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INTRODUCTION

Greek society is sometimes characterized as an epigraphical society because of the vast number of inscriptions found in Athens. It is possible, however, that erection of large numbers of public inscriptions was not so common in other cities and that the conduct of public business might either have avoided the use of written documents, or that such documents might have been limited to materials other than stone.

This dissertation had its beginning in an attempt to test the validity of the characterization of Greece as an epigraphical society in respect to cities other than Athens. The epigraphical situation of Corinth for example is particularly striking. More than fifty years of excavations there have revealed barely 100 inscriptions from the entire city from its beginnings down to the Roman destruction of 146 B.C. This small number is astonishing and numerous explanations have been attempted. However striking the situation of Corinth may be, I soon realized that it was not the best city for my comparison with Athens because of the lack of evidence.

Consideration of other cities led me to decide upon Sparta as the most logical choice. The city has been
thoroughly excavated over a period of many years; it did not suffer destruction in 146 B.C.; and the literary and epigraphical evidence is more abundant for Sparta than for Corinth.

The possibility of a relation between the rate of literacy or illiteracy and the numbers of public inscriptions erected by ancient cities has often been raised. Desiring to explore the possible relation between literacy and numbers of inscriptions erected, or as in the case of Corinth not erected, I determined to make a fuller study of the question of literacy in Sparta in all periods making use of all literary and epigraphical evidence possible. A similar study of literacy in the city of Corinth did not seem feasible because of the scarcity of evidence; in fact I have found none at all with the possible exception of a chance statement of Cicero to the effect that he had never heard of an orator from Corinth. Because of the importance of the inscriptions for my study of literacy in Sparta and because of the necessity of considering the subject from a chronological point of view, I have arranged the inscriptions in chronological order by centuries whenever possible. It was not long before I discovered that dating Spartan inscriptions is a difficult
matter and that some of the dates published by Tod
and by Kolbe, differ by as much as three centuries. 
Therefore one suspects that many inscriptions assigned
to the second century B.C. may belong to the first and
other errors may be expected. By and large, however,
I think the dates suggested by Kolbe, Tod, Woodward and
others are roughly correct and I have kept them in almost
every instance. In a very few cases it seemed to me
that the dates might be further refined and such per-
sonal preferences are noted in the proper place.

Along with the arrangement of the inscriptions in
chronological order I have attempted to provide as full
a description of the contents of each as was practicable.
In the case of the late lists of magistrates it did not
seem to me useful to provide a description of contents.
A simple statement of type such as "a list of Ephors" or
"a list of names from an unknown board of magistrates"
seemed adequate. For this reason uniformity of style
is not always carried throughout the chapter. Thus
some inscriptions such as the decrees have very full
descriptions, others none at at all. In addition
I have attempted to add interpretations and comments
of my own wherever possible.
The effort to arrange the inscriptions in a usable sequence and in a few cases to suggest possible refinements of dates led me to a consideration of numismatic evidence. The main body of physical evidence for the late Spartan history other than inscriptions and architectural remains is the coins which have survived from the second century B.C., and a small number from the second half of the first century B.C. and later.

The primary goal of my study of the coins of Sparta was the establishment of a date for the bronze coins, but from the first I expected that the study would yield other useful information. Two conclusions (other than the date of the coins) eventually became apparent to me. The first was that Sparta like other cities (except Athens) ceased to operate a local mint after 146 B.C. and was thus, at least in this respect, not accorded a degree of freedom greater than that of other Greek cities. The second conclusion was suggested by the appearance of a few coins with the monogram ϕ. They were struck shortly before 146 B.C. and it is my conclusion that they mark the return of the Ephors to the figurative head of the Spartan magistracy. It had been suggested by the editors of IG, V.1.4 and 5 that the inscriptions were erected during a period when the Ephors were not in power since they
are nowhere mentioned. This is evidence from silence only and therefore not of the best, but the coins do prove that the Ephors were in office at the time they were struck and to a large extent they confirm rather than contradict the theory that the Ephors were not in office when the inscriptions were erected. Therefore it seemed desirable to devote chapter three to certain historical and constitutional questions of the first half of the second century B.C. The main emphasis is on the office of the Ephorate and the chapter is divided into three parts: 1. The literary evidence. 2. The epigraphical evidence. 3. The numismatic evidence.

