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NOTES TO CHAPTER I

1. On the Solonian boule see Ch. V; pp. 221-2.

2. A.P. 22.ii; cf. Appendix to Ch. IV, pp. 204-5.


4. 600, Pl. Demetr. 10.vi; 650, IG ii2 687,53, 547,26; 600 again, IG ii2 1013, 7, 16, 1072,10.

5. E.g. IG ii2 4210. For the date, cf. J. A. Notopoulos, TAPA LXXVII 1946. The exact size of Hadrian's boule is uncertain:

S. Dow, Hesp. Supp. I 1937, 196, assumed that 500 was the correct figure; P. Graindor, Athènes sous Hadrien, 83-5, envisaged a total of about 540, with tribal contingents varying between 40 and 42; A. E. Raubitschek, Ε. Ραβίτσιχ, Ιάσων ο Αντιοχίδης, 242-55, believes in a boule of 13 x 40, and is followed in this by D. J. Geagan, Hesp. Supp. XII 1967, 95-6.

Raubitschek argues that the wealthy patron who acted as ἓκτονος to the tribe (cf. p. 13 and n. 88, below) should be regarded as a member of the prytany only in those prytany-dedications where he is named with the prytanes and not apart from them, and claims that there were 40 prytanes in each of the twelve complete lists which have survived from this period.

These lists, of which further details will be found in Table A, are:-

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tribe</th>
<th>IG ii2</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Members</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AEGEIS</td>
<td>1765</td>
<td>138/9</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PANDONIS</td>
<td>1773</td>
<td>166/7</td>
<td>40 incl. γρ.*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1776</td>
<td>169/70</td>
<td>40 incl. γρ.*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1077</td>
<td>209/10</td>
<td>41 incl. γρ.*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACAMANTIS</td>
<td>1774</td>
<td>167/8</td>
<td>39 + γρ.* + ἐκατ.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+ ἐκείνητον</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1775</td>
<td>168/9</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CECROPIES</td>
<td>1782</td>
<td>177/8</td>
<td>40 incl. γρ.* but not ἐκατ.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Notes to I) - 240 -

(AIANTIS  P 121  ?  Traces of 39 names, but probably part of list of 50, c.120. Not discussed by Raubitschek)

ANTIOCHIS  IG ii 1783  221/2  40 incl. ΥΡ.
1817  c.220  (no demotics) 40 incl. ΥΡ.

ATTALIS  1794  180/1  40 incl. ΥΡ.
1824  221/2  (no demotics) 40?+

Regular lists of 40 cannot be obtained without forcing the evidence, and it seems better to admit the possibility of variation.

6. 600, IG ii 2 3664 (c.200? - presumably a mere slip if the date is right); 750, IG ii 2 3669(269/70); 300, IG ii 2 3716, 4222 (C4). It has been suggested by D. J. Geagan, Hesp. Supp. XII 1967, 75, that from the third century all eligible citizens were admitted to the boule for life.

7. X. M. I. ii. 35, D. XXII. Andr. hyp. i. i; cf. "Draco" in A.P. 4. iii, "constitutions" of 411 in A.P. 30. ii, 31. i. It is possible that the age requirement was not that a man should have reached the age of thirty but that he should have entered on his thirtieth year (and so have reached the age of twenty-nine). Cf. Ch. IV, pp. 173-80 and especially n. 175.


9. Lys. XXXI. Phil. 33, Harp., Suid., E.M. ἐξήλαξας; cf. (on ἐρχαί in general) [Lys]. VI. And. 4, Is. XV. Ant. 150.


11. And. I. Myst. 75. Cavalry service under the Thirty was probably made another bar to membership: Lys. XXVI. Evand. 10.

13. A. I. Tim. 28 - 30; cf. the questions asked at the δοκιμασία of archons (cf. Ch. IV, p. 184). A. I. 28 - 30 must in its present form be a product of the post-404 democracy, but the grounds of disqualification look older. On the quasi-official standing of διηπορές in the fourth century, see S. Perlman, Athen. XLI 1963, esp. 353 - 4.


15. A.P. 7 iv. There were of course periods after the death of Alexander when the poorer citizens were deprived of all political rights, including membership of the boule. D. J. Geagan suggests, Hesp. Supp. XII 1967, 76, that under the Roman Empire membership of the boule was restricted to those who had performed ephoric service, and in commenting on SEG XXI 509, a 6, 18 (pp. 86 - 7), he conjectures that only these men were entitled to speak in the assembly. At any rate ephoric service and membership of the boule came to form two normal elements in the Athenian cursus honorum, but J. H. Oliver (Hesp. XXX 1961, 402 - 3) thinks that the requirements for οἱ ἔκκλησις ζωντες κατὰ τὰ νομίζωμα may have been less strict than for membership of the boule.

16. Cf. Ch. IV, pp. 184 - 7. Physical infirmity apparently disqualified a man from the archonship (Lys. XXIV Pens. Inv. 13): this too may have applied to bouleutae.

17. A.P. 62. ii.

18. AEGEIS Παρ. Androtion IG ii 2 61, D. XXII Andr. 38 (cf. n. 28, below)

'Εστ. Posidippus IG ii 2 1749 (341/0), 1700 (335/4)
Notes to 1)

$\eta\gamma$. Polycrates  
IG ii* 1747 (c.350), SEG XIX 149 (336/5?).

$\psi\lambda$. Dionysius  
IG ii* 1747 (c.350), 1749 (341/0).

PANDIONIS Μυρρ. Aeschylides  
IG ii* 1751 (after mid C4).

Πρασ. Timandrus  
SEG XIX 149 (336/5?).

Ωα. Eupolemus  
REG 1960, 88 - 99 (first qr. C4), SEG XIX 149 (336/5?).

ACAMANTIS Ζητητ. Timarchus  
A. I. Tim. 109 (361/0), ibid. 80 (347/6).

OENEIS Θρτ. Cleopompus  
IG ii* 1745 (360/59). 1698 (before mid C4).

Περτ. Callicrates  
IG ii* 1745 (360/59), 1746 (c.350).

CECROPIS Ζυκ. Antidotus  
IG ii* 337 (333/2), 'Αγχ. 'Εφ.

1917, 40 - 8 (328/7).

Autobulus  
IG ii* 2384 (360 - 50), 1700 (335 - 4) (cf. n.19, below)

AIANTIS 'Αφ. Demetrius  
SIG 287 (332/1), 'Αγχ. 'Εφ.

1917, 40 - 8 (328/7).

Euthycrates  
IG ii* 242/3 (337/6), 'Αγχ. 'Εφ.

1917, 40 - 8 (328/7).

Ολν. Phyleus  
IG ii* 330 (336/5), 360 (325/4).

ANTIOCHIS Παλλ. Philostratus  
IG ii* 1700 (335/4). 410 (c.330),

Theodorus  
IG ii* 1700 (335/4), 'Αγχ. 'Εφ.

1917, 40 - 8 (328/7).

(Not all the identifications are certain.) For Demosthenes see below, n. 29.
19. IG ii² 1772, 6 (162/3); 1773, 13 (166/7); SEG XXI 610, 13 (end C2); cf. Geagan, Hesp. Supp. XII 1967, 75 (but Raubitschek, Πέρσης Κεραμοκουλλαν, 244, writes as if the old rule still applied): Geagan also cites Heliodorus Ἀρτέμιδος ΚυτάμηναΤος, in Hesp. XI 15 (c. 160); IG ii² 1773 (166/7); 1776 (169/70); and also 2478 (mid C2) - but the last, a fragment with 9 names and no demotic, may not belong to a list of prytanes. Autobulus Αὐτοκόφου ᾿υπαλήττεις appears in IG ii² 2375 (before mid C4 B.C.) as well as in the two lists mentioned in n.18, above, but this list with 4 ᾿υπαλήττεις is probably not a list of bouleutae. It is likely that the oligarchic régimes of the late fourth and early third centuries had to relax this rule: cf. Ferguson, Hellenistic Athens, 25 - 6.

20. In the democratic constitution imposed on Erythrae perhaps in 453 a man might serve once in four years (HMA 26, 12) - but pace Kahrstedt (U.M.A., 135 - 6) this need have no implications for practice in contemporary Athens.

21. Gomme, Population of Athens, 26, and Ehrenberg, The Greek State, 33, have estimated the numbers of adult male citizens as follows (Gomme's figures do not include men over 60):-

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Gomme</th>
<th>Ehrenberg</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C. 480</td>
<td>35,000</td>
<td>25,000 - 30,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. 432</td>
<td>43,000</td>
<td>35,000 - 45,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. 400</td>
<td>22,000</td>
<td>20,000 - 25,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. 360</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>28,000 - 30,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>323</td>
<td>28,000</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>313</td>
<td>21,000</td>
<td>21,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

21A. So Larsen, Representative Government, 10 - 11.
Notes to I) - 244 -

22. Ar. Eq. 774 - 6.

23. Stated as a fact by Wilamowitz, Aristoteles und Athen, I. 129 n.11.

24. Ar. Ach. 379 - 81: it is not certain that Cleon did this as a bouleutes.


26. In 421/0: IG1\(^2\) 84, 5 with 44.

27. Plat. Com., frs. 166 - 7 (Kock).


29. D. XIX F.L. 154, 234, A.II. F.L. 17, &c.,cf. S. Periman, Athen. \(^2\) XLI 1963, 343. It has been supposed on the basis of A.III Ctes. 160, Pl. Dem. 22.1 that he served again in 337/6, but Kahrstedt (U.M.A., 136 n. 3) has shown that the evidence is far from compelling.

30. SEG XIX 149, 144; cf. the original publication by S. Charitonides, Hesp. XXX 1961. I am not convinced by the arguments of J.A.O. Larsen, CP LVII 1962, for an earlier date.

31. IG ii\(^2\) 1672, 302 (cf. Ch. II, p. 64 with n. 96, and n. 155 to Ch. III).

32. Schol. A. III. Ctes. 4.
33. J. Sundwall, *Epigraphische Beiträge*, Ch. i.
35. A.P. 62. ii. G. T. Griffith, in *Ancient Society and Institutions*, 123, notes that the bias towards the rich must have been considerable before the introduction of pay for members.

36. In the accounts of the Eleusinian epistatae for 329/8 unskilled labourers are paid $1\frac{1}{2}$ drachmae a day, skilled 2 or $2\frac{1}{2}$ drachmae (IG ii 1672, cf. Jones, 143 - 4 n. 86); in the Erechtheum accounts of 409 - 7 unskilled workers received 3 obols and skilled 1 drachma (IG i 2 373 - 4, cf. Gomme, *Hist. Comm. Thuc.*, II. 45).

37. Most of the bouleutae of 405/4 were sufficiently congenial to the Thirty to be reappointed for 404/3 (Lys. XIII. Ag. 20), but what happened in the last years of the Peloponnesian War when the fleet was absent from Athens cannot be regarded as typical.

38. [D]. XLVII Ev. & Mnes. 21.
39. D. XIV. Symm. 16.
41. On all these bouleutae, see Charitonides' notes in *Hesp.* XXX 1961. I have also consulted J. K. Davies, *Athenian Propertyed Families*, and bracket here and in n. 42 the three bouleutae whom he does not include in his Register. Trierarchs under Periander's law: Callias (113), Philocrates (281) (discharges a trierarchic debt for some one else, IG ii 2 1622, 247). Trierarchs under Demosthenes' law: Anytus (3), [Pythodorus(76)], Demades (144) (σὺντιθέτης).
42. Related to trierarchs under Periander's law: [Pythiades (14)],
    [Leontius (36)].
    Related to trierarchs under Demosthenes' law: Athemion (7),
    Cleon (74), Timotheus (289), Autoclines (307).
43. Homophron (9), Pythiades (14), Blepes (33), Blepsias (140),
    Midocrates (164), Damias (230), Eubiodemus (232), Onesion (256),
    Dipolis (260), Epagrus (274), Ergomeles (275), Euchirides (295),
    Calliphemus (315).
44. Note that Pythiades (19) may come from a trierarchic family.
45. T. VIII. 69. iv, A.P. 32. i.
46. T. VIII. 67. iii.
47. A.P. 31. i. I imagine that A.P. 31 is a regularisation of the
    Four Hundred's position for future use; A.P. 30 is a promise
    made to appease those who were unhappy about the extreme oli-
    garchy, a promise which few of the oligarchs intended to keep
    (i.e. an authentic document published by the Four Hundred but
    not a genuine statement of intent).
48. T. VIII. 86. vi.
49. Hignett, 372 cf. 378, on And. I. Myst. 95. Cf. G. E. M. de
50. And. I. Myst. 96 - 8, with GHI 83; cf. B. D. Meritt, Athenian
50A. Who appointed congenial men as bouleutae: cf. X.H. II. iii.
    2, 11 (quoted p.2) , and Lys. XIII. Ag. 20.
52. IG ii 2 514, 5 - 6, 678, 11.
53. A.P. 22. v.

54. We can safely argue (with Larsen, Representative Government, 9) from this clause in the decree for Erythrae, HMA 26, 8-9. G. T. Griffith, Ancient Society & Institutions, 123, regards appointment by lot as Cleisthenic.


57. For the few exceptions to this rule cf. p. 11 and n. 66-7, below.


59. The evidence for deme-representation is set out in detail in Table A. Some texts, mostly of the Hellenistic period, still await publication.

59A. There are noticeable differences between these and our fifth-century list.

60. So Larsen, Representative Government, 8.

61. Π 1 used to be dated 327/6, with the famine from which Athens suffered invoked to explain the non-representation of some small demes. Traill's dating after 307/6 (Hesp. XXXV 1966, 231) lessens but does not eliminate the abnormality of this list. See Table A.

62. Here it seems that demotics were inscribed on a pattern that would leave room for 50 members, and the names of some but not all of the prytanes were added under their demes. Raubitschek writes (D.A.A., p. 190):-
Notes to I) - 248 -

It must have been an intentional act on the part of these prytaneis whose names are omitted, to cancel their participation in the common dedication; but the mystery remains.

63. Under Κοινωνία we have one member and three vacancies.

64. So Schoeffer, R.E, V, Cols. 9, 28, s.v. οἰκονομος.


66. In the following lists members are given their demotics but are not grouped by demes (all dates here and in n. 67 are A.D.):-

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demotics</th>
<th>IG ii</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Demotics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PANDIONIS</td>
<td>1826</td>
<td>222/3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OENEIS</td>
<td>1803</td>
<td>215 - 20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIPPOCHONTIS</td>
<td>1808</td>
<td>170 - 6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1819</td>
<td>c. 200</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PTOLEMAIS</td>
<td>Hesp. XI 25</td>
<td>180 - 92</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

67. In the following lists members are not given their demotics:--

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demotics</th>
<th>IG ii</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ANTIOCHIS</td>
<td>1817</td>
<td>c. 220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATTALIS</td>
<td>1824</td>
<td>221/2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1825</td>
<td>222/3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1827</td>
<td>223/4?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1828</td>
<td>224/5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HADRIANIS</td>
<td>1832</td>
<td>231/2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

68. For ὄνομακροτάτη conducted by the boule, cf. Ch. IV, pp. 179-77. Notice in particular the questions asked at the archons' ὄνομακροτάτη, p. 184.

69. Notice the arguments employed in Lys. XVI. Mant. (N.B. § 9), XXXI. Phil.

70. For the content of the oath at different times see the appendix to Ch. IV, pp. 201-11.

71. T. VIII. 70. i; Cf. also D.XIX. F.L. 190, XXI. Mid. 114.
Notes to I)  - 249 -


73. Ar. Ay. 794 with schol., Hes. βουλευτικὸν , Suid. βουλευτικὸς, Poll. IV. 122 (this last passage is oddly explained by W. A. McDonald, Political Meeting-Places of the Greeks, 147). For tokens which could have been used in this connection see M. Crosby, Tokens, 79 - 80, 112 - 3.


75. Lyc. Leocr. 37.

76. T. VIII. 69. iv.

77. Presumably this was payment for attendance, not an automatic daily grant.

78. A.P. 62. ii.

79. Foucart's restoration (RPh^2 XLII 1918) of a corrupt passage in A.P. 62. ii has won little favour, and does not seem very likely (cf. p. 22 ).

80. A.P. 41. iii with Ar. Eccl. 184 sqq., &c.

81. A.P. 61. ii with Ar. Eq. 797 - 800, &c. The view that Cleon had raised the fee from 2 obols rests on the emphasis given by Aristophanes to the τριῶβολον and an emended version of school. Ar. Vesp. 88.

83. It is assumed that this is why jury pay was taken to be symbolic of the ΕΠΙΜΕΤΕΧΕΩΝ ΚΟΛΛΗΣ, as in A.P. 27. iii - iv.

84. Cf. S. Dow, *Hesp. Supp.* I 1937, 14 - 15, on the treasurer of the prytanes. There might be other liabilities too: the second century A.D. regulations of the Iobacchi make membership of the boule one of many offices for which, if he was appointed to it, a member of the guild was required to offer a worthy ΟΧΟΝΩΜΗ (IG ii² 1368, 131).

We learn from Cassius Dio (LXIX. 16. ii) that under a law of Hadrian bouleutae were forbidden to engage in tax-farming.


86. Cf. IG ii² 3597.


89. E.g. IG ii² 1817.


91. IG ii² 956, 14, with commentary; 957, 9; 958, 12; 959, 11.

91A. Towards the end of 343/2 the boule honoured its best speaker and invited the demos to join in the honours (IG ii² 223 A); in 290/89 the demos crowned the three best bouleutae of the year (IG ii² 2797); and about the same time the boule was honoured by one of its members (SEG XXI 360).
92. A. III. Ctes. 20, cf. And. II. Red. 19. In addition to this corporate responsibility of the boule, individual members could be attacked within a year in the γραφαὶ παρανόμων and νόμον μη ἐξητηνιότον θεῖναι for measures which they had proposed, even if their proposals were adopted by the boule and demos ([D]. LIX. Nearer. 4 - 5, &c., cf. Ch. II, pp. 62); and πρυτάνες ορ προεριδι, who had put an illegal or inexpedient motion to the vote could be prosecuted for that (cf. pp. 21, 24).

93. It was laid down in particular that the boule was not entitled to this δῶρα except it had built new triremes as required (A.P. 46. i: for the shipbuilding requirement cf. Ch. III, pp. 115 - 7).

94. This is the natural inference from A.I. Tim. 111 - 2, D. XXII. Andr. 36, 38 - 9.


96. IG ii 223 B, 13 - 14.

97. E.g. IG ii 672, 13 - 15; D. XXIII. Arist. 23, 89.

98. D. XXII. Andr. 38. For the date see above, n. 28.

99. Ibid. 8.

100. IG ii 223B, 5 - 6, 7 - 8.

101. Cf. IG ii 223A, 1 - 3 - but this may be another reference to the crown awarded for the Dionysia.

102. A. III. Ctes. 9 - 12.

103. The index in IG ii 4vi, p. 51 i, s.vv. ἐδώδυνας ἐδώδυναι, lists IG ii 223A, 13; B, 13; C, 13 (343/2); 330, 42 (336/5); 338, 18 (333/2); 410, 22 (c. 330); 415, 27 (c. 330/29); 354, 21 (328/7); and I can add Ἀρχ., Eq. 1917. pp. 40 - 8, no. 92,
33 - 5 (328/7). There is a fifth-century example in IG i² 46, 19, but here it appears that officials concerned with the foundation of a colony were not to sail there until they had passed their euthynae in Athens.

104. IG ii² 672, 35 (280/79); 780, 20 (252/1). Hellenistic prytanes were regularly honoured while still bouleutae and even, if theirs was the last prytany of the year, while still prytanes (cf. S. Dow, Hesp. Supp. I 1937, 7 - 8).

105. A.P. 46.1.

106. A.P. 43.11, cf. lexica and scholia s.v. In the earliest passages cited by LSJ a ΧΡΥΣΑΝΤΩΣ seems to be a "ruler" or "chief".

107. On the Tholos and neighbouring buildings in general see pp. 36 - 4, and on the date of the Tholos and its possible implications see pp. 17 - 18.

The Tholos and its immediate surroundings are probably to be identified with the ΧΡΥΣΑΝΤΩΣ, where decrees honouring prytanes were regularly published in the third and second centuries (cf. E. Vanderpool, Hesp. IV 1935, R. E. Wycherley, Testimonia, p. 184). It should not be confused - as it frequently was by lexicographers and scholiasts - with the ΧΡΥΣΑΝΤΩΣ, or town hall, where those whom the city wished to honour were entertained (cf. D. Levi, ASAA VI - VII 1923 - 4, S. Dow, Hesp. Supp. I 1937, 22 - 4, Wycherley, Testimonia, p. 166): it will be seen from pp. 16 - 17 that I am not prepared to accept Mr MacDowell's compromise suggestion that the prytaneum was the original headquarters of the prytanes (commentary on And. I. Myst., p. 69).


108A. G. T. Griffith, Ancient Society & Institutions, 123, mentions the absence of early evidence for the epistates of the prytanes, but nevertheless thinks that the office, with at any rate the duty of presiding in the boule, was created by Cleisthenes.
Notes to I) - 253 -


110. Hermes LXXXIX 1961. Even if the document goes back to an authen­
tic text of Miltiades, such details as the tribe in prytany could
have been invented by a later editor in the interests of supposed

111. IG i² 4, 21 - 5.

112. E.G.H., 180 - 200, on GHI 32. I explain my reasons for doubt in
n. 387 to Ch. IV. If this inscription can be dated c. 450 the
earliest epigraphic reference to prytanes may be HMA 21 (c. 457?).
Another possible piece of evidence for prytanes before 462 is
the "Xanthippus Ostracon" as interpreted by A. Wilhelm, Anz. Wien
LXXXVI 1949, but his explanation seems a little too ingenious to
be credible. For other attempts to solve this problem see A. E.
Raubitschek, O. Broneer, E. Schweigert, A²JA LI 1947, LII 1948,
LIII 1949. My disbelief in pre-Ephialtic prytanes is not much
weakened by Plat., Gorg. 516 D - E, or by Teleclides' comedy,
Πουξάνειος (Ath. XII. 553 E).

113. IG i² 3, 16 - 17; 4, 26 - 7.


115. IG i² 4, 17 sqq.

IV Alc. 7.


118. Cf. A.P. 43. v.


Professor Thompson now dates the Old Bouleuterium rather later:
cf. n. 215A, below.
Notes to I) - 254 -


120. Hesp. Supp. IV 1940, 43.

121. I have been helped in this matter by correspondence with Professor E. Vanderpool. He reminds me that the earlier buildings seem better suited than the Tholos to the needs of the prytanes - which remains a problem regardless of when prytanes were instituted and when the Tholos was built.

122. On the pre-Ephialtic boule see the appendix to Chapter IV, pp. 207 sqq., and on the problem in general cf. Chapter V, pp. 222-3.

123. A.P. 49. ii. For an allotment-machine which could have been used for this purpose, see Professor Dow's αἰτητήτητον

124. See W. S. Ferguson, Athenian Secretaries, 19 - 27. The decisive phrase is

τοῦτος προστάτης οὗ ἐν τυχαίωσιν προτανεύσοντες
μετὰ τῆς ἐν οἰκήματι φυλήν.
(IG ii 2 553, 16 - 17).

125. Kahrstedt (Klio XXXIII 1940, 9 - 10) maintained that the system was introduced at the time of the Peloponnesian War in place of a single sortition which had been used to determine the order for the whole year: but IG i 2 166 is no longer restored with the text on which he relied (cf. SEG X 96), and all the fifth-century evidence we possess now seems compatible with the practice of separate sortitions (cf. B. D. Meritt, AJP LXIX 1948, 69 - 70).

126. The latest inscription I know which betrays ignorance of the next tribe in prytany is IG ii 2 654, 50 - 3 (287/6) (there is no positive evidence that any of the régimes under which Athens passed c.300 used a different system). The order of
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Prytanies in different years continued to vary as long as we have any evidence, and it may be assumed that the lot continued to be used (D. J. Geagan, Hesp. Supp. XII, 1967, 96).


128. A.P. 43. iii - vi, 44. iv, cf. 45. iv, D. XXI. Mid. 8 - 9. In citizenship grants under some fourth-century and third-century régimes the prytanes were ordered to

\[ \deltaοῦναι περὶ τοῦ δεξιοῦ τὴν ψηφον έν τῇ πρώτη εκκλησίᾳ. \]

(presumably to order and organise the meeting, as the proedri now presided): references given at IG ii 2 IVi, p. 61, s.v.

\[ \piρυτάνειες. \] Cf. also HMA 46, 35 - 7, 40 (where I would read \( πο[ταθεν]; \) ); 87, 26 - 31, 33 - 8.

129. L.S. 296 - 8, Phot. Πρόεδρυτα.

130. Our best evidence for advance publication of agenda is in connection with \( \nuομοδεσία \) (D. XXIV Tim. 23, cf. 18, XX. Lept. 94), but in a system where for example \( \iotaκτηριαλ \) were permitted at one ecclesia in each prytany (A.P. 43. vi) there must surely have been some notice of what matters were to come up on which occasions. The last sentence of A.P. 43. iii might be read as evidence that the boule received advance notice of matters to be discussed, and in the law for rebuilding the walls usually dated to 337/6 the boule is to be given the opportunity to study in advance the \( \συγγραφάζει \) on which it will have to vote (IG ii 2 244, 6 - 9).

131. References in IG i 2, p. 369. ii - iii, s.v. πρύτανις, IG ii 2 IVi, p. 60. ii (paragraphs 6 - 7) s.vv. πρυτάνεια κτλ.

132. D. XVIII. Cor. 169 - 70. \( \άνεκπετάνυναι \) is Girard's conjecture, cf. schol. Ar. Ach. 22; the MSS read \( \ενεκπίμπγον. \)

134. P 23 (235/4) to Hesp. XVII 12 (95/4).


136. E.g. Ar. Ach. 167–73, X. H. I. vii. 14–15. Before the creation of the prytanes I imagine that presidency of the ecclesia and probably of the boule also rested with the archon, or with the college of archons (cf. Hignett, 150–1); and I do not see why this practice should not have lasted until the reforms of Ephialtes.

137. Cf. p. 32.

138. For the ecclesia see Ar. Ach. 23–6, cf. 40–2, Eccl. 86–7.

139. E.g. Ar. Ach. 54 with schoi. (ecclesia), Eq. 665 (boule).

140. Ar. Ach. 169–73; cf. Eq. 674.

141. HMA 46, 35–7.

142. Ar. Eq. 300–2. In Lucian, D. Meretr. 15. ii, a foreigner who has committed a drunken assault is to be denounced to the prytanes - but it is not clear what powers the prytanes are here thought to possess or how closely Lucian is following Athenian procedure in any period. See J. Delz, Lukians Kenntnis der athenischen Antiquitaten, 150, D. J. Geagan, Hesp. Supp. XII 1967, 103.

143. Pl. Per. 32. iii: for the date see F. J. Frost, JHS LXXXIV 1964.

144. HMA 87, 51–4. There is a more unusual appearance of a prytanis in the judicial sphere in Hesp. V 10, 116–7, cf. 12–13, where courts confiscating property are attended by κυρωτῆς παρὶ πρυτάνεων; Meritt (comm. on 12–13) would make a similar restoration in IG ii² 1678, aA 27.
145. GHI 51A, 7 – 13. Cf. GHI 88, 33 – 8, where the prytanes are to supervise the deletion of certain records.

146. SEG X 96. I am not happy about the restoration: 1. 5 seems to entail an unfortunate situation in which the new prytany's colarettae will be liable to punishment if they do not deal promptly with a payment left to them by the slackness of their predecessors, who themselves will escape punishment; and there is no good parallel to the punitive power ascribed to the prytanes in ll. 7 – 8.


150. The prytanes are to be fined if they fail to set in motion the machinery for the reassessment of the Delian League at the time of the Great Panathenaea (HMA 87, 26 – 31), and Thudippus' decree itself seems to have been enacted under a similar sanction (ibid. 33 – 8; cf. Additional Note B, pp. 420–2); cf. HMA 46, 35 – 7. The document in Demosthenes' speech against Timocrates which outlines the procedure for an annual ἐπιχειροτονία τῶν νόμων states that both prytanes and proedri may be prosecuted (by ἐνδοξίζεις to the themothetae) if they prevent the lawful appointment of nomothetae (D. XXIV. Tim. 22).


152. IG ii2 1142 (beg, C4).

153. IG ii2 1742, 2 (370/69?).

154. IG ii2 1743, 1. In Hesp. XVI 41 we find dedications by prytanies of 362/1, 361/0, 370/69 and 363/2, but we are not told what occasioned them; the preamble to Hesp. XXXVI 34 (381/0) seems not to have named the awarding body; in DAA 167 (408/7) Raubitschek restores a formula similar to that in IG ii2 1743.
155. In 164/3 the prytanes of Erechtheis (SEG XVI 96), Ptolemais (SEG XVI 95) were honoured.
156. E.g. IG ii² 1749, 1750.
157. Prytany "first" decrees, passim.
158. Prytany "second" decrees, passim.
159. A.P. 44. i, cf. lexica and scholia. Under the Roman Empire one man seems to have served as ἐξόπλωττης for the whole prytany: P. Graindor, Athènes de Tibère à Trajan, 68 n. 2, Geagan, Hesp. Supp. XII 1967, 102 - 3.
160. Until the proedri were created to preside in the boule and ecclesia it will not have been possible for them to remain in the Tholos for the whole 24 hours - but doubtless it was only intended that they should be available there when not otherwise occupied with public business.
161. IG ii² 204, 39 - 40. In A.D. 38/9(?) the public seal is used by the herald of the Areopagus (IG iv² 83, 17 - 19).
165. U.M.A., 38 with n.3., cf. D. M. Lewis, Hist. XII 1963, 35 with n. 122. The idea that lists of prytanes were regularly organised by trittyes goes back to R. Loeper, AM XVII 1892.
166. The table is based on the pre - 307/6 figures in Table A. Some attributions of demes to trittyes are uncertain, and figures for some demes change during the century, but this summary must be somewhere near the truth. Compare the table in C. W. J. Eliot, Coastal Demes of Attika, 143, whose grading my figures do not wholly support.
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167. Hist. XV 1966. For an unfavourable reaction to this article, stressing the exceptions which have to be allowed, see C. W. J. Eliot, Phoen. XXI 1967.

168. For a detailed presentation of the evidence, see Table B.

168A. IG ii² 1748 (Pandionis, 348/7) was avowedly organised by trittyes of some kind, but the arrangement which this entailed has not survived.

169. It does not clash with what little information we have from other inscriptions of Cecropis, but I fear this is accidental.

170. A.P. 44. ii - iii, Poll. VIII. 96, Eust. Od. XVI. 455, Harp, Suid. ἕπιστάται, L.S. 244. 31, 290.8, cf. A.I. Tim. 104, II. F.L. 84. The number of tribes determined the number of proedri, so that in the twelve-tribe periods, for example, there were eleven proedri (e.g. IG ii² 502, 5 sqq.). The ban on repeated service as epistates seems ultimately to have broken down: Stratophon was twice epistates of the proedri in 106/5 (IG ii² 1011, 63 sqq., 73 sqq.).

171. S. B. Smith, CP XXV 1930, 267.


173. Schol. A. III. Ctes. 3, 4, D. XXII. Andr. hyp. ii. 7 (which adds an annual five-day interregnum), E.M. ἕπιστάται.


175. REG XXXIV 1921.


177. GHI 97, IG ii² 2, Hesp. X 78.

178. GHI 123, 124.
179. GHI 124, 6.

180. Lys. XIII. Ag. 37.


182. Schol. Ar. Eccl. 87. Dr. Lewis says he is inclined to discount these passages, as the prytanes would still need to be well placed at meetings (cf. e.g. D. XVIII. Cor. 169): his caution may be justified with regard to the passage from Aristophanes, but the Thirty, before whose régime the proedri had certainly not come into existence, must surely have occupied the presiden­ tial benches.

183. Cloché delivered a powerful blow against the view that the boule was thought to be growing too powerful (REG XXXIV 1921), but the idea has persisted (e.g. S. B. Smith, CP XXV 1930, and cf. A. Andrewes, Ancient Society & Institutions, 13 - 14). Avoidance of that continuity and access to the best information which we should regard as essential seems almost wilful, but I am reluctant to believe in an attack on the boule when in a fairly well documented period there are no traces of controversy on the matter. Compare my remarks in Ch. V, pp. 231, with notes referring to my discussions of related problems.

184. For what little is known about discipline after the institution of the proedri, see Ch. IV, pp. 144 - 50.

185. Cf. the νόμος in D. XXIV. Tim. 50.

186. A.P. 59. ii.

187. A. III. Ctes. 3.

188. Hyp. II. Phil., esp. 4 - 6.

189. IG ii2 204, 31 - 9.

190. Ibid., 65 - 70.
191. It is scarcely more likely that the poletae should have performed these duties: cf. Ch. III, pp. 97 - 9 (on the poletae in general), 125 - 6.

192. (For νομοθετικά and νόμοι cf. Ch. II, pp. 49 - 52, and Table G.) Cf. SEG XII 87 and (restored) IG ii² 333; also the νόμος in D. XXIV Tim. 71.

193. IG ii² 222, 41 - 6; 330, 18 sqq; vii 4254 = SIG³ 298, 35 - 41.


195. IG ii² 222, 48 - 52.

196. T. VIII. 67. iii.

197. T. VIII 70. i: retention of the lot by an oligarchic boule is a little surprising.

198. IG ii² 12 = IG i² p. 297, 4 - 8: cf. G. E. M. de Ste Croix, Hist. V. 1956, 17 - 19. Dr D. M. Lewis has noted (Hist. V 1956, 18 n. 85a) that if reference to a prytany is wanted 11. 1 - 2 might be restored:

    [ —— 8 —— ] ΗΝ [ —— 14—— έδοξεν ]

    [τῆι βολῆι, ἢν τεῖταρτη τῆς πρυτανείας].

Ferguson, Mélanges Glotz, 354, linked the restoration of π[ρῷδερευον] with A.P. 30; but even if that chapter reflects an actual constitution, which I do not believe, the title πρὸδερος does not appear there or elsewhere in the A.P.'s account of the year 411.

199. Kahrstedt, Klio XXXIII 1940, 12, therefore preferred to restore π[ρυτάνες] λόγον. Notice also A.P. 29. iv, where we are told that salaries were abolished for all but the nine archons and τῶν πρυτάνεων εἰλαν άσιν.

201. Cf. n. 47, above.

202. Cf. p. 6

203. [Pl]. X.Or. 833D - 834 B: I quote from 833E (εὖοςες and Παλληνιςδς are emendations, but are certain). See on this prescript de Ste Croix, Hist. V 1956, 16 - 17.

204. The secretary and epistates belonged to the same tribe, which was not possible before the fourth-century changes in presidency and secretaryship (cf. Ch. III, p. 117); and a count of days within the prytany was not used in the prescripts of decrees under the democracy until the 360's (cf. Additional Note A, p. 41). Failure to specify the prytany by name or number may well be due to careless transmission of the text.

205. X. H. II. iii. 2.

206. X. H. II. iii. 11.

207. Cf. the trials of Theramenes (X. H. II. iii. 23 - 56, esp. 50) and of Agoratus' victims (Lys. XIII. Ag. 37: see p. 26 and n. 182, above).

208. A.P. 43. iii, Lucian, Pseudol. 12. I would agree with D. W. Bradeen (TAPA LXXXVI 1955, 27) that in the immediately post-Cleisthenic period meetings were probably less frequent.

209. Schol. Ar. Vesp. 663. The Athenians had more festivals than other cities; cf. 0. O. iii. 2, 8, T. II. 38 i, [Plat]. Alc. ii. 148E.

210. Pl. Alc. 34. i.
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211. Ar. Thesm. 79 - 81.


213. Ath. IV. 171E.

214. Cf. p. 13 and n. 91, above.

215. Texts concerning the bouleuterium are collected by R. E. Wycherley, Testimonia, pp. 128 - 37; concerning the Metroum, ibid. 150 - 60; concerning the Tholos, ibid. 179 - 84. For excavation reports see on the bouleuteria and Metroum H. A. Thompson, Hesp. VI 1937, 115 - 224; on the Tholos and on the whole complex of buildings H. A. Thompson, Hesp. Supp. IV 1940; and for a recent summary see Agora Guide, pp. 45 - 50. The buildings under discussion are illustrated in my Plans A - F; on the sixth- and early fifth-century buildings see my remarks on pp. 171-1. I shall not give references for activities and their dates which can be found in the Chronological Index in Hesp. Supp. IV. 1940, 153 - 6.

215A. The statement made in the text has not yet been disowned in print, but I understand from Professor Wycherley that Thompson now believes that the Old Bouleuterium and Temple of the Mother were not built until after the Persian Wars: this will be justified in a forthcoming book on the Agora by Thompson and Wycherley.

216. The external measurements of the Old Bouleuterium (whole building) are 23.30 X 23.80 m.; the wall separating the vestibule from the chamber is centred 6.20 m. from the south wall, making the external measurements of the chamber 23.30 X slightly more than 17.60 m. (Hesp. 1937, 128 - 32).

The external measurements of the New Bouleuterium (chamber only) have been variously reported. The plan in Hesp. 1937,
plate viii (which I take as correct) gives us 21.40 X 16.90 m., but in the text (Hesp. 1937, 142) we are given 22.50 X 17.50 m. (which seem from the plan to be foundation measurements), and W. A. McDonald (Political Meeting-Places, 172) compromises on 22.50 X 16.90 m.

Thompson thought that the Old Bouleuterium "might have accommodated about 700 persons" (Hesp. 1937, 134, cf. McDonald, op. cit., 172), but I would modify his restoration (cf. pp. 324-34 with n. 227 and Plan E). On the excavators' allowance of \(\frac{1}{2}\) m. of bench per member my plan has comfortable room for 50 prytanes on the benches against the south wall, and about 490 places on the other benches - but some deduction must be made for aisles providing access to the seats. The maximum for the New Bouleuterium after wooden benches had given way to stone is calculated as "just over 500" with an allowance of \(\frac{1}{2}\) m. per member (Hesp. 1937, 160).

This compares with external measurements of about 22 3/4 X 16 3/4 m. for the chamber of the House of Commons (S. Rossiter [ed.], Blue Guide : London, plan on pp. 16 - 17), which at present has 630 members and seats for 602 (ibid., 18).

221. From c. 450 (HMA 34, 7 sqq.) to 342 ([D]. VII. Hal. 33) but not thereafter we find references to stelae ἐν τῷ βουλευτηρίῳ, while throughout the fourth century (And. I. Myst. 95 [400] to IG ii² 487, 19 - 20 [304/3]) stelae might be erected ἐμπροσθεν τοῦ βουλευτηρίου. In 353/2 a νόμος
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was to be published ἐμπροσθεὶς τοῦ ἴμπτροψου (IG ii² 140, 34 – 5); from 343 (D. XIX. F.L. 129) until the third century A.D. documents were kept ἐν τῷ ἶμπτροψῳ, but late in the fourth century A.D. Julian, V. 159 A – B, uses the past tense for this practice.

The area in front of the bouleuterium/Metroum is probably denoted also by the ἐμπροσθεὶς τοῦ συνεδρίου or πρὸς τῷ συνεδρίῳ found in three inscriptions of the third century B.C. (Hesp. VI 2A, 12; VII 18, 39 – 40; VII 19, 5); but Professor Wycherley in his note on συνεδρίου (Testimonia, 126 – 8) seems too willing to apply to a building uses of the word which probably refer to a meeting.

The area in front of the Old Bouleuterium could also be regarded (more loosely) as in front of the New Bouleuterium, but it seems likely that from about the 340's the Old Bouleuterium was becoming known as the Metroum.

222. SEG XII 87, 24 – 6.

223. Hesp. XXII 1953, 52. On this passage see also Meritt, Hesp. XXI 1952, 358, XXII 1953, 129, Wycherley, JHS LXXV 1955, 118 – 21, Testimonia, 127. Βολευτηρίου in this law must surely refer to the council-chamber of the Areopagus, and συνεδρίου to meetings of the Areopagus in its Βολευτηρίου or anywhere else.


225. Cf. Plans C and D.


227. Cf. W. A. McDonald, Political Meeting-Places of the Greeks, 131 – 8. I reproduce his plan of the New Bouleuterium (plate xviii) as Plan F, and suggest a similar reconstruction of the internal arrangements of the Old Bouleuterium in Plan E. (Until stone benches were installed it is assumed that the seats in the
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New Bouleuterium, as in the Old, were arranged to form three sides of a rectangle: Hesp. 1937, 134, 150.).

228. McDonald applies all the evidence to the New Bouleuterium: this is certainly wrong for some passages.

229. Ant. VI. Chor. 40.


231. From 410/09 each member had to sit in the seat allotted to him (Phil. 328 F 140): at that time prytanes certainly sat apart from the other members, and they apparently occupied special seats, perhaps front benches or, say, "right wing" benches later (cf. Din. II. Arist. 13). A location for the presidential benches is suggested at no. 4 in Plans E and F: McDonald failed to allow for the change in presidency. The seven νομοφύλακες instituted in the late fourth century sat with the proedri (Phil. 328 F 64b). (For a machine which could have been used for the allotment of seats see Dow's κληρωτήριον III, Hesp. Supp. I 1937, 204 - 5, 211 - 2.).

232. But contrast [D] XXV. Arist. i. 23, Harp. ἀπεοχοινισμένος. Perhaps there was an outer barrier at the entrance to the precinct and/or to the vestibule (of the Old Bouleuterium), and this too was called a κιγκκαλίς (cf. Hesp. 1937, 134, 213, McDonald, 172. The bases of two pairs of posts which may have supported such a κιγκκαλίς are marked K on Plan C, and there is a similar pair, not shown on the plan, due south of the west wall of the Old Bouleuterium).


234. Ibid., 674 - 5.

235. X. H. II. iii. 50.

236. Ibid., 52, cf. D.S. XIV. 4. vii, 5. iii, [P1]. X. Or. 836 F.
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237. X. H. II. iii. 55.

238. Poll. VIII. 17, cf. 124.

239. See Plans E and F: ὅρφακτοι, no. 3; κτνκλῖς, nos. 5 (E), 8 (F).

240. Ar. Eq. 665.

241. Cf. Plans B, C, E. The New Bouleuterium had nothing corresponding to this vestibule until a porch was added on the south side shortly before 275, but the force of Scythian archers was disbanded early in the fourth century (cf. Busolt & Swoboda, 979 - 80) and it is not known that their police duties at meetings of the boule passed to any other body (for the ecclesia, cf. Ch. IV, pp. 49-50).

242. And. I. Myst. 44.

243. And. II. Red. 15.

244. A. II. F.L. 45, Din. fr. 8 (Burtt) = 2XVIII. i. (Sauppe).

245. See Plans E and F: έστία, no. 1; βουα, no. 2.

246. Ant. VI. Chor. 45.


248. IG ii² 3543.

249. IG ii² 5054.

250. Hesp. XII 16 and 17 (Cl. B.C.)

251. IG ii² 1813, 16 (c. A.D. 200).

253. Schol. A.II. F.L. 45, s.vv. χεῖρ τὴν ἐφυγὼν κτλ.,
Bachmann, *Anecdota Graeca*, I. 181. 9; cf. McDonald, *Meeting-
Places*, 137 n. 51, D.M. MacDowell, commentary on And. I. Myst.
44.

254. McDonald, *Meeting-Places*, 141 - 7, discusses meeting-places
other than the bouleuterium.

l 11 sqq. (pp. 286 - 7, Dindorf).

256. And. I. Myst. 45.

257. GHI 51 A. 18 - 21.

258. X. H. VI iv. 20.

259. GHI 61, 53 - 4.

260. GHI 200, 247 sqq. We may wonder how formally such a meeting was
organised and how many members attended it.

261. Pl. Phoc. 32. iv. Athens had lost most of her ships in 322
(D.S. XVIII. 15. ix, Pl. Demetr. 11. iv, Marm. Par. 239 B 9).

262. P 44, 3.

263. IG ii² 783, 4.

Graindor, *Album d’Inscriptions Attiques d’Époque Impériale,
28*).

265. And. I. Myst. 111, cf. P 36, 30 - 1. (On IG ii² 794, 4, see
PééléCidis, REG LXIII 1950, 112 - 7).

266. IG ii² 1039, 3.


268. IG ii² 1043, 4 - 5.
269. IG ii 2 893, 5 - 7, restored by Meritt (AJP LXXVIII 1957) to read

\[ \text{[βου λή\]}

[καὶ ἐκκλησία ἐν τῷ θεσπρωτεύομεν ἐκ Παναθηναϊκοῦ σταδίου]

(later underlined read by Lolling but not by Meritt)

"this being an abbreviated form ... probably implying that
the deliberations had been begun with a meeting of the Council
in the Panathenaic stadion and concluded with a meeting of the
Assembly in the theater" (p. 397). I should like to see a more
secure parallel to this odd formula.

270. Poll. VIII. 86 (not in A.P.).

271. Pl. Per. 10. 1.


274. And. I. Myst. 36.

275. Ar. Vesp. 689 - 90.

276. Ar. Thesm. 277 - 8 and schol.

277. A. I. Tim. 23, cf. Ar. Ach. 44 and schol., Eccl. 128 and schol.,
Harp., Suid., Phot. χαθροτόν, Suid. χερστάρχος,
Poll. VIII. 104.


278. Din. II. Arist. 16, Lyc. Leocr. 31.

279. Din. II. Arist. 14.
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283. D. XVIII, Cor. 282, XXIII, Arist. 97, Din. I, Dem. 47.


287. From texts cited above, nn. 281 - 3.

288. Cf. Ar. Thesm. 347 - 51. There is a considerable overlap
with the specific strand of the νόμος εἴσαγγελτικὸς
(cf. IV, p. 169 - 70); and compare also the bouleutic oath
(appendix to Ch. IV, p. 206).


290. Compare the order in which items are listed for the third and
fourth assemblies of the prytany, in A.P. 43, vi; and also the
"future constitution" of 411 (A.P. 30, v). For the προχειροτονία
held before the ecclesia settled down to serious debate, cf.
n. 65 to Ch. II. There is no evidence for προχειροτονία
in the boule.

291. A. I. Tim. 23.

292. Pl. An Seni 784 C - D.

293. A. III, Ctes. 2. ισιγιορία in the ecclesia has recently
been discussed by Mr. G. T. Griffith (Ancient Society & Institutions
115 - 38) and Mr. A. G. Woodhead (Hist. XVI 1967). Mr. Griffith
would date the appearance of complete freedom of speech there
to the period immediately after 462 (p. 125), but Mr. Woodhead
has stressed that there must always have been freedom of speech
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294. Ar. Ach. 45, Thesm. 379, Eccl. 130; cf. D. XVIII. Cor. 170 (but if the longer formula was in use Demosthenes would no doubt have shortened it here for rhetorical effect).


297. Ibid. 10. I do not imagine that the right to address the assembly was even formally defined in terms of these property-classes.

298. Cf. e.g. L. Robert, BCH LVIII 1934, 513.

299. IG i2 59, 19; post-403/2 references collected IG ii2 IV1 under lemmata cited at p. 62.1 s.v. χρητον μετά τα τερ.  

300. IG ii2 772, 14 - 16.

301. IG ii2 1224 ab, 17 - 18. Wade-Gery and Meritt wrote of the arrangements for carrying of Thudippus' assessment decree (HMA 87, 33 - 8):-

It seems that on the second day the adjourned business came χρητον , not merely χρητον μετά τα τερ.  

(AJP LVII 1936, 387 - 8 n. 28.)

It would perhaps be fairer to say that if the matter could not be settled in one day the assembly would be adjourned, and business would naturally be resumed where it had been interrupted. For a short discussion of this passage, see
302. Lys. XXIV. Pens. Inv. 26. But voting was by show of hands in the ὅιοκμαστα of archons (A.P. 55. iv), and surely in that of bouleutae also.

303. [D]. XLVII. Ev. & Mnes. 42.

304. νόμος in A. I. Tim. 35.

305. A. I. Tim. 112.

306. Cf. Lys. XIII. Ag. 37.


308. GHI 61, 5 sqq; IG ii 88, 1 – 5; GHI 77A, 1 – 3; 114, 13 sqq; 166, 5 sqq; IG ii 674, 18 – 20. Compare the boule's vote on whether to fine Theophemus 500 drachmae or refer the case to a δικαστήριον for a heavier penalty [D]. XLVII. Ev. & Mnes. 42).

309. Cf. p. 12 and n. 74, above.


311. Plat. Legg. VI 758 B.


313. D. VIII. Chers. 4.

314. D. XIX F.L. 17 (the scholiast ad loc. thinks that the λόιώται were mingling with the members).

315. A. III. Ctes. 125. μεταστηθαμενος τοις λοιώται surely means "having the public removed" (cf. Budé and Loeb translations), but Professor Jones oddly translates it as "pushing aside the ordinary members" (Athenian Democracy, 120).
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316. Plat. Menex. 234 A - B.

317. Ar Eq. 625 sqq.

318. Cf. Plans E and F.

319. τῶν πάντων could certainly enter the chamber when a meeting was not in progress: cf. Ant. VI. Chor. 40.


322. Ibid. 42. v.

323. Cf. n. 185 to Ch. II.

324. Perhaps Ephorus misunderstood the use of ἄπειρος in T. I. 90. iv (so Gomme, Hist. Comm. Thuc., I. 258, after Pfister). The Piraeus story is dubious in the extreme, and our confidence in it is not increased by Cicero's application of part of the mechanism to a different story about Themistocles (Cic. Off. II. 49).

325. Ar. Eq. 647 - 50.

326. And. I. Myst. 11 - 12.

327. Ibid. 45.

328. D.S. XIII. 2. vi.

329. And. II. Red. 3, 19, 21.

330 Lys. XIII. Ag. 21.

331. H.O. 6. i - ii (Bartoletti).

332. D.II.01.ii. 6.

333. CQ 13 1963.
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336. Professor F. W. Mitchel wants to believe in a secret agreement with the Aetolians, negotiated on behalf of the boule (Phoen. XVIII 1964, 16 - 17), but see Mr de Ste Croix's article, cited n. 333 above.

On the implications of this for the internal arrangements of the bouleuterium, cf. p. 32 and n. 232, above.

338. Lys. XXXI. Phil. 31.


341. References IG i2. p. 369. i. s.v. πρὸσοδος, IG ii2 IVi, 59, ii. s.v. πρὸσοδος.

342. E.g. GHI 42, 12 - 14, D.XIX. F.L. 185. For two foreign representatives who did not get beyond the boule see H.IX. 5.ii, X.H. VI. ix. 20.


344. A.II. F.L. 16 - 17.

345. E.g. Athenian ambassadors, IG i2 40, 207; generals, IG ii2 108, GHI 143, IG ii2 187, 408, 414a cf. Hesp. IX 1940 340 - 1, IG ii2 735; religious functionaries, IG ii2 47, 330, 365, 403, 410, 661, 689, 775, 780, 783, 807, 839, 976, SEG XVIII 22, 26, XIX 124;
other officials, on their religious and other duties,
IG ii 491, 665, 668, 781, 929, 941, 949, 1011, 1039,
1042, 1043, SEG XIV 64, 65, pty any decrees passim (on
religious reports cf. Ch. III, p. 135 );
lουτρατ, GHI 108 (probably), IG ii 70, 243, 276
(probably a metic), 502 (a δημόσιος );
foreigners, GHI 122, 124, 126, 131, 133, 134, 135, 146,
147, 159, 167, 168, 175, 178.

346. E.g. GHI 168, cf. Lyc fr. 105 (Sauppe).


349. Pl. Nic. 5.i.

350. Pl. Per. 7. v, cf. Praec. Ger. Reip. 800 C (βασιλευ and
bouleuterium).

351. E.g. SEG X 53, 105, GHI 90, 173, 178, 181.

352. GHI 42, 3 - 4. In 11. 64 - 9 the boule is ordered to appoint
three of its members to join with Hierocles in sacrificing
for Euboea; and so that this can be done as soon as possible
the generals are to συνεπιμελοὺς and to pro-
vide the money.

353. SEG X 54, 10 - 11.

354. SEG X 80, 27 - 30.

355. T. IV. 118. xi - 119.ii.

Andrewes and D. M. Lewis, JHS LXXVII 1957.

