

MARTHA C. TAYLOR

A FOURTH-CENTURY HONORARY DECREE OF THE ATHENIAN
DEMOS ON SALAMIS

aus: Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik 107 (1995) 289–295

© Dr. Rudolf Habelt GmbH, Bonn

A Fourth-Century Honorary Decree of the Athenian *Demos* on Salamis

D. Harris and C. Lawton recently identified a fragmentary figure on the relief of a fourth-century honorary decree found on the island of Salamis as Eurysakes, the son of Aias, and, partly on the basis of this identification, interpreted the document as a decree of the *genos* of the *Salaminioi*.¹ I think it more likely that the stele in question is actually an honorary decree of the Athenian citizens resident on Salamis who despite their constitutional status did have legislative authority. If I am correct, this decree would represent the only known document of the *demos* of Athenians on Salamis earlier than the third century and would thus be of particular interest and importance. It seems worthwhile, therefore, to reopen discussion of the decree and its relief.

Harris and Lawton argue that the decree is not likely to be a document of the Athenian *demos* because the dates of the only Athenian eponymous archon whose name will fit the remains read in line 2 do not agree with the Lykourgan date assigned to the decree on letter forms and style.² Secondly, the placement of the archon's name in the second line of the pre-script is unusual.³ Thus the decree probably originates in an organization other than the Athenian *demos* which is, nevertheless, like the *demos* headed by an archon.

Harris and Lawton's identification of a badly damaged figure on the relief as Eurysakes, the son of Aias, leads them to interpret the official named in line 2 as the archon of the *genos* of *Salaminioi* and the decree as a document of this cult organization because this *genos* had a connection to Eurysakes.⁴ Members of the *genos* managed the cult of Eurysakes in Athens and erected their stelai in his temenos in the city.⁵ It is also often assumed that members of this

¹ D. Harris and C. Lawton, *ZPE* 80 (1990) 109-115, Taf. II a, b. The decree was originally published by D.I. Pallas, *ArchEph* (1948-49) 121, 128, no. 1 (published in 1951); *Polemon* 4 (1949) 113-117, figs. 1, 2.

² *ZPE*, 109-111. Harris and Lawton read ο οφημο ἄρχο[ντος] in line 2. Nikophemos of 361/0 is the only eponymous archon whose name will fit the remains.

³ See *ZPE*, 110 and A. Henry, *The Prescripts of Athenian Decrees (Mnemosyne, Supp. 49, Leiden 1977)*.

⁴ Three documents of the *genos* of *Salaminioi* are known: *IG II²* 1232, an honorary decree of the fourth century, and W.S. Ferguson, *Hesperia* 7 (1938) 1-74 nos. 1 and 2, dating to the mid-fourth and the mid-third century respectively. See also F. Sokolowski, *Lois sacrées des cités grecques, Supplément* (Paris 1962), no. 19. By the mid-fourth century at least, the *genos* was divided into two branches, comprising οἱ ἀπὸ Κουνίου Καλαμίνιοι and οἱ ἐκ τῶν ἑπταφυλῶν Καλαμίνιοι. Each branch of the *genos* was headed by an annually changing archon (*Hesperia* 7 (1938) no. 1, lines 69-75, 80-85) and from 363/2 onwards a further archon was chosen to oversee the *oschophorion*. See Ferguson, *Hesperia* 7, 61ff. and note to line 69.

