces and restored [δπως αι τῶν]ν by Tsountas, whom Kirchner followed. The space is 0.075 m. long and calls for ten letters; accordingly, I have restored [δπως μή αι τῶν]ν.

Line 23: The traces will not permit the reading [καθο]ιερ[ωμ]ήν[ον], which was suggested by Lolling and adopted in I.G. ΙΕΠΕ can be read clearly, and the letter following was probably alpha. The reading ἄργυρος ἀλογοῦσα was suggested to me by J. H. Oliver. This is consistent with Tsountas' diagram (which shows the two verticals one can still see after the first alpha) and with the text he printed: ἀ...αλογοῦσα. Kirchner read ἀτομοῦσα, which is unlikely epigraphically because it would mean a very wide pi, with a full-length right leg contrary to this stonecutter's practice. Kirchner's reading is still less likely grammatically, for (as Professor Oliver pointed out to me) Liddell-Scott-Jones do not admit active forms for this verb.

Line 27: Here Tsountas read καὶ ἐτ[ο]μα[ν]α[ν]α[ν]α. Though Kirchner accepted this, it cannot stand. The first epsilon is followed by a complete iota and a tau of which only the left half of the top is missing. Then come ΙΝΑ, with only the nu open to question. Therefore one should read καὶ ἐτ[ο]μα[ν]α. At the end of the long lacuna the previous editors read nu on the basis of a diagonal followed by a vertical. These two strokes do not touch one another, however, and in this inscription the diagonal of nu usually touches the right vertical above its lower end. The strokes are more probably AI, and the restoration should then be καὶ ἐτυμα [προς θεων κ]αί.

The final letters of this line were in prior texts [ΤΑ]ΣΙΑ; but the sigma is clearly epsilon, and the pi must be read as IT. Were it a pi, it would be the only one in this inscription with no overhang of the horizontal to the left and with both legs of equal length. The phrase must be, as in line 7, τιμᾶς ἑτα[ν].
Line 31: The reading Πολ[αθ]ι, for which I am indebted to H. R. Immerwahr, is to be preferred to πολ[λε]ι of the published texts because the space between the lambda (which is very faintly visible on the stone) and the iota measures 0.015 m., enough for two or three letters.

The center of the stone is badly weathered in an area extending from line 31 to line 41. Professor Eugene Vanderpool suggests that it may once have been a floor slab in the corner of a building that served as a latrine (note the precise right angle where the weathering stops), and that it was subjected to accumulation of uric acid. Whether by that agent or some other, the marble has been eaten away, leaving very wide, shallow depressions where the grooves of the letters once were. Carbon wash and direct observation were of little use on this area. Water on the stone in strong raking light was helpful, as was patient scrutiny of repeated squeezes; but even at best the readings so obtained are very uncertain. I distinguish such letters by the term “ghosts.”

The ghosts of upsilon and pi appear after πρότερον; Tsountas included them on his facsimile. Therefore Lolling’s restoration [MEN] should be rejected.

Line 34: The first lacuna is 0.010 m. wide, too much for the reading -ΜΕΝΟ[Ι]. I suggest -ΜΕΝΟ[ΙΣ], although these two letters usually require 0.012 m. of space. This would give two participles in the same grammatical construction.

The next lacuna ought to be restored Μ[εγαρίς] (Toepffer 17) and not Μ[θδωσ] (Tsountas). The 0.050 m. space is too long for the latter word, as Tsountas himself (col. 224) later admitted.

Line 37: The word read by Tsountas as ετοιμείαν and by Kirchner as εττίμειαν is <ΕΙΤΟΠΝΕΙΑΝ> on the stone. The dissatisfaction of the editors is understandable, since the artisan stumbled at the awkward word. The correct spelling is <'ΗΕΤΙΩΝΕΙΑΝ>.

Line 38: Both Tsountas and Kirchner start the line with ΕΘΩΣ, but I read the word as ΗΡΩΣ. The H alone is questionable, since the lower two-thirds of the left vertical is missing. Pi and omega are wholly preserved. H. R. Immerwahr’s unpublished notes also show ΗΡΩΣ.

Line 41: The two former editors began the line ΗΣ.ΟΛ.Ν. I can find no trace of the nu they saw, but there are traces to suggest τ[γ]ής πόλεως.

