

ELEUSINIAN INSCRIPTIONS: THREE EMENDATIONS

IN THE PUBLISHED TEXTS of two Eleusinian inscriptions, there are three monetary figures which are either probably or certainly wrong.¹

1. The first inscription is *IG II² 140* (E.M. 466), the law of 353/2 B.C. concerning the dedication of the Eleusinian first fruits, where Kirchner's Corpus text reports that [2]0 [drachmas] are to be paid for inscribing the law, on the same stele as an earlier law on the same subject:²

ΣΤΟΙΧ. 26

τὸν δὲ γραμμα[τέα τῆς βουλῆς]
προσαναγράψαι τ[ὸν νόμον τόνδε]
πρὸς τὸν πρότερο[ν τὸν Χαιρημον]-
ίδου εἰς τὴν στήλ[ην τὴν ἔμπροσθ]-
εν τοῦ Μητρώιου, εἰς δὲ τὴν ἀναγρ]- 35
αφὴν τῆς στήλης δ[οῦναι τὸν ταμί]-
αν τοῦ δήμου ὕΔ[Δ ὕ δραχμὰς ἐκ τῶν]
εἰς τὰ κατὰ ψηφί[σματα].

Nolan reported from autopsy that the actual text in line 37 is ὕΔ ὕ δ[ραχμὰς], and he suggested in explanation for this low figure that the stele had been quarried on nearby Mt. Hymettos instead of more distant Mt. Pentelikos (as Kirchner had reported) and thus that the cost of quarrying and transport was less than normal.³ But, as I shall argue at greater length shortly,⁴ (a) amounts appropriated for public inscriptions are for inscribing only (among

¹ I am grateful to the Greek Ministry of Culture, its Department of Prehistoric and Classical Antiquities, and Charalambos Kritzas, Director of the Epigraphical Museum, for permission to examine the two inscriptions discussed in this article, and to William D. E. Coulson, Director of the American School of Classical Studies at Athens, and Maria Pilali, his administrative assistant, for their assistance in obtaining this permission. I also thank Kevin Clinton, the dean of Eleusinian epigraphers, for enlightening correspondence at an early stage on 2 a and several other Eleusinian details, and Sara B. Aleshire, for help with readings when I examined the stones, on 27 May 1994. Finally, I thank Clinton and Stephen V. Tracy for reading and commenting on the penultimate draft of this article, for whose remaining errors I alone am responsible.

² As Nolan (1981, p. 144) observed, “[t]he present text is clearly all there ever was [on this stele] and is clearly not part, in its present form, of a stele which also had on it the ‘earlier law of Chairemonides’.” This inscription may in fact be a copy inscribed later than 353/2 of a law of that year.

³ Nolan 1981, pp. 142–144. I express no opinion as to the quarry source for this stele, which probably would not be relevant in any event since the stele which carried the “earlier law of Chairemonides” (note 2 above) was not necessarily from the same quarry. What would be relevant, if quarrying, transport, etc. *were* taken into account in determining the amounts appropriated for polis inscriptions, is the fact that the stele which carried the “earlier law of Chairemonides” already had been quarried, transported, and partially inscribed, leaving only the inscribing of the new law to be paid for by this appropriation. In my view, however, such appropriations always are for inscribing only (see below with notes 4 and 5).

⁴ Loomis in preparation, chap. 8 (“Inscribers”).

other reasons, the formulaic language εἰς τὴν ἀναγραφὴν τῆς στήλης does not mention quarrying, transport, sculptural decoration, etc.), and (b) among the more than fifty sums attested as appropriations for polis inscriptions in the period *ca.* 403–330 B.C. none is lower than 20 drachmas,⁵ so that if Nolan's report of the text were correct, the inscriber almost certainly would have omitted a Δ by mistake. In fact, however, Nolan's reading cannot be right. In this formulaic section of a 26-letter stoichedon line, we need to fill five letter spaces with some combination of deltas and uninscribed spaces, e.g., Kirchner's $\nu\Delta[\Delta^{\nu}\delta\rho\alpha\chi\mu\acute{\alpha}\varsigma]$. Nolan's text fills only four letter spaces. After examining the stone myself, I can report that after the upsilon of δῆμου (in the tenth stoichos), there is a *vacat* in the eleventh stoichos, a delta in the twelfth stoichos, a *vacat* in the thirteenth stoichos, and probably a *vacat* in the fourteenth stoichos. The stone breaks off in the fourteenth stoichos, but at least the left one-third of the stoichos is preserved, directly below the delta of δ[οὔναι] in line 36, and there is no trace of delta or any other letter in this space. Accordingly, I would print $\nu\Delta\langle\Delta\rangle^{\nu}[\delta\rho\alpha\chi\mu\acute{\alpha}\varsigma]$ with the note that $\langle\Delta\rangle$ fills an uninscribed space on the stone. Aleshire (note 1 above) suggests to me that this Δ could have been painted in the uninscribed space.⁶

