

WILLIAM S. MORISON

AN HONORARY DEME DECREE AND THE ADMINISTRATION OF A PALAISTRA IN
KEPHISSIA

aus: Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik 131 (2000) 93–98

© Dr. Rudolf Habelt GmbH, Bonn

AN HONORARY DEME DECREE AND THE ADMINISTRATION OF A PALAISTRA IN KEPHISSIA

The chance find of a fourth-century BC deme decree in the early 1960s (appropriately enough by a schoolboy) provides evidence for one of the most distinctive of Greek social institutions, a palaistra, in the large, wealthy deme of Kephissia. This document has been little discussed by scholars since Eugene Vanderpool's brief article.¹ The purpose here is to present a new text of this inscription,² to provide a brief commentary, and to suggest that the honorand held the office of *epistates* of the palaistra. This decree is one of the few pieces of evidence for the administration of an Athenian palaistra—and the only one to refer to a deme palaistra—and provides invaluable insights into its operation.

The Inscription

The decree is inscribed on a block of gray, medium-grained micaceous marble. The total preserved height of the stone is 0.206 m. The maximum preserved height of the inscribed face is 0.085 m. and the maximum preserved width 0.150 m. The back of the stone is roughly finished and tapers from bottom to top (bottom 0.068 m.; top 0.038 m.). The unscribed upper portion of the stone is rounded with its bottom edge is beveled; it appears to have been dressed with a toothed chisel. The left side of the inscribed face appears to have been damaged from a blow, the impact point of which appears to have been at the fourth line of the inscription. The damage extends from one letter space in the first line to six letter spaces in lines 9 and 10. The right side of the inscribed face and the bottom of the stone are entirely broken. The lettering is non-stoichedon and at times uneven, but deeply cut. A total of eleven lines may be read or restored with certainty, and it is likely that the inscription continued at least a few more lines.

Calculation of the original dimensions of the inscribed face is difficult, because the spacing of letters varies throughout the text. Based on the extant lettering, the 'average' letter space has been calculated at ca. 0.0069 m.³ Line 9 follows a common formula and its restoration appears certain. If iota is counted as a half space, this line provides 36.5 letters as a guideline for restoration. The restored width of the inscribed face, then, assuming an average of 36.5 letters per line, was ca. 0.251 m.⁴

In the following text, lines have been restored up to a maximum of 38 letter spaces or a minimum of 36 letter spaces. The count for each line is printed at the right side of the text. The numbers in parentheses represent the iota-count. Readers should take special note of words marked as questionable in the text below. These restorations, which are admittedly speculative, are included for the reader's convenience; ordinarily these lines would be relegated either to the critical apparatus or the commentary, where arguments for their inclusion would be presented. Vanderpool dated the inscription on the basis of letter forms to sometime in the second half of the fourth century BC.⁵

¹ Vanderpool, *Deltion 24 Melet.* (1969 [1970]) 6-7 and pl. 5 (*SEG* XXXII 147). A brief discussion with suggested restorations for lines 7-8 by L. Robert appeared in the *Bulletin Épigraphique* (1971) no. 286; G. Panessa, *ASNP* 13 (1983) 380 n. 66 (*SEG* XXXIII 142) makes several conjectures. Also, D. Whitehead (*The Demes of Attica* [Princeton 1986] 248 and n.116), briefly mentions the decree in his larger discussion of *philotimia*.

² I am grateful to the 2nd Ephoria of Prehistoric and Classical Antiquities for permission to study ΜΠ 3514, which is housed in the Ephoria's storerooms in the Piraeus Museum. I also wish to thank the Regents of the University of California and the Classics department at University of California, Santa Barbara for their generous financial support.

³ This calculation is based on an average of the measurements of the preserved letter spaces in each individual line. The average is based on only on the average measurements for the three lines with the largest number of fully preserved letters: 1, 8, 9. These lines *fully* preserve 17 (average 0.0065 m.), 21 (average 0.0065 m.), and 19 (average 0.0071 m.) letter spaces respectively.