Line 44: The nu of αρχαίον is defective; its diagonal was never cut.

Line 45: The reading [Ε]ρκάνης could be ακάνης as Kirchner has it, for only a tiny mark near the top of the space remains of the disputed letter. The kappa is safe, though; the top of its vertical and the top half of its upper diagonal are preserved. The next letter is extant only as an apex, but must be alpha; lambda or delta could not be pronounced.

Line 47: The I.G. text reads δείγματος, adding an epsilon to the stonecutter’s ΔΙΓΜΑΤΟΣ. I have left this Roman-date spelling unaltered; cf. line 10 κυμέονις, line 48 τίχψ.

Line 49: Both printed editions show γυμπτόν [ν]. The lower third of the circular letter is missing, and in the bracketed space is the upper half of a centered vertical. By comparison with the spacing of other letters, such as the nu of τοῦ προβολοῦ in line 53, I conclude that the missing letter is not nu but iota, and the ending is thus ΤΩΙ, dative. H. R. Immerwahr’s notes also show this interpretation.

Line 55: Tsountas and Kirchner restored [γυμπτ]τίων in this line, but the traces do not support them. The letter on the stone is pi, not tau. It is entirely preserved, with the right leg shorter as is typical of this inscription. Therefore one should restore [Ολυμπ]τίων. E. Vanderpol was kind enough to verify this reading on the stone.

Near the end of the line the stonecutter inadvertently made a theta of the omicron in οκγανον.

Line 57: Kirchner shows ζεντών ια, including two dotted letters Tsountas missed. The iota is now wholly gone, and only the very apex of lambda remains.

Line 58: The one-space blank after -ΒΗΣ at the beginning of the line is not in I.G., but is in Tsountas’ text.

At the end of the line both editors show τῆν πρός. The last four letters are now wholly gone, apparently through the loss of a chip since the beginning of this century, which also took away the iota on the line above.

17 Quaestiones Pisistrateae, Dorpat, 1886, p. 21, note 2.
Date

The nearly ninety years since the discovery of this inscription have produced no real agreement on its date. Estimates have varied by some 300 years. Indeed, soon after the stone was published two schools of thought developed. One (Kirchner, Keil) held that it must come from before Sulla’s sack of Peiraeus because the port town could not have been as the document pictures it after that catastrophe; and because the old acrophonic numerals appear in the text. The other (Gurlitt, Wachsmuth) argued that the archon -komedes must be Lykomedes, who belongs to the second century after Christ, and that the orthography requires a date at least this late. The argument has been continued sporadically through the years. The last few decades have seen a shift toward the middle begun by Oliver, and a willingness to date the decree around Augustus’ time.

18 Here are the dates advanced at various times:
Toepffer, Quaestiones Pisistrateae, Dorpat, 1886, p. 21, note 2: not before 31 B.C.;
Wachsmuth, Die Stadt Athen in Alterthum, Leipzig, 1890, vol. II, p. 12, note 1 and p. 58, note 4: 2nd century after Christ;
Gurlitt, Über Pausanias, pp. 209, 238-239: A.D. 138/9-170/1;
Lolling, Topographie von Athen, Munich, 1901, p. 321, note 4: after A.D. 14/5;
Tod, B.S.A., XVIII, 1911/12, p. 129: 2nd century after Christ; but in B.S.A., XXVIII, 1926/7, p. 151 he accepted Graindor’s later view of the 1st century after Christ;
Kirchner, I.G., II², 1035: beginning 1st century B.C.;
Graindor, Chronologie des Archontes Athéniens sous l’Empire, Académie Royale de Belgique, VIII, fasc. 2 et dernier 1922, p. 142-144; A.D. 139/40–170/1, but he later chose the first century after Christ: Musée Belge, XXVIII, 1924, p. 117; Athènes sous Auguste, Cairo, 1930, p. 198; Athènes de Tibère à Trajan, Cairo, 1931, p. 162, note 2;
Dinsmoor, The Archons of Athens in the Hellenistic Age, Cambridge, 1931, p. 294: 2nd century after Christ;
Day, C.W., XXVI, 1933, pp. 138-140: A.D. 128/9–137/8; but in Economic History, p. 148, note 158 he revised his view to make it Augustan, after Oliver examined the lettering;
Ferguson, Hesperia, VII, 1938, p. 17, note 3: 2nd century after Christ;
Sarakakis, The Hoplite-General in Athens, Princeton, 1951, p. 71: reign of Augustus;
Kahrstedt, Das wirtschaftliche Gesicht Griechenlands in der Kaiserzeit, Bern, 1954, p. 60, note 6: “der proletarischen Republik unter Mithradates”;
Raubitschek, Hesperia, XXIII, 1954, p. 319: age of Augustus;
This study has not produced evidence to fix the decree in a single year, but we can now, I think, narrow the search to one decade. The evidence is cumulative, and is best treated one thread at a time.

