ΤΟ ΠΛΕΘΟΣ IN A TREATY CONCERNING THE AFFAIRS OF ARGOS, KNOSSOS AND TYLISSOS

Two inscriptions, one (A) found at Tylissos on Crete, the other (B) found at Argos,[1] both dated about 450,[2] concern relations between Argos and the Cretan towns of Knossos and its smaller neighbour, Tylissos. The close relationship between the treaties of fragment A and fragment B – and therefore the interconnection among Argos, Knossos, and Tylissos – seems generally recognized by scholars.[3] The articles of the agreement lay down a diverse and complex set of arrangements among the three parties, but as a whole, the treaty has been interpreted in two ways: (1) the three πόλεις have entered into some sort of federal union; (2) only Argos and Knossos are signatories to the treaty, while Tylissos is a dependency of Argos. The former interpretation has gained wider acceptance than the latter,[4] and if it is correct, just

[1] Sources for text and commentary on these inscriptions include W. Vollgraff, *BCH* (1910), 331–54 (B); (1913), 279–309 (B); J. Chatzidakis, Ἀρχ. Ἐφ. (1914), 94ff. (A); *SIG* i³ 56 (B); E. Schwyzer, *DGE* 83 (B) and 84 (A); C. D. Buck, *Gr. Dial.* 80 (1928), pp. 285f. (B); F. Solmsen and E. Fränkel, *Inscr. Gr.* 27 (1930), pp. 47–9, (B); M. N. Tod, *GHI* (1933) 33, pp. 59–63, (B); M. Guarducci, *Inscr. Cret.* (1935), i, viii, 4, p. 56; i, xxx, p. 306; E. Kirsten, *Kreta im V u. IV Jahrh.* (1936), pp. 16f., pp. 27–8; *RE* vii.A.2 (1948), s.v. Tylissos, pp. 1723–6; U. Kahrstedt, *Klio* 34 (1942), 72–91, (A and B); P. Amandry and J. L. Caskey, *Hesperia* (1952), 21, 217–18, (B); C. Schick, *Riv. di Fil.* NS 33 (1955), 371–2 (B); F. Gschnitzer, *Abhängige Orte* (1958), pp. 44–8 (A and B); H. Bengtson, *Staats. Alt.* ii.147 (A) and 148 (B) (1962), pp. 51–7; A. J. Graham, *Colony and Mother City* (1964), pp. 154–60, 235–44 (A and B); R. Meiggs and D. Lewis, *GHI* 42 (1969), pp. 99–105 (A and B); L. Piccirilli, *Gli arbitrati interstatali Greci I*, 18–19 (1973), 82–96 (A and B); K. Rigsby, *TAPA* (1976), 106, 326–8, (B); B. Bravo, *ASNP* (1980), 10, 706, 725, 822, (B); *SEG* 30 (1980), 354 (A and B); C. W. Fornara, *Archaic to Pel. War* 89 (1983), pp. 88–90; and finally the exhaustive commentary by Willem Vollgraff on A, B and four small fragments 'Le Décret d'Argos relatif à un pacte entre Knossos et Tylissos', *Verhandelingen der Koninklijke Nederlandsche Academie van Wetenschapen*, afd Letterkunde, NS 51.2 (1948), pp. 1–105, to which references are made in this essay as Vollgraff, 'Décret'.

[2] So Vollgraff, 'Décret', p. 13, who argues for a date near the end of the Argivo–Athenian Alliance of 464, but before the Argivo-Spartan Thirty Years' Peace was signed in 451. Also, Chatzidakis, Schwyzer, Buck, Tod, Guarducci, Kahrstedt, Gschnitzer, Bengtson, Graham, Meiggs–Lewis, Piccirilli and Fornara. Vollgraff cites three exceptions to the 450 dating (p. 14): Wilamowitz (*Platon* i (1919), p. 669 n.1): first half of fifth century; Kirsten (*RE*, 1726): second half of fifth century; von Gärtringen (*SIG* ³56): after 450: Cum et Cretes quinto saeculo communes Graecorum res parum curarent, et Argivi, postquam a. 450 pacem cum Lacedaemoniis sanxerunt, usque ad Niciae pacem neque Spartanis neque Atheniensibus faverent, facile fieri potuit, ut inter hos neutrorum partes secutos arctiores necessitates, quae iam coloniarum deductarum fama nitebantur, illis potissimum annis (450–421) restituerentur. Jeffery, *LSAG*, p. 165, notes the occurrence of later letter forms in A, which casts some doubt on a date fixed securely in the 450s: '[the Tylissos stone] shows a curious mixture of earlier and later forms: β1, γ1 or 4, θ1, ν4–5, ν3, φ3, ψ3. ν5 is not normal even in Attic before the third quarter of the fifth century. This would not quite suit Vollgraff's thesis... It is perhaps easier to imagine Argos active in Crete during her alliance with Athens than after her peace with Sparta; but in that case the Argive mason who cut the copy for Tylis[s]os was in the forefront of fashion with his ν5'.

[3] See, e.g. Jeffery, *LSAG*, p. 165: 'Vollgraff has put forward the attractive hypothesis that the fragments... are in fact a part of the same decree'; Meiggs–Lewis, *GHI*, p.102: 'it seems highly probable that the two texts belong together'.

[4] Vollgraff argues in favour of a federation (τὸ πλέθος = 'federal assembly', 'Décret' pp. 20–6) and in favour of Argos as the mother city of Crete ('Décret', pp. 37f., pp. 91–104); Kahrstedt (pp. 90–1) proposes a bilateral agreement between Argos and Knossos, a view supported by Gschnitzer, who maintains also that Tylissos 'ist argivisches Territorium' (p. 46).

such a federal union would represent a remarkable advance in the development of Greek political institutions. In this paper we shall press a philological point based upon the information we have both from the treaty and from contemporary sources, and in so doing, we shall attempt to show that a federal union is unlikely. We shall then offer our own interpretation of the regulations governing the insular cities with regard to the formation of alliances and the declaration of friends and enemies.