⁴ The measurements for the remaining lines, the number of fully preserved letters, and the measurements for them are as follows: L. 2, 15 letters@0.0068 m.; L. 3, 11 letters@0.0073 m.; L. 4, 10 letters@0.0069 m.; L.5, 13 letters@0.0069 m.; L. 6, 14 letters@0.0067 m.; L. 7, 15 letters@0.0072 m. Thus, the average letter spacing for these lines is 0.0069, which is comfortably close to the average established above. The differences in individual lines, however, are striking. The maximum possible width, based on these measurements, is 0.266 m.; the smallest possible width is 0.244 m.

⁵ The lettering of this decree corresponds remarkably well with that of the cutter of *IG* II² 1176, which S. Tracy (*Athenian Democracy in Transition. Attic Letter-Cutters of 340 to 290 B.C.* [Berkeley-Los Angeles-London 1995] 129-131) dates to 326/5-318 BC. Compare his description: "The work of this cutter is characterized by the fact that his known inscriptions



Piraeus Museum ΜΠ 3514

post a. 350 a.c.

1	[Ἐ]πικλῆς εἶπεν· ἐπε(ι)δὴ Φρο[υρ (ca. 8) καλῶς καὶ]	Non-stoich. ⁶
	[φιλ]οτίμως τῶν ἱερῶν τῶ[ν Ἑρμαίων? ἐπεμελήθη καὶ]	38 (3) ⁷
	[ἐν? τῶ]ι αὐτοῦ χωρίωι τῶ[ι? (ca. 18)]	39 (5)
4	[. . . καὶ τ]ὴν κρήνην καὶ τὸν [ὄχετον καὶ (ca. 8)]	37 (3) ⁷
	[κατεκ]εῦάσε καὶ τῆς παλα[ί]στρας ἐπεστάτησε?·]	37 (2)
	[καὶ τὸ] ἀποδυτήριον τῆς πα[λαί]στρας ἐπεσκεύασε]	39 (3)
	[καὶ τ]ὴν κρήνην ἔφραξεν ὥ[στε τὰ πρόβατα μὴ εἰσι]-	38 (3)
8	έναί εἰς αὐτήν καὶ τὰλλα φι[λο]τίμως ἔπραξε πρὸς]	39 (5)
	τὸν δῆμον τὸν Κ[η]φ[ι]κ[ι]έων· δ[εδόχθαι τοῖς δημόται]-	39 (5)
	[c] ἐπαι[νέσα]ι Φρου[ρ] ca 23]	

1 Vanderpool Φρο[υρ] *scripsi collata lin. 10; post litteras 2-5 patronymicum expectes* 2 τῶ[ν Ἑρμαίων? ἐπεμελήθη καὶ] Morison 3 Vanderpool τῶ[ι?] Morison 4 [. . . καὶ τ]ὴν Morison ὄχετον Panessa [καὶ τὸ φράγμα?] Morison 5 [κατεκ]εῦάσε Panessa ἐπεστάτησε vel ἐπεμελήθη Morison 6 [ἐπεσκεύασε] Morison 7-8 ὥ[στε --- μὴ εἰσι]έναί Vanderpool τὰ πρόβατα Robert 8 Morison φι[λο]τίμος ἐστὶ πρὸς vel εἰς] Robert 9-10 Vanderpool 10 Φρου[ρ] κτλ. Morison

are *non-stoichedon* and the letters of his texts are *crowded together*. ... His letters vary in height, with rho, upsilon, and phi usually being taller, and omikron and omega smaller” (129, emphasis added). For example, Tracy’s description of the upsilons of the cutter of *IG II² 1176* is as follows: “This letter varies in height. The vertical is usually more than half the height of the letter and is surmounted by a fairly large and slightly symmetrical V.” This matches accurately what may be seen clearly in Pl. 1 on lines 3, 6, and 8. Additional examples may be easily observed by a comparison of Tracy’s description and photographs of the inscription provided here.

