

THE ATHENIAN CASUALTY LISTS

IN the continuing discussion and debate over the development of letter-forms in fifth-century Athens, the official casualty lists from the public cemetery have played little part. One of them, however, the so-called 'Koroneia' epigram and related fragments (*SEG* x. 410; xxi. 123; and *IG* i². 942), has been used in the argument by H. B. Mattingly, who has assigned it to Delion and claims its tailed rho for the 420s.¹ But, the epigraphical argument aside, it seems to me that in so doing he has ignored two important characteristics of the lists—characteristics that are not apparent from these fragments by themselves but that can be seen from all the inscriptions of this class taken as a group. No summary of our knowledge of these lists has been written for almost 50 years,² during which time the number known has almost doubled. In this paper I should like to outline the present state of our knowledge and to give some impressions of them gained from examining all known fragments and preparing them for publication. I wish to stress that these impressions were formed slowly, with no *parti pris*, no idea of their being used in any debate over letter-forms, but merely with the purpose of understanding as much as possible about the lists as a group. I think them valid and hope they will be useful to anyone who approaches one of these monuments without knowledge of them all. I fully realize that conclusions drawn from a general study do not absolutely prove anything about one particular list; there can always be an exception, but, when one is claimed, it should be recognized and defended as such.

First, from the remains that we now possess, it is clear that we have not yet attained anywhere near a complete series of these inscriptions. At present there are 108 fragments plus copies of twelve pieces now lost. These represent at a maximum 41 regular annual monuments of Athenian dead, at a minimum 30.³ The true figure is probably nearer the minimum, but certainty is made impossible by the difficulties in deciding whether some of the lost fragments belong together or with any of those extant,⁴ whether some of the epigrams were parts of the same monuments as some of the lists,⁵ and whether some fragments with slightly different lettering and spacing belong to different stelai of large monuments.⁶ At any rate, the pieces we now have should represent about one-half, or a few more, of the public monuments of this type erected in the fifth century. Again certainty is impossible because we do not know when the annual inscriptions began; 464 is the latest date for this, but it is likely that they began earlier.⁷ A further complicating factor is our ignorance of how many years there were in the fifth century during which there were no

¹ 'Athenian Imperialism and the Foundation of Brea', *C.Q.* n.s. xvi (1966), 191–2.

² G. Smith, 'Athenian Casualty Lists', *CP* xiv (1919), 351–64.

³ There are also represented one monument to Argives, two to Ionians or Aeolians, and two to Lemnians, which I do not include in the above statistics. A few other lists of names may have been casualty lists; cf. *SEG* xxi. 98–103. Lists with demotics or patronymics must be of another type; the

deme names on *SEG* xix. 39 show that this does not list casualties.

⁴ e.g. *IG* i². 937 and 938, known only from Pittakys's transcriptions, are said by him to have been like *IG* i². 933.

⁵ These were in different hands on *IG* i². 943 and *SEG* xix. 123.

⁶ Cf. *SEG* xix. 118 and *IG* i². 928; *SEG* xix. 134 and *IG* i². 958, 965, 966; *SEG* xix. 136 and *IG* i². 960, 963, 968.

⁷ See Appendix I.

Athenian war-dead, and therefore no monuments; it is difficult to conceive of many, but there must have been a few between 445 and 432 and perhaps after the peace of Nikias. But as the series becomes more complete, and it will continue to do so, its value in a study of the development of letter-forms is obvious. Perhaps the sample we have now is not large enough to mean anything, but it should be pointed out that the lists with the three-barred sigma represent a maximum of fourteen years, a minimum of ten; those with four-barred sigma a maximum of twenty-seven, a minimum of twenty. This percentage fits very well with the traditional view that places the change in this letter between 450 and 445.

Be that as it may, one of the most disappointing things about the lists is the difficulty in dating them. Only five can be definitely dated from internal evidence, thus giving fixed points in the series. These are *IG* i². 928 in 464;¹ *IG* i². 929 in 460;² *IG* i². 945 in 432;³ *IG* i². 949 in 423;⁴ and *SEG* xxi. 131 in 409.⁵ We are still far from realizing the hope implied by Adolph Wilhelm when he wrote: '... der Versuch einer Beziehung auf bestimmte Kriegsjahre und Schlachten nicht aussichtslos erscheint'.⁶ Before this can be accomplished, a great many more fragments must come to light, not only of new lists but also of those represented now by small fragments that give no idea of the size of the monuments. In a few cases we can guess with some confidence,⁷ but the continuing unresolved search and debate over the 'Sicilian List', even though we have fragments of five large monuments from the latter part of the century, reveal the difficulties involved.⁸

But despite these difficulties in actual dating, our knowledge of the form and contents of the lists has greatly increased. It can now be shown that the large monuments developed from ten individual stelai, one to a tribe, into a wall of connected stelai that at times had sunken channels cut in the face between tribes in order to simulate individual stelai.⁹ An examination of the stones themselves shows how common was the addition of names, sometimes perhaps unofficially, but often even before the erection of the stele. Apparently very often names came in after the monument had been planned. An inspection of *IG* i². 943, our one complete monument, well illustrates this. It was originally planned to list in large letters casualties from the Chersonese and from Byzantion in separate columns, each with tribal headings. The first stone-cutter did this. There were only eleven dead from Byzantion, but they required all the tribal names. The twenty-four dead from the Chersonese (not including the general Epiteles) included none from Leontis, Akamantis, or Aiantis. These headings were omitted, although fortunately some extra space was left where the former two would have stood. Then nineteen more names of those killed in other areas must have been reported. These were fitted, under the heading 'Other Wars', into the space below the two original columns in much smaller letters, although apparently by the same mason. They were listed

¹ See *Hesp.* xxxvi (1967), 321-8.

² For this date see *ATL* iii. 174-5.

³ Compare *Thuc.* i. 63 with the epigrams.

⁴ See Appendix II.

⁵ See *Hesp.* xxxiii (1964), 43-55.

⁶ *Jahresh. Oest. Arch. Inst.* i (1898), Beiblatt, 46.