**Orthography.** The most notable clue under this head is a tendency for ὶ and  epsilon to be confused. The tendency runs to replacing epsilon with simple ὶ: κυμ[ἐν]οις (line 10), Πιραεὶ (15), δύμματος (47), τίχη (48), τίχοις (56). Yet the artisan will sometimes cut epsilon for a long iota: τεμάς (line 7), but τιμάς (line 27); ὀπλεῖταις (line 12). This carelessness in spelling two near-identical sounds began to appear around 100 B.C. and continued in Attic inscriptions throughout the empire.29

**Letter Forms.** This canon is not very helpful for documents of Roman date, but it may be used with caution. The reader may compare the lettering of this decree with no. 113 of Kirchner’s Imagines Inscriptionum Atticarum, Berlin, 1948, which is dated 52/1 B.C. The close similarity of the letter forms (note especially Ψ, Π, Ρ and Κ) suggests a date early rather than late in the Roman period. J. H. Oliver has judged the lettering to be Augustan,20 and D. J. Geagan, who examined the lettering at my request in 1970, concurs in that view.

**Datable Internal References.** It is unfortunate that most such references are too early to be helpful (e.g., the Themistokles trophy on Salamis: 479 B.C.), and those few which would be helpful are hardest to date (e.g., -komedes as archon). The overall question, “when could all the shrines named have required restoration at the same time?” will be taken up a bit later in this article; for now it is sufficient to cite two dates which are fairly solid and serve as working terminus post and ante quem.

The Horologion or Tower of the Winds in the Roman Market was completed by a little after the middle of the first century B.C.21 Its appearance in line 54 establishes that the inscription cannot be earlier than ca. 30 B.C., even if the Tower fell into neglect almost from the time it was completed. At least a decade must have elapsed before it could need restoration. We therefore have a terminus post quem of ca. 30 B.C.

---

21 D. S. Robertson, A Handbook of Greek & Roman Architecture, Cambridge, 1954, p. 338 and T. Fyfe, Hellenistic Architecture, Cambridge, 1936, p. 56, note 1, both say ca. 50 B.C.; Graindor (Musée Belge, XXVIII, 1924, p. 115; Byantion, III, 1926, p. 30; and Athènes sous Auguste, p. 197), Day (Economic History, pp. 130-132 and C.W., XXVI, 1933, p. 139, note 31), Robinson (A.J.A., XLVII, 1943, p. 302), and Travlos (op. cit. [note 13], p. 281) are in substantial agreement on the period 47-37 B.C. For earlier views cf. Robinson, op. cit., p. 302, where the citations are assembled. I take it as certain that the reference in line 54 is to the Horologion; only Robinson (pp. 298-299, note 21) has denied this, and he did so under the mistaken conviction that the inscription includes no shrines within the city wall.
The moat of Athens, or *taphros*, appears in line 56. Excavation has shown that sometime in the first half of the first century after Christ the *taphros* was filled in with earth and rubble. Had it been cleaned in accordance with our inscription after that date, the datable pottery would not have been there for modern investigators to find; therefore the inscription cannot date from later than the middle of the first century after Christ. These dates reinforce the inference obtained from the letter forms that the decree is Augustan.

Of course, the bare possibility exists that the decree dates from the reigns of Tiberius, Gaius, or Claudius; yet archaeological evidence suggests that very little building took place in Athens under these three emperors. Moreover, the most likely of the three to have looked with favor on this Athenian revival is Claudius, who did not come to power until 41. So late a date strains the evidence of the filling in of the *taphros*, which is judged to have occurred in the first half of the century.