357. GHI 68, 8 - 9.
358. T.V. 47. ix.

359. GHI 103, 10 - 12.

360. As in IG ii² 21, 11 - 13; GHI 122, 16 sqq.; 144, 38 sqq.

361. SEG X 86, 13.

362. GHI 61, 55 - 6.

363. T. IV. 118, xiv.


365. T. II. 59. iii.

366. Hist. Comm. Thuc., II. 76. I agree that regular meetings of the assembly are unlikely to have been suspended; but contrast de Ste Croix, Dover, Brunt, cited in n. 369, below.

367. Ibid., 167. The assumption that the prytanes were bound to be "little men" is unfortunate.

368. Pp. 246 - 7; he believed that the generals were ex officio members of the boule, but had no special powers beyond that.

369. For more recent discussions of this topic see Jones, 124 - 5, G. E. M. de Ste Croix, Hist. V 1956, 3 n. 12, K. J. Dover, JHS LXXX 1960, 74 - 5, P. A. Brunt, Phoen. XIX 1965, 265.

Hignett seems to have exaggerated the involvement of the generals with the boule: they did not attend the secret meeting which considered the Hermocopid scandal, and I have little confidence in the secret meeting which Diodorus makes them attend to decide what to do with Sicily when it has been conquered (cf. p. 40 and nn. 327 - 8, above).

370. SEG XII 26, 7 - 9.

371. SEG X 84, 32 - 4.

372. GHI 77A, 14 - 19.
373. Cf. Ch. II, pp. 54-5, 64, on προβοσκέλευτας.

374. HMA 68 (revised from SEG X 86), 47 sqq.

375. IG ii² 27, cf. Hesp. VIII 1939, 68.


376A. Three other texts illustrate the relations of the generals and the boule during the Peloponnesian War. In Thudippus' assessment decree the generals are to apply to the boule, directly rather than via a court unless the ecclesia decrees otherwise, if they want an extra collection from the allies (HMA 87, 44 - 50); in a naval decree of about 409/8 the generals are to apply to the boule if they need more oars (SEG X 131, 10 - 12); and about the same time we find the ecclesia ratifying an on-the-spot agreement made by the generals with Clazomenae (GHI 89). None of these texts suggests anything approaching ex officio membership of the boule.

377. Cf. n. 325, above: the last inscription cited there is of the third century, the others are of the fourth.


379. In that case he must have been inside the chamber (cf. pp. 39-40) - but it is unwise to rely too much on the background details of a story of this kind.

379A. On the στρατηγὸς ἐξ ἡλικίας see now D. J. Geagan, Hesp. Supp. XII 1967, 18 - 31; he discusses the general's relationship with the boule and ecclesia on pp. 27 - 9, cf. 92.

380. IG ii² 897, 4 - 6; 911, 6 - 7; 954, 2; cf. SEG XV 108, 50 - 4.
381. IG ii² 1039.

382. IG ii² 1072 (A.D. 136/7). In IG iv² 82 - 4 (A.D. 38/9?) the same man is author of the decree of the Areopagus and of the decree of the boule and demos, but there is no reason why he should not have been a bouleutes.


384. IG ii² 1078/9 (c. A.D. 220).

385. IG ii² 1077, 5 - 17 (A.D. 209/10).

386. Hesp. Supp. VI 31/2 with SEG XXI 506/5 (A.D. 229/30 or 230/1).

NOTES TO CHAPTER II


3. For a sensible discussion of the difference between νόμος and ψηφίσματα in Athens see U. Kahrstedt, Klio XXXI 1938, 1 - 19.

3A. The inclusion of περὶ νόμων θέσεως in the list of the boule’s interests in O.O. iii.2 will then refer to the part played by the boule in the making of decrees.

4. Lys. XXX. Nic., esp. 2 - 5.


7. The distinction is acknowledged but belittled in three decrees which authorise expenditure not provided for in the annual μετρίωσις and order the nomothetae to make the necessary change (IG ii 2 222, 41 - 6; 330, 15 - 23; vii 4254 = SIG 3 298, 35 - 41 [not 39 - 45]; in GHT 167, 39 - 44, no νόμος is needed, presumably because what is ordered is only a temporary adjustment. The theoric fund was regulated by a mixture of νόμος (D. III. Ol. iii. 10 - 11) and ψηφίσμα (D] XLIV. Leoch. 38); Apollodoros attempted to divert theoric monies to the stratiotic fund by ψηφίσμα ([D] LIX. Neaer. 4 - 5), and the change achieved by Demosthenes seems likely to have been by ψηφίσμα (Phil. 328 F 56a); Hegemon’s measure weakening the position of financial officials was a νόμος (A. III. Ctes. 25).

9. IG ii² 487.

10. SEG XV 108. The title νομοθέτης was borne by Tib. Claudius Novius in A.D. 61 (IG ii² 1990, 6) and by Annius Pythodorus from 118/9 to 124/5 or after (Inscr. de Délos, 2535 – 7), but we know nothing of their activities.

11. This is not the place for a full discussion of the subject, though one is badly needed. The only recent studies of nomothetic procedure are by U. Kahrstedt, Klio XXXI 1938, 1 - 19, and K. M. T. Atkinson, Bull. John Ryí. Lib. XXIII 1939 (briefly reviewed by A. W. Gomme, CR LIV 1940, 38); cf. A. R. W. Harrison, JHS LXXV 1955, 35.


13. D. XXIV Tim. 20 – 3, XX. Lept. 94, 137. A. III. Ctes. 38-9 seems to move rather awkwardly from a meeting of the ecclesia to appoint nomothetae, to the resulting meeting of the nomothetae to pass judgment on the laws.

14. Great as the difficulties are, I cannot believe in the complex procedure outlined by Mrs Atkinson, whereby a man who wanted to change the law had to undertake a χρηματί against the old law and persuade the ecclesia to adopt his proposal in a ψηφισμα, before the appointment of nomothetae was even discussed, and it is suggested that the decision of the nomothetae may have required ratification by the ecclesia. It seems reasonably clear that the assembly’s involvement was limited to deciding (by ψηφισμα) that νομοθεσία was needed and setting the machinery in motion.
15. For a list of surviving $\nu\omicron\omicron\omicron\times$ and their formulae see Table G: SEG XII 87 was enacted in the ninth prytany of 337/6. I have argued in Ch. I. (p. 29) that the proedri mentioned in connection with $\nu\omicron\omicron\omicron\times$ are proedri of the nomothetae, to be distinguished from those of the boule.

16. D.XXIV. Tim. 27. The documents quoted in this speech are in general acceptable, and this decree ought if possible to be explained rather than dismissed as a clumsy forgery. Nevertheless the difficulties are considerable: nomothetae exist on 11.1 (Hec.) and can be ordered to meet on the following day, but the appointment ought not to be made until a later assembly (these might perhaps be the nomothetae of the previous year, still in office).

17. A.III. Ctes. 40. The easiest inference from these two passages is that the prytanes on behalf of the ecclesia drew up a $\chi\rho\gamma\rho\mu\mu\mu\mu\alpha$ specifying the dates of the nomothetae's meetings and the topics to be discussed.


19. Another instance of the boule's combining with a heliastic panel is found in the trial of Cleophon, for which see the appendix to Ch. IV, p. 191.

20. Is. XII. Panath. 144.

21. D.XVIII. Cor. 120 - 1, A.III. Ctes. 32 sqq. Aeschines' argument, that there can be no contradiction as a procedure of $\delta\lambda\rho\theta\mu\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron$ exists to eliminate contradictions, is not wholly convincing.


27. G. Gilbert, pp. 295 - 6; cf. 293 - 4 n.4, citing exchanges between Gilbert and Hartel.


29. D. XXIV. *Tim.* 48, confusing (no doubt deliberately) the procedures for decree-making and νομοθέτησις.


31. [D] XXV. *Arist.* i, hyp. 1 - 2 (probably deriving its information from Lycurgus' lost speech).

32. D XVIII. Cor. 170 with 173.

33. H. IX 5. i - ii. There are no procedural indications in Herodotus' account of earlier negotiations (VIII. 140 - 4), and I am not disposed to place much faith in Plutarch's version of this story (*Arist.* 10. ii - vi). On the boule and the generals see Ch. I, pp. 43-8.

34. T. V. 45. i.

35. X. H. VI. iv. 20.

36. Cf. X. H. /i. 2, 11.

37. A. II. F. L. 16 - 17.

38. A. II. F. L. 45 - 6.

40. D. XVIII. Cor. 169 - 70.


42. Ibid. 43 - 5.

43. Ibid. 46 - 60: though no subject for debate has been mentioned, this attempt to raise a topic from the floor of the house is quickly ruled out of order.

44. Ibid. 61.

45. He can order silence (ibid. 59, 64), call for the archers (54), and on the prytanes' behalf dissolve the assembly (173).

46. Ibid. 124 - 5.

47. Ibid. 134.

48. Ibid. 173.

49. On debates περὶ φυλακῆς τῆς χώρας see Additional Note C, pp. 123-5).

50. A. Reusch, De Diebus Contionum Ordinarium apud Athenienses, predicted that the division of business between the second, third and fourth assemblies in Poll. VIII. 96 would not be found in the A.P.: it is interesting to note that this has only partly been borne out. Professor Jones argues (108 with n. 77) from a similar clause in the "future constitution" of 411 (A.P. 30. v) that the items for discussion at the third and fourth assemblies were picked by lot from those put forward; Wilamowitz thought that the selection was made by τροχιτροτονία (cf. n. 65, below).
51. For ἱκετηρίας at any rate Wilamowitz thought that each individual supplication had first to receive the boule's approval: Aristoteles und Athen, II. 252 - 3.


53. See pp. 72-3 and notes.

54. IG ii² 192.

55. GHI 74, 53 - 4, with commentary, p. 184.

56. P. Guillon, BCH LXXXVI 1962, 467 - 75, thinks he can find one.

57. Similarly, when the συγγραφεῖς of 411 made their report, the democratic constitution had not yet been upset: to minimise the obstacles to its being upset they πρῶτον μὲν ἔγραψαν ἐπανάγχες εἶναι τοὺς πρυτάνεις ἄκαντα τὰ λεγόμενα περὶ τῆς σωτηρίας ἐπικαταφέρξειν (A.P. 29. iv).

58. A.III. Ctes. 125. For other probouleumata obtained in this way see A.P. 29; (cf. p. 64 with n. 96, and p. 74 ), D.XXIII. Arist. 9, 14; cf. also n. 69, below.


60. T.VIII. 69 - 70.i. Further details would have been particularly welcome of the debates on the alliances offered by Corinth and Corecyra in 434/3, on the fate of Mytilene in 427 (when Cleon, author of the original decree, was probably a bouleutes - cf. Ch. I, p. 3 ) and on the institution of the προβουλεύω in 413. Professor Andrewes, noticing
Thucydides' silence on the Spartan gerousia, shows insufficient surprise at his near-silence on the Athenian boule (Ancient Society & Institutions, 4 - 5).


62. X.H. VI. iv. 20: another instance of the boule's refusal to act at II. ii. 15. G. T. Griffith, Ancient Society and Institutions, 129, believes that the boule's right to prevent action was restricted during the fifth century: I imagine that the right remained, but was exercised only when the boule was confident that public opinion was on its side.

J. A. O. Larsen, Representative Government, 16 - 17 with n. 38, thinks that such negative action was "not rare."

63. [D]. LIX. Neaer. 4.

64. Ibid. 5. The only ground of illegality which we know is that Apollodorus as a state debtor was temporarily ἐντιμος and so not entitled to sponsor decrees.

65. The procedure of προχειροτονία is first found in the fourth century. The clearest statement of what it involved is given by Harpocration and Suidas s.v. (Suidas omits the final sentence):

(εἰδεν Ἀθηναίοι τοιοῦτο τι γέγονεθαί, ὡστε τὴς βουλῆς προβουλευσάσης εἰσφέρεται εἰς τὸν ὕδημον ἧ γνώμη πρότερον γίνεται χειροτονία ἐν τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ ποτὲρον ὅσχει περὶ τῶν προβουλευσάντων σκέψασθαι τὸν ὕδημον, ὡς ἀρχεῖ τὸ προβουλεῦμα. ταῦτα δὲ ὑποσημαζόμενα ἐν τῇ ἄνω τοῦ πρὸς τὴν ἱερὸν γραφήν.

(Cf. A.P. 43. vi, where there is a clear lacuna, A.I. Tim. 23, D. XXIV. Tim. 11 - 12).
If, as seems to have occurred in the case of Euctemon, there was an open element in the probouleuma the προχειροτονία must have determined not whether the probouleuma should be accepted at once or discussed but whether the matter should be discussed or rejected outright. Wilamowitz, *Aristoteles und Athen*, II. 254 - 6, referred this particularly to the limitations in *A.P.* 43, vi, and thought that by προχειροτονία the ecclesia decided which of the items offered to it by the boule it would discuss, and in what order.

66. D.XXIV. Tim. 11 - 14.


For other possible open probouleumata in literary texts see A.II. F.L. 45 - 6 with 53, cf. III. Ctes. 66 - 7, D.XIX. F.L. 234; and also the debate on 16.xii. (Scir.) 347/6 (D.XIX. F.L. 17 - 18, 31 [denied A.II. F.L. 121 - 2], 35). In the latter case it is far from clear what happened: Mr Cawkwell believes that on learning that Philip was beyond Thermopylae the boule met again, suppressed the original probouleuma, and issued another more appropriate to the changed circumstances (PEG LXXV 1962, 458); but Demosthenes' ἐπειδὴ οὐδεὶς Την Βουλήν (§18) is perhaps a little weak for inclusion in the probouleuma, and it is possible that the probouleuma, though including a pro-Phocian motivation clause indicating what kind of action was envisaged, was open in that it did not contain
a definite proposal, and that such probouleumata did not need to be read out in full. (On this point we have only the evidence of parodies: in Ar. Thesm. 372 - 9 a short open probouleuma is read out, and cf. Eccl. 394 - 8; in Lucian, Deor. Conc. 1, the probouleuma is not read.).

For open probouleumata in inscribed decrees see Table F: the clearest instance is the first decree in GHI 189. Larfeld, Handbuch der griechischen Epigraphik, II.ii. 675 - 6, thought that open probouleumata were very rare and that most "non-probouleumatic" decrees were carried against a probouleuma. This assumption cannot be checked, but if it is correct and the criteria I shall use in this chapter for identifying non-probouleumatic decrees are sound the boule must have been "defeated" alarmingly often in the fifth and fourth centuries.

69. A. III. Ctes. 125 - 7 (Demosthenes' practice may have been sharp, but it can hardly have been illegal, or we should have heard much more about it). For other decrees which are or may be ratified probouleumata see D.XIX. F.L. 286, A.II. F.L. 16 - 17; perhaps A.II. F.L. 19; and perhaps D.S. XVII. 111. iii; many inscribed texts contain a clear indication that this procedure has been followed, in the probouleumatic formula (cf. p. 155 and Table C). The friends who sponsored decrees on Demosthenes' behalf after Chaeronea may well have been bouleutae: Pl. Dem. 21. iii gives a sensible compromise between D.XVIII. Cor. 248 and A.III. Ctes. 159, though in Din. I. Dem. 78 - 80 we have one post-Chaeronea decree γραφέντος πρὸ Δημοσθένους.

70. In Ar. Thesm. 431 - 2 the speaker, having outlined her proposal from the floor of the ecclesia (under an open probouleuma), promises to draft the final version with the help of the secretary. At the second assembly to discuss peace with
Philip, on 19. ix. (Elaph.) 347/6, Demosthenes had a ready-drafted motion with him in case Philocrates let him down (A.II. F.L. 67 – 8).

71. X.H. VII. i. 1 – 14. Mr Cawkwell has suggested (CQ² XIII 1963, 133) that we have another motion carried against a probouleuma in 344/3 – [D] VII. Hal. 19 – 20 – but though the motion was proposed from the floor of the house I am not satisfied that there was a specific probouleuma with which it conflicted.

72. D.XXI. Mid. 162 – 3. It has been suggested that news of Phocion's victory arrived while the assembly was in progress: Schaefer, Demosthenes und seine Zeit, II.82, Cawkwell, CQ² XII 1962, 128 – 9.

73. The final decision on new alliances was taken by the ecclesia, though we should perhaps conclude from the οὐ νῦν ρωτεμεν's declared willingness to abide by the decision of the ecclesia in 346 – A.II. F.L. 60 – that even at this late stage the allies could not be committed without their formal approval. In any case, they could still refuse the oath to a new member.

74. GHI 133, 8 – 13.

75. GHI 144, 12 – 16.

76. A.III. Ctes. 67 – 8.

77. A.II. F.L. 61, 65, cf. III.Ctes. 68. What I have identified as a probouleuma Aeschines calls a ψυχοβολεία. Dr D. M. Lewis believes that the assemblies for 18 and 19. ix were fixed by decree of the demos at the abortive assembly on 8. ix – BSA L 1955, 25 – 6 – but having been
thwarted once the Athenians will probably have waited until the envoys arrived before committing themselves again to a date, and I suspect that on their arrival Demosthenes was the author of a probouleuma appropriating for the discussion of the peace terms on assembly previously arranged for other business.

78. A. II. F.L. 60.

79. I should perhaps stress that there could be different degrees of openness in probouleumata: compare the probouleuma of Demosthenes which was not read out on 16.xii (Scir.) 347/6 (n. 68, above) and the open probouleuma at the assembly in the Thesmophoriazusae (ibid.), in each case indicating a line of action but not offering a definite suggestion.

80. A. II. F.L. 61.

81. Ibid. 65.

82 D.XIX. F.L. 159, A.II. F.L. 67 - 8, cf. 64. I cannot share Mr Cawkwell's view (REG LXXIII 1960, 434 - 5) that "the proposal of Philocrates was the Council's ἄρθρον θεωρεῖν..."

83. A III. Ctes. 69 - 70.


85. D.XIX. F.L. 159.


87. A.II. F.L. 82 - 4, cf. III. Ctes. 73 - 4.

88. [D]. XXV. Arist. 1, hyp. 1 - 2. Cf. p. 54
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89. D.XXII. Andr. 5 - 6, cf. hyp. i. 2, hyp. ii. 9.

90. See most recently D. Hereward, BSA XLVII 1952, esp. 111 - 3.


92. And. I. Myst. 17.

93. E.g. Lipsius, 36, 383, Glotz & Cohen, HG, II. 140.

94. D.XXIII. Arist. 92.

95. Schol. D.XXIII. Arist. 92.

96. Cf. A.III. Ctes. 125, where Demosthenes' guileless accomplice is ὁ γράφων; and almost certainly A.P. 29.i:

εἰκόνας τὸν μὲν κρότο τοῦ ψηφίσματος λόγον ἱλαρότου,  
τὴν δὲ γνώμην γράφαντος Πυθοδόρου

(on which see p. 74 ). I would conclude from IG ii² 1672, 302, that Lycurgus was a member of the boule in or before 329/8 (cf. Ch. I, p.3 with n. 31, and n. 155 to Ch. III).

97. There is no undoubted instance of this, but it is the most likely form of probouleuma when a decree is the work of συγγραφείς (commissioned by the demos at a previous assembly?) or follows a γνώμη στρατηγική (for the powers of the generals vis-à-vis the boule and ecclesia see Ch. I, pp. 43-8 ), or for the proposals envisaged by Lampon in his rider to GHI 74. Decrees of the demos with special origins are listed in Table E.

98. For an exhaustive analysis of the formulae in inscriptions known C.1900 (none has since been attempted) see Larfeld, Handbuch der griechischen Epigraphik, II.ii, esp. 601 - 81. In vol. I, 465 - 87, and in his Griechische Epigraphik³
Notes to II)  

(HdA, vol. I.v) he compares the formulae employed in different states. For a brief modern discussion see Klaffenbach, Griechische Epigraphik, 2 70 - 5.

99. Found occasionally from the late third to the early first century. (I repeat these abbreviations in the introductory note to Tables C - K, pp. 492-3).

100. Found frequently but not invariably from 336/5 onwards: IG ii 2 330 &c.

100A. BY and B could be misapplied to probouleumata ratified in the ecclesia: cf. n. 144, below.

101. SEG X 1 (C6), IG i 2 3, 4 (485/4).

102. SEG XVIII 153 (purporting to be of 480, but inscribed later), IG i 2 5 (c. 475 - 450? - D. M. Lewis per epistulam), GHI 32 (c. 469 - 450), HMA 21 (458?) &c. The only apparent exception is ἔτος given by all MSS of Thucydides for the one-year truce with the Peloponnesians in 422 - T.IV. 118. xi. SEG X 86, 47, restored [ἔτο] in the decree for an alliance with Perdiccas of Macedon, but the longer line of the latest text allows [ἔτιβκτ] : ATL, III. 313 n. 61 = HMA 66, cf. more cautious text at Svt 186.

103. Decree ap. And. I. Myst. 83 (403/2) GHI 114 (387/6), &c.

104. In IG ii 2 243 (337/6) a careless mason cut ἔτοκτο.

105. ἑψηφοθεῖα δὲ Ἀθηναίων τῷ δημιωτέρῳ in rider, GHI 97.1(403/2), cf. IG ii 2 19, 26: ἑψηφοθεῖα Ἀθηναίων, GHI 100 (403?); ψτὸ, IG ii 2 47, 23 sqq. ("beg. C4"): ἔτος, GHI 114 (387/6); &c.

106. GHI 133 (369/8) &c. And cf. n. 107, below.
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107. GHI 124 (378/7); cf. IG ii² 79, 82 ("before 378/7") &c.

108. Preserved in GHI 96 (405/4), IG iv² 84 (c. A.D. 40 - 2), ii² 1072 (A.D. 116/7); restored in IG ii² 895 (188/7) (unnecessarily; not in new text, SEG XXI 436), Kerameikos, III. A5 (c. 100), IG ii² 1040. i & ii (mid 40's). It is a common formula in other states, and if not standard it at any rate became common in Athens under the Roman Empire (cf. J. Delz, Lukians Kenntnis der attenischen Antiquitäten, 138, D. J. Geagan, Hesp. Supp. XII 1967, 66).

109. Three decrees require special notice:-

| GHI 100 | 403? | ετο; εγιναθεί Αδηναλος |
| IG ii² 672 | (E: [ετα]κτο;) |
| (E: [ετα]κτο;) | 280/79 | (στο;) |
| (stone ends) | IG ii² 839 | 221/0 | ετβ; PF |

110. For an analysis of ἔλαλον ἔανθον clauses see Table K.

111. Mr G. L. Cawkwell has suggested to me that IG ii² 360 comprises one commissioning of a probouleuma and four probouleumata ratified by the ecclesia. My analysis is, I believe, confirmed by the fact that we are told of only two acts on account of which Heraclides deserved to be honoured.

112. Cf. A. Billheimer, AJA² XLII 1938, 467 n. 3. Larfeld, Handbuch der griechischen Epigraphik, II. ii. 676 - 7, thought that amendment by reformulation was rare; but we cannot tell.

113. J. Tréheux has however suggested that this is the procedure underlying a Lampsacene document of c. 100 B.C. (SEG XIII 458) which he published in BCH LXXVII 1953, 426 - 43 (discussion of procedure, 438 - 40), and the arguments used against his interpretation by J. and L. Robert, REG LXVII 1954, 159 - 62, no. 209, have failed to convince Mr W. G. G. Forrest (Phoen. XXI 1967,
14 with n. 9). The inscription comprises two decrees: the first, with the formulae ἔτος; ἀργαλί, commissions a probouleuma and cites a law which permits the demos to do this; the second, with the formulae ἔτος; ἀργαλί, begins with a reference to the demos' having commissioned a probouleuma. It seems to me that the content of the decrees makes the procedure followed so clear that there is no need to resort to the prescript-formulae: the first decree is the measure by which the demos commissioned the probouleuma, and the second is the resulting probouleuma, which we may assume from its publication as the second and last decree of this document to have been ratified verbatim by the ecclesia. If this is correct the secretary will have been very careless in his adding of minute-headings and enactment-formulae - but such carelessness did happen. (My interpretation of this document is very close to that of the Roberts.)

114. GHI 154 (357/6), IG ii² 193 (before 353/2), 360. iii (330/29), Chron. Hell. Ath. 104 - 8 (204/3) - see Table D. Cf. G. Klaffenbach, Griechische Epigraphik, 2 74.

115. IG ii² 336 (334/3), 338. i (333/2), 552 (after 318/7), Hesp. Supp. VI 31/2. ii (A.D. 229/30 or 230/1) - see Table D.


117. GHI 193 also seems to have a preamble which has been over-condensed. It reads:

ἐδοξεν [τῇ βουλῇ]καὶ τῷ ὁμιλεί. ἔσοδος ἀνατευχήσεως ἐπί τῇ ἡμέρᾳ πρῶτον ἐπιθέσει τὰ ἐπὶ [τῆς —] ἐπὶ πρωτεῖα τῷ πρῶτῳ πρὸς ὁμίλους ἐστιν ἐν τῷ ἡμιλεί [πρὸς ὁμίλους ἐστιν] — stone ends].
Most of this is restored, but what is on the stone makes the restoration disturbingly likely: yet it should be the boule in its probouleumatic formula, not the ecclesia, which gives orders to the proedri in this way.

I offer this reconstruction exempli gratia:

\[\text{ἐπὶ ὧν ὁ δῆμος ἐψηφίσταται ἐκ τῆς — κρυπτανειάς}
\[<\text{τὴν} \text{βουλὴν} \text{προβουλεύοσαν} \text{ἐξενεγκεῖν} \text{ἐλ} \text{τὸν} \text{δῆμον} \text{ἐπὶ} \text{Ῥηξοῦλου} \text{ο} \text{τ} \text{ἢ} \text{ἂν} \text{ἄφθι} \text{δοκεῖ} \text{ὅριστον} \text{ἐν} \text{iω}, \text{ἐψηφίσοι} \text{τῇ} \text{βουλή} > \text{τοὺς} \text{προέδρους} \text{κτλ.} \]

118. Cf. Kahrstedt, U.M.A. 291 - 2 with 292 n. 1. He thought that in such cases the proposer offered his motion to the boule, which then accepted it as a probouleuma - but I believe that if the boule chose formally to adopt a proposal rather than to commend it to the demos in an open probouleuma a bouleutes should figure as the nominal proposer: cf. p. 69 with n. 96, and p.74.

119. Cf. GHI II, p. 128. The decrees are:

\[\begin{array}{ll}
\text{GHI 142} & 363/2 \quad \text{ἐτβκτδ}; \text{ωτδ}
\\
\text{IG ii² 118} & 361/0? \quad \text{[ἐτδ}; [ἐτδ]; [πε]ρ ὧν [ἀγγειαν κτλ.]}
\\
121 & 357/6 \quad \text{ἐτβκτδ}. \quad \text{ONLY}
\\
130 & 355/4 \quad \text{ἐτβκτδ}. \quad \text{ONLY}
\\
\end{array} \]

289 before 336/5 Ar. is the author of an RP.

Aristophon is notorious as the man who claimed to have been acquitted in 75 γραφαὶ καρανομον (A. III. Ctes. 194).

120. \[\begin{array}{ll}
\text{IG ii² 328} & 336/5 \quad \text{ἐτ[βκτδ]}; \text{pf}
\\
333 & 335/4 \quad \text{a religious υόμος}
\\
\text{GHI 189.iii} & 333/2 \quad \text{ἐτδ}; \text{ϑτδ} \quad \text{(in response to an open probouleuma)}
\\
\text{IG ii² 345} & 332/1 \quad \text{ἐτδ} \quad \text{ONLY}
\\
\end{array} \]
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IG ii² 351 330/29 et[δ]; òτò
1672, 302 in or before 329/8 a decree of the boule
452, revised Ath. Yr., 95-6 328/7 E ONLY (date accepted by Dow, Hesp. XXXII 1963, 438-50; rejected by Pritchett, Ancient Athenian Calendars on Stone, 281-3)
414a before 325/4 et[δ] ONLY

121. Demades' decrees have been collected by A. N. Ολυνομολόγης, Πλάτων VIII 1956, 109 sqq.: I give in my first column the numbers of the decrees in his list.

2. Hesp. IX 35 337/6 [etò] ONLY; refers to boule in 11, 12, 15, 16.
4. GHI 181 337/6 [δ]τò
5. IG ii² 241 337/6 δ[τ]ò
6. SEG XXI 274 334/3 E; è[tò] ONLY
8. IG ii² 346 332/1 etò ONLY
9. 405 334/3 E; è[tò] ò [ONLY (cf. Hesp. IX 1940, 340)]
10. 353 329/8 [etò] ONLY
11. 372 322/1 E; e[tò] ONLY (see n. 128, below)
12. 380 320/19 etò; òò
13. SEG XXI 306 320/19 E; [etòkòtò] is the latest restoration of both Dow and Meritt: Pritchett declines to restore. Correct text uncertain.
14. 305 320/19 E; etòkòtò ONLY

(16. IG ii² 400 now dated beg. C3 and ascribed to Demades the younger)

For the possibility that the ban on more than two years' service was lifted under the oligarchy cf. Ch. I, p. 2 with n. 19.

122. IG ii² 231 340/39 [etò] ONLY
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123. Cf. Kahrstedt, U.M.A., 292 n. 1. The decrees are:

\[
\begin{array}{ll}
\text{IG ii}^2 & 455 \quad 307/6 \quad [\text{etö}] \quad \text{ONLY.} \quad [\text{Στοντοκάλη}] \\
\text{IG ii}^2 & 457 \quad 307/6 \quad \text{etö} \quad \text{ONLY (no enactment-formula, [P1])} \\
\text{IG ii}^2 & 461 \quad 307/6 \quad \text{etö} \quad \text{ONLY} \\
\text{IG ii}^2 & 471 \quad 306/5 \quad \text{etö} \quad \text{ONLY} \\
\text{IG ii}^2 & 486 \quad 304/3 \quad \text{etö} \quad \text{ONLY} \\
\text{Hesp. VII} & 22 \quad 304/3 \quad [\text{etö}] \quad \text{ONLY} \\
\text{IG ii}^2 & 492 \quad 303/2 \quad [\text{etö}] \quad \text{ONLY} \\
\text{IG ii}^2 & 495 \quad 303/2 \quad \text{etö; Ôto} \\
\text{IG ii}^2 & 496 \quad 303/2 \quad \text{etö} \quad \text{ONLY} \\
\text{IG ii}^2 & 499 \quad 302/1 \quad [\text{etö}] \quad \text{ONLY} \\
\text{IG ii}^2 & 503 \quad 302/1 \quad \text{etö} \quad \text{ONLY} \\
\text{Hesp. I} & \text{ACR iv} \quad 302/1 \quad [\text{etö}] \quad \text{ONLY} \\
\text{IG ii}^2 & 560 \quad 307/6 - 301/0 \quad [\text{etö}] \quad \text{ONLY} \\
\text{IG ii}^2 & 568 \quad \text{end C4} \quad [\text{etö}] \quad \text{ONLY} \\
\text{IG ii}^2 & 640 \quad 301/0 \quad [\text{etö}] \quad \text{ONLY} \\
\text{Arch. Ath., 1-15} & 641 \quad 299/8 \quad \text{etö; Ôto} \\
\text{Arch. Ath., 1-15} & 293/2 \quad \text{etö; Ôto} \\
\text{GHI} & 133 \quad 369/8 \quad \text{PF} \\
\text{GHI} & 136 \quad 368/7 \quad [\text{etö}]; Ôto
\end{array}
\]

125. Jones, 112 - 3. Larfeld thought that RP was restricted to probouleumatic decrees but RI could be used with either kind:

Handbuch der griechischen Epigraphik, II.i1ii. 678 - 81.

126. Professor Meritt has worked on the assumption that all Athenian decrees were probouleumatic (even as I define the term), that the first rider to any decree must be introduced by RP, and
that RI must always introduce a second or subsequent rider
(Document on Athenian Tribute, 32 - 3 with n. 36, A.T.L., I. 213).

There is a rider to Cleonymus' tribute decree, ATL D 8, beginning at 1. 27, which must be \( \kappa \alpha \delta \acute{a} \lambda \varepsilon \rho \delta \varepsilon \iota \nu \alpha \), and this is the first and only rider of which traces are preserved, but to fit the decree to his presuppositions Meritt restored a previous rider with RP in 1. 10. A new fragment has been discovered, which makes it clear that 11. 27 - 8 should read \( \kappa \alpha \delta \acute{a} \lambda \varepsilon \rho \delta \varepsilon \iota \nu \alpha \, \kappa \lambda \varepsilon \delta \omicron \nu \iota \mu [\omicron \zeta] \), and in view of this Meritt has withdrawn his first rider (AJP LXXXVIII 1967; withdrawal of first rider, p. 32) but without discussing the principle which had led him to suggest it. Nevertheless the dating of the decree to Cleonymus' year in the boule, 426/5, appears sound. Cleonymus was the author of a probouleumatic decree for Methone in the first prytany of 426/5 (GHI 61, 32 - 56, N.B. 51 sqq; dated from GHI 64, 5); in the Cecropid prytany of one year he was the author of ATL D 8. i, D 8. ii and SEG X 73 (the last two on the same day). Cecropis held the second prytany of 426/5 (GHI 64, 4 - 5); in Cleonymus' decree for Methone, in the first prytany of that year, we read that priority is to be given in the second prytany to one or more debates on the other cities, and it is tempting to see in D 8 the decrees resulting from these debates (cf. Meritt, AJP 1967, 31 - 2). There is no reason why a decree which is technically non-probouleumatic should not stand in the name of a bouleutes.

There is no second rider in which RP is found; GHI 167 provides the only instance of RI in what is demonstrably a first rider; but there are only nine inscribed examples of RI in all.
Some mention ought to be made of two fifth-century documents where we seem to have riders without an orthodox rider-formula. GHI 40, the first decree for the priestess of Athena Νεκή, contains two motions introduced by the name of the proposer alone: Meritt has argued (Hesp. X 1941, 307 - 15) that these are both riders to an original motion which was inscribed on a superimposed block of stone, now lost. In GHI 42 we have first a motion by Diognetus; in l. 40 a motion of Anticles begins, introduced simply by 'Αντικλές εἰκε; and in l. 70 Archestratus proposes a rider χαθε- περ 'Αντικλές. The relationship between the motions of Diognetus and Anticles is uncertain: the manner in which Anticles prescribes the oath suggests that his may be the earlier of the two motions, but Meritt, Documents on Athenian Tribute, 33 n. 36, regarded Anticles' motion as a first rider.

In IG ii² 448. i a rider is introduced with the unparal-leled τάδε Πανφίλου Ευφίλητου.

127. Including IG ii² 235 (340/39), with a new enactment-formula (ΕΤ[δ]), and IG ii² 373 (322/1), where the rider has a complete new prescript (Ε; ΕΤδ) with the date in both archontic and bouleutic calendars. The latter must surely and the former may possibly have been enacted on a later occasion than the original decree (perhaps on the resumption of an adjourned assembly?). This process has developed further in IG ii² 682 (after 256/5) and perhaps SEG XXI 359 (beg. C3): here a probou-leumatic decree is followed by a pseudo-rider, not embodying one of the old formulae, to the decree as previously enacted (τὰ μὲν ἄλλα πράπτειν κατὰ τὸ πρῶτερον ψήφισμα).

With this we may compare IG ii² 140, a υόμος which was framed as an amendment to an already existing υόμος.
128. I include among these decrees IG ii² 289. E. Schweigert linked with this the prescript-fragment IG ii² 372, where the formulae are E; etō (Hesp. VIII 1939, 173 - 5, cf. SEG XXI 300; this is one of Demades' decrees, cf. n. 121, above). Since the fragments are very different in colouring and do not join, his case is not compelling, and the evidence for Demades' career and for the association of RP with probouleumatic decrees makes it safer to keep the two fragments apart.

(After I had written this note Dr D. M. Lewis drew my attention to J. Pokírka, LF LXXXIX 1966, 262 - 6, cf. The Grant of Enktesis, 57, who dissociates the fragments on epigraphic grounds.)

129. ἔδοξεν ... ἐν τῇ βουλῇ:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IG ii²</th>
<th>218</th>
<th>346/5</th>
<th>PF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>276</td>
<td></td>
<td>before 336/5</td>
<td>(discussed in text)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| IG ii² | 196 | before 353/2 | PF |

| 218, 22 sqq. | 346/5 | in RP; cf. above for probouleuma |
| 336. iii * | 333/2 | (no indication of origin: date Dow, Hesp. XXXII 1963, 341 - 2) |
| 502 * | 302/1 | E; etō |

* ἐν τῇ δήμῳ restored to fit στοιχεῖον arrangement; ἐν τῇ βολῇ has same number of letters, but is unlikely this late.

GHI 166 (348/7) has [κερι δὲν οί 'ολόνθετοι ἔδοξεν ἐννομα ἡκατέσθεν ἐν τῷ τῇ δήμῳ καὶ ἐν τοῖς συμμάχοις
restored (!) and an open proposal which might but need not belong to a probouleuma.

GHI 189. ii (333/2), a non-probouleumatic decree published with an open probouleuma, has ἔδοξαν ἔννομα ἱκετεύειν αἱ-τούντες τὸν δήμου χαρίς ὑπήκοιν.

In IG ii² 404 (before mid C4) the ἱκετεύειν - clause cannot safely be restored.

130. Most of the ἱκετεύειν - clause is restored, and we ought perhaps not to rule out the possibility that it has been restored wrongly.

131. An open clause in a probouleuma seems particularly likely in financial matters: cf. IG ii² 223A, 13, P 16; and notice also as examples of the caution prescribed in finance the three orders from the ecclesia for νομοθέτησα to adjust the μερήξιμος: IG ii² 222, 41 - 6; 330, 15 - 23; SIG³ 298, 35 - 41.

132. IG ii² 61, 6 - 7. Dr D. M. Lewis lists possible years before and after 378/7 at BSA XLIX 1954, 34.


134. Epigraphische Untersuchungen. See A. Billheimer, AJA² XLII 1938, for a detailed reply.

135. And notice τοιῶνε here (29. ii), but τοῦτην 4. i, τόδε 30. i, τὴνος 31. i, τόδε 39. i.

136. In SEG X 84, 30 sqq., Meritt claims to have detected a rider added while the probouleuma was still before the boule: Hesp. X 1941, 320 - 6.
137. Jones, 113 with 156 n. 96. In Table J I give a classified list of the relevant decrees, showing that the phrase is used in some certainly non-probouleumatic decrees.

137A. Except IG ii² 174, ordering proclamation \([\epsilon ν \tau \omega \ ους] \varphi \ ικα \ μ]\varepsilon ν \ ιερει \ ([\varphi γωνι]) .

138. IG ii² 30 (386/5), GHI 144 (362/1), GHI 146 (362/1). See Table J, § ii, and for GHI 144 cf. p. 70.

139. See Table D for details of formulae. The decrees marked with an asterisk are based on some one's report, and the probouleuma may have been that the demos should hear what the man in question had to say and make up its mind accordingly.

140. It was normal Hellenistic practice to publish a (non-probouleumatic) decree of the demos honouring the prytany ("first" decree) and a decree of the boule honouring the officials of the prytany ("second" decree) - cf. S. Dow, Hesp. Supp. I 1937, 3 with n. 2. Dow makes inferences as to the origins of decrees from the nominatives in "citations" (op. cit., 22, 76): I would rather suppose that after the demos had voted to honour a prytany (under a probouleuma that it should hear the prytany's report) the boule also voted to honour the prytany, in a separate, unpublished decree. Cf. Pritchett's review of Dow, AJP LX 1939, 260.

The only known exceptions to normal practice are P 84.i (155/4), where the prytany is honoured in a decree of the boule; SEG XVI 100 (104/3), where the "first" and "second" decrees are both probouleumatic; and Kerameikos, III. A5 (c. 100), where the "second" decree (the only one surviving) is probouleumatic. Etiquette did not prevent Euctimenus ΕΕδόημου Ελεεατος , who in 140/39 was both treasurer and secretary of his prytany, from proposing the "first" and "second" decrees in honour of that prytany: Hesp. XVII 9.
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141. I include here IG ii² 26 (394 - 387), whose formulae are eto; εκανέσας μέν; ἐπηφ[ειδοι δε —].

142. GHI 124.


144. Mr R. Meiggs has suggested to me that these "crossbreeds" are probouleumatic decrees with δ/ψτο inserted to emphasise the demos' approval of them; he could follow Miller (who believed that ἐτβχτο and/or PF is a guarantee of a probouleumatic decree; only those with eto and δ/ψτο are non-probouleumatic) in leaning heavily on IG ii² 109 (363/2), where δτο seems uniquely to be dependent on the δοξετ τη βουλή of the probouleumatic formula. Against this I would cite GHI 144, one of the most substantial decrees with mixed formulae, which can hardly be probouleumatic as I define the term (cf. p. 39).

For carelessness in the application of formulae, cf.

 IG ii² 32 385/4 et[b]; RP
 839 221/0 [Δ]Ψ; Ε; etβ; PF
 847 215/4 ΒΥ; Β; etβχτο; PF
 1072 A.D. 209/10 Β; ἐτβχτο

(For other possible misapplications of etβ , cf. pp. 54 - 7).

145. See Table C for details of formulae. The decrees marked with an asterisk are again based on some one's report. On Hesp. XI 56 see further, Additional Note C, esp. p. 430.

146. Cf. Klaffenbach, Griechische Epigraphik, ² 74 - 5.

148. I include decrees earlier than 403/2 for completeness' sake only: the figures signify nothing as we cannot guess at the origins of most fifth-century decrees. 403 and 321 are obvious dividing-points; the next line could be drawn anywhere between about 285 and about 260 to yield the same result; 200 and 100 are of course purely arbitrary. So many decrees are only approximately dated, or are tied to magistrates whose date is insecure, that it seems unwise to attempt further precision. A survey of dated decrees from the troubled period 321/0 - 263/2 yields the following results:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Decrees of both kinds</th>
<th>Probouleumatic decrees</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>321/0 - 319/8</td>
<td>(esp. non-prob.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>318/7</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>5 non-probouleumatic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>317/6 - 308/7</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>1 non-probouleumatic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>307/6 - 302/1</td>
<td>many</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>301/0 - 263/2</td>
<td>(no prob. before 291/0)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I have marked with an asterisk in Tables C and D those decrees which I am regarding as substantial for the purposes of these statistics. Alliances, tribute regulations and the like clearly are matters of substance, while at the other extreme purely honorific decrees (though it may be of great significance that at a particular time the political climate is favourable to a particular man, and a bitter controversy may underly a motivation-clause, as in the rider to GHI 116) cost the state little and are easily drafted; but in many cases it is hard to give a verdict.

149. Ar. Ach. 19 - 22; contrast D.XVIII. Cor. 169.

150. IG ii² 845 (204/3).

151. As Professor Jones believes (p. 118).
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152. E.g. D.VIII. Chers. 4.

153. Non-members in the boule: D.VIII. Chers. 4, XIX F.L. 17 and
      schol., A.III. Ctes. 125, Plat. Menex. 234 A - B. Cf. Ch. I,
      pp. 39-40.

      C - D; Lucian, Iup. Trag. 18 and schol., Deor. Conc. 1; Ar.
      Thesm. 372 - 9.

155. GHI 31.

156. GHI 61. ii.

157. HMA 87.

158. GHI 96 - 7.

159. GHI 124.

160. GHI 126.

161. GHI 157.

162. GHI 159.

163. GHI 133, 136.

164. SEG XVII 19.

165. IG ii² 334.

166. GHI 114.

167. GHI 154.

168. GHI 144; cf. p. 70

169. P. 59 with nn. 61 - 2, above.

171. GHI 77A, 19 - 21; 86, 36 - 8. The same principle seems to be taken for granted in Thudippus' assessment decree of 425 (HMA 87, 42 - 4).

172. SEG X|84, 39 - 40. The same seems to be implied by the Neapolis decree of 407/6 as restored by Merritt and Andrewes (SEG XII 37, 56), but I would restore ἡ τί δυν δοξῆι διὰ δοκεύονται to produce an ἀλλὰ διὰ πάντων clause of my first type (Table K). The decree concerning the goddess Bendis contained a clause giving the boule some kind of authority or duty, possibly that of filling gaps in the original decree: for different reconstructions see SEG X 64a, 36 (Roussel), 64b, 27 (Ferguson); XVII 5, 23 (Bingen - who offers no restoration of this clause); XXI 52, 23 (Sokolowski).

173. SEG XIV 47, B 3 sqq.; GHI 157, 34 - 6; IG ii$^{2}$ 204, 85 - 6; 435, 7 - 9; GHI 200, 264 - 9 (the clause added in (IG ii$^{2}$ 1629) 272 sqq. is presumably a supplementary decision made under this provision by the boule).

174. GHI 200, 264 - 9. Cf. SIG$^{3}$ 736, 180 - 94, the final clause of a law of Andania of 92 B.C.

175. The commonest form of this is an order to protect honorands from injustice and to see that they enjoy the right of ξρόγογος to the boule and demos that has been conferred upon them: HMA 80, 2 - 9; SEG X 53, 17 sqq.: 105, 14 - 19; &c. For the coupling of the generals with the boule and prytanes in responsibilities of this kind cf. Ch. I, pp. 43 - 4; on the provisions for stopping gaps in decrees see further Additional Note C, pp. 423 - 31.

176. The proxeny inscriptions to be considered here are GHI 98, IG ii$^{2}$ 49, 13, Hesp. VII 11, IG ii$^{2}$ 32, 63, 77, 95; compare the citizenship award in IG ii$^{2}$ 17. The questions which I discuss are
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treated by A. Lambrechts, *Text en Uitzicht van de Atheense Proxeniedecreten*, chs. ii A 4 (French summary, pp. 141 - 2) and ii B 2 a (French summary, pp. 142 - 3): she seems far too eager to give precise dates to different formulaic practices.

177. So Kirchner, in his notes on IG ii² 13, 32, 63; cf. 17 and 77; also Lambrechts, ii A 4. Heydemann, *De Senatu Atheniensium*, thought that the boule could give this permission only if no public expense was involved.


179. GHI 98, IG ii² 9; cf. the confirmation of the honours for Samos, GHI 96 - 7.

180. GHI 98.

181. The question is bedevilled by formulaic ambiguity. In the fifth and early fourth centuries a decree conferring a proxeny might use either the formula εἶναι ἀδότων προξενον or ἀναγράψαι ἀδότων προξενον (IG i² index s.v. προξενος, p. 368. iii; IG ii² IV i index s.v. προξενος καὶ εὐεργετης, p. 58. i - ii: Miss Lambrechts, ii B 2 a, violently redates decrees so as to make the second formula standard until 389/8 and the first standard from 388/7). Of the decrees listed in n. 176 IG ii² 13, 32, 63, 77. i and 95 all have the ἀναγράψαι formula (ἀναγράψαι ἀδότων εἶναι προξενον in 63), while 77. ii alone has the εἶναι formula. In 77 (where both decrees have the enactment-formula ετέ κατὰ τὸ τοῦ ὅμιον ψήφισμα) it is clear that decree i is ordering the publication of decree ii -

(ἀναγράψαι ἀδότων προξενον) . . . [κατὰ τὸ ψήφισμα] ὁ ἐνέκησε περὶ ἀδότου προξενου (5 - 5) -
and so we see that the Δναγράψατ formula could be
used not only for the award but alternatively for the publica-
tion of an award already made. (Compare IG ii² 17, where
decree ii, whose prescript cannot be recovered, makes a grant
of citizenship and orders its publication, and decree i (ετβ)
introduces with the words
[Δναγράψατ Σθόρμι] .. . τὰ δῇητα[σκενανερτ]
Σθόρμος τῷ i ἱμωτ (8-11)
a modification of the publication order.)

It must be admitted that towards the middle of the
fourth century the boule did refer a mere publication order
to the assembly: IG ii² 172 (PF) deals with the renewal of an
hereditary proxeny where the original stele has disappeared.

182. GHI 103. The words
[ξελεσθεὶν ὁ Πρόσωπος αὐτίκα μᾶλζα] τῷ Βουλήν (17-18)
tell us nothing about the origin of the decree (cf. pp. 75-6).

183. I have placed in my Table C only those decrees where we have
some reason to presume ratification by the demos, and have
listed the others among decrees of the boule in Table F.

184. GHI 103.

185. See for example S. Accame, La Lega ateniese, 234-5. Special
delégations of power to the boule are discussed by P. Cloché,
REG XXXIV 1921, 254-8, and G. E. M. de Ste Croix, CQ² XIII
1963, 114-5 with 115 n. 2. Though it may not always have been
clear how extensive the power conferred was (cf. Ch. IV. pp. 178
with n. 172, 189 with n. 230, and 196-5 ) it seems that
duties specially delegated were of the same order as the boule's
regular duties, subsidiary to the major decisions of the ecclesia,
and there is no evidence that the demos was willing to surrender
its right to take these major decisions.
186. GHI 108. Tod accepts this as a decree of the boule alone (GHI II, p. 25).

187. For the question of who might honour whom see Francotte, MB III 1899, 246 - 81, IV 1900, 55 - 75, 105 - 13; and see further on the honours conferred by the Athenians Heydemann, De Senatu Atheniensium, 11 - 21, and Kahrstedt, S.S.A., 332 - 3. Most of the honorific decrees inscribed in the name of the boule honour the officials of a prytany when the demos has honoured the prytany as a whole; but it is likely that when the demos had honoured a prytany the boule would add its own honours but not publish the decree (cf. n. 140, above).

188. IG ii² 145.

189. BSA XLIX 1954, 36 - 7.

190. Elections in general, like other acts of the demos, were held under a probouleuma (A.P. 44. iv): I imagine that except when there was an obvious candidate, such as the retiring herald's son, the probouleuma will have been open, simply providing that a man be elected to a specified office.

191. See appendix to Ch. IV, pp. 33-493-4.

192. See my remarks in Ch. V, pp. 231-2, with notes referring to my discussions of related problems.

193. There are however signs that disagreement persisted as to who should count as members of the demos (in addition to the vexed question of how generously non-citizens who had helped the democrats could be rewarded, notice Phormisius' proposal to restrict citizenship to landowners: D. H. 525 - 33. Lys. 32 - 3). Archinus' irregular use of the boule to condemn a man to death
(A.P. 40. ii, cf. appendix to Ch. IV, p. 189-90) probably sprang from a desire for rapid action rather than constitutional dogmatism; the circumstances in which Thrasybulus brought forward his 
\( \Delta \pi \rho \rho \sigma \omega \upsilon \lambda \epsilon \upsilon \tau \nu \nu \upsilon \psi \tau \iota \omicron \mu \alpha \) are not clear (cf. pp. 12-13).

194. P 84. i. It is possible that the ecclesia ratified the honors voted for the priest of Asclepius in 94/3 (SEG XVIII 29: the ecclesia honoured the ephebi at this time).

195. IG ii\(^2\) 839.

196. IG ii\(^2\) 840. S. Dow, Hesp. Supp. I 1937, 100 with n. 2, suggests a date c. 124/3, but his argument is not such as to rule out a date some twenty years later.

197. W. S. Ferguson, Klio IV 1904; Hellenistic Athens, 427 sqq. with 427 - 8 n. 4.

198. See Tables C and D, where decrees of the demos continue until 94/3.


200. IG ii\(^2\) 1046.

201. In IG ii\(^2\) 1042 (c. 41/0) the "acceptance decree" is of the boule alone, but the two decrees which follow it are probouleumatic decrees of the demos.

202. IG ii\(^2\) 1043.

203. E.g. IG iv\(^2\) 84 (A.D. 38/9?). On changes in the Athenian constitution from 91 until the Sullan settlement see Ferguson, Hellenistic Athens, 440 sqq., 454 sqq. On the restoration of democracy under Caesar and return to oligarchy under Antony see Kirchner's notes on these inscriptions in IG ii\(^2\), following Kolbe, Die attischen Archonten: their view has been generally accepted, though Ferguson
dated the democratic interlude c. 70 - 54/3 (Klio IX 1909, 323 - 30, 340).

