



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

VIII. — *Notes on the Athenian Secretaries and Archons.*

BY DR. WILLIAM S. FERGUSON,

CORNELL UNIVERSITY.

IN regard to the secretary, which comes first in the treatment of Aristotle, different views have recently been put forward by two German scholars. The task of each has been to supplement the description given in the *Politeia* by means of the facts offered in the epigraphic material. This necessitates a recognition in the inscriptions of the secretary Aristotle had in mind.

Aristotle's statement is as follows :¹

Κληροῦσι δὲ καὶ γραμματέα τὸν κατὰ πρυτανείαν καλούμενον, ὃς τῶν γραμμάτων [τ'] ἐστὶ κύριος, καὶ τὰ ψηφίσματα τὰ γιγνόμενα φυλάττει, καὶ τὰλλα πάντα ἀντιγράφεται καὶ παρακάθηται τῇ βουλῇ· πρότερον μὲν οὖν οὗτος ἦν χειροτονητός, καὶ τοὺς ἐνδοξοτάτους καὶ πιστοτάτους ἐχειροτόνου· καὶ γὰρ ἐν ταῖς στήλαις πρὸς ταῖς συμμαχίαις καὶ προξενίαις καὶ πολιτείαις οὗτος ἀναγράφεται· νῦν δὲ γέγονε κληρωτός.

From the year 363 B.C. on, the title *γραμματεὺς κατὰ πρυτανείαν* is applied in the inscriptions to the annual official whose task it was to write out the decrees of the Senate and Assembly, and to have them engraved on stone tablets. Before this year, the title *γραμματεὺς τῆς βουλῆς* is given to the official whose duties are, so far as can be determined, identical with those of the *γραμματεὺς κατὰ πρυτανείαν*, but whose term of office is limited to a single prytany. There can be no doubt whatever that this is the secretaryship of which Aristotle gives the history.

But the difficulty is that after 363 B.C., for a period of about fifty years, or, more precisely, till 318/7 B.C., the title *γραμματεὺς τῆς βουλῆς* exists alongside of the title

¹ *Ath. Pol.* LIV. 3.

γραμματεὺς κατὰ πρυτανείαν, and with duties which a special examination, made for the purpose of discovering differences, has proved to be exactly identical.¹ It is in disposing of this title that the two German scholars, Penndorf² and Drerup,³ have been unable to agree.

Aristotle discusses two other secretaries besides the one in question, viz. the secretary in charge of the laws, and the secretary to whom he ascribes the sole task of reading documents before the Senate and Assembly. Penndorf found it impossible to identify the γραμματεὺς τῆς βουλῆς of the period 363–317 B.C. with either of these. He, therefore, concluded that the γραμματεὺς τῆς βουλῆς of this period was the γραμματεὺς τῆς βουλῆς of the earlier period, but with this difference, that his duties were almost, if not entirely, given over to a newly created state official, the γραμματεὺς κατὰ πρυτανείαν. To find something for the γραμματεὺς τῆς βουλῆς to do, he identifies him with the one mentioned in the inscriptions along with the prytanes who particularly distinguished themselves in their term of office.⁴ This latter official usually has the title γραμματεὺς τῆς βουλῆς καὶ τοῦ δήμου. As a reason for this identification is urged the fact that, just as the γραμματεὺς τῆς βουλῆς before 363 B.C. always belonged to a different tribe from the one for which he officiated, so the γραμματεὺς τῆς βουλῆς καὶ τοῦ δήμου, in the five cases known to us, is also from a different tribe from the one whose prytanes are commended.

The difference between the γραμματεὺς τῆς βουλῆς and the γραμματεὺς κατὰ πρυτανείαν, which Penndorf particularly emphasizes, is that the former is a senatorial or prytany official, and the latter a state official. If the name γραμματεὺς τῆς βουλῆς καὶ τοῦ δήμου given to the assumed senatorial official means anything, it implies an activity in the Assembly as well as in the Senate. It cannot be proved, moreover, that the γραμματεὺς τῆς βουλῆς καὶ τοῦ δήμου held office for one prytany only. The number of cases, in which a difference

¹ *Leipzig. Stud.* xviii. p. 146.

² *Leipzig. Stud.* xviii. p. 101 ff.

³ *Phil.-hist. Beiträge f. Curt Wachsmuth*, p. 137 ff.