If one scans the evidence of the individual shrines with the assumption that the decree was passed in Augustus’ reign, no problems emerge. The evidence for the use of the various sanctuaries is everywhere consistent with a period of neglect prior to Augustus and a general restoration in his regime.

*Hoplite General and King Archon.* The former of these is Metrodoros, son of Xenon, of Phyle (line 6), dated only as “principate of Augustus” by Sarikakis, and not identifiable with certainty. But if he is the grandfather of the Metrodoros who was archon sometime between A.D. 40/1 and 53/4, the chronology will fit well enough. Some sixty years would separate them, and we arrive at a date of 20-14 B.C., with a leeway of a few years on either side.

The King Archon Mantias of line 12 may be provisionally identified as *Mavrias (II) Kleomévous Maratównos*, who was born ca. 60 B.C. That date I infer from the fact that his son Kleomenes II was old enough to be archon *thesmothetes* around A.D. 22/3 and had become a father before (or very shortly after) the turn of the era. It was a prominent family; Mantias II’s aunt Panarista had helped to weave the sacred *peplos* of Athena shortly after the beginning of the century. Mantias would then have been a close contemporary of Augustus, and might have been King Archon at nearly any time in the latter’s reign, though a member of so noteworthy a family

---

26 Stemma in *I.G.*, II², 3488.
27 *I.G.*, II², 1730, 13; cf. Dow, *Hesperia*, III, 1934, p. 160. His parenthood is certified by *I.G.*, II², 3529, a dedication to Demeter and Kore by Kleomenes and his wife for their daughter.
would not have been likely to have to wait beyond age 60 (the turn of the era) for that honor.

Nikanor and Salamis. An important date for this question is the purchase of Salamis by Gaius Julius Nikanor and his subsequent gift of it to the city of Athens. This dramatic individual,\(^{29}\) distinguished for his wealth, his poetry, his public service, and his friendship with Augustus, bought back the island for Athens after the city had been compelled to sell it. From ephebic inscriptions Graindor has shown that the loss of the island occurred around the time of Sulla, but the inscriptions do not show when Athens got it back; they show only that it was still "foreign" (ephebes from there listed as foreigners in the catalogues) as late as the 30's B.C.\(^{30}\) By the time of Strabo it was back in Athenian hands (IX, 394: καὶ νῦν μὲν ἐξοντων Ἀθηναίων τὴν νήσου), and Dio Chrysostom records that it was Nikanor who bought it back for them (XXXI, 116).

It would be very helpful to know the exact date of the gift, for it was probably the occasion for our decree. As John Day argued, "What could be more reasonable than to suppose that many lands on Salamis had been alienated from public or from sacred control during the period when Salamis was not under the jurisdiction of Athens, and that upon regaining the island the Athenians found it necessary to rectify the conditions there?"\(^{31}\) Unfortunately, a precise date is not yet available; but an approximation can be derived from two pieces of evidence.

The first is an inscription\(^{32}\) which honors Nikanor and mentions various properties on Salamis. It almost certainly has some connection with the purchase of the island or the events which followed, and it is dated by the archonship of Lakon. Graindor thinks this Lakon is the son of Julius Eurykles, who fought with Augustus at Actium.\(^{33}\) While we do not have exact dates here, it is unlikely that the son of one of the officers of Actium would be mature enough to be eponymous archon before ca. 15 B.C., and perhaps a decade or more later is most probable.

The second bit of evidence is that Augustus staged a naval battle between Persians and Athenians in 2 B.C., with the Athenians winning.\(^{34}\) This attention to Salamis

---

\(^{29}\) Cf. Stein, Kroll, and Wendel, s.v. Nikanor (18) and (22), R.E., XVII, pp. 270-272; Graindor, Athènes sous Auguste, pp. 8-10, 168, 176; Sarikakis, op. cit. (note 18), pp. 73-74; and Raubitschek, Hesperia, XXIII, 1954, pp. 317-319.

\(^{30}\) Graindor, Athènes sous Auguste, p. 9.