⁷ e.g. *IG* i². 944+ probably belongs to 431,

although this depends upon Wilhelm's restoration of Alope in line 3; cf. Raubitschek, *Hesp.* xii (1943), 25-7. *IG* i². 933 is a large monument of several stelai and should be the result of one of the two major disasters of the 50s, Tanagra or Egypt.

⁸ See Appendix III.

⁹ Cf. *Hesp.* xxxvi (1967), 321-8; xxxiii (1964), 21-9; 43-7.

under seven tribes and Eleutherai. Even these must not have become known all at once, as there is much crowding under Kekropis (lines 86–8) and one name was added in the margin under Pandionis (line 76). Even later one more casualty from Byzantion and two from the Chersonese became known; these were added by a second hand, which also had to put in the tribal headings for Leontis and Aiantis in one column (lines 18–19, 35–6, 67). This hand also added the epigram at the bottom. Finally, one more victim from the Chersonese was inscribed in a third, irregular hand (line 15). This type of crowding and adding names was fairly common in the lists,¹ although at times the additions seem later and probably unofficial.² It clearly indicates a desire to get all the casualties of a year on the list, as well as the difficulties in doing so when they occurred at different times and places.

Our knowledge and understanding of the rubrics and titles on the lists have also greatly increased. The latter, inscribed above, below, or alongside a name, now represent most of the officials of the Athenian military. Two generals are certain and there is probably one other.³ In *IG* i². 929. 5, there occurs the word *στρατηγόν*, generally taken as meaning that a man named in the following line, restored by Kirchhoff as *Φ[ρόν]ιχος*, was a general. But the use of the participle has never been well explained, especially since *στρατηγός* appears in line 62 of the same inscription. Although Kirchhoff's restoration has apparently become established in the text, it seems to me that Boeckh's suggestion, *Φ[ύλαρ]χος*, is much more plausible. Thus both lines would refer to Pantaleon in line 7, meaning that he was 'phylarch acting as general'. There are one other phylarch,⁴ two 'archons of the fleet',⁵ at least three taxiarchs,⁶ a toxarch,⁷ a peripolarch,⁸ more than ten trierarchs,⁹ one physician,¹⁰ and one seer.¹¹ There may be a helmsman¹² and a phrourarch.¹³

The rubrics fall into three categories: descriptive of non-Athenians, geographical, and tribal. The last are most common, appearing on at least 22 of the lists we have. In three cases they were inscribed in the nominative rather than the usual genitive.¹⁴ There are no demotics or deme headings. It seems safe to say that, except when a few scattered casualties were reported from different areas, perhaps late, Athenians were always listed under their tribes. It has been thought that *IG* i². 950 proved otherwise—that they were sometimes listed

¹ It occurs, e.g., on *IG* i². 928, 929, 933, 940, 949, 965.

² Names with Ionic letters were added on *IG* i². 949, 952, 960, and *SEG* xix. 42.

³ *IG* i². 929. 62; 943. 4. In *SEG* xxi. 123. 2, there is a name in large letters covering two columns; it must represent an important official, probably a general.

⁴ *IG* i². 950. 180.

⁵ *SEG* xxi. 131. 11–16. For an interpretation of this title, see *Hesp.* xxxiii (1964), 49–50.

⁶ *SEG* xix. 42b, Col. III. 1; *SEG* xxi. 131. 17–20. On *SEG* x. 424, Stele VII. 4, 6, 8 are some endings representing either taxiarchs or trierarchs.

⁷ *SEG* xix. 42b, Col. III. 2.

⁸ *SEG* xix. 42b, Col. II. 35.

⁹ *IG* i². 953. 3; 950. 3, 42; 951. 8 and 34; *SEG* xix. 42b, Col. II. 33, Col. III. 30; xxi.

131. 22, 24, 25, 28. The title nauarch, sometimes cited (Smith, op. cit. 358) from *IG* i². 953, does not seem to have existed there but is rather a result of dittography in Pittakys's copy; cf. Hiller ad loc.

¹⁰ *IG* i². 950. 153.

¹¹ *IG* i². 929. 129.

¹² In *SEG* xix. 42b, Col. II. 34, Mastrokostas plausibly restored [*κυβερνή*]τες; this cannot be absolutely certain, as titles of other petty officers would fit.

¹³ In *IG* i². 929. 49 and 952. 36, this apparently is a name, not a title. But in *IG* i². 950, at the top of Col. II, two lines seem to have been deliberately erased; the first began with *φρο*- and may therefore represent a title.

¹⁴ *IG* i². 928. 54, 965. 8; *SEG* xxi. 123. 1.

by ships' crews.¹ This view, however, can no longer be accepted. It was a reasonable enough assumption from *IG* i². 950 alone; this stele is broken off at the top and holds two columns of names, including trierarchs, with no rubrics appearing at all, while the third column has a few names listed under tribal headings. Now, however, there have been found two examples of large monuments on which trierarchs were listed under their tribes, and on one of these certainly, on the other probably, there was another column in which a few dead, apparently from a different area, were listed under a different set of tribal rubrics.² *IG* i². 950, which has anathyrosis on the left, must be the right-hand stele of another similar large monument on which tribal names were repeated at least twice.

The geographical rubrics are of several types. *IG* i². 929 has one heading listing all the places where casualties occurred during the year,³ whereas *IG* i². 943 has tribal names repeated under separate rubrics for Byzantion, the Chersonese, and 'Other Wars'; a similar system seems to have been used on *SEG* x. 418. These headings are found not only on the face of the stele, but in one case, *IG* i². 945, on the base over the epigram. Very likely at times they were put on the face of the decorative moulding; such at least seems the logical place to have had one on *SEG* xix. 42 and xxi. 123, where the tribal names come just below the moulding. This assumes, of course, that some geographical designation appeared on every monument; to me that seems a safe assumption.⁴

There also occur on three monuments geographical rubrics followed by only a few names without tribal designation. On *IG* i². 928, Thasos, Sigeion, and Eion are mentioned twice, Kardias once. In all these cases, however, both rubrics and names were added in different hands at the bottom or on the sides of the stelai; it seems obvious that they became known after the planning of the main body of the list, which must represent the casualties at Drabeskos.⁵ On *IG* i². 949, three casualties from Potidaia and one each from Amphipolis, Thrace, Pylos, Sermyleia, and Singos were inscribed at the foot of the left-hand column in the original hand. It should probably be assumed that it was not thought necessary to add the tribal designations here, perhaps because of lack of space. These dead may have been reported late; in any event, they would not have been added under their tribes in the main columns above, since both of these must have had geographical headings.⁶ The situation on *IG* i². 944

¹ Cf. Hiller, ad loc.; Wilamowitz, *Aus Kydathen*. 85.