204. Cf. Ch. I, pp. 46-8

205. On decree-making under the Empire cf. P. Graindor, Athènes sous Auguste, 100 - 5, Athènes de Tibère à Trajan, 62 - 7, Athènes sous Hadrien, 86 - 90; and now D. J. Geagan's study of the post-Sullan constitution, Hesp. Supp. XII 1967, esp. 32 - 6, 64 - 7, 71 - 81, 83 - 90. Geagan does not consider the possibility that minute-headings (σουλής ψηφίσματα, &c.) may have been misapplied (see n. 144, above), and I cannot share his faith in the reliability of genitives after άξωπή τύχη as a guide to the origins of a decree: whether it is on the demos of Athens or the boule and demos that good fortune is invoked in a decree surely tells us nothing about the procedure by which that decree was enacted. I agree with Geagan, 66 - 7, against Delz, Lukians Kenntnis der athenischen Antiquitäten, 138 - 9, that the formula άτεκτό (cf. p. 46 and n. 108, above) should not be taken to imply that there were now joint sessions of the boule and ecclesia. Geagan does not make his own view of the extent to which the different decree-making bodies were independent of each other entirely clear: on pp. 79 - 80 he seems to accept Keil's view (Beiträge zur Geschichte des Areopags, 29) that the boule "had the ability to formulate decrees in the name of the whole community;" on p. 85 he writes that "the demos, like the boule, was able to pass valid decrees by itself, although probably subject to the approval of the other corporations" (i.e. Areopagus and boule).

Decrees of the boule and ecclesia continue into the reign of Hadrian, with IG ii² 1072 (116/7) and probably 1073 and 1075; later still we have a non-probouleumatic decree in IG ii² 1078/9 (c. 220), and a decree which is thought to be probouleumatic but does not exhibit any of the older formulae in Hesp. Supp. VI
31/2 with SEG XXI 506/5, ii (229/30 or 230/1). Beside these, however, we find resolutions of the Areopagus (υπομνηματικοι) to c. 200, e.g. IG iv² 83 [38/9?]; επερωτήματα from c.150 or δόγματα from c. 200, e.g. Hesp. Supp. VI 31 &c., iii [229/30 or 230/1] – see Geagan, 42 – 8), and at any rate in the first of the cases cited the resolution of the Areopagus came last and determined the wording of the dedication (IG iv² 82 – 4: Geagan, 33 – 5, after Keil). Meritt has suggested (Hesp. XXXII 1963, 29) that the third-century document contained as its first item a decree of the Sacred Gerousia, established under Marcus Aurelius.

Dedications (listed by Geagan in his Appendix I, pp. 140 – 59) show that honours could be awarded or permitted by the Areopagus, boule and ecclesia together, or by one or two of these bodies alone: Geagan notes (pp. 63, 68, 82 – 3) that honours of the boule, the demos or the two together are found particularly in the time of Augustus; there is a further group of honours by the demos in the time of Claudius and of honours by the boule in the time of Hadrian.


4. E.g. HMA 67B, 15 - 17.

5. O.O. iii. 2.


7. Ar., Eq. 773 - 6.

8. This is not the place to discuss Mr H. B. Mattingly's attempt to downdate various documents assigned to the mid fifth century, in a series of articles published since 1961 (most recently in Ancient Society & Institutions, 193 - 223; on HMA 46 see Hist. X 1961, 150 - 69). Though his warning that we should not be too confident in assigning dates on a basis of letter-forms is not to be ignored, I do not think he has succeeded in showing that "the forms of sigma and rho have put many decrees in contexts where they do not really make full sense" (JHS LXXXI 1961, 132).

9. HMA 46 (ATL D 7), 5 - 11.

10. Cf. O.O. iii. 2, giving <περὶ τῶν ἐν τοῖς συμβάσεως as one of the topics discussed by the boule and φόρον ἀξιοποιοῦν as one of the boule's responsibilities.

11. HMA 46, 11 - 18.


13. ATL D 8; new fragment B. D. Meritt, AJP LXXXVIII 1967. On the date see n. 126 to Ch. II.
14. ATL D 8, 11-16.

15. Ibid. 52 - 7.

16. HMA 87 (ATL A 9); cf. translation and commentary in ATL, III. 70 - 8. The rider formula in 1. 51 shows that this decree was drafted in the boule.

17. HMA 87, 4 - 7.

18. Ibid., 8 - 12. The number is restored from [And], IV. Alc. 11.

19. For the elimination of the archon, see ATL, IV. ix n. 10.

20. In line 16 ATL restore [ νομο ] θέστα [ ἵ ] after Meritt and West, The Athenian Assessment, 44, cf. 59. This was challenged by Kahrstedt (GGA CXCVII 1935, 51 - 2, U.M.A., 284 n. 2, Klio XXXI 1938, 9, cf. Wade-Gery. CR XLIX 1935 186, Nesselhauf, Gnomon XII 1936, 297; Meritt defends the restoration in AJP LVI 1935, 323, Epigraphica Attica, 132 - 6 with 150 nn. 26 - 7) on the grounds that nomothetae are not attested for the fifth-century democracy. In view of the task to be performed by these officials I feel certain that [ θεομο ] θέστα [ ἵ ] must be the correct restoration, even though it requires the crowding of five letters into four spaces (so Wade-Gery, op. cit.).


22. Ibid., 38 - 44.

23. Ibid., 44 - 50.

24. ATL list 25, iii. 60 - 1, list 26, ii. 43 - 4. For a recent discussion of the rubrics, see F. A. Lepper, JHS LXXXII 1962.
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26. ATL, III. 77.

27. GHI 61 (ATL D 3), 5 - 9, 29 - 32.

28. ATL D 21, 17 - 18 (largely restored).

29. A.P. 47. i, cf. Poll. VIII. 97. For these treasurers' control of all sacred treasures at this time, see W. S. Ferguson, Treasurers of Athena, 118.

30. GHI 51 A, 18 - 22.

31. Ibid., 2 - 7. The background to these decrees is not directly relevant to the present study, but I believe that both the 3,000 talents paid to Athena and the smaller sum paid to the Other Gods represent the repayment, with interest, of sums borrowed at the time of the Samian War. The authors of ATL regard the 3,000 talents as the total of a planned series of payments made for building purposes from the tribute (ATL, III. 118 - 32, 326 - 41, B. D. Meritt, Hesp. XXIII 1954, 185 - 231, H. T. Wade-Gery & B. D. Meritt, Hesp. XXVI 1957); Gomme believed that until 434/3 there was a substantial surplus in the state treasury, which Callias transferred to Athena for safer keeping (Hist. II 1953 - 4, III 1954 - 5, Hist. Comm. Thuc., II. 26 - 32). Mr Mattingly has attempted to revive the old date of 422/1 for these decrees (PACA VII 1964).

32. On the logistae, see p. 111.

33. GHI 51 A, 7 - 13.

34. IG ii² 120; for the date see E. Schweigert, Hesp. VII 1938, 281 - 9, ACR 16, publishing a new fragment of IG ii² 1938, which mentions the inventory made in accordance with this decree.
35. This part of the inscription is too fragmentary to allow a continuous text to be reconstructed.

36. \textit{IG ii}^2 120, 7 - 24.

37. \textit{Ibid.}, 24 - 32. Dr. D. M. Lewis tells me that J. Tréheux, in an unpublished Paris thesis, reads l. 27 as

\begin{quote}
[\nu]\sigma\gamma\gamma\nu\omega\omicron\mu\epsilon\omega\nu\nu \tau\varsigma \omicron \pi\epsilon\rho \iota\omicron\nu[\tau\omicron\nu \\alpha\kappa\omega \tau\omicron\nu \\epsilon\nu \tau\zeta<\nu>] \chi\alpha\lambda\kappa\omega[\theta]
\end{quote}

or... \\epsilon\kappa \tau\omicron\nu \\epsilon\nu \tau\zeta\iota \iota... and comments:

L' intention du Conseil est claire. Il veut, pour aviser aux moyens de le combler, apprécier le déficit de la collection (11. 30 - 1 \ \tau\alpha \ \varepsilon\lambda\lambda\varepsilon\pi\omicron\nu\tau\alpha) entre 362/1 et la date de l' \varepsilon\xi\varepsilon\tau\omicron\mu\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron. Il comparera donc la consistance du lot dans les dix années écoulées, telle que la décrivent les παραδόσεις, avec ce qu'il en rest effectivement au début de 353/2.

38. \textit{IG ii}^2 1492, 103 - 18.


41. Ferguson, \textit{Treasurers of Athena}, 134; for "certification" (epistates named) see 11. 95, 110 of the inscription.


44. D. XXIV. \textit{Tim.} 96; see Ch. IV, pp. 152 - 6, for the part played by the boule in the collection of public debts.
45. GHI 74. The decree has been variously dated between 445 and 415, though most scholars place it in the last decade of this period. In particular, there has been disagreement as to whether it should precede or follow IG i² 311, which records the handing over by the hieropoei to the epistatae of the proceeds from the sale of corn offered at Eleusis in the quadrennium 422/1 - 419/8: the arguments on both sides are summarised by Ziehen in Prott & Ziehen, Leges Graecorum Sacrae, II. i, pp. 21 - 2, who fails to convince me that GHI 74 is the earlier inscription. The American calendar specialists agree in dating the decree in or after 418 (Dinsmoor, Archons of Athens, 335 - 41, and this is currently accepted by Meritt, CW LVI 1962 - 3, 41 n. 2, with AJP LXXXV 1964, 416 n. 7, cf. Meritt & McGregor, Phoen. XXI 1967, 88 - 9); recently arguments for 422/1 have been presented by P. Guillon (BCH LXXXVI 1962) and Mattingly, having first accepted these (BCH LXXXVII 1963, 391) would now revert to Ziehen's date of 423/2 (PACA VII 1964, 53 - 5, IX 1966, 66 n. 42, 76).

46. GHI 74, 22 - 4.

47. Ibid., 30 - 2. We have seen that heralds were also under the supervision of the boule in the assessment decree of 425/4 (p. 91 and n. 22); but in Clearchus' coinage decree they were dispatched by the demos (HMA 39 = ATL D 14, § 9: fr.iii (Aphytis), 11. 23 - 4, reads ἐλεοσθαλ τῶν ὄνοματος, with the o clearly visible in ATL, II, pl. vi). Heralds are again dispatched by the boule in ATL D 8, 52 - 7 (426/5), [SEG X 136, 15 - 17 (407/6) - wholly restored] and GHI 137, 14 sqq. (367/6). It seems fashionable to assume that the boule began as a powerful body and was gradually weakened to the profit of the ecclesia (e.g. A. G. Woodhead, Hist. XVI
1967; see my remarks in Ch. V, pp. 226-9, esp. 228 9), but at any rate in matters of this kind I should expect what in the early fifth century was a prerogative of the demos to be delegated to the boule as the volume of diplomacy increased; and if I am right we have here slight support for an early dating of HMA 39 and a late dating (i.e. 425 - 415 rather than c. 445) of GHI 74.

48. GHI 74, 36 - 44. On the hieropoi, see pp. 130 - 3.

49. GHI 74, 27 - 30.

50. IG ii 2 140, 8 - 10. Substantial fragments of Chaeremonides' law have now been discovered, and await publication.

51. IG ii 2 140; Elter's restorations incorporated in IG ii 2 Addenda, SIG 3 200; most recent text Sokolowski, Lois Sacrées (Suppl.), 13 (cf. SEG XXI 253).

52. IG i 2 79: discussed by B. D. Meritt, Greek Historical Studies, 25 - 6, with revised text of 11. 7 - 9 at 26 n. 34 (cf. SEG XXI 441).

53. IG i 2 79, 9 - 11.

54. Ibid., 15 - 18.

55. SEG XXI 80 with W. E. Thompson, Mnem. 4 XIX 1966, 338 - 9. The inscription is dated to 404/3, but the decree of the boule which is cited could be earlier.

56. IG ii 2 839.

57. On the general τὴν παρασκευήν and the architect τὴν ἱσμα, cf. pp. 127 - 8. The general worked with a committee of Areopagites and other citizens to check the treasures of Asclepius in 247/6 (IG ii 2 1534, 149 - 51) and in 215/4 (IG ii 2 1539).
58. IG ii² 839, 36 - 7, cf. the more fragmentary decrees 841 and 842.

59. IG ii² 840. For the date see Ch. II, p. 87 and n. 196.

60. A.P. 47. ii - iii (cf. Harp., Suid. Ξωλαγτα, L.S. 291. 17): the asterisked [l'] is printed in Kenyon's Oxford Text; but R. J. Hopper has shown that whereas a term of ten years is compatible with the literary evidence surviving mine leases point to a term of seven years for categories other than δρυσικα (BSA XLVIII 1953, 226, 237), and M. H. Chambers reads γ' and accordingly regards this as an error for ζ' (TAPA XCVI 1965, 36 - 7).

61. See p. 105 and n. 133, below.

62. See Additional Note D, p. 432. The office clearly was collegiate when A.P. 47 was written.


64. A.P. 7. iii. The latest dated evidence for their existence is IG ii² 463, 36, 1589, 1 (both 307/6).

65. Down to 405/4 only (references IG i², p. 369. iii, s.v. Ξωλαγτής: N.B. δπομιτοσιστσητον ήτο πολεταλ εν τετ ραβλετ [GHI 86, 34 - 5]; οτ δε πολεταλ διπμιτοσιστσητον κατα των νυ]7]μον [GHI 87, 8]). After the restoration of the democracy in 403/2 the reference to the poleta dis­appears, and for much of the fourth century it was customary to state how much would be spent on the stele; later the treasurer was ordered to disburse simply τω γενομενον ንհլషా (references IG ii² IV i, pp. 37 - 8, s.v. δναγραφη).

66. On contracts for public works see pp. 125 - 6.
67. And. I. Myst. 134.

68. A. I. Tim. 119.

69. SEG XXI 37, 6 - 7.

70. SEG XIX 133, 1 - 2 (cf. Hesp. V 9, 4 - 5, with commentary suggesting that the ratification might be made by any one of the archons, with his συμβολοντ or ήρωθον).

71. A.P. 47. iv. Presumably the poleis also were involved, as in IG i^2 94, 11 - 13.

72. IG i^2 94, most recently studied (for its topographical interest) by R. E. Wycherley, BSA LV 1960.

73. IG i^2 94, i - ii.

74. See n. 87, below.

75. Aegaeis was not in prytany when the decree was passed, and the decree must therefore belong to the ninth prytany, when it would be known by elimination that Aegaeis would hold the tenth and last prytany of the year (cf. Ch. I, p. 18 with n. 124). On the interpretation of 11. 18 - 20 see B. D. Meritt, CQ XL 1946, 45 - 6.

76. IG i^2 94. 11 - 28.

77. Ibid., 29 - 38.

78. SEG XVIII 13; cf. original publication and commentary by D. M. Lewis, Hesp. XXVIII 1959, 239 - 47. For a discussion of the Νεα see L. Robert, Hellenica XI - XII 1960, 189 - 203, suggesting that the revenue in question comprises the customs dues from Oropus.
79. SEG XVIII. 13, 11 - 15.


81. Hesp. XI 56, 9 - 12.

82. Ibid., 17 - 19.

83. A.P. 47. v.

84. In view of Thucydides' contempt for technicalities and the pre-454 context of the passage this cannot be inferred with certainty from T.I. 96. ii. Polux, indeed, would have imperial revenue like domestic paid in the first instance to the apodectae (VIII. 97):

\[ \delta \kappa \delta \varepsilon \kappa \tau \alpha \iota \delta \xi o\varsigma \delta \varepsilon \kappa \alpha, \iota \tau \sigma \varsigma \tau e \varsigma \phi \omicron \omicron \omega \varsigma \chi \alpha \iota \mu \tau \varsigma \varsigma \varsigma \epsilon \lambda \omicron \sigma \omicron \omicron \varsigma \varsigma \varsigma \varsigma \kappa \iota \tau \tau \varsigma \tau e \varsigma \nu \kappa \varepsilon \delta \varepsilon \chi \kappa \nu \nu \eta \zeta, \]

and this is accepted in ATL, III. 12 - 13. But despite the Cleisthenic origin alleged for the apodectae in Andr. 324 F 5 they are not mentioned before 418/7 (p. 100 with n. 87, below) and if they did in the 440's exist and receive tribute their absence from HMA 46, 16 - 22, is surprising.

85. A.P. 48. i, cf. E.M. \[ \Delta \kappa \delta \varepsilon \kappa \tau \alpha \iota \delta \], L.S. 198.1, 427.13. For the part played by the boule in the collection of fines and overdue debts see Ch. IV, pp. 152 - 6.


87. IG i 2 94, 15 - 18, where they are to pass their receipts to the treasurers of the Other Gods \[ \chi \alpha \tau \lambda \tau \delta \tau \varsigma \nu \omicron \omega \varsigma \omicron \omicron \nu \]: Dr. D. M. Lewis suggests that the \[ \nu \omicron \omega \varsigma \omicron \omicron \omicron \] may be simply GHI 51 A, which established this board of treasurers.

88. Ibid., 28; they appear also in GHI 74, 51 - 2 (perhaps to be dated to 416/5 - cf. n. 45, above); an allusion in Ar. Av. 1541
(414) does not guarantee their continued existence. The "future" constitution of 411 provides for an enlarged board of 20 Hellenotamiae in charge of all non-sacred monies (A.P. 30. ii), and we do find that in and after 410 the Hellenotamiae numbered 20 (GHI 83 with Meritt, Athenian Financial Documents, 98 - 103) and made payments which earlier would have been made by the colacretae (cf. p. 103 with n. 106, below). It is likely therefore that in or perhaps shortly before 411 the imperial and city treasuries were finally merged, (the fact that the treasuries could have been merged earlier than 411 is noted by W. K. Pritchett, BCH LXXXVIII 1964, 474 with n. 3 - but I do not find his speculations about the Hellenotamiae in pp. 474 - 80 attractive) and though the authors of ATL believe that under the democracy the colacretae were revived to handle jury pay there is no evidence for this. (Like the poletae, the colacretae are said in A.P. 7. iii to have existed in the time of Solon.).

For recent discussions of financial organisation in the late fifth century see ATL, III. 359 sqq., and Jacoby's commentary on Andr. 324 F 5.

89. Cf. again p. 103 with n. 106, below.

90. But see n. 95, below, on SEG X 138.

91. They are last found in IG ii² 365, b 6; 1631, 324 - 5 (both 323/2). On the question of their continued existence in the heyday of the theoric officials, and on the relationship to them of the antigrapheus, see Additional Note D, pp. 439 - 41.


93. See the examples given in IG ii² IV i, p. 38. i - ii, s.vv. &c., and cf. pp. 109 - 10 on IG ii² 674.


Dr. D. M. Lewis has suggested to me that we have here a foreshadowing of the fourth-century μερισμός with emergency arrangements being made because the shipbuilding grant is temporarily exhausted. But revenue from a specified source could be allocated in advance for a particular purpose as early as 434/3 (GHI 51 A, 4 - 7) and if similar arrangements had been made here for a particular consignment of new ships I do not think this decree need presuppose a significant departure from fifth-century practice.

96. GHI 116, 18 - 22 (386). This decree is our earliest clear evidence for the fourth century μερισμός.

97. GHI 117, 14 - 17 (386/5). A. C. Johnson, CP IX 1914, 417 - 23, proposed to restore a similar mention of the apodectae in two other decrees which he assigned to this date, IG ii² 33 and 81 (cf. W. B. Dinsmoor, AJA XXVI 1932, 158 with n. 4); but the verb διδωμα makes it more likely that in these cases a treasurer or treasurers paid.

98. IG ii² 40, 21 - 3. Johnson proposed to associate this decree with those cited above, but it seems settled in 378/7, and the verb μερισμός should guarantee the restoration of the apodectae (Kirchner, IG ii² IV i, p. 37. ii, s.vv. λυσιστατημα) &c., against Wilhelm in IG ii² Add. Johnson recognised in his notes on IG ii² 301 and 520 that μερισμός was not an appropriate verb for treasurers: CP IX 1914, 424 - 5, 428.).
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99. The fund is attested, with variations of title, from the second quarter of the fourth century. Its first dated appearance is in 368/7 (IG ii 2 106, 18 - 19), but the ταμειας του δημου, who administered it, is mentioned in IG ii 2 21 (c. 376? - Johnson, CP IX 1914, 421) and GHI 129 (c. 375 - 3), and the fund was probably set up about 376. For payment for stelae in the first quarter of the century, see n. 119, below; and on the fund after 323 see pp. 108 - 9.

100. IG ii 2 222, 41 - 6. We have two other decrees calling on the treasurer of the demos to make a payment and on the nomothetae to see that he is reimbursed: IG ii 2 330, 15 - 23 (335/4); IG vii 4254 = SIG 3 298, 35 - 41 (not 39 - 45) (329/8).

101. GHI 167, 39 - 44.


103. Ibid. 22.

104. IG ii 2 1622, 566 - 72.

105. IG ii 2 1631, 505 - 11.

106. They are best described as ταμειαι του δημου πολιτευσαν χρηματων (schol. Ar. Av. 1541 = Andr. 324 F 36). (Notes in scholia and lexica are conveniently assembled by J. Oehler, RE, XI. 1068). They were responsible for jury pay (Hes., Suid. χωλαξμεται, L.S. 190.15, 275.22, cf. Ar. Vesp. 695, 725, Av. 1541) and for various other stipends - for theori (Andr. 324 F 36), for heralds (HMA 87, 50 - 1), for hieropoei (IG i 2 84, 22 - 3) and for the priestess of Athena IXη (GHT 73) - and also for the publication of documents (e.g. GHI 31, 11 - 13; HMA 87, 23 - 6; GHT 74, 51 - 2) and for various other state payments (e.g. IG i 2 80, 7 - 9; 336, 4 - 5;
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SEG X 84, 26 - 30, 41 sqq; 243, ii. 24 - 5; SEG XXI 52, 20 - 2).

107. Cf. HMA 79, GHI 64, where the sacred treasurers provide money either for the Hellenotamiae or for generals in immediate need.

108. The authors of ATL write of a single fund, τὸ δημόσιον, from which the colacretae or Hellenotamiae made payments as appropriate (ATL, III. 360 - 1), but records of borrowing from the sacred treasuries show that the fifth-century Athenians were careful to note which sums of money belonged to whom, and as long as the city's officials were distinct from those which she supplied to the Delian League it seems more realistic to think in terms of two separate funds.

109. SEG X 84, 26 - 30, and 96 (but here I have doubts about the restoration: see n. 146 to Ch. I), with A. Wilhelm, Sb. Wien CCXVII. v. 1939, 52 - 72; cf. Wilamowitz, DLZ XIX 1898, 383, on GHI 73.

110. Cf. n. 88, above.

111. GHI 86, 34 - 6; 87, 4 - 9; 96, 39 - 40.

112. GHI 86, 10 - 12.


115. A.P. 50. i.

116. A.P. 56. iv (at an earlier date they had been expected to defray their expenses out of their own pockets).
117. *IG ii² 380, 14 - 17*. We have seen that the use of the
verb μετέχειν continued into the Hellenistic period,
but with a weakened meaning (p. 101 and nn. 92 - 3, above).

118. Cf. p. 102 and n. 99, above.

119. On the assumption that at any one time there should be
only one source of payment for stelae W. B. Dinsmoor, *AJA²*
XXXVI 1932, 158 - 9 (modifying the views of A. C. Johnson,
*CP IX* 1914, 417 - 23) suggested that payments were made by
the joint sacred treasurers from 404/3 until 387/6, by the
apodectae in 386/5, by the treasurers of Athena from 385/4
to 377/6 (from a special 10 - talent fund in the last two
years of this period: *GHI 123* is dated to 378/7; the other
decrees mentioning the fund are *IG ii² 22, 84, GHI 139, IG ii²*
173); and by the treasurer of the demos from 376/5. The
succession of joint sacred treasurers, treasurers of Athena,
treasurer of the demos may be accepted; but one of the three likely
references to the apodectae seems later than 386/5, and it
is easier to believe that they might make a direct payment
in any emergency (cf. p. 102 and nn. 97 - 8, above); and it is
an obstacle (though perhaps not fatal) to Dinsmoor's view of
the 10 - talent fund that many have thought the content of *GHI*
139 to be better explained by a date in the 360's (see Tod's
commentary).

There is no justification beyond the actual sum involved
for the attempt of some scholars to identify the 10 - talent
fund with the proceeds of the levy imposed on metics (*IG ii²*
505, 14 - 15). For a recent discussion of the fund see S.
Accame, *La Lega ateniese*, 65 - 6 (not aware of Johnson and
Dinsmoor); Jones simply identifies the fund with the ecclesia's
expense-account (102 with 154 n. 33).
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120. E.g. IG ii² 120, 21 - 2.

121. E.g. IG ii² 223A, 7; B, 15; Kahrstedt (S.S.A., 332 - 3) has noticed that although in the Demosthenic period the boule could award gold crowns it later awarded only green crowns, except in those oligarchic periods in the first century when the boule made awards which at other times would have been ratified by the demos (cf. Ch. II, pp. 7-8). This is presumably due to Athens' comparative poverty and to the great increase in honours in the Hellenistic period, rather than to any deliberate desire to reduce the boule's financial independence.


123. E.g. IG ii² 223B, 5; P 10, 10 sqq.

124. U.M.A., 193 with n. 6: Kahrstedt should have specified the Tholos, not the Prytaneum.

125. The ΔΕΟΥΣΩΣ in "second" prytany decrees thank not the prytanes but the prytanes' treasurer, and the payments specifically attributed to him are for sacrifices, not for board residence. We cannot rule out (as Kahrstedt did, S.S.A., 223) the possibility that the prytanes received a separate allowance for expenses of this kind, which their treasurer administered; but since in IG ii² 674, 16 - 21, sacrifices of the prytanes were to be charged to the boule's expense-account it is certainly possible that the prytanes' expenses were always considered to form a subsection of the boule's.

126. Philocles was appointed c. 368 - 358 by the boule and demos (IG ii² 145. ii), and I argue in Ch. II, p. 86,
that the appointment of his father c. 398 - 390,

\[ \text{κηρυκευσαν . . . τῷ βολῇ καὶ τῷ ὅμω-} \]

\[ \text{τῷ Ἀθηναίων ,} \], was made by the demos

(IG ii 2 145. i).

127. Cf. Ch. IV, pp. \[ \text{11}-4. \]

128. This is the figure for the quorum at an \ departed or an assembly to ratify a grant of citizenship.

129. P. \[ \text{111.} \]

129A. I am greatly indebted to Dr D. M. Lewis for letting me see his unpublished essay on Eubulus and Lycurgus, and notes on it by Messrs. G. E. M. de Ste Croix, A. R. W. Harrison and G. L. Cawkwell.

130. \[ \text{[D]} \] XLIX. Tim. 12, 16; cf. for 362 \[ \text{[D].} \] L. Poly. 10.

Glötz' view that the fund was a creation of the 340's (RH CLXX 1932) has been answered by G. L. Cawkwell, Mnem. \[ \text{4.} \] XV 1962, who thinks it possible that a stratiotic fund existed as early as the 390's. A ταμίας στρατιωτικὴν first appears in 344/3 (IG ii 2 1443, 12 - 13), but there is no reason why the office should not be as old as the fund.

131. According to \[ \text{[D].} \] LIX Neacr. \[ \text{4.} \], when Apollodorus made his illegal proposal in 349/8 the laws prescribed

\[ \text{ὅταν κόλεμος Ἰ, τὰ χερσάντα χρήματα τῆς} \]

\[ \text{διοικητικῆς στρατιωτικῆς ἐξανά,} \]

but Athens had been formally at war with Philip since his capture of Amphipolis in 357 (Is. V. Phil. 2, A. II. F.L. 21, 70, 72, III. Ctes. 54 ) and in 349/8 surplus money was clearly going to the theoric fund. Presumably the creation of the latter fund after the Social War had in fact upset
the arrangement to which the speaker alludes.

132. I would however infer a μερισμός to the stratiotic fund from GHI 167, 39 - 44 (347/6). The fund is mentioned also in 349/8 (IG ii² 207, bcd 11) and its treasurer in 344/3 (cf. n. 130, above), and as at this time surpluses went to the theoretic fund an allocation in the μερισμός seems inevitable.

133. J. van Ooteghem, LEC I 1932, cf. G. L. Cawkwell, JHS LXXXIII 1963, 55 - 6 with n. 53, relying on Justin, VI. ix.1 - 5 and schol. A. III. Ctes. 24 (in edition of F. Schultz, 1865, or ap. NJhb XCIII 1866 (i), 27); J. J. Buchanan, Theorika, 48 - 53, prefers the attribution to Agyrrhius in Harp. Θεωρικά. Eubulus seems at any rate to have been responsible for the name Θεωρικά (Philinus ap. Harp. s.v.) and for the important position held by the theoretic officials in the 340's (A. III. Ctes. 25).

134. Apollodorus' attempt to divert surpluses to the stratiotic fund in 349/8 was thwarted by a γραφή παρακατώνων ([D]. LIX. Neaer. 4 - 6). According to Libanius (D. I. O1.i. hyp. 5) the death penalty was threatened for repetitions of this proposal.

135. Phil. 328 F 56a: the change is unlikely to have outlasted the settlement of 338/7 (but for a different view see F. W. Mitchel, TAPA XCIII 1962, 224 - 5 with 224 n. 33).


137. In 349/8 Demosthenes thought that the large-scale expedition he wanted to send to Olynthus could be financed from the theoretic fund (D. I. O1.i. 19 - 20, III. O1.iii. 10 - 11), and in 346 Eubulus thought it necessary to warn the Athenians that if they did not make peace on terms acceptable
to Philip the theoric monies would have to be diverted to the stratiotic fund (D. XIX. F.L. 291).

138. A. III. Ctes. 25 (the asterisked insertion is my own; Kaibel suggested καὶ νεωρὰς ἡμῖν; the Teubner and Bude editors retain the MSS' text unchanged). The powers of the theoric officials, their term of office, and whether there was a single man, ὃς ἐπὶ τὸ θεωρικὸν, or a board, have all been disputed: see Additional Note D, pp. 432-42.

139. Phil. 328 F 56a, Harp. θεωρικά. Since Demosthenes spent 10 talents ἐξ τῆς ὀικισθείσης on the walls (A. III. Ctes. 31), and ὀικισθείσης was the business of the theoric officials (A. III. Ctes. 25; Hyp. V. Dem., col. 28, referred by D. M. Lewis ap. G. L. Cawkwell, JHS LXXXIII 1963, 58 n. 68, to Demosthenes as a theoric official) it is likely that the fund also financed Eubulus' work on the fortifications (schol. D. III. OI.iii. 29).

140. Pl. Quaest. Plat. 1011 B.

141. See Additional Note D, pp. 437-42.

142. Quoted on p. 97. Similarly in 307/6 ἰπὶ τῆς ὀικισθείσης combined with the poletae to make a wall-building contract: IG ii² 463, 36.

143. A.P. 43. i.

144. A. III. Ctes. 24.

145. [Pl]. X.Or. 841B, decree ap. 852B.

146. D.S. XVI. 88. i.

147. Decree ap.[Pl]. X.Or. 852 B, D.S. XVI. 88.i.
148. ταχεῖς δὲ ἐξὶ τῇ διοικήσει τῶν χρημάτων,
Hyp. fr. 118 (K); cf. [Pl. X.Or. 841 C, D.S. XVI. 88.1,
D. Ep. iii.2. D.H. 660. Din. 11 describes Menassechmus
δημοσίως
as μετὰ δυνατορίου τὴν διοίκησιν τῶν/χρημάτων παραλαβὼν.

149. [Pl. X.Or. 841B, decree ap. 852B.

150. [Pl. X.Or. 841C.

151. IG ii² 1493/4/5 with F. W. Mitchel, TAPA XCIII 1962,
esp. 219 - 25, arguing that Demades was treasurer of the
stratiotic fund for the Panathenaic quadrennium 334 - 0
(cf. Additional Note D, pp. 135-6 ); he was at any rate
treasurer in 334/3. If we are to be tied to Panathenaic
quadrennia for Lycurgus, which at any rate in the case of
an extraordinary appointment does not seem inevitable,
I should prefer to think that the twelve years began in
334 and that Lycurgus did not live to the end of the third
quadrennium (cf. [Pl. X.Or. 842F).

152. For Hyperides see n. 148, above. In Hesp. XXIX 3 = SEG
XIX 119 [Ἐνοκλής Ἐ]εινδός 2[φήττες] is
said to have been <ἀτατεῖς ἐπ'] τῇ διοικήσει
tῆς ἀλεως (καὶ [ἡρημένος ἐπί], D. M. Lewis) (7 - 9),
and his activities to have involved ἐμπρόσθεν τοις ἐλαχίστον τοῖς ἄθοροι [τὸ γένος τὸ Κ]ήρυκων (10 - 13).
Xenocles was active from 346/5 to 306/5 (PA 11234, cf.
Meritt's commentary on this inscription), but Meritt thinks
the letters "too well cut to fit comfortably into the last
years of the century" (Dr Lewis tells me that he concurs)
and regards ὡς ἐκ τῇ διοικήσει as the title
borne first by Lycurgus and then by his friends, and Xenocles
as one of these friends.
153. Possibly this is an element which later misunderstanding has allowed to enter the tradition, but SEG XIX 119 would seem to confirm it, and we have so little detailed information on Lycurgus' position that it is dangerous to reject anything we are told. One could nevertheless perhaps argue against this element from IG ii² 1672, 11. recording an order issued by Lycurgus in 329/8 (certainly after the end of his first quadrennium) that an architect should be paid in advance.


155. δ ἐν τῇ δήμου ἡγεσίᾳ worked with the poletae in 307/6 (n. 142 above). If Lycurgus' office was extraordinary rather than established, this may have seemed a sufficient reason for its omission from the Athenaeion Politeia; if Lycurgus' own tenure was limited to one quadrennium any constitutional power will have passed with the office to his deputy - but it was the right of every citizen to request an audience with the boule and to address the assembly, and Lycurgus will surely have exercised this to the full. He was the author of a decree of the boule in or before 329/8 (IG ii² 1672, 302), but the safest inference from this is that he was a member at the time (Ch. II, p. 64 with n. 96; cf. Ch. I, p. 3 with n. 31). Mitchel, TAPA XCIII 1962, 222 n. 26, confuses the right of ἄρσονδον with the members' right to propose motions.

156. E.g. IG ii² 393, 11 - 15 (322/1 - 319/8); 448, 85 - 7 (318/7); 505, 62 - 4 (302/1).

157. E.g. IG ii² 463, 36 (307/6 - but we have no reference to his paying for stelae in this first year); 500, 40 - 3 (302/1).
Notes to III) - 332 -


158. IG ii² 806, 6 - 9; 809, 4 - 8; Hesp. VIII 12, 5 - 9; IX 45, 29 - 32 - with E. Schweigert's commentary on Hesp. IX 45, p. 351.

159. IG ii² 558, 29 - 31.

160. IG ii² 657, 70 - 3; 672, 16 - 17. IG ii² 675 is linked with 525 and dated to 306/5 by W. K. Pritchett, AJP LVIII 1937, 329 - 33; for 806, 809 cf. n. 158, above.

161. IG ii² 641, 29 - 32, 643, 9 - 12.


164. At the end of the third century an honorific decree almost certainly of the boule (IG ii² 863: it ends with the "citation", ἡ βουλὴ [τὴ]ν ἔρεταν, 11. 10 - 11) was to be paid for simply by δ ταμίας (11. 7 - 9). Kirchner quotes the opinion of Hartel and Fellner that this was the ταμίας τῆς βουλῆς, but in view of the absence of any parallel after 323 the ταμίας τῶν στρατιωτικῶν is more likely.

165. For the history of the office see n. 456, below.


168. Notice that here and in Hesp. XI 56 (cf. p. 106) the treasurer of the striatic fund still exists, though at this time he is not involved in payment for stelae.
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169. Cf. Ch. I, p. 12 with n. 84.

170. The διορθωμολ still had funds at their disposal in 320/19 (cf. p. 104 and n. 117, above).

171. A. P. 47. ii, 49. v.

172. A. P. 45. ii.

173. ATL list 1, 2, p.s.; list 2, 1; list 3, 1.

174. GHI 51 A, 7 - 9.

175. GHI 64. The similarity of function makes it as good as certain that we are dealing with the same board again. Logistae, again with no number stated, reckoned up the expenditure of the Eleusinian epistatae: HMA 41, 22 - 8.


177. A. P. 54. ii, cf. scholia and lexica. Phot., E. M. ευθυνα confuse these with the ευθυνολ, on whom see n. 22 to Ch. IV.

178. A. III. Ctes 9 - 23, esp. 22.

179. Though little trust can be placed in such general charges as A. III. Ctes. 9-10.


182. Ant. VI Chor. 35.

183. Ibid. 49.

184. A. I. Tim. 110.

185. O. O. iii. 1 - 3.
Notes to III)


188. Hyp. IV. Eux. 8; cf. Ch. IV, pp. 149-150.


191. Notice, for example, T.III. 27 - 8.

192. IG i2 114, 1. 35 in the enumeration of H. T. Wade-Gery, BSA XXXIII 1932 - 3, 113 - 22. I discuss this inscription in the appendix to Ch. IV, pp. 208 - 11, and argue:

(i) that ὁμιος καληθών means simply "people in assembly", and that clauses in which this phrase rather than ὁμιος alone is used are likely to be older than 450 B.C., but that the whole document need not represent a single enactment, with a single date;

and (ii) that the imposition of an oath (whose text was given at the beginning of this inscription) on the boule in 501/0 does not justify the inference that anything which the boule then swore not to do it had previously been allowed to do (that is, I regard the oath as consolidating Cleisthenes' reform, not as modifying it).
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197. A.P. 42. iv.


199. A.P. 42. i - ii, &c. I discuss this ὀξύμαστα in Ch. IV, pp. 187 - 8.

200. IG ii² 1156, 1189. On the date of the institution see the discussions cited in n. 186 to Ch. IV.

201. So Beloch, Klio V 1905, 351; Go², III. ii. 402; Gomme, Population of Athens, 11; Jones, 82. A.P. 42 and Lyc. Leocr. 76 imply that ephebic service was compulsory for all Athenians: I find it incredible that the thetes should have been subjected to a two-year programme of hoplite training, but my incredulity is not shared by Pélékidis, Histoire de l'Éphybe attique, 113 - 4.

202. A.P. 42. iii - v.

203. IG ii² 1156, 64.

204. Cf. Pélékidis, Histoire de l'Éphybe attique, part III.

205. The earliest instance is Hesp. VII. 20, 17 - 18.

206. A.P. 49, i - ii, &c. For these ὀξύμαστα see again Ch. IV, pp. 181 - 3.

207. A.P. 46. i.

208. The ὅδε was first deleted by Kenyon, followed by Blass, Sandys, Opperman and Mathieu & Haussoulier, cf. Gilbert, 278 - 9 n. 3;
δ' was read by Keil; δέκα by Thalheim, Kolbe and Wilcken, cf. Busolt & Swoboda, 1032, Miltner, RE, VII A. 121.

209. D.S. XI. 43. iii.


212. E.g. Keil, Anonymus Argentinensis, 74 - 5; Kolbe, AM XXVI 1901, 411 - 3; Wilcken, Hermes XLII 1907, 387 - 9 cf. 399 - 402. Keil dotted the ε, but nowhere discussed the reading; Wilcken printed the ε as certain.


214. I have obtained this photograph through the cooperation of Professor J. Schwartz and Mr R. G. Maber, and Dr J. D. Thomas has kindly examined with me this, a photograph taken for Professor B. R. I. Sealey (lent to me by Dr D. M. Lewis) and the photograph published in Hesp. XXVI 1957. Schwartz' opinion, based on an examination of the papyrus, is that le καππα est absolument sûr et il est précédé d'une lettre ronde que l'on est tout naturellement porté à lire epsilon.

215. Cf. n. 212, above. He accepted Keil's readings and restored:

τριτ-
[ρων τον έτι πλωμων επιμελείας έσθατα, καινώς δ' επι-
ναυπηγεν εκατόν]
[διομένην δε αύτῆς άνδρας δέκα.

216. IG ii² 1611, 9.
217. G. L. Cawkwell, _C & M_ XXIII 1962, 41-2, arguing against D. M. Lewis, _BSA_ XLIX 1954, 44. Even if full details of the ἐξαπρετοί had survived, we do not know when any of the πρῶτοι, δεύτεροι and τρίτοι were built.

218. Cf. D. XXII. _Andr._, hyp. i. 1, hyp. ii. 8.


220. _IG_ i2 73, 4.

221. _Ibid._, 13-14.

222. _SEG_ X 131, 8-13.

223. _SEG_ X 138, 4-9: cf. pp. 101-2 and n. 95, above. Cf. _SEG_ X 226, 11 sqq., (largely restored) where the sacred treasurers in 431/0 provide money for the ναυκεγούς and trieropoei.


225. _Ibid._, 14-20.

226. The funds must have been voted by the assembly - presumably a special vote for each consignment of ships in the fifth century and in the fourth an allocation in the μερίσματος (which can have been a regular sum only if there was a regular quota). Meritt and Wade-Gery restore in 11. 17-18 of the Anonymus Argentinensis a note that money for building triremes was voted by the boule (_Hesp._ XXVI 1957, 164 cf. 177); earlier editors (e.g. Wilcken, _Hermes_ XLII 1907, 407-9) did not attempt to restore a full text of this section.

228. There is a full treatment of the epimeletae by G. Glotz, DA, II. i. 669.1 - 673.i. For the boule's interest in the dockyards cf. O.O. iii. 2.

229. SEG X 142, 5, 6 (c. 406).

230. E.g. IG ii² 1627, 214 - 6.

231. E.g. IG ii² 1628, 339 sqq. Further references, DA, II.i. 672. ii with n. 156.

232. [D]. XLVII. Ev. & Mnes., esp. 33, 41 - 2. On the misdeeds of Theophemus see Ch. IV, pp. 159 - 61.

233. IG ii² 1609. 111.

234. IG ii² 1623, 200 sqq.

235. IG ii² 1629, 272 sqq.; cf. the enabling clause, 264 - 9.

236. IG ii² 1627, 49 - 51; 1628, 231 - 3; 1629, 358 - 61.

237. IG ii² 1628, 297 sqq.

238. IG ii² 1629, 417 - 20, 1133 - 6; 1631, 196 - 9, 326 sqq.

239. IG ii² 1629, 430 - 6.

240. IG ii² 1627, 374 - 95; 1628, 533 - 51; 1629, 1010 - 29; 1631, 237 - 51.

241. CHI 61, 53.

242. IG ii² 1627, 279 sqq.; 1628, 501 sqq.; 1629, 976 sqq.

243. IG ii² 1631, 212 sqq.

244. IG ii² 1629, 11 - 15, 31 - 6, 53 - 7, 99 - 104, 113 - 23, 133 - 8, 152 - 7, 277 - 97 marg.

245. IG ii² 1631, 655 - 8.
246. Similarly the decree cited in [D] XLVII. Ev. & Mnes. 21 probably made general provisions for the working of Periander's law.

247. IG ii² 1622, 379 – 85.

248. Ibid., 420 – 2.

249. Ibid., 444 – 8.

250. See Additional Note D, p. 441.


252. The lacuna must have included detailed provisions as to the fleet which Miltiades was to take with him: cf. 11. 165 – 9.

253. τηρεῖμαι is, I think, best interpreted as a dative of the agent, so that this clause will place the ἀνοσολείας under the supervision of the boule.

254. [D], XLVII. Ev. & Mnes. 26.

255. Ibid. 33.

256. A.II. F.L. /The office is not mentioned by Demosthenes, pace Jacoby and others: the passages cited in the commentary on Phil. 328 F 63 refer to dispatches but not to dispatchers.

257. Texts conveniently assembled at Phil. 328 F 63 and commentary.

258. Cf. IG ii² 1953.

259. D. LI. Cor. Tri. 4. Cf. Ch. IV, p. 158.
Notes to III) - 340 -

260. Ar. Eq. 912 - 8 with schol., D.XXXV. Lacr. 48. XXXIX

Boe. Nom. 8, A.P. 61.i; cf. the "decree of Themistocles",

SEG XVIII 153, 18 - 23, with the remarks of M. H.

Jameson, Hist. XII 1963, 395 - 7: when the preliminary
lists had been drawn up the boule and the generals were
to πληροῦν the ships (11. 35 - 40).

261. GHI 77A, 5 - 6.

262. Ibid., 10 - 12.

263. Pp. 158 - 64

264. D.XXII. Andr. 20. The final ΚΩΤΗ is Jurinus' generally
accepted emendation for the ΚΩΤΗΥ or ΚΩΤΩ of the MSS.

265. Schol. D.XXII. Andr. 20 (not in Sauppe; 679. 15, Dindorf;
quoted O.C.T. app.).

266. A.P. 43. i.


268. In Ch. II, p. 56, I argue from IG ii² 145 that the
herald of the boule and demos was appointed by the ecclesia,
which could accept a recommendation made in a specific
probouleuma.

Dr D. M. Lewis has suggested the following alternative
solution. There is some evidence to support a theory that
the office rotated among the tribes:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tribe</th>
<th>Periods</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>IG ii² 1622, 387 - 90;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>IG ii² 1627, 23 - 4, 374 - 5; 1628, 3 - 6, 83 - 6;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IX</td>
<td>IG ii² 1628, 11 - 14; 1629, 275; 1632, 14 - 15;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

but the treasurers for 363/2 and 359/8 were both from X.
Such an officer would probably be appointed by lot, and the boule's offence would then lie in having a man elected. But this is incompatible with the scholium cited in n. 265, above, and Demosthenes' emphasis seems to me to be on the part played by the boule rather than on the fact of election.

269. A.P. 49. iii: in 60.i. the athlothetae appointed to manage the Panathenaea τοῦ ἀληθοῦς οἰκοδομηθεὶς κοινῷ ποιοῦν τοῖς βουλῇς.


271. Ibid., 14 sqq.

272. So Tod, GHI, I, p. 80.

273. HMA 45.

274. IG i^2 88, 1 - 5.

275. IG i^2 81.

276. SEG XXI 37, a 7 - 10.

277. IG i^2 84, 38 - 9.

278. IG ii^2 204, 5 - 12, cf. 69 - 70, 74 sqq. (352/1).

279. Ibid., 67 - 70.


281. IG ii^2 244. G. L. Cawkwell, JHS LXXXIII 1963, 66 with n. 109, would prefer to date this a little earlier and connect it with the activities of Eubulus, and his argument may be strengthened by the appearance of the antigrapheus in 1. 23 (cf. Additional Note D, pp. 48 - 9).

282. IG ii^2 244, 6-10.

283. Ibid., 40 - 2.
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284. IG ii² 463, 6 - 7, cf. 9.

285. Ibid., 21, 32, 117. In the IG text the architects, both singular and plural, are linked with ὁ ἐπὶ τῷ δολοκητῶν, though the sum total of the evidence for this is that in 1. 9 the architect is followed by καλ and in 1. 36 ὁ ἐπὶ τῷ δολοκητῶν is combined with the poletae. An additional fragment (Hesp. IX 9) makes it clear that at any rate the division of the work into sections (117 - 8) was made by the architects alone, and all the restorations of this combination disappear in the latest text, Maier, GMBi 11.

286. IG ii² 463, 23, retained by Maier.


288. GHI 40, 5 - 8.

289. HMA 45, 8 - 11.

290. HMA 67B, 10 - 11, has the restoration [ ἐστελεχώτα]; Wilhelm’s text (SEG XII 18) does not, but he agreed that further expenditure on the Acropolis was to be severely limited.

291. ATL D 19/HMA 69, 7.


293. IG ii² 1669, 8, 21, &c.

294. IG ii² 1678, 27 - 8. This must antedate the loss of Delos in 314.

296. A.P. 46. ii. On the καταγγοσσα of the papyrus text see n. 92 to Ch. IV. The τεράδ whose ἐπιμελεία is credited to the boule in 0.0. iii. 2 are probably religious buildings rather than ceremonies.

297. But the Eleusinian epistatae are known to have been elected: HMA 41, 7 - 13.

298. IG i² 335 sqq, e.g. GHI 47 (chryselephantine Athena), 52 (Parthenon), 53 (Propylaea).

299. Cf. p. II. The boards of epistatae seem to have kept their accounts by the bouleutic calendar: see Additional Note A, p. 417.

300. HMA 67B, 2 - 12.

301. SEG XII 18, cf. his article in JHS LXVIII 1948. I cannot, however, see why the treasurers should require the architect to produce a παρδηγύμα: Wilhelm offers this restoration of 11. 8 - 9 without comment in his final sentence (p. 129).

302. SEG X 44, 3 - 6.


304. IG ii² 244, 38 - 40.

305. Ibid., 26 - 7, 36 - 7.


307. IG ii² 463, 25.

308. IG ii² 244, 6, 40 - 1.
309. D.XVIII. Cor. 28, cf. A.II. F.L. 55. This architect appears twice in inscriptions, IG ii² 456, 32 - 3; 792, 7 - 9.


311. The office is not mentioned in A.P. 61. i. Ferguson noted that IG ii² 1487, shows six στρατηγίων τῶν ἐκ τῆς τοῦ πολέμου παρασκευῆς κεκεπήκομενον] in 307/6, and ii. 91 sqq. record the handing over of military equipment by generals to the treasurers of Athena in 306/5. Shortly afterwards the treasurers of Athena were abolished (cf. Ferguson, Treasurers of Athena, 126) and στρατηγὸς ὄν ἐκ τῆς παρασκευῆς became a regular office (apparently so in IG ii² 682, 21 - 4 [296/5]). Ferguson suggested that this general was primarily responsible for military stores, some of which were kept in the temples, and through this came to be concerned with everything that was kept in the temples.

312. Cf. n. 57, above.

313. IG ii² 839 (221/0): on the decrees concerning this shrine cf. pp 96 - 7.

314. IG ii² 841, 842.

315. IG ii² 840.

316. Hesp. XVI 64; I quote l. 15.


318. IG ii² 1046.

319. IG ii² 1039. ii, 1043. ii.
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320. E.g. P 97.


322. IG i² 5, 2 (c. 475 - 450).

323. SEG X 6, 89 - 92 (c. 460).

324. GHI 74: see pp. 95 - 6 and especially n. 45, above.

325. GHI 74, 8 - 10, 16 - 18, 34 - 5.

326. Ibid., 10 - 12.

327. Ibid., 40 sqq.

328. Ibid., 9 - 10, 17 - 18. The title is given as τερο-ποιότερον Ἠλευσινδής by Oehler, RE, VIII. 1585, but Ἠλευσινδής is surely to be read with παραθύδατι.

329. IG i² 311, 18 - 19 (422 - 418).

329A. HMA 41 (after 450), IG i² 311.

330. IG ii² 1672, 279 sqq.

331. Cf. p. 96 and nn. 50 - 1, above.

332. IG ii² 140, Add., cf. SIG³ 200, 25 - 6.
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334. IG ii² 1749, 80 - 4, honouring τοῖς ἱεροποιοῦσι τοῖς τῇ μυστηρίᾳ ἱεροποιήσαντας Ἐλευσίνης. All ten were members of the tribe Aegeis (which was presumably in prytany at the time of the festival); one of them was the treasurer of the prytany, and another was also a συλλογευτής τοῦ ὀνόματος. The honours for the συλλογευτής were proposed by a ἱεροποιός; the honours for the hieropoei, by a συλλογευτής; and honours for the ἱεροποιός who had proposed the συλλογευτής' honours, by another ἱεροποιός: the proposer of the honours for the hieropoei also proposed the honours for the treasurer of the prytany. A friendly set of men.

Demosthenes addressed to (hypothetical) dikasts the following comment on Midias:–

ἵχειροτονήσατε τοῦτον . . . ἡμικερότερον ἐκμελητὴν καὶ ἱεροποιόν ποτε καὶ βοώνην (D. XXI. Mid. 171).

It is perhaps unwise to insist from this passage on the same mode of appointment to all three offices, but it is at any rate possible that before 353/2 the Eleusinian hieropoei were not appointed by the boule, and that Midias held office under the old dispensation.

In 329/8 the Eleusinian epistatae spent 70 drachmae on sacrificing an ἁρπαστὰρος to each of the two goddesses, in accordance with a decree of the boule proposed by Lycurgus (IG ii² 1672, 302).