Thus the final form of this dissertation has come to comprise separate chapters on the most important aspects of my studies: the inscriptions, the chapter on literacy in Sparta, and the chapter on historical and constitutional questions. Each chapter is of roughly equal importance in its own right. That is not to say, of course, that each chapter is not in some way related to the others. For in fact the chapter on literacy could not have been written without the chapter on the inscriptions and the chapter on inscriptions would be less complete without the chapter on Spartan coinage.
In summary the three chapters of this dissertation include:

1. A catalogue of all Spartan inscriptions collected from various sources and arranged in chronological order for the purpose of facilitating my study of literacy in Sparta.

2. The examination of the problem of literacy in Sparta on the basis of the epigraphical evidence collected in chapter one. In addition a critical survey of the literary evidence has been included; my lengthy conclusions are summarized on pages 273-279.

3. A brief historical summary of Sparta's relationship to the Achaean League during the years 188-146 B.C., and an evaluation of the evidence concerning the existence of the Ephorate during these years. In addition to the literary and epigraphical testimony the evidence of the coins has proved most helpful and I have concluded that the Ephors probably returned to power shortly before 150 B.C. It is also concluded that after 146 B.C. Sparta ceased to operate an independent mint and at least in this respect was not accorded a greater degree of freedom than other Greek cities.
An appendix on Corinth studies the practices of the Corinthians in erecting inscriptions. It is concluded that they never set up very many inscriptions but that the high proportion of inscriptions on poros suggests that considerably more once existed on that stone, but because of the delicacy of the material they have perished. The question of why the Corinthians did not erect many inscriptions is important for my study of literacy in Sparta since it might be argued that a high degree of illiteracy is suggested by the paucity of inscriptions in Corinth. Because of the lack of evidence it is unlikely that the question can be answered in the case of Corinth, but it seemed possible that the problem there might throw some light on the relation of literacy to the numbers of inscriptions in Sparta.
CHAPTER I
THE INSCRIPTIONS

The following catalogue of Spartan inscriptions is intended to be complete. All known inscriptions from the city of Sparta are listed in chronological order with the exception of the public decrees which are listed separately because of their importance for my discussion of literacy and the Spartan bureaucracy. Thus the order of inscriptions published by Kolbe in Inscriptiones Graecae, Volume V, fascicle 1 (hereafter: cited as IG.,V.1), is followed only to a very limited extent. Some inscriptions, especially the public decrees, and any which seemed to be of special interest for the question of literacy in Sparta, have been provided with commentary; others have much less commentary, and some such as the very late lists of magistrates have none at all, being merely described as "a list of Ephors" etc.

In every case possible I have included a statement describing the type of stone or other material used, but this information was not always available. In nearly every case I have accepted the dates provided by Kolbe in IG.V.1, or by the editors of inscriptions not found in IG.V.1. At least as often as not, reasons for the dates assigned by Kolbe are not given. Often such inscriptions were probably dated merely on the basis of letter shapes. In many other
cases no dates at all have been suggested by the original editors and I have sometimes attempted to provide my own approximate dates on the basis of letter shapes when photographs or hand drawn facsimiliees of the inscriptions are given. But I have placed the vast majority of these inscriptions in a section reserved for inscriptions of unknown or uncertain date. Thus with very few exceptions the dates given in the following pages are those of the original editor and I have made no attempt to improve them.

For the purpose of easy reference, I have assigned my own number to each inscription in addition to the number given in \textit{IG.\,V.\,l} or to the publication number of inscriptions discovered after the appearance of \textit{IG.\,V.\,l}. Most subsequent discoveries have been published in the \textit{Annual of the British School in Athens}, (hereafter cited as \textit{B.S.A.} with the appropriate volume number), or in \textit{'Αργειο-λογικὴ Ἑφημερίς} (hereafter cited as \textit{'Αργ.\,Εφ.} with the volume number).

