

STEPHEN D. LAMBERT

THE ATTIC GENOS SALAMINIOI AND THE ISLAND OF SALAMIS

aus: Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik 119 (1997) 85–106

© Dr. Rudolf Habelt GmbH, Bonn



## THE ATTIC GENOS SALAMINIOI AND THE ISLAND OF SALAMIS<sup>1</sup>

Thanks in large part to two inscriptions discovered in 1936 in the American excavations of the Athenian Agora we know more about the Attic genos Salaminioi than about any other group of this type;<sup>2</sup> and among many matters on which the inscriptions cast light, they are of fundamental importance to an understanding of the Attic genos *tout court*. It is a mark of the utility of Ferguson's *editio princeps*, promptly published in *Hesperia* 1938, as well as of the many intractable problems raised by the texts, that, despite their importance and the extensive scholarly literature they have generated, there has been no subsequent full edition. This paper offers some initial contributions arising out of work in progress towards such an edition.

Ferguson's published texts, based on a transcript by Meritt and produced with advice from Meritt and Dow, contain mistakes bearing both on points of linguistic interest and on matters of substance. These have been carried over into subsequent editions (none of which is independent of the *editio princeps*), where they have been compounded by misprints and other minor errors. In Part 1 I publish new, more accurate, texts, based on autopsy of the stones in 1995, squeezes taken then and photographs, followed by notes, mainly on the new readings and matters arising from them. In Part 2 I tentatively suggest a new theory on the relationship of the genos to the island of Salamis.

### PART 1: TEXTS AND NOTES

#### Texts

**No. 1.** Complete stele of white ("Pentelic") marble, surmounted by an overhanging pediment and with a tenon protruding from the bottom (now encased in a concrete base). Found in 1936 on the Kolonos

---

<sup>1</sup> I am very grateful to Kurt Raaflaub, co-Director of the Center for Hellenic Studies, Washington D.C., to Carla Antonaccio and to other Fellows of the Center in 1995/6 for helpful comments on a draft of this paper written there; to Kerry Christensen, Martha Taylor and Tim Winters for stimulating discussion, including when I delivered a version of the paper in the context of the Salamis panel at the meeting of the American Philological Association in New York, December 1996; to the respondent on that occasion, John Camp, to whom I am also grateful for facilitating study of the inscriptions in the Athenian Agora; and to the British Academy and the Leverhulme Trust for financial support in 1994/5. The following abbreviations are used for works frequently cited:

Cargill: J. Cargill, *Athenian Settlements of the Fourth Century B.C.* (1995).

Daux: G. Daux, *REG* 54 (1941), 218–27.

Ferguson: W.S. Ferguson, *Hesperia* 7 (1938) 1–74.

Guarducci: M. Guarducci, *Riv. Fil.* 26 (1948) 223–43.

Humphreys: S.C. Humphreys, *ZPE* 83 (1990) 243–48.

Kearns: E. Kearns, *The Heroes of Attica* (1989).

Nilsson: M. P. Nilsson, *AJP* 59 (1938) 385–93.

*Phratries*: S. D. Lambert, *The Phratries of Attica* (1993).

*Rationes*: S. D. Lambert, *Rationes Centesimarum* (1997).

R. Osborne: in S.E. Alcock et al., *Placing the Gods* (1994) 143–60.

Parker: R. Parker, *Athenian Religion: A History* (1996).

Sokolowski: *Lois Sacrées des Cités Grecques, Supplément* (1962).

Taylor: M. C. Taylor, *ZPE* 107 (1995) 289–95.

Threatte I: L. Threatte, *The Grammar of Attic Inscriptions*, vol. 1 (1980).

Walbank: M. W. Walbank, *Agora* 19 (1991) III.

Whitehead: D. Whitehead, *The Demes of Attica* (1986).

Wilhelm: *SBAW* 220, 5 (1942) (= *Attische Urkunden* V).

<sup>2</sup> There is a useful recent summary of these two inscriptions with concise discussion by Parker, 308–316. The genos is nowhere referred to explicitly in the literary record. For other inscriptions attributed or attributable to it see the Appendix, below.

Agoraios, where it was re-used to cover a Hellenistic cistern, SW of the Hephaisteion. The findspot is probably close to the site of the Eurysakeion, where the stele was originally set up (lines 84–85, cf. Pollux 7.132–33; Wycherley, *Agora* 3, nos. 246–255) and which was also used for posting documents of the phyle Aiantis (e.g. *Hesp.* 7 [1938] 94–96, no. 15). Now (1995) displayed in the south colonnade of the Stoa of Attalos. *Agora Inv.* I 3244. Height: 1.33 m. (of which 1.08 inscribed, 0.17 pediment, 0.08 tenon). Width: 0.445 (at top), 0.49 (at bottom), 0.50 (bottom front of pediment). Thickness: 0.12 (of which 0.028 is roughly dressed area at back). Textual Bibliography: Ferguson, no. 1 (ph.), based on a transcript by Meritt and with advice from Meritt and Dow (“F”); Nilsson, 392 (line 86); Wilhelm, 136 (lines 4, 57, 75); Sokolowski, no. 19 (“S”); *SEG* 21.527; Walbank, L4a (“W”). : indicates punctuation in that form on the stone. All other punctuation is editorial. Underlining indicates letters recorded as having been read by F but of which I was unable to detect trace.

Stoich. 38 (lines 2–68)

Quasi-stoich. 39–41 (lines 69–79)

Non-stoich. 79–102 (lines 80–97)

Θ                    ε                    ο                    ί

363/2 ἐπὶ Χαρικλείδ(ο) ἄρχοντος Ἀθηναίους· ἐπὶ τοῖσδ  
ε διήλλαξαν οἱ διαιτηταὶ Σαλαμίνιος τὸς ἐκ τῶ  
ν ἐπτὰ φυλῶν καὶ Σαλαμίνιος τοὺς ἀπὸ Σονίου ὄμο  
5 λογόντας ἀλλήλοις καλῶς ἔχειν ἃ ἔγνωσαν οἱ δι  
αιτηταὶ Στέφανος Μυρρινόσιος, Κλεάγορος Ἀχα  
ρνεύς, Ἀριστογείτων Μυρρινόσιος, Εὐθύκριτος  
Λαμπρεύς, Κηφισόδοτος Αἰθαλίδης. τὰς ἱερεωσ  
ύνας κοινὰς εἶναι ἀμφοτέρων εἰς τὸν αἰεὶ χρόν  
10 ον τῆς Ἀθηνᾶς τῆς Σκιράδος, καὶ τὴν τὸ Ἡρακλέο  
ς τὸ ἐπὶ Πορθμῶι, καὶ τὴν τὸ Εὐρυσάκος, καὶ τὴν τῆ  
ς Ἀγλαύρο καὶ Πανδρόσο καὶ τῆς Κοροτρόφο· καὶ κ  
ληρῶσθαι κοινῇ ἐξ ἀμφοτέρων ἐπειδὴν τελευτ  
ῆσει τις τῶν ἱερείων ἢ τῶν ἱερέων· τὸς δὲ λανχάν  
15 οντας ἱερεῶσθαι ἐφ’ οἷσπερ καὶ οἱ πρότερον ἱερ  
εῶντο. τὴν δὲ γῆν τὴν ἐφ’ Ἡρακλείωι τῶι ἐπὶ Πορθμ  
ῶι καὶ τὴν ἀλ(λ)ῆν καὶ τὴν ἀγορὰν τὴν ἐν Κοίλῃι νε  
ίμασθαι δίχα ἴσην ἑκατέρως, καὶ ὄρος στήσαι τῆ  
ς ἑαυτῶν ἑκατέρως. θύειν δὲ τοῖς θεοῖς καὶ τοῖς ἡ  
20 ρωσι κατὰ τάδε· ὅσα μὲν ἢ πόλις παρέχει ἐκ τῶ δημ  
οσίου ἢ παρὰ τῶν ὠ[σ]κοφόρων ἢ παρὰ τῶν δειπνοφόρ  
ων γίγνεται λαμβάνειν Σαλαμίνιος, ταῦτα μὲν  
κοινῇ ἀμφοτέρως θύοντας νέμεσθαι τὰ κρέα ὦμ  
ἃ τὰ ἡμίσεια ἑκατέρως· ὅσα δὲ ἀπὸ τῆς μισθώσεως ἔ  
25 θυον Σαλαμίνιοι παρὰ σφῶν αὐτῶν θύειν κατὰ τὰ  
πάτρια, τὸ ἡμυσυ ἑκατέρως συμβαλλομένος εἰς ἅ  
παντα τὰ ἱερά. τοῖς δὲ ἱερεῦσι καὶ ταῖς ἱερεῖαι  
ς ἀποδιδόναι τὰ γέρα τὰ γεγραμμένα· τῶι δὲ τῷ Ἡρ  
30 ακλέος ἱερεῖ ἱερεώσυνα ΔΔΔ δραχμάς· εἰς πελαν  
ὸν δὲ ΗΗΗ δραχμάς· τούτων τὸ ἡμυσυ ἑκατέρως συμ  
βάλλεσθαι· τῶν δὲ ἱερείων ὧν ἂν κατάρξῃται τῶν  
κοινῶν λαμβάνειν ὄαρτὸ δέρμα καὶ τὸ σκέλος, εὐ  
στὸ τὸ σκέλος· βοὸς δὲ ἐννέα σάρκας καὶ τὸ δέρμα.

35 τῶι δὲ τῷ Εὐρυσάκος ἱερεῖ ἱερεώσυνα ΠΓ δραχμά  
 ς· εἰς πελανὸν ἀμφοτέρωσε ΠΓΓ δραχμάς· σκέλος κ  
 αὶ δέρματος ἐν Εὐρυσασακείωι ΔΓΓΓ δραχμάς· τούτ  
 40 ων τὸ ἥμισυ ἑκατέρος συμβάλλεσθαι· τῶι ἥρωι τῶ  
 ι ἐπὶ τῇ ἀλῆι τῶν θυομένων λαμβάνειν τὸ δέρμα  
 καὶ τὸ σκέλος. νέμειν δὲ τοῖς ἱερεῦσι καὶ ταῖς ἰ  
 45 ερείαις ἐν τοῖς ἱεροῖς ὅπο ἂν ἕκαστοι ἱερεῶντ  
 αι μερίδα παρ' ἑκατέρων. τὸς ἄρτος ἐς Σκιράδος ν  
 ἔμειν κατὰ τάδε, ἀφελόντας ἐξ ἀπάντων τὸς νομι  
 ζομένος ἀφαιρεῖσθαι κατὰ τὰ πάτρια· κήρυκι ἄρ  
 50 τον, Ἀθηνᾶς ἱερεῖαι ἄρτον, Ἡρακλέος ἱερεῖ ἄρτο  
 ν, Πανδρόσο καὶ Ἀγλαύρο ἱερεῖαι ἄρτον, Κοροτρό  
 φο καὶ καλαθηφόρωι ἄρτον, κόπαις ἄρτον· τῶν δὲ ἄ  
 λλων νέμεσθαι τὰ ἡμίσεια ἑκατέρος, ἄρχοντα δὲ κ  
 55 ληρῶν ἔμ μέρει παρ' ἑκατέρων ὅστις καταστήσει  
 τὸς ὠσκοφόρος καὶ τὰς δειπνοφόρος μετὰ τῆς ἱε  
 ρείας καὶ τὸ κήρυκος κατὰ τὰ πάτρια. ταῦτα δὲ ἂν  
 ἀγράψαι ἐς στήληι κοινήι ἀμφοτέρως καὶ στήσα  
 60 ι ἐν τῶι ἱερῶι τῆς Ἀθηνᾶς τῆς Σκιράδος. τὸν δὲ αὐ  
 τὸν ἱερέα εἶναι τῶι Εὐρυσάκει καὶ τῶι ἥρωι τῶι  
 ἐπὶ τῇ ἀλῆι. ἐὰν δέ τι δέη ἐπισκευεῶσαι τῶν ἱε  
 55 ρῶν ἐπισκευάζεν κοινήι συμβαλλ(λ)ομένος τὸ ἥμ  
 υσυ ἑκατέρος, ἐπὶ Χαρικλείδο ἄρχοντος οἱ ἐκ τῶ  
 ν ἑπτὰ φυλῶν παρέσχον ἄρχοντα. τὰ δὲ γραμματεῖ  
 α κοινὰ εἶναι ἀμφοτέρων ἅπαντα. τὴν δὲ γῆν ἐργά  
 ζεσθαι τὸμ μεμισθωμένον ἕως ἂν ἐξέλθῃ ὁ χρόν  
 60 ος ὃν ἐμισθώσατο, ἀποδιδόντα τὴν ἡμίσειαν μίσ  
 θωσιν ἑκατέροις. τὸ δὲ πρόθυμα τὸ ἀμίλλο ἔμ μέρ  
 ει ἑκατέρος κατάρχεσθαι· τῶν δὲ κρεῶν τὰ ἡμίσει  
 α ἑκατέρος λαμβάνειν καὶ τῶν δερμάτων. τὴν δὲ ἰ  
 65 ερεωσύνην τὸ κήρυκος εἶναι Θρασυκλέος κατὰ τ  
 ἄ πάτρια. τῶν δὲ ἄλλων ἐνκλημάτων ἀπάντων ἄφε  
 ῖσθαι τῶν τε ἰδί(ω)ν καὶ τῶν κοινῶν εἰς τὸν ὕ Βοηδ  
 ρομιῶνα μῆνα τὸν ἐπὶ Χαρικλείδο ἄρχοντος. <sup>vv</sup>