\(^{31}\) Day, Economic History, pp. 148-149.

\(^{32}\) I.G., II², 1069, now associated with various other fragments. For a skeleton text see Meritt, Hesperia, XXXVI, 1967, pp. 68-71, no. 13. Meritt simply dates it "aet. augusti."

\(^{33}\) Graindor, Athènes sous Auguste, p. 10. Lakon apparently has not yet been dated more precisely than "aetate augston"—see Oliver, Hesperia, XI, 1942, pp. 82-84, and note 31, above.

\(^{34}\) Ovid, Ars Amatoria, I, 171-172. Raubitschek, in Hesperia, XXIII, 1954, p. 319, claimed that Julius Nikanor led the Athenians in that sham battle, thus winning a new battle of Salamis.
would come most appropriately soon after the philanthropist had returned the island to Athens' control, and our attention is then directed to the last decade before Christ.

A combination of these bits of evidence suggests that the island of Salamis was returned to Athens by Nikanor sometime in the last decade B.C. A date materially earlier would do violence to the evidence concerning Lakon's archonship, and a date after 2 B.C. would involve the incongruity of the Athenians "defending" a Salamis which did not even belong to Athens.

The Date. Now it should be possible to display the results of the evidence we have been considering. A glance at the chart (Fig. 1) shows that a date prior to 20 B.C. is quite unlikely. The open years 19/8-17/6 are not so open as they appear, for Demeas must be fitted in there somewhere. If both -komedes (this inscription) and Lakon (I.G., II², 1069) must also be placed there, the crowding becomes severe. Besides, this period is really too early for Nikanor. The years which follow, down through 11/0, are already assigned; but there is room in the period 10/9 through 3/2 to fit in both -komedes and Lakon. Therefore I offer the period 10/9 through 3/2 as the date of the inscription, with the observation that the first years of that period fit best the presumed ages of Metrodoros the Hoplite General and Mantias the King Archon.

The View taken by Oliver. James H. Oliver has recently found reason to date this inscription "almost precisely in the year 27/6 B.C." He rests his conclusion on two principal considerations, each deserving of careful notice.

He has restored the line-length as ca. 105 characters by this version of lines 15-16: [ἐκθε]ῖναι ὑπὲρ μὲν ἐν Ἀκροπόλις παρὰ [τὴν Ἰωάννην], ἦν δὲ ἐν Πυραϊοὶ παρὰ τῷ Δίῳ τῷ Σωτῆρι καὶ τῇ[τῇ] | ['Αθηναὶ τῇ Σωτερίᾳ, ἐστὶ τοῦ βασιλέως καὶ τοῦ ταμίῳ τῆς ἑρας διαστῆσαι εἰς τετραετίαν καὶ ἀναγράψαι ἐν στήλῃ κ.τ.λ. "to publish which for a period of four years, one on the Acropolis by Athena Polias, the other at Piraeus by Zeus Soter and Athena Soteira, it is the duty of the basileus and of the treasurer of the sacred diataxis," etc.

This restoration has the advantage that it permits one to read the stone as it and earning the title which we know the Athenians gave him: the New Themistokles. His theory has been rejected by G. W. Bowersock (Augustus and the Greek World, Oxford, 1965, p. 96, note 7) and L. and J. Robert (R.E.G., LXVIII, 1955, p. 210, note 79). It seems to me that his purchase of the island for Athens would be enough to explain the title the Athenians gave him.

See Oliver, Hesperia, XI, 1942, pp. 29-103 and Notopoulos, Hesperia, XVIII, 1949, pp. 1-57. I have not entered the names of the archons on Figure 1, but have only indicated which years have names definitely assigned to them and are thus excluded. For names and evidence the reader may consult the articles cited in this note.