The primary evidence for the existence of a federal union rests in the articles of the treaty inscribed on the Tylissos stone. These articles provide for the formation of new alliances and the designation of friends and enemies according to a vote of τὸ πλέθος. The passage as printed here follows the text and restorations of Vollgraff.

A 6–11   *New alliances, Argives have one third of the vote.*
σπονδὰς νεοτ||[έρας] μὲ τίθεσθαι μεδατέρο||[νς, αἰ] μὲ συνδοκοῖ τôι πλέθε||[ι, συνβ]άλλεσθαι δὲ τὰν τρίτ||[αν αἶσ]αν τὸς Ἀργείος τὰν ψά||[φον·
A 11–17   *Friends to enemies, enemies to friends, Tylissians have one third of the vote.*
καὶ] τινας τὸν εὐμενέον | δυσμενέας τιθείμεθα καὶ τ|ὸν δυσμενέον εὐμενέας, μὲ θ|έσθαι, αἰ μὲ συνδοκοῖ τôι πλ|έθει, συνβάλλεσθαι δὲ τὸνς | ἐκ Τυλισô τὰν ψάφον τὰν τρι|ταν αἶσαν.

Here is Vollgraff's translation of the passage:

Ni les uns ni les autres ne feront de nouveaux traités, à moins que l'assemblée fédérale n'y consente; les Argiens auront le tiers des voix. Si nous voulons avoir certains de nos amis pour ennemis, ou certains de nos ennemis pour amis, nous ne ferons rien sans que l'assemblée fédérale y consente; les Tylissiens auront le tiers des voix ('Décret' p. 8).

L'assemblée fédérale is therefore an interpretation[5] of τὸ πλέθος. The following two considerations are relevant here: first, no contemporary example can be found of πλῆθος meaning 'a federal assembly', and second, the existence of a federal assembly is not required in order to make sense of the treaty as it is written. We shall first consider Vollgraff's citations of the word in support of his hypothesis; then we shall investigate how the word is used by Herodotus, Thucydides, and in various inscriptions; whereupon we shall suggest an interpretation of the treaty using τὸ πλέθος in its sense of 'the People'.[6]

This would seem unlikely, however, given the fact that the treaty's provisions appear to assure the rights of Tylissos against her stronger neighbour; the purpose of such assurances must surely be to maintain the independent status of Tylissos. Graham (pp. 156–7; 234–9) has a thorough discussion of both points of view in which he disposes of the theory advanced by Kahrstedt. The existence of a federation is needed to support Graham's argument for a metropolis–colony connection between Argos and the island cities.

[5] Of those scholars listed in note 1, their translations of τὸ πλέθος or interpretations of the passage in which it occurs are as follows. Chatzidakis: Στίχ. 8. τῶι πλέθει ἐνταῦθα συνώνυμον τῶι τοῖς πολλοῖς ἢ τοῖς πλείοισι, τῆι πλειοψηφίαι... (p. 97). Kahrstedt: τὸ πλέθος is a 'Volksversammlung' (p. 88), but the voting takes place city by city in chronological succession (p. 90). Bengtson translates both occurrences of τὸ πλέθος by 'Bundesversammlung' (p. 52). Kirsten finds a political arrangement among the three cities, but he is noncommittal as to the nature of the arrangement: 'Tylissos ist sekundär in eine Abmachung zwischen Argos und Knossos eintritt ...' (*RE*, p. 1723). Graham: 'the assembly' (p. 237); 'Vollgraff has shown that the word πλῆθος must here mean the assembly of the allies to which delegates are sent ...' (p. 240). Meiggs and Lewis: 'federal assembly' (p. 103), 'the text seems to imply a federal structure in which Argos, Knossos, Tylissos ... are linked ...' (p. 104). Fornara: 'the (common?) assembly' (p. 88), 'or, "the majority"' (p. 89 n.).

[6] Support for the meaning 'the People' is given by Gschnitzer in his discussion of Kahrstedt, but he does not develop the idea further: '[Kahrstedt] meint, es hätten der Reihe nach die Volksversammlungen (das πλῆθος) von Knossos, Tylissos, Argos zu entscheiden, wobei derjenigen, die als dritte abstimme, praktisch die Entscheidung zufiele. Aber diese Deutung wird dem Wortlaut offenbar nicht gerecht: es ist deutlich von *einem* πλῆθος die Rede, und die Deutung der τρίτα αἶσα im Sinn der Zeitfolge hat etwas Gezwungenes; zumal dann die Parallele zu den Bestimmungen über die Aufteilung der Beute wegfällt' (p. 48 n.).

Vollgraff bases his interpretation of τὸ πλέθος on three sources: Thucydides 5.30.1, Sparta's complaints to Corinth for not signing the Peace of Nikias; Tod ii. 127 (= *IG* ii² 2.97; *Staatsverträge* 263; Syll³ 151), a treaty between Athens and Corcyra dated to 375/4; and *Insc. Cret.* i, xxiv, 2, an inscription from Priansos concerning a grant of proxenia by the Council of Crete which dates to the second century B.C.