⁵ The known decrees of the *genos* reveal that it controlled priesthoods of Athena Skiras, of Herakles, of Eurysakes and of Aglauros, Pandrosos and Kourotrophos. *Hesperia* 7 (1938) nos. 1 and 2 make provision for a copy of the decree to be set up in the Eurysakeion. It is likely that they were in fact set up there; Ferguson, *Hesperia* 7, 1, reports that both stelai were found re-used in the construction of a water conduit in the agora close to the most likely location of the Eurysakeion near the Kolonos Agoraios. For the location of the Eurysakeion, see R.E. Wycherley, *The Athenian Agora III, Literary and Epigraphical Testimonia* (Princeton 1957) 90-93.

genos traced their ancestry back to Eurysakes and his son (or brother) Philaios, either or both of whom are said to have immigrated to Athens from Salamis and to have traded their island for Athenian citizenship (Plut. *Sol.* 10, Paus. 1.35.2).⁶

However, despite their name, we would not normally expect to find a document of the *genos* of *Salaminioi* on the island of Salamis. While an association between the *genos* and Salamis is often assumed, and it has been suggested that members of the *genos* of *Salaminioi* were originally inhabitants of Salamis who emigrated to the mainland at some point before the fifth century⁷, none of the attempts to associate the *genos* with the history of the island is convincing.⁸ There is no evidence to support these theories apart from the name of the organization itself, which Ferguson specifically claimed was "politically programmatic".⁹ Whatever the history of the group, the known decrees of the organization reveal that in the mid-fourth century, at least, the *genos* was located on the mainland with concentrations at Sounion and at locales throughout "the seven tribes". The *genos* held land at Porthmos and Koile and regularly set up its decrees in the Eurysakeion in Melite on the Kolonos Agoraios;¹⁰ it is not evident that the *genos* had anything to do with the island.

It is only in certain cult regulations that make provision for the erection of stelai in a shrine of Athena Skiras that we may see an association between the *genos* and Salamis.¹¹ There was a temple of Athena Skiras at Phaleron (Paus. 1.1.4, 1.36.4) where Philochoros locates a temple of Skiros (*apud* Plut. *Thes.* 17,6-7).¹² But Strabo (9.1.9) says that Skiras was

⁶ Plutarch calls Eurysakes and Philaios both sons of Aias and attributes the donation of Salamis to both brothers. Pausanias ascribes the gift to Philaios, whom he calls the son of Eurysakes. Herodotus 6.35 and Pherekydes *FGrHist* 3 F 2 (*apud* Marcellinus *Vit. Thuc.*) call Philaios the son of Aias but Sophocles, *Aias* 530ff., seems to take Eurysakes as the only son of Aias. As Ferguson, *Hesperia* 7, 16 says, "the version which makes Philaios the son of Aias and the sole donor of Salamis to Athens may have been devised *ad maiorem gloriam* of the Philaidai." That those who traced their lineage back to Eurysakes and Philaios were members of the *genos* of *Salaminioi* is never specifically stated. Alcibiades, for example, in [Plato] *Alc.* 1.121a1ff, is made to say only καὶ γὰρ τὸ ἡμέτερον, ὦ Σώκρατες, εἰς Εὐρυσάκη [τὸ γένος ἀναφέρομεν]. He does not say that he is, therefore, a *Salaminios*. So Herodotus, speaking of Miltiades says τὰ μὲν ἀνέκαθεν ἀπ' Αἰακοῦ τε καὶ Αἰγίνης γεγονός, τὰ δὲ νεώτερα Ἀθηναῖος, Φιλαίου τοῦ Αἴαντος παιδός γενομένου πρώτου τῆς οἰκίης ταύτης Ἀθηναίου. He does not use the term *Salaminios*. But it is generally assumed that Eurysakes' and Philaios' association with Salamis makes the designation of their supposed descendants as members of the *genos* of *Salaminioi* not unlikely.

⁷ See, for example, M. Nilsson, *AJP* 59 (1938) 385-393; M. Guarducci, *RFC* 26 (1948) 223-237; and, more recently, S. Humphreys, *ZPE* 83 (1990) 243-248; T. Figueira, *Athens and Aigina in the Age of Imperial Colonization* (Baltimore 1991) 145-146; and R. Osborne, *AJA* 96 (1992) 348.

⁸ See M. Taylor, *The Geographical Dimensions of the Polis: The History of the Island of Salamis from the Sixth to the Third Century BC* (Diss. Stanford Univ. 1993) 28-38.