⁶ Non-stoichedon decrees are infrequent in the fourth century BC, but do occur. See, for example, the honorary decrees *IG II² 223* (343/2), 275 (before 336/5), 348 (331/0), 366 (323/2), 399 (320/19), 421 (318/7), 477 (305/4), 479 (305/4), 509 (after 307/6), 513 (end of the fourth century BC), and 543 (before 303/2).

⁷ N.B. The count of letter spaces includes un-restored letters, which are counted as full letter spaces.

- 1 [E]pikles spoke: whereas Phro[ur ... (*patronymic*) well and
honorably oversaw] the sacred rites (sacrifices?) [of the Hermaia and]
on? his own land [...]
- 4 [... and constructed] a springhouse and a [channel and ...],
and [was the *epistates*] of the pala[istra,]
[and repaired the] *apodyterion* of the pa[laistra,]
[and] fenced-in the spring so that [sheep do not get]
8 into it, and [accomplished] the rest [of his duties honorably for]
the deme of the Kephissians, [the demesmen decided]
to praise Phro[ur (*patronymic*) and to crown him]
[...]

- 1 [Ἐ]πικλῆς: see s.v. *LGPN* II. No other Epikles is known from the deme Kephissia or the tribe Erechtheis, although the name was common in Attica.
- 1-2 [καλῶς καὶ φιλο]στύμιος: Compare *IG* II² 223A.11, which is the earliest dateable occurrence of this formula (342 BC). D. Whitehead (*Classica et Mediaevalia* 34 [1983] 62) has noted that it “is quite certain that from the 340s onwards the *philotimia* words were integral to the language of achievement and reward in *all* Athenian honorific decrees.” If Whitehead is correct, the use of the formula here provides a *terminus post quem* consistent with Vanderpool’s post-350 BC date for the decree.
- 2 τῶν ἱερῶν τῶ[ν Ἑρμαίων?]: The performance of, or financial responsibility for, rituals (sacrifices?) on the part of the honorand is clear. Unfortunately there is no parallel for this phrase. But because the inscription honors someone’s services to a palaistra (see below), some of his merits may concern the Hermes festivals in the palaistrai. Although other deities (e.g., Herakles) may have received honors in Athenian palaistrai during the Classical period, Hermes is the only deity for whom these honors are securely attested (Aischin. *Tim.* 11-12 and Pl. *Lys.* 206D [with mention of the sacrifices], 207D, and the schol. *ad loc.*).⁸ In 131/0, the clerouchs of Salamis honored a *gymnasiarchos* who was responsible for agonistic *Hermaia* (*IG* II² 1227; L. Deubner, *Attische Feste* [Berlin 19932] 217). *IG* II² 2980 (2nd cent. BC) attests a torch race as part of *Hermaia*. However, the antiquity of this particular torch race in Athens (attested only by this inscription) and its connection with the *Hermaia* in the palaistra is uncertain. In comparison, the *Hermaia* recorded by the gymnasiarchal law found in Veroia (2nd cent. BC) included a torch race and sacrifices to Hermes by the *paides* under the direction of the *paidotribes* (see *SEG* XXVII B59-67). How much the Macedonian *Hermaia* were like their Athenian counterparts, and for how long a torch race had been a part of these rites is, of course, impossible to say with certainty.
- 3 [ἐν? τῶ]ι ἀτυοῦ χωρίῳ: At the top of the fifth letter space, which is at the edge of the break and badly damaged, the top of a vertical (.002 m.) is visible and, therefore, a dotted iota is printed. But prepositions other than ἐν are also possible. The reference appears to concern activity that has some proximity to or is on the private property of the honorand. τῶ[ι? ca. 18]: A description of the location of the honorand’s property may have been given. The property might have been located near a popular sheep run, which, thus, necessitated the fencing-in of the springhouse (line 7).
- 4 [. . . καὶ τ]ῆν κρήνην: The stone appears to have been abraded—perhaps deliberately erased to correct a mistake—in this line. In the seventh letter space the upper portion of a right vertical is visible; and faint traces remain of a nu and kappa in the eighth and ninth spaces. A κρήνη is a natural spring, as opposed to a φρέαρ, an artificial well. The construction mentioned here is presumably the housing around a natural spring that likely supplied water for the palaistra.⁹

