



The Constitutive Act of Demetrius' League of 303

Author(s): W. W. Tarn

Source: *The Journal of Hellenic Studies*, Vol. 42, Part 2 (1922), pp. 198-206

Published by: [The Society for the Promotion of Hellenic Studies](#)

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/625902>

Accessed: 14-03-2015 10:57 UTC

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at
<http://www.jstor.org/page/info/about/policies/terms.jsp>

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.



The Society for the Promotion of Hellenic Studies is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *The Journal of Hellenic Studies*.

<http://www.jstor.org>

THE CONSTITUTIVE ACT OF DEMETRIUS' LEAGUE OF 303

THE important inscription from Epidaurus, published in Aug. 1921 by M. Cavvadias,¹ raises many questions beside those dealt with in the very full commentary. Cavvadias attributes the document to 223 and the Achaean League. It is, I think, certain that it cannot belong to the Achaean League, and almost certain, as I hope to show, that it belongs to 303 and the revived League of Corinth of Demetrius I. The last few lines of the inscription have long been known (*I.G.* iv. 924), and have been exhaustively studied by A. Wilhelm,² who placed the fragment which in *I.G.* is marked β; Cavvadias does not refer to Wilhelm's study, and unfortunately omits any mention of β from his restoration. The document contains no proper names.

A preliminary point is to restore l. 13, if possible. Ll. 11–18 run as follows :—

- 11 συνέρχῃσθαι δὲ τοὺς συ-
 12 νέδρους ἐμ μὲν τῇ εἰρήνῃ το[. ?ἐ]ν δὲ τῷ πολέμῳ
 ᾧσακίς ἂν δοκῇ
 13 συμφέρειν τοῖς συνέδροις καὶ [τοῖς ἀρχουσι? κα]ὶ τῷ ὑπὸ τῶν βασιλέων
 ἐπὶ τῆς κοι-
 14 ν]ῆς φυλακῆς καταλελειμμέν[ωι- Συ]νεδρεύειν δὲ ὅποσας ἂν ἡμέρας οἱ
 πρόεδροι
 15 τοῦ συνεδρίου παραγγέλλωσ[ιν- Τ]ὰς δὲ συνόδους γενέσθαι τοῦ
 συνεδρίου, [ἔ-
 16 ως μὲν ἂν ὁ κοινὸς πόλεμος λυ[θῇ, ο]ὔ ἂν οἱ πρόεδροι καὶ ὁ βασιλεὺς ἢ
 ὁ<ι> ὑπὸ τῶν βα-
 17 σιλέων ἀποδεδειγμένος στρ[ατ]ηγὸς παραγγέλλῃ, ὅταν δ' ἡ εἰρήνη
 γέν[ηται,
 18 οὐ ἂν οἱ στεφανῶνται ἀγῶνες ἄγωνται.

Now these two clauses balance each other; one declares *when* the συνέδριον is to assemble, and the other *where*. This can hardly have been decided by two such different sets of authorities; if 'the king' helped to say *where*, he must also have helped to say *when*. Consequently for Cavvadias' tentative restoration in l. 13 [τοῖς ἀρχουσι? κα], I suggest that we must read [τῷ βασιλεῖ] ἢ. The inscription is not written στοιχηδόν, and the lines vary

¹ P. Cavvadias, 'Ἡ Ἀχαικὴ Συμπολιτεία κατ' ἐπιγραφὰς ἐκ τῶν ἀνασκαφῶν Ἐπιδαύρου. Ἐφ. Ἀρχ. 1918, 115. The inscription in question is No. 3, p. 128; I shall also have to refer to Nos. 2 and 3 β.

² *Attische Urkunden*, I. 1911, pp. 31–44. Cf. U. Wilcken, *Beiträge zur Geschichte des korinthischen Bundes*, Sitzungsab. Akad. Munich, 1917, Abh. 10, p. 37.

considerably in length; taking Cavvadias' arrangement of the fragments and measuring the gap, $\tau\omega\iota$ βασιλεῖ ἥ fits very well, while the mark on the stone (it is the lower half of an upright stroke) which Cavvadias restored as the iota of καὶ may just as well be the lower half of the second upright of H. It follows from this restoration that, if the decision is to be made by the σύνεδροι (or their πρόεδροι), acting in the one case in conjunction with 'the king or the general appointed by the kings,' and in the other case in conjunction with 'the king or the person left (appointed) by the kings for the common protection,' then the person appointed for the common protection and the kings' general are the same man, his formal title being given the first time only.

