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## PREFACE.

THE preparation of the present volume was planned not long after the memorable publication of Mr Kenyon's editio princeps on Friday, the thirtieth of January, 189. In that important work much was happily done by its able editor to facilitate the study of the newly discovered treatise by a skilful decipherment of the papyrus, by a careful comparison of the text with that of the existing fragments, by a judicious restoration of a large number of passages imperfectly preserved in the manuscript, and by an eminently readable commentary on many interesting points of constitutional history. The editio princeps was also the editoris primitiae; and, considering the brief limits of time within which it was prepared, and notwithstanding certain superficial blemishes which have since been removed, it was undoubtedly a remarkable achievement.

In the opinion, however, of competent critics there appeared to be room, by the side of Mr Kenyon's work, for an edition in which closer attention might fitly be paid to matters of scholarship and verbal criticism, together with a more minute comparison of the fresh evidence with that already familiar to us in two closely allied departments of Classical learning, (I) the Constitutional History, and (2) the Legal Antiquities of Athens. There was also at that time an acknowledged need of an Index Graecitatis; and lastly there was a call for a fuller and clearer statement of the evidence on the text so far as it could be derived from quotations in later Greek literature. It has been the aim of the present writer to endeavour to supply such an edition.

The Introduction begins with a slight sketch of the political literature of Greece before the time of Aristotle, so far as it was directly concerned with theories of government. This is followed by a brief notice of the Politics of Aristotle and of the lost political works ascribed to the same author. The external evidence as to the authorship of the Modıreiat is next reviewed in chronological order, showing that, according to testimony extending over fifteen centuries from the age immediately succeeding that of Aristotle, the work, as a whole, was ascribed to Aristotle and to none beside. A brief account of the later literature of the subject is succeeded by a description of the Berlin Fragments, and the
 treatise is placed between 328 and 325 B.c., which corresponds to the latter part of Aristotle's life; and, after a discussion of its relation to the Politics, and an examination of its style and language, it is accepted as being substantially the work of Aristotle himself; due regard is, however, paid to the considerations that have been urged on the other side by several eminent scholars. The discussion of the authorship is followed by an indication of the authorities either certainly or probably used by the writer. This is succeeded by an abstract of the contents, which (excepting a few dates added for the sake of clearness, with one or two items supplementary to the lost beginning of the treatise), is strictly confined to the author's own statements, any extraneous matter being carefully distinguished as such. The rest of the Introduction is mainly devoted to a conspectus of the Bibliography of the treatise, showing that, apart from editions and translations and separate works, the number of writers of signed contributions to the literature of the subject, in the department of periodical publications alone, already exceeds one hundred and thirty. Many of these papers were not published until after the present edition was already in type, the Commentary on the first forty-one chapters and the first draft of the Critical Notes and Testimonia having been written during the Long Vacation of 1891, while the greater part of the Introduction was prepared for delivery in the form of College Lectures in the autumn of the same year. An abstract of the contents of some of the more recent literature is included in the conspectus, wherever it seemed to be desirable. Professor Bruno Keil's important volume of nearly $25^{\circ}$ pages on the Solonian Constitution as described in the 'A $\theta \eta v a i \omega \nu$ modıceia, with many interesting criticisms on the treatise in general, did not appear until the present edition was nearly ready for publica-
tion; but it has been found possible to include a few references to it in the Addenda and in the English Index.

In settling the Text I have constantly used the facsimile published by the Trustees of the British Museum ; and, on nearly all points of special difficulty, I have also endeavoured to form an opinion of my own by consulting the papyrus itself. In the case of passages imperfectly preserved in the ms, I have considered it safer to accept Mr Kenyon's testimony as to the exact number of letters still visible, than that of other editors who, without having had the advantage of inspecting the ms, much less of having constant access to it, have not unfrequently indicated letters as actually visible which (at the best) are represented only by the faintest traces in the facsimile on which their texts are confessedly founded. Where the reading is uncertain, or the ms defective, I have freely admitted conjectures that commended themselves to my judgment as sound restorations of the text. My own conjectures, so far as they are here put forward for the first time, are always distinguished by an asterisk whenever they are included in the text; but even of these, several must be regarded as merely provisional and tentative restorations. Others are only suggested in the notes. References to all of them may be readily found in the English Index, under the heading 'Conjectures.'

In the Critical Notes the readings of the ms are for convenience recorded in a distinctive type. No one, however, who is familiar with the facsimile as a whole, or with the specimen published in Mr Kenyon's Translation, will regard these 'small uncials' as intended to represent the actual characters used by any one of the four copyists employed on the work. I have also indicated the readings or conjectures adopted in the principal critical editions that have already appeared; the Dutch edition, by van Herwerden and van Leeuwen; the two German editions, by Kaibel and von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, and by Blass respectively ; and the third (and carefully revised) edition by Mr Kenyon. Where Mr Kenyon has himself withdrawn the reading proposed in his first edition, I have not thought it desirable to record the reading so withdrawn, unless it helped to explain some of the earlier conjectures which in themselves appeared deserving of mention. I have therefore said nothing about such purely provisional readings as кapסía каì коьvñ in c. 40 l. 17. It was clear that kapסía could not be right, and more than one scholar (for example, Professor Blass, Professor Mayor, and Mr Bywater) saw at once that кaì ióía каì кowv̂ was a necessary correction; S. A.
but, now that it is admitted that this is virtually the reading of the papyrus, in which KAIDIA is corrected into KAll $\Delta I A$, it is no longer necessary to record the text of the first edition. At the time, however, when the above suggestion was made, it had every right to be described as an 'emendation'; and it may be interesting to add that, as such, it attracted the notice of the late Mr Freeman, who observes in the preface to the third volume of his History of Sicily:-'such an emendation as this is not conjecture at all ; it is the keen instinct of the true expert seeing his way straight to the right thing.' Again, it has not been deemed desirable to record all the conjectures that have been proposed since the publication of the editio princeps, many of them, however attractive at first sight, being excluded by our present knowledge of the actual readings of the papyrus, or by other considerations.

The Testimonia, printed immediately below the critical notes, contain further evidence on the text, in the form of quotations in Greek Lexicographers, Scholiasts, and others. Many, but by no means all, of these, had already been recorded in the various editions of the Fragments. In the present volume, a good deal of pains has been spent on the endeavour to trace in the Scholiasts, and in authors such as Aristides, tacit quotations or paraphrases of our text, which had hitherto escaped detection owing to their source having been unacknowledged. In the case of these quotations, it has been thought best not to remain content with giving references alone, but (as a general rule) to print the passages in full. It is only thus that their exact value in relation to the text can be readily seen.

In the Explanatory Notes considerable space has naturally been assigned to the quotation of parallel passages, especially from the Politics; and on every point an endeavour has been made to compare the new evidence with the old. In the historical notes to the first part (c. r--4I) much had already been accomplished by Mr Kenyon; but the second part (c. 42 to the end) was comparatively new ground. Throughout the work special attention has been given to the evidence of Greek Inscriptions.

The Greek Index gives a complete list of the vocabulary, with full citations of the phraseology of the treatise, including that of the passages quoted from the poems of Solon and the decrees of Athens, which are duly distinguished from citations from the body of the work. Words not recorded in the Index Aristotelicus, and words hitherto unknown; are indicated by distinctive marks. In checking the items in this Index,
much help has been derived from the two Greek Indices, the Index Dictionis and the Index Nominum et Rerum, of the Dutch edition; but in the present work it has been thought best to have only one Greek Index, and to adopt a more convenient mode of reference. The preparation of this Index has been a laborious task and has considerably delayed the publication of the volume.

The Archaeological Illustrations in the frontispiece are borrowed from Daremberg and Saglio's Dictionnaire des Antiquités (Hachette, Paris) : the Aeginetan and Attic coins on p. 39, from Baumeister's Denkmäler des Klassischen Alterthums (Oldenbourg, Munich). To the publishers of both of these important works, the best thanks are due for the readiness with which they have accorded the use of these illustrations.

Among those who in other ways have aided me in preparing the present work, I gladly mention in the first place Mr Kenyon, who, with his able colleagues in the department of mss at the British Museum, has afforded me every facility for studying the papyrus; and, at times when my daily duties in Cambridge made it impossible for me to visit the Museum, has readily given me the fullest information on any point on which I had occasion to consult him. It is a pleasure to add that for a large number of valuable notes and references I am indebted to the kindness of two whose names have long been eminent in the world of scholars :-Mr W. L. Newman, Fellow of Balliol College, Oxford, and editor of Aristotle's Politics; and the Rev. John Eyton Bickersteth Mayor, Senior Fellow of St John's, and Professor of Latin in the University of Cambridge. I am similarly indebted in no less degree to a scholar of more recent reputation, Mr W. Wyse, late Fellow of Trinity, and now Professor of Greek in University College, London, whose felicitous emendations of the text, founded mainly on a minute acquaintance with the Attic Orators, and proposed at a time when he was resident in his College rooms in Cambridge, are one more proof that the spirit of Dobree still happily dwells in its ancient home. Lastly, in response to a request conveyed by Mr George Macmillan, Secretary of the Hellenic Society and a member of the firm by which this volume is published, his Excellency the Minister for Greece, whose recent departure from England is regretted by all lovers of Hellenic learning, was good enough to lend me his own copy of the admirable emendations proposed by his brother, Anastasios Gennadios, in the columns of an Athenian newspaper taking its name from the Acropolis.

He also kindly allowed me the use of a number of a Greek philological magazine, ' $\mathrm{A} \theta_{\eta \nu \hat{a}}$, containing valuable articles on the textual criticism of the treatise by G. A. Papabasileios, and K.S. Kontos. This magazine was not to be found in the Library of the British Museum, and is practically inaccessible in England except to its annual subscribers. While engaged in exploring the scattered literature of such a subject as the present, one feels in such a case, no less than in that of the Sitzungsberichte of the Berlin Academy, the full force of the complaint made not long ago by the late Mr Freeman. 'No man can undertake to find out every pamphlet and every article. And, when one has found what is wanted, it is sometimes forbidden to buy the number that one wants, unless one chooses to buy a whole volume that one does not want.' I can only add that I shall be grateful to writers of similar articles for any separate copies of their papers that happen to be available; and, if in this way I become possessed of any duplicates, I propose to present the duplicate to a Library where it will be readily accessible to many who are interested in the subject.

I owe much besides to the principal editions of the treatise, especially to Mr Kenyon's third edition, more particularly for details connected with the readings in the papyrus. The study of the ms and of the facsimile alike has been considerably facilitated by the convenient plan adopted in the Dutch edition of Professors Van Herwerden and Van Leeuwen, in which the contents of the ms are indicated, not merely column by column, but also line by line. The edition of the text by Professors Kaibel and von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff has been of much use in revising the text and the testimonia, and in dealing with the fragments. In this last particular, as in some others, a still further advance has been made in the very useful Teubner text recently edited by Professor Blass, the results of whose subsequent examination of the papyrus have, by his own kindness, reached me in time to be included in the Addenda.

My obligations to other published works are acknowledged as they arise, and are also expressed in general terms at the close of the bibliographical part of the Introduction. It may here be noticed that several of the most important of the books of reference to which I am thus indebted, are already attesting in their new editions the value of the evidence on the Constitutional History and the Public Antiquities of Athens which is contained in the treatise that, little more than two
years ago, was so unexpectedly restored to us from the tombs of Egypt.

Up to the time of that fortunate event, the student was compelled to satisfy his curiosity with the scattered fragments that, in successive generations, first in Italy and France, and afterwards in Holland and Germany, had been diligently sought by the industry of scholars, and collected into one by those 'friends of Truth,' who (in Milton's phrase) 'imitating the carefull search that Isis made for the mangl'd body of Osiris, went up and down gathering limb by limb still as they could find them.' Even now, when in place of these disiecta membra, the actual body of the work has been happily recovered in an approximately complete condition, the 'friends of Truth' have made much ado over many minor details of the great discovery. After all that has been found, the quest continues still ; but it is no longer limited, as it was two years ago, to the enterprise of a single scholar, enjoying all the privileges, and, at the same time, encountering not a few of the perils of a solitary pioneer. On the contrary, it is shared by a goodly number of eager investigators in many lands; and the very number of those who are joining in the quest is almost a source of embarrassment to any one of them who attempts to gather up the main results of their research and to combine them with his own. The last two years have led to many points connected with the new treatise being viewed in a more sober light and with a more fitting sense of proportion : the exaggerated expectations that were at first aroused have been followed by a natural reaction, which is now succeeded in its turn by the prevalence of an intermediate state of settled contentment. Meanwhile, the excitement of that earlier time is over ; and those who are still engaged on the quest must be content to continue their patient toil unstimulated and unrewarded by any such general and public interest as that which justly awaited the first announcement of an event which has enabled men of letters to realise in the present day some of the joyous surprises of the age of the Renaissance. In the feeling language lately used in Cambridge by a learned prelate belonging to both of the two oldest Universities of the United Kingdom, 'the dignity and nobility of a scholar's life lie in this, that it claims no recognition, and asks for no reward. It seldom admits of excitement ; it has no prospect of great encouragement; it looks forward to no definite achievement.' There are times, however, when a student, while attempting to restore and explain some imperfectly recorded remnant of
the past, may take a quiet pleasure in obeying the precept of George Herbert :-
'If studious, copie fair what Time hath blurr'd'.
And at last there is a moment when, in the spirit of thankfulness that comes with the completion of an arduous undertaking, he may, as at present, offer to the kindly criticism and to the use of others a work which, however long delayed by lack of leisure, and however inadequate in itself, has at least been the result of the most unsparing labour and the most strenuous endeavour.

December 27, 1892.
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## INTRODUCTION.

## § 1. The political literature of Greece before the time of Aristotle.

In a brief preliminary survey of the political literature of Greece ${ }^{1}$, it is unnecessary to dwell on the names of representatives of the pre-Socratic schools of philosophy, such as Pythagoras of Samos and Protagoras of Abdera, although the former is said to have written a $\pi о \lambda \iota \tau \iota \kappa o ̀ \nu \tau \gamma \gamma \rho a \mu \mu \alpha$ (Diog. Laert. viii 6), and the latter a treatise $\pi \epsilon \rho i=\pi o \lambda \iota \tau \epsilon i^{\prime} \alpha$ s (ib. ix 55 ). The work ascribed to Pythagoras was undoubtedly spurious; like that of Protagoras, it has been lost to posterity.

The earliest extant specimen of this branch of literature is the treatise preserved among the works of Xenophon under the title of ${ }^{2}$ A $\theta \eta \nu \alpha i ́ \omega \nu$ тодı $\tau \epsilon i ́ a$. Among modern scholars Cobet stands almost alone in being content to accept it as Xenophon's (Nov. Lect. p. 706). Its authorship is in fact uncertain : it has been attributed to Alcibiades ${ }^{2}$, and also to Critias ${ }^{3}$, who is known to have written on the $\pi 0 \lambda \iota \tau \epsilon i \alpha l$ of Sparta, Thessaly and Athens. It may fairly be regarded as emanating from the oligarchical party at Athens, and as primarily intended for the perusal of readers at Sparta who sympathised with their aims. It was probably written between B.C. 426 and 413 . It is in any case the earliest Greek political treatise that has come down to us. More than this, it is the 'oldest extant specimen of literary Attic prose ${ }^{4}$; it is also 'the oldest extant specimen of a political pasquinade'. The real or imputed abuses of the Athenian Democracy are attacked in a tone of bitter sarcasm or insidious irony, relieved by acute remarks on interesting points of national economy, such as the relations of Athens to her subjects and rivals, and the comparative strength and weakness of her naval and military establishments ${ }^{5}$.

The $\Lambda a \kappa \kappa \delta a \iota \mu \alpha \nu i \omega v$ тodırєía, though regarded as spurious by Deme-

[^0][^1]trius of Magnesia (Diog. Laert. ii 57), is accepted as the work of Xenophon by Plutarch ( $L y c$. r) and others in ancient times, and among the moderns by Cobet (Nov. Lect. p. 705-724) and many others. Its date is possibly later than the battle of Leuctra ( 37 I ) ; but is more probably between 403 and 40 r . It is a work inspired throughout by admiration of Spartan institutions. The Kúpov $\pi a i \delta \epsilon i ́ a$ is later than the death of Socrates (Cyrop. 111 i 38-40), and was probably written after Xenophon's return from exile, or about 369 . While professing to describe the education of the founder of the Persian empire, it is really a historical and political romance, an idealised biography with a didactic purpose, being practically an encomium on Socratic principles and Spartan practice. It is prompted by the author's experience of Hellenic political and social life, especially the instability and vicissitudes of various forms of government ${ }^{1}$.

The pamphlet entitled $\pi \sigma^{\prime} \rho o \iota[\hat{\eta} \pi \epsilon \rho i$ i $\pi \rho o \sigma a ́ \delta \omega \nu$ ] was probably not the work of Xenophon, but was written about 346 b.c. as a manifesto of the party who held that the commercial prosperity of Athens depended on peace with Philip. It suggests several expedients for enlarging the revenue, especially by means of taxes levied on resident aliens, as well as profits derived from the labour of ro,000 public slaves who were to be employed in the mines of Laurium.

Passing from 'Xenophon' to Plato, we have in the Republic the most memorable of all delineations of an Ideal State. In the first four books the description of the State is in harmony with Hellenic notions of religion and morality; in the remainder, the Hellenic State is transformed into an ideal kingdom of philosophy, of which all other governments are perversions ${ }^{2}$. In the eighth book ${ }^{3}$ all conceivable forms of constitutions are reduced to five classes, represented by aristocracy, timocracy, oligarchy, democracy and despotism or tyranny, corresponding to five leading types of individual character. In the portraits of the typical 'timocrat', tyrant, and democrat, and in the account of the successive changes which they represent, we have a sequence of transformations that is not entirely in accordance with historical facts, but nevertheless supplies us with something of the nature of a philosophy of history. The author is clearly no lover of democracy, or indeed of any of the existing varieties of government. His gaze is fixed on something above and beyond the horizon of his time. In his view, as expressed in the closing words of the ninth book, the man of understanding is little likely to be a politician in the land of his birth, though he will certainly be a politician in an ideal city which is all his own;

[^2]a city whose pattern is laid up in heaven, and he who desires may look on that pattern and in the vision find indeed his home. But whether there really is, or ever will be, such a city, is of no concern to him; for he will do all things in obedience to the laws of that city and of no other.

The Republic is almost always called the חoдıтéa, but sometimes bears the plural name, Пo入ıteîal. Thus Themistius (ii 32 c ) associates
 The dialogue on the Lawes was composed after the Republic (Ar. Pol. ii 3, r), and was published after the author's death (Diog. Laert. iii 37). It sets forth in minutest fulness the details of an Ideal Code; and, in the absence of any actual code of the institutions of Athens, the indications of the existing laws therein contained are often of special value ${ }^{1}$. The lofty conception of the 'rule of Philosophers' is here abandoned, and the state described is the best which is practically possible under the existing limitations of Greek life. In the third book the author reviews the constitutions of Sparta, Persia and Athens, noting the causes of the success and failure of each; and then proceeds to develop his own constitution. In the Platonic dialogue, entitled the Moגıтькós, or an inquiry into the definition of a Ruler, there is much affinity with the Laws of Plato and the Politics of Aristotle. In contrast to the doubtless earlier scheme in the Republic, with its five types of constitution, we here find a series of seven, in which, apart from the ideal and only perfect type, we have six existing forms of government. These six are obtained by dividing the rule of the One ( $\mu$ ovapxia), of the
 two varieties each, (r) into kingship and tyranny, and (2) into aristocracy and oligarchy, while the two varieties of democracy ('constitutional government' and 'simple democracy') are undistinguished by any differences of name. The distinction in each of these three pairs turns upon the question whether Law is observed or not ${ }^{*}$. In its political views, and probably in its date, this dialogue occupies an intermediate position between the Republic and the Lawes; and its classification of typical forms of government reappears, with slight differences of terminology, in the Ethics and Politics of Aristotle ${ }^{3}$. Of the other political dialogues bearing Plato's name, the Epinomis is an appendix to the Lazes, and is mainly concerned with Education; the Minos dis-

[^3]cusses the definition of Law ; but neither of these can be reckoned among the genuine works of Plato.

The above summary has been purposely confined to writings strictly concerned with politics, to the exclusion of historical works in which political discussion only plays a subordinate part. Otherwise, we might have recalled the debate on the relative merits of monarchy, oligarchy and democracy, which is ascribed to the Persian grandees in the pages of Herodotus (iii 80-82); and the reflexions on the effects of party spirit in Grecian politics, to which Thucydides is prompted by the narrative of the vengeance of the victorious demos on the oligarchs of Corcyra (iii 82 f ). As it is, in the limited field of purely political literature, we have noted the rise of the polemical pamphlet, and the historical romance, while in Plato's delineation of an Ideal State and an Ideal Code, we have seen the prototype of writings such as Sir Thomas More's Utopia and Bacon's Nerw Atlantis. The setting forth of such ideals became a favourite medium for the expression of political criticism ; but it is characteristic of Aristotle that, while following this fashion, he succeeded in bringing the political speculations of philosophy into closer relation with the facts of history.' In the language of one of the foremost authorities on the political writings of Aristotle, "political science 'begins' for Aristotle 'in History', no less than in Ethics"'. 'The vision of an ideal State did not make Aristotle indifferent to the problems and difficulties of the actual State. The age which dreams of ideal States is often on the point of losing its interest in politics; but this was far from being the case with Aristotle ${ }^{2 \prime}$.

## § 2. Political works ascribed to Aristotle.

Among the political writings ascribed to Aristotle by far the most important is, of course, the Politics. The imperfect form in which it has come down to us has been variously explained. The earlier view, supported by Spengel ${ }^{3}$, was that the work of Aristotle was originally completed by himself, and that important portions of it were afterwards lost. The later view, which is more probable in itself, and is accepted by almost all Aristotelian scholars in modern times, regards the Politics as a work that was left unfinished. This view is corroborated by the fact that in later writers we have no reference to the Politics which cannot be traced to the existing work. The latest event mentioned in it is the death of Philip, в.c. 336 (viii (v) 8, 10, p. 13ıi b 2). As to

[^4]the order of the books, it can hardly be doubted that, owing to the nature of their contents, books vii and viii should come immediately after iii, while it is not quite certain that books $v$ and vi should be transposed. The order adopted by Susemihl is as follows : i, ii, iii, vii, viii, iv, vi, v . Thus books iv-viii of the new order correspond to vii, viii, iv, vi, v, of the old ${ }^{1}$. In the Politics Aristotle discusses the origin of the household, the village and the state, and examines the nature of property, and in particular of property in slaves (Bk. 1). The citizen is defined as one who shares in the judicial or deliberative administration of a state. In the next book, Aristotle criticises the Republic and the Lazes of Plato, the constitutions framed by Phaleas and Hippodamus, and the actual forms of government prevailing in Sparta, Crete and Carthage, closing with some (possibly interpolated) criticisms on Solon and Pericles (II). The various types of government are thereupon described in turn, Monarchy, Aristocracy and a mixed constitutional system called moдıтєia, together with the three forms into which they respectively degenerate, Tyranny, Oligarchy and Democracy (in). The author next delineates his Ideal State, and deals with the subject of Marriage and of Education, Bk iv (vir). The latter should be national and also liberal; its two main branches are 'music' and 'gymnastic', Bk v (viil). The types of government are then discussed in detail. Of the three perversions, Tyranny, the perversion of Monarchy, which is itself the best and most divine, is necessarily the worst. Oligarchy, the perversion of Aristocracy, is not so bad as Tyranny; the last, and the least bad, is Democracy. The different kinds of government are then further discriminated, with the forms assumed by the deliberative and the executive power in each, Bk vı (iv). The basis of democracy is defined to be liberty, which includes the principle that 'all should rule and be ruled in turn'. The characteristics of democracy are then described :-all officers of state are appointed 'by all, and out of all'; all rule over each, and each in turn rules over all; the appointment is by lot, except in cases where special knowledge is required ; there is little or no qualification ; office is held for a short time only, and rarely (if ever) twice, except in the case of military offices ; all men, or at least persons selected out of all, sit in judgment in all causes, or at any rate on the most important; the public Assembly is supreme, not the officers of state ; when the citizens are paid, even the Council loses its

[^5][^6]power, as the Assembly and the Lawcourts take all the business to themselves. Then follow the various kinds of oligarchies; and the consideration of the due coordination of offices in the state, Bk vir (vi). The author's design is now nearly completed. He has still to speak of the motives, objects and occasions of revolutions in states. Revolutions begin in trifling matters but involve important issues. They are brought about either by force or by fraud. The author next considers how revolutions may be avoided, and tyrannies and monarchies preserved; he describes a despot of a virtuous, and beneficent type; and adds some reflexions on the short duration of tyrannies and oligarchies. Lastly, he attacks the views put forward in the Republic as to the cycle through which states are described as passing in the course of their decline. Thus the work ends (as it began) with a criticism on Plato.

Among the lost writings of Aristotle was one entitled Пoдıcıкós, a dialogue in two books, expressly mentioned by Diogenes Laertius (v 22), and vaguely noticed by Cicero ${ }^{1}$. The anonymous list of his
 That of Diogenes Laertius, a work entitled $\pi \epsilon \rho \grave{~} \beta a \sigma \iota \lambda \epsilon i a s$, said to have been addressed to Alexander ${ }^{2}$; and a dialogue on colonisation under

 said to have contained the formal pleas on the points of difference submitted by the Greek states to the arbitration of Philip ${ }^{4}$. A work of far wider scope was that known as the vó $\mu \iota \mu$, or ขо́ $\mu ц а$ вар $\beta$ арька́, of Aristotle. This was a comprehensive account of the institutions of various non-hellenic peoples, including the Etruscans, under the head of $\nu \dot{\prime} \mu \mu \mu a \operatorname{Tv\rho \rho \eta \nu \omega \imath v.~An~abstract~of~this~existed~at~one~time~under~the~}$ name of $\nu о \mu i \mu \omega \nu \beta a \rho \beta a \rho \iota \kappa \omega ิ \nu \sigma v \nu \alpha \gamma \omega \gamma \eta^{5}$.

Lastly, there was the work entitled the Подıтєial, or sketches of the constitutional history of a large number of Hellenic states. Constitutional history, however, was far from forming the sole subject of this extensive work. The numerous fragments that have survived give abundant proof that local legends, national proverbs, and even anecdotes of social life found a place in its pages ${ }^{6}$. It is generally supposed

[^7][^8]that the great collection of facts comprised in the Пoגıreial formed the materials for the composition of the Politics. It will be shewn at a later point that the 'A $\begin{aligned} & \eta \nu \alpha i \\ & \omega\end{aligned}$ л $\pi$ odıreia in particular was not completed until about nine years after the latest date recorded in the Politics; but this fact is not inconsistent with the materials collected for the Пoдırєiat being used in the Politics even before they had themselves been reduced into their present form. As regards the comparative value of the two works, the general character of the fragments of the Mo入ıreial shews that it would be going too far to say that we could wish that the חodtтєial were 'preserved, even at the expense of the extant book on the theory of politics', especially when we reflect that, in the words of the writer just quoted, 'the Politics are confessed on all hands to be the ripest and fullest outcome of Greek political experience ${ }^{\prime 1}$.

The treatise known as the 'A $\theta \eta v a i \omega v$ подıтєia formed part of the vast collection of חodıréal $^{\text {w }}$ which the unanimous voice of antiquity ascribed to the pen of Aristotle. In tracing the literary history of the Mo入ıteiat we must necessarily begin with the well-known story of the fate of Aristotle's library, which is told in full by Strabo (p. 608-9), and more briefly touched upon by Plutarch (Sulla, 26). On the death of Aristotle, in 322 b.c., his library passed into the possession of his pupil, Theophrastus, who presided over the Peripatetic school at Athens until his death in 287. The library of Theophrastus, including that of Aristotle, was bequeathed to a pupil of both, named Neleus, who removed it to Scêpsis, an inland town of Asia Minor, in the S.E. of the Troad. From Neleus it passed to his descendants, who were men of neither literary accomplishments nor philosophic tastes. They are described by Strabo as i i $\delta \omega \pi$ тai. They were, however, sufficiently conscious of the value of the manuscripts to prevent their being appropriated by the kings of Pergamos, who began to form their famous library about thirty or forty years after the death of Theophrastus. The manuscripts were accordingly concealed in a cellar, where they were exposed to injury from the effects of damp and the depredations of worms. It was probably after the death of the last of the Pergamene Kings in b.c. 133, that they were sold to Apellicon of Teôs, a wealthy adherent of the Peripatetic school at Athens. On examination they were found to contain many compositions which were unknown to the successors of Theophrastus at the head of the Lyceum. Their owner caused them to be copied; but, as he was 'more of a bibliophile than a philosopher', the transcripts published under his care proved to be far from accurate. In 86 b.c. Athens was captured by Sulla, and the library of Apellicon was taken to Rome. It was there placed under the charge of a librarian, by whose

[^9]permission it was properly arranged by a learned Greek, a friend of Cicero and a preceptor of Strabo (p. 548), named Tyrannion. Copies were obtained from Tyrannion by Andronicus of Rhodes, who classified the works according to subjects ${ }^{1}$, published them, and drew up the lists which were current in the time of Plutarch?

On the strength of this last statement it has been supposed that all the extant lists of Aristotelian writings are to be ultimately traced to Andronicus ${ }^{3}$. But, even before his time, the successors of Theophrastus possessed copies of a few at least of the works of Aristotle, chiefly of the exoteric or popular class ${ }^{4}$. As examples of these, the list suggested by Grote ${ }^{5}$ includes the dialogues; the legendary and historical collections; and the constitutional histories of various Hellenic cities. Thus, the חoגıréă may have been known to the successors of Theophrastus even before the library of Aristotle was for a time restored to Athens more than two centuries after the owner's death. But, to show that the fate of Aristotle's writings did not entirely depend on the fortunes of the library buried in the vault at Scêpsis, we have abundant proof of some of them being familiar to the philosophic world during the interval in which his library itself was lost to view ${ }^{\boldsymbol{\theta}}$; and it is probable that many of them, including those of more general interest, were at an early date transcribed at Athens and thence transmitted to the great library at Alexandria.

In the case of Theophrastus, we know for certain that lists of his works were drawn up, not only by Andronicus of Rhodes, but also by Hermippus of Smyrna, who lived till about the end of the third century b.c. and was a pupil of Callimachus, the chief librarian of the Alexandrian Museum ${ }^{7}$. Such a list is preserved by Diogenes Laertius ${ }^{3}$, with the titles arranged in alphabetical order. The corresponding list of the writings of Aristotle is not in the order of the alphabet, but is arranged with a certain degree of method under 146 titles as follows. "First we have the dialogues and other exoteric works, then two or three early abstracts of Platonic lectures or writings, then we come to a part of the list in which logical works seem to predominate; ethical, political and

[^10]rhetorical works predominate towards the middle; then come physical and zoological works; last in order we have works designed in all probability for Aristotle's own use ('hypomnematic works'), letters and poems ${ }^{11}$. The arrangement seems hardly sufficiently precise to be that of Andronicus, who is said to have introduced the plan of grouping the writings according to their subject-matter ${ }^{x}$; and this is not the only reason for regarding it as independent of Andronicus ${ }^{3}$. It has in fact been conjecturally ascribed to Hermippus, and has been generally supposed to be founded on the catalogue of Aristotle's works in some great library like that of Alexandria. In a subsequent passage (v 34) Diogenes observes that the books enumerated were nearly 400 in number. He even adds that their genuineness was not contested by any one ${ }^{4}$.

There is a second list, ascribed to Hesychius and containing only 127 titles, 27 of those in Diogenes being here omitted and 8 added in their place ${ }^{5}$.

A third list, ascribed to 'Ptolemy the philosopher,' is found in an Arabic translation only. This includes $9^{2}$ titles. It is certainly later than the time of Andronicus, as one of the titles relates to certain treatises found in the library of Almikun (Ablikun or Atlikun), the Arabic form of Apellicon.

In all three lists the Modıreial are included. In 1 they appear





In inI 8r the Arabic description is translated as follows: 'liber quem inscripsit de regimine civitatum et nominatur bulitija, et est liber in quo commemoravit regimen populorum et civitatum plurium e civitatibus ( $r$ raecorum et aliorum earumque relationem (originem? cognationem?) ; numerus vero populorum et civitatum quarum meminit [in eo] clxxi [civitates magnae] ${ }^{\text {b }}$.

In int the number of the $\pi$ odicteial is given as 17 I ; whereas I and in agree in making it 158 . The ancient Latin Version of the life of Aristotle states the number as $25^{\circ}$; while, among the early expositors of Aristotle, Elias twice gives the same number, and Ammonius has

[^11][^12]250．The higher estimate is either a mere mistake，or has arisen from
 latter view is confirmed by the fact that one of our authorities for the larger number ${ }^{1}$ mentions it in immediate connexion with the statement that Aristotle accompanied Alexander on his expedition to the East， even as far as＇the land of the Brahmins，＇where（according to this imaginative commentator）he actually compiled＇the 255 mo入ıreîal＇； while the estimates of Elias are in both cases given in a similar connexion．We may therefore discard the larger number，and accept 158 as resting on better authority ${ }^{2}$ ．

The total number of $\pi 0 \lambda_{\iota \tau \epsilon \hat{a}}$ included in modern collections of their fragments is 99 ．In 5 r of these the name of Aristotle and the title of the $\pi$ одıтєía are expressly mentioned，generally thus：＇A 1 $\dot{\epsilon} \nu \tau \hat{\eta}$－$\omega \nu \pi \pi_{0} \lambda_{\imath \tau \epsilon i}$ ．In 16 others，Aristotle is cited，but the name of the state is not given，though it can be inferred from the contents of the passage．Lastly，out of the total number of 80 states mentioned in the Politics，there are 32 that are not named in the fragments already enumerated，but which may fairly be assumed to have been included in the original work．Thus we have a list of $5 \mathbf{r}+\mathrm{r} 6+32$ ，or 99 states， more than half of which（5r）are represented by fragments in which the title of the work，as well as the name of Aristotle，is mentioned， while in more than two－thirds（ 67 out of 99 ）the name of Aristotle occurs．The three classes are as follows ：

| I（51） |  |  | II（16） | III（32） |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | ${ }^{*} \mathrm{I} \mu$ epalas |  | ＇Avtavōpluv | ＇$\Delta \mu \phi \iota \pi 0 \lambda \iota \tau \omega \nu$ |  |
|  | Kelav | Naglov | ＇Атрацитךуढิข | ＇A $\lambda \tau \tau \sigma \sigma a l \omega \nu$ | Kavavalup |
| Al $\tau \omega \lambda \hat{\omega} \nu$ | Kєpkиpalw |  | ＇Erióauplar |  | Kıajouentav |
|  | Kıavへิข |  | Oqßalwy |  | K $\boldsymbol{\nu} \boldsymbol{\delta}$ ¢ $\omega \nu$ |
|  | Ko入oф $\omega \nu$ l $\omega \nu$ | ＇Opxouevitiv | ＇Ia $\sigma^{\prime} \omega{ }^{\prime}$ | $\epsilon \nu \Pi \delta \nu \tau \psi$ | K ${ }^{\text {cos }}$ |
|  |  | Пaptuv |  | ＇Apuoiquêv | ＾apıaбaluy |
| ＇Apreluv | Kubvius |  |  | ＇Aфuraluy | $\Lambda \in о \nu \tau i \nu \omega \nu$ |
| ＇Apkádus | Kıpal ${ }^{\text {r }}$ |  | Kutyplar | Bujavtimp |  |
| ＇Axaı̂̀ | Kıapluy |  | M $\eta \lambda \lambda \omega$ |  | Mavtuelay |
| Botrialuy | Kupqualav | $\Sigma<k v \omega \nu$ luv | Midjolu | ＇Epetpléar | Mo入oб大ढิ้ |
|  |  | $\Sigma \nu \nu \omega \pi \in \omega \nu$ | ${ }^{\text {＇P} \eta \gamma^{l}{ }^{\prime} \omega \omega^{\prime}}$ | ＇Eputpalw | Muti入ךvalwy |
| $\Delta \epsilon \lambda \phi \omega{ }^{\text {a }}$ |  | Eupakootur | ${ }^{\text {P Podial }}$ |  | ${ }^{\text {＇Podtur }}$ |
| $\Delta \eta \lambda i \omega \nu$ | \окрढิv | Tapaytlvop | $\Sigma \Sigma^{0} \lambda \epsilon \omega \nu$ | Zayклai＇${ }^{\text {d }}$ | Фарба入l ${ }^{\text {d }}$ |
| ＇H2elw | Aukl ${ }^{\text {dev }}$ | Teүєaтต̂v | $\Sigma \cup \beta a p \iota \tau \omega \hat{\nu}$ |  |  |
| ＇Нтєррот ${ }^{\text {¢ }}$ |  | Tevediun |  |  | $\mathbf{X} / \omega \nu$ |
| Ө̇тта入的 | Meraptar | TpotSpulw | $\mathrm{X} a \lambda \kappa \eta \delta o \nu i \omega \nu$. | empalav | ＇贝peitù． |
| ＇İakทolw |  |  |  | ＇I $\sigma \tau \rho t \in \omega \nu$ |  |

[^13]The modıreial are said to have been arranged in the order of the alphabet ${ }^{1}$. Some have seen indications of this in the reading preserved in a single ms of Harpocration, s.v. $\theta \epsilon \sigma \mu 0 \theta$ étal:-'Apıбтотє́ $\lambda \eta$ s द̀v $\tau \hat{\eta}$

 Ithaca appears to be described as 42 nd in the series. If we test this by taking the 99 extant titles of $\pi 0 \lambda \iota \tau \epsilon i a \iota$ as the basis of our calculation, Ithaca, which is 37 th in the list of 99 , would have been 58 th in the complete list of 158 ; if, again, we take the 67 titles in which Aristotle is named, Ithaca, which is 2 Ist of the 67 , would have been 50 th in the complete list; if the 5 r in which the name of the particular modıreia is specified, Ithaca, which is 17 th of the 5 I , would have been 52 nd , not 42 nd. This calculation, of course, assumes that in the longer list, the names in alphabetical order are distributed in the same proportion as in the shorter lists. But it is highly probable that $\overline{\mu \beta}$ is a corruption of either $\mu^{\epsilon} \mu \nu \eta \tau a \iota$ or (as proposed by Bergk) $\mu a \rho \tau v \rho \epsilon \hat{i}$. If so, we cannot rely on this phrase as proof of an alphabetical order. Besides, if the order was alphabetical, it was unnecessary to specify the number of any particular treatise. Such an arrangement, however, although not attested with any certainty, is natural in itself, and the constitution of Athens would in any case have occupied the first place.

## § 3. On the evidence of ancient authorities as to the authorship of the Подıтeial.

We may now proceed to review in chronological order the successive quotations from the Hodıreial which are preserved in ancient authorities.

Firstly, there is reason to believe that the historian Philochorus, writing before 306 B.c., or less than 20 years after the composition of
 which have been suggested for this belief are as follows :-
(1) The Scholium on Arist. Vesp. 1223 includes a quotation from ' $\Delta \theta$. $\pi 0$ d. 13 , 11. $16-20$; the latter part of that Scholium coincides with one on $L y s .58$ which is proved by Strabo, p. 392 c, to come from Philochorus. Hence it is possible that the whole of the Schol. on Vesp. 1223 really comes from Philochorus, and that Philochorus is our real authority for the citation from the ' $A \theta$. $\pi o \lambda$. (2) In the term $\dot{d} \pi o \psi \eta$ $\phi \iota \sigma \theta \hat{\eta} \nu a \iota \tau \grave{\partial} \not \partial \chi \theta o s$ (frag. 57), Philochorus appears to be correcting or explaining
 in'A $\theta$. $\pi \mathbf{0} \mathbf{0} .6 \$ 1$. (3) In Plutarch's Life of Themistocles, 10, Aristotle is cited as
to alter $\pi 0 \lambda \iota \tau \epsilon l a c s$ into $\bar{\epsilon} \pi \iota \sigma \tau 0 \lambda a i ̂ s$ (Ideler, in Ar. Meteor. I xii n. 40 ), or (with greater probability) to regard $\gamma \nu \eta \sigma i a u s$ as a corruption of the number $\overline{\rho \nu \eta}(158)$; Heitz, Frag.

Ar. p. 223 a.
${ }_{1}$ катd. $\sigma$ тоь $\chi \in \hat{a} a$, Elias, ap. Rose, Frag. p. $25^{3}, 1$. 29 .
authority for a statement respecting the action of the Areopagus immediately before the battle of Salamis ('A $\theta$. $\pi 0 \lambda .23$ § i). Cleidemus, the author of an 'A $\boldsymbol{A} \theta t \mathrm{~s}$, is next quoted as asserting that this action was due to the wiles of Themistocles. Then follows the story of the dog of Xanthippus which, in Aelian, de Natura Animalium, xii 35, is attributed to 'Aristotle and Philochorus.' It has been plausibly suggested that Aelian had read an extract, ultimately derived from Philochorus, on the events immediately preceding the battle of Salamis, in which the name of Aristotle may have occurred in connexion with the account of the action of the Areopagus, and in which the story of the dog of Xanthippus was also related. This may have lead Aelian to make the mistake of quoting Aristotle, as well as Philochorus, as authorities for the story about the dog. If, as is not improbable, the whole of the narrative in Plutarch comes from Philochorus, then Philochorus, and not Plutarch, is our authority for attributing to Aristotle the quotations from the ' $A \theta$. $\pi 0 \lambda$. respecting the action of the Areopagus. This implies that 'a careful historical student and critic, who lived and wrote at Athens in the generation immediately following Aristotle's,' accepted the 'A $\theta \eta \nu a l \omega \nu$ $\pi 0 \lambda \iota \tau \epsilon l \alpha$ as the work of Aristotle himself' ${ }^{1}$

An early notice of the חodıreial may also be traced in the attack made by Timaeus on Aristotle's account of the origin of the Greek colony of Locri Epizephyrii. Timaeus was born about $35^{2}$ b.c. (or 30 years before the death of Aristotle), was banished from Tauromenium in 3 ro , and from about that time resided in Athens for more than 50 years, dying about 256 B.c. The evidence for this attack on the part of Timaeus is to be found in Polybius, who rejects the view of Timaeus, and emphatically supports the account given by Aristotle ${ }^{y}$. From a subsequent passage it appears that the attack of Timaeus was directed against Theophrastus as well. We are not told in which of Aristote's works the description of the origin of Locri was to be found, but it is reasonable to suppose that it was the Modıreial. The only other
 now represented by its title only. Now Timaeus was in Athens for ${ }_{23}$ out of the 35 years during which Theophrastus presided over the Lyceum as the successor of Aristotle. He had thus exceptional opportunities for becoming acquainted with Aristotle's writings, and with the traditional knowledge of them preserved by the Peripatetic School; and he may fairly be quoted to prove that within 66 years of the death of Aristotle, one of the חodıreial was attributed to that author.

The Modıreiau appear to have been also quoted by Philostephanus of Cyrene, the author of works entitled $\pi \epsilon \rho \grave{\imath} \varepsilon \dot{\rho} \rho \eta \mu a \dot{a} \tau \omega \nu$ and $\pi \epsilon \rho \grave{\imath}$ $\nu \eta$ ' $\sigma \omega$, who lived under Ptolemy Philopator (b.C. 222-206). 'Aristotle' and Philostephanus are quoted by Varro (apud Servium ad Verg. Georg. i 19) and by Pliny ( $N . H$. vii 57); and it has been conjectured
${ }^{1}$ Abridged from Prof. J. H. Wright's article in the American Fourn. of Philo$\log y$, xii 3,3 ro- 318.

[^14]that Varro and Pliny took their quotations of Aristotle at second-hand from Philostephanus ${ }^{1}$.

It was probably in the middle of the second century b.c. that excerpts from the Mo入ıceial were made by Heracleides Lembos, who appears to have followed his original with an almost slavish fidelity. We have only fragments of these excerpts under the title éк $\tau \bar{\omega} \nu$


Cicero refers as follows to the Подıтєía and vó $\iota \iota \alpha$ $\beta$ ар $\beta$ арıка̀ of Aristotle, as well as to the work of Theophrastus $\pi \epsilon \rho \grave{\imath}$ vó $\mu \omega \nu$ :--omnium fere civitatum non Graeciae solum sed etiam barbariae ab Aristotele mores instituta disciplinas; a Theophrasto leges etiam cognovinus (de Fin. v 4 § i1); but there is no proof of any direct acquaintance with the text of the חoגıreíal ${ }^{3}$. In the de Officies, ii 18, he quotes, as from Theophrastus, the account of the liberality of Cimon which we find in c. 27 of the 'A $\theta \eta \nu a i \omega v$ подıтєía. In the de Senectute $\S 72$ he tells an anecdote about Solon and Peisistratus without showing any knowledge of c. 14 of that treatise. Similarly, in de Offciis, i 75, he writes of Solon and Themistocles with reference to the Areopagus without betraying any close acquaintance with chapters 23 and 25 . Whatever knowledge he possessed as to the contents of those chapters was probably obtained secondhand from his authority, Panaetius, who, as we know from Cicero himself (de Fin. iv 28 § 79), constantly quoted from Plato, Aristotle, Xenocrates, Theophrastus and Dicaearchus. About Dicaearchus in particular Cicero writes to Atticus in glowing terms :-in his Tusculan villa he has been reading with admiration that author's account of the constitution of Pellene, while he fancies that his library at Rome contains a copy of the Constitutions of Corinth and of Athens ${ }^{4}$. These

[^15]critic from whom they are supposed to have been derived. -See also Prof. Wright in Harvard Studies, iii 15 , and Holzinger in Philologus, vol. 5o, p. 436. Infra, p. 250.
${ }^{3}$ See also Shute, l.c., p. 72.
${ }^{4} \mathrm{Ad}$ Att. ii 2 , ' ${ }^{\prime} \mathrm{Ie} \lambda \lambda \eta \nu a l \omega \nu$ in manibus tenebam et hercule magnum acervum Dicaearchi mihi ante pedes exstruxeram. O magnum hominem! et unde multo plura didiceris quam de Procilio. Kopel$\theta t \omega \nu$ et 'A $\theta \eta \nu a l \omega \nu$ puto me Romae habere. Mihi crede, leges;...mirabilis vir est.' ${ }^{\text {² }}$ Heitz, Verl. Schr., p. 244, considers that these may have formed part of the plos 'Eג入 $\dot{\delta} \delta o s$ of Dicaearchus. Bergk, Rhein. Mus. $188 \mathrm{I}, \mathrm{p} .113$ n. 2, suggests that the reference is to the Політєiau of Aristotle. He would alter Dicaearchi into Dicaearchiae (i.e. 'at Puteoli'); but his sug. gestion (with the textual alteration which. it involves) seems very improbable.

Constitutions may well have been written in imitation of the earlier work ascribed to Aristotle; and the imitation may have been sufficiently close to lead to the contents of the Пoдıreial of Aristotle becoming known to later writers through the medium of Dicaearchus ${ }^{1}$.

It has been conjectured that many of the quotations from the Haдırєial in later authors were taken second-hand from the works of Alexandrian scholars such as Didymus Chalcenterus, and his successor, Pamphilus ${ }^{2}$. Didymus was born in 63 b.c. and compiled a Lexicon of Tragic and Comic Diction, while among the lexicographical works of Pamphilus, who flourished in 20 b.c., was one entitled 'Atтıкаì $\lambda$ '́̇єєs. The scholiast on Aristophanes, Aves 47 r , quotes Aristotle $\dot{\epsilon} v \tau \hat{\eta} \Sigma a \mu i \omega \nu$ $\pi$ odıreía, as well as the comic poet, Plato; and such a scholium may readily have been derived from Didymus ${ }^{3}$; but the indebtedness of later writers to this able and industrious compiler has been greatly overrated ; and, now that we know of the actual existence of copies of the ' $\mathrm{A} \theta \eta \nu a i \omega v$ madıreia at a time when it was supposed to have been hopelessly lost, there is less reason for attributing to the interposition of Didymus a knowledge of the Подıтєiac which may easily have been derived from the work itself. It has further been supposed that some of the accounts of remarkable phenomena found in later collections,
 originally borrowed from the Пoдıтєiau. Thus, Antigonus of Carystus, who probably lived in the time of Ptolemy Philadelphus, in his 'I $\sigma$ oo-
 by Aristotle of the two fountains of the Sun in the temple of Zeus Ammon. This description may have been derived from the חoдıréa of Cyrene ${ }^{4}$.

In the age of Augustus, the Подıтєial are not quoted by Dionysius of Halicarnassus, who, however, refers to the Tvpр $\quad$ ขши Nó $\mu \tau \mu a$, which


Strabo (who belongs to the same age) refers in general terms to Aristotle in connexion with Elis (Rose, Frag. 493 ${ }^{3}$ ), Argos (482), Epidaurus (49r), Tenedos (594), and Chalcis (6or. 603). In a single passage (on p. $32 \mathrm{r}-2$ ), after stating that the migrations of the Leleges are attested by ai 'Apıoтotédous màıтєial, he appeals to no less than four of them as his authorities, viz. those of the Acarnanians, Opuntians, Megarians and Leucadians. When we remember that the story of the recovery of the lost library of Aristotle is told by Strabo (doubtless on

[^16]the authority of his preceptor Tyrannion），we are not surprised at finding in his pages not a few traces of a first－hand acquaintance with the חo入ıтєía．Nevertheless，the fact that only a comparatively small number of the $\pi$ odıreial are noticed in Strabo has led to the suppo－ sition that he had no direct knowledge of that work ${ }^{1}$ ．

Pliny the elder（23－79 A．D．）names Aristotle as his authority mainly on the geography of several of the Greek islands（Tenos，Delos， Melos and Samos），and also in connexion with Argos，Thebes and Chalcis．One of his references may be traced to the Nó $\mu \mu \alpha$ Bap $\beta \alpha$－ pıко．He also states that，according to Aristotle，the art of painting was introduced into Greece by Euchir，Daedali cognatus（Rose，Frag． $382^{3}$ ）；but there is no sufficient warrant for referring this to a lost passage of the＇A $\theta \eta v a i \omega v$ mo入ıteía．Pliny＇s references to Aristotle may safely be regarded as taken at second hand ${ }^{2}$ ．This has also been assumed，but with perhaps less justice，in the case of Plutarch （c． 46 － 120 A．d．）．

Plutarch repeatedly mentions Aristotle as his authority：－five times in the life of Lycurgus $^{3}$ ；once in that of Cleomenes $^{4}$ ；and twice in that of Pericles ${ }^{6}$ ，in passages that may perhaps be traced to the $\sum a \mu i \omega v$ $\pi$ rodıréa．In five instances Aristotle is named in connexion with Naxos， Tegea（twice），Troezen and Ithaca ${ }^{\text {b }}$ ；and in two others we may trace
 fairly be regarded as the source of Plutarch＇s references to Aristotle in the lives of Theseus ${ }^{4}$ ，Solon ${ }^{9}$ ，Themistocles ${ }^{10}$ ， Cimon $^{11}$, Pericles $^{12}$ and Nicias ${ }^{13}$ ； as also of certain passages in which Aristotle is not actually named ${ }^{\text {＂4 }}$ ．At this point it may be interesting to notice two good examples of tacit quotation from the＇A $\left.\begin{array}{l}\eta \nu a i \omega v \\ \pi o \lambda \iota \tau \epsilon i\end{array}\right)$ in the pages of Plutarch．In c． 14 § 4 of the $\pi 0 \lambda \iota \tau \epsilon i a$ we read that，with the aid of $\Phi v ́ \eta$ ，Megacles



 a passage that has not hitherto been noticed in this connexion，we find five consecutive words applied to Solon，which are identical with those

[^17] $\nu 0 \mu 0 \hat{\theta}^{\prime} \boldsymbol{\tau} \eta \nu$.

In view of such instances it seems difficult to maintain the theory that Plutarch had only a second-hand knowledge of the 'A $\begin{aligned} & \text { quaíw } \\ & \text { modıteía', }\end{aligned}$ He has even been charged with the incredible carelessness of keeping words such as $\nu \hat{v} \nu$ unchanged in copying from the intermediate authorities which he is supposed to have followed. Thus, in Solon, c. 25, his statement that fragments of the wooden tablets on which the laws of Solon were inscribed were still to be seen in his own day ( $\epsilon \tau \iota$ ка ${ }^{\circ}$ $\dot{\eta} \mu \hat{a} s)$ in the Athenian $\pi \rho v \tau a v \epsilon \hat{\imath} 0$, was regarded by Rose as a careless
 Прvтavє $\epsilon \varphi^{2}$. Similarly, in Lycurgus, c. 28, è́т кaì vîv was held to refer to the age of Plutarch's authority Ephorus ${ }^{3}$. In the former case, at any rate, the statement of Plutarch is corroborated by the evidence of Pausanias (i 18 § 3) who, even at a later date, observes that in the
 Plutarch are ascribed by Rose to the Eclogae and Collectanea of previous writers, such as Didymus; but this ascription is not supported by the context of the quotations themselves. Plutarch places the Подıтєia. of Aristotle in the same category as the works of Herodotus, Xenophon, Eudoxus and Aristoxenus, implying that all these writers dealt with important and interesting events in a style that was at once vigorous and graceful ${ }^{4}$. Such is not the language of one whose knowledge of

[^18]an abridgment of these parts of the Respub. Ath. was embodied. In transcribing from this abridgment he interpolates foreign matter, which is inconsistent with the unabridged Aristotle. The abridgment omitted the main part of cc. 2-4, also c. 13 [ $8 \S 2,3$, as well as many minor statements. The poetical quotations of Plutarch are from a different collection; such as coincide are in a different order...Plutarch's otherwise unaccountable omission in his Them. of the characteristic anecdote of Themistocles, Ephialtes, and the Areopagus (Respub. Ath. c. 25) may be explained on the hypothesis that the copy of Aristotle's work used by Plutarch did not contain this story. In Pericles, Aristotle is cited, but immediately there follow statements as to Pericles which directly contradict Aristotle (cf. Ad. Bauer, Forschungen, p. 77, who believes, however, in a firsthand use of Respub. Ath. by Plutarch).'
${ }^{2}$ Preller on Polemon, p. 87.
${ }^{3}$ Rose, $A$. P., pp. 413, 491.
${ }_{4}$ Non posse suaviter vivi sec. Epicurum,

the Подıтєią was mainly or solely derived from second-hand sources of information.

Zenobius, who flourished in the time of Hadrian (117-138 a.d.), refers to c. 28 of the 'A $\theta_{\eta v a i \omega v} \pi$ о $\lambda \iota \tau \epsilon$ ía, and mentions the $\pi 0 \lambda_{\iota \tau \epsilon i a l ~ o f ~}^{\text {a }}$ Corcyra, Samos, Delphi and Methone (Frag. ${ }^{3} 5^{1} 3,576,487,55^{2}$ ). He also names Aristotle as his authority for facts relating to Cythnus and Thebes (Frag. ${ }^{3}{ }^{523}, 502$ ).

Aulus Gellius (115-180 a.d.) names Aristotle in connexion with Solon's law against neutrality. The law is found in 'A $\theta$. $\pi 0 \lambda$. c. 8 § 5 .

Aristides, one of the most celebrated rhetoricians of the 2nd
 but the only poems of Solon which he quotes are extracted from those preserved in that treatise; he also paraphrases other passages from those poems and from the text of Aristotle'.

Diogenes Laertius (towards the close of the $2 n d$ century a.d.) twice appeals to Aristotle for facts connected with Corinth (Frag. ${ }^{3}{ }_{5}$ 16, 517). In the first of these passages he couples him with Ephorus. In a third passage he refers to Aristotle èv $\tau \hat{\eta} \Delta \eta \lambda i \omega v$ подereiạ (Frag. ${ }^{3} 489$ ); but, as the vague plural фaoiv occurs in the previous context, there is no certain proof of first-hand acquaintance with the work in question. In this author, however, we have several parallels to the account of Solon given in the 'A $\begin{aligned} & \text { quai } \omega \nu \text { moдı } \tau \epsilon a^{\prime} \text {. }\end{aligned}$

Pollux of Naucratis ( $f$. 180-238 A.D.), who dedicated his 'Ovoнaбtıóv to Commodus (Emp. 180-192), quotes largely from the Modıreial, especially from that of Athens. The latter is his main authority on all points of Athenian law and antiquities ${ }^{3}$. Many consecutive lines are either transcribed or paraphrased from its pages, e.g. the epigram about Diphilus and a large part of its context in c. 7 § 4. But his debt to the 'A $\theta \eta v a i \omega v$ moдıтєia, though vast, is invariably unacknowledged, while the only passage in which he mentions the name of Aristotle in connexion with a term of Attic law, is not

[^19][^20]found in that treatise，so far as it has been preserved ${ }^{1}$ ．Several of the other $\pi$ oג七七єiac are，however，expressly mentioned，viz．that of Acragas （twice in Frag．${ }^{3}$ 476），Himera（twice in 510 ），Tarentum（590），Orcho－ menus（ 566 ），and Sicyon（ 580 ）．In other passages，where Aristotle is named，the information may have been ultimately derived from the Constitutions of Cyprus（ 527 ），Rhegium（ 568 ），Syracuse（ 585,589 ）， Cyrene（529）and Argos（48I），or from the Tvpp $\nu \nu \omega \nu$ vó $\mu \mu \mu$（ 608 ）．

Athenaeus，who，like Pollux，was a native of Naucratis（fl．c． 200 A．d．）expressly mentions the $\pi 0 \lambda \iota \tau \epsilon \mathrm{E}$ a of Aegina（Frag．${ }^{3}$ 472），Delos （490），Naxos（558），Troezen（596），Thessaly（499），Methone（551）， Colophon（545），Massalia（549），Croton（583），Sybaris（584）and Syracuse（588）．The name of Aristotle is also mentioned in connexion with Miletus（557）；and that of Timaeus with reference to Aristotle＇s account of Locri（547），which has already been noticed ${ }^{2}$ ．Aristotle $\dot{\epsilon} v$ Tvppjıvev vouínoss is also quoted（607）．It has been conjectured that these quotations may have been taken second－hand from lexicographical works，such as the lexicon to the Comic poets compiled by Pamphilus from that of his predecessor Didymus．This is supported by the fact that on p． 499 Athenaeus twice quotes the comic poet Diphilus；and， between the two quotations，inserts a reference to Aristotle $\dot{\epsilon} v \tau \hat{\eta}$ © $\Theta \tau \tau \alpha \lambda \omega \bar{\omega} \pi$ o $\lambda \iota \tau \epsilon \epsilon^{\prime}$ to prove that the Thessalians used a feminine form $\eta^{\dot{\eta}}$ $\lambda \alpha^{\prime}$ vovos ${ }^{3}$ ．But a native of a country，in which，as we now know，copies of the＇A $\theta \eta \nu a i \omega \nu \pi 0 \lambda \iota \tau \epsilon$ ía were actually in existence at the time，may well have derived much of his information from the original work．Apart from the British Museum papyrus and the fragments of the Berlin papyrus，both of which came from Egypt，we know of a third copy， which is mentioned in the catalogue of an Egyptian library of the third century A．D．${ }^{4}$ ，

Harpocration of Alexandria，the lexicographer of the Attic Orators，who is doubtfully ascribed either to the second，or（less
 $\dot{\epsilon} v$＇A $\theta \eta \nu a i ́ \omega v$ modertía in no less than 50 places．A lost passage in the
 （ 38 r ）．There are nine other $\pi 0 \lambda \iota \tau \epsilon \bar{a}$ ．which he mentions by name， those of Arcadia，Elis，Thessaly，Cythnus，Cyprus，Sparta，Massalia， Opus and Pellene．The quotations from the＇A $\begin{aligned} & \text { quaicuv } \pi o \lambda \iota \tau \epsilon i \alpha ~ a r e ~ s o ~\end{aligned}$ numerous and so precise，that it may fairly be assumed that they were taken at first－hand from the treatise itself．

Clement of Alexandria（ob． 220 A．d．）quotes the mo入ıteial of

[^21]Phocaea and Locri, and refers in more general terms to that of Sparta (Frag. 599, 548, 535); while Aelian (fl. 250 A.D.) tells the story of the usurpation of Peisistratus in language almost identical with that of $c .14$


Hesychius of Alexandria, who belongs to the end of the fourth century, or (more probably) to the fifth, is a compiler from earlier authorities, the best of whom is Diogenianus of Heraclea (of the time of Hadrian). The lexicon of Hesychius expressly quotes the Constitution of the Opuntians (Frag. ${ }^{3}{ }^{56} 3$ ), and names Aristotle as the authority for statements respecting Cyrene (528), Corcyra ( $5 \mathrm{I}_{3}$ ) and Sparta (54r). The second of these items may, however, be traced back to Zenobius. Not a few articles are ultimately founded on the 'A $\begin{aligned} & \eta \nu a i ́ \omega \nu \\ & \pi o \lambda \iota \tau \epsilon i ́ a, ~\end{aligned}$ though neither the work is named, nor its author. Such are the


 т 0 oxós ( $49 \S \mathrm{r}$ ). To the same source may be traced the articles on



Photius, the patriarch of Constantinople ( $8 \mathrm{r} 5-891$ a.d.), states that excerpts from the rodıreial of Aristotle, viz. from those of Thessaly, Achaia, Paros, Lycia and Ceos, were included in the twelfth book of the historical selections of Sopater (sixth cent.) ${ }^{2}$. In his Lexicon, the

 traced back to Zenobius. The modıteia of Sparta, Samos and Ithaca are expressly cited (Frag. ${ }^{3} 586,575,509$ ); and Aristotle is named in several articles ${ }^{2}$, including one on $\pi \epsilon \lambda$ átal ('A $\theta . \pi 0 \lambda .2 \S 2$ ). During the embassy 'to the Assyrians' the patriarch perused and epitomised no less than 280 volumes, many of which are now lost; but there is nothing to prove that the 'A $\theta \eta v a i \omega v$ modıceía was included among them.

Tzetzes of Constantinople (born c. rizo a.d.) refers to the $\pi$ odt$\tau \epsilon \hat{a} \alpha \iota$ of Orchomenus (Frag. ${ }^{3}$ 505) and Ithaca (504 and 508). Of the last two references the former is also found in the Etymologicum Magnum; so that possibly all three may have been borrowed from earlier sources. The lexicon last named, s.v. ífoomoooí, expressly quotes
 $\delta a r \eta \tau^{\prime \prime}{ }^{\prime} s\left(\right.$ Frag. $4^{22}$ ) which may be traced to Harpocration (c. $56 \S 6$ ). It also names Aristotle in connexion with Cumae (Frag. ${ }^{25}$ ), and we know that this article comes ultimately from the Пoдıтeiac.

[^22]Eustathius of Constantinople，archbishop of Thessalonica（who died c． 1198$\rangle$ refers to the $\pi 0 \lambda \iota \tau \epsilon \hat{a}$ a of Sparta（545）and Ithaca（506）， and names Aristotle in a passage which comes from the $\pi 0 \lambda_{\imath \tau \epsilon i}$ a Thessaly（437）．But there is no proof of direct acquaintance with any
 is borrowed from Telephus of Pergamos who lived under Hadrian and （among other works）wrote on the Laws and Customs，and on the Lawcourts of Athens．

Thus far we have surveyed in chronological order the writers who， either at first or second hand，quote from the $\Pi$ плıгєiaц of Aristotle．We have still to notice a few anonymous citations．
（r）The unknown author of the $\dot{v} \pi \dot{\delta} \theta \in \sigma$ s to the Areopagiticus of Isocrates，a Christian writer of perhaps the sixth century，is the only person who quotes the anecdote in c． 25 respecting the part ascribed to Themistocles in the overthrow of the Areopagus ${ }^{1}$ ．
（2）The Scholia to Aristophanes refer to the＇A $\theta . \pi 0 \lambda$ ．in no less than thirteen places ${ }^{2}$ ．They also expressly quote the $\pi 0 \lambda \iota \tau \epsilon \hat{i}$ ． of Sparta and Samos，and name Aristotle in connexion with Orchomenos， Corcyra and Cyrene．Many of the Scholia on Aristophanes are de－ rived from Aristophanes of Byzantium and his pupils Callistratus， Aristarchus and Didymus；as well as from the Pergamene scholars， Herodicus and Asclepiades．The earlier Scholia were drawn up in the 3rd century A．D．；while the later Scholia go down as far as the age of Thomas Magister and Triclinius（end of $13^{\text {th }}$ cent．）．

The Scholia on Sophocles cite Aristotle for a fact mentioned in＇A $\theta$ ． $\pi 0 \lambda .60 \S 2$ ；those on Euripides quote from the $\pi 0 \lambda \iota \tau \epsilon i a l$ of Sparta（Frag． 544）and Thessaly（498），and name Aristotle in connexion with terms relating to the $\pi$ oд⿱宀八九єía of Cumae（ $524-5$ ）．Those on Homer give us evidence as to the $\pi$ odıreial of Iasos and Samos（ 503 and 571 ）；those on Pindar cite the modıreial of Sparta，Syracuse and Gela（Frag．532， 587，486），and name Aristotle in connexion with Aegina，Rhodes， Crete，Acarnania，Opus and Locri．Those on Plato quote Aristotle for facts which may be traced to the modıreiau of Athens（385）and Thessaly （498）．Those on Apollonius Rhodius refer to the $\pi ⿰ \boldsymbol{\lambda} \lambda \iota \tau \epsilon \hat{i} a \iota$ of Samos and Samothrace，Sinope and Tegea，Corcyra and Kios in Mysia ；those of Theocritus refer to Croton，Ceos and Crete ${ }^{3}$ ．The Scholia on

[^23][^24]Aeschines contain no express mention of Aristotle, but they include several items of information ultimately derived from the 'A $\theta \eta \nu a i \omega v$ $\pi$ тлıreía ${ }^{1}$.

It will be observed that the references to the \#odırêat, which have now been enumerated, extend over a period of no less than fifteen centuries, and attest different degrees of acquaintance with the work in many parts of the ancient world, chiefly in great centres of learning, such as Alexandria and Constantinople. In the case of the 'A $\theta \eta \nu a i ́ \omega \nu$ modıreia, the exact degree to which the text of the treatise was known to those who refer to it, may in general be traced in the Testimonia which are printed below the critical notes in the present edition. All the external evidence is in favour of ascribing the Modıreial to Aristotle.

## § 4. The later literature of the Пo入ıteial.

After the revival of learning in Italy it was Francesco Patrizzi who, in the course of a calumnious attack on the personal character and philosophical authority of Aristotle, unconsciously did some little service to the cause which he impugned by investigating the earlier sources of information as to the lost works of Aristotle. In his Discussiones Peripateticae, published in $\mathbf{5 7} \mathrm{r}$ at Venice, and reprinted ten years later at Basel, he made the first attempt to "collect their fragmentary remains ${ }^{*}$. Patrizzi's collection was included in Casaubon's Aristotle (r590), and in 1593 a more comprehensive edition was promised by Casaubon himself ${ }^{3}$. The lost $\pi 0 \lambda \iota \tau \epsilon \hat{a} a, ~ a r e ~ a l s o ~ m e n t i o n e d ~ b y ~ t h e ~ l e a r n e d ~ S e l d e n ~ ", ~$ but meanwhile Casaubon's promise remained unfulfilled. The importance of the fragments was noticed by Niebuhr ${ }^{5}$ and others.

It was not until 1827 that C. F. Neumann, then living at Munich, published his Aristotelis Rerumpublicarum Reliquiae, including fragments from 50 of the $\pi 0 \lambda \iota \tau \epsilon i a u$, the number traced to the 'A $\begin{aligned} & \text { nvaí } \omega v \\ & \pi 0 \lambda \iota \tau \epsilon i ́ a ~ b e i n g ~\end{aligned}$ 59 in all. In 1843 a similar collection was published by H. A. Van Dyck at Utrecht. These were superseded by Carl Müller's edition in the Fragmenta Historicorum Graecorum, Paris (Didot), 1848, in which the editor says of Neumann's work: qui quidem libellus nullius nobis usus esse potuit: tam supina est auctoris negligentia. The total number of $\pi$ o久ıreial in this new collection is 95 , and the fragments of the


This collection served as the foundation for a still more extensive

[^25][^26]work by Valentine Rose. In his Aristoteles Pseudepigraphus (1863), we have 213 fragments, 89 of which are assigned to the 'A $\theta . \pi 0 \lambda$. Rose's second edition of these fragments was included in Vol. $v$ of the Berlin edition of Aristotle (1870), with three new fragments (445, 470, 5 rr ) from the modureiat of Delphi, Corcyra and Methone published by a French scholar from a ms of Zenobius discovered on Mount Athos ${ }^{1}$. Lastly, in 1886 Rose's third edition was published by Teubner; the number of fragments is now 223 , and of these 9 r are traced to the 'A $\theta$. $\pi 0 \lambda$., the two new fragments being no. 413 and 429 (corresponding to c. 3 § 5 and 52 § r).

Meanwhile, in $\mathbf{~ 8 6 9 ,}$, the fragments had been edited by Emil Heitz, the able author of Die Verlorenen Schriften des Aristoteles (1865). This edition was practically simultaneous with the second edition by Rose which, although printed in 1867 , was not published until 1870 .

In the case of the more important $\pi$ odır $\bar{i} a \iota$ and especially in that of Athens, the substance of these fragments has been not unfrequently set forth by modern scholars in various degrees of fulness. Thus Carl Müller (FHg ii 104) supplies an epitome of the Fragments on Athens; and Rose, a brief digest in the form of a table of contents. But the most successful endeavour to give life to these fragmentary remains is to be found in the Appendix to the important work of Oncken on the political teaching of Aristotle ${ }^{\text {a }}$. The fragments are there discussed in their historical bearing, and the scattered facts contained in them presented in a consecutive order and in an interesting form. The introduction to the analysis of the fragments closes with some valuable criticisms to the following effect:-

The method of dealing with the history of Athens which was pursued by Aristotle and his pupils must be regarded as marking the beginning of a new epoch. Without in any way undervaluing the influence of the contemporary school of Isocrates, as represented by Ephorus, Theopompus and Androtion, we may say without exaggeration that the picture, not only of the political life of Athens down to the overthrow of her freedom, but also of most of her statesmen, which became permanent in the literary tradition of later ages, was in its leading traits first delineated by the school of Aristotle and his followers.

The analysis concludes with the following remarks on the second part of the 'A $\theta \eta v a i \omega \nu$ по入ıтєía :--

Even a hasty glance at all these details gives one an impression of the extraordinarily valuable store of authentic facts here gathered by the industry of Aristotle. He has presented us with a description of the very subjects which the Athenians themselves did not deem worth the trouble of describing, since the knowledge of these de-

[^27]tails of every-day life was for themselves the merest matter of course. In Aristotle the scientific instinct of the genuine investigator was blended with the natural curiosity of the foreigner; and this double interest served to add a fresh keenness to his perception of what posterity would deem to be best worth knowing. For later generations his moditela became a veritable treasure-house of accumulated learning. Things that are only incidentally noticed by the orators and poets of the time, as being perfectly familiar to every one, are here narrated, described and elucidated by Aristotle for the benefit of all of those to whom this information was unknown. It was an important and an imperishable service. It was also one which was the natural result of his peculiar method as an investigator. To display the various members of the living body of definite fact, to separate all the complex framework into its component parts, to trace the sequence of a series of results as they came into being, to describe for after ages what was regarded by contemporaries as no less obvious than their daily meat and drink,-to do all this was thoroughly characteristic of Aristotle. It is more than enough to prove the truth of the opinion that Aristotle is above all others the scientific investigator of the Hellenic idea of political life.

Thus far we have dealt with laborious collections of the merest fragments of the Modıceiol, and with one vivid commentary upon the most important of the series. Meanwhile, the original work was deemed to have vanished as completely as the lost decads of Livy. Neumann, in the Prolegomena to his edition of the fragments, laments the loss in the following terms: eheu amissum est in sempiternum praeclarum opus, nisi e palimpsestis quibusdam fortasse eruatur. In the Bibliothèque Orientale of Herbelot (p. 97r), mention is made of an Arabic translation of the work, but the hope inspired by this statement remained unfulfilled ${ }^{1}$. To cherish such a hope, even for a moment, was in $\mathbf{r} 865$ denounced as folly ${ }^{2}$.

## § 5. The Berlin Fragments of the 'A $\theta \eta v a i \omega v ~ \pi o \lambda \iota \tau \epsilon i a . ~$

In the year r 880 the interest of scholars was aroused by the announcement that, among the fragments of papyrus found in the Fayoom near the ancient Arsinoe, and acquired for the Egyptian Museum at Berlin, there were two small pages with writing on both sides. They were skilfully deciphered by Blass, and a comparison with other papyri led
${ }^{1}$ The title of the alleged translation is Ketab Siassat Almoden (the book of the government of States). Herbelot's authority is Haji Khalfa, who died in 1658. In Fluegel's ed., vol. v p. 97, no. 10, 203, Haji Khalfa says that, in the book on 'the Government of States,' Aristotle mentions 171 great States. He distinguishes this book from the Politics, and says that the latter was translated into Arabic, which perhaps implies that the 'Government of States' was not. Part of this statement is doubtless derived from the list of Aristotle's writings
in Ibn Abi Useibia, which includes ${ }^{a}$ book about the Government of States and the number of the nations, in which he mentions $I_{5}$ I great States' (ed. Müller, 1884, p. 68). As this list is confessedly taken from a Greek catalogue by Ptolemy (see supra p. xvii), we have no right to assume that the Arabs possessed the book. It is not at all the kind of book that was likely to interest them. For the substance of this note I am indebted to Prof. W. Robertson Smith.

2 Heitz, Verl. Schr., p. 230.
to their being provisionally assigned to the second century A.D. The first fragment contained on one side ( $\mathrm{I} a$ ) the long passage in lambic verse quoted by Aristides from the poems of Solon; on the other (I b), a passage in prose on the archonship of Damasias. The second fragment had on one side (II $a$ ) an account of the reforms of Cleisthenes; and on the other (II $b$ ), a passage on the ostracism of Megacles and Xanthippus, with some mention of the mines at Maroneia. So imperfect were the indications given by the context that Blass identified Damasias as the archon of 639-8, instead of the archon of 582-1 and $58 \mathrm{I}-0$. The institution of the nine archons seemed to be mentioned after the extract from Solon. It thus appeared impossible to attribute the fragments to a historical work written in chronological order, such as that of Ephorus or one of the writers of 'Artiठes. But Theopompus was known to have closed the tenth book of his Philippica with an excursus on the demagogues of Athens. This (as Blass thought) might well have begun with some account of Dracon and Solon, followed by a digression on the early history of the archonship and by notices of various statesmen such as Megacles, together with some observations on the institution of Ostracism and the reforms of Cleisthenes. It was accordingly conjectured that the newly discovered fragments belonged to Theopompus.

Here the matter rested for a very short time. The article by Blass was published in Hermes in October, 1880. The very next number of the Rheinisches Museum contained a brilliant contribution by the veteran scholar Bergk, who was then in his 6gth year and had just completed the fourth edition of his Poetae Lyrici Graeci, and whose attention was perhaps mainly drawn to the fragments because they included fresh evidence on the poems of Solon. Bergk pointed out that the passage on Cleisthenes corresponded with a scholium on Aristophanes, Nubes, 37. The papyrus as deciphered by Blass had the following letters:

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { - - - ג日hnaioic } \\
& \text { - - хо •••єגєк • днмо! }
\end{aligned}
$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { - то•с днмоүсаna.. } \omega \text { н }
\end{aligned}
$$

With the help of the Scholium Bergk restored the second and following lines thus:

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \kappa a \tau] \epsilon ́ \sigma[\tau \eta \sigma] \epsilon \delta \grave{\varepsilon} \kappa[a i \quad] \delta \eta \mu a \rho-
\end{aligned}
$$

This Scholium, although introduced by the words 'Aptatoté $\lambda \eta \mathrm{s}$ Sè $\pi \epsilon \rho i$ K $\lambda_{\epsilon \iota \sigma \theta \in ́ v o v s ~} \phi \eta \sigma i$, had not found its way into either of Rose's previous editions of the fragments, its place having been taken by a less accurate transcript in the lexicon of Harpocration (Rose, $359^{2}$ ); but it is duly cited in the edition by Heitz (no. $19=388$ ).

In addition to the proof supplied by this citation, the internal evidence of the style of these scanty fragments was enough to convince Bergk that the prose portions could not have come from any other work than the lost $\pi$ odıreiat of Aristotle ${ }^{1}$. But Bergk could not believe that so long a passage of poetry as the fragment of Solon could have been cited in the 'A $\theta \eta v a i \omega v$ modıceía. He accordingly suggested two alternative solutions: either the poem was an interpolation inserted in a complete copy of the ' $\mathrm{A} \theta \eta v a i \omega v$ aoductia by a copyist who desired to illustrate the reforms of Solon by transcribing the poem, or the work consisted of selections from various writers on the constitution of Athens.

The Berlin fragments were further discussed by Landwehr, who published a transcript and a restoration of the text in 1883 ; which he afterwards revised and corrected in the Philologus (Suppl. Bd. v 195). They were also the subject of an able paper by Diels in $1885^{*}$. According to his view the fragments are simply two loose pages of papyrus filled with transcripts from the 'A ${ }^{2} \eta \nu a i \omega v$ modıcela by some schoolboy of Arsinoe. Damasias is rightly identified as Damasias II, and many other points are discussed in a masterly manner. It is also maintained for the first time that all the four pages belong to the same work, and that the 'A $\theta$. $\pi 0$. of Aristotle. The paper includes a convenient reprint of the various restorations of the fragments, and also a lithographed facsimile.
${ }^{1}$ p. go, 'Wohl aber erinnert die Behandlungsweise an Aristoteles : selbst ein blödes Auge wird erkennen, dass der Verfasser vollkommen mit seinem Gegenstande vertraut ist, dass er zwischen Wesentlichem und Unwichtigem sehr wohl zu scheiden weiss, dass hier nicht ein buchgelehrter Grammatiker zu uns spricht, sondern ein erfahrener Mann, der mit scharfen Blicke das politische Lehen zu betrachten gewohnt war, der sein histo-
rischer Sinn vor jeder Befangenheit des Urtheils hewahrte. Nicht minder erinnert die schlichte und schmucklose, nur auf die Sache gerichtete Darstellung an die Weise des Begriinders der Stantswissenschaft. Auf mich wenigstens machten diese Bruchstücke sofort den Eindruck, als hätte ich Reste der Aristotelischen Politie der Athener vor mir.'
${ }_{2}$ Philos. u. Hist. Abhandlungen, Berlin Acad., $\mathbf{1 8 8 6}$, ii pp. 1 - 57.

## § 6. The British Museum papyrus.

Thus far the student of Aristotle's $\Pi_{0} \lambda \iota \tau \epsilon i a \iota$ had to found his conclusions as to the character of the work solely on meagre fragments laboriously collected from many sources, and on two barely legible and most imperfect scraps of papyrus in the Museum at Berlin, when suddenly, on the morning of Monday, Jan. 19, r891, the readers of The Times were startled by the announcement that a ms containing the greater portion of Aristotle's Constitution of Athens had been acquired by the British Museum as part of a collection of papyrus rolls from a place in Egypt which, for adequate reasons, it was not expedient to specify more particularly. It was not until the rolls had been examined at the British Museum that it was found that three of them contained what was identified as the text of the ' $A \theta \eta \nu a i \omega \nu$ тодıтє́́a.

The secret of the discovery had been well kept: and by its first public announcement the interest of scholars at home and abroad was roused to a high pitch of expectation. Only eleven days later, on Friday, Jan. 30 th, the printed text appeared under the editorship of Mr F. G. Kenyon, Fellow of Magdalen College, Oxford, Assistant in the Department of mss, British Museum. It was soon discovered that, although the text was described in the preface to the editio princeps as 'in good condition' and requiring 'little emendation', there was a still deeper truth in the editor's fuller statement on a later page:- 'There remain not a few passages which still require emendation by conjecture, in some of which the reading of the ms is completely lost, while in others a few faint traces of letters remain, which will serve as tests of the accuracy of any proposed emendation'. A vast number of conjectures of very various degrees of merit were accordingly proposed by English scholars in the pages of the Athenaeum, and the Academy, and the substance of these, together with the criticisms of continental scholars, were reprinted, with many other suggestions, in successive numbers of the Classical Revieze (March to July, r891). Many further contributions to the criticism and elucidation of the treatise have since appeared. A conspectus of the literature of the subject is reserved for a later section (§ ro).

Early in March the Trustees of the British Museum published a Facsimile of the papyrus. The immediate, and indeed the permanent, result of this publication was a widely expressed recognition of the remarkable skill with which Mr Kenyon had accomplished the task of deciphering the ms. In those portions of the ms which are most easily read in the original, the facsimile is an adequate substitute for the
papyrus. It is mainly, though by no means exclusively, in the places where the papyrus is rubbed, and the remains of the letters only faintly visible, that it is absolutely necessary to resort to the original.

The ms consists of four separate rolls with the letters A, B, F, written at the beginning of the first three:

I 7 feet, $2 \frac{1}{3}$ inches, in length, by about Ir inches in height, including Columns I -ri
II 5 " $5^{\frac{1}{2}} \quad " \quad " \quad$ " $\quad$ 12-24
III 3 " , " $\quad$, ${ }^{25}$ - 30

IV about $\mathbf{3}$ feet (originally) in length, by about to inches in height, including remains of Columns

31-37
Total length about 18 feet, 8 inches ${ }^{1}$.
The ms is written in four hands: (1) extends over Columns i-r2, and is described as 'a small semi-cursive hand, employing a large number of abbreviations of common syllables.'
(2) begins with Col. 13 and ends in the middle of Col. 20. This is described as an 'uncial of fair size,' plain but not ornamental, employing no contractions, and making a large number of blunders in matters of spelling.
(3) is a 'straggling' and often ill-formed semi-cursive hand, of larger size than the first. This extends from the middle of Col. 20 to the end of Col. 24; and also includes the mutilated remains of Cols. $3 \mathrm{I}-37$.
(4) closely resembles (I), and 'employs many of the same abbreviations,' but is generally finer and more upright, and possesses some distinctive forms of letters. This extends over Cols. 25-30".

Abbreviations are not used uniformly by all the four hands. They are chiefly confined to hands ( 1 ) and (4), while they are very sparingly used by (3), and not at all by (2). Hence it is obvious that, in restoring the text, it is solely in Cols. 1-12, and 25-30, that we can assume the existence of abbreviations. They can only be admitted within very narrow limits in Cols. 20-24, and 31-37; while they cannot be admitted at all in Cols. I3-20.
(I) and (4) have many abbreviations in common; but at the same time each of the two has some that are characteristic of itself alone. This will be made clear by the following classified list ${ }^{3}$.

[^28][^29]hands (I) and (4)

| $\dot{r}=\gamma{ }^{\text {aj }} \boldsymbol{r}$ | $\wedge=\pi a p a ́ a n d ~ \pi a \rho a-$ |
| :---: | :---: |
| $\Delta^{\prime}=\delta \epsilon$ and $-\delta \epsilon$. | $\kappa^{\prime}=\pi \epsilon \rho l$ |
| $\Delta=\delta<a ́ a n d ~ \delta \iota a-$ | $\hat{c}=\sigma \delta \nu$ and $\sigma v v$ - |
|  | $\boldsymbol{T}$ = - $\tau$ al |
| $\gamma=\epsilon \sigma \tau l$ | $\grave{\dagger}=\tau \dot{\eta} \nu$ and $-\tau \eta \nu$ |
| $\hat{k}^{\prime}=\kappa \alpha l$ and $-\kappa \alpha_{\text {l- }}$ | $T^{\prime}=\tau \hat{\eta} \mathrm{s}$ and $-\tau \eta$ |
| $\mu^{\prime}=\mu \hat{\epsilon} \nu$ and $-\mu \epsilon \nu-$ | $\mathrm{T}^{\prime}=\tau \hat{\omega} \nu$ and $-\tau \omega \nu$ |
| $\mu=\mu \epsilon \tau \dot{a}$ and (in I) $\mu \epsilon \tau \alpha-$ | $\boldsymbol{\omega}=-\omega \nu$ |
| ó $=-0 ¢$ |  |


| hand (3) only | hands (3) and (4) only <br> $Y^{\prime}=\dot{j} \pi \epsilon \rho$ |
| :---: | :---: |
| $k \quad=-k \alpha l$ and in (3) кal |  |


| hand (1) only $\begin{aligned} & 0=-o t,-o v,-o \nu, o u s,-o u s \\ & N=\pi \epsilon \rho \\ & \mathrm{c}^{\theta}=-\sigma \theta a t \\ & f=\chi \rho \sigma \nu o s,-o v,-o v,-\omega v,-o t s \\ & \omega=-\epsilon \omega s \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: |
| $\begin{aligned} & \quad \text { hand (4) only } \\ & \alpha^{\prime}=\dot{\alpha} \nu a- \\ & ==\varepsilon l \sigma l \\ & c \theta=-\sigma \theta a u \\ & Y^{\prime}=\dot{u} \pi \delta \text { and } \dot{v} \pi o- \end{aligned}$ |

Hands (r) and (4) have not only certain distinctive abbreviations, but they also use with different degrees of frequency the abbreviations that are common to both. Thus the symbol for eival is found fourteen times in (r), and only five times in (4); that for $\mathfrak{c} \sigma \tau \boldsymbol{\iota}$ four times in (r), and twenty-eight times in (4); that for $\sigma v v_{-}$seventy times in ( I ), and six times in (4); that for -ovv- three times in (r), and sixteen times in (4); that for - $\tau \alpha l$ twenty-four times in ( r ), and fifty-seven times in (4); and that for -os is far more frequent in (x) than in (4) ${ }^{1}$. These considerations prevent us from identifying the two hands. There are also certain distinctive differences in the shapes of the letters used by each ; and the same remark applies to hands (2) and $(3)^{2}$.

Final syllables are often omitted in (r) and (4). Thus $\phi v^{\lambda}$ is found in both hands for $\phi u \lambda \hat{\eta} s$ and $\phi u \lambda \lambda^{\prime} v$, and $\beta o v^{\lambda}$ is used for all the cases of $\beta$ ov $\lambda^{\prime}$ in the singular. Hand (3) has $\chi \omega \rho$ for $\chi{ }^{\omega} \rho a \nu$ (col. 22, 2); $\tau \rho o$ for
 $a v$ is exceptionally used for aủrทiv (in col. 9,8 ); and a symbol for $\delta \rho a \chi \mu \eta^{\prime}$, found in cols. $2 \mathrm{I}, 35$ and 26,54 , is common to hands (2) and (4). Numerals are denoted by the ordinary symbols in all hands alike ${ }^{3}$.

[^30] $\pi^{\prime}$ aut' $(4,15) ; \pi^{\prime} \tau^{\prime} \delta^{\prime} \nu \in \mu \in \sigma^{\theta} \tau^{\prime} \gamma \eta \nu(4,2$ I), ; $\mu \tau^{\prime} \tau^{\prime}$ עо $\mu \omega \nu$ $\theta \in \sigma L \nu(5,23)$; ov $\gamma^{\prime} \epsilon \nu \delta \in \chi \in \tau$ ) (7, 2) ; $\mu \pi \epsilon \mu \pi о \mu_{0 \sigma}(7,14)$; $а \rho \mu о \delta \iota^{\circ}$ ( 7 , 25) ; $\sigma^{\prime} \pi a \nu \tau а \sigma^{\prime}$ oı $\sigma(8,2 \mathrm{I})$; $\delta^{\prime} \kappa \alpha \mu \tau^{\prime} \boldsymbol{\pi}^{\prime}$ то $\operatorname{a\sigma \tau v}(9,4) ; \kappa^{\prime} \tau^{\prime} \sigma^{\prime} \mu a \chi^{\omega}(10,12) ; ~ \ \kappa ́$
 $\delta^{\prime} \mu^{\prime} \tau^{\prime} \epsilon \nu \sigma \iota \epsilon \in \lambda \epsilon \nu \circ \mu^{\prime} \eta \nu$ ס'форау (II, 46); $\left.\sigma \gamma \rho a \psi \epsilon \iota a^{a} a \nu \eta \gamma \omega \nu \tau\right\rangle$, i.e. $\sigma v \gamma \gamma \rho d \psi \in \iota \nu$ à à $\nu$ $\dot{\eta} \gamma \omega \nu \tau \alpha \iota(12,3)$.

In (4), also found in (1):-к' $\beta a \lambda \lambda \epsilon T$ ) $(25,25) ; \delta \rho a \chi \mu \omega(27,1) ; ~ a \rho \chi о \nu \tau^{\circ}(27$, 23) ; $\pi^{\prime} \alpha \iota \rho \in \iota \tau \alpha \iota(29,18) ; \delta^{\prime} \tau \iota \theta \eta \sigma \iota(29,23)$; $\mu^{\prime} \tau^{\prime} \beta_{o u \lambda}(29,50) ; \pi^{\prime} \tau \iota \theta \varepsilon \nu \tau \alpha L(30,41)$.

In ( 1 ) alone: ${ }^{0}=0 v$ in 15 places, $\varepsilon . g$.

Tota adscriptum is hardly ever omitted in (r) ; hardly ever inserted in (2); (3) and (4) do not follow any fixed rule ${ }^{\text {i }}$.
$\epsilon \iota$ and $\iota$ are frequently interchanged, especially in (2); some of these mistakes are however corrected by hand ( x . But even in ( I ) we sometimes have $\iota$ for $\epsilon \iota$, e.g. $\pi \iota \sigma \iota \sigma \tau \rho a \cos$ in three places (Col. 5, 28, 33, 37), besides four other instances. In (2) there are as many as 4 r , e.g.
 five respectively. Conversely we have $\epsilon \iota$ for $\iota$ in all the four hands, the number of instances being $\mathrm{r}_{4}, 11,15$ and 2 respectively. Both of these mistakes are combined in $\pi 0 \lambda \epsilon \epsilon \tau \iota a \nu(C o l .13,3)$ and $\pi 0 \lambda \epsilon \tau \tau \iota a \rho$ ( $14, \mathrm{I}$; $16,26)^{2}$.

There is nothing resembling a mark of punctuation, except the short horizontal line in the margin (Cols. 1,$40 ; 2,4 ; 7,15,30 ; 11,5$, 31 ; 13, 15 ). In some cases this may be a true $\pi \alpha \rho a \gamma \rho \alpha \phi \eta$, as in Col. $r$, 40 and $8,2 \mathrm{rf}$, where it coincides with the natural end of a chapter; in others (as suggested by Blass ${ }^{3}$ ) it may denote a corruption; at any rate this appears more probable than van Leeuwen's ${ }^{4}$ opinion that it draws attention to an important or striking statement.

There are no breathings or accents, except in $\epsilon \kappa \mu \alpha \rho \tau v \rho \omega \nu \quad$ (Col. 3, 9),
 $(29,46)$. In some of these cases they are apparently added to prevent ambiguity of meaning ${ }^{5}$.

Blunders made by hand (2) are occasionally corrected, apparently by hand (r), or possibly (4). It has been suggested that the transcript was begun by some one who desired a copy for his own use, and, after writing out the first twelve columns, entrusted to others the task of copying the remainder, being content to revise their work and to correct their misspellings and their other mistakes ${ }^{6}$. The editors of the first German edition, Kaibel and von Wilamowitz ${ }^{7}$, hold that all the corrections are due to hand ( $\mathbf{r}$ ) which they identify with (4). To account for the fact that many blunders are left uncorrected, they assume that the
$a \rho \in \iota^{0} \pi a \gamma^{\circ},(2,9) ;=0 \nu$ in 44 places, e.g. $\theta \eta \tau \iota K^{0},(3,3) ;=0 \iota$ in 8 places, e.g. $\delta \iota \sigma \times 1-$ $\lambda t^{\circ}(10,17) ;=o t s$ once, $a \lambda \lambda^{\circ}(2,33)$; $=-o v s$ in 16 places, e.g. $\kappa \lambda \epsilon \epsilon \sigma \theta \epsilon \nu{ }^{\circ}$, ( 12 , 8) $; \kappa^{\prime} \pi(8,9)$.

In (4) alone : $-/ /=\epsilon l \sigma l$ (in 20 places, e.g. twice in 27, 11 and 28,41); $\dot{v}=\dot{v} \pi \boldsymbol{b}$ $(26,19,30 ; 27,20 ; 28,24) ; \sigma \theta^{\prime}=-\sigma \theta a l$ in I6 places, e.g. $\delta v \nu a \sigma \theta^{\prime}(26,9) ; \dot{v}=\dot{v} \pi \delta$ in 26, 19 and $30 ; 27,20 ; 28,24$; also $=\dot{v} \pi 0-$ in $\dot{\cup} \zeta y \iota \omega \nu(26,52) ; \dot{\alpha}=\dot{\alpha} \nu \alpha-$ in 13 places, e.g. $\dot{\alpha} \beta \eta \nu a \iota$ зо, 3.
In (3) alone : $\vec{v}=\dot{i} \pi \notin \rho$ twice 21,24 and 23, 22 (cf. 22, 44). (3) кל $=$ кal (22, 13 bis ;

23,22 ;) =-кал- in avarкלov (23, 14). $\chi \omega \rho$ $=\chi \dot{\omega} \rho a \nu(22,2) ; \tau \rho \Delta=\tau \rho б \pi о \nu(22,11)$; ato $\quad$ ค $\dot{\alpha}=$ á $\pi о \gamma \rho a \phi \dot{\alpha}$ 22, 35. Final $\nu$ above last letter of word, seven times, cf .


I Van Leeuwen, l. c. p. 165.
2 Van Leeuwen, l. c. p. 166.
${ }^{8}$ Praef. p. xi.
${ }^{4}$ l.c. p. 166.
${ }^{5}$ Mr Kenyon's Introd. last page ; and van Leeuwen, l. c. p. 167.
${ }^{6} \mathrm{Mr}$ Kenyon's Introduction, p. xi.
7 Praef. p. vii.
text depends on two earlier mss, one of them much more accurate than the other ${ }^{1}$. Blass however, holds, with apparently greater probability, that there are several correctors: all the four hands correct some of their own mistakes; and one or more of them correct the work of the rest, not to mention the possibility of a revision independent of all the four. The same critic divides the 'corrections' into five groups, the most important of which he prefers to regard as variae lectiones which were recorded as such in the ms from which our papyrus was copied ${ }^{2}$.

The process by which the papyrus plant was made into material for writing was as follows : the tall stem had its rind stripped off and the pith cut with a sharp instrument into broad slices of extreme thinness and considerable length. These were laid in long strips on a flat board; across these were placed in the opposite direction and touching one another, a number of short strips corresponding in length to the proposed height of the roll. The upper and lower surfaces were made to adhere to one another by means of the slightly glutinous sap of the pith. or (failing that) by means of paste. The long scroll thus formed was thereupon smoothed down with an ivory instrument or a shell ${ }^{8}$. The proper side for writing is that on which the horizontal strips allow of the pen running freely without traversing the frequent joinings of the successive parallel strips of papyrus. Thus, the British Museum papyrus of the first three speeches of Hyperides is written entirely on what may be called the 'horizontal' side, i.e. that on which the strips of papyrus run in a horizontal direction. If any writing is added on the back, it may be described as written on the 'vertical' side, that on which the strips run vertically and overlap one another at their edges. After the front of a scroll has been filled, the back is not unfrequently used for some other writing on a totally different subject. For example, the British Museum papyrus of the Funeral Oration of Hyperides has a Greek horoscope on one side, and that the 'horizontal,' or right side; while the speech of Hyperides is written on the 'vertical,' or wrong side. Similarly the 'A $\begin{aligned} & \text { quai } \omega \nu \\ & \pi 0 \lambda \iota \tau \epsilon \text { 'a is written on the vertical, or wrong side, }\end{aligned}$ technically called verso (or 'reverse') as opposed to recto. It may be inferred that the text of any author so inscribed on the back of the scroll is not only later in date than that on the other side; but also that it has been copied solely for the private use of the owner, and not for publication or for preservation in a public library ${ }^{4}$.

On the horizontal side of the papyrus of the ' $\mathrm{A} \theta \eta \mathrm{q} a i \omega \nu$ то入ıтєía are

[^31][^32]the accounts of receipt and expenditure drawn up by a bailiff on a private estate in the eleventh year of Vespasian (from Aug. 78 to June 79 A.D.) ${ }^{1}$. After (but probably not very long after) the time when the accounts had ceased to be valuable, the other side was used to the extent of a column and a half for the transcription of an argument to the Midias of Demosthenes ${ }^{2}$; the latter was then struck out, the roll turned upside down and the 'A $A \eta \nu a i \omega v$ moдıreia written on it, beginning at the other end of the roll. The ms has been assigned to 'the end of the first century of our era or, at latest, the beginning of the second,' and this opinion is confirmed by several dated documents of the first and second centuries which have come to light since the first publication of the papyrus ${ }^{3}$.

## § 7. Date and Authorship of the 'A $\theta \eta \nu \alpha i \omega v$ modıтєia.

The date of the original composition of the treatise is determined by internal evidence. The system of electing Strategi for special departments of military duty, which is recognised in c. 61 § I , was introduced after b.c. 334. Hence the work was written later than that date. The latest date expressly quoted in it is the archonship of Cephisophon, b.c. $329-8$ (c. 54 § 7). Again, since in c. 46 § 1 mention is made of triremes and quadriremes, and not of quinqueremes, it has been inferred that it was written before B.c. $325-4$, the earliest date at which quinqueremes are named in connexion with the navy of Athens ${ }^{4}$. Further, it is clear that the treatise could not have been composed after 322 b.c.; because, in that case, we should certainly have had some account of the change in the constitution of Athens which was brought about by Antipater in that year ${ }^{5}$. Lastly, the treatise describes the Athenians as still sending officials to Samos (c. 62, 16) ; in the autumn of b.c. 322 that island ceased to be under the control of Athens. B.c. 322 is also the year of the death of Aristotle: hence, the evidence derived from the treatise itself shews that it was written while Aristotle was still alive; and the reasons above assigned enable us to place its date between в.c. 328 and 325 .

We have already traced in chronological order the evidence of all

[^33][^34]the ancient authorities who quote the חoגıreiac. We have seen that the work as a whole is assigned to Aristotle by the unanimous voice of antiquity; and it has just been shewn that the ' $\mathrm{A} \theta \eta \nu \alpha i \omega v \pi 0 \lambda \iota \tau \epsilon^{\prime} \alpha$ was certainly completed while Aristotle was still alive. In such a case we must necessarily accept the work as Aristotle's, unless internal evidence is conclusive on the other side. The consideration of that evidence turns partly on questions of style, partly on the relations subsisting between the 'A $\theta \eta v a i \omega v$ modırєia and the Politics. Let us consider the latter point first.

The latest event mentioned in the Politics is the death of Philip in b.c. 336. Had the Politics been finished even as early as seven years after that date, it would have been completed before the 'A $\theta \eta \nu a i \omega v$ $\pi 0 \lambda \iota \tau \epsilon i ́ a$. But, according to the opinion now prevalent among Aristotelian scholars, it was left incomplete by its author and was not given to the world in his lifetime. Books vii (iv) and viii (v) are more carefully composed than the rest, being specially marked by the avoidance of hiatus. It is possible that these two books represent the author's finished style; it is also possible that they owe their polish to the skill of a pupil of the Peripatetic school ${ }^{1}$. But in either case they are not of the nature of a popular work, and there is nothing to prove that they were in general circulation during the author's lifetime.

Probably the greater part of the Politics had already been written by the year 336. It has sometimes been supposed that the vast collection of facts relating to the $\pi$ o $\lambda \iota \tau \epsilon i a \iota$ of various Greek states was formed to serve as materials for the theoretical treatment of the subject in the Politics. The Politics, however, were never completed, whereas the 'A $\theta \eta \nu a i ́ \omega \nu$ modırєía assumed a finished form more than three years before the death of Aristotle. But it is quite possible that the materials for the 'A $\theta \eta v a i \omega v$ по $\lambda \iota \tau \epsilon i ́ a$, and for the rest of the series, were collected before the larger part of the Politics was reduced to writing. The same materials would serve for both; but, in the case of the Moдırє $\hat{\alpha}$, they were embodied in a finished work for popular perusal ; in the case of the Politics, they formed part of the preliminary studies for courses of lectures probably confined to the philosopher's immediate circle. Now, as the Politics may have continued to supply the theme for such lectures in and after 334 , while the 'A $\theta \eta v a i ́ \omega v$ $\pi 0 \lambda \iota \tau \epsilon i ́ a$ was not ready for public perusal until 6 or 8 years later, we need not be surprised to find in the Politics no reference whatsoever to the Mo入ıreial. At a time when only fragments of the latter were known to scholars, this fact used to be quoted in proof of the spuriousness of the work. But now that

[^35]nearly the whole of one of the $\Pi_{o \lambda \iota \tau \epsilon i a l ~ h a s ~ b e e n ~ r e c o v e r e d, ~ a n d ~ i t s ~}^{\text {a }}$ date determined to be later than the latest event noticed in the Politics, no argument against its genuineness can be founded on the fact that the author of the unfinished work says nothing of a popular treatise that had not yet been published while the theoretical work was still in course of preparation.

The question arises whether the Пo入ıтєial are ever mentioned in the undisputed works of Aristotle. At the close of the Ethics, when about to state the theme of the ensuing discussion in the Politics, Aristotle speaks of $\tau \hat{\omega} \nu \pi \lambda^{2} \iota \tau \epsilon \epsilon \bar{\nu}$ ai $\sigma v \nu a \gamma \omega \gamma a i$ and also of $\tau \omega \bar{\omega}$ $\sigma v \nu \eta \gamma \mu{ }^{\prime} \nu \omega v \pi 0 \lambda \iota \tau \epsilon \epsilon \omega \bar{\omega}(\mathrm{x} 9 \S \S 2 \mathrm{I}, 23)$. The sense of the context of the latter phrase may be expressed as follows: 'First then let us endeavour to review whatever is to some extent valuable in the statements of our predecessors, and then to learn from the constitutions which have been collected (or put into juxtaposition with one another), the causes which are apt to preserve or to destroy states, and the causes which have this effect on the several constitutions.' This promise is sufficiently fulfilled by the review of the various constitutions in Book in, their classification in Books IH-vI ${ }^{1}$, and the discussion of the ways in which revolutions may be caused or prevented in Book viri (v).

Rose, however, in his Aristoteles Pseudepigraphus, while regarding the $\pi o \lambda \iota \tau \epsilon \omega \hat{v} \sigma v \nu a \gamma \omega \gamma a i$ as existing collections of facts forming materials for the Politics, insists at the same time that Aristotle had not himself written any such work or expressed any intention of writing it ${ }^{2}$. The Politics of Aristotle, he adds, were supplemented in due time by the works on $\nu 0 \mu 0 \theta \epsilon \sigma i a$ written by his pupil Theophrastus; but neither Aristotle nor Theophrastus, he contends, ever wrote any work on $\pi 0 \lambda_{i \tau \epsilon i a l}$. The Пoдuteial, attributed to Aristotle, are ascribed by Rose to some anonymous Peripatetic who was less of a philosopher than a historian and philologist. Such was Demetrius Phalereus who wrote works $\pi \epsilon \rho \grave{\imath}$

${ }^{1}$ Cf. Newman, Ar. Pol. vol. i pp. 2, 214 - 220.
${ }_{2}$ Rose, A. P. p. 396.
Camerarius and Victorius understood $\pi 0 \lambda \iota \tau \epsilon i a l$ $\sigma u \nu \eta \gamma \mu \hat{\nu} a l$ as a reference to Aristotle's historical work, a view supported by Grant and Stahr, Ar. Pol. (i860) p. 66. Heitz, Verl. Schr. p. 232, quotes the paraphrase of Andronicus:

 From the use of $\sigma v{ }^{2}$ a $\omega$ ral in Pol. vii (vi)

 $\tau \hat{\nu} \nu \tau \rho \delta \pi \omega \nu$, and $\sigma \cup \nu a \kappa \tau \epsilon \bar{\epsilon}$ els $\delta \lambda<\gamma a$ in
$1319 b 23$, he infers that they are die unter eine gewisse Anzahl von Rubriken vertheilten, verschiedenen Verfassungs. formen. But the meaning of $\sigma_{\nu \nu a \gamma \omega \gamma a i}$ in the former of these two passages is determined by Aristotle himself by the use of the word $\sigma v \nu \delta v a \zeta 6 \mu \varepsilon \nu \alpha$ in the very next line, and $\sigma u v \delta u a \sigma \mu o i$ in the subsequent context. It refers to constitutions which exceptionally comóine oligarchic and democratic elements; and this sense has nothing to do with the interpretation of the passage in the Ethics proposed by Heitz. Susemihl (followed by Mr J. A. Stewart) brackets Eth. x 9 § 22, 23 .
was Dicaearchus，whose $\pi$ òırêial were known to Cicero．The author of the $\Pi$ II $\lambda_{\iota \tau \epsilon}$ iat was（according to Rose）inspired，like Dicaearchus，by the example of Aristotle who，in his Politics，touches on the constitutions of a large number of states．Now that we know that the＇A $\theta \eta v a i \omega v$ тoдıтєía was completed several years before the death of Aristotle， while the Politics was still unfinished，the suggestion that the unknown author of the Modıceial was inspired by the Politics falls to the ground， unless indeed we are to assume that the author was one of the pupils of Aristotle who attended his course on the Politics at some date after his return to Athens（334）．If so，it is singular that the name of this remarkably prolific writer should not have been preserved．On the contrary，the name has completely vanished，and in its place we find everywhere the name of Aristotle and of none beside．

The only two that have been seriously suggested as authors of the ＇A $\begin{aligned} & \text { quai } \\ & \text { modıceía are Demetrius Phalereus and Dicaearchus．The }\end{aligned}$ former is suggested by Rose in his Aristoteles Pseudepigraphus，p． 398. Two of the fragments seemed to imply a more aristocratic type of constitution than any that prevailed at Athens before about 317 b．c．； and，on the other hand，the work must have been composed before the number of the Attic tribes was increased from ten to twelve（b．c． 307 ）． The fragments in question are those on $\theta \epsilon \sigma \mu \circ \theta \epsilon \tau \omega \bar{\nu}$ àvákpı $\sigma \iota$（ $4 \times 4^{3}$ ）and
 supported by the context in which we find those fragments in the present work（c． 55 § I and c． 53 § 7）；and we now know that the treatise was written not between 317 and 307 ，but between 328 and 325 ． Rose＇s suggestion has been recently revived by Schvarcz ${ }^{1}$ ．If any de－ tailed refutation of this view is necessary，it may be noticed that，of all the passages attributed to the work of Demetrius $\pi \epsilon \rho i \quad \tau \hat{\eta} \mathrm{~s}$＇A $\theta \dot{\eta} \nu \eta \sigma$ $\nu \nu \mu 0 \theta \epsilon \sigma i a s$（either by Harpocration，s．v．бкафүोópot，Zè̀s épкєios and тapá⿱宀a⿱亠乂ьs，or by Plutarch，Sol．23，or by the Scholiast on Arist．Nubes 37，or by other authorities mentioned in Müller＇s FHG），not one is to be found in the roגıceía．Indeed，in the very first fragment of the work of Demetrius，the account of кvpia éккл $\boldsymbol{\epsilon} \boldsymbol{i}$ a is described by Harpocration as less satisfactory than that of＇Aristotle＇which is found in c． 43 § 4 ． Similarly Harpocration，s．v．mapá⿱宀八aбıs，prefixes to a quotation from
 modereía which is found in c． 59 § 3 ；and the Scholiast on Arist．Nubes 37 quotes from both treatises，his quotation from＇Aristotle＇being found inc． 21 §5．（From the other work，$\pi \in \rho \grave{\imath} \tau \hat{\omega} \nu{ }^{\prime} A \theta \dot{\eta} \nu \eta \sigma \iota \pi 0 \lambda \iota \tau \epsilon \omega \bar{\omega} \nu$ or $\pi 0 \lambda \iota \tau \omega \hat{v}$ ，named in Diog．Laert．v 8o，not a single fragment has

[^36]survived.) To meet these difficulties Schvarcz suggests that, at the
 identifies with the 'A $\theta \eta \nu a i \omega \nu$ modereia, Demetrius was unacquainted with the facts which he afterwards ascertained by further study in the archives
 And yet, strange to say, the account of кирia éкккд ${ }^{\prime} \sigma^{\prime}{ }^{\prime} a$ in this 'later work' is in the judgment of Harpocration inferior to that in the treatise which Schvarcz identifies with the 'earlier work' of Demetrius.

It is equally impossible to assign it to Aristotle's pupil, Dicaearchus, for not a single fragment attributed to him by ancient authorities is to be
 of Pellene and Corinth, or Sparta and Athens; and the few remains of
 and חava日quaïкós, have nothing in common with the treatment of those topics in the treatise ascribed to Aristotle.

While in the Politics there is no allusion to the חoderêal, there are many passages in the 'A $\theta$. $\pi 0 \lambda$. which, either in thought or expression, are so closely parallel to the Politics, as to suggest a common authorship. Such coincidences might of course be due to the retentive memory of a pupil attending the master's lectures on his unfinished and unpublished work; but it seems more natural to ascribe them to a common author. Let us first consider the more general coincidences of thought.
(1) The 'A $\theta_{\eta \nu a i \omega v} \pi 0 \lambda_{\iota \tau \epsilon i}{ }^{\prime}$ is the work of one who displays a certain predilection for an aristocratic form of government.

In the Politics there is no question as to the author's general sympathies being on the side of an aristocratic government. Aristocracy is to Aristotle an ápícrך modercia. It is marked by election for merit; it is distinguished from the perfect state as being a government of men who are only good relatively to the constitution; it is so called because the best rule, or because the best interests of the state are consulted; it is analogous to royalty as a government of the best: it is even preferable to royalty, because under it the good are more than one. Oligarchy, the perverted form of Aristocracy, is inferior to constitutional government ( $\pi$ o $\lambda_{\iota \tau \epsilon}(\dot{a}$ ), and to its perverted form, Democracy.

Democracy is described in the Politics as the government of the many in their own interests; it is the perversion of constitutional government; it is akin to tyranny; in its extreme form it is peculiarly apt to pass into tyranny; it is, however, the only possible form of government in large states; and it is more stable than oligarchy. 'Liberty and equality', as well as the 'use of the lot', are dispassionately
described as characteristic of democracy; and suggestions are propounded for the improvement of this form of government ${ }^{1}$.
 the services rendered by the Areopagus in the times of Dracon (c. 4) and Solon (c. 9), and in the sixteen years immediately succeeding the formation of the confederacy of Delos (c. 23). Cleon is regarded as a demagogue who corrupted the people (c. 28). Nicias, Thucydides (son of Melesias), and Theramenes, are counted among the best statesmen of Athens (c. 28). The writer shows the greatest interest in the constitutional measures proposed by the Four Hundred (c. 29-32); at the same time he does not disguise the atrocities committed by the Thirty (c. 35 end). The restoration of the democracy is described in dispassionate and unenthusiastic terms (c. 38). The defeat of a proposal to reward all who had aided in its restoration is mentioned in language implying that the author did not disapprove of the result.

On the other hand, the transfer of judicial functions from the $\beta$ ov $\lambda \dot{\eta}$ to the $\dot{\mathbf{~}} \kappa \kappa \lambda \eta \sigma i \alpha$ is commended on the ground that 'small bodies are more open to corruption than large ones' (c. 41, 1. 28); but this approval is expressed in the mildest terms and does not imply sympathy with democracy as such. It has been quoted ${ }^{2}$ as inconsistent with the Politics; but the reason given for the writer's approval of the transfer is in perfect accord with a passage in the Politics ( 1286 a 30 , quoted in note on c. 4 I l. 28). There are two periods in which Athens enjoyed a good government:- (I) the 16 years during which the Areopagus was supreme; and (2) the time immediately after the Four Hundred. The only phrase that does not remind one of the writer of the Polititics is the reference to the 'forgiving spirit' of democracy in
 anything like it in the Politics, but I may observe that it recalls a notable passage in the Republic, and may possibly be a reminiscence of it ${ }^{\text {a }}$.

The attitude of the author of the $\pi 0 \lambda \iota \tau \epsilon i a$ towards Peisistratus and Theramenes is in harmony with what we should expect from the author of the Politics. Both agree that Peisistratus rose to power by attacking the men of the Plain ${ }^{*}$; unless a certain passage in the Politics is interpolated, both observe that he was summoned before the Areopagus,

[^37][^38]and that he was twice exiled from Athens ${ }^{1}$. When recommending 'the constitution that gives predominance to the moderately wealthy class' ( $2296 a 38$ ), Aristotle adds that 'only one of those who had played a leading part in the affairs of Greece had encouraged the introduction of this form'. As to the person meant there is much diversity of opinion; but whether (with Mr Newman) we identify him with Theramenes, or (as Dr Jowett prefers) with Solon, we have in either case a complete agreement with the 'A $\theta \eta \nu a i \omega \nu$ modıcéa, though this does not exhaust the question. Again, the description of Ostracism and its object is 'to a considerable extent in harmony with that given in the Politics's. The account of the policy of Aristides is less favourable than we should expect (see c. 24), 'inasmuch as he is said to have converted a citizenbody largely consisting of peasants into an urban citizen-body subsisting on pay and exercising a despotic authority over the subject states, and thus to have contributed to the establishment of an extreme democracy'. We are taught, however, in the Politics (r292b41-r293a6) to 'connect the establishment of a $\tau \epsilon \lambda \epsilon v \tau \alpha i a ~ \delta \eta \mu о к \rho a \tau i a$ with a great increase in the size of the city and with the provision of pay'; and we also know that the opinion of Aristotle's pupil, Theophrastus, on the policy of Aristides, 'was not an altogether favourable one' (Plut. Aristid. c. 25) ${ }^{\text {² }}$.

While the two works are in general agreement on the points above mentioned, there are certain apparent discrepancies that must now be noticed. (r) The 'Draconian Constitution' of the modıctia is in conflict with the passage in the Politics ( $\mathrm{r} 274 b$ 15) which states that Dracon 'adapted his laws to a constitution that already existed'; but the 'Draconian Constitution' has been vigorously attacked on its own merits, while the passage in the Politics is of doubtful genuineness. Again, the подıтéa states that Peisistratus reigned for 19 years; the Politics ( I 3 r 5 b 3 r ) makes his reign last for r 7 , but the whole of the context of the latter passage is bracketed by Susemihl in his 2nd and ${ }_{3}$ rd editions. In a disputed passage of the modı兀є'a, Themistocles co-operates with Ephialtes for the curtailment of the power of the Areopagus: in a possibly interpolated chapter of the Politics (ii 12), the place of Themistocles is taken by Pericles, but not without protest on the part of critics, even before the discovery of the $\pi$ odıreía. In the modıтєía (c. $21 \S 6$ ) we are told that Cleisthenes 'allowed every one to
 to his ancestral rights'; in a perfectly genuine passage of the Politics ( $1319{ }^{2}{ }^{2} 3$ ) it is implied that Cleisthenes 'increased the number of the phratries' and 'converted a number of private worships into a few

[^39]public ones'. But these passages may be readily reconciled with one another if we consider that the passage in the rodıreía refers to those who were already citizens; that in the Politics to the veото入itau.

It has been pointed out by Mr Macan that 'the ideas underlying the second part of the work are conspicuously Aristotelian. The distinction beween ${ }^{a} p \chi \epsilon \omega$ and ${ }_{\alpha}^{\mu} p \chi \epsilon \sigma \theta a a$ and its relation to the franchise; the definition and essence of citizenship ( $1275 a 22$, and $b 22$ ) $\ldots$; the theory of citizenship in the Politics, especially in Bk in ad init. might seem to be presupposed in the treatment of the $\alpha_{\rho}^{j} \rho \chi^{a i}$ in the work under consideration'.

The comparison we have endeavoured to draw between the 'A $\theta \eta v a i \omega \nu$ $\pi$ odıreía and the Politics cannot perhaps be better concluded than by a striking example of identity of thought and language in the two works.




 the Politics we are told that (even under a democracy) it is advisable to provide the poor (rov̀ ámópovs) with capital, and encourage them to
 oligarchy and a tyranny to drive the people out of the city and disperse them ( $\mathrm{I} 3 \mathrm{Ir} a$ 14). We learn elsewhere that the best material for a democracy is an agricultural population; for being poor they have no leisure ( $\left.{ }^{\prime} \sigma \chi \chi^{\circ} \lambda o s\right)$, and therefore seldom attend the assembly; and, not having the necessaries of life, they are always at their work ( $\pi \rho o{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{s}$ rois
 lastly, that while mechanics or traders or labourers are apt to frequent the city and find it easy to attend the assembly, the agricultural class (oi $\gamma \epsilon \omega \rho \gamma o v ̂ \nu \tau \epsilon s$ ) do not attend meetings, or equally feel the need of assembling together, because they are scattered over the country ( $\delta a i$
 imagine a more complete series of parallelisms in expression as well as thought.

Next, as to the language and style of the treatise. The vocabulary includes nine words that are not found elsewhere: these fall into two groups, ( I ) technical expressions, viz. '̇̇ $\pi \iota \zeta \eta \mu i \omega \sigma \iota \varsigma(45,9$, quoted from a law),
 ( 59,6 ) ; (2) words compounded with two prepositions, viz. $\dot{\epsilon} \pi \epsilon \epsilon \sigma \kappa \alpha \lambda \hat{\omega}$
 The technical terms need no defence ; é $\pi \tau \in \tau \eta \rho i s$ is exactly analogous to

[^40] elsewhere. Of the compound words the first three occur in quotations from public documents, and the last is supported by the analogy of
 Double compounds are in fact characteristic of Aristotle; in the Index Aristotelicus, out of nine words compounded with $\dot{\boldsymbol{e} \pi \epsilon \epsilon \sigma}$ one is found in Aristotle alone, and two others are first found in his pages; while, among the compounds with $\pi \rho o \sigma a v a-$ and $\pi \rho \sigma \sigma a \pi \sigma$-, two are found in Aristotle alone, and five are used by no earlier writer ${ }^{1}$.

Among words that are not found in the Index Aristotelicus may be
 ( 14,8 ), aj $\boldsymbol{a} \eta \lambda a \tau \epsilon \hat{\nu} \nu(20,8)$. Of these $\dot{a} \gamma \eta \lambda a \tau \epsilon i v$ is obviously quoted from
 (though not in the same historical connexion), comes immediately after a word borrowed from that historian. The rest are part of the necessary vocabulary of the subject, and their non-appearance in the undisputed works is merely accidental. Exception has been taken to $\sigma v \mu \beta o v \lambda \epsilon \dot{\prime} \epsilon \iota \nu$ (c. 30, 14) as non-Aristotelian, and toít $\omega v$ xápıv (29,25) and évтòs $\tau \rho \omega \omega v$ $\mu \nu \omega \nu(49,26)$ have been described as apparently un-Aristotelian ${ }^{*}$; but the last of these is cited from a law, and the other two are also in quotations; so that here at any rate we have no right to demand adherence to Aristotelian usage.

Among the compound verbs that are not found in any contemporary


 èvayíruara. The word $\pi \rho o \delta a v e i{ }_{6} \epsilon \nu$, which has been quoted as only used by later writers, is actually found in contemporary decrees ${ }^{3}$; and тplakovtópıov, which has been described as an 'entirely new word', is to be seen in contemporary inscriptions ${ }^{4}$. $\mu \epsilon \mu \psi \iota \mu \circ \rho \rho_{i}$ is not found in Aristotle, but he uses $\mu \epsilon \mu \psi i ́ \mu o r o s$.

Lists of 'un-Aristotelian words and phrases' have been collected by various scholars in the Classical Review ${ }^{\circ}$; and many of the items in such a list will call for notice in the course of the commentary. Attention has also been drawn to the absence of certain turns of expression characteristic of the undisputed writings of Aristotle: thus in the $\pi$ oдıréia

[^41][^42]'there is a good deal about democracy, but we miss the technical terms
 no person or thing is either $\sigma \pi$ ovoaios or $\phi$ av̂dos' ${ }^{1}$. But, however acute such criticism may be, and undoubtedly is, much of its point is removed, and its edge appreciably blunted, by a frank recognition of the necessary distinction that separates the style of a popular manual like the $\pi$ oдıréa from that of a philosophical investigation like the Politics.

To a similar cause we may ascribe the differences which may be noticed in the degree to which certain particles and conjunctions are used in the $\pi$ odıreia as compared with the undisputed works already known to us. Of the particles, $\gamma \epsilon$ is not used at all, and consequently रoûv does not occur, zol occurs only once in $\mu$ évoó $(28,35)$ where its existence is solely due to a probable, but not perfectly certain, emen-

 but is sometimes found after a demonstrative pronoun, once after a superlative (кád $\lambda \iota \sigma \tau \alpha \delta \eta^{\prime} 40,17$ ); and in several instances where $\tau \epsilon$ is followed by каì $\delta \dot{r}^{\prime} \kappa a i ́$; $\dot{\epsilon} \pi \epsilon \iota \delta \bar{\eta}$ is rare, while $\dot{\epsilon} \pi \epsilon \iota \delta \dot{\alpha} \nu$ is common. Of the conjunctions, oưv is never used except in $\mu \grave{\iota} \nu$ oṽv (hence it cannot be
 proposed). $\ddot{a}^{\ddot{2}} \rho a$, тoivvv, тoíqa $\rho$, and $\tau \epsilon \gamma^{\prime} \rho$, are not found. $\dot{a} \lambda \lambda a \grave{a}$ occurs some thirty times, but always after a negative. kaì always follows $\delta$ to, and nearly always follows ${ }_{0} \theta_{\epsilon} \theta$, when used in the sense of $\delta \iota{ }^{\circ}$; iva is


In the undisputed works, $\gamma \epsilon$ and ${ }^{\boldsymbol{o} v} \nu$ and $\tau \epsilon \gamma \dot{a} \rho$ are common; äpa is rare in the Politics; $\quad$ oívvv, $\mu$ évтol and каíтo frequent in the Metaphysics, Physics and Politics; yet, in the Rhetoric, $\mu$ évooc is found only four times; кaíroc only five. $\mu \eta_{\nu}$ is used not only after $\boldsymbol{o v}^{3}$ (as in the $\left.\pi_{0} \lambda_{\iota \tau \epsilon} \dot{a} \alpha\right)$, but also after $\alpha^{i} \lambda \lambda \alpha^{\prime}$; ov̉ $\mu \grave{\eta} \nu a^{a} \lambda \lambda \alpha^{\prime}$, though only found once (except in quotations) in the Rhetoric ( $136 \mathrm{I} a 29$ ), is not infrequent in
 The argumentative sense of $\delta \dot{\eta}$ is common, but $\delta \dot{\eta}$ is never found after a superlative (as once in the тодıтєía); as a variation on каì סrो каi (which also occurs in the $\pi 0 \lambda \iota \tau \epsilon i a$ ) we have кai followed (but never immediately followed) by $\delta \eta^{\prime} ; \delta \theta \in \nu$ is followed by кaì in Pol. 1384 a 1 ,
 such as $i v a$ and $\bar{\circ} \pi \omega s$, whether the tense of the principal verb be present or not, the optative is hardly ever used, but almost invariably the subjunctive ${ }^{3}$. Now that $i v a \mu \grave{\eta} \sigma v \mu \mu \iota \gamma \epsilon i \in \ell \nu \tau \iota$ has been withdrawn from

[^43][^44]the text of c. 42,35 , the only exception to this rule in the $\pi$ odıctia is
 be a quotation, as suggested by the introductory phrase, ws of $\delta \eta \mu o \tau \iota \kappa o i$ $\phi a \sigma t v$. In the undisputed works ö ö $\pi \omega s$ àv generally has a relative sense, which it does not entirely lose even when the sense appears to be final ${ }^{1}$; in the $\pi o \lambda \iota \tau \epsilon \dot{a}$, the only instances of $\delta \pi \omega s \stackrel{\Delta}{\omega} \nu$ are in quotations from decrees of the fifth century, in which ön $\omega$ s with the subjunctive is never found without ${ }_{\alpha}{ }^{2}{ }^{2}$; all the other instances of ${ }^{\circ} \pi \omega_{s}$ in the $\pi 0 \lambda_{\iota}-$ $\tau \epsilon \dot{\alpha} \alpha$ are in strict accordance with Aristotle's usage.

In the above statement such divergences as have been noticed may be fairly attributed to the different character of the works compared. There is clearly less scope for a multiplicity of particles, or of illative conjunctions (such as ovj $\nu$ and $\tau o i ́ v \nu \nu$ and $\ddot{\alpha}^{\prime} \rho \alpha$ ), in a consecutive exposition of constitutional history and antiquities, than in the course of a philosophic discussion.

In a review of the modıctia it has been well observed by the latest editor of the Politics, that 'the style differs much from the style of the recognised works of Aristotle. It is a clear and precise, though a rather bald style, a style which has not the pregnancy which we associate with the style of Aristotle, and is also comparatively free from the ambiguities and irregularities which beset it'. But 'the work before us is a narrative and descriptive work addressed apparently...to the world at large, not to the pupils for whom the recognised works of Aristotle were probably designed, and it is not likely that it would be written in the same style ${ }^{\prime 3}$. The treatise is in fact the sole representative of the more popular class of writings attributed to Aristotle, and it enables us for the first time to appreciate the justice of some of the ancient encomiums on Aristotle's style, which have hitherto been hard to reconcile with that of his abstruser works. Thus Cicero speaks of his flumen orationis aureum ${ }^{4}$, and his dicendi incredibilis copia and suavitas ${ }^{5}$; and similar phrases are found in Dionysius of Halicarnassus and Quintilian ${ }^{6}$. The encomium in Cicero's Academica in particular may indeed owe its exaggerated form to a desire to point the contrast between the style of Aristotle and the style of the Stoics; but the general purport of these eulogies is enough to prove that, at a time when the abstruser writings of Aristotle were imperfectly known, his style enjoyed the reputation of being marked by a singular charm and

[^45][^46]richness and variety. This language has been generally explained as applicable to the lost dialogues of Aristotle; but there seems no sufficient reason for refusing to recognise it as holding good in the case of other popular works, ascribed to the same author. Such a work was the 'A $\theta$ चvaíw $\pi$ подıєєía, and the style of that work may be fairly described as on the whole smooth and flowing, and severely graceful.

It is perhaps even more than this. It is observed by Blass that its composition is marked by a high degree of attention to laws of rhythm similar to those adopted by Isocrates, and generally approved in the third book of the Rhetoric. Within the compass of a single sentence we repeatedly find a series of five to twelve or more syllables immediately followed by another of identical, or nearly identical, rhythm. Many examples of this have been noticed ${ }^{1}$ but a single instance of an exceptionally striking character may perhaps suffice for the present purpose (c. 55 § 4):-

$\dot{\epsilon ̇ \pi-\epsilon \rho \omega \tau \hat{a}, ~ ' \tau o v i \tau o v ~ \beta o u ̃ \lambda \epsilon \tau a i ́ ~ \tau \iota s ~ к а т \eta \gamma о \rho \epsilon i v ; ; ' ~}$

Here the first word is followed by a double series of nine syllables, passing off into a double series of eight; and, within each pair of sequences, the quantities of all the syllables correspond.

The general avoidance of hiatus in this treatise implies that it is a finished work prepared for popular perusal and not a mere series of memoranda (or viтouvínara) for personal use. This point was observed by Blass even in the scanty remains preserved in the Berlin fragments, and also by Mr Newman in the case of the work as a whole. It has since been investigated more minutely by Mr J. W. Headlam in the Classical Review.

He shows ( r ) that a definite principle is observed throughout the greater part of the work. (a) as a general rule hiatus occurs only after the article, after numerals, after $\kappa \alpha \ell, \delta \iota \alpha$ and $\pi \epsilon \rho t^{2}$, and after words in which the last vowel is readily elided e.g.
 at a pause, as well as in the middle of a sentence. ( $\beta$ ) In quoted documents the rule does not hold (contrast c. 28 with latter part of c. 29). Nor $(\gamma)$ in certain technical


 $(42,8)$. To these may be added $\dot{\eta}$ (or $\psi^{*}$ ) övoua ( $\mathrm{r}_{4}, 27 ; \mathrm{r}_{7}, 13$ ).
(2) The exceptions are very unevenly distributed. A list of all that occur in the first part (cc. 1-4r) shows that, at the beginning, clear and undoubted exceptions are very rare: in cc. $1-r_{4} \S 3$ (omitting c. 7, 21-30), there are only five. In the second part, the first few pages are as free as any in the first part; then cases become more

[^47]frequent, and at the end the rule is almost completely neglected. The author had to insert so many technical expressions that he gave up troubling about the matter. In the first part the more striking exceptions often occur directly after a quotation (c. 32 § ). In the first part at least, no conjectural emendation should be accepted which violates hiatus.

The rule is much laxer than that of the school of Isocrates. Hence the work was not written by any member of that school. On the other hand there is considerable evidence that it is from the hand of Aristotle himself, for the usage in this matter is very nearly the same as that of some of his best authenticated works ${ }^{1}$.

While it cannot have been written by any of the .Isocratean school it exhibits the same familiarity with the works of Isocrates as that displayed by Aristotle himself ${ }^{2}$. A passage that reminds us of the Gorgias is introduced by the characteristic $\tau v e \epsilon$, which is Aristotle's favourite way of referring to Plato in the Politics ${ }^{3}$.

Thus far I have endeavoured to state the internal evidence in favour of accepting the treatise as being substantially the work of Aristotle. It is impossible, however, to ignore the fact that not a few highly competent scholars at home and abroad hesitate to accept it as such ${ }^{4}$. Doubtless, in its manner of dealing with matters of history and particularly of chronology, side by side with much minuteness of detail on the subject of dates, there is evidence of occasional carelessness. There is sometimes a certain lack of intellectual force and vigour. And, further, there is an absence of those long and tangled sentences in which Aristotle, as we have hitherto known him, reviews and discusses a rapid succession of difficulties, doubts, and contradictions amid frequent irregularities of construction and amid repeated violations of his own rule against the use of parenthesis (Rhet. iii 5 § 7).

Much, perhaps too much, has been made of such points, and in consequence some have been disposed to regard the treatise as simply a product of the Peripatetic School, the work of some pupil writing with or without the general guidance and direction of Aristotle. It must, however, be remembered that, even in the case of works which are without question accepted as Aristotle's, it is extremely difficult to determine how far they were actually composed by him in the form in which they have reached us; how far they are merely notes of his oral teaching, not given to the world in his lifetime, but revised and edited after his death by the industry and devotion of his pupils and successors. Of the usually accepted works of Aristotle it is doubtful whether any one, as a whole, passed beyond the limits of the lecture-room during

[^48]the life of its author. 'Portions of the Metaphysics and de Caelo, some at least of the Parva Naturalis, the two books $\pi \epsilon \rho i ̀ \phi \lambda i a s$, now included in the Nicomachean Ethics, and the two books on the ideal state, Politics vii (iv) and viii (v), may have first seen the light in some other form during the lifetime of Aristotle." On the other hand, the Пoдıтєía (like the Dialogues) 'would have been very likely to see the light early, for they were on a subject of far greater general interest than most of Aristotle's works...It could only be through his Dialogues and Ho之ırêal that he could hope to be immediately known to a wide circle of non-philosophic readers. If he were during his lifetime something more than the revered teacher of a limited circle of pupils, we may safely assume that the publication took place. ${ }^{2}$,

The above remarks are quoted from the work of an Aristotelian scholar of the highest promise, whose History of the Aristotelian Writings was published in 1888, after his own death, and several years before the discovery of the 'A $\theta_{\eta \nu a i \omega \nu ~ \pi o \lambda ı \tau \epsilon i ́ a . ~ T h e ~ i n f e r e n c e ~ t h e r e ~ d r a w n ~ o n ~}^{\text {a }}$ grounds of a priori probability, as regards the Пodıcєiac in general, is conclusively confirmed by the internal evidence of the date of the
 published, before the death of Aristotle.

I may also appeal to the same unimpeachable testimony as to the exact degree of value to be attached to the evidence afforded by the avoidance of hiatus:-


#### Abstract

' Wherever it occurs, we have a work, or a portion of a work, in exactly the state which was given to it by the author who threw it into its present form. As to whether this author was or was not Aristotle himself, a good deal may be said on either side.'

On the one hand, 'the Aristotle whom we know shows the most absolute contempt for all matters of style,' and seems little likely to have adopted the Isocratean rule of avoiding hiatus. On the other, there is 'nothing wonderful or difficult in keeping one style for oral lectures and another for published books. Still less wonderful would it be if there was a wide difference to be found between mere notes for such lectures and deliberately finished publications ${ }^{3}$.'

Assuming, as we fairly may, that the 'A $\begin{aligned} & \text { quaíw } \pi \text { тодıтéa was a work }\end{aligned}$ of Aristotelian origin, it may still remain uncertain whether it was prepared for publication by the great teacher himself, or by some unknown and unnamed pupil who was skilled in certain graces of style that were apt to win the popular ear. The latter hypothesis might help to account for certain divergencies from the diction of the generally accepted works of Aristotle. To the interposition of such an editor we might perhaps attribute the general smoothness of style that marks its composition.


[^49]To the same source we might possibly trace certain inaccuracies of historical statement that tend to impair the authority of the work. But even Aristotle himself may have been quite capable of making a mistake in matters of history. The 'master of those who know' was not necessarily omniscient.

It must also be admitted that works like the Подıтєiau, owing to the miscellaneous character of their contents, were, in their transmission from age to age, peculiarly liable to interpolation. It has even been suggested that, like the History of Animals and the iovopiaı generally; 'they represent not any fixed work of Aristotle or of anyone else, but merely a continuously open note-book ' ${ }^{1}$. The 'A $\theta \eta v a i ́ \omega v \pi 0 \lambda \iota \tau \epsilon$ ía may have suffered to some extent from this cause of corruption.

The difficulties as to the authorship of the treatise appear to be fairly met by an eminent Transatlantic scholar who expresses his opinion as follows :
'We are compelled to believe, from many indications, that it was written mainly by Aristotle, with perbaps the help of a pupil who prepared certain of the less important passages, the padding as it were; the work was then revised, but not rewritten, by him. If we are ready to maintain-a proposition by no means self-evident-that the main body of the writings current as Aristotle's are the genuine works of the master in their original form, and that, accordingly, they are the only norm by which everything else is to be tested, we may still account for the "non-Aristotelian" peculiarities of the language of the ' $\mathrm{A} \theta \eta \nu a l \omega \nu$ modıreta as due, in part, to the fact that the historical sources (epigraphic and literary) are often given in verbal quotations, or at least in paraphrases that retain original forms of expression; due in part, perhaps, to the stylistic idiosyncrasies of an assistant whose work was incorporated with the master's, and finally to the most significant fact that the work was intended not for the scientific inner circle, but for the general reader'...
'The evidence, internal and external, of essentially Aristotelian authorship, as well as authority, seems so overwhelming, that, as between the two alternatives, one should prefer to modify his conceptions of Aristotle than reject this treatise. As
 telisch sondern aristotelischer als die meisten der uns erhaltenen Lehrbücher an welcher sich jene Skeptiker halten' ${ }^{3}$.

If we now revert to the evidence of ancient writers who, either directly or indirectly, quote the 'A $\begin{aligned} & \text { quai }\end{aligned}$ Aristotle, we find that, out of 56 fragments in which the 'A $\theta \eta v a i \omega v$ $\pi$ odeтcia is expressly mentioned, 53 are found in our ms; of the remaining three, one (Frag ${ }^{\text {s }} .385$ ) belongs to the lost beginning, one (463) to the mutilated end; the third (447) is an inaccurate transcript of c. 54 § 2. Of the 35 fragments in which Aristotle is named without any express mention of the work, 25 are found in the MS ; of the remainder, three belong to the lost beginning ( $38 \mathrm{I}, 3^{84}$, and the new fragment on p .253 ,

[^50]1. 50 ) ; seven probably do not come from this work at all ( 382,386 , 392, 399, 401, 415, and part of 394); one (456) may possibly have come from the mutilated end of the work; and one (396) is a misquotation of the text, which can readily be brought into harmony with it. Thus, of the total number of 93 fragments (of which 86 are probably genuine references to this work), 78 are found in the ms, and all the rest are satisfactorily accounted for ${ }^{1}$. More than 50 of the fragments of the $\pi$ одıтєía are preserved by Harpocration alone, and all of these are found in the ms.

Lastly, the Berlin fragments are all here. These fragments correspond to the following passages in the text:


 22, ro.

In I $a$ the long Iambic passage is written as consecutive prose, and I $b$ is less complete than II $a$ and $b$. Hence it is difficult to found any calculation on leaf I. But the contents of leaf II are equivalent to 44 lines of print in the present edition. Hence one page is equivalent to about 22 (say 24) lines of print. The number of lines of print now lost between the bottom of leaf I and the top of leaf II is 240 $(4+30+26+44+18+38+39+23+18)$. Thus it is not improbable that the lost portion is equivalent to 10 pages, and that the mS was made up of gatberings of 12 pages each. The number of lines in our printed text preceding $I a$ is 245 , which would take up only to pages. Hence the first two pages of the lost ms to which the Berlin fragments belong, were either left blank, or they actually contained the beginning of the treatise. If the latter, then the amount of the ' $A \theta$. $\pi \circ \lambda$. which is now lost is equivalent to about 44 to 48 lines of the present edition.

## § 8. Authorities followed in the 'A $\theta \eta \nu a i \omega v ~ \pi o \lambda \iota \tau \epsilon i a$.

The only authors actually named by the writer are Solon and Herodotus. From Solon he quotes a large number of verses, most of them already familiar to us through Aristides, who shows no proof of any acquaintance with the poems of Solon, beyond that which he derived from the present work. The writer's debt to Herodotus is far larger than appears at first sight. He only mentions the historian once (c. 14), but he closely follows him in the account of Peisistratus and Cleisthenes (cc. 14, 15, 20), though not without interesting variations. He also borrows from Thucydides, while deliberately differing from him on several important points in the story of Harmodius and Aristogeiton (c. 18). He coincides with the historian in many parts of his narrative of the revolution of the Four Hundred (cc. 29, 33) ; but the
${ }^{1}$ The same facts have been duly stated by Mr Kenyon in his Introduction, p. xv; revised in ed. 3, p. xvi.
coincidence is not complete, and the writer quotes original documents which are not quoted by the historian. As regards Xenophon, we find a close resemblance in the account of the speech of Theramenes (c. 36) and elsewhere; at the same time, the divergences are sufficiently numerous to suggest that the authority followed here was the same as that followed at a later date by Diodorus Siculus. This authority has sometimes been supposed to have been the Hellenica of Theopompus ${ }^{1}$; it has also been suggested that the writer owes to another work of Theopompus, the tenth book of his Philippica, his list of the Athenian demagogues, and his portrait of Cleon. It is just possible that the exaggerated account of the generosity of Cimon, which appeared in that work, is tacitly corrected in c. 27 § 3. But there is reason to believe that Theopompus did not publish his work until 324 , after Alexander's departure from India; if so, it was later than the $\pi o \lambda \iota \tau \epsilon i \alpha$. The common source, followed by Diodorus as well as the writer, was more probably Ephorus, who is expressly mentioned by Diodorus ${ }^{2}$.

As regards the writer's relation to the various writers of 'A $A \theta i \delta \epsilon 5$, there is no trace of any indebtedness to Hellanicus, whose carelessness on points of chronology ${ }^{3}$ would have been enough to prevent his being trusted by a writer who usually aims at being precise in matters of chronological detail. To Cleidemus, the next in order of time, we may probably attribute the Ionism in c. 14 § 4, where the form mapatßarov́rŋs appears to be an echo of $\pi \alpha \rho a \iota \beta a \pi \eta \dot{\sigma} \alpha \sigma a \nu$ in Cleidemus' description of the stately woman who assumed the garb of Athene and rode in the chariot of Peisistratus on the occasion of his first restoration to Athens. The account of the disciplinary powers entrusted to the Areopagus (c. § 6), bears some resemblance to a passage attributed to Phanodemus; but a statement to the same effect is attributed to a writer of the next generation to that of Aristotle, namely Philochorus, who may, however, have borrowed his phraseology from Phanodemus. In any case, the resemblance between the passage in the $\pi 0 \lambda \iota \tau \epsilon i ́ a$ and that attributed to 'Phanodemus and Philochorus' is not sufficiently close to make it quite certain that the writer was following Phanodemus ${ }^{4}$.

Androtion may be identified with the person attacked in the 22 nd speech of Demosthenes; he may therefore be placed earlier than the age of Aristotle. If so, he is closely followed in the account of the ostracism of Hipparchus son of Charmus ( $22 \S 3$ ); and the statement as to the number of the $\sigma v \gamma \gamma \rho a \phi \in i \bar{s}$ in c. $29 \S 2$ is in accordance

[^51]with that of Androtion. But the writer differs from Androtion as to the nature of Solon's $\sigma \epsilon \sigma a_{\chi} \theta \epsilon \epsilon a$, without going out of his way to controvert it. Here, as sometimes elsewhere, he is only tacitly polemical.

The most famous of the writers of 'A $\tau \theta i \delta \epsilon \epsilon$, Philochorus, belongs to the age after that of Aristotle, and has several points in common with the writer of the $\pi$ oдı七єía. As has been shown by Professor Wright, it is not improbable that he actually quoted the latter and accepted it as the work of Aristotle ${ }^{1}$.

On the relations subsisting between the 'A $\left.\begin{array}{l}\text { quai } \omega \nu \\ \pi 0 \lambda ı \tau \epsilon i a\end{array}\right)$ and the Atthidographi, I may be allowed to quote some criticisms for which I am indebted to the kindness of Mr W. L. Newman.

It is remarkable that while, in the Politics, there is little to remind us of the writings of the Atthidographi, in the monereia there is much. This indeed holds good of the חodıreial generally. No doubt it is not unnatural that the 'Constitutions' ascribed to Aristotle, containing as they do sketches of local history, should follow the model furnished by local histories like the Atthides; still it is strange that, if Aristotle was the author of these 'Constitutions,' he should be so little influenced by the Atthides in the Politics, if indeed he is so at all. Readers of the modicela, on the contrary, find it hard to avoid the suspicion that some Atthis has been largely used by the writer, very possibly the Atthis of Androtion. We may note the following resemblances between the ' $\mathrm{A} \theta$. $\pi 0 \lambda$. and the other Пo入ıтeial ascribed to Aristotle on the one hand, and the writings of the Atthidographi on the other :-
( 1 ) The'A $\theta$. $\pi 0 \lambda$. is up to the mark of the last new historical fashion in respect of chronological exactitude. No doubt the effort to be chronologically exact is traceable early in the development of Greek historical literature. Thucydides knows the date of the fall of Troy ( $\mathrm{i}_{12}$ ), and the approximate date of the founding of Melos ( v II2). Still the passion for chronological exactitude increased during the fourth century b.c. and later; for instance, Ephorus (Frag. 9 a) and Callisthenes knew that Troy was taken on the 2 zrd of Thargelion. As to Timaeus see Diod. $\mathbf{v} 1$ and Polyb. xii ıo. Nothing of this care for exactness in dates appears in the Politics or in other recognised writings of Aristotle. The writer of the 'A $\theta$. ro $\lambda$.; again, often dates by archons, but Aristotle never does so in the Politics. This dating by archons was perhaps no new thing in historical writing; some think that Hellanicus reckoned by archons, but here again we have an Atthidographic feature. Androtion and Philochorus reckoned by archons (Busolt, Gr. Gesch. i 363, note 4); see also Philoch. Frag. 52 (where Philochorus knows in whose archonship at Athens Homer flourished) and Androt. Frag. 46.
(2) The ' $A \theta$. tro 0 . and other Constitutions ascribed to Aristotle resemble the Atthides in the interest they show in the origin of words and familiar phrases. See ${ }^{\prime} A \theta . \pi 0 \lambda . c_{0} 2,5 ; 6,12 ; 13,25 ; 21,6$ and $21 ; 45,7 \& \mathrm{c}$; ; and Aristotle's Constitutions (Frag ${ }^{\text {d }} .477,484,488,49 \mathrm{r}, 495,512,514,519,536,562,580,582,595,596$ ); and compare Androtion, Frag. 28-29, 33 : Phanodem. Frag. 1, 13. 14 : Ister, Frag. 28, 32, 35, 39, 43, 52, 57: Philoch. Frag. 4, 5, 6, 7, 10, 12, 16, 42, 48 and many others. The interest which the 'A $\theta$. $\pi 0 \lambda$. and the other Constitutions show in these matters is a good deal more marked than that which we trace in Aristotle's recognised works, and the same may be said of

[^52](3) the interest which the 'A $\theta$. $\pi 0 \lambda$. and other Constitutions share with the Atthides in (A) the origin of institutions and the like, and (B) the explanation of proverbs.

As to (A), compare 'A $\theta . \pi$. $\lambda$. ... 8, 3 and passim, and Aristotle's Constitutions, Frag. ${ }^{\text {. }} 475,479,501,51$ 1, 519 , with Philoch. Frag. 51, 56, 66, 189.

As to (B), see 'A $\theta . \pi 0 \lambda$. c. 16,$18 ; 21,6 \& c$., and Aristotle's Constitutions, Frag. ${ }^{3}$ $487,505,513,523,528,545,558,559,571,584,591,592$. Demon, one of the Atthidographi, wrote a book about Proverbs (Müller, fhg i 379).

In choosing his authorities and in deciding between them when they differ, the author is guided by the consideration of the comparative probability of the accounts before him. He repels the calumnies against Solon (6) and Theramenes (28); and, in the story of Harmodius and Aristogeiton, gives an adequate reason for not accepting an opinion sanctioned by Thucydides ( $18 \S 4$ ). On the other hand, he is himself far from infallible as a historian. There is much confusion in the chronology of the years between the archonship of Solon and that of Damasias II (p. 50) ; and in that of the times of Peisistratus (p. 56). The presence of Themistocles in Athens in 462 seems impossible to reconcile with the chronology of his later years suggested by the data in Thucydides (p. ror); and there are several grave inaccuracies in the brief allusion to the trial of the generals after the battle of Arginusae (p. 129).

Besides relying on the testimony of Solon's poems, the writer draws inferences from popular poetry such as the scolium in honour of Cedon and that on the baffled heroes of Leipsydrium (cc. 19, 20). He quotes archaeological evidence derived from the $\kappa \dot{v} \rho \beta \epsilon \iota$ of $\operatorname{Solon}^{\prime}(7$ § I), from the prae-Solonian coinage (c. 10), and from a relief and inscription on the Acropolis (7 § 4). He alludes to proverbial phrases, $\chi$. ${ }^{\text {piov }}$
 in quoting official documents ${ }^{1}$.

The decrees proposed by Aristion ( 14 § r) and Themistocles ( 22 § 7) are noticed in general terms; that proposed by Pericles in 451 -0 ( 26 ult.), is expressly quoted. The official documents cited in extenso are those connected with the revolution of the Four Hundred in 413 ; viz. the motion of Pythodorus for the appointment of 30 $\sigma v \gamma \gamma \rho a \phi \in i s$, with the amendment by Cleitophon; the formal record of the preliminary

[^53]$\Delta \nu$, and none of $\partial \pi \omega$ s with the subjunctive. In view of this fact it is clear that
 copyist's mistake for öncos äv. This is noticed by Prof. Wright in The Nation, i May, 1891, p. 383. It must not, however, be inferred that ö $\pi \omega \mathrm{s}$ c. fut. is not found in inscriptions : on the contrary it is very common (Meisterhans, note $1705^{2}$ ).
proposals and of the constitution drawn up by the $\sigma v \gamma \gamma \rho a \phi \epsilon i s(c .29)$; with the ultimate and the provisional constitutions drawn up by the hundred Commissioners (cc. 30, 31 ). We have also the terms of the reconciliation effected between the oligarchical and democratic parties in 403 (c. 39). These documents were presumably preserved among the archives of the State in the Metroon; but they probably owed their publication not only to their historical importance, but also to their including typical forms of oligarchical constitutions which afforded suitable themes for discussion among students of the theory of politics. The writer's evident interest in the detailed history of the period between b.c. 413 and 403 is one of the considerations in favour of identifying him with the author of the Politics. In the latter Aristotle selects the Revolution of the Four Hundred as a typical instance of a revolution effected by fraud on the part of those who, when the deception is over, still endeavour to retain the government by force ( $1304 b 12$, quoted on c. 29, 8). Elsewhere, while discussing revolutions in oligarchies arising within the governing class, he mentions, as first of the two types of the oligarchical demagogue, 'one who practises on the oligarchs themselves; for, although the oligarchy are quite a small number, there may be a demagogue among them, as at Athens the party of Charicles predominated among the Thirty, that of Phrynichus in the Four Hundred' ( $1305{ }^{b} 24-27$ ). It is, however, only fair to add that neither Phrynichus nor Charicles is mentioned in the $\pi$ odıreía.

In the absence of direct historical evidence, the writer's favourite form of argument is that indicated by Mr Macan in an interesting contribution to the Journal of Hellenic Studies. 'The author has a source of knowledge, or rather a method of reconstruction, to take the place of direct testimony, tradition or evidence: This method consists in a process of inference from the present to the past, from existing circumstances to their presumable antecedents, from a given state of institutions to a former condition of the same'. ${ }^{1}$ As instances in which the author mentions the employment of this method by others, we have ( I ) the oaths of the nine Archons ( $3 \S 3$ ); and (2) the property qualification of the $i \pi \pi \epsilon \hat{i}(7$ § 4). He uses it himself in cases such as the following: (1) the sacral marriage of the $\beta a \sigma i \lambda \iota \nu v a$ ( 3 § 5); (2) the Solonian method of appointing officials (8§ 1); (3) the institution of the oi кaтà $\delta \dot{\eta} \mu o v s$ $\delta_{\text {ккa⿱土asai }}$ by Peisistratus ( $16 \S 5$ ); and (4) the motive for the institution of ostracism by Cleisthenes $(22 \S 3)^{2}$.

[^54]
The work is divided into two parts, (r) a Sketch of the Constitutional History of Athens down to the Restoration of the Democracy in 403 B.c. (cc. 1-4I); and (iI) a detailed analysis of the machinery of the Constitution between 328 and 325 B.c. (c. 42 to the end). The first has been well described as a 'Primer of Constitutional History'; the second, as a 'Citizen's Handbook.' '

Part 1, in its complete form, comprised an account of the 'original constitution' of Athens, and of the eleven changes through which it successively passed (c. 4r). Accordingly, in the following abstract, we have to deal with a series of twelve constitutions.
(1) The constitution in the time of Ton. The original constitution of Athens was an absolute monarchy. In process of time, owing to some of the hereditary line of kings being feeble in war, Ion, the son of Apollo by the daughter of an Attic king, was summoned to their aid, and inyested with military command. Such was the origin of the office of Polemarch, which was second to that of Basileus in order of date ( $3 \S 2$ ). In the days of Ion, the people were divided into four tribes, with four $\phi u \lambda o \beta a \sigma \iota \lambda \epsilon \hat{s}$ or 'tribal kings' ( $4 \mathrm{I}, 6-9$ ). To Apollo's son, the first Polemarch, the Athenians owed the name of Ionians and the worship of Apollo $\pi \alpha \tau \rho \hat{\psi}$ os (frag. $381^{2}$ ).
(2) The constitution in the time of Theseus. Under Theseus, we are simply told that the constitution exhibited a slight divergence from absolute monarchy (41, ro; and frag. $34^{8}{ }^{3}$ ).
[Abont 1088 в.c., on the death of Codrus, and the accession of his son Medon, the kingly power ceased to be hereditary. Henceforth the kings were elected for life from members of the royal house.] ${ }^{2}$ By the side of the King, the Polemarch was already in existence as commander in the time of war; and in the reign either of Medon, or his son Acastus, a third office, that of Archon, came into being, and was endowed with some of the royal prerogatives by the descendants of Codrus ( 3 § 3 ). In process of time the name of Archon was transferred from the third officer of State to the first [c. $753 / 2$ B.c.]. The chief Archon was elected [from the royal house], but his term of office was limited to ten years ( 3 § 1 end), while the title of King, with the privilege of attending to certain religious duties, was assigned to another archon, called the Basileus. It was not until the three primary offices of State, those of Archon, Polemarch and Basileus, had become annual [c. $683 / 2$ B.c.], that their number was increased by the institution of the six Thesmothetae, whose duty it was to record and preserve all legal decisions with a view to their being enforced against transgressors of the law ( 3 §4). In the course of time the Archons were elected by the Conncil of the Areopagus ( 8 § 2) under qualifications of birth and wealth (3 § 1), while the Areopagus itself was composed of those who had filled the office of Archon.

[^55]It was the duty of the Areopagus to maintain the supremacy of law, to inflict personal punishments and fines, and to administer the State in general ( 3 § 6 ).
[In an Olympic year between $6_{3} 6$ and 624 B.c.] an attempt to seize despotic power was made by a young nobleman named Cylon [who had been a victor in the Olympic games of 640 ]. The attempt was unsuccessful: the adherents of Cylon were put to death under the authority of the Archon Megacles, of the house of the Alcmaeonidae, who violated their right of sanctuary and thus brought a curse on Athens and his descendants (Heracl. Epit. §4).

The constitution at this time was thoroughly oligarchical. There was a conflict between the various orders in the State: the land was in the hands of a few; discontent prevailed among the poor, who, if they failed to pay their rent, became the slaves of the rich (c. 2).
(3) The Constitution of Dracon, It was with a view to providing a remedy for these evils that (in 621 B.c.) the first code of law was drawn up by Dracon (41, II). The franchise was at this time possessed by all who could provide their own equipment for war, It was these who elected the Archons and other principal officers of State; and out of their own body a Council of 4 or members was appointed by lot from among those who had attained the age of 30 . Members of the Council were liable to fines varying with their social status. The Council of the Areopagus continued to maintain the supremacy of law and the efficient discharge of the duties assigned to the officers of State; it also received formal complaints from persons aggrieved by the infringement of any statute (c. 4).

In duc time the friends of the exiled members of Cylon's party acquired sufficient power to compel the Alcmaeonidae to submit to a trial before a special court of 300 citizens selected from the noblest families of Athens. They were found guilty; the dead bodies of the offenders were cast out, and their surviving relatives condemned to perpetual exile. Athens was further purified from the curse of sacrilege by Epimenides (c. r). ${ }^{1}$
(4) The Constitution of Solon. Dracon's legislation having failed to remedy the wrongs of the poor, the conflict of the orders broke out afresh and was not allayed until [c. 594 b.c.] both parties agreed on choosing Solon as mediator and as Archon ( 5 § 2). Solon cancelled all existing debts, whether public or private; and for the future he made it illegal to lend money on the security of the person of the debtor ( $6 \S 1$ ). With the exception of the laws on homicide, the code of Dracon was repealed, and a new code published. The people were divided into four classes, Pentacosiomedimni, Hippeis, Zeugitae, and Thetes; the various offices of State being now assigned to the first three classes in proportion to the amount at which they were severally rated, while the fourth class bad only the right of taking part in the public Assembly and in the Law-courts (c. 7). The nine Archons were now appointed by lot, out of forty selected candidates, nominated to the number of ten by each of the four tribes. A Council of 400 was also constituted, roo from each tribe. The Areopagus, which still retained the duty of supervising the laws and maintaining the constitution in general, was now empowered to try cases of treason (c. 8). In Solon's constitution the specially democratical elements were:-(1) the prohibition of loans on the security of the person; (2) the privilege of every citizen to claim legal satisfaction on behalf of any one who was wronged ; and (3) the right of appeal to the law-courts. The power of voting in the law-courts made the com-
${ }^{1}$ On the date of Epimenides, see P. 3, and cf. Prof. Wright's Date of Cylon, pp. 70 and 74, where the visit of Epi-
menides, as well as the trial of the Alcmaeonidae, is conjecturally assigned to 615 в.с.
mons master of the constitution (c. 9). Solon also introduced a new standard of coinage, and of weights and measures (c. 10). His legislation, however, did not prove acceptable to either of the two great parties in the State. Finding himself beset and harassed by both, and declining to make himself despot at the expense of either, he withdrew for ten years to Egypt (c. 11).

When he had gone abroad, although the State was still disturbed by divisions, they lived in peace for four years; but, in the next year, and again four years later, their divisions prevented the election of an Archon. After another term of four years(?), the choice fell on Damasias [582], who succeeded in remaining in office for two years and two months. The interval of civil strife was closed by an agreement to elect ten Archons from the several orders in the State, five from the Eupatridae, three from the Agroeci, and two from the Demiurgi. But the general discontent was not allayed. Some of the rich had lost their wealth; others had lost their political power; a few besides were inspired by personal ambition. At this time the three parties of the Shore, the Plain and the Highlands, representing the moderate, the oligarchical and the democratic spirit respectively, were under the leadership of Megacles, Lycurgus, and Peisistratus. The party of Peisistratus was reinforced by those whom Solon's legislation had deprived of the debts due to them, and also by persons whose dubious birth gave them an uncertain claim to the rights of citizenship (c. 13). These struggles found tbeir issue in the tyranny of Peisistratus and his sons.
(5) The tyranny of Peisistratus and his sons. Peisistratus, who had won distinction in the war against Megara, persuaded the people to grant him the protection of a body-guard, and with the aid of the latter seized the Acropolis ( 560 в.c.). He ruled in a constitutional spirit; but, five years later, he was expelled by a coalition between the parties of Megacles. and Lycurgus. Eleven(?) years afterwards he was restored by the aid of Megacles on condition of marrying his daughter ( $\mathbf{r}_{4}$ ). This condition was only nominally fulfilled; and, about six years later, he was once more expelled. He withdrew to Macedonia, where he acquired money and mercenary troops. Ten years subsequently, with the help of Thebes, of Lygdamis of Naxos, and the Knights of Eretria, he recovered his power and disarmed his subjects ( $\mathrm{I}_{5}$ ). His rule, however, was mild and humane. To encourage agriculture he advanced money to the poorer classes, with a view to their staying in the country and looking after their own affairs instead of coming into the town and taking part in public business. With the same object he instituted 'local justices,' and himself visited various parts of the country, thus making it unnecessary for the tenants to neglect their farms by bringing their grievances to Athens. Besides this, the cultivation of the soil promoted an increase in his revenues (16).

Peisistratus died in $527 / 6$ b.c., having held actual possession of his power for nineteen out of the thirty-three years that had elapsed since he had originally established himself as 'tyrant' (c. 17). He was succeeded by his sons Hippias and Hipparchus, who at first ruled in their father's spirit; but, when Hipparchus had been slain in the conspiracy of Harmodius and Aristogeiton (c. r8), the rule of Hippias became more severe. Three years afterwards (c. 19 § 2) he was expelled by Cleomenes, king of Sparta (in the spring of 5 ro b.c.).
(6) The Reforms of Cleisthenes. After the overthrow of the tyranny the rival leaders in the State were Isagoras, an adberent of the tyrants, and Cleisthenes, of the house of the Alcmaeonidae. Isagoras invited the aid of Cleomenes. Thereupon Cleisthenes withdrew, while Cleomenes vainly endeavoured to supersede the Council and to set up a body of 300 partisans of Isagoras in its place. Cleisthenes soon returned, and became leader of the people (c. 20). In 508 B.c. be distributed the population
into ten tribes instead of the existing four ; and instituted a Council of 500 (fifty out of each of the ten new tribes), in place of that of 400 (roo out of each of the four tribes). He also made the deme the unit of his social organisation, combined the demes into groups ( $\tau \rho \tau \tau \tau \dot{\text { u }}$ ), and assigned these groups to the several tribes in such a manner that each tribe had three groups allotted to it, one from the urban or suburban district, one from the coast, and one from the interior (c. 21). The reforms of Cleisthenes made the constitution more democratic than that of Solon. Among the laws now passed was that concerning Ostracism, which was at first intended to serve as a safeguard against the reestablishment of a tyranny. In 504 B.C. [or, more probably, in 50I], the oath, which was still in use in the writer's time, was first imposed on the Council. The Generals were elected according to tribes, one from each tribe ( $22 \$ 2$ ). The law of Ostracism was enforced for the first time in $488 / 7$, two years after Marathon, the person ostracised being Hipparchus son of Charmus ( 84 ); he was followed in $487 / 6$ by Megacles [a nephew of Cleisthenes], by Xanthippus [the father of Pericles] in $485 / 4$, and about $484 / 3$ by Aristides. Meanwhile, in $4^{87} / 6$, for the first time since the establishment of the tyranny, the nine Archons were appointed by lot out of 500 [or more probably, roo] candidates selected by the demes. In $483 / 2$, on the discovery of certain silver mines in Attica, Themistocles persuaded the people to lend the proceeds to the hundred wealthiest men in Attica, and thus brought about the building of the hundred triremes, with which the battle of Salamis was won [480].
(7) The supremacy of the Areopagus. Thus far the.growth of the democracy had been advancing with the gradual growth of Athens; but, after the Persian wars, the Council of the Areopagus once more assumed the control of the State. It owed this high position, however, not to any formal decree, but to the spirited action it had taken in connexion with the battle of Salamis. When the Generals were unable to cope with the crisis, it was the Areopagus that provided pay for the crews, and thus ensured the manning of the fleet and the gaining of the victory ( 23 § 1 ). The leaders of the people at this time were Aristides and Themistocles. On the establishment of the Confederacy of Delos, Aristides assessed the amount to be paid to the common fund by the allies of Athens, beginning with the year $478 / 7$ (§5). By his advice the inhabitants of Attica left the rural districts and settled in the city, on the assurance that all of them would be able to maintain themselves by the discharge of military duties or by taking part in public affairs, and would thus secure the control of the league. Thus it was that Athens came to adopt the policy of oppressing her allies, from which Chios, Lesbos and Samos alone were exempt.
(8) The restored and developed democracy. The supremacy of the Areopagus lasted for about seventeen years ( 478 to 462 inclusive). The power of the people was meanwhile increasing, and Ephialtes, on becoming their leader, attacked the Areopagus, by depriving it of all the more recent privileges by which it had attained the control of the constitution, transferring some of them to the Council of Five Hundred, and others to the Assembly and the Law-courts ( 462 b.c.). In this revolution he was aided by Themistocles (25).

Thereupon the administration of the State became more and more lax owing to the rivalries that arose between successive aspirants for popular favour. At this time the aristocratical party had no real chief, although their leader was Cimon, who was comparatively young for that position, and had been rather late in entering on public life. In $457 / 6$ the office of Archon was thrown open to the Zeugitae. In $453 / 2$ the thirty 'local jnstices' were restored; and in $45 \mathrm{r} / \mathrm{o}$, on the proposal of Pericles, it was enacted that the franchise should be limited to those who were of citizen blood by both
parents (26). Under Pericles, the constitution became still more democratic. He deprived the Areopagus of some of its ancient privileges, and also prompted Athens to aim at the empire of the sea ( 27 § r). The Peloponnesian war (B.c. $43 \mathrm{I}-$ ) inured the people to military service, and led to their assuming the administration of the State (§ 2). Pericles was also the first to provide pay for serving in the Law-courts (§3).

So long as he was leader of the people, public affairs were managed comparatively well ; at his death there was a great change for the worse ( 28 § I). It was then that, for the first time, in the person of Cleon, the people had for their leader one who was of no reputation among the upper classes (§ 2); on the other side, the leader of the aristocracy was Nicias. These two were succeeded by Cleophon and Theramenes respectively. It was Cleophon who was the first to provide each citizen with the grant of two obols for a seat in the theatre ( $\$ 3$ ); and the series of demagogues, who succeeded him, owed their position to their recklessness of language, and to their readiness to gratify the immediate desires of the populace (\$4). Of the leaders of the aristocratical party, Nicias and Thucydides (son of Melesias) are justly esteemed as statesmen. Concerning Theramenes there is a conflict of opinion; but, on calm reflexion, it is clear that, so far from subverting every kind of constitution, he really supported each in turn, so long as it was faithful to the laws; thus proving that, like a good citizen, he was capable of living in contentment under any form of government, while he could never be a party to unconstitutional conduct, but on the contrary was always its resolute foe ( $\$ 5)^{1}$.
(9) The revolution of the Four Hundred. After the failure of the Sicilian expedition [Sept. $4^{\mathrm{r}}$ ]], when the power of Sparta had been increased by her alliance with Persia, Athens was compelled to abolish her democracy and to accept the oligarchical revolution of the Four Hundred. At this crisis it was proposed by Pythodorus that the popular Assembly should elect a Committee of thirty in all, to draw up proposals for the public safety; and that any other person might make such proposals as he pleased, so that the people might decide on whatever course it thought fit ( $29 \$ 8 \mathrm{r}$, 2). An amendment moved [and probably carried] by Cleitophon made it an instruction to the Committee to take into consideration the constitution of Cleisthenes in drawing up their report (§3). The Committee reported in favour of the Prytanes being compelled to put to the vote any motion for the public safety (instead of exercising their own discretion in the matter). They also proposed the abolition of all indictments for illegal motions, all impeachments before the Council or the Assembly, and all citations before the Law-courts, so that nothing should hinder any citizen from offering such counsel as he thought fit. If any person attempted, either by fine or citation or prosecution, to prevent such counsel being given, he was to be summarily brought before the Generals and delivered up to execution ( $\S 4$ ). They further drew up the following form of constitution :- The revenues were to be spent solely on the conduct of the war. So long as the war lasted, no officers of State were to receive any pay except the nine Archons and the Prytanes. The franchise (including the right of making treaties) was to be entrusted to not less than Five Thousand of the citizens who were best able to serve the State. The list of the Five Thousand was to be drawn up by a Commission of one hundred formed by electing ten out of each of the tribes ( $\$ 5$ ).

When these proposals had been ratified, the [provisionally acting body of] 'Five Thousand' elected from among their own members the hundred Commissioners for

1 There is a monograph on Theramenes by Dr Carl Pöhlig (Teubner, 1877 ). On the party of 'moderate oligarchs'
to which Theramenes belonged, see Dr Jackson's article on Socrates in Encycl. Brit. ed. 9.
drawing up the constitution. The Commissioners proposed for the future a Council, which was to be in power for a year at a time, and to include certain officers of State (about 100 in all) as members ex officio. The Council was to appoint these out of a larger number of selected candidates chosen out of the members of the Council for the time being. All other offices were to be filled by lot ( 30 § 2) . There were to he four Councils of four hundred each, such four Councils serving in turn, for a year each, in an order to be determined by lot ( $\$ 3$ ). Memhers of the Council absent without leave were to be fined ( $\S 6$ ).

For the immediate present, there was to be a Council of Four Hundred (as in the constitution of Solon), forty from each tribe, appointed out of a larger number selected by the members of the several tribes. This Council was to appoint the officers of State, and to have complete discretion in questions of legislation, official audits, \&c.; but was to have no power to alter the new constitution ( $\mathbf{3 1}$ § 1 ). Military officers were to be elected provisionally by the 'Five Thousand,' but ultimately by the Council ( $\$ 2$ ). No office, except that of a General or a member of the Council, was to be held more than once (§3).

About the end of May, 411 , the existing Council was dissolved; and on June 7 the Four Hundred entered on office. An oligarchical constitution was thus established nearly a century after the expulsion of the tyrants ( 510 ). The leaders of the Revolution were Peisander, Antiphon and Theramenes. The Four Hundred sent envoys to Sparta, proposing the termination of the war on the basis of uti possidetis; but, as the envoys declined to surrender the maritime supremacy of Athens, Sparta refused to come to terms (c. 32).
(10) The restored Democracy. The defeat of Athens in the naval battle of Eretria, and the consequent loss of Euboea, led the people to depose the Four Hundred, after they had been in power for four months (May to August, 41I); and to entrust the management of affairs to the Five Thousand, a body consisting of all citizens capable of providing a military equipment. No pay was to be given for any public office. This revolution was led by Aristocrates and Theramenes, both of whom disapproved of the Four Hundred for keeping all the power in their own hands, and not referring anything to the Five Thousand. The constitution at this time appears to have worked excellently, inasmuch as it was a time of war and the franchise was entrusted to those who provided a military equipment (c. 33 ).
[After the victories in the Hellespont in 410 ] the people soon deprived the Five Thousand of their exclusive right to the franchise. In 406 the victory of Arginusae was won, but that victory was attended with the following results: (t) Under the misleading influence of passionate appeals to the feelings of the people, all the Generals who had won that victory had their fate sealed by a single verdict (see note on pp. 129-130); and (2), when Sparta proposed to evacuate Decelea, Cleophon protested that she should be required to surrender all the cities that owed allegiance to her ( 34 § 1). Athens soon had good reason to regret her mistake. In 405 she was vanquished at Aegospotami; and Lysander became master of Athens and established the rule of the Thirty (§ 2).
(11) The despotic government of the Thirty and of the Ten. The Thirty, instead of framing a constitution, appointed a Council of five hundred, out of a large number of selected candidates; associated with themselves ten officials in the Peiraens, eleven superintendents of the prison, and tbree hundred attendants; and, with the help of these, kept the city completely under their own control. At first they acted with moderation : they professed to restore the ancient constitution; repealed the laws of Ephialtes curtailing the privileges of the Areopagus; and abolished the limitations
to the right of bequest granted by Solon. But, as soon as they had established themselves in power, they proceeded to put to death those who were eminent for wealth or birth or reputation ; and, within a short time, the number of their victims rose to 1,500 (c. 35). Alarmed, however, by the indignant protests and the ever increasing popularity of Theramenes, they offered to draw up a list of 3,000 who were to receive the franchise. Theramenes was still dissatisfied; the list was withheld, and, when published, was constantly liable to arbitrary alterations (c. 36).

Meanwhile, winter set in, and the Thirty were repulsed in their attack on Thrasybulus, who, with the exiles of the democratic party, had taken possession of the fort of Phyle. The Thirty now resolved on disarming the people and getting rid of Theramenes. For the latter purpose they compelled the Council to pass two proposals, ( 1 ) giving the Thirty power to put to death any person not included in the list of the 3,000 ; ( 2 ) preventing any one from enjoying the franchise if he had taken part in demolishing the fort of Eetioneia or had in any way opposed the Four Hundred. Theramenes had done both. After putting him to death, they disarmed all the people except the 3,000 ; and proceeded to further extremities of cruelty and crime (37).

After this, Thrasybulus and his soldiers occupied Munichia and defeated the partisans of the Thirty. The party of the city retreated to Athens; and, on the next day, held a meeting in the market-place, deposed the Thirty and elected Ten of the citizens as commissioners with full powers to bring the war to a conclusion. The Ten did nothing of the kind; they sent to Sparta to ask for aid and to borrow funds. Finding that this was resented by those who possessed the franchise, and fearing they might be deposed in consequence, they arrested a citizen of the highest repute and put him to death. They thus strengthened their position, and they were further supported by the Spartan harmost Callibius and his Peloponnesians, and by certain of the Knights. The party of the Peiraeus, however, were soon joined by all the people, and began to get the upper hand in the struggle. Thereupon, the party of the city deposed the Ten, and elected in their place another body of the same number, consisting of men of the highest character, among whom was Rhinon (who was afterwards elected one of the Generals). Under the management of this new body of Ten, and with the aid of Pausanias and ten Commissioners from Sparta, terms of reconciliation were drawn up and the democratic party returned to Athens (c. $3^{8}$ ).

The terms were as follows: All who had remained in Athens might reside at Eleusis, while retaining their property and their full rights as citizens ( $35 \S \mathrm{r}$ ). The temple at Eleusis was to be common ground for both parties; but, except at the season of the Mysteries, the settlers at Eleusis were not to enter Athens, or the residents in Athens to visit Eleusis. The settlers at Eleusis were to contribute their share to the federal fund ( $\S 2$ ). If any one killed or wounded another, trials for homicide were to be held, as of old ( $\$ 5$ ). Lastly, there was to be a general amnesty towards all persons, except the Thirty, the Ten (who immediately succeeded them), the Eleven, and the Ten who had ruled in the Peiraeus; and even these were not to be excluded, if they rendered an account of their office ( $\$ 6$ ).

A prominent part was played at this time by Archinus:- (1) He accelerated the date for the closing of the list of settlers at Eleusis ( 40 § 1); (2) he successfully resisted the proposal of Thrasybulus to confer the franchise on all who had aided in the restoration of the democracy; and (3) he insisted on the penalty of death being inflicted on one who attempted to violate the amnesty (§ 2). The funds which the Thirty had borrowed from Sparta for their own purposes, were repaid out of the
public treasury ( $\S 3$ ). A further reconciliation was effected with the settlers at Eleusis in B.c. 401/0 (§4).
(12) The restored and extreme Democracy. The constitution established in B. С. 403 remained in force until the time when the work was written (b.c. $3^{28-325)}$ with ever-increasing accessions to the power of the people. The people had made itself master of everything, and administered all the affairs of State by means of the decrees of the Assembly and the decisions of the Law-courts. In the latter, no less than in the former, the people ruled supreme. Even the judicial decisions formerly in the hands of the Council were transferred to the people, a course which the writer approves on the ground that small bodies are more liable to corruption than large ones (41 §2). At first it was decided not to provide pay for attendance at the Assembly; but, as its members were habitually absent, an allowance of one obol a day was introduced by Agyrrhius, to be increased to two obols by Heracleides, and to three by Agyrrhius hïmself ( $\$ 3$ ).

Part II, which describes the machinery of the 'existing Constitution,' under the general heads of (i) the Franchise (c. 42), (ii) Legislature (43-45), (iii) Administration (46-62), and (iv) Judicature ( 63 to end), may from one point of view be regarded as entirely concerned with a single subject, being an account of $\alpha i$ a $\rho \chi^{\alpha i}$, the 'posts of power or service, honour or emolument, for which the Athenian citizen becomes eligible or qualified sooner or later,' when once the franchise is conferred on him. It may be divided into four sections (i) the conditions of the franchise (c. 42); (ii) the exercise of the full franchise in the ${ }^{\epsilon} \gamma \kappa \dot{\prime} \kappa \lambda \iota o \iota a^{2} \rho \chi^{a i}(\mathrm{cc} .43-62$ ), first the к $\lambda \eta \rho \omega \tau \alpha i$, , the Council with sundry other authorities (43-54), and the Archons (55-59). From these may
 (iv) the Dikasteria ( 63 to end), placed here because they are permanent and not concerned with administration ( $\dot{\eta}^{\mathfrak{j}} \delta_{\circ} \iota^{\prime} \kappa \eta \sigma \iota s$ ), although recruited by the Lot (Mr Macan, $J . H$. S., xil 2 r ). Or, again, we may for convenience use $\alpha \rho \chi^{a}$ in the narrower sense, and divide the second part into three main portions under the head of (i) тодıтєía (c. 42); (ii) ả $\rho \chi^{\alpha i}$ (cc. $42-62$ ); (iii) $\delta \iota \kappa a \sigma \tau \dot{\eta} \rho \iota a$ (cc. 62 to end).

In (i) we have first an account of the method of enrolling citizens, with interesting details as to the military training of youthful citizens between the ages of 18 and 20 (c. 42). In (ii) the foremost place is occupied by the administrative functions of the Council and of the officials who act in concert with it (43-49); while the éкк $\lambda \eta \sigma / a$ is only briefly dealt with in connexion with the $\pi \rho u \tau d \boldsymbol{d} \epsilon$ as and $\pi \rho \delta \epsilon \delta \rho o t$ in c. 43 and c. $44^{-}$ Then follow certain other officials appointed by lot, with some account of the public Arbitrators (50-54), and the nine Archons ( $55-59$ ), with a detailed statement of the duties of the Archon (56), the Basileus (57), the Polemarch (58) and the Thesmothetae (59) respectively. Next come the $\dot{d} \theta \lambda o \theta \dot{\epsilon} \tau a \iota$, with some notice of the Sacred Olives ( 60 ). Thusfar for officials appointed by lot. Next in order we have the military officers ( 6 r ), who have already been briefly mentioned with other officials elected by show of hands ( $43 \S$ 1). This portion of the work closes with a chapter on Salaries (62). The remainder is entirely concerned with the Law-courts, and, in particular, with the way by which the dicasts were allotted to the several courts, the method of voting, the
measurement of time during the proceedings, and lastly the arrangements for paying the dicasts when their duties were over.

A large amount of the contents of the Second Part was already known to us in a fragmentary way, through the quotations preserved by gram. marians and lexicographers; but it is a signal advantage to have before us the source of all these quotations with the opportunity of testing every statement by the light of its immediate context. We are thus at last able to deal with a first-hand authority for the Constitutional Antiquities of Athens. Whatever hesitation there may necessarily be as to the historic value of certain details in the First Part of the treatise, especially in cases where the writer is describing the institutions of a distant past, which had left behind it $n \rho$ contemporary records except a single chapter from the code of Dracon, with the laws and poems of Solon; or where his account refuses to be reconciled with that of writers such as Thucydides and Xenophon; there can be no question as to the great importance and the completely trustworthy character of the Second Part, with its terse and clear description of the machinery of the State towards the close of the third quarter of the fourth century b.c. And the value of all this is unimpaired by any doubts that have been entertained as to the authorship of the work.
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(77) Richards, Herbert [quoted in critical notes by surname only], (a) ems. in Academy, 14 Feb. '91, p. 163-4; and 18 Apr. p. 371 ; (b) ems. in Class. Rev. v 105 -, 122, 175, 224, 334 ; (c) 'Unaristotelian words and phrases,' ib. 184, 272. (78) Ridgeway, W., Academy, 21 Feb. '91, p. 186-7 (Class. Rev.v 109). See also Origin of Metallic Currency and Weight Standards, pp. 306, 324. (79) Ruehl, F., (a) Rhein. Mus., '91, p. 426-464; (b) Wochenschr. für klass. Philol., '92, no. 1; cf. ( 128 ). (80) Rutherford, G., (a) 'The New Aristotle Papyrus in its bearings on Textual Criticism,' Class. Rev. v 89-91; (b) ems. ib. 105-, 175. (81) Saint-Hilaire, B., Revue Bleue, 2 I March, '91. (82) Sandys, J. E., (a) ems. in Academy, 7 Feb. '91, p. 137 (Class. Rev. v $105-$ ) ; (b) ems. \&c. Camb. Phil. Soc. Proc., 26 Feb. '91, p. 14 (with additions in Cáass. Rev. v $119-1$ 20). (83) Schneider, G. J., Review of Mr Kenyon's ed. in Wochenschr. für klass. Philol., 29 Apr.-20 May, '91, pp. 37r, 498, 528, 544. (84) Schoell, R., Münchener Allgemeine Zeitung, Beilage, no. ro6-109; Sonderabdruck der 4 I Philol.-Versammlung in München, Mai '9I (J. G. Cotta) Munich. (85) Schvarcz, J., Ungarische Revut, Apr. '91. See also IV (I2). (86) Sidgwick, A., ens. in Class. Rev. v 105-. (87) Stewart, J. A., em. in Academy, 7 March, '91, p. $23+$ (Class. Rev. v 179).
(88) Smith, Cecil, Ostracism of Xanthippus, Class. Rev. v $277 . \quad$ ( 89 ) Smith, J. A., em. in Academy, 14 Feb. (Class. Rev. v i18). (90) Szanto, E., Wochenschr. für klass. Philol., '9r, p. 76 r . (9r) Thompson, E. S., (a) em. in Class. Rev. v 223, 224-; 277; (b) The Draconian Constitution, ib. 336; (c) Date of the Expulsion of the Pisistratids, ib. vi 181; (d) Age of the doalт $\eta$ ral, ib. 182. ( $\mathbf{9 2}^{2}$ ) Torr, Cecll, (a) on the date, Alhenaeum, 7 Feb. (Class. Rev. virg note) ; (b) on 5ı §4, Class. Rev. v 1 I 7 ; (c) on the $\sigma \pi \rho a \tau \eta \gamma 0 \mathrm{l}$ in c. 6ı, ib. p. 119; (d) on c. 54, the Delian festival, ib. 277. (93) Tyrrell, R. Y., (a) ems. in Academy, 28 Feb. '91, p. 210; 7 March, p. 234 (Class. Rev. v 175-); (b) 'The New Papyri,' Quarterly Review, April, '9ı, p. 320-350. (94) Vanderixindere, Revue Belgique, March, '91. (95) Wachsmuth, C., 'zur Topographie von Athen,' Rheinisches Museum, '91, Heft 2. (96) Walker, E. M., Chronology of $462-445$ в.C., Class. Rev. vi $95 . \quad$ (97) Wardale, J. R., Class. Rev. v $273 . \quad$ (98) Weil, H., 7 ournal des Savants, April, '91, p. 197. (99) Whibley, L., (a) on cc. 22, 23, 28, Class. Rev. v 168-9; (b) em. ib. 180; (c) on the Authorship, ib. 223. (roo) Wright, J. H., (a) Review of Mr Kenyon's ed. in The Nation, 7 May, '91; (b) 'Did Philochorus quote the 'A $\theta$. $\pi 0$. as Aristotle's?', American Fournal of Philology, xii 3, 310-318. (c) 'The Date of Cylon,' a Study in early Athenian history, Harvard Studies in Classical Philology, iii 1892 . Also reprinted, pp. 8o (Ginn and Co.) Boston. (ıо⿱) Wyse, W., (a) ems. in Camb. Phil. Soc. Proc. for Fcb. 12, '91; also in Athenaeum, Feb. 14
and 21，and Academy， 21 Feb．p． 186 （Class．Rev．v 105－）；（b）ems．in Class．Rev． v 225－；（c）notes，ib．122，224，274－6，335－6；（d）on $\pi \rho 0 \delta a \nu e l(\xi \varepsilon \nu, 16 § 2, i b$. vi 254－7．

Many of the following articles appeared at a later date than the above：－
（roz）Bérard，J．，Aristote，La Constitution d＇Athènes，（Extrait）Paris．（103） Betge，popular article in Gegenwart，＇91，no．29．（r04）Buse日kul，（a）on cc． 4 and 25，Journ．d．Min．der Volksaufkl．；noticed in Berl．Phil．Woch．， 8 Oct．＇92，p．1289； （b）in Russ．hist．Rundschau，ii 22r－239（both in Russian）．（ros）Cauer，Paul， Aristoteles Urteil über die Demokratie，Fleckeisen＇s Jahrb．＇92，p．58r－593．（106） Cavazza，P．，Discorso in Annuario dell＇Istituto di studi superiori in Firenze，pp．20，＇92． （107）Derewizki，A．，（in Russian）Charkow，＇9r．（ro8）Dimitsas，M．G．，＇Eג入ds，iii 4 p．357－379．（109）Duemmler，F．，Die＇A $\theta$ ．$\pi$ ग入．des Kritias，in Hermes，＇92，p． 260－280．（110）Ferrini，C．，Rendiconto dell＇1st．lombardo，ser．ii，vol．xxiv，fasc． 8－9．（Iri）Fontana，G．，On Aristides in＇A $0 . \pi 0 \lambda .$, pp．26，（Tedeschi）Verona． （112）Fraccaroll，G．，due versi di Solone（c．12，28），in Rivista di Filologia，xxi，p． 49－50．（ 113 ）Goodell，T．W．，＇Ar．on the Athenian Arbitrators＇in Amer．Journ． of Philology，xii 319－326．（114）Grunzel，J．，（Friedrich）Leipzig．（155）Hertz， M．C．，On c．38，Jahrb．f．Philol．，＇91，p．192．（116）Hude，K．，On the murder of Hipparchus（where Ar．differs from Thuc．he is probably following Androtion），Jahrb． f．Philol．，＇92，p． $17 \mathrm{I}-6 . \quad\left(\mathrm{I}_{17}\right)$ Knoke，F．，popular article in Grenzboten，＇g1，no． 43－44．（ 1 18）Köhler，U．，（A）On Heracleides of Clazomenae，Hermes，＇92，p． 68 f． （в）Die Zeiten der Herrschaft des Peisistratas；Sitzungsberichte of the Berlin Academy， 7 April，＇92，pp．339－343；a not entirely accurate abstract in Berl．Phil． Woch．， 13 Aug．p．1053－6．［（a）The account of Peisistratus in cc．14， 15 is primarily derived from Hdt．i 59－64，combined（but not harmonised）with other sources of information．The second exile lasted ro years；the first $\tau u p a \nu \nu i s 5$ ；and the first exile and the second and third rupayvis， 6 years each．This result was probably obtained by deducting the 10 years of the second exile from the 33 years of c． 17 ，and dividing the remainder（ $2_{3}$ ）into four approximately equal parts，thus making the $\tau u \rho a p \nu i s$ last for 17 years in all，and the exile for 16 years．The 19 years of $\tau v \rho a \nu \nu i s$ in $c .17 \$ 1$ ， which are inconsistent with this，are obtained（as already suggested on p． 76 a ）by deducting the 17 years of the rule of the Peisistratidae（c．19 ult．）from the 36 years assigned by Hdt．to the rule of Peisistratus and his sons．（The connexion of Peisis－ tratus with Rhaecelus explains the offer of Amyntas I to allow Hippias to settle at the neighbouring town of Anthemuts，Hdt．v 94．）（b）The author＇s method of combining different sources of information is further illustrated by comparing his account of Cleisthenes（c．20－21）with that of Hdt．（The beginning of the $\sigma \tau$ dats is placed by Köhler before 508／7，and the reforms of Cleisthenes in $507 / 6$ ．）（c）In the figures given in c． 24 the main stress is laid on the total，20，000（cf．Arist．Vesp．706－8）， not on the details；it is an exaggeration to put the number of the $\dot{\alpha} \rho \chi \alpha a l \not z \nu \delta \eta \mu o l$ and $\dot{v} \pi \epsilon \rho \delta \rho \iota \circ$ at 700 each；and the estimate of 2500 hoplites and 20 guardships properly belongs to the time of the battle of Tanagra．A body as numerous as the 2,000 $\phi$ poupol must have held office for more than a year．（d）c． 25 describes the censorial powers of the Areopagus as $\mathfrak{e} \pi i \theta$ cra，whereas，in cc． $3,4,8$ ，these powers are described as having belonged to it from the earliest times．Hence we may infer that c． 25 is founded on a different account of the historical development of the powers of the Areopagus to that followed in the previous chapters．Further，it is more probable that Ephialtes，in his attack on the Areopagus，cooperated with Pericles than with Themistocles．The story about the latter in c． 25 is a läppischc，chronologische unmögliche Erzählung，probably borrowed from some such writer as Stesimbrotus．］
(119) Kurze, F., Westermann's Monatshefte, Nov. '91, p. 281-4. (i20) Mahaffy, J. P., abiter dicta in Problems in Greek History, pp. 84, 87, 89, 96, 122, $128 . \quad$ (121) Melber, J., Aristoteles 'A $\theta \eta \nu a l \omega \nu$ mo入ıтela u. die bisher darïber erschienene Littera. tur in Blätter für das bayerische Gymnasialwesen xxviii $\mathbf{~}$, p. 29-44 (Class. Rev. vi 375). ( 122 ) Meyer, P., (a) der neue Ar. u. die Schule, in Gymnasizm, '92, no. 2-3; (b) Reviews in Zeitschr. f. d. Gymnasialwesen, xlvi 144-155. (123) Mulier, H. C., in 'EגAd s iv, pp. 76 ff , and Kenyon, ibid. 137, Leyden, '92. (124) Munro, J. A. R., 'The Chronology of Themistocles' career,' Class. Rev. vi 333 f. (125) Niesen, H., die Staatschriften des Ar. in Rhein. Mus. '92, vol. 47, pp. 161-206 (holds that the Monıreial were intended to lead up to the publication of a code for the dominions of Alexander, and also to serve as a series of hand-books for the use of Macedonian diplomatists. The article is ably criticised by Brono Keil, die Solonische Verfassung, p. 127-150). (126) Plccolomini, Aeneas, In Aristot. at Herodam animadv. criticae, in Rivista di filologia, xx p. 456-264, Turin, 1892 . (127) Postgate, J. P., em. $\mathfrak{\eta} \lambda \dot{a} \sigma \alpha \tau \epsilon$ for áá $\sigma \alpha \tau \epsilon$, in c. 5, 16 (Class. Rev. v 109). (128) Ruehl, F., Der Staat der Athener und kein Ende, in Jahrb. f. class. Philol. Suppl. Bd., 18, pp. 675-706; also reprinted (Teubner) Leipzig. [Rev. in Neue Philol. Rundschau, '92, no. 15, p. 229 (P. Meyer); Woch. f. kl. Philol. '92, no. 35, p. 949 (G. J. Schneider) ; Berl. Phil. Woch. 15 Oct. p. 1317 (Schöffer). 'Fassen wir des Ergebniss meines ersten Aufsatzes (79) und das der vorstehenden weiteren Ausführungen zusammen, so ergibt sich die neue Schrift als ein Werk, das sich sehr nahe an die aristotelische ' $\boldsymbol{A} \theta$. $\pi \boldsymbol{\pi} \boldsymbol{\lambda}$. anschloss, stellenweise fast oder ganz wörtlich, das ihr manche feine, echt aristotelische Wendung verdankte, das sie aber einerseits an vielen Stellen zusammenzog, anderseits dagegen auch erweiterte und möglicherweise auch einzelne Partien durch andere ersetzte' (p. 700). He holds that the editor of the work was 'Herakleides Lembos' (p. 701 f.).] (129) Schöffer, Val. von, (a) On the date of the 'A $\theta . \pi 0 \lambda$. in Introd. to Bürgerschaft u. Volksversammlung zu Athen, I, Moscow, '91 (in Russian), Berl. Phil. Woch. 8 Oct. '92, p. 1290; (b) Reviews in Berl. Phil. Woch. 8 and 15 Oct. '92. ( 130 ) Schultz, H., Russ. Phil. Rundschau, ii p. 33-44 (in Russian). (I3I) Stern, E. v., die neuentdeckte 'A $\theta$. $\pi 0 \lambda$. des $A r$. pp. 42 (Abdruck aus B. II der Annal. der hist.-phil. Ges.), in Russian, Odessa, '92; [attacks the views of Schvarcz, Rühl and Cauer, Berl. Phil. Woch. \& Oct. '92, p. 1291]. (I32) Szanto, E., zur drakonischen Gesetzgebung, in Arch.-epigr. Mittheilungen aus Oesterreich, xv 2, p. 180-2. (133) Tacchi-Venturi, Civiltà Cattolica, xii no. 995-6. (134) Zielinski, Th., on c. 4, in Russ. Phil. Rundschau, i 2, p. 125 f. (in Russian). (135) Zingerle, A., Zeitschrift f. d. Oesterr. Gymn. xliii 207 f.

## (IV) SEPARATE WORKS.

(I) Bauer, A., Litterarische u. historische Forschungen zu Aristoteles' 'A $\theta$. mo $\lambda$. (C. H. Beck) Munich, pp. 190, May '91. (Rev. in Athenaeum, 5 Sept. '91, p. 317 ; Academy, is Aug. '91, p. 137; Berl. Phil. Woch. 15 Oct. '92, p. 1321, Schöffer; and elsewhere.) [In three parts: (I) On the relations of Ar. to the historical literature of Greece ; (2) historical results derived from the ' $A \theta$. $\pi 0 \lambda$. ; (3) Chronological tables, drawn up in accordance with the dates given in the 'A $\theta . \pi 0 \lambda$.]
(2) Cassel, Paulus, Vom neuen Aristoteles n. seiner Tendenz (Bibliograph. Bureau) Berlin, '91. (Rev. in Berl. Phil. Woch. 15 Oct. '92, p. 1320, Schöffer; and elsewhere.) [An unscholarly pamphlet, describing the ideal of the author of the 'A $\theta$. то八. as 'die alte, erbliche, patriarchalische, gewissenhafte, königliche Verfassung.']
(3) Cauer, Fr., 'Hat Aristoteles die Schrift vom Staate der Athener geschrieben?
ihr Ursprung und ihr Wert für die ältere athenische Geschichte,' (Göschen) Stuttgart, pp. 78, '9r. (Rev. in Acadenty, 6 June '91, p. 540; Athenaeum, 5 Sept. '91, p. 317; Deutsche Litteratur-Zeitung, p. 878, Diels; Litt. Centralblatt, p. 1 r20; Wochenschr. f. kl. Phil. no. 28, Szanto; Gymn. p. $5^{67}$, P. Meyer; Berl. Phil. Woch. '92, p. 1288, Schöffer; and elsewhere.) [Argues against the treatise being the work of Aristotle.]
(4) Droysen, H., Vorläufige Bemerkungen zu Aristotèles' 'A $\theta$. тod., Oster Programm des königstädt. Gymn. (Gärtner) Berlin, '9r. [Mainly chronological.]
(5) Gomperz, Th., Die Schrift vom Staatswesen der Athener und ihr neuester Beurtheiller, (Holder) Vienna, 'gı. [A polemical pamphlet directed mainly against Dr Franz Rühl's article in Rheinisches Museum, xlvi 426.]
(6) Hagfors, E., de praepositionum in Ar. Politicis et in'A日. $\pi 0 \lambda$. usu, Helsingfors Dissertation, pp. 130 (Mayer u. Müller, Berlin, '92). [Rev. in Woch. f. kl. Philol. ' 92, p. 997 . The net result of this elaborate statistical investigation is that, in the prepositions, the writer finds nothing in the 'A $\theta$. $\pi \mathbf{\pi} \boldsymbol{\lambda}$. divergent from the usage in the Politics. On the other hand, there is little in the use of prepositions in the former that is distinctively characteristic of Aristotle. This is limited to the use of $\epsilon \xi$ a $\rho \chi \hat{\eta} s$
 positionum usu concludere licet, ille liber ah Aristotele potest esse conscriptus.']
(7) Hammond, B. E., Greek Constitutions, (a sketch including fresh details from the 'A $\theta . \pi$ ол.) pp. 68 (E. Johnson) Cambridge, ' 9 r.
(8) Headlam, J. W., Appendix to Historical Essay, Election by Lot at Athens, pp. 183-190, (University Press) Cambridge, '91. See also III (38).
(9) Herzog, E., Zur Litteratur über den Staat der Athener, pp. 83 (Fues) Tiibingen, Nov. '92. (1) On [Xen.] 'A $\theta . \pi \mathrm{o} \mathrm{\lambda}$. ; (2) on Ar. 'A $\theta . \pi o \lambda$. c. 4 .
(เo) Kell, Bruno, Die Solonische Verfassung nach Aristoteles, pp. 248 (Gärtner) Berlin, Nov. '92. [Ar. was engaged in the preparation of the Politics from about 350 to 335 B.C. It was apparently after this that he put into shape the materials collected for his Moגıтєtal, the redaction of the 'A $\theta . \pi 0 \lambda$. falling between 329 and 325 . In its polemical passages and elsewhere, it shows the influence of the 'A $\tau \theta$ is of Androtion, besides other traces of further research subsequent to the preparation of the Politics. It was intended for publication, as is proved by the elaborate style of certain portions, by the attention paid to rhythm at the ends of the sentences, by the avoidance of hiatus, and by other indications of deliberate purpose and methodical plan. The work did not, however, receive the author's finishing touches, and was probably not given to the world until after his death.-The text of chaps. $5-13$ is printed with critical notes, followed by a commentary on each chapter, together with many valuable remarks on the work as a whole. Among the restorations of the text here proposed


(ir) Meyer, Peter, Des Aristoteles' Politik u. die 'A $\theta$. $\pi 0 \lambda$., nebst einer LitteraturUebersicht, pp. 72 (Cohen) Bonn, 'gr. (Rev. in Berl. Phil. Woch. 8 Oct. '92, p. 129r, Schöffer; and elsewhere.) [Gives some nseful parallel passages from the Politics; but goes too far in contending that Politics ii I 2 and c .4 of 'A $\theta$. $\pi 0 \lambda$. are both equally authoritative.]
(12) Schvarcz, Julius, 'Aristoteles u. die 'A $\theta$. $\pi 0 \lambda$.,' I Abtheilung des Werkes Die Demokratie, pp. 25 (Friedrich) Leipzig, '9I. [Ascribes the treatise to Demetrius Phalereus.]
(13) Schjott, P. Aristoteles om Athens Statsforfatning. Christiania, '91, Dybwad. (Rev. by B in Lit. Centralblatt, no. 29, p. 1025.)
(14) Wright, J. H. The Date of Cylon, (Reprint of III (roo c), 1892); noticed
in Academy, 11 June, '92, p. 570; Class. Rev. vi 457; Berl. Phil. Woch. '92, p. 1555 ; and elsewhere. [Places the attempt of Cylon between 636 and $6_{24}$ B.C., and the trial and banishment of the Alcmaeonidae, and the visit of Epimenides, in 6.5.]

