AN ATHENIAN DECREE OF THE YEAR 335/4 B.C.

(PLATE 33)

The first seven lines of this text were published by Benjamin D. Meritt. The decree first came to the present writer's attention during the research for Athenian Democracy in Transition, for it was inscribed by one of the more prolific cutters in that study, the Cutter of IG II² 334. Permission to publish the stone in full has now been generously granted by the Greek Ministry of Culture.4

The decree is on a fragment of white marble in the Epigraphical Museum in Athens preserving part of the top and right side of the original stone. The circumstances of discovery are not recorded. It is 0.275 m high, 0.28 m wide, and 0.13 m thick. The height of the letters is 0.006–0.007 m; the checker is 0.011 × 0.013 m.

Inv. no. E.M. 13067; Pl. 33
a. 335/4 a. ΣΤΟΙΧ. 25

[Θ] ε ο [ι]
[έπι Ευαίηνετον ἄρχοντος ἐπὶ τῆς-
[ς Ἀντιοχίδου δεκάτης πρωταγ[νε]-
4 [ας ἧς] Πρόεξενος Πυλαγόρου [Ἀχε]-
[ρδούσιος έγραμμάτευεν. Σύμφωνο]-
[φοριῶνος οὕδησι ἐπὶ δέκα, τρί[τ]-
7 η ι ι] εἴκοσιτί τῆς πρωταγ[εια]-
[. . . ο] ο Λαμπρέους Αλκιμαχ[ός ή]
10 [. . . ή] ἡ Μυρογούττης εἰπ[ει] ν πε[-
[ρι ον] ο δὴμο[ς] προσέτα[ζεν τῆς βο]-
[ιλῆ προβο[ν] λεύσο[ν] σφα[ν] ξενεν[ξ]-
13 [ε]ν περι Νυ[κ]σφατότου [κ] [θ] οι τ-]
[μηθύστετα[ι] εις τήν έκ[κλη] σ[α]ν]
[. . . . . . . . . .] ΚΑΤΗ, δεδ[άγαθαι τῇ]-
16 [ι βουλής] τοὺς προέδρους διὰ τὴν -
[άχωσιν προεδρ[ευέν εις τήν πρ]-
[ώτην] ἐκκλησιάσασθαι [χρηματ] τ[ο]-
19 [π] τούτων, γνώμονα δὲ ξυν[βά]λλες]-
[θαι τῆς βουλῆς εις τήν δ] [μον δτ]-
[i δοξεῖ κτλ.]

Line 2: Meritt, relying on a text supplied by George Stamires, printed ἐπὶ elided with the archon's name and thus included in line 2 the sigma of τής and so on. This is possible, but careful measurement suggests that this sigma and the other letters would have to have been inscribed just at the right edge of the

2 Tracy 1995.
3 Tracy 1995, pp. 82–95, esp. 87.
4 I am deeply indebted to Charalambos Kritzas, Director of the Epigraphical Museum in Athens, for his friendly cooperation, and to John D. Morgan, who thoroughly checked the text in Athens and provided a useful transcript of it. The photograph was supplied by the Epigraphical Museum in Athens. Christian Habicht and John Morgan kindly read an early draft of this paper and offered helpful suggestions.
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stone. This is unlikely, for cutters usually leave a margin between the final letter and stone’s edge. Moreover, in the two instances where we can determine the practice with regard to elision of ἐν with this archon’s name, it was not elided. It seems better, then, not to elide the name and to assume that this cutter followed his normal practice in leaving a margin at the right edge. My word divisions thus differ some from Meritt’s in the first seven lines.

Where it is not broken, this text has vertical lines of water erosion and heavy wear along the right part of the text, apparently from foot traffic. Despite this, most of the text on the preserved parts can be read, except for the ends of lines, where the letters have been completely worn away. Stamires reported some letters in the first seven lines that I cannot read, and so I underline them.

Line 8: There is the shape of the dotted iota legible in the line of water erosion. After the final nu there appear very faint traces of a letter. A vertical in the left part of the stoichos alone is clear. Nu, pi, and rho are some of the possibilities.

Line 9: Of dotted tau, the crossbar alone can be made out.

Line 10: The dotted nu, tau, and sigma are very worn, all but effaced. Here alone in what is preserved the cutter broke stoichedon: rho and iota occupy a single stoichos, and the four letters after omicron are crowded into three stoichoi. I suspect that the inscriber initially omitted one or more letters and corrected by crowding in the letters.

