Researches in Athenian and Delian Documents. I.

By William Scott Ferguson.

1. *The Priest of Artemis.*

The priest of Artemis for Kimon's archonship (237/6) was Διονυσόδωρος Σημαχίδης¹⁾. Semachidai belonged to the tribe Antiochis (XII). For the following year (Ekphantos 236/5), the priest was Ἀντιδωρος Ἀντιδώρου Περγασῆθεν²⁾. At this time Pergase belonged to Antigonis³⁾ (I). The tribes of these two priests are seen thus to follow one another in the official order. Is it probable that this was the case otherwise?

Artemis Kalliste was worshipped in Athens in a shrine which lay outside the Dipylon gate, by the side of the road which led thence to the Academy⁴⁾. She had also the epithet Ariste. Besides the two inscriptions which give us the two priests above mentioned only one other document has a reference to Kalliste. This was found by Mylonas during the excavations conducted by him in the Dipylon region in 1890⁵⁾, but was published for the first time by Wilhelm in the *Εφημερίς Ἀρχαιολογική* for 1905⁶⁾. It yields nothing but the name. At the same time, and in the same region, however, were found two other inscriptions, now published in IG II, 630 b and IG II, 1620 e. Of these the first is a decree passed by the Soteriastai in honor of the founder of their club. The stone on which it was cut was placed in the temenos of the Soteira. This temenos Mylonas unwittingly found⁷⁾, and in it was an altar to which belongs a *bathron* with the second (late) inscription: Ἀρτέμιδι Σωτείρα[ι] Μάκων ἀνέθηκε Μάκωνος. Soteira was accordingly Artemis⁸⁾. Were Artemis Soteira and Artemis Kalliste joined in a common cult administered by a single priest? Apparently; for the temenos of Artemis Soteira has been discovered just where Pausanias locates the shrine of Artemis Kalliste, and third century B.C. inscriptions referring to Kalliste have been found in the same vicinity with first century inscriptions re-

A. The writer begs to acknowledge the assistance received from the Carnegie Institution of Washington in the prosecution of these researches.

1) Wilhelm, *Εφ. Ἀρχ.* 1905 pp. 237 ff., esp. pp. 240 ff. — 2) *Ibid.*, p. 219.

3) Kirchner, *Rh. Mus.* 59 1904 pp. 294 ff. — 4) Pausanias I 29 2.

5) *Πρακτικά* 1890 pp. 19 ff., p. 24; cf. *Εφ. Ἀρχ.* 1893 p. 59.

6) Pp. 215 and 220 ff. — 7) Wilhelm, *Εφ. Ἀρχ.* 1905 pp. 240 f.

8) *Εφ. Ἀρχ.* 1893 p. 59.

ferring to Soteira. Another document (IG II, 618 b), found in the same general neighborhood, refers to the temenos simply as the *ιερόν* of Artemis. It is unlikely that two distinct shrines of Artemis, each tended by a state priest, were located within a stone's throw of one another.

The priest of (Artemis) Soteira in Menandros' archonship was the founder and *archeranistes* of the Soteriastai, Διόδωρος Σωκράτους Ἀρχ[ιδ-*ναῖος*]. Menandros was archon in 35/4 B.C., if the following calculation, made by Kirchner¹⁾, is conclusive. The group Euthydomos, Nikandros, Diokles of Melite, Menandros, Kallikratides, Theopeithes is inseparable²⁾. Euthydomos, furthermore, was in office in the Pythian year³⁾, *i. e.* in the third year of an Olympiad. On the other hand, in a decree of Kallikratides' year the Ἀριωνῆα τὰ Παναθηναῖα Ἀριωνίου Θεοῦ νέον Διονύσο[ν] are mentioned. This locates the fifth archon of the group in the period 39—32 B.C.⁴⁾. These conditions make 42/1 and 38/7 alone possible for Euthydomos. Kirchner excludes 42/1, for some reason not clear to me, and hence assigns Menandros as above stated, to 35/4⁵⁾. Now, the priesthood of Asklepios was due to the tribe Ptolemais in the year 35/4⁶⁾. The same tribe gave, as we see, the priest of Artemis; for Aphidnai, the deme of Diodoros, belonged to Ptolemais. Is this a mere coincidence, or did the official order exist for the priests of Artemis, and did it coincide at this time with that of the priests of Asklepios? In the middle of the third century there was no such coincidence; for, while the priesthood of Artemis fell in 237/6 and 236/5 to Antiochis and Antigonis, the priesthood of Asklepios and the prytany secretaryship fell for the same years to Antigonis and Demetrias.

The conclusions towards which the data above given tend, namely the existence of the official order for the priests of Artemis in the third and first centuries and its coincidence in the latter time with the official order of the priests of Asklepios, are far from demonstrated. They need the confirmation which the discovery of new priests can alone bring. Should they find such confirmation, then we have strengthened by accumulative evidence the assignment of the archons Kimon and Ekphantos to 237/6 and 236/5, and definitely fixed the group Euthydomos-Theopeithes in 38/7—33/2 B.C. Are other priests of Artemis discoverable?

We have left undiscussed the lack of coincidence between the tribe of the priest of Artemis and that of the priest of Asklepios in the third century. Now we must ask the question: why was the former taken from Antiochis in 237/6 and the latter from Antigonis?

1) *Rh. Mus.* 53 1898 p. 391 n. 1. — 2) IG II 5 630 b.

3) Colin. *Le culte d'Apollon Pythien à Athènes* pp. 143 ff. = BCH XXX 1906 pp. 304 ff.

4) Koehler, IG II 482. — 5) PA No. 5567.

6) *The Priests of Asklepios* (Univ. of Calif. Publ., Class. Phil. I) pp. 131 ff.

2. *The Priests of the Foreign Gods at Delos.*

We get an answer through studying the tribal relations of the priests placed by Athens in the temples at Delos in the years between 167 and 88 B.C. The total list of them is as follows:

Priest of Apollo
 Priest of Artemis
 Priest of Zeus Kynthios and Athena Kynthia
 Priest of Dionysos
 Priest of Asklepios
 Priest of Roma
 Priest of Hekate?
 Priest of Herakles?
 Priest of Anios
 Priest of Sarapis
 Priest of Aphrodite Hagne
 Priest of the Great Deities, Dioskuri, Kabiri.

The *locus classicus* for these priests is the list of subscribers to the Delphian Pythaïs published in IG II₂ 985 — a roll of officeholders for the period of the first *ennecteris*¹⁾, 103/2—95/4 B.C. All the priests did not subscribe every year: hence the omission of a title is no evidence for the non-existence of a priesthood. Thus the priest of Asklepios and the priest of the Great Deities do not appear anywhere among the subscribers. The Delian inscriptions are equally incomplete. Thus I have been unable to find the tribe and year of any priest of Artemis, Anios, Zeus Kynthios, or Roma, who held office prior to 103/2. Nor have I succeeded in ascertaining such data for two priests of Asklepios or Dionysos. Hence there is no use in studying the tribal relations of these priests now. And I omit from consideration all the other priests who belong after the year 103/2; for, as is well known²⁾, the obligarchic revolution in Athens in this year was accompanied by the abandonment of allotment and rotation of office, and hence also of the official order of the tribes in the distribution of magistracies. Accordingly, all inferences from the tribal relations of the priests as shown in IG II₂ 985 are invalid for the earlier period of Athenian occupation of Delos.

On the other hand, we can establish the tribe and year for several of the earlier priests of Aphrodite Hagne and the Great Deities, and for the larger half of the priests of Sarapis. They are combined in the following table with the names of the Athenian archons and the Delian *epimeletai*³⁾:

1) The reason for beginning the *ennecteris* in 103/2 is given in *Klio* IV pp. 1 ff.: cf. Dürrbach, BCH XXX pp. 294 ff. The Pythaïs had nothing to do with the Pythia; for it was certainly sent in 128/7 and 97/6. 97/6 was the sixth year of the *ennecteris*: perhaps it was arranged to send the Pythaïs regularly at that time; but probably the year within the *ennecteris* was not fixed.

2) *The Oligarchic Revolution at Athens of the Year 103/2*, *Klio* IV pp. 1 ff.

3) I omit such *epimeletai* as cannot be assigned to a precise year.

Year	Archon	Epimeletes of Delos	No.	Priest of Great Deities	Priest of Sarapis	Priest of Aphrodite
166/5			5			
165/4	Pelops		6			
164/3	Euerg —		7			
163/2	Erastos		8			
162/1	Poseidonios		9			
161/0	Aristolas		10	Εὐβουλος Δημη- τρίου Μαραθω- νιος		
160/9			11			
159/8	Aristaichmos		12			
158/7	Anthesierios		1			
157/6	Kallistratos		2			
156/5	Mnesitheos		3			
155/4			4			
154/3	Zaleukos ?	Πανσίμαχος Δη- μοκλέωνος ἐκ Κο- λωνοῦ	5			
153/2	Phaidrias	Βύπτακος? Πέρ- ρον Λαμπρεῦς	6			
152/1	Lysiades		7			
151/0	Archon		8			
150/9	Epikrates		9			
149/8	Theaitetos		10			
148/7	Aristophon		11			
147/6		Ἡγησίας Φιλο- στράτου Θυμαί- τάδης?	12	Ἡραῖος Ἀπολλο- δώρου Σουνιεύς?		
146/5			1			
145/4			2			
144/3	Meton		3	Ἀρίστων Ἀρίστω- νος Στειρ[ιεύς]		
143/2			4			
142/1		Πρότιμος Ἀωσι- θέου ἐκ Μυρρι- νούτης	5			
141/0	Dionysios	Δράκων Ὀφέλου Βατήθεν	6			Θεόδωρος Θεοδώρου Αἰθαλίδης
140/9	Hagnotheos		7			
139/8			8			
138/7	Timarchos		9			
137/6	Herakleitos		10			
136/5			11			
135/4	Nikomachos	Φίλων Τ[... ἐκ Κολ]ωνοῦ	12			
134/3			1			
133/2	Metrophanes		2			
132/1	Ergokles		3			
131/0	Epikles		4			
130/9	Demonstratos		5			