2. *IG II*² 1672 (E.M. 10051 + 10048), the account of the Eleusinian epistatai and treasurers for 329/8 B.C.

a. In lines 6–8, Kirchner's text reports payments for rations to letter inscribers:

[τοῖς τὰ] γράμματα ἐπικολάψασιν ἐπὶ τὸ ἀνάθημα ἐν τῷ Ἑλευσινίῳ σιτ-	6
ία : Π††† : καὶ ἐπὶ τῆς Λεωντ[ιδ]ος τῆς ἡμέρας : †† : ἡμερῶν : ΔΠΠ† : κερά-	7
λαι : ΔΠ†††††††††† : καὶ ἐπὶ τῆς Οἰνητῶδος	
δεκάτης προτανείας σιτία ΔΔ[ΔΔ]†††††††† :	8

Clinton (note 1 above) is of the view (*per ep.*) that the dedication probably was not so large that more than one inscriber could have worked on it on a given day, and he therefore believes that single inscriber days are involved in each case. In Leontis (the ninth prytany of 330/29; see Kirchner's commentary *ad loc.*), the rate is explicitly stated to be 1 dr. 1 ob. per day, and this is confirmed by the further statements that the rate was for 17 days and that the total for Leontis was (therefore) 19 dr. 5 ob. The restoration for the (following) tenth prytany,

⁵ *IG II*², 22b, lines 9–10; 24b, line 10; 31, lines 15–16; 40, line 22; 43, line 67; 51, line 15; 53, line 8; 76, line 22; 81, line 12 (+ *SEG XXXII* 51); 84, lines 5–6; 106, line 18; 107, line 24; 109b, line 28; 111, line 26; 116, line 45; 120, line 21; 133, line 19; 141, lines 17–18; 148, line 8; 151, line 1; 197, line 4 (+ *SEG XXXII* 69); 212, lines 48–49; 222, line 31; 226, line 24; 237, line 37 (+ *SEG XXXI* 76); 238, line 18; 240, lines 24–25; 256, line 6; 264, line 12; 269, line 7; 276, line 21; 299, line 3; 302, line 3; 304, line 13 (+ *SEG XVIII* 11); 306, line 3; 307, line 3; 338, line 29; 344, lines 23–24; 373, line 13; 410, line 41; 418, line 9; 424, line 16; 426, line 16. *IG VII* 4252, line 36; 4253, line 32. *SEG XII* 87, line 28; *XXI* 230, line 3 and 345, lines 9–10; *XXVIII* 52, lines 27–28; *XXXI* 67, line 11. *Hesperia* 43, 1974, p. 322, no. 3, line 23.

⁶ In *Syll.*³ (published in 1915, two years after his 1913 Corpus edition), Kirchner printed the same text of line 37 except that, instead of printing superscript ν s, he reported: “In v. 37 ante et post ΔΔ unum spatium vacuum relictum est.” Because Kirchner put everything after the first Δ in square brackets, his second Δ probably completes what he thought was the lowest figure possible (20 dr.), and his posited *vacat* probably resulted from the requirements of the stoichedon line. In any event, his text is consistent with the spacing of my reading.