⁸ Hermes Enagonios is listed (*IG* I³ 5.3) among the deities to receive sacrifices at Eleusis (ca. 500 BC). Scholars have debated his appearance as a youth in the *Iliad* 24.347 and *Odyssey* 10.278 (e.g., A. Heubeck and A. Hoekstra, *A Commentary on Homer’s Odyssey* [Oxford 1989] *ad loc.*), but his later association with palaistrai and ephebes surely had antecedents. Prof. A. Athanassakis points out to me that Hermes is described in Archaic Greek poetry as a παῖς (Hom. *Hym. Merc.* 254, 271; also cf. 386) and further notes that when Hermes addresses Apollo as Διὸς ἀγλαῶς κοῦρος (490), he implies that he himself is a κοῦρος also. The evidence for worship of deities other than Hermes in Athenian palaistrai during the fourth century BC is slim. Aischines (*Tim.* 10), however, makes it clear that the Muses were worshipped in the *didaskaleia* and Hermes in the *palaistrai*. The ancient scholiast on this passage reports that “[there were] shrines in the inner building of the schools and palaistrai for the Muses, and Hermes and Herakles” (ναϊκάρια ἐν τῷ ἐνδοτέρῳ οἴκῳ τῶν διδασκαλείων καὶ τῶν παλαιστρῶν, Μουσῶν, καὶ Ἑρμοῦ καὶ Ἡρακλέους). No other references attest the worship of Herakles in the palaistrai themselves during the Classical period.

⁹ For the meaning of κρήνη as springhouse, see [Dem.] 13.30 and Philochoros, *FrGH* 328F122.13. In both cases the verb κατασκευάζω is used.

5 τῆς παλ[αίτρας ἐπετετάτησε?]: Repetition of the word “palaistra” in lines 5 and 6 is difficult to understand, unless mention was made of an office held by the honorand that was related to the governance of a palaistra, which probably belonged to the deme itself.¹⁰ The benefactions performed by the honorand have to do with performance of rituals at festivals, and with repairs or building for the palaistra and a spring that serviced it. It is reasonable to posit that the office in question was that of the *epistates*. The office of *epistates* would have included maintenance of and capital improvements to a palaistra,¹¹ and perhaps even in the superintendence of the *Hermaia*. Alternatively, a more general verb of superintendence (e.g., ἐπιμέλομαι) may have been used. Because so little is known about the administration of palaistra in Athens itself, and because nothing at all—aside from what this decree may tell us—is known about palaistra in the demes, precision is impossible. It is not unlikely that the duties performed by the honorand may have included those normally associated with the *paidotribai* or the *gymnasiarchs*, whose function in the palaistra are not precisely known.¹²

It is not surprising that palaistra were located outside of Athens and its environs. Kephissia was a large deme and its distance from Athens may have made it inconvenient for the local youth to exercise at the athletic facilities in or near the city itself.¹³ It is not unlikely that other demes that were a considerable distance from Athens, such as Aphidna and Thorikos, also had palaistra. The sanctuary of Artemis at Brauron had both a gymnasium and palaistra, and the deme of Rhamnous had a gymnasium from at least the 330s. There were, possibly, athletic facilities at Marathon during the fifth century BC as well.¹⁴

Because the Kephissia decree was not found *in situ*, attempts to locate the site of the palaistra itself must remain speculative. However, Vanderpool’s report on the vicinity of the findspot is worth repeating here: “If the place of [the] finding of the inscription may be taken to indicate the general location of the palaistra, we see that it was well situated. The intersection of Charilaou Trikoupi and Karaiskaki Streets where the stone was found by a schoolboy is three blocks, or about 400 meters, south of Kephalaria, the great flowing spring of Kephissia. A modern irrigation ditch which carries water from the spring passes just a block to the west of the intersection so that the fountain house of a palaistra located in this general area could easily be supplied with water from the spring” (*Deltion* 24 [1969] 6).