Year	Archon	Epimeletes of Delos	No.	Priest of Great Deities	Priest of Sarapis	Priest of Aphrodite
129/8	Lykiskos		6		Σωκλῆς Ἀφροδισίου Φλυεύς	
128/7	Dionysios	Ἀμμώνιος Ἀμμωνίου Ἀναφλύστιος	7	Γάιος Γαίου Ἀχαρνέες	Εὐθύμαχος Ἐργοχάρον ἐκ Κεραιμίων	
127/6	Theodorides		8		Ἀντίσχος Πανσανίου Ἀχαρνέες	Φιλοκλῆς Ζήνωνος Σφῆτιος
126/5	Diotimos	Θεόφραστος Ἡρακλείδου Ἀχαρνέες	9	Σωσικλῆς Σωκλέους ἐκ Κοίλης	Ἀθηναγόρας Ἀθηναγόρου Μελιτεῦς	
125/4	Iason		10		Θεόφρατος	
124/3	Nikias and Isigenes		11		Δημήτριος Ἐρμησίωνος Μαραθῶνιος	
123/2	Demetrios		12		Δημόφιλος Πολυκλέους Ἀλωπεκῆθεν	
122/1	Nikodemos		1		Διοκλῆς Διοκλέους Τυρμειδῆς	
121/0	Xenon		2		Δημήτριος Ἡλιόδωρον Περγασῆθεν	
120/9	Eumachos		3		Δάμων ἐγ Μυρρινούτης Τήλεφος Ὀτρυνεῦς	
119/8	Hipparchos		4		Διονύσιος Μηρίου Παιανιεύς	
118/7	Lenaïos	Ξένων Ἀσκληπιάδου Φυλάσιος	5		Στασέας Φιλοκλέους Κολωνῆθεν	
117/6			6		Ζώϊλος Ζωΐλου Φλυεύς	
116/5			7		Στρατόδαμος Θορίκιος Διονύσιος Διονυσίου Σφῆτιος	
115/4	Nausias		8		Γάιος Γαίου Ἀχαρνέες	
114/3		Ἰππάρχος Τιμοκλέους Πειραιεύς	9	— Μανίου Πειραιεύς	Ἀριστίων Εὐδόξου Μελιτεῦς	Σέλενκος Ἀχαρνέες?
113/2	Paramonos		10		Νικόστρατος Πειραιεύς Καλλίστρατος Ἐρσιάδης	
112/1	Dionysios		11		Σέλενκος Ἀνδρονίκου Ραμνοῦσιος	
111/0	Sosikrates	Διονύσιος Δημητρίου Ἀναφλύστιος	12		Δημήτριος Δημητρίου Ἀναφλύστιος	
110/9	Polykleitos	Διονύσιος Νίκωνος Παλληνεύς	1		Σωσίων Εὐμένωνος Οἰναῖος	Δημόνικος Εὐρήμωνος Ἀναφλύστιος Μενέλαος??
109/8	Iason	Καλλίμαχος Ἐπιζράτου Λευκονοεύς?	2		Διονύσιος Ζήνωνος Κηφισεύς	
108/7	Herakleides	Πύρρος Πύρρου Λαμπρεῦς	3		Δίκαιος Δικαίου Ἰωνίδης	

Year	Archon	Epimeletes of Delos	No.	Priest of Great Deities	Priest of Sarapis	Priest of Aphrodite
107/6	Aristarchos	Ἀριστάρχου	4		Θεόμνηστος Θεογένου Κυθαθηναίεύς	Ἀισχρίων Αἰσχροίωτος Μελιτεὺς
106/5	Agathokles		5		Ἀπολλοδώρος Ἀπολλοδώρου Κρωπίδης	Νικόστρατος Δημαρέτου Λαμπρεὺς
105/4	Menoites	Σωκράτης Ἀριστίωνος ἐξ Οἴου	6		Ἰππόδικος Ἰππονίκου Φλυεύς	Ζώϊλος Ζώϊλου Φλυεύς
104/3	Sarapion	Ἀνδρέας Ἀνδρέου Πειραιεύς	7			Σίβιλος Σωσιπάτρου Κηφισιεύς
103/2		— — Παιανιεύς?			Ἀθηναγόρας — ελεν — Κηφισιεύς?	
102/1	Theokles	Διοσκουρίδης			Λέων Ἀγαθάρχου Μαραθῶνιος?	
101/0	Echekrates	Θεόδοτος Διοδώρου Σοννιεύς		Ἡλιάναξ Ἀσκληπιοδώρου	Ἀ — —	
100/9	Medeios	Καλλίστρατος — εὺς			Θεόβιος Διονυσίου Ἀχαρνέως Κυθήνων Διονυσίου Μελιτεὺς?	
99/8	Theodosios	Σαραπίων Σαραπίωνος Μελιτεὺς			Φιλόξενος Φιλοξένου Σοννιεύς?	
98/7	Prokles	Πολύκλειτος Ἀλεξάνδρου Φλυεύς			Ἀθηναῖος [Διογένους?] Κυθαθηναίεύς?	Θεόβιος Διονυσίου Ἀχαρνέως
97/6	Argeios	Μήδειος Μηδείου Πειραιεύς				
96/5	Argeios					
95/4	Herakleitos	Ἀριστίων Σωκράτους ἐξ Οἴου ¹⁾			Εὐκταῖος Εὐρυπτολέμον Εἰταῖος	
94/3	Demochares	Ἀροπος Γλαύκου Πειραιεύς			Ζήνων Διοσκουρίδου Λαμπρεὺς?	
93/2		Ἐπικλῆς Ἐπικλέους Κρωπίδης			Μάρκος Ἐλενσίσιος?	
92/1	Diokles?	— ορος — Στειριεύς?			Ἀριστέας Ἀριστέου Μαραθῶνιος??	
91/0	Medeios	Ἀροπος Λέοντος [Μ]α[ραθῶ]-ν[ι]ο[ς]?			Φιλοκράτης Φιλοκράτου?	
90/9	Medeios					
89/8	Medeios				Φιλοκράτης Φιλοκράτου?	

1) Von Schoeffer (*De Deli insulae rebus* p. 226. 3) has restored IG II 985 C II 8 as follows: [Ἀριστίων Σωκράτους ἐξ Οἴου], and, since the title [ἐπιμελητῆς Δ]ῆλον appears immediately above in line 7, he conjectured that Aristion was governor-general of Delos in 98/7 (Prokles). Since we knew from the Delian documents that Polykleitos, son of Alexandros, of Phlya was *epimeletes* in 98/7. Homolle suggested that the latter was *suffectus* (BCH VIII p. 127; Kirchner, PA No. 11978).

But the priest of Zeus Kynthios for 98/7 was Sarapion, son of Sotades, of Aigilia (Kirchner, PA No. 12561); while the priest for the year in which Aristion was *epimeletes* was Ἀχαρνέως (Loewy, *Inscr. griech. Bild.* No. 247). Is it thinkable that here too one was *suffectus*?

Rather we should supply [Ἐπὶ Μενόιτου] ἄρχοντος in line 3 of IG II 985 C II and regard the officials of lines 3 ff. as belonging to 105/4. Then we should restore line 8 [Σωκράτης Ἀριστίωνος ἐξ Οἴου]. See Kirchner, PA No. 11978 for a similar restoration.

The number in the fourth column indicates the position in the official order of the tribes to which the priest of the Great Deities belonged. It does more than that, however: when reduced by one and by two it indicates the same fact for the priest of Sarapis and the priest of Aphrodite respectively. In other words, the tribe which gave the priest of the Great Deities in one year gave the priest of Sarapis in the following year, and the priest of Aphrodite in the next after that again. Of course, we do not possess data sufficient to demonstrate this relation between the three priesthoods for many years in the period 166/5—103/2. But from CIG II 2270 it results that Eubulos of Marathon was priest of the Great Deities in or about 161/0, while the location of Gaïos of Acharnai in 128/7¹⁾, and of Sosikles of Koile in 126/5²⁾, is quite certain. So, too, we know beyond a doubt that Philokles of Sphettos was priest of Aphrodite in 127/6³⁾ and Demonikos of Anaphlystos in 110/9⁴⁾. From these data, therefore, we are warranted in constructing a speculative scheme for the entire earlier period.

We know that the official order was abandoned in the case of the priests of Sarapis in approximately 103/2. Thus Ptolemais was due for 105/4, and Hipponikos of Phlya was priest. In 100/99 Aiantis was due, but Theobios of Acharnai was priest. The interruption had obviously occurred in the meanwhile, and in an article in the fourth volume of *Klio*⁵⁾ I have shown reasons for believing that it took place in 103/2. We do not know at what time the official order was given up for the priests of the Great Deities⁶⁾. For the priests of Aphrodite the end came between 110/9 and 107/6. Thus, while Aigeis should have received this priesthood in 107/6, Aischrion of Melite was chosen⁷⁾; and with a similar disregard of tribal rights, Nikostratos of Lamptraï and Zoïlos of Phlya succeeded one another, perhaps in 106/5 and 105/4⁸⁾. We are not on this account war-

Aristion, son of Sokrates, ἐξ Οἴου was the son of the *epimeletes* of 105/4 (Kirchner, PA No. 13119). Eutychedes, whose dated activity in Delos belongs to 116/5, 108/7, 106/5, 99/8?, was still at work in Aristion's year. Hence the father and son must have held the governor-generalship quite close together. Now, in 100/99, 96/5, and 95/4 Theobios, the son of Dionysios, of Acharnai was priest of Sarapis, Aphrodite, and Zeus Kynthios respectively. It is obvious that we have to restore the passage in Loewy (No. 247) thus: ἐπὶ ἐπαύρῳς [Θ]ε[οβίου Διονυσίου] Ἀχαρνέως, and place the *epimeleia* of Aristion, son of Sokrates, of Oion in 95/4.

1) CIG II 2296. — 2) BCH VII p. 370.

3) BCH VI p. 347; VII p. 367; VIII p. 131, n. 2 on p. 132.

4) BCH VI p. 489. — 5) P. 7.

6) Since this priest does not appear at all in IG II 2 985. and since Helianax figures in c. 101/0 as priest of Poseidon Aisios for life and of the Great Deities (BCH VII p. 349), it is possible that at this time annual tenure had been replaced by life tenure. — 7) Ἀθήν. IV p. 462.

8) *Ibid.* IV p. 460. The donor, Kleostratides, binds Nikostratos and Zoïlos to Aischrion = 107/6; cf. Ἀθήν. IV p. 461: so does the *demosios*. Eutychedes, who is common to the three priesthoods.

ted in doubting the maintenance of the official order for the fifty eight preceding years, the analogy of the priests of Sarapis being decisive on this point.