² For the monument of 409, see *Hesp.* xxxiii (1964), 43-7; one of the surviving stelai of *SEG* xix. 42 contains two columns headed Antiochidos, yet has anathyrosis which indicates that the monument contained more casualties.

³ The fact that the tribal name is cut in much larger letters above the geographical heading has led some to doubt that this was part of a large monument of ten stelai. Pope, *Non-Athenians in Attic Inscriptions* (New York, 1935), 77, suggested it was a special monument put up by the tribe Erechtheis. But it is hard to imagine why, at a time when public monuments were erected, the names should have been inscribed a second time. *IG* i². 928, four years earlier, was composed of ten

individual stelai (cf. *Hesp.* xxxvi [1967], 321-7) and it seems most likely that 929 was also. The geographical rubric may have been repeated on the other stelai, but probably it was not felt necessary. The tribal name obviously was considered more important; contemporary Athenians were apparently not so impressed as we are by the wide range of military activity reflected in the geographical heading.

⁴ *IG* i². 953, known only from Pittakys's copy, which seems defective, appears to have a more general heading ἐν τοῖς πολέμοις in line 1. Line 2 seems to be a case of dittography, as are 3 and 4, but it may have contained a geographical rubric; cf. *SEG* x. 418.

⁵ *Hesp.* xxxvi (1967), 327-8.

⁶ See Appendix II.

seems similar, with only a name or two under such headings, but this monument is so fragmentary that it is impossible to picture it adequately.¹

The rubrics descriptive of non-Athenians are varied. Ethnic names are rare. They appear on the same stone with Athenians only on *IG* i². 928, where Madytioi and Byzantioi seem to have been added in empty spaces below Athenian names.² Allies generally had their own stelai; we have fragments of the monument for the Argives who died at Tanagra and two pieces listing Ionic and Aeolic names.³ Lemnians appear twice. On *IG* i². 947 the heading *ΔΗΜΝΙΩΝ ΕΤ ΜΥΠΙΝ* in Ionic letters is cut over names listed by Attic tribes in Attic letters. These most likely were Lemnian allies, descendants of the early Athenian settlers, who were organized in the Athenian fashion.⁴ On *IG* i². 948, known only from Pittakys's copy, the ethnic *ΔΗΜΝΙΟΙ* appears under the tribal name, Hippothontidos. If this copy is correct, it seems that these were Athenian klerouchs after the new settlement of ca. 449, listed under their Athenian tribes because they were still thought of as citizens.⁵ Finally, one name is listed under the rubric Eleutherathen; the exact relationship of this border town with Athens is not clear.⁶

Some other rubrics for non-Athenians define categories of service. Most surprising is the heading *therapontes*, known only from a fragment associated with *IG* i². 928,⁷ where it is followed by only one name; apparently the practice of listing slaves did not become common.⁸ The heading *τοχαστάι βάρβαροι* occurs four times.⁹ Elsewhere we find the rubric *τοχαστάι* twice, *χιπποτοχασότες* once. Although Athenians certainly served in both these capacities,¹⁰ it seems quite clear that the archers listed under these headings were non-citizens. On *IG* i². 949 they are listed at the foot of a column with non-Athenians above and below them. On *SEG* xii. 73 the *hippotoxotes* is at the foot of a column just below barbarian archers. On *IG* i². 929 four archers were listed in a different hand at the bottom of the stele. These have sometimes been thought to be Athenian citizens because of the large heading, *Erechtheidos*, on the stele,¹¹ but generally they are considered non-citizens because one is named *Tauros*¹²

¹ *IG* i². 944 + *SEG* x. 415 + *SEG* xii. 72 + *SEG* xxi. 124. The excellence and size of the lettering as well as Wilhelm's emendation of Alope led Raubitschek to the attractive suggestion that the date is 431. We do know that the monument was of more than one stele, had geographical rubrics, and listed some non-Athenians.

² On *IG* i². 933 *Κείος* was added in a second hand beside the name *Delodotos* in line 13; it seems to have been a case of a foreigner having been erroneously listed with Athenians.

³ *IG* i². 931/2 + *SEG* x. 407 + xii. 69; *SEG* x. 416; *SEG* xix. 40.

⁴ *IG* i². 936, known from Pittakys, may be of the same type. Under the otherwise unknown heading *ἐκ τῆς Λέου[τιδος]* are listed names, some of which appear to be non-Athenian. They are in early Attic letters except for the use of *xi* three times.

⁵ For the much-disputed question of the status of Lemnians, see, in the latest in-

stance, P. A. Brunt, 'Athenian Settlements Abroad in the Fifth Century, B.C.', *Ancient Society and Institutions*, especially pp. 80-1 and n. 37.

⁶ Eleutherai is probably also mentioned on a sherd that depicts the public funeral stelai; cf. Walters, *Sitzb. München*, 1913, *Abh.* 5, and Bradeen, *Hesp.* xxxvi (1967), 324-5.

⁷ *Ag.* I. 7009; see *Hesp.* xxxvi (1967), 326.

⁸ Pausanias 1. 29. 7, mentions slaves' names inscribed on a stele, but the occasion is not clear. Slaves are listed in the crews of the triremes on *IG* ii². 1951, but this is not a regular casualty list.

⁹ *IG* i². 950. 136-7 (cf. *Hesp.* xxi [1952], 340. 1); *SEG* xii. 72. 2-3; xii. 73. 9-10; xxi. 135. 35.

¹⁰ *Thuc.* 2. 13. 8; *Lysias* 15. 6.

¹¹ Cf. Pope, *op. cit.* 77, for a survey of opinion.