The principal books of reference used in preparing the commentary are: (a) the Corpus Inscriptionum Atticarum, quoted as CIA; with E. L. Hicks, Gk. Historical Inscriptions, and Dittenberger's Sylloge; also von Hartel's Studien über Attisches Staatsrecht u. Urkundenwesen (1878), and Meisterhans, Grammatik der Attischen Inschriften, ed. 2 (1888).
(b) the Index Aristotelicus of Bonitz; and the editions (or translations) of the Politics by Susemihl, Jowett, Newman and others; also the various editions of the Fragments.
(c) the Greek lexicographers, esp. Bekker's Anecdota, vol. i; Etymologicum Magnum (Gaisford); Harpocration (Dindorf); Hesychius (Schmidt); Photius (ed. Porson, revised by Dobree, 1822, who printed as Appendix the Lexicon Rhetoricum Cantabrigiense; Dobree's transcript of the latter was also published posthumously in 1834); also id. (ed. Naber, $8864-5$ ); Pollux (Bekker); and Suidas (Bernhardy).
(d) in Gk. History :-Herodotus, Thucydides, Xenophon, also C. Müller's Fragmenta Historicorum Graecorum, quoted as FHG:-among modern writers, Thirlwall, Grote (ed. 1862 in 8 vols), Curtius (ed. Ward), Duncker, Busolt, Holm, Abbott; also Gilbert's Beiträge. In Chronology, Eusebius (ed. Schoene, r866-75); and the Marmor Parium in Müller's fhg; also Clinton's Fasti, and Peter's Zeittafeln.
(e) in Antiquities and Law: (1) Boeckh, Die Staatshaushaltung der Athener, ed. z, $18{ }_{5}$ 1, ed. 3 (by Fränkel) 1886 ; also the translations of ed. I by Sir Geo. Cornewall Lewis 1828,5842 ; of ed. 2 by Lamb, Boston, U.S., 1857 . (2) the new edition of K. P. Hermann's Lehrbuch der Griechischen Antiquitäten'. (3) Meier u. Schoemann, der Attische Process, 1824 , ed. Lipsins $188 \mathrm{I}-6$; also Lipsius, in Verhandlungen d. $k$. Süchs. Gesellschaft d. Wissenschaften, '91, p. 41-69. (4) G. F. Schoemann, Antiquities of Greece, vol. i translated by Hardy and Mann, r880. (5) Gilbert, Griechische Staatsalterthümer, 1881 - 5 (new ed., and English trans. of vol. i in preparation). Busolt, Die Griechischen Alterthümer, 1887 (ed. '2, '92), and Stengel, Sakralalterthümer, 189o, both in Iwan Müller's Handbuch. (7) A. Mommsen, Heortologie, 1864. (8) Smith, Dict. of Gk. and Roman Antiquities, ed. Wayte and Marindin (with Appendix on 'A $\theta$. $\pi 0$ 人.). (9) Daremberg et Saglio, Dict. des Antiquités. (10) Haussoullier, la Vie Municipale en Attique, 1884; Hauvette-Besnault, les Stratęges Athéniens, 1885; A. Martin, les Cavaliers Ath., 1887 ; Dürrbach, L'Orateur Lycurgue, 1890, and other monographs in the same series. (11) Philippi, Beiträge zu einer Geschichte des Attischen Bürgerrechtes (1870), and Der Areopag und die Epheten, $1874 \cdot$ ( 2 ) Fraenkel, die attischen Geschworenengerichte, 1877. (13) Schulthess, Vormundschaft, 1886 . (14) U. von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, Aus Kydathen, in 'Philol. Untersuchungen,' 1880 . ( 15 ) Dissertations by Thumser, de Civium Atheniensiun muneribus, 1880; Kornitzer, De Scribis Publicis, 1883; Haederli, Astynomen u. Agoranomen, 1886; Panske, de Magistratibus Atticis, qui saeculo A. C. quarto pecunias publicas curabant, i, 889 ; and others. (16) Articles in Philological Journals, \&c.
${ }^{1}$ Vol. 1, Part ii, Der Athenische Staat und seine Geschichte, edited by Thumser,
was published in Nov. 1892, too late to be of use in the present work.
§ Ir. Abbreviations used in the critical notes, foc.

## SIGLARIUM.

Papyri Londinensis lectiones litterae 'unciales' indicant;
[ ] quae in papyro prius, nt videtur, fuerunt, nunc autem evanuerunt;
$<>$ quae in papyro per errorem omissa, propter sensum addenda sunt;
【】 quae in papyro scripta, ut aliena omittenda sunt:

+ obelus lectionem corruptam designat;
* asteriscns coniecturas non antea ab editore prolatas.


## Editiones.

$\mathrm{K}^{1}=$ Kenyonis ed. prima; $\mathbf{K}^{2}$ secunda; $\mathrm{K}^{3}$ tertia;
$\mathbf{K}-\mathbf{w}^{\mathbf{1}}=$ Kaibel et von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, ed. prima; $\mathrm{K}-\mathrm{w}^{2}$, ed. altera;
$\mathbf{H}-\mathrm{L}=$ van Herwerden et van Leeuwen;
$\mathrm{B}=$ Blass.

## § $\mathbf{1 2}$. List of Illustrations.

In Frontispiece. Fig. I; Heliastic $\pi \iota \nu$ ácuov, from Daremberg and Saglio's Dict. des Antiquités, iii 190, fig. 2410; first published by M. Rayet, Annuaire de l'Association des Études Grecques, 1878, p. 206. See note on p. 235.

Fig. 2 and 3 ; two bronze counters, probably used in the allotment of citizens to the several heliastic divisions. On the obverse, four owls and two sprays of olive, encircled with the word $\theta \in с м о \theta \in \tau \omega N$. On the reverse, fig. 2 (from the Berlin Museum) bears the letter E; fig. 3 (published in Parnassos, Athens, 1883), the letter A. From Daremberg and Saglio, l.c., fig. 24II, 2412. See note on p. 236 b.

Fig. 4 and 5 ; heliastic $\sigma \dot{\prime} \mu \beta o \lambda a$. On the obverse, a copy of the design on a $\tau \rho \omega \dot{\beta} \beta \circ \lambda o \nu$, -an owl surrounded with two sprays of olive, and $A \Theta H$ in fig: $4, \Theta$ only in fig. 5 . On the other side, a letter, probably denoting one of the heliastic sections. See note on p. 240 b. From Daremberg and Saglio, l.c., fig. 2413, 2414,

Fig. 6 and 7; bronze $\psi \hat{\eta} \phi o \leftarrow$ used for voting, found at Athens (Bull. de Corr. Hellén. 1887, xi 210). From Daremberg and Saglio, l.c., fig. 2415-6. See note on p. 246.

On p. 39; Aeginetan Didrachmon; Berlin Cabinet, Friedländer u. Sallet, Beschreibung, no. 2. From Baumeister's Denkmäler, fig. 1010.

Ibid. and Title-page. Early Attic Tetradrachmon; Berlin Cabinet, u.s., no. 54. From Baumeister's Denkmäler, fig. 1013.

## CORRIGENDA.

p. 2b, 1. 17 from end : read ' either as early as 636 or as late as 624. ,
p. 7,1. 3 : dele asterisk.
p. 133, in critical note on 35, 5: read Meapatéws K, K-w.

## ADDENDA.

Introduction, p. xii. The sketch on pp. ix-xii is perhaps needlessly limnited to the literature of the theory of government. A survey of 'political literature', if interpreted in its wider sense, might have included some account of the de Pace and the Areopagiticus of Isocrates. Of these two political pamphlets the first advises Athens to abandon the Empire of the Sea; the second commends the earlier mode of appointing the officers of State by election (al $\rho \in \sigma t s$ ) rather than by lot ( $\kappa \lambda \lambda \eta \rho \omega \sigma t s$ ), and pleads for the restoration of the censorial power once wielded by the Council of the Areopagus. Both of these works may be ascribed to the year 355 B.C., and both have important points of contact with the 'A $\theta \eta \boldsymbol{\eta}$ alav moגicela, which was written nearly 30 years later. Some of these points are noticed in Bruno Keil's Solon. Verf., pp. 78 ff, 215 \&c.
p. l. The observations of Blass on the rhythm of the 'A $\theta \eta \nu a l \omega \nu \pi o \lambda \iota \tau \epsilon l a$ are perhaps unduly fanciful. In the extreme case quoted in the text the metrical correspondence is possibly due to accident alone. The central clause of the sentence is
 language used immediately before and after this clause, the writer was consciously guided by the metrical value of the successive syllables of the quotation itself. One may also fairly mistrust a theory which leads its exponent to print the trisyllabic $\Pi \epsilon \iota \rho a \iota \hat{s}$ in $c .35 \S 1$, while everywhere else he prefers the quadrisyllabic $\Pi \epsilon \rho a t \epsilon \omega s$. A more cautious and sober view is that of Bruno Keil, l.c., p. 36, who observes:'die Unfertigkeit des Aristotelischen Buches lässt eine Rhythmik in dem Umfange, wie Blass sie annimmt, m. E. überhaupt gar nicht suchen'. Elsewhere, p. 33, he makes the interesting remark: 'das Tempo der Sprache unseres Buches ist im ganzen ein scbnelles'.

Commentary, p. 9 (c. 3, 25) : ßoukо入єîov кт入] Cf. Bruno Keil, in Berl. Phil. Woch. 21 May, 1892, p. 652 f.
p. 14 (c. 4, 6): $\tau \alpha \mu(a s]$ The earliest inscription in which the $\tau \alpha \mu(a \iota$ are mentioned belongs to the first half of the sixth century, cIA iv $373^{238}$, p. 199, oi $\tau \alpha \mu l a i \tau \alpha ́ \delta \epsilon \chi \alpha \lambda \kappa l a$ $\kappa \tau \lambda$. Cf. J. H. S. ix 125.
p. 28 (c. 7, 23 ) : $\Delta \iota \phi\left(\lambda o v{ }^{\prime} A v \theta \epsilon \mu(\omega \nu]\right.$ Bruno Keil, Solon. Verf., p. 67, identifies with this monument a work of art mentioned in CIA, ii 742 A I2 (Catalogi signorum
 $\kappa v \nu \hat{\eta} \nu \quad \chi_{\chi \in t} \kappa a i \lambda 6[\gamma \chi \eta \nu]$ vel $\lambda 6[\phi o \nu]$. He accordingly infers that the monument may
 Catalogi as ultimis decenniis saeculi quarti non multo antiquior. But the work of art itself may easily have been very much older, some of the rest in the list having certain portions missing. Cf. Boeckh, i1 $31^{2}, 279^{3}$.
 ordnung des Kleisthenes, with Map, Reimer, Berlin, Oct. '92; and Szanto, Hermes, '92, p. 312.
 p. 54, proposes to identify Archestratus with the mover of the last amendment in the



 The spirit of this proposal harmonises with the policy of Ephialtes.

Addenda Notulis Criticis. Bm=Blass, Mitteilungen aus Papyrus-handschriften, in Fleckeisen's Jahrbücher, Oct. 1892, pp. 571-5. Lectionum harum ipsa-papyro inspecta prolatarum exemplar Blassii ipsius benevolentiae acceptum refero; ex eisdem nonnullas ab eodem impertitas in editione capitum 1 - 4 I in textum nuperrime recepit Hude. Recensentur infra etiam coniecturae quaedam, quas nuper proposuit Bruno Kell.







 éviavolas (Hude).
$4,10 \delta \iota \epsilon[\gamma \gamma]] \hat{a}[\sigma \theta a \iota]: \delta \iota \epsilon[\gamma \gamma v] a ̂ \nu$, cautionem (vel sponsionem) exigere, Bm (Hude); idem coniecerat Fränkel, Rhein. Mus. xlvii 473, sed alio sensu, spondere. $12 \pi(a \rho a) \sigma \chi o \mu \dot{\epsilon} \nu 0 s^{*}$ cum Blassio conieceram : $\delta \in \chi \rho \mu \epsilon \nu o u s \mathrm{k}, \mathrm{k}-\mathrm{w}$, (participio cum ťvous constructo) bm (Hude). 13 oй $\pi \epsilon \rho<\epsilon l \sigma \nu \nu>$ Hude.

 $\mu \epsilon \tau p l o \sigma \iota \tau \iota \ldots \theta \epsilon \mathrm{Bm}$; recte igitur $\tau l \theta \epsilon \sigma \theta \epsilon$ proposuerat Platt. $21 \tau \bar{\eta} \nu \tau \epsilon \phi \iota[\lambda a-$ $\chi \rho \eta \mu] a \pi i a \nu$ (quod coniecerat Kontos) Bm, qui usitatam lectionem фinapruplav cum litterarum vestigiis non congruere arbitratur, sed spatium litteris tribus PHM paullo angustius esse confitetur.

6, 15 à $\pi \epsilon \chi \theta \in \sigma \theta a \iota<\epsilon \lambda \lambda \epsilon \sigma \theta a \iota>$ Hude, hiatu sine causa admisso.
18 катарри$\pi a \mid \nu[\epsilon] \iota \nu: \kappa a \tau a \rho \rho \cup \pi \hat{\eta} \nu a \iota$ Gertz (Hude), hiatu admisso.
 'machte fest', 'gab Geltung', Hude ; sed explicandum potius leges suas intra centum annorum spatium inclusit. $\quad 9 \tau \iota \mu \eta \mu a\left[\tau a \delta_{\iota}\right] \epsilon i \lambda \epsilon \nu: \tau \iota \mu \eta \mu a \tau \iota[\delta \iota] \epsilon \lambda \lambda \epsilon \nu$ Wessely,
 vacuo relicto) Bm (Hude).
 $\epsilon] \kappa \tau[l y] \in \sigma \theta(a l)$ Bm (Hude) ; idem coniecerat Tyrrell.

9, 11 ö $\pi \omega s \pi(\epsilon \rho l) \tau \hat{\eta} s \kappa \rho / \sigma \epsilon[\omega s$ ò $\delta] \hat{\eta}[\mu 0 \mathrm{j} \hat{\eta} \kappa] \cup \rho \iota o s$ Keil.



 $\mu \nu a \hat{i} \mathrm{Bm}$, supra versum hastam numeri signum prodentem cerni posse testatus: at $\tau \rho \in \hat{i}$ каl є $\ell \kappa о \sigma \iota\left(\kappa \gamma^{\prime}\right.$ Gertz) $\mu \nu a \hat{i}$ Hude.

11, 10 An $\gamma \in \nu \in \sigma \theta a l \tau \dot{\eta} \nu[\nu \in a \nu] \tau \alpha \xi \iota \nu$ ? Keil.
$12 \hat{\eta} \sigma[\chi \epsilon \delta \delta \nu \quad$ à $] \pi a \rho a \lambda \lambda a \kappa r a \nu$
 $\sigma v \sigma \tau \dot{\alpha}[\nu \tau] a \mathrm{Bm}$ (Hiude).

12, 14 öбoıs: öтoıs Hude. $\pi \circ \lambda \lambda \hat{\eta} L \sigma[c] \nu \mathrm{Bm}$ ( $\pi 0 \lambda \lambda \hat{p} \sigma c \nu \mathrm{Hude}$ ).
 ieceram. $\quad 27 \dot{\epsilon} \theta[\rho \nu] \lambda \lambda[\epsilon \hat{i}] \tau o: ~ \epsilon \nu \theta v_{\cdot}^{\prime} \mu \varepsilon(o \nu) \tilde{\eta}^{\prime} \nu \mathrm{Bm}$ (Hude), qui lectionem novam idem



 $[d \lambda \lambda] \omega \nu \mathrm{K}(\mathrm{Bm})$.
 admisso Hude.


 28, 16 тaîs $\dot{\rho} \rho \mu \alpha i ̂ s<\chi a \rho \iota\} b \mu \epsilon \nu o s>J 13$ Mayor (Hude).
 nomine etiam alias usurpato, c. 28, 22, c. 34,27, c. 38,22 ; Pythodorum igitur non Epizeli filium tribus Aegeidis sed Anaphlystium quendam tribus Antiochidis fuisse censet b.

$$
8 \tau(\delta \nu) \beta a \sigma l \lambda \epsilon a \mathrm{Bm} .
$$

31, 19 [ Toîs] aúzoîs: тoîs ג̇бтô̂s $\mathrm{K}^{3}(\mathrm{Bm})$. кovóvt $\omega \nu$ ( $\mathrm{H}-\mathrm{L}$ ) Bm .

32, 16 i $\pi \alpha \kappa о \nu[\sigma \alpha] \nu \tau \omega \nu: \dot{v} \pi \sigma^{*}$

 $\gamma \rho \alpha \psi a \nu \tau \hat{\omega} \nu \epsilon \xi \omega \theta \epsilon \nu$ Hude.

38, 7 *єл $\epsilon[\sigma \tau \epsilon \lambda \lambda o \nu]-\mu \epsilon \tau a \pi \epsilon[\mu \pi b \mu] \epsilon \nu 0 \iota: ~ ध \pi \epsilon[\mu] \pi \rho[\nu]-\mu \epsilon \tau a \pi \epsilon \mu \pi b \mu \epsilon \nu \circ \mathrm{Bm}$ (Hude).


 Bm ), Hude. $\quad 27<\dot{\alpha} \nu>\epsilon \lambda \eta \lambda \dot{\theta} \theta \alpha \sigma \omega$ Hude.

42, 11 ধ́à : HaN (deleto H) Bm. 43, 15 ка日l乡є 1





48, $5 \delta \iota \pi \lambda[0 \hat{\nu} \nu \dot{a}] \nu a ́ \gamma \kappa \eta: \delta \iota \pi \lambda \alpha ́[\sigma \iota o \nu a ́] \nu \dot{\alpha} \gamma \kappa \eta \mathrm{Bm} . \quad 8 \tau \dot{\alpha} \chi \rho[\eta \dot{\eta} \mu \alpha \tau \alpha] ; \tau \dot{d} s \tau[\mu \dot{\alpha}] s$
 indicantis) Bm , qui à $[a \delta \iota \kappa l] a \iota s$, appellationum causa, dubitanter conicit. $21 \tau \delta$

 litteris apto.
 textu congruente. Cf. Pl. Leg. 735 в трофєùs $\ell_{\pi} \pi \omega \nu$.

 quam alias commemorari. 36 каi $\tau 0$ © $[\nu] \quad \mu a$.
 [лроє]! $\rho \eta \tau \tau[!$ mavult Bm .

56, $21[\tau \hat{\eta} s \tau \epsilon]:[\tau \hat{\eta}]$ s (littera producta) Bm.
 $\delta[\iota]$ кабт ${ }^{\prime} \rho \iota o \nu \mathrm{Bm}$.

 fallaces, non litterarum vestigia vera, superesse arbitratus. $28 \delta\left[\ell \kappa \alpha \iota \nu \frac{\epsilon}{\epsilon}\right] \mu \beta a \lambda \epsilon \hat{\imath} \nu:$ $\nu[\delta \mu 0 \mathrm{~S} \epsilon] \mu \beta \alpha \lambda \in \hat{L} \nu \mathrm{Bm}$.

61, 27 кal $\alpha \lambda \lambda o \nu \tau \hat{\eta} s\left[\tau 0 \hat{v}{ }^{*} A\right] \mu \mu \omega \nu o s: ~ \kappa \alpha l ~ \nu[\hat{v} \nu] \tau \hat{\eta} s$ (superscr.) [ $\left.\tau 0 \hat{v}{ }^{*} A\right] \mu \mu \omega \nu o s$ mavult Bm .

62, $5 \delta[\eta \mu \delta \tau] a s: \delta \eta \mu[\rho v] s$ вm.
63, 18 тıуáкıov: [каі] тıขáкıov, suadente spatio, Bm .

 $\epsilon \bar{s}[\dot{\omega}] \nu[a \dot{u} \tau \hat{\omega}] \nu: \dot{v} \pi \dot{\alpha} \rho \chi \epsilon \epsilon-\epsilon / s \tau \dot{d} \nu$ (Wessely) $\kappa[\lambda \hat{\eta} \rho o] \nu$, sortitioni iam antea paratus est, aut sortem iam antea duxit, bm, $\epsilon i s \tau \grave{\nu} \nu[\alpha \rho \iota \theta \mu \partial] v$ sensui magis congruere confessus.
 litteras primas $€ \lambda \kappa$ (ut videtur) scriptum, bm, cui nihil sensui aptum obtigit: scri-


 K -w.







 conieceram, sed postea $\tau \dot{\alpha}[\pi \tau \nu]$ d́ $[\kappa \iota a]$ praetuli. 28-35 кarà $\delta \iota \kappa a \sigma \tau \grave{\eta} \rho \iota o \nu$ (pIN






Pag. 33; $33^{\text {a }}$ et $33^{\text {b }}$, composita a K -w (B), vix revera coniuncta fuisse putat Bm; $33^{\mathrm{a}}$ et $34^{\mathrm{c}}$ potius componenda: cumque primum $34^{\mathrm{c}}$ et $35^{\mathrm{a}}$, deinde $35^{\text {a }}$ et $35^{\mathrm{b}}$, denique 35 et 36 coniuncta sint, fragmenta in hunc ordinem redigenda:-32, $33^{\text {b }}, 34^{\text {ab }}$ (cum $33^{\text {b }}$ coniunctum), $33^{\text {a }}+34^{\text {c }}, 35,36,37$.


 substitui potest, Bm . $17 \pi \iota \epsilon[\zeta \epsilon]: \pi t \epsilon[ \}] \omega \nu$ satis clare apparet, Bm . $23 \lambda \alpha-$

 27 [ $\kappa a i]$ ] $\tau \grave{\pi} \lambda \grave{\eta} \rho \eta \delta \bar{\eta} \lambda(a), \lambda$ supra $\Delta \mathrm{H}$ scriptum, Bm.

## APIミTOTENOYミ A $\because H N A I \Omega N$ TONITEIA.




## $\theta a p \theta \in N$




 Idem scripserunt K -w et $\mathrm{K}^{3}$ Kircbhoffium et Kontum secuti. עekpoi quondarn $\mathrm{K}_{\text {, oi }}$ $\nu \in \kappa \rho o l$ H-I, sed articulo quem desideramus spatium non sufficit, et in ipsa papyro litterae т potius quam $P$ apparet vestigium.

Testimonia. 1 Capitis primi partem deperditam in compendinm redactam



I. Cylon's attempt to establish a tyranny, and its consequences.
Mupwros] Myron of Phlya is mentioned by Plutarch alone, Sol. 12, as the accuser of the Alcmaeonidae who were involved in the curse of Cylon. At a later time one of the Alcmaeonidae, named $\Lambda \epsilon \omega \beta \dot{\omega} \tau \eta \mathrm{s}$, had his revenge for this act of a member of the deme of Phlya by bringing a charge of high treason against a distinguished member of that deme, Themistocles (Plut. Them. 23; cf. ib. 1 § 3). Busolt, Griechische Geschichte, 1885 , i 508.
 quoted in c. 29 (at end), $\dot{\partial} \mu \dot{\sigma} \sigma \nu \tau \epsilon s$ к $\alpha \theta^{\prime}$ i $\epsilon \hat{\rho} \hat{\nu} \tau \in \lambda \epsilon l \omega \nu$.
d ${ }^{1}$ lepüv oubбavtes, but must go with some such verb as $\varepsilon \delta \delta_{\kappa a j o v}$ in the earlier part of the sentence. We may perhaps infer from Plutarch Sol. i2 that the sentence ran as

 aploгivd$\eta \nu$. According to Plutarch the Alcmaeonidae were tried by a court consisting of 300 persons selected from the
noblest families ( $\delta \kappa \kappa a \zeta b \nu \tau \omega \nu$ áp $\omega \sigma \tau i v \delta \eta \nu$ ). The number is confirmed by its being identical with that of the Boule of the partisans of Isagoras which Cleomenes king of Sparta endeavoured to establish at Athens in a subsequent attack on the Alcmaeonidae (Hdt. v 72). For $\dot{\alpha} \rho \ell \sigma \tau / v$. $\delta \eta \nu$ cf. c. 3, 1. 2.
 charge of sacrilege having been made good' by the sentence of condemnation passed by the court.
 incident is mentioned in Plutarch l.c., and Thuc. l. c. In the latter it seems to be more closely connected with the second expulsion of the tyarcis (in 508 в.c.), than with the first.

The principal ancient authorities on the affair of Cylon are as follows. Hdt.












 count is unduly favourable to the Alcmaeonidae. It is materially corrected by























 plies us with the following narrative, which has several points of contact with the account in the text. $\tau \dot{\delta} \delta \dot{\delta} \mathrm{K} u \lambda \omega \dot{\omega} \epsilon \operatorname{cov}$













 $\pi \epsilon \rho \iota \gamma \in \nu \delta \mu \epsilon \nu \circ \iota \pi d \lambda \iota \nu \hat{\eta} \sigma a \nu$ l $\sigma \chi \nu \rho o l$ каl $\sigma \tau a-$

 $\sigma \tau \dot{\alpha} \sigma \epsilon \omega s$ áк $\mu \grave{\eta} \nu \lambda a \beta o v \sigma \eta s ~ \mu \dot{d} \lambda \iota \sigma \tau a$ кal то仑









 $\theta \epsilon \mu \epsilon \nu \omega \nu \dot{a} \pi \pi \epsilon \beta a \lambda \delta \nu \quad \tau \epsilon$ Nt $\sigma a l a y$ ol 'A $\theta \eta \nu a i o l$






 $\phi і \lambda \psi \pi о \lambda \lambda \grave{\alpha} \pi \rho о \sigma v \pi \epsilon \rho \gamma \dot{\sigma} \sigma а т о$ каl $\pi \rho о \omega \delta о-$



 од $\mu \nu$ роау катє́бт $\eta \sigma є$.

The date of the Olympic victory of Cylon is 640 b.c. Sex. Julius Africamus (early in 3rd century A.D.), as quoted in the Chronicon of Eusebins, i p. $145=$ 198, has, under Ol. 35, $1=$ b.c. 640 , Recutsum Cylon Atheniensis, is qui tyrannidem affectavit. Plutarch l.c. implies that Epimenides visited Athens, in connexion with the expiation of the curse of Cylon, shortly before the legislation of Solon (archon 594 B.c.). Hence the attempt of Cylon has generally been placed after the date of Dracon ( 62 r b.c.). Thucydides, i 126 ,3, places Cylon's attempt to seize the tyranny in an Olympic year. It has therefore been assigned to the Olympic years 620 (Clinton and Peter), 6 r 6 (Duncker), 612 (Corsini). But Herodotus l.c. describes the partisans of Cylon as an $\epsilon \tau a \iota \rho \eta i \eta \tau \hat{\omega} \nu \dot{\eta} \lambda \iota \kappa \iota \omega \tau \dot{\epsilon} \omega \nu$, which points to a company of young men. Hence it has been suggested that the attempt was made at an earlier date, before the time of Dracon. It has accordingly been assigned to varions Olympic years between 640 and $620 \mathrm{~B} . \mathrm{C}$., either as early as 636 or as late as 620 (Busolt, Griechische Geschichte, 1885, i 498 note 8 , and 505). The same opinion was maintained by Prof. John H. Wright as reported in the Proceedings of the American Philological Association, 1888, p. xxvi. His arguments were drawn from the language of Herodotus, Thucydides and the other anthorities on this incident; from considerations of the probable age of Megacles and the date of Cylon's father-in-law, Theagenes of Megara. He also urged that 'the adoption of the earlier date lent unexpected coherence and significance to certain phenomena in early Attic history, the episode thus being one of the important steps in the social

## 2. $\mu \epsilon \tau a ̀ ~ \delta e ̀ ~ \tau a v ̂ t a ~ \sigma v \nu e ́ ß \eta ~ \sigma \tau a \sigma \iota a ́ \sigma a \iota ~ \tau o u ́ s ~ \tau \epsilon ~ \gamma \nu \omega \rho i ́ \mu o v s ~ \kappa a \grave{~ \tau o ̀ ~}$

II 1 ctaciacal fortasse in Diacthcal mutandum, idem suspicantur h-L coll. Arist. Vesp. $41 \tau \partial \nu \delta \hat{\eta} \mu \nu \nu \dot{\eta} \mu \hat{\omega} \nu \beta o v i \lambda \epsilon \tau a \iota \delta u \tau \tau \dot{a} \nu a \iota$; alioqui $\tau \delta \nu \delta \hat{\eta} \mu o \nu$ secludendum.
and political development of Athens, and not an unrelated event.' This opinion is confirmed by the text which clearly implies that the affair of Cylon preceded the date of Dracon.
*'фvүєv dंє!фvy[av] Plat. Leg. 871 D,

 ${ }^{24}$, тoîs фєú
 रadev $\theta \in \nu \tau \omega \nu$.
' $\mathrm{Em} \mu \mu \mathrm{\epsilon vi}[\eta \mathrm{\eta}$ ] The purification of Athens by Epimenides is generally assigned to в.c. 596-5, shortly before the archonship of Solon in 594-3 (Clinton, Fasti, and Busolt, i 509). These dates are consistent with the account in Plutarch and were possibly suggested by it, or derived from some common source, such as Hermippus of Alexandria, quoted in Plut. Sol. II. The chronology of the life of Epimenides is however extremely uncertain. Diogenes Laertius, i ini, quotes Phlegon as stating that Epimenides returned to Crete and died not long after at the age of 157 . He adds that Xenophanes made him die at the age of 154 , and the Cretans at 299. (But the Cretans, as we know on the authority of Epimenides himself, 'are always liars.') Suidas puts his birth in O1. 30 (about 659 B.C.), and describes him as an old man at the time of the purification, which he places in Ol. 44 (B.c. 604-), corrected by Bernhardy into Ol. 46 (B.C. 596 -). At the latter date he would have been 63 .

On the other hand, Plato, Leg. 642 D, 698 c, describes him as coming to Athens and offering expiatory sacrifices in 500 в.c. This account is rejected by Bentley and Grote. The former says of Plato: 'that great Man did not tie himself in his Discourses to Exactness of Time' (Phalaris, P. 58); the latter regards the statement in the Laws as 'a remarkable example of carelessness in chronology' (H. G., c. 10, ii 294). The sacrifices ascribed to Epimenides by Plato may, indeed, be connected with the outbreak of a plague attested by an inscription of about 500 b.C. (CIA i 475 , Busolt i 509 ), but this is not enough to warrant our placing the prophet a century later than the age of Solon.

Thus we have two accounts of the date of Epimenides, ( I ) that represented by

Plato, placing him about 500 B.c.; (2) that represented hitherto by no earlier authority than Hermippus, placing him about 600 B.C. (2) is supported by the text, which mentions his visit immediately after an account of a trial assigned by Plutarch to the time of Solon. The discrepancy between the two accounts is explained by Diels as arising from the fact that Plato is referring to the Epimenides of literature and not to the Epimenides of history. The Theogony ascribed to Epimenides was written under Orphic influence shortly before the Persian wars; and the story of the protracted sleep of Epimenides, which lasted for a whole century, was a fiction designed at the same time to give currency to the poetical fabrications ascribed to him. The curse of Cylon was originally expiated through the banishment of the Alcmaeonidae and the purification of Athens by Epimenides abont 600 b.c. In the following century the Alcmaéonidae returned and about 508 b.c., after tbe expulsion of the Peisistratidae, when Cleisthenes, the Alcmaeonid, was the foremost man in the state, the influence of the exiles led to a revival of the memory of the ancient crime. At such a time as this the story of Epimenides was naturally revived by the opponents of Cleisthenes, and his oracles invented as part of their machinations against the guilty race of the Alcmaeonidae (Diels, Sitzungsberichte of the Berlin Academy, April 16, I891, part xxi; abstract in Berliner Philologische Wochenschrift, p. 766).
i $\boldsymbol{\pi}$ l tovitors] either 'thereupon,' or 'besides.' ' $\mathrm{E} \pi i$ toúrots in the former sense $=\mu \epsilon \tau \dot{\alpha} \quad \tau a 0 ̂ \tau a \quad$ has hitherto been found only in the spurious works (Eucken, Sprachgebrauch des Ar., p. 51). The latter sense (praeterea) is on the whole preferable, and is found in Rhet. ii 6, $138_{4}$ a 9. Cf. Pol. ii 9,1271 a 39, $\epsilon \pi i$ тoîs $\beta a \sigma i \lambda \epsilon \hat{\sigma} \sigma \iota \nu \dot{\eta}$ vavapxia $\dot{\epsilon} \tau \in \rho \alpha$ ßaбi入єla $\kappa а \theta \in \sigma \tau \eta \kappa \in \nu$.

Eкגं $\theta$ Прє $]$ For the details of this purification, see Plut. Sol. 12 ad fin. (кatap$\mu 0 i{ }^{\text {s }}$ ), and Diogenes Laertius i ino.

## II. The conffict of the classes before the times of Dracon and Solon. <br> $\mu \in \tau \dot{\alpha}$ тâ̂Ta] i.e. after the affair of Cylon, which must have been the main







#### Abstract

  єlpүáSovжo H-L.   codices, emendavit Jungermann ; éкт $\neq \mu \rho \rho \circ$ Cobet Pollucis sui in margine) $\delta \dot{e} \pi \alpha \rho \dot{d}$ тоîs 'Атткоîs, id. iii 82 ; Plut. Sol. 13 (Rose, Ar. Frag. $35^{2}$, $389^{3}$ ).


subject of the previous chapter; although, in the part that has been preserved, the narrative of its consequences is brought down to the time of Epimenides (and Solon).

For the general sense, cf. Plut. Sol. 13 init., ol $\delta$ ' 'A $\theta \eta \nu a \hat{i o l} \tau \hat{\eta} s \mathrm{~K} v \lambda \omega \nu \epsilon l o v \pi \epsilon \pi a \nu-$



 $\sigma \tau \dot{a} \sigma \eta s$.

In the editio princeps tòv $\delta \bar{\eta} \mu o \nu$ was regarded as 'superfluous,' and as 'probably a gloss upon $\tau \dot{d} \pi \lambda \hat{\eta} \theta$ os.' The text was thereupon defended by Professor Mayor as follows: 'when Cobet removes glosses from late texts, he can appeal to scholia, in which even common words are explained. Readers and scribes in Egypt, say roo A.D., needed no such helps: again $\pi \lambda \hat{\eta} \theta 0 s$ is not coextensive with $\delta \hat{\eta} \mu \mathrm{os}$, and is elsewhere found in close connexion with it ( 20 § $\mathrm{r} ; 21$ § r ). Here ol $\gamma \nu \mathrm{L}$ $\rho \iota \mu_{0}$ and $\tau \dot{d} \pi \lambda \hat{\eta} \theta_{0 \text { os }}$ are the factions whose struggles convulse $\tau \delta \nu \delta \bar{\eta} \mu o \nu$. For $\sigma \tau a-$ $\sigma a \dot{\zeta} \zeta \omega$ is here transitive. Otherwise $\pi 0 \lambda \nu v$ x $\rho$ jovo must have been placed just before or just after $\sigma \tau a \sigma \iota a ́ \sigma a c$. In the manuscript reading it separates the complex subject of the verb from the object and keeps the reader in suspense.' Mr Kenyon, in his third ed., replies that ' $\delta \bar{\eta} \mu$ os does not seem to be used in this treatise as denoting the whole state except with the collateral sense that the state was a democracy.' Even in c. 14 § r, $\epsilon \pi a \nu a \sigma \tau \grave{\alpha} s$ $\ldots \tau \hat{\varphi} \delta \eta \mu \varphi$, and $15 \S 3$, $\pi a \rho \in \lambda \neq \mu \epsilon \nu 0$ s тоטे $\delta \eta{ }^{\prime} \mu 0 \nu$ rd $\delta \dot{\delta} \pi \lambda$, 'there is the sense of an attack on the democracy by a despot,' He also modifies his view respecting $\tau \dot{\partial} \nu$ $\delta \hat{\eta} \mu \mathrm{\nu}$, suggesting that the words were 'written as a correction of $\tau \mathbf{d} \pi \lambda \hat{\eta} \theta$ os, not as an explanation.'

The transitive use of $\sigma \tau a \sigma t a \dot{c} \epsilon c$, , above suggested, is very rare. In [Dem.] in §

 in L and S) really means 'we do not cause faction in any of his affairs' (see Weil ad loc.). The intrans. sense is also clearly marked in Lysias 18 § 18, toits



 The trans. use is found in 'Anon. apud Stobaeum 510, 1 otkous'; but the Indices to Plato and Aristotle supply no example of this use. To express the trans. Isocrates
 $\sigma \tau a \sigma t a\} \in \nu$ is intrans. twice in 885 , twice in 13 § 2 , also in 20 § $r$, and elsewhere. Hence we must either take it as intrans. here, and strike out $\tau \delta \nu \delta \bar{\delta} \tilde{\mu} \mu \nu$ (which I prefer), or regard ctaciacal as having taken the place of a trans. verb diaстнсаі. Cf. Hdt. ix I § $2, \pi \epsilon \neq \pi \pi$
 $\tau \hat{\eta} \sigma \iota \pi \delta \lambda \iota \sigma \iota, \pi \epsilon \epsilon \mu \pi \omega \nu \delta e ̀ \tau \grave{\eta} \nu{ }^{\text {' } E \lambda \lambda \alpha \delta a} \delta \iota \iota$.



 same period) $\tau \hat{\eta} s \pi \delta \lambda \epsilon \omega s \delta^{2} a \sigma \tau \alpha \sigma \eta s$. Ar.


 alternative one might suggest $\delta$ ia $\sigma \tau a \sigma a \dot{a}-$ $\sigma a L$, to form into separate factions,' Pol.


 pous.
 2, ro. In 18 § 2 and $19 \S 3$ we have кal alone in the second clause. It is exceptional for $\tau \epsilon$ to be omitted, as in Lycurg.
 (where Baiter prefers $\epsilon \pi l \tau \epsilon$ ).

тєлátal] used by Plutarch in eight passages as an equivalent for the Roman clientes (Romulus 13, Poplicola 5, Corio. lanus 13 and 21 § 4, Marius 5 §5, Crassus






 Хоутєร.

 matik der Attischen Inschriften, p. $\left.14^{1}{ }^{2}\right)$; itaque ubique praetuli $\gamma(\gamma \nu \rho \mu a . \quad$ кal oi

 $\mu \dot{\eta}$ крат]єêu H-L Blassii coniecturam secuti.

21 §5, Cato Minor 34 § 3, Tib. Gracchus 13 §2); also in Agis 6\$5, and Quaest. Conviv. ii 10, ( $\dot{\alpha}$ кıтTdेs) Boı кal $\pi$ apaaitos äp.
éктпй́por] (1) Plut., Sol. 13, states that these tenants paid their landlords a sixth part of the produce ( $\xi_{\kappa \tau \alpha} \tau \hat{\omega} \nu \gamma^{\iota \nu} \mu_{\mu} \hat{\nu} \omega \nu$ $\tau \epsilon \lambda o \hat{v} \tau \epsilon s$ ). Similarly, Hesychius, s. v. $\epsilon \pi l$ нортоs. (2) Photius, s.z. $\pi \in \lambda \dot{d} \tau a \iota$, says that they cultivated the soil in return for a

 Hesychius, s. v. $\dot{\epsilon} \kappa \tau \eta \dot{\sigma} \rho o t$, and the Scholiast on Plato, Euthyphron 4 C. Thus Plutarch makes them pay $1 / 6$ and retain $5 / 6$ for their own maintenance; while Photius makes them pay $5 / 6$ and retain $\mathrm{x} / 6$. The former view is preferable and it is supported by Oncken (Staatslehre, ii 437 n ) who observes that a tax of $\mathrm{x} / 6$ was sufficiently severe to imply a considerable amonnt of distress, and by Gomperz (in Appendix irr to his polemical pamphlet, Die Schrift vom Staatswesen der Athener, Pp. 45-48).
$\mu$ íब $\theta \omega \sigma \boldsymbol{}$ ] 'rent' (not 'wages'). Inf.
 $\delta \epsilon \delta \omega \kappa \epsilon$ т $\eta \boldsymbol{\nu} \mu i \sigma \theta \omega \sigma \nu$, and $43 \S 58$ (Lex) тovs $\mu \grave{\eta} \dot{\alpha} \pi \dot{\delta} i \delta \delta \nu \tau \alpha s \tau \grave{\alpha} \mu_{\mu} \sigma \theta \dot{\omega} \sigma \epsilon \epsilon s \tau \hat{\omega} \nu \tau \epsilon \mu \epsilon \nu \hat{\omega} \nu$.
 is not materially different in Pol. viii (v)
 and infrac. $291.9, \delta i^{\prime} \delta \lambda l \gamma \omega \nu \pi o t \eta \sigma^{\prime} \omega \nu \tau a l$ $\tau \grave{\eta} \nu \pi$ одıcelav, also Pol. $1318 b 34$, al $\tau \epsilon \gamma \dot{\alpha} \rho$



 brauch des $\left.A r ., \mathrm{p} .3^{8}\right)$.




Diod. Sic. i 79, 16 (of an Egyptian law-





SaveL $\sigma \mu \mathrm{ol} \kappa \tau \lambda$.] c. 4 ad fin., c. 9 § I
 Ant. Rom. iv 9, P. 658, 6 Reiske (of


 $\tau \hat{\omega} \nu \dot{U} \pi \sigma \chi \rho \epsilon \in \omega \dot{a} \pi \tilde{\eta} \gamma \sigma \nu \sigma \dot{\omega} \mu a \tau a$. The word סav $\epsilon \sigma \mu \mathrm{ds}$ occurs in Eth. if3i a 3, Plat. Rep. 473 E, Leg. $842 \mathrm{D}, 92 \mathrm{I}$ C.

тov ठіңцоv тробтáтทs] In Plut. Sol. ${ }^{13}$ ad fin., the oppressed citizens resolve
 the choice falls on Solon. The same term is applied infra c. 28 to Solon, Peisistratus, Cleisthenes, Xanthippus, Themistocles and Aristides, Ephialtes and Pericles, Cleon and Cleophon. According to Grote's definition, which is mainly applicable to a time later than that of Solon, the term 'denotes the leader of a popular party, as opposed to an oligarchical party (see Thuc. iii 70,82 , iv 66, vi 35 ) in a form of government either entirely democratical, or at least in which the public assembly is frequently convoked and decides on many matters of importance' (Hist. of Gr. vii p. 304 n). See Dr Hager's article in Smith's Dict. of $A n t$. ii 504 .
§ 3. oủठєvòs...凶்s єimetv] An example of the normal use of $\dot{\dot{\omega}} \mathrm{elmeiv}$, to modify a numerical exaggeration. To the passages quoted in my note on Dem. Lept. § 140 , the following may be added, from Aristotle's Politics. $\dot{\text { s el }}$ inciv is used with $\pi$ as in $1263 b_{4}, 1273{ }^{2} 17,1282 a_{5}$,




III 3 sid̀ $\beta l o v \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{W}, \mathrm{H}-\mathrm{L}\left(\mathrm{K}^{3}, \mathrm{~B}\right):$ ácl quondam K ．

1314a14， $1319 a 30,1323$ a 20， $1328 b$ 16；also with numbers in $1285 b 34 \sigma \chi \in \delta \partial \nu$


 єiтєєिय，in 1293b34，1299 a 25， 1310 a 37 ．
$\dot{\omega}$ s $e i \pi \epsilon i v$ is less frequently used to modi－ fy a strong metaphor or other emphatic phrase unconnected with number：1263



 d $\rho \chi$ al $\mu e ̀ \nu$ ỗv $\dot{\omega} s$ elieîy［bracketed by Susemihl，transferred after $\pi \eta \gamma$ al by


 $\dot{\omega} s \in i \pi \epsilon \hat{v}$ ．$\dot{\omega} s$ $\pi \hat{s}$ ， $1252 b 29$ ；also infra c． 57 § 1，and with $\pi \lambda \epsilon \hat{i} \sigma \tau \alpha$ in 49 § 5 ．It is quite un－ necessary to substitute it for $\dot{\omega} s \in l \pi \epsilon \hat{\epsilon} \boldsymbol{p}$ here．

## III．The Athenian Constitution before the time of Dracon．

According to the current account the title of king was abolished on the death of Codrus．His son Medon，and twelve successors，beginning with Acastus and ending with Alcmaeon，were archons for life．In the second year of Alcmaeon （ $75^{2}$ B．C．）the life archonships of the Medontidae were reduced to the duration of ten years．The names of seven decen－ nial archons have been preserved．In 712 B．C．，with this limitation in the tenure of the office，the archonship was thrown open to all the Eupatridae．Lastly，in the archonship of Creon（ 683 b．c．），or on the expiration of that of Eryxias（682， Duncker，Hist．of Greece，ii 135 E．T．），the single decennial archon was abolished， and his duties were distributed over nine officials who held office for a year only， and were elected by the Eupatridae out of their own body（Grote，H．G．，ii chap． 1o init．）．The legend that it was out of gratitude for the heroism of Codrus that the title of king was abolished has no earlier authority than that of Justin（ii 7 ）． It is not recognised by Plato or Aristotle， or by any early writer．Plato describes Codrus as meeting his doom in quest of glory and in the interests of the royal
status of his descendants，Symp． 208 D，
 Pol．viii（v） 10, p． 1310 b 37 ，implies that he was one of those who earned their royal power by their services to their
 $\lambda e v \epsilon(\nu)$ ．The life－archons were elected from the royal house，and bore the title of $\beta a \sigma \lambda \lambda e^{\prime} s$（Pausanias i 3 § 3）．This title was never formally abolished，but survived even in later times in the name
 of the office of life－archon is described by－ Pausanias，iv $5 \$$ ro，as a change $d y \tau l$
 planation of this phrase it has been sug－ gested that the life－archon was＇respon－ sible to the general body of the Eu－ patridae＇（See Archon，p． 166 a，in Smith＇s Dict．Ant．）；but it seems more probable that Pausanias used a phrase which was an obvious antithesis to an irresponsible monarchy without having any real knowledge of the nature of the responsibility attaching to the holder of a life－archonship（Busolt，i pp． 400 f）．－ Cf．Lugebil，fahrb．f．class．Philol．， suppl．Bd v 539－564．


 рєі̂бөai тойs ăрхоутаs， 1293 b 10 ，о́тои


 $=к а \tau^{2}$ à $\rho \in \tau \eta \nu 1273$ a 26 ．Isocr．Paneg．

 Andoc．de Pace 30，mo入hoùs＇A $\begin{aligned} & \text { qualwy }\end{aligned}$ $\dot{\alpha} \pi 0 \lambda \epsilon ́ \sigma a \nu \tau \epsilon s \dot{\alpha} \rho \iota \sigma \tau\langle\nu \delta \eta \nu$ каі $\tau \hat{\omega} \nu \quad \sigma \nu \mu \mu \dot{\alpha} \chi \omega \nu$, I should prefer to read apo $\eta \nu$ ，which is combined with dimo入入ưval in Plato Rep． 421 A．The adverb is defined by Timaeus
 Prof．Mayor adds to lexicons the following examples of $\dot{\alpha} \rho \iota \sigma \tau \ell \nu \delta \eta \nu$ ：＇Dem．p．1069， 7 ， Plut．Sol． 12 § 2，Lysand． 13 § 7 （where also $\pi \lambda o u \tau i \nu \delta \eta \nu$ ，as in Septem Sap．Conv． 11 pr．p．154）．Euseb．Ecl．Proph．iv 4 p．177，18．CIA i 61, App．Bell．Civ．i 35 ．
 has $\pi$ गourlyơ $\eta \nu$＇（Class．Rev．v 120）．

Sid ßlou］Pol． 1270 b 39， 1272 a 37， 1285 a 15 ；inf．at end of $\$ 6$ ．


 $a \rho \chi i ́ a ~ \delta \iota a ̀ ~ \tau o ̀ ~ \gamma \epsilon[\nu] \epsilon ́ \sigma \theta a \iota ~ \tau \iota \nu a ̀ s ~ \tau \omega ̂ \nu ~ \beta a \sigma \iota \lambda \epsilon ́ \omega \nu ~ \tau \grave{a} \pi о \lambda \epsilon \mu \iota \kappa \grave{a} \mu a \lambda[a-$




 $\rho \eta \sigma a ́ \nu \tau \omega \nu \tau \omega \hat{\nu} \mathrm{Ko} \mathrm{\delta}[\rho \iota \delta \hat{\omega} \nu]$, *ả $\nu \tau a \pi o \delta o \theta \epsilon \iota \sigma \hat{\omega} \nu \tau \hat{\omega}$ ả $\rho \chi о \nu \tau \iota \delta \omega \rho \epsilon \hat{\omega} \nu$.


#### Abstract

            $\Delta 0 \theta \varepsilon \operatorname{cc} \omega \mathrm{~N}$ ), quod litteris valde obscuris scriptum esse dicitur, scripserim aut avti-  tredecim spatium sufficit.


§ 2. $\pi 0 \lambda \epsilon \mu a \rho \chi^{[a]}$ This account of the original relation of the $\pi 0 \lambda \in \mu a \rho \chi o s$ to the $\beta a \sigma i \lambda \epsilon v^{\prime}$ is illustrated by the Schol. on Plat. Phaedr. 235 D , where the former is described as $\ddot{\omega} \sigma \pi \epsilon \rho$ 入oxayòs $\tau 0 \hat{v} \beta a \sigma \iota \lambda \epsilon \omega s$ (Wyse in Class. Rev. y 224). Similarly in certain semi-savage tribes the institution of a 'war-king' has grown up beside that of the regular hereditary monarch. Cf. Post, Bausteine, ii p. 84 .
$\mu a \lambda a k o v s]$ Heraclidis epitoma, Rose,



"I $\omega$ va] Ion, the son of Creusa, daughter of Erechtheus, was summoned to the aid of Athens against Eleusis and was entrusted with the conduct of the war. Hdt. viii ${ }_{44}$, Paus. vii 5 , 1 , and esp. i 31





 (Rose, Frag. $343^{2}=381^{3}$ ). This scholium may have been derived either from the present passage, or from another in
which Ion was mentioned near the beginning of the treatise.
te入єutaia-ápXovtos] It is uncertain whether the president of the board of nine magistrates bore the title of Archon before the time of Solon. Probably up to that time the members of the board were called $\pi \rho u \tau \dot{d} \dot{v} e l s$ and their president retained the ancient title of $\beta$ arciners. It was the $\beta$ acticus that presided over the archons when assembled as a judicial body (Busolt, i 408). On the other side, see Gilbert's Gr. St., i 117-118.
§ 3. MéSovtos] son of Codrus. 'Akáatov, successor of Medon (Busolt, i 403).
oupviovar] The oath of the archons is also mentioned in 7 § r and in 55 ad fin., but this particular clause is not cited elsewhere.
$\pi a p a x \omega p \eta \sigma \dot{d} \boldsymbol{v} \omega \omega v]$ For the constr. cf. Dem. P. $38,{ }^{24}, \dot{\alpha} \xi \omega \hat{i} \dot{\mu} \mu$ âs $\mu \grave{\eta}$, $\pi a \rho a \chi \omega \rho \epsilon \hat{\nu}$ $\tau \hat{\eta} \mathrm{s} \tau \mathrm{d} \xi \in \omega \mathrm{s}, \mathrm{p} .655,17, \pi$. $\tau \hat{\eta} \mathrm{s} \mathrm{a} \rho \chi \hat{\eta} \mathrm{s}$. For the sense, Pol. 1285 b 14, $\tau$ d̀ $\mu$ ìv aủt $\pi a \rho \iota \epsilon \nu \tau \omega \nu \tau \hat{\omega} \nu \beta a \sigma \iota \lambda \epsilon \omega \nu, \tau \grave{a} \delta_{\hat{\epsilon}} \tau \hat{\omega} \nu$

 тоîs $\beta a \sigma \iota \lambda \in \hat{\sigma} \tau \iota \mu \partial \nu 0 \nu$.













#### Abstract

          


sponding privileges being (at the same time) assigned to the archon.' divri $\tau \hat{\omega} \nu$ $\delta_{0} \theta \in \sigma \omega \bar{\omega}$, suggested by Mr Kenyon, is confessedly a somewhat remarkable expression, and is interpreted to mean 'in consideration of the privileges which were surrendered to the archon'; but this is hardly satisfactory in point of sense. What we expect is $\dot{\alpha} \nu \tau \tau \pi \dot{d} \lambda \omega \nu \delta o \theta \epsilon L \sigma \hat{\omega} \nu \tau \hat{\psi}$ ă $\rho \chi$ оуть $\delta \omega \rho є \hat{\omega} \nu$.

о́тотерws пот Exte] De Physica Aus-


入eî̀ (Index Ar.).
§ 4. $\theta \in \sigma \mu \circ 0$ étal, literally 'legislators,' from $\theta \varepsilon \sigma \mu_{0}$, the old term for $\nu \delta \mu o u$. The name was 'probably applied to them as the judges who determined the great variety of causes which did not fall under the cognizance of their colleagues; because, in the absence of a written code, those who declare and interpret the laws, may be properly said to make them, (Thirlwall, ii 17 ). According to the text, the object of their appointment was to secure that the enactments of the law should be publicly recorded and duly preserved, with a view to their being enforced against transgressors. In the absence of a code of law, such as Dracon afterwards gave to Athens, the $\theta \dot{\epsilon} \sigma \mu, a$ of the text were presumably 'judicial deci-
sions ' recorded as precedents for similar cases in the future. See also Holm, Gr. Gesch. i 516.

ávaypáчavets] not exactly to 'commit to writing' (Poste), but to engrave on a tablet and set up in a public place (this is the force of ${ }^{2} \nu a-$ ) ; in brief, 'to record publicly.'
80j] does not appear to refer to the immediately preceding clause, but to the beginning of the previous sentence. It was because the thesmothetae were not instituted until the time when magistrates were appointed annually that, unlike the three senior archons in former days, they never held office for more than a year.
§ 5. oûTo- $\mathrm{d} \lambda \lambda \hat{j} \lambda \omega \nu]$ 'Such then is the order of precedence which these magistrates have over one another in point of date,' i.e. (r) $\beta a \sigma \cdot \lambda \epsilon \nu s,(2) \pi 0 \lambda \epsilon \mu \alpha, \rho \chi o s$, (3) a $\alpha \chi \omega \nu$, (4) $\theta \in \sigma \mu \sigma \theta \dot{\tau} \tau a l$. $\mathbf{d} \lambda \lambda \dot{\eta} \lambda \omega \nu$ is somewhat loosely used.
 reference to the lexicographical articles quoted above, in the Testimoonia, it was remarked by Schömann (Ant. Gr. p. 412 E. T.) that ' before the time of Solon, as we are assured by evidence which, it must be admitted, is exceedingly apocryphal in character, the nine Archons were not permitted to sit in judgment all to-

#  



25 Boykoגion（K，н－L，в）：ßouко入єion K－w．


#### Abstract

      et Mathiae）$\tau o u ̀ s$ duviotkous．


gether．They were，however，equally precluded from doing this in the times better known to us，and the statement must therefore be based on some kind of misapprehension．＇It was also noticed that，before the time of Solon，the archon could not have had his official residence
 $\dot{\epsilon} \pi \dot{\prime} \dot{\nu} u \mu 0$, or national heroes that gave their names to the ten Attic tribes，could not have existed before the institution of those tribes by Cleisthenes（ 508 b．c．）． Hence it was inferred by K．F．Her－ mann（Gr．Staatsalt．，p．407，note 14） that the information referred to the post－ Solonian time．But at that time the official residence of the Arcbon－Basileus was the Stoa Basileios，not the Basi－ leion．Accordingly it was suggested by Wecklein（Monatsber．der München．Akad．， $1873,5 \cdot 3^{8}$ ）that the Basileion，which he supposed was the residence of the $\phi u$ ho－ $\beta a \sigma i \lambda \epsilon i s$ ，had been confounded with that of the Archon－Basileus．

We now see that the main source of the information，so far as it is correct，was the present passage．The information really refers to the time before Solon； but the lexicographers commit an ana－ chronism，for which they are themselves responsible，in placing the office of the archon near the Eponypri，instead of in the Prytaneum，in the neighbourhood of which the statues of the Eponymi were afterwards set up．

Bovko入etov］We are here told that the official residence of the Archon－Basileus was the building which，in the time of the writer，was called the $\beta$ ouкo入eiov．This explains the otherwise obscure passage quoted in Athenaens， p ． 235 ，from the law relating to the Archon－Basileus：rous

 In Telfy＇s Corpus Iuris Attici $\$ 358$ the
 strangely rendered absque dolo．It is now，however，clear that they must refer to the residence of the Archon－Basileus
and are used in the same sense as $\boldsymbol{\epsilon} \kappa \boldsymbol{\tau} \boldsymbol{v} \hat{v}$ ßouko八elou，which was perhaps the original reading．

The $\beta$ ouкo入єôo is possibly connected with the $\beta$ ou Síytov，or field of sacred ox－ ploughing，described by Plutarch（Con－ iugalia Praccepta，xlii）as below the

 Boušúvov（Miss Harrison，Mythology and Monuments of Ancient Athens，p．166）． It has been suggested that a black－figured vase－painting on a hydria in the Berlin Museum，where an ox is standing within a small Doric shrine，not bound as for sacrifice，but free and stately，is a repre－ sentation of the sacred ox in his $\beta$ ovкo－ $\lambda \epsilon i o v$, whether it be the building below the Acropolis or some other shrine of Zev＇s Пo＾etés（ib．p．428）．It is more probable，however，that the $\beta$ ouko八eion was connected with the worship of Dionysus，who was often represented in the form of an ox（cf．Eur．Bacchae，100， 920－922，1017， 15 59）．There was a play of Cratinus called the Boukbrot， which began with a dithyramb，and it has been inferred from Aristoph．Vesp．
 fov，that the votaries of the Thracian Dionysus，$\dot{o}$ тaup $\delta \mu$ opфos，were called Bouxbえoc（O．Crusius，in Philologus，xlvii 34）．It will be observed that in the text the $\beta$ ouko八eioy is mentioned in connexion with Dionysus．Curtins is content to regard it as having been in primitive times a royal farmhouse，including a slaughter－house for the royal sacrifices （Stadtgeschichte von Athen，1891，p．51）．

трvтave［ov］The position of the Pry． taneion is disputed，and it is sometimes supposed that there was more than one building of the name．Pausanias tells us （i $18 \$ 3$ ）that near the Agrauleion is＇the Prytaneion，in which are inscribed the laws of Solon．＇By this is probably meant the original Prytaneion，the centre of the ancient city and the site of the hearth of the state．This Prytaneion was probably






 $29 \pi о \lambda \epsilon \mu \alpha \rho[\chi \omega \hat{\omega}]$ н-L, invita papyro.


a little to the east of the ground beneath the northern, or north-eastern, cliff of the Acropolis, somewhat high up the slope (Miss Harrison, l. c., p. 165). Before reaching it Pausanias had seen (i 5 § I) the statues of the $\epsilon \pi \dot{\epsilon} \nu v \mu 0$ 'above the Bouleuterion' or Council Chamber of the Five Hundred. Near the latter he sees
 Prytanes offer sacrifice.' It was apparently for this reason that the Oblos was sometimes called the $\pi \rho \nu \tau a \nu \epsilon \hat{o} v$, e.g. in Schol. on Aristoph. Pax 1183 , т $6 \pi$ os

 (ib. p. 17 I note 106). Curtius places the original Prytaneion in the Old Agora which, according to his view, was S. of the Acropolis; he recognises a second Prytancion in the Thalos situated in the Agora of the Cerameicus; while he regards the Prytaneion of Pausanias, on the northern slope of the Acropolis, as a building belonging to Roman times (Stadtgeschichte, p. 302). Wachsmuth (Stadt Athen, i 465) accepts the Prytaneion of Pausanias as the original building and regards the Tholos in the Cerameicus as a 'dépendance' in which the Prytanes had their public meals in the democratic days of Athens. Round the original Prytaneion rose the official residences of an earlier age. First among these was the $\beta a \sigma l \lambda e t o \nu$, or official residence of the kings, which may be identified with the building in which the four $\phi \cup \lambda o \beta a \sigma$ ı $\lambda \in i \hat{s}$ performed their religious
 $\pi \alpha \rho \dot{\alpha} \tau \dot{\delta} \beta$ оиколє $\epsilon \stackrel{\nu}{\nu}$ ) and with the residence of the Archon-Basileus (Wachsmuth, p. 468). See also Busolt, i 407 note 4 .

そit кal-yápos] Either on the second day of the Anthesteria at the beginning of March, or at the Greater Dionysia at the end of that month, there was a procession representing the entry of Dionysus 'Eגevépeis 'from without the city into
the little temple of the Cerameicus,' 'and his incorporation into the city by union with the noblest woman of the land, the wife of the king.' On this occasion the Basilinna was accompanied by fourteen venerable priestesses, and was solemnly and secretly betrothed to the god. In the temple in Limnae she administered a vow to the priestesses, offered a mystic sacrifice, wherein she prayed for all blessings for the state, and then remained for the night in the interior of the temple. Cf. [Dem.]c. Neaeram, $\$ \S 74-78$, and Mommsen's Heortologie, pp. 358-360, quoted by Mr Purser on Dionysia in Smith, Dict. Ant. i $6_{39} a$. The passage in the $c$. Neae$\mathrm{ram} \S 76$ speaks of the law relating to the $\beta a \sigma \cap \iota \nu \nu a$ as inscribed on a tablet in the temple of Dionysus $\epsilon \nu \mathrm{M} / \mu \nu a t s$ opened only once a year on the second day of the $A n$ thesteria. It also describes her as $\tau \grave{\eta} \nu \theta \epsilon \hat{\psi}$ रuvaîka סo $\begin{aligned} & \eta \sigma о \mu \ell \nu \eta \nu \text {, but says nothing of }\end{aligned}$ ber spending the night in the temple.
 scribes the official residence of the Polemarch as $\epsilon \nu$ Avкєi $\varphi$, and accordingly it is generally held that 'the Polemarch had his office outside the walls, but quite close to the city, beside the Lyceum, a shrine consecrated to Apollo and frequently mentioned on account of a gymnasium existing there' (Schömann, Antiquities, P. 412 E. T.; see also Curtius, Stadtgeschichte, p. 58). The office was doubtless $\dot{\epsilon} \pi i$ Aukel $\psi$ (not $\dot{\varepsilon} \nu \Lambda \nu \kappa \in(\psi)$, and this is what is meant by the name ' $\mathrm{E} \pi \iota \lambda u{ }^{\prime} \kappa \epsilon<\nu$. This is far more probable than the story about the 'polemarch Epilycus,' which is justly rejected by Mr Kenyon.
$\theta \in \sigma \mu 0 \theta$ erє $\hat{0} \mathrm{ov}]$ Suidas, s. v. á $\rho \chi \omega \nu$, on the authority doubtless of the present passage, says that the $\theta_{\epsilon \sigma \mu} \mu \theta \epsilon \tau a \iota$ held their court $\pi$ apà $\tau \dot{\partial} \theta \epsilon \sigma \mu 0 \theta \dot{\epsilon} \sigma \iota 0 \nu$ (Bekker, Anecd. 449, $\left.{ }^{23}, \pi \alpha \rho \dot{\alpha} \tau \delta \partial \epsilon \sigma \mu 0 \theta \epsilon \sigma \iota \nu\right)$. Cf. Hyperides, $E u x$. xxii, $\theta \epsilon \sigma \mu 0 \theta \epsilon \tau \omega ิ \nu \sigma v \nu \epsilon \bar{\rho} เ \boldsymbol{\nu}$. It was there also that they dined at the public expense: Schol. Plato, Phaedr. 235 D ,





 тои̂vтo, $\theta \epsilon \mu i \sigma \tau \iota o \nu$ (leg. $\theta \in \sigma \mu 0 \theta \in \operatorname{colov}$ vel $\theta \in \sigma \mu о \theta \in \tau \in \hat{L} 0 \nu)$ Éка入єíto. Its position is unknown, but it was not improbably near the $\pi \rho u \tau a v e \hat{c} 0$, , though there is nothing to prevent its being placed in the dizopd, as (from the very first) the $\theta \in \sigma \mu 0-$ $\theta$ etral had judicial duties to discharge. Köhler conjectures that it was near the Bovieuryptov, but the evidence for this is inconclusive (Wachsmuth, l. c. i p. 4823, ii 353-4).
 Laert. i 58 (of Solon), kal $\pi \rho \hat{\omega}$ тоs $\tau \grave{\eta} \nu$

 $\delta \in \nu \tau \epsilon \rho \psi \pi \epsilon \rho l \nu \rho \mu 0 \theta \epsilon \tau \omega \hat{\omega}$. The text confirms the conjecture of Schömann (Ant., p. 412 E. T.) that the 'Thesmothesium' was used by the whole board of the nine archons. It also favours the view that as early as the time of Solon all the nine archons were called Thesmothetae (K. F. Hermann, Staatsalt. § 138 , n. 3, and Bergk in Rheinisches Museum xiii 449, quoted by Wachsmuth, l. c., ii 354).
av̉тоте入єîs крivetv] c. 53 § 2.
крivelv...тpoavakpivelv] Pol. 1298 a


 троауакрірєاข, $\delta \nu \pi \epsilon \rho \dot{\eta}$ тєлєuтаia $\delta \eta$ -

 gested by Suidas).- 'In the later and better-known times of Athenian law, we find these archons deprived in great measure of their powers of judging and deciding and restricted to the task of first hearing the parties and collecting the evidence; next, of introducing the matter for trial into the appropriate dikastery, over which they presided' (Grote, H. G. chap. то, ii 283 ed. 1862).
 first establishment of the senate of Areopagus is sometimes ascribed to Solon. Thus Plutarch, Sol. 19 init., says of Solon

 Pol. ii $121274 a$, it is stated that the Council of the Areopagus was already

 $\lambda \grave{\eta} \nu \kappa a i \tau \dot{\eta} \nu \tau \hat{\omega} \nu \dot{\alpha} \rho \chi \omega \hat{\omega} \nu a i \rho \in \sigma t \nu$. On the other hand, Cicero, de Off. i 22 § 75, speaks of it as the senatus, qui a Solone erat constitutus; and Pollux, viii ${ }^{2} 25$, describes it as established by Solon as a tribunal of homicide, in addition to that of the Ephetae. 'But there can be little doubt' says Grote, ii p. 28I, 'that this is a mistake, and that the senate of Areopagus is a primordial institution, of immemorial antiquity, though its constitution as well as its functions underwent many changes. It stood at first alone as a permanent and collegiate authority, originally by the side of the Kings and afterwards by the side of the archons. It would then of course be known by the title of The Boulê-The senate or council; its distinctive title, "Senate of Areopagus" (borrowed from the place where its sittings were held), would not be bestowed until the formation by Solon of the second senate or council, from which there was need to discriminate it.' The Areopagus appears to represent the Homeric $\beta$ ouǹे $\gamma \in \rho \rho_{0} \boldsymbol{\tau} \boldsymbol{\omega} \boldsymbol{\nu}$ (Meier and Schömann p. 10), and is probably as early as the time of the Attic kings; but, if so, its number must have been very limited. By modern writers its number is sometimes supposed to have been either 300 (Schömann, Jahrb. f. $k l$. Philol. 1875, p. I 54, Hermann, Staatsalt. § 102, 17, Lange, Ephet. u. Areop. P. ${ }^{27}$, Duncker, Gesch. des Alterth. v $473=H . G$. ii 141 E. T.); or 360 , representing the $3^{60} \gamma^{\epsilon} \nu \eta$ (Philippi, Areop. u. Epheten, p. 206); or 60 , i.e. 15 nominated by each of the four tribes, and including the 9 archons, the remaining 51 being those known as the Ephetae (Busolt, i 4 18). As soon as it became customary for the archons to be added to the Areopagus at the end of their year of office, the number would cease to be fixed; but we do not know at what time this method of recruiting the Areopagus was first adopted. Mr Kenyon suggests that 'the automatic process of forming it from all ex-archons was probably put into operation from the date of the establishment of the annual archonship.'
 Grote's statement that 'the functions of



 $\nu \eta \kappa \epsilon$ Sıà ßiov кaì עv̂v.



36 кal ко入ḑováa kal delet Gennadios ( $\mathrm{H}-\mathrm{L}$ ). ante $\dot{\eta} \gamma \dot{\alpha} \rho$ aliquid excidisse putat Keil.
$37 \gamma$ àp $: \delta \not ̇$ mavult Gennadios,
the Areopagus were originally of the widest senatorial character, directive generally as well as judicial.' With the context, cf. Isocr. Areop. § 37, тì $\boldsymbol{\epsilon} \xi$












סьarทpeiv тò̀s vómous] Aeschin. 3 § 6,
广єтац каl $\grave{\eta}$ ठ $\eta \mu$ ократla.
yà ] The Areopagus was entrusted with all these powers, because it consisted of archons who had themselves been elected under special qualifications of birth and wealth.

The constitution of the Areopagus is the subject of a fragment of Philochorus (frag. 58 in Müller's Frag. Hist. Gr., i






 cation of the Ephetae and the Areopagus).
 रov $\beta$ ov $\lambda \dot{\eta} \nu \quad \tau \epsilon \lambda \epsilon \hat{\nu} \cdot \dot{\alpha} \lambda \lambda$ ' ol $\pi a \rho$ ' 'A $\theta \eta \nu a l o t s$



$\left.\delta \mathbf{L}^{\circ}-\mathrm{kal} \nu \mathrm{v} v\right]$ ' This is also the reason why it is the only office which has continued to be held for life down to the present day.' For $\delta \mathbf{L d}$ ßlov, cf. 2 § I.

## IV. The Draconian Constitution.

 Ar. de Gen. Anim. ii 6, 743 b $20-25$,






Xpóvov- $\delta\llcorner\in \lambda \theta$ óvtos] A vague note of time, the event from which the writer reckons being apparently the affair of Cylon and its more immediate consequences (c. 1).
'Aplotalхиоv dpxovtos] The name of this archon ('Aplatacरuos) is now known for the first time. It follows that
 the year, as has been sometimes supposed (e.g. Busolt, i 510 ). Cf. Pausanias, ix 36



 plas $\mu 0<\chi$ ov̂. It may fairly be assumed that he was one of the $\theta \epsilon \sigma \mu \circ \theta \in \tau a \zeta$, in the narrower sense of the term. Hence Grote is right in describing him as 'the thesmothet Drako.' His legislation may be assigned to в.c. 621 (Clinton's Fasti, sub anno; Busolt, i 5 10).
 view that he was one of the $\theta \epsilon \sigma \mu 0 \theta \varepsilon \tau a c$ at the time. $\theta \in \sigma \mu o l$ was the term generally applied to the laws of Dracon: Andocides,
 kal toîs $\Delta$ pakovtos $\theta \epsilon \sigma \mu o i ̂ s$. But even the laws of Solon were by himself called $\theta \in \sigma$ $\mu \mathrm{ol}$. Plutarch, Sol. 19, quotes from one
 and the word occurs in his own poems
 same ancient term was preserved in the oath of the $\pi \epsilon \rho / \pi 0 \lambda 0$ in Pollux viii ro6,
 which in later Greek would have been expressed тoîs vópois roîs кєч $\mu$ bous (cf. Grote, c. ro, ii p. 283 , note).
 $\tau \mathrm{d} \xi \iota s$, or constitution, with the $\theta \in \sigma \mu 0 \ell$, or

## 

legislation, is inconsistent with the distinction drawn by Aristotle in Pol. 1289 a 15 ;


 גрхоутаs ápXec $\kappa \tau \lambda$. Cf. also 1286 a 3 . This distinction is maintained in cc. 7 and 9 , but not in c. 34. The term $\theta \epsilon \sigma \mu \mathrm{ol}$ has a distinctive meaning and can only refer to a code, not to a constitution (Class. Rev. v 167 a).
Dracon has hitherto been recognised as a legislator alone. There is a well-known passage respecting him in Ar. Pol. ii 12,

 $\kappa \tau \lambda$. This passage, which describes Dracon as adapting his laws to a constitution already in existence, is inconsistent with the present chapter, which almost ignores the legislation of Dracon and represents him as the framer of a constitution.

The passage in question comes from a chapter which, in the opinion of Zeller, Susemihl and other Aristotelian scholars, has suffered from considerable interpolation. Thus Mr W. L. Newman conjectures 'that Aristotle may have left only the fragment about Solon and a few rough data for insertion after the notice of the Carthaginian constitution, and that some member of the school, not very long after his death, completed them as best he could ' (Newman's ed. ii 373, 377). Accordingly it is possible that the passage about Dracon in the Politics was not written by Aristotle himself.

In Rhet. ii 23 § 29, $1400{ }^{\text {b }}$ 21, Ar. quotes Herodicus (the physician) as saying of

 the actual legislation of Dracon little is known, since his laws (with the exception of those on homicide) were repealed by Solon (c. $7 \S$ I $\pi \lambda \dot{\eta} \nu \tau \hat{\omega} \nu \phi o \nu c \kappa \omega \nu \nu$ and Plut. Sol. it there quoted). This is possibly a sufficient reason for the absence of any reference to it in the constitutional part of this treatise, except in the words
 sufficiently described in the second part of the work, in the account of the procedure in cases of homicide (c. 57).
According to the text the main points in the constitution of Dracon's time are ( 1 ) a hoplitic franchise, already in existence; (2) those who had this franchise elected the Archons, the Tamiae, the Strategi, the Hipparchi and the Prytanes (unless, indeed, these are identical with
the Archons) from among thase who were duly qualified by a property-qualification. (3) A Council of 40 I , elected by lot from among those who had the franchise, and were over 30 years of age. The same limitation held good for other offices filled by casting lots, and no one was to hold office twice till every one else had had his turn. (4) Members of the Council were fined for not attending meetings of the Council or Assembly, and the fine varied with their status.

This 'Draconian constitution' has, not unnaturally, been viewed with suspicion. It tells us of a Council of 401, of which we never hear elsewhere, and (which is more serious) of certain property-qualifications which have hitherto been regarded as part of the subsequent legislation of Solon, and which the author himself minutely describes in connexion with Solon (c. 7). A writer in the Athenaeum, 1891, p. $435 b$, denounces it as 'the amazing Draconian constitution.' It has also heen attacked by Weil (Fournal des Savants, Avril, 1891), and Cauer; also by Mr Macan in the Fourn. of Hellenic Studies, April, 1891, Pp. 24, 27, and in detail by Mr J. W. Headlam in an article in the Class. Rev., v 166 - 168 ; followed by valuable criticisms by Mr E. S. Thompson, ib. p. 336, and by M. Théodore Reinach in the Revue Critique, p. 143-5.

Mr Headlam's main points are these: (1) No other writer knows anything of a constitution attributed to Dracon. Plutarch, when speaking of the $\theta \epsilon \sigma \mu 0 \mathrm{o}$ of Dracon, mentions nothing but a code of law. (2) Other passages in the $\pi$ odictio itself support the view taken by Plutarch and in the Politics. (a) In chap. vii the writer speaks of the $\theta \epsilon \sigma \mu 0 l$ of Dracon in comnexion with the new code of laws made by Solon, but makes no reference to Dracon in speaking of the constitutional innovations of Solon. (b) The recapitulation in c. 4 r states that the characteristic feature of Dracon's legislation was the publication of the law. This is inconsistent with chap. 4 and its very remarkable constitution. (3) Among the provisions of the constitution at least one could not possibly have been devised in Dracon's time, the property-qualification for the archonship being expressed in terms of money that probably belong to a later age; nearly all of them are very difficult to reconcile with what we know of the state of Athens at the time; and several of them inconsistent with other




IV 4 aYt' ( $=\alpha u \tau \eta s$ ) : correxit $\mathrm{K} . \quad \mu \dot{\text { èv }} \boldsymbol{\nu}$ per compendium, ut videtur, scriptum ( K -w, $\mathrm{K}^{3}, \mathrm{~B}$ ): mihi quidem $\Delta^{\prime}$ ( $\delta \dot{\epsilon}$ ) potins quam $\mathrm{M}^{\prime}(\mu \dot{\epsilon} \nu)$ videtur scriptum: om. H-L.
 Weil (fournal des Savants, p. 10) ; 'maiorem censum nemo non expectet' H-L.
statements in this book. (4) None of the provisions, some of them very remarkable, are ever quoted by later writers. (5) The whole constitution is exactly like those afterwards described in connexion with the aristocratic revolutions in 411 . The details connected with the above criticism will be noticed as they occur in the following notes.

Dr P. Meyer (Des Aristoteles Politik
 regards the passage in the Politics and the present chapter as, both of them, equally gennine, and vainly endeavours to reconcile the two. He holds that the
'Draconian constitution' does not differ materially from the constitution which preceded it, the d $\rho$ pala modırtla of c. 3. If so, the writer of the present chapter has not succeeded in making the points of resemblance clear. The 'Draconian constitution' is defended with greater success by Prof. Gomperz (Die Schrift vom Staatswesen der Athener, P. 43). He holds that, in distributing the citizens of Attica into four classes, Solon availed himself of existing social divisions, and gave them a new definition. This may hold good in the case of the $l \pi \pi \epsilon i s$, the $\zeta \in v \gamma \hat{\tau} \alpha \iota$ and the $\theta \hat{\eta} \tau \epsilon s$. But it is difficult to accept it in the case of the $\pi \in \nu \tau а к о \sigma t о-$ $\mu$ Eji $\mu \nu 0$ o. The term is used without any explanation in the present chapter; but, in the description of Solon's constitution, it is defined with precision as though it were then used for the first time. One would be glad to believe with Mr Kenyon, in his note on this chapter, p. 13 ed. 3 , that 'a sober historical judgment will probably in the end find its statements not so startling as they at first appear'; but at present the contents of the greater part of the chapter seem to require the most careful scrutiny before they can be finally accepted.
Considerations in favour of the account are urged by Busolt, in Philol. 1891, vol. 50, pp. 393-400. He points out that the Psendoplatonic $A x i o c h u s$, which has several points of contact with this treatise (cf. c. 18 § $1,34 \S 1,42 \S 2$ ), uses the phrase
 (p. 365). While admitting the coincidences with the oligarchical constitutions of 411 , he holds that the oligarchs professed to aim at the restoration of the $\pi \dot{\alpha} \tau \rho 0 \mathrm{os}$ modectia, which may fairly be identified with the pre-Solonian constitution. (i) The term $\pi \in \nu \tau \alpha \kappa о \sigma \iota \rho \mu \varepsilon \delta ц \mu \nu 0 s$ must originally have referred to measures of corn: Solon extended its meaning to measures of wine and oil, and gave it a different value by changing the standard. (2) Fines in money may have been exacted by the State at a time when private transactions were settled by the transfer of oxen. (3) We know little of the early history of the $\sigma \tau \rho a \tau \eta \gamma{ }^{2}$, but it is possible that the fears inspired by the affair of Cylon may have led the aristocracy to limit the authority of the polemarch by means of four $\sigma \tau \rho a \tau \eta \gamma o i$ appointed from the wealthier class.

а่ $\pi \epsilon \delta \in \delta о т о ~ к \tau \lambda$.$] not \alpha \pi \epsilon \delta \dot{\theta} \theta \eta$. The tense implies that the franchise had already been given and that this was not part of the alleged constitution of Dracon. This point is brought out by Mr Poste who translates: 'Sovereign power was already wielded by the class of persons capable of providing its own equipment for war.' He adds in a note: 'This agrees with the statement of Aristotle, Pol. ii 12, thiat Prakon made no change in the constituton. The revolution had already taken place. Drakon's task was to adjust the laws to the changed centre of political power.' Mr Kenyon's rendering is here less exact: 'The franchise was given \&c.' (see, however, Class. Rev. v 467 b).-The same kind of franchise is to be found in the constitution proposed by the party of Theramenes in 4 rI , c. 33 at end, Thuc. viii 97 , and Xen. Hell. ii 3 (Class. Rev. v 68 a).
$\delta \in \kappa a, \mu \nu \omega \nu]$ We have to notice ( I ) the nature, no less than (2) the amount of the property-qualification required of archons.
(I) At this time property was reckoned not in money but in corn. Now, the qualification of a 乡 $\epsilon \gamma i \tau \eta$ was to possess land capable of producing $200 \mu \dot{e} \delta \dot{\delta} \mu \boldsymbol{L}: ~ a$





 Dobr．Adv．in Thuc．ii 13 ：eגàtrov＇${ }^{2}$ lim K．
 mulabat Marindin（Smith，Dict．Ant．ii 1071 $b$ ）．$\vec{\eta}$ delet Thompson，utpote ex numerali


 van Leeuwen（edd．），quod et in papyro scriptum et unice verum est，cf．［Dem．］ 25


$\mu$ k햐 $\mu \nu \mathrm{vos}$ of corn was worth at this time about a drachma（Plut．Sol．23）．Land of this extent must thus have been worth not less than 2000 drachmas．According to this，men were eligible to the archon－ ship who were excluded by Solon from all office（Class．Rev．v 167 b）．
（2）In the constitution described in c ． 29，the archons and prytanes alone were to eceive pay， 2 obols a day，implying tha no high property－qualification was req red．The comparatively high quali－ fica fon for the generals， 100 minae（if the text is sound），would be natural in 4 II but not in 621 （ $i b .168 a$ ）．
申usolt，however，points out that the tw中 qualifications of roo and of ro minae respectively correspond to the relative valpues of gold and silver in ancient times， 10：1．He supposes that a piece of land valued at 1000 Aeginetan drachmae might
produce a return of $120-130$ Aeginetan
or 166 － 180 Attic drachmae；and if we assume that in those early days，when molney was scarcer than in Solon＇s time， a n pedimnus was worth only 2 to 3 Aegi－ net an obols，the yearly produce would be from 360 （or 390 ）to 250 medimni．This wo uld correspond to the census of a $l \pi \pi \in \dot{\text { i }}$ und der the Solonian constitution（Philol． 18．p1，Pp．393－400）．
．6．Enevetpav，＇unencumbered．＇Isaeus
 trasted with $\dot{\cup} \pi$ óxpews．Dem． 35 § 21 ，

 ter berger，Sylloge，no．344，38；294，10； 124 ，20，28．Cf．c．${ }^{12,} 34$.

8．orparクyovs］It is urged by Mr H\＆adlam that（a）We have no other record of $\sigma \tau \rho a \tau \eta \gamma$ ol at this time：in the list in c． vil § 3 they are not mentioned．（b）The clause about their children is entirely
new．（c）If there were such officers， they held an inferior position，and the comparatively high property－qualifica－ tion is unaccountable（Class．Rev． 167 b）． Qualifications of a similar character may， however，be noticed at a much later date， in Deinarchus，contr．Dem．，$\S 71$ ，tous



 $\sigma \theta a \iota$, пáбas тàs дıкаlаs $\pi l \sigma \tau \epsilon t s$ тараката－
 Mou．

סıfyyväの日aı］If this is the right read－ ing，it must presumably be rendered ＇should have security given on their be－ half．＇The accepted meaning of the word in the passive is＇to be bailed＇by any one，e．g．Thuc．iii 70, bктакобi $\omega \nu \tau a \lambda \alpha \nu \tau \omega \nu$ тoís $\pi \rho \circ \xi$ g̀vots $\delta \iota \eta \gamma \gamma u \eta \mu \notin \nu$ ou．
tov̀s mputávess］Here mentioned for the first time，whereas the form of the sentence（so far as the text is sound）im－ plies they have already been referred to． If so，they must either be included among

 the latter alternative，it is probable that up to the time of Solon the archons were called $\pi$ purdéces．This is inferred by Busolt，i 408 ，from the term for court－ fees，$\pi \rho u \tau a v e \hat{a} a$ ，which cannot be ex－ plained with the help of anything in the post－Solonian constitution，and from the analogy of Greek states in Asia，where the king was succeeded by a $\pi p$ úrauts． It will be remembered that the official residence of the Archon was the $\pi p u$－ тaveioy，c．3．§ 5．This appears better than identifying them with＇the presi－ dent of the Council and Assembly in later days．＇






 Rutherford，itcxomenoyc fortasse volebat corrector；idem conicit Blass qui in ectypo $\pi \epsilon$（supra scr．oy $=0$ ỗ $\pi \epsilon \rho$ ）ХOMENOYC in $\Pi \subset X O M \in N O Y C$ correctum agnos cit． 15 трідкол $\theta \in$ тн．
$16 \pi \epsilon p \iota \epsilon \lambda \epsilon \epsilon \hat{\nu} \mathrm{~K}^{1}$ ．Expectares potius aut $\epsilon i s \pi d \nu \tau a s \pi \epsilon p<\epsilon \lambda$－



 malui：praestaret $\delta \iota \epsilon \xi \in \lambda \theta \epsilon \hat{\imath} \nu\left(\mathrm{K}-\mathrm{w}^{2}\right)$ ，sed spatium non sufficit．
$\mu '$＇xpt єvi日vvشิy］＇until the audit．＇At Athens，according to the evidence of later times，all officials were $\dot{u} \pi \epsilon \dot{v} \theta v o l$.

 $\pi \rho \circ \sigma \in \lambda \eta \lambda \nu \theta \delta \tau \omega \nu$.
тарабхоц́́vovs］Often used in middle
 $\pi \lambda \hat{\eta} \theta 0 \mathrm{~s} \mu a \rho r i \rho \omega \nu$, and Ant． $5 \$ 20,22$ ， ${ }^{24}, 28,30, \&$ c．Cf．Aeschin．c．Ctes． 199 ， $\sigma v y \eta \gamma \dot{d} \rho o u s$ mapa $\sigma \chi$ दो $\sigma \theta a$ ．The usual verb
 $39,40,55$ ，and esp． 144 ，ôs àv É $\gamma \gamma \nu \eta \tau \dot{d} s$

§ 3．Bouncúctv］This is the only men－ tion of a Draconian council of 401．In c． 8 we are told of Solon $\beta o u \lambda \grave{\eta} \nu \delta \dot{\varepsilon} \epsilon \pi \mathrm{~mol}$－ $\eta \sigma \epsilon \tau \epsilon \tau \rho a к о \sigma l o u s$, i．e．＇he set up a council of 400．＇Had the writer already men－ tioned a council of 4 or he would prob－ ably have expressed himself differently in c．8．The addition of the＇one＇is a common device to prevent the votes being exactly equal．But it is a device mainly characteristic of later times，e．g． the fixafrípta consisting of 501，or 1001， duraotal．On the other hand，we have the 51 Ephetae who are generally ascribed to the time of Dracon．

$\kappa \lambda \eta \rho o v ิ \sigma \theta a L]$ the first mention of elec－ tion by lot in this treatise．Hitherto，it has been generally agreed that，even in Solon＇s time，the Council was not ap－ pointed by lot，and this view is accepted by Thirlwall，Grote，Schömann（Antiq． p． $33^{1}$ E．T．），and others．The introduc－ tion of the lot for this purpose has been usually ascribed to the time of Cleisthenes （ 508 b．c．）．But the present passage im－ plies that the use of the lot was as early as the time of Dracon．This，if true，sup－
ports the opinion of Fustel de Coulanges （la Cité Antique，p．2r2－4，ed．18\＄3）， that the lot is an institution of religious origin and therefore of great antiquity． See Mr J．W．Headlam＇s Election by Lot at Athens，esp．pp．183－，and note on c． 8 § 1 infra．

Tds addas dpxds，exclusive of the Archons，Strategi and Hipparchi，alt ${ }_{h}$ idy mentioned，but probably not excluut i of


три́коита $\ell \tau T]$ This is the age at which an Athenian citizen could become a $\beta$ ou入єut ${ }^{2} \mathrm{~s}$（Xen．Meni．i 2 § 35）or a $\delta_{i k a \sigma \tau \eta \dot{s}}$（c． 63 §3，cf．document quoted in Dem．Timocr．151，and Pollux，viii $\mathrm{r}_{2} 2$ ）． It has already been inferred（Meier and Schömann，Att．Proc．，p． 240 Lipsius） that the same requirement of age beld good for other officials，the äג ac dplual of the text．（The Ephetae and the pubilic Envoys were，however，required to be 50 years of age ；the Diaetetae 59．）




 in general we read in Dem．Timocr． 150 （document quoted as ópкos $\dot{\eta} \lambda(a \sigma \tau \hat{\omega} \nu$ ）o中 $\downarrow \tau \epsilon$

 avtê．The same citizen could be a $\beta$ pu－ גevtìs more than once，as is shewn by the case of Timarchus and that of De－ mosthenes（adv．Mid．I 14 and Aeschin．， F．L． 17 ）；and is stated in c． 62 ad $7 n$ ． It is doubted by Boeckh（Staatsh．ii $7 \sigma_{3}$ ） whether the same citizen could be a $\beta$ ov－ $\lambda \in u \tau \dot{\eta} s$ for two years in succession，blut this is purely conjectural（Hermannt＇s



18 ёк入limot h－L．
 $\pi \rho u \tau \dot{\partial} \nu \in \omega \nu$ was not allowed to hold that office more than once（c． 44 § ）．
The rotation of all in office was a well－ known device of later times（cf．Headlam＇s Election by Lot，p．88）：but it may well be asked how far it was applicable to a large body of citizens，most of whom lived at a considerable distance from Athens．It was in fact the work of a de－ veloped democracy（Class．Rev．v 168 a）．









 $\hat{a}^{\alpha} \nu \delta \iota \epsilon \lambda \theta \eta \delta \iota \dot{\alpha} \pi \dot{a} \nu \tau \omega \nu \tau \hat{\omega} \nu \pi 0 \lambda \iota \tau \hat{\omega} \nu$ $\kappa \tau \lambda$ ．）．It is characteristic of the oli－


 It would，however，be more natural to
 $\dot{a} \rho \chi \dot{\eta} \nu$ ），as in Pol． $1273{ }^{b}{ }_{17}$ ，$\delta \dot{d} \dot{d} \pi \dot{\alpha} \nu \tau \omega \nu$
 the passages quoted in last note．

For $\bar{\xi} \epsilon \lambda \theta \in \mathbb{i} \nu$ ex urna（van Leeuwen）cf． Horace＇s sors exitura，but this use of ${ }^{\boldsymbol{\xi}} ⿱ ⺊ 口$－ $\varepsilon \lambda \theta \epsilon \hat{i}$ is doubtful．In Pol．ii if， $1273{ }^{a}$ 16，the word is applied otherwise，to the ＇going out of office＇（of certain officials in the Carthaginian constitution），каl $\gamma$ àp $\bar{\epsilon} \xi \in \lambda \eta \lambda \nu \theta b \tau \epsilon s$ ápXovat каl $\mu \in \lambda \lambda о \nu \tau \epsilon s$.

 of the citizens，in or before the times of Dracon，nothing is known．＇The people must have had some power＇（says Mr Abbott，History of Greece，i 2301），＇or the Draconian laws would not have been published，and Solon would not have been chosen to reform the constitution．We do not know that the officers were elected by，or responsible to，the assembly，and of legislative and judicial authority the people had none．Perhaps we may as－ sume that war could not easily be pro－ claimed without their consent，as they formed the bulk of the soldiers．If that were the case，the safety and power of the State depended，in the last resort， upon the General Assembly．＇
 win＇s Moods and Tenses，§462．

غ̇к入єlmot ті̀v $\sigma$ úvodov］Xen．Hell．v 2


 is not found in Aristotle，although in Pol．




 тaúrys，and to the $\sigma$ vo

 generally intrans．in Ar．－Fines for non－ attendance are mentioned in Pol． 1297 a 17 （among the devices by which oligar－ chies deceive the people），$\pi \in \rho l$ eкк $\lambda \eta \sigma l a y$

 $\zeta \omega \sigma \omega \nu .$. ，and（among the counter－devices on the part of democracies） $1297 a 37$ ， ，ois






 $\mu$ lav smalav．

Mr Headlam observes that the only Atbenian instance of a law inflicting a fine for non－attendance at the Council is to be found in the constitution of the 400 in c． 30 ult．

There is no evidence as to fines for non－attendance at official duties in the earlier part of Athenian history．The fines inflicted by Solon＇s legislation are of a completely different character．

In the laws of Dracon fines were levied in terms of so many head of oxen：Pollux
 $\nu \in \iota \nu$ elkood $\beta$ ooon．This may have been the compensation paid to a man＇s relatives in a case of unintentional homicide．But （as observed by Busolt，Philol．1891，p． 399）fines paid to the public chest in the form of oxen would be very inconvenient， and in such cases the payment was prob－ ably exacted in money．
ánétivov］Ar．Pol．ii 12， $1274{ }^{b}$ 20， $\zeta \eta \mu l a \nu$ árotlvelv（in an interpolated chap－ ter）．
 see c．7§4．All these have hitherto been







 23- $4 \in \pi l-\eta \nu v$ spuria putant Richards et Keil. $\quad \delta \varepsilon \delta \in \mu \xi \nu 0, ~ q u o n d a m ~ d u b i t a n t e r ~$

regarded as characteristic results of Solon's legislation ; but some sort of property classification, even before the time of Dracon, is implied in c. 3 § I , where magistrates are described as chosen $\pi \lambda o u-$ $\boldsymbol{\tau} \boldsymbol{\tau} \boldsymbol{\partial} \eta \nu$.

We here reach the end of that part of the chapter which is open to most dispute. Its possible origin is thus indicated by Mr Headlam :
'The constitution described betrays the thought of a particular party; the reformers of this school used to advocate their policy by maintaining that it really would restore Athens to the condition in which it was before the democratic changes began. Many as we know looked on Solon as the originator of the changes which they deplored (Ar. Polit. ii 12). They would then recommend a constitution of this kind by saying it was like that which prevailed in Athens before the time of Solon. This has misled some transcriber or editor. After the
 the expression at the beginning of chap. iii he desiderated some account of the constitution in the time of Draco and inserted this passage out of some other book ' (Class. Rev. v 168 b).




т $\hat{\omega} \nu \nu$ vó $\mu \omega \nu$ ] esp. the $\theta \epsilon \sigma \mu \mathrm{l}$ of Draco mentioned in 1.3 immediately before the disputed passage.

Eloayץen $\epsilon \epsilon \nu$ ] 'to impeach,' or 'lay an information' or 'denunciation.' The first known instance of the verb belongs to an inscr. soon after 446 B.c. (Bull. de Corresp. hellen. 1880, p. 225). The use of the term here does not correspond precisely with any of the technical senses which it afterwards bears in a more highly developed stage of Attic law. An el $\sigma a \gamma \gamma \in \lambda a$ could be brought before the Archon or the Polemarch in certain cases,
or before the Boule or the Ecclesia, but not before the Council of the Areopagus. See Dr Hager in Smith, Dict. Ant. s. v.
 the advantage of being able to appeal to the Areopagus against acts of injustice, the people had the standing grievance of having their persons mortgaged to their creditors \&c. The statement follows naturally from the previous sentence and leads up to the account of the rebellion of the poor against the rich in the next. It is therefore unnecessary to accept the view of a writer in the Edinburgh $R e$. view, 1891, 479: "the statement is quite superfluous; the conjunction does not link it with the preceding sentence, which is concerned with a wholly different subject, and the form, 'as has been said,' shows clearly that it is a marginal comment made by some one who wished to impress the fact on his memory." So far from wishing to strike out this passage, we should be grateful for its preservation, as it has made it possible to restore the sense in the previons mention of the same facts in chap. 2. It has already been shewn that it is quite in harmony with the context.

## V-XII. The legislation of Solon.

V § 1. Tók $\mathrm{E}_{\mathrm{\omega}}$ ] If in the previons chapter, the description of the $7 d \mathfrak{k}$ ts is an interpolation, and the mention of the $\theta \in \sigma \mu 0 l$ in relation to the Areopagus and the economic condition of the poorer classes is alone to be regarded as genuine, the use of $\tau \alpha \xi \epsilon \omega s$ here becomes open to suspicion, unless we are content to regard the powers of the Areopagus and the right of bringing grievances before them as snfficient to constitute a $\tau \dot{\alpha} \xi \underline{c} s$, or constitutional order of things.
 $\tau \hat{\mathrm{y}} \mathrm{s}$ monırelas, the gen. being avoided because of the gen. preceding. Cf. De Ger.







 $\pi \rho \epsilon \sigma \beta \nu \tau a ́ \tau \eta \nu$ é $\sigma о \rho \hat{\nu} \nu$ रaîà 'Iaovlas.


 usque ad annum $3^{25}$ A.c. in titulis Atticis scriptum fuisse constat (Meisterhans, p. ${ }^{1422^{2}}$ : an ot $\mu \omega j^{5} \omega$ ? H-L. 8 'Iaovin Richards (Class. Rev. v $334 a$ ). $9 \in \Pi \epsilon \lambda A Y N \in N$ legit $K$ ( $\epsilon \pi \dot{\eta} \lambda \alpha u \nu \in \nu K^{1}$ sed tempus praesens flagitat contextus).
 quondam tentabam, sed desideratur accusativus velut tovs тpaxuvout̀ous; ĖTध-

§ 2. àv $u k a \theta \eta \mu \hat{\mu} \nu \omega \nu]$ a metaphor implying two forces watching one another. The literal sense is found in Thuc. v 6 § 3 , and similarly with $\alpha \nu \tau \iota \kappa a \theta l \zeta \in \sigma \theta a \iota i b$. iv 124 § 2 .
Sıa入入актìv кal ápxovta] Plut. Sol.
 Praec. Ger. Reip. 10 § 16 p. 805, oú $\delta \in \nu\rangle$


 ib. p. 825 D $\eta \mu \epsilon \rho o \nu \delta \iota a \lambda \lambda a \kappa \tau \dot{\eta}^{\nu} \nu$, and esp. Amatorius 18 § 14,763 D, тov̂тov $\epsilon$ Vी
 $\nu_{0} \mu 0 \theta \dot{\epsilon} \tau \eta \nu$. The last passage supports the opinion that Plutarch had a first-hand acquaintance with this treatise.
The archonsbip of Solon is assigned to в.c. 594 (Clinton $F$. $H$., ii p. $298=363^{3}$; Busolt, i 524 , note 2). Cf. note on 13 § I.
т $\mathfrak{v} v$ è $\lambda \epsilon \boldsymbol{\epsilon}$ lav] here, and in 1.3 from end of chapter, 'the elegiac poem.' The fem. form is found in Theophrastus, Hist. Plant. ix 15, 1 , and also in late authors (e.g. Plut. Sol. 26, Cimon 10). Aristotle

 iii 2, éncүela $\Delta$ ovvolov (cf. Class. Rev. v $334 a$ ).
The lines quoted have been hitherto unknown. They may fairly be accepted as the opening couplet of the poem cited in Dem. de Falsa Leg., p. 421, § 255 , some-
 The passage as there quoted begins with the words :


Voemel saw no difficulty in regarding the passage quoted by Dem. as the actual beginning of the poem: "Particula $\delta \in$ non
obstat initio....Similia initia Tyrtaei, Mimnermi, Callini. Imo optime convenit commoto atque elato Solonis animo relictâ sententiâ 'Aliae quidem urbes interierunt et interibunt,' sic incipere: 'sed Athenae sunt perpetuae'." But, if the couplet quoted in the text comes from the same poem at all, we now have the true beginning of that composition. The poet begins in a strain of sorrow and dejection due to the sad condition of his country, mingled with fear of the consequences of the avarice and pride of the wealthy (in-
 Afterwards (in the passage preserved by Dem.) he changes his tone to one of exultant trust in the overruling power of the patron-goddess of Athens. He then dwells on the injustice, the insolence, and the greed of the $\delta \dot{\eta} \mu \mu \nu \dot{\eta} \gamma \epsilon \mu 6 \nu \in s$; and insists on the evils caused by bad legislation and the blessings brought about by good. Thus far we have only an attack against one of the two parties in the state. The other topics may have found a place in the lost portions of the poem.
${ }^{\prime}$ Iaovlas] 'Iaoviny is proposed by Mr H. Richards on the ground that Solon is not likely to have used Tonia for 'all lands where Ionians dwell.' The Ionic form may have been wrongly written 'I aoviav, and then altered into 'Iaoylas in consequence of the superlative. Considering, however, that it was a fixed belief of the Athenians that Ion had been their own $\pi 0 \lambda \epsilon \mu a \rho \chi 0 s$, and was the father of the four progenitors of the Ionian tribes, Attica may well be called the oldest land in all the Ionian world.
è èє $\lambda a u \dot{v} \epsilon \mathrm{l}]$ apparently intransitive; used elsewhere of military movements



 $\mu a \rho \tau \nu \rho \epsilon \hat{\imath}, \pi a \rho a \iota \nu \omega ̂ \nu$ тоîৎ $\pi \lambda o v \sigma i o \iota \varsigma ~ \mu \eta े ~ \pi \lambda \epsilon о \nu \epsilon \kappa т \epsilon i ̂ \nu$.







 aliquatenus Aristides ii 361 Dind. in commentario exscriptus, qui in loco nostro suos

 intransitivo usurpatum : correxit Postgate coll. Tyrtaei loco infra allato; idem conicit Naber (edd.). $17 \tau[l \theta \epsilon \sigma \theta \epsilon]$ Platt ( $\mathrm{H}-\mathrm{L}$ ); $\mu \epsilon \tau \rho i=t s \tau \ell \rho \pi \epsilon \sigma \theta \epsilon$ Kontos. 18 áprta:


 quondam Blass. 19 diєı ( $\mathrm{K}, \mathrm{K}-\mathrm{w}, \mathrm{B}$ ) : $\dot{\alpha} \in l(\mathrm{H}-\mathrm{L})$. Formam utramque usurpant decreta
such as 'charging' (Hdt. ix 49), or 'marching against' (i 17 ); bere perhaps of 'attacking.' This sense would lead up. to the next verb $\mu \dot{\alpha} \chi \epsilon \tau \alpha l$. Another suggestion, $\epsilon_{i} \alpha \lambda \lambda a ́ r \tau \epsilon$, as observed by one of its proposers, 'seems suitable to describe the attitude of a man who sees and takes both sides of a question at once, who is at home in both camps' (H. Richards in Class. Rev. v 107 a). But we should expect $\delta \nu \sigma \chi \epsilon \rho a l \nu \epsilon \iota$ or $\dot{d} \nu \tau \iota \tau \epsilon(\nu \epsilon \iota$.
 purport of this part of the poem must have been the same as that of the 入óyot of Solon described in Aristides, ii 361 , who probably had this passage in view:








§ 3. Tñ $\mu$ घ̀v фúrєt $\kappa \tau \lambda$.] Plut. Sol. i,



ти้̂ $\mu \notin \sigma \omega v \kappa \tau \lambda$.] Ar. Pol. vi (iv) Ir,



( $\delta \eta \lambda 0 i \delta^{\prime} \epsilon \kappa \tau \hat{\eta} s \pi 0 \iota \eta \quad \sigma \epsilon \omega s$ ). This statement is proved by the verses here quoted. $\tau \hat{\sigma}$ $\mu \hat{\epsilon} \sigma \omega \nu$ must not be confounded with our 'middle classes.' It refers rather to the moderately wealthy citizens (see Newman's Politics of Ar., i p. 500). Cf. Pol. $1295 b$, $1296 a 7$, 13, $1289 b 29 \mathrm{f}$.
गोण्यúa avess] The vb is transitive in this tense alone. Plat. Rep. 572 A, 市 $\sigma u x a$ a-
 These four lines have been hitherto unknown.
 into surfeit of many good things.' Tyr-

 ( $\tau \delta \pi \rho \bar{\alpha} \gamma \mu a$ ), 'they drove it thus far'; $\mathbf{v} 50$,

 we (who are oppressed) continue to obey you, nor will you (who are wealthy) find all things perfect.
"ртıa $\left.\pi \dot{d} v \tau^{2}\right]$ Solon 4 ( 13 ) 3k, évoula




 $\pi \dot{\alpha} \nu \tau<$ роє̂̀.

тग̀̀v aitlav...divámтel] 'ascribes the origin' (к). Rare in Aristotle; Met. 12, 4,







publica usque ad annum ${ }^{361}$ a.c., ex quo anno del tantum inventum est, quamquam
 quod autem inter Aristotelis editores nonnulli modo hanc, modo illam formam malunt, velut in Pol. 1276 a 36, 38 ubi inter trium versuum spatium kalmep aiel et кaimep áel legitur, vix credibile est scriptorem eundem formam utramque usurpasse. $21 \tau \eta \nu \tau \epsilon \phi[i \lambda a \rho \gamma \cup \rho] l a \nu \mathrm{~K}, \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{W}, \mathrm{H}-\mathrm{L}$; $\tau \dot{\eta} \nu \phi[i \lambda o \chi \rho \eta \mu a \tau] l a \nu$ Kontos, Bernardakis: $\tau \eta \eta^{\nu}$ $\tau \in \alpha[\chi \rho \eta \mu] a \tau l a \nu$ в. $\tau \dot{\eta} \nu \quad \tau \epsilon \dot{u} \pi \epsilon \rho$. ( $\mathrm{K}, \mathrm{k}-\mathrm{w}$ ); $\tau \dot{\eta} \nu \theta^{\prime} \dot{\dot{v}} \pi \epsilon \epsilon$. J B Mayor, Jackson, $\mathrm{H}-\mathrm{L}$; et metrum et $\tau \in$ iteratum poetae versum produnt.
 c

 Bapoc k etc.: $[a ̈ \alpha \theta]$ ]os H-L.



 $\sigma \epsilon \epsilon \sigma \chi \chi \epsilon \epsilon a,=$ Apostolins $17,52$.
 ascribe or refer to.' Common in Plutarch, e.g. Lycurg. 6, т $\grave{\eta} \nu$ áp $\chi \grave{\eta} \nu$ каi $\tau \grave{\eta} \nu$




 petv. Mr Poste and Mr H. Richards (Class. Rev. v 466 a) understand it 'imputes the blame.' This might be defended by Od. ii $86 \mu \hat{\omega} \mu o \nu$ à $\downarrow \dot{\alpha} \psi$ ac (Schol.
 fers $\epsilon x \mu \hat{\omega} \mu о \nu$ à $u$ á $\psi a t$. But in Attic Gk we should expect $\pi \in \rho \dot{d} \pi \tau \epsilon t$ irr this sense (Dem. Lept. io). tîs è $\lambda \in \boldsymbol{\gamma} \epsilon$ las, § 2.
סєEonkéval кт入.] Plut. Sol. 14, $\delta \in-$
 $\tau \grave{\eta} \nu \dot{i} \pi \epsilon \mu \eta \phi \omega^{2} l a \nu$. The double $\tau \varepsilon$ is far more common in verse than in prose (Kühner, \& $\mathbf{5 2 O}^{20}$ ).

 $\pi \dot{\eta} \nu \quad \sigma \epsilon \iota \sigma \dot{\alpha} \chi \theta \epsilon \iota a \nu$ bио $\mu \dot{\alpha} \sigma a \nu \tau$. тои̃то




סaveļelp. Diog. Laert. i 45. The phrase $\chi \rho \epsilon \omega \nu \dot{\alpha} \pi о к о \pi a l$ is found in Dem. $17 \S 15$, 24 § 149, Andoc. de Myst. 88, Plut. ii 226 в, Cic. ad Att. vii in § I, $\chi$. áтокопŋे in Plato, Legg. 736 c .
$\boldsymbol{\sigma} \epsilon \sigma \operatorname{cóx}^{\theta \epsilon \operatorname{Lav}] \text { (I) Most of our ancient }}$ authorities understood this to imply a complete remission of debts; this is the view of the text, and of Philochorus, frag. 57, and it is accepted by Schömann, Ant. p. 328 E. T.; Gilbert i 130 ; Landwehr, Philol. Suppl. $B d$ v (1884) 13 Iff ; and Busolt, i 525 . (2) Others, including Androtion (see note on Io § I), held that Solon relieved the debtors, partly by a diminution in the rate of interest, partly by the introduction of a new money-standard; this is accepted by Boeckh; Hermann, Staatsalt. § ro6; E. Curtius; and (in the main) by Duncker, Gesch. d. Alt. vi ed. 5, I58. (3) Grote (c. I I, ii 304) assumes a total remission of debts, but limits it to the case of debts secured on the debtor's person or his land.
 15, $\pi \rho a ̂ \gamma \mu a \delta^{\prime}$ aủtê $\sigma \nu \mu \pi \epsilon \sigma \epsilon \hat{\lambda} \nu \quad \lambda \epsilon \gamma \epsilon \tau \alpha$,


 $[\beta o v \lambda] o ́ \mu \epsilon \nu о \iota \beta \lambda a \sigma \phi \eta \mu \epsilon i ̄ \nu, \kappa a i ̀ ~ a u ̉ \tau o ̀ \nu ~ \kappa о \iota \nu \omega \nu \epsilon i ̂ \nu . ~ \delta a \nu \epsilon \iota \sigma a ́ \mu \epsilon \nu o \iota ~ \gamma a ̀ \rho ~$










 of $\left.\pi 0 \lambda \lambda^{\prime}\right)$ ；$\epsilon \tau \tau \alpha \mu \epsilon \tau^{\prime}$ H－L． 11 гіnomenhc（ $\mathrm{K}^{1}$ ）：$\gamma \in \nu 0 \mu \notin \nu \eta$ S Rutherford， $\mathrm{K}-\mathrm{w}$ ，

 tis．$\mu a \rho \tau u \rho \epsilon \bar{i}$ legunt Wessely et Blass，quod mihi quoque in mentem venerat．$\tau 0 \hat{u} \tau 0$


 repugnat papyrus．$\mu$ aptúp $[\mathrm{c}][\nu \mu \epsilon] \gamma a$ Blass，sed tio potius quam 「a in papyro apparet．


#### Abstract

              $\sigma v \nu a \delta \kappa \kappa о \hat{\nu} \tau \tau a, \kappa a \tau \epsilon \sigma \tau \eta \sigma a \nu$ ．$\dot{\alpha} \lambda \lambda \grave{a}$ то仑̂то       $\lambda \epsilon \sigma a, \nu$（the story of the five talents comes from some other source than the text）． Praecept．Ger．Reip． 13 § 10 p .807 ，то̂̀то रд̀ $\rho$ каl $\Sigma o ́ \lambda \omega \nu a$ кат $\dot{\eta} \sigma \nu \nu \varepsilon$ каl $\delta \iota \epsilon \in \beta a \lambda \epsilon$    




 өє̀tos，oi $\mu \grave{̀} \nu$ é $\phi a ́ \nu \eta \sigma a \nu$ oikias $\tau \epsilon \lambda a \mu \pi \rho d s$




§3．кarappumalvecv］To the passages from Isocr．and Plato，quoted in L and S ， may be added Plut．de Cohibenda Ira 6， ii P．456，катар $\rho \boldsymbol{\pi} a l \nu \in \iota$ каl $\pi i \mu \pi \lambda \eta \sigma \nu$ aंooklas，de Profectibus in Virt．17，ii p．
 The word is not found in Ar．
§ 4．тaúтๆ้ тウ̀v égoưlav］sc．тô̂ тupav－ $\nu \in \hat{i}$ ．Plut：Sol． 14 and Solon fragm．33，
 also fragm． 32.
$\tau \dot{a} \tau \in \pi \rho a ́ \gamma \mu a \tau a$ vóvồvтa кт入．］Prof． Tyrrell（Class．Rev．v 177 ）defends $\mu$ ere－ крои́бato（ $\mathrm{K}^{1}$ ）as follows：＂The idea of a balance underlies the word，as in mapa－ крои́є $\theta a t$ ，and＇he shifted the balance of affairs＇would be a not unnatural way of saying＇he changed the face of politics．＇
 in itself，one could hardly justify such a mixture of metaphors as＇adjusting the









 $\tau \hat{\eta}{ }^{\prime} \mathrm{A} \theta . \pi 0 \lambda . \phi \eta \sigma l$ кal ${ }^{2} \mathrm{~A} \pi 0 \lambda \lambda 6 \delta \omega \rho o s$ (Rose, Frag. $35^{2}{ }^{2}, 390^{3}$ ).
balance of the maladies of the state.' My former suggestion עопойעтa $\mu \epsilon \tau \epsilon \chi \epsilon \epsilon \rho /-$ oato is defended in point of expression by the passages of Plato quoted in the critical notes. It is also incidentally confirmed in point of sense by a passage in Grote's History of Greece (ii 327), where he speaks of the 'discontents of the miserable Athenian population' experiencing Solon's 'disinterested and healing management.' The $\tau \epsilon$ in this case would mean 'and accordingly' (being armed with this authority), as often in Herodotus and Thucydides, and not seldom in Xenophon (Kiihner, § 519, 3). The usage of Ar. does not differ in this from that of other writers (Eucken, De Ar. dicendi ratione, $\mathbf{i} \mathrm{p} . \mathrm{I}_{3}$ ).

The suggestion that the sense required is 'docet et res publica aegrotans et' ( $\mathrm{K}-\mathrm{w}^{\mathrm{T}}$ ) admits of being carried out by proposing $\tau \dot{\alpha} \tau \epsilon \pi \rho \alpha ́ \gamma \mu a \tau a$ עобои̂̀та $\mu a \rho \tau \cup \rho \in i ́ ~ т о и ̆ т о . ~$ The sequence $\mu а \rho \tau \nu \rho \in \hat{i} \ldots \mu \epsilon \dot{\epsilon} \mu \nu \eta \tau a \iota \ldots \sigma v \nu 0-$ $\mu 0 \lambda o y o v i \sigma t$ would in this case find its parallel in c. $5 \S 3,{ }^{\ell} \kappa \tau \epsilon \tau \hat{\omega} \nu \dot{d} \lambda \lambda \omega \nu \dot{\partial} \mu \nu \lambda o-$
 $\mu a \rho \tau v \rho \in t$, and 12 § I. Cf. Pol. I334 a 5
入óroıs, Metaphysica 282 b 22 ó 入óyos $\mu а \rho т \cup \rho \in \hat{\imath}, ~ D \ell ~ A n i m a ~ 410 ~ a ~ 29, ~ \dot{\omega s ~-, ~}$

 $\pi 0 \lambda \epsilon \sigma \nu$, \&c. Since this note was written $\mu a p r y p e i$ has been conjectured in $\mathrm{K}-\mathrm{w}^{2}$, and this is the reading which I now prefer.
 lowed by voroîvtes metaphorically used in the same sense. Plat. Rep. 470 C,


$\mu \dot{\mu} \mu \nu \eta \tau \alpha L]$ 'makes mention of,' usually c. gen.; here $\delta \pi \iota$ is due partly to the influence of $\sigma v \nu_{0} \mu 0 \lambda 0 \gamma o v \sigma l$, and still more to $\mu a \rho \tau \nu \rho \in \hat{L}$, if that be accepted. Cf. 12


VII § т. $\Delta$ ра́коутоs $\theta \in \sigma \mu$ оis§] c. 4 § .
$\pi \lambda \eta े \nu ~ \tau \omega ̂ v ~ ф o v เ к \omega ิ v] ~ P l u t . ~ S o l . ~ 17 ~ i n i t . ~ . ~$


 $\mu l \omega v . \quad$ Cf. Dem. 23 § 66, Aelian V. H. viii ıo, Josephus Apion. i 4, $\tau \omega \hat{\nu} \delta \eta \mu \circ \sigma i \omega \nu$

 $\mu o v s$. On the revision of the laws of Athens, after the restoration of the democracy in the summer of 411 b.c., the laws of Dracon respecting homicide were once more retained. An inscr. of 409 B.c. records a decree authorizing the $\gamma \rho a \mu \mu a \tau \epsilon \dot{s}$ of
 corders of the laws, a true copy of Dra-


 $[\tau] a[\theta \epsilon \nu] \tau[\omega \nu \pi \rho \circ ́ \sigma \theta \epsilon \nu \quad \tau] \hat{\eta}[s]$ $\sigma \tau o a ̂ s ~ \tau \eta ̂ s$ $\beta a \sigma \iota \lambda e l a s$. (Cf. Andoc. i 84, 85)... Then follows a copy of the $\pi \rho \hat{\omega} \tau o s a \xi \omega \nu$ of Solon, containing Dracon's law on involuntary homicide (CIA i 61 ; Dittenberger, p. 87; Hicks, Greek Hist. Inscr. p. 112).

кup $\beta$ кьs] Rectangular wooden tablets painted white and arranged in sets of four, each set forming a 'pillar' about the height of a man. This pillar revolved on an upright axis; hence the кúppets were called $\vec{\alpha} \xi=0$ es, the axes ligneae of Gellius ii 12. The $\kappa 0 \quad \rho \beta \epsilon t s$ are mentioned in a fragment of Cratinus, quoted by Plutarch Sol. 25. An inscr. of 409 b.c. cites the
 $\kappa \hat{\omega} y)$. Lysias, Or. 30, c. Nicomachum (B.C. 399), § 17 ràs $\theta$ volas $\tau \grave{\alpha} \mathrm{s} \dot{\epsilon} \kappa \tau \hat{\omega} \nu$ кúp $\beta \in \omega \nu$. In Dem. Aristocr. p. 629 § 28, the law of homicide is found $\dot{\epsilon} \boldsymbol{\tau} \hat{\psi} \alpha$


Aristotle is said to have written a treatise in five books $\pi \epsilon \rho l \tau \omega \nu \Sigma \delta \lambda \omega \nu 0 s a \xi \xi \nu \omega \nu$ (see list of his works, ascribed to Hesychius, in Rose, Fragm. Ar. p. 16, 1. I40). Eratosthenes supposed that the several tablets were triangular in shape. This

## 

mistake was corrected by Polemon of Ilium，who，on the strength of his own observation，insists on the quadrangular shape of the tablets（Harpocr．s．$v$.


 $\tau \rho a ́ \gamma \omega \nu 0 九 \tau \dot{\partial} \sigma \chi \hat{\eta} \mu a, \delta \iota a \sigma \dot{\varphi} \varsigma о \nu \tau a \iota \delta \dot{\varepsilon} \dot{\epsilon} \nu \tau \hat{\varphi}$


 Polemo fragm．48，Mïller，FHg iii 130 ）． A pupil of Eratosthenes，the famous critic Aristophanes of Byzantium，gives a clear account of their shape：Etymolo－ gicum Magn．p．547，$\dot{\alpha} \mu \phi о \tau \epsilon \rho \omega \nu \delta \dot{e}(s c . \tau \hat{\omega} \nu$



 $\pi \lambda \eta \rho \epsilon \epsilon s, \varepsilon \in \alpha \tau \tau \in \rho \omega \theta \epsilon \nu \delta \dot{\epsilon} \kappa \nu \omega \dot{\delta} a \kappa a s$（＇pivots＇），

 Didymus（Plut．Sol．I）and Seleucus （Suidas，s．\％．ठpyєढิยs）wrote mono－ graphs on the $a \mathfrak{k} \boldsymbol{\xi}^{2} \mathrm{ves}$ ．Plutarch，in his life of Solon，refers to the first，the thir－ teenth and the sixteenth $d \xi \omega \nu$（c．24，19， 23），and states that some small fragments of the d $\xi_{0} \nu \bar{s}$ were still to be seen in his own day in the Prytaneum（c．25）．

Some of the Greek lexicographers erro－ neously distinguished between the кúp $\beta$ ets and $\ddot{\alpha} \xi 0 y e s$ in respect to shape，material and contents（cf．Schol．on Apollonius Rhodius iv 280）．The distinction as－ sumes the following form in Tzetzes， Chiliades，xii 349 ：

But the identity of the $a \xi$ goves and кúp－ $\beta$ Bets has been proved by Hulleman， Miscellanea Philol．（Amsterdam，1850）， and is now generally accepted．Cf．Preller on Polemon，p． 87 ；Frohberger＇s Lysias， III p．23；Rose，Ar．Pseudepigraphus， 414 ；and Oncken，die Staatslehre des Ar．， 422．In view of the text，it is no longer possible to regard the $\kappa$ bopets（placed in the $\sigma$ rod $)$ as later copies of the a $\xi_{\text {oves }}$ in the Prytaneum（so Busolt，i 539，and Müller，Handbuch，iv i 118 ）．
 $\dot{\eta} \beta a \sigma \omega \lambda l^{2}$ in CIA i 6 n （quoted in n ．on
 ecos $\sigma$ тod：$\delta \dot{v o}$ elol $\sigma$ roal $\pi a \rho^{\prime}$ a $\lambda \lambda \hat{\eta} \lambda \lambda a s, ~ \ddot{\eta}$


In literature it is known as $\boldsymbol{\eta}$ toû $\beta a \sigma \iota \lambda$－ tws $\sigma$ rod́（Plat．Euthyphron 2 A ，Theaet．
 Eccl．684）．Cf．Pausan．i 3，1，кa入ov－

 $\lambda$ clav．Pausanias，entering the inner Cerameicus from the north，sees the $\sigma \tau o \dot{\alpha}$ ßaci $\lambda \varepsilon c o s$ as the first building on his right，i．e．on the $W$ ．side of the Cera－ meicus．Apparently he did not go inside， and he tells us nothing of the altar out－ side，where the Archons took their oath． （See esp．Wachsmuth，Stadt Athen，ii 344－35I ；Curtius，Stadtgeschichte von Athen，p．xc $b$ ，and p． 294 ；and cf． Miss Harrison＇s Mythology \＆c．of Athens， p．24．）

The use of this $\sigma$ rod as a place for keeping a record of the laws of Athens is attested in Andoc．De Myst．82，85，

 The statement of Anaximenes（in Harpo－ cration，s．v．ò кả̃ $\omega \theta \in \nu \nu o ́ \mu o s)$ ，that Ephi－ altes transferred roùs à $\xi$ ovas кal roùs кó $\rho$－ $\beta$ eis from the Acropolis to the $\beta$ ouneutipiov and the $\alpha \gamma o \rho d$, is inconsistent with the text， and is probably a mere flourish of rhe－ toric．The кúpßets were apparently al－ ways in the doopá．Cf．Oncken，Stats－ lehre，ii 422．Secret meetings of the Areopagus were sometimes held $t\rangle \tau \hat{\eta}$ $\beta a \sigma \iota \lambda \in \epsilon \notin \sigma \tau o \hat{q}$, Dem．${ }^{25}$, Aristog．A，§ 23 ．

むцобау кт入．］Plut．Solon 25，кочу̀у


 $\tau \alpha \phi a \pi l \zeta \omega \nu$, el $\tau \ell \pi \alpha \rho a \beta a i \eta \tau \omega \hat{\eta} \nu \quad \theta \in \sigma \mu \hat{\nu} \nu$,
 $\epsilon \nu \Delta \epsilon \lambda \phi o i s$ ．On the oath of the Archons， cf．c． 55 § 5，and Plato Phaedr． 235 D，kal



The word loonétpquav is omitted in the text and in Pollux viii 86．It is ingeni－ ously explained by Bergk（Rhein．Mus． xiii $44^{8)}$ as virtually equivalent to lao－ $\sigma \tau \dot{d} \sigma o y$ and as implying that the statue in gold was to be equivalent in weight to the amount of silver received as a bribe． This，he urges，is suggested by Deinar－ chus i 60 ，ii 17，where the $\delta$ हкат $\tau l \mu \eta \mu a$ may be explained with reference to the relative value of gold to silver at Athens in the time of Solon，being ro：r． According to this view the archons swore that they would pay a fine equivalent to ten times the value of any bribe they


 тєía $\tau$ тóv $\delta \epsilon<\tau \grave{\nu} \nu>\tau \rho o ́ \pi о \nu$.


$8 \tau \delta \nu \delta \epsilon<\tau \partial \nu>\tau \rho \delta \pi о \nu$ edd. ; cf. c. 29 § 5, 37 § г. $\quad 9<\tau \dot{d}>\tau \iota \mu \eta \mu a \tau a$ Blass
 $\delta_{\delta \epsilon \in \lambda \in \nu}$, coll. Hesych. et Harp.



received. In tbe text, however, we have no reference to receiving bribes and no mention of the bulk of the statue; nor again have we either here, or in the excerpts of Heraclides or in Pollux, any mention of Delphi. Suidas (as observed by Thompson on PI. Phaedr. l.c.) 'makes the statues three instead of one and represents them, as portrait-statues of the delinquent,



 trait-statues were not in use in Solon's time, and 'it is very unlikely that the Delphians would have allowed their sacred peribolus to be defiled by the statue of a detected criminal. And if the penalty was intended to be enforced, the offering must needs have been of much more limited dimensions. It is therefore conceivable that both loo $\bar{\epsilon} \tau \rho \eta \tau o \nu$ and ai rov were introduced by late writers into the text of the original oath, in order to make it conformable to the supposed meaning of Plato.' The text shews that this conjecture is right, and also that the insertion of $z \nu \Delta \in \lambda \phi o i s$ has no warrant in the original form of the oath.

The $\lambda i \theta$ os was possibly identical with the altar of Zeds ajopaios (Wachsmuth, Stadt Athen, ii 352 ).
§ 2. єis ékaтò ét $\ddagger$ ] Plut. Sol. 25 init.,
 avtois $\epsilon \delta \omega \kappa \varepsilon$.
§ 3. тил been universally held that the classification of citizens according to property was first devised by Solon. Plut. Sol.

 $\beta o u \lambda \phi \mu \in \nu=s, \tau \dot{\eta} \nu \delta^{\prime} \dot{a} \lambda \lambda \eta \nu \quad \mu \hat{\beta} \xi a i \quad \pi 0 \lambda \iota \tau \epsilon i a \nu$,











 $\mu \epsilon \tau \epsilon \hat{\chi} \chi^{\nu} \tau \hat{\eta} s$ moderelas. The quotations in Harpocration are to the same effect. They ignore the ' Draconian constitution,' and they lend no support to the phrase:
 decline to accept the 'Draconian constitution' must necessarily omit the words just quoted. Mr Kenyon suggests that the statements in c. 4 can only be reconciled with the general ascription of the classes in question to Solon, by supposing that the latter brought them into a new relation to the political constitution. Solon began bis reforms by repealing all of Dracon's laws except those relating to homicide. This implies that 'Solon made a clean sweep of all the laws relating to the constitution, so as to have a free hand in reconstructing it according to his own ideas. He then re-introduced the property classes, as well as the Council of Four hundred and the Areopagus.' This explanation is skilful and ingenious and may possibly be right.

On Solon's $\tau \mu \eta \dot{\mu} \alpha \tau a$, see Boeckh, Book iv c. v; Grote, c. Ir, vol. ii 318; Busolt i 527. The term $\tau i \mu \eta \mu a$ occurs first in CIA i 3 .
 to one who kept a pair of mules (Isaeus $5 \S 43 ; 6 \$ 33$ ), or of working horses, or a yoke of oxen.





 riatas (quod legi posse concedit k ) delendum, aut in sequentibus complura mutanda putat.



 Pollux viii $130 \tau \iota \mu \dot{\eta} \mu a \tau \alpha \delta^{\prime} \hat{\eta}_{\nu} \tau \epsilon \epsilon \tau \tau a \rho a$ ктл. Hesych. єк $\tau \iota \mu \eta \mu a ́ \tau \omega \nu: . . \delta \iota \hat{\eta} \rho \eta \tau 0$


 ऽеะ $\mu$ bуov.
 does not mean that the members of all the three highest classes were eligible for the office of archon. The first part of the sentence must be read in the light of the second, which implies that there was a kind of scale of eligibility according to the class in which the citizen was placed. Those in the first class alone would be eligible for the archonship. Cf. Plut.



 class supplied the raulat c. 8 § I. On the raplat and the $\pi \omega \lambda \eta \pi a l$, see c. 47 ; on the ${ }^{2} v \delta \in к а, ~ c . ~ 52 . ~$

кшлакре́таs] The form given by Photius and Suidas: $k \omega \lambda a \gamma \rho \epsilon \tau \eta$ s in the Ravenna ms of Aristoph. and in the lexicon of Timaeus; lit. 'collectors of hams,' so called from receiving the prime parts of the victims to aid them in providing the public meals in the prytaneum. They are said to have had the control of financial matters in the time of the kings; in later times they acted as treasurers of the naucrariae. They were left untouched by the legislation of Solon, in connexion with wbich they are mentioned in the text; but in the reforms of Cleisthenes they lost the charge of the finances, which was then transferred to new officers called Apodectae (48). Under Pericles they were assigned the duty of paying the dicasts, and they were considered officials of some importance in the time of Aristophanes (Schol. on Vesp. $695,727, A v$. 1541). There is no docu-
mentary proof of their existence after the Archonship of Euclides ( 403 B.c.). Cf. Boeckh, ed. Fränkel, note 302, and Schömann's Antiquities, i 327 E. T.; also Mr Wayte's article in Smith's Dict. Ant., s.z., Gilbert, i 119 and Busolt, i 159 .

 á $\rho \chi$ às à $\pi \dot{d} \tau \iota \mu \eta \mu a \tau \omega \nu$ єtval $\kappa \tau \lambda$.








 $\mu \epsilon \tau \hat{\eta} \nu$. Cf. end of this chapter, tovs
 $\dot{\alpha} \rho \chi \bar{\eta} s$.
 longed to the thetic census.' It will be observed that they are not here called $\theta \hat{\eta} \tau \epsilon \mathrm{s}$. Of those who were placed in the fourth class Grote (ii 32 I) observes: 'It is said that they were all called Thetes, but this appellation is not well snstained and cannot be admitted: the fourth compartment in the descending scale was indeed termed the Thetic census, because it contained all the Thetes, and because most of its members were of that humble description, but it is not conceivable that a proprietor whose land yielded to him a clear annual return of roo, 120,140 or r8o drachms, could ever have been designated by that name.' See, however, 1. II.
$\tau \in \lambda \epsilon \hat{\nu}$ does not necessarily mean actual






17 т $\hat{s}$ : $\gamma \hat{\eta} s$ Bywater; $\tau \hat{\eta} s$ defendit Kontos (Athena iii 321-2). $\quad \xi \eta \rho \hat{\omega} \nu$ kal









 $\tau \epsilon$ доû̀тas éкá̀ovy.
payment, but 'the being included in a class with a certain aggregate of duties and liabilities,'-equivalent to censeri, 'to rank as '; Boeckh, p. 36, Grote, p. 32 In .
е́кк $\boldsymbol{\eta} \boldsymbol{\eta} \boldsymbol{C l a s}-\mu o ́ v o v]$ Pol. 128 r b $\mathbf{3 0}$,
 $\mu \in \tau \in \chi$ モLL aủzoús $\kappa \tau \lambda$.
§ 4. Tolt̂i] [Dem.] Phaenipp. 42 § 20, p.


 $\kappa \tau \lambda$. Hitherto, it has been sometimes supposed that one who obtained from his land a net return of 500 measures of dry produce, such as corn or barley, together with 500 measures of liquid produce, such as oilor wine, rankedin thefirst class (Bruno Keil in Berl. Phil. Woch. 1891, p. 52 I n.). It has also been held that a net return of either 500 dry measures or 500 liquid measures constituted a claim to that class (Busolt, i ${ }_{527}$ ). It is now clear that the 500 measures could be made up of dry and liquid produce taken together, and this is also the purport of some of the evidence previously known to us, e.g. the article in Bekker's Anccd. 298, 20, which, it now appears, was taken from the present passage. By $\mu \dot{\epsilon} \tau \rho a$ is meant either a $\mu \dot{\varepsilon} \delta \dot{\delta} \mu \nu \mathrm{os}$ ( $=$ six $\dot{\epsilon} \kappa \tau \in \hat{\epsilon}=$ six modii $=$ about 12 imperial gallons, or a bushel and a half) of dry measure, or a $\mu \epsilon \tau \rho \eta \tau \eta$ 's in liquid measure. The latter is the standard $\dot{\alpha} \mu \phi \circ \rho \epsilon \dot{\Delta}$ of $12 \chi^{\dot{j} \epsilon s}=69^{\circ} 33$ pints, or slightly over $8 \frac{1}{2}$ gallons, and therefore three-fourths of the standard dry measure, the $\mu \dot{\varepsilon} \delta \dot{\tau} \mu \mathrm{vos}$.
imтdía] ( $\tau \in \lambda \epsilon i v)$. Isaeus 7 § 39 , $\dot{a} \pi \epsilon-$

 Lex. of Photius, the first article on $i \pi \pi \dot{d} s$ (followed by Suidas) makes the curions mistake of distinguishing the $l \pi \pi \epsilon i s$ and the $i \pi \pi d s$ and treating the latter as a fifth class; the second article, with the help of Harpocration's quotation from 1l. 9 , 10 of this chapter, corrects this mistake, adding $\tau \hat{\omega} \nu$ ồv $i \pi \pi \epsilon \epsilon \nu \nu$ ol (sic) $i \pi \pi a \dot{d} \delta \epsilon s$.
 discrepancy between the two views, all whose land produced a net return of 300 $\mu \varepsilon \delta \mu \nu 0 \iota$ being deemed to have enough property to enable them to keep a horse for military purposes and to serve in the cavalry. Suidas, s. v. imetis, following Schol. on Aristoph. Eq. 627, says : $i \pi \pi \in \epsilon$


 $\mu \sigma \tau \eta \dot{\eta} \rho o s)$, a horse would be required for the servant of the $i \pi \pi \epsilon$ és $^{\prime}$, and those who belonged to this class would also need a team for agricultural purposes (Boeckh, p. 639, Lamb, p. 579, Frä̉nkel).
$\omega_{\omega}{ }^{\text {an } \nu-k \in[\mu \epsilon v o v] ~ ' a s ~ t h o n g h ' ~(o r ~ i m-~}$ plying that') 'the name was derived from the fact just mentioned.' Ar. Analytica Posteriora, Г 3, $72 b$ 9, ஸ́s oűk d̀v $\dot{\epsilon} \pi \iota \sigma \tau a-$



 often, for the perf. pass. part. of $\tau i \theta \eta \mu \iota$.
 $\pi a \tau \rho \delta{ }^{2}{ }_{\kappa \in l}(\mu \in \nu 0 \nu$, nomen a patre impositum (Cobet, V.L. $3^{11}, N . L .703$ ). Similarly
 тац...d̀ $\nu \Theta \eta \kappa \epsilon$.

 ๆє́үраттаı та́סє'



$21 \Delta \varphi \|_{\text {inou secl. Thompson, } \mathrm{k}-\mathrm{w}, \mathrm{B} .}$
23 каi $\tau \grave{\varepsilon} \epsilon \pi i \gamma \rho a \mu \mu a \quad \Delta l \phi i \lambda o v$ ' $A \nu \theta \epsilon \mu i \omega \nu$

 $\dot{\alpha} \nu \epsilon \theta \eta \kappa \epsilon \nu$. Pollucis vero e codicibus unus habet $\Delta \iota \phi i \lambda o v$ ' $A \nu \theta \epsilon \mu i \omega \nu \tau \delta \nu \delta$ ' $\alpha^{2} \nu \epsilon \theta \eta \kappa \epsilon \theta \epsilon o i s$. Nostro autem in loco versum hexametrum nonnulli restituerunt, velut $<l_{\pi \pi \pi y}>$
 $\theta \epsilon o i ̂ \sigma t$ numerosius J B Mayor, dंv $\epsilon \theta \eta \kappa \epsilon$ ex ove $\theta \eta \kappa \epsilon$ ortum fuisse arbitratus (Class. Rev.
 Sed Pollucis codices, non minus quam papyrus nostra, testantur versum priorem
 Tyrrell et olim Blass ( $\mathrm{H}-\mathrm{L}$ ); etiam $\dot{\epsilon} \kappa \tau \hat{\omega} \nu \dot{\alpha} \rho \iota \sigma \tau \epsilon \rho \hat{\omega} \nu$ Blass, sed exspectares $\dot{\epsilon} \xi \dot{\xi} \dot{\alpha} \rho \iota \sigma \tau \epsilon \rho \hat{a} s$. Equidem тєкмнpion ad explicandum sensum quondam adscriptum postea in єКМАртYP $\omega N$ mutatum fuisse crediderim ; TY in litura. els $\mu$ aprúploy ed. Blass.




of Ptolemy Epiphanes (в.c. 204-18I) devoted four books of his $\pi \epsilon \rho t \eta \eta \eta \sigma$ ts the d dua $\theta \dot{\eta} \mu a \tau a$ on the Acropolis (Strabo, ix 396). If the present passage was inserted at a later date than the time of Aristotle, it may possibly have been borrowed from the work of Polemon; but the only reason for doubting whether it is by the same hand as the rest of the treatise is the exceptionally frequent occurrence of hiatus, а́кротблєь єlкผ̀
 was known to Pollux (viii 13r), but whether his quotations from this treatise are taken at first hand or not, is uncertain.
$\left.\Delta u \phi \lambda_{0 v}\right]$ The statue was dedicated by Anthemion son of Diphilus. Diphilus himself had apparently belonged to the $\theta \eta \tau \iota \kappa \delta \nu$ télos and would therefore have had no claim to be represented with a horse beside him. Mr A. S. Murray is therefore probably right in regarding the statue as that of the son, Anthemion (Class. Rev. v 108). Anthemion probably owed his promotion from the lowest to the second class either to a legacy or some other stroke of fortune which suddenly made him a wealthy man (Boeckh, p. $6_{4 \mathrm{I}} \mathrm{Lamb}$ ).

It is very improbable that an inscription of such a date consisted of two pentameter lines. 'Vix crediderim inscripti-
onem vetustam ex duobus pentametris constitisse. Exempla quidem id genus titulorum quae Kaibel in ind. [Epigr; $G r$ ] p. $7^{02}$ affert, sunt recentissima, (Preger, Inscr. Gr. Metricae, 189r, no. 74). The lines happen to give a consecutive sense but are possibly selected from two successive couplets of the original set of verses, the intermediate hexameter being omitted. ‘ä $\partial \delta \rho a \pi \alpha_{\rho} \rho \sigma \tau \eta \kappa \delta \tau a$ in versibus omitti non mirum... In anaglyphis saepius equi ad ordinem equestrem significandum additi sumt, cf. Goettling, Opusc. Acad. 243 ' (Preger, l.c.).
еккцартираю] екцартvр $=$ palam testificor in Aesch. Eum. 461 , 入ourp $\omega \nu$ $\xi_{\xi} \epsilon \mu a \rho-$ тúpet $\phi$ buop, and Aeschin. p. 15, 19,Or. 1

 $\pi о \lambda \lambda o \nu s$ èk $\mu a \rho т и \rho \hat{\eta} \sigma \alpha$, . This sense is just tolerable in the present passage, though the word is perhaps needlessly strong for the context. It would be clearly out of place to give it the technical sense corresponding to that of éккaprvpla (Class. Rev. v 177 a), i.e. a deposition made by a witness who, by reason of illness or absence abroad, was unable to attend in court. The horse in this case may metaphorically indeed be described as giving evidence; but (so far from being either absent abroad or on the point of leaving the country) it is standing in the very







Testimonia. 27-29 Pollux viii izo ol dè tò jeuphotoy (codd., Hesych., Phot.,




centre of Athens, on the platform of the Acropolis. The technical sense is therefore out of place, and the word is probably corrupt.
©s-onualvovoav] For the participle used as an accusative absolute after $\dot{\omega}$, cf. c. 29 §3, ws oú $\delta \eta \mu о \tau \iota \kappa \grave{\eta} \nu$ di $\lambda \lambda \dot{\alpha}$ rapa-



 § 488 d; Maetzner ad Lycurgum, § 90 , p. 231 ; Rehdantz, Ind. Dem. s. v. Participium. Trans. 'implying that this was the meaning of the status of Knight.'
cevylowop] This form is supported by the Etymologicum Magnum (and Gudianum) alone. The codex Sorbonicus of the


 oütws oûv kal yeulloov. 'Per í scribendum docet Choeroboscus in Crameri Anecd. ii p. 255, ro.' Fränkel (n. 805 to Boeckh) urges that $\zeta \in v \gamma \dot{\eta} \sigma t o \nu$ is the right form, and is better accredited than Seuyiotov.

Sıakóvala The property qualification of the $\oint$ evjital has hitherto been a matter of dispute. Boeckh, p. 641 Lamb, fixes it at 150 medimni. This he infers from a law quoted in [Dem.] Macart. 43 § 54 , p. 1067, according to which a пеутако$\sigma \iota o \mu \dot{\delta} \dot{\delta} \mu \nu 0 s$ was to pay the $\dot{\epsilon} \pi \ell \kappa \lambda \eta \rho o s$ a dowry of 500 drachmae, a $\{\pi \pi \epsilon \dot{s} 300$, and a jevilins 150 . From the correspondence of the first and second of these sums to the annual income of members of the first and second class, he infers that the dowry required of a $\zeta \epsilon v \gamma / \tau \eta \mathrm{s}$ is identical in amount with his annual income. But he admits that all the positive evidence is in favour of 200 medimni.

This view, which is adopted by Grote (ii 320 riote), is supported by the anthority of the text.
8.oे кal vv̂v $\kappa \tau \lambda$.] 'Hence it is that even now, when one who is about to draw lots for any office is asked to what rank he belongs, no one would say that he belonged to the rank of the Thetes.' The subject of ${ }^{2} \rho \eta \tau \alpha l$ is the officer superintending the drawing of lots for an appointment. The same vague use of the verb occurs in c. $55, \epsilon \pi \epsilon \rho \omega \tau \omega \bar{\omega} \iota \nu$ and $\phi \eta \sigma l \nu$. As it was under the superintendence of the Thesmothetae that officials were appointed by lot (Schömann, Antiquities, p. 402 E. T.), the subject is probably $\dot{\delta} \theta \epsilon \sigma \mu 0-$ $\theta$ ย́t $\eta$ s.

At first it was only the $\pi$ титакобго$\mu \hat{\delta} \delta \mu \nu 0 \iota$ who were eligible to the office of archon; next the $i \pi \pi \in i \hat{s}$; the $\zeta_{\text {evyital }}$ became eligible in $457 \mathrm{B.C}$. (see c. 26). The present passage, as observed by Mr Kenyon, is interesting as shewing that the property qualification can never have been entirely abolished by law.
 ' appointed by lot, out of candidates selected by each of the (four) tribes.' Each of the 4 tribes nominated ro, and, out of these 40 , the 9 archons were appointed by lot. The archons had formerly been elected by the Areopagus; and, whatever may have been the rule under Dracon, it was Solon who, with a view to extending the political power of the people, devised the combination of selection and sortition described in the text. It has hitherto been sometimes supposed that appointment by lot was not used in Athens before the time of Cleisthenes. This is the view of Grote, C. F. Hermann, Busolt, Gilbert, Duncke: and others. Grote in fact cannot believe

2


 rous $\dot{\epsilon} \pi \epsilon \kappa \lambda \dot{\eta} \rho o u y \mathrm{~K}^{3}$ coll. $59 \S 5$, 'litterae unius tantum spatio inter toy et $\boldsymbol{\epsilon}$ relicto, ubi


it was introduced as early as the time of Cleisthenes (c. 3 r , iii 123 n .). Curtius (i $47^{8} \mathrm{E}$. T.) assigns it to this time. Schömann, in his criticisms on Grote (Const. Hist. of Athens, p. 73 E. T.), shews tbat an earlier date was not improbable; while Fustel de Coulanges (La Cité Antique, p. 212-4, ed. 1883) claims it as an institution of religious origin and therefore of great antiquity. The evidence of this treatise is in favour of its having been introduced at an early date.

The text enables us to understand the statement in Isocrates that, 'in the times of Solon and Cleisthenes,' they did not apply the lot to filling up offices out of the whole body of citizens, but selected those who were the best and the most suitable candidates for each office: Areop.


 where, Panath. 145, he describes the constitution that the Athenians maintained 'for 1000 years' down to the age of Solon and the rule of Peisistratus, and says of the Athenians of old time that

 legislation of Dracon). He then adds: $\pi \epsilon \rho l$ tovs aítoùs $\chi$ pbyous кa $\theta l \sigma \tau a \sigma a \nu ~ \epsilon ̇ i$


 times after the $\sigma v \nu 0 u \kappa \sigma \mu \partial s$ of Theseus:
 $\kappa \rho i \tau \omega \nu \kappa \kappa \tau^{\prime}$ d̀ $\nu \rho a \gamma a \theta l a \nu \chi \in \varphi \rho о \tau о \nu \omega \nu$, where however we have mention of election by show of hands instead of appointment by lot. The use of the lot in the time of Solon is implied by Dem. Lept. § 90 (after mentioning Solon), $\tau 0 \cup \mathrm{v}$ $\theta \in \sigma \mu 0 \theta \in \tau a s$
 too great stress must not be laid on this phrase, as the orators sometimes ascribe to Solon institutions which really belonged to a later date.

The natural interpretation of the present passage is that Solon introduced a new principle by combining selection with sortition. In this respect it is not perhaps inconsistent with the statement in

 $\tau \varepsilon \beta$ 访 $\eta \nu$ (i.e. the Areopagus) kal $\tau \eta \eta^{\nu} \tau \omega \hat{\nu}$

 had just before remarked that some had singled out, as an aristocratic element in Solon's constitution, rò $\tau \dot{\text { à }}$ d $\rho \chi \chi \dot{\alpha} s$ aipetás ( $\in \mathbb{L} v a$ a). He adds that Solon did not abolish this principle, for alpeots is not the 'manner of electing the magistrates,' but simply their election. They were still elected, but the details of the method of election were partly new; the new element being apparently the selection by the tribes. Aristotle approves of this method in Pol. viii (v) 5,1305 a 28 , $\mu$ era-







 $\mu \dot{\eta} \pi \dot{\alpha} \nu \tau a \operatorname{toj} \delta \delta \bar{\eta} \mu \sigma \nu$.

In Pol. vi (iv) 14, 1298 b 9 , while discussing oligarchies, he mentions some

 $\rho \omega \tau$ оl $\hat{\eta} \dot{\alpha} \pi \lambda \omega \bar{\eta} \hat{\eta} \epsilon \kappa \pi$ рок $\rho \boldsymbol{l} \tau \omega, \hat{\eta}$ кош $\hat{\eta}$

 aừท̂s. Cf. 1266 a 8; Plat. Leg. 945 B, 753; Rep. 537 D.
 context are among the many in which the author argues from survivals, or infers a fact from a reason.
'The signals of this method,' as remarked by Mr Macan (F. H.S. xii ${ }^{88}$ ), 'are the innocent $\gamma$ da (c. 21.5, c. 31.6 et alibi), the more elaborate $\partial \theta \in \nu$ or $\partial \theta \in p$ kal (c. 31.8 , c. 81.3 ), the suspicious $\delta i d, \delta i d$ кal (c. 3 1. 17, c. 8 1. 16) and above all the term $\sigma \eta \mu \epsilon \hat{i o v}$. Wherever these signals occur the critical reader will beware of danger ahead. It may not be necessary in every case to reject the supposed evidence and inference, but it will always be expedient carefully to examine before admitting them.' The writer is bere arguing that the method of appointing archons
















adopted in his own day is a survival from that in the times of Solon．The inter－ vention of the tribes is the point in com－ mon between the two methods：but， whereas in the earlier method they select， in the later they only appoint by lot．In the former，the lot is resorted to in the second stage only；in the latter，in both．

кvapeveєv］is synonymous with $\kappa \lambda \eta \rho o \hat{\nu} \nu$ ， the кuapos，or bean，being employed in the process of appointment by lot．The procedure was as follows：Two jars were set up；in one of these was placed a num－ ber of white and coloured beans，in the other the small tablets with the names of the candidates．Then a tablet and a bean were drawn simultaneously and the candidate whose name came out along with the white bean was nominated （Schömann，Antiquities，p． 402 E．T．）．

киацеยєєц occurs in the доркоs $\dot{\eta} \lambda \iota a \sigma \tau \omega ิ \nu$




 кขацєขт $\hat{\varphi}$ ．c． 22 § 5.
$\sigma \eta \mu \varepsilon i o v \delta^{\prime}$ ö $\tau \iota \kappa \tau \lambda$ ．］The law requiring the $\tau a \mu l a c$ to be elected from among the $\pi \in y \tau a \kappa о \sigma t o \mu \epsilon \delta<\mu \nu o t$ is quoted to prove that Solon regulated the allotment of office according to the property classes．The law existed in the writer＇s time but was practically unenforced，as appears from c．47．Pol． 1282 a 2g，$\tau \hat{\eta} s ~ \mu \grave{̀} \nu ~ e ̀ к \kappa \lambda \eta \sigma l a s ~$



广óvar．
 passage gives us definite authority for the manner in which the public officials were elected in earlier times at Athens．Here－ tofore it could only be conjectured that they were elected by the Areopagus．$\tau$ ò $\dot{\alpha} \rho \chi \chi^{2} \hat{i} o \nu$ is vague，and may either mean up to the time of Solon，or up to that of Dracon．In c． 4 we have been told that， under Dracon，the officials were elected by oi ö $\pi \lambda \pi$ тааєє $6 \mu \epsilon \nu o c$ ，but the Draconian constitution is much disputed．
dvaка入єбацќv $\eta$ ］＇having summoned，＇ without any necessary allusion to the fact that the $\beta$ ou $\lambda \dot{y}$ of the Areopagus was $\dot{\eta}$

 ＇АрІбтбб $\eta \mu$ оу．
§3．фu入ai］The successive names of the four tribes in the early history of Athens are quoted by Pollux viii 109. In the time of Erechtheus they took their
 ＇A $\rho \gamma \mathrm{a} \delta \epsilon t s$ ）from the sons of Ion．Cf．Hdt． v 66 （of Cleistbenes）$\tau \hat{\omega} \nu{ }^{\text {＂I }}$ I $\omega \nu$ os $\pi a i \delta \omega \nu$

 Ion 1579，Г $\epsilon \lambda \epsilon \omega \nu$（Canter：T $\epsilon \lambda \epsilon \omega \nu$ vulg．）


 § 2，and Antiquities，p． 317 f．E．T．； Philippi，Att．Bürgerrecht，pp．233－296．）
$\phi v \lambda o \beta a \sigma \cdot \lambda \in i s]$ These officials are iden－



 $\mathrm{H}-\mathrm{L}$ ，sed spatium vix sufficit． 15 Гinomenac（ $\mathrm{K}-\mathrm{w}$ ）．
tical with those called $\beta a \sigma i \lambda \in i s$（ I ）in the ${ }^{1} 3^{\text {th }}$ Axon of Solon，quoted by Plutarch，



 E¢cuyov，and also（2）in the decree of Patro－ cleides，Andocides，de Myst．$\S 78$（founded on the language of the law just quoted），$力$



 yots．In the context of the first passage they are called $\pi \rho \nu \tau d y \in s$ ；in that of the second，they are distinguished from the Archon－Basileus．The identity of the $\beta a \sigma t \lambda e i s$ of Solon with the $\phi v \lambda a \beta a-$ Gideis of Pollux（viii 111,120 ）is sup－ ported by the connexion of both with the Притаvêav．The $\beta$ aбt $\lambda e i$ is apparently dealt with cases of persons who aimed at a rupavuls．They also presided over the Ephetae in the court of homicide at the Piytaneum（cf． 57 end）．They probably represented＇the priestly functions of the ancient chieftains of the several separate tribes which were ultimately fused into a single community＇（Prof．Ridgeway in Smith，Dict．Ant．s．v．）．The fact that they were four in number was already known from the quotation of the present passage in Photius，s．v．pav－ kpapia．Cf．Pollux viii in1，as emended by Wecklein，al $\delta \dot{\epsilon} \phi . \quad \epsilon \xi \in \dot{\epsilon} \pi \pi a \tau \rho \ell \delta \hat{\omega} \nu$ $\tau \dot{\epsilon} \sigma \sigma a \rho \epsilon s(\bar{\delta}$ for $\delta \bar{\delta})$ ä $\nu \tau \epsilon s \kappa \tau \lambda$ ．In the Butletin de Correspondance Hellénique， iii 69 ，we have an inscr．found on the Acropolis respecting a fund called $\tau \grave{\mathrm{a}}$ фидаßабı入ıка̀，part of which was spent on celebrating a religious festival．

тритти́es ．．．vaukpaplai］The plupf． shews that these divisions had existed before the time of Solon．Photius，s．v． pavkpapla，carelessly quotes Aristotle as his authority for ascribing to Solon the origin of the term paúkpapos（इó入ovas
 $\phi \eta \sigma l$ ）．That he had the present passage in view is indicated by his quoting it ver－ batim at the end of his article．

The existence of the vaukpaplac before the time of Solon is proved by Hdt．v

71，where their $\pi \rho \cup \tau \dot{d} \nu \in t$ are described as holding an important position in the go－ vernment of Athens at the time of the conspiracy of Cylon：of ，$\pi \rho v \tau a ́ v i \epsilon s ~ \tau \hat{\omega} \nu$
 то́тє тàs＇A $\theta$ خेvas；but Thuc．i $126 \$ 5$ corrects this account and substitutes for them the nine Archons，adding $\tau \dot{\delta} \tau \epsilon \delta \dot{\delta}$

 endeavours to reconcile both narratives by assigning to the nine Archons a place on the board of Prytaneis．

The Naucrari were the presidents of the Naucrariae，and the latter were the administrative districts into which the country was then divided．There were 12 in each tribe or 48 in all．Every four of these districts formed a group called a tpirtús，or third part of a tribe．In Pho－ tius p． 196 Porson，and in Bekk．Anec．p． 275，mention is made of a vavкpapla called $\mathrm{K} \omega \lambda$ tás which is the name of a strip of coast and cliffs near Phalerum．The term yau－ кpapla has reference to the duty imposed on these districts of equipping a ship of war，in addition to that of providing two borsemen（Pollux viii 108）．Grote，c． 10，ii 264 n ．，thinks＇the statement that each Naukrary was obliged to furnish one ship can hardly be true of the time before Solon．＇The actual expense proba－ bly fell on the wealthier inhabitants of the district，and it would naturally be from their number that the vavípapol，or pre－ sidents of the vavкpaplat，were chosen． There was one president for each vav－ xpapla，or 12 for each tribe．Hesychius


 Ė $\kappa \lambda \not \geqslant \theta \eta \sigma a \nu$（Schömann，Antiquities，p．${ }^{26}$ E．T．；Duncker，H．G．ii 144 E．T．； Gilbert，Gr．St．i r 35 ；Fahrb．f．cl．Phil． $1875, \mathrm{pp} .9$ and 452）．vaúk $\bar{a} p o s$ is formed from $\nu \alpha \hat{v} \hat{S}_{s}$ and the root $\kappa \overline{a p}$（by metathesis $\kappa \rho \bar{a}$ ）which appears in $\kappa \rho \alpha=\boldsymbol{\nu} \omega$＇to complete or accomplish＇（G．Meyer in Curtius， Studien，vii 175）．


 адад $\omega \mu a \tau \alpha$ ．











$17 \pi 0 \lambda \lambda a \chi 0 \hat{1}$ Wessely（ $\mathrm{K}^{3}$ ，b，litteris incertis $\alpha \chi$ ）；$\pi$ о $\lambda \lambda a \chi 6 \theta_{l}$ Paton（ $\mathrm{H}-\mathrm{L}$ ），sed spa－ tium vix sufficit；$\pi 0 \lambda \lambda[\dot{\alpha k l}] s$ K－w． $20 \dot{\epsilon} \pi l \boldsymbol{j} \dot{o}$ Paton，Gennadios（ $\mathrm{K}-\mathrm{w}, \mathrm{H}-\mathrm{L}, \mathrm{K}^{3}$ ，



 scripsi，coll．Plat．Leg． 762 в $\tau \dot{\eta} \nu \quad \delta \iota \pi \lambda a \sigma l a \nu(\zeta \eta \mu l a \nu) \pi \rho a \tau \tau \epsilon \sigma \theta \omega \tau \dot{\nu} \nu \dot{\imath} \pi \circ \phi \in \dot{\prime} \gamma 0 \nu \tau a: \tau 00$
 $\mathrm{K}-\mathrm{w}$ ；тov $\epsilon \kappa \tau \ell \nu \in \sigma \theta a \iota$ Tyrrell．
$26 \nu \delta \mu o \nu$ єl $\sigma \alpha \gamma \gamma \in \lambda l a \varsigma$ Wessely et $\mathrm{K}^{3}$ ；$\nu \delta \mu 0 \nu$

êv toîs vópousктג．］Phot．Lex．vaukpapla：
 d $\mu \phi \iota \sigma \beta \eta \tau \hat{\eta}, "$ каl＂тоѝs рauкрд́pous тoùs

 A new council of 400 is here contrasted with the previously existing council of the Areopagus．There is nothing in the phrase to shew that the writer has made any mention of a previous council under Dracon．Cf．Plut．Sol．19，$\sigma$ vбт $\eta \sigma$ á $\mu \in v o s$


 $\mu$ evos．
＇Apєотаүıгӣv］Philippi，Areop．u． Epheten，pp．199－246；Gilbert，i 136 ． Duncker，Gesch．d．Alt．（XII 12）vol．vi 187－r94．








甲グขохеリ．

 $\tau 0 \hat{\delta} \epsilon \epsilon \tau \iota \stackrel{\psi}{ } \pi^{\prime}{ }^{\prime} A \theta \eta p a l \omega \nu \pi b \lambda c s$ ．Aristoph．

Nub．69，Eq．267，Lys．245．＇In inscriptions $\dot{\epsilon} \nu \dot{\alpha} \alpha \rho \rho \frac{\pi}{6} \lambda \epsilon t$ is first found in B．c． $387-6$ ， according to Bull．d．Corr．Hell． 1888 p．149．In fourth century prose the use of $\pi b \lambda c s$ is preserved in certain familiar and unambiguous combinations：［Xen．］ De Red．v $12, \chi \rho \eta \dot{\mu} \mu a \tau a \operatorname{\epsilon ls} \tau \grave{\eta} \nu \pi 6 \lambda c \nu$ dive－

 （possibly quoted from one of the writers of＇A $\tau \theta i \delta \epsilon s$ or from Craterus）．For＇other references see Maetzner on Antiph． $6 \$ 39$ $\epsilon \boldsymbol{\epsilon} \tau \hat{\eta} \pi \dot{\sigma} \lambda \epsilon$ ．On the other hand Andoc． 3 §7，and Aeschin． $2 \S 175$ ，have $\alpha \nu a \phi \epsilon \rho \epsilon \iota \nu$ $\epsilon l s \tau_{\eta} \nu \dot{\alpha} \kappa \rho \delta \sigma_{0} \lambda \iota \nu$＇（Wyse）．
 $a_{\gamma} \gamma^{\ell \lambda(a s] ~ e l \sigma a \gamma \gamma \in \lambda \lambda e t p}$ has already been used in a general sense in $4 \S 4$ ．We now find a definite $\nu \delta \mu o s$ el $\sigma a \gamma \gamma \in \lambda l a s$ ascribed for the first time to Solon．The special case here mentioned corresponds to the first of the three classes of crimes which， according to Hyperides，were included in the $\nu$ duos $\epsilon l \sigma a \gamma \gamma \epsilon \lambda \tau \iota \kappa b s$ ，pro Eux．22，

 éralpıкdy owvaүárp（Isocr．de Big．6； Dinarch．c．Dem．94）．Cf．Theophr．apud Lex．Rhet．Cantab．s．v．єlनay $\boldsymbol{\epsilon} \boldsymbol{\lambda}(a$ ：Єáv
 that the definition given by Theophrastus applies to a far earlier date than the time






 Mayor, Marchant, Blass, Gennadios, $\mathrm{H}-\mathrm{L}$ ) quondam conieci, coll. Plut. Sol. 20 т $\epsilon \rho$ -

 äroßaivov scribendum. spatium vix sufficit.
 secutus K ; $\tau \rho \mathrm{la} \tau \dot{d} \delta^{\prime} \mathrm{H}-\mathrm{L}, \mathrm{K}-\mathrm{w}^{2} . \quad \tau \dot{\alpha}$ om. $\mathrm{H}-\mathrm{L}$.

Testimonta. 28-30. *Gellius, ii 12 : In legibus Solonis illis antiquissimis quae Athenis axibus ligneis incisae sunt quasque latas ab eo Athenienses ut sempiternae manerent poenis et religionibus sanxerunt, legem esse Aristoteles refert scriptam ad hanc sententiam: 'si ob discordiam dissensionemque seditio atque discessio populi in duas partes fiet et ob eam causam irritatis animis utrimque arma capientur pugnabiturque, tum qui in eo tempore in eoque casu civilis discordiae non alterutrae parti sese adiunxerit, sed solitarius separatusque a communi malo civitatis secesserit, is domo patria fortunisque omnibus careto, exul extorrisque esto' (Rose, Frag. 353 ${ }^{2}$, $39^{r^{3}}$ ).
after Eucleides, to which it has been assigned by Fränkel, Att. Geschroorenenger., p. 77 .

There is a vague reference to elaay $\sigma$ Nac in the time of Solon in Pollux viii 53,

 $\pi \epsilon \nu \tau a \kappa b \sigma \iota o \iota$, cf. Philochorus, 155 Müller,

 $\chi^{\iota \lambda i \omega \nu} \pi \epsilon \nu \tau a \kappa \sigma \sigma t \omega \nu$ (cf. Duncker, G.d.A. vi 179 n ). The special case mentioned in the text came before the Areopagus.





 $\theta \epsilon \in \mu \epsilon \nu 0 \nu \quad \tau \grave{d}$ olкєîa кal $\tau \hat{\varphi} \mu \dot{\eta} \quad \sigma v \nu a \lambda \gamma \epsilon \hat{\nu}$




 § 1, ii 823 F, $\dot{a} \pi о \rho \eta \sigma \epsilon \iota \ldots$ кal $\theta a \nu \mu \dot{\alpha} \sigma \epsilon \iota \tau$

 $\mu \in \nu 0 \nu$, De Sera Numinis Vindicta 4 , ii 550


 ad Atticum x 1, 2, ego vero Solonis...
legem neglegam, qui capite sanxit, si quis in seditione non alterius utrius partis fuisset. (Cf. Grote, c. 11, ii 34I.) Prof. Mayor (Class. Rev. v 120 b) also refers to Cantacuzen. iv 13, and Nicephorus Gregora ix 6 fin.
 up a position in the face of an enemy.

 phrase is frequent in Xenophon's Anabasis in several military senses, e.g. eis $\tau \dot{d} \xi \iota \nu$
 (Krüger's Lexikan, or Vollbrecht's Wörter. buch).
$\left.\mu \eta \mathbf{\delta E} \mu \epsilon \Theta^{\prime} \dot{E T} \in p \omega v\right]$ Also in Thuc. ii 67 § 5 , cf. v 48 , oú $\delta^{\prime} \dot{\cup} \phi$ ' ' $\tau \epsilon \rho \omega \nu$. vi 44 § 4 , ovóz $\mu \in \theta^{\prime} \notin \tau \dot{\epsilon} \rho \omega \nu$. vii 59 § $1, \mu \eta \delta \dot{\epsilon} \mu \epsilon \theta^{\prime}$ єє $\tau \rho a$.

 $\delta \eta \mu о \kappa \rho a \tau l a \nu, \eta \eta^{\nu} \nu \Sigma 6 \lambda \omega \nu \mu \hat{\nu} \dot{\delta} \delta \eta \mu \circ \tau<\kappa \dot{\omega}-$ татоs $\gamma \in \nu \quad \mu \epsilon \nu$ os $\in \nu 0 \mu 0 \theta \epsilon \tau \eta \sigma \epsilon$. Dem. 18 § $6, \Sigma 6 \lambda \omega \nu, \epsilon \ddot{\nu}$ $\kappa 6 s$. For Solon's relations to democracy see Pol. ii 12, 1273 b 35. In the language of Mr Newman's excellent paraphrase in vol. i p. 373, we are there told that 'certain persons regarded Solon as the destroyer of an extreme oligarchy, on the ruins of which he constructed the $\pi \dot{a} \tau \rho \iota o s \quad \delta \eta \mu o \kappa \rho a \tau l a$, a wisely mixed constitution: they took him to have founded





 $\mathrm{H}-\mathrm{L}\left(\mathrm{K}^{3}, \mathrm{~B}\right) ; \dot{\Psi} \kappa a l \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{w}$; $\hat{\eta} \mathrm{K}^{\mathbf{1}}$.

6, 9, 13 「IN (K-W).
the Areopagus, to have introduced the system of filling magistracies by election, and to have created the popular dicastery, thus as it were equipping the State with a complete set of new institutions....To this view of Solon's work Aristotle objects: he says that Solon would seem to have found the council of the Areopagus, and the system of filling the magistracies by election, already established, and that he...left them as he found them, whereas he did institute the popular element in the constitution by founding the popular dicasteries. He appeals in support of his contention to the opinion of a second set of critics, who made Solon responsible for the existing extreme democracy. They complained that, so far from being the author of a mixed constitution, he overpowered the oligarchical element by the democratic, inasmuch as he gave supreme power to the popular dicastery. Armed with this judicial authority, the people became masters of the State; one statesman after another had to play into their hands, and so the extreme democracy gradnally came into being. Aristotle, however, holds that these inquirers ascribed to Solon's institution of popular dicasteries consequences which wonld not have resulted from it, if it had not been for accidental circumstances. Solon was far from intending to found an extreme democracy; he gave, in fact, only a modicum of power to the people-enough to content them and no more-and reserved office for the better-to-do classes. On the other hand, he was not the contriver of an elaborate mixed constitution, but rather the founder of the beginnings of popular liberty; still less was he the undoer of the power of the Few. He left office in their hands, and gave the people only just enough power to make the holders of office govern well.'







 $\ddot{\omega} \sigma \pi \epsilon \rho$ évds $\mu \dot{k} p o u s ~ \sigma u v a \iota \sigma \theta d \nu \epsilon \sigma \theta a \iota$ каl $\sigma u \nu-$





 тous à ásкойvтas."
 changes from the substantival use of the infinitive to an ordinary substantive. The eulogists of Solon, referred to in Pol. ii $12,1273^{b} 4 \mathrm{I}$, recognise the $\delta<\kappa \alpha \sigma \tau \dot{\eta}-$ pıov as the element which is $\delta \eta \mu о \tau<\kappa \partial \nu$ in his constitution; while his critics describe him as having subordinated the oligarchical element, кúptov $\pi о \iota \eta$ ク̆баута ті̀
 totle himself subsequently mentions as one of the two elements in the necessary modicum of political power assigned to the people that of $\epsilon \dot{\theta} \dot{\prime} \dot{\nu} \epsilon \epsilon \nu$, i.e. calling the officials to account in the law-courts,

 (after saying of the $\theta \hat{\eta} \tau \epsilon s$ that $\tau \hat{\psi} \sigma v p \epsilon \kappa-$






 yous. Grote (ii 325) holds that the popular dicasteries were not established by Solon, a view which is not in accordance with the text. He also points out (p. 326) that, although Solon laid the foundation of the Athenian democracy, his institutions were not democratical (as compared with those of Cleisthenes and Pericles). The dicasteries doubtless became more highly developed in later times, but of their existence in Solon's time for certain purposes, such as the control of officials, there can be no reasonable doubt. See Duncker, Gesch.d. Alt. vi 179, 180 .








#### Abstract

  propter tot generis neutri vocabula pluralia in contextu cumulata numerus singularis videtur elegantior．$\quad 11 \tilde{j} \mathrm{~K}^{3}(\mathrm{~B}) ; \tau \iota \mathrm{K}$－W（in papyro ntrumvis legi potest）．ö $\pi \omega \omega$   13 тєpi入aBєIN etiam ante кגӨo入oy scriptum et deinde deletum；$\pi \alpha \nu \tau a \chi 0 \hat{0}$ sine causa legendum suspicantur H－L．


§ 2．$\dot{\alpha} \pi \lambda \omega \hat{\omega} . . . \sigma a \phi \hat{\mathrm{~s}}$ ］Dem．Lept．§ 93 ， $\dot{a} \pi \lambda a \hat{a} k a l$ $\sigma a \phi \hat{\eta}$ ，Isaeus 11 § $32, \dot{a} \pi \lambda \hat{a}$ каl $\gamma \nu \dot{\rho} \rho \mu \mu \alpha \mu \alpha \hat{\epsilon} \hat{\nu}$, Dem． $24 \S 68$ ，ám $\pi \hat{\omega}$ s кal $\pi a ̂ \sigma \iota ~ \gamma \nu \omega \rho l \mu \omega s, \gamma \epsilon \gamma \rho a t \phi \theta a l$ ．In all these passages perspicuity is described as a merit in legislative enactments．Here the obscurity of some of Solon＇s laws is said to have increased the powers of the people as interpreters of the law in the dicasteries．
 to the law of intestate succession quoted in Dem．Macart． 43 § 5I，p． 1067 ．Parts of this law are paraphrased or expressly cited in Isaeus II §§ 1,2 ，and 7 § 20 ．
 Dem． $43 \S 16,54$ ，and $46 \S 22$ ，ending
 $\mu \dot{\eta} \tau \epsilon \kappa \lambda \hat{\eta} \rho \circ \nu \mu \dot{\eta} \tau \epsilon \epsilon \pi \pi / \kappa \lambda \eta \rho \circ \nu$. This law is referred to in Isaeus 38864,74 and else－ where．Both laws may be fairly ascribed to Solon，and students of Isaeus will admit the ambiguity of certain clauses in them．The greater part of Plutarch＇s Sol． 20 is devoted to details of the law of the $\dot{\epsilon \pi} \ell \kappa \lambda \eta \rho o s$, but the points there touched upon are curious rather than obscure． In the time of Aristophanes the decision of rival claims to the hand of an＇heiress＇ was one of the most cherished privileges of the Athenian dicast（Vesp． $583-587$ ）． Cf．inf． 42 § $5, \pi \varepsilon \rho l$ к $\lambda \eta \rho o v$ каl $\epsilon \pi \iota \kappa \lambda \eta \dot{\rho} \rho v$,




 $\delta e ́ \delta \rho \theta \omega \bar{s}$ ．
oloveal кт入．］Plut．Sol．18，$\lambda \in \gamma \in \tau a l$






 is hardly just to Plutarch＇（says Grote） ＇to make him responsible for the absurd remark that Solon rendered his laws intentionally obscure．．．We may well doubt whether it was ever seriously intended even by its author，whoever he may have been＇（Grote，c．11，ii 330）． We now see that Plutarch quotes from the text，where the authors of this opinion are not specified．The opinion is only quoted to be rejected．The real cause for the obscurity of some of Solon＇s laws is introduced with the words of $\mu \eta{ }^{\prime} u$ єlкд̀s ктл．

 ，his being unable to attain the perfection of legislative expression while drawing up his laws in general terms．＇It is characteristic of a legislator to deal with т j кa $\theta 6 \lambda \mathrm{ov}$ ，leaving the dicast to deal with the details．Rhet．i I $\$ 7, \dot{\eta} \mu \dot{\eta} y$






 modu．Eth．Nic．v 14， 1137 b 15 ，Pol． iii $1 \mathrm{I}, \mathrm{I} 282 b$ ，（those in authority must


 39， $1269 a$ 9， $1286 a$ 1о．
 mine in express words，draw up in a legal form＇（L and S），Plat．Leg． 823 в，Aripa



 $\kappa a i ̀ \mu \epsilon \tau a ̀ ~ \tau a v ̂ \tau a ~ \tau \eta ́ \nu ~ \tau \epsilon ~ \tau \omega ̂ \nu ~ \mu \epsilon ́ \tau \rho \omega \nu ~ \kappa a i ̀ ~ \sigma \tau a \theta \mu \omega ̂ \nu ~ \kappa a i ̀ ~ \tau \grave{\nu} \nu ~ \tau o \hat{v}$






 (embrace, include) $\tau \alpha \hat{v} \tau a \pi \dot{\alpha} \nu \tau a$, iii 12 ,




 writer's favourite methods of reconstruction is 'inference from the present to the past, from existing circumstances to their presumable antecedents, from a given state of institutions to a former condition of the same.' We here find 'part of a formula for the critical application of this method,' or rather for the limitations under which it may be applied ( Mr Macan, F. $H$. S., xii 37 f.).
 Solon's general legislation falls between the $\sigma \epsilon \sigma \sigma \dot{d} \otimes \in \epsilon a$ and the alteration of the currency. There is thus no direct connexion between the change in the coinage and the famous 'disburdening' ordinance. It was not by a modification of the monetary standard that Solon relieved the oppressed debtors; it was by an absolute cancelling of the debt. The opposite view was held by Androtion, whose opinion is quoted by Plutarch only to be rejected: Sol. 15, kalтoı тù̀s










 $\delta \dot{e} \pi \lambda \epsilon \hat{L} \sigma \tau \sigma \iota \pi \alpha ́ \nu \tau \omega \nu \dot{\partial} \mu 0 \hat{v} \tau \hat{\omega} \nu \sigma \nu \mu \beta o \lambda a i \omega \nu$


т $\omega \nu \mu \tau \tau \rho \omega \nu$ каl $\tau \tau \alpha \theta \mu \hat{\omega} \nu$ каl...тоиิ
vopi $\sigma \mu a \tau o s$ avj $\eta \sigma เ v]$ 'the augmentation of the measures and weights and of the currency.' Andoc. De Myst. 83 (the decree of Tisamenus), $\pi 0 \lambda \iota \tau \epsilon \dot{v} \epsilon \sigma \theta a '^{\prime} A \theta \eta \nu a l o v s$

 was held by Boeckh (Metrologie, 1838, xv § 2) that Solon 'not only debased the coin but also altered the weights and measures.' Grote dissented from this opinion on the latter point, giving his reasons in the Classical Museum, i p. 25: 'I believe that the statement of Androtion...has no reference to the medinnus and metretes, and that we cannot even deduce from it the vague inference...that Solon made some new arrangement of the measures.' He interprets the words $\tau \omega \bar{\nu}$ $\mu \dot{\epsilon} \tau \rho \omega \nu \in \pi \alpha \cup \xi \eta \sigma \iota \nu$ (Plut.) of the monetary standard alone, referring them to the 'increased number of drachmae, which every mina and every talent were now made to contain.' He even adds that 'we know positively that Solon did not meddle with the weights.' He holds that it was 'for tbe express purpose of affording relief to debtors, that Solon degraded the monetary standard, and maintains that Solon ' would not choose such a moment for rearranging the liquid and dry measures.' The present passage conclusively confirms the opinion held by Boeckh.
 to the fact that 73 old Aeginetan drachmas were replaced by 100 Attic drachmas, so that the same amount of silver was represented by a larger number of coins.


 тоуע $\quad$ aloorl. The date of Pheidon is disputed. He is sometimes placed in Ol. $8=$ b.c. 748 (Pausan. vi 22, 2, followed by Unger, Duncker, and Busolt, i 140 n ); sometimes (by altering the text of Pausanias) in Ol. $\mathbf{2 8}=$ b.c. 668 (Weissenborn, followed by Curtius). Hdt. l.c. mentions a




 admisso) coniecerat Mahaffy (Athenaeum, 1891, p. 344), sed numerum omnibus notum indicat articulus.
son of Pheidon among the suitors of the daughter of Cleisthenes, despot of Sicyon, which would make Pheidon's date shortly before 600 в.c. The first of these dates is half a century before the beginning of Greek coinage, which may be placed about b.c. 700 (Busolt, i 355). The earliest anthority for the statement that silver coins were first struck by Pheidon at Aegina is Ephorns, quoted by Strabo P. 376 , ${ }^{*}$ E $\phi$ opos $\delta$ ' $\epsilon y$ Al $\gamma l y \eta$ d $\rho$ -



 (cf. Busolt, i 144 n). This last is the only passage which describes Pheidon as an inventor of weights; and even here the epithet 'Pheidonian' is applied to the $\mu \dot{k} \tau \rho a$ alone. The Marmor Parium, ep. 30, connects him with silver coinage as well as with a reform in the measures of
 $\mu \epsilon ́ \tau p a \ldots к a i$ à $\nu \epsilon \sigma \kappa \epsilon \dot{a} \sigma \sigma$ ('reformed them')
 The Etymologicum Magnum, s. v. ${ }^{\beta} \beta \in \lambda l-$ okos, mentions his coinage, but implies that he made no change in standards of

 $\mu \sigma \mu a \kappa a l$ d $\nu a \lambda a \beta \dot{\omega} \nu$ rous $\dot{\beta} \beta \epsilon \lambda l \sigma \kappa o v s$ (spits, or small bars, of metal), dं $\nu^{2} \theta \eta \kappa \epsilon \quad \tau \hat{\eta} \hat{\ell} \nu$






 Orion p. 118 'qui Heraclidis Pontici auctoritate utitur,' Gaisford] rapeठifouv oi áppaîou. The text mentions him solely in connexion with $\mu \dot{k} \tau \rho a$, or ' measures of capacity,' and not in comexion with coinage or weights, the present section dealing in order with three topics (1) measures, (2) coinage, (3) weights, which must not be confounded with one another. Similarly, in another of the $\pi 0 \lambda \iota \tau \in i a u$, that of Argos (Rose, Frag. 480, 3, Pollux 10 , 179) $\mu \notin \tau \rho a$ alone are mentioned in connexion with Pheidon; $\epsilon^{\prime} \eta \delta^{\prime}$ à kal $\phi \epsilon \epsilon \delta \omega \nu$




The present passage tells us for the first time that the Pheidonian measures of capacity were smaller than the corresponding Attic measures. The Pheidonian scale of measures may be identified with the Babylonian, and the ratio of the Pheidonian to the Solonian measures may accordingly be $12:$ 13. Thus, in liquid measure, the Solonian $\mu \epsilon \tau \rho \eta \tau \eta$ 's is already known to have contained about 39 litres, or 81 gallons: the Pheidonian $\mu \epsilon \tau \rho \eta \tau \eta \eta_{s}$ would therefore contain about 36 litres, or rather less than 8 galions, and be identical with the Babylonian epha and the old Egyptian artabe. Similarly, in dry measure, the Solonian $\mu \delta \delta \mu \nu$ os contained about 52 litres, or about 12 gallons; and the Pheidonian, 48 litres, or about ${ }^{11}$ gallons (Hultsch, Neue Fahrb. für Philologie, 1891, pp. 263-4). For the opinion held hitherto, that the Pheidonian measures were larger than the Solonian, cf. Duncker, Hist. Gr. Bk II, c. ii, vol. ii 26 E.T.
 statement of Androtion in Plut. Sol. 15, Solon, in introducing a new standard for silver coin, lowered the standard to the extent of 27 per cent. Ioo drachmas of the new standard contained no more silver than 73 of the old. Thus the new mina was equivalent in weight to 73 unreduced drachmas. As 73:100:: 100: 137 ; hence, 100 drachmas of the old standard would be equivalent in weight to 137 of the new. 73 to 100 is precisely the proportion between the Attic drachmas of 67.5 grs. and average Aeginetan drachmas of rather over 90 grs (73: roo :: $67 \cdot 5: 92^{\circ}$ ), the Attic mina being to the Aeginetan as $100: 137$ (Head's Historia Numorum, p. 309). If, however, instead of taking Aeginetan coins of average weight, we take those of actual maximum weight, the stater of two drachmae weighs 194 grs. The corresponding Attic coin weighs 135 grs. Then as $194: 135:: 100: 69 \frac{5}{57}$. Hence the number of drachmas of the Aeginetan
 $\nu \delta \mu \iota \sigma \mu a>\delta \ell \delta \rho a \chi \mu \circ \nu \mathrm{~J}$ B Mayor. $\quad \sigma \tau a \theta \mu \mathrm{~d} \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{W}, \mathrm{K}^{3}, \mathrm{~B} ; \quad \sigma \tau \alpha \theta \mu \partial \nu \mathrm{K}^{1} ; \pi \rho o ̀ s \tau \partial \nu \quad \sigma \tau \alpha \theta \mu \partial \nu$ то̀ 的 $\mu \tau \sigma \mu a$ ? $\mathrm{H}-\mathrm{L}$.
standard, which would be equivalent in weight to 100 Attic drachmas, would be about $69 \frac{1}{2}$. Thus, according as we take average or maximum weights, Mr Ken-
 $\mu$ ás, will mean either 73 or $69 \frac{1}{2}$. -The reading proposed by Blass gives us exactly 73 drachmas.

The new standard introduced by Solon in place of the Aeginetan has been convincingly proved by Mommsen (Röm. Münzzeesen, p. 43 sq., Mon. Rom. ed. Blacas, i 29 sqq., 73 sq.) to have been the Euboic, and henceforth Euboean coins would circulate freely in Attica, side by side with the new Attic money (Head, p. 3 10, cf. 302 and xxxviii-xlii). Thus Solon's reform of the currency was not necessarily due to economic reasons connected with the debts of the poorer citizens. It had a commercial object and was intended to facilitate trade with the neigbbouring island of Euboea (especially with Chalcis and Eretria), and with other Greek cities (for example, Cyrene), where the Euboic standard prevailed. It would also promote trade with Corinth, where a similar standard was in use (Busolt, i p. 525), and with the Greek colonies in Chalcidice and Sicily (Köhler, in Mittheil. d. d. arch. Inst. 1885 , x 151 ${ }^{-1}$ 57). It has further been suggested by Mr R. S. Poole (Dict. of the Bible, art. 'Weights and Measures') that the new Solonian standard was borrowed from Egypt. The Egyptian unit of weight was $I_{40}$ grains, and the Solonian didrachm weighed 135 grains. Thus, whether the standard was actually borrowed from Egypt or Euboea, the Solonian coinage would facilitate intercourse with Egypt as well as with the countries where the Euboic standard was in use.

In this connexion it is interesting to notice that, after reforming the currency, and thus facilitating trade with countries employing either the Euboic or the Egyptian standard, Solon set out for Egypt, where he stayed for ten years, one of his avowed objects being the pursuit of commerce.
dver $\lambda \eta p \omega^{\prime} \theta \eta$ ] 'was raised to the full number of a hundred drachmas.'
$\eta^{\circ} v-\delta(\delta \rho a x \mu \circ v]$ 'the primitive type of coin was the two-drachma piece.' रapaк-

that which has a stamp impressed upon it, cf. Plato, Politicus, 289 B, $\dot{\eta}$ тои $\nu 0 \mu l \sigma$ -
 характ $\eta \rho o s:(2)$ the stamp itself, as in


 $\sigma \eta \mu \epsilon \hat{0} 0$. Oecon. ii 5 (of Hippias), т̀ $\delta \dot{\text { è }}$



 $\gamma$ úpoov.

Before the time of Solon, the only money current in Attica, as well as in Boeotia and Peloponnesus, seems to have been the Aeginetan didrachm of about 194 grains; but there are no Athenian coins extant of Aeginetan weight. Thus, apart from mere tradition (Plut. Thes. 25
 there is no proof of any coins having been struck at Athens before Solon (Head, p. xlii). The text must therefore refer to the old Aeginetan didrachms in circulation in Attica before the time of Solon. These coins had on the obverse a tortoise with a plain shell and a row of dots down the middle of its back; and, on the reverse, an incuse square divided into eight triangular compartments, of which four or more are deeply hollowed out (Head, l.c., p. 332, fig. 220).


From the time of Solon the standard coin of Athens was the tetradrachm of the

full Euboic weight of 270 grains. The common type is a head of Athena of rude
 $\mu \dot{\eta} \theta \eta \sigma a \nu[a i] \mu \nu a \hat{\imath} \tau \hat{\omega} \sigma \tau a \tau \eta ̂ \rho \iota ~ \kappa a i ̀ ~ \tau o i ̂ s ~ a ̈ \lambda \lambda o u s ~ \sigma \tau \alpha \theta \mu o i ̂ s . ~$
 way, retinuerunt $\mathrm{K}-\mathrm{w}$, в.
archaic style with large prominent eye, wearing a round earring and close-fitting crested helmet : on the obverse is an owl with head facing and wings closed; also an olive-spray and the letters A $\theta$ E ( $i i_{0}$. p. 310, fig. 209). After the time of Solon, coins of Eretria, stamped with the head of a bull, together with other Euboean coins, may have circulated in Attica, side by side with the Solonian 'owls.' But there is no authority earlier than Philochorus (in the generation after Aristotle), for stating that the early didrachms, which preceded the Solonian 'owls,' were impressed with the figure of an ox (Head, l.c. p. 309). Cf. Schol, on Arist.



 ' $\mathrm{A} \theta \eta \nu \mathrm{a} \mathrm{s}, \tau \hat{\omega} \nu \quad \pi \rho \delta \tau \epsilon \rho о \nu$ हो $\delta \delta \rho \alpha \chi \mu \omega \nu$ ö $\nu \tau \omega \nu$



 ever, ignore the fact that archaic coins of Enboea, bearing the bull's head, have repeatedly been found in Attica (cf. Koehler, Mittheilungen, ix 357-9).
émoiñéayoúras] 'He also instituted standard weights corresponding to the coinage, $6_{3}$ minae weighing the talent,' i.e. 'at the rate of 63 minae to the weight of a talent.' Cf. c. 5 I , $\tau \boldsymbol{\partial \nu} \sigma \tau \alpha \theta \mu \partial \nu$


Much difficulty has been felt respecting these $6_{3}$ minae, on the ground that, in every standard, a talent invariably consists of 60 minae. Thus it is ingeniously suggested by Mr Kenyon and others that $\tau \rho \epsilon i s$ кal ' was written as an explanation of тарат入hбtov above, and was subsequently inserted in the text in the wrong place, and this suggestion has been regarded with considerable favour. But the text, as it stands, admits of a ready explanation If we regard it as stating the weight of the Solonian currency as compared with the average weight of the corresponding coins of the Euboic standard.

The average weight for the Solonian silver coinage was slightly higher than that of the Euboic. Solon made his new talent consist of 63 old minae of the average Euboic weight ; and this talent was, like
all other talents, divided into 60 minae. As the post-Solonian mina weighed about 6750 grains, the talent must have weighed 60 times that amount, or 405,000 grains. To obtain the weight of the mina superseded by the Solonian mina, we divide by 63 and the result is $64^{2} 8_{9}^{4}$ grains. A stater, or fiftieth part of this, is I 284 grains. In other terms, $63: 60:$ r35: $128 \frac{4}{7}$. This is in sufficiently close agreement with the actual weights of the coins of Euboea, as compared with those of Attica. The two-drachma piece of the former weighs r3o grains (only one grain and three-sevenths more than the weight above mentioned) ; that of the later, 135 grains. The substance of this explanation is due to Prof. Ridgeway, who also shews that, while the Aeginetan standard was used for silver, the Euboic was used for gold and silver, being in fact the only standard used for gold. Solon framed for the coinage of Athens a standard founded on that already in use for all transactions in gold. Possibly to adjust his silver currency to the standard gold unit, he angmented the silver standard, making 63 old minas go to his new talent of 60 minae. Thus, while about 70 Aeginetan drachmas are equal in weight to 100 Attic drachmas, rather less than 63 , or, strictly speaking, $62 \frac{2}{9}$ Euboic minas are equal in weight to 60 of the Solonian standard.
The above note refers to the average weight of coins of the Euboic standard. In the case of coins of full weight, that standard is practically identical with the Solonian, the staters of both weighing 135 grains (see Head's Brit. Mus. Cat. of Coins of Corinth, 1889, p. xix).
iti $\left.\delta \delta \epsilon \nu \in \mu \eta \eta^{\prime} \emptyset \eta \sigma a v\right]$ 'The minae were divided into fractions consisting of (lit. 'were apportioned out by') the stater and the other weights." $\dot{\epsilon} \pi i \delta \iota a \nu \epsilon \mu \omega$, "' to distribute besides,' Philo 2, 651 ; $7 v \nu t \pi$ Josephus, B. J. 2, 6, 3 " (L and S).
$\sigma \tau a \tau \grave{\eta} \rho$ is the general term for a standard unit of weight and (more frequently) of money. It here denotes the weight of a fiftieth part of a mina. The weights here meant are probably coin-weights alone, market-weights being apparently left out of consideration. Solon made no change in the zeeights used in com-
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merce，the Aeginetan mina being still retained unaltered（see Dr Percy Gardner on Pondera，in Smith＇s Dict．Ant．ii p． 449 b）．





















 àктท̂s．
グขผ́x ${ }^{\prime}$ ovy］This form is found in Xen． Cyr．V 3，56，Isocr． 5 § 53，Aeschin．I § 58，Dem．Lacr．16，Olymp．19．In Lacr． 30 the mss vary between $\epsilon \nu \omega \chi \lambda o \hat{v}-$ $\mu \epsilon \nu$（ $\Sigma$ and other mss），$\dot{\epsilon \nu o \chi \lambda o v} \mu \epsilon \nu$ （Aug．I），$\eta_{\nu \omega \chi \lambda о \nu}^{\mu \epsilon \nu}$（vulgo）．The Rhet． ad Alex． $1445 \quad b 2$ has $\dot{\eta} \nu \omega \dot{\chi} \lambda \eta \sigma \sigma a \nu$ ．In Aeschin． $3 \S 44$ the mss vary between
 èvux quotes Photius：$\dot{\eta} \nu \epsilon \ell \chi \in \tau 0$ кal $\dot{\eta} \nu \dot{\omega} \chi \lambda \epsilon \epsilon .$.
 Lobeck＇s Phrynichus，p．${ }^{154}$ ．

Séca évèv］For the fact cf．Hdt．i 29 ， $\dot{a} \pi \epsilon \delta \dot{\eta} \mu \eta \sigma \varepsilon \notin \tau \varepsilon a \delta \dot{\varepsilon} \kappa a$ ．For the construc－





 The nom，c．inf．after $\delta i k a \iota o \nu$ eiva may perhaps be defended（I）by Dem． 15 § 16 ，
 civai（where，however，several editors prefer $\delta i k a \iota o c \not \partial y$ ，which involves a hiatus）； （2）by Dem．Prooem．P．1439，14，${ }^{\prime} \gamma \boldsymbol{\omega}$
 aüros elreiv．In the text the construction after $\delta$ isalov $\epsilon$ Ival is apparently identical with that often found after $\delta \epsilon \hat{\nu}$（Rehdantz， Ind．Dem．s．v．ot $\epsilon \sigma \theta a u)$ ．
§ 2．ä да ס 8 kal кт入．］Plut．Sol． 16




$\mu \epsilon \tau a \theta \in \sigma \theta a t]$＇changed their opinion with regard to him，＇i．e．＇were alienated from him．＇





 ${ }_{15} \kappa a l$ тà $\beta$ é $[\lambda \tau \iota] \sigma \tau a \nu 0 \mu о \theta \epsilon \tau \eta \dot{\eta} \sigma \varsigma$.

 $a \dot{v} \tau \omega \hat{\nu} \dot{\varphi} \nu \tau \tau i ̂ \sigma \delta \epsilon \cdot$

 $\kappa a i ̀ ~ \tau o i ̂ s ~ \epsilon ̇ ф \rho а \sigma a ́ \mu \eta \nu ~ \mu \eta \delta e ̀ \nu ~ a ̀[\epsilon \iota] \kappa e ̀ s ~ e ̂ ́ \chi \epsilon \iota \nu . ~$






 altera $\rho$ discerni putat k , in altera spatium plurium litterarum capax superesse. $\mu \kappa \kappa \rho \dot{\nu} \nu \mathrm{K}-\mathrm{w}$. $\quad 13$ нВоү $\lambda \epsilon$ то ( $\mathrm{K}-\mathrm{w}, \mathrm{B}$ ), quod in titulis Atticis ante annum $300 \mathrm{~A} . \mathrm{C}$.