⁹ Ferguson, *Hesperia* 7, 17 and 42-43, argued that the cult organization was artificially created by mainlanders as part of a concerted attempt to solidify Athens' claims to Salamis over those of Megara during the sixth century.

¹⁰ *Hesperia* 7 (1938) 1-74 no. 1, lines 84-5; *IG* II² 1232, lines 21-22. For the testimonia on the Eurysakeion, see Wycherley (note 5, above), 90-93.

¹¹ The earliest known decree of the *genos* makes provision for something to be set up in the shrine of Athena Skiras and for a copy of the stele erected in the Eurysakeion to be set up in the peribolos of the shrine of Athena Skiras (*IG* II² 1232, lines 15-16). *Hesperia* 7 (1938) 1-74 no. 1, lines 50-53 also requires that a stele listing the regulations concerning gifts of honor from sacrifices be erected in the shrine of Athena Skiras.

¹² *FGrHist* 328 F 111; see also F 14-16.

the ancient name of the island of Salamis, and Athena Skiras had a temple on Salamis on the cape Skiradion that Plutarch implied was the starting point of Solon's assault on the island.¹³

It is unlikely, however, that the *genos* refers to this temple of Athena Skiras in its regulations. The first *Hesperia* decree mentions *oschophoroi* and *deipnophoroi* — religious personnel who helped celebrate the *oschophorion*. It is clear, therefore, that the *genos* was involved with the *oschophorion* and therefore with the temple of Athena Skiras in Phaleron, which was the focus of this celebration.¹⁴ There is no evidence of a connection between celebrations at the shrine of Athena Skiras in Phaleron and the shrine on Salamis; nor is there any evidence that the *genos* of *Salaminioi* had other ritual business on Salamis unrelated to its activity at the shrine of Athena Skiras in Phaleron.¹⁵ Indeed, Ferguson takes as proof that the *Salaminioi* "had no concern with shrines, rites or sacrifices on the island" the fact that the *genos* did not feel compelled to indicate in its documents whether the shrine of Athena Skiras with which it was concerned was that on Salamis or in Phaleron.¹⁶ Failure to specify the location suggests that the *genos* was involved with only one shrine of Athena Skiras; this must be the one in Phaleron at which the *oschophorion* was celebrated.

Since no evidence links the *genos* of *Salaminioi* to the island of Salamis, it is curious to find a decree of the *genos* on the island. It is conceivable, as Harris and Lawton argue, that the *genos* may have set up the decree in question (or a copy of the decree) on Salamis rather than in the Eurysakeion, its normal place of publication, if the honorand was a resident of the island (*ZPE* 80, 114), but it would be attractive to find a closer link between document and find-spot. Although certainty is impossible, and the provenance of stelai found at coastal and island sites is always problematic, I think it more likely, if this decree is original to the island of Salamis, that it is not a document of the *genos* of *Salaminioi* but rather an honorary decree of the Athenian residents on the island. In that case the magistrate who appears in line 2 should be the archon for Salamis mentioned in the *Ath. Pol.* (54.7-8): κληροῦσι δὲ καὶ εἰς Καλαμῖνα ἄρχοντα, καὶ εἰς Πειραιέα δήμαρχον, οἱ τὰ τε Διονύσια ποιοῦσιν ... ἐν Καλαμῖνι δὲ καὶ τοῦνομα τοῦ ἄρχοντος ἀναγράφεται.

Salamis was, of course, not a constitutional deme in the Kleisthenic system; but this need not mean that the citizen body¹⁷ resident on the island had no legislative authority in the

¹³ Herodotus 8.94 mentions the temple of Athena Skiras on the island; Plutarch discusses cape Skiradion at *Sol.* 9.

