

MICHAEL B. WALBANK

THE PROPERTY OF AIANTIS AND AIGEIS

aus: Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik 84 (1990) 95–99

© Dr. Rudolf Habelt GmbH, Bonn



## THE PROPERTY OF AIANTIS AND AIGEIS

In 1987, M.K.Langdon published an intact, but sadly worn stele bearing the text of a decree of the Attic phylai Aigeis and Aiantis.<sup>1</sup> Langdon's text of lines 1-20 is as follows:

- Θεοί  
 [.]οιο[...ι[...8....]ρχουι[...8....]η[.....27.....]  
 [.]α[.]ν[.]ιλ[...5..]ργα[.]ιν[.]ιλ[.....34.....δε]-  
 [δ]όχθαι ται[...λ[.]τουσ [...8....]ι[.....29.....]  
 5 [.]ς λιθινα[...νο[.]λ[.]ι[...ν[.....35.....]  
 [τ]ὸ κεφάλαιον [..5..]η[.....40.....]  
 [.] φυλῶν [...7...]εκ[...6..]γγ[.....10.....]ιου[.]τα[.....18.....]  
 α[.]κι[.]τουσ [.]τησ[...ε[.....39.....]  
 οι[...7...ατα[... φυλη[...8-9...] γγacat  
 10 [..]δε[...λη[.]ο τὰ ἐδά[φη τ]ὰ ἐ[ν 'Ωρ]ω[πῶι τ]ῶ[ν] Αἰγείδων καὶ Αἰαντίδων  
 [...6...]  
 [...7...]οστο[...7...]δων [....]οκράτης Ἴπποκ[...υ[.]ο[.]ρχι[...8....]  
 [.]κ[.]λλου[.]ρα[.]α[...ο[.....11.....]ορος [....]αφια[.....15.....]  
 [....]ο[...ιφαλ[...5..]ν[...7...λ[.]ι[...7...λλ[.]λλρ[...8....]ραν[.]ο[...]  
 [...7...]σταλ[...6...η[.....13.....]λ[.]ακ[.....15.....]ι[...5..]  
 15 [.]α[...6...ου[.]ο[.]ο[.]ο[.....10.....]οροι[.]ι[...στο[.....12.....]ο[.]ν[...α[.]  
 [K]αλλικράτης [-----] vacat  
 [...5..]ωνεν[.....43.....]οκράτ-  
 [η]ς [...ο[.]λιτ[...ο[.....37.....]οξεν  
 [...δ[...]: ΗΗ: Δη[.....43.....]ομ[...]  
 20 [.]τοσιαμ[...8....]λ[.....37.....]ο[...]

Langdon recognized that lines 1-9 formed the text of decree concerned with Oropos, and saw in this document a reflection of circumstances similar to those described by the orator Hypereides in his speech in defence of Euxenippos:<sup>2</sup> when Athens acquired Oropos in 338 B.C. the Athenians gave the land to the phylai which were formed into pairs to receive and manage it. Langdon suggested that there might have been an archon-formula in line 2, but was unable to devise a convincing restoration that would fit both the known acquisition of Oropos by Athens and the relatively late stage in Athens' possession of the land that is implied in the listing of these properties: thus, he rejected any restoration involving the name of the Athenian archon Philochoros (337/6 B.C.).

<sup>1</sup> M.K.Langdon, *Hesperia* 56,1987,47-58, with photographs, plates 9 and 10.

<sup>2</sup> Hypereides 4.16.

In 1989 W.Ameling suggested in this journal,<sup>3</sup> on the basis of the text printed by Langdon, that the name of the Athenian archon Olympiodoros (294/3 and 293/2 B.C.) could be restored here: this would fit well in the second period during which Athens had possession of the Oropia, namely the period between 304 and 287 B.C., when, once again, pairs of phylai managed the land.

