

The Public Archives in Fourth-Century Athens

William C. West

WE KNOW, from references in Demosthenes and other authors, that the central archives of the Athenian state were kept in the Metroon, the Temple of the Mother, on the west side of the Athenian Agora. It is likely that such an archive was established there in the last decade of the fifth century B.C. The extant remains of the foundation of this building represent its Hellenistic phase, dating from the second century B.C. Given these fixed points, scholars continue to be cautious and minimalist in speculating about the form and organization of the archives in classical times.¹

Two recent studies illustrate this point. According to E. Posner, "How the records were kept and arranged in the building [*i.e.* the archives] we can only guess.... much can be said for the theory that records were kept in annual accumulations under the name of the *archôn eponymos* and thereafter according to the different *prytaneis*." And R. Thomas writes: "It has been suggested that the documents themselves were stored in yearly batches under the archon year and different prytanies. This is inferred from the fact that many documents do not have dates and therefore the exact dates of each must have been obvious to the keeper of the archive from the place where they were stored. However, this is not only speculative, but optimistic."²

¹ Demosthenes cites the Metroon as the repository for archives (19.129); Aeschines implies it (3.187), as does Deinarchus (1.86). *IG II²* 463.28 mentions the Metroon in a context which may indicate the handling of documents, but the text is heavily restored. In an anecdote preserved in Athenaeus (9.407c) Alcibiades is said to have erased from a legal charge in the Metroon the name of a man who consulted him. If true, this is the earliest indication of the use of the Metroon as an archive. Cf. A. L. Boegehold, "The Establishment of a Central Archive at Athens," *AJA* 76 (1972) 23–30; for discussion of the remains, H. Thompson, "Buildings on the West Side of the Athenian Agora," *Hesperia* 6 (1937) 215ff.

² E. Posner, *Archives of the Ancient World* (Cambridge [Mass.] 1972) 112f; R. Thomas, *Oral Tradition and Written Record in Classical Athens* (Cambridge 1989) 78. See also W. V. Harris, *Ancient Literacy* (Cambridge [Mass.] 1989) 76ff.

The documents without dates may have been records of those who owed money to the state, which were kept on the Acropolis by the *praktores*, with a copy possibly sent to an archive.³ But decrees of the assembly were stored in the archives; and the versions of these texts recorded on stone do have a scheme for dating, which is indicated in the prescript, although it is not standardized at the beginning of the fourth century.

The evidence of stone inscriptions has strongly influenced our attitude toward the recording of dates in public documents. It suggests that the Athenians recorded dates in the prescripts of decrees in terms of the conciliar calendar and only after several decades added dates by month and day to the information included. Yet the prescripts were added to the texts of decrees by the secretaries of the council.

Over the years there have been different views of the final 'authorship' of these decrees, interpreting the significance of the names of the secretary and the orator in the prescript. W. Larfeld emphasized that the orator is a private person who, in proposing a text officially, acts in a quasi-official capacity. He seems to suggest that the secretary is responsible for adding the prescript and ensuring that the text is drafted. W. S. Ferguson was more precise: "the name of the [prytany] secretary in the prescript is to guarantee that the text is word for word equivalent to the resolution passed by the state assemblies." More recently, A. Henry has argued for a more substantial rôle for the secretary, holding that he was responsible for the final draft and its duplication on stone, when this was specified.⁴

The secretary has total responsibility for drafting the prescript, but, as Henry's detailed study shows, an exact, undeviating format was never required. A standard format may have existed in general, but variants from it were easily tolerated: "verbal accuracy was neither demanded nor expected.... The ancient attitude to the recording of documents ... was different from ours: provided the essential information was conveyed, complete fidelity of reproduction just did not enter into it" (105). Henry does not discuss who was responsible for the text of the decree, but implies that the orator was.

³ As suggested by Boegehold (*supra* n.1) 26f.

⁴ W. Larfeld, *Handbuch der griechischen Epigraphik* II.2 (Leipzig 1902) 642ff; W. S. Ferguson, *The Athenian Secretaries* (Ithaca 1907) 31; A. Henry, *The Prescripts of Athenian Decrees* (Leiden 1974) 3 and 10 n.36.