The phrase [Κρηταιέων]πλῆθος occurs in lines 5–6 and 12–13 of the stone from Priansos, the last of the above-mentioned documents. Democratic Crete of the second century did have a federal assembly,[7] and [Κρηταιέων]πλῆθος may indeed refer to this federal body; but the evidence from a second-century inscription may not be applied to relations existing among Crete's cities during the mid-fifth century. Vollgraff correctly observes that the absence of *le régime démocratique*, which was not in place on the island until the third century, does not preclude a federal arrangement. Following Aristotle's discussion of Cretan constitutions in *Politics* II,[8] in which it is stated that the popular assemblies lent their approval to decisions made by the κόσμοι and γέροντες, Vollgraff envisions a situation wherein τὸ πλέθος of the three cities acts in a similar capacity: 'Si, dans notre texte, on entend πλῆθος comme synonyme de δᾶμος ou ἐκκλησία, le traité obligerait le gouvernement de Knossos et celui de Tylissos de faire ratifier par le peuple la conclusion de nouveaux traités d'alliance'. Some such arrangement may have been in effect on the island in the second century; however, we must find documentation of the same practice in the fifth century if Vollgraff's hypothesis is to stand.

We now turn to Vollgraff's evidence from the fourth century and give the relevant passages from Tod ii. 127, a law regulating affairs between the Athenian Empire and Corcyra, 375/4:

πό[λ]ε[μ]ον δὲ καὶ εἰ|ρήνην μὴ ἐξεῖναι Κορκυραίοις ποιήσασ|θαι [ἄ]νευ Ἀθηναίων καὶ [τοῦ π]λήθους τῶν σ|υμμάχων· ποιεῖν δὲ καὶ τἀλλα κατὰ τὰ δόγ|ματα τῶν συμμάχων. ὅρκος· (12–15)

καὶ περὶ πολέμου καὶ ε|ἰρήνης πράξω καθ' ὅτι ἄν τῶι πλήθει τῶν σ|υμμάχων δοκῇ, καὶ τἀλλα ποιήσω κατὰ [τ]ὰ | [δ]όγματα τῶν συμμάχων. (20–3)

περὶ πολέμ[ο]υ κ[αὶ εἰρή]|[νης πράξω καθ' ὅτ]ι κ[α] Ἀ[θ]ηναίο[ι]ς κ[α]ὶ [τῶι] π[λήθει τῶν συμμάχ]ων δ[ο]κῇ, κ[αὶ τἀ]λλα ποι[ήσω κατὰ τὰ δόγματα] τὰ Ἀθηνα[ί]ων κα[ὶ τῶ]ν | [συμμάχων. (31–5)

The bi-cameral nature of the Second Athenian Sea League is generally recognized.[9] The Athenian Demos did not have a seat in the Synedrion; the two bodies voted separately. Hence it is clear that what is meant by Ἀθηναίων καὶ τοῦ πλήθους τῶν συμμάχων in the above treaty is 'the Athenians and the majority of the allies', and not 'the federal assembly (comprised) of the Athenians and their allies'. Moreover, in accordance with contemporary terminology πλῆθος is not used when referring to an assembly of allies. Members of the συνέδριον were called σύνεδροι as in the League Charter, Syll³ 147, 378/7 B.C.:

ἐὰν δέ τις ὠνῆται ἢ κτᾶται ἢ τι|θῆται τρόπωι ὁτωιόν, ἐξεῖναι τῶι βολο|μένωι τῶν συμμάχων φῆναι πρὸς τὸς συν|έδρος τῶν συμμάχων· οἱ δὲ σύνεδροι ἀπο||[δ]όμενοι ἀποδόντων [τὸ μὲν ἥ]μισυ τῶ[ι] φήναντι, τὸ δὲ ἄ|[λλο κοι]νὸν [ἔσ]τω τῶν συ[μμ]άχων· (42–6)

---

[7] Cf. P. V. M. Benecke, *CAH* viii. 291.

[8] The key passage is: ἐκκλησίας δὲ μετέχουσι πάντες· κυρία δ' οὐδενός ἐστιν ἀλλ' ἢ συνεπιψηφίσασθαι τὰ δόξαντα τοῖς γέρουσι καὶ τοῖς κόσμοις, *Polit.* II.vii. 4 (1272a) where Volgraff would have ἐκκλησία = πλῆθος.

[9] See, e.g. R. Sealey, *History* (1976), p. 410; P. Culhan, 'Delian League, Bi-cameral or Unicameral?', *AJAH* 3 (1978), 27–31; M. Cary, *CAH* vi(iii). 73.

and again in a treaty of the Athenians with the Corcyreans, Acarnanians, and Cephallenians, *Syll*³ 150, 375/4 B.C.:

π[έμψαι δὲ καὶ συνέδρο]ὶς τῶν πό[λ]εων ἑκάστην ἐς τὸ συ[νέδριον τῶν συμμάχω|ν] κατὰ τὰ δόγματα τῶσσυμμάχω[ν καὶ τὸ δήμο τὸ 'Αθην|α]ίων. (23–5)

Herodotus, who applies the usage of his own age, writes τὸ συνέδριον to refer to the congress of the Greeks at Salamis after the fall of the Athenian citadel: νύξ τε ἐγίνετο καὶ οἱ διαλυθέντες ἐκ τοῦ συνεδρίου ἐσέβαινον ἐς τὰς νέας (8.56) and again on the occasion of Themistokles' strategem: ἐνθαῦτα Θεμιστοκλέης ὡς ἐσσοῦτο τῆι γνώμηι ὑπὸ τῶν Πελοποννησίων, λαθὼν ἐξέρχεται ἐκ τοῦ συνεδρίου... (8.75). Thucydides refers to the congress of the Delian League as αἱ σύνοδοι (1.96.2). At no time does either author employ πλῆθος to refer to an assembly of delegates from several cities.[10]

We shall now consider Vollgraff's evidence closest to the time of the treaty, Thucydides 5.30.1, in which the Spartans express their discontent with the Corinthians:

Λακεδαιμόνιοι δὲ αἰσθόμενοι τὸν θροῦν τοῦτον ἐν τῆι Πελοποννήσωι καθεστῶτα καὶ τοὺς Κορινθίους διδασκάλους τε γενομένους καὶ αὐτοὺς μέλλοντας σπείσεσθαι πρὸς τὸ Ἄργος, πέμπουσι πρέσβεις ἐς τὴν Κόρινθον βουλόμενοι προκαταλαβεῖν τὸ μέλλον, καὶ ἠιτιῶντο τήν τε ἐσήγησιν τοῦ παντὸς καὶ εἰ 'Αργείοις σφῶν ἀποστάντες ξύμμαχοι ἔσονται, παραβήσεσθαί τε ἔφασαν αὐτοὺς τοὺς ὅρκους, καὶ ἤδη ἀδικεῖν ὅτι οὐ δέχονται τὰς 'Αθηναίων σπονδάς, εἰρημένον κύριον εἶναι ὅτι ἂν τὸ πλῆθος τῶν ξυμμάχων ψηφίσηται, ἢν μή τι θεῶν ἢ ἡρώων κώλυμα ἦι.

Gomme, Andrewes, and Dover remind us that this is the *locus classicus* for the constitution of the Peloponnesian League, reading here 'the majority vote'. Again, Classen-Steup *ad loc*. say: 'τὸ πλῆθος, die Majorität wie I.25.1.' The Crawley translation gives: 'the decision of the majority of the allies'; the translation of C. Forster Smith in the Loeb series: 'whatever the majority of the allies decreed...' Jacqueline de Romilly's Budé translation has 'la majorité des alliés'. And the *Lexicon Thucydideum* of B. E. A. Bétant has *ad loc*.: 'major pars'. Vollgraff's interpretation of the Thucydidean passage is not supported.

Inscriptional evidence points likewise in the same direction. In the oath contained in the Regulations for Erythrai, perhaps 453/2 B.C., but of uncertain date (Meiggs–Lewis 40 = *IG* i². 10.21, 22), the Erythraians swear:

βολεύσο hος ἂν [δύ]νο[μ]α[ι] ἄριστ[α κα|ὶ] δ[ι]κα[ιότα]τα 'Ερυθραίον τôι πλέθει καὶ 'Αθεναίον καὶ τὸν [χσυ]νμά[χ]ον [κ]αὶ οὐκ [ἀπος]τέσομαι 'Αθεναίον τὸ π[λ]έθος οὐδὲ [τ]ὸν] χσυνμάχον τὸν 'Αθεναίον... (21–4)

I shall give counsel as best and as honestly as I am able to the People of the Erythraians and of the Athenians and of the allies, and I shall not revolt from the People of the Athenians nor of the allies of the Athenians...[11]

---

[10] πλῆθος is indeed a common word in the Greek language. Herodotus uses πλῆθος or an oblique form 93 times, Thucydides 130 times, Thucydides 130 times. It is demonstrable in each instance that the word has one of its three accustomed meanings. (1) 'many, large number': Thuc. 2.89.1 Phormion addresses the frightened Athenian troops: ὁρῶν ὑμᾶς, ὦ ἄνδρες στρατιῶται, πεφοβημένους τὸ πλῆθος τῶν ἐναντίων ξυνεκάλεσα... (2) 'majority': Thuc. 1.125.1 Vote of the Peloponnesian League for war: οἱ δὲ Λακεδαιμόνιοι ἐπειδὴ ἀφ' ἁπάντων ἤκουσαν γνώμην, ψῆφον ἐπήγαγον τοῖς ξυμμάχοις ἅπασιν ὅσοι παρῆσαν ἑξῆς, καὶ μείζονι καὶ ἐλάσσονι πόλει· καὶ τὸ πλῆθος ἐψηφίσαντο πολεμεῖν. (3) 'the People, the Plebs, popular assembly': Thuc. 4.21.3 Kleon's persuasiveness: μάλιστα δὲ αὐτοὺς ἐνῆγε Κλέων ὁ Κλεαινέτου, ἀνὴρ δημαγωγὸς κατ' ἐκεῖνον τὸν χρόνον ὢν καὶ τῶι πλήθει πιθανώτατος·

[11] So K.-W. Welwei, '"Demos" und "Plethos" in athenischen Volksbeschlüssen um 450 v. Chr.', *Historia* 35 (1986), 181: 'Entsprechend kann τὸ πλῆθος in Erythrai nicht nur die breite Masse sein. Gemeint ist vielmehr auch hier die Bürgerschaft von Erythrai in ihrer Gesamtheit,

Also in the Law of the East Lokrians, perhaps *c.* 500–475 B.C. (Meiggs–Lewis 20 = *SIG* 47):

*hόσστις ⋮ κα τὰ ϝεϝαδεϙότα ⋮ διαφθείρει ⋮ τέχναι καὶ μαχανᾶι ⋮ κα\ὶ μιᾶι, ⋮ hότι κα μὲ ἀνϕ-
οτάροις ⋮ δοκέει, ⋮ hοποντίον τε χιλίον ⋮ πλέθ\αι καὶ Ναϝπακτίον ⋮ τὸν ἐπιϝοίϙον πλέθαι, ⋮
ἄτιμον εἶμεν ⋮ καὶ χρέ\ματα παματοφαγεῖσται⋮* (38–41)

Whoever subverts these decisions on any pretext or by any device whatsoever, save so far as is resolved by both parties, the assembly of the Opuntian Thousand and the assembly of the Naupaktian colonists, he shall be without rights and his property shall be confiscated (trans. Meiggs–Lewis, p. 39).

Again in a law of the Lokrians concerning the settlement of new territory, perhaps 525–500 B.C. (Meiggs–Lewis 13 = Wilamowitz, *Sitz. Berl.* 1927.7–17):

*αἰ μὲ πολέμοι ἀνανκαζομένοις δόξξαι ἀ\νδράσιν hενὶ κέκατον ἀριστίνδαν τôι πλέθει ἄνδρας
δια\κατίος μεῖστον ἀξξιομάχος ἐπιϝοίκος ἐφάγεσθαι...* (A 7–9)

Unless under the pressure of war a majority of 101 men chosen from the best citizens decide to bring in at least 200 fighting men as additional settlers... (trans. Meiggs–Lewis, p. 24).