This suggestion is attractive, but should be rejected for two reasons: the letter-forms probably do not support so late a date; and what Langdon prints in stoichoi 18-22 of line 2, and which is definitely on the stone, is not part of an archon-formula, but the end of a name in the genitive, therefore part of a father's name, probably followed by a demotic. The only instances of demotics in archon-formulae seem to be cases where homonymity requires the use of a further distinguishing element, and, even then, the father's name is not included. It is possible, I suppose, that an Athenian archon, used to establish the date of a decree of a phyle or deme, might be identified by his father's name and his demotic, but I think it unlikely. If this line does, indeed, contain a dating-formula, as I believe it may, we must look for an official of one or other of the phylai involved, probably the phylarch (and, since this seems to be a decree jointly passed by the two phylai, in fact, we should look for two phylarchs). I suggest that lines 2-3 may have contained something like the following. "In the term of office of O[--- son of -a]rchos of the deme I[---] as Phylarch of the Aigeidai and of [---] as Phylarch of the Aiantidai ..." It might be possible also to include somewhere a reference to the current Athenian archon as well, as, for instance, we find in SEG 21, 527, line 2: ἐπὶ Χαρικλείδου ἄρχοντος Ἀθηναίων. However, I doubt whether there is room for an archon-formula in line 3, especially if we have to allow space for an orator-formula as well.

In 1988, in the course of preparing a corpus of Attic documents dealing with leases of public property, I had an opportunity to examine Langdon's stele in a strong light, with a blownup version of the photograph published by him. As Langdon remarks, the stone has been badly corroded by sewer-gases, and it is impossible to make squeezes of it, for fear of destroying what still survives: thus, the only means of expanding Langdon's text is the extremely time-consuming task of comparing each letter-trace on the stone with what appears in Langdon's photograph. The publication of Ameling's article has led me to re-examine my 1988 transcript alongside a set of photographs kept at the Institute for Advanced Study at Princeton,<sup>4</sup> and to attempt to make better sense of the opening of this document. The results of my work are as follows:

ἐπὶ Ο[... ]ι[... ]ιϰτᾶρχου Ι[...8....]η[.....27.....]  
[.]α[.]ν[.]ιλ[...5..]ργα[.]ιϰ[.]ιλ[.....34.....δε]-

<sup>3</sup> W.Ameling, ZPE 77, 1989, 95-96. For the evidence, see SEG 3, 117, dated to 303/2 B.C.

<sup>4</sup> I am grateful to Professor C.Habicht for permission to work with these photographs in the Fall of 1989: they derive from a completely different set of negatives from those employed for Langdon's photograph, and are better lit.

- [δ]όχθαι ταῖς [φ]υλαῖς θύς[αι? ...6...]ι[.....17.....ἐν δυοῖν? κτήλαι]-  
 5 [ι]ς λιθίνα[ις..]νο[.]λ[.]ι[...ν[.....35.....]  
 [τ]ὸ κεφάλαιον [...5..]η[.....38.....τῶ]-  
 [ν] φυλῶν ἐδά[φη? ...5..εκ[...6...]γγ[.....10.....]ιου[.]τα[.....15.....]  
 α[.]κι[.]τους [.]της[...ε[.....20.....] τ[ῶν] φυλῶν [...κα[...]] ἐκ κ-  
 οίνων χρημάτων [τῶν] φυλῶν[...οτη[....] *vacat*  
 10 [ο]ἶδε ὠρί(ς)αντο τά ἐδά[φη τ]ὰ ἐ[ν] Ὠ[ρ]ωπ[ῶι τ]ῶ[ν] Αἰγείδων καὶ  
 Αἰαντίδων [...6..]  
 [.]ατ[.]: [...]οκτων[.]ς [...]λῶν: Μ[.]δοκράτης ἐκ[κ]ο[.: .]ο[.]ύ[.]ιος [Ἐ]ρχι[.  
 ...6...]ιν  
 [.]η[ς Κ]ολλυ: Ἱεροκλῆ[ς..]ο[...5...α[.] κηλυουσα[...κλ[....8....]μ[....]αρχα[.]  
 [.]η [.]όνιος Φαλ[η]: Κκ[.]ιν[...5...]τια[.]ι[.]τ[...5...λλυ[τ]: Αρ....8....]ρανῖοι  
 [.]ι: Χρ[έ]μης Φαλ[η:] Ῥο[...ν[.....16.....]λινῖλ[...8....]λοντ[...ι[.]  
 15 [.]α[...]: Λυκοῦργος [.]ο[.....10.....]οροῖ[:] Ἀ[ρ]ιτο[.....11.....] παῖς[...α[.:]  
 Καλλικράτης [...ν[--10-11--]. *vacat*

The decree, comprising lines 2-9, is followed by a list of names (lines 10-16), and then (lines 17ff.) by a case-by-case discussion of properties in the Oropia belonging to the two phylai, whose disposition had been under dispute. These properties had evidently been allotted to the two phylai as a result of the acquisition of Oropos by Athens.