As to the preservation of decrees on stone, it should be noted that the publication formula ("inscribe this decree on a stone stele and set it up") simply means, "give this decree wider publicity." The deposit of a copy in the archives (on papyrus, *etc.*) is taken for granted and not specified because it is part of the regular procedure. Reference to this procedure in Hellenistic times simply clarifies the usual procedure, and does not mean that it was a novelty.

M. H. Hansen has asserted that there is no supporting evidence for the widely accepted view that the originals were recorded on papyrus and filed.⁵ The publication formula itself constitutes some evidence, however, especially in light of the apparently low rate of survival of the total number of decrees originally passed. The formula means that a decree is to be inscribed and thus given wider publicity than it would have if it simply went into the archives.⁶ The fact that inscribing has to be prescribed implies that the original is preserved in another form. This understanding of the formula can be better appreciated by considering the ratio of the number of surviving decrees to the estimated total of those actually passed. The decrees that were inscribed were in fact a very small percentage of those passed by the assembly.⁷

A striking instance of the variety allowed in the composition of the prescript can be seen in the new form of the chairman formula, which is first attested in 378/7 and does not fully replace an older form until more than forty years later (see the

⁵ *The Athenian Assembly* (Oxford 1987) 183 n.700.

⁶ Basic elements of the formula (from the fifth century on): (1) action (ἀναγράφαι, ἀναγράφας); this element always occurs in the formula; (2) object (τὸ ψήφισμα, τὰ ἐψηφισμένα, αὐτόν, *etc.*); often, but not always expressed; (3) medium (ἐν στήλῃ λιθίνῃ, ἐν σάνιδι, *etc.*); (4) location (στήσαι/καταθεῖναι ἐμ πόλει, *etc.*). Motivation is sometimes specified (*IG I*³ 103?, 119, 126?, 174), occasionally purpose (84.26, 1453.13 [composite]). From the middle of the fourth century, a purpose clause is often added, signifying that, by being displayed, decrees conferring honors and privileges are to give wider publicity to the honorands. The clause occurs in *IG II*² 183 (restored) and 196 (restored), both of 353/2, 244 and 243, both of 344/3, and is increasingly common thereafter. For remarks on the development of this formula, *cf.* W. C. West, in *Data Bases in the Humanities and Social Sciences III* (Osprey [Fla.] 1987) 528.

⁷ On the relation of the number of decrees preserved on stone or in literary quotation to the total number of decrees passed, *cf.* M. H. Hansen, *GRBS* 25 (1984) 128–32, calculations for the period 355–322. *Cf.* also Hansen (*supra* n.5) 108–18.

Appendix *infra*). The earliest inscription in which this formula is certain is *IG II² 44* of 378/7 B.C., but it gradually replaces the old form in the course of the fourth century. In the old form of the prescript the official who presided over the assembly is the *epistates* of the *prytaneis* and is regularly cited in the same place in the prescript that is later occupied by the *proedros*. Undoubtedly the two officials (*epistates* in the fifth century and part of the fourth, then chairman of the *proedroi*) performed the same function of presiding over the assembly and, consequently, moving passage of the decree when appropriate in the agenda.

Aristotle (*Ath. Pol.* 44.2f) tells us that the president at meetings of the assembly was chosen by the *epistates* of the *prytaneis* to preside for one day only. He, and eight others, came from the tribes not in prytany to form an agenda committee, οἱ πρόεδροι, for that meeting. Scholars have interpreted the change as prompted by a desire of the *prytaneis* to share out the increasing load of public business. Rhodes notes that the change probably occurred in the 380's.⁸

The epigraphical evidence confirms this. The presiding πρόεδρος designated in the prescripts of decrees is first attested definitely in 378/7, whereas the *epistates* of the *prytaneis* had been so designated earlier. Over a considerable period of time, however, the new formula for designation of the presiding official does not displace the old formula entirely, as ὁ δεῖνα ἐπεστάται continues to be used and may be found as late as 343/2. But the substance of the change, so far as we can check it from inscriptions, is invariably followed, for the new president, regardless of how he is designated, comes from a tribe not in prytany. This is clearly indicated in the prescript by his demotic, which shows that he is not of the prytanizing tribe. No epigraphical text that we have violates this rule.