*vacat*

70 ἐπὶ Διφίλο Διοπείθους Σουινέως Σαλαμινίοις ἄρχ  
 οντος οἶδε ὄμοσαν Σαλαμινίων τῶν ἀπὸ Σουνίου· Διο  
 πείθης Φασυρκίδο, Φιλόνεως Ἀμεινονίκου, Χαλκιδ  
 εὺς Ἀνδρομένους, Χαριάδης Χαρικλέος, Θε(ο)φάνης  
 Ζωφάνους, Ἡγίας Ἡγησίου, Ἀμεινίας Φιλίνου. ἐπὶ Ἀν  
 75 τισθένους Ἀντιγένους Ἀχαρνέως ἄρχοντος Σαλαμι  
 νίοις οἶδε ὄμοσαν ἐκ τῶν ἑπτὰ φυλῶν· Θρασυκλῆς Θρά  
 σωνος Βουτά, Στρατοφῶν Στράτωνος Ἀγρυ, Μελίτιος  
 Ἐξηκεστίδου Βουτά, Ἀρίσταρχος Δημοκλέους Ἀχαρ, ὕ  
 Ἀρκέων Εὐμηλίδου Ἀχαρ, Χαϊρέστρατος Πανκλείδο Ἐ  
 80 πικηφί, Δήμων Δημαρέτο Ἀγρυλῆ. *vac.*  
 Ἀρχέλεως εἶπεν· ὅπως ἂν Σαλαμίνιοι τὰ ἱερά θύωσι αἰεὶ  
 τοῖς θεοῖς καὶ τοῖς ἥρωσι κατὰ τὰ πάτρια καὶ  
 γίγνητα[ι] ἐφ' οἷς διήλλαξαν οἱ διαλλακταὶ ἀμφοτέρως

- καὶ οἱ αἰρεθέντες ὄμοσαν, ἐψηφίσθαι Σαλαμινί  
 οἰς τὸν ἄρχοντα Ἄρισταρχον ἐγγράψαι τὰς θυσίας ἀπάσας  
 καὶ τὰς τιμὰς τῶν ἱερέων εἰς τὴν στήλην ἐν εἰ  
 αἰ διαλλαγᾷ εἰσιν ὅπως ἂν οἱ ἄρχοντες αἰεὶ παρ'  
 ἀνφοτέρων εἰδῶσι ὅ τι δεῖ ἀργύριον συνβάλλεσθαι εἰς τὰ[ς]  
 θυσίας ἀπάσας ἑκατέρους ἀπὸ τῆς μισθώσεως τῆς γῆς τῆς  
 ἐφ' Ἡρακλείω καὶ στήσαι τὴν στήλην ἐν τῷ
- 85 Εὐρυσακείωι. <sup>v11/2</sup> Μουνιχιῶνος. ἐπὶ Πορθμῶι· Κουροτρόφωι  
 αἶγα Δ, Ἰολέωι οἶν ὀλόκαντον ΔΓ: Ἄλκμήνει οἶν  
 ΔΗ, Μαίαι οἶν ΔΗ, Ἡρακλεῖ βοῦν <sup>Ρ</sup>ΔΔ, ἥρωι ἐπὶ τει ἀλεῖ  
 οἶν ΔΓ, ἥρωι ἐπ' Ἀντισάραι χοῖρον ΗΗΗΗ, ἥρωι Ἐπι-  
 πυργιδίωι χοῖρον ΗΗΗΗ, Ἰον(ι) οἶν θύειν ἐναλλάξ παρ'  
 ἔτος· ξύλα ἐφ' ἱεροῖς καὶ οἷς ἡ πόλις δίδωσιν ἐκ κύρβω(ν)  
 Δ. ὀγδόει ἐπὶ δέκα Εὐρυσάκει ἦν ΔΔΔΔ· ξύλα ἐφ'  
 ἱεροῖς(ς) καὶ εἰς τᾶλλα ΗΗ. Ἑκατονβαιῶνος. Παναθηναίοις Ἀθηνᾶι  
 ἦν: ΔΔΔΔ· ξύλα ἐφ' ἱεροῖς καὶ (εἰ)ς τᾶλλα ΗΗ.
- Μεταγετινιῶνος. ἐβδόμει Ἀπόλλωνι Πατρώωι ἦν: ΔΔΔΔ, Λητοῖ χοῖρο(ν)
- 90 [Η]ΗΗΗ, Ἀρτέμιδι χοῖρον ΗΗΗΗ, Ἀθηνᾶι Ἀγελάαι χοῖρον ΗΗΗΗ·  
 ξύλα ἐφ' ἱεροῖς καὶ εἰς τᾶλλα ΗΗΗΗ. Βοηδρομιῶνος. Ποσει  
 δῶνι Ἰπποδρομίωι ἦν ΔΔΔΔ, ἥρωι Φαίακι χοῖρ(ο)ν ΗΗΗΗ,  
 ἥρωι Τεύκρωι χοῖρον ΗΗΗΗ, ἥρωι Ναυσείρωι χοῖρον ΗΗΗΗ[Η].  
 ξύλα ἐφ' ἱεροῖς καὶ τᾶλλα ΗΗΗΗ. Πυανοψιῶνος. ἔκτει Θησεῖ ἦν ΔΔΔΔ·  
 εἰς τᾶλλα ΗΗ. Ἀπατουρίοις Διὶ Φρατρίωι ἦν ΔΔΔΔ· <sup>v</sup>  
 ξύλα ἐφ' ἱεροῖς καὶ τᾶλλα ΗΗ. Μαιμακτηριῶνος. Ἀθηνᾶι Σκιράδι  
 οἶν ἐγκύμονα ΔΗ, Σκίρωι οἶν ΔΓ· ξύλα ἐπὶ τὸν βωμὸν ΗΗ[Η].  
 κεφάλαιον οὐ δεῖ ἀναλίσκειν ἀμφοτέρως ἐς ἅπαντα τὰ ἱερά <sup>Ρ</sup>ΔΔΔΗΗ. <sup>v</sup>  
 ταῦτα θύειν κοινῆι ἀπὸ τῆς μισθώσεως τῆς γῆς τῆς(ς) ἐφ' Ἡρακλ
- 95 ἐφ' Ἰονίω, ἀργύριον συνβαλλομένους ἑκατέρους ἐς ἅπαντα τὰ ἱερά.  
 ἐὰν δέ τις εἴπει ἡ ἄρχων ἐπιψηφίσει τούτων τι καταλῶ  
 [σ]αι ἡ τρέψει ποι ἄλλοσε τὸ ἀργύριον, ὑπεύθυνον εἶναι τῷ  
 γένει ἅπαντι καὶ τοῖς ἱερεῦσι κατὰ ταῦτα καὶ ἰδία ὑπό  
 δικον καὶ τῷ βουλομένωι Σαλαμινίων. *vac.*

**No. 2.** Complete stele of grey (“Hymettian”) marble. Found in 1936 on the Kolonos Agoraios, in the same area as **no. 1**. Now stored in the basement of the Stoa of Attalos. *Agora Inv.* I 3394. Height: 0.77. Width: 0.25, broadening to 0.31 at the bottom. Thickness: 0.07–0.085. Textual bibliography: Ferguson, no. 2 (ph.), based on a transcript by Meritt and with advice from Meritt and Dow (“F”); Daux, 220–22 (on 25, 30, 39, 42, “D”); Thraette, 235 and addenda (on 8, “T”); Walbank, L4b (“W”). All punctuation is editorial.

Non-stoich. 26–30

mid-3rd cent.  
(265/4?<sup>3</sup>)

ἀγαθῆι τύχηι. ἐπὶ Φανομάχου ἄρχ  
 οντος, Μουνιχιῶνος· Ἡρακλείοις,  
 ἐπὶ τοῖσδε διελύσαντο τὰ γένη π  
 ρὸς ἄλληλα, τό τε Σουνιέων καὶ τὸ  
 5 ἀπὸ τῶν ἐξ Ἑπταφυλῶν, ὑπὸ τῶν αἰρε  
 θέντων διαλυτῶν, ὡς Ἀντιγένου Ση  
 μαχίδου καὶ Καλλ[λιτέλο]υ Σουνιέως,  
 ἐφ' ὧτε τοῦ μὲν Ἡρακλέως τοῦ τεμέ  
 νους ἄνετομ μὲν εἶναι ὡς οἱ βωμοὶ κ  
 10 αὶ τὸ ἐπέκεινα τοῦ ἰκρίου ὡς αἱ ἐλ  
 ἀαι αἱ πρῶται. [ἦ] τὸ δ' ἄλλο τέμενος ὡ  
 ρίσθαι βορρᾶθεμ μὲν ὡς ἡ αἰμασιὰ  
 ἡ πρῶτη, ὡς ἡλίου δὲ ἀνέχοντος ὡς οἱ  
 ὄροι κείνται οἱ ὀρίζοντες τὰ χωρ  
 15 ἴα, ὡς δυομένου δὲ ὡς οἱ ἐμβατήρες ὡ  
 οἱ τε πρὸς τῆι θαλάττη καὶ ὁ ἄνω κ  
 εἶμενος, καὶ εἶναι κοινὸν τοῦτο τὸ  
 τέμενος τῶν γενῶν ἀμφοτέρων. ὡς ἄλ  
 ω δὲ κατασκευῆσαι Σαλαμίνιους τοῦ  
 20 ς ἀπὸ Σουνίου τοῖς αὐτῶν ἀναλώμασ  
 τιν ἐν τῶι τεμένει τῶι κοινῶι τὸ αὐτ  
 ὸ μέγεθος τεῖ ἑαυτῶν, καὶ εἶναι ταύ  
 την τὴν ἄλλω Σαλαμινίων τῶν ἐξ Ἑπτα  
 25 φυλῶν. ὡς τὴν δ' οἰκίαν τὴν μὲν ὀμοροῦ  
 σαν τῶι τεμένει εἶναι Ἀρχαιοσαλαμ  
 ἴνιων τῶν ἐξ Ἑπταφυλῶν ὡς αἱ θύραι  
 αἱ φέρουσιν ἀμφοτέραι αἱ ἀπὸ θαλάτ  
 τῆς καὶ ὡς οἱ ὄροι ὀρίζουσιν εἰς ὀρθ[θ]  
 30 ὄν οἱ τῶν χωρίων. ὡς τὴν δ' ἑτέραν οἰκί  
 αν τὴν πρὸς ἡλίου ἀνατολὰς εἶναι Ἀ  
 ρχαιοσαλαμίνιων τῶν ἀπὸ Σουνίου ὡ  
 ς αἱ θύραι αἱ φέρουσιν αἱ ἀπὸ θαλάττ  
 τῆς καὶ ὡς οἱ ὄροι ὀρίζουσιν εἰς ὀρθὸν  
 35 οἱ τῶν χωρίων. ὡς εἶναι δὲ καὶ τοὺς κήπ  
 ους καὶ τοῦ φρέατος τὸ ἡμυσυ ἑκατέρ  
 ου τοῦ γένους, ὡς τὴν δὲ ἀλὴν καὶ τὴν ἀγ  
 ορὰν τὴν ἐν Κοίλει κοινήν εἶναι ἀμφο  
 τέρων τῶν γενῶν, ὡς τῶν δὲ χωρίων τὰ μὲ  
 40 ν πρὸς ἡλίου ἀνατολὰς εἶναι Ἀρχαιο  
 σαλαμίνιων τῶν ἀπὸ Σουνίου ὡς οἱ ὄρ  
 οὶ κείνται. ὡς τὰ δὲ πρὸς ἡλίου δυσμὰς ε  
 ἶναι Ἀρχαιοσαλαμίνιων τῶν ἐξ Ἑπτα  
 φυλῶν ὡς οἱ ὄροι κείνται, καὶ τὴν ἱερὰ  
 ν ἄρουραν. *vac.*

<sup>3</sup> The archon Phanomachos is not otherwise attested. For the possible date see M. J. Osborne, *ZPE* 78 (1989) 229–30. On the possibility, not strong in my view, that he was not archon of Athens but archon of Salamis, see Part 2. S. V. Tracy, *Hesp.* 57 (1988) 305, has identified the hand as that of the cutter of Ag. I 3238 and 4169, whose datable work falls within the period 286/5–245/4.