¹⁴ See Plutarch, *Thes.* 22, 23; Hesychius *s.v.* ὠσχοφόριον comments: τόπος Ἀθήνησιν Φαλεροῖ ἐνθα τὸ τῆς Ἀθηνᾶς ἱερόν; see also Hesychius *s.vv.* ὠσχοφόρια, δειπνοφόροι; Harpocration *s.v.* ὠσχοφόροι; *Suda s.v.* ὠσχοφόροι, δειπνοφόροι; L. Deubner, *Attische Feste* (Berlin 1932) 142-147; and E. Simon, *Festivals of Attica* (Wisconsin 1983) 89ff.

¹⁵ The thesis of B. Jordan, *The Athenian Navy in the Classical Period* (Berkeley 1975) 167-181, that the *Salaminioi* regularly performed a *theoria* in the sacred trireme *Salaminia* to the shrine of Athena Skiras on Salamis is not convincing. See Taylor (note 8, above), 120-124.

¹⁶ *Hesperia* 7, 19. See also, 24-25, 33 and 36ff. on the temple of Athena Skiras at Phaleron and the *Oschophorion*.

¹⁷ There was a citizen population on the island, made up of men who were members of mainland demes. The new fragment of the Salamis decree (*IG* I³, 1) now precludes all restorations of the word defining the population on the island which would make that population "native". See A. Matthaïou, *Horos* 8-9 (1990-91) [published in 1993], 9-14 no. 1, fig. 1. The evidence for a "native" or non-citizen population on the island is

Classical period¹⁸ and could not produce honorary decrees on which it might inscribe the name of its archon. This seems implicit in the passage of the *Ath. Pol.* quoted above. The last line should mean that the archon for Salamis was an eponymous officer as were the demarchs in the demes.¹⁹ Unfortunately, the *Ath. Pol.* does not make clear on what sorts of documents the archon for Salamis would be eponymous. Mathieu and Haussoullier speak of "actes publics" and Sandys refers to "official documents".²⁰ Neither explain whom they envision generating these documents. There is one example of a fourth century dedication from Salamis on which the name of the archon appears alongside that of a victor in the dithyramb (*IG II² 3093*). But this is an individual dedication, not an "official document" of the community this archon governed on Salamis. The constitutional demes, as administrative units, clearly had the power to generate their own decrees on which the demarch might be eponymous;²¹ but this right was not exclusive to the Kleisthenic demes. Certain documents suggest that the citizen residents of Salamis (like other non-deme sub-groups of the *demos* including, e.g., the *genos* of *Salaminioi*) also had the power to join together as a corporate body to bestow honors and record these honorary decrees on stone.

We have clear evidence of one occasion that should date before 318 on which the residents of Salamis did join together as a community, along with other sub-groups of the Athenian *demos*, in order to honor a benefactor: Ἀθηναίων ὁ δῆμος ὁ ἐν Καλαμίῳ appears alongside [Ἀθη]ναίων [οἱ ἰ]ππεῖς, ὁ δῆμος ὁ Ἀθηναίων and Ἀθηναίων ὁ δῆμος ὁ ἐν Ἰμβρῳι voting a bronze statue on an honorary inscription for an unknown honorand (*IG II² 3206*).²² The appearance of the Salaminian *demos* on this inscription suggests that the residents of the island had some sense of themselves as a community; it argues that they could act together as a corporate entity under their archon and that they did strive to identify and honor individuals who benefited their corporate aims. In a later appearance, ὁ δῆμος ὁ Καλαμίνων occurs in a corona alongside ὁ δῆμος and οἱ φυλῆται (also in coronae) at the bottom of

slim to non-existent. The thesis of Figueira, 142-148, regarding the special nature of Salaminian citizenship is not convincing. See Taylor (note 8, above), 65-80.

¹⁸ It is well known that Salamis had legislative authority under the Macedonians, as shown by the great decree of the *Salaminioi* in honor of Herakleitos Athmoneus dating to the mid-third century (*IG II² 1225*). It is usually assumed without argument or evidence that this power was a result of Macedonian control of Attica and did not exist when Athens was independent.