Finally, LSJ[9] under $\pi\lambda\hat{\eta}\theta os$ cite our decree as a fifth-century example of the word, and they do not give 'federal assembly' as a meaning either in the context of this decree or in any other passage. We note LSJ's other inscriptional citations: fifth-century Lokrian (Meiggs–Lewis 13, above) 'by a majority'; and the Erythrai Decree (Meiggs–Lewis 40, above) 'The commons, plebs, popular assembly'.

We have been unable to find convincing evidence to support the meaning of $\tau\grave{o}$ $\pi\lambda\acute{\epsilon}\theta os$ as 'federal assembly'. We now suggest that the term be interpreted as 'the People', a meaning which has a greater likelihood of truth by virtue of stronger support from the information available to us. Our investigation will continue along the following lines: first, linguistic: evidence for the close association of Argos and $\tau\grave{o}$ $\pi\lambda\acute{\epsilon}\theta os$ from the syntax, grammar and vocabulary of the treaty; second, contextual: the ratification process as defined by the treaty itself; and third, external: evidence from Thucydides which supports the hypotheses of items one and two.

If $\pi\lambda\hat{\eta}\theta os$ were a rare word, and if the date of the inscription were demonstrably outside of the fifth century, the hypothesis of an Argivo-Cretan federal assembly might be arguable; we have shown, however, that within the context of the fifth century, $\pi\lambda\hat{\eta}\theta os$ should mean 'a large number', or 'the majority' or 'the People'. Allowing, for the moment, that $\tau\grave{o}$ $\pi\lambda\acute{\epsilon}\theta os$ means the majority, the cities with which we are concerned are three in number: Argos, Knossos, and Tylissos. In any vote taken by these cities, the outcome must always result in a majority: 3-0, 2-1. A majority is the inevitable outcome whenever three parties vote. If representatives of the three cities did actually meet – all in the same place (Vollgraff) or successively *in ecclesia* (Kahrstedt) – to vote on alliances and/or the determination of friends and enemies, the winner in the voting would be called 'the majority' whether the treaty defined it as such, or not.[12] The language of the treaty need hardly seek to clarify the results of the vote for those islanders who may have trouble counting to three, so that a *de jure* stipulation that 'the majority' be the winner of the vote serves no purpose.

die übrigens in diesem Dekret (2.20) auch als Demos bezeichnet wird'. Welwei cites W. Schuller, *Die Herrschaft der Athener im Ersten Seebund* (Berlin–New York, 1974), p. 89, who takes $\pi\lambda\acute{\epsilon}\theta os$ here as 'die Masse des Volkes im Gegensatz zum Adel'.

[12] In fact Chatzidakis, who takes $\tau\grave{o}$ $\pi\lambda\acute{\epsilon}\theta os$ to mean 'the majority', considers the intervention of Argos to be 'superfluous' (*ἡ ἀνάμιχις τοῦ "Αργους ἦτο περιττή*, p. 96) in a situation wherein each of the three cities has one third of the vote.

Finally, it is quite unclear how the vote would be apportioned under this arrangement, even with one-third going to Argos or Tylissos. Let us therefore rule out the meaning 'the majority' along with 'the federal assembly'.

We move finally to a consideration of 'the People' as a meaning for τὸ πλέθος. The legislative bodies of democratic cities are not infrequently known as τὸ πλῆθος, as for example, τοῦ πλήθεος τοῦ 'Αθηναίων Hdt. 5.76; 'Αθηναίων γοῦν τὸ πλῆθος Thuc. 1.20.2; τῶι γὰρ πλήθει τῶν Πλαταιῶν Thuc. 2.3.3. Indeed, specific mention is made of the People of Argos by Thucydides 5.41.3: ἐκέλευον δ' οἱ Λακεδαιμόνιοι, πρὶν τέλος τι αὐτῶν ἔχειν, ἐς τὸ "Αργος πρῶτον ἐπαναχωρήσαντας αὐτοὺς δεῖξαι τῶι πλήθει. Considering the fact that the provisions of the treaty were made under the auspices of democratic Argos, it is not unreasonable that τὸ πλέθος in this context makes sense with the meaning 'the People (of some city or other)'. It has been noted above that on fifth-century Crete, the People had not yet attained the position of authority which they already held in the democracies of the mainland. Therefore, it is possible that in the absence of democratic assemblies on Crete, the People referred to in the inscription are the People of Argos.

Consideration of the following words from the passage may help us to such a conclusion:

μεδατέρο|[νς, line 7, means 'neither of the two', and naturally refers to the two island cities; it is doubtful that Argos would limit her own right to make alliances. **συνδοκοῖ**, line 8, should not be translated as if it were the same word as δοκέω, a verb appearing frequently in decrees. This less common compound is given by LSJ as 'to seem good also'. Among the various citations, the one whose context most closely approaches the usage here is from Thucydides 8.84: ξυνεδόκει δὲ καὶ τοῖς ἄλλοις ξυμμάχοις ταῦτα. Accordingly we read here 'unless it seems good also to τὸ πλέθος'. **δέ**, lines 9 and 15. As it occurs in both part A and B of the treaty, δέ is often connective, indicating the transition from one article to another, i.e. A 17–18: αἰ δὲ μάχα γένοιτ|ο μὲ παρέντον τὸν ἀτέρον, κτλ, 'and if there should be a battle when one of the two is not present, etc.' Adversative δέ occurring in lines 9 and 15 lends special emphasis to its respective clauses: *but* the Argives shall cast one-third of the vote; *but* those from Tylissos shall cast one-third of the vote. The emphasis of δέ is furthermore directed to the second element of the αἰ clause. Clearly, then, either in making new treaties or declaring friends and enemies, the approval of τὸ πλέθος receives no particular emphasis, but the stipulation that one party is entitled to one-third of the vote *is* an unusual and perhaps unexpected voting arrangement, hence it is signalled by adversative δέ.