⁴ See *C.I.A.* II. 865 ff.

between the tribe of the *γραμματεὺς τῆς βουλῆς καὶ τοῦ δήμου* and the tribe whose prytanes are commended, is too few to be inexplicable on the basis of a yearly tenure of office.

Penndorf maintains the continuity of the office held by the *γραμματεὺς τῆς βουλῆς* from the earliest times until after the death of Aristotle. Aristotle, however, and he is our only sure authority, quite clearly designates the *γραμματεὺς κατὰ πρυτανείαν* as the successor of the *γραμματεὺς τῆς βουλῆς*, and totally disregards the *γραμματεὺς τῆς βουλῆς* of the period 363–318/7 B.C. For him there is but one contemporary official concerned with the psephismata. The continuity of the office held by the *γραμματεὺς τῆς βουλῆς* is maintained after 363 B.C. by the *γραμματεὺς κατὰ πρυτανείαν*, just as if the office of the *γραμματεὺς τῆς βουλῆς* had gone out of existence. Penndorf is obliged to admit this, and to seek a way out by attributing an oversight to Aristotle.

This much is certain, that between 363 and 318/7 B.C., the name of only one secretary, the *γραμματεὺς κατὰ πρυτανείαν* is present in the preamble of decrees, and that the purpose of its presence is to certify that the published copy of the decree is official and is identical with the motion carried in the meeting. The name of the *γραμματεὺς κατὰ πρυτανείαν* serves as guarantee for the correctness of the inscriptions even when they are published by the *γραμματεὺς τῆς βουλῆς*. When Penndorf was discussing the secretaries of the period prior to 363 B.C. he held it for self-evident that a secretary could not attest the correctness of a decree which he had not himself published.¹ The same should surely hold true for the period 363–318/7 B.C. as well.

The view of the other scholar, Drerup, is based on the dogma "dass in einer feststehenden Formel wie im Publications-beschluss, verschiedene Titel auch verschiedene Ämter bezeichnen müssen."² The result of the application of this

¹ *Leipz. Stud.* xviii. p. 124; cf. also Drerup (*l.c.* p. 143): Von vornherein ist aber die Annahme von der Hand zu weisen, dass die Aufzeichnung der Dekrete wechselweise vom Prytanienschreiber und einem Unterbeamten besorgt worden wäre.

² *Berl. Phil. Woch.* 1898, p. 1457.

dogma to the epigraphic material is that all three of the secretaries mentioned by Aristotle, the secretary *ἐπὶ τοὺς νόμους*, the secretary who *οὐδενός ἐστι κύριος ἄλλ' ἢ τοῦ ἀναγνώσαι*, as well as the *γραμματεὺς κατὰ πρυτανείαν*, are at some time or other intrusted with the publication of decrees. Even worse atrocities than this would result if the term "feststehende Formel" were not so elastic. Since outside of the stereotyped formulae a certain variety of nomenclature undoubtedly appears, it is more methodical to take as a working hypothesis the dogma that identity of function implies identity of office. The assumption of Drerup that all the secretaries mentioned by Aristotle must be found in the inscriptions, is unwarranted. In the nature of the case we should not expect to find the secretary of the laws there.

All this goes to show that the view put forward by Boeckh and Gilbert, and recently supported by me in the "Athenian Secretaries,"¹ has more in its favor than the testimony of Aristotle. That view is, that *γραμματεὺς κατὰ πρυτανείαν* and *γραμματεὺς τῆς βουλῆς* are merely different titles for one and the same official. In view of the simplicity of this solution, it is worth while to consider why scholars have felt themselves constrained to assume an error on the part of Aristotle. The reason is found in the occurrence of the two titles *γραμματεὺς τῆς βουλῆς* and *γραμματεὺς κατὰ πρυτανείαν* side by side in the same inscription. Apart from the fact that there is no good reason why a writer should not vary his expression by employing at pleasure both of two identical terms, there is in the inscription itself, it seems to me, a very good motive for the use of each title in its own place. The inscription runs as follows:²

καὶ ἐπειδὴν τὸ οἶκημα ἀ[νοι]χθεὶ ἐξετάζειν κατὰ ἔθνος ἕκαστα καὶ ἐπιγράφειν τ[ὸν] ἀριθμόν, ἀντιγράφεσθαι δὲ τὸν γραμματέα τὸν κατὰ πρυτανείαν καὶ τοὺς ἄλλους γραμμα(τέ)ας τοὺς ἐπὶ τοῖ[ς] δ]ημοσίοις γράμμασιν· ἐπειδὴν δὲ ἐξετασθῆ πάντα καὶ ἀναγραφῆ, τὸν γραμματέα τῆς βουλῆς ἀναγράψαντα ἐν στήλῃ λιθίνῃ στήσαι ἔμπροσθεν τῆς χαλκοθήκ[ης· ἐς] δὲ τὴν

¹ *Cornell Studies in Class. Phil.* VII.