## Notes

## No. 1

**Lettering.** The lettering falls into four sections:

- (a) 1, inscribed at bottom of pediment (letter height, 1 cm.);
- (b) 2–68, slightly wavering stoich. 38 (l.h. 0.6 cm. Stoich. square: 1.2 cm. horizontal, by 1.1 cm. vertical). At the start there is no margin, but one develops on either side as the stele tapers towards the bottom;
- (c) 69–79, as (b), except that the stoich. pattern frequently breaks down and the letters are slightly closer together, 39–41 per line. The margins continue to increase in width (to max. c. 2.5 cm. on each side);
- (d) 80–97, non-stoich. with no margins and slightly smaller and much more crowded letters, min. 79 letters per full line, increasing towards the end up to max. 102.

The hand, which is the same throughout, shows some marked peculiarities, which, for the most part, are well described by F, pp. 8–9. The short strokes of letters are commonly omitted. Thus A is frequently  $\Lambda$  and I may represent B, P, E, K, T,  $\Phi$ , and  $\text{†}$  (1 drachma) as well as I (1 obol), II can be H and M can lack its two central strokes.  $\Sigma$  in one case consists of the upper two strokes only (88,  $|| <$  for EIS). With the exception of  $\Lambda$  for A, which is very common, and M without central strokes, which, because the bars slope inwards, leaves no doubt about the reading of the letter, I have indicated such short-stroke omissions (including a number not noted by F) by subscript dots (noted in the commentary below only where the reading of the letter is in doubt). The strokes of  $\Delta$  are usually of equal length and omission of the bottom horizontal is less common, but, though not noted by F, it does occur (32,  $\Lambda\text{APTO}$  for  $\Delta\text{APTO}$  and 86–87,  $\text{EΠΙΠΥΡΓΙΑΙΩΙ}$  for  $\text{EΠΙΠΥΡΓΙΑΙΩΙ}$ ). Five times a letter is omitted altogether and a vacant space left. In four of these the letter in question is O or  $\Omega$  (2, 66, 72 and 91), in the fifth (88) the letter,  $\Sigma$ , should consist of short strokes and is immediately preceded and followed by long verticals. As Dow perceived, all these features are probably due to the cutter's inscribing long strokes first, using his long chisel, and back-filling short strokes and rounded ones later, which, however, he frequently omitted to do. This tendency is more marked towards the end of the inscription, especially in lines 80ff. Omission of one or more letters without leaving a space apparently occurs at least twice at the ends of the crowded lines 87ff (not noted by F) and occasionally within those lines (see notes on 87, 89 and 94). The centre dot of theta is occasionally omitted (e.g. in 18; I have not marked these with subscript dots). Twice, gemination of  $\Lambda$  occurs (17 and 55; not N, as F p. 8 has it).

Within the list of sacrifices, 85–94, two devices are used sporadically to mark off money signs from ordinary text: punctuation of the common 4th century type, “:”; and extra space between characters. Where this space amounts to about the average width of a letter I have indicated it in the text as a *vacat*, but I have not marked the more frequent cases where the extra space is less than this.

1. The space between each successive letter decreases.

2.  $\text{Χαρικλείδ(ο)}$ .  $\text{Χαρικλείδ}^{\nu}$  F,  $\text{Χαρικλείδ}^{\prime}$  S,  $\text{Χαρικλείδ}^{\nu}$  W. As Dow saw, the O was omitted in error and a blank space left, omission of a type which occurs several times with round letters in this text (see **Lettering**, above). There is no question of elision or deliberate abbreviation.

$\text{τοῖσδ}$ .  $\text{τοῖσ[δ]}$  previous eds. The left part of the  $\Delta$  is visible.

3.  $\acute{\epsilon}\kappa$ .  $\acute{\epsilon}\kappa$  F, S,  $\acute{\epsilon}\zeta$  W.

4.  $\acute{\epsilon}\pi\tau\acute{\alpha}$   $\phi\upsilon\lambda\omega\tilde{\nu}$ .  $\acute{\epsilon}\pi\tau\acute{\alpha}$   $\phi\upsilon\lambda\omega\tilde{\nu}$  S, following Wilhelm,  $\acute{\epsilon}\pi\tau\alpha\phi\upsilon\lambda\omega\tilde{\nu}$  F, W. In 4th century Attica, and with the other branch being described as from an Attic place, Sounion (one of the Cleisthenic demes, though the name was admittedly pre-Cleisthenic, see *IG* i<sup>3</sup> 1024), F's suggestion that the “seven phylai” are the seven Cleisthenic phylai to which non-Sounian members of the genos belonged, is consistent with the demotics of attested members (though not definitely implied by them, see F, 13) and, while not certain, remains the most attractive. Parker, 312, with some other commentators he cites, is sceptical on the ground that “seven is a significant number, and it seems more likely that the ‘seven tribes’ is an archaic

organisation (perhaps of Salamis itself) otherwise unknown”. But it is not rational to posit otherwise unattested entities when the phenomena can be explained as easily by existing ones, and any significance which one might wish to attribute to the use of the number seven would seem consistent with its being the number of Cleisthenic phylai to which members belonged, whether by accident or design. On whether the description amounted to a name or was simply a factual statement of provenience, see note on **no. 2, 5**.

**4–5.** ὁμολογῶντας. ὁμολογοῦντας previous eds. The O is followed in the next stoichos by N. There is certainly no Y.

**6.** Κλεάγορος. Κλεαγόρας previous eds. The penultimate letter is certainly O. This arbitrator may be identical with the only other Kleagoros attested in Attica, on the judicial curse tablet from Piraeus, *IG* iii 3, 38 + A. Wilhelm, *Österr. Jahreshfte* VII (1904), 120 (cf. E. Ziebarth, *SBAB* 1934, 1029): Φιλίππιδης, Εὐθύκριτος, Κλεάγορος, Μενέτιμος, καὶ τὸς ἄλλος πάντας ἡόσοι συν[ήγο]ροι αὐτο[ί]ς]. It is possible that the curse tablet belonged in the context of the disputes recorded in our inscription: another of the names on the tablet, Euthykritos, is the same as one of our arbitrators (7–8; while not rare, the name was not especially common. *LGN* II records eleven 4th century cases, several interrelated); the findspot of the tablet would suit a link with a genos with a cult role at Phaleron and an interest in the island of Salamis; and the curse arose from a judicial context involving *synegoroi*, while the decision recorded in our inscription was reached in the context of a number of ongoing ἐγκλήματα, both ἴδια and κοινά (now to be terminated, 65–66). The orthography of the curse tablet would suit a date in or around the 360s, though a somewhat later date could not be ruled out; as is clear from **no. 2**, some of the matters were still in dispute a century later.

**10–11.** Ἡρακλέο/ς. Ἡρακλέο/υ F, S, Ἡρακλέο/ς W. One would expect this priesthood to be described as “of Herakles”, rather than “of the Herakleion”. Cf. the other priesthoods in this list (e.g. “of Eurysakes”, not “of the Eurysakeion”) and the reference to this priesthood at 44. However, I was unable to detect sufficient trace to confirm the reading of the final letter as sigma.

**17.** For the gemination of Λ in ἀλλήν cf. συμβαλλομένος in 55 and see Threatte I, 532.

**18.** δίχα ἴσιν. διχαστήν previous eds. διχαστός, attested elsewhere as meaning “divisible by two” (*LSJ* cites [Iambl.] *Theol. Arithm.* 35), never suited the sense required here (“here it seems to mean halved”, F p. 55). The letters between A and H are not easy to read at autopsy. However, F’s T is undoubtedly Σ on my squeeze (small and with very nearly horizontal upper and lower bars, as commonly elsewhere in this text). The previous letter is less clear, but there may be faint trace of the I (possibly cut over an erased Y?) which the context seems in any case to require. I take the sense to be that this property is to be divided in two equal parts for each branch. *LSJ* Suppl. s.v. διχαστός should be deleted.

**19.** θύεν. θύεν F, W, θύειν S.

**24–25.** The left edge of the stone is chipped away, leaving very little trace of the initial letter of either of these two lines.

**32.** δαρτῶ. See **Lettering**, above.

**41.** ἐς. ἐς S, ἐς F, W. The Σ has suffered slight damage at the junction of the two central strokes, but is otherwise quite clear on my squeeze.

**54.** ἐπισκευεάσαι. ἐπισκευεάσαι F, W, ἐπισκευάσαι S.

**55.** ἐπισκευάζεν. ἐπισκευάζεν F, W, ἐπισκευάζειν S.

**57.** ἐπὶ φυλῶν παρέσχον. Ἐπταφυλῶν F, W, ἐπὶ φυλῶν S. See on 4. The Λ has been obliterated by damage. In παρέσχον the E and Σ are difficult to read and the X is almost completely obliterated by damage.

**58.** ἀμφοτέρων. ἀ[μφο]τέρων previous eds. The lower left bar of M and the full outline of Φ are visible.

**59.** μεμισθωμένον. μεμι[σ]θωμένον F, W, μεμι[ι]σθωμένον S. All letters of this word are legible.

**65–67.** In these three lines what is normally the fifth stoichos from the end of the line is left blank. F and W mark this in 65 and 66, but not in 67 (ἄρχοντος). In addition the final two stoichoi of 68 are vacant (correctly marked by F and W). S marked none of these vacats.



drachma signs from comparison with the cost of this item elsewhere in the list, i.e. as another case of failure by the cutter to inscribe short horizontals, see **Lettering**, above.

χοῖρο(v). χοῖρο[v] previous eds. There is no room for the final nu. Cf. 87.

**90.** [F]††III. [†]††III F, W, [†]††III S. The first sign is illegible from wear. The second two are again I. ἐφ'. ἐφ' previous eds. The E is again I.

**91.** ὄν. ὄν: previous eds.

χοῖρ(ο)v. The O was not inscribed and the stoichos was left blank, cf. **Lettering**, above.

†††III. †††III previous eds.

**92.** †††III. ††† previous eds. Cf. on 94.

**94.** ††††III. †††††††† is also possible. ††††III F, W, ††††††† S. Given the tendency of the cutter to inscribe I for † (cf. 89 and 90), it is impossible to determine which of the two was intended here. As F noted (pp. 64–65), even taking the lower figure, 530<sup>1</sup>/<sub>2</sub> dr., this total of expenditure ἐς ἅπαντα τὰ ἱερὰ is not easily reconcilable with the sum of the priestly perquisites, 59 dr., and the recorded costs of the sacrifices, 461 dr. (F's 460<sup>1</sup>/<sub>2</sub> is three obols short because of the misreading in 92), i.e. 520 dr. It is difficult to see the reason for this. It may be due to simple error. Alternatively it may, as F suggested, be accounted for by the sacrifice for Ion in alternate years, for which there is no sum entered in its place on the stone (line 87). That, however, would still seem to leave a surplus of 1<sup>1</sup>/<sub>2</sub> or so dr. One wonders if the cost of the loaves in the shrine of Skiras (41) might have something to do with it.

τῆς. The omission of the sigma seems to have been a straightforward error. No space was left for it.

**94–95.** Ἡρακλ/έωι Σονίο. Ἡρακλ(είωι) / τῶι Σονίο is also possible. Ἡρακλ[είωι] / [έπ]ι F, W, [έπ]ι S. There is no room for any further letters after ΗΡΑΚΛ at the end of 94 (cf. 87 and 89 for end-line abbreviation). At the start of the following line I read a lower vertical (I for E or T ?, cf. **Lettering**, above), followed by what appears more like a straight-sided omega than a pi, running into the following iota, which is quite clear.

**95.** συνβαλλομένου. συνβαλλομένου previous eds. Cf. 83.

**95–96.** καταλ[υ][σ]αι. καταλ[υ][σ]αι previous eds.

**96.** γένει. γένει previous eds. The second E is I, cf. **Lettering**, above.

## No. 2

**Lettering.** Tracy has attributed this inscription to the prolific “cutter of *Agora* I 3238 and I 4169”, whose datable work falls within the period 286/5–245/4 (*Hesp.* 57 [1988] 305). He identifies the salient features of the hand as that, with the exception of omega, round letters are cut with straight strokes, “omicron and theta have straight sides; occasionally the lower part may curve somewhat. The loop of rho is almost always square. The central part of phi is usually quite rectangular.” In contrast to **no. 1** the letters are cut neatly and carefully and the inscription makes an elegant impression. Although the text is strictly non-stoichedon, columns of letters are frequently aligned. Occasional errors were corrected by erasure and re-inscription and no mistakes remain in the final text.