XII $1<\tau \grave{\partial} \nu>$ propter homoeoteleuton exciderat. $\epsilon \chi_{\chi} \in \nu \mathrm{K}-\mathrm{w}$. $4 \Delta$ нмоі.




Testimonia. XII 4-9 Plut. Sol. 18. 11-14 Plut. Comp. Sol. et Popl. 2.




 $\mu b \nu$, Plat. Leg. 684 .






XII \& t . $\delta \mathrm{r} \mu \mu$ - $\mathrm{d} \delta i \kappa \omega \mathrm{~s}]$ These six lines are quoted in Plut. Sol. $18=$ frag. 5 Bergk.

1. 4. däapкєi] 'is sufficient,' as in Aesch. Pers. 474, Soph. O. C. ${ }_{1769 \text {, Eur. }}$

 was not enough ${ }^{3}$ (L and S). Grote (ii 326), who had before him Plutarch's
reading $\epsilon \pi a \rho \kappa \varepsilon \hat{\ell}$, translates: 'I gave to the people as much strength as sufficed for
 either (a) 'to supply' or (b) 'to be strong enough '(whether to help or to hinder). Plutarch's $\overline{\epsilon \pi a \rho \kappa \in \hat{i}}$ is the only instance of the absolute use of the verb given in $L$ and S, except Soph. Ant. 612, е̇тapкéa עópos "of', 'this law shall prevail' or
 satisfactory explanation given by Professor Jebb, who adds that in the only other instance, i.e. in Plutarch's quotation from Solon, ' we must surely read d́ $\pi \alpha \rho \kappa \varepsilon i$ with Coraës.' This opinion is conclusively confirmed by the reading given us by the papyrus.
 Plut. Solonis et Poplicolae comparatio, c. 2 ; frag. 6 Bergk.


 $\beta o \nu \lambda о \mu \epsilon ́ \nu \omega \nu^{*}$









 secl. K-w. $\quad \delta^{\prime} \epsilon \tau \epsilon \rho \omega \theta l$ mov R D Hicks, Wyse, Sidgwick, idem ego quoque con-


 ( $\mathrm{K}-\mathrm{w}, \mathrm{K}^{3}, \mathrm{~B}$ ) : $\delta \dot{\eta} \iota o$ in Plutarcho Reiskium secutus Bergk ( $\mathrm{K}^{1}, \mathrm{H}-\mathrm{L}$ ). $\quad 22$ á $^{\text {a }} \mu \mathrm{z} \nu$
 ${ }_{\alpha} \in \lambda \pi \tau \alpha$ coniecit Gaisford, recepit Bergk, versus initium arbitrati. 23 In Aristidis



Testimonia. 20, 21 Plut. Sol. 16.
22-23 Aristid. ii 536.
 Clemens Alexandrinus (Stronateus, vi


 !ityтa. (Theognis 153, followed by the
 The Schol. on Pindar Ol. xiii 12 cites the first line as 'Homer's:' In the Proverbs of Diogenianus, viii 22, it appears in the form $\boldsymbol{\tau} \kappa \kappa \tau \epsilon \iota \tau 0 \iota-\kappa \alpha \kappa \hat{\varphi} \dot{\alpha} \nu \delta \rho l$ тареіт.

Diog. Laert. i 59 quotes, among the apophthegms of Solon; кal тdे $\mu \dot{\nu} \nu \kappa \delta \rho о \nu$
 ப் $\pi \dot{\delta}$ той кб́pov.
§ 3. кal $\left.\pi \dot{\alpha} \lambda \iota \nu \delta^{\prime}\right]$ кal- $\delta \dot{\varepsilon}$ is common in Ar.; e.g. Pol. 1252 a 13,1254 b ${ }^{24}$, ${ }^{1287}$ a 7, 1297 b 6 ; and especially in Ethics iv, viii, ix, x; 'adjungit autem кal- $\delta \dot{\epsilon}$ rem novam, saepe tam leni modo, ut idem fere valeat atque $\tau \epsilon$. Etiam saepius quam Aristoteles Theophrastus iis particulis utitur' (In the Historia Plantarum there are about 100 instances; in the Characters more than 70)-Eucken, De Ar. dicendi ratione, i 32.

$40_{4} b 2$ ('A $\left.\nu a \xi \alpha \gamma b \rho a s\right), \pi o \lambda \lambda \alpha \chi 0 \hat{0} \mu$ èv $\gamma \dot{\alpha} \rho$
 $\lambda \epsilon \gamma \epsilon \iota, \dot{\epsilon} \tau \epsilon \rho \omega \theta_{\iota} \delta \dot{\delta}$ то̂̀тov $\epsilon \tau \nu a t \tau \grave{\eta} \nu$ $\psi \nu \chi \dot{\eta} \nu$, De Partibus Animalium, iii 2,
 Sol. 2, $\alpha_{\lambda \lambda \prime}^{\prime} \dot{\epsilon} \tau \epsilon \rho \omega \theta_{L} \lambda \epsilon \gamma \in L$ (of Solon).
 Lines 17 -19, 24 and 25 are entirely new; 20 and 21 are quoted by Plutarch Sol. 16; part of 22, 23 by Aristides, ii 536 Dind.,


 ${ }^{2} \rho \delta \delta \nu$. Two other fragments in the same metre are assigned by Bergk to the same poem. The first of these is described in Plut. Sol. 14 as addressed $\pi \rho o ̀ s ~ Ф \omega к о \nu ;$ the second is quoted by Hutarch immediately afterwards, beginning with vúk ${ }_{\epsilon}^{\prime} \phi v \Sigma \delta \lambda \omega \nu \beta a \theta \dot{\prime} \phi \rho \omega \nu$.

1. 19. каí $\mu \in \kappa \omega \tau(\lambda \lambda$ ovta--vóov] 'and that 1 , though smoothly glozing, would reveal my rude intent.' Eкфадeiv cannot be translated as though it were synonym-
 cf. Theognis 852 , ìs $\tau \grave{\partial} \nu \dot{\text { éraîpov } \mu a \lambda \theta a \kappa \grave{a}}$ $\kappa \omega \tau(\lambda \lambda \omega \nu \xi \xi a \pi a \tau a \hat{\nu} \boldsymbol{\xi} \theta \in \lambda \epsilon \epsilon$.

#   

## 


 menti Berolinensis pagina prima continentur． $27<\tau 6 \tau \epsilon>\delta \iota d \mathrm{H}$－L． 28 oiveka， in poetis Atticis a criticis suspectum，saeculi quinti et sexti in titulis legitur，CIA
 vi－v）．Meisterhans，p． $177^{2}$ ．$\epsilon \nu \in \kappa$＇k－w．elveка $\xi u \nu \eta \gamma a \gamma o \nu$ Platt，coll．Pol．
 rajod h－L．Equidem oynekazynh animadvertit k supra litteram $\bar{z}$ scriptum esse 0 ，et litteras 「a厂 litteris $\lambda a t$ aut cat


 Leeuwen．Aut $\zeta v \gamma \eta \lambda a \tau o \nu$（quod nusquam adhuc inventum est）aut 广vүךфброע






§ 4．1．28．The doubtful reading $\mathfrak{d \xi}$ o－ v $\dagger \lambda a z o v$ is found in Aesch．Suppl． 18 I ， $\sigma \dot{u} \rho \iota \gamma \gamma \in s . . . \mathrm{d} \xi \circ \sim j \lambda \lambda a \tau 0 \ell$ ，＇whirling on the axle＇（ L and S ）；＇the sockets（in the naves）pressed by the axle，or through which the axle is driven＇（Tncker）．It seems impossible to interpret it（with Mr Kenyon）as a metaphor indicating＇a tor－ ture such as that of Ixion．＇Mnch less can we understand it as an allusion to the ágoves of Solon．－ $\mathfrak{a} \xi \xi^{2} \nu \eta \lambda a \dot{a} \tau o v y$, impf． of $d \xi_{o v} \eta \lambda a \tau \epsilon i v$, has been suggested；this is supported by O．Crusius（Philologus 1， 177）as a metaphor from the race－course which he considers characteristic of So－ lon，comparing l． 47 к $\epsilon \nu \tau \rho o \nu . . . \lambda \alpha \beta \dot{\omega} \nu$ ，and fragm． 23 Bergk，which merely mentions
 the country as strangers，＇though not found elsewhere，is implied in $\xi \in \nu \eta \lambda a r \epsilon \hat{\nu}$ ，and might be defended by Plut．Sol． $13, \dot{\epsilon} \pi l$ $\tau \grave{\eta} \nu \xi \in \nu \eta \nu \pi \iota \pi \rho a \sigma \kappa \delta \mu \in \nu 0 \iota$ ，and $i b .{ }_{15} a \nu \eta-$ रayov $\dot{d} \pi \delta \quad \xi \in \nu \eta s$ followed by a quotation of 11． $3^{8-41}, \gamma \lambda \omega \sigma \sigma \alpha \nu-廿 \chi o \nu \tau a s$.

On the whole，I prefer accepting in the first line $\xi_{v} \eta_{\gamma}{ }^{\prime}$ arov．For the second I gladly adopt a suggestion due to Pro－ fessor Jebb，who makes the sentence interrogative．He adds that the rhetorical emphasis obtained by placing the relative clause（ $\tau \hat{\nu} \nu \mu \dot{\varepsilon} \nu$ ）before the antecedent （ $\tau 0 v^{\prime} \tau \omega \nu$ ）seems to confirm the view that this is a question．＇But，as to the ends for which I formed the popular party，or

（less probably）gathered the people into one（by healing the divisions which sepa－ rated the various orders in the state）， why did I desist before I had attained those ends？＇（With | enavad $\mu \eta \nu, ~ c f . ~ 1 . ~$ |
| :---: | in fragment at the end of this chapter： ＇anyone else would not have restrained the people＇$\dot{\prime} \delta^{\prime} \dot{\epsilon} \pi \alpha \dot{\prime} \sigma a \tau o \kappa \tau \lambda$ ．）Solon is here quoting the question addressed to him by some of his opponents who held that he had not carried his reforms far enough．He is in fact putting in his own words the complaint which elsewhere he gives in the words of the malcontents，

 $\mu$ éva｜סtктuov（frag． 33 Bergk $^{4}$ ，1．3）．In the triumphant $\sigma v \mu \mu a \rho \tau v \rho o i \eta$ кт $\lambda$ ．，he seems to say，＇Earth is the best witness whether I had cause enough $\tau 0 \hat{v} \tau \delta \nu \delta \hat{\eta} \mu \Delta \nu$ avparareiv，without going on to do those things which I am blamed for not doing．＇ Prof．Jebb further points out that it is pro－ bable that the first two lines formed a separate sentence，as Aristides does not quote them，and it is unlikely that he would have begun his quotation with the third line，бuниартироt,$\kappa \tau \lambda$. ，if it had been in the middle of a sentence．I may add that the sense thus gained is confirmed by a subsequent line， 1.44 ，in which Solon protests that he has performed all that he has promised：$\delta \iota \hat{\eta} \lambda \theta 0 \nu$ wis $\dot{v} \pi \epsilon \sigma \chi 6 \mu \eta \nu$ ．Cf．

 бv $\mu \mu a \rho \tau \nu \rho[0 i] \eta$ тâ̂т' à̀ èv dikn $\chi$ рóvov
$\mu \eta \dot{\eta} \eta \rho \rho \in \gamma i \sigma \tau \eta \quad \delta a \iota \mu \delta \nu \omega[\nu$ 'О $\mathrm{O} \nu] \mu \pi i \omega \nu$
 [̈] $\rho o v s ~ a ̀ \nu \in i ̂ \lambda o \nu ~ \pi o \lambda \lambda a \chi \hat{\eta} \pi \epsilon \pi \eta \gamma o ́ \tau a[\varsigma]$,


 habet: K $\rho^{\circ} \nu_{\nu o u ~} \mu \hat{\eta} \tau \eta \rho$ Clavigerus apud Bergk ${ }^{2}$, qui ibidem ipse conicit $\dot{\epsilon} \nu \Delta i \kappa \eta s$
 \& $\tau \eta$ ? J B Mayor.

Testimonia. 30-54 Aristid. ii 536-8. 33, 34 Plut. Sol. i5.
 Quoted by Aristides, ii $536-8$, in two portions, (a) 11. 30-49 ending oủk $\hat{a} \nu$ $\kappa a \tau \epsilon \sigma \chi \epsilon \delta \hat{\eta} \mu o \nu$, and (b) $\epsilon l$ रà $\dot{\eta} \theta \in \lambda o \nu$ to the end, (b) is introduced with the words : $\epsilon \tau \tau a \tau i \phi \eta \sigma i \nu \dot{\delta} \Sigma 6 \lambda \omega \nu$;

1. зo. èv $\delta<\mathrm{k} \eta$ Xpóvou] possibly ( I ) 'before the tribunal of time,' a bold expression, but less bold than that in Eur. Bacch.
 (2) 'in the justice of time,' i.e. 'justice which time eventually brings.' $\sigma v \mu \mu a \rho-$ tupề is combined with $\chi$ popos in Xen. Hell, iii 3 \& z, $\sigma v \in \mu a \rho \tau \dot{u} p \eta \sigma \epsilon$ סе $\tau a \hat{v} \tau^{\prime}$
 elvai. Solon appeals to Earth to bear witness before the tribunal of Time that he had attained the ends he had in view.
2. $\left.\mathbf{3}^{\mathrm{I}} . \mu \dot{\eta} \tau \eta \mathrm{p}-\Gamma \hat{\eta}\right]$ Even the Attic land set free from its encumbrances is boldly personified as Mother Earth. Cf. Plato, Leg. 740 A, $\delta \in \hat{\imath} \tau \dot{\nu} \nu \lambda a \chi^{\alpha} \nu \tau a, ~ \tau \dot{\eta} \nu \lambda \hat{\eta} \xi \iota \nu$






3. 33, 34. öpous-inevetpa] These lines, and part of $11.38-4 \mathrm{I}$, are quoted in


öpovs à $\nu \in i ̂ \lambda \varepsilon-\nu \hat{\nu} \nu$ è $\lambda e v \theta$ épa.



4. 33. "̈pous] Sir George Cox, Hist. of Greece, i 2or, bas suggested that this means boundaries, and similarly in the Edinburgh Review, 189士, p. 493, 'These boundary stones were the marks of the religious ownership of the Eupatrids.' This view is refuted in Mr Evelyn Abbott's History of Greece, i $\ddagger 07$.

As regards the meaning of opos and cognate words in early Greek literature, the ambiguity in $I l$. xii $42 \mathrm{I}, \dot{\alpha} \mu \phi^{\prime}$ of ${ }^{\prime \prime} \rho o \sigma_{\sigma}$
 passages, which prove that the oipa are 'stones (xxii 405 ) marking off the allotments, and are easily moveable by a fraudulent neighbour (xxi 489 ),' Leaf ad loc. In Hdt. 193 oifoc is used of stones bearing inscriptions. In the present passage we have the earliest instance of $z_{\rho o c}$ in the sense of 'mortgage pillars,' 'stoneslabs or tablets set up on mortgaged property, to serve as a bond or register of the debt' ( $L$ and $S$ ). This use is common in the time of Demosthenes, e.g. Or. 31

 oú $\delta \epsilon i s$ öpos $\ddot{\epsilon} \pi \epsilon \sigma \tau \tau \nu \quad \epsilon \pi i \quad \tau \hat{n}$ ध́ $\sigma \chi \alpha \tau i \hat{q}$, and

 removed the tablets,' and $\S$ Ir, $\dot{\eta}$ ov ovia

 $\mu \epsilon \nu \eta \dot{\eta} \nu, 25$ § 69 , ol $\tau \in \theta \in \nu \tau \epsilon s$ öpoc $\dot{\epsilon} \sigma \tau \eta-$ $\kappa 6 \tau \epsilon s, 4 \mathrm{I}$ § 6, 8pous $\epsilon \pi \iota \sigma \tau \hat{\eta} \sigma \alpha L \chi^{i \lambda i \omega \nu}$

 Theophrastus (Char. $10=24$ Jebb) it is characteristic of the $\mu เ \kappa \rho \circ \lambda 6$ 子os to inspect the $\delta \rho o t$ day by day. Harpocr. s. $v$.




Originally the dpos was doubtless a boundary-stone or land-mark. In the absence of other means of registration, it became customary to inscribe on these boundary-stones a notice of the charges on the property. Solon, by his $\sigma \epsilon \sigma \alpha x-$ $\theta$ aia, released the poorer classes from the burden of their debts, and set the land, which was security for these debts, free from encumbrances. No sooner was the debt itself abolished, than the stones in-
$[\pi \rho o ́ \sigma \theta] \epsilon \nu$ ठè $\delta o v \lambda \epsilon v ́ o v \sigma a, \nu \hat{\nu} \nu$ è $\lambda \epsilon v \theta \epsilon ́ \rho a$. $\pi o \lambda \lambda o v ̀ \varsigma ~ \delta ' ~ ' А ~ \theta i ́ \nu a \varsigma, ~ \pi a \tau \rho i \delta ' ~ є i s ~ \theta є o ́ \kappa \tau \iota \tau[o \nu], ~$





$34 \delta \epsilon: \gamma \epsilon \mathrm{J}$ B Mayor (H-L). $\nu \hat{v} \nu \delta^{\prime}$ н-L. $\quad 35$ өєоктIcton: idem habent Aristidis codices prope omnes. 38 хр $\quad 3 \sigma \mu \partial \nu \quad \lambda \epsilon$ үоутas (quod intelligi nequit) Aristides. $\quad 41 \eta \eta \eta$ Aristides, correxit Bergk.
scribed with the record of the security were removed, and the land set free. (Cf. Blass in Hermes, xv 286 ff .)

Many exx. of these inscribed $8 \rho o \mathrm{have}$ been found. Those of Attica are published in CIA ii, the ordinary boundary-stones forming nos. 1062-1102 and the termini fundorum pigneratorum nos. 1103- 1153. A specimen is figured in Duruy's Histoire des Grecs, 1385 ; and all the extant Greek inscriptions of this kind are collected and classified in the Inscriptions 7 uridiques Grecques by MM. Dareste, Haussoullier and Th. Reinach, r891, i p. 107-142. Classes A and B are securities (ámoт $\iota \mu \boldsymbol{\eta}$ $\mu a \tau a)$ for money belonging either to minors ( $\mathrm{I}-9$ ) or married women ( $10-$ 24). Class C (25-59), records of sale with right of redemption, 'ostensibly a purchase, but really a loan of money secured by the conveyance of property.' 'The debtor continues to occupy it, paying interest on the purchase-money and possessing the power of redemption within a certain time' (Hager in Smith's Dict. Ant. s. v. Hori). The following are some of the more interesting dated examples: A 5 (cia ii 1138) $\boldsymbol{\epsilon \pi l}$ Nько-



 Xaıpl $\pi \pi \varphi$ кal Xaplq. B 17 (CIA ii 1137)





 ßoúnou äpXovtos (в. с. 315/4). 8pos oinlas $\pi \varepsilon \pi \rho a \mu e ̀ \nu \eta \mathrm{~s}$ è $\pi l$ $\lambda \dot{\prime} \sigma \epsilon \mathrm{c}$. D 61 (CIA ii 1134)

 ILazayeí $\mathrm{XX}=2000 \mathrm{dr}$.

All these inscriptions belong to the
latter part of the fourth century. It cannot be supposed, however, that lending money on mortgage was unknown in the previous century. Under the Second Athenian Confederation (CIA ii ${ }^{17}$ ), the Athenians were forbidden to purchase lands or houses in the territory of their allies or to lend money on mortgage. This implies that, under the First Confederation, lending money on these terms was not forbidden. But it would appear that for some centuries the Athenians, while still employing houndary-stones for their public or sacred domains, gave up using them as records of mortgages. It has been suggested that ' in the early times, which followed the reforms of Solon, no one had recourse to recording his claims on the detested tablets of stone whose removal from the land had been celebrated with such entbusiasm by the legislator himself' (Inscr. 7 uridiques, i 122 ). -For a similar reform among the Jews in the latter part of the fifth century, see Nehemiah v, $\mathbf{1}$ - 13 .
$\left.\pi \epsilon \pi \eta \gamma^{\circ} \boldsymbol{\tau a s}\right]$ Lycurg. Leocr. § 73, öpous



 $\sigma \epsilon \tau \alpha$.

1. 36. mpa日évтas] Solon ap. Dem. F. L.

 Grote, c. II, ii 310 n .


 by Plut. Sol. 15 .
1. 40 . $\delta$ oun inv $^{2}$ ] Ionic forms are characteristic of Solon's verses: cf. I. . $4 \mathrm{I}, ~ \tau \rho 0$ $\mu \in \cup \mu \in \nu 0 u s$, and in Plut. Sol. 14, al $\delta \in \hat{y} \mu a \iota$ and $\delta o \kappa \epsilon \omega$.
2. 4 I . ท̈ $\begin{array}{r}\eta \\ \text { — } \tau \rho о \mu є ч \mu e ́ v o v s] ~ ' t r e m b l i n g ~\end{array}$ at each mood of their masters.'



 єن̉Өєià єis єัкабтоע aip


 à тoîs є̇vavтío[ $\omega \sigma \iota] \nu$ ท̆ $\nu \delta a \nu \epsilon \nu$ то́тє,




42 крдтєє।: кра́тєє (кра́тך cod. $\theta$, Bergk) Aristides: кр. $\tau \eta$ Papyrus Berol.
 Aristides. $\delta \iota \grave{\eta} \lambda \theta o v: \delta \iota \eta \eta_{\nu v \sigma^{\prime} ? ~ H e r w e r d e n . ~}^{45}$ т $\epsilon$, ut videtur, correctum in $\theta^{\prime}$ ( K ): $\boldsymbol{\delta}^{\prime}$ Aristides (Wyse, K-W, H-L, B). $\quad \dot{\text { molous Bergk, Aristidis codices duos }}$ secutus. $49 \triangle H M O N$ : idem habent Aristides et Plut. Sol. 16: $\theta v \mu \partial \nu$ hic et infra v. 63 legendum suspicantur H-L; idem olim Cantero et Reiskio placuerat. $\quad 50 \dot{a}$

 $\delta \iota \dot{\alpha}$ (кaкdे Valckenaer, $\beta l q$ Schaefer, $\delta(\chi a$ O Schneider et Ahrens, $\delta \rho a ̂ \sigma a c ~ \delta(\chi a$ Bergk)

 бalato Tyrrell. 52 є̇ $\chi \epsilon \rho \dot{\omega} \theta \eta$ Aristides, correxit Valckenaer. $\quad 53$ оүлєк (к,



Testimonia. 38-41, 43 Plut. Sol. 15.

[^56]subsequent portion of the same poem quoted near the end of this chapter.
 their foes devised within their hearts' (K.). This does not explain the construction; roî̃t cannot go with oürepoc, for 'their foes' would be $\tau \omega \nu$ oïrepol, 'those different from these.' roitct must be dative
 inf . = to tell one to do so and so, but the inf. is sometimes omitted, as in Hom.

 be 'whatever at any time the other party would devise for their opponents,' or per-
 riotoc) to do.' The évautlo are the party opposed to Solon's remedial measures. The oitcepol are the popular party. With фрaбalaco cf. moolato at end of next quotation.



1. 53. тotév $\mu$ кvos] An Ionism; cf. note

 $\phi o \tau e ́ \rho \omega \nu^{\circ}$

 єӥסovtes $\epsilon i \delta 0 \nu$ ．
öбo九 $\delta e ̀$ é $\mu$ ȩ́ovs каi ßià à àeivoves aìoîè ằ $\mu \in \kappa$ каì фí̀ov поooíaтo．
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Testimonia．63， 64 Plut：Sol． $16 . \quad 65-66$ Cf．Aristid．infra exscriptum．
on l． 40 ，$\delta 0 \cup \lambda l_{\eta \nu}$ ．In Soph．O．C． 459 ， $\alpha^{\lambda} \lambda \kappa \eta े \nu \quad \pi o \iota \in \hat{i} \sigma \theta a \iota$ means＇to succour．＇
 A reminiscence of Homer， $11.12,4^{2}$ ，${ }^{\text {t }} \boldsymbol{\nu}$

 $\sigma \tau \rho \in ́ \phi \epsilon \tau \alpha \iota$ кака́．
§ 5．$\delta \iota \alpha \phi \alpha \delta \eta \nu] \delta \iota a \phi \rho a \delta \eta \nu$ is unknown． $\delta \iota a \phi p a \delta k \in \omega$ means＇distinctly＇（of sound） in Hippocrates 408．סcaфdi $\delta \eta \nu$ ，＇openly，＇ is here accepted．This is found in Pollux ii $129, \dot{\alpha} \rho \rho \eta \dot{\partial} \delta \eta \nu$ ，$\delta \iota a \rho \rho \eta \tilde{\eta}^{\delta} \eta \nu, \delta \iota \alpha \phi \alpha \dot{\partial} \eta \nu$ ．

1．59．é̈ $\delta$ ovtes］＇even in their dreams．＇ Dem．F．L．275，ä $\mu \eta \delta^{\prime}$ bуар ${ }^{\prime \prime} \lambda \pi \iota \sigma \alpha \nu$ $\pi \dot{\mu} \pi о \tau \epsilon$ ．

1．6o．órol］sc．ciol．The last two lines refer to the rich，the first three to the poor．The whole of this passage （57－61）is new．

1．62．cl үáp tıs кт入．］Plut．Sol． 16 ， quoted in note on l． 49.

1．64．$\pi \rho l v-\gamma a i \lambda a] \pi \rho i \nu$ c．subj．aor．（or $\pi \rho l \nu a^{a} \nu$ in Attic Gk）is properly only used after negative clauses，to denote a point in future time before which something else must happen；or（as Goodwin puts it，Moods and Tenses，§ 638），＇when a clause with $\pi \rho i v$ ，until，refers to the fu－ ture，and depends on a negative clause of future time（ $n o t$ containing an optative），
$\pi p l \nu$ takes the subjunctive．＂Such a con－ struction is out of place here，where we require $\pi \rho i \nu c$ ．indic．With the text，as emended，cf．Plat．Meno 86 D，оúk à $\nu$

 é $\sum \eta \tau \eta \sigma \alpha \mu \epsilon \nu$（ib． 84 C and Theaet． 165 D ： Goodwin，§ 637）．
divtapájas］In Ionic（as well as Doric poetry）$\dot{a} \nu$－and $\dot{a} \mu$－stand for $\dot{\alpha} v a-. ~ O d$ ． i $44^{\circ}$ ，$\alpha \gamma \kappa \rho \epsilon \mu \alpha \sigma \alpha \sigma \alpha$ ，and elsewhere $\alpha \nu$－ $\sigma \tau \eta \dot{\sigma} \omega \nu \nu, \dot{\alpha} \nu \sigma \tau \dot{\eta} \tau \eta \nu, \dot{\alpha} \nu \sigma \tau \boldsymbol{\eta} \mu \in \nu \alpha \iota$ ；Il．xxiv 756 ，d⿱亠乂⿰丿㇄ à $\nu \sigma \chi \hat{\eta} \sigma \in \sigma \theta a l$ ，á $\nu \sigma \chi \in 0$ ，àv $\sigma \chi \in \tau o \delta_{s}$ ．
$\pi i ́ a p]$（ $\pi i \omega \nu$ ）lit．＇fat，＇an Epic and Ionic word；11．xi 550，xvii 659，$\beta$ оشَv $\hat{\epsilon}_{\kappa} \pi \hat{\imath} a \rho$ é $\lambda \in ́ \sigma \theta a \iota$ ，of cream in Solon；also used metaphorically of＇the cream＇of a thing，the choicest and best（ $L$ and S）． Hesychius，míap：тò крáтıбтov．This suits the context better than $\pi \hat{v} a \rho$ ，which is ＇the first milk after calving，＇＇beestings，＇ or the rennet made from it．The sense requires not a particular kind of milk， such as＇beestings＇；but the best part of the milk，the＇cream．＇The constr．is
 else $\gamma \dot{\alpha} \lambda \alpha$ is acc．after the complex verb $\pi \hat{\imath} \alpha \rho \hat{\epsilon} \xi \in \hat{\imath} \lambda \in \nu$.




a landmark between two armed hosts.' Hdt. viii 140,2 (of dehateable land),



 or 'wall,' seems a harsh metaphor, except perbaps in one who, like Solon, had the $\mathrm{f} \rho o \mathrm{c}$, the boundaries as well as the mort-gage-tablets, of Attica much in his mind. The passage is paraphrased in Aristides,




 II §I.
ミón $\omega \nu \mathbf{}$ S. had gone abroad, although the state was still disturbed by divisions, yet for four years they lived in peace, but in the fifth year' \&c. $\quad$ a $\pi 0 \delta \eta \mu \epsilon \hat{i} \nu$ has two meanings (I) to be abroad, and (2) to go ahroad. (r) is found in Pol. $\mathrm{I}_{3} \mathrm{O}_{3} \mathrm{~b}_{2} 3$, and Poet.
 present passage. The fact that revapay$\mu \in \nu \eta s$ precedes, accounts for the article in $\pi \lambda^{\prime} \nu \sigma \tau \sigma \omega \nu$.
 The archonship of Solon is usually placed in в.с. $594 / 3=$ Ol. 46 , 3. This is the date given by Diog. Laert. i 62 on the authority of Sosicrates of Rhodes, the author of a work on the History of Crete and on the Succession of Philosophers, who flourished between 200 and I28 в.c. The archons about this time are given by Clinton as follows :

\[

\]

Jerome places Solon in 592: and the Armenian version of Eusebius in 590. 592 is already occupied by Eucrates, and 590 (in the Marmor Parium, see § 2 n ) possibly by Simon. The text of c. 14 § 1 appears to place Solon 31 years before the archonship of Comeas (в.с. 560), i.e. in 59r. But if Solon is placed in $₹ 9 \mathrm{r}$, Philombrotus and Dropides must be placed in 592 and 590 , which are already
assigned to other archons. Again, if Comeas is (by another method of reckoning) assigned to 56 r , Solon falls in 592, the year assigned to Eucrates. Eucrates, however, may really belong to a later date. Sosicrates (ap. Diog. Laert, i 101) places him in Ol. 47 (592-589) and makes Anacharsis visit Solon during the archonship of Eucrates. But Solon left Athens for ten years when his own archonship was over, so that, if Sosicrates (our only authority for Eucrates) is right ahout the date of the visit of Anacharsis, Eucrates cannot be earlier than 583 . On the year of Solon's archonship, cf. Clinton, Fasti, ii 298; Fischer's Gr. Zeittafeln, p. 1I4; and Busolt, i 534.

If Solon was archon in 594, and if ' in the fifth year' means four years after Solon, then the first year of anarchy falls in 590 , and the second in 586 . Then, if $\delta \iota a ̀ \tau \hat{\omega} \nu$ a $u t \hat{\omega} \nu \quad \chi \rho \phi \nu \omega \nu$ is retained in the sense, ' after the same interval of time,' i.e. four years later, the archonship of Damasias begins in 582. This is Mr Kenyon's view. In this calculation the first period of four years of peace must include either the year of Solon's archonship or the first year of anarchy; and the second period must include one of the years of anarchy.

On the other hand, if the first 'four years' extend from B.C. 593 to 590 , then the first year of anarchy is 589 ; again, if ${ }_{\xi}{ }^{\prime} \tau \epsilon \iota \pi \epsilon \mu \pi \tau \psi$ is taken as meaning 'five years afterwards,' the second year of anarchy is 584 . Further, if $\delta \iota \grave{\alpha}$. $\tau \hat{\omega} \nu$
 polation, the beginning of the rule of Damasias follows at once in 583 . This is the view of Baver, and of Kaibel and Wilamowitz. But the first year of Damasias coincides with that in which the Pythian festival was transformed into an $\dot{\alpha} \boldsymbol{\gamma} \dot{\omega} \nu \sigma \tau \epsilon \phi \alpha \nu i \tau \eta s$, and the festival was held in the third year of each Olympiad, whereas 583 is the second year. The opinion that it fell in the second year of the Olympiad, which has been inferred from Thuc. iv r17 and $\mathrm{V}_{1}$, is refuted in Clinton's Fasti, ii p. $195=$ $245^{3}$.

Again, if the archonship of Solon is placed in 59 I , the years of anarchy may be put at intervals of four years in 587 and 583 . Then, if $\delta \iota \dot{\alpha} \tau \hat{\omega} \nu$ aủ $\tau \hat{\omega} \nu \chi \rho 6 \nu \omega \nu$




$18 \delta \iota \dot{\kappa} \kappa \epsilon \nu$ continentur fragmenti Berolinensis in pagina secunda. add. e papyro Berol. aitianapXaian: aitiay dyapxiay Campbell, Jackson,
 aủroû xpbyou? Herwerden.
be omitted, we get 582 as the first year of Damasias. This is the view of T. Reinach and of Poland. It has the advantage of leaving the text in c. 14 § I untouched, and it gives a date for Damasias which is consistent with Pausanias $\times 7,5$, where the first Pythian a $\gamma \dot{\omega} \nu \bar{y} \sigma \tau \epsilon \phi a \nu i \tau \eta s$, which coincided with the first year of Damasias, is placed in 582. If so, the archonship of Simon which, according to the Scholiasts on Pin-
dar, was five years before Damasias, may provisionally be placed in 587 , instead of 590 , the year assigned to it by the Parian Marble; but 587 was on this view a year of anarchy; hence it is not improbable that Simon was really archon in 586.

All the above views agree in placing the beginning of the archonship of Damasias later than 586 b.c., in or about 582 . The following is a conspectus of the views above mentioned.

|  | Mr Kenyon | $\begin{gathered} \text { Bauer } \\ \text { and } \mathrm{K}-\mathrm{W} . \end{gathered}$ | Reinach and Poland |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Solon, archon | 594 | 594 | 591 |
| First period of 4 years | $\left\{\begin{array}{l}594-\mathrm{I} \\ 593-0\end{array}\right.$ | 593-590 | 591-588 |
| First year of anarchy | 590 | 589 | 587 |
| Second period of 4 years | $\left\{\begin{array}{l}590-87 \\ 589-86\end{array}\right\}$ | 588-585 | 586-583 |
| Second year of anarchy | 586 | 584 | 583 |
| Third period of 4 years | $\left\{\begin{array}{l}586-3 \\ 58-2\end{array}\right\}$ | nil | nil |
| Damasias, archon | ${ }_{582}$ | $5^{8} 3$ | 582 |

A space of 13 years, 594 to 582 inclusive, does not allow of three periods of four years, and four years besides. It only admits of three periods of three years (and four years over). But these can only be obtained by altering ret $\tau a \rho a$ into $\tau \rho l a$ and $\pi \dot{\epsilon} \mu \pi \tau \psi$ twice into $\tau \epsilon$ $\tau$ ג́pтч. This, however, would perhaps be going too far.
§ 2. $\Delta$ a $\mu$ arias] On the discovery of the Berlin fragments, much controversy arose respecting the Damasias there mentioned. It was at first proposed to identify him with Damasias I, the archon of 639 B.C. This opinion was conclusively refuted by Diels (Berlin Acad. 1885, p. 12) ; and, now that we have the context of the fragment before us, it is obvious that Damasias II can alone be meant.

Hitherto the determination of the date of Damasias II has depended on a mutilated passage in the Parian Marble.
(This important chronological document was bought in Smyrna by an agent of Thomas Howard, Earl of Arundel and Surrey, ${ }^{1585-1646, ~ a n d ~ s e n t ~ t o ~ A r u n d e l ~}$ House in 1627 . It was first edited by Selden, 1628 . In 1667, at the instance of John Evelyn, Letters, Aug. 4, 1667, Diury, Sept. 19, Oct. 8, 17, 25, it was presented by the Earl's grandson to the University of Oxford, and in 1676 it was edited once more by Prideaux. After being preserved for many years in the Ashmolean Museum, it was removed to the University Galleries in 1889. It has been edited by Boeckh, cig ii 2374, and C. Müller, fhg i 535-590. The authority for the chronology recorded in this Marble is probably Phanias of Eresos, a pupil of Aristotle. The dates are reckoned by the number of years that had elapsed before the archonship of Diognetus, B.c. $26_{4}-3$.)



 9 aлolk $\omega \nu$ Berol.; litterae P partem inferiorem cerni posse putat k.


The passage, with which we are concerned, is restored as follows: 1l. 53-





 $\Delta a \mu a \sigma$ lov $\tau 0 \hat{v}$ ठєurtpou. The interval between the year of Diognetus and that of Damasias is here denoted by the symbols HHHA.. II (312). (a) Boeckh and C. Müller insert PI (6), thus making the number 318; (b) Chandler and Clinton, $\Delta$ (10), making it 322 ; while Dopp (the latest editor) proposes $\Delta \mathrm{I}$ (II), making it 323. The corresponding dates b.c. are: (a) $582 / \mathrm{I}$ or $58 \mathrm{I} / \mathrm{o}$, according as we reckon exclusively or inclusively; or (b) $586 / 5$, according as we reckon inclusively with 323 or exclusively with 322. But the archonship of Damasias coincides with a Pythian festival; this excludes 581 and leaves us the choice between 586 and 582 .

It has been urged in favour of $586 / 5$ that Diog. Laert. I i 22 describes Thales and the other Wise Men of Greece as flourishing in the archonship of Damasias; and that $586 / 5$ would be an appropriate year to mark their epoch, because the eclipse predicted by Thales took place on May 28, 585 B.c. (Cf. Busolt, i 493.)

On the other hand, $582 / 1$ is supported by Pausanias ( $\mathrm{x} 7,4-5$ ), who implies that the first $\alpha \gamma \dot{\omega} \nu \quad \sigma \tau \epsilon \phi a \nu i \tau \eta s$ was in $582 / \mathrm{s}$, and the last $\alpha \boldsymbol{\gamma} \dot{\omega} v \cdot \chi \rho \eta \mu a \tau i \tau \eta s$ in 586/5.

It may here be suggested, that probably the first year of Damasias coincided with the first celebration of the Pythian games after their transformation into an $\dot{\alpha} \gamma \dot{\gamma} \nu$ $\sigma \tau \epsilon \phi a v i \tau \eta s$, i.e. with 582 . Subsequently, a confusion may have arisen between the year of that celebration and the actual year in which the change was made ( 586 ). The archonship of Damasias was thus put four years too early. If the archonship of Simon coincided with the last $\dot{a} \gamma \dot{\omega} \nu$ $\chi \rho \eta \mu a \tau i \tau \eta s$ and if that $\alpha \gamma \dot{\omega} \nu$ was four
years earlier than the change in the Pythian games (586), it follows that the archonship of Simon must be put in 590 . Simon is placed in that year in the Parian Marble; and the evidence of the text, which gives at least to years between the year of Solon and that of Damasias, points to 582 as the year of Damasias.

If Damasias was archon in 582 , Solon would by that date have returned to Athens after his absence of ten years (593-584 inclusive). This may be held to favour the conjecture of Diels (Berl. Acad. 1885, p. I3 f.) that Solon refers to the usurpation of Damasias in fragm.' 32 and 33, quoted in Plut. Sol. 14, $\epsilon l$ 位
 $\beta a \theta \dot{\prime} \phi \rho \omega \nu$. The trochaic passage quoted above in c .12 has been ascribed to the same poem, $\pi \rho d s$ Ф $\omega$ коу.
 in the papyrus and in the restoration of the Berlin fragment by Blass $\epsilon \xi \eta \lambda \phi[\sigma] \theta \eta$. For $\eta^{\lambda} \lambda a \dot{\sigma} \theta \eta \nu$ Veitch, s.v. E่ $\lambda a \dot{v} v \omega$, quotes Diod. Sic. 20, 51 , ouv- Plut. Caes. 17. Gaisford, however, edits $a \pi$ - and $\epsilon \xi$ $\eta \lambda d \sigma \theta \eta \nu$ in Hdt. ifi 54 , vii $6 \& c$ [Hdt.
 $\epsilon \xi \eta \lambda d \sigma \theta \eta$ cod. Florentinus: $\epsilon \xi \eta \lambda a d \theta \eta$ al. iii ${ }_{5} I$ and i 173,,$\xi \in \lambda a \sigma \theta \in l s$, in the latter passage the cod. Parisinues has $\left.\epsilon_{\xi} \in \lambda a \theta \epsilon i s\right]$.
dexovtas-8éka] Owing to a lacuna in the Berlin fragment, which only mentions the three archons elected by the second class and the two by the third, it was supposed that the first class elected four, making nine archons in all. It now appears that in this particular year the number was ten. This election was a reactionary measure. It implied an abandonment of the classification by assessment which was the cardinal point of Solon's constitution.
áypolк $\omega v$ ] The Berlin fragment has a $\pi 0 / \kappa \omega \nu$. There is a similar confusion in 1.2 of the poems of Herondas, where ATOIKIHC was first written and then corrected into ATPOIKIHC. The usual name for this class is $\gamma \epsilon \omega \mu \sigma \rho \circ$ (Plut. Thes. 25; Bekker's Anecd. Gr. 257, 7; Etym. Mag. P. 395, 50, \&c), or $\gamma \in \omega \rho \gamma \mathrm{ol}$













 et c. 34 § 3 coniecit Bury ( $\mathrm{H}-\mathrm{L}$ ).


 троєєттйкєє Пеєбібтратоs.
(Schol. on Plat. Axioch. p. 253, Moeris,
 used in Dion. Halic. ii 8 (after men-


 $\pi \rho \sigma \sigma \epsilon \lambda \eta \dot{\eta} \theta \eta \sigma \alpha \nu$ érl $\tau \dot{\alpha} \mathrm{s} \mathrm{d} \rho \chi \alpha \dot{\alpha}$. Cf. Hesych.


 $\tau \hat{\omega} \nu \delta \eta \mu \nu \quad \nu \rho \bar{\omega} \nu$. (Landwehr in Philologus, Suppl. v, 1889, p. 139-155, Die drei Stände in Attika.)
§ 3. vorov̂vces] of faction, c. 6 near end.
 are different sections of the Eupatridae, some of whom resented the loss of money involvedin Solon's $\sigma \epsilon \sigma \dot{\alpha} \chi \theta_{\epsilon L a}$, whileothers lamented the loss of political influence; besides these, a few were actuated by the mere spirit of factious rivalry.
 $\ldots \tau \omega \nu \pi \epsilon \delta \operatorname{ca\kappa } \hat{\omega} \nu . . . \tau \omega \nu \delta$ бakplav] Hdt. I ${ }^{2} 9$, (Peisistratus) $\sigma \tau a \sigma \iota a \zeta \gamma \nu \tau \omega \nu \tau \hat{\omega} \nu, \pi \alpha-$ $\rho \dot{\alpha} \lambda \omega \nu$ кal $\tau \hat{\omega} \nu \dot{\epsilon} \kappa \quad \tau 0 \hat{\theta} \pi \in \delta / \sigma \nu \quad$ ' $\theta \theta$ -


 $\tau v \rho a \nu \nu 1 \delta a \sim \not{\eta} \gamma \epsilon \epsilon \rho \epsilon \tau \rho \epsilon \tau \eta \nu \quad \sigma \tau \alpha \sigma \sigma \nu, \sigma v \lambda \lambda \epsilon \xi \alpha s$
 $\kappa \rho l \omega \nu, \pi \rho \rho \sigma \tau \dot{\alpha} s \mu \eta \chi a \nu a ̆ \tau \alpha \iota \tau o d \dot{d} \delta \epsilon$. (Dion.






 $\mu a ́ \lambda \iota \sigma \tau \alpha, ~ \tau o i ̂ s ~ \pi \lambda o v a l o c s ~ a ̀ \chi \theta b \mu \epsilon \nu o s . ~ i b . ~ 13 ~$ (of the $\sigma \tau \dot{\alpha} \sigma \epsilon c s$ just before the legislation








 ralia 805 D т $\omega \nu \quad \Delta c a \kappa \rho l \omega \nu . . . \tau \hat{\omega} \nu ~ \Pi \epsilon \delta \delta \epsilon \omega \nu$
 $\kappa \rho l \omega v, \Pi \epsilon \delta t \epsilon \omega v)$. Пedit $\epsilon \hat{s}$ is the form found in Diog. Laert. i 58, and Schol. on Arist. Vesp. 1223, a confused account (founded on this passage, see Testimonia), in which the $\tau \alpha \xi \epsilon \epsilon s$, as they are there called, are apparently regarded as the result of Solon's legislation. Suidas s. v. חápa入oc


On these three parties, cf. Schömann, Ant. p. 327 f., E. T.; Gilbert, i 126 f.; Duncker, 6, 447 f .

For the form $\pi \epsilon \delta \iota a \kappa \omega \nu, c \mathrm{cf}$. Pol. viii (v)










#### Abstract

21 тробєкєкбдлұуто н-L, Kontos, Gennadios; $\pi \rho о \sigma є \nu є \nu є \mu \eta \nu т о$ Butcher, coll.   $23 \tau \hat{\omega} \nu$ addiderunt Rutherford, Blass, Gennadios, $\mathrm{K}-\mathrm{w}, \mathrm{H}-\mathrm{L}\left(\mathrm{K}^{3}\right)$.

24 ДІдфнMICMON: $\delta \iota a \psi \eta \phi \iota \sigma \mu \partial \nu$ scripsi, idem scripserunt Blass, $\mathrm{K}-\mathrm{W}, \mathrm{H} \cdot \mathrm{L}\left(\mathrm{K}^{3}\right)$.



 $\pi \varepsilon \delta \iota a \kappa \circ$ ús.

§. 5. тробєкєко́б $\mu \eta \nu \tau 0]$ ' had joined their ranks'; the compound verb is not found elsewhere in this sense.
of $\tau \in-\phi \mathbf{d}^{6} \beta \mathbf{o v}$ ] The faction of Peisistratus was joined by those whom Solon's legislation had deprived of the debts due to them. The allegiance of these was prompted by their losses. Peisistratus was also joined by those who were not of pure descent. The latter were afraid of the oligarchical faction gaining the ascendency and depriving them of the privileges of citizenship in consequence of their inferior birth. Landwehr, who doubts whether the parties really existed before the time of Solon (Philol. Suppl. v 155), suggests that ol dф $\phi \quad \rho \eta \mu$ е́pol $\tau \dot{\alpha}$ $\chi p \in a$ are the capitalists belonging to the $\pi a \rho a$ d $\iota o t$ who had lost their money, whereas the $\pi \epsilon \delta<a$ кol still had their land.
опиеโоv 8'—тробท̂кov] The writer infers that the party of Peisistratus included persons of dubious origin from the fact that, after the rule of the Peisistratidae was brought to an end, there was a revision of the list of citizens. Cf. note on 8 § I, $\partial \theta \in \nu z \tau \iota \delta \iota a \mu \notin \nu \in L$.

סıa $\psi \eta \phi\llcorner\sigma \mu \dot{\partial} v]$ The word occurs in Athenaeus, $218 \mathrm{~A}, \delta \iota a \psi \eta \phi \iota \sigma \mu \delta \mathrm{~s}$ д $\gamma \epsilon v \delta$ -
 The verb is used in $\mathrm{c} .42 \S \mathrm{I}, 1.4, \delta \iota a \psi \eta \phi l$ yourau. The admission of citizens took place in their 18 th year, when, if their title to citizenship was sufficiently proved, they were entered on the register called
 years afterwards) in the $\pi i \nu a \xi$ éк $\lambda \eta \sigma \iota a \sigma \tau \iota-$ $k$ bs. The lists of citizens were revised on special occasions, particularly when there was reason for suspecting that a number of persons had been improperly regis-
tered. The names were then read one by one from the register, and, as each was read, it was asked whether any objections were to be made to it. Such objections were discussed and evidence brought forward, so that the matter could not be despatched in one assembly, but required several meetings of the members of the deme (Dem. Eubulides $\S 9$ seq.). If, finally, a vote was taken, and the result was unfavourable, the name was struck out (Schömann, Ant. 368 f. E. T.). See esp. Dem. Eubul. (an appeal against the vote of the $\delta \eta \mu o \tau a l$, who had struck the speaker off their list) $\S 7, \epsilon \nu \tau 0 i s \delta \eta \mu \delta$ -

 $\tau \hat{\eta} \pi \rho о \tau \epsilon \rho q q^{\prime} a \psi \eta \phi i \sigma \epsilon$. Hitherto, the earliest known revision of the roll of citizens has been that in the archonship of Lysimachides B.C. $445 / 4$ (Philochorus in Schol. on Ar. Vesp. 718 ; Plut. Pericles 37. Philippi, however, contends that the procedure of $\delta \iota a \psi \eta \phi \downarrow \sigma t s$ was not resorted to on this occasion, Euirgerrecht, pp. 34 -49). The next was in the archonship of Archias, 346 B.C. Cf. Harpocr. s. v. סta-





 $\dot{\nu} \mu \hat{\omega} \nu, \psi \hat{\eta} \phi o \nu \quad \delta \epsilon \delta \omega \kappa \epsilon \pi \epsilon \rho l$ тồ $\sigma \dot{\omega} \mu a \tau o s$,



 $\epsilon \nu 5^{\prime} \tau \hat{\eta} \mathrm{s}$ 'A $\tau \theta 1 \delta o s$. Cf. Schol. Aeschin. I § 77, 114 ; Hermann, Staatsalt. § 121 , I9, and Meier and Schömann, p. 989 Lips.
 parties derived their respective designations from the districts in which they held their lands,' the Plain, the Shore

 є̇autò $\nu \sigma \nu \nu \in ́ \pi \epsilon \iota \sigma \epsilon \tau \grave{\nu} \nu \delta \hat{\eta} \mu o \nu, \dot{\omega} \varsigma[\dot{\nu}] \pi[\grave{o}] \tau \hat{\omega} \nu \dot{a} \nu \tau \iota \sigma \tau a \sigma \iota \omega \tau \hat{\omega} \nu \tau a \hat{\tau} \tau a$



XIV 2 Пú
and the Mountain (or Highlands). The men of the Mountain led a hard life in the uplands of Parnes which afforded pasturage for sheep and goats, and were scantily supplied with the fruits of the field or of trees. (2) The men of the Shore enjoyed more abundant means of support in the building of boats, in ferrying and fishing, and in the manufacture of salt. (3) The men of the Plain formed the wealthiest class, with their groves of olives in the valley of the Cephisus and their fields of corn stretching inland from Eleusis. (Cf. Curtius, FI. G., i 3 II E. T.) Grote, c. in, ii p. 300 n, observes that Plutarch's description of the men of the Plain, as representing the oligarchical tendency, and the men of the Mountain, the democratical, is ' not quite accurate when applied to the days of Solon. Democratical pretensions, as such, can hardly be said to have existed.' Plutarch (or the authority he follows in c. I3) possibly makes these parties come into existence too early; elsewhere, c. 29, he places them after Solon's time, probably on the authority of the text, which distinctly describes the men of the Plain as oligarchical in spirit.



 Plut., Sol. 8, mentions the long and distressing war with Megara for the possession of Salamis, and describes Peisistratus as taking the lead in supporting Solon in his endeavour to rouse the people to fight once more for the recovery of the island. At the end of $c$. 9 he says of Solon, zעik $\eta \sigma \varepsilon$ тois Meyapeas. He implies that the war for the possession of Salamis was the origin of Solon's influence in Athens; if so, it can hardly be put later than 600 b.c. But Daimachus of Plataea (third century b.c., quoted in Plut. Sol. et Popl. comp. 4) denied that Solon acted as general in the war against Megara. That Peisistratus took any prominent part in a war as early as 600 B.C. is improbable, as he lived to $5^{2} 7$ B.C.
(Abbott, H. G., i 400 n ). Solon, who was some 30 years older than Peisistratus, took a leading part in the conquest of Salamis before he was archon, i.e. possibly about 600 b.c.; Peisistratus in the capture of Nisaea, probably about 570 B.c. (Busolt, i 521 n ). Curtius (i 672 , note 135) places the capture of Nisaea in 565, and Holm (i 48I) shortly before the tyranny. In c. 17 we are told that the relative ages of Solon and Peisistratus make it impossible to accept the story that the latter was $\sigma \tau \rho a \tau \eta \gamma \delta \mathrm{~s}$ in the war with Megara for the possession of Salamis (i.e. the first Megarian war), in which Solon was concerned. Salamis and Nisaea were, however, recaptured by the Megarians (Plut. Sol. 12); and Pesistratus may have distinguished himself in a subsequent war with the Megarians for the recovery of the island.
кататрачцатібаs ктл.] Hdt. i 59,











 бas aívds є́autòvó $\Pi \epsilon \iota \sigma i \sigma \tau \rho a \tau o s$. Polyaen. i $21 \S 3$ and Diogen. Laert. i 60 have $\kappa a \tau a \tau \rho \dot{\omega} \sigma \alpha s$, or $\kappa a \tau \epsilon \tau \rho \omega \sigma \epsilon \nu, i b$. § $66 \dot{\epsilon} \dot{\epsilon} \omega \tau \hat{\varphi}$

 $\pi \rho о є \lambda \theta \epsilon i \hat{v}$. кататраuмati $\zeta \omega$ is also found in Polyb. xv 13 § I , Dion. Halic. and Dio Cass.
'Apıoticvos $\kappa \tau \lambda$.] Plut. Sol. 30 § 2 ,

 $\sigma \tau \rho \dot{\tau} \psi \phi \quad \phi \lambda a \kappa \grave{\eta} \tau 0 \hat{v} \sigma \dot{\omega} \mu a \tau 0 \mathrm{~s}$.

кориvךфópovs] Plat. Rep. 566 в, тd $\delta \bar{\eta}$

 Ar. Rhet. i $2,19, \mathrm{M}_{\epsilon i \sigma i \sigma \tau \rho a r o s ~}^{\epsilon \pi t}$ -













Testimonia. 8-15. Verbis fere isdem rem narrat Aelianus, Var. Hist. viii i6:





$\nu \epsilon v \sigma \epsilon . \quad$ Pol. viii (v) $9,1310 b 15, \sigma \chi \epsilon \delta o ̀ v$



 ти́раעуоs катебтт.

катє́бхє тク̀̀v àкро́тодıv] Plut. Sol. 30 § 4, ті̀ $\dot{\eta}$ акр $\rho \pi о \lambda \nu \nu к а \tau \mathcal{\epsilon} \sigma \chi \epsilon$. Phaedrus i 2, 5, arcem tyrannus occupat Pisistratus. The political importance of the citadel in revolutions is exemplified in Juv. x 307 n , Lucan viii 490 , Diod. Sic. xvi 70 § 4, Plut. Timol. 20 § 1 (Mayor).
 archon in 560 B.c., it would follow from the manuscript text that Solon was archon in 591. But, as Solon was more probably archon in 594 , $\delta \in u \tau \ell p \psi$ should be altered into $\tau \epsilon \tau^{\prime} \rho \tau ч$, the former being possibly a corruption of $\bar{\delta}$. We thus get an interval of 33 years and keep the usual date for Solon's archonship (Bauer, p. 45 f).
ini K $\omega \mu$ éov] Plut. Sol. 32, е̇ $\pi \epsilon \beta l \omega \sigma \varepsilon$






 apjavtos. (Plutarch is possibly quoting from the work of Phanias, on $\tau u p a j \nu \omega \nu$ àvalpetıs ex rtucplas. Oncken, Staatslehre, ii 445 n .)
The present treatise and the Politics, v

5, 23, agree in stating that Peisistratus lived for 33 years after usurping the government of Athens; the Peisistratidae ruled for 18 years (Pol. l.c.), and the interval between their expulsion and the battle of Marathon was 19 years (Thuc. vi 59 ). Thus the rule of Peisistratus began 70 years before B.c. 490 , i.e. in 560 . The year given by the Parian Marble $(297+264 / 3=) 561 / 0$ (as well as by Jerome and the Armenian version of Eusebius) must be corrected to 560 (Clinton's Fasti, sub anno).








 Cf. Diog. Laert. i 49-50, 65; Aelian Var. Hist. vili 16 (who tells the story in almost the same words as the text); and Aristid. i 765 Dind. The story is also told in Valer. Max. v 3 e 3, viii 9 EI.

ÉGapápevos rà öтлa] Plut. Sol. 30,
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 хоутоs $\dot{\alpha} \nu а \lambda а \beta \dot{\omega} \nu \tau \grave{\eta} \nu \pi а \nu о \pi \lambda l a \nu \pi \rho о \hat{\eta} \lambda \theta \epsilon \nu$


 кат＇aúròv $\mu$＇́pos．Grote，ii 352 ，says of this incident，as related by Plutarch： ＇As a last appeal，he put on his armour and planted himself in military posture before the door of his house．＇$\theta \in \mu \in \nu 0 s$ ， however，is not used absolutely，but must be construed with $\partial \pi \pi \lambda$ ．
 Cf．inf．c． 16 § 8．Hdt．i 59 ，ö̈re riùàs tàs

 ${ }_{\kappa о \sigma \mu \epsilon \omega \nu} \kappa а \lambda \omega \bar{s} \tau \epsilon$ каі $\epsilon \bar{v}$ ．Thuc．vi 54. For mo入ırıкผ̂s，cf．（with Mr Wyse）Isocr． iv 79,151 ；ix $46, E p$ ．ii 3 ．




 каі т $\grave{\nu} \nu \tau \cup \rho а \nu \nu \ell \delta a$ ойкш ка́ $\rho т а ~ є ́ \rho \rho \iota \zeta \omega \mu \epsilon-$ $\nu \eta \nu$ ย＇$\chi \omega \nu \dot{a} \pi \epsilon \beta a \lambda \epsilon$ ．
 would be 555／4．
The following are the notes of time given in the manuscript text for the chronology of Peisistratus ：

14 § 3．First exile．$\epsilon \kappa \tau \notin \epsilon \tau \epsilon$ ．
 $\mu \epsilon \tau \grave{\alpha}$ rav̂ra．

15 § I ．Second exile． $\boldsymbol{t}_{\tau \epsilon \iota} \mu \alpha \lambda \iota \sigma \tau a$


15 § 2. Second return．द̇v $\nu \epsilon \kappa \alpha ́ \tau \varphi . .$.畀 $\tau \in$ ．

178 I ．Total duration of rule．（ $\quad \tau \eta$ ）

ib．Death， 33 years from beginning
 áкорта каі тріа．

The above data alone account for a total of at least $(5+11+6+10=) 32$ years；and，as Peisistratus lived for

33 years after usurping the government， they leave only one year for the third period of rule．But c． 17 § itells us that he ruled for 19 years in all ；if so， his third period of rule must have lasted （19－5－6＝） 8 years．On the other hand，the passage in Pol．v 9 § 23，p． 1315 $b 32$ ，gives 17 years for the total duration of his rule，thus leaving 6 years for the third period．The chronology has been much discussed both before and after the discovery of this treatise．The following table gives a conspectus of some of the arrangements proposed．As typical in－ stances，before the discovery of this treat－ ise，I have selected Clinton（Fasti，vol．ii， Appendix iI）and Busolt（i 55I）．To these I have added the years as arranged by Bauer（Forschungen zu Ar．＇A $\theta$ ．$\pi \mathbf{0}$ ．）， and Poland（in the notes to his German transl．）．Thus far the chronology pro－ posed accords，in the total number of years of rule and exile，with the data in the Politics．The other two estimates， those of Mr Kenyon and M．Th．Reinach， adkere more closely to the data of the present treatise．

|  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { E } \\ & \text { E } \\ & \text { B } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 品 } \\ & \text { 品 } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 喜 } \\ & \text { 届 } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 荷 } \\ & \text { " } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 5 \\ & \stackrel{5}{5} \\ & \text {. } \end{aligned}$ | 岩 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| ISt rupaplis | 6 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 |
| Ist exile | 6 | 5 | 6 | 6 | 4 | 3 |
| 2nd tupavis | 1 | 1 | 1 | 6 | 6 | 6 |
| 2nd exile | Io | II | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 |
| 3rd tupavils | 10 | 11 | 11 | 6 | 8 | c． 9 |
| years of tupavis | 17 | 17 | 17 | 17 | 19 | 20 |
| years of exile | 16 | 16 | 16 | ${ }^{16}$ | 14 | c． 13 |

It will be observed that there is a general consensus as to the duration of the first rupaypls and the second exile． The greatest discrepancies are in the duration of the second and third rupaypls．









 ws





 narrationem Plutarcho fuisse notam.

In the first exile, Bauer and Poland assume that $\psi_{\tau \tau \epsilon L} \delta \omega \delta \epsilon \kappa \dot{\alpha} \tau \varphi\left(\mathrm{I}_{4}\right.$ § 4) is reckoned from the beginning of the usurpation and that $\mu \in \tau \dot{d}$ тâ̂̃a is to be either omitted or altered into $\mu \in \tau \dot{\alpha} \tau а u ́ \tau \eta \nu$; while Mr Kenyon and M. Reinach alter $\delta \omega \delta \epsilon \kappa \dot{d} \tau \varphi$ into $\tau \epsilon \tau \mathfrak{a} \rho \tau \varphi$. In the second
 $\S$ 1) into $\mu \eta \nu i . ., \dot{\beta} \delta \delta \delta \mu \varphi$. For the length of the third $\tau u \rho a \nu \nu i s$ we have no data except those gained by subtracting the two earlier periods of rule from the total duration of actual rule. Of the above arrangements, Mr Kenyon's alone strictly adheres to the total of 19 years. The 19 years of this treatise do not seem to admit of being reconciled with the 17 years of the Politics. It is suggested by Bauer that the difference may be obtained by supposing that the fractions of the years in the three periods of rule were excluded in one reckoning and included in the other. This would imply that each of the three periods of rule, as estimated in the present treatise, extended to an average of two-thirds of a year beyond the duration stated in the Politics. This is possible, but not probable. It may be added that the genuineness of the passage in the Politics is not certain. Susemihl, in his and and 3rd editions, brackets the whole of the paragraph in which it occurs; and, even if both passages are equally due to Aristotle, the present treatise may possibly represent his latest views.
 would naturally mean 'eleven years after the first exile.' But the sum of the two periods of exile was (according to 17 § I) 33-19, or 14 years; and the second exile lasted 10 years ( $15 \$ 2$ ), leaving only four years for the first exile. Such a number of years may perhaps be obtained by altering $\delta \omega \delta \epsilon \kappa a \tau \varphi$ into $\tau \epsilon \tau d p-$ $\tau \psi$ (see $N . C$.), and by assuming that the symbol $\bar{\delta}$ followed by the erroneons explanation $\delta \in \kappa a \tau \varphi$ led to the reading $\delta \omega$ $\delta \in \kappa \dot{a} \tau \varphi$. Another alternative (adopted in Kaibel and Kiessling's transl.) is to count the eleven years from the beginning of the rule of Peisistratus. This involves either omitting $\mu \in \tau \grave{\alpha} \tau a i ̂ \tau a$ or altering it into $\mu \epsilon \tau \dot{\alpha} \tau a \dot{\tau} \tau \eta \nu(\tau \grave{\eta} \nu \pi \rho \omega \dot{\tau} \tau \eta \nu \kappa a \tau \alpha ́ \sigma \tau a \sigma \iota \nu$ ). See Bauer, p. 50 f.



 $p l \delta$.
 49, 800, and Suidas, s.v.
 $\tau \hat{\varphi}$ Matavtéc. This is the only passage in which any writer of prose is named in this treatise. The only poet quoted by name is Solon.

Kod入vтov̄] Wachsmuth, Stadt Athen, ii 262 f .
© $v$ ' $\eta$ ] The Schol. on Arist. Eq. 449 calls her Muppivn.



 $\kappa a ́ \theta o \delta o \nu, 一 o v ̀ ~ \gamma a ̀ \rho ~ \pi o \lambda \grave{v} \nu \chi \rho o ́ v o \nu ~ к а т \epsilon i ̂ \chi \epsilon \nu, ~ a ̀ \lambda \lambda[a ̀] ~ \delta ı a ̀ ~ \tau o ̀ ~ \mu \grave{~}$






#### Abstract

 өaupájovtes delet Richards (H-L), defendit Gennadios coll. Xen. Hell. i 6, ri.    $1 \lambda$ (H-L, в). 6 рдKндоС.


#### Abstract

тараıßатои́гңs] A noteworthy Ionism, but not derived from the account in Hdt. The same word is used as a reference to the same incident in Cleidemus, $a p$. Athenaeum, $\sigma 09 \mathrm{C}, \sigma \tau \epsilon \phi a \nu b \pi \omega-$       364). Cleidemus, who wrote an 'Arols (Athen. 235 A), has been identified with Cleitodemus, mentioned by Pausanias ( $\mathrm{x} 15,5$ ) as the most ancient writer of Athenian history. Plutarch (Arist. 19) refers to his account of the battle of Plataea; so that his date is after 479 в.c.

The story is also told in Polyaen. i 2r, 1; Val. Max. i 3, 3; Hermogenes de Invent. ii 185, 21 Spengel, with Schol.; and Phylarchus ap. Athen. 609 c (Mayor).  been urged by Bauer (p. 51) and Rühl (Rhein. Mus. $189 \mathrm{I}, \mathrm{p} .442$ ), that it is improbable that Megacles waited so long as six years to avenge the neglect of his danghter by her husband, Peisistratus; and the text implies that the duration of the second rupaupls was short. Baurer accordingly  $\mu \eta \nu$, and for similar reasons K -w alter $\dot{\epsilon} \beta \delta \delta \mu \mu$ into $\tau \rho i \tau \varphi$. On the other hand it is plausibly suggested by Gomperz (p. ${ }^{23}$ n) that the compact between Megacles and Peisistratus was made before the daughter of the former had attained a marriageable age.






 кат $\dot{\alpha} \nu \delta \mu о \nu$.


 Herodotus mentions the help offered by the Thebans and Argives, and byLygdamis of Naxos, and then continues: $\bar{\epsilon} \xi{ }^{\prime}$ ' $p \rho \in$ -
 ámiкоуто $\delta \pi i \sigma \omega$. Eretria alone is there mentioned in connexion with tbis period of exile.
§ 2. 'Palkๆ入os] The Schol. on Lycophron, 1236 , states that this was the old name of Alvos in Macedonia. It is identical with the Alyeca of Hdt. vii $\mathrm{r}_{23}$, and is situated to the $S$. of the promontory at the extreme west of Chalcidice, opposite the mouth of the Axius and Ludias. (There was another Alvos in Thrace, near the mouth of the Hebrus.)

тov̀s $\pi \epsilon \rho \mathrm{L}$ Пá $\gamma$ yacov тómous] the region near the mouth of the Strymon. Though Herodotus says nothing of this region in connexion with the second exile of Peisistratus, the account in the text is illustrated by the passage in which the historian says of the tyrant on his final restoration:


 $\tau \alpha \mu, \hat{v} \sigma v \nu \iota\langle\nu \tau \omega \nu$. Here $\tau \hat{\omega} \nu \mu \hat{\varepsilon} \nu$ and $\tau \hat{\omega} \nu$ $\delta \dot{\epsilon}$ naturally refer to $\chi \rho \eta \mu \alpha \tau \omega \nu$ alone, and $\sigma v \nu t 6 \nu \tau \omega \nu$ in the second clause echoes









 Frag. $355^{2}, 393^{3}$ ).
$\sigma \nu \nu o ́ \delta o L \sigma l(=\pi \rho 0 \sigma b \delta 0 / \sigma c)$ in the first. We may therefore agree with Thirlwall (ii p. 6I), as against Grote (iii 92 n ), who refers $\tau \hat{\nu} \nu \mu \dot{e} \nu$ to $\chi \rho \eta \mu \dot{\alpha} \tau \omega \nu$ and $\tau \hat{\omega} \nu \delta \dot{z}$ to $\epsilon \pi เ-$ койробб. Thirlwall had said of Peisistratus that he 'possessed lands on the Strymon in Thrace, which yielded him a large revenue.' Grote thought this improbable, adding: 'If Peisistratus had established any settlement at the mouth of the Strymon, we must surely have heard something of it afterwards.' The text does not indeed tell us that Peisistratus made an actual settlement near that river, but it supplies us with exactly the kind of evidence which would have removed Grote's hesitation in accepting Thirlwall's inference from the account in Herodotus. The text tells us more than the historian. It informs us definitely that Peisistratus visited the region near the mouth of the Strymon, and thence drew his supplies of men, as well as of money.

It is interesting to notice these details respecting Rhaecelos and the country around Mount Pangaeus. The Pangaean Mount is plainly visible across the gulf of the Strymon from the neighbourhood of Stageira; and the bold promontory, north of Rhaecelus, is in full view across the plains that extend to the mouth of the Ludias from the Macedonian capital at Pella. These topographical considerations may serve to support the ascription of the treatise to the authorship of Aristotle, who was a Macedonian by birth and spent the first seventeen years of his life, and seven years besides, at his native town of Stageira. In the Historia Animalium, pp. 592 a 7,597 a 10 , Aristotle makes special mention of the eels and the pelicans of the Strymon.
ródıv] confirms the account of Hdt., implying that Peisistratus had in the first
instance retired to Eretria, though we are not expressly told so in the text.
 $\alpha \nu \alpha \sigma \dot{\psi} \sigma \alpha \sigma \theta \alpha, \tau \grave{\eta} \nu \quad \alpha \rho \chi \dot{\eta} \nu$, and in the same chapter $\dot{\alpha} \nu \alpha \lambda \alpha \beta \epsilon \hat{\nu} \nu$ and $\dot{\alpha} \nu a \kappa \tau \hat{a} \sigma \theta a \iota ~ \tau \grave{\eta} \nu$


 $\lambda о \nu \tau o \tau \hat{\eta} \delta \delta \sigma \iota \tau \hat{\omega} \nu \chi \rho \eta \mu \dot{\alpha} \tau \omega \nu$.

Avyס́ápos] Hdt. l.c., кal үàp 'A $\rho \gamma \in i=0$





 $\tau \hat{\omega} \nu \mathrm{N} a \xi(\omega \nu$. The story of the way in which Lygdamis became tyrant of Naxos is quoted in Athen. viii 348 , from 'Aristotle
 the wrongs done by some Naxian youths to the wealthy and popular Telestagoras





 Rose ${ }^{3}$.)
 who held the supreme power in the constitution of Eretria' (K.). mohereia is here ius civitatis, potestas in civitate, often used in the Politics in the phrase $\mu \epsilon \tau \epsilon \chi \epsilon \omega \tau$ тодı $\tau$ las (Index Ar. s.v.3). Eretria was under the rule of an oligarchy of Knights, which was overthrown by one Diagoras, probably not long before the Persian wars, Pol. viii (v) 6, гз 06 a 35, Tiेv है
 $\Delta \iota a \gamma \delta \rho a s$ калє $\lambda \nu \sigma \in \nu$ à $\delta \kappa \eta \theta \epsilon i s, \pi \epsilon \rho l$ үá $\mu \omega \nu$, and vi (iv) $3,1289 b 36, \epsilon_{\pi} l^{\top} \tau \omega \nu \quad \alpha \rho \chi a i \omega \nu$



## 






 freti (Dittenberger 158 , II, titulo Iliensi post Alexandri mortem scripto, $\tau \hat{\omega} \nu \bar{\xi} \xi=\pi \lambda \alpha-$
 tura etiam in Diodori Siculi codicibus servata est). OHCEIWI nunc in papyro legit к (в) : alnakeimi legunt K -w, quod ex Polyaeno quondam sumpserat $\mathrm{K}^{1}$ ( $\mathrm{H}-\mathrm{L}$ ).


 served in the temple of Artemis, abont a mile from the city, recorded that the Eretrians used to march to that temple with 3000 hoplites, 600 horsemen, and 60 chariots (Strabo, p. 448). Cf. Gilbert, Gr. St., ii 67 n .
 the way from Marathon to Athens.
 The deme Pallene lay near Gargettos, between Pentelicus and the northern spurs of Hymettus. It has been proposed to place it S.E. of Hymettus, near Koropi (Ath. Mittheilungen, xvi 200-234); but this appears to have been the site of Sphettos, and the proposed identification does not suit the data in Hdt. ; while the name of Pallene survives in Balldana between Kantza and Hieraka (Milchhöfer in Berl. Phil. Wochenschr., 1892, no. 1 and 2). Cf. Arist. Ach. $233 \beta \lambda \epsilon \pi \epsilon \epsilon \nu$ Ba入$\lambda \dot{\eta} \nu a \delta \varepsilon$. In the Austrian map the name Baldnas is given to a stream which rises near Kantza and falls into the sea at Araphen, after flowing in a direction parallel to the ronte by which Peisistratus marched to Athens round the S. of Pentelicus.
Ná̧ov— $\Lambda$ úy $\delta a \mu ı v]$ Hdt. i 64 , kal
 $\pi 0 \lambda \epsilon \mu \varphi$ каl $\epsilon \pi \epsilon \in \tau \epsilon \psi \in \Lambda \dot{\prime} \gamma \delta \alpha \mu$. Schol. Aristoph. Vesp. 355, Názos éả $\omega \omega \in \pi l$ חetбเбтра́тои.

As Polycrates came to the end of his rule of 16 years in B.c. 521 , having been aided in its establishment by Lygdamis, it follows that Lygdamis was in power at Naxos in 537 (Duncker, G. d. A. vi ${ }_{4}{ }_{5}$ and 512). As Peisistratus, who restored Lygdamis, died in 527 , it would follow that the third $\tau u \rho a \nu v / s$ probably lasted 10 or il years. The only alternative is to suppose that Lygdamis aided Polycrates
before he himself needed the aid of Peisistratus.
§ 4. тарє $\lambda_{\epsilon \epsilon \tau о-\tau \alpha}$ \% $\left.\pi \lambda a\right]$ characteristic of a rupavpls. Pol. viii (v) Io, I3II a
 $\tau \dot{\eta} \nu \pi \alpha \rho a i \rho \epsilon \sigma \nu \nu \pi о \iota \hat{v} \nu \tau \alpha \iota \tau \hat{\nu} \nu \delta \pi \lambda \omega \nu)$.
द̇gorlıolav] Cf. Xen. Anab. i 7 § 10 , $\dot{\epsilon} \nu \tau \hat{\eta} \epsilon \xi 0 \pi \lambda \iota \sigma i q$, of an armed mustering of troops in preparation for a battle, the only passage in which the word is used by Xenophon. Cyrop. viii $5 \$ 9 \epsilon \xi 6 \pi \lambda \iota \sigma t s$. ė $\xi 0 \pi \lambda \backslash \xi \in \sigma \theta a \iota$ occurs in $A n a b$. i 8 § 3, ii I
 28, iv 3 § 3 . Diodorus xix 3 $\epsilon \nu$ taîs

The story is told as follows in Poly-



 $\mu \in \nu$ оs $\delta \eta \mu \eta \gamma \sigma \rho \eta \bar{\eta} \alpha \iota$, каi $\sigma \mu \iota \kappa \rho \hat{q} ~ \tau \hat{\eta} \phi \omega \nu \hat{\eta}$


 $\mu \hat{e} \nu \dot{\eta} \sigma u \chi \hat{\eta} \delta_{\iota \epsilon \lambda \in ́ \gamma \epsilon \tau 0,}$ ol $\delta^{\prime} \dot{\epsilon} \nu \tau \epsilon i \nu a \nu \tau \epsilon s ~ \tau d s$




 $\tau \hat{\omega} \nu$ ö $\pi \lambda \omega \nu$.

The 'Avakesov, or temple of the Dioscuri or ${ }^{*}$ Avaкes (Plut. Thes. 33, Cic. Nat. Deor. iii 53), mentioned by Polyaenus, stood S.E. of the market of the Ceramicus (Curtius, Text der Sieben Karten, p. 53; Stadtgeschichte von Athen, pp. XLVI and 82). It was probably some way up the northern slope of the Acropolis. Lucian, Piscator, 42, humorously describes the philosophers 'planting their ladders
 the Acropolis. Andocides, De Myst. i 45 , mentions a cavalry muster at the ${ }^{\text {A }}$ Avdketop, and Thucydides, viii 93, says that the hoplites who had destroyed the




$17 \tau \hat{\eta} s \delta \varepsilon \phi \omega \nu \hat{\eta} s$ é $\chi \dot{d} \lambda a \sigma \epsilon \nu$ coniecit Kontos（laudant h－L in praefatione，accepit
 textu）． 20 дıєтрєıBє． $20-21$ тоүт（ $\omega \mathbf{N}$ ）．тєтдГ：тои́тч Rutherford et


 ӧт $\lambda a$（Miss Harrison，Mythology etc．of Athens，152）．

The precinct of Agraulos，also men－ tioned by Polyaenus，may be placed below the ancient stone staircase in the N．cliff of the Acropolis，some 60 yards W．of the N．Porch of the Erechtheum， （Cf．Curtins，Stadtgeschichte，pp．Xliv， 37．）

The $\Theta \eta \sigma \hat{\epsilon} 0 \nu$ is mentioned in the text． Its position is approximately determined by the description of Pausanias．After leaving the Gymnasium and the $\Theta \eta \sigma \in \hat{L} 0 \nu$ ， which are near one another and＇not far from the Agora，＇he passes from the Өnбeion to the＇Avdiceiov，and adds that above the latter is the precinct of Agraulos （i 17 § 2， 18 §§ I，2）．The $\theta_{\eta \sigma \epsilon i o v}$ was probably E．of the Agora and is not to be confounded with the building on the ＇hill of Colonus＇within the walls，popu－ larly called the＇Theseum，＇but now generally identified as the temple of Hephaestus（Miss Harrison，l．c． 145 ， 118）．According to Polyaenus，the weapons are at first left in the＇Avakeov and transferred to the＇Aypaú入cov．Ac－ cording to the text，they are left in the $\Theta_{\eta \sigma \epsilon i o p}$ and are then locked up eis rà
 buildings near the Thesenm，＇as we might have expected，but＇the neighbouring buildings of the Theseum．＇The latter phrase suggests that some other building than the $\Theta \eta \sigma \in i o \nu$ has already been men－ tioned，and this（so far as it goes）is in favour of $\epsilon \nu \tau \hat{\Psi}$＇A $\nu a \kappa \epsilon l(L$, although it is not in the ms．If $\dot{\epsilon} \nu \hat{\psi}$＇$A \nu a \kappa \epsilon(\psi$ is accepted， it proves that the Theseum is near the Anaceum，below the N．cliff of the Acropolis（C．Wachsmuth，Rheinisches Museum，xlvi ${ }^{27}$ ）．

 Hist．Anim．xii 46.

With $\phi \theta \epsilon \in \gamma \gamma \epsilon \sigma \theta a \iota \delta^{\prime} \epsilon \sigma \pi \sigma \delta \delta \alpha \sigma \epsilon \nu \mu \kappa \kappa \rho \phi \nu$ ， printed by k－w，may be compared Dem．
 216，ка入д̀ каl $\mu \epsilon \in \gamma a$ oîtos $\phi \theta \hat{\epsilon} \gamma \xi \epsilon \tau a \mu, .$.
 37 § 52，$\mu \dot{\epsilon} \gamma a \phi \theta \epsilon \gamma \gamma \epsilon \tau a l$ ，Steph． 45 § 77 ， $\lambda \alpha \lambda \epsilon \hat{\nu} \nu \mu \epsilon \gamma a$ ，Lysias 16 § $19, \mu \iota \kappa \rho d \nu \delta \iota a \lambda \epsilon-$ $\gamma \quad \gamma_{\mu \epsilon \nu 0 .} \epsilon \sigma \pi о \dot{\delta} \delta a \sigma \epsilon \nu$ is not，however， convincing．

т̀̀ $\pi \rho \bar{\delta} \pi \boldsymbol{v} \lambda \boldsymbol{\lambda} \boldsymbol{v}]$ Apparently used on purpose to avoid the grander term $\pi \rho o \pi \dot{v}$－ خaca，which would have been an ana－ chronism in so far as it wonld have suggested the Propylaea of the time of Pericles．$\pi \rho \delta \pi \nu \lambda o \nu$ itself is seldom used in the singular．Cic．ad Att．vi 1，26， audio Appium $\pi \rho \sigma \pi \cup \lambda o \nu$ Eleusine facere， Plut．Mor． $363 \mathrm{~F}, \quad \epsilon \nu \tau \hat{\varphi} \pi \rho о \pi \dot{u} \lambda \psi \tau \hat{v}$ lepoû т $\hat{\mathrm{\eta}} \mathrm{~s}$＇ $\mathrm{A} \theta q \nu a \mathrm{a}$（at Sais），Plin．N．H． xxxv 1or，Minervae delubri propylon，xxxvi 32，in propylo Atheniensium．Pliny may have borrowed this exceptional form from Heliodorus，who possibly lived under Ptolemy Epiphanes，and wrote a work on the Acropolis（Wachsmuth，Stadt Athen，i 36）．The word is found（in pl．） in Hdt．，Hippocrates，and in an inscription from Smyrna．Mr H．Richards accord－ ingly suggests that it may be an Ionism． But the word is also found in an inscr．of the 5th century from the Peiraens，CIA ii


Traces of the fonndations of this ancient portal have been noticed S．of the E．hall of the Propylaea．It faced S．W．（Milch－ höfer in Baumeister，Denkm．i 201 a）．
yє $〒 \omega ́ v n]$ Ar．De Anima ii 8， $420 a \mathrm{r}$ ，


 cf． $802 b$ 6，$a$ 23．Probl． 917 b 21，$\dot{\text { o }}$
 $\mu \epsilon \tau^{\prime} \alpha \lambda \lambda \omega \nu \not \approx \delta \omega \nu \ddot{\eta} \mu b \nu o s$, cf．goi $b$ 31 $\gamma \epsilon \gamma \dot{\varphi} \alpha \sigma \iota, 904{ }^{b} 35 \gamma \epsilon \gamma \omega \nu \omega$（Index Ar．）． Antiphon，de caede Herod．44，$\pi 0 \lambda \lambda \hat{\varphi}$
 （Cobet，Mnem．iv 153）．$\gamma \in \gamma \omega \nu \in \hat{\nu} \nu$ is the normal form in Attic prose，but the word is far from common．




 $\lambda \eta \dot{\sigma} \sigma \sigma \theta a \iota \pi a ́ v \tau \omega \nu$.








 partem autem notae quae катd́ significaret apparere, indicavit Blass. 24 [kal w's


 єivac exprimit \in papyro inesse divinavit Wyse, invenit K . aürds é $\pi \tau \mu \in \lambda \eta \sigma \epsilon \sigma \theta a \iota$


 Voemel, Prolegomena Grammatica ad Dem. Contiones, § 29: $\pi \rho \hat{q} o s ~ k-w, ~ H-L . ~$
 रoûvтo H-L.
$8 \delta \iota \epsilon \sigma \pi a \rho \mu t \nu 0 \iota<\bar{\omega} \sigma l>$ Kontos (H-L).

[^57]same spirit, we read in Plut. Sol. 31, wis



 Mr Wyse compares Xen. de Red. i i ; iv 49 ; Schol. Aristoph. Vesp. 1446, épy ${ }^{2}-$
 sense, cf. Pol. 1320 b 7 , (even under a
 $\gamma \nu \omega \rho i \mu \omega \nu$ каl $\delta \iota a \lambda a \mu \beta a \nu 0 \nu \tau a s$ тoùs árbpous áфор $\mu$ às $\delta \delta \delta \delta \nu \tau a s ~ \tau \rho \epsilon \pi \epsilon \epsilon \nu \in \pi$ ' $\rho \rho \gamma a \sigma l a s$.
$\left.\pi p o \varepsilon \delta \alpha^{\prime} v \in \iota_{\epsilon} \epsilon\right]$ In this verb $\pi \rho$ does not mean 'beforehand,' but 'in advance.' $\pi \rho o \delta a \nu \in i \zeta \in \nu$, originally 'to make an advance,' develops the meaning 'to lend without interest.' The conjecture $\pi \rho o \sigma$ $\epsilon \delta \dot{\partial} \epsilon \iota \zeta \epsilon$, 'he also lent money,' is withdrawn. It rested on the assumption that $\pi \rho о \epsilon \delta \delta \nu \in!\zeta \in$ meant 'he lent beforehand,' a sense unsuitable to the context (Wyse in Class. Rev. vi 254










 $\lambda a \dot{\tau} \tau \omega \nu \mathrm{~K}^{1}$ (H-L); lacuna vix quattuor litterarum capax.


#### Abstract

 $\sigma \nu \mu \mu \epsilon \tau \operatorname{la\nu }, \dot{\alpha} \lambda \lambda \grave{a} \mu \hat{a} \lambda \lambda о \nu \pi \epsilon \rho \bar{\sigma} \sigma \theta a l$. Rhet. i $4,1359 b 6$. For the general sense,   






 $\sigma \pi \dot{\alpha} \rho \theta a \iota \kappa \alpha \tau \grave{\alpha} \tau \dot{\eta} \nu \chi \dot{\omega} \rho \sigma \nu \nu{ }^{\prime} \tau^{\prime} \dot{\alpha} \pi \alpha \nu \tau \hat{\omega} \sigma \nu \nu$
 vi (viii) 5 , $1292 b_{25}$, $8 \tau \alpha \nu \mu \not ิ \nu$ oûv $\tau \dot{\delta}$




 кalas екккл $\eta$ olas. vii (vi) 4,1318 b 9 ,


 Diogenes Laert. i 98 says of Periander, on the authority of Ephorus and Aristotle,
 Similarly, in the abstract of Aristotle, by
 (Rose, Frag. ${ }^{3}$ 61 i, 20).

Cf. Aelian V. H. ix 25; Max. Tyr. xxix 3; and Dion Chrys. Or. 7 i p. 257 f. R., i 520-I R. (Mayor).
$\tau \omega ิ \nu \mu$ етр $\{\omega v] 27$ § 3 .


$\mu \eta(\tau \epsilon \sigma \times 0 \lambda d \xi \omega \sigma \iota \nu]$ Similarly in Pol. viii (v) $11,1313 b 23$, the object of the Peisistratidae, in beginning the building of the Olympieum, was $\dot{a} \sigma \chi \circ \lambda i a \nu$ ( $k a l$ $\pi \epsilon \nu(a v) \tau \hat{\omega} \downarrow \dot{\alpha} \rho \chi 0 \mu \epsilon \nu \omega \nu$. Cf. $i b$. г 9 ff.
§ 4. Sєка́ $\tau \eta v]$ Hitherto, the main evidence for this has been the spurious letter of Peisistratus to Solon, Diog. Laert. i 53. The present passage supports the view of

Boeckh (iii 6), Arnold (on Thuc. vi 54 § 5) and Thirlwall (c. xi, p. 72-74), that Peisistratus levied a tax of ten per cent. Grote demurred to accepting this, on the ground of insufficient evidence. (It is mentioned in Zenobins iv 76 , Mantissa Proverb. i 76, and Proverbiorum Appendix, ii 66.) Thuc. l. c., after mentioning Hipparchus, says $\epsilon \pi \epsilon \tau \eta \delta \epsilon \nu \sigma a \nu$

 $\pi \rho a \sigma \sigma \delta \mu \epsilon \nu 0 \iota \kappa \tau \lambda$. , and the scholars abovementioned accordingly assumed that the tax was reduced by the Peisistratidae. The text implies that this assumption was correct.
§ 5. Tov̀s kard $\delta$ rírovs- $\delta$ Lca.नтds] The origin of these 'district-judges,' who went on circuit through the demes of Attica, is here for the first time ascribed to Peisistratus. Their number is stated as 30 under Pericles (c. $26 \S 5$ ). After the time of the Thirty Tyrants the number was changed to 40 , four from each tribe (c. 53 § I).
 Zenobius, Proverb. cent. iv 76, каl $\sigma \phi \dot{d}$ $\kappa \in \lambda \circ \iota \pi 0$ сои̂ $\sigma \iota \nu \mathrm{a} \tau \epsilon \lambda \epsilon \iota a \nu(=$ Suidas s.v.











 verb. cent. i 76 ( $=$ Apostolius $\times 80$ ed. Pontini). Diodorus Sic. ix 57 Bekker,









 ${ }_{25}$ oủ $\delta^{\prime}$ є̀ $\nu$ тoîs ä入入oıs $\pi a \rho \omega ́ \chi \lambda \epsilon \iota \kappa a \tau \grave{a} \tau \grave{\eta} \nu \dot{a} \rho \chi \eta \dot{\eta} \nu$, ả $\lambda \lambda ’$ ảeì $\pi[a] \rho \epsilon-$







 Wessely, в; sed exspectares potius $\epsilon \pi \iota \mu \epsilon \lambda \omega \bar{s}$ vel $\epsilon \pi \iota \pi \delta \nu \omega s$ : $\pi \rho \epsilon \sigma \beta \hat{\tau} \tau \eta \nu$ invita papyro

 sed spatium non sufficit. 20 [ $\pi \varepsilon \rho \iota] \gamma i \gamma \nu \epsilon \tau \alpha \iota$ K-W invita papyro. $21 \tau \hat{\omega} \nu \kappa \alpha \kappa \hat{\omega} \nu$ $\kappa \alpha l \tau \hat{\omega} \nu \delta \delta u \nu \hat{\omega} \nu$ om. H-L; $\tau \hat{\omega} \nu$ ante $\delta \dot{\delta}\left\langle\nu \hat{\omega} \nu\right.$ secl. K-W. $\quad 23<a \dot{v} \tau \delta \nu>\alpha \alpha^{\gamma} \nu \hat{\omega} \nu \nu$ H-L.


 cum papyri indiciis obscuris congruere existimat K$) ; \epsilon \theta[\rho u] \lambda \lambda[\epsilon \hat{\imath}] \tau 0 \mathrm{~B} . \quad 28 \delta \iota a[\delta \epsilon \xi \alpha-$

 тродрєíто $\mathrm{K}-\mathrm{W}, \mathrm{B}$.



 Villoison, $A n e c d$. ii 40.

The story has been traced to Demon, the writer of a work on proverbs, who is probably the same as the writer of an 'A $\tau \theta$ is, earlier than Philochorms (Zenob. Athous ii 4 quoted by O. Crusius Anal. ad Paroem. p. 132 f). But, if this Demon is the same as the nephew of Demosthenes bearing that name, he is later than the date of this treatise.
§ 7. $\left.\pi a \rho \omega \chi^{\lambda} \epsilon \in\right] \pi a p o \chi \lambda \epsilon \omega$ is found in Theophr. C. P. iii ro, 5. $\pi a \rho \in \nu 0 \chi \lambda \epsilon \omega$ is less uncommon.
$\delta^{\prime}$ él Kpóvov $\beta$ los] 'the golden age.' [Plat.] Hipparch. 229 в (after the death





 ovios. The same proverbial phrase is applied by Plutarch, Arist. 24, to the happy condition of the Athenian allies finder the administration of Aristeides, and in Cimon ro to the liberality of Cimon (inf. c. 27 § 3 ).

§ 8. $\delta \eta \mu 0 \tau<\kappa \dot{v} v]$ c. 14 init.


 ets "Apetoy ndyov. Plut. Sol. 3r, ös $\gamma \in$ кal









 $\kappa a \theta[\eta \dot{\eta} \kappa] \omega \nu$ т $\rho o ̀ s ~ \tau \grave{\eta} \nu<\kappa a \tau a ́ \sigma \tau a \sigma \iota \nu>\tau \eta ̂ s ~ \tau u \rho a \nu \nu i ́ \delta o s . ~ \nu o ́ \mu o s ~ \gamma a ̀ \rho ~$





$34 \epsilon \xi \in \lambda t \pi \epsilon \nu$ Richards coll. Dinarch. 3, 98 et Plat. Leg. 943 A (H-L). 35 é
 posse putat k et post ${ }^{(\mu \mu \epsilon L \nu \epsilon \nu}$ partem inferiorem litterae $\phi$, deinde quinque sexve litterarum spatium. єtтє $\lambda a m B a n \epsilon\left(\mathrm{~K}^{1}\right)$; áтє $\lambda \dot{a} \mu \beta a \nu \epsilon$ Wyse, Gennadios, Ferrini,








 Hager. $\quad<\hat{\eta}>\tau \iota<s>k^{3}$ : cum in papyro $\hat{\eta}$ et $\pi \iota$ prorsus similia sint, fortasse nihil nisi $\hat{\eta}$ legendum suspicatur K ; ${ }^{\boldsymbol{\eta}} \mathrm{K}-\mathrm{w}$, в

44 єlyat каl H -І ('fortasse recte' к), B: єival K .
xVII 1 єлкатєгнрасє (probat Rutherford).
 sketch of the best means for maintaining a tupavpls in Pol. $131_{4}$ a 30-1315b 10.
 of indefinite frequency, followed by the impf., as in Pol. viii (v) 5,1305 a $7, \dot{\epsilon} \pi l \delta \bar{\epsilon}$
 yòs каl arparүךbs, els тvpavylסa $\mu \epsilon \tau \epsilon$ $\beta a \lambda \lambda o \nu$. For $\alpha_{\nu \in \lambda \alpha, \mu \beta a \nu \epsilon c f . ~ H d t . ~ i i i ~ 73, ~}^{\text {, }}$

§ 10. kal $\delta \dot{\eta} \mathrm{kal}]$ as often with of $\tau \varepsilon$ あ $\lambda$ oc preceding; supra § 2.
éav reves-kal yévos] Andocides, $D e$
 $\dot{\eta}$ тду $\tau \cup \rho a \nu \nu о \nu ~ \sigma и \gamma к а т а \sigma \tau \eta ं \sigma \eta$. In later times such an offence would be met by a
 nalty would be death and confiscation of property. The decree against the orator Antiphon and Archeptolemus (one of the Four Hundred) required them to be put
to death and their property to be confiscated. It also declared each of them to
 (Pseudo-Plut. vit. Antiph. § 28).
Cf. Arist. Thesm. 338, et its...tupapyeîv
 495, 498, 502, Lys. 630. The text shews that in Andoc. l.c. Dobree's suggestion, $<\dot{\epsilon} \pi l \tau \hat{\varphi}>\tau \nu p a \nu \nu \in \hat{\nu}$, is unnecessary.

XVII § 1. Éүкатєүทiparє] used metaphorically in Dinarchus, Aristog. § 3, по-
 re₹npakvíay, 'inveterate.' Plut. Phocion
 $\kappa \epsilon \iota \nu$ is similarly used c. dat.

Cf. Thuc. ví 54,2, П. $\gamma \eta \rho a \iota o ̂ ̂ ~ \tau \epsilon \lambda \epsilon v \tau \eta \dot{\eta}-$ oavios; Val. Max. viii 9 E 2, 'decrepitum.'
 name of the archon of the year is now ascertained for the first time. The date of the death of Peisistratus was known











 9 тродгдгоntєc : corr. Rutherford, J B Mayor, Blass, k-w, h-L (k ${ }^{3}$ ). 10 <'A -


Testimonia. 3 Heraclidis epitoma (Rose, Ar. Frag. 6it, $4^{3}$ ) Meiflotpatos

already. He died in the beginning of B.c. 527 , the latter half of $\mathrm{Ol} .63,1$. The date is fixed by Ar. Pol., quoted below, and by Thuc. vi 59 § 5. The former makes the rule of the Peisistratidae last 18 years; the latter says that the battle of Marathon was in the 2oth year after the expulsion of Hippias. $490+18+19=527$ (Clinton, Fasti, ii 254).
 12, 1315 б 30, $\dot{\eta} \tau \hat{\omega} \nu$ Пє $\boldsymbol{\sigma} \sigma \sigma \tau \rho a \tau \iota \delta \omega \nu$





 part of a paragraph regarded as an interpolation by Susemihl, ed. 2 and 3.
 above, the rule of Peisistratus is said to have lasted 17 years. It has been proposed to reconcile the two accounts by supposing that fractions of a year are included here, and excluded in the Politics. See, however, note on 14 §3.
§ 2. दрळ́ $\mu$ ยvov] Ael. V. H. viii 16,


Meyaptas] c. 14 § i.
áréavev] Solon died not long after 560 b.c. (Plut. Sol. 12); Peisistratus, in 527.
§ 3. Tòv aủròv тpótov] Thuc. vi 54 884 f. 6 .

ék Tท̂s 'Apyelas] Hdt. v 94, Hetol-


 ruvackós. "Herodotus calls Hegesistratus $\nu 6 \theta o \nu$, because after the middle of the fifth century (c. 26 ad fin.) women of foreign blood certainly could not occupy at Athens the position of a lawful wife: the children of a $\xi \in \nu \eta$ were both $\nu 6 \theta o c$ and $\xi$ teol. The same distinction is present to the writer: he contrasts 'the wedded wife' of Athenian birth with the 'Argive woman.' The reading need not be altered. Thucydides (vi 55 § I) seems to include Thessalus among the legitimate sons of Peisistratus, $\tau \hat{\omega} \nu \gamma \nu \eta \sigma l \omega \nu d \delta \epsilon \lambda \phi \hat{\omega} \nu "(W y s e$, Class. Rev. v 226 b). In i 20 § 2, after stating that Hippias was the eldest son, he adds that Hipparchus and Thessalus were his brothers. The name of Thessalus was probably given him ont of compliment to the Thessalian allies of the house of Peisistratus. The Thessalians ineffectually sent 1000 horse to defend Hippias shortly before his expulsion (Hdt. v 63). Plutarch, Cato major 24, calls Thessalus the son of Peisistratus and Timonassa, but we now know for the first time that this was another name for Hegesistratus. As regards the nationality of his mother it will be remembered that Peisistratus was aided, during his second exile, by mercenary troops from Argos (Hdt. i 6I).







18. $\grave{\eta} \sigma a \nu ~ \delta \grave{e ̀ ~ \kappa u ́ p ı o \iota ~} \mu \in ̀ \nu ~ \tau \hat{\omega} \nu ~ \pi \rho a \gamma \mu a ́ \tau \omega \nu ~ \delta \iota a ̀ ~ \tau a ̀ ~ a ̉ \xi \iota \omega ́ \mu a \tau a ~$


<br>$16{ }^{\prime} \mathrm{H} \gamma \eta \sigma \iota \sigma \tau \rho a t o v$ primus <br>XVIII 1 T $\omega \mathrm{N}$ M N : $\mu \dot{\nu} \nu \tau \omega \bar{\nu}$ Blass, Richards, edd.

Plat. Soph. 228 c. The adj. $\pi$ apeví $\mu$ Los is found in Plat. Leg. 757 D, and the corresponding verb in Ar. Phys. vii $3,245{ }^{b}$


 nary form of the adj. in Ar. is $\pi$ apóv $u \mu o s$.
 $\left.K_{v \psi \epsilon \lambda}{ }^{\circ} \delta \omega v\right]$ Cypselus (tyrant of Corinth for 30 years from в.c. 658 or 655 ) was succeeded by his son Periander. Among the contemporaries of the latter was another Periander, son of Gorgus, who was either a son or a brother of Cypselus. This second Periander was a tyrant of Am bracia. The establishment of a branch of the Cypselidae in Ambracia was in accordance with the ambitious policy of that dynasty. They attempted to occupy the coast of the Ionian sea as far as Illyria (Müller, Dor. i 8 § 3). Periander was deposed probably after the death of the Corinthian tyrant of the same name (b.c.




 relay. Ambracia was colonised in the reign of Cypselus (Strabo, p. 452) either by that tyrant's brother, Torgus, or his son Gorgus. Strabo, P. 328, describes
 ктl $\sigma \mu a$ (Clinton's Fasti, sub anno 612 B. C.). In the Politics the affair of Harmodius and Aristogeiton is mentioned just before the fall of the Ambracian tyrant, Periander: here it is narrated shortly after a reference to another member of the Ambracian branch of the Cypselidae-On Ambracia see Duncker, H. G. ii 353 E.T.

èктє〒óvтa...катéXovia] If Peisistratus married Timonassa on his first usurpation of the government in 560 b.c., Hegesistratus may have been either 21, 23,24 or 26 years of age at the battle of Pallene according as we place that event in 539 (Bauer), 536 (Reinach), 535 (Kenyon) or 533 (Poland). If he married her on his first expulsion, the son may have been four years younger ( 17 to 22) in the year of the battle. The latter view seems preferable, as his marriage with the 'Argive woman' is more likely to have taken place, when it was to his interest to secure the aid of Argos, than on his first usurpation, when her presence in the palace would not have ingratiated him with his Athenian subjects or with his wedded wife. The beginning of the second tyranny, four to six years later, is out of the question, partly because Peisistratus was then in alliance with Megacles, while Timonassa was probably no longer alive; and partly because this would make the son $\mathrm{I}_{5}$ at the most on the occasion of the battle.

Within about eight years of this time Hegesistratus was old enough to be placed in charge of Sigeum (Hdt. v 94). He was 'much younger' than Hipparchus (c. 18 § 2). Hipparchus, again, was younger than Hippias, and Hippias was an old man in B.c. 490 (Thuc. vi 59 § 5 ). If Hippias was more than 70 in 490 , he was born before 560. Hippias and Hipparchus were already 'young men' (Hdt. i 6I) when their father married the daughter of Megacles, either 8, 9 or II years after 560 . All these considerations are in favour of placing the marriage at the time of the first exile.
XVIII. Harmodius and Aristogeiton.







Testimonia. 4-7 Heraclidis epitoma (Rose, Ar. Frag. 6ir, $4^{3}$ ) "I $\pi \pi a \rho \chi o s$ ó

 $\nu a \nu \tau \partial ̀ \nu \dot{\partial} \delta \epsilon \lambda \phi \partial \nu$ aưtov.





 § $2 ; 55$ § 1 , 2 .

In [Plato], Hipparchus, 228 в, Hipparchus is wrongly described as the eldest son.
$\phi$ ф $\lambda$ ónovoos] Hipparchus is said to have set up in the demes of Attica Hermae inscribed with verses. Hipparch. 229 A,


 र pa $\mu \mu \varepsilon \nu$. The Homeric recitations introduced by Peisistratus at the Panathenaea were improved in certain respects by Hipparchus (ib. 228 в, Aelian, V. $H$. viii 2 ).
tovs $\pi \epsilon \rho l]$ 'Formula ol $\pi \epsilon \rho[$ tıva...interdum ita usurpatur, ut ab ipso personae nomine non multum differat, ol $\pi \epsilon \rho l$ ' $\mathrm{E} \mu \pi \epsilon$ ठок $\lambda \epsilon$ ка ка $\Delta \eta \mu b к \rho \iota \tau о \nu$ de Caelo ii $7,305{ }^{6}$
 ol $\pi \epsilon \rho \mathrm{l}$ ' $\mathrm{I} \pi \pi о к \rho \dot{d} \tau \eta \nu$ Meteor. i 6,342 b 35


 Cf. de Gener. et Corrupt. 3 14 a 25, Pol.v 6, $13^{\circ} 5^{b}$ 26', Index Aristotelicus. In such cases the proper name has no article (Eucken, Sprachgebrauch, Praep. p. 66).
'Avaкріоута каі $\Sigma ц \mu \omega \nu$ ( $\delta \eta \nu$ ] Hipparch. 228 c, (Hipparchus) ' $\pi$ ' 'A $\nu$ акрєоขта


 $\delta \dot{\omega} \rho o t s ~ \pi \epsilon l \theta \omega \nu$.

Simonides (born 556 b.c.) was 29 years of age on the death of Peisistratus in 527. It was probably after the expulsion of the Peisistratidae that he wrote the epitaph on Archedice, daughter of Hippias, quoted in Thuc. vi 59. Cf. Plat. Protag.

346 в. He also celebrated the death of


 spending some years at the conrt of the Aleuadae in Thessaly, he returned to Athens and there commemorated in verse some of thegreat events of the Persian wars. See also Freeman's Sicily, ii 258-264.

There is no evidence of intimate relations between Simonides and Anacreon, unless we ascribe to Simonides the epitaphs on Anacreon in Anthol. Pal. vii 24,25 , which are assigned with greater probability to a later poet, Leonidas.

Anacreon lived for many years at the court of Polycrates of Samos (Hdt. iii 121, Strabo, xiv 638), who was put to death in 522. The death of his patron and the unpopular rule of his successor would prompt him to accept the invitation of Hipparchus. At Athens he made the acquaintance of various members of noble families, such as Critias, son of Dropides (Plat. Charmides, 157 E) and Xanthippus, afterwards the victor of Mycale and the father of Pericles. On the death of Hipparchus, he probably went (like Simonides) to the court of the Alenadae.
rov̀s än入ovs mot $\eta$ ràs] e.g. the founder of the Athenian school of Dithyrambic poetry, and the teacher of Pindar, Lasus of Hermione, one of the rivals of Simonides (Aristoph. Vesp. 1410 Schol.). His detection of the forgeries of Onomacritus led to the banishment of the latter by Hipparchus (Hdt. vii 6).
§ 2. ©eтta入os] Diodorus.Sic., x 16, 1 , gives him a character for wisdom : ámel$\pi \alpha \tau 0 \quad \tau \grave{\eta} \nu \quad \tau \nu \rho a \nu \nu i \delta a$.
' $\phi$ ' o o $]$ Whether oṽ is neuter or (more probably) masculine, it is clear that the troubles of the Peisistratidae are here ascribed to the u Pots of Thessalus, who is naturally the subject of the next sentence







 （ $\mathrm{H}-\mathrm{L}$ ）． $13 \pi a \rho \circ \xi \nu \nu \theta \epsilon \nu \tau a s \mathrm{H}-\mathrm{I}$ ，sed＇spatium deest．＇ $14 \mu \epsilon \tau \epsilon \chi \chi^{6 \nu \tau \omega \nu} \pi 0 \lambda \lambda \hat{\omega} \nu$




Éparөtis $\gamma \grave{\mathrm{a}} \rho \kappa \tau \lambda$ ．This is so completely at variance with the account in Thucy－ dides that Mr Kenyon in his first ed．felt constrained to throw the description of Thessalus into a parenthesis．But the writer does not hesitate to disagree with Thucydides in several of his details，and he may have deliberately disagreed with him in this important point．It does not follow that Thucydides is wrong．The whole of the episode on Harmodins and Aristogeiton is apparently written with extreme care to refute a popular error． It must also be remembered that（accord－ ing to Hermippus，in Marcellinus，Vit． Thuc．p．ix，and Schol．on i 20）the historian was related to the Peisistratidae．
 a $\lambda \lambda \omega \nu$ ．On the other hand，the writer of this treatise shews in the latter part of c． 17 that he knows more than Thucy－ dides about Thessalus，and Thucydides himself tacitly corrects in book i 20 some of the details in the account in book vi （Weil，Fournal des Savants，avril 189 r ）．
épaoөels tov̂＇Apuoठiov］This is re－ ported of Hipparchus by Diod．Sic．x 16 § 2，Plut．Amator． 16 § 27，p．760， Athen．p． 602 A （Mayor）．
èvєoŋpuaivero тикршs］On the other hand，Thuc．（vi 54 §4），with greater partiality towards the Peisistratidae，says
 $\delta \rho a ̂ \nu . ~ F o r ~ \epsilon ̀ \nu \sigma \eta \mu a i \nu \epsilon \sigma \theta a l$ ，cf．Isocr． 20





 viii（v）ro，rarr b $3^{6}$ ，（the rule of the Peisistratidae was attacked）$\delta(\dot{\alpha} \tau \delta \pi \rho o \pi \eta$－



 incident with the approaching Pana－ thenaic festival，at which Hipparchus was put to death．The Panathenaea are mentioned in connexion with the sister of Harmodius by Aelian $V$ ．$H$ ．xi 8，and Max．Tyr．24，2．The year was B．c． 514 ．

On кavךфорєiv，cf．Aristoph．Eccl． 732，Av．1551，and Harpocr．s．v．каขך－



 Ovolap，тoîs $\tau \epsilon$ Пava日quaiols кal тaîs ä $\lambda \lambda a \omega s$ т $\pi ⿰ \mu \pi \pi a i ̂ s$（for other authorities，see Michaelis，Parthenon，p． 329 f．）．The Panathenaea had been revived by Peisi－ stratus，but even in 566 b．c．，six years before his first usurpation，it was attended by a large concourse in consequence of the institution of gymnastic contests at that date（Marcellinus，Vit．Thuc．i）． The Scholiast on Aristides，iii 323 Dind．， says of the great Panathenaea，Пeıनlotoaros $\epsilon \pi 0 i \eta \sigma \epsilon$ ．
$\mu a \lambda a к \dot{v}]$＇effeminate，＇opp．to ка $\rho \tau є \rho$－ кós in Eth． $\mathrm{rr}_{47} \mathrm{~b}_{23}$ ， $\mathrm{rr}_{50} \mathrm{ar}_{14}$ ， 33 ；Eth．
 $\hat{\eta} \pi \epsilon \rho l$ оороs．Cf．c． 3 l． 7.
$\mu \in \tau \in \chi \dot{\varphi} \nu \tau \omega \nu$ то入入ỗ］This contradicts


 57 § r）describes Hippias as marshalling the procession outside Athens in the （outer）Cerameicus，and adds that，on noticing one of the conspirators conversing with him，Harmodins and Aristogeiton， fearing that the plot was discovered， rushed within the gates（ $\left.\mathrm{el}^{\prime} \sigma \tau \hat{\omega} \nu \pi \nu \hat{\omega} \nu\right)$ ， found Hipparchus near the Leocorium and stabbed him to death．Hippias， meanwhile，had remained ontside the















gates, and it was there that he disarmed the citizens. The text describes $H$ and $A$ as waiting for Hippias on the Acropolis. On observing some one conversing with Hippias, they descend ( $\kappa \alpha \tau \alpha-$ ßáyтes) and slay Hipparchus near the Leocorium. The two accounts are impossible to reconcile. In more than one point our author deliberately differs from the historian (inf. § 4).



 $\xi v \lambda \lambda \eta \phi \theta \eta \eta \sigma e \sigma \theta a L . \quad \pi \rho \delta \partial ~ \tau \hat{\eta} s \sigma v \lambda \lambda \eta \psi \in \omega s$ confirms Thuc. i $21, \pi \rho l \nu \sigma \nu \lambda \lambda \eta \phi \theta \hat{\eta} \nu a L$, suspected by Cobet.
 begun the attack without waiting for their confederates.'



 In vi 57, the historian mentions Hippias alone as marshalling the procession outside the gates: (Harm. and Ar.) $\pi \in \rho \iota$
 калои́ $\mu \in \nu о \nu$.

тd Sewkópelov] The monument of the three daughters of Leos who, at the command of an oracle, sacrificed themselves for their country, [Dem.] 60 § 29, Cic. Nat. Deor. iii 50. Harpocration places it in the midst of the (inner) Cerameicus. It is mentioned in connexion with the dropd in Dem. 54 § 7. Cf. Wachsmuth, Stadt Athen, ii 417 ,
and Judeich in Fleckeis. Fahrb. 1890, p. 756 .
§ 4. $\pi$ ohìv xpóvov aikcoetis] Thuc.

 of Aristogeiton and Hippias by Seneca, $d_{e} I r a$, ii 23 , and Justin. ii 9 SS $1-6$. Cf. Diod. Sic. x 15 § 3,4 . The like story is told of Zeno of Elea, Cic. Tusc. ii 5 2, Val. Max. iii 3 E § $I$ (where the tyrant is Phalaris, as in Heraclides Ponticus in Athen. 652 B), Diog. Laert. ix 26, 27, Plut. ii 505 D (Mayor). Polyaenus


 $\delta \xi$ roùs 'Intlov $\phi$ R

 $\tau \dot{\delta} \sigma \tau \rho a \tau \eta \gamma \eta \mu a \tau \omega ิ \nu \phi \lambda \omega \nu$.





 Antiphon, $d e$ Chor. 25 . Thuc. i 99 § 1 ,

中ưrel] 'in birth', as in c. 5 \$ 3 .
[xvos] met. as in Antiphon, Tetral. A $\gamma$

 ффvov. Ar. Hist. An. 8, 588 a 33 , $\epsilon_{\nu}$ toîs
 (ס̇iv otov ' $\chi \nu \eta$ каl $\sigma \pi \epsilon \rho \mu a \tau a, a 19 ; 9$, 608 b 4 .












 $\sigma \pi a \sigma a ́ \mu \epsilon \nu 0 \varsigma ~ т \grave{\eta} \nu \mu a ́ \chi a \iota \rho a \nu \delta \iota \in ́ \phi \theta \epsilon \iota \rho \in \nu$ av̉тóv．





 quod in titulis non misi post annum 300 A．c．invenitur，Meisterhans，p． $134^{2}$ ．
 37 катєcХen correctum in－єIXEN．

XIX 2 tIM K－w．





 The conspirators purposely selected the festival of the Panathenaea（about Aug．

 ous $\gamma \in \nu \dot{\epsilon} \sigma \theta a t$ ．（The passage in Lysias i3 §
 $\sigma \nu \nu \epsilon \pi \epsilon \mu \pi \epsilon \tau \dot{\eta} \nu \pi о \mu \pi \dot{\eta} \nu \mu \epsilon \tau \dot{\alpha} \tau \hat{\omega} \nu \pi 0 \lambda \iota \tau \hat{\omega} \nu$ тpos $\tau \dot{\alpha}$ a $\sigma \tau \nu$ ，quoted in Michaelis，Par－ thenon，332，does not refer to the Pana－ thenaea，but to the festal procession on the restoration of the democracy，on Sept． 31，403．）The statement in the text is intended as a deliberate correction of the account in Thucydides，but we have now no means of ascertaining the ultimate anthority for the correction．The first line of the famous scolium of Callistratus（pro－ bably written not long after the Persian war），implies that Harmodius and Aristo－ geiton concealed their daggers in branches
 $\sigma \omega)$ ，but says nothing about spear or shield．
\＄5．dö quence of their destroying the innocent； $\gamma^{\epsilon} \nu 0<\nu \tau 0 \quad \alpha \sigma \theta \in \nu \in \hat{S}$ ，that of their destroying their own friends．
§ 6．тávza motûv］［Lys．］ 8 § 5，हो $\phi$－
 $\dot{\alpha} \pi \alpha \lambda \lambda a \gamma \hat{\eta} \tau \dot{\epsilon} \mu o v$ ．Lys． 12 § 84，$\pi \dot{\alpha} \nu \tau \alpha$



ovei8lous］Cf．Polyaen．quoted on § 4 ． ＇The narrative of the end of Aristogiton betrays the same liking for sensational stories as we trace，for instance，in Phy－ larchus＇（W．L．Newman in Class．Rev． v 161 $b$ ）．

XIX．Hippias．§ r．тpaxutépav］Hdt．




 то入入ous ťктєLшє кт入．










 $\tau \hat{\psi}$ a correctore additum abesse propter numeros mavult Blass. MOYNYXIAN
 Sidgwick (H-L, B): ЄKєI K, K-w. 7 Дaкє


 arbitratus.




 Athen. 695 et Suidas; $\delta \pi \delta \tau^{\prime}$ Etym. M. codex Dorvillii Bodleianus, et Apostolius vii 70) $\epsilon \delta \epsilon \epsilon \xi a \nu$ ol $\omega \nu \pi a \tau \epsilon \rho \omega \nu$ Ë $\sigma a \nu . \quad$ Cf. Rose, Frag. $356^{2}, 394^{3}$.








 12, 入éүєтal $\delta \dot{\epsilon}$ (Epimenides) $\tau \dot{\eta} \nu$ Mouvixia




 i II4). The height of Munichia, which commanded the harbours of Munichia and Zea, is 255 Paris feet above the sea, whereas the highest part of the Peiraeus is only 191. It was an important point in the fortification of the harbours, instituted by Themistocles; and its importance is also shewn by the fact that in 411 b.c. we read of the commander têv $\pi \in \rho t-$
 viii 92, 3); it was fortified by Thrasybulus in 403 (Xen. Hell. ii 4, 11-12; Diodor.
 $\tau \in \rho \sigma \nu)$. In the time of Alexander (325/4) one of the $\sigma \tau \rho a \tau \eta \gamma o l$ was specially ap-
pointed to guard this point (c. 6I §1). In $3^{22}$ it was occupied by a Macedonian garrison (Plut. Phocion 27, 28; Curtius, Stadtgeschichte, p. 222); in 307 the fort was destroyed by Demetrius Poliorcetes (Plut. Demetr. 10), but was soon restored in the Macedonian interest, to be evacuated in 229. It was probably destroyed by Sulla. By the time of Straho (p. 395 c) it was in ruins (C. Wachsmuth, Stadt Athen, ii 42-45).
 X $甲 \eta \sigma \mu \omega \hat{\nu}] i b .63$ (quoted on §4).
 62, (the Alcmeonidae) $\alpha \mu \alpha$ roí $\sigma L$ a $\lambda \lambda \frac{2}{} \sigma$




 A. vi 501 , places this incident in B.C. 513 . Cf. J. H. Wright, The date of Cylon, p. 54 -
$\Lambda \in \iota \notin$ ífpov] a 'waterless' spot on the southern flank of Parnes. The site has







 secl．Hude， $\mathrm{K}-\mathrm{w}, \mathrm{H}-\mathrm{L}$ ，utpote ex dittographia ortum． $16-17 \mu \mathrm{~d} \chi \in \sigma \theta a l \tau^{2}$ á $\gamma \mathrm{a}$ Oovs

 ка入oús，cüratplóas Bury．






 $\dot{\epsilon}^{\dot{1}} \boldsymbol{\lambda} \lambda \omega \sigma a \nu$（Rose，Frag． $357^{2}$ ， $395^{3}$ ）．
not been identified．Leake（Demi，p．39）， placing Paeonidae at Menidhi，regarded the monastery of St Nicolas at the upper end of a long acclivity three or four miles （drei Stunden，Kastromenos，die Demen， p．95）to the N．as the site of Leipsydrinm． The monastery is＇built in a strong situa－ tion upon the summit of a height，backed by the pine woods of Parnes and near the right bank of a remarkable torrent＇． But the presence of the torrent is un－ favourable to this identification of the ＇waterless＇spot．Kastromenos，l．c．，mere－ ly says of this torrent that its water＇has certainly never failed to supply Leipsy－ drium，＇but he does not say clearly that this fact goes against the proposed identifica－ tion．Menidhi is now identified as the site of Acharnae，wbile Paeonidae may possibly correspond to the ruined village of Vari－ pompi，two hours north of Menidhi at the southern edge of Parnes，and Leipsydrium may have occupied the same position as the Pyrgos above that village（Hanriot， Recherches，p． 55 sqq．，quoted in Bur－ sian＇s Geographie，i 334）．
ñoov év toîs $\sigma$ ко八lous］cf．c． 20 at end． On scolia，see K．O．Müller＇s Lit．of Ancient Greece，i 249 E．T．＇The rhythms of the extant scolia are very various，though，on the whole，they re－ semble those of the Aeolic lyric poetry； only that the course of the strophes is broken by an accelerated rhythm，and is
in general more animated．This is par－ ticularly true of the apt and elegant metre，which occurs in eight Scolia（one of them the Harmodius），and of which there is a comic imitation in Aristoph． Eccl． $93^{8 .}$

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { ーニ Łーいーい - - - } \\
& \text { ーニムーー - - - - - } \\
& \text { ールレーー レーいー } \\
& \text { ムーー - - ムーー - - }
\end{aligned}
$$

Here the hendecasyllables begin with a composed and feeble tone；but a more rapid rhythm is introduced by the ana－ paestic beginning of the third verse；and the two expressions are reconciled by the logacedic members in the last verse．＇This scolium is quoted with many others in Athenaeus，xv p． 695.

троб $\omega \sigma$ Éralpov］a rare epithet appro－ priate to an impromptu song．It was afterwards used in late prose by Dio Cassius 58，14．The only other word
 ＇a boaster who breaks his word＇．Both words are noticed by Lobeck，Phryn． 770 （ L and S ）．















20 olко $\delta о \mu \epsilon \hat{i} \nu \quad \forall \theta \epsilon \nu$ єن่ $\pi \dot{\partial} \rho \eta \sigma \alpha \nu \chi \rho \eta \mu \dot{d} \tau \omega \nu, \mathrm{~K} ; \chi \rho \eta \sigma \mu \hat{\omega} \nu$ ? Wyse; commatis signum
 post $\chi \rho \eta \mu \alpha \dot{\alpha} \tau \omega \nu$ indicata). $\quad \eta \dot{\prime} \pi \delta \rho \eta \sigma \alpha \nu$ H-L. $\quad 21 \pi \rho o u ́ \phi \in \rho \in \nu$ H-L, cf. v. $23 \pi \rho o \gamma$ $\tau \rho \epsilon \psi \epsilon:$ проєф (к, к-w, в). dıє। (к, к-w, в); cf. $5,19 . \quad 22$ єІСтоүтєY $\theta \epsilon \omega \mathrm{C}$ : correxit Blass e Schol. Arist. Lys. 1153 ( $\mathrm{K}-\mathrm{W}, \mathrm{h}-\mathrm{I}, \mathrm{k}^{3}$ ). 24 cyn -




 ii 180. Schol. Aeschin. 3, 116 .

The temple at Delphi was burnt down in B.c. 548 ; the contract of 300 talents for rebuilding it is assigned by Duncker, G. d. A. vi 493, to about 535. Pharaoh Amasis, who contributed to its restoration, died in 526.

Rose, A. P., p. 418, observes, on Schol. Arist. Lysistr. 1153 , that the writer of the ' $\mathrm{A} \theta$. $\boldsymbol{\pi} \boldsymbol{\sigma}$ : : must have closely followed Herodotus. But this is no proof of the spurionsness of the treatise, as Ar. frequently refers to Herodotus in his undisputed works: $123 b 9,523 a 17,736 a$ 10, 756 b 6, 1343 a 20, 1344 a 16, 1409 a 27, 1451 b 2 (Heitz, Verl. Schriften, p. 246).

It appears impossible to take $\begin{gathered}\theta \\ \theta\end{gathered} \nu$ as $=$ d $\phi$ ' $\boldsymbol{\omega} \nu($ as proposed by Mr Kenyon). It can only mean: 'hence it was that they had abundance of money'. Similar uses of $\delta \theta \in \nu$ occur in $6 \S 2,7 \$ 4,21 \S \$_{2}, 4$. We bave here a slight divergence from the account in Herodotus. The historian describes the wealth of the Alcmaeonidae as enabling them to undertake the contract for rebuilding the temple, which they carried out in a splendid manner. The text states that, owing to their undertaking the contract, they had large supplies of money. These sums were entrusted to them to enable them to execute their contract, but they were (partly) applied to securing the aid of Sparta against the Peisistratidae. This account is confirmed by a subsequent Atthidographer, Philochorus, frag. 70, FHG; 395,



 кобон $\hat{\eta} \sigma \alpha$, каі $\delta \epsilon \xi \notin \mu \in \nu$ о $\chi \rho \dot{\eta} \mu a \tau \alpha$ каl

 $\sigma \tau \eta \rho / \omega \nu \pi \lambda \epsilon \iota \delta \nu \omega \nu$ ávчкобб $\quad \mu \eta \sigma a \nu \tau \hat{\varphi} \quad \theta \in \hat{\psi}$
 de Perm. 232 describes the Alcmaeonid Cleisthenes as having established the de-

 Similarly Dem. c. Mid. 144 says of the





$\pi \rho \circ$ иैфєрєv] This defends $\pi \rho o \phi \epsilon \rho \epsilon \nu$ in Hdt. v 63, against $\pi p o \phi \alpha=1 \nu \epsilon \nu$ (preferred by Bekker and Dindorf).


$\sigma v v \in \beta \dot{1} \lambda \lambda \epsilon \tau 0-\mu o i p a v]$ Plat. Tim. 47 C ,
 $\mu 0 \hat{\rho} \rho a \nu$, and often with $\mu \notin \rho o s$. Ar. de

 de Part. Anim. iii 12, 673 b 25, бuщ ${ }^{2} \dot{\lambda}$.
 (vii) $11,1330 \quad 13$, тaûta $\pi \lambda \in i ̂ \sigma \tau o \nu \sigma \nu \mu-$



 $\pi \rho d s$-.


 ${ }^{2} A \gamma \chi^{\prime} \mu_{0} \lambda_{0} \nu$ is the reading in the Ra. venna ms of Schol. on Aristoph. Iys. 1153.














(K-W, H-L, K ${ }^{3}, \mathrm{~B}$ ).
 H-L).

Kıvéav] Hdt. l.c. Өєб $\sigma a \lambda o i . . . a \pi \epsilon \in \pi \epsilon \mu-$
 $\sigma \phi \epsilon \tau \in \rho a \nu \mathrm{~K} \iota \nu \in \eta \nu$.







 Lys. $1150-6$.


 $\mu \hat{\nu}$

Пeגapyusiv тeix $\left.{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{s}\right]$ the ancient fortification surrounding the west end (if not the whole) of the Acropolis; it had nine gates, and was the chief fortress of Athens until the expulsion of the Peisistratidae. It was thereupon destroyed and its site was left unoccupied (Thuc. ii 17). Even in the second century A.D. the blocks of stone from its ruined walls were still to be seen (Lucian, Piscator 47). Cf. Bursian, Geogr. 1305 and Lolling in I. Müller's Handbuch, iii 337. Curtius insists on the literal sense of the passages describing it as surrounding the Acropolis, Hdt. vi 137 ,
 è $\lambda \lambda a \mu \notin \nu 0 v$, Dionys. Hal. i 28, Paus. i. 28 3 (Stadtgeschichte pp. Lxxvi, 47, and map on p. 6I). Cf. Holm, ii 34I. After the
building of the wall of Cimon, the name was probably confined to the west end of the fortification (Judeich in Fleckeis. 7ahrb. 1890, p. 753 f.).





 sion of the Peisistratidae belongs to the year $51 \mathrm{r} / \mathrm{o}$ b.c., being placed by.Thuc. vi $59 \S 5$ ( $\pi a \nu \theta \epsilon i s \in \nu \quad \tau \hat{\psi} \tau \in \tau \dot{a} \rho \tau \varphi)$ ), in the fourth year of the sole rule of Hippias, which began in $51_{4}$ B.c. It is also the fourth year before the archonship of Isagoras in b.c. 508/7 (21 § I). The name of the archon is now known for the first time.
Wben Thucydides (l.c.), as observed by Mr Kenyon, describes Hippias as fighting at Marathon 'in the 2oth year ' after his expulsion, he is using a round number, as the actual interval was 20 years and a few months. Mr E. S. Thompson (Class. Rev. vi 181) connects the Plataean alliance with the expulsion of the Peisistratidae, placing both events in b.c. 51 /o. Hence, in Thuc. iii 68, where the fall of Plataea is put in the 93rd year after its alliance with Athens, Mr Thompson proposes to alter the 93rd into the 84th year.









$39 \delta \epsilon \tau \nu \mathrm{~J}$ E B Mayor, Sidgwick, K-w ( $\mathrm{K}^{3}$ ): $\Delta \in 1$ hic et 27 § 2 ( $\left.\mathrm{H}-\mathrm{L}, \mathrm{B}\right)$.
XX 2 ticandpoy. 3 aikmeoniden hic et v. 20 . htthmenoc ( K ):

 et $\dot{\eta} \eta \eta \lambda a ́ \tau \varepsilon \iota$ K et h-L; ceterum cf. Jebb ad Soph. O. T. 402.




 $\pi \epsilon \tau \tau \eta(\kappa o v \tau a]$ In Pol. viii (v) 12, 1315 $b 3 \mathrm{~J}$, the rule of the sons lasts 18 years, while from the beginning to the end of the rupavils of the father is 33 years, thus giving a total of 51 years. The 49 years of the text include 'about 17 years' for the rule of the sons, added to the 33 years assigned to the father in $\mathrm{C} .17 \$ 1$. In Hdt. v 65 the actual rupauyls of Peisistratus and his sons lasts for 36 years. It is probably by deducting from this number the 17 years here mentioned, that the writer gets 19 years as the duration of the actual rule of Peisistratus in 17 § 1.
$\sigma$ viv] Rare in Attic prose, except in Xenophon, its place being generally taken by $\mu$ erà with gen. One of the special uses of $\sigma \dot{v}$ in Attic prose is to express numerical addition. According to Eucken, Sprachgebrauch des Ar., p. 29 , the following are the only instances of $\sigma i v$ in the genuine writings of Aristotle.




 $\pi 0 \lambda \lambda \hat{\varphi}$. Hist. Anim. 490 a 32, al $\gamma \dot{a} \rho$



 $\pi \dot{d} \nu \tau a s$ бiv тaîs $\chi$ q入aîs. De partib. anim.

$\sigma \dot{v} \nu$ toîs à $\lambda \tau$ ккoîs $\mu$ oplocs. It will be observed that in several of these exx. the numerical sense is prominent. In the spurious works near the time of Ar. there is no instance of $\sigma u v$, but it occurs in those of much later date. In the most extensive of the works of Theophrastus it is only found thrice: Hist. Pl. ix 20, 4, Caus. Pl. ii 17, 8, v 6, 6 (Eucken, p. 3 ).
$\delta_{\in i v}$, not $\delta \epsilon \hat{i}$, is the right form here, and
 as in Rhet. ii 14 fin. To make deîv stand for $\delta \mathcal{E}_{0}$ is a barbarism (Kühner, Gr. Gr. $\S 50,11$, p. 216 Blass) and cannot be defended on the analogy of $\pi \lambda$ êt ('more than') which is really for $\pi \lambda \epsilon \hat{c} \nu$, not for $\pi \lambda \epsilon o \nu$. It is remarkable that this numerical expression (=undequinquaginta) has escaped lexicographers and grammarians (Mayor).
XX-XXII. The Constitution of Cleisthenes.
 66, (K $\lambda \epsilon \iota \sigma \theta \epsilon \nu \eta s$ кal' $\mathrm{I} \sigma a \gamma 6 \rho \eta \mathrm{~s}$ ) $\epsilon \sigma \tau a \sigma l a \sigma a \nu$

 $f n . \hat{\eta} \nu \quad \delta \epsilon \tau \delta \nu \quad \delta \bar{\eta} \mu о \nu \quad \pi \rho \sigma \sigma \theta \epsilon \mu \in \nu 0 s \pi 0 \lambda \lambda \hat{\psi}$

 тєхиâtal тáde, On étalpeíal cf. Pol. гзı a 39 ff .

 $\xi \in \in ̄ \nu \nu$.











 $\tau \nu \rho a ́ \nu \nu \omega \nu$ oi＇ $\mathrm{A} \lambda \kappa \mu \epsilon \omega \nu i ́ \delta a \iota, \kappa a i ̀ \sigma \tau a \sigma \iota a ́ \zeta o \nu \tau \epsilon \varsigma ~ \tau a ̀ ~ \pi o \lambda \lambda a ̀ ~ \delta \iota \epsilon \tau \epsilon ́ \lambda \epsilon \sigma a \nu$ ．



> є้้ $\gamma \chi є \iota \kappa a i \mathrm{~K} \eta \dot{\eta} \delta \omega \nu \iota, \delta \iota a ́ \kappa о \nu \epsilon, \mu \eta \delta^{\prime}$ є่ $\pi \iota \lambda \eta \eta^{\prime} \theta o v$, $\epsilon i ̉ \chi \rho \eta \grave{\eta}$ тoîs àraӨoîs à $\nu \delta \rho a ́ \sigma \iota \nu$ oivo $\chi o \epsilon i ̂ \nu$.

21．$\delta i a ̀ ~ \mu \epsilon ̀ \nu ~ o u ̉ \nu ~ \tau a u ́ \tau a s ~ \tau a ̀ s ~ a i ̉ i ́ a s ~ \epsilon ̇ \pi i ́ \sigma \tau \epsilon \nu є \nu ~ o ́ ~ \delta \eta ̂ \mu o s ~ \tau \hat{̣}$



[^58]
#### Abstract

  $\sigma \theta \in \nu \in a$ кal тoùs èvaүéas，K         ＇I $\sigma a \gamma b \rho \eta s$ кal ol $\sigma \tau a \sigma \iota \omega ิ \tau a \iota$ aúтô̂ ката入ац－     ムaкє $\delta a \iota \mu b \nu ⿺ 夂$ ．Isagoras withdrew with the Lacedaemonians（74）；the rest of the Athenians who had taken his side were put to death（ 72 fin．）．





 ad fin．
§ 5．K $\dagger \boldsymbol{\eta} \delta \omega v]$ Nothing else is known of this person．His endeavour to expel the tyrants was doubtless one of the unsuc－ cessful attempts recorded in c． 19 in the general phrase ：ál $\pi \rho o \sigma \dot{\epsilon} \pi \tau a c o \nu$.
kai fls roûrov］i．e．as well as the baffled heroes of Leipsydrium celebrated in the song recorded in c．19，and quoted by Athenaeus immediately after this couplet．This juxtaposition seems to shew that both quotations were derived from this work．
 doxovios］The fourth year after the expulsion of the Peisistratidae（ $511 / 0$ ） corresponds to $508 / 7$ B．C．The archon－ ship of Isagoras is placed by Dionysius

#   

4 oyneneime: ouvèelue Newman, Kontos, Gertz, h-L ( ${ }^{3}$ coll. 41 § 2, b); oủy
 censent. $\delta \delta \epsilon \varepsilon \epsilon \mu \epsilon$ Wyse, $\dot{\alpha} \nu \epsilon \nu \epsilon \iota \mu \epsilon$ Thompson.

§ $5 \sigma 0 \mu \mu \mathrm{El} \xi \mathrm{G}:$ : anamizal.

Hal., Ant. Rom. i 74, in Ol. 68, $\mathrm{I}=$ 508/7 B.c.; and his second mention of the same date, in $\mathrm{v}_{\mathrm{I}}$, shews that it was an Olympic year.

The text implies that the reforms of Cleisthenes were subsequent to the expulsion of Isagoras and Cleomenes. Cleisthenes begins by offering ( $\dot{\alpha} \pi 0 \delta \delta \delta \delta_{0} \dot{s}$, 20 § 1) the commons a share in the constitution; Isagoras appeals to Cleomenes for his assistance against Cleisthenes, and is defeated; thereupon Cleistbenes carries out his proposed reforms. Herodotus briefly mentions some of these reforms (v 66 and 69), and describes the calling in of Cleomenes as a counter-move on the part of Isagoras (70). Hence modern historians, e. g. Thirlwall, Grote, Curtius and Busolt, place the constitutional reforms of Cleisthenes before the calling in of Cleomenes. This appears improbable, for (as justly observed by Mr Kenyon) 'there was not time to have introduced such extensive constitutional changes before the Spartan invasion; a remark which had already been made by Sauppe, De Demis Urbanis, p. ı. The evidence of Herodotus, when carefully examined, is partly in favour of the account in the text. He begins by describing Cl . as courting the aid of the
 He then adds that it was afterwards ( $\mu \epsilon \tau \dot{\alpha} \dot{\delta} \bar{\epsilon}$ ) that Cl . transformed the four tribes into ten. This part of his narrative is a digression, and the story is resumed in c. $69, \hat{\eta}_{\nu} \tau \epsilon \tau \partial \nu \delta \bar{\eta} \mu 0 \nu \pi \rho 0 \sigma \theta \epsilon \mu \epsilon \nu 0 s \pi 0 \lambda \lambda \hat{\psi}$
 view, I find myself in agreement with Lugebil, Philol. Suppl. Bd. iv 165.





 $\kappa а т \dot{y} \varepsilon \mu \mu \epsilon$ és ràs $\phi u \lambda d s$. In the Politics, Ar. alludes to these reforms as follows:





 $\mu \epsilon \tau 0 i \kappa o u s$, i.e. enrolled (as citizens) in the tribes not only free-born foreigners but also slaves who by emancipation had already become $\mu$ ётокко (cf. Gilbert, Gr. St. i 144 ; Hermann, Staatsalt. § ini, 18). The text, as it stands, makes no direct mention of these, though it incidentally names the veoronital at the end of § 4. Cf. $i b$. vii (vi) 4, 1319 b 20,









 $\zeta \epsilon u \chi \theta \omega \bar{\sigma} \iota \nu$ al $\pi \rho b \tau \epsilon \rho a l$. See Grote, c. 31 , ii p. 109- 113 ; and inf. p. 83 .
${ }_{\sigma}^{\prime} \theta \in v$ - $\beta$ oundopévovs] 'Hence the advice, not to notice the tribe, which was tendered to those who would scrutinise (the lists of) the clans.' This is the interpretation suggested by Mr Kenyon who, in the course of an excellent note, observes that, as the $\phi$ vial, after the reforms of Cleisthenes, ' no longer bore any relation to the $\gamma \in \varphi \eta$, it was useless to enter on, an examination of the tribes for the purpose of reviewing the lists of the $\gamma^{\dot{\epsilon}} \nu \eta \ldots$ A number of persons were admitted to the new tribes who had not been members of the old, and these were not necessarily entered on the rolls of any of the $\gamma \in \nu \eta$. Formerly, on any review of the citizenroll, it was no doubt usual to go through it tribe by tribe, following all the subdivisions of the old patriarchal system. Now, the tribe-roll had no relation to that of the $\gamma \boldsymbol{t} \boldsymbol{y} \boldsymbol{y}$, and consequently those persons who wished to examine the latter would have nothing to do with distinctions of tribe.' In the words of Grote, c. 10, ii 273 , 'the gentes had no connection, as such, with these new tribes, and the members of the same gens might belong to different demes'.







 $\sigma \nu \nu \in \pi \iota \pi \tau \epsilon \nu$ Richards ( $\mathrm{H}-\mathrm{L}$ ); ov̉ $\sigma \nu \nu \epsilon \pi \iota \pi \tau \epsilon \nu{ }^{\text {an }} \nu \mathrm{Hude}, \mathrm{k} \cdot \mathrm{W}, \mathrm{K}^{3}$, в.







фu入okpıveiv] 'to draw distinctions between tribes'. The word occurs in Thuc.

 $\tau a \mu \epsilon \epsilon \epsilon \sigma \theta a \mathrm{in}$ in 3 , and $\sigma \tau \sigma \rho \epsilon \sigma \omega \mu \epsilon \nu$ in $\S 4$, it is a vivid metaphor characteristic of the speaker, Alcibiades. Cf. Lucian,


 and Phalaris alter, 9, фu入oкршeiv tà

 passages there is a v.l. фıлокриटeiv). In late authors we also have $\phi$ идокрipךобs,
 and S). Pollux, viii rio, after recounting the names of the Attic tribes, adds and
 Suidas explains $\phi$ خोoкpıvê by dıaкpivel, катабокє $\mu \dot{d} \epsilon \epsilon \pi \epsilon \rho \iota \epsilon \rho \gamma \omega \mathrm{~s}$. Cf. Phrynichus, P. $7 \mathrm{I}, 8$ Bekk. An. $\phi \cup \lambda о к \rho \nu \in \in \hat{v} \cdot \kappa \nu \rho l \omega s \mu e ̀ \nu$

 бьaкрlvєw, id. 'App. Soph. p. 8r, 7, фiло-
 катє $\xi \in \tau \alpha \oint \epsilon!$ ', quoted by Schmidt on
 крlvetv.

 once a slave). Cf. note on Dem. Lept. $\$ 5$.
 forward the Solonian Council of 400 is superseded by that of $500, \dot{\eta} \tau \hat{\omega} \nu \pi \epsilon \nu \tau a-$
 (Aeschin. Ctes. § 2) as it was sometimes called, to distinguish it from the Council of the Areopagus. The institution of the

Council of the Five Hundred has always been attributed to Cleisthenes, in connexion with the introduction of the ten tribes ; but this passage is probably the first express statement on the subject in any ancient author.
 $\chi \eta$, and $\eta_{\nu} a \mu \eta \ldots \xi \xi \in \lambda \in \gamma \chi \omega \sigma \tau$.

трıтт̂̀s] c. 8 § 3 .
où $\sigma v \nu \ell \pi เ \pi \tau \epsilon \nu$ àv- $\pi \lambda \hat{\eta} \theta$ os] 'quod si fecisset, non contigisset ut multitudo misceretur' ${ }^{2}$ Hude (placing $\bar{\eta} \sigma a \nu-\tau \rho!\tau \tau \cup \in s$ in a parenthesis).
 §3, дıaעєiцaı... $\tau \epsilon \tau \tau a \rho a \mu \epsilon \rho \eta$, Xen. Cyrop. vii 5 , 3, то̀ $\sigma \tau \rho \dot{\alpha} \tau є \nu \mu a$ катєуєє $\mu є \delta \dot{\delta} \delta є к а$ $\mu \epsilon p \eta$, Plato, Politicus, p. 283 D $\delta \iota \epsilon \lambda \omega \mu \in \nu$
 $6 c$ ).

Cleisthenes divided the whole of Attica into 30 portions, each of them called a $\tau \rho \iota \tau \tau \dot{\prime}$ 's. To of these were urban or suburban, ro on the coast, and ro in the interior. Each of the ro tribes had three $\tau \rho \tau \tau \tau \hat{\mathrm{v}}$, allotted to it, one from each of the above districts. Thus 'the tribe, as a whole, did not correspond with any continuous portion of the territory, nor could it have any peculiar local interest, separate from the entire community' (Grote). In this way the evils that had arisen during the previous century from the factions of the Shore, the Plain and the Mountain, were effectually counteracted.

The number of demes in each $\tau \rho \iota \tau \tau u{ }^{\prime}$ is not known. From the passage in Hdt. v
 $\phi \nu \lambda d s^{\prime}$, 'Cleisthenes distributed the demes among the tribes by tens', it has been inferred that he 'at first recognised exactly




100 demes, distributed in equal proportion among his 10 tribes'. This is the view of Schömann (Ant. p. 365 E. T.). K. F. Hermann (Staatsalt: © III, 12) held that this is what Herodotus meant to affirm, but he does not accept the account as true. Gilbert, Gr. St. i $1 \mathbf{1 4 2}$, notes that the existence of the Attic demes before Cleisthenes is implied in [Plato], Hipparch. p. ${ }^{228-9 .}$. He also quotes

 one of the Attic demes, is thus identical in name with one of the 100 kriotal $\dot{\epsilon} \pi \dot{\omega} \nu \nu \mu o l$ of the demes. He therefore accepts the statement of Herodotus. Others again (e.g. Corsini, Grote in his first ed., and Dietrich, de Clisthene, Halle, 1840, p. 32) connect $\delta \hat{\delta} \kappa \alpha$ with $\hat{\prime} s ~ \tau d s$ s $\phi u \lambda{ }^{2} s$ and contend that such a collocation is not uncommon in Herodotus. Madvig, Adv. Crit. i 305 , strikes out $\delta \epsilon \kappa a \delta \dot{k}$. Bake (Bibliotheca Critica iv 272) alters it into kal oj̀. Cf. Schömann, On Grote, § 6 , and $A n t$. pp. 336, 366 E. T.
Even supposing that too demes were recognised by Cleisthenes, that number did not remain unaltered. Early in the and century b.c. (in the time of Polemon, quoted by Strabo p. 396) the number was 174. The number known to us from inscriptions is 182 , besides 8 doubtful cases (Hermann's Staatsalt. ed. 5, p. 797). Out of these 182 , there are 14 duplicate names, such as 'upper' and 'lower Lamptrace'; so that the number of known names of demes is 168 . Landwehr (Philologrus, Suppl. v, 1889 p. 16ı-166) holds that 174 was the original number, and that this remained unaltered. The number of $\tau p \tau \tau \tau \hat{s}$ s was evidently constant and it may be fairly assumed that the demes belonging to each $\tau \rho \iota \tau \tau$ ís $^{\text {s }}$ were, as a general rule, contiguous. If there were 100 demes, each of the 30 т $\tau / \tau \tau \hat{\mathrm{u}} \mathrm{s}$ would contain 3 or 4 demes, twenty of them containing only 3 demes each, and the remaining ten as many as 4 , $(20 \times 3+\overline{10 \times 4}=100)$. Dividing this number by to we get for each tribe $\overline{2 \times 3}+\overline{1 \times 4}$ demes, distributed in such a way that each tribe has one $\tau \rho / \tau \tau$ ís consisting of 4 demes, and 2 consisting of 3 . In the case of each tribe, one of these rpictûs would be situated in or near the
capital, one near the coast, and one in the interior. The following scheme shows how it would be possible to distribute 400 demes among ten tribes while assigning ten trittyes of 3 or 4 demes each to each of the 3 districts:

|  | urban or <br> suburban | the <br> coast | the <br> interior |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Erechtheis | 4 | 3 | 3 |  |
| Aegeis | 4 | 3 | 3 |  |
| Pandionis | 4 | 3 | 3 |  |
| Leontis | 3 | 4 | 3 |  |
| Acamantis | 3 | 4 | 3 |  |
| Oeneis | 3 | 4 | 3 |  |
| Cecropis | 3 | 3 | 4 |  |
| Hippoöntis | 3 | 3 | 4 |  |
| Aeantis | 3 | 3 | 4 |  |
| Antiochis | $\mathbf{3}$ | 3 | 4 |  |
|  | $\mathbf{3 3}$ | $\mathbf{3 3}$ | $\mathbf{3 4}$ |  |
|  | Total: 100 demes. |  |  |  |

Out of the 160 demes in Smith's Dict. Geogr., 124 are assigned to certain tribes; no tribe has less than 10, though several have more; Acamantis, Hippothontis, and Leontis having as many as 15,16 and 17 respectively.
Athens itself, with its immediate neighbourhood, was divided into several demes and those demes assigned to several tribes, as follows: Agryle (Erechtheis), Kollytus and Diomeia (Aegeis), Kydathenaeon (Pandionis), Scambonidae (Leontis), Cerameicus (Acamantis), Lakiadae (Oeneis), Melite (Cecropis), Ceiriadae (Hippothontis), Phaleron (Aeantis), Colonus dyopaîos (Antiochis?). The Peiraeus was assigned to the tribe Hippothontis. (Lolling in I. Müller's Handbuch, iii 306.) In the case of the demes in or near Athens it would be difficult for them to be contiguous with the other demes in the same $\tau \rho i \tau \pi u s$. It is not impossible that less than 3 demes may in some cases have constituted a $\tau \rho \tau \tau$ tus. On the distribution of the demes among the tribes, cf. Wilamowitz, Aus Kydathen, i 110; Hug, Gemeinden und Bürgerrecht in Attika, 19; Milchhöfer, Erl. Text zu Curtius und Kaupert, Karten von Attika i 28, ii 39 n. 3 (Busolt, i $614,7.5$ ).

 $\tau \hat{\omega} \nu \tau \delta \pi \omega \nu \pi \alpha \dot{\nu} \tau \epsilon s, \mu \in \tau \epsilon \chi \omega \sigma \iota \nu$. Plat. Leg. 745 B-E (Newman).


 $5 \sigma \phi \hat{s}$ aủ


$18 \pi \rho \circ \sigma a \gamma о \rho \in v ́ \omega \sigma \iota \nu$ Richards. каl < $\langle\hat{v} \nu\rangle \mathrm{K}$-W.







$\left.\delta \eta \mu \dot{\tau} \tau u s-\delta \eta \eta^{\prime} \mu \omega \nu\right]$ Under this arrangement every one originally belonged to the deme in which he lived. His descendants, whether they had property in the deme or not, continued to belong to the same deme. It was only through adoption tbat a member of one deme became a member of another, by being enrolled in the deme of his adoptive father (Dem. Leach. §§ 22, 34; Schömann, Antiq. p. 367, E. T.).
 and resident aliens were added by Cleisthenes to the roll of citizens (Pol. 12756 37, quoted on p. 78): Such a newly enrolled citizen, if called by his father's name alone, would betray his foreign origin; but, by being designated by his deme, he lost the badge of his alien birth and was put on equal terms with the other members of the deme. marpó$\quad$ cv] Xen. Oecon. vii 3, Pausan. vii 7 § 4 -

 and $i b . \$ 51$.
 officially) call them by their demes.' Cf.
 (Plat. Euthyphro, 213, and Dem. 39 §
 may be inferred that before the time of Cleisthenes Athenians were not described by the name of their demes. 'In Athens, at least after the revolution of Kleisthenês, the gentile name was not employed: a man was described by his own single name, followed first by the name of his father and next by that of the deme to which he belonged' (Grote c. 10, ii 274).
§ 5. катєбт $\boldsymbol{\eta} \boldsymbol{\epsilon}$ - $\delta \eta \mu a ́ p x$ ous] Photius, s.v. עaukpapla, quotes from this treatise (c. 8 §3), фu入al $\delta \dot{\epsilon} \dot{\eta} \sigma a \nu-\kappa \alpha \theta^{\prime} \epsilon \kappa \dot{\epsilon} \sigma \tau \eta \nu$. After this quotation should follow the words which have by mistake been placed before

 of his article he cites Cleidemus ( $\bar{\epsilon} \nu \hat{\eta}$




 Siebelis) ка入ov̂at $\sigma u \mu \mu o p i a s ~(F H G ~ i ~ 361) . ~$ According to this view, the change in the number of tribes from four to ten involved a change in the number of עauкpaplat from $48(12 \times 4)$ to 50 . If the normal number of demes recognised by Cleisthenes was roo, it would follow from this that he combined every two demes into a vavk papla (Schömann, Ant. p. 370 E.T.); or rather that he transferred the duties of each vaukpapla to a pair of contiguous demes. The importance of the Naucrariae naturally did not remain the same as it had formerly been, and we hear in particular that the business which had once belonged to the Naucrari now passed to the Demarchs (ib. p. 370, on the authority of quotations from this passage in Harpocration \&c.).

In the passage above cited from Photius Mr P. Giles (English Historical Review, 1892, p. 331) proposes, instead of $\pi \epsilon \nu \tau \dot{\eta} \kappa о \nu \tau a$ (i.e. N ) $\mu \epsilon \rho \eta$, to read $\tau \rho \dot{\text { í- }}$ коута (i.e. $\wedge) ~ \mu \epsilon ́ \rho \eta$, and to identify these $\mu \epsilon \rho \eta$ with the $\tau \rho \iota \tau \tau \hat{s}$. He also assumes that this sentence was followed by a clause referring to the $\delta \bar{\eta} \mu \mathrm{ol}$. He is doubtless justified in adding that this treatise gives no direct support to the view that the vaukpapla consisted of two


The Peripatetic, Demetrius Phalereus (Müller, FHG, ii ${ }^{6} 6$ ), ascribed the establishment of demarchs not to Cleisthenes but to ol $\pi \epsilon \rho \stackrel{\Sigma}{ } \delta \lambda \omega \nu a$ (Newman).



 Londin. $\epsilon \mathrm{N}$ legendum suspicatur; certe litteris valde obscuris $\epsilon \mathrm{TI}$ indicatur) : ä $\pi a \sigma \overline{ }$



23 фатpiac, idem habet corr. Berol.


#### Abstract

 some of the demes from their localities, and some from their founders.' Demes were already in existence before Cleisthenes; but they were now recognised as component parts in the new constitutional order, and had their names fixed by official sanction. Many of them had local desiguations derived either from natural  $\Delta \epsilon \iota \rho d \delta \epsilon s$, ' $\mathrm{A} \lambda \iota \mu 0 \hat{\mathrm{O}} \mathrm{s}$ ), or places in their neighbourhood (Oto $\Delta \epsilon к \in \lambda \epsilon \epsilon \delta \nu$, Otov $\mathrm{K} \epsilon$ ра $\mu \epsilon \epsilon \delta \delta \nu)$, or plants or trees that grew    other local designations may be men-      


 and Schol. Aristoph. Plut. 586.Other demes were named 'from their founders,' i.e. from one of the 'hundred heroes' or eponymous founders of the demes (Herodian, quoted on § 3). The names of these are collected by Sauppe, De Demis Urbanis, p. 4 ff.; but since many of them are obviously coined from the names of the demes, it is in these cases inaccurate to describe the demes as designated after their founders. Many of the demes were called after distinguished gentes who held property in them (e.g. Butadae, Thymaetadae, Cothocidae, Perithoedae, Semachidae, Scambonidae, Colleidae). There are as many as 30 such demes ( 25 of them are given in Grote, c. 10, ii 273 n.): and it has been suggested that all of these were constituted by Cleisthenes. ' It seems that Kleisthenes' (says Grote, l. c.) ' recognised a certain number of new demes to which he gave names derived from some important gens resident near the spot. It is thus that we are to explain the large number of Kleisthenean demes that hear patronymic names.' If, under Cleisthenes, the number of demes
was roo, it follows that before his time 70 demes were already in existence. (Cf. Smith, Dict. Ant. s. v. Demus.) 'The demes named after gentes are situated. mainly in that part of the country which has been assigned to the Phyle of the Geleontes, and where accordingly the greater number of noble families and the most important of them lived' (Schömanm, Ant. p. 366 n. E.T.). It is not impossible that $\tau \hat{\omega} \nu \kappa \tau \sigma \sigma \dot{d} \nu \tau \omega \nu$ is meant to include the ancestors of these families as well as the 'eponymous heroes'; but the distinction is immaterial, as a deme might readily regard, as its eponymous hero, the founder of the family from which it derived its name.
ov $\mathbf{y d} \rho$-тоís тótors] 'for (from the time of Cleisthenes) the demes were no longer called in all cases from the localities' (understanding $\pi \rho \circ \sigma a \gamma 0 \rho \epsilon v \theta \in \nu \tau \epsilon s$ from $\pi \rho \circ \sigma \eta \gamma \delta \rho \epsilon v \sigma \epsilon)$; i.e. they then ceased to be in every instance designated by 'local' names. These old 'local' names had often been derived from the villages or hamlets included within the limits of the deme as constituted by Cleisthenes. Many of these were superseded by gentile or patronymic or heroic names, -names derived $\dot{\alpha} \pi \bar{\partial} \tau \hat{\omega} \nu$ к $\tau \iota \sigma \alpha$, $\tau \omega \nu$. oú $\gamma \dot{\alpha} \rho \boldsymbol{\varepsilon} \tau \iota$ is inconsistent in sense with $\dot{v} \pi \hat{\eta} \rho \chi{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{v}$, unless the latter is made to mean little more than $\hat{\eta} \nu$. Possibly the sentence implies that (even in the time of Cl .) the demes had already lost their local designations, and had received names derived from persons instead. Cl . gave official recognition to both classes of names, local and personal. Poland translates as follows: Denn nicht alle Gaue entsprachen mehr den alten Namen der Örtlichkeiten, adding in a note, that, in naming the new demes, Cl . availed himself of the old names, but had often, for example, to break up an old deme into several divisions and thus create new names. Blass reads èv тoîs totocs, with the following interpretation : non omnes demi erant inter vicos qui iam exstabant; itaque multos ab heroibus appellavit.



 nүмоүс Berol.; idem coniecerant J B Mayor, Richards: $\dot{\epsilon} \pi \omega \nu \nu \mu[$ ias $] \mathrm{K}^{1}$.

25-26 Etym. M. è $\pi \dot{\epsilon} \dot{\omega} v \mu 0<$ (locus infra exscriptus).
 passage in the Politics, 1319 b 20, quoted on p. 78 , implies that Cleisthenes increased the number of the phratries (and it was so understood by Buermann, $\mathfrak{F} a h r b$. $f$. kl. Phil. Suppl. Bd. ix 1878 , 597 sqq.). The text states that he allowed every one to remain in his former phratria. It was once held by Busolt (Gr. Gesch. i 394 , note 5, after Landwehr, Philologus, Suppl. $\mathrm{Bd} . \mathrm{v}$ 168) that the reference to the phratries in the passage in the Politics did not necessarily apply to Athens, but to Cy rene, which is mentioned in the same passage; and with this view Mr W. R. Paton agrees (Class. Rev. v 221 b). See also Duncker, G. d. A. vi 59 r note. Busolt, however, has since admitted that the фpatplai are those of Athens (I. Müller's Handbuch, iv I, p. 144 note i1); he adds that the present passage (as represented in the Berlin fragment) implies that the principle of the organisation of the phratries according to $\gamma \epsilon \boldsymbol{\epsilon} \eta$ remained unchanged. 'Probably the phratries before the time of Cleisthenes were larger bodies which, on the occasion of his reforms, were broken up into smaller portions. The number of the phratries is unknown; but they must have been more than 12 (ib.).

The present passage has been held to be 'somewhat out of harmony' with that in the Politics, and the question has been asked whether the statement as to priesthoods can be easily reconciled with the fact that Cleisthenes converted a number of private worships into a few public ones' (Mr W. L. Newman, in Class. Rev. v 162 a). If we are compelled to choose, one would prefer the definite statement in the text to the inference drawn from the less definite statement in the Politics, not to mention the disturbing influence of the mention of Cyrene in that passage. The two statements may, however, be reconciled. I take the text to refer to those who were already citizens connected with existing $\gamma \in \nu \eta$ and $\phi \rho a-$ тpia. Cleisthenes allowed all these to continue as of old in their respective $\gamma^{\frac{1}{2} \nu \eta}$ and $\phi \rho a \tau \rho l a$, , with their religious
institutions intact. Among these institutions would be (1) the sacrificial rites performed by the $\phi u \lambda o \beta a \sigma \iota \lambda \epsilon \hat{\iota}$, who survived the change from four tribes into ten ( $8 \S 3 ; 57$ end); and (2) the hereditary priesthoods such as those held by the Eumolpidae, Kerykes and Eteobutadae. Cf. Lex. Dem. Patm. p. 152, Sakkelion, (of the $30 \gamma^{\epsilon \nu \nu \eta \tau a i)}{ }^{1} \nu$ al

 'Eтєoßoutádau, யेs latopeî $\epsilon \nu \tau \hat{\eta}$ 'А $\theta$. $\pi o \lambda$. 'Apl $\sigma \tau 0 \tau \in \lambda \eta s \kappa \tau \lambda$. (Rose, Frag. $385^{3}$ ).

In contrast to the existing citizens there were a number of other persons who had hitherto not belonged to that body and therefore had no $\gamma \in \frac{e}{} \boldsymbol{\eta}$. These are the $\nu \in о \pi о$ גital of $\S 4$. It was for these that Cleisthenes provided new $\phi \rho a-$ qpla. At the same time he absorbed many of the minor local cults into public festivals held at Athens.

In Class. Rev. v 222 b, Mr W. R. Paton observes that the $\nu \epsilon \circ \pi o \lambda i$ ital could not be received into the $\gamma \epsilon \nu \eta$, all the members of which were allied (or supposed to be allied) by blood; but he considers that they could be received into the phratries, each of which was a group of $\gamma^{\hat{\epsilon}} \boldsymbol{\varphi} \eta$ not claiming a blood-relationship with each other and therefore more elastic. He assumes that Cleisthenes did not increase the number of phratries; whereas it is not improbable that he did, and there is nothing in the present passage to prove that he did not.
 s. $v . \epsilon \pi \dot{\epsilon} v \nu \mu o l$, after mention of the $\epsilon \pi \dot{\omega}$ $\nu \nu \mu o \iota \tau \hat{\omega} \nu \quad \dot{\eta} \lambda \iota \kappa \epsilon \hat{\omega} \nu$ (c. 53 ), we have, con-


 ‘'I $\pi \pi о \theta b \omega \nu$, At'as, 'A $\nu \tau i o \chi o s$ ' taûta $\delta$ è $\tau \grave{a}$


 Cf. Lex. Dem. Patm., p. I5, Sakkelion (Bull. de corr. hellên. 1877), ...tồ $\theta \in o \hat{v}$

 Aristid. iii 33I, 20 Dind. This is one of several instances in which the influence







 (к, к-W, н-L, в). $\quad 5 \dagger \pi \epsilon \mu \pi \tau \varphi \dagger$, an $6 \gamma \delta \delta \varphi$ ? к. $\quad 6$ ермоү|крєоптос (к).

Testimonia. XXII 5-39 Heraclidis epitoma (Rose, Frag. 6if, ${ }^{3}$ ): кal $\boldsymbol{\tau} \boldsymbol{d} \boldsymbol{v}$


of the Alcmaeonidae with the oracle at Delphi was of important consequences to Athens.
 selves called da $\rho \chi \eta \gamma \in \tau a \iota$ in Aristoph. Frag.



XXII. Ostracism.

 $\tau \varepsilon \theta \hat{\eta} \sigma \tau 0 \chi \alpha \bar{\alpha} \xi \sigma \theta \alpha_{\iota} \chi \rho \dot{\eta} \tau \omega \bar{\nu} \mu \hat{\epsilon} \sigma \omega \nu$.
óбтракьซ $\mu$ о̂] Our knowledge of the procedure in cases of ostracism is founded on a fragment of Philochorus $79 b$ (FHG i 396), in the Appendix to Photius, p.
 $\pi \rho \dot{\partial} \tau \hat{\eta} s \eta^{\prime} \pi \rho \cup \tau a \nu \epsilon l a s$ (see c. 43 § 5 ), $\epsilon l$





 $\gamma^{\ell}{ }^{\text {¢ }}$











 According to Ephorus and Theopompus the object of ostracism was to check $\boldsymbol{v}^{\boldsymbol{\pi} \epsilon \rho \rho \chi \dot{\eta}}$ (cf. Diod. xi 55, Nepos, Them. 8, Cimon 3; Plut. Arist. 7, Them. 22, Nic. 11, Alcib. 13). This opinion is shared by Ar. Pol. iii 13, 1284 a 17 and

36, and viii (v) 3, $1302 b$ 5.5. The checking of $\dot{v} \pi \epsilon \rho 0 \chi \dot{\eta}$ may well have been its original purpose, but in process of time it was made the means of preventing mischief arising from $\sigma \tau$ d $\sigma \epsilon \iota s$ by suppressing the leader of the opposition and leaving the majority free to carry out their wishes without hindrance. See Grote, c. $3^{1}$; Busolt, i 620 , and in Müller's Handbuch, iv 1, 121 ; Lugebil, Das Wesen und die historische Bedeutung des Ostrakismos in Athen, in $\mathfrak{F}$ ahrb.f. cl. Phil. Suppl. Bd. iv, 1 Ig-175; Gilbert, Gr. St. i 446-6; Abbott's Hist. of Gr. $\mathrm{i}^{\text {a }}$ 481-3; and Smith, Dict. Ant. s. v.
 implies $504 / 3$ b.c., four years after the archonship of Isagoras, 508/7. But the archon of $504 / 3$ is already known, Acestorides (Dionys. v 37), and not Hermocreon. The year is the 12 th before the battle of Marathon 490/489, and must therefore be 501/0, the archon of which year has not hitherto been known. It is just conceivable that the reforms of Cleisthenes may have taken three years to get into complete shape, but nothing is said to this effect in the text, and it seems therefore necessary (as suggested by Mr Kenyon) to alter the 5 th year into the 8th ( $\bar{\epsilon}$ into $\bar{\eta}$ ).
toîs тevtakoolors] So called to distinguish it from the Council of the Areopagus. The addition of these words is not inappropriate here, as the establishment of the Council of 500 was one of the recent reforms.

 тoùs vbuous $\beta$ oùeícelv. Lys. 3I § 1 ,










 K－W．

12－17 Harp．＂I $\pi \pi a \rho \chi$ os（locus infra exscriptus）．
 ［Dem．］ 59 § $4, \delta \mu \omega \mu о к \dot{\omega} s ~ \tau \grave{a} ~ \beta \in \lambda \tau \iota \sigma \tau a$
 Solon＇s time the $\beta$ ou $\lambda \dot{\eta}$ swore $\quad$ tovs $\Sigma 6 \lambda \omega \nu$ os $\nu \delta \mu o v s \epsilon \mu \pi \epsilon \delta \omega \sigma \epsilon \iota \nu$（Plut．Sol．25）．

The oath included a clause，ov̀ $\delta \dot{\epsilon} \dot{z} \delta \dot{\eta} \sigma$




 $\kappa \alpha \tau \alpha \beta \alpha \lambda \lambda \eta$（Dem． 24 § 144）．Arist． Thesm． 943 ，$\delta \delta o \xi \in \tau \hat{\eta} \beta o v \lambda \hat{\eta} \sigma \epsilon \delta \epsilon i ̃$ ．Dem． ib． 148 refers the $\delta_{\rho \kappa o s} \beta o u \lambda \epsilon u \tau \iota \kappa \delta$ s to Solon；but it was the Areopagus that had cognisance of high treason assigned to it by Solon（c． 8 §4），and presumably did not lose it until b．c． $462 / \mathrm{I}$（c． 25 § 2）． The statement that the oath in the times of Cleisthenes was the same as that in the times of the writer seems inconsistent with the account in c． 45 ，where we are told that the $\beta$ ou $\lambda \dot{\eta}$ had meanwhile lost the right of imprisoning，\＆c．（Wyse）．

бтратпүov่s ทूpov̂vro］Grote observes that＇there were now created，for the first time，ten stratêgi or generals，one from each．tribe．．．The ten generals， annually changed，are thus（like the ten tribes）a fruit of the Kleisthenean con－ stitution＇（c．3I，iii 』16）．Plut．Aristid．5，


 $\gamma o v$, where mention is made of $\chi \in\llcorner\rho 0-$ ropla（Busolt，i 6i6，n．3）．Unless we are prepared to accept the＇Draconian constitution＇of c． 4 ，there is no reason for departing from the ordinary view that the institution of the $\sigma \tau \rho a \tau \eta \gamma$ ol dates from the time of Cleisthenes．
 $\mu a p X 0 s]$＇Even after the stratégi had been created，under the Kleisthenean constitution，the polemarch still retained a joint right of command along with them －as we are told at the battle of Marathon，
where Kallimachus the polemarch not only enjoyed an equal vote in the council of war along with the ten strategi，but even occupied the post of honour on the right wing＇（Hdt．vi 109－1 II；Grote， l．c．）．In still closer accordance with the fresh evidence of the text，Busolt，i 616，observes：der Polemarchos zog nach wie vor an der Spitze des Heeres aus der Stadt．
§ 3．SLa入ıtóvtes ètr סv́o］i．e．in B．C． 488／7．Pol． 1299 a 37，тov̀s $\mu$ èv סıa入elा $\epsilon \iota \nu$ то入ùv $\chi \rho 6$ роу，Hist．Anim． 523 a 8，ס．èv ETos．

Өappoûvтos－тồ $\delta$ ทípov．The con－ nexion here and elsewhere established （cc．24，27）＇between moments of elation and self－confidence at Athens and con－ stitutional changes for the worse＇may be compared with Isocr．Areop．§ 3 sqq．and Panath．§ 133 （W．L．Newman，Class． Rev．vi6ia）．

тepl tòv óбтр．］c．gen．in § r．＇Ad significandam eam rem，de qua agitur ac disputatur，$\pi \epsilon \rho i$ etiam c．acc．ita usurpatur ut ab usu praep．$\pi \in \rho i$ c．gen．non videatur discerni posse，veluti．．．Pol．i 300 a 8，9； $1322630,31,1286 b 34$ et $1287 a \mathrm{I}$ ；Rhet． 1414 a 28 ， 1418 a 2 ＇Ind．Ar．
 Xápमov］Archon in 496／5．Harpocr．s．v．


 who，in his absence，was condemned to death for $\pi \rho 0 \delta o \sigma l a$ ；nothing else is known of him and it is not impossible that Tuid $\rho \chi o v$ in Lycurgus may be a mistake for Xá $\rho \mu o v)$－$\pi \epsilon \rho l$ סè тoútov＇A $\nu \delta \rho o \tau l \omega \nu$ èv $\tau \hat{\eta} \beta^{\prime}$（frag．5）$\phi \eta \sigma i \nu \delta \tau \iota \sigma v \gamma \gamma \epsilon \nu \eta{ }^{\prime} \mathrm{s} \mu \dot{\epsilon} \nu{ }_{\nu} \tilde{\eta}^{\nu}$


 $\psi \ell a \nu \tau \hat{\omega} \nu \pi \epsilon \rho l \Pi_{\epsilon} \epsilon \sigma \ell \sigma \tau \rho a \tau о \nu$ ，$\delta \tau \iota \delta \eta \mu a-$


It will be observed that language almost identical with the text is quoted


 $\sigma \theta \in ́ \nu \eta s$, éşє $\lambda a ́ \sigma a \iota ~ \beta o v \lambda o ́ \mu \epsilon \nu o s ~ a v ̉ \tau o ́ v . ~ o i ~ \gamma a ̀ \rho ~ ' A \theta \eta \nu a i ̂ o \iota ~ \tau o v ̀ s ~ \tau \hat{\omega} v$





16 колүттєүс.
18 cynezz

 cf. 34 § 2 .
by Harpocration from the 'A $\boldsymbol{\text { ot }}$ is of Androtion. The historian of that name is almost certainly identical with the orator attacked in Dem. кaгd̀ 'Avঠpotluros, in 355 в.c. He had then been a prominent politician for 30 years (Dem. 2.c. § 66). The authorities in favour of this identification are Westermann, and Arnold Schaefer; against it are Ruhnken, Dindorf and C. Miiller (Fhg, i p. Ixxxiii) and recently M. Weil, Fournal des Savants, 1891, p. 203. All the extant quotations from the 'A $A \theta l \mathrm{l}$ (except the present) ' just cover the period of Androtion's political career, and a few more years which he may have passed in exile: the latest event noticed is the $\delta<a \psi \dot{\eta} \phi$ ofts .. in в.c. $346-5 .{ }^{\circ}$ He probably left Athens soon after b.c. 355 , retired to Megara, and there wrote his ' $A \tau \theta$ ts in the enforced leisure of banishment, Plut. de exil. $1_{4}$,
 ${ }_{z}^{2} \nu \mathrm{M}$ Maposs (Wayte, Dem. Androt. p. xlix, 1). If the present work was written about $3^{2} 5$ B.C., the passage in the text may well have been borrowed from Androtion, who was probably no longer alive at the time. If he began public life at 30 , he must have been born in B.C. $415(355+30+30)$ and, if alive, would have been 90 at the date assumed for the present work.

 $\kappa a i \sigma \tau \rho a \tau \eta \gamma \delta s$, els $\tau v \rho a \nu \nu(\delta a \mu \epsilon \tau \epsilon \beta a \lambda \lambda o \nu *$
 $\nu \omega \nu \quad \epsilon \kappa \delta \eta \mu a \gamma \omega \gamma \omega \bar{\nu} \quad \gamma \epsilon \gamma \delta \nu a \sigma \tau \nu$, and (on Peisistratus in particular) ib. 13 ro 627 ; Isocr. Panath. I48; Dio Chrys. i 303, ${ }_{1} 3$ D.
§ 4. триิтоs $\omega \sigma \tau \rho a к(\sigma 0 \eta \kappa \tau \lambda$.$] Plut.$
 xos i Xo入apyevs (probably a mistake for
 rov̂ тupávpov. According to Cleitodemus, ap. Athen. 609 c , Hippias had married a daughter of Charmus.


 pav. It may be doubted whether any such praise as that of $\pi \rho q \dot{\sigma} \tau \eta \mathrm{~s}$ is ever ascribed to the $\delta \bar{\eta} \mu$ os in the extant works of Ar.

 pov (eviaut $\delta \nu$ ) is contrasted with $\frac{1}{2} \nu \pi \rho \omega \hat{\tau}$ and the former is found in $45 \$ 3$.
éri Teג date mentioned having been 488 в.c. (i.e. 'two years after Marathon'), the archonship of T. may be placed in $487 / 6$. The only years after B.C. 496 (down to 292) for which the archons are not already known are 487 and 486.482 may be assigned to Themistocles, and 48 I to Hypsichides (c. 22 end).
ékvánevarav tov̀s évvéa äpXovtas кт入.] Under the Solonian constitution (c. 8) the archons had been appointed by lot out of forty candidates nominated by the four tribes. From the close of the rupaupls the archons had been elected (ol $\delta \dot{E} \pi \rho b \tau \epsilon \rho 06$ $\pi \dot{d} \nu \tau \epsilon s{ }_{\eta} \quad \sigma a \nu$ aip $\left.\epsilon \tau 0 l\right)$, by whom we do not know, possibly (as Mr Kenyon suggests) by the $\epsilon \kappa \kappa \lambda \eta \sigma l a$. The general principle of the Solonian system was now revived by introducing a combination of selection and sortition.

The successive changes in the method of election to tbis office (as summed up by Mr Kenyon) were as follows: (r) the archons were originally nominated by the Council of the Areopagus, c. $8 \$ 2$; (2) under the 'Draconian constitution' they were elected by the general body of
 $\mu \epsilon \tau a ̀ ~ \tau \eta ̀ \nu ~ \tau \nu \rho a \nu \nu i ́ \delta a ~ \pi \rho \omega ิ \tau o \nu, ~(o i ́ ~ \delta e ̀ ~ \pi \rho o ́ \tau \epsilon \rho o \iota ~ \pi a ́ \nu \tau \epsilon \varsigma ~ \eta ̉ \sigma a \nu ~ a i \rho \epsilon \tau о i ́) . ~$

 J W Headlam，$\tau о \hat{0} \delta \dot{\eta} \mu о \nu \pi \epsilon \nu \tau a к о \sigma \iota о \mu \epsilon \delta \ell \mu \nu \omega \nu \mathrm{H}-\mathrm{L}$ ．
 Weil）：$\tau 6 \tau \epsilon$ Blass， $\mathrm{K} \cdot \mathrm{W}, \mathrm{H}-\mathrm{L}, \mathrm{K}^{3}$ ．
citizens（c． 4 § 2）；（3）under the Solonian constitution，they were in ordinary course appointed by lot from forty candidates selected by the four tribes（c． 8 § r）； （4）under the $\tau u \rho a p y$ is this system was perhaps practically in abeyance，though nothing had been formally done to repeal appointment by lot（Peisistratus，son of Hippias was archon，Thuc．vi 54 ，and there was always one of the ruling house holding office）；（5）under the constitution of Cleisthenes they were elected by the
 $\rho \in \tau 0 i)$ ；（ 6 ）from 487 в．c．they were ap－ pointed by lot from 100 （or 500 ）candi－ dates selected by the tribes；（7）subse－ quently，from an uncertain date down to the time of the writer，the lot was applied to the preliminary nomination by the tribes as well as to the actual appoint－ ment（c． 8 \＆1）．
As appointment to the archonship by lot was apparently done away with by Cleisthenes in 508，and was re－introduced in 487 ，it follows that the archons in 490 were not appointed by lot，and that He－ rodotus was therefore mistaken in de－ scribing the polemarch of that year as $\dot{o}$ $\tau \hat{\varphi} \kappa v \dot{\alpha} \mu \varphi$ 入ax́́v（vi rog）．This had already been maintained by Grote（c．3r， iii 126），Busolt（ii 338）and others，and their opinion is now found to be correct． Cf．Lagebil in Fahrb．f．class．Philol．， Suppl．Bd．v $5^{6} 4$－699；Holm，Gr．Gesch． ii 140 ，note 18 ．
Aristides was archon in 489 when the office was still elective，yet Demetrius Phal．makes him archon in $47^{8}$ ，and， consistently with this，describes him as кvápч $\lambda a \chi \dot{\omega} \nu$（Plut．Arist．I，5）．On the other hand，Idomeneus（fl．B．C．3ro－ 270），having in view the archonship of 489，as it appears correctly，speaks of him as having held office où кuauєvtì
 who，shortly after the battle of Plataea， carried a proposal that they should thence－ forth choose（aipeiotal）the äpxoy $\epsilon \in s$（in the widest sense of the term）from all the Athenians alike．Duncker，G．d．A． vi 593 ，holds that it was on this occasion that appointment by lot was introduced：
before it，we find the office of archon filled by leading statesmen；not so，after－ wards．He also holds that the reforms of Cleisthenes did not touch the method of appointing the archons．

There is a difficulty as to the persons by whom the preliminary selection was made．The text，as it stands in the ms， speaks of them as 500 selected by the members of the demes．The practice down to the writer＇s time was for each tribe to nominate ten by lot，or roo in all （c．8）．Now if each tribe ever nominated 50 ，it is improbable that its privilege would be reduced to that of nominating 10．Hence Mr Kenyon proposes to alter $500\left(\phi^{\prime}\right)$ into $100\left(\rho^{\prime}\right)$ ．
＇It seems possible that Demetrius Phal． accepted this date（B．c． $4^{87}$ ）for the in－ troduction of the lot ：he placed the archon－ ship of Aristides the year after Plataea （Plut．Arist．c．I and 5）and spoke of


 $\eta \gamma \delta \rho \in$ vop（ib．c．1）：the admission of i $\pi \pi \in i_{i}$ then，according to Demetrius，is after 478 ．We see now that there is not necessarily any conflict between Idomeneus of Lampsacus and Demetrius，except as to the year when Aristides was archon Idomeneus，like Plutarch，may have as－ signed Aristides to the year after Marathon （ii．c．5）：in which case his statement
 $\mu \in v \tau o ̀ \nu \dot{a} \lambda \lambda^{\prime}$＇$\grave{\lambda} \alpha \mu \notin \nu \omega \nu$＇$\left.A \theta \eta \nu a l \omega \nu\right)$ agrees with the＇A $\theta$ ．Пo入．＇（Wyse）．
Meүак入 $\overline{\mathrm{s}}$ ］son of Hippocrates（Hdt． vi 13 I），grandson of Megacles（the op－ ponent of Peisistratus c． 14 and 15 ），and nephew of Cleisthenes．Through his sister，Agariste，he was the uncle of Peri－ cles．There was another Megacles in the same generation（victor in the Pythian games，Pind．Pyth．vii 15），a son of Clei－ sthenes，and grandfather of Alcibiades． The ostracism of this second Megacles is mentioned in Lysias，Alc． 14 § 39．Ac－ cording to Pindar（l．c．）the house of Megacles was subject to $\phi \theta \delta \nu$ os on account


It is remarkable that an institution





N
27 меөictato: $\mu \in \theta$ lotato в, -lotavto ceteri.
founded by Cleisthenes should have thus been brought into play against his son and his nephew. According to Aelian, Var. Hist. xiii 24, Cleisthenes himself was ostracised, but of this there is no proof. As to the ostracism of the nephew there is no doubt. Even one of the pieces of pottery used in voting on the question has been found. It bears the name
 (published in Benndorfs Gr. u. Sic. Vasenbilder p. 50, pl. 29, no. 10). It is a fragment of black-glazed ware, apparently cut into a circular form for the purpose. It was discovered in the prePersian stratum to the E. of the Parthenon (Class. Rev. v 278 a). CIA iv 3 no. 569.
§ 6. ETT Tpla] Mr Kenyon holds that the three years are в.с. $489-87$, i.e. the two after the battle of Marathon and the year in which Hipparchus son of Charmus was ostracised; but, unless we press the meaning of the imperfect $\omega \sigma \tau \rho \dot{d} \kappa i \zeta o \nu$, and apply it to the purpose and desire of the people, rather than to their acts, it seems better to consider the period of three years to begin with that in which Hipparchus was banished, i.e. $488 / 7$. Thus the three years would be B.c. $488 / 7,487 / 6$ and 486/5. Then the ostracism of Xanthippus, $\tau \hat{\varphi} \tau \epsilon \tau \dot{d} \rho \tau \varphi \in \tau \epsilon$, would be in $485 / 4$ and 'the third year after this,' $483 / 2$, the archonship of Nicodemus, which is in accordance with the cbronology adopted in Clinton's Fasti. èv rovíous toîs кaupois (i.e. not necessarily under Nicodemus, but in the previous year $484 / 3$ ) Aristides was banished; and, in the 'fourth year after,' he was recalled, $4^{8 \mathrm{r}} / \mathrm{o}$ (Bauer, p. 59).


 $\mu e l j \omega \nu$, and the correction of this (says Ar.) was the object of ostracism.



 $\theta \epsilon \nu$ (distant in relationship), iii 9,1280

 $\sigma \nu \mu \mu \alpha \chi^{\omega} \nu \nu$ (alliances, of which the members live apart), ib. 18, el tives oikoiev
 far off) $\omega \sigma \tau \epsilon \mu \bar{\eta}$ кошข $\omega \nu \epsilon \hat{\nu}$, ' ol $a \pi \omega \theta \epsilon \nu$, syn. ol a $\gamma \nu \omega \bar{\omega} \tau \epsilon s$, opp. ol $\gamma \nu \omega \rho \mu \mu \iota$, ol $\sigma v \nu \dot{d}-$
 ol $\sigma u \nu \eta \dot{\eta} \theta \epsilon t s$ кal ol $\pi 0 \lambda i ̂ \tau a \iota(\mu \hat{a} \lambda 10 \nu) \tau \hat{\omega} \nu$ $\ddot{\alpha} \pi \omega \theta \epsilon \nu$ : c. gen. in Thuc. iii 111 § 1 ,
 $a ̆ \pi \omega \theta \in \nu \quad \tau \hat{\eta} s \kappa \in \phi a \lambda \hat{\eta} s$.
ÉÉveltros ó 'Apldpovos] During the excavations on the Acropolis in 1886, a fragment of a late black-figured vase was found in the pre-Persian stratum E. of the Parthenon, with the following inscription clearly incised upon it.

## XSANФIПГOS <br> ARRIDPONOS

The fragment was published by Studniczka, Arch. Fahrb. 1887, p. 161, who observed that the position in which it was found proved that the ostracism of Xanthippus took place before B.C. 480 (Class. Rev. v 277 b). CIA iv 3,568 . In March, 1891, after the first publication of this treatise, another fragment was found at Athens in the $\dot{\delta} \delta \partial s$ Пet $\rho a t \omega \bar{s}$ with the first five or six letters of the father's name written (with the double $\rho$ ) above that of the son (CIa iv 3,57 r).

Xanthippus impeached Miltiades in $490 / 89$ (Hdt. vi $\mathrm{r}_{3} 6$; Grote, c. 36 , iii 312). The present passage shews that his ostracism falls in 485/4, before that of Aristides ( $484 / 3$ ). Of its causes we know nothing; but it is natural to suppose that the friends of Miltiades had something to do with it. In 480 Xanthippus left Athens with the other inhabitants at the approach of Xerxes: Plutarch, Them. ro, tells the story of his dog, which conld not endure to be left behind on this occasion. Xanthippus was the archon of 479 (Diod. xi 27). He commanded the Athenians at Mycale (479, Hdt. ix 114) and at the siege of Sestos (ix 121). By Agariste, daughter of Hippocrates, and sister of the Megacles mentioned above, he became the father

29 Nікомндоүс (к-W, H-L, в) : N(ıко) днмо(Y) Berol. et Dion. Hal. viii 83 (к).
 (ib. 226).
of Pericles (Hdt. vi 131) and Ariphron (Plut. Alc. 1, Plat. Protag. 320). The elder of the two legitimate sons of Pericles was named after his grandfather, Xanthippus (Plut. Per. 24, 36 ).
§ 7. *itc....тpitw after 486 , would bring us to $484 / 3$ for the archonship of Nicodemus. It was $\dot{\varepsilon} \nu$ roúrois roîs кaloois that Aristides was ostracised, and in $48 \mathrm{I} / \mathrm{O}$ all the citizens who had been ostracised were
 But Nicodemus, according to Dionysius Hal. viii 83, p. 1711 Reiske, was archon in the consulsbip of L. Aemilius Mamercus and K. Fabius, 270 A.v.c. (Cato). In Baiter's Fasti Consulares this is identified as A.U.C. $269=$ B.C. 484 . This would support Mr Kenyon's view. See, however, note on § 6, ё $\tau \eta$ ๆpla.

Neкou $\eta \delta o u s$ is the reading in the papyrus; $\mathrm{N}(\iota \mathrm{ko}) \mathrm{AHMO}(v)$ that of the Berlin fragment, and similarly in Dionysius. Mr Kenyon, perhaps rightly, holds that, in this conflict between the two mss, 'the authority of Dionysius may turn the scale.'

The name Nıко $\boldsymbol{\eta} \delta \boldsymbol{\eta}$ s ('victor in counsel ') is formed from $\mu \eta \delta o \mu a l$ on the analogy



 $(=\mathrm{K} \lambda \epsilon \circ) \mu \eta \dot{\eta} \delta \eta \mathrm{s}, \quad \mathrm{K} \lambda \nu \tau о \mu \dot{\eta} \delta \eta \mathrm{~s}, ~ \Lambda а о \mu \dot{\eta} \delta \eta \mathrm{~s}$,
 (i.e. ' $0 \nu a \sigma \iota$-) $\mu \dot{\eta} \delta \eta \bar{\eta}, ~ \Pi а \lambda а \mu \dot{\eta} \delta \eta \mathrm{~s}, ~ \Pi є \rho \iota \mu \dot{\eta} \delta \eta \mathrm{~s}$ and Пo入u $\mu \neq \bar{\sigma} \eta$ (Pape-Benseler, Eigennamen, p. xxx). It cannot be interpreted as 'conqueror of the Medes,' which would be M Mobviкos. Similarly, the alternative name Nuкठס $\eta \mu \mathrm{os}$ means ' with victorious army or people' $i b$. s. $v$.

 $\mu \epsilon \gamma \hat{d} \lambda \omega \nu \epsilon \nu \tau \hat{\varphi} \kappa о \omega \nu \hat{\varphi}, \tau \dot{\alpha} \epsilon \epsilon \kappa \tau \hat{\omega} \nu \mu \epsilon \tau \dot{\alpha} \lambda \lambda \omega \nu$




 $\tau \delta \nu \pi \rho b s$ Alyıpì $\tau a s$ $\lambda \in \gamma \omega \nu$. (Plut. Them. 4 ,

 $\delta_{1 \alpha \nu}(\mu \in \sigma \theta a t \kappa \tau \lambda$.) This account, esp. the word $\pi a v \sigma a \mu \dot{y} v o u s$, implies that the revenue for the mines had hitherto been distributed among the people (to the extent of 10 drachmas a head).
$\xi \varnothing \alpha \nu \eta$ can only mean 'were discovered,' which may possibly be supported by $\epsilon \dot{\varphi} \rho \in \theta \eta$ in Bekker's Anecdota, p. 279,
 $\tau \dot{\alpha} \mu \epsilon \tau a \lambda \lambda a \epsilon \dot{v} \rho \dot{\epsilon} \theta \eta$. The mention of the revenue of 100 talents from the works comes somewhat suddenly after the first announcement of the discovery of the mines, and possibly some other word was really written by the author. The author of the tract $\pi \epsilon \rho l \pi \delta \rho \omega \nu$ implies that they were of immemorial antiquity, but there are indications that they had only recently come into prominence. Aeschylus in the Persae, 238, the dramatic date of which is $480 \mathrm{~B} . \mathrm{C}$., makes the chorus answer an enquiry of the wife of Darius as to the wealth of Athens by the reply doyupou
 'At what time they first began to be worked,' says Grote (c. 39, iii 406), ' we have no information; but it seems hardly possible that they could have been worked with any spirit or profitable result, until after the expulsion of Hippias and the establishment of the democratic constitution of Kleisthenes.' It is quite conceivable that a very recent discovery of a very productive mine at one particular place, Maroneia, may have given a new importance to the question of the best disposal of the revenue. - It has even been suggested that the mines had originally belonged to Aegina and had been wrested from her by Athens (Mahaffy, Rambles and Studies in Greece, p. 163); but neither the text nor the parallel passages in Hdt. and Plut. lend any support to this. The Athenians had to rely on the revenue from the mines to make way against the Aeginetans.
$\boldsymbol{\tau d}$ ' $\boldsymbol{v}$ Mapovela] 'The mining district, besides the demi Anaphlystus, Besa, Amphitrope, and Thoricus, contained several places which were not demi, as
 Dem. 37 § 25 , Aeschin. I § 101], Maroneia, Aulon [Aeschin. l. c.]' (Leake's Demi, p. 274). Laurrium may have been the general term for the district, derived from its numerous shafts and tunnels, $\lambda a 0 \mathrm{pai}$, lit. 'narrow passages'. Maroneia may perhaps be identified with some ruins five miles N . of Sunium. In Dem. Pant. 37 §4, Nicobulus and his partner Euergus






allege that they lent to Pantaenetus ros

 the silver mines of Laurium, see Boeckh's Dissertation, pp. $615-678$, printed as Appendix to Boeckh's Public Economy, trans. Lewis; K. F. Hermann, Privatalt. § 14, 17; Büchsenschütz, Besitz und Erwerb, pp. 98-103; Select Private. Orations of Dem. ed. 2, ii p. 89.

ті́入avтa ékaт̀̀v кт $\lambda$.] Polyaenus, i 30












 каі ката̀ Пєрбஸ̂v є̇ $\chi \rho \dot{\eta} \sigma а \nu \tau о$.

In Hdt. vii 144 the amount available for distribution is stated as io drachmas a head. Elsewhere (in v 97) Hdt. reckons the citizens at 30,000 . This gives us 50 talents for distribution. IHe also speaks of 200 ships. But 50 talents is far too small a sum for a fleet, even if only 100 ships were built at the cost of only one talent each. It has accordingly been suggested that Hdt. founded his calculation on the diminished returns of the mines at a later date, about 430 b.c. (Stein ad loc.). Boeckh considers that the population was probably 20,000 at the time meant by the historian. The amount to be distributed, at ro dr. a head, would in that case be $200,000 \mathrm{dr}$. $=33 \frac{1}{3}$ talents.

It was Boeckh's opinion that all the public money arising from the mines was (annually) divided among the members of the community (Dissertation, § 8, p. 652 Lewis ed. 2). Grote himself held that the sum for distribution only formed 'part of a larger sum lying in the treasury, arising from the mines. Themistokles persuaded the people to employ the whole sum in
ship-building, which of course implied that the distribution was to be renounced. Whether there had been distributions of a similar kind in former years...is a matter on which we have no evidence' (c. 39, iii 407 n.). The evidence of the text supports Grote's view. The date of the building of the fleet is discussed by Busolt, ii 123 f., but the text was then represented by the Berlin fragment only.
 position of archon eponymus in the year of the proposal to distribute the revenue from the silver mines. The archon of that year was Nicodemus (483/2). He was in office, however, at the time when he proposed the fortification of the

 éviautò ' $A \theta \eta \nu a l o l s ~ \eta \rho \rho \xi \in$, and he may have been archon eponymus at that time. The archon for $48 \mathrm{r} / \mathrm{o}$ is Hypsichides (infra § 8). We may therefore place the archonship of Themistocles in $482 / \mathrm{r}$.
Dionysius Hal., Ant. Rom. vi 34, p. III7 R, makes Themistocles archon in 493 B.C., but (as Mr Kenyon shews) this is very improbable.

The chronology suggested by Bauer is as foliows: according to Plutarch (Them. 31 and Cim. 18) Themistocles died at the age of 65 at the time of Cimon's expedition against Cyprus ( $448 / 7$ ). This would give us 5 r 3 for his birth. He would be 30 in $483 / 2$, and this was the year in which he brought about the formation of a fleet. His archonship should probably be placed in $482 / \mathrm{I}$, a year that is not yet filled by any name. This is supported by the scholiast on Thuc. $\pi \rho d \bar{\delta} \dot{\epsilon} \tau \hat{\omega}$

 $\pi a \rho \dot{\omega}$, which is unfavourable to placing his archonship as far back as 493: $\nu \in \omega \sigma \pi i$ is more likely to denote an interval of two, than of 13 years. The Themistocles of 493 (Dionysius) would in this case be another of the same name. But there is more probability in Mr Kenyon's second alternative, that Dionysius has simply made a mistake.

In $480 / 79$ he was $\sigma \tau \rho a \pi \eta \gamma$ bs of the











 39 тетd $\rho \tau \varphi$ ：т $\rho i \tau \varphi$＇corr．e Plut．Ar． $8^{\prime}$ к－w ${ }^{2}$（в）．

40 Y $\Psi$ HXİOY ante corr．
 （velut etiam in codicibus）et $\sigma \tau \rho a \tau \epsilon i a$ et $\sigma \tau \rho a \tau \iota \alpha$ expeditionem significat（ $\sigma \tau \rho a \tau \epsilon \dot{\epsilon} \sigma \theta a \iota-$ ràs $\sigma \tau \rho a \tau \epsilon l a s$, b．c． $325 ;-\tau$ ds $\sigma \tau \rho a \tau$ iàs в．c． $33^{\circ}$ ）Meisterhans，p． $43^{2}$ ．
entoc K，K－W，H－L：éкcos Wyse（B），quod egregie confirmat Philochorus in Lex．Rhet．


Athenian troops that marched to Tempe （Hdt．vii ${ }^{7} 73$ ）．
ö $\tau 1$ Xpグणeral］Plat．Crit． 45 c ，ouk

êv rovíols tois kalpoîs］Jerome has， under O1．74， $\mathrm{I}(=484 / 3)$ ，Aristides cum ignominia eicitur．On the ostracism of Aristides，cf．Plut．Arist． 7.
 the date of the archonship of Hypsichides， a name that is now known for the first time．Plut．，Arist．8，says that the Athenians recalled Aristides，$\Xi \rho \rho \xi=v$ did Oetra入ias kal Botwtias èaúvodtos，i．e．in the spring of 480 b．C．He adds that the vote for the recall was passed in the third year after the banishment．This note of time may be explained by the fact that，if the vote for ostracising Aristides took place at the 6th（or 8th）$\pi \rho \cup \tau a \nu e l a(c$. 43 § 5 ），this would fall early in e．c． 483 ， and the corresponding date in $4^{80}$ would be the end of the third year after．
kate $\delta \xi\{a v \tau 0$ ）Andoc． I § 107 （of the

 $\pi ๐ \hat{\text { ఫुбal．}}$



 $\gamma i \nu \eta s \delta \iota \epsilon \beta \eta$ ．Snidas，s．v．＇Apıбтєi $\delta \eta s$ ，



 fact that Aristides remained in Aegina explains the provision that henceforth persons ostracised were to reside outside Geraestus and the Scyllaean promontory． According to Plintarch（Cim．17），Cimon when ostracised appeared at Tanagra （Wyse in Class．Rev．v 274 b）．
 suggests that the object of the regulation was to keep the ostracised person＇within very narrow boundaries，＇so as to obviate the danger of a banished citizen entering into communication with Persia．But， as Aristides had remained within these limits，it is more reasonable to suppose that the line beyond which the ostracised person was to withdraw was thencefor－ ward made the subject of special regu－ lation．Banishment had in fact to be defined more strictly．Otherwise the exile might remain within a very short distance of Attica and carry on intrigues against his opponents．

Themistocles，while under ostracism， lived at Argos，Thuc．i r 39，E $\chi \omega \nu$ סiaıтay

 $\sigma o y$ ，and afterwards went to Corcyra，and Epirus，to Pydna in Macedonia，and thence to Naxos and Ephesus．He clearly kept outside the limits described in the text as emended．Hyperbolus，again， lived in Samos（Thuc．viii 73 § 2）．Both these cases exemplify the rule．According
 $\dot{a} \pi a \xi$.








 pp. 219-220. 6 c $\omega z \in \mathbb{N}$ : $\sigma \dot{\psi} \zeta \in \iota \nu$ (edd.), cf. Meisterhans, p. 142 $^{2} . \quad 7$ inter






to the Schol. on Aristoph. Vesp. 947, one of the differences between those who are banished for life and those who are ostracised is that the former 'have no fixed place of abode, no time of return assigned, but the latter have' (каi $\tau \delta \pi$ оs


「єparotov̂] The cape at the s.w. extremity of Euboea. (Hdt. viii 7, ix
 the cape at the eastern extremity of the territory of Troezen (Thuc. v 53), the most easterly point of the Peloponnesus, and forming (with the opposite promontory of Sunium) the entrance to the Saronic' gulf.
 that of perpetual $\dot{\alpha} \tau \mu \mu \mathrm{l}$. For $\kappa \alpha \theta \dot{a} \pi \pi \xi$ in this connexion cf. Dem. Mid. $\mathrm{s}^{8} 3^{2}$, 87, Aristog. i § 30. The various disabilities in such a case are enumerated by Aeschines, c. Timarch. § 18 (see Smith, Dict. Ant. i 242 a).
XXIII, XXIV. The supremacy of the Areopagus. Aristides and Themistocles.