¹⁹ While not denying that the archon on Salamis was eponymous, P.J. Rhodes, *A Commentary to the Aristotelian Athenaion Politeia* (Oxford 1981) 612, remarks of this passage in the *Ath. Pol.*, "... this sentence ought to state something that is true of Salamis but not of the Piraeus, and the allusion may rather be to a published list of ἄρχοντες ." But Salamis was a special case and the emphasizing for Salamis of something that is also true of the Piraeus may be due to a desire on the part of the *Ath. Pol.* to point out that the archon for Salamis and the demarch of Peiraieus served this similar function despite the differing constitutional natures of their respective communities.

²⁰ G. Mathieu and B. Houssoullier, Aristotle, *Constitution d'Athènes* (Paris 1952) 58; J.E. Sandys, *Aristotle's Constitution of Athens* (London² 1912) 215.

²¹ For a list of deme decrees, see D. Whitehead, *The Demes of Attica* (Princeton 1986) append. 3, 374-393.

²² 318 is the year in which Imbros fell away from Athens (Diodoros 20.46, *IG XII.8.p.3*).

a decree dated to 282/1 in honor of Euthios (archon in 283/2), suggesting that the *demos* of *Salaminioi* had a hand in the honoring of this former archon.²³

On both of these decrees the *demos* of *Salaminioi* appears alongside other groups. There is, however, no sound reason to suggest that the community on Salamis always honored individuals in this way and could not also honor benefactors alone and on its own initiative, which would imply generating its own documents. The money that the Salaminian *demos* must have controlled in order to reward the unknown honorand of *IG* II² 3206 with a statue argues that the *demos* had the means to honor individuals as it wished and might have recorded those honors on a stele erected at its own expense.

IG II² 1260, an honorary decree from Sounion dated to 307-304 BC²⁴, voted by the *demotai* of Sounion or soldiers stationed there, hints at just such an occurrence. The stele alludes to earlier honors οἱ Καλαμίνιοι granted the honorand because of the care he showed for the walls of Salamis when he served as general there.²⁵ This certainly suggests the existence of an earlier decree voted by the *Salaminioi* themselves that granted the honors alluded to here. The text of the *Ath. Pol.* suggests that the name of the presiding archon for Salamis would have been included on any such document. Despite its unusual constitutional status, the *demos* on Salamis had the power to generate decrees.²⁶ Thus the stele found on Salamis, with its difficult archon-name, is likely to be an honorary decree generated by the *demos* on Salamis with the name of the eponymous archon for Salamis inscribed in the prescript.²⁷

²³ *Hesperia* 7 (1938) 77-160 no. 18, lines 43-45 (*SEG* 25.89, lines 43-45). For a full discussion of this decree and its historical context, see T.L. Shear, *Kallias of Sphettos and the Revolt of Athens in 286 BC* (Princeton 1978).

²⁴ The dating of the decree is difficult. A date of 307-304, i.e. the period of the "Four Years War", was originally urged by A. Wilhelm, *Sonderschriften des Oesterreichischen Archäologischen Institutes in Wien* 7 (1909), 60. He was followed by Kirchner in *Inscriptiones Graecae*. F.G. Maier, *Griechische Mauerbauinschriften* (Heidelberg 1959), 110-112, accepts this dating with caution and argues for a *terminus ante quem* of 294. See also Taylor (note 8, above), 229ff.

²⁵ The text of Maier, no. 23, lines 14-20, which is more conservative than *IG*, reads: -----
]τρατηγός χειροτονηθ[εἰς ----- Κα]λαμίν[α] χρήματά τε πρ[οεδάνεισεν Καλαμινί ?]οις εἰς τὴν
 ἐπικουρήν | [-----] συνε]πεμελήθη τῶν τε τειχῶ[ν]-----δικ[?]αίως καὶ φιλοτιμῶς καὶ | [-----] ἔτεράνω[ς] ἀν
 αὐτὸν Καλαμίν[ιο]ι ἀρ[ι]στ[ο]κ[ρα]τ[ο]ν ἐνεκα καὶ δικαί] ούνης εἰς ἑα[ν]τοῦς.

