

A CATALOGUE  
OF THE  
SPARTA MUSEUM

BY

M. N. TOD, M.A.

AND

A. J. B. WACE, M.A.

EDIZIONE ANASTATICA

"L'ERMA" di BRETSCHNEIDER - ROMA  
1968

# CONTENTS

	PAGE
PREFACE . . . . .	iii
NOTE ON INSCRIPTIONS . . . . .	v
SCULPTURE AND MISCELLANEOUS ANTIQUITIES . . . . .	vi
PART I: INSCRIPTIONS. M. N. TOD:	
(1) INTRODUCTION . . . . .	1
(2) CATALOGUE . . . . .	32
(3) INDICES, &c. . . . .	87
PART II: SCULPTURE. A. J. B. WACE:	
(1) INTRODUCTION . . . . .	98
(2) CATALOGUE . . . . .	132
(3) INDEX, &c. . . . .	213
PART III: MISCELLANEOUS ANTIQUITIES. A. J. B. WACE:	
(1) INTRODUCTION . . . . .	221
(2) CATALOGUE . . . . .	231
(3) INDEX . . . . .	247
LIST OF CASTS AND PHOTOGRAPHS . . . . .	248

# PART I

## INSCRIPTIONS

### ABBREVIATIONS

R., r. = right.

L., l. = left, line.

- Cauer = P. Cauer, *Delectus Inscriptionum Graecarum propter dialectum memorabilem*.
- Collitz-Bechtel = H. Collitz und F. Bechtel, *Sammlung der griechischen Dialekt-Inschriften*.
- David = E. David, *Dialecti Laconicae monumenta epigraphica*.
- Dittenberger = G. Dittenberger, *Sylloge Inscriptionum Graecarum*.
- Dressel-Milchhoefer = H. Dressel und A. Milchhoefer, *Die antiken Kunstwerke aus Sparta und Umgebung* (*Ath. Mitt.* ii. 393 ff.).
- Hicks and Hill = E. L. Hicks and G. F. Hill, *A Manual of Greek Historical Inscriptions*.
- *I.G.A.* = H. Roehl, *Inscriptiones Graecae Antiquissimae*.
- Kaibel = G. Kaibel, *Epigrammata Graeca ex lapidibus collecta*.
- Le Bas-Foucart = Ph. Le Bas, *Voyage archéologique en Grèce: Explication des Inscriptions* par P. Foucart.
- Michel = C. Michel, *Recueil d'Inscriptions grecques*.

Dimensions are given in metres.

## PREFACE

SOME apology may be thought necessary for the publication of a catalogue of the Sparta Museum after the work of Dressel and Milchhoefer, which appeared in the second volume of the *Athenische Mitteilungen*, and was afterwards issued separately. In 1872 Stamatakes, the Ephor General of Antiquities, founded a new Museum to replace the collection brought together by Ross in 1834 and shortly afterwards destroyed by fire. Five years later Dressel and Milchhoefer published their account of the 'Kunstwerke' from Sparta and its neighbourhood. During the thirty years which have since elapsed, the Museum has been successively reorganized and enlarged by Dr. Kastriotis and Dr. Philios in 1900 and 1902: since then a considerable number of acquisitions have been made, so that at present the manuscript catalogue of the Museum contains over 800 entries, while Dressel and Milchhoefer, although including monuments from all parts of Laconia and in many different collections, of which some had disappeared and several were no longer in Laconia nor even in Greece, only describe about 300 items. It is true that some of the more important new discoveries have been published in scattered articles in various periodicals; but a large number of most interesting monuments still remain unpublished and unknown. Under these circumstances it has seemed to us that there is some call for a catalogue of the monuments at present in the Sparta Museum, which should not merely describe the objects individually but also attempt by means of introductions to classify and interpret them. Only thus could we hope that our work would be at the same time a handbook for the archaeologist and a guide for the dilettante.

It will be readily understood that our catalogue is based on the previous labours of Dressel and Milchhoefer, of Kastriotis and of Philios: we are under special obligations to the latter's unpublished manuscript catalogue, which at present serves as the Museum inventory, and embodies the results of his predecessors' work. At the same time, though taking into consideration

all the published opinions of various scholars, we have attempted as far as possible to arrive in each case at an independent judgment. Each of the authors, however, must be held responsible for that section of the catalogue only to which his name is appended. We regret that for various reasons we have been prevented from close collaboration, and this has rendered unavoidable some lack of uniformity in minor points. The introductions to the sections are not intended to be exhaustive, but rather to indicate broadly the significance of the various classes of monuments, dealing at length only with those which are of special interest. The purpose of our catalogue as explained above has necessitated the utmost brevity, compatible with accuracy in our descriptions and discussions.

We have finally the pleasant task of acknowledging much kind assistance, which has materially lightened our work. To Professor Gregorakes, Curator of antiquities at Sparta, our heartiest thanks are due for his unflinching courtesy and the ready help he has afforded us. To Mr. R. C. Bosanquet we are deeply indebted: it was he who originally suggested the making of the catalogue, and he has throughout helped us by his criticism and encouragement. We owe much, also, to the late Provost of Oriel, Dr. D. B. Monro, who was at all times ready to aid us in various questions concerning publication. Our hearty thanks are also due to the Oxford University Press for undertaking the publication of this catalogue, and to the British School at Athens for supporting and making a grant in aid of the same, as the firstfruits of its archaeological survey of Laconia. We greatly regret that we have unfortunately been obliged to exclude Professor Furtwängler's promised appendix on the Amyclæum, the manuscript of which was not in our hands at the time of passing the proofs for press.

M. N. T.

A. J. B. W.

the Laconian alphabet has also been discussed by Kirchhoff<sup>1</sup>. The question of the dialect has been made the subject of a special study by Müllensiefen<sup>2</sup>, while the dialect inscriptions have been published by him, and more recently by Meister<sup>3</sup>.

## II. ARCHAIC INSCRIPTIONS

§ 2. Although hardly justifiable from the point of view of a logical classification according to subject, it is a usual practice, and one which has some obvious advantages, to place archaic inscriptions in a group by themselves. In the present work we shall allow the word 'archaic' its widest possible range, and include all inscriptions prior to the introduction of the Ionic alphabet into Laconia, though of course excluding the archaizing inscriptions which belong to the period of the Antonines<sup>4</sup>.

The number of archaic inscriptions in the Spartan collection is eight (Nos. 200, 386, 387, 440, 447, 599, 611, 625)<sup>5</sup>. Of these No. 200 remains an unsolved riddle, in which only the words *αἱ τῆς δις κίου* or *δισκίου* (l. 2) are distinguishable, and even they cannot claim to be regarded as certain. Nos. 599 and 625 are so fragmentary as to render impossible not only any restoration but even any certain conjecture as to their nature. No. 611 has usually been regarded as a metrical epitaph, and has been conjecturally restored by Roehl<sup>6</sup> on that supposition: but even this, owing to the mutilated condition of the stone, must be regarded as not proven, and Kirchhoff<sup>7</sup> has argued that it is more probably a votive than a sepulchral inscription. Some confirmation of this view may perhaps be found in the fact that the two metrical inscriptions of this period which have come down to us intact<sup>8</sup> are both dedicatory. The earlier one (No. 447), consisting of an elegiac distich, is inscribed on a relief of the Dioscuri dedicated by Plestidas 'dreading the wrath of the twin sons of Tyndareos.' The other, the famous Damonon inscription (No. 440), after an introductory hexameter couplet in which Damonon dedicates the stele to 'Ἀθηνᾶ Πολυᾶχος to commemorate a career of victory which has eclipsed all his contemporaries, contains a list in prose of the victories won by Damonon in various contests: this is followed by an enumeration, unfortunately almost entirely lost, of the successes gained by a woman, whose relation to Damonon is seemingly not stated. Finally we have the epitaphs of two soldiers who fell in battle (Nos. 386, 387), which will best be discussed in connexion with the whole series to which they belong<sup>9</sup>.