 Areopagus to contrast it with the Four hundred (c. 29) and the Thirty (c. 34 end, and Isocr. Areop. 67, ol... $\psi \eta \phi l \sigma \mu a \tau \iota$ $\pi a \rho a \lambda a \beta b \nu \tau \epsilon s \tau \grave{\eta} \nu \pi b \lambda \lambda \nu)$.

Tîs mepl Eaiapiva vaupaxias] Pol.

1304 a 22, ठ עaut





 $\mu a \sigma \iota$. For the general sense of the context, cf. Cic de Off. i 75, et Themistocles quidem nihil dixerit, in quo ipse Areopagum adiuverit, at ille vere a se adiutum Themistoclem; est enim bellum gestum consilio senatus eius qui a Solone erat constitutus.

торlбaбa $\delta \rho a x \mu a s]$ Probably from the sacred treasure on the Acropolis; cf. Philippi, Areopag. 293; Oncken, Staatslehre, 468.
 The most common construction of rapa$\chi \omega \rho \in i v$ is $c$. dat. pers. et gen. rei vel loci.
 Aeschin. 54, 21. Polyb. iv 5, 1 etc., $\pi$.





Mr Kenyon prints тapex $\dot{\omega} \rho o v \nu$ aiv $\hat{\eta} \tau \hat{\psi}$ d $\xi \omega \omega \mu a \tau \iota$, 'gave place (or 'precedence') to it in rank' (or 'reputation'). The simple dat. may here be equivalent to ty-. The latter is found in Magn. Mor.
 $\dot{E} \pi t \in c \kappa \bar{y} s$, but I can find no exact parallel for the dative alone.











9 кai (ante katd) secl. K, K-w; retinent h-L (B), coll. $3383 . \quad 10 \mathrm{k}$ (АТа)







sequent context, cf. Isocr. Areop. 5 I (of


 $\sigma \phi a ̂ s ~ a u ̉ r o u ̀ s ~ \tau o i ̂ s ~ \mu e ̀ v " E \lambda \lambda \eta \sigma \iota ~ \pi \iota \sigma \tau o u ́ s, ~ \tau o i ̂ s ~$



 $\sigma a \nu$. De Pace, $75-77$, esp. т $\hat{\mathrm{y}} \mathrm{s}$ то入ıтelas


кal кard тoúrovs tov̀s кalpoús] кal is perhaps added because Athens had been well governed when the Areopagus was in power before, cf. § 1 , $\pi \dot{d} \lambda e \nu$ l $\sigma \sigma \chi \sigma \sigma \nu$ (Newman).
 Isocr. Paneg. 72 (after the Persian wars),






 Thuc. i 96 , rapa入aßóvтes ol 'A $\theta$. т $\boldsymbol{\eta} \nu \dot{\eta} \gamma \epsilon-$
 חavaaviou $\mu i \sigma o s$. In Xen. Hell. vi § 34 a Spartan declares that the Athenians
 $\nu i \omega \nu \sigma \nu \mu \beta o v \lambda \epsilon v o \mu \epsilon \nu \omega \nu$. None of the above passages sbews that the Lacedaemonians were really willing to surrender the supremacy; and in Thuc. i 96 the reference is not to the Lacedaemonians, but to the allies of Athens who smarted under the
overbearing conduct of Pausanias. Hence $\dot{\alpha} \kappa \delta \nu \tau \omega \nu$ should be retained.
 c. 28. Holm, Gr. Gesch. ii 43 , 110 .

Nєok $\lambda$ éous] Plut. Them. $\mathbf{1}$, N. of tề ă $\gamma a \nu \dot{\epsilon} \pi \iota \iota a \nu \hat{\omega} \nu$ ' $\mathrm{A} \theta \dot{\eta} \nu \eta \sigma \tau$.

тd̀ $\pi 0 \lambda \epsilon \mu \iota \kappa$ ì $]$ Pol. 1305 a 14 , à $\pi \epsilon \epsilon \rho / a$
 $\pi о \lambda \epsilon \mu \kappa \omega \bar{\nu}$. Ind. Ar. On the other hand, $\pi 0 \lambda \epsilon \mu$ os is rare in Ar. Cf. c. 3 1. 7.

Sıkatooúvn] Plut. Arist. 3 fin., and 7, тд̀ ठ८каьоу.
 Aristotle obviously refers to the rival claims of Themistocles and Aristides in Pol. viii (v) 8, 1309 a 39, ë $\chi \in\left\llcorner\delta^{\prime}\right.$ à $\pi 0-$






 utela toivapuiov. On the other hand Isocr., Panath. 143, strangely maintains that the best $\sigma \dot{\prime} \mu \beta$ ounos will also prove the best general (Class. Rev. v 161 a).

 кal тà $\tau \epsilon i \chi \eta$. Themistocles went as envoy to Sparta to gain time while the walls were being built ( $i b .90$ ), while Aristides was one of the $\xi \nu \mu \pi \rho \epsilon \sigma \beta \epsilon \epsilon s$ who afterwards announced to Themistocles ex $\chi$ elv
 ii 32 I-9.

 20 тov̀s $\Lambda a ́ \kappa \kappa \nu a \varsigma ~ \delta \iota a \beta є \beta \lambda \eta \mu \epsilon ́ v o v s ~ \delta \iota a ̀ ~ \Pi a v \sigma a \nu i ́ a \nu . ~ \delta ı o ̀ ~ к a i ̀ ~ \tau o v ̀ s ~ 5 ~$










 $\mathrm{K}-\mathrm{W}, \mathrm{K}^{3} . \quad 21 \pi \dot{\sigma} \boldsymbol{\lambda} \epsilon \sigma \iota \mathrm{H}-\mathrm{L}$. $\quad 23$ ฝّ $\mu \sigma \sigma \epsilon \mathrm{H}-\mathrm{L}, \mathrm{B}$.

## $\bar{B}$

à
 K-w. 5 тра́ттоval H -L. 6 тoîs $\tau \epsilon$ : тoîs b.






 ${ }^{2} 3$. On the other hand Hdt. viii $3, \pi \rho \delta$ -

 $\nu$ lovs. On Pausanias cf. Pol. 1307 a 2 , ${ }^{1} 333{ }^{6} 3^{2}$.
§5. rov̀s фópous] 'tributes.' Thuc. i 96 ,





 $\dot{\epsilon} \pi$ ' 'Apıбт $\epsilon \ell \delta o u$. Plut. Arist. 24. Schol. Aeschin. $3 \S 258$, 'A $\rho \in \sigma \tau \in i \delta \eta s$ o $\delta$ rous $\phi$ ópous
 in the first instance at 460 talents.

The commencement of the Athenian ascendancy is placed hy Diodorus (xi 41) in the year of Adeimantus (477/6). This is the date accepted by Clinton. Ephorus appears to have placed the first payment of tribute in the spring of $47^{6}$ (Busolt, Rhein. Mus. xxxvii 313 ), and accordingly this has been the date usually assigned to the formation of the Confederacy of Delos.

Dem., Phil. iii 23, makes the Athenian ascendancy last 73 years, and the Lacedaemonian 29. The 29 years are reckoned from the battle of Aegospotami (July 405) to the battle of Naxos (Sept. 376). As the first of these battles marked the end of the Athenian empire, it follows that Dem. reckoned the beginning of the Athenian empire from 478 , the first year after the Persian wars. For further details, see Clinton's Fasti, Appendix, c. 6; and Busolt, ii 345 .
тov̀s öpkous شّ $\mu$ orev] Plut. Arist. 25,


 The same symbol of an irrevocable oath is recorded in Hdt. i 165, ol $\Phi$ wialées




 Epod. 16, 25.

XXIV § i. Өappoíqๆs] c. 22 § 3
 contrast to Peisistratus who encouraged agriculture with a view to preventing his subjects from living in Athens (c. I6 § 3).
§ 2. $\lambda a \beta$ óvtes $\tau \dot{\eta} v \dot{a} \rho X \dot{\eta} \nu]$ The simple verb is similarly used in Isocr. $4 \$ \mathbf{7 2}^{2}$; $5 \S 61 ; 7 \S 7 ; 8 \$ 830,69,74,104 ;$






$8<\tau$ às $>\pi a \rho^{\prime}$, Ricbards, $\mathrm{k}-\mathrm{w}$. 'dictum erat de cleruchis' K -w.
 tentiam non praebent...certe ipsi auctori tribuenda non videntur' H -L. 11 фор $\mathbf{L} \mathbf{N}$ : єí $\sigma о \rho \omega \hat{\nu}$ Whibley (H-L). каì $\tau \hat{\nu} \nu \quad \sigma \nu \mu \mu a ́ \chi \omega \nu$ secl. к-w, в.
 8 § 126.
反єбтотькштєршs] This comparative of the adverb is not in L and S. Pol.iv io,

 Thuc. i 19 , (in the interval between the Persian and Peloponnesian wars) 'A $\theta \eta \nu a \hat{i o s}$
 $\pi \dot{0} \lambda \epsilon \omega \nu \quad \tau \hat{\varphi} \quad \chi \rho b \nu \varphi{ }^{\alpha} \pi \rho a \lambda a \beta b \nu \tau \epsilon \varsigma, \pi \lambda \eta \nu$
 $\pi \hat{a} \sigma \iota \tau \alpha \dot{\xi} a \nu \tau \varepsilon s \phi^{\epsilon} \rho \in \epsilon \nu$. Even when (under Pericles) the confederacy of Delos was transformed into an empire on the part of Athens, with her former confederates degraded into tributary dependencies, Chios, Samos and Lesbos alone remained on their original footing of autonomous allies.

It was after the revolt of Samos in 440 B.C. that that state was conquered by an armament under ten generals, including Pericles and Sophocles, and after a prolonged contest disarmed and dismantled (Thuc. i 115-117). Lesbos and Chios still remained in a privileged position (Thuc. iii 10 ).

Mitylene and the greater part of Lesbos revolted in $428(i b .2)$, one of the reasons being that the Mitylenæans 'had no security that Athens would not degrade them into the condition of subject-allies like the rest' (ib. Io fin.). The fortifications of Mitylene were razed, all her ships of war captured, and the greater part of the island allotted to Athenian settlers ( $i b .50$ ).

In 425 Chios incurred the suspicion of Athens by building a new wall, which implied an intention to revolt (Thuc. iv 51). The Athenians insisted on the destruction of the wall (52). Chios actually revolted in 412 and was much harassed by the Athenians (Thuc. viii 14-6r).

It is to the result of these revolts that Aristotle refers in Pol. iii $13,128_{4}$ a 39, where, after speaking of ostracism as a means of suppressing undue prominence,




 Td̀s $\sigma v p \theta \dot{\eta} \kappa \alpha s)$. But (as observed by Schlosser) the remark in the Politics is untrue of Lesbos, and barely true of Samos and Chios. The account in the text correctly describes the position of privilege at first enjoyed by these three islands. The passage in the Politics refers to a later time and is therefore not inconsistent with the text (cf. W. L. Newman, Class. Rev. v 162 b).
 are here combined, (I) the acc., as in
 $\epsilon \dot{\epsilon} \alpha \sigma \epsilon \iota \nu \tau \dot{\eta} \nu \partial \lambda \lambda \eta \nu \pi 0 \lambda \iota \tau \epsilon l a \nu$, and (2) the
 Іลิ̃ $\sigma a i$ ӥбтєроу.
$\hat{\omega} y$ étvxov dpXovtes] For Chian possessions on the mainland, cf. Hdt. i 160 (Wyse). On the relations of Athens to Chios, Lesbos and Samos, cf. Wilamowitz, Aus Kydathen, pp. in, iz.
 ' If the policy of Aristides is placed in a less favourable light than we should expect, inasmuch as he is said to have converted a citizen-body largely consisting of peasants into an urban citizenbody subsisting on pay and exercising a despotic authority over the subject states, and thus to have contributed to the establishment of an extreme democracy, we remember that we are taught in the Politics (iv 6, 5, 1292 b 4 I sqq.) to connect the establishment of a reोcutala onuoкparla with a large increase in the size of the city and with the provision of pay, and also that Theophrastus' opinion of Aristides was not an altogether favourable one (Plut. Arist. c. 25).' (W. L. Newman in Class. Rev. v 162 b.)

T $\boldsymbol{\omega} \nu$ фóp $\omega \boldsymbol{\nu}]$ See note on 23 § 5 .
т $\hat{\nu} v$ т $\epsilon \lambda \omega \nu]$ 'taxes.' With the exception of the produce of plunder in war




12 дıкастд1: $\delta \pi \lambda і$ ital? van Leeuwen, Gennadios.
and sale of prisoners, the $\phi$ boos was at this time the only source of revenue from foreigners. (The duty on merchandise passing to or from the Euxine was not levied until 409.) Hence the reference in $\tau \epsilon \lambda \omega \nu$ is to taxes imposed by the Athenians and levied at home, whether (1) ordinary taxes, such as harbour-dues, market-dues, court-fees, and payments made by resident aliens, or (2) extraordinary taxes. The latter were levied for special purposes, viz. the propertytax (elo $\phi \circ \rho$ á) which was practically a war-tax, and the $\lambda$ proup $\overline{\text { alic }}$, or compulsory services. These last did not contribute towards the support of the citizens except by relieving them of expenses which might otherwise have fallen on the public chest. Lastly, there was the income derived from rents of public lands, and from the mines at Laurium.

In Thuc. vi 91, 6, Alcibiades enumerates some of these sources of revenue, viz. the mines, the public land and the law-courts and the tribute paid by the
 There is a fuller enumeration in Aristoph.





 (making a total of nearly 2000 talents, of which the $6000 \delta$ onactal received 150 ).

As the $\sigma \dot{0} \mu \mu \alpha \chi o \iota$ contribute no payment except the $\phi 6 \rho o s$, it is clear that the mention of them in the text is superfluous.
'The text, as it stands, appears to imply that the citizens of Athens derived maintenance from the allies over and above the $\phi$ ofot and the $\tau \epsilon \lambda \eta$ paid by them; cf. [Xen.] Rep. Ath. i 16-18. Fees paid by the allies in lawsuits may be included in the reference, for these helped to maintain the dicasts (Gillert, $\mathrm{i} 382,4$ ). There was also an $\epsilon \pi \iota \phi 0 \rho \alpha \dot{d}^{(i b}$. 397 ). The visits of the citizens of the allied states to Athens would be another source of profit' (Newman).
$\pi \lambda \in$ lous $\eta$ " 8 ir $\mu$ uplovs] The numbers actually specified amount to 15,750 . If to this we add (with Mr Kenyon) ' 4000
men for the 20 guard-ships at the usual rate of 200 men to each ship, ${ }^{2}$ we obtain a total of 19,750, not including the orphans and other privileged persons mentioned at the end of the chapter.

Sukarтal] As these were not paid until the time of Pericles, this must be (as Mr Kenyon notices) an anticipation of the results of the policy initiated by
 tribe. This is apparently the number of the dicasts in the times of the democracy after Cleisthenes. The Heliastae were instituted by Solon; but their number in his days is unknown, though it was probably not very small.

тоگ̧óral] The context shews that citizens serving as bowmen are meant. The figures in the text are partly borrowed from Thuc. ii $13 \$ 7$, where Pericles, on the outbreak of the Peloponnesian war, estimates the number of the $\tau 0 \xi \sigma \tau a l$ at
 $\xi$ ¢oals. In Thuc. vi ${ }_{25}$ Nicias requires for the Sicilian expedition $\tau 0 \xi 0 \tau \hat{\omega} \nu \tau \hat{\omega} \nu$
 St., i 305 , quotes CIA i 79, $70 \xi 6$ otal ol
 $\delta \epsilon$ ) $\kappa$; and i $55,433,446$; ib. i 79, ol $\tau 6 \xi a \rho \chi o \iota$. The 1600 freeborn bowmen in the text must be distinguished from the 1200 Scythian bowmen of Andocides (de Pace, 7) and Aeschines (F. L. §8 173-4). The latter were a police force instituted in 480 b.c. when 300 were purchased for this purpose by the state (Andoc. l. c. 5).
imetis] The same number is found in Thuc. ii. $13 \$ 7$, and in Andocides and Aeschines (l.c.) In 490 Athens had no cavalry (Hdt. vi i12). The number gradually rose to 1000, Arist. Eq. 225, Philochorus $\epsilon \nu \tau \epsilon \tau \dot{a} \rho \tau \varphi$ (B.C. 456-404) ap. Hesych. s. v.; and this number was maintained in the fourth century (Xen. Hip. parch. 9, 3; Dem. 14 § 13). The number 1200 in Thuc. includes the imтото $\xi 6 \pi a \iota$. As the latter were Scythian slaves, it was a discredit to an Athenian citizen to serve in this force (Lys. $15 \$ 6$ ). The fact that only 1000, out of the total 1200 , are really citizens is apparently overlooked in the text. Gillert, Gr. St., i 305, n. 5, quotes
 $\pi \lambda \hat{\eta} \theta \eta$ катà $\chi \rho \sigma \nu 0 \nu$ 'A $\theta \eta \nu a l o c s$, but holds



$$
15 \tau \hat{\eta} \text { secl. K-W }{ }^{2} \text {, b. } \quad 16 \mathrm{M}(\epsilon \mathrm{~N}) \text { HCAN } \in I c .
$$

that little credit can be given to any statements giving 1200 as the total number of the $i \pi \pi \in \operatorname{tis}$ alone.
$\phi p o u p o l v e \omega p(\omega v]$ I cannot find any other passage in which these are expressly mentioned. In Thuc. ii 13 § 6 half the circuit of the Peiraeus and Munichia is described as $\epsilon \nu \phi \cup \lambda a x \hat{\eta}$, and the total number of j̀ $\pi \lambda \hat{i} \tau \alpha \iota ~ \tau \hat{\omega} \nu$ è $\tau 0$ ôs $\phi \rho o \nu-$
 §3). This number is the force employed on the outbreak of war.
 the $y \in \dot{\omega} p t a$ in the previous clause might at first sight suggest that these $\phi$ poupol were concerned with the upper $\pi \delta \lambda_{t s}$ in contrast with the Peiraeus: but, if so, we should expect $\dot{\epsilon} \nu \tau \hat{\varphi} \dot{a} \sigma \tau \epsilon \iota$ as the normal term to express this contrast. It is therefore probable that $\tau \hat{\eta} \pi \dot{d} \lambda \epsilon t$ refers to the Acropolis, and it is so translated by Th. Reinach. This view (as Mr Wyse suggests to me) is supported by an inscr. of the 5 th cent. published in the Bulletin de Corr. Hellénique, 1890 , 177 - 180 , and ascribed to 447 B.C. in CIA iv $3,26 a,[\tau] \eta \nu$
 $\delta \rho a \pi \epsilon \tau \eta s \quad \mu \grave{\eta} \quad \in[\sigma l] \eta \quad \mu \eta \delta \grave{\epsilon} \lambda \omega \pi o \delta \dot{u} \tau[\eta s]$.




 $\tau \hat{\eta} s$ фu入解 $\tau \hat{\eta} s[\pi] \rho \nu \tau a \nu \in v o v i a \eta s . ~ M . ~ F o u-~$ cart understands the three ro $\xi 6 \tau a l$ who are to act as фúhaкes to be trois Scythes, on the ground that the police was not recruited from the citizens, but it will be observed that they belong to a $\phi \nu \lambda \bar{y}$ and are therefore citizens. They are appointed to guard the approach to a particular part of the Acropolis and to prevent runaway slaves from seeking sanctuary in the temples. $\pi 6 \lambda \iota s$, or $\dot{\eta} \pi \delta \lambda \iota s$, is regularly used of the Acropolis in the 5 th century. Thuc.


' Aristophanes always uses $\bar{\epsilon} \nu \pi \delta \lambda \epsilon \epsilon$, $\epsilon l$ $\pi \dot{0} \lambda \omega \nu$ (without the article) when be means the Acropolis. In prose writers, however, there are places where the MSS give the article: Xen. $A n a b$. vii i, $27, \dot{v} \pi a p-$

 Antiph. 6 §39, $\delta \downarrow \eta \lambda \lambda \alpha ́ \gamma \eta \nu \tau o u ́ \tau o u s ~ \grave{\epsilon} \nu \tau \hat{\eta}$
$\pi o ́ \lambda \epsilon \iota$ éva $\nu \tau l o \nu \mu \alpha \rho \tau \dot{\sigma} \rho \omega \nu$, [Xen.] de Red. 5 § $12, \pi 0 \lambda \lambda \grave{\alpha} \chi \rho \dot{\eta} \mu a \tau a \operatorname{\epsilon ls} \tau \dot{\eta} \nu \pi o ́ \lambda \iota \nu$ à $\nu \in \nu \epsilon-$

 $\epsilon \nu \tau \hat{\eta} \pi \dot{0} \lambda \epsilon \epsilon \kappa \rho l \nu 0 \iota \epsilon \nu, \epsilon \mu \pi \dot{\prime} \lambda \epsilon \iota$ is no doubt the normal form in cIA i' (Wyse).
d $p x a l . . . k v \delta \eta \mu 01]$ The total number is large, and there is nothing to shew that the higher officers of state are excluded. Schömann (Ant. p. 147, E. T.) says : 'so far as our knowledge extends, the offices of government were unpaid.' Again, on p. 402, 'official functionaries,' as contrasted with subordinates, 'served without pay' (cf. ib. 436). But in c. 62 the archons receive for maintenance 4 obols a day each, and in c. 29 (under the constitution of 4 II) the archons and $\pi \rho u$ táycis are excepted from the rule that all offices should be without pay.

ข̇tєpóplot] In Pol. iii 14, 12856 14,
 $\tau \dot{\alpha} \dot{v} \pi \in \rho \phi \rho!a \quad \sigma \nu \nu \epsilon \chi \bar{\omega} s \hat{\eta} \rho \chi o \nu$, and the term
 quoted in Aeschin. c. Timarch. 47, $\mu \eta \delta$ è
 $\dot{u} \pi \in \rho 6 \rho \circ \frac{1}{}$. Mr Kenyon's translation distinguishes between magistrates 'within the city' and 'those whose jurisdiction lay outside it'; Mr Poste (more satisfactorily) between 'home' and 'foreign' magistrates. The latter would naturally include the officials in the Athenian $\kappa \lambda \eta \rho o u x l a l$. The first $\kappa \lambda \eta p o u \chi i a$ was that settled near Chalkis in 510 b.c. The number of cleruchs sent out between 460 and 427 amounted to $9,45^{\circ}$, not including those sent to Lemuos, Imbros and Aegina (Gilbert, Gr. St. i 42 I , note 4 ).

The cleruchs were subject to military orders, and we sometimes hear of civil magistrates being sent out by Athens, e.g. ápxoytes sent to Lesbos (Antiphon, de Caede Her. § 47). Cf. the $\begin{aligned} & \pi l \boldsymbol{\sigma} \kappa о \pi о ь\end{aligned}$ of Aristoph. Av. 1022, 1050 (see Wilamowitz, Aus Kydathen, p. 75), and the $\begin{aligned} & \text { E } \pi t- \\ & -\end{aligned}$ $\mu \in \lambda \eta \tau a l$ sent to Miletus (CIA iv 1, $22^{\text {a }}$ ) and in later times to Delos, Haliartos and Paros (Boeckh, i $508 a$, and n. 709 Fränkel).

The ápxal új $\epsilon \subset \rho \rho_{\rho} \rho o l$ would also include the фpoipapxol, as at Erythrae, cIa i 9 (Ditt. no. 2), and ro. фpoupapxla is mentioned in Xen. Mem. iv 4, 17 , and фpoú $a \rho$ रoc possibly in [Xen.] $d e$ Rep.





 aperte corrupta,' H-L; $\mu \sigma \theta 0 \phi b \rho o u s ? ~ H e r w e r d e n . ~$
 $\mu \omega \nu$ à $\mu \dot{\partial} \nu$ оus, тoús $\tau \epsilon \sigma \tau \rho a \tau \eta \gamma o u s$ каl тous
 $\pi \rho \epsilon \epsilon \beta \epsilon \iota s$ (Wilamowitz, Aus Kydathen, Pp. 73-76). Cf. inscr. ascribed to the beginning of the Peloponnesian war (CIA
 ขंтєроріа.
 $\sigma v \sigma \tau \hat{\eta} \sigma a \iota$ or $\sigma \cup \sigma \tau \dot{\eta} \sigma a \sigma \theta a t \pi \dot{\beta} \lambda \iota$ or $\pi 0 \lambda_{i}$ $\tau \epsilon l a \nu$ is found in the Politics and $\tau \dot{\alpha} \pi \rho \alpha \gamma-$ $\mu a \tau a$ ouviotaota. (of tragic poets) in the Potics 6, p. 1450 a 37. Again, in Thuc.
 oúdels $\xi v v \in \sigma \tau \eta$, and Hdt. vi 108 has $\sigma u \nu-$ $\varepsilon \sigma \tau \epsilon \omega \hat{\omega} a s$ Bot $\omega \tau 0 \hat{i} \sigma$ for 'engaged in conflict with' the B. Here, if $\tau \dot{\alpha}$ els were to be inserted, it might mean ' organised,' as in Xen. Anab. vii 6 § 26 im $\pi \iota \kappa д \nu \quad \sigma v p-$
 'a standing army,'in Dem. p. 93 fin.
$\dot{\delta} \pi \lambda i \tau a l]$ The number 2,500 is difficult to reconcile with the figures mentioned elsewhere. The number of Athenians who fought at Marathon was 9,000 (Pausan. x 20, 2) or $\mathrm{r} 0,000$ (Justin. ii 9); at Plataea, 8,ooo. In Thuc. ii 13 \$ 2, Pericles estimates the number of hoplites at 13,000 fit for service in the field, and r6,000 (of the oldest and the youngest of the citizens) as fit to serve on garrison duty and to man the walls. In Thuc. ii 3 I § 2 , the Athenians march into Megara with a force of not less than ro,000 hoplites who were citizens, and not less than 3,000 who were $\mu$ ह́тouko. Acharnae (the largest of the demes) could put into the field 3,000 hoplites. Possibly these numbers are exceptionally large and represent the maximum number of hoplites available on an emergency; but the number in the text professes to be that of the hoplites on the outbreak of war. The armament for the Sicilian expedition included not less than 4,000 hoplites (Thuc. vi 31, 2). In Thuc. vii 20 the hoplites $\bar{\epsilon} \kappa$ ката入буои number $\mathrm{x}, 200$.

It seems certain that these 2,500 hoplites (as partly implied in $\pi \rho d s$ coúrocs) are in addition to such of the citizens who were available in time of war. Most of
these have already been enumerated under previous headings. Thus, if we add to the 2,500 hoplites the 6,000 dicasts and the 500 members of the $\beta$ ou $\lambda \eta$, we obtain a total of 9,000 , the exact number of Athenians who (according to Pausanias) fought at Marathon. Again, if we further add the 700 home officials, we get a total of 9,700 , only 300 less than the 10,000 Athenian hoplites who marched into Megara early in the Peloponnesian war.

Blass understands by oj $\pi \lambda i \tau a l ~ q u i ~ c o n-~$ tinuo in praesidiis erant.
$\nu \eta \eta^{\ell s}-\phi p o v p[8 \epsilon s]$ 'guard-ships.' In Thuc. iv $13 \$ 2$ the Athenian fleet at Pylos includes $\tau \hat{\omega} \nu \phi \rho o u \rho l \delta \omega \nu \tau \tau \nu \dot{e} s \tau \hat{\omega} \nu \hat{k} \kappa$ Navтdктоv: the ships from Zacynthus are 50 in all ; of these 35 were already at that island in c. 5 , and 4 ships came from Chios, leaving eleven as the number of guard-ships from Naupactus, which had been an Athenian naval station ever since its capture in 455 B.C. (Thuc. i 103). The only other passages in which 'guardships' are mentioned are Xen. Hell. i 3, 17, where they form part of the Spartan fleet in the Hellespont, vaûs at $\mathfrak{\eta} \sigma a \nu ~ t y ~ \tau \hat{\psi}$
 and cia iv $22 a$, at Miletus, [áno] $\sigma \tau \epsilon \lambda$ ád $^{2}-$ $\tau \omega \nu$ [ $\delta \dot{\delta} \sigma]$ ф $\rho o u \rho \ell \delta \epsilon$. Cf. Wilamowitz, Aus Kydathen, p. 73 f.

The Athenian triremes were generally manned by about 200 each (Boeckb II xxii p. 376 Lamb; Gilbert, i 310 ).

Tous-dyougar] $\phi$ boous raises a serious difficulty. It has hitherto been supposed that the 'tributaries' of Athens paid in the money themselves to the Council (Boeckh ${ }^{11}$ vii, p. 177 Lewis; Gilbert, i 398). Pollux (viii 114) inaccurately says that the $\dot{e} \lambda \lambda \eta \nu 0 \tau a \mu l a c$ collected the tribute, but this duty (when necessary) was (after 446 ?) performed by the ėк入oyєis. It was only the collection of arrears or fines that was enforced by means of $\boldsymbol{\nu} \hat{\eta} e s \dot{\alpha} \rho \gamma \nu \rho 0 \lambda \delta \gamma o$ (Thuc. iii 19; iv 50,75 ) under the command of one or more $\sigma \tau \rho a \tau \eta$ yol (Gilbert, i 398, and Beiträge, p. 67). Further, unless we suppose a lacuna, $\tau o \neq s$ ävojoas cannot be construed. Hence the suggestion фpoupoús, which follows naturally

 $\sigma \iota s{ }^{\eta} \nu$.




 $\tau \eta \sigma t s \mathrm{H}-\mathrm{L}$.

XXV 1 € $\boldsymbol{C I N}$ (K-w).
Testimonia. XXV 4 Heraclidis epitoma (Rose, Frag. 6it): 'Eфıá $\lambda \tau \eta s$.
after $\phi \rho o u p i \delta \epsilon s$ and enables us to take тous adofas in apposition with it. In addition to the guard-ships stationed at places like Naupactus, there would be transports to take the $\phi$ poupol to the places where they were to be stationed. These $\phi \rho o v-$ pol were appointed by lot by the demes. Even when changes were made in other appointments, the $\beta$ ouneutal and the $\phi \rho o v-$ poi still continued to be thus appointed (c. 628 1).

трutaveiov] i.e, the persons maintained in the prytaneum, e.g. citizens who had done good service and were entertained at the public expense, either on a special occasion or for life. Among the latter were victors in the panhellenic games, distinguished generals or statesmen, and the representatives of Harmodius and Aristogeiton. The archons and other officials are not included in this list, as they have already been included in the $\dot{d} \rho \chi a l$ 解 $p$ $\delta \eta \mu 06$; and besides, in historic times, the archons probably dined in the Thesmothesion and the prytanes and certain other officials in the Tholos (see Dict. Ant. s.v.). Cf. Hermann, Staatsalt. § 127,17 f.
ópфavoi] The sons of citizens who had fallen in war were maintained during their minority at the public expense. The regular phrase for this was $\delta \eta \mu 0 \sigma l a \tau \rho \in$ -





 The institution is said to have gone back as far as the time of Solon (Diog. Laert. i. 54). Cf. Schulthess, Vormundschaft, pp. 13-26. ' $\quad \rho \phi$ avol are mentioned in an inscr. said to be not later than 460 в.c. (Dittenberger, no. 384, 1. 120), but the latter part is much mutilated' (Wyse).

סєб $\mu \omega \tau \omega ิ v$ фídakes] The Eleven had the management of the prison and had under them subordinates, such as jailers, executioners and torturers; but as these were $\delta \eta \mu \dot{\sigma} \omega t$, or public slaves, the reference may possibly be to the Eleven themselves, who are called $\delta \in \sigma \mu \circ \phi u ́ \lambda a \kappa \epsilon s$ in the Schol. on Dem. Androt. § 26, Timocr. § 210, and on Aristoph. Plut. 1108 where the term is corrupted to $\theta \in \sigma \mu 0 \phi 00 a \kappa \epsilon s$.
8ıofkクणьs] lit. 'administration.' Pol.
 $\delta \iota o \kappa र \dot{\eta} \sigma \epsilon \omega \mathrm{~s}$, and $133 \mathrm{I} \quad b 9, \pi \epsilon \rho l$ रpaфàs
 iv (vii) 10 , $1330 a 7$ (it is not easy for all the citizens to pay their share in the
 The word is often used in the Politics, of management or administration. The primary meaning is 'to keep house,' as in Plato Meno gi a, tás $\tau \in$ otklas kal tàs
 keeping' in Dem. Steph. 45 § 32, Tभ̂s $\kappa \alpha \theta^{\dagger} \dot{\eta} \mu \epsilon \rho a \nu \delta \delta o \kappa \hat{\eta} \sigma \epsilon \omega \mathrm{~s}$. In the text it includes maintenance ( $\sigma / \tau \eta \sigma t s$ ) and payment of money.

## XXV. Ephialtes.

 From $478 / 7$ b.c., the date of the Confederacy of Delos ( 23 § 5), in the first year after the Persian wars, to $462 / 1$, the archonship of Conon.
 c. $23 \S \mathrm{I}$, and Politics there quoted.


 name is given ( $\Sigma_{0} \phi_{-}$) in Aelian Var. Hist. ii 43 ; iii 17 ; xi 9 ( $\pi \epsilon \nu \epsilon \sigma \tau a \tau o s ~ \hat{\eta} \nu)$. The last of these passages illustrates $\dot{\alpha} \delta \omega \mathrm{posi}$ к $\eta$ ros. He declined an offer of 10 talents from his friends, saying: $\tau a \hat{u} \tau \dot{\alpha} \mu \epsilon \dot{\alpha} \nu a \gamma-$



#     

 $\mathrm{K}-\mathrm{W}, \mathrm{K}^{3}, \mathrm{~B} ; \pi a \rho \epsilon \mathrm{\lambda} \epsilon \tau 0 \mathrm{H}-\mathrm{L}$.
 Cim. ıo. On Ephialtes, see Duncker, G. d. A. viii; Holm, Gr. Gesch. ii ${ }^{7} 76$ -7.
 phrase reminds us of the Politics; v 9 § I ,

 (Class. Rev. v 160 a). Aelian Var. Hist.






 had made himself feared by his opposition to Cimon in particular; Cimon's party was in a minority, as may be inferred from his being ostracised, probably in the spring of 462 (Busolt, i 454 n ).-Cf. Oncken, Staatslehre, pp. 492-505, ${ }^{\text {'Ephi- }}$ altes und die Gerichtsreform.'
 Hitherto the date of this attack on the Areopagus has not been accurately known. It has sometimes been assigned to B.C. 460 (Diodorus xi 77 , followed e.g. in Peter's Zeittafeln) or about 458 (e.g. in Smith, Dict. Ant. s. v. Areopagus). Cf. Philippi, Areop. p. 256-9.

 27 § 1.

On the overthrow of the Areopagus by Ephialtes, cf. Pol. ii 12, 1274 a 7 , kal
 $\dot{\epsilon} \kappa$ к $\lambda о \nu \sigma \epsilon$ каі Пєрьклйs (каl П. bracketed by Sauppe). It was not until a later date that Pericles deprived the Areopagus of some of its remaining privileges, c. 27 \& I . The text implies that he was not the leader of the present attack. Philochorus (fhg i $40 \%$ ), ' ' $\boldsymbol{\phi}$. $\mu$ о́va катє $\lambda \iota \pi \epsilon$
 ош́ $\mu a \tau o s$. Theopompus is supposed to be the authority followed on this point by Plutarch: Pericles 7 (Eph.) каг' $\lambda \nu \sigma \epsilon \tau \grave{\partial}$



and ib. 9 (of the Areop.) $\ddot{\omega} \sigma \tau \epsilon \tau \dot{\eta} \nu \mu \dot{\epsilon} \nu$















 Philippi, Der Areopag, pp. 256-271; Busolt, ii 460 .

In the Eumenides (681-706) we have a well-known defence of the jurisdiction of the Areopagus in matters of homicide, the main point which was left untoucbed by the reforms of Ephialtes. The date of the play is fixed by the hypothesis to the Agamemnon as the archonship of Philocles, Ol. 80, $2=$ 459/8; and the list of pîkaц Dıovvatakal found on the Acropolis in 1886 describes Aeschylus as exhibiting in that year, i.e. in March, $45^{8}$ : 'E $\phi$. 'A $\rho \chi$. 1886, p. ${ }^{209,}$ quoted in Haigh's Attic Theatre, p. 322,

 It was held by Meier, Boeckh and K. O. Müller that even the cognisance of cases of homicide was taken away from the Areopagus by Ephialtes and not restored until after the expulsion of the Thirty. Miiller (Dissertation on Eum. § 36) went so far as to affirm that the motion of Ephialtes was carried after the representation of the Eumenides, whereas Diodorus places it two years earlier (460) and the text four years earlier.' The fact that they retained their jurisdiction in cases of homicide is clearly stated by Philochorus (l.c.) and has been conclusively proved by Forchhammer ( 1828 ). The very privilege that the reformers left untouched is prominently brought forward by the poet.

#  



$11 \epsilon \Pi \rho d \cdot \epsilon$ ？，$\notin \pi \rho a \xi \epsilon \mathrm{~B}, \ell_{\pi} \boldsymbol{\varepsilon} \rho a \tau \tau \epsilon \mathrm{~K}$ etc．
11 ＊Isacr．Areopagitici argumentum（ed．Benseler，p．Iviii ；Schol．in Aeschin．etc．






 катє̇лvбav aúroús．

Cf．Philippi，Areop．pp．264，290，and Grote，c． 46 （iv I 12 n ）．
 leges＇include almost everything except the ancient prerogatives of the Areopagus in connexion with trials for homicide． The legend of Orestes and the history of the first Messenian war（b．c．743）alike imply that it had jurisdiction in such cases＇from of old，＇Pausan．iv $5 \AA 2$ dikas
 Meier and Schömann，Att．Process，ed． Lipsius，p． 11.

Harpocr．s．v．émıṫtous èopтás defines them as $\tau$ às $\mu$ ì $\pi a \tau p l o u s$（cf．c． $3,16-18$ ），


 тоєє Avolas кт入（cf．Philippi，Areop．157）． The reference to Lysias shews that the $\epsilon_{\pi} l \theta \epsilon \tau a$ meant by Harpocr．are after the time of the Thirty and are not the same as those meant in the text．

фu入akí］c． 4 § 4 фú入a ，and 8 § 4， غ̇тlбкотоs．Schömann＇s Ant．pp． 332 and 493，E．T．Among the privileges now taken away from the Areopagus would be the general superintendence of educa－ tion and of public morals，e．g．the en－ forcing of the ancient $\nu \delta \mu o s$ daplas． Grote，c．46，iv 112 ；Schömann，p．498； Philippi，Areop．pp．162－170，268－272．
 enses quibusdam temporibus sublato Areopago nihil nisi populi scitis ac decre－ tis agebant．＇
roîs $\delta$ цкartnpiors］Thus，the jurisdic－ tion in cases of $\boldsymbol{\alpha} \sigma \epsilon \beta_{\varepsilon \epsilon \alpha}$ seems in general to have been transferred to the law－ courts；but certain forms of $\dot{\alpha} \sigma \in \beta \epsilon a$ con－ tinued to be tried by the Areopagus，esp． the offence of doing damage to the sacred olive－trees（Lys．Or．7）．Schömann，p． 498．On the general question，cf．Phi－ lippi，Areop．pp．272－289．
 ovs］Hitherto，the attack on the Areopagus has been generally attributed to Ephialtes and Pericles（Pol． $1274 a_{7}$ ）；the present passage assigns a prominent part to．The－ mistocles．The only other authority for associating Themistocles with Ephialtes on this occasion is to be found in the argument to the Areopagiticus of Isocrates （see Testimonia），probably due to a Chris－ tian writer in the sixth century（Rose， A．P．，p．423）．Duncker，G．d．A．viii 258－260，discusses the account just men－ tioned．He attributes the attack on the part of Themistocles to a change of policy in the Areopagus due to its now containing a large number of ex－archons who had been merely appointed by lot and not by open election．

The text implies that Themistocles was still at Athens in 462 b．c．，whereas，ac－ cording to the current view，he was ostracised in 47 I b．c．（Diod．xi 54 ）and fled to Persia about 466 b．c．In his flight he passed through the Athenian fleet which was besieging Naxos（Thuc． i 137 § 2，and Plut．Them． 25 § 1）．The reduction of Naxos took place before the battles at the Eurymedon（Thuc．i 100 § I），which are assigned to 466 ．Xerxes died in 465 and，according to Thuc．i 137 § 3，Themistocles on his arrival at the Persian court found Artaxerxes $\boldsymbol{\nu \epsilon \omega \sigma \pi i}$
 of Lampsacus，one of the Xoyoypapo prior to Herodotus，is quoted by Plutarch， Them． 27 § I ，as making Themistocles reach the conrt after the death of Xerxes． The authorities there quoted，as making him arrive before the king＇s death，are Ephorus，Deinon，Cleitarchus and Hera－ cleides；but the account of Thuc．is accepted as＇agreeing better with the dates，althongh these again have not been firmly settled beyond dispute．＇

If the narrative in the text is accepted, Themistocles was at Athens in 462, awaiting his trial on the charge of Medism. This must be the first accusation, prior to his ostracism, and on this charge (according to Diod. xi 54) he was acquitted (Grote, c. 44, iv 36, 37). The second accusation, which is the only one mentioned by Thuc. (i 135 § I), and Plut. (Them. 23), was not brought forward until after his banishment. We should then be compelled to place his ostracism not earlier than 46 I , and his flight to Persia about 460 , when Artaxerxes had been on the throne for about five years. To reconcile this with $\nu \epsilon \omega \sigma \pi l$ in Thuc., Mr Kenyon suggests that 'the fifth year of a king who ruled for forty might well be spoken of as in the beginning of his reign.' But the incident connected with the siege of Naxos makes it impossible to make the narrative in the text agree with the account in Thuc. Mr Kenyon proposes two alternatives: either ( I ), the story of the flight of Them. should be connected with some operations about 460 B.c. and not with the siege of Naxos; or (2), there were two inconsistent accounts of the latter years of Them., that adopted by Thuc. and that in the present text. We can hardly hesitate in choosing the second alternative, and in following the authority of Thucydides. Cf. Abbott, Hist. Gr. ii $386-8$.

The chronology of this period has been investigated anew by Bauer, who implicitly accepts the statement in the text, and accordingly alters the date of the siege of Naxos. His dates as compared with those of Clinton are as follows:

|  | Clinton | Bauer |
| :--- | ---: | :--- |
| Siege of Naxos | 466 | 460 (spring) |
| battle of Eurymedon | (") | (autumn) |
| revolt of Thasos | 465 | 459 (spring) |
| third Messenian war | 464 | (summer?) |
| defeat at Drabescus | 465 | ", (autumn) |
| Thasos subdued by Cimon | 463 | 457 (spring) |
| expedition to Egypt | 460 | 456 (spring) |
| ostracism of Cimon | 46 r | 455 (spring) |
| recall of Cimon | 456 | 452 (winter |
| end of Egyptian war | 455 | 450 (spring) |
| death of Cimon | 449 | $44^{8}$ |

These dates involve setting aside the text of Thuc. iv ioz in two points: in § I we are told that the defeat at Drabescus was 32 years after the failure of Aristagoras to establish himself on the Strymon, and (ib. §2) 28 years before the founding of Amphipolis (in 437 B.c.), Schol. Aeschines ii 3 I . It is more in accordance with the narrative in Hdt. v 126 to place the failure of Aristagoras
in b.c. 497 than in 491. Again, the alliance with Argos is placed late in 457 , whereas the Eumenides of Aeschylns, which contains a clear reference to this alliance (1. 290, 757-766), was performed in March, 458, more than a year earlier (Athenaeum, 1891, p. 317). See also Mr E. M. Walker in Class. Rev. vi 95-99.

It is remarkable that in Plutarch's Life of Themistocles not a word is said as to his having taken any part in the attack on the Areopagus. In this connexion Plutarch mentions Ephialtes and Pericles alone (note on § $2, \pi \epsilon \rho(\epsilon \mid \lambda \epsilon \tau 0)$. We must infer either ( I ), that Plutarch had no firsthand acquaintance with this treatise; or (2), that he carelessly omitted to notice this narrative ; or (3), that he had no such narrative in his copy.

Against ( I ) we may set the fact that in io § 3 Plutarch quotes Aristotle as his authority for a statement found in c. 23 § I, and also for the murder of Ephialtes mentioned at the end of this very chapter. Bnt this makes Plutarch's silence on Themistocles all the more singular. (Cf. Abbott, Hist. Gr. ii 5 I8.)
Against (2) it may be remarked that the story would have admirably illustrated the duplicity of Themistocles, and as such would naturally have been welcomed by the biographer. Mr Kenyon suggests that the omission 'can hardly be explained except on the theory that in actually writing his lives he used the notes and extracts he had previously made without having the complete work before him'; but this puts the difficulty only one stage further back, and compels ns to ask how Plutarch came to omit to make any note of this narrative. He accepts the statement in Thucydides that Themistocles reached the Persian court after the death of Xerxes as in better agreement with the dates. This implies that the biographer had paid some attention to the chronology of the time. It seems possible therefore that he rejected the narrative on theground that it did not fit in with the date of the siege of Naxos, which Plutarch, following Thucydides, mentions in connexion with the flight of Themistocles. But even supposing he deliberately rejected the narrative, it is strange that he says nothing about it. His treatment of his authorities is, however, by no means systematic and uniform. In his Life of Themistocles, he quotes no less than 30 different authorities of very various degrees of importance. Even Thucydides does not command his






 $\rho \epsilon \theta \in \nu \tau a s$ н-L, coll. Thuc. iv 38 ; $\epsilon \xi$ - Poland. OY: ol H-L.
undivided allegiance. With regard to the adventures of Themistocles in Asia, while respecting the chronology of Thucydides, Plutarch disdains to reproduce the historian's account of those adventures, following by preference the untrustworthy romance of Phanias of Eresos (Holden's Introd. §§ 17, 22). Such a fact detracts considerably from his authority as a judicious critic of the materials which he had before him.

As to (3), Prof. Tyrrell in the Quarterly Reviere, $189 \mathrm{r}, \mathrm{p}$. 344, infers from the silence of Plutarch that he 'never read the work before us. But he had certainly read some other treatise ascribed to Aristotle on the Athenian Constitution; therefore there must have been other editions of the Athenian Constitution circulating under the name of Aristotle.' Yet both the passages, which Plutarch in his Themistocles quotes as from this treatise, are to be found in the edition which we possess. Prof. Tyrrell regards the description of this attack on the Areopagus as 'very bald and feeble.' Such a consideration might point to its not being by the same hand as the main bulk of the treatise; and suggest that, without our assuming that it was absent in Plutarch's copy, it might on this ground alone be regarded as an interpolation. But the style of the narrative does not appear to me to differ materially from that of the context, and I should therefore prefer to attribute it to the same author as the rest of the treatise. But, while the narrative may be genuine, we can hardly regard it as authentic. The celebrated story of the proposal of Themistocles to burn the Hellenic fleet at Pagasae is described by Grote (v 27, note 2 ) as 'probably the invention of some Greek of the Platonic age'; and the present narrative has probably no earlier origin.
 position to the fact that he had been archon in $482 / 1$; see note on c. $22 \$ 7$.
ovvapadigev] The object of Themisto-
cles perhaps was to inveigle the Areopagus into exposing itself to a charge of attempting to 'pounce upon' an influential citizen. It was one of the things remembered against the Thirty that they ' pounced on' citizens in this way, Lys. 12 § 96 (Newman).
 retained, means not 'the persons despatched hy the Areopagus,' but 'members of the Council of the Areopagus selected and set apart for the purpose.' Hist. An. 6, 22, 576 b 23 , 山̈pa $\boldsymbol{\delta}^{\prime}$ оúк
 Rev. v r64a). áфaцpế $\theta a \iota$, however, is very rarely used in this sense.
'In Lys. 13 § 23 the Codex Palatinus
 Reiske's correction ol al $\rho \in \theta \in \nu \tau \epsilon s$ has been generally accepted; Weidner, however, proposes ol $\delta \epsilon \kappa \alpha \alpha a l \rho \in \theta \in \varphi \tau \epsilon s^{\prime}$ (Wyse).
ov $\delta$ iépi $\beta$ кv] usually understood as 'the house of Ephialtes. In c. 16 we have $\hat{\epsilon} \nu \tau \hat{\psi}$ ä $\sigma \tau \epsilon \iota \quad \delta \iota a \tau \rho \stackrel{\beta}{\beta} \omega \sigma \nu \nu$. It need not imply anything so definite as a 'house': it may refer to any public place, such as the precincts of a temple. Ephialtes, on receiving the hint that the Council was intending to arrest him, may well have taken the precaution of being not only in the company of his friends but also within reach of sanctuary in the neighbourhood of a $\beta \omega \mu$.
 as places of refuge, cf. Eur. Ion, 1257-

 tunic only,' instead of the $l \mu$ ácop as well. Such a guise would be appropriate to his position as a suppliant. The word is formed on the analogy of $\mu 0 \nu 6 \pi \epsilon \pi \lambda_{0}$ 'wearing but one robe,' 'wearing the tunic only,' Eur. Hec. $933=$ a $\pi \pi \epsilon \pi \lambda o s$, ' without the upper garment'; Pind. N. i 74. But, hitherto, it has not been found earlier than Polybius (fragm. xiv 1r, 2). It was also quoted from Pythaenetus, $a p$. At hen.
 ${ }_{\eta} \nu$. tòv $\beta_{\left.\omega \mu \rho^{\circ} v\right]}$ The article is

є่ $\pi \grave{\imath}$ тò̀ $\beta \omega \mu o ́ v . ~ Ө a \nu \mu a \sigma a ́ \nu \tau \omega \nu ~ \delta \grave{e ̀ ~ \pi a ́ \nu \tau \omega \nu ~ \tau o ̀ ~ \gamma є \gamma o \nu[o ̀ s] ~ \kappa a i ̀ ~ \mu \epsilon \tau a ̀ ~}$











 J B Mayor, Blass, ( $\mathrm{H}-\mathrm{L}$ ).

 idem mavult Herwerden qui dд $\nu$ оú $\sigma \tau \epsilon \rho о \nu$ coniecerat; 'fort. $\nu \omega \theta \rho \delta \nu$ ' в; $\nu \omega \theta \dot{\epsilon} \sigma \tau \epsilon \rho о \nu$ vel





Testimonia. XXV 23, 24 * Plut. Per. 10 (infra exscriptum).
peculiar. If the 'house' of Eph. is meant, it implies 'the family altar.' Otherwise, some notable altar may be intended, such as the 'altar of the twelve gods' (so Milchhöfer in Curtius, Stadtgeschichte, p. cxxi), or that of Zè̀s à $\gamma$ opaîos. The latter was near the $\sigma$ rod $\beta a \sigma i \lambda \epsilon l o s$ where meetings of the Areopagus were sometimes held (Dem. 25 § 23). Cf. Lys.



т $\omega \hat{\nu}$ тevтакоб $[\omega \nu]$ added to contrast the $\beta o u \lambda \eta$ of the Five Hundred with that of the Areopagus mentioned in the context.


 $\dot{\omega}^{\prime}{ }^{\prime} A \rho / \sigma \tau 0 \tau \epsilon \lambda \eta s$ el $\rho \eta \kappa \in \nu$. In the same chapter Plutarch quotes and rejects the





 $\tau 00$ ßlov $\tau \epsilon \lambda \epsilon u \tau \eta \nu . \quad$ [Plat.] Axioch. 368 D ,



## XXVI. Cimon.

§ i. dvleafat-modirtlav] The metaphorical use of $\dot{d} \nu / \epsilon \sigma \theta a t$ is common in

Ar. e.g. Rhet. i 4, 1360 a 24, тo入ıteíal
 (with Cope's note), Pol. v 1, I zoı ${ }^{17}$,

 каl цалакаl (opp. to $\sigma v \nu \tau о \nu$ ف́тєраи), iv (vii)
 $\pi \lambda \hat{\eta} \theta$ os. The origin of the metaphor (from the strings of a musical instrument) may be seen in Pul. v (viii) $7,134^{2}$ 22,

For the facts, cf. Plut. Cimon 15 , is









 to which Plutarch refers is later than Cimon's subjugation of Thasos ( 463 Clinton; 457 Bauer). He is following those who place the beginning of the influence of Pericles at an earlier date than that assumed in the present treatise.


$\boldsymbol{v} \epsilon \boldsymbol{\omega} \tau \in \rho \circ \mathrm{V}]$ possibly means 'rather young'
 é $\phi \theta a ́ \rho \theta a \iota ~ \tau o u ̀ s ~ \pi o \lambda \lambda o ̀ ̀ \varsigma ~ \kappa a \tau a ̀ ~ \pi o ́ \lambda \epsilon \mu о \nu . ~ \tau \eta ̂ ऽ ~ \gamma a ̀ \rho ~ \sigma \tau \rho a \tau \epsilon i ́ a s ~ \gamma \iota \gamma \nu o-~$





$$
7 \text { ГIN (k-w). } \quad 10 \text { alel ( } k, \mathrm{k} \text {-w). }
$$

to be the leader of a great political party. But, as Cimon had fought at Salamis i8 years before (Plut. Cim. 5), be could hardly have been less than 36 in B.C. $4^{62}$; and was probably more than $4^{0}$, if we place his birth in $50_{4}$ (the date given on p. 39 of Ekker's ed. of Plut. Cim.). His birth should probably be placed earlier, as he was $\sigma \tau \rho a \tau \eta \gamma o \mathrm{~s}$ (and therefore over 30) at Eion in 476 (Thuc. i 98). Again, Pericles, who was probably born in B.C. 493, is described as a young man ( $\nu$ tos $\omega \boldsymbol{\omega}, 27$ § I), when he made his reputation by accusing Cimon, presumably after the expedition to Thasos, 463 . How then can Cimon, who was obviously older than Pericles, and who had won the battle of Eurymedon three years before, be described as 'rather young' shortly after b.c. 462 ? $\nu \in \omega \dot{d} \tau \in \rho \nu$ has therefore been generally regarded as corrupt, and various emendations have been suggested, expressive of Cimon's inadequacy for the position of a political leader. The fact that his intellectual development was somewhat tardy is implied in the story preserved by Aristides, ii 203 Dind., according to which his guardians did not allow him to manage his own property until some time after he had come of age ( $\left.\mu \varepsilon \chi \rho \iota \pi \delta \rho \rho \omega \tau \hat{\eta} s{ }_{j} \hat{\eta} \lambda \kappa l a s\right)$, while in Plut. Cim. 4 he is said to have resembled his father in evi $\dot{\theta} \theta \epsilon \mathrm{a}$. (Cf. Wyse in Class. Rev. v 274 b.) The combination of $\nu \epsilon \omega \dot{\epsilon} \tau \rho \rho \nu$ and $0 \psi \dot{\varepsilon} \pi \rho \circ \sigma \epsilon \lambda \theta 6 \nu \tau \alpha$ is in itself open to suspicion.
$\nu \omega \theta \rho \dot{\sigma} \epsilon \rho \rho \frac{\nu}{}$ (which has been suggested) is found in Ameipsias, frag. Ј6, Pollux ix 138 ; cf. the description of Chares in Theopompus, frag. 288, $\nu \omega \theta \rho 0 \hat{v} \tau^{\prime}$ д̈ $\nu \tau 0 s$ кal $\beta$ padèos. See also Schol. to Aristides in iii $515,8-10$ and ${ }_{517}$, 28-30 Dind.
$\nu \epsilon \dot{\sigma} \tau \epsilon \rho \frac{\nu}{}$ is, however, retained by Bauer (p. Ior), who suggests that, under the influence of the Areopagus, the leaders of the political parties had generally been elderly men. Mr E. M. Walker (Class. Rev. vi 98 ) holds that the epithet is consistent with c. 25 which implies that Themistocles was at Athens in 462 : 'it
is only when we recognise that the author ...put the battle of Eurymedon some eight years too late, and that the interval between Tanagra and the five years' truce found no place in his historical retrospect, that we can understand how he came to apply to Cimon in the year $46_{2}$ those much discussed words $\nu \in \dot{\omega} \tau \epsilon \rho \circ \nu$, óv $\tau \alpha$ каl

 'having been rather late in entering on public life.' I am not aware of any exact parallel to this phrase; but we have some-


ék ката入óyou] 'from the roll of hoplites,' as contrasted with the mercenary troops that came into vogue at a later date.

тarpıкds] here 'ancestral.' See c. 28 § 5 ;
 De Pace $\$ 87$ (of the losses sustained by Athens in her pursuit of supremacy at






 B.c. the Athenians were defeated by the Corinthians at Halieis ( $45^{8}$; Thuc. i ro5, 1 ), and by the Lacedaemonians at Tanagra ( 457 ; ib. 108, I). The operations in Egypt, which had been begun in $4^{60}$, came to an unsuccessful conclusion in 455 (ib. 1 10, 1). On the other hand, they were victorious over the Peloponnesians on the sea at Kekryphaleia, and over the Aeginetans in a naval engagement in 458 (Thuc. i 105, 1-2). During the absence of the main body of the Athenian soldiers in Egypt and Aegina, Myronides defeated the Corinthians in the territory of Megara ( 458 , i 105, 4). In 456 the Atherians defeated the Boeotians at Oenophyta, and in the same year Aegina yielded to Athens.

 aï $\rho \in \sigma \iota \nu$ oủк є̇кì






 $\pi о \lambda \iota \tau \omega ิ \nu, \Pi \epsilon \rho \iota \kappa \lambda \epsilon ́ o v s ~ \epsilon i \pi o ́ \nu \tau о \varsigma$, єै $\gamma \nu \omega \sigma a \nu \mu \eta े \mu \epsilon \tau \epsilon ́ \chi \epsilon \iota \nu \tau \eta ̂ \varsigma \pi o ́ \lambda \epsilon \omega \varsigma$ ôs


12 oủx quondam delebat Wyse. $\quad 14 \dot{d} \lambda \lambda^{\prime} \hat{\eta}$ Blass ( $\mathrm{H}-\mathrm{L}$ ). $\quad 18$ iè add. k (edd.). post $\pi a \rho \epsilon \omega \rho \hat{\alpha} \tau 0$ deletum $\dot{\nu} \pi \grave{\partial} \tau \hat{\omega} \nu \quad \delta \hat{\eta} \mu \omega \nu$ retinent h-L. 21 м $\in T \Delta Y$ -

 main change was the reduction of the power of the Areopagus. But while, in this and other respects, Athens departed from her previous constitutional arrangements, she retained the limitations under which the archons were appointed from among the first and second classes of citizens. It was not until 457 that the archonship was thrown open to members of the third class.

ектч عтек] It was in 462 b.c. that Ephialtes overthrew the Areopagus; and 457 is the date of the change in the archonship immediately before the archonship of Mnesitheides. The latter event is 5 years (or in the sixth year) after the former. The change in the archonship is here described as happening in the sixth year 'after the death of Ephialtes.' It follows (as observed by Mr Kenyon) that Ephialtes was put to death in the year in which he overthrew the Areopagus.
ék 乌evyเт $\hat{y}$ ] Originally the office of archon was open to members of the first class only (cf. c. 7 \& 3 and Plut. Arist. ז). In course of time it became open to the second class, possibly after the Persian wars, when, according to Plut. Arist. 22, the archonship was made accessible to 'all the Athenians,' on the motion of Aristides, who (after the battle at Plataea)

 alpeî $\theta a$. . Lastly, in 457 we here have the office open to the third class. It was
never legally open to the fourth class (c. 7 ad fin.). Cf. Abbott, Hist. Gr. ii 385-6.
$\pi \rho о к \rho[v \in \sigma \theta a t] 8$ § $1 ; 22$ § 5 .


 $\lambda \in u ́ s$, and $i b .24 \S 13, \tau i \mu \varepsilon \kappa \omega \lambda v ́ \epsilon \iota \kappa \lambda \eta \rho o \hat{v}-$ $\sigma \theta a \iota \tau \hat{\nu} \nu \epsilon \nu \nu \epsilon a \dot{a} \rho \chi \chi^{\delta \nu} \tau \omega \nu$;

тds ${ }^{6} \mathbf{y} \kappa v \kappa \lambda$ lovs] $s c . ~ d \rho \chi \chi s$, 'the ordinary (i.e. inferior) offices.' Pol. i 7, 12556



 $\pi 6 \lambda \varepsilon \mu 0 \nu$. The term had already been similarly used by Isocr. 3 § 22, $\boldsymbol{t} v$ roîs
 $\gamma \iota \gamma \nu \quad \mu \dot{́} \nu o t s$, and de Pace 87. Inf. c. 43, 1. 3 .
 laws were strictly observed'; in other words, the members of the third class were, strictly speaking, eligible for the ordinary offices alone; but occasionally by an oversight they were elected to the office of archon. Similarly, in later times even members of the fourth class became archons, although not legally qualified.
§3. Éri $\Lambda$ vortкр́́тous] в.С. 453/2.
oi трlaкоутa] 16 § 5 .

IIєрьк入є́ovs єіто́vтоs-үєүovш́s] Pol.










XXVII 2 прютоץ: $\pi \rho \grave{̀}$ то̂̀ Jackson, van Leeuwen; $\pi \rho \hat{\omega} \tau 0 \nu$ Blass, alii ( $K-w$,
 $\tau \rho \epsilon \psi \epsilon \mathrm{H}-\mathrm{L}$.

 Aelian Var. Hist. vi 10, xiii 24, frag. 68. Cf. Isaeus 8 § 19; 12 § 9 ; Aeschin. I § 39. Philippi, Bürgerrecht, p. 69 seq.

The text places this event early in the public career of Pericles: Plutarch places it later. It has been argued that no such law could have been proposed by Pericles (see Buermann, 7ahrb. f. cl. Phil. Suppl. Bd ix $62_{4-}, 1878$; Gilbert, Gr. St. i 179 ; Schenkl, Wiener Studien, ii 171 ; Duncker, Bericht d. Bèrl. Akad., 1883, p. 935; Busolt in Muiller's Handbuch Iv 1, 141). According to these, the 'law of Pericles' was really a revision of the list of citizens in $445 / 4$ (Athenaeum, 1891, 435 c). See also Westermann's Introduction to Dem. Eubulides.

## XXVII. Pericles.

 Plutarch, Cim. 14, states that Cimon was put on his trial on his return from the reduction of Thasos on the ground that he had been bribed not to follow up his success by an invasion of Macedonia: $\delta i \kappa \eta \nu$

 He also quotes from Cimon's contemporary, Stesimbrotus, the story of Cimon's sister Elpinice appealing to Pericles
 tatos) in favour of her brother. The result was that Pericles $\frac{*}{} \nu \boldsymbol{\gamma} \boldsymbol{\gamma} \boldsymbol{\tau} \hat{\eta} \delta i \kappa \eta \pi \rho a \dot{o}-$




 less than the rest of the prosecutors to damage the cause of Cimon. Cimon's expedition to Thasos has generally been placed in b.c. 465-3. The date suggested by Bauer for the revolt of Thasos is 459 , and for its reduction ( $\tau \rho i \tau \underset{\epsilon}{\text { E }} \boldsymbol{\tau} \tau \epsilon$, Thuc. i 101) 457 .

 Plutarch, Pericles 9 , describes Pericles as
attacking the Areopagus after he had instituted pay for the law courts at the instance of 'Damonides.' He also states that it was by the aid of Ephialtes that he deprived the Areopagus of the greatest part of its jurisdiction. In the text, which Plutarch professes to follow, by quoting Aristotle as his authority for 'Damonides,' the present attack on the Areopagus is placed before the account of the payment of the law courts; and Ephialtes is no longer alive (c. 25 § 4).
тapatpê $\sigma \theta a t$, in mid., is used of 'disfranchising persons' in Pol. iii $5,127^{8} a$


 (of the withdrawal of royal privileges on the part of the people), viii (v) 1o, 1311 i $b$ 6, $\gamma$ vpaîкa $\pi a \rho \epsilon \lambda \hat{\epsilon} \sigma \theta a l$, to seduce. In Hdt. ii rog, $\pi$. $\pi l \pi \tau^{2}$ os is used in the general sense of 'taking away from,' 'stealing away from.' In c. $15 \$ \$ 3,4$, and twice in 37 § 2 , it is applied to ot $\pi \lambda \alpha$.

тєриa $\rho \epsilon i \sigma \theta a u$ is similarly used of 'stripping off' and 'taking away,' e.g. Dem. p.



 $\nu a \mu \nu$ avirఫ̂s кal $\epsilon \xi$ ai $\rho \in \tau \omega \bar{\nu}$ к $\kappa \eta \rho \omega \tau о \dot{s}$ roteîp. Both words are equally defensible and the Ms reading may therefore be retained. We have $\pi є \rho \stackrel{a}{\rho} \rho \hat{\epsilon} \sigma \theta a \iota \tau \dot{\alpha} \dot{\epsilon} \pi i \theta \epsilon \tau \alpha$ in $25 \$ 2$, and $\tau \grave{\eta} \nu \delta \dot{\nu} \nu a \mu \nu$ in $25 \$ 4$; we also have $\pi \epsilon \rho t a \iota \rho \epsilon i \sigma \theta a l ~ \sigma \tau \epsilon \phi a v o \nu$ in c. 57 § 4.
vavtıкクั̀v Súvapıv] Pol. vii (vi) 7, $13{ }^{21}$

 (immediately after mention of the influence of the Areopagus), кal $\pi \dot{d} \lambda \boldsymbol{\nu} \dot{\dot{o}}$
 इa入apîva viкךs каl סid $\tau \alpha u ́ \tau \eta s$ ( $\tau \alpha u ́ \tau \eta \nu$

 $\tau \dot{\epsilon} \rho a \nu$ éroinoev. The inhabitants of the Peiraeus, consisting mainly of the $\nu a \nu \tau \operatorname{cod}$ $b \chi^{\lambda o s}$, were distinctively democratical.









.d.


 $-\kappa \lambda \eta \sigma \theta \epsilon l_{S} \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{W}, \mathrm{H}-\mathrm{L}, \mathrm{B}$.

10 стPגTIAIC.
Testimonia. 14-18 Heraclidis epitoma (Rose, Ar. Frag. 6ir, $5^{3}$ ): tovs ldolous
 (infra exscriptum).

Oapprígavtas] c. 22 and 24 § I.
§ 2. $\delta \in i v]$ c. 19 end.
 after $480 / 79$. Thuc. ii 2 , § 1 fixes the date of the beginning of the war as the Spring

èvé $\sigma \tau]$ ] $\sigma u \downarrow$ Ė $\sigma \tau \eta$ has been proposed, on
 instans, and $\sigma v \dot{\omega} \sigma \pi \eta$ to a bellum ortum.
 ovidels $\xi v \nu \dot{\epsilon} \sigma \tau \eta$. It is true that in Isocr. p. 82 в $\tau \dot{\delta} \nu \pi \delta \lambda \epsilon \mu 0 \nu \tau \dot{\partial} \nu \quad \epsilon \nu \sigma \tau \alpha \cup \tau \alpha \ldots \tau \hat{\eta}$ $\pi \delta \lambda \epsilon \epsilon$ refers to an imminent war, but it is equally true that in Dem. 255, io (cf. 274, 6) the beginning of a war is expressed by $\dot{0}$

 phrase is contrasted, in the Rhet. ad Alex. 3,1425 a $3^{6}$, with $\gamma i \gamma \nu \varepsilon \sigma \theta a \iota \quad \mu \in \lambda \lambda \omega \nu$.


 ข0ิ.

 $\phi \cup \lambda \alpha \sigma \sigma \epsilon L \nu, i b .14-17$.


 Aristides, ii 192 Dind. Boeckh, II xv ; Grote, c. 46, iv 103; Gilbert, Gr. St. i 325 .
 Miltiades, was (on the side of his mother, Hegesipyle) grandson of the Thracian king Olorus (Plut. Cim. 4). The fine of 50 talents inflicted on Miltiades was paid by Cimon.
 $\lambda \eta r o v \rho \gamma \mathrm{~d}$ are quoted as Attic forms by ancient grammarians (Ammonius 89 ; Moeris 202; Bekker's Anecd. 277, ol
 $\gamma \epsilon \hat{v})$; and the forms in $\lambda \eta$ - are found in inscriptions of the fourth century. In 386 B.c. we have [ $\lambda$ ] $7 \iota \tau o u p \gamma \iota \hat{\omega} \nu$, CIA ii add. $554 \quad 6 \mathrm{I} 4$; in the time of Demosthenes and Aristotle, $\tau \dot{\alpha}[s \quad z] \lambda \lambda a s{ }^{2} \lambda \eta-$

 4. Meisterhans, Grammatik d. Attischen Inschriften, ed. 1888, p. 29, note ${ }^{174}$ (Introd. to Dem. Lept. p. iii).
 Cime. го, $\tau \hat{\omega} \nu \tau \in \gamma \dot{\alpha} \rho$ á $\gamma \rho \hat{\omega} \nu$ то̀ेs $\phi \rho \alpha \gamma \mu$ òs













 $\tau \epsilon \kappa \alpha \theta^{\prime} \eta \mu \epsilon \rho \alpha \nu \tau \hat{\varphi} \delta \epsilon \rho \mu \epsilon \nu \varphi \pi a \rho \epsilon \chi \omega \nu{ }^{\prime} \mathrm{A} \theta \eta-$

 $\delta \pi \omega s$ ó $\pi \omega \rho l\} \omega \sigma t \nu$ ol $\beta$ ounó $\mu \in \nu 0$, , тoúcous $\dot{o}$
 $\pi \rho \delta_{s} \tau \dot{\eta} \nu \tau \hat{\omega} \nu \delta \eta \mu \sigma \sigma i \omega \nu \quad \delta<\alpha \nu \circ \mu \eta \nu$. The






 (Class. Rev. v 227), cf. Wilamowitz, Hermes xiv 320. Olñ $\theta \in \nu$ H-L, $\mathrm{K}^{3}$ (Meisterhans, 45 ${ }^{2}$ ); Ol $\eta \theta \in \nu$ K-w, B.

19 * Plut. Per. 9 (Ar. Frag. $365^{2}, 403^{3}$ ), infra exscriptum.
story of Cimon's generosity appears in an exaggerated form in Theopompus, Philippica x (FHG ii 293, ap. Athen. 533 A),







 'A $\theta \eta v a l \omega \nu$ elqóvivas $\delta \in \iota \pi \nu \epsilon i v$. This exaggerated account is recorded by Plutarch to be corrected on the authority of the present passage. Aristotle's pupil, Theophrastus, was no less careful in adhering to the truth, Cic. de Off. ii 64, 'Theophrastus scribit Cimonem Athenis etiam in suos curiales Laciadas hospitalem fuisse: ita enim instituisse et vilicis imperavisse, ut omnia praeberentur, quicumque Laciades in villam suam devertisset.' The excerpts ascribed to Heracleides tell the same story of Ephialtes:

 The text is apparently the authority followed by the Schol. on Aristides, iii 517

 $\tau \grave{\eta} \nu$ okklav $\dot{\alpha} \rho \iota \sigma \tau o \hat{\sigma} \sigma \nu \nu$ al $\rho \epsilon i \sigma \theta a l($ ? $)$, and $i b$. p. 446 1. 18. Cf. Nepos, Cimon 4 § 1.

The various forms which the story of the generosity of Cimon assumed have been examined in Mnemosyne, ix 58 .

иaкıа $\delta \hat{\omega} v]$ The $\delta \eta \mu \dot{t} \boldsymbol{\tau} a l$ of Cimon, Plut. Cim. 4. The deme itself was also called $\Lambda$ акıáda.

Td $\mu \dot{\epsilon} \boldsymbol{\tau} \rho \mathbf{a}]$ 'moderate provision,' Xen.

 $\tau$ 崝 $\sigma \tau \omega \nu$.
otaws $\left.{ }_{6} \xi \underline{j}\right]$ This implies that Cimon caused his fences to be pulled down in order to allow his fellow demesmen to enter his orchards. This constr. is sup-
ported by $\delta \pi \omega s \delta \pi \omega \rho l j \omega \nu \tau a u$ in Theopompus
 $\epsilon \xi \hat{\eta} \eta$ would be quite out of place here (Goodwin, Moods and Tenses, § $333^{2}$ ).
 pass. c. gen., 'to fall short of,' is found in [Plat.] Epinomis 978 A. $\epsilon \pi i \lambda e l \pi \epsilon \iota \nu$ is far more frequently used in act. in the sense of 'to fail.' In Ar. we have Eth. iv 3,
 $\dot{v} \pi \dot{p} \rho о y \tau a$, and there are several exx. of its intransitive use. ámodeє $\delta \boldsymbol{\beta} \epsilon \nu$ os does not appear to be supported by the usage of Aristotle, as shewn in the Index Aristotelicus. More probable than either is $\dot{\delta} \pi \mathbf{0} \lambda \epsilon \pi \delta \mu \epsilon \nu 0 s$. Cf. Pol. iv (vii) $16,1334 b$

 єLual, and i 5, 1254 b 35, el тобои̂тоу




$\Delta a \mu \omega v(\delta o v]$ Damonides is mentioned in Plut. Per. 9, $\tau \rho \epsilon \pi \epsilon \tau a l \pi \rho \delta s \tau \grave{\eta} \nu \tau \hat{\omega} \nu$

 collato Steph. Byz. s. w. ${ }^{\circ}$ Oa: $\Delta \eta \mu \omega v i \delta o u$



 фршу каі філоти́радעоs $\epsilon \xi \omega \sigma \tau \rho a \kappa l \sigma \theta \eta$, ib. 14, Nic. 6, and Arist. т. Plat. Alc. 1 r18 C, Lach. 180 D, Rep. $400 \mathrm{~B}, 424 \mathrm{C}$. Duncker, G. d. A., ix c. 8; Busolt, ii 443 ; Holm, ii 345, 17.
$\Delta d \mu \omega \nu$ and $\Delta a \mu \omega \nu i \delta \eta s$ appear to be two forms of name belonging to one person (cf. Duncker, Gesch. des Alt.ix p. 12, 11. 1). As other exx. of double names we have K $\lambda \epsilon a \nu \delta \rho l \delta \eta s$ and $\mathrm{K} \lambda \in a \nu \delta \rho o s$, Ф $\rho a \sigma \iota \kappa \lambda \epsilon \ell \delta \eta s$ and $\Phi_{\rho a \sigma \iota \kappa \lambda \hat{\eta} s, ~ E u ́ \beta o u \lambda i \delta \eta s}$ and Eiviounos,

 $\Theta \epsilon \sigma \pi l a ́ d \eta s$ and $\Theta \dot{e ́ \sigma t c o s ~(H e m s t e r h u y s ~ o n ~}$






$20 \pi 0 \lambda \lambda \omega N\left(\mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{w}, \mathrm{K}^{3}\right.$, в）：$\quad$ по $\lambda \epsilon \mathrm{M} \omega \mathrm{N}\left(\mathrm{K}^{1}\right), \pi 0 \lambda \iota \tau \iota \kappa \omega \hat{\nu}$ Wyse（ $\mathrm{H}-\mathrm{L}$ ）． $22 \delta_{\iota \kappa \alpha-}$ $\sigma \tau \eta p l o u s$ Blass，Richards（ $\mathrm{H}-\mathrm{L}$ ），propter $\chi \in 1 \mathrm{p} \omega$ in versu proximo positum．da＇ovi
 $\tau \dot{\alpha} \kappa a \tau \grave{\alpha} \tau \grave{\eta} \nu \pi 0 \lambda \iota \tau \epsilon l a \nu$, vel $\tau \eta \eta_{\nu} \pi \dot{\sigma} \lambda \iota \nu$ ，excidisse putant J B Mayor et Rutherford；$\tau \dot{\alpha}$





 какө̂s $\epsilon \sigma \tau \rho a \tau \eta \dot{\eta} \eta \sigma \in \nu$ ．Cf．Rose， $37 \mathrm{I}^{2}, 409^{3}$ ．

Lucian，Timonn，p．${ }^{157}$ ）， $\mathrm{K} a \lambda \lambda \iota \pi i \delta \eta s$ and



 and Eavol 189r，pp．385－394，${ }^{\text {＇Die Anwendung von }}$ Vollnamen und Kurznamen bei derselben Person＇）．Plutarch，Per． 4 init．，tells us that certain persons said that the first syllable of $\Delta \alpha \mu \omega \nu$ was pronounced short．

Mr Kenyon suggests that Plutarch con－ fused two persons，the musician Damon， son of Damonides of＂Oa，and the politician Damonides of $0 t \eta$ ，and transferred to the former some of the attributes of the latter． The demonymic of the former would be ＂Oa $\theta \in \nu$ ；of the latter， $0 t \hat{\eta} \theta \in \nu$ ．This has also been suggested by Gomperz，Deutsche Rundschau，May 189 r, p．232，and is pro－ bably the best solution of the discre－ pancy．
 Thuc．viii 48，тous кa入ous кà $\quad$ a $\theta$ ous－
 $\tau \hat{\oplus} \delta \dot{\eta} \mu \varphi . \quad$ Pol．ii 8， 1268 b 30 ，єl $\sigma \eta \gamma \epsilon і \sigma \theta a_{\iota}$ （advise，propose）$\nu \delta \mu \omega \nu \lambda \dot{\nu} \sigma \nu$, and $v i$（iv）
 and several times in［Ar．］Rhet．ad Alex．
 proposal．＇
 offer the people what was their own＇ －an easy piece of liberality．In epi－ grammatic point this phrase is somewhat of an exception to the ordinary style of the treatise and reminds one of Aristotle＇s manner；but the epigram is ascribed to Damon and the writer does not necessarily
claim it as his own．＇The dry way in which the sarcastic counsel of Damonides of Oea，the Abithophel of his time，is repeated is not unlike Aristotle＇（W．L． Newman，Class．Rev．v 159 b）．
x $\in$ \｛pous $\left.\gamma \in v \in v_{0} \theta \alpha,\right]$ The writer is possibly referring to Plato＇s Gorgias 515 E，，wauri


 $\sigma \tau \dot{\eta} \sigma a \nu \tau a$ ．Aristotle often refers to Plato in the Politics as $\tau \nu \nu \epsilon \mathrm{s}_{\text {，e．g．in }}$ iv（vii） 7 ， $5,1327 b 3^{8}$（W．L．Newman in Class． Rev．v 160 b）．
§ 5．Seкájetv］Lys． 29 § 12，$\delta \in \delta \epsilon \kappa а \sigma$－


 wis $\epsilon \delta \in \kappa \alpha$ S $\epsilon \tau 0$ ．Cf．note on Dem． $46 \$ 26$ ，
 Private Orations，ii 139 ，ed． 1886 ．Plut． Pericl． 9 § 3，$\sigma v \nu \delta \epsilon \kappa \alpha \sigma \alpha s ~ \tau 亠 幺 \pi \lambda \eta \theta o s$.
＇Ayútov］＇In 409 B．c．Pylos，which had remained an Athenian post since 425 ，was retaken by the Lacedaemonians．The Athenians had sent to its relief 30 triremes under Anytus，who however came back without even reaching the place．On his return he was put on his trial for having betrayed the trust confided to him． Diodorus xiii 64 ．Plut．Coriolanus $1_{4}$ ，


 He is mentioned in c． $34 \S 3$ as one of the leaders of the moderate section of the oligarchical party．He was afterwards notorious as one of the prosecutors of Socrates（Anyti reus）．
$\sigma \tau \rho a т \eta \gamma i ́ a \nu . ~ к \rho \iota \nu o ́ \mu \epsilon \nu o s ~ \gamma a ̀ \rho ~ i ́ v o ́ ~ \tau \iota \nu \omega \nu ~ \delta ı a ̀ ~ \tau o ̀ ~ a ̉ \pi o \beta a \lambda \epsilon i ̂ \nu ~ \Pi u ́ \lambda o \nu, ~$
















 Richards (H-L; B).

Testimonia. XXVIII 15-18 *Schol. in Luciani Timonem 30 (i p. 100 ed.


## XXVIII. The sutcessors of Perides.

 From about B.C. 450 (c. 28 § I) till his death in the summer of 429 . The writer's praise of the policy of Pericles is so briefly expressed, that it hardly arrests our attention. The text implies that the excellence of that policy was not absolute, but re-lative:- $\beta_{\epsilon} \boldsymbol{\lambda} \boldsymbol{\tau} i \omega$, as contrasted with that of his successors, which was $\chi$ el $\rho \omega$. The merits of Pericles are here recognised with far less generosity than in the pages of Thucydides. In the text, Pericles is the last leader of the popular party who, owing to his high birth, was acceptable even to his opponents: the decadence begins with his successor, Cleon, who had no such advantages.




 $\tau \hat{\omega} \nu \pi \alpha \dot{\alpha} \nu \lambda a \mu \pi \rho \hat{\omega} \nu \pi 0 \lambda \iota \tau \hat{\omega} \nu$.
 unofficial title, applied to the leader of the popular party. Cf. $2 \S 2$, and see Whibley's Political Parties, p. 5I.

either insert $\hat{\omega} \nu$ after $\epsilon \dot{\forall} \gamma \epsilon \nu \hat{\omega} y$, or understand the words to refer to Solon and Peisistratus, or remove them from the text. In any case Peisistratus, who is described as $\delta \eta \mu о \tau \iota \kappa \omega \dot{\tau} a \tau o s$ in I $3 \S 4$ and $\mathrm{I}_{4} \S \mathrm{I}$, is to be regarded as a $\pi \rho o \sigma \tau \alpha \dot{\alpha} \tau \eta s$
 $\epsilon \dot{\jmath} \gamma \epsilon \nu \hat{\omega} \nu \kappa a l \boldsymbol{\gamma} \omega \rho \rho!\mu \omega \nu$. Below, $\tau \hat{\omega} \nu \gamma \nu \omega$ $p l \mu \omega \nu$ is contrasted with $\tau 0 \hat{\delta} \delta \eta \mu o v$.
 v 69. Not found in Ar.
 leaders of the popular party, c. 23 § 3 -
©ouku $\delta(\bar{\eta}\rangle \mathrm{s}$ ]son of Melesias, of Alopeke, mentioned below ( $\$ 5$ ) with Nicias and Theramenes. He was ostracised in 444 B.c., and it has been considered worthy of note that the writer says nothing of this fact (Rhein. Mus. xlvi 455), but to mention it here would only impede the natural course of the narrative.
 here, and below, to avoid the too frequent repatition of $\tau \hat{\omega} \nu \gamma \nu \omega \rho / \mu \omega \nu, \tau \hat{\omega} \nu \in \dot{\jmath} \pi \delta \rho \omega \nu$, or $\tau \hat{\omega} \nu \epsilon \pi<\notin a \nu \omega \nu$.
§ 3. Nıкlas-тe入єutị́as] Thuc. vii 86 § I .

K $\left.\boldsymbol{\lambda}^{\prime} \omega \boldsymbol{\omega}\right]$ Gilbert, Beiträge, pp. 127146.





 hendum fortasse diavopaîs, coll. Plut. Arist. 24 (de demagogis post Periclem) tòv


 $20 \Delta I \omega$ Bodian.










16 Heraclidis epitoma, 611, 6, Клє́шע $\pi a \rho a \beta a \lambda \dot{\omega} \nu \delta є \epsilon ф \theta \varepsilon є \rho \varepsilon$ тò $\pi о \lambda \iota \tau \epsilon \nu \mu a$.
20-23 Locum de pecunia theorica ad iudicum mercedem male transtulerunt

raîs ippais] hardly 'his wild undertakings' (Kenyon), or even 'his incitations' (Poste), though the latter rendering may be preferred. Better ses emportements (Reinach), 'his impulsive ways.' Plut.

 $\nu \in 6 \tau \eta \tau o s$ d̀paîs. The pl. is found in

 $1197{ }^{b} 39$, apetal фúaet olà jppal tıves ${ }_{\epsilon} \boldsymbol{\nu}$ Éк $\dot{a} \sigma \tau \psi$. In contrast to Cleon, we read of Pericles (Plut. Per. 20) oú ouvc-
 use of the word in the text is curious, and it is perhaps better to propose $\delta$ cayouaîs which would obviously refer to Cleon's raising the $\mu \iota \sigma$ òs $\delta \iota \kappa \alpha \sigma \tau \iota \kappa \delta$ s to three obols.
 $\beta \hat{\eta} \mu a$ nor $\dot{\alpha} \nu \alpha \kappa \rho \dot{\alpha} \zeta \omega$ is found in the Index $A r$.

The Pnyx was first identified by Cbandler in 1765 (Travels in Greece, ii $8_{4}$, ed. 1825 ) as 'a large semicircular area or terrace, supported by stones of vast size cut into squares, nearly opposite the rock of the Areopagus,' from the centre of which it is distant about a quarter of a mile to the S.W. The excavations directed by Lord Aberdeen in 1822 disclosed a projecting cubic block, hewn out of tbe rock, and approached on each side by steps. This was identified as the $\beta \hat{\eta} \mu a$ of the Athenian orators. It
has, however, been maintained by Ulrichs (1842), Welcker (1852), E. Curtius ( 1862 , 1868), that this block is an altar, and the
 The site of the $\beta \hat{\eta} \mu a$ is placed by Curtius on the slopes of the 'Museum' hill, due S. of the Areopagus. See his Att. Studien, i 23 -, and Stadtgeschichte, pp. 30 and 61. See also Prof. Crow and Mr Clarke in Papers of Aner. School, iv 205-277.
avékpayc] Arist. Vesp. 596, К入є́ $\omega$ y $\dot{\text { o }}$
 \# $\chi \omega v$.
$\pi \in \rho!$ दूळбápevos] 'with his cloak girt up short about him' (Kenyon), 'with his robes fastened or tucked up, as if he were engaged in some manual labour' (Poste, n). Cf. Plut. Nic. 9, $\pi \in \rho \iota \sigma \pi$ diaas $\boldsymbol{\tau}$ l l $\mu$ átıoy (with Holden's n), and contrast Mor. ii


Oทpapévךs] inf. § 5 .
 by Andoc. de Myst. § 146 ; Aesch. F. L. $\S 76$; and the Scholiast on Aristoph. Thesm. 805, Ran. 681 (as restored by Taylor). Cf. Suidas, s.v. ф८лотє $\mu$ т $\epsilon \rho a \downarrow$ Kлєофйעтos. Aelian, Var. Hist. xii 43, says that his father's name was unknown (Mayor). Cf. Lysias $13 \$ 88,9,12 ; 30$ $\$ \S \mathrm{r}-13$; and inf. 34 § I . For further details see Holden's Onomasticon to Aristophanes.

 Пala


#### Abstract

 $\kappa a \tau \eta \dot{\zeta} \xi \eta \sigma \varepsilon$ Whibley． $22 \pi \rho \hat{\sigma} \tau o \nu$ van Leeuwen．      rum Kenyon noster arbitratur schol．ad Arist．Vesp． 684 referre partim ad e． 62 § 1  tum ubi de iudiciis agitur．  exscriptus＝＊Photius et Suidas，s．v．；fere eadem habet Pseudo－Plut．Proverbia，in i． Cf．Boeckh II xv p． 299 Fränkel；Meineke，Com．Gr．Iv p．700．Macarius iv 68．．．  ро́vтшע．





 must refer to the theoricon，the fund for paying the price of admission to the theatre at the rate of 2 obols for each of the ordinary seats（Dem．de Cor．p．${ }^{234}$ ， ${ }^{24}, \hat{\epsilon} \nu$ roîv $\left.\delta v o i ̀ \nu 6 \beta 0 \lambda o \hat{\nu}\right)$ ．The payment of the theoricon out of the treasury of the State is attributed to Pericles in Plutarch，Pericl．9，ír＇єкєlvou фaбt $\boldsymbol{\text { ojv}}$
 $\mu \iota \sigma \hat{\omega} \nu \delta c a \nu o \mu \dot{\alpha} s$ проax $\theta \hat{\eta} \nu a l$ ，and Ulpian on Dem．Ol．i init．т̀̀ $\chi \rho \eta \eta_{\mu} \mu \tau a$ raûra $\tau \grave{a}$

 тoîs $\pi \epsilon \nu \eta \sigma c \nu . \quad$ Cf．Gilbert，i 324 ．

It cannot refer to the $\mu<\sigma \theta \partial \mathrm{s}$ dıкабтєкós， for it was long before the time of Cleophon that Cleon（about $4^{28}$ b．c．）raised the dicast＇s fee to three obols：Schol．on Ar． Plut．330；Vesp．80，300；Eq．51， 255 （425 в．С．）；Vesp．607，682，688，797， 1 116 （423 в．c．）；Aves 1540 （415 B．c．）．Boeckh， II xv p． 326 Lamb．Probably it was originally one obol and never two．Again， it cannot be the $\mu \iota \sigma \theta$ òs $\dot{\epsilon} \kappa \kappa \lambda \eta \sigma \iota a \sigma \tau \iota \kappa 6$ s as this was introduced by Agyrrhius at the rate of one obol，increased by Heracleides to two obols，and again by Agyrrhius to three（c． 41 end）．
 paid．＇кат $\left.{ }^{2} v \sigma \epsilon\right]$ either（ 1 ）＇over－ threw him，＇＇ousted him＇（K．），＇outbid him＇（Reinach）；or（2）＇abolished it＇ （Kaibel and Kiessling，Poland and Haus－ soullier）．（2）is probably right；but we should have expected some notice of the suhsequent restoration of the theoricon． This omission may，however，be only
accidental．Pbilochorus，ap．Harp．s．v． $\theta \epsilon \omega \rho \kappa \kappa \delta y$ ，says that it was restored by Agyrrhius；but this is doubtful．－Agyr－ rhius was certainly concerned with the $\mu \varepsilon \sigma \theta b s$ éкк $\lambda \eta \sigma a \sigma \sigma \tau<\kappa o ́ s$（c． 42 end）．

Kad入ıкра́тๆs］In Zenobius vi 29，and elsewhere（Boeckh，II xv p． 327 Lamb）， we read of a proverbial phrase $\dot{v} \pi \dot{\xi} \rho \tau \grave{\alpha}$ Ka入入ıкр́orous applied to excessive wealth by the inhabitants of Carystus in Euboea． This explanation of the proverb is quoted from Clearchus．Then follows an inac－ curate reminiscence of the present passage in the following form：＇Aptotorè $\eta$ ns $\delta \hat{k}$



 $\ddot{\sigma} \theta \epsilon \nu-\epsilon i \rho \hat{\eta} \sigma \theta a \iota$ ，has got displaced and should be placed at the end of the pre－ vious senterice，immediately after the mention of the proverb．The first part of the explanation will then run as fol－




 In any case it is not absolutely necessary to suppose that the proverb was ever quoted in this treatise．Zenobius mis－ understood the passage as referring to the pay of the dicasts，which had been in－ creased to 3 obols about 428 b．c．，where－ as Cleophon，and a fortiori Callicrates， belongs to a much later date．
 grant of the fee of two obols a head out of the theoric fund was sufficient to en－ able all the poorer citizens to attend the theatre，it is not easy to see what object










 Gennadios ( $\mathrm{H}-\mathrm{L}, \mathrm{B}$ qui $\tau 0$ etiam in papyro invenit) : $\tau \dot{\alpha} \mathrm{K}, \mathrm{K}-\mathrm{w}$. $\Delta \epsilon$ ex $\Delta \epsilon 0$ corr.
 K $\Delta \lambda \omega c$
semel tantum apparet anno 302 A.C. (Meisterhans, p. $114^{2}$ ).
32 татрІкшс.
28-30 * Plut. Nic. 2 (infra exscriptum).
there was in increasing it. But the theoricon was not confined to the Dionysia, it was also paid at the Panathenaea and at all the great festivals (Boeckh, il xiii p.
 $\mu а \tau а \cdot \ldots$ al

 $\pi \iota \kappa \omega ̂ \nu \Delta \eta \mu \sigma \sigma \theta \in \nu o u s($ i.e. Ol. i).

Qávarov] We know nothing of the death of Callicrates. That of Cleophon is well attested. In 404 b.c., not long before the establishment of the Thirty, he was condemned and put to death on the plea of having neglected his military


 rà $\tau \epsilon i \chi \eta$. The Council, whose temper and proceedings he had denounced, illegally constituted itself part of the tribunal that tried him ( $26.30 \$ 810-14$ ). According to Xenophon, Hell. i 7 § 35 , Callixenus and others, who had prompted the people to put to death the generals who had neglected their duty at Arginusae, made their escape before they could be put on their trial, $\sigma \pi d \sigma \epsilon \omega \dot{s} \boldsymbol{\tau} \boldsymbol{\tau}$
 c. $65, \mathrm{v} 55^{2}$ ).
$\left.\mu \stackrel{\sigma}{ }{ }^{[v}\right]$ Ar. Rhet. ii 4 . Similarly in Xen. Hell. i 7 § 35 Callixenus, the proposer of the motion against the generals who fought at Arginusae, who is there included among those who т $\boldsymbol{\partial} \nu \quad \delta \bar{\eta} \mu_{0} \nu$ $\epsilon \xi \eta \pi d \tau \eta \sigma a y$, returned on the restoration of
 $\tau_{\tau \nu} \lambda_{\iota} \mu \hat{\varphi}$ áteधavє.

Mr W. L. Newman suspects a tacit reference to the death of Socrates, cf. Diod. xiv 37, and Diog. Laert. ii 43 .
 Panath. 132 sq.
 Arist. Pax 681, ov̂ros ('T $\pi \epsilon \rho \beta$ olos) $\mu \in \tau \dot{a}$
 $\tau \dot{\eta} \nu \delta \eta \mu a \gamma \omega \gamma(a \nu$ (Wyse).
mapavtlka] Hitherto found only in spurious writings of Ar., esp. in the De Plartis and in the Rhet. ad Alexandront (Eucken, Sprachgebrauch des Ar., Praepositionen, p. 62, quoted in Class. Rev. v 160 a ). It occurs (without the article) in Thuc. viii 48,3 and iv 76,5 .
§ 5. Soкоиิの$\tau \omega ิ \nu . . . \pi 0 \lambda เ \tau \epsilon v \sigma a \mu \in \nu \omega v]$ This is somewhat carelessly paraphrased in Plut.






 the three as reputed to be the best politicians: Plutarch describes them as actually being the best citizens. The text describes Nicias and Thucydides as ruling the State in a paternal spirit; Plutarch ascribes to them a hereditary affection for it. $\beta$ entiotol here has a political sense;
 in $\S 5$; and see Holm, Gr. Gesch. ii 583 . татрькผิs] 'paternally'; not 'they acted in all their public life in a manner worthy of their ancestry' (Kenyon), but
$\mu e ́ \nu o v ৎ, ~ \pi \epsilon \rho i ̀ ~ \delta e ̀ ~ \Theta \eta \rho a \mu e ́ v o u s ~ \delta ı a ̀ ~ \tau o ̀ ~ \sigma v \mu ß 习 ̂ \nu a \iota ~ к а т ’ ~ a u ̛ \tau o ̀ \nu ~ \tau a \rho a-~$














XXIX $1 \pi \rho \dot{\gamma} \gamma \mu a \tau \alpha$ secl. H-L.
$3 \lambda(1 a) \phi \circ p a n: \sigma u \mu \phi$ орà $\nu$ Richards, K-w (e




Testimonia. XXIX 3 v. notam proximam.
'they ruled the state as a father rules his household' (Poste). Pol. viii (v) if, 1315
 Totoúuyov.

Similarly Aristides ii 16r Dind. (quoted by Mr Wyse, Class. Rev. v 275 a) describes Pericles as, in certain re-


Cf. Pol. iii 14, 1285 a 19 ( $\beta$ aбı $\lambda \epsilon \hat{i} \alpha$ ) кal


 eulogy of Theramenes is all the more welcome as the traditional opinion respecting him is that he was not much better than an Opportunist. His nickname, $\delta$ к 60 opy os, is notorious. He is one of those who have been suggested as the politician referred to in Pol. vi (iv) II,


 $\pi \mathrm{o} \iota \tau \epsilon \mathrm{la} \mathrm{\nu})$. See Newman's Politics, i p. 470. But it seems more probable that Solon is meant (cf. Susemih1 ${ }^{2}$ note I 303 ).







 $\dot{\rho} q \delta t \omega s$ áтофаіуоvтa.
 referred to, Xen. Hell. ii 3, 3o. Cf. Lys. 12 § 78 (Newman).

тарауодои́баıs ov่ $\sigma v \gamma x \omega p \omega \hat{\nu}]$ See Meineke's notes in Frag. Com. Gr. ii 867 and 1165 , where he quotes Hesych.

 The text dwells on the kindly feeling of Theramenes towards the whole city: we may contrast with this Lys. 13 § 10 (Newman).
XXIX-XXXIII. The Revolution of the Four Hundred.
XXIX § i. íóppoтa] Compare Eth. $9,1,116_{4} b_{4}, \tau \iota \mu \hat{\eta} \tau \in$ l $\sigma$ боротоs où à $\gamma^{\epsilon}$ עouto, De Part. Anim. iv 12, 695 a 12 , iборрбтои бутоя той $\beta$ ajpovs. Thuc. i io5,

 viii 24, 5, $\mu \epsilon \tau$ à $\tau \hat{\eta} \nu \Sigma \iota \kappa \varepsilon \lambda \iota \kappa \grave{\eta} \nu \xi \nu \mu \phi о \rho \alpha ́ \nu ~(i \partial . ~$ vii $85-87$ ). Dem. Lept. 42, Isocr. 66 $\S 15$.

Bardía] After the Persian wars $\beta a$ $\sigma d \lambda e{ }^{\prime} s$; without the article, is the ordinary designation of the king of Persia (e.g. Hdt. vii 174, Thuc. viii 36 ). $\delta$ ßaбincus is found in this sense in Hdt. i ${ }_{132}$, 137 ( $L$ and $S$ ).
$\sigma u \mu \mu a \chi^{\text {(av] }}$ in allusion to the successive treaties with Tissaphernes on behalf







 septem octove litterarum capax, ut nomen utrumque scribi potuerit $\boldsymbol{\tau} \boldsymbol{0}[\boldsymbol{Y}$ поגy

 papyri scripturae evanidae minus congruere confitetur K .



of Persia. For the first of these, see Thuc. viii 18 : for the second, $i b$. 37 ; for the third, ib. 58 (Grote c. 62, v pp. 330, 346, 373). See also Andoc. 2 § $\mathrm{II}-17$.
 Thuc. viii 54-97, esp. 67.
$\pi \rho \delta$ ] either 'in favour of' (Reinach), like $\dot{\boldsymbol{u} \pi \dot{\ell} \rho \text {; or 'previous to' (Kenyon). }}$ Poste vaguely renders: 'the orator who prepared the public mind for the change.' But, unless sufficient authority can be found for either use of $\pi \rho \delta$ in such a context, it may he safer to accept $\pi \epsilon \rho l$, proposed by Mr Wyse.
M ${ }^{\boldsymbol{\eta} \lambda o \beta \text { Lov] almost certainly }}$ identical with the Melobius who was afterwards one of the Thirty and who joined in the attack on Lysias and his brother Polemarchus, Lysias 12 § 12.

HuӨoscopov] Pythodorus is the name of the archon in whose year of office the Peloponnesian war began (Thuc. ii 2, 1). It is also the name of a $\sigma \tau \rho a \tau \eta \gamma \delta s$ ( $a$ son of Isolochus) in b.c. $426 / 5$ etc, Thuc. iii $115,1,3$; iv 2,1 , and 65,3 , who is described in Plat. Parm. 126-1 30 as entertaining Parmenides and Zeno (Alc. i 119 A): this Pythodorus had among his friends one Aristoteles $\tau \delta \nu \tau \hat{\omega} \nu \tau \boldsymbol{\tau}$ táкоутa $\gamma^{\epsilon \nu}{ }^{\prime} \mu \in \nu 0 \nu($ Parm. 127 D): it was hence inferred by Bergk (Comment. de rel. Com. ant., p. 100) that he was identical with the archon of B.c. 404-3. The name of Pythodorus was also borne by a representative of Athens in the treaty of B.C. 421 (Thuc. $v$ 19 and 24). A IIvob$\delta \omega \rho o s$ 'A $\lambda a \epsilon \epsilon$ 's was first $\tau a \mu l a s ~ \tau \hat{\eta} s, ~ \theta \epsilon o \hat{v}$ in b.c. $418 / 7$ ( Cla i $^{157}$ ). The date of the

Pythodorus of Thuc. vi 105 (B.c. $414 / 3$ ) makes it likely that he was identical with the Pythodorus who is mentioned in the text. This Pythodorus, the archon of B.c. $404 / 3$, is identified as the prose-

 8,54 ). But the name of his fatber was
 scription ascribed to the early part of the
 $\gamma \in L$ (CIA ii 1250); and a pre-Euclidean inscr. at Eleusis bears the name of a $7 \pi$ тapxos who was son of 'Emliŋnos. The
入os is paralleled by the corruption of the
 خos of Diog. Laert. i 2,56 and elsewhere. Cf. Athen. Mittheil. xiv 398.
 viii 48,1 , Alcibiades assures the Athenian officers who had crossed over to the mainland from Samos, Tla $\alpha a \phi \notin \rho \nu \eta \nu$

 $\pi \iota \sigma \tau \epsilon \hat{\sigma} a \iota \mu \hat{a} \lambda \lambda о \nu \beta a \sigma \iota \lambda \in a)$. Ib. 53 § 2 , Peisander asks each of his opponents at

 $\sigma \phi a ̂ s$. On their replying in the negative he says plainly ( $\$ 3$ ) that they cannot hope for any deliverance $\boldsymbol{\epsilon l} \mu \dot{\eta} \pi \pi_{0} \lambda \tau \epsilon \dot{d}$ -




 $\pi \delta \lambda \epsilon \mu, \nu \kappa \tau \lambda$.








 18 oтт $\omega C$--Boy K-W, B. Cf. v. 24, c. $3^{\circ}$, 20, et Meisterhans, p. $212^{2}$.
§ 2. т ̂̂v- Séra mpoßoú入ov] Thuc. viii 1 § 3 , ( $£ \delta 6 \kappa \epsilon \epsilon) \dot{\alpha} \rho \chi \eta \nu \nu \tau \nu \alpha \pi \rho \epsilon \sigma \beta u \tau \epsilon \rho \omega \nu$

 c. $6 \mathbf{1}, \mathrm{v}$ 318 $^{18-9}$. This passage confirms Grote's observation that this 'Board was doubtless merged in the Oligarchy of Four Hundred.' Hermann, Staatsalt. § 165,10 and II; Curtius, ii $60^{\circ}{ }^{6}$ n. 162 (Germ.ed.). Hagnon, the adoptive father of Theramenes, is described as one of the $\pi \rho b \beta o v-$ $\lambda_{o c}$ in Lysias 12865 , and as joining Theramenes in favouring the establishment of the 400 . It is implied in Ar. Rhet. iii 18,2 that all of the $\pi \rho 6$ Bovioc lent their countenance to the change in the constitutional government of Athens (Grote c. 62, v 379 n). CE. Isocr. Areop. 58; Pol. 1299 b $30-38$.
The ten $\pi \rho \phi \beta$ ounoc of the present passage are identical with the ten $\check{\xi}\langle\gamma \gamma \rho a \phi \varepsilon i s$




 oккīбета.
In Bekker's Anecd. p. 301, 13, no number is given, but Harpocration, s.v. $\sigma u \gamma \gamma \rho a \phi e i s$, describes that body as numbering 3o, and Suidas, s.v. $\pi \rho \phi \beta o v \lambda o u$, speaks of 20 being elected in addition to the $10 \pi \rho b \beta 00 \lambda 0$ to form a body of 30 ouvrpapeis. Hence in the above passage of Thuc. it has been suggested by C. F. Hermann, Staatsalt. 165, in, to alter $\delta$ हккa
 is correct so far as it goes, but is less minute than that in the text, which has been followed by Harpocration and Suidas.
Cf. Schol. on Aristoph. Lysistr. 421,
 rồs oû̃ ${ }^{\prime}$ Suidas ; correxit Schoell) $\dot{p} \rho \epsilon$ -

 $\Sigma \iota \kappa \in \lambda t a \sigma \nu \mu \phi о \rho a \dot{\prime}$.
The account in the text is in accordance with the statement of Androtion (probably written hefore it) and of Philochorus (certainly written after it), as recorded by




 $\pi \rho 0 \beta o i ́ \lambda \omega y$. Cf. (with Wyse) Schol.


 $\sigma \tau a i s$ (where Cobet inserts ${ }^{\prime}$ after $\tau \hat{\omega} v$, following Thuc. l. c.).
§ 3. K Ketroф $\hat{\imath} \mathrm{V}$ mentioned with Theramenes as a 'pupil' of Euripides, in

 Identified by Holden (Onomasticon Arist.) with Cleitophon, son of Aristouymus, who gives the title to one of Plato's dialogues and is mentioned with Thrasymachus in Rep. 328 в (where Stallbaum does not identify them). He is named, with Cleon, as $\phi a 00$ nos in Plut. Mor. 8o5, but this is probably a mistake for Cleophon.
 is the regular formula for introducing an amendment to a proposed decree. As examples before the archonship of Eucleides we have cia i (1. 28), 18, 38, 41, ${ }^{5} 2^{c}, 54,55,85,95,119,131,135(?), 138$, 146, 163, 186 (Hartel, Studien iuber Attisches Staatsrecht, p. 221). Swoboda, Gr. Volksbeschluisse, p. 14, shews that amendments are not often found except in Athenian inscriptions. Plato refers to the customary formula in Gorg. 451 B ,












23 проклнсєIC: corr. Wyse, Blass (K-W, H-L, K³)
25-26 нєІСАГНІнєІС: corr. K.
 implies (like Cleitophon) that the constitution of Cleisthenes was identical with, or closely similar to, that of Solon. The text, while correcting the view of Cleitophon, is also a tacit correction of that of Isocr. (Class. Rev. v 161 a). For $\mathrm{\omega}_{\mathrm{s}} \mathrm{c}$. acc. of the participle, cf. c. $7 \$ 4$ isбұцаivougav.
For the view that the constitution of Cleisthenes was not democratic, cf. Plut.

 өє̀ous érєipet̀ apıбтократlà.
 We here find stated in full detail what is briefly summarised in Thuc. viii 67 , $\epsilon \sigma \eta$ -

 sen, following Wilamowitz in Hermes, xii
 $\pi \epsilon \iota$, mss; 'A $\theta \eta \nu a l o u s$ Suidas; 'A $\theta \eta \nu a i \varphi$
 ed. 1883, following Sauppe. The text is in favour of the restoration of 'A $\theta \eta \nu a l \omega \nu$ or some similar word, instead of accepting the conjecture of Wilamowitz. 'A $\theta \eta \nu a i \omega \nu$ тois
 but would involve too great a departure


 $\epsilon \pi \epsilon \theta \in \sigma a \nu$.
 The members of the tribe presiding for the time being were thus compelled to put every proposition to the vote, undeterred by any risk of penalties falling on the proposer or themselves.
 $\gamma \rho a \phi \grave{\eta} \pi a p a \nu \delta \mu \omega \nu$ having become recognised as one of the safeguards of the democratic constitution, it was necessary to repeal it before any revolutionary changes could be introduced. Dem. Timocr. 24 § 154 , dкои́ш...ката入ข $\neq \hat{\eta} \nu a \iota$




 Process, p. 428-437 Lipsius; Hager in Smith's Dict. Ant. s. v.).
tloay ${ }^{\text {ellas] }}$ various forms of denunciation, applied to three kinds of legal
 $\kappa \eta \mu \dot{\alpha} \tau \omega \nu$ (Caecilius, in Lex. Rhet. Cant. p. 667, possibly referring to the times before Eucleides, see 8 §4); (2) wrongs done to orphans, heiresses and widows; (3) complaints against סıaur $\quad$ ral (c. 53 §6). See Hager in Dict. Ant. s. v.; Att. Proc. 312 f. Lips.
 forms of summons to the defendant. Att. Process, p. $770-2$. In the ms $\pi \rho 0-$ $\kappa \lambda \eta \dot{\eta} \sigma \epsilon$ ('challenges') is a mistake for $\pi р о \sigma \kappa \lambda \dot{\eta} \sigma \epsilon \epsilon$. Similarly in Plat. Leg. 936 E, and Dem. c. Aphob. iii § 20, т $\rho 0 \times a \lambda \epsilon \epsilon-$ $\sigma \theta a t$ has been wrongly suggested instead of $\pi \rho 0 \sigma-$ (Att. Process, p. 884).
of z日ènovtcs] 'Notetur usus verbi $\theta \theta \epsilon$ $\lambda \epsilon \nu$ pro $\beta$ oú $\epsilon \epsilon \theta \theta a l$, qui per haec decreta (etiam c. 30) obtinet, ad imitationem veteris linguae, qua vel Solo (c. $35 \S 2$; Dem. 46 § $\mathrm{I}_{4}$ ) vel Clisthenes usus erat (Blass).
 posal which he thought fit.
 all three cases the present here has a tentative sense. $\quad \$ \eta \mu \omega i=1 m p l i e s ~ a n ~ a t-~$ tempt to get the speaker fined either by means of a $\gamma \rho a \phi \dot{\eta} \pi a \rho a \nu b \mu \omega \nu$, or an $\epsilon l \sigma a \gamma-$ $\gamma^{\prime} \lambda i a$. $\pi \rho о \sigma к a \lambda \eta$ тal refers to the abovementioned $\pi \rho \sigma \sigma \kappa \lambda \eta \boldsymbol{\sigma} \epsilon \mathrm{cs}$. єlod́yn $\kappa \tau \lambda$. to the fact that, under the first of the three varieties of eloay ${ }^{\prime} \lambda \lambda a$, the $\beta o u \lambda \eta$ might hand the defendant over for trial by a court, instead of fining him. Cf. Att. Proc. p. 45 Lips.
 тoùs $\sigma \tau \rho a \tau \eta \gamma \circ u ́ s, ~ \tau o ̀ ̀ \varsigma ~ \delta \grave{e ̀ ~} \sigma \tau \rho a \tau \eta \gamma o u ̀ \varsigma ~ \pi a \rho a \delta o v ̂ \nu a l ~ \tau o i ̂ s ~ e ̀ v \delta є \kappa a ~$











#### Abstract

26 єis $\tau \grave{\partial}$ H-L. $\quad 29<\tau \grave{\nu} \nu$ cf. c. 7 v. $8 . \quad<\tau \dot{a}>$ add. $\mathrm{K}(\mathrm{K}-\mathrm{W}): \chi \rho \eta ́ \mu a \tau a$ del. Richards ( $\mathrm{H}-\mathrm{L}$ ). 33 macin ( K ): $\pi \hat{a} \sigma a \nu$ J B Mayor, Newman, $\mathrm{K}-\mathrm{w}, \mathrm{H}-\mathrm{L}, \mathrm{B}$. $\omega \mathrm{N}$  delere neglexerat; illud existimat K ( $\vec{\eta} \pi \epsilon \nu \tau a \kappa i \sigma \chi i \lambda i o s, ~ \mathrm{H}-\mathrm{L}$ et B), hoc K-w ( $\pi \epsilon \nu \tau a-$ $\kappa \iota \sigma \chi i \lambda(\omega \nu)$.


Sukaotiphov] articulo 'non opus in sententia condicionali' (Blass).
 these forms of procedure was there any summons: hence they were suited to the present emergency, in which $\pi \rho o \sigma \kappa \lambda \eta{ }_{\eta} \sigma \varepsilon \iota$ had been abolished. $\alpha \pi a \gamma \omega \gamma \dot{\eta}$ was a summary process, resorted to in certain cases of theft, but also applicable to murderers and adulterers, and to robbers of temples. $\neq \nu \delta \epsilon \xi$ Ls was a charge in writing handed over by the prosecutor to the proper authority, who was bound to arrest or hold to bail the person criminated. It was directed against state-debtors, and others who exercised rights while labouring under a disqualification (Dict. Ant. s. v.). The text shews that, under the Four Hundred, these forms of procedure were arbitrarily extended to the case of those who attempted to resort to the ordinary legal remedies at a time when they were in abeyance. Cf. Att. Proc. pp. 270-280 Lips.

тpós tovs $\sigma$ тparnүoùs] In normal cases of $\dot{\alpha} \pi a \gamma \omega \gamma \dot{\eta}$ the delinquent was immediately brought before the Eleven; in
 Thesmathetae. The Four Hundred departed from those principles in providing that the offender should appear before the $\sigma \tau p a \tau \eta \gamma o l$, whose jurisdiction was usually limited to military matters. Such a provision may be illustrated by our
modern declaration of martial law in cases of emergency.



 $\tau \epsilon \in \nu \tau \hat{\omega} \nu \pi \rho a \gamma \mu \dot{a} \tau \omega \nu \pi \lambda \epsilon i o \sigma \iota \nu \eta \pi \epsilon \nu \tau a \kappa \kappa \sigma-$
 $\chi \rho \dot{\eta} \mu a \sigma \iota$ каil тоîs $\sigma \dot{\mu} \mu a \sigma \iota \nu \dot{\omega} \phi \epsilon \lambda \epsilon \hat{\nu} \nu$ oloí $\tau \varepsilon$ $\hat{\omega} \sigma \nu$, and $67,3, \epsilon \nu \tau a v \theta a$ $\delta \dot{\eta} \lambda a \mu \pi \rho \omega \bar{s} \epsilon \lambda \epsilon-$






 токрdторая. кal тov̀s тєyтакıбхiNious $\delta \dot{k}$ $\xi \cup \lambda \lambda \epsilon \gamma \epsilon \epsilon \nu$ ó $\pi \delta \tau a \nu$ aútoìs $\delta о \kappa \hat{\eta}$. Lys. 20 §8 13, 16; 30 § 8.
roís Svvaтwтárous $\kappa \tau \lambda$. 1 The language is almost technical. Cf. (besides Thuc.
 and 65, already quoted) Xen. Hipparch. I

 $\mu a \sigma \iota$ kal бы́ $\mu a \sigma \iota$. Also CIG 1845, 44 (inscr.from Corcyra), $\epsilon \lambda \epsilon \sigma \theta a \iota ~ \delta \epsilon \in \tau \alpha \dot{\partial} \nu \beta o u \lambda \dot{\alpha} \nu$

 (Gilbert ii 320 ), and the phrase $\dot{\alpha} \sigma \theta \in \nu \eta$ ) хрїцаби (Wyse).
 $165, \lambda . \tau о i ̄ s ~ \sigma \dot{\omega} \mu a \sigma \iota$.









 These were the кaтa入oreis appointed to enroll the 5,000 persons to whom the franchise was conceded by the Four Hundred. One of them was Polystratus who is defended in a speech ascribed to Lysias, Or. 20, on the 'charge of seeking to abolish the Democracy.' He claims credit for having placed as many as 9,000 on the roll: $\$ 13$, $\dot{\mu} \mu \omega \nu \nu \geqslant \eta \phi \iota \sigma a \mu t \nu \omega \nu$

 He served for eight days only, shortly before the overthrow of the Four Hundred ( $\begin{aligned} & \S \\ & I_{4}\end{aligned}$ ), who in the last resort found themselves compelled to take steps towards enrolling the 5,000 . In § 2 it is
 $\tau \hat{\omega} \nu$. This is explained by the text, in which ten кaza入oyeis are described as elected by each of the tribes. It was supposed by Grote c. 62, v 413, that Polystratus had the sole responsibility of drawing up the list. It is now clear that he was one of a hundred persons charged with this duty.

 Eкабтои (the Athenians on the one part, and the Argives, Mantineans, Eleans and their allies on the other part) $\tau \delta \nu \mu$ ' $\gamma \mathrm{l} \sigma \tau 0 \nu$ катà $l \epsilon \rho \omega \hat{\nu} \boldsymbol{\tau} \epsilon \lambda \in \ell \omega \nu$. Müller, Handbuch, v 3, 104. supra c. .

XXX § 1. кvp $\omega \in \ell \downarrow \tau \omega v]$ Cf. $3^{2}$ 1. 2, $\epsilon \pi \tau \kappa \nu \rho \omega \theta \in \nu \tau \omega \nu$. The use of the two words in connexion with $\psi \eta \phi \ell \sigma \mu a \tau a$ is discussed by Hartel, Studien, p. 207 ff., and Swoboda, Gr. Volesbeschlüsse, p. 88 ff . The latter has collected a large number of examples from inscriptions (Wyse).
 tov̀s divaypiqovtas] Here, and in c. 32 § I , the existence of the 5,000 is assumed; whereas in 32 § 5 we are told
 latter statement is in accordance with

Thuc. viii 92, 11 , of тєтрак $6 \boldsymbol{\sigma}+0$... ouk

 had been proposed by Peisander tous
 $\delta_{o \kappa \hat{\eta}}$, and this proposal was ratified by the éккл $\eta \sigma l a$ in 69 § 1. Mr Kenyon suggests that 'all who could bear arms were provisionally entitled the Five Thousand until a body of that exact number had been drawn up by the board of 100 which was to be appointed for that purpose.' On the fall of the Four Hundred, the government was transferred to a body called the Five Thousand, consisting of all who could furnish arms (Thuc. viii 97, 1). Like the present, this would really be a body of indefinite number; whereas the body of 5,000 contemplated by the oligarchical revolution, though it never came into actual existence, was limited and definite in number. The envoys from the Four Hundred (as observed by Mr Kenyon) assure the army at Samos 'that they will all be members of the Five Thousand in turn'
 $\mu \in \theta \in \xi \circ v \sigma \iota \nu$, Thuc. viii 86,3 ).
§ 2. триákovta. ${ }^{\text {etrp] }}$ ] This was the age at which an Athenian citizen became capalule of belonging to the Council under the regular constitution, Xen. Mem. i 2, 35.
ävev $\mu \mathrm{L} \sigma 0$ oфopâs] characteristic of an oligarchy. On the other hand, it is characteristic of a democracy $\mu / \sigma \theta_{0 \phi о р \epsilon i \nu}^{\nu}$


 kuplas ( $P o l$. vii (vi) 2, $1317 b 35$ ). Similarly in the case of the law conrts, Pol. vi (iv) $8,1294 a 38 ; 13$, $1297 a 37$; 14, 1298 $b$ 18; and of the assembly, $1293 a$ 5 -10. One of the causes that led to the fall of democracy in Rhodes was the
 ( $\mathrm{r}_{3} \mathrm{O}_{4} \mathrm{~b}_{27}$ ).






 iure secludit Thompson, sed idem è $\lambda \lambda \eta \nu \circ$ ra $\mu$ las retinet (Class. Rev.v 277 a).

тovituv $\delta^{*}$ eival $\kappa \tau$ र.] Here follows a list of official members of the new $\beta$ ount $\eta$. They are elected out of the $\beta$ oun $\eta$ for the time being. Mr T. Nicklin (Class. Rev. V. 228 b) suggests that $\tau 0$ of $\quad$ ( refers
 that these are the body from which the four councils of 400 each, and the generals \&c must come; also that the è $\lambda \lambda \eta \nu o \tau a \mu i a!$ must not at the same time be in the council for the year. This interpretation appears improbable; Mr Kenyon has already pointed out that it involves the insertion of kal before toús.
 хоvтаs] с. 55. ієрорип́ноva] а геcorder or notary. Pol. vii (vi) 8, $1321 a$



 Hermann-Thumser, Staatsalt. p. 99; Gilbert, ii 413 .
таदıápXous] c. 6r § 3 . immápXovs] c. 61 §4. 中unópxous] c. 61 § 5 .
 the commanders of Athenian garrisons. c. 24 §3. Gillbert, Gr. St. i 400.

 the treasures of the various temples were under the charge of officials called $\tau a \mu l a t$ $\tau \hat{\nu} \nu$ l $\epsilon \hat{\rho} \nu \nu \quad \chi \rho \eta \mu \dot{\alpha} \tau \omega \nu$ (cf. Ar. Pol. vii (vi) 8, 1322 25). The most important of these treasures was that of Athene on the Acropolis. The officials in charge of this were called $\tau a \mu a \iota \tau \hat{\eta} s \quad \theta \epsilon o \hat{v}$ or $\tau \hat{\omega} \nu \tau \hat{\eta} \mathrm{s}$ $\theta \epsilon 0 \hat{v}, \tau a \mu l a \imath ~ \tau \hat{\omega} \nu \quad$ lєр $\hat{\nu} \nu \quad \chi \rho \eta \mu a \dot{\alpha} \omega \bar{\nu} \tau \hat{\eta} s$
 $\theta$ єoù. They are first mentioned in Hdt. viii 51 at the time of the battle of Salamis, тauias toû lepoû; also in documents relating to the transfer of the treasure from one body of officials to their successors, from the date of the consecration of the Parthenon to 406 b.c.; in public accounts previous to Euclides; in Dem. Macart. p. 1075, 2, and Aeschin. Timarch. p. 127 § 110 ; lastly in inscriptions belong-
ing to в.c. 385,325 and 300 . Similarly, every temple had its special treasurers who, together with its superintendents (è $\pi \iota \sigma \tau \dot{\alpha} \tau a \iota)$ and sacrificers ( (єротон!), had the money of the same under their care.

In 435-4 b.c. (cia i 32) these several treasurers of the temples, with the exception of those of the temple of Athene, were all united into a single board called $\tau a \mu l a \iota \tau \bar{\omega} \nu \theta \epsilon \hat{\omega} \nu$ or $\tau \hat{\omega} \nu \bar{a} \lambda \lambda \omega \nu \theta \epsilon \omega \bar{\nu}$. From this date all the sacred moneys were kept in the Acropolis, but the treasures of Athene and those of the other divinities were generally under separate officials. Dem. Timocr. p. 743, 1, oi $\tau a \mu l a \iota ~ \dot{\epsilon} \phi$

 theless we find that both were united for a time as one board of officers, as in the text, and in a decree quoted in Andocides de Myst. p. 36, roùs raulas $\tau \hat{\eta} s$ $\theta \in 0 \hat{0}$ кai $\tau \hat{\omega} \nu \tilde{a} \lambda \lambda \omega \nu \nu \theta \epsilon \hat{\omega} \nu$. In inscriptions ascribed to b.c. 401, 400, 399-397 they are called
 $\tau \hat{\omega} \nu \partial \lambda \lambda \omega \nu \theta \epsilon \omega \nu$, and are (as here) in 4 Ir B.c. ten in number. In 385 the treasurers of the goddess again became a separate board of Ten, who were independent of the treasurers of the other deities (see Boeckh II v, 217-220 Lamb, and Gilbert, Gr. St. i $234-5$ ).
The тaplac have been mentioned in c. 4 § $2, \mathrm{c} .7 \S 3, \mathrm{c} .8$ § I. They are called of taulau $\tau \hat{\eta} \mathrm{s}$ 'A $\theta \eta \nu \mathrm{a} \mathrm{s}$ in $\mathrm{c} .47 \S \mathrm{I}$, and simply ol taulat in c. 60 § 3 .
è $\lambda \lambda \eta$ voraplas] obviously corrupt. These officials are immediately afterwards described as excluded from the Council and they could not possibly be here enumerated among its official members.

That portion of the treasures on the Acropolis which, in contrast to the lepà $\chi \rho \eta \dot{\mu} \alpha \tau a$, was known as ö $\sigma \iota a \quad \chi \rho \eta \dot{\mu} \mu \tau a$, was according to Suidas (s. v. тaplac, art. I) entrusted to 'the treasurers chosen by lot who had the care of the statue of Athene.' Thus the public money was ordinarily kept by the $\tau a \mu l a t ~ \tau \hat{\eta} s \quad \theta$ єô, who were often called $\tau a \mu l a \iota a l o n e$ (Boeckh







l.c. p. 221-2). In the text, with a view to multiplying the official members of the 400 , a separate board of 20 is mentioned.

Mr Kenyon infers from the present passage that separate $\tau \alpha \mu l a z ~ \tau \hat{\omega} \nu \dot{\sigma} \sigma l \omega \nu$ $\chi \rho \eta \mu \dot{a} \tau \omega \nu$ formed part of the ordinary Athenian constitution ; in the absence of evidence it is perhaps better to regard them as a special body created by the oligarchical revolution.
(єротоovis] c. 64 § 6. Gilbert, Gr. St. i 249. Pol. vii (vi) 8, $1322 \quad b$ 22-25,



 $\tau \hat{\omega} \nu$ l $\epsilon \rho \hat{\omega} \nu \quad \chi \rho \eta \mu \dot{\alpha} \tau \omega \nu$.
$\dot{\epsilon} \pi<\mu \mathrm{e} \lambda \mathrm{\eta} \mathrm{~T} \mathrm{~d} \mathrm{~s}]$ Pol. vii (vi) 8, $1322 \quad b$ 19,




 тoùs $\theta$ єoús. The lepoтotoi, the vaoфúגaкєs and the $\tau \alpha \mu i a \iota \tau \hat{\omega} \nu$ lep $\hat{\nu} \nu \chi \rho \eta \mu d \tau \omega \nu$ are in Pol. l. c. separate officials entrusted with this $\dot{\epsilon} \pi \iota \mu \epsilon \lambda \epsilon a$. The term $\dot{e} \pi \iota \mu \epsilon \lambda \eta \tau \eta \eta_{s}$ is vague, but the context implies that the official here meant was connected with matters of public ritual.
aipếr日al-ik $\pi$ pokpltcuv] 'and that they (the Council, c. 31,15 ) should appoint all these officials ont of a number of selected candidates, choosing a larger number (than those actually required) out of the members of the Council for the time being.' All the officials enumerated were to be members of the Council of 400 , and the Council itself was ( 1 ) to nominate candidates out of its own body to succeed these officials and (2) to choose such suc. cessors out of the number so nominated.
e $\lambda \lambda$ п $\nu$ oraplas] it is probably this passage, and not the corrupt passage a few lines earlier, that is the source of Harpocration's notice s. v. Mr Kenyon leaves both passages as they stand in the MS;
he points out the inconsistency between them in his commentary and endeavours to remove it in the notes to his Transla-tion:-" If this is not to be taken as directly contradicting the statement made just above, it must be supposed that the actual handling of the money was confined to a few of the Hellenotamiae (probably in rotation), the duties of the rest being to advise and superintend." The Hellenotamiae, or special board for the management of the tribntes, existed from the time of the formation of the confederacy of Delos and lasted to the end of the Peloponnesian war. They are frequently mentioned in inscriptions down to the time of the anarchy. On the restoration of the democracy, the office was not revived, as the $\dot{\eta} \boldsymbol{\gamma} \mu$ ovia of Athens, and the duty of paying tribute on the part of her allies, had come to an end.

In $410 / 9$ we know of eleven Hellenotamiae, three of them from one tribe alone, and two others from another tribe. Two of the tribe Acamantis were Hellenotamiae in the same prytaneia, and the two of the tribe Aeantis were similarly holding office at the same time. Boeckh supposes that in their appointment no regard was paid to the tribes (II vii p. 243 Lamb). Cf. Gilbert, Gr. St. i 23 b.
§ 3. $\beta$ oulds-тtitapas] i.e. four Councils of 400 each, each of the four holding office for one year ( $\epsilon$ ls $\epsilon \nu$ vautb inf.). The order in which they were to hold office was to be decided by lot (cf. тd $\lambda a \chi \dot{\partial} \nu \mu \tilde{p} p o s)$. The one hundred who had drawn up the constitution were to distribute themselves and 'the rest,' i.e. the rest of the 5,000 above the age of thirty, into four divisions of 400 each. At the end of c. 3 I provision is made for the future 'in order that the 400 may be distributed over the four divisions (els $\tau$ ds тєтTapas $\lambda \eta \xi \xi \in(s)$,' one hundred being assigned by lot to each of the four divisions of 400 .

The total number of the officials above












 $20 \mathrm{c} \omega \mathrm{d}$; et $\sigma \hat{\omega}$ as et $\sigma \hat{\omega}$ in titulis Atticis exstant (Meisterhans, $\mathrm{Pp} .5^{2}, 117^{2}$ ): $\sigma \hat{\omega} \dot{a} \mathrm{~K}$-w.



enumerated is as follows, if we assume that the numbers were in every case the same as usual:




 ral (ro), making 92 out of a total of perhaps 100.

The ăpXay $\quad$ es els $\tau$ à $\phi p o u p t a$ were possibly eight in number, in which case they may have represented the 8 tribes not represented by the 2 i $\pi \pi a \rho \chi a$. Thus $\bar{\eta}$ may have dropped out after $\phi$ poúpia (1.7). But it is more probable that there was only one $l \pi \pi a \rho \chi o s$ under this constitution and therefore 9 ä $\rho \chi a \nu \tau \epsilon s \epsilon i s \tau \grave{a} \phi \rho a u ́ p i a$, in which case $\theta$ may be the missing number. This is confirmed by the fact that the number of Attic $\phi$ poupia known to us is exactly nine, Eleusis, Anaphlystns, Sunium, Thoricus, Panactum, EEnoe, Phyle, Aphidna and Rhamnus (Boeckh, II $x$; the evidence for the last two belongs to the times of Philip).
 xpovov c. 31 § 1.

Tov̀s ä̉̉ ous] probably, not the 300 co-opted by the 100 (Thuc. viii 67,3 ), but the rest of the 5,000 .



凶s lraltara] Plat. Leg. 744 c. Sta$\kappa \lambda \eta{ }^{*} \omega \bar{\sigma} a \mathrm{~L}$, to 'assign them by lot,' Thuc.
viii $30,1, \delta t a \kappa \lambda \eta \rho \omega \sigma d \mu \epsilon \nu 0 c$, 'having drawn


§ 4. $\sigma \hat{\omega} a]$ The evidence of inscriptions shews that $\sigma \hat{\omega} a s$ and $\sigma \hat{\omega} s$ were alike in use (Meisterhans, Gr. p. in7 ed. 1888). Cf. Dem. Lept. § $\mathrm{I}_{4} 2$ note. The codex $\Sigma$ of Dem. has nom. masc. $\sigma \hat{\sigma}$ s in Mid. 126, Aristocr. 131; neut. $\sigma \hat{\omega} \nu$ Lept. 142 ; acc. pl. $\sigma \hat{\omega}$ s in Pac. 17, Chers. 15 ; gen. sing. $\sigma \dot{\omega} a s$ F.L. 78 ; pl. $\sigma \hat{\omega}$ ou in $\bar{F} . L .57$, 153, 326; acc. sing. $\sigma \dot{\prime} \leftarrow a \nu$ Mid. 177 ; pl. nom. $\sigma$ ŵtol Cor. 49, Phil. iii 70, Timocr. 1об (Voemel, Praleg. Gramm. in Dem. Cont. § 33).
cis tod סéav áva入loxŋtat] Aristoph. Nub. 859, $\epsilon \mathrm{is} \tau \dot{d} \delta \epsilon \epsilon \mu \dot{\alpha} \pi \dot{\omega} \lambda \epsilon \sigma a$, Dem. Ol.
 23.
 rov are only found in this passage.
" $\delta$ pas $]$ c. 4 § 3. It is the technical term. cIa i $3 \mathrm{I}, 7 ; 59,41$; ii $800 b{ }_{5} 5$ cet. (Mayor).
 a time'; but 'once every five days'; cf. кar' Eviavtby ('year by year'), кazà $\mu \hat{\eta} v a$. $\kappa a \theta$ ' $\dot{\eta} \mu \epsilon \in \rho a \nu$ ('daily,' Thuc. vii $8 \$$ I and 50 § 3). Mr Poste extracts both senses out of the passage: 'the sessions of the council shall be for five days at a time with intervals of five days.' Under the democracy the $\beta$ cun $\grave{\eta}$ met daily except on public holidays ( 43 §3).












 （ $\mathrm{K}, \mathrm{k}$－w）．


#### Abstract

 äpxovtas］This means either（1）that the Council is to appoint the archons by lot， or（2）the archons are to superintend the sortition of the Conncil．（1）is followed by Kaibel and Kiessling，and also by Poland；（2）by Mr Poste and Mr Kenyon． In（I）the order is verb，subject，object，  rovs E日enovtas；and this is supported by the context．We are first told how the Council is constituted，and next what it has to do．But this view is open to a fatal objection．The Council cannot ap－ point the archons by lot，because under the present constitution the archons are chosen out of a select list（ $\$ 2,1.1$ r）． We must therefore suppose that the archons were to superintend the sortition of the Council．Those of the 5,000 ，who were over $3^{\circ}$ years of age，have already been divided into four groups determined by lot（ $\S_{3}$ ）．The archons in each year have to draw lots for appointing 400 out of each of these groups to serve on one of the four successive Councils．M．Th． Reinach regards this sentence as an inter－ polation．

For $\pi \lambda \eta \rho o \hat{\nu} \nu$ ，which has been proposed in place of $\kappa \lambda \eta \rho o \hat{v}$, cf．$\delta \kappa \kappa \alpha \sigma \tau \nmid p l a \pi \lambda \eta \rho o \hat{v}$ in Dem． 24 § 92， 21 § 209，and Isaeus 6 § 37；also Arist．Eccl．89，$\pi \lambda \eta \rho o \nu \mu \epsilon \nu \eta s$ $\epsilon \kappa \kappa \lambda \eta \sigma$ las．

Xeเpotovlas крlvetv］＇decide divisions taken by show of hands．＇The five functionaries act as＇tellers．＇One of them is appointed by lot for each of the five days during which the Council sits， ＇to put questions to the vote，＇i．e．to act as president or chairman．


§ 5．к $\lambda \eta p \circ$ v̂v— $\beta o v \lambda \hat{\eta} s]$ These five
persons were to determine by lot the order of precedence among those who wished to appear before the Council．
 $\lambda \omega v]$ The two alternative constructions are arranged in the order of a chiasmus or introverted parallelism，the two nearest and the two furthest terms corresponding in construction．Apart from love of variety there is no apparent reason for this change．Exactly the same order and the same variety of expression is found in the statement of the proceedings in the
 $\pi \rho \in \sigma \beta \varepsilon l a u s . . . \dot{\delta} \sigma \omega \nu$ ．Cf．also Aeschin．



§ 6．тìv ※́pav］not＇the hour，＇but ＇the time＇；the use of $\Phi \rho \sigma$ for＇hour＇is not earlier than the Alexandrine age．
 fine for non－attendance is characteristic of an oligarchy．Pol．vi（iv） $9,1294^{a} 3^{8}$ ，（of


 It is one of the devices of aristocracies mentioned ib．13， 1297 a 17，乌ŋulav èmt－
 Fines for non－attendance at the $\beta$ ov $\lambda \lambda$ in particular are apparently not mentioned in the Politics．

єіргбк $\delta \mu \in \nu_{0}$ ，＇in the enjoyment of leave of absence，＇is less likely to be right than ©ivó $\mu \in \boldsymbol{v}$ os，＇having obtained for himself leave of absence．＇
$d \phi \epsilon \sigma เ v]$ not found in this sense in Ar． The corresponding adj．á申éaços occurs in c． 43 § 3 ．






















XXXI § 1．Xpóvov．．．каıpஸ̂］Ar，Anal．

dve＇үpaquv］＇drew up，＇c． 2 § 4.
 Council of 400 under the Solonian con－ stitution，c． 8 § 4．The phrase is in－ serted to propitiate those who regarded Solon as the founder of the Athenian democracy．
 According to this，the ten tribes were to make a preliminary selection of more than the requisite number；but we are not told how the final choice was made out of those nominated by the tribes． According to Thuc．viii 67,3 ，the pro－ posal carried at the $\dot{\epsilon} \kappa \kappa \lambda \eta \sigma$ la held at Colonus was to choose five $\pi \rho \delta \in \delta \rho o t$ ；and for these to elect 100 in all，and for each of these 100 to co－opt three others．The historian＇s account supplies an omission in the text by describing the process by which the requisite number was arrived at．The two accounts may be partly reconciled by supposing that the 100 were limited in their choice to selecting the additional 300 out of those preliminarily selected by the tribes．As regards the
method by which the original hundred were appointed，the precise account in Thuc．seems more trustworthy than the vague description of the appointment of the 400 given in the text．
ยvดvvâv］＇the examination of official accounts，＇＇audits．＇c． 48 § 4．Att．Proc． p． 259 Lips．
§ 2．т̀̀ vîv єival］Plat．Rep． 506 E ， Xen．Cyr．v 3 § 42.

ка．тa．ттn̂］ 32 § 2．Lys．I3 § 34 and





el⿱宀八九́yтa］during the＇ensuing＇year， after the lapse of the two remaining months of the archonship of Callias．

Intrapxov zua］The normal number was two（c．6I §4）．中u入ópxovs，c．6I \＆ 5 ．
 Under the normal constitution of Athens military offices might be repeatedly held by the same person，but none of the others more than once，except in the case of membership of the Council，which


 єєкатòv ä $\nu \delta \rho \epsilon \varsigma$.







18－20 lva et ö̃av locum inter se mutasse putat Hude，qui etiam（cum Thomp－
 $\delta \iota a \nu \epsilon \mu a \nu \tau \omega \nu$ nimis audacter Poste． 19 roîs a $\sigma$ тoîs secl． $\mathrm{K}^{3}$ ，retinent k－w；roîs
 poic aut simile aliquid scriptum fuisse videtur；malui tamen aüroîs accipere，et rois secludere，utpote ex interpretamento $\tau 0 i ̂ s \tau^{\prime}$（sc．тoîs $\left.\tau \in \tau \rho a \kappa o \sigma i o s s\right)$ exortum．
 к，H－L；єi $\dot{\eta} \in \sigma \sigma \nu$ K－w，в．

might be held twice（see c． 62 end，and Pol． $1275 a 25 ; 1299 a 10 ; 1317 b 24 ;$ there quoted）．


＇As regards the future，in order that the 400 may be distributed into the four divisions（above mentioned， $30 \S 3$ ），let the hundred make the distribution when it is possible for them（i，e．the 400）to sit in council with the rest．＇

T $\omega v d \lambda \lambda \omega v$ refers to the 5,000 ，as in c． $30 \S 3$ ，twice．avitoís refers to the тєтракббєо aforesaid．

Kaibel and Wilamowitz explain tûv ä $\lambda \lambda \omega \nu$ as $\tau \hat{\nu} \nu \dot{\ell} \Sigma \Sigma \measuredangle \mu \varphi$, but（as observed by Mr Kenyon）＇$\beta$ ou $\lambda \in \dot{\varepsilon} \varepsilon \iota \nu$ is a technical word，and the Athenians with the fleet would not become members of the $\beta$ ounخे on their return，and there would be no occasion to await their return before arranging the subdivision of the Four Hundred among the four councils．${ }^{\text {a }}$

In סiaveцpóvtuv we have a sudden transition from the inf．of orat．obliqua to the imperative of oratio recta．

XXXII § 1. emı廿ท中loc．vtos］ 30 § 4 end．＇ApLoto $\mu$ áxou，otherwise unknown．
＇The absence of the name of father and deme is in accordance with the lapidary style of the sth $^{\text {th }}$ century，in which the decrees simply have $\dot{\delta}$ $\delta \in \hat{\nu}$ a




KadMas eite．On the other hand，the addition of the deme（c． 34 ult．，Eqpa $\psi \varepsilon \tau$ $\psi \dot{\eta} \phi ı \sigma \mu a \Delta \rho a к o \nu \tau i \delta \eta \mathrm{~s}$＇ $\mathrm{A} \phi \iota \delta \nu a i=s$ ）or father
 रov）of the proposer，is not in the manner of 5 th century inscriptions＇（Wyse）．

mplv Siaßou入evíat］＇before the com－ pletion of its term of office．＇The word is not found elsewhere in act．$\delta$ oaßou－ $\lambda \in \dot{v} \in \sigma \theta a t$ ，＇to deliberate thoroughly，＇is found in Andoc． 28 19；and in the sense of＇taking counsel＇in Thuc．ii 5 and else－ where（ $L$ and S），e．g．vii 50 § 4 ，＇to discuss．${ }^{\text {＇}}$ As appears from the context， the Council was within a month of com－ pleting its year of office．
 of Thargelion（May－June）or about the end of May．Évárn фetvovtos ©apyr－ $\lambda$ twvos，the 2 rst of Thargelion，or about
 the $r_{4}$ th of Scirophorion（June－July），or about the end of June．

सE6t］＇was bound＇in ordinary course， according to the normal constitution．

 $\beta_{0}$ （of the attack of the Four Hundred and their emissaries on the Council of $4 \mathrm{r} 2-$
 $\lambda \in v \tau a i s$ ．The object of the emphatic mention of kía $\mu o s$ is to point the contrast between the constitutional Council and











 $\epsilon \mathrm{EP}$


that of the Revolution. The latter was not appointed by lot out of the general body of citizens. Cf. 3I, 4, outs $\alpha \nu \operatorname{tin} \omega \nu$ таi.
§ 2. $\mu$ а́入ıбта éкатóv] B.c. 5 10-to end of May 411 , or 99 years; hence $\mu d$ -



Meıनdivסpov] Thuc. viii 49, 53-56, $63-68$, esp. 68 § i (of the $\epsilon \kappa к \lambda \eta \sigma i a$ held








 Phrynichus who $\pi a \rho \epsilon \epsilon \sigma \chi \epsilon \ldots$ हаvт $\dot{\partial} \nu \pi \dot{d} \nu \tau \omega \nu$



 $\dot{\alpha} \pi^{\prime} \dot{\alpha} \delta \delta \rho \hat{\nu} \nu \pi о \lambda \lambda \hat{\omega} \nu \quad \kappa a i \quad \xi \nu \nu \epsilon \tau \hat{\omega} \nu$ (cf.
 каiтєр $\mu \epsilon \gamma \alpha$ ду $\pi \rho о \dot{\chi} \dot{\omega} \rho \eta \sigma \epsilon$. On Peisander, see also Lys. 12 §66; 25§9; and Andoc. 2 §§ in-15: on Antiphon, Lys. $12 \S 67$; on Theramenes, $i b .62 \rightarrow 78$.






oi $\delta \mathbf{E}$ тетрако́бtol $\kappa \tau \lambda$.] Thuc. viii 70 , ol

 т $\hat{\nu} \nu$ סéka] the ten $\sigma \tau \rho a \tau \eta \gamma$ oi of c. 3 I § 2.
$\pi \rho \dot{s}$ s Lak. $\kappa \tau \lambda$.] Thuc. $i b$. $\pi \rho b s{ }^{2} \tau$

 $\lambda a \gamma \eta ̂ \nu a \iota \beta o u ́ \lambda \epsilon \sigma \theta a u(G r o t e, v$ p. 391). 7 I §3,




 $\lambda a \gamma \hat{\eta} \nu \alpha L$.


 סatmovious. Lastly, gr § i, ot és $\tau \hat{\eta} s$ Sake-
 $\rho \eta \sigma a \nu$ тоîs $\xi \cup \mu \pi \pi a \sigma \iota \xi \nu \mu \beta a \tau \iota \kappa \delta \nu$. 'We read with astonishment,' says Grote, v 409, 'that the (Lacedaemonians) could not be prevailed upon to contract any treaty and that they manifested nothing but backwardness in seizing the golden opportunity.' But the envoys clearly could not answer for the armament at Samos, and therefore returned without obtaining any terms that would apply to the Athenians at large. The text tells us what we do not learn from Thucydides, viz. that the reason for this failure in the negotiations was due to the envoys declining to surrender the maritime supremacy of Athens. This embassy was afterwards impeached by Theramenes (Lysias $12 \S \$ 66-68$ ); Antiphon was condemned and executed (Phrynichus had been already assassinated).

кате入íovто] tentative impf.











## גo



 edd.



 The 400 were practically in power from the end of May to the end of June, also for the two months of July and August in the civil year next ensuing ( $\delta(\mu \eta \nu o \nu)$. This makes three months. Hence the oligarchical revolution began about a month earlier, i.e. at the end of April, while the constitutional Council was still nominally in office (Thuc. viii 66,1 ), and the four months are May, June, July and and August. Thuc. viii 63,3 , places the fall of the democracy a little earlier than the spring of 41 I. It has been assigned to March 411 , soon after the Lenaea in which the Lysistrata was produced (Wattenbach, De Quadr. p. 29, quoted by Classen, Thuc. l.c.). Similarly Grote, c. 63 init., describes the Four Hundred as 'installed in the Senate-House about February or March 4 II B.c., and deposed about July of the same year,' and speaks of Athens undergoing 'four or five months of danger and distraction.' It now appears that these dates are rather too early.

Mv$\eta \sigma$ ( $\lambda_{0 x}{ }^{\circ}$ s] the archon eponymus selected by the 400 . M $\mu \eta \sigma$ (hoxos is mentioned in the list of the Thirty given in Xen. Hell. ii 3, 2 and there is every probability that the two are the same. Cf. CIA iv $3,179{ }^{d}$ 1, P. 162, ['A $\left.\theta \eta \nu a i ̂\right] o l$
 This expenditure was authorised not (as usual) by vote of the $\delta \hat{\eta} \mu o s$, but $\psi \eta \phi t \sigma \alpha-$
$\mu \epsilon \nu \eta s \tau \bar{\eta} s \beta o v \lambda \hat{\eta} s$. At the date specified, the 2 Ist of Hecatombaeon, the Four Hundred were still in power.
©єo $\frac{0}{\mu} \mu \pi 0 v$ ] the archon eponymus appointed by lot on the restoration of the democracy in the third month of the civil year, в.C. 111-10. $^{11}$
$\dot{i} \pi$ inolimovs] not found in the Index Ar. In 40 \& 1 we have the ordinary word $\dot{\text { unfoholitous. }} \dot{\epsilon} \pi i \lambda o l \pi o s$ is often used by Plato, Rep. 540 в and Leg. 728 D, $\tau \partial \nu$
 xpóvov.

т 95. In Lys. $20 \S 14$ one of the ката入о$\gamma_{\text {fîs }}$ sails for Eretria after holding office under the 400 for eight days only. $\pi \lambda \eta v$ ${ }^{\prime} \Omega$ рєov. Thuc. l.c. $\$ 7$, (the Lac.) Evoouav



 т $\hat{\omega} \nu \bar{\nu} \pi i \nu \pi a \rho \epsilon \sigma \tau \eta$.

入ov̂vтo. Decelea was at this time in the occupation of Agis.

катєлvбаv то̀ेs тєтракобlovs ктл.] Thuc. viii $97 \$ \mathrm{I}$, тò̀s тєтракобlous ката-


 $\mu \eta \delta \dot{\epsilon} \alpha a \notin \rho \in \epsilon \nu \mu \eta \delta \epsilon \mu \hat{a} d \rho \chi \hat{\eta}$.
 Thuc. viii 89, 2 (of the opposition to the







 I
 Herwerden．
 d．
 $\nu \kappa \kappa ̂ \nu \tau a s ~ e ~ m a r g i n e ~ i r r e p s i s s e ~ p u t a t ~ R i c h a r d s . ~ . ~$





extreme members of the 400 ），妾 $\chi 0 \nu \tau \epsilon \mathrm{~S} \dot{\eta} \gamma \epsilon$－ $\mu b \nu a s \tau \hat{\omega} \nu \pi \alpha \dot{\nu} v$［ $\sigma \tau \rho \alpha \tau \eta \gamma \hat{\omega} \nu$ ］$\tau \hat{\omega} \nu$ év $\tau \hat{\eta}$ $\delta \lambda \iota \gamma a p \chi i \notin[\kappa \alpha l]$ e $\nu$ apxais $\delta \nu \tau \omega \nu$ ，oTov $\theta \eta$－
 $\tau \partial \nu \Sigma_{\kappa \epsilon \lambda \lambda l o v . ~ L y s . ~}^{\text {I }} \mathbf{2}$ §66，（Theramenes） $\mu \varepsilon \tau \in \sigma \chi \in \tau \hat{\omega} \nu$＇A

Aristocrates had been one of the envoys who negotiated the peace of 421 B．C． （Thuc．$v 19$ and 24）．In $4 I_{4}$ B．c．he is represented as a typical＇aristocrat＇in Arist．Aves，125，（＂Ето廿）dрибтократєі－

 Plat．Gorg． 472 A．He was a taglapxos under the 400 （Thuc．viii $9^{2}$ ）and is ex－ tolled by the author of the speech against Theocrines，［Dem．］ $58 \S 67$ ，for taking part in the destruction of the fortress of Eetioneia and restoring the democracy． He was one of the generals at Arginusae （406）．
 $X^{1 \lambda}$ lois］In Thuc．l．c．the opponents of the






 עето каl êk $\pi о \nu \eta \rho \hat{\omega} \nu \tau \hat{\omega} \nu \pi \rho a \gamma \mu d \tau \omega \nu$ тои̂то
 v 430 ．




XXXIV．Arginusae and Aegospotami．
 ship of Theopompus was in B．c． $4 \mathrm{r} / \mathrm{o}$ ； that of Callias in $406 / 5$ ．Thus，the latter was in the sixth year after the overthrow of the Four Hundred．Mr Kenyon sug－ gests that＇the calculation was probably made by inadvertence from the establish－ ment of the Four Hundred，which was in the official year $412-411$ B．c．＇

то̂́ $\left.{ }^{\prime} A y \gamma \in \lambda \boldsymbol{\eta} \theta \in \boldsymbol{\theta}\right]$ ．Added to distinguish him from the Callias who was archon in B．C． 452 （c． 32 § 5）．Others of the same name were archons in $45^{6}$ and 377.

It was more usual to remove such am－ biguities by adding the archon of the previous year，e．g．Arg．to Arist．Ranae， $\dot{\epsilon} \pi l$ Kan入lov tồ $\mu \in \tau$＇＇Avir $\gamma \in \nu \hat{\eta}$（the Cal－ lias of the text）；Schol．Ach．Io，Ka入入iou $\tau 0 \hat{v} \mu \varepsilon \tau \dot{\alpha}$ M $\eta \eta \sigma$ l $\theta$ cov（the Callias of 456 ）． In Schol．Nub．97I Phrynis is said to have been victorious at the Panathenaea é $\pi l$ Ka入入lov ä́ $\rho \chi$ оутos，probably B．c． 406 ， as this was the third year of the Olympiad （Wyse）．
＇Apyıvov́caıs］Xen．Hell．i 6，27－38． Cf．Grote，c． 64 ，v $501-536$ ；Holm，Gr Gesch．ii $573 \mathrm{ff}, 5_{5}{ }_{5}$ ．
toùs סéka orpatijyoùs］In Xen．Hell． i 5,16 we have the names of the ten generals：Conon，Diomedon，Leon（also mentioned in $6 \S 16$ ，but probably a mistake for Lysias，who is mentioned in 6 § 30 ，and 7 § 1），Pericles，Erasinides， Aristocrates，Archestratus，Protomachus，

## 

Thrasyllus, Aristogenes. Of these Conon was blockaded in the harbour of Mitylene, and was therefore not present at the battle of Arginusae (Hell. 6 § 56 ff.). Leon and Erasinides were with Cleon when he first made for Mitylene (l.c. § 16) and we hear no more of them until we find Erasinides among those engaged in the battle (\% 29). The other generals engaged in it were Aristocrates, Diomedon, Pericles, Protomachus, Thrasyllus, Lysias, and Aristogenes. We know from Lysias 21 § 8 that Archestratus died at Mitylene, though Xenophon is silent on this point; and Erasinides probably left Mitylene on board the vessel mentioned in the passage of Lysias just quoted : ámoөavby
 $\epsilon \mu 0 \hat{v} \sigma \nu \nu \epsilon \pi \lambda \epsilon$. (Baner P. 159, assumes that Leon is the tenth general of whom Xenophon is silent, and that he is not identical with the general who bears the name of Lysias.)

Thus only eight of the ten were engaged in the battle; after the battle, the generals were recalled. Two of them, Protomachus and Aristogenes, declined to come. 'Warned of the displeasure of the people and not confiding in their own case to meet it, they preferred to pay the price of voluntary exile' (Grote $\mathrm{v}_{5} \mathrm{IO}$, c . 64 ).

Only six returned to Athens. It was ultimately proposed to the Council by Callixenus (Xen. Hell. i 7 § 9) and carried, that the case should be decided by the public assembly voting in their tribes by ballot, and that one single vote was to decide the case of all the generals (\$34,
 sembly it was moved by Euryptolemus that each of the generals should be tried separately (крlעe $\sigma \theta a, ~ \tau o u s ~ d \nu \delta \rho a s ~ \delta i \chi a$ $\Psi_{\text {к }}$ кабтov, ib.). The assembly first voted by show of hands (סiaxceporovia) in favour of this motion, and then against it; thereupon they condemned all the eight generals who had taken part in the battle ( $\kappa \alpha \tau \in \psi \eta \phi і \sigma \alpha \nu \tau 0 \tau \hat{\omega} \nu \nu \alpha u \mu \alpha \chi \eta \sigma \alpha \nu \tau \omega \nu \sigma \tau \rho \alpha-$ $\tau \eta \gamma \hat{\omega} \nu, \delta \kappa \tau \dot{\omega}$ öy $\nu \omega \nu)$. The six who had returned were put to death.

If we now turn from the narrative in Xenophon to the description in the text, we find several discrepancies: (I) all the ten are put on their trial, not eight alone;
 it was only the vote on the rival motions (including the decision to try them collectively) that was taken by show of
hands, and the final verdict was given by
 vaupax $\eta \sigma a \nu \tau a s$ must refer to Conon who was at Mitylene, and to Archestratus who died there. tovs $\delta^{\prime} \dot{\epsilon}^{\prime} \pi^{\prime}$ àdnotplas $\nu \in \dot{\omega} s{ }^{\sigma} \omega \theta \dot{\epsilon} \nu \tau a s$ is so far borne out by Xenophon that, according to the statement made in the speech of Euryptolemus (l.c. § 32), one of the generals was $\epsilon \pi i$
 99).

As regards our other authorities, Philochorus (frag. 12I) speaks of six generals as having been put to death; Diodorus (xiii roI-2) describes six only as actually condemned. Accordingto Androtion's Atthis (quoted by Pausanias vi 7,7 ) the decision was limited to the generals who actually took part in the battle. Plut. Per. 37 says of Pericles the younger,
 $\sigma v \sigma \tau \rho a \tau \eta \gamma \omega \mathrm{v}$. The Schol. on Aristoph. Ran. 698 describes four of the generals as having escaped and six as having been put to death. This is somewhat fancifully regarded by Bauer (p. 161) as implying tbat the charge concerned all the ten.



 $\tau \dot{\alpha} \nu \epsilon \omega \nu \dot{\eta} \nu a \nu \tau \iota \omega \dot{\theta} \eta \eta \nu \dot{v} \mu \hat{\nu}$. [Plat.] Axioch. 368 D states that all the ten $\sigma \tau \rho a \tau \pi \gamma \mathrm{ol}$ were condemned to death. This account is carelessly followed by Aelian $V$. $H$. iii

 Valerins Max. iii 8, 3 and Schol. Aristid. iii 245,24 Dind.

According to Bauer the 'dream of Thrasyllus' (Diod. xiii 97, 6) implies that seven of the generals were put to death. The seventh (he suggests) was Leon. Diodorus (xiii 101 § 5) states that Conon also was accused but acquitted. Bauer considers the account in the text too definite in its terms (zu scharf ausgedruickt), in so far as it takes no note of Conon's acquittal; but he actually regards it as more correct than the narrative in Xenophon. He suggests that Xenophon passes over the case of Leon who had not been present at the battle, because it would put the injustice of the sentence in too extreme a light. In Bauer's opinion the author can only refer to Leon in the vague plural $\boldsymbol{\tau}$ ouss oudè $\sigma u \nu \alpha u \mu \alpha-$ $\chi \eta \sigma a y \tau a s$, which Bauer admits is an exaggeration.







6 €Zamath $\theta \in n t \epsilon C$ corr. $k . \quad 8$ anienal: àmtéval J B Mayor, Sidgwick, Wyse, Blass, Herwerden, Naber, Gennadios, coll. Schol. Arist. Ran. r 532 , H-L,



 $\pi a \tau \eta \theta \in \nu$ Rutherford.

7-12 *Schol. Arist. Ran. $\mathrm{I}_{532}$; v. Testimonia in p. 129.




rapopy[favias] in Act. hitherto found only in N. T.
 occupied by Agis since the spring of 413 b.c. (Thuc. vii 19 § I), and it was retained until the end of the Peloponnesian war. On the site, about 15 miles N.E. of Athens, near the entrance of the defile leading between Parnes and Pentelicus from the plain of Athens to Oropus and Tanagra, see Leake's Demi p. 18 and plan in Curtius, Sieben Rarten.
 overtures after the battle of Arginusae are not mentioned by Xenophon or Diodorus. The terms are the same as those proposed, according to Diodorus (xiii $5^{2}$ ), after the battle of Cyzicus in 410 B.c., and opposed by Cleophon (ib. 53) (see Grote c. 63 , v 458-461). The present overtures are in fact 'a second edition' of those put forward four years previously. Xenophon says nothing of them on either occasion. The account in Diodorus led Grote (c. 65 init. p. 537 n ) to suppose that the Scholiast on Aristoph. Ranae ult., who quotes the present passage, had confounded the two battles. It now appears that the Scholiast's quotation was correct. It is not improbable that Diodorus is wrong. It is to the overtures in the text that we should refer the account in Philochorus, fragm. 117-118 Müller (ap. Schol. ad Eur.

 'A $\theta \eta \nu a i 0$ oú $\pi \rho о \sigma$ रोкаито. Cf. Schol. on 1. 722. Grote $v 460 \mathrm{n}$.
 28 § 4 Cleophon (and Callicrates) are described as having 'deceived the people.' Cleophon's action is described as follows in Lysias $\mathrm{r}_{3} \S 8$, $\partial \tau \epsilon \gamma \dot{\alpha} \rho \dot{\eta} \pi \rho \dot{\omega} \tau \eta$ ѐ $\kappa \kappa \lambda \eta \sigma l a$


 $\nu \iota о \iota, \epsilon l$ катабкафєі $\eta$ т $\hat{\nu} \tau \epsilon \iota \chi \hat{\omega} \nu \tau \hat{\omega} \nu$ макр $\hat{\nu}$

 $\tau \omega \hat{\nu} \tau \epsilon \chi \hat{\omega} \nu \tau \hat{\eta} \mathrm{s} \kappa а \tau \alpha \sigma \kappa a \phi \hat{\eta} \mathrm{~s}, \mathrm{~K} \lambda \epsilon \circ \phi \omega ิ \nu \tau \varepsilon$

 Aeschin. F. L. 76 , К Кєофй...$a ́ \pi о к б \psi є \iota \nu$

 $\left.\pi a \sigma \iota \nu{ }^{*} \kappa \phi \rho \omega \nu \bar{\epsilon} \gamma \epsilon\right\rangle \in \tau 0$ (with schol. on 150 , where $\epsilon \ell \tau \iota \varsigma \in l p \eta \nu \eta \gamma \in \nu \nu \eta \theta \eta \sigma \epsilon \tau \alpha l$, printed
 for $\left.\epsilon i p \eta \eta^{\prime} \eta s \mu \nu \eta \sigma \theta \dot{\eta} \sigma \epsilon \tau a l\right)$. Cf. Arist. Ran. $a d$ fin. K $\lambda \in \propto \phi \hat{\omega} v \delta \dot{\delta} \mu a \chi \dot{\epsilon} \sigma \theta \omega$, and Holden's Onomasticon s. v.
 been suggested (by Hartman) that we should read $\theta \dot{\omega} \rho a \kappa a$ t $\chi \omega \nu$ and interpret the latter as a metaphorical phrase equivalent to $\mu \in \theta \dot{v} \omega \nu$ (coll. Aristoph. Vesp. rig etc). If so, the writer has misinterpreted a phrase borrowed from a comedy and quite out of place here. But there is nothing unreasonable in Cleophon's appearing in armour. His life was not safe, as may be inferred from the animosity with which he was regarded by members of the oligarchical party (Aristoph. Ran. 1504, Lys. $13 \S 7 \mathrm{ff}$., 30 § 10 ff .). (Herwerden's n.) It will be remembered that Cicero, at the time of the Catilinarian conspiracy, went down to the Campus Martius armed with a lata insignique lorica (Cic. pro Murena, § 52).
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 c

 K-W, H-L, K ${ }^{3}$.

20 apxian corr. J B Mayor, Rutherford, Blass, Fränkel.
 Kontos, Hultsch (H-L).

§ 2. ' $\epsilon \pi^{\prime}$ ' $\left.\mathrm{A} \lambda \epsilon \xi \mathrm{lov}\right]$ B.C. $405 / 4$.
 tional, but quite intelligible, phrase for expressing 'defeat in the naval engagement.' We have something like it in Aristides ii 334 Dind., $\Sigma_{0 \phi о \kappa \lambda \hat{\eta} s} \Phi_{\iota} \lambda 0-$

év Alyòs тотapoîs] Xen. Hell. ii r , 2 1-32. Plut. Lysander, c. 11-12. Grote c. 65, v $542-7$.

ムúбavסpov] Lysias ${ }_{2}$ §§72—76. Plut.

 65, v 559.
 1. 3. Xen. Hell. ii 3 § $2, \varepsilon \delta 0 \xi \epsilon \tau \hat{\psi} \delta \eta \eta_{\mu} \varphi$

 The term (as Mr Kenyon observes) was 'sufficiently vague,' indicating generally the constitution of Solon; but, as the virtue of the constitution depended on its working, it was possible for moderate democrats, extreme oligarchs, and moderate aristocrats alike to hope that it would be modelled according to their views. Diodorus (xiv 3 ) recounts the arguments of the opposing parties at some length, and describes Theramencs as urging the Athenians to follow $\tau \hat{\eta} \pi a \tau \rho l \Psi$ ronırelq.
$\tau \omega \hat{\nu} \gamma \nu \omega \rho[\mu \omega \nu] 2$ § 1,5 § $1,16 \$ 9,28$ § 2 .
ĖTalpelats] CE. Thuc. iii 82, 8 ; viii 54, 4. Hermann, Staatsalt. 70,2 and ro; Schömann, Ant. p. 363 E. T.
'Apxivos] Dem. Timocr. p, 742 § 335 ,



 Isocr. 18 § 2, Aeschin. c. Ctes. 187, 195. Inf. c. 40 S§ i, 2.
${ }^{2}$ Avvtos] In the speech made by Theramenes in his defence, in Xen. Hell. ii 3 § 42, Anytus is mentioned with







K入єtгоф $\omega \hat{y}$ ] the proposer of the rider to the proposal of Pythodorus respecting the establishment of the 400 ( 29 § 3 ). Isocr. Callim. nI $\S$ zo. He is possibly the same as the son of Aristonymus and pupil of Socrates who gives his name to Plato's Cleitophon. In Plut. Mor. 805
 probably a mistake for $К \lambda \epsilon о \phi \hat{\nu} \nu$.
 Dionys. Halic. de Lysia, c. 32, toû Yàp
















 Harberton, mutato $\chi \downarrow \lambda i \omega \nu$ in $\pi \epsilon \nu \tau a \kappa \iota \sigma \chi \iota \lambda \omega \nu$ et nostro in loco $\pi \rho \sigma \sigma \in \lambda \delta \mu \epsilon \nu 0<\delta \epsilon$ scripto
(Class. Rev. vi 123 ).







$\nu \omega \nu \lambda \delta \gamma \omega \nu, \Phi_{o \rho \mu l \sigma t b s} \tau \iota s \tau \omega \hat{\omega} \sigma v \gamma \kappa a \tau \epsilon \lambda \theta b \nu-$ $\tau \omega \nu \mu \epsilon \tau \alpha ̀ ~ \tau o 0 ~ \delta \eta \dot{\eta} \mu \nu \quad \gamma \nu \dot{\mu} \mu \eta \nu$ єl $\sigma \eta \eta^{\prime} \sigma \alpha \tau 0$,


 каi $\Lambda a \kappa \varepsilon \delta a \mu \mu \nu L \omega \nu$. Grote c. 66 vi 4 ; Schömann, On Grote, § II, holds that it is wrong to regard Phormisius as an adherent of the oligarchical party; at the same time he was no friend to extreme democracy. Schömann's view is supported by the text.

He was sent with Epicrates and others as an envoy to Artaxerxes before the Corinthian war and accepted valuable gifts from the king. The envoys were attacked for this in the $\Pi \rho \epsilon \sigma \beta e c s$ of Plato, ap. Athen. 229 F (frag. 119 with Kock's note). He is mentioned in Arist. Ran. 965 as an admirer ( $\mu a \theta \eta \tau \eta$ ) ) of Aeschylus. Dịdymus, in Schol. ad loc., describes him as $\delta \rho a \sigma \tau \kappa \kappa \grave{s}$ каl $\tau \grave{\eta} \nu \kappa 6 \mu \eta \nu \quad \tau \rho \epsilon \phi \omega \nu$ ка!

$\Lambda v \sigma a ́ v \delta \rho o v-\tau o i ̂ s ~ க ̀ \lambda เ y a p x ı k o i ̂ s] ~ D i o-~$ dorus, xiv 3.
$\psi$ 'ि' $\left.^{\prime} \phi \sigma \mu \mathrm{a}\right]$ Isocr. 15 § 67, ol $\mu \xi \nu \gamma \mathrm{d} \rho$ $\psi \dot{\eta} \phi \iota \sigma \mu a \tau \iota \pi a \rho a \lambda a \beta b \nu \tau \epsilon s \tau \grave{\eta} \nu \pi o ́ \lambda \iota \nu$.
$\Delta$ ракоит $\delta \eta \mathrm{s}$ ] Lysias 12 § 73, Ө $\boldsymbol{\eta}$ ра-


 157 with Schol. He was himself nominated as one of the Thirty (Xen. Hell. ii 3 § 2; Hypereid. ap. Harp. s.v.). Cf. Plat. Com. frag. 139 Kock.

XXXV-XXXVII. The Rule of the Thirty.
XXXV § ı. oi...tplákovra] Diodorus (xix $3^{2}$ etc) is the first writer who calls them of $\tau \rho$. тupaipou. The same designation occurs in Plut. Suzll. 5 and in later writers.


 Hell. ii 3 § 1 ; cf. however Lys. 7 § 9 .





 au̇tois. Tods dilas dpxás, e.g. that of King-Archon which was filled by Patrocles, Isocr. Callim. 18 § 6.
 those selected beforehand, i.e. out of the 1000.' If $\chi^{\circ} \lambda(\omega \nu$ is right, the reference is to the Knights. Cf. Philochorus, fragm. 100, ap. Hesych. s. v. $i \pi \pi \hat{\eta} s$, $i \pi \pi \in i \hat{s}$





 Gr. St. i 305 . The Knights were generally credited with oligarchical sympathies. Cf. Martin, Les Cavaliers Athéniens, 1886,





 $\epsilon i \chi \chi o \nu, \kappa a i ̀ ~ \tau o ̀ ~ \kappa v ̂ \rho o s ~ o ̂ ~ \grave{\eta} \nu ~ \epsilon ̇ \nu ~ \tau o i ̂ s ~ \delta \iota \kappa a \sigma \tau a i ̂ s ~ \kappa[a \tau \epsilon ́] \lambda v \sigma a \nu, ~ \omega ́ s ~$


 K-w, h-L, в, coll. с. 13, 18 . 11 ДIAMф|zВнт. 13 АNAMфIZВнтнton. Post annum 329 A.c. etiam in titulis Atticis apparet $\zeta$ aut $\sigma \zeta$ pro $\sigma$, e.g. $\begin{gathered}\boldsymbol{\nu} \downarrow \dot{d} \xi \zeta \mu o u s\end{gathered}$ ( 329 A.C.), $\psi \dot{\eta} \phi \iota \zeta \mu a$ (paullo post 100 A.c.), Meisterbans, p. $68^{2}$.
pp. 472-480, Les Cavaliers et les Trente.
It is improbable however that the select body, out of which the 500 and the other officials were appointed, numbered only reoo. Hence it has been proposed to
 (as observed by Mr Kenyon) we know of no such body as in existence at this time, unless it is vaguely applied (as under the 400 ) to all capable of bearing arms.

 oтijoas apxoyтas. Plat. Epist. vii p. 324 B. Scheibe, Oligarchische Umzoälzung, p. 68.
$\psi^{2} \delta \in \kappa \kappa 1$ c. 52 § 1. Xen. Hell. ii 3 § 54 . This new board of Eleven was under the control of Satyrus, one of the most violent partisans of the Thirty.

Martiyoфópovs] The word occurs in Thuc. iv 47 . Xen. Hell. ii 3 § 23 mentions certain pedpeokol, who carried out the orders of the Thirty, but their number is not specified.
§ 2. $\mu \hat{k}$ тpıot] cf. Xen. Hell. ii 3 § 12. The Thirty began by attacking the бuкoфáv $\quad$ aı alone. Plut. Mor. ii pp. 959, 998. Inf. 1. 18.
'Нфи́Atov] c. 25 § 2.
 of that name in the Peloponnesian war, a son of Lycomedes (Thuc. i 57 § 4 ; Xen. Hell. i 5, 16; ii 2, 15). He died at Mitylene (Lys. 2I §8). In Thuc. viii 74 § I we have an Archestratus, who is described as the father of Chaereas.

Mr Kenyon conjectures that 'probably Archestratus was one of the supporters of Ephialtes, and some of the laws curtailing the power of the Areopagus stood in his name.'

каөеî̀or és 'Apeiov táyov] This im. plies that the laws of Ephialtes \&c limiting the powers of the Areopagites were actually preserved on the Areopagus and that the Thirty removed them from the hill of Ares and thereby virtually repealed them. The context further implies that the laws of Solon were also preserved on the Areopagus, whereas they were really preserved in the Prytaneum (note on 7 § 1 , кíppets). Possibly we should strike out $\dot{\epsilon} \xi$ 'Apetou $\pi \dot{a}$ you. As a milder remedy we may remove the comma after $\epsilon i \chi o \nu$, so as to bring the laws of Solon here referred to under the influence of the verb катe入vaay: but as the text stands, the laws of Solon are coupled to those of Ephialtes and Archestratus and can only be separated from them by striking out $\tau$ ' before 'Eфıá入тov.

Zódavos] Schol. Aeschin. 1 § 39, of $\lambda^{\prime}$


$\theta \in \sigma \mu \omega \hat{\nu}]$ c. 12 § 4 l. 45 , in the Iambic lines from Solon.
 been remarked that the right of appeal to a lawcourt was one of the strongest points in the democracy as constituted by Solon. In the same passage the ambiguities in the law of property and the law of 'heiresses' are described as giving additional power to the lawcourts. Some of these ambiguities are removed by the Thirty and the power of the lawcourts (and the commons) pro tanto diminished.
 in Pol. iii $1_{3}, \mathrm{I}_{2} 83 \mathrm{~b}_{4}$, and coupled with фavepdy in $1332 b 20$ and Categ. $5,3^{b} 4$. The adverb is found in Categ. 8, if $a 2$.

 үท́p









#### Abstract

    $\pi a p a \nu o \omega \nu>$ Poland; eadem (nisi quod $\dot{\varepsilon} \nu \in \kappa \alpha$ malunt et $\pi a \rho a \nu o \omega \hat{\nu}$ non accipiunt) н-L.  aoristus ( $=\pi \epsilon \epsilon \sigma \theta \epsilon l$ )' '-L. $\quad 19$ кal secl. к-w. 20 exalpon propter participium   H-L, K-W.











 $\pi є t \theta \overline{\mu \epsilon \nu} \mathbf{0}$. See note on Dem. Lept. § 102.

каӨámak] 'absolutely.' Under Solon's law it was only in the event of a man's having no legitimate children that he could make a will at all. Possibly the Thirty made the right absolute.
 inconvenient limitations attaching thereto' or 'the additional inconvenient limitations'; probably the former.
 46 § $14, \dot{\epsilon} \dot{\alpha} \nu \mu \eta \eta^{\mu} \mu \nu \iota \hat{\omega} \nu \hat{\eta} \gamma \dot{\eta} \rho \omega s \hat{\eta}$



 ката入ŋфөєцта. 48 § 56 , äки $\alpha$ d $\gamma є \tau \alpha \hat{\tau} \tau \alpha$





§ 3. тoùs бukoфávras ктл.]. Xen. Hell.
 $\tau \hat{\eta}$ б $\eta \mu о к \rho a \tau i q$ à $\pi \dot{\partial}$ бикофаутias § $\hat{\nu} \tau a s$ каі тoîs кa入oîs кảyaOoîs $\beta$ арєîs д̀vтas $\sigma u \lambda \lambda a \mu$ -




 $\pi o \iota \eta \hat{\sigma} \sigma \iota \tau \grave{\eta} \nu \pi b \lambda \iota v$. Plato, then a young man of 24 , and a nephew of Critias, was at first misled by thesesplendid professions, Epist. 324 BC (Grote, ${ }^{2} 562$ ).
 4, 4: Hell. vi 3, 7; Rhet. i 1, 1354 b 34,





Theramenes protested against putting people to death simply because they had enjoyed influence under the democracy: ' Even you and I (he reminded Kritias) have both said and done many things for the sake of popularity' Xen. Hell. ii 3 $\S_{5}$ (Grote, $\mathrm{v} 5^{65}$ ).
§ 4:- oűठєvòs dं



 and § $17, \dot{a} \pi \sigma \theta \nu \eta \sigma \kappa \delta \nu \tau \omega \nu \quad \pi о \lambda \lambda \hat{\omega} \nu \quad к а \dot{i}$ adicws. Among those who were put to death were Strombichides and other officers who were attached to the demo-




 $\mu \epsilon \tau a \delta o \hat{\nu} \nu a \iota$ ठ̀̀ $\tau \hat{\omega} \nu \pi \rho a \gamma \mu a ́ \tau \omega \nu$ тoîs $\beta e \lambda \tau i \sigma \tau o \iota s$ ．oi $\delta \grave{\epsilon} \pi \rho \hat{\omega} \tau o \nu$










24 ау $\boldsymbol{\xi} \mu \mu \alpha \sigma$ H－L． $\theta \delta \nu \tau o s$ Herwerden．

25 дıatrecontoc（edd．）？：$\delta \iota a \lambda \iota \pi \delta \nu \tau o s$ J B Mayor，$\delta \iota \epsilon \lambda$－ 2 ГIN（k－w）．$\quad 3$ пратоI corr．к．$\quad 6$ ката－ $9 \mu \epsilon \tau а \delta \delta \delta \sigma a \sigma \omega \mathrm{H}-\mathrm{L}$ ．

Ka
12 мєта－
$\lambda$ ејovol H－L．
7 дICXIAıYॅ corr．к．

XXXV 26 Heraclidis epitoma，Frag．6i i， $6^{3}$（locus infra exscriptus）．
cracy（Lysias 13 § 13 ； 30 § 14）；Lycurgus who belonged to one of the most eminent sacred gentes in the State（［Plut．］Vit． Orat．p．838）；a wealthy man named Antiphon；Leon of Salamis（Plat．Apol． p．32）；and even Niceratus the son，and Eucrates the brother，of Nicias，Xen． Hell．ii 3，39－4I ；Lysias 18 §§ 5－8 （Grote v ${ }^{566}$ ）．
 moving（making away with）all whom they had reason to fear．＇Plat．Rep． 567 B ，and in pass．Thuc．viii 70 （of the Four Hundred）divopas．．． $\boldsymbol{\pi} \pi \in \kappa \tau \in L \nu a \nu$ ou
 $\rho \in \theta \hat{\eta} v a u$. Either tòv $\phi o ́ \beta o v$, as suggested by Mr W．L．Newman（Class．Rev．v $164 b$ ），is the＇object of their fear＇（a some－ what poetic usage），or we must render the passage＇getting quit of their own apprehension．＇
Xidious $\pi \in \boldsymbol{\nu} \tau \mathbf{a k o \sigma}$ lovs］Heraclides 9 ，
 Areop． 67 （of the Thirty），of $\mu \xi \nu$ रà $\psi \eta \phi l$－

 $\dot{a} \pi \notin \kappa \kappa \epsilon \epsilon \nu a \nu$, Paneg．13I．Aeschin．Ctes． § 235．Cf．Grote v 577 n ．The Schol．
on Aeschin．I $\S 39$ quotes Lysias for the number 2500.

 $-17$.
$\delta \iota \epsilon \sigma \pi a ́ p \eta \sigma a v] \delta$ ．$\lambda \delta \gamma_{o v}$, Xen．Hell．vi § 25 ．



 трঠ̀s aúriv ol то入íral，катале́yovat трıб－


тробта́тทs той $\delta \eta \eta_{\mu} u \mathrm{u}$ c． 21.9 ；c． 28 § 2.

 äтото⿱










т $\mathbf{\nu} \nu \boldsymbol{\delta} \dot{\epsilon}$ кaтdi入oyov $\kappa \tau \lambda$ ．］The narra－ tive in Xenophon（Hell．ii 3 §20）pro－


 $\tau \omega ิ \nu$ e̋ $\xi \omega \theta \epsilon \nu$.






 $<\dot{\epsilon} \gamma>\gamma \epsilon \gamma \rho a \mu \mu \bar{e} \nu \omega \nu$ Herwerden（H－L，K－W，B）．

XXXVII 2 kal secl．k．w．
Стрatian K，h－L，B：atparelan K－w．
3 ol
$\epsilon$

4 тарієс白al
corr．к．$\quad 5<r \partial \nu>\mathrm{k}-\mathrm{W}, \mathrm{H}-\mathrm{L}, \mathrm{K}^{3}, \mathrm{~B}$, coll．©． $7,8$.
ceeds immediately with an account of the review of the 3000 in the agora and of the rest（ $\tau \hat{\omega} \nu \vec{\xi} \xi \omega \quad \tau 0 \hat{v} \kappa a \tau a \lambda \delta \gamma 0 v$ ）else－ where．The кará $\lambda o \gamma o s$ is the list of the 3000 referred to by Theramenes in Xen． Hell．ii $3 \$ 5^{2}$ ，lкeтevi $\omega . . . \mu \grave{\eta}$ eml K $\rho \iota \tau l a$,


 ib． 4 § 28.
divetvejpaфov］The word is used by Dem．，but only in the pass．
XXXVII § 1．тov̂ Xєчนิेvos èvєनтผ̂тos］ the winter of B．C． $404 / 3$ ．
ката入аßóvтоs－Фu入خ́v］Xenophon （Hell．ii 3，23－56）completes the story of the opposition of Theramenes to the proceedings of the Thirty，and his con－ sequent death，before relating the capture of Phyle by Thrasybulus．In ii 4 ， 1 ，after the death of Theramenes，the opponents of the Thirty were compelled to withdraw， and many of them went to Megara and Thehes．Thereupon（ $\epsilon_{\kappa}$ qourou § ${ }^{2}$ ） Thrasybulus $\dot{\delta} \rho \mu \eta \theta \epsilon l s^{\epsilon} \kappa \kappa \quad \Theta \eta \beta \hat{\omega} \nu \dot{\sin } \sigma \dot{v} \nu$
 lo $\chi u p b y$ ．In the text the occupation of Phyle，and the defeat of the force sent out by the Thirty against the holders of that fort，are described as the cause of the dis－ armament of the general body of citizens and the execution of Theramenes．
This implies that Thrasybulus held Phyle for a longer time than has generally been supposed．It was not long after the surrender of Athens，on the r6th of Munychion（end of April），that the Thirty came into power，probably early in May，

404．Cleocritus in Xen．Hell．ii 4，21， speaking immediately after the battle which ensued on the occupation of Munychia，describes the rule of the Thirty as having lasted for eight months．This brings us to the end of December， 404 ：

It was not until the small force which originally occupied Phyle，variously stated as $30,60,70$ or over 100 （Grote v 585 ），had increased to 1000 that Thrasy－ bulus advanced on Athens．Mr Kenyon suggests that＇they probably remained for two or three of the winter months at Phyle．＇The fact that it was during the winter that Phyle was in occupation is illustrated by the narrative of the snow－ storm which thwarted the Thirty in their attempt to blockade Phyle after their first repulse（Xen．Hell．ii 4，2）．
тd．ӧтлa тарелє $\sigma \theta a l]$ Xen．Hell．ii 3
 $\pi a \rho \in i \lambda о \nu \tau 0$ ，and $i b . \S_{41}$ ．Pol． $1311 a 8 \mathrm{ff}$ ．

av่токра́тораs－трıбXı入（ $\omega v]$ Xen．Hell．







 plies that there were other кacעol $\nu$ ó $\mu$ or， and the second given in the text，but un－ recognised by Xenophon，would be one of them．But if it had already been passed before the meeting of the Council at which Critias denounced Theramenes，










 14 Өanatoyntac (k, k-w) defendit Kontos coll. Thuc. v 34, Plat. Leg. 878 e, Polyb. iii 85, 2 etc. : धavaroû̀ Lacon, Keil, ( + aủ ${ }^{2} \nu$ Poland), coll. Xen. Hell. ii 13, 51 .

 Leeuwen.
the latter would obvionsly have withdrawn from Athens. The only alternative is to suppose, with Mr Kenyon, that Critias proposed the second law on the spot and 'forced it down the throat of the council by the threat of armed force.' This is not inconsistent with striking the name of Theramenes out of the list of the 3000 , the only detail recorded by Xenophon, who omits the second law as superfluous, and as therefore marring the dramatic effect of his narrative.




入оүoy é $\gamma \gamma \rho$ рá $\psi a s$.

тò èv'Hetiavelạ reîxos katarkáqavtes] 'the projecting mole which contracted and commanded, on the northern side, the narrow entrance of Peiraeus,' Grote c. 62, v 403, 408, 412 . See Map of Peiraeus in Curtius, Sieben Karten, no. 2.















 теіхьбда. In [Dem.] Theocr. § 17 p. 1343 , the incident is wrongly referred to the time of the Thirty.
 already been mentioned as resolved by the Thirty, in § I. Xenophon places the actual disarmament before the execution of Theramenes, Hell. ii 3, 20.


 after the disarmament, and before the death of Theramenes, that, according to Xenophon, ten of the $\mu \dot{\epsilon}$ тockoc became the victims of the Thirty. Among these was Polemarchus, the brother of Lysias (Lys.
 tis ro $\beta$ e入tiov єival, Eth. го, 5, 1175a 35 ,



$\pi р \dot{\epsilon} \sigma \beta$ ets $\pi \in \dot{\mu} \mu \psi a v \tau \epsilon 5]$ This asyndeton is not justifiable on the same grounds as $\nu \delta \mu o u s$ eloŋ̀ $\nu \in \gamma к a \nu$ in the second sentence of this chapter; and betrays some serious disturbance of the text. 'There is no connexion whatever between the first of these sentences and those that go before them, and the coming of Callibius preceded the final measures taken against Theramenes' (Edinburgh Review, 1891 p. $4^{8}$ ). Besides, it is too late to accuse Theramenes when he is already executed. There is thus every reason for believing (with van Leeuwen) that this paragraph ought to be transferred to


 ѐ $\lambda$ Óóvтєs є̀ $\phi \rho o u ́ \rho o u \nu$.










 $\tau \omega \hat{\nu} \pi о \lambda \iota \tau \hat{\omega} \nu \dot{a} \pi \epsilon ́ \kappa \tau \epsilon \iota \nu a \nu, \kappa a \grave{\imath} \tau \grave{a} \pi \rho a ́ \gamma \mu a \tau a \quad \beta \epsilon \beta a i ́ \omega \varsigma$ єì $\chi o \nu, \sigma v \nu a-$

17 aүtoIc ( $\mathrm{K}, \mathrm{H}-\mathrm{L}$ ) : aùtoîs K-w, éautoîs b.
XXXVIII 2 et 16 MOYNYXIAN. Cf. c. 19, 5. 4 cYnacepoice? 6 enoic


 $\mathrm{H}-\mathrm{L}$. $\quad 11 \Delta \eta \mu \alpha \dot{\alpha} \rho \tau 0 \nu$ Blass ( $\mathrm{K}-\mathrm{W}, \mathrm{H}-\mathrm{L}, \mathrm{K}^{3}$ ); post hoc nomen aj $\rho \in \tau \hat{\eta}$ fortasse recte


Testimonia. XXXVIII 5 Bekk. An. 235-6 (cf. Testim. ad xxxv 5-6).
some such place as the end of c. $3^{66}$. Xenophon's narrative (Hell. ii $3 \S \S \mathrm{r}_{3}, \mathrm{r}_{4}$ ), as noticed by Mr Kenyon, is supported by Diodorus xiv 4, and is in itself more probable than that in the text:-'It would hardly have been possible for the Thirty to have carried on their Reign of Terror without an armed force at their backs, whereas Aristotle represents it as having occurred while the whole body of Athenians was still in possession of weapons.' Part of this objection is removed by transferring the passage to the end of c . $3^{6}$, but we still have the protests of Theramenes placed after, instead of before, the arrival of the Spartan garrison.

Kad(ßıov] Xen. l.c. and Plut. Lysand. $I_{5} \mathrm{ad} \mathrm{fm}$. In neither of these passages is the number of the garrison mentioned.
XXXVIII-XL. The Rule of the Ten.
The end of the oligarchical revolution and the restoration of the democracy.
XXXVIII § І. каталаßóvт $\omega \nu$-MovvıX(av $\kappa \tau \lambda$.] Xen. Hell. ii 4, 1 I -ı 9. Andoc. De Myst. 80.



тov̀s трเáкоута катé\ขбау кт入.] ib. 23,

 $\phi \nu \lambda \bar{\eta} \mathrm{s}$.

The appointment of the Ten is described by Lysias, c. Eratosth. I2 §54, apxop-
 Among them were Pheidon, formerly one of the Thirty, with Hippocles and Epichares and others who were regarded as opposed to the extreme party of Charicles and Critias ( $\$ 55$ ). $\lambda a \beta b \mu \tau \epsilon s . . . \tau \dot{d} s$ aj $\rho \chi$ às

 $\dot{\nu} \mu \hat{\imath} \nu \pi \dot{\alpha} \nu \tau \alpha$ какล̀ $\pi \epsilon \pi о \nu \theta \dot{\sigma} \sigma \iota(57)$. $\sigma \tau \epsilon \lambda \lambda o v \kappa \tau \lambda$.$] (Pheidon) \overline{\lambda \lambda \theta \grave{\omega} \nu \epsilon l s \text { пакє- }}$


 (58-59). They were appointed soon after the time when $\pi \epsilon \rho i[\tau \tilde{\omega} \nu]$ j $\delta a \lambda \lambda a \gamma \omega \hat{\omega} \nu$ oi

 (60). The 100 talents are also mentioned by Xen. Hell. ii 4,28 . Suidas and Harp. s.v. $\delta e ̂ \kappa a$.













 $\boldsymbol{\epsilon} \boldsymbol{\epsilon}$

 mantoc $K^{1}$（K－w，h－L）．aYthn（K）：aútoùs Blass，Kontos，Hude，k－w，h－L． 22 axєpдoycץioc corr．Bywater，etc． $22-23$ mpin h maycanian te кi入

$\boldsymbol{\epsilon} \boldsymbol{\epsilon}$
 （Meisterhans，p．${ }^{2} 5^{2}$ ）duodecim in locis habent，e．g．Dittenberger 337，9，14， 3 （B．c．
 $\dot{j}-\beta a \sigma \iota \lambda \epsilon \nu$ s del．Richards，regis nomine iam antea commemorato．


§ 2．Toîs immev̂ ${ }^{2}$ ］Xen．Hell．ii 4,24 ． Lysias Mantith． 16 § 3，oủ $7 \pi \pi \epsilon v o \nu . .$. $\dot{E} \pi i \tau \bar{\omega} \nu \tau \rho L \dot{d} \kappa \boldsymbol{\nu} \tau \alpha$ ．After the restoration of the democracy there was evidently a prejudice against those who had been $i \pi \pi \epsilon \hat{i} s$ at the time of the Thirty．Man－ titheus meets this prejudice by shewing that he was not of the number，and also that many who were，had subsequently become members of the $\beta$ où $\eta$ or had been elected $\sigma \tau \rho a \tau \eta \gamma o i$ and $\ell_{\pi \pi \pi a \rho \chi o u(i b, 8) .}$
§ 3．ä入入ous eilovto $\delta \in \epsilon \in a]$ These are not mentioned either by Lysias or by Xenophon．
 cal party．тoútwv probably refers to the Ten．
 $\gamma \in \nu \delta \mu \in \nu 0 s$ ，but Isocrates does not clearly distinguish this board of Ten from those who were elected immediately after the overthrow of the Thirty：$\S 5, \hat{\eta} \rho \chi{ }^{\circ} \nu^{\mu}{ }^{2} y$
 $\sigma \tau$ datcs．
$\boldsymbol{\Phi}$ ávi $\lambda$ Ios］otherwise unknown．
mpir］The removal of $\eta$（proposed by Herwerden）is justified not only by its rarity in Attic Greek，but also by the fact that MSS often vary between $\pi \rho l \nu$ and $\pi \rho l \nu \dot{\eta}$（Wyse）．
 $\ell \chi \epsilon \iota \nu=\pi \epsilon \rho a l \nu \epsilon \sigma \theta a L$ is found in Isocr． 42 B ， Lycurg．I55， 34 （ $\$ 60$ ）and elsewhere：and




 recorded in the Index Ar．，though $b \gamma \operatorname{\gamma \epsilon \nu }$ $\dot{\epsilon} \pi i \ldots$ ．．．occurs in Pol． 1313 a $19 ;$ 1270 a 6.
Mavбavias］Xen．Hell．ii 4，29－39．



 be observed that Xenophon mentions $I_{5}$ ， not 10，and as the number is exceptional it is more likely to be right than not．）ol



















XXXIX 2 a $\theta$ HNAILN，supra T $\omega$ N additum，retinet $K$ ，post $\tau \hat{\omega} \nu$ locat $\kappa^{1}$ ，coll．c．
 ante $\tau \hat{\omega} \nu$ ponunt Blass et $\mathrm{K}^{8}$ ． $4 \hat{\epsilon}[a v] \pi \hat{\omega} \nu$ Jackson， $\mathrm{K}-\mathrm{W}, \mathrm{K}^{3}$ ，в：$\dot{f}[\pi l \pi \hat{a} \sigma] \iota \nu \mathrm{K}^{1}$ ； $\dot{a} \pi \alpha^{\prime} \nu \tau \omega \nu$ Poland（ $\mathrm{H}-\mathrm{L}$ ）．$\quad 8$ éxacépovs fortasse aut defendi aut excusari posse putat Jackson，sed mavult t́kart́focs，＇mysteriis maioribus minoribusve＇；idem mavult Hude．


 （aủzov̀s Hartman）＇E入evoî̀a катоぃкeìp．
 $403 / 2$ ．The $\delta \iota a \lambda u ́ \sigma \epsilon \iota s$ took place near the end of the summer of 403．Xen．l．c．§ 25 speaks of the party of the Peiraens as
 Mor．P． 349 F （de gloria Ath．）gives the 12 th of Boedromion（September）as the date of the return of the exiles．
 we should probably have to render the passage：＇should have Eleusis to migrate to．＇The words are generally understood to mean ：＇should have it in their power to migrate to Eleusis．＇This would re－ quire＇Enevoluade．Cf．Dem． 29 § 3，
 an incident of the same date as the present，（Philon）$\sigma v \sigma \kappa \in v a \sigma d \mu \in \nu o s \gamma d \dot{d} \rho \tau$

èrırifous］in full possession of their rights as citizens；cf．Xen．Hell．ii 2， 1 I（of an earlier date，when Agis was holding
 éкартє́pouv．Xenophon is referring to the $\psi \dot{\eta} \phi \iota \sigma \mu a$ of Patrocleides，quoted in Andoc．


 ditluous $\ell \pi \iota \tau l \mu o v s ~ \pi o \iota \eta ิ \sigma a u$ ．Then follows the locus classicus about drıula in which， among those who were under partial $\dot{d} \tau \mu l a$ ，are mentioned（in $\S 75$ ）the sol－
 $\tau \hat{\eta} \pi 6 \lambda \epsilon \iota$（ $\tau \epsilon \tau \rho a \kappa o \sigma t \omega \nu$ may be suggested instead of тvpady $\omega \nu$ ；this suggestion is anticipated by Dobree，and approved by Blass；in any case the Four Hundred are meant；and not the Thirty）．kupious кal aúтокрáтopas］＇possessing full and independent powers of self－government＇ （K．）．
§ 2．iepodv］The temple of Demeter at Eleusis．
 c． $57 \$ \mathrm{I}$ ．

Toî＇E入evoivo日ev］constructiopraegnans， influenced by lévac；similarly below，$\notin \kappa$ $\tau 0 \hat{\imath}$ ä $\sigma \tau \epsilon \omega \mathrm{s}$ ．
ékarépous］The constr．changes from the dat．to the acc．with the inf．For a similar change of constr．after $\epsilon \xi \in \hat{\nu} \nu a l$ ，cf．



















 $\nu \in \sigma \theta a u$ (Kühner, § 475, 2 c , Anm. 1). éka$\tau$ tpous is possibly preferred to avoid the ambiguity arising from ékattpots, which would naturally agree with $\mu \nu \sigma \pi \eta p l o t s$ and has actually been proposed in this sense.