² *C.I.A.* II. 61.

ἀναγραφήν τῆς στήλης δοῦναι τοὺς ταμίαις [τῆς] βουλῆς: Δ Δ Δ:
[δρ]αχμὰς ἐκ τῶν κατὰ ψηφίσματα ἀναλ[ισκο]μένων τῇ βουλῇ·
ποιήσασθαι δὲ τὸ γ γραμματεῖα τ[ῆς β]ουλῆς ἀντίγραφα ἐκ τῶν
στηλῶν τὰ ἀναγεγραμμένα [πε]ρὶ τῶν ἐν τῇ χαλκοθήκῃ.

In the first place the title *γραμματεὺς κατὰ πρυτανείαν*, which the issue shows to have been the one in popular use, is employed. In the second place we have to deal with a stereotyped formula, in which, before the time of this inscription, the title *γραμματεὺς τῆς βουλῆς* alone is found. Usage forced the writer to employ the old official title in this formula. For the repetition of the title *γραμματεὺς τῆς βουλῆς* in the third place no reason is needed from our point of view. A reason is, however, needed for the ascription of the task of copying to the *γραμματεὺς τῆς βουλῆς*, if this task is thought of as a mark of differentiation between the *γραμματεὺς τῆς βουλῆς* and the *γραμματεὺς κατὰ πρυτανείαν*; for the task of copying is attributed by Aristotle to the *γραμματεὺς κατὰ πρυτανείαν*.

In the latter half of the fourth century B.C. the Prytany Secretaries followed one another in the official order of their tribes and I have already attempted to prove that the same is true for the two centuries following 307/6 B.C.¹ The recent publication of an inscription found at Magnesia² seems to present evidence hostile to my contentions, for through this the archon Thrasymphon is definitely fixed in the year 221/0 B.C. It is only hostile, however, if the introduction of the tribe Ptolemais is regarded as certainly determined for the year 229 B.C.³ If the tribe Ptolemais was not established before 227/6 B.C., the evidence of this new inscription is perfectly in accord with an unbroken continuation of the official order from the beginning of the third century until 221/0 B.C.

¹ See *Cornell Studies*, VII. and X.

² The Magnesian inscriptions are in the hands of Otto Kern, and are to be published *shortly*. In the meanwhile, they are being lent round to various German scholars, and have been in part already used by Dittenberger in the second edition of his *Sylloge Inscr. Graec.* 1898, No. 256 ff.; cf. Pauly-Wissowa, II. 1, p. 1134.

³ Dr. F. O. Bates, whose name is most prominently associated with this view, has signified to me his willingness to accept the neighborhood of 227 B.C. instead.

Let us arrange by means of the official order the archons of the latter part of the third century. They must group themselves somewhat as follows:

YEAR.	ARCHON.	TRIBE.	YEAR.	ARCHON.	TRIBE.
237/6	Heliodorus	Kekropis	217/6	<i>Aischron</i>	Pandionis
236/5	Leochares	Hippothontis	216/5	Patiades	Leontis
235/4	Theophilos	Aiantis	215/4		Ptolemais
234/3	Ergochares	Antiochis	214/3		Akamantis
233/2	Niketes	Antigonis	213/2	{ <i>C.I.A. IV.</i> } 2, 385 f.?	Oineis
232/1	Antiphilos	Demetrias			
231/0	Jason	Erechtheis	212/1		Kekropis
230/29		Aigeis	211/0	<i>Nikophon?</i>	Hippothontis
229/8	<i>Kallaischros?</i>	Pandionis	210/9	<i>Dionysios?</i>	Aiantis
228/7	Diomedon	Leontis	209/8		Antiochis
227/6	Menekrates	Akamantis	208/7	Archelaos	Antigonis
226/5	<i>Chairephon</i>	Oineis	207/6		Demetrias
225/4 -s	Kekropis	206/5	Kallistratos	Erechtheis
224/3	Diokles	Hippothontis	205/4		Aigeis
223/2	Euphiletos	Aiantis	204/3	Antimachos?	Pandionis
222/1	Herakleitos	Antiochis	203/2		Leontis
221/0	Thrasymphon	Antigonis	202/1	Phanarchides?	Ptolemais
220/19		Demetrias	201/0		Akamantis
219/8		Erechtheis	200/199	<i>Sosigenes?</i>	Oineis
218/7		Aigeis			