I will now first give briefly the reasons why the League of the inscription cannot be the Achaean. (1) The Assembly is a συνέδριον (l. 15, twice) composed of σύνοδοι (ll. 11, 13, 22, 24, 37). The term συνέδριον is unknown to the Achaean League, whose two Assemblies are, in Polybius, always σύγκλητος and σύνοδος.³ (2) Nomographi (l. 23) are to be chosen by lot ἐξ ἔθνους ἡ πόλεως, i. e. the constituent members of the League comprise ἔθνη as well as cities. There were no ἔθνη in the Achaean League, any ἔθνος joining being broken up into cities or districts.⁴ There was one exception, Elis; but Elis was not a member till later than 223. (3) The League officials include γραμματεῖς (ll. 24, 26). The Achaean League had only one γραμματεὺς.⁵ These γραμματεῖς must be those of the various constituent members of the League, whether ἔθνη or independent cities. (4) Five πρόεδροι (ll. 16, 21) are to be elected from the σύνοδοι. This office and title are unknown in the Achaean League, and apparently are unknown everywhere else except at Athens. (5) When peace is restored, the League meetings are to be held (l. 18) οὗ ἂν οἱ στεφανῶνται ἄγωνες ἄγωνται, i. e. at the four Panhellenic festivals. The Achaean League in 223 could never have contemplated holding its meetings at Delphi or Olympia, Delphi, moreover, being actually and Elis indirectly controlled by the unfriendly Aetolians. Cavvadias attempts to restrict the meaning to the Isthmia and Nemea; but the Greek cannot, I think, mean this. In fact, the meetings of the Achaean σύνοδος in the years following 223 were *not* held in accordance with the provisions of our inscription (either for peace or war), but continued to be held as usual at Aigion.⁶ (6) There is a joint kingship, which excludes the Achaean League of 223 (see *post*). (7) The provision of a general ἐπὶ τῆς κοινῆς φυλακῆς is unknown to the Achaean League. (8) That Antigonus Doson should have been given the right to interfere in what were, in fact, domestic concerns of the Achaean League, as 'the king' of ll. 11–18 would be entitled to do, is almost incredible, seeing that the basis of Doson's League was the old formula that the constituent members (of whom the Achaean League was one) were to be ἐλευθέρους

³ Details, etc., in Swoboda, *Staatsaltertümer* (in Hermann's *Lehrbuch*, 1913), p. 388 *seq.* That Pausanias calls the σύνοδος συνέδριον is immaterial. Plutarch gives σύνεδροι once (*Arat.* 35), but Polybius never.

⁴ *Ib.* p. 381.

⁵ *Ib.* p. 410.

⁶ Polyb. 2, 54, 3. 4, 7, 1; 26, 7–8; 82, 7.

πολιτείαις καὶ νόμοις χρωμένους τοῖς πατρίοις.⁷ Philip's interference in 218, when he supported a particular candidate for the generalship, is represented by Polybius (4, 82, 5-8) as a usurpation, inspired by Apelles. (9) Our inscription is written in ordinary Hellenistic Greek, and should therefore deal with the relations of several states, as both Wilhelm and Cavvadias point out.—These reasons seem to me to be conclusive.