It thus appears that the way was left open for a man should he aspire to hold the three priesthoods in succession; for, had the same tribe received them all in the one year, a candidate could secure the three only after the lapse of twenty five years. This was objectionable, not so much, perhaps, from the disability it put upon individuals, as from the handicap it imposed upon those who were interested in the prosperity of the foreign cults. Wealthy men should be encouraged to hold the priesthoods, not debarred by restrictions, artificial at best, and quite unintelligible to orientals; for what did Syrians or Hieropolitans know of the democratic theory that all citizens should be advanced in turn to public trusts? In addition, there was a practical objection to placing unnecessary obstacles in the way of successive tenure of priesthoods. These charges belonged almost, if not quite, exclusively to the members of the Athenian settlement on Delos; for, whereas the holders of the higher insular magistracies meet us at every turn in the contemporary Athenian inscriptions, and were demonstrably sent from the capital, the priests are rarely found outside the Delian documents. Perhaps the distinction conferred by a priesthood was not sufficient to induce an Athenian to spend a year on the island, and return home feeling mean if he had not made some handsome gift to the shrine of which he had had charge. Perhaps the priesthoods were given over as perquisites to the kleruchs. At any rate the responsibility of attending to the *cultus*, of erecting temples, images, balustrades, exedras, and priests-houses, of paving courts and building walks and walls, of frescoing ceilings, and providing windows, doors, fountains, *etc.*, in a word, of equipping a new and expanding precinct, fell upon the devotees of the various gods in the first instance, but very heavily also upon the shoulders of the wealthy men in the colony; for to these the priesthoods were ordinarily left. Such men were relatively few in number. Upon this point we must not be misled by appearances. The recent proof that there were but 700 citizens in Delphi¹⁾ shows again that it does not take many grasshoppers to make a noisy orchestra. The Athenian kleruchy was, in fact, a small settlement, and we can be sure that there were not too many suitable men at hand each year for allotment to the priesthoods of the foreign deities. Hence the necessity of opening them in quick succession to the same person.

The reason for treating the priesthood of the Great Deities, Dioskuri, Kabiri — to give it its full title — (to which that of Poseidon Aisios was added later), the priesthood of Sarapis (to which fell the cult of Isis, Anubis, and Harpokrates), and the priesthood of Aphrodite Hagne (to which the worship of Adad and Atargatis was closely related) as a special unit was that they had as their collective function the care of all the

1) Bourguet. *L'administration financière du sanctuaire Pythique* pp. 44 f.

foreign deities recognized in Delos. They had nothing to do with the Apollo-Artemis-Leto precinct and its aggregate of native shrines. To them belonged a new precinct, with a complex of temples, located on the slope of Mt. Kynthos, by the edge of the Inopos ravine, at a slight distance from the old religious centre of the island. It is possible that Herakles, *i. e.* Melkarth, and Asklepios were regarded as foreign deities likewise¹⁾, and relegated to the same region. Hence we should like to have some data for establishing the tribal relations of the priests of these deities, but unfortunately we cannot be sure that a priest of Herakles existed at all, and we can make nothing out of the few references to the priest of Asklepios.

Since the priesthoods of the foreign gods formed a group by themselves we must not conclude that the mode of election used in their case was that employed for the other priesthoods in Delos. Here the most natural parallel is the priesthood of Asklepios in Athens itself, and the evidence at present available is quite against the use of the official order to distribute this priesthood in the second century B.C.²⁾. Such is also the case for the priesthood of Apollo in Delos. To be sure, only one priest prior to 103/2 can be assigned to a precise year, and this one³⁾, Dionysios, son of Demetrios, of Anaphlystos (111/0) came from the same tribe as that which in this year gave the priest of Sarapis and the prytany secretary. But Ares, the son of Ares, of Kephisia was priest of Apollo in the year (147/6?) in which Heraios, son of Apollodoros, of Sunion was priest of the Great Deities⁴⁾. Had the priest of Apollo belonged to the same tribe as the priest of Sarapis, Ares should have been registered, not in Erechtheis, but in Attalis. Hence, while the point is not definitely established, it seems most likely that the tribal order was disregarded in the selection of the priests of Apollo.

We have now answered the question with which we started our examination of the Delian priestships, and we can affirm confidently that the priest of Asklepios for 237/6 was taken from the tribe Antigonis, and the priest of Artemis from the tribe Antiochis, in order that — the arrangement of this year being taken as indicative of the general practice — it might be possible for the priests of Asklepios to offer themselves as candidates for the priesthood of Artemis in the following year. Otherwise they would have been obliged to wait for twelve years, and by that time an ambitious man was less likely to trouble himself with the petty duties of a priesthood.

3. *Chronologica.*

A. *Aristaichmos.* According as we reckon inclusively or exclusively,

1) Reinach, BCH VII pp. 333 and 366. — 2) *Priests of Asklepios* p. 144.

3) BCH XIII p. 372; CIG II 2298.

4) Ἀρχιμυλλῆς Ἀρχιμυλλέου Λαζιάδης was ὁ ἐπὶ τὰ ἱερά in this year: an Ἀρχιμυλλῆς Λαζιάδης was *hieropoios* in 152/1.

the archon Aristaichmos belongs to 159/8 or 160/59 B.C.¹⁾. Since it appears that Eubulos of Marathon was priest of the Great Deities in 161/0, and that he held the priesthood of Asklepios between that year and the archonship of Aristaichmos, in which he was priest of Dionysos²⁾, it is necessary to assign Aristaichmos to 159/8. Prior to the tenure of his priesthoods, Eubulos had headed the theoria sent by the kleruchs to the Panathenaia, and in this capacity won for his colony the first public award of a crown. Since the Great Panathenaia are probably meant, and the summer of 166 was entirely occupied with the turmoil of settling on the island, the theoria of Eubulos should be dated in 162/1. Eubulos is a striking case of a man who sought three priesthoods in succession.

B. *Meton*. Meton was provisionally assigned by S. Reinach³⁾ to the end of the second century, and by Kirchner to *post* 150. The priest of the Great Deities for his year was Ἀρίστων Ἀρίστωνος Στειριεύς, of the tribe Pandionis. Pandionis held this priestship in 156/5, 144/3, 132/1, 120/19, and 108/7 within the period possible for Meton. Of these the only year without an archon is 144/3⁴⁾.

C. *Dionysios*. From BCH VI p. 491 we learn the name of an archon Dionysios. From the fact that the archon for 128/7 is always designated Διονύσιος μετὰ Δυκίσκων Kirchner⁵⁾ rightly inferred that another Dionysios preceded 128/7 by a short interval. This Dionysios he found in BCH VI p. 491. The priest of Aphrodite Hagne for the archonship of Dionysios was Theodoros of Aithalidai (Leontis). Leontis had this priesthood prior to 128/7 in 129/8, 141/0, 153/2, and 165/4. Of these 141/0 is alone available. By dating Dionysios in 141/0 we have at the same time dated the *epimeletes*, Drakon, son of Ophelas, of Bate, and οἱ ἐπὶ τὰ ἱερά Arketos (son of Echedemos), of Kydathenaion and Hestaios (son of Theocharis), of Kerameikos. Both the *epimeletes* and οἱ ἐπὶ τὰ ἱερά are known elsewhere. Drakon, for example, was an ephebe in Antesterios' archonship (158/7)⁶⁾. He must have been *epimeletes* at the age of 35. That is rather young, and it must be admitted that a later date than 141/0 for Dionysios would be slightly preferable on prosopographical grounds. Thus the father of Arketos was a knight in 153/2⁷⁾. He could not have had a son sufficiently mature for a Delian magistracy much earlier than 141/0. Hestaios⁸⁾ was subsequently hoplite-general in 99/8. He too must have been quite a young man in 140⁹⁾.

1) Kirchner, *Gött. gel. Anz.* 1900 p. 462; cf. PA *Suppl.* No. 1641.

2) CIG II 2270. — 3) BCH VII p. 341. — 4) PA II p. 650. — 5) PA No. 4110.

6) IG II 445 Col. II 40. — 7) Kirchner, PA Nos. 6166 and 6165.

8) Theocharis, ὁ ἐπὶ τὰ ἱερά in 98/7, was probably the son of Hestaios, ὁ ἐπὶ τὰ ἱερά in 141/0 and hoplite-general in 99/8, not, as in Kirchner PA No. 7188, identical with Theocharis, *kosmetes* in 119/8 and herald of the Areopagos in 100/99.

9) It is probable that the office ἐπὶ τὰ ἱερά came early in the Athenian *cursus honorum*. It was rarely filled by people of whom we have knowledge in other connections.

D. *Xenon*. Xenon must be transferred from where he is now placed, in the neighborhood of 135—130 B. C.¹⁾, to c. 120 B. C. The *paidotribes* at Delos in the archonship of Xenon was Staseas, son of Philokles, of Kolone²⁾. This person was the director of a palaestra on the island³⁾, and as *paidotribes* put up a list of his ex-pupils who, while under his charge, had served as priests, *agonothetai*, *lampadarchs*, and *gymnasiarchs* ἐκ τῶν ἐλευθέρων παιδῶν τὰ Ἑρμαῖα⁴⁾. The main body of the catalogue was compiled doubtless in Xenon's archonship; for we have no evidence that Staseas or anybody else was *paidotribes* in Delos twice. However, the list was not all inscribed at that time; for a supplement of five names of *gymnasiarchs* was put to it later⁵⁾. The interval between the first draft and the additions was not a great one, since otherwise the catalogue would have been extended by more than five names. Now, the final draft was finished in or about the year 108/7 in the archonship of Herakleides; for among the additions are the names of Heliodoros and Dies, sons of Dies, Athenians, while among the ephebes for Herakleides' year are named the sons of Dies, Heliodoros and -ένης of Tyrmeidai⁶⁾. Heliodoros, an ephebe in 108/7, was a *παῖς* of the competitive age (12—19) between 114/3 and 107/6 at the outside. Hence the additions were not made prior to 114/3. On the other hand, the *paidotribai* for Herakleides' year were Staseas and Philokles, sons of the Staseas who published the list of his prize ex-pupils. This we learn through restoring the text which Dürrbach has published in the BCH for 1905⁷⁾. It should probably read as follows:

9 Νάξιος, Διοκλῆς (c. 19 letters) -ένης

10 Διήους Τυρ[μ]ε[ί]δης. Παιδοτριβούντων Σ]τασέου

11 καὶ Φιλοκλέους [τοῦ Στασέου Ἀθηναί]ων⁸⁾

vacat

12 Ἀπολλών[α οἷδε ἐνίκων κτλ.

It is likely that in 108/7 the sons had charge of the palaestra, their father having already died or retired. Hence Heliodoros cannot have issued from the palaestra of Staseas Sr. later than 109/8.

1) *The Athenian Archons* p. 73; Kirchner, PA No. 11323.

2) BCH XV p. 252 and XIX p. 511. Staseas is also known from several references in the Delian *graffiti* BCH XIII pp. 374 ff. and especially plates XII and XIII. He was apparently an athletic hero among the youth of the island.