§ 3. The writing of these inscriptions is of interest as affording us examples of the old Laconian alphabet<sup>10</sup>, which belonged to the 'Western

<sup>1</sup> *Studien zur Geschichte des griech. Alphabets*<sup>4</sup>, p. 149 foll.

<sup>2</sup> *De titulorum Laconicorum dialecto* (*Dissert. philol. Argentor.* v. pp. 131-260), Strassburg, 1882.

<sup>3</sup> Collitz and Bechtel, *Sammlung der gr. Dialekt-Inschriften*, iii. Band, 2. Hälfte, 1. Heft, Göttingen, 1898. Cauer's collection (*Delectus inscr. graec. propter dialect. memorab.*<sup>2</sup>, Leipzig, 1883) is less complete than Müllensiefen's or Meister's.

<sup>4</sup> i. e. Nos. 218-221.

<sup>5</sup> To these should perhaps be added No. 527: see § 43.

<sup>6</sup> *J.G.A.* 62.

<sup>7</sup> *Sitzungsber. der Berl. Akad.* 1887, ii. 989 foll.

<sup>8</sup> Kirchhoff's restoration of No. 447 may be regarded as certain.

<sup>9</sup> See § 32, below.

<sup>10</sup> For a full discussion see Roberts, *Introduction to Greek Epigraphy*, i. 248 foll., and Kirchhoff, *Studien zur Geschichte des griech. Alphabets*<sup>4</sup>, p. 149 foll.

# INTRODUCTION

## I. PREVIOUS PUBLICATIONS

§ 1. Before attempting a classification of the inscriptions contained in the following catalogue, we may briefly refer to some of the more important publications dealing with Spartan epigraphy.

The first volume of Boeckh's *Corpus Inscriptionum Graecarum*, published in 1828, contained all the inscriptions from Laconia known up to that date: of these 230 had been discovered at Sparta or in the neighbourhood. Some few of them had been seen by Cyriac of Ancona, Muratori, Dodwell, &c., but the large majority rests solely on the copies of Fourmont, made in 1729 and 1730. A number of Fourmont's inscriptions had previously been published, especially by Osann, but Boeckh re-edited the whole series from copies made expressly by Imm. Bekker from Fourmont's papers. There are also twenty-three others, most of them attributed to Amyclae, which Boeckh published among the *Inscriptiones Fourmonti Spuriae*. Not the least valuable part of Boeckh's work is his introductory chapter dealing with the Spartan lists of magistrates: though in some particulars it must be modified and supplemented in the light of subsequent evidence, yet it remains a masterpiece of clear and cogent reasoning.

A number of new Spartan inscriptions were published by Leake<sup>1</sup> and Ross<sup>2</sup>, but far more numerous and important were those copied by Le Bas during his visit in 1843. These were edited in 1869 by P. Foucart, who added to them the inscriptions published by other scholars in the intervening years and a number of texts copied by himself in 1868. In all, 104 inscriptions from the Upper Eurotas plain occur in this collection. The commentary which accompanies them is invaluable to the student of Spartan epigraphy, marked as it is by extraordinary keenness of insight, command of material, and lucidity of expression.

The year 1877 saw considerable additions made to the number of published Spartan inscriptions, thanks to the work of Dressel and Milchoefer<sup>3</sup> and of Martha<sup>4</sup>. The quarter of a century which has since elapsed has witnessed a deepening rather than a widening of our knowledge, although some important texts were discovered by Tsountas<sup>5</sup> during his excavation at the Amyclaeum in 1891. The archaic inscriptions have been separately published by Roehl<sup>6</sup> and by Roberts<sup>7</sup>, while

<sup>1</sup> *Travels in the Morea*, 3 vols., London, 1830. The inscriptions are collected at the end of vol. 3.

<sup>2</sup> *Inscriptiones Graecae Ineditae*, fasc. I, Nauplia, 1834.

<sup>3</sup> *Die antiken Kunstwerke aus Sparta und Umgebung*, *Ath. Mitt.* ii. p. 293 foll.

<sup>4</sup> *Bull. Corr. Hell.* i. p. 378 foll.

<sup>5</sup> *Ἐφ. Ἀρχ.* 1892, p. 1 foll.

<sup>6</sup> *I.G.A.* Nos. 49-91; *Imag. Inscr. Gr. Antiq.*<sup>3</sup> p. 25 foll.

<sup>7</sup> *Introduction to Greek Epigraphy*, §§ 100, 101, p. 248 foll.

## SCULPTURE AND MISCELLANEOUS ANTIQUITIES

IN cataloguing the Sculpture and the Miscellaneous Antiquities the following principles have been observed as regards references to previous publications. The chief references given by Dressel and Milchhoefer or in Friedrichs-Wolters have been repeated, and all later ones added. For the more important and better known monuments I have given references only to the standard histories of Greek Sculpture: otherwise I have tried to make the list of references as complete as possible. The architectural fragments are not discussed in detail for obvious reasons. Some of the sculptures in private possession mentioned by Dressel and Milchhoefer are now in the Museum, and have been identified accordingly; others are still in private possession or have gone elsewhere. Of the fragments excavated by Waldstein and Meader on the Acropolis in 1893, and published in the *American Journal of Archaeology* (1893, p. 422 seqq.), I have identified all but *b, i, j, k, l, m, and n*.

I have personally examined nearly all the sculptures of Laconian provenance in other museums. Those that are important are discussed in their proper places in the introduction, and many are illustrated together with other sculptures not of Laconian provenance, but of use in illustrating Spartan sculpture.

The illustrations have been drawn either from the previous publications or from my own photographs by Mr. F. Anderson. I have to thank Professor Furtwängler for photographs of 27 and 588, Dr. Watzinger for one of Berlin No. 732, and Dr. Riezler for one of the Munich leaden figurines. For much kind assistance in the catalogues or their introductions I am deeply indebted to Professors Furtwängler, E. A. Gardner, P. Gardner, Ridgeway, and Waldstein, Miss Harrison, Dr. Sieving, Dr. Thiersch, and Mr. J. L. Myres. To M. Papapolychroniou, Head Master of the school at Dhimitzana, my heartiest thanks are due for permission to photograph the Spartan sculptures in the library there.

I am also deeply grateful to Dr. Cecil Smith who voluntarily undertook to supervise the preparation of the illustrations.

A. J. B. W.



## NOTE ON INSCRIPTIONS

IN the text of the inscriptions the usual conventions have been followed :

- | Marks the end of a line.
- - - Denotes an uncertain number of missing letters.
- . . . . Denotes a known number of missing letters, equal to that of the points.
- [ ] In square brackets are enclosed letters conjecturally restored.
- ( ) In round brackets are enclosed (1) letters which, though not wholly lost, are defective ; (2) letters needed to complete a word abbreviated in the original ; (3) the repetition of a name as patronymic : this is denoted in the inscriptions by the signs < κ β &c. ; e. g. ΦΙΛΟΚΛΗΣ < is written Φιλοκλήs (Φιλοκλέους).

The text here given rests in every case upon my own reading, but I have called attention in the notes to all important variations between my text and that of previous editors.