Given this remarkable consistency in the epigraphical record, we are in a good position to test the statements of Aeschines and Demosthenes in the embassy speeches of 343 and the Ctesiphon speeches of 330 when they refer to and read out decrees

⁸ P. J. Rhodes, *A Commentary on the Aristotelian Athenaion politeia* (Oxford 1981) 534. Hansen (*supra* n.5: 37) believes that the change may have occurred *ca* 400, on the basis of *CSCA* 5 (1972) 164–169, a decree of 379/8, in which the *proedroi* are supposedly first attested. But the text is heavily restored, although the decree is written *stoichedon* and the restorations are logical.

of 346 retrieved from the public archives. In two instances from Aeschines' speeches *On the Embassy* and *Against Ctesiphon* we have evidence for the prescripts of the archive copies of decrees which have dates by month and day and suggest that they had fuller headings than their counterparts on stone. Could the same stylistic tolerance allowed in the recording of details on stone, one wonders, also have applied to dates by the lunar calendar, which first appear in 341/0 and, with a few exceptions, are usual thereafter?

Aeschines and Demosthenes supply the earliest references to retrieval of decrees from the archives. They do not indicate any difficulty in finding what they were looking for, and they imply that the opportunity is open to anyone. Neither orator challenges the other on this point, although it was in the interest of both to do so. Some scheme of classification was obviously in place in the second half of the fourth century, and it is logical to assume that it was devised when the archive was created. To anticipate my conclusion, I think that the dates of the assembly did in fact form the basis of the system used for filing decrees in the archives. A close reading of chapters 89–92 of Aeschines' speech *On the Embassy* will reveal the prescripts of decrees cited from the archives as the section of the text by which the dates of meetings could be established. The indicators of date in the prescripts of decrees on stone became more precise over the course of the fourth century, but from the beginning it was always possible to infer the date of the assembly from the archon and the name of the presiding official.

It has long been thought that the prescript of a decree was used for dating, but scholars have called attention to problems. Larfeld thought that items in the prescript made increasingly refined references to the date: archon/year, prytany/month, *epistates*/day of the month. Interested in the development of the prescript, Henry thought that Larfeld's formulation was "too neat;" emphasizing the shortcomings of the early prescripts for exact dating, he argued that the name of the *epistates* is included simply as the official who put the motion to the vote.⁹ He went on to show that, over the fourth century, there was an increasing awareness of the need for exact dating, and the items of the prescript were expanded to include the ordinal number of the tribe in prytany, the day of the prytany (the day on which the assembly was held), and the day of the lunar

⁹ Larfeld (*supra* n.4) 649; Henry (*supra* n.4) 26.

month. Furthermore, from 354/3 on the patronymic of the *epistates* is always cited, providing another instance of the increasing desire for greater precision.¹⁰

Despite the lack of exact dating before the second half of the fourth century, there is a link to the day of the assembly within the prytany in the name of the chairman of the *proedroi*, who serves for one day only and once only in a prytany. This man presides over the agenda, and puts to vote all items on the day he presides. The function of his name in the prescript may be to record the name of the presiding official, as Henry says, but the fact remains that his name is unique within his prytany and can serve as an indicator of the day of the assembly. Not all inscribed decrees have a date formula in the prescript, but all do have the chairman's name in the prescript, either as *proedros* or as *epistates*. The name of this man is a link to the date.

Aeschines makes a specific statement about the name of the president as a point of reference for archives, but this passage has not figured in the scholarly literature about them. In defending his conduct on the embassies to Philip II in which the Peace of Philocrates was agreed to, Aeschines appeals to the decrees of the assembly,¹¹ filed in the public archives, that document his activity. Parts of several of these decrees are quoted by him, and in one instance he remarks upon their ready availability in the archives (2.89):

τοὺς χρόνους καὶ τὰ ψηφίσματα καὶ τοὺς ἐπιψηφίσαντας ἐν τοῖς δημοσίοις γράμμασι τὸν ἅπαντα χρόνον φυλάττετε.

You keep for all time in the public archives the dates, the texts of decrees, and the names of the men who put them to vote.