The dating of the group Leochares, Theophilos, Ergochares, Niketes, Antiphilos, Jason, -s, Diokles, Euphiletos, Herakleitos, Thrasymphon, seems tolerably certain.¹ The appearance of the public slave Dionysios in Diokles' archonship with the title *νεώτερος*, and in Thrasymphon's archonship without it,² indicates that Diokles, and consequently the whole group, precedes the year 221/0 B.C. One of the immediate predecessors of Menekrates is Kalli-, and it is possible to identify this fragmentary name with the other fragmentary name [Ka]lla[ischros], which has recently been discovered. Diomedon is dated in 228/7 B.C., because of the

¹ See for fuller discussion of these archons the *Cornell Studies*, X. p. 39 ff.

² *C.I.A.* II. 839, l. 10; II. 403, l. 52.

connection between the inscription which bears his name and the events of that and the preceding year. The location of Menekrates and his successor, . . . -on, which Schtschoukareff has already supplied with Chairephon, concerns us next. At the end of Menekrates' archonship it is probable that Ptolemais was in existence.¹ The two archons just mentioned must come between . . . -s and Antiphilos. This seems only possible when Menekrates occupies 227/6 B.C. But at the beginning of 227/6 B.C. Ptolemais was not yet in existence. Only when we suppose the new tribe to have been created in the course of this year, can we explain the facts. With the introduction of this tribe may perhaps be associated the receipt of the money which Ptolemy sent to help buy off the Macedonian commander Diogenes.

The location of Heliodoros and Archelaos must next be discussed. Heliodoros was archon before, and Archelaos probably after, the introduction of Ptolemais. The most suitable place for Heliodoros seems to be 237/6 B.C. We can be pretty certain from internal evidence that some time intervened between the two.² In Archelaos' archonship Eurykleides and Mikion are still alive and active. From the fact that Pausanias³ cites, as an analogy for the murder of Aratos by Philip of Macedon, the poisoning by the same monarch of Eurykleides and Mikion, it has often been assumed that these assassinations took place at the same time, viz. in 214/3 B.C. This date, however, is attested only for the death of Aratos. The time of the death of Eurykleides and Mikion is nowhere given, and has been assigned

¹ Professor V. v. Schoeffer in reviewing the Russian work cited below says: "Ohne auf Einzelheiten einzugehen kann Ref. nur die Bemerkung machen, dass die Ptolemais nicht vor Antiphilos, höchst wahrscheinlich erst unter Menekrates, eingerichtet worden ist," *Berl. Phil. Woch.*, 1899, p. 1027.

² In No. X. of the *Cornell Studies*, p. 39 f., I have contended for such an interval. Professor Schebelew in a Russian treatise on the history of Athens between 229 and 31 B.C., has independently come to the same conclusion, and his arguments have convinced Professor V. v. Schoeffer that he was wrong in making Archelaos the immediate successor of Heliodoros; cf. *Berl. Phil. Woch.*, 1899, p. 1027.

³ Paus. II. 9, 4.

by the latest historian¹ of this period to the years immediately preceding 200 B.C. There is no reason for believing that these statesmen were dead in 209/8 B.C., and consequently no objection to placing Archelaos in that year.

The absence, however, of Ptolemais in 227/6 B.C. makes a break in the list of secretaries' tribes, which must be supplied by the insertion of some other tribe in the interval between 221/0 B.C. and 169/8 B.C., or rather between 221/0 B.C. and 200 B.C.; for such an insertion is best conceivable in connection with the creation of Attalis and the dropping of Antigonis and Demetrias. It is possible that Attalis was irregularly given representation in the secretaryship in the year of its creation, but such an hypothesis lacks analogies and evidence. It seems to me best to admit frankly a difficulty here, without despairing of a solution. The addition of new evidence must be awaited.

¹ Niese, *Geschichte d. griech. u. maked. Staaten*, II. 1899, p. 589.