335. IG i² 84, 19 - 21.

336. Ibid., 23 - 5.

337. GHI 83, 6 - 7.

339. Ibid., 34 - 5.

340. IG ii² 410.

341. A.P. 54. vi.


343. IG vii 4254 = SIG³ 298.

344. In reply to suggestions by Foucart and Wilhelm that 'Αμφιάρεια should be restored Keil quoted (in Hermes XXX 1895, 474) a letter from Kenyon stating that the restoration was impossible; and Dr J. D. Thomas tells me that he would read [H] φολτ[στ [υ] a] from the 1891 facsimile. More recently the Dr. D. M. Lewis has favoured the Amphiarea, and suggestion has been mentioned by J. K. Davies, JHS LXXXVII 1967, 35 with n. 36.

345. Cf. Ch. I p. 19. For the number compare the three from Aegaeis in 341/0 (IG ii² 1749, 75 - 9: cf. n. 334, above) with Poll. VIII. 104, Hes., Phot. Τριάκοντα. Glotz, The Greek City, 189, suggested that one of the three was appointed from each trittys; but the three men named as Συλλογές in IG ii² 1749, 79, represent only two of W. E. Thompson's Τριττυες των Κρυτηνων, and only one Cleisthenic trittys.

IG ii² 1425, 126 - 30, records gold crowns dedicated by the Συλλογές in the treasury of Athena in 370/69 and 369/8 ("and perhaps annually thereafter" - D. M. Lewis, BSA XLIX 1954, 45); IG ii² 2821 records a further dedication in 351/0.

346. IG ii² 1257A.
347. IG ii² 1257B.
348. IG ii² 1496, 82 - 3, 113 - 4.
349. IG ii² 330.
350. Kirchner in IG ii² I i, p. 135.
351. Cf. 11. 6 - 7, 33 - 4.
352. D.XXI. Mid. 114 - 5.
354. S.v. τεροποτος.
355. S.v. τεροποτος . The conclusion is based on a fragment of Dinarchus' speech against Lycurgus (fr. viii. 1, Sauppe); D.XXI. Mid. 115 is quoted without the words τρίτον αὐτῶν.
356. In the fifth century the boule also provided some religious treasurers: cf. p. 96 and nn. 53, 54, above.
357. See nn. 264 and 265 to Ch. I.
358. IG ii² 223 B, 7 - 9, cf. 5 - 6.
358A. D.XIX. F.L. 128.
359. GHI 42, 64 - 9.
360. IG ii² 204, 5 - 6.
361. Ibid., 42 sqq.
362. Ibid., 23 - 42.
363. Ibid., 16 - 23.
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367. Cf. Ch. I, p. 16

368. Cf. Ch. I, pp. 17-8


370. E.g. IG ii² 689, 775, 976, SEG XVIII 22, 26. (I make no claim to completeness for the list of references in nn. 370 - 80. The decrees cited are, inevitably, late: honours were not awarded, or at any rate their award was not published, on such slight pretexts before the Hellenistic period).

371. IG ii² 410.

372. IG ii² 783 (a decree of the boule).

373. IG ii² 661.

374. SEG XIX 124.

375. IG ii² 403.

376. IG ii² 365.

377. IG ii² 780.

378. IG ii² 668, 781, 929.

379. IG ii² 1011, 1039, 1042, 1043.

380. IG ii² 949.

381. Prytany "first" decrees, passim.
382. Cf. S. Dow, Hesp. Supp. I. 1937, 8 - 11. Artemis appears commonly but by no means invariably; the friends and allies of the Athenians are added to the list of beneficaries from c. 200. Two third-century inscriptions add further sacrifices:–

[ἐθυσαν δὲ καὶ]

[τὰ άτηνια καὶ τὰ] Χαλκεῖα καὶ τὰ τὰ κατρία ὑκέρ τε τῆς βουλῆς
[kαὶ τοῦ δήμου].

(P 4, 6 - 8)

[κυ]-

υσαν δὲ καὶ τὰ άτηνια καὶ τὰ [δι]τῶν τει δήμητρα καὶ τει [Κόρη]
ζ καὶ τοῦ δήμου.

(IG ii² 674, 6 - 8)

Artemis βουλάζα (of whom there was an altar in the precinct of the Tholos: Hesp. VI 3, 19 - 20), Artemis ψωφοφόρος and αἱ Ψωφοφόραι seem to have been particularly associated with the Tholos: see H. A. Thompson, Hesp. Supp. IV 1940, 137 - 41. In the second century A.D. an official with responsibilities for the Tholos acted also as ἤρεθζ Ψωφοφόρων: cf. n. 465 below. See also on sacrifices in the Tholos or its precinct Paus. I. 5. 1.

383. IG ii² 2790.


385. IG ii² 2792.

386. IG ii² 1544, 47 - 50.

387. E.g. Hesp. XVI 41.

388. IG ii² 956, 14 - 15; 957, 9 - 10; 958, 12 - 13; cf. restoration of 959, 11 - 12.
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390. Theoph. Char. xxi. 11.

391. Ant. VI. Chor. 45.


393. SEG XXI 38, 7 - 8.

394. IG ii² 47, 35 sqq.

395. IG ii² 334, 10 - 16.

396. IG ii² 847, 25 - 6. The inclusion of this in a decree of the demos reflects the dominant position which the boule had by now acquired in the enactment of decrees.

397. Ibid., 17 - 20.

398. SEG XII 95 (J. H. Oliver, Hesp. XXI 1952, 381 - 99).

399. A.P. 54. iii - v.


401. In 403/2 Cephisophon appears both as author of a probouleumatic decree (GHI 97. i) and as secretary (GHI 97. ii).

402. E.g. GHI 31, 12; 32, 24; 42, 59; HMA 87, 24 - 53.

403. GHI 87, 6 - 7, where Dr R. S. Stroud reads χαρὰ τῷ βίᾳ φιλίᾳ [ος με]τ[α]μ ὡραμ[ν]ατέος τῆς βολῆς (information supplied by Dr D. M. Lewis).

404. This title used to be restored in the passage quoted in n. 403, above.
405. See Ferguson, The Athenian Secretaries, Ch. viii, suggesting that the secretary had himself named for purposes of ostenta-
tion in the headings of inscriptions recording alliances and
grants of proxeny or citizenship; Brillant, Les Secrétaires
athéniens, Ch. I, § ii, arguing that the secretary was named
in the heading to date a document, and in the prescript when
it was inscribed at public expense to guarantee the official
nature of the publication (on this last point I would prefer
to say that the whole prescript was the mark of a text derived
from the official records, whoever was responsible for pub-
lication).

406. On the assimilation of the bouleutic to the archontic year
see Additional Note A, pp. 412, 415. The secretary is
named in two headings shortly after the reorganisation: IG ii 119
(360/59), GHI 157 (356/5).

407. GHI 134, contr. 131, 135, 136.

408. IG ii 109, 110, 111 = GHI 143, 142.

409. IG ii 223 C with 224, 225 (343/2).

410. IG ii 1749, 63 - 5, with 228 - 9 (341/0). Χαληρωντος διϊδ της
βουλης (Poll. VIII. 98) seems to be a simple misquotation
from A.P. 54. iii.

411. Ferguson discovered that this office normally rotated among
the tribes in their official order, and in Klio XIV 1914 - 15
he suggested that the regular cycles beginning with tribe VII
in 356/5 were preceded by a cycle in which each tribe took by
lot one of the ten years 366/5 - 357/6, and that 366 was
therefore a likely year for the institution of annual
secretaries. This may be right, but many have doubted it.
412. T. VII. 10.

413. He is first found as γραμματεὺς τῆς βουλῆς καὶ τῶι ὀνόματι in IG ii^2^ 1740 (before 350?) and the title is used also in IG ii^2^ 1747 (c. 350), Hesp. III 54 (where Ἄγωντς [sic] was restored by Wilhelm, Abh. Berlin 1939, xx, and [independently] by Raubitschek, Hesp. XI 1942, 305-6) (same year, but Raubitschek's argument for a date after 355 is weak - cf. n. 462, below), and Ag. I 4720 (303/2) (unpublished; information from Dr D. M. Lewis). In IG ii^2^ 1700 (335/4) and Hesp. XI 11 (324/3) he is styled γραμματευτής τοῦ ὀνόματι; in P 10 (256/5) he is called γραμματευτής τοῦ ὀνόματι (but the usual version of the title is found in P 8, another inscription of the same year), and this form occurs in two other third-century documents, P 13 and 34. (It is not clear which secretarial office was held by the γραμματευτής of REG LXXIII 1960, 88 - 99, 11. 60 - 2 [first quarter C3] and the γραμματευτής βουλῆς of IG ii^2^ 1744, 18 - 21 [before 350].)

Some scholars have claimed to find supporting evidence for the identification of this secretary with the Reader in IG ii^2^ 223 A, 10 (343/2):-

ἀναγ[νῶ]ναι τὸ ὠνόμα τοῦ γραμματέα τῶι ὀνόματι (so Brillant, Les Secrétaires Athéniens, 113, Schulthess, RE, VII. 1725). They may be right to interpret τοῦ γραμματέα τῶι ὀνόματι as a title, but we have seen that this was not the usual form of the title, and it seems to me equally likely that the author of the decree intended τοῦ γραμματέα as the title (ἀναγνῶναι makes it clear which secretary is meant) and τῶι ὀνόματι as indirect object.
According to A.P. 54. v

οὕτως οὐδενὸς ἐστὶν κύριος ἄλλα τοῦ ἀναγνώσιν,

but modern scholars have disagreed. Brillant, op. cit., 110 - 1, 122, claimed that the actual reading aloud of documents would be performed by the herald under the guidance of this secretary, whose duties would make him a highly influential Keeper of the Statute Book. Dow, Hesp. Supp. I 1937, 16, identified him with the γραμματεὺς τῆς βουλῆς (cf. n. 422, below) and claimed that in the Hellenistic period this was "a political office":

one holder of the office, Euthymachus, was earlier ὕπογραμματεὺς and later a member of the boule (Dow, op. cit., 103 - 4, on P 48). Contrast however K. J. Dover in his commentary on T. VII. 10 (regarding γραμματεὺς τῷ ὀνόματι as the normal fourth-century version of the title).

414. E.g. IG ii² 222, 27 - 8.
415. E.g. GHI 147, 42 - 3; 166, 11.
416. The Athenian Secretaries, Chs. iii - iv; Les Secrétaires athéniens, Ch. III.
417. RE, VII. 1711 - 22.
418. IG ii² 120, 13 - 19 (353/2).
420. IG ii² 138, 139.
421. Cf. n. 409, above.
422. Schweigert in publishing this text failed to draw the obvious conclusion from it (Hesp. VII 1938, 286 - 7). The list of ᾿ατοῦ in P 1 (305/4?) includes both the γραμματεὺς
The office was one which a man might hold in middle life:

Dieuches, secretary in 349/8 (IG ii 2 206, 2 - 3; 208, 3 - 4; 209, 2 - 3), was 40 years old at the time (IG ii 2 2409, 50, with D. M. Lewis, BSA L 1955, 32 - 3).

425. Hesp. X 11 (324/3); P 1 (305/4) (Meritt, Hesp. X 1941, 45 - 6, substitutes ἐπὶ τῷ ὁδὲς νόμονος for Dow's ἐπὶ τῷ ἀνδρ-θημα); Ag. I 4720 (303/2). Poll. VIII. 98, in contradiction to the Athenaion Politeia, states that this secretary was elected by the boule.
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rary decrees, published by the γραμματευς της βουλης (IG ii² 140, 31; SEG XII 87, 23 - 4).

430. IG ii² 1700, Hesp. X 11, P 1, Ag. I 4720: it is probably the holder of this office who is honoured in IG ii² 415 (c. 330?) for his attention to the ἀναγραφή τῶν γραμματων (cf. S Dow, HSCP LXVII 1963, 39 - 40). He is not to be confused with the ἀναγραφετς τῶν νόμων of the late fifth century (Lys. XXX. Nic. 2 cf. 25; GHI 87, 5 - 6) and the man or men probably given the same title in 304/3 (cf. IG ii² 487).

431. IG ii² 1700, P 1, Ag. I 4720. On this "ἀντιγραφετς της βουλης" and the earlier "ἀντιγραφετς της διοικησεως" see Additional Note D, pp. 437 41.

432. IG ii² 120, 15 - 17.

433. E.g. the ἀπογραμματευς (Ant. VI. Chor. 35) or γραμματευς (A.P. 55. i - ii) of the thesmothetae; the γραμματευς of the Eleven (Poll. VIII. 102; IG ii² 1631, 377 sqq., 389 sqq.).

434. Lys. XXX. Nic. 29. The rule seems not to have been in force in the Periclean period: Satyrus χασαγραμματευς in ATL, lists 12, 36 and 13, 2 (444/3 and 432/1): and Anticles was probably secretary to the epistatae of the Parthenon throughout the period of the work (IG i² 339 - 53; esp. 349, i; 351, 55; 352, l - 2; 353, l - 3; in the earlier lists he χασαγραμματευς but no colleague is named).


436. HMA 39, § 12.
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437. SEG XII 37, 58.

438. GHI 87, 4 - 7 (on the text of 1. 6 see n. 403, above).

439. GHI 97, 22 - 3.

440. GHI 96, 25 - 8.

441. Ar. Thesm. 431 - 2.

442. HMA 87, 51 - 4.

443. D. XIX. F.L. 249 cf. 314; the scholiast on § 249 says that in the Tholos ευπτσωστηντο ἀρδι τοῦ δῆμου γραμματέος οἱ χειρο-

τουργεῖτες ἀρδ οὐκ (ἄρα? — P.J.R.) τῆς πόλεως.

Kahrstedt, S. S. A., 336, combined these δεξιοτέτοι with those whom the state entertained as a mark of distinction in the Prytaneum; but see S. Dow, Hesp. Supp. I. 1937, 22 - 4.


446. The fact of election is attested for the treasurer in prytany "second" decrees, passim; for the secretary in Hesp. III 16, 8 - 9.

447. Once called διαγραμματέος τοῦ [δῆμου]: P 84.

448. The priest is first found in Hesp. XXXIII 26 (c. 250); the αἴθητης in P 28 (c. 229 - 7).
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449. P 86 (145/4); restored in Hesp. XXXIII 37 (c. 150). His restoration at a higher place in the list in P 58 (before 178/7) seems less likely, but some additional officer must be found to fill this place.

450. SEG XII 101, Hesp. XXXII 21 (both 135/4); Hesp. X 77 (131/0); Kerameikos, III, A5, Hesp. XXXIV 5 (both c. 100); Hesp. XVII 12 (95/4).


452. The principal lists of the intervening period are P 110, 116, SEG XVIII 53 (Augustan); Hesp. XI 2, IG ii² 1759, Hesp. XI 13, IG ii² 1769 (A.D. CC 1-2). One official in SEG XVIII 53 is described as γρ[αμματεςς τος ουνεδριους] γ[ευμενος]. On the post-Sullan δεσποτος in general, see now D. J. Geagan, Hesp. Supp. XII 1967, 103-12.

453. IG ii² 1077, 2 with 50 (col. iii) shows that Περι το βημα was a title of the eponymous secretary.

454. E.g. Hesp. XVI 87B (A.D. 177/8 or 188/9), IG ii² 1796 (c.180), 1808 (end C2). See Geagan, Hesp. Supp. XII 1967, 101, who notices especially IG ii² 1775 (168/9): the heading names ὁ γραμματευς τῶν βουλευτῶν τῆς Ἀκαμαντικοῦ φυλῆς Φιλοσμενος Ὑρωτος Κεφαληθεν, and there follows a full list of 40 members, not including this man. But normally this office seems to have been held by one of the prytanes.

456. The treasurers of the boule are mentioned in the plural in IG ii² 120, 20 - 2 (353/2), and there are two of them in IG ii² 223 C, 7 - 9 (343/2); in IG ii² 1700, 218 - 9 (335/4) we find one τομίας τῆς βουλῆς and one τομίας τῶν εἰς τὸ ἄνδρημα.

Thereafter the boule’s funds were regularly administered by a single treasurer (A. C. Johnson, CP IX 1914, 418, explained as an error the apparent mention of a single treasurer of the boule in IG ii² 24, b 8 - 10, an early fourth-century decree), but increasing financial centralisation lessened the importance of this officer (cf. pp 103-46 and S. Dow, Hesp. Supp. I 1937, 18). On the treasurer after Sulla see Geagan, Hesp. Supp. XII 1967, 98 - 9, 115 - 6: he appears in Π 108 (c. 40 B.C.) and (restored) in Π 110 (29/8 - 22/1); the τομίας τῆς βουλῆς in Π 116 (c. 20) Geagan regards as an erroneous description of him; in the Christian era, when the boule was largely dependent on private benefactions (cf. Ch. I, pp. 1-13) no comparable treasurer is regularly listed, but we do find a τομίας, not further specified, in IG ii² 1759 (A.D. 90 - 100) and 1799 (c. 180), and a τομίας φυλῆς in IG ii² 1827 (Q3).

457. Cf. p. 104 and n. 125, above.


459. A. P. 47. v, 48. i.

460. D. XIX. F.L. 129; IG ii² 463, 28 - 9; 583, 5 - 7. In IG ii² 120, 11 - 13, Eucles the Ὀμηνῖτις was to write down what was found in the Chalcothece.
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461. IG ii² 879.

462. Hesp. XI 1942, 305 - 6, reediting Hesp. III 54. A. E.

Raubitschek ad loc. suggests that he had taken the place of the old antigrapheus, mentioned after the secretary in IG ii² 1740 (before 388/7); but there is far too little evidence to make this a safe inference. Wilhelm, Abh. Berlin 1939, xx, restored [υπ. Ψηφετης Εφών] in IG ii² 2411, 4, and argued that each tribe in the boule had its Ψηφετης. (He also made the restoration of secretary and Ψηφετης in Hesp. III 54.)

In L.S. 248. 7, E.M. ἐκφυλλοφορία, the origin of this unusual method of voting on the fate of a bouleutes (for which see Ch. IV, pp. 146 - 9) is ascribed to the fact that a Ψηφετης had once tampered with the ordinary ballots.

463. P 105 (40 - 30 B.C.), P 108 (45 - 30 B.C.), Hesp. XI 2 (late A.D. C1).

464. IG ii² 1759 (A.D. 90 - 100), Hesp. XI 11 (first half C2).

465. E.g. Hesp. XII 23 (165/67); IG ii² 1774 (167/8); Hesp. XI 18, IG ii² 1775 (both 168/9); 1794, 1797 (c. 180). The man who is styled ἐκλ. Ξυλός in the last two inscriptions elsewhere bears the title ἐρευς Εὐσεβής καὶ ἐκλ. Ξυλός: IG ii² 1795, 1796, 1797, Hesp. III 43 (all c. 180); SEG XIV 92 (182/3); in IG ii² 1077 (209/10) the title ἐρευς Εὐσεβής alone is used. On the development of this office see now D. J. Geagan, Hesp. Supp. XII 1967, 14 - 15, 110: The ὄμμοσις gives way to a metic λειτουργός between c. 56/5 and 14/13 B.C., and the office is first held by a citizen in A.D. 168/9. For the cult of the Phosphori cf. n. 382, above.
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466. IG ii² 1799, 25 sqq. (c. 180): six names are preserved.


468. IG ii² 1013, 37 - 43 (the other copy, in which this passage has not survived, is published as Hesp. VII 27).

469. IG ii² 1013, 45 - 7.

470. Lys. XIII. Ag. 21 - 9, cf. Ch. IV, pp. 171 - 2. In Ar. Thesm. a τοξοτής is available to the prytanis to fasten Mnesilochus to his plank (ll. 931, 940): obviously the bouleutae would always make use of attendants for work of this kind.

471. Sophilus, fr. 2 (Kock), ap. Ath, VI. 228B.
NOTES TO CHAPTER IV

1. A. I. Tim. 110 - 1.

2. Ibid. 112.

3. In L.S. 248,7, E.M. ἐκφυλλοφορεῖα, the origin of this strange practice is ascribed to the fact that a ἕβηρτης had once tampered with the ordinary ballots.

4. Ant. VI. Chor. 49.


6. X.H. I. vii. 8.

7. Ibid. 35.


9. X.H. II. ii. 15.

10. E.g. the condemnation of Cleophon - p. 191.

11. A.I. Tim. 35.

12. Phil. 328 F 140.

13. Ar. Eq. 665 (boule); Ach. 54 with schol., &c., Plat. Prot. 319c (ecclesia).

14. A.I. Tim. 33 with schol., III. Ctes. 4 with schol., [D]. XXV Arist. i. 90.

15. Gilbert, 290 with n. 4.

16. Earliest dated inscription, IG ii 1006, 20 - 1 (122/1).

17. X.H. II. iii. 50, 55.

18. A.P. 45. ii.
19. For this story and its implications see the appendix to this chapter, pp. 188 sqq.

20. Notice especially [D]. XLVII. Ev. & Mnes. 43,

τὰς πενταχοσίας, ὅσον ἦν κυρία κατὰ τὸν νόμον:

GHI 74, 57 - 9, and 200, 234 - 6, are less decisive. Lipsius, 198 with n. 67, was prepared to believe in an appeal against any verdict of the boule on an official, but see Bonner & Smith, II. 240 - 3 (For ὀρθιμακατα see pp. 179 - 87.)

21. The εὐσεβεῖς could fine up to 10 drachmae in petty cases (A.P. 52. ii - iii), and in the νόμος of A.I. Tim. 35 the proedri could fine up to 50 drachmae; it seems that in the later fifth and fourth centuries the archons retained limited punitive powers (e.g. νόμος ap. [D]. XLIII. Mac. 75, cited by Wade-Gery, E.G.H., 185 n. 2; and cf. Hignett, 222 - 3).

22. A.P. 48. iii, Poll. VIII. 99; cf. Lys, XXX Nic. 5. The boule was only slightly involved in the process of ἐπενευναί which all officials had to undergo on retirement. The annual board of ten λογίσται and ten οὐνηγοροὶ was appointed from the whole demos to look into the strictly financial side, and referred men to the δικαστήρια for conviction or clearance; the ten εὐθὺνατοί and twenty ἀρεάροι who received miscellaneous complaints were bouleutae, but if they found there was a case to answer they referred the charges to the δικαστήρια or the δικασταὶ κατὰ δήμους. Cf. Ch. III, p. iii.

Another check which the boule made each prytany in the fourth century concerned the μερίσματα. After the
apodectae had completed their allocation of revenue to the various spending authorities the boule was given the opportunity to consider any offences (A.P. 48. ii). Cf. Ch. III, pp. 100-1.

The boule's concern with weights and measures committed it to another regular inspection: the Tholos was one of four places where a standard set was kept (IG ii² 1013, 37-47; cf. Ch. III, p. 144), and this late second-century inscription makes it the duty of the boule to compel the ἀρχαὶ if they do not συνεπισχύσαι τοὺς ὅλωτας (6-7) and to check in the month of Hecatombaeon each year that the traders are using correct measures (16-18).

23. Ant. VI. Chor. 35.
24. Ibid. 49. Cf. Lipsius, 198-9 with n. 69.
25. X.H. I. vii. 1.
26. Ibid. 3.
27. Ibid. 4-24. The involvement of the ecclesia makes this act of rough justice analogous to the procedure called ἐλογικὴ, on which see pp. 169-78.
28. A.P. 48. i.
29. And. I. Myst. 73-4.
30. Ibid. 92-3.
32. Ibid. 82-3, cf. 86.
33. Ibid. 96.

34. Schol. D. XXIV. Tim. 40 (ἐξην αὐτοῖς, Sauppe; ἐξην αὐτῆς, Dindorf).

35. In 369 Xenoclides, who had bought the right to collect the 2 per cent corn tax, had to pay an instalment in the bouleuterium every prytany ([D]. LIX. Neaeer. 27); in 343/2 Mixodemus was guarantor to three men who defaulted on prytanyly payments (Hesp. V 10, 118 - 53); and cf. A.P. 47. iii.


37. Agyrrhius spent many years in prison ἐως τὰ χρήματα ἀπέτελον καὶ ἡμείς τῆς πόλεως ἄντι ἔχειν (D.XXIV. Tim. 134 - 5); in the bouleutic oath not to imprison any citizen offering three guarantors from his own property-class an exception was made ἔδωκα τις... τέλος προτίμημαν ὅ ἡγησαιμενον ἔκλεψεν μὴ καταβάλλῃ (ibid. 144). Mixodemus in Hesp. V 10 (cf. n. 35, above) has had an apartment house confiscated and sold to pay the debts of the three men he was backing. In [D]. XI. Bce. Dot. 20 we read of the collection from the bouleuterium of the surplus proceeds of a sale of confiscated property, after the debt to the state had been paid.

38. A.I. Tim. 35, D.XLIII. Mac. 71; cf. two fragmentary inscriptions, IG i² 75, ii² 45. In the amnesty after Aegospotami, the boule and πρᾶκτορες were ordered to cancel records of outstanding debts (And. I. Myst. 77 - 9).

39. Commentary on And. I. Myst. 93.

40. On precautionary and penal imprisonment cf. Bonner & Smith, II. 275. In the fourth century, at any rate, the boule seems to have had powers of precautionary imprisonment only (cf. n. 225, below).
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41. Fines, D. XXIV. Tim. 60, 63 - 5 (another νομος of Timocrates, though the clause providing for imprisonment until the fine has been paid was probably not an innovation), 103, 105; restitution of stolen property, 105, 114 - 5; of misappropriated public property, 111 - 2, cf. 135.

42. D. XXIV. Tim. 97 - 8 with schol. The term perhaps also covers other items of revenue which could not be calculated in advance, such as προτασεως (Jones, 102 with 154 n. 29).


44. Imprisonment in connection with χλοσις (cf. n. 41, above) is an obvious red herring. χλοσις was an δοξα. δικαιος (§ 114), and the optional five days ἕν τῇ παροικίᾳ were a mark of disgrace, not a precaution against the offender's absconding without paying his debt.

45. HMA 46, 31 - 43. Since each of the prytanes could be fined a sum which must be restored as 1,000 or 10,000 drachmae if they failed to bring the case before the boule, any "suitable" penalty would obviously be in excess of the boule's 500-drachmae limit. See pp. 2 φο - 1, where I quote the text.

46. ATL D 8, 55 - 7.

47. Pp. 90 - 3

48. HMA 87, 38 - 40.

49. HMA 39, § 12.

50. Cf. GHI 142, 11 sqq., 156, 16 sqq. For jurisdiction left to or shared with the allies in the early years of the League, see GHI 123, 41 - 6, 51 - 63.

52. On φδολος in general, see Lipsius, 309 - 16.

53. Ar. Ach. 818 sqq. The authority to whom this φδολος would be made is not specified.

54. Ar. Eq. 300 - 2.

55. Is. XVII. Trap. 42.

56. Lys. XXII. Frum. 2. On this speech see R. J. Seager, Hist. XV 1966, and on the implications of these two cases for the judicial powers of the boule see pp. \(\S\) 153.

57. Is. XVIII. Call. 5 - 6.

58. IG ii² 1623, 6 sqq., 26 sqq., 118 sqq., 129 sqq.: 1629, 545 sqq., * 572 sqq., * 1085 - 92.; 1631, 184 - 6.
   (*In these two cases the trierarch διμολογησεν as elsewhere, but there is no reference to the punishing authority, or to the ειμολος of the old ship.)*

59. IG ii² 1629, 646 - 9; 1631, 116 sqq., 141 - 3, 342 - 7.

60. IG ii² 1623, 144 sqq.


62. IG ii² 1631, 430 - 3.

63. IG ii² 1627, 241 - 8 with 271 - 4; 1628, 460 - 4 with 492 - 4; 1629, 722 - 9 with 805 - 7; 1631, 100 - 5.

64. D.LI. Cor. Tri. 4: cf. Ch. III, p. 12. But in 361, when trierarchs who had made over their duties to contractors were held responsible for Athens' defeat by Alexander of
Pherae, the case probably went as an ἔλογγγελεῖα to the assembly (cf. n. 228, below).

65. IG ii 1623, 50 sqq., 60 sqq., 87 sqq., 91 sqq., 105 sqq., 136 sqq., 218 sqq.; 1628, 621 sqq., 631 sqq.; 1629, 1100 sqq.; 1631, 289 sqq., 297 sqq., 304 sqq., 312 sqq., 319 sqq. (* In 1623, 50 sqq., the punishing authority is not named.)

66. IG ii 1631, 350 - 403.

67. Probably to be interpreted as twice the original debt plus a fine (Boeckh, Urk. Seew., 212).

68. Boeckh (Urk. Seew., 536 - 7) thought this would be possible only if full powers for the collection of naval debts had been delegated to the boule. There must obviously have been some legal basis for the boule's passing an adjusting decree of this kind, but I suspect that the ordering of a penalty in excess of the boule's 500-drachmae limit indicates a gap in the law which no one had thought of plugging.

69. [D]. XLVII. Ev. & Mnès.

70. § 20.

71. § 44.

72. The navy lists published by the ἐπιμεληταὶ τῶν νεωρῶν constitute a record of the παραλαμβάνειν and παραδόναι of these officials (cf. the headings of IG ii 1607, 1611, 1623), so it must surely be the epimeletae and not the boule (as Kahrstedt would prefer, U.M.A., 2) to whom the speaker refers as ἥ ἄρχῃ.

73. §§ 21 - 2.

74. § 26.
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75. § 28.

76. § 33.

77. Perhaps the arrangements for the transfer of equipment directly from one trierarch to another were an innovation, and Theophemus and his fellow-offenders were taking advantage of uncertainties caused by the new law. See pp. 162-3.

78. § 34.

79. § 35.

80. § 36.

81. § 37.

82. § 38.

83. § 41.

84. § 42.

85. § 43. The verb used is προστιμήθην έστι, denoting an additional penalty.

86. We are not told that Theophemus surrendered the equipment even now, but it is to be presumed that he did: the inventory was produced in the course of the hearing (§ 43), and the speaker was somehow enabled to leave Athens with his ship (§ 45).
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88. [D]. XLVII. 26, with Lipsius, 114. Since ἀποστολεῖς were an extraordinary commission (Ch. III, p. 121) the duty was probably assigned specifically to the ἀποστολεῖς of that year.

89. [D]. XLVII. 33. Cf. n. 77, above.

90. D. XXIV. Tim. 11 - 14. I take it that 8 9 is to be referred to this: Androtion was condemned by the boule, which made a probouleuma to bring Euctemon before the assembly; by the assembly, which enacted Euctemon's decree; and by the courts which upheld the legality of the decree and found against Androtion in the δικαστεία. Since what we should expect to be a legal process found its way to the assembly, Euctemon's μηνυσίς was presumably regarded as or converted into an ἐστιγματίζα (for such conversion, see n. 169, below.).


92. A.P. 46. ii. καταγνωσόμενος is the reading of the papyrus: Kaibel and Wilamowitz, followed by most subsequent editors, proposed καταγνώνως, but Opperman and the Budé editors retain καταγνωσόμενος. See also, for the emendation, B. Keil, AM XX 1895, 46 - 7 n. 2; against it, P. Foucart, R Ph2 XVIII 1894, 247 - 8 (who appreciated the real difficulty), Lipsius, 197 n. 61, 981, Kahrstedt, U.M.A., 207, n. 2. For καταγνωσόμενος of a case to be referred to a δικαστήριον, cf. HMA 46, 38 (quoted on p. 176), A.I. Tim. 111 (quoted on p. 146), D.XXIV. Tim. 63.

93. As the champions of the emendation believe.

94. L.S. 315. 16.
95. A. III. Ctes. 25.

96. IG ii 2 463, 25. The xi was read by early editors, but not by Koehler (IG ii 167): it is still printed in the most recent text (F. G. Maier, G Mbi 11).

97. So Kahrstedt, U.M.A., 226 n. 2. The surviving portion of the inscription mentions no body which is likely to have been specified as ἡ Ἀρχή.

98. GHI 74, 57 - 9.


100. Cf. And. I. Myst. 121: this is the charge in connection with which the speech was written. ἔνδοξικός was a formal pointing-out that a man was using rights to which he was not entitled (cf. Lipsius, 331 - 7, MacDowell, edition of this speech, p. 13 and commentary on § 111): when the rights in question were secular the charge was not heard by the boule.

101. On some charges, presumably those for which there was a fixed penalty, a man who confessed his guilt could be punished without a formal trial (D. XXIV. Tim. 63, cf. Arist. i, hyp. 1). We cannot tell certainly from Lysias' verbal juggling whether the στοχάζων of Lys. XXII. Frum. admitted their guilt, but even if they did they claimed the authority of the στοχάζων for what they had done (§§ 5 - 6).

102. And. I. Myst. 110 - 6.

103. Ibid. 29.

104. Commentary on § 111.

105. [D]. XXV. Arist. i, hyp. 1 - 2, Din. II. Ar. 12.
106. [D]. XXV. Arist. i. 14.

107. δικαστήριον - physically taking the accused to the authorities - was permitted when an offender was caught in the act. See in general Lipsius, 317 - 31, and compare the right of arrest possessed by all British citizens who are sure that the offence they see committed is a felony.

Though Aristogeiton's decree was first proposed in the ecclesia, it is not clear from the hypothesis in what way it was technically δικαστήριον: see Ch. II, p. 54.

108. Hesp. XVIII. 1949, 78 - 83 = SEG XII 32.

109. GHI 86, 41 - 4. Lipsius, 184 n. 23, suggested παραδικαστήριον, but an infinitive here seems preferable.


111. A.P. 8. iv. ἐλάσυγγελία appears also in the "Draconian" constitution (A.P. 4. iv), apparently for charges against the ἄρχαλ.

112. Pp. 211 - 4


114. Hyp. IV. Bux. 7 - 8, Poll. VIII. 52, L.R.C. ἐλάσυγγελία.


116. Hyp. § 8, Poll., L.R.C.

117. Poll., L.R.C.
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119. D. H. 651. Din. 10 (ελογγελά is added from Harp., 

ΔΝΤΙΒΛΗΘΕΝΤΟΣ), D. XXXIV. Phorm. 50.

120. T. Thalheim, Hermes XXXVII 1902. The first two of these 

charges would probably be covered by the law as quoted by 

Hyperides.


123. German scholars have rejected the non-specific strand, and 

have tried to deduce from the trial of relevant cases when 

"the νόμος ελογγελτικός " was enacted (Lipsius, 

for instance, dated "the νόμος " about the middle of the 

fourth century, and supposed that the non-specific rule 

applied to ελογγελά before this date: this is 

now repeated by Berneker in Der Kleine Pauly, II. 218. ) But 

this is to make too rigid a thing of "the νόμος ": before 

410 any measure providing for ελογγελά was a 

νόμος ελογγελτικός ; the revision of the laws at the 

end of the fifth century probably resulted in the compilation 

of a list of offences which at that time were eisangeltic, 

and which we may call the νόμος ελογγελτικός ; but a 

procedure existed in the fourth century for altering the νόμος, 

and unless the late fifth-century compilation was so framed 

as to limit ελογγελά to certain charges (which is 

unlikely) an ordinary ΨΗΦΙΟΜΑ would probably have 

sufficed to make further offences eisangeltic. (But the 

decree in IG ii^2 1631 is merely bringing an offence under an 

already existing heading.).
The offences specified as eisangelitic bear a strong resemblance to those for which men were solemnly cursed in the prayer which began all meetings of the boule and ecclesia (cf. Ch. I, p. 36). The oaths taken by archons, bouleutae and (no doubt) other officers of state may be regarded as distant relatives.

125. Lys. XIII. Ag. (cf. XII. Erat. 48).
126. §§ 1 - 19.
127. §§ 20 - 2.
128. § 23.
129. §§ 24 - 8.
130. § 29.
131. §§ 30 - 1.
132. § 32.
133. §§ 34 - 5.
134. § 55.
135. §§ 35 - 7.
136. § 38.
137. § 56.
138. § 50.
139. § 56.
140. ἑλογγετεῖαι is surely technical here, pace Lipsius, 208.

141. Lys. XXVIII. Erg., especially §9.

142. Hyp. I. Lyc. 3.

143. A.P. 43. iv, Poll. VIII. 93, Harp., Suid., κυρία ἐκκλησία, L.R.C. κυρία ἡ ἐκκλησία. It is stated elsewhere that the thesmothetae

τὰς ἑλογγετεῖς ἑλογγετεῖσιν ἐλευθεροῦν ἐκ τῶν ὄξων.

(A.P. 59 II, Poll. VIII. 87, Phot. θεσμοθέται,


That the thesmothetae should have presided at an eisangeltic session of the ecclesia is unlikely, and what is needed is a statement that they were the ἐλογγοῦσα ἀρχή when an ἑλογγετεῖα was referred to a δικαστήριον, which is what the Plato scholiast seems to mean. Blass (A.P., 4th edition) and Lipsius (207 n. 99) read <ἀ> ἑλογγέττουσιν, and Dr D. M. Lewis has suggested <τοῖς> ἑλογγετέτουσιν. The appearance of τροβολατι later in the list may possibly be a sign of more serious corruption, but many if not most of the cases which were the subject of τροβολατι (informal complaints in the ecclesia, which need have no legal consequence - cf. Lipsius, 211 - 9) would come to the courts of the thesmothetae, and carelessness on the part of the author is a more likely explanation.

144. W. S. Ferguson, Mélanges Glotz, I, 349, cf. T. Thalheim, RE, V. 2140. Lipsius, 184, 206, also cited by Ferguson, does not support the part of his account which I have quoted. For the condemnation of Antiphon see [Pl]. X.Or. 833B - 4B, with G. E. M. de Ste Croix, Hist. V. 1956, 16 - 17, and p. 192 of this thesis, with note.


147. Is. XV. Antid. 314.


149. And. I. Myst. 11.

150. And. I. Myst. 27.

151. Is. XVI, Dig. 6. (Lipsius, 195 with n. 57, follows Isocrates, regarding Andocides' version as rhetorical exaggeration.).


153. Cf. n. 143, above.


156. Hyp. IV. Eux. 28, cf. schol. A. I. Tim. 64, where Hager (JP IV 1872, 85 - 6) accepted Meier's παρ' ὀλύγον for παρανόμων.


159. Cf. n. 92, above.

160. When a case was referred to the ecclesia, the boule would make a probouleuma in the normal way. For procedure when a case was referred to a δικαστήριον , Timocrates' habeas corpus
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law (D. XXIV. Tim. 63) is our best guide: the boule's 
κατάγνωσις was given to the thesmothetae by the chief 
secretary, the γραμματεύς κατὰ ξυναντέων, and 
(subject to the limitations in the bouleutic oath - cf. pp. 
204-7) and the accused could be kept under arrest to await 
his trial; prosecution was not taken over by the boule but 
remained the responsibility of private citizens. If the 
charge did not carry a fixed penalty the boule's 
κατάγνωσις could probably include a recommendation (cf. HMA 46, 39 - 41, 
where the prytanes are to γνώμας ποι[έσθον 
(π. 300 be'low) 
which I would restore in place of καλόντων 
- on the 
penalty in an officialese.

161. Ar. Vesp. 590 - 1.


163. HMA 46, 37 - 9 (4477).

164. GHI 42, 75 - 6 (446/5); cf. Ant. VI. Chor. 21 (419), where the 
same court is called the heliaea of the thesmothetae and 
a δικαστήριον.

165. HMA 87, 49. A reference to the heliaea in line 14 is said to 
be to the building (ATL III, 71).

166. IG i 114 (on this inscription see pp. 208-11). I trans­ 
late δῆμος κληθών as "people in assembly."

167. In the Mysteries investigation a δικαστήριον condemned 
to death (And. I. Myst. 66), but this right is reserved for 
the δῆμος κληθών in IG i 2 114, 37 (= 1. 36, Wade- 

168. The boule's acquisition of official jurisdiction cannot of course 
be dated. I believe that the process was started by Ephialtes 
(cf. pp. 216 sqq.) and greatly encouraged by the need to administer
the Delian League, and that the situation in the fourth century will have been more nearly static than in the fifth.

169. Many factors will have assisted the confusion. It takes time to build up a vocabulary of technical terms, and verbs like εἰσαγγέλλειν, μηνυεῖν and φαίνειν could easily be used in contexts that were not technically appropriate. (A.P. 45. ii,

εξεστὶ δὲ καὶ τοῖς θύμων τοῖς εἰσαγγέλλειν ἡν δὲν βούλωνται τῶν ἄρχων μη χρησθαι τοῖς νόμοις,

may be a case in point; in Lys. X. Theomn. i. 1 εἰσηγγέλλει is used in a case which should have been an ἐνδεικτικός — the Budé editors have suggested the more innocuous ἐπιγγέλλει.)

Lipsius, with A.P. 45. ii particularly in mind, was brought to the conclusion (196 - 7):

Von dieser probuleutischen Tätigkeit des Rats bei Eisangelien über Verbrechen wider den Staat ist nun aber zu scheiden seine selbstständige Strafgewalt. ... Von Anzeigen über Vergehen, die von Beamten oder Privaten an ihn gelangen, ist εἰσαγγέλλειν der herkömmliche Ausdruck.

I should prefer to say that there was a tendency to use εἰσαγγέλλειν, technically incorrectly, of cases heard by the boule which were not even thought to be covered by the νόμοι εἰσαγγελτικοῦ.

It appears also that a laying of information might be converted into an εἰσαγγέλλα, or be treated as an εἰσαγγελτικα in retrospect. The speaker of [D]. XLVII. Ev. & Mnes. consulted the boule informally and was told to εἰσαγγέλλειν (§§ 41 - 2); Agoratus began by being arrested on an eisangeltic charge, but was finally released ὅτι ἐπὶ δοξῇ τάλημα εἰσαγγελλω (Lys. XIII. Ag. 50).
170. This in turn will have encouraged the use of ἐλαχιστέα for cases that were not of major importance.

171. Cf. Lipsius, 184, Bonner & Smith, I. 300 - 1.

172. This last, rather than enhanced punitive power, is perhaps what was intended when the boule was made ἀνακριτῷ in a judicial matter (cf. n. 230 & pp. 76 - 8) - but I suspect that the implications of this term were never openly formulated.

173. A.P. 42. i - ii. On this δοκιμασία, see Ch. Pélékidis, Histoire de l'Éphébie Attique, part ii, Ch. 2.

174. Cf. Lys. XXI. Pec. Acc. 1; D.XXX. Onet. i. 15 is not decisive against this.

175. ἐγγέγραφονται... ὁκτώκαλδεκα ἡγουμένης (A.P. 42. i); καὶ τὸς ἄλλον νεωτέρος ὁκτώκαλδέκεις ἡγούμενος (A.P. 42. ii). It has now been argued by J. M. Carter, BICS XIV 1967, that these expressions mean not "at the age of 18" but "in the 18th year".


177. X.M. i. ii. 35.


179. A.P. 53. iv.

180. GHI 105, with Pélékidis, op. cit., 94 n. 2. Dexileos was born in 414/3 and killed in 394/3; Pélékidis dates his birth in 413/2 but makes him 21 years old at his death!

181. Ar. Vesp. 578.
There are several references in Lysias to the δοκιμασία of young citizens, but they throw no light on the procedure:

X. Theomn. i. 31, XI. Theomn. ii. 12, XXI. Pec. Acc. 1, XXVI. Ev. 21, XXXII. Dio. 9.

Habicht argues from IG i 79 that in the fifth century the thetes were excluded from the ληξισταρχία γραμματέων (Hermes LXXXIX 1961, 5-6), but he has been sufficiently answered by Meritt (Greek Historical Studies, 25-6) and Jameson (Hist. XII. 1963, 399-400).

 Were the πενακες perhaps instituted when assembly-pay was introduced?

if pressed, this would support the A.P. view that registration followed the eighteenth birthday — but see n. 175, above, for a suggestion that the phrase should mean "in the 20th year"), cf. Lucian Iup. Trag. 26. See Gilbert, 199.

Wilamowitz, Aristoteles und Athen, I. 193-4. Recent arguments for an earlier origin: O. W. Reinmuth, TAPA LXXXIII 1952; Ch. Pélékidis, op. cit., part i.

GHI 204, 5-20, cf. Lyc. Leocr. 76, Poll. VIII. 105-6, Stobaeus, Flor. xliii. 48.

A.P. 42. iv.


The speech gives us a fascinating account of the proceedings in the assembly of the deme Halimus (88 9-14);
§8 shows that Eubulides was a member of the boule as well as dearmach (cf. IG ii² 218, 6 sqq. [346/5]).

191. X. Hipparch. i. 8.

192. A.P. 49. i - ii.

193. Threpsiades and Vanderpool, AA VIII 1963, 103 - 9, 1 = SEG XXI 525.

194. X. Oec. ix. 15, Hipparch. i. 13 cf. iii. 9 - 14.

195. Hes. ΤΡΥΣΙΧΣΙΟΥ.

196. Phot. ΊΧΧΟΥ ΤΡΩΧΟΣ.

197. Poll. VII. 186.

198. X. Oec. ix. 15.

199. [Lys]. XIV. Alc. i. 10, cf. 1. [Lys]. XIV. Alc. i. 8, XV. Alc. ii. 7, Lys. XVI. Mant. 13, Harp., Suid. ὅσσιμασσας mention the ὅσσιμασσα of the cavalry without specifying the examining authority.

200. Berlin 2296; Beazley, ARV², 412, no. 1; illus. AZ XXXVIII 1880, pl. 15.

201. G. Körte, AZ XXXVIII 1880. We have no evidence on the organisation of the cavalry as early as this vase, and it is at any rate possible that in the pre-Ephialtic period the examining authority was not the boule. (For my view of the boule between Cleisthenes and Ephialtes, cf. pp. 255 sqq.) W. Helbig, Mémoire Ac. Inscr. XXXVII 1904, ch. vi, discussed this vase and three others depicting Athenian cavalry, quoted from Hauser a date of 485 - 455 for the vases, and suggested that they are to be linked with a reorganisation of the Athenian armed forces.
shortly after 477. He would identify one at least of the inspectors as a hipparch, and Körte's hipparch as an ordinary member of the public (op. cit., 230 – 1).

202. A.P. 49. iv, A. I. Tim. 103 – 4 with schol.


204. Pl. Sol. 31. iii – iv, cf. schol. A. I. Tim. 103, whose rate of 3 obols is perhaps due to a confusion with jury pay (so Böckh, Jacoby).


206. A.P. 49. iv, Hes. ΑΔΟΥΑΤΟΙ.

207. Philochorus, 328 F 197A, with Jacoby’s commentary. (F 197B, from L.S. 345. 15, has the figure of 5 obols!) Earlier in the fourth century the grant was being paid once a prytany (A. I. Tim. 104).

208. Lys. XXIV. Pens. Inv. (boule, §1, &c.).

209. §§ 4 – 5 ,10 – 12.


211. A.P. 45. iii.


213. The papyrus reads [ καὶ ] τὰ τέλη τελεῖ. Most editors have followed Kaibel and Wilamowitz in inserting <ε> before τελεῖ from L.R.C. θεσμοθετῶν ἀνάκρισις, and in referring this to payment of taxes; but Gilbert, 219, compared A.P. 7. iv and thought that the question referred to membership of a Solonian property-class. The latter must be the interpretation of Pollux, who paraphrases: καὶ τὰ τὸ
τίμημα ἄτιν αὐτοῖς (VIII. 86: ἦ is Koch's suggestion in RE, V. 1271, for ἐτ'), but the orthodox interpretation is confirmed by Cratinus Junior, fr. 9 (Kock), and Dinarchus, II. Arist. 17 - 18.

214. D.XX. Lept. 90 (ascribing the rule to Solon, as usual).

215. E.g. Lipsius, 271, Kahrstedt, U.M.A., 62. Reference of all archontic ὀφειλόμενον to a court is accepted by Bonner & Smith, II. 243 - 4, and also by Professor Wade-Gery, E.G.H., 194 - 5, whose view is slightly different from that advocated in the text. He believes that confirmation by the heliaea was always required when the boule accepted a candidate, but originally the boule's rejection was final: in the time of the Athenion Politeia "the Archon designate must (before he can take office) be scrutinised twice, by Boule and lawcourt: two fences must be taken but only the second need be cleared," but "formerly, the Archon had to clear both fences." He would date the introduction of appeal against the boule's rejection late and thinks that in Lys. XXVI Evand. 14 - 15 "it is perhaps rather implied that there is none."

216. Lys. XXVI Evand. 6 - 7.

217. This has happened on previous occasions (§ 8).

218. The passage is normally taken to mean that there will be no time for an appeal before the new year if the boule rejects Evander, but it is Evander and his friends who are stressing the dire consequences of his rejection; the objector's reply ought to be that this argument is irrelevant as Evander will not be able to play his part in the inaugural sacrifices
even if he is accepted. §8 will to some extent be a red
herring, as the sacrifices will be presided over by the
basileus whether Evander is ultimately allowed through or
not.

219. If pressed, the wording of A.P. 55. iv might point to the
conclusion that in the author's day the boule did not vote
unless objections were raised, but this is more probably
an unfortunate condensation.

220. This does not, of course, rule out changes: ΦΩΘΕΝ ΤΩΝ ΔΗΜΩΝ
must be post-Cleisthenic. Kahrstedt (U.M.A., 61 - 2)
thought that the archaic state with its small ruling class
did not need δοκιμαστα, and suggested that their intro-
duction might be linked with that of the bouleutic oath;
but I do not think that a formal, rather than genuinely
fact-finding, interrogation before the swearing of the
archontic oath would be impossible in the sixth century.


222. We have two speeches of Lysias written for delivery at the
δοκιμαστα in the boule of a prospective bouleutes:
XVI. Mant. (so Blass, Attische Beredsamkeit, 2 I. 517),
XXXI. Phil. (cf. § 2); and cf. XXVI. Evand. 10 - 11.

223. A.P. 45. i.

224. See p. 151 and n. 20, above.

225. The boule could order the arrest of the generals accused
of misconduct at Arginusae (p. 152 ), of defaulting state
debtors (pp. 152-6 ) and of men whom it found guilty on
an ελεγγελα, whose case it intended to refer to
for a heavy penalty (D.XXIV. Tim. 63); but it swore not to imprison a man who could provide three guarantors from his own property-class except on a charge of treason or conspiracy against the demos or under the νόμοι τελωνικοί (p. 206 with n. 324). These are all cases of precautionary imprisonment, to ensure that a man discharged a debt or stood trial (cf. n. 40, above): I imagine that it was left to the boule to decide in any case for which it was responsible whether these precautions were necessary (so Lipsius, 813, on ελαχιστά).

If we refer this passage to penal acts only, however, the Athenaion Politeia seems to be right in denying that the boule possessed such powers in the author's day; but I have suggested on pp. 155 ff that in the fifth century penal imprisonment may have been automatic when a man defaulted on a debt to the state.


227. Lys. XXII. Frum. 2.

228. Is. XVII. Trap. 42. We should not see in [D]. LI. Cor. Tri. 8 - 9 another instance of temptation to the boule, in 361. Though the speech is addressed to the boule the case alluded to here probably came before the ecclesia as an ελαχιστά (Lipsius, 180 - 1 n. 41, Gernet, Budé edition of D's Plaidoyers Civils, III. 62 - 3 n. 3).

229. Lys. XXII. Frum. 5, Is. XVII. Trap. 3 - 4.

230. GHI 142, 37 - 41. Perhaps the boule had been made κυρία to enquire into this matter - in which case there may have been more doubt than ever as to what the boule's powers were (cf. n. 172 above, and pp. 196 ff ).
231. A.P. 40. ii.

232. Though the letter of the law gave him a convenient excuse to attack Thrasybulus' citizenship decree (A.P. 40. ii, A. III. Ctes. 195, [Pl] X. Or. 835F - 6A), Archinus was prepared to upset the original arrangement made with the oligarchs who had withdrawn to Eleusis (A.P. 40. i), and until the new code of νόμοι had been ratified there was genuine uncertainty as to what was law (cf. And. I. Myst. 81).


234. The story in its present form belongs to the period when it was held that the full judicial power of the demos was vested in the δικαστήρια, but οδὸ... διανευδικαστηρίου γνώσεως could be a fourth-century paraphrase of an earlier οδὸ διανευ δημοῦ.

235. A.P. 41. ii. It is not clear how widely κρίσεις should be interpreted: its coming shortly after δικαστηρίους should mean that strictly judicial matters are at any rate included; if the οἰκείωσις of bouleutae and archons (45. iii) and the choice of παραδειγματα and the Panathenaic Πέπλος (49. iii) are to be included as well, it would be dangerous to assume that all these changes must have taken place at the same time.