**5.** Ἐπταφυλῶν (thus also F, W). ἐπτὰ φυλῶν is also possible, but the absence of immediately preceding definite article here, in contrast to **no. 1**, line 4 etc., suggests the possibility (no more, I think) that what, in 363/2, was a simple description of the provenience of one of the two branches of the genos had evolved a century later into the name of one of the two gene into which the branches had evolved.

**7.** Καλλ[λιτέλο]υ. Καλλιτέλου F, W. Traces suggest ΚΑΛΙΑΕ *vel sim.* was erased and corrected to ΚΑΛΛΙΤΕ.

**8.** Ἡρακλέως. Ἡρακλέως Threatte, Ἡρακλέος F, W. Ω for OΥ is very unusual in Attic texts, but, as Threatte I, 235 noted, correcting F's reading of an O here, this is one of a number of attestations of it in the genitive of Ἡρακλῆς.

**11.** πρῶται. [v]. πρῶται. v F, W. A letter (?E) was erased and a stoichos left blank.

19. κατασκεῦσαι. κατασκευάσαι F, W. For the contraction of this verb in the future, fairly common in the Hellenistic period, cf. e.g. *IG* ii<sup>2</sup> 2499, 10 and see Dittenberger *ad SIG* 1097 note 6. The only other example in the aorist seems to be *P. Corn.* 4.8–9 (κατασκεῦσαι, 3rd cent.).

25, 30, 39, 42. Ἀρχαιοσαλαμίνιον. Ἀρχαιοσαλαμίνιον Daux, ἀρχαίο Σαλαμινίων F, W. F's explanation that the intention was that the property in question should be "(inalienable) capital of the Salaminioi", reading ἀρχαιο(v) or ἀρχαίο for ἀρχαίου and attributing the spelling to legal/business archaism (cf. Threatte I, 259), fails to convince, not least given the absence of parallels either in general for legal-archaic spellings of this type or specifically for provision of inalienability using such a formula. More attractive is D's tentative suggestion that the letters be read as a name, Ἀρχαιοσαλαμίνιοι, "the Old Salaminioi". Admittedly, the Salaminioi twice refer to themselves in this inscription simply as Σαλαμίνιοι (19 and 23), but that is sufficiently accounted for by the fact that, at both places, it is one or other of the two branches that is specified and there is therefore no risk of confusion about what Salaminioi are meant. On my theory about the relationship of the genos to the island (see Part 2) an explanation is also to hand as to why they were not called "Old Salaminioi" in no.1, i.e. between the two inscriptions, control of Salamis had passed to the Macedonians and the genos members had been ejected from the island.

## PART 2: THE SALAMINIOI AND THE ISLAND OF SALAMIS

Both our inscriptions document settlements by arbitration of disputes between the two branches of the genos Salaminioi, the Salaminioi from Sounion and the Salaminioi from the Seven Phylai. The settlement of 363/2, recorded in **no. 1**, dealt with a number of issues relating to the cult and property of the genos. Among other things we learn that its members had Athenian demotics and that it possessed land and a saltpan in the area of Sounion and an agora in Koile. We learn of a rich variety of religious activity, much of it, as was probably a defining feature of formal Attic gene, entailing a leading role in the public cult of the city. The genos had important functions, for example, in the administration of the polis festival Oschophoria, the chief location of which, the temple of Athena Skiras at Phaleron, was a genos centre; it enjoyed public funding and provision in the *kyrbeis* (i.e. Solon's sacred calendar of the polis) for some of its cult;<sup>4</sup> it had a priesthood and cult centre in central Athens, at the Eurysakeion, also used by a Cleisthenic phyle, Aiantis.<sup>5</sup> The shorter **no. 2** dates to about a century after the first. Cult does not loom as large; but again the two branches, which now describe themselves as separate gene, settle a dispute about their common property: about the temenos of Herakles at Sounion, threshing floors and houses within it and associated agricultural land; about gardens and a well; about the saltpan and the agora in Koile again.

One of many tantalising issues raised, but not explicitly resolved, by the inscriptions of this genos, is that of its relationship to the island of Salamis. The genos consisted of Athenian citizens, it owned property and administered cult in Attica. Its name, however, suggests an association with Salamis, an association confirmed by several of its cults, including those of Athena Skiras – Skiras was a name specially associated with Salamis and indeed was thought to have been an old name of the island itself<sup>6</sup> – and of Eurysakes, son of the Salaminian hero Ajax and personification of his broad shield.<sup>7</sup> How is this to be explained?

<sup>4</sup> **no. 1**, 20 and 87.

<sup>5</sup> Cf. Parker, 57–59 with 310–11, who properly stresses the public role of the genos in line with that attested for other Attic gene, including those more prominent in the literary record, such as the Kerykes, Eumolpidai and Eteoboutadai. In the 5th century a genos without such public function, such as the Gephyraioi, was remarkable. See further below.

<sup>6</sup> Strabo 9.393. Cf. Hdt. 8.94 (a shrine of Athena Skiras on Salamis); Plut. *Sol.* 9 (cape Skiradion on Salamis); *FGH* 328 Philochoros F 111 (shrine of Skiros of Salamis at Phaleron) etc. See Parker, 308–16.

<sup>7</sup> Paus. 1.35.2, Plut. *Sol.* 10.2 etc. See Ferguson, 16.

Most earlier theories have fallen broadly into two sets. On the first, the ancestors of our genos members were originally native Salaminians who at some stage had migrated to Attica, either in the Dark Ages, or in an exchange of populations between Athens and Salamis when Athenian control of the island was firmly established at the end of the 6th century.<sup>8</sup> On the second, they were originally Athenians, but with a Salaminian connection: Athenians who had occupied Salamis in the Dark Ages, had been ejected by Megara before Solon's early 6th century campaign to recover the island and had returned to Attica,<sup>9</sup> or Athenians who had never been to Salamis at all, but were constituted as a genos in the archaic period as political propaganda in Athens' struggle with Megara for control of the island.<sup>10</sup>

In the current state of the evidence, decisive arguments for or against any of these theories are elusive. All of the them, however, have weaknesses. It does not seem very plausible that Athenians should have undergone a mass voluntary exchange of land with relatively remote Salamis; that they should have done so on terms which gave Salaminians not only Athenian citizenship, but positions of high privilege in the religion of the polis, seems near inconceivable, especially in the years following the fall of the tyranny, when there was acute sensitivity to the issue of access to citizen rights, even among existing inhabitants of Attica.<sup>11</sup> At an earlier period the incorporation of immigrants into the community of the polis may have been less problematic;<sup>12</sup> but the role of the genos in polis religion would remain difficult to credit. Later it was normal to exclude groups enfranchised *en masse* from certain of the religious *intima* of citizenship, including a strict prohibition on tenure of any priesthood.<sup>13</sup> It might be argued that this was a product of a preoccupation with defining and restricting citizenship characteristic of the classical period. I think it more likely that it reflects, at least in part, a deep-seated sensitivity to the central role of religion in defining community, at the level of both the polis and its subgroups, a sensitivity which one might expect to have originated very much earlier, and which is indeed observable even in our historical record for the archaic period, meagre though that record is. On the incorporation of Eleusis the Eleusinian gene were allowed to retain their role in the Eleusinian religion, they were not provided with new priesthoods in the Athenian; and there are instructive differences between the Salaminioi and the one Attic genos which we know to have been regarded in antiquity as being composed of archaic immigrants, the Gephyraioi.<sup>14</sup> In the 5th century this genos was notable for

---

<sup>8</sup> Nilsson (late 6th century exchange of populations); M. Zambelli, *Riv. Fil.* 104 (1976) 163–81 (Dark Age immigration, 6th century acquisition of genos status by campaigning for recovery of Salamis, Sounian branch added later); Humphreys (Dark Age immigration to Athens, spreading out into Attica later); R. Osborne (similar to Humphreys, claiming support in the archaeological record). The poor soil of Sounion, suitable for settling immigrants (cf. n. 60 below), can be claimed in support of such theories, as can the actual case of a group of Aeginetan democrats being settled there, Hdt. 6.90.

<sup>9</sup> M. Guarducci, *Riv. Fil.* 26 (1948) 223–43.

<sup>10</sup> Ferguson, 42. N. Robertson, *Festivals and Legends* (1992), 128, has recently sought to undermine still further a real link with Salamis. He suggests that the Salaminioi were so named not from the island of Salamis but from their association with beaches, salt-flats etc., i.e. directly from ἄλς, ἄλή etc. I do not find this persuasive. The etymology deriving the words Salamis and Salaminioi from ἄλς, ἄλή etc. is very uncertain (cf. Oberhammer, *RE* 1920, cols. 1826–27, who notes an alternative possible derivation from Semitic “shalom”, “peace”) and other Attic names that clearly do derive from it are not in Sal-, but Hal-, e.g. Halimous, Halai. Moreover the theory sits uneasily with the connection with the island implicit in the location and character of genos cult. It seems implausible that this defining feature of the identity of the genos should have arisen simply from verbal coincidence.

<sup>11</sup> *Ath. Pol.* 13.5 and 21.2, *Arist. Pol.* 3.1275b34–37 with *Phratries*, 262–66.

<sup>12</sup> Solon, *Laws* F 75R was said to have granted naturalisation to those who immigrated with their families to practise a trade with a view to encouraging such persons to settle at Athens; and note the immigrant genos Gephyraioi, discussed below.

<sup>13</sup> Dem. 59.92, 104, 106; M. J. Osborne, *Naturalization in Athens* (1981–83) D1 and vol. IV, 173–76. Cf. *Phratries* 51–54.

<sup>14</sup> Hdt. 5.57–61, cf. Parker, 288–89. The status of the Gephyraioi as a formal genos does not seem in serious doubt. In later antiquity it is firmly attested as such (*SEG* 30.85; *IG* ii<sup>2</sup> 3629–30) and there is no known formal Attic genos in the Hellenistic and Roman periods which demonstrably had some different status in the Archaic and Classical.

maintaining separate, distinctive, cults in which other Athenians did not participate,<sup>15</sup> while they themselves were excluded from some (apparently minor) aspects of citizenship.<sup>16</sup> I have suggested elsewhere that these restrictions may have been similar in character to those which applied to enfranchised immigrant groups in the classical period.<sup>17</sup> In any case, it is clear that the immigrant status of the Gephyraioi caused them to maintain a sort of religious apartheid. The fact that there is no sign of such apartheid in the case of the Salaminian genos, and indeed that, to the contrary, they played the prominent role in public religion which is observable in our inscriptions, including supply of state priesthoods, suggests that the genos Salaminioi may not have been an immigrant group.

The archaeological case recently made for a movement of population from Salamis in the Dark Ages is unconvincing, both because insufficient evidence has yet been adduced to show that the population of the island was lower at this period than at previous and subsequent ones, and because, even if such evidence were forthcoming, it is an obvious fallacy that low population implies population movement. Other causes, e.g. disease, drought, famine and war, are no less likely. Indeed relatively low population levels are suggested by the archaeological record during this period throughout Greece, including Attica itself. A satisfactory explanation of these will clearly need to comprehend factors other than population movement within Greece.<sup>18</sup>

The theory of early Salaminian immigration also faces the difficulty of explaining the concentration of a branch of the genos at Sounion. There is, it seems, no archaeological evidence for cult activity there before the end of the eighth century.<sup>19</sup> It has been suggested that the genos had an original base in the city of Athens and that one branch later moved *en masse* to Sounion.<sup>20</sup> But it is an awkward theory that requires the positing of such a complex and chronologically distant sequence of events to explain our 4th and 3rd century phenomena. Moreover, little support for an original Athenian base can be gleaned from our texts.<sup>21</sup> The name of the branch, “from the seven phylai”<sup>22</sup> and the demotics of known members suggest a wider spread;<sup>23</sup> and such connections with Athens as there are in our inscriptions, the Eurysakeion and possibly the agora in Koile,<sup>24</sup> might better be explained as a consequence of a role

<sup>15</sup> καί σφι ἰρά ἐστι ἐν Ἀθήνησι ἰδρυμένα, τῶν οὐδὲν μέτα τοῖσι λοιποῖσι Ἀθηναίοισι, ἄλλα τε κεχωρισμένα τῶν ἄλλων ἰρῶν καὶ δὴ καὶ Ἀχαιῆς Δήμητρος ἰρῶν τε καὶ ὄργια. Hdt. 5.61.2.