¹⁰ For discussion of the incorporation of dating formulae in the prescript, see Henry (*supra* n.4) 19–27, 37f, and Appendix II. Though usually found thereafter once it appears for the first time, each item necessary for dating according to the festival and conciliar calendars occurs gradually over the century: ordinal number of the tribe in prytany, 394/3 (*IG II²* 18); number of the day in prytany, 368/7 (*IG II²* 105+523 [Tod II 136]); day of the lunar month, 341/0 (*IG II²* 229 with p.659). On the citation of the patronymic in the name of the *epistates*, see Hansen (*supra* n.7) 125f.

¹¹ For discussion of frequency of meetings of the assembly, with particular attention to Elaphebolion 347/6, see Hansen, *The Athenian Ekklesia* (Copenhagen 1983) 35–72, and, for critical debate, E. M. Harris, "How Often Did the Athenian Ekklesia Meet?" *CQ* N.S. 36 (1986) 363–77, with Hansen's reply in *GRBS* 28 (1987) 35–50.

My translation is less elegant than those of Adams (Loeb) and Martin and Budé (Budé), but it intentionally preserves the series of three items connected by καί.¹² χρόνος clearly refers to the date by lunar month and day, as it does in 91 and 92, where a decree is read to the jurors, including its date, which Aeschines emphasizes by repeating month and day. The phrase τὰ ψηφίσματα probably means "the texts of decrees," without the prescripts, which are added by the secretary of the council. The individual officials who preside over the assemblies on given days are designated in the phrase τοὺς ἐπιψηφίσαντας. The first and third of the serial items, then, come from the prescripts, and the second is the text itself. Aeschines might be paraphrased as saying, "You can find any decree in the public archives and tell the date of it and who moved it."

In this section of his speech (89–92) Aeschines aims to clarify the sequence of events of 347/6 at the end of Elaphebolion and the beginning of Mounichion by citing documents in the archives. In the course of his argument two texts are read, a letter of Chares informing the Athenians that Cersobleptes' kingdom has been lost, and a decree of the council authorizing the embassy to Philip. The official who presides over the assembly and whose name is recorded as putting a decree to vote, is an administrative functionary who serves for one day only; but his name is important for Aeschines' rhetoric in this section because it allows him to fix Demosthenes' whereabouts on Elaphebolion 25, the day on which Demosthenes was president of the assembly (90). No decree of this day is read, but the point is not challenged by Demosthenes in his own speech. Aeschines must have thought it was credible to an Athenian jury. The epigraphical record shows that his use of technical language is exact (*cf.* Appendix).

The departure of the fateful embassy is established by the date of the council's decree that authorized it, Mounichion 3 (2.91). Since this decree is read out and its date specifically referred to after the reading (92), it is not likely that Aeschines is lying. The trial at which the speech was delivered can be dated in 343 B.C. It deals with events of 346.¹³

¹² See J. D. Denniston, *The Greek Particles*² (Oxford 1954) 289 §I(1).

¹³ It occurred in the archonship of Pythodotus (343/2) according to Dion. Hal. *Ad Amm.* 10. In 2 hypoth. 11 Dem. 19, it is said to occur three years after the indictment.

Aeschines refers to Demosthenes' presidency on Elaphebolion 25 of 346 also in 3.73f, and in 75 a decree carried on that day is read. It would have Demosthenes' name in the prescript. In 73 Demosthenes is said to be presiding over the assembly (προκαθεζόμενος=προεδρεύων) on Elaphebolion 25. In 74 attention is called to a decree of Philocrates carried on that day, and the jury is to notice that Philocrates moved it (ὁ γράψας) and that Demosthenes put it to a vote (ὁ ἐπιψηφίσας). In 75 the decree is read.¹⁴ After the reading the jury is reminded of the ease with which anyone may verify these facts in the public records.

Aeschines' speech *Against Ctesiphon* was delivered in 330. The decree read at 75 was carried in 346. It was retrieved from the archives after sixteen years, and Aeschines directs attention to items of the prescript that support his case. They allow him to establish his principal point against Demosthenes, but this also supports his second point, ease of access.