Line 2: I doubt whether there is any case for reading the first omicron as a phi: there are two very short cuts, one above and one below, that might be interpreted as the ends of the vertical of a phi, but the resulting letter would be quite unlike any other phi on the stone.

Lines 3-5: Langdon remarks that ταῖς φυλαῖς would be an attractive reading, but that the tau reported by him, although "deformed", cannot be interpreted as a sigma. I disagree: the offending "tau" is an illusion (but a justifiable illusion, given the desperate condition of the stone). Similarly, Langdon hesitates to restore in lines 4-5 [ἐν δυοῖν κτήλαι]ς λιθίνα[ις], whereas, given that the bottom of iota is preserved at the left edge, before sigma, and the bottom of another after alpha, [ἐν κτήλαι]ς λιθίνα[ις] is acceptable, although Langdon's [δυοῖν] is questionable.

Lines 6-7: After the nu of φυλῶν traces survive of three more letters, which I read as ΕΔΑ.

Line 8: Again, more is visible than printed by Langdon. I assume that this line contains instructions to officials of the phylai for setting up the stelai of lines 4-5.

Lines 8-9: Here, Langdon reads very little, beyond the letters ΦΥΛΗ in stoichoi 17-20. The eta seems, in fact, to be an omega. I suspect that here the costs of publication are directed to be met out of the common funds of the phylai.

Line 10: Here begins the list of commissioners (Horistai?) who have surveyed the land in question. The mason has omitted the sigma of ὠρίσαντο. I read a little more than does Langdon at the beginning of the line, and one or two more letters than he elsewhere. The list

begins at the end of this line, I believe, and the commissioners are named with abbreviated demotics, each name-and-demotic ending with a colon placed inter-stoichos. In general, Langdon reads much less than I do, and, in one or two cases, I believe that his reading is inaccurate.

Line 11: Langdon read nothing of the first name, but two letters of the demotic survive, alpha, followed by what is either an upsilon or a damaged tau: of the latter, which I believe more likely, the demotic will be [B]ατ[ῆ(θεν)], a deme belonging to Aigeis; if the second preserved letter is upsilon, the demotic will likely be Aὐ[ρ(ίδης)], which belonged to Hippothontis; however, the abbreviation would probably be Aὐ[ρί], not Aὐ[ρ]. Of the second name Langdon read [---]οστο[....]δων. His delta has suffered damage at the bottom, and I believe that it may be, in fact, a lambda, in which case, the demotic may be [ἐκ Κο]λῶν[ος] (Aigeis), rather than [ἐκ Κή]δων (Erechtheis). The third name Langdon read as [---]οκράτης Ἴπποκ[-], but there is a little more to be made of the name, which is probably M[ει]δοκράτης; the first three letters of the demotic seem to be EKK, rather than ΙΠΠ, and there is no trace on the stone of Langdon's final kappa. Thus, I read the demotic as ἐκ Κο[λ(ώνος)] (Aigeis), despite the different abbreviation from that employed earlier in this line, rather than Ἴπποτ[ζ(αμάδης)] (Oineis). Of the fourth name Langdon read only [...]υ[.]ο[.]ρχι; I detect traces of a vertical, perhaps an iota, before his omicron, and of a sigma after it; there are traces that suggest a rho before, and of a possible sigma after, the upsilon: thus, the personal name may be [Φ]όρυς[κος], and the demotic must be [Ἐ]ρχι[εύς] (Aigeis).

Lines 11-12: Langdon read [---]κ[.]λλου. His kappa looks more like a sigma, and there is no omicron between lambda and upsilon: the demotic [Κ]ολλυ[τεύς] (Aigeis) seems inevitable, although this demotic seems to be abbreviated as [Κο]λλυ[τεύς] in line 13.

Line 12: Langdon read [.]ρα[.]α[....]ο[---], but much more survives of the name, and his two alphas are, in fact, an omicron and a lambda, respectively. There are many choices for the demotic, but one possibility is [Δι]ο[μ(εύς)] (Aigeis). Of the next name Langdon read [---]ορος[....]αφια; this suggests, perhaps, the demotic Ἀφιδ[ν(αίος)] (Aiantis), but my readings do not match Langdon's here, and I cannot suggest anything plausible. After this, there should be two more names, but all that can usefully be made out is the demotic of the second, Φαλ[η(ρεύς)] (Aiantis). The next two names are equally indistinct: the demotic of the second may be [Κο]λλυ[τεύς] (Aigeis), but the surviving letter-traces are not very helpful.