бuvte入єǐ...єis] Dem. Lept. 28, бuvte-


т̀̀ $\sigma \nu \mu \mu a x\llcorner\kappa \dot{\partial} v]$ elsewhere of the allied forces' (Thuc. iv 77), or of a 'treaty of alliance' (iii 91, v6): here 'the fund for the common defence.
§ 3. $\sigma v \mu \pi \in[\theta \in L v]$ not 'shall first obtain the assent of the owner' (Poste), but 'the people would help them to obtain the consent of the owner' (Kenyon).
ovvoukeiv] ' of the inhabitants of Eleusis, those whom the secessionists desired should live in the same community.' Thuc. ii 68 ,
 In Thuc. vi 64, 3 (the Syracusan horsemen tauntingly ask the Athenians) el $\xi v v o u k \eta_{-}^{-}$

 кьô̂vтєs, ib. ii 68,3. The proceedings have an arbitraryair as against the ordinary inhabitants of Eleusis, but it would appear that Eleusis was, subject to certain conditions, handed over to the secessionists.
 proposed to secede were required to enter their names in a list (cf. 40 § 1). a $\mathrm{a}_{\mathrm{o}} \mathrm{o}$ $\gamma \rho a \phi \eta$, in Attic law, is generally applied to a register of land, property, moneys, rather than of persons. Lys. 25 § 9 ,
 $\gamma \rho \alpha \psi a \mu \epsilon \nu \omega \nu, \dot{\xi} \xi \in \lambda \theta b \nu \tau \epsilon s \mu \epsilon \theta^{\prime} \dot{\text { ن }} \mu \hat{\omega} \nu, \dot{\epsilon} \pi \sigma-$入ıоркойдто $\mu \epsilon \tau^{\prime}$ айт $\hat{\nu} \nu$ (Westermann, Cobet;
 Scheibe, Frohberger).

Tovs ópkous] 'the oath of pacification' (Poste). Xen. Hell. ii 4, 43 (of a slightly later time, after the conmanding officers of the party at Eleusis had been put to death and a reconciliation effected with the re-


 shall again register himself in the list with a view to residence in the city.' Lys. 25 § 9 quoted above. di $\pi \sigma \gamma \rho \dot{a} \phi \in \sigma \theta a u$, mid. to register oneself (e.g. as a citizen: Pol. vi (iv) 13, 1297 a 24 , éviaxoû $\delta^{\prime}$



 Hell. ii $4 \S 8$, vi 5 § 29. The passive is


 does not help us to decide the question whether the Areopagus was suspended or not by the Thirty. Lys. I $\$ 30$ (delivered after the year of Eucleides) says of this


 $\delta \iota \kappa \alpha \zeta_{\epsilon}$. Grote, Rauchenstein (Philol. x 604 ff.) and Curtius (iv 16 note) hold that it was suspended; Schömann (Ant. p. 549 E. T.) that it was not. Practically, however, its authority was obviously superseded by the Reign of Terror. See also Philippi, Areop. p. 265, 266, and Frohberger's Lysias vol. ii 180 .










$\epsilon \quad \epsilon$




 $\epsilon \quad \epsilon$

 $\Delta$
 taC：rous $\dot{\alpha} \lambda$ obvas $B$ ，qui in archetypo litteras $\theta \epsilon$ deletas，et $A$（non $\Delta$ ）scriptum fuisse putat．

Testimonia．XXXIX 21－23 Bekk．An．235－6（cf．Testim．ad xxxv 5－6）．

 be a poetic form of expression，but au $\tau 6 \chi \in \epsilon \rho$ itself is used in prose，as in Dem． p．321， 18 ；549． 5 ；552， 18 ．т $\rho \omega \boldsymbol{\omega} \sigma a s$ ， ${ }_{n}^{\text {＇by }}$ wounding，＇gives less good sense than $\hat{\eta}$ ध̈ $\tau \rho \omega \sigma \epsilon \nu$ ，but might be defended by $\dot{\epsilon} \notin \nu$
 ＇Unlawful wounding＇comes under the cognisance of the courts that try cases of
 $\tau \boldsymbol{\tau} \boldsymbol{\lambda}$ ．
§6．$\mu v \eta \sigma \iota \kappa a \kappa \in i ̂ v]$ Xen．Hell．ii 4 ult．，




 $\mu \epsilon$ ，with Schol．Andoc．de Myst．go，кal


 $\dot{\eta} p \xi \in \nu$ and $i k .8 \mathbf{1}, 9 \mathrm{I}$ ．Aeschin．F．L． 176 ， （Archinus aṇd Thrasybulus）$\tau \dot{\delta} \mu \grave{\eta} \mu \nu \eta \sigma t-$
 бтクбdyтuv．Justin v ro §it．Cf．Lueb－ bert，De Amnestia，Kiel， 1881 ．
kal tovs $\delta$ éka］Neither in Xenophon （Hell．ii 4,38 ）nor in Andocides is this body of Ten described as excluded from the amnesty．Xenophon mentions the ＇Ten who ruled in Peiraeus＇（c． 35 § $)$ ；

Andocides does not mention even these．
èv rois èv $\Pi$ etpatê］not＇for all matters coming within the limits of Peiraeus＇ （Kenyon），but＇before the courts held in the Peiraeus．＇＇To the residents in Peiraieus＇is Mr Poste＇s rendering ；but such a rendering of an account would be very informal．Some lawfully constituted body is clearly meant．
 ＇before a court consisting of those who can produce rateable property＇i．e．who have property on which they pay taxes． This limitation excludes all paupers or citizens of the lowest class．$\pi a \rho \in \chi \in \sigma \theta a l$ ， is＇to have as one＇s own，to produce as one＇s own，＇＇to bring forward＇（ L and S ）； тois ö $\pi \lambda a$ a $\pi$ apex $\mu \mu$ èvous occurs in c． 4 ，but I can find no instance of $\pi a \rho \epsilon \chi \epsilon \sigma \theta a \iota$ being coupled with $\tau \iota \mu \dot{\eta} \mu a \tau a$ ．

тцрй $\mu a т a$ is here understood of penal－ ties，by Poland，Kaibel and Kiessling， and Haussoullier（eنひ७讠vat came under the class of stкaı $\tau \iota \mu \eta r a l$, Att．Proc．pp．226， $26_{4}$ Lips．）．Reinach makes $\boldsymbol{\tau}$ l $\mu \eta \mu a$ syn－ onymous with dimo $(\mu \eta \mu a$ ，＇a security， comparing CIA ii $570,21,[\tau \tau \mu \eta] \mu a \tau \iota \hat{\eta}$ $\epsilon \quad \bar{\epsilon} \cup \eta \tau \hat{\eta}$ ，and Lys．ap．Harp．s．v．$\tau \ell \mu \eta \mu a$ ．
outcos］after satisfying all these legal requirements．
ãoסô̂val X ${ }^{\omega p i s]}$ inf．c． 40 § 4 ．









 H-L, B.

XL § 1. 'Apxivos] mentioned (with Dion) as an orator in Plat. Menex. 234 B , and with Cephalus in Dinarchus, x §76. He was the proposer of a law to prevent $\sigma$ vooфautla after the amnesty (Isocr. c. Callim.

 It was on his motion that the Ionic alphabet was adopted in public documents from the archonship of Eucleides onwards (Suidas s.v.). The action recorded in the text is not mentioned elsewhere. He is described as cooperating with Thrasybulus in the restoration of the democracy,
 $\delta \eta{ }^{\eta} \mu v$, Aeschin. F. L. ${ }^{1} 7^{6}$. It was Archinus who moved the decree on that


 opposition to a proposal of Thrasybulus, see below.
 numbers.'
 of the term of days allowed for the purposes of registration.
 $\sigma \cup \beta o u ́ \lambda o v]$ This fact is well known owing to its having affected the position of Lysias. who fully deserved promotion from the position of a $\mu$ érocкоs to that of a citizen for his great services towards the restoration of the democracy, and for the losses he had incurred at the hands of the Thirty, who had even put to death his brother Polemarchus ( $O$ r. 12).

Aeschines, c. Ctes. § 195, describes Archinus as having resisted the proposal to confer the distinction of a crown on some of those who had done good service in the restoration of the democracy. The scholia give us further details: $\Theta \rho a \sigma t-$


 MS , correxit Wyse) $\tau \hat{\varphi}$ 户ेंभоо $\rho \iota \pi 0 \lambda \lambda \dot{\alpha} \epsilon \dot{u} \in \rho \gamma \epsilon-$



















 after $\epsilon \gamma \rho a \psi \in \nu$ by Schultz). $\delta \quad \delta \bar{\epsilon} \epsilon \nu \tau \hat{\eta}$ $\tau \iota \dot{\eta} \sigma \epsilon \iota \pi a \rho \in \lambda \theta \dot{\omega} \nu, \theta a \nu \dot{d} \tau 0 \nu, \nsucceq \phi \eta, \tau \iota \mu \hat{\mu} \mu \alpha$



 Planudes, Scholia on the $\sigma \pi d \sigma \epsilon \epsilon s$ of Hermogenes in Walz, Rh. Gr. v 343,







 tous $\begin{gathered}\text { zowson; Cf. [Plut.] } 846 \mathrm{~A} \text {. The }\end{gathered}$

 i.e. between the return from exile and the restoration of the democracy. At that time the $\beta$ oun $\grave{y}$ had not yet been constituted. See Blass Att. Ber. i $340^{1}$,

















## $\epsilon \omega c$


$\epsilon$




 （ $\mathrm{H}-\mathrm{L}, \mathrm{K}-\mathrm{W}$ ），quod unice verum est，－＇alibi cum vicerunt populares，spoliare solent divites，non propria etiam bona in publicum commodum absumere＇（Herwerden）．

3492，and Jebb，Att．Orators，i 151 ；cf． Wyse in Class．Rev．v 335.
tip§aто－$\mu \eta \eta \sigma \iota к а к є \hat{\imath}]$ с． 39 § 6．The action of Archinus is the natural sequel of his law against oukoфavila（Isocr．$c$ ． Callim． 88 2，3）．Cf．Curtius，$H$ ．G．iv 59. But his method of procedure was arbitrary in the extreme．Nevertheless，the author passes no condemnation on it．$\dot{d} \pi$－ aүaү⿳亠丷厂阝］of summary arrest， 29 §4．


§3．кdג入ıनтa $\delta \dot{\eta}]$ According to Eucken （ $D_{e}$ Aristotelis dicendi ratione ；de parti－ cularum usu，p．49），ס̀ $\grave{y}$ is nowhere found in the writings of Aristotle after a super－ lative（Class．Rev．v 160 a）．


 dè $\theta \in i v a u, 30 \S 5$ ，Tà $\mu \grave{e} \nu$ Érypádets rà $\delta^{3}$ E $\xi a \lambda$ all $\phi$ es．Here probably metaphorical，


$\lambda_{\text {el }}\left(\phi \in a \nu\right.$ is not found in the Index $A r_{\text {．}}$ ； áràeiфet occurs in c． 47 fn．and 48 init． and $\pi \rho a \epsilon \xi a \lambda \epsilon l \phi \epsilon t \nu$ in c． 47 ult．

тà хри́иата－ínovolas］See note on

 $\tau$ д̀ रрभ̆ $\mu a \tau a$ ，and Isocr．Areop．$\$ \S 67,68$ there quoted．
oủx ött］oux olov is not found in Ar．

 in De Gen．Anim．iv 1， $76_{5} b 19$ ，De Anima ii 7， 419 a 21，Anal．i 41,49 b $_{22}$ ．
$\pi р о \sigma \tau \bullet \theta \in a \sigma \iota \nu \tau \hat{\omega} v$ olkel $\omega v$ ］＇pay addi－ tional sums out of their own property．＇
oi $\delta \bar{\eta} \mu \mathrm{ol}$ краттíøavтєs］Pol．vi（iv）8，
 кal $\dot{\varepsilon} \nu \delta \dot{\eta} \mu \circ \mathrm{ots}$ ．viii（v）10， 1310 b 21 ，of
















26 € N supra scriptum melius alesset ( K , coll. Cobet, Var. Lect., pp. 30, 201);

 द' $\xi$ ouk. 'et propter hiatum et propter spatium vestigiaque' condemnat.
 indicant K -w, 'hiat sententia; damnatae Pythodori memoriae facta erat mentio.'




 $\epsilon \dot{\pi} \pi \delta \rho \omega \nu$. Thuc. iii 82, I; viii 65 , 1.






 daemonians about the time of the second






§ 4. Sıe入úө







 $\delta \bar{\eta} \mu .0$.
 The final reconciliation is thus placed later than has generally been inferred from Xenophon's phrase $\dot{v} \sigma \tau \hat{\xi} \rho \Psi \quad \chi \rho b \nu \psi$ (corresponding to $\overline{\epsilon ̇ \nu}$ roîs barepò кaıpoîs of c. 4 I § x). Grote c. 65 end, v 598-9.
XLI. Recapitulation.

$\sigma \tau \dot{\eta} \sigma a \sigma \theta a \iota \tau \grave{\partial} \pi \rho a \hat{\gamma} \mu a$. Intrans. 5 . $\$ 2, i b$. ult., 17 §4, 27 § $2,37 \S 1$. The intrans. parts are those generally used in Ar. On the other hand $\sigma v \nu \omega \sigma \pi d \nu a l$ ( $\sigma v \sigma \tau \eta \eta_{\sigma a l}, \sigma v \sigma$ $\tau \dot{\eta} \sigma a \sigma \theta a \iota) \pi \dot{b} \lambda \iota \nu$, $\pi 0 \lambda \iota \tau \in i a \nu$, is found in Pol. 1266 a 23 , 1284 b 18, 1288 a 40, $1319{ }^{b}$ 33, also in Oecon. 1343 a 7.
 § I the formal convention for the restoration of the democracy is placed in the archonship of Euclides ( $403 / 2$ ). But the return of Thrasybulus and the other exiles of the democratical party, and the occupation of the Peiraeus, took place about Jamuary 403, in the archonship of Pythodorus.
The text implies 'that the subsequent extension of the democracy...was justified by the fact of its having secured its own re-establishment, without the open help of any other nation, and in the face of the opposition of a powerful party at Sparta ${ }^{\text {' }}$ (Kenyon). But it is difficult to resist Mr Kenyon's suggestion that the passage is corrupt, and that the position of Thrasybulus as leader of the restored democracy was recognised in the latter part of this sentence.
 The constitution under Ion (which is, of course, prehistoric) was doubtless described in the early chapters of the treatise. Cf. fragm. $343^{2}=38 \mathrm{~s}^{3}$,











 HN
c． 15,7 et Thuc．i 24 ，vi $5 . ~ 8$ тєссарac． 9 мета таута ехоүса！（deleto I）




 $\delta^{\prime} \dot{\eta}$ J B Mayor， $\mathrm{k}-\mathrm{w}, \mathrm{H}-\mathrm{L} . \quad 17$ є̇ $\pi \epsilon \tau \in \lambda \epsilon \sigma \epsilon \mathrm{H}-\mathrm{L}$ ．

бvvoukทのáviov］Heraclides init．，$\sigma v \nu 0$－

els $\tau d s \quad \tau \in \tau \tau a p a s-\phi v \lambda a ́ s]$ c． 8 § 3.


фu入oßarıлeîs］c． 8 § 3 ；c． 57 ult．
 tion of Theseus was second to that of Ion and was the first of the eleven $\mu \varepsilon \tau \alpha \beta$ o入al．
 àpxalas толıтéas．
 The prehistoric＇constitution of Theseus， was treated in an early chapter that is now lost．The lost passage is referred to in Plut．Thes．25，̆̈ть $\delta \hat{\epsilon}$ трติтоs $\dot{\alpha} \pi \epsilon \kappa \lambda \iota \nu \varepsilon$



 к $\lambda$ Leel intr．is found in Hist．Anim． 498 a 16，бке̇ $\lambda \eta$ цккрdу els тd $\pi \lambda a ́ \gamma เ o \nu$




 Pol．ii 11， 1273 a 5，Tà $\mu$ èv $\operatorname{els} \delta \hat{\eta} \mu \mathrm{D}$

 The summary does not strictly correspond to the original account in c．4．Nothing was there stated on the important fact that under Dracon the laws were first
reduced to a written code，though it was partly implied in the words：rous $\theta \in \sigma \mu$ ous $z^{z} \theta_{\eta \kappa \varepsilon \nu}$ ．On the other hand，the remark－ able＇Draconian constitution，＇which has justly aroused considerable suspicion，finds no recoguition in the summary．This supports the view that the description of that constitution is an interpolation．



 23.

Aplare［ $\delta \eta \mathrm{\eta}$ ］Aristides ishere described as having traced the outtine which was completed by his successor Ephialtes． The former admitted the lower classes to a larger share in public life．Though he did not actually throw the archonship open to all the citizens of Athens（as asserted in Plut．Arist．22），he encouraged the rural population to resort to Athens （c． 24 § 1）and thus prompted them to take an interest in political affairs．Ephi－ altes carried this democratical movement still further by abolishing the supremacy of the Areopagus．

There is no justification for the criti－ cism of Rühl（Rhein．Mues．46，432）that Aristides is hererepresented as cooperating with Ephialtes．The absence of the name of Themistocles is，however，worthy of note．As a constitutional reformer he is eclipsed by Aristides．It may even be
 $\tau \eta ̀ \nu \pi o ́ \lambda \iota \nu$ סià тov̀s $\delta \eta \mu a \gamma \omega \gamma o v ̀ s ~ a ́ \mu a \rho \tau a ́ \nu \epsilon \iota \nu--~ \delta i a ̀ ~ \tau \grave{\eta} \nu ~ \tau \eta ̂ S$









   THC: тои̂ H-L. $\quad 24$ Locus corruptus, K -w. $\quad 26 \psi \eta \phi l \sigma \mu a \sigma \iota$ H-L.

doubted whether he really has any claim to have acted with Ephialtes in overthrowing the Areopagus, as narrated in c. 25 §
 2, 1404 b 25, and Poet. 4, $144^{8}$ b 37. Cf. Hdt. i 189, Xen. Oecon. xi 18. The metaphor is probably derived 'from the tracing of lines underneath by a writingmaster, for the pupil to follow or write over,' Protag. 326 D (Cope's Introd. to Ar. Rhet. p. 284).
'Eфıi ${ }^{\prime} \tau \eta \mathrm{g}$ ] From the tenour of the earlier part of the work we are prepared to find a prominent place assigned in the summary to Ephialtes, as compared with Pericles. The reforms in the Areopagus due to the latter were of minor importance. But it is singular that so notable a name should find no mention in the present passage. He is here regarded as one of the demagogues whose influence was detrimental to Athens. The slight notice of his policy in 28 § I is indeed not unfavourable; but it is certainly far from enthusiastic.
 de Pace, 79.
 кратla] 34 .

गं ти̂у трเdкоута-тvpavuls] more accurately described as an oligarchy in 53 init.

 Égovolav] Schömann, Ant. p. 386 E.T.: 'The demagogues found it their interest to extend the activity of the popular assemblies as far as possible, and to
establish the principle that the people was, in the most comprehensive sense of the term, lord over everything, and could do what it pleased (in Neaer. p. 1375; Xen. Hell. i 7 , i2). On the other hand, men of keener insight complained that the State was administered by Psephismatathat is, according to the pleasure at any moment of the sovereign people-rather than according to the laws, and that there was only too often a contradiction between the laws and these Psepbismata.' Pol.




 бприаншүои́s $\kappa \tau \lambda$. Dem. Lept. § 92 .
cls тòv $\delta \bar{\eta} \mu \mathrm{ov}$ è $\lambda \boldsymbol{\eta} \lambda \dot{\theta} \theta a \sigma \iota \nu]$ In the department of judicature indictments or informations concerning breaches of the law, which could not be dealt with in the ordinary course, were in the first instance brought before the Council. If the offence were too important for the competency of that body, they passed to the popular assembly. The Council could not inflict any fine beyond 500 drachmae. Schömann, Ant. 394-5 E.T. Cf. 45 and 49 § 3 ; Pol. $1299{ }^{6} 3^{8} \mathrm{ff}$.

кal то仑ิто ктл.] This is understood by Cauer (p. 48 f.) as a general eulogy of the fully developed democracy and as inconsistent with the views expressed in the Politics. But the eulogy is really limited to one particular point, the transfer of judicial functions from the $\beta 0 u \lambda \eta$ to the $\hat{e}_{\kappa \kappa \kappa \lambda \eta \sigma i a}$, and both of these bodies are




 'A
 т $\rho \iota \omega$ ßодоу.


 H-L. $\quad \delta^{\prime}: \delta \dot{\varepsilon}<\tau \dot{\eta} \nu>\mathrm{K}-\mathrm{W}$, $\delta \dot{e} \mathrm{~B}$. $\quad$ co(?) $\phi I z O M \in N \omega N$ Blass, Gomperz, $\mathrm{K}-\mathrm{W}, \mathrm{K}^{\mathbf{3}}: \psi \eta \phi \iota \zeta \nu \mu \dot{\nu} \omega \nu \mathrm{K}^{1}, \psi \eta \phi \iota \zeta \rho \mu \epsilon \nu \omega \nu<\mu \dot{\phi} \nu \omega \nu>\mathrm{H}-\mathrm{L}$.



distinctly democratic. The text is in fact in perfect accord with a passage in the Politics, iii $\mathrm{I}_{5}, 1286$ a 30, סıà то0̂тo кal



 Philol. 1, p. 175.
 of the democracy.
'Ayuppros] a statesman belonging to the deme of Collytus, prominent as a financier in the early part of the fourth century. In 400 b.c. he had a dispute with Andocides about the lease of a tax (Andoc. De Myst. 133, with Marchant's note).

Schol. on Arist. Eccl. (B.C. 392) 102-5


 бvpeт $e \mu e$ (cf. Schol. on Ran. 367 and Plat. Com. frag. 133 Kock) kal $\pi \rho \omega \bar{\omega} \boldsymbol{c}$ ย̇ккл ${ }^{2} \sigma \iota a \sigma \tau \iota \kappa \partial \nu \delta \dot{\epsilon} \delta \omega \kappa \epsilon$. In Eccl. 300310 the poet refers to the time when only one obol was allowed instead of three:

 ib. 380, 392, Plut. (ed. z, в.C. 389) 329 and 171 with the Schol. where, however, the $\mu \iota \sigma \theta \delta s$ ékк $\lambda \eta \sigma \tau a \sigma r u \kappa \delta s$ is confounded with the $\mu$. סıкабтıкбs. The text shews that the Schol. on Eccl. 102 was right in making Agyrrhius the originator of the fee. Boeckh (II xiv p. 316 Lamb) inferred from the mention of Myronides in Eccl. 305 that the fee was introduced some time after the beginning of the influence of Pericles. He was further led
to ascribe its origin to one Callistratus, Append. Vatic. Proverb. iii, $\quad$ ठ $\beta$ o $\lambda \partial \nu$ evi $\rho \in$ Парии́тทs. Кал入lбтратоs 'А $\theta \dot{\eta} \nu \eta \sigma \iota ~ \pi о \lambda t-$

 oıa $\sigma a t s$. Possibly Callicrates, who added
 really meant ( 28 § 3 ). The text also proves that for a short time the fee for the public assembly was two ohols, though this was denied by Boeckh, l. c.

Agyrrhius also restored the $\theta \epsilon \omega \rho \iota \kappa \delta \nu$ (Philochorus ap. Harpocr. s.v.). On the death of Thrasybulus (early in 389) he was elected $\sigma \tau \rho a \tau \eta \gamma \delta \mathrm{~s}$ (Xen. Hell. iv 8 , 31; Diod. xiv 99). Plat. Com. frag. 185

 poov. It was probably after 387 that he was long in prison as a debtor to the State (Dem. 24 § I 34 ).
 in Plat. Ion, 54I D (with Phanosthenes of Andros), ovis $\eta \delta \varepsilon \dot{\eta} \pi \dot{b} \lambda c s \xi \in \nu o u s$ bvtas,

 Favorinus ap. Athen. 506 A ; Aelian, Var. Hist. xiv 5. The name $\beta a \sigma i \lambda \in \dot{\prime}$ 's is perhaps due to his belonging to some royal family in Asia Minor (cf. Strabo, p. 632; CIG 2881, 2069, 2157,2189 ). Peisistratus was called $\beta a \sigma i \lambda \epsilon \psi s$ in the $\Delta \hat{\eta} \mu o s$ of Eupolis (frag. 123 p. 291 Kock). O. Crusius in Philol. 1, p. 177. Heracleides is identified by Köhler (Hermes, xxyii 68 ff .) with the person of that name mentioned in an inscr. in Bull. Corr. Hell. 1888, p. 163.



















Part II, c. XLII-LXIII. The Existing Constitution.
XLII § 1 . Enrolment on the list of citizens.
 1268 a 24,27 ; 1275 b 3 ; 1290 a 4.




 $\mu \eta \tau \rho \delta$ s. See note on $26 \S 4$.
éүYpáфоvтal] Pol. iii 1, 1275 a 14,




 $\psi \hat{\eta} \phi о \nu$ クै $\nu \in \gamma к \epsilon \nu$. Isaeus $7 \S 28, \delta \mu b \sigma a \nu \tau \epsilon s$



 liest ephebic inscr. (B.C. 334-3) mentions
 Erypaфévтes. By this registration the youthful citizen entered on the duties of civil life at the same time as he was enrolled on the list of ephebi. This was the only list of ephebi kept by the demes, and such a phrase as $\epsilon \gamma \gamma \rho \dot{a} \phi \in \sigma \theta a t ~ \epsilon l s ~ \epsilon \phi \eta$ Bous (Pseudo-Plat. Axioch. 366 E ) is an inaccurate equivalent for $\epsilon^{\epsilon} \gamma \gamma$. els rovs $\delta \eta \mu \delta \tau a s$ ( P . Girard, in Daremberg and Saglio, iii 624).



$\delta \iota \epsilon \tau \mathfrak{t} \mathrm{s} \dot{\eta} \beta \hat{\eta} \sigma a \iota$ (Aeschin. l. c.) denoted the close of the two years intervening between the ages of 16 and 18 (A. Schäfer, Dem. iii 2, 19-38; Lipsius in N. Jahrb.f. Philol., no. I17, p. 299 ff. ; Gilbert, Gr. St. i 186).
In Aristoph. Vesp. 578 it is regarded as a privilege of the $\delta ı x a \sigma \tau a l$ to take part in ascertaining the physical maturity of Athenian youths on the occasion of the $\delta$ oкı $\mu$ aota. In the present passage the preliminary enrolling belongs to the б $\eta \mu$ отац, while the subsequent $\delta о к ц \mu а \sigma$ ta is now for the first time assigned to the Bounn, to which it was perhaps transferred after the time of Aristophanes. According to the text, the $\delta$ cka $\sigma$ al are only concerned in the event of an appeal on the question whether the person enrolled was of free birth or not. (Cf. Meier and Schömann, Att. Process, p. 253-4 Lipsius. The doubt there suggested as to the accuracy of the Schol. on $V$ esp. 578 is now withdrawn by Lipsius, in the Verhandlungen der $K$. Süchsischen Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften, Leipzig, 1891, p. 63.) Possibly, in the event of a dispute on the question of age, the matter was similarly referred to a court, but this is not stated in the text.

סLa $\psi \eta \phi[$ [̧ovtat] The ordinary $\delta \iota a \psi \dot{\eta}-$ фtats here described might be followed by an appeal to a $\delta<\kappa a \sigma r \eta$ ipo cedure was the same as in the special $\delta \iota a \psi \eta \dot{\phi} \iota \sigma t s$ described in Dem. 57 § 60 , $\ell \pi \epsilon \epsilon \sigma \epsilon \delta \iota a \psi \eta \phi l \sigma a \sigma \theta a \iota$ Tovs'A入 $\mu \mu 0 u \sigma$ lous












 al


 aut al supra verbi finem scribit, $N$ autem septies eodem in loco ponit, c. 41, 30
 $\nu \quad \nu$ pотоує, 29 кє $\lambda \epsilon \cup \sigma v \sigma \iota$; quorum exemplorum sex in fine versus inventa sunt. 13 бкт $\omega$ $\kappa \alpha i \delta \epsilon \kappa$ ' $\mathrm{k}-\mathrm{w}, \mathrm{B}$.
$14 \epsilon \operatorname{TTAN}$ : $\dot{\pi} \epsilon \epsilon \delta \delta \dot{\partial} \nu \mathrm{H}-\mathrm{L}$.
 Dem. 57 §§ $11,56,58$, 59, 62 ; followed by $\mu \grave{\eta}$ in F. L. ${ }^{1} 74$, á $\pi \in \psi \eta \phi i \sigma a \nu \tau 0 ~ \mu \grave{\eta}$ $\pi \dot{\epsilon} \mu \pi \in \omega . \quad \dot{\epsilon} \pi \iota \psi \eta \phi i \zeta \in \sigma \theta a \iota$ is found $c$. acc. in Dion. H., Ant. vi 7 1, and Diod. xix 61; but these passages do not justify the retention of $\overline{\epsilon \pi} \tau \psi \eta \phi l \sigma \omega \nu \tau a \iota$.





 and Photius, s. v. Éфєनts, quoted in Testim.
 cedure in the decree of the фр́тєрєs recorded in the Decelean inscr., cia ii 2, p. $534-6$, no. 84 I b, ll. $30-34$, є̇à $\delta \epsilon$



 रєүovotas. Cf. Class. Rev. v 221 a.
$\pi \omega \lambda \in i]$ Dionys. on Isaeus, 16 p. 617 ,






 kal тà хр $\bar{\mu} \mu a \tau a$ єlvai $\delta \eta \mu$ б́бa. Bekker,







 $\mu \circ \sigma \theta$ tums (de Cor. 132). Cf. Meier and Schömann, p. 440 Lips., n. 705.
§§ 2-5. On the military training of the Ephebi. On the Ephebi, see Dittenberger, De Ephebis Atticis, 1863 ; Dumont, Essai sur l'E'phébie Attique, 1875-6; Grasberger, Erziehung und Unterricht im Klass. Alterthum, iii, 188 I . Also Capes, University Life in Ancient Athens, 1877; Wayte on Ephebus in Smith, Dict. Ant.; P. Girard, l'éducation Athénienne, 1889 , pp. 271-327; and esp. the same scholar's article in Daremberg and Saglio, 1891, iii 621-636 (the only account of the subject written since the discovery of this treatise).
 that of adopted sons) probably took place at the time of the d $\rho \chi a t p \in \sigma$ lat (Isaeus 7 § 28 ; Dem. c. Leoch. 44 § 39) at the beginning of the official year (Lys. 2I § 1). Cf. Gilbert, i 187.
 xopry's who had boys under his superin. tendence had to have attained the age of 40 ( 56 § 3 ).




19 ... Mhthn?: коб $\mu \eta \tau \grave{\eta} \nu$ Paton, van Leeuwen (H-L), $\mathrm{k}-\mathrm{w}, \mathrm{K}^{3}, \mathrm{~B} ;[\epsilon \pi \tau \mu] \epsilon \lambda \eta \tau \grave{\eta} \nu \mathrm{K}^{1}$. manta vel mantac ante cy $\pi а \rho a \lambda$. H-L.

18-25 Bekk. Anecd. 301 (infra exscriptum).

Xєьротоиєi] one of the few exceptions to the general rule by which appointments at Athens were made by lot. Cf. 43 § I and Headlam, On the Lot, p. 104. $\sigma \omega \phi$ povtoviv] [Plat.] Axioch. 367 A,





 cles, the $\sigma \tau \rho a \tau \eta \gamma$ bs here referred to, was a $\sigma \omega \phi p_{0 \nu} \sigma \tau \eta \dot{\prime}$, not a коб $\mu \eta \eta \dot{\eta} s$ (Gilbert, i 297; Dumont, Essai sur l'Ephébie Attique, 1876, p. 169 f.). In Bekker Anecd.




 (similarly in Photius and Etym. M. s.v.).

They are mentioned in the earliest ephebic inscr. now extant, b.c. 334-3 (Bull. Corr. Hell. xiii 253); also in b.c. 320/19(CIA ii 58 r ); and in B.C. 305/4. This last inscr., as restored, includes the words :

 pears to be named near the beginning :




 (Köhler, Mittheilungen, 1879, iv 324-7). The latest inscr. belongs to B.C. $303 / 2, \ldots$






 $\kappa 7 \lambda$. (Bull. Corr. Hell. 1888, xii 149). A relief published in Rev. Arch. 1876, ii 185, copied in Daremberg and Saglio, iii 628, represents three $\sigma \omega \phi$ poviotal in their robes holding their wands of office in the presence of a divinity who cannot be identified. The office was apparently suppressed early in the third century b.C. to be restored in imperial times. See Ditten-
berger, De Ephebis Atticis, pp. 29, 44; Dumont, Sur $l^{2}$ Ephefie, p. 200; Smith, Dict. Ant. i 998 b; and esp. Girard in Daremberg and Saglio, iii 626.

 $\pi$ роуоoivies. The word is found in [Plat.] Axioch. 363 E (as quoted by Stobaeus), $\overline{\epsilon \pi \epsilon l-}$
 кal $\phi b \beta o s \chi c i \rho \omega \nu$, and in a general sense in Plat. Leg. 372 A. The usual formula for the election of this officer is $\chi$ єяотои $\eta$ -

 467,469 : in $47 \pm 1.5^{6}$ the people коб $\mu \eta$ -
 Tw . Hardly any of the inscriptions in which this officer is mentioned are earlier than the second century. The earliest belongs to b.c. $305 / 4$ (quoted in last n.); the next to about b.c. 282 (CIA ii 316 , $10=$ Dittenberger, Inser. no. 346). It is suggested by Dittenberger (De Ephebis, p. 31) that the office was created in the time of Alexander. The inscr. of b.c. 305 (already quoted) shews that for a short time the коб $\mu \eta \tau \dot{\eta} s$ and the $\sigma \omega \phi \rho о \nu / \sigma \tau a l$ existed together. This is confirmed by the text, if the restoration is correct. Cf. Dumont, Epheb $i e$ Attique, p. r66 ff.; Gilbert, i 299; and Girard in Daremberg and Saglio, iii 626-7.

In literature, one of the earliest passages on the кo $\mu \mu \eta \gamma \eta^{\prime} \mathrm{s}$ is in Teles (fl. middle of 3 rd cent.), ap. Stob. $98,72, \varepsilon^{z} \phi \eta \beta$ os $\gamma \in \gamma^{\ell} \nu \varepsilon \nu^{*}$ $\ddot{\epsilon} \mu \pi а \lambda c \nu \tau \delta \nu$ коб $\mu \eta \tau \grave{\eta} \nu \quad \phi 0 \beta \epsilon \epsilon \tau a \iota, \tau \partial \nu \pi \alpha \iota \delta \sigma-$ $\tau \rho l \beta \eta \nu, \tau \dot{\partial} \nu \dot{\grave{\prime}} \pi \lambda о \mu \dot{\chi} \chi о \nu, \tau \dot{\partial} \nu \quad \gamma v \mu \nu a \sigma l a \rho \chi о \nu$,




$\ell \pi i$ тávtas] For $\dot{\ell} \pi$ l, of persons set over others, cf. Xen. Cyr. iv $5,58, \epsilon \pi i$
 iii 4,20 . In this sense it is more common c. gen. or dat.
§ 3. Td iepd $\pi \epsilon \rho\left[\hat{\eta} \lambda \theta_{0}\right.$ ] It was probably at this stage that the $\begin{gathered} \\ \phi\end{gathered} \beta$ oc took the oath in the cave of Aglauros (Dem. F. L. 303 ; Lycurgus, Leocr. 76; Stobaeus, Flor. 43, 48; Pollux viii 105; another clause is quoted in Plut. Alc. 15).





 ate $\overline{\text { then }}$




Cobet, N. L. 223, regards the formula in Stobaeus and Pollux as a figment of the grammarians; but it can hardly be doubted that some such oath was taken, although it is not mentioned in the text. (Cf. Schömann, Ant. p. 359 E. T.; Gilbert, i 296 n .) The taking of the oath is exhibited on a vase in the Hermitage Museum, which shews us an $\neq \phi \eta \beta_{0}{ }^{\circ}$, armed with shield and spear, holding his right hand over an altar ; the oath is being administered by an aged man (probably representing the $\beta$ ou $\lambda \dot{\eta})$ beyond it: behind the $\notin \phi \eta \beta$ os we have a $N \ell_{\kappa \eta}$ holding a helmet (Daremberg and Saglio, iii 624).

Movvix(av] 19 § 2. Even in Roman times, b.c. ıоо, the ephebi $\pi \epsilon \rho \bar{\epsilon} \pi \lambda \epsilon \cup \sigma a \nu$ ...eis Mouvixian (CIA ii 467,22 ).
'Актग'y] the name given to the southern peninsula of the Peiraeus, the highest point of which is about 180 feet above the sea. Harpocr. s. v. $\epsilon \pi t \theta a \lambda a \tau \tau i \delta i o s$ $\tau \iota s \mu 0 \hat{\rho} a \tau \hat{\eta} \mathrm{~s}$ 'Atrıкฑ̂s. Lycurg. Leocr. §8 17, 55 ; Diod. xx 45 ; inf. 61 § 1. Wachsmuth, Stadt Athen, ii 46.
тaıסotp ( $\boldsymbol{\beta a s}$ ] officials employed to train the ephebi in gymnastic exercises. In B.C. $305 / 4$ their number was reduced to one (Köhler, Mittheilungen, iv 327, cf. Teles ap. Stob. Flor. 98, 72). In the inscriptions this officer generally takes precedence over the other instructors. Dumont, pp. 177-185; Daremberg and Saglio, iii 627 b.
 this term is regularly applied to the instructors of the ephebi, including the $\pi a \dot{\delta} о \tau \rho(\beta \eta s$, the $\dot{\delta} \pi \lambda o \mu a \chi 0$ and the rest (CIA ii $341,465,467,469$ ): after that date they are usually called $\pi a \iota \delta \epsilon v \tau a l$. Dumont, p. 176; Daremberg and Saglio, iii 627; Grasberger, iii 167.
The four following verbs describe the functions of the several instructors. The corresponding official titles have hitherto heen known to us from the ephebic inscriptions of the 3 rd century. The literary evidence of the text is earlier than the earliest inscriptions mentioning these instructors.

о̇тлоцахєiv] Xen. Anab. ii i, 7; Plat. Gorg. 456 Е, тoùs тaidoтptßas кal тoùs
 271 D, Laches 179 E, 182 B, Leg. 804 D, 813 D, 833 E; Teles ap. Stob. Flor. 98, $7^{2}$; Theophr. $\pi є \rho l$ цекроф८лотьpias (with Jebb's note on p. 203). In the ephebic inscriptions the $\dot{\partial} \pi \lambda^{\prime} \mu \mu$ d $\chi$ os, or 'drill-serjeant,' ranks next to the кoo $\mu \eta \tau \eta$ 's and the $\pi$ aioorpl $\beta \eta$ ) (Dumont, pp. 185-9). CIA ii 467 ( $=$ Ditt. no. 347) l. 52, b.C. 100 ,


 of Teos, the $\delta \pi \lambda o \mu \alpha \chi o s$ precedes $\tau \delta \nu \delta \nu-$
 a stipend of 300 dr ., as against 250 (Ditt. no. 349, 22-27). In the Attic inscriptions the usual order of precedence is
 $a \phi \epsilon \tau \eta s$, and after these the $\gamma \rho a \mu \mu a \tau \epsilon{ }^{\prime} s$ and $\dot{\text { Un }} \boldsymbol{\pi} \eta \epsilon \epsilon \eta$ ) (CIA ii $316,465,467,469-$ 471,482 ). The drill was held in the Lyceum (Grasberger, iii 139).
$\tau 0 \xi \in \dot{\varepsilon} \epsilon เ v]$ On the $\tau 0 \xi$ ór $\eta \mathrm{s}$, see Dumont, p. 152 ; Daremberg and Saglio, iii 628. He was not necessarily an Athenian (CIA ii 316, ll. 29, 72). Cf. Plat. Leg. 813 D.
dкоитíctw] On the dкоутібтйs, see Dumont, p. 190; Daremberg and Saglio, l.c. The same person is repeatedly mentioned in the inscriptions as holding this office for several years (CIA ii 465, 471).

кататá $\lambda \tau \eta v$ á ф'є́val] Eth. iii 2, 17, p.

 кататє $\lambda \tau \eta$. The instructor in charge of this department was called the $\alpha \phi E \tau \eta s$ or the катата入тафéๆs (le maître de balistique). The former title is found in B.C. 100 ; the latter in b.c. 282, CIA ii 316


 кal $\tau \delta \nu \quad \tau 0 \xi \sigma \tau \eta \nu$ (mentioned last in this case because he was not an Athenian, but
 $\phi \in \sigma$ la and $\kappa a \tau a \pi d \lambda \tau \eta s$ occur in an inscr. of Ceos, Ditt. no. 348, 25, 30, 27. Cf. CIA ii 413 (=Ditt. 196), 15 (after B.C. 200),







 זיז
 $\epsilon \pi \iota \delta \epsilon \epsilon$. H-L.
 סє́т

 Aeschin. 2, 167.
 engine used in this exercise is termed in
 $\lambda_{c} \theta_{0} \beta \lambda_{0}$ os. кататалт $\hat{\nu}$ is the spelling found in b.c. 330 (cia ii $807 b 129$, 131 , r32); in в.с. 325 (ib. 809 e 10, 12, 13); and in B.c. $3^{23}$ (ib. 8 rr 6 196, 200). Cf. Dumont, p. 191 ; Daremberg and Saglio, iii $628 a$; Grasberger, iii 166.

8рахщウ̀̀ $\mu$ lav клд.] Bekker, Anecd. zo1, quoted on $\sigma \omega \phi \rho 0 \nu i \sigma \tau \dot{\eta} \nu$ P. $152 a$. Boeckh, II xvi p. 332 Lamb.
 Aeschines says of himself, F. L., $2 \S 167$,
 E $\tau \eta$. Hence it has been supposed that
 years (Schömann, Ant. p. 3 бo E. T.; Philippi in Rhein. Mus. 34, 6 r $_{3}$ ). The text describes the first year as spent in military exercises, and the second as devoted to the duties of $\pi \in \rho i \pi 0$ oloc (this was the view already held by Dittenberger, De Ephebis, and Gilbert, i 296). The discrepancy is noticed in Harpocr. s. v.

 $\pi \in \rho \iota \pi \delta \lambda o \iota s \quad \gamma l \gamma \nu \in \sigma \theta a \mathrm{c}$ тovs $\dot{\epsilon} \phi \hat{\eta} \beta$ ous, $\dot{o} \delta \dot{\epsilon}$
 purport of the text is quoted by the Schol.






 the present passage shews that they acted as $\phi \rho o u p o l$ for both years ( $\$ 5$ ), while it is
implied that they served as $\pi \epsilon \rho / \pi 0 \lambda o t$ for the second year alone. Girard endeavours to remove the discrepancy by observing that the author 'ne dit pas expressément, en effet, que les éphèbes n'étaient astreints au service de $\pi \epsilon \rho / \pi 0 \lambda o t$ que la seconde année. Il se borne à constater que la première année était remplie par une sorte d'apprentissage du métier de soldat, mais cet apprentissage, qui se faisait au Pirée et à Munychie, avait déjà le caractère de ce que devait être, l'année suivante, la vie éphébique'(Daremberg and Saglio, iii 629, note 174). It seems simpler to suppose that Aeschines was using a popular and only approximately accurate phrase in describing himself as $\pi \epsilon \rho i \pi 0 \lambda o s$ for two years.
 Bühnenalterthümer, p. 74; and Jebb in Smith's Dict. Ant. ii 820 a. 'Juv. x 128 ; Plut. Timol. 34, 3; 38, 3 ; Nepos, Timol. 4, 2. Athenian decree in Joseph. Ant. xiv 8,5 . The inscriptions bearing on this point are collected by Adam Reusch, de diebus contionum ordinariis af. Athenienses, diss. phil. Argentor. sel. iii 4' (Mayor).
 public proof of proficiency in military exercises.' Harpocr. has amoঠє $\frac{\xi}{\alpha} \mu \in \nu 00$, corrected by Dittenberger, De Ephebis,
 similarly appeared in public, at the end of their period of service, $\dot{\varepsilon} \pi \sigma=\hat{\eta} \sigma a \nu \tau 0 \quad \delta \dot{E}$
 $\tau \hat{\eta} \beta o u \lambda \hat{\eta}$, cIA ii $467(=$ Ditt. 347,43 ); cf. ii 468,26 .







 тро́тоу.

$31 \tau$ à om. Harp.
$32 \tau \hat{\eta} s \pi \delta \lambda \epsilon \omega s: \tau 0 \hat{\chi} \delta \dot{\eta} \mu \nu \nu$ Harp. et Schol. Aeschin. $35 \pi[\rho] \delta[\phi] a \sigma t s \tilde{\eta} \tau[0] \hat{v} \dot{\alpha} \pi t \in \nu a t$ in ectypo feliciter agnovit Blass $\left(\mathrm{K}^{3}\right)$; legebatur $\pi \rho \alpha ́ \gamma-$


 hans, p. $3^{6}$ ).

37 ДYєIN : סvoîd K-w'.
$\dot{\alpha} \sigma \pi(\delta a$ кal $\delta o ́ p u]$ These are exhibited on the vase representing the ephebus taking the oath, mentioned in note on § 3 , $\tau \mathrm{d}$ lepd $\pi \epsilon \rho \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{\eta} \lambda \theta o \nu$.
§5. фроvpoíनt] The Schol. on Aeschin. F. L. 167 quotes the two following lines from Eupolis, oûtos $\mathfrak{\epsilon} \nu$ toîs $\phi$ pouploss кoutá-
 $\phi \rho o u ́ p c a$. The è $\phi \eta \beta$ ol of b.c. ioo (CIA ii

 Among the $\phi \rho o \dot{\rho} \rho \mathrm{a}$ were Anaphlytus, Thoricus, Sunium, Rhamnus, Eleusis, Phyle, Aphidna (Gilbert, i 297).
x $\lambda$ apúbas] 'short gowns or mantles.'


 каi $\frac{1}{2} \nu$ пе́тасор.
Cf. Antidotus, ap. Athen. 240 B, Eqr $^{2} \mathrm{pa}$ $\phi \hat{\eta} \nu a_{i}$ ка. $\lambda a \beta \epsilon \hat{\imath} \nu$ тò $\chi \lambda a \mu \dot{\delta} \delta \iota \nu$. Meleager, in $A n t h$. P. vii 468 , has an epitaph on a youth whom his mother $0 \kappa \tau \omega \kappa \alpha i \delta \epsilon \kappa \epsilon \in \tau a \nu$
 $\beta_{0 u}$ in Plut. ii $75^{2}$ e, cf. 754 F. It appears on vases as the characteristic dress of young men (L and S), e.g. Tischbein, Vases, i 14 ; Hamilton, Vases, i 2 (in Smith, Dict. Ant. i 416 ) ; and esp. on a lecythus from Eretria (Studniczka, $\neq$ ahrb. des Kais. deutsch. arch. Inst. ii 163; Daremberg and Saglio, iii 630, fig. 2680). The garb of the $\ddot{\epsilon} \eta \eta{ }^{2}$ is sometimes supposed to have been 'yellow or saffron-coloured, (Dict. Ant. l.c.), but it was black according to Philostratus, Vit. Soph. ii 1, 5,
 $\sigma$ las $\pi \epsilon \rho \epsilon \epsilon \kappa \dot{d} \theta \eta \nu \tau 0 ~ \kappa a l ~ \tau \grave{a} s ~ \pi о \mu \pi \grave{d} s$ è $\pi \epsilon \mu \pi о \nu$.

Herodes Atticus altered it into white and himself defrayed the cost of the change (cIA iii 1132 ; Capes, Univ. Liff, p. 9).
i $\tau \in \lambda \epsilon \hat{i}$ - $\pi \dot{a} \nu \tau \omega \nu]$ This general exemption did not include the $\tau$ penpapx la, which was incumbent on all Athenians of a certain census from the time of their enrolment on the $\lambda \eta \xi$ Lapגıкд̀ $\gamma \rho a \mu \mu a \tau \epsilon \hat{\rho} \nu$ (Dem. Mid. 154). Even this Ayroupyla was remitted for one year in the case of orphans, Lys. 32 § 24 , ovis $\dot{\eta}$ mbiles ov

 $\dot{\alpha} \pi \alpha \sigma \hat{\omega} \nu \tau \hat{\omega} \nu \lambda \eta \tau o v \rho \gamma t \hat{\omega} \nu$.
 his guardians as soon as he came of age,
 the age of 18 , the young Athenian became
 frag. 90 , Hyperid. frag. 223 $=194$; Suidas,
 fer, Dem. III 2, p. 24 f.

The list of lawsuits in the text is possibly not exhaustive. In Lys. io § 4 the speaker, who was 13 at the time when his father was put to death by the Thirty, instituted a prosecution against them before the Areopagus as soon as he
 (§ 31, in B.C. 399). The other alternative is to assume that the statement applies only to the time of the writer (Hager in Smith, Dict. Ant. ii 1066 a).

XLIIII § 1. On officials elected by show of hands.








K
 Richards.

3 крнNWN : коц $\omega \boldsymbol{\omega}$ J W Headlam (H-L).




тaplov- $\sigma$ тратьштскล̂v] Tbe war-fund included the income from the propertytax and the surplus of the yearly revenue, [Dem.] Neaer. 4, т̀̀ $\pi \in \rho t b \nu \tau a$ хр $\eta \dot{\eta} a \tau a$ $\tau \hat{\eta} s$ stowkícews. The fund was administered by the $\tau a \mu i a s ~ \tau \hat{\omega} v \sigma \tau \rho$. This official provided pay for the troops and defrayed all other military expenses (Smith, Dict. Ant. ii $761 b$ ). He is first mentioned in B.c. 338, [Plut.] Lycurg. 27. In 334 (CIA ii 739) he makes payments to the treasurers of Athene and to the commissioners for restoring the figures of $N / k m$ and the articles of plate used in processions (see further in Hartel, Studien über att. Staatsrecht, pp. 135-6; Gilbert, i 237 ; Dürrbach, l'orateur Lycurgue, Pp. 3233). For some of his other duties cf. inf. c. 47 § 2,49 § 3 .
 under the administration of Eubulus (between B.C. 354 and 339). It has been a moot point whether there was only one official $\epsilon \pi i \tau \delta \theta \epsilon \omega \rho \iota \kappa \dot{\nu} \nu$ or more (Gilbert i 229). The text implies that there were several. In B.C. $343 / 2$, CIA ii II4 C 5, a single individual is mentioned $\in \pi l \boldsymbol{\tau} \dot{\boldsymbol{o}}$ $\theta \in \omega \rho \kappa \kappa \delta \nu$, immediately after the $\gamma \rho a \mu \mu \alpha \tau \epsilon{ }^{\prime} \mathrm{s}$ $\kappa a \pi \grave{\alpha} \pi \rho \nu \tau a \nu \varepsilon l a \nu$ and $\dot{\epsilon} \pi i \tau \grave{\alpha} \psi \eta \phi i \sigma \mu a \tau a$, and immediately before the $\beta$ ou $\lambda \hat{\eta} s$ raulat; thus he is possibly only a $\beta o v \lambda \varepsilon u \tau \eta$ s charged with looking after that department of business and is not necessarily to be identified with the management of the fund. Aeschines, $c$. Ctes. $\$ \mathbf{2 4}_{4}$, mentions the archon of the year in which Dem. was elected treasurer of the $\theta \epsilon \omega$ ptкóv; hence it was inferred by Boeckh (II vii p. 248 Lamb) that the office was anmual. The text shews that it was held for four years, from one Panathenaic festival to the next. Cf. 47 § 2.
$\kappa \rho \eta \nu \omega \hat{\nu} \dot{\epsilon} \pi \iota \mu \in \lambda \eta \tau \sigma \hat{v}] \kappa \rho \eta \nu \hat{\omega} \nu \quad \in \pi \iota \mu \varepsilon \lambda \eta \tau a l$ are mentioned in Pol. 132 I $b$ 26, where Athens is doubtless in Aristotle's mind, though not expressly named. Plato, Leg. $75^{8} \mathrm{E}$, refers to $\kappa \rho \eta \nu \hat{\omega} \nu, \in \pi \mu \mu \epsilon \lambda \eta r d s$. An inscr. published in the 'E $\phi \eta \mu \epsilon \rho /{ }^{\prime}$ 'A $\rho \chi$ גalo-

入оүเкй, 1889, pp. 13-16, no. 28, describes the work done by one Pytheas as $\epsilon \pi t$ -



 ठıкato



Cf. Hesych. s. v. к $\rho \eta \nu a \gamma \gamma \eta(s i c))^{d} \alpha \rho \chi \grave{\eta}$ $\epsilon \pi i \tau \hat{s} \mathrm{~s} \varepsilon \pi \iota \mu \epsilon \lambda e l a s$ vidatos, and Pollux viii


 кal $a \rho \chi \eta \dot{\eta} \tau \iota s$ ' $\mathrm{A} \theta \dot{\eta} \nu \eta \sigma \iota \nu$. It is uncertain whether $k \rho \eta \nu 0 \phi \dot{j} \lambda a \xi$ was another name for this officer or the title of a subordinate official. The importance of this officer is indicated by his being elected and not appointed by lot. The office of $\dot{v} \delta \dot{\alpha} \tau \omega \nu$ $\epsilon \pi \iota \sigma \tau \dot{\alpha} \tau \eta \mathrm{s}$ was held by Themistocles (Plut. Them. 31 § 1). Cf. Daremberg and Saglio, s.v. Epimeletes, ii p. 668 b.

As two of the officials mentioned in the text are connected with finance, some surprise has been felt that no notice is taken of the important financial officer
 $\dot{0} \dot{\epsilon} \pi i \tau \hat{\eta} \delta \iota o \kappa \eta \dot{\eta} \sigma$. (The latter title is supposed by Fellner to have been introduced about 300 b.c., but the supposition is not approved by Gilbert, i 233 . Cf. Dürrbach, Lycurgue, pp. 2r-38.)

This official, like those in the text, held office for one term of four years only, [Plut.] vit. Lycurg. 3. Lycurgus, whose financial activity began in 338 , is described
 121 Blass) ; he probably ceased to hold this office in 334, and this treatise was written about ten years later. Hence, it is suggested by Mr J. W. Headlam to alter кр $\eta \nu \hat{\omega} \nu$ into кool $\omega \nu$. It would be safer, however, to suppose that kai toî $\epsilon \pi l \tau \hat{\eta} \delta \iota o \kappa \eta_{\eta} \sigma \epsilon \iota$ had dropped out, than to accept this suggestion. The fact that
 Panathenaea (about $23-28$ Hecatombaeon, before the middle of August) is confirmed by the above decree in honour of Pytheas, which is dated 9 Metageitnion,



$6 \bar{\phi} \overline{\mathrm{~N}}(\mathrm{~K}, \mathrm{H}-\mathrm{w}, \mathrm{B}) ; \pi \epsilon \nu \tau a \kappa \delta \sigma \iota o l, \pi \epsilon \nu \tau \eta \dot{\eta} \kappa \nu \tau \alpha \mathrm{H}-\mathrm{L} . \quad<\tau \hat{\eta} \mathrm{S}>\phi \nu \lambda \hat{\eta} \mathrm{S}$ в.












 $\pi \epsilon \nu \tau \epsilon \kappa \tau \lambda$.
eleven days after the close of the Panathenaea.
 for four years. The phrase (with es for els) occurs in CIA i 32 A 28, в 27 (Hicks, no. 37) ; 117, 3; 121; 125; 129; 133; 141, \&c; 170; 273 (Hicks, no. 46). The greater Panathenaea were held in every third Olympic year, in the same year as the Pythian games. The loci classici are collected in Michaelis, Parthenon, Anhang II, 318-333.
 $\sigma \tau \rho a \tau \eta \gamma 0 \mathrm{l}$ and their subordinates, the
 Gilbert i 220 ff ., and Headlam, On the Lot, p. 102; inf. 6r § r.
§ $\$ 2,3$. The Council. On the subject in general, see Hermann, Staatsalt. §§ 125-127; Schömann, Ant., P. 371-9, E. T.; Gilbert, i 251 -264; Smith, Dict. Ant. i 309.
§ 2. к入ๆроиิтal] It was appointment by lot that made the Council consistent with the democratical constitution of Athens and prevented its becoming an oligarchical body of higher authority than the public assembly. The power of the old aristocracy had centred in a Council, and this power was broken down by the introduction of the lot. The Council of 400 under the 'Draconian constitution' is described as appointed by lot ( 4 § 3 ). The earliest documentary evidence bearing on this subject is an inscr. of Erythrae, the constitution of which was modelled on that of Athens in B.c. 455-450. It is there ordained for Erythrae (as for

$=$ Hicks, no. 23). Cf. Headlam, On the Lot, pp. $4 \mathrm{I}-56,86$.

трvтavévet] 'presides,' i.e. sits as a superintending sub-committee of the Council. Cf. Harpocr. s. v. $\pi \rho \cup \tau \dot{d} \nu \epsilon \mathrm{~s}$, Schol. Aeschin. 3 § 3 ; also Schömann, p. 376, and Gilbert, ${ }^{1} 255$. Even the order in which the $\pi \rho u \tau a \nu e t s ~ h e l d ~ o f f i c e ~ i s ~ d e t e r-~$ mined by lot (cf. Headlam, l.c., p. 51). This fact had already been ascertained by Clinton, Fasti, ii $344-6=415-8$.
 year consisting of 354 days, the tenth part would be 35 days, and 4 over. It has been supposed by Gilbert, i 255 , that these four days were assigned to the several prytanies by lot. The text states that they were assigned to the first four prytanies, which thus lasted for $3^{6}$ days, the remaining six lasting for 35 only. This fact was already known to us through Photius, Suidas and the Schol. in Hermogenem, v p. 509 ; but their authority was set aside on the evidence of the Choisenl Marble, CIA i 188 (Ditt. no. 44), 1l. 2540, в.c. $410 / 9$, where we have express mention of the 3 th day of the 8th, 9 th, and roth prytanies. Hence it was inferred by Clinton, Fasti, ii 346-418, that the four supernumerary days were assigned to the last tribes and not to the first. While this was clearly the case in B.c. 410 , the text shews that, in the writer's time, the latter plan was adopted instead.

The duration of the $\pi \rho u \tau a \nu \in i a u$ is discussed by Unger, Philol. $3^{8}$ p. $4^{25}$ ff., Usener, Rhein. Mus. 34 P. 392 ff., and A. Schmidt, Gr. Chronologie, pp. 241, 423 etc.







9-10 катà $\sigma \epsilon \lambda \eta \eta^{2} \eta \nu$ — $\dot{\epsilon} \nu a v \tau \delta \nu$ del. Lipsius, Herwerden.
10 ăyouat H-L.
 om. Harp. (k-w, H-L, B) : retinet k coll. Ar. Poet. 1458 a 25 etc (Ind. Ar. p. 540 b). TAHNENAN COIT. K. 14 XPHMATIZEI COIF. K.








 (Frag. $394^{2}, 434^{3}$ ). Cf. Schol. in Aeschin. I § 104.






кarà $\sigma \in \lambda \eta{ }^{\prime} \nu \eta \nu$-évıavtóv] This explanation is introduced quite as naturally as that in the corresponding passage of Schömann's Ant., p. 376 E. T., where, immediately after defining the duration of a prytany, the writer continues: 'The Athenians, it may be explained, had a legal lunar year consisting of 12 months of 29 and 30 days alternately, and therefore of 354 days altogether.' The phrase reminds one of Arist. Nub. 626, кarà
 and Diog. Laert. i 59 (of Solon), $\dot{\eta} \xi t \omega \sigma \epsilon$
 à $\boldsymbol{\epsilon} \epsilon \nu$. The explanation (like many others in this treatise) would not be needed by Athenian readers; but it does not necessarily follow that it is an interpolation, as suggested by Lipsius, Leipzig Verhandl., 1891, p. 47 n.




 тáveıs кa入eîral đólos. Cf. Pollux viii 155; Bekker, Anecd. 264. On a special emergency the $\beta$ ouh $\eta$ even passed the night there, Andoc. de Myst. 45. It was also called the $\sigma$ кud́s (Gilbert, i $256, \mathrm{n} .4$ ). It was near the $\beta$ ouneutipioy (Paus. i 5,
I), to the north of the east end of the Areopagus (Curtins, Stadtgeschichte, p. xciii and 171). Thus the $\pi \rho v \tau d y e t s$ could readily leave the $\theta 6$ hos to attend the meetings of the whole body of the Council in the neighbouring $\beta$ ouneuctipıov. Cf. Wachsmuth, Stadt Athen, ii 315 .
ouváyovatv $\kappa \tau \lambda$.] CIA ii 417,459 and elsewhere (of the $\pi \rho \nu \tau \dot{d} \nu \epsilon \in s), \dot{\varepsilon} \pi \epsilon \mu \epsilon \lambda \dot{\eta} \theta \eta \sigma a v$

 ol $\nu 6 \mu \mathrm{ol}$.
ö $\sigma a l ~ \mathfrak{\eta} \mu$ épal] The manuscript reading has been retained, 'as it facilitates the following tis' (J. B. Mayor). Hitherto our earliest authority for this equivalent to d $\sigma \eta \mu t \rho a t$ has been Themistius (A.D. 355), who also has örat wipat in p. 192 D . ة̈бoc $\mu$ गेves occurs in Dem. 744, 25 (L and S ).
 large number of such holidays is noticed in [Xen.] $d e$ Rep. Ath. 3, 2. Among them were the Apaturia (Athen. I7I E), the Thesmophoria (Arist. Thesm. 79), the Kronia (Dem. 24 § 26), and the d $\pi$ oфpades $\dot{\eta} \mu$ е́pat (Plut. Alc. 34). Gilbert, i 258, n. 4.

тетрákıs] Elsewhere (Photius, s. v. $\kappa \nu \rho l a \dot{e \kappa \kappa \lambda \lambda \eta \sigma\{a, ~ S c h o l . ~ A r i s t . ~ A c h . ~} 19$ and Schol. Dem. 24 § 20) we are told of three









 aNa「IN（K，K－w）；verbum in v． 21 secl． $\mathrm{k}-\mathrm{w}$ ，b．




meetings in each month，all of them termed кuplaı èккл $\eta \sigma l a c$ ．But the text shews that there was only one кupia Éккд $\eta \sigma$ la in each month（ $\$ 4$ ），as already held by Gilbert，i 269 ，n．．．
 $\beta$ ount，though ordinarily held in the Bounevtupoo，were occasionally trans－ ferred to the Eleusinion，the Theseum or the Panathenaic Stadium，or even to the Acropolis（Gilbert，i 259 n．r）．${ }^{8} \pi \iota$ of кaөfiкct could only mean＇what is not suitable＇；and such a sense is out of place here．I was once inclined to sug－ gest öтav кa0 $\theta \dot{\eta} \kappa \eta$ ，＇at the proper time，＇ lit．＇whenever the time arrives．＇Dem．
 тй $\nu \dot{\mu} \mu \boldsymbol{\nu} \kappa \alpha \theta \dot{\eta} \kappa \eta$ ．Ar．Hist．An．viii z，23，д̀ хpbขos каөйкєє．
 таи̂та тарабкєva $\sigma \theta \hat{\eta}$, тoùs $\pi \rho \cup \tau a ́ \nu \epsilon \epsilon s \pi \rho 0-$
 ol̂ $\boldsymbol{\nu} \tau \epsilon \hat{\eta}$ ．
§§ 4－6．The Public Assembly．
§4．троүра́фоибı—єкклךбlas］Five days notice was given ；Bekker，Anecd． 296，8，$\pi \rho \sigma \pi \epsilon \mu \pi \tau a$（Gilbert，i 270 n ．x）．
 § 3．The agenda for the кupla éкк入 $\overline{\text { ola }}$ were already known through citations of this passage in Harpocr．（Gilbert，i 282）．
 of．＇＇Нагросr．s．v．катахєцротоуla：EOos



 xєцроторia he refers to Theophrastus，ì $\delta^{\prime}$ N $6 \mu \omega \nu$ ．Cf．Schömann，De Comitizs， p．231；Ant．391．E．T．The term $\pi p o-$
$\beta 0 \lambda \eta$ is inaccurately applied to the $\epsilon \pi<\chi \epsilon t-$ potovia．（Meier and Schömann，note 389 Lips．；and Smith，Dict．Ant．ii 492 b）．





 оโаөа，дто́бац тє филакаі є̇тікаироі́ єlбь
 cial $\kappa \tau \lambda$ ．This topic of deliberation is mentioned in Ar．Rhet．i 4 § xo，$\pi \in \rho$ l
入́áтєтal ктл．：in Pol． $1298 a 3$ it is omitted．Cf．CIA ii 225 and 334，$\epsilon$ ls


Tגs tioayye入las］Such information might either be brought before the $\beta$ où $\dot{\eta}$ ，
 the $\dot{\epsilon} \kappa \kappa \lambda \eta \sigma l a$ ，through the $\theta \epsilon \sigma \mu 0 \theta \epsilon$ тal（c． 59）．Cf．Hager in Smith，Dict．Ant．i 709，ii 1067.
 ventories of confiscated property．＇Pol．
 रpaфخ̀ see Meier and Schömann，pp． $30_{4}$ －6 Lips．，and Dict．Ant．s．v．
 $\kappa \lambda$ in $\rho \omega \nu$ ］i．e．the legal claims（or＇lists of suits＇）for the right of succession to in－ heritances，and for that of marrying the daughter of a citizen who has left no son to inherit his estate（ $56 \S 6$ ，$\kappa \lambda \eta \eta \rho \omega \nu$ кal $\dot{\epsilon} \pi \iota \kappa \lambda \dot{\eta} \rho \omega \nu \quad \dot{\epsilon} \pi \iota \delta \iota \kappa a \sigma l a i)$ ．Meier and Schömann，pp．791－4，606－8， 616 Lips．； Dict．Ant．s．z．Heres，i $947 a$ and Epi－ clerus，p． 747 a．
 have cognisance of any vacancy in an






## 23 HPHM <br> $\epsilon \pi \iota \chi \in \rho \rho o r o v i a v$; idem habet lexici rhet. Cantabrig, codex a







estate.' This clause refers only to the suits concerning $\kappa \lambda \hat{\eta} \rho o t$ and $\dot{\epsilon} \pi i \kappa \lambda \eta \rho o$. tpm $\quad$ os is a specially appropriate epithet for an estate deprived of its owner, or for children bereft of their father: Plat. Leg.
 object of this public recital was partly to draw attention to any claims on the estate; partly to give due notice to all who were interested in establishing a right of succession.
 when the Attic year began on July 14 , the sixth mputavela began on Jan. 5, B.c. 409 (Clinton, Fasti, ii $347=418$ ).
óттакофорlas]. On this occasion the point to be determined was whether there was a case for having recourse to ostracism; if so, a day was fixed for the final voting in the eighth $\pi$ putavela. (Lex. Cant. s. v. $\dot{\text { dे } \sigma \tau \rho a \kappa \iota \sigma \mu b s ; ~ S c h o l . ~ A r i s t . ~ E q . ~ 851, ~}$ and fragm. Lex. Dem. Aristocr.; cf. Blass in Hermes, 1882, p. 152).
"A. Schmidt, Gr. Chronologie, P. 259, seeks to reconcile Aristotle and Philochorus. The date of the baт aкoофopla is explained by the desire to settle a dangerous political struggle before the opening of spring, i.e. before the end of Anthesterion. The 6th prytany in an ordinary year is equivalent in general to Gamelion 1Anthesterion 5. But Philochorus wished to embrace the case of an intercalary year in which the 7 th prytany is equivalent in general to Gamelion 22-end of Anthesterion : 'before the eight prytany' means either in the 6 th or 7 th, for $i f$ the principle was that the ostracism was to be proposed in Gamelion or Anthesterion, it might fall in the $7^{\text {th }}$ prytany of an intercalary year. The hypothesis is absurd, for absolutely no reason is suggested why the Athenians should have ostracised men later in the year if it chanced to be inter-calary,-to say nothing of other obvious
objections" (Wyse).
 a preliminary criminal information brought before the public assembly; if the people approved, a trial before an ordinary lawcourt ensued. This procedure was applied in the case of those who had accused the generals concerned in the battle of Arginusae (Xen. Hell. i 7 § 34). The case against Midias began with a $\pi \rho \circ \beta \circ \lambda \lambda^{\prime}$. Cf. Schömann, De Comitiis, p. $23 \mathrm{Iff.}$, Meier and Schömann, P. 335 Lips., Dict. Ant. ii $492 a, 732 a$.

For its application in the case of бuko-



 and Aeschin. F. L. ${ }^{1} 45$, т $\hat{\nu} \nu$ бuкофадт $\omega \hat{\nu}$



т $\hat{\nu} \nu \mu$ нeoik $\boldsymbol{\omega} \nu$ ] This implies that a $\mu$ Eтoוкos could be charged with oukoфayrla. Hence it follows that he was entitled to give information against public offenders. Ordinarily this right was confined to citizens (Plut. Sol. $18, \dot{\epsilon} \xi \hat{\eta} \nu \tau \hat{\varphi}$ $\delta \nu \nu a \mu \hat{e} \nu \varphi$ каі $\beta$ оилодѐч кгл.). A foreigner, who desired to accuse a person of any offence against the people, was required to obtain special permission for that purpose, ädea, Andoc. De Myst. §15. Cf. Meier and Schömann, p. 330 Lips.



 and $i b .135$ (where it is called a $\nu o ́ \mu$ os ajpxaios and death is named as the penalty). The procedure began either with a $\pi \rho o \beta o \lambda 力$ (as in Xen. Hell. i 7 §35) or an elcar $\gamma^{\text {ella }}$, [Dem.] c. Timoth. $49 \$ 67$.
§ 6. iкeт $\eta$ plavs] 'supplications,' 'formal





27 oүBoү^о corr. K. $\omega \mathrm{NK}$ : $\pi \in \rho l \boldsymbol{\omega} \boldsymbol{\nu}$ Kontos, Lipsius, Gertz, k-w, sed spatium vix duarum litterarum capax vacuum relictum ; 白 $\pi \dot{\rho} \rho(\hat{Y}) \dot{\omega} \nu \mathrm{H}-\mathrm{L}(\mathrm{B})$. $\quad 28 \Delta \mid \alpha-$
 $\Delta 0 c ı \omega N$ suprascripto cypakocime 'corruptumne ex capa $\triangle$ ocicn ut Ar. tértapa $\delta^{\prime} \dot{\delta} \sigma t \omega \nu$ scripserit?' K-w.
$\chi \rho \eta \mu a \pi l$ Sovat H -L.
petitions.' For $\theta$ els...iкєтทplav cf. Dem.


 $\chi р \mathfrak{\eta \mu a r a} \mathfrak{a} \nu \theta \rho \omega \pi т о$, ib. 53 ; Aeschin. F. $L$.
 lкerppla ( $\rho a j \delta o s)$ was an olive-branch bound with wool (Aesch. Suppl. 22, 192), which the 'suppliant,' or petitioner, held in his hand before depositing it on the altar in the place of public assembly. Such an application for the right of petition might also be laid before the $\beta$ ounin, Aeschin. c. Timarch. 104. In Andoc. De Myst. nio-ri6, it is laid before the $\beta$ ounj on the occasion of its session in the 'Enevaluov, although presenting a petition in that place was forbidden, $i b$. 116. Such petitions might include applications for the recovery of civil rights, or for the remission of sentences; and, in general, for exemption from legal penalties. Cf. Dem. c. Timocr. 46, $\tau \hat{\eta} \mathrm{s}$ d $\dot{\delta} \delta \mathrm{Elas}$ סobelons, and see Schömann, Ant. p. 397 E.T.; Gilbert, i 294 ; Dict. Ant. i 24 b, 702 a.
ai $\delta \in$ Sío $\kappa \tau \lambda$.] Pollux, who gives in viii 96 a paraphrase of the present passage and its context, describes the hearing of heralds and embassies as the business of the third $\dot{\epsilon} \kappa \kappa \lambda \eta \sigma\{a$, while that of the fourth is $\pi \epsilon \rho l$ l $\epsilon \rho \bar{y} \mathrm{y}$ кal $\dot{\delta} \sigma l \omega \nu$. This distinction is not in accordance with the text. The latter is confirmed by Aeschines


 The statement in Pollux may have originated in some confused and fragmentary reminiscence of the constitution in c. 30 $\S 5$, where, in the order of business before the $\beta$ oun $\lambda$, the third place is assigned $\pi \rho \in \sigma \beta \in l a t s$, after which they deliberate $\pi \in \rho i \tau \hat{\omega} \nu \ddot{\alpha} \lambda \lambda \omega \nu(=\dot{\delta} \sigma l \omega \nu)$.
tpla] This implies that only three questions under each of the several headings were allowed to be discussed in each тpuraveia. Similarly in $\S 5$ only three

against Athenians, and three against resident aliens. These limitations have been hitherto unknown.

Hartel, Studien über Urkundenzeesen, cites, as examples of business connected with ritual etc., being brought before the people $\epsilon \boldsymbol{p}$ lepoîs, CIA ii $325,352 b, 373 b$, and (a decree of the Kipukes and Ev $\mu$ о入$\pi i \delta a 1) 605$. On p. r73, ff., he cites the
 (=Ditt. no. 101, Hicks no. 111) l. 55 (в.с. $347 / 6$ on the $\pi \rho \epsilon \sigma \beta \epsilon t$ from the sons


 privilege of access to the $\beta$ ou $\dot{\eta}$ (and in most cases to the $\delta \hat{\eta} \mu \mathrm{c}$ ) $\mu \epsilon \tau \grave{\alpha} \tau \dot{\alpha}$ lepá was granted to Aretus of Colophon (CIA i 36 ), to the Neotoлitat (ib. 5 r Suppl. p. 17), to the communities of Mytilene, Colophon and Cythnus (CIA ii $52 \epsilon, 164,233$ ), and to certain individuals named in $1 b, 34$, 206, 209, 289, 316. Cf. Dem. 24 § 25 ff.

Lepôv...ঠס $\delta(\omega \nu]$ 'things sacred and profane.' Bota, when contrasted with lepá, includes all that is untouched by divine law. Thus, in things concrete, lepà would include temples and their treasures; $8 \sigma \iota a$, civic buildings and money belonging to the state. Dem. $24 \$ 9, \tau \hat{\omega} \nu \operatorname{le} \rho \hat{\omega} \nu \mu \bar{\nu}$
 $\pi \dot{d} \lambda \omega \boldsymbol{d} \boldsymbol{\alpha} \pi о \sigma \tau \epsilon \rho \epsilon \hat{L}$. The same terms are used to contrast religious and civil privileges, Dem. $23 \S 65 ; 39 \S 35$; as well as the corresponding legal enactments, as in
 divtrypapeús (see Frohberger's Lysias, iii p. 172, and Ruhnken, Timaeus, s.v. ö́cu• тà lot
 tion changes from gen. to dat., as in Aeschin. 1 § 23, where the order in which the four kinds of business are mentioned is the same as in the text. Foreign envoys were usually introduced to the $\epsilon \kappa \kappa \lambda \eta \sigma l a$ by the $\beta o v \lambda \eta$ (Aeschin.
 $\kappa a l \pi \rho \in \sigma \beta \in l a s . \quad$ Cf. c. $30 \S 5$.


 ${ }_{33}$ точ́тоия à $\pi о \delta \iota \delta \dot{\partial} a \sigma \iota$.

$32 \pi \rho \cup \tau \alpha ́ \nu \epsilon \sigma \iota \mathrm{H}-\mathrm{L}, \mathrm{B}$.
$33 d \pi 0 \delta \iota \delta 6 a \sigma \iota \nu$ H-L.





















'Sometimes the members of the $\epsilon \kappa \kappa \lambda \eta$ ola take the initiative in bringing forward public business, without a preliminary vote (on the question whether it will discuss a proposal on the part of the $\beta$ ov $\lambda \boldsymbol{\eta}$, or accept it without discussion).' Cf. Harpocr. s.v. $\pi \rho о \chi$ elpozovia. ...о́тóтау






 § 23 , and see Gilbert, i 276 n. 3.

The course described in the text would involve a departure from the principle

 Sol. 19). This principle was also virtually set aside when the $\beta$ ound, without arriving at any conclusion on its own part, referred a question to the $\dot{\epsilon} \kappa \kappa \lambda \eta \sigma l a$ direct. Tlus, on the memorable evening when the messenger arrived with news of Philip's capture of Elateia, the $\epsilon \kappa \kappa \lambda \eta \sigma / a$ had already begun to assemble before the Boun $\dot{\eta}$ had had time to draw up a preliminary decree; and, the business being urgent, the $\pi \rho u \tau d \nu \in i s$ brought it immediately before the assembly (Dem. de

Cor. 170). It was also open to any member of the ékкл $\eta \sigma l a$ to take the initiative by moving to refer any question to the $\beta$ oùǹ with a view to a $\pi \rho o \beta o i_{-}$ devua being drawn up by the latter (Gilbert, i 278 n. 3).
 tov] Aeschin. F. L. ${ }_{\mathbf{z}} 8$, (the $\beta$ ou入 $\grave{\eta}$ )
 $\pi \rho o \sigma b \delta o u s \pi \rho o \beta o u \lambda e t \epsilon \mathrm{~L}$. On the capture of Elateia, the messenger brought the news às toùs $\pi$ putávets (de Cor. 169). Cf. Arist. Thesm. 654, taî̃a roîs $\pi \rho \nu$ $\tau \dot{\alpha} \nu \epsilon \sigma \iota \nu$ á $\gamma \gamma \epsilon \lambda \bar{\omega}$.
XLIV. The Public Assembly, continued.
 the fifth century the $\dot{\epsilon} \pi t \sigma \tau \dot{\alpha} \tau \eta \mathrm{~s} \boldsymbol{\tau} \hat{\omega} \nu \pi \rho v-$ тáyeढy actually presided at the meetings of the $\beta$ ouǹ $\dot{\eta}$ and $\epsilon_{\kappa \kappa \kappa \lambda \eta \sigma l a, ~ a n d ~ t o o k ~ t h e ~}^{\text {a }}$ sense of the meeting. Tbus, in 415 B.C., we find Nicias addressing the President at the Assembly in the words $\kappa a l a v, \dot{\omega}$
 Again, in 406, on the memorable occasion when Socrates refused to put the illegal proposal that the generals concerned with the battle of Arginusae should have judgment passed upon them collectively, his own tribe was the $\phi u \lambda \grave{\eta}$ mputavelovaa (Plat. Apol. 32 B), and he








XLIV 2 oür ध̈ $\sigma \pi \iota \pi \lambda \in l \omega$ H-L.
3 клєIC (K-w, $\mathrm{K}^{3}$, в; cf. Meisterhans, p. 28²):








was $\dot{\varepsilon} \pi \iota \sigma \tau \dot{a} \tau \eta$ for the day (Xen. Mem. i
 Cf. Gilbert, i 257 n. 3.

In the fourth century, on the institution of $\pi \rho \sigma \in \delta \rho o l$ with an ėrı$\sigma \tau a ́ \tau \eta s$ of their own, the duty of presiding in public was transferred to the $\epsilon \pi$. $\tau \bar{\omega} \nu \pi \rho \circ \bar{\omega} \rho \omega \nu$ (Gilbert, ib. n. 5), while the $\dot{\epsilon} \pi . \tau \omega \nu \pi \rho \nu-$ тóveav discharged the duties stated in the text. As the latter remained in the $06 \lambda$ os for the day and night during which he was in office, he was necessarily precluded from presiding over the $e^{i} \kappa \kappa \lambda \eta \sigma t a$ or the $\beta$ ounty. On the institution of the тра́єд́рои, see § 2.
 public treasure kept in the $\delta \pi \sigma \sigma \theta \dot{\sigma} \delta o \mu$ os on the Acropolis (Boeckh, III xx). The custody of the keys did not involve any responsibility for the actual management of the fund. The Arg. to Dem. Androt. p. 590 applies to the $e^{\pi} \iota \sigma \tau \dot{a} \tau \eta$ s language of less precision than that in the text:




tôv iepêv does not necessarily imply that the public treasure was kept in more than one temple. Hence the pl. throws no light on the obscure question whether the $\delta \pi \tau \sigma \theta$ ó $\delta \rho \mu o s$ of the 'old temple' of Athene between the Erechtheum and Parthenon was at this time still in use, as well as the Parthenon (see Miss Harrison's Mythology \&oc of Athens, p. 505 8). The 'old temple' was burnt in 406 B.c. (Xen. Hell. i 6), and the burning of the $\delta \pi \iota \sigma \theta \delta \delta o \mu \mathrm{os}$ mentioned in Dem. 24
§ 136 may refer to the same event. In B.c. 353 the priestess transferred to the
 in the archonship of Thudemus certain 'gold ornaments' which were removed from the 'old temple' to the Parthenon (CIA ii 758 II 7). The public records (ура́риата) were preserved in the $M \eta$ -
 § 187 ; Paus. i 3, 5 ; Lycurg. Leocr. 66). Cf. Curtius, das Metroon, Gotha, 1868.
 $21, \dot{\alpha} \nu \delta \rho \dot{\alpha} \pi \sigma \delta \alpha \quad \sigma \epsilon \sigma \eta \mu a \sigma \mu \dot{\epsilon} \nu a \tau \hat{\psi}$ бो $\eta \mu \sigma \tau \psi$ $\sigma \eta \mu a \dot{\nu} \rho \mu 4$. The seal probably represented an owl or a Gorgon's head. Cf. Curtius, Abh. d. Berlin Akad. 1874, p. 88 (Gilbert, i p. 256 n .2 ). Both the badges above mentioned may be seen on the extant

§ 2. $\quad$ Tpotipous] In the fifth century it was the $\pi \rho$ oróvets who presided over the $\beta$ oùخे and $\dot{\epsilon} \kappa \kappa \lambda \eta \sigma i a$ in the person of one of their own body who was the eimt$\sigma \tau \alpha \dot{\tau} \eta \mathrm{\eta} \boldsymbol{\tau} \hat{\omega} \nu \pi \rho \nu \tau \dot{\alpha} \nu \epsilon \omega \nu$ and was necessarily a member of the $\pi \rho u r a v \in \dot{v} \circ \cup \sigma a \phi \cup \lambda \eta$. Thus, in CIA ii $\mathrm{r} b$, we have two decrees of the year of Eucleides, B.c. 403-2. (1) was passed in the prytany of the tribe Pandionis, and the $\dot{\epsilon} \pi \iota \sigma \tau \alpha \dot{d} \eta$ s was of the deme of " $\Omega a$, which belonged to that tribe ; (2) in the prytany of the tribe Erechtheis, and the $\dot{\epsilon \pi} \tau \sigma \tau \dot{a} \tau \eta \mathrm{~s}$ was of the deme of $\mathrm{K} \eta \delta a l$ belonging to that tribe. As a general rule the deme of the $\hat{\epsilon} \pi$. $\tau \hat{\omega} \nu \pi \rho \nu \tau \dot{d} \nu \epsilon \omega \nu$ is not specified; it necessarily belongs to the presiding tribe.

In the fourth century the $\pi \rho \sigma \in \delta \rho o l$ came into existence. The $\dot{\epsilon} \pi / \sigma \tau \dot{d} \tau \eta s \tau \omega \hat{v} \pi \rho v$ $\tau \dot{\partial} \nu \epsilon \omega \nu$ was deprived of his preeminence


$10 \pi \rho б \gamma \rho a \mu \mu a$ corrupte mutatum in $\pi \rho a ̂ \gamma \mu \alpha$ habet Suidas s. v. émьбтár $\eta s$.
oit K-W, в ; ol K, H-L.
and obtained in its place the privilege of appointing by lot nine $\pi \rho o ́ \varepsilon \delta \rho o c$, one from each of the tribes except his own, and of drawing lots among those nine for one of them to act as the $\dot{\varepsilon} \pi \iota \sigma \tau \alpha \dot{\alpha} \eta \bar{S}^{\tau} \hat{\omega} \nu \pi \rho o-$ $\dot{\epsilon} \delta \rho \omega \nu$. Under this system, the $\dot{\epsilon} \pi$. $\tau \hat{\omega} \nu$ $\pi \rho о \epsilon \delta \rho \omega \nu$ was necessarily a member of some other than the $\pi \rho v r a v e v o v a a ~ \phi u \lambda \eta$. In CIA iir ${ }^{7}{ }^{b} b$ (Ditt. no. 64), in the archonship of Nausinicus, B.c. $378 / 7$, though the $\pi \rho \rho \dot{\theta} \delta \rho o t$ are mentioned, the deme of the $\bar{\epsilon} \pi \iota \sigma \sigma a r \eta s$ is uncertain ; but in CIA ii ${ }^{1} 7$ (Ditt. no. 63), in the same year, in the prytany of the tribe Hippothontis, the $\epsilon \pi \iota \sigma \tau a \tau \eta s$ is of the deme ${ }^{*} A \theta \mu o \nu \nu$ which belongs to a different tribe, Ce cropis. In ii 50 (Ditt. 75), в.c. $368 / 7$, in the prytany of the tribe Aeantis, the $\dot{\epsilon} \pi$ torár $\eta \mathrm{s}$ belongs to a deme of the tribe Aegeis. In ii 116 (Ditt. 107), B.c. $341 / 0$, in the prytany of the tribe Pandionis, the $\dot{\epsilon} \pi \kappa \sigma \tau \alpha \dot{d} \eta \mathrm{~s}$ belongs to another tribe. Between the years 378 and 320 we have in all 24 decrees giving the name of the prytany and the president, and in no case does the deme of the president belong to the $\phi \cup \lambda \dot{\eta} \pi \rho \nu \tau a \nu \in \dot{j}$ between Eucleides and Nausinicus (403378 ) there is at present no evidence; but it is probable that the change came into force in the latter year, a date of special importance in the financial history of Athens. The aim of the change was clearly to give all the tribes a concurrent share in the superintendence of the $\beta$ oviǹ and $\overline{\epsilon \kappa \kappa \lambda \eta \sigma i a \text {, instead of each tribe having }}$ in turn the sole superintendence for the duration of its own prytany. (See esp. Prof. W. W. Goodwin's paper in Trans. of the American Philol. Association, 1885 , vol. xvi 165-175.)

In the fifth century the formula for describing the president was $\dot{o} \delta \in \in \hat{i} a \dot{\varepsilon} \dot{\epsilon} \pi \varepsilon-$ $\sigma \tau \dot{d} \tau \epsilon \iota$. From 378 to 347 the same formula is used to denote the $\bar{\epsilon} \pi \iota \sigma \tau \dot{d} \tau \eta \bar{\tau} \tau \hat{\nu} \nu \pi \rho o-$ $\delta \delta \rho \omega \nu$, side by side with a new formula,
 347 onwards the last alone is found (Gilbert, i 257 n .5 ).

It was once supposed that the $50 \pi \rho v$ távets were divided into five groups of ten $\pi \rho b \epsilon \delta \rho o c$ holding office for one-fifth of a prytany (generally for seven days) and appointing one of their number to serve as $\mathfrak{e} \pi \iota \sigma \tau \dot{d} \eta \eta$ for each day. This supposition rested on the Scholia to Aeschin.
c. Ctes. 39 and Dem. p. 594, 5, and on the 2nd Arg. to Dem. Androt. p. 590. It was accepted in an early work of Schömann (De Comitiis Ath., 18 r 9 ), where, in the endeavour to reconcile the conflict of evidence, it was suggested that there were two sets of $\pi \rho \sigma \in \delta \rho o t$ in existence at the same time, (1) the proedri contribules, belonging to the same tribe as the $\pi \rho v$ rávecs, and forming a subdivision of that body; and (2) the proedri non-contribules, belonging to a different tribe to that of


Nearly three centuries earlier it was held by Sigonius (1529-1584) in his De Atheniensium Reprublica, that wherever the $\pi \rho \sigma \epsilon \delta \rho o t$ were mentioned, they were the nine who were not of the same tribe. This opinion was accepted by K. F. Hermann (1843), who noticed further that the $\pi \rho b \in \delta \rho o t$ are never mentioned until after the time when one of the $\pi \rho v \tau \dot{y}$ ats used to preside in the Assembly. Hence the $\pi \rho b \in \delta \rho o l$ ( $n o n-c o n t r i-$ bules) were a later institution, and the proedri contribules were a merely imaginary body. Schömann's earlier view survived in Grote, c. 3 I, iii is 8 , but it had meanwhile been abandoned by Schömann himself, in favour of Hermann's view which is conclusively confirmed by the text. See Schömann, Ant. p. 377 E.T.

Some confusion has arisen from the fact that Harpocration, s. v. $\pi$ об́e $\delta \rho o l$, implies that the $\pi \rho$ óe $\delta \rho o c$ held office during the whole of each prytany, whereas the text, which he professes to follow, really describes them as appointed by lot for each meeting of the $\beta$ où̀̀ or è $\kappa \kappa \lambda \eta \sigma l a$. The most accurate citation of the text is that preserved by Telephus ap. Eustath. on Od. 17, 455, and by Suidas, s. $v$. $\dot{\epsilon \pi} \pi \sigma \tau \dot{d} \tau \eta s$, art. 2. On the general question see Goodwin l. c., and Gilbert i 257 (with the authorities there quoted); also Caillemer on Boule in Daremberg and Saglio, i $740-1$, and Chavannes on Epistates, ib. iii 700; and Wayte in Smith's Dict. Ant. i 320-1, and on Dem. -Timocr. § 21.
 mentioned as presiding ( 1 ) at the $\beta$ ou $\lambda \dot{\eta}$ in Aeschin. c. Timarch. 104, Bov入єutìs
 333) $\tau \hat{\omega} \nu \pi \rho \circ \dot{\epsilon} \delta \rho \omega \nu \dot{\epsilon} \pi \epsilon \psi \eta \dot{\eta} \phi \iota \zeta \epsilon \nu$, and similarly in ii 179 (B.C. 325) about the time







 . $\Delta \in \operatorname{lk}(\mathrm{a})$ ).
 $\left\langle\tau^{\prime}\right\rangle \mathrm{K}-\mathrm{w}$. $\quad 13 \tau^{2}$ delent Richards, Blass, $\mathrm{K}-\mathrm{W}, \mathrm{B}$; in $\delta^{2}$ mutat Hude;

 male iterato exortum, idem fecerunt Blass, Fränkel, k-w, H-L, ${ }^{3}$; etiam in versu propinquo (18) dittographiae vitium denuo apparet M€TATATHN ( $\mu \varepsilon \tau \dot{d} \tau \dot{\eta} \nu)$ ).
when this treatise was written ; (2) at the

 $\mu \varphi, F . L .82$, (Demosthenes) $\lambda a \gamma \chi$ á $\overline{\epsilon \iota} \pi \rho \rho-$



тd тро́үра $\mu \mu а] 43$ § $3, \pi \rho о \gamma \rho a ́ \phi o v a$.
 previous century the same duties had been performed by the mpuráveis with the aid of the rogbtal: Arist. Thesm. 923, 929-946, and esp. 854, ei $\mu \grave{\eta}$
 фavĵ. The $\pi \rho \delta \in \delta \rho o \mathrm{c}$ as well as the $\pi \rho v$ rápecs are named in Aeschin. c. Ctes. 4,




The phrase $\dot{\epsilon} \pi \tau \mu \epsilon \lambda \epsilon \hat{i} \sigma \theta a t$ є $\dot{\kappa} к о \sigma \mu l a s$ is found in Pol. $1299 b 16$ and 19 (cf. $1321 b$ $\mathrm{I}_{4}$ and 20); also in Isocr. Areop. $37^{-}$
тротьөєarıv] 48 § 2 ; Xen. Mem. iv $2,3, \tau \hat{\eta} s \pi \delta \lambda \epsilon \omega s$ 入órov $\pi \rho o \tau \epsilon \theta \epsilon l \sigma \eta s$. In Aeschin. F. L. 65 we have the exceptional proposal that, at the first of two éкк $\lambda \eta \sigma l a l$, there should be a debate; and that, at the second, the $\pi \rho 6 \epsilon \delta \rho o t$ should put the question to the vote, $\lambda \dot{\sigma} \gamma o \nu \delta \dot{\varepsilon} \dot{\epsilon} \mu \grave{\eta}$ $\pi \rho 0 \tau t \theta \in \nu a c$. In the fifth century this was the duty of the $\pi \rho \nu \tau d y e s$. Thuc.
 iii 36,$4 ; 42,1$.
xє!potovias] Aeschin. c. Ctes. 3, à



dффêvan] Arist. Ach. 173, ol $\gamma$ à $\rho \pi \nu$ -

 $\beta_{0 u \lambda \hat{\eta} s .}$


Dittenberger, Inscr. nos. 98 and ior, we have two decrees in the same prytany of в.c. 347-6, in both of which
 rightly inferred by A. Schaefer that both were passed at the same meeting of the eккл $\eta \sigma$ la. The text shews that no one
 than once in each year.
 61 §4. tôv $\alpha \lambda \lambda \omega v, 61$ § 3, 5. Cf. Aeschin. c. Ctes. 13 , ( $\dot{\alpha} \rho \chi$ às) às $\dot{\delta} \delta \bar{\eta} \mu o s$

 dáp ${ }^{\text {dós, }}$, also Xen. Mem. iii 4, 1 ; Dem. 23 §171; Plut. Phoc. 8.
 The author of the 2nd Arg. to Dem. Androt. p. 590 erroneously states that the d $\rho \chi \alpha \rho \epsilon \sigma$ ial fell on the last four days of the Attic lunar year of 354 days. But, as observed by Schömann, Ant. 390 E.T., they could not possibly have been held so late in the year: they must necessarily have taken place much earlier, so as to allow time for the $\delta о к<\mu a \sigma l a$. It has been inferred by Köhler (Monatsb. d. Akad. d. W., Berlin, 1866, p. 343), that they were held in the first éккл $\eta \bar{\sigma}$ la of the ninth prytany. This inference is drawn from an inscription of the time of the 12 tribes (after b.C. 307 ), CIA ii 416, in which the doxalpeqial are fixed
 Munichion (early in May), corresponding (in the time of the to tribes) to the beginning of the ninth prytany (see also Gilbert's Beitrüge, pp. 5-13, and Busolt in Müller's Handbuch, Iv i 152). The text shews that the election was held in the seventh prytany. This would begin
 20 точ́т $\omega \nu$.



 XIV $1 \chi \rho \dot{\eta} \mu a \sigma \iota$ H-L.<br>2 post $\alpha_{\pi} \boldsymbol{\sigma} \boldsymbol{\kappa} \tau \in \hat{\imath} \nu \alpha \iota$ lacunam indicant K-W.

three days before the end of Gamelion (the first six prytanies containing 214 and the first seven months 217 days), and would mainly correspond to the month Anthesterion (middle of February to middle of March).
This statement has a direct learing on the story of Sophocles being appointed $\sigma \tau \rho a \tau \eta \gamma \delta \mathrm{~d}$ against Samos \&c owing to the success of his Antigone (on the authorities for the story, see Jebb's Introd. p. xliii). If the play was produced at the Great Dionysia (ro-15 Elaphebolion $=$ March-April), i.e. late in March, B.c. 441, the ordinary election of $\sigma \tau \rho a \tau \eta \gamma 0 \mathrm{l}$ for the ensuing official year had already taken place a month before. We must therefore either infer that the story is false; or that the date of the election was exceptionally delayed in that year owing to inauspicions weather; or that, at that time, the d $\rho x a l \rho e \sigma i a l$ fell later than was the case in B.C. 325. If the election of Sophocles took place a month before the Great Dionysia, and was prompted by the success of the Antigone, the play must have been performed at the Great Dionysia of the previous year, in which case eleven months must have elapsed before the election. But by that time the impression produced by the play would have become appreciably weaker, and the story would have lost its point. On the bearing of the date of election on the 'deposition of Pericles,' see Mr Marchant in Class. Rev. v 165.

єủonu(a] 'on whatsoever days there are signs of fair weather.' ejonula is found in Hippocr. 1170; e $\begin{aligned} & \sigma \sigma \eta \mu \text { os in }\end{aligned}$



The proviso is one of practical importance in the case of a large meeting on an open hill-side like that of the Pnyx. Even when the ordinary $e^{2} \kappa \lambda \eta$. olat came to be held in the theatre of Dionysus (e.g. in 290 b.c.), the Pnyx continued to be the scene of the dpxal$\rho \in \sigma$ lat (Pollux viii 133 ).

When the $\delta \hat{\eta} \mu \mathrm{os}$ was desiring to elect Cleon as $\sigma \tau \rho a \pi \eta \gamma b s$, there was thunder and lightning, an eclipse of the moon and
afterwards one of the sun, Arist. Nub. 581 -6 (and Schol.). Presumably amid all these portents the election was deferred. In Thuc. $\mathbf{4 5}$ ult. an éкк $\lambda \eta \sigma l a$ is adjourned because of an earthquake. Even a drop of rain was sufficient to be regarded as a 'sign from heaven,' סьoбnuia 'бть каl pavis $\beta \in \hat{\beta} \lambda \eta \kappa \epsilon \mu \epsilon(A c h .17 \mathrm{I})$. Cf. Suidas, s.v.

троßoviגєч $\mu a, \kappa \tau \lambda$.] In accordance with the general principle ordained by Solon,
 $\dot{\epsilon} \kappa \kappa \lambda \eta \sigma i a \nu$ єl $\sigma \phi \dot{\epsilon} \rho \in \sigma \theta a$.

## XLV-XLIX. The functions of the Council.

 Boviǹ was not competent to inflict a higher fine than $500 d r$., Dem. $c$. Euerg. p. ${ }^{11} 52$ §43, (after an el $\left.\sigma \alpha \gamma \gamma \in \lambda i a\right) ~ \dot{\varepsilon} \nu \tau \hat{\psi}$

 ö $\sigma o v \tilde{\eta}^{\nu} \nu$ кupla катà $\tau \dot{\partial} \nu \nu \partial \mu о \nu$. In a dẹcree drawn up about 446 B.c. any encroachment on the $\Pi e \lambda a \rho \gamma \iota \kappa d \nu$ is punished by a fine of $500 d r_{\text {. }}$, to be inflicted after an eloayye入la has been brought before the Fou入 $\dot{\eta}$ by the archon $\beta a \sigma i \lambda \epsilon{ }^{\prime}$ 's (Ditt. no. 13,59 ).
 $\beta o v \lambda \hat{y} \sigma \epsilon \delta \in \hat{v}$. A limitation to this right is mentioned in the oath taken by the Council in Dem. c. Timocr. 144, oư $8 \dot{\xi}$




 It is there stated that this oath was in the interest of untried persons to give them every opportunity for preparing for their defence. In § I 48 we are told that 'Solon' made the Council $\alpha_{\kappa v \rho o \nu} \tau 00 \delta j \bar{j} \sigma t$, i.e. did not grant them an absolute right of imprisonment, but a limited right subject to proper bail being found. In certain cases, however, bail was not allowed, and in these the Council's right was not barred. See also 22 § 2 and 48 § I .

Cleophon was imprisoned by the Council and then handed over to the dicastery (Lys. 30 § 10); he was condemned to death by a court consisting of







 ठıкабтаi $\psi \eta \phi і ̈ \omega \nu \tau a \iota, ~ т о и ̆ т о ~ к u ́ \rho \iota o \nu ~ є i v a l . ~$




 K－w，H－L， K $^{3}$ ，в，cf．Meisterhans，p．141 ${ }^{2}$ ，n． 1234 － 3 єүмнлєIднC（в coll．


4 А $\AA \omega \Pi \epsilon \theta$ нкє corr．к． $5<\tau \hat{\psi}>\delta \iota \kappa a \sigma \tau \eta \rho i \varphi \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{W}$ ，idem in c． $4 \sigma$ ， to et $\mathrm{c} .55,7 \pi \hat{\psi}$ non inserunt． 6 a $\pi \epsilon$－



the Council and a dicastery，ib．11，and 13 § 12 （Newman）．
$\Delta v \sigma\left[\mu a x^{\circ} v\right]$ possibly the person of that name mentioned in Xen．Hell．ii 4，8，

 ED $\delta \in \kappa a$ ．On the restoration of the demo－ cracy his services to the Thirty may well bave been remembered against him．

 398 a 35， 568 b 2 ．

One Sosias bad a similarly narrow escape：Antiphon $5 \S 70$ ，ó áv $\bar{\eta} \rho \dot{\alpha} \pi \dot{\eta} \chi \chi \eta$ （MSS，$\dot{\alpha} \nu \eta \chi \theta \eta$ Dobree，$\alpha \pi \epsilon \lambda v \theta \eta$ Kayser， $\dot{\alpha} \pi \eta \lambda \lambda \alpha \chi \theta \eta$ Baiter ；$\dot{\alpha} \phi \in \dot{\lambda} \lambda \epsilon \tau о$ ，in the text， suggests $\dot{\alpha} \phi \eta \rho \in \theta \eta$ ）$\dot{v} \pi \delta$ rô̂ $\delta \eta \dot{\eta} \mu \nu v$ rồ


Eun $\mu \boldsymbol{\eta}$（ $8 \eta \mathrm{~F}$ ］The only passage where the name is found，as that of an Athenian， is［Dem．］ $49 \S \mathrm{Ir}, \tau \hat{\psi} \pi a \iota \delta \ell \tau 0 \hat{0}$ E $\dot{\mu} \mu \eta \lambda l \delta o v$ ． The date of the speech is в．c． 362 ．
＇dфє $\boldsymbol{D}_{\text {ero }}$ ］here＇rescued him．＇It is used below in another sense ：＇deprived of the power of．＇
ó aंग̀ rov rutávov］＇the man who escaped the bastinado．＇＇Schol．Arist． Plut．476，тú $\mu \pi \alpha \nu a . . . \xi 勹 ́ \lambda a, \delta i \iota^{\top} \nu$ rovs кaradikous Ėturrov，and Photius，s．z． ти $\mu \pi$ àov．Cf．Lys． 13 § 56 ，$\dot{\omega} s \dot{a} \nu \delta \rho o-$
 $\tau \cup \mu \pi \alpha \nu i \sigma \theta \eta, i b .67,68$ ；and Dem． $9 \S 6 \mathrm{r}$ ． This form of punishment was inflicted on

какоурјоь，including àдбофбиои．This confirms the conjecture that Lysimachus was arraigned for taking part in causing citizens to be put to death under the Thirty（Xen．l．c．）．The restriction in the powers of the $\beta$ oulin mentioned in this chapter has already been noticed in more
 єis $\tau \delta \nu \delta \hat{\eta} \mu о \nu \epsilon \lambda \eta \lambda\langle u \theta a \sigma \iota \nu$ ，a passage referring to the time subsequent to the archonship of Encleides．Even before that time the $\beta o u \lambda \eta$ did not necessarily enforce its right of inflicting penalties，but sometimes ex－ ercised the option of referring the case to a law－court，cf．CIA i 59，（ $\tau \grave{\eta} \nu \beta$ ou入ウ̀ $\nu$ ）

 $\kappa \alpha \theta b \tau \iota \stackrel{a}{\alpha} \delta о к \hat{\eta}$ аúт $\hat{\eta}$ ．
 $\epsilon \pi \iota \zeta \mu \mu a$ is used of＇penalties＇in Dem． and Plato；$̇ \pi \iota \S \eta u \iota o \hat{v} \nu$ ，in Xen．Hell． v 2 § 22 ；$\epsilon \pi \iota \zeta \eta \mu i \omega \mu a$ ，in Pollux viii 149.
$\theta \in \sigma \mu 0 \theta \in ́ t a s] 59$.
$\S \%$ крlvel ràs ápXàs］Antiphon， 6 § 49，тv日b $\mu \in \nu=s$ avirous（the moptorai， $\pi \omega \lambda \eta \tau \alpha i, \pi р а к т о ́ \rho \in s$ and $\dot{\text { i }} \boldsymbol{\pi о \gamma \rho а \mu \mu a \tau \epsilon i s ) ~}$
 $\tau \dot{\eta} \nu \beta_{0} \boldsymbol{\nu} \lambda \dot{\eta} \nu$ ．










 ${ }^{2} 0$ бıкабтท่рıоу.






$19<\kappa a l>\tau o u ́ \tau o s s$ K-w, B. $\quad 23$ кãà $\gamma$ à $\rho \tau \alpha u ̂ \tau \alpha$ Kontos, H-L; v. Dem. $20 § 96$.



#### Abstract

pro Imaginibus 15, ̇̇фÉcunov ... $\delta i k \eta \nu$. Pollux viii 125 , ( $\kappa \rho / \sigma \tau \nu) ~ \epsilon \phi \epsilon \epsilon \tau \mu 0 \nu$. elvayjendelv] probably here used in the general sense of bringing to the knowledge of the Council, without reference to the special process called $\epsilon l \sigma a \gamma \gamma \in \lambda d a$. The procedure in the latter case is described by Dr Hager in Dict. Ant. s. $\begin{aligned} & \text {., }, ~\end{aligned}$ i 709 a.




 'A тод $\nu$ дцццор докор ктл. Two of the speeches of Lysias are concerned with
 кard̀ $\Phi \lambda \omega \bar{d}$ os, is a speech for the prose-
 defence. \& 9 of the latter speech shews the wide scope of the scrutiny in such
 тaptòs tồ $\beta$ iov $\lambda$ brov $\begin{gathered}\text { oibbval. }\end{gathered}$
ápxovtas] Lys. Or. 26, кǎ’ Eưdudoov, is a speech in accusation of one who was appointed by lot to be First Archon in reserve. The case was heard on the last day but one of the preceding official year (midsummer, b.c. ${ }^{882}$ ). The next day was a public holiday, and, in the event of his rejection, an appeal was im-
 $\pi \lambda \eta \rho \omega \theta \hat{\eta} v a c$. Dem. Lept. go asserts that the junior archons underwent a double


 the $\beta o u \lambda \eta$ is called an tivd $\kappa \beta / \sigma$ ss in Dem. Eubuul. 66; it is described as affecting all
the archons (ib. 7o). Cf. c. 55 § 2.
 19, quoted on c. 44 ult.
троүрáчшбгเv] 43 § 3 ult.
 turns on a point of form. Among cases in point are the motion of Androtion to award a crown to the outgoing fount (Dem. Androt. 5); and that of Thrasybulus to grant Lysias the citizenship of Athens (note on $40 \S 2$ ).
XLVI § נ. т $\hat{\omega} v$ т $\left.\rho \imath \eta \eta^{\rho} \omega_{v}\right]$ Gilbert, i 26 r n. 4.
 engines,' and 'the tackling of ships:' [Dem.] 47, 九. Euerg. § 19 , $\sigma \kappa \kappa \dot{v} \eta$ трıпрькd. Xen. Oec. viii 12, סic̀ $\pi 0 \lambda \lambda a ̂ \nu . . . \xi \nu \lambda\langle\nu \omega \nu$ бкєuผิע ('oars,' 'rudders,' 'masts,'

 $\kappa \rho \epsilon \mu a \sigma \tau \omega \hat{\nu}$ ('sails' and 'rigging') калоч$\mu \hat{E} \nu \omega \nu \pi \lambda \in \hat{\epsilon}$. The specifications of the famous $\sigma \kappa \varepsilon v o \theta \dot{\eta} \kappa \eta$ in the Peiraeus, designed by the architect Philon under the administration of Lycurgus, are still extant (CIA ii $1054=$ Ditt. no. 352). This бкєшö $\dot{\eta \kappa \eta}$ was intended тoîs крє $\mu \sigma \sigma \tau 0 \hat{s}$ $\sigma k \in \dot{\varepsilon} \sigma \tau$, and (though not finished) was probably already in use in b.c. 329 , a few years before the text was written. Cf. Dürrhach, Lycurgue, pp. 64 -73.
$\tau \omega ิ \nu \nu \in \omega \sigma \sigma$ oh $\kappa \omega \nu$ ] Strictly speaking the $\nu \in \omega \sigma=$ oro are the sheds in which the ships are laid up, and vé́pıa the dockyards; but the terms are sometimes interchanged (cf. Dict. Ant. ii $206 a$, and Diirrbach, l.c. .p. $65, \mathrm{n} .3$ ). In [Xen.] de Rep. Ath. iii 2, among the duties of








 10 Katarnoycd K，H－L ：катaүpbıtos K－w，B．$<\tau \hat{\varphi}>\delta \iota \kappa \alpha \sigma \tau \eta \rho l \varphi$ Gennadios， Naber（ $\mathrm{H}-\mathrm{L}$ ，idem $\tau \hat{\psi}$ non addunt in c． 45,5 et c． 55,7 ）．
the $\beta o u \lambda \grave{\eta}$ we find $\nu \epsilon \omega \rho / \omega \nu \varepsilon \pi \iota \mu \epsilon \lambda \eta \theta \hat{\eta} \nu \alpha c$ ． From B．C． 347 to 323 an annual property tax amounting to ten talents was raised for the building $\tau \hat{\omega} \nu \quad \mu \epsilon \omega \sigma o l \kappa \omega \nu$ кal $\tau \hat{\eta} s$

kaıvàs трıท́pets］Twenty，according to Diod．xi 43 ．In B．c． $356 / 5$ the Council failed to build the requisite number of new triremes；Androtion nevertheless moved that they should receive the customary compliment of a golden crown； and for this he was attacked under a $\gamma \rho a \phi \grave{\eta} \pi а \rho a \nu b \mu \omega \nu$（Dem．Androt．8）．
$\eta$ тerp $\eta$ pess］In the list of the fleet for B．C．330／29 eighteen quadriremes are mentioned：CIA ii 807 b 76－79，тєт－
 $\Pi_{\text {III，}}, \dot{\epsilon} \mu \pi \lambda \hat{\varphi} \delta \dot{\varepsilon} \Delta$ ．For the three years between B．C．334／3（ib．804）and the above date the lists are missing．The earliest notice of quinqueremes is in B．C． $325 / 4$ ，when seven are mentioned， ib． 809 d 90 ，the list for the previous year（ib． $808 \quad d \quad 36$ ）giving quadriremes， as well as triremes，but no quinqueremes （Boeckh，Seeurkunden，p．76）．The archonship of Cephisophon，B．c．329／8， is mentioned in c． 54 § 7．Hence the date of the treatise falls after B．C． $3^{28}$ ， and before 325 ，the year in which quin－ queremes appear for the first time（C． Torr in Athenaeum，Feb．7，1891；and Lipsius in Leipzig Verhandlungen，1891， P．45）．
dpXıт́кто⿱㇒⿻二亅⿱八乂，$]$＇naval architects，＇or ＇master ship－builders．＇These are not mentioned elsewhere，but the names of 35 such persons are known to us from inscriptions（Boeckh，Seeurkunden，pp． 93－100）．The $\alpha \rho \chi \iota \tau \epsilon \in \tau \omega \nu$ of Dem．$d e$ Cor．$\S 28$ is a different kind of official，－ the manager of the Theatre of Dionysus．



 36）．

трітротоьoús］In Dem．Androt． 17 the treasurer of this body is mentioned：



 in Aeschin．c．Ctes． 30 implies that they


 last passage suggests that they were chosen by the tribes out of candidates nominated by the demes：the text implies that the choice rested with the $\beta$ ouln． Probably the latter ratified，as a matter of course，the selection made by the tribes．Among similar commissioners elected by the tribes，may be mentioned the relxorrolol and the raфporolol；the $\dot{\alpha} \pi \boldsymbol{\pi} \boldsymbol{\sigma} \tau \boldsymbol{\lambda} \boldsymbol{\lambda} \epsilon \hat{i}$ s were certainly elected $\epsilon \xi{ }^{\prime} \mathrm{A} \theta \eta$－ $\nu a l \omega \nu \dot{a} \pi \dot{\alpha} \nu \tau \omega \nu$（Gilbert，i 250）．
§ 2．oiкоסонท́paral The inspection of public buildings has not hitherto been known to be one of the functions of the $\beta o u \lambda \dot{\eta}$ ．But it is naturally connected with their duty of letting $\tau \epsilon \mu \epsilon \nu \eta$ кal $\operatorname{l\epsilon \rho }{ }^{2}$ kal olklas，［Xen．］de Vect．iv 19.
áтофаlvel］＇formally denounces，＇ ＇reports．＇Ant．de Chor．9，dтoфท́vaoc


 （the Areopagus），and ib．49，$\dot{\alpha} \pi \epsilon \phi \eta \nu \in \nu \dot{\eta}$ $\beta$ ou $\lambda$ خ．

тара $\delta(8 \omega \sigma \iota$（ккабт $\quad$ р $(\omega)$ CIA i 59 ， （B．C． 410 ），$[\tau \grave{\eta} \nu \beta o u \lambda \grave{\eta} \nu \quad \beta o v \lambda \epsilon \hat{v} \sigma] a \iota$ è $\nu \tau \hat{\eta}$
 $\lambda \alpha \dot{\zeta} \epsilon \iota \nu \hat{\omega} \nu \delta \omega \rho 0[\delta о \kappa \eta \sigma \alpha \nu \tau \omega \nu$ ката廿］$\eta \phi \ell-$










 $\delta \eta \mu \dot{\sigma} \iota a$ Phot. et Bekk. An.' k-w.







 The full title is $\tau \alpha \mu l a \iota \tau \hat{\omega} \nu$ i $\epsilon \rho \hat{\omega} \nu \chi \rho \eta \mu \dot{\alpha} \tau \omega \nu$ $\tau \hat{\eta} s$ ' $A \theta \eta \nu a l a s$. This is found in the inventories of the treasures in the Parthenon, the Hecatompedos and the Pronaos (cia i 117-175), and in the records of payments from the treasure of Athena for public purposes (ib. 179, 180, 188). Cf. Hicks, Hist. Inscr. nos. 50 , 51, 53, 54. The short title, $\tau a \mu l a s ~ \tau \hat{\omega} \nu$ $\tau \hat{\eta} s \theta \in 00$, is found in inscr. of 325 (Boeckh, Seeurkunden, p. 465). See Boeckh II v; Schömann, p. 418; Gilbert, i 234; and cf. note on $30 \$ 2$, $\tau a \mu l a s ~ \tau \hat{\omega} \nu i \in \rho \hat{\omega} \nu$ $\chi р \eta \mu \Delta \tau \omega \nu$ кт $\lambda$.; also Panske, de Magistratibus Atticis, 1890 , i pp. 13-46.


 regulating the qualification was practically obsolete. Cf. c. 7 ult.

тара $\lambda a \mu \beta$ ávovбt $\kappa \tau \lambda$.] The accounts of the treasures transferred in each year were annually audited; they were also inscribed on blocks of stone once in four

rò dya $\left.{ }^{2} \mu a\right]$ The statue is not mentioned in our inventories; hut from 8.c. 385 there is proof of the existence of a separate specification respecting it. This was kept in the temple and the treasurers certified in each year that the statue and its appurtenances were all safe kã⿺̀ $\tau \grave{\eta} \nu$ $\sigma \tau \eta \lambda \eta \nu$ (Köhler in Mittheilungen, 1879 , p. 89, quoted by Hicks, p. 89). The a $\gamma a \lambda \mu a$ is incidentally named in CIA ii 652,42 (B.C. 398).
rds Nicas кal тòv biג About $435 / 4$ B.c. the treasures of the Parthenon included golden figures of Niky, CIA i 32, в 2, tàs Nitkas tds
$\chi \rho \cup] \sigma \hat{a} s$ кal $\tau \grave{a} \pi[0 \mu \pi \varepsilon i a]$. The number was probably ten. About 407/6 eight of these were melted down and made into gold coin, the kaцpdy xpuaiov of Arist. Ran. 720 (see Schol.). Seven of the pedestals of these figures were still in existence between 377 and 367 (CIA ii 678,47 ). In the earliest inventory after the archonship of Eucleides a xpur囹 $\mathrm{N} k \boldsymbol{\eta}$ is mentioned (CIA ii 642). This Niкๆ, which was nearly two talents ( 52 kilogr. $=115 \mathrm{lb}$.) in weight, was probably made out of the proceeds of the confiscated property of the Thirty (Michaelis, Parthenon, p. 301). The same $N \kappa \kappa \eta$ is entered in an inventory of the $\tau \alpha \mu l a l \tau \hat{\omega} \nu \quad$ $\epsilon \rho \omega \hat{\nu} \nu \chi \rho \eta-$
 who existed as a joint body from about 403 to 380 B.C., to be separated again in 385. It is also named in CIA ii 677 , B.c. 367 .

Under the financial administration of Lycurgus (в.с. $338 / 7-326 / 5$ ) part of the surplus of the public revenues was spent on preparing a number of golden Nîkal, which were set apart among the treasures on the Acropolis. The decree of Stratocles, preserved in [Plut.] ii $85^{2}$, recites




 кашךфбрovs (cf. ib. vit. Lycurg. § 5, $\pi о \mu-$
 бкеটuae каi Niкas $\chi \rho v \sigma \hat{a} s$, and Paus. i 29,

 It was in B.C. 334 that, according to the $\lambda 6$ रos $\tau \alpha \mu \hat{\omega} \nu \tau \hat{\eta} s \quad \theta \epsilon \hat{v}$ and a special commission acting with them, part of the surplus handed over by the raplas $\tau \hat{\omega} \boldsymbol{\nu}$

2







 erat fortasse тג т АРГА к̀ тд єРГасімд. $\quad 12 \sigma v \gamma к є \chi \omega \sigma \mu є \nu a$ Poland, Busolt.


 $\pi 0 \lambda$. Fere eadem in Bekk. An. 291, 17 et Lex. Dem. Patm. p. 14. Pollux viii 99:

 $401^{2}, 44 \mathrm{r}^{3}$ ).
$\sigma \tau \rho a \tau \iota \omega \tau<\kappa \hat{v} \nu$ was spent cils tàs $\mathrm{N} / k\left[\alpha s_{s}\right.$ кail] $\tau \mathrm{d}$. $\pi[0 \mu] \pi \in \hat{i} a($ CIA ii 739). These may be identified with certainty as the Níka of the text. кóव弓os refers in part to the кbбuos кay $\eta \phi$ optкos (CIA ii 162, frag. $c$ ro), including $\delta(\phi \rho o t, ~ \dot{u} \pi \mathbf{\pi} \delta \in \rho(\delta \in s$ (necklaces), $\dot{\mu} \varphi \iota \delta \in a i$ (bracelets), and $\sigma \tau \in \phi a v a($ (ii 74 r в $\subset 3-5$ ). Cf. Michaelis, Parthenon, p. 292; Boeckh, note 719 Fränkel; Foucart, Les Victoires en or de ${ }^{1}$ Acropole, Bull. de corr. hellén. xii 283-; and Dïrrbach, Lycurgue, pp. 8o-91.
§ 2. $\pi \omega \lambda \eta$ rai] Hermann, Staatsalt. § 151, 2; Schömann, p. 417; Gilbert, i 227 ; Panske, de Magistratibus Atticis, ip. r 0.
$\mu$ нrӨoûб! кл入.] 'farm out the public contracts.' Thus the contracts for setting up tablets inscribed with public documents ( $\sigma \tau \hat{\eta} \lambda a \iota$ ) were let out by the
 The contract for building the walls of Athens in $334-326$ is let out by the same body (cia ii 167 ).
 the mines' is meant the sale of the right of working them. The 'purchaser,' who may be more correctly described as the lessee, paid a fixed price together with one twenty-fourth part of the net produce as a perpetual tax. The ordinary price of a share was one talent. See Boeckh, On the Silver Mines of Laurium, Appendix to Publ. Econ., ed. Lewis. In Cia ii $780-783$, and 782 b (p. 513 ), we have fragments of $\delta$ caypaф́al $\mu \in \tau \dot{d} \lambda \lambda \omega \nu$ drawn up by the $\pi \omega \lambda \eta r a i$.
rd. Tek $\eta$ ] Most of the tolls, customs and taxes were farmed by $\tau \in \hat{\text { anvan }}$ (Boeckh, III viii; Gilbert, i 335; Dict. Ant. s.v.).
 management of military finances, which, in the fifth century, had been entrusted to the è $\lambda \lambda \eta \nu o \tau a \mu l a l$, was entrusted in B.c. $33^{8}$ to a new officer called the $\tau a \mu l a s ~ \tau \hat{\omega} v$ бт $\quad a \tau \iota \omega \tau \iota \kappa \omega \nu$. The first to hold this office was Callias, the brother-in-law of Lycurgus ([Plut.] Vit. Lyc. § 27). It was supposed by Boeckh (II vii) that it was immediately after the archonship of Eucleides that the $\in \lambda \lambda \eta{ }^{2} 0 \tau a \mu i a i$ were superseded by the $\tau a \mu i a s ~ \tau \hat{\omega} \nu \sigma \tau \rho$. and the superintendents of the theoric fund. But as late as 347 b.c. we find the a $\pi$ од $\ell \kappa \tau a u$ described as making payments
 vi 152), which implies that the raplas $\tau \hat{\omega} \nu \sigma \tau \rho$. was not yet in existence (A. Schaefer in Rhein. Mus. xxxiii 43 r, quoted by Gilbert i 237 n. 3, and Dem. $u$. s. Zeit, $11^{2} 307$ n. 2). In Boeckh, n. 317 , Fränkel assigns 347 as the date when this office was instituted; but he is opposed by Hartel, Studien, p. ${ }^{32}$ (Dürrbach, Lycurgue, p. 32). It is at present therefore impossible to assume any earlier date than 338 for its institution.-The same official took part in superintending the Panathenaic games ( $49 \S 3$ ).
 officers were apparently instituted under the administration of Eubulus, between 354 and 339. The plural here decides the question whether there was only one official of the name, or more. Boeckh (II vii, p. ${ }^{449^{2} \text { ) supposed that there were }}$ ten. The pl. in Aeschin. . . Ctes. 25, oi $\epsilon \pi l$ $\tau \grave{\theta} \theta$. кєхєєротор $\eta \mu \in \nu$ о used to be understood of successive holders of the office. Cf. Gilbert, i 230.

трla êt $]$ It has hitherto been supposed








 conieci) acceperunt $\mathrm{H}-\mathrm{L}$; $\Delta \lambda \lambda$ (i.e. $\ddot{\alpha} \lambda \lambda \omega s$ vel $\not \partial \lambda \lambda o \theta \epsilon \nu$ ) post $\mathrm{T}(\omega \mathrm{N})$ agnosci posse



that the state never let the mines for a term of years, but only granted them on perpetual leases (Boeckh's Silver Mines of Laurium, § 7, p. 645).

We have already been told that the $\pi \omega \lambda \eta \tau a l$ 'sell the mines.' We are now told that they lease for a term of three years, not only the mines that are still workable, but also those that are the subject of special concessions. It is observed by Boeckh, l. c. p. 646 , that it could 'scarcely have been compulsory upon a tenant to pay to the state the purchase money of a new mine, if, after having expended his trouble and capital, he was unsuccessful in finding any ore.' It may therefore be bere suggested that a term of three years was fixed for a provisional letting of the lease, and that the annual payment of $\frac{1}{24}$ was not due until the three years had elapsed. Possibly the original purchase money was in the first instance paid conditionally, and was recovered in the event of no ore being found. In the other event, at the end of the three years the provisional lease would be 'confirmed ' in the presence of the $\beta$ ou $\lambda$ g'.

In connexion with the mines, a period of 'three years' is mentioned in Hyperides, Eux. col. xliv, and [Dinarchus] fragm. in Baiter and Sauppe, Oratores Altici, ii $325^{6}{ }_{4}$; but it seems to have no bearing on the present passage.

тd $\sigma \nu \mathbf{\gamma \kappa \epsilon \chi} \boldsymbol{\omega} \rho \eta \mu \dot{\epsilon} \nu \alpha]$ possibly mines 'let under a special agreement' without the previous payment of purchase money. It has been suggested, however, that some word contrasted with $\epsilon \rho \gamma \dot{d} \tau \mu a$ is needed, such as $\sigma \nu \gamma_{\kappa} \kappa \chi \omega \sigma \mu \hat{\nu} \nu a$, exhausted mines with heaps of scoriae accumulated near them. Such mines, if they had reverted in any way to the state, would
have to be 'sold ' for a very much smaller sum. In CIA ii 782 , shortly after the time of Lycurgus, we find mention of a
 mine reopened and worked afresh,' which is sold in the second $\pi \rho \nu \tau a v \in i a(i b .780$ ) for the small sum of r 50 dr .
 trials before the Areopagus a person accused of wilful murder might (except in cases of parricide) withdraw from Attica 'after delivering his first speech' (Dem. 23 § 69), and thus avoid the penalty of death (Pollux, viii 117). Such a person was never allowed to return; and, when any decree was passed to sanction the restoration of exiles, there was a special clause excluding oi $\dot{\epsilon} \xi$ 'Apelou $\pi a ́ \gamma o v$ фévources, Plat. Leg. 87 I D. Their property was confiscated, Dem. $23 \S 45, \tau \hat{\omega} \nu \dot{\alpha} \nu \delta \rho \circ \phi \phi \nu \omega \nu \tau \hat{\omega} \nu \epsilon \xi \in \lambda \eta \lambda \nu \theta \delta \tau \omega \nu$,

$\left.\boldsymbol{\tau} \hat{\nu} \boldsymbol{v} \delta \boldsymbol{\phi} \varepsilon \lambda_{\lambda \in \tau} \hat{\omega}\right]$ If a debt to the treasury remained unpaid at the ninth prytany, it was doubled and the debtor's property sold (Andoc. De Myst. 73; Dem. c. Nicostr. p. 1255 § 27 ; c. Neaer. P. 1347 § 7 ).
 $\lambda_{\epsilon} \lambda \in \omega \kappa \omega \mu \in \nu 0 \nu$. Lys. 9 § 6, (of a fine)
 סoбav. Dem. 24 Timocr. 23, (of a new


 $\mu a ́ \tau \omega \nu$ е̇тıтй $\delta \epsilon \iota o s$.
§ 3. катаßá $\lambda \lambda_{\epsilon \epsilon \nu . . . к а т а \beta о \lambda \dot{\nu}}$ ] of payment by instalments, as in [Dem.] c. Neaer. $27,{ }^{2} \epsilon \omega \nu \eta \mu \varepsilon \nu$ as $\tau \eta \eta^{2} \pi \epsilon \nu \tau \eta \kappa о \sigma \tau \eta \nu$

 тavelay, c. Timocr. 98, ai тف̂̀ $\tau \varepsilon \lambda \hat{\omega} \nu$ катаводаі.









 $\mathrm{K}^{3}$, в: $\pi$ ара $\delta \delta \delta \omega \sigma \iota$ quondam Paton ( $\mathrm{H}-\mathrm{L}$ ). $26 \mathrm{~T}(\omega \mathrm{~N}) \mathrm{M}(\epsilon \mathrm{N}) \omega \mathrm{N}: \tau \hat{\omega} \nu \tau \epsilon \mu \epsilon \nu \omega \bar{\omega}$ Wyse, Blass, ( $\mathrm{K}-\mathrm{w}, \mathrm{H}-\mathrm{L}, \mathrm{K}^{3}$ ). 27 suppleverunt Jackson, van Leeuwen (edd.).
èvárŋs mpuravelas] The time when the purchase-money for the $\tau \in \lambda \eta$ was paid: Dem. Timocr. 93, 98.
dтоүpaфévia] In CIA i 274-28I we have the accounts rendered by the $\pi \omega \lambda \eta$ rai for property (probably that of the 'Epuокот( $\delta a l)$ which had been confiscated and sold by the state. See also CIA ii 777 , and 779 ( $\tau \dot{6} \dot{\delta} \delta^{\prime} \dot{\epsilon} \pi \rho \dot{\alpha} \theta_{\eta} \boldsymbol{\epsilon} \delta \dot{\alpha} \phi \eta \dot{\alpha} \tau i \mu \eta \tau a$


 а́р $о$ ортоs, в.c. $3^{24} / 3$; cf. Boeckh, Seeureunden, p. 543.
$\pi \dot{\epsilon} v \tau \epsilon . . . \delta \in \mathrm{k} \times \mathrm{a}]$ These details have been hitherto unknown. The only definite statement about the rent of a house is in Isaeus II §42, where a house in Melite worth 30 minas, and another at Eleusis worth 5, jointly produce an annual rent of 3 minas; so that in less than 12 years the occupant would have paid the value of the houses. In the same passage an estate at Thria, worth 150 minas, produces 12 minas per annum; so that in $12 \frac{1}{2}$ years the occupant would have paid the value of the estate.
§ 4. $\delta$ ßaoidevis] The functions of this archon being mainly religious, he is here described as responsible for bringing the leases of sacred enclosures to the knowledge of the Council. Cf. cIA iv fasc. 2, 53 a (quoted by Wyse, Class. Rev. $\mathrm{v}^{275}$ a): (418/7 B.c.) v. 3 sqq.











 $\lambda \epsilon \dot{\iota} s \mu[l] \sigma \theta \omega \sigma a ́ \tau \omega$ кal ol $\pi \omega \lambda \eta \tau a l$ тд̀ тध́-







 $\tau \hat{\nu} \nu a \lambda \lambda \omega \nu \quad \theta \epsilon \omega \hat{\nu} \pi a \rho a \delta \delta \delta \delta \nu \tau \omega \nu \kappa a \tau \dot{a} \tau \partial \nu$


 $\epsilon \dot{\iota} \theta v \nu \dot{\ell} \sigma \theta \omega \quad \mu \nu \rho i \eta \sigma_{\iota} \quad \delta \rho a \chi \mu \eta{ }_{\eta} \sigma \nu . \quad \tau \dot{\partial} \nu \quad \delta \hat{\epsilon}$





 $\mu \iota \sigma \dot{\omega} \sigma \eta \tau a \iota$ àvтє $\boldsymbol{\gamma} \rho \rho a \psi a ́ \tau \omega$ ó $\beta a \sigma \iota \lambda \epsilon \dot{s}$ és

 J. R. Wheeler in American Fournal of Archaeology, iii, nos. I and 2.
The $\beta a \sigma \iota \lambda \epsilon \dot{s}$ is associated with other officials in an inscr. of B.C. 329 , ' $E \phi$. 'A $\rho \chi$. iii, 1883, р. т1ов $29,[\tau \omega \nu \tau \epsilon \mu \epsilon \nu \omega \nu]$

 $\mu \epsilon \lambda \eta \tau a i \tau \hat{\omega} \nu]$, $\mu \tau \tau \eta \rho(\omega \nu$.

 $T \omega \nu \tau \epsilon \mu \nu \omega \nu$. Didymus ap. Harpocr. s.z. $\dot{a} \pi \dot{\partial} \mu \tau \sigma \theta \omega \mu \dot{\partial} \tau \omega \nu$ (Isocr. Areop. 1 I)... ${ }^{\boldsymbol{\epsilon} \kappa}$ $\tau \hat{\omega} \nu \tau \mu \epsilon \nu \kappa \hat{\omega} \nu \pi \rho о \sigma о \delta \omega \nu . \quad$ [Xen.] de Vect. iv 19, $\mu \iota \sigma \theta$ ồ $\nu \tau a l$ Үô̂v каi $\tau \epsilon \mu \epsilon \bar{\nu} \eta$ каl
 $\pi o ́ \lambda \epsilon \omega s . ~ P l a t . ~ L e g . ~ 759 ~ E . ~$






 $35 \pi \rho o \epsilon \xi a \lambda[\epsilon \iota \phi \theta \hat{\eta}]$.

 spatium non sinit.
$32 \kappa a \theta \epsilon[\lambda \dot{\omega} \nu] \dot{d} \pi[\dot{\partial} \tau \hat{\omega} \nu] \operatorname{van}$ Leeuwen ( $\mathrm{H}-\mathrm{L}, \mathrm{K}^{3}$, в) : ка $\theta \epsilon \lambda[\dot{\omega} \nu]$ $\epsilon \kappa[\tau \hat{\omega} \nu] \mathrm{k}-\mathrm{w}$ sed $\lambda$ incertum et $\epsilon \kappa$ valde dubium putat K . $33 \Delta \epsilon$, ante $\tau \dot{d}$

 $\phi \eta \tau a l]$ H-L.




Eтף $\delta$ fka] cia ii 1059 ( $=$ Inscr. Brit. Mus. p. 24 xiii), in B.c. $3^{21,} \mu \iota \sigma \theta 0 \hat{0} \sigma L$
 $\lambda a \tau \epsilon \mu \epsilon \nu \eta{ }^{2} \pi \pi a \nu \pi$ for a term of ten years. The same term of years is recorded in a lease granted by a $\phi \rho a \tau p i a$ in e.c. 300 (ib. 600), and also in an Attic inscr. relating to some land in Delos and Rheneia belonging to the Delian temple, cia i 283 (b.c. 434). Wyse (Class.Rev. v 275 b) quotes a Delian inscr. of b.c.

 (Homolle, Les Archives de I'Intendance Sacrée à Delos, p. r9 n. r).
 be noticed that all who had not paid their debts to the treasury by this date. (the penultimate prytany of the Attic year) had their property sold by the state (see note on $\dot{\delta \phi \varepsilon \epsilon \lambda \epsilon \tau \hat{\nu}, ~ s u p r a, ~ § ~ 2) . ~}$
§ 5. © $8 \eta \mu$ ó $\quad$ เos] ' the public clerk'; slaves were employed as áptivpadeis or 'checking-clerks.' Dict. Ant. s.v., and Gilbert, i $3^{23}$ n. 3 .
 sc. тà үрациатєía.
$\ell \pi เ \sigma \tau v \lambda i \omega v]$ It has been suggested that this term is metaphorically applied to the 'columns' in the list of accounts (Class. Rev. v 181 b); but obviously it cannot mean 'columns' at all, but something that rests upon them. In architecture the $\dot{\epsilon} \pi\llcorner\sigma \tau u \hat{\lambda} / o \nu$ is generally the 'architrave' (Plut. Per. 13 § 5 ; Vitruv. iv 3 § 4 , 'supra epistylium conlocandi
sunt triglyphi cum suis metopis'; cIG 4608 (A.D. 151), тapaбтá $\delta a s ~ к а і ~ к$ кópıa
 it is even said to be sometimes used of the whole of the entablature (Smith, Dict. Ant. s.v. ad fin.), but I know of no authority for this statement.

In the present passage I should understand it to mean a shelf supporting a series of 'pigeon-holes,' and itself supported by wooden pedestals, in the office of the public clerk. The entablature in Doric architecture, with its originally open metopes alternating between the triglyphs, may well have suggested a metaphorical term for a shelf of 'pigeon-holes' used for the preservation of public documents. K-W translate it repositorium or loculi. Haussoullier suggests a modern parallel in 'certains bureaux turcs (bureaux de douane ou de santé), où les papiers sont serrés dans les sacs que l'on accroche aux poutres et que l'on décroche au moyen d'un long bâton.'
$\pi \rho \circ \epsilon \xi a \lambda \epsilon \iota \phi \theta \hat{\eta}]$ not found elsewhere. $\dot{\epsilon} \xi a \lambda \epsilon i \phi \epsilon \iota \nu$, however, is found as a synonym of $\mathfrak{a} \pi a \lambda \epsilon l \phi \epsilon \nu$, being applied to annulling laws and decrees (in Lys. i § 48 , and Andoc. De Myst. 76), and to cancelling debts (in Dem. ${ }^{2} 5 \S 70$, $\dot{\varepsilon} \xi a \lambda \dot{j} \lambda \iota \pi \tau a \iota$ $\tau \grave{\partial} \phi \phi \lambda \eta \mu a$, and CIA i 32 , ro, d $\dot{\alpha} 0$ о́óvtup
 fasc. 2, $53 a$, $\dot{\epsilon} \xi a \lambda \epsilon \psi \dot{\alpha} \tau \omega$ contrasted with


XLVIII § i. àmo $\mathbf{\delta E \kappa т a l ] ~ ' g e n e r a l ~ r e - ~}$ ceivers.' These officials were instituted














 Leeuwen ( $\mathrm{K}-\mathrm{W}, \mathrm{H}-\mathrm{L}, \mathrm{K}^{3}, \mathrm{~B}$ ). 9 el $\sigma \phi \in \rho \sigma=\sigma$ van Leeuwen ( $\mathrm{K}-\mathrm{w}, \mathrm{H}-\mathrm{L}, \mathrm{K}^{3}$ ). $10 \pi \rho 0 \pi t \in \epsilon a \sigma \nu \nu$ olim conieci ( $\mathrm{H}-\mathrm{L}$ ), idem habent $\mathrm{K}-\mathrm{w}, \mathrm{K}^{3}$, в.






by Cleisthenes to take over most of the duties previously performed by the $\kappa \omega \lambda \alpha$ $\kappa_{\rho} \epsilon \tau a l$ (Androtion ap. Harpocr. s. v.). They are mentioned in Dem. c. Timocr. §§ 162, 197, Aesch. c. Ctes. 25 , Pol. 1321



 toútous кal raulas, also in an inscr. of $418 / 7$ B.c. quoted in note on $\S 4, \dot{\delta} \beta a \sigma \iota-$入eús. See Boeckh, II iv; Schömann, p. 417 ; Gilbert, i 226; and Dict. Ant. s. v.; also Panske, de Magistratibus Atticis, i 46-60.


 $b 30$, in в.с. $329 / 8$; 803 col. $d 93$ and
 B.c. $3^{60}$ and 363 .
 instalment.' Polyb. iv 60, 2, è $\lambda \lambda \epsilon \lambda=1-$ $\pi \epsilon \nu a c \tau \nu \partial \dot{\alpha} \tau \hat{\omega} \nu \delta \psi \omega \nu i \omega \nu$.
 this document '; this seems preferable to
 from this record' (K.). e' $\gamma \gamma p d \phi e a$ is specially applied to entering the names of state-debtors, Dem. 25 § 70 (cf. L and S, $\mathrm{II}_{3}$ ).

8ŋ̂бar кupla] In Dem. c. Tinzocr. 98 the speaker argues that, owing to the law proposed by Timocrates, allowing debtors to the treasury to find securities instead of making prompt payments, the $\beta o u \lambda \dot{\eta}$ (as well as the $\delta \kappa \kappa a \sigma r \eta \dot{p} \cdot a$ ) ceases to be кupla $\delta \eta$ चेбat. Cf. 45 § i.
§ 2. $\mu \in \rho[$ goval] CIA ii 38,18 (not later than OI. $100=$ B.c. $380-$ ), $\mu \in \rho l \sigma a \iota ~ \delta \grave{\epsilon} ~ \tau \grave{~}$






 тov. $834 b$ (в. С. $3^{29} / 8$ ) col. ii $3, \tau \delta \mu \epsilon-$
 тats'Eגєuolvo日ey. Pol. $13^{21}{ }^{6}$ 35, quoted above. Cf. Boeckh, i zıo n. a, Fränkel.
$\mu \epsilon \rho / \sigma \mu$ òv ] 'the apportionment'; rarely found in this sense. For exx. see Dittenberger, no. 344, ${ }^{18,21,23 .}$
oav (8ı] rare in sing. Dem. $25 \S 70$ (of the record of a debt) $\dot{\eta} \sigma a \nu i s \dot{\eta} \pi a \rho \dot{\alpha}$ $\tau \hat{\eta} \theta \epsilon \hat{\varphi} \kappa \epsilon \epsilon \mu \hat{\psi} \eta$.
$\pi \rho о \pi เ \theta \in ́ a \sigma เ \nu] 44$ § 3.
§ 3. $\lambda_{0}$ เo $\tau \alpha_{\text {s }}$ ] These are identical in name and number with those mentioned in 54 § 2. Both bodies are appointed by lot; but the doyoral in the text are a











[^59]committee of the Council．They are there－ fore to be distinguished from the board of入ovtoral，who，with their $\sigma v y \eta \gamma \quad 0 \rho o l$ ，audit the accounts of all officials at the close of their term of office．The officials ap－ pointed by lot are enumerated in c． $50-$ $6_{4}$ ；c．54，in which the 入oviaval are named， is introduced with the words：$\kappa \lambda \eta \rho \circ \hat{0} \sigma \iota$
 the officials in question have not been mentioned before．The existence of a committee of the Council，side by side with a board of the same name，appears to be supported by the analogy of the
 $\dot{\eta} \rho \eta \mu \dot{E} y o=$（CIA ii 739），and the $\beta$ ouncurìs
 c 5），existing by the side of the official board oi $\dot{\epsilon} \pi i \quad \tau \hat{\varphi} \hat{\theta} \theta \omega \rho \iota \kappa \varphi ̂$ ．The double sense of $\lambda_{0}$ нto $a l$ is confirmed by Pollux


 סしoко0َ̈ı（Lipsius，Leipzig Verhandl．pp． 66,67 ）．入oyıaral $\delta 00$ is the reading in Bekker＇s best MS；the rest have déo $\delta^{\prime}$ ，
 54 §3）．


 pougl MSs）．The text shews that this pas－ sage was rightly understood by Schömann， as referring to the accounts which had to be presented to the $\lambda o y \iota \sigma \tau a l$ ，and not to the
 $\rho \epsilon \iota \nu$ nihil aliud esse potest quamquod alibi
 tam rationem ad eos，quibus ea examinanda est，deferre，quemadmodum ipsum Lysiam mox hoc verbo érypá $\psi a t$ utí videmus，et
 rous doy $\sigma \tau$ ús dicit，in Ctesiph．§22，eodem sensu quo paullo ante，§ zo，dóqoy é $\gamma \boldsymbol{\gamma p a}$－
 Acad．i 295）．
§ 4．єu่ $\theta$ úvovs］＇Examiners of accounts．＇ Harp．in Testim．At the audit of accounts by the board of $\lambda_{0} \boldsymbol{y} L \sigma \tau a l$ ，the $\epsilon \mathbb{D} \theta$ voo were entitled to bring charges against the $\dot{v} \pi \in \dot{v} \theta u v o s$ ．The assessors of the $\epsilon 0 \theta v y$ are mentioned in Andoc．De Myst．78，

 （ $\hat{\eta}$ MSS）$\tau \hat{\omega} \nu \pi a \rho t \delta \rho \omega \nu$ ，and in CIA $809 b$ ，
 lepàs $\tau \hat{y}$ ’A $\theta \eta \nu \hat{a}$ кal $\dot{o}$ e $\forall \theta v \nu o s$ кal ol

 （B．c．368），the $\epsilon \theta \theta v{ }^{3}$（of a deme）is mentioned together with his $\pi a \rho \in \delta \rho o l$ ； and $i b .578$ ，the $\varepsilon \forall \theta u v o s$（of another deme） with the $\lambda$ oqua

The text shews that，even after the audit had been passed，officials were liable to be prosecuted by private persons in respect to the manner in which they had discharged their duties．Cf．Lipsius in Leipzig Verhandl．pp．66， 67.
taîs dyopais］i．e．at the regular meetings held by the several tribes for the transaction of tribal business．CIA









 тоиิто кú］pเóv є่ єть．


 turn putat K．$\delta \delta \delta \omega \sigma \iota$ H－L． 23 a［vakpivas］Wayte，Lipsius：$a^{[ }\left[\nu \alpha \gamma \nu o v_{s}\right]$ Blass，






 agnoscit；катd $\sigma \tau a \sigma \iota \nu$ Wyse（ $\mathrm{H} \cdot \mathrm{L}$ ）．
$554 b, \epsilon \nu \tau \hat{u}$ à $\gamma a \rho a ̣ ̂$（of the tribe Pandi－
 i 192）．

 document，Dem．p．IOI4，25，${ }_{\epsilon} \mu \beta \in \beta \lambda \eta$－

 ехйvov．

 Lex ap．Aeschin．I \＆ $16, \tau / \mu \eta \mu a \quad \epsilon \pi t-$ $\gamma \rho \alpha \psi d \mu \epsilon \nu 0 s$. Dem． 29 § 8，$\tau \hat{\nu} \nu \dot{\epsilon} \pi \tau \gamma \epsilon-$ үрацд $\dot{\nu} \omega \nu$（＇the damages claimed＇）$\epsilon \tau i-$ н поа⿱亠䒑．
§5．ávakplvas－катаүvఱ̂］The exami－ nation of the accounts by the doztoral
 Ar．ap．Lex．Rhet．Cant．s．v．入oyıg $a l$ ，
 $\lambda_{0} \gamma(\sigma \tau a i s)$ ．For the general use of dya－ крlyw，as applied to the official conducting

 $\beta \eta \tau o v \sigma \iota \nu$ ，and Isaeus，Dicaeog．32，d̀a－
 ${ }_{5} 6$ § 6 （ $\gamma \rho a \phi a l$ and diкat）às dyakpivas cls rd diкa $\sigma \tau \eta \rho \iota o y$ elod $\gamma \epsilon \epsilon$ ．The statement that the d $\nu \dot{d} \kappa \rho / \sigma$ ts was also called an a ${ }^{2}$ di $\nu \omega \sigma \iota s$ rests on a wrong reading in Dem． $53 \$ 22$ ．The object of an d̀dáкpıots was to determine by a preliminary exami－

 § $3 ; 53$ ．


 Sovtas，Lys．Pancl．ц，rous $\tau \hat{\eta}$＇ $\mathrm{I} \pi \pi \mathrm{o}-$

 סoúhous 入avxayoytal סikat（Meier and Schömann，p． 90 n．Lips．）．

їтเүрá申кเ］Aeschin．I § 35，$\mu \epsilon \chi \rho_{t} \pi \epsilon \nu-$
 $\epsilon \pi \iota \gamma \rho \dot{\alpha} \phi \epsilon \iota \nu$ тоїs $\pi \rho \alpha к к т о \rho \sigma \iota \nu$.

One of the other suggestions，$\hat{\epsilon} \gamma \gamma \rho \dot{\alpha} \phi \in \epsilon$ ， is supported by Aeschin． $3 \S 20$ ，入órov
 Dem． 24 § 199，Arist．Vesp． 996 （Lipsins）．

The construction is slightly irregular， as a principal verb is not wanted，$\pi a \rho a-$ $\delta i \delta \omega \sigma \iota$ being the verb to both clauses－ $\mu \dot{\epsilon} \nu$ and $\delta \epsilon$ ．The irregularity is removed by striking out $\mu \hat{\epsilon}$ ，but this involves a needless hiatus and is not absolutely necessary．
ö tı du－кúpเóv évтt］Cf．c．45，l． 10.
 Xen．Oec．ix 15 ，خे ßou入ोे iñous kail

 Іттико0，and iii 9－14．A patera from Orvieto，now in the Berlin Museum，






##  $\lambda_{\Gamma}(\mathrm{vel} \lambda \lambda)$ <br> 

 certe usurpatur in Arist. Av. 383, 400, $\mathbf{1} 720$ et Xen. Cyr. vii 1, 45 àvayayìv é $\sigma \tau \rho a-$

 post $\gamma^{\nu} \dot{d} \theta a v \mathrm{H}-\mathrm{L}\left(\mathrm{K}^{3}\right)$, sed (ut videtur) novem tantum litteris locus relictus; praestat


 spatium superest. $\quad 6$ тinam[po]X (ut infra, v. 7): $\tau u v^{\prime} \dot{a} \pi o \chi$. J B Mayor, Campbell, Wyse, Blass, etc. $\mathrm{K}-\mathrm{w}, \mathrm{H}-\mathrm{L}, \mathrm{K}^{3}$.

Testimonia. XIIX 4 Hesych. $\tau \rho u \sigma l \pi \pi \iota a y$ et $l \pi \pi \pi o u \tau \rho o \chi d r$, infra exscriptus. Phot.


represents three horsemen in chlamys and petasus leading their horses by the bridle past two standing figures who examine them as they pass. A third figure is seated and is entering memoranda on a scroll resting on his knees. In the centre is a $i \pi \pi \pi \tau 0 \xi 67 \eta s$ standing beside his horse. The subject is doubtless a $\ell \pi \pi \omega \nu$ doktMacla (Archaeol. Zeitung, 37, 1880, pl. 15; Duruy, Hist. d. Grecs, ii p. 177; Daremberg and Saglio, s.v. Dokimasia, p. 327; Schreiber's Bilderatlas, i 40, 7). On the סoкıдacia of the limтeis and their horses, see Martin, Les Cavaliers Athéniens, pp. 328-334;
 Xen. Mem. iii 3, 4, tà $\nu=$ oiv ... $\pi a p \notin \chi \omega \nu \tau a l$

 áo





 $\tau \hat{\omega} \nu \ell \pi \pi \omega \nu$. duáy $\omega$ yos is also an epithet of 'unmanageable' dogs in Mem. iv 1, 3 .
$\tau \rho o x d \nu=k \pi\left\llcorner\beta_{0} \lambda_{1} \lambda_{6]}\right.$ Hesych. $\therefore v$.


 $\mu \epsilon \nu a \nu$ addidit Petitus>, liva $\mu \eta \kappa$ éтı $\sigma \tau \rho a-$




入eíto $\delta e ̀$ kal tpualmaıov. Aelius Dionys. apud Eustath. ad Od. iv 562, p. 1517 , 8,







 $\beta a \lambda \lambda o \nu \quad \tau a i \mathrm{~s}$ бıarbot $\tau \hat{\omega} \nu$ l $\pi \pi \omega \nu$. Eupolis

 трибititiov and limiov tooxds, and Pollux vii 186. As suggested by Kaibel and Wilamowitz, most of the above explanations probably rest ultimately on a scholium on the Taxiarchi of Eupolis founded on the present passage.
 Tbe term is applied by Hdt. to 'horsemen in advance of an army.' Xen. Hipparch. i 25, uses it of 'javelin-men' under the command of a cavalry officer :
 öт
 march of Alexander to the Granicus, the Paeonians formed a special corps of $\pi p b-$ סpouac for purposes of reconnoitring (Arr. An. i 12, 7; Droysen, Kricgsalterthümer, p. 117, 3).

тробрацєи̇єเv] not found elsewhere.
ката $\left.\beta \in \beta \eta_{\kappa \in v}\right]$ 'dismounts' (as dis-











 （ut supra，v．6）．$\quad 12$ TIINaKaNOIZaNTEC：mlvak＇dy．K－W，B；тlvaкa à $\nu$. K，H－L．


qualified）；used differently in［Dem．］ 42 § 24 of giving up riding，катаßє $\beta \eta \kappa \epsilon \nu$ dто̀ $\tau \hat{\omega} \nu \ell \pi \pi \omega \nu$ ．
d $\mu$（Trrovs］＇infantry fighting in the ranks of the cavalry．＇Thuc．$v 57,2$ ， （of the Boeotians at Delium）ò $\pi \lambda \hat{i} \tau a$, ， $\psi i \lambda o l, l \pi \pi \eta \hat{\eta}_{s}$ and $\dot{\alpha} \mu \mu \pi \pi o l$ ．Xen．Hell． vii 5,24 （Epameinondas）$\dot{d} \mu l \pi \pi o u s ~ \pi \epsilon \zeta$ ovs
 site side was $\epsilon \rho \eta \mu \circ \nu \pi \epsilon \zeta \hat{\omega} \nu \quad \alpha \mu l \pi \pi \omega \nu$（23）； the MSS have in both cases dul $\pi \pi$ ．， corrected by Morus．Xenophon recom－ mends their use：Hipparch．v 13 ，$\dot{\alpha} \sigma \theta \epsilon \nu$ es
 $\pi \epsilon$ §ous $\epsilon^{\chi}$ Хov．Harpocr．s．v．．．．oi $\sigma$ iv itraols отратєиб $\mu \epsilon \nu о \iota . . \mu \dot{\eta} \pi т о \tau \epsilon$（perhaps）$\pi \rho б \delta \rho о-$

 $\pi \rho о \delta \rho$ огоия．Ar．，in Pol． 1321 17， speaks of generals of avvסuajovat mpds

 Cavaliers Athéniens，p． 410.
§ 2．oi kara入oyeis］These officials（who bear the same name as the кara入oyeîs under the Four Hundred，Lys． 30 § in，but are not mentioned elsewhere）are described as employed in drawing up the roll of the cavalry；they hand it over to the Hip－ parchi and Phylarchi，to be brought by them before the Council．The fact that the $\beta 0 u \lambda \dot{\eta}$ conducted the $\delta$ oкс $\mu a \sigma i a$ of the imreis was already known（Xen．Oec．ix 15）．In Lys＇． 14 § 10，＇A入кı $\beta \iota a ́ \delta \eta s$ є̇т $6 \lambda$－
 $\theta c i s$ ，the pronoun loosely identifies the סokaotal with the pouneutai．The text
shews that no proceedings before a law－ conrt were involved in a $\delta 0 \kappa \iota \mu a \sigma l a l \pi \pi \epsilon \in \omega \nu$ ．

The term катá入oyos is applied to the official list of the $l \pi \pi \epsilon \hat{\imath}$ s in Lys． $16 \$ 13$
 $\beta o u ́ \lambda \psi$（doubtless his Phylarchus）$\epsilon \xi a \lambda \epsilon i \neq a l$ $\mu \epsilon$ є́к то̂́ ката入órov，ib．§ 6，тоѝs $\phi \cup \lambda a \rho$ ．
 Hipparchi，as well as the Phylarchi，were responsible for the $\kappa a \tau \alpha \lambda o \gamma o s$, as had al－ ready been pointed out by Bake，Scholica Hypommemata，v 150, у70：the text shews that it was drawn up in the first instance by the кaranoүeis．

Tòv rivak＇］The кardinoyos of the imeteis under the Thirty is described as drawn up on a $\sigma a v i \delta o \nu$（Lys． 16 § 6）or



 （in the scheme proposed for the appoint－

 $\pi \hat{a} \sigma l$ тоis $\pi 0 \lambda i \tau a l s$.



 Schol，on Arist．Eccl． 1026.
 above，and 16 \＆ 6 （as emended by Mark－
 $\kappa \alpha \tau \alpha \lambda \delta \gamma \Psi \dot{\epsilon} \gamma \gamma \in \gamma \rho a \psi \in \tau a \iota$.
 （the lists of $l \pi \pi \in \hat{\imath} s$ under the Thirty）






 $\tau \iota \kappa \omega ิ \nu$.

#  




§ 3. тарабєly $\quad$ ara] Of the architect's plan for the temple at Delphi, Hdt. v 62. The construction of such a $\pi a \rho \dot{\alpha} \delta \epsilon c \gamma \mu a$ is illustrated by an inscr. cited by Homolle, Les Archives de l'Intendance Sacrée à Dé-



 The wood used for the $\pi$ tha $\xi$ is also men-
 rô̂ mapadelyuatos (Wyse, Class. Rev. v 275 b). Cf. CIA ii $807 b$ 10r (b.c. 330),


 recurs in B.C. $325, i b .809$ col. $e 8$, and in в.C. 324, ib. 8if col. $b$ 193.

тòv $\pi \dot{\epsilon} \pi \lambda o v]$ woven by é $\rho \gamma a \sigma \tau \hat{\nu} a \iota$, under the superintendence of two $\alpha_{\rho \rho} \rho \eta$ $\phi \dot{\rho}$ oc and certain priestesses. In CIA ii 477 we have an inscr., ascribed to b.c. 98, referring to a proposal to dedicate to Athene a silver $\phi t d \lambda_{\eta}$ with $100 d r$. on the


 $\nu 0 u \sigma a t($ Hesych.). In cIA ii 956, 957,957 $b$, we have lists of $\epsilon \rho \gamma a \sigma \tau i v a c$ (one of them containing more than 100 names) arranged under their respective tribes, many of them belonging to the Eujaarploat (Bull. Corr. Hellén. xiii r70; Mittheil. viii 65). A new peplus was made every year (Schol. Arist. Eq. 566). The loci classici are collected in Michaelis, Parthenon, Anhang II \$8 151 $-164,17 \mathrm{r}-3$, p. 328-9. Suidas, s. v. $\dot{\epsilon} \pi \iota \dot{\omega} \psi$ aro, descrihes the ápp $\phi \delta \rho o \mathrm{c}$ as selected by the archon $\beta$ aathés, while Harросг., s. v. а д $\rho \eta \phi о \rho \epsilon i v$, states that four
 two of these explvoyтo to superintend the $\pi \in \pi \lambda o s$. The text shews that the appointment was ultimately transferred to a law-
court to secure an impartial selection.
 this transfer to a law-court of duties formerly entrusted to the Council is uncertain. The тapá $\delta \epsilon с \gamma \mu a$ of the $\sigma \kappa \epsilon v o \theta \eta \dot{\gamma} \eta$ designed by Philo was expounded in public by the architect himself:-Cic. de Or. i 62, 'Philonem illum architectum, qui Atheniensibus armamentarium fecit, constat perdiserte populo rationem operis sui reddidisse'; Val. Max. viii 12, 2, 'Philonem...rationem institutionis suae in theatro reddidisse constat.' It was constructed between B.C. $34 \% / 6$ and $330 / 29$.

The fact that the exposition took place before the 'people,' 'in the theatre,' is suggestive of a meeting of the éкк $\lambda \eta \sigma l a$ rather than one of the $\beta o u \lambda \dot{\eta}$. It is certainly inconsistent with an appearance before a $\delta \iota \kappa a \sigma \tau \dot{\eta} p t o \nu$. There is more evidence for the theatre being used for meetings of the éккл $\boldsymbol{\sigma}$ ) (Müller's Bühnenalterthuimer, $\mathrm{p} \cdot 73$ ) than for those of the $\beta$ oun $\eta$. The only evidence for the latter is CIA ii $4^{82}$, B.C. 39-32.

Thus, the above passages respecting Philo suggest that the duty of deciding on mapadelyuata was in his time not yet transferred to a law-court; on the other hand, they do not refer to any hearing before the Council.

N $\kappa \kappa \bar{v} v] 47 \S$ I.
т $\omega$ у $\left.{ }^{2} \theta \lambda \omega \psi\right]$ The musical, gymnastic, and equestrian contests. Among the minor contests were those in eduadjia ( 60 § 3), the Pyrrhic dance and the Lampadedromia (see Michaelis, Parthenon, Anh. II $\S \$_{46-130 \text {, and Smith, Dict. Ant. s. v. }}$ Panathenaea). The special officials were the ten Athlothetae ( $60 \$ \mathrm{I}$ ), who received subsidies from the tajulat $i \in \rho \hat{\omega} \nu \chi p \eta \mu d \tau \omega \nu$


тацlov т $\hat{\nu} \nu \sigma \tau \rho a \tau \omega \tau \iota \kappa \hat{\omega} v] 43 \S$ г.
§ 4. Tov̀s d́dvvárovs] Schol. Aeschin.


 $\dot{\eta} \mu$ épas．
 єimeîv．


 delet Herwerden utpote＇ex capitis 47 initio maximam partem repetita，hic autem incommoda＇：eadem recte idcirco retinet k ，quod talia Senatus officia nondum omnia sint cormmemorata．











 $\tau \hat{\omega} v$ ．At first it was only citizens who were disabled in war that received relief from the state．This institution is ascribed to Peisistratus in Plut．Sol．31，$\delta \boldsymbol{j} \mathbf{\nu} \mu \mathrm{os} \boldsymbol{\delta}$
 $\phi \epsilon \bar{\nu} \kappa \in \lambda \epsilon \dot{u} \omega \nu$ ．This limitation was after－ wards removed．It is clear that the
 had never seen any service in the field； otherwise he would have mentioned the fact（Gilbert，i 329）．The speech is ad－ dressed to the $\beta$ ounn on the occasion of an $\epsilon$ loaryenia．The $\beta$ oun $\dot{\eta}$ are there de－ scribed as having given the grant（\＄7， ＊$\delta 0 \tau \epsilon$ ，and in more general terms $\$ \mathbf{2 2}$ ，
 had to be confirmed by each successive Bou入h，as implied in § $26, \tau \dot{\eta} \nu \quad a \dot{u} \tau \dot{\eta} \nu$
 It rested ultimately on a decree of the
 To deyúpov，but it does not follow that the case of each recipient was settled by decree．
 Lys． $24 \S 6, \tau \epsilon \chi \nu \eta \nu \kappa \in \kappa т \eta \mu a \iota \beta \rho a \chi \in a$ סvva－



סoxıpógevv］The fact is stated by

Harpocr．，Bekker＇s Anecd．Gr．345，18， and Suidas．

סv́o óßoえov̀s］Hence in Harpocr．s．v． áóvaroc the words $\dot{\eta} \dot{\partial} \beta 0 \lambda \partial \nu$ must be struck out（as was suggested by Hulle－ man，Quaestiones Graecae，p．5）．The text is correctly quoted in Bekker＇s Anecd．Gr．345， 15.
taplas］In b．C．343／2，CIA ii II4， there were two $\beta$ ou入角s $\tau \alpha \mu l a \iota$ ．They su－ perintended $\tau$ à кагд $\psi \eta \phi l \sigma \mu a \tau a \dot{a} \nu a \lambda \iota \sigma \kappa \delta-$ $\mu \in \nu a \quad$ th $\beta$ ou $\lambda \hat{y}$（ 114 B 6r）．Early in the third century we have an inscr．mention－




 ßou入̂̀ j $\rho \theta \hat{\omega} \mathrm{s}$ каі $\mathbf{\delta e к a i \omega s ~ ( G i l b e r t , ~ i ~ 2 5 4 ) ; ~}$ cf．ii 43 r， $3^{6}$ ．
§ 5．$\sigma$ ．




## L－LIII．On minor afficials appointed by lot．

 pairers of temples＇；not mentioned else－ where．The small sum allowed for this department（ 30 minae）implies that their duties were unimportant．The word is used in an unofficial sense in Dem．Androt． 69.










##  alc

 in titulis Atticis סvề cum plurali tantum innctum sit, Meisterhans, p. г62²; סveì CTA
 J E B Mayor (K-w, H-L, $\mathrm{K}^{3}, \mathrm{~B}$ ), $\bar{\ell} \nu \tau \partial \mathrm{s} \bar{\imath} \sigma \tau a \delta i \omega \nu<\dot{\alpha} \pi \dot{\delta}>$ malebat van Leeuwen. 10 каtabadhi? ante corr. emime入ontal.






§ 2. áのтvvópor] Pol. 1321 18,


 $\tau \eta \rho i a \operatorname{kal} \delta \iota \delta \rho \theta \omega \sigma \iota s \kappa a l \tau \hat{\omega} \nu \partial \rho l \omega \nu \nu \omega \bar{\nu} \pi \rho \partial s$ $\dot{\alpha} \lambda \lambda \eta \dot{\eta} \lambda o u s . . . ~ к a \lambda o \hat{v} \sigma \iota \delta^{\prime} \dot{a} \sigma \tau v v o \mu l a \nu$ ol $\pi \lambda \epsilon \hat{c}-$
 $\kappa \alpha \lambda о \nu \mu \epsilon \nu \eta \nu$ d $\sigma \tau v \nu o \mu l a \nu$. The fact that the davuvbuot were appointed by lot is stated in Dem. 24 § 112 . Cf. Gilbert, i 245, and Häderli, die Astynomen und Agoranomen (Teubner) 1886.
aủ $\lambda_{\eta \tau} \rho\left(\delta a_{s}\right]$ Hỳperides, ii 4,3 , $\pi \lambda \in l o v o s$
 Cf. Plato, Protag. 347 D (of the $\sigma \nu \mu \pi \sigma \sigma \iota a$





 The aid $\lambda \eta \tau \rho l s$ (as well as the $\kappa \iota \theta d \rho a$ ) is to be seen at the symposium, in Schreiber's Bilderatlas, i 76, 2 and 4 ; and the kc Oaptofpia and the $\psi a \lambda \tau p l a$ in the mural paintings from the Farnesina garden in Baumeister's Denkmäler, figs. 1605, 1609. котродо́үшv ктл.] Arist. Frag. 662 Kock, кот $\rho \circ \lambda о$ уeí кóqıрод $\lambda a \beta \dot{\omega} \nu$. Schol. Dem. Timocr. 735, 16, d, $\sigma \tau v \nu o ́ \mu o s ~ \dot{~ o ̀ ~} \tau \hat{\omega}$
 єlval $\tau \dot{\eta} \nu \pi \delta \lambda \iota \nu$. Cf. Wachsmuth, Stadt Athen, ii 282.
rds ódovis] A decree relating to the Peiraeus which was proposed by Demades in B.C. 320 (Ditt. no. 337) assigns to the $\dot{\alpha}$ уораро́до some of the duties of the






 $\mu \eta \delta a \mu \mathrm{v} \hat{v}_{\mathrm{o}}$ Cf. Meier and Schömann, p. 105-8 Lipsius.

катоккобонкiv] [Xen.] de Rep. Ath. ііі
 $\tau \iota \delta \eta \mu \dot{\sigma}_{\sigma} \sigma \nu$. The general superintendence of buildings has been ascribed to the da $\sigma \tau v-$ עo $\mu \mathrm{o}$ on the analogy of the provisions






8рифа́ктovs] Balconies projecting from the fronts of houses. (Lat. maeniana, like that of the casa del balcone pensile at Pompeii; forbidden at Rome in A.D. 368





 $\lambda \eta$ ทิтau.

 $\dot{\alpha} \sigma \tau v "$ (Frag. $\left.409^{2}, 449^{3}\right)$.
and again by Honorius and Theodosius.) Schol. Arist. Vesp. 386 סри́факто' $\tau$ d $\nu \hat{\nu} \tau \alpha \beta \lambda \omega \tau \dot{\alpha}$ ( $\tau \alpha \beta \lambda \omega \mu a \tau \alpha$ Schol. Eq. 675)
 $\xi 勹 \lambda a$, cf. 349 and 830 with Schol.
 99; cf. Wachsmuth, Stadt Athen, p. 284-5.
 usually a 'window,' as in de Animas 404 $a_{4}$ and Probl. 913 a 10, al $\delta \iota \dot{\alpha} \tau \hat{\nu} \nu$ vupl$\delta \omega \nu \dot{a} x \tau \hat{\nu} \epsilon \mathrm{~s}$, also in Arist. Vesp. 379, and Thesm. 797, е่к $\theta u \rho i \delta o s ~ т а р а к и ́ \pi т \omega \mu є \nu, ~$ Plut. Dion 57, тpds $\tau a \hat{s}$ Oúpass тô̂ oûkou кal taiss $\theta$ vplocv, and Mor. 522 (de Curiositate 13). The same meaning can be re-
 кой $\frac{1}{}$ lסeiv èvovтa עeкрóv, cf. Lucian, Hermotintus, 20, тд̀ $\dot{\alpha} \rho \chi \iota \tau \epsilon \in \kappa \tau о \nu a \dot{\epsilon} \pi \epsilon \pi \lambda \eta \xi \epsilon \tau \delta \nu$

 $\kappa \tau \lambda_{\text {. }}$, and Plut. Mor. 2, 273 B, $\delta \iota \dot{a} \tau \ell \pi u ́-$

 $\psi a \sigma a$. I can find no passage in which $\theta u p l s$ means thesame as $\theta u p a$. In $L$ and $S \theta u p i s$ is defined as a diminutive of $\theta u ́ p a$; but, of the two passages quoted, the first (Plato, l.c.) is inconclusive, and in the second (Plutarch l. c.) it certainly means a 'window.' In a Greek house the principal windows were in the peristyle, and any that looked into the street were on the upper storey. We must suppose that windows with shutters opening outwards on to the street were prohibited. Possibly such shutters were considered dangerous in the event of their being loosened by the wind and falling into the street.

The author of the Oeconomica, 2, 1347 a 6, says of Hippias, $\tau \dot{\alpha} \dot{v} \pi \epsilon \rho \in \chi o y \tau \alpha, \tau \hat{\omega}$


 (taxed, cf. Wachsmuth, Stadt Athen, ii 286); and Plutarch, Poplic. 20, infers from
the comic poets that in former days the doors of Greek houses usually opened outwards. Mr Kenyon, who regards $\theta u p l s$ as synonymous with $\theta u p a$, supposes that the $d \sigma \tau u v b \mu o t$ prohibited this. If so, it must have been in defiance of the $d \sigma \tau v$ vómoc that the doors of Athenian houses, in the time of the Attic comedy, 'habitually opened outwards.' The fact is far from certain, but it does not concern us here, unless $\theta$ upis is to mean the same as $\theta$ úpa, an opinion which, in the light of the general usage of Greek authors, we can hardly accept. - $\theta u p l \delta a s$ and $\theta u ́ p a s$ are, however, sometimes confounded in mss (see apparatus criticus to Aesch. I §74,
 $\theta u p l \delta a s)$.
ávaıpov̂ซıv] ' take up for burial,' Arist. Vesp. 386, Xen. Anab. vi $4,9$.

LI § ı. dүopavó


 $\tau \grave{\nu} \nu$ єúкoбulav, and $1299{ }^{6}$ 17. Lys. 22 $\kappa a \tau \grave{\alpha} \tau \hat{\omega} \nu \quad \sigma \iota \tau 0 \pi \omega \lambda \hat{\omega} \nu, \S 16, \epsilon \in \pi l \mu \grave{\epsilon} \nu \tau 0 i ̂ s$
 $\sigma \tau \dot{\eta} \sigma a \tau \epsilon$. In Dem. 24 Timocr. § 112 the dropayo $\mu o s$, as well as the $\alpha \sigma \tau v \nu \delta \mu o s$, is described as holding a $\kappa \lambda \eta \rho \omega \tau \dot{\eta} \nu \quad$ a $\rho \chi \dot{\eta} \nu$. Arist. Vesp. 1407, Ach. 724, 968 and Schol. on 896 ; Xen. Symp. ii. 20. Cf. Meier and Schömann p. 101-4 Lipsius; Schömann, Ant. p. 416 ; Büchsenschütz, Besitz u. Erwerb, p. 536; Gilbert, i 246 ; Häderli, die Astynomen und Agoranomen.
 end of the next sentence the papyrus has $\epsilon \pi \tau \iota \epsilon \lambda \epsilon \hat{\imath} \sigma \theta a \iota$ followed by ö $\pi \omega s \chi \rho \eta \dot{\sigma} \sigma \omega \nu \tau \alpha$. In the inscriptions of the fourth century against 37 exx. of $\delta \pi \omega s \dot{\alpha} \nu$ c. subj. we have only one of $\delta \pi \omega s$, CIA ii II5, 45 (Ditt. no. 106), ̇̇ $\pi \iota \mu \epsilon \lambda \epsilon i \sigma \theta a \iota . . . \delta \pi \omega s . .$.
 occurs twice (Meisterhans, p. $212^{2}$ ). Cf. 29 §3. In this respect the usage of in-
$\kappa \lambda \eta \rho o v ̂ \nu \tau a \iota ~ \delta e ̀ ~ \kappa a i ̀ ~ \mu \epsilon \tau \rho о \nu o ́ \mu o \iota, ~ \pi \epsilon ́ \nu \tau \epsilon ~ \mu e ̀ \nu ~ \epsilon i \varsigma ~ d ̀ \sigma \tau v, ~ \pi e ́ \nu \tau \epsilon ~ \delta e ̀ ~ 2 ~$





 $8 \delta \dot{\kappa} \kappa a l<\delta \hat{\epsilon} \kappa a>B ;$; $\lambda \eta \rho \omega \tau 0 l<\iota^{\prime}>$ ex Harp. addiderunt K-w. Quidni etiam in vv. I, 5 ?



 $\epsilon i s a ̆ \sigma \pi v$ : epitomes ope correxit Dind. collato Voemelio in Bergkii Ephem. antiq.











 (Frag. $4^{1 I^{2}, 455^{3} \text { ). }}$
scriptions differs from that of ordinary literature. In the latter $\partial \pi \omega \varsigma \not \partial \nu \nu$ is less common; $\partial \pi \omega s$ with the future indicative is frequent in both. See Goodwin's Moods and Tenses, $\$$ 339, 348, ed. 2; Madvig, Gk. Syntax, \$\$122-123.
§ 2. $\mu \epsilon \tau р о$ ® $^{\prime} \mu$ о $]$ The numbers given in the text, five for the city and five for the Peiraeus, confirm the account in Photins, s.v. art. 1, and Bekker's Anecd. 278,25 (accepted by Voemel, and Gilbert, ${ }_{i}$ 247). The mss of Harpocr. have:
 $i^{\prime}, \epsilon^{\prime} \delta^{\prime}$ ets áa $\sigma \tau v$. Boeckh accepts 15 as the total, but assigns five to the Peiraeus and ten to the city. Dindorf corrects Harpocr.
 $\Pi_{e \imath \rho a i \hat{a}, ~} \epsilon^{\prime} \delta^{\prime}$ els ä́a $\sigma v$, and this is confirmed by the text.
$\boldsymbol{\tau} \hat{\omega} \nu \mu \dot{\varepsilon} \tau \rho \omega \nu$ кal $\left.\tau \hat{\omega} \nu \sigma \tau \alpha \theta_{\mu} \omega \bar{\nu}\right]$ These are the subject of a long inscr. in CIA ii 476 , early in first century b.c., discussed in Boeckh, Staatsh. ii 318-332 Fränkel. The af $\rho \chi$ outes mentioned in the inscr. are doubtless the $\mu$ ет $\rho$ оу $д \mu о$.

 Codices Graecos paulo diligentius inspexit saepissime vidit librarios ö $\boldsymbol{\pi} \boldsymbol{\omega}$ s et
ö $\pi \omega s{ }^{\mu} \boldsymbol{\eta}$ cum coniunctivi aoristis [primis] coniungere, nbi veteres indicativi futurum posuissent' (Cobet, Nov. Lect. 266). Cf. 1. 3 .
§ 3. नוтофर́入aкєs] Harpocr. s. v. ī $\sigma a \nu$

 as altered by Valesius, seemed to be con-

 $\epsilon^{\prime} \delta^{\prime} \hat{\epsilon}^{\prime} \nu$ Mecpauti, and were accepted by Boeckh. But the text, which is Harpocration's authority for his statements, shews that $i^{\prime} \epsilon^{\prime}$ must be separated in Photius, as well as in Harpocration, so that we get oо in all, 5 in the city and 5 in the Peiraeus. In Lys. 22 § 8 (of the $\sigma \tau \tau о \phi u \lambda a \kappa \epsilon s$ ), ol $\mu \grave{\nu} \nu \tau \in \sigma \sigma a p \epsilon s$ (Bergk, for $\delta \hat{0} 0$, a corruption of $\delta^{\prime}$ ) are contrasted with another member of the board, Anytus. Cf. Boeckh, i 105 Fränkel; Gilbert, i 247.
 алтокл $\eta$ рйтє.

 the total is correct, but the text shews that Photius ought to have said: $\kappa^{\prime} \mu \dot{\nu}$ $\dot{\epsilon} \nu a \partial \sigma \tau \epsilon, \iota^{\prime} \epsilon^{\prime} \delta^{\prime} \dot{\epsilon} \eta \Pi$.
 $\tau a ̀ s ~ \tau \iota \mu a ̀ s ~ \tau \hat{\omega} \nu \kappa \rho \iota \theta \hat{\omega} \nu \tau a ̀ ~ a ̈ \lambda \phi \iota \tau a ~ \pi \omega \lambda \eta \prime \sigma о v \sigma \iota \nu ~ к a i ̀ ~ o i ~ a ̀ \rho \tau о \pi \omega ̂ \lambda a \iota ~$









#### Abstract

 ḋ $\sigma \tau<k b y$ quondam proposui coll. Bekk. $A n .255,208,284,456$; accepit B: nunc unice verum arbitror 'A ${ }^{\prime} \tau \tau \kappa \delta \delta$, etenim $\sigma \iota \tau \iota \kappa \grave{y} y$ et $\alpha \sigma \tau \iota \kappa \delta \nu$ oculi errore e proximis verbis $\sigma$ liou et $\check{\alpha} \sigma \tau v$ videntur irrepsisse. 


















бîros ápyòs] ' unprepared corn,' Hippocr. Vet. Med. 12, mupoi deyol.' The position of a $\alpha \rho \gamma \delta$ (after, instead of before, $\sigma i(\tau o s)$ is defended by Eth. Nic. vi $4,2, \dot{\eta}$

 Dr Jackson to prove that part of a complex epithet may be placed after the article and substantive. Mr Newman adds Pol. $125^{2} b 27, \dot{\eta} \dot{\epsilon} \kappa \pi \lambda \epsilon \epsilon \delta \nu \omega \nu \kappa \omega \mu \hat{\omega} \nu$

 is known of these officials apart from the statement in the text, is that they were the proper authority to receive legal notice ( $\phi$ ácss) of any infringement of the law forbidding citizens and resident aliens lending money on the security of a cargo bound for any other port than that of Athens. Dem. $35 \S \S 50,51$, $\dot{\epsilon} \dot{d} \nu \tau(s, .$.
 'A $\theta$ qual ${ }^{2}$; 58 §§ 8, 9 (Gilbert, i 248). Cf. Meier and Schöm., p. 98 Lips. The $\epsilon \mu \pi \delta \rho 10 \nu$ extended over the greater part of the east shore of the harbour of the

Peiraeus; Wachsmuth, Stadt Athen, ii 96-esp. 114 .
éprópiov] After $\tau 0 \hat{0}$ olvou the epithel $\sigma \tau \tau \kappa \dot{o} y$ (which is first found in Polybius) is redundant. The variant ' $A \tau \tau \iota \kappa \delta \nu$ in Harpocration's quotation of this passage is supported by Dem. $34 \S 36$, 'A $\theta$ $\eta \dot{\eta} \nu a \zeta \epsilon$ $\epsilon l s \tau_{\delta}^{\prime}$ ' $А \tau \tau \iota \kappa \partial \nu \quad \epsilon \mu \pi 6 \rho t 0 \nu \quad \sigma \iota \tau \eta \gamma \epsilon \hat{\nu}$, and

 $\dot{\epsilon} \mu \pi o \rho l o u$ (quoted by Mr Torr). $\dot{\alpha} \sigma \pi \kappa<\dot{\nu} \nu$ is suggested by Bekk. Anecd. 208, d $\sigma \tau \iota к \grave{\nu}$

 284,456 . One of the parts of the $\bar{\epsilon} \mu \pi \sigma^{6} \rho \circ \frac{1}{}$ in the Peiraeus was the $\sigma \tau 0 \mathrm{~d} d \lambda \phi \iota \tau \delta \pi \omega \lambda \iota s$, also called the $\mu a \kappa \rho d$ $\sigma \tau o \alpha$ (Dem. 34 § 37 , cf. Thuc. viii 90,5 , Wachsmuth, $u$. s. p. 101); but I can find no authority for applying the epithet $\sigma \iota \tau \kappa \kappa \bar{\partial} \nu$ to the $\epsilon \mu$ $\pi \delta p t o v$, or to any part of it, at or before the date when the text was written.

LII § i. тov̀s \&vठeka] c. 7 § 3 . Schömann, p. 414; Gilbert, i 243; Dict. Ant. i 942 .





 $\pi \omega \lambda \eta \tau a i ̂ s, \kappa a i ̀ ~ \tau a ̀ s ~ \epsilon ̇ \nu \delta \epsilon i \xi \epsilon \iota \varsigma ~ \epsilon i \sigma a ́ \xi o \nu \tau a s \cdot ~ \kappa a i ̀ ~ \gamma a ̀ \rho ~ \tau a u ́ \tau a s ~ \epsilon i \sigma a ́ \gamma o v-~$
 $\theta$ ćtal.


2 <какоúpүous, $\tau$ oús $\tau \epsilon>\kappa \lambda \epsilon \epsilon \pi \tau a s$, k-w, coll. Etym. Mag. 3 tois bis delent H-L. $\quad 3,4$ द̇d $\nu$ bis H-L. $\quad 4$ zHMI $\omega$ ehcontacen $\Delta$ corr K.










 өapátч Éкbia दौv $\delta \in \ell \xi \in \epsilon$. Schol. Patm. Dem. P. 11, 16, Sakkelion; Schol. Lucian. iv 170 Jacobitz.

 rds...入штrofívas] Isocr. Antid. § 90 ,
 $\tau \eta \nu$ кal $\lambda \omega \pi$ од́́vт $\eta \nu$. Meier and Schöm. p. $273-6$, Lips. Pollux $\dot{\alpha} \nu \delta \rho a \pi o \delta \iota \sigma \tau \eta^{\circ}{ }^{-}$


$\kappa \lambda \epsilon \pi \tau \alpha \iota, \dot{\alpha} \nu \delta \rho a \pi о \delta \iota \sigma \tau \alpha l$ and $\lambda \omega \pi о \delta \dot{\tau} \tau \alpha$, came under the general heading of какоирүои; cf. [Dem.] 35 Lacr. 47, Tot-


 Cf. Meier and Schöm. p. 86 Lips.


 tovs $\delta^{\prime}$ d $\alpha \nu \nu \mu \notin \nu o u s$ к $\rho / \nu \in \sigma \theta a i$, and Dem.





 єls $\delta$ oraortخpıov єlo $\hat{\eta} \gamma \boldsymbol{}$. These passages (quoted in Class. Rev. v 224) prove the incorrectness of the interpretation suggested in the Saturday Review, March 21,

1891, p. 359 'if (the Eleven) are unanimous...or if they disagree.' See also the passages quoted in the Testimonia.
Өaváтч] Dem. 4 § 47, то̀ $\boldsymbol{\nu}$ ад $\nu \rho а \pi о-$ $\delta \iota \sigma \tau \hat{\omega} \nu$ каl $\lambda \omega \pi \sigma \delta \nu \tau \hat{\omega} \nu$ өdvaтор...какоіррүои

тd dтоүрафо́нєга хшріа ктл.] Our knowledge of this part of the duties of the Eleven has hitherto been derived from the Etym. Magn. 338, 35, which is obviously quoted from the text: see Testinoonia. Meier and Schömann, p. 88 Lipsius.

$\left.\pi a^{\prime} \mathrm{s} v \delta \in[\xi \in \mathrm{~s}\}\right]$ Schol. Arist. Vesp. 1108,


 $\theta \in \sigma \mu 0 \epsilon \mathrm{\epsilon} \alpha \mathrm{~L}$. Etym. Mag. 338, 39, єlन $\hat{\eta} \gamma \mathrm{a}$
 p. 87 Lipsius). The text does not enable us to distinguish between the $\bar{\epsilon} \delta \epsilon \epsilon \xi \xi \in$ under the control of the Eleven, and those under that of the Thesmothetae. The general statement, kal $\gamma \dot{d} \rho$ raútas ci $\sigma$ ayovaty ol $\ell \nu \delta \epsilon \kappa a$, is modified in the following sentence.
§ 2. Eloay $\omega$ §as] These officials are













mentioned twice in Pollux viii 93, d $\rho \chi$ भ̂s


 existence was doubted by Meier. These doubts were dispelled in 1869 by the publication of an inscr. of B.C. $425 / 4$ relating to the superintendence of judicial proceedings connected with the assessment of the tribute; cIa i $37,47,6 \pi l$ $\tau \hat{\omega} \nu$ '̇бay $\omega \boldsymbol{\epsilon} \dot{\epsilon} \omega$ (Meier and Schömann, p. 94 Lips.; Gilbert, i 396). The text shews that their number was five; not ten, as had been conjectured.

Pollux is mistaken in placing $\epsilon \mu \pi$ орккal dikac under the control of the eifaruyeis. These were under the Thesmothetae as is proved by passages in the Orators, and by c. 59 § 5, quoted elsewhere by Pollux himself. In cIa i 38 , frag. $f$, certain $\epsilon \pi<\mu \in \lambda \eta \tau a l$ are appointed to attend to cases of delay in the payment of tribute,
 סcкaбтiploy, thus shewing that at that time (probably shortly after 432 B.C.) there were some $z^{\prime} \mu \mu \eta \nu 0$ oikat not under the care of the elfay $\omega$ yeis (Gilbert, i 358 ).
tads éphrivous- $\delta$ [kas] Lawsuits which had to be decided within a month (Meier and Schöm. p. 906 f.). They are first mentioned in B.C. $425 / 4$, CIA i 38 (quoted in last note). The text mentions several varieties of such lawsuits that are omitted by Pollux.

троцкós] ]actions for restitution of dowry. (I) If the husband divorced his wife, he was bound to return the dowry or to pay interest at the rate of 18 per cent. per annum (Dem. Aph. i 17 , Neaer. 52). The $\kappa$ uptos might enforce these claims by
 similar action might be brought against the heirs who kept a widow out of her
rights. The $\delta$ ikal $\pi$ pous $\delta$ s in the text are limited by the definition in the next

 expeditions process for recovery of debts is here limited to creditors who are satisfied with what in Athens was regarded as the moderate rate of 12 per cent. (Dem. Aphob. i 23, 35; Aesch. Ctes. 104; cf. Boeckh, i 156 Fränkel). Those who charge higher rates, such as 16, r8 or even 36 per cent., are excluded from this privilege. Lipsius in Leipzig. Verhandlungen, x89r, p. 57 n .
dфор $\boldsymbol{\eta} \boldsymbol{\eta} \nu]$ 'capital.' The speech of Dem. pro Phormione is a $\pi \alpha \rho a \gamma \rho a \phi \dot{\eta}$ to a $\delta i \kappa \eta$ d $\phi$ о $\mu \mu \eta \mathrm{g}$. The text refers to the case of a small tradesman setting up business in the market-place and refusing to repay the capital he had borrowed for the purpose.
aiktlas] Meier and Schöm. p. 647 f. Lips. About b.C. $346 / 5$, according to Dem. c. Pantaenetum 37 § 33, the tribunal in such cases was the Forty ; cf. Schol. Plat. Rep. 464 E. The text implies that the tribunal had been changed.
epavikal] lawsuits for the recovery of friendly loans, or for the decision of disputes between various members of an Epavos (Meier and Schöm. p. 637-643 Lips.).
kotvavıkal] suits against corporations (Meier and Schömann, p. 767 Lips.). In
 property held by corporations (ib. p. 602, Lips. note 321).
ávסpanóઠ̌ $\omega v$ ] Dem. Callicl. 55 §§ 31, 34 (Meier and Schömann, p. 766). By the law of Solon quoted in Lys. c. Theomnest. i 19, (the owner was liable) olk




 го ${ }^{\prime \prime} \mu \mu \eta \nu a$.



18 бѐка $<(=\delta \rho a \chi \mu \hat{\nu})$.
LIII 1 <тous> тєттapakovтa k-w. фүлнс
 2 ad入ac: lías Wyse.












 бıaıтทтаís тараסıбbaбıv" (cf. p. 310, 22 ; Frag. $413^{2}, 453^{3}$ ).

1. 16. $\boldsymbol{\cup} \pi 0 \xi v \gamma(\omega \nu]$ actions arising out of damage done by beasts of dranght or burden. Cf. Solon's law in Plut. Sol.
 l $\pi \pi$ os (Dinarch. c. Antiph. $\pi \epsilon \rho l$ l $\pi \pi \pi 0 \nu$ ) $\boldsymbol{\eta}$ кúvy (Lys. $\pi \epsilon \rho l$ toû кuvds ap. Harpocr.

 ті̀̀ $\beta \lambda a \beta \eta \nu$ ( $\tau \dot{\partial} \nu \delta \epsilon \sigma \pi o ́ \tau \eta \nu$ ). The special case of homicide caused by a vimosiorov
 (inf. c. 57 ad fin.).
трinpapxias] The speech delivered by Apollodorus against Polycles, [Dem.] Or. 52, belongs to this class. Polycles failed to join his ship for four months after the official year had expired, and his predecessor Apollodorus had incurred extra expenses for which he sues Polycles.
тратєц̆чгикаl] In the Trapesiticus of Isocr. the banker Pasion is accused of repudiation and forgery.- סiкaє $\mu \epsilon \tau a \lambda \lambda ı x a l$ and $\epsilon \mu \pi о \rho i k a l$ are not included in the list, probably because they came under the $\dot{\eta} \gamma \in \mu \mathrm{opla}$ of the Thesmothetae (Dem. c. Apol. § 12, and inf. 59 § 5).
 povia tô $\dot{\text { dexajotyplov in these law-sults,' }}$ Meier and Schöm. p. 43 Lips. Cf. c. 57 ad fin.
dimodekrai] c. $4^{8}$ § i.
тoîs tenúvaus] e.g. the farmers of the public taxes were allowed to bring a фáts against any one suspected of defrauding the revenue. They might even arrest him and bring him before a magistrate. Cf. Gilbert, i 335 .

LIII § 1. тєтгapúkovтa] a body of officials instituted by Peisistratus under
 $\S 5$ ), revived in b.c. $453 / 2(26 \$ 3$ ), and (as stated in the text) increased in number from 30 to 40 after the time of the Thirty tyrants. They are mentioned in Isocr.
 ( $\sigma a \nu i \sigma \tau \nu$ d̀ $\nu a \gamma к a i ̂ o \nu$ èfival) toús $\tau^{\prime}$ è toîs

 we are told that cases of aikela and $\boldsymbol{\tau} \dot{d}$ $\tau \hat{\omega} \nu \beta \iota a l \omega \nu$ came under their jurisdiction. They are described as appointed by lot



 $\alpha \rho \chi \grave{\eta} \nu \check{\alpha} \rho \xi \underline{\xi} \alpha$. It was only in unimportant cases, where the matter in dispute was not aboye the value of 10 drachmas, that they were competent to decide on their own authority : other cases they referred,










 $\gamma \iota \gamma \nu \dot{\sigma} \sigma \boldsymbol{\kappa} \boldsymbol{v a t}$ (coll. 54, 7 et Herondae papyro v 21) в: sed cf. Meisterhans, p. 141, ${ }_{17} 7^{2}$. $\quad 9$ є́à H -L.









 $\dot{\epsilon} \pi \epsilon \delta \delta \delta o u v$ (fere eadem habet "Schol. Arist. Vesp. 1436, additis $\tau 0 \hat{v} \delta^{\prime}$ ä $\gamma \gamma o v s$ toútou



 258, 6). Cf. Frag. $415^{2}, 455^{3}$.
in the first instance, to the arbitrators, and, if necessary, to the law-courts. Cf. Gilbert, i 358.

Most of the cases concerned with the rights of property were supposed by Meier to come under the jurisdiction of the Thesmothetae. Lipsius, in his revised edition of Meier and Schömann, p. 93, (1) assigns them to the Forty; he also ( 2 ) identifies the $\delta$ ккaбтal кãd $\delta \dot{\eta}$ $\mu$ ous with the $\delta$ oxa $\quad$ tal concerned with the several tribes (ib. p. 90 n.). Thus they could act in their several divisions of four for each of the ten tribes. Lastly, (3) he holds that after a time they ceased to go on circuit and held their court in Athens. The first of these opinions is opposed by Caillemer in Daremberg and Saglio, Dict. Ant. iii 200 f . ; but all three are confirmed by the text. ( I ) is supported by $\tau \dot{d} s \not a \lambda \lambda$ as $\delta i k a s$, whereby they have jurisdiction over all causes not assigned to the Eleven, the eloarojeis and
 elodyovтєs, 58 § 2, ol $\tau \dot{\eta} \nu \quad \phi u \lambda \dot{\eta} \nu \quad \delta \kappa \kappa \alpha ́-$与oyves, and inf. § 2, of rì̀ $\phi u \lambda \grave{\eta} \nu$ тov̂

фєúyovios סıкá\}ovтєs.
入ayxávovotr] sc. 'the suitors.'
 445/4 (CIA i 29 and iv p. 12) we have mention of a court probably consisting of thirty members, appointed by lot from the $\kappa \lambda \eta \rho \circ \hat{0} \chi 0$ of Hestiaia and Ellopia and competent to decide cases of this kind. In Pol. $1300 \quad 623$ and 32, Ar. approves of the institution of two separate courts, according to the value of the matter in dispute: matters that are worth little more than five drachmas need not be referred $\epsilon l s \delta \iota \kappa a \sigma \tau \omega \hat{\nu} \pi \lambda \hat{\eta} \theta_{o s}$.
aítotencis] 3 § 5 ult.
סıaırqrais] Meier and Schöm. pp. 48, 1009-1015; Smith, Dict. Ant. s.v. The text shews that all private causes (except the ${ }^{\frac{}{4}} \mu \mu \eta \nu_{0} \delta(\kappa \alpha a, ~ c . ~ 52)$ were in the first instance tried by the $\delta$ caut $\eta \tau a l$.

 $\dot{\epsilon} \mu \beta a \lambda \epsilon \hat{\nu} \nu$ and $i b .57$, also $48 \S 48$, d $\nu \tau!-$
 щартиplas, Meier and Schöm. p. 873 ff. Lips.; трок $\boldsymbol{\lambda}_{\boldsymbol{\eta}} \boldsymbol{\sigma} \epsilon \iota, i b .871 \mathrm{ff}$.











 Wyse, $\mathrm{K}-\mathrm{W}, \mathrm{H}-\mathrm{L}, \mathrm{K}^{3}, \mathrm{~B}$, coll. c. 48 § 5 , c. 58 § 2.
§ 3 Pollux viii 48 infra laudatus.