6 [τὸ] ἀποδυτήριον τῆς πα[λαίτρας]: *Apodyteria* were likely a part of every structure or area associated with athletics. Plato’s description (*Lys.* 206E) of the *apodyterion* in the palaistra where a certain Mikkos (204A) taught makes it clear that an *apodyterion* could be an integral part of the palaistra building itself. However, in Plato’s description of an *apodyterion* in the Lyceum (*Euthyd.* 272E), there is no mention that this structure was part of a built palaistra or gym-

¹⁰ For a more detailed discussion, see W. Morison, “Attic Gymnasia and Palaistra: Public or Private?”, *The Ancient World* 31 (2000) (in press). Despite the traditional view taken by many scholars (see, e.g., Glass, “Greek Gymnasium”, 162 and D. Kyle, *Athletics in Ancient Athens* [Leiden 1987] 67) that palaistra were private institutions, the evidence to support this position relies solely on phrases like ἡ Ταυρέου παλαίτρα, which may refer to the builder, the teacher, the *paidotribes*, or perhaps an owner (J.H. Krause, *Die Gymnastik und Agonistik der Hellenen* [Leipzig 1841] 110). On the other hand, the evidence for *public* building of palaistra is relatively abundant. For example, the author of Ps. Xenophon’s *Athen Pol.* (2.10) plainly states that “the *demos* itself builds for itself many palaistra, dressing rooms, baths; and from these the mob takes pleasure more than the few and the blessed.” The reported text of a still unpublished inscription from Brauron—most recently discussed in *SEG* XL 91—reveals that a palaistra and a gymnasium were built and dedicated to Artemis at state expense.

¹¹ An *Epistates* is mentioned in connection with a palaistra in the Academy (Hyperid. *Dem.* fr. 7. col. 26), and Hesychios (s.v. ἀρχέλας) mentions τὸν ἐπιτάτην τοῦ Λυκείου. In other cases “epistates” is used for an official of the city, especially for the overseer of construction work (Harp. *Lex.* s.v. Λύκειον, Περικλέους ἐπιτατήσαντος τοῦ ἔργου. Philochoros 328 F 37 [Suda s.v. Λύκειον] Περικλέους φησὶν ἐπιτατοῦντος αὐτὸ γενέσθαι. Lykourgos is said to have repaired τὸ ἐν Λυκείῳ γυμνάσιον and many other buildings ἀεὶ . . . ἐφεκτὼς τοῖς ἔργοις (Ps. Plutarch, *vitaedecem oratorum* 841D; see also *IG* II 2² 457.7-8 (*Syll.* 326; cf. J. Delorme, *Gymnasion* [Paris 1960] 42).

¹² Most epigraphical and literary references to gymnasiarchs mention only their liturgical role in the tribal torch races at the Panathenaia, Hephaistia, and Prometheia (most recently, N. Sekunda, *ZPE* 83 [1990] 153-158), but gymnasiarchs also served in the demes (Isaios, *Men.* 42.5 [deme unknown, second quarter of the fourth century BC] and *IG* II² 3109 [Rhamnous, early third century BC]). See also R. Parker, *Athenian Religion. A History.* (Oxford 1996) 254, esp. n.126 and Whitehead, *Demes* 152 and 224-226.

¹³ Kephissia was the seventh largest of the Attic demes and was located about five miles northeast of Athens. See J. Traill, *The Political Organization of Attica.* (Princeton 1975) 67.

¹⁴ None of these facilities are attested by the extant literary sources, but are only known from recently discovered epigraphical evidence. For Brauron see *SEG* XL 91; *Ergon* (1961 [1962]) 24 and J. Papadimitriou, *Scientific American* (June 1963) 110-120; for Rhamnous see B. Petrakos, *Praktika* (1994 [1997]) 1-44, esp. 38-39. Some scholars have doubted the existence of athletic training facilities at Marathon (e.g., J. Delorme, *Gymnasion* [Paris 1960] 61-62), but a fourth-century BC agonistic dedication (*SEG* XXXII 206) found near Marathon mentions a term of service by a particular *paidotribes* (ἐπι— —) ἰονος παιδοτριβοῦ[τος]. While not conclusive, this inscription does suggest a local palaistra or gymnasium.