236. Aristoteles und Athen, II. 195 - 7: change between 386 (Lys. XXII. Frum.) and 352 (D.XXIV. Tim.).

237. Commentary on A.P. 45. i, οδὸ τοῦ τυπόνου.

238. X.H. II. iii. 12.
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240. X.H. II. iii. 50 - 1.

241. Lys. XIII. Ag. 36 -8.

242. X.H. II. iii. 51. A.P. 37. i.

243. X.H. II. iv. 8 - 10.

244. A.P. 38. ii.

245. D.XXIV. Tim. 56.

246. Lys. XXX. Nic. 10 - 11, cf. XIII. Ag. 12.


248. Decree quoted [Pl]. X.Or. 833E - F.

249. A.P. 33. i.


251. We are given the date within the prytany, not otherwise found in dating a decree before 368/7 (GHI 136); and the secretary and ἐπιστάτης are from the same tribe, which under the democracy could not occur before the reorganisation of the secretarial office between 368/7 and 363/2 (GHI 136, contr. IG ii² 109). Cf. Ch. III, p. 138.

252. This is not the place to discuss the general nature of the constitution of the 5,000, but I may remark that I am not persuaded by Mr G. E. M. de Ste Croix's arguments (Hist. V. 1956) that the property qualification applied only to office-holding and not to membership of the ecclesia.

253. GHI 86, 38 sqq.
Notes to IV)

254. P. Cloché, REG XXXIII 1920 (except where otherwise stated, all references to Cloché are to this article). This is the most important study of the problems examined in this appendix.

255. Compare also the arrest of Archestratus, with what result we do not know, for proposing in the boule that the terms offered by Sparta after Aegospotami be accepted (X.H. II. ii. 15).

256. No charge specified, Lys. XXX. Nic. 10 - 11. προφασιν μὲν ὅτι ὅθεν ἔλεγε τὸ ὀκλα ἀνακαυσάμενος, Lys. XIII. Ag. 12 - but the penalty for ἀποτάτεια or ἀποταξέας was not death but ἄμμως (A.I. Tim. 29, III. Ctes. 176, Lys. X. Theomm. i. 1, D. XV. Rhod. Lib. 32 cf. XXI. Mid. 58) without loss of property (And. I. Myst. 74), and the charge was heard not in a regular court but by the generals and soldiers ([Lys]. XIV. Aλc. i. 5, XV. Aλc. ii. 1, D. XXXIX. Boe. Nom. 17). Doubtless this was one of the charges made against Cleophon but it was probably not the only one.


258. BSA XXXIII 1932 - 3, 113 - 22. I cite by Wade-Gery's line numbers throughout: to obtain the correct reference in IG i

259. The evidence of this inscription must be used with extreme caution, as fragment a is very badly preserved: I am prepared to assume that letters read both in IG i

214, add one.
the first letter seemed most like a K; beyond that I
could identify nothing, nor more than faint traces of
[ Θ ]ο[ νοτ ]Ο[ ι ] in i. 36; θοδν ῥπβαλξ[ν]
is clearly legible on the better-preserved fragment b: see
further on the readings nn. 340, 341A, 343, below.

260. He agreed that the death sentence passed at the instance
of Archinus very shortly after the restoration in 403 was
probably illegal.

260A. For other suggestions that the boule was deprived of various
powers in the early part of the fourth century see my re­
marks in Ch. V, pp. 231-2, with notes referring to my
discussions of related problems.

261. T. VIII. 67. iii.

262. And. II. Red. 13 - 15.

263. T. VIII. 70. ii.

264. V. Coulon in the introduction to the Budé edition of
Aristophanes, M. Platnauer in the Oxford Classical Dictionary,
and W. Kraus in Der Kleine Pauly, I, all give this date with­
out hesitation.

265. Ar. Thesm. 76 - 80.

266. cf. Ar. Vesp. 661 - 3.


268. Mr P. A. Brunt has suggested to me that if this passage has
any implications for the powers of the boule, arrest pending
trial might suffice.

269. Ar. Thesm. 943 - 4.

271. And. I. Myst. 11, cf. 14, 27.

272. § 12.

273. § 15.

274. § 17. We do not know what was illegal about this proposal.

275. § 13, cf. 15, 16. 25.

276. § 19.

277. § 15.

278. Profanation, § 14.

279. § 36.

280. § 43.

281. §§ 44 - 5.

282. § 61.

283. §§ 64 - 5.

284. §§ 65 - 6.


286. Is. XVI. Big. 6 - 7, Pl. Alc. 19 - 20 (esp. 20. v), 22. iv, T. VI. 28. i, 61. i.

287. Is. XVI. Big. 7.

288. T. VI. 60. i.

289. Ibid. iv.

290. Ibid. 61. iv, cf. 53. i.

291. Ibid. 61. vii.
292. Mr MacDowell in his commentary on And. I. Myst. 66 points out that Diocles was not guilty of mutilating the Hermae and we do not know the charge on which he was condemned; but his implication in the affair ought to have been sufficient to bring him within the scope of the boule's special powers.

293. Cf. nn. 172 and 230, above.

294. See n. 45 to Ch. III.

295. GHI 74, 57 - 9.


298. GHI 42, 4 - 10.


300. HMA 46, 31 - 43. Cf. n. 45, above. \( \tau \varepsilon \gamma \sigma \theta \varsigma \omega \nu \) in 1. 40 is my suggestion for the usual \( \tau \varepsilon \delta \nu \tau \gamma \nu \); cf. T. III. 36. ii. The prytanes are surely expected to hold a debate in the boule rather than to make proposals on their own account.

301. Most recently, B. B. Rogers, in his edition of the Thesmophoriazusae.

302. Cf. p. 192 and notes.

303. My arguments are set out in Additional Note E, pp. 443-7.


306. A.P. 22. ii.
307. Some of which have already been made by W. Peremans (LEC X 1941, 193 sqq.). Cloché's reply (LEC XII 1943 - 4) deals only with the interpretation of IG i 2 114 by J. Sencie and W. Peremans (LEC X 1941, 329 sqq.).

308. It is important to distinguish between the decisions of individual magistrates and corporate bodies. Solon gave the people the right to appeal against a magistrate's verdict, but the Areopagus retained considerable/appellable powers until 462/1 (similarly in Rome the right of provocatio ad populum against a magistrate's decision was granted very early, but senatorial quaestiones passed capital sentences in the second century B.C. until prevented by a law of C. Gracchus).


310. Ibid. 18. Cf. most recently A. G. Woodhead, Hist. XVI 1967, 139 - 40 with n. 33.

311. Phil. 328 F 140.


313. REG XXXIV 1921.


319. Mr A. N. Sherwin-White has drawn my attention to T.I. 18.i:

έτη γάρ δοσι μαλλιστα τετρακόσια καὶ ὄλυψ πλείω ὑπὶ τὴν
tελευτὴν τοῦτος τοῦ πολέμου δὲ ὁ ἀλκεδαιμὸνιν τῇ
αὐτῇ πολιτείᾳ χρώνται.


321. I number the clauses as in Wade-Gery's study, BSA XXXIII 1932 - 3, 113 - 22, and bracket those whose inclusion in the oath I doubt.

322. X.M. I.i. 18 (407/6).

323. Lys. XXXI. Phil. 1 (soon after 403/2), [D], LIX. Neaer. 4 (shortly before 339); we can perhaps trace this back to 405/4 from Lys. XXX. Nic. 10.


325. [And]. IV. AIC. 3 (putative date c. 415; perhaps written early C4 but probably much later - see, most recently, A. E. Raubitschek, TAPA LXXIX 1948 "[genuine speech of Phaeax], A. R. Burn, CQ IV 1954 [late school composition]).

326. Lys. XXXI. Phil. 2 (soon after 403/2).

327. Lys. XXVI. Evand. 8 (383/2).

328. Phil. 328 F 140.

329. HMA 39, § 12.
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331. And. I. Myst. 91.

332. GHI 42, 4 – 10.

333. X.M. I. i. 18 implies that as late as 407/6 or when Xenophon wrote this was covered by κατὰ τοῦς νόμους ηποιεσθαι, but this is the one clause of which these seem to be reliable traces in the oath in IG i² 114 – cf. p. 108.

Glotz, The Greek City, 183, included in the oath an undertaking "to maintain secrecy on the affairs of the State;" but, likely as this is, I know no evidence for it.

334. Compare the summary of the archontic oath in A.P. 55. v: since the archons ceased to be powerful magistrates there was less need to add to this later.


337. HMA 39, § 12.

338. In his enumeration; in IG i², 1 – 17.

339. A few more letters can be read "dotted".

340. Line 31: I read [τέν] ταξιο [σ] [ . . . ] ξ[ . . ] (the ξ was very doubtful, and I would not rule out δ — cf. n. 259, above). Hiller von Gaertringen read [πέ] νταξιοσφος \\
δ ρ α [μ ι γ ζ ] (sic); Wade-Gery [πέντα] οχοσι [ . . ] δ ρ α [μι - ]; Dr D. M. Lewis, who has examined the stone recently, tells me he would read Νταξιοσι[. . .] δραί — .

341. At any rate in l. 25.

341A I could make out only [θ] [ον Τ. ζ [ι] (l. 36); Dr Lewis reads Θαν[α]το [ζεμ] ος, and in l. 37 [δ] [εμο το 'Αθεναιον πλεον[ν]υς [...]] δοχαιον ατιμισας.
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342. Publishing the inscription as IG i 37.

343. IG i 2 3, 16; 4, 26 (485/4). Dr Lewis reads the line as

τόδε εὐδοκεῖν ἕλθεν θυσία ἔντον [τῷ] δόλῳ τῇ 'Ἀλέξανδρῳ
[κλ.]εθή γραφή.

344. The other citations in LSJ are Od. II. 192, Il. XIII. 169, Archilochus, 109, Democritus, 262, and two fifth-century inscriptions. The verb θοδωρεῖν is found as late as the end of the fourth century. Cf. n. 353, below.

345. Similar phrases occur in the Olympian bronze inscriptions of the sixth or fifth century, where certain matters require the approval of the boule and the δῆμος πληθυσμόν (HMA 124 b, c).

346. Cf. p. 177 and n. 167, above.

347. See Lys. X. Theomn. i. 15 - 19 for some examples.

348. Compare the requirement of 6,000 voting citizens at an ostracism (Pl. Arist. 7. v - vi - all relevant texts quoted at Phil. 328 F 30, and recent discussions cited by I. C. Limentani, edition of Pl. Arist., pp. xlviii - xlix).

349. LEC X 1941, 329 sqq.

350. Compare the use of πληθυσμός as a near-synonym for ἀδοκίματα. Larsen arrives by a very different route at a conclusion with the same practical effect, regarding the δῆμος πληθυσμόν as the "entire demos", as opposed to the boule (Representative Government, 15 - 16).

351. GHI 42, 9 - 10.
352. *JHS* LXXXVII 1967, 132. I am grateful to Dr Lewis for letting me see the manuscript of this before publication.

353. The exact meaning of θωάδν ἐπιβαλὲν is not clear. In the Hecatompedon Inscription θωάδν is used of small fines, up to 3 obols (IG i² 4, 7 - 8, 12 - 13), and έθύνεον of larger (100 dr.) fines in the late fourth century edict of the priest of Apollo Erithaseus (IG ii² 1362). Dr Lewis has suggested to me that έθύνεον may refer specifically to fines imposed at an official's εὔθυνατ (cf. HMA 87, esp. 28 - 31, where there is some contrast between δῆλεν and έθύνεον). For non-Attic instances, where θωάδν seem to be punishments in general and fines in particular, see

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gortyn</td>
<td>Inscri. Cret. IV, 13m</td>
<td>CC 7 - 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chios</td>
<td>GHI 1, 14 - 16 (= L.H. Jeffery, BSA LI 1956, 157 - 67, 11. C 5 - 7): the βολή ἡ έπιθυμοτος.</td>
<td>c.600 - 550</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elis</td>
<td>Buck, Greek Dialects, 64, l: C6 an ox and full purification</td>
<td>c.450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Locris</td>
<td>GHI 34, 9: &quot;double&quot;.</td>
<td>c.450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miletus</td>
<td>GHI 35, 12: 100 staters</td>
<td>c.450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thasos</td>
<td>BCH L 1926, 214, no. 2.</td>
<td>c.415</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delphi</td>
<td>Buck, Greek Dialects, 52, D 19: (fines of 1 obol mentioned in a later clause).</td>
<td>c.400</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


355. Ibid. 104. ii.
356. Ibid. 136. i.

357. Lyc. Lecor. 117. His treachery probably belongs to the war with Xerxes (Wilamowitz, Aristoteles und Athen, I. 114 - 5, Burn, Persia and the Greeks, 352).

358. L.R.C. ἔλαχγγελτα.


360. T. I. 135. ii - iii.


362. A.P. 27. i.

363. Pl. Per. 10. vi.


366. Lipsius, 179 - 81, Bonner & Smith, I. 299 - 300.

367. I accept the Solonian boule as historical: see Ch. V, pp. 221-2.


370. Even on Professor White's estimate (JHS LXXXIV 1964)

Themistocles' condemnation was at least four years before Ephialtes' reform. But the most incredible stories must originate somehow, and this one will be more intelligible if it was the Areopagus that had condemned Themistocles.

The rejection of Mardonius' peace offer is ascribed to the boule (cf. pp.201-2 and n. 304, above); Diodorus tells rather unlikely stories of two secret meetings of the boule shortly after the defeat of the Persians (D.S. XI. ch. 39. v, 42. v; cf./I, p. 40); and Plutarch in one of his two accounts makes it the boule which by passing a decree prevented Cimon's rejoining the Athenians at Tanagra, a few years after the Ephialtic reform (Pl. Cim. 17. v, contr. Per. 10. i; cf. Ch. I, p. 35).

A.P. 25. (i-) ii.

Pl. Cim. 15. ii.

Phil. 328 F 64 b (A).

Arson, D. XXIII. Arist. 22; sacred olives, Lys. VII. 01. 22, A.P. 60. ii; other religious cases, [D]. LIX. Neaer. 79-80.

I am not directly concerned with the enactment of the reforms. Some have been tempted by the mention of Ephialtes and Archestratus in A.P. 35. ii and by what is said of Pericles in A.P. 27. i and Arist. Pol. II. 1274 A 7-8 to postulate a reform in two or more stages: but A.P. 27. i may well be an attribution to Pericles of a share in the reform of 462/1, not properly coordinated with Ch. 25, and Archestratus was a common fifth-century Attic name. See Hignett, 197-8.

D.S. XI. 77. vi, Paus. I. 29. xv.

Professor Sealey has suggested (CP LIX 1964, 13) that the talk of ἘΦΙΑΛΛΟΤΑ derives not from the propaganda of the time but from an attempt in the third quarter of the fourth century to compare the pre-Ephialtic powers of the Areopagus with the enhanced powers which it exercised at that time, but the slogan is older than that, for the word was
used of the Areopagus' powers in a lost speech of Lysias:

εἰλέγετο δὲ καρ' αὕτοις καὶ ἄλλα ἐκτετα τινα, ὅπως μὴ πάτρια ὄντα ἢ ἢ Ἀρεσοῦ πάγου βουλή ἑδύκαζεν, ὡς σαφές ποιεῖ τὰύτας ἐν τῷ πρὸς τὴν Μειδώμην γράφην.

(Lys. fr. 178a [Sauppe], from Harpocratration)

379. A.P. 3. vi.
381. A.P. 8. iv.
384. Examples cited by Hignett, 208 with nn. 4, 5.
386. D. XVIII. Cor. 134, cf. [Pl]. X. Or. 850A, Hyp. frs. 67 - 76 (Kenyon); Pl. Phoc. 16. iv. Every citizen had the right of ξρόσοοός πρὸς τὴν βουλὴν καὶ τὴν ὁμοιον, and could hardly be prevented from stating that the view he advanced had the backing of some corporate body to which he belonged. On the enactment of decrees in general see Ch. II, and notice especially the decrees with special origins listed in Table E.
387. This brings him into conflict with Professor Wade-Gery (E.G.H., 180 - 200) over the interpretation of the Athenian decree for Phaselis, GHI 32. Wade-Gery sees references to the archon's personal jurisdiction in the words

παρ[η τῷ πο]σεμάρχω (9 - 10)

and

[ε] ἐὰν καταδικασ[ει, ἢ καταδίκη] ἰἀκιρος ἐστι (18 - 1)
and, assuming an abrupt reform which Aeschylus celebrated in the *Bumenides*, dates this decree before it; Sealey thinks this language would be entirely possible even after such a reform, and for \textit{καταδίκασεν} compares Plat. *Legg.* XII. 958 B–C. To add to the uncertainty, Mr W. W. Wyndham has pointed out in an unpublished essay that we could restore the more innocuous \textit{καταδίκασ[θηρεται, ἡ ὄξυ] or καταδίκασ[εται τι, ἡ ὄξυ]}, and the decree is one of the many for which Mr H. B. Mattingly would like a much later dating (PAGA VII 1964, 37–9, cf. Ancient Society & Institutions, 216–7 n. 29).

There may well have been a law at some point, possibly enforcing a change but more probably confirming an evolution that had already taken place; but new language for new procedures does not become established overnight, and even if Wade-Gery were right in principle the decree could belong to a period of overlap when the old language was used of the new procedure. The changes in judicial procedure which I would ascribe to Ephialtes will probably have made necessary the division of the heliaea into \textit{ὀλιγοστὶμος,} if this division had not already been made, but I am not convinced that Ephialtes must have abolished the archons' personal jurisdiction.

388. I prefer to think that Ephialtes made a point of attacking those about to join the ranks of the Areopagus, in the \textit{ἐθνοναυα} which they had to undergo on retiring from the archonship (cf. Wade-Gery, E.G.H., 177).
389. I should not like to say exactly how this was done, as I find it hard to believe in the Ephialtic νομοφύλακης of Philochorus. Wilamowitz (Aristoteles und Athen, II. 188) regarded a purely negative clause as impossible, but ensuring that the δραχαί kept the laws became one of the responsibilities of the boule (cf. A.P. 45. ii), and the duty of νομοφύλακης may have been assumed by the boule and demos. Aeschylus' Eumenides (704 - 6) suggests to me that the issue of νομοφύλακης was raised in some form at this time, and that at any rate after the event the poet thought the Areopagus ought to have retained this privilege (cf. E. R. Dodds, PCPS VI 1960, esp. 22).

390. A.P. 22. v.


392. ἐπειδὴ δὲ τεθῇ οἱ νόμοι, ἐκμελετῶσθαι ή βουλή ἡ ἐξ Ἀρείου κάγου τῶν νόμων, ὅπως ἐν αἱ δραχαί τοῖς κειμένοις νόμοις χρησταί.

(degree ap. And. I. Myst. 84).

What in practical terms Tisamenus meant by this I do not know, and I doubt whether he knew. MacDowell ad loc. discusses various possibilities.

393. The fragment of Lysias quoted in n. 378, above, suggests that about this time the arguments about "accretions" and "established rights" were resurrected.

394. A fact doubtless far less appreciated at this time than by the political theorists of a century later.

395. A.P. 45. i.

396. A.P. 41. ii.
But the correct form of address to the Areopagus remained, Ἡ βουλὴ (Lys. III. Sim. 1, IV. Vuln. Praemed. 1, VII. OL. 1).

A.P. 25, passim.
NOTES TO CHAPTER V


2. For a full statement of the case for the Solonian boule see Cloché, REG XXXVII 1924, 1 - 26; of the case against it, Hignett, 92 - 6. Recent writers who believe in the Solonian boule include W. G. G. Forrest, The Emergence of Greek Democracy, 164 - 6; A. Andrewes, Ancient Society and Institutions, 16 with 20 nn. 26 - 7, and (more cautiously) G. T. Griffith, ibid., 121 with 135 n. 35; A. G. Woodhead, Hist. XVI 1967, 135 - 6.

3. Diogenes Laertius (I. 49) has a story that when Solon tried to warn the ecclesia against Pisistratus ἡ βουλή, ἡ εἰσιστρατεῖα τετρακεφαλή, said that he was mad.

4. H. V. 72. ii.

5. A.P. 31. i. For a brief statement of my views on the constitutional documents in A.P. 30 - 1 see n. 47 to Ch. I.


   Of the inscriptions which have been adduced in this connection GHI 1 (= L. H. Jeffery, BSA LI 1956, 157 - 67) with its emphatic mention of a δημοσίη βουλή makes it very likely that two βουλαί coexisted in Chios before c. 550; a new fragment of GHI 11 makes it virtually certain that the boule was mentioned in 1. 12 (SEG X 1), but this decree need not be pre-Cleisthenic.

8. For discipline in the fifth and fourth centuries see Ch. IV, pp. 146 - 50.

10. Cf. n. 136 to Ch. I.

10A See Hignett, 115 – 23: We do not know in what ways or to what extent Pisistratus influenced the deliberations of the boule and ecclesia.

11. On the membership of the Cleisthenic boule see Ch. I, pp. 15-15. I do not know the authority for Mr Woodhead’s statement (Hist. XVI 1967, 135) that the members of Solon’s boule were "elected, apparently for life."

12. Cf. appendix to Ch. IV, p. 213. Mr Woodhead agrees that Cleisthenes left the boule’s powers unchanged, but makes the sixth-century boule a powerful body (Hist. XVI 1967, 135 - 6 with 135 n. 17).

13. Cf. n. 372 to Ch. IV.


17. A.P. 22. ii.

18. Cf. appendix to Ch. IV, pp. 201-11.


22. Cf. appendix to Ch. IV, pp. 212-4, 218.


25. Cf. Ch. I, p. 41; Ch. II, pp. 54-5. (In this paragraph I concentrate as far as possible on duties which the boule is known to have acquired before the end of the fifth century; but I have made use of some fourth-century material where we have no reason to believe that there had been a change in practice since the fifth century.)


33. Cf. Ch. IV, pp. 139-42.

34. Cf. Ch. IV, pp. 145-78.

35. History XXVI 1951 = More Essays, 177 - 93.


37. Cf. Ch. II, pp. 53-83; esp. 73-83.


39. Cf. n. 79, below.

39A. O.O. iii. 1 sqq. (variously dated between c. 445 and c. 415: see most recently G. W. Bowersock, HSCP LXXI 1966, 33-8, arguing for an early date; but I would prefer to date the pamphlet after 431) emphasises the amount of business transacted by the boule and perhaps provides a terminus ante quem.
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43. More Essays, 185.

44. On the members of the boule cf. Ch. I, pp. 2–5.

45. This point is stressed by Mr Woodhead, Hist. XVI 1967.

46. More Essays, 186.


48. The growth of όπωρία in Athens is discussed by G. T. Griffith, Ancient Society and Institutions, 115–38, and A. G. Woodhead, Hist. XVI 1967. The machinery of the full democracy required the active participation of a large number of citizens, and the spread of willingness to take part in the assembly’s debates must have been roughly paralleled by a spread of willingness to hold public office, each factor encouraging the other.

49. W. L. Ehrenberg, The Greek State, 63. Professor Ehrenberg’s account of the relationship between the boule and ecclesia, ibid., 61–5, is the one with which I am most in sympathy.


51. T. VIII. 1. iii.
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52. A.P. 29. ii., cf. for their number D.S. XII. 75. iv; L.S. 298. 25 gives their number as nine (but one from each tribe). For a discussion of the προδομουλων see F. D. Smith, Athenian Political Commissions, Ch. iii.

53. Produced in 411. I prefer to date the Thesmophoriazusae to 410 (cf. Additional Note E, pp. 441-7) and therefore cannot use that play as evidence for powers retained by the boule and prytanes during the existence of the προδομουλων.

54. Ar. Lys. 420 - 3.

55. Ibid. 430 - 66.

56. Ibid. 598 - 610.

57. Ibid. 980 - 1013.


Details of the means by which the four hundred came to power need not be discussed at length here; but I believe that the accounts of Thucydides and the Athenaión Politeía can be reconciled without great difficulty if we remember that the first is giving an account of "what really happened" in so far as an exiled Athenian could discover that, while the second account is based, whether directly or at second hand, on the documents through which the oligarchs hoped to make their rule seem respectable.

60. T. VIII. 67. ii - 68. i. init., A.P. 29. iv - v with 31. i init. Quotations are from A.P. 29. v. on the five thousand, A.P. 31. i and T.VIII. 67. iii on the four hundred. The
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motion may have stood formally in the name of the \( \sigmaυγγραφετζ \) (A.P. 29. v), but Pisander doubtless spoke for it (T.VIII. 68. i).

61. T.VIII. 70. i, A.P. 32. iii cf. 33. ii.

62. Notice the assurances sent to the fleet at Samos, reported in T. VIII. 72. i.

63. T. VIII. 89 - 96, A.P. 33.

64. T. VIII. 97. i, A.P. 33. i. I cannot accept the account of this constitution given by Mr G. E. M. de Ste Croix, Hist. V 1956.

65. T. VIII. 97. ii; for the admiration cf. A.P. 33. ii.

66. On the membership and organisation of the \( \beta\omegaλαξ \) of 411 - 410 see Ch. I, pp. 5-6, 28-9; on the judicial power which they wielded, appendix to Ch. IV, pp. 199-5 for the four hundred, \( \beta\omegaλαξ \) with \( \beta\gamma\alphaυτεκνοτες \), \( \beta\omegaλαξ \) and Additional Note E, pp. 403-7 (date of the Thesmophoriazusae) for the boule under the five thousand.

67. For the date cf. n. 50 to Ch. I.

68. X.H. II. iii. 2 - 3, A.P. 34. iii, D.S. XIV.3. vi - vii, Pl. Lys. 15.

69. X.H. II. ii. 2, 11, quoted in Ch. I, p. 29.

70. On the boule under the thirty see Ch. I, pp. 6 with n. 50A, 29, appendix to Ch. IV, pp. 190-1.

71. Cf. Ch. IV, pp. 157 with n. 57.

72. See especially And. I. Myst. 81 sqq.

73. But some seem still to have hankered after a restrictive qualification for membership of the citizen body: see n. 193.
74. Cf. Ch. II, pp. \textquotesingle 4-7

75. Cf. appendix to Ch. IV, pp. \textquotesingle 3-4.

76. Cf. Ch. I, pp. \textquotesingle 5-3


78. Cf. Ch. III, pp. \textquotesingle 1-4

79. A.P. 4\textmacron. iii, dated by references to the Τρυγιόνον in (392?) Ar. Eccl. 183 - 8, 289 sqq., &c.

80. Cf. p. 229 with n 50, above.

81. For a full statement of this view, see P. Clouché, REG XXXIV 1921.

82. The strategia, always a military office even when it was also of political importance, was the main exception to this rule: generals were elected and could be reelected. For elective offices in the 320's see A.P. 43.1, 61.

83. I have attempted to give an explanation of the view which I adopt in Ch. III, pp. \textquotesingle 5-8', with Additional Note D, pp. \textquotesingle 2-42.


86. A.P. 47. ii (treasurer of the stratiotic fund elected: 43.1).

87. The poletae are last found in 307/6, combining with Τρυγιόνον to make a contract (IG ii 2 463, 36, cf. 1589,1); the apodectae are last found in 323/2 (IG ii 2 365, b6; 1631, 324 - 5).

88. IG ii 2 244, 6 - 10. On the date see Ch. III, p. \textquotesingle 25 with
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n. 281.

89. Ibid., 28 sqq. For the appointment of $\tau\varepsilon\tau\chi\omicron\omicron\rho\omicron\omicron\omicron$ by tribes see \textit{IG} ii$^2$ 1658, 1 (394/3); 1660, 1 - 3 (393/2); cf. A. III. Ctes. 30.


92. See, for example, Plat. \textit{Protag.} 319 B 5 - C 8.

93. See W. S. Ferguson, \textit{CP} XXIV 1929, 9, on \textit{IG} ii$^2$ 644, and compare Professor Meritt's calendar studies, cited in Additional Note A, p. 414.

94. Ch. Ch. II, pp. 79-83.


98. Cf. Ch. II, pp. 87-8 with notes.


Modern study of the bouleutic calendar began with Keil's discovery (published in two articles in Hermes XXIX 1894) that for part of the fifth century the archontic and bouleutic years were not conterminous, and was given a new impetus by Professor Meritt's recognition (The Athenian Calendar) that the independent bouleutic year was a solar year. This led to a series of studies in which assumptions about the archontic calendar were allowed to dictate a good deal of irregularity in the bouleutic, a practice that was challenged in 1947 by Professors Pritchett and Neugebauer (The Calendars of Athens). Of more recent publications the most important are:

- W. K. Pritchett, Calendars of Athens again, BCH LXXXI 1957
- W. K. Pritchett, Expenditure of Athena, 408-406 B.C., and the Hellenotamiai, BCH LXXXVIII 1964
- B. D. Meritt, Athenian Calendar Problems, TAPA XCV 1964

In addition to the "festival" or archontic calendar, in which the year, identified by its archon, was divided into twelve or thirteen lunar months, the Athenians found it convenient to use a "civil" or bouleutic calendar, in which the year was divided into ten (or more) prytanies. For much of the fifth century the bouleutic year was wholly independent of the archontic calendar, being a solar year of 365 or 366 days (thus Meritt, TAPA 1964, 200; invariably 366 days, Pritchett & Neugebauer, 94 - 7, Pritchett, BCH 1957, 294): the bouleutic year 419/8 began on 16.i (Hec.) by the archontic calendar (Ant. VI. Chor. 44 - 5, with Meritt, Athenian Calendar, 121 - 2),
and the bouleutic year 411/0 would have begun, but for the revolution, on 14. xii (Scir.) (A.P. 32. i). At some time in the last decade of the century it was decided that the boule's term of office should be the lunar, archontic year of c. 354 or c. 384 days (for the boule's serving an archontic year in the fourth century cf. schol. D.XXI. Mid. 114, in BCH I 1877, 16). Meritt first used GHI 83 and 92 to date the change between 410/09 and 407/6, in CP XXV 1930, and he now regards 407/6 as the first year under the new dispensation (TAPA 1964, 201, 211): Pritchett, who takes a different and to me less convincing view of GHI 92, regards the date of the change as uncertain (BCH 1964, 470 - 3).

There has been much disagreement as to when the independent bouleutic year was instituted: Keil (Hermes XXIX 1894, 74 - 5) and Meritt (Ath. Cal., 71 - 2, 124 - 6) ascribed it to Cleisthenes; Dinsmoor (Archons of Athens, 327 n. 1) and Giffler (AJP LX 1939) linked it with the adoption of Meton's calendar in 432; Kahrstedt (U.M.A., 88) with the introduction of prytanies, which he attributed to Ephialtes. Meritt for a time thought that the independent bouleutic year might have been instituted about 450 (Hesp. V. 1936, 374 - 8) but in Ath. Yr., 203 n. 4, he accepted the demolition of the argument on which this was based (Pritchett & Neugebauer, 105 - 6) and reverted to his original opinion.

Methods of dating employed in fifth-century documents (cf. below) make it very likely that the independent bouleutic year goes back at any rate to the middle of the century, and I like Kahrstedt would associate it with an Ephialtic division of the boule into prytanies (cf. Ch. I, pp. 16 - 18): the prestige of the archons was under attack at the time, and this seems a suitable occasion for the creation of an alternative to the archontic year.

Neither kind of year is divisible into ten equal units, and the prytanies like the months must therefore have been unequal in
length. For the fourth century we are told explicitly in A.P. 43. ii that the first four prytanies in the year were of 36 days each and the remaining six of 35. Pritchett and Meritt disagree strongly in their attitude to "the rule of Aristotle". Meritt now accepts that there were normally four prytanies of 36 and six of 35 days (though tampering with the calendar might sometimes lead to departures from this), but he regards the Athenaion Politeia's placing of the long prytanies at the beginning of the year merely as one possibility, which was not followed every year (Ath. Yr., passim, esp. Ch. V, TAPA 1964, 200 – 12) while Pritchett insists that until positive disproof can be found this arrangement should be accepted as a binding rule (Pritchett & Neugebauer, 34 sqq., Anc. Ath. Cal., 356, BCH 1964, 467 – 70), and even postulates a similar rule for the fifth century (e.g. Pritchett & Neugebauer, 94 – 7). We possess many documents giving "calendar equations" between a date in the archontic calendar and a date in the bouleutic calendar: a few of these equations are intact or can be restored with certainty, but the great majority can be restored in more than one way according to the restorer's presuppositions concerning the calendar. So far Meritt and Pritchett have both been able to fit all the evidence to their own assumptions; there is no text which cannot be compatible with Pritchett's strict reliance on the Athenaion Politeia, and detailed and uncontroversial information for a number of years would be needed to throw serious doubt on Meritt's freer interpretation. Both scholars have found it necessary to postulate errors and irregularities in other calendar rules and in the inscription of calendar equations, and Pritchett by refusing to allow irregularities of this one kind has inevitably had to admit more and greater irregularities of other kinds (cf. D. M. Lewis, JHS LXXXIII 1963, 195, reviewing
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Ath. Yr.). Because his scheme is less neat than Meritt's it is not necessarily wrong, but I believe he is unwise to assume that the Athenion Politeia is telling not merely the truth and nothing but the truth, but even the whole truth. The very text on whose completeness he relies makes no mention of leap years, in which there should normally have been four prytanies of 39 and six of 38 days (e.g. Meritt, TAPA 1964, 202), or of ordinary years with a total of other than 354 days (e.g. D. M. Lewis, BSA L 1955, 25); and there are various other matters of which the account given in that treatise cannot be accepted as the whole truth (see, for example, my Ch. IV, pp. 151 and 185-9, on A.P. 45. ii, and Ch. III, pp. 138-42, on A.P. 54. iii - v).

Though the general structure of the calendars is clear, room has to be found within it for many irregularities, and it seems unwise to make one rule sacrosanct because it happens to be stated in the Athenion Politeia.

The bouleutic calendar continued with modifications after the creation of new tribes. In leap years when there were thirteen tribes and in ordinary years when there were twelve there will have been as many months as prytanies, but it is agreed that months and prytanies were not made conterminous (pace Poll. VIII. 115: Pritchett & Neugebauer, 78 - 9, Meritt, TAPA 1964, 202). Meritt believes that in 307/6 it was decided to add the intercalary month only when the year was in progress, and six prytanies of 30 days were therefore followed by six of 34 (Ath. Yr., 1976 - 8, TAPA 1964, 243); in 296/5 what was left of the year after the fall of Lachares' tyranny was shared among the twelve tribes (Ath. Yr., 178 - 9, TAPA 1964, 244); and the bouleutic years 222/1 and 166/5 each ended a month early (TAPA 1964, 256 - 9, 242 - 7).
It was obviously convenient to use the bouleutic calendar rather than the archontic in connection with the proceedings of the boule and ecclesia. Our earliest public document from Athens, the late sixth-century decree for Salamis, seems now to have borne no date (the new fragment has made an archon-year in 1. 12 unlikely: cf. SEG X 1), and the decrees of the Hecatompedon Inscription are dated to the archon-year 485/4 (IG ii 2 3, 16, 4, 26); but the series of decrees which begins probably in the 450's relies for dating on the bouleutic year, specifying the tribe in prytany and the secretary of that prytany (HMA 21 [c. 457?], 26 [453/2], 28 [451/0], 29 [c. 450], &c.; cf. Ch. I, p. 16 with n. 112), and shortly afterwards we find a previous year identified by the secretary of its first prytany (GHI 44, 16 - 17 [c. 445]). In the course of the next century more detail found its way into the prescripts of decrees, and there was an increasing tendency to give the date in both calendars, but it appears throughout that the bouleutic date was still felt to be the more important. Early in the fourth century the tribe in prytany was not only named but was given its ordinal number within the year (first found in heading, GHI 108 [394/3]; in prescript, GHI 126 [375/4]), and from the 360's a count of days within the prytany allowed greater precision (first found in prescript, GHI 136 [368/7]; in heading, IG ii 2 109 [363/2]; in financial documents, on which see below, this manner of specifying a day is found as early as GHI 55 [433/2], but in decrees the day had previously been identified by the name of the epistates only). Mention of the archontic year became common from about 420 (there are probably a few earlier examples, e.g. GHI 22 [458/7]), but not, I believe, enough to lend much support to the restoration of an archon-date in HMA 26, 2; Mr H. B. Mattingly by redating decrees would eliminate all archon-dates before 421/0 [JHS LXXXI 1961, 128 with
A.P. 43. iii - vi reports provisions for four regular meetings of the ecclesia in each prytany, with definite items of business allocated to each; and annual matters such as nomothesia (D.XXIV. Tim. 20), ostracism (A.P. 43.v) and elections (A.P. 44. iv) were assigned to dates in the bouleutic year. It is uncertain how old this practice is: elections certainly and ostracisms possibly took place before Athens had a boule divided into prytanies; but the designation of one ecclesia in each prytany as χυρή (A.P. 43. vi) suggests that there may have been a time when these ten were the only guaranteed meetings in the year (cf. G. T. Griffith, Ancient Society & Institutions, 124 with 136 n. 43). The indication ἐκκλησία is not found in prescripts before 336/5 (IG ii² 330), so there is no help to be obtained from this source, but the Peloponnesian War and Cleon's courting of the people provide as likely an occasion as any for an increase in the number of regular assemblies. Many ancient commentators say that there were three regular assemblies a month, and that these were called χυρή (schol. Ar. Ach. 19, A. I. Tim. 60, III. Ctes. 24, D. XVIII. Cor. 73, XXIV. Tim. 20; Phot. χυρή ἐκκλησία): this yields nearly the same annual total as four assemblies a prytany, and after 307/6 there may have been three regular assemblies in each of the twelve prytanies (cf. Busolt-Swoboda, 987 n. 4), but as far as we know the term χυρή was always restricted to one meeting in each prytany. I do not think HMA 69, 8 - 10, need imply that there was more than one χυρή ἐκκλησία, or even more than one regular ecclesia, per prytany in the 430's; and IG i² 42 (SEG X 37), 22, is of no help.
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in this connection.

We find both calendars used in other aspects of Athenian public life. The bouleutic year was in general the state's financial year (cf. schol. A. I. Tim. 104, s.v. προναυεσεις), with a general reckoning in the ninth prytany (cf. Ch. IV, pp. 152-4). The colacretae, important financial officers in the fifth century, held office for a term of one prytany (A. Wilhelm, Sb. Wien CCXVII. v 1939, 52 - 72), and the various boards in charge of public works in the fifth century seem to have regarded the bouleutic year as the more relevant to their activities:

**Parthenon accounts:** first ten years identified by ΔΡΧ (ordinal number, secretary) and boule (first secretary); by remaining five/epistatae (i.e. ΔΡΧ ) (secretary), boule (ordinal number, first secretary) and archon - IG i 2 339 - 48; 349 - 53.

**Chryselephantine Athena:** by epistatae (secretary) and commonly boule (first secretary) - IG i 2 354 - 62 cf. SEG X 257 - 63.

**Propylaea:** first year by epistatae (secretary), archon and boule (first secretary); next three years by ΔΡΧ (ordinal number, secretary) and boule (first secretary)- IG i 2 363; 364 - 6.

It is normally accepted that the Hellenotamiae held office for a Panathenaic year (dependent on the archontic calendar):

Pritchett has recently challenged this view (AJP LXXXV 1964, 44 - 6, BCH 1964, 455, 477 - 9) but Meritt upholds it (TAPA 1964, 212). In the headings of most of the quota lists of the Delian
League they date by years of their own (Δρυχ) alone, but in three late lists references are added to the archon and the first secretary of the boule (ATL Lists 33, 34, 39: the list published as 33 should in fact be 37 - R. Meiggs, CR II 1952, 99, B. D. Meritt & M. F. McGregor, Phoen. XXI 1967).

The inscription of the logistae, GHI 64, gives dates in the bouleutic calendar alone for sums which the state borrowed from the treasurers of Athena, and dates in both calendars for sums borrowed from the treasurers of the Other Gods (cf. J. A. Notopoulos, AJP LXVI 1945) - yet the beginning of the inscription defines some kind of accounting period with reference to the Panathenaea (cf. Additional Note D, pp. 434-5).

It is normally believed that the sacred treasurers held office for a Panathenaic year (e.g. Ferguson, Treasurers of Athena, 138 - 9 n. 1); Pritchett has recently suggested that the logistae's year of office was the Panathenaic year while the treasurers served for the bouleutic year (Hesp. XXXIV 1965, 145 - 7), but this can scarcely be reconciled with any interpretation of GHI 51A, 24 - 9. However the interaction of calendars is to be explained, it seems clear that the sacred treasurers worked primarily on the bouleutic calendar (in addition to GHI 64, see GHI 55, HMA 79, GHI 75, 83, 92; for the fourth century cf. IG ii 2 1493); and the Hecatompedon Inscription's orders to the treasurers to check the contents of the Hecatompedon on three specified dates in each month provide one of my reasons for suspecting that in 485/4 the division of the boule into prytanies, and the bouleutic calendar based on it, had not yet come into existence (cf. Ch. I, pp. 16-18). The poletae worked under the close supervision of the boule (cf. Ch. III, pp. 97 - 9, 125 - 6), but their function of selling
confiscated property brought them into contact with the courts, and in view of the archons' presidency we might expect the courts to work on the archontic calendar. Thus in SEG XII 100, a document of 307/6, confiscated property is sold on a date specified in the archontic calendar (1 - 39), and mines are hired out in certain prytanies (40 sqq). The tenth of the stelae relating to the property of the Hermocopids has dates in both calendars (SEG XIII 21); a document of the 340's, again giving sales of confiscated property, uses the archontic calendar to date the relevant court orders (Hesp. V 10; cf. again IG ii² 1578, 1 - 2). In GHI 200 (325/4) we find the archontic calendar used for the sessions of a law-court (204 - 17) and to specify the day by which trierarchs must have their ships ready to sail (183 - 90; cf. [D]. LI. Cor. Tri. 4).

But though the Athenians were a good deal more successful than the French revolutionaries in their creation of a civil calendar, the archontic calendar remained the religious calendar, by which all festivals were fixed, and it also remained the "natural" calendar, by which the ordinary citizen instinctively dated (cf. J. A. Notopoulos, AJP LXVI 1945, A. G. Woodhead, The Study of Greek Inscriptions, 115 with 132 n. 14.). The reader of Demosthenes and Aeschines can give precise dates for many of the events of 347/6, but although these events were very much bound up with the proceedings of the boule and ecclesia our dates for them are all dates in the archontic calendar. Archontic dates occasionally appear in other places where a bouleutic date might be expected: in GHI 167 a certain item of business is reserved for debate \([\tau\pi\nu \delta\gamma]\dot{o}o\eta\nu \xi\nu \delta\epsilon\kappa\alpha\) (53 - 9), and this must be 18.ix (Elaph.) 347/6 (cf. A. II. F. L. 61). The bouleutic calendar was well established for official purposes, but it never became more than an official calendar.
Additional Note B : HMA 87, 33 - 8

On p. 19 I remark that the prytanes could be held responsible for ensuring that an item of business came before the boule and ecclesia: the editors of ATL have suggested that Thudippus' assessment decree of 425/4 ought to have been put to the ecclesia by a specified prytany but was in fact delayed until the beginning of the following prytany.

The decree was carried when a seven-letter tribe was in prytany: -

εὔοχεν τῇ δι βολή καὶ τῇ ὅμοιοι. Ἀεσοτίς ἐπροτάνευε, κτλ.

(1.3) (Ἀεσοτίς) preferred to Ἀλαντίς,

Hesp. XIV 1945, 119). In the course of the decree, however, we come across a typical piece of Athenian carelessness, provisions for bringing the decree before the assembly which will have been entirely appropriate in a probouleuma but ought not to have survived in the text as ratified in the assembly (for this kind of oversight, cf. the retention of the rider in GHIR 90). A certain prytany is threatened with heavy penalties if it fails to get the decree through the assembly before the end of its term of office, and there are only six letters for the name of the tribe: -

ἐκσενενεγκέτο δὲ τ—

αὕτα ἐς τὸν ὅμοιον ὡς ὁλιγεῖς προντα[νώς] ἐκταναγχες


αὕτα ἐς τὸν ὅμοιον ὡς ὁλιγεῖς προντα[νώς] ἐκταναγχες


αὕτα ἐς τὸν ὅμοιον ὡς ὁλιγεῖς προντα[νώς] ἐκταναγχες


αὕτα ἐς τὸν ὅμοιον ὡς ὁλιγεῖς προντα[νώς] ἐκταναγχες


(11.33 - 8)
That is, despite the penalties with which it was threatened the prytany of 1. 34 did not get Thudippus' decree through the assembly as it had been ordered.

The editors of ATL explain this as follows (Meritt & West, Athenian Assessment, 52 - 7, Wade-Gery & Meritt, AJP LVII 1936, cf. Meritt, AJP LVIII 1937). The expedition of line 34 is that with which Cleon has captured the Spartans on Sphacteria: on hearing the news of this victory Thudippus put his decree to the boule and had it adopted as a probouleuma, but he wanted Cleon to take part in the final debate in the assembly, and believed that this would be possible before the end of the second prytany of the year. Cleon had promised to bring back the Spartans alive within 20 days (T. IV. 28. iv), and to Thucydides' surprise he kept his promise (39. iii), but he need only have spent four days at Pylos (AJP 1937, 392) and probably had ample time after his victory. Without breaking his promise he arrived home later than expected, and it proved impossible for the prytanes of Oeneis to discharge the duty laid on them by Thudippus: the decree was therefore submitted to the assembly early in the third prytany, and whether or not the threatened penalty was imposed no one saw fit to remove the clause under discussion from the published text.

It seems to me entirely possible that if this reconstruction of the course of events is correct 11. 33 - 8 should have been retained in the official text of the decree; a supplementary decree declaring that as the delay was not their fault the prytanes concerned were to go unpunished might well have been inserted, but its absence is not enough to refute the theory. Nevertheless this is a great deal to build on a difference of one letter between the tribe to be restored in 1. 3 and that to be restored in 1. 34. Where he can be checked, the mason who cut
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this text was careful with his aspirates and kept strictly to a οτοιχιμόδυν pattern, but a glance at The Athenian Assessment, plate I, shows clearly how little of the text has survived. At another point the editors have been able to save the οτοιχιμόδυν pattern only by restoring

\[\text{hοι δὲ \[νομο]θέτα[ι δικαστέριον\] νέον κα[θιστών̃ν \[χ[ιλιος δικαστάς] (1. 16)\]}

although nomothetae are not otherwise attested at this time and [θεσμο\[\[θέτα[ι]]] though one letter longer yields a far more satisfactory sense (cf. n. 20 to Ch. III). To postulate an epigraphic irregularity and restore the same tribe, Leontis, in 11. 3 and 34 may strain credulity less than to insist on regular aspirates or a regular οτοιχιμόδυν pattern whatever the historical consequences (cf. H. B. Mattingly, Hist. X 1961, 154 - 5). What the authors of ATL suggest could have happened, but a far more secure text would be needed to demonstrate that it must have happened.
We possess four Athenian decrees which are said to have been enacted "for the defence of the country":

**IG ii² 435** after 336/5 (prescript lost) Honours for exiles from (somewhere).

13: [ταῦτα δὲ ἐλνα] τις φυλακήν τῆς χώρας].

**GHI 200** 325/4 ἡπ. Colony to Adriatic.

270 - 1: ταῦτα δ' ἐλνα ἱκανα σὲ τις φυλακήν τῆς χώρας.

**IG ii² 1631, 350 sqq.** 324/3 ἡπβ. Relaxing harsh treatment of naval debtor.

401 - 3: τὸ δὲ ψήφισμα τόδε ἔκαν ἐλνα τις φυλακήν τῆς χώρας, ἐκείδη ἐστὶ μερὶ χρημάτων εἰσφράξεως.

**Hesp. XI. 56** 247/6 Ἐ; ἐτό; πφ. Appeal for contributions to stratiotic fund.

16 - 9: ἐκιωδζϊναι σὲ τήν σωτηρία τῆς πόλεως καὶ τήν φυλακήν τῆς χώρας.


Cf. also 30 - 2.
With these we may compare a decree of the Athenian cleruchs on Salamis, enacted in 116/5:

**IG ii² 1228**


**SIG³** displays similar formulae in third and second century decrees of Chios (SIG³ 402, 38), Erythrae (412, 13-14) and Magnesia (589, 67-8) – none of them concerned with defence.

The defence of the country is included in the *Athenaion Politeia*’s list of items which appeared on the agenda of a κυρία ἐκκλησία

ἐν ἓν δὲ τὸς ἐρχόμενον ἐκπειειδητονεῖν ἐλ δοκοῦσιν καλῶς ἐρχειν, καὶ περὶ όστου καὶ περὶ φυλακῆς τῆς χώρας χρηματίζειν.

(A.P. 43. iv)

(Reusch, De Diebus Contionum, p. 72, noted that of the examples given above Hesp. XI. 56 was enacted not at an ἐκκλησία κυρία but at one of the other ἐκκλησίατω). Sandys in his commentary on the passage remarked that the defence of the country is one of the five major topics of deliberation named in Aristotle’s *Rhetoric*:
It does not figure in Aristotle's expansion of τὸ βουλευόμενον περὶ τῶν κοινῶν in the Politics:

Defence does however appear in a list provided by Xenophon, when he makes Socrates, in order to curb Glaucocn's desire to speak in the ecclesia, expose his complete ignorance of the city's revenue and expenditure, the strength of its own and of its enemies' forces, the φυλακὴ τῆς χάρας, the mines, and the corn supply (Xen. Mem. III. vi. 1 - 13). But in none of these three lists do I think there is any conscious echoing of official decree-categories: the topics mentioned are matters with which any Greek city was bound to concern itself. (When particular "departments" were assigned to particular generals in the fourth century one man was designated στρατηγὸς ἐπὶ τὴν χάραν (e.g. Phil. 328 P 155, referring to 350/49): the earliest reference to this general calls him τὸν στρατηγὸν τὸν ἐπὶ τὴν φυλακὴ τῆς χάρας κεχειροτονημένον (IG ii2 204, 19 - 20: 352/1). But the division of his duties in the first half of the third century between the στρατηγὸς ἐπὶ 'Ελευσίναι and the στρατηγὸς ἐπὶ τὴν καραλείαν shows that again
φυλακὴ τῆς χώρας is to be interpreted literally. (See W. S. Ferguson, Klio IX 1909, 314 - 23).

Since Boeckh studied the Athenian navy-lists it has been recognised that to place a decree in the category ἐς φυλακὴν τῆς χώρας ought to have given it some special importance, which would lend some point to the inclusion in this class of decrees which had little or nothing to do with the defence of the country (Urk. Seewesens, 467 - 8, commenting on GHI 200, 270 - 1; cf. SIG 305, note 17; 402, note 12; 589, note 23). Most recently Dr Tod has written, "By the final clause ... the present decree is placed in the highest class of priority" (GHI II, p. 288, commenting on GHI 200). One clear result of a motion's being assigned to this class is that it could be discussed at a κυρία ἐκκλησία; but the classification must have meant more than this, for one of our examples is a decree of the boule, with which the ecclesia was not concerned. We should expect to find some kind of priority granted for the execution of the decree (so Boeckh, though neither he nor any one else has been able to suggest what this could have involved): it may be significant that the three decrees of the ecclesia include two of the five post-403 decrees which authorise the boule to make supplementary enactments if necessary (IG ii 2 435, GHI 200. See Ch. *II, p. 84 and n. 173).

We have seen that contributions were requested in Hesp. XI.
56 ἐς τὴν σωτηρίαν τῆς κόλεως καὶ τὴν φυλακὴν τῆς χώρας, and σωτηρία τῆς κόλεως is a phrase which we find elsewhere. Very close to Hesp. XI. 56 is Isaeus, V. Mer.Die. 37:

εἰδοφορῶν τούτων τοσοῦτον γεγενημένων ἀπὸ τοῦς πολέτας ἐς τὸν κόλεον καὶ τὴν σωτηρίαν τῆς κόλεως δικαιογένης ὅπως ἔστιν κατώτατα εἰλευκήνοχον.
(Other references to money given εἰς φυλαχῆν : IG ii² 283, 12 – 13; 768, 12; 798, 19 – 20; money given εἰς σωτηρίαν: IG ii² 479, 8 – 9). Here the subject-matter is adequate to explain the choice of phrase, but in Isaeus and in three other passages Wilamowitz was inclined to regard σωτηρία τῆς κόλεως as a technical term (Aristoteles und Athen, I. 102 n. 7). In all the ten πρόβουλοι were joined by twenty colleagues, and the thirty men were to συγγράψοντο περὶ τῆς σωτηρίας (A. P. 29. ii); and Isocrates begins his Areopagiticus with the words,

πολλούς δὲν οἶμαι θαυμάζειν, ἣντινα κατε γνώμην ἥχων περὶ σωτηρίας τῆς πρόσοδον ἐξοικείσθην.