Cavvadias' reasons for attributing the inscription to the Achaean League are three. (1) The stone was found built up in a wall together with the stone containing No. 2, a list of νομογράφοι of the Achaean League at a time when it included Sicyon, Argos, the Acte, and Megalopolis; and Cavvadias thought that the two were probably connected and that No. 3 might be the νόμος provided for by No. 2. (As, however, No. 3 provides for the appointment of nomographi, the connexion, if any, might have to be reversed, No. 2 being that appointment.) But two stones, even if taken from the same precinct, used in a later building have not necessarily any connexion with each other. (2) The League in question is a league of cities only. This is negated by l. 23, ἐξ ἔθνους ἢ πόλεως. (3) L. 18, τὰ δὲ δόξαντα τοῖς συνέ[δ]ροις [κύρια] εἶναι, fits (he considers) the Achaean League, but not Doson's, since Polyb. 4, 26, 2 shows that the acts of the συνέδριον of Doson's League were not κύρια. But there is nothing in this point. Even if [κύρια] be correct, the distinction cannot be maintained; for the acts of the synedri of Doson's League were κύρια with certain exceptions, *e.g.* declaring war;⁸ and the acts of the σύνοδος of the Achaean League (with which Cavvadias equates the συνέδριον of the inscription) were in no better position, as the σύνοδος (among other disabilities) could not declare war, that being reserved to the general assembly, the σύγκλητος.⁹ Also κύρια, if correct, may fit other Leagues beside the Achaean.

We are then, it appears, dealing with a League which comprised both ἔθνη and πόλεις, which contemplated holding its (political) meetings at the four Panhellenic festivals, and in which 'the king' had authority. That 'the king' must be some Macedonian is certain; the only alternative (if it be one), Areus I of Sparta, has been considered and rejected by Cavvadias for reasons quite conclusive. There are consequently three alternatives to be considered: the League of Corinth of Philip II and Alexander, dissolved in 323; the revival of this League by Demetrius I in 303; and the League of Doson and Philip V. As regards the letter-forms of the inscription, I note here that Fränkel called *I.G.* iv., 924, fourth or third century; Wilhelm (*l.c.* p. 33) has said it is certainly (*sicherlich*) fourth century; Cavvadias says in one place (p. 129) that it is third century, and subsequently (p. 135) that it *may* (δύναται) be third century. Evidently then the fourth century is open, if historical considerations point that way.

Now Wilhelm definitely attributed *I. G.* iv., 924 to the League of Corinth;

⁷ Polyb. 4, 25, 7; 84, 5. Cf. 2, 70, 4.

⁸ *Ib.* 4, 13, 6, ἐπεκύρωται; 4, 26, 2, τοῦ δόγματος κυρωθέντος. This shows that the inability to declare war of 4, 26, 2,

constitutes only an exception to their powers.

⁹ Swoboda, pp. 393, 396.

and there is a very startling parallel in language between the Covenant of that League and our inscription; l. 25 τῶι ὑπὸ τῶν βασιλέων ἐπὶ τῆς κοινῆς φυλακῆς καταλειμμέν[ωι recalls Pseudo-Demosthenes, *On the treaty with Alexander*, § 15, τοὺς ἐπὶ τῇ κοινῇ φυλακῇ τεταγμένους (cf. *I.G.* ii.², 1, 329). (As we have already seen from our inscription that the person appointed ἐπὶ τῆς κοινῆς φυλακῆς is probably the same as the general of 'the kings,' it seems to follow that Kaerst's interpretation of the phrase in Pseudo-Demosthenes is probably right;¹⁰ that is, the phrase does, in fact, refer to Antipater.) Nevertheless, there can be little question, now that we have more of the document of which *I.G.* iv. 924 formed part, that it does not refer to the League of Corinth at all. (1) There is a joint or double kingship,¹¹ which puts both Philip II and Alexander out of the question. (2) The League is engaged in a war, κοινὸς πόλεμος (ll. 7, 12, 16, 36), and that war is on the Greek mainland, making it necessary for the synedri to contemplate having to meet in different places. This puts every year from the foundation of the League of Corinth to its dissolution in 323 out of the question, except the autumn of 331; and as to 331, the circumstances and duration of Antipater's campaign against Agis of Sparta prohibit the idea that in the middle of that brief struggle delegates from the League States met to settle a new constitution, Alexander, moreover, being in Asia and Antipater otherwise engaged. (3) The scale of penalties for failure to send troops. For brevity's sake I refer once for all to Wilhelm's discussion; it suffices to say here that the penalty in our inscription of twenty drachmae a day for a hoplite shows that a hoplite's pay was two drachmae a day, the same payment as is provided for in the treaty between Aetolia and Acarnania of *circ.* 272 (*Syll.*³ 421), while in Alexander's time his hypaspists only got a drachma a day (*I.G.* ii.² 1, 329), and as they were his best heavy-armed infantry, a hoplite cannot possibly have got *more*; consequently we are dealing with a period later than Alexander, when the fall in the value of money consequent on the circulation of the Persian treasure had taken effect.—The League of Philip II and Alexander may therefore be left out of consideration; and the question is, Demetrius or Doson?

