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
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τὸν δὲ γραμματέα τῆς βουλῆς
προσαναγράψαι τὸν νόμον τόνδε
πρὸς τὸν πρῶτον τὸν Χαριπηνον·
ίδου εἰς τὴν στήλην τὴν ἐμπροσθή·
ἐν τούῃ Μητρώου, ἐς δὲ τὴν ἀναγρῆ·
αφὴν τῆς στήλης δίονυσί τού ταμίῳ·
αν τού δήμου ἩΔ[Δ ᾠδραχμὰς ἐκ τοῦν]
eἰς τὰ κατὰ ψηφίον[sματά].

Nolan reported from autopsy that the actual text in line 37 is ἩΔ[Δ ᾠδραχμὰς], 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”).
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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 stoicheion line, we need to fill five letter spaces with some combination of deltas and uninscribed spaces, e.g., Kirchner’s \(\nu\Delta [\Delta^{\nu} \delta\rho\alpha\chi\mu\alpha\varsigma]\). Nolan’s text fills only four letter spaces. After examining the stone myself, I can report that after the upsilon of δήμου (in the tenth stoichos), there is a \(\nu\nu\nu\nu\) in the eleventh stoichos, a delta in the twelfth stoichos, a \(\nu\nu\nu\nu\) in the thirteenth stoichos, and probably a \(\nu\nu\nu\nu\) 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 \(\delta[\omicron\upsilon\nu\nu]\) in line 36, and there is no trace of delta or any other letter in this space. Accordingly, I would print \(\nu\Delta (\Delta^{\nu}) [\delta\rho\alpha\chi\mu\alpha\varsigma]\) 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:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{τοῖς τὰς γράμματα ἐπικολύψασιν ἐπὶ τὸ ἀνάθημα ἐν τῷ Ἑλευσύνων σιτiou} & \quad \text{6} \\
\text{λα : ΠΗΠΠΠ : καὶ ἐπὶ τῆς Λεωντ[ί]ος τῆς ἡμέρας : ΤΙ : ἡμερῶν : ΔΠΠΠ : κεφά-} & \quad \text{7} \\
\text{λα : ΑΠΠΠΠΠΠΠ : καὶ ἐπὶ τῆς Οἰληνίδος} & \quad \text{8}
\end{align*}
\]

Clinton (note 1 above) is of the view (\textit{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 \textit{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 XXIX 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 \textit{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 \(\nu\), 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 \(\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\) resulted from the requirements of the stoicheion line. In any event, his text is consistent with the spacing of my reading.
From autopsy, I can report that in its current state the total at the end of line 298 is $\text{HHH}^{\Gamma} \Delta \Delta \Delta \Pi$ [ ].\(^8\) 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 $\Delta$ 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 expenses\(^9\) = 382 dr. 1/4 ob. Thus, at the end of line 298 we should read $\text{HHH}^{\Gamma} \Delta \Delta \Delta \langle \Delta \rangle \Pi$ [C].

---

\(^7\) Using pre-Leiden conventions, Kirchner enclosed letters, numerals, and words (a) inscribed by mistake with $\langle \rangle$ 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 $\langle \rangle$ (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 $\ell$ 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 $\omega[v]$ at the end of line 286 and $\upsilon[v]$ 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.
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