Only three others must go in this period: Νικής Σαραπίων Ἀθηναύς (a. 10/9-2/1); Ζένων Μενίδου Φελίς (post a. 9/8); and Ἀπαλλήξις ἐκ Οἰοῦ (8/7-2/1). See the preceding note.

is inscribed (nonnull), and not edit it into τὴν, twice in the line. Previous editors had not commented on the matter, and their insertion of tau implies that they viewed it as a stonemcutter's error. Yet there is another possibility, one which will make it unnecessary either to charge the stonemcutter with a double error or to criticize the framers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Metrodoros</th>
<th>Mantias</th>
<th>Nikanor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>30/29</td>
<td>assigned</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29/8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28/7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27/6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26/5</td>
<td>assigned</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25/4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24/3</td>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23/2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22/1</td>
<td></td>
<td>L</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21/0</td>
<td>assigned</td>
<td></td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20/19</td>
<td>assigned</td>
<td>O</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19/8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18/7</td>
<td></td>
<td>R</td>
<td>U</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/6</td>
<td></td>
<td>U</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16/5</td>
<td>assigned</td>
<td>U</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15/4</td>
<td>assigned</td>
<td></td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14/3</td>
<td>assigned</td>
<td>I</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13/2</td>
<td>assigned</td>
<td></td>
<td>T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/1</td>
<td>assigned</td>
<td>T</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/0</td>
<td>assigned</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8/7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7/6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5/4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4/3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(naumachia)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Fig. 1.**

with an awkward, double-relative construction. It may be an example of the substitution of the relative for the demonstrative definite article. The usage appears in Greek sporadically from the time of Demosthenes on.\(^{38}\)

It is the length of the line, however, which is the weak point of this restoration. As Oliver has it, only some 29 characters are missing at the left. With so short a line, some of the expressions will not make sense. Take line 4: \[εδοξεν των δήμων.\]

—— ἐπεὶ· περὶ τῶν ἱερῶν καὶ ἐπεὶ περὶ τῶν ἱερῶν καὶ] κ.τ.λ. This is 39 letters, ten more than Oliver permits, and yet it allows only six spaces for a proposer’s name. Line 3, of course, would need a totally different restoration. Line 13, with just the name I have restored and θυσίαν ἀρεστήριον, is 30 letters, and still needs a verb. Line 29 would be uncentered, far to the left. The stone cannot have been so narrow as Oliver has made it.49

The other major point in Oliver’s argument is that I.G., II³, 1035 should be studied alongside the Leyden inscription from Cyme. The latter is a ruling in 27 B.C. by the consuls Augustus and Agrippa, and a letter of the proconsul Vinicius, both of which concern the restoration of public and sacred properties to the control of the individual city-states. The ruling is based on a iussus Augusti authorizing the restoration. Persons who have taken over the properties must relinquish them, and furniture and other movable items from the shrines are to be recovered as well. Both seizure and sale of the properties by individuals are forbidden. Oliver believes that I.G., II³, 1035 is also based on that imperial iussus.

The similarity of subject matter does argue for a connection between the inscriptions; unfortunately, the imperial order itself has perished, and we know of it only from a mention in the Leyden inscription. We could be more certain of the relationships if the text of the iussus were available for comparison.

There is no doubt that the iussus Augusti is a valuable piece of evidence, but we need not infer, as Oliver does, that Athens immediately made use of it to recover its properties.40 There was ill will between Athens and the young Caesar for some years after Actium; even as late as 22/1 B.C. he was still angry enough at them to winter on Aigina as a deliberate slight to the Athenians.41 Their attitude toward him was displayed when he came to the city; a statue of Athena on the Acropolis turned round and spat blood.42 For these reasons I believe it is unlikely that Athens would have laid claim to the iussus Augusti so early; but she may have done so later, when her relationship with the emperor was not so strained. It is possible that, when the recovery of Salamis in the last decade B.C. provided the occasion, the twenty-year-old imperial order provided the legal basis for the restoration of the Attic shrines.

Gerald R. Culley

University of Delaware

49 There is an additional difficulty with this view. It has the officials publishing the names for a four-year period, while the period referred to is more probably the term of the leases. Leases for four years appear in the nearly contemporary inscription (Hesperia, XXXVI, 1967, pp. 68-69, no. 13A and pl. 23) recently published by Meritt.

40 Oliver admits that some states did not act at all to recover the domain; op. cit. (note 37), p. 197, note 14.

41 G. W. Bowersock, Cl. Quart., n.s., XIV, 1964, pp. 120-121; idem, Augustus and the Greek World, pp. 105-106.

42 Ibid.
The Stele, fragments A and C. Photograph courtesy of the Greek Archaeological Service.
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