¹² Line 68; cf. Wilamowitz, *op. cit.* 85. The names were not included in *PA*.

and because such additions, without reference to tribal headings, can be paralleled elsewhere.¹

Finally there are two headings more difficult to interpret: *engraphoi*, which occurs once, and *xenoi*, three times. Both appear in the same column on *IG* i². 949, with two *engraphoi* listed above and six *xenoi* below nine archers.² Both terms are so vague that there has been a wide range of conjecture about their exact meaning. Generally the *engraphoi* are taken as metics or some special category of metics or foreigners with special privileges.³ The *xenoi* are usually interpreted as allies or mercenaries. That they were the former seems unlikely, as allies seem to have been listed on their own stelai, except for *IG* i². 928, where they are given ethnics, as one would expect. It is possible that they were mercenaries. We do not hear of the Athenians using Greeks in this capacity until the Sicilian expedition,⁴ although it may be that some of the *peripoloi* were foreigners earlier.⁵ But Athens did use barbarian mercenaries⁶ and, although the names of the *xenoi* seem Greek, so do most of those listed as barbarian archers. Most plausible, however, is Miss Smith's suggestion that these *xenoi* were metics.⁷ That the title was technically correct for them seems clear.⁸ If there was an official fifth-century usage, it is uncertain. The term metic appears at least three times on inscriptions,⁹ and Thucydides (iv. 90. 1) seems to differentiate between *xenoi* and metics when speaking of the muster for Delion, although later (iv. 94. 1) he lists only *xenoi* and *astoi*; it is not clear there whether the metics are to be included with the citizens as *astoi* or with the foreigners as *xenoi*, but other evidence makes it far more likely that it was the latter.¹⁰ In the 'Themistokles Decree' *xenoi* is used in an official context applying to a group that must have been the metics.¹¹ In a naval catalogue of the last decade of the fifth century or the first decade of the fourth, the heading *xenoi* appears over the names of both metics and foreigners.¹² At the very least, the evidence makes it clear that the *xenoi* of the casualty lists could have been metics; the absence of ethnics makes it likely. If this is true, it seems most probable that the *engraphoi* were either *isoteleis* or men from districts neighbouring on Attika, such as Oropos or Eleutherai.¹³

¹ Most pertinent is *IG* i². 928, only four years earlier; later examples are *IG* i². 944, 949, 950.

² At present, line 76 shows clearly only the letters *EN* with very faint traces that might be *APA*. Earlier editors, however, seem to have had little doubt about these letters; granted that they were correctly read, Osann's restoration seems almost obligatory.

³ Cf. Pope, op. cit. 79. 42, for a summary of opinion.

⁴ Cf. Parke, *Greek Mercenary Soldiers* (Oxford, 1933), 16.

⁵ These were Athenians at the war's outbreak (Thuc. 2. 13. 6) but foreigners were serving by 411 (Thuc. 8. 92. 2 and Lysias 13. 71); cf. Busolt-Swoboda 1195.

⁶ Thuc. 4. 129. 2.

⁷ Op. cit. 358-9.

⁸ Cf. Clerc, *Les Métèques Athéniens* (Paris, 1893), 295-7.

⁹ *IG* i². 84. 25; 188. 53; 329. 14.

¹⁰ Pace Clerc, op. cit. 44. On *IG* ii². 1951. 46, 110, 188, 341, the term *nautai astoi* is followed by citizens only, while both metics and foreigners are combined under the title *xenoi*.

¹¹ *SEG* xviii. 153. 7, 13, 30. I accept this as genuine, but that is not essential to the argument here. A fourth-century forger could be expected to use official terminology.

¹² *IG* ii². 1951; in line 229 it is followed by foreigners, designated by ethnic; in line 451 by metics designated by deme and by at least one foreigner. This information is based on a new study of this list by Donald R. Laing, *A New Interpretation of the Athenian Naval Catalogue, IG II². 1951* (unpublished diss., Cincinnati, 1965).

¹³ These are respectively the views of Clerc, op. cit. 45-6, and Wilamowitz, *Hermes* xxii (1887), 216-17.

Of course proof is impossible that these *xenoi* were metics, but in any case it is obvious that metics must have had a place on the casualty lists at times; they certainly were more important than barbarian archers. The majority of metic hoplites were not often in a position to become casualties. Thucydides (2. 13. 7) makes it clear that their main duty was guarding the walls, but some were called up for the invasions of Megara and for Delion.¹ Light-armed metics were also called for these campaigns near home, and in case of emergency all metics could be pressed into naval duty, as they were in 427 and for Arginou-sai.² Undoubtedly there were many metics rowing regularly in the fleet, but they were, in effect, mercenaries. With the exception of this last group, metic casualties in all these categories seem to have some claim to being listed. We cannot be sure that they were, but, in view of the inclusion of barbarian archers, it is likely. The presence of any foreigners on the lists in itself seems strange. Thucydides does not mention them in his account of the public burial; there are only the eleven caskets—one for each tribe and one for those not recovered. Yet he does say that foreigners could attend the ceremony, and the existence of foreigners' names on the public monuments must mean that these men were buried in the *demosion sema*. By whom or why it was decided that this should be done, we do not know; perhaps much depended upon the circumstances surrounding the deaths and the preliminary burning of the bodies. At any rate, we do know that the practice was fairly common and that in 423 foreigners were listed. In view of this, it is clear that Mattingly does not help his case by trying to split the hoplite casualties at Delion, in 424, between Athenians and metics and claiming that the latter would not have been listed.³ For if any non-citizens deserved a place on the public monuments, the metic hoplites did, especially when they had died fighting alongside Athenians near the borders of Attika. There certainly would not have been any difficulty in tabulating the losses among them; both the demes and the polemarch had lists.⁴ In view of all this, it seems almost certain that they must have been on the monument for 424.

This review of our knowledge of the lists, and especially of the rubrics, when combined with our external evidence, leads logically to two assumptions: (1) that only one official list was put up each year during which there were casualties,⁵ and (2) that all Athenians who were known to have died in war that year were listed thereon. These are the characteristics that, I believe, Mattingly ignores in assigning *SEG* x. 410 and xxi. 123 to 424; I shall refer to his arguments in the following discussion.