The reference to the day of the lunar month (ἕκτη φθίνοντος, 3.73) must have been in the prescript, because it strengthens Aeschines' main point considerably. The year is 346, but the earliest inclusion of the day of the lunar month in the prescript of a decree preserved on stone is *IG II* ² 229, of 341/0.¹⁵ In this inscription the day of the lunar month is specified in addition to the number of the day in the prytany. The calendar equation, which is attested here for the first time and became more and more common in succeeding years, represents the extent of the fourth-century movement towards precision in dating. The decree cited by Aeschines in 3.73–75, interpreted in light of the more explicit information of 2.89f, must have had a calendar equation in its prescript.

I have argued that there are two decrees in Aeschines' speeches (2.91, 3.73–75), taken from the archives for 347/6, with dates by lunar month and day in their prescripts. This feature is at variance with the epigraphical record, where calendar equations in dated decrees are first attested in 341/0. Once they have appeared, Henry notes, they become usual thereafter, although a few exceptions do crop up. Does the slight difference in years have any significance? It would not, if the archival copies of texts were recorded on stone exactly in the form in

¹⁴ Our Mss. indicate a decree, but perhaps only the prescript was read, for Aeschines only speaks of items in the prescript.

¹⁵ Henry (*supra* n.4) 37.

which they were kept in the archives. Certainly this must have been true of the bodies of the decrees. But the prescripts were added by the secretaries, and variation in style is evident over the course of the fourth century. The prescripts of decrees on stone show some movement towards uniformity, but absolute uniformity was never achieved. This is especially true of the indicators of date, where in the fourth century and later we see increasing attention to precision in the addition of details (ordinal number of the prytany, day of the prytany, day of the lunar month). Might not this lack of uniformity result from the fact that the details in the stone version of a decree were selected—by the individual secretary—from a fuller prescript recorded in the archives?

In short, it is entirely possible that the dates of decrees (by lunar month and day) were always recorded in the prescripts of the archival copies, from at least the late fifth century at the time the central archive was founded. The recording of the date would establish a basis for filing the decrees by dates as well as keying them to the conciliar calendar. The ordinary individual, with the assistance of the public slave (*δημόσιος*), would thereby be able to gain access to the archives. This hypothesis does not contradict any ancient evidence, and it at least uses the evidence available to show that access to the archives was a point that an Athenian juror could believe, even if he did not take the trouble to avail himself of it.

Ease of access implies a filing system. In focusing attention on the prescript of the decree Aeschines suggests that this is the element that permits such access. Aeschines 2.89f has never been used as evidence for the archival filing system. But it is accurate in its citation of the presiding official, as the epigraphical evidence shows (*cf.* Appendix). It may be going too far to claim that this means that items were so filed, but it is certainly consistent with that view. Consequently Aeschines 2.89f supports what logic suggests.

The *proedroi* in this period (after 379/8) came from a tribe not in prytany. *IG II*² 212 indicates that in 346 Elaphebolion fell in prytany VIII, the prytany of Aigeis. Demosthenes, of the deme Paiania, tribe Pandionis (*cf.* *Meid.* 13), would qualify. This is another indicator of Aeschines' veracity here.

Other references to the prescript in Aeschines and Demosthenes may now be noted. Aeschines makes seven allusions to the public records. Of these, six associate the public records

with items in the prescripts of decrees (dates, officials):¹⁶ (1) 2.58, dates of the election of ambassadors; (2) 2.89, decrees, with dates and names of officials; (3) 2.92, dates of assemblies; (4) 2.135, dates of the embassies; (5) 3.24, archonship, month, day, assembly for Demosthenes' election; (6) 3.75, decree of Philocrates read, attention called to the proposer, and the official who put it to a vote. All six references deal with his quarrel with Demosthenes. Aeschines uses the prescript to focus attention on the decree, which is sometime read and sometimes not. Note that Aristotle (*Rh.* 3.14) says that "calls for attention" are appropriate in all parts of a speech.

Demosthenes' references are more general.¹⁷ In 19.128 he charges that Aeschines, while on an embassy to Philip (in 346), attended his celebration, with the Thebans, of victory over the Phocians. In 129 Demosthenes cites documents from the public archives (a decree with Aeschines' name and a sworn denial). Furthermore, he submits as evidence the depositions of Aeschines' colleagues on the embassy. He reminds the jury that he, Demosthenes, declined to go.