3) In BCH XV p. 257 Staseas speaks of ἡ ἐαυτοῦ παλαίστρα. — 4) *Ibid.*

5) Fougères, BCH XV p. 25. — 6) BCH XXIX pp. 229 ff. — 7) *Loc. cit.*

8) This restoration demands that line 11 should be a trifle shorter than those preceding it. In favor of it we urge that it supplies the names of the *paidotribai*, which are not usually lacking in the Delian ephebic documents. Otherwise, the two genitives connected by καὶ are inexplicable. The space between lines 11 and 12 is quite natural, if with Ἀπολλών[α] a new list began. Of course, Ἀπολλωνι may be read Ἀπόλλωνι, or restored as Ἀπολλών[ος], instead of Ἀπολλών[α], but the latter is probably better; cf. BCH XXVIII p. 146; III p. 378.

We shall not go far astray if we place the *paidotribate* of Staseas Sr. in c. 121/0 and the completion of the list about eleven years later in c. 110/9. We have, accordingly, assigned Xenon to 121/0.

This being so, Epikrates, son of Epikrates, ephebe in Xenon's year, will be the grandson of the archon of 150/49, if he belongs to the same family at all. Iason, son of Seleukos, (of Paiania), ephebe in Xenon's year, will be the cousin of Seleukos, son of Jason, *gymnasiarch* in the list of Staseas. The colleague of Staseas in the *paidotribate* was Sotades of Aigilia. This will be the son of Sotades Σωτάδου of Aigilia, *agoranomos* in Zaleukos' archonship (c. 154). His brother Sarapion was priest of Zeus Kynthios in 98/7 B. C.¹⁾

The archonship was ordinarily held before the *epimeleia* of Delos: thus Dionysios, son of Demetrios, of Anaphlystos was archon in 128/7²⁾ and *epimeletes* in 110/0: Hipparchos was archon in 119/8 and *epimeletes* 114/3³⁾: Dionysios was archon in 112/1 and *epimeletes* in 110/9 and Polykleitos was archon in 110/9 and *epimeletes* in 98/7, if, indeed, they are the same: Sarapion was archon in 104/3 and *epimeletes* in 99/8: Medeios was archon in 100/99 and *epimeletes* in 97/6. So, too, Xenon, archon in 121/0, was *epimeletes* in 118/7. Staseas, son of Philokles, of Kolone, *paidotribes* in 121/0, was priest of Sarapis in 118/7. There is no difficulty anywhere.

E. *Sosikrates and Herakleides*. The only problem in the dating of these archons has been to decide to which two of the years 114/3, 111/0, 108/7, they belong. Thus, while I placed Herakleides in 114/3 and Sosikrates in 111/0⁴⁾, Kirchner put them in 111/0 and 108/7⁵⁾, neither of us having the means of making a sharp assignment. The matter is now settled definitely. The *epimeletes* of Delos for 111/0 was Dionysios, son of Demetrios, of Anaphlystos⁶⁾. From an inscription published by Dürrbach in 1905⁷⁾ we learn that the *epimeletes* for Herakleides' archonship was Pyrrhos of Lamptrai. Herakleides, accordingly, was not archon in 111/0. That year should, therefore, be assigned to Sosikrates — the fact that Neon of Aphidnai was *paidotribes*⁸⁾ in 108/7 and 107/6, as well as in Sosikrates' archonship, being decisive against 114/3. On the other hand, the official order locates Dikaïos, son of Dikaïos, of Ionidai as priest of Sarapis in 108/7⁹⁾. Now Dikaïos held this priestship ἐν τῷ ἐ[φ]...? κλ... οὐ

1) Kirchner. PA No. 12561.

2) BCH XXX p. 184: he was hoplite-general in 106/5 (BCH XXX p. 186).

3) He was general ἐπὶ τὸ ναυτικόν in 128/7 (BCH XXX p. 226).

4) *Cornell Studies* X p. 84. — 5) PA II p. 647. — 6) CIG II 2298.

7) BCH XXIX p. 229.

8) *Cornell Studies* X p. 82.

9) His general neighborhood is indicated by the fact that Eutychides (116/5 = Loewy, *Inscripfen griech. Bildhauer* No. 245 to 95/4 = *Ibid.* No. 247) was working in Delos during this priestship (Loewy, No. 244).

ἀρχοντος ἐνιαυτῷ[ε]¹). Homolle has already suggested 'Hρα]χλ[εῖδ]ου²), which is unquestionably right. Herakleides, consequently, belongs to 108/7.

F. Demochares. In the *Athenian Archons*³) I assigned Demochares to 108/7. The prime reason for so doing was that the secretary for his archonship was from Pandionis, and 108/7 was the only year available for such a secretary in the entire neighborhood. Kirchner⁴) objected that the presentation of a peplos to Athena was made only at the time of the Great Panathenaia in the third year of an Olympiad, yet this ceremonial was completed in Demochares' archonship. This had been Koehler's opinion⁵), and August Mommsen⁶) had assented to it, in so far, at least, as the second century B. C. was concerned; but a glance at the evidence compiled by Michaelis⁷) showed that the tradition was self contradictory on this point. Hence, notwithstanding that an elaborate memorial of the presentation, such as we have for Demochares' archonship, was natural for the *quinquennial* but unnatural for the annual occasion, in *Klio* IV p. 10 notes 5 and 6 I expressed my adherence to my original opinion.

Kirchner assigned Demochares to 94/3, the only available third year of an Olympiad in the desired vicinity. Wilhelm, however, affirmed that Dionysia and Hierokleia, two maidens in Demochares' year were the daughters of Asklepiades and Dionysios of Phlya⁸), who had been ephebes in 107/6. Of course boys of 18 in 107/6 could not have had daughters in 108/7. Nor could they have had daughters old enough to work on the peplos of Athena in 94/3, argued Wilhelm in claiming for Demochares a date long after 94/3.

108/7 is now out of the question. Demochares was archon after 103/2. We have to choose between 94/3 and a much later date. But first we have to ask ourselves, how old were the women who spun Athena's peplos? The evidence is again self-contradictory⁹). The work was begun by two maids (*arrhephoroi*) not under seven nor over eleven years of age. But, says the scholiast to Euripides' *Hekuba* 468: Ὁ μόνον γὰρ παρθένοι ὕφαινον ὡς φησιν Ἀπολλόδορος ἐν τῇ περὶ θεῶν † ἀνλῆς, ἀλλὰ καὶ τέλειαι γυναῖκες, ὡς Φερεκράτης ἐν Δουλοδιδασκάλῳ. Hence we are allowed to assign very different ages to the ἐργαστῖναι of Demochares' archonship.

The daughters of men who were ephebes in 107/6 must have been children in 94/3. On the other hand, the daughters of Hagias, son of Bulon (phylarch in 128/7¹⁰), of Pyrrhos of Lamptrai (epimelete of Delos

1) Loewy, No. 244 = Homolle, *Mon. Gr.* 8 (1879) pp. 39 ff. Line 3 had two letters after the one above the epsilon of 'E[φ]': line 6 had 2½ and line 7 had 3½ — according to Loewy's reproduction of the stone. 'E[φ]' 'Hρα]χλ[εῖδ]ου is, therefore, possible.

2) BCH XVIII p. 337. — 3) *Cornell Studies* X p. 85.

4) *Gött. gel. Anz.* 1900 p. 473. — 5) *Ath. Mitt.* VIII p. 62.

6) *Feste der Stadt Athen* pp. 112 ff. — 7) *Der Parthenon* p. 328.

8) *Urkunden dram. Aufführ.* pp. 82 f. — 9) Michaelis, *Der Parthenon* p. 329.

10) BCH XXX p. 238; cf. pp. 255 ff. and p. 292. These new data make some changes necessary in the genealogical tree constructed by Hiller in IG XII 3 p. 286, No. 1298.

Klio, Beiträge zur alten Geschichte VII 2.

15

in 108/7. herald of the Areopagos in 97/6, hoplite-general in 95/4¹), and of Gerostratos of Lamptrai (the father of Poseidonios, kleiduch in 106/5², married and father of a son in 97/6)³) could have been τέλειαι γυναῖκες in 94/3. But since many children were usual among the upper classes in Athens at this time, we may suppose the ἐργαστῖναι to have been the youngest of large families. But that almost all the girls we can identify among those named in the list of the *ergastinai* were late born, or that the workers of the peplos were habitually grown up women (they were represented by their fathers, not their husbands, both in Theokles' year and in Demochares' year³), are quite improbable hypotheses. But on no other supposition can we locate Demochares later than 94/3.

4. *The Precinct of the Foreign Gods.* A Sarapieion⁴) and an Isieion⁵) existed in Delos before the second Athenian occupation. The location of these edifices seems to be as yet unknown. That they formed part of the cluster of buildings unearthed on the banks of the Inopos is unlikely; for in this region no dedication has been found — to my quite limited knowledge — which antedates 167/6.

The history of the Inopos precinct can be made out now from the extant dedications and monuments.

The chief temple in the Sarapis-Aphrodite *ιερόν* — that of which the priest of Sarapis, Isis, Anubis, and Harpocrates was titular — was dedicated to Sarapis, Isis, and Anubis by the *demos* of Athens in 135/4 B.C. This is clear from the dedication on the architrave⁶). The second temple, distinguished in the same way⁷), was opened solemnly in 130/29. It was sacred to Anubis. The architrave of the third, which bore the official inscription ὁ δῆμος ὁ Ἀθηναίων Ἰσιδι and probably also the names of οἱ ἐπὶ τὰ ἱερά, shows that the formal dedication took place in 128/7⁸). This was the temple of Isis. In the same year in which this building was accepted by the people of Athens, Achaïos, son of Apollonios, a Hieropolitan dedicated a temple, a building adjoining it, and some little altars to his native deities Adad and Atargatis. Associated with him in making the gift were his wife Eubula, his five children, and his three brothers. The city of Hieropolis sanctioned the donation, and perhaps the people of Athens formally accepted it, but no priest was designated by Athens for Adad and Atargatis, and the synod of the Hieropolitans on the island chose one of their own number annually to administer the cult⁹). The fifth temple was seemingly the gift of the priest of Aphrodite¹⁰) for 127/6, and was dedicated by him in that year. It was

1) BCH XXIX p. 229; Kirchner, PA No. 12520.

2) BCH VI p. 346; XXIX p. 234 n. 1. — 3) IG II 477 and IG II 5 477 d.

4) BCH VI pp. 20, 24, 27, 52; XXVIII p. 159. — 5) BCH VI pp. 27, 52.