There are a number of facts which are ambiguous. The find-spot, Epidaurus, was in Demetrius' League (Plut. *Dem.* 25) as well as (through the Achaean League) in Doson's. In all the three Panhellenic Leagues the organ of the League was a συνέδριον or assembly of σύνεδροι,¹² and the Macedonian king was called ἡγέμων.¹³ The scale of penalties affords no help as between 303 and 223, for it seems that the rate of pay remained much the same;¹⁴

¹⁰ Wilhelm, *l.c.* p. 47 (cf. Niese, 1, 38), contended that the phrase in Pseudo-Demosthenes denotes a special authority representing both Alexander and the synedri of the League of Corinth; while Kaerst (*Rhein. Mus.* 52, 532; *Gesch. des Hellenismus*, 1², 529), followed by Wilcken, *op. cit.*, interpreted it as meaning 'das makedonische Königtum selbst und seine Organe.'

¹¹ Ll. 13, 16, τῶν βασιλέων; l. 29, συμφορόντων τοῖς βασιλεῖσιν.

¹² Philip and Alexander: *Syll.*³ 283 and 261, and much literary evidence. Demetrius: Diod. 20, 46, 5; Plut. *Dem.* 25. Doson: Polyb. 4, 25, 5; 26, 2, 5, 28, 3; 102, 9; 103, 1.

¹³ Philip II: *I.G.* ii.² 1, 236. Demetrius: Plut. *Dem.* 25. Doson: Polyb. 2, 54, 4.

¹⁴ Doson's treaties with Eleutherna and Hieropytna; Wilhelm *op. cit.*, with references. Unfortunately not in Dittenberger.

neither does the war on the Greek mainland, which may equally well be the Cleomonic war or the war of Demetrius and his League against Cassander. The resemblance already noted to Alexander's League with regard to the *κοινὴ φυλακὴ* does not help, for both Demetrius and Doson were largely copying Alexander. But there are five points which should enable us to decide.

(a) The joint kingship. In ll. 11–18 we have before us, twice, an alternative authority for doing something, either 'the king' or 'the general of the kings'; that is, if 'the king' be not actually at the *συνέδριον* himself, or for some reason be not acting, his place is to be taken, not by a general appointed by himself, but by one appointed by 'the kings.' 'The kings' then were both in existence at the moment when our document was drawn up, and cannot (as Cavvadias thought) refer generally to the dynasty. In 303 Antigonos I and Demetrius I satisfy this condition. We do not know their precise relationship as joint kings; but as Demetrius took orders from Antigonos, and in particular formed the League of 303 pursuant to such orders¹⁵ (the idea being his father's), there is no difficulty in supposing that his deputy would be appointed in his father's name as well as his own, or (l. 29) that something should be spoken of as agreeable to them both. But when we turn to 223, we are met by the difficulty that Doson was sole king. Certainly there is a reference to 'the kings' in an inscription of Eretria (*I.G.* xii. 9, 199), which Tsuntas, who published it,¹⁶ interpreted as meaning a joint kingship of Doson and Philip V; but I think no one has adopted this suggestion, and the inscription undoubtedly belongs to 303 or 302; Ziebarth in *I.G.* xii. 9 prints it among a group of inscriptions of the end of the fourth century. On the other hand, the evidence that Doson and Philip V were *not* joint kings seems complete.^{16a} Polyb. 4, 2, 5 says that Philip *παρελάβανε τὴν Μακεδόνων ἀρχήν*, and this verb seems regularly to mean to take over from a dead predecessor as an inheritance, the term for a joint king succeeding to the entirety being *διαδέξασθαι*.¹⁷ Doson's political testament (Polyb. 4, 87, 7) is irreconcilable with a joint kingship. Above all, there is Doson's own dedication on Delos to commemorate Sellasia (*I.G.* xi. 4, 1097), made at the very end of his life; in this he is sole king without reference to Philip. And this is common sense; for the reason for a joint kingship (*e.g.* Ptolemy I and Ptolemy II in 285/4) would normally be an old man's desire to make safe the coming transition of power; but Doson died unexpectedly in the prime of life. 'The kings' then of the Epidaurus inscription are Antigonos I and Demetrius I, and 'the king' is Demetrius. There is epigraphic evidence for Greek states referring to Demetrius simply as 'the king,'¹⁸ and to him and his father as 'the kings.'¹⁹ But our inscription may have named Demetrius previously.