The decree, the "records" (γράμματα), and the depositions are then read to the jury (130). The decree would be the decree of the assembly in which Aeschines, Demosthenes, and others were elected ambassadors. The records would be Demosthenes' sworn denial (ἐξωμοσία) that he would go. The depositions of Aeschines' colleagues would be written depositions which were read, although Demosthenes cites them as active witnesses (καταμαρτυρήσουσιν). The first two items come from the public records; the third is introduced in amplification of these records because it proves that Aeschines did go on the embassy and testifies to his conduct.

¹⁶ The odd reference is *Emb.* 32: καὶ τούτων τὸ κοινὸν δόγμα τῶν Ἑλλήνων καὶ τοὺς ψηφισαμένους ἐκ τῶν δημοσίων γραμμάτων μάρτυρας παρεσχόμεν, "the common decree of the Greeks and the names of those who voted it I furnished as evidence from the public records."

¹⁷ 18.55, cited in LSJ *s.v.* γράμμα III.2 for δημόσια γράμματα, is part of the indictment of Ctesiphon, a document inserted in our Mss. of *De corona*. Such documents are generally considered spurious, since Dindorf's edition of Demosthenes. 18.142 refers to decrees of 346 (κείμενα: 'stored, deposited'), possibly showing that Philip was elected Leader of the Amphictyons. 19.129, discussed below, cites decrees of the assembly, in the public archives, recording election of ambassadors *and* their sworn denials (if they declined to undertake the office). This is the point of the reference to ἐξωμοσία and decree. Decrees recording by name the election of ambassadors: *IG* II² 34, 41, 43, 175.

Demosthenes also gives other information about the public archives. He says that they are kept in the Metroon (our earliest reference to this building as the archives building) and that a public slave (δημόσιος) is in charge of them.¹⁸ The slave is the archives librarian who will assist people in finding documents stored in the archives. The filing system envisioned in this paper is one that requires reference service. But as both Demosthenes and Aeschines readily read documents in the speeches of 343 and 330, it is clear that they had access to the archives. Demosthenes charges Aeschines with misuse of the information of the documents he has retrieved (18.225), but he never says that he did not have access and never challenges a document that was read.

To return to Aeschines' remark (2.89), it makes good sense, if chronology is the basis of the filing system. In 343 B.C. two forms of prescript were in use in the texts of public decrees by which the chairman of the board of presiding officials (*proedroi*) was indicated. In the newer form of prescript he is explicitly cited by name as moving passage of the decree.

Aeschines' general observation in 2.89 invokes the date and the presiding official as the items of the prescript that made it possible to find the decrees in the archives. The name of the man who moved passage of the decree is the item of the prescript that would provide a link to the day on which the decree was passed. This official was explicitly named in the prescripts of decrees contemporary with Aeschines. The name of this man could be keyed to the day of the month and would support an archival filing system that was chronological in nature. When Aeschines calls attention to the fact that decrees kept in the archives have dates (*i.e.*, lunar dates) and the names of presiding officials, he implies that these items made it easy to find them.

Ideally, one would have to know the day on which a decree was passed in order to retrieve it easily; but failing that, if one knew the approximate time, a decree could be found without difficulty. If one wanted all the decrees proposed by a certain

¹⁸ 19.129, ἀλλ' ὑπὲρ μὲν τῆς ἐξωμοσίας ἐν τοῖς κοινοῖς τοῖς ὑμετέροις γράμμασιν ἐν τῷ μητρώῳ ταῦτ' ἐστίν, οἷς ὁ δημόσιος τέτακται, καὶ ψήφισμ' ἀντικρὺς περὶ τούτου τοῦ ὀνόματος γέγραπται: "As for the denial of the office it is among your common records in the Metroon, over which the public slave has charge, and a decree is clearly written with his name." Harp. *Lex.* 89f: Δημόσιος· Δημοσθένης Φιλιππικοῖς. δημοσίους λέγουσι τοὺς τῆς πόλεως δούλους. Αἰσχίνης κατὰ Τιμάρχου "ἄνθρωπον δημόσιον οἰκέτην τῆς πόλεως."

orator, it would require some digging, but someone whose concern was professional (*i.e.*, an inquiring orator assisted by the slave archivist) could come up with them without difficulty. An inscription dated slightly after 362 B.C. (*IG II² 120*) informs us of a public slave helping secretaries of the public records take an inventory of objects kept on the Acropolis.¹⁹ Lines 7–19 specify in detail the process whereby a list is created, copied, and disseminated. We are not similarly informed of the process whereby the text of a decree or law, entered into the debate of the assembly, would eventually find its way into the public archives, but we may be sure that it would, as Demosthenes and Aeschines claim.