6) BCH XVI p. 481. — 7) BCH VI p. 340 No. 48.

8) BCH VI p. 334 No. 32. — 9) BCH VI p. 495 No. 12; cf. also p. 496 No. 13.

10) BCH VI p. 347 No. 68; VII p. 367; VIII p. 131 n. 2 (on page 132).

sacred to Aphrodite Hagne, and, unlike those of Isis and Anubis, it had its own priest and cult.

The sixth temple (*ναός* is the word invariably used) was a gift of Nikomedes II of Bithynia¹). It was sacred to Isis Nemesis, and was dedicated by the priest of Sarapis in 110/9. It contained a statue of this goddess, and is probably to be identified with the little edifice placed on the heights behind the *podium*²) marked RS on the plan of Hauvette-Besnault³). The statue has been found and described by Hauvette-Besnault in the *Bulletin* for 1882⁴). A rough sketch of it is published by S. Reinach in the same journal for 1884⁵). An Egyptian statuette of Isis was also found in this temple⁶).

It is possible that the *ναός* of Isis Nemesis was built from funds raised by subscription (Nikomedes II being one of the chief subscribers) and that it was not finished till the following year. Thus, while Kallimachos, son of Epikrates, of Leukonoe was *epimeletes* of Delos, a man from Laodicea ἀνέθηκε τὸν ναὸν Ἰσιδι⁷), and conceivably at the same time a certain Menelaos, priest of Aphrodite? dedicated τὸν ν[αόν] to [Sarapis] and Isis⁸) and the other deities of the Egyptian group. The year of Kallimachos has not yet been determined — the first clue being that he was king-archon in 99/8⁹). I have conjectured that he belongs to 109/8 for the following reason. In his year Euodos χοροῦ of Antioch was sacristan of the shrine of Aphrodite for the eighteenth time. We naturally think of eighteen successive years. In 107/6, however, Demetrios was sacristan¹⁰). Hence the term of Euodos must precede or follow this year. If it followed 107/6, then his eighteenth term¹¹) fell in 89/8 or 88/7 at the earliest und latest. The political situation, however, forbids us to think of a temple being constructed in Delos at this time. On the other hand, if we put Kallimachos in 109/8 — the first year prior to 107/6 which lacks an *epimeletes* — Euodos began to serve in 127/6 or 126/5, according as we calculate exclusively or inclusively. I assume that Euodos secured his appointment as sacristan when the temple of Aphrodite was opened in 127/6.

The Sarapis-Aphrodite precinct was provided with several *exedrae*. A group was built as an appendage to the Sarapis temple by Staseas of Kolone, priest in 118/7¹²). One was erected in the Aphrodite *ιερόν* by

1) This is inferred from the fact that the dedication was made ἐπὶ τοῦ δήμου τοῦ Ἀθηναίων καὶ ἐπὶ βασιλείᾳ Νικομήδου; BCH VI p. 337 No. 39.

2) Or whatever this structure may have been. — 3) BCH VI Plate XI.

4) Pp. 304 and 308. — 5) P. 187. — 6) BCH VI pp. 304 f. and 313.

7) BCH VI p. 335 No. 35; cf. *Ibid.* p. 346 and XXVIII p. 151.

8) BCH VI p. 493 No. 7. — 9) Kirchner. PA No. 8021.

10) *Ἀθ. γ.* IV pp. 461 and 462.

11) From Lebègue *Rech.* p. 142 (cf. 139) we learn that a certain Nikephoros was sacristan of the temple of Zeus Kynthios for 37 times. Within his term Kointos of Azenia was *epimeletes*. — 12) BCH VI p. 320 No. 6.

Antiochos of Tyre in 109/8?¹). Another was constructed by P. Aimulius L. f., a Roman, likewise for the Aphrodite precinct. The donor was at his *akme* in about 100 B.C.²). The *epimeletes* at the time of the gift was Andreas, son of Andreas, of the Peiraieus, a man who was herald of the Areopagos in 95/4. He was *epimeletes* perhaps in 104/3³). Finally an *exedra* was donated by Midas, son of Zenon, of Herakleia, the same who in the priesthood of Philoxenos of Sunion (98/7?)⁴) donated the mosaic pavement for the building marked M on the plan of Hauvette-Besnault already referred to. The *exedra* was possibly the little *odeion* which stood directly opposite the mosaic (g h on the plan). It was probably made between 109/8 and 104/3, though only an examination of the extant ruins can determine this point definitely.

Apart from the *exedrae* of Staseas, a fountain, the gift of Dionysios of Sphettos, priest of Sarapis in 116/5, was the only work done⁵), so far as our record goes, between 127/6 and 112/1; for the residence of the *therapeutai* of Sarapis was given by two cousins, Lucius and [Decimus] Aimulius, whose *akme* belongs to about 130 B.C.⁶). It was, therefore, a product of the great building period 137/6 to 127/6 B. C. In 112/1 this house was finished up inside in fine style⁷), and two years later we have a notice of some similar decorative work (*ἐνζυαυσις*) being done on the house of the *therapeutai* of Aphrodite⁸). A new period of activity opened with the erection of the temple of Isis Nemesis in 110/9 and 109/8. Not simply was a subscription list started for the adornment of the shrine of

1) When Kallimachos was *epimeletes*. BCH VI p. 346; cf. p. 478 n. 2.

2) The genealogical tree may be constructed as follows:

3) He came after 109/8, since Krates, not Euodos, was sacristan of the Aphrodite precinct. He does not belong to 96/5, because of the priest of Aphrodite. After 96/5 only the three archonships of Medeios are vacant, and it is unlikely that an *exedra* was built at that time. Moreover, the man was probably governor-general of Delos before he was herald of the Areopagos. Thus Pyrrhos of Lamptrai, herald of the Areopagos in 97/6, had been *epimeletes* in 108/7. It is difficult to find any year but 104/3 which fulfils all the conditions. — 4) BCH VII p. 280.

5) BCH VI p. 347. Of course, I leave simple dedications out of account.

6) BCH VI p. 323.

7) A certain Theophilos of Antioch provided stucco for the priests' house, frescoing for the walls and ceiling, encaustic painting upon the doors, ends of beams upon the wall-plate, and the slab placed upon these. CIG II 2297.

8) BCH VI p. 489.

Aphrodite (*ἐπιζόσμησις τοῦ ἱεροῦ*), but some work was done on the stoas, a transposition of [dedications]? (*μετάθεσις τοῦ —*) was made, and a throne for the goddess was overlaid with gold¹). At the same time pedestals were provided for statues which had probably lacked suitable positions²). The *demos* of Athens, too, yielding to repeated injunctions given by the goddess (*κατὰ προσιτάγματα* instead of the usual *κατὰ πρόσταγμα*), made a donation to the shrine of Aphrodite through the medium of the *epimeletes* and *οἱ ἐπὶ τὰ ἱερά* of Delos³). This was all done in 110/9. In 107/6 Aphrodite received a new throne and a new altar⁴), and in the years immediately following, her temple was decorated with pilasters and cupids⁵). The latter have been found and described by Hauvette-Besnault in BCH VI pp. 306 f. In 106/5? a *podium* and pavement were placed in front of the temple of Isis Nemesis⁶): in 105/4 arcades, altars, and an approach to the precinct were built⁷), and in 103/2? the whole was finished off with pylons⁸). At a slightly later date retaining walls and a stairway *ἕως τοῦ ναοῦ* closed operations on the temple of Isis Nemesis⁹).

Upon the slopes of the hill on the other side of the Inopos ravine, directly opposite the precinct of Sarapis-Aphrodite, stood another *ἱερόν* in which were at least three temples¹⁰). One of these, as yet seemingly undiscovered, was the Herakleion, and provision made in 159/8 that an inscription should be placed in it proves its relative age¹¹). The second was that of the Great Deities, Dioskuri, and Kabiri. Of this S. Reinach has found the ruins. From it have come few dedications, and of the four inscriptions taken from the vicinity two belong prior to 137/6¹²): the others date from 128/7 and 114/3¹³). It would seem, therefore, that this part of the region devoted to the foreign deities was equipped before the work was begun on the terrace or the other side of the ravine; for the only objects located in the Sarapis-Aphrodite precinct which belong earlier than 137/6 are some vaults or arcades (*ψαλίδες*)¹⁴); erected to Aphrodite by the priest and the *therapeutai* in 141/0. Then, while the building up of the adjacent precinct was in progress, the *ἱερόν* of the Great Deities was apparently neglected. This neglect, however, may be only apparent and due simply to the deficiency of our knowledge. At any rate, after

1) BCH VI p. 494. — 2) BCH XXIX p. 223: *τὸ ἄγλυμα καὶ τὰς βάσεις ἐπισκευάσας*.

3) BCH VI p. 491. — 4) *Ἀθήν.* IV p. 461; *ibid.* p. 462. — 5) *Ἀθήν.* IV p. 460.

6) BCH VI p. 346; *cf. below* p. 231. — 7) BCH VII p. 368.

8) BCH VI p. 322 No. 11: the priest was Athenagoras of Kephisia. In *Ἀθήν.* IV p. 458 No. 6 we read: *Ἀθηναγόρας καὶ . . . τοὺς πύλωνας καὶ . . .*

9) BCH VI p. 330. The date is purely conjectural.

10) BCH VII pp. 329 ff.; *cf. Carte archéologique de l'île de Délos* by Ardaillon and Couvert. *Bibliothèque des écoles françaises*: Appendix I 1902.

11) CIG II 2270. — 12) We have assigned them in the table to 147/6 and 144/3.

13) CIG II 2296 and BCH VII p. 339. — 14) BCH VI p. 491.

the second period of activity in the shrine of Aphrodite-Sarapis had come to a close (110/9—103/2?), Helianax, the son of Asklepiodoros, erected a third temple on the other side of the Inopos, 101/0¹). The fact that this man was priest of Poseidon Aisios for life indicates the deity which it housed. That he associated with this charge that of priest of the Great Deities²) shows that Poseidon Aisios was taken into their cult. This is the temple from which have come curious medallions, within which were set portrait busts of many contemporary kings and courtiers.

5. *The Priests of Sarapis.* It is thus clear that building operations began in earnest in the precinct of Sarapis about thirty years after the Athenians took possession of Delos. The foreign colony had to grow before the turn of the foreign gods came. On the other hand there is no evidence for the maintenance of the cult of the oriental deities after 88 B.C. The Egyptian and Syrian settlement was probably broken up at that time. Hence place must be sought for priests of Sarapis, in whose years dedications were made to the shrine on the Inopos ravine, preferably between 140 and 88 B. C.