(Is. VII. Areop. 1)

Neither of these passages by itself compels us to accept Wilamowitz' view (though on A. P. 29 see below), but the principal text on which he relied was Aristophanes, Ecclesiazusae, 394 – 402:

ΒΑ. ἄτιρ τὸ τὸ πράγμα ἢν, ὅτι τοσοῦτον κρῆμ' ὠλον οὖτως ἐν ὀρᾷ ἐξυπερήγνυ;

ΧΡ. τῷ οὖσας τὸις προτάραξι περὶ ἑκτηρίας

γνώμαις καθώσις τῆς πολιτείας; κατ' εἴθεσιν πρῶτος ἐποιήσατος ὁ γλάμων παρετρυσάσθη. παρετρυσάτε' ὁ δῆμος ἀναβοῦ κόσσον δοκεῖτε, "οὐ δεινὰ τολμᾶν τοιοῦτοι δημηγορεῖν, καὶ ταῦτα περὶ σωτηρίας προκειμένου, δι' αὐτῶς αὐτῷ βλεφαρίζονδε, διάδοσε;"
This does make it seem likely that περὶ σωτηρίας was a 
recognised formula analogous to the Romans' de re publica (cf. 
Livy, XXII. 1. v, Varro ap. Gellius, XIV. vii. 9), which would 
permit any proposal for the general good of the state (cf. F.P. 
Smith, Athenian Political Commissions, 49: "In such cases the 
Senate virtually abrogated its privilege of offering a probou-
leuma"). More pertinent, perhaps, than A.P. 29. ii is the re-
commendation finally produced by the thirty συγγραφεῖς, 
which Wilamowitz did not cite:

οἱ δ' αἰρεθεντες πρῶτον μὲν ἐγγραφαν ἐκάναντες εἶναι 
tὸς πρωτάς τὰ λεγόμενα περὶ τῆς σωτηρίας ὕπωθοσ'εἶναιν, 
ἐπειτα τὰς τῶν παρασελίων γραφὰς καὶ τὰς εὐαγγελίας καὶ 
tὰς προκλήσεις ἄνευ ὅπως ἄν οἱ δεξιοτετερ' ἁθηναῖων 
συμβουλευσοι περὶ τῶν προκειμένων.

(A.P. 29. iv)

Thucydides, as often, eschews technical language:

ἐσήνεγκαν οἱ συγγράφης ἄλλο μὲν οὐδέν, αὖτι δὲ τοῦτο, 
ἐξείπει μὲν ἁθηναίων ἀνατελ εἰκεῖν γνώμην ἢν ἢ τις 
βοηθηται; ἢν δὲ τῶν εἰπόντα ἢ γράφηται παρασελίων 
ἡ ἄλλη τῷ τρόπῳ ἠλπίζῃ, μεγάλας ἐπιμέλειας ἐπέθεσαν.

(T. VIII. 67.ii)

The appearance of περὶ τῆς σωτηρίας both in the 
συγγραφεῖς commission in A.P. 29. ii and in their quasi-
probouleuma in 8 iv can hardly, I think, be accidental.

The phrase must at any rate originally have meant what it says, 
and have been employed in times of crisis. I should not like to
guess when this form of completely open probouleuma was first used, but it appears from A.P. 29 and the Ecclesiazusae that the standard formula had come into use by the end of the fifth century. A very likely occasion for its use in the fourth century may be found in 339, when the news reached Athens that Philip had occupied Elatea (D. XVIII. Cor. 169 - 70; cf. Ch. II, pp. 55, 60); and Demosthenes himself uses the phrase, \( \pi \varepsilon \rho \iota \varsigma \varsigma \tau \omicron \sigma \nu \tau \iota \rho \varsigma \alpha \varsigma \varsigma \tau \omicron \varsigma \varsigma \varsigma \varsigma \), in connection with the crisis brought upon Athens by the battle of Chaeronea:

\[
\text{μετά γὰρ τὴν μάχην εὐθὺς ὁ δῆμος . . . πρῶτον μὲν περὶ σωτηρίας τῆς πόλεως τὰς ἐμᾶς γνώμας ἐκείροσαν, καὶ πᾶν τὸ σας τῆς φυλακῆς ἕνεκ' ἐκράτητο . . . διὰ τῶν ἐμῶν γνησίων τεταγμένο.}
\]

(D. XVIII. Cor. 248)

Demosthenes' claim is denied by Aeschines (cf. note 69 to Ch. II, above), but whether or not that is true it is possible that at this time the words \( \pi \varepsilon \rho \iota \varsigma \varsigma \tau \omicron \sigma \nu \tau \iota \rho \varsigma \alpha \varsigma \varsigma \tau \omicron \varsigma \varsigma \varsigma \varsigma \) appeared in an open probouleuma, and that decrees were enacted \( \epsilon \iota \varsigma \phiυλακήν τῆς χώρας \) - though there can be nothing merely technical in the \( \pi \varepsilon \rho \iota \varsigma \varsigma \tau \omicron \sigma \nu \tau \iota \rho \varsigma \alpha \varsigma \varsigma \tau \omicron \varsigma \varsigma \varsigma \varsigma \) reported by Lycurgus from Hyperides' decree (Lyc. Leocr. 37).

There is some temptation to link "the safety of the city" with "the defence of the country" (though so far as I know no one has tried to establish this link), but there are important differences to be noticed. \( \pi \varepsilon \rho \iota \varsigma \varsigma \tau \omicron \sigma \nu \tau \iota \rho \varsigma \alpha \varsigma \varsigma \tau \omicron \varsigma \varsigma \varsigma \varsigma \) belongs to the deliberative stage, before a decree is enacted, while \( \epsilon \iota \varsigma \phiυλακήν τῆς χώρας \) is a classification applied to enacted decrees, as well as to a part of the agenda at a \( \chiυρή \, \chiκχλησία. \)
Furthermore, περὶ τῆς σωτηρίας is an "open" category (removal of the usual safeguards may, as Wilamowitz thought, regularly have accompanied a debate περὶ τῆς σωτηρίας, but the Prytanes could only propose such a removal and ask the demos to clear the way for a free debate by ratifying it); but it appears that ἐκ τοῦ φυλακὴν τῆς χώρας was a "closed" category, and there was some law specifying which decrees could be included in it: the Salaminian decree and two of the four Athenian decrees contain a clause explaining their qualification for the title (IG ii2 1228, 1631, Hesp. XI. 56). Of these decrees, only Hesp. XI 56 (which in lines 16 - 17 and 30 - 2 does couple σωτηρία with φυλακὴ) seems at all likely to have been proposed in a general debate περὶ σωτηρίας, yet here despite ἐδοξέων τῶι δῆμωι we have the probouleumatic formula. The text of the decree is not complicated, and could have been produced in a hurry, but I feel that for clarity and straightforwardness it ranks well above the Athenian average. I am inclined to think that this is an ordinary probouleumatic decree (cf. Ch. II, pp. 77 - 81): conceivably the Prytanes arranged a debate περὶ σωτηρίας in the boule, but the safety of the city is perfectly appropriate to its context, and need have no intended connection with the technical use of the phrase. There remains the possibility (which cannot be checked) that any decree which was enacted in a debate περὶ τῆς σωτηρίας would have been classified as ἐκ τοῦ φυλακὴν τῆς χώρας (it is not likely that the reverse was true).

We are no nearer, I fear, to discovering what was involved in this classification. The benefits must be applicable to independent decrees of the boule as well as to decrees of the ecclesia, and it is possible that the clauses authorising the
boule to stop gaps in decrees of the ecclesia are instances of a more general provision for the rapid execution of these decrees. Beyond this point we can only guess.
In the 320's this office was certainly collegiate (in A.P. 43.1 and 47.ii there are references to τού ταμίου τῶν στρατιωτικῶν καὶ τῶν ἐπὶ τὸ θεωρικὸν), and it is widely assumed that the theoric officials always formed a board (G. L. Cawkwell, JHS LXXXIII 1963, 47 with n. 4, G. E. M. de Ste Croix, CR XIV 1964, 191; J. J. Buchanan, Theorika, 57–60, accepts this view without discussion). Outside the Athenaion Politeia there is very little evidence: A. III. Ctes. 24 is certainly not decisive for the existence of a single officer, but § 25 (quoted p. 106 ) need not be decisive for a board, if for some years the office was monopolised by Eubulus and his associates. A. II. F.L. 149 and D. XXIII. Arist. 209 likewise seem to prove little or nothing. There remains one text which does seem to me to point to the existence of a single official in the 340's, IG ii 2 223 C, 5. This is a document relating to the boule, not to one tribal prytany, but among the officials named in the heading to the decree is Cephisophon, ἐπὶ τὸ θεωρικὸν. Those who believe in a board suppose that this one member was particularly associated with the boule, but I think it may be an easier hypothesis that Cephisophon is named alone because he was the sole theoric official at that time. One of the ways in which Hegemon's law (A. III. Ctes. 25) weakened the position of the theoric officials will then have been by substituting a college for the single officer.

The office was elective, in the time of the Athenaion Politeia (43.1, 47. ii) and a fortiori before the law of Hegemon; if A.P. 62. iii may be pressed reelection was forbidden during the 320's, but the scope of τὰς ἀρχὰς κατὰ πόλεμον ἀρχὰς was so nearly coextensive with τὰς χειροτονητὰς ἀρχὰς that I would not wholly exclude the possibility that our author
Add. Note B) has formulated the ban on repetition incorrectly even for the 320's (on the claim that Lycurgus was unable to hold his office for more than one quadrennium, see Ch. III, p. 108 with n. 153), and I would certainly not rule out reelection before the law of Hegemon. Dr D. M. Lewis has suggested that Hegemon enacted

μὴ πλεῖστω πέντε ἐτῶν διέκειν τὸν χειροτονηθέντα
ἐκ τὰ δημόσια χρήματα

([Pl. X.84 1c]),

and that this measure, aimed at the theoric officials, was held to apply to Lycurgus (unpublished essay, cited by G. L. Cawkwell, JHS LXXXIII 1963, 55. n. 52): I think it quite likely that this may have been among the effects intended, though I should prefer not to base any arguments on the words used to describe the officials.

The officials' term of office also has been disputed. In A.P. 43. i we read that all the elective financial officers, the treasurer of the stratotic fund, the theoric board, and the epimelete of the springs, ἐπὶ γεναθήματα ἐξ Ἡρωθηναίων εἰς Ἡρωθηναία. This was at first interpreted as meaning the four-year period from one Great Panathenaea to the next; Ferguson (Hellenistic Athens, 474 - 5) argued that the purpose of the words was simply to define the year of office as the Panathenaic (beginning on 28. i [Hec.]) rather than the archontic or bouleutic, and most subsequent writers have ignored rather than actively disputed this; but the case for the original interpretation has been restated by F. W. Mitchel, TAPA XCIII 1962, 220 - 1, cf. J. A. Davison, JHS LXXVIII 1958, 23, 31 - 3. We must therefore examine the arguments.

In the fifth century the treasurers of Athena (IG i² 232 sqq.)
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and of the Other Gods (GHI 51 A, 24 - 7) were manifestly annual officials; when the board of the Other Gods was established this order was given:

καὶ ἐκ Παναθένας

οὐ̣ δὲ Παναθένας τὸλ λόγον διδόντων, καθάπερ οἱ τὰ τῆς Ἀθηνᾶς τὰ [α]μελέσοντες.

(GHI 51 A, 27 - 9)

This, coming immediately after a sentence making it clear that the office was annual, ought to be a definition of the year of office. The treasurers of Athena, though each board left its separate record, were for some purposes combined in groups of four, with the standard rubric,

τάδε παρέδοσαν αἱ τέσσαρες Δραχαὶ, αἱ ἐκ βοῆς τοῦ λόγου ἐκ Παναθένας ὑπὸ Παναθένας.

(IG i² 232 sqq., 256 sqq., 276 sqq.)

A similar rubric introduces the record kept by the logistae of borrowings from the sacred treasuries during the Archidamian War:

[τάδε ἐλογίσαν]το οἱ λογιστ[α]ι ἐν τοῖς τέσταρσιν ἔτεσιν ἐκ Παναθένας ὑπὸ [Παναθένας ὁφελάμενοι],

(GHI 64, 1 - 2)

In each of these cases the four-year period is in fact a quadrennium from Great Panathenaea to Great Panathenaea, and I find it hard to resist the conclusion that this is what the rubrics mean. It must be admitted that in the inscription of the logistae the four years are preceded by seven (with no sign of subdivision), and that the fragments left by the treasurers of the Other Gods (IG i² 310) probably began in the non-Panathenaic year 429/8 (the only main rubric, dated to that year, heads one face); but
this need not affect my argument that in the rubrics quoted ἐκ Παναθηναϊκῶν εἰς Παναθηναῖα refers to Panathenaic quadrennia. But Davison’s view that Παναθηναῖα alone always refers to the major festival is difficult to maintain: GHI 51 A, 24 – 9 (part quoted above), and 75, 61, cannot easily be fitted to this interpretation. I am inclined to think that the phrase was left to take its meaning from its context, and that its use in fifth-century inscriptions does not therefore fix its meaning in A.P. 43. i.

We must now consider the actual offices whose term the Athenaion Politeia defines in these words. On the theoretic officials themselves there is no evidence that can help us, but we are a little better informed on the other officials. The treasurer of the stratiotic fund in the last years of the century served for one year (at any rate, the office changed hands in a non-Panathenaic year), but his year was not bounded by the Panathenaea (Habron was treasurer in xii [Scir.] 306/5, Philippus on 14. i [Hec.] 305/4: IG ii2 1492, 118 – 24, 124 – 38), and where one change is certain a second is possible. Callias Ἀξιωματικὸς Βοτινθοῦ is described as τοῦ τευτευόντος στρατιωτικοῦ ἐπὶ Χαρίανδου ἀρχοντος (338/7: [Pl.] X.Or. 842 F) in a context where one would most naturally assume that he held office for a year only (but how would the Athenians have identified one in a series of quadrennial offices?). Demades was certainly treasurer in 334/3 (IG ii2 1493, restored by Mitchel after Wilamowitz: SEG XXI 552, XXII 133); and in an anecdote reported by Plutarch we are told that in 331 he τῆς προσόδους ἐξ ἀφ' ἐντεῦθεν τῆς κόλους (Pl. Praec. Ger. Rep. 818E; for the date cf. E. Badian, Hermes XCV 1967, 190 – 2).

Mitchel combines these passages to argue that Demades was treasurer for the quadrennium 334 – 330 (TAPA XCIII 1962, 219 – 25: he
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seems to bring forward the Great Panathenaea of 330 to 331).
It is central to Plutarch's anecdote that Demades held a financial
office which enabled him to provide money for the Choes, and the
story should not be dismissed too lightly: if the office in
question is the treasurership of the stratiotic fund we must
therefore allow either the possibility of reelection (perhaps up
to a maximum of four years' tenure - cf. pp. 432-3, above) or
a quadrennial office. On balance, however, what we know of the
office makes annual appointment seem more likely than quadrennial.
The same is true of the third office which ran ἐκ Παναθηναϊκῶν
ἐλίς Παναθηναία, that of the epimelete of the springs.
The reference to Cephisodorus in IG ii 2 215 is too generously
restored for this text to carry much weight -

[Κηρίσω]-
δὸς Καλλί[ο Άγνοοστου αἰρεθέ]-
ντος ἐπ[ι] θε[μιστοχλέους ξραχον]-
τος ἐπί[μελεσθαὶ τῶν χρημῶν]

(11. 9 - 12; the year in question is 347/6) -

but a Panathenaic quadrennium seems unlikely in the case of Pytheas,
αἰρεθέλες ἐκ τὰς χρήμας, who on 9. ii (Metag.)
333/2, more than a year after the quadrennium 334 - 330 had begun,
was honoured for what he had done in this capacity, subject to his
passing his euthynae (IG ii 2 338). Unlikely, but not impossible:
once it is realised that at this time a man could be provisionally
honoured, before he had presented his accounts on retirement from
office (cf. Ch. I, p. 4), there is no real reason why such
provisional honours should not be decreed at any time; and although
to us a three-year wait seems rather long the end of Pytheas'
first year may have been considered a suitable occasion for such
a decree. (It is even possible, I suppose, that a quadrennial
officer would be required to pass his euthynae on each year separately.)
Nevertheless an annual office again seems the likelier solution, and with annual appointment likely for the epimeleto of the springs and the treasurer of the stratiotic fund it is likely for the theoric officials too. But it is to be hoped that one day further evidence will allow us to decide the matter with certainty.

The most important text on the powers of the theoric officials is A. III. Ctes. 25, which I quote on p. 106. The sentence begins with a mention of ἄρχω, which the theoric officials ἔρχον before the law of Hegemon was passed, and ends with a list of other tasks which these officials performed. This second part need imply no interference with other offices of state: for the theoric officials to have built the οἰκειοθήκη and to have been δοσολογοί, it is enough for an orator that they should have provided the money, and perhaps have taken the initiative in having the work undertaken (though δοσολογὸς was the title of an Athenian office: A.P. 54. i). The first part of the sentence, however, should mean (if Aeschines is not very seriously exaggerating) that the theoric officials either replaced or at any rate became the acknowledged superiors of other officials - the antigrapheus, the apodectae, and probably the epimeletae of the dockyards (on the textual dispute here see n. 138 to Ch. III: if Kaibel's text is adopted it can perhaps be argued that the clause concerning the dockyards belongs to the end of the sentence rather than the beginning).

We are certainly intended to think that the office of the ἀντιγραφεύς was abolished or drastically changed. Aeschines' previous sentence reads

πρότερον μὲν τούτων, ἢ ἄνδρες Ἀθηναῖοι, ἀντιγραφεύς ἦν χειροτονητὸς τῇ κόλει, δέ καὶ ἐκάστην προσάντας ἀκελογίζετο τὰς προσόδους τῇ ὁμῷ,
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and it ought to follow from A.P. 43. ii that Aeschines' anti-
grapheus, if still in existence, was in the 320's no longer
elected. Harpocratian has the following entry (cf. Poll. VIII.
98):-

\[
\text{ΑΝΤΙΓΡΑΦΕΥΣ} - \delta \ \kappaαθιστάμενος \ \epsilonκι \ τῶν \ καταβαλλόντων \ τινὰ
tῇ πόλει χρήματα, ὅστε ἀντιγραφευσαι ταῦτα. Δημοσθένης
ev tῇ κατ᾽ 'Ανδροτέλωνος (XXII, 38, 70) καὶ Αισχύνης ἐν
tῇ κατὰ Κτησιφώντος (III. 25 - cf. above ). Ὁποτελ οἶ


καὶ ἂν ἀντιγραφεῖς, ὁ μὲν τῆς διοικήσεως, ὁς πησεν Φιλο-

χορος (328 F 198 - known only from this reference),

δὲ τῆς Βουλῆς, ὁς 'Αριστοτέλης ἐν 'Αθηναίων Πολιτείᾳ

(no - some think this is an amalgamation of the secretaries
in 54, iii - v, but I am not convinced).

I believe that the best interpretation of this passage is one
rejected without much discussion by Brillant, Les Secrétaires
athéniens, app. i, that Harpocratian's two ἀντιγραφεῖς did
not exist simultaneously. Aeschines' antigrapheus can easily be
identified with the official of that name in D. XXII. Andr.
(355/4? - cf. n. 28 to Ch. I) and IG ii² 1740 (before 350? -
he and the secretary are the only officials named), and this
will be the man who could later be described as ἀντιγραφεὺς
τῆς διοικήσεως. In the heyday of the theoric
officials this office was abolished, and its responsibilities
taken over by the theoric officials: thus there is no anti-
grapheus among the officials heading IG ii² 223 C (343/2), but
the officials include Cephisophon, ἕπι τῷ θεωρικὸν.

(The antigrapheus of IG ii² 244, 23, is probably the older official,
and this would strengthen Mr G. L. Cawkwell's argument for
dating the inscription earlier than 337/6: cf. Ch. III, p. 125
with n. 281). But at any rate by 335/4 the title existed again,
for an antigrapheus ranks fifth among the eight officials listed
in IG ii² 1700: he appears also in other lists of officials
connected with the boule in the late fourth century, occasionally
in the following three centuries, and regularly in the Christian
era. This man I should like to identify with Harpocratin's
Δνυγραφαζς Της Βουλης. His duties are un­
certain: they may, but need not, have been financial (according
to two lexica [L.S. 185.16, Suid. γραμματευς ] which do
not name their authority he had secretarial duties in the boule;
in the prescript of IG ii² 967 he is named after the eponymous
secretary).

A change of this kind could mean that the title, antigrapheus,
ceased for a few years to be used at all, and was brought back
into use when a new office was created; but it could equally mean
that in the one act of reorganisation the title was transferred
directly from one office to a totally different one. (From 321/0
to 319/8 and from 294/3 to 292/1 the title of Δνυγραφαζς,
at other times used by one of the lower secretaries, was borne by
the principal public secretary, who at other times was commonly
called γραμματευς κατα πρωτανειαν - see Ch. III,
pp. 142-3). Ηρχον . . . την τοι Δνυγραφαζς αρχην will
therefore mean that the old office of antigrapheus disappeared; but
a part of his work may have been done by a similar official, now
subordinated to δ ξατι το θεωρικοιν, and his title
will either immediately or after a few years' disuse have passed
to another office.

What Aeschines says of the antigrapheus he seems also to be
Add. Note D

saying of the apodectae. In 347/6 the apodectae were ordered to advance _έξ τῶν στρατιωτικῶν χρημάτων_ (which I take to mean, from the sum which they would normally have allocated to the stratiotic fund) money which was thereafter to be paid from the ecclesia's expense-account (GHI 167, 39 - 44), about 343 the apodectae were mentioned in connection with an adjustment to the _μερολογίς_ (IG ii² 222, 41 - 6; but A. C. Johnson, CP IX 1914, 424, dated the decree in or after 331), and another reference to the _μερολογίς_ performed by the apodectae occurs c. 336 - 4 (SEG XVIII 13, 19 - 21); the navy lists attest various payments to the apodectae in the 320's (IG ii² 1627, 227 - 9; 1628, 424 - 7, 628 - 30). If the apodectae did disappear, they did not do so for long, and there is no evidence that their powers after about 335 were less than their powers before 350. But I have suggested above that responsibility, duties and title may be three different things; and I would suggest that in this case _δὲ ἐξὶ τὸ θεωρικὸν_ was deemed to have ultimate responsibility for revenue, while men very like the apodectae continued to do much of the routine work, and these may or may not have retained the title, apodectae. It seems from the passages quoted on pp. 437-8, above, that the _ἡγιασμός τῆς ὁλοκλήρωσις_ was concerned with revenue, and may have acted as an expert adviser to and spokesman for the apodectae; and though some work may have been left to a lower official it is likely that the more public and distinctive part of his duties passed to _δὲ ἐξὶ τὸ θεωρικὸν_. Supersession of the apodectae, however, may have been more formal than real, and if _δὲ ἐξὶ τὸ θεωρικὸν_ had to some extent supplanted the antigrapheus, and had also (as I suggest in Ch. III, pp. 104-7) been allowed to co-operate with the financial boards in bringing business to the boule, that might have been enough to justify the claim that he
It is not certain that Aeschines' mention of the dockyards is parallel to his mention of the purely financial offices. But if what he says is to be understood in this way, what I have said of the apodectae must be said even more forcibly of the epimeleetae of the dockyards: though responsibility may have passed to the theoric officials, much of the work must have been done by successors to the old epimeleetae, and these successors may or may not themselves have been called epimeleetae. Dr Lewis has noted that the epimeleetae are not directly attested between 348/7 (IG ii² 1622, 549 – 52) and 334/3 or later (IG ii² 1623, 1 – 3 [title restored]; date, l. 285), and that IG ii² 1622 is a very different document from the other navy-lists: among other things, the officials responsible, in or after 342/1 (379 – 85), refer to a ὅτι τὰ νεώρια who in 347/6 performed duties which would normally have fallen to the epimeleetae (444 sqq). He argues from this document (unpublished essay, cited by G. L. Cawkwell, JHS LXXXIII 1963, 57 n. 62) that for a time the epimeleetae ceased to exist, and I would accept that the epimeleetae as known at other times may have ceased to exist, though the work still had to be done and the title may have survived with the work. The transfer of their ὁρχη to ὅτι τὸ θεωρικὸν may have had the same implications as I have suggested in the case of the apodectae, but the epigraphic evidence does seem this time to point to a more drastic change.

The law of Hegemon established a board, if the theoric office had previously been exercised by a single man, and it may also have set limits to any one man's tenure of a financial office. The old
antigrapheus seems to have disappeared for ever, though the title survived or was revived for another office, but any major change affecting the apodectae or the epimeletae of the dockyards seems to have been reversed. The only trace in the *Athenaion Politeia* of what must have been a serious upheaval is the passage on which I have tried to base an account of how the theoric officials became so powerful, which reveals that in the 320's the theoric board and the treasurer of the *stratiotic* fund joined with the *poletae* in presenting leases and tax contracts to the *boule* (*A.P.* 47. ii). I have suggested that before the law of Hegemon δ ἔλθη τῷ θεωρικῷ by sharing in the work of the different boards was able to acquire that general knowledge of the state's finances which had previously been the monopoly of the boule, and I imagine that power which had seemed dangerous in the hands of one man was innocuous enough when divided among a board of limited tenure. At some time the treasurer of the *stratiotic* fund was admitted to these privileges, and in some way Lycurgus acquired great financial powers ἔλθη τρεῖς πενταετηροδός, but neither of these innovations need have been made by Hegemon.
Additional Note E: The Date of the THESMOPHORIAZUSAE

(I am grateful to Mr W. G. G. Forrest for reminding me that the fashionable date of 411 for this play has not always been accepted.)

We have no hypothesis to this play, whose dating depends mainly on allusions to Euripides. Scholars have been divided between 411 and 410, but 411 has always been the more popular date, and so far as I know no one since Rogers has seriously challenged it (cf. appendix to Ch. IV, pp. 95 and n. 264, 201 and n. 301; the case for 411 is presented by Wilamowitz, Aristoteles und Athen, II. 343 sqq.).

Rogers made six points in favour of a dating to 410 (I cite by pages of the 1920 reprint of his edition of the play) :-

1. (xxxiii - xxxiv) The difference in tone between Lysistrata and Thesmophoriazusae. This is too subjective: Rogers, arguing for 410, found Lys. tense but Thesm. cheerful and carefree; Professor Andrewes, arguing for 411 (Oxford lectures, H.T. 1962) finds general uneasiness in Thesm. but no trace of it in (two months earlier, as he believes) Lys.

2. (xxxiv - xxxvii) The allusion in Thesm. 804 to the defeat of Charminus, which can hardly be earlier than Dec./Jan. 412/1 (T. VIII. 41 - 2: Henderson, Great War, 495, dates it winter 412/1). This certainly rules out Lenaea 411 for Thesm., but it would not rule out Lenaea 411 for Lys. (whose hypothesis specifies the year but not the festival) and Dionysia 411 for Thesm.

3. (xxxvii - xxxviii)

Διήθεν Βοθύνης τῶν κέρυσσών τις βουλευτῆς ἐκ τῶν ἀμείων παραδοχῶν ἐτέρψε τὴν βουλεύσαν; (Thesm. 808 - 9)
Champions of 411 refer this to the institution of the πρόβουλοι (T. VIII. 1. iii); champions of 410, to the paying-off of the boule of 412/1 before its year of office was over (T. VIII. 69. iv, cf. A.P. 32. i). I do not feel that either interpretation is obviously better than the other: the boule of 412/1 was paid off by oligarchs who before the spring of 410 had been deposed, so that by then it could safely be said that its acquiescence had been a weak betrayal; but similar remarks might well have been made with reference to the πρόβουλοι in March 411. (Wilamowitz, though dating the play to 411, thought that 410 provided the better explanation of this passage.)

4. (xxxviii) The general civic arrangements. In Lys. the πρόβουλοι are in office: they intervene to keep order, employ the Scythian archers, and in general perform the duties of the boule (see esp. Lys. 421 - 66, 980 - 1013); in Lys. 1011 - 2 the πρόβουλος even issues orders to the boule. But in Thesm. the πρόβουλοι make no appearance, while one of the prytanes does appear, and has the archers at his disposal. Rogers comments:

The constitutional Council of 500 had been restored to, and was in quiet enjoyment of, its normal privileges; and accordingly in the Thesmophoriazusae order is kept and the Scythian archers employed in the normal manner by the council acting through its prytanes, just as in the Acharnians and the Knights.

In fact the boule seems to be enjoying more than its normal privileges: Thesm. 76 - 80 may prove nothing, but in 929 - 44 the boule exercises powers for which I have found no parallel under the democracy (cf. appendix to Ch. IV, pp.195-6). But,
avoiding the temptation to a circular argument, I think Rogers' point can be accepted. Lys. was not produced immediately after the institution of πρόβουλον: if that is to be assigned to the Lenaea and Thesm. to the Dionysia of 411 the institution will have been as topical at the second date as at the first, and if the πρόβουλον perform boule- and prytany-like functions in Lys. we should expect them to do the same in Thesm. Wilamowitz attempted to counter this argument, but he seems to me to have over-stressed Lys. 980 - 1013 at the expense of 421 - 66.

5. (xxxviii - x1)

επειδή τὸν Δάμαχον οὐν· ἦν γὰρ ἐτευθυμεῖν ἐν
Σεικελίᾳ, τετάρτῳ ἔτει πρότερον. (Schol. Thesm. 841)

Lamachus died in the summer of 414 (T. VI. 101. vi : Wilamowitz, p. 343, says winter 415/4). Rogers seizes on Diodorus' date of 414/3 (D.S. XIII. 8. i : Rogers wrongly prints XIV), from which inclusive counting would place the play in 411/0 (and exclusive in 410/09). Professor Dover in his recent school edition of Thucydides VI dates this episode with some probability to April - June, i.e. before the end of 415/4 (which would place Thesm. in 412/1 or 411/0) - but this is immaterial: what matters is not the actual archon-date but the archon-date given by the scholiast's source, of which we can only say that we know one user of archon-dates who gave 414/3.

6. (x1 - xii)

γέρων γὰρ τότε ἔξοδος ἦν· ἐκτῷ γούν ἔτει
ὑποτερον τελευτᾶ. (Schol. Thesm. 190)

Euripides' death is variously dated to 407/6 (Marm. Par. 239 A 63) or 406/5 (Apollodorus ap. D.S. XIII. 103. v). Wilamowitz preferred 407/6 (edition of Eur. Her., Vol. I, p. 3), which is indeed generally accepted as the more likely (e.g. Lesky, Hist. Gk. Lit., 363): Rogers seems not to have known that any
alternative to 406/5 was possible. 407/6 would mean a date for Thesm. of (413/2 by exclusive counting or) 412/1 by inclusive counting, 406/5 would date the play to 412/1 or 411/0.

But again we need to know not the real date but the date which the scholiast found in his source, and we know only that both dates were current in antiquity.

Nothing is proved by points 1 - 3; 4 seems to me to favour 410, though it is not on its own conclusive; 5 and 6 can be manipulated to favour either date. There remains a point which Andrewes regards as decisive in favour of 411 (cf. Rogers, pp. xli - xlii). As well as containing a single allusion to Euripides' Palamedes, Thesm. frequently parodies his Helen and Andromeda. The Helen is recent:

τὴν κατην 'Ελένην μιμήσομαι.  
(Thesm. 850)

and we have no reason to doubt that it was produced at the same time as the Andromeda (Schol. Thesm. 1012). But that play can be dated to the year before Thesm:

"Ἡχυ, λόγων ἀντιγόνος ἐπικοκκάστριαν,  
τῇ πέμοι ἔν τοῖς κατή ἔριβαν  
ἔδρισθη κατη ἐνηπονιζόμενῃ.  
(Thesm. 1059 - 61)  
(ἐξεῖ περετειν δόλῳ ἐπισκέπη ἢ Ἄνδρωμέδα. [Schol. Thesm. 1060])

Andromeda is dated also from a scholium on the Frogs, which places it eight years before that play, i.e. 413/2 even on inclusive counting (and 414/3 on exclusive) (Schol. Ran. 53), and if this is correct 411 is the only possible date for Thesm. Confirmation has been sought from a passage in Lys.:
If the Andromeda is indeed parodied in Lys., then the Andromeda cannot be later than 412 and Thesm. must be dated to 411. However, Rogers (ad loc.) regarded the scholiast's note as remarking on a resemblance rather than an actual parody, and compared Vesp. 1326 & schol., where a similar scholium with παρά compares a play which the writer admits to be later than the Wasps. He could well be right about this scholium, but even if he is not and the scholiast did think he had detected a parody (and had not checked the dates of the plays) a string of τούτος's need not have been written in parody. The argument from the Andromeda must be taken seriously, but the possible parody in Lys. does not much help it.

Essentially the conflict is between schol. Ran's dating of the Andromeda and the general civic arrangements of Lys. and Thesm. The reappearance of the prytanes in Thesm. is not conclusive, but it perhaps ought to reflect a change in the government of Athens; the scholiast's date could be wrong, but nothing apart from the civic arrangements of Lys. and Thesm. seriously suggests that in fact it may be wrong. At any rate the case for 411 is not proven, and if the account of the boule's jurisdiction which I have put forward in the appendix to Chapter IV can be accepted the case for 410 will be strengthened.
Table A: Deme-Representation in the Boule

I record here the figures from all the lists which I believe are or may be lists of prytanes or bouleutae, and add references to lists which I have considered but rejected.

I use [square brackets] to indicate that the demotic is restored; question marks outside the brackets to show that the demotic is doubtful and inside to show that the figure is doubtful; 0 to indicate certain absence from a full list and [0] to indicate probable absence; and X to show that the demotic is wholly or partly restored but nothing survives of any name assignable to that deme. Figures for the numbers of demesmen listed in PA are as adjusted by Gomme (op. cit. infra).

I am indebted to Dr J. K. Davies and Dr D. M. Lewis for information on unpublished Agora inscriptions.

Bibliography for deme-affiliation and tribal organisation :-


SCHOEFFER, V. von. art. Ἀρχόντες, I. Attika. RE, V (1905), 1-33, 35-122.


(Ch.i = AJP LXI 1940, 186-93; ch. ii = AJP LXIII 1942, 413-31.)

NOTOPOULOS, J.A. The Date of the Creation of Hadrianis. TAPA LXXXVII 1946, 53-6.


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Men in</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F.A.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A 42</td>
<td>'Aphrod</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A 27</td>
<td>Eucharis</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A 25</td>
<td>Thale</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A 142</td>
<td>'Anagraphe</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A 391</td>
<td>Lampro</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A 44</td>
<td>on Kepha</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A 34</td>
<td>Pamphyl</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A 25</td>
<td>Phour</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A 71</td>
<td>Peripat</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A 22</td>
<td>Saphra</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SEE NEXT PAGE FOR NOTES.
ERECHTHEIS: NOTES

DAA 167
* Figures for Λαμπτρετς and Εδωνυμετς conjectured by Raubitschek.
+ Two names have been inserted here by another hand.

Hesp. XI 43
* 'Αγρυλετς tout court.
+ Λαμπτρετς Πάραλος.
+ Παμβωττόδατ or Συβρίδατ [?1].

IG ii² 1700
* Περγασετς not differentiated as K and Y.

Hesp. XXXV
* See Hesp. for figures conjectured by Traill to fill list.

P 47 (+61)
* A + K + θ + (Ε or Δ) = 31; Δ or E = 7.

I have also considered:

IG ii² 2366 (beg. C4);
IG ii² 1697 (before mid C4).

I have not included in the table IG ii² 1759 (c. A.D. 90 - 100), which lists men who paid a visit to Salamis, including 24 of the 50 prytanes. The figures are:

Εδων. 2, 'Αναγ. 1, Λαμπτ. 8, Κηφ. 13.
### Table: II. AEGEIS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>P. 10</th>
<th>SEG XXXI 595</th>
<th>SEG XXXIII 44</th>
<th>SEG XXXV 1765</th>
<th>SEG XXXVI 604</th>
<th>SEG XXXVII 79A</th>
<th>SEG XXXVIII 611</th>
<th>SEG XXXIX 1615</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A98</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A45</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A37</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A32</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A106</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A58</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A47</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A195</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A47</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A91</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A23</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A60</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A68</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A138</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A262</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A128</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A30</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A44</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A44</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A55</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:**
- [PART TO ANTONINUS, 307/6 - 201/0; TO ATTALUS FROM 201/0](#)
- [TO HADRIANUS FROM 126/7](#)
- [PART TO ANTONINUS, 307/6 - 201/0; TO ATTALUS FROM 201/0](#)
AEGEIS: NOTES

'Ikarpiev'c * Transfer of part to Ptolemais doubted by D. M. Lewis, BSA LI 1956, 172.

Hesp. XXXV * See Hesp. for figures conjectured by Traill to fill list.

SEG XXI 595 * 'Epkeviev'c or 'Epixevel'c [1].

I have also considered:

IG ii² 1697 (before mid C4);
IG ii² 2388 (mid C4);
IG ii² 1699 (343/2?) (names not grouped by demes).
### III. PANDIONIS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tritus</th>
<th>Demesmen in P.A.</th>
<th>Κυδαθύματις</th>
<th>Αγγεληθεν</th>
<th>Μυρινωσιοί</th>
<th>Πραγια</th>
<th>Προβαλίσιο</th>
<th>Στερίς</th>
<th>Φημιαί</th>
<th>Κονθυλίδαι</th>
<th>Κυθήρεια</th>
<th>Παναυγις</th>
<th>Υψθεν</th>
<th>Γρανς</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>295</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>377</td>
<td>67</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Kυδαθύματις</td>
<td>Αγγεληθεν</td>
<td>Μυρινωσιοί</td>
<td>Πραγια</td>
<td>Προβαλίσιο</td>
<td>Στερίς</td>
<td>Φημιαί</td>
<td>Κονθυλίδαι</td>
<td>Κυθήρεια</td>
<td>Παναυγις</td>
<td>Υψθεν</td>
<td>Γρανς</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8?+</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>?7+</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3?+</td>
<td>?4?+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3?+</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>[3]</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>?12</td>
<td>[?11]</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>?7+</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>[0]</td>
<td>[0]</td>
<td>[0]</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>?4?+</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6?+</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>[0]</td>
<td>[0]</td>
<td>[0]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>348/7</td>
<td>336/9?</td>
<td>before 307/6</td>
<td>304/3</td>
<td>279/8</td>
<td>35/4</td>
<td>155/4</td>
<td>c.100</td>
<td>c.100</td>
<td>c.200</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87+</td>
<td>97+</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>87+</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>147+</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>17+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1(?)</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>19</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>57+</td>
<td>732</td>
<td>14157+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8+?</td>
<td></td>
<td>+ye.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>+ye.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>+ye.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

[To Attalisc from 201/0]

[To Ptolemais from 224/3]

[To Hadrians from 126/7]
PANDIONIS: NOTES

IG ii² 1740  
* Gomme, Pop. Ath., 51-2 n.2, suggested  
Προβαλότοι 4, Κυθήρρτοι [1].

IG ii² 1753  
* So Gomme, Pop. Ath., 51-2 n.2, 58, mis- 
reported as "after 307/6" by D. M. Lewis,  
BSA L 1955, 19 with n. 20.

Hesp. XXXV  
* See Hesp. for figures conjectured by Traill  
to fill list.

SEG XXI 596  
* Published as possibly part of a prytany list.

P 116  
* Ἀγγελῆθεν or Ὁδῆν [2?1].

IG ii² 1077  
* "Number seems to have been 40" (A. E.  
Raubitschek, Ὀμολογία, 252 n.4)

IG ii² 1826  
* Names not grouped by demes.

I have also considered:

IG ii² 1699 (343/2?) (names not grouped by  
demes).

.
### IV. LEONTIS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1742</td>
<td>1744</td>
<td>1752</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>1700</td>
<td>1562</td>
<td>304/3</td>
<td>303/3</td>
<td>mid c3</td>
<td>c240-230</td>
<td>212/1</td>
<td>185/4</td>
<td>c140</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3*</td>
<td>1*</td>
<td>?[4]</td>
<td>[4]</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>?[3]</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>[TO DEMETRIAS, 307/6-20110]</td>
<td>1?+</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>?[2]</td>
<td></td>
<td>[TO ANTIGONIS, 307/6-20110]</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A?π</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5*</td>
<td>1*</td>
<td>[ONE PART TO DEMETRIAS, 307/6-20110]</td>
<td>1?+</td>
<td>1?+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>π</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1?+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>π</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>[TO ANTIGONIS, 307/6-20110]</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>π</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>π</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7?+</td>
<td>7?+</td>
<td>vac</td>
<td>vac</td>
<td>2?+</td>
<td>2?+</td>
<td>?[2?+]</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>π</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1?+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>π*</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2?+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>π</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2?+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>π</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1?+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>π</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2?+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>π</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2?+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>?M</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2?+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:
- Hesp. XXIII 32
- Hesp. XXXVI 43
- Hesp. 1760 + 1761
- Hesp. III 52
- 705-70
- Before mid 62
- 165-70
'Αλιμοσσίων * M. Kirsten; A. D. M. Lewis, Hist. XII 1963, 32 with n. 98, assuming that IG ii² 1742 was arranged by Cleisthenic trittyes.

IG ii² 1742 * So B. D. Meritt, Hesp. XVI 1947, 151.

SEG XIX 149 * Presumably all Ποτήρια together.

Hesp. XXXV * See Hesp. for figures conjectured by Traill to fill list.

P 77 * Assuming demotics interchanged in error.

I have also considered:

IG ii² 2382 (360-350);
IG ii² 1699 (343?/2?) (names not grouped by demes);
IG ii² 2410 (after 330).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ΤΕΙΤΤΟΣ</th>
<th>ΔΕΘΜΕΡΙΟΝ ΕΠ Π.Α.</th>
<th>Α. Ι. 1864</th>
<th>Α. Ι. 1874</th>
<th>Α. Ι. Κ.Β. 44</th>
<th>ΙΕΩΝ ΧΧΧΙ 149</th>
<th>Α. Ι. 1870</th>
<th>Α. Ι. 1872</th>
<th>Α. Ι. 35720</th>
<th>Α. Ι. 2438</th>
<th>Α. Ι. 5105</th>
<th>Α. Ι. 246</th>
<th>Α. Ι. 1775</th>
<th>Α. Ι. 1110</th>
<th>Α. Ι. 1820</th>
<th>Α. Ι. 1821</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A 21</td>
<td>Ειρείδαι</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>[5]</td>
<td>376+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A 54</td>
<td>'Ερείδαι</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>[7]</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A 40</td>
<td>Μεισσόνα</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A 191</td>
<td>ἐκ Κερείου</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>[7]</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A 127</td>
<td>Χαλαργής</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>[7]</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A 177</td>
<td>Κυρτείδαι</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A 38</td>
<td>Πάροι</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>[ΤΟ ΔΕΜΕΡΙΑΣ, 307/6 - 201/0]</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A 23</td>
<td>Ραμίδαι</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Π 136</td>
<td>Θόρινοι</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>[3]</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Π 135</td>
<td>Καραγης</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>18?+</td>
<td>11?+</td>
<td>8?+</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Π 52</td>
<td>Ερείπων</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>[ΤΟ ΑΝΤΙΓΩΝΟΙ, 307/6 - 201/0]</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>[ΤΟ ΗΛΕΙΩΝΑΣ ΦΡΟΝ ΑΖ]</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2?+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Π 40</td>
<td>Κικικηνεάς</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Μ 99</td>
<td>'Αγαμήοι</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Μ 90</td>
<td>Προκόπιοι</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>[Σ?]</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Μ 178</td>
<td>Σάρττοι</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8?+</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| + one other | + one other | + one other | + one other | + two other | + one other | + two other | + two other | + two other | + two other | + two other | + two other | + two other | + two other | + two other |
| another | another | another | another | another | another | another | another | another | another | another | another | another | another | another |

| 39 + 40 | 50 |
ACAMANTIS: NOTES

SEG XVII 44
* Perhaps Κεφαλεσίς [5?], to fit W. E. Thompson's Τριττιζ' theory (cf. p. 45f., below)?

IG ii² 2397 (+ 2423)

P 1
* If this was a full list of 50 there were probably 10 Σφάκττοι and only four of the seven (or, with 'Ραξίφωρ, eight) demes not accounted for can have been represented. The problems are less with Traill's dating (Hesp. XXXV 1966, 231) in the twelve-tribe period than with the old date of 327/6, but they still exist. See the cautionary note of S. Charitonides, Hesp. XXX 1961, 36 n. 10.

Hesp. XXXV
* See Hesp. for figures conjectured by Traill to fill list.

Ag. I 5105
* This fragment = IG ii² 2411. Cf. Gomme, Pop. Ath., 60 n. 2.

P 45
* Cf. B. D. Meritt, Hesp. XXXIII 1964, 188-9 n. 67.

IG ii² 1774
* List followed immediately by Υρ., ἔκτων., then Ἀσυλεττοί: A. E. Raubitschek, Τέρας Κεραμοσυλλον, 248 describes the placing of the ἔκτων. as "apart from panel." Total 40 if Υρ. is included but not ἔκτων.
I have also considered:

IG ii² 1699 (343/2?) (names not grouped by demes);
IG ii² 2410 (after 330);
IG ii² 2435 (mid C3).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Τεῖττος</th>
<th>Δημοσιεύσεσ</th>
<th>16 ii 1745</th>
<th>16 ii 1746</th>
<th>16 ii 1700</th>
<th>Hesper. XXXV 1972</th>
<th>SEG xxi 593</th>
<th>Π</th>
<th>Ag. I 585</th>
<th>16 ii 2438</th>
<th>16 ii 2446</th>
<th>Hesper. xxxii 28</th>
<th>SEG xix 153</th>
<th>SEG xxi 597</th>
<th>Π</th>
<th>Π 94</th>
<th>Hesper. xxxvi 46</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>36 Βουτάδαι</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>[</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>42 Ἐπικηρόσιοι</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1+</td>
<td>1+</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>97 Λακιάδικι</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>30 Λουσιές</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>65 Τυρμεδικι</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>[1]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A?π</td>
<td>69 Περισσίδικι</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1+*</td>
<td>[</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A?π</td>
<td>23 Πτελεάρσιοι</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>π</td>
<td>101 Θριάσι</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4+</td>
<td>[5?6?]?*</td>
<td>[5?6?]† 3+</td>
<td>2+</td>
<td>8+</td>
<td>5+</td>
<td>9+</td>
<td>[</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>π</td>
<td>12 Ἕπαρτομάδαι</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>π</td>
<td>97 Κωστιάδικι</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>π</td>
<td>105 Ὀσιϊν</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1[3]?*</td>
<td>[2]?</td>
<td>[5?6?]*</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>π</td>
<td>83 Φιλάσι</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>452 'Ἀκρενεΐς</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>[4]?*</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CONTINUED ON NEXT PAGE
### Oeneis, continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>A.D.</th>
<th>16 II</th>
<th>16 III</th>
<th>16 II</th>
<th>16 III</th>
<th>16 II</th>
<th>16 III</th>
<th>16 II</th>
<th>16 III</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1780</td>
<td>1796</td>
<td>1801</td>
<td>1802</td>
<td>1803</td>
<td>1804</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>From</td>
<td>Attalic</td>
<td>From</td>
<td>201/0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1874</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Boutadai**
- **Epigraphia**
- **Ammadi**
- **Aousias**
- **Tyrmeidai**
- **Pergamidai**
- **Pelaontoi**
- **Oriasoi**
- **Papinomadiai**
- **Kodwidaei**
- **Okean**
- **Phylaiosoi**
- **Akaeveis**
* Despite the evidence of IG ii² 2438 it is commonly stated that the whole deme was transferred to Demetrias.

* These restorations are very uncertain: for an alternative guess see Gomme, Pop. Ath., 51 n. 2.

* See Hesp. for figures conjectured by Traill to fill list.

* The stone has Περρεσόος. Dow suggests that this was a new deme created out of ‘Αχαρνετζς; Eliot, Coastal Demes, 152 n. 37, disbelieves and suggests a simple error - in which case Περρεσόος is a fairly easy correction; most recently B. D. Meritt, The Classical Tradition, 32 - 5, has identified Περρεσόος with the later Περρός, suggesting that it was separated from ‘Αρτόναζος (Aiantis) in 307/6 and formed part of Oeneis until its transfer to Ptolemais in 224/3.

* W. Peek, AM LXXVII 1942, 32, no. 31.

* Names not grouped by demes.
### VII. CECROPIS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Demes-</th>
<th>SEG</th>
<th>IG II 16</th>
<th>IG III 17</th>
<th>IG III 23</th>
<th>SEG XXX 880</th>
<th>SEG XXX 891</th>
<th>Horp. XXXV 39</th>
<th>Horp. XXXV 390</th>
<th>P 146</th>
<th>Horp. XXXV 39</th>
<th>SEG XXX 880</th>
<th>Horp. XXXV 39</th>
<th>SEG XXX 880</th>
<th>Horp. XXXV 39</th>
<th>SEG XXX 880</th>
<th>Horp. XXXV 39</th>
<th>SEG XXX 880</th>
<th>Horp. XXXV 39</th>
<th>SEG XXX 880</th>
<th>Horp. XXXV 39</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Melitēs</td>
<td>297</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9+</td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ξυπαντίωνες</td>
<td>108</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Αἴγωνες</td>
<td>237</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Αλαϊτες</td>
<td>119</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Επιεικίδαι</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ἀθρονείς</td>
<td>141</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Δαιδαλίδαι</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Τιθέσ</td>
<td>82</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Συμαλλίτται</td>
<td>83</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Τρινυμεῖς</td>
<td>29</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Φλυκεῖς</td>
<td>224</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Κυκυνείς</td>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*One other deme: 16, 21+*
VII. Cecropis, continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A.D.</th>
<th>IG ii² 1790</th>
<th>1770</th>
<th>1770</th>
<th>SEG xvi 48</th>
<th>SEG xvi 614</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>170-80</td>
<td>174/5</td>
<td>177/8</td>
<td>c.180</td>
<td>c.180</td>
<td>beg. C3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mark</th>
<th>Meliteis</th>
<th>Συμπερίονες</th>
<th>Αἴσωνεις</th>
<th>Αλιαίης (Αίσονίδης)</th>
<th>Επιγειίδαι</th>
<th>[Ἀθωνεῖς — TO ATTALIS FROM 201/0]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>174</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>3+</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mark</th>
<th>Δαιδαλίδαι</th>
<th>Πώλοις</th>
<th>Συμπαλήτταοι</th>
<th>Τεκέμες</th>
<th>Κικυνεῖς</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[TO HADRIANEIS FROM 126/7]</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3+</td>
<td>[TO PTOLEMAIS FROM 224/3]</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

[740 B.C. incl. yr.]
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Trify</th>
<th>Demer</th>
<th>Hosp. XV</th>
<th>Hosp. IX</th>
<th>IG II 1698</th>
<th>IG II 2377</th>
<th>IG II 1700</th>
<th>Ag. I 4780</th>
<th>Ag. I 5105</th>
<th>Hosp. XV</th>
<th>SEG XXI 598</th>
<th>P 60</th>
<th>P 64</th>
<th>Hosp. IX</th>
<th>Hosp. XII</th>
<th>Hosp. XII</th>
<th>Hosp. XXVI</th>
<th>Hosp. XII</th>
<th>Hosp. XVII</th>
<th>Hosp. XVII</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A 26</td>
<td>Θυματάδαι</td>
<td>1?+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A 39</td>
<td>Κεριάδαι</td>
<td>2(?4)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2(196)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2(196)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A 14</td>
<td>Κοποδάλλεις</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>2? a</td>
<td>2? a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A 37</td>
<td>Ερετάδαι</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A 78</td>
<td>Αβανείας</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>16?+</td>
<td>21?+</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5?6 a</td>
<td>10? a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A 64</td>
<td>Αλμαχάτες</td>
<td>2?+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>(196) a</td>
<td>(196) a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A 39</td>
<td>Αλακαίες</td>
<td>4?+</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>[196]</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>(196) a</td>
<td>(196) a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A 43</td>
<td>Αλεσσόσεις</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6?+</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A 30</td>
<td>Ελεφαντάνια</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A 41</td>
<td>Κοπρεαίοι</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A 64</td>
<td>Διαυλεατις</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4(15)</td>
<td>(196) a</td>
<td>(196) a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A 35</td>
<td>Οίγον (Λαμπαδέα)</td>
<td>2?+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Αρμονίτες |            |           |            |            |            |            |            |           |           |       |       |           |             |             |             |             |             |
| Αμπάφλες |            |           |            |            |            |            |            |           |           |       |       |           |             |             |             |             |             |
| Σπευδάκις |            |           |            |            |            |            |            |           |           |       |       |           |             |             |             |             |             |

*Note: Some entries are marked with a question mark, indicating uncertainty.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>+ one other deme</th>
<th>+ one other deme</th>
<th>+ one other deme</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2?</td>
<td>4?</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A B</th>
<th>C D</th>
<th>E F</th>
<th>G H</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CECROPIS: NOTES

IG ii² 1698
  * Μελιτεύς or 'Αλατεύς [17?+].
  'Αλατεύς now seems more likely: cf. B. D. Meritt, Hesp. XXXIII 1964, 207-8, on the representation of Μελιτεύς.