The first of these assumptions follows primarily from Thucydides' description of the public funeral (2. 34). It seems elementary, but it appears necessary to stress the close connection of these lists with the public burial. On them are the names, tribe by tribe, of the men who were buried tribe by tribe in the

¹ Thuc. 2. 31; 4. 90. I agree with Mattingly, op. cit. 192, that this was unusual and caused by the absence of Athenian hoplites; cf. Clerc, op. cit. 48. But the number of 1,600 metics, which fits so well his calculations, is clearly uncertain; many more Athenian hoplites must have been serving as epibatai.

² Thuc. 3. 16. 1; Xen. *Hell.* 1. 6. 24.

³ Op. cit. 191-2.

⁴ Cf. Jameson, *Historia* xii (1963), 400-1.

⁵ This does not, of course, preclude special monuments. Pausanias 1. 29 mentions two to cavalry, two to generals, and four to allies. None of these, however, was in the *demosion sema* proper; see Appendix I. Those to Athenians were probably cenotaphs, on which were repeated names also listed on the casualty lists.

demosion sema. Since Thucydides does not mention the lists specifically, it is often forgotten that they are as much a part of the *patrios nomos* as the ceremonies he describes. And there is no question but that the *nomos* was to bury all the war-dead of the whole year at one time during the winter;¹ Thucydides twice states that Perikles was speaking over the first who died in the war. That there was one list for the year is corroborated by the monuments themselves. The crowding and adding of names and the variety of geographical rubrics all point to an attempt to include everyone.² Mattingly ignores all this, arguing only from the epigrams, taking them very literally as demanding that all names above refer only to the battle or area mentioned.³ There are only three pertinent examples, none of which is conclusive. We have the base of the monument for those who died at Poteidaia in 432 with three epigrams upon it; the stele which once stood on it has not been identified.⁴ Above the first epigram is the beginning of a geographical rubric, 'Εμ Ποτ[- -]; we may never know if any other place was mentioned here. The last two epigrams also mention Poteidaia in the text, but the first one seems general. The only casualties for that year would have been from the force that went first to Macedon, then with reinforcements attacked Poteidaia, and finally was reinforced by Phormion to blockade that city on both sides.⁵ A few men may well have been lost before or after the attack on the city, but the main body of the casualties were suffered there. Certainly no one would complain that the epigrams specifically mentioned that attack, even though a few died elsewhere, and it seems inconceivable that men from the same expeditionary force would have been buried separately. In the second example, *IG* i². 943, we have the whole monument.⁶ The epigram there refers to those who died by the Hellespont, which clearly includes the casualties from Byzantion and the Chersonese inscribed in the two main columns above. These almost certainly were the only dead known when the monument was planned and, presumably, the epigram commissioned. But, by the time the latter was cut, casualties had come in from 'Other Wars'. It seems arbitrary to insist that these, too, were all killed by the Hellespont. In fact, the rubric itself seems to imply otherwise—that they were from several separate areas.⁷ Finally, there is the 'Koroneia' epigram, which certainly seems to refer to only one battle, be it Koroneia or Delion, but this should cause no surprise. Both were major defeats and their casualties would have dominated the list and the feelings of the mourners. This, however, certainly would not preclude the addition of the other casualties of the year, either with or without special geographical rubrics. That the monuments for both battles had geographical designations on them is clear, since Pausanias (1. 29. 13–14) mentions them both. Surely any strict interpretation of the epigram cannot outweigh the evidence that only one list was put up per annum, and certainly the stelai that stood above the epigram could not have held all the casualties of 424, in which year occurred Nikias' action around the Peloponnese, the attack on Megara, and Demosthenes' attempts on Boiotia and Sikyon.⁸

¹ If this simple fact had been kept in mind, rather than theories about the chronology of the pentekontaetia, there would not have been the debate over whether *ἐνιαυτός* on *IG* i². 929 meant war-years or civil-years.

² See above, pp. 146–8. ³ *Op. cit.* 191.

⁴ *IG* i². 945 + *SEG* x. 414.

⁵ Thuc. 1. 57–65.

⁶ See above, pp. 146–7.

⁷ Cf. Meiggs, *HSCP* lxxvii (1963), 17–18, who plausibly dates this monument to 447 and suggests that some of the 'other wars' were in the Chalkidike.

⁸ Thuc. 4. 53–6; 66–74; 89; 101. 3–4.

The second assumption—that all Athenians known to have died in war were listed—is not the standard one. It is generally assumed that only the hoplites ἐκ τοῦ καταλόγου would have been included.¹ This view, absolutely vital to his case, is approved by Mattingly as follows: ‘... I incline strongly to the opposite view, which has many supporters (e.g. A. E. Raubitschek, *Hesperia* xii [1943], 48 n. 102) and seems reasonable at least for the period down to the Peace of Nikias.’² I have never been able to understand how it can be considered reasonable that, under a heading similar to *AΘENAION HOIAE* (*IG* i². 943) or *EPEXΘΕΙΔΟΣ HOIAE* (*IG* i². 929), thetes would be excluded while barbarians and foreigners were listed. This view needs defence, but it is generally merely assumed. Only Wilamowitz gives a supporting argument, insisting that the tribal headings refer to regiments only, not to civil divisions.³ His ‘proof’ of this is the mistaken interpretation of *IG* i². 950 as containing casualties listed by triremes in two columns, then hoplites by tribes in a third. It has been pointed out above (p. 148) that, in the light of new finds, this interpretation cannot stand; all evidence points to all these casualties having been listed by tribes. Wilamowitz’s view, nevertheless, was less extreme than that of Raubitschek and Mattingly, in that it admitted the listing of thetes lost in naval warfare.⁴ There can be no question but that the latter would have been known; the Athenians certainly had complete rosters of their triremes,⁵ and it would have been easy to consolidate losses at sea by tribes with those among the hoplites. It remains inconceivable to me that this was not done in the political climate of the fifth century.