All references in chapters two and three to inscriptions discussed in the following catalogue are by page number plus sequence number. Thus the reference 1.1 is to page 1, number 1 etc. Cross references within the catalogue itself are by sequence number only. References to the work of M. Tod in \textit{A Catalogue of the Sparta Museum} are to
museum numbers cited by Tod (hereafter cited as Tod, nr. 743 etc.). This method of reference was necessitated by Tod's division of his discussion of the inscriptions into three separate parts. References to The Local Scripts of Archaic Greece by L. Jeffery are by page number.
1. IG., V. 1. 4. A proxeny decree inscribed on a stele of gray-white marble, found near Sparta in use as a door step. It honors Damion the Ambraciot and was set up in about 188 B.C. in the judgement of the original editors. The date was arrived at on the grounds that the absence of any mention of the Ephors in the decree indicates a probable constitutional change in Sparta which is to be attributed to the city's recent membership in the Achaean League. This dating assumes that Sparta was separated from the Achaean League in 184/3. It is my own judgement expressed elsewhere (p. 297 ff) that Sparta remained a member of the league until sometime near the year 151, and therefore the inscription should not be dated so closely to the year 188. My own preference is for 188 - 150 B.C.

The style of the decree is one in which the man to be honored was required to approach the Assembly (Συναρχιες) and Demos where he presented his case and made formal application for the honors. The honors bestowed were not unusual. They included a status of Proxenos to Damion and to his offspring, free possession of property if they should desire to live in Laconia. An official, the Egdotetar (ˈΕγδοτηρ), was required to erect a stone inscription in the temple of Athena and the procedure was supervised
by the Architekton. The Stewards provided the money.

The seemingly unusual style of the decree in which the man had to request his honors led Tod (nr.217b) to believe that it was a unique example and to attribute the seeming rudeness to a complete inexperience in the drafting of such decrees by the Spartans. There may be some truth in this, but Tod had not yet seen the following inscription found during the British excavations of 1906.

2.  A proxeny decree on a white marble stele. The inscription was given approximately the same date as the preceding and for the same reasons. The wording of both decrees is essentially the same and once again no mention is made of the Ephors. The appearance of this second example suggests that the form was not so unusual as Tod supposed and that, when proxeny decrees were made during the period of Sparta's membership in the Achaean League, this form might have been regular. The awarding of such honors may, of course, have been rare. The stone was found in a tomb near the theatre in 1906. It honors Karneades, the son of Aiglanor, the Kyrenaian. He too has been forced to ask for this honor. There are some minor differences in the wording of this decree that make it even more awkward than the previous example. The first lines are repetitious in a way not evident in the other.
Since Karneades the son of Aiglanor of Kyrene has made a motion so that he might address the Demos concerning his philanthropy and proxeny honors; Since Karneades, son of Aiglanor, has made his motion to the Demos concerning philanthropy and proxeny honors, it seemed good to the Demos....

The first six lines repeat twice the statement that Karneades has approached the people seeking the honors that he feels are due to him. The very slight variation in expression may suggest that Karneades had to get permission before he could actually address the Demos, and that his preliminary approach had been made in written form submitted to the proper authorities who in turn brought the matter before the Demos. If the examples provided by 15 and 39 are typical of the regular Spartan practice, we may assume that a written copy of the decree
was sent to the home town of Karneades to be set up there.

From the end of line six, the decree is in the familiar style found not only in Sparta, but in Attica and elsewhere. By the time the decree was proposed, regular laws concerning proxeny honors had been established. Karneades was awarded everything provided for in the proxeny laws (γέγραπτα ἐν τοῖς νεομοίς). The official known as the Ekdoter was to set up the stele in the temple of Athena Chalkioikos. The place in the temple was to be determined by law according to the opinion of the Architekton. This time the expense of the decree was to be met by the Epidamíourgos (Ἐπίδαμιόργος). This is the first (and last) time this official is mentioned in a Spartan inscription, but he seems to have been a regular magistrate of the Achaean League and of some individual cities in the league. The probable meaning of this official for the history of the Spartan constitution is discussed elsewhere (p. 296 ff.).