²⁶ This right was not confined to some period of Macedonian domination or partial "independence" for Salamis. Salamis was taken by Kassandros towards the end of the fourth century (Pausanias 1.35.2, Polyainos, *Strategems*, 4.11.1). Although this capture is usually dated to 304, I argue elsewhere that it is better placed in 317 (see Taylor [note 8, above], 194ff). If the earliest document on which the *demos* of Athenians on Salamis appears is correctly dated to 318 or before, it stands as evidence that the residents were acting as a community in bestowing honors before any Macedonian occupation. Thus a Lykourgan date does not preclude assignment of the Peiraieus stele to Salamis. The Sounion decree, whenever it is dated, and the decree for Euthios clearly belong to periods when Salamis was under the control of the democratic *asty*, not the Macedonians. A fourth document belonging to the community on Salamis was published by A. Wilhelm, *Jahreshefte des Oesterreichischen Archäologischen Institutes in Wien*, 12 (1909) 135-136. This seems to be a public document recording the conduct in office and benefactions of Salaminian officials including a γραμματεὺς τοῦ δήμου and a ταμίαις. [τοῦς] Καλαμινίους do appear in the document. The dating of this document is difficult (Wilhelm suggested the end of the fourth or early third century); since it makes no reference to the *asty* or city officials, it might be thought to date to a period of Macedonian control of Salamis.

²⁷ It is difficult to know what the residents of Salamis may have called themselves on this decree because it is hard to determine whether there is chronological significance to the different names used to refer to the res-

The identification of Eurysakes, which led Harris and Lawton to suggest that the decree belongs to the *genos* of *Salaminioi*, does not preclude this interpretation of the stele.²⁸ Although the *genos* of *Salaminioi* worshipped Eurysakes, he would not be inappropriate on a decree of the *demos* on Salamis. As the hero that is said in legend to have immigrated to the mainland and traded the island to Athens in exchange for Athenian citizenship, he might well have been honored by the Athenian residents of Salamis. In any case, Eurysakes is the personification of Aias' wide shield (which also appears on the stele's relief) and this shield had strong associations with the island. Throughout the fourth century, either on its own authority or at the instigation of Athens, Salamis minted bronze coins with the head of a female (presumably the nymph Salamis) on the obverse and on the reverse a sword in its strap lying on a shield above the legend CAΛΑ. Fifty-five of these coins have been found in the American Excavations in the Athenian Agora, and they circulated as far as Olynthos.²⁹ The shield of Aias and its personification Eurysakes would have been a potent symbol for the community on the island in the fourth century and would not be out of place on a decree of the *demos* of *Salaminioi*.

The importance of the symbol of the shield of Aias to the *demos* on Salamis suggests that Pallas may have been correct when he identified the figure most closely associated with that shield on the Peiraieus relief as a personified representation of the *demos* of *Salaminioi*.³⁰ Harris and Lawton reject this possibility because "apart from his dress" he does not closely resemble Demos, "who is consistently larger in scale and more active in bestowing the city's

idents of the island in the decrees discussed here: Ἀθηναίων ὁ δῆμος ὁ ἐν Σαλαμῖνι (on *IG II²* 3206 of 318 or before), ὁ δῆμος ὁ Σαλαμινίων (on *SEG* 25 of 282/1), and οἱ Σαλαμίνιοι (on *IG II²* 1260 from c. 307-304 and the decree published by Wilhelm [see note 26, above] of the late fourth or early third century). Although the term Σαλαμίνιος was in use as early as the fifth century for residents of the island (see Taylor [note 8, above], 65-80), it is perhaps significant that it is extant only on documents that date after Kassandros' capture of the island (if that capture is placed in 317) even if the documents themselves date to a period of freedom from Macedonian occupation for both Salamis and *asty*. That is, a period of Macedonian influence on the island may have encouraged and fostered the residents' sense of themselves as a community and this may have resulted in a change of name. The elaboration of the mid-third century decree in honor of Herakleitos Athmoneus, (see note 18, above), suggests that as the third century wore on the Salaminians' corporate identity grew stronger. In addition, with the decline of the political importance of the Kleisthenic demes under Macedonian control, the importance of the Salaminian *demos* would have grown.