Mattingly, to be sure, thinking only of Delion, does not address himself to this ramification of the general position he takes, but discusses only the light-armed at that battle. Now it is clear from Thucydides’ account (4. 90. 4 and 94. 5) that few of these were present at the actual fighting, and it is difficult to see how a great number of them, along with baggage-carriers, could have been killed, as Thucydides states later (4. 101. 2). This latter passage can be reconciled with the earlier only by assuming that most of the dead were baggage-carriers or that the Boiotian cavalry after the battle caught up with the light-armed who had gone on home. Since Thucydides neither says nor implies either of these alternatives, Classen’s suggestion that an οὐ has probably dropped out of the text before πολὺς has much to commend it. One must agree with Mattingly too that the light-armed ‘were not strictly part of the army establishment’ and so had no regular units or rosters, which fact accounts for Thucydides’ lack of figures on them both here and elsewhere. But would this mean that no records at all were kept when these men were called up, as they were, not only for this campaign but also for invasions of Megara in 460 and 431?⁶ We do not know how such a call was made, but it would most logically have been through the demes by means of the *lexiarchika grammateia*.⁷ Since this service was part of a man’s civic duty, it is only reasonable that some record was kept of those who responded. The demes should have had such information,

¹ Cf. Raubitschek, *Hesp.* xii (1943), 48. 102; Mastrokostas *Ἐφ. Ἀρχ.*, 1955, 187; Busolt, *Gr. Gesch.* iii. 315; Wilamowitz, *Aus Kydathen.* 84–5. Gomme, *Comm.* i. 311, takes the opposite view.

² Op. cit. 191.

³ Loc. cit.

⁴ I confess that I do not understand the

reason for Mattingly having stipulated, as noted above, the limitation ‘at least until the Peace of Nikias’. Perhaps he was thinking of lists like *IG* i². 950; but I can see no reason for a change around 421.

⁵ Cf. *IG* ii². 1951 and *SEG* xviii. 153.

⁶ Thuc. i. 106. 2; 2. 31.

⁷ See Jameson, op. cit. 399–400.

even if the generals neither needed nor wanted a list. When the casualty lists were drawn up, the demes must have known who had been killed, and this is true even if there were no reliable lists of those who responded to the call. Again, I cannot conceive of a man being left off the list because he was a thete.

I should be the first to admit that there is no absolute proof for either of the last two assumptions nor for the one that the metics would be listed, but I should also maintain that, in the light of our knowledge of the lists as a whole, all three of them are almost compulsory. That all three should be wrong, as is necessary for Mattingly to be correct in his attribution of *SEG* x. 410 to Delion, seems incredible. I point out again that these assumptions emerged from a study of all the evidence from these inscriptions with no preconceived notions about using them in an argument about letter-forms. When I first studied the 'Koroneia' monument,¹ I considered only campaigns near the middle of the century because of the letter-forms, but, when Mattingly's challenge made dating by letter-forms suspect, I approached the monument again merely with the aim of finding an Athenian defeat that fitted the epigram and, above all, was in a year having the right number of casualties. Athenian defeats of any real magnitude occurred at Tanagra, Egypt, Koroneia, Delion, Amphipolis, Sicily, and Aigospotamoi. We do not know how many died at Tanagra. Thucydides (1. 108. 1) says *φόνος πολὺς*, which probably could apply to any number over 500, but I do not think that anyone would accept the four-barred sigma as early as this. In Egypt, Sicily, and Aigospotamoi too many for this monument were lost.² Delion may be eliminated for the reasons detailed above. Amphipolis, where about 600 were killed (Thuc. 5. 11. 2), remains as a hypothetical possibility. Yet it was the identification of Amphiaraios with the demigod of the epigram that made Mattingly's suggestion of Delion attractive.³ The case can hardly be made for Amphipolis; the epigram fits Koroneia much better. This is hardly decisive, however, and, when it comes down to a choice between these, the only two alternatives, we do have to fall back on the letter-forms and the general impression they give. And it seems to me, at least, that a comparison of *IG* 12. 949, known to have been cut in 423, with *SEG* x. 410 and xxi. 123 should convince anyone that the monuments could hardly have been inscribed in consecutive years.

APPENDIX I

Jacoby's '*Patrios Nomos*'

In his long impressive article, '*Patrios Nomos*', in *JHS* lxiv (1944), 37-66, Jacoby has advanced two theses, neither of which is accepted in the text. The first is that the Athenian custom of public burial in the *demosion sema* was established by a democratic law in 464 after the disaster at Drabeskos. Gomme, *Comm.* ii. 94-8, has very well exposed the shakiness of the argument, which depends upon a dogmatic eclecticism that accepts one statement in Pausanias' account of the public cemetery while rejecting several, in the same section,

¹ *Hesp.* xxxiii (1964), 21-9.

² This would be true even if rowers were not included; each ship had at least 15 Athenians: a trierarch, 10 epibatai, and 4 archers. For the casualties in Egypt, see *Hesp.* xxxiii (1964), 24-5; Sicily, below, Appendix III; Aigospotamoi, *Hesp.* xxxiii (1964), 52.

³ *Hist.* xii (1963), 261-2; *C.Q.* n.s. xvi (1966), 176-7. This argument is made suspect, however, by the archaeological evidence, which indicates that the Amphiareion at Oropos was not important until the end of the fifth century; see the latest survey by B. Petrakos, *Εφ. Αρχ.* 1967, 1-13.

which it contradicts. There is little to add to Gomme's refutation, but it is interesting to note that W. Kierdorf, *Erlebnis und Darstellung der Perserkriege* (Göttingen, 1966), 83-95, approaching the problem from a different point of view in an attempt to find the beginning of the *epitaphios logos* as we know it, concludes that it began shortly after 478. Yet we know this was a later addition to the *patrios nomos* (Thuc. 2. 35. 1; Dion. Hal. *Ant. Rom.* 5. 17. 4; Diod. 11. 33. 3).