¹⁵ Diod. 20, 99, 1; 100, 5; and in particular, 20, 46, 5.

¹⁶ 'Εφ. 'Αρχ. 1887, 80, No. 2.

^{16a} Certainly one cannot set up Eusebius' statement (Schoene, 1, 239, 240), that Philip after Doson's death *χωρὶς τοῦ ἐπιτρόπου* . . . *ἄρχειν ἤρξατο*, against Doson's Sellasia dedication. It merely shows that Eusebius' source

did not understand Doson's real position.

¹⁷ The evidence is collected in my *Antigonos Gonatas*, p. 433.

¹⁸ *I.G.* xi. 2, 146, A. 1. 76 (Lysixenos' year, 301, *i.e.* it refers to an event of 302); *I.G.* xi. 4, 566, l. 10.

¹⁹ *I.G.* xi. 4, 1036, l. 46, and 566, l. 7; *I.G.* ii.² 1, 495, 555, 558, 560; *Syll.*³, 347.

(b) The four Panhellenic festivals. In 223 Aetolia was, to Doson, an unfriendly neutral, barring his way through Thermopylae (Polyb. 2, 52, 8). She controlled Elis, and Elis' attitude was similar. Doson's League, therefore, cannot have thought of holding meetings at Delphi or Olympia. (The known meetings up to 217, two at Corinth and one at Panhormus, are no argument, being in war-time.) On the other hand, whether Phocis (as is probable) or Aetolia controlled Delphi in 303, Phocis was in Demetrius' League²⁰ and Aetolia (whether or not in his League) was his ally (Diod. 20, 100, 6); while Elis, freed in 312 by Antigonos' general Polemaeus (Diod. 19, 47), and not apparently attacked again by anyone, would be favourable to Aetolia's ally and may well have been in the League, though our scanty sources do not say. But there is more than this. It is very probable, as Droysen originally suggested, that the *συνέδριον* of the League of Corinth met (or was meant to meet) at the four great festivals (it certainly met at the Pythia), and, if so, Demetrius was almost bound to adopt the same idea. I refer for details to Kaerst's study of this question;²¹ it looks as though his prophecy (p. 529) about Demetrius' League, 'Wir würden dann hier ebenso . . . die panhellenische politische Aktion wieder an die panhellenische Festfeier angelehnt finden,' has come true.

(c) The fleet. L. 40 *seq.* of our document (= *I.G.* iv. 924) gives the scale of penalties for not supplying troops, calculated for four categories: horsemen, hoplites, light-armed, and something else. Wilhelm placed here the fragment β of *I.G.* iv. 924, which contains the word *ναύτην*, and made the fourth category sailors. He read (end of line 42 and beginning of 43) [$\kappa\alpha|\tauὰ\delta\epsilon$] *ναύτην*[. . . δ] *ραχμάς*. Cavvadias' reading is [$\kappa\alpha\iota\ \kappa\alpha$]| $\tauὰ\ \tau\omicron[\xi\acute{o}\tau\eta\nu\ \piέντε\ \delta]$ *ραχμάς*, the principal new fragment, which he numbers β' , showing four letters TATO at the beginning of l. 43, after which it breaks away. Now β in the diagram in *I.G.* has a sort of tail which reaches to the margin and shows a blank space of four or five letters, and from the shading it appears that the surface has gone; and I imagine that it will be found that the break is a splintered one and that the tail of β fits *underneath* that part of the surface of β' which bears the letters TATO. Only examination can show if this be correct; but if it be, then the reading seems clear: [$\kappa\alpha\iota\ \kappa\alpha$]| $\tauὰ\ \tau\omicron[\nu]$ *ναύτην*[. . . δ] *ραχμάς*. Now it is known that the maritime cities of Demetrius' League had to supply ships (*I.G.* xii. 9, 210). But this is very doubtful as regards Doson's League. We hear of no warships in the Cleomenic war; and in the Social War Philip V gives no thought to the sea till the second year, when he decides that he must take to the water, and so begins by hiring some Illyrian vessels, and subsequently collects a few from his allies and improvises a Macedonian fleet by putting his phalangites to the oar.²² The matter is not certain; but Philip's improvisations seem quite inconsistent with a definite provision for naval warfare in the constitution of the League.