I have had to study economy of space as far as possible. Hence in the case of inscriptions published in Collitz-Bechtel<sup>1</sup> no references are given to previous publications, except where these have been accidentally overlooked in that work. Where texts have been published in Le Bas-Foucart but not in Collitz-Bechtel, only the former is cited, together with subsequent publications. In all other cases the list of references will, I hope, be found complete.

To the kindness of Freiherr F. Hiller von Gaertringen and Professor U. von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff I am indebted for help in connexion with No. 524. I regret that Meister's interesting article on the Spartan and perioec dialects (*Dorer und Achäer*, I, p. 7 foll.) came into my hands too late for me to make use of it.

M. N. T.

<sup>1</sup> *Sammlung der griechischen Dialekt-Inschriften*. The Inscriptions from Laconia and Messenia are edited by R. Meister (iii. Band, 2. Hälfte, 1. Heft, Göttingen, 1898).

group' of alphabets and is very closely allied to that of Phocis and Thessaly. None of them is purely retrograde<sup>1</sup>, but three (Nos. 200, 599, 625) are written *boustrophedon*, i.e. the lines read alternately from left to right and from right to left<sup>2</sup>. As regards the letters employed, there is no material variation in the forms of ADIKAMOTY(=X). The letters Β (No. 200), Γ (No. 611), X (= ξ) (No. 440), Θ (No. 611), and Ζ (No. 200)<sup>3</sup>, occur once only: θ has the form ⊗ (Nos. 440, 611) or ⊕ (No. 625), ρ appears in one inscription as ϐ (No. 611), ν in one, as Υ (No. 200), π as Ϟ (No. 447): the sign C twice appears in a retrograde line (Nos. 200, 599: also in *I.G.A.* 54, l. 5), seemingly as a mark of punctuation. E represents both ε and η, except in No. 387 where Η is used for η as well as for the *spiritus asper*; with this exception Η invariably represents the *spiritus asper*. Ο stands for ο and ω. The greatest variation is found in the forms of ε, ν, and ρ. We find:

(1) Ε (Nos. 200, 599), ϐ (No. 447), Ε (No. 611), Ε (Nos. 386, 387, 440, 625):

(2) Ν (Nos. 200, 599, 611), Ϟ (No. 447), Ν (Nos. 386, 625), Ν (Nos. 387, 440):

(3) Ζ (Nos. 200, 447, 599, 611), Ζ (Nos. 386, 440).

The development of the later from the earlier forms gives us a ground for arranging the inscriptions in chronological order. No. 200 bears every mark of being the earliest of the series. This is followed by Nos. 599, 447, and 611, the characters of which are very similar; the ε of No. 611 shows a more advanced form than that of the two others, and hence we may perhaps place them in the order indicated. No. 625 shows still more developed forms of ε and ν, and is probably later than the inscriptions mentioned, in spite of its being *boustrophedon*. Nos. 386, 400, and 387 complete the series, the latter showing the first traces of Ionic influence in the use of Η as η. That influence is seen still more strongly at work in No. 377, where Η appears as the symbol of η and of the *spiritus asper*, and Ω is employed to represent ω.

§ 4. An accurate dating of these inscriptions is of course impossible. Yet there are some Laconian inscriptions of the fifth century which can be dated with a probability amounting almost to certainty, and by comparison with them a tolerably correct idea may be gained of the time to which our Spartan examples belong. Thus, the celebrated list of the states represented on the Greek side in the battle of Plataea (479 B.C.) inscribed on the bronze serpent-pillar now in the Hippodrome at

<sup>1</sup> With the possible exception of No. 527 (§ 43). The retrograde Laconian inscriptions are collected by Roberts, *op. cit.* 248 foll., Nos. 243-247. No. 248 is really retrograde throughout, though an attempt has been made by the lapidary to write *boustrophedon*.

<sup>2</sup> Besides those referred to in the text I know no other Laconian *boustrophedon* inscriptions.

<sup>3</sup> This letter occurs in Sicyonian inscriptions (Roberts, *op. cit.* Nos. 94, 95) with the value ε, while in the Pamphylian alphabet (*ibid.* p. 316) it stands for ξ. It is also found in an inscription from Olympia (Dittenberger-Purgold, *Die Inschriften von Olympia*, No. 14), where it probably represents ψ, according to a conjecture of Meister.

Constantinople<sup>1</sup>; the tombstone of Eualkes<sup>2</sup>, who fell in the battle of Mantinea (418 B.C.); and the Delian marble<sup>3</sup> on which is inscribed a Spartan decree passed soon after the battle of Aegospotami (405 B.C.), can be assigned with confidence to the years 479 or 478 B.C., 418 or 417 B.C. and 403-398 B.C. respectively. With the data thus given we may perhaps assign No. 200 to about the middle of the sixth century, Nos. 599, 447, and 611 to the close of that century, and No. 625 to the earlier years of the fifth. Then follows a long period unrepresented by any inscription, for No. 386 is very similar in character to the Eualkes inscription just referred to, and must therefore be attributed to the second half of the Peloponnesian War. No. 440 was probably inscribed about 400 B.C.<sup>4</sup>, and No. 387 in one of the earliest years of the fourth century.

### III. DECREES: LETTERS FROM FOREIGN STATES

§ 5. There are few facts which strike the student of Spartan inscriptions more forcibly than the almost entire absence of a class of documents which in most states occupies a large and important place,—decrees, whether of the state itself or of the smaller corporations, public or private, comprised within it. Only one Spartan decree from Laconia is extant (No. 217 B)<sup>5</sup>, though we have probably the closing words of a second, restoring to the island of Delos the control of its temples and temple-treasures soon after the battle of Aegospotami (Collitz-Bechtel 4415). No 217 B records the grant of the *προξενία* to a certain Damion, an Ambraciote, for services rendered in his native city to Spartan citizens. He and his descendants are likewise granted exemption from public burdens (*ἀτέλεια*) and the right of owning land or house, but this latter privilege is restricted to those who actually reside in Sparta (*εἰ οἰκοῖεν ἐλ Λακεδαίμονι*). That such decrees were comparatively rare seems a legitimate conclusion from the fact that only this one example has survived: this conclusion is borne out by a certain clumsiness in the wording and arrangement of the clauses, which would argue unfamiliarity with such documents. We shall see below<sup>6</sup> that the Spartan state employed another means of doing honour to its prominent citizens than by passing formal decrees lauding their deserts.

A second decree in the Museum (No. 217 A) contains a grant of *προξενία* made by the Council and Commonwealth (*ἅ βουλὰ καὶ τὸ κοινόν*)

<sup>1</sup> Collitz-Bechtel 4406; Hicks and Hill, *Greek Historical Inscriptions*, No. 19; Dittenber<sup>er</sup>, *Sylloge*<sup>2</sup>, 7; Michel, *Recueil*, 1118.

<sup>2</sup> Collitz-Bechtel 4529; Roberts, *Introduction*, 263.

<sup>3</sup> Collitz-Bechtel 4415; Hicks and Hill, No. 83; Dittenberger, *Sylloge*<sup>2</sup>, 60; Michel 180.

<sup>4</sup> That the inscription cannot be assigned to a much earlier date is proved by (1) the relatively advanced forms of the letters employed, especially of N and Σ, and by (2) the fact that it contains the record of a woman's victories; for Pausanias explicitly says that Kyniska, daughter of King Archidamus II (reigned 469-427 B.C.) *πρώτη τε ἱπποπόρῳσσε γυναικῶν καὶ νίκην ἀνέλετο Ὀλυμπικῆν*, and in the basis of Kyniska at Olympia the Ionic alphabet is used. On the other hand, the date cannot be much later than 400 B.C., for there are as yet no traces of Ionic influence.