<sup>16</sup> Ἀθηναῖοι δὲ σφραγῶν ἐπὶ ῥητοῖσι ἐδέξαντο σφραγῶν αὐτῶν εἶναι πολιήτας, (οὐ?) πολλῶν τεων καὶ οὐκ ἀξιαπηγῆτων ἐπιτάξαντες ἔργεσθαι. Hdt. 5.57.2.

<sup>17</sup> *Phratries* 53, n. 120.

<sup>18</sup> R. Osborne, 157, claims relatively abundant archaeological evidence from the island in the Submycenaean period and again in the Classical, but little inbetween (a pit containing late Helladic and Geometric pottery from Prophitis Elias; isolated tomb finds beginning to appear in the 6th century). But the only evidence he adduces for high Submycenaean population level is just one cemetery, quite inadequate to establish that the population of the island as a whole was higher at this period than later. Perhaps there was e.g. a move in burial site, or a move in population within the island (note the tradition of an older city of Salamis to the south of the island, Strabo 9.393 with Frazer on Pausanias, ii p. 478) or a change in funerary practices (note the later isolated tomb finds and cf. Plut. *Sol.* 10, where Hereas of Megara is said to have claimed that Salaminian practice was to bury in small groups). The truth is that not enough is yet known of the archaeology of Salamis to justify conclusions about its population levels at any of these early periods.

<sup>19</sup> See R. Osborne. Admittedly here and elsewhere he glosses over the serious problems inherent in archaeological arguments on such matters *e silentio*. Cf. previous note.

<sup>20</sup> Humphreys, 247 (first settlement close to Acropolis, move out to Alopeke and, in the 6th cent., to Sounion, when the silver mines began to attract interest); R. Osborne, 158 (first settlement at Athens, move to Sounion sometime after end of 8th century).

<sup>21</sup> Humphreys' theory, based on *IG* ii<sup>2</sup> 2345, that the genos belonged to a phratry based at Alopeke, is uncertain. See Appendix, C.

<sup>22</sup> Cf. Part 1 above, note on **no. 1**, line 4.

<sup>23</sup> Some were from demes in the city area (e.g. Skambonidai, Epikhephisia), others from demes further out (e.g. Acharnai).

<sup>24</sup> If (a) Koile was the city deme of that name and (b) the agora was used by genos members and not let out. Both are attractive possibilities, but neither is certain. On (a) J.H. Young, *Hesp.* 10 (1941) 163–91, argued that the Herakleion at

in a central state cult and of the tendency, well attested for Attic corporate groups especially during and after the Peloponnesian War, to have meeting places etc. for convenience in the area of the city.<sup>25</sup>

It seems more likely that the genos was Athenian in origin. But the idea that they never went to Salamis is less easy to credit. Certainly one may believe that the tradition of the donation of Salamis to Athens by Philaios and Eurysakes, sons of Ajax, originated in the context of the struggle for the control of Salamis in the archaic period;<sup>26</sup> but it is a large step from this to the idea that the genos Salaminioi defined themselves as descendants of Eurysakes and were an instrument for the pursuit of this claim. That a genos should be created and named for mere propaganda seems implausible, and recent work on the gene and other groups with patronymic-type names in -idai has shown it to be highly questionable that they regarded themselves as descendants of their eponyms or of the objects of their cult.<sup>27</sup> Here the group does not even have an eponym of this sort. It seems no more likely that they regarded themselves as descendants of Eurysakes, whose priesthood they held, than of the Hero at the Saltpan, whose priesthood they also held.<sup>28</sup>

Guarducci's suggestion of an early Dark Age migration to Salamis and subsequent return escapes some of the difficulties inherent in other versions of the immigration theory: the group's role in Athenian religion becomes less problematic, for example; but it faces difficulties of its own. That the archaeological record suggests that Salamis was all but unpopulated at the time of the supposed inward migration is not perhaps one of them, for, as noted above, that record is insufficient to bear such an inference; a more serious problem is that it relies to an extent on an idea to be found in later sources, namely that early Athenian settlers on Salamis had been ejected shortly before Solon. This is not a sure implication of surviving fragments of Solon's poem on Salamis and may be a false deduction from it by later writers.<sup>29</sup> In any case, unease would remain about positing a complex hypothesis about events in the Dark Ages to explain our phenomena of the 4th and 3rd centuries.

There is another possible explanation. So far as I can see it is not, any more than the earlier theories, demonstrably true or false, and my intention here is to do no more than float it as a possibility for consideration. It is that the genos of the Salaminioi consisted of Athenians who were established on Salamis between the 6th century and the early Hellenistic period.

The history of Salamis in the 7th and 6th centuries can not be reconstructed in any detail from our mostly anecdotal sources. We can be confident of little more than that there was a struggle for control of

---

Porthmos referred to in our texts was to be located at point Zeza, on the East Coast a little north of cape Sounion and, building on this, an agora discovered in this area has been tentatively identified as the "agora in Koile" which the genos decided to divide in two in 363/2 (no. 1, 17) and to hold in common again a century later (no. 2, 36–37; see E. Ch. Kakavoyiannis, *Arch. Delt.* 32 (1977) [1982] *Mel.* 206–207; M. Salliora-Oikononakou, *Arch. Delt.* 34 (1979) [1986] *Mel.* 161–73.). Young's case, however, is inconclusive, relying to a worrying extent, for example, on seductive tales spun him by locals. A west coast location of the Porthmos would arguably be more comfortable for a group with Salaminian links and would suit a natural reading of no. 2, 15–16, where the temenos of Herakles is bounded to the west by οἱ ἐμβατήρες οἱ τε πρὸς τῇ θαλάττῃ καὶ ὁ ἄνω κείμενος. The toponym Koile is otherwise attested in Attica only in relation to the city deme of that name and if the agora was used by the genos it is not easy to see that a Sounian location would be convenient for the members of the branch "from the seven phylai". It seems possible that the new agora belongs rather to the deme Sounion (two deme agoras are attested by *IG* ii<sup>2</sup> 1180). Our texts themselves are indecisive on the issue. The proponent of a city location may point out that, in contrast to the saltpan, after which the agora is mentioned at no. 1, 17 and no. 2, 37, it is given a specific location, which might imply that, while the saltpan was in the same general location as the rest of the property mentioned at Sounion, the agora was in a different area. On the other hand, the fact that it is listed in a single sequence with the Herakleion at Porthmos and the saltpan at no. 1, 16–17, has suggested to at least one distinguished scholar with whom I have discussed this issue (though it does not to me) that all were located in the same area. On (b) I have not hitherto been able to extract any good argument from the text. Agoras *could* apparently be let out, see *IG* ii<sup>2</sup> 2500.

<sup>25</sup> *Phratries* 13 and *ZPE* 110 (1996) 79–81; Whitehead, 86–90; cf. N. Jones, *Hesperia* 64 (1995) 503–42.

<sup>26</sup> *Plut. Sol.* 10, cf. *Paus.* 1.35.2, *Hdt.* 6.35, *Sophocles Ajax* 530ff. Ferguson, 16.

<sup>27</sup> See e.g. Kearns, 92–101; *Phratries* 220–22.

<sup>28</sup> It is in part for this reason that it is uncertain whether Alcibiades, who *was* said to be descended from Eurysakes (*Plato Alc.* I 121a), was a member of this genos (cf. *Isoc.* 16.25).

<sup>29</sup> See next note.

the island between Athens and Megara, that Solon urged the Athenians to capture the island in his poem, *Salamis*, and that, at the latest by the time of the Athenian decree, *IG* i<sup>3</sup> 1, which concerns the property and obligations of Athenians on Salamis and which probably dates to around the end of the 6th century, Athenian control had been established. It is possible that, in the course of this struggle, control of the island had changed hands more than once.<sup>30</sup> *IG* i<sup>3</sup> 1 contained regulations for an Athenian settlement, probably a cleruchy,<sup>31</sup> members of which it is attractive to identify as the men from Salamis, γένος εόντες Ἀθηναῖοι, whom Aristides landed on Psyttaleia during the battle of Salamis.<sup>32</sup> From the 4th and 3rd centuries we have evidence for the members of this settlement, whom I shall call “Atheno-Salaminians”, as a corporate entity passing honorific decrees and the like and referred to variously as Ἀθηναίων ὁ δῆμος ὁ ἐν Σαλαμῖνι, ὁ δῆμος ὁ Σαλαμινίων or possibly just Σαλαμῖνιοι.<sup>33</sup> An individual member of the community could also be referred to as “Salaminios”.<sup>34</sup> There was an annual archon for Salamis, referred to in *IG* i<sup>3</sup> 1. From *Ath. Pol.* we learn that he was appointed centrally at Athens, like the demarch for Piraeus. He seems to have combined the roles that, in Attica, would have been performed by a demarch and the eponymous archon.<sup>35</sup> Salamis came under Macedonian control when it was taken by Kassandros towards the end of the 4th century. It was apparently restored to Athens by Aratos in 229, though there seem to have been periods of Athenian control in the interim.<sup>36</sup>

One attraction of the theory that the *genos* were Atheno-Salaminians would be its economy. In **no. 1** the term “Salaminioi” is used without qualification in reference to the *genos*; see lines 2–3, 22, 80, 83 etc. The *genos* does not differentiate itself from the Atheno-Salaminian community, as it might have done if it was entirely separate, e.g. by calling itself explicitly “the *genos* of the Salaminioi”. A good theory posits the smallest number of entities consistent with the phenomena. It is preferable, *ceteris*

<sup>30</sup> Fragments of Solon’s *Salamis* are preserved by Plut. *Sol.* 8 and D.L. 1.47. Several different accounts of a successful Solonian campaign to capture the island were current later in antiquity (two at Plut. *Sol.* 8–9, a third at Paus. 1.40.5), but some or all of these may arise from the tendency of later generations to attribute to Solon notable historical achievements and/or to overinterpretation of the *Salamis* poem, the surviving fragments of which do not necessarily imply a campaign led by him. Some thought that Peisistratos had been a general in this campaign (*Ath. Pol.* 17.2) and Peisistratos’ capture of the Megarian port of Nisaea (Hdt. 1.59) was interpreted by Plut. *Sol.* 12 (or his source) as following a Megarian reconquest of Salamis and Nisaea. The dispute over Salamis was supposed to have been resolved by Spartan arbitration in Athens’ favour, Solon arguing Athens’ case and a Cleomenes, possibly the late 6th century king of that name, among the arbitrators (Plut. *Sol.* 10). For a fuller summary of the ancient accounts see R. P. Legon, *Megara* (1981) 121–29 and 136–39.

<sup>31</sup> Σ Pind. *Nem.* 2, 19; *IG* ii<sup>2</sup> 30b, 4; *ML* 14; *IG* i<sup>3</sup> 1, 2 with Ad. et Corr. at *IG* i<sup>3</sup> vol. 2, p. 935.

<sup>32</sup> Hdt. 8.95

<sup>33</sup> The evidence is conveniently collected by Taylor, esp. n. 27. See also her forthcoming book on Salamis, to be published by Gieben, and below Appendix, D. The clearest case of “Salaminioi” used in an inscription in reference to the Salaminian community seems to be A. Wilhelm, *Österr. Jahreshefte* 12 (1909) 135–36.

<sup>34</sup> Timodemos of Acharnai, Salamis-bred in the 5th century (Pind. *Nem.* 2), Leon “Salaminios” at the time of the Thirty (Plato *Apol.* 32c–d; Xen. *Hell.* 2.3.39) and the 4th century politician Moirokles of Eleusis and “Salaminios” (Harp. s.v. Μοιροκλής), were probably all members of this community. Cf. the use of “Salaminios” by Aristophanes, discussed below. (Λ)ευκόλοφος ἐξ Σαλαμῖνος, who registers property of the Thirty at *Agora* 19 P2 d8 and ἐξ Σαλαμῖνος Τιμόθεος Ἀλωπε on the Eleusinian accounts of 329/8, *IG* ii<sup>2</sup> 1672, 274, were perhaps archons of Salamis (see below). If there were “native” Salaminians in the 5th and 4th centuries who were not Athenian citizens, they have left no certain trace in the historical record. For metics on Salamis (who might or might not have been “natives”) see *IG* ii<sup>2</sup> 1570, 42; 1574, 4, 10 etc.