- nasium.¹⁵ [Xen.] *Ath.Pol.* 2.10 mentions *apodyteria* as structures separate from palaistrai and gymnasia. S. Miller has excavated a freestanding building at Nemea to the west of the stadium that he identifies as an *apodyterion*.¹⁶
- 7 [τ]ὴν κρήνην ἔφραξεν: The enclosure of the spring seems to indicate that there was a previous problem with pollution of the water supply either by errant humans or animals. Clean water both for the sacrifices to Hermes and for the athletes in a palaistra or gymnasium would have been a major concern, as the decree (*IG I³ 257*) concerning the tanners and the Kynosarges Herakleion on the Ilissos river suggests.¹⁷
- Moreover, it is no accident that the Lyceum and Kynosarges were both located close to the Ilissos river and that the Academy was located near the Kephissos river. Plato (*Leg.* 761D) connects gymnasia with bathing establishments, which by definition require copious amounts of clean water. Kimon's piping of water from the canalized Eridanos river out to the Academy in the second quarter of the fifth century BC was necessary not only for landscaping (as *Plut. Cim.* 13.7), but also for cult use and for bathing. The Lyceum may have had a reputation in antiquity for being muddy,¹⁸ at least in parts. There also appear to have been waterworks (Theophrast. *Plant.* 1.7.1). Strabo 9.1.19 and 9.1.24 mentions rivers and springs in the neighborhood of the Lyceum.
- τ]ὴν κρήνην ἔφραξεν: The return to the spring, already mentioned in line 4, may indicate that the fence was added after the original construction. Or it simply stresses the importance of the fence.
- 7-8 ὄ[στε τὰ πρόβατα μὴ εἰσι]έναι εἰς ἀντήν: L. Robert has rightly pointed out that the sense of this line requires a word referring to animals (*Bul. Epigr.* [1971] no. 286). Of the various possibilities, Robert rightly gives preference to τὰ πρόβατα because it is more likely to fit the number of required letter spaces—he also suggests τὰ θρέμματα or τὰ βοσκήματα or τὰ τετράποδα. In a rural deme like Kephissia, conflicts between human needs and livestock were apt to have been common. These πρόβατα are probably sheep (as *IG II² 1672.289*: τοῦ προβάτου καὶ τῆς αἰγός).
- 8-9 τὰλλα φι[λοτίμως ἔπραξε πρὸς] τὸν δῆμον: A summary of the honorand's proper fulfillment of sundry other duties would have been appropriate here.¹⁹ Robert's conjecture (φι[λότιμός ἐστι πρὸς vel εἰς | ---]) fits the sense, but would seem to leave the line short by several letter spaces. They create a line of 34 or 32.5 letter spaces, respectively.
- 9 τὸν δῆμον τὸν Κ[η]φ[ι]αίων: The tip and the upper part of the arc of a phi in the 14th letter space are visible.
- 10 Φρου[ρ ca. 8]: On the left edge of the break on the right side of the inscribed face, the tip of the left diagonal is visible. Chi and upsilon are both possible palaeographically, but sense and the position of the diagonal above the preceding omicron makes reading upsilon certain (cp. the carving of upsilon and chi in line 3: αὐτοῦ χωρίωι). Four names beginning with Φρου- are attested: Φρούραρχος, Φρουρίδης, Φρουρίων, and Φρούρος. None of the known individuals listed with these names in the *LGN II s.vv.* is known to have come from Kephissia. It is also possible that the honorand was not enrolled in Kephissia's deme register. The names Phourarchos and Phourides are perhaps the least likely as they would leave only ca. 3-4 letter spaces respectively for a patronymic.
- 11 I expect mention of the specific honors voted (e.g., a crown) (e.g., *IG II² 237.14* and *IG II² 343.8*), and it is probable that at least one or more lines followed the extant text.