<sup>5</sup> Fragments, however, of other Spartan decrees were copied by Fourmont (*C.I.G.* 1331, 1333?) and Benthylus (*C.I.G.* 1332). From these must be distinguished the decree of the *κοινόν τῶν Λακεδαίμονιων* found at Taenarum by Pouqueville (*C.I.G.* 1335). See also *I.G.* iv. 940.

<sup>6</sup> See § 9.

of the Acarnanians to three Spartans and their descendants; of the rights which accompany this grant three (*ἀσφάλεια, ἀσυλία, γὰς καὶ οἰκίας ἔγκτησις*) are expressly mentioned, but the rest are grouped together in the phrase 'all the other honours and privileges accruing to the other *προχρηνοὶ* and benefactors of the Commonwealth of the Acarnanians.' As no provision is made in the decree itself for the deposit of a copy in Sparta, we must suppose that the three men therein honoured had this copy inscribed at their own expense and erected in some public place in their own city. Though neither this decree nor the one discussed above can be dated with certainty, there is reason to believe that they both belong to the period between 220 and 180 B.C.

§ 6. We possess, further, two fragments (Nos. 241 and 262+408) of letters addressed to the ephors and city of the Lacedaemonians: unfortunately these are both so mutilated that it is not possible to give any probable conjecture as to the nature of the communications, and the name of the state by which it was sent is entirely lost in one case and in the other rests upon an uncertain restoration. A portion of a third similar document is extant (*Bull. Corr. Hell.* i. 384, No. 11), but in an even more fragmentary condition than the other two. All three inscriptions, being addressed to the ephors as the highest officials of the Spartan state, are probably<sup>2</sup> prior to 226 B.C., for about that time the ephorate was temporarily crushed by Cleomenes III, and though it came into existence again, it never took its place at the head of the Spartan magistracy. To judge from the forms of the letters used, No. 241 is somewhat earlier than No. 262, but neither can be dated before the middle of the third century B.C.

§ 7. Decrees of smaller corporations within the state are represented by that of the *ὠβὰ τῶν Ἀμυκλαίων* (No. 441), dating from the first or second century B.C., by which the ephors of the corporation<sup>2</sup>, three in number, are praised, and receive the grant for life of a special portion on the occasion of the sacrifice (*ἐπὶ τῷ προστροπῷ*) as a reward for the disinterested and mild discharge of their duties. After regulations regarding the cost of the inscription, and the place at which it was to be set up, the decree closes with a clause, seemingly added as an amendment, praising the ephors' secretary. As in the case of the Spartan decree<sup>2</sup> the place chosen for the display of the monument was the most famous and revered sanctuary of the city, the temple of Athena Chalkioikos, so here it is enacted that the stele be set up in the sanctuary of Alexandra, or Cassandra, which, as Pausanias<sup>4</sup> tells us, was the principal sight of Amyclae.

No. 446 is probably similar in character to No. 441. Although the greater part of the inscription is illegible, yet the words *ὠβὰ* and *δεδοχθαι πάντα τὰ τῆς ὠβᾶς* are distinguishable, as well as the name of a certain *Ἀριστοτέλης*, which recurs twice or three times.

§ 8. In No. 782 we seem to have a fragment of an Imperial rescript.

<sup>1</sup> But the formula *Λακεδαιμονίων ἐφόροις καὶ γερονσίᾳ καὶ δήμῳ* occurs in a letter of about 150 B.C. (Josephus, *Archaeol.* xiii. 166).

<sup>2</sup> These must be distinguished from the state ephors. The Spartan guild of *σιτηθέντες* had also an official with this title (No. 203). Several Eleutherolaconian cities also are known to have had ephors, e.g. Geronthrae (Collitz-Bechtel 453c, 4532), Gythion (ibid. 4566, 4567, 4568), Taenarum (*C.I.G.* 1321, 1322), Cotyrta (Collitz-Bechtel 4544), Epidaurus Limeria (ibid. 4543), Oetylus (*C.I.G.* 1323).

<sup>3</sup> See above, § 5.

<sup>4</sup> iii. 19. 6.

Its mutilated condition renders any attempt at restoration futile, and all we can say is that it regulates in some way the buying and letting of landed property (col. I, ll. 3, 4), and at the same time extends or defines the right of appeal in cases of dispute (col. II).

No. 224 is a document whose nature cannot in its present fragmentary condition be determined; since, however, it would seem to deal with the recovery of state debts, it is in all probability either a decree or a publication of some magistrate (? the *χρεοφύλαξ*) or board of magistrates, and as such it may fittingly be included in this class of inscriptions.

#### IV. HONORARY INSCRIPTIONS

§ 9. It has been remarked above<sup>1</sup> that the Spartans did not as a rule follow the custom prevalent in other Greek states of passing laudatory decrees in honour of those who were prominent in the political or religious life of the community. In earlier times, no doubt, the consciousness of public services rendered to the best of his ability was sufficient reward for a Spartan, whose whole education was framed to inculcate the idea of the subserviency of the individual to the common weal: at any rate, it was enough for him to have his merit prized by his fellow citizens without any external display. But at a later period the craving for personal recognition arose, and the response to it took the form of commemoration by means of portrait statues. Such statues were often set up by the state, but since the drain on the public exchequer must have been severely felt, the actual expense was, during the Imperial period, in nearly all cases defrayed by one or more of the relatives or friends of the person honoured. Their names were included in the inscription on the base of the statue, which in consequence usually followed the skeleton formula *Ἡ πόλις (sc. ἀνέθηκε) τὸν δαίνα . . . προσδεξαμένου τὸ ἀνάλωμα τοῦ δαίνοιο . . .*

Six such inscriptions, whole or fragmentary, are in the Spartan Museum (Nos. 246, 281, 385, 456, 621, 691), a remarkably small number when we consider the fact that in the *C.I.G.* alone we have some fifty examples of this class from Sparta and the immediate neighbourhood: of these, only one (No. 246) is now in the Museum. Of the six inscriptions in question two (Nos. 385, 621) are so fragmentary as to be practically useless. No. 246 commemorates a certain Sextus Pompeius Spatalus, patronomus and permanent gymnasiarch, for the magnificence of his public life and the zeal and foresight displayed during his second tenure of the office of gymnasiarch, which he undertook of his own accord. The cost of the statue is defrayed by his wife Aurelia Xeno. No. 281 praises one Lucius Volussenus Arist — —, a descendant of Heracles and Perseus, on the general ground of 'merit and good will towards the state.' No. 456 is inscribed on the base of a statue of a woman, Aurelia Oppia, who bears the honorary titles of *ἑστία πόλεως* and *νέα Πηλεόπεια*: in this case it is a brother-in-law who pays for the statue. The remaining inscription (No. 691) is in honour of Tiberius Claudius Pratolaus, who had held the office of *ἀγορανόμος* and had been entrusted with the special duty of the conservation of highways: the cost of the statue is borne jointly by his two children, Tiberius Claudius Aelius Pratolaus and Claudia Damostheneia, of whom we shall have something to say below<sup>2</sup>.

<sup>1</sup> See § 5.

<sup>2</sup> § II.

§ 10. So familiar had the formula become that even the words *ἡ πόλις* were sometimes omitted, and the inscription began with the accusative of the person honoured. Thus in No. 252 we find simply *Ἐπίγονοι Φιλοστράτου Βαμοσίκην ἀνδρείας ἔνεκεν προσδεξαμένων κτλ.*, and no doubt Nos. 243 and 544 are analogous, though in both these cases the latter part of the inscription is lost. In No. 243 we have merely the name of the man whose portrait head crowned the shaft on which the inscription is engraved, while in No. 544 we have not only the name, Sextus Eudamus, but a long list of the priesthoods and other sacred offices which he had held, most of them vested in the family of which he was a member, which claimed to be descended from Heracles and the Dioscuri. It is interesting to notice that the men commemorated in these last two herm-inscriptions were members of the same family, possibly even brothers.