σπονδὰς νεοτ|[έρας], lines 6–7; **τὸς 'Αργείος**, line 10. First and second declension accusatives plural regularly appear in their more archaic Cretan form (-ανς, -ονς) in both inscriptions A and B. We note with interest that the only aberrations from the local dialect in A[13] occur in the vicinity of Argive institutions, and that these forms appear to be heralded twice by adversative δέ. While this does not prove anything, a possible explanation could be a close association of τὸ πλέθος with the Argives. **τιθείμεθα**, line 12, that is, 'We Tylissians and Knossians'. So Vollgraff, 'Décret', p. 24. Support for 'We the Tylissians and Knossians' as subject of τιθείμεθα may be found in the parallel usage at B 5 *hέλομες συνανφότεροι*, and B 29–30 *τὸ Μαχανεῖ θύομ|ες*. The repeated use of forms of ἀμφότερος and μεδάτερος throughout the two documents with reference to Knossos and Tylissos justify our taking them as subject of τιθέμεθα.

---

[13] The only instance in B is ἐ|πὶ κόσμος (41–2).

συνβάλλεσθαι, line 15. LSJ give 'to vote', and cite only this occurrence as an example. Perhaps by analogy with συνδοκοῖ above συνβάλλεσθαι means here 'to vote also', the implication being that both τὸ πλέθος and the Argives are doing something 'along with' (συν-) the two island cities.

ἐκ Τυλισō, line 16, 'outside of Tylissos' as opposed to within the city. (So also Vollgraff, 'Décret', p. 25.) This could take place somewhere on Crete, or the Tylissian delegates might indeed cast their votes before the People at Argos.

αἶσαν, lines 10 and 17. An unusual word-choice if the meaning is 'part'. One would expect μέρος, as in τὸ τρίτον μέρος of B 6. Indeed, Kahrstedt's opinion is that 'die Bedeutung kann nur sein "der dritte Teil" in chronologischer Reihenfolge' (op. cit. (n. 1), p. 90). αἶσα is part of the epic vocabulary, and in a brief look at how Homer uses the word, it is certain that when King Priamos says, εἰ δέ μοι αἶσα | τεθνάμεναι παρὰ νηυσὶν... (*Iliad* 24.224–5), he is talking about the lot apportioned to him in life. But, on the other hand, when Achilleus recalls having promised Menoitios that he would bring back his son Ἴλιον ἐκπέρσαντα, λαχόντα τε ληΐδος αἶσαν (18.327), he means that Patroklos will be alloted his *share* of the spoils.[14] Also when Odysseus, disguised as a beggar, tells Eumaeus that there is still some hope for his own return, he does so using the phrase ἔτι γάρ...ἐλπίδος αἶσα (*Od.* 16.101), 'For there is still a share of hope'.[15] Clearly, αἶσα can be used to show a share or portion of the whole, and this usage is not far from the reading 'a one-third share of the vote'.[16]

Let us look again at our passage of the treaty with 'the People of Argos' and the foregoing suggestions in mind.

> σπονδὰς νεοτ-
> [έρας] μὲ τίθεσθαι μεδατέρο-
> [νς, αἰ] μὲ συνδοκοῖ τοι πλέθε-
> [ι, συνβ]άλλεσθαι δὲ τὰν τρίτ-
> [αν αἶσ]αν τὸς Ἀργείος τὰν ψά-   10
> [φον· καὶ] τινας τὸν εὐμενέον
> δυσμενέας τιθείμεθα καὶ τ-
> ὸν δυσμενέον εὐμενέας, μὲ θ-
> έσθαι, αἰ μὲ συνδοκοῖ τοι πλ-
> έθει, συνβάλλεσθαι δὲ τὸνς   15
> ἐκ Τυλισō τὰν ψάφον τὰν τρί-
> ταν αἶσαν. (A 6–17)

The passage A 6–17 may now be translated thus:

Neither of the two, Tylissos or Knossos, shall make a new treaty unless it seems good also to the People of Argos; and the Argives shall cast also the third part of the votes. And if we Tylissians and Knossians make some of our friends enemies and some of our enemies friends, we will not, unless it seems good also to the People of Argos; and those from out of Tylissos shall cast also the third part of the votes.

We shall now consider exactly who is allowed to vote according to article A 6–11, which contains provisions for the formation and ratification of new treaties. There are four parties named therein. They are:

(1) and (2) μεδατέρο|[νς] (7–8)
(3) τοι πλέθε‖[ι] (8–9)
(4) τὸς Ἀργείος (10).

[14] Similar passages with the phrase λαχὼν ἀπὸ ληΐδος αἶσαν occur in *Od.* 5.40 and 13.138.
[15] Odysseus employs the same words in a reference to his return when speaking to the servant Melantho at 19.84.
[16] Of course this does not explain the occurrence of μέρος in τὸ τρίτον μέρος in B 6. Perhaps this discrepancy in terminology may be used as evidence that A and B, while contemporary, are not parts of the same decree.