Purpose of the Decree and the Restoration of its Missing Text

The extensive damage to the inscribed face of this stone, and the resultant loss of at least half of its original text, makes certain restoration unattainable. On the other hand, enough remains to restore much of text with a fair degree of accuracy. The first step is to delineate precisely what the extant text of the inscription tells us; and, then, to see what connections may be drawn from these points. The restoration of the missing text and the overall interpretation of the decree are based on these connections.

¹⁵ Pace Glass, "The Greek Gymnasium. Some Problems", in *The Archaeology of the Olympics*. W.J. Raschke, ed. (Madison 1988) 167.

¹⁶ See S. Miller, *The Ancient Stadium of Nemea* (Berkeley 1993) 6-8 and *passim* and in *AR* 37 (1991) 17-18. For a general discussion of *apodyteria* as a part of palaistrai and gymnasia, see Delorme, *Gymnasion* 296-301.

¹⁷ I take *IG I³ 257* to refer to the Herakleion in Kynosarges *contra* M.-F. Billot, "Le Cynosarges. Histoire, mythes et archéologie", in *Dictionnaire des Philosophes Antiques*, ed. R. Goulet (Paris 1994) 966 and *BCH* (1992) 155-156.

¹⁸ Theokritos of Chios mocks Aristoteles as having moved from the Academy to "live in discharges of muddy filth" ναίειν ἰ ἀντ' Ἀκαδημείας βορβόρου ἐν προχοαῖς (*Epigr. Graeca* 627-30 Page). But it is uncertain whether the joke is to be taken literally or morally or in both ways. Page follows Plutarch, *Exil.* 10, 603C and sees here an allusion to Aristotle in Makedonia, not in the Lyceum (D.L. Page, *Further Greek Epigrams* [Cambridge, London, New York etc. 1981] 93-95; for the attestation of the epigram by Didymos in his *Demosthenem commenta* see now L. Pearson's and S. Stephens' edition [Stuttgart 1983], col. 6).

¹⁹ For parallels, see *ASAtene* 3 (1941-1942) 79.7 (honorary decree, 250-200 BC), *SEG* XXV 89.14 (282/281 BC), and *IG II² 1023.3* (honorary decree, end of second century BC). Also, cf. *IG II² 1156.56* (ephebic dedication, 334/333 BC) and 1330.54 (decree, after 163 BC).

First, what precisely does the extant text of the decree tell us? This decree, passed by the demesmen of Kephissia, honors an individual whose name is lost beyond certain restoration. The individual is honored for the following services: 1) performance of, or provision for, rituals (sacrifice?) probably at a festival, 2) something to do with his own land, 3) building or repair of a springhouse and perhaps a pipeline, 4) activities involving a palaistra, 5) repair of the *apodyterion* of a palaistra, 6) the fencing-in of a springhouse to keep animals (or persons) out, and 7) the honorable completion of certain other unspecified benefactions for the deme of Kephissia. Thus, in brief, the honorand received praise for having done certain things concerning cult rites, for having built certain waterworks, and for having built or repaired part of a palaistra.

What connections may be reasonably made between these facts? We know from literary sources that cult rites (sacrifices?), water, and the maintenance of the buildings were all part of the operation of palaistrai. The deme of Kephissia would have needed someone to oversee the *paides* in their observance of the *Hermaia*, to oversee the physical training of the youth and, perhaps, to pay for expenses of the festival including those of the sacrifices. The palaistra may also have required a reliable source of clean water for washing and bathing, and buildings would also require maintenance.

The connections between the individual benefactions mentioned in this decree build a strong case for taking this decree as honoring benefactions performed by the *epistates* (or another official) of a palaistra. The emphasis of the decree on building and repair of waterworks and the palaistra seem most suited to the little we know of the *epistatai* connected with Athenian athletic facilities. In demes like Kephissia wealthy members of the community may have been expected or encouraged to perform multiple functions in the course of their duties. More importantly, this decree provides us with evidence for deme palaistrai and some insight into their administration and maintenance.