We have, further, two cases in which the expense of the statue has been borne by the city which resolved upon its erection. In one case (No. 648) that city is Sparta, and the person honoured is the same Tiberius Claudius Pratolaus to whom reference has already been made. The second case (No. 253) is one in which the city of Smyrna honours<sup>1</sup> a tragedian, Gaius Iulius Iulianus, who had won a contest at Sparta at the games called *Οὐράνια*. It is recorded that he had gained 358 other victories, and had been granted the rights of citizen 'in all Greece and Macedonia and Thessaly<sup>2</sup>.'

§ 11. Statues, however, could be erected by private individuals as well as by the state. A common base (No. 393) served for those of a priest, Diaries, and Eubalkes, an Olympian victor, who had, according to a probable conjecture of Roehl, taken the part of *σταφυλοδρόμας* at the festival of Carneian Apollo. A second (No. 267) bears the name of an *ἀγορανόμος*, Socrates, who is distinguished by the mention not only of his father's name, but also by that of his brother-in-law: possibly it was the latter who defrayed the expense of the statue. We have, finally, two inscriptions (Nos. 85, 443) which differ from all the rest in formula, and bear a very close resemblance to each other: the former runs *Κλαυ. Βρασίδαν τὸν πατέρα*, the latter *Κλ. Δαμοσθένειαν τὴν θυγατέρα*. This likeness extends even to the forms of the letters used, and the arrangement of the words on the bases of the statues, both of which are extant, though headless. We have had occasion to notice two inscriptions (Nos. 648, 691) commemorating Tiberius Claudius Pratolaus, son of Brasidas: one of these (No. 691) mentions his daughter, Claudia Damostheneia, as sharing with her brother the expense of the statue. This enables us to conjecture with a considerable degree of probability that the two statues (Nos. 85, 443) were erected by this same Tiberius Claudius Pratolaus, the one in

<sup>1</sup> It is doubtful whether a statue was erected to Iulianus: probably this tablet alone was set up to commemorate his success.

<sup>2</sup> It was the custom during the Imperial period, for states to confer citizenship and often also the title of *βουλευτής* on noted artists or athletes. See *C.I.G.* 2811 b (of an athlete of Aphrodisias) *ἔστιν δὲ καὶ πολέτης πόλεων τῶν ὑπογεγραμμένων*: Περγαμνῶν Ἀντιοχείων Καισαρέων Κολωνῶν· καὶ βουλευτής Θηραίων καὶ βουλευτής Ἀπολλωνιατῶν Λυκίων Θρακῶν, καὶ βουλευτής Μειλησίων, Πισσινουρτίων, Κλαυδιοπολεϊτῶν: *ibid.* 3208 Περγαμνῶς καὶ Σμυρναῖος καὶ Ἀθηναῖος καὶ Ἐφέσιος: *ibid.* 3426 Κυραῖος καὶ Ἀθηναῖος καὶ Φιλαδελφείδος καὶ Ῥόδιος καὶ ἄλλων πολλῶν πόλεων πολέτης καὶ βουλευτής: *ibid.* 4324 Ῥοδιοπολεῖτην καὶ Μυρέα [καὶ] Φασηλείτην, [β]ο[υ]λευτὴν γενόμενον, καὶ ἐν ταῖς κατὰ Δυκίαν πόλεσι π[ί]σασις πολειτευσ[ά]μενον. Foncart quotes *Le Bas-Waddington, Ins. d'Asie Mineure*, 1652 b, and *Φιλίστωρ* i. 329.

honour of his father Brasidas, the other in honour of his daughter Claudia Damosiheneia. The similarity of formula is thus explained, and also that of the writing, for the same artist would probably be employed in both cases.

We may mention here two cases in which the person commemorated is already dead: one (No. 251) is that of a certain *Δευκτριάδας*, whose statue is erected by his daughter, the other (No. 589) that of a son who is represented on a relief set up by his father. In both cases the dead is described by the term *ἥρωες*<sup>1</sup>, and the monument, in the latter if not in the former, seems to have served as a tombstone.

§ 12. As regards the date of the class of inscriptions under discussion, the main point to notice is that, with at most three exceptions, they all belong to the Imperial period, the greater number being referable to the second century of our era. No. 393 is very considerably older, and probably goes back to the fourth century B.C., while Nos. 251, 252 are doubtful, but probably belong to the earlier years of the Empire or the time immediately preceding.

#### V. CATALOGUES OF MAGISTRATES, &c.

§ 13. What is at once the most numerous and the most characteristic class of inscriptions in the Spartan Museum comprises the catalogues of names, whether of magistrates or of private corporations, together with the closely related documents setting forth the *cursus honorum* of single individuals. Some of these may go back to the second century B.C., but the large majority belongs to the first century before and the first and second century after our era. They thus shed a valuable light upon Spartan constitutional history at a time when little is to be gathered from our literary sources, and enable us to form a more accurate picture than would otherwise be possible of the actual working of the state during the Imperial period.

To begin with the highest magistrates, we possess in No. 777 a list, happily complete, of the *πατρονόμοι* of one year: the date is uncertain, but must fall somewhere within the first century B.C. or the last few years of the preceding century. Pausanias tells us that Cleomenes III τὸ κράτος τῆς γερουσίας καταλύσας πατρονόμους τῷ λόγῳ κατέστησεν ἀντ' αὐτῶν (ii. 9. 1): the *patronomi* are also mentioned by Plutarch<sup>2</sup>, and Philo-

<sup>1</sup> For the heroisation of the dead see Keil, *Anal. epigr. et onom.* p. 39 foll.; Wassner, *De heroum apud Graecos cultu*, Kiel, 1883; Furtwängler, *La Collection Sabouroff*, i. p. 20 foll. The word *ἥρωες* is found but seldom in Laconian epitaphs (Le Bas-Foucart 184, 199, 203 e, 253, 254, and the two instances in the Spartan Museum), nor is it common in Attica, but in Boeotia it became the almost universal custom to insert it (*I.G.* vii. Index p. 760), and it is also found in Hermione (*I.G.* iv. 725), Cenchrea (*I.G.* iv. 207), Mytilene (*I.G.* xii. fasc. 2, 286, 289, 291, 292, 367, &c.), Carpathus (*I.G.* xii. fasc. 1, 986, 987, but these are both the graves of foreigners), Thera (ib. xii. 3, 863 foll.), &c. Even children of four and five years old become heroes (*I.G.* xii. fasc. 1, 987; iii. 1460). In an unpublished epitaph in the Candia Museum we have the lines κείμεθ' ὁμοῦ τρεῖς παῖδες δμῆαιμονες ἥρωες ἀγνοί (l. 1) and δόγμασι δημοσίοις γεγενημέθα ἥρωες ἀγνοί (l. 11).