(d) The *πρόεδροι* of our inscription recall Demetrius' beloved Athens, who was in his League, but not in Doson's; and they recall nothing else.

²⁰ Beloch, 3, 2, 300.

²² Polyb. 5, 2 *seq.*; 4, 29, 7.

²¹ *Rhein. Mus.* 52, 1897, pp. 526–529.

(e) Our inscription generally calls the constituent members of the League in question πόλεις (ll. 11, 21, 37, 40), but refers once to ἔθνη (l. 23). This excludes Doson's League, whose constituent members were all ἔθνη or κοινά.²³ The position in regard to Demetrius' League is unknown, but the probabilities agree well enough.

The result then is that (epigraphical reasons apart) historical considerations imperatively demand the attribution of the Epidaurus inscription to Demetrius' League of 303. The only argument for attributing it to Doson's League would be that it was found built up into a wall with another stone containing an inscription referable to about Doson's time. This does not necessarily mean anything at all.

Now what sort of a document is our inscription? It is clear that it is not a treaty or συνθήκη forming the League; we possess the very end of it (shown by the blank stone below), and it contains neither oath-formula nor any other mark of a treaty; moreover, l. 37 probably refers to the preceding συνθήκαι, —[ἀν] δέ τις πόλις μὴ ἀποστε[ίλῃ κ]ατὰ τὰς [συνθήκας] συνέδρους—, while the reference in l. 40 to τὴν δύ[ναμιν τῇ]ν τεταγμένην shows that the contingents of the members had already been settled, presumably by the συνθήκαι. It seems equally clear that it is not a decree or law of the σύνοδοι; no doubt they could have decided as to their meetings, fixed a quorum, appointed πρόεδροι, and other such matters, but they could never have decreed such provisions as l. 18 τὰ δὲ δόξαντα τοῖς συνέδ[ροις] [κύρια] εἶναι, or l. 20 περὶ δὲ τῶ[ν ἐν] τῷ συνεδρίῳ δοξάντων μὴ ἐξέστ[ω ταῖς] πόλεσιν ἐνθύνας λαμβάνειν [παρὰ] τῶν ἀποστελλομένων συνέδρω[ν]. It must then be an act of the constituent assembly of the League, a constitutive act.²⁴ The League would be formed by a number of treaties; delegates or πρεσβεῖς from the constituent members would then meet and pass the constitutive law of the League, of which I take our document to form part; subsequent meetings would be held by the synedri.

This being so, one can probably restore the gap in l. 40:—καὶ ἄν τις πόλις [μὴ ἀ]ποστείλῃ τὴν δύ[ναμιν τῇ]ν τεταγμένην, [ἦν ἂν ὁ ἄρχων? πα]ραγγέλλῃ, κ.τ.λ. The spacing of the letters in the inscription varies, and as far as I can see from measurements the twelve letters given for this gap by Cavvadias constitute a maximum, while eleven would be fully sufficient. As the contingent of each city was already τεταγμένη, fixed (i. e. by the treaties, presumably), it cannot have been provided that some one should fix it again. On the other hand, the calling out of the contingents already fixed would certainly rest with Demetrius as commander-in-chief. Hence I would read, after τεταγμένην, [ἀν ὁ ἡγέμων πα]ραγγέλλῃ.²⁵

It is unfortunate that the latter part of l. 36 is so broken. Cavvadias prints the reading of *I.G.* iv., 924: Προεδρεύειν [δὲ]ων ραστ

²³ Emphasised by Beloch, 3, 1, 737.