The following³) are not yet dated:

- 1 Theomnestos, son of Theogenes, of Kydathenaion
- 2 Apollodoros, son of Apollodoros, of Kropidai
- Athenagoras, son of Diokles
- 3 Athenagoras, son of -elen-, of Kephisia
- 4 Leon, son of Agatharchos, of Marathon
- 5 Kydenor, son of Dionysios, of Melite
- 6 Philoxenos, son of Philoxenos, of Sunion
- 7 Athenades, son of Diogenes?, of Kydathenaion
- 8 Zenon, son of Dioskurides, of Lamptrai
- 9 Markos of Eleusis⁴)
- 10 Aristeas, son of Aristeas, of Marathon
- 11, 12 Philokrates, son of Philokrates (twice).

This list may be reduced somewhat. Thus it is not clear that Athenagoras, son of Diokles⁵), was a priest of Sarapis: he may have been priest of some other deity. He probably should not be identified with 'Α . . . Κηφισιεύς, priest in some year after 109/8⁶). The father of Athenagoras Κηφισιεύς of BCH VI p. 347, who is doubtless the same as the priest 'Α — — Κηφισιεύς, had the letters .]ελην[in his name.

Markos of Eleusis made a dedication as priest to Ammon on behalf

1) BCH VII p. 364. — 2) *Ibid.* p. 349.

3) For the references see Kirchner, *Prosopographia Attica*.

4) BCH VI p. 342. All the *Μάγοι* (*Μαγόροι*) are omitted in the *Prosopographia* also the Athenians found in the small group of inscriptions published by Homolle in *Mon. Gr.* 8 (1879) pp. 37 ff.

5) CIG II 2301. — 6) BCH VI p. 323.

of the Egyptian king Ptolemy Soter II. The inscription was found in the precinct of Sarapis-Aphrodite. Markos was probably a priest of Sarapis.

It is possible that Aristeas of Marathon was a priest of Aphrodite or the Great Deities¹⁾ since there is nothing whatever to connect him with Sarapis. Still, it is better not to exclude him altogether from consideration here.

Since all the priests listed above must precede 137/6 or follow 108/7, it should not be difficult to decide in which neighborhood to locate them. None the less, it happens in several instances that the internal evidence is ambiguous, so that the final judgment will have to be made on the basis of the lettering.

Theomnestos of Kydathenaion was priest of Artemis in 101/0²⁾. He probably held the lesser priesthood earlier — hence on the criterion of the tribe he is assigned to 107/6.

Apollodoros of Kropidai belongs to the period after 108/7, because of the other connections in which we find mention of Poseidonios, the son of Gerostratos, *kleiduch* in his priesthood³⁾. Since the tribe admits of so doing, I have placed him in 106/5.

Athenagoras of Kephisia was in office later than Dionysios, son of Zenon, of Kephisia (109/8)⁴⁾. I have put him in 103/2, because he held office after 109/8 by only a short interval, and because it is conceivable that the priest for 109/8 should have made a belated dedication upon the change of government in 103/2.

The genealogical tree of Athenagoras of Melite shows that Kydenor of Melite belongs after 108/7:

In 141/0 a dedication was made to Leonides, son of Athenagoras, by his sister and brothers, Athenagoras being among the latter⁶⁾. Athenagoras, son of Athenagoras, was priest of Sarapis in 126/5⁷⁾. To him a statue was erected by his three nephews in the priesthood of Kydenor⁸⁾.

1) Kirchner, PA No. 1678 (Ephebe in 107/6 B.C.) and No. 12304. where an inscription is republished from *Αθήν.* III p. 653 No. 15.

2) Kirchner, PA No. 6968. — 3) See *above* p. 226.

4) Kirchner, *Gött. gel. Anz.* 1900 p. 472.

5) Zenon and Satyros, sons of Athenagoras, of Melite are to be added to the genealogical tree in the *Prosopographia* (No. 217) from *Mon. Grecs* 8 (1879) p. 41 No. 4. Along with their sister they erected a statue of their mother, the daughter of Satyros, son of Hermokrates, of Auridai? (PA No. 11834 f.) in 108/7.

6) BCH I p. 88. — 7) BCH XVII p. 147. — 8) *Αθήν.* IV p. 458.

Supposing Athenagoras to have been twenty-five in 141/0, he was 40 in 126/5, and 67 in 99/8, in which year we have provisionally placed Kydenor. Moreover, a second statue, erected in honor of Athenagoras by his nephews Menias and Zenon, was made by the sculptor Eutychides ¹⁾. This man was working in Delos between 116/5 and 95/4 ²⁾.

In the year in which Athenades of Kydathenaion was priest Menodoros, son of Phainandros, of Mallos was working in Delos as a sculptor ³⁾. This same Menodoros made a statue which was erected at Delos in 97/6 ⁴⁾.

Markos of Eleusis was priest while Soter II and Alexander I were rivals for the throne of Egypt, 108—88 B. C. ⁵⁾.

Philokrates was priest when it was permissible for a man to hold the same civil office twice, 103/2—88/7 B. C. ⁶⁾.

For two other of the dozen priests no prosopographical data exist, Zenon of Lamptrai and Philoxenos of Sunion. In Zenon's priesthood a certain Apollonios constructed *τὴν ἀνάβασιν καὶ τοὺς τοίχους ἕως τοῦ ναοῦ*. The dedicatory inscription was cut upon the steps which, from their position when found, had obviously led up to the temple of Isis ⁷⁾ — that marked behind RS on the French plan. Whether this was the temple of Isis erected in 129/8 or, as we have conjectured ⁸⁾, the one of Isis Nemesis given by Nikomedes II in 110/9, Zenon was priest after 108/7. Perhaps it was his grandfather who made a subscription in 183/2 ⁹⁾. Midas, the son of Zenon, of Herakleia, *ὁ καὶ τὴν ἐξέδραν ἀναθεῖς*, donated the pavement for the floor of the building marked M on Hauvette-Besnault's plan, and immortalized his gift by inserting his name in the mosaic itself ¹⁰⁾. Only autopsy can determine the relative age of this edifice. The man is designated *Ἡράκλειος*, a form of the *ethnikon* found in dated examples only at the time of the artists Lysippos, Eutychides, and Agasias, 116—88 B. C. ¹¹⁾. Since, moreover, the fine mosaic was probably not put into a building prior to the development of the precinct in 137/6 ff., we are justified in locating Philoxenos after 108/7.

1) BCH IV p. 222.

2) Loewy, *Insch. griech. Bild.* pp. 180 ff.; cf. BCH XVIII pp. 336 f. Loewy, No. 244 belongs to 108/7; No. 245 to 116/5; No. 246 to 106/5; No. 247 to 95/4, and No. 248 to an uncertain year. The other statues by Eutychides cannot be dated. The priest of Sarapis dates 244 and 245. In 246 Zenon, the son of Zenon, is designated *pythaïstes* in Athens: from BCH XXX p. 197 we learn that Zenon was *pythaïstes* in 106/5. For the date of No. 247 see *above* p. 225.

3) BCH VI p. 322; cf. VIII p. 135 n. 2. — 4) BCH VII p. 13.

5) Dittenberger, OGIS No. 170 n. 2. — 6) *Klio* IV pp. 3 f.

7) BCH VI p. 330 Nos. 25 and 24.

8) See *above* p. 227. — 9) Kirchner, PA No. 6214.

10) BCH VI p. 305; VII p. 280.

11) BCH VII p. 373 = VIII p. 488; XXIII p. 68; VIII pp. 143 and 146; XI pp. 260 and 270; but cf. *Archiv f. Papyrusforsch.* IV. 1907, p. 238.

Leon, son of Agatharchos, of Marathon alone remains¹⁾. In BCH XXIII p. 66 is published the name of an *epimeletes* of Delos from apparently about 95 B. C., Ἀρόπος Λέοντιος [Μ]α[ραθῶ]ν[ι]ο[ς]. Leon the priest is perhaps the father of this officer, but not if Kirchner's restoration²⁾ of the deme name, Ἀ[ραφῆ]ν[ι]ο[ς], is correct. We have assigned Leon in a provisional way to 102/1. If we accept the restoration *Marathonios*, it would be perhaps more satisfactory to place him in the period before 137/6, *i. e.* in 148/7; but since no other dedication to Sarapis found on the Inopos terrace antedates 136/5, and since an Italian, Quintus Gaii f., was the author of this one, I have preferred to think of Leon as obtaining the priesthood in his old age, and of his son as reaching the highest office in Delos about twelve years later³⁾. Since the *κομπεταλιασται* disappear with the sack of Delos in 88⁴⁾, but are still found in the *epimeleia* of Aropos⁵⁾, it is illegitimate to descend farther than 89/8 with this *epimeletes*.

The stone on which are inscribed the *fasti* of the temple of Sarapis at Delos has been described very inadequately by the scholars who found and edited it. But from the brief note given by Hauvette-Besnault in BCH VI p. 350 we may infer that the *fasti* ended with the name of Sosion of Oinoe in 110/9. Since this was the time at which the official order of the priests of Aphrodite ceased to exist⁶⁾, we are justified in surmising that some noteworthy event in this shrine also took place then.

M. Homolle has said nothing about the condition of the stone at the point where the extant list of priests begins. He simply prints the names as follows⁷⁾:

ΤΙΜΙ	[Τ]ιμ . . .
ΔΗΜΟΣΙ(	Δημόσι[ος]
ΔΗΜΟΣΙΟ	Δημόσιο[ς]
ΦΑΝΟΒΙΟΣΕΛΕΥΣΙΝΙΟ	Φανόβιος Ἐλευσίνιο[ς]

We are left in doubt on many important points. Is the stone broken off above [Τ]ιμ . . ., or were no other names there originally? Did proper names, now lost, follow Δημόσιος in lines 2 and 3? Does the list form a column at the left side or in the middle of the stone? Until these questions are answered our inferences must remain somewhat uncertain.

Demosios is not an Attic proper name⁸⁾: it is the title of a public slave. Hence whether we are at the beginning of a list, or at its middle, the insertion of two extraneous titles at the point just prior to 137/6 (the year of Phanobios of Eleusis) shows that something abnormal took

1) BCH VI p. 325. — 2) PA No. 2244.

3) Thus Sokrates and Aristion of Oion, father and son, were *epimeletai*, the one in 105/4, the other in 95/4.

4) BCH XXIII p. 73. — 5) *Ibid.* p. 66. — 6) See *above* p. 219.