Oineis, assumes the same (1 dr. 1 ob. p.d.) rate for every day of a 38-day prytany (1 dr. 1 ob. \times 38 = 44 dr. 2 ob.). No such neat equation is possible for the 8-drachma entry in line 7, presumably for inscribing in Antiochis, the first prytany of the new year 329/8 (lines 1–2), and Clinton accordingly supposes that the rate there was 1 dr. 2 ob. p.d., which for 6 days would work out to 8 drachmas (from autopsy I can confirm that Π†† is on the stone). But the number of days is not stated. Moreover, a higher rate for Antiochis (than the 1 dr. 1 ob. p.d. attested two prytanies earlier for Leontis and restored with near certainty for the immediately preceding Oineis) is less likely than an inscriber’s error, of which there are at least forty-three in this lengthy and detailed inscription.⁷ I suspect that the inscriber added an extra † by mistake (1 dr. 1 ob. for 6 days would work out to Π††), but because this question is not free from doubt (the rate *could* have been increased in the new year), I would print Π†† {†?}.

b. In lines 297–299, Kirchner’s text reports a payment for grain and other items:

	πυρῶ[ν] μέδιμνοι ΔΔΔΠΙ, δέκα ἡμ[ι]-	297
εκτεῖα ἔχοντες τὴν ἐπιβολήν, τιμὴ τούτων ΗΗΔΔ† · κριθῶν μέδιμνοι		298
ΔΔΔΔΙΙΙ, ἡμιεκτε[ῖ]α τέτταρα ἔχοντες τὴν ἐπιβολήν, τιμὴ		
τούτων, τοῦ μεδίμνου ἑκάστου †† ΙΙΙΙΙ · σύμπαν τιμῆς κεφά-		
λαιον ΗΗΗΓΔΔΠ†† [.]·		
ἀπὸ τούτου προμετρητεῖ †† μισθωτοῖς ΙΙΙΙΙΤ · ἐνοίκιον †† κεφάλαι-		299
ον ἀναλώματος [Π]Τ · περίεστιν ΗΗΗΓΔΔΔ†† Τ·		

From autopsy, I can report that in its current state the total at the end of line 298 is ΗΗΗΓΔΔΠ†† [.]⁸ Kirchner did not comment on this total, which (before the square brackets) should be 387 dr. (43 4/12 medimnoi of barley \times 3 5/6 dr. = 166 1/9 dr. + 221 dr. for wheat = 387 1/9 dr.), i.e., the inscriber (or the scribe who prepared the original text) omitted a Δ by mistake. Within the square brackets, we might expect the 1/9 dr. to be rounded up to either 1 ob. (1/6 dr.) or 3/4 ob. (1/8 dr.). But Clinton (note 1 above) points out to me that the 382 dr. 1/4 ob. total in line 299 shows that the 1/9 dr. must have been rounded *down*, to 1/2 ob. (1/12 dr.): 387 dr. [1/2 ob.] – [5 dr.] 1/4 ob. for expenses⁹ = 382 dr. 1/4 ob. Thus, at the end of line 298 we should read ΗΗΗΓΔΔ(Δ)Π†† [C].

⁷ Using pre-Leiden conventions, Kirchner enclosed letters, numerals, and words (a) inscribed by mistake with () rather than { } (in lines 42, 49, 60, 129, 138, 141, 150, 172, 195, 199, 255, 269, 271, and 300) and (b) omitted by mistake with () rather than () (in lines 15, 16, 17, 20, 21, 52, 57, 87, 101, 108, 112, 139, 142, 150, 160, 164 [twice], 165, 180, 201, 249, 251, 258, 260, 271, 297, 300, and 310). An additional omission, in line 298, is noted below in **2 b**.

⁸ The first † has been damaged, but the bottom of its vertical is still visible. The space in square brackets has been broken off, but it occupies the same vertical space as ω[ν] at the end of line 286 and ωω[ν] at the end of line 287, so that it *could* have accommodated as many as three numerals, although in fact it seems to have accommodated only one (see last sentence below).

⁹ The restoration of 5 dr. is guaranteed by preserved individual expenses of 2 dr., 1 dr. 5 1/4 ob., and 1 dr. 1 ob.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Loomis, W. T. In preparation. *Wages, Welfare Costs and Inflation in Classical Athens*

Nolan, B. T. 1981. "Inscribing Costs at Athens in the Fourth Century B.C." (diss. Ohio State University 1981)
Ann Arbor

WILLIAM T. LOOMIS

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN
Departments of Classical Studies and History
Ann Arbor, MI 48109