²⁴ See the interesting study of the constitutive law of the League of Corinth given by Wilcken, *op. cit.*

²⁵ Cf. *I.G.* ii.² 1, 236 (Philip II and

League of Corinth): πολεμῆσω—καθότι—ὁ ἡγέ[μων κελεύει]. Also the proceedings of Philip V in the Social War with regard to the League troops.

[. *Αν]. But Wilhelm considers that Nikitsky's later reading βασι (for ραστ) is certain. As Μακεδόνων is out of the question in 303, the reading must be Προεδρεύειν [δὲ τῶν βασι[λέων.—*Αν . .], *i. e.* there is a space of two letters vacant at the end of the line; the lines end irregularly, and as many as three spaces are vacant at the end of ll. 5 and 6. The subject of the sentence being τοὺς προέδρους, the real question now is, was the preposition ἀντὶ or μετὰ? If μετὰ, one would expect τοῦ βασιλέως, as Antigonus' presence could hardly be expected; still, the proedri might be considered in theory the colleagues of both kings. If ἀντὶ, a rather startling vista is opened up. I see no means of deciding.

Lastly, one must look at the fragment 3 β. As it contains part of an oath-formula, it belongs to a συνθήκη, as Cavvadias points out; it cannot, therefore, be part of our inscription, No. 3. It may not belong to the same period at all. Whether it can be part of one of the preliminary συνθήκαι of Demetrius' League may depend on the true reading of l. 31, which Cavvadias gives as [βασ]ιλείαν τήν' α? - - - . What Cavvadias' representation of the stone shows, however, is clearly a lambda, Λ; perhaps a fresh examination might show if it be really Λ, or Ἀ[ντιγόνου, or Δ[ημητρίου. The two proper names in 3 β, Ἀχαιοὺς and Ἡλαιοὺς, offer no difficulty. Elis, we have seen, may well have been in Demetrius' League; and as to Achaea, Demetrius freed some towns in 303 (Diod. 20, 103, 4). I am aware that many text-books state that Alexander dissolved the Achaean League in 324; but the statement is quite unfounded. The passage in Hyperides (κατὰ Δεμ. col. 18) runs καὶ τῶν ἐπιταγμάτων ὧν ἦκεν φέρων παρ' Ἀλεξάνδρου περὶ τοῦ τοὺς κοινούς συλλόγους Ἀχαιῶν τε καὶ Ἀρκάδων καὶ Βοιωτῶν [breaks off]. The words as they stand have no meaning, and we have no right to invent one. The invention is not even probable; for if Alexander really gave these three peoples a first-class grievance by *ordering* the dissolution of their Leagues (he can have had no time to carry out the dissolution, any more than he had time to carry out the restoration of the Samians, which he *did* order in 324), how came it that Achaea and Arcadia refused to join the Greeks in the Lamian war, while Boeotia heartily aided Antipater? In fact, Polybius (2, 41) is quite explicit about the old Achaean League; its dissolution took place somewhere between Alexander's time and the 124th Olympiad (284/3–281/0 B.C.), and he implies that it was not an act but a process. If Ἀχαιοὺς *must* mean a League (why not a Folk?), there is no difficulty about supposing that the old Achaean League existed in 303. But 3 β *may* not belong to this period.

The conclusion then is that in the Epidaurus inscription No. 3 we have part of the constitutive act of Demetrius' League of 303, a League of which the literary sources tell us comparatively little, but which is epigraphically attested by three inscriptions of Eretria (*I.G.* xii. 9. 198, 199, 210). Details of procedure apart, we see that Demetrius' League was primarily (though not exclusively) based on cities, that it was planned on a Panhellenic scale, and that, after Cassander was overthrown, it was to meet at the four Panhellenic festivals. The adoption of the system of προέδροι was meant as a compliment to Athens.

The inscription also confirms the well-established fact that Antigonos I regarded himself (and Demetrius) as standing in Alexander's place and monarch of the whole empire; for Demetrius envisages the day when, himself in Asia, he shall hand over the conduct of the League's affairs to a general appointed 'for the common protection,' just as Alexander had entrusted them, under the same title, to Antipater.

W. W. TARN.