3. A proxeny decree for Philistos of Leukadios.

The decree is on a type of stone not specified by Kolbe and no date is suggested. The decree uses a wording which differs from 1 and 2. Philistos was not required to initiate the proposal. Unfortunately no magistrates are listed in the surviving fragment and it is not possible to compare the text of this example closely enough.
with the two preceding inscriptions. The letter forms as described by Kolbe are similar to those of the other two, so perhaps a date in the second century B.C. would not be far wrong.

4.____7. An honorary decree for a Roman citizen residing in Sparta, found in a house near the city. The type of stone is not identified by Kolbe. The Nomographoi are to insure that the person is properly honored in the city; the caretakers of the Roman hotel (Ἐπιμεληταῖ τοῦ Ρωμαίου καταλύματος) are to see to it that the man had everything provided for by law. This latter class of officials is of particular interest and Kolbe suggests, probable correctly, that "sunt proxeni, qui curam habebant civium Romanorum." The British excavations of 1906/7 revealed a number of stamped tiles with the words κατάλυμα τῶν Ρωμαίων καὶ δικαστῶν (hotel of the Romans and ambassadors), indicating a special building had been erected to house this class of officials. A.J.B. Wace (B.S.A., XIII [1906/7], p.40), points out that the Spartans had no close relations with Rome until "she was separated from the Achaean League by Roman intervention after 184 (or 178) when she was restored to her former autonomy; we cannot suppose that any κατάλυμα existed till that time, and this date fits in very well with that given
above (184)." My own view expressed elsewhere (p285 ff.) and is that Sparta was not separated from the league in 184 but that in about 182 she entered into a relationship with the league which was somewhat less restrictive than the relationship existing during the period 192-184/3. Therefore I prefer a date somewhat later than 184 as proposed by Wace for both tiles and buildings. It is true of course that the building could have been put up regardless of Sparta's position in the league, and it is also true that the walls of the city were restored by Roman intervention about 184 as Wace says; thus his date cannot be completely disproved. Even so, it is difficult to believe that a special building was erected and that a new board of magistrates was created for the housing of Roman visitors so early in the diplomatic history of Sparta and Rome.

5.____11. A decree from the early first century B.C. on white marble, mutilated on all sides. It seems to have been concerned with overdue debts (Tod, nr. 224 ).

6.____15. Apparently a proxeny decree of the second century B.C. in which allies are mentioned and some provisions for surety (ἐνέγυρα ) are given. Kolbe suggests that the decree is from Kotyrta. An examination of the
inscriptions of Kotyrta shows that several Spartans were
so honored there and that instructions were included in
the decrees of the city which provided for a copy to be
sent to the Ephors of Sparta. If prior conclusions (pp.
11-12 and 13-14) regarding the presence or absence of
the Ephors are correct, the decrees of Kortyrta must have
been enacted after ca. 150 B.C. All existing inscriptions
of Kotyrta are proxeny decrees, very regular in style, four
on red marble and two on blue.

7. 18. A large block of marble said by Woodward
*B.S.A.*, XII (1905/6), p. 445) to be of the blue variety.
The inscription, from the end of the first century A.D.
was part of a monument and contains regulations for the
Leonidea.

7. 19. A block of blue marble with an inscription
concerning athletic contests.

7. 20. A block of blue marble which together with the
two preceding stones is shown by Woodward (*B.S.A.*, XII
(1905/6), p. 445 ff. and XV (1908/1909), p. 98) to have been a
single complicated enactment regulating the Leonidea. This
block contains provisions for setting up inscriptions
and declares that the contest will be held annually on
τῆς ἄρῃ according to the rhetra (*ῥήτρα*). This
shows the existence of a written set of regulations
kept by the Grammotophylax. Names of winners were to be inscribed by the Grammateis in the gymnasium and placed in the Grammatophylakion (γραμματοφυλακιον). This is the first mention of a records office in Sparta, but its prior existence is argued elsewhere (p. 256 ff).