Of course the erection of stelai bearing names may also have been a later addition, as Gomme suggested (*op. cit.* 97. 3), but this does not seem likely. Recording the names seems more basic than the speech itself. Furthermore, Pausanias mentions two monuments before 464: for Eurymedon (1. 29. 14) and for the Aeginetan War (1. 29. 7). This raises the insoluble problem of the value of Pausanias' description of the cemetery and the methods he used in its composition. I myself believe the account to have been written, with consultation of other sources, from notes taken during a walk to the academy and back; the fifth-century *polyandria*, which are Thucydides' *demosion sema*, are described in roughly reverse chronological order in 1. 29. 9-14 (cf. *Hesp.* xxxiii [1964], 57-8). But there are too many unknowns for certainty: the extent of damage by Philip and Sulla, the type of reconstruction undertaken, and Pausanias' basis, if any, for choosing what monuments to mention. Yet I can see little reason to doubt that early monuments mentioned by Pausanias existed and one should keep in mind that he says (1. 32. 3) that the dead of Marathon were listed by tribes. It is true that we have no fragments which can be surely dated before 464, but some might well have been inscribed earlier. *SEG* xxi. 98 especially looks earlier, but its type is uncertain. There may be another indication of earlier lists on a sherd which depicts public funeral monuments; on one of these the inscription has the early upright form of chi (see *Hesp.* xxxvi [1967] 324-5).

Jacoby's second thesis, that the public burials were celebrated as part of the *Genesia* on the 5th of Boedromion, has also been well refuted by Gomme. To have placed a ceremony for the dead of a campaigning year as early as September seems hardly possible. I can only add that *IG* i². 949, which contains a casualty incurred at Amphipolis in the winter of 424/3 but not those at Delion (see Appendix II), which was fought at the beginning of that winter, seems to me to be almost formal proof that the ceremony was not held in September.

APPENDIX II

The Date of *IG* i². 949

IG i². 949 has been known from the eighteenth century, when it was copied by Clarke (*Travels* ii. 2. 592-3). Fourmont also made a transcription, which Boeckh used (*Proem. Cata. Lect. Univ. Berol. Hib. a. 1816-1817* = *Kl. Schrift.* iv. 98-112). It has appeared in various editions of the *Corpus* (*CIG* i. 171; *IG* i. 446; *IG* i². 949) and was published by Hicks in *Br. Mus.* i. xxxviii. It is the lower part of a stele of Pentelic marble which stood by itself, thus representing the complete monument for the year; this is made clear by its polished sides. It contained two columns, in each of which casualties were listed under all the tribal headings. Below the left column were inscribed, under geographical rubrics, three casualties suffered at Poteidaia, and one each in

Amphipolis, Thrace, Pylos, Sermyleia, and Singos. These had no tribal designations nor were they necessarily members of the last tribe, Antiochis (*pace* Hicks, *op. cit.* 106). This group was originally set off from the last name under Antiochis by a vacant space, which was later filled by the name Antiphanes in coarser Ionic letters. This is deceptive, since on a printed page the separation disappears. Below the right column were listed non-Athenian casualties under the headings *engraphoi*, *toxotai*, and *xenoi* (see above, pp. 149-51).

In view of the attention that this inscription has received and the information supplied by the geographical rubrics, it is surprising to find such variety in the dating of it and in the identification of the battles or areas where fell the casualties in the two main columns. Boeckh suggested 423 and the sieges of Skione and Mende, with which Hicks agreed; Kirchhoff, 425 and Pylos and Solgeia, with the right column containing klerouchs; von Domaszewski (*Sitzbe. Heidelberg. Ak.* 1917, *Abh.* 7, 16), 424/3 and Megara, with the right column containing Plataians; Hiller hedged with 425/4 or 424/3. A study of the monument, its parallels, the geographical rubrics, and our increased understanding of the lists as a whole shows that Boeckh was right about the year. First, this must be the monument for the dead of one campaigning year (see above, pp. 151-2), and therefore it was a year when casualties were light. Second, the two columns must represent Athenian casualties from two battles or campaigns, as is done in *IG* i². 943; such a column of klerouchs or Plataians is unparalleled. Therefore it is a year when there were light casualties in two campaigns, scattered ones elsewhere. 425 is eliminated by the fact that there was only one man killed at Pylos; the original campaign would have produced many more dead. Kirchhoff gives no justification for his view that some of the men above were killed there. This is hardly possible in view of the rubric; there was room to add one name under any tribal heading above. 424 is eliminated by Delion; almost everyone has recognized that this stele could not have contained the dead of that battle. Delion occurred at the beginning of winter, but must have been early enough to have been included in the list for 424. Amphipolis came afterwards, during the winter, and a casualty from there is on our list. This is crucial to the dating. From Thucydides' account of the capture of that city, it seems clear that the only time that an Athenian could have died there was when Brasidas drove the guard from the bridge (Thuc. 4. 103. 5). The other scattered casualties from Thrace fit well with Brasidas' advance on Torone (Thuc. 4. 110); the dead from Poteidaia with his unsuccessful night attack (4. 135). This year also had two other campaigns which would have produced enough casualties for the two main columns: Brasidas' capture of Torone (Thuc. 4. 110-16) and the Athenian expeditions against Skione and Mende (Thuc. 4. 129-31). Casualties from the latter would not be in two columns, as Boeckh suggested; they would have been grouped under a heading such as 'in Pellene'. Therefore all the evidence combines to give a firm date of 423 for this list.

APPENDIX III

The 'Sicilian List'

The monument honouring the Athenian dead of the Sicilian expedition has proved to be an elusive will-o'-the-wisp. Raubitschek reconstructed what he

called 'The Casualty List of the Sicilian Expedition' (*Hesp.* xii [1943], 37-48 = *SEG* x. 424), but later finds reduced the hypothetical size of the monument and placed its date after 410 (*Hesp.* xxxiii [1964], 43-55 = *SEG* xxi. 131). Mastrokostas published a newly found stele, associated with *IG* i². 955, as "Ἡ στήλη τῶν ἐν Σικελίᾳ πεσόντων" (*Ἐφ. Ἀρχ.* 1955, 180-202 = *SEG* xix. 42). Papagiannopoulos-Palaios, who had previously insisted that the epigram on the 'Koroneia' base referred to the Sicilian expedition (*Ἀρχ. Ἑλλην. Ἐπιγραφαί* [Athens, 1946], 98-105), then attempted to associate the stelai with this base (*Πολέμων* viii [1965], 1 ff.). Most recently S. Koumanoudes, apparently recognizing the major difficulty in Papagiannopoulos-Palaios's case, has tried to dissociate *IG* i². 955 from the rest, claiming that EM 13190 and the base constitute what is left of the *Μνημεῖον τῶν ἐν Σικελίᾳ θανόντων Ἀθηναίων* (*Ἐφ. Ἀρχ.* 1964, 83-6).