катабпипра́ $\mu \in$ vol, cf. 39 § $17, \sigma \epsilon \sigma \eta \mu \alpha \sigma$ -

 бov kal $\mu \mathrm{ap} \mathrm{\tau vplas}$ ), and $54 \S 27, \tau \hat{\varphi} \mu \eta$


In Meier and Schöm. p. 904 Lips. it is assumed that the $\bar{\epsilon} \chi$ vos was used for the reception of documents handed in at the d̀vdipiots. Thus Dem. $28 \$ \mathrm{r}, \dot{e} v \epsilon-$
 is there referred to the 'last day of the àvápıбts.' Mr Wyse suggests that there is no reason why it should not refer to the arbitration. It may be doubted whether in the Attic orators there is a single certain example of éxivos except in connexion with arlitration. To the passages above quoted may be added 39 §§ 22, 37; 34 § $46 ; 40$ §§ $21,28,58$; 45 §§ 8, 20, $31,57,58,61 ; 49$ §§ 59 , 55,$65 ; 54 \$ 30$. There is nothing in the lexicographers which refers to the àdкрtats before the presiding magistrate: Harp. s. v. є́x̂vos (=Phot. $\mathrm{i}_{\text {, Suid. }}$ I); Schol. Arist. Vesp. $143^{6}$ where ol datтqтal are named, (=Phot. 3, éxâvol$\dot{\epsilon} \pi \epsilon \delta i \delta o u v$, and Suid. s. $v . ~ \epsilon ̇ \chi i v o t) ; ~ P h o-~$ tius, $\dot{\epsilon} \chi \hat{\chi}$ vos 2 ( $=1$ ex Seg. 258, 3, with trifling variants; cf. Etym. Mag. p. 404, 54) ; Harp. s. v. \&calrทtal; Pollux viii ${ }_{127}$; Schol. Patm. Dem. $4^{8}$ § 48.-It is clear from col. 3I 1. in that Hesychius in $\dot{\epsilon} \mu \pi \dot{\eta} \kappa \tau \eta$ s does not refer to the duákptors as supposed in Meier and Schöm. l.c. (Wyse).

тробартทjoavtes] used in several passages of Hist. An.
 govart] $48 \$ 5 ; 58 \S 2$. Prohably those of the Forty who belonged to the same
tribe as the defendant.
§ 3. tขvòs $\mathrm{X}^{\llcorner\lambda \ell \omega \nu} \kappa \tau \lambda$.] The number of the $\delta$ wa $a \sigma$ al varies with the value of the matter in dispute : for property under 1000 dr . the court consists of 201 iokarral; for property above that amount, of 401. Pollux, viii 48 , says of cases of $\phi$ áats:

 тетракоаlous. This statement ultimately comes from the text which shews that the distinction was not confined to cases of фáots. This conclusion had already been drawn by Heffter, Att. Gerichtsverfass. p. 55, and Fränkel, Att. Geschzoorenengerichte, p. 102. From Dem. c. Mid. 223 it has been inferred that the round number of 200 was the smallest number

 (Meier and Schöm. p. 170 Lips.).
 lodorus charges Stephanus with having stolen an important deposition which the speaker expected to find in the exivos. Cf. Meier and Schöm. p. 904 Lips.
 the age of 59 . As explained below, there was a cycle of $42 \dot{\epsilon} \pi \dot{d} \dot{\prime} \nu \mu 0 t \tau \hat{\omega} v \dot{\eta} \lambda \iota \kappa \epsilon \hat{\nu} \nu$. All who attained the age of 18 in any given year had an $\dot{\epsilon \pi} \pi \omega^{\prime} v{ }^{2} \mu \mathrm{os}$ assigned to them. After completing 41 years, during which they were liable to be called out on military duty, they reached the age of 59 and then served as stait $\eta$ ral for one year,-their 'sixtieth year.' The $\boldsymbol{\epsilon \pi} \mathrm{\omega}^{\prime}$ $\nu \nu \mu \mathrm{s}$ assigned to the ${ }^{\prime} \phi \eta \beta \circ$ in each year was the $\dot{\epsilon \pi \dot{\sigma} \nu \cup \mu o s ~ o f ~ t h e ~ \delta t a u \tau \eta \tau a l ~ w h o ~ h a d ~}$ held office in the previous year.







$22<0 i>$ é $\gamma \gamma \rho \propto \phi \delta \mu \epsilon \nu 0$ quondam Blass ( $\mathrm{H}-\mathrm{L}$ ) ; oi etiam Harp. omisit. enjpaф.
 Poland, в. $\quad \Delta \epsilon \Delta|\Delta| т н к \omega c$ (edd.): $\delta \epsilon \delta \epsilon \iota \tau \iota \kappa \dot{\omega}$ (Harp. codices plerique), $\delta \epsilon \delta \iota \eta \tau \eta$ кús Aldum secutus Dind., $\delta \epsilon \delta \iota \varphi \kappa \eta \kappa \dot{\omega}$ R Rose ; $\dot{\epsilon} \pi i \delta \epsilon \delta \eta \mu \eta \kappa \dot{\omega} s$ Photius et Suidas. 26 ' $\pi$ ' (sc. $\pi \epsilon \rho l)$ fortasse per errorem pro $\pi^{\prime}(\mathrm{sc}, \pi a \rho a ̀)^{\prime} \mathrm{K} . \quad \pi \epsilon \rho l$ dubitanter retinet K ; $\pi a \rho \dot{\alpha}$ $\mathrm{k}-\mathrm{w}, \mathrm{H}-\mathrm{L}, \mathrm{B}$.







## 

 supposed that the archon $\dot{\epsilon} \pi \dot{\epsilon} y \nu \mu o s$ of the year, in which a citizen reached the age of military service, was deemed to be the $\dot{\epsilon} \pi \dot{d} \dot{v} v \mu o s$ of that citizen and of all who came of age in the same year. Thus the
 archons corresponding to the 42 groups of citizens who were at any given time between the ages of 18 and 60 (Schömann, Ant. p. 423; Gilbert, i 300 ). But in the text the a $a \rho \chi 0 \nu T \epsilon s$ are contrasted with the $\dot{\epsilon} \pi \dot{\mu} y \cup \mu o c$, and the latter divided into $\dot{\epsilon} \pi \dot{\omega} \nu \nu \mu 0 \iota \tau \hat{\omega} \nu \quad \phi \nu \lambda \omega \hat{\nu}$ and $\tau \hat{\omega} \nu \dot{\eta} \lambda<\kappa \iota \hat{\omega} \nu$. As the $\dot{\epsilon} \pi . T \hat{\omega} \nu \phi u \lambda \hat{\omega} \nu$ derived their names from ten of the Attic heroes, selected out
 presumably selected out of the remaining go. The period of military service was included within a cycle of 42 years, each of them probably bearing the name of one of the Attic heroes. When a youth attained the age of 18 , he was enrolled under the archon of the year and also under the eponymous hero under whom those of the citizens who had just completed their $\mathbf{4}^{2}$ years had been originally entered. This is Mr Kenyon's view and it appears to be substantially correct, except that the 42nd year of service was really devoted to the duties of the $\delta$ oait $\eta$ ral which occupied the sixtieth year of the citizen's life
 the age of 59 (not 60, as Mr Kenyon
says) that the citizen served as an arbitrator.

The lists were unfortunately drawn up on perishable material, at first on wood and afterwards on bronze, and no example of the $\sigma \tau \dot{\eta} \lambda \eta \chi^{a \lambda \kappa \hat{\eta} \text { of the writer's }}$ time has survived. Had marble been used instead, the result might have been different, and an interesting question might have been conclusively decided. We have indeed several lists of daarच all on marble; but these are for another purpose. Thus for b.c. $325 / 4$ we have no less than 103 names with the super-

 $\delta \dot{\eta}] \mu o v$ (CIA ii 943); also (for an unknown year) a list of 88 names (ib. 944); and there are lists of a few such names for B.c. 330 and 329 ( $i b .94 \mathrm{r}-2$ ). But none of these preserve any record of an

入e入evкeupéva] 47 S§ 2, 4.
 sion for the eponymus of the citizens who served as $\delta$ cour 7 ald for the previous year.

8e8caerךкќs] In classic Attic this verb usually has the double augment in the pf. and plpf., e. g. pf. Dem. 33 § 3 I $\delta \in \delta \dot{\partial} \dot{\eta}-$ $\tau \eta \kappa a, 21 \$ 85$ катє $\delta \epsilon \delta \iota \eta \tau \eta \hbar \epsilon \iota$ (Dind.) or ката $\delta \epsilon \delta$ - (Bekk.); Thuc. vii 77 סє $\delta \iota \eta(\eta \eta \mu a \iota$, Dem. 2 r §8 85,96 d $\pi 0-, 55$ § 6r ката-;












 $\kappa a i ̀ ~ \epsilon ่ \pi \omega \nu[\dot{v} \mu о \nu \mu] \epsilon ́ \chi \rho \iota ~ \tau i ́ \nu \omega \nu ~ \delta \epsilon i ̂ ~ \sigma \tau \rho a \tau \epsilon v ́ \epsilon \sigma \theta a \iota$.


 （ $\mathrm{K}, \mathrm{K}-\mathrm{w}, \mathrm{H}-\mathrm{L}$ ）． 37 tincon ：tuvos Harp．

§ 6 Harp．el $\sigma a \gamma \gamma e \lambda l a$ infra exscriptus．

 фи入al．
§5．＇่̇ $\pi\llcorner\kappa \lambda \eta \rho \circ \hat{\sigma} \sigma เ \nu]$ Pollux viii 126，

 $\tau \grave{\eta} \nu \quad \epsilon \pi \iota \kappa \lambda \eta \rho \omega \theta \in \hat{i} \sigma \alpha \nu$ jlaita，In Dem． Aphob．iii 58 a puhlic（as contrasted with a private）arbitrator is described as $\kappa \lambda \eta \rho \omega \tau 6$ ．Cf．Meier and Schöm．p． 1012 Lips．
ék $\delta$ rautâal not found in this sense else－ where．Cf．ék $\delta i \kappa \alpha \dot{\beta} \zeta \epsilon \nu$ in［Xen．］Rep．


 has hitherto been inferred from Bekker， Anecd． 235 （ $=$ Schol．Plat．Leg． 920 D），
 and from the less precise statements in
 $\gamma \epsilon \gamma 0 \nu \delta \tau \omega \nu$ ，and Hesych．ol $\pi \epsilon \rho l$ $\epsilon \xi \eta \eta_{\kappa о \nu \tau \alpha ~}$
 given in Bekker Anecd． 186 and Suidas， s．v．סıaıт $\quad$ Tal．
 probably meant．
dंтe入eîs］＇exempt＇from serving as dial－ т $\boldsymbol{\tau} \boldsymbol{\tau} \boldsymbol{\sigma}$ ．




 （cf．Bekk．Anecd．235， $24=$ Schol．Plat．

Leg． 920 D，and Lex．Dem．Patm．p．13）．
We have an example of this procedure in


 $\delta \iota a \iota \tau \eta \tau \eta \eta$, first explained in this sense by Bergk，Zeitsch．f．All．1849，273，supported by Fränkel，Alt．Geschworenenger．p． 73 f．， as quoted in Meier and Schöm．p． 334 Lips．；see also Daremberg and Saglio， iii 126．Cf．Dr Hager on elfarye入la in Smith，Dict．Ant．i 710 b，where，how－ ever，it is accidentally stated that，in Harpocr．l．c．，Bergk＇rather needlessly＇

 altered $\delta \kappa \kappa \alpha \sigma \tau d s$ into $\delta<\alpha u \tau \eta \tau \alpha s$ ，and the text confirms his alteration．The dial－ tural for any given year form a＇college，＇ or corporate body；they pass resolutions and decree rewards in the phrase | E $\delta(\xi e y$ |
| :--- | тoîs diaurचtaîs（Hubert，de Ar－bitris，p．25； Meier－Schöm．p．${ }^{1013}$ Lips．）．It is their president who is described as $\pi \rho \nu \tau a \nu \varepsilon i \omega \nu$ in Dem．Mid．l．c．Hitherto it has been deemed uncertain whether the eloarre入la of an arbitrator came before the $\delta<a u \tau \eta \tau a l$ or before a body of $\delta$ ckactal（Hubert，p． 55；Gilbert， i 371 ）．The text is decisive for the former alternative：but it also shews that the sentence was subject to appeal．In the latter event it would come before a law－court．










LIV 5 <ol> ins. J B Mayor, k-w, H-L, $\mathrm{K}^{\mathbf{3}}$, hiatu admisso.

Testimonia. LIV § 1 Schol. in Aeschin. $3 \S 25$ infra exscriptum.





 Bekk. An. 245, 6 et Lex. Dem. Patm. p. 142). *Lex. rhet. Cantab. Noy $\omega \tau a l$, infra exscriptum.
$\because \chi \omega \sigma \omega \nu$; Dem. Ol. $3 \S 4, \dot{\epsilon} \psi \eta \phi l \sigma a \sigma \theta \epsilon \ldots$... $\alpha a l$
 aùvoùs $̇ \mu \beta a l \nu \epsilon 1 \nu . ~ A e s c h i n . ~ F . ~ L . ~ 133, ~$




 $\mu^{2} \rho \epsilon \sigma \tau \nu \quad \xi \bar{\eta} \lambda \theta 0 \nu$ (Gilbert, i 302, and Beiträge, 5 If.). Cf. Lycurg. Leocr. 39, al $\delta^{\prime}$

 For троүрáфovatv, cf. Arist. Av. 450,
 $\mu \in \nu$ èv тoîs $\pi \iota \nu a k l o u s$.
LIV § 1. ס́סotovov̀s] mentioned in Aeschin. 3 § 25 (with Schol. oi $\epsilon \pi t \mu \epsilon$ -
 $\pi \delta \lambda \epsilon \omega s)$, and by a Comic poet quoted in Plut. Praec. Reip. Ger. 15 § 9, Mntloxos $\mu \hat{y}<\gamma \mathrm{d} \rho>\sigma \tau \rho a \tau \eta \gamma \epsilon \mathrm{i}, \mathrm{M} . \delta \dot{\delta} \dot{\epsilon} \tau$ às ò $\delta$ oús, M.

 (ascribed to Cratinus by Bergk; Meineke, Frag. Com. iv p. 675). Boeckh, II x, p. ${ }^{2} 57$ Fränkel.
 $b_{11}$, speaking of $\tau \grave{\nu} \nu \eta \psi о \mu \epsilon \nu \eta \nu \lambda о \gamma \tau \sigma \mu \partial \nu$

 $\delta^{\prime} \xi \xi \in \tau a \sigma \tau \dot{d} s$ of $\delta \dot{\epsilon} \sigma u \nu \eta \gamma \delta \rho o u s$. It had already been proved by Boeckh (II viii, p. ${ }^{239}{ }^{3}$ ) that the $\lambda_{0 \gamma \sigma \sigma \tau a l}$ and $\epsilon \theta \theta v \nu o c$ were separate bodies; and this is confirmed by the present treatise (cf. 48 § 4). Almost all the $\dot{v} \pi \in \dot{v} \theta$ voo had to send in their accounts to the doytotal (Aeschin. c. Ctes.

 $\pi p o s$ toùs $\lambda$., Schol. on $\S \S 9,15$ ). CIA ii 444, 446, (an $\alpha \gamma \omega \nu 0 \theta \epsilon \in \tau \eta s) \alpha \dot{\alpha} \pi \epsilon \nu \eta \nu 0 \chi \in \nu \lambda \delta-$










 $12<\delta \epsilon>$ ins. $k$ (edd.).

10 ádulov Harp. infra exscriptus.














 117, öтє $\mu \epsilon \in \ell \sigma \hat{\eta} \gamma \circ \nu$ ol $\lambda о \gamma ı \sigma \tau \alpha i$, and $F . L$. 2 II.



 $\mu \dot{\epsilon} \nu \quad \tau \eta \nu \quad \delta \epsilon \kappa a \pi \lambda a \sigma l a \nu$ eival, and 127 ,



катаүเүขผ́бкоvणt] the compound verb, in the special sense, is followed by the simple participle $\tau \delta \gamma^{\nu} \omega \sigma \theta \epsilon \nu$, which, although more general in itself, has its meaning necessarily coloured by the previous context. To repeat the preposition is no more necessary here than in 57,7 , where $\delta t a t i \theta \eta \sigma t$ is followed in the next sentence by $\tau l \theta \eta \sigma$ t. Cf. Dem.
 is followed several lines later by $\tau \dot{\alpha} \gamma^{\nu} \omega$ -
 to my note on Eur. Bacch. 1065, кar $\hat{\eta} \gamma \epsilon \bar{\nu}$, $\hat{\eta}^{\eta} \gamma \epsilon \nu, \vec{\eta} \gamma \epsilon \nu$, where $H e c$. 168, $\dot{d} \pi \omega \lambda \ell \epsilon \sigma a \tau^{\prime}$, $\dot{\omega} \lambda \epsilon \epsilon \sigma \tau^{\prime}$, and Med. 1252, кarl $\delta \epsilon \tau^{\prime}$, t $\delta \epsilon \tau \epsilon$, are quoted.

ठ $\hat{\omega} \rho a . . . \delta \epsilon \kappa a \pi \lambda 0 \hat{v} v]$ This penalty is also
mentioned in Dinarch. c. Aristog. 17. The penalty of death (unnoticed in the text) is mentioned $i b . \S \S 4,20$. The two penalties are contrasted as alternatives in Dinarch. c. Dem. 60 and c. Philocl. 5 (Meier and Schöm. P. 445, n. 723).
 ötc. Aeschin. 3 § 228, т $\hat{\mathrm{y}} \mathrm{s}$ 亩 $\rho$ altlas


distriov] here of 'maladministration.'


 The term is not found in the Orators, but is mentioned in Harpocr. s. v. | Equt |
| :--- |
| $\delta \varepsilon$ |



 p. 424-8; Lipsius, Leipz. Verhandl.p. 64.
 been hitherto unknown.
§ 3. रpapparta] The full title is $\delta$
 with the shorter forms $\gamma p$. $\tau$ भ̂s $\beta$ ou $\lambda \hat{\eta} \mathrm{s}$ or $\gamma \rho$. кazà $\pi \rho \nu \tau a \nu$ elav. The regular form before the year of Eucleides was $\boldsymbol{\delta} \boldsymbol{\gamma} \boldsymbol{\rho}$. $\tau \hat{\eta} s \beta o u \lambda \hat{\eta} s$. As an exception we findin B.c.
ôs $\tau \hat{\nu} \gamma \rho a \mu \mu a ́ \tau \omega \nu$ є̇ $\sigma \tau i ̀ \kappa u ́ p \iota o s, \kappa a i ̀ ~ \tau a ̀ ~[\psi \eta] \phi i ́ \sigma \mu a \tau a ~ \tau a ̀ ~ \gamma \iota \gamma \nu o ́ \mu \epsilon \nu a$

 Naber, K-w, H-L, $\mathrm{K}^{3} . \quad<\tau^{\prime}>$ post $\gamma \rho a \mu \mu a ́ \tau \omega \nu$ addidit B ex Harp. $\quad$ IN (K-w): $\boldsymbol{\gamma \epsilon v}$. Harp.

409/8, CIA i 61 (as restored by Köhler)

 century the title ó $\gamma \rho a \mu \mu a \tau \epsilon \dot{s} \mathrm{~s} \dot{\dot{o}} \kappa a \tau \dot{\mathrm{a}} \pi \rho \mathrm{fu}$ tavelay is first found in an inscr. of b.c. $358 / 7$ or of $354 / 3$ (CIA ii 61 , where the
 found, and where mention is made of tovs a $\lambda \lambda$ ous $\gamma p a \mu \mu a \tau \epsilon a s$ tois $\epsilon \pi l$ tois $\delta \eta \mu \circ \sigma$ lots $\gamma \rho d \mu \mu a \sigma \omega)$. The two forms are interchanged with one another down to b.c. $322 / \mathrm{I}$, when the short title $\gamma \rho$. tं $\hat{\eta} \mathrm{s} \beta$ ou $\lambda \hat{\eta} \mathrm{s}$ appears for the last time (CIA ii 186 ), while the title $\gamma \rho$. $\dot{\text { of }}$ кãà $\pi \rho \nu \tau a \nu c l a \nu$ continues in use down to the Roman age (Gilbert in Philol. xxxix p. $13 \mathrm{I}-6$, and $G r$. St. i 254 ; also Müller's Handbuch, iv i 167). This $\gamma \rho a \mu \mu a \tau \epsilon \dot{s}$ always belonged to a different tribe to that presiding at the time (CIA i $45,46,51,61,188$; Gilbert, Philol. p. 133); but, in or after в.C. $322 / \mathrm{I}$ (the date of the death of Aristotle), the $\gamma \rho$. so called belonged to the presiding tribe.

The 'full title' cited at the head of this note is not actually found except in CIA i 6 I (as restored); and there is much to be said in favour of the restoration proposed by C. Schaefer : $\pi$ apa-

 literature of the Athenian $\gamma \rho a \mu \mu a \tau \varepsilon \hat{i s}$ includes (in addition to the works already quoted) two dissertations of 1878 by C. Schaefer and C. A. H\&lle; and Hartel's Studien, published in the same year; also an article by von Wilamowitz (in Hermes, xiv $\mathrm{I}_{4} 8-153$ ), who, like Stoientin, in Fahrb. $^{\text {f. Philol. 1880, }}$ 189-202, rightly attributed to Aristotle the account which we find in Pollux. The dissertation by Kornitzer ( 1883 ) unfortunately receded from this position, whicb is now proved to be the only tenable one.
 all public documents'. According to the law quoted in Dem. c. Timocr. 63, he delivered to the $\theta \in \sigma \mu_{0} \theta \in \tau a l$ the decrees of
 'has the (general) custody of the public archives' (in the M $\eta \tau \rho \psi \hat{\psi} \boldsymbol{\nu}$ ). In Dem. F. L. p. $3^{81}$ these are described as under
the (special) charge of a public slave:

 $\mu b \sigma \omega o s \tau \epsilon \bar{\epsilon} \alpha \kappa \tau \alpha c$. This $\gamma \rho a \mu \mu \alpha \tau \epsilon \dot{\nu} s$ is mentioned by Aeschin. 3 § 15, $\lambda$ doov кal
 кal toùs $\lambda_{0} \gamma / \sigma \tau d s_{\text {, }}$ and by Chamaeleon, ap. Athen. 407 C , (Alcibiades) $\tilde{\eta} \kappa \in \nu \in i s$





$\tau \ddot{\partial} \lambda \lambda a$ d̀vтเүpá中єтal] 'checks (or supervises) the transcription of all other public documents.' Thus, in the inventory of the $\chi$ a $\lambda \kappa 0 \theta \dot{\eta} \kappa \eta$ in CIA ii 61 , ascribed to B.C. 358 or 354 , Eủк $\lambda \hat{\eta} s \dot{o} \delta \eta \mu \delta \sigma \tau o s$ is to enter all the items and the $\gamma \rho$. кa $\alpha \dot{\alpha}$ $\pi \rho v \tau a \nu e l a \nu$ is to check them ( $a \nu \tau \tau \gamma \rho a-$
 tavelà kal toùs äh hous qpapuatéas ròs $\epsilon \pi i$ roîs $\delta \eta \mu \sigma \sigma i o s s \gamma \rho \dot{\alpha} \mu \mu a \sigma \nu)$, and lastly, the $\gamma \rho a \mu \mu a \tau \epsilon \dot{\nu} s \hat{\eta}^{\prime} s \beta o v \lambda \hat{\eta} s$ is to record the list on a tablet and to make a copy ( $\dot{d} \nu \tau \boldsymbol{\gamma} \rho a \phi a$ ).

Pollux, viii 98 , after describing the $\gamma \boldsymbol{\gamma}$. $\delta$ кaтd $\pi p \nu \tau a \nu \in l a \nu$ and the $\gamma \rho$. $\epsilon \pi i$ rovs $\nu^{\delta} \mu \mathrm{ous}$ in terms borrowed in part from the text, continues as follows: $\dot{d} \nu \tau \tau$

 $\kappa a \theta \eta \mu \varepsilon \nu o s=\tau \hat{\eta} \beta o u \lambda \hat{\eta}$. In Bekker's best ms the following words, $\delta v^{\prime} \delta^{\prime} \delta^{\prime} \boldsymbol{\eta} \sigma a \nu$, $\dot{b}$
 after the next heading $\lambda o \gamma \sigma \sigma \tau a l$, and this order is approved by Lipsius; but Harpocration $s . v$. agrees with the other MSS in making them apply to the d dy $\tau \gamma \rho a-$ $\phi \in i ̂ s:-\dot{d} \kappa a \theta \iota \sigma \tau a ́ \mu \in \nu 0 s \quad \epsilon \pi l$ $\tau \hat{\omega} \nu \kappa a \tau a \beta a \lambda-$
 áy $\downarrow \iota \gamma \rho a ́ \phi \epsilon \sigma \theta a \iota ~ \tau a \hat{\imath} \tau a$ (Dem. c. Androt. p. 615 and Aeschin. c. Cles. 25). סıtтol


 Anecd. p. 185 , $\dot{\delta} \delta \dot{\kappa} \kappa a \tau a \gamma \rho a \phi \delta \mu \epsilon \nu$ оs $\tau \dot{a} \epsilon \bar{\epsilon}$
 only passage in the treatise to which Harpocration can refer, but it is remarkable
 in the text.






$17 \mathrm{~K}\left(\mathrm{a}_{1}\right)$ атाIct : corr. K. e Polluce (edd.).

19-20 єтा тоүtoic $n[0]$ MON $\epsilon$ тєpon: corr, к

тро́тepov] The date at which this official ceased to be $\chi$ cepozovitrs and became $k \lambda \eta \rho \omega \tau \partial$ is unknown. The office became annual between B.C. $3^{67}$ and 363. The last example of its being held for a $\pi \rho u \tau a \nu c l a$ only is in $368 / 7$; the first example of its being held for a year is in $363 / 2$. Possibly appointment by lot was introduced about the same time.
tovs ev between 450 B.c. and 403 B.c., about 28 names are known (Hille in Leipz. Stud. i 240); but only one is at all familiar,
 In the fourth century, down to B.C. $\mathbf{3 2}^{22}$, we have 38 names, not one of them 'famous ' (see Wyse in Class. Rev.v 276).
$\sigma \tau \eta$ indas] cf. note on Dem. Lept. § 3 .
tais $\sigma u \mu \mu a x[a u s]$ e.g. in в. c. 433/2, the treaties between Athens and Leontini (Cia iv 33 a) and Athens and Rhegium (CIA iv 13), Xaplas єरpa $\mu \mu \dot{\text { áceve: }}$ also in ह.C. $378 / 7$, the second maritime Confederacy (CIA ii 17 ), Ka $\lambda \lambda i \beta$ los K $\eta \phi \iota \sigma \circ \phi \omega ̈ \nu \tau o s$ $\epsilon \quad$ 'र $\rho \alpha \mu \mu \dot{\tau} \tau \epsilon \epsilon$. The latest example now known belongs to B.c. $356 / 5$ (CIA ii 66 )
$\pi \rho o \xi \in v / a, s]$ ' grants of the title of $\pi \rho \dot{o}$ Gevos' (cf. note on Dem. Lept. 60, and Gilbert, i 173 ). As exx. we have (in b.c.





 $\tau \in v \epsilon$, and ii 3 (Amyntor, Eurypylus, \&c)



 ii 69 (Philiscus, B.c. 355 ) èvá $\tau \eta s$ s $\pi \rho v \tau a \nu$ elas

 ii 119 (Apelles of Byzantium, b.c. 339)-
 калà $\pi \rho и \tau a \nu \epsilon$ elav. ii 124 (an officer of Philip
 $\kappa \tau \lambda$. Cf. Monceaux, Les Proxenies Grecques, p. 83 .
modırelars] 'grants of citizenship. The oldest inscr. on this subject is that in ' $\mathbf{W} \phi$.
 'Aөך



 $\theta \in \mu \nu \nu$ (friend of Demetrius Poliorcetes)-

 moגırela is used of 'a grant of citizenship' in inscriptions of Ephesus, Ditt. no.




 Ant. p. 355; Gilbert, i 175 ; Dict. Ant. i 443 ; Hartel, Studien, p. 271-3; Reinach, $l$ Epigraphie Grecque, p. 37 I.
divaypóфeral] Thus, in a decree in honour of Thrasybulus of Calydon, the first two lines are inscribed in large

 $\tau \in v \in$. Then follows the decree in smaller characters and the name of the $\gamma \rho a \mu \mu a-$ $\tau \epsilon \dot{s}$ is repeated in the second line, $\Lambda \delta \beta \omega \nu$




 Rev. v 276 a) points out that this style is not found in any inscr. between 356/5 and $320 / 19$.


 applies to the first $\gamma \rho a \mu \mu a \tau \epsilon$ ss of an earlier time, and not to the second $\gamma p a \mu$ $\mu a \tau \epsilon$ '́s.
§ 5. Tòv divayvшбó $\mu$ evov] It is probably the same official that is meant in Dem. Lept. 94 (of a new law), $\tau \hat{\varphi}$ үра $\mu \mu a \tau \epsilon і$ i $\pi \alpha p a-$
 $\nu \dot{\omega} \sigma \kappa \in \nu$. When the letter of Nicias was delivered in Athens (Thuc. vii ro) $\dot{\delta} \boldsymbol{\gamma} \boldsymbol{\rho} \mu$ -
 $\kappa v ̂[p i] o s a ̀ \lambda \lambda a ̀$ тov̂ ảvayvติval.





$23 \alpha \lambda \lambda \alpha$ : $\dot{d} \lambda \lambda^{\prime} \hat{\eta}$ Blass, Richards, Gennadios (e Suida $\mathrm{K}-\mathrm{w}, \mathrm{H}-\mathrm{L}$ ) ; $\dot{\mathrm{a}} \lambda \lambda \dot{\alpha}$ defendit





 $\pi$ oh. Pollux viii ro 7 ieporoool, p. ig8 a exscriptus.
 'A Anvalots, where Herwerden, Stahl and Hude bracket $\tau \hat{\eta} s \pi^{6} \boldsymbol{j} \lambda \epsilon \omega \mathrm{~s}$. The margin of $M$ (the Ms in the British Museum) has:

 expected to find him named in CIA ii 61 ,

 CIA ii 114, io (B.C. 343/2) we read of a decree in honour of Phanodemus: $\mathrm{d}_{\mathrm{L}} \mathrm{a} \mathrm{\gamma}-$
 $\tau \bar{\varphi} \delta \bar{\eta} \mu \varphi$. In [Plut.] ii 84I F, we learn that the orator Lycurgus required the $\gamma \rho . \tau \hat{\eta} s \pi \delta \lambda \epsilon \omega s$ to see that the authorised text alone of Aeschylus, Sophocles and Euripides was adopted in the public performances of their plays, [Plut.] ii $8_{4 I}$ F,


 22, vii 13, 1152 b 30, Rhet. ii 23, 5402 a 27 (Index Ar.).
§ 6. ieporooovs] 'Commissioners of


 $\tau \epsilon \tau \dot{\alpha} \dot{\nu} \pi \dot{a} \dot{\rho} \chi о \nu \tau a$ каl $\dot{a} \nu о р \theta о \hat{0} \sigma \theta a \iota \tau \dot{a} \pi i \pi-$

 lepoтосойs кт入. The text is quoted in Etym. Magn., without any distinction between the two boards. The article adds a reference to Dem. P. 47, 13, ol גoүonool
 поtढ̂p. The lepoтoool are mentioned under the Four Hundred in 30 § 2. Cf. [Dem.] $58 \S 29, \tau \grave{\eta} \nu \mu \dot{\nu} \nu \dot{a} \rho \chi \dot{\eta} \nu \quad \hat{\eta} \nu$ éкềvos áp $\rho \chi \omega$







 $\sigma \iota \nu t \omega \nu \pi a \rho a ̀$ lepoatoùv. Certain kinds of leporool, however, were elected and not appointed by lot. Thus, Dem. c. Mid. §§ 115,171 states that he had the honour of being 'elected' from among all the Athenians as one of the three ieporoool $\tau \hat{\omega} \nu \sigma \epsilon \mu \nu \omega \bar{\omega} \theta \epsilon \hat{\omega} \nu$. In an inscr. published in 'A $\theta \dot{\eta} \nu a \iota o v, 6$ p. 483 , we find 10 lepotoool
 the io tribes). Gilbert i p. 249; Müller's Handbuch, v 3, 34.
éк日́́цата] The word is hitherto only known in the sense of 'pustule' (Hipp. Epid. 3, 1086 L and S). é $\kappa \theta \dot{v} \omega$, however, means in act. to sacrifice, in Soph. El. $57^{2}$, and Eur. Cycl. 371 ; and, in middle, to expiate. In the text éx $\theta \dot{\text { úa }}$ ara (if genuine) means 'expiations.' The corresponding phrase in an inscr. of B.c. $3^{29} / 8$, in ' $\mathrm{E} \phi$. ' $\mathrm{A} \rho \chi$. 1883, $110-126$, в 82 , is $\epsilon i s \tau \dot{a}$ é $\pi \iota \theta \dot{\sigma} \sigma \iota \mu a$.
«avтєutd] 'appointed by oracle.' Xen.
 $\mu a \nu \tau \epsilon u \tau \delta s \hat{\eta}_{\nu} \nu$. Sacrifices are enjoined in the $\mu a \nu \tau \varepsilon \hat{a} a l$ quoted by Dem. c. Mid. 52-54.
 тoıs (тoîs $\theta \in o i ̂ s) ~ к а \lambda \lambda \iota \epsilon \rho \eta \prime \sigma a \nu \tau a s ~ a \rho р \chi \epsilon \sigma \theta a \iota$ тồ
§ 7. rov̀s kar' éviavtòv] possibly corresponding to the $\epsilon \pi \iota \mu e \lambda \eta \pi d s$ of 30 § 2.

тєvтeт $\eta$ pl(5as] These festivals are also enumerated in Pollux viii 107 (as cor-



```
\(29 \epsilon[l \sigma l \delta \epsilon] \mathrm{K}, \mathrm{K}-\mathrm{W}, \bar{\epsilon}(\mathrm{sc} . \pi \epsilon \nu \tau \epsilon)\left[\delta^{\prime} \epsilon i \sigma i\right] \mathrm{H}-\mathrm{L}(\mathrm{B}) . \quad \pi \epsilon \nu \tau \epsilon \tau \eta \rho\left(\delta \epsilon \mathrm{s}<\delta^{\prime}>\mathrm{K}-\mathrm{W}\right.\).
```

rected by Rose), lepotocol. $\delta \epsilon к а$ бутєs
 (ràs added by Kenyon) $>\pi \epsilon \nu \tau \epsilon \tau \eta \rho / \delta a s$

 codd.; corr. Jungermann), $\tau \dot{\eta} \nu$ ' $\mathrm{E} \lambda \epsilon v \sigma \tilde{\nu} \nu$.
$\pi \lambda \dot{\eta} v$ חava日 $\eta v a i \omega v]$ At this festival the procession was marsballed by the

 Schol. Arist. Nub. 37, oírou $\delta \dot{\epsilon} \tau \grave{\eta} \nu \quad \pi 0 \mu$ -
 741 lepotool are twice mentioned in connexion with a Panathenaic festival : a 34,

 former refers to B.C. $333 / 2$, the latter to $332 / 1$, and, as neither of these is the 3 rd year of an Olympiad, the lesser Panathenaea must be meant, and not the ' penteteric' festival mentioned in the text. The difficulty is more serious in CIA i 188, 74 (Ditt. no. 44) : ${ }^{\dot{\alpha}} \theta \lambda 0 \theta \epsilon \in \tau a \iota s ~ \pi a \rho \epsilon-$ $\delta 6 \theta \eta$ és Пavaitívaca tà $\mu \epsilon \gamma \dot{d} \lambda a$ (such


 p. 8 Fränkel, supposes that, in the Panathenaea, it was the $\dot{d} \theta \lambda o \theta \in \tau \alpha l$ who undertook the duties connected with the games, which were undertaken by the icpototol in the other festivals, while the lepotoool were only concerned with making arrangements for the hecatomb.
els $\Delta \hat{\eta} \lambda o v$ ] The ancient $\pi a \nu \dot{\eta} \gamma \nu \rho \iota s$ at Delos was revived by the Athenians in the spring of b.c. 425 , Thuc. iii 104, 2,

 Besides the $\pi \epsilon \nu \tau \epsilon \tau \eta \rho l s$ mentioned in the text there was an annual $\theta \epsilon \omega$ pla (Plat. Phaedo 58 в, Crito 43 c). Hermann, Gottesdienst. Alt. § 65, 31-34.

It was formerly supposed that the Delian festival was held on the 6th and 7 th of Thargelion=May-June (Boeckh, in p. 72 Fränkel). The Delian inscriptions point to its having been really held in the month known at Delos as 'I $\epsilon \rho \mathrm{d}$ s, corresponding to the Attic Anthesterion $=$ Feb. March (Robert in Hermes xxi 161 , approved by A. Mommsen in Bursian's $\mathfrak{F a h r e s b}$. 1886, 3 p. 335-8). It included musical (Plut. Nic. 3 ; Lucian de Salt. 16) and gymnastic competitions,
as well as horse-races (Thuc. iii 104; Dittenberger, 121,16$)$.
M. Homolle (Bull. Corresp. Hellén., 1891, pp. 149-155) remarks that 'the inventories from Delos for 279 B.C. mention 30 of the cups that the Athenians gave every year, and 23 of the wreaths that they gave every four years... He also remarks that the inventories for 334 B.c., which come next in date, mention 11 of these cups and 20 of these wreaths, so that the last cup would have been given in $3^{1} 5$ в.c., and the last wreath in 322 . He argues that, as the Athenians certainly left Delos before 310 b.c., the cessation of their gifts after 315 B.C. is attributable to their departure and marks the exact date. But then one would like to know why there was not a twenty-fourth wreath for 318 b.c. The new treatise suggests the reason. It states that the Athenians held a festival at Delos every four years; but adds parenthetically and every six years also, and then alludes obscurely to the archonship of Cephisophon in 329 B.c. Suppose that [after the festival in 330] the interval was increased in 329 from four years to six: the twenty-second and twenty-third wreaths would then belong to 324 B.c. and 318 B.c. and would probably complete the series; for there is no other record of festivals at Delos every six years, and such festivals would presumably have been recorded, had they existed for any length of time' (Mr Torr in Class. Rev. v 277 ).

Bpaupóvia] The festival originally held at Brauron in honour of Artemis is mentioned in Hdt. vi 138 (cf. Arist. Lysistr. 646 and Schol.). It was afterwards held in the Brauronion on the Acropolis (Paus. i 23, 9; Wilamowitz, Aus Kydathen, 128 n .47 f.). We have lists of dresses dedicated to Artemis by Athenian ladies (CIA ii 751 ff., p. II3), one of whom actually bears the name of חevтeт $\quad$ pis ( $i b$. 756,15 , в.c. 345 ).

There was also a festival held at Brauron in honour of Dionysus, Arist.

 the Dionysia are described by Suidas i 454 as having been held every four years at Brauron. But the country Dio nysia were celebrated annually through-





 $\epsilon \mathrm{N}$ ？





out Attica；and it is more probable that the festival under the control of the lepo－ rool was the distinctive Brauronian festi－ val of Artemis．Hemsterhuys，Corsini and others refer the Brauronian $\pi \epsilon \nu \tau \epsilon-$ $\tau$ ppls（cf．Pollux viii ro7）to the Dionysia． K．O．Müller points out that the exist－
 parlas（Dinarch．Arist．12）does not prevent the festival being under the management of the ieporoool，and Rinck， die Religion der Hellenen，ii 105，refers it to the festival of Artemis．Hermann l．c． 862,14 － 20 ．
＇Hpáк入єเa］Dem．F．L．§ 125，$\pi$ aîous

 Нагросг．s．v．$\pi \circ \lambda \lambda \hat{\omega} \nu$ ठ $\nu \tau \omega \nu$ т $\hat{\nu} \nu$ кard


 paioc．The festival referred to by Dem． was probably held about midsummer，ap－ parently in the month Hecatomboeon， at the same time as the Panathenaea： Steph．Byz．s．v．＇EXe入lסai＇一тố $\tau \epsilon \tau \rho a-$

 necke，Forschungen，p．65．）．On the
 Pind．Ol．ix 95，Schol．Pind．Ol．xiii ino．See also Hermann l．c．§ 62， 21 － 24.
${ }^{3}$ Enevolvia］A festival held（as the context shews）once in four years and therefore distinct from the Eleusinia in the ordinary sense of the term．A．Momm－ sen，Heortologie，1864，p．243，doubted its existence．Cf．，however，inscr．from Eleu－



 $\tau \hat{\eta} s \pi \dot{a} \eta \eta[\gamma \dot{j} \rho \epsilon] \omega s \tau_{\hat{\omega} \nu}{ }^{\prime} \mathrm{E} \lambda \epsilon v[\sigma \tau] \nu i \omega \nu \quad \tau \hat{\omega} \nu$ $\mu \epsilon \gamma d \lambda \omega \nu$ ．It has been conjectured that the $\tau p \epsilon \epsilon \tau \eta \rho / \mathrm{s}$ and $\pi \epsilon \mu \tau \epsilon \tau \eta \rho l \mathrm{l}$ fell in the
second and fourth year respectively of the Olympiad．If the inscr．in CIA ii 741 （Ditt．374）is correctly restored，the
 were concerned with the annual celebra－ tion of the＇Eגєualvca，cf．$c 66$［ $\epsilon \xi$＇ $\mathrm{E} \lambda \epsilon] \nu$－
 first year of an Olympiad，and $d 74 \in[\xi$
 the second year of an Ol．For the fourth year of an Ol．，333／2，the inscr．$b 39$ ，as

 $\epsilon \pi \iota \mu \in \lambda \eta \tau \hat{\omega}] \mathrm{D}$ ．（Wyse，in Class．Rev．v 335 b．）

The inscr．in＇ $\mathrm{E} \phi$ ．Ap ．1883，mention－ ing the $\pi \epsilon \nu \tau \epsilon \tau \eta \rho / s \tau \omega \bar{\nu}{ }^{\prime} \mathrm{E} \lambda \epsilon v \sigma \iota \nu / \omega \nu$ ，refers to b．c． $329 / 8$ ，the very year in which Cephisophon was archon．Payments are there made to the ieporool ol кaq＇èvavt $\delta \nu$ ，
 $\theta] \cup \sigma[l a s]$ ），and to the lepotoool é $\gamma$ Bou入îs
 （Wyse，ib．）．

Mava日 $\mathfrak{\eta} v a \leq a]$ the great Panathenaea； c． 60 ．
ìv $\tau \hat{\varphi}$ aùv仑̂］probably means＇in the same place，＇which is true，the festivals being associated with Delos，Brauron， Marathon，Eleusis and Athens respec－ tively．＇At the same time＇is in itself a less likely interpretation．It is not at all probable that the festivals would actually clash in respect of date；but there would be no point in drawing attention to this． The Delian festival and the great Pana－ thenaea were alike in the third year of an Olympiad（Thuc．iii ro4）．The Delia of 334 fell in the third year ；those of 279 in the second year of an Ol．The Delia were probably held in the month of An－ thesterion；the Panathenaea（and pro－ bably the Heracleia）in Hecatomboeon； the Eleusinia possibly in the fourth year of an Olympiad，and probably in the same month as the annual Eleusinia，i．e．

## 



## aut fortasse $\rho$, scriptum fuisse arbitratus, conicit [ $\tau 0 \hat{1} \tau 0$ ] $\delta \dot{\epsilon}$ т $\pi \rho 6 \kappa \epsilon \tau \tau a \iota$ [ $\gamma \rho a \phi$ ]aîs [ $\tau a i ̂ ̧$ ]





 $\psi \eta] \phi l \sigma[\mu a \tau a \tau \dot{a}] \quad \epsilon \pi l \kappa \tau \lambda . ;$ sed Cephisophon Olympiadis in anno quarto archon erat, nec video cur in anno proximo post Panathenaea, potius quam ante ludos illos, nova



in Boedromion. The month (and even the year) of the Brauronia is unknown. (A. Mommsen, Heortol. 409, assigns it to the 16 th of Munichion.)

The insertion of $\dot{\epsilon} \boldsymbol{y} a v \tau \varphi \hat{\varphi}$ is only possible if we disconnect the Panathenaea from the four penteteric festivals. The text, as edited by $\mathrm{K}-\mathrm{W}$, implies that not one of these four is in the same year as the Panathenaea; which is only possible if the Delian festival had already been transferred to the second year of the Ol., and the Heracleia to the first year, leaving the Brauronia (and possibly the Eleusinia) in the fourth year.

1. 32. $\dot{\alpha} 0 \lambda_{a} \delta \dot{\delta}$ т т $\bar{a} \theta \lambda a$ is confirmed (in point of sense) by the context, and (in point of expression) by Pol. 1330 a 33, roîs $\delta 0$ री入ous $\dot{a} \theta \lambda o \nu$ $\pi \rho \circ \kappa \in \hat{i} \sigma \theta a \iota \tau \eta े \nu \in \lambda \in u \in \varepsilon \rho l a \nu$, Hdt. ix 101 ,

 $63^{8} \mathrm{c}$, т $\rho о к є \dot{\epsilon} \mu \nu a$ à $\theta \lambda a$, Xen. Cyr. ii 3,
 Cf. inscr. found at Sestos, in Dittenberger,


 this suggestion to find that $\hat{\alpha} \theta \lambda a$ has been independently proposed by Mr Newman, Class. Rev. v 117 b.

The inscr. already quoted from ${ }^{\prime} \mathrm{E} \phi$. 'ApX. 1883, Pp. $110-126$, describes the payments made to the lepotoool ol $\kappa a \tau^{\prime}$
 $[\tau] \delta[\epsilon l s \theta] \nu \sigma[$ las $]$, and $\gamma 7$ кal ro0to (more

 date of the inscr. is the archonship of Cephisophon, B.c. $329 / 8$. It is clear that in that year, on the proposal of Lycurgus, there was a special decree of the people affecting the $\pi \epsilon \nu \tau \epsilon \tau \eta \rho / s$ of the 'Enєualula. The same decree added a horse-race to the contests, and we are told that the prize in that contest was 70 medimni,

 The suggestion in the text assumes that, under the active administration of Lycurgus (cf. Dürrbach, Lycurgue, pp. 99102), prizes for the other festivals as, well were the subject of decrees in the same year, but there is no evidence on this point. It may also be admitted that the $4^{\text {th }}$ year of an Olympiad is not a very likely year for a decree to be passed affecting the Panathenaic and Delian festivals, which would not be held till three years later, in the 3 rd year of an Olympiad.
 latest date mentioned in this treatise.
§ 8. єis इanapiva d"pxovтa] CIA ii 594


 סoîs. ib. ii 469 (somewhat before 69 B.c.),


 $47^{\circ}$, v. $5^{8}$ ). Before the discovery of this treatise there was nothing to shew how the archon in Salamis was appointed. Cf. de Schoeffer, De Deli Insulae Rebus, p. 201: 'Archon Salaminis insulae fueritne ab Atheniensibus constitutus an a cleruchis electus, prorsus ignoramus; nomen archontis minime obstat quominus illud verisimilius videatur,' Dittenberger, Syll. Inser, Graec. n. $3^{83}$, n. 2, on an 'archon' in a decree of Scyros posterior to 196 b.c. (Wyse in Class. Rev. v 335.)
Salamis was not reckoned as a regular Attic deme, but as a community dependent on Athens. Hence (like Athens) it had an archon at its head (Hermann, Staatsalt. §117, 4).
 we have a decree, of the second half of the fourth century, placing the $\theta \epsilon \sigma \mu o-$ $\phi \dot{\rho}$ to in the Peiraeus under the protection of the $\delta \eta \mu a p x o s$. . In ii 573 the ohmapxos is mentioned in connexion with a theatre in the Peiraeus. In an inscr.
 àvarpáфєтац.







 [ $\epsilon \mathrm{p} p$ ] rai. $[\nu \hat{v} \nu]$ B, cum versus proximi in spatio eodem non plus quam tres exstent litterae. $\quad 4 \kappa \lambda \eta \rho \circ \hat{\sigma} \sigma \iota$ H-L. $\quad 5 \dot{\epsilon} \kappa \alpha \dot{\sigma} \tau \eta \mathrm{~s}<\tau \hat{\eta} s>$ B. $\quad 7,10<\tau \hat{\varphi}>\delta \iota \kappa a \sigma$ т $\eta$ ple $\varphi$ hic et in c. $45,7 \mathrm{k}-\mathrm{w}$; idem in c. 46,13 et c. 55 , 10 articulum omissum non inserunt.

Testimonia. LV §§ 1, 2, 4 Heraclidis epitoma; Rose Frag. 611, 8: elal dè кal

 dуa日 $\boldsymbol{\eta} \sigma \varepsilon \iota$.
§§ 2, 3 Pollux viii 85,86 , p. $202 b$ exscriptus. ${ }^{*}$ Lex. rhet. Cantab. $\theta \epsilon \sigma \mu \theta \theta \epsilon \tau \hat{\omega} \nu$




 $375^{2}, 414^{3}$ ).
ascribed to the beginning of the 3 rd cent., ib. 589, one Callimedon has a place of precedence assigned him $\bar{\epsilon} \nu \tau \hat{\varphi} \theta \epsilon \dot{\alpha} \tau \rho \varphi$

 тpov. Lastly, in ii ro59, a lease granted by the $\Pi \varepsilon \varphi \rho a \varepsilon i$ is is superscribed $\dot{\epsilon} \pi i$
 woos $\delta \eta \mu a \rho \chi o \hat{0}[\nu \tau o s]$. Cf. Wachsmuth, Stadt Athen, ii 5. While, in the other demes, the $\delta \dot{\eta} \mu a \rho \chi 0$ s was elected by the members of the deme, in the important deme of the Peiraeus he was appointed by lot. Otherwise he would have become too powerful a personage.
 in the month Poseideon, and on the grandest scale in the Peiraeus. cia ii 589 (quoted above), ib. 741 (Ditt. 374),
 Cf. Müller's Handbuch, v 3, 162, and Wyse in Class. Rev. v $276 b$.
LV-LVI § I. On the nine Archons. Hermann, Staatsalt. § 138 ; Schömann, Ant. p. 410-414; Gilbert, i 239-243; Dict. Ant. s. v.
 8 §1; 22 §5; 26§2.
$\kappa \lambda \eta p \circ \hat{u} \sigma \nu \nu=\kappa \tau \lambda$.] The process is de-


 has hitherto been uncertain whether, in the annual appointment of archons, the holders of the office were taken from different tribes. Those who (like Schömann, p. 410) accepted this view, supposed that one of the ten tribes was unrepresented. We now learn that the tenth tribe supplied the $\gamma \rho a \mu \mu a \tau \epsilon$ 's to the $\theta \in \sigma \mu 0 \theta \in \tau a l$.
$\gamma \rho a \mu \mu a r \notin a]$ The existence of a $\gamma \rho$. to the thesmothetae has hitherto been unknown. Pollux, viii 92 , after stating that the three first archons select two $\pi \dot{\alpha} \rho \in-$ $\delta \rho o t$ each, adds: $\pi \rho \circ \sigma \alpha \iota \rho o u ̂ v \tau a t ~ \delta e ̀ ~ к a l ~$
 but says nothing of any such secretary to the other six archons.
§2. Sokıцá̧oviat] Harpocr. s.v. סoкı-


 $\mu d\} o \nu \tau a l$ ктл." Bekk. Anecd. 235, 1 .. Dem. Left. 90 describes the six thesmothetae as undergoing a double סokцuacia,
 т $7 \mathrm{p} / \varphi$ (cf. Lys. 15 § 2). Dem. 57 §§ 66, 70 refers to the $\delta о к ц \mu a \sigma i a$ of all the nine archons. Gilbert, i 208; Schömann, p. 406.











 k-w e Lex. Cantabr. coll. Dinarch. ii 18.
 schin. c. Ctes. §§ 14,15 ; Lysias 26 § 6 , 12. Pollux viii 44 , סoкıцабia đé toîs á $\rho$ -

 $\epsilon i \tau \epsilon \kappa \alpha a \eta \eta$. The text states that, whereas the nine archons were examined by the Council and by the law-court, all the other officers (whether appointed by lot or by show of hands) were examined by the law-court alone. This is in exact agreement with the view put forward by C. Schaefer in $\mathcal{F}$ ahrb. f. class. Phil. 1878 , 821 (the other views are stated in Gilbert, i 208, n. 3).

The passages bearing on the $\delta о к ц \mu \alpha \sigma l a$


 and Aesch. Ctes. ${ }^{15}$, $\chi$ єlpotop 1 Tds dp-
 т $\eta \mathrm{p}$ l $\varphi$. In the latter passage it is added that the $\kappa \lambda \eta \rho \omega \tau a l$ d $\rho \rho \chi a l$ are ouk $\dot{d} \delta o \kappa l$ uaoto, but nothing is stated about the lawcourts. Cf. c. 45 § 3 .




 and Sauppe, coll. § $18 \pi a \tau \rho \partial s \mu \nu \hat{\eta} \mu a)$



 $\tau \iota \varsigma \tau \hat{\omega} \nu \gamma 0 \nu \epsilon \omega \nu \tau \epsilon \lambda \epsilon \cup \tau \eta \sigma d \nu \tau \omega \nu$ тous $\tau$ á $\phi o u s$
 $\tau a i ̂ s ~ \tau \omega ̂ \nu ~ d . \rho \chi b \nu \tau \omega y ~ \delta о к ı \mu a \sigma$ lats. Lys. 16 § 9 (of the $\delta$ okipaбla of a $\beta o u \lambda \epsilon \nu \tau \nmid \mathrm{~s})$, $\overline{\text { l }}$
 $\beta$ stov $\lambda \delta$ रov $\delta i \delta b \nu a t$. Pollux, viii 85,86 ,
gives a summary of the text, eкa入eío $\delta \hat{\epsilon}$

 rovias кai $\tau \grave{\partial} \nu \delta \hat{\eta} \mu \mathrm{o} \nu$ (corrected in margin of Cobet's copy into $\tau \hat{\omega} \nu \delta \dot{\eta} \mu \omega \nu$, which is proved to be right by the text) $\pi \delta \theta \epsilon \nu$, кai


 $\tau\langle\mu \eta \mu a$ है $\sigma \tau \iota \nu$ a $\dot{\sigma} \tau o i \hat{s}$. In the quotation in Lex. Rhet. Cant. the clause last quoted is in closer accordance with the text, $\epsilon i \pi d$ $\tau \epsilon \lambda \eta \tau \epsilon \lambda o \hat{\sigma} \iota$ : though the form in Pollux has been supposed to be the older form (Gilbert i 210, n. 1).
 viii 85 , 'A $\theta \eta \nu a i o t-\epsilon \kappa \quad \tau \rho \iota \gamma o \nu l a s$, not necessarily part of an earlier formula.
 gods of the Athenian's home. Dem. 57

 and $\S 67$ quoted below. Cf. Harp. s. v.












ग̇pia] Dem. 57 § 66, 山̈ $\sigma \pi \epsilon \rho$ रà $\rho$ rovis




 $\dot{\eta} \rho l a \operatorname{tad} \tau d$ (cf. Dinarchus, quoted above).
 $\pi a \rho a ́ \sigma \chi \eta \tau a \iota$ то̀̀s $\mu a ́ \rho \tau u \rho a s ~ \epsilon ̇ \pi \epsilon \rho \omega \tau a ̂, ~ ' \tau о u ́ \tau о v ~ \beta o u ́ \lambda \epsilon \tau a i ~ \tau \iota S ~ 20 ~$













 єíซє́ $\rho \chi о \nu т a l$.



 an $\gamma \phi$ incertum ; utrumque libri Pollucis') $\varphi \tau \dot{\alpha} \tau 6 \mu i^{\prime}$ ' $\sigma \sigma \tau \ell \mathrm{K}$-w. mihi quidem littera Y cum $\phi$ connexa potius quam $\epsilon$ scripta videbatur (sed $\epsilon$ posse legi censent k et
 $\beta \omega \sigma \iota \nu$ H-L. $\quad 33 \beta a \delta l$ ¢oval H-L.

LVI 1 каl ó $\beta a \sigma \iota \lambda \epsilon{ }^{\prime} \mathrm{s}$ om. Harp.
§ 5, $28{ }^{*}$ Harp. $\lambda$ (toos (cf. Testim. ad c. 7, 5).







§ 4. $\Psi \eta$ ทे ov$]$ Meier and Schöm. p. 635 ff . Lips.

 кal $\delta$ oaфөєlpas, also And. de Myst. 122, supra c. ${ }^{27}$ ad fin.
§ 5. $\pi$ pòs $\tau \dot{d} \nu \lambda(\theta \mathrm{ov}]$ Dem. 54 § 26, $\pi \rho \partial s$ т $\partial \nu \lambda\left(\theta_{0 \nu}\right.$ (Harpocr. ; $\beta \omega \mu д \nu$ MSS)

 $\dot{\alpha} \gamma 0 \rho \hat{q} \pi \rho \partial s \tau \hat{\psi} \lambda<\theta \varphi$.
 Aristocr. 68 (the prosecutor in a case of homicide before the Areopagus) $\delta \mu \nu v \sigma \iota \nu .$.

 тbuá its. The archon's oath was taken


 vibs corr. Bergk, Ep. crit. ad Schiller., p. 131).
 i 211 , n. 3 .

LVI § i. тapéEpovs] In [Dem.] 59 § 72, and in CIA ii 597, the $\pi$ ápe $\delta \rho o s$ to the archon $\beta a \sigma i \lambda \epsilon\rangle s$ is mentioned. Gilbert, i 218, n. 4.

 $\delta \iota \delta o ́ a \sigma \iota \nu$ є่ $\pi a ̀ \nu \pi a \rho \epsilon \delta \rho \in \dot{v} \sigma \omega \sigma \iota \nu$ ．





 $\phi \nu \lambda \omega \hat{\nu}$ єis $\Delta \iota o \nu v ́ \sigma \iota a ~ \grave{a} \nu \delta \rho a ́ \sigma \iota \nu ~ \kappa a i ̀ ~ \pi a \iota \sigma i ̀ \nu ~ \kappa a i ̀ ~ \kappa \omega \mu \varphi \delta o[\imath] \mathrm{s}$ ，каі̀ єis





 $\pi \epsilon \mu \pi о \mu \epsilon \nu \omega \nu$＇$А \theta \dot{\eta} \nu \eta \theta \epsilon \nu \chi о \rho \omega \bar{\nu} .$.
ťкабтоs］éка́тєроs is found in the cita－ tion in Harpocr．，where，however，кai io $\beta a \sigma \iota \lambda \epsilon \dot{s}$ is omitted．It was conjectured by Meier（Att．Proc．p． 71 Lips．）that it was owing to this omission that Ěa had been corrupted into ékáтєpos．We now see that this was actually the case （Lipsius，Leipz．Verhandl．p．53，n．3， was accidentally led to state the contrary by the reading in Mr Kenyon＇s first edi－ tion，èкáтєpos）．
§§ 2－7．The Archon．
§ 3．Xop p．iv－vii；Haigh＇s Attic Theatre，p． 71－75；Albert Müller＇s Bühnenalter－ thiumer，p． 193.

траүщ8оīs］Lys． 24 § 9，катабтa日єis
 $\chi_{0} \neq \eta \eta \eta$ ба．Cf．Kühner，§426， 2.

т $\boldsymbol{\sigma}$ is］In tragedy the number of com－ petitors was limited to three．In the extant notices we never find more than three tragic poets competing，e．g．B．c． 467，（1）Aeschylus，S．C．T．\＆c，（2）Aris－ tias，（3）Polyphradmon．B．c． 43 I，（1） Euphorion，（2）Sophocles，（3）Euripides， Medea，\＆c．B．c．428，（1）Euripides， Hippolytus，\＆c，（2）Iophon，（3）Ion． Cf．Haigh，Attic Theatre，p． 19.
$\kappa \omega \mu \mu \delta i=1 s-\pi \in \tau \tau \epsilon$ In comedy the num－ ber of competitors during the fifth century was three，as in tragedy ：thus Aristo－ phanes，in producing at the City Dionysia the Clouds，the Peace and Birds，during the latter part of the fifth century，had in each case two competitors．The same
was the rule at the Lenaea．With the beginning of the fourth．century the number was raised to five at both festi－ vals（cf．Arg．Arist．Plut．and CIA ii 972， Haigh，l．c．p．30－31）．
то⿱㇒土тous－фépovoıv］Dem．p．996，22，

 $\rho \omega \sigma \omega$ ；It is only in the case of comedy that the $\phi v \lambda a l$ nominate；and even here it is a recent innovation．The $\chi$ op $\eta$ rol con－ cerned with the production of tragedies were not nominated by the tribes；cf． Lipsius，Leipz．Verhandl．1885，p． 411.

 nysia，besides the dramatic contests，there were choral competitions，between cho－ ruses of men and boys respectively．There were five choruses of men and five of boys， each chorus being provided by one of the ten tribes，each tribe being represented by one of its members as $\chi$ op $\eta \gamma$ bs．Haigh， l．c．pp．14， 15 ．
©apyn $\lambda$ ıa］On the second day of the festival，abont May 25，there was a com－ petition among the cyclic choruses of men and boys．Lys． 21 § $1, \Theta a \rho \gamma \eta \lambda l o t s ~ \nu \kappa \kappa \eta \sigma a s$



 Mid．$\S 10$（lex），$Ө a \rho \gamma \eta \lambda i \omega \nu \tau \hat{\eta} \pi \rho \mu \pi \hat{\eta} \kappa \alpha i$ $\tau \hat{\psi}$ dajūl．Cf．A．Mommsen，Heortol．， 414－424．








$13 \delta \hat{\epsilon}$ ，quod in lacuna absorptum censet k ，in codicis imagine videre sibi visi
 $\mathrm{K}^{3}$ ，в（coll．Meisterhans，p． $162^{2}$ ，ubi in titulis $\delta v \in \AA{ }^{2} \nu$ cum plurali tantum coniungi





 protuli）B； $\bar{\xi} \epsilon \lambda \eta \lambda \nu \theta 6 \tau \omega \nu$ non accipiunt K －w．Locum totum 15－19 ita constituunt





 Lipsius，Fränkel，k－w，в．Cf．Boeckh，ii $84^{3}$ ，n． 39 r．



Svoîv фu入aîv eîs］Ant．de Chor． 11 ，

 Schol．Dem．Lept．27，द̀v $\tau 0 i \mathrm{~s}$ Өaprj入lous סvoî̀ фu入aîv єîs $\mu$ byos каOlбтaro дорךүós．
à̀vtíórets］Lys． 24 § 10，єl－ката－
 dut $i \delta 0 \sigma \iota \nu$ ．Dem．Lept． 8840,130 ，and $O r$ ． 42 adv．Phaenippum．［Xen．］de Rep．Ath．
 Өap $\gamma \dot{\eta} \lambda \iota a$. Cf．Boeckh，iv xvi，Meier and Schom．p． $73^{8} \mathrm{Lips}$. ；Dict．Ant．s．7．
 $\sigma \tau \rho a \tau \eta \gamma o l$ ，who dealt with $\dot{d} \nu \tau \iota \delta \delta \sigma \varepsilon \epsilon$ s in the case of the trierarchy and property－ tax，just as the archon did in that of the
 $\theta \hat{\omega} \sigma$ ．Meier and Schömann，p． 743 n．





 owing to the period of his exemption
having not yet expired．＇The obligation to perform a $\lambda$ proupfia recurred only every other year，Dem．Lept． 7 ．
 Timarch．§ $11, \kappa \epsilon \lambda \epsilon \dot{\prime} \epsilon \iota \tau \partial \nu \nu \quad \chi \circ \rho \eta \gamma \partial \nu \quad \tau \eta ̀ \nu$




 ＇A $\theta \dot{\eta} v$. vii p． 480 ，no． 3 （Gilbert i 240）； Thuc．iii 104，$\$ 83,6$ ；Xen．Mem．iii 3， 12，Xopds．．．$\dot{\delta} \epsilon l s \Delta \hat{\eta} \lambda o \nu \pi \epsilon \mu \pi \delta \mu \epsilon \nu 0 s$, Lucian




 aúr $\omega \nu$ ．On the Delian $\pi \epsilon \nu \tau \epsilon \tau \eta \rho i s$, cf． 54 § 7 ．
dipx ${ }^{\text {®日écopov］Plut．Nic．} 3 \text { § } 5 . ~}$
т $\uparrow$ тракаиторiџ кт $\lambda$ ．］Xen．Mem．iv 8，
 Phaed．p． 58 A；Plut．Thes．23，$\tau \dot{\text { d }} \pi \lambda \frac{1}{2} \frac{1}{}$ ，





$$
\dot{\eta} t \theta \text { tous } \mathrm{K} . \quad 22 \Gamma \mid \mathrm{N}(\mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{W}) . \quad<o l>\mu . \mathrm{K}-\mathrm{W},-\nu<o l>\mu . \text { H-L. }
$$














$\dot{\epsilon} \sigma \dot{\omega} \theta \eta, \tau \grave{\eta} \nu \tau \rho \iota a \kappa 6 \nu \tau о \rho о \nu$. Cf. Boeckh, Seeurkunden, pp. 76-79; A. Mommsen, Heortologie, p. 402. In the Class. Rev.,
 'entirely new word'; but it is actually found in a contemporary inscr. of B.c. $325 / 4$, CIA ii 8 II, p. 261 , col. 2 , 180, , $\rho \iota a-$ коуторішу ки́тта.
nं0́ovs] trisyllabic in Attic, Eur. Phoen.

 it $\theta$ oos. The Homeric form $\bar{n} t \theta$ eos is retained by editors in Plat. Leg. 840 D, 877 E.
§ 4. Tஸ̂̀ 'А




 night of the 18 th Boedromion, the eve of the festal march to Eleusis, was probably spent by the devout in sleeping in the temple of Asclepius, S. of the Acropolis (Mommsen, Heortologie, p. 253, ap. Dict. Ant. i 718 b).
$\Delta$ lovvol $\omega v]$ The $\pi 0 \mu \pi \eta$ was on the 9 th of Elaphebolion (about March 28). In it the statue of Dionysus Eleuthereus was carried from his temple in Limnae to another of his sanctuaries, near the Academy (Paus. i 29, Philostr. Vit. Soph. ii ${ }^{15}$ ); and then brought back again and placed in the theatre. The procession included the priests and civil officials, the knights and the citizens in their tribes, as well as the ephebi, and the canephori (Schol. Arist. Ach. 242). Daremberg and Saglio, iii 242.


Dem. c. Mid. 15, they are described as

 In Phil. 1 § 35, Dem. implies that the functionaries concerned with the Dionysia were appointed by lot: $\tau \grave{\eta} \nu \quad \mu \epsilon \nu$



 Philippic falls in the first half of B.c. 35 r. The speech against Midias is assigned by Dionys. Hal. Epist. Ammon. i 4, 4 (A. Schaefer, Dem. ii 103 ) to B.c. $349 / 8$; the Dionysia at which Midias insulted Dem. fell two years before, early in April 351 or 350 ; and Midias must have been elected $\dot{\varepsilon} \pi \iota \mu \mathrm{E} \lambda \eta \tau \eta \dot{\eta}$ s either for $352 / \mathrm{I}$ or $351 / \mathrm{o}$. As the appointment of the $\epsilon \pi t-$ $\mu \in \lambda \eta \tau a l$ by lot had come into force in the first half of 351, Midias must have been elected $\dot{\epsilon} \pi \leftharpoonup \mu \epsilon \lambda \eta r \dot{\eta} \mathrm{~s}$ for $352 / \mathrm{t}$, and the change was probably made between the Dionysia, early in April, and the end of the civil year, about June.

After the time when the text was written, the appointment by lot was apparently given up. In B.C. 28I/o ('A $\theta \dot{\eta} \nu$. vii 480, no. 3) we have to $\epsilon \pi \iota \mu \epsilon \lambda \eta \tau a l \tau \eta{ }_{\eta}$ $\pi о \mu \pi \hat{\eta} \mathrm{~s} \tau \hat{\psi} \Delta_{\iota o v} \sigma \boldsymbol{\sigma} \varphi$ representing only 6 or 7 of the tribes, and therefore probably elected out of the whole body of citizens, instead of being taken by lot, one from each tribe. After b.c. 265 (CIA ii $\mathbf{4}^{20}$ ) they are described as ol $\chi \in \epsilon \rho o \tau 0 \nu \eta \partial \epsilon \in \varphi \tau \epsilon s$ $\epsilon \pi \kappa \mu \in \lambda \eta \tau a l \tau \hat{\eta} s \pi o \mu \pi \hat{\eta} s$ and their number is 24 (two for each of the 12 tribes of that time). Daremberg and Saglio, s. v. iii 682 -4.









 $\Delta \iota \nu] \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{K}-\mathrm{W}, \mathrm{B}: \tau \mathrm{d}[\nu \tau \hat{\omega} \nu \Delta \iota \nu] \mathrm{H}-\mathrm{L}$ sed spatium non sufficit. $<\tau \partial \nu>\tau \hat{\omega} \nu \theta$.
 certa. $\left.\quad \gamma_{0}\right] \nu \epsilon \omega \nu$ Wyse, Blass, K-W, H-L, K ${ }^{3}$.

Ékarìv $\mu \nu \mathrm{ais}$ ] Probably the sum granted to the whole body.
 On the second day there was a procession, as well as a cyclic chorus.
 which included a public sacrifice, was held on the i4th day of Sciropborion, the last montb of the Attic year, either in Athens in the Cerameicus (so Hermann-Stark, Gottesdienst. Alt. § 61, 21 ; Boeckh, ii 117 , 125 Fränkel; A. Schaefer, Dem. iii 337 , n. 2; A. Mommsen, Heortol. p. 453), or in the Peiraeus (see esp. Wachsmuth, Stadt Athen, ii 143 ). The text does not help to decide the dispute as to the place where the festival was held. It should probably be distinguished from the $\theta$ vola to $Z \epsilon \dot{s} \Sigma \boldsymbol{\Sigma} \omega \tau \eta \mathrm{\eta} \rho$ on the last day of the year (Lys. 26 § 6), which was also superintended by the archon. Shortly before B.C. 268 the sacrifice of the elvit $\eta$ pla for the $\beta o u \lambda \grave{\eta}$ and $\delta \hat{\eta} \mu o s$ was offered not by the archon, but by the priest of Zeis $\Sigma \omega T \chi_{0}$ (CIA ii $325-6$ ).
§6. ypaфal ${ }_{\kappa \tau} \lambda$.] The archon eponymus succeeded to many of the judicial functions of the ancient kings, and was specially regarded as the public protector of those who were unable to defend themselves. This is shewn by the duties here assigned to him. Cf. Dem. 25 Lacr. 48,

 Law quoted in Dem. 43 Macart. 75. In the following list we have no clear distinction drawn between $\gamma \rho a \phi a i$ and $\delta i x a c$.
ávakpivas] Dern. Olymp. 31 , $\delta$ áp $p \omega \nu$
 Meier and Schöm. pp. 43, 823 Lips.; Dict. Ant. s. v. Anakrisis.
 Anecd. p. 269, s. ш. какө́бєшs, the three kinds of $\kappa \alpha \kappa \omega \sigma \iota s$ are all mentioned in the same order, and in the same terms, as in
 $\gamma \sigma \nu \epsilon \omega \nu \kappa \alpha \kappa \dot{\omega} \sigma \epsilon \omega \mathrm{s}, \mathrm{d} \rho \phi а \nu \hat{\omega} \nu \kappa \alpha \kappa \omega \bar{\sigma} \epsilon \omega \mathrm{~s} \dot{\eta}$
 forms of кג́кшәts cf. Meier and Schöm. p. 353-360 Lips.
 those who struck or reviled their parents, or even were disobedient to them; by those who refused them the means of support... or did not bury them after their death and pay them proper honours' (Dict. Ant. s. v.) ; Xen. Mem. ii 2, 13,


 $\tau \eta \sigma \dot{d} \nu \tau \omega \nu$ тoùs $\tau \dot{d} \phi o u s \mu \dot{\eta}$ коб $\mu \hat{\eta}$, кal тои̂то
 marlats. Dem. Timocr. 107, (the laws)


 Laert. i 55 (lex Solonis), $\epsilon \not \approx \nu \tau \iota s \mu \grave{\eta} \tau \rho \epsilon \phi \eta$ тoùs үoveas, äтцио є̇ $\sigma \tau \omega$. Isaeus 8 § 32 ,
 yoveas. Hyperides, pro Eux. c. 21, фаû\os
 точ́тои ка́ $\theta \eta \tau a$. .
duy $\left.{ }^{2} \mu \mathrm{loL}\right]$ Dem. 37 Pant. 46 (in a case


 those who wronged orphans. Dem. Ma-
 фар $\hat{\nu} \nu \kappa \alpha, \tau \hat{\omega} \nu \in \pi \iota \kappa \lambda \eta \dot{p} \omega \nu$. Schol, ad
 брфаушิ.







36 rà [ $\dot{\alpha} \alpha \nu \tau 0 \hat{v} \kappa \tau \bar{\eta} \mu \alpha \tau \alpha] \mathrm{K}$, decem tantum litterarum spatium relictum confessus; $\tau \dot{\alpha}$ [ $[\pi \alpha \tau \rho \hat{\varphi} a]$ Wyse ( $\mathrm{H}-\mathrm{L}), \tau[\partial \nu$ otkov] K - w , sed plures litterae flagitantur et rd fortasse legi potest; fortasse recte igitur rà [ímdjp才ovra] B. $\quad \Delta I \Delta I T h T \omega N$ :





 кal ol $\mu \dot{\varepsilon} \nu$ ßoù





émıк久ท́pov какш́бєшs] committed by the guardians of poor heiresses; or by their nearest relatives, who either declined to marry them or give them a dowry, or who kept them out of their wedded rights. Law in Dem. Macart. 54, 75. Isaeus 3 §46, oúk ây elofry $\overline{\text { e }}$ -



 pots; and $i b .47$ (cf. Meier and Schöm. p. 333 Lips.).
 the ordinary cases, but the statement is not exhaustive. Dem. 37 Pant. $45, \dot{\eta} \pi \iota-$ á $\sigma a \tau 0$ éкє $\hat{v}$

oíкou ópфаขıкovi] ' an orphan's estate,' the regular technical sense of otkos, Xen.
 and vi ${ }_{4},=\kappa \tau \hat{\eta} \sigma t s \dot{\eta} \dot{\eta} \sigma \mu \pi \alpha \sigma \alpha$. Thus, in Dem. $27 \S 15$, oikoy $\mu / \sigma \theta 0 \hat{v} \nu$ is ' to let the orphan's estate,' whereas in $\S 16$ we have olкйv oiklav in a different sense.
mapavolas] This suit might be instituted by a son (or other relative acting on his behalf), against one who had become mentally incapable of managing bis own affairs. Plat. Leg. 928 D ; Arist. Nub. 844 ff.; Xen. Mem. i 2, 49 ; Aeschin. c. Ctes. 251. Meier and Schöm. p. 566 Lips.

єis $\delta a \tau \eta \tau \omega \hat{v}$ alp $\rho \sigma \sigma t v$ ] If, in a business
held in partnership, any one or more of the partners wished to retire, and the partners could not agree, those who insisted on the winding up of the concern might bring an action for the appointment of liquidators (Harpocr. s. v. סateía $\theta a i)$. It has been conjectured that $\delta a \tau \eta \tau a l$ might be appointed even in cases not involving partnership in business, e.g. in disputes as to the division of an inheritance, and that this was the original object of the legal process (Meier and Schöm. p. 483 Lips.). This is confirmed by the context, which refers to matters of family property and the duties of guardians. Probably it was only in the case of the inheritance of a citizen that the archon eponymus was the responsible official. Daremberg and Saglio, s. v.
 a wardship.' In the absence of directions by will, the next of kin acted as $\dot{\epsilon} \pi i \tau \rho o \pi o r$ if authorised by the archon (e.g. the elder brother, Lys. c. Theonn. $\mathrm{i}_{5}$; or the uncle, Isaeus, Cleonym. § 9). Failing relatives suitable for the duty, the archon selected some one from the general body of citizens. Dict. Ant. Epitropus, $\mathbf{i} 751$ b; Meier and Schöm. p. $55^{2}$.
 tween rival claims to a wardship.' Meier and Schöm. p. 47I ff. Lips.; and Lipsius, Leipzig Verhandl. p. 50.




 $\epsilon i s]$ тò $\delta \iota \kappa a[\sigma \tau \eta \dot{\prime}] \rho \iota o \nu . \quad \mu \iota \sigma \theta o i ̂ ~ \delta e ̀ ~ \kappa a i ̀ ~ \tau o u ̀ s ~ o l k o v s ~ \tau \hat{\omega} \nu ~ o ́ \rho \phi a \nu \omega ̂ \nu ~$





 H
44 post érıк入ทŋp $\omega \nu$ lacunam indicant K -w.
дкגІД...TєIC; $\delta[a \tau \eta] \tau \grave{\eta} s \mathrm{~K} ; \delta . . . \tau \eta \mathrm{s}$


is suggested by Harpocr. s. v., $\delta$ $\delta \dot{\epsilon}$ ' $A \rho$.


 placed here by Kaibel and Wilamowitz, by Mr Kenyon (ed. 3), and by Blass. But there is something to be said in favour of placing it (with Lipsius) before
 the lacuna with words that agree with the




 $\S 14, \epsilon \xi{ }_{\epsilon}^{\epsilon} \mu \phi a \nu \hat{\nu} \nu \kappa a \tau a \sigma \tau \alpha ́ \sigma \epsilon \omega 5$. A man in possession of goods or documents, which another person either owned or had a legal right to inspect, might be required by the latter to produce them, $\dot{\epsilon} \mu \phi \omega_{\hat{\eta}}$ катабт $\hat{\sigma} \sigma a$. If he refused, he might be fined; on the other hand, the party summoned might disclaim possession of the things required or decline to admit the obligation of producing them. In either case the person demanding their production might bring an action $\epsilon l s \in \mu \phi \alpha \nu \hat{\nu}$ катáधтaбә. Meier and Schöm. p. 478 Lips.
In the present context, the phrase can only refer to procedure connected with cases of inheritance (ib. p. 59).
 Dem. 43 Macart. 16 . When a person claimed an inheritance or heiress adjudged to another, the former summoned the latter before the archon, who brought the case into court. Meier and Schom. pp. $603-617$ Lips.
 is $\dot{\epsilon} \pi \kappa \kappa \lambda \nmid \rho \omega \nu$ кal $\delta \rho \phi a \nu \omega \bar{\nu}$ кúpoos (Lysias, 26 Evand. 12). Cf. Dem. 43 § 75 (lex), $\dot{\delta}$







 § 48 ; Aesch. 1 § 158.



 $\mu \iota \sigma \theta \omega \sigma \epsilon \omega \tau \bar{\omega} \nu \pi a l \delta \omega \nu \quad \tau 0 \hat{\theta}$ Nıкiov, and 11

 $\mu \iota \sigma \theta \omega \sigma a \iota ~ \tau \partial \nu \nu$ otкov. Dem. 27 Aphob. A
 $\tau \hat{\nu} \nu \pi \rho a \gamma \mu \dot{\alpha} \tau \omega \nu \mu \iota \sigma \theta \dot{\omega} \sigma a \nu \tau \iota \tau \dot{\partial} \nu$ oikov, and $29 \$ 60$. The income was often more than 12 per cent.

The lessees had to give security (d, ${ }^{2}$ orl$\mu \eta \mu a)$ for the property leased to them. The archon sent certain persons (ámotь$\mu \eta \tau a l$ ) to value the security and determine whether it was a fair equivalent for the property leased (Harpocr. s. v. dimoti-





 offered as security a bpos was placed, with an inscr. stating the person for whose property it served as security, CIA ii II 35 ,
 $\delta_{\rho \rho ф а \nu}^{\omega} \Delta \iota o \gamma \epsilon i \tau o v o s ~ \Pi \rho \circ \beta a[\lambda \iota \sigma l o v]$. Meier and Schöm. p. $362-3$ Lips. ; Schulthess, Vormundschaft, pp. 139-173.
тєттаракаı $\delta \in \kappa$ étis] If this restoration is correct (and none better has been pro-






 misso) quondam conieci. $\quad \operatorname{EAN}(\mathrm{K}, \mathrm{K}-\mathrm{w}, \mathrm{B})$ : olằ (ex ol tàd) van Leeuwen ( $\mathrm{H}-\mathrm{L}$ ).



 Gertz (K•W, H-L, B).












posed), we here have the age at which the $\dot{\epsilon} \pi i \kappa \lambda \eta \rho o s$ ceased to be under the care of the archon. Nothing has hitherto been known on this point (Schulthess, p. 177). Isaeus ( 6 § 14) simply tells us that one Callippe would naturally have ceased to be under an $\boldsymbol{E \pi l} / \tau \rho o \pi=s$ at the

àтоть $\left.\dot{\eta}^{2} \mu a \tau a\right]$ here of lands offered as security by persons who had the estates of minors leased to them. The term is also applied to the security which a husband gives the kúpoos of his wife as a guarantee that her marriage-portion (of which he has the usufruct) will remain intact (Meier and Schöm. p. 518). [Dem.]

 Schulthess, l.c. p. 157 , and see note on $\mu \sigma \theta o \hat{\text {, }}$, above.

бítov] Pollux viii 33, $\sigma i$ itos $\delta \epsilon$ é $\sigma \tau \iota v$ al
 and Meier and Schöm. p. 525-6 Lips.
LVII. The archon basileus.
§ 1. Barinevis] The archon basileus succeeded to the religious duties of the ancient kings. Gilhert i 24 ; Meier and Schöm. p. 6i Lips.
$\mu \nu \sigma \pi n p l \omega v]$ [Lys.] 6 c. Andoc. 4, âp...



 $\mu \in \lambda$ дбєтаı $\mu \mathrm{v} \sigma \tau \eta \mathrm{plocs}$;
$\dot{\varepsilon} \pi / \mu \in \lambda \eta \tau \omega \bar{\omega}]$ sc. $\tau \hat{\omega} \nu \mu \nu \sigma \tau \eta \rho / \omega \nu . \quad$ Dem.

 decrees in honour of these $\epsilon \pi \mu \mu \mathrm{A} \boldsymbol{\eta} \mathrm{ral}$ in CIA ii 315 (= Ditt. 386, 26; B.C. $283 / 2$ or $282 / 1$ ), and 376 (before end of $\mathbf{3 r d}$ cent. B.c.). In each of these decrees the compliment is paid to the two $\dot{\epsilon} \pi \iota \mu \epsilon \lambda \eta \tau a l$ elected out of the whole body of the citizens, and not to those belonging
 ii 741 ( $=$ Ditt. 374, ${ }^{\text {ro }}$ ), в.c. $334 / 3$, [ $\left.\epsilon \gamma\right]$
 $\rho l \omega \bar{\xi} \epsilon \pi \iota \mu e \lambda \eta \tau \omega \hat{\nu}$.
 K $\not$ puке , about the age of Alexander) :


 тà $\mu \nu \sigma \tau \mathfrak{j} p l a \kappa \pi \lambda$.
 called $\Lambda \ell \mu \nu a$, S. E. of the Acropolis, about Jan. 28-3I (Dict. Ant. i 638 ). It was the festival at which Comedies were generally produced, e.g. the Acharnians, Equites, Vespae and Ranae.









 ajứv. Tク̀ $\nu$ ] $\mathrm{k}-\mathrm{w}$. Supplementum illud parum multas, hoc parum paucas, litteras habere arbitratur K , sed (nisi fallor) fere viginti litteris spatium aptum est, ut помпнќмоүсıкнсаГ $\omega$ Nт litteras undeviginti continere possit.

7 төнс। (к, в): < $\delta \iota a>+i \theta \eta \sigma L$ Richards, Gertz, K-w, H-L. 8 кal del. k-w, H-L.

 (K1). $\quad 12 \gamma \epsilon] \rho \hat{\omega}$ к е Bekk. $A n .219$ (k-w, H-L, B) : lєp $\omega \nu$ (quod etiam in ectypo videt b, coll. Bekk. An. 3ro), Richards.












$\pi о \mu \pi \dot{\eta}^{1} \kappa \tau \lambda$.] 'law of Euegoros' in Dem.
 $\tau р a \gamma \psi \delta o l$ кal ol $\kappa \omega \mu \mu \delta о$. Cf. Plat. Protag. 327 E, and Schol. Arist. Eq. 547. The mistake in the MS ( $\Lambda \eta \nu a l \omega \nu$ for $\Lambda \eta \nu a i \varphi$ ) possibly arose out of such phrases as évika $\delta i s$ émi $\Lambda \eta v a i \omega \nu$ (Schol. Aeschin. 2 § 15 ).
 катаүч $\boldsymbol{\nu \omega \sigma \sigma к о и \sigma \iota . . . т \delta ~} \gamma \nu \omega \sigma \theta \in \nu$.
$\lambda a \mu \pi d \dot{d} \delta \omega \nu$ ad $\gamma \omega \overline{v a s}]$ At the Panathenaea (Mommsen, Heortol. p. 169 f.) and Thesea (ib. 282), and the festivals of Hephaestus (ib. 311 f.), Prometheus and Pan. Plut. Sol. 1 ad fin. The expenses connected with the torch-race were bome by a quevarlap रos. In cia ii 606 we have a decree in honour of a $\gamma v \mu \nu a \sigma l a \rho \chi o s ~ r e-~$ citing the names of certain $\lambda a \mu \pi a \delta \eta \delta \rho \sigma \mu \circ$ (about 350 B.c.). Law-suits concerning the $\gamma \nu \mu \nu a \sigma t a p \chi o t$ came before the archon basileus (Dem. 35 §48).
w's "toos timetv] here modifying máoas. Cf. $49 \S 5$; and $2 \S 3$, $\dot{s} \epsilon l \pi \in \tau \mathcal{L}$, with oũdevos.
$\pi a r p l o v s$ 日volas] Pol. 1285 $\quad$ 16, al
 $\lambda \in \hat{\sigma} \sigma L \mu b \nu 0 \nu$, Plat. Politicus, $290 \mathrm{E}, \tau \hat{\psi}$ $\lambda a \chi{ }^{6} \nu \tau \iota \beta a \sigma \iota \lambda \epsilon \hat{\imath} \phi a \sigma \iota \tau \eta \bar{\eta} \dot{\delta}$ (at Athens) $\tau \dot{\alpha}$



 altous.
§ 2. ypaфal $\kappa \tau \lambda$.] Meier and Schöm. p. $6 \mathrm{I}-64$ Lips.
deeßelas] Hypereides, pro Eux. c. 21,
 $\epsilon i \sigma i \pi \rho \delta s{ }^{2} \delta \nu \beta a \sigma \iota \lambda \epsilon a$. Meier and Schöm. pp. 62, 367 Lips.
iepewoiv


$\tau \hat{\nu} \nu \boldsymbol{\gamma} \rho \rho \hat{\nu} v]$ Bekk. Anec. 219, 16 ( $\tau \hat{\omega} \nu$ $l_{\epsilon \rho \bar{\omega}}, i b .3$ Io, 6 , and Photius), quoted in Testim.). Cf. Aeschin. c. Ctes. 18, tous








14 द̀à H -I.
$15 \geqslant \tau \rho \Leftrightarrow[\sigma] \eta \mathrm{K}-\mathrm{w}$, quod fortasse legi posse recte (ut videtur)




 каі фарнакку каl пиркаїаs.







$17{ }^{*}$ Harp. $\beta o u \lambda \epsilon \dot{\sigma} \sigma \epsilon \omega s$, infra exscriptus (Frag. $418^{2}, 458^{3}$ ).

 lepoù aropas, Ant. de Chor. 34, 40, Herod.


 Macart. ro69, троєı $\pi \in \hat{L}$ that we are not justified in restricting the $\pi \rho \delta \rho \rho \eta \sigma=s$ to the next of kin, to the exclusion of the archon basileus (as urged by Philippi, Areop. p. 70).
§ 3. фóvov 8(kaı] Pol. і 300 b 24, фоу ской





 Фрєаттої ঠькабтйрьоע. Meier and Schöm. p. 376-387 Lips.

траи́цатоs] Dem. p. 1ог8, 9, траи́ $\mu a т$ бs

 93, Ctes. 51 and 212, тpaíuatos Ék
 only ' wounding with intent to kill ' that was classed with $\phi$ bvos; in the absence of proof of such intent, the case was one of unlawful wounding (alkela, $\mathbf{j}^{2} \$ 2$ ).

єк $\pi$ povalas к $\tau \lambda$.] Dem. 23 c. Aristocr.

 volas каl тиркаїas каі фардáкшу, éà тts dлоктeirn doús. Lucian, Anacharsis 19.

фарцдккш] Philippi, Areop. pp. 4I, 51. Meier and Schön. p. 382 Lips.


 essential that actual death should ensue, and that the poison should have been administered by the person charged before the Areopagus: 'etenim qui per alium curasset ut venenum daretur, eum oportuit $\beta$ ov̀є $\dot{\sigma} \sigma \omega \mathrm{c}$ accusari' (Forchhammer, de Areop., p. 30). Similarly Antiphon, Or. 1, катqүopia фармакеlas, is really a case of $\beta$ oúlevots, which would be tried by ol $\epsilon \pi l \Pi a \lambda \lambda a \delta i \varphi$.
 as to $\phi$ bvou к.т.入. : Magn. Mor. i 16 (17),





$\pi$ тиркaïās] Meier and Schöm. p. 387 Lips.
ákovat $\omega v$ к $\kappa \lambda$.] Schol. Aeschin. F. L.




ßovגєن́のєడs] 'conspiracy (against life).' Harpocr. (and Suidas) s. v.-ö́тav $\xi \xi \in \pi t-$







 de Myst. 94, Ant. de Chor. 16. Meier







 censet k. [ol $\ddagger \phi \in \tau a u \epsilon \pi l$ II.] Brooks, $\mathrm{H}-\mathrm{L}$, sed ne his quidem verbis satis spatii relictum.
 ( k -w), sed neque $\Delta$ cerni posse neque spatium litterae aptum superesse putat k .


 deducit Harp. ; $\Phi \rho \epsilon \underline{\tau}$ ồ Harp., Ar. Pol. г $300 b 29$ codex Ambrosianus, Helladius in
 Bekk. Anec. 311, 20 (K, H-L).


#### Abstract

     Phot. $\epsilon \pi i \Delta$., Hesych. (Frag. $419^{2}, 459^{3}$ ). $22 \epsilon \nu \Phi \rho \in a ́ \tau o v . ~ C f . ~ P o l l . ~ v i i i ~ i z o ~ i n f r a ~ e x s c r i p t u m . ~$


and Schöm. p. $384-6$ Lips.; Philippi, Areopag, p. 29-50; Dict. Ant. s. v.







 Paus. i 28, 8. . Philippi, Areopag, p. 23.
The Palladium and the Delphinium were probably S. E. of the Acropolis, near the Olympieum (Milchhöfer in Baumeister's Denkm. p. 179 f.).




 p. 55.

 кéval. Paus. i 28 , io, Pollux viii i19,
 $\Delta \in \lambda \phi \nu \nu \mid \psi$.





 379 f.
 the harbour of Zea). Paus. i 28, 1I, 光 $\sigma \tau t$
 Philippi, Areop. p. 48. There can be little doubt that the place derived its name from $\phi \rho^{\prime}$ ap, and was so called long before the invention of the eponymous hero $\Phi \rho^{2}$ ãos. Ulichs puts it west of the entrance to the harbour of Zea, at a point where there is a very small bay with a landing-place to the S.W.; near the latter is an oval depression, resembling a slipper-bath, hewn out of the rocky shore, with a small round pit in front of it, both of them filled by a spring of fresh water,
 Milchhöfer, with perhaps more probability, prefers assigning it to the southern extremity of the tongue of land east of Zea (Baumeister's Denkmäler, p. 1200 a).


 $\hat{\epsilon}^{\boldsymbol{\epsilon}} \tau \hat{\eta} \gamma \hat{\eta}$. Paus. i 28, 11 , ol $\pi \epsilon \phi \epsilon \nu \gamma \dot{\sigma} \epsilon \mathrm{c} . .$.



 $\left.\pi \alpha{ }^{2} \tau a\right]$ Lipsius.

24 Harp. $\notin \phi \notin \tau a l$ infra exscriptus.


 $\beta a \lambda \lambda 6 \mu \epsilon \nu 0 \nu$. Helladius in Photius, Bibl.

 бүкирау кавlс. Bekker, Anecd. 311, 17,










 Harpocr. derived his information from this treatise (Philippi, Areopag, p. 210), and this is the only passage where the term can be inserted.

The é $\phi e ́ \tau a c$ were 51 in number (law in Dem. Macart. 57); they were more than 50 years of age and were selected from noble families, $\dot{\alpha} \rho\llcorner\sigma \tau l \nu \delta \eta \nu \quad a i \rho \in \theta \in \nu \tau \epsilon s$ (Pollux viii 125). The $\epsilon \phi \epsilon$ fal and the Areopagus were probably among the primitive institutions of Attica, being certainly earlier than Solon (Plut. Sol. 19) and perhaps earlier than Dracon. According to Lange, die Epheten, the 51 $\epsilon \phi \in \tau \alpha a$ and the 9 archons formed the preSolonian Areopagus. But (as has been shewn by Mr J. W. Headlam, Class. Rev. vi 249-252) all our evidence respecting the $\epsilon \phi \epsilon \tau a l$ is derived from legal and judicial documents, and there is no proof that they ever held any constitutional position outside the law-courts. The
 in a quotation from a law of Dracon incorporated in those of Solon: $\operatorname{\epsilon \grave {\alpha }\mu \mu \eta }$ ' $\kappa$


 ras $\delta \iota a \gamma \nu \omega \nu a!$ (cf. Dem. Macart. 57 and Aristocr. 37). Solon reserved the форıкаl סixal for the Areopagus, leaving the $\bar{\varepsilon} \phi \epsilon-$ rat to preside in the four courts held in the precincts of the Palladium, Delphinium and Prytaneum, and 'in Phreatto.'

One of Solon's laws quoted in Plutarch's Solon ry, runs as follows:- $\bar{\epsilon} \pi t$ -



 Here $\dot{\epsilon} \pi l \phi \dot{\partial} \varphi \underset{\text { refers to }}{ }$ cases under the cognisance of the Areopagus, $\sigma \phi a \gamma a i \sigma \downarrow \nu$ to those under that of the $\bar{\epsilon} \phi \dot{\epsilon} \tau a$, and $\dot{\epsilon} \pi l$ тupavyl $\delta \mathrm{c}$ to those under that of the court sitting in the Prytaneum to try offences against the Constitution. This law is incorporated in the decree of Pa trocleides (Andoc. de Myst. $7^{8 \text { ) }}$ after the time of the 400 , where we find excluded from the privilege of a $\delta$ eta all the names



 $\dot{\eta} \tau v \rho a p \nu i \delta L$. (So Droysenand Lipsius. The mss, followed by Blass, have : $\hat{\eta}$ है $\pi \rho v-$


 pápyots. But $\ddot{\eta} \Delta \epsilon \lambda \phi \nu \nu$ ov must have been added by some one who confused the court for trial of Constitutional offences held in the Prytaneum, with that for trial of inanimate things held in its precincts; and, since the archon basileus presided in the Areopagus and Prytaneum, as well as in the four courts, the $\beta a \sigma \iota \lambda \epsilon \hat{s}$ cannot be contrasted with these courts as is implied by $\hat{\eta}$.) In Dem. Aristocr. 38 it is stated that, in the event of a banished manslayer being killed, the $\bar{\epsilon} \phi \epsilon \tau a l$ were to bave cognisance of the matter, $\delta \iota a \gamma เ \gamma \nu \dot{\sigma} \sigma \kappa \kappa \nu$, ,-a term not necessarily implying that they acted as judges, but not inconsistent with it.

In Isocr. c. Callim. S85 52, 54, a trial for homicide, held $\xi \pi l \Pi a \lambda \lambda a \delta(\varphi$, , is stated to have come before a tribunal of 700 di -


 Similarly in [Dem.] c. Neaeram § 10 a trial $\dot{\varepsilon} \pi i$ Ma入入a $\delta l \varphi$ came before 500 dicasts. Hence it has been inferred that the $\dot{\epsilon} \phi \dot{\epsilon}$ rat had been deprived of their jurisdiction in that court (Gilbert, i 360 n ). The first speech of Lysias is connected with a case of justifiable homicide, but there is nothing to shew whether it was delivered before $\delta$ ıкaбтal (Schömann, Scheibe, Frohberger, Blass, Philippi), or before é $\phi \epsilon \tau a!$ (Forchhammer and others) in the court of


 exscriptis．Ceterum $\sigma$ кoтaîo cum litterarum evanidarum vestigiis non congruere nunc confiteor，et hac certe in clausula Areopagitarum iudicium excludi videtur．



the $\Delta_{e \lambda \phi l \nu t o v . ~ T h e ~ t e x t ~ i m p l i e s ~ t h a t ~}^{\text {a }}$ the $\dot{\epsilon} \phi$ тal had not lost the privilege of trying such cases ；possibly they retained it only in a formal sense as a kind of presiding committee，while the actual voting was in the hands of the dicasts． This is consistent with the statement of



Sikáłouvı кт入．］To restore the missing word is a difficult task．According to Lucian，one of the courts of homicide， that of the Areopagus，held its sittings during the night：－Hermotimus 64，
 sovow，and de Domo，18，el $\tau<s . . . \frac{1}{2} \nu \cup \kappa \tau l$
 $\tau \grave{\eta} \nu$ aкрбабш．This suggests the emenda－ tion бкотаiot，proposed by me in the Academy，Feb．6，i891，and accepted in the Dutch edition；but this proposal assumes either that the writer now re－ verts to the description of the procedure before the Areopagus，or that，if（as is more probable）he refers to all the courts of homicide，this particular detail in the trials before the Areopagus was also adopted in the three courts which have just been mentioned．

Again，if we refer to the account in Pollux viii ${ }_{11}$ ，we find that the court of the Areopagus sat for three consecutive days before the last day in each month，
 $\phi \theta l \nu=y \tau o s, \tau \rho i \tau \eta$ ，$\delta \in u \tau \in \rho q$（cf．Schol． Aeschin．I § 188）．Then（after a sentence stating that the court of the Areopagus was composed of those who had been
 ка§ov．This suggests тpıraîol，which has independently occurred to Lipsius and Mr T．Nicklin：the sense would then be＇they give sentence on the third day＇；but סuxáject naturally means＇to， try a cause＇and not＇to pass a sentence，＇ $\psi \eta \phi t \xi \in \sigma \theta a l$.

Both the above suggestions are open to the objection that they do not suit the faint traces still visible in the ms．These traces point to some word beginning with
$a \lambda$ or $\epsilon \lambda$ followed by something resem． bling $\iota \eta$ preceding the termination．Such a word is $\alpha \lambda \epsilon \epsilon L \nu 0 l$（from $d \lambda \epsilon a$ ）．Hdt．ii





 $\delta \iota \kappa a ¢ \phi \mu \epsilon \nu 0 s$ ，and $\dot{\eta} \lambda$ rala either from $d \lambda_{\epsilon} d-$ $\zeta \in \sigma \theta a i(d \theta \rho o l \zeta \in \sigma \theta a \iota)$ or from то̀ $\nu \tau 6 \pi о \nu$ каì $\dot{\eta} \lambda \iota o \hat{\sigma} \sigma \theta a l$ ．This assumes that an epithet usually meaning＇lying open to the sun，warm，hot，＇can here be applied to a tribunal holding its meetings in the sunlight，as well as in the open air． If so，the three courts are contrasted in this respect with the court of the Areo－ pagus．But such an application of the epithet is quite unprecedented．

As a better alternative one might sug－ gest ì $\dot{\eta} \lambda \iota a l a,[\epsilon N H \lambda 1] a 1[\Delta] \mid$ ，which is found without the article in Arist．Eq． 897 tiv $\dot{\eta} \lambda$ cail, Posidippus ap．Athen． 59 r C $\epsilon l_{s} \dot{\eta} \lambda \_a i a \nu \dot{\eta} \lambda \theta \epsilon$ ，and Diog．Laert．i 66. If this is right，the collocation of $\dot{v} \pi a l \theta \rho t o t$ supports the view of those who connect $\dot{\eta}$ 入ıala with $\tilde{\eta}^{\prime}$ ios ：Et．Mag．s．v． 1 ：els


 $\dot{d} \theta \rho 0<\zeta 0 \mu \epsilon \nu 0 u s$, and at end of art． $2: \dot{\eta} \lambda c \dot{\alpha}-$
 $\zeta \in \omega$（Welcker，Gr．Götterlehre，i 403，and Wilamowitz，Aus Kydathen，p．90）．The term $\dot{\eta} \lambda c a l a$ is indeed suggestive of a large body of $\delta$ ckavzal，and it is so explained by the grammarians．Harp．s．z．men－ tions 1500 or 1000；and Pollux， 500 （at

入ouv，where it is contrasted with the courts for the trial of homicide．But we know of trials $\varepsilon \pi i \quad \Pi_{a \lambda \lambda a} . \delta!\varphi$ coming before 500 to 700 dicasts（p． 214 b）；and such a tribunal may well be called＇a heliastic court．＇
$\dot{\mathbf{u} \pi} \mathbf{\pi a l ( \theta p ı o l ] ~ A n t i p h o n , ~ d e ~ c a e d e ~ H e r o d i s , ~}$








 teram secundam $z$ vel $\xi$ fuisse suspicantur $\mathrm{K}-\mathrm{w}$, sed in papyro litterae neutrius apparet vestigium. dגıH vel $\in \lambda_{1 H}$ aegre discerni posse putat $G F$ Warner; post $\delta \iota \kappa$ dSovol[ $\nu]$ litterarum vestigia evanida hanc fere speciem habere testatur Kenyon:E^lli..al.I, prima praesertim littera obscure scripta. Legendum fortasse $\epsilon \boldsymbol{\nu} \dot{\eta} \lambda c a l e$ sc.



 ( $\mathrm{K}, \mathrm{K}$-W, B:) $\mu \eta \delta \in l \mathrm{l}$ H-L, sed spatii non satis est. $\quad \mathbf{3 0}$ et $\delta \hat{\eta}$ Wyse (K-W, H-L, $\mathrm{K}^{3}, \mathrm{~B}$ ). Post $\lambda a \gamma \chi \alpha \nu \epsilon i$ 'intercidit fere $\dot{\delta} \pi \rho \rho \sigma \neq \eta \kappa \omega \nu \dot{\epsilon} \pi i \pi \rho \rho \nu \tau a \nu \epsilon l \varphi$ ' K-w. $31 z \omega \omega N$. Desi-


29-31 Pollux viii 120 infra exscriptus.
ròv $\sigma T$ ¢ ${ }^{\text {davov] }}$ characteristic of the office of archon. Aeschin. I § I9, ă a тts

 $\phi b \rho o s \dot{\eta} \dot{d} \rho \chi \chi \dot{\eta}$, and Schol. ad loc., of $\gamma \dot{\alpha} \rho$
 with Hesych. s. v. $\mu \nu \rho \rho \iota \nu \omega v$, and Pollux viii 86, $\mu \nu \rho p i \nu \eta \delta^{\prime}$ é $\sigma \tau \epsilon \phi a ́ v \omega \nu \tau 0$. Hence in Photius, s.v. $\dot{\eta} \gamma \epsilon \mu$ ovia סıка $\sigma \tau \eta \mathrm{plov}$ ad fin., (of the archon $\beta a \sigma \iota \lambda \varepsilon u s)$, $\neq \chi \in \iota \quad \delta \epsilon$ $\mu b \nu o s$ кal $\sigma \tau \in \phi a \nu o \nu$ should be corrected
 26 \& 8 (of the archon), [Dem.] 58 \& 27 (of the $\theta \in \sigma \mu 0 \theta \dot{\epsilon} \tau \alpha i$ ). Hermann, Staatsalt. § $124,12$.




 áyopày ${ }^{\prime} \mu \beta \dot{\beta} \lambda \lambda \epsilon \epsilon s$. Lycurg. Leocr. 5, els



 $\phi \circ \beta \frac{i \tau}{}{ }^{\prime} \in \mu \beta a \lambda \in \omega \nu$, alsoil. 60 and $A n d r o t .77$.













 Pollux, viii 90 , says (of the $\beta a \sigma \iota \lambda \epsilon \dot{\prime}$ ), $\delta<\kappa d$. -



 These statements have hitherto been regarded as inconsistent with one another, and it has been supposed by Philippi, Areop. p. 18, that the duty of the фulo$\beta a \sigma \iota \lambda \epsilon i s$ was simply to cast the condemned object beyond the bounds of Attica. The text shews both the statements are correct and that the $\beta a \sigma i \lambda e v s$ and the $\phi v \lambda o \beta a \sigma i \lambda e i s$ jointly presided over this court.

The trial was held in the precincts of the Prytaneum. Dem. Aristocr. 76, Éd $^{2} \nu$






 In the ceremony of the $\beta$ oupbuca, the priest who slew the ox fled after flinging away the axe, ol $\delta \dot{\partial} \dot{\alpha} \tau \epsilon \tau \delta \nu \bar{d} \nu \delta \rho a$ ofs $\delta \delta \rho a \sigma \epsilon$
 $\pi \epsilon_{\lambda \in \kappa v \nu}$ (Paus. i 24, 4, cf. 28, it and vi 11, 6).

 (Kühner § $405{ }^{b} \mathrm{n} .1$ ).
The fact that animals could be tried has been hitherto unknown. But the






 ENYW

 posito. $\tau \hat{\psi}: \tau \psi$ Rutherford 'vix recte.' $\quad 5 \mathrm{M}(\epsilon \mathrm{N}) \mathrm{K}, \mathrm{H}-\mathrm{L}, \mathrm{B}: \mu 6 \nu \mathrm{\nu} \mathrm{~K}$-w. 6 FINOMENAI (adscr. OIC).






case is provided for in Plato's Lawes,





 Then follows the case of things without

LVIII. The Polemarch.
§ 1. то入́́ $\mu a p \times{ }^{\circ}$ ] Hermann, Staatsalt. § 3 38, 8-10; Gilbert, i 242.
 duties performed in early times by the Polemarch in bis military capacity. 'Ap-
 in memory of the battle of Marathon on the 6th day of Boedromion, Xen. Anab. iii 2, 12: Plut. de malign. Her. 26 ; Aelian, V. H. ii 25 (wrongly ascribed to the 6th of Thargelion) ; Schol. Aristoph. Eq. 660 (Hermann, Gottesdienst. Alt. $\$ 56$, 3 and 5; Mommsen, Heortol. p. 213).






 Heortologie, p. 281, and Daremberg and Saglio, s. v. Epitaphia, iii 727, where this commemorative festival is connected with the $\Theta \eta \sigma \in i a$ and assigned to the $7^{\text {th }}$ of Pyenepsion (end of October), cf. CIA ii


 this part of his duties the Polemarch was assisted by the $\sigma \tau \rho a \tau \eta \gamma o l$; Gilbert, Beiträge, p. 6 r .
 7 (of Achilles); and ii 10, I (of Heracles). The offerings consisted of libations of wine, oil, milk and honey. Hermann, Gottesdienst. Alt. § 16, $\mathrm{I}_{4}$; Müller's. Handbuch, v 3 p. 98.
§2. 8(каи...ifiat] Meier and Schömann, pp. 64 - 70,619 ; Lys. 23 § 2, $\pi \rho о \sigma є к а \lambda \epsilon-$


$\pi \rho \circ \xi \in v o r s]$ the addition of $\xi \in \nu \omega \nu$, after $\pi \rho \circ \xi \in \nu \omega y$, proposed by Meier in the corresponding passage of Pollux, is proved by the text to be unnecessary. $\xi \in \nu 0 c$ who were not resident in Attica, could only be concerned in $\delta l$ ккat $\dot{\alpha} \pi \dot{d} \sigma \nu \mu \beta \beta^{\prime} \lambda \omega \nu$ or
 here understand the privileged class of foreigners presented by Âthens with rights such as those of $\bar{\epsilon} \gamma \kappa \tau \eta \sigma \iota s, \dot{a} \tau \epsilon \lambda \epsilon \iota a$ and $\pi \rho o \in \delta \rho l a$.

The privilege of the Polemarch's protection is expressly granted to a $\pi \rho^{\circ} \xi \in \nu=s$

 In 13 I , we also have the grant of $\alpha \tau \dot{\lambda} \lambda \epsilon a$
 Schöm. p. 70 Lips.





 $\mu \epsilon т о і к о \iota \varsigma$ о $\pi о \lambda \epsilon ́ \mu а \rho \chi о \varsigma$.



$$
7 \mu \text { epos secl. k-w. } \quad 9 \text { тô secl. k-w; habet Harp. }
$$





















 Schol. in Aeschin. I § 16 in p. 219 a exscriptum.

тov̀s тท̀v фu入ìv Sukátovtas] i.e. the four $\delta i \kappa a \sigma \tau a l$ assigned to each tribe, who introduce private actions concerning members of that tribe. As resident aliens are not members of any tribe, the lawsuits in which they are concerned are distributed by lot among the ten groups of four $\delta \iota \kappa a \sigma \tau a l$ each. This shews that $\mu \epsilon-$ токо were in no way enrolled in any particular deme, as once suggested by Wilamowitz, Hermes, xxii 2 II . Cf. 53 § 1 .

The quotation of this passage in Pollux is unintelligible, and none of the various corrections (enumerated in Hubert de Arbitris Atticis, P. 29 f.) are satisfactory (Lipsius, Leipzig Verhandl., p. 55).
§3. dтобтaбiov kal diтpootaбiov] The former designation was applied to the case in which a $\mu$ étoukos deserted (or acted without the sanction of) the $\pi \rho o$ $\sigma \tau a ́ \tau \eta s$ under whom he had been enrolled; the latter, to that in which he had no $\pi \rho о \sigma \tau a ́ \tau \eta$. Dem. 35 Lacr. 48, a $^{2} \lambda$ ' $\delta$
 áт $\rho о \sigma т a \sigma$ lov.

On the $\delta i \kappa \eta$ aं $\boldsymbol{\pi} \sigma \sigma \tau a \sigma i o v$, see Meier and Schöm. p. 619-623 Lips.; on the $\gamma \rho a \phi \dot{\eta}$ aंтробтабіоv, ib. p. 388-391.
 [Dem.] 46 § 22, É $\pi \stackrel{\delta}{6} \kappa \kappa a \sigma l a t$ e $\tau \nu a \iota \quad \tau \hat{\omega} \nu$
 $\pi \epsilon \rho l \mu e ̀ \nu \tau \hat{\omega} \nu \pi \circ \lambda \iota \tau \hat{\omega} \nu \tau \dot{\partial} \nu a^{\prime} \rho \chi о \nu \tau a \epsilon l \sigma a ́ \gamma \epsilon \iota \nu$

 $\mu \epsilon \tau o l \kappa \omega \nu$, corrected by Meier into $\kappa \lambda \eta \eta \rho \omega \nu$
 general purport of this correction is confirmed by.the text.
LIX. The Thesmothetae.
§ I. $\theta$ єб $\mu о \boldsymbol{\theta}$ द́таl] Meier and Schöm. p. 72-81 Lips.; Gilbert, $\mathbf{i} 243$; and Dict. Ant. s. v. Archon.
 Mid. 47 (of a $\gamma \rho a \phi \eta \geqslant \geqslant \rho \rho \varepsilon \omega \mathrm{~s}$ ), oi $\delta \dot{\text { è }} \theta \varepsilon \sigma \mu \circ-$
 $\dot{\eta} \mu \varepsilon \rho \omega \mathfrak{\omega} \boldsymbol{\nu} \kappa \tau \lambda$. (Meier and Schöm., p. 906 Lips.).




 defendunt Pollux et Photius : ei $\sigma$ doou $\iota \iota$ Schol. ad Plat. Phaedr. 235 et ad Aesch. i 16 (Gomperz).
$6<\tau o \hat{v}>\boldsymbol{\nu} \delta \mu \circ \boldsymbol{\nu}$ J B Mayor (H-L).
§ 2. floayyenias] The statement of Pollux, viii 87 , that it was the $\theta \epsilon \sigma \mu 0 \theta \epsilon \tau a l$ who laid ciloay ${ }^{6}$ \iat before the popular assembly was doubted by Boeckh (Kleine Schriften, v p. 163) ; but it is now clear that the nltimate anthority for the statement was the present passage. Cf. Schol.







катахєрротоvias] they bring forward all cases of 'removal from office by the votes of the people.' In Dem. c. Mid. 6 , the noun is applied to the preliminary vote of condemnation called $\pi \rho \circ \beta o \lambda \dot{\eta}$ :
 similarly with the verb in $\$ 82,199$ and twice in $\$ 175$. In $51 \S 8$, in a speech before the $\beta$ ound, it is applied to a case of

 кal $\lambda \in \lambda o \iota \pi \epsilon \nu a \iota \tau \eta \eta^{\nu} \tau a \xi \iota \nu$. In the text the reference is to sentences passed by the $\dot{\epsilon} \kappa \kappa \lambda \eta \sigma i a$ on the occasion of an el $\sigma a \gamma \gamma \epsilon \mathrm{~N}(a$, and then referred to a court of law (Lipsius, Leipzig Verhandl. p. 48).
$\left.\pi p o \beta 0 \lambda{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{s}\right]$ c. 43 § 5. Preliminary decisions of the $\epsilon \kappa \kappa \lambda \eta \sigma / a$ directing public prosecutions to be instituted, Dem. c. Mid. \&s 9, II. Isocr. 15 \& 3r4, $\pi \rho 0 \beta$ ohàs $\epsilon \nu \tau \varphi \bar{\delta} \dot{\eta} \mu \varphi \in \pi \pi о i \eta \sigma a \nu$.
$\pi \rho \circ \beta \circ \lambda a l$ were only resorted to in case of offences against religion (Dem. c. Mid.), complaints against magistrates (Harpocr. s. ข. катахе $\rho \circ \tau o v(a)$, and against бuкофацгас ( 43 § 5). Meier and Schöm. p. 335-344 Lips. The supposition that apoßonal could only be.brought against magistrates at the $\epsilon \pi c \chi \in$ © $p o \tau o v i a, ~(S c h o ̈-~$ mann, de Comit. p. 23I f.) is founded on passages of grammarians connecting $\pi p o-$ Bonai with катахєьотоуia, and this supposed connexion may have originated in a misunderstanding of the present passage. The statement that the $\dot{\eta} \gamma \epsilon \mu \boldsymbol{\nu}$ โa $\delta<\kappa a \sigma-$ typlov belonged to the $\theta \in \sigma \mu \circ \theta \epsilon \tau a, ~ i s$ confirmed by Dem. c. Mid. 32, Tஸ̂̀ $\theta \in \sigma \mu 0 \theta \epsilon \tau \hat{\omega} \nu$ той $\tau \omega \nu$.

үpaфdis тapavó $\mu \omega v$ ] c. $29 \S 4, \mathrm{Hy}$ perides, pro Euxenippo, c. 21, 27, тарá-


 sometimes been supposed that a $\gamma \rho a \phi \grave{\eta}$ $\pi a \rho a \nu o ́ \mu \omega \nu$ conld be directed against $\psi \eta \phi l \sigma \mu a \tau a$, as well as against $\nu 6 \mu o t$, on the ground of inexpediency, as well as on that of illegality.

This opinion rests on passages such as (I) the spurious law quoted in Dem. $c$.





 and contradictory laws are confusedly blended together.) (2) Pollux viii 56 ,

 and 44 (in a $\gamma \rho a \phi \grave{\eta} \pi a \rho a \nu \delta \mu \omega \nu) \delta(\eta \lambda \lambda \epsilon \gamma \chi \in \nu$


It was urged by Madvig (Kleine Schrif$t e n, \mathrm{p} .378 \mathrm{ff}$.) that, in the case of $\nu \dot{\boldsymbol{\mu} \rho \mathrm{o} \text {, }}$ no less than in that of $\psi \eta \phi i \sigma \mu a \tau a$, the argument from inexpediency was really irrelevant, the only legitimate ground of attack in both cases being that of illegality. This opinion has, however, been contested by Schöll (Sitzungsber. d. k. b. Akad., München, i886, p. 136). Relying partly on the passage in Pollux viii $8_{7}$, which proves to be quoted from the text (see Testimonia), he contends that, under a $\gamma \rho a \phi \dot{\eta} \pi a \rho a \nu \dot{\text { - }}$ $\mu \omega \nu$, a $\psi \dot{\eta} \phi \omega \sigma a$ could only be impugned on the ground of illegality, whereas a vo $\mu$ os might be formally attacked on the ground of inexpediency, as well as on that of illegality (Dem. c. Timocr. 61, 68, 108). Cf. Gilbert, i 284 , n. I; Meier and Schöm. p. 43 I Lips. ; Dict. Ant. ii 340 a.

Lipsius, who formerly supported Madvig, now holds that the text confirms Schöll's view (Leipzig Verhanall. p. 48). But it will be observed that in the text the reference to inexpedient laws is introduced by kal, which (unless it is merely epexegetic) makes the following clause an additional item in the enumeration.



 glossa ?' K-w. 9 т $\grave{\nu} \bar{\xi} \epsilon \nu \mathrm{las}$ Meier, Att. Pro. p. 73, H-L.
















 33 бшро弓evlas $\delta$ iкخ.

This fact is in favour of a separation of legal proceedings on the ground of inexpediency from the strict procedure of the $\dot{\gamma} \rho a \phi \grave{\eta} \pi a \rho a \nu b \mu \omega \nu$. We may accordingly suppose that the $\gamma \rho a \phi \grave{\eta} \pi a \rho a \nu 6 \mu \omega \nu$ was originally intended to be directed against $\psi \eta \phi i \sigma \mu a \tau a$, as well as $\nu 6 \mu 0 \iota$, on the sole ground of illegality; and that, subsequently, fresh powers were granted for the institution of formal proceedings against $w f \mu \mathrm{oc}$ alone, on the sole ground of inexpediency. This new kind of procedure is the subject of the additional

 тритауıкخ which is mentioned together




 Cf. c. 44 .
 § 38 ; [Dem.] 49 § 25. Generals might even be called back to give account before the expiration of their office (Lys. 28 § 5). Meier and Schöm. p. 263 Lips.; Gilbert, Beiträge, pp. 26-28; Schöll, de Synegoris, pp. 12, 14 ; Wilamowitz, Aus Kydathen, p. 62 ; Hauvette-Besnault, les Strateges Ath. Pp. $5^{6-63}$.
§3. Ypaфal] Meier and Schöm. p. 437 ff. Lips.

drachm) paid to the state by the prosecutor in certain public causes. The present passage (as quoted by Harpocr. s. v.) has been the authority for the causes in which it was paid ; but the list is probably not exhaustive. The fee was not paid in an $\epsilon l \sigma a \gamma \gamma \epsilon \lambda i a$ как $\dot{\sigma} \sigma \epsilon \omega \bar{\epsilon} \pi \pi-$ $\kappa \lambda t \rho \omega \nu$ (Isae. 3 Pyrrh. 45). Meier and Schöm. pp. 799 f., $8 \mathrm{r} 3-4$ Lips.
$\xi_{\text {Evias] }}$ a prosecution for usurping the rights of citizenship. Meier and Schöm. pp. 437-442 and 95-98, Lips. ; Dict. Ant. s. $v$.

The Lex. Rhet. Cant. adds the need-
 eivat.

Sapojevias] If a person tried on the charge of $\xi \in \nu l a$ was 'acquitted by fraudulent collusion with the prosecutor or witnesses, or by any species of bribery, he was liable to be indicted afresh by a $\gamma \rho$. $\delta \omega p o \xi \varepsilon v l a s$ ' (Dict. Ant. s. $v$. ; Meier and Schöm. p. 44 I Lips.).
oukoфavtias kai $\delta \omega \dot{\rho} \omega v$ ] omitted by Harpocr. and the Lex. Rhet. Cant. in their list of causes in which $\pi a \rho d \sigma \pi a \sigma t s$ was paid. Lipsius (Att. Proc. p. 73) was led to propose the addition of these causes by Bekker's Anecd.p.310, 14, where бuкофагтias, $\delta \dot{\omega} \rho \omega \nu, \quad$ v $\beta \rho \in \omega s$ are inserted. On the $\gamma \rho$. бuкофаитlas, see Meier and Schöm. p. 413 Lips.; on the $\gamma \rho$. $\delta \omega \rho \omega \nu$, p. 444 .










 Pollux: <кa





$\psi$ wvoeyypaфض̄s] a prosecution against a public officer for making a false entry in the list of debtors to the state. Meier and Schöm. P. 415 Lips.; Dict. Ant. s. v.
$\psi \in v \delta a k \lambda \eta T \in[$ as] a prosecution for falsely appearing as witness to a summons. Meier and Schöm. p. $\cdot 414$ Lips., and Dict. Ant, s. $v$.
ßovגє́́rєшs] a prosecution instituted by one who was wrongfully inscribed as a state debtor against one who had so inscribed him. The distinction between this kind of $\gamma \rho$. $\beta o u \lambda \epsilon \dot{\sigma} \sigma \epsilon \omega$ s and the cognate $\gamma \rho . \psi \in \bar{\delta} \epsilon \gamma \gamma \rho a \phi \hat{\eta} s$ is stated as follows by Boeckh, p. 390 Lewis: 'whoever falsely declared that another had been registered was liable to the action for false registration ( $\psi \epsilon \in \bar{\delta} \boldsymbol{\gamma} \gamma \rho a \phi \hat{\eta} \mathrm{~s}$ ). If, on the other hand, a man who had been a state debtor bad paid all that was due, but his name was not erased, or, having been erased, was re-entered, the action for conspiracy applied ( $\left.\beta_{0}=u \lambda \epsilon \dot{\sigma} \sigma \epsilon \omega \mathrm{~s}\right)$.' Meier and Schöm. p. 415 Lips.; Dict. Ant. i p. 314 a.
dypadiov] a prosecution for non-registration of a name in the list of state debtors, instituted in the event of the name being improperly erased before the debt was paid. This action might be brought either against the person whose name was improperly erased, or against the officer who omitted to register the debt. If the name of a debtor had not been registered at all, he could only be proceeded against by $\begin{gathered} \\ \nu \\ \delta \epsilon \epsilon \xi \zeta s, \text { and was not }\end{gathered}$ liable to the $\dot{\alpha} \gamma \rho \alpha \phi l o v$ ypáq' (Dem. $c$.

Theocrin. 67), Meier and Schöm. p. 4479 Lips. ; and Dict. Ant. s. v.
Motxelas] Meier and Schöm. p. 402-9 Lips.; Dict. Ant. i $29 b$.
 i 210 .
 claims to citizenship were rejected at the $\delta$ au $\psi \dot{\eta} \phi \iota \sigma$ s, held by the members of the deme, might appeal to a law-court. $13 \S 5 ; 42 \S 1$; Meier and Schöm. p. 989 f . Lips.


 heard during the winter, when the sea was closed to mercantile enterprise. These, as well as the $\mu \in \tau \alpha \lambda \lambda \iota \kappa a l$ $\delta$ iкac, belonged to the class of ${ }^{*} \mu \mu \eta \nu o \iota ~ \delta i k \alpha \iota$, which were decided within a month. Meier and Sch., p. 635 Lips.; Dict. Ant. i p. $73^{\circ}$ 'a.
$\mu$ eta $\lambda \lambda ı$ ıds] mining suits, Dem. Pant. 35: Boeckh, On the Silver Mines of Laurium, § 12; Meier and Sch., p. 634 Lips.

反ovincu] It was only in the event of a ठiкך какךүoplas being brought by a freeman against a slave that the $\theta \in \sigma \mu 0 \theta \in \tau \sigma$ presided over the court. In other cases, it came before the Forty. Meier and Sch., pp. 80, 628 Lips.
 (in a decree in honour of a $\theta \epsilon \sigma \mu 0 \theta \epsilon \tau \eta \mathrm{~s}$ )
 кабт $\quad$ рiau. Meier and Sch., p. 160 Lips.

$\kappa a i ̀ \tau a ̀ s ~ \delta i ́ \kappa a s ~ \tau a ̀ s ~ a ̉ \pi o ̀ ~ \tau \omega ̂ \nu ~ \sigma \nu \mu \beta o ́ \lambda \omega \nu ~ \epsilon i \sigma a ́ \gamma o v \sigma \iota, ~ \kappa a i ̀ ~ \tau a ̀ ~ \psi ఢ \epsilon v \delta o \mu a \rho-~$







17 rà $\psi$ ．тac mutatum in taw．$\quad 18<\tau d>$ Bernardakis， $\mathrm{K}-\mathrm{w}, \mathrm{H}-\mathrm{L}, \mathrm{B}$ coll．Poll．
 Schol．Arist．Vesp． 775. 19 TTANTAC K－W ：Tajutes corr，K，H－L，B．
 Harp．infra laudatum．






＇international contracts．＇Such agree－ ments were finally ratified by a heliastic court．In［Dem．］ 7 \＆ 9 ，Philip claims that they shall－be ratified oùk émetioà $\bar{e} \nu$
 ${ }_{\nu}^{2} \mu \mathrm{os}$ кe入eúe．C．Cf．［Andoc．］in Alcib．I8． They secured to the citizens of the con－ tracting states the reciprocal right of suing and being sued；Pol． 1275 u 8，（among those who are not citizens are）ol $\tau \hat{\omega} \nu$


 decision was given in the court of the defendant＇s city，and in accordance with laws agreed upon in the $\sigma \dot{\mu} \mu \beta 0 \lambda \alpha$ ．
 These were mainly commercial suits；but while，in the ordinary $\delta t \kappa a<~ \dot{\epsilon} \mu$ жорькаl，the suit was tried in the state where the con－ tract was made，and in accordance with the laws of that state；in the $\delta$ iкаи $\alpha \pi \delta$ $\sigma \nu \mu \beta_{0}{ }^{\prime} \omega \nu$ ，it was tried in the defend－ ant＇s state and in accordance with the laws agreed upon in the $\sigma \dot{v} \mu \beta 0 \lambda a$ ．Thus， on the reduction of Chalcis in B．C． $446 / 5$ ， the inhabitants retained their own ju－ risdiction except in the case of offences punishable by disfranchisement，exile，or death．These were to be sent to Athens



In Bekker＇s Anecd．i 436 we read ：

 （so far as regards the first statement）
 but it will be observed that the text says nothing of $\dot{\boldsymbol{\pi} \pi \tilde{\eta} к о o 6 . ~ C f . ~ P o l l u x ~ v i i i ~} 63$ ，
 §оуто．Harpocr．$\sigma \dot{v} \mu \beta \mathbf{\beta} \lambda a$ ：тàs $\sigma v \nu \theta \dot{\eta} k a s$

 7à otkaza，and similarly Phot．and Etym． M．On this subject cf．Meier and Schöm． pp．994－roo6 Lips．；Goodwin in Ameri－ can Fournal of Philology，i 1880，p．1－16； Dict．Ant．ii 734－6．
rd $\psi e v \delta o \mu a p \tau u ́ p L a]$ this form has hith－ erto been found only in Plat．Theaet． 148 B ，
 of $\delta i \kappa a \iota \psi \in v \delta о \mu a \rho \tau \nu \rho \iota \hat{\omega} \nu$ in general，the management of the suit was in the hands of the same authorities as the trial at which the alleged false witness was ten－ dered ：it was only in the event of false witness before the Areopagus，that the case came under the cognisance of the $\theta \in \sigma \mu 0 \theta \dot{\epsilon} \tau a l$ ．Meier and Schöm．P． $4^{8} 5$ f．
 Meier and Sch．，p． 160 Lips．

б үрацратєіेऽ］ 55 § I； $63 \S 1$ ．
LX．The Athlothetae．
§ i．d0入o日Écas］The lists of payments from the treasures of Athena for public purposes include the following items： CLA i183（Hicks，no．53）， 7 （in the British
 415， 9 talents；$i b$. I 88 （Ditt．no．44）， 5
 тà $\mu$ eqá $\lambda a$ ，in B．c． 410,5 talents， 1000 drachmae．









 Schol．Arist．Nub．roos．
 56－58．Michaelis，Parthenon，p． 327.





 nis of Mytilene won the prize with the $\kappa \iota \theta$ dipa in в．c．456．The prizes for $\kappa$－ $\theta a p \not \psi_{0} 0$ were a crown，together with 500 ， 300,200 ，or 100 dr ．（schol．，Arist．$A v$. 11）；and for the $a v \delta \rho \epsilon s$ aù $\lambda \varphi \delta o l$ ，a crown and 100 dr ．This competition is men－ tioned in Plut．ii 1134 A，de Musica，8，


 The prize for the äv $\delta \rho \in s$ кı $\theta a \rho \iota \sigma \tau a l$ was a crown，or 200 or 100 dr ；there was also a prize for the av̉ $\eta \tau a l$ ，probably a crown （Michaelis，Parthenon，p．322）．A crown won at a $\mu$ оuбккд̀ $\mathfrak{a} \gamma \dot{\omega} \nu$ is represented in an inscr．published in＇E $\mathbf{E} \eta \mu$ ．＇A $\rho \chi$ ．1862， 219 （copied ib．p．318）．
$\boldsymbol{\gamma} \mu \nu \iota \kappa \dot{\nu} \boldsymbol{\alpha} \boldsymbol{\alpha} \boldsymbol{\gamma} \boldsymbol{\omega} \mathrm{va}]$ mentioned in docn－ ments quoted in Dem． 18 § 116 and Hip－ pocrates iii 830 Kiuhn，also in CIA ii 331，
 $\tau \hat{\varphi} \gamma \psi \mu \nu<\kappa \hat{\varphi} \dot{\alpha} \gamma \omega \bar{\omega} \nu$ ．The contests included running，wresting，boxing，and the $\pi \epsilon \nu$－
 p． 323 ）．
immodpoplav］The horse－races were beld at Echelidae（тótos＇A $\theta \dot{\eta} \nu \eta \sigma \iota ~ \sigma \tau a-$
 The race is mentioned in Xen．Symp，i 2.
 aA $\eta$ pa＿a（cf．Michaelis，pp．324－5）．

тém入ov］ 49 § 3：Schol．Arist．Av．

 Hava日qualwv．Among the mythological subjects represented on it was the battle of Athene with the Giants．Michaelis， l．c．p． 328.
 prize was a garland from the sacred olive－ trees，together with a vase filled with oil from the same．Pindar＇s ornate descrip－ tion of the prizes is well known ：Nem． x



 кi久ous（with Schol．）．Cf．Simonides in Anth．




Many of the Panathenaic vases have been found in Italy，Sicily，Greece，and at Cyrene．They have the figure of Athene on one side，and a representation of the contest for which they were awarded on the other．The earliest Panathenaic vase，now extant，known as the＂Burgon Vase＂in the British Museum（Vase Room II в 1 ），is ascribed to the 6th century в．C．， and there are 14 others in the same room；in Room iv there are ro of the 4 th century，to which the majority of such vases belong，varying in date from 368 to $3{ }^{13}$ B．C．One of those in the Museum，bearing the inscr．$\tau \hat{\omega} \nu$ ${ }^{\prime} \mathrm{A} \theta \eta \eta_{\eta} \theta_{\epsilon \nu} d \theta \lambda \omega \nu$ ，belongs to B．C．328， about the date when the text was written． Many of these vases are reproduced in colours in Monumenti delp Inst．Arch． x；and single vases in Birch＇s Ancient Pottery，p．430，Duruy，Histoire des Grecs，i 762 ，and Murray＇s Handbook of Gk．Archaeology，p．104－－A Panathenaic amphora，with a spray of olive rising out of it and with three crowns beside it， may be seen on a table in front of a gnarled olive－tree，represented in relief on the outer side of several marble stalls found at Athens（see cut in Michaelis， Parthenon，p．29）．
§ 2．Eौalov－$\mu$ орı $\omega \mathrm{v} \boldsymbol{\kappa} \tau \lambda$ ．］Arist．$N u b$ ．
 $\mu o \rho l a c s \dot{\alpha} \pi \circ \theta \rho \xi \xi \epsilon \iota$ ，and Schol．$\pi \epsilon \rho l$ aùrò̀ $\delta^{\prime}$













 $\kappa \hat{\omega} \mathrm{s}$; formam utramque defendunt tituli (Meisterhans, p. $24^{2}$ ).
 єк) тоү ктнматос ( K -W, в) : клнматос legerat $\mathrm{K}(\mathrm{H}-\mathrm{L})$. 12 точ ( $\mathrm{H}-\mathrm{L}, \mathrm{K}^{3}$, amo (correctum in 16 ГIГN (edd.).

 өnvalwy. Lucian, Anach. 9 ; Schol. Plat. Parm. 127 A; Suidas s. v. $\mu o p l a t$ (Michaelis, Parthenon, p. 322).



 $\kappa \tau \lambda$.
 being about $\frac{1}{2}$ pint.


 speech is not. earlier than B.c. 395 (Blass, Alt. Ber. $\mathrm{i}^{2}$ p. 591) : thus $\pi \rho \dot{\rho} \tau \varepsilon \rho \frac{1}{}$ here refers to a time not earlier than the archonship of Eucleides.
 addressed to the Areopagus, who (besides attending to the sacred olives every month) sent overseers ( $\gamma \nu \dot{\mu} \mu \mathrm{\mu} \boldsymbol{\nu} a \mathrm{~s}$ ) to examine them every year (§25). In § 7 the speaker states the charge on which he is being tried:

 рома.
©avár凶] The terms used in Lys. 7 § 3, $\pi \epsilon \rho l$ $\pi a \tau \rho l \delta o s ~ к a l ~ \pi \epsilon \rho l ~ \tau \hat{\eta} s$ ourlas dywyl$\sigma a \sigma \theta a l$, and § 41 , $\pi a r \rho i \delta o s-\sigma \tau \epsilon p \eta \theta \epsilon l s$, imply that the penalty at that time was (as in other cases of $\dot{\alpha} \sigma \notin \beta \epsilon \alpha a$ ) banishment with confiscation of property. This shews that, even before the time when the state, instead of selling the olives,
exacted from the tenant the delivery of a certain quantity of oil, the capital penalty had already become obsolete.

ктn̆paros] The delivery of the oil has now become a regular tax on the property, i.e. either on the $\chi$ wolov or on the store of oil manufactured by the proprietor. The alternative reading $\kappa \lambda \dot{\eta} \mu a \tau$ о draws a distinction between the 'fresh shoots' (Xen. Oec. 19, 8, тò̀ $\beta \lambda \alpha \sigma \tau \grave{\partial} \nu \tau 0 \hat{1}$ $\kappa \lambda \eta \mu a \tau o s)$, and the trunk of the tree, implying that the state insists that the oil supplied to it shall be from the former. But this proviso, even if intelligible in theory, would be difficult to insist upon in practice. Besides $\sigma \tau \ell \lambda \epsilon \chi$ os is the ordinary term applied to the tree as a whole.

 $\pi \lambda \epsilon i \nu \eta \geqslant \chi(\lambda \iota a \sigma \tau \epsilon \lambda \epsilon \chi \eta, \delta \theta \epsilon \nu \in \lambda a \iota o \nu \pi 0 \lambda \nu$
 बтє $\lambda \in \chi \in O S$.
§ 3. ' $\boldsymbol{q}^{\prime}$ ' Eavtov̂] 'in his own year of office,'
raplars] 4 § $2 ; 7$ § $3 ; 8$ § r ; and esp. 30 § 2 and 47 § I .
 could not take his place among the members of the Areopagus at the close of his year of office until he had handed over to the treasurers (of Athene) the full amount of olive-oil due for the year. For


 $\dot{\eta} \mu \dot{\varphi} \rho a, s$.



 énalov. - - -
61. $\chi \epsilon \iota \rho о т о \nu о \hat{\sigma} \iota \iota \delta_{\epsilon} \kappa a i ̀ ~ \tau a ̀ s ~ \pi \rho o ̀ s ~ \tau o ̀ \nu ~ \pi o ́ \lambda \epsilon \mu о \nu ~ a ̀ \rho \chi a ̀ \varsigma ~ a ́ \pi a ́ \sigma a \varsigma, ~$

 ( K -W), d $\dot{\rho} \boldsymbol{\gamma} v \rho \bar{a}$ каil $\chi \rho v \sigma \hat{a}$ (Rutherford). 23 'interciderunt magistratus creati in quadriennium, cf. cap. r8' K -w ; idem coniecerat Weil ; c. 43 § I et c. 6 г § I ( $\chi$ єьрот. $\delta \dot{k} \kappa a l$ ) confert $b$, qui addit tamen nihil amplius Polluci notum fuisse.
 ( $\mathrm{K} \cdot \mathrm{W}, \mathrm{H}-\mathrm{L}$ ) ; $\boldsymbol{\epsilon} \kappa \dot{\alpha} \sigma \tau \eta \mathrm{S} \boldsymbol{\tau} \hat{\eta} \mathrm{S}$ в.







 xpurla] The prizes recorded in inscriptions are crowns and sums of money varying from 100 to 500 dr . (Dittenberger, no. 395: Michaelis, Parthenon, p. 322). dipyúpla, in pl. of 'sums of money,' Arist. Av. 600.
evavoplav] This contest is mentioned in
 Mem. iii 3, 12, Athen. 565 F ; also in Harpocr. s. v. and Bekker's Anec. p. 257, г3. Cf. Thumser, de Civium Ath. Muneribus, pp. 81, 97-9. d $\sigma \pi$ i $\delta$ es] In the early part of the fourth century the prize was an ox ; CIA ii 965 (Ditt. 395,
 not know the date when the ox was superseded by the portable prize mentioned in the text. The 'shields' are not named elsewhere.
 In the above inscr. 11. 23-70 we have the record of the number of $\alpha \mu \phi o \rho \hat{\eta} s$ einaiou awarded ( I ) to the boys, and (2) to the youths, who were victorious in running, wrestling, boxing, or in the pentathlum or pancratium; and (3) to the victors in the horse-races. The part enumerating the prizes given to the men is lost.
LXI. Officials alected by open voting (Military Officers).
 $\mu 0 v$ d́pXás] 43 § 1 ad fin.
 case on the occasion when Cimon and his
colleagues were called upon to act as judges in the dramatic contest of b.c. 468 , when Sophocles gained the prize against Aeschylus: Plut. Cimon 8, describes the
 Eккабтоע. At some later date, which is not specified, the generals were chosen out of all the citizens ( $\dot{\xi} \dot{\xi} \dot{\alpha} \pi \dot{d} \nu \tau \omega \nu$ ) without distinction of tribe.

It was held by Schömann (Ant. p. 420), Boeckh (on Antig. 190, and CIG pp. 294, 906), Sauppe and others, that the generals were elected by the several tribes alone. A. Schaefer (Dem. ii 182) held that they were elected $\bar{\xi} \xi \dot{\alpha} \pi \dot{\alpha} \nu \tau \omega \nu$ (as attested by Pollux). The view that in earlier times the generals were elected кaтà $\phi u \lambda \eta \eta^{\nu}$, and afterwards $\dot{\xi} \xi \dot{\alpha} \pi \dot{\alpha} \nu \tau \omega \nu$, was held by Bergk, Lugebil, Miiller-Strïbing and others (see Gilbert, i 220, and Beiträge, $\mathrm{pp} .16-20$ ). This is proved by the text to be right.

Gilbert (Beiträge, pp. $2 \mathrm{I}-23$ ) accepts the narrative in Plutarch's Cimon, but does not admit that on that occasion the 10 generals belonged to the 10 different tribes, although this is the obvious meaning, as in the phrase in Pollux viii 94, of
 In $440 / 39$ two of the 10 generals, Pericles and Glaucon (FHG iv 645), belonged to the same tribe, Acamantis; this is our earliest evidence for a departure from the older system; possibly the change was due to a desire to elect the ablest men,





 в) : Пetpatâ h-L. MOYNYX.
such as Pericles, independently of the tribe to which they belonged. But, even after the change, nearly all the tribes were in practice represented on the board. Thus in b.c. 433/2 out of seven generals, six belonged to different tribes; in $424 / 3$, out of six whose demes are known, five; in $418 / 7$, all the six whose demes are given; in $417 / 6$, all the five; and in $357 / 6$, six out of the seven. There is no example of more than one tribe being represented by two $\sigma \tau \rho a \tau \eta \gamma o l$ in the same year (Hauvette-Besnanlt, Les Strateges Athéniens, pp. 24-29).

Sıaтáтtourt] The fact that about this time the duties of the $\sigma \tau p a \tau \eta \gamma o l$ were distributed over several members of the board was already known. The five officers charged with specific duties had already been identified, but it was not known that there were only five. The date of this change was supposed to fall between 334 and 325 . In 334 B.C. (CIA ii 804 A 63) the $\sigma \tau \rho a \tau \eta \gamma o l$ are still acting as a body in reference to the $\sigma \nu \mu \mu o p i a l$, whereas in $325 / 4$ we hear of a $\sigma \tau \rho a \tau \eta \gamma \delta \mathrm{~s}$ $\dot{\epsilon} \pi l \tau$ às $\sigma u \mu \mu o \rho l a s$. Cf. Hauvette-Besnault, Les Stratlges Ath., PP. 159 ff. (Gilbert, i 220, and Busolt in Müller's Handbuch, iv i 162 ). The latest date actually mentioned in this treatise is B.C. 329; but it does not follow that the change in question took place earlier than that date, as the treatise may have been written in any year between B.C. 329 and 325 .
ini $\pi$ ov̀s o $\pi \lambda i \tau a s]$ In Lys. $32 \S 5$ we have what at first sight appears to be a mention of this officer: $\chi \rho \delta \nu \varphi$

 and we know that Thrasyllus was elected a $\sigma \tau \rho a \tau \eta \gamma \delta$ s in the spring of 4 rI . (Thuc. viii 76 ) and held office for $410 / 9$ (ib. 104); but the words $\tau 0 \hat{\theta} \epsilon \pi l$ are omitted in two mss, Florentinus and Ambrosianus, and the construction is parallel to кaталєүєis


The decrees in the De Corona mention
 $\tau \hat{\omega} \nu \delta \pi \lambda \omega \nu$ ( $\mathrm{II}_{5}$ ) and $\dot{\delta} \epsilon \pi i \tau \hat{\omega} \nu \dot{d} \pi \lambda \iota \tau \hat{\omega}$
( I 16 ), but these are forgeries of a later date (Hauvette-Besnault, p. ェ 60 f ).
In CIa ii 302 (c. 294/3 B.C.) Philippides is described as [ $\chi \in \iota \rho \circ \tau \circ \nu \eta] \theta \in i[s \quad \sigma \tau \rho a \tau] \eta \gamma \partial s$
 33 the career of Phaedrus is described: in 296/5 he was twice elected $\sigma \tau \rho a \tau \eta \gamma \delta \mathrm{~s}$ $\dot{\epsilon} \pi l \tau \dot{\eta} \nu \pi a \rho a \sigma \kappa \epsilon \cup \dot{\eta} \nu$, and was often elected $\sigma \tau \rho$. $\dot{\epsilon} \pi l \quad \tau \grave{\eta} \nu \quad \chi \dot{\omega} \rho a \nu$ and thrice $\dot{\epsilon} \pi i$ rov̀s gevous. It was probably after 272 b.c. that he was elected $\epsilon \pi i \tau \dot{d}$ ö $\pi \lambda a$ o $\frac{\sigma}{\tau p a \tau} \eta \gamma \delta$ s and was afterwards $\chi \epsilon \rho \rho \sigma \frac{1}{} \eta \theta \epsilon \epsilon s \dot{\epsilon} \pi \dot{\imath} \tau \grave{a}$
 After the end of the fourth century this $\sigma \tau \rho a \tau \eta \gamma \dot{ }$ s was the foremost member of the board. Ultimately in the theatre of Dionysus the only stall reserved for any of the $\sigma \tau \rho a r \eta \gamma o l$ was inscribed with the
 $\dot{\epsilon} \pi i$ tous $\dot{\delta} \pi \lambda i \tau a s$ probably acted as president of the $\sigma \tau \rho a \tau \eta \gamma 0 i$ (cf. Gilbert, i 222 ).

 317). CIA ii 331 (quoted above), and 1195 (towards the end of the 3 rd cent.).
 volved placing patrols at important points in the interior and along the coast; Thuc.

 $\pi \epsilon \rho l \phi u \lambda a \kappa \eta \eta_{s} \tau \hat{\eta} s \chi \dot{\mu} \rho a s$, mention is made of $\phi$ иגакаl and фроироl. In в.c. 445 this $\phi u \lambda a \kappa \grave{\eta}$ extended as far as Euboea; CIA iv

 [Dem.] 7 § $14, \mathrm{I}_{5}$, it has expanded into a
 sense. About b.c. 265, CIA 334, we find a decree in honour of those who $\epsilon \pi \dot{\varepsilon} \delta \omega \kappa$ ки
 $\kappa \grave{\eta} y \tau \hat{\eta} s \chi \omega$ jpas. In the time of the text this duty, which had once been shared by all the $\sigma \tau \rho a \tau \eta \gamma o l$, was apparently divided
 the interior, and the two $\sigma \tau \rho a r \eta \gamma \mathrm{ol} \dot{\boldsymbol{\varepsilon} \pi i}$ $\tau \delta \nu$ Пє $\rho a \iota \epsilon^{\prime}$ a for the coast,-assuming that $\phi u \lambda a \kappa \hat{\eta} s$ is the rightreading in the passage referring to the latter.






 кฑ̂s Thucydidis in codicibus saepe confusa esse monet Wardale，Class．Rev．v 273）． $\chi \eta \lambda \hat{\eta} \mathrm{s}$ Torr（ $\mathrm{H}-\mathrm{L}, \mathrm{K}^{3}$ ）．$\quad$ K $\alpha i \rrbracket \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{W}(\mathrm{B})$ ，fortasse recte． 9 alterum aúrois secl． $\mathrm{K} \cdot \mathrm{w}^{2} . \quad 10 \pi \rho \alpha{ }^{2} \mu a \tau a$ supra scriptum delent H －L．

mentioned in the same context as the overseer of the $\nu \in \omega$ pia．Between b．c． 3 r 8 and 229 the Peiraeus and Salamis were under an officer called the $\sigma \tau \rho a \tau \eta \gamma \delta{ }_{\delta} \dot{\epsilon} \pi i$

 Hellén．vi ${ }_{5} 26$ ）．About roo в．c．we read
 1207），and the archon of B．C． $97 / 6$ is

 1206.

Gis Tìv Mouvixiav］In b．c．325／4 we find Philocles mentioned by Dinarchus，

 Munichia，cf． 19 § $2 ; 42 \S 3$.
 the officer called the $\sigma \tau \rho a \tau \eta \gamma \delta s \dot{\epsilon} \pi l \tau \grave{\eta} \nu$
 son of an official of B．c． $382 / \mathrm{r}$ ），and 1195 （B．C．24I）．The latter inscr．was found at Sunium．On＇Aктй cf． $4^{2} \$ 3$ ．

фu入aкท̂s］sc．$\tau \hat{\eta} \mathrm{s}$ र山َpas $\tau \hat{\eta} \mathrm{s} \pi$ тapa入las， the rest of the $\phi u \lambda a \kappa \dot{\eta}$ being assigned to the $\sigma \tau \rho . \bar{\epsilon} \pi l \tau \dot{\eta} \nu \chi \dot{\mu} \rho \alpha \nu$.

 єlбax $\theta \omega \bar{\omega} \iota, \tau 0 \nu \stackrel{s}{s} \theta \epsilon \sigma \mu 0 \theta \in \tau a s \pi a \rho a[\pi \lambda] \eta \rho \bar{\omega} \sigma a \iota$

 The $\sigma k \dot{\eta} \psi \in \iota s$ mentioned in this inscr．，and in c． $56 \$ 3$ ，are the pleas put forward by one who maintains that another is better able to bear the expense of a trierarchy and who therefore challenges him either to undertake it or to exchange proper－ ties．It may also refer to any plea of exemption．It is used elsewhere（CIA ii 804）of the reasons pleaded by a trierarch for being unable to restore to the state the vessel confided to his care（Hanvette－ Besnault，p．143）．For the relations of the board of $\sigma \tau \rho a \tau \eta \gamma o$ to the $\sigma u \mu \mu o p l a t$ and the $\tau \rho$ in $\rho a \rho \chi i a$ before the distribution of offices among the members of the board，cf．Dem． 39 § 8，$\tau l v a \delta^{\prime}$ ol $\sigma \tau \rho a \tau \eta \gamma o l$
 $\gamma р \alpha \phi \omega \sigma \iota \nu, \hat{\eta} \hat{a} \nu \tau \rho \iota \eta \prime \rho a \rho \chi{ }^{\circ} \nu \kappa a \theta \iota \sigma \tau \hat{\omega} \sigma \iota \nu$ ，and
 тẫtv．
divtıóofls－тoté］［Dem．］42 § 5，（on the 2nd of Metageitnion，August）$\in \pi$ rolouv ol $\sigma \tau \rho a \tau \eta \gamma o l$ тois $\tau \rho l a k o \sigma l o \iota s ~ \tau \dot{s} s \dot{\alpha} \nu \tau \iota \delta \delta \sigma \epsilon t s$. Suid．s．v．$\dot{\eta} \gamma \epsilon \mu$ орla $\delta<к а \sigma \tau \eta \rho l o v . ~$

סıaסıкабlas］t．g．［Xen．］de Rep．Ath．




 $\delta \iota a \delta \in \delta \kappa \alpha \sigma \mu \epsilon \nu \omega \overline{2}$ ．Boeckh，Seeurkunden， p．214；Meier and Schöm．pp． 467 f．In ［Dem．］ 47 § 26 （в．c．339）we read of the
 that these were the officials who elo $\hat{\eta} \gamma o v$ $\tau \partial \tau \varepsilon$（c．в．C． 344 ）$\tau$ às $\delta \iota a \delta \iota \kappa \alpha \sigma l a s s ~ \pi \epsilon \rho l \tau \hat{\nu} \nu$ $\sigma \kappa \epsilon \omega \bar{\nu}$, Cf．Meier and Schöm．p． 475.
rovs $\left.\delta^{\prime}{ }^{\prime} \lambda \lambda \lambda o v s\right]$ This shews that the above list of special posts is complete by the time when the treatise was written．

In the spurious decrees quoted in Dem． de Cor．$\S \$ 38,{ }^{115}$ an officer called $\dot{o} \dot{\epsilon} \pi i$ $\tau \hat{\eta} \mathrm{\delta} \delta a<\kappa \dot{\eta} \sigma \epsilon \omega \mathrm{s}$ is mentioned（in the former decree immediately after $\dot{\delta} \dot{\epsilon} \pi i \tau \hat{\nu} \nu \dot{o} \pi \lambda \omega \nu$ $\sigma \tau \rho a \tau \eta \gamma \delta s$, in the latter after $\tau \delta \nu \dot{\epsilon} \pi l \tau \hat{\omega} \nu$ ö $\pi \lambda \omega \nu$ ）．It was once supposed that this was the title of one of the $\sigma \tau \rho a \tau \eta \gamma \circ$ ，but it is now agreed that this was not the case（Boeckh，note 322 Fränkel；Schö－ mann，p． 42 I n．3）．Again，in cra ii 33 r Thymochares，the father of Phaedrus （who held office between b．c． 296 and

 Phaedrus is described as $\sigma \tau \rho a \tau \eta \gamma \delta \mathrm{~s} s \pi i$ $\tau \dot{\eta} \nu \pi a \rho a \sigma \kappa \varepsilon \nu \eta \dot{\eta} \nu$ and $\epsilon \pi i$ rovs $\xi \in \varphi=u s$. The $\sigma \tau \rho$ ．$\dot{\delta} \dot{\epsilon} \pi i \tau \grave{\eta} \nu \pi \alpha \rho \alpha \sigma \kappa \varepsilon \nu \eta \dot{\eta} \nu$ is mentioned in CIA ii 403－405 in connexion witb melting down the $\tau \boldsymbol{u} \pi \mathrm{mo}$ dedicated to the $\eta$ クows laтpos（2nd century b．C．）；also ib． 839 ． The decree in Pseudo－Plutarch ii p． 852 describes Lycurgus as $\chi \in \varphi \rho o \pi o \nu \eta \theta \in l s \in \pi l$
 not prove that he was a $\sigma \tau p a \tau \eta \gamma{ }^{b}$ ；and， in any case，these last titles belong to a later date than the text．



















 $\alpha_{p} \chi \epsilon \omega \nu$ ．This procedure must have been instituted with special reference to military officials；hence the fulness with which it is treated here in comparison with 43 § 4 （Lipsius，Leipzig Verhandl．p．49）．
$\tau \iota \omega \bar{\omega} \tau v]$ It was a $\delta i \kappa \eta \tau \iota \mu \eta \tau \sigma s$（Meier and Schöm．p．${ }^{21} 3 \mathrm{f}$, Lips．）．
$\delta \hat{\eta} \sigma a l]$ During the Sicilian expedition Lamachus put to death a soldier who was caught signalling to the enemy，Lys． 13 $\S 67$ ；and Iphicrates at Corinth transfixed with his spear a sentinel whom he found asleep at his post（Frontinus iii 12，2）． In Dem． 50 § 51 even a trierarch fears he may be put into bonds by a $\sigma \tau \rho a \tau \eta \gamma \sigma_{s}$ ：



 late for the battle of Corinth and the march to Coroneia，had a scuffle with the taxiarch and struck him，кal $\pi a \nu \sigma \tau \rho a \tau \hat{\alpha}$


 This implies that the offender was ex－ pelled from the army，after being publicly proclaimed unworthy to serve as a soldier． Lys． 3 § 45 ．



 $\epsilon \pi \iota \beta \alpha \lambda \lambda \epsilon \iota \nu \quad \delta \hat{\varepsilon} \tau \hat{\psi} \quad \phi \nu \lambda \alpha \rho \chi \varphi$, 名 $\tau \iota \quad \hat{\xi} \xi-$




§ 3．Taktaipxous］commanders of the 10 $\tau \dot{a} \xi \in t s$ of hoplites corresponding to the $10 \phi u \lambda a l$ ．They were instituted after 490 в．C．Dem． 4 § 26，оย์к єौХєрото⿱ยєิтє

 $\delta v_{0}$ ；each of the taxiarchs commanded the hoplites of a single tribe，Dem． 39


 rule the taxiarch was a member of the tribe which he commanded，Thuc．viii 92 ：

 i 225 ）．

入oxayoús］Isocr． 15 § 117 ，Isaeus 9 § 14．The text shews that they were appointed by the raglapxol，and not，as has been supposed（Gilbert i 225），by the $\sigma \tau \rho a \tau \eta \gamma o l$ ．
§4．immápXovs］Their importance is





8ivo］Dem． 4 § 26 supra，cIA ii 445,15 ．
 $\kappa u ́ \rho \iota o \iota ~ \delta \grave{~} \tau \hat{\omega} \nu$ aủ $\tau \hat{\omega} \nu \epsilon i \sigma i \nu, \omega \hat{\omega} \nu \pi \epsilon \rho$ oi $\sigma \tau \rho a \tau \eta \gamma o i ̀ \kappa a \tau \grave{\alpha} \tau \hat{\omega} \nu \dot{o} \pi \lambda \iota[\tau \hat{\omega} \nu$ ．





 ［ $\tau 0 \hat{u}$＂ A$] \mu \mu \omega \nu o s$.

 фu入apxous add．$\delta \dot{\epsilon} \kappa \alpha$ Richards， $\mathrm{k}-\mathrm{w}, \mathrm{H}-\mathrm{L}$, в；post $\delta \dot{\epsilon} \kappa a l$ excidisse antea putabam． $24 \tau \hat{\omega} \nu i \pi \pi \epsilon \omega \nu$ Pollucem secutus add． K （ $\mathrm{K}-\mathrm{w}, \mathrm{H}-\mathrm{L}, \mathrm{B}$ ）．


 （Frag． $39^{2}{ }^{2}, 432^{3}$ ）．



 रốvтas，ä入入ous $\eta^{\pi} \tau \rho \iota \eta \rho a \rho \rho$ ous（cf．Frag． $402^{2}, 442^{3}$ ）．



 s．v．＇A $\mu \mu \omega \nu i s$ ，Lex．Dem．Patm．p． 150 （Frag． $403^{2}, 443^{3}$ ）．

тds фu入às $\pi$ tévte éknítepos］Xen． Hipparch． 3 § 11，öтav oi li $\pi \pi a \rho \chi o \iota \dot{\eta} \gamma \omega \bar{\nu} \tau a \iota$ тaîs $\pi$ èv
кúpıot］The disciplinary powers of the ir $\pi$ apxoc are illustrated by Hesych．s．z．

 $\pi а р є \sigma \eta \mu \epsilon เ \frac{\partial \nu}{\tau \tau}$ ．
§ 5．фu入apXovs］In CIA ii 444,445 the $\phi \hat{\lambda}$ apxor belong to the tribes which they command．
§6．єis $\Lambda \hat{\eta} \mu v o v$［ттrapXov］This officer was in command of a corps of Athenian cavalry stationed in Lemnos．That island had long been in the possession of Athens and was held by Athenian $\kappa \lambda \eta$－ poîxo．Athens had recovered possession of Lemnos，Imbros and Scyros before b．c． 387 and her right was recognised in that year by the＇peace of Antalcidas＇． Hyperides，pro Lycophrone，c．14，文 $\mu \in \hat{i}$











 $\chi$ ］ồvтos év $\Lambda \eta \not \mu \mu \varphi$ ．CIA ii 593 （a decree passed by the к $\lambda \eta \rho o 0 \chi o l$ at Myrina after the third Macedonian war），$\epsilon \pi i \delta \dot{\delta} \Lambda \hat{\eta} \mu \nu \nu_{0}$

 ＇A $\mu \nu \nu$ lov＇Eка入 $\hat{\eta} \theta \epsilon \nu$ ．Cf．Gilbert， $\mathbf{i}_{424-5 ; ~}^{\text {；}}$ Hauvette－Besnault，pp．169， 170 ．
§7．тaplav тins Пapaiov］In Dem． Mid．§ 173，Midias is described as saying：
 Demosthenes adds ：$\tau \hat{\eta} s \mu \dot{\epsilon} \nu$ mapádov $\tau \alpha-$
 tá̀adta．§174，Midiasallowed the Paralus to be outstripped in speed by one of the ordinary triremes，oü $\tau \omega \mathrm{s}$ єut $\tau \grave{\eta} v$ i $\in \rho \dot{d} \nu$
 is mentioned in CIA ii 804 в 66 （b．c． $334 / 3$ ），and probably also in 808 a 79 （в．C．326／5）．The tapias provided for the sacred trireme at the cost of the state all that，in the case of ordinary vessels，



was provided by the trierarch himself． The ship was entirely manned by Athenians（Thuc．viii 73，5）who were paid 4 obols a day（Harpocr．s．v．）．Cf． Boeckh， 305 ff．Fränkel．The Paralos and Salaminia are mentioned in Arist．Av． 1207 and Thuc．iii 33， 2 ：the Salaminia was sent in pursuit of Alcibiades in vi 53 ， I and $6 \mathrm{r}, 4$（cf．Arist．Av．147）．A state－ ment in Photius（s．v．тápa入oc），$\lambda \epsilon \boldsymbol{\epsilon} \epsilon \tau a l ~ \delta \dot{\epsilon}$ $\dot{\eta} a \dot{\jmath} \tau \dot{\eta} \kappa a l \Sigma a \lambda a \mu \nu l a$ ，led Boeckh to accuse Photius of confounding the two triremes with one another，which is inconsistent with the same lexicographer＇s article on mápàos．Mr Marindin，in Dict．Ant．ii 827．a，understands $\eta^{\eta}$ aú $\frac{1}{\eta}$ as meaning＇of a similar character＇；but I should prefer attributing the mistake to a careless cita－ tion from the Schol．on Av．1204，where we are told that，if，instead of Mápaios $\hat{\eta}$ $\Sigma a \lambda a \mu \nu l a$ ，we read $\Pi$ ápa入os $\dot{\eta}$ इà $a \mu \nu l a$ ：


1．28．Tov̂＂A $\mu \mu \omega \operatorname{vos}]$ It follows from the passages quoted in the Testimonia that the state－trireme，formerly called the Ea入amvia，was superseded by one named after Zeiss＂A $A \mu \omega \nu$ and known as the ＇A $\mu \mu \omega \nu$ is（Harpocr．）or＇ $\mathrm{A} \mu \mu \omega \nu \mathrm{d} \mathrm{d}^{\prime}$（Lex． Rhet．Cant．）．It was specially intended to convey $\theta$ ewplal to the coast of Cyrene， on their way to the shrine of Zevs＂ $\mathrm{A} \mu \mu \omega \nu$ ． Cimon sent from Cyprus to consult the oracle shortly before his death（Plut．Cim． 18）；in the Aves， 716 and 618，Ammon is mentioned by the side of Delphi and－ Dodona；and it is therefore possible that $\theta \in \omega$ plac may have been sent there as early as 415 B．c．In［Plat．］Alc．ii 148 E，the Athenians consult the oracle on the ques－ tion why they were constantly being beaten by the Lacedaemonians．We have a record of a sacrifice to ${ }^{*} \mathrm{~A} \mu \mu \omega \nu$ on the part of the $\sigma \tau \rho a \tau \eta \gamma 0 \mathrm{l}$ in B．C． 333 （CIA ii 741，32）；Boeckh ii i 18－121 Fränkel． Thus it seems probable that the oracle was originally consulted by Athens in connexion with military undertakings， and this custom may account，not only for the sacrifice offered by the $\sigma \tau \rho a \tau \eta \gamma o l$ ，but also for the connexion in which the vessel is mentioned in this chapter，at the close of a description of the military officers of Athens．－Hesych．s．v．＇$А \mu \mu \dot{\omega} \nu(' A \mu \mu \dot{\omega}-$
 would benatural that the general interest in
the oracle should be increased by the visit paid by Alexander the Great in b．c． 331 ． The sacred trireme＇$A \mu \mu \omega \nu$ ls was men－ tioned by Dinarchus in his speech against Himeraeus（Harpocr．s．v．＇A $\mu \mu \omega \nu(s)$ ， which may be assigned to B．C． $\mathbf{3 2 4}^{2}$（Rose， Ar．Pseud．p．397）．

It has been suggested（by Rose，l．c．） that the name of the sacred trireme Salaminia was changed in consequence of the revolt of Salamis in b．c． 318 （Paus．i 35，2；Polyaen．iv 11，I；Diod．18，69； CIG i P． 418 ），but the text shews that the ＇A $\mu \mu \omega \nu$ is superseded it at an earlier date．

The name Salaminia was in itself not uncommon．Thus，in B．C．357／6 there were two ships bearing the name Sala－ minia（one belonging to the second class， CIA ii 793 ${ }^{b} 33$ ；the other，one of the
 Salaminia foundered at sea shortly before B．C． $325 / 4$（CIA ii $809 d 29$ and 811,89 ）； and a $\tau \in \tau \rho i p \eta s$ of the same name occurs in an inscr．of b．C． $323 / 2$ or shortly after： CIA ii 812 a 123 ．In the same inscr．， $a 25$ and 42 ，there are two triremes named Mapa入la（not Mápa入os）．All these，how－ ever，are warships．Not one of the sacred triremes is mentioned in the naval archives of Athens．Cf．Boeckh II xvi，vol．I p． 306 － 7 ，and note 448 Fränkel．

LXII．Salaries．
§ 1．ai $\mu \hat{v} \nu \mu \in \tau^{\prime}$ èvvéa dipXóvtwv］It is not known what offices are meant：Mr Kenyon suggests that the phrase in－ cluded＇all the various boards of ten．＇A similar phrase occurs in the öpкos $\dot{\eta} \lambda c a \sigma \tau \omega \nu$


 $\tau \hat{\eta}$（ $\tau \hat{\eta}$ aürй ？）$\dot{\eta} \mu \notin \rho a$, каі кरйрикоs каl $\pi \rho \epsilon \sigma-$ Belas кal $\sigma \nu \nu$ हб $\rho \omega \nu$ ．
 offices assigned by lot in the Theseum＇ （c． 15 § 4）．In Aeschines，c．Ctes．§ 13 （в．c． $33^{6-330}$ ），the offices to which the people elect（ $\chi$ є甲 $\rho 0$ тov $\epsilon$ ），such as those of the $\sigma \tau \rho a \tau \eta \gamma 0 \mathrm{l}$ and l $^{2} \pi a \rho \chi o$ ，are con－ trasted with those as of $\theta \in \sigma \mu .0 \in \tau a l$ a $\boldsymbol{\alpha} \pi 0-$
 inferred from this that the Theseum was the only place in which the allotment was held；whereas the text implies that the archons were appointed elsewhere．The place is not known．











 K, K-w, B, coll. v. ц.

Sınpoûvтo]'used to be distributed over ${ }^{2}$ the demes.
$\pi \lambda \grave{j} \nu$ ßovievtêv] This shews that the preliminary appointment of members of the Council was made by the demes. The fact that the demes lost the preliminary appointment to certain offices, owing to their being corrupt, makes us understand how it was possible for Aeschines to taunt Demosthenes with baving secured his appointment as $\beta$ ov$\lambda_{\varepsilon u \tau \grave{\eta} s}$ by bribery and intrigue, Aesch. in Ctes. 62, ойтє $\lambda a \chi \dot{\omega} \nu$. oüтє $\epsilon \pi i \lambda a \chi \dot{\omega} \nu$ a $\alpha \lambda \lambda^{\prime}$
 $\epsilon \kappa \pi a \rho a \sigma \kappa \epsilon \cup \hat{\text { fेs. }}$
The lists of Prytanies for the fourth century (CIA ii 864-874) prove that the number of members of the Council belonging to each deme varies with the size of the deme, and that the number appointed from the same deme is constant. It was inferred from this that a certain number were appointed from each deme, and not from the whole tribe indiscrimimately (Köhler in Mittheil. iv 97; HauvetteBesnault in Buill. Corr. Hell. v 3 6r ; Headlam, On the Lot, pp. 55, 56). This inference is confirmed by the text. Probably each deme nominated twice the requisite number; half of these were appointed by lot, and the rest held in reserve to take their places if necessary (Headlam, P. 188). Even in the case of offices filled by lot something of the nature of candidature is implied by Lys. 3 § 33 (of one who had drawn the lot to

 Ėvėa $\alpha \rho \chi \chi^{\delta} \nu \tau \omega \nu$ (cf. $20 \S 13$ ), and Isocr.

фpoupêv] possibly the 500 ppovpol
$\nu \epsilon \omega \rho i \omega \nu$, mentioned with the $500 \beta 0 u \lambda \epsilon u \tau \alpha, l$ in 24 § 3 .
§ 2. $\delta \rho a x \mu \eta v]$ At the end of $c .41$ the highest sum named as the $\mu \sigma \theta \theta \delta$ é $\epsilon \kappa \kappa \lambda \eta$ $\sigma$ oa. $\sigma \tau \iota \kappa$ ss was 3 obols. The text implies that this sum had been doubled. In Arist. Vesp. 691 and Schol. a drachma is the sum paid at that time to the ouviropor, but there is no probability that that is the fee here meant.

т $\rho \in \mathfrak{i c} \mathrm{s}$ ä $\beta$ o入oús] In 27 § 3 the institution of the $\mu \omega \sigma \dot{\circ}$ o $\delta \iota \kappa \alpha \sigma \tau \iota \kappa \dot{d} s$ by Pericles is mentioned ; but the amount is not named. It was raised to three obols by Cleon. (Schol. Arist. Vesp. 88, 300 ; Gilbert i 325-6.)

тє́vтє $\boldsymbol{\beta} \beta$ oloús] one obol more is the amount named in Hesych. s. v. $\beta$ oviĥs

 bably confounded the five obols paid to the ordinary $\beta$ oudeut $\dot{\eta} s$ with the six paid to the $\pi \rho u \tau \dot{\alpha} \nu \in \epsilon s$. Thuc. viii 69 mentions the $\mu \tau \sigma \theta \delta s$ without naming the amount.
apXovies $\kappa \tau \lambda$.] This shews that the archons, amongst others, actually received something of the nature of a stipend. It was supposed by Schömann (Ant. p. 402) that the 'executive functionaries ' (a, $\rho \times 0 \nu \tau \varepsilon s)$ as well as the 'commissioners ' (é $\pi \mu \mu \lambda \eta \tau a l)$, as contrasted with the 'subordinates' (uா $\boldsymbol{\eta} \rho \in \tau a l$ ), 'served without pay.' Boeckh, II xvi p. 304 Fränkel, more cautiously describes this as the 'original ' distinction between an $a \rho \chi \grave{\eta}$ and a $\dot{\text { in }} \boldsymbol{\eta} \rho \in \sigma$ la. c. 24 § 3 mentions the 700 d $\rho \chi$ al $\frac{\epsilon}{\epsilon} \delta \nabla \eta \mu o t$ as in receipt of pay; and in c. $29 \S 5$ the board of Thirty appointed in B.C. 4 II propose $\tau \dot{d} \mathrm{~s} \dot{a} \rho \chi$ às







 єis $\sigma i \tau \eta \sigma \iota \nu$ àpyúpıov.


 $\beta$ ávoval> add. $\mathrm{K}(\mathrm{K}-\mathrm{w}, \mathrm{H}-\mathrm{L})$ : nihil addit B .

 (as observed by Mr Kenyon) that 'the magistrates named, and others who are not named, received pay.' [Xen.] de Rep. Ath. I, 3, says that the $\delta \hat{\eta} \mu$ os is not eager for offices like those of $\sigma \tau \rho a \tau \eta \gamma$ ós or $\ell \pi \pi \pi a \rho \chi$ os,

 $\delta \hat{\eta} \mu \mathrm{os}{ }^{d} \rho \chi \epsilon \iota \nu$.
 $\alpha \quad \alpha \quad \rho \chi o \nu \tau t$ and the $\alpha \dot{u} \lambda \lambda_{\eta T} \dot{\eta} s$ are mentioned in CIA iii 1005 and 1007 (Gilbert i 157 n. 4).
äрхшv els इa入apiva] 54 § 8.
 principal day of the greater Panathenaea ( $54 \S 7 ; 60 \S$ I) was the third from the end of Hecatombaeon. Probably the lesser Panathenaea were also held in the same month : in Dem. c. Tiwocr. 28, the Panathenaea (of Ol. 106, 4, B.c. 353) are at hand on Hecatombaeon irth. In the text the greater Panathenaea alone appear to be meant.
 Commissioners of the funds of the Delian temple, called d $\mu \phi \quad \kappa \tau$ voves because in theory they were the deputies of the
 iii 104). The 'Sandwich marble,' now in the library of Trinity College, Cambridge, records their accounts from s.c.
 фiктúoves 'AOppaluv. Each Amphictyon administered the temple for one year, beginning with Hecatombaeon, the first month in the Attic civil year (Hicks, $G k$. Hist. Inscr. p. 142-148; CIA ii 8i4).
is $\Delta \dot{\eta} \lambda o v$, from the funds of the Delian temple.

Zápov] Athenian $\kappa \lambda \eta p o i ̂ \chi o t$ were settled in Samos after its conquest by Timotheus in b.c. 365 . к $\lambda \eta$ poîxot were also
sent in 361 and again in $35^{2}$ (Aeschin. I $\S 53$; A. Schaefer, Dem. i $^{2}$ p. 99 n, P. 474 n).

After the autumn of $\mathbf{3 2 2}$ the Athenians were no longer in a position to send d $\rho \chi$ al to Samos; at that date the island ceased to be under their control, and the Samians banished by Athens were restored by Perdiccas, Diod. xviii 18 (F. Cauer in Berl. Phil. Woch. 9 April, 1892, p. 458).
 $\mu a \tau \epsilon \dot{s} \tau \boldsymbol{\tau} \hat{\hat{0}} \delta \dot{\eta} \mu \circ 0$ for each of these islands is mentioned in inscriptions published in Bull. Cor. Hell. 1879 p. 63, CIA ii $59^{2}$ : and Conze's Reise, p. 88, respectively;
 Corr. Hell. l. c.). Cf. Gilbert, 1424.
 Thus Pericles was general for 15 years, and Phocion 45 times (Plut. Per. I5, Phoc. 8).-In Pol. 1371 I $b$ 24, (it is character-

 т $̂ \nu$ кат̀̀ $\pi \delta \lambda \epsilon \mu о \nu$. Dem. Prooem. p.







 äp $\rho \in \epsilon \nu$ ย̀vlas (a $\rho \chi$ das).

The effect of the rule forbidding more than one reappointment to the Council was to give every Athenian citizen at some period of his life a seat in that body. At the time when the number of citizens was at its highest (about 30,000 in 460 B.c.), it is probable that the number who reached the age of 30 in each year, and thus became qualified for the Council, was rather less than 1,000 (Headlam, On the



 ewteises
LXIII 1 Tad( $\epsilon)$ Ta corr. K. $\quad \pi \lambda \eta \rho o \hat{\sigma} \iota \nu$ Dareste. $2<\tau o u ̀ s>\tau \hat{g} s$ H-L,


Testimonia. LXiti Schol. ad Arist. Vesp. 775 (v. Testim. c. 59 ult.). Schol. ad










Lot, p. 50 n ). Each of these might be a member of the 500 twice in his life, but not oftener. In the few cases in which the names of the $\beta$ ouneural from the same deme are preserved for more than one year, only one case of reappointment is to be found, viz. Atovíctos'H $\phi$ aıбтicuos of the deme $\Phi \iota \lambda a \hat{\delta} \delta a \iota$, (in the middle of the fourth century) CIA ii 870,3 , and (in B.c. 341) $872,17$.

Boeckh, ii 515 Fränkel, states his conviction that no one could be a member of the $\beta$ oud $\dot{\eta}$ for two consecutive years : the text proves that it was possible.

As regards other offices, we know the names of a large number of $\tau a \mu i a,, \dot{\varepsilon} \lambda \lambda \eta$ poraulat and $\dot{\epsilon} \pi \mu \varepsilon \lambda \eta \tau a i$; but we never find one man holding the same office twice (Headlam, p. 91).
LXIII to the end. The Law-Courts.
On the Athenian procedure for the distribution of the סıкaбтal over the several' $\delta \iota \kappa a \sigma \tau \hat{p} \rho \iota a$, see Schömann, De Sortitione Iudicum apud Athenienses, Opusc. Acad. i 200-229; Schömann, Ant. p. 475 E. T.; Att. Process, pp. ${ }^{4} 6$-162 Lips.; Fränkel, Att. Geschwoorenengerichte, 1877, pp. 92 ff. ; Gilbert, i 374-7; Busolt in Müller's Handbuch, iv i180; and Caillemer in Daremberg and Saglio's Dict. iii 19 r.
§ I. Sıкабтท'pla к $\lambda \eta \rho \circ \hat{\sigma} \sigma เ v]$ Pollux, viii $8_{7}$, mentions as one of the duties of the archons, $\kappa \lambda \eta \rho o \hat{v} \nu \delta \iota \kappa a \sigma \tau$ ás. A distinction must, however, be drawn between $\kappa \lambda \eta \rho o \hat{v} \nu$ $\delta<\kappa a \sigma \tau \alpha \dot{s}$, which refers to the original assignment of dicasts to a heliastic division by means of the $\operatorname{lot}(\mathrm{c} .59 \S 7$ ), and $\kappa \lambda \eta \rho \circ \hat{v} \nu$ $\delta_{i k a \sigma \tau t p t a, ~ w h i c h ~ r e f e r s ~ t o ~ t h e ~ a l l o t m e n t ~}^{\text {t }}$ of the several law-courts to the dicasts so
appointed (ib. §5). [Dem.] $47 \$_{17}, \kappa \lambda \eta$ -

 фudas is not meant to imply that each סькaгтйpıo was allotted to a different tribe, but that representatives of all the tribes sat in each $\delta<\kappa a \sigma \tau \eta p / o \nu$ : Hitherto it has generally been supposed that the daily allotment was not 'by tribes,' but by heliastic divisions or 'sections' (Schömann, Ant. p. 475).
§ 2. cloodor $\kappa \tau \lambda$.] the separate entrances for the members of the several tribes would not only facilitate entrance and exit, but also make it easier to detect personation. It may perhaps be inferred that the members of each tribe sat together in the court.

It seems premature, however, to mention the entrances to the law-courts at this stage of the description; it may
 been written by mistake for $\kappa \lambda \eta \rho \omega \tau \dot{\prime} \hat{\eta} \iota a$. The ei $\sigma$ odos in 1.7 is clearly the entrance into the pair of $\kappa \lambda \eta \rho \omega \tau \eta \eta_{p} a$ assigned to each tribe.
 holding lots' (urnes à lots, Reinach); or (2) 'rooms in which the dicasts have their several courts allotted to them' (so Kaibel and Kiessling, Poland, and Haussoullier). Mr Kenyon gives in the text of his translation 'twenty vessels for holding votes,' adding in the note the alternative rendering, 'rooms in which the jurors are elected.'
( I ) is the preferable sense in Arist.












 del. K ( $\mathrm{K}-\mathrm{w}, \mathrm{H}-\mathrm{L}, \mathrm{B}$ ). EAN.
ãaquas (where the Schol. absurdly explains $\kappa \lambda \eta \rho \omega \tau \eta \dot{\eta} \iota \alpha$ as $\tau \dot{d} s \kappa \lambda \eta \rho \omega \tau \grave{d} \mathbf{d} \alpha \rho \chi a ́ s)$. $\kappa \lambda \eta \rho \omega \tau \rho l s$ means an urn for holding votes in Schol. Arist. Vesp. 674, $\kappa \lambda \eta \rho \omega \tau \rho l \delta \iota \tau \omega \bar{\omega}$ $\psi \dot{\eta} \phi \omega \nu$, and 752, тov̂ к $\dot{\eta} \varphi \cup \kappa$ os $\tau \grave{\eta} \nu \kappa \lambda \eta \rho \omega$ -
 Both senses are recognised in Pollux x


 єуариббєєєv. The sense is uncertain in Eubulus ap: Athen. 640 B, к $\lambda \eta \tau \hat{\eta} \rho \epsilon s . . \mu \dot{\mu} \rho$ -
 $\mu 06$, ypaфal, and in CIA ii 44 r , [áva] ${ }^{\alpha} \rho \dot{\alpha} \psi \alpha$
 [ 1 - - ] 10 v .
(2) is supported by Plut. ii $793 \mathrm{D}, \pi \rho \in \sigma$ -


 кal $\sigma v \nu \in \delta \rho l o v ~ \pi о \lambda \nu \pi \rho a \gamma \mu \sigma \sigma \dot{v} \eta$, Pollux ix
 and Bekk. Anecd. p. 47, к $\lambda \eta \rho \omega \tau \dot{\eta} \rho \iota \alpha:$
 has this meaning in col. 31. 1. 18, $\delta \dot{d} \rho \chi \omega \bar{y}$ $\tau \grave{\eta} \nu \phi \nu \lambda \dot{\eta} \nu \quad \kappa \alpha\left[\lambda \epsilon \hat{\epsilon} \epsilon l_{s} \tau \dot{\delta} \kappa\right] \lambda \eta \rho \omega \tau \dot{\eta} \rho \iota o \nu$, and it therefore seems best to understand it in the same sense in the present passage. It is not obvious why each tribe requires two $\kappa \lambda \eta \rho \omega \tau \eta \dot{p} t a$, unless we are to suppose that one of them was merely an antechamber serving as a waiting-room for the other.

кь $\beta$ ढ́tгa] 'small boxes,' Arist. Plut. 7 rr . The number of the first set of kL $\beta \dot{\cos } \boldsymbol{a}$ is 100, yo for each tribe, because the dicasts in each tribe are distributed over all the ten divisions into which all the dicasts are divided. In each tribe, all the tickets ( $\pi \iota \nu \alpha \kappa \kappa \alpha$ ) bearing the names of the dicasts in division $A$ are placed in the first $\kappa \iota \beta \dot{\omega} \tau \iota o \nu$, those of division B in the second, and so on for all the ten divisions. According to the number of
dicasts required, an equal number of tickets is drawn by lot from each of the 100 кц $\beta \dot{\prime}$ ть. Each ticket so drawn has a court assigned it by lot; and the tickets are now placed in the second set of 10 $\kappa \iota \beta \omega \tau \iota a$, all tickets of dicasts assigned to any given court being placed in the $\kappa \iota \beta \dot{\omega}$ toov which bears the letter corresponding to that court. The names of all the dicasts who are selected to serve are thus distributed over the several courts that are to sit on the day in question. The process is described in detail in col. 3 r .
$\pi$ เıákเa] see note on § 4 .
ßaктทplar] 'bâtons' serving the dicasts as badges of office. The $\beta$ aкт $\eta$ pla was marked with the same letter and colour as the court assigned to the dicast, who gave it up on entering the court when he received a $\sigma \dot{v} \mu \beta \beta_{0} \lambda_{0 \nu}$ (or 'token') instead. This $\sigma \dot{v} \mu \beta o \lambda o \nu$ enabled him to claim the $\tau \rho \iota \dot{\beta} \beta \boldsymbol{\lambda} \boldsymbol{\nu}$. See infra col. 32 1. 3-15, and cf. Dem. de Cor: 210, ( $\delta \epsilon \bar{\epsilon}) \pi \alpha \rho \alpha \lambda a \mu \beta \dot{\alpha}-$


 p. 185, ßактทріа каl $\sigma \cup \mu \beta о \lambda о \nu: ~ \dot{\rho} \alpha \beta \delta o \nu$


 $\sigma u ́ \mu \beta о \lambda о \nu, \beta а к т \eta \rho i a,<\pi \iota \nu \alpha \dot{\alpha} \iota o \nu>, \pi \iota \nu \alpha \kappa \iota o \nu$ $\tau \iota \mu \tau \tau \kappa \delta \nu$.
$\left.\beta \alpha{ }^{2} \alpha^{2} v o t\right]$ either actual acorns or (more probably) ballot balls of metal shaped like them. In either case the $\beta$ álayos had the letter of the court scratched upon it.
$\left.\pi \lambda \eta \rho \omega \theta{ }^{\prime} \sigma \epsilon \sigma \theta a 1\right]$ to be made up to their full complement of $\delta i \kappa a \sigma \tau a l$. Dem. $c$. Timocr. 92, дєкабт $\mathfrak{\rho} \rho \iota \alpha \pi \lambda \eta \rho o \hat{\tau} \tau$. Mid. 209 ; Lys. $26 \S 6$; Isae. $6 \$ 37$; cIA ii 395 (of the $\theta \in \sigma \mu \circ \theta \dot{\epsilon} \tau \alpha$, ) öта⿱ $т \rho \bar{\omega} \tau о \nu$ п $\pi \lambda \eta$ -
 бıкaotás. Cf. Meier and Sch. p. 156, note 18 Lips.







 ptov el $\sigma a \gamma \gamma \varepsilon \lambda l a K^{1}$ ( $\epsilon l \sigma a \gamma \gamma \epsilon \lambda l a$ Fraenkel, H-L).

15, 16 атотісаІ-Ектісн. 18 єкабтоs < $\delta>$ в.



§3. тpıákovta EैTך] Pollux viii 122,

 Dem. c. Timocr. 123 and Law ib. 50.
The text lends no support to the opinion that the number of dicasts was limited to 6,000 annually appointed by lot from the general body of duly qualified citizens. On the contrary, it favours Fränkel's view that all duly qualified Athenians might be enrolled on the list of dicasts. At Ardettos, near the Panathenaic stadium, $\delta \eta \mu 0 \sigma l a \pi \alpha \nu \tau \epsilon s \omega_{\mu} \mu \nu \nu_{0}$
 (Harp. s.v. 'A $\bar{\delta} \eta \tau \tau \delta s$ ). Fränkel, Att. Geschworenenger., esp. pp. 14-20. The number 6,000, however; occurs in c. 24, 13 with reference to the previous'century.
 in force against debtors to the state (Dem. Androt. 33, Nicostr. 14). In Dem. c. Mid. 182 Pyrrhus is prosecuted by êv$\delta \epsilon t \xi s$ for acting as dicast. Cf. Dict. Ant. i 734 b.
 where a person illegally acted as dicast, it was left to the court to impose the penalty, Dem. c. Mid. l.c.; similarly in the event of a disqualified person speaking in the $\epsilon \kappa \kappa \lambda \eta \sigma$ la ([Dem.] Aristog. i § 92 ).
§ 4. тьvákเov] All the extant тıуáкıa are of bronze; those of boxwood, mentioned in. the text, having presumably perished. The specimens from the British Museum are given in Hicks, Hist. Inscr. p. 202. Out of the 65 collected in CII ii $875-940$, seventeen are mere fragments: the remaining 48 exhibit in the upper left-hand corner one of the first ten letters of the Greek alphabet:-A(4), B(6), $\Gamma(5), \Delta(9), E(8), 4(4), \mathrm{H}(2), \theta(6), I(3)$,
$K(\mathrm{I})$. Two of them ( $9 \mathrm{r}_{4}-5$ ) were found in the same tomb, both bearing the same letter and the same name (with a slight difference in spelling). Cf. 917-8. Apparently each dicast remained permanently in the division first assigned him; so that the annual $\kappa \lambda \dot{\eta} \rho \omega \sigma \iota s \delta \kappa \kappa a \sigma \tau \hat{\omega} \nu$ only affected those citizens who on reaching the age of 3o were assigned to a particular division for the first time. The $\pi \iota \nu \alpha{ }^{\prime} \kappa l a$ are discussed by Dumont, Rev. Arch. 1868, p. 140; C. Curtius, Rhein. Mus. 1876, 28 I ; Klein, fahrb. des Vereins von Alterthumsfreunden in Rheinland, r876, p. 57-; P. Girard in Bull. Corr. Hell. 1878 , p. $5^{23}$ -; Fränkel, Att. Geschworenenger. pp. 94, 95, 105; Meier and Schömann, pp. $\mathbf{I F 1}^{-2}$, Lips. ; and Caillemer in Daremberg and Saglio, iii 189 f . The $\pi \iota^{2}$ व́ккоу reproduced (as fig. i) at the head of the frontispiece bears the name of ciovifoos $\Delta \operatorname{covv}[\sigma \operatorname{lov}] \in \kappa \mathbb{K} o t[\lambda \eta s]$; in the upper lefthand corner is the letter of the division, A; below this, an owl between $A$ and $\theta$, being part of $\mathrm{A} \Theta \mathrm{H}$, for ' $A \theta \eta \nu$ al $\omega \nu$; towards the right are two owls between A and A , and to the right of this is a gorgon's head (CIA ii 876).
The use of the $\pi \iota \nu a ́ \kappa เ o \nu$ in drawing lots for certain public offices is mentioned in Dem. 39 (adv. Boeotum de nomine) § 12 ,



 раккoy was of bronze is proved by $\S 10$,



 $\pi \iota \nu a \kappa \kappa o \nu$ is sometimes called the $\gamma \rho a^{\prime} \mu \mu a$





 тò $\delta \iota \kappa] a \sigma \tau \grave{j} \rho \iota \nu$ тò $\gamma \rho \dot{\rho} \mu \mu a$ тò $\lambda a \chi o ̛ \nu$.
 $\mathrm{K}^{1}(\mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{W}, \mathrm{H}-\mathrm{L}) . \quad 23$ ยккабтоע $\boldsymbol{\tau}$ д в.

 रрámua is synonymous with the section of dicasts indicated by a particular letter :

 (Meier and Schöm. p. 1 50, note 9 Lips.).
 753 c (in the scheme for the election of magistrates), els $\pi เ \nu \alpha ́ \kappa \iota o \nu ~ \gamma \rho a ́ \psi a \nu \tau a ~ т о ð-~$


 i.e. are divided intoten sections distributed over the tribes. The ten $\mu t \rho \eta$ did not coincide with the ten tribes, but each $\mu$ épos had a nearly equal number of dicasts from all the tribes. The extant тıváкєa prove that members of different tribes belonged to the same section (Benndorf, Götting. gel. Anz. 1870, P. ${ }^{276-)}$.
 to K .

 $\kappa \alpha \sigma \tau \eta \rho_{L a} \tau \dot{a}$ l $\delta \iota a$ каі $\tau$ à $\delta \eta \mu b \sigma \iota a$. CIA ii $567 b$ (inscr. in honour of a $\theta \in \sigma \mu a \theta \hat{\epsilon} \tau \eta \mathrm{~s}$ ),
 $\rho i \omega \nu, i b .809,206$ (B.C. 325/4), тous $\theta \epsilon \sigma \mu 0$ -
 каi dєakoбlous. The $\theta \in \sigma \mu о \theta \in \tau \eta$ draws lots assigning the letters ( $\Lambda, \mathrm{M}, \mathrm{N}, \mathrm{P}, \& \mathrm{c}$ )
to the several courts. The letter thus allotted was placed over the entrance of the court. Hence $\gamma \rho \alpha \mu \mu a$ is synonymous


 In the next three lines the letters $B, \theta$ and $K$ can only refer to the ten heliastic divisions ( $A$ to $K$ ) severally marked on the dicast's mivistov. In line 688 we have another sense of $\gamma \rho a \dot{a} \mu \mu a: \delta \tau \varphi \bar{\delta} \dot{\varepsilon} \tau \delta$
 Plut. 277) $\gamma \rho a \dot{\mu} \mu a$ is synonymous with the $\pi$ tuakiov, which has the letter of the heliastic division stamped upon it.
Even the original allotment of the citizens to the several heliastic divisions was under the superintendence of the $\theta \epsilon \sigma \mu \circ \theta \epsilon-$ Tal (cf. $59 \$ 7$ ). This would involve the use of a set of balloting balls or counters marked with a letter indicating the several divisions (A, B, $\Gamma, \Delta, E$, to $K$ ). It is probably specimens of these that have survived in two bronze counters having on the one side four owls arranged diagonally and encircled with the word $\theta \epsilon \sigma \mu 0 \theta \epsilon \tau \omega \nu$, and on the other the letter A or E (Fränkel in Sallet's Zeitschrift f. Numismatik, iii p. 383 f, and Caillemer in Daremberg and Saglio, iii 19r). See figs. 2 and 3 in frontispiece.

## FRAGMENTA

ex papyri paginis ultimis.
 'трó $\theta \in \nu \quad\left[{ }^{*} \tau \hat{\omega} \nu \dot{a} \rho \chi o ́ \nu \tau \omega \nu{ }^{*} \kappa\right] a \theta^{\prime}$ é $\kappa a ́ \sigma \tau \eta \nu \tau \grave{\eta}[\nu \phi \nu-$

 $\nu \delta_{\iota \kappa} \alpha \sigma \tau[\hat{\omega}] \nu \tau[\grave{\alpha} \pi \iota \nu a ́ \kappa] \iota a$ єís тò кıßผ́ть[ov,






Fragmentorum in lacunis supplendis post editorem primum multum praestiterunt H-L et Haussoullier (Revue de Philologie, xv, 2); etiam plura contulerunt k-w et B, quem in rebus dubiis plerumque secutus sum; ipse nonnulla olim tentavi, quaedam nunc primum protuli.

Pag. 31, 1 (=pag. $32 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{w}$; sed non satis causae apparet, cur paginam unam pluresve intercidisse censeamus). Paginae huius partem sinistram et dextram, ectypi in editione prima ordine inverso separatim expressam, coniunxit k. $\tau] \grave{\alpha} \delta \bar{\xi}[\kappa \kappa \beta \omega \tau \iota \alpha$




 $\Delta \in M$
idem suppleverunt ceteri. $\quad B \lambda \lambda B \omega C I N . \quad[\tau \hat{\omega} \nu][[\tau]] \delta \iota \kappa a \sigma \tau[\hat{\omega}] \nu \mathrm{K}-\mathrm{w},[\tau \hat{\omega} \mid \nu$ $\delta \iota \kappa a \sigma \tau[\omega] \nu \mathrm{H}-\mathrm{L}, \mathrm{K}^{3}$, ol $\delta \iota \kappa a \sigma \tau[a i]$ в. $6 \dot{\epsilon} \pi \iota[\gamma \epsilon \gamma \rho a] \mu \mu \dot{\varepsilon} \nu \circ \nu$ Hauss. (edd.). $7 \dot{a}[\pi \dot{d}]$ supplevi cum K-w (?), H-L, K ${ }^{3}$, B. $\quad 8$ dıaбєlбavtos K-w (Hauss., H-L, в).
 are the 100 boxes arranged in sets of ten; the boxes in each set being distinguished by the first ten letters of the alphabet; the first box contains all the tickets of the first heliastic division, the second those of the second, and so on. Each box is shaken in turn by the attendant, and the presiding official, the $\theta \epsilon \sigma \mu \sigma \theta \epsilon \tau \eta s$, draws one ticket out of each box.
 mentioned in c. 63 , init.

rarum (Blass).
8. Start[бavias] Cf. the Homeric $\kappa \lambda \eta^{\prime}$ pous $\pi \dot{d} \lambda \lambda \epsilon \nu$, Il. $7,171-189 ; 15,191 ;$ 2.3, 353-4, 861; 24, 400; Od. 10, 206.