7) BCH XVII p. 146. — 8) See the *Prosopographia Attica*.

place at that time. The mention of two *demosioi* in connection with a temple document suggests a commission of some sort, for public works, or, still more likely, for the classification of dedications¹). Since the temple of Sarapis was formally opened in 135/4 it is probable that this commission? had something to do with the building of the edifice, or, perhaps preferably, with the transfer of dedications from an older shrine. After the enumeration of the commissioners? and the *demosioi* the list of priests was begun, or continued, with the names of those who held office during the building of the new temple and afterwards. It ended in 110/9. This was the year in which the temple of Isis Nemesis was erected, and, as has been pointed out already, it was the year in which a general repair and reorganization of the shrine of Aphrodite was made. It was the opening of a new period of building activity for the whole precinct. Part of the work of 110/9 was to hunt out and arrange in chronological order the names of the priests of Sarapis who had served prior to the opening of the new Isis temple, perhaps from the Athenian occupation of Delos on, but more likely from the construction of the temple of Sarapis on the banks of the Inopos. The list ended in 110/9 because that was the year of its compilation, and it was compiled at that time because the re-arrangement of the dedications consequent upon the opening of a new temple showed the need of publishing the *fasti*. The reorganization of the Aphrodite precinct was accompanied by a change in the mode of electing the priest, the official rotation of the tribes being abandoned²). A similar alteration was made in the method of designating the priest of Sarapis — but not until 103/2. That there were special reasons for the abandonment in Delos of time-honored Athenian usages we shall now proceed to make clear.

6. *The Dissolution of the Kleruchy*. The Delian year began at the winter³), the Attic year at the summer solstice. Since the Athenians received Delos in the winter of the Attic year 167/6⁴), it is likely that their government was established at the end of the Delian year 167. The magistrates sent by Athens to manage affairs on the island came thus into control without any violent interruption of business, or disturbance of contracts⁵). Athenian simply took the place of Delian officials and everything went on as before.

1) A *demosios* attached to the *hieron* of Aphrodite is mentioned in 'A9/v. IV pp. 460, 462 (107/6—105/4). I believe that no reference to one for the shrine of Sarapis is extant. For *demosioi* in connection with building operations see IG II *Add.* 834 b and c; II 5 834 b: in connection with classification of dedications IG II 403, 404, 839, 840 *etc.* The temple and treasury commissioners at Delos had a *demosios*; BCH XIII p. 426.

2) It may have been abandoned in 109/8, that being the last year of a rotation-period. — 3) Homolle, BCH V pp 25 ff.; XXVII p. 63 n. 1.

4) Niese, *Gesch. d. griech. u. maked. Staaten* III p. 189.

5) BCH IV pp. 182 ff. (Maturing of loans made under the Delian regime); XXIX pp. 532 ff., esp. p. 557 (Reappearance of articles found in Delian catalogues).

Thus the *epimeletes* superceded the Delian archon as governor-general and special *eponymous* magistrate of the island. In the place of the four *hieropoioi*¹⁾ who had managed the temples and the moneys came a commission of four Athenians composed of two sections of two officials each, *οἱ ἐπὶ τὰ ἱερά*, and *οἱ ἐπὶ τὴν φυλακὴν τῶν ἱερῶν χρημάτων*²⁾. Three Athenian *agoranomoi*³⁾ took the place of three Delian *agoranomoi*⁴⁾. An Athenian *gymnasiarch* came and took charge of the Delian gymnasium. To each of the temples came an Athenian priest instead of a Delian priest, the *kleiduchs* and *kanephoroi* becoming Athenian where such subordinates were needed. The natives were retained only as sacristans.

The Delians had been essentially parasites of the temple. Now that the honors and profits of the religious charge were taken from them, and the Athenians were not disposed to retain them on the island as laborers and souvenir makers and vendors, they had practically nothing to do. Accordingly, the government of Athens, drove them out altogether, and sent a colony of its own citizens to take possession of Delos. The organization of this new settlement was determined in advance by traditional considerations: it could not be other than that of an Athenian *kleruchy*. Hence the Athenian immigrants, at the same time that they moved into the houses of the Delians, occupied their *ekklesiasterion*, and their council chamber. They established a little republic on the Athenian pattern, with a probuleutic senate, prytanies to dispatch business, and proedri to preside at the meetings of council and people. They had all the mechanism for local legislation, and they set about passing decrees and erecting monuments in honor of officials and benefactors of all kinds.

The republic, however, was deformed from the start. It had two organic weaknesses: it did not choose or control its own executive⁵⁾, and its legislation was subject to revision by the mother state⁶⁾. Its position was, in fact, that of the colonies in British North America prior to the concession of responsible government in 1841. We are told by Strabo⁷⁾ that the Athenian administration of Delos was efficient. There is, indeed, no evidence to the contrary, but we can be quite sure that there were

1) Homolle, BCH XIII p. 427; von Schoeffer, PW IV pp. 2486 f.

2) BCH XXIX p. 553.

3) BCH XIII p. 410. The number was reduced to two between 155 and 151/0 (BCH XVI p. 371; IG II 985 I E 36).

4) Von Schoeffer, *loc. cit.* p. 2488.

5) This results clearly from the documents published in BCH XIII p. 421; XVI p. 371 and p. 372; XIII p. 410; XVI pp 375 f., and from the list of subscribers IG II 985.

6) Doubted by von Schoeffer, PW IV p. 2497, but established by Francotte, *La législation athénienne sur les distinctions honorifique et spécialement des decrets des clérouchies athéniennes relatifs à cet objet*. Louvain, 1900.

7) X, 486.

frequent conflicts of opinion and authority between the local and the central government.

From 167/6 to 131/0 the republic just described operated normally. We have decrees extant at intervals throughout the entire period¹). We hear of the *boule* and the *prytanies*, of *ekklesia* and *ekklesiasterion*, of inscribing documents on stone tablets, of audit by Athenian jury courts, of forwarding documents to the Metroon, and of embassies going to and fro between the two communities. Then of a sudden it all comes to an end, and from Febry. of 131 there is no further intimation of the existence of a Greek republic on Delos. There are no more town meetings, and no more decrees. Even resolutions of private associations fail from this time on. At the same time, a new organism makes its appearance. From 126/5 to 54/3 the public activity of the island is incorporated, not as before in the Athenian colony, but in the aggregate of Athenians, Romans, Greeks and others both in permanent residence on the island and frequenting it as merchants and shippers. In other words, the Athenian *kleruchy* was dissolved and a multifarious assemblage of all the freemen who happened to be on the island at the moment took its place²). Naturally, this heterogeneous body could not act as a miniature Athens: it could not take the place of a Lower House and pass measures along for ratification or rejection by the Athenian *ekklesia*. It was in fact left without a political organization. We do not know how or when it met, or how it was managed when assembled. Its sole determinable function

1) BCH XXIX p. 199 (time of settlement): BCH X p. 36 = XIII p. 245 (165/4); BCH VIII pp. 121 f. (Synod of Melanephoroi? c. 160); CIG II 2270 (159/8); BCH XXIX p. 198 (?); BCH X p. 33 (154/3? Zaleukos) = XIII p. 410 (153/2?); CIG II 2271 (Synod of Tyrians 153/2); BCH X p. 38 (151/0?); BCH XXIX p. 196 (151/0); BCH XVI p. 371 (151/0); BCH XIII p. 412 (150/49); BCH XVI p. 372 (150/49); BCH XIII p. 250 (133/2); BCH XVI p. 375 (133/2); BCH XVI p. 376 (132/1).

2) 'Αθηναίων οἱ κατοικοῦντες ἐν Δήλῳ καὶ οἱ ἔμποροι καὶ οἱ ναύκληροι καὶ Ῥωμαίων καὶ τῶν ἄλλων ξένων οἱ παρεπιδημοῦντες BCH VIII p. 123 (126/5); 'Αθηναίων καὶ Ῥωμαίων καὶ τῶν ἄλλων ξένων οἱ κατοικοῦντες καὶ παρεπιδημοῦντες ἐν Δήλῳ CIG II 2286 (126/5); *idem* CIG II 2288 (-doros, son of Zenon, of Athmonon *epimeletes*); BCH XVI p. 152 (124/3); BCH III p. 371 (118/7); BCH IV p. 220 (c. 115) = XI p. 263?; BCH XI p. 262?; 'Αθηναίων καὶ Ῥωμαίων καὶ τῶν ἄλλων Ἑλλήνων οἱ κατοικοῦντες τὴν νῆσον BCH XVI p. 151 (110/9); 'Αθηναίων καὶ Ῥωμαίων καὶ τῶν ἄλλων Ἑλλήνων οἱ κατοικοῦντες καὶ παρεπιδημοῦντες ἐν Δήλῳ BCH V p. 463 (102/1); 'Ἰταλοὶ καὶ Ἑλληνες BCH IV p. 219 (c. 102/1: different from the others prior to 88 both in formula and in that a Roman, not an Athenian magistrate, was honored by the assemblage); BCH X p. 37 (98/7); BCH XVI p. 150 (94/3). also metrically as *below* p. 240; BCH III p. 151 (Apolodoros archon c. 80); BCH III p. 156 (c. 80); CIG II 2287 (54/3); BCH VIII p. 175 (Zenon, son of Zenon, of Marathon *epimeletes* c. 50); BCH XVI p. 157 (?); BCH IV p. 221 (?). A bilingual inscription of c. 80—78 B.C. is as follows: *Italicei et Graecei quæ Delei negotiantur* = 'Ἰταλικοὶ καὶ Ἑλληνες οἱ κατοικοῦντες BCH XXIX p. 229, *cf.* BCH I pp. 283 f. A latin inscription of about the same date runs thus: *Plebs Atheniensis et Italicei et Graecei quæ in insula negotiantur* BCH III p. 147.

was to record its appreciation of services rendered to itself by erecting statues or other monuments of the Athenian officials¹). In this limited activity, however, it was unfettered by the legal disability of consulting the Athenians. It could, apparently, honor, or refuse to honor, its magistrates as it itself saw fit²).

The net result of this change was threefold. 1. The Athenian magistrates obtained a freer hand in administration through not being obliged to consult a local *ekklesia*. They could thus act more promptly and more vigorously. They were obliged, like the Roman proconsuls, to render an account only to a people among and over whom they did not serve³). 2. The community of Delos in its entirety obtained more liberty of action through being emancipated from the constant interference of the *ekklesia* in Athens. It could act quickly in a crisis without waiting for the Athenian government to give the word, and without fear of legal consequences. 3. The public life of the island was strengthened through the destruction of the exclusive privileges of the small colony of Athenians. The widening of the quasi-citizenship extended in like measure interest and responsibility in the affairs of the island. In particular, the influence of the solid settlement of Italians was enhanced, and in time they came to act as open masters of Delos⁴).