None of this will do. The stelai and the base do not go together. A shaky case can be made for EM 13190 as having been the third stele from the left on the base. It is 20.5 cm. thick, while the traces on the base are between 18.5 and 19 cm.; perhaps this is close enough. It is only 102.4 cm. wide, which is about 7 cm. narrower than the other two middle stelai must have been, but, since the base is broken where it would have stood, there is no absolute proof that it could not have been in this position. However, *IG* i². 955 is over 6 cm. too narrow and 3 cm. too thin to have sat where it should have been as the second stele on the base; in its position, all the markings on the base are clear. Yet Koumanoudes's attempt to separate this from EM 13190 is impossible to accept. He gives three reasons for doing so. The first is that the arrangement of letters is different, and he adds that Mastrokostas's account shows it. But this is not true. Mastrokostas points out that the vertical stoichedon arrangement on EM 13190 varies from 20.4 to 18.5 cm. for ten lines; and the pattern on *IG* i². 955 agrees with the last two columns there. Koumanoudes's second reason is that the cuttings for the T-clamps are different. Since he gives no details it is hard to understand what he means by this. The corners of *IG* i². 955 are so badly broken that it is impossible to give any accurate measurements. Here the cuttings are nearer the back than they are on EM 13190; I presume that he must mean this. But all that this proves is that *IG* i². 955 was a thinner stele, meant to be attached to thicker ones. His third reason is that *IG* i². 955 is too thin, which is really begging the question. Yet in favour of Mastrokostas's association of the two stelai is the fact that they are of approximately the same height and width, with the same moulding at the top and the same arrangements of both columns and letters; he must be right. This leaves, in favour of the identification of the base with the Sicilian casualties, only Papagiannopoulos-Palaios's very subjective view that the epigram is Euripidean. Aside from the weakness of such a criterion, I think that my demonstration (*Hesp.* xxxiii [1964], 21-9) that *IG* i². 942 and EM 12883 and 13344 stood on the base requires more refutation than Koumanoudes's statement that my reconstruction is 'inelegant and un-Greek'. I am rather at a loss to understand what this means. It can hardly refer to the sunken channels cut to imitate individual stelai; they exist not only here but on *IG* i². 958, 965, and *SEG* x. 415, so they must have been used by fifth-century artisans. If he means the treatment of the extra width of the first and last stelai, I submit that my arrangement, when compared with the base and its epigram, is quite rational.

But without the base, the monument as reconstructed by Mastrokostas will hardly serve as *the* Sicilian list. It is much too small; according to his calculations it held between 700 and 1,200 Athenian casualties. To reckon the dead in Sicily as so few, he has to assume that only the regular hoplites and knights were listed, and that only about half of these died. I have tried to show above that Athenian rowers would also have been listed, but, even if this is wrong, the trierarchs, epibatai, and toxotai on the ships must have been listed. These alone came to over 4,000 Athenians (see Beloch, *Gr. Gesch.* ii². 2. 295–6) and one must assume a loss of well over half of these in an expedition of which Thucydides (7. 87. 6) says ‘few out of many returned home’.

The difficulties met in the search for the ‘Sicilian List’ may well have been caused by the fact that just one did not exist; there probably were several. We know that there was one for 414, while the Athenians as a whole were victorious. Pausanias (1. 29. 13) mentions it and Plutarch (*Nicias* 17. 4) gives two lines of Euripides from an epigram upon it, although this cannot have been part of the original monument, having been written after the defeat. The list for 413 would have contained the dead from the first naval battles and the loss of Plemmyrion. Whether it held the losses in the night-attack on Epipolai is questionable. The Athenians got back their dead after this (Thuc. 7. 45. 1) and certainly had time to send back their ashes and names before the harbour was closed; whether they did so or not is doubtful. But all the losses of the final naval battles and the retreat—and these must have been the great majority—could not have been known to the Athenians for years. The list for 412 could have included the generals and a good many others, but who was to know whether many were dead or still alive as slaves? In such a case, the listing of casualties could have gone on for several years, unless some deadline was set, after which all missing were presumed dead. Pausanias’ reference (1. 29. 11–12) to the Sicilian list merely compounds the confusion. He states that τὰ ἐλεγεῖα show that on the same stele were listed the dead from Euboia, Chios, the borders of Asia, and Sicily. He goes on to say that among the last were listed the Plataians and the generals except Nicias, stating that he agrees with Philistos in his reasons for the latter’s omission (but cf. Westlake *C.Q.* xxxv [1941], 64. 5). The detail in this account has led most to take it seriously, although the casualties in Euboia should have been in 411 (Thuc. 8. 95) and the others 412 (Thuc. 8. 24–5). Domaszewski (op. cit. 6) thought it might be a reference to a reconstructed composite monument, but Gomme (op. cit. ii. 96. 2) has pointed out the difficulties of this theory. Yet no one takes seriously Pausanias’ statement in the next sentence that ‘on the same stele’ were the dead from Thrace, Megara, Mantinea, and Sicily. There is an obvious confusion here, and I suspect there may be one in his previous statement. If not, Pausanias must be referring to the list of 412, and the dead from Euboia must have been from scattered resistance in that year (cf. Thuc. 8. 5 and 6), not the sea fight off Eretria. If that is true, the list for that year was probably the largest for the expedition, but it certainly could not have been complete. I doubt that the stelai published by Mastrokostas could contain enough names to belong to 412; they well may be *a* Sicilian List, but not *the* Sicilian List. Other large monuments near the end of the century may have a better claim. *IG* i². 950, if the columns per tribe were equal, as on all known parallels, would be the last of seven stelai in the monument. *IG* i². 951 and 952 + *SEG* xii. 73 + xiv. 20 +

xix. 43 are from a monument of unknown size. *SEG* x. 424 Stelae II and III, known only from Wheeler's copy, seems to be the largest, with three columns of names per tribe, but its date is not certain (cf. *Hesp.* xxxiii [1964], 44-5). It perhaps has the best claim to being the largest list, that of 412, but, at the present state of our knowledge, this is only conjecture.

University of Cincinnati

DONALD W. BRADEEN