<sup>35</sup> *Ath. Pol.* 54, 8: κληροῦσι δὲ καὶ εἰς Σαλαμῖνα ἄρχοντα, καὶ εἰς Πειραιέα δήμαρχον, οἳ τὰ τε Διονύσια ποιοῦσι . . . ἐν Σαλαμῖνι δὲ καὶ τοῦνομα τοῦ ἄρχοντος ἀναγράφεται. Rhodes *ad loc.* observes that the cryptic final clause “ought to state something that is true of Salamis but not of the Piraeus” and suggests that the allusion may be to a published list of the archontes there. I suspect that it implies rather that the archon on Salamis was “written up” on Salaminian inscriptions, i.e. was used for dating them *in place of* the Athenian eponymous archon (whereas in Piraeus the demarch was *in addition to* the Athenian eponymous, see *IG* ii<sup>2</sup> 2498). See e.g. *IG* ii<sup>2</sup> 3093 and Appendix, D.

<sup>36</sup> Capture by Kassandros: Paus. 1.35.2, Polyain. 4.11.1, usually dated to 304, but Taylor, n. 26 suggests 317. In an honorific decree for the Athenian archon of 283/2, Euthios, *SEG* 25.89, 43–45, ὁ δῆμος ὁ Σαλαμινίων appears in a corona, suggesting that Salamis may then again briefly have been under Athenian control (cf. Taylor, 293). Restoration to Athens in 229: Plut. *Arat.* 34, Paus. 2.8.6. Paus. 1.35.2 claims that the Athenians expelled the “Salaminians” from Salamis for colluding with Kassandros, cf. Polyain. 4.11 and Frazer’s note *ad loc.* See further n. 38 and *IG* ii<sup>2</sup> 1260, discussed below.

*paribus*, to identify a group of Athenian “Salaminioi” as members of an Atheno-Salaminian community that we know existed at this period than to explain it by positing the existence of an otherwise unattested group of Athenian citizen Salaminioi.

In lines 24ff. of **no. 2**, however, we find the term “Archaiosalaminioi”. If, as seems likely, this means “Old Salaminioi”,<sup>37</sup> the question arises as to why the name has changed. No clear answer is available on the theories proposed hitherto. On the theory being suggested here the explanation would be apparent: it would reflect the fact that, since the earlier inscription, the island of Salamis had come under Macedonian control. Strictly speaking, *genos* members were no longer “Salaminians”.<sup>38</sup>

Another aspect of the wording of the inscriptions which the theory might help us to understand is the dating formulas. The first, ἐπὶ Χαρικλείδ(ο) ἄρχοντος Ἀθηναίοις, “in the archonship of Charikleides for the Athenians”, is notable for its specification “for the Athenians”. This may in part have been determined by the need to distinguish between the Athenian eponymous archon and the archons of the *genos*, one for each branch, used for dating purposes later in the document (**no. 1**, 69–70, 73–75 and 82). If this were the only factor, might one not have expected the same wording in **no. 2**, where the formula is the conventional ἐπὶ Φανομάχου ἄρχοντος? Presumably each of the two *gene*, as they had now become, continued to have its own archon. The *genos* archons are not mentioned in **no. 2** and so, it might be argued, the need to make a distinction did not arise so forcefully. That may be true; but the impression remains that in **no. 1** the Athenians were in some sense an external power, and this suggests another factor that may have been relevant. One can not help thinking that the wording in **no. 1** might have met a need to distinguish the Athenian archon from the archon of Salamis, who, as we noted above, was used for dating purposes there, and that, if so, such a need would have arisen more forcefully if *genos* members were Atheno-Salaminians.

This raises the question whether Phanomachos in **no. 2** was Athenian eponymous or archon of Salamis. The latter can not perhaps be ruled out: certainly, there is no other evidence for an Athenian eponymous of this name. Our knowledge of the Athenian archons of this period is, of course, very patchy, however. The inscription was set up in the Eurysakeion, in Athens, not on Salamis, and dating by Athenian archon would therefore be more natural. It seems more likely that Phanomachos was indeed Athenian eponymous; and one suspects that at least part of the reason why, in contrast to **no. 1**, he is not specified as archon “for the Athenians” was that there was no longer any potential for confusion with the Athenian archon for Salamis, who, we may suppose, with Macedon controlling the island, no longer existed.

In one of Plutarch’s two alternative accounts of the capture of Salamis by Solon, he is said to have taken with him 500 Athenian volunteers, δόγματος γενομένου τούτους, ἃν κατασχῶσι τὴν νῆσον, κυρίου εἶναι τοῦ πολιτεύματος.<sup>39</sup> This account was linked with certain later δρώμενα re-enacting a surprise landing on the island by an “Attic ship” which were cited by Plutarch in support of its historicity. As often, Solon may have attracted anecdotal material in relation to events with which he may not, in fact, have been connected. The 500 volunteers to be in charge of the *politeuma*, however, also sound as if they might be part of the foundation tradition of a real institution. The cleruchy/demos of the Salaminians would be a candidate, though it is notable that the tradition concerns not the whole Atheno-Salaminian community, but its leaders. Traditions of this sort could also be maintained in *gene*, probably a common source for the Atthidographers from whom Plutarch’s account presumably derives. I see no way that it can be demonstrated conclusively, but it does not seem impossible that the *genos* of the Salaminioi might have regarded themselves as descendants of the original 6th century settlers on Sala-

<sup>37</sup> See Part 1, note on **no. 2**, 25.

<sup>38</sup> One might hesitantly suggest that they might have been, or been among, the “Salaminians” said to have been expelled from Salamis for collusion with Kassandros, see n. 36, though it also seems possible that this might refer to a “native” community.

<sup>39</sup> Plut. *Sol.* 9.2.

mis, leaders of the Salaminian *politeuma*. Their establishment as a *genos* complete with Salamis-related cult roles in Attica would have taken place at the time of the settlement on Salamis as a mark of honour (or an incentive) for the volunteers, an already existing festival, the Oschophoria, adapted to accommodate them. The location of this and other cult interests of the *genos* in the west coastal area opposite Salamis would, of course, be very suitable for a *genos* with Atheno-Salaminian members. As we shall see, it would even be possible that the “Attic ship” referred to by Plutarch in his account was the Salaminia, crewed from the *genos*.

*IG ii<sup>2</sup> 1260* is a fragmentary honorary decree found within the fortress at Sounion and dating probably to the period of the Four Years War, 307–304.<sup>40</sup> It honours an unknown man who, as general, had apparently been responsible, among other things, for repairing fortifications on Salamis, in which capacity the “Salaminioi” (without qualification) had previously honoured him (lines 19–20). This decree has been overlooked in earlier discussions of the *genos* Salaminioi and its relationship to the island of Salamis; it should, I think, be taken to be relevant. Sounion was one of the main bases of the *genos*; all known members of the branch “from Sounion” belonged to the deme. “Salaminioi” could denote members of the Atheno-Salaminian community, but is also used, as we have seen, by the *genos* to refer to itself. Earlier scholars have attributed this honorary decree to soldiers stationed at Sounion or to the deme Sounion.<sup>41</sup> Given the link between the *genos* and Sounion, it is likely, I suggest, that *genos* members were at least lurking in the background: that they were involved with the decree directly or (if it was passed by the soldiers) indirectly in their capacity as individual members of the deme Sounion; and/or that the *genos* itself awarded the earlier honours or, *ex hypothesi*, that its members were involved with that award in their capacity as Atheno-Salaminians. It even seems possible that the *genos* was responsible for or was a joint party to the passing of the later decree. In any case, an attractive explanation would be available for its members’ involvement in such a decree, whether direct or indirect: *genos* members had an interest in the fortifications on the island of Salamis because they were Atheno-Salaminians.

There is an obvious objection to the theory that *genos* members were Atheno-Salaminians which probably explains why it has not previously been proposed. It is that our two inscriptions from the Agora give the clear impression that the *genos* was firmly based in Attica. There is no clear evidence that it had property or cult on Salamis.<sup>42</sup> Nor is there any demonstrable link between known members of the *genos* and the island. This argument, however, is rather less persuasive than it may at first sight appear. In part that is because it is *e silentio*: Salamis is too poorly known to sustain a view that, if the *genos* had cult or property there, we ought to know about it; our inscriptions give us the identity of a very small handful of *genos* members and our knowledge of the Atheno-Salaminian community is also slight.<sup>43</sup> The argument also rests, however, on a questionable assumption, namely that members of a corporate group firmly based in Attica could not also have been Atheno-Salaminians.

My point here can perhaps best be made by a parallel. There is another Attic corporate group with known Salaminian interest, the Eikadeis. In the 4th century this group owned land in Attica in the area of Sphettos and Hagnous<sup>44</sup> and maintained a cult of Apollo Parnessios, in whose sanctuary they erected an honorific decree in 324/3, arising from an internal dispute about property.<sup>45</sup> We also know, however, that, probably also in the 320s, they sold an estate on Salamis as part of a systematic programme of land

<sup>40</sup> Discussed most recently by G. Stanton, *BSA* 91 (1996) 345–46.

<sup>41</sup> Whitehead, 389–90, raised the possibility that the deme Sounion was responsible; Stanton, *loc. cit.*, argues for the traditional view that it was passed by soldiers based there. Joint decrees between soldiers and demesmen are attested from the “garrison” demes Rhamnous and Eleusis, but not (yet?) from Sounion.

<sup>42</sup> *SEG* 40.130 is a doubtful exception. See Appendix, D.

<sup>43</sup> For a discussion of the individuals who can be associated with the island see Cargill, 119–33.

<sup>44</sup> *Ag.* 19 P26, 384 and 395; *IG ii<sup>2</sup> 2631–32*.

<sup>45</sup> *IG ii<sup>2</sup> 1258*.

sales by Attic corporate groups.<sup>46</sup> On the inscription which recorded this sale these Eikadeis are listed outside the sequence of the Cleisthenic phylai as “from Salamis” (ἐκ Σαλαμῖνος Εἰκαδέων).<sup>47</sup> Like the Salaminioi, the Eikadeis were probably a multi-partite organisation and they may have been a genos: they not only had multiple archons, like the Salaminioi, but apparently a Boule also, an institution appropriate to a multi-partite group. It would also seem that, while as a whole or in one of its branches, it was Atheno-Salaminian, it had property and a cult centre in Attica. The Eikadeis undermine the assumption that a group with property and cult in Attica and members with Athenian demotics could not also have been Atheno-Salaminian.

Atheno-Salaminians would doubtless normally have had property on Salamis and have spent some time there. The Salamis decree apparently contains restrictions of some sort on leasing by Atheno-Salaminians of their allotments of property on the island; a number of tombstones of (presumably) Atheno-Salaminians have been discovered on Salamis<sup>48</sup> and we know from an argument between Aeschines and Demosthenes that, in the 4th century, the agora there, no doubt used by Atheno-Salaminians, contained a statue of Solon.<sup>49</sup> At the start of the *Lysistrata* Lysistrata and Kalonike are in Athens awaiting the arrival of Athenian wives from, among other places, Salamis.<sup>50</sup> But we also know that Atheno-Salaminians, like the members of our genos, had membership in the Attic demes.<sup>51</sup> This fact in itself suggests that, in 508 at least, they had a residence and/or property in mainland Attica; and given what we know about an Athenian’s relationship with his deme, it would be surprising if most did not maintain the connection. Thucydides famously describes how difficult it was for Athenians during the Peloponnesian War to abandon their Attic home towns, each a polis in microcosm, and move into the city.<sup>52</sup> It would scarcely have been easier for the members of the original 6th century Atheno-Salaminian community to abandon their Attic homes; and it would seem, indeed, that it was not necessarily expected of them. The Salamis decree specifies only that Atheno-Salaminians were *allowed* to live on Salamis (οἰκῆν ἐῶ Σαλαμῖνι);<sup>53</sup> the terms of the decree may have encouraged them to do so – in part no doubt because, given the likely defensive character of the settlement, an Athenian presence on the island was desirable – but it apparently did not oblige them and there are indications that some did not do so and even that those that did would usually maintain Attic connections. One of the women in the *Ecclesiastousai* lives with a man in Athens. He is described as a Salaminios.<sup>54</sup> Even within Attica it seems that, for the better off in particular, scattered landholdings were fairly common, as, however, was maintenance of property in the hereditary deme.<sup>55</sup> Close relatives of Athenians buried on Salamis are known to have owned property, or been buried, in mainland Attica.<sup>56</sup> The anecdotal case of the

<sup>46</sup> *Rationes*, F13A, 12–16, with pp. 199–201.

<sup>47</sup> Cf. the branch of the genos Salaminioi “from Sounion”. The representative of the “Eikadeis from Salamis” in this sale was Ὀλυμπιόδωρος Εὐμήλου Π/ or ΠΙ. As Sally Humphreys suggests to me, this man may be related to (son of?) Eumelos son of Eumeliades, councillor in 335/4, and to Kleomelos son of Eumelides, councillor in 303/2, both for Prospalta, a deme which neighboured the attested area of interest of the Eikadeis in Attica. This should have been noted at *Rationes*, sect. 5, no. 81 and it further undermines the possibility, never attractive (cf. *Rationes*, 200), that the Salaminian Eikadeis were an entirely separate group from the Attic Eikadeis.