It is now necessary to ascertain the reasons for the dissolution of the kleruchy, and the formation of this hybrid body-politic. The ultimate cause was, of course, the enormous growth of the foreign population of Delos⁵). This made it increasingly difficult for the handful of Athenians to maintain their position and prestige, especially since the „outlanders“ were usually rich, or supported by wealthy corporations, or strong political interests. To this was added the chafing of the Athenian officialdom at the restraints of public control. Athens itself was becoming more and more aristocratic, and its rich men more and more contemptuous of democratic shibboleths. The pervasive influence of Roman opinion, moreover, was making for restrictions upon the power of the populace. Still, an occasion was necessary for the deposition of the kleruchs, entrenched as they were behind the breastworks of Athenian tradition. A successful

1) After 88 it conferred similar honors upon Romans.

2) For the procedure in case a club wished to erect a statue to an Athenian magistrate in Athens itself IG II 475 (112/1) is singularly instructive. In Delos after 131/0 clubs, priests, private persons erected statues of Athenian magistrates when they pleased.

3) That is to the Athenians upon their return. After 103/2 they did not have even this ordeal to face, *Klio* IV pp. 4 ff.

4) Athens joined Mithradates in 88: Delos supported Rome against Athens at the same time.

5) 20000 are said to have been slain by the general of Mithradates: Appian, *Mith.* 28.

attack must follow failure. Failure came in about 131/0 B. C. It was the time of the slave revolts. Sicily had been the scene of a ferocious struggle. In various parts of Italy, and even in Rome itself, an uprising had taken place. Andronikos, the bastard son of Eumenes II, sought to retain his father's kingdom by summoning the slaves to his standards. Apparently the whole of the vast under-population of the ancient world was seething with sedition and aspiring to liberty, and by means of „underground railroads“ communications were carried on between one slave centre and another. It thus happened that a revolt broke out in Delos and in Athens simultaneously¹⁾. In the latter place over a thousand men, probably in large part miners from Sunion, though all detailed information is lacking, tried to gain their freedom by force, and required the authorities to give their attention exclusively to the home danger. In Delos the slaves, we can well believe, were too many for the Athenian kleruchs to cope with unaided. The whole free population was forced to unite in suppressing the outbreak. To be sure, the slaves were quickly beaten in both places, and the Roman government was not obliged to go to the aid of the local authorities as in the case of Sicily. But the entire population had of necessity to act in common to crush the insurrection. What more natural than that the body politic, created in the face of the gravest conceivable danger, should be perpetuated to prevent

1) The time is not designated with any precision. Diodoros (XXXIV 2) simply mentions it while citing slave revolts contemporaneous with the „first“ uprising in Sicily: οὐ διαβοηθέντος κατὰ τε Ρώμην δούλων ἀπόστασις ἑκατὸν πεντήκοντα συνομοσίντων ἀνῆπτετο, καὶ κατὰ τὴν Ἀττικὴν ὑπὲρ χιλίων, ἔν τε Δῆλῳ καὶ κατ' ἄλλους τόπους· οἷς τάχει τε τῆς βοηθείας καὶ τῇ σφοδρᾷ κολάσει τῆς τιμωρίας οἱ καθ' ἕκαστον ἐπιμεληταὶ τῶν κοινῶν θάπτον ἡφάνισαν. σωφρονίσαντες καὶ τὸ ἄλλο ὅσον ἦν ἐπὶ ἀποστάσει μετέωρον. The outbreak of the servile troubles in Sicily he dates sixty years μετὰ τὴν Καρχηδονίων κατὰλυσιν, i. e. after the fall of Syracuse? 211 B.C. Holm (*Gesch. Sic.* III p. 519 ff.) puts the beginning of the revolt in 139 and its end in 132. Diodoros defines the incident in a general way again in XXXIV 4: τὸ παραπλήσιον δὲ γέγονε καὶ κατὰ τὴν Ἀσίαν κατὰ τοὺς αὐτοὺς καιροὺς, Ἀριστονίκον μὲν πτλ. The troubles with Aristonikos began in 133 and continued till 130.

The last Delian decree extant belongs to the year 133/2, but it received the sanction without comment of the Athenian *ekklesia* in Febry. of 131. This is the *terminus post quem*. The first extant dedication made by the new assemblage of the Delians dates from 126/5, but there is decisive evidence of the change from 127/6; for in this year occurs the first instance (BCH VIII p. 131 n. 2) of a dedication made ὑπὲρ τοῦ δήμου τῶν Ἀθηναίων καὶ τοῦ δήμου τῶν Ρωμαίων — the two joint overlords of the island. From the fact that a temple was dedicated in the precinct of the foreign gods in 130/29, two in 128/7, and a fourth in 127/6, I am inclined to think of this building activity as subsequent to the slave revolt and a consequence of the dissolution of the kleruchy in 131/0. The absence of any reference to the kleruchy in the period 130/29—127/6, notwithstanding that it is richly represented by documents, confirms this opinion. The revolt probably took place immediately after the victory of Andronikos over Crassus in the spring of 130 (Niese. III p. 369).

a recurrence of the peril? What more natural than that the leading men, both among the Romans and the Athenians, should think the moment opportune to suppress the local democracy? In Rome the senatorial reaction which followed the overthrow of the popular government of Tiberius Gracchus was at this time at its height.

The military coefficient of political equality did not prevail for long. In 131/0 the foreigners without regard to race or language had united to force the slaves back into their pens and subterraneous lodging places. And until 118/7 the *ξένοι*, all alike, found recognition in the assemblage of the islanders. Then a distinction was drawn in the formula by which the action of the gathering was expressed, and the word *Ἕλληνες* took the place of *ξένοι*¹⁾. The facts doubtless corresponded, and from this time on the three participators in the meetings are Athenians, Romans, and Greeks. The official preamble discloses few secrets²⁾, but a metrical paraphrase of it is not equally discreet or reserved. Thus the following epigram³⁾, put upon a monument in honor of Aropos, governor-general of Delos in 94/3 B. C., lets us see how frankly the Romans were recognized as masters of the island:

Καὶ προγόνων ἀρετῆς σε καὶ εὐκλεος εἵνεκα δόξας
ἔστασεν Γλαύκου Πειραιέως, Ἄροπε,
Ἑλλήνων πλᾶθος τε καὶ ἄστεα μύρια Ρώμας
καὶ κλυτὸς ἀρχαίου δᾶμος Ἐπιχθονίου.
[Τ]ῶν μὲν γὰρ βιοτᾶν αἰδοῦς μέτα, τῶν δ' ἐφύλαξας
δόγματα, τῶν δ' ἐσάους πάτριον ἐννομίαν.

The three elements could, perhaps, act severally: but no case is extant in which the Athenians alone met in assembly. They were probably merged in the political organization of Athens itself⁴⁾. If they substituted a *koinon* for a polity, all evidence to this effect is lacking. The Romans on the other hand, like the various groups of Greeks and foreigners, had their own national union and a splendid club room besides. This was the scene of a busy communal life; for the associations in Delos had, of course, freedom of meeting under the Athenian law promulgated in the first instance by Solon and finally tested in the case of the Peripatetic

1) See *above* p. 237 n. 1.

2) In 104/3. when three Cretan cities concluded to deposit at Delos a copy of a treaty negotiated between them, they made all their arrangements with the *epimeletes* (BCH III p. 293 ll. 15 ff.). The committee sent to the island to have the document inscribed on stone had nothing to do with a local *πόλις* (*Ibid.* p. 294 ll. 43 ff.).

3) BCH XVI p. 150.

4) Nothing betrays more clearly the consciousness of the Athenians that Delos was not theirs. but Rome's, than the frequency with which they designated themselves *Ἀθηναῖοι*, instead of by the *demotika*, on the Delian monuments. Perhaps, too, Athenians born on the island, who reached their 18th year after 131/0, did not always take pains to have themselves registered in their paternal demes.

School in 307/6 B. C. But, as has been remarked already, no resolutions couched in the familiar terms of the Greek *psephismata*, like that of the Tyrian synod in 153/2 or of the synod of the *melanephoroi*? of about the same time, are extant for the period after 131/0 B. C.

The irresponsibility of the Athenian officials for the twelve months of their service on Delos bore its fruit in a recalcitrant attitude towards the strict control to which the magistracy was subjected at home, and, as I have pointed out in another connection¹), it was from the circles officially connected with the administration of Delos that the oligarchic revolution of Athens in 103/2 B. C. issued. And doubtless in full consciousness of the precedent established, they chose the occasion of the slave revolt in Attica, when the miners at Laurium broke away from their guards, seized the fort at Sunion, and ravaged the country round about²), to effect a *coup d'état* similar in its general effect upon the institutions of Athens to that which put an end to the Delian kleruchy in 131/0. The revolution in Athens was accompanied by changes in the administration of Delos to which reference will be made in another place. It did not affect in any way the composition of the assembly of the Delians. This remained the same in form, though in substance it was far from unfluctuating, till the agony of the civil war in Rome. Then in place of the composite formula there appears at the head of dedications simply $\delta \delta\eta\mu\omicron\varsigma \text{ Ἀθηναίων καὶ οἱ κατοικοῦντες τὴν νῆσον}$ ³). The old scheme appears for the last dated occasion in the archonship of Zenon (54/3 B. C.): the new one is first dated sharply in the time of Augustus, but it probably originated in some change of the status of Delos made by Pompey, Caesar, or Antony.

1) *Klio* IV pp. 10 ff.

2) Poseidonios in Athenaeus VI 272 e and f. The connection between the second slave revolt and the oligarchic revolution noted by me in *Klio* IV p. 12, was already surmised by S. Reinach in his work on *Mithradates Eupator* pp. 137 f.

3) BCH III p. 159 No. 7; cf. BCH VIII p. 154 (c. 44 B.C. ?); BCH III p. 159 No. 8; cf. BCH VIII p. 154 (same time ?); BCH VIII p. 154 (?); BCH XXVIII p. 148 (?); CIG II 2282 (43—27 B.C.); CIG II 2283 b (27 B.C.—14 A.D.); BCH II p. 399 No. 7 (27 B.C.—12 B.C. Pammenes priest of Apollo for life); BCH VIII p. 156 (same time); BCH III p. 162 (12 B.C.—14 A.D.); CIG II 2283 d (after 27 B.C.); BCH III p. 156 = *Rh. Mus.* XLII p. 148 (Zenon, son of Pammenes, priest); BCH III p. 365 (4 B.C.—38 A.D.); BCH II p. 400 and III p. 161 (Claudius Emperor: Tib. Klaudios Novios priest).