8. A list of contributors to the Spartan war fund on a stele of blue marble; found built into the church of St. Basil near the city. Kolbe, following an earlier publication of Kirchoff, dates the inscription to the years 428-21 B.C. on the basis of the mysterious listing in line 9 of "the friends of the Chians." The argument is that the inscription must have been set up before the Chians were associated with Sparta and before the Spartans made any attempt to attract any of the Ionian islanders away from Athens. Because Kolbe's argument may be somewhat difficult to follow I give it here in his own words: "unde apparet tunc Chiorum civitatem societate cum Lacedaemoniis non coniunctam esse, id quod cadit in belli Peloponnesiaci initium. Itaque veri est simillimum hunc catalogum intra annos 428, quo Lacedaemonii civitates Ionicas ad deflectionem sollicitaverunt, et 421 scriptum esse." What Kolbe means, of course, is that the words referring to the friends of the Chians are a deliberate attempt to conceal the donor who was still in league with
the Athenians, and since the Chians had revolted from Athens in 412 there would have been no reason for concealment after that date. Since the Melians are also mentioned in the inscription, Kolbe's argument is that it must have been erected before the destruction of Melos in 416. The mention of a gift of a talent of silver by a certain Molobros may be a reference to the same Molobros mentioned by Thucydides (4.8) as the father of the Spartan commander at Sphacteria in 425.

Another date, after 404, is suggested by Fränkel (Rheinisches Museum, LVII, p. 540) because of the letter forms and the return of the Melians to the island after the war.

I accept the date given by Kolbe and believe that his argument is basically sound, but prefer the latest possible date within the range he suggests because of the double listing of Melos. If Melos was assessed at a very high rate by Athens in 425 (the assessment was apparently for 15 talents; see B. D. Meritt et al., The Athenian Tribute Lists, A9,165 = IG. I², 63). The double listing of the island in the present inscription might well represent an attempt by the Melians, to insure the friendship of Sparta in a rather desperate situation.

Study of the facsimile published by Kolbe (the stone itself is lost) has led me to believe that not all of the
stone was necessarily inscribed at the same time and that some of the entries may have been inscribed several years later than the first entries.

The stone is inscribed on both sides, but the two sides are very different in style and content. Side a lists very explicitly the exact nature of each contribution (coined and uncoined silver, dried grapes, and Persian darics), and states the purpose of the contribution (πῶς τὸν πόλεμον). The broken sides of the stone have caused the loss of the beginning of every line and the ends of some. Even so, the surviving parts of the lines are long and some contain as many as forty letters.

Side b is inscribed in a completely different style. No details are given about the gifts, and the words πῶς τὸν πόλεμον are absent. The lines are so short (the longest being of ten letters) that the inscription is intact except for a very few letters near the bottom of the stone. Only three entries are listed on side b, the two gifts of the Melians and the gift of Molobros which has been placed on the stone between the two Melian entries.

This all seems to suggest that side b might have been cut at a different (later) time and even that the two gifts of the Melians were made in two different years or at least in two different installments, each of which
was inscribed at the time the donation was made. Thus the contributions of Melos may be dated more closely to the year 416 when they would represent to an even greater degree an attempt to buy help from Sparta. The absence of the statement that the contributions were for the war would fit a date after 421 well. They were not for the war, for the peace of Nicias had ended the war in 421. The gifts were made by the Melians in the hope of bolstering their friendship with Sparta and because of their great fear of Athens.

In any case a date as late as possible seems best. The assessment of fifteen talents in 425 was impossibly high and the most modest gift of twenty mina recorded in this inscription probably represents more accurately the Melians' ability to pay in the year 416.

9.____12. A very small fragment of what appears to have been an honorary decree. The type of stone is unspecified and no date was suggested by Kolbe, but the letter forms might be appropriate for the second or first century B.C. The fragment was found in Sparta near the theatre.

10.____13. A fragment of an honorary decree on gray marble. Woodward suggests either the late first century B.C. or the early first century A.D. as a likely date (B.S.A., XIV, 1907/1908, p. 198). Nothing can be determined about the
decree except that what survives is from the middle part and contains the usual provision that the man and his offspring will be honored.

11. A fragment of an honorary decree on blue marble, dated by Woodward (B.S.A., XV [1908/9], p.78) to the first century B.C. The ambassadors being honored were named, but the names have been lost except for a very few letters of one name.

12. A very small fragment on white marble. Not a single word remains intact, but Tillyard's restoration (B.S.A., XII [1905/6], p.441) seems convincing enough to suggest that it was probably an honorary decree. No date is given in the corpus but the letter forms suggest the second or first century B.C.