Line 13: Just the bottom third of dotted upsilon and the lower parts of the slanting strokes of dotted alpha can be made out.

Line 14: The dotted lambda and eta of ἐκκλησιάσαν, much effaced, are preserved in the worn area.

Line 15: In stoichos 8 there appears in the photograph a shape that could be taken for eta or nu. I cannot confirm it from the squeeze and suspect that these marks may not be parts of letter strokes. I have, therefore, not indicated any reading in my text at this point. The letter following eta is not at all certain. From the photograph iota seems certain, although there are faint traces of what might be nu. The traces on the squeeze under some lighting conditions also congrue with the shape of sigma.

Line 18: Of dotted nu, only the top of the right vertical can be discerned at the break.

The end of line 10 through the beginning of line 14 can be restored nearly verbatim from another text inscribed by this cutter, IG II² 338, lines 7–9. For similar wording, see also lines 11 through 14 of IG II² 248 and lines 47 through 49 of IG II² 360. The infinitive ἐξενεγκεῖν governs the prepositional phrase ἐξ τῆς ἐκκλησιάσαν at the end of line 14. In other cases the meeting of the ekklesia is modified by the adjective πρῶτα, specifying the next meeting. Whatever stood at the opening of line 15 must have defined ekklesia in some way. The remains appear to be part of a date in the dative case. I cannot suggest any probable restoration and can offer no parallel. The wording does not appear to be formulaic.

The orator, Alkimachos, [. . .]οῦ, of Myrrhinoutta (lines 9–10), is also attested as a διαίτης during the year 330/298 and, in 325/4, as the proposer of a measure of the Boule relating to a quadrireme. His father’s name is not given in either place and remains unknown. Alkimachos can be added to those who are known to have served twice in the Boule. The provisions to honor Νι[κ]οστράτου (line 13) do not provide any clues that enable us to identify him more closely. The name is a very common one in Athens in the 4th century B.C.

It has recently been argued by R. Malcolm Errington that shortly after Chaironeia there was a radical change in the practice regulating the matters to be considered at meetings of the assembly.

---

5 See IG II² 330, line 1, and Agora XVI, no. 76. IG II² 331 is not stoichedon and therefore not a reliable witness on this matter. Please also note that the virtual identity of the texts in lines 1 through 4 of IG II² 331 and of IG II² 882 reveals that they are the same inscription inadvertently published twice (I owe this information to an unpublished notation by Stamires in the margin of Meritt’s copy of IG at the Institute for Advanced Study in Princeton).

6 He customarily left rather large margins; the margin at the right in IG II² 334, for example, is 0.008 m wide, and in IG II² 338 it is over a centimeter in width.

7 IG II² 125, line 8; 191, line 6; 193, line 7; 360, line 48.

8 IG II² 2409, lines 19–20.

9 IG II² 1629, line 273.

particularly the major meeting. This change is reflected, he contends, in the tendency toward the close of the year 336/5 and afterward to mention whether a meeting of the people was an ekklesia or an ekklesia kyria. However, preambles of the period 336/5 to 322/1 are, as Errington himself notes (p. 141), often incomplete. This fact suggests that the change was as likely to be in the style of preambles as one that had legal or constitutional substance.

Indeed, the present preamble from the tenth prytany of 335/4 does nothing to bolster Errington’s case. Rather, it augments the list of those that are incomplete: it includes no mention of the meeting in line 8 and has no ratification clause in line 9. Agora XVI, no. 76 (SEG XXXV 67) and the first decree of IG II² 330 also belong to this year and are well enough preserved to enable us to ascertain their state of completeness. The latter is complete; the former, like E.M. 13067, is abbreviated. It not only lacks mention of the meeting and the clause of ratification, but it also omits the day of the prytany. Seemingly, Proxenos, son of Pylagoras, of Acherdous, the secretary for the year 335/4, felt no necessity to include for each measure to be inscribed all the details of date and meeting.
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12 Rhodes (1995) makes substantially the same point in a reply to Errington’s article.

13 Neither IG II² 331 nor 332 is sufficiently preserved to come into the discussion on this matter. IG II² 363 has been assigned to this year (see SEG XXIII 53), but the restorations are far from certain. See also, on this text, Schwenk 1985, pp. 322–333.

14 I think it rather unlikely that an inscriber would have had the discretionary power to omit such matters.
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