<sup>2</sup> *An seni respublica gerenda sit*, § 24, p. 795 F, τρόπον τινα πάντες οἱ τηλικούτοι (sc. οἱ πρεσβύτεροι) τάξιν ἀρχόντων ἢ τινων πατρονόμων ἢ παιδαγωγῶν ἔχοντες κτλ. This passage is cited by Boeckh (*C.I.G.* i. p. 605, col. II) and Liddell and Scott, as a reference to the Spartan magistrates in question. To me the whole sense of the passage and the fact that neither *ἀρχων* nor *παιδαγωγός* is the name of a Spartan magistrate seem to make it clear that the word *πατρονόμος* is not here used in its

stratus<sup>1</sup>, but these three passages exhaust the literary evidence. Fortunately the inscriptions come to our aid. The number of patronomi is fixed by No. 777, from which we see that they formed a college of twelve, six of whom were patronomi in a stricter sense of the word, while the other six were called *σύναρχοι*<sup>2</sup>. Several explanations have been suggested<sup>3</sup> with regard to the difference involved, none of them satisfactory, and it seems best to suppose that while all twelve magistrates held the same office and perhaps had the same duties, six of them occupied a position of higher honour than the rest, just as at Athens the six *thesmothetae*, though an integral part of the college of the Nine Archons, ranked below their three colleagues, the *βασιλείς*, the *ἐπόνημος* and the *πολέμαρχος*. That we have only one college in No. 777 is clear both from the use in other instances of the word *σύναρχοι*<sup>4</sup> and also from the fact that they have one secretary and one servant in common. The secretary is assisted by three clerks, a fact which shows that the amount of business transacted by the patronomi must have been considerable, and points to the conclusion that we have in them the supreme magistrates of the Spartan state. This is fully in accord with the words quoted above from Pausanias, and with another fact which we have now to mention. The senior patronomus was during the period subsequent to Cleomenes' reforms the eponymous magistrate of the whole Spartan state. This is in direct contradiction to Pausanias (iii. 11. 2), who, speaking of his own time, says "Ἐφοροὶ δὲ τὰ τε ἄλλα διοικοῦσι τὰ σπουδῆς μάλιστα ἄξια, καὶ παρέχονται τὸν ἐπόνημον, καθὰ δὴ καὶ Ἀθηναίοις τῶν καλουμένων ἐννέα ἐπόνημός ἐστιν εἰς ἄρχων. Boeckh, however, showed conclusively<sup>5</sup> that Pausanias had transferred to his own day the facts of the previous epoch, and the further material which has since accumulated has but afforded fresh evidence for Boeckh's contention. We have lists of ephors dated by an eponymous magistrate who is not of their number<sup>6</sup>: we have the phrase *ἐπὶ πατρονόμου τοῦ δείνος* constantly used to signify dates<sup>7</sup>, and we actually find in some cases the same year referred to indifferently as *ἐπὶ τοῦ δείνος* or *ἐπὶ πατρονόμου τοῦ δείνος*<sup>8</sup>. Finally we may note that

technical sense, but as a quite general term corresponding to the use of *πατρονομία* by Plato (*Leges* 680 E) and Plutarch (*Δίο* 10) = 'to be ruled by a paternal government.' Cf. the use of *πατρονομία* in Lucian, *Δημοσθένους ἐγκώμιον*, § 12, and of *πατρονομική* in Plato, *Leges* 927 E.

<sup>1</sup> *Apollon. Tyan.* iv. 32 γυμνασάρχῳ τε καὶ ἔφοροι καὶ πατρονόμοι πάντες.

<sup>2</sup> Compare *C.I.G.* 1356 οἱ συνάρχοντες τῆς πατρονομίας προσεδέξαντο τὸ ἀνάλωμα. We can hardly doubt, however, that here all the eleven colleagues of Xenarchidas are referred to.

<sup>3</sup> Le Bas (*Rev. Archéol.* 1844, p. 639) proposes to see in the *σύναρχοι* either vice-patronomi (*suppléants*) or assessors (*adjoints*), or six magistrates entrusted with the reform of the laws like the Athenian *θεσμοβέται*. Foucart (*Le Bas-Foucart*, note to 168) suggests that the patronomate may have been held for six months only, and that while the *πατρονόμοι* are those actually in office, the *σύναρχοι* may be those who were to hold the magistracy during the second half of the year. But he admits that there is no evidence for the existence of such a system at Sparta.

<sup>4</sup> See Foucart's note quoted above. Nos. 214, 216, *C.I.G.* 1277, &c.

<sup>5</sup> *C.I.G.* i. p. 605 foll.

<sup>6</sup> Eight cases will be found in Boeckh's *Tabula Ephorum* (*C.I.G.* i. p. 608): two of these are from No. 204.

<sup>7</sup> e. g., six times in No. 204 col. II, 213, 219, 220, 221, &c.

<sup>8</sup> e. g., compare No. 783 with No. 204 col. I, l. 13; 204 col. II, l. 21 with *C.I.G.* 1242, l. 21; 204 col. II, l. 26 with *C.I.G.* 1243, l. 8; 204 col. II, l. 29 with 204 col. I, l. 6; 204 col. II, l. 31 with 204 col. I, l. 7, No. 627, *C.I.G.* 1243, l. 11; *C.I.G.* 1256 col. II, l. 14 with *C.I.G.* 1259, l. 4.



a man was re-eligible to the patronomate: the most striking case is that of Publius Memmius Pratolaus son of Damares, who held the office four times (*C.I.G.* 1341). But except in the case of a person of especial note re-election was probably far from common.

§ 14. The catalogues of ἔφοροι<sup>1</sup> are more numerous, but several of them are very fragmentary. In No. 464 we have simply the letters ΕΦΟΡ and the first three letters either of the head (πρέσβυς) of the college or of the eponymous patronomus. No. 242 gives the names of three ephors in office during the year of M - - -, No. 718 furnishes the beginning of a similar list for the year of Iulius Lysicrates, and No. 215 that for the year of Lycurgus. Fortunately we have two complete lists as well as these mutilated ones: these enumerate the ephors in the year of Gaius Iulius Eudamus and Cassius Aristoteles respectively, and are both contained in No. 204, an inscription to which we shall have occasion to return<sup>2</sup>. From these it appears that the number of ephors was five, one of whom was head of the college and assumed the title πρέσβυς ἐφόρων. To this magistracy also a man might be elected more than once (cf. *C.I.G.* 1258 col. II). It is a well-known fact that one of the chief aims of Cleomenes III's policy was to crush the power of the ephorate, which threatened to reduce the kingship to a mere form. The attempt succeeded, and the supremacy of the ephors was for ever broken. But the abolition of the office did not prove a permanent change. The office was revived, we do not know when, and the five ephors once more took their place as high, though not the highest, magistrates. Their existence during the Imperial period is attested not only by the evidence of numerous inscriptions, but by Pausanias (iii. 11. 2) who mentions the office (ἀρχεῖον) of the ephors as situated on the market-place.

In many cases<sup>3</sup> a list of ephors is followed immediately by that of the νομοφύλακες in office during the same year. This fact renders it very probable that we have catalogues of ephors in the earlier part of Nos. 225, 411, and 672, though the headings have disappeared. In No. 411 we have fragments of three names, in No. 672 of four, in No. 225 of five. Since, then, the number of ephors was five, we shall expect to find this list preceded by the usual ἔφοροι ἐπὶ τοῦ δέινος, and so we may probably restore the three fragmentary letters of l. 1 ἔ 1 Ο Ρ οἱ ἐπὶ - - -.

§ 15. In discussing the νομοφυλακία we are met with greater difficulties. The inscriptions in the Museum furnish us with four lists, of which that in No. 225 is too fragmentary to be of use. No. 672 contains a list of five names, and the same number occurs also in the complete list contained in No. 204. This agrees with the conclusion reached by Boeckh<sup>4</sup> and maintained by Foucart<sup>5</sup>. But the former is right in pointing out the difficulty of reducing the number in every case to five, and this is illustrated by No. 411, where the list of νομοφύλακες contains only four names. This may be due to the omission of one name by the stone-cutter, though such a supposition is unlikely: or the name of one

<sup>1</sup> In addition to those mentioned in this paragraph, the most important lists of ephors are those in *C.I.G.* 1237 (1238), 1243, 1244, 1245, 1247, 1249, 1252. For ephors other than those of the Spartan state see p. 5, note 2.