παρ-

[εἰ]να[ι δὲ καὶ τοὺς ταμίας] τῆς θεοῦ ὅσοι ἐταμίευσαν ἀπ-
 [ὸ Μ]ό[λ]ω[νος ἄρχοντος. ἀ]νειπὲν δὲ καὶ τὸν κήρυ[κ]α τῆς βου-
 [λῆ]ς παρ[εῖναι τὰ]ς ἀρχὰς ταύτας εἰς τὴν ἡμέραν ἣν ἄ[ν] πρ-
 [ο]γράφω[σιν οἱ] πρυτάνεις. παραγγεῖλαι δὲ τοὺς πρυτάν-
 [ε]ι[ς] καὶ Ε[ύκλ]εῖ τῶι δημοσίῳ ἥκειν εἰς ἀκρόπολιν γρα-
 [ψόμ]ενον τ[ὰ] ἐν τῇ χαλκοθήκῃ καὶ ἐπειδὴν τὸ οἶκημα ἀ-
 [νοι]χθῆι ἐξετάζεν κατὰ ἔθνος ἕκαστα καὶ ἐπιγράφεν τ-
 [ὸν] ἀριθμόν, ἀντιγράφεσθαι δὲ τὸν γραμματέα τὸν κατὰ
 [πρ]υτανείαν καὶ τοὺς ἄλλους γραμματ(τε)έας τοὺς ἐπὶ τοῖ-
 [ς] δημοσίοις γράμμασιν· ἐπειδὴν δὲ ἐξετασθῆι πάντα κ-
 [αὶ] ἀναγραφῆι, τὸν γραμματέα τῆς βουλῆς ἀναγράψαντα
 [ἐν] στήλῃ λιθίνῃ στήσαι ἔμπροσθεν τῆς χαλκοθήκη[ς].

Let the Treasurers of the Goddess, from the archonship of Molon [362/1] on, be present. Let the herald of the Council announce that these officials are to be present on the day which the *prytaneis* proclaim. Let the *prytaneis* also direct E[uc]les the public slave to come to the Acropolis to write down the objects in the Chalkotheke. When the chamber has been opened, scrutinize each object by class²⁰ and record the number. Let the prytany secretary and the other secretaries of the public records make copies.²¹ When everything has been scrutinized and

¹⁹ Dated 353/2 by E. Schweigert, *Hesperia* 7 (1938) 286.

²⁰ *I.e.*, take the inventory, whether on papyrus, wooden tablet, or other medium.

²¹ The prytany secretary keeps a copy of the list for the *prytaneis*; the other secretaries keep a copy for the public records. Who are “the other secretaries of the public records”? This has been understood as a general reference rather than to a group of officials who had this title: so Ferguson (*supra* n.4) 10, J. Treheux (*BCH* 80 [1956] 468 n.4), and S. Alessandri (*ASNP* 12 [1982] 26–29,

copied,²² let the secretary of the Council inscribe [the list] on a stone pillar and set it up in front of the Chalkotheke.²³

The handling of the chairman formula in the prescripts of decrees on stone shows that the style varied over the course of the fourth century. Not all secretaries adopted the new formula at the time it was established. I suggest that a similar process occurred in respect to the recording of dates. They were always recorded in the prescripts of the archival copies of decrees, where they could be used for purposes of filing, but they were not recorded on stone until after the middle of the fourth century.

APPENDIX: Prescripts of Attic Decrees, Chairman Formula

Among the total of extant decrees (published in *IG* and elsewhere), those that preserve the chairman formula in whole or part show the following distribution of the old and the new (I supply citations only for those texts particularly relevant to the present argument).