13. A fragment of a letter from the Illyrian city Byllis to the Demos of the Lacedaemonians. Kolbe suggests a date in the third or second century B.C. basing his opinion on letter forms. The address of the letter directly to the Demos with no mention of the Ephors could support either date. It was a copy of an honorary decree set up in Byllis and was found near Sparta.

14. A proxeny decree on a large white marble stele. Kolbe assigns it to the second century B.C. on the basis of letter forms. It was found near Sparta and
is complete. The decree was issued by the Boule and Koinon of Akarnania and it honors several Spartan citizens. They and their offspring are awarded safety and refuge in time of war and peace, property rights, and other honors not specified but required by law. The first eleven lines contain an elaborate dating system listing the holders of a priesthood of Apollo, the Grammateus of the Boule, the Promnomamos (another clerk-recorder), the Sympronnomamos, his assistants (three are listed), and ending with the month of issue (the Akarnanian month Kourotropos). From this point the decree follows the familiar form "it seemed good to the Boule and to the Koinon...." This inscription suggests that a fair sized bureaucracy existed in Akarnania and that its chief function was the issue of such decrees and the keeping of such extensive public records in a building such as the Spartan Grammatophylakion. This practice was probably common in many cities and the subject of public records is taken up in greater detail in my chapter concerning literacy in Sparta.

15. 30. A fragment of a decree on marble in the form of a letter from a Grammateus addressed to the
Ephors of Sparta. The preserved part says that the Grammateus has written out a copy of the decrees or laws (ψηφίσμα) recorded in the book in the town hall (τῷ Ἀρχείῳ) which is in his keeping. Apparently the Spartans sent for the copy, which probably contained an honorary decree for some one of their citizens. Of primary importance is the fact that a very definite reference is made to a record book in a public archive in a Macedonian or Achaean town. The Spartans were interested enough to request a copy, and we may assume that a similar archive center existed in Sparta. Such a center (the Grammatophylakion) is mentioned in 7 for the first century A.D. and it seems likely that the same building or a similar one existed earlier. A letter to Sparta quoted in I Maccabees,14 mentioned written records of the city. The writer of I Maccabees simply took it for granted that all cities had such records. It was normal.

The date is given in the text of the inscription as the 25th year. This must mean the 25th year from the time the area became a Roman province. Hence the suggested dates 123 (if it is from a Macedonian city) or 121 (if Achaean).
16. B.S.A., XXVI [1923-25], p. 231, nr. 22. A fragment of a gray marble stele found in the excavations of the theatre in 1906. The inscription is a proxeny decree honoring several persons. The letter forms are not like those associated with the numerous inscriptions of the second century; they are less polished and less regular, and thus Woodward suggests a date in the third century B.C.

17. 23. A fragment of a gray marble stele broken all around, found in the excavations of 1906. The letters are irregularly spaced and definitely of a later style than the preceding. Woodward can suggest only that the inscription must be no earlier than the late second century B.C. and no later than the first century A.D. The decree honored citizens who appear to have arbitrated some dispute.

18. 24. A fragment of a gray marble stele found in the excavations of the theatre in 1906. It honored the zeal of some ambassadors. Woodward suggests the second century B.C. as a date.

19. 28. A fragment of a blue marble stele, badly mutilated, found on the acropolis near the ruined Byzantine church. The decree honored several persons sent by Sparta to Eretria. The persons involved were two dicasts
and a grammateus. The dicasts were awarded golden crowns and bronze statues; the grammates got only an olive wreath.

20. **B.S.A.**, XXIX(1927/28), p. 62, nr. 85. Eight fragments of a gray marble stele. The fragments are part of number 19 above. The decree was passed by the Synedroi and Demos of Eretria and is one of a large number from that city.

21. A proxeny decree of Arcadian Orchomenos in favor of Kleoxenos, a Spartan citizen. The stone is gray marble broken on the right side and along the bottom. The date proposed by Woodward is the second century B.C. based on the letter forms. The first lines of the decree are similar to 1 and 2 in which an individual petitioned for proxeny rights. Here the Synedroi and Archons of Orchomenos made the petition to the Demