

Greek texts. We believe that the closing sentence of the passage should read as follows:

‘They bind in the seams from within with papyrus.’

Texas A&M University

The University of Texas at Austin

CHERYL W. HALDANE

CYNTHIA W. SHELMEERDINE

ARCHAISMS IN THE TROIZEN DECREE

The decree of Themistocles, discovered by M. H. Jameson and first published by him in 1960 has given rise to an intense debate centring on the question of the decree’s authenticity.¹ This debate has focused to an important extent on supposed archaisms or anachronisms in the text. If a word appears to be used in an ‘archaic’ manner, i.e., in this instance, one peculiar to the early fifth century, it may be an indication of the inscription’s authenticity. Conversely, a word employed in a manner proper to a later time may be an indication of the decree’s actual period of origination. Thus an early and influential commentator, D. M. Lewis, argued for the decree’s authenticity asserting: ‘I see no reason to suspect a forgery. There are too many traces of official and archaic language.’²

However, in the commentary to the decree in Meiggs–Lewis only the use of *μεθίστημι* instead of *δοστρακίζω* in line 45 and the use of *ξένοι* for *μέτοικοι* in lines 7, 13 and 30 were still regarded as examples of official and archaic language: ‘These seem to be the surviving points from an attempt to show that there was “no reason to suspect forgery”’.³ But are these in fact instances of the archaic employment of these two words?

Lines 44–7 of the decree contain provision for the recall of certain men previously ostracized:

ὅπως δ’ ἂν καὶ ὁμονοοῦντες ἅπαντες, Ἀθηναῖοι ἀμύνωνται τὸν βάρβαρον, τοὺς μὲν μεθεστηκότας τὰ [δ]έκα ἔτη ἀπιέναι εἰς Σαλαμίνα καὶ μένειν αὐτοὺς ἕκκεῖ ἕως ἂν τι τῷ δήμῳ δόξῃ περὶ αὐτῶν.

Lewis comments, ‘I find this the clearest single piece of evidence for authenticity. These men have been ostracized, but the word is not used, although forms of it are frequent and universal in general literature from Herodotus (8.79.1) onwards. It is not used because it is not the official word, perhaps even because it does not yet exist. The official word is *μεθίστημι*.’ He goes on to say that this official word occurs in only a few passages all of which, he thinks, ‘depend, directly or indirectly, on documents’: Philochorus 328 F 30, Schol. *Knights* 855, Arist. *Pol.* 1284a21, Plut. *Them.* 11.1, Plut. *Arist.* 8.1, and Aristides 46, p. 248 Dind. Lewis concludes: ‘A forger who avoided τὸς ὠστρακισμένους would have shown remarkable restraint and knowledge.’⁴

Leaving aside the question of whether the Athenians employed an ‘official’ word for ostracism in 480 or afterwards, I wish only to draw attention to some examples of the subsequent use of the verb *μεθίστημι*. Most important is Ps.-Demosthenes

¹ *Hesperia* 29 (1960), 198–223. A summary of the early stages of the debate is provided by M. H. Chambers in *Philologus* 111 (1967), 166–9.

² *CQ* n.s. 11 (1961), 61–6.

³ R. Meiggs and D. M. Lewis, *Greek Historical Inscriptions* (Oxford, 1969), p. 52.

⁴ *Op. cit.*, p. 62.

26.6: Ἀριστείδην μὲν γέ φασιν ὑπὸ τῶν προγόνων μετασταθέντ' ἐν Αἰγίνῃ διατρίβειν, ἕως ὃς ὁ δῆμος αὐτὸν κατεδέξατο. This speech, transmitted in the Demosthenic corpus, may be dated to between 338 and 324.⁵ The usage of *μεθίστημι* is exactly parallel to that in the passages cited by Lewis. Is there reason to suppose that documentary evidence, reflecting some 'official' usage, has here been employed? The answer must be negative. The orator has simply drawn from his own memory a fact, which, one should suppose, was part of the common historical patrimony of every educated Athenian. This one example undercuts the notion that the verb's employment in our decree is archaic. For here we have a writer of the later fourth century, the very time at which the decree makes its first appearance in our sources, employing precisely the same idiom as that encountered in the Themistocles decree.⁶ On the basis of this passage, it cannot be maintained that what we have in line 45 of the decree is necessarily an 'archaic' usage.

Although not as in the above case employed as an exact synonym for *ὀστρακίζω* (and it is interesting to note that the word *ὀστρακίζω* – 'frequent and universal in general literature from Herodotus onwards', according to Lewis – never once occurs in the vast Demosthenic corpus), *μεθίστημι* nevertheless is common in Demosthenes in the sense of removing oneself/being removed from some place. For example, at 23.39, *ἔστι δ' αὖτε τις; ἐκ τῆς τῶν πεπονθότων μεταστάντα εἰς τὴν τῶν μηδὲν ἡδικομένων ἀδεῶς μετοικεῖν*; at 23.45, *ἐὰν τις τινα τῶν ἀνδροφόνων' φησι 'τῶν ἐξεληλυθότων, ὧν τὰ χρήματα ἐπίτιμα'*; at ps.-Dem. 25.23, *ὅσας οἱ λαχόντες ἄρχουσιν ὑμῶν, τῷ τὸν ὑπρέτην εἰπεῖν "μετάστητ' ἕξω" ...*. These examples suggest that for a writer of the fourth-century seeking a word to describe someone who has been 'removed' (for instance, someone who has been ostracized), *μεθίστημι* was a natural choice.

Also of note is the usage of this word by Aeschines. He employs *μεθίστημι* in the sense of 'banish' at 3.129: *... καὶ τοὺς μὲν ἐναγεῖς καὶ τῶν πεπραγμένων αἰτίους μετέστησαν*. Similarly, at 3.125: *εἰσελθὼν εἰς τὸ βουλευτήριον καὶ μεταστησάμενος τοὺς ιδιώτας*, and at 2.35, *... ὡς δ' ἦν σιωπὴ, μεταστήναι ὑμᾶς ὁ κήρυξ ἐκέλευσεν*. Thus, Aeschines, as the first example illustrates particularly well, sometimes employs the verb *μεθίστημι* in a way similar to its employment in the Themistocles decree. Interestingly, the first mention of the decree known to us was made precisely by Aeschines: *'τίς ὁ μακροὺς καὶ καλοὺς λόγους ἐκείνους δημηγορῶν, καὶ τὸ Μιλτιάδου καὶ Θεμιστοκλέους ψήφισμ' ἀναγιγνώσκων ... οὐχ οὗτος; (i.e. Aeschines)'* (Dem. 19.303). The evidence of Demosthenes and Aeschines should be sufficient to indicate that the employment of *μεθίστημι* in the Themistocles decree is not archaic but rather quite similar to certain fourth-century usages of the verb.

Similarly mistaken is the notion that the use of *ξένοι* rather than *μέτοικοι* is archaic. Lewis writes, 'I do not think it likely that a forger would have failed to use *μετοίκους*' (in lines 7, 13 and 30).⁷ The question becomes, would a fourth-century forger be likely to employ the word *ξένος* for the word *μέτοικος*? It seems that the answer is positive. In the decree, provision is made that Athens might fight *πανδημεῖ*. The distinction is made between citizens and non-citizens, with the non-citizens called *ξένοι* (lines 7, 13, 30). This seems to be in no way incompatible with fourth-century Athenian divisions of their population. Occasionally a distinction is made among the

⁵ Termini for the speech are provided by a reference to the battle of Chaeronea in 338 (26.11) and by Dinarchus' knowledge of the trial of Aristogeiton in a speech of 324 B.C. (2.13).

⁶ The decree's first appearance is at Dem. 19.303.