We know that μεδατέρο‖[νς] refers to the Tylissians and the Knossians because the article itself is concerned with how these two cities will make new treaties. The Argives are mentioned explicitly. This leaves τôι πλέθε‖[ι] as the unknown factor. We know from the next article of the treaty, A 11–17, that the Tylissians take part in the voting on the designation of friends and enemies; they are, in fact, specifically assigned one-third of the vote. If the subject of τιθείμεθα (12) is 'We, the Tylissians and Knossians', then both the Tylissians and Knossians vote in the designation of friends and enemies. In fact the difference between σπονδὰς νεοτέρας τιθέσθαι and εὐμενέον δυσμενέας τιθείμεθα, κτλ may simply exist in whether the pact is negotiated amidst hostilities or whether an existing pact is changed because hostilities are imminent.[17] As for the other two parties in lines 9–11, it is spelled out that the Argives shall cast one-third of the vote, and by συνδοκοî (8) it is implied that τὸ πλέθος is also a voting body. It would be possible, but impractical, to apportion the remaining two-thirds of the vote among these three parties (the Tylissians, the Knossians and τὸ πλέθος) at two-ninths of the vote each. Another solution would be to envision a situation wherein our unknown, τὸ πλέθος, is identified with one of the three other parties named in the article. This way the voting is distributed equally in thirds. (If τὸ πλέθος could be identified jointly with the other three, the result might be called a federal union. We have already shown the unlikelihood of that possibility, however.)

A 17–20, which follows the article on the making of friends and enemies, provides for an emergency truce of five days *without* requiring the consultation of τὸ πλέθος:

αἰ δὲ μάχα γένοιτ‖ο μὲ παρέντον τὸν ἀτέρον, σπ‖ονδὰς θέσθο 'ν τôι δεομένο‖ι πέντε ἀμέρανς.

If τὸ πλέθος were a local Cretan body, it could quickly vote whether to approve such a truce – particularly if the Tylissian army could serve as an *ad hoc* πλῆθος, and a vote could be taken on the spot. But if τὸ πλέθος is a permanent body which sits elsewhere, the five-day period would be sufficient for word to be brought to and action to be taken by, as we suggest, Argos.

The following scenario should illustrate the machinery of the treaty in operation. Let us say that under the provisions of A 11–17: (*a*) Knossos declares a certain city to be her friend; (*b*) Tylissos, previously having declared this city an enemy, views the action of Knossos as a threat to her security; accordingly Tylissos votes against the alliance; (*c*) the matter is now brought before τὸ πλῆθος of Argos, which, upon hearing the arguments of both sides, disapproves; (*d*) because the vote of each party counts one-third, the Knossian alliance becomes invalid. We see, therefore, how the interests of smaller Tylissos are protected by the stipulation that her vote counts one-third, and by her right to refer the matter to Argos for arbitration.[18]

Finally, let us turn to Thucydides Book 5, a source rich in its description of the role which the Argives played in the alliances and negotations, both public and secret, which took place in the aftermath of the Peace of Nikias in the eleventh year of the war. We take up Thucydides' account following approval of the Peace, as the Korinthians make a detour to Argos. There they endeavour to persuade certain magistrates that the treaty between Sparta and Athens, once her bitterest enemy, was

[17] Note that while both cities vote, Knossos and Tylissos will not always be in concord in such designations. For this reason, the treaty specifies an arbitrator – Argos – to resolve the issue.

[18] An analogous, but non-Greek situation (where a popular assembly is empowered to break a tie resulting from the disagreement of two other bodies) may be found in Aristotle's discussion of the Carthaginian constitution (*Politics* 1273a23). Here, matters are submitted to the People in the event of a disagreement between the King and the Council of Elders: τοῦ μὲν γὰρ τὸ μὲν προσάγειν τὸ δὲ μὴ προσάγειν πρὸς τὸν δῆμον οἱ βασιλεῖς κύριοι μετὰ τῶν γερόντων ἂν ὁμογνωμονῶσι πάντες, εἰ δὲ μή, καὶ τούτων ὁ δῆμος.

made with a view towards the enslavement of the Peloponnesos. They urge the Argives to save the Peloponnesos by decreeing that any city of Hellas that wanted could enter into an alliance with the Argives for mutual defence. The Korinthians further advise the Argives

ἀποδεῖξαι δὲ ἄνδρας ὀλίγους ἀρχὴν αὐτοκράτορας καὶ μὴ πρὸς τὸν δῆμον τοὺς λόγους εἶναι, τοῦ μὴ καταφανεῖς γίγνεσθαι τοὺς μὴ πείσαντας τὸ πλῆθος· (27.2)

An independent commission would conduct the negotiations. No debate, however, would take place before the Demos, lest, in the event that the prospective allies failed to persuade a majority, they would be detected by the Lakedaimonians.[19] Thucydides imputes on the part of the Korinthians the knowledge that alliances normally were debated and voted on by the People of Argos.

Subsequently, the Argives did put through a proposal similar to what the Korinthians had suggested. Thucydides' wording is especially important in our interpretation of the inscription from Tylissos.

ἐπειδὴ ἀνήνεγκαν τοὺς λόγους ἔς τε τὰς ἀρχὰς καὶ τὸν δῆμον, ἐψηφίσαντο 'Αργεῖοι καὶ ἄνδρας εἵλοντο δώδεκα ... (28.1)

after they referred the matter to the magistrates and to the People, the Argives voted and chose twelve men...

This phrase is strikingly parallel to the wording of A 6–11, wherein neither of the two insular cities may make new treaties

αἰ] μὲ συνδοκοῖ τōι πλέθε∥[ι, συνβ]άλλεσθαι δὲ τὰν τρίτ∥[αν αἶσ]αν τὸς 'Αργείος τὰν ψά∥[φον·

In Thucydides, however, we know that τὰς ἀρχὰς καὶ τὸν δῆμον are unmistakably οἱ 'Αργεῖοι. It is tempting to conclude that by analogy τὸ πλέθος of the Tylissos stone is likewise the People of Argos.[20]

There is yet another parallel between the two documents. Thucydides tells us that the members of the Argive commission are instructed to make an alliance with any of the Hellenes who wants

πλὴν 'Αθηναίων καὶ Λακεδαιμονίων· τούτων δὲ μηδετέροις ἐξεῖναι ἄνευ τοῦ δήμου τοῦ 'Αργείων σπείσασθαι. (28.1)

This sounds very much like the wording of the Tylissos decree, in which also the two cities and the approval of τὸ πλέθος are likewise involved in making a new treaty.