 $\epsilon \epsilon \kappa \alpha \tau \epsilon] \rho \rho[\nu \epsilon] \mu \mu \epsilon \in \epsilon \epsilon$. Cf. Eustath. p. 675 ,

 $\theta \epsilon \sigma a \nu \quad \epsilon \mu \beta \alpha \lambda \lambda \epsilon \iota \nu \kappa \alpha l \pi \rho \omega \bar{\tau} \sigma \nu$ d $\nu \epsilon \lambda \kappa \epsilon \iota \nu$,
 Class. Rev. v 335 a).
$\kappa a \lambda \epsilon і[\tau] a \iota \dot{\epsilon} \mu[\pi \eta \dot{\eta} \kappa \tau \eta]$, $\kappa$ каi $\dot{\epsilon} \mu \pi \eta \dot{\eta} \gamma \nu \nu \sigma_{\iota}$
$\tau \grave{a} \pi \iota \nu a ́ \kappa \iota a\left[\begin{array}{lll}\tau \grave{\alpha} & \text { èк } & \tau o\end{array}\right] \hat{v} \kappa \iota \beta \omega \tau i ́ o v ~ \epsilon i ́ s ~ \tau \grave{\eta} \nu$


15 ó aủzòs $\grave{\epsilon} \mu \pi[\eta \gamma \nu v ́ \omega \nu] \kappa a \kappa o v \rho \gamma \hat{\eta}$. єícì $\delta \grave{\epsilon}$

$\rho \omega \tau \eta \rho i ́ \omega \nu$. [ $\left.\grave{\pi} \pi \epsilon \iota \delta a ̀ \nu \delta^{\circ}\right]$ द́ $\mu \beta a ́ \lambda \eta ~ \tau o v ̀ \varsigma ~ \kappa u ́ ß o v s ~ o ́ ~ a ̈ \rho \chi \omega \nu, ~ \tau \eta ̀ \nu ~$
$\phi \nu \lambda \grave{\eta} \nu \kappa a[\lambda \epsilon \hat{\imath} \epsilon i \varsigma ~ \tau o ̀ ~ \kappa] \lambda \eta \rho \omega \tau \eta ́ \rho \iota o \nu . ~ \epsilon i \sigma i$




$\pi о \nu$. $\epsilon \pi \epsilon \epsilon \delta a ̀ \nu \delta^{\prime} \dot{\epsilon}[\xi a \iota \rho \hat{\imath}]$ тov̀s кúßous, $\kappa a \lambda \epsilon \hat{\imath}$

 $\kappa \lambda \eta \rho 0 \hat{\imath} \tau a \iota \delta^{\prime}$ propter sententiam addiderunt $\mathrm{k}-\mathrm{w}$, vocis ante lacunam superscriptae vestigia agnovit K . $15 \dot{\epsilon} \mu \pi[\eta \gamma \nu \dot{v} \tau \eta \mathrm{~s} \hat{\omega} \nu] \mathrm{K}^{1}, \epsilon \mu \pi[\eta \dot{\eta} \kappa \tau \eta \mathrm{E} \dot{\omega} \nu]$ Bywater, (Hauss.,
 $19 \chi a\left[\lambda \kappa 0 \hat{i} \mathrm{~K}^{3}\right.$ litterarum vestigia valde obscura secutus, [ $\xi \dot{\text { ćnccuoc }} \mathrm{K}-\mathrm{W}$ (8), color talorum albus et ater cum ligno magis quam metallo congruit; [ $\pi 0 \lambda \lambda 0$ i $\mathrm{H}-\mathrm{L}$, [ $\mathrm{A} \theta 0 \mathrm{\theta}$






 $\dot{\delta} \theta \epsilon \sigma \mu \nu \theta \epsilon \tau \eta$.

22 'hinc nati errores in scholio Iunt. ad Ar. Plut. 277 p. $339{ }^{b} 47$ (Dübner)'



11. $\boldsymbol{e} \mu \pi \dot{\mathfrak{j}} \kappa \tau \eta \mathrm{s}]$ This designation is here applied, not to the $\theta \epsilon \sigma \mu \cdot \theta \in T \eta s$ (as supposed by Hesych. and Bekk. An.), nor to the $\dot{\boldsymbol{j} \pi \eta \rho \in \tau \eta s \text {. There is a separate }}$ $\dot{\varepsilon} \mu \pi \dot{\eta} \kappa \tau \eta$ s taken by lot from each heliastic division.
13. kavov [8a] probahly a wooden frame fitted with a number of 'straight rules' or parallel ledges ( $\kappa a v i v e s$ ), stretching horizontally across it. We may suppose that the upper surface of each of these ledges was grooved and that each $\pi \iota \nu \dot{\alpha} \kappa \iota o \nu$, as it was drawn, was inserted with its lower edge in the groove. In each $\kappa \lambda \eta \rho \omega \tau \chi \rho \iota \circ \nu$, or balloting chamber, there were ten of these frames, one for each of the heliastic divisions.
14. к $\lambda \eta$ рои̂тal] not mid. lut pass., 'is
chosen by lot.' The object of this, as we are told, is to prevent the jobbery that might arise, if the $\epsilon \mu \pi \dot{\eta} \kappa \tau \eta s$ were always the same and were therefore known beforehand.
19. kúßol] wooden dice (or lots) of two colours, black and white, but differing from ordinary dice by not being marked with any pips. One out of every five lots was white, the rest black. The number of white lots is equal to the number of dicasts required. The archon draws the lots in succession; if the first lot is white, the bearer of the name on the first $\pi t$ $\nu$ ákto is considered to have drawn the lot to serve as dicast, and so on; the names of these dicasts are then called out.









 $\hat{\eta} \sigma v \nu a ́ \gamma \epsilon \iota \nu$ [ $\epsilon i \varsigma]$ ] ठıкабтท́pıov oûs à $\nu$


 $\kappa а \sigma \tau о \nu$, öтєр $\hat{a}[\nu \hat{\eta}]$ тои $\delta \iota \kappa a \sigma \tau \eta \rho i ́ o u ~ є ̇ к а ́ \sigma-~$
[00. 32.] Tov] єIX - - - - - - -
ข] $\pi \eta \rho \in ́ \tau \eta$ єІ $N \omega$

 $26[\epsilon \lambda \eta] \chi[\omega \bar{s}]$ B; non $X$ sed $\Delta \epsilon$ legebat K ; $\pi$ a $\rho \epsilon \sigma \tau \grave{\omega} s$ fortasse scribendum; omnia in-

$\mathrm{K}-\mathrm{w}$; fortasse $\pi \rho \rho \delta \epsilon l \xi a s$ scribendum. .... $\omega \nu$ edd.; $\alpha \nu \epsilon \chi \omega \nu$ supplevi. $28 \pi \rho \hat{\omega}[[\nu \nu$ $\mu \dot{e} \nu]$ к, н-L; TP H-L. $\in N B$ (K-w, B). $30 \quad \delta \pi 0 \theta \epsilon \nu$ H-L. 31 restituerunt Hauss., $K-w$,




 Hauss., (edd.); öбaтє $\operatorname{exspectabant~k-w.~} 37$ NTaçctoixєione..

Pag. 32. Etiam haec pagina in partes duas sinistram et dextram discerpta; in medio litterae complures exciderunt. 1 єIX.. T! $\Lambda$. Y (supra scr. €) K-w. $2 \omega \mathrm{c} . . \mathrm{N} \omega$ K-w.
26. $\beta a \lambda_{a v o v} \kappa \tau \lambda$.] The dicasts having now been determined, it has still to be settled in which court each is to sit; each of them, when called, draws out of the urn a ballot marked with a letter denoting one of the courts and shews it to the presiding official, who now puts the ticket of the dicast concerned into the box marked with the same letter as the ballot which the dicast has drawn. The number of these boxes is as many as the number of courts that are to sit
on the day in question. This ensures the dicast's taking his seat in the court he has actually drawn, and makes it impossible for him to choose his own court or to arrange to sit in the same court with certain others who are drawn as dicasts.
 on c. 63,11 . These passages shew that (as in Ar.) the future, as well as the present, is found after $\mu \in \lambda \lambda \epsilon \omega \nu$ in the ' $A \theta$. $\pi 0 \lambda$.





 $\mu] a[\tau] a$ é $\pi \iota \gamma \in ́ \gamma \rho a \pi \tau\left[a \iota{ }^{*} \pi \hat{\alpha} \sigma \iota \nu\right] \dot{\epsilon} \pi \grave{\imath} \tau \hat{\varphi} \sigma \phi \eta-$



 $\beta a ́ \nu \in \iota ~ \sigma u ́ \mu \beta o \lambda o \nu ~ \delta \eta[\mu о \sigma i ́ a] ~ \pi a \rho a ̀ ~ т o v ̂ ~ є i ̉ \lambda \eta-~$

3 ос к， $\mathrm{k}-\mathrm{w}$（？）， $\mathrm{H}-\mathrm{L} . \quad 3-7$ restituerunt $\mathrm{K}-\mathrm{w}$ ，coll．Bekk．An． $220 . \quad 4$［ $\tau \hat{\psi}$
 $\eta \nu$ k．$\quad 6$ aívoû k－w，éautov̂ b． 8 ＂rectissime Hemsterhusius pro $\chi \rho \hat{\mu} \mu a$ rescribi vult $\gamma \rho \alpha \mu \mu a$ ，id quod vel adiunctum verbum postulat．Quis enim，




14 CYnBoAON $\mathbf{K}-\mathrm{W}$ ， $\mathbf{B}$ ．







 ßо入ov．Lex．Dem．Patm．P．144．Schol．Arist．Vesp． 1110 é8lסovto dè кal $\beta$ акт



Pag．32，8－15＊Schol．Arist．Plut． 278 （om．cod．Ravennas et cod．Venetus）$\pi \in \rho l$

 ant gives the dicast a small staff of the same colour as that assigned to the court in which he is to sit．The colour on the staff is thus substituted for the letter on the ballot，as it is obviously easier for the doorkeeper to see that each dicast，as he files in，has a staff of the right colour than one marked with the right letter．

阝aктทplav］Dem．de Cor．§ 210 quoted on c． 63 § 2 ．

4．$\dot{\delta} \mu^{\circ} \mathrm{X} \rho \omega v$ ］Each of the courts is marked outside with the colour corre－ sponding to that on the several staves． We read in Paus．i 28 of two courts that derived their name from their colour：




 Opusc．Acad．i 226.
9．$\sigma \phi \eta_{\kappa(\sigma \kappa 凶]] ~ ' t h e ~ l i n t e l, ' ~ s u p e r c i l i u m ~}$ januae，Steph．Thesaurus，vii 1606 Paris．



14．$\sigma \dot{v} \mu \beta o \lambda o v]$ Dem．de Cor．quoted on c． 63 § $2 \beta a \kappa \tau \eta p l a$, ，and Arist．Plut． 279 quoted $i b . \AA_{4} 4 \pi \nu \alpha \dot{\alpha} t o \nu$ ．Cf．Etym．Mag．

 дıкабтєко̀у екоріรоуто．

It has been proposed to identify with these $\sigma \dot{\prime} \mu \beta \circ \lambda \alpha$ certain leaden counters stamped on the one side with a design resembling that used for the reverse of a














 $\delta \eta \mu o \sigma l a!s ̧ \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{w}$. Versus in fine $\dot{\forall} \pi \neq \rho$ scripsi, quod manus tertia per compendium $\dot{v}$ indicat, cf. p. 21, 24, p. 23, $22 . \quad 20 \pi[a \rho a \delta \iota] \delta \sigma a \sigma \iota \nu$ в; $\dot{\alpha}[\pi \delta \delta i] \delta 6 a \sigma \iota \nu \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{W}, \mathrm{K}^{3}$;








 $\delta ı \kappa \dot{d} \sigma \epsilon \omega 5$.
$\tau \rho \omega \beta_{0} \beta_{o \nu}$, and on the other with one of the first ten letters of the alphabet (Benndorf, Zeitsch. f. d. Oésterr. Gymn., 1875 p. 601 ). See figs. 4 and 5 , frontispiece.

The fact that letters after k are not found on these counters shews that the letters do not indicate the courts, but the heliastic divisions. If the courts had ten entrances each, these would correspond to the beliastic divisions, and all who left the court by the proper exit would receive counters marked with the letters corresponding to their own division. They would take these to the place where they had had their court allotted to them, and there receive payment in the chamber in which the allotment took place (col. 37 ult.).-In c. 63 , 3 , if the text is correct, the courts are actually described as having ten entrances, each of them, however, corresponding to one of the tribes, and not to one of the heliastic divisions.
15. Tìv $\dot{\alpha} \rho X \dot{\eta} v]$ The official's title is not given. According to an inscr. of B.c. 341/o (Mittheil. d. arch. Inst. vii 103), the $\delta t a \dot{\delta} \sigma \sigma \iota s \tau \hat{\omega} \nu \sigma \nu \mu \beta \sigma \lambda \omega \nu$ in the $\tilde{\epsilon} \kappa \kappa \lambda \eta \sigma i a$
was entrusted to the $\sigma u \lambda \lambda o \gamma \epsilon \hat{\epsilon}$ s $\tau 0 \hat{0} \delta \dot{\eta} \mu o v$ (Rose, Frag. ed. p. 299 n). Schömann, Opusc. Acad. i 206, suggests either the $\kappa \omega \lambda a \kappa \rho \epsilon t a l$ or the officials presiding over the trial, inclining to the latter; but it seems more probable that the $\sigma \dot{u} \mu \beta$ oida were distributed by a person of less importance than the presiding officials, perhaps by a 'public slave' (Att. Proc. p. 162 Lips.). In the time of Aristophanes it was the кш入aкрétal who paid the dicasts their fee of three obols: Schol. Av. 1541; Vesp. 695; Bekk. An. 275, 22; lex. rhet. Cant. 672, 15 . But there is no proof of the existence of the $\kappa \omega \lambda \alpha к \rho \epsilon \tau a l$ after 403 B.C.
16. Bakт stated something about the dicast's delivering up his $\beta$ aкт $\eta \rho\{a$ in exchange for the $\sigma \tilde{\mu} \mu \beta_{0} \lambda о \nu$.

19-24. The tickets belonging to the dicasts in each court have been sorted out into ten boxes; these boxes are taken by the attendants of each 'tribe,' and handed over to the proper officials at the ten entrances of the court, to be re-



$\kappa а т a ̀ ~ \delta \iota \kappa а \sigma \tau \eta ́ \rho \iota a ~ T p ~ . ~ . ~ . ~ . ~ e n t \omega ~-~-~$
$\delta_{\iota \kappa} \alpha \sigma \tau \eta \dot{\eta} \iota \circ \nu[\hat{\eta}] \delta[\iota] \kappa a \sigma[\tau \eta \dot{]}] \rho \iota a \kappa a i ̀-\omega_{N}$


т $\omega \epsilon$ — — — — — — — — — то. . $\tau \hat{\omega} \nu[\theta \in \sigma \mu о-$


35 тท́ $\rho \iota o \nu . \quad$ ó $\delta$ è $\tau \hat{\omega} \nu$ ả $\rho \chi[o ́ \nu \tau] \omega \nu$ - -

— - - кнру —. - — -




5
${ }^{10}$ $\mu] \grave{\dagger} \omega \boldsymbol{\omega} \sigma \epsilon \ldots \mathrm{N}$ — — — — - $\sigma \iota \nu$.




 tovs трผ́tous $\delta$ - - - - - eт̣ $[\tilde{v}-$ $\delta \omega \rho$ тє́ттарая — — - - - - ous..








Pag. 33. Fragmenta $a$ et $b$ una collocarunt k -w ; in nonnullis certe versibus $(6,7,18)$ litterae extremae cum subsequentibus congruunt.
$3 . \varepsilon \mu \alpha, . \sigma \iota K^{3}$.
 K-W ( $\mathrm{K}^{\mathrm{y}}$ ) ; [ $\left.{ }^{2}\right] \delta \omega \rho \tau \epsilon \tau \tau \alpha \rho a s$ B.
turned by them to the dicasts to whom they belong.
 this point we have mention of the official paying the $\tau p t \omega \beta$ ohov.

 $\gamma$ रुvєтаı $\pi \rho о \sigma \tau \epsilon \tau а \gamma \mu \epsilon \nu a$ тoîs $\nu 6 \mu 0 เ s$ (Blass).
31. Evєрои кvंßol] The purpose of this fresh set of 'dice' or 'lots,' as distinguished from those of col. 31, 19, is not clear. Possibly they were used to distribute the superintendence of the courts among the thesmothetae (or some other officials).

|  <br> $\ddot{\partial} \delta \omega \rho \mu \dot{\eta} \tau \epsilon$ тоN — — — — $\tau \omega$. |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| . нтя п!p!ca.. - - - a $\quad$ - | 15 |
| ....... 入a才ovt тovt |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  | 20 |
| \Ia. aton $\nu \mathrm{DO}$ - - |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
| őтà $\mu$ ¢̀̀ т тa - - - |  |
| $\tau \hat{\oplus} \dot{\alpha} \rho \iota \theta \mu \hat{\omega}$ - - - - - | 25 |
|  |  |
| cis aưtò тò m[pây |  |
| $\sigma \iota \lambda \epsilon \grave{s}$ - - - - - $\epsilon \mu[\iota] a-$ |  |
| cı. єiб८ $\delta$ - - - - - - - |  |
| к̧ous тı - - - - | 30 |
| ( |  |
| (sequuntur versus fere sex prorsus evanidi) |  |
| (desunt versus decem) |  |



 $\tau \alpha \hat{1} \tau \alpha \dot{\mathbf{v}} \pi \mathrm{~J}_{\mathrm{\delta}} \mathrm{~K}^{\mathbf{3}}$.

Pag. 34. Fragmentum $a$ paginae 33 fragmento $b$ adhaeret. Frustulum $b$ ex incerta coniectura adiunxit в. $\quad 15-23(\mathrm{~B})=\mathrm{p} .78$, col. $34 b$ г $8-25$, et p. $79 b \mathrm{I}-9(\mathrm{k}-\mathrm{w})$ : illud non descripsit K ; hoc dedit in p. 199, col. 34, frag. $2\left(\mathrm{~K}^{3}\right)$.
col. 33 a 17-19. Cf. col. 37 ult.

 and 60, Ép $\hat{\omega} \delta^{\prime}$ єls autd $\tau \dot{\partial} \pi \rho \bar{\alpha} \gamma \mu a$. As the archon $\beta a \sigma \iota \lambda \epsilon \dot{s}$ is apparently mentioned in the next line, the present passage refers to the procedure before the Areopagus, in which irrelevant matter was


$\pi \dot{a} \gamma \psi$, Lycurg. Leocr. 12, 13, $\mu \grave{\eta}$ é $\pi \iota \tau \rho \hat{\epsilon}-$
 Rehdantz, p. 126 and Meier and Schöm. p. 933 Lips.). On the other hand, the mention of $\dot{v j \omega \rho \text { in ll. I2, I4 suggests }}$ that the text may refer to the procedure in a $\gamma \rho a \phi \eta$ т $\pi \alpha \rho a \nu \delta \mu \omega \nu$, Aeschin. 3, 197,



$$
16-2
$$

(b)
(a) $\tau \hat{\varphi} \delta \iota \kappa \mid a \sigma \tau \eta \rho[i \hat{\omega}$ ————
$\delta_{\iota a \sigma \tau a ́ \mid}^{\mid \text {ṗєєs — — — - - }}$
є]iб८. . | мнп — — - -


20

$$
\ldots \kappa a \lambda \mid \hat{v} \sigma \iota \tau \rho-\text { — (c) [ảvay- }
$$

$$
\kappa a ́ \zeta \omega \sigma \mid \iota \tau o v s ~-~-~-~ \lambda-~
$$

$$
{ }_{o ̈ \tau a \nu}[\tau \mid \dot{\delta}] \nu \delta \iota \kappa[a \sigma \tau \eta े \nu-\mathrm{N} \cdot \mathrm{~N}
$$

-     - |. . Nok - - - Y... on

$$
------\quad i \delta i ́ o v
$$

$$
— — — — — — — \dot{a} \gamma] \omega \nu \omega \nu
$$

$$
\text { — - - - - - - } € \mathbb{N} \ldots .
$$

- — — — ——

$$
\sigma \iota a]- \text { — - - -. . } \kappa \Delta!\kappa-
$$

$$
-----\div--\dot{a} \chi o v s[\delta] \bar{\varepsilon}
$$

$$
----\sim-\operatorname{co\Delta eI} . \mathrm{TE} \mathrm{\lambda}
$$

$$
-\sim-\text { - - - }-\ldots \Pi \text {. QTEP }
$$


— — — — — — بл каì סíxovs
— — — — — кai $\delta i \chi \chi o[v]$ s é $\xi a ́ \chi o[u$





Fragmentum $c$ cohaeret cum p. 35 frag. d. 34, $\boldsymbol{c} 20-36(\mathrm{~s})=35, \mathrm{r}-16(\mathrm{k}-\mathrm{w})=34$

 $\omega \nu \tau[\omega] \nu \mathrm{K} . \quad 26 \lambda \ldots 01 \mathrm{~K}^{3} . \quad 29$ 'suprascriptum $\epsilon$, legendum igitur $\chi$ des' K -w. 30 ó $\delta$ ' єt今 $\tau 0 \hat{\mathrm{~K}} \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{w}$; toy pr., tєa superscr., inducta illa, B. 31 єts ข... $\pi \epsilon \rho \mathrm{K}^{3}$;
 36 an $\omega c l \epsilon \pi$ ? ? b.

Pag. 35, 1-37 (B) $=36 a+b$, p. 80, + fragmentum incertum p. $79 a(\mathrm{k}-\mathrm{w})=34(3)$ + nil +34 (1) (к). al 1 ©Na K-w; vaK. 1-4 supplevit в. bI N]OMON $\mathrm{K}^{3}$ (ap. в). $\quad$ a $2 \mu a \rho[\tau v \rho(a l]$ vel $\mu \dot{\alpha} \rho[\tau v \rho \epsilon s] \mathrm{K}-\mathrm{w}$.
col. 34, 32-34. The terms è $\pi$ ráxous, סíxous, égáxous refer to different intervals of time as measured by the $\kappa \lambda \epsilon \psi \dot{v} \delta \rho a$. The word $\delta i \chi$ ous is quoted from Posido-

 ésáxous is found in Plutarch (Sol. 23).
 aì $\lambda l \sigma \kappa o s$ is the short neck of the $\kappa \lambda \in \psi \hat{v}$ -
$\delta \rho a$. The attendant could stop the flow of the water by placing his hand on the top of this. Ar. Probl. 16, 8, p. $914 b$






 $\pi \iota \lambda a \mu \beta[a ́ \nu \epsilon \tau a \iota-$ — ———— $\quad$ - $\ddot{\delta} \omega \rho \rho$
$\tau \hat{\varphi} \quad \tau \varepsilon \kappa a[\tau \eta \gamma o \rho-$ - — - — — - - -


$\kappa \rho \hat{\omega} \nu \tau \hat{\omega}[\nu-\quad-\quad-\quad-\quad-\quad-\quad$
. такто — — — — — — — — — — aypa..
$\delta \hat{[ }[\kappa] a \iota$ - - - - - - $\epsilon] i \sigma[i] \nu \delta \dot{v} \hat{v}^{\prime}[\epsilon \in-$

 (syllaba secunda brevi) quattuordecim in locis scriptum (Meisterhans, p. 42²). $9 \mathrm{XP} \omega \mathrm{NT} \mathrm{K}, \mathrm{K}-\mathrm{w}$.
















col. 35, 3, 4. $\delta \mathbf{\delta} \alpha \mu \xi \mu \epsilon \tau \rho \eta \mu \in ́ \nu \eta \nu]$ Dem.


 рома.
6. Tஸ̂̀ $\tau \in \kappa$ кат $\eta$ Yop-] Aeschin. 3, 197 (in a $\gamma \rho a \phi \eta$ خे $\pi a \rho a \nu b \mu \omega \nu$ the day was di-






 ú $\delta \rho a$ in courts of justice is mentioned in Arist. Ach. 692, Vesp. 93, 857, and in the Orators, Dem. de Cor. ${ }^{139}, \dot{\epsilon} \tau \hat{\varphi} \dot{\epsilon} \mu \hat{\varphi}$
 Steph. i § 8, c. Conon. 36 є $\pi \uparrow \lambda a \beta \epsilon \tau \dot{\partial} \ddot{\nu} \delta \omega \rho$, and (at the end of a speech) pro Phorm. $\xi \xi \in \rho a \operatorname{\tau d} \dot{v} \delta \omega \rho$. The strncture of the ${ }_{\kappa} \wedge \in \psi \psi \delta \rho a$ is described in Ar. Probl. 16, 8.
It was observed that the length of a
short day in one of the winter months was equivalent to the time in which eleven
 their water. The standard adopted was a day in the month of Posideon (Dec. -Jan.). To ensure perfect accuracy it would be necessary to make allowance for the fact that the rate at which the water flowed would depend on its temperature (cf. Athen. p. 42 ; Plut. Quaest. Nat. c. 7). I learn from Mr J. Larmor that, when the level of the water in a waterclock is maintained constant, the rate at which it percolates through narrow tubes or pores of any form depends only on the degree of viscosity of water. According to the experiments of Poiseuille (Mémoires de l'Institut, x ), the rate of percolation is increased by about onethirtieth for each degree Centigrade of rise in the temperature. Thus a rise of $\mathrm{I}^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$. should make a water-clock go faster by about two minutes every hour.


$\lambda a \mu \beta a y$ - - - - - - - $\epsilon \pi \epsilon \iota$. $\epsilon \tau \epsilon$
роs тoîs $\delta$ — — — — — — — ả] $\bar{\omega} \hat{\omega}[\sigma] \iota \nu$



$\epsilon] \sigma \tau \iota \delta \epsilon \sigma \mu[\grave{\jmath} \varsigma$ — — — - $\delta] \eta \dot{\eta} \mu \epsilon v \sigma \iota \varsigma$

(d) $\hat{\eta} \mid \dot{a} \pi о \tau \epsilon \hat{\epsilon}[\sigma a \iota-\quad-\quad-\quad-\delta \iota \kappa] a \sigma \tau \eta \rho i ́ \omega \nu$

$\Delta \epsilon \Delta \epsilon$ — — — — - $\epsilon i] \sigma a \gamma a \gamma \epsilon i \nu$
$\sigma v \nu$ - - - - - - - Tanhnм -
тол — — — - - - - - - -
трlà - - [ $\psi \hat{\eta} \phi o \iota ~ \delta e ́ ~ \epsilon i \sigma \iota ~ \chi a \lambda \kappa a i ̂], ~ a u ̉ \lambda i ́ \sigma-~$


${ }^{c} 14 \mathrm{Y}$ supra v. $b 18 \Delta$ et a suprav. 20 ecc! pr. 22 ' H est in $d$, дпот। in $c$ ' $\mathbf{b}$. 23 'post $\dot{\epsilon} \sigma \tau \iota$ sequebatur numeri nota, bipartita ut vid.' $\mathbf{B}$. $23 b$ NHNOTAN K-w. $25 b$ ф $\alpha$ NHNAI K-W, $\epsilon \nu \eta \nu \mu \in \nu$ K. $d 27-35$ ex Harp. restituit K . 28 MICIAI.

 " $\psi \hat{\eta} \phi 0$ - $\lambda \alpha \mu \beta a \nu \omega \sigma \iota \nu$." Codices meliores, ABCD, post $\pi \lambda \eta \eta_{\rho \epsilon \epsilon}$ in v. 29 inserunt $\mu \dot{\eta} \tau \epsilon$
 ex $\mu \nmid \tau \epsilon \tau \epsilon \tau \rho \cup \pi \eta \mu \epsilon \nu a s)$ in v. 34 indicat Dind. In v. 34 post $\pi \lambda \eta \dot{p} \epsilon \iota s$ habent A et b
 ...... $\lambda a \mu \beta a \nu \omega \sigma \iota \nu$, unde in deterioribus codd. exorta $\mu \dot{\eta} \tau \epsilon \pi \dot{\alpha} \nu \tau \eta \tau \epsilon \tau \rho \nu \pi \eta \mu \epsilon \nu a s(\mathrm{k}-\mathrm{w})$. $\pi \alpha \nu \tau \eta$ om. ETD et Photius; ravít apud Suidam in codd.




 dтри́т $\eta$ тov. Bachmann Anec. ii 333, $15-25$ et 373 , 1 -10.
 In Aeschin. c. Timarch. 79, the herald standing by the side of the orator is described as proclaiming that of the two votes given to each dicast, that which was perforated, $\tau \hat{\omega} \nu \psi \eta \phi \omega \nu \eta \geqslant \tau \epsilon \tau \rho \pi \eta \mu \epsilon \nu \eta$, öт $\bar{\delta} о к \epsilon \hat{\imath} \kappa \tau \lambda$., was the vote of condemnation ; that which was not, the vote of acquittal, $\dot{\eta} \delta \grave{\delta} \pi \lambda \lambda \dot{\eta} p \eta s, o ̈ \tau \psi \mu \dot{\eta}$ (with Schol.).


These $\psi \eta$ 多oc are identified with certain small discs of bronze which have been found at Athens, pierced with a short
metal stem. In the two specimens given in figs. 6 and 7 this stem, the audlorkos of the text, is in one case perforated, in the other not: the former is clearly a $\psi \eta$ भos $\tau \epsilon \tau \rho u \pi \eta \mu \epsilon \nu \eta$, the latter a $\psi \cdot \pi \lambda \eta \eta \eta \xi$. On one side of the disc are the words $\psi \eta$ 位 $\delta \eta \mu \sigma \sigma l a$, on the other is punched a letter of the alphabet ( $\Gamma$ or K in the only two specimens at present known to us). These letters probably correspond to those of the heliastic divisions (A to K). Cf. Meier and Scböm. p. 936 Lips., and Daremberg and Saglio, iii 196.



 $\tau \epsilon \pi \lambda \hat{\eta}[\rho \epsilon \iota \varsigma \mu \eta \dot{\eta} \tau \epsilon \tau \epsilon \tau \rho v \pi \eta \mu \epsilon \in \nu a s]$ à $[\mu \phi \circ] \tau \epsilon \in \rho a s$
$\lambda a \mu \beta[a ́ \nu \omega \sigma \iota \nu-\cdots-\cdots \quad[\lambda] a ́ \chi \omega[\sigma \iota \nu$
amo入a
廿нфIz
M. ICOM . .
aKo . .













 $\mathrm{K}-\mathrm{W}, \lambda a[\mu \beta \alpha \nu] \epsilon\left[\left[\nu \mathrm{K}^{3}, \lambda a[\beta] \epsilon \hat{L} \nu \mathrm{~B}\right.\right.$. versus in fine IBopon vel -Boion K apud B.


 11 ol articulo spatium non superesse putat K . $\quad \mathrm{AN}:[\ell] \boldsymbol{\nu}^{\prime} \mathrm{H}-\mathrm{L} . \quad \mathbf{c K \epsilon}$ : correxit $\mathrm{K}-\mathrm{w}$.






col. 36, 1. $\overline{\mathbf{\gamma}} \lambda a \mu \beta a ́ v \eta] \quad \gamma$ seems to refer to the $\beta a \kappa \tau \eta \rho i a$ and the two $\psi \hat{\eta} \phi \circ<$ received by each dicast during the trial; not to the three obols paid him when it is over. ' $\bar{\gamma}$ et roeís et $\tau \rho$ ts esse potest' (Blass).
3. đuфорeîs] also called кádou or ка-



 é $\psi \eta \phi$ офо́pouv ol סıкабтаl...Bekk. Anec. 275
 $\psi \eta \hat{\phi} \phi$ rầ $\delta \iota \kappa a \zeta 0 \mu \hat{\nu} \omega \nu$. Schol. Arist. Vesp. 321 \&c (Meier and Schöm. p. $93{ }^{8}$
$-94^{2}$ Lips.). Lys. 13 § 37. Cf. the vipiai of Xen. Hell. i 7,9, and cia iv i, I $16 h, \mathrm{p} .24$.
8. $\in \pi(\theta \eta \mu a]$ also called кךцós Arist. Vesp. 754 (Pollux viii $16 \delta t^{\prime}$ oũ кarŋ்єбay

 $\psi \eta \tilde{\eta}$ os. Cf. Meier and Schöm. p. $93^{8, ~ n . ~}$ 492-3.
11. ${ }^{-}$к кท̂pu§] Arist. Vesp. 752, кєî̀
 divi $\sigma \tau \dot{a} \sigma \theta \omega$.


$\pi \tau \omega \nu] \tau a \iota$ oi à à $\nu\left\langle\delta \not \delta \kappa o \iota ~ \tau a i ̂ s ~ \mu a \rho \tau \nu \rho i a \iota \varsigma^{\cdot}[\delta \varepsilon] \hat{\imath}\right.$ rà $\rho$ $\pi \rho o ́ \tau \epsilon \rho о \nu]$ е̇ $\pi \iota \sigma \kappa \eta \dot{\eta} \psi a \sigma \theta a \iota[a \dot{u}] \tau a[\hat{\imath}] \mathrm{s} \pi \rho i \nu[\pi] a \dot{\nu} \tau a[\varsigma] \delta \iota a \psi \eta-$

















12 tac maptypiac corr. $\mathrm{K}-\mathrm{w}$ ( $\mathrm{K}^{3}, \mathrm{~B}$ ). $\quad 13$ ataic scriptum fuisse videtur,



 [ $\mu \dot{\xi} \sigma \sigma \nu$ ] conicit в.






$24 \ldots . . . \alpha \sigma \iota \mathrm{K}$; $\dot{\epsilon} \sigma \tau \hat{\eta} \kappa] a \sigma \iota \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{w}$; $[\hat{\epsilon} \pi \alpha \phi] \iota \hat{\sigma} \sigma \iota \mathrm{B}$.






 крíata. (Meier and Schöm. p. 488 Lips.).
 tiff: roû vortpov, the defendant. Cf. l. 32-33. Similarly in the trials of the generals after Arginusae, Xen. Hell.i 7, 9, the votes of condemnation are placed in what is briefly called the $\pi \rho o \pi \epsilon \rho a \dot{u} \delta \rho l a$; those of acquittal, in the $\dot{v} \sigma \tau \in \rho a$; cf. Lys. 13 § 37.
17. Xuxvelov] a ' lamp-stand,' probably with two branches, each of them supporting a flat disk, or pan ( $\pi$ цuáкıò, Pollux, $x$ 155). In the ordinary use of
the $\lambda u \chi^{v e i o v, ~ t h e ~ t w o ~ p a n s ~ w o u l d ~ b e ~ t h e ~}$ proper place for the $\lambda \dot{u} \chi \nu o u$; in its present use, or rather in the metaphorical application of the term to part of the machinery of the law-courts, the two pans are the place for the two sets of $\psi \hat{\eta} \phi o \mathrm{o}$. The contrivance probably resembled a very simple type of epergne.
18. ov ठєนкนข่ $\omega v$ ] Cf. Dem. F. L. 239, $\kappa \rho \nu \beta \delta \eta \nu \quad \psi \eta \phi l \zeta \in \sigma \theta a \iota$, Meier and Schöm. p. 937 Lips.
24. '"ßaxa] 'a reckoning-board,' Pollux $x$ 105-6, here used to count the votes. Cf. Arist. Vesp. 332, 并 $\delta \hat{\eta} r a \lambda i \theta_{0}$


 à $\pi о \delta \iota \delta o ́ \nu \tau \epsilon \varsigma, ~ \beta а к т \eta \rho i ́ a \nu ~ \delta e ̀ ~ \pi a ́ \lambda ı \nu ~ \pi а р а \lambda а \mu-. ~$




є̇̀ $\lambda a \chi{ }^{\circ} \nu$ ย̈ккаттоь.



Pag. 37, 1, 4 TєIM. 5 єкגт $\epsilon$ P $\omega$ N pr. $6-8$ claudit librum coronis ingens ante hos versus infraque porrecta; unde apparet hoc in loco opus ad finem fuisse perductum.


 $\left.425^{2}, 4_{65}{ }^{3}\right)$. Harp. кâv loal, Hesych. loau $\psi \hat{\eta} \phi o \iota$ et $\kappa a ̈ \nu \nu l \sigma \alpha \iota$, Append. prov. iii 30, 42, Schol. ad Arist. Ran. 685.
35. Kбal] Probl. 39, 13, סLà $\pi l$ тотє,

 Aeschin. 3 § 252, Ant. Herod. 51 , Arist. Ran. 685, Aesch. Eum. 732-3 (Meier and Schöm. p. 938, n. 495 Lips.).
col. 37, 1, 2. тц $\mu \omega \hat{\sigma}$-т т̀̀v av́ròv трótov


 Dem.F. L. §290 (Meier and Schöm. p. 943 Lips.). In Plat. Apol. cc. 1- 24 are supposed to have been spoken $\epsilon \pi l \tau \hat{\eta} s \pi \rho \dot{\alpha} \tau \eta s$ $\psi \dot{\eta} \phi \circ u$, and $25-28$ è $\tau \hat{\eta} \tau \iota \mu \eta \sigma \epsilon \iota$ (Shil-
leto on F. L., l.c.). Cf. Ar. Probl. 953

2. $\sigma \dot{\mu} \mu \beta \circ \lambda o v$, col. 32, 14 .
3. Baктךpiav, ib. 3. The dicast has received the $\sigma \dot{\nu} \mu \beta_{0} \lambda o \nu$ which entitles him to draw his pay; but, as a second voting is necessary and he is not entitled to his pay until this is completed, he gives up his $\sigma \dot{\mu} \mu \beta \circ \lambda o \nu$ and receives his $\beta a \kappa \tau \eta \rho l a$ instead.
 to 5.76 pints.
 р $\omega \tau \eta \rho^{\circ} \circ \frac{1}{}$, col. 31, 18. Cf. also col. $33 a$ 17-19.

## HERACLIDIS EPITOMA.



 тoîs vioîs. 2. кaì $\delta \iota \epsilon \tau \notin \lambda o v \nu ~ o u ̉ t o \iota ~ \sigma \tau a \sigma \iota a ́ \zeta o \nu t \epsilon s . ~ \Theta \eta \sigma \epsilon u ̀ s ~ \delta e ̀ ~$

















 ( 18 § 1, 2). тoûtoע тvpa
 ${ }_{25} \pi \iota \kappa \rho o ́ т а т а ~ є ́ т \nu \rho a ́ \nu \nu \epsilon \iota(19 § 1) . ~$






Ediderunt Schneidewin (Heraclidis politiarum quae extant, 1847), Carolus Mueller (FHG ii 208, 1848), Valentinus Rose (Ar. Frag. 6it, ed. 1886, p. 370);
 3 Cf. Strab. 392, schol. Arist. Lys. 58, $59 . \quad 4$ c. 41 \& 2 . $\quad 5$ molpq sive $\tau \mu \mu \hat{p}$ in codd. additum delevit Schneidewin. $8 \mu \epsilon \tau$ à $\mathrm{K}-\mathrm{w}$ (B) coll. frag. $4: \pi \epsilon \rho$ codd.






 àvท̀j ка入òs кaì ảraOós ( 37 § 1 ; 38 §4).
10. Өє $\mu \tau \sigma \tau о \kappa \lambda \hat{\eta} S \kappa a l$ 'A $\pi a ́ y o u ~ \beta o v \lambda \eta ̀ ~ \pi o \lambda \lambda a ̀$ ć $\delta \dot{v} v a \tau o ~(23 § \mathrm{I})$.








## FRAGMENTA

## ex prima libri parte

I (Rose, Frag. $381^{3}$ )


 ỏvoнабӨŋิขal. Harp. 'Aт. $\pi a \tau \rho$.

 <үvעaıкòs> évévєтo. schol. Aristoph. Av. 1527; cf. Bekk. An. $291=$ schol. Plat. Euthydem. p. 369 Bk. Heracl. epit. I.

$$
2\left(384^{9}\right)
$$






[^60]







 tarch. Thes. 25. Cf. Heracl. epit. 2; 'A日. $\pi 0 \lambda .41$, 10.
$$
3\left(385^{3}\right)
$$



 єீка́бтך бข









 $\dot{a} \nu \delta \rho \hat{\omega} \nu$. Lexicon Dem. Patm. p. 152 Sakkelion (Bull. de Corr. Hellén. i 1887). Cf. schol. Plat. Axioch. $37 \mathrm{I}^{\text {d}}$ : 'A $\rho \iota \sigma \tau o-$







[^61]
 ＇A $\theta$ ．тод．Cf．Pollux viii III；Moeris，Suid．，Harp．，s．v． үєขvท̂тa८．

## 4 （frag．Rosio ignotum）





 Eur．Hipp．II Schwartz．Cf．Apollod．bibl．iii 15，5，ë้しo 55 Aiyéa ミкuplov eivvaı $\lambda$ érovaıข．Plutarch．Thes．35，Cim．8； schol．Lycophr．1326．Frag．attulerunt K－w，B．

## dubia

$$
5 \text { (cf. } 394^{3} \text { ) }
$$

 סopvфópovs кт入．（Schol．Arist．Lys．665）；cf．Phot．$\lambda$ чкóтобas． Quae scholiis in eisdem（ $L y s$ ．665－6）de Leipsydrio com－60 memorantur，èx Aristotele（c．19 §3）revera hausta sunt；qua． ex causa fortasse etiam $\lambda$ икóтoós Aristoteli per errorem ad－ scriptum．

$$
6\left(447^{8}\right)
$$

Lex．rhet．Cantab．，s．v．$\lambda o \gamma \iota \sigma \tau a i ́$, ad c． 54 § 2 laudatum．

$$
7\left(456^{3}\right)
$$


 viii 62）．Res prope finem libri fortasse commemorata erat；sed $\pi a \rho a ́ \beta o \lambda o \nu$ nusquam alibi inventum et iure suspectum；mapa－ ßólıov condemnat Phrynichus．

$$
8\left(389^{3}\right)
$$




[^62]Testimonia ad c. 2, 5). Quamquam $\pi \epsilon \lambda \dot{a} \neq a \iota$ in libro scriptum est,
 cuius inter glossas politicas haec inventa sit (61. Fresen., Miller, ${ }_{75}$ Mel. de litt. Gr. 433).
aliena
$9\left(382^{3}\right)$
picturam Aegypti (invenerunt) et in Graecia Euchir Daedalo cognatus, ut A ristoteli placet (Plin. N. H. vii 205).

$$
\text { 10 }\left(386^{3}\right)
$$

Epimenides qui postea Buzyges dictus est secundum A ristotelem (schol. Lemov. ad Vergil. Georg. i 19).

$$
11\left(392^{3}\right)
$$



 тoṽ фı̀л oróoov (Plut. Sol. 32).

$$
12\left(399^{8}\right)
$$








 xii 35, ex Alexandro Myndio, ut putant $\mathrm{k}-\mathrm{w}$ ). èv ois ioto-




 eodem et Aristotele, c. 23 § I, et Cleidemo nominato). Fortasse in zoico quodam libro Aristotelem haec narrasse putant K -w,
'sicut in Hist. An. Z 24 mulum ab Atheniensibus immunitate 100 donatum commemorat, quem Plutarchus in eodem capite Ca tonis (Cat. mai. c. 5) cum cane Xanthippi componit'. Rectius fortasse narrationem Philochoro tribuit J. H. Wright (cf. Introd. § 3 init.).

$$
\text { I } 3\left(40 I^{3}\right)
$$

 тò̀ ä $\nu \delta \rho a \quad \phi \eta \sigma i \nu$ (de Pericle Plut. Per. 4).

$$
14\left(415^{3}\right)
$$

 тота́тора 'A $\rho \iota \sigma \tau о \tau \epsilon ́ \lambda \eta S \kappa \alpha \lambda о \hat{\imath}$ (Pollux iii 17, ex Aristophane Byzantio, ut putant K-w).

I5 (frag. 436 Heitz, a Rosio consulto praetermissum)


 a Rosio (Arist. Pseud. p. 446) laudatus, coll. Hesych. s. v., Etym. Magn. $\pi \epsilon \zeta a i$, Schol. Eur. Alc. 447, Theopomp. ap. Athen. xii 532. Aristotelis nomen fortasse ex alio eiusmodi fonte de- 115 fluxit, qui e capite 50 § 2 ( $\tau a ́ s ~ \tau \epsilon a u ̉ \lambda \eta \tau \rho i ́ \delta a s ~ \kappa a i ̀ ~ t a ̀ s ~ \psi a \lambda \tau \rho i a s ~$


## FRAGMENTORUM IN PAPYRO LONDINENSI INVENTORUM INDEX.

Fragmentorum numeri e Rosii editione Teubneriana (1886) repetiti, editionis Berolinensis (1870) numeris in parenthesi praepositis.

| 18701886 | 'A0. то入. | 18701886 | 'A日. $\pi$ o ${ }^{\text {a }}$. | 18701886 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| (345) 383 | 60 § 2 | $(378) 417$ | 59 | (404) 444 | 54 § 6 |
| (349) 387 | 8 § 3 | (379) 418 | 59 § 3 | (405) 445 | 48 § 4 |
| (350) 388 | 783 | (380) 419 | 59 § 6 | (406) 446 | 48, 54 |
| (351) 389 | 2 § 2 | (381) 420 | 56 §§ 5-7 | (407) 447 | 54 § 2 (?) |
| (352) 390 | 7 § 1 | (382) 421 | 56 § 6(?) | (408) 448 | 50 § 2 |
| (353) 391 | 8 § 5 | (383) 422 | 56 § 6 | (409) 449 | 51 § 1 |
| (355) 393 | 15 § 3 | $(384) 423$ | 56 § 7 | (410) $45^{\circ}$ | 51 § 4 |
| (356) 394 | 1983 | (385) 424 | 57 | (411) 451 | 5183 |
| (357) 395 | 19 §§4,5 | (386) 425 | 57 §1 | (412) 452 | 51 § 2 |
| (358) 396 | 19 § 6 | (387) 426 | 58 | (413) 453 | 53 § |
| (359) 397 | 21 § 5 | (388) 427 | 58 § 3 | (414) 454 | 53 § 2 |
| (360) 398 | 23 § 1 | (389) 428 | 56 § I | (415) 455 | 53 § 2 |
| (362) 400 | 30 § 2 | (deest) 429 | 52 § 1 | (417) 457 | 57 §3 |
| (363) 402 | 27 § 3 | (390) 430 | 61 § 1 | (418) 458 | 57 §3 |
| (365) 403 | 27 § 4 | (391) 431 | 6184 | (419) 459 | 57 § 3 |
| (366) 404 | 25 § 3 | (392) 432 | 61 § 5 | (420) 460 | p. 32, 8-15 |
| (367) 405 | $25 § 4$ | (393) 433 - | 43 § 2 | (421) 461 | $28 \S 3 ; 62 \S 2$ |
| (368) 406 | 28 § 3 | (394) 434 | 43 §§3-6 | (422) 462 | 28 § 3 |
| (369) 407 | 28 § 5 | (395) 435 | 43 § 3,4 | (423) 463 | p. 35, 1-8 |
| (370) 408 | 34 § 1 | (396) 436 | 43 § 4, 5 | (424) $4^{6} 4$ | p. 35, 27-35 |
| (371) 409 | 27 § 5 | (397) 437 | 44 § I | (425) 465 | p. 36, 32-35 |
| (372) 410 | 33 § 1 | (398) 438 | 44 § 2 | (426) 466 | p. 36, $3^{-10}$ |
| (373) 411 | 3483 | (399) 439 | 54 §§3-5 | (427) 467 | 42 § 2 |
| (374) 412 | 55 §83,5 | (400) 440 | 48 §§ $\mathrm{I}, 2$ | (428) 468 | 42 § 5 |
| (deest) $4{ }^{13}$ | 3 § 5 | (401) 441 | 47 §§ 2 , 3 | $\left(4^{29}\right) 469$ | 53 § 7 |
| (375) 414 | $55 \S 2,3$ | (402) 442 | 47 § I | (430) 470 | $49 \S 4$ |
| (377) 416 | 7§ 1; 55§5 | (403) 443 | 6I §7 | (431) 47 I | 56 § 3 |

## GREEK INDEX.

Chapters $1-63$ are quoted by chapter and line; columns 31 to 37 , by column (col.) and line.
** The double asterisk denotes words not found elsewhere ; * the single asterisk, words nor found in the Index Aristotelicus, or only in the corresponding fragments of the ' $\mathrm{A} \theta$. по入.

* ${ }_{\alpha}^{\alpha} \beta \alpha \xi$ col. $36,24,29$

 $\theta \hat{\omega} \nu 5,16$ (Solon) ; v. ápıбтоs, $\beta \in \lambda \tau \ell \omega \nu$, $\beta$ हлtıotos
${ }_{\alpha}^{\alpha} \gamma \alpha \lambda \mu \alpha$ т $\hat{\eta} s^{\prime} A \theta \eta \nu a ̂{ }^{2} 47,5$


${ }^{\prime} A \gamma \gamma \in \lambda \eta \theta \theta \in \nu$ 34, 3
${ }^{*} \alpha \gamma \eta \lambda a \tau \hat{\omega}{ }^{\cdot} \eta^{\eta} \gamma \eta \lambda a \dot{\sigma} \epsilon!20,8$
áy $\quad$ rol 12,6 (Solon)
 57, 20
"A ${ }^{\prime}$ var 28, 19
 dरopdy 38, 4; 57, 28; тaîs áropaîs ( $\tau \hat{\omega} \nu \phi \nu \lambda \epsilon \tau \hat{\omega} \nu) 48,16$
áqupaj̧el 42, 27

áapeúel col. 36, 1 I
áyos 1, $2 ; 20,7$
* aypadiov 59, 10

аурроскос 13,9
d'ypos" pl. 2,6; 16, 16; 24, 3

'Avúpplos 41, 33 f
'A $\gamma \chi$ luonos 19,26

 фоovpoùs (?) àyoúal 24, 19; $\tau \hat{\psi} \tau \rho \iota a-$
 (3) of weight $10,5,8 ; 51,13$ (4)
 тelay-äरety els aútaús 27, 6; elp $\eta \nu \eta \nu$
 38, 24
बं $\gamma \dot{\omega} \boldsymbol{\gamma} \boldsymbol{\gamma} \mu \mathrm{\mu}$ 2, 7 (in different sense in Meteor. $359 a 8$ т $\delta \tau \hat{\omega} \nu$ á $\gamma \omega \gamma(\mu \omega \nu \beta \alpha ́ \rho o s)$

 $\tau l \theta \eta \sigma \iota \nu 57,7 ; 58,2 ; \lambda a \mu \pi d \dot{\delta} \delta \omega \nu$ d $\gamma \omega \bar{\nu} \alpha{ }^{2}$
 25; 7
 ऍouévols col. 36,18
$\dot{a} \gamma \omega \nu / \sigma \tau \dot{\prime} s 60,20$
$\dot{d} \bar{\delta} \epsilon \lambda \phi \dot{\eta}$ I 8 , II
д. $\delta є \lambda \phi$ б́s 18,$36 ; 19, ~ г$


* $\dot{\text { d́bıкlov } \tau \iota \mu \hat{\omega} \sigma \iota \nu} 54,10$


 d $\delta \iota \kappa 0 \hat{\sigma} \sigma \iota \nu 56,42 ; \pi \alpha \rho^{2} \delta \nu \dot{d} \delta \iota \kappa \in i ̂ \tau \alpha t ~ \nu 6 \mu \circ \nu$

 53, 33
doikws I2, 9 (Solon)
d́бóкциоs 49, 4 (omitted in Index Ar.; found in [Ar.] Oec. ii 1347 a 8 т̀ $\nu \delta \mu \tau \sigma \mu \alpha-\dot{\alpha} \delta \dot{\sigma} \kappa \iota \rho \nu \epsilon \epsilon \pi о і \eta \sigma \epsilon)$
dioúvatol 49, 25

* $\dot{\alpha} \delta \omega \rho 0 \delta 6 к \eta$ тоs 25,5
del 5, 19 ( $n . c_{.}$) ; 13, 11; 16, 25; 19, 7, IO, 2 I \&c; $\dot{\alpha} \in i \mu \hat{\alpha} \lambda \lambda \alpha \nu 27,23 ; \tau \hat{\omega} \nu \dot{\alpha} \in l$
 $\mu e \lambda \lambda \eta$ col. 31, 36
detкท́s I2, 7, 40 (Solon)
*deıфvүlav, є́фuүєע 1,3
dshumos 56, 3 I (Rhet. 1372 a 12 )
 á $^{\prime} \alpha \lambda \mu \alpha$ 47, 5
'A $\theta \hat{\eta} \nu a \iota 19,22$; ' $A \theta \eta \eta_{\nu} \eta \sigma \iota 28,29$
'A $\theta$ クขaîol 16, 39 ; 19, 32, 37 ; 20, 9; 21, $18 ; 22,17,33 ; 23,9 . \tau \hat{\omega} \nu$ 'A $\theta$. каl



 56， 3

$\dot{\alpha} \theta \lambda, 0 \in \tau a \iota 60,2,19 ; 62,12$
ä $\theta \lambda$ रov pl．49， $22 ; 54,32$（？）；60， 20




alaî 19， 15 （scol．）
Alqeís frag． 4
Alyds $\pi$ otapol 34， 15
Alyuntos in， 5
＊aldeबts $57,2 \mathrm{I}$
alkelas（ $\delta 1 \kappa \eta$ ） 52,15

 $\sigma \tau \rho a \tau \eta \gamma \hat{\omega} \nu \kappa \tau \lambda$ ） 3 I， 10 and 15 （decree）． $\epsilon l s \quad \delta a \tau \eta \tau \omega ิ \nu$ alpeศг $5^{56}, 3^{6}$
aipetol 22， 23
 （＇elect＇）＇aipoûvтai 38,$5 ; 42,9,15$ ； aipeĩ $\theta a \mathrm{l} 30$ ，II（decree）；aipou $\mu \hat{\nu} \nu \omega \nu$ 3， 20；मेройขт0 4，5；22，8；єіीєто II，І4；
 31， 4 （decree）；$\epsilon \lambda \epsilon \sigma \theta a \iota 13,8$ ；and（in decrees）29，10，37；31，11，14；39，


 25,16 ；of alpe $\theta \in \nu \tau \in s 29,21 ; 30,1,3$ ； 32，1；38，18；and（in decrees）29， 17 ； 31，12； $\mathfrak{n} \rho \eta \mu \in \nu \omega \nu 4$ 4， 10

 altiay 23， 8 ；－тavitas．tàs altias 13 ， ；


 $\tau \dot{d} s \pi \epsilon \rho l \tau \omega \hat{\nu} \pi \rho о \tau \epsilon \rho \omega \nu$ altias $\epsilon \xi \eta \lambda \epsilon \iota \psi a \nu$ 40， 19
alitos－vaumaxias altia 23，5；aiticv $\mu$ ì－
 18；33， 9
 27， 22

＊Aкабтos 3，iof．
 dikatop）
＊${ }^{2} \lambda \lambda \eta \rho \omega \tau l$ 30， 30 （decree）
ลко入ovөヒิ้ข 49， 3

 1272 68 акоб $\mu\left(\alpha, \frac{\omega}{\nu} \nu \delta \nu \nu a \tau \omega \nu\right)$

 decree）29， 19
aкрıтор ג̇токтєival 40， 12 （Meteor． $36 \mathrm{I} b$

 14，6；тठ $\pi \rho 6 \pi \nu \lambda o \nu \tau \hat{\eta} \mathrm{~S}$ д．15，19；
 $\epsilon ф \rho о$ óovy 37,19 ．（2）without article， ṫ à．7， $21 ; 18,14 ; 60,18 ;$ Els á． 55 ， 33；60，16．See $\pi 6$ 人ls．


 40， 6
$d \lambda \gamma \in \alpha 5,7$（Solon）

à $\lambda \eta$ Ə̀＇s 18,28
 di $\lambda \kappa$ tín， 53 （Solon）

 $\phi \nu \gamma \dot{\alpha} \delta \omega \nu) \pi \rho \sigma \epsilon \iota \sigma \tau \dot{\eta} \kappa \in \sigma a \nu 19,9 ;$ K $\lambda \epsilon-$ $\sigma \theta \in \nu \eta \eta^{\tau 00} \gamma \notin \nu 0 u s \tau \hat{\omega} \nu$＇A． 20,$3 ; 28,8 ;$

 ＇A．K $\eta \delta \omega \nu \quad \epsilon \pi \epsilon \theta \epsilon \tau 0$ тoî $\tau u \rho d \nu y o u s 20,20$
à $\lambda \dot{\alpha}$ occurs about 30 times，always with negative preceding．$\alpha \lambda \lambda \dot{\alpha} \eta^{\#} 53,17$ ； also 26， $14 ;$ \｛4， 23 （Blass）；$\mu \dot{\eta} \tau \epsilon — \dot{d} \lambda \lambda a ́$ 16，8；cf．$\mu \boldsymbol{u}^{\prime} \nu$
 a $\lambda \lambda \dot{\lambda} \lambda$ ous 23,18



 （formula of amendment）；$\tau \hat{\omega} \nu \vec{a} \lambda \lambda \omega \nu$

 кal ò̀े кal 2， 3
＊${ }^{2} \lambda \lambda \sigma \sigma \epsilon \delta a \pi a y \hat{\eta} \sigma a l 29,30$（decree）

a $\lambda \lambda \omega \omega$ s 34,2 I
б $\lambda$ ф८та 51, I2
＇А $\lambda \omega \pi \epsilon \kappa \hat{\eta} \theta \in \nu$ 22，24；45， 4
ä $\mu \alpha 3,23 ; 11,7 ; 16$, II；$\pi \rho \sigma \hat{\eta} \lambda \theta \epsilon \nu \dot{\eta} \pi 6 \lambda \iota s$





＊ăцıाтol 49， 7

${ }^{2} \mathrm{~A} \mu \mu \omega \nu 0 \mathrm{~s}, \dot{\eta} 6 \mathrm{I}, 28$
＇А $\mu \pi \rho а к ь \dot{\prime} \tau \eta \mathrm{~S}$ I7， 14
${ }_{\alpha} \mu \phi \iota \beta a \lambda \omega{ }^{2}$ 12， 8 （Solon）

а $\mu \phi\llcorner\sigma \beta \eta \tau \eta \sigma \iota s 28,34 ; p l .9,9 ; 57,11$

¿ $\mu ф$ рре̂̃ 60,6 ；（in the lawcourts）col． 36， 3
а $\mu \phi$ бтєраs． $11,9,12 ; 12,55 ; 15,4 \& c$. $\epsilon \xi \dot{\alpha} \mu \phi \sigma \tau \epsilon \rho \omega \nu-\dot{\alpha} \sigma \tau \hat{\omega} \nu{ }^{22}, 2$

à passim ；áv $\tau \epsilon-a \nu \tau \epsilon 48,19 ; v . \delta s a \nu$ ，

à $\nu \mathrm{a}$ d $\delta \sigma \chi \iota \lambda$ lous 26， 10

 60， 17

 22；$\alpha \nu a \gamma^{\nu} \omega \nu \alpha l$ 54，23．Probl．and （omitted in Index Ar．）Poet． $1462 a 12$
à $\nu \alpha \kappa \kappa \alpha \oint є \iota \nu ~ 51, ~ 18 ; ~ \eta ु \nu \alpha \gamma к \alpha ́ \sigma \theta \eta \sigma \alpha \nu — к \alpha \tau \alpha-~$

 34， 26
іраүкаїо c．inf．44，5；48，16；53，28；
 itmo $\chi$ pelous 12,37 （Solon）
іра́ $\gamma к \eta$ с．inf． 9,$9 ; 47,24 ; 48,5 ; 54,4$ ． tiv taîs àpá
 $\rho \epsilon \dot{\omega} \omega \iota, \tau \hat{\omega} \nu \delta \eta \mu \omega \nu 2 \mathrm{I}, ~$ г 8
 41，12；toùs $\nu$ buous eis toùs кúp阝eis 7，


 c．acc．pers． 47,18 ，and $\epsilon i l_{s} \lambda \epsilon \lambda \epsilon u \kappa \omega \mu e ́ v a$
 d̀vaүрáфєтal 54，37；Є̀ taîs $\sigma \tau \dot{\lambda} \lambda a l s$

 47， 31
 youoc（？）49， 3 （Blass）
＊ả $\nu$ á $\gamma \omega \gamma$ os（？）49， 3


ג $\mu \alpha \theta \dot{\eta} \mu \alpha \tau \alpha$ 7， 20


 öpous àveỉhov 12， 33 （Solon）；（4） 700 s бบкофф́vtas ávpıpouv 35，20；à $\nu \in i ̂ \lambda e \nu$





ảyautious，d̀ve入óvtes toùs 18,31
ג $\nu \alpha \kappa \alpha \lambda \in \sigma a \mu \epsilon \nu \eta$ 8， 9


 （Cleon）28， 17
＇Аиакре́ $\omega \boldsymbol{\nu}$ 18， 5
 （forensic term）48， $23 ; 56,30$
ḋ $\nu \alpha \lambda \alpha \mu \beta \dot{\alpha} \nu \omega^{\prime}(\tau \dot{\eta} \nu \dot{\alpha} \rho \chi \dot{\eta} \nu)$ 16， 35

 20 （decree）．met．${ }^{\prime} \sigma \tau \epsilon \quad \dot{\alpha} \mu \lambda \lambda \sigma \kappa \epsilon \sigma \theta a \iota$ roùs értelkeî＇s 26 ，I 1
 17，7

dуव́ $\lambda \omega \mu a \operatorname{22}, 34 ; 56,24$
 $\mu \iota \quad \gamma^{\nu} \dot{v} \nu a \iota$ Rhet．，à a $\mu \iota \chi \theta \omega \sigma \iota$ Pol．）
 35，I 3

$\dot{\alpha} \nu \alpha \pi \lambda \eta \rho \hat{\omega} \cdot \alpha \nu \in \pi \lambda \eta \rho \omega \dot{\theta} \eta \eta$ 10， 6
àá $\pi \tau \epsilon l$, т $̀ \nu$ altiav 5， 19 （not thus used in Ar．）
ávap才là є́ тоl $\eta \sigma \alpha \nu$ 13， 5
à $\nu \alpha \sigma \dot{\psi} \sigma a \sigma \theta \alpha-\tau \dot{\eta} \nu \dot{d} \rho \chi \dot{\eta} \nu 15,9$
 32 ；d山é $\theta \eta \kappa \in 7,23$（anon．）

 （Solon）
 35
áり $\delta \rho a \pi \delta \delta \omega \nu(\delta i к a \iota) 52,16$
à $\nu \delta \rho \epsilon t \delta \tau \in \rho \circ \mathrm{I}_{4}, 10,12$
dข $\delta \rho \iota \alpha \downarrow \tau \alpha$, à $\nu a \theta \dot{\eta} \sigma \epsilon \iota \nu 7,5 ; 55,32$
＊$\alpha \nu \in \rho \omega \tau \eta \dot{\eta} \sigma a s 55,19$
d̀ $\nu \epsilon \cup \mu \iota \sigma \theta \circ \phi \circ \rho \hat{a} s$ 30， 5 （decree）；$\pi \rho 0 \chi \in \iota \rho 0-$ тovias 43，41；סuka $\quad$ ； 45， 4
$a \nu \epsilon \chi \omega \nu(?)$ col． 3 г， 27

 $d_{\nu} \nu \delta \dot{\alpha} \sigma \omega \nu 56$, I 1,12
＇Ap $\theta \epsilon \mu l \omega \nu, \Delta l \phi l$ Rov 7， 23
＊$\dot{\nu} \nu \theta l \sigma \tau \eta \mu \cdot{ }^{\bullet} \dot{a} \nu \tau \epsilon \sigma \tau \eta \eta$ тoîs $\gamma \nu \omega \rho l \mu o t s$ ó $\delta \hat{\eta} \mu o s$

a $\nu \theta \rho \omega \pi$ os 16,$22 ; 27,24$
 12， 12 （Solon）
 тд̀ пірака 49， 12
＊גцоккоб6 $\mu \eta \sigma \iota s, \tau \in \iota \chi \omega ิ \nu 23,17$
 3， 29
ג $\nu \tau \alpha \pi 0 \delta 0 \theta \in \omega \sigma \omega \nu($（？） 3,13
àvтapájas 12， 14 （Solon）
＊$\dot{\alpha} \nu \tau \in \gamma \gamma \rho \alpha \dot{\alpha} \phi \omega \cdot \alpha \nu \tau \epsilon \nu \hat{\alpha} \gamma \rho a \phi 0 \nu 36$ ， 15
$\dot{\alpha} \nu \tau l 7,24$（anon．）；$\tau \hat{\omega} \nu \tau \epsilon \tau \tau \alpha \rho \omega \nu 21,4 ;$ $\tau \epsilon \tau \rho a \kappa о \sigma t \omega \nu 21,7 ; \tau \hat{\nu} \nu \nu \alpha u \kappa \rho \alpha \rho t \hat{\nu}{ }^{2} 21$, $2 I$
＊$\dot{\alpha} \nu \tau i \gamma \rho \alpha ́ \phi \epsilon \tau \alpha l$ 54， 15,20
＊$\dot{\mu} \nu \tau \iota \delta \eta \mu \alpha \gamma \omega \gamma \omega \hat{\omega}$ 27， 12
àтiסıкоs 53， 9 ；col． 35,33 ；col． 3 6， 28



$\dot{a} \nu \tau i \lambda \alpha \mu \beta \dot{\alpha} \nu \in \sigma \theta a \iota \tau \eta ิ s \dot{\eta} \gamma \epsilon \mu 0 \nu$ las 24， 2


${ }^{\text {＇}} \mathrm{A} \nu \tau \iota \phi \hat{\mu}{ }^{\nu}$ 32， 10
＊Avutos 27， 25 ；34， 23
àvó $\omega^{\circ}$ グข $\nu \sigma \alpha$ 12， 12 （Solon）；oủ $\delta$ èv

d $\xi \cos 63,14 \& \mathrm{cc}$ ．
む $\xi$ Lov̂̀ $\mathrm{I}_{4}, \mathrm{I} 5$ ；$\dot{\eta} \xi l o u v ~ 37, ~ 18 ~$
á乡l由رa 23，8；pl．18，1；35， 24



$$
17-2
$$

$\alpha \pi \alpha \gamma \omega \gamma \gamma^{\prime} \nu,{ }^{*} \nu \delta \in \iota \xi \iota(\nu$ —Kal 29， 26 （decree）； not used thus in Ar．
＊ama，$\in \in\{\phi \omega$（of debts）47， $34 ; 48,2$
á $\pi a \lambda \lambda a \xi \eta$ тou＇s кат $\eta \gamma$ bouvs 55,26
 16， 33
 44，I4
атарке̂̂12， 4 （Solon）
 $\tau \omega \nu$（opp．$\dot{\alpha} \phi \phi^{\prime} \in \kappa \dot{\alpha} \sigma \tau \eta s \tau \hat{\eta} s \phi u \lambda \hat{\eta} s$ ）57，3；

äт $\pi \epsilon \leftharpoonup \iota(a b s u m) \cdot$ à $\pi \hat{\eta} 34,8$
ắтєццц（abibo）＊árıévą 34，8；42， 35








 $\mu \eta \delta \hat{\epsilon} \sigma a \phi \hat{\rho} 9,7$
á $\pi \delta$ passim．（I）＇beginning with＇，${ }^{2} \pi \delta$ К $\lambda \in о ф \hat{\nu} \tau$ тоs 28,25 ；а́тд̀－той $\lambda 63$ ，го； cf．a＇$\phi^{\prime}$ ỗ neut．17， 2 ；masc．？18， 7 ； बं $\phi$＇$\omega \nu$ 27，22．（2）the source from which，$\dot{a} \pi \delta \quad \tau \hat{\omega} \nu \phi b \rho \omega \nu 24,11 ; \tau \hat{\omega} \nu$ $\gamma เ \gamma \nu 0 \mu \epsilon \nu \omega \nu 16$ ， 12 ．（3）the derivation of a name，$\tau \hat{\omega} \nu \tau \delta \pi \omega \nu \kappa \tau \lambda$［3， $25 ; 21$ ， 22．（4）interchangeable with $\dot{\epsilon} \xi$ ，$\in \kappa$ $\tau 0 \hat{v} \kappa \tau \eta \mu a \tau 0 s$ ，о仑к $\dot{\alpha} \pi \delta \delta \tau \hat{\omega} \nu \quad \sigma \tau \epsilon \lambda \in \chi \hat{\omega} \nu 60$ ， 14；áф＇＜éкג்бтクs $\tau \hat{\eta} s>\phi \cup \lambda \hat{\eta} s$ opp．





дंтоßа入eiv Пúlov 27， 26
 in Ar．in this sense）

 （decree）；à $\nu \alpha \beta a \lambda \lambda о \mu \in ̇ \nu \omega \nu$ т $\grave{\nu} \nu$ à．40， 3 ；
 （2）Tàs ả $\pi о \gamma \rho a \phi \grave{s} \tau \hat{\omega} \nu \delta \eta \mu \epsilon v o \mu \hat{v} \nu \omega \nu 43$ ， 20
 $\pi \alpha ́ \lambda \iota \nu$ 39， 18 ；pass．тà ámоүраф́t̀та каl $\pi \rho \alpha \theta \in ́ v \tau \alpha$ 47，22；$\tau \grave{\alpha}$ d̀ $\pi о \gamma \rho \alpha ф 6 \mu \epsilon \nu \alpha$ $\chi$ wpla 52， 6

áтоб́ктаL＇esp．48， 1 －12；also 47， 32 ； 50，3；52， 18


 13，${ }^{2}$
 7 ；62， 5 ；col． 32,20 ；$\dot{a} \pi 0 \delta \iota \delta \delta \nu a \iota 40$ ， 2 r ；a $\pi \mathrm{od} \delta \delta 0$ ús 7，14；20，4；col．36，1； $\dot{\alpha} \pi 0 \delta \iota \delta \delta \nu \tau \epsilon s$ col．37，3；$\dot{\alpha} \pi 0 \delta \omega \sigma \epsilon \epsilon \nu$ I ，
 $\dot{\alpha} \pi<\delta \hat{\varphi} 52,13 ; \dot{\alpha} \pi 0 \delta \hat{\omega} \sigma \iota 56,46$ ；$\dot{\alpha} \pi 0-$ סoûval 39，26；47，24；58，8；áme סото 4， 4
 $\mu \dot{a} \sigma \epsilon \epsilon \boldsymbol{1}$ 55，I I


áто́кєเтаL $\chi \omega$ рі＇s 47， 34

 Poet． 1458 b 1）

 39，19；ȧékктє $\nu \alpha \nu 18,20 ; 38$ ，12；
 7 ；40，12；45，2；57，18， 22
גто入а $\mu \beta \alpha^{\prime} \omega^{*}$ col． 33, I7；37， 6

$\dot{\alpha} \pi 0 \lambda \epsilon \iota \pi \sigma \mu \epsilon \nu 0 s, \dot{a} \pi 0 \lambda \epsilon l \pi \epsilon \sigma \theta a \iota, \quad$ conj．for $\epsilon \pi \iota-q . v$.
 $\alpha \pi \sigma \lambda \lambda u \sigma \theta \alpha \iota 26,1$ I
${ }^{\prime} А \pi 6 \lambda \lambda \omega \nu \pi \alpha \tau \rho \overline{\mathcal{O}} \mathrm{O} 55,21$ ；frag．I
 16， 33 （only in Rhet．ad Alex．）
áro入oүia 55， 21



 $1309 a_{21}$ ）
áropla 13,22
वँторos 16， 6
áтобєเ $\alpha_{\mu} \mu \notin \nu \omega \nu$ тд̀ $\beta$ ápos 6， 5
＊á $\pi$ ootálov 58， 9
$\dot{a} \pi \delta \sigma \tau \alpha \sigma \iota s(t r a n s.) \tau \omega \hat{\nu}{ }^{\prime} I \omega ́ \nu \omega \nu 23,18$



 62,16
 $\rho \dot{\eta} \theta \eta \tau \hat{\eta} s \dot{\epsilon} \pi \iota \mu \in \lambda \in \operatorname{las} 26,2$
áтотl $\mu \eta \mu \alpha 5_{5,45}$

 $54,8,9,10$
aтоruzरávovtes 19，9

 10；28，35；àтофаlvovтal tàs dıaltas
 Pol． $1303 b 35$

$\dot{a} \pi o \phi \epsilon \dot{\gamma} \gamma \omega^{*}$ of acquittal，á $\pi \epsilon \phi \nu \gamma \in \nu 27,27$ ； 45，6；ȧтофúrv 59，9；61， 14 ；ãoфú－ $\boldsymbol{\gamma} \omega \sigma$ 52，5．Opp．áúvectai de Part． An． 663 a 13
＊áтохєьротор $\omega^{*} 49,6,7 ; 61,12$
a $\pi о \chi \omega \rho \eta{ }^{\prime} \sigma \alpha \nu \tau \epsilon s, ~ к а к \omega ิ 37,3$


a $\pi \rho \circ \beta$ ои́ $\lambda \in \cup \tau 0545,22$


＇Apyeîos 17,13 ；pl．17，15；19，25．＇A $\rho-$ रeias（ $\gamma$ uvalkos）17，II；т $\boldsymbol{\eta} \nu$＇Apreial 17， 17
＇Apүしขoúбals，èv 34， 3
＊Ap＇os 17,13

d．pүúpıov 8，18；22， $31 ; 62$ ，17；Éà d ajp piou т $\iota \mu \eta \hat{\eta} 63$ ，15；á $\rho \gamma \dot{p} \rho t a$ 60， 21
 ＇Apeiou $\pi$ ayou $\beta$ ou入 $\eta$ 41，16；60， 1 1；


 ＊Apelov тaүov 16，33；60， 17
${ }^{\text {＇Apeoтaरital 3，38；8，19；25，3，7，12，}}$ 21；27，4；35，10；रो $\tau \hat{\omega} \nu$＇Арєотауเт $\hat{\nu} \nu$ $\beta$ où ${ }^{\prime} 3,34 ; 4,22 ; 26$ ， 1

ส $\rho \in \sigma \kappa \eta$ ，Є̇ $\alpha \nu 22,34 ; 53,8$
d $\rho \in T \hat{\eta} 36,10$
ápı $\theta \mu$ ós $4 \mathrm{I}, 6$ ；col． $36,26,32$

＇Aploteiol 22,$39 ; 23,13,19 ; 24,10 ;$ 28，11；41，17

＇Aploti ${ }^{14}$ 14， 4
${ }^{\prime}$＇Ар $\sigma \tau 0 \gamma \epsilon i \tau \omega \nu 18,13,22 ; 58,3$
＇Apıбтbঠ́коs 25， 24
＇Арьбтокра́тәs 33， 10
${ }^{3}$ Apı тт $6 \mu a \chi o s$ 32， 3


 тal à $\rho \iota \sigma \tau \alpha 30,2$（all in decrees）
dриатоs，є $\Phi$＇14， 29 （de Mundo 400 b 6， de Xenoph． 980 a 12 ）
${ }^{\text {＇}} \mathrm{A} p \mu 6 \delta \mathrm{cos} 18,8,12,13,21 ; 58,3$
$\dot{\alpha} \rho \mu \delta \sigma \alpha s$ 12，46（Solon）
＊áapooтtท́s 37， 19
$\dot{\alpha} \rho \pi \alpha \gamma \alpha \hat{i} \sigma L \nu 12, ~ I 7$（Solon）


aprios $12,14,18$（Solon）
$\dot{a} \rho \tau о \mathrm{~s}, \dot{\alpha} \rho \tau о \pi \hat{\omega} \lambda a \iota, 5$ 1，12， 13


 $\chi^{\text {ail }}{ }^{2} 7,21$
d，$\rho \chi$ диребtaı 44， 16

áp $\chi \neq$（1）＇beginning＇，5，6；41，13；$\epsilon \xi$ d $\rho \chi \hat{\eta} \mathrm{s} 3,6$（？）；16， $1 ; 28,5 ; 41,7 ;$ 55，3；$\dot{\epsilon} \nu \dot{a} \rho \chi \hat{\eta} 5$ ， 20 ；$\dot{d} \rho \chi \eta \dot{\eta} \nu$（＇motive＇） каl $\pi \rho б ф \alpha \sigma \iota \nu 13,13 ; ~ d \rho \chi \grave{\eta} \nu-\kappa \alpha \kappa \omega ิ \nu 18$ ， 8；кат＇d $\rho \chi$ ás 35 ， 18
（2）＇rule＇，＇office＇，＇official＇；the last two combined in $3,4, \pi \rho \hat{\omega} \tau \alpha \tau \tau \hat{\omega} \nu \dot{\alpha} \rho$ ．
 $\mu \hat{\nu} \nu \dot{\eta}$ то̂̃ $\beta$ aat $\lambda \epsilon \epsilon \omega s$. Sing．3，18；7， 15，30；8，14；13，4，7，12；14，17，

18；15，9；16，25，28；16， 35 （？）；17， $1,4,9,18 ; 18,4 ; 24,6,8 ; 36,11 ;$ 41，20；55，34；т̂̂s dं $\rho \chi \hat{\eta} \mathrm{s}$ t̀veка 55， 32 ；á $\rho \chi \eta^{\nu}{ }^{\prime} \rho \chi \omega \nu \tau \iota \nu \dot{a} 53,31 . \quad$ Pl．áp－
 т $\delta \nu \pi \delta \lambda \epsilon \mu 0 \nu \quad d \rho \chi \alpha i \quad 43,5 ; 44,17 ; 61$ ， 1；ai кат̀̀ $\pi \delta \lambda \epsilon \mu о \nu$ a．62， 18 ；à．к $\lambda \eta-$ pural 8，1，5；30， 13 （decree）；43，2；


 8 ，10；тâ̂s á $\rho \chi \alpha \hat{\imath} s 48,8,14 ; 59,3,11$ ；
 $\rho \omega \tau$ ús 8，1；alpoupè $\omega$ v тàs a．3，20；

 $\sigma \theta$ ous 29， 30 （decree）
＊$\dot{\alpha} \rho \chi \eta \gamma \in \tau \alpha \mathrm{c}$, éкато̀ $\nu 2 \mathrm{I}, 25$

 1122 24）


a $\rho \chi \iota \tau \epsilon \kappa \tau о \nu \in s-\epsilon \in \pi i$ тàs עaûs 46,4

 ทै $\rho \xi a \tau 027,24 ; 40,11$ ；dं $\rho \xi \dot{\alpha} \mu \in \nu 0<62,13$. （2）＇rule＇，or＇hold office＇，ap $\chi$ 位 47,4 ； 61,$14 ;$ ắ $\rho \chi 0 \cup \sigma \iota 43,4 ; 50,5$ ；ä $\rho \chi \omega \sigma \iota$

 $\alpha^{\alpha} \rho \xi \in \iota \nu$ 55，31；$\eta \rho \xi \in \nu$ 13，7；19，39；
 36，i I
${ }^{a} \rho \chi \omega \nu$ esp． $56,5-46$ ；also 3，5，9，13， 16，27；13，6，11；14，8；17，2；17，8； 55，5；Solon 5，4；Lygdamis $15,15$. éni－ap apovios about zo times；Neкo－
 $\chi^{i \delta o v} 22,40$ ．For list of archons，see
 col．31，17，24，35；$\tau \hat{\varphi}$ ä $\rho \chi 0 \nu \tau \iota \tau \hat{\varphi}$

 21；29，3I；30，6；45，18；47， 15 ；55， $2 ; 59,19 ; 62,2,10 ; 63$, ；cf． 3,11 ，





 35， 6
à $\sigma a \phi \in$ ís 9， 1 I
$\dot{\alpha} \sigma \epsilon \beta \in\{\alpha s, \gamma \rho a \phi \grave{\eta} 57$ ， 10

$\dot{d} \sigma \epsilon \lambda \gamma \in\{a s-\pi a \cup \dot{\sigma} a \sigma \theta a l 36$, z
$\dot{a} \sigma \theta \in \nu \in \hat{\imath} \mathrm{~S}$ 18， 3 I
＇А $\sigma \kappa \lambda \eta \pi i \psi, \pi о \mu \pi \grave{\eta}$ 56， 21
$\dot{\alpha} \sigma \kappa \omega े \nu 23,14$（n．c．）；$\dot{\alpha} \kappa \kappa \hat{\eta} \sigma \alpha, ~ 23$ ， 10
d $\sigma \pi$ is 42，3I；60， 22
 $\dot{\epsilon} \xi \dot{\alpha} \mu \phi о \tau \epsilon \in \rho \omega \nu-\alpha \dot{\alpha} \sigma \tau \hat{\omega} \nu 42,3$
 19，5；$\epsilon l s$ тò $\mathbf{\alpha} \sigma \tau v 6,15 ; 39,7$（decree）；

 катд̀ $\tau \grave{\nu} \nu \chi \dot{\omega} \rho a \nu) ; 24,3$（opp．غ̇к $\tau \hat{\omega} \nu$


 39，г（decree）；$\tau \hat{\omega} \nu \dot{\psi} \boldsymbol{\epsilon} \tau \hat{\psi}$ a．39， 17 （de－ cree）；$\tau$ ovs $\epsilon \nu \tau \hat{\psi}$ d．39， 24 （decree）．－


＊дтактоі̂̀та 61， 15

$\dot{\alpha} \tau \varepsilon \lambda \dot{\eta} s{ }^{56}$ ， $16 ; \dot{\alpha} \pi \dot{d} \nu \tau \omega \nu 16,24 ; \pi \dot{\alpha} \nu \tau \omega \nu$
 16， 8
ăтсиоs 8，30；16，44；22，42；53，30； 63， 12

＇A $\tau \tau \kappa \kappa \grave{\eta} \nu$, els $\tau \dot{\eta} \nu$ 19， 31 ；$\gamma \lambda \omega \bar{\omega} \sigma \sigma \alpha \nu-\mathrm{A} \tau-$
 $5 \mathrm{I}, 17$


av̂ers 12， 5 I（Solon）．Not in Index．

＊av̉ $\eta \tau \rho \delta \delta \in s 50,6$

 col． 34,36
аúgavo $\mu \epsilon \nu \eta$ ，кaтà $\mu \kappa \kappa \rho \partial \nu 23,2 ;-0 \cup$ то̂́
 $\alpha \nu \zeta \eta \theta \epsilon i \sigma a .3,18$
a

 коута－атоктєі̀аに 37，6；ঠєка—айто－ крдтораs 38，5；а．єаvт $\omega \nu$ 39， 4 （decree） айт $6 \mu a \tau 0 \nu, \tau \dot{\partial}$ 8， 28
aút 6 s 6,$20 ; 12,2 ; 14,13 ; 15,25 ; 16$ ， 14，33；aữol $2,4,7$ ；aùzol $\delta i$ àù $\hat{\nu}$ 19．9．－$\alpha u ̈ \tau \grave{\eta} \nu \mu b \nu \eta \nu \chi \omega \rho \epsilon i \nu \tau \dot{\eta} \nu \psi \hat{\eta} \phi о \nu$ col． $3^{6,8}$ ．－Tov̂ aùrô̂ 4,12
aưтотє入єís крlvè 3,$32 ; 53,5$
aítbхєцр 39， 19 （decree）．Frag． $15533^{b 2}$



 ＇deprived of＇ $34, \mathrm{x} ; 45,7$ ；＇rescued＇ 45， 4
áфavifal，Tovs vbuous 22， 3

$\alpha \phi \epsilon \sigma \omega$, ，є $\rho \sigma \mu \epsilon \nu 0530,33$（decree）






 $\dot{\alpha} \phi \hat{\omega} \sigma_{l} \tau \dot{\alpha} s \pi \delta \lambda \epsilon \epsilon s 34,12$
 38， 26



aủroús 38 ，16；Eủßolas àmoatáaךs 33， 4


＊«фракта，$\chi \omega$ р ${ }^{2}$ 27， 17
${ }^{\prime}$ Ахєрбоибооs $3^{8,22}$
d $\psi(\chi \chi \omega \nu, \delta<k a \iota 57,31$

 ג́кр6тольข 55， 33
קaктクpla 63，6，8；col．32，3，10，16； col．37， 3
$\beta$ à $\lambda a \nu o l$, sortes， $63,8,9 ;$ col．31，32；32， 5， 13 （not found elsewhere in this sense）
$\beta \dot{\lambda} \lambda \lambda$ oval， тò̀s кúßous col．32， 33 ；$\beta \dot{a} \lambda \lambda \eta$ col．36， 10
阝ápßapoc 22， 38
阝apos 6， 5
Baбticla 3， 12

$\beta a \sigma \iota \lambda \epsilon$＇s，king of Persia，29，4，8．o $\beta a \sigma i \lambda \epsilon \delta^{s}$, archon，esp．57， $1-3^{r}$ ；also 3，4，5，17，24；19，7，30；col．33，28；
 $\beta a \sigma \iota \lambda \in \epsilon \nu$, early Attic kings，3，7；$\dot{\boldsymbol{j} ~} \beta$ ． of Pausanias king of Sparta 38， 25 ．

$\beta a \sigma \iota \lambda \iota \hat{\eta} s(\pi 0 \lambda \iota \tau \epsilon l a s) 4$ I， 1 I
$\beta \in \beta a l \omega s$ I5，14；38， 12
$\beta \in \lambda \tau i \omega$ ，opp．$\chi \in l \rho \omega$ 28， 1 ．тd $\beta \in \lambda \tau u \sigma \tau o \nu$

 $\mu \epsilon \tau \alpha \delta о \hat{\nu} a \iota \tau \hat{\nu} \nu \pi \rho a \gamma \mu \dot{\alpha} \tau \omega \nu$ тoîs $\beta \in \lambda \pi l$－ бтots 36,3 ；$\beta$ елтiatous 38 ，19； 42,16 ；
 $\sigma \tau \alpha-\tau \hat{n} \pi d \lambda \epsilon t 29,13$（decree）
＊$\beta$ クु $\mu a$ 28， 17
阝lq 13，7；I5， 9
$\beta \iota a \zeta 6 \mu \in \nu 0$ I $_{2}, 12$（Solon）

Blos，ó éml Kpoyou 16，27；סíà Blov 3，3，
 $\beta$ low 17,8
$\beta$ ldioas（？）$=\beta$ toús 17， 3
$\beta \lambda a \sigma \phi \eta \mu \epsilon \bar{\nu}$ 6， 9 ；cf．Ar．Dial．frag．1481 a 35 （ $\kappa \alpha \tau \grave{\alpha} \tau \hat{\omega} \nu \tau \epsilon \tau \epsilon \lambda \epsilon \cup \tau \eta \kappa \dot{\delta} \tau \omega \nu)$ ）$\beta \lambda \alpha \sigma$－


 Bon日elats 16,38

＊$\beta$ оиколєі̂̀ 3,25

ßоилєบт $\eta \rho<0 \nu$ 32，14；48，3，10；53， 26 （only in corresponding frag．and in Rhet．ad Alex．）
ßouncuTท́s 4，17；35，4；45，17；48，13； 49，17；62， 4
 $\lambda \epsilon \hat{\sigma} a_{l} \delta i s 62,19$. （In decrees）30， 4,16 ， 19；31，2；and $\epsilon \kappa \tau \omega \bar{\omega} \alpha \in \epsilon^{\prime} \beta o u \lambda \epsilon v \partial \nu \tau \omega \nu$ 30， $\mathbf{1 2}$ ；also mid．ßou入éve $\beta$ Oal（e conj．）


 26，1；$\dot{\eta}$ $\epsilon \xi$＇Apelov $\pi$ dayou 4，20；60，
 $\tau \eta \eta \nu$＇Aрєота

 $24 ; \beta$ ．（тетракббьь九）8， 18 ；20， $10 \mathrm{f} ; \beta$ ． （ol тevтaкобtot）esp．43， 6 ff ；and 45 － 49：21，7；22，7；24，14；бuva日poí－



 i；（ $\mu \sigma \theta о ф о \rho \in i ̂) ~ \pi \epsilon \nu \tau \epsilon ~ \delta \beta o \lambda o u ́ s ~ 62,8 . — ~$ Bounds rettapas 30， 14 （decree 411 ）
אob̉л $\eta \sigma$ ts 9,14
ßочдоиєขоs с．inf．11，3；12，16；18，i8； 21， 5 f；22， 17 ；25， 12 ；ol $\beta$ ои入 $6 \mu \in \nu 0 ᄂ$
 $27 ; 17 ; \tau \hat{\psi} \beta$ ．ムакєа $\delta \hat{\omega} \nu 27,15 ; \tau \hat{\omega \nu}$ $a ̈ \lambda \lambda \omega \nu \tau \hat{\psi} \beta$ ．29，14；тovs $\beta$ ．＇$\Delta \theta \eta \nu a l \omega \nu$ 39， 2 （decree）：$\beta o v \lambda \in \sigma \theta a \iota 15,4$ ；$\epsilon \beta o v-$入єто 11,13 ；$є \beta$ ои́入оуто 16， 36
 20）

Bpax́̄os，хpovou 35， 25
$\beta \omega \mu b \nu, \kappa a \theta l \zeta \epsilon-\dot{\epsilon} \pi l$ т $\quad \nu \quad 25,19$
raîay 5， 8 （Solon）
$\gamma^{1} \lambda a{ }_{12}, 64$（Solon）
 io（Frag． $172^{2}$ ）
र $\alpha$ коs 3， 27

रáa passim．After $\sigma \eta \mu \hat{i} \hat{0} \nu \delta \hat{\epsilon} 7,21 ; 8$ ， 7．каl $\gamma \mathrm{d} \rho 22,2 ; 41,27 ;$ кal $\gamma \mathrm{a} \rho$－ kal 19，2；27；4．In third place，$\mu \dot{\varepsilon} \nu$ रd $\rho-\delta \dot{k} 3,9 ; 11,10 ; 14,10 ; 16,37$ ； 24，12；28， 5 ；40，14；41，6；47，2； тє $\gamma \mathrm{d} \rho-\kappa а \mathrm{l}$ 16，4，31；19， 10 ；кат
 4；白 $\pi l$ mépas $\gamma \mathrm{d} \rho$ 38，24．In fourth
 रda 59， 3

＊$\gamma \in \nu \nu$ र̂ral frag． 3


 21，6，23；тot̂s $\gamma$ éveat 57 ， 1 I
Гєра। $\sigma$ тbs 22， 42
 12
＂$\gamma \epsilon \omega \mu \rho \rho o t$ frag．2， 14
 16，17；－ras 16， 7
री 2，6；12， 15 \＆c．кат $\dot{\alpha} \gamma \hat{\eta} \nu 19,30$.


$\boldsymbol{\gamma} \gamma \nu 0 \mu a c$（often spelt $\gamma \iota v$ ．in papyrus） 2 ， 8 n．с．；16，11；$\tau l$ रlүveтal；16，20； тouút


 32，Io．$\gamma \in$ रुove 3,$18 ; 42,7 ; 54,19$ ；
 28，28，31；42，5；56， 18 f；үєчо⿱宀́s 26，23；－bs 15,$24 ; 25,19 ;-$－́тes $4^{22}$ ， $3 ;-6$ тas 29， 38 ；30， $5 ;-6 \sigma \iota \nu 63$ ， 11
$\gamma \subset \gamma \nu \omega \sigma \kappa \omega$（often spelt $\gamma \psi \nu$－in papyrus） 5 ， 7 （Solon）．$\quad \gamma \iota \gamma \nu \dot{\omega} \sigma \kappa о v \sigma t$（＇decide＇） 53 ， 7；єүvarav c．inf．26，15，22；37，3． c．acc．34， 14 ；ó rı à $\gamma \nu \omega \bar{\omega} \omega$ ol $\delta \iota$－ кабтаl 48，27．тоे $\gamma \nu \omega \sigma \theta$ еे 54,7 ；rous Eqע $\omega \sigma \mu \in \nu$ оus 36,14
$\gamma \boldsymbol{\lambda} \omega \sigma \sigma \alpha \nu-' A \tau \tau \kappa \kappa \eta \nu 12,38$（Solon）

रunolous，$\pi$ aî̃as 4， 9

 фļova $2 \boldsymbol{4} 48,12$
$\gamma \nu \dot{\rho} \rho \mu \mathrm{\mu}$（＇friends＇）6，7；opp．to $\delta \hat{\eta} \mu \mathrm{os}$ ， 2，1；5，2；11，8，11；16，36；28，7， 10；34， 19
 $\tau \eta \tau \circ \hat{0} 53$ ， 12 （not used thus in Ar．）
 55， 17
Topyinos＇Apyeios 17， 13
үрд $\mu \mu$ а $63,19,21,22,24$ ；col．31，6， 13，27；col．32，4， 12
रраццатє̂̂o $47,16,19,20,27,30 ; 48,2$ ， 4；53，13， 22

 21．$\theta \epsilon \sigma \mu 0 \theta \epsilon \tau \hat{\omega} \nu 55,4,7$ ；59，19； 63 ，2．（ $\sigma \tau \rho a \tau \eta \gamma \omega \bar{\nu}$ in $_{411}$ ） $3 \mathrm{I}, 12$（de－ cree）
रpapal．áypaфlou 59，10；ádılou 54，10；
 $\delta \omega \rho 0 \xi \in \nu l a s ~ 59, ~ 8 ; ~ \delta \omega \omega \rho \omega \nu ~ 54, ~ 9 ; ~ 59, ~ 9 ; ~$
 $\kappa \lambda о \pi \hat{\jmath} s$（ $\delta \eta \mu \circ \sigma / \omega \nu \quad \chi р \eta \mu \alpha \dot{\alpha} \omega \nu$ ）54，68； močelas 59，11；छєvlas 59，8；тара－ $\nu 6 \mu \omega \nu 29,23 ; 45,24 ; 59,6$ ；каi $\nu \delta \mu \nu \nu$
 59，6；тиркаїӓs 57，16；трайцатоs（ঠікаи） 57，14；бикофартlas 59，9；фар $\mu \dot{\alpha} \boldsymbol{\omega}^{\prime}$ （ठlкך） 57,15 ；$\phi \delta \nu 00$（ঠiкаи） $57,12,14$ ；

 9；56， 29
 29， 17 （decree）；34，27；є̈ $\gamma p a \psi a \nu 29$. 21；रpá廿as els $\pi$ тıákıo 48，20；－àtos $\gamma \nu \omega \mu \eta \nu 14,5 ; 29,7 ;-a \nu \tau \epsilon 548,9$ ；


 $\pi а р a \nu 6 \mu \omega \nu 40,8$.
$\gamma \nu \mu \nu \kappa \grave{\partial} v$ á $\hat{\omega} \nu a$, тò $\nu 60,5,22$




 41

$\Delta a \mu \omega \nu \delta \delta \eta s=1 \hat{\eta} \theta \in \nu 27,19$
 $\nu \in \check{\zeta} \delta \mu \in \nu 0 \iota 38,8 ;$ Édavєlनavio 39, 25;
 -ot 6, 9; 22, 35
$\delta_{\alpha \nu \epsilon \epsilon \sigma \mu 0 l} 2,8 ; 4,23$
סamaví 8, 15; 22, 35
$\delta a \pi \alpha \nu \hat{\omega}^{+} \delta a \pi a \nu \eta \bar{\sigma} \sigma \iota 29,^{29}$, 30 (decree)

* $\delta a \tau \eta \tau \hat{\omega} \nu a \neq \epsilon \epsilon \tau \nu, \epsilon l s, 56,36$

 \&c.; кal- $\delta \dot{\text { é 12 }} 12,15 ; 41,20$ (?)



 cree)


 $3^{6}$, 18


 $\epsilon l s \delta . \phi \cup \lambda a ́ s ~ 21,4 ; ~ \delta . ~(\mu \epsilon ́ \rho \eta) ~ 21, ~ г 3 . ~$
oi déкa- (1) under the Four Hundred, in $411, \delta$. á̇тократорєs $31,10-12 ; 3^{2}$, 13; (2) after the Thirty, in 404, aúro-

 2r) ; superseded by (3) another Board of Ten, toùs $\beta \in \lambda t l \sigma t o u s$ єival סoкоivtas,

 Other bodies of Ten (in 41I), $\pi$, $\dot{o}^{-}$阝ounol 29, 11; (катадоүеîs) 29, 37;
 $\mu \in \lambda \eta$ ral 30, 8-10 (decree): (in 404) то̂ Пеєраєtшs apхоутєs $\delta .35,6 ; \delta$. $\delta \iota a \lambda \lambda a \kappa \tau \hat{\omega} \nu 3^{8,} 26$. For official bodies of Ten under the normal constitution








* סєкаєтlav, ${ }^{\boldsymbol{\eta}}$ рХоу 3, 4
 27, 27
 8 f ; $7 \delta$ 8. 54,12
$\delta є к а т \eta ~ 16, ~ І 3, ~ 22 ~$
 $\phi u \lambda \hat{\eta} \mathrm{~s} 63,2$
$\Delta$ екедеса 34, 8


 $\boldsymbol{\tau} \boldsymbol{\eta} \boldsymbol{\nu} \delta$. $\delta \in \delta \omega \kappa є 18,36$



$\delta \in \sigma \mu \omega \tau \eta p l o v$ фи́入акеs $35,6: \epsilon \nu \tau \hat{\varphi} \delta, 52,2$

סєбтот $\kappa \kappa \omega \tau \epsilon \rho \omega s$ 24, 7



 14, 30

 2 ( $т \rho о б \tau є \rho \circ \nu) ; 48,7$; ( $\sigma \tau \rho а \tau \eta \gamma \circ i)$ кйрьоь

 I6


 40, 17. кal ס̀̀ каl 2, 3; 16, 5, 40
ס $\dot{\eta} i \mathrm{O}=12,21$ (Solon)


 20

$\delta \eta \mu a \gamma \omega \gamma \delta{ }^{2}$ 22, ${ }^{1} 4$
$\delta \eta \eta a \gamma \omega \gamma \hat{\omega}$. $\pi \rho o ̀ s ~$ тò $\delta \eta \mu a \gamma \omega \gamma \epsilon \hat{\nu} \nu$ є $\lambda$ өбутоs

 ঠпиа аүшүойтаs 26, 3
$\Delta \eta \mu \alpha \rho \in т о$ з 38 , 11
 54, 34

$\delta \eta \mu \eta \gamma \circ \rho \hat{\nu} \nu 15,20$; ̇̇ठ $\begin{aligned} & \eta\end{aligned} \eta \gamma \dot{\rho} \rho \eta \sigma \in$ 28, 18
ס $\bar{\mu} \mu \mathrm{os} 45,3$

бұиократіа 23, 2; 29, 2, 5, 18; 38, 30 ; 40, 13; 4I, 13, 21



 $\sigma \iota \tau \hat{\omega} \nu \delta .21,19 ; \pi \dot{\delta} \theta \in \nu \tau \hat{\omega} \nu \delta .55,13$,
 катà $\delta \eta \eta_{\mu}$ us $^{21}, 12 ; 48,24$; ol катà $\delta$. ঠєкабтаl 16, 3; 26, 21; 53, 3; $\delta \iota \eta-$ poûvto els tous $\delta .62,3$
(2) populus, 12, 4, 11, 29, 49, 57
（Solon）．5，2；6，1；9，12；11，10； 15，14，16；18，29；20，4，13，16，17； 21，1； 25,1 1，10；29，10；34，I，7，19， 26；35，19；36，6；38， $17,20,28$ ； 41，2，4，5，25－7；42，2，31；43，12， 28．$(=\epsilon \kappa \kappa \lambda \eta \sigma(a) 44,8 ; 45,22 ; 46$ ，
 $\sigma \tau \alpha \tau \eta \mathrm{y} 2,9 ; 23,13 ; 25,4$ ．өарооїvos

 26， $11 ;$ Пє $\rho \kappa \lambda \hat{\eta} s ~ \pi \rho о є \epsilon \sigma \tau \grave{\eta} \kappa \epsilon \tau$ той $\delta$ ． 28 ，



 кратク̆аитеs 40,24
д̀nubocos，$\dot{\text { a }} 47,31 ; 48,4$ ．lotos and $\delta \eta$－ $\mu$ bбtos 6,$4 ; 43,27 ; 48,25 ; 59$ ， 16 ．




$\delta \eta \mu$ б́т $\varsigma^{*} 21,16 ; 22,22 ; 27,14 ; 42,3$ ， $5,9,11,13 ; 59,12 ; 62,5$
 то入ıтеlà 29，19；$\delta \eta \mu$ отька́ 10,$1 ; \delta \eta$－ $\mu о т \iota \kappa \dot{\prime} \tau \epsilon \rho a 22,1 ; 27,3 ; 41,15 ; \delta \eta$－ мотьки́татоs 13，20；14，1；тріа－б $\eta \mu$ о－ тєкผ́тата 9，2．ol $\delta \eta \mu о т \iota к о$ е，6，13； $16,3^{6 ; 18,30 ; 34,18}$
Sta．c．gen．（I）duration of time，$\delta i a ̀$阝lov 3，3，39．（2）interval of time， ס九à $\tau \hat{\omega} \nu$ aút $\hat{\omega} \nu \chi$ रóvà 13，6；adverbial
 Rhet． 1386 b $\quad$ I \＆c）．（3）agent，$\delta L^{\prime}$

 41，5．（4）means，סıà toútcv 25 ，I； $\delta \iota^{\prime} \omega^{\nu} 25,9 . \quad(5)$ distributed possession， $\dot{\eta} \gamma \hat{\eta} \delta l^{2} \delta \lambda i \gamma \omega \nu \hat{\eta} \nu \quad 2,6 ; 4,29 ; \epsilon \dot{a} \nu \delta \iota^{3}$

c．acc．（1）personae，$\delta \iota^{\prime} \delta v 22,16$ ； Sid Пavoavlay 23，20；тoùs $\delta \eta \mu a \gamma \omega-$
 toùs тарорүiбavтas 34，7：（2）rei，סià тои̂тo 21，8；тaûta 38，3I；тоนฝ́v $\delta^{\prime}$ aitiav 19，8；таúтŋу тウ̀v aiтlav 23，8； taútas tàs altias 21，I；тà d $\xi_{\iota} \dot{u}^{\prime} \mu a \tau a$



 18，2；ті̀े $\pi a \rho \rho \eta \sigma i a \nu ~ 16,23 ; ~ \tau \grave{~} \pi \lambda \hat{\eta} \theta$ os $\tau \hat{\omega} \nu \pi 0 \lambda \iota \tau \hat{\omega} \nu 26,21$ ；$\tau \grave{\eta} \nu \dot{\rho} q \theta \nu \mu l a \nu 8$ ， 28；т $\dot{\eta} \nu \sigma \epsilon \iota \sigma a \chi \theta \epsilon เ a \nu ~ 12, ~ 27 ; ~ \tau \grave{\eta} \nu ~ \sigma \nu \mu-$


 19，2；а́тоßа入єîv Пú入ov 27，26；$\beta o \eta-$
 7；11，9；Өavuáaal 16，19；$\mu \in \gamma d \lambda \eta \nu$



 $\sigma \tau a \sigma\llcorner a ́ \zeta \in \iota \nu 13,8 ; \sigma \nu \mu \beta \hat{\eta} \nu a \iota 28,33$ ； $\tau \iota \mu \omega \rho \in \hat{\imath} \nu$ I 9,2
 $\delta t a \beta \in \beta \lambda \eta \mu \in \mathcal{\nu}$ OUS 23,20
＊$\delta \iota a \beta o v \lambda \epsilon \hat{v} \sigma a \iota,(\kappa a \tau \epsilon \lambda u ́ \theta \eta) \dot{\eta}$ ßov $\lambda_{\eta} \pi \rho \iota \nu$, 32， 4
 $\mu \in \chi \chi \rho \tau$ т̂̂s $\nu \hat{v} \nu$ c．part． 4 I， 23
 Slároval 42，29
 28 （cf．Pol． 1293 a $29 \tau \hat{\tau} \nu \tau \epsilon \lambda \epsilon u \tau \omega ้ \nu \tau \omega \nu$ $\delta \iota a \delta \epsilon \chi \in \sigma \theta a \iota$ тoùs vt̂îs）；$\delta \iota \in \delta \in \in \chi о \nu \tau 0$ $\sigma u \nu-$ $\epsilon \chi \omega \hat{s} \tau \grave{\eta} \nu \quad \delta \eta \mu \alpha \gamma \omega \gamma$ lay 28， 26
 $\delta \iota \epsilon \delta \omega \kappa \epsilon 23,7$ ；（ $\delta \iota \omega \beta \in \lambda(a) \delta \iota \in \delta \iota \delta о \tau 0$（？） 28， 21
 57， 10 （only in corresp．frag．and Oec． ${ }^{1} 3476$ 28）
 каl $\epsilon \pi เ \kappa \lambda \dot{\eta} \rho \omega \nu$ 56， 39 ；（т $\rho \iota \eta \rho а \rho \chi \hat{\omega} \nu)$ 6I， 9

 $\tau \epsilon \tau \tau \alpha \rho a \quad \tau \epsilon \lambda \eta 7,9 ; \delta \iota \dot{\rho} \eta \tau 07,9 ; \delta \iota \eta$ ．



 53，28；̇ккঠuuтầ 53， 29

 $\pi \alpha р$ т тoû ठ． 53,18



 （decree）
סidkove 20， 22 （scolium）
 （ $\delta \kappa \alpha a \sigma \tau \alpha s) 53,15 ; \delta а к \delta \sigma \iota a(\mu \epsilon \tau \rho a) 7$, 27



 28


 26
 I；40，I

 ＇Eлeufivl 40， 25


 25，2；33， 1
$\delta \iota \alpha \mu \phi เ \sigma \beta \eta \tau \epsilon \hat{\varepsilon}, \dot{v} \pi \hat{\epsilon} \rho \quad \alpha \mu \phi о \tau \epsilon \rho \omega \nu \quad \mu \dot{\chi} \chi \epsilon \tau \alpha \iota$ kal 5， 20
 ö $\sigma 0 \mathrm{ol} 35,11$

 тク̀̀ $\chi \dot{\omega} \rho a \nu \quad \tau \rho \iota \alpha ́ к о \nu \tau \alpha ~ \mu \hat{\rho} \rho \eta ~ 21, ~ 12 ; ~ \delta \iota \alpha-~$
 $\delta \epsilon \kappa \alpha \mu \epsilon \rho \eta$ 30， 17 （decree）；$\delta \iota \alpha \nu \epsilon[\mu a \nu \tau \alpha$


 38， 23
бьатєббитоs（？），$\chi$ рбуои 35,25

$\delta \iota a[\rho t \theta \mu 0 \hat{\imath} \sigma \nu]$ col． 36,29

＊＊$\delta \iota \alpha \rho \rho \iota \nu \omega$＂$\epsilon \pi i \theta \eta \mu a \quad \delta \iota є \rho \rho \iota \nu \eta \mu \epsilon \nu 0 \%$ col． $3^{6,}$ 8

$\delta с а \sigma \eta \mu \alpha \downarrow \nu \omega^{\cdot} \delta \iota \epsilon \sigma \eta \eta \eta \nu a \nu 15,22$

 $\pi \lambda \hat{\eta} \theta$ os $3^{6,4}$
入орто 19， 11



 $\tau 6 \xi a \sigma a 8$ ， 11


 20， 19
 d́ $\rho \chi$ ás 4,$30 ; \tau \grave{\alpha} \mu \epsilon \bar{\gamma} \sigma \sigma \tau \alpha \tau \hat{\omega} \nu \pi 0 \lambda \iota \tau \tau \kappa \omega \hat{\nu}$ 8， 22

$\delta \iota \alpha \tau \rho l \beta \omega^{-}$c．part．$\delta \iota \in \tau \rho \iota \beta \in \delta \eta \mu \eta \gamma \circ \rho \omega \hat{\nu} 15$ ，

 фи入акт ${ }^{2}$ plots 42， 33
$\delta c a \phi a \dot{d} \eta \nu{ }^{12,57}$（Solon）




$\delta c a \phi \theta \in \epsilon \rho \alpha$, （＇corrupt＇）$\tau \delta \nu \delta \bar{\eta} \mu \nu \nu 28,16$.


סtá́фороs c．dat． $1 \mathrm{I}, 8$

$\delta \iota \alpha \chi є \rho l \zeta \omega \sigma-\chi \rho \dot{\eta} \mu a \tau a 30,{ }^{14}$（decree）； cf．43，13，and Pol．s 322 b 28
＊$\delta \iota \alpha \chi$ єє $\rho о т$ оуойбเข 49,17
＊$\delta<\alpha \psi \eta \phi l \xi \in \sigma \theta a \epsilon$ 55，${ }^{2} 5$ ；col． 36 ， 10 ；$\delta \iota \alpha-$
 $3^{6,}$ ， 3

$\left.\delta_{1} \delta \dot{\sigma} \sigma \kappa \alpha \lambda 0 \iota(\xi \phi \eta\} \beta \nu\right) 42,22$

＊$\delta \delta \delta \rho \alpha \chi \mu 0 \nu$ 10， 7 ；Oec． 1353 a 17

 $\delta i \delta \omega \sigma \iota-\epsilon l_{s} \tau \rho \circ \phi \eta \dot{\nu} 42,2_{4} ; \delta i \delta \omega \sigma \iota \nu$ ह̇лt－ $\chi \epsilon \rho \rho \tau о \nu i a \nu-\psi \hat{\eta} \phi \circ \nu 55,22 \mathrm{f}$ ；$\delta<\kappa \eta \nu$（42，




 кабт $\dot{\eta}$ са） 59,2 ；（фа́р $\mu \alpha к о \nu)$ סоv́s 57，16； סous катクץoplà кal ámo入oriav 55， 2 I
＊$\delta \iota \epsilon \gamma \gamma v a ̂ \sigma \theta a \iota 4$ ， 10
 $\delta \iota \epsilon \lambda \theta \delta \nu \tau \omega \nu-\epsilon \in \omega \bar{\omega} \nu 42,36$
$\delta \iota \kappa d j \omega$ of the officials presiding at a
 $57,17,21,23-26,30 ; 59,2 ; \epsilon \mu \mu \eta-$ vous elod $\begin{gathered}\text { Yoytes } 52,17 \text { ；cf．} 57,27 \text { and }\end{gathered}$


 37， 5
 каєоу 9，13；11，64；סькаlocs（ $\mu$ етрогs


 31

бькабтท门рıa（under Solon）7，15；9，5，10； （Ephialtes）25，ro；（Pericles）$\mu, \sigma \theta 0$－ $\phi 6 \rho \alpha 27,11$ ；（Anytus）$\delta \epsilon \kappa \alpha \sigma \alpha s$ rd $\delta t-$
 peov（29，26），$\epsilon \mathrm{s}$ т $\tau \delta .45,10 ; 48,26$ ；


 $\delta \kappa к a \tau \tau \eta \rho l \varphi{ }^{5} 5,7,10 ; \epsilon \nu \tau \hat{\Psi} \delta .47,22$ ； 48,$18 ; 55,22 ; 56,3 ; 61,12$ ．тò $\delta$ ． 63,17 ；т $\dot{\alpha} \delta .63,23$ ；троүра́чає 59，г．


 tis $\tau$ à $\delta$ ．（？） 63,3
סєкабтท่s，Е̌кабтоs，63， 18 ；$\delta$ ккабтаі－




 кл $\eta \rho \circ \hat{0} \sigma \iota 59$, І 8

 1． 46 ．
 бiкаs $\lambda a \gamma \chi a ́ v o v a \iota \nu 53,2 ; ~ \delta i к а є ~ \lambda a \gamma \chi a ́ \nu-$ оута！$\pi \rho$ òs avitbv 58,4 ；$\delta$ iкаs крivelv 3 ， 32
 16；$\dot{\alpha} \pi о \sigma \tau \alpha \sigma l o v, \dot{\alpha} \pi \rho о \sigma \tau а \sigma і о \nu, 58,9 ;$



 52，ІІ－20；$\dot{\epsilon} \mu \pi$ торкаи 59 ， 14 ；єрауькаи 52， 15 ；toıal 58，5；59，13；к入йрыу каl







 $\mu о \sigma(\omega \nu \quad \chi \rho \eta \mu a \tau \omega \nu)$ ，тиркаіӓs，траúpaтоs， $\phi \delta \nu o \nu$, see $\gamma \rho \alpha \phi а і$
$\delta \ell \mu \eta \nu 0 \nu \bar{\eta} p \xi \in \nu 33,2$
ס८d каl 3，17，21，38；5，19；8，16；16， 13，26，34；17，4；20，21；23，15，20； 27，20；סeठ кal ע仑̂v 7， 29
 3，16；тávтa，16，31；44，12；тク̆

 кои̂ $\iota, ~ \pi \epsilon у \tau \epsilon \tau \eta \rho / \delta a s$ 54，28；$\pi о \mu \pi \eta \eta$

 $\pi \sigma \lambda \iota \nu 16,2 ; \tau \grave{\eta} \nu \pi 6 \lambda \iota \nu 23 ; 3$ ．$\tau \grave{\mathrm{c}}$ ä $\lambda \lambda a$ $\pi \alpha \nu \tau a \quad \delta \iota \dot{\kappa} \kappa \frac{\nu \nu}{26}$ ， 12 ．$\delta \iota \dot{\psi} \kappa \eta \sigma \alpha \nu, \tau \epsilon \epsilon-$


 $\pi \epsilon \rho i \tau \hat{\omega} \nu \delta \iota \psi \kappa \eta \mu \notin \nu \omega \nu \quad 25,7$
 43．I
 56，22；$\tau \hat{\omega} v$ è $\pi i$ $\Lambda \eta \nu a l \varphi$ 57， 4 ；in Sa－ lamis and Peiraeus 54， 35
Aévugos 3， 26

$\delta<\pi \lambda о$ йтає 54,12
$\delta i s ~ \tau \delta \nu \nu \alpha u ๋ \tau \partial \nu \mu \grave{\eta}$ ă $\rho \chi \epsilon \iota \nu 4, \mathrm{I} 5$ ；๑ủk єั $\sigma \tau \iota \nu$


＊$\delta$ б $\sigma \mu$ úpoo 24， 12
 סi $\sigma \chi$ inlous 26， 10
$\Delta i \phi t \lambda o s ~ 7,21,23$
＊$\delta 1$ रous col． $34,33 \mathrm{f}$
$\delta \omega \omega \beta \in \lambda(a$ 28， 20 （ $\delta \omega \omega$（

 ros，＇the plaintiff，＇ 53, ir ；col．36， $3^{2 .}$


 moulay 23， 4
 12；—ßou入evtás 45，17；－$\theta^{\prime}$ ăpхоутаs
 49， $1,5,7$ ；－d́duvárous $49,25,27$ ．סo－


 55，27；（ol d $\theta \lambda о \theta \epsilon \tau \alpha \iota) 60,3$ ；бокццаб－ $\theta \omega \sigma$ ov ol $\ddagger \phi \eta \beta o \iota 42,14$
 （oi $\theta \in \sigma \mu \Delta \theta \in \tau a u) 59,11$
ठок $\omega \hat{\text { p }}$ pasim．c．inf．6，12；9，2；10，1； 20，7；22，17；25，5；28，35 \＆c．тà


 Eth．II3I $a 7$
$\delta \delta \xi a \nu, \pi \alpha \rho \dot{\alpha} 1 \mathrm{II}$, 10；$\tau \hat{\eta} \phi \dot{\nu} \sigma \epsilon \iota$ каl $\tau \hat{\eta} \delta \delta \xi \eta$ 5，12；סià $\tau$ d̀s $\pi a \tau \rho \iota \kappa \grave{s} s \delta \delta \xi a s$ 26， 9
$\delta 6 p v_{42,} 31$
סорифбоо（of Hippias）18， 22
 $\pi \lambda$ ouvlocs 2,$3 ; \tau \omega \bar{\nu} \pi 0 \lambda \lambda \omega \bar{\nu} \delta o u \lambda \epsilon u b \nu-$
 －סovicúouva 12， 34 （Solon）

$\Delta \rho \alpha к о \nu \tau 1 \delta \eta$ s 34,27
Арdкшу 3，1；4，3；7，2；41，11
${ }^{*} \delta$ рах $\mu \dot{\eta}^{*} 3,19 ; 10,6 ; 23,7 ; 42,25 ; 50$ ， $7 ; 62,7,12,14 . \quad \epsilon \pi i \quad \delta \rho a \chi \mu \hat{\eta}$ 52，13． $\mu \epsilon \chi \rho \iota$ ठєка $\delta \rho a \chi \mu \hat{\nu} \nu$ 52，19；53，5． Omitted $\dot{\epsilon} \nu \tau \delta s \chi^{\imath \lambda}\left\langle\omega \nu-\dot{v} \pi \dot{\epsilon} \rho \chi^{i} \lambda l a s 53\right.$ ， If f．（ $\sigma v \nu a \lambda \lambda d \gamma \mu a \tau a) ~ \delta р a \chi \mu \iota a i ́ a ~ к а l ~ \pi \epsilon \nu-$

＊др́́фактоs 50， 11



$\delta \dot{v} \nu a \mu \nu, \epsilon \tau \chi 0 \nu 12,6$（Solon）；$\mu \epsilon \gamma i \sigma \tau \eta \nu$


 22， 13 （cf．$\tau \hat{\omega} \nu \overline{\epsilon ̇ \nu}$ тaîs ĖGovalats Eth． 1095 6 21）




$\delta u v a \sigma \tau \epsilon l a \nu, \kappa \alpha \tau \alpha \lambda\left(\sigma_{\eta} \tau \grave{\eta} \nu\right.$（of the Thirty） 36， 6






 $\chi$ áp $\nu \nu$ 16，7．dat．ठvoîv фu入аî̀ 52，12；
 Cf．Kühner，ed．Blass，í p． 633




$\delta \dot{\sigma} \delta$ ека 8 ，13；21， 9

 рєผิ้ 3， 13

$\delta \hat{\omega}_{\rho a}$ סoús 59,9 ；$\lambda a \beta 6 \nu \tau a 54,8 ; \mu \grave{\eta} \lambda \eta^{-}$ $\psi \in \sigma \theta a l 55,3 . \delta \omega \dot{\rho} \omega \nu \nu \rho a \phi \dot{\eta} 59,9 ; \delta \omega$－ $\rho \omega \nu \tau \iota \mu \omega \sigma \iota \nu 54,9$
éáv 7；6；16， 42 （law）；17，7；22， 34 \＆c．Cf．$a^{\prime} \nu$
 ċautoús（ $=a \dot{a} \lambda \lambda \hat{\eta} \lambda$ lous） 13,12
е் $\beta \delta о \mu$ иккогта 10， 6

$\dot{\epsilon} \gamma \gamma i \gamma \nu \in \tau a l 54,32$

є $\gamma \gamma \rho a ́ \phi о \nu \tau a l-\epsilon i s$ тoùs $\delta \eta \mu$ бтаs 42，3，4；
 סıкalws é $\gamma \gamma \rho a ́ \phi \in \sigma \theta a l$ ， 42,10 ；toùs é $\gamma \gamma \rho a-$ $\phi \varepsilon ́ \nu \tau a s 42$ ， 12 ；ol $\delta$＇ह́ $\phi \eta \beta$ ot ol ह́ $\gamma \gamma \rho a \phi$ ó－



 $\tau \hat{\omega} \nu$ é $\gamma \gamma \epsilon \gamma \rho a \mu \mu \dot{\nu} \nu \omega \nu$（ $\epsilon l_{\mathrm{S}}$ тд̀ $\boldsymbol{\tau}$ т $\hat{\nu} \nu \tau \rho \iota \sigma-$ $\chi \backslash \lambda l \omega \nu$ катdлоүov）36， 15.


 тàs ć $\gamma \gamma \rho a \neq a ́ s$ Pol． $1322 a$ ）
é $\gamma \gamma \mathrm{r} \eta$ ral 4,12
 $\kappa a \lambda \in \sigma \epsilon \nu$ aúzoís 38,30
＊$\epsilon \gamma к a \tau \epsilon \gamma \eta \dot{\eta} \rho a \sigma \epsilon \tau \hat{\eta} \alpha \rho \chi \hat{\eta}$ 17， 1
$\dot{\epsilon} \gamma \kappa \rho a \tau \epsilon \sigma \tau \epsilon \rho \circ \nu \quad \dot{\theta} \sigma \chi \chi^{\circ}, \tau \dot{\eta} \nu \quad \pi 6 \lambda \iota \nu$ 35， 22
 $1284 a 40$ ）．


E $\gamma \chi$ モ८ 22， 22 （scalium）
＊é $\gamma \chi \in \iota \rho 1 \delta \iota a$ 18， 27
 — $\tau \hat{\eta} \mathrm{s} \beta \mathrm{\beta ou} \lambda \hat{\mathrm{y}} \mathrm{s} 30,24$
Écojov 12， 23 （Solon）
$\dot{\varepsilon} \theta \epsilon \lambda \omega$ passimt ；in pap．saepe $\theta \in \lambda \omega$ ．$\mu \grave{\eta}$ ＇$\theta$ é $\lambda o v \sigma \iota$ ，49， 3 ；$\mu \dot{\eta}$＇$\theta \hat{\epsilon} \lambda \eta$ 56，37．ol

$\epsilon l \mu \dot{\prime} \tau \iota$ тарєшра̂то 26， 18 ；$\epsilon l \mu \dot{\eta}-$ á $\pi о-$
 $\mu \dot{\eta}$ ，after $\epsilon \dot{a} \nu \mu \epsilon \nu, 22,35$ \＆c ；after $\kappa \not a^{\prime} \nu$
 23
eiкbs 6，г3；9，І2 \＆c．
єїкобє 17，4；24，19；29，11；30，10
elкढ́l 7， 21
 eival 15,25 ；$\pi \rho$ òs toîs líiots ồves 16 ， 9．$\tau \delta \nu \hat{\nu} \nu$ cival 3I， 9 （decree）
єlлєîข 2，12；14，9；岗 $\epsilon l \pi \epsilon \hat{L} \nu 2,12 ; \dot{\omega} \mathrm{s}$ ध̈


 12， 22 （Solon）．Cf．elp $\rho \tau \alpha \downarrow$
$\epsilon і \rho \gamma \epsilon \sigma \theta a \iota \quad \tau \hat{\omega} \nu \nu 0 \mu l \mu \omega \nu$ 57，13；$\epsilon i \rho \gamma \epsilon \tau a \iota$




$\epsilon \check{\rho} р \eta \tau \alpha\left\llcorner, \kappa a \theta \dot{d} \pi \epsilon \rho 4,24 ; \ddot{\omega}_{\sigma \pi \tau \rho} 16,3\right.$ ；öv－






（2）of time，els Éviautà 30， 19 （de－

 decrees）$\tau \dot{\partial} \nu \lambda o \iota \pi \delta \nu \chi \rho \cdot 30,15 ; \tau \delta \nu d \lambda \lambda o \nu$
 $\theta \dot{\eta}$ рaıa 43， 4 ．
（3）of measure，or limit，eis è $\pi \tau a$－ кoбlous äl $\delta \rho a s 24,16$
（4）of relation to，$\hat{\eta} \delta \delta_{0 \nu}-\epsilon i s$ toútov

 èvós סeî 19，39；27， 27 ；évós סéovta 17， 4 ；घ̀a 4，14；$\mu l a 13,17$ ；$\mu l a \nu 4,19$
 ar $\gamma \in$ ilas 8,$26 ; p l .29,23 ; 43,19$ ； 59， 4
 ßoùì̀ 4，22；els rou＇s $\delta \iota a \iota \tau \eta \tau d s ~ 53, ~ 32 ;$ （ol $\theta \epsilon \sigma \mu о \theta \dot{\varepsilon} \tau a l) ~ \tau a ̀ s ~ \epsilon l \sigma a \gamma \gamma \epsilon \lambda L a s ~ \epsilon l \sigma a \gamma-$

 $\lambda \omega \nu \tau a \iota \tau \hat{\omega} \nu$ á $\rho \chi \hat{\omega} \nu \mu \dot{\eta} \chi \rho \hat{\eta} q \theta a t ~ \tau o ̂ ̂ s ~ \nu o ́ \mu o \iota s$ 45， 14 （not found in Ar．in technical sense）
 tis $\tau \delta$ ס८кабтท́pıov 45，ro（law）；48， 26 ； $52,4,6 ; 53,15 ; 54,6 ; 56,30,42$ ； 63，14．סlкаs $5^{2}, ~$ 12，17；58，8；59，

 кт入 59，5．тоís סıкабтаîs тô̂s т $\eta \nu$ $\phi \cup \lambda \eta \eta \nu-\epsilon l \sigma a ́ \gamma o v \sigma \iota \mu$ 48， 25.
${ }^{*} \in l \sigma a \gamma \omega \gamma \in i ́ s 52,1$ I

 35 ；$\epsilon l \sigma \epsilon \lambda \theta \epsilon \hat{\epsilon} \nu \in l s \tau \grave{\eta} \nu \dot{d} \rho \chi \eta \eta_{\nu} 56,6 . \quad \epsilon l \sigma \epsilon \lambda-$

 （ $\epsilon l_{s} \delta \iota \kappa a \sigma \tau \eta \rho \iota o v$ ）col．31，33；col，32， 7 ． $\epsilon l \sigma \epsilon \lambda \theta \epsilon \check{\imath} \nu \mathrm{els} \tau \partial े l_{\epsilon \rho \delta \nu}^{57}, 29$ ．Abs．$\epsilon \dot{v} \theta \dot{J} s$ $\epsilon i \sigma \epsilon \lambda \theta \dot{\omega} \nu 56,5$ ；$\epsilon l \sigma \dot{\eta} \epsilon \sigma a \nu$ and $\epsilon l \sigma t \epsilon \nu a l$
 （decree）
$\epsilon l \sigma \eta \gamma \eta \dot{\eta} a \tau 0$ ，${ }^{\omega} \sigma \pi \epsilon \rho{ }^{\prime}$＇A $\rho / \sigma \tau \epsilon l \delta \eta s$ 24， 10
＊elб $\eta \gamma \eta \tau \eta{ }^{\prime}$ s 27， 20
єlбodos，els $\tau \grave{a}$ סıкаनтท́pıa（？）63，3，7； סıкабтทplov col．32， 10


$\epsilon l \sigma \phi \in \rho \in\llcorner-\tau \dot{\alpha} s \quad \mu \sigma \theta \dot{\omega} \sigma \epsilon \iota s \quad 47,26 . \quad \epsilon l \sigma$ ．

 $\epsilon l \sigma \dot{\eta} \nu \epsilon \gamma \kappa \alpha \nu \epsilon l s ~ \tau \eta े \nu \beta o v \lambda \dot{\eta} \nu 37,5$ ．$\epsilon i \sigma \phi \in-$
 30
єlбфopd 8， 15
$\epsilon І \tau a \cdot \epsilon โ \tau^{\prime} 8,4 ; 22,34$ ．$\pi \rho \hat{\omega} \tau 0 \nu \mu \grave{\nu} \nu-\epsilon โ \tau^{\prime} 42$ ， $20 ; \pi \rho \tilde{\omega} \tau 0 \nu \mu \hat{\nu} \nu$－$\because \tau \epsilon \iota \tau a-\epsilon \hat{\ell} \theta^{\prime} 62,6-9$.
 $\theta \cup i q-\pi \rho q \underline{6} \tau \eta \tau \iota 22,19$



 $\gamma \alpha \mu \epsilon \tau \hat{\eta} \mathrm{s} 17$ ，10．＊$\epsilon \kappa(=\dot{u} \pi \mathrm{~d}) \tau \hat{\omega} \nu \partial \lambda \lambda \omega \nu{ }^{*}$ $\dot{\dot{o}} \mu \mathrm{o} \lambda о \gamma \in \hat{\tau} \tau \alpha \iota$ 5，13．（3）inference，$\epsilon^{\prime} \kappa \tau \hat{\omega} \nu$
 $\theta \epsilon \omega \rho \in \hat{\nu} \nu$ 9，13．（4）time，$\epsilon \xi$ d $\rho \chi \hat{\eta} s$ （ $=\underset{\iota}{ } \nu \alpha \rho \chi \hat{n}) 16,1 ; 28,5 ; 41,7 ; 55,3$ ；

 $\epsilon l_{s}$ II．$_{43}, 4$
 $\phi \nu \lambda \omega \nu 8,2$.

The art．generally added，but some－
 15；$\tau \hat{\eta} s \dot{\eta}_{\mu \epsilon \rho a s ~}^{\epsilon} \kappa \alpha \sigma \tau \eta s$ 62， 15 ．т $\hat{\eta} s$
 $\pi \rho$ ．є́ к $\alpha \sigma \tau \eta \nu$ 61， 11 ：$\kappa \alpha \tau \dot{\alpha} \pi \rho$ ．є̀ $\kappa \alpha \sigma \tau \eta \nu$
 29，37；44，8；53ं， 1 ；$\tau \hat{\eta} \mathrm{s} \phi$ ．еंкর́ $\sigma \tau \eta \mathrm{s}$ 48，17；col．32，20；аं $\pi \dot{\delta}<\tau \hat{\rho} s>\phi$ ． ย̇кá $\sigma \tau \eta \mathrm{s} 43,6$ ；à $\phi$＇éкá $\sigma \tau \eta \mathrm{s}$ т $\hat{\mathrm{s}} \mathrm{s} \phi$ ．6I，



 $\tau \hat{\eta} \phi \nu \hat{\eta}$ 58，7；$\tau \hat{\eta} \phi . \dot{\varepsilon} \kappa \alpha \sigma \tau \eta$ 63，3，4，


Art．without êka

 $\delta \rho \alpha \chi \mu \eta \nu \nu \tau \hat{\eta} s \dot{\eta} \mu \epsilon \rho a s$ 62，12．ä $\pi \alpha \xi$ है $\nu$



Pl．7，14；13，25； 21,24 \＆c．
є́кdтєроs passim．е่катєроч ßloу 17，8；


ย $\kappa \alpha \tau \epsilon \rho \omega \theta \iota 54,35$
＇Екатоц阝аєஸ́v 62， 13
 фu入خ̂s 8， 19 （cf．21，8）；\＆$\nu \delta \rho a s$ ，тойs
 3I，2I；32，1．ध̈ $\tau \eta$ 7，7．$\mu \nu \hat{\omega} \nu 4,9 ;$

$\epsilon \in \kappa \beta \delta \lambda \lambda \omega^{*} \epsilon \epsilon \xi \epsilon \beta a \lambda o \nu(\Pi \epsilon \iota \sigma l \sigma \tau \rho \alpha \tau 0 \nu) 14,19$ ； $\pi 0 \lambda \lambda$ oùs－$\epsilon \kappa \beta \epsilon \beta \lambda \eta \kappa \epsilon \nu \alpha i$ 19，3；éк т $\boldsymbol{\epsilon} \nu$ $\tau \dot{\alpha} \phi \omega \nu \dot{\epsilon} \xi \epsilon \beta \lambda \dot{\eta} \theta \eta \sigma \alpha \nu$ I， 2
$\epsilon_{\epsilon} \kappa \beta 0 \lambda \eta^{*} \tau \hat{\omega} \nu \tau \nu \rho \alpha{ }^{\prime} \nu \nu \omega \nu 20,18$
＊éкסıんutầ，סıaltas 53， 29
éкঠík
Є̇кє̂̂ 55,34 ；pap．19， 6
ย̇кยิิยยノ 15， 6
éкeî̀os 15,$20 ; 16,40 \& \mathrm{c}$ ．

${ }^{*} \epsilon_{\kappa} \theta \dot{\prime} \mu a \tau \alpha$（？） 54,24

екклทбta，under Dracon，4，18；under Solon，7， $15 . \quad \dot{\epsilon} \kappa \kappa \lambda \eta \sigma$ ial，esp．43， 16 f. É．кvpla 43，17；62，7．$\epsilon \lambda \theta \dot{\omega} \nu$ єls т $\boldsymbol{\eta} \nu$
 （apХaıpєбiai）ধ́v тท̂̀ є．44，17．$\mu \iota \sigma \theta 0-$
 and $o v ̉ \sigma v \lambda \lambda \epsilon \gamma \circ \mu \epsilon ́ \nu \omega \nu \epsilon l_{s} \tau \grave{\eta} \nu$ é． $4 \mathrm{I}, 30$ ；

є́кк入 $\eta \sigma \iota \alpha \mathfrak{\alpha} \zeta є \iota \nu 15,17$

$\epsilon \epsilon \kappa \lambda \epsilon i \pi 0 \iota \tau \dot{\eta} \nu \sigma \dot{\nu} \nu 0 \delta o \nu, \epsilon i \quad \delta \epsilon \in \tau \iota \varsigma \tau \hat{\omega} \nu \beta o \nu \lambda \epsilon v-$ Tف̂v 4， 18

$\epsilon \kappa \pi \epsilon \mu \pi \omega^{\circ}$ К $\lambda \epsilon о \mu \epsilon \nu \eta \nu \quad \epsilon \xi \epsilon \pi \epsilon \mu \psi \alpha \nu$ 19，29；

 $\pi \epsilon \epsilon \mu \pi 0 v \sigma \iota \nu 6 \mathrm{I}, 10$

 17．$\dot{\omega} \mathrm{s} \epsilon \xi \epsilon \pi \epsilon \sigma 0 \nu$（ $\epsilon \kappa \tau \hat{\eta} s \pi \delta \lambda \epsilon \omega s$ ）of $\pi \epsilon \rho l$ $\tau \delta \nu$＇І $\sigma \alpha \gamma 6 \rho \alpha \nu 28,9$
 тu á $\nu \nu \omega \nu$ 19， 13
 ó $\delta \dot{o} \nu 50,12$

 éктєібך 63， 16 （［Ar．］Rhet．ad Alcx． $1444 b$ 2）
éктiбels 8， 23
éк $\kappa$ б́s 22， 41 （év $\nu$ ós pap．）

Є́кфаעєîv 12，I9（Solon）
 $\psi$ ау каi $\epsilon \xi \eta \nu \in \gamma \kappa \alpha \nu 30,4$
Ėкヒ́ン 27， 10
êגaià moplay 60，II
ènaıov 60， 7 bis，14， 23

 （Solon）
${ }^{*} \epsilon \lambda \in \gamma \in i \alpha \nu, \pi 0 เ \eta \dot{\eta} \sigma \alpha \nu \tau \iota \tau \dot{\eta} \nu 5,6 ; \mathrm{cf} .5,20$
 $\lambda \epsilon \gamma \eta$ 59，14．，oúvla ${ }^{2}-\epsilon \lambda \epsilon \nu \theta \epsilon \rho \alpha \nu 4,6,9$
 $\dot{\eta} \lambda \epsilon \cup \theta \epsilon \rho \omega \sigma \sigma$ 6， 2 ；$\in \lambda \epsilon \nu \theta \epsilon \rho \omega \theta \in \nu \tau \omega \nu \quad \delta \iota \alpha$



 $\nu i \omega \nu 39,13$
 31， 26
 $\kappa \eta \tau \grave{̀}$ Є $\lambda \lambda \epsilon \iota \notin \theta \in \grave{\nu} \kappa \alpha \tau \alpha \beta \alpha \lambda \lambda \in \iota \nu 48,5 \mathrm{f}$

＊$\in \lambda \lambda \eta \nu o \tau \alpha \mu l a \iota 30,9$（？）and 13 （decree）
$\epsilon \lambda \pi l \delta^{\prime}-\dot{\alpha} \phi \nu \epsilon \alpha \nu 12,17$（Solon）

 $\tau \delta \pi \iota \nu \alpha \kappa \iota \circ \nu$ col．31，29；$\dot{\epsilon} \mu \beta \alpha \lambda \omega \sigma \iota \nu-$
 $\dot{\epsilon} \mu \beta \alpha ́ \lambda \lambda \epsilon \tau \alpha-\tau \dot{\alpha} \pi \iota \nu \dot{\alpha} \kappa \iota \alpha 63$ ，5．（c）$\beta \dot{\alpha}-$ $\lambda a \nu \circ \iota \epsilon l s \tau \grave{\eta} \nu \dot{v} \delta \rho l a \nu \in \notin \beta \alpha \lambda \lambda о \nu \tau \alpha \iota 63,8$. （d）$\epsilon \in \mu \beta a ́ \lambda \eta$ тоùs $\kappa u ́ \beta$ ous col．3I，17；${ }^{\epsilon} \mu$－

ßa入bytes tàs $\mu a \rho \tau v \rho l a s-\epsilon l s ~ \epsilon ̌ \chi i \nu o u s ~ 53, ~$


 $\epsilon \mu \beta a \lambda \epsilon \hat{\epsilon} \nu$ aí $\frac{\varphi}{\varphi}$ 57， 28
＊$\epsilon \mu \beta \iota \beta a ́ \zeta \omega^{*} \dot{\epsilon} \nu \epsilon \beta!\beta \alpha \sigma \epsilon \nu$ 23， 7
 $\nu \omega \sigma \iota\left(\tau 0 i ́ s \gamma^{\nu \omega \sigma \theta e i \sigma l}\right) 53,8$

$\dot{\epsilon} \mu \pi \dot{\eta} \gamma \nu v \sigma \iota$ тà $\pi \iota \nu a ́ k \iota a \operatorname{col}$ ． 3 r， 1 I；$\epsilon \mu \pi \eta \gamma-$ $\nu$ úw
＊$\epsilon \mu \pi \dot{\eta} \kappa \tau \eta \mathrm{s}$ col．31， $1 \mathrm{I}, 24$
$\epsilon \mu \pi$ орlav，кат＇II， 4

$\dot{\epsilon} \mu \pi \mathrm{o} \rho \mathrm{lov} \dot{\epsilon} \pi \tau \mu \in \lambda \eta \tau \dot{d} s-\tau \hat{\omega} \nu \quad \dot{\epsilon} \mu \pi o \rho i \omega \nu \quad \dot{\epsilon} \pi \tau-$ $\mu \varepsilon \lambda \epsilon \hat{\imath ̂} \sigma \theta a \iota$ 5I， 15,16
${ }^{*}{ }^{*} \mu \pi$ торос 51,17
$\dot{\epsilon} \mu \phi a \nu \hat{\omega} \nu$ кaтá $\sigma \tau \alpha \sigma \iota \nu$, єis $56,3^{8}$
є $\mu \phi \rho_{\boldsymbol{\prime}}$ I8， 3
$\hat{\epsilon} \nu$ passim．（ r ）of place，$\dot{\epsilon} \nu \tau \hat{\eta} \sigma \tau o \hat{q} 7,3$ ；
 cree）；of trial before a court，$\epsilon \nu \tau 0 i ̂ s$（ $\epsilon \nu$ $\Pi$ пı $\rho a t \epsilon \hat{i}) 29,23$（decree）；with vb ．of motion，rov̀s $\mu \dot{\delta} \delta \rho o u s$ èv $\tau \hat{\psi} \pi \epsilon \lambda a ́ \gamma \epsilon \iota \kappa \alpha \theta$－ eía $\alpha$ 23，24；（2）of circumstances $\& c$ ．，
 ко́ $\sigma \mu \Psi 28,18$ ．（3）of time，è $\nu \hat{\Psi}$ I5， 20 ；
 $\phi \rho \in \sigma l$ 4， 15 （Solon）
＊ย $\nu a \gamma \hat{\omega} \nu, \epsilon t \nu a \iota \tau \hat{\omega} \nu 20$
＊Évaүlo $\mu a \tau a$ 58， 4
 36，го
 and（in decree） 30,28
 11，13
 in Ar．in technical sense）
＊$\ell_{\nu} \delta \in \iota \xi(\nu-\kappa a l \dot{\alpha} \pi a \gamma \omega \gamma \dot{\eta} \nu \quad 29,26$（decree）； pl．52，8， 9
घу


èvঠ́̇хетаь 17,7
है乞 $\delta \eta \mu 0 c$, á $\rho \chi a l$ 24， 16
t $\nu \delta 0 \theta \in \nu 5,7$（Solon）
é̀סo弓̆́ratos 54， 16

 35， 16
$\epsilon \nu \hat{\eta}($ ？$)$ col． 31,33
 1299a7）




セ้ขしo 3,$10 ; 7,18 ; 8,27 ; 13,15 ; 18,32$.刘しく 27， 4
Evlote 43， 30
 27，9．T $\dot{\eta} \nu \dot{\epsilon} \nu \epsilon \sigma \tau \hat{\omega} \sigma \alpha \nu$ ф८

入ıtelan 4I， 2

 I322 $a$ II）



È тav̂da 3，26；48，5；54， 30 \＆c．
$\epsilon \in \tau \in \mathrm{Q} \theta \in \nu 55,33$
$\epsilon \nu \tau \delta \mathrm{s} \chi\llcorner\lambda i \omega \nu 53,15 ; \tau \rho \iota \hat{\omega} \nu \mu \nu \hat{\omega} \nu 49,26 ;$
$\tau \rho \iota \hat{\omega} \nu \dot{\eta} \mu \in \rho \hat{\omega} \nu 48$ ，I8；бє́ка $\sigma \tau \alpha \delta i \omega \nu 50,9$

＇ELvá入cos 58， 2
$\epsilon \xi$ ，see $\epsilon \boldsymbol{\epsilon} \boldsymbol{x}$

Є $\xi \alpha \varphi p \hat{\eta}$（or $\epsilon \xi \xi \in \lambda \eta$ ）тoùs кúßous col．31，23． $\dot{\epsilon} \xi \in \hat{\epsilon} \lambda \epsilon \nu 12,64$（Solon）
 ö $\pi \lambda a \pi \rho \dot{\partial} \tau \hat{\omega} \nu \quad \theta \nu \rho \hat{\omega} \nu 1_{4}, 13$
 $\boldsymbol{\epsilon} \boldsymbol{\gamma} \rho \alpha \mu \mu \epsilon \nu \omega \nu 49$ ， 13 ；$\dot{\epsilon} \xi \bar{\eta} \lambda \epsilon \iota ф о \nu$ ，орр．
 $\tau \hat{\omega} v \pi \rho \circ \tau \epsilon \rho \omega \nu$ airias $\dot{\xi} \xi \eta \lambda \in \iota \psi \alpha \nu 40$ ， 19



＊$\epsilon \xi \alpha \pi о \rho \hat{\omega}^{*} \epsilon \dot{\epsilon} \xi \alpha \pi о \rho \eta \sigma \alpha \nu \tau \omega \nu$ тois $\pi \rho \alpha \dot{\gamma} \mu a \sigma \iota$ 23， 5
＊eł̧áxous col．34， 34
 13， 7
$\epsilon \epsilon \xi \in \lambda \in \dot{\gamma} \gamma \chi \in \tau a \iota$ col．32，7；lva $\mu \dot{\eta}-\epsilon \in \xi \in \lambda \in ́ \gamma-$
 тоעта $\epsilon \in \epsilon \lambda \epsilon \hat{\gamma} \xi \omega \sigma \iota \nu 54,7$
 $\mu \notin \nu a 46,5$
 16，14．（Of troops）$\tau \hat{\omega} \nu \dot{\epsilon} \xi<\sigma \nu \tau \omega \nu 26$ ，

䜤 $\in \sigma \sigma \iota 44,15 ; 45,14,22 ; 53,17 ; 62$ ， 18；63，11，13．ЄЄケที้ 4，21；27， 15 ．
 II，13．Ėজєivai 9，4；29，14，29；39， 6，16，21（decree）
 кобо $\mu$ ทиата 46， 8



є६ทккоута го， 8

 toùs été入ovtas 39， 25 （ib．）；toîs $\beta$ ou入o－
 40， 3
＊Є彑оiкทбts 39， 15 （decree）；40， 26


 $\tau \dot{\alpha} \mathrm{s} \mu a \rho \tau v \rho i a s 55,30 .(\epsilon \xi 6 \mu \nu v \sigma \theta a \iota \tau \dot{\eta} \nu$ á $\rho \chi \eta \dot{\eta} \nu$ Pol． 1297 a 20 ）
 14)
 $\sigma b \mu \in \nu 0 \iota \tau b \pi o \iota$, [Ar.] de, Admir. $833{ }^{b}$ 4)
ţovala 6, 19; 4I, 4,24

$\bar{\epsilon} \xi \omega \theta \epsilon \nu, \tau \hat{\omega} \nu{ }^{2} 6,16$







 $\cdot 33$, 12


 (Used in literal sense in Ar.)


 24, 17 \&c.

* $̇ \pi \varepsilon \iota \delta a ́ \nu 7,29$ \&c.


 22 f (decree)
 v.), but never followed by $\delta \varepsilon$. Cf. єita.
$\varepsilon \pi \in \lambda a \dot{\nu} \boldsymbol{\nu} \epsilon$ (?) 5,9
$\dot{\epsilon} \pi \epsilon \rho \omega \tau \hat{\omega} \sigma \iota \nu, \dot{\epsilon} \pi \epsilon \rho \omega \tau \hat{q} 55,13,20$
$\epsilon \pi i^{\cdot}$ passim. (I) c. gen. (a) of place \&c.,

 15, 25 . (b) 'in the case of ', $\epsilon \pi i \tau \hat{\omega} \nu$
 уаикра аıиิv 8, I4. (d) of time, $\epsilon \pi l \tau \hat{\eta} s$ Ёкт $\eta \mathrm{s} \pi \rho \cup \tau a \nu$ elas 43, 22; cf. 44, 15; 47,






 17, 2; 19, 37; 21, 3; 22, 6; 22, 11, 21; 23, 22; 25, 8; 26, 19; 27, 8; 33, 2; 34, 14; 35, 1; 40, 1; 41, 3; 54, 33 ; $\epsilon \pi i$ omitted only twice:-Nıко $\dot{\eta}^{-}$סous (?) äp才оутos 22, 29, and ä $\rho \chi$ оитos ' $\mathrm{T} \psi\left(\chi^{i \delta 0 \nu} 22,40 . \quad \epsilon \phi\right.$ ' $\underset{\omega}{\omega} \nu$ ('under the authority of') 38,19 .
(2) c. dat. (a) of place, 'upon', '̇ $\phi$ ' $\bar{\eta} 7,21$; 'at', or 'near', $\varepsilon \pi l$ Пa $\lambda \lambda \eta \nu i \delta \iota$
 Пa 23,$24 ; 32,15 ; 34,8$; $̇ \pi l$ тoútots 1 , 3 (?); 23, 36 ; en $^{2} \tau \hat{\eta} \sigma \omega \tau \eta \rho l \underline{q}$ 19, 35 ; $\dot{\epsilon} \phi^{\prime}{ }_{\psi}^{\psi} \tau \epsilon$ 14, 22; 34, ${ }^{17}$. (c) ground


2, 12; $\chi a \lambda \epsilon \pi \omega ̂ s ~ ф \epsilon \rho б \nu \tau \omega \nu ~ є ̇ \pi l ~ \tau o u ́ \tau o t s ~$

 $\mu \epsilon \nu$ ots 36,2 ; $\epsilon \phi$ ' ots $\epsilon \chi a t p \epsilon \nu \dot{\eta} \pi 6 \lambda \iota s ~ 35$, 20; $\epsilon \phi^{\prime}{ }^{\Psi} \mathbf{\psi} 63$, 17. (d) object, $\epsilon \pi i$ ката-
 25, 15 ; ̇̇ $\phi$ ' ots 38 , 6 ; 'for', ' ' $\phi$ ' éќ́ $\sigma \tau \eta$ $\tau \hat{\omega} \nu \mathrm{d} \rho \chi \bar{\omega} \boldsymbol{\omega}$. (e) 'in the power of ', $\epsilon \pi l$ тoîs $\delta \iota \kappa a \sigma \tau \alpha i s$ security of', غ̇াi тois $\sigma \omega \mu a \sigma i 2,8 ; 4$, 33; 6, 2; 9, 3
 9. 'over', ধ̇ $\pi l$ тávтas 42, 19; $\boldsymbol{\text { d }}$ Өєшрькбу 43, 2; 47, га; тѝ є́көйцата
 $61,4-8$; $\tau$ às $\nu a \hat{v} \mathrm{~s}$ 46, 4. 'for', $\epsilon \pi l$





 22, 25
$\epsilon \pi \iota \beta \dot{\alpha} \lambda \lambda \varepsilon \iota \nu 56,42$; $\epsilon \pi \iota \beta 0 \lambda \lambda^{\prime} \nu 61,15$; s .






 $\sigma$ тосхєíov col. 31 , 3 I . 'allege', $\pi \rho \delta$ фабь 8,24 . 'paint on', $\boldsymbol{\tau}$ ois $\delta \iota \kappa a \sigma \tau \eta-$

$\epsilon \pi \iota \delta \epsilon \xi \omega \sigma \omega, \tau \omega \nu a \delta \hat{\omega} \rho a \lambda a \beta b \nu \tau a 54,8$
$\dot{\epsilon} \pi \delta \eta \mu \hat{\omega} 39,14,16$ (decree)
${ }^{*} \epsilon \pi \iota \delta \iota a \nu \dot{\epsilon} \mu \omega \cdot \dot{\epsilon \pi} \iota \delta \delta \epsilon \nu \epsilon \mu \eta \eta \eta \sigma a \nu$ 10, 8
$\dot{\epsilon} \pi i \delta \delta \delta \omega \mu \cdot \cdot \dot{\epsilon} \pi \dot{\epsilon} \delta \sigma \sigma a \nu \pi \rho \delta \mathrm{~s} c . a c c,, 37,16$
 39
 $\tau 0 i ̂ s ~ \dot{\epsilon} \pi$. 28, $4 ; \tau \hat{\omega} \nu \dot{\epsilon} \pi$. (opp. $\tau \hat{\omega} \nu \tau v$ $\chi \chi^{\dot{d} \nu \tau \omega \nu)} \dot{\alpha} \nu \theta \rho \dot{\omega} \pi \omega \nu 27,24 . \quad$ тous $\epsilon \pi$. каl


${ }^{\prime} E \pi l \zeta \eta$ गos 29,7
** $\dot{\epsilon \pi \iota \zeta \eta \mu \iota \dot{\sigma} \sigma \in เ \varsigma ~ 45,9} 9$ (law)
 where in same sense)
${ }^{*}$ E $\pi l \theta \eta \mu a$ col. 36,8

 $\lambda \in \sigma \dot{a} \mu \in \nu 0 s$ c. acc. 20, 6


$\epsilon \pi \kappa к \eta \rho \cup к \varepsilon \cup \sigma \alpha \mu \epsilon \nu 0 s, \pi \rho d s$ с. асc., 14, 21.
 Oec. ii $1351 b 31$
 39, 40, 44




 1321 a 19）
 32，2；$\epsilon \pi . \tau \hat{\omega} \nu \nu \delta \mu \omega \nu$ 37， 12



 27， 18 （act．in Ar．）
$\epsilon \pi \iota \lambda \dot{\eta} \theta_{0}$ 20， 22 （scolium）
＊$\ell \pi$ l $\lambda o l \pi o s 33,3$
＇Епiliuкos 3，29；＇Етı入úкєוov 3，28， 30

$\dot{\epsilon} \pi \iota \mu \epsilon \lambda \eta \tau a l$（under the 400 ） 30 ， 10 （decree）；

 43， 3
 5；42，17，28；44，11；46，1；51，3， 16；52，г；56，21，26，29，39；57，г，2； 61，7，25．（2）followed by öncs c．fut． 50，10；51，10－12．（3）Abs．39， 5 （decree）

 Io
 quotes $\pi \epsilon \rho l$ к $\delta \sigma \mu \circ \nu$ only）




 $\tau \dot{\eta} \nu \dot{\epsilon} \pi\left(\sigma \kappa \eta \psi \iota \nu\right.$ Pol． 1274 b $^{7}$ ）


 $\epsilon \pi \epsilon \sigma \tau \dot{d} \tau \epsilon \iota 18$ ， 3 ；$\epsilon \pi \iota \sigma \tau a \tau \hat{\eta} \sigma a \iota 44$ ， 13 （only found in Rhet．ad Alex． $1422 b 17$ ， and that in another sense）
 $\delta \rho \omega \nu 44,9$
＊$\ell \pi \tau \sigma \tau a \tau \iota \kappa \dot{\eta}, \gamma \rho a \notin \dot{\eta}$ 59， 7 （in this sense， here only）
${ }^{*} \ell \pi \tau \sigma \tau \in \lambda \lambda \omega^{\circ}{ }^{\prime} \pi \epsilon[\sigma \sigma \epsilon \lambda \lambda o \nu]$ conj．38， 7 （only in Rhet．ad Alex． 1420 a 6 हो $\pi^{2}$－ $\sigma \tau \epsilon \lambda d s{ }^{\mu} \mu t$



$\epsilon \pi \tau \tau \epsilon \lambda \hat{\omega}^{*} \cdot \dot{\epsilon} \pi \epsilon \tau \epsilon \lambda \epsilon \sigma \epsilon \nu$（ $\pi 0 \lambda \iota \tau \epsilon 1 a \nu$ ） 41,17 ； $\tau \delta \nu$ ä入入ò $\lambda$ bүov 15,23
 6．$\tau \dot{\text { à }}-\epsilon \mathrm{ta}, 42,27$
$\epsilon \pi i \tau \eta \delta \epsilon s 9,11 ; 18,30$
 той $\delta$ voîv $\delta \beta 0 \lambda 0 i ̂ v$ à

 тupávyous 20，20；т $\hat{\underline{\beta}} \beta$ ovin̂ 25， 6
 є̇aut $\omega \boldsymbol{\nu}$ 39， 3 （decree）
 èmıтıц̣̣̂ кal тoúroıs 36,8


 $\psi \in \tau$
 סıабıкабlay 56， 38
е̇пітротои 56， $32 \mathrm{f}, 35,38,45$
énıффауEís 18,$24 ; 28$ ， 14

＊е̇тгхє









Strab． 445 ；Rose，Frag．6o13）




＊＊e $\pi$ rádous col． 34,32

${ }_{\epsilon}{ }^{2} \pi \omega \nu \nu \mu l a 13,25 ; 45,6$
$\dot{\epsilon} \pi \dot{U} \nu \nu \mu 0<(\phi \cup \lambda \omega \nu) 21,25 ; 48,17 ; 53,21$ ，


 （found in $\pi \epsilon \rho l \kappa b \sigma \mu \circ \nu$ ，and in a quota－ tion in Rhet．）



 2， 5

 $924 a_{\text {1）}}$



 xla 33， 4
＇EpeX ${ }^{\prime} \in \dot{\prime}{ }^{\prime}$ Heracl．Epit．1． 3

tepкecos，Zeivs 55， 16 （see Jebb on Soph．


 $\mu \epsilon \nu \eta \nu$ Rhet．І391 $a$ 10）





t＇$\rho \omega$ т
è $\sigma \theta$ גoús 12,25 （Solon）
Éซop $\hat{\nu}$ 5， 8 （Solon）

ет тацреla 20，4；34，19， 21
＇Етєоßoutádal frag．3，1． 30

 19
$̇ \tau \epsilon \in \rho \omega \theta \iota 12,15$
 25；7，6；8，6；22，7．Étc $\delta \in$ кal 9， 7 ． е́тட ס̇̇ 15,$11 ; 24,20 ; 27,16 ; 52,15$ ；


 $\rho \Psi$ ЕौєєL 22，20；т $\rho / \tau \psi 22,28 ; 23,21 ;$ тєтd́pтч 19，3；21，2；22， 39 ；$\pi \dot{\epsilon} \mu \pi \tau \boldsymbol{\psi}$
 2；$є \nu \delta \in \kappa \alpha ́ \tau \varphi ~ 15, ~ 9 ; ~ \delta \omega \delta \in к а ́ т \varphi ~ 22, ~ 10 . ~$


 є̈тๆ тpla 22，25；els єкато̀v êтך 7，7；

ยv์ $\pi 0 \epsilon \in \mathbb{i} 55,17$
＊ejavdpla 60， 21
Eviolas ámootá $\sigma \eta$ ）33， 4
eírevins 28， 7
 $\chi$ la oúk єídúáфөороs Pol． 1306 a 10）




evidoutes 12， 59 （Solon）
є才Өvעav－$\epsilon \mu \beta a \lambda \epsilon \sigma \theta a u$ 48，20；єlбáyovol 48,26 ，cf． 54,6 ．evivívas $\delta \iota \delta \omega \hat{\sigma} \nu \nu$ and


 ย่̇ $\theta v v \hat{\nu} \nu$ 3I， 7 （decree）
є $6 \theta$ vo 048 ， 15,23


 $\delta$（кทv 12， 46 （Solon）


єї入оүа́тєроу с．і̀nf．7， 26




 27， 13
 $\chi р \eta \mu a ́ \tau \omega \nu 19,20$
 12

＊eirnula 44， 19

＊фeбus 9,$6 ; 45,15,19 ; 55$, II（not found in Ar．in technical sense）
${ }^{*}$ Ефє́тас（？） 57,24


${ }^{\prime} \mathrm{E} \phi \dot{1} \lambda \tau \eta \mathrm{~s} 25,4,13,17,18,21,23 ; 26$, 14；28，11；35，9；41， 17
 rò $\delta .53,9$（not found in Ar．in techni－． cal sense）



Ex 0 pa 5,22
 23
EXivos $53,11,18$（not found in Ar．in technical sense）

 42，33．With double acc．тoírous фv́na－



 $\pi \delta \lambda \iota \nu \dot{\epsilon} \boldsymbol{\gamma} \kappa \rho a \tau \in \sigma \tau \in \rho \circ \nu \quad$ ध $\sigma \chi \chi^{0 \nu} 35,22 ; \tau \omega \bar{\nu}$



 adv．äpı $\sigma \tau a 30$ ， 20 （decree）；ка入̄ิs 28 ，
 3，I4
 ténvtes tàs mo入ıreias map＇aúroîs kal
 12，9（Solon）

 28，г；т оойтрє $\psi \epsilon$ 19，22．c．opt．\＃देs

 44 ；－єктеІбท 63 ， 16
＊Seviotov 7， 27
§evilins 4，19；7，10，12；26，15， 18 （Pol． 1274 a 20 ）
 $\pi о \mu \pi \grave{\eta} 56,27$


乡ŋm
 29， 28 （decree）；$\theta$ ．ऽทuны́б оитаs 52， 4 ；

 9．ЋПци

 ò $\delta \bar{\eta} \mu \mathrm{os}$ Pol． 1298 a II）
$\hat{\eta}$ passim；（＇than＇）2， 17 \＆ $\mathrm{c} . \hat{\eta}-\hat{\eta} 11$, 1I \＆c．$\dot{\eta}$（＇or else＇）22， 43 （law）

（decree）；omitted by author in 2，II； 7，5；55，31
 23，II
$\dot{\eta} \gamma \epsilon \mu \dot{\omega} \nu 20,17 ; 22,9,20 ; 26,4$ ．$\dot{\eta} \gamma \in-$ $\mu \dot{\nu \in \sigma \sigma \tau \nu} 12$, II（Solon）


ท̀ 000 uat，（1）＇lead＇，c．gen．13，19；61，4， 18，20， 24 ；abs．61， 14
（2）＇think＇，29， 13 （decree）；35， 21 ） 40，22；42， 16 （ウ่ $\boldsymbol{\eta} \dot{\eta} \sigma \alpha \sigma \theta a l$ c．inf． quoted only from Meteor． $339 b 22$
$\eta{ }^{\circ} \delta \eta$ 3，19；14， $14 ; 15,14 ; 18,14 ; 28$ ， 26；42， 37 \＆c．

＇Hetı $\omega$ vela 37， 9
グ $\theta$ cos 56， 21



भेגıala（？） 57,20 （cf．Pol．1301 b 23）


 $\tau \hat{\eta} s$ aiv $\hat{\eta} s$ में $. ~ 30,15,23$（decree）； ＇those of the military age＇，ötav $\dot{\eta} \lambda \kappa \kappa l a \nu$



 15．ро́кта каl $\dot{\eta} \mu \rho \rho a \nu$ 44，г．ठбаи
 $\delta \epsilon \overparen{\delta} \delta \kappa d\rfloor \oint \epsilon \nu 59,2$


गinlious col．37， 4 （Hist．An． 630 a 34）
＇Нрฝ́клєa，тєעтєтทрls 54， 30

${ }^{*}{ }^{\text {njpla（ }}$（pl．） 55,17
＇Hpbootos 14,25


 7）
ทีrop 5， 15 （Solon）

 $27 ; \dot{\eta} \tau \tau \eta \theta \in \nu \tau \epsilon S-\nu a \nu \mu a \chi l q 33,3$


 d $\rho \chi$ خो $\nu$ रभीs $\theta$ ．32， 16
ө́́датоs 19，4；26，14；28，23；29，28； 52，4；60，12．d $\mu \phi о \tau \epsilon \rho \omega \nu$ өàvaтoу катє $\gamma \nu \omega \sigma a \nu$ 28， 13
 7；kuplous eival өavaroîvas 37， 4. өavatúrovtas 52，． 5 （ $\theta a \nu a \tau \hat{\omega} \sigma a \iota$ ，opp． $\phi v \gamma a \delta \epsilon \hat{\sigma} \sigma a l$ ，Oec．ii $1347{ }^{\text {b }} 33$ ；Өavaтн－ $\theta \hat{\eta} \nu a \iota d e$ Adm． $83^{6}$ a 6 ）
 aloyúola Met． 1023 b 11）
Өарүך入cúv 32， 4 f



$\theta a \nu \mu a ́ ̧ \epsilon \iota \nu 15,24 ; ~ \theta a \nu \mu a ́\} o \nu \tau \epsilon s ~ 14,30 ;$
 25,19

 21；28， 11
$\theta \in 6 \kappa \tau \iota \tau 0 \nu, \pi a \tau \rho l \delta^{\prime}$ els 12， 35 （Solon）

$\theta \epsilon 6 s, \dot{\eta} 30,8$（decree）．$\theta \in 0 i ̂ s ~ 7,23$ （anon．）；3o， 8 （decree）

$\theta \epsilon \sigma \omega v, \nu 6 \mu \omega \nu$ 14， 7 （Pol．1289 a 22，1298 a 18）
 каl $\pi \dot{\alpha} \tau \rho \iota a 16,42$（law）
$\theta \in \sigma \mu 0 \theta \in \tau a l$ 3，19， 30 ；45，10； $48,25 \mathrm{f}$ ； 55,$4 ;$ esp．59，1－20；col．32， 32.

 63，22；col．31， 9




 $\theta \epsilon o \hat{v} \theta \epsilon \sigma \mu 0 \hat{\imath}$



$\theta \epsilon \omega \rho l a \nu$, кала̀ 11，5．$\quad \theta \epsilon \omega p l a$ sent to Delos 56， 20 note

$\theta$ Ө阝aîot 15，II
 33,$10 ; 34,25 ; 36,1$
$\theta \hat{\eta}_{s^{*}} \theta \hat{\eta} \tau a{ }_{7}, 11$
$\theta_{\eta \sigma \in i o \nu}^{15} 15,16,22$

 （anon．）；өŋтькд̀v（ $\tau \epsilon \lambda \in \hat{v})$ 7，28， 30
$\theta 6$ 人 os 43，11；44， 6 （not found in Ar．in this sense）



 Eth． $1115^{6}$ 33）
Өpaoús 18， 7
Өрâtra 14， 27
$\theta \rho \nu \lambda \lambda \epsilon i \nu^{\cdot} \in \theta[\rho u] \lambda \lambda[\epsilon \bar{\imath}] \tau 0 \quad 16,27$
өича́тทि 14，22；15，4；17，13
$\theta \nu \rho \omega \hat{\nu}, \pi \rho \dot{\partial} \tau \hat{\omega}{ }^{2}{ }_{14}, 13$
tupls 50， 13
Qúc 58，1；өúouat 54， 25
 57， 9

＇Iaoplas 5， 8 （Solon）
 6,$4 ; 43,27 ; 48,19,24 \mathrm{f}$ ； 59 ， 15. $\nu 6 \mu \mathrm{\nu}-\mathrm{i} \delta \mathrm{Lo} \mathrm{\nu} 8,29$ ．tota 9，10；taîs els
 єLval 15,25 ．трòs тoîs tolots b̀jтes 16 ， 9；тоîs loiols j̀ $\boldsymbol{y} \tau \mathrm{â}$ то 27， 21
 （opp．$\beta$ ov $\bar{n}$ ）$+5, I_{4}$
โepevorı 57 ， 1 I
lepe $\omega \sigma u ̛ \nu \eta ~ 21,24 ; 42,36 ; 57$ ， 10
โєро $\nu \eta \dot{\eta} \mu \nu 30,36$（decree）
lepov，at Eleusis，39，5．Tà lepá 55，16； $\pi \epsilon \rho \stackrel{\hat{\eta}}{\lambda} \theta$ o $\nu$ 42，20．$\tau \hat{\omega} \nu$ l $\epsilon \rho \hat{\omega} \nu$ 44， 4 ；

＊ieporouol 30， 10 （decree）；54， 24
$i \in \rho \hat{\nu} \nu$ adj．30， 29 （decree）；43，29．$\tau \hat{\omega} \nu$ Ієр $\omega \boldsymbol{\nu} \chi р \eta \mu$ а́т $\omega$ у 30,8 （decree）
iкeтpplay $\theta$ eis 43，27；тaîs iкeт 4 piaus 43，
 14II $b$ 7）
${ }^{3}{ }^{1} \mu \beta \rho o \nu, \alpha \rho \chi a l$ $\epsilon l_{s} 62,16$
iva，usually c．subj．even after past tense （cf．Eucken，i 52 ），aipồvaı 29， 15 （decree）；$\gamma \epsilon \gamma \omega \boldsymbol{\omega} \eta$ 15，19；$\gamma \epsilon \nu \eta \tau \alpha l$ 55，
 $\mu \dot{\eta}-\hat{\eta}$ 42，35；$\mu \hat{\eta}-\kappa а к о v \rho \gamma \hat{\eta}$ col．31， 14；$\mu \grave{\eta} \pi \rho о є \xi \alpha \lambda \epsilon \iota \phi \theta \hat{\eta} 47,34$
 veís 18,30
${ }^{3} \mathrm{I} \circ \phi \hat{\omega} \nu \mathrm{I} 7, \mathrm{II}$
im $\pi \alpha \dot{\alpha} \delta(\tau \epsilon \lambda \epsilon \hat{\nu}) 7,18 ; 7,24$（anon．）；7， 25 （Pol． 1274 a 21）

 4，8，11，13；30，7；44，16；49，10；
 $1322 \dot{b}$ 3）
${ }^{*}$ Iт $\pi$ ap 0 os，son of Peisistratus， 17,10 ； $18,2,4,16,19 ; 19,4$

inté̛́s 4，19；7，10， 12 ．$i \pi \pi \epsilon$ îs 24，14； 26，17；38，14；49，8；61，20， 26. tr $\pi \in i ̂ s(\epsilon \nu \nu$＇Eperpiq）15， 12 ．Thessalians 19，29， 31
$\iota_{\pi \pi \epsilon u ̛ \in \iota \nu}^{49, ~ 14, ~} 16 \mathrm{f}$
${ }^{\prime}$ Itrias 17,10 ； $18,2 \mathrm{f}, 15,17,26,35,37$ ； 19， 32
${ }^{*}{ }^{\prime}$ iт $\pi о \delta \rho о \mu i a 60,5,22$
＂ $\mathrm{I} \pi \pi$ окро́т ${ }^{2}$ s 22， 24

 in Boun的 49，I
 a 11）
${ }^{3}$ I $\sigma a \gamma b \rho a s$ ó Tel $\sigma a j \nu \delta \rho o v$ 20，2，5，10， 13 ； 28，9．ă $\rho \chi \omega \nu(508 / 7) 21,3$

lббррота та тра́үрата 29， 1
loos $63,8,2 \mathrm{I}$ ．loal（ai $\psi \eta \hat{\eta} \phi$ ）col． 36 ， 35
＊ᄂботє $\lambda \in \sigma \iota$, ठiкац $\tau 0$ îs 58,5

 （ $\mu \eta \nu o ̀ s$ ）iбта $\mu \epsilon \nu \circ \cup 62,14$
 29， 3

 （seems not to occur in Ar．in this sense）

${ }^{3}$ I $\omega \nu$ 3：8；4I， 7

 I， 4
 $\pi \alpha$ रov 35，10；каөє $\lambda \dot{\omega} \nu$（ $\tau \grave{\alpha} \gamma \rho \alpha \mu \mu \alpha \tau \epsilon i \alpha$ ） 47， 32
каөámaそ，árluovs єโขal 22， 43 （law）；кú－
 $1259 b 36$ ； $133^{2} b 23$ ）


 $\mu \epsilon ̀ \nu$ ä̀ $\lambda \lambda \alpha$ каө́áтeן кт入（formula of a－ mendment）29， 16
 ка日apoi 13， 23


 An． 59 г a 8；cf．$i b .568$ a 17， 573 a $30_{\text {，}}$ 585 a 18 ）
 45， 3
 （ ті̀ $\nu \beta 0 \nu \lambda \eta ̀ \nu) 43,15$
 बav 23， 24

 18；ка日lбтך тウ̀ $\delta \eta \mu о к р а т і а д ~ 29, ~ 18 ~$ （decree），кuplovs каӨıбтávai 20， 11.
 каӨı $\sigma \hat{\alpha} \sigma \iota ~ 54, ~ 36$ ；каӪi $\sigma \tau \alpha \sigma \alpha \nu$ ，d́ $\rho \chi \grave{\alpha} s$ 3，2．то入ьтєlav катєбтךбе 7，1；áp－
入ウ̀


 29，5；тоùs трLáкоขта 34，16；тоѝs
 $\chi$ d̀s）35，4．кат $\epsilon \sigma \tau \eta 16,1 ; 17,2 ; 22$, 15；катєбтๆбаv 26，20；35，1；катабт $\hat{\eta}$ 31，ІІ（decree）．каӨiбтарто 3， 38 ；55， 3．то入є́ $\mu$ оv ка $\theta \epsilon \sigma \tau \hat{\omega} \tau 0 s 33,14$ ．
кá̈odos 15，13；19，10；38，24；41，5，23 ка $\theta 6$ 入ov $9, ~ 12$
$\kappa \alpha \theta^{\prime}$ ó $\tau \iota{ }_{\alpha}^{\wedge} \nu 43,7 ; 59,3$
 16，5， 40
кaıvàs т $\tau$ tijpets 22， 3
каiтep c．gen．abs．19，23．c．part．23， 17；25， 3 （Pol．1269 b 1）

каıрbs＇катà тoúzous toùs к．23，9，13；33， 13；катd тò̀s к．тoútous 26,4 ；кат＇ ékelvous roùs $\kappa$ ．16， 40 ．év toútots roîs

как 1 16， 20 ；как $\hat{\nu}$ у 16,$21 ; ~ 18,8$
＊какотрdㄱuшу 35，і9

какофраঠそ́s 12， 48 （Solon）
какйs 19，4；37，3；49，2；59， 14
$\kappa \alpha \kappa \kappa \omega \sigma \iota s \gamma^{\prime} \nu \epsilon \omega \nu 56,3 \circ ;$ ठ $\rho \phi a \nu \hat{\omega} \nu 56,32$ ；
 34 （ $\sigma \omega \mu \alpha \tau \omega \nu$－как $\omega \sigma \in \iota$ Rhet． 1386 a 8）
Ka入入las ắp才 $\omega \nu$（412／I）32，3， 8
Ka入入ias d＇＇A $\gamma \gamma \epsilon \lambda \hat{\eta} \theta \epsilon \nu \alpha{ }^{\alpha} \rho \chi \omega \nu(406 / 5) 34,3$
K $a \lambda \lambda i \beta \iota o s$ á $\rho \mu 0 \sigma \tau \eta \eta_{s} 37,18 ; 38,13$
 $\lambda \iota \epsilon p o \hat{v} \sigma \iota \mu \epsilon \tau \dot{\alpha} \tau \hat{\omega} \nu \mu \dot{L} \nu \tau \epsilon \omega \nu$ 54， 25
Ka入入ıкрáтฑs Maıavıeús 28， 21

 ка入ท̂́ $1_{4}, 25$
$\kappa \alpha \lambda \hat{\omega}^{\cdot} \kappa a \lambda \epsilon \hat{\iota} \epsilon l s \tau \grave{̀} \kappa \lambda \eta \rho \omega \tau \eta \rho \iota \nu \nu \operatorname{col} 3 \mathrm{I}, 18$ ； тovs єlлŋфбтаs ib．25．калойбt 6，4； 21，18；49，15．кá入є toùs páptupas 55，19．ка入єі̂тац 13，16；е̇ка入єі̂то 3， 28．тд ка入оú $\mu \in \nu \circ \nu$ 19， 32 ；тд̀ к．54， 13；ка入oú $\mu \in \nu$ оє 55， 2 ；ка入ou $\mu \notin \nu$ оus 14， 6；54， $25 . \quad \epsilon \kappa \lambda \dot{\eta} \theta \eta$ 3， 30 ；к $\lambda \eta \theta \epsilon \epsilon ้ \nu ~ 16, ~$ 18
калढ़s 16,$38 ; 23,9 ; 28,25 ; 33,13 ; 34$ ， 13；40，7；43，18；61，12．ка́ $\lambda \lambda \iota \sigma \tau \alpha$ $\delta n^{\prime *} 40,17$
＊каע $\eta \phi$ ореì 18 ，I I
＊каขovls col．31，13， 16
картbs 60， 10
＊картоv $\mu \notin \nu 0 \nu \mathrm{~s}, \tau \dot{d}$ aút $\hat{\omega} \nu$ 39， 4 （decree）
ка $\boldsymbol{\tau} \epsilon \rho д \nu \boldsymbol{\eta}_{\boldsymbol{\eta} \tau о \rho}^{5}$, I $_{5}$（Solon）
катd́ c．gen．（1）каө＇lєрஸ̂̀ $\delta \mu o ́ \sigma a \nu \tau \epsilon s ~ \mathrm{I}$ ， I；$\dot{\alpha} \mu \delta \sigma \alpha \nu \tau \epsilon s ~ к \alpha \theta^{\prime} l \in \rho \hat{\omega} \nu \quad \tau \in \lambda \epsilon i \omega \nu 29$ ，39． （2）катд $\tau \hat{\omega} \nu$ є $\pi \iota \tau \rho \sigma \pi \omega \nu 56,33 \cdot$（3）кú－ pıot－$\epsilon l \sigma \iota \nu-\kappa \alpha \tau \dot{\alpha} \tau \hat{\omega} \nu \dot{o} \pi \lambda \tau \tau \hat{\omega} \nu 61,21$
c．acc．（1）of place，（a）катd $\theta d \lambda a \tau-$
 $\tau \grave{\eta} \nu$ єloo є̇т $\dot{\omega} \nu \nu \mu 0 \nu$ 48，17．（c）фu入ás 22， 21 ；
 aย์тท่ע，＇by itself＇，or＇on its own re－ sponsibility ${ }^{\prime}, 8$ ， 10. （d）катえे $\pi \epsilon \nu \tau \epsilon$ тı $\nu \alpha \kappa \iota a$ els col．3I， 2 I．（2）of object， є́ $\mu \pi$ орlà каі $\theta \in \omega \rho l a \nu ~ 11, ~ 4 . ~(3) ~ ' a c-~$ cording to＇，tovs $\nu$ buous $16,3 \mathrm{I}$ ；$\tau$ d



 17；＇in respect to＇，$\tau \hat{\omega} \nu$ кат̀े $\tau \eta े \nu \pi o-$入ıтelay 2，II；nearly equivalent to $\delta \iota \dot{\alpha}$

 $\nu$ b $\mu \omega \nu 45,23$ ；（of rent）$\tau \alpha u ̛ \tau \eta \nu \tau \eta े \nu \mu l \sigma$－ $\theta \omega \sigma \iota \nu$. （4）（a）of parts of time，$\dot{\epsilon} \nu \iota a \nu \tau b \nu$ 30， 4 （decree）；єк $\alpha \sigma \tau \eta \nu \tau \dot{\eta} \nu \dot{\eta} \mu \epsilon ́ \rho \alpha \nu 27$ ， 16；30， 27 （decree）；cf，кат $\alpha \mu$ ккр $\delta \nu 23$ ，
$2 ; 25,3$ ．（b）of periods of time，ékel－ עous tov̀s кalpoús 16,40 ；toútous $\tau 0$ U＇s к． 23,9 ，13；тovs к．тoútous 26， 4 ：$\tau \hat{\omega} \nu$
 I8
катаßalyovтєs єls ä $\sigma \tau v$ 16，15；катаßdvтаs
 （from the acropolis） 18 ， $19 . ~ к а \tau \alpha \beta \epsilon-$ $\beta \eta \kappa \in \nu$（ex equo）49， 6
$\kappa \alpha \tau \alpha \beta a ́ \lambda \lambda \omega^{*}$（1）lit．кaтаßa入eí кбтрор 50 ， io．（2）of payment（esp．by instal－ ment） $47,19,25,28,33 ; 48,2,6$（ $\tau$－ $\mu \nmid \nu$ Oec．ii 1346 b 29， 1349 b）
катaßo入 $\quad$（of payment）47，20，30，32； 48， 5 （al катаßо入al $\tau \hat{\omega \nu} \pi \rho о \sigma 6 \delta \omega \nu$ Oec． ii $5351 a$ 9）
$\kappa \alpha \tau \alpha \gamma เ \gamma \nu \omega \sigma \kappa \omega^{*} \quad \kappa \lambda о \pi \grave{\eta} \nu-\kappa \alpha \tau a \gamma \iota \gamma \omega \sigma \kappa \kappa \cup \sigma \iota$ 54，7．тоช́т $\omega \nu$－Өávaтov катє́ү $\nu \omega \sigma a \nu$ 28， 23 （cf．Rhet．1380 $b$ 13）．áv $\tau \iota \nu 0 \mathrm{~s}$
 $\gamma \nu \hat{\omega} \sigma \iota \nu$ 54，10．（ $\alpha \cup \cup \tau \hat{\omega} \nu) \kappa \alpha \tau \alpha \gamma \nu \hat{\varphi} 45 ;$ 16；（ $\tau \iota \nu \delta s) ~ к а \tau \alpha \gamma \nu \omega ิ \sigma \iota \nu ~ 53, ~ 34 ; ~ \epsilon \ell ~ \tau o u ~$ катaүขoin 60，12．Abs．катаүעథิ 48，

 Toíd aous $\mathrm{I}, 2$
кат $\alpha \gamma \nu \cup \mu L^{*}$ é $\lambda a l a \nu — к \alpha \tau \alpha \xi \epsilon \iota \epsilon \nu 60,11$
＊катаү $\boldsymbol{\nu} \omega \in \sigma \iota \varsigma$, єi $\sigma$ á $\gamma \epsilon \iota \nu 45,9$（decree）；cf． 59，I 3
 （Pol．13II b 19）
 $\hat{\epsilon} \nu a \rho \gamma \hat{\omega}$ Ar． 1583 a 15 in epigram on Plato）
 кıбرévous 22， 39 （de Respir． 476 a 29 $\kappa а \tau а \delta є \chi \epsilon \sigma \theta a \iota \tau \dot{\eta} \nu \tau \rho \circ \phi \eta \nu)$


 27， 9
катакои́є兀 $a b s .15,18$ ．（єdд катакои́бш－ $\sigma \iota \nu$ aủ ${ }^{\prime}$ $\epsilon \sigma \theta a \mathrm{c} \tau \grave{\eta} \nu \phi \omega \nu \eta \nu \nu$ Hist．An．6І $4 b$ 23）


 Mouvixlà 38，1；xpelas－$\lambda a \beta$ ov́ $\sigma \eta s 3,8$
 8，10；тovs $\pi \epsilon \nu \tau a \kappa \iota \sigma \chi \iota \lambda l o u s ~ 29,37$（de－ cree）；$\tau \rho \iota \sigma \chi \iota \lambda$ lous 36,7 ；т $\rho \iota \eta p \alpha \rho \chi$ оus
 49， 15 （ $\pi \lambda \eta \rho \omega \mu \dot{\alpha} \tau \omega \nu$ катєı $\lambda \epsilon \gamma \mu \epsilon \dot{\nu} \omega \nu \quad \epsilon i s$ ekarò v vaus Oec．ii I353 a I9，the only authority for this sense in Index Ar．）
＊катa入oүєís（l $\pi \pi \epsilon \in \omega \nu$ ）49，9；（in 4II）29， 38 note




 $\rho \alpha \nu \nu \omega \nu$ 13，24；41，14；（ $\tau \hat{\omega} \nu \tau \epsilon \tau \rho \alpha-$





 $\theta \in l \sigma \eta s \quad \tau \hat{\eta} \mathrm{~s}$ тupavilios．20，1；28，7）． тخे $\nu$ ßou $\lambda \dot{\eta} \nu 20,10 ; 25,13 ; 41,18$

 36，6；тд к仑̂pos 35， 12 ；тov̀s тет $\alpha$－ кобlous 33，7；тovs тpéкоута 38， 5 ； тous $\delta \in \kappa a 38,18$ ．катє $\lambda u \sigma \in 28,2 \mathrm{I}$ ．

Pass．$\grave{\eta}$ крlбts ката入є $\lambda \nu \tau a l ~ 60, ~ 14 ; ~$
 c．genn．$\mu \grave{\eta} \kappa \alpha \tau a \lambda v \theta \omega \sigma \sigma \nu \tau \hat{\eta} s{ }^{d} \rho \chi \hat{\eta} s{ }^{2} 8$ ， 10

 10

 $3^{8, \text { Io }}$
＊катарритаโрєє 6， 18


катаб $\omega \pi \omega_{\omega \sigma}{ }^{14}$ 14， 12

 $\tau \grave{\eta} \nu$ ápхク̆̀－катабкєvá̧ovтєs 36， 12.
 тои̂то 18， 29 ；$\mu \sigma \theta$ офорà̀ тоîs $\delta \iota \kappa a \sigma \tau \alpha i ̂ s ~$
 37， 10
катабкєиŋ，тонпйs 56， 26
 тєтракобl $\omega \nu$ 41，20；cf．11，10；14，20； 16，41；22，6；41， 6 ．（2）é $\pi \tau \tau \rho о \pi \hat{\eta} s$ 56，37．（3）є $\mu ф а \nu \omega \bar{\nu}{ }^{56}, 38$
＊кататра⿱䒑䶹arloas éautby 14,2
 фатıкbs，Ar．saepius，e．g．Categ． 12 b 7


$\kappa a \tau \alpha \chi a \rho l \zeta \in \sigma \theta a \iota ~ \tau \grave{\eta \nu} \kappa \rho i \sigma \omega \nu$ 49， 21 （ $\pi 0 \lambda \lambda \grave{\alpha}$ т $ิ \nu \kappa о \iota \nu \hat{\nu} \nu$ Pol． 1271 b3）
＊катахєцроторіа 59,5



 II

 $\delta \eta \eta_{\mu} \nu_{12}, 49$ and 63 （Solon）．（2）＇re－
 5．（3）＇hold＇；＇gain，or keep，posses－







19，37；abs．кaтєîX $\nu_{15}$ ， 3
катทүopla 55， 21
${ }^{*}$ кат ${ }^{\text {quopos }} \mathbf{4 2}^{2}, 9 ; 55,21,26$
кат $\eta \gamma \circ \rho \hat{\omega}$ c．gen．18，23，29；25，20；37，
 K $/ \mu \omega \nu 0$ os 27,2

катоккิ．22， $\mathbf{4}^{2} ; 39,17 \mathrm{f}$（decree）；40， 26
кєіта．5， 7 （Solon）：оро $\mu a-\kappa \in / \mu \in \nu 0 \nu 7,20$ $\kappa \in \lambda \epsilon \dot{u} \epsilon \ell 8,7 ; 49,26 ; 51,14 ; 53,3 \mathrm{I}$.