<sup>48</sup> Cargill, 119–33 with Appendix B.

<sup>49</sup> Aeschin. 1.25; Dem. 19.251–52, undermining Aeschines’ attempt to deduce Solon’s rhetorical posture from the statue by stressing that it had been erected less than 50 years previously.

<sup>50</sup> See further below.

<sup>51</sup> See e.g. Lys. 12.52 and 13.44; Ag. 19 P2; *IG* ii<sup>2</sup> 1590a; above n. 34; and the use of Athenian demotics on gravestones from the island.

<sup>52</sup> Thuc. 2.14–15.

<sup>53</sup> *IG* i<sup>3</sup> 1, 2.

<sup>54</sup> Ar. *Eccl.* 38.

<sup>55</sup> Cf. R. Osborne, *Demos: the Discovery of Classical Attika* (1985) 60–63.

<sup>56</sup> As M. C. Taylor will make clear in her forthcoming book on Salamis (cf. n.33).

dramatist Euripides<sup>57</sup> and the real one of Archiades in Demosthenes 44<sup>58</sup> show that actually living on Salamis could be regarded as rather odd and reclusive behaviour. For the politically and commercially active a residence in or near Athens had always been desirable. We hear several times in the written record about the Salamis ferry. It was obviously busy – sufficiently so to justify state safety regulations.<sup>59</sup> As to a lesser extent with other Athenian cleruchies, we should not be misled into imagining that the Atheno-Salaminian community was a coherent, self-contained unit, whose members all lived permanently on the island and had little or nothing to do with Attica. A more fluid picture is probably closer to the truth: some members of the community living in Attica and visiting the island occasionally; others perhaps living mainly on the island and visiting Attica; in any case most maintaining to some extent their traditional group memberships and associated cults in Attica. Against this background it would not, I suggest, be very surprising to find a *genos* consisting of Atheno-Salaminians also having a firm base in Attica.

How, on this theory of the *genos*, should its branch structure be explained? One possibility would be that the split between the two branches existed *de facto* from the start. In other words, whether or not they had prior corporate existence, a group of these Athenians established on Salamis in the 6th century came from Sounion, perhaps impelled by the poor farming in the Sounion area<sup>60</sup> to seek their fortune elsewhere, perhaps unsettled or displaced by early silver discoveries and consequent increasing population. To this Sounian core, if one may describe it as such, were added members from a variety of places elsewhere in Attica. At some time after Cleisthenes the split was formalised by names which reflected the Cleisthenic units, at which time the non-Sounian members were found to belong to seven of the Cleisthenic *phylai*. Alternatively, rather as envisaged by Humphreys, the move of a group to Sounion may have post-dated the establishment of the Atheno-Salaminian community, and may even be post-Cleisthenic, with names reflecting the Cleisthenic units from the start.

Apart from the Atheno-Salaminian community and the *genos*, there is a third group of “Salaminioi” that one might hesitantly bring into the picture, the crew of the sacred ship *Salaminia*, which, with its sister ship the *Paralos*, is familiar from the pages of Thucydides as a sacred ship sent on special missions.<sup>61</sup> Some years ago B. Jordan suggested that the crew of this ship were identical with our *genos*.<sup>62</sup> The theory has not been taken up in subsequent discussion; it is not demonstrable with any certainty and is not fully convincing in every detail as Jordan propounded it;<sup>63</sup> but in its main thrust it has attractions. We know from Thucydides that the *Paralos* was crewed by the “*Paraloi*” and from inscriptions that the *Paraloi* had a corporate organisation apparently similar to that of our *genos*.<sup>64</sup> There are passages of Aristophanes which, as we shall see, suggest that, as the parallel with the *Paralos* might suggest, the term “*Salaminios*” could connote a member of the crew of this ship.<sup>65</sup> Aspects of the cult of the *genos* certainly have a nautical flavour, in particular the sacrifices to Poseidon and to Phaiax and Nauseiros at

<sup>57</sup> *Vita Eurip.* 62ff. (Budé).

<sup>58</sup> Dem. 44.10. Cf. J. Davies, *Athenian Propertied Families* (1971) p. 195.

<sup>59</sup> Aeschin. 3.158.

<sup>60</sup> Cf. R. Osborne, *Demos*, 38–40.

<sup>61</sup> Thuc. 3.33; 3.77; 6.53; 6.61; 8.73–74.

<sup>62</sup> B. Jordan, *The Athenian Navy* (1975) 167–72.

<sup>63</sup> For example, Jordan tends to *equate* the crew of the ship and the *genos*, whereas it is more plausible and more consistent with **no. 1**, 46 to view the crew as *supplied from* the *genos*. Moreover, Jordan was inclined to accept the theory that the *genos* consisted of late 6th century immigrants from Salamis, a theory we have seen reason to question. In his view the nautical role of the *genos* arose from a need to maintain links with ancestral cults on the island by *theoria*. I should prefer to envisage a link with Plutarch’s story of the capture of Salamis by “Solon” and the 500 volunteers and the later *δρόμεια* involving a *ναῦς Ἀττικὴ* sailing to Salamis. Cf. above n. 39.

<sup>64</sup> Thuc. 8.73; *IG* ii<sup>2</sup> 2966 (a dedication by “the *Paraloi* from x” and “the *Paraloi* from y”, cf. the two branches of the *Salaminioi*); *IG* ii<sup>2</sup> 1254 and *SEG* 37.102 (honorific decrees).

<sup>65</sup> See also Phot. s.v. *Σαλαμίνιος*; Pollux 8.116.

Phaleron, the last two traditionally pilot and look-out man for Theseus.<sup>66</sup> Perhaps most notably, in line 46 of the first inscription the list of recipients of loaves from the temple of Athena Skiras includes κώπαις. Literally this means “handles” or “oars”, by metonymy those who use them. Ferguson took it to mean the millers of the bread, an unparalleled sense; and I agree with Jordan that it is much more likely to have one of its commonest senses, “oarsmen”.<sup>67</sup> In the second inscription the boundary of the temenos of Herakles at Sounion at Porthmos (“the ferry” or “the strait”) is marked, towards the sea, by *embateria*, which, as Ferguson saw, probably means “embarking places”. If Jordan’s theory and that suggested in this paper were both true, the three groups of Athenian “Salaminioi” attested in the classical period, genos, members of the Athenian community on Salamis and the crew of the sacred ship would be nicely interconnected; and that might just explain why contemporary writers and contemporary documents apparently saw no need to distinguish explicitly between them.<sup>68</sup>

There are three passages of Aristophanes which seem to connect the crew members of the Salaminia with the island of Salamis. I have already mentioned the “Salaminios” with whom one of the women in the *Ecclesiazousai* lives.<sup>69</sup> He is naturally understood to be an Atheno-Salaminian, but the description of his sexual vigour the previous night may, as the scholiast on the passage suggests, imply that he was also supposed to be a lusty member of the crew of the Salaminia. At the start of the *Lysistrata* when the arrival of women from different parts of Attica is awaited early in the morning, it is noted that the women of the Paraloi, i.e. of the crew of the Salaminia’s sister ship, have not yet arrived. Immediately it is remarked that the women from Salamis have not yet arrived either and again there follows a punning allusion to sexual high spirits on the boats.<sup>70</sup> A connection between the Salaminia and the island again seems implicit. Finally, in the *Frogs*, Dionysos, on the ferry to hell, when asked to help row, complains that he can not possibly do so, among other things because he is ἀσαλαμίνιος; and the context again contains sexual double-entendre.<sup>71</sup> Partly the idea seems to be that he is not used to travelling on the Salamis ferry, as an Atheno-Salaminian would be; partly that he lacks the attributes of a member of the crew of the Salaminia. As often with Aristophanes, we are treading on unsure ground in trying to infer realities from his jokes and puns: the apparent connections between the crew of the sacred ship and the island implicit in these passages may be no more than verbal play. But it is arguable that such play works better if the connection was real; the flow of thought in the *Lysistrata* from the women of the Paraloi to the women of Salamis (not explicitly of the Salaminia) is perhaps smoother, for example, and more readily comprehensible. If Jordan’s theory is right and the crew of the Salaminia were indeed supplied by the genos Salaminioi, the connection between the crew and the island which seems implicit in these passages of Aristophanes would, if it reflects reality, be further indication of a contemporary link between the island and the genos.

<sup>66</sup> no. 1, 90–91; *FGH* 328 Philochoros F111; Parker, 314–15.

<sup>67</sup> See *LSJ* s.v. κώπη 1.

<sup>68</sup> If Alcibiades was a member of the genos (see n. 28 above) and the genos did indeed supply the crew of the Salaminia, it would add interesting colour to Thucydides’ account of the Salaminia’s mission to collect him from Sicily for trial in Athens and, in particular, his subsequent escape, Thuc. 6.53 and 61.

<sup>69</sup> ὁ γὰρ ἀνὴρ, ὃ φιλιτάτη, / Σαλαμίνιος γὰρ ἐστὶν ὃι ζῦνειμ’ ἐγώ, / τὴν νύχθ’ ὄλην ἤλαυνέ μ’ ἐν τοῖς στρώμασιν, / ὥστ’ ἄρτι τουτὶ θοιμάτιον αὐτοῦ ἴλαβον. Ar. *Eccl.* 37–40.

<sup>70</sup> ἀλλ’, ὃ μέλ’, ὄψει τοι σφόδρ’ αὐτὰς Ἀττικὰς, / ἅπαντα δρώσας τοῦ δέοντος ὕστερον. / ἀλλ’ οὐδὲ Παράλων οὐδεμία γυνὴ πάρα, / οὐδ’ ἐκ Σαλαμίνος. Ar. *Lys.* 56–59. I doubt if this has to do with the Paralia in the sense of the coastal regions of S.E. Attica, as commonly understood by editors (see e.g. Sommerstein’s 1990 edition). Why mention them in particular (and should they not be *Paralioi*)? Rather, in keeping with the nautical flavour started with the reference to *Attikai* in 56 and the talk of arriving late, the reference is to wives of the *Paraloi*, i.e. the crew of the fast ship Paralos, who, it is implied, might be expected to arrive more promptly. One wonders incidentally whether οὐδ’ ἐκ Σαλαμίνος was intended to be spoken by a different speaker from the previous words.

<sup>71</sup> κᾶιτα πῶς δυνήσομαι / ἄπειρος, ἀθαλάττωτος, ἀσαλαμίνιος / ὢν εἶτ’ ἐλαύνειν; Ar. *Frogs* 202–204.

APPENDIX: NOTES ON OTHER INSCRIPTIONS ATTRIBUTED OR ATTRIBUTABLE  
TO THE GENOS SALAMINIOI

**A.** *IG* ii<sup>2</sup> 1232. Apart from the two texts from the Agora discussed above, there is only one other inscription definitely attributable to the genos Salaminioi, the badly worn honorific decree, found between the theatre of Dionysos and the Odeion of Herodes Atticus, *IG* ii<sup>2</sup> 1232, known since 1877. From the fact that it talks of the Salaminioi as one genos rather than two (10–11) it certainly predates the second Agora inscription and its orthography (e.g. no *o* for *ou*) is more advanced than that of the first. Εὐφρόσυνον Ὀν- in line 5, apparently one of the honorands, is probably identifiable with a Euphrosynos of Paiania who was envoy to Keos c. 350 (*IG* ii<sup>2</sup> 1128, 40; see further on C). Copies of the inscription were to be set up in the temple of Athena Skiras and the Eurysakeion (21–24). Ours is presumably the latter copy.