²⁸ Of course the crowning figure of Aias is at least as appropriate to a document from Salamis as he is to the *genos* of *Salaminioi*. Aias was the legendary hero of Salamis (even if the lines of Homer linking him to the island are generally taken to be a politically motivated Athenian interpolation [see Plut., *Sol.* 10]), and Pausanias (1.35.3) locates a temple of Aias on Salamis (cf. *IG II²* 1035.32).

²⁹ J. Kroll, *The Athenian Agora XXVI: The Greek Coins* (Princeton 1993), K640-642, 214-216. Kroll argues that the coinage was minted by the "cleruchy" on Salamis. But see Taylor (note 8, above), 190-191, where it is argued that the coinage may have been minted and struck in Athens and circulated with a Salaminian legend to avoid the embarrassment of bronze issues with Athenian legends. On the Athenian aversion to this practice, see Kroll, 26-27. For the coins of Salamis, see also U. Köhler, *Ath. Mitt.* 4 (1879) 250-267; B.V. Head, *A Catalogue of the Greek Coins in the British Museum*. R. Poole (ed.), *Attica. Megaris. Aegina*, (London 1888) lxi-lxii, and *Historia Numorum* (Oxford 1911) 391ff; E. Babelon, *Traité des monnaies grecques et romaines*. II.iii (Paris 1914) 141ff.

³⁰ *Polemon* (see note 1, above) 117. Pallas believed that the document, which he dated to c. 320 BC, belonged to a period of "quasi-independence" (ἡμιανεξαρτησία) for Salamis, and this may have influenced his thinking on this point.

honors..." Demos is "usually depicted in the same scale or very nearly the same scale as the gods" (*ZPE* 80, 114).

Yet it seems more appropriate to compare the figure to representations of the local demes of Attica rather than to representations of the *demos* of Athenians as a whole. M. Meyer refers to several representations of Demos which seem to come from deme decrees, and specifically calls three of these personifications of a local deme.³¹ Two of these representations of Demos from deme decrees represent a standing man clothed in a himation. In one case he is a full head taller but in the second only about a half head taller than the honorand so that on the basis of size, at least, it cannot be ruled out that the intermediate figure on the Piraeus relief (who is more than half a head taller than the honorand) is a representation of a subordinate *demos*.³² The figure, however, is so badly damaged that it cannot be determined whether he is bearded or not. If the figure is beardless, he cannot be Demos; he must be a youth.³³ But if the figure was bearded, it is possible that we have on this document a personified representation of the corporate community on Salamis in the guise of Demos. The term *demos* is not reserved to the constitutional units of the Kleisthenic reforms. It is used for the community on Salamis on two documents where the *demos* of Salaminians appears alongside the *demos* of Athens itself. If the term is allowed to the community on Salamis, there seems no obvious reason why the representation of Demos should not be granted as well.

Whether the figure on the relief is identified as Eurysakes or Demos, however, the document should be recognized as a decree of the *demos* of *Salaminioi* on Salamis.

Loyola College in Maryland

Martha C. Taylor

³¹ M. Meyer, *Die Griechischen Urkundenreliefs* (*Ath. Mitt.*, Beiheft 13, Berlin 1989), 185: A119, Taf. 34, 1; A182, Taf. 52,4; A144 and possibly A94, Taf. 28,2, though this relief may be from a religious document.

³² It is true that the standing figures of Demos are usually actively bestowing honors, but see Meyer's A94 where a sitting Demos is only a spectator while Herakles crowns Athena.

³³ I am indebted to R. Stroud for bringing this point to my attention.