IG ii² 2377

Hesp. XXXV
  * See Hesp. for figures conjectured by Traill to fill list.

Ag. I 4720
  * Cf. B. D. Meritt, Hesp. XXXIII 1964, 208 with n. 98.

P 61
  * Μελιτεύς or 'Αλατεύς or Συκεταλοευς [7].

IG ii² 1782
  * A. E. Raubitschek, Γεράς Κεραμοποιάλον, 251, describes the Επών. as "above panel," but perhaps he should be regarded as heading the panel, to make a total of 41.

I have also considered:

IG ii² 2375 (before mid C4);
IG ii² 2383 (360-350) (cf. B. D. Meritt, Hesp. XXXIII 1964, 207-8);
IG ii² 1699 (343/2?) (names not grouped by demes).
HIPPOTHONTIS: NOTES

ἐξ οὗν

* Transfer to Ptolemais, 224/3 - 201/0, now confirmed by Hesp. XXXIV 3.

IG ii² 1698

* ἔκ Κοιλῆς or Πετραιτζ or 'Ελευσύνιοι [10 ? 11 ? +].
+ 'Ερστάνα or 'Ελασούσιοι [1].

IG ii² 1700

* Ὀλυναῖοι or Δεξαλειατζ [ ? 6 ].

Hesp. XV II

* Πετραιτζ or 'Ελευσύνιοι [ 8 ? + ].

Hesp. IX 25

* In col. ii a name overflows into a second line, which is left blank in the other columns.

IG ii² 1808

* Names not grouped by demes.

IG ii² 1819

* Names not grouped by demes.

I have also considered:

IG ii² 1699 (343/2?) (names not grouped by demes).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>G15</th>
<th>G16</th>
<th>SEG</th>
<th>G17</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>A.D.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>235</td>
<td>243</td>
<td>304/3</td>
<td>303</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>281</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>X</th>
<th>X</th>
<th>X</th>
<th>X</th>
<th>X</th>
<th>X</th>
<th>X</th>
<th>X</th>
<th>X</th>
<th>X</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Φιλάρετος</td>
<td>97+</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>57+</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Μακαθυνιός</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>[6±2]</td>
<td>[22]</td>
<td>[22]</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Οίνιτος</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>[10±2]</td>
<td>[17±2]</td>
<td>[18±2]</td>
<td>[18]</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>37+</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ραμνουχιος</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>[17]</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Τριαγούσιος</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>[17]</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Αφίδνας</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>[13±2]</td>
<td>[18±2]</td>
<td>[18±2]</td>
<td>[18]</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>37+</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Θυρυμβιδας</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>[13±2]</td>
<td>[18±2]</td>
<td>[18±2]</td>
<td>[18]</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>37+</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Κυριλλας</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>[13±2]</td>
<td>[18±2]</td>
<td>[18±2]</td>
<td>[18]</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>37+</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Παρωδιας</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>[13±2]</td>
<td>[18±2]</td>
<td>[18±2]</td>
<td>[18]</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>37+</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Τιτακιδας</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>[13±2]</td>
<td>[18±2]</td>
<td>[18±2]</td>
<td>[18]</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>37+</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ψαφίδας</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>[13±2]</td>
<td>[18±2]</td>
<td>[18±2]</td>
<td>[18]</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>37+</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
AIANTIS: NOTES

Περρίςατ * See note on ΟΕΝΕΙΣ, under P 3.


Hesp. XXXV * See Hesp. for figures conjectured by Traill to fill list.


Hesp. XXXIII 23 ( = SEG XXI 592) was originally published as a list of Oeneis.

I have also considered:

IG ii² 2400 (after mid C4).
<p>| | | | | | | | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**CONTINUED ON NEXT PAGE**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A.D.</th>
<th>SEG xxi 601</th>
<th>SEG xxi 602</th>
<th>SEG xxi 603</th>
<th>SEG xxi 1764</th>
<th>SEG xxi 1765</th>
<th>SEG xxi 1764</th>
<th>SEG xxi 1765</th>
<th>SEG xxi 1764</th>
<th>SEG xxi 1765</th>
<th>SEG xxi 1764</th>
<th>SEG xxi 1765</th>
<th>SEG xxi 1764</th>
<th>SEG xxi 1765</th>
<th>SEG xxi 1764</th>
<th>SEG xxi 1765</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CI</td>
<td>CI</td>
<td>bég C2</td>
<td>188/9</td>
<td>First half C2</td>
<td>c.180</td>
<td>187/8</td>
<td>195/6</td>
<td>End C2</td>
<td>c.120</td>
<td>211/2</td>
<td>181/5</td>
<td>180/6</td>
<td>1792</td>
<td>1794</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1. Αλληνείς</strong></td>
<td><strong>30. Αλληνείς</strong></td>
<td><strong>31. Αλληνείς</strong></td>
<td><strong>32. Αλληνείς</strong></td>
<td><strong>33. Αλληνείς</strong></td>
<td><strong>34. Αλληνείς</strong></td>
<td><strong>35. Αλληνείς</strong></td>
<td><strong>36. Αλληνείς</strong></td>
<td><strong>37. Αλληνείς</strong></td>
<td><strong>38. Αλληνείς</strong></td>
<td><strong>39. Αλληνείς</strong></td>
<td><strong>40. Αλληνείς</strong></td>
<td><strong>41. Αλληνείς</strong></td>
<td><strong>42. Αλληνείς</strong></td>
<td><strong>43. Αλληνείς</strong></td>
<td><strong>44. Αλληνείς</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TO PTOLEMAIS FROM 229/3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1. Αλληνείς</strong></td>
<td><strong>30. Αλληνείς</strong></td>
<td><strong>31. Αλληνείς</strong></td>
<td><strong>32. Αλληνείς</strong></td>
<td><strong>33. Αλληνείς</strong></td>
<td><strong>34. Αλληνείς</strong></td>
<td><strong>35. Αλληνείς</strong></td>
<td><strong>36. Αλληνείς</strong></td>
<td><strong>37. Αλληνείς</strong></td>
<td><strong>38. Αλληνείς</strong></td>
<td><strong>39. Αλληνείς</strong></td>
<td><strong>40. Αλληνείς</strong></td>
<td><strong>41. Αλληνείς</strong></td>
<td><strong>42. Αλληνείς</strong></td>
<td><strong>43. Αλληνείς</strong></td>
<td><strong>44. Αλληνείς</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1. Αλληνείς</strong></td>
<td><strong>30. Αλληνείς</strong></td>
<td><strong>31. Αλληνείς</strong></td>
<td><strong>32. Αλληνείς</strong></td>
<td><strong>33. Αλληνείς</strong></td>
<td><strong>34. Αλληνείς</strong></td>
<td><strong>35. Αλληνείς</strong></td>
<td><strong>36. Αλληνείς</strong></td>
<td><strong>37. Αλληνείς</strong></td>
<td><strong>38. Αλληνείς</strong></td>
<td><strong>39. Αλληνείς</strong></td>
<td><strong>40. Αλληνείς</strong></td>
<td><strong>41. Αλληνείς</strong></td>
<td><strong>42. Αλληνείς</strong></td>
<td><strong>43. Αλληνείς</strong></td>
<td><strong>44. Αλληνείς</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1. Αλληνείς</strong></td>
<td><strong>30. Αλληνείς</strong></td>
<td><strong>31. Αλληνείς</strong></td>
<td><strong>32. Αλληνείς</strong></td>
<td><strong>33. Αλληνείς</strong></td>
<td><strong>34. Αλληνείς</strong></td>
<td><strong>35. Αλληνείς</strong></td>
<td><strong>36. Αλληνείς</strong></td>
<td><strong>37. Αλληνείς</strong></td>
<td><strong>38. Αλληνείς</strong></td>
<td><strong>39. Αλληνείς</strong></td>
<td><strong>40. Αλληνείς</strong></td>
<td><strong>41. Αλληνείς</strong></td>
<td><strong>42. Αλληνείς</strong></td>
<td><strong>43. Αλληνείς</strong></td>
<td><strong>44. Αλληνείς</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1. Αλληνείς</strong></td>
<td><strong>30. Αλληνείς</strong></td>
<td><strong>31. Αλληνείς</strong></td>
<td><strong>32. Αλληνείς</strong></td>
<td><strong>33. Αλληνείς</strong></td>
<td><strong>34. Αλληνείς</strong></td>
<td><strong>35. Αλληνείς</strong></td>
<td><strong>36. Αλληνείς</strong></td>
<td><strong>37. Αλληνείς</strong></td>
<td><strong>38. Αλληνείς</strong></td>
<td><strong>39. Αλληνείς</strong></td>
<td><strong>40. Αλληνείς</strong></td>
<td><strong>41. Αλληνείς</strong></td>
<td><strong>42. Αλληνείς</strong></td>
<td><strong>43. Αλληνείς</strong></td>
<td><strong>44. Αλληνείς</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1. Αλληνείς</strong></td>
<td><strong>30. Αλληνείς</strong></td>
<td><strong>31. Αλληνείς</strong></td>
<td><strong>32. Αλληνείς</strong></td>
<td><strong>33. Αλληνείς</strong></td>
<td><strong>34. Αλληνείς</strong></td>
<td><strong>35. Αλληνείς</strong></td>
<td><strong>36. Αλληνείς</strong></td>
<td><strong>37. Αλληνείς</strong></td>
<td><strong>38. Αλληνείς</strong></td>
<td><strong>39. Αλληνείς</strong></td>
<td><strong>40. Αλληνείς</strong></td>
<td><strong>41. Αλληνείς</strong></td>
<td><strong>42. Αλληνείς</strong></td>
<td><strong>43. Αλληνείς</strong></td>
<td><strong>44. Αλληνείς</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1. Αλληνείς</strong></td>
<td><strong>30. Αλληνείς</strong></td>
<td><strong>31. Αλληνείς</strong></td>
<td><strong>32. Αλληνείς</strong></td>
<td><strong>33. Αλληνείς</strong></td>
<td><strong>34. Αλληνείς</strong></td>
<td><strong>35. Αλληνείς</strong></td>
<td><strong>36. Αλληνείς</strong></td>
<td><strong>37. Αλληνείς</strong></td>
<td><strong>38. Αλληνείς</strong></td>
<td><strong>39. Αλληνείς</strong></td>
<td><strong>40. Αλληνείς</strong></td>
<td><strong>41. Αλληνείς</strong></td>
<td><strong>42. Αλληνείς</strong></td>
<td><strong>43. Αλληνείς</strong></td>
<td><strong>44. Αλληνείς</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

X. Antiochis, continued
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tribe</th>
<th>Previous Tribe</th>
<th>PREP. REPR.</th>
<th>Hesp. II 14%</th>
<th>Hesp. KKKK pp. 305-40</th>
<th>SEG XVI 70</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>AEG. PART of 'Αγρολεῖς (Ker Y)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>304-310</td>
<td>201-201/0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>ER. PART of 'Αγρολεῖς (Ker Y)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>R. Kυδάθγουσεῖς</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8?+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Π</td>
<td>L.E. Δειγματίων (or Demetrias?)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10?+</td>
<td>1+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Π</td>
<td>ER. PART of Λαμπρεῖς (K)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5+</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5?+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Π</td>
<td>L.E. Ποτάμιοι Δειγματίων</td>
<td>1 or 2</td>
<td>1 or 2</td>
<td>1 or 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ΠΜ</td>
<td>Α. Eἰτείαι</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>L.E. Αἴδαλίδαι</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3?+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>AEG. Γαρυγγίτεις</td>
<td>6?</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>AEG. PART of Ίπαρεῖς (&quot;A&quot;)</td>
<td>4 or 5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1?+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>ΡΑΝ. Κυθήρεις</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>ΡΑΝ. PART of Παναρεῖς (Y)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>[2?+]</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>ER. PART of Περγασεῖς (Ker Y)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>[2?+]</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
'Ἀγκυλεῖς

* Assignment rejected by Pritchett, *op. cit infra*, but *Hesp. XXXV* list confirms.

**Predicted representation**


*Hesp. II 14*


*Hesp. XXXV*

* See *Hesp* for figures conjectured by Traill to fill list.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tribe</th>
<th>Previous Tribe</th>
<th>Present Representation</th>
<th>Hist.</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Hist.</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Hist.</th>
<th>Age</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Aeg. Διομεδέης</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Hip. ἐν Κοιλίς</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>[324]</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Ccc. Μέλισσας</td>
<td>?17 ?</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>[62?]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Ccc. Ζυγεσταίους</td>
<td>?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Le. Ἐρωτοῦ (Κεραμείσον)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>?A</td>
<td>Ac. Πόριος</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>[3]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A?π</td>
<td>Le. part of Ποτάμιον (Ker Y)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>π</td>
<td>Ant. part of 'Ατταίς (&quot;B&quot;)</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>π</td>
<td>Ant. Θορμαίας</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>π</td>
<td>Oen. Ἱπποτομάδαι</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>π</td>
<td>Oen. part of Κόθωνιδαι</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>π</td>
<td>Oen. part of Φιλάσιοι (&quot;B&quot;)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>π</td>
<td>Ant. part of 'Αμφετραίας (&quot;B&quot;)</td>
<td>?1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>?π</td>
<td>Hip. part of 'Ανκυλαίτης (&quot;B&quot;)</td>
<td>?2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>μ</td>
<td>Ac. 'Αγγελίας</td>
<td>4?2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>μ</td>
<td>Ccc. Δαιδαλίδικα</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
But see note on CECROPIS, under IG ii² 1698.

Whole deme normally assigned, but IG ii² 2438 shows that a part remained in Oeneis (q.v.). Pritchett’s predicted representation is for the whole deme.


See Hesp. for figures conjectured by Traill to fill list.

J. Sundwall, Eranos XXV 1927 (in Finnish) notes that there were no more than 4 Φυλάττοντων.
PTOLEMAIS: NOTES

'Ικαριείς

* Transfer doubted by D. M. Lewis, BSA LI 1956, 172.
On the demo-list of 200 B.C., IG ii² 2362, 53, see W. K. Pritchett, TAPA LXXXV 1954.
Representation: C4 whole deme 5, C3 part "A" 6.

εἰς Οἶου

* Cf. Hesp. XXXIV 3.

Περρόδαι

* See note on Oeneis, under P 3.

Σημαχεύδαι

* Representation: CC4-3 whole deme 1, C2 part "B" 9-10.

'Υκωρειεῖς

* For the suggestion that this deme was created out of 'Αφθαντοί (Aiantis) in 307/6 and formed part of Aegaeis until its location in Ptolemais in 224/3 see B. D. Meritt, The Classical Tradition, 32-5.

Hesp. XI 25

* Names not grouped by demes.
The following lists of Attalis have no demotics:

- IG ii² 1824 (A.D. 221/2);
- IG ii² 1825 (A.D. 222/3);
- IG ii² 1827 (A.D. 223/4?);
- IG ii² 1828 (A.D. 224/5).

IG ii² 1824 is a full list. A. E. Raubitschek, Γέρας Περαμακούλου, 255, n. 1, reports the total as "probably only 40" but I do not think the possibility of one or two more can be excluded.
## Hadrianis (from A.D. 126/7)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demes Listed in RE V, s.v. ὅμοιοι, Whose Tribal Affiliation is Unknown</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Κεφυρίς</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'Εχαλίδαν</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Ολεύα)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Σπαργίλιον</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Χαστιές</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Κελιδωνία)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Demes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TRITYS</th>
<th>Preuna Tribe(s)</th>
<th>IG IV 1768 B</th>
<th>IG IV 1770</th>
<th>IG IV 1793</th>
<th>Hesper. XV 71</th>
<th>IG IV 1795</th>
<th>IG IV 1807</th>
<th>IG IV 1779</th>
<th>IG IV 1810</th>
<th>Hesper. IV 12</th>
<th>SEG XIV 94</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>LE. Σκαμβεινίδαι</td>
<td>c.142</td>
<td>mid C2</td>
<td>c.180</td>
<td>186/8</td>
<td>188/9</td>
<td>c.190</td>
<td>end C2</td>
<td>end C2</td>
<td>C3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p</td>
<td>ANT. Βθεσαίης</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5?±</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>i?±</td>
<td>11?±</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p</td>
<td>OCM. Θριάσανοι</td>
<td>1?±</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1?±</td>
<td>11?±</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n</td>
<td>Av. Οίνοι</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n</td>
<td>Av. Τευερόντει</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n?m</td>
<td>Ac. Εύφαλιον</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n</td>
<td>HIP. 'Ελαιόσανοι</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n?m</td>
<td>EK. Παμβιανίδαι</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>?n</td>
<td>Ag. Φαγικής</td>
<td>?±</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m</td>
<td>Av. Α'Φιδωνίδαι</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m</td>
<td>Δωδεκάλιδαι</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m</td>
<td>PAND. 'Παταίνον</td>
<td>10?±</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEW DEME</td>
<td>'Αντινοκώοι</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*One other deme 8?±*

*One other deme 9?±*
IG ii² 1810  * Ξαμβώνται or Δαιδάλται [4?+].

IG ii² 1832 (A.D. 231/2) has no demotics.
Table B: Tritty-Divisions in Prytany Lists

I note here the arrangement of all lists of the ten-tribe period which are substantial enough to be of use in this respect.

The letters A, II and M denote Cleisthenic trittyes; the arabic numerals 1, 2 and 3 denote W. E. Thompson's trittyes (Hist. XV 1966) in the order in which they occur in SEG XIX 149 (Aegies to Acamantis), IG II2 1745 (Geneis) or 1750 (Antiochis); the roman numerals i, ii and iii denote the columns of the inscribed lists. The lists discussed by Thompson are indicated by an asterisk.

ERECHTHEIS

DAA 167 (408/7)

Pi [Lambda K.] Pi [Lambda Y.]

A Pi Pi A

A M M M


Hesp. ΧΧΧΥ 34 (381/0)

Pi Anav. Ayp.

Hesp. XI 43 (367/6)

A Pi M

M


[Omo. or Συμπ.]
* SEG XIX 149 (336/5?)

A I A II/M I
i Εδων. Κην. Αγρ. Παρμ. Αναγ.

M III A II/M II
ii Κην. Περγ. Εημ. Φηγ. Λαμπτ.

IG ii² 1700 (335/4)

. . . [Εδων.] Περγ. Περγ. Φηγ. Εημ. (ends)

AEGEIS

* IG ii² 1747 (c. 350)

. . . ΠΙII ΜIII ΠI IIΠI
i . . . Φίλ. 'Ιων. 'Αλ. 'Φηγ.'

ii . . . 'Αγχ. Κυδ. Κολων. Βατ. 'Αραφ.'

iii . . . Γαργ. Κολλ. Πλωθ.

* IG ii² 1749 (341/0)

MIII MIII ΠIII MIII MIII
i 'Ερχ. Γαργ. Φιλ. Κυδ. 'Ιων.'

ΠII A II ΑΠΙΙ Α II ΠII IIΠII ΠII ΠII
ii 'Ικαρ. 'Εστ. Βατ. Κολων. Κολλ. Πλωθ. 'Οτρ. 'Εξ

ΠI ΜI IIΠI ΠI ΠI ΠI ΠI ΠI ΠI ΠI ΠI ΠI
iii 'Αλ. Τεθ. Φηγ. 'Αραφ. Εμπρ. 'Αγχ. Διομ. 'Αγχ.'

* SEG XIX 149 (336/5?)

(1) i 'Αλ. Διομ. 'Αραφ. Φηγ. Εμπρ. Τεθ. 'Αγχ.'

(2) i/i 'Ικαρ. Κολλ. / Κολων. 'Εστ. Βατ. 'Ερχ.' 'Οτρ.

(3) ii 'Ερχ. Γαργ. 'Ιων. Κυδ. Φιλ.'

IG ii² 1700 (335/4)

MIII A II ΠII MII A II ΠII IIΠII ΠII ΠII ΠII ΠII ΠII ΠII ΠII

. . . [Ερχ.] 'Εστ. 'Οτρ. 'Ερχ.' 'Εστ. 'Βατ. 'Κυδ. 'Πλωθ.

A I Διομ. (ends)
PANDIONIS

* IG ii² 1740 (early C4)

    [image of text]


    [image of text]

IG ii² 2370 (before mid C4)

    [image of text]

* IG ii² 1751 (after mid C4)

    [image of text]

* SEG XIX 149 (336/5?)

    [image of text]

IG ii² 1700 (335/4)

    [image of text]
If a third column is missing, which contained Κωθ. (M 3) and Κυδ. (A 2), the list will in general arrangement (apart from the displacement of Κωθ.) but not in column division fit Thompson’s theory. "De dispositione tituli non constat" — IG ii² 1753; at IG ii 873 the majuscule copy and minuscule transcription show significant differences. (A two-column arrangement might fit Thompson’s theory even more neatly, but would be ruled out if the majuscule copy were to be accepted as correct.)

### LEONTIS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IG ii² 1742 (370/69?)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A 2 M 2 AΠ 1 AΠ 1 A 2 A 2 ?M 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Κήτττ. ‘Άλμ. Ποτ. Κ. Ποτ. Υ. Σχαμβ. Άευχ. Χολλ.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Π 1 Π 1 Π 1 Π 1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SEG XIX 149 (336/5?)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1) i Ζουν. Δειρ. Ποτ. (Δ, Κ, Υ) Φρε.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) Α Α / Μ / Μ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Σχαμβ. Κήτττ. Άευχ. / ‘Άλμ. Χολλ.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3) ii ΑΘ. Πατ. Κολ. ‘ΥΒ. Εδξ. Πηλ. Ολ. Κρωκ. ‘Εξ.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In IG ii² 1742 (above), where Ποτ. are divided, K and Y are included among the demes of 2.
ACAMANTIS

SEG XVII iv (c. 340)

i  missing

\[
\begin{array}{cccc}
\text{M} & \text{3} & \text{II} & \text{?A 1} \\
\end{array}
\]

ii  ...  \[\text{[Προσπ.]} \, \text{Θρ.} \, \text{Πρ.}\]

But another possibility for the first demotic (based on the patronymic Λυσσαντου in l. 5) is Κεφ. (Π), the third deme of (1).

* SEG XIX 149 (336/5?)

(1)  II  Π  ?A

(2)  i/ii  Κεφ.  Εμ.  'Ερμ.  /  Κολ.  'Ιρ.  Εμτ.

(3)  ii  Σφηττ.  'Αγύ.  Προσπ.  Κεφ.

IG ii 1700 (335/4)

\[
\begin{array}{cccc}
\text{M} & \text{3} & \text{A 2} & \text{A 2} \\
\end{array}
\]

...  \[\text{Προσπ.} \, '\text{Ερμ.} \, \text{Εμ.} \, \text{(ends)}\]

IG ii 2397 (& 2423) (before 307/6)

\[
\begin{array}{cccc}
\text{A 2} & \text{Π/Μ 3} \\
\end{array}
\]

...  \[\text{’Ιφ.} \, \text{Κεφ.} \, \text{(ends)}\]

OENEIS

* IG ii 1745 (360/59)

(1)  i  \[\text{’Εκλ.} \, \text{Φυλ.} \, \text{Πτελ.} \, '\text{Ικκ.} \, \text{Λαχ.} \, \text{Βουτ.} \, \text{Λουσ.} \, \text{Περιθ.}\]

(2)  ii  Κολ.  Θρ.  'Ον.  \[\text{’Α;} \, \text{(cf. col. iii)}\]

(3)  iii  ('Αχ. contd.)
IG ii² 1698 (before mid C4)
A 1 Π 1 Π 2
Δουσ. Φυλ. Θρι. ...

IG ii² 1746 (c. 350)
i missing Π 2 Α/Π 1 Α 1 Α 1 Α/Π 1 Α -
ii ... ?[Οη.] Περιθ. Βουτ. Λακ. Δουσ. Πτελ. Τυρμ.
A 1 'Εξτ. ...

CECROPIS

IG ii² 1743 (before mid C4)
M Π top of i Φυλ. top of ii 'Αλ. top of iii Μελ.

IG ii² 1700 (335/4)
... Συκ. Πτ. Δατό. (ends)

SEG XXI 591 (c. 321)
M Μ
i Συκ. Δατό.
ii Μελ. Συκ.

HIPPOTHONTIS

Hesp. IX. 5 (first half C4) 'A
... Κερ. Βροι. (column ends)

IG ii² 1693 (before mid C4)
Π Α Π II Π II
i 'Αζ. Κερ. Κοπρ. 'Αναχ. ...
ii ... [Περ. or Ελαυ.] ['Ελαυ. or Βροι.] ...

IG II² 2377 (before mid C4)

Π Ακ. 'Αναχ. Δέκ. 'Ελαι. 'Αμαξ. . . .

IG II² 1700 (335/4)

... [Δέκ. or Ολυ] 'Αναχ. (ends)

AIANTIS

Nothing substantial enough to merit inclusion.

ANTIOCHIS

HeSp. CCXVI 35 (c. mid C4)

Π/ΙΤ ΠΙΤ 3 Π 2 Π/ΙΤ 3...

Kολ. Θορ. 'Εροτ. . . .

IG II² 1700 (335/4)

ΠII 2 Π/ΙΤ 3...

Παλλ. Ελτ. (ends)

IG II² 1750 (334/3)

(1) II 'Αναφ. 'Αμφι. Βησ. 'Ατ.

(2) II Αλγ. Θορ. Παλλ.

(3) III 'Αλωοπ. Κρπ. Κολων. Ελτ. 'Εροτ. Επιμ.

Summary

ERECHTHEIS: no agreement.

AEGEIS: IG II² 1749 and SEG XIX 149 agree; IG II² 1747 and 1700 do not fit.

PANDIONIS: IG II² 1740, REG 1960 88-99, IG II² 1751, SEG XIX 149 agree; IG II² 1753 seems to come near to pattern and 2370 is not incompatible with it; but IG II² 1700 does not fit.
LEONTIS: IG ii² 1742 and SEG XIX 149 agree; IG ii² 1752 fits this pattern; but IG ii² 1700 does not.

ACAMANTIS: SEG XVII 44 may fit pattern of SEG XIX 149; IG ii² 1700 and 2397 do not.

OENEIS: IG ii² 1746 fits pattern of 1745; IG ii² 1693 does not fit.

CECROPIS: IG ii² 1743, 1700 and SEG XXI 591 all small, but fit division by Cleisthenic trittyes.

HIPPOTHONTIS: insufficient evidence.

AIAHTIS: insufficient evidence.

AINTIOCHIS: Hesp. XCVI 35 and IG ii² 1700 do not fit pattern of IG ii² 1750.
Tables C - K, illustrating Chapter II

In compiling Tables C - J I have examined every Attic decree published in IG i² and ii², in SEG X - XXI, and in Hesperia (regular issues and supplements to the end of 1965), together with others known to me for any reason; Table K is limited to decrees published in IG i² and ii². Hellenistic dates have been taken over uncritically from Pritchett and Meritt, The Chronology of Hellenistic Athens, and Meritt, The Athenian Year, and within each table or category decrees are arranged as far as possible in chronological order.

In listing formulae I use brackets to give some idea of how much has to be restored: many of the restorations are certain, and I draw attention to all serious doubts; restorations which I reject are [bracketed and underlined], and decrees for which the whole entry is so treated are not included in my statistics. Since I am inclined to place more faith in the motion - than in the enactment - formulae I stress with an ONLY in Tables C and D those decrees where only the enactment formula is available. Where there is no entry in the contents column of Tables C and D the decree is honorific, of a familiar type.

Abbreviations for formulae (cf. pp. 64–6):-

1. Minute-headings:
   \[\text{\textit{bouleutêc} \textit{ψηλωμα(τα)}}\] \(\beta\gamma\)
   \[\text{\textit{ðemou} \textit{ψηλωμα(τα)}}\] \(\Delta\gamma\)

2. Records of meeting:
   \[\text{\textit{bouleutê}}\]
   \[\textit{ekklêsota or ekklêsota kyrê} \] \(\text{B}\)
   (unusual records of meeting-place are transcribed in full)

3. Enactment-formulae:
   \[\text{\textit{έδοξεν τῇ ðêmwi}} \] \(\varepsilon\theta\)
   \[\text{\textit{έδοξεν τῇ bouleutê kai tãi ðêmwi} \] \(\varepsilon\theta\kappa\theta\)
   \[\text{\textit{έδοξεν τῇ bouleutê} \] \(\varepsilon\beta\)

4. Motion-formulae:
   \[\text{\textit{ðeðóçháitai/é̄ψηφόλοθαι} tãi ðêmwi} \] \(\delta/\psi\delta\)
   \[\text{\textit{ðeðóçháitai/é̄ψηφόλοθαι} tãi bouleutê} \] \(\delta/\psi\beta\)
probouleumatic formula PF
probouleumatic formula revealing that the CPF
demos has commissioned a probouleuma CP
δεδοξαί/ἐνηχρισθαί τῇ βουλῇ καὶ τῷ δήμῳ ὑ/ψεκαί

5. Commissioning of probouleuma

6. Mention of probouleuma:

7. Rider formulae:

τὰ μὲν ἄλλα καθάρει τῇ βουλῇ RP
τὰ μεν ἄλλα καθάρει ὃ δέναιa RI

An asterisk in the Contents column denotes a decree which I regard
as substantial for the purposes of the discussion in ch. II, pp. 79-83
(cf. especially n. 148 to ch. II).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>REF.</th>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>FORMULAE</th>
<th>CONTENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GHI 31</td>
<td>458/7</td>
<td>RP</td>
<td>*Alliance with Egesta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEG X 20</td>
<td>c.450/49</td>
<td>[RP] restored</td>
<td>Judicial benefits for men of Parium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GHI 40 +</td>
<td>c.449</td>
<td>?[χρηματίσαι -formula]; 2 riders? (both simply δόξων εἰς ἐπέπτωμα). (See n.126 to ch. II)</td>
<td>* Priestess and temple of Athena Νικη</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEG X 30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>* Eleusinian epistatae</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HMA 41</td>
<td>aft. 450</td>
<td>RP; second rider καθά[περ Θεσπίους]</td>
<td>Work on water supply</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HMA 69</td>
<td>bef. 431</td>
<td>R[P] both texts; second rider RI</td>
<td>* Eleusinian law</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATL D 8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>* Second Methone decree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEG X 60</td>
<td>c.430</td>
<td>RP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GHI 61.ii</td>
<td>426/5</td>
<td>χρηματίσαι -formula 51-6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATL D 8</td>
<td>426/5</td>
<td>SEE TABLE D</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HMA 87</td>
<td>426/5</td>
<td>χρηματίσαι -formula 27 sqq; RP</td>
<td>* Thudippus' assessment decree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEG X 84,1</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>RP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii</td>
<td>424/3</td>
<td>30-40 seem to incorporate rider added in boule (Meritt, Hesp. X 1941, 320-6); RP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IG ii 2 8</td>
<td>424/3</td>
<td>RP</td>
<td>(date uncertain; see most recently J. Pečírka, The Grant of Enktesis, 22-5)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SEG X 91 421/0 [RP]  
IG i² 84 421/0 RP  
94 418/7 RP  
ii² 174 c.412 [RP]  
SEG X 127 410/09 [RP] restored  
GHI 86 410/09 [RP]; second rider [RI]  
90 408/7 RP  
SEG X 136 407/6 bouleutic formula, 3-6; [RP wholly and wildly restored] (complete text repeated Svt 208 but labelled within hypothetisch)  
SEG XII 37. ii 407/6 bouleutic formula, 56? (I would read [hO δεόνται] for [γε τι βουΚατ]); see n.172 to ch. II; RP  
GHI 96 405/4 οτβκτό; RP (γνωμ and rider by prytanes; cf. Table E)  
Hesp.XXI 3 end c5 RP  
GHI 97.1 403/2 [ετβκτό]; RP υτό RP  
iι 403/2 [ετβκτό]; RP  
IG ii² 2 403/2 [ετβκτό] ONLY  
7 soon aft. [ετβκτό]; δησηφοσ[θαι δε -6-] μολήν  
403/2 δ-9  

* Regulations for the Hephaestia  
Work on sanctuaries  
(date Weston, AJP LXI 1940, 353-4)  
Citizenship grant  
Honours for Phrynichus' assassins  
* Alliance with Carthage  
Second, honorific Neapolitan decree  
* First Samian decree  
Second Samian decree  
Third Samian decree
Hesp. XXVI 53
beg. c4
\(\varepsilon \tau \beta \varkappa \tau \delta \) ONLY

Hesp. X 1941, 336–337
first
qr. c4
RP

GHI 103
394/3
\(\varepsilon \tau \beta \) but E should ratify (cf. p. 55)

GHI 108
394/3
\(\varepsilon \tau \beta \) but assembly should ratify (cf. pp. 55–6)

IG ii2 19
394/3
\(\varepsilon \tau \beta \nu \tau \delta \); \(\dot{\xi} \gamma \dot{\eta} \dot{\eta} \dot{\theta} \nu \tau \dot{\mu} \dot{e} \) a6; rider \(\alpha \theta \varepsilon \nu \rho \) b4;
\(\varepsilon \dot{\eta} \varepsilon \sigma \nu \varepsilon \nu \) c5; \(\tau \tau \rho \omega \nu \dot{\iota} \mu \mu \nu \) b5

GHI 110.1
aft. 394/3
\[\varepsilon \tau \beta \varkappa \tau \delta \] ONLY

Hesp. X 66
aft. 389
\[\varepsilon \tau \beta \varkappa \tau \delta \] ONLY

IG ii2 23
388/7
\(\varepsilon \tau \beta \varkappa \tau \delta \); \(\varepsilon \dot{\alpha} \iota \varepsilon \iota \iota \varepsilon \iota \mu \iota \nu \iota \) 6;
\(\varepsilon \psi \gamma \iota \varepsilon \varepsilon \iota \varepsilon \iota \iota \varepsilon \iota \iota \iota \iota \) 9–10

GHI 116
387/6
\(\dot{\epsilon} \varepsilon \nu \mu \iota \iota \iota \iota \iota \) \(\dot{\iota} \varepsilon \iota \iota \varepsilon \iota \iota \iota \iota \varepsilon \iota \iota \iota \iota \); RP

117
386/5
\[\varepsilon \iota \tau \beta \varkappa \tau \delta \] ONLY

IG ii2 32
385/4
\(\varepsilon \tau \beta \) but assembly's ratification proved by RP

Svt 255
378/7
RP (CP)

(IG 40)

GHI 122
378/7
\[\varepsilon \tau \beta \varkappa \tau \delta \] ONLY

* Alliance with Eretria

* Honours and privileges for Carpathus

* Alliance with Methymna

* Alliance with carpauth

* Honours and privileges for Carpathus

* Treaty with Thebes & Mytilene?
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IG ii² 124</th>
<th>378/7</th>
<th>έπικτό</th>
<th>ΠF</th>
<th>(two copies)</th>
<th>*Alliance with Chalcis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IG ii² 59</td>
<td>bef. 378/7</td>
<td>έπικτό</td>
<td>ONLY</td>
<td>?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60 - ...</td>
<td>[ε]πικτό</td>
<td>ONLY</td>
<td>?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61 - ...</td>
<td>[ε]πικτό</td>
<td>ONLY</td>
<td>?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77 ii - ...</td>
<td>έπικτό γένη τοῖς ἄλλοις</td>
<td>ONLY</td>
<td>?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80 - ...</td>
<td>RP</td>
<td>?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85 - ...</td>
<td>έπικτό</td>
<td>ONLY</td>
<td>?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86 - ...</td>
<td>έπικτό</td>
<td>ONLY</td>
<td>?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEG XVII 16 c4</td>
<td>έπικτό</td>
<td>ONLY</td>
<td>?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IG ii² 95</td>
<td>377/6</td>
<td>ΠF (no dated example before 378/7)</td>
<td></td>
<td>SEE TABLE F</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IG ii² 76</td>
<td>385-76?</td>
<td>έπικτό</td>
<td>ONLY</td>
<td>(date, Dinsmoor, AJA 1932, 158 with nn. 5-6)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22 378-6?</td>
<td>[RP] far from certain</td>
<td>(date, Dinsmoor, AJA 1932, 158 with nn. 5-6, but Svt 238 still dates 390/789)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84 - ...</td>
<td>RP</td>
<td>(date, Dinsmoor, AJA 1932, 158 with nn. 5-6)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(date, Dinsmoor, AJA 1932, 159 with n.6)

* Alliance with Corcyra, &c.

Treaty with Cephallenia

Praise and apologies for Mytilene

Ordering register of gifts to Ammon
GHI 143 363/2  ετβκτό ; PF; RP

IG ii² 115 362/1  ετβκ[τ]ό  ONLY

SEG XVII 19 c.362-355  ε[τβκ]τό  ONLY  * Judicial relations with Siphnos

IG ii² 117 361/0  [ετβκτό] ; PF

145.ii 368-358  [ετβκτ]ό ; PF  (for decree i see Table D)  Giving son father's heraldship

121 357/6  [ετβ]κτό  ONLY

Hesp.VIII 4 357/6  [ετ]βκτό ; PF  Concerning Elaeus

Hesp.XIII 3 357/6  [ετβκτ]ό ; proclamation ο[τ]αυτόν τον ὀ[τ]αυτόν ὀ[τ]άτορα; R[P]([δτδ]  Citizenship grant

not decisive; R[P]([δτδ]

GHI 156 357/6  ετβκτό  ONLY  Appointment of general for Andros

157 356/5  [ετ]βκτό  . ; PF  *Alliance with Thracian &c kings

159 356/5  ε[τ]βκτό  ; PF  #Alliance (?) with Neapolis

IG ii² 130 355/4  ετβκ[τ]ό  ONLY

248 bef. 354  [ετβκ]κτό ; CPF  (date Johnson, CP IX 1914,424)

136 354/3  ετβ[κτό] ; PF

137 354/3  [ετβ]κτό  ONLY

152 bef. 353/2  ετβκτό  ; CPF

153 ...  [ετβκτ]ό  ONLY  ?
On occasion of proxeny renewal, to replace lost stele

Extending proxeny to descendants

Echina; refers to σύμβολα

Honours for epimelete of springs
IG ii² 218 346/5  
περὶ δὲν ... ἐδοξεῖν ἐννομα
τικετεύειν ἐν τῇ βουλῇ,  
22 sqq new speaker; περὶ δὲν ἐδοξεῖν ἐν τῷ ὁμωι ... ἐννομα τικετεύειν, ...
ψτὸ RP

GHI 170 c.345 PF

Hesp.VIII  
EP. NOTES 3 345/4  
[ετ]β[κτό] ONLY
223A 343/2 ὅτι on B's prize for best speaker, turning to PF at 8 sqq.

GHI 173 c.342 χρηματίζον -formula 33-5; RP

IG ii² 227 342/1  
ετβ[κτό] ONLY
229 341/0 ετβ[κτό]; PF
232 340/39 PF; RP
235 340/39 bouleutic formula 0-3; ετ[δ], new speaker, 
RP([ψτό) 4 sqq:

SEG XVI 52 339/8 ε[τό]; PF

IG ii² 243 337/6 [ετ]δωτβ (sic); CPF

SEG XXI 340 aft. mid PF

IG ii² 255 bef. 336/5 PF

265 --- RP
273 --- PF  
Praise for Byzantium

[ 276 --- SEE TABLE D]
IG ii² 277 bef.336/5 PF
284 -.=. PF

IG ii² 289 bef. 336/5 RP (Schweigert, Hesp. VIII. 1939, 173-5, links with IG ii² 372, which I place in Table D. See n. 128 to ch. II.)
328 336/5 ετ[βκτό]; PF

330.iii 336/5 Ε; ετβκτό; PF
Honours for a hieropoeus

423 aft.336/5 PF
428 -.=. PF
442 -.=. PF

334 c.335/4 (ψτό) RP
538 334-1 PF
340 333/2 [Ε; [ετβ]χ[τό] ONLY
Citizenship grant (date, Johnson CP IX 1914,428)

SIG³ 287 332/1 Ε; εττό; PF

GHI 193 331/0 ε[τ]βκτό: and an unlikely formula, discussed in n. 117 to ch. II.

IG ii² 410 c.330 PF
415 -.=. ετβκτό; PF
Honours for priests and hieropoei

Honours for Διαγραφης
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Line(s)</th>
<th>Date(s)</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IG ii² 416</td>
<td>c.330</td>
<td>PF</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hesp. IX 41</td>
<td>c.325</td>
<td>PF</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IG ii² 373</td>
<td>322/1</td>
<td>PF. 16 sqq complete new prescript: Εττδο; speaker: RP(ψτδ)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>403</td>
<td>350-320</td>
<td>PF</td>
<td>Repairs to statue of Athena Νεχη</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>394</td>
<td>321/0-319/8</td>
<td>PF</td>
<td>Citizenship grant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEG XXI 305</td>
<td>320/19</td>
<td>Ε; ετβκτδ ONLY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEG XXI 306</td>
<td>320/19</td>
<td>Ε;ετβκτδ ONLY, Dow, HSCP LXXVII 1963, 67-75, &amp; Meritt, Hesp. XXXII 1963, 431-2. But Meritt formerly restored [ετδ], and the text is far from settled, so I exclude this from my statistics.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEG XXI 312</td>
<td>319/8</td>
<td>Ε;ετβκτδ; Ετβκτδ ONLY</td>
<td>Citizenship grant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>310</td>
<td>319/8</td>
<td>ετβκτδ; PF</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IG ii² 548</td>
<td>318/7-308/7</td>
<td>ετβκτδ ONLY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEG XXI 341</td>
<td>318/7-300</td>
<td>Ετβκτδ; PF</td>
<td>Citizenship grant and οςτηςις</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chron. Hell.</td>
<td>307/6</td>
<td>[Ε]; [ετβκτδ] ONLY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ath. p.20</td>
<td>307/6</td>
<td></td>
<td>Honours for Colophon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IG ii² 456</td>
<td>307/6</td>
<td>Ετβκτδ; E ONLY (order sic)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IG ii² 466</td>
<td>307/6</td>
<td>PF</td>
<td>* Judicial relations with Tenos</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
[E]; PF

SEG XXI 336 aft. 306/5 PF

IG ii² 557 --- PF

478 305/4 E; \text{[e\(\tau\beta\\xi\tau\delta\)]}; PF

479/80 c. 305/4 PF

482 304/3 E; [e\(\eta\\theta\)\xi\tau\delta\ ONLY]

Hesp. VI EM 4 304/3 e[\(\tau\beta\xi\tau\delta\)] ONLY

IG ii² 491 303/2 PF

498 303/2 [E]; PF

SEG XIV 58 302 PF

IG ii² 691 aft. 303/2 PF

500 302/1 PF

505 302/1 E; e\(\tau\beta\xi\tau\delta\); PF

Honours for Colophon

Honours for a bouleutes

Honours for ephebi

Honours for taxiarchs

* Dispatch of embassy to Antigonus (Pritchett, AJP LVIII 1937, 329-33)

with Hesp. IX 1940, 341-2 302/1 [E]; e[\(\tau\beta\xi\tau\delta\)] ONLY

IG ii² 561 307/6 [e\(\upsilon\)\beta\(\varsigma\)[\(\tau\delta\)] ONLY

-301/0
<p>| IG ii² 566 | end c4 | PF | Citizenship grant |
| IG ii² 572 | -...- | PF |
| IG ii² 574 | end c4 | PF |
| IG ii² 583 | -...- | PF |
| IG ii² 587 | -...- | [ἐτ]βω[τό] | ONLY |
| IG ii² 591 | -...- | PF |
| IG ii² 592 | -...- | [ἔ]; ἐ[τβχτό] | ONLY |
| IG ii² 593 | -...- | PF |
| Hesp. XXVIII 6 | c4-3 | PF |
| Hesp. XXVIII 716 | c3?(4?) | PF | Confirming citizenship grant |
| Hesp. XXVIII 8 | beg. c3 | PF |
| SEG XXI 359 | -...- | PF, 8 sqq [ἐλξεν. ξερι μὲν —]—[ὅτο κάνα τὰ ἁλα πράττειν κτλ.] | cf. IG ii² 682, 92-5. (after 256/5). Citizenship grant |
| IG ii² 693 | -...- | PF |
| 708 | -...- | PF |
| 717 | -...- | PF |
| 718 | -...- | [PF] | Citizenship grant |
| 708 | -...- | PF |
| 717 | -...- | PF |
| 718 | -...- | [PF] | Citizenship grant |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IG ii² 669 291/0</td>
<td>E; (ετπχτό) ONLY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IG ii² 658 c.289/8</td>
<td>(ετπχτό); PF</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEG XXI 356 288/7?</td>
<td>[Ε] ; (ετπχτό) ONLY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IG ii² 652 aft. 288/7 PF</td>
<td>Citizenship grant</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Citizenship grant with

Honours culminating in statue and οστησως

Honours for [theoi]
IG ii² 659 285/4 PF  Rite of Aphrodite Πάννος
660 ii 283/2 [Ε] ετβχτδ; κερι δι [- κροβεβολευ-
τα] τει βουλε; PF Praise for Tenos. See p. 70

Hesp. IV 40 283/2 E;ετβχτδ PF Honours for taxiaruchs
Hesp. IX 48 287-278 PF Citizenship grant

Hesp. XXVIII 12 c3 [Ε]; [ετβχτδ] ONLY ?

IG ii² 677 aft. 277 PF Honours for agonothete (?) of Panathenae.

Hesp. II 5 277/6 E;ετβχτδ PF Honours for taxiaruchs
IG ii² 710 295/4-276/5 PF Citizenship grant
712 --- PF

676 275/4 E; [ε]τβχ[t]δ; PF Honours for epimeletae 1/c sacrifices to Ζωτήρες
770 274/3 E; [ετβ]χτδ ONLY

SEG XVI 64 272/1 [Ε]; ε[τβχτδ] ONLY Honours for priest of Zeus Ζωτήρ
65 272/1 E;[ετβχτδ]; PF Honours for astynomì

IG ii² 701 aft. 272 PF (reading [δ/Ψτβ] for IG's [δτδ]) Honours for taxiaruchs
SEG XIV 64 271/0 E;ετβχτδ; PF
Honours for sitones
On public doctors' sacrifices
Honours for epimeletae of mysteries
Honours for ephebi
Citizenship grant

Honours for ephebi

Honours culminating in statue and οὔτη σιτίσις μὴ ἀλλα πάντα πράττειν περὶ τῆς Δωρίδος ἣς ἐπηκεν 

Beginning of 682 not preserved, but probably L was proposer and here moves supplementary decree on later occasion.

Honours for priestess of Athena Πολύδες

Honours for sitones
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Document</th>
<th>Line(s)</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SEG XIX 70</td>
<td>c3</td>
<td>PF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IG ii² 734</td>
<td>734</td>
<td>E; [et]βx[tō] ONLY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>735</td>
<td>[et]tō ; PF</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>801</td>
<td>mid c3</td>
<td>PF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>804</td>
<td>734</td>
<td>PF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>807</td>
<td>734</td>
<td>PF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>822</td>
<td>734</td>
<td>PF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IG ii² 823</td>
<td>mid c3</td>
<td>[PF?]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hesp. VII 23</td>
<td>250/49</td>
<td>E; etβx[tō] ; PF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IG ii² 779</td>
<td>250/49</td>
<td>PF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>782</td>
<td>250/49</td>
<td>E; [et]βx[tō] ; PF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>798</td>
<td>250/49</td>
<td>etō ; PF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEG III 92</td>
<td>249/8</td>
<td>[E];[et]βx[tō]; stone ends,[looks as if leading to PF]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IG ii² 683</td>
<td>248/7</td>
<td>E; etβx[tō] ONLY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hesp. X 56</td>
<td>247/6</td>
<td>E; etō ; PF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hesp. VII 21</td>
<td>247/6</td>
<td>[E]; [et]β[λ]x[tō] ONLY</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Citizenship grant

Honours for epimeletae of mysteries

Lamian arbitration between Athens & Boeotia

Honours for Lamian arbitrators

*Scheme of voluntary contributions to stratiotic fund

SEG XXI 391 245/4 Ε; [ετρχτό] ONLY
392 244/3 [Ε]τρχτό; PF

Hesp. XVII 3 244/3 Ε; ετρχτό ONLY

SEG XVIII 19 i 244/3 [Ε]τρχτό; PF
ii 241/0 Ε; [ε]τρχτό; PF

Hesp. XVII 24 243/2 Ε; [ε]τρχτό ONLY

IG ii² 784 240/39 Ε; ετρχτό ONLY

SEG XIX 78 239/8 [Ε]τρχτό; PF

Hesp. VI 2A 239/8 PF

IG ii² 786 soon aft. 239/8 PF

IG ii² 787 236/5 Ε[ε]τρχτό ONLY
788 235/4 Ε[ε]τρχτό; PF
808 239-229 PF
821 --- PF

Honours for ephesides
Honours for sitones
Honours for priest of Asclepius
Honours for ephesides
Honours for architect
Honours for σιτοφύλακες
Honours for priest of Calliste
IG ii² 832 229/8 ΔΥ; Ε; PF

SEG XIX 80 soon aft. 229/8 PF

IG ii² 836 ... PF

837 227/6 Ε[ετ]βκτδ[ο] ONLY

Hesp. IV 39 226/5 Ειεφκτδ; PF

IG ii² 851 bef. 224/3 PF

SEG XXI 396 ... Εετβ[κτδ] ONLY

IG ii² 857 ... Δ[δ] ; Εετβκτδ[ο] ONLY

839 221/0 [Δ ] ; Εετβ; PF

HSCP XLVIII 11 216/5 βουλὴ ἐν τῷ Ἔλευσιν ἡμικλήσει καὶ ἐκκλησίᾳ ηετ[βκτδ] ONLY

1937 {120-6 c.215} [ετβκτδ]; PF

IG ii² 847 215/4 Ψ; Εετκτδ; PF

IG ii² 853 end c3 PF

858 ... PF

859 ... PF

Citizenship grant

Honours for a banker

Dedication to Hero Doctor

Refounding of Lycea

Honours for ephebi

Honours for epimeletae of mysteries

Citizenship grant

Concerning Cyme
IG ii² 861 end c3  [E];[οτρεγγε] PF [Meritt, Ath. Yr. 166, restores οτο for no apparent reason]

862 -...- PF

Honours for Lamian arbitrators

SEG
XXI 411 end c3 PF

Honours for ephebi

IG ii² 867 end c3? [ε.τ.βουλ.] ε & x[ατ τ.δ] ONLY

869 -...- PF

871 -...- PF

872 c3? PF

?

IG ii² 850 shortly bef. 200 E; PF

Citizenship grant

Hesp. X 23 c.200 PF

Hesp.
XIII. 10 -...- PF

Praise for Ephesus

Hesp. XVI 55 -...- [PF?]