Old Formula: ὁ δεῖνα ἐπεστάτε(ι)

Earliest occurrence, restored: *IG* I³ 7, dated 460–450

Earliest occurrence, certain: *IG* I³ 10, dated 469–450

Latest occurrence: *IG* II² 249, dated 352/1–343/2

New Formula: τῶν προέδρων ἐπεψήϊζεν ὁ δεῖνα demotic

Earliest occurrence: *IG* II² 44, dated 378/7

Late 6th c.–405/4

(Extant decrees: 260)

Prescripts with presiding official (old formula)

89

59). M. Guarducci (*Epigrafia greca* II [Rome 1969] 191) implies a formal group but does not develop her discussion. At any rate, the secretary of the council would be one of these, for his copy is inscribed (and delivered to the council, cf. lines 21–23); the posts of γραμματεὺς ἐπὶ τὰ ψηφίσματα and γραμματεὺς ἐπὶ τοὺς νόμους had been created in 366/5 and these also may be meant.

²² *I.e.*, when the inventory has been completed, from the initial scrutiny through the making of copies.

²³ The ‘publication formula’ specifies that the list is to be inscribed on stone so that it will have wider publicity than the copies kept by the *prytaneis* and in the public archives.

403/2–378/7

(Extant decrees: 95)

Prescripts with formula of presiding official	<u>40</u>
Texts with old formula	39
(a) with demotic? [= tribe not in prytany], possible ²⁴	1
(b) with demotic [= tribe not in prytany], certain ²⁵	1
Texts with new formula ²⁶	1

377/6–353/2

(Extant decrees: 113)

Prescripts with formula of presiding official	<u>42</u>
Texts with old formula	37
(a) without demotic, certain or likely ²⁷	4
(b) without demotic, possible ²⁸	6
(c) with demotic, certain or likely [= tribe not in prytany] ²⁹	17
Texts with new formula ³⁰	15

352/1–337/6

(Extant decrees: 125)

Prescripts with formula of presiding official	<u>32</u>
Texts with old formula	10
(a) without demotic, possible but not on stone or restored ³¹	3
(b) with demotic, certain or likely [= tribe not in prytany] ³²	7
Texts with new formula ³³	22

²⁴ CSCA 5 (1972) 164–169 (379/8).²⁵ IG II² 43 (378/7).²⁶ IG II² 44 (378/7).²⁷ IG II² 95, 142, 190, *Hesperia* 8 (1939) 5–7.²⁸ IG II² 108, 134, 138, 154, 217, *SEG* XIV 47.²⁹ IG II² 99, 106f, 109–12, 114, 116, 121, 136f, 139, 145, 152, 157, *Hesperia* 8 (1939) 12–14.³⁰ IG II² 103, 117a, 118, 123, 12f, 13033, 140, 172, *Hesperia* 3 (1934) 2 no. 3, *Tod* II 136 (IG II² 105+523), *SEG* XXII 89.³¹ IG II² 227, 248f.³² IG II² 206, 207a, 208, 212–214 (cf. *SEG* XXIV 88: Pecirka [1966] 47–49, new readings), 225.³³ IG II² 205, 209, 218f, 220.1–22, 220.23–33, 224, 228f, 231, 233a, 237, 240–43, 276, *Hesperia* 7 (1938) 292–94, *Hesperia* 8 (1939) 172, *Hesperia* 9 (1940) 325f A, *Hesperia* 9 (1940) 342, *Hesperia* 21 (1952) 355–59.

336/5-319/8

(Extant decrees: 189)

Prescripts with formula of presiding official	<u>75</u>
Texts with old formula	0
Texts with new formula	75

Note: The chairman formula is in transition between 379/8 and 337/6, but if the old formula is used, the rule can be checked by the chairman's demotic, if it is on the stone, which should show that his tribe is not in prytany. There are 39 texts in this period with the old formula, 10 without demotic, of which only 1 is certain (*Hesperia* 8 [1939] 5-7). All of the texts without demotic fall in the period 377-352, and none violates Hansen's theory that after 355/4 the chairman is always given with patronymic and demotic.³⁴

UNIVERSITY OF NORTH CAROLINA AT CHAPEL HILL
June, 1990

³⁴ I am grateful to M. H. Hansen and H. R. Immerwahr for reading drafts of this paper and helpfully discussing several points. They are not, of course, responsible for the views expressed.