**B.** *IG* i<sup>3</sup> 972, a dedication of c. 550? found in the area of Anavyssos (Aigilia?, see J.S. Traill, *Demos and Trittys* [1986], 144–46), set up by an Ionichos son of Manis and listing a single individual, Herakleides, followed by four archons, two of whom, [Ἀρί]σταρχος and Δεμοκλῆς, share a name with a representative of the Salaminioi from the seven phylai in our **no. 1**, Aristarchos son of Demokles of Acharnai (77).<sup>72</sup> J. Wiseman and J.W. Shaw, *Hesperia* 39 (1970), 143, accordingly raised the possibility that the dedication should be attributed to the Salaminioi. As they point out, however, both names are fairly common. One might add that four archons in the Salaminioi would be surprising in the 6th century. In **no. 1** there was an eponymous for each of the two branches and provision seems to be made for the appointment of a further archon in the future, to be selected alternately from each branch and to be jointly responsible for appointment of the *oschophoroi* and the *deipnophoroi* (47–48, 57). Findspots can be deceptive, but Anavyssos is not close to Acharnai or very close to any known area of Salaminian interest. It is even possible that the genos did not exist when this dedication was made. If the dedication did originate in the area of the deme Aigilia, two groups with a known Aigilian connection seem better candidates. The Brytidai, Phrastor's genos in Dem. 59, had two Aigilians among its seven known members, Phrastor himself (59.50) and Euphranor (59.61). More attractive, however, is the Pyrrhakidai, one of whose two Delian monuments of c. 400?, *ID* 66, is inscribed Τριτοπάτωρ/ Πυρρακιδῶν/ Αἰγίλιων.<sup>73</sup> The Pyrrhakidai are usually assumed to have been a genos,<sup>74</sup> but, while possible, this is far from certain. The fact that Hesychius makes Pyrrhakos a descendant of the eponym of another group with known Delian connections which *does* seem to have been a genos, the Erysichthonidai,<sup>75</sup> is not a strong argument; the ancient mythographers certainly wove eponyms of groups other than gene into their configurations. One thinks of Medon, long supposed to have been a genos eponym until the discovery of a 4th century poletai document showed the Medontidai to have been a phratry.<sup>76</sup> Nor is the appearance of representatives of the Pyrrhakidai on the lists of the Athenian *theoriai* at Delphi between 138 and 97 among those of other gene, the Kerykes, Euneidai and Erysichthonidai, strongly indicative, for groups which were not gene appear in the same lists: the Cleisthenic phylai, for example, the Tetrapolis and the eupatridai.<sup>77</sup> *Phratries*, 368, raised the possibility that the Pyrrhakidai were a phratry. If so, *IG* i<sup>3</sup> 972 is not especially likely to have belonged to it, since the office of archon is nowhere attested in

<sup>72</sup> The others are [Σ]πινθέρ and [Εὐ]τυχος.

<sup>73</sup> The other (*ID* 67) is inscribed Νύμφαι Πυρρακιδῶν.

<sup>74</sup> Most recently by Parker, 308 (a hesitation, however, at 284).

<sup>75</sup> Hesych. s.v. Πύρρακος· ἥρως κατ' Ἐρυσίχθονα γεγονώς. The status of this group as a genos seems fairly secure, given its role in supplying priests for a public cult, *ID* 1624bis; 2515–18.

<sup>76</sup> *Phratries*, 315–18.

<sup>77</sup> *FD* III (2) 7 I 11 (138); 8 II 7–8 (128); 13 I 7–8 (106); 10 II 13–16, slightly improved text at S.V. Tracy, *Hesp. Suppl.* 15 (1975) no. 7b, 47–50 (97). On the eupatridai, probably the aristocratic caste rather than a genos of that name, cf. Parker, 323–34.

Attic phratries.<sup>78</sup> Somewhat more attractive, I think, though no more than a good possibility, is that the Pyrrhakidai were, or were a component of, a pre-Cleisthenic local grouping like the Tetrapolis or the Tetrakomoi. The *Rationes Centesimarum* suggest that, even in the 4th century, there were many more *komai* in Attica than those which are certainly known;<sup>79</sup> and a recollection of a *kome*-type group of this name might underlie Phot. s.v. Ῥακίδα· δῆμος Ἀκαμαντίδος; indeed, there are Akamantid demes immediately to the NE of Anavysos. As we know was the case with many other demes (Dekeleieis, the Tetrakomoi, Boutadai etc.), Aigilia might have co-existed with a pre-Cleisthenic group of the same name, component perhaps of a SW Attic Pyrrhakid Tetrakomia, or name of one of which the Pyrrhakidai were a subgroup. If the findspot of *IG* i<sup>3</sup> 972 was not far from its original location and if that location was that of the deme Aigilia, the inscription would suit such a hypothesis rather well: the four archons would be appropriate for a quadripartite grouping of units of *kome* type, like the Tetrakomoi or the Tetrapolis, and might even be paralleled for components of such a grouping.<sup>80</sup> Herakleides was certainly not a rare name, but the Aineias son of Herakleides who represented the Pyrrhakidai on the Delphian *theoria* of 106 might just have been a descendant of the Herakleides who is named together with the four archons on *IG* i<sup>3</sup> 972.<sup>81</sup>

C. *IG* ii<sup>2</sup> 2345. A list of names divided into thiasoi. Fathers' names and demotics occur sporadically and some of the names are followed by figures. Ferguson recognised two of the men listed, Stratophon and Demon of Agryle, as members of the genos Salaminioi.<sup>82</sup> A third may be added. Εὐφρόσυνος Ὀν- is named, probably as an honorand, on the Salaminioi inscription, *IG* ii<sup>2</sup> 1232, line 5. He seems very likely to be the [Εὐ]φρόσυνος Παϊανίο listed at *IG* ii<sup>2</sup> 2345, 13–14, confirming Humphreys' suspicion (243, n.2) that Παϊανίο here and in the previous line is not a father's name but a form of the demotic of Paiania (normally *Paianieus*). This also adds weight to Humphreys' identification of this man with the Euphrosynos of Paiania who was an envoy to Keos c. 350, *IG* ii<sup>2</sup> 1128, 40. On the basis that subdivision into groups called thiasoi was characteristic of Attic phratries, it was long assumed that this was a phratry list and Humphreys, on the basis of a prosopographical study of the names and the findspot of the inscription, suggested that the names listed without demotics belonged to the deme Alopeke and that the phratry to which the genos Salaminioi belonged was therefore based there. *Phratries*, 64–66 and 82–

<sup>78</sup> Though on the existing quantity of evidence an argument on such a point *e silentio* is, I think, no more than suggestive.

<sup>79</sup> Perhaps of the order of 70 in all, see *Rationes*, 253–54.

<sup>80</sup> If, that is, the komarchs listed on the victory dedication of the *kome* Xypetaiones, *IG* ii<sup>2</sup> 3103, were komarchs of that *kome* and not of the whole Tetrakomoi. Cf. *IG* ii<sup>2</sup> 3102 (Phalereis); *Rationes* F9B, 1–22.

<sup>81</sup> Other known Pyrrhakidai give no hint of connection with Aigilia or the names on *IG* i<sup>3</sup> 972. The succession of Pyrrhakid *theoroi* in the same family in 138–97, Eukles (I) son of Timanax (I), Timanax (II) son of Eukles (I) and Eukles (II) son of Timanax (II), were from Phlya, a deme N.E. of Athens, while the demotic of the two other known members, Aineias himself and Sosikrates son of Theotimos (on the *theoria* of 97), is not identifiable. A. Nikitsky, *Hermes* 28 (1893) 628, identified two further inscriptions as possibly referring to the Pyrrhakidai: (a) *IG* ii 834b II 28 (accounts of Eleusinian epistatai, 329/8 B.C.), where the nomenclature of the metic Kallias was read as ἐν Πύλ. (-) οἰκοῦντι. The ed. princ., however, Tsuntas, *Eph. Arch.* 1883, p. 115, 28, read [Κ]υ[δ] and this was followed by *IG* ii<sup>2</sup> 1672, 164 (printing (Κ)υ[δ]). If, as seems certain, Pyrrhakidai was not a formal deme, it would indeed be unexpected (I think unexampled) to find it used in metic nomenclature, though not perhaps impossible if it were a *kome*, given the occasional use of *komai* as property locations, e.g. in the *Rationes Centesimarum*, and, in the Roman period, in quasi-demotics. Incidentally, the alternatives for the deme name here are wider than implicit in *IG* ii<sup>2</sup>'s reconstruction: in addition to Kydantidai and Kydathenaion, Kytheros and even Tyrmeidai would be consistent with at least some of the mark(s) recorded by Köhler as visible in the initial letter space; (b) the fragmentary funerary monument, apparently from the Laurion area, Milchhöfer, *AM* 12 (1887) p. 298, no. 265, which, it has since become clear, has nothing to do with Pyrrhakidai, see *IG* ii<sup>2</sup> 9273; Peek, *AM* 67 (1942) no. 213; Clairmont *CAT* 233. Incidentally, it would seem that this text should be reconstructed somewhat differently from previous eds., i.e.: [woman's name, followed by man's name in genitive] γυνῆ, Μακεδὼν Ἀγρ[.]. The final surviving letter might be omicron (thus Milchhöfer; of names in Ἀγρο-, Ἀγροίτης is attested in Attica) or omega (thus Peek, who read only the upper part of the letter and suggested Ἀγρω[voς], in which he is tentatively followed by *LGPN* II and *POAA* 107635).

<sup>82</sup> *IG* ii<sup>2</sup> 2345, 77 and 79; no. 1, 76 and 79.

84, observed *inter alia* that it is not quite certain that the Salaminioi belonged to a phratry at all; and that the only firm example of thiasoi within a phratry is in the House of the Dekeleieis, *Phratries* T3, which may well, when its thiasoi were founded, have been a phratry subgroup rather than a whole phratry; even if not, one case would be insufficient basis for the proposition that groups subdivided into thiasoi were always, or typically, whole phratries. Alopeke was a very large deme (bouleutic quota 10); one would expect many names to occur there; and there are other candidate demes for some of the men listed without demotic.<sup>83</sup> C. Habicht, *ZPE* 103 (1994), 117–27, has shown how commonly name-father's name pairs occur in different demes and how insecure identifications of men attested by name, or name and father's name only, can be. Demotics were less important in phratric groups than they were in demes,<sup>84</sup> and one doubts whether the rationale for their occasional inclusion on this list was as systematic as Humphreys envisages; other rationales seem possible, e.g. the need to distinguish between homonyms, and one should not discount the possibility that there was no rationale at all. With the identification of a Paianian on the list as a Salaminian gennete, in addition to the two men from Agryle, it seems near certain that this list does have something to do with the genos, though it remains notable that other Salaminioi on our **no. 1** do not appear on it. The alternatives seem to be: (a) the old idea that this is a list of the phratry to which (some or?) all<sup>85</sup> of the Salaminioi belonged is correct; (b) this is a list of the genos Salaminioi;<sup>86</sup> (c) it is a list of the Salaminioi from the seven phylai; (d) it is a list connected with the sacred ship Salaminia or with the Athenian cleruchy on Salamis. I hope to take this discussion further elsewhere.

**D. SEG 40.130.** A relief depicting the crowning of a bearded man to the left by a much larger bearded central figure, holding a spear in his left hand. To the right, a smaller male, partly obscured by a later pivot-hole, probably steadying a large round shield. Near-illegible inscription. Found on Salamis. D. Harris and C. Lawton, *ZPE* 80 (1990) 109–15 (ph.; see now also Lawton, *Attic Document Reliefs* [1995], no. 146), dated the monument to c. 350–25, suggested that the figures represent Ajax crowning an unknown honorand, with Ajax's son, Eurysakes, named for his father's broad shield, to the side. They read [-]ιοφήμιο ἄρχο[ντος] in line 2 and suggested this archon was of the genos Salaminioi and that the inscription therefore belonged to the genos. M. C. Taylor, *ZPE* 107 (1995), 289–95, pointed out that the archon is more plausibly identified as the archon of Salamis mentioned at *Ath. Pol.* 54.7–8<sup>87</sup> and that the inscription is probably therefore a document of the *demos* of the Salaminioi.<sup>88</sup> Taylor's identification of the archon as that of Salamis seems very likely to be correct. That does not, I think, prove that the inscription belongs to the *demos* of the Salaminioi. Given what *Ath. Pol.* says and what we know from inscriptions found on the island (cf. n. 35), one might expect any inscription there to be dated by the Salaminian archon. On present evidence, however, given the other documents of the *demos* of the Salaminioi found on the island and the attested practice of the genos in erecting its inscriptions in mainland Attica, the *demos* of the Salaminioi does seem the stronger candidate.

**E. IG ii<sup>2</sup> 1260.** Discussed in Part 2, above.

The British School at Athens

Stephen D. Lambert

<sup>83</sup> See, albeit perhaps overconfidently, *Phratries*, 370.

<sup>84</sup> Cf. e.g. *IG ii<sup>2</sup> 2344* (= *Phratries* T18), the list of a phratric group in which the names have no demotics at all.

<sup>85</sup> The fact that the Salaminioi had a common sacrifice at the phratry festival Apatouria (**no. 1**, 92) suggests that, if they belonged to a phratry, they all belonged to the same one, but it falls short of proving it.

<sup>86</sup> It might in that case have been set up originally in the Eurysakeion, the temple of Athena Skiras or even the Agora in Koile. Cf. n. 24 above.

<sup>87</sup> See above n.35.

<sup>88</sup> Given the association between Eurysakes and Ajax's shield, her suggestion that the *demos* of the Salaminioi might be represented by the figure to the right is in my view somewhat less plausible.