Lines 13-14: The initial letters of this name are AP; of the demotic Langdon read ραν[.]ο[---]; it may be Ῥαμνού[ς]ι(ος) (Aiantis), but Langdon and I agree that the third letter is a nu; I see after this iota, omicron, iota.

Line 14: Of the first name Langdon read [---]τταλ[---]; his tau is a damaged phi, and most of the personal name Chremes survives before this. Phaleron belonged to Aiantis.

Neither Langdon nor I have anything useful to offer for the next three names, except that the first seems to me to begin with 'Po[--], perhaps 'Pó[δων] or 'Pó[διος], and the demotic of the last may be A[...], which allows three choices from Aigeis and one from Aiantis.

Line 15: Most of the name Lykourgos is preserved here: given the position of the apparent omicron of his demotic, it would be possible to restore an abbreviation of [B]ο[υτάδης] here, but many other restorations are equally feasible, including [K]ο[λλυτεύς] (Aigeis) and ['A]φ[ιδνωίος] (Aiantis). If all the Horistai were drawn, as I believe, from Aigeis and Aiantis, this man cannot be the famous Lykourgos, nor, indeed, anyone of his family. The next name has disappeared, but Langdon and I agree that the letters OPOI seem to be preserved, which I believe to be part of the demotic: a possible reading is [Τρικ]ορύς[ς(ιός)] (Aiantis), but this will leave only five letters for the personal name. The antepenultimate name of this list is likely to begin 'A[ρ]ιτο[--], but its demotic has entirely disappeared. The penultimate name likewise has disappeared, but its abbreviated demotic ends with alpha: thus, [Μαρ]α(θώνιος) (Aiantis) is a possibility. This gives parts of twenty names, to the end of line 15: if each of the two phylai contributed ten Horistai, the twenty-first name (line 16) is likely to have been that of the Secretary to this body. His name is Kallikrates. His demotic has disappeared, except for a possible nu: the position of this suggests the demotic ['Ραμ]ν[ούσιος] (Aiantis). It is not clear whether the next 10 or 11 stoichoi were inscribed or not (Langdon and I agree that the space under the letters OPOI in line 15 is uninscribed, but the intervening surface before this has perished); if they were, there is just room for the word [ἐγραμμάτευε], if this nu is the last letter of the abbreviated demotic.

For the convenience of readers I print here my restored text of lines 10-16:

- 10 [ο]ἶδε ὀρί(ς)αντο τὰ ἐδά[φη τ]ᾶ ἐ[ν] ᾿Ω[ρ]ωπ[ῶι τ]ῶ[ν] Αἰγείδων καὶ  
 Αἰαντίδων [...6...]  
 [B]ατ[ῆ]: [...]οττων[.]ς [ἐκ Κο]λῶν: Μ[ε]ιδοκράτης ἐκ Κο[λ]: Φ[ο]ρ[ύ]ς[ς]κος  
 [Ἐ]ρχι[ς: ...6...]ιν-  
 [.]η[ς Κ]ολλυ: Ἱεροκλῆ[ς Δι]ο[μι: ...]α[.]κηλυουσα[...κλ[....8 ....]μ  
 [...]αρχα[.]  
 [.]η[.]όνιος Φαλ[η]: Cκ[.]ιν[.5...]τια[.]ι[.]τ[... Κο]λλυ[τ]: Αρ[....8....]ραγῖοι  
 [.]ι: Χρ[έ]μης Φαλ[η: 'Ρο[....]ν[.....16.....]λινιλ[....8...]λοντ[...ι[.]  
 15 [.]α[...]: Λυκοῦργος Κ[ο]λλυτ: ...5.. Τρικ[ο]ρύς[ς: 'A[ρ]ιτο[.....11.....]παια[ς  
 [Μαρ]α[θ:]  
 Καλλικράτης ['Ραμ]ν[ο ἐγραμμάτευε] *vacat*

At line 17 the detailed listing of properties begins. I have no useful comments to make on these, as yet, except to point out that Langdon's restoration [ἔδ]οξεν at the end of line 18 is likely to be incorrect: a personal name, such as Proxenos, should be restored here.