<sup>2</sup> See §§ 15, 19, 22.

<sup>3</sup> *C.I.G.* 1237, 1238, 1242, 1245, 1247, &c.; No. 204 col. I.

<sup>4</sup> *C.I.G.* i. p. 608 foll.

<sup>5</sup> Le Bas-Foucart, note to 168 g.

of the magistrates, e. g. of the γραμματοφύλαξ, may for some reason have been purposely omitted. In any case, the balance of evidence is strongly in favour of the existence of a college of νομοφύλακες consisting normally of five members: sometimes<sup>1</sup> one of these held the title γραμματοφύλαξ, sometimes<sup>2</sup> this official was distinct from the five νομοφύλακες, though he may have formed a member of their body for some purposes.

As regards the duties of these magistrates the inscriptions give us no information, but it is most probable that in Sparta, as elsewhere<sup>3</sup>, the νομοφύλακες were intended to be a check upon too rapid legislation and a safeguard against the subversion of the established order by unconstitutional measures. Such at least seems to have been their theoretical *raison d'être*<sup>4</sup>, though in practice they appear rather as exercising police and even financial functions<sup>5</sup>. As in the case of the other magisterial colleges, the head of the νομοφύλακες was called πρέσβυς νομοφυλάκων (Nos. 204, 213, 411).

§ 16. One fragmentary inscription (No. 627) gives the beginning of a list of βίδεοι. The name of these magistrates occurs in the inscriptions as βίδεοι<sup>6</sup> or βιδυοί<sup>7</sup> indifferently, but there is no epigraphical evidence for the spelling βιδιάιοι found in Pausanias<sup>8</sup>. Etymologically the word is closely connected with ιδυίοι, i. e. φιδυίοι (*φιδέω, videre*), and the initial β represents an original φ, as often in the Laconian dialect<sup>9</sup>. The form βιδυίοι occurs in an inscription from south-western Messenia (*J.H.S.* xxv. p. 50). The college numbered five members according to Pausanias<sup>10</sup>, but the inscriptions show that in reality there were six<sup>11</sup>. Their office lay in the Agora close to the Athena Temple<sup>12</sup>. With regard to their functions our sole information is that of Pausanias, who says that they had the oversight of various contests of the *ephebi*<sup>13</sup>.

§ 17. Four inscriptions (Nos. 210, 211, 212, 612) give us catalogues of γέροντες, i. e. members of the Spartan γερουσία. Of these two (Nos. 211, 212) are too fragmentary to aid us much, but the other two are

<sup>1</sup> *C.I.G.* 1304, 1247 (?), 1251 (?).

<sup>2</sup> *C.I.G.* 1239 (1240), 1242, 1249.

<sup>3</sup> Νομοφύλακες occur also at Athens (Gilbert, *Greek Constit. Antiquities*, pp. 155, 160), Ceos? (Ditt. *Syll.*<sup>2</sup> 934), Corcyra (*J.G.* ix. 1. 694, l. 104), Demetrias (*Athen. Mitteil.* xv. p. 296), the κοινόν τῶν Μαγνήτων (ibid. vi. p. 304, Beilage I, vii. 71 foll., 339), Abdera (*Bull. Corr. Hell.* iv. p. 52), Tomi (*Arch.-epigr. Mittheil. aus Oesterr.-Ungarn*, vi. p. 19, No. 39, xix. p. 222, No. 89), Chersonesus (*Bull. Corr. Hell.* ix. 269), Chalcedon (*C.I.G.* 3794), Mytilene (*J.G.* xii. 2. 484, l. 7), Philadelphia (*C.I.G.* 3419, l. 9), Laodicea ad Lycum (*C.I.G.* 3937), Mylasa (*Athen. Mitteil.* xv. p. 268). We may compare the θεσμοφύλακες at Elis (Thuc. v. 47) and the νομοδεῖπται at Andania (Collitz-Bechtel 4689, l. 114).

<sup>4</sup> Xen. *Oec.* ix. 14 ἐν ταῖς εὐνομομέναις πόλεσιν . . . νομοφύλακας προσαιροῦνται, οἵτινες ἐπισκοποῦντες τὸν μὲν ποιοῦντα τὰ νόμιμα ἐπαινοῦσιν, ἐν δὲ τις παρὰ τοὺς νόμους ποιῆ, ζημοῦσι. Cicero, *de legibus*, iii. 20 § 46 'Graeci hoc diligentius, apud quos νομοφύλακες creabantur, nec ii solum litteras, sed etiam facta hominum observabant ad legesque revocabant.' See *Bull. Corr. Hell.* iv. 59, &c.

<sup>5</sup> Cf. Plato, *Leges* vi. 754 D foll., xii. 961 A; Aristotle, *Pol.* 1287a 21; 1322 b 39.

<sup>6</sup> e. g., Nos. 204, col. II, 400, Collitz-Bechtel 4469, *C.I.G.* 1242, 1255, 1256, &c.

<sup>7</sup> e. g., Nos. 202, 203; *C.I.G.* 1254, 1270, 1271.

<sup>8</sup> iii. II. 2; 12. 4.

<sup>9</sup> Müllensiefen, *De tit. Lacon. dialecto*, p. 47 [177] foll.

<sup>10</sup> iii. II. 2 τοῖς δὲ ἐφόροις καὶ βιδιάιοις πέντε ἀριθμὸν ἐκατέρους οὔσι.

<sup>11</sup> *C.I.G.* 1271, 1364. They were elected annually, but were eligible more than once (*C.I.G.* 1268, 1269).

<sup>12</sup> Paus. iii. 12. 4 τοῦ δὲ τῶν βιδιάων ἀρχείου πέραν ἐστὶν Ἀθηναῖς ἱερόν.

<sup>13</sup> iii. II. 2 τοῖς βιδιάιοις τοὺς ἐπὶ τῷ Πλατανιστῆ καλουμένῳ καὶ ἄλλοις τῶν ἐφήβων ἀγῶνας τιθέναι καθίστηγεν.

documents of importance for the history of the Spartan constitution. Before the fall of the monarchy the Council of the Elders consisted of twenty-eight members, chosen by acclamation and holding the office for life<sup>1</sup>. To them were added the kings and, at a later time, the ephors. Cleomenes III besides abolishing the ephorate reduced the power of this Council: τὸ κράτος τῆς γερουσίας καταλύσας πατρονόμους τῷ λόγῳ κατέστησεν ἀντ' αὐτῶν (Pausan. ii. 9. 1). But, though weakened, the *γερουσία* continued to exist through the Imperial period, and Pausanias mentions among the notable buildings in the Spartan Agora τῆς γερουσίας βουλευτήριον (iii. 11. 2). In No. 210 we have a complete list of the members dating from the reign of Hadrian: they consist of a *πρέσβυς*, twenty-two ordinary members, a secretary (possibly two)<sup>2</sup> and a cook. In No. 612 we possess an earlier list, belonging probably to the first century B.C. and containing twenty-three names. Two facts become at once clear, that the *γέροντες* were elected annually, and that they were eligible for re-election: in No. 210, for instance, the *πρέσβυς* is serving on the Council for the fifth time, a second member has been elected four times, seven (perhaps eight) are in their third term of office and six in their second. The number of members of the college is a more difficult question. Foucart<sup>3</sup> thought that the traditional number thirty was maintained, and to arrive at this he included the *γραμματεῖς* and added the six *patronomi*. But to this there are two objections: (1) the stone seems to mention two secretaries<sup>4</sup> and not one only as in Foucart's text, and (2) No. 612, an inscription discovered subsequently to Foucart's publication, gives only twenty-three names in a list of *γέροντες*. I would suggest, with all due reserve, that the college consisted of twenty-three members, to whom were added the twelve *patronomi*, thus bringing the total to thirty-five, as in the latter part of the period of the monarchy, when to the twenty-eight members were added the two kings and five ephors.