$\kappa \in \lambda \in u о v \sigma \hat{\omega} \nu 40,21$
$\kappa \in \nu b \nu$ col．33， 10
кеутроу 12， 47 （Solon）
$\kappa \epsilon \rho \delta \epsilon \iota$ каl $\chi$ а́р $\iota \sigma \iota \nu 4 \mathrm{I}, 29$
$\kappa \eta \delta \in \sigma \tau \eta{ }^{2} 28,13$
$K \eta \delta^{\circ} \omega \nu 20,20,22$
 the law－courts）col．36， 1 I， 3 I．pl． $\kappa \eta \rho \nu \xi(\nu-\pi \rho \epsilon \sigma \beta \epsilon l a t s 20,29$（decree）； 43， 30
Кйрикєs 39，5；57， 4
$\kappa \eta \rho \nu \xi<\nu \tau \omega \nu, \tau \hat{\omega} \nu \nu \quad \sigma \tau \rho a \tau \eta \gamma \hat{\omega} \nu \quad 23,6 . \quad \dot{\delta}$


$\kappa \iota \beta \dot{\tau} \tau ь \nu$ 63， 4 f；col． $31,1,5,10,12,14$ ， 30；col．32， 20
＊кı日apıбтрla 50， 6
Kl $\mu \omega \nu 26,5 ; 27,1$ ；his єúmopla 27，13；


Kıveas 19， 28

 кратlav 29， 4
Kגa§ouévios $4 \mathrm{I}, 33$


К $\lambda_{\epsilon \epsilon \sigma \theta \epsilon \nu \eta s} 20,3,4,8,15,17 ; 21,2$ ； 22，4，16；28， 7 ；29，17，20；41， 15
K $\lambda \epsilon \epsilon \tau \circ \phi \hat{้} \nu 29,15 ; 34,24$
K кєo $^{\prime} \epsilon \nu \eta$ 19， 6,$29 ; 20,6,13,14$
K $\lambda \epsilon о ф \hat{\omega} \nu 28,19,26 ; 34,10$
$\kappa \lambda \epsilon \pi \tau \eta{ }^{5} 51,2$
．$\kappa \lambda \dot{\epsilon} \pi \tau 0 \nu \tau^{\prime} 54,6$
K $\lambda \epsilon \epsilon^{\omega} \nu 28,15$
$\kappa \lambda \hat{\eta} \mu \alpha$（？）бо， 14 n．c．
 $\epsilon \pi \iota \kappa \lambda \dot{\eta} \rho \omega \nu \mathrm{y} 9,8 ; 43,2 \tau ; 56,39 ; 58,9$
$\kappa \lambda \eta \rho \hat{\omega}^{-}$act．$\hat{\epsilon} \xi \dot{\psi} \pi \alpha \rho \chi \hat{\eta} s \kappa \lambda \eta \rho \rho 0 \hat{\nu}$ 4， 17 ； （in appointment of archons）$\delta \epsilon \kappa \alpha a \lambda$ ．





 （decree）


lepotoloús 54， 24 ；leporoloùs tov＇s кaт ${ }^{2}$ єvıautby 54，27；$\Delta$ וovvolurp $\epsilon \pi \iota \mu \in \lambda \eta \tau d s$ 56， 25
$\kappa \lambda \eta \rho o \hat{\sigma} \sigma$－$\alpha \theta \lambda o \theta \epsilon \in \tau a s ~ 60,2 ; \gamma p a \mu-$


 $\gamma \rho a \mu \mu a \tau \epsilon \nu^{\prime} \tau \hat{\omega} \nu \quad \theta \epsilon \sigma \mu a \theta \epsilon \tau \hat{\omega} \nu$ ）59，18；
 63，1；єis $\sum a \lambda a \mu \hat{\nu} \nu a$ ă $\rho \chi$ оута каl els
 52，II；єÜỚyous 48，14；$\theta \in \sigma \mu a \theta$ étas 55，4；入oүเбтás 48， 13 ；ঠ́бoтolov̀s кт入． 54，I；（тоüs）тєт таракко $\tau \alpha$ 53，I
（ $\tau \rho \stackrel{\tau \tau}{ }$ ûs）$\epsilon \kappa \lambda \eta \rho \omega \sigma \epsilon \nu \tau \rho \epsilon i ̂ s ~ \epsilon i s ~ \tau \eta ̀ \nu \nu ~ \phi \nu \lambda \eta ̀ \nu$


 （of dicasts）$\kappa \lambda \eta \rho o \nu \mu \epsilon \nu \omega \nu-\mu \hat{a} \lambda \lambda o \nu \tau \hat{\omega} \nu$

 т $\omega \nu$ 26， 15


 $\phi \nu \lambda \hat{\eta} \mathrm{s} 47,2$ ；（ $\tau \hat{\omega} \nu \tau a \mu \iota \hat{\omega} \nu \tau \hat{\eta} \mathrm{~s}$＇ $\mathrm{A} \theta \eta \nu \hat{a} s)$



 $\tau \eta \hat{s} \quad \phi \cup \lambda \hat{\eta} s \quad 8 \lambda \eta s \quad \kappa \lambda \eta \rho \circ v_{\mu} \in \nu a l$ 62，2；

 48，I



 à $\rho \chi a l$ к $\lambda \eta \rho \omega \tau a l$ 8，1， 5 ；30， 13 （decree）； 43,2 ；55； 1 ；62， 1
$\kappa \lambda о \pi \grave{\eta} \nu(\delta \eta \mu о \sigma i \omega \nu \quad \chi \rho \eta \mu a ́ \tau \omega \nu)$ ката $\gamma \iota \gamma \nu \omega$－ бкоขбะ 54， 7
Kodplסal 3， 13
коиข $5,4,10 ; 23,17 ; 40,18,21 ; 57,6$
 c．gen．39， 5 （decree）．tis tò кouvò 42 ， 28．т $\dot{a}$ ко七ขá 9,$10 ; 14,17 ; 15,25$ ； 16，10；24， $5 ; \alpha \pi \delta \tau \hat{\omega} \nu \kappa 0 เ \nu \omega \nu \nu 25,21$ ； 56， 37 ；tàs кolvàs $\lambda$ ptouprias 27， 14


 $\nu \omega \tau \eta \kappa \omega \dot{s} 37$ ， 1 I
кочушускаl סlкає 52， 15 （not found in Ar． in technical sense）
 ко入 $\alpha \zeta \epsilon \iota \nu$ 8， 23
Koג入utbs 14；26；22， 16
$\kappa 6 \lambda \pi$ os，$\theta \in \rho \mu a \operatorname{ios}$ 15， 6
 troops）17，16．Mid．ко $1 \sigma a \sigma \theta a l$ т $\dot{\text { a }}$

K $b \nu \omega \nu \alpha \rho \chi \omega \nu(402 / \mathrm{I}) 25,8$

$\kappa 6 \rho o s 12,13$（Solon）
＊кориข $\eta \phi$ б $\rho$ о 14,5
＊коб $\mu \eta \tau \boldsymbol{\eta} s{ }^{42}$ ， 19

13，28；то̀̀ ä入入од к $\sigma \sigma \mu о \nu$（of the Par－
thenon）47，6．є $\boldsymbol{\varepsilon} \kappa 6 \sigma \mu \varphi \lambda \epsilon \gamma 6 \nu \tau \omega \nu 28,18$ ．
 $\kappa \rho a \tau \hat{\omega} \nu 41,26$ ；о $\delta \hat{\eta} \hat{\eta} \mu \circ \iota$ крат $\eta \sigma \alpha \nu \tau \epsilon S$ 40， 24 кратєро̀̀ бдккоs 12， 8 （Solon）
кра́тоs 12， 42 （Solon）
$\kappa \rho \eta \nu \hat{\omega} \nu \epsilon \in \pi \iota \mu \in \lambda \eta \tau \eta \eta^{\prime} 43,3$
кре $\begin{gathered}\text { al } 51, ~ \\ 12\end{gathered}$
$\kappa \rho i \nu \epsilon \iota \nu$ ，ठiккаs 3，32；aи̃тaтє入єîs крlvєl 53 ，
 $\nu о \nu \sigma \iota \nu(\sigma \tau \rho a \tau \eta \gamma \quad \bar{\nu}) 6 \mathrm{I}, 12$ ；к $\rho(\nu a \sigma \alpha 8,9$ ； ěкрıขєע 8， 25 ；60， 11 ；тарабєl $\gamma \mu a \tau a-$ $\grave{\eta} \beta o u \lambda \eta$ 49，20；крlขє $\sigma \theta a \iota$ M $\eta \delta \iota \sigma \mu \circ \hat{1} 25$ ， 12；кри $\boldsymbol{\kappa} \mu \in \nu$ оs 27， 26
крlб८s，ой киріа 45，13；ката入е̂̀итає 6о， 14．крlбe

 $\chi a \rho l \zeta \in \sigma \theta a \iota \tau \dot{\eta} \nu \kappa \rho i \sigma \iota \nu 49,22 . \quad a i$ т $\eta$ s ßou入ท̂s крlaєts 41， 27

$\kappa \tau \hat{\eta} \mu a$ 60， $1_{4}$
$\kappa \tau i \xi \omega^{*} d \pi \delta \tau \omega \hat{\nu} \kappa \tau \iota \sigma \alpha \nu \tau \omega \nu 21,22$（Pol． 1275633 ， 13 Io ${ }^{6} 38$



 тoùs—ム̆ $\rho \chi$ оутаS 22， 21
кúa，
 32， 6
кúßol col． 3 1， 17 f；col．32， 3 I
（Kún $\omega \nu$ ） $\mathrm{I}, \mathrm{I}-3$ notes
кúpßeєs 7,3 （only in de Mundo 400 b 30 ，

 13；киріа єєккд $\quad$ біа 43，17；62，7；$\dot{\alpha} \mu$－ форєن̀s кúplos，áкироs，col．63， 2 r ；ки－ plav（ $\psi \hat{\eta} \phi \circ \nu$ ）col．36，20；ö̀ $\tau \iota$ ầ ol ठ८кабтal $\psi \eta \phi \ell \sigma \omega \nu \tau a \iota$, тои̂то ки́pıò єivaı


c．gen．$\dot{\alpha} \pi \alpha \dot{\alpha} \nu \tau \omega \nu 41,25 ; \tau \hat{\omega} \nu$ aध่̛ $\hat{\omega} \nu$ 61，21；т $\hat{\omega} \nu \quad \gamma \rho \alpha \mu \mu \alpha \tau \omega \nu$ 54，14；тท̂s

入e由s 20， 11 ；34，16；35，2；тท̂s $\pi 0$－入ıтelas 9,$7 ; \tau \hat{\omega} \nu \pi \rho a \gamma \mu \alpha \tau \omega \nu 6,1 ; 18,1 ;$

c．inf．3， $31 ; 8,23 ; 29,36$（decree）； 44,$13 ; 45,19 ; 56,42 ; 58$ ，1；61，14
c．part．37， 13 kuplous elvai $\theta a \nu a-$ toûvias

 To 35， 12





$\mathrm{K} \nu \psi \in \lambda\left(\bar{a}{ }^{2} \mathrm{I}_{7}, \mathrm{I}_{4}\right.$
києіิ 56,42

＊кшлакре̇тац 7,13


 léval 19，3I；as in Ar．（Index p． 4196 32）never followed by $\mu \dot{\eta}$

 хорпүढу Eth． 1123 a 23；хорду кшцч－
 $b$ 1）


 col．37，8．тov̂ $\epsilon \lambda \eta \eta \chi^{6} \tau 0 s$ col．32， 14 ；
 $\sigma u \nu$ col．32，24－às àv $\lambda a \chi \chi \eta$ dialitas 53 ，



 49， 21 ；тд̀ 入aхд̀̀ $\mu$ е́pos 30,16 （decree）； 58，7；т $\hat{\varphi} \lambda a \chi b \nu \tau \iota ~ 50,9 . ~ o l ~ \lambda a \chi b \nu \tau \epsilon s ~$ 57，24；oi $\lambda$ ．$\epsilon \pi i$ tàs $\psi$ hiфous col．35， 30；т $\hat{\nu} \nu \lambda a \chi \delta \nu \tau \omega \nu$ бıкабт $\hat{\nu} \nu 63,6$ ；то它 $\lambda a \chi b \nu \tau \alpha{ }^{2} 4,14$ ；（ $\pi \epsilon \nu \tau \epsilon$ ）30，26， 28

 57，9；$\delta<\kappa a \iota \lambda . ~ \pi \rho d s ~ a \dot{u} \tau \delta \nu \quad 58,4 ; \lambda$ ． סікаเ 57,12
Аакєбацибท⿺𠃊 19，7，21；23，19；29，3； 32,$14 ; 34,8 ; 37,18 ; 38,25 ; 40,20$
Макє $\delta a l \mu \omega \nu 37,17 ; 38,7,27$
Макıádal 27， 15
\ák $\begin{aligned} & \text { ves } 19,7,21,25 ; 23,20\end{aligned}$
 ßápováข 42，34；$\lambda$ ．ঠшрєа́̀ 46，7；els бІтๆб兀 $\lambda .62$, 10．$\lambda а \mu \beta a ́ \nu \omega \nu \nu 25,26 ;$


 $35 ; \pi \rho \circ \sigma \tau \dot{a} \tau \eta \nu \quad$ モ $\lambda a \beta \in \nu$ oं $\delta \bar{\eta} \mu \mathrm{os} 28$ ， 3 ．
 $\tau \eta \nu 16,22 ; \lambda . \tau \grave{\eta} \nu \bar{\epsilon} \xi 0 v \sigma \operatorname{la\nu } 4 \mathrm{I}, 4 ; \tau \dot{\eta} \nu$

 13 ；$\delta \omega \rho \epsilon \dot{\alpha} \nu \lambda .46,6 ; \lambda . \tau \dot{\eta} \nu \in \pi \epsilon \mu \dot{\lambda} \epsilon \epsilon \iota \nu$
 रò $\lambda$ 入． 57 ，19；$\lambda a \beta b \nu \tau \epsilon s ~ d \sigma \pi i \delta a ~ 42,31 ;$ $\delta \hat{\omega} \rho a \quad \lambda a \beta \dot{\rho} \nu \tau a \quad 54,8$ ．$\delta \hat{\omega} \rho a \quad \lambda \eta \dot{\eta} \psi \sigma \theta \alpha \downarrow$ and $\lambda_{\alpha} \dot{\beta} \beta \omega \sigma t 55,32 . \lambda \eta \phi \theta \in \nu \tau \omega \nu(=\dot{d} \lambda \sigma \nu$－ т $\omega \nu$ ）19， 34
$\lambda \alpha \mu \pi \dot{a} \dot{\delta} \omega \nu \dot{\alpha} \gamma \omega \nu \epsilon{ }^{57}, 7$
 $\pi \rho \hat{\omega} s$ Eth． 1122 b 22 $^{\text {）}}$




 dos $\lambda$ ofos 18， 26 ．$\epsilon \lambda \epsilon \chi \theta \eta$ 21，5．v．$\epsilon$－ $\pi \in \hat{\nu}$ and $\epsilon \bar{\ell} \rho \eta \tau a$.
$\Lambda \in \leftharpoonup \mu \dot{\nu} \eta \eta$（＇I $\pi \pi о \mu \notin \nu o v s)$ Heracl．epit．1． 12
$\lambda \epsilon i \pi \omega \cdot$（ $\delta i \kappa \eta \nu$ ） $\boldsymbol{\epsilon}^{\wedge} \iota \pi \epsilon \nu 16$ ， 34 （retinet Blass， coll．Dem． 49 § 19， 59 §60）

$\lambda \in i \omega_{1}$ 12， 19 （Solon）
$\Lambda \in \sigma$ blot 24,7
$\lambda \in u \kappa 0 l$, кußol col．31， 19

 32 （only in Phys．Ausc． 185 b 29 ód ab－






 （decree）；t tpa $\nu \in \mu \eta \theta \omega \sigma \sigma \nu$ els $\tau \dot{d} s \tau \in \tau \tau a \rho a s$ $\lambda \hat{r} \xi \in \epsilon$ s 3 I， 19 （only in de Mundo 401

 $\lambda \eta \rho \omega \dot{0} \eta \mathrm{~s}$ Rhet． 1414 b 16；Hist．An． 579b3）
入дroupyla 27，14；56， 16
$\lambda_{\eta \tau о \nu \rho \gamma \omega} \cdot 27,14 ; 29,35$（decree）； 56 ， 15 f

 b 33；入lap à $\pi$ 入oû̀ Meteor． 339 b 34； $\dot{\dot{a} \pi \lambda \hat{\omega}} 365 a 26$ ）






 $\tau \epsilon \lambda \epsilon \sigma \epsilon \nu$ 1 $_{5}, 23$ ；$\tau \grave{\partial} \nu \pi \rho \grave{\partial} \tau 0 \hat{v} \psi \eta \phi l \sigma \mu \alpha \tau \sigma s$ $\lambda \delta$ yò 29， 6 ；in the law－courts，（ $\epsilon l \rho \eta \mu \hat{\xi}$－


 $\gamma$ боеу os $\lambda$ бобos 18， 26 ；＇rumour＇，＇re－

 （3）＇in name alone＇，$\lambda 6 \gamma \varphi{ }^{\prime} \mu$ óvo ${ }^{2} 3^{2,12 .}$





$\lambda 0 \xi \grave{\partial} \nu-\dot{\partial} \rho \hat{\omega} \sigma \iota 12$ ， 21 （Solon）
入oxaroi 61， 18 （de Mundo 399 b6；Oec． ii 1350 b 11 ；，入oxaflat Pol． 1322 b 4 ）
ムúyóaus ó Nágıos $15,11,15$
$\Lambda v к о \mu \eta \dot{\delta} \eta \mathrm{\Sigma}$ इки́pıos Heracl．epit．1． 7
＊$\lambda$ ико́тобєs frag． 5
$\lambda$ úkos 12,54 （Solon）
Дикойрүоs 13，20；14， 19
 18， 21

Aúaayסjos，King of Sparta 34，16， 25
$\Lambda v \sigma \iota к \rho \dot{\alpha} \tau \eta$ s ä $\rho \chi \omega \nu$（453／2）26， 19
Nuoluaxos，father of Aristides，22，39；23， I3

${ }^{*} \lambda u \chi^{\nu \in \hat{\imath} 0 \nu}$ col． 36, I 7

малакб́s 3，7；18， 12
 $\dot{a} \in l \mu \hat{a} \lambda \lambda{ }_{\lambda}{ }^{2} 27,23 .-\mu a ́ \lambda \iota \sigma \tau a \operatorname{9,4;} 13$ ， 18；16，40；18，4；22，16；25，2．$\pi 0 \lambda$－ $\lambda \hat{\imath l} \nu \mu e ̀ \nu$ каl ä $\lambda \lambda \omega \nu, \mu$ ．ठé $\Theta \eta \beta a l \omega \nu 15$ ，
 32，9；$\mu$ á入った $\alpha a$ with numbers 32， 9 ； $\tau \hat{\omega} \nu \pi \rho \sigma \gamma \epsilon \gamma \epsilon \nu \eta \mu \epsilon ้ \nu \omega \nu$ 33，5．－$\mu \alpha ́ \lambda a$ does not occur．

＊$\mu a \nu \tau \epsilon v \tau d$ lepá 54， 25
$\mu a ́ \nu \tau \epsilon \omega \nu, \mu \epsilon \tau \dot{a} \tau \hat{\omega} \nu 54,26$
Mapa日 $\omega \nu$ ，Év 22， 10
мaptuplà 53，10， 17 ；55， 30
$\mu а р т \nu \rho \in \hat{\imath} 5,14 ; 6$ ， 19
$\mu a ́ \rho \tau v \rho e s ~ 55,30 . ~ к a ́ \lambda e \iota ~ \tau o u ̀ s ~ \mu a ́ p \tau v p a s ~ 55, ~$ 19；є́ $\pi \epsilon \iota \delta d \nu \pi a \rho \alpha \sigma \chi \eta \tau \alpha \iota \tau$ oùs $\mu$ ． 55,20
Mapovela 22， 30
＊$\mu а \sigma \tau$ түоф́роиs－íviре́таs 35， 6
$\mu \alpha^{\prime} \chi a เ \rho a \nu, \sigma \pi a \sigma a ́ \mu \in \nu$ os $\tau \dot{\eta} \nu$ 18， 38


 коута 38,2

Mevaci $\hat{\eta}_{s}$（the slayer of Cylon）Heracl． epit．l．I 5
Мє
 （ $+\pi \epsilon \rho i \Sigma \alpha \lambda a \mu i ̂ \nu o s) ~ 17,6$
 $\mu \mathrm{el} \xi \omega \nu$（＇too powerful＇）22，27；$\mu \mathrm{el} \xi \omega$ 10，4；$\left.\sigma \tau \delta \lambda_{0} \mu=l\right\} \omega$ 19， 30
$\mu E ́ \gamma \iota \sigma \tau a i$ кai $\pi \rho \hat{\omega} \tau a i \tau \hat{\omega} \nu \hat{a} \rho \chi \hat{\omega} \nu 3,4 ;$ $\tau \dot{\alpha} \pi \lambda e \hat{\sigma} \sigma \tau \alpha$ каl $\tau \dot{\alpha} \mu \epsilon ́ \gamma เ \sigma \tau a 3,35 ; 8,22$ ； $\pi \rho \hat{\omega} \tau о \nu$ каl $\mu \epsilon \gamma \iota \sigma \tau о \nu$ 9，3；$\mu \in \gamma / \sigma \tau \eta \nu$
 $\hat{\eta}^{\hat{\eta} \nu} 16,29$
$\mu \in \gamma \in \theta$ os $\tau 0 \hat{0} \tau \iota \mu \eta \mu a \tau o s 7,14$
Mé $\omega \nu$（ $\left.\beta a \sigma \iota \lambda \epsilon \iota_{s}\right) 3,9$
${ }^{*} \mu \in \theta \iota \delta \rho v \sigma \phi \mu \in \nu 0 s, \epsilon \kappa \kappa \in \imath \sigma \in$ 19， 6
$\mu \in \theta l \sigma \tau a \tau 022,27$
$\mu \in \theta \dot{u} \omega \nu$ 34， 1 I
$\mu e ̂ \lambda a v e s$, кúßoc col． 3 г， 19
$\mu \in \lambda \lambda \omega$ c．inf．praes．6，6；7，29；18，11； 24，12，14；45，3；col．36， 10 c．inf．fut． 63,10 and col． $31,3^{6}$ $\mu \epsilon \lambda \lambda \eta \pi \lambda \eta \rho \omega \theta \eta \sigma \in \sigma \theta a \iota$（not noted either by H－L，or in Class．Rev．v $185 b$ ）．
 $\chi$ रobón 3I．I

$\mu \varepsilon \mu \psi \iota \mu \circ\llcorner\mathrm{pla} \cdot$ pl．12， 55 ：（only in de Virt． 1251 b 25 ；$\mu \in \mu \psi$ H $_{\mu o t p o s ~ i n ~ H i s t . ~ A n . ~}^{\text {．}}$ $608 b$ 10）
$\mu e ̀ v-\delta \epsilon$ passim， $1,2 \mathrm{f}$ ；3， 2 f \＆c．$\mu \epsilon \boldsymbol{v}$ without $\delta \epsilon 19,9 ; 48,23$ ．$\mu \epsilon \nu$ in irre－ gular position 48,$24 ; \mu \hat{y} \nu-\delta \dot{e}-\delta \epsilon \hat{2} 2$ ， 13．$\mu \hat{\iota} \nu$ oũ $\nu$ passim，2，10；3，14，33； 4,$1 ; 8,8 ; 9,1,10 ; 10,1 \& c$ ．
$\mu \in \nu<\tau 0 \iota>28,35$
 $\mu \epsilon \iota \nu \alpha \nu \tau \omega \nu$ 38， 3 I；39，3．$\mu \varepsilon \mu \epsilon \bar{\nu} \eta \kappa \epsilon$ סLd $\beta$ lov 3， $3^{8}$


$\mu \varepsilon \rho \iota \sigma \mu b s$ 4，9，І І（Met． $1027 b 20 \mathrm{Bz} \mu$ ． $\alpha \nu \tau(\phi \dot{\alpha} \sigma \epsilon \omega s)$
$\mu \notin \rho o s, \kappa a \tau \grave{d} 55,5 ; ~ \tau \grave{d} \lambda a \chi \grave{\nu} \nu \mu \notin \rho o s 30,16$
 $\mu \in \rho \in \iota$ col．37，7．тà סúo $\mu \epsilon \rho \eta \eta_{1} 1$ ， 17 ．
 12 ；$\delta \iota a \nu \epsilon \hat{\imath} \mu a \iota \tau \epsilon \tau \tau a \rho a \mu .58,6 ; \nu \in \nu \epsilon \in \mu \eta-$ таı－$\delta$ е́ка $\mu .63,20$
$\mu \in \sigma \sigma \gamma \in \epsilon$ оs，$\dot{\eta} 21,14$
$\mu \varepsilon ́ \sigma o s^{*} \Sigma \delta \lambda \omega \nu-\tau \hat{\eta}$ oúciă кal $\tau$ oîs $\pi \rho a ́ \gamma \mu a \sigma \iota$ $\tau \hat{\omega} \nu-\mu \epsilon \sigma \sigma \omega \nu 5,12 ; \tau \eta \nu \nu \hat{\epsilon} \sigma \eta \nu \pi 0 \lambda \iota \tau \in l a \nu$
 $\mu \epsilon ́ \sigma \varphi$ col． 35,28
$\mu \in \tau \grave{\alpha}$ c．gen．$\tau \omega \nu$＇A $\theta \eta \nu a i \omega \nu$ 19，33；aútou 20， 11 ； $6 \lambda \gamma \omega \nu 20,18$ ；$\dot{\delta} \pi 0 \tau \epsilon \rho \omega \nu 11$ ， 13 ；тои́ $\tau \omega \nu 14,6 . \mu \epsilon \theta$＇ö $\pi \lambda \omega \nu 18,28$. $\mu \in \tau \dot{a} \sigma \pi o v \delta \hat{\eta}{ }^{25}$ ， 17
c．acc．roùs ápxalous 28，29；т̀̀v－ $\theta$ ávaтov 19，4；$\tau \dot{\eta} \nu \tau \hat{\omega} \nu \nu \delta \mu \omega \nu$ $\theta \in \sigma \tau \nu$ 14，
 кard̀̀vou 13，24；21，3；rウ̀v $\pi \rho \dot{\mu} r \eta \nu$
 $\sigma \tau \alpha \sigma \iota \nu 22,6 ; \tau \alpha ̀$ M $\eta \delta \iota \kappa \alpha ́ 23,2 ; 25,2 ;$ $\tau \grave{\eta} \nu \nu a \nu \mu a \chi l a \nu 23,22 ; \tau \dot{\eta} \nu \nu l_{\kappa} \eta \nu 22,11$ ；
 24；34，13；тaûta 2，1；10，3；14，20；



$\mu \in \tau a \delta \iota \delta 6 a \sigma \iota 36,9 ; \mu \epsilon \tau \epsilon \delta l \delta o v$ 40， 9 ；$\mu \epsilon \tau \epsilon-$ $\delta \omega \kappa \epsilon 40,9 ; \mu \in T a \delta o u ̂ v a l ~ 36,39$ ．Constr． tives tivi
$\mu \varepsilon \tau a \iota \chi \mu l \varphi, \epsilon \nu 12,65$（Solon）
$\mu \in \tau a \kappa \iota \nu \in i \nu(\tau o v s, \nu \delta \mu o u s) 31,9$（decree）
$\mu \notin \tau a \lambda \lambda a ~ 22,29 ; 47,8,1$ I
${ }^{*} \mu \epsilon \tau а \lambda \lambda \iota к a l$ бікає 59， 14
＊$\mu \in \tau a \pi \epsilon \mu \pi о \mu a{ }^{\prime} 3,8 ; 18,6 ; 20,16 ; 38$ ， 8
$\mu \epsilon \tau a \tau l \theta \eta \mu l^{\cdot}$ тàs $\sigma \tau a ́ \sigma \epsilon \iota s$ di $\mu \phi o \tau \epsilon ́ \rho a s ~ \mu \epsilon \tau a-$ $\theta \in \sigma \theta a c$ II， 9

 $22 ; \tau \eta$ 今 $\pi 0 \lambda \iota \tau \epsilon l a s ~ 21,5 ; 42,2 ; \pi \alpha \nu \tau \omega \nu$ $\tau \hat{\omega} \nu \tau \sigma \pi \omega \nu 21,15 . \quad \mu \epsilon \tau \epsilon \chi \delta \nu \tau \omega \nu \pi 0 \lambda \lambda \hat{\omega} \nu$ 18， 14

$\mu$ етоккоя 43,$25 ; 57,18 ; 58,11$ ．ठікаи－ $\mu \in \tau o l$ кous 58,5 ， 10


 16．Ev，$\mu$ erplotot 5,17 （Solon）

$\mu \epsilon \tau \rho \circ \nu 7,17,26 ; \pi \epsilon \nu \tau \alpha к b \sigma \iota \alpha \mu \epsilon \tau \rho a 10,4 ;$ $\mu$ е́т $\rho \omega \nu$ каl $\sigma \tau a \theta \mu \hat{\nu}$ го， 3
＊$\mu \epsilon \tau \rho \circ{ }^{2} \% \mu \mathrm{O}$ 51， 5
$\mu \notin \chi \rho \iota$ ठє́ка боах $\mu \omega ิ \nu$ 52，18；53， 5 ；єй－ $\theta \cup \nu \hat{\omega} \nu 4,12 ; \Sigma \dot{\omega} \lambda \omega \nu \circ 52,9 ; \dot{d} \rho \chi \hat{\eta} \mathrm{~s} \tau \epsilon$－入ous 56，7；$\tau \ell \nu \omega \nu .52,37$ ；$\tau \hat{\eta} \bar{\nu} \nu \hat{\nu} \nu$（sc． $\pi$ тגıтelas кaza usurpat Ar．）；$\tau 00$ к 63，20；col．31， 4 ； тоútou 23，I；$\tau \rho$ しิ̂y 43， 25
$\mu \dot{\eta}, \mu \eta \partial \dot{\epsilon}, \mu \eta \delta \varepsilon \epsilon \mathrm{s}, \mu \eta \tau \epsilon$ passim．
$\mu \eta \partial \dot{\varepsilon} \mu \in \theta^{\prime} \dot{\varepsilon} \in \epsilon \in \rho \omega \nu 8$ ， 29 （law of Solon）． $\mu \dot{\eta}-\mu \eta \delta \dot{\epsilon} 9,7 . \mu \dot{\eta} \tau \epsilon-\mu \eta \tau \epsilon \mathrm{II}, 3 ; 16$ ， 10；39， 6 （decree）；col．35，34．$\mu \boldsymbol{\eta} \tau \epsilon$ －da入d 16,8
М $\eta \delta \iota \kappa$ á，$\mu \epsilon \tau \grave{a} \tau \grave{a} 23,2 ; 25,2 ; 41,16$
＊$\mu \eta \delta i \sigma \mu 00$, ，крl $\downarrow \in \sigma \theta a l 25,12$
M $\eta$ 人 6 киos 29， 6
$\mu \eta \nu^{-}$oủ $\mu \grave{\eta} \nu$ ả̉入á 6，12；7，20；＋кal 2，
 29， 12 （decree）
$\mu \eta^{\prime} \nu, \dot{\delta} \cdot \mu \eta \nu 6 s 3_{2}, 4 ; \mu \hat{\eta} \nu \alpha 62,13 ; \mu \hat{\eta} \nu a s$ 13， 7
 18， 34
$\mu \eta \tau \tau \eta$ and $\mu \eta \tau \rho \partial_{s} \pi a \tau \eta{ }^{\prime} \rho 55$, I4
$\mu \kappa \kappa \rho \partial \nu 3,14 ; 11,12 ; 15,17 ; 25,3 ; 4 \mathrm{I}$ ， Io．év oütc $\mu$ мкроі̂́s 6,17

$\mu \sigma \theta \delta s$（ $\delta \iota \kappa a \sigma \tau \iota \kappa b s$ ）col．33，18；col．37，
 $\sigma_{\text {ta }} \sigma \tau i \kappa 6$ s） $4 \mathrm{I}, 29-35 ; 62,6 \mathrm{f}$
 סıкабтaîs（Pericles）27， 22 ；$\partial \nu \epsilon \nu \mu i \sigma \theta 0-$ $\phi \circ \rho a ̂ s ~ 30,5$（decree）．$\mu \sigma \theta 0 \phi о \rho a ̀ \nu \pi 0-$ pijely Pol． 1304 b 27

 $\mu \sigma \theta о \phi \phi \rho \circ \nu 33,9 ; \mu \sigma \theta \circ \phi \quad \rho \circ \nu \dot{\epsilon} \kappa \kappa \lambda \eta$－
 Pol．г 303 b 1；Rhet． 1399 b 2.

 $\mu \tau \sigma \theta 0 ф 0 \rho \omega \hat{y} 49,8$. Cf．Pol． $1317{ }^{b} 35$

 $\chi^{\text {bעt }} \mu \iota \sigma \theta 0 \hat{0} \sigma \iota 50,9 . \quad$ Pass．ӧ $\pi \omega \mathrm{s}-\mu \grave{\eta}$ $\mu \iota \sigma \theta \omega \theta \dot{\eta} \sigma 0 \nu \tau a l$ 50，7．Mid．$\sigma \tau \rho a \tau \iota \omega ́ r a s$ $\mu \nu \sigma \theta \omega \sigma \dot{a} \mu \epsilon \nu$ оs 15，18；$\epsilon \mu \sigma \theta \dot{\omega} \sigma a \nu \tau о ~ \tau \grave{\nu}$

＊$\mu \sigma \theta \theta \dot{\omega} \mu \pi \tau \alpha$ 47， 8
$\mu \sigma \theta \omega \sigma \iota s 47,27 ; \mu \sigma \theta \omega \dot{\sigma} \epsilon \iota s, \tau \omega \nu \quad \tau \epsilon \mu \epsilon \nu \omega ิ \nu$


$\mu \nu \sigma \hat{\omega} \cdot \mu \sigma \epsilon \hat{L} \nu 28,24$
$\mu \nu \alpha \hat{\alpha}$ Io， $5,8,9$ ；$\epsilon \nu \tau \delta s \tau \rho \iota \omega \nu \mu \nu \hat{\omega} \nu 49,26 ;$


＊$\mu \nu \eta \sigma$ ткакєì 39， 20 （decree）；40， 1 1． е́ $\mu \nu \eta \sigma \iota к а ́ к \eta \sigma є ~ 40, ~ г 6 ~(\mu \nu \eta \sigma t к а к о s ~ R h e t . ~$ 1381 $b_{4}$ ；Eth．II25 $a_{5}$ ）
 $\mu$ î̃pay 19， 24
$\mu 0 七 \chi$ elas $\gamma \rho a \phi{ }^{\prime}{ }^{2} 59$ ，II
$\mu о<\chi \delta \nu \lambda a \beta \omega \dot{\nu} 57,19$
$\mu b \nu o s$ c．gen． $3,2 \mathrm{I}, 38 \& \mathrm{c}$ ．ò $\mu$ bעov－ à $\lambda \lambda \grave{\alpha}$ каl $40,18 \& c$ ．$\quad \dot{\sigma} \sigma \tau^{\prime} \sigma \dot{u} \tau \grave{\eta} \nu \mu b \nu \eta \nu$
入lots $\mu$ byots 36,9
＊$\mu 0 \nu 0 \chi i \tau \omega \nu 25,18$
＊$\mu$ oplat 60，8，9；enalav uoplay 60， 1 I
Mouvixia 19，5；38，1，16；42，21．（ $\sigma \tau \rho a$－ $\tau \eta \gamma \dot{d} \mathrm{~s}) \in \operatorname{ls} \tau \dot{\eta} \nu \mathrm{M} .6 \mathrm{I}, 6$


$\mu \delta \delta \rho o t 23,24$（only in de Mundo $395 \delta$ $23 \mu \nu \delta \rho o u s \delta_{1}(a \pi$ úpous）

${ }^{M} u \rho \omega \nu_{\mathrm{I}}, \mathrm{I}$
${ }^{*} \mu \nLeftarrow \sigma \tau \alpha \iota$, öтà olкочр $\hat{\sigma} \sigma t$ 56， 22
$\mu \nu \sigma \tau \eta \dot{\rho} \leftharpoonup a \operatorname{39,~8;~57,~г~}$
Náktos 15, II
Najos 15， 15
＊даuкрарlaı 8，13 f
＊даикрарıкой ápरuplov，èк тồ 8， 18 （de－ cree）
＊ даикрара 8，14， 17 ；21， 20
$\nu a \nu \mu a \chi i a, \dot{\eta} \pi \epsilon \rho i \Sigma^{2} a \lambda a \mu i \nu a 23,5 ; \epsilon \nu \Sigma a \lambda \alpha-$
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 pous 22， 37
 36 （only in Oec． 1349 a 25 vaum $\eta \gamma \epsilon \hat{\epsilon} \sigma \theta a \iota$ $\tau \rho \iota \eta \rho \epsilon \epsilon s \mu \dot{\epsilon} \lambda \omega \nu . \nu \alpha \nu \pi \eta \gamma \delta s$ and $\nu a u \pi \eta \gamma i a$ in Pol．；עava $\gamma \boldsymbol{\iota}$ кो in Eth．）

 $\nu \alpha \hat{v} \mathrm{~s} 23,7$

 $\epsilon \kappa \dot{\epsilon} \sigma \tau \eta \nu 30$, I6（decree）；ఫעa $\nu \in \mu \eta \theta \omega \sigma \sigma \nu$


 фu入às $\delta e ̇ \kappa \alpha ~ \mu \epsilon ́ \rho \eta$ oi $\delta \iota \kappa \alpha \sigma \tau a l ~ 63,20$.
 $\nu \in \mu \in \sigma \theta a \iota 56,37$
Nєoк $\hat{\eta}^{\prime} \mathrm{S}$ 23， 14


 $\nu \epsilon \omega \tau \epsilon \rho о \nu(?) 26,5$
＊$\nu \in \omega \rho / \omega \nu, \phi \rho \circ u p o l$ 24， 15

＊$\nu$ єббоккос 46，ц， 4
עє $\omega \sigma \tau 13,18$

Nıкlas 28，I5， 29
 22， 29
 $l_{\pi \pi \epsilon \hat{L}}$ 19，31．c．acc．cogn．vecinoas




 2；тov̀s $\tau \hat{\eta}$ עavuaxlqu עtк $\hat{\omega} \nu \tau a s$ 34， 5 ． o vektras（of one who gets a decree passed）45，24．（In the law－courts）$\in \dot{d} \nu$

$\nu о \mu \zeta \epsilon \iota \nu 6,2 \mathrm{I}$ ；$\nu 0 \mu i \sigma \alpha \nu \tau \in \mathrm{~s} 18$ ， 18
$\nu о \mu l \mu \omega \nu, \epsilon \ell_{\rho} \gamma \epsilon \sigma \theta a \iota \tau \hat{\omega} \nu 57, I_{4}$
$\nu 6 \mu \sigma \mu \alpha 10,4,7$
$\nu 0 \mu o \theta \in \sigma$ la 10,2
 II， 5 （both of Solon）






 тoùs $\nu 6 \mu$ ous àm $\pi \hat{\omega} s$ $\mu \eta \delta \dot{e ̀} \sigma a \phi \hat{\omega} s 9,7 ; \nu 6$－

 10，1；катà тò̀s vbuous 4， 21 ；Toùs－

 22，I2．$\nu 6 \mu 0<$ quoted，$\pi \epsilon \rho l \tau \hat{\omega} \nu \tau \alpha \mu \epsilon \bar{\omega}$ 8，6；$\Sigma 6 \lambda \omega \nu$ оs $8, ~ г 6 ; \pi \epsilon \rho l \tau \hat{\omega} \nu \tau v \rho \dot{\alpha} \nu \nu \omega \nu$ 16， 39
 and עо $\mu о \phi \cup \lambda a \kappa l a$ in Pol．）
$\nu 60 \nu, \tau \rho \epsilon \phi \in \sigma \theta \epsilon \mu \epsilon \gamma a \nu 5,17$（Solon）



 кal עט̂̀ 3，39；7，29．Єैтє кal עט̂̀ 3，25； 7,$6 ; 8,6 ; 22,7$. עûv $\delta \epsilon$（opp．$\pi \rho \delta \tau \epsilon-$ مоע $\mu \notin \nu) 53,24 ; 54,19 ; 55,11,25$ ； 56,$25 ; 6 \mathrm{I}, 2$ ；（opp．$\left.\pi \rho \delta \sigma \tau \epsilon \rho 0 \nu \delta \epsilon^{\prime}\right) 56$ ， 9；（орр．тотє）49，20；（орр．т $\mu \mathrm{\mu} \nu \bar{\epsilon} \epsilon$ $\dot{d} \rho \chi \hat{\eta} s) 55,4 ; \nu \hat{v} \nu \delta^{\prime}$ after impf． $5 \mathrm{I}, 9$

䒧 $\epsilon \nu a l \nu \in \tau o s ~ d \rho \chi \omega \nu(401 / 0) 40,27$

$\xi \notin \nu 0 s 19,23 ; 20,6 ; 57,18$


 кúßoc col．31， 19
$\xi \nu \nu \dot{\eta} \gamma a \gamma 0 \nu 12,28$（Solon）
 §úo $\mu \epsilon ́ \rho \eta$ 51，I7．

Article often found in periphrastic phrases，ol $\pi \epsilon \rho l$＇Avakpéovia 18， 5 ；ol $\pi \epsilon \rho \ell \tau \dot{\partial} \nu \mathrm{K} \lambda \epsilon 0 \mu \epsilon \nu \eta \nu 20,12 ; \tau \hat{\omega} \nu \in \nu \tau \hat{\eta}$ толıтela 38， 9 ；$\tau$ d $\pi \epsilon \rho l$ tds ápxás 3，


 29，I f．

Sometimes omitted（I）before the names of officials，as $\theta \epsilon \sigma \mu 0 \theta \epsilon \tau a \iota 3,3^{\circ}$ ； $\sigma \tau \rho a \tau \eta \gamma$ oùs каl $i \pi \pi \alpha \dot{\rho} \rho$ Хous 4,8 ；cf． 30 ， 7：（2）in certain set phrases，as $\epsilon \nu$ dंүop


 є́к ката入óyov 26，8；ধ̇̀ $\mu \epsilon \in \rho \in \iota ~ 43, ~ 7 ; ~$

 15， 9 \＆c；кal aúтdे каl $\gamma \in \nu$ оs 16,44 ； $\tau i s \pi a \tau \rho o ̀ s$（and $\mu \eta \tau \rho d s$ ）$\pi a \tau \eta \rho 55,14 \mathrm{f}$ ． Similarly with $\alpha \rho \chi \dot{\eta} 5,6,20$ ．（The exx．mainly from H－L，s．v．Articulus．） See also ő $\delta \epsilon$ ，є́кабтоs and тр $\sigma \pi \%$ ．


 42，26；62，10；$\pi \in \nu \tau \epsilon 62,7$ ；tעv $\epsilon_{\alpha} 62$ ， 7
ö $\delta \epsilon$ ，article sometimes omitted in papyrus after， 7,$8 ; 29,29 ; 37,5$ ；not omitted
 16，42
＊ódonotol 54，I
ó 8 ＇s 50， 1 I－14；54， 2
ठסúval 16， 21
ö $\theta \in \nu$（ 1 ）＇whence＇，（of place）15，7；（of origin \＆c）6，II $\delta \theta \theta \downarrow$ ф $\phi a \sigma l$ $\gamma \in \nu \in \sigma \theta a l$ ；


 $\nu \in i ̂ \nu . \quad$（2）＇wherefore＇，$\delta \theta \epsilon \nu$ кal 3，8； 17，15； 21,$18 ; 8 \theta є \nu$ Ётน каl ขט̂̀ 7,6 ； $\delta \theta \epsilon \nu$ ปैं $\sigma \tau \epsilon \rho \circ \mathrm{I}, \mathrm{I} 3$
 $\epsilon l \delta \hat{\eta} 57,20 ; \epsilon l \delta \delta т \epsilon \leqslant$ 14， 12
Ol $\hat{\theta} \theta \in \nu \quad 27,19$
olкelas，Єк $\tau$ र̂̀ 7,17 ；т $\hat{\nu}$ olкelav 40， 24
olкelws elXov 36， 5

olкүиата 15， 21
olkla• tady－olklav $\lambda a \mu \beta a \nu \omega \sigma \iota \nu$ 39， 10 ；ol－ klas 20，9；тà $\chi$ wpla кal tàs oiklas 52， 6
olкoסoueĩ 19， 20

 ठофа⿱亠䒑䶹̄ 56， 43
＊olкоир $\omega \sigma \iota \mu$ úvтal，ö́ $\alpha a \nu 56,22$
 praep．то̀̀s olкои̂̀тas év éка́бтч т $\bar{\nu} \nu$
 3 \＆c．甲кฑ
olvo $\chi$ ocîy 20， 23 （scol．）
oloual oloyтal 9，1о；oleбӨai 10，6；థето 1I， 10
oTov，＇for example＇，35，14；57，19．＊ov̉ $\chi$ oLov＊papyri lectio 40，23
ठкть́ 23，7．ठкктшкаіঠєка єิтท 42，3， 13
${ }_{0}{ }^{\prime} \lambda$ Bos $12,13,18$（Solon）




 4
 тô̂s b̀ $\iota \gamma a \rho \chi \iota \kappa$ ôs 34,25
$\delta \lambda i \gamma o s^{\prime} \delta \iota ' \delta \lambda l \gamma \omega \nu{ }_{\eta}{ }^{\prime} \nu 2,6 ; 4,24$ ．ol $\delta \lambda l$－ रou 41，28；т $\hat{\omega} \nu$ тo Toís ỏ入lyots 5， 2
ठ $\lambda \iota \gamma \omega \rho \hat{\omega}^{*}$ тои́т $\omega \nu \mu \epsilon \hat{\nu} \dot{\omega} \lambda \iota \gamma \dot{\omega} \rho \eta \sigma a \nu 36$ ， 12
 $\lambda \hat{\text { § }}$ ö $\lambda \eta s$ 62， 2
$\delta ̋ \lambda \omega \mathrm{~s} 13,12$
днL入iaus－пробभ́үєто，raîs 16,37





 15；55，29，33；$\hat{\eta} \mu \hat{\eta} \nu 29$ ， 12 （decree）；
 39 ；$\quad \mu \delta \sigma \omega \sigma \iota \nu 39$ ，I 5
 $\epsilon \pi i \grave{\tau} \hat{\omega} \nu \hat{a} \lambda \lambda \omega \nu 35, ~ 17$
\％$\mu$ о入оүla 19： 35

 31



 32，II
 ठiбa८ 12， 57 （Solon）
ӧ $\nu о \mu \alpha$ 7，19；14，27；17，13；48，20；54， 36；63，19

 тарєЮИоуто 37，14；тарє入є́бөal 37，4；
 did $\tau \hat{\omega} \nu$ ö $\pi \lambda \omega \nu$ 18，27；тoîs êk т
 $\lambda \iota \tau \in\left\{a s\right.$ о0́ $\sigma \eta$ s 33，14；$\mu \epsilon \theta^{\prime} \delta \pi \lambda \omega \nu 18$ ，


$\delta \pi \lambda i \not \tau \alpha \iota 24,18 ; 61,21,24$ ．（ $\sigma \tau \rho a \tau \eta \gamma \dot{\partial} s)$

＊$\dot{\text { ö } \pi \lambda 0 \mu \alpha \chi \in i ̂ \nu ~ 42, ~} 22$

ठัтои 43， 15
бт $\pi{ }^{\prime} \rho a$ 27， 17
öт $\omega$ s（1）with subj．pres．（a）after past

 $\phi \cup \lambda \alpha ́ \tau T \omega \sigma \iota \nu$ 3， 21 ；$\mu \hat{\eta} \tau^{\prime}$ ย̇ $\pi \iota \theta \nu \mu \hat{\omega} \sigma \iota \mu \dot{\eta} \tau \epsilon$ $\sigma \chi 0 \lambda a \zeta \omega \sigma \iota$ 16，10；$\mu \grave{\eta} \hat{\eta} 35,16 ; \mu \grave{\eta}$ $\pi \alpha \rho \alpha \mu e \lambda \omega ิ \sigma \iota 16,15 ; \mu \grave{\eta} \sigma \nu \mu \beta \alpha i \nu \eta 2$ 1， 9. （b）after pres．inf．dependent on pf ． ind．$\pi \rho \circ \sigma \tau \epsilon \in \tau \alpha \kappa \tau \alpha-\epsilon ่ \pi \iota \mu \in \lambda \in \hat{i} \sigma \theta a \iota, \quad 8 \pi \omega s$ $\pi \omega \lambda \hat{\eta} \tau \alpha \iota 51,2-4$ ．
（2）with subj．2nd aor．$\mu \in \tau \alpha \dot{\alpha} \sigma \omega \sigma \iota$ 21，5；$\mu \eta \delta \bar{t} \nu \alpha \lambda a ́ \theta \eta$ 43， 22.
 （decree）；वैע $\sigma \nu \mu \beta$ оилєú $\omega \sigma L 29,24$（de－ cree）；àv $\sigma \hat{\omega} a \hat{\eta} 30,20$（decree）
（4）with fut．ind．（after $\bar{\epsilon} \pi \iota \mu \in \lambda o \hat{\nu} \nu$－

 боутац（ $\chi \rho \hat{\eta} \sigma \omega \nu \tau a l \mathrm{MS}$ ）；（after $\sigma к о \pi о \hat{-}$－ $\sigma \omega \nu)$ ，öт $\pi \omega s \mu \eta े-\mu \omega \sigma \theta \omega \theta \eta \sigma \sigma \nu \tau \alpha \iota 50,7$
 $\tau \grave{\nu} \boldsymbol{\partial} \rho \gamma \gamma \dot{\eta} \nu 18,9$




＊8ркєа тосที́беเข（？） 3,12
 23 ；тоі́s ö $\rho к о \iota s$ द̇ $\mu \mu \hat{L} \nu \in \iota \nu 40$ ， 13

8 pos 12，23， 66 （Solon）



 до $\hat{\omega}$ passim．$\delta \rho \hat{\omega} \nu, 26$ ；$\delta \rho a ̂ \nu$ col．35， 33 ； $1 \delta \omega \nu 16,18$ ；lióvtes 18,16

 $\hat{\eta} \dot{\partial} \nu \dot{\eta} \gamma \hat{\omega} \nu \tau \alpha \iota \sigma \nu \mu \phi \in \rho \in \iota \nu 31,7$（decrees）
$\dot{\delta} \sigma \ell \omega \nu 43,30 ;+\chi \rho \eta \mu \alpha ́ \tau \omega \nu 30,9$（decree）




 38，11；ö $\pi \epsilon \rho$ каl $\sigma v \nu$ еौт $\pi \epsilon \sigma \epsilon \nu 40,15$ ；ö $\pi \epsilon \rho$


 $\sigma \iota \nu 48,27 ;$ бокй 48，22；63，15；є́ $\gamma \kappa а \lambda \hat{\eta}$ 48，21；т ообт $\mu \dot{\eta} \sigma \eta$ 63，7；хє८ротоขท⿱㇒冋刂 47，ІІ；$\psi \eta \phi l \sigma \omega \nu \tau a \iota ~ 45, ~ 10 ; ~ \mu \eta ̀ ~ \pi \rho о-~$

 55， 11
дбтракlऍш 22，15，24，25，27，38，40，41； 27， 20

ботракофоріа 43， 23
öтay passim．4，17 \＆c
öтє passim；c．opt．16，35；36， 14
öть passim；6， 18 \＆c
oú passim；方 oô 49，28，oűx 18， 32 （Poet．1448 b 18， 1459 a $218 c$ ）．oú


oúdè and oúdels passim；où $\delta^{\prime}$ al cis cluou 7， 30

оиккєть $\chi \rho \hat{\varphi p \tau a \iota ~ 8, ~} 16$ \＆c
оиขека 12，28， 53 （Solon）
ойт ${ }^{14}$ ， 17
oữla 4，8；5，12；27，13，19；49， 16.
Pl．35，23， 25 ；47， 13

оїтepot 12， 5 I（Solon）
 тодт $\omega \nu$ ס＇$\epsilon$ โעal 30,5 （decree）

${ }^{*}[0 \phi \epsilon \lambda \epsilon] \tau \omega \hat{\omega}($（ $) ~ 47, ~ I 4 ~$

 $\tau \hat{\psi} \delta \eta \mu=\sigma t \varphi 6_{3}, 12$
 $1165 a_{3}$ ）

$\dot{3} \psi \in \mathbf{2 6 , 6}$
חárरaıo 15,7

Пaıa⿱亠䒑ev＇s 14,$26 ; 38,22$
$\pi a \iota \delta \iota \omega \bar{\eta}{ }^{\text {I }}$ 18， 4
$\pi \alpha u \delta \pi \tau \rho\left(\beta \eta s\right.$ 42，$_{22}$
$\pi \alpha i{ }_{s} 16,19 ; \pi a i ̂ \delta \epsilon s ~ 2,8 ; 4,9 ; 19,35$.



＊тa入atóт ${ }^{2}$ оито 6,12
$\pi \AA \lambda \nu \nu 11,11 ; 12,55 ; 14,21 ; 15,9 ; 16$ ， 35；20，6．$\pi a ́ \lambda ı \nu ~ \epsilon \xi ~ \forall ̇ \pi a \rho \chi \hat{\eta} s ~ 4, ~ 16 . ~$ $\pi \dot{d} \lambda \iota \nu \delta \epsilon \epsilon_{12}, 10,15,26$
Пa $\lambda \lambda \alpha \delta i \varphi$, é $\pi l^{57}, 18$

 54，28，31；60，4，19；62， 13
$\Pi a \nu \delta t \omega \nu$ Heracl．epit．I． 3

 $\pi a \rho d \grave{c o i ̂ s ~ " ~}^{\mathrm{E}} \lambda \lambda \eta \sigma \iota \nu 23$ ，II



 4， 23
$\pi a \rho \dot{\alpha} \beta$ oגoy＇p． 253 frag．dubium 7 （not found elsewhere in this sense）

 49， 20.
 $\mu a \tau \epsilon i a) ~ \tau o i ̂ s ~ a ́ m o \delta \epsilon к т а ı s ~ 47, ~ 32 ; ~ \tau \grave{a ̀ ~} \mu \grave{y}$

 тара $\delta \iota \delta 6 a \sigma \iota(\tau \grave{\alpha} \tau \epsilon \lambda \eta) \tau \hat{\eta} \beta o v \lambda \hat{\eta} 47,17$ ；




 col．32，31．$\pi a \rho a \delta \dot{\sigma}$ боvтas тoîs $\pi \omega \lambda \eta$－ таîs 52，7．тарєठшкау ті̀े аккрठто入еу 19，36．$\pi a \rho a \delta \omega \sigma \iota \nu \epsilon \xi \in ь \rho \gamma a \sigma \mu \epsilon \nu a 46,5$ ；




 13；$\pi a \rho \epsilon i \lambda \epsilon \tau \circ 15,15 ; \pi a \rho \in \lambda \epsilon \sigma \theta a l$ 37，
 mas．
$\pi a \rho a \kappa d \theta \eta \tau a l ~ \tau \hat{g} \beta o v \lambda \hat{p}$ 54，15， 20 （only quoted from de Admir． 845 b 28 tyel－

$\pi а \rho а к а \lambda \omega \bar{\nu} a b s .14$, Іб










$\pi а \rho a \lambda(\alpha, \dot{\eta} 21,13 . \pi \alpha \rho a \lambda(\omega \nu(\sigma \tau \alpha \sigma \tau s) 13,17$
$\pi \alpha \rho a \lambda \lambda a \xi \xi \epsilon \nu 11,12$
Пápa入os 6r， 27
 $\pi a \rho \eta \mu \epsilon \lambda \eta \mu \epsilon \nu \eta$ Eth． 1175 a 10 ）
тapavolas，sikخ 56，35．Cf．de Part．An． $635{ }^{b} 5$
тарароноїє 28， 37 ；тарауонои́баия 28， 38 ； тара
тарау $6 \mu \omega \nu \quad$ үрафŋ 45,$24 ; 59,6 ; p l .29$,
 1255 a 9）
＊парауооиิขта 56， 35
$\pi a \rho a \pi \lambda \eta \sigma l a y$ c．dat．29，20．Adv．тара－ $\pi \lambda \eta \sigma_{10 \nu}$ 10， 5
$\pi \alpha \rho a \pi \lambda \eta \sigma t \omega s$ trol 63,21

 different senses）

таратпроїитеs 18 ， 14
 63， 7
＊таратрєфоиає кйрика каl aù入 $\lambda \tau \bar{\eta} \nu$（of the archons）62， 11

тарахр $\bar{\mu}{ }^{\text {a }}$ 18， 25


 IO
${ }^{*} \pi a \rho \epsilon \delta \rho \epsilon \cup \epsilon \epsilon \nu 56,3$
＊$\pi \dot{d} \rho \epsilon \delta \rho o c$（to the äp $\rho \omega \nu, \beta a \sigma i \lambda \epsilon u^{s}$ and $\pi 0 \lambda \epsilon \mu a \rho \chi o s) 56,1$ ；（to the $\epsilon \forall \theta v \nu o c$ ） 48 ， 15
$\pi \dot{\alpha} \rho \epsilon \iota \mu \iota(\epsilon l \mu i) \cdot \pi a \rho \omega ̀ \nu 1 \mathrm{I}, 4,6 ; \tau \hat{\eta} s \pi a \rho-$
 $2 ;+\kappa \alpha \iota \rho \hat{\varphi} 3 \mathrm{r}_{2} 2 ; \tau \hat{\omega} \nu \pi \alpha \rho \phi \nu \tau \omega \nu$（masc．）
 10
 19， 3 I
тарєрү $\omega$ s 28， 35
 7；т $\hat{\omega} \nu \pi а \rho є \lambda \eta \lambda \nu \theta \delta \sigma \tau \omega \nu$－$\mu \nu \eta \sigma \kappa к а к є \hat{\nu}$ 39， 20 （decree）
 тov 56，13．Mid．тоîs ठ̈т入a тарєхо－
 7．é è $\gamma \cup \eta r d s$ s $\pi a \rho a \sigma \chi o \mu e ́ v$ ous 4,$12 ; \pi a$－



Máp $1 \eta$ ：19， 12
$\pi a \rho о \xi v \nu \theta \epsilon \nu \tau a 18,13 ; \pi a \rho \omega \xi \cup \nu \epsilon 18,36$
тарор $\bar{l} \sigma \alpha \nu \tau \alpha \mathrm{~s}$, ठıà тous 34,7 （Act．hither－ to found in Gk．Test．alone）
тарор $\hat{\omega}^{+} \tau \dot{\alpha} \delta \delta \xi \alpha \nu \tau \alpha-\pi a \rho \epsilon \dot{\omega} \rho \omega \nu$ 35， 3 ；$\epsilon i$ $\mu \dot{\eta} \tau \iota$ тарєшра̃то 26， 18
$\pi \alpha \rho \sigma \chi \lambda \hat{\omega}^{\cdot} \pi \alpha \rho \dot{\omega} \chi \lambda \epsilon \epsilon$ 16， 25
таррךтia 16， 23

mâs，dٌras，passim．$\pi a ́ \nu \tau e s ~ 12,2 ; \pi a ́ \nu \tau^{\prime}$ $\dot{\alpha} \nu \alpha \dot{\delta} \alpha \sigma \tau \alpha \pi о \iota \eta \sigma \epsilon \iota \nu$ II，II；$\pi \alpha \dot{\alpha} \nu \tau \alpha \pi 0 \omega \hat{\omega} \nu$ 18， 33


 4
татท́р 19，39；55，13；татро̀s татท́ๆ 55，I4

 та́трьо今 та́трıор то入ıтєโà 34，18，22； $\tau \hat{\omega} \nu \pi \alpha \tau \rho l \omega \nu$ 3，16；$\pi \alpha \tau \rho l o u s ~ \nu o \mu o v s ~ 29, ~$ I7（decree）；татplous $\theta v \sigma$ las 57，8；
 31，3；39，6， 19
 $\pi a \tau \rho l \delta \iota 14,14$


 （only in Pol． $1 з \circ 3 \dot{b} 34 \dot{\eta} \tau \omega \nu \pi \alpha \tau \rho \dot{\varphi} \omega \nu$ ро $\mu \hat{\eta}$ ）
$\bar{\pi} а т \tau \dot{\alpha} \lambda \varphi(?) 16,18$
Mavaaplas，Spartan general in Persian war，23， 20
Пavoavias，$\Lambda a \kappa \epsilon \delta a \iota \mu о \nu t \omega \nu$ Faбl入eús 38， 23， 25


 29， 63 （Solon）
$\pi \epsilon \delta \iota a \kappa \hat{\omega} \nu(\sigma \tau a ́ \sigma \iota s) 13,19$
$\pi \epsilon \zeta$ às $\mu 6 \sigma \chi$ ous p． 255 frag．alienum 15
$\pi \epsilon l \theta \omega^{*}$ ои́к $\xi^{\prime} \pi \epsilon \iota \theta \in \nu$ 14，12．$\pi \epsilon l \sigma a s$ 18， 34 ；
 ขaıкі $\pi \iota \theta \delta \mu \epsilon \nu 0 s 35$ ，I6（law of Solon）． $\pi \epsilon \iota \sigma b \mu \theta^{9} 5,18$（Solon）
 35,5 ；$\tau \hat{\omega} \nu$ є́ $\kappa$ П．кат $\lambda \theta \delta \nu \tau \omega \nu 38$ ， 3 I； тovs тoû II．dígavtas 39，22；тoîs $\epsilon \kappa$

 рaceî．38， 23 ；39， 23 f ；50， 5 ；6r， 7 ． Пeıpaıéa．38，16；42， 21 ；5I， $1,6,8$ ， Io；ets II．$\delta \hat{\eta} \mu a \rho \chi o s 54,34 ;(\sigma \tau \rho a \tau \eta \gamma o l)$ ${ }^{\epsilon} \pi i t \tau \delta \nu$ П． $6 \mathrm{I}, 6$
$\pi \epsilon \iota \hat{\omega} \mu a \iota \cdot$ c．inf．6， $5 ; 20,10 ; 34,19$
Пeloavס 0 os 3I， 9
Пeıб८бтраті交ai 19， 24 f， 34
Meiviotpatos 13，20；I4 passim；I5，22； I6 and 17 passim；23， $14 ; 28,5 ; 4 \mathrm{I}$ ， 13
$\pi \in \lambda a \gamma o s 23,24$

＊$\pi \epsilon \lambda \alpha \tau \alpha<2,5$
 II． $3^{8,13}$
$\pi \epsilon \mu \pi \tau \psi\left(\epsilon_{\tau \epsilon \iota}\right) 13,3,5 ; 26,19$


$\pi \epsilon \nu \eta$ S 47，4；$\pi \epsilon \nu \eta \tau \epsilon \mathrm{S} 2,3$ ；$\pi \epsilon \nu \eta \sigma \iota \nu$ 13， 14
${ }^{*} \pi \epsilon \nu \theta \eta \mu \mu \epsilon \rho \nu, \kappa a \tau \dot{d} 30,24$（decree）
${ }^{*} \pi \in \nu \tau a \kappa \iota \sigma \chi{ }^{\lambda \lambda \iota o \iota}$ ，ol 29，35， 39 （decree）； 30，2；31，10（decree）；32，1，12；33， 8， 12
$\pi \epsilon \nu \tau a \kappa b \sigma \iota \circ \iota$ ，oi 21,$7 ; 22,7 ; 25$ ，10．$\pi$ ． 22,$22 ; 24,14$ f， 18 ；55，6．$\quad$ т．$\beta o v-$入єvtás 35，3；43，6．тєขтакбб८a 7，17
$\pi є \nu т а к о \sigma \iota о \mu$ е́ $\delta \iota \mu \nu 0$ ， 4,$18 ; 7$ ，Іо $\mathrm{f}, 27 ; 8$ ， 7；26，17；47，3．－ov тe入єî̀ 7， 16
тєєрте 13，8；19，36．тєртекаl $\delta$ бка 51，9
$\pi \in \nu \tau \in \tau \eta \rho i \delta \epsilon s 54,28-32$（ $\delta i \dot{\alpha} \pi \epsilon \nu \tau \alpha \epsilon \tau \eta \rho i \delta o s$ Pol． 1308 b 1 ）
$\pi \in \nu \tau \eta{ }_{\eta}<\nu \tau \alpha 19,39 ; 21,8 ; 24,15$
＊$\pi \in ́ \pi$ лios（of Athena） 49,$20 ; 60,6$
$\pi \epsilon \rho a s$, é $\pi l 38,24$





 $\sigma \alpha \sigma \theta a \iota 6, ~ 16 ; ~ \tau 00 ̂ \pi \lambda \eta ̂ \theta o u s ~ 12, ~ 10 ~$
c．acc．（local）тoे ä $\sigma \tau \cup 2 \mathrm{I}, \mathrm{I} 3$ ；$\Sigma \Sigma \lambda \alpha-$ $\mu i ̂ \nu a 23,4$ ；Пá $\gamma \gamma a<o \nu 15,7$ ；тд̀ $\nu$ Өep－
 $\dot{\delta} \tau \rho а к \iota \sigma \mu \delta \nu 22,13 ; \tau \delta \nu \chi \rho \delta \nu о \nu$ таขิтоע 23，1о．—oi $\pi \epsilon \rho i{ }^{\prime} А \nu а к р є о \nu \tau \alpha ~ к а і ~ \Sigma \iota-~$

 ${ }^{2}$ Piv $\omega \nu$ 人 38,28


 Cf．$\pi а \rho a \iota \rho \hat{\omega}$

＊$\pi \epsilon \rho \iota \in \lambda a u \nu \delta \mu \in \nu 0 s \tau \hat{\eta} \sigma \tau \alpha \sigma \epsilon \iota$ 14， 2 I


〔 $\hat{\omega} \sigma \theta a \iota ~ \tau \dot{\eta} \nu$ фор阝eià Pol．1324 b 16）

IIepıк入ifs＇（law concerning citizenship） 26 ，

 12；$\pi \rho \grave{o s} \tau \pi u ́ \tau \eta \nu \quad \tau \grave{\nu} \nu \quad \chi 0 \rho \eta \gamma i a \nu \quad \epsilon \pi i \lambda \epsilon l-$

 12

$\pi \epsilon \rho l \pi j \lambda o \hat{\sigma} \iota \iota \tau \grave{\eta} \nu \chi \dot{\omega} \rho a \nu 42,32$（not found in technical sense；occurs only in frag． $\left.12^{2}, 147^{6} a 6, \ddot{\eta} \lambda \iota o y \pi \epsilon \rho \iota \pi 0 \lambda о \hat{\nu} \tau a\right)$
$\pi \epsilon \tau \rho a s$ бкdптоута 16， 19
$\pi \dot{\eta} \gamma \nu \nu \mu \cdot{ }^{\circ}$ ö $\rho o u s-\pi \epsilon \pi \eta \gamma \delta \tau a s$ 12， 33 （Solon）

тiap 12， 64 （Solon）
$\pi$ uelpas $\chi^{\theta 0 \nu 6 s} 12,24$（Solon）

$\pi \iota \kappa \rho$＇s 19，3．$\pi \iota \kappa \rho$ бтатоу 2, 10．$\pi \iota \kappa \rho \omega \hat{s}$ 18， 10
 $\pi$ ．$\pi \cup \xi \iota \nu 0 \nu 63,18 ; \pi \iota \nu a ́ k \iota \nu \nu$ col．31，7， 10，30；pl．63，6；col．31，5，11；col． 32，19；col．33，9．Èv тoîs סiкaбт
 damus）Pol． $1268 a_{2}$
$\pi i \nu a \xi 49,12(\pi i \nu \alpha \xi \delta \nu \bar{\alpha} \downarrow \nu \epsilon \theta \eta \kappa \epsilon-\chi \rho \rho \eta \gamma \eta \sigma a s$ Pol． 1341 a 36）
${ }^{*} \pi เ \pi \rho \alpha \dot{\sigma} \sigma \omega^{*} \tau \grave{\alpha} \quad \pi \rho \alpha \theta \epsilon \ell \tau \alpha \mu \epsilon \tau \alpha \lambda \lambda \alpha 47,11$ ； $\mu . \pi \epsilon \pi \rho a \mu \hat{\nu} \nu \alpha 47,12 \mathrm{f} ; \tau \epsilon \lambda \eta \pi \epsilon \pi \rho a-$ $\mu t \nu a, 47,16\left(\pi \rho a \theta \in \nu \tau \omega \nu \geqslant{ }^{n} \mu \tau \sigma \theta \omega \theta \in \nu \tau \omega \nu\right.$ Rhet．ad Alex． $1 \mathbf{1 4 2 5}_{2} b_{23}$ ）

$\pi$ motews $\chi$ di $\rho \iota 1$ 18， 34
тьбтбтатоs 54， 17
$\pi \lambda \alpha \nu \omega \mu \dot{\nu}$ ous 12,39 （Solon）
$\pi \lambda a \tau \tau \delta \mu \in \nu 0$ с 18,32
$\pi \lambda є о \nu \alpha ̆ \kappa ı s$ 62， 18


$\pi \lambda \hat{\eta} \theta 0 \varsigma, \tau \dot{2} 2,2 ; 9,5 ; 12,10 ; 16,24 ;$ 20， 5,$12 ; 21,2,12 ; 22,4 ; 25,4 ; 28$ ， $24 ; 34,9 ; 36,4 ; 41,24,32$ ．т̀े $\pi \lambda$ ． $\tau \omega \nu$ ，$\pi$ о $\iota \tau \omega \bar{\nu} 26,2 \mathrm{I} . \quad \pi \lambda \hat{\eta} \theta 0 \mathrm{o}$, ＇num－ ber＇，36，10；40， 4
$\pi \lambda \grave{\eta} \nu$ c．gen． 7,$2 ; 24,7 ; 29,31 . \pi \lambda \eta \eta \nu$
 62，19．$\quad \pi \lambda \grave{\eta} \nu \mu \nu \sigma \tau \eta \rho l o t s ~ 39,7$（decree）
 33
$\pi \lambda \eta \rho \omega \theta \neq \sigma \epsilon \sigma \theta a \iota$ ，$\delta \iota \kappa a \sigma \tau \nmid p \iota a$ 63，11；col． 31， 37 （not found in Ar．in this tech－ nical sense）
$\pi \lambda \eta \sigma$ lov c．gen．3，25．$\tau$ à $\pi \lambda$ ．otк $\eta \mu a \tau a$ 15， 21
$\pi \lambda o l=t, \epsilon \nu 57,23$
$\pi \lambda o u \sigma_{0}{ }^{-1} 2,4,6 ; 4,14,19 ; 22,33$.

$\pi \lambda o v \tau i \nu \delta \eta \nu 3,2,37$
$\pi \lambda o v \tau \hat{\omega}^{\cdot}$ impf．6， 11
$\pi \delta \theta \epsilon \nu \tau \omega \hat{\nu}$
тоє $\eta \mu a \tau а ~ 5, ~ 13 ; ~ 6, ~ 20 ~$
 12， 2

тoíon $\tau \in \operatorname{los} \tau \in \lambda \in \hat{i} 7,20$
 $\theta \epsilon \operatorname{la\nu } 6,6 ; \pi 0<\epsilon \hat{\nu}-\mu \epsilon \tau \rho a \quad 7,17 \mathrm{f}, 28$.


 －$\sigma \tau \alpha \theta \mu \dot{\alpha}$ 10， 7 ；$\alpha \tau \epsilon \lambda \hat{\eta}-\epsilon \in \pi o i \eta \sigma \epsilon \nu$ 16，





 бал $\theta a \iota$ 6， 16 （cf．Eth． $1160 \quad b \quad 15$ ）．
 خià $\pi о \iota \eta \sigma a ́ \mu \varepsilon \nu o l$ 19，35．à $\lambda \kappa \grave{\eta} \nu — \pi o t-$ є́́pevos 12， 53 （Solon）；тоolato 12， 6 1 （Solon）

${ }^{*} \pi \rho \lambda \epsilon \mu \alpha \rho \chi$ ia 3， 6
то入є́ $\mu a \rho \chi$ оs $3,5,17,27 ; 22,9 ; 55,5 ;$ esp． 58
толє $\mu a \rho \chi \hat{\omega} \cdot-\chi \eta \dot{\eta} \sigma a s 3,29$
$\pi о \lambda \epsilon \mu \kappa \dot{\alpha}, \tau \grave{\alpha} 3,7 ; 23,14$


 24,$17 ; \tau \dot{\alpha} \in l_{s} \tau \dot{\partial} \nu \pi \lambda_{\epsilon} \mu_{0 \nu} 23,10 ; \tau \dot{\alpha}$ кaтà $\tau \grave{\partial} \nu \pi b \lambda \epsilon \mu 0 \nu 29$, 1．al кaтà $\pi$ ．
 $5 ; 44,7$ ；61，1．$\epsilon \nu \pi 0 \lambda \epsilon \mu \varphi, 57,20$ ；
 $\dot{\epsilon} \nu \tau \hat{\eta} \chi \dot{\omega} p \underset{\square}{61}, 5$
 $\lambda \in \mu \in \hat{i}$ oítos 61， 5





 $\tau \hat{\nu} \nu \epsilon \nu \tau \hat{\eta} \pi b \lambda \epsilon \iota$ 3， $35 ; \tau \hat{\eta} \pi 6 \lambda \epsilon l, \pi \epsilon \rho \iota$
 $\mu \ell \nu$ ous 28，32．$\pi \delta \lambda \iota \nu$－$\sigma \tau a \sigma \iota a ́ \zeta o v \sigma a \nu ~ 8$,



$=\alpha \kappa \rho \sigma \pi 0 \lambda \iota s^{*} \epsilon l s^{\pi} \pi \lambda \iota \nu 8,24 ; \epsilon \nu \tau \hat{\eta}$ $\pi \dot{\pi} \lambda_{\epsilon l} 24,15$
то入ıтеla 2，2，11；3，1；4，15；5，1，5； $7,1,7 ; 8,21 ; 9,2,14 ; 11,1 ; 13,14$ ， 18，25；15，12；20，5；21，5；22，2； 25，2，9，15；27，6，11；29，28，33． Pl，24，8；28， 34,36 ；（＇grants of citi－ zenship＇）54， $18 .{ }^{\text {rà }}$ кãd̀ $\tau \grave{\eta} \nu \quad \pi 0-$










 $\kappa a \lambda \omega \hat{s} \pi о \lambda \iota \tau \epsilon \nu \theta \hat{\eta} \nu a l 33,13$
 28，38；$\tau \hat{\omega} \nu \pi 0 \lambda \iota \tau \hat{\omega} \nu$ दो $\nu$ ious 8,27
то入ıтько́s，$\tau \hat{\eta}$ фи́беє 18 ， 3 ；ă $\nu \delta \rho a s-\pi о \lambda \iota-$ тוкои́s 28,32 ；тd̀ $\mu$ é $\gamma \iota \sigma \tau a \operatorname{\tau \omega ̈\nu } \pi о \lambda \iota \tau \iota-$ $\kappa \hat{\omega} \nu 8,22 ;{ }^{\circ} \tau$ d̀ то入ıtıкd $\delta$ ecvós 23， 14 ； $\pi \epsilon \rho \ell \tau \hat{\omega} \nu \pi 0 \lambda \iota \tau \iota \kappa \hat{\omega} \nu$ з1，8；$\tau \hat{\omega} \nu \pi о \lambda \iota \tau \iota \kappa \hat{\omega} \nu$
 17；16，14；то入ıтьки́тата 40， 17
тод入áкıs 8,$27 ; 16,14,26$
$\pi 0 \lambda \lambda a \chi \hat{\eta}$ 12，33， 39 （Solon）
 8， 17
$\pi 0 \lambda$ ús＇$^{\pi} \pi \lambda \dot{\nu} \nu \quad \chi \rho \delta \nu 0 \nu 2,2 ; 5,3 ; 16$ ， 34 ；


 6 ；$\delta \eta \mu о \tau \iota \kappa \omega \tau \in ́ \rho a ~ \pi o \lambda u ́ ~ 22, ~ r . ~ \pi o \lambda \lambda \hat{\varphi} c$. compar．16，28；19，1．of $\pi 0 \lambda \lambda$ ot 2 ， 10；4，2；27，2I；28，27；29，8；36， 5．$\tau \hat{\omega} \nu \quad \gamma \nu \omega \rho i \alpha \omega \nu-$ ol $\pi 0 \lambda \lambda o l$ 16， 37. $\pi о \lambda \lambda \omega \hat{\nu}-\alpha{ }^{2} \lambda \lambda \omega \nu$ 15，10；$\mu \epsilon \tau \epsilon \chi \delta \nu \tau \omega \nu$


 ä $\pi a \xi 31,17$ ；44，14．$\pi \lambda e i o \nu 0 s 50,7$ ；
 $\pi \lambda$ eíous $2 \mathrm{I}, 5 ; 24,12 ; 50,8$.

тà $\pi \lambda \in \hat{L} \sigma \tau a 3,35 ; 8,21 ; 49,3 \mathrm{r}$
$\pi о \mu \pi \epsilon \cup ์ \omega$ 18， 27
${ }^{*} \pi \tau \mu \pi \dot{\eta} 57,5$ ．$\tau \dot{\eta} \nu \pi о \mu \pi \eta \nu, \dot{\alpha} \pi \sigma \sigma \tau \epsilon \lambda \lambda \omega \nu$ 18，16；ঠıакоб $\mu о \hat{\nu \tau а ~} 18,20$ ；àa入ы́－ цата єis 56， 24 ；коьข $\hat{\eta} \pi \epsilon \mu \pi о \nu \sigma \iota \nu$ 57， 6；$\delta \iota \iota \kappa 0 \hat{v} \sigma \iota 60,4$ ，$\pi о \mu \pi \hat{\omega} \nu 56,21$
тovचpós 35，20；55， 26
торךpia 37， 15
тореи́oита८，єls Пеєраєе́a 42， 2 I
 23，6；$\delta \beta$ ò̀̀ $\nu$ ย́ $\pi$ б́ $\rho \iota \sigma \epsilon \nu 4 \mathrm{I}, 33$ ；тウ̀ $\nu$ $\delta \iota \omega \beta \epsilon \lambda i ́ a \nu 28,20$
Побьঠєथิ้ขos col．35， 7


$\pi$ тотєроу－${ }^{\prime \prime}$ ơ 49， 17

$\pi 0 \hat{~ \tau a ̂ ̂ ̃ a ~ \tau \alpha ̀ ~ i ̀ ~} ฺ \rho \dot{\text { é }} \sigma \tau \iota 55$ ， 16 f
$\pi р a ́ \gamma \mu а т а$ ．＇government＇，троабортєs тà $\pi \rho \alpha ́ \gamma \mu a \tau a ~ І 7, ~ 10 ; ~ к а т а \sigma \chi o ́ \nu \tau о s ~ т o v ̂ ~ \delta \eta \dot{\eta}$－ $\mu 0 \nu$ т̀̀ $\pi \rho \dot{\alpha} \gamma \mu a \tau a$ 20， 17 ；тà $\pi \rho$ ．тарé－



 траүда́тти 4 I, ч．＇Public affairs＇，тá тє тра́үиата עобои̂ขта цартvрєí 6， 19 ； є́ $\xi a \pi о \rho \eta \sigma \alpha \nu \tau \omega \nu$ тоís трá $\gamma \mu a \sigma \iota 23,6$. ＇Occupation＇，vitae studia ac negotia （Herwerden），$\tau \hat{\eta}$ ov́бị кal тоîs $\pi \rho a ́ \gamma-$ $\mu a \sigma \iota \tau \hat{\omega} \nu \mu \varepsilon \sigma \sigma \omega \nu 5,12$
 є $\lambda \nu \mu \nsim \nu a \nu \tau о$ ті̀ $\nu \pi \rho$ ． $18,2 \mathrm{I}$ ；кон $\omega \nu$ ой $\nu$ ．
 18， 26







Mid．є́тра́ттєто а́тд $\tau \hat{\omega \nu} \gamma \iota \gamma \nu о \mu \in ́ \nu \omega \nu$ $\delta є \kappa \alpha ́ \tau \eta \nu$ 16， 12 ；［ $\tau 001$ т $\rho a ́ \tau \tau] \in \sigma \theta a \iota$（ $\tau$ d̀s ékтiбels，or $\tau \grave{\eta} \nu$ 乡 $\eta \mu l a \nu) 8,24$
$\pi \rho \in \sigma \beta$ íals 30,29 （decree）；43， 30 （in an－ other sense，kard $\pi \rho \in \sigma \beta$ eial Pol． 1259 b r 3 ）
$\pi \rho \in ́ \sigma \beta$ ecs 37，16；43， 32 （not in this sense in Index Ar．；т $\rho \in \sigma \beta \in v \tau a l$ aipov̂̀тaı Pol． 1299 a 19）
 14
$\pi \rho \in \sigma \beta u ̛ t \epsilon \rho o s ~ 18,2 . \quad \pi \rho \in \sigma \beta v \tau \alpha ́ \tau \eta \nu \quad 5,8$ （Solon）
$\pi \rho \in \sigma \beta \dot{\prime})^{\prime} \mathrm{r}_{4}, \mathrm{I}_{4}$
 $\pi \rho \ell \nu$ à $\nu \dot{a} \pi о \gamma \rho a ́ \psi \eta \tau a \iota 39$, 18（decree）；
 38， 22 （de Part．Anim． 668 a 35）．
 64 （Solon）
 $\tau \hat{\omega} \nu \quad \theta u p \hat{\omega} \nu$ I4，I3．（2）of time，тоט́

 $\lambda \eta$ भ́ $\psi \in \omega \mathrm{s}$ I8， 18 ；тои́тоv 26，17．тд $\nu$



 $\lambda \iota \tau \epsilon i a s) \pi \rho o d \alpha^{\prime} \epsilon \nu 28,37$
троа үореט゙ $\omega \nu$ ，（ 1 ）＇proclaim＇，57，13；（2）
凶゙ $\rho \alpha \nu \tau \eta \nu \pi \rho о р \rho \eta \theta \epsilon \hat{L} \sigma a \nu 30,32$（decree）
 тò̀s pbuovs 16,30 ；тродреíro ті̀ $\boldsymbol{\pi}$ о－

$\pi \rho о а \nu а к р і \nu \in \iota \nu$ 3， 32
$\pi \rho \circ \beta o \lambda \dot{\eta} 43,24 ; 59,5$（not in Ar．in tech－ nical sense）
＊$\pi \rho \circ \beta$ oú $\bar{\epsilon} \mu \mu$ 44， 19
 $1298 b 30$ ， $1299 b 33,1322 b 16)$
т $\boldsymbol{\rho}$ о́ $\beta$ oviou 29， 1 I
 －acs $\sigma \nu \mu \phi \quad \rho a i ̂ s ~ 40,18$
＊трбура $\mu \mu$ 44， 10
$\pi \rho o \gamma \rho a ́ \phi o v \sigma \iota$（oi $\pi \rho \cup \tau \alpha ́ \nu \epsilon \iota s$ ），$\delta \sigma a \quad \delta \in i ̂ \chi \rho \eta$－ $\mu a \tau l \zeta \in \iota \nu$ т $\grave{\nu} \nu$ ßоu入ウ̀ $\nu$ кт入 43， 16 ；тàs е́ккл $\eta$ бias ib．cf．45，23．（ol $\theta \in \sigma \mu 0-$
 poo 59，I．（Of the people）т $\rho 0 \gamma \rho a$－ фovour 53，36．（Found only in the fragments，and in Oec．ii $1352 a$ I）
 $\mu a \pi a$ 16， 6

＊＊тродроиєи́є́v 49， 6
$\pi \rho 6 \delta \rho \rho \mu \mathrm{~L} 49,5$（not in Index in this sense）
${ }_{\pi}^{\pi \rho o \delta \omega \sigma e ́ t a l p o v, ~ \Lambda e ч \psi u ́ d p t o v ~ 19, ~} 15$（scol．）
＊$\pi \rho 0 \varepsilon \delta \rho \in \dot{\prime} \epsilon \iota y$ 44， $\mathrm{I}_{4}$

$\pi \rho \delta \in \delta \rho o \iota 44,8$（found in technical sense in the fragments only）

${ }^{* *} \pi \rho \sigma \in \xi a \lambda \epsilon \iota \phi \theta \hat{\eta} 47,35$
＊$\pi \rho о є \xi a \nu a \sigma \tau a \dot{\nu} \tau \epsilon s \tau \hat{\omega} \nu[\lambda о \kappa \pi \omega \nu]$ 18， 19
 $\kappa \tau \lambda \pi \rho o \notin \chi$ оутas 35， 24
 тıyds $\pi \rho \circ \underline{f} \rho \chi$ оутau Pol． $1280 a$ Io）
$\pi \rho о \theta \nu \mu о \nu \mu е \nu \omega \nu 3^{8,} 21$
$\pi \rho о \theta \dot{\jmath \mu \omega s} 26,3$
троккдs（ $\delta$ Lк $\eta$ ）52， 12

 21．$\pi \rho 0 \in \sigma \tau \eta \kappa \dot{\omega}$ 2 21,$2 ; \pi \rho 0 \in \sigma \tau \dot{\prime} \tau \omega \nu 25$ ； 2；троєотd́val 26， 5 （Pol． 1285 a $3^{6}$ ， 1319 67 ）
 29， 25 （decree）
$\pi \rho \delta \kappa \lambda \eta \sigma \iota \varsigma 53$, го， 17
 $\pi \rho о к \rho l y o v \tau а я ~ 30, ~ 12 ~(d e c r e e) . ~ \pi \rho о к р t-~$ $\nu \epsilon \sigma \theta a \iota 26,15$ ．$\dot{\epsilon} \kappa \tau \hat{\omega} \nu \pi \rho о к \rho \iota \theta \dot{\epsilon} \tau \omega \nu 21$ ， 25；22，22
 （decree）；35，4
 15 （Pol． 1300 b 26）．
＊$\pi \rho 0 \xi \in \varphi$ lau 54,18


$\pi \tilde{\rho} \rho \rho \rho \eta \theta \varepsilon \hat{\sigma} \sigma a \nu, \tau \grave{\eta} \nu \stackrel{\mu}{\mu} \rho a \nu$ тضे 30,32 （de－


 $\tau \hat{\psi} \lambda i \theta \varphi 7,5$ ．тoîs lílots ỏvтes 16,9
 фотtpous $11,1_{4} ; 16,38$ ；тovs＇Apyelous 17，15；тov̀s＇Apeotayitas 15， 14 ；Tîs






 28；т̀̀ тардута трфуиата 61，1о；тд̀







 $\eta \gamma \delta \rho \in u \sigma \in 21,21$
тробаүаүбутas roùs $\sigma \tau \rho a \tau \eta \gamma o u ́ s, ~ \tau \grave{\mathrm{a}}$ тô̂ то入є $\mu о v-$ фкк $\lambda \eta \rho \omega \tau i$（decree）．Mid．тaîs д $\mu \lambda \lambda$ laus $\pi \rho о \sigma \dot{\eta} \gamma \epsilon \tau о 16,38 ; \pi \rho о \sigma \eta \gamma$ а́уєто
 b 36 ）
＊$\pi \rho \rho \sigma \alpha \iota \rho o \hat{\mu} \mu a \iota \cdot \pi \rho \rho \sigma \epsilon \lambda \delta \mu \varepsilon \nu 0 \iota \sigma \phi l \sigma \iota \nu$ aüтoîs ap oporas 35， 53 （only quoted in Index from Pollux viii ${ }^{2}$ ）
$\pi \rho о \sigma а \nu а \beta$ ク̆vaı 15,18
${ }^{*}{ }^{*} \pi \rho \rho \sigma a \nu a \ \eta r \hat{\eta} \sigma \sigma u$ 29， 16 （decree）
$\pi \rho о \sigma a \rho \tau \eta \sigma a \nu \tau \epsilon \varsigma, \tau \grave{\eta} \nu \quad \gamma \nu \hat{\omega} \sigma \iota \nu \tau 0 \hat{v} \dot{\partial} \delta a \iota \tau \eta \tau 0 \hat{v}$ 53， 13
 35， 15

 $\dot{\alpha} \pi \dot{\partial} \tau \omega \hat{\nu} \eta \pi \rho \circ \sigma t \delta \nu \tau \omega \nu$ 39， 8 （decree）
 olav 4I， 24
 t̀vaytion $\tau \hat{\eta} \mathrm{s}$ ßou入ग̂s 30， 28 （decree）．
 Cf．$\pi \rho \delta \sigma \epsilon \iota \mu \mu(\epsilon \tau \mu)$
$\pi \rho о \sigma \epsilon \chi$ оутєs，тoîs ybuots 26， 13 （frag． $496^{2}$ ）
$\pi \rho о \sigma \hat{k} к о \nu$, ỏ 13,25
$\pi \rho \delta \sigma \theta \epsilon \nu$（？）col．31， 2


тробка $\theta \eta \mu$ е́vov đ́＇aưrồ 19， 33
 32 ；d $\pi \rho о \sigma к а \lambda \in \sigma a ́ \mu \in \nu$ оs 16， 34 ；éà $\nu$－ тробкалйтає 29， 25 （decree）

${ }^{*} \pi \rho о \sigma к о \sigma \mu \hat{\omega} \cdot \pi \rho о \sigma \in к є к о ́ \sigma \mu \eta \nu \tau о$ 13， 21 （not found elsewhere in this sense）
трогкиขоиิ้тєs 14,30
т $\rho 0 \sigma$ óóous，$\tau$ às 16 ， 11


＊тробтаратlөєбөal c．dat．63， 22


$\pi \rho o \sigma \tau \dot{d} \tau \eta s, \dot{\eta} \gamma \epsilon \mu \dot{\omega} \nu$ kal（of Hipparchus）
 $18 ; 23,12 ; 25,4 ; 28,6 ; 36,6 . \pi \rho о-$

$\pi \rho о \sigma \tau \dot{d} \tau \boldsymbol{\omega} \boldsymbol{\pi} \boldsymbol{\pi \rho о \sigma \tau \epsilon т а к т а є ~ 5 1 , ~} 2,15 ; 54,2$




 16 in Testimoniis，c． 57 § 2）
＊$\pi \rho \circ \tau \in \rho a l \underline{q}, \tau \hat{n} 48,8$
тро́тєроу 3，28；7，10；8，20；10，5；12， 27 ； 17,$14 ; 20,20 ; 62,1 ; 63,16$ ．







 pol 22， 23
тротєөєабเข 44，11；48， 10
$\pi \rho о \tau \rho \in \pi \omega^{*} \pi \rho о т \rho \dot{\epsilon} \psi \epsilon \iota \nu 40,14 ; \pi \rho 0 \forall \tau \rho \epsilon \psi \epsilon$ （ $\epsilon l_{s}$ ）19，22；（ $\epsilon \pi l$ c．acc．）27， 5 ；д̀ $\pi \rho 0-$ $\tau \rho \in \mathcal{\psi a s}(\epsilon \pi \pi i c . a c c$ ．）23， 19



 фабь $\tau 000$［ $\pi \rho a \tau \tau] \epsilon \sigma \theta a \iota ~ 8, ~ 24 ; ~ a \rho \chi \eta \grave{\eta} \nu$ каl $\pi$ ро́qабг 1 13， 13
$\left.\pi \rho о \phi \epsilon \rho \omega^{*} \pi \rho \circ 0\right\rangle \phi \epsilon \rho \epsilon \nu, \dot{\eta}$ Пuөla 19， 21 （not in Index in this sense）
$\pi \rho \circ \chi$ elpotovias，ävev 43， 3 I（only in frag． $39^{6}$ ）

 $\tau \grave{\eta} \nu \pi \rho .48, \mathrm{I}_{4} ;+\dot{\epsilon} \kappa \alpha \dot{\alpha} \sigma \tau \eta \nu 6 \mathrm{I}, \mathrm{II} ; \epsilon \epsilon \pi i \tau \hat{\eta} \mathrm{~s}$
 $\pi \rho$ ． 54 ， 1 I
тритауєіои $3,25,27 ; 24,20 ; 62$ ， 12 （only in de Mundo $400 b$ 19）
тритávets 4，11；29，21， 32 ；4I，3I；43， 32；44，I；45， 23


 （The Index refers to the fragments only） $\pi \rho \hat{\omega} \tau o s ~ 22, ~ 27$ ；ol $\pi \rho \hat{\rho} \tau о \iota ~ 5, ~ 12 ; ~ \pi \rho \hat{\tau} \tau a \iota$
 （never द̂̃elta $\delta \epsilon$ ） 9,3 ；21，3；24，8； 25，6；27，13；29，21；34，4；36，8； 43，ІІ；51，1о； 56,7 ；57，2；59，1．－

 $55, ~ \mathrm{I} 3 \mathrm{f} ; \tau \dot{\partial} \pi \rho \hat{\omega} \tau о \nu-\mu \epsilon \tau \grave{\alpha} \tau \pi \hat{\imath} \tau a 3$ ， 3. $\pi \rho \hat{\omega} \tau о \nu-\tau \dot{\tau} \epsilon 28$ ， 3 ；тбтє $\pi \rho \hat{\tau} \tau о \nu 15$ ， 9；22，12，23；41， 7
Пubia，$\dot{\eta}$ 19，21；21， 26
Пиө6ס $\omega \rho$ os ${ }^{2} \rho \chi \omega \nu(432 / \mathrm{I}) 27,8$
 కグगov 29，7，10， 16

Múnos 27， 25

$\pi v \rho к а і ̈ a ̆ s ~(\gamma \rho a \phi \dot{\eta}) 57,16$
тupot 51， 13
$\pi \dot{\omega} \cdot 00 \ddot{\pi} \omega$ 14，17；$\pi \dot{\epsilon} \pi о \tau \varepsilon$ apparently does not occur
 refers to frag． $4 \mathrm{or}^{2}$ only）
$\pi \omega \lambda \epsilon \hat{\imath}$ то̂̂тov $\dot{\eta} \pi 6 \lambda \iota s$ 42，IO；$\tau \dot{\alpha} \mu \hat{\alpha} \tau \alpha \lambda \lambda \alpha$ $\pi \omega \lambda$ ốन 47,9 ；tàs oúrlas 47 ，15；тà


 $\lambda_{\text {ovy ol }}^{\delta \eta} \mu o c$（ $\tau \dot{d} s \dot{d} \rho \chi d \hat{s}$ ）62，3．Pass． ö $\pi \omega \mathrm{s}-\pi \omega \lambda \hat{\eta} \tau a \ell$ 51，3．$\tau \grave{\alpha} \quad \pi \rho \alpha \theta \in \nu \tau \alpha$ 47，і1，22．$\tau \dot{d} \pi \epsilon \pi \rho a \mu \epsilon \nu \alpha 4$ 4，I2 1 ．
jqסtws 16， 36
рq日upia 8， 28
Paikn入os 15， 6
$\dot{\rho} \in\{\in L D$ 12，24， 44 （Solon）

${ }^{\prime} \mathrm{P}$ L $\nu \omega \nu$ 38，21，28， $3{ }^{2}$
．$\sigma$ ákos 12， 8 （Solon）

áp $\alpha \omega \nu$ єls $\Sigma a \lambda a \mu \hat{\nu}{ }^{2}$ 54，34；62， 11
इaduol 24， 7

oavis 48， 9 （only in de Admir． 832 a 9）
$\sigma \alpha \phi \hat{\omega} \mathrm{s}, \gamma \in \gamma \rho a ́ \phi \theta \theta a \mathrm{~g} 9,8$
＊$\sigma \epsilon \sigma \sigma$ áx $\theta \epsilon \epsilon a, 4,7 ; 12,27$





 $\sigma . \delta \dot{\text { E．}}$ dap 3,25
 $\epsilon \nu \Sigma$ ．$\gamma \in \nu о \mu \epsilon \nu \eta \nu \quad \sigma \nu \mu \phi о \rho \alpha \nu 29,2$
$\Sigma \iota \mu \omega \nu \ell \delta \eta s$ 18，5
＊＊it $\eta \sigma c \nu$, els 62， 9 f， 17

oîtos áp ós 51,$11 ; \pi \in \rho$－$\sigma$ litou 43,18 ；

 46
бוтофи́入aкes 51， 8 （Index quotes corre－ sponding frag．only）

$\sigma \kappa \epsilon \dot{\prime} \eta$ ，＇tackling＇\＆c．40， 23

 $\sigma к \eta ิ \psi \iota \nu T o p .13$ I $b$ 1г）

бкб́入ıoу 19， $14 ; 20,21$

इкu入入aîo 22， 42

$\sigma[\mu к р \phi \nu]$ 12， 12 （ $p a p . ?$ ）；$v . \mu к к \rho \sigma$ s
$\Sigma 6 \lambda \omega v 5,5,11 ; 6,1,6 ; 8,7,16,25 ; 9$, 2；13， 2 f ； $14,8,15$ ；17，6；22，If； 29，20；4I，12，15；（appointment of
 28，6．$\Sigma$ бb入 $\omega \nu$ os $\theta \epsilon \sigma \mu \omega ิ \nu$ 35，II


бофúrepos I4，io，II
इォapтıâтat 19， 23



 $\sigma \pi$ ovóņs，$\mu \in \tau \dot{\alpha}$ 25， 17
$\sigma \pi \hat{\omega} \cdot \sigma \pi a \sigma \dot{\alpha} \mu \in \nu$ оs $\tau \grave{\eta} \nu \mu^{\alpha} \chi \alpha \iota \rho a \nu 18,38$

 10，3；$\sigma \tau a \theta \mu$ î́s 10,9

aтa⿱亠á̧ovaay 8，27；$\sigma \tau a \sigma \iota a \S o u ́ \eta \eta s ~ \tau \hat{\eta} S$

 2， 1
 $\tau \grave{\eta} \nu$ aitlav $\tau \hat{\eta} \mathrm{s} \sigma \tau \alpha \dot{\sigma} \sigma \omega \mathrm{s}$ 5，19．$\pi \in \rho \iota \epsilon-$


 $\sigma \tau \hat{a ́ \sigma \epsilon t s ~} \tau \rho \in \hat{i s} 13,16$
$\sigma \tau \alpha \pi \eta^{\prime} \rho$ 10， 9 （Oec．ii I 349 a 28，and frag－ ments）
${ }_{\sigma} \tau \epsilon \lambda \epsilon \cos 60,9,15$
${ }^{*} \sigma \tau \epsilon \phi \alpha \nu 0 \pi \omega \lambda_{l s} 14,27$
oтєфavos 57,27
$\sigma \tau \hat{\eta} \lambda \eta$ $\chi a \lambda \kappa \hat{\eta} 53,25$ ；द̀v $\tau a i ̂ s ~ \sigma \tau \eta \dot{\eta} \lambda a \iota s ~ 54$, 17
 fragm．only）
$\sigma \tau 0 \iota \chi \epsilon \hat{o} \nu 63,9,20 ;$ col．31，3，8， 37
atbios 19， 30

atparela，＇military expedition＇22， 41 （стратIAN）；26，7；27， 10 （стра－ Tlaic）；53，35；55， 18


 Pol． 1324 b 15 ）
$\sigma \tau \rho a \tau \eta \gamma i a 27,26$
$\sigma \tau \rho a \tau \eta \gamma$ d $^{22} 2,14 ; 23,16 ; 26,8 ; 38,32$.
 29，27；30， 5 ；34，4；44，16；еsp．61，




${ }_{\sigma \tau \rho a \tau \eta \gamma \in i ̂ v}^{17}, 6$
＊$\sigma \tau \rho \alpha \tau \iota$ ，（ 1 ）＇army＇ 19,$27 ; 22,9$. （2）＇expedition＇катà $\tau \grave{\eta} \nu \sigma \tau \rho a \tau \grave{d} \nu$

$\sigma \tau \rho \alpha \tau i \dot{\omega} \tau \eta$ S $^{15}, 8 ; 37,19$
 and 49，${ }^{2} 3$
$\sigma \tau \rho \epsilon \phi \omega^{-} \in \sigma \tau \rho \dot{\alpha} \phi \eta \nu 12,54$（Solon）

$\sigma v \gamma \gamma \neq \nu \in \sigma \theta a t$ I5， 4


 Eud． $1214 a_{2}$ and Rhet．ad Alex．）
 каӨє $\sigma \hat{\omega} \tau \epsilon s$ 34， 21
 （Pol． 1300 a 18）
$\sigma \nu \gamma \chi \omega \rho \hat{\omega} \nu, \pi а \rho a \nu о \mu о$ йбаıs oú 28，39；тג̀ бขүкєХ $\omega \rho \eta \mu$ еу $\alpha$ 47， 12
$\sigma \nu к о ф ф \nu \tau \eta \mathrm{~s} 35,17 \mathrm{f}$ ；бuкофаขтиิע тро－ Bo入al 43， 24


 23




$\sigma \nu \lambda \lambda \dot{h} \psi \epsilon \omega \mathrm{~s}, \pi \rho \bar{d} \tau \hat{\eta} s$ 18， 18 （not in Ar．in this sense）
$\sigma \nu \mu \beta a l \nu \omega \cdot$ c．inf．$\sigma \nu \mu \beta a i \nu \eta$ 21，9．$\sigma \nu \nu \epsilon-$ ßalvev 11，7；16，11；19，1；24，10； $26,2,10 ; 37,12$ ．$\sigma v \nu \epsilon \beta \eta 2,1 ; 6,6$ ； 16，28；18，7，12；22，2；23，9；26， $3 ; 27,5 ; 34,5,16 ; 37,19 ; 41,1,18$ ． $\sigma \nu \nu \epsilon \beta \epsilon \beta \dot{\eta} \kappa \epsilon \iota$ I3，14．$\sigma \nu \mu \beta \hat{\eta} \nu \alpha \iota<\epsilon \tau \nu a \iota>$ 28，33；sine inf．16，17．बंब $\nu$ लो $\sigma \nu \mu \beta a l \nu \omega \sigma \iota \nu$ à $\lambda \lambda \eta \lambda o t s 39$ ， 1 I（decree）
 pay 19， 24
$\sigma\langle\mu \beta о \lambda о \nu, \pi а \rho а \lambda а \mu \beta a \nu \epsilon \iota$ col．32， 14 ；

 $\tau \dot{d} \mathrm{~s} \alpha \pi \delta \tau \hat{\omega} \nu \sigma \nu \mu \beta 6 \lambda \omega \nu 59,17$
$\sigma v \mu \beta o u \lambda \epsilon ট \epsilon \epsilon \nu 30,14$（decree）；$\sigma v \mu \beta o v-$ $\lambda e \nu 6 \nu \tau \omega \nu$ 22， 31 ；$\sigma \nu \nu \epsilon \beta \circ \sigma \lambda \epsilon \nu \epsilon \nu 24,2 ;$ $\sigma \nu \mu \beta o v \lambda \epsilon \ell \omega \sigma \iota 29,24$（decree）；$\sigma \nu \mu$－
 $\mu \in \tau \dot{d} \tau \hat{\eta} s \beta_{\text {ou }} \hat{\eta} s$ 31， 3 （decree）
$\sigma$ бивоидоs 23 ， 16


 19；$\pi \rho$ д̀s таîs $\sigma \cup \mu \mu a \chi$ laıs 54， 18
$\sigma \nu \mu \mu а \chi \iota 66 \nu, \tau \delta 39,9$（decree）．Isocr．$̇ \nu$ $\tau \hat{\varphi} \sigma \nu \mu \mu a \chi ⿺ 𠃊 \hat{\varphi}$（in another sense）Rhet． $1418 a 32$
 17， 15 （Pol． 1300 a 18，Rhet． 1396 a 18）
би́мнахос 24，6， 11 （Pol．1269 b і，г3г5 a 2，omitted in Index Ar．）
$\sigma \dot{v} \mu \mu \varepsilon \xi_{\xi}$ ss 3， 26 （not in Ar．in this sense）
 6I， 8
$\sigma \dot{\mu} \mu \pi \alpha{ }^{\cdot} \cdot \sigma \dot{\jmath} \mu \pi a \nu \tau a 19,39$
$\sigma \nu \mu \pi \epsilon 1 \theta \epsilon \iota \nu \tau 亠 \nu \quad$ кєкт $\eta \mu \epsilon \nu \nu \nu$ 39， 10 （decree）； $\sigma \nu \nu \in \pi \epsilon \iota \sigma \epsilon \tau \delta \nu \delta \hat{\eta} \mu \sigma \nu 14,3$ ；$\sigma \nu \nu \epsilon \pi \epsilon \epsilon \sigma \epsilon \nu$ c．inf．zo，6．$\sigma \nu \mu \pi \epsilon \epsilon \sigma \theta \epsilon \nu \tau \omega \nu \tau \bar{\omega} \nu \pi 0 \lambda-$ $\lambda \omega \nu 29,8$
$\sigma \nu \mu \pi l \pi \tau \omega^{*}$ c．inf．ov̉ $\sigma \nu \nu \in \pi \iota \pi \tau \epsilon \nu$ ầ 21 ， 11；$\sigma \nu \nu \epsilon \pi \epsilon \sigma \epsilon 19,33 ; 26,4$
 $\mu \epsilon \tau \grave{d} \tau \hat{\nu} \nu \tau \rho \iota a ́ к о \nu \tau a \quad \sigma v \nu \epsilon \pi о \lambda \epsilon \mu \eta \sigma \alpha \nu 40$ ， 2

$\sigma \nu \mu \phi \epsilon \varphi \rho \epsilon \nu, \dot{\eta} \dot{\alpha} \nu \dot{\eta} \gamma \omega \bar{\omega} \nu \tau \alpha \iota 3 \mathrm{I}, 7$（decree）
туцфорá 19，14；29，3；таîs $\pi \rho о \gamma є ү є \nu \eta-$ $\mu$ évats $\sigma v \mu \phi о \rho a i ̂ s ~ 40, ~ 18$（ $\sigma \nu \mu ф о \rho a i ̂ s$ $\pi \in \rho \iota \pi \epsilon \sigma \epsilon i \nu$ Eth． 1100 a 7；word omit－ ted in Index $A r$ ．）
$\sigma \nu \mu \phi \omega \nu 0 \hat{v} \sigma \iota \pi \dot{\alpha} \nu \tau \epsilon s$ 12， 2 （frequent in genuine works；but the closest parallel is in the spurious de Admir． $838 b 34$ $\sigma \nu \mu \phi \omega \nu o v \sigma \iota \nu$, uno ore perhibent）
 19， 39

44，7；$\sigma v$ vá $^{\gamma} \epsilon \iota \nu$（？）col．31， 34



Opolotèvtes els тì̀ á áapáy 38， 4

$\sigma^{\sigma \nu \alpha ́ \mu \phi \omega ~ 7, ~ 17, ~} 28$

 бvyapub；as 12， 43 （Solon）
quvapтájє $\epsilon \nu 25,14$
 47，I；49， 3 I

${ }^{*} \sigma \nu \nu \epsilon \epsilon \sigma \eta \dot{\gamma} \alpha \gamma \in \nu \mu \epsilon \tau^{\prime}$ aưtầ 14,28
 22， 18

${ }^{*} \sigma v \nu \epsilon \pi \iota \mu \epsilon \lambda \epsilon \hat{\tau} \tau a l$ ，$\tau \hat{\omega} \nu \quad a ̈ \theta \lambda \omega \nu-\mu \epsilon \tau \grave{\alpha} \quad \tau \hat{v}$ тaplov 49， 23

बvvex $\hat{\text { ons }} 28,26$


$\sigma v y \theta \dot{\eta} k \alpha s$ $\sigma v \nu \tau l \theta \in \sigma \theta a \iota ~ 29,36$（decree）；
 $\tau \hat{\omega} \boldsymbol{\nu} .40,21$
$\sigma v \nu i \sigma \tau \eta \mu c \cdot \sigma v \nu \epsilon \sigma \tau \eta \quad \phi i \lambda l a, \pi \sigma \lambda \epsilon \mu \sigma s$ conj． van Leeuwen，for $\epsilon \nu \in \sigma \tau \eta, 17,15 ; 27$ ，


 $\pi 0 \lambda \iota \tau$ elas 25， 15 ．$\sigma \nu \nu \epsilon \sigma \tau \dot{\eta} \sigma a \nu \tau 0 \quad \tau \grave{\nu}$ $\pi b \lambda \in \mu \sigma \nu 24,17$


 $\phi \nu \lambda \alpha ́ s ~ 41,8$
$\sigma 0 \nu 0 \delta 0 s 4,18$

 $\tau \omega \nu 56,34$ ；$\sigma \nu \nu 0<\kappa \eta \sigma \alpha ́ \nu \tau \omega \nu 4 \mathrm{I}, 7$
ovvoukife 15， 5 （？）

$\sigma \nu \nu 0 \rho \hat{\omega}$ ．$\sigma v \nu i \delta \omega \nu \tau \delta \pi \lambda \eta \theta \theta 0 s 40,4$
 21， 9
$\sigma v \nu \tau \in \lambda \epsilon \hat{\nu} \nu-\epsilon l_{s} \tau \dot{\partial} \sigma \nu \mu \mu \alpha \chi \iota \kappa \dot{\partial} \nu 39,8$（decree）
$\sigma u v \tau l \theta \in \sigma \theta a l, \sigma v \nu \theta \eta \hbar k a s 29,36$（decree）

 1259 a 24）
 38， 24
 43， 11
$\sigma \phi a ̂ s ~ a u ̉ r o u ́ s ~ 21, ~ 19 ; ~ 30, ~ 15 . ~ \sigma \phi \hat{\omega} \nu ~ a u ̛ \tau \omega ̂ \nu ~$ 30， 2
$\sigma \phi \eta \kappa l \sigma \kappa o s ~ c o l . ~ 32,9$（only in corresp． frag．）
 $\tau \eta$ S 14， 14
$\sigma \phi \rho \alpha \gamma i \delta \alpha, \delta \eta \mu о \sigma l a \nu 44,5$
$\sigma \chi \in \delta \dot{\partial} \nu 20,18 ; 28,3$ 1
$\sigma \chi 0 \lambda a ́ s \omega \sigma \iota \nu$ I6， 10
 кратlà $\sigma \underline{\varrho}\} \in \iota \nu 40,13 \cdot \sigma \dot{\omega} \sigma \alpha s \tau \eta \dot{\nu} \pi \alpha \tau \rho \ell \delta a$

 $\sigma \omega \dot{\mu} \mu a \tau$ оs 14，4，é $\pi l$ rô̂s $\sigma \dot{\omega} \mu \alpha \sigma \iota \nu 2,8 ;$ 4， $23 ; 6,3 ; 9,3 . \sigma \omega \dot{\omega} \mu a \sigma \iota \nu-\lambda \eta \tau 0 \nu \rho-$
 тoîs $\sigma \omega \mu \alpha \sigma \iota \nu 49,14$
$\sigma \hat{\omega} \alpha \hat{\eta}, d^{\prime} \pi \omega s$ ây 30,20 （decree）；only in Oec．ii 1347 a 24
 $\theta$ ebs de Mundo 397 b 20）
 $\tau \hat{\omega} \nu \pi \alpha l \delta \omega \nu \sigma \omega \tau \eta \rho l \neq 19,35$

Abs．$\pi \in \rho l$ т $\hat{\mathrm{y}} \mathrm{s}$ $\sigma \omega \tau \eta \rho l a s$ 29，14， 22 （decree）
＊$\sigma \omega \phi \rho \circ \nu \iota \sigma \tau \alpha l_{42}$ ， $18,25,27$
т $\dot{\alpha} \mu \dot{\nu} \nu$ ả $\lambda \lambda \alpha \kappa \alpha \theta a ́ \pi \epsilon \rho$ 29， 16
тá入аутoy 10，8；22， 30
тaulas（ $\tau \hat{\eta} s \beta o v \lambda \hat{\eta} s$ ）49，30．т．$\sigma \tau \rho \alpha \tau t \omega \tau \iota-$ $\kappa \hat{\omega} \nu 43,2 ;$ c．art．in 47，9；49，23．
 $\mu \omega \nu$ os 61， 27 ．

тарlac 4，6；7，13；8，6，7；6о， 16.

 $\theta$ eaîs $\delta e ́ \kappa \alpha$（4II）30， 8 （decree）
Tavarpâ̂os 25， 24
тaklap才ot 30，6；6x，I7（Oec．ii $1350 b$ 10， de Mundo 399 b 7；тa乡ıap ${ }^{6} \hat{\imath} \nu$ and $\tau a \xi \iota a \rho \chi i a \iota$ in Pol．）
 41，10；$\tau \hat{\eta} s \tau \dot{\alpha} \xi \in \omega s-\dot{\epsilon} \nu \tau \hat{\eta}$ то $\lambda \iota \tau \varepsilon l q$

 тoùs $\nu$ ónous 3，34；т $\boldsymbol{\eta} \nu$ aủ $\tau \grave{\nu} \nu \tau a ́ \xi \iota \nu$
 тákels 42， 3 I

$\tau \alpha \rho a \chi a i ̂ s$, ṫ $\nu$ тaîs 22， 18 （Pol．1302 a 22）


 тро́тоу 9，1；тoùs ，фóous oữos $\tilde{\eta}^{\nu}$ ó
 39，I2（decree）；ö $\sigma o \nu$ d $\downarrow>\tau \dot{\alpha} \xi \omega \sigma \iota \nu-$ тá $\tau \epsilon \epsilon \nu(\tau \partial \nu \sigma \tau \alpha \theta \mu \partial \nu) 51,14 \cdot$（ $\sigma \tau \dot{\alpha} \sigma \iota s$ ）
 тєтаү $\mu \epsilon \nu$ 人 15,21 （Pol．1307 b 13）； （ảp $\chi \eta$ ）$\tau \epsilon \tau \alpha \gamma \mu e ̇ \nu \eta \pi \rho d s c . a c c .8,15$ ；ol тєтaүнévo九 col． $3^{6,23}$
тádos I， 2
тáxous，$\delta$ oà 34，ュ
те—каl passim
Teloavdoos 19， 2
${ }^{*} \tau e \iota \chi i \zeta \epsilon \iota \nu$ Ig， $5 ; ~ \tau \epsilon \iota \chi l \sigma a \nu \tau \epsilon s$ 19， 1 I
 $\nu \in l a 37,9 ; \tau 0 \hat{v} \tau \in l \chi o u s 50,10 ; \tau \eta \nu \tau \hat{\nu} \nu$ $\tau \in \iota \chi \hat{\omega} \nu$ áтокко $\delta 6 \mu \eta \sigma \iota \nu 23,17$

тeкva 2， 4
$\tau \epsilon \lambda \epsilon l \omega \nu, \kappa a \theta^{*}$ lep $\omega \hat{\nu} 29,39$（decree）
Te $\lambda \in \sigma$ ivos á $\rho \chi \omega \nu(487 / 6) 22,2$ I
$\tau \epsilon \lambda \epsilon u t a i ̂ o s ~ 3,9 ; 53,26$


 18，22；тєт $\frac{\lambda}{} \epsilon \nu \tau \eta \kappa \delta \sigma \iota \nu 58,3$
 тє́入ous 56，7．adv．18，33．Classis，



 15；55， 18
 $\tau \epsilon \lambda \epsilon i ̂ \nu 7,16,27 ; \pi 0 \hat{o} 0 \nu \tau \hat{\lambda}$ os $\tau \epsilon \lambda \epsilon \hat{\imath} 7,30$ ； $\epsilon l-\tau \mathrm{d} \tau \epsilon \lambda \eta \tau \in \lambda \in \hat{i} 55,18$（quoted in this sense from the fragments only）
$\tau \in \lambda \hat{\omega} \nu \alpha{ }^{52}$ ， 18
$\tau \epsilon \mu \epsilon \nu \hat{\omega} \nu, \mu \iota \sigma \theta \omega \dot{\omega} \sigma \epsilon \iota s 47,26$
$\tau \in \tau \alpha \rho \tau \Psi$, є̈т $\tau\llcorner 19,4 ; 21,2 ; 22,26$
 Ібтaノєンov 62， 14
тєт $\rho \alpha ́ \kappa \iota s$ 43， 14
тєтракобlous каl \＆ （ $\beta$ ои入і̀ $\nu$ ）тєтракобlous 8，19：＊̈עа каl тет $а к о \sigma i o u s ~(\delta \iota к \alpha \sigma \tau \alpha ́ s) ~ 53, ~ 16 . ~ o l ~ т \varepsilon-~$ тракббєоє с． 29 ；37，10；4I， 20
тет $\rho$ дुеєьs 46,3 （frag． $55^{2}$ ）
＊тєттаракаıбєке́тьs（？）56， 44
 I f ； 53,27 （quoted from frag． $413^{2}$ ）．

$\tau \ell \tau \tau a \rho \epsilon \mathrm{~s} 4,12 ; \phi \cup \lambda o \beta a \sigma \iota \lambda \epsilon$ ís $7.8,12$ ； $\dot{\alpha} \nu \tau l$ т $\hat{\omega} \nu \quad \tau \epsilon \tau \tau \alpha \dot{\alpha} \rho \nu(\phi \nu \lambda \hat{\omega} \nu) 21,4 ;$ $\tau \epsilon ̇ \tau \tau \alpha \rho a s$ фи入ás $4 \mathrm{I}, 8$ ．те̇ттара $\tau \epsilon \lambda \eta 7$ ，
 §ovaty 53，I3









 $\Sigma 6 \lambda \omega \nu 0 s \theta \epsilon \nu \tau \delta s \nu \delta \mu o \nu$ elaar $\gamma \epsilon \lambda$ las $8,26$. Pass．$\in \tau \epsilon \theta \eta$（ $\nu 6 \mu \mathrm{os}$ ）21， $4 ; 22,13,26$ ； тoís $\nu \delta \mu o t s$ ổ ầ $\tau \epsilon \theta \hat{\omega} \sigma \iota \pi \epsilon \rho \hat{l} \tau \hat{\omega} \nu \pi 0 \lambda \iota \tau \iota-$

 （ $\nu \delta \mu \mathrm{ous}$ ）$\theta \in \epsilon \sigma \theta \alpha \iota$ 3I， 9 ；ôs $\hat{\alpha} \nu \mu \hat{\eta}$ $\theta \hat{\eta} \tau \alpha \iota$

тikтel I2，I3（Solon）
 39， 12 （decree）；$\pi \rho d s$ тds $\tau \iota \mu \dot{d} s T \hat{\omega} \nu$ $\kappa \rho t \theta \hat{\omega} \nu \tau \dot{\alpha} \dot{\alpha} \lambda \phi \iota \tau \alpha \kappa a l \pi \rho \delta s \tau_{\alpha} \tau \iota \mu \dot{d} s \tau \hat{\omega} \nu$ $\pi u \rho \hat{\omega} \nu$ тovs à $\rho \tau 0 u s$（ $\pi \omega \lambda \epsilon i \nu) 5 \mathrm{I}, 12$. $\tau \iota \mu \hat{\eta} s 12,5$（Solon）
$\tau \iota \mu \eta \mu \alpha \tau \alpha \delta \iota e i \lambda \in \nu \eta, 9 ; \mu \varepsilon \gamma \in \theta \in \iota-\tau \mu \eta \mu \alpha \tau 05$
 $\mu a \tau \alpha$ тарє $о \mu \epsilon \nu о \iota s(?)$ 39， 24 （decree）．
＇Penalty＇，тi $\eta \eta \mu$ є $\pi \tau \gamma p \alpha \psi \alpha \mu \epsilon \nu$ os 48 ，

$\tau l \mu \eta \sigma \iota s$ col．37， 4

 Alex． 142766 （the only ref．）
$T \mu \rho \sigma \theta \epsilon \nu \eta s{ }^{d} \rho \chi \omega \nu(409 / 8) 23,22$
 Litem aestimare，$\delta \dot{\omega} \rho \omega \nu$ тı $\mu \omega \sigma \nu \nu 54,9$ ；


 63， 16
Tı $\mu \dot{\omega} \nu \alpha \sigma \sigma \alpha 17,13$
$\tau \iota \mu \omega \rho \in \imath \imath \nu \tau \hat{\psi}$ d $\delta \in \lambda \phi \hat{\psi}$ 19， 2 （cf．Pol． 13 г I $b$ 2I，Rhet．1401 a го）；viṫ $\rho$ т $\hat{\nu}$
 тıvos Rhet． $1372{ }^{6}$ 4）

Tls；tis бol $\pi a \tau \eta \rho \kappa \pi \lambda$ ；55，13．$\tau \ell$ $\gamma i \gamma \nu \in \tau a \iota ; 16,20$
$\tau \iota \tau \omega \dot{\omega} \kappa \omega^{\cdot}$ єт $\tau \omega \sigma \epsilon \nu$ 39， 20 （decree）；$\tau \rho \dot{\omega} \sigma \eta$ 57， 15 ；т $\omega \hat{\omega} \sigma \alpha$ 57， 22
тоцб $\sigma \delta \epsilon^{\circ} 3,2 ; 29$ ， 10

${ }^{*} \tau$ оциа 55,28
тоگev́ely 42， 23
то乡6тає 24， 13


 т $6 \sigma 0 \nu-\delta \sigma^{\prime} \sigma \sigma o \nu 12,4$（Solon）
$\tau \sigma \sigma \sigma \sigma \delta \epsilon^{\prime}$ not found（？）in＇A $\theta$ ．$\pi \boldsymbol{\pi} \boldsymbol{\lambda}$ ．
тобои̂то今＇ $16,{ }_{2}$
тбтє 4，16；14，16； 15,$9 ; 18,28 ; 21, \downarrow$ ， 8；22，12，22；41，7．тбтє $\delta^{\prime}$ after
 dant after $\epsilon l \delta \epsilon \mu \dot{\eta}, 52,5$



т $\rho a \chi \grave{\nu}-\nu 6 о \nu$ 12， 19 （Solon）．т $\rho a \chi v \tau \epsilon ́ \rho a \nu$

треis 4，19；8，13；13，9， $16 ; 21,14$. трєîs каl є́ $\grave{\text { коита } \mu \nu a ̂ s ~ 10, ~ 8 . ~ т р і а ~}$ $\tau \alpha \hat{\tau} \tau^{\prime} 9,2 ; \tau \rho l a \quad \mu \xi \nu \nu$ lєр $\hat{\omega} \nu \quad \chi \rho \eta \mu \alpha \tau l \zeta \epsilon \iota \nu$,
 $\dot{\delta} \sigma l \omega \nu 43,29 . \mu \epsilon \chi \rho \iota \tau \rho \iota \hat{\omega} \nu 43,25$ ；$\epsilon \nu$－ $\tau \delta \mathrm{s} \tau \rho \iota \omega \nu \nu \dot{\eta} \mu \in \rho \hat{\omega} \boldsymbol{\nu} 48,18$
 тго入入oús 27，15．трє́фє $\sigma \theta \epsilon$（עóov）5， 17 （Solon）；т $\rho \in ́ \phi \in \in \sigma \theta a \iota ~ 24,12$


 34，17；35－37；40，20；41，22；53， 4

т $\rho \iota \alpha к о \sigma$ lous 20，1о；трьако́бьа（ $\mu \in ́ \tau \rho \alpha$ ） 7 ， 18
${ }^{\pi} \tau \rho \iota а к а \sigma \tau \varphi(\hat{\varphi}(\xi \tau \epsilon \iota) 14,7$

трı $\quad \rho a \rho \chi$ las（ $\delta i к \alpha \iota) 52,16$
трй $\rho \alpha \rho \chi \circ$ 6 6,7
трıиреєь 22， $36 ; 46,1-8$
т рітротогоі 46， 8
tpls 47， 19
 15
трiтov 9，4；т $4 i \tau \eta$（ $\sigma \tau \alpha ́ \sigma \iota s$ ）13，20；$\tau \hat{\eta}$
 21
${ }^{*} \tau \rho \iota \tau о \pi \alpha \dot{\tau} \omega \rho$ frag．alienum 14 p． 255
 21，10，14；$\delta \dot{́} \delta е \kappa а$ трเтти́єs $21,11$. $\tau \rho \iota \tau \tau \dot{\nu} \nu \tau \hat{\omega} \nu \pi \rho v \tau \alpha \dot{\nu} \in \omega \nu$ 44， 6 （reff．to Frag．only）
$\tau \rho \iota \dot{\beta} \beta \mathrm{\lambda} \lambda \frac{\nu}{41,35}$（reff．to Oec．ii 1347 a 35 and Frag．only）

тро́тоע，т $\nu$ аúтò̀ 17 ， $10 ; 25,22$ ；col．31， 22 ；col．37，1．тои̂тoע т $\delta \nu \tau$ то́тоע 3， 33 ； 9,1 ； 12,$1 ; 16,2$ ；26， 1 ；32，7； 42,$38 ; 55,27 ; 60,1$ ．тóv $\delta \epsilon \tau$ т̀̀ $\tau \rho o ́-$ тоу 7,$8 ; 15,6 ; 29,29 ; 37,5 ; 42$, 1．


 фض̀ $\nu \quad \in \sigma \epsilon \sigma \theta a \iota \quad \pi \hat{a} \sigma \iota 24,3 ; \delta l \delta \omega \sigma \iota-\epsilon l s$ $\tau \rho о ф \eta ̀ \nu-\delta \rho \alpha \chi \mu \dot{\eta} \nu 42,24 ; \delta \iota \delta o ́ \nu \alpha L-\tau \rho 0-$ фض̀v $\delta$ v́o $6 \beta$ o $\lambda$ oús 49， 28 （law）

трит $\eta$ иата col．36， 25
$\tau \rho v \pi \hat{\omega}^{*} \psi \hat{\eta} \phi$ os тєт $\rho \cup \pi \eta \mu \epsilon \in \nu \eta$ col．35， 29 f ； col．36，14，19，30， 33
тvүхápш＇८．part．2，12；18，15；24，9； 37，9，11；53，3I．$\mu \hat{\alpha} \lambda \lambda \frac{1}{2} \tau \hat{\omega} \nu \tau \cup \chi o \nu$.

тvтánov，d dád тô 45， 7 （not in Ar．in this sense；$\& \pi \sigma \tau \nu \mu \pi \alpha \nu i \zeta \in \sigma \theta a l$ in Rhet． ${ }^{1} 3^{8} 3$ a 5）
тขраурєरิ้ 6，І5； 1 I，4；16，43
 тบрavขıк $\hat{\omega}$ ，орр．по入ıтıк $\omega \mathrm{s}, 14,17 ; 16$, 4 ；19， 8
tupapuls 14， $11 ; 15,14 ; 16,1,27,41$ ， 43；19，2，37；20，1；22，3，23，28； 28，7；41，14．$\dot{\eta} \tau \hat{\omega} \nu$ трıd́коута каl $\tau \hat{\omega} \nu$ ถéкa тvpapyls 41， 22
тúpayvos 1ך， $3 ; \tau$ ．катє̇ $\sigma \tau \eta$ 22， $14 ; \tau \hat{\omega} \nu$ то̂̀ $\tau v \rho d \nu \nu o v$ $\phi l \lambda \omega \nu$ 18，зо．ol $\pi \epsilon \rho l$ т $\hat{\omega} \nu \tau \nu \rho \alpha ́ \nu \nu \omega \nu$ עb $\mu$ о 16,39 ；тoùs $\tau \hat{\omega} \nu$ т．фìous 22， 18,25 ；$\dot{1} \pi \dot{\delta} \tau \hat{\omega} \nu$ т．19，



vßply 12， 13 （Solon）
$\dot{v} \beta \rho \iota \sigma \tau \eta \eta^{\prime} \mathrm{I} 8,17$
ข่ $\gamma \rho \alpha, \mu \in \tau \tau \rho \alpha-\xi \eta \rho \dot{\alpha}$ каl 7,17
vípla $63,6,8$ ；col． $3 \mathrm{I}, 26$
 37， 5
vlớ＇viteîs 17,$9 ; 19,34 ;$ vlé $\omega \nu$ 16， 28
${ }^{2} \Upsilon \mu \eta \tau \tau \hat{\varphi}, \notin \nu 16,17$

 34， 9
ย $\pi$ ap $\chi \hat{\eta} \mathrm{f}, ~ \epsilon \xi$ 4， 17 （de Gen．Anim． 745 a 18，de Anima 412 a 4，Rhet． $1355 b$ 24）
 19，25；ن่ォท̂pХєє каі тро́тєроу 8，20； $\dot{v \pi \eta ŋ p \chi o \nu ~ 21, ~} 23$

 Rhet．ad Alex． $1432 b$ I3，the only ref．）

 $\theta$ бोтоs 20， 8

 $\rho \omega \nu$ 5，9．$\tau \hat{\omega} \nu \quad \gamma \in \rho \hat{\omega} \nu 57,12 ; \hat{\omega} \nu \delta \epsilon \hat{\imath}$ $\chi \rho \eta \mu a \tau l \zeta є \iota \nu 44$, I
 －т $\rho \iota d_{к о \nu \tau \alpha-4, ~ I 5 ; ~ 30, ~}^{4}$（decree）；3I， 4 （decree）；—тєттара́коута—29，12， 37 （decree）；42，16；56，19；63，11．$\tau \dot{\alpha}$
 $\chi$ 시as 53， 16
 עор їл $\epsilon \rho \beta$ á入入орто 36， 13 （Rhet．ad Alex． $\mathrm{I}_{420} a 8,143^{8} b 6$ ，the only reff．）
$\dot{v} \pi \in \rho \eta \phi a \nu i a$ 5， 21 （Solon）
imepbptoь，$\alpha p \chi a l 24,16$
 12
＊ن́ $\pi \epsilon^{\prime} 0 \cup \nu 0554,5$
íтทре̇тๆs 63，${ }^{2} 3$ ；col．31，8；col．32，2，
 14；$\mu \alpha \sigma \tau \iota \gamma \circ \phi \delta \rho o u s-i \pi \eta \rho \in \tau \tau \alpha$ 35， 7

 12， 44 （Solon）
 18， 37 ；ن́тd $\tau \hat{\omega} \nu \tau v \rho a ́ \nu \nu \omega \nu ~ 19, ~ I 3 ~$
$\dot{v} \pi о \beta \alpha \hat{\lambda} \lambda \omega \nu \tau \alpha \iota$（？）col． 36,5
ímoүрафи́ 4，I
 17

úsó入olmos 40,5

 I $303 b 24$ ，the only ref．



 quoted from frag．and spurious works
$\dot{\cup} \sigma \tau \in p a l q, \tau \hat{\eta} 38,4 ; 48,9$

 （ $\phi v \lambda a l$ ）43， 9
ปัбтєроу adv． 3,$19 ; 6,12 ; 16,18,28 ;$ 18，22，29；19，13；24，18；27，21；


 éкßо入ท̂s $\mu a ́ \lambda \iota \sigma \tau \alpha$ éкатóv 32,8
$\dot{v} \phi \epsilon \hat{i} \lambda \epsilon$ tàs $\dot{v} \pi o \lambda o l \pi o u s \dot{\eta} \mu \epsilon ̂ \rho a s ~ 40,5$（ $\dot{v} \phi a l-$ pol $\eta$ de Caelo $294 a$ 18，the only ref．）


 Éф $\dot{\prime} \nu \eta$ rd $\mu \epsilon ̇ \tau a \lambda \lambda a$ 22， 29
$\phi \alpha \nu \in \rho \alpha{ }^{2} \delta \dot{\delta} \rho \hat{\alpha} \nu$（ $\psi \eta$ ท́ $\phi o u s$ ）col．35，33．фаעє－
 IO

фа́бк $\omega \nu$ c．inf．，after ov，15，18；34， 12 ； 45,4 ；ol фа́бккоขтеs 17,5

Фєt $\delta \dot{\omega} \nu \in \iota a \quad \mu \in ́ \tau \rho a$ Io， 5
 （decree）；（of expenditure）$\tau \dot{\alpha} \dot{d} \nu \alpha \lambda \dot{\omega}$－ $\mu \alpha \tau \alpha-\eta ้ \nu є \gamma \kappa \sigma \nu$ 56，25．（of election） （ $\chi \circ \rho \eta \gamma o u s$ s $\kappa \omega \mu \varphi \delta \circ i ̂ s$ ）al фu入al $\phi \epsilon \rho \circ v \sigma \iota \nu$
 $\dot{v} \pi \delta \tau \hat{\omega} \nu \quad \phi \nu \lambda \hat{\omega} \nu 56$ ，10．$\chi \alpha \lambda \epsilon \pi \hat{\omega} s, \phi \epsilon-$

 тò $\gamma$ ра́ $\mu \mu \boldsymbol{\mu} 63,23$

 $\pi a ́ \gamma o v \quad \phi \in v \gamma o ́ \nu \tau \omega \nu 47$ ，14；$\phi \in \cup ́ \gamma \omega \nu \phi v$－ $\gamma \eta \nu 57,21$ ；（of the defendant）48， 21 ； 53，II；col．36， 32
$\phi \eta \mu l^{*} \phi \eta \sigma \iota \nu$ 14， 25 ；55，19；фабl 6， 1 1； 7,$18 ; 9,5 ; 16,17 ; 17,17 ; 18,30$ ， \＆c．$ย 申 \eta$ 14，13；16， $21 . ~ \phi \hat{\eta} 56$ ，15； 57， 19

$\phi \theta l \nu o \nu \tau o s ~ Ө a \rho \gamma \eta \lambda \iota \omega ̂ \nu o s, ~ e ̀ v a ́ \tau \eta ~ 32, ~ 5 ~$
$\phi \iota \lambda a \dot{\nu} \theta \rho \omega \pi 0$ м 16，4，30．$A d z .18$ ， 17
$\phi \iota \lambda a \rho \gamma v \rho l a(3) 5,2$ I（Solon）
$\phi i \lambda \in \rho \gamma 1 a 16,24$（Rhet．1361 a 8）
$\phi\left\llcorner\lambda\right.$ 1 $_{17}, 15 ; 18,9$ ；19， 26
фı入oктท́u $\omega \nu$ I2， 48 （Solon）
фи入ó $\mu$ ov oos 18， 4 （Eth． 1175 a 34）

 $\dot{\alpha} \lambda \lambda \dot{\lambda} \eta$ ious $\phi .13,16$
 $\tau \hat{\nu} \nu$ тồ тupávעov $\phi l \lambda \omega \nu \mathrm{I} 8,30$ ；тovs
 18， 32 ；$\phi l \lambda$ os $\tau \hat{\omega} \nu$ rupá $\nu \nu \omega \nu 20,2$ ；$\tau \hat{\nu}$ $\phi l \lambda \omega \nu$ 20，II；$\delta \iota \dot{d} \tau \hat{\omega} \nu \phi .6,8$
$\phi o ́ \beta o \nu, \dot{v} \pi \epsilon \xi \alpha \iota \rho \circ \cup ́ \mu \epsilon \nu 0<\tau \delta \nu 35,24$
 9；$\phi о \beta \eta \theta \epsilon \in \nu \tau \epsilon s \mu \eta$ —ката入и́ $\mu \eta 36,5$ ；фо－
 40， 1
＊фovev́s 18,36
$\phi o \nu \iota \kappa \hat{\omega} \nu(\theta \epsilon \sigma \mu \hat{\omega} \nu)$ 7， 2 （Pol． 1269 a I， $1274 b 24,1275 b$ 10， $1300 b 24$ ）
 фóvov ठ̂＜kal 57，12；фóyov ठ́lкає каl траט́ $\mu a \tau 0$ 57， I $_{4}$
Фор $\mu \mathrm{l} \mathrm{\sigma tos} 34,24$

фópos＂roùs фópous－Toùs $\pi \rho \dot{\alpha} \tau 0 \cup s{ }^{2} 23,21$ ； ámd $\tau \hat{\omega} \nu$ фо́p $\omega \nu$ 24， 1 （（Pol． 1272 a 18）； фópous（ pap．$_{\text {．}}$ ）á रovба। $\nu \hat{\eta} \in \mathrm{s}$ 24， 19
 oalato 12， 51 （id．）
фрatplal 21， 23
Фрєáтov，èv 57， 22
 15 （id．）

＊ф $\rho 0 \mathrm{v} \rho \mathrm{l} \delta \mathrm{es}, \nu \hat{\eta} \in \mathrm{s} 24, \mathrm{I} 8$
ф poupol 24，14，19（？）；62， 5



 $a 28$ ，the only ref．）
фuүádes 19，8；20，16；34，20；37，г
$\phi \cup \gamma \eta \dot{\nu}, \phi \in \dot{\gamma} \gamma \omega \nu$ 57， 21
Фú 1 14，$^{2} 7$

 $\tau \hat{\eta} s \chi{ }^{\omega} \rho a s$ 43， 18
 Rhet．1360 a 9）
 24，8；$\delta є \sigma \mu \omega T \hat{\omega} \nu \quad \phi \dot{\lambda} \alpha \kappa \in s$ 24，21；то̂́ $\delta \epsilon \sigma \mu \omega т \eta \rho l o u$ фи́ $\lambda \alpha \kappa \in \mathrm{s} 35,6$
фй $\lambda a \rho \chi \circ \div 30,7$ ；3I，14；49，10；6I， 23

 （ $\left.\tau \grave{\eta} \nu \chi^{\omega} \rho \rho \alpha \nu\right) 6 \mathrm{r}, 5 . \pi \alpha \rho, ~ a \cup ่ \tau o i ́ s ~ e ́ \phi u ́-~$

$\phi \cup \lambda e ́ t \alpha \iota 31,4$（decree）；42，15，26；6I， I8
Фu入ท́ 37，2；38，1， $15 ; 41,23$

 53，14；тoùs тìv $\phi$ ．ठıкá§ovtas 58，7．


 סoîs）al фu入al фє́poval 56，9；（хорךүous）

 6I，20；катд̀ $\phi \nu \lambda$ às 22，8，22；42， 15 ，
 $\phi \nu \lambda \hat{\eta} s$ ö $\lambda \eta s{ }^{2}$ 2，2，4．For $\tau \hat{\eta} s \phi \nu \lambda \hat{\eta} s$ $\dot{\epsilon} \kappa \dot{\alpha} \sigma \tau \eta s$ et sim．，and for $\epsilon \boldsymbol{l}_{s} \dot{\epsilon} \kappa$ т $\hat{\eta} s \phi \cup$－ $\lambda \hat{\eta} s, v$ ．हैка，
 57， 3 I
＊фи入окришеі̂य 21， 6
$\phi \dot{\sigma} \sigma \epsilon, \tau \hat{n} 5,10 ; 18,3,24$
 38
$\phi \omega \nu \hat{\mathrm{p}} \mathrm{S}(\mathrm{?}) \mathrm{I} 5,17$
$\phi \omega \rho \hat{\omega}^{\cdot} \epsilon \phi \omega \dot{\omega} \rho \alpha \sigma \in \nu$ I8， 27
 35， 20


 38， 8
 col．35，27；$\sigma \tau \hat{\eta} \lambda \eta \nu \nu \ltimes \lambda \kappa \hat{\eta} \nu 53,25$
$\chi$ харкттй $\rho$, ó á $\rho \chi a \hat{\circ}$ оs 10,7

$\chi$ đápıs• $\pi \rho$ òs $\chi$ ápıข ò $\mu \iota \lambda o \hat{\nu} \nu \tau \alpha s$ 35， 19
Adv．тlotє $\omega$ s $\chi a ́ p o \nu ~ 18, ~ 35 ; ~ \tau 0 \hat{~} \beta \epsilon \lambda$－ тlotov $\chi$ ．35，21；$\tau 0 v \dot{\tau} \omega \nu \chi$ ．29， 25 （de－ cree）；ঠuô̂ע $\chi .16,7 ; \dot{\omega} \nu \chi$ र．22， 25

Pl．גápıot 41， 29
Xápuos，father of Hipparchus，22， 16 $\chi$ aîva 12， 20 （Solon）
$\chi \in \iota \mu \hat{\omega} \nu \circ s, \tau 0 \hat{\nu} \chi$ ．$\epsilon \nu \in \sigma \tau \hat{\omega} \tau o s, 37$, I
$\chi$ Хєрото⿱亠巾тós 54， 16 （Rhet．ad Alex． 1424


 32 ；tàs रeєpotovlas крlyєı 30， 25 （de－
 т $\hat{\eta}$ रelpotoviq 61， 3 （frag．and Rhet．ad Alex．，the only reff．）
$\chi$ єєотоу $\hat{\omega}^{-} 34,26 ; 42,18,22 ; 43,3-5$ ； $46,3,4 ; 49,9,18 ; 54,17,21 ; 56$ ， $24 ; 57,3 ; 61,1,17,19,23,25,27$
$\chi \in l \rho \omega \nu^{\prime} \chi \in l \rho o u s 27,23$ ；$\chi \in l \rho \omega 28,2$
$\chi \eta \rho \hat{\omega}^{*}$ є $\chi \eta \rho \omega \dot{\theta} \eta \quad 12,52$（Solon）
$\chi^{\text {l }}$ เо 17,$16 ; 19,28 ; 24,13,14 ; 35$ ， 5 （？）；Х८ilovs тєעтакобlous 35， 26
Xiol 24， 7
 only ref．）
$\chi 0 \lambda o u ́ \mu \in \nu 0 \iota 12,20$（Solon）
Хор $\gamma^{i l a}$ met．27， 18

 คךүoùs ка $\theta \iota \sigma \tau \hat{\alpha} \sigma \iota \nu$ 54，35．єis $\Delta \hat{\eta} \lambda \frac{1}{} \chi$ ． 56， 20


$\chi \rho \in \iota o$ ôs，vimd 12,38 （Solon）
$\chi \rho \in a$ ，oi dфضрך $\mu \in \nu 0 \iota ~ \tau \grave{d}$ I3，21．$\chi \rho \in \hat{\omega} \nu$ дтокотац 6，3；11，8；$\chi \rho \in \hat{\omega} \nu$ а́токотй 6，II；10，2；I2，26；13，13（Probl．and Oec．，the only reff．）
$\chi \rho \eta$ 6，2I； 15,24







 30， 8 f ．$\chi \rho \hat{\eta} \mu a \sigma \iota \nu \quad \lambda \eta \tau 0 \cup \rho \gamma \epsilon i ้ \nu$ 29， 34 （decree）
$\chi \rho \eta \mu a \pi l \zeta \in \iota \nu$ 43，14， 29 f ；44， 1 II ；$\pi \in \rho l$ ol $\tau 0 \cup \kappa \alpha l$ т $\tau \rho l$ фи入акฑ̂s $\tau \hat{\eta} s \chi^{\omega} \rho a s$ 43，

$\chi р \eta \sigma \mu \omega \bar{\nu} \gamma \iota \gamma \nu 0 \mu \epsilon \bar{\epsilon} \omega \nu$ 19， 7
＊$\chi \rho \eta \sigma \tau \eta \rho \iota a \zeta о \mu$ ยиoเs 19， 22
 хрóvov ס८aтєбóvtos（？）$\beta \rho a \chi$ र́os 35， 25.
 23 ；ои่ то入ù $\chi \rho .15,3$ ；रр．тобойтоע 3，23；$\chi \rho$ ．тL山d 28，21；$\pi \lambda \epsilon l \omega ~ \chi \rho . ~ 44, ~$
一入оıтд $\nu \chi \rho$ ． 30,15 （decree）；$\mu \in \tau^{\prime}$ oú $\pi \rho \lambda \dot{v} \nu \chi \rho .25,24 ; 34,13$ ．Pl．ठıà $\tau \hat{\omega} \nu$ aúт $\hat{\omega} \nu \quad \chi \rho$ ．13，6；т $\hat{\nu} \nu \chi \rho o ́ \nu \omega \nu-\mu \dot{\eta}$ є $\xi$ ．

 $\pi \rho о ́ т \epsilon \rho о \nu ~ \chi \rho . ~ 28, ~ 4 ~$
$\chi$ रurlon＊pl．60， 21
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$\chi \rho \omega \hat{\mu \alpha \iota^{\circ}}$ тоîs $\Delta \rho \alpha ́ к о \nu \tau о s ~ \theta є \sigma \mu 0 i ̂ s ~ \chi \rho \omega ́ \mu \epsilon \nu 0 \iota ~ 7$,





 $\chi \rho \hat{\omega \nu \tau о ~} \tau \hat{\psi} \mu \hat{\epsilon} \nu \quad \sigma \tau \rho a \tau \eta \gamma \hat{\varphi} \tau \hat{\psi}$ ठ̀̀ $\sigma \nu \mu-$




 $\pi \rho \alpha ́ \gamma \mu a \sigma \iota 34,13$



 16，8；$\epsilon l s \tau \grave{\eta} \nu \chi$ ．16， 14 ；（ $\sigma \tau \rho a \tau \eta \gamma \delta \delta_{\mathrm{o}}$ ）


$\chi \omega \rho \epsilon \hat{\nu} \nu \tau \dot{\eta} \nu \psi \tilde{\eta} \phi 0 \nu$, aủ $\tau \dot{\eta} \nu \quad \mu \delta \nu \eta \nu$ col． 36,9
$\chi \omega \rho l o \nu 15,6 ; 16,20 ; 60,13 ; \chi$ ．äтe入és 16，18．Pl．27，17；47，21，24；52，6； 60， 8
$\chi \omega \rho l$ 3 39， 26 （decree）；$\chi \omega \rho i s$ $\mu k ̀ \nu-\chi \omega \rho i s$ $\delta \notin 47,18 ; 53,11$. Not found c．gen． in＇ $\mathrm{A} \theta$ ．$\pi 0 \lambda$ ．
$\psi a \lambda t p l a \iota 50,6$（only in corresp．frag．）
$\psi \in \nu \delta \epsilon \gamma \gamma \rho \alpha, \phi \hat{\eta} s \gamma \rho \alpha \phi \eta$ 59， 10 （only in cor－ resp．frag．）
$\psi \in v \delta \hat{\eta} \tau \dot{\eta} \nu$ alitav elval 6， 21
 resp．frag．）
 cf．col．36，I1，I3．Form 廿ev $\tau \cup \rho \iota \omega ̄ \nu$ in Pol．\＆c．
 col． 36,3 ；$\epsilon$ ls oùs（sc．a $\mu \phi о \rho \in \operatorname{as}$ ）$\psi \eta \phi i-$


 23；$\psi \eta \phi \iota \sigma \dot{\alpha} \mu \epsilon \nu \circ \iota \quad \mu \eta \varepsilon \in \mu l a \nu$ á $\rho \chi \grave{\eta} \nu$ є $โ \nu a \iota$ $\mu с \sigma \theta о ф 6 \rho о \nu$ 33， 9
$\psi \eta$ ทौє $\sigma \mu \alpha \cdot 29,6,10 ; 34,27 ; 40,8 ; 4 \mathrm{I}$ ， 26．тd $\psi \eta \phi l \sigma \mu a \tau a \quad \phi v \lambda a ́ \tau \tau \epsilon \iota ~ 54, ~ 14$. $\psi \eta \phi i \sigma \mu a \tau a$ quoted（Pericles）26， 22 f ．

B．c． 411 （Pythodorus）29，10－19（with amendment）；29，21－39；c．30；c．3I． в．C． 403 （al $\delta \measuredangle a \lambda \dot{\sigma} \sigma \epsilon t s \notin \pi^{\prime}$ Eivk $\left.\epsilon \ell \delta o v\right)$ с． 39



 $\mu \epsilon \overline{\nu a L}, \pi \lambda \eta \rho \epsilon t s, i b .29 . \psi \eta \eta^{2} \phi \omega \nu, d \rho \iota \theta \mu \partial s$ col． $3^{6,} 3^{2}$

勈 12,11
 this sense in Meteor．the only ref．）
 51， 13
 ทrau 47， 17

＇ $2 p$ és 33， 5

 $\gamma \in \operatorname{i\tau caL} 5,12$
 Io

 16， 27
＇when＇，山s $\bar{\epsilon} \xi \in \pi \epsilon \sigma \epsilon 15,2 ; \xi \xi \in \pi \in \sigma O \nu$ 28，6；ойк е̇ঠ̛́vaтo 18，33；E入aßєу 18，
 кра́тоиу 38，гб
 кєluevov．7， 20 （ $\omega s a \dot{a} \nu$ not noticed else－ where in Ar．in this sense）；$\delta u v \dot{a} \mu$ uvos то入ıтєйє $\theta a \iota 28,37 ; \pi \epsilon \pi о \nu \theta \dot{\omega} 514,4 ;$



 49，31；57， 8
c．gen．abs．6， $5 ; 13,24 ; 36,9$
c．acc．abs．7，25；29， 19
c．numeralibus，ís є̇т 19
c．superl．山̈s loaitaza 30， 18 （decree）
$\dot{\omega} s=\pi \rho \delta s, \dot{\omega} s \operatorname{cò}^{\nu} \delta \dot{\eta} \mu \mu o \nu 45,3$
※゙वTє 8,$20 ; 9,8 ; 16,3 ; 24,10 ; 61$ ，






$\delta\langle\nu a \sigma \theta a L 49,27$


## ENGLISH INDEX.

The numerals refer to the pages; $a$ and $b$ denote the first and second columns of the commentary.

For proper names not found here, see Greek Index.

Abbott's History of Greece quoted, iך $a$, 45 a
abbreviations in the ms classified, xxxvi
Aegospotami, 132
Aeschines, Schol. on F. L. 150 corrected, 131 $b$; Schol. on ii 87 quoted, 2 12
Alcmeonidae $\mathrm{r}, 72$ - 76
altars as places of refinge, ro3 $b$
Ambracia, Cypselidae in, 67 a
amendment, formula for, $117 b$
Ammonias, state-trireme, $230 a$, cf. Keil,
Solon. Verf. 149
amnesty after the fall of the Thirty and the Ten, ${ }^{1} 43$ a
Anaceum, 60 b
Anacreon, $68 b$
Andocides, de Myst. 78; 214 (cf. Keil, Solon. Verf. iro f)
Androtion, lv; on Solon, $37 a$; date of, $86 a$; cf. Keil, Solon. Verf. 190 f
animals, damage done by, $188 a$; judicial trial of, 216 b
Anthemion, 28, and Addenda, lxxvii Antiphon, 127
Anytus, rio $b, \mathrm{r}_{2} b$
Apollonius Rhodius, scholia on, xxviii
arbitrators, 190-192
Archestratus, $134 a$, and Addenda, lxxvii
Archinus of Ambracia, 67
Archinus, a leader of the moderate party, 404 B.C., $132 b, 144 a$
archons, early history of, 6; official residences of, 8-1I; mode of appointment before Dracon, 12, 3 ; inder Dracon, 14; under Solon, 29-3r; under Cleisthenes, 86 ; their appointment
by lot, $29 b, 87 a$; archonship opened to zeugitae, ro6 $b$; oath of, $7,25,203$; salaries of, $231 \quad b$; scrutiny of, $201 \quad b$; archons of same name, how distinguished, $129 b$
chronological list of archons (*denotes
those hitherto unknown)
621 * Aristaechmus, $12 b$
594 Solon, $19 a, 49 a, 55 a$
582 \& i Damasias II, 50 f
560 Comeas, $55 a$
555 * Hegesias, 57
527 * Philoneos, $65 b$
5 II * Harpactides, 75 b
508 Isagoras, $77 b$
501 * Hermocreon, $84 b$
490 Phaenippus, 85
487 * Telesinus, 86 b
483 Nicodemus, $88 a, 89 a$
481 * Hypsichides, 9 г $a$
$47^{8}$ Timosthenes, $94 a$
462 Conon, roo $a$
457 Mnesitheides, $106 b$
453 Lysicrates, $106 b$
451 Antidotus, 106 $b$
432 Pythodorus, $108 a$
412 Callias, $126 b$
41 I Mnesilochus, $128 a$
411 Theopompus, $128 b$
406 Callias 'A $\gamma \gamma \epsilon \lambda \hat{\eta} \theta \epsilon \nu, 129 b$
405 Alexias, $132 a$
404 Pythodorus, $133^{b}, 146^{b}$
403 Eucleides, 141 a
401 Xenaenetus, $146 a$
329 Cephisophon, 200 b
Areopagus, before Dracon, II and 3 r $b$;
under Dracon, 18; under Solon, 33; revival of its authority after Persian war, 92 ; attacked by Ephialtes, 100 f; privileges of, roi $a$; attacked by Pericles, 107; under the Thirty, $142 b$; trials before, $172 b, 212$. Ćf. Keil, Solon. Verf. $100 \mathrm{f}, 120$
Arginusae, 129 ; overtures of Sparta after, І $31 a$
Aristides, archonship of, $87 a b$; ostracism and recall of, $91 ;$ т $\quad 0 \sigma \tau a ́ \not \tau \eta \mathrm{~s}$ тồ $\delta \dot{\eta} \mu o v, 93$; co-operates with Themistocles in building the walls of Athens, 93; withdraws the Ionians from alliance with Sparta, 94 ; assesses the tribute, $i b$.; counsels the people to live in Athens and to assume the control of affairs, $i$. ; promoter of the seventh change in the constitution, 147
Aristides, rhetor, $\mathbf{x x v}, 20 a, 45 a, 49 a$, 147 b. Cf. Keil, Solon. Verf. 196 f
Aristogeiton, 69 f
Aristophanes, scholia to, xxviii
Aristotle and Macedonia, 59 a; Politics, xii $\mathrm{f}, \mathrm{xl}$, xliii-xlvi, Iviii, $63 . u$, $66 a$, $67 a, 76 a, 78,83 \& c$.; Politicus, xiv; $\pi \in \rho l$ קa $\sigma \lambda \in l a s$, xiv (cf. Keil, Solon.

 xiv-xxxi; style of, xlix; see 'Athenian Constitution'
assembly, public, under Dracon, 14; under Solon, 26; pay for attendance, instituted by Agyrrhius, 149; its final amount, 231. Number of meetings, 158; business at each, 159 f, 162 f
Athenaeus, xxvi
Athênê, statue of, i $70 a$; peplus of, $180 a$, $223 a$; treasurers of, 170, cf. 121
Athenian ascendancy, beginning of, 94
'Athenian Constitution', abstract of, lix -lxvii; authorship of, xxxix-liv; authorities followed in, liv (cf. Keil, Solon. Verf. $48,5 \mathrm{I}, 186,205,227,231$, and esp. 200 f); date of, xxxix ; Berlin fragments of, xxxi f; British Museum papyrus of, xxxiv-xxxix; language and style, xlvi-1; literature of, 1xviilxxv; relation to the Politics, xliiixlvi; lviii; $57 . a, 83 a$; rhythm, 1 and Addenda, 1xxvii
Atthides, writers of, lv f(cf. Keil, Solon. Verf. 200 \&c.)
Attica; men of the 'Highlands', the 'Shore', and the 'Plain', 54 u
Attic lunar year, 1576
auditors, $193 a$
Bauer, Prof. A., quoted, $56 b, 58 a, 9 \circ b$, 1 zo $b$
beasts of burden, damage done by, 118 a
Bergk quoted, xxxii f
Berlin Fragments, the, xxxif, liv

Blass, Prof. F., quoted, xxxi f, xxxviii, 1 , lxxviii, 82 b , and, in the critical notes, passim
Bouzyges, 254 frag. 10
bowmen, citizens serving as, $96 b$
Brauronia, 198 b
British Museum papyrus described, xxxivf
Busolt, Prof. G., quoted, $14 a, 15,17 b \& c$.
Callixenus, $114 a$
Cauer, F., criticised, 148 b
chiasmus, 124 b
Chios, 95 a
choregi, 204 f
chronology of rule of Peisistratus, 56 of later years of Themistocles, 101-3
Cicero's mention of the Hohıreîat, xxi
Cimon, 104 f ; accused by Pericles, 107; his liberality, 108 f
citizens, revision of the roll of, 53 ; registration of, 150
citizenship, grants of, $196 b$
Cleidemus, lv
Cleisthenes, 76-92
Cleitophon, 117 b
Clement of Alexandria, xxvi
Cleomenes, King of Sparta, 75-7
Cleon, in f
Cleophon, itizf, i3i
clerks, public, 194-6
cleruchi, 97 b
Cobet, marginal correction of Pollux viii 85, 202 b
Codrus, 6
coinage, Aeginetan and Euboic, 39
Comedy, choregi appointed for, 204
conflict of classes before Dracon and Solon, 3-5
conjectures proposed, (c. 2, 1) 4 ; (c. 3, 13) 7 ; (c. 4, 13 and 16) 16 bis; (c. 6 , 19) 22 ; (с. 8, 24) 33; (с. 8, 28) 34 ; (с. 13, 24) 53 ; (с. 26, 5) 104; (c. 28, 16) І12 $a$; (с. 35,9 f) $\mathbf{1 3 4 ~} b$; (с. $3^{8,7}$ ) 139; (c. 39, 24) 143 ; (c. 43, г5) 159 a; (с. 45, 3) 167 ; (с. 47, 14) 172; (c. 49, 24) 177 ; (c. 51,17 ) 185 ; (c. 54,32 f) 199; (c. 56, 46) 210; (с. 57, 26) 215 ; (c. 63,3 ) 233 l. 3 ; (c. 63, 8) 234 ; (col. 31, 1f) 237 ; ( $\mathrm{col} .31,27$ ) 239; (col. 32, 9) 240 ; (col. 32, 15, 16, 19) 24 I. Schol. on Aeschin. F. L. 150 corrected, i3 $1 b$.
 rected, $216 a$; mistake in Photius, s.v. $\pi a ́ p a \lambda o l$, accounted for, $230 a$
Council of 401 under Dracon, 16; 400 under Solon, 33. Council of 500, instituted by Cleisthenes, $79 a$; appointed by lot, $157 a, 231 a$; functions of, 168 f ; their right of imprisoning, 166 $b, 175 b$; salary of, $23 \mathrm{r} b$; scrutiny on appointment to, $168 a$; transfer of some
of their duties to the Assembly $148 b$, or the law-courts, 180 b
crown of archon basileus, 216 a
Crusius, Prof. O., quoted, $9 b, 44 a$, ino a, 149 a
Curtius, Prof. E., quoted, $9 b, 10,54 a, \& c$. Cylon, 1 - 3
Cypselidae in Ambracia, 67 a
Damasias II, 50 f
Damonides, 109
Dareste, M. R., quoted, 46 a
Deceleia, I3I a
Delos, festival at, 198, 199 b; amphictyones, $232 a$; choregiand architheoros, 2056
Delphi, temple at, $74 a$
Delphinium, court in precincts of, $213 a$ demagogues, ini
demes, names of, 82 : number and distribution of, 80
Demetrius Phalereus, xlii
Dicaearchus, xxi, xliii
dicasts, $6000,96 \mathrm{~b}$; number of, 190 b , $235 a$; pay, $241 b$; procedure for their allotment to the several law-courts, 233 f ; votes of, 246
Didymus, xxi f (cf. Keil, Solon. Verf. 59 f)
Diels, Prof. H., xxxiii, 3, 5 I 6
diobelia, $112 b$ (cf. Keil, Solon. Verf. 223)

Diogenes Laertius, xxy
Dionysia, 20I $a, 204 b, 206 a$
'district-judges', $63 b$
dowry, restitution of, $187 a$
Dracon, constitution before, 6-12; constitution of, 12 - 18 (defended by Keil, Solon. Verf. 96-98, 202); laws of, $12 b, 23 b$

Edinburgh Review, 1891, p.478 f, quoted, $18 b, 13^{8} b$
Eetioneia, $138 a$
Eleusinia, 199 a
Eleusis, 14 If
Eleven, the, $996,185 \mathrm{f}$
ephebi, $150-155$
ephetae, 214 ; cf. Keil, Solon. Verf. 106 ff, 108
Ephialtes, 99-104; cf. Keil, Solon. Verf. 120, 213
Epimenides, 3
Erechtheus, 250, 1. 3
Eretria, Knights of, aid Peisistratus, 59 b; battle of, 4 II B.c., 128 b.
Etymologicum Magnum, xxvii
Euboea, revolt of, 4 II B.C., 128
Eucken, Prof. R., quoted, xlviii f, 3, 43 a, $76 a$, $145 a$
Euripides, scholia on, xxvii; 253 frag. 4
Eustathius, xxviii

Festivals, of Asclepius, 206; Brauronia, 198; Delian, 198, 205; Dionysia, 204; Heracleia, 198; Lenaea, 210 b; Panathenaea 223; Thargelia 204 f, 207
Five Thousand, the, $120,126,127,128$
fortresses of Attica, $123 a, 155 a$
Forty, the, 1886
Foucart, M., quoted, $97 a$
Four Hundred, the, II5-128
Fragments, index of, 256
Gellius, xxv
generals, 85 ; election and duties of, 225 ; at Arginusae, 129 f
gennetae, 252 (cf. Keil, Solon. Verf. 64 f)
Gilbert, G., $7 b, 225 b$, and passim
Giles, Mr P., quoted, 8 I $b$
Girard, M. P., I $_{51} b$, $154 b$
Gomperz, Prof., quoted, xlvii, $5 a, 14 a$, $58 a$
Goodwin, Prof. W. W., $164 a, 222 b$
Grote, quoted, $26 b, 35 b, 36 b, 37 b, 42 a$, $56 a, 59 a, 63 b, 79 b, 8 \mathrm{I} a, 85,127 b$, 128 $a$, г 3 I $a, 135 b$, г $64 b$; supported by text, $90 \quad b, 117 a$
guards, on the acropolis, $97 a$; over the dockyards, $i b$.
guardships, $98 b$
Hager, Dr H., II 8 b \&c.
Harmodius, $67-7 \mathrm{I}$; commemoration of, 217
Harpocration, xxvi
Hartel, Prof. von, quoted, i6I $b$
Haussoullier, M. B., quoted, $174 b, 237 \mathrm{f}$
Head, Mr B. V., quoted, $38 b, 39 b, 40$
Headlam, Mr J. W., quoted, l, 13 -18, $15^{2} a, 156 b, 157 b, 214 a, 231 a, 23^{2} b$
Hegesistratus, $66 b, 67 b$
heliaea, $215 b$
Heracleia, $199 a$
Heracleides of Clazomenae, 1496
Heracleides Lembos, xxi, 250
Hermippus, xvi f
Herodotus, liv, $57 b$; (v 66, 69) $7^{8} a$; (v 69) $79 b$; (v 71) I $b$ (cf. Keil, Solon. Verf. 96, 117)
Hesychius, xxvii
hiatus, 1 , lii (cf. Keil, Solon. Verf. 195)
Hicks, Mr R. D., 178 (n. c.)
Hipparchus, 68
" son of Charmus, $85 b$
holidays, Athenian, $158 b$
Homer, scholia on, xxviii; Solon's reminiscence of, $48 a$
homicide, law of, $23 b$; the Areopagus and its cognisance of, $100 b$, $142 b$; trials for, 212-6
hoplites (2500), $98 a$
horses and horsemen, $\delta 0 \kappa \iota \mu a \sigma l a$ of, 177 f
houses, purchase-money of, 173 ; windows of, 183
Hultsch, quoted, $38 b$

Ion, I $_{4} 6 b, 250$ 1. $2,25 \mathrm{Ifrag} . \mathrm{I}$
Ionisms in Solon's verses, $46 b, 47 b$; in Cleidemus, $58 a$
Isocrates, li, $12 a, 30 a, 93 a$; (cf. Keil, Solon. Verf. 78 ff, 89 ff)

Jackson, Dr H., quoted, $185 a$, and in critical notes 22, $41,44 \&<$.
Jebb, Prof. R. C., quoted, 42 b, 44 , $166 a$

Keil, Prof. Bruno, quoted, 1xxiv, 1xxvii
Kenyon, Mr F. G., quoted, xxxiv f, $4 a$, $1_{4} b, 25 b, 47 b, 74 a, 78,86 b, 102$, $110 a, 120 b, 122,134 a, 139 a, 146 b$, 191 $a$, $193 b$, and in the critical notes passim
Knights (1200), 96 b; (1000) 1 $33 b$; under the Thirty, 142. Of Eretria, 59 b
Köhler, Prof. U., quoted, lxxiv, 39 a
Larmor, Mr J., quoted, $245^{b}$
law-courts, allotment of, 221 b, 233 f ; Gk. Index, s. ข. סккабтípıa, "Apetos $\pi \alpha ́ \gamma o s, ~(\epsilon \in \pi i) \Delta \epsilon \lambda \phi \iota \nu l \varphi$ and $\Pi a \lambda \lambda a \delta l \varphi$, ( $\epsilon \nu$ ) Фреа́тov
law-suits, see Gk. Index, s. v. रpaфal, and $\delta$ ika
leases of mines, 171 f ; of sacred enclosures, 173 f ; property of minors, $209 b$
Leeuwen, Prof. van, quoted, xxxvi f, and in critical notes passim
Leipsydrium, $72 b$
Lemnos, $\imath^{2} \pi$ rapxos sent to, $229 a$
Leocorium, 70 a
Lesbos, 95 a
Liddell and Scott's Lexicon, 183 a
Lipsius, Prof. J. H., quoted, $150 b$, I $58 a$, 189a, 195 b, $219 b \& c$.
lot, appointment by, $16 a, 29 \mathrm{f}, 87,230 b$, $23^{6} b$; Council appointed by, $157 a$, ${ }^{2} 30$ a. See also Gk. Index, s. v. к $\lambda \eta \rho \hat{\omega}$ and $\lambda a \gamma \chi a \dot{a} \nu \omega$
Lycurgus, administration of, iyo $b$, 200 ab
Lygdamis, 59 f
Macan, Mr R., quoted, lviii, lxvi, 30 b, $37{ }^{a}$
Mahaffy, Dr J. P., quoted, xy, $89 b$
maladministration, fines for, $194 b$
Marmor Parium, 50 b \&c.
Maroneia, mines at, $89 b$
Mayor, Rev. Prof. John E. B., quoted, $4 a, 55 a, 58 a, 154 b, 182$ ( $n . c$. ) \&c.
Mayor, Rev. Jos. B., quoted, xlvii ( $n$.), 21 (n. c.), 67 (n.c.), 145 (n. c.) \&c.
Megacles, son of Hippocrates, 876
Megarian war, 54
Meyer, P., quoted, 14 a
military discipline, $228 a$; period of military service, $19 \mathrm{I} a$
mines, $89 \mathrm{f}, 17 \mathrm{If}$
Müller, Carl, xxix
Munichia, 72, 226a
naucrari, $3^{2} b, 8 \mathrm{I}$ b; cf. Keil, Sol. Verf. p. 93 ff
neutrals, Solon's law against, 34
Newman, Mr W. L., quoted, xlv, lvi, 13 $a, 20 b, 34 b, 71 \quad b, 83 a, 85 b, 95 b$, $96 a, 103 b, 114 b, 167 a, 200 a$
Nicias, 114
Nicodemus, or Nicomedes, 89 a
Niké, figures of, 170
officials, home and foreign, 97 ; appointed by lot, members of Council, 157, 23 I $a$; other officials so appointed, 170-5, 18 I -201, cf. Gk. Index, s. v. $\kappa \lambda \eta \rho \omega$. Military officials, 225 f ; elected by show of hands, 155 f ; time of electing, 165 b. Scrutiny of, $202 a$
oil from the sacred olive-trees, 223 f
Oncken, Prof. W., quoted, xxx
opisthodomos, 163 a
orthography; see critical notes on á $\in l$ 2of;



Ostracism, $84-92$; i60 $a$; archeological evidence on, $88 a b$

Palladium, court in precincts of, $213 a$
Pallene, $60 a$
Panathenaea, $7 \mathrm{I} a, 157 a, 198 a, 222 \mathrm{f}$
Panathenaic vases, $223 b$
papyrus, xxxvii
Paralos, 229 b (cf. Keil, Solon. Verf. 149)
Paton, Mr W. R., quoted, 15 ( $n$.c.), 83
Patrizzi, xxix
Patrocleides, decree of, $214 b$
paupers, relief of, $18{ }^{1}$ ( cf . Keil, Solon. Verf. 75)
Peiraens, demarch of, 200 b ; generals set over, $226 b$; party of, $140-5$
Peisander, 127
Peisistratus, chronology of, 56 (cf. Köhler, on p. lxxii, and Keil, Solon. Verf. 51); in Macedonia, 58
Pericles, 106-1II; law of citizenship carried by, 106 $b$; his accusation of Cimon, 107 ; his successors, III
petitions, 16I $a$
Phanodemus, lv
Pheidon, $37{ }^{6}$
Philochorus, xix, lvi; on ostracism, $84 a$
Philon's $\sigma \kappa \epsilon v ⿺ 辶 \dot{\eta} \kappa \eta, 168 b, 180 \quad b$
Philostephanus of Cyrene, xx
Phormisius, a leader of the moderate party 404 B.C., $132 b$
Photius, xxvii; s. v. $\dot{\eta} \gamma \epsilon \mu o v i \alpha$ סıкабт $\quad$ ррlov corrected, $216 a$; mistake, s. v. $\pi$ d́ $\rho a \lambda o c$, accounted for, $230 a$
'Phreatto', 2 I3 $b$

Phyle, 137
plans of buildings removed from cognisance of the Council, $80 a$
Plato's Republic, Politicus and Lawes, x, xi ; Rep. 558 B, xliv $n$; Gorgias 515 E , r1o; cf. Keil, Solon. Verf. 158, 2 I8f; scholia on, xxviii
Pliny the Elder, xxiii
Plutarch and the חo入ıreial, xxiii $\mathrm{f}, \mathrm{r} 9 a$; Theseus, 147 a, 251 frag. 2 ; Solon, xxiii $f, \mathrm{r}-3,21,24 \mathrm{f}, 33-37,4 \mathrm{r}-4^{8}$ (cf. Keil, Solon. Verf. 40, 45, 55, 164, 173, 175, \&c.) ; Themistocles, 102 ; Cimon, $104 \mathrm{f}, 107 \mathrm{f}$; Pericles, $106-9$; Nicias, $2,1_{4} b$
Polemon, $27 b$
Pollux, xxv $\mathrm{f}, 28,176 \mathrm{a}, \& \mathrm{c}$., and in the Testimonia, passim (cf. Keil, Solon. Verf. 64); corected by Cobet, $202 b$
Poole, Mr R. S., quoted, 39 a
Poste, Mr E., quoted, $14 b, 21 a, 97 b$, $115 a, 123 b, 142 a$
Postgate, Dr, 20 (n. c.)
proedri, 163
proxenos, grants of title of, 196 a
prytaneum, court in precincts of, 216 b
prytanies, duration of, $157 b$
Pythocleides, 255 frag. 13
Pythodorus, archon $432 / \mathrm{r}$, 108 $a$; arcbon $404 / 3,1 \mathrm{r} 6 b, 133 b$
quadriremes, 169 a
Quarterly Review, Apr. 1891, quoted, $103 a$

Reinach, Th., $13 b, \mathrm{r}_{43} b \& \mathrm{c}$.
Richards, Mr H., quoted, xlvii $f$, 19 , $6 \mathrm{r} b$, and in critical notes passim
Ridgeway, Prof., $40 b$
Robertson Smith, Prof., xxxi
Rose, V., xxx, 74 a \&c.
rotation in office, $16 \mathrm{f}, 125 b$
Riuhl, F. xxi ( $n$ ), lxxiii, 147 b \&c.
sacrifices, commissioners of, $197 a$
Salaminia, 230 ab
Salamis, battle of, 92 ; archon in, $200 b$
salaries, 230 f
Samos, $95 a, 232 a$
'Sandwich marble', $232 a$
scholia, quotations from $\pi o \lambda \iota \tau \in \hat{\imath} a \iota ~ i n, ~$ xxviii
Schöll, quoted, $219 b$
Schömann, quoted, $133 a, 148 a, 164 b \& c$.
Schvarcz, criticised, xlii f
scolia, 73, 77
seal of Athens, $16_{3} b$
Selden, xxix
Shute, Mr R., quoted, xl, liif
Simonides, $68 a$
slaves, damage done by, $187 b$
Solon, liv, $18-48$; date of his archonship, $49 \mathrm{f}, 55 \mathrm{a}$; legislation of, 23 ;
obscurities in his laws, $36 b, 134 b$; law against neutrality, 34; limited power of testation granted by, $135 a$; verses of, 19-21; 44-48; democratic tendency of his reforms, 34 ; reform of coins, weights and measures, 37 (cf. Keil, Solon. Verf. 70 f, 163-172); withdraws to Egypt, 4 I ; opposes Peisistratus, 55 ; ashes of, 254 frag. 11 ;
 l. c. 58 ); ४ $\rho \circ\llcorner 45 \mathrm{f} ; \sigma \epsilon \iota \sigma \dot{\alpha} \chi \theta \in \angle \alpha 2 \mathrm{I}, 37 b$ Solon and Peisistratus, 55, 66
Sophocles, his $\sigma \tau \rho a \tau \eta \gamma$ la, 166 a; scholium on O. C. 7or, 223 .
Strabo and the $\Pi$ о $\lambda \iota \tau \in \hat{\varepsilon} \alpha c$, xxii
symmories, generals set over the, $226 a$
taxes, Athenian, 95 f
Ten, the, appointed to succeed the Thirty, ${ }^{1} 39 b$; their atrocities, $i b$. ; superseded by another body of Ten, 140; excluded from the amnesty, $143 a$; allowed to settle at Eleusis, ib. For other bodies of Ten, see Gk. Index, s. v. $\delta \in \kappa \kappa \alpha$
Themistocles, brings about building of triremes, 90 f ; date of his archonship, 90 ; co-operates with Aristides in building walls of Athens, $93 \bar{b}$; accused of Medism, 102; helps Ephialtes to overthrow the Areopagus (B.c. 462), roif
theoricon, $\mathrm{rr} 3 \mathrm{f}, \mathrm{r} 56 a, \mathrm{r} 7 \mathrm{I} b$
Theramenes, leader of aristocratical party, 114; character of, II5. A leader of the 400,127 ; joins in subverting them, 128 . Leader of moderate party after Aegospotami, r33; opposes extreme measures of the Thirty, 136 ; put to death, 137. Cf. lxiii $n$
Theseum, 61 $a, 230 b$
Theseus, $147 a, 251$ frag. 2, 253 frag. 4
thesmothetae, 218 f ; clerk to, 201
Thettalus, $66 b, 68 b$
Thirlwall justified, $59 a, 63 b$
Thirty, the, established by Lysander, r33; their rule,. $133-6$; defeated at Munichia and expelled from power, 139 ; excluded from amnesty, allowed to settle at Eleusis, 143
Thompson, Mr E. S., quoted, $13 b, 75 b$
Thompson, Dr W. H., quoted, $25 a$
Thrasybulus, occupies Pbyle and defeats forces sent by the Thirty, 137 ; decree proposed by T. attacked by Archinus, 144
Three Thousand, privileged body under the Thirty, 137 a
Thucydides (i 126), $2 a$; on Harmodius, liv, 69-7r; (viii 67) 117f, $125 a$
Thucydides (son of Melesias), leader of aristocratical party, III
Timaeus, xx
torch-races, 2 II $a$

Torr, Mr Cecil, xxxix, $169 a, 185 b$
treasurers, lxxvii, 121, 170; treasurer of the Council, $18 \mathrm{I} ~ b$
treaties, $196 a$
tribes, four in early times, $31 b$; ten
instituted by Cleisthenes, $83 b$
triremes, building of, $90 \mathrm{f}, 169$ a
'tyranny', law against, 65
Tyrrell, Prof. R, Y., quoted, $22 b, 103 a$
Tzetzes, xxvii
verbs, compound followed by simple, $194 a$
votes of dicasts, 246; reckoning-board for, $248 b$

Walker, Mr E. M., quoted, Io5 a
'war-king', 7
water-clock, 244 f
weights and measures, $184 a$

Weil, Prof. H., quoted, 14 n. c., 69 a
Wilamowitz, von, quoted, $97 \mathrm{f}, 195 a$, $218 a$, and in critical notes passim
wills, 135 a
Wright, Prof. J. H., xix f, xxiv, 1vii, 1x
Wyse, Prof. W., quoted, $33 b, 62 b, 66 b$, $85 a, 91 \quad b, 97 a, 99 a$, 103 $b, 119 b$, 126, $190 a$, $199 b$ \& c.; also in critical notes passim

Xanthippus, son of Ariphron, ostracised, $88 b$; his dog, 254 frag. 12
Xenophon and the ' $A \theta$. $\pi 0 \lambda ., \mathrm{lv}$; his political writings, ix, x; Pseudo-Xenophon, 'A日. то入., ix (cf. Keil, Solon. Verf. 215)
year, lunar, 158 a
Zenobius, xxv; (vi 29) criticised, $113 b$

Euripides.-Bacchæ. With Critical and Explanatory Notes, and with numerous Illustrations from Works of Ancient Art. 1880, Third Edition, 1892, pp. clv +275 , crown 8vo, gilt top, $12 s .6 d$.*

Isocrates.-Ad Demonicum et Panegyricus, pp. xliv +I 69 , 1868, Second Edition, 1872, crown 8vo, 4 s. 6d. Rivingtons (now Longmans), London.

Demosthenes.—Select Private Orations. With Introductions and English Notes.
Part II.-Containing Pro Phormione, Contra Stephanum I, II, Nicostratum, Cononem, Calliclem. 1875, New Edition, 1886, pp. lxxii +27 I , crown $8 \mathrm{vo}, 7 s .6 d$.*

Demosthenes.-Speech against the Law of Leptines. With Introduction, Critical and Explanatory Notes, and Autotype Facsimile from the Paris MS. 1890, pp. xlviii + 122, demy 8vo, gs.*

Cicero.-Ad M. Brutum Orator. A Revised Text. With Introductory Essays and Critical and Explanatory Notes, 1885, pp. xcix +258 , demy $8 \mathrm{vo}, 16$ s.* $^{*}$

Aristotle.-The Rhetoric. With a Commentary by the late E. M. Cope, Fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge, revised and edited (with Indices) by J. E. Sandys. With a biographical Memoir by the late H. A. J. Munro, 1877. 3 Vols, pp. xx+913, demy 8vo, $21 s$.*

Dictionary of Classical Mythology, Religion, Literature, Art, and Antiquities. Revised and Edited from the German of Dr Oskar Seyffert, by Professor Nettleship and Dr Sandys. With about 500 illustrations. Second Edition, 1891, with new and full Indexes of Contents and Illustrations; pp. 706, double columns, crown 4 to, 21s. Swan Sonnenschein and Co., London (Macmillan and Co., New York).

An Easter Vacation in Greece, with lists of books on Greek Travel and Topography, and Time-tables of Greek Steamers and Railways, by J. E. Sandys, 1887, pp. 171, crown 8vo, 3s. 6d. Macmillan and Co., London and New York.
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[^0]:    I Cf. Henkel, Studien zur Geschichte der Griechischen Lehre vom Staat, esp. pp. 1-17, die politischen Schriften der Philosophen.
    ${ }_{2}$ W. Helbig, Rhein. Mus., xvi ${ }_{51}$ Iff.
    ${ }^{3}$ e.g. by Boeckh, Public Economy of

[^1]:    Athens, III v, vol. i p. 390 Fränkel.
    ${ }^{4}$ Jebb, Primer of Gk. Lit., p. 114 .
    ${ }^{5}$ Col. Mure's Literature of Greece, v 422-5. See also A. Kirchhoff, in the Abhandlungen of the Berlin Academy for 1874 .

[^2]:    1 Introduction to Holden's ed.
    ${ }^{2}$ Jowett, Introd. to the Republic, p. 3.
    ${ }^{3}$ P. 544, compared with IV ult.

[^3]:    ${ }^{1}$ See esp. K. F. Hermann, De vestigiis institutorum veterum, imprimis Atticorum, per Platonis de Legibus libros indagandis, 1836 .
    ${ }^{2}$ Politicus, pp. 291, 302.

[^4]:    ${ }^{1}$ Mr W. L. Newman's Politics, vol. i p. 15 .
    ${ }^{2}$ ib. p. 89.
    ${ }^{3}$ Ueber die Pol. des Ar., pp. 44 ff.

[^5]:    ${ }^{1}$ In the present work, whenever the books of the Politics are specified, the number in the new order is given first, followed (in parenthesis) by that of the old order. As a general rule, however, the references are solely to the pages and

[^6]:    lines of the Berlin ed.-Among the most recent discussions of the order of the books may be mentioned Shute's History of the Aristotelian Writings, pp. 164${ }_{17}{ }^{6}$; and Newman's Politics, vol. i 292, vol. ii pp. xxi-xxiv.

[^7]:    I De Fin. v 4, it, 'cpmque uterque eorum (Aristoteles et Theophrastus) docuisset, qualem in republica principem esse conveniret'-; ad Quintum fratrem, iii 5, 1, 'Aristotelem, quae de republica et praestante viro scriljat, ipsum loqui.' Cf. Bernays, die Dialoge des Ar. pp. 53, 153.

    Cf. Bernays, l. c., pp. 53, 154 ; published by Lippert (189I) from an Arabic translation.

[^8]:    3 Bernays, l. c., pp. $56,156$.
    ${ }^{4}$ Rose, Aristotelis qui ferebantur librorum fragmenta, (Teubner) 1886, frag. 612-614.
    ${ }^{5} \mathrm{i} . \mathrm{V}$. frag. 604-61o. Diels (Berlin Academy, 30 July, 1891) suggests that pap. ix p. 29 of the Flinders Petrie papyri is an excerpt from the $\nu \delta \mu \mu \mu \alpha$ $\beta$ ар $\beta \alpha \rho \iota к \alpha$.
    ${ }^{6}$ Rose, Aristoteles Pseudepigraphus, p. 395 ; Fragmenta, 381-603, ed. 886.

[^9]:    ${ }^{1}$ Mahaffy's Hist. of Classical Gk. Literature, ii 414.

[^10]:    1 Porphyry, life of Plotinues, c. 24, p. II7 Didot.

    Plut. Sulla, 26; cf. Grote's Aristotle, i pp. 50-54, and Shute's History of the Aristotelian Writings, p. 29-39.
    ${ }^{3}$ Rose, Ar. Pseud., p. 8; Frag. (1886) p. I.
     $\pi \epsilon \rho \tau \pi d \tau \omega \nu$ тoîs $\mu \epsilon \nu \nu \dot{d} \lambda \lambda a l$ тoîs $\mu \epsilon \tau d$ d $\theta \epsilon$.
    
    
    ${ }_{5}$ Aristotle, p. 55 .

[^11]:    ${ }^{1}$ Mr W. L. Newman's ed. of Ar. Pol. vol. i p. vi.
    ${ }^{2}$ Porphyry, ref. on p. xvi, note I .
    3 Zeller, II ii, 51 f.
    ${ }^{4}$ Grote's Ar. i 40.
    5 First published by Ménage on Diog. vol. ii 20 I . The same list was found by

[^12]:    Rose in two mss in the Ambrosian library at Milan (A. P. p. 709). All the lists are given by Rose in the Berlin Ar., vol. v $1463-1473$, and in the Teubner text of the Fragmexta, pp. 322.
    ${ }^{6}$ Rose, Frag. pp. 8, 16, $21^{3}$.

[^13]:    1 Vita Ar．vulg．，Rose，Frag．p． $258{ }^{3}$.
    ${ }^{2}$ A division of the ro入ıreîal into genuine and spurious seems to be im－

[^14]:    ${ }^{2}$ Polyb. Excerpita libri xii 5-8, and 11; Rose, Frag. 547 ${ }^{3}$; cf. Heitz, Verl. Schr. p. 243, and Shute, l. c., p. 39.

[^15]:    ${ }^{1}$ Rose, A. P., pp. 4ro, 534; Susemihl, Gr. Litt. in der Alexandrinerzeit, i 476 .
    ${ }^{2}$ Heracleides Lembos, probably born at Kallatis in Pontus, was the author of an extensive compilation called 'I $\sigma$ roplat. He flourished under Ptolemy vi, Philometor (181-146). Cf. Susemihl, u. s., i 503-5. (Rühl even supposes that he was the editor of the ' $A \theta$. $\pi 0 \lambda$. in its present form.)

    The author of the excerpts is, however, regarded by Rose (in his $A$. P., p. 532) as far later in date, and as having borrowed his excerpts from Didymus (who was born B.c. ${ }^{63}$ ). But the part played by Didymus in transmitting the knowledge of the Полıreial to a later time has been much exaggerated, and the form in which the excerpts from Heracleides have reached us is hardly worthy of the industrious and intelligent

[^16]:    ${ }^{1}$ Heitz, Verl. Schr., p. 244.
    2 Rose, A. P., p. 400 ; Heitz, Verl. Schr. p. 244, and Ar. Frag. p. 219.
    ${ }^{3}$ Rose, A. P., p. 52 I .
    ${ }^{4}$ Rose, Frag. 531 ${ }^{3}$; A. P. p. 487; Heitz, Verl. Schr. p. 245 .
    ${ }^{5}$ Rose, Frag. $609^{3}$.

[^17]:    ${ }^{1}$ Heitz，Verl．Schr．p．${ }^{244}$ ．
    ${ }^{2}$ e．g．through Philostephanus of Cy － rene．
    ${ }^{3}$ cc．1，5，6，28， 3 ；Rose，Frag ${ }^{3}$ ． 533－538．
    ${ }^{4}$ c． 9 ； Frag $^{3}$ ． 539.
    ${ }^{5}$ сс．26，28；Frag．${ }^{3}$ ． 577 －8．
    ${ }^{6}$ Frag＇．$^{3}$ 559，592，507， 597.
    ${ }^{7}$ Camill．22，and De Cohibenda Ira
    11；Frag ${ }^{3}$ ．610， 608.
    ${ }^{8}$ c． 25 （Frag．384）．
    ${ }^{9}$ c． 25 （Frag． $390=$＇A $\theta$ ．$\pi 0$ 人 ．c． 7 § I， $\kappa u ́ \rho \beta \epsilon \epsilon s)$ ．
    ${ }^{10}$ c． 10 （Frag．398）．
    ${ }^{11}$ c． 10 （Frag．402）．
    ${ }^{12}$ c．9， 10 （Frag．403，405）．
    ${ }^{13}$ c． 2 （Frag． 407 ）．
    ${ }^{14}$ Solon，c． 20 （Frag．391），c． 25 （Frag． $4^{16)}$ ．

[^18]:    ${ }_{1}$ Prof. J. H. Wright, The Date of Cylon, p. 25, observes: 'Most of Plutarch's statements on the affair of Cylon are traceable to Aristotle's Respub. Ath. A comparison of Plutarch's account of pre-Solonian affairs with that of Aristotle shows, however, first, that this dependance is not immediate, and, secondly, that there is much admixture of foreign matter'...In the note he refers to $3^{8}$ passages in Plutarch's Solon which bear resemblance to passages in Aristot. Resputb. Ath., and are evidently traceable to the latter work. Only once, however, is Aristotle here named (Sol. 25 ad init.) 'A minute comparison of the wording of these parallel passages, and a consideration of the order in which they occur in the two writers, as also of extraneous matter inserted and of important and illuminating facts omitted, show that Plutarch was certainly not intimately acquainted with the Respub. Ath. The resemblances, the dissimilarities, and the discrepancies alike are intelligible only on the supposition that Plutarch was transcribing from some work in which

[^19]:    
    
    
    
    
    
    
    
     $\mu \varepsilon \lambda \eta \tau \delta \nu \dot{\epsilon} \sigma \tau \iota \nu$.
    ${ }^{1}$ Cf. Aristides ii 360, 36r Dind., with 'A $\begin{gathered}\text {. } \pi 0 \text {. } .5 § 2, ~ \\ 5\end{gathered}$ 535-538 with 'A $\theta$. $\pi$ o A. c. 12; and lastly
    
    

[^20]:    
     with 'A $\theta$. $\pi 0 \lambda . c .14$ § 2.
    ${ }^{2}$ Diog. Laert. i $\$ 845,50,58$.
    ${ }^{3}$ Even before the discovery of the 'A $\theta$. mod. this fact had been partially ascertained by comparing the language of Pollux with that quoted from the 'A $\theta$. $\pi 0 \lambda$. in the lexicographers. Cf. Stojentin, De Julii Pollucis in publicis Atheniensium antiquitatibus enarrandis auctoritate, (Breslau) 1875; and Stoewer, in quibus nitantur auctoribus Iulii Pollucis rerum iudicialium enarrationes, (Münster) 1888.

[^21]:    ${ }^{1}$ Pollux viii 62，$\pi$ apóßo入oy（Frag．${ }^{3} \quad{ }^{x}$ Rose，A：P．，p．471，Frag． $499^{3}$.
    

[^22]:    ${ }^{1}$ Phot. Bibl. Cod. 161, p. $104{ }^{b}$ 38, quoted by Rose, A. P. p. 40 , Frag. ${ }^{9}$ p. $25^{8 .}$
    ${ }^{2}$ Frag. ${ }^{3}$ 496, 541, 593, 554.

[^23]:    ${ }_{1}$ Rose，A．P．，p．423，no．359；Frag． $404{ }^{3}$ ；
    ＇A0．то入． 7 § 1 （＊Av．1354）； 15 § 3 （＊Ach．234）； 19 § $3\left({ }^{*}\right.$ Lys． $66_{5}$ ），§ 4 （Lys． 1153 ），§ 6 （Vesp．502）； 21 § 5 （Nub．37）；с． $28 \S 3$ ？（Vesp．684）； $34 \S$ г （Ran．1532），\＆ 3 （Vesp．157）； 34 ult． （Vesp．157）； $54 \AA_{2}$（Vesp．691）；col．32， 8－15（＊Plut．278）；col．36，3－9（Eg．

[^24]:    1150）．In four of these places（marked with an asterisk）the title is given in full： ＇Ap．$\epsilon \nu$＇A 0. то入．；in two（Vesp．157，684）
    
    ${ }^{3}$ In the Schol．on Theocr．iv 7 we are told that the Olympic crown ék tins
    
    
    

[^25]:    likely to have been derived from the $\theta a u-$
     of Elis.

    1 'А $\theta . \pi 0 \lambda .28$ § 3,57 § 3,59 §§ $\mathrm{r}, 2$.
    ${ }^{2}$ Hallam, Lit. of Europe, ii 6; ed.

[^26]:    1854; Heitz, Verl. Schr., p. I.
    ${ }_{3}$ Note on Diog. Laert. p. 76, ed. 1615.
    ${ }^{4}$ De jure naturali \&c., Opera I i $74-5$.
    ${ }^{5}$ Hist. Rom. i 20, p. 12 of 3 rd Eng. ed.

[^27]:    ${ }^{1}$ E. Miller, Melanges de littérature grecque, Paris, 1868; p. 369.
    ${ }^{2}$ A. P., p. 402.
    ${ }^{8}$ Die Staatslehre des Aristoteles in Historisch-Politischen Umrissen, vol. ii (1875), pp. $\mathbf{4 r o}^{\text {ro }} 528$.

[^28]:    ${ }^{1}$ According to Pliny (N. H. xiii § $7^{8}$ ) the two best kinds of papyrus were thirteen digits in height ( $13 \times \cdot 72821=$ ro 4653 inches), rather less tall than rolls I-III, but rather taller than IV.
    ${ }^{2} \mathrm{Mr}$ Kenyon's Introduction, p. xi. The proposal to identify hands (I) and (4), and hands (2) and (3), made by Kaibel and Wilamowitz on pp. v-vi of

[^29]:    their preface, is refuted by Mr Kenyon
    (ed. 3 p. xii) whose opinion is justly confirmed by Blass (Praef. iv-vii).
    ${ }^{3} \mathrm{Mr}$ Kenyon has already given a general list on the last page of his Introd. I
    have endeavoured to classify this list, and ral list on the last page of his Introd. I
    have endeavoured to classify this list, and to represent approximately the shapes of the letters used in the papyrus.

[^30]:    ${ }^{1}$ For the details of these statistics, see van Leeuwen's Observationes Palaeographicae in the Dutch edition, pp. 170-7.
    ${ }^{2}$ See the alphabets reproduced in Class. Rev. v 183.
    ${ }^{3}$ The use of the above abhreviations, and their distribution over the several hands, may be illustrated by the following examples. For convenience, ordinary type is here used, and the words are separated from one another.

    Ablreviations in (I), also found in (4): - $\sigma^{\prime} \in \beta \eta$ (col. 1,3 ) ; $\pi^{\top} \chi \omega \rho \eta \sigma a \nu \dot{\tau}(\mathrm{I}, 20) ; \tau \alpha$
    
    

[^31]:    1 Praef. p. ix.
    ${ }^{2}$ Blass, Praef. pp. viii-xi.
    8 Martial xy 209, 'Levis ab aequorea cortex Mareotica concha Fiat : inoffensa

[^32]:    currit harundo via.' Cf. Bliumner's Technologie, i 308-325.
    ${ }^{4}$ U. Wilcken, Hermes 1887 , p. 487 492, Recto oder Verso.

[^33]:    ${ }^{1}$ そrous èvdeкátov à̉токрàтороs Kaloapos
    
    
     olov $\chi \in \epsilon \rho \zeta \zeta \rho \mu \epsilon \nu \omega \nu$ (in the original there are no accents).
    ${ }^{2}$ Printed in the Dutch ed. of the ' $A \theta$. тo入., pp. $180-185$; and in Mr Kenyon's 3rd ed., pp. 215-219.

[^34]:    ${ }^{3}$ Mr Kenyon's Introd. to ed. 3, p. xvi.
    ${ }^{4}$ Mr Cecil Torr in Athenaeum, Feb. 7 , r89r; Bruno Keil, Berl. Phil. Woch. 189r, p. 614 ; J. H. Lipsius, Verhandlungen der Sächs. Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften, 28 Feb. 189r, p. 45. See note on 46 § .
    ${ }^{5}$ Bruno Keil, u. s. p. 6 r 3.

[^35]:    ${ }^{1}$ Shute's History of the Aristotelian Writings, pp. 164-170.

[^36]:    ${ }^{1} A r . u n d$ die＇ $\mathrm{A} \theta . \pi \mathrm{r} \boldsymbol{\lambda} ., \mathrm{pp} . c, d$.

[^37]:    ${ }^{1}$ For the reff. as to all these points, see Index to Jowett's Politics s. v. Aristocracy and Democracy.
    ${ }^{2}$ Caner, Hat Ar. die Schrift vom Staate der Athener geschrieben? p. 49.
    ${ }^{3}$ p. $55^{8} \mathrm{~B}$ (of the 'forgiving spirit' of democracy), $\dot{\eta} \sigma v \gamma \gamma \nu \dot{\omega} \mu \eta$ каl ov̀ $\delta^{\prime} \delta \pi \omega \sigma-$ тьồ $\sigma \mu \iota \kappa \circ \lambda o \gamma i a$ aúr $\hat{s}$ s. The term

[^38]:    $\pi \rho q 6 \pi \eta s$ happens to be used just before, but it is there applied to the 'calmness' with which condemned criminals go about the world like heroes under a democratical government:- $\dot{\eta}$ тpqárvs
    
    ${ }^{4}$ Pol. 1305 a 23 .

[^39]:    ${ }_{2}^{1}$ Pol. 1315 ${ }^{b} 21$, 31.
    ${ }^{3}$ Ibid.
    ${ }^{2} \mathrm{Mr}$ Newman in Class. Rev. v 162 b .

[^40]:    ${ }^{1}$ 7. H. S. 1891, p. 21.

[^41]:    1 Gomperz, Anzeiger der phil.-hist. Classe, Wien, 1891, no. xi.
    ${ }^{2}$ Class. Rev, v 273.
    ${ }^{3}$ The decree of Stratocles preserved in [Plut.] $85^{2} \mathrm{~B}$; and another inscr. relating to Lycurgus in CIA ii $162 \subset 7$ and 9 (cf. Class. Rev. vi 255 a).

[^42]:    ${ }^{4}$ Besides the inscr. of B.c. $325 / 4$ quoted on 56,20 , we have one of $330 / 29$ in which the word occurs twice:-cf. Boeckh's Seeurkunden, p. 393.
    ${ }^{5}$ v 123 (J. B. Mayor), 184 and 272 (H. Richards); 'rare words', ib., 229 (E. J. Chinnock). See also Greek Index.

[^43]:    ${ }^{1}$ Class. Rev. v 273 (H. Richards).
    'Cf. van Herwerden's Index Dictionis, s.v. 'Particulae.'

[^44]:    ${ }^{3}$ The exceptions are Pol. 1320 a 35 , and Eth. III7 $b_{9-12 . ~ S e e ~ E u c k e n, ~}^{D} \boldsymbol{b}$ Particularum usu, p. 53. This work

[^45]:    has also been used for other details in this paragraph.
    ${ }^{1}$ Eucken, p. 55.
    ${ }^{2}$ Meisterhans, Gr. d. Att. Inschriften, p. 212.
    ${ }^{3}$ Mr Newman in Class. Rev. v 159.

[^46]:    ${ }^{4}$ Acad. Prior. ii 119.
    ${ }^{5}$ Topica i 3.
    ${ }^{0}$ Grote's $A r$. i $43-47$; the passages are quoted at length in my note on the Orator of Cic., § 62.

[^47]:    ${ }^{1}$ Blass, Praef. xvi-xxv.
    ${ }^{2}$ Also after $\ddot{\eta}, \epsilon l$ and $\mu \neq \eta$.

[^48]:    ${ }^{1}$ Class. Rev. v 270-2.
    ${ }^{2}$ See notes on $26 \S 2$ ult., and $35 \S 4$ ult., and Newman in Class. Rev. v 160-r.
    ${ }^{4}$ c. g. the Dutch editors; also F. Cauer and F. Rühl; and in England Mr H . Richards and several other contributors to the Classical Review.

[^49]:    ${ }^{1}$ Shute, History of the Aristotelian Witings, p. 23.
    ${ }^{2}$ Shute, p. 23.
    ${ }^{3}$ Shute, p. 165 f.

[^50]:    ${ }^{1}$ Shute, p. 72.
    ${ }^{2}$ Archiv f. Gesch. d. Philos., iv, p. 479.
    ${ }^{3}$ Prof. J. H. Wright, The Date of Cylon, p. 22 f.

[^51]:    ${ }^{1}$ Th. Reinach's Transl. of 'A $\theta . \pi 0 \lambda .$, p xxiv.
    2 xiv 11 and 22; Baner, Forschungen, p. 155. Theopompus, in Pollux, v 43 -
     оик дккр七 $\beta \omega \mathrm{s}$.
    ${ }^{4}$ See note on p. I $2 \boldsymbol{a}$.

[^52]:    ${ }^{1}$ American Fournal of Philology, xii 310 f.; supra, p. xix f.

[^53]:    ${ }^{1}$ In these quotations we find a minute but not uninteresting proof of his fidelity : in the whole work, out of 17 instances of ot $\pi \omega$ s with subjunctive or with future indicative, we have only two of $\overline{0} \pi \omega$ s $\grave{\alpha} \nu$ with the subjunctive ( 29,24 , and 30 , 20 ); both of these occur in decrees of the fifth century, and the inscriptions of that century give us $\mathbf{x} 6$ instances of $\% \pi \omega s$

[^54]:    ${ }^{1}$ F. H. S. 1891, p. 37.
    ${ }^{2}$ ib. p. 38. For some of the 'signals
    of this method,' cf. note on $8 \$ \mathrm{x}, \mathrm{p} .3^{0}$,
    

[^55]:    ${ }^{1}$ Cambridge Review, 20 Feb. 189r, p. 212 a.
    ${ }_{2}$ Throughout this abstract, dates and other items derived from sources extraneous to the treatise itself are distinguished by being placed within brackets.

    Such items generally represent the traditional accounts of Attic history accepted (whether rightly or wrongly) by the Athenians themselves.-The dates in this paragraph depend mainly on the Marmor Parium (Busolt, Gr. Gesch., $\mathrm{i}_{4}{ }^{1}{ }^{1}$ ).

[^56]:    I. 45. $\theta$ EGuoùs] In Plut. Sol. 19 end,
     Solon's laws. Cf. note on c. 4 § I.

    1. 47. кévтpov] the 'goad' is here the symbol of strong control, as in Soph. Frag. 606 (of sovereignty), $\lambda a \beta \stackrel{\omega}{\omega} \nu \overline{\delta \dot{\epsilon}}$
    
     these words the first quotation in Aristides ends. Plutarch, however (Sol. 16), cites two lines with the following introduction:
     $\tau \grave{\eta} \nu \delta\langle\nu a \mu \nu \nu$,
    
    
    Hence in Bergk's ed. of frag. 36 these two lines are added to the passage quoted by Aristides; and the passage $\epsilon l$ $\gamma \dot{\mathrm{a}} \rho$ $\eta \theta \in \lambda o y-\lambda u ́ k o s$, quoted subsequently by Aristides, is treated as a separate fragment (37). But the text makes it clear that this last passage followed immediately after his first quotation, while the couplet in Plutarch comes from a
[^57]:     тd̀s $\dot{\epsilon} \phi^{\prime} \dot{\epsilon} \kappa \dot{\alpha} \sigma \tau o c s ~ \tau \epsilon \tau a \gamma \mu e ́ v a s . ~ \tau \epsilon \tau a ́ \chi \theta a l ~$ may have $\epsilon \pi l$ with the dat. or acc., the former is found in Xen,, and both in
    
     Leg. 952 E , zovs émi toútous ă $\rho$ रovtas
    
     $\dot{\epsilon} \pi^{\prime}$ aủ $\frac{1}{\alpha} \tau a \hat{v} \tau \alpha, ~ \tau \in \tau \alpha \kappa \tau a l . ~ T h e ~ g e n . ~ i s ~$ comparatively rare.
    
     ro) is not found in Ar.
     viii (v) 8, $1309 a 6$, ol $\gamma \dot{\mathrm{d}} \rho \mathrm{d}$ d $\pi$ opor oủ
    
    
     $\delta \epsilon \hat{\sigma} \theta a \ell \tau \hat{\omega} \nu \kappa o \tau \nu \omega े \nu$.

    XVI § 2. єlpףтal] 14 § 3.
    кal $8 \eta$ кal] § 10.
    toîs $\alpha \pi$ ópois- $\gamma \epsilon \omega p y o u ̂ v t a s] ~ I n ~ t h e ~$

[^58]:     $\dot{a} \gamma \eta \lambda a \tau \epsilon \hat{\imath} \mathrm{~B}$, coll．HAt．v 72 ． 11 MтоY sc．$\mu \in \tau \alpha$ тоv． 15 aфієсаN：
    
    
     $\cdot 0$－
    
     $3 \dot{\epsilon} \pi^{\prime}$ H－L．

[^59]:    
    
    
    
    
    
     $\delta \dot{E} \delta v_{0} \pi a \rho \bar{t} \delta \rho o v s$（Frag． $405^{2}, 445^{3}$ ）．

[^60]:    32 ot $\pi a ́ \nu \tau a s(\pi \alpha ́ \nu \tau a$ B) à $\nu o \mu l a s ~ \epsilon \nu \epsilon \pi \lambda \eta \sigma a \nu$ codd.; om. K-w.
    38 à $\nu$ oк. codd.;
    
    

    7 juyaıкòs add. Rose (B).

[^61]:    
     $\epsilon l_{s}^{\ll u j \pi a \tau \rho l \delta a s ~ к a i>~ \gamma \epsilon \omega p \gamma . ~ e ~ f r a g . ~ 2, ~ 14, ~ K-W, ~ s e d ~} \epsilon \dot{\pi} \pi a \tau \rho l \delta a s$ et in schol. Plat. et in Moeride omissos esse monet B , cum de plebe tantum sermo sit. $29<\xi \xi>$ et $<\alpha i>$ ex Harp. K-w, B. $32 \dot{a} \pi \dot{d} \tau \hat{\omega} \nu \mu \iota \theta \omega \sigma a \mu e ́ \nu \omega \nu$ cod., ex Suida correctus.

[^62]:    52， 53 suppletum ex Heraclidis epitoma，v． 7.

[^63]:    * Edited for the Syndics of the Cambridge University Press; Cambridge Warehouse,

    Ave Maria Lane, London (Deighton, Bell and Co., Cambridge; F. A. Brockhaus, Leipzig; Macmillan and Co., New York).