⁷ Lewis, op. cit., p. 62.

three groups, citizens, metics and ξένοι as at Dem. 23.23: *τίνι τάξει... πότερα ξένος ἢ μέτοικος ἢ πολίτης ἐστίν*. But, as A. R. W. Harrison writes, 'It would perhaps be safe to say that in a legal context the word ξένοι will be held to include metics unless they are specifically excluded.'⁸

The words can even be used, in effect, as synonyms as in Dem. 46.22: *τὸν τοίνυν νόμον ἐπὶ τούτους ἀνάγνωθι, ὃς κελεύει ἐπιδικασίαν εἶναι τῶν ἐπικλήρων ἀπασῶν, καὶ ξένων καὶ ἀστών, καὶ περὶ μὲν τῶν πολιτῶν τὸν ἄρχοντα εἰσάγειν καὶ ἐπιμελεῖσθαι, περὶ δὲ τῶν μετοίκων τὸν πολέμαρχον*. Most important is the fact that frequently the entire citizen body is divided precisely between citizens and ξένοι, with metics clearly included under the latter appellation. For instance this is the case in Dem. 20.123, *ὁ γὰρ ἄξια τῆς ἀτελείας εὖ πεποιηκέναι δόξας καὶ ταύτην παρ' ὑμῶν λαβὼν τὴν τιμὴν μόνην, ἢ ξένος ἢ καὶ τις πολίτης...*; and Dem. 57.24, *ἐξ ὧν ἔστιν εἰδέναι, πότερόν ποτ' ἀστὸς ἢ ξένος ἦν ὧ ταῦθ' ὑπήρχεν*; and, finally, at Dem. 23.47, *πάλιν οἴσθ', ἐκῶν ἢ ἄκων, καὶ ξένος ἢ πολίτης ὁ τοῦτο ποιήσων ἔσται*. The upshot of all of this is that it would be normal later fourth-century parlance to refer to the mass of non-citizens as ξένοι. Rather than being an 'archaism', ξένος was the word most likely to have come to the mind of a fourth-century forger looking to label non-citizens.

In conclusion, it is clear that the alleged 'archaisms', supposed indications of authenticity, are nothing of the sort. Both *μεθίστημι* and ξένοι are employed in the decree in a manner standard to the fourth century. This does not, however, by any means prove that the Themistocles decree is a forgery. B. D. Meritt has argued that anachronisms indicate only that the text has been recopied with changes occurring in language rather than in content.⁹ However that may be, it is important to be aware that we are not in any instance dealing with a text containing 'archaisms'.

Brown University

JAMES J. KENNELLY

⁸ A. R. W. Harrison, *The Law of Athens* (Oxford, 1968), p. 188.

⁹ *Lectures in Memory of Louise Taft Semple*, 1st Series (Princeton, 1967), pp. 119–32.

LYSANDER AND LIBYS

To convince the Spartans of his suggested reform of the kingship, Lysander tried to get the sanction of the oracle of Zeus Ammon at the oasis of Siwa in Libya, and even attempted to bribe the priests there.¹ The priests reported him to the Spartans. Only after his death, upon the discovery of a speech he had ordered concerning the reform, was the full scale of his plans revealed.²

Why did Lysander expect Zeus Ammon to be favourable? Why did he expect his bribery to succeed? The way a Spartan went about bribing an oracle may be understood by a parallel: the attempt by the Spartan Kleomenes to bribe the Pythia at Delphi.³ At Delphi this bribery was effected through a local magnate, someone

¹ Ephorus, F. Jacoby, *FGrHist* 70 F 206 = Plut. *Lys.* 25; Nepos, *Lys.* 3.2–4; Diod. 14.13.5–8.

² Ephorus, F. Jacoby, *FGrHist* 70 F 207 = Plut. *Lys.* 30; Plut. *Ages.* 20.3; *Apophthegmata Laconica* 212c, 229f. For discussions of chronology and credibility see R. E. Smith, 'Lysander and the Spartan Empire', *CP* 43 (1948), 148–9; H. W. Parke, *The Oracles of Zeus* (Oxford, 1967), pp. 219–21; C. D. Hamilton, *Sparta's Bitter Victories* (Cornell, 1979), pp. 89–94; J. F. Bommelaer, *Lysandre de Sparte* (Paris, 1981), pp. 134–8.

³ Hdt. 6.66.