A further problem is suggested by the occurrence in several inscriptions of the title *γραμματεὺς βουλῆς*<sup>5</sup>, and the mention of the *βουλή* in a number of other passages<sup>6</sup>. Boeckh<sup>7</sup> draws a sharp distinction between this and the *γερουσία*, while Foucart<sup>8</sup> on the other hand regards the two as identical, or else would make the *βουλή* consist of the *γέροντες* with the addition of the colleges of magistrates (*συναρχαίαι*). In either case he would see in the secretary of the *γερουσία* and the secretary of the *βουλή* one and the same person either under two different titles or acting in two different capacities.

§ 18. Of *ἀγορανόμοι* we have two lists. One of these (No. 214) is incomplete, but contains a list of four *συναρχοί* of an *ἀγορανόμος* who held office probably in the first century B.C. To the same period belongs

<sup>1</sup> For the manner in which the *γέροντες* were elected see Plut. *Lyc.* 26: Aristotle (*Pol.* ii. 9. 27) characterizes it as *παιδαριώδης*. For the life-long tenure of the office see Arist. *Pol.* ii. 9. 25; Plut. *Lyc.* 26; Polyb. vi. 45. 5.

<sup>2</sup> The existence of two secretaries is not certain. The name of the *μάγιστρος* may be that which is lost at the beginning of l. 26, in which case Ἐπαφρόδιτος would be a servant or other inferior official. The position of this last name on the stone (see Le Bas-Foucart, No. 173 a) is very unusual.

<sup>3</sup> Le Bas-Foucart, note to 173 a.

<sup>4</sup> See, however, note 2.

<sup>5</sup> The *γρ. βουλῆς* is mentioned in No. 204, col. I, *C.I.G.* 1246, 1253, 1259, 1345.

<sup>6</sup> No. 781 (?); *C.I.G.* 1341, 1345, 1370, 1436? *βουλευτής*, *ibid.* 1375.

<sup>7</sup> *C.I.G.* i. p. 610, iv. § 1.

<sup>8</sup> Le Bas-Foucart, *Exphic.* No. 173 a, p. 95.

a second and fuller list (No. 784), where we have the mention of an *ἀγορανόμος* together with thirteen *σύναρχοι* and a *γραμματεὺς*. This document raises afresh the question of the number of *ἀγορανόμοι*, which seemed to be fixed at eight (a *πρέσβυς* and seven *σύναρχοι*) by Foucart<sup>1</sup>. The term *αἰώνιος ἀγορανόμος* occurs in several inscriptions<sup>2</sup> as a title of honour, like *αἰώνιος γυμνασιάρχος*<sup>3</sup>. Of the special duties of these magistrates at Sparta we are not informed, but they were in all probability at the head of the police service and corresponded to the Roman *aediles*; one of them appears to have had charge of the repair of the roads, for we meet with the title *ἀγορανόμος ἐπὶ τὰς ὁδοὺς* (No. 691).

The *πενδιάνομοι* seem to have had duties somewhat similar to those of the *ἀγορανόμοι*, but while the latter exercised their functions in the city the former would seem to be restricted to the country<sup>4</sup>. Of their number we have no information, for we possess only the first two lines of an inscription which contained a list of these magistrates (No. 396).

§ 19. In one inscription we have a complete list of *ἐπιμεληταὶ* in a certain year (No. 216): they form a college of six members, of whom one is called *ἐπιμελητῆς* in a special sense, while the rest are *σύναρχοι*. Other inscriptions furnish us with the exact titles of some of the Spartan *ἐπιμεληταὶ*. Thus in No. 204, col. I, Agathocles is spoken of as *ἐπιμελητῆς πόλεως*, and the same title recurs in *C.I.G.* 1258, col. I, l. 15<sup>5</sup>: an *ἐπιμελητῆς Κορωνείας*<sup>6</sup> and an *ἐπιμελητῆς Ἀμυκλῶν*<sup>7</sup> are also found in several inscriptions, and an *ἐπιμελητῆς . . . θεοῦ Δυκούργου*<sup>8</sup> is once mentioned. In another inscription we seem to have an *ἐπιμελητῆς* of various public buildings restored by a certain Paulinus<sup>9</sup>. Whether this refers to an office created *ad hoc* or to an already existing magistracy is not clear, nor can we say with certainty whether any or all of the *ἐπιμεληταὶ* referred to under special titles were members of the college of six whose names are given in No. 216.

§ 20. Appended to the lists of magistrates are in many<sup>10</sup> cases the names of persons designated at *ἔνοιτοι*, varying in number from one to three. These are not magistrates, but 'those who, after the tenure of some office, had by their services won the privilege of taking their meals with the magistrates of the college to which they had belonged during the previous year<sup>11</sup>'. Thus we find *ἔνοιτοι* of the colleges of the *νομοφύλακες*<sup>12</sup>, *ἔφοροι*<sup>13</sup>, and *ἀγορανόμοι*<sup>14</sup>. These must be distinguished from the *σύσσιτοι* of *C.I.G.* 1249, since the same inscription has also a list of

<sup>1</sup> Le Bas-Foucart, No. 168 b.

<sup>2</sup> Ibid. 178, 179; *C.I.G.* 1363, 1364, 1375, 1379.

<sup>3</sup> No. 246; *C.I.G.* 1326, 1349, 1353, 1379; in Collitz-Bechtel 4481 we find the phrase *γυμνασιάρχος ἀπὸ τὰς πρώτας ἀλικίας*.

<sup>4</sup> Vischer, *Epigraphische Beiträge*, No. 32 (= *Inscr. Spart. partim ined. VIII*, No. 4); Le Bas-Foucart, *Explíc.* No. 168 e.

<sup>5</sup> This seems to me a convincing restoration instead of Boeckh's *ἐπιμελητ[ῆς] -- -- β[ῆ]εος ἐπὶ -- --*

<sup>6</sup> *C.I.G.* 1243, 1255 (?), 1258. <sup>7</sup> Collitz-Bechtel 4520 (= *C.I.G.* 1338).

<sup>8</sup> *C.I.G.* 1341.

<sup>9</sup> *C.I.G.* 1330. We have also a mention of *ἐπιμεληταὶ τοῦ Ρωμαίου* (*C.I.G.* 1331).

An *ἐπιμελητῆς* with three *συνάρχοντες* occurs in *Bull. Corr. Hell.* i. p. 380, No. 4.

<sup>10</sup> Nos. 372 &c., 411, 569; *C.I.G.* 1253 and the inscr. quoted in notes 12-14.

<sup>11</sup> Le Bas-Foucart, *Explíc.*, No. 168 b. <sup>12</sup> *C.I.G.* 1242, 1249 col. II, 1252.

<sup>13</sup> No. 411 (?); *C.I.G.* 1240 (a list of *σπονδοφόροι* comes between the *ἔφοροι* and the *ἔνοιτος*).

<sup>14</sup> Le Bas-Foucart 168 b.