The right of the Argive People to vote on treaties with Sparta (or Athens) is in one case observed, and in another flagrantly violated. In the summer of the twelfth year of the war, the Argives still lacked a treaty with the Boiotians, and, faced with a separate agreement between the Lakedaimonians and the Boiotians as well as the destruction of Panakton, they feared being left alone and desertion of the entire symmachy to the Lakedaimonians. Moreover, they believed that the possibility of an alliance with the Athenians would no longer be open to them. So, quite at a loss over this state of affairs, and afraid of fighting with the Lakedaimonians and Tegeates, Boiotians and Athenians all at once, the Argives sent envoys to Sparta to obtain the best terms possible (5.40). Upon their reaching an agreement,

ἐκέλευον δ' οἱ Λακεδαιμόνιοι, πρὶν τέλος τι αὐτῶν ἔχειν, ἐς τὸ "Αργος πρῶτον ἐπαναχωρήσαντας αὐτοὺς δεῖξαι τῶι πλήθει, καὶ ἢν ἀρέσκοντα ἦι, ἥκειν ἐς τὰ 'Υακίνθια τοὺς ὅρκους ποιησομένους. (41.3)

[19] ἵνα μὴ φωραθῶσιν ὑπὸ τῶν Λακεδαιμονίων οἱ συνθέμενοι τοῖς 'Αργείοις explains the scholiast.

[20] A modern equivalent to both the Thucydidean and the Tylissian phrases might be, 'neither of the two cities may make a new treaty unless Congress agrees, and the Americans shall cast one-third of the vote'.

Here a treaty is subject to the approval of τὸ πλῆθος, and the word is used in a context where its meaning is indisputably 'the People of Argos'.

Two years later, the Spartans and their allies found it necessary to invade the Argolid, because the Epidaurians were hard pressed by the Argives. Meeting the enemy on the Argive plain, the majority of the Argive alliance considered their situation to be ἐν καλῶι. However, two Argive citizens, Thrasylos, one of the five generals, and Alkiphron, proxenos of the Lakedaimonians, approached King Agis before the engagement of hostilities, and immediately arranged a truce. Thucydides states that the host led by the Spartans was the finest yet to have been assembled (60.3), so that it may indeed have been in the best interests of the Argives not to fight. Nevertheless, Thrasylos and Alkiphron acted out of complete disregard for the right of the People of Argos to approve the truce:

καὶ οἱ μὲν ταῦτα εἰπόντες τῶν Ἀργείων ἀφ᾽ ἑαυτῶν καὶ οὐ τοῦ πλήθους κελεύσαντος εἶπον· (60.1)

Again τὸ πλῆθος is the People of Argos. The truce had been made without consultation with anyone ἐν τέλει on the Spartan side and without a vote of τὸ πλῆθος on the Argive side. Agis is held subsequently ἐν αἰτίαι... πολλῆι (60.2) by the Lakedaimonians and their allies for having missed an excellent opportunity. How strongly the Argives reacted to this unauthorized and impromptu treaty may be seen from how they dealt with Thrasylos and Alkiphron:

Ἀργεῖοι δὲ καὶ αὐτοὶ ἔτι ἐν πολλῶι πλέονι αἰτίαι εἶχον τοὺς σπεισαμένους ἄνευ τοῦ πλήθους, νομίζοντες κἀκεῖνοι μὴ ἄν σφίσι ποτὲ κάλλιον παρασχὸν Λακεδαιμονίους διαπεφευγέναι· πρός τε γὰρ τῆι σφετέραι πόλει καὶ μετὰ πολλῶν καὶ ἀγαθῶν ξυμμάχων τὸν ἀγῶνα ἄν γίγνεσθαι. τὸν τε Θράσυλον ἀναχωρήσαντες ἐν τῶι Χαράδρωι, οὖπερ τὰς ἀπὸ στρατείας δίκας πρὶν ἐσιέναι κρίνουσιν, ἤρξαντο λεύειν. ὁ δὲ καταφυγὼν ἐπὶ βωμὸν περιγίγνεται· τὰ μέντοι χρήματα ἐδήμευσαν αὐτοῦ (60.5-6).

Of course the material from Thucydides has shown only the role played by τὸ πλῆθος of Argos in the approval of alliances involving its own πόλις. But it is indeed likely, it being abundantly clear from both stones that Argos has been set up as arbitrator between Knossos and Tylissos, that τὸ πλῆθος of Argos held a similar role in overseeing the alliances of the two Cretan cities.

Neither one nor the other of the two insular cities may form a new alliance without the approval first of the People of Argos. Yet, the Argives do not have veto power when the island cities are in agreement. Their one-third vote gives them only the right to break a tie vote. In effect, this gives the Argives the obligation to protect the interests of the smaller Tylissos. Provisions are made throughout fragment (B) for occasions when the two cities do take part in a combined effort, but they need not do so at all times, and therefore there is no reason to think that under the watchful eye of Argos, Tylissos and Knossos are acting together as partners in forming new alliances in an emerging Cretan League. In conclusion, Argos' position is not as partner in a federal assembly where policy is debated, voted upon and implemented. Rather, in the role of hegemon, perhaps even that of metropolis, stronger Argos takes an active part in the affairs of the two smaller island cities. Representative government in a federal union of Greek states is an institution which has yet to come.[21]

Brown University   WILLIAM P. MERRILL
Providence, Rhode Island

[21] The author wishes to thank Professors A. L. Boegehold and C. W. Fornara for their advice and encouragement.