Honours for [epimeletae of mysteries]

IG ii² 922 beg.c2 PF

Citizenship grant

923 -...- PF

927 -...- PF

931 -...- PF

Citizenship grant
Honours culminating in statue and οἰκτησίς

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IG ii² 936</td>
<td>beg. c2</td>
<td>PF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>926</td>
<td>beg. c2?</td>
<td>PF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>978</td>
<td>199/8</td>
<td>ΔΨ ; Ε;τρκτό; PF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>785</td>
<td>196/5</td>
<td>ΔΨ ; Ε;τρκτό; PF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hesp. V 15</td>
<td>196/5</td>
<td>ΔΨ ; Ε;τρκτό; PF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IG ii² 886</td>
<td>193/2</td>
<td>[Ε]; ετρκτό</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>844</td>
<td>193/2</td>
<td>PF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEG XVI 77</td>
<td>193/2</td>
<td>[Ε]; ετρκτό</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IG ii² 892</td>
<td>188/7</td>
<td>έκχλησατα δραχαρεσται κατὰ τὴν μαν—τ[ε]τα[ν το]θ [θ]εον; ετρκτό</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEG XXI 435 i</td>
<td>187/6</td>
<td>PF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hesp. XV 38</td>
<td>186/5</td>
<td>PF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>900</td>
<td>185/4</td>
<td>PF</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Honours culminating in statue and οἰκτησίς

Honours for ephebi

Citizenship grant

Honours for ephebi
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Record</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IG ii² 889</td>
<td>181/0</td>
<td>E;(\varepsilon \tau \beta \kappa \tau \delta); PF</td>
<td>Citizenship grant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IG ii² 905</td>
<td>175/4</td>
<td>E; (\varepsilon \tau \beta \kappa \tau \delta) ONLY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hesp. X 75</td>
<td>173/2?</td>
<td>[ E]; (\varepsilon . \tau . \beta . \chi . \tau . \delta . ) ([\omicron \omega]); ONLY</td>
<td>Honours for epimeletae of mysteries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEG XVI 92</td>
<td>173/2</td>
<td>[Δ(\omicron)]; E((\varepsilon \tau \beta \kappa \tau \delta)) ONLY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hesp. XXVI 4</td>
<td>173/2</td>
<td>E; (\varepsilon \tau \beta \kappa \tau \delta) ONLY</td>
<td>Honours for ephebi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEG XIX 97</td>
<td>c184-171</td>
<td>PF</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEG XXI 452</td>
<td>173/2</td>
<td>E; [PF]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hesp. XV 40</td>
<td>171/0</td>
<td>i E; (\varepsilon \xi [\omicron . \omicron]); PF</td>
<td>Honours for ephebi and cosmetes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii E; (\varepsilon \tau \beta \kappa \tau \delta) ONLY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IG ii² 907</td>
<td>c170</td>
<td>PF</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>908</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>PF</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>909</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>PF</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hesp. IV</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>PF</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACR 37</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>PF</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hesp. XXXVI 6</td>
<td>c170</td>
<td>[ E]; [(\omicron \tau \delta)]; PF</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Hesp. V 17 169/8 E; εμετο; PF

IG ii² 945 168/7 έκκλησα αυθ'κλητος, εν ταύ τε θεστρω κατ' το σφησίμα δ — εικεν; ετβκτ[φ]; PF

946 166/5 E; ετβ[κτ]δ ONLY

947ii 166/5 E; ετβ[κτ]δ ONLY

1 aft. 166/5 [φτ]β but E should have ratified

949 165/4 E; ετβκτδ; PF

SEG

XVIII 22 165/4 E; ετβκτδ; PF

Hesp. III 20 163/2 E; ετβ[κτ]δ ONLY

IG ii² 956 161/0 PF

Hesp. II 16 161/0 [ετδ]; PF

* Hesp. XVI 64 161/0 E; [ετβκτδ]; condensed PF

IG ii² 953 160/59 E; εμετο; ONLY

954 bef. 159 [μουλθ] ου γκλητος στρατη[γ]υν παραγγε{λαιτων κατ άπ της μουλθς έκκλησα

άρ[χαιρεσαι κατα την μαντειαν την του] θεου; PF

955 -.- έκκλησα αρχαιρεσαι ιτηλ.; ετβεκτ[ε]δ; PF

957 157/6 PF

(proxyeny)

Honours for demarch of Eleusis (conduct of Eleusinia)

Honours for Priest of Asclepius

Honours for taxiarch

Honours for agonothete of Thesea

Honours for cosmetes of ephebi

Repairs to sancutary

Honours for agonothete of Thesea
Citizenship grant
Honours for agonothete of Thesea

Honours for agonothete
Citizenship grant

perhaps concerned with Salamis
Honours for priest of Asclepius
Honours for priest of Asclepius

Citizenship grant
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IG ii² 988</td>
<td>a/r mid c2</td>
<td>PF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hesp. II ACR 24</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>PF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEG XVI 102</td>
<td>C.150-100</td>
<td>Φίλαθρον καὶ μὲν τὴν Περιφέρειαν ἐκ τῶν θεοὺν</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IG ii² 971</td>
<td>140/39</td>
<td>ΦΙΠΠΟΣ ; PF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEG XVIII 24</td>
<td>140/39?</td>
<td>PF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEG XIX 102</td>
<td>139/8?</td>
<td>ΦΙΠΠΟΣ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEG XVIII 25</td>
<td>138/7</td>
<td>ΦΙΠΠΟΣ ; PF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEG XXI 469</td>
<td>129/8</td>
<td>ΦΙΠΠΟΣ ; PF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEG XV 104</td>
<td>127/6</td>
<td>ΦΙΠΠΟΣ ; PF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IG ii² 1006+</td>
<td>122/1</td>
<td>ΦΙΠΠΟΣ ; PF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEG XIX 108</td>
<td>122/1</td>
<td>ΦΙΠΠΟΣ ; PF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEG XXI 476</td>
<td>c.120</td>
<td>ΦΙΠΠΟΣ ; PF</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Citizenship grant
2. Work in temple of Asclepius
3. Honours for priest of Asclepius
4. Regulations for cult of Apollo
5. Honours for ephebi and cosmetes
Honours for ephebi and cosmetes

Amphictyonic business

Honours for ephebi and cosmetes

Honours for makers of the πόλεως

"First" and "second" decrees for prytanes and officials (usually i is non-prob.; ii boule alone)

Honours for cosmetes of ephebi

Honours for theori to Thespiae

Honours for treasurer of prytanes and great variety of officers
Honours for ephebi and cosmetes

Honours for makers of the πεπλος

Honours for ephebi

Honours for ephebi

Honours for priest of Asclepius

Honours for cosmetes and ephebi (order sic)

Honours for cosmetes and ephebi (sic) (date O.W. Reinmuth, Hesp. XXXIV 1965)

Honours for cosmetes and ephebi (sic)

A decree of the Areopagus, with many departures from the language of decrees of the boule and demos)

Sacrifices for house of Septimus Severus

(for early part of prescript see ch. I, p. 47)
I omit the second decree in *Hesp.* Supp. VI 31/2 with SEG XXI 506/5 (A.D. 229/30 or 230/1), which is thought to be probouleumatic but does not exhibit any of the older formulae (l. 29/18 describes the enactment as a δέχεται). The third decree is a resolution of the Areopagus; 31 fr. a probably belongs to a decree of the Sacred Gerousia.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>REF.</th>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>FORMULAE</th>
<th>CONTENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SEG X 26</td>
<td>c.450</td>
<td>RI</td>
<td>Lease of public property</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GHI 44</td>
<td>c.445?</td>
<td>RI (περὶ μὲν ... καθήκερ Δ στῆκε)</td>
<td>Colony at Brea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HMA 66, 47 sqq</td>
<td>c.436?</td>
<td>[ἐφήγησα ἡμῖν] στρατηγόν; CP (cf. ATL, III, 313 n.61, more cautious text SVT 186: older texts e.g. SEG X 86 read [ἐτῶ])</td>
<td>Alliance with Perdiccas &amp; Arrhabaeus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEG XII 26</td>
<td>c.430</td>
<td>CP</td>
<td>Tribute collection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATL D 8</td>
<td>426/5</td>
<td>[No reason to restore RP at 10;] RI, 27-8</td>
<td>Curetus’ tribute decree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEG X 87</td>
<td>c.423/2</td>
<td>[ἄρχεσθαι ἐκναγής περὶ τῶν ἐργῶν] Coinage τῶν ἐν τῇ Μυρείᾳ Ῥῶς ἐν [σφηκτῶ]</td>
<td>D.M. Lewis, BSA XLIX 1954, dates c5 and probably before 412 from fr. b, but post-403 safer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IG ii² 3</td>
<td>c.400?</td>
<td>[ἐτῶ]</td>
<td>D.M. Lewis, BSA XLIX 1954, dates c5 and probably before 412 from fr. b, but post-403 safer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GHI 100</td>
<td>403?</td>
<td>[ἐφήγησα] ἡμῖν Ἀθηναίος</td>
<td>Rewards for Phyle metics (see D. Hereward, B.S.A. XLVII 1952, esp. 111-3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IG ii² 145</td>
<td>402-399</td>
<td>[ἐτῶ] better than [ἐτῶ]: see ch.II, p. 92</td>
<td>Appointing herald</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47,23 sqq</td>
<td>bef. c4</td>
<td>ψτῶ twice</td>
<td>Cult of Asclepius</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
IG ii² 26 394-387 ἑτὸ; ἀπαίνεσσαι μέν, 7; ἐςπ[ἰσθαί δὲ], 10-11

51 bef.387/6 [ἑτὸ] ONLY

GHI 114 387/6 ἑτὸ; ὀτὸ

* Regulations for Clazomenae

IG ii² 30 386/5 ἑδεῖαθαῖα-formula (of ch.II, pp. 75-6); ὀτὸ

* Cleruchs on Lemnos

GHI 118 384/4 ψτὸ

* Alliance with Chios

IG ii² 62 bef.378/7 ἑτὸ ONLY

70 --- [ἑτῇβ[τὸ] ; ψτὸ

72 --- [ἑ[τὸ] ONLY

78 --- [ψτ][δ]

83 --- [ψ[τ][δ]

GHI 123 i 378/7 ἑθῆκτὸ; ψτὸ

* Prospectus of Second Athenian League

[ii

the decree beginning in 1. 91 seems to have been appended without an enactment-
or rider-formula

IG ii² 99 375/4 ἑτ[ἰ]δο] ONLY

HespIII 3 373/2 [ἑτὸ] ONLY

SEG XIV 45 371/0? [ἑτὸ] ONLY

IG ii² 104 368/7 [ψ][τ][δ]

Reply to ambassadors
GHI 136 368/7 [ετό]; ὀτό
139 c.367? RI
SEG XIV 47 365/4 [ετό] ONLY
GHI 142 363/2 ετβκτό; ὀτό
144 362/1 ετβκτό; ἡφθαντα -formula; mention of allies' δῆμα; MP; ὀ[τό]
GHI 146 362/1 ετβκτό; εὑρίσκοντα -formula; ψτό
147 361/0 ετβκτό; ψτό
IG ii 118 361/0? [ετό]; [ὀτό]
GHI 154 357/6 [ἐτ][ὁ]; [ψτ]τό; CP
IG ii 132 355/4 i ε[τό] ONLY
ii ε[τό] ONLY
133 355/4 ε[τό]; ψτ[τό]
134 354/3 [ἐτβκτό; [ψτ]τό
177 bef.353/2 ὀ[τό]
193 --- CP
138 353/2 ετβκ[τό]; [ὀτό]
252 mid c4 [ὀτό]
660 i c.350-325 δ[τό] (Date A.C. Johnson, CP IX 1914, 429)

* Alliance with Diomédis I
* Diplomatic relations with Sidon
  Transfer of sacred property
* Regulations for Iulis
* Alliance with Arcadia
* Cleruchy for Potidaea
* Alliance with Thessaly
* Regulations for Eretria
**Renewal of alliance with Mytilene**

Order to inscribe honorific decree

> Alliance with Messenians and others

> Ratifying Chabrias' alliance with Ceos
Hesp. VII
ACR 19  337/6  [ετ]δ  ;  ὅ[τ]δ

Hesp. IX 35  337/6  [ετδ]  ONLY; refers to boule 11, 12, 15, 16.

IG ii² 263 bef. 336/5  [ετδ]  ONLY

276  ...  ἕπερι ὧν ἔδωκε ... ἐν τῇ ἁγιείᾳ ἐννομα ἡ[νευειν], ὅ[τ]δ; but RP, 23 sqq. See ch.II, pp.72-

283  ...  [δτ]δ

285  ...  δ[τδ]

IG ii² 288  ...  δ[τδ]

304  ...  ὧ[δ]τδ

436  aft.336/5  E;  ε[τδ]  ONLY  ?

330 i  335/4  E; ετδ; ὅτδ

SEG XXI 274  334/3  E;  ε[τδ]  ONLY

275  334/3  E;  ε[τ]δ  ONLY

276  334/3  [Ε];  ε[τ]δ  ONLY

IG ii² 336  334/3  E;  ετδ; MP;  ψτδ  Citizenship grant

CHI 189 ii  333/2  ετδ  ;  ὅτδ; published with OPEN PROBOULEUMA Allowing Citian merchants to build temple
Honours for a hieropoeus

Honours for men chosen for ἐξουσίευσις of festival of Amphiaraus
Honours for priest of Asclepius

Honours for some board

Telemachus commissions probouleuma;

Cephisodotus' motion adopted as probouleuma;

Telemachus' motion adopted in place of probouleuma, on which it improves.

'Phyleus' motion adopted as probouleuma;

Demosthenes' motion adopted in place of probouleuma, on which it improves.

* Dispatch of colony to the Adriatic

Concerning the proedri?
Concerning the Phocians

Citizenship grant

* Duties of agoranomi

Reply to ambassadors?

?
Concerning Antipater

Citizenship grant made;

and confirmed

Honours for ἐξελεξτότι

Citizenship grant

Citizenship grant (date, A.C. Johnson, CP IX 1914, 425)

Decree for Thessalian exiles
Honours culminating in στολής and statue

Citizenship grant

* Rebuilding of city walls
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Column</th>
<th>Text</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hesp. III 6</td>
<td>306/5</td>
<td></td>
<td>[E]; e(\tau) \text{ ONLY}</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IG ii² 703</td>
<td>305/4</td>
<td></td>
<td>E; e[(\tau)] \text{ ONLY}</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>796</td>
<td>305/4</td>
<td></td>
<td>E; [(\varepsilon\tau)] \text{ ONLY}</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>797</td>
<td>305/4</td>
<td></td>
<td>[E]; [(\varepsilon\tau)] \text{ ONLY}</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hesp.V</td>
<td>1936, 201-5</td>
<td>305/4</td>
<td>[E]; e[(\tau)] \text{ ONLY}</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IG ii² 483</td>
<td>304/3</td>
<td></td>
<td>E; (\varepsilon\tau); (\delta\tau)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>486</td>
<td>304/3</td>
<td></td>
<td>E; (\varepsilon\tau[\delta]) \text{ ONLY}</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEG XVI 58</td>
<td>304/3</td>
<td></td>
<td>E; [(\varepsilon\tau)][(\delta)] \text{ ONLY}</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IG ii² 540</td>
<td>bef.303/2</td>
<td>303/2</td>
<td>(\delta\tau) \text{ ONLY}</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Add) 558</td>
<td>c.303/2</td>
<td></td>
<td>(\delta\tau[\delta])</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>559 + 568</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>\ldots \ [(\varepsilon\tau)] \text{ ONLY}</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>492</td>
<td>303/2</td>
<td></td>
<td>(\varepsilon\tau) \text{ ONLY}</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Add) 493+518</td>
<td>303/2</td>
<td></td>
<td>E; (\varepsilon\tau); (\delta\tau)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>494</td>
<td>303/2</td>
<td></td>
<td>E; [(\varepsilon\tau)] \text{ ONLY}</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>495</td>
<td>303/2</td>
<td></td>
<td>E; (\varepsilon\tau); (\delta\tau)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Add) 496+507</td>
<td>303/2</td>
<td></td>
<td>[E]; (\varepsilon\tau); (\delta\tau)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>499</td>
<td>302/1</td>
<td></td>
<td>E; [(\varepsilon\tau)][(\delta)] \text{ ONLY}</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Concerning Mytilene

Citizenship grant

Citizenship grant

Citizenship grant
IG ii^2 502 302/1  E; ετό; honours for a ὅμιλος who ἐξοδεύεν ἐν τῷ ᾨμίῳ ἔννομοι ἱκανοῖς εἰς τεθείουν
503 302/1  E; ετὸ ONLY

Hesp. IV 6 302/1  [ E; ετ[ὁ] ONLY
Hesp. IX 20 302/1  E; ετό; ὅτω

Honours for taxiarths

Hesp. VII 640 301/0  E; [ετ]ὁ ONLY

ACR 25 310-300  ὅτ[ὁ]

IG ii^2 568 end c4  [ετό] ONLY

573 ... ὅτό] BUT citations (1) ΠΑΡΙΑΝΟΥΣ ἄμοι; (2) ἄμοι
586 ... [ὁ]τ[ὁ]

400 beg. c3  ε[τό] ; ὅ[τό]
695 ... ὅτό
707 ... ὅ[τό]
713 ii ... ὅ[τό]
750 ... [ετ]ὁ ONLY

Concerned with a festival

Hesp. XIII 7 301/0-295/4  ὅτῳ

SEG XXI 361 beg. c3  [ὁτό]
362 ... [ὅτ]ὁ
IG ii² 641 299/8  Ei; eto ; oto

646 295/4  Ei[e]to ; oto

Arch. Ath. 1-15 293/2  Ei; eto ; oto

IG ii² 651 288/7  Ei; eto[j] ; o[to]

653 287/6  Ei; eto[j] ; oto

654 287/6  Ei; eto ; oto

655 287/6  Ei; eto[j] ; oto[j]

Hesp. IX 15 285/4  Ei; eto[j] ; oto[j]

Hesp. VII 18 284/3  Ei; eto ; oto

Hesp. VII 106 280/79  [Ei; eto[j] ] ; o[to][j]

IG ii² 672 280/79  [Ei; eto[j] ] ; o[to]

Hesp. X 1941 338-9 ANOTHER COPY  Ei; eto[j] - stone ends

SEG XXI 366 279/8  [Ei; eto[j] ] ; o[to][j]

364 279/8  eto[j] ONLY

P 4 290-275  Ei; eto ; oto

IG ii² 674 275/4  eto ; oto

SEG XIV 63 c.275  Ei; eto[j] ; o[to][j]

Citizenship grant, ειτηρί, statue

Honours culminating in οἰκήμα and statue

Citizenship grant

Honours for prytanes

Honours for an archon

Honours culminating in statue and οἰκήμα

Honours for prytanes

Honours for prytanes

Honours for prytanes

Honours for prytanes
Honours for those elected for επιμέλεια of sacrifices to Σωτήρες

Honours for archon and epimeletae of ΠΟΜΠΗ

* Alliance with Sparta

Honours for Prytanes

Honours for Prytanes

Honours for an agonothete

Honours for archon

Honours for Prytanes

Right of asylum at Smyrna
Honours for prytanes

Honours for prytanes

Honours for prytanes

Honours for prytanes

Grants statue on Acropolis; allows erection in Τέμενος of Demos and Charites instead

Honours for prytanes

Honours for prytanes

Honours for prytanes

Honours for prytanes

Honours for prytanes
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Note</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SEG XIX 91</td>
<td>c3-2</td>
<td>$\delta \tau \delta$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IG ii² 884</td>
<td>c.200</td>
<td>$\delta \tau \delta \eta \mu \omega \iota$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>922</td>
<td>beg.c2</td>
<td>$[\varepsilon]; [\varepsilon \tau \delta]$ ONLY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>929</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>$[\Delta \psi]; \varepsilon; [\varepsilon \tau \delta]; [\delta \tau \delta]$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hesp.XXXII 14</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>$\delta \tau \delta$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hesp.XV 52</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>$[\varepsilon \tau \delta]$, $\delta \tau \delta$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEG XXI 422</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>$\varepsilon; \varepsilon \delta$ ONLY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P 48 ii</td>
<td>199/8-189/8</td>
<td>$[\varepsilon]; \varepsilon \tau \delta$, $\delta \tau \delta$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P 49 ii</td>
<td>192/1</td>
<td>$\varepsilon; \varepsilon \tau \delta$, $\delta \tau \delta$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P 51</td>
<td>188/7</td>
<td>$[\Delta \psi]; \varepsilon; \varepsilon \tau \delta$, $\delta \tau \delta$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P 52</td>
<td>c.188/7</td>
<td>$[\delta \tau \delta]$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hesp.XV 6</td>
<td>188/7</td>
<td>$[\Delta \psi]; [\varepsilon]; [\varepsilon \tau \delta]$ ONLY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IG ii² 891</td>
<td>188/7</td>
<td>$[\varepsilon]; [\varepsilon \tau \delta]$, $\delta \tau \delta$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>896</td>
<td>186/5</td>
<td>$i \varepsilon; \varepsilon \tau \delta$, $\delta \tau \delta$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P 55</td>
<td>182/1</td>
<td>$\varepsilon; \varepsilon \tau \delta$, $\delta \tau \delta$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEG XVI 86</td>
<td>182/1</td>
<td>$\varepsilon; \varepsilon \tau \delta$, $\delta \tau \delta$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Honours for prytanes

Honours for archon

Honours for prytanes

Honours for prytanes

Honours for prytanes

Honours for prytanes

Honours for prytanes

Honours for prytanes

Honours for Canephorus and epimeletae of ΚΟΜΠΗ

Honours for prytanes

Honours for prytanes
SEG XXI 440 181/0  
442 181/0  
IC ii 888 180/79  
P 64 1 178/7  
SEG XXI 447 177/6  
SEG XVI 89 175/4  
90 174/3  
91.i 173/2  
P 71 169/8  
72 167/6?  
SEG XVI 95 164/3  
96.i 164/3  
P 83 180-155  
65 153/2  
SEG XVI 87 c. 182-150  
Hesp. XVI 96 mid c2  
P 85 145/4  
Hesp. XVII 91 140/39  

βουλή ἐν βουλευτηρίῳ σύνκλητος στρατηγῶν παραγειάλατον καὶ ἀπὸ βουλῆς ἐκ-κλησθα χηρτά ἐν τοῖς θεστρομ; ἐτό; ὄτο

Honours for prytanes

Honours for prytanes

Honours for prytanes

Honours for prytanes

Honours for prytanes

Honours for prytanes

Honours for prytanes

Honours for prytanes

Honours for prytanes

Honours for prytanes

Honours for prytanes

Honours for prytanes

Honours for prytanes

Honours for prytanes

Honours for prytanes

Honours for prytanes
SEG XII 1011 135/4

Honours for prytanes

P 88 131/0

Honours for prytanes

SEG XXI 4681 c.130

Honours for prytanes

SEG XV 104 128/7

Honours for prytanes

P 90 125/4

Honours for prytanes

91 125/4

Honours for prytanes

92 124/4

Honours for prytanes

93 122/1

Honours for prytanes

SEG XXI 478 118/7

Honours for prytanes

IG ii² 1011 107/6

Honours for prytanes

1020 end c2? [e]το-only

1038 beg. cl δ[το]

SEG XXI 490 ...

Honours for prytanes

IG ii² 1035 c1? "restored for no cogent reason"

Honours for prytanes

Restitution of sacred lands

SEG XVII 121 95/4

Honours for prytanes

A.D.

IG ii² 1078/9 c.220

Honours for prytanes

of Revival/Eleusinia
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>REF.</th>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>FORMULAE</th>
<th>CONTENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HMA 26</td>
<td>453/2?</td>
<td>[γνώμε τὸν χυγγραφέον]</td>
<td>Regulations for Erythrae</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>30</td>
<td>[τάδε ηοι χ]συγγρα[φές χυνγγραφεον]</td>
<td>Regulations for Mytilene</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GHI 74</td>
<td>416/5?</td>
<td>τάδε ηοι χυγγραφές χυνύ[γαφα]σαν</td>
<td>Eleusinian first-fruits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>RIDER τα μεν άλλα κακάπερ αι χυνγγραφει. κερι δε το έλαιο τες ακαρχες χυγγραφεον λαμπον</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>έπιδειχατε τει βολει επι τες ένατες κρυτα νεας, λε δε βολε δε τον λαμπον έχωιεννενετο εκαναγες</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATL D 9</td>
<td>410/09</td>
<td>[γνωμε τον χυγγραφουν]</td>
<td>Repayment of sacred monies to Athená</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEG X 123</td>
<td>c.410</td>
<td>[γνωμε τον χυγγραφουν]</td>
<td>Sacred Law</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>And compare decree of Demophonantas ap. And.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1. Myst. 96-8 - SEE TABLE H</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47 sqq.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IG ii² 27</td>
<td>416/5</td>
<td>γνωμα στρατηγην</td>
<td>Proxeny (date, B.D. Meritt, Hesp. VTT 1939, 68)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GHI 96</td>
<td>405/4</td>
<td>Original motion and RP both γνωμη κατεφοι και κυνητανων. PROBOULEUMATIC DEGREE:</td>
<td>First Samian decree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SEE TABLE C</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Boule orders allied ρυνέρον to submit όγυμα to ecclesia. SEE TABLES C & F

Relations with Dionysius I

Alliance with Arcadia &c.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>REF.</th>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>FORMULAE</th>
<th>CONTENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SEG</td>
<td>409-391</td>
<td>[ετβ] : [ετδ] would fit. (In either case, later date perhaps safer.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XIV</td>
<td>38</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GHI</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>soon after</td>
<td>To republish proxeny decree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[ετβ] (On this formula in proxeny decrees see ch.II, pp. 84-5)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IG 11</td>
<td>145.i</td>
<td>402-399</td>
<td>SEE TABLE D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IG 11</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>beg C4</td>
<td>[ετβ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12.ii</td>
<td>[ετβ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
<td>[ετβ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>399/8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hesp</td>
<td>VII</td>
<td>c.398-0</td>
<td>[ετβ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GHI</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>394/3</td>
<td>SEE TABLE C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GHI</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>394/3</td>
<td>SEE TABLE C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IG 11</td>
<td>17.i</td>
<td>394/3</td>
<td>[ετβ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[32]</td>
<td>385/4</td>
<td></td>
<td>SEE TABLE C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>before</td>
<td>[ετβ]</td>
<td>Honorific decree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>378/7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Concerning transfer of proxeny from father to son

To publish proxeny decree

(cf. n. 181 to ch. II)

Concerning a proxeny

Dionysius I

? Boule's prize for best speaker

Honorific decrees

Honours for taxiarch

Honorific decree

Citian merchants' request for temple
[ετβ]; B. Probably beginning of PROBOULEUMA mentioned in i - SEE TABLE D)

Honorific decree

ψτβ: SPECIFIC PROBOULEUMA (SEE TABLE D for i, the non-probouleumatic decree which superseded it)

Honorific decree

Honours for bouleutei i/c a dedication by 21 bouleutae and 10 others

Honorific decrees

Relaxing harsh treatment of defaulting naval treasurer's brother

Honours for an ἀναγραφεός of the laws

Honours for a bouleutes

Honours for officials of prytanes
Honours for officials of prytanes

Special honours for treasurer of boule

Honours for officials of prytanes

Honours for officials of prytanes

Honours for officials of prytanes

Honours for officials of prytanes

Honours for officials of prytanes

Honours for officials of prytanes

Honours for officials of prytanes

Honours for officials of prytanes

Honours for officials of prytanes

Honours for officials of prytanes

Honours for officials of prytanes

Honours for officials of prytanes

Honours for officials of prytanes
Honours for officials of prytanes

Honours for officials of prytanes

Honours for officials of prytanes

Honours for officials of prytanes

Honours for officials of prytanes

Honours for officials of prytanes

Honours for officials of prytanes

Honours for officials of prytanes

Honours for officials of prytanes

Honours for officials of prytanes
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P 47</td>
<td>161/0</td>
<td>Β; ετβ; οτβ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hesp Supp. IV 1940, 144-7</td>
<td>161/0</td>
<td>[Βγ]; [Η]; οτβ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P 58</td>
<td>before 178/7</td>
<td>οτβ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64.ii</td>
<td>178/7</td>
<td>Β; ετβ; οτβ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEG XVI 91.ii</td>
<td>173/2</td>
<td>Β; ετβ; οτβ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P 70</td>
<td>182/1-170/69</td>
<td>οτβ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hesp IX 24</td>
<td>176-169</td>
<td>[ετβ]; οτβ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P 71.ii</td>
<td>169/8</td>
<td>δ[τβ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73</td>
<td>166/5</td>
<td>ΒΥ; Β; ετβ; οτ[β]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>96.ii</td>
<td>948</td>
<td>166/5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P 80</td>
<td>164/3</td>
<td>δ[τβ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEG XVI 96.ii</td>
<td>164/3</td>
<td>ΒΥ; Β; [ετβ]; [οτ]β</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Honours for officials of prytanes

Honours for 3 bouleutae 1/c equipment in the Scias

Honours for officials of prytanes

Honours for officials of prytanes

Honours for officials of prytanes

Honours for officials of prytanes

Honours for officials of prytanes

Honours for officials of prytanes

Honours for officials of prytanes

Honours for officials of prytanes

Honours for performance of some sacrifice

Honours for officials of prytanes (date, Meritt, Hesp XXVI 1957, 74)

Honours for officials of prytanes
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>P 75</th>
<th>161/0</th>
<th>B; etβ; δ[τβ]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>77</td>
<td>C.160</td>
<td>δτβ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78</td>
<td>C.160</td>
<td>[φ]τβ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81</td>
<td>169/8-156/5</td>
<td>[φ]τβ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84.i</td>
<td>155/4</td>
<td>[B]; iετβ; [δτβ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ii</td>
<td>B; etβ; δτβ</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Honours for priest of Zeus Soter at Piraeus

**SEG**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>462</th>
<th>Mid C2</th>
<th>B; et[β]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>990</td>
<td>&quot;&quot;</td>
<td>-τβ</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Honours for officials of prytanes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1000</th>
<th>after mid C2</th>
<th>etβ; δτβ</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P 86</td>
<td>145/4</td>
<td>[B]ν</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Honours for some officials

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hesp</th>
<th>XVII 9.ii</th>
<th>140/39</th>
<th>bouλη [δ]μ Περικλῆς ἐν τῷ Φωσφόρῳ; etβ; δτβ</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SEG</td>
<td>XII 101.ii</td>
<td>135/4</td>
<td>B; iετβ; [δτβ]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Honours for performance of some sacrifice

UNIQUELY AS B-DECREE, Honours for prytanes
Honours for officials of prytanes

Repairs to sacred objects in shrine of Hero Doctor

Honours for officials of prytanes

Honours for officials of prytanes

Allowing prytanes to honour treasurer

Allowing prytanes to honour treasurer

Honours for ephebi and cosmetes

Honours for hieropoei

Allowing prytanes to honour treasurer
Allowing Prytanes to honour treasurer

Allowing Priest of Asclepius to rebuild shrine at own expense

Honours for ephesi and cosmetes ("acceptance decree")

Honours for Treasurer of Prytanes

Honours for ephesi and cosmetes

(date O.W. Reinmuth, Hesp XXXIV 1965, 264)

Allowing Prytanes to honour treasurer

Allowing Prytanes to honour treasurer

Allowing Prytanes to honour treasurer

Concerning Augustus' birthday

Allowing Prytanes to honour treasurer

Praising Prytanes and honouring officials
Allowing prytanes to honour treasurer

Allowing prytanes to honour treasurer

Allowing prytanes to honour treasurer

Honorific decree

Praising prytanes and various officials

Honours for officials of prytanes
In general the prescripts are modelled on those of contemporary
Eleusinian first-fruits
Rebuilding of Piraeus walls
Law against tyranny
Regulations for Panathenaea
Religious laws
Compulsory purchase of olive oil

The following decrees contain a formula commissioning a /vola: µε(φιλαία) νο(μο)θε(σας)
who put the question, and name of proposer.

TABLE G: FORMULAE IN νολα:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>REF.</th>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>FORMULAE</th>
<th>CONTENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IGI 1</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>353/2</td>
<td>δεδοθέται τον νομοθέτας τα [μεν διαλα καδάκιρ τον Χαίρημον] νόμον περί της απαρχής</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEG XII 87</td>
<td>337/6</td>
<td>δεδοθέται τον νομοθέτας</td>
<td>Rebuilding of Piraeus walls</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEG XVIII 13</td>
<td>336-4</td>
<td>δεδοθέται τον νομοθέτας</td>
<td>Law against tyranny</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IGI 2</td>
<td>333</td>
<td>335/4</td>
<td>refs. to τόνδε τον νόμον, 7, 11; νομοθετῆν ἔδορα, 13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEG XV 108</td>
<td>1. A.D. 124</td>
<td>κε(φιλαία) νο(μο)θε(σας) Αὐριανος</td>
<td>Religious laws</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEG</td>
<td>222</td>
<td>41-6; 330, 15-21: SIG 298, 35-41 (not 30-45)</td>
<td>Compulsory purchase of olive oil</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
T.IV.118. xi-xiv 423
etô (all MSS; e<τρ>χ<π>τό, Gomme); ἐκκλησίαν ὁ δὲ θεοίσαντας τοὺς στρατηγοὺς καὶ τοὺς χρυσάντες πρῶτον περὶ τῆς εὐεργείας
... βουλεύσασθαι Ἀθηναίους καθ’ ὃτι ἄν ἔμαθη ἑκατέρα περὶ τῆς καταλύσεως τοῦ πολέμου

A.P.29.i- iii 411
(ἐκάντος τὸν ἁνωπὸς τῶν ἄνω καθολικοῦ, And. I. 410 Myst. 96-8)
quoted as 196.12 (all MSS; e<T>[3]>Τ>5, Gomme); Se Toutouvace; arou^ otp a.Τ;r)c xaJ av xa6'
(3ouAsi5oaa6at, 'av xuira-
1:6 v ij.ev ὑπὲρ του Ἀρχάπολεος του Ἀθηναίων)

[Plj.X.Or. 411/0 833 E-F](quoted as 196.12) ετεχθύν, MSS)

And. I. Myst. 96-8 410
(quoted as 196.12) ετεχθύν; τάδε Δημόφαντος

Ibid. 77-9 405
ὑπερδοσάθαι τὸν ὄλιμπον with first clause

Ibid. 83-4 403
ἐτέχθυν

Ath. IV. 171 E 366/5 or 323/2

[Plj.X.Or. 307/6 SEE IG ii 457 IN TABLE D]

CONTENTS

Ref. Date Formulae

Year’s truce with Sparta
To draft new constitution
Trial of Archeptolemus and Antiphon
Safeguards for democracy
Reinstatement of ἄτιμον
Providing for νομοθεσία
Boule gives itself 5 days’ holiday for Apaturia
D.L. VII. 260/59 E; ὠτὸ Language bears signs of reediting Honours for Zeno

Jos. A.J. 106/5 E; <ε>τὸ; ὃς ὑπὸ τὸν κόμην court

On the mock decrees in Lucian see F.W. Householder, Jr., TAPA LXXI 1940; J. Delz, Lukians Kenntnis der athenischen Antiquitäten, 134-50.
Table I: Riders to Decrees

1. Riders proposed by mover of original motion: IG i² 94 (418/7), GHI 96 (405/4), 97.i (403/2) (Clisophus and his fellow-prytanes), 97.ii (?) (403/2), IG ii² 109 (?) (363/2), GHI 143 (363/2), IG ii² 182 (?) (before 353/2), 206 (349/8), 334 (C.335/4), pseudo-rider 682 (after 256/5). Rider by mover's son, IG ii² 448.1 (323/2).

2. Riders of real substance: GHI 31 (?) (458/7?), Hesp. XIV 4 (?) (C.450), HMA 41 (after 450), GHI 40 with Hesp. X 1941, 307-15 (C.449), GHI 42 (446/5), 44 (C.445?) (for different interpretations of this rider see G.E.M. de Ste Croix ap. Jones, Athenian Democracy, 168, P.A. Brunt, Ancient Society & Institutions, 71), ATL D 19/HMA 69 (before 431), SEG X 60 (?) (C.430), ATL D 8 (426/5), SEG X 87 (?) (C.423/2), IG i² 94 (418/7), SEG XII 32 (418/7), GHI 74 (416/5?), GHI 86 (410/09), Svt 255 (378/7), GHI 139 (C.367?), IG ii² 176 (before 353/2). An amending νόμος of substance, IG ii² 140 (353/2), HMA 87 (425/4) a small point, but not purely routine.

3. Riders extending to further recipients some or all of the honours granted in the main decree: Hesp.XXI 3 (end C5), GHI 97. ii (403/2), IG ii² 32 (385/4), Svt.255 (378/7), IG ii² 84 (378-6), GHI 131.i (368/7) (see note at end of this table), 167 (347/6).

4. Riders making more or less routine additions (mostly in honorific decrees; some may deal with what was intentionally omitted from the original motion, but one or two certainly and perhaps many more are repairing accidental omissions):

   PUBLICATION - IG i² 84 (421/0), GHI 74 (416/5?), 96 (405/4), 97.ii (403/2), IG ii² 19 (394/3) (repeating from original motion), SIG 3 158. i (369/8), IG ii² 109 (363/2), 206 (349/8), 232 (340/39), 289 (before 336/5) (publication at private expense?), 373 (322/1).
INVITATION TO PRYTANEUM - GHI 97.i (403/2), IG ii^2 19 (394/3), GHI 116 (386), IG ii^2 109 (363/2), all repeating from original motion; GHI 96 (405/4), IG ii^2 182 (before 353/2), 206 (349/8), 265 (before 336/5).

RIGHT OF ΠΡΟΣΩΠΟΣ AND/OR PROTECTION FROM INJUSTICE - SEG X 76 (425/4), IG ii^2 80 (before 378/7), SIG^3 158.i (369/6), IG ii^2 188 (?) (before 353/2), 373 (322/1).

ΓΗΣ/ΟΙΚΙΑ ΕΥΧΕΛΙΣ, &c - SEG x 84.i (424/3) (ἄτελεία, άλλο ἄγαθον) (cf. J. Pečirka, The Grant of Enktesis, 2-4), 91 (421/0 (ἐγκτεσις, άλλο ἄγαθον) (cf. Pečirka, op.cit., 8-12), IG ii^2 8 (424/3 or c.386) (motivation, ἐγκτεσις καθάπερ τοις ἄλλοις προέζωνοις ) 80 (before 378/7) (ἄτελεία, ἐγκτεσις, judicial privileges καθάπερ τοις ἄλλοις προέζωνοις ), 265 (before 336/5) (same as 80), 373 (322/1) (olive crown, ἐγκτεσις).

Perhaps likely to be genuine additions:

Addition to other honours of ΜΕΤΙΚ PRIVILEGES - IG ii^2 218 (346/5);
of status of ΕΥΒΡΕΤΕΙΗΣ - SEG X 76 (425/4);
of PROXEITY - GHI 116 (386), IG ii^2 235 (340/39);
of CITIZENSHIP - IG ii^2 19 (394/3), 109 (363/2).

Certainly to be thought of as corrections:

prytanes to δοῦναι ψήφον for citizenship grant - IG ii^2 448.i (323/2);
thesmothetae to hold a δοκιμασία δωρεάν - pseudo-rider IG ii^2 682 (after 256/5); revised motivation for honours - GHI 116 (386);
cf. a manifest verbal correction - GHI 90 (408/7).

5. Riders following up open clause in probouleuma: SEG XII 37.i (407/6), and probably GHI 173 (0.342).

NOTE. The rider to GHI 97.i simply repeats two clauses, one of them καθάπερ ἦ βουλή προβουλεύσασα [καὶ τὸν ὤξων δολὴν γνεῖς, from the substantive motion (by the same man): perhaps the rider is to repair an unintentional omission, and the secretary has altered the main decree accordingly while preserving the rider (so Jones, 115; cf. GHI 90.
7-8 with 26 sq., SEG XII 37, 7-8 with 58 sq.). Miller, de Decretis Atticis, 46 sq., followed Reifferscheid in claiming that here and in GHI 131.i the true purpose of the rider is to delete those clauses which are not repeated: this I find very hard to believe. In GHI 131.i Tod thought that the purpose of the rider was to extend the honours to further recipients (GHI, II, p. 97); alternatively, if as some have supposed the ambassadors of 31-3 are identical with those of 24-5, I presume the point of the rider will be to have them named in the decree and/or to read "Lesbos" for "Mytilene".

For IG ii² 19, GHI 116 and IG ii² 109, where the rider includes a repetition of the invitation to the prytaneum, Miller's solution (p. 51) was similar but not identical: he did not suggest that any clauses in the probouleuma were in fact to be rejected, but he nevertheless thought that the invitation was repeated to ensure that no one supposed the clause was to be rejected. I know no satisfactory explanation of these riders.

Table J: Clauses requiring Immediate Action (άςτύχα μελα)

I use SUPERIOR LETTERS to indicate: Α αςτυχα or αςτυχα μελα, Ε ην. In other decrees there is no advetb of immediacy).

1. In the ecclesia, indicating an open clause in an otherwise specific probouleuma or ευγγραμμα or motion produced from the floor of the house, and proving nothing of the origin of the notion: GHI 61, 5 sq. with 29 sq. A; IG i² 88, 1-5; GHI 77A, 1-3 A; SEG XII 37, 56-3 (in manifest probouleuma)* GHI 114, 13 sq. with 22 sq. (ετυ, ετυ A; 166, 5 sq A; 173, 33-5*; IG ii² 360, 62-3 with 35 sq., 75 with 17 sq (probouleumata); Ε 6, 18-20 (ετυ, ετυ).

(* In SEG XII 37 and GHI 173 the resultant decision is presented in a rider (RP) instead of the more usual bare footnote).
2. In the ecclesia, ordering the herald to make a vow on the spot: IG ii² 30 (ὁτα); GHI 144 (ἐπιβασκω, mention of ὀμημα and probouleuma, ὤτα); GHI 146 (ἐπιβασκω, ὤτα).

3. In the ecclesia, proving nothing:
   (a) men to be elected for some job - ΗΗΑ 30, 4 sqq (ἐνυπροφατ); GHI 42, 45-7; IG ii² 243, 12-14; GHI 123, 72-5 (ἐπιβασκω, ὤτα); 156, 4-6 (ἐπιβασκω); IG ii² 204 5 sqq with 74 sqq; 244, 28 sqq (νῦνος); 360, 37 sqq with 46-7 (ὑτό: enlarging on probouleuma); 409, 10 sqq; 555, 16 sqq. ([ὑτό] unnecessarily restored); 646, 40 sqq (ὑτο, ὤτο); 648, 6 sqq with 15-16; 653, 42 sqq (ὑτο, ὤτο); 672, 36-7 H with 43 (ἐπιβασκω, ὤτο but second copy has ὤτο); 682, 84 sqq H with 98 sqq(PF); Add 687, 48 sqq with 68-9 (ὑτο, ὤτο); 793, 8-11 with 21-2; Hesp VI 3 + XIII 1944, pp. 250-4, 11.5-6 with 23; IG ii² 839, 25 sqq with 47 sqq (ἐτο,PF); iv² 84, 38 sqq with 45-6 (ὑτο); also D.L. VII. 11 H with 12.
   (b) instructions to men in an official position - Τ.ΙV.118.xiv (ὑτο, MSS)
   GHI 97, 21-2 (ἐπιβασκω; RP); 142, 42-5 (ἐπιβασκω, ὤτο); IG ii² 148, 11 (?); 204, 34-5. cf 174, 5-11 (ἐπιβασκω; [RP])
   (herald to make proclamation ἐν τοι ἀδετηκα μάλα ἐν ζωτει [ἀγώνι]).

4. In the ecclesia, giving instructions or authority to boule: GHI 103, 17 sqq (ἐτο but ecclesia must have ratified); 137, 14 sqq (ἐπιβασκω).

5. In the boule: IG ii² 223 B, 2, 14; 840, 19 sqq with 32 sqq.

6. Footnotes implying a lost clause requiring immediate action: ATL D 21, 17-18 (type 1); SEG XII 32, 5-6 (type 1); GHI 121, 16 sqq (type 3a).

Table K: Κλλο διαδοθοι Clauses

Several Athenian decrees contain a clause in which further benefits are offered to an honorand: εἶναι δε ἀπτοι καὶ Κλλο παρε τοι δημου εὑρεσθαι διαδοθον ὅτου ἐν δοκηι δεινος εἶναι, vel simile quid (for verbal variations, see IG ii² IV i index, p.51.ii,s.v. εὑρεσθαι).

This normally takes the form either of an OPEN CLAUSE in which the proposer
SEG X 84 424/3 5-7 προσα[γ]αγόν[τον αύτόν ηοι οτιρατε]οι καὶ
hoi πρυτα]νεις πρὸς τῇμ βο[λὲν καὶ τὸν ὃ]μον
σύρονται ἥτι ἀν ὁ]μαται δαχῶν taken up in RP

SEG XII 37.ii 407/6 56 καὶ ὑπ]ρ[ισκοσσα]θεὶς αὐτός παρὰ τῷ ὅ]μοι τῷ
Ἄθηναιν ἥτι ἀν ὁ]μαται δαχῶν ἂδων ὅ]μοι (P.J.R.; published
text δαχὸ]ν τῇ]ν βουλῇ) (RP takes up different point)

GHI 97.ii 403/2 ετβητό 20-1 OPEN CLAUSE, taken up in RP
143 363/2 ετβητό ; PF 17-18 OPEN CLAUSE, taken up in RP
IG ii2 169 223c Ref.353/2 [ὅ]το 6 sq Price at promise rest.
232 340/39 PF haesitanter Kirchner
235 340/39 14-13 OPEN CLAUSE (referring to
demος: almost a proboleuma)

330 ii 336/5 ετβ ; [ἐτβ] 12 sq Price at promise rest.
turning at 42 sq into proboleuma con-
424 aft.336/5 taining simply this OPEN CLAUSE
360 iv 330/29 CPF small fragment with OPEN CLAUSE
6 325/4 PF 62 sq Price at promise rest.
415 0.330/29 ετβητό ; PF 75 sq Price at promise rest.

available).

provides for further benefits to be added to his own, or of a FUTURE

because of its honor and loyalty to Athens. The

table which follows lists Ἕλλας ὥριόν

clauses in decree

published in IG ii and IG ii only (though I cite more recent texts when

ends).
20-2 OPEN CLAUSE

23 OPEN CLAUSE (decree very fragmentary)

23-5 OPEN CLAUSE

1-4 OPEN CLAUSE; 5 sqq new decree (small fragment)

13-14 OPEN CLAUSE (narrow fragment)

5 sqq [\(\text{καὶ ἄλλο εὐρεσθαι ἤδη τοῦ δεη[ταί δειαθήν, καί}

κράτο[ς αὐτ[ῳ [ε[πιν }κρ[δς τὴν βουλὴν καὶ] τὸ

δῆμον μετ[α τὰ τερ[δ]. FUTURE PROMISE crossed with

κράτος- clause

4-6 FUTURE PROMISE

61-3 OPEN CLAUSE for further benefit from boule ὑπὸ δῆμος
agonothete praised now; 20-2 promised further benefit after ἡμηναι

28 sqq FUTURE PROMISE

27-8 FUTURE PROMISE

17 sqq FUTURE PROMISE

48 sqq FUTURE PROMISE

8 sqq FUTURE PROMISE
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Segment</th>
<th>Text</th>
<th>Future Promise</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>861</td>
<td>end C3</td>
<td>ιττβκτδ</td>
<td>24-6 OPEN CLAUSE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>862</td>
<td>end C3</td>
<td>PF</td>
<td>8-9 FUTURE PROMISE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>864</td>
<td>C.200</td>
<td>δτ[δ]</td>
<td>17 sq q FUTURE PROMISE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>926</td>
<td>beg. C2</td>
<td>PF</td>
<td>11-13 FUTURE PROMISE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>844</td>
<td>iii</td>
<td>193/2</td>
<td>68-70 FUTURE PROMISE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>891</td>
<td>188/7</td>
<td>[ιτ]δ; οτδ</td>
<td>15-17 FUTURE PROMISE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>892</td>
<td>188/7</td>
<td>(ιττβκτδ ; lacuna prob. containing beginning of fresh decree)</td>
<td>12 sq q FUTURE PROMISE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEG XVI 84</td>
<td>188/7</td>
<td>[ε]ττβκτδ</td>
<td>23-5 FUTURE PROMISE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEG XXI 435</td>
<td>187/6</td>
<td>PF</td>
<td>8-9 FUTURE PROMISE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IG ii² 907</td>
<td>C.170</td>
<td>PF</td>
<td>10 sq q FUTURE PROMISE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C.170</td>
<td>PF</td>
<td>15-17 FUTURE PROMISE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>980</td>
<td>C.170</td>
<td>[ιτβ]κτδ; PF</td>
<td>17-19 FUTURE PROMISE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>982</td>
<td>mid C.2</td>
<td>PF</td>
<td>20 sq q FUTURE PROMISE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEG XIX 108</td>
<td>122/1</td>
<td>ιττβκτδ ; PF</td>
<td>13-15 FUTURE PROMISE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IG ii² 1023</td>
<td>end C2</td>
<td>PF</td>
<td>96 OPEN CLAUSE (cosmetes of ephebi)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1028 ii</td>
<td>100/99</td>
<td>οτδ; PF</td>
<td>23 sq q FUTURE PROMISE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>102-3 OPEN CLAUSE (cosmetes of ephebi)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The OPEN CLAUSE occurs almost always with formulae of the probouleumatic type (IG ii² Add. 687 + 686 (267/6) is the only instance with non-probouleumatic formulae: it is also unique in providing for further benefits from the boule or demos - so that this is not a pure open clause but looks ahead to future meetings of the boule or ecclesia). But open clauses are possible in non-probouleumatic motions, and we cannot use the clause to argue a probouleumatic origin for decrees with no other indicating formulae. The open clause, like other indications that the demos might be expected to make up its own mind on a point, is very rare after the end of the fourth century.

The FUTURE PROMISE is found principally in the third and second centuries: probouleumatic decrees predominate (as in all enactments of the period) but there are some non-probouleumatic decrees containing this clause.
I include in this list only those works which are cited in the
notes to this thesis, and of them I exclude (i) standard editions
of literary texts cited only for their text or translation and
(ii) publications and republications of inscriptions except when
there is matter of particular relevance in the commentary.
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A. Area of Bouleuterium in the Last Quarter of the Sixth Century (Hesp. Supp. IV 1940, Fig. 13)

B. Area of Bouleuterium at the End of the Sixth Century (Hesp. Supp. IV 1940, Fig. 32)

C. Area of Bouleuterium in the Middle of the Fifth Century (with Additions to the Early Third Century) (Hesp. Supp. IV 1940, Fig. 62)

D. Area of Bouleuterium in the First Century A.D. (with the Addition of the West Annexe) (Hesp. Supp. IV 1940, Fig. 63)

E. Old Bouleuterium: Restoration of Interior Arrangements (P.J.R.)

F. New Bouleuterium: Restoration of Interior Arrangements (W. A. MCDONALD, The Political Meeting Places of the Greeks, Plate XVIII)

Plans A - D are reproduced by kind permission of the Publications Committee of the American School of Classical Studies at Athens; Plan F is reproduced by kind permission of the Johns Hopkins Press.
PLAN A

Area of Bouleuterium

in the Last Quarter of the Sixth Century

Hesp. Supp. IV 1940, Fig. 13
PLAN B

Area of Bouleuterium
at the End of the Sixth Century

Hesp. Supp. IV 1940, Fig. 32
PLAN C
Area of Bouleuterium
in the Middle of the Fifth Century
(with Additions to the Early Third Century)

Hesp. Supp. IV 1940, Fig. 62
"The second room from the south in the Hellenistic metron should possibly be restored with a solid back wall, hence with a te-trid-like scheme" (Addenda, Hesp. Supp. IV, p. v). It is thus restored by J. Travlos, Hesp. Supp. VIII 1949, Fig. 2, facing p. 390, and in subsequent Agora publications.
1. ἐστία
2. βῆμα
3. δρύφακτοι
4. Prytanes' benches
5. κιγκλίδες (?)

PLAN E
Old Bouleuterium
Restoration of Interior Arrangements (P.J.R.)
PLAN F
New Bouleuterium
Restoration of Interior Arrangements

W. A. McDONALD, The Political Meeting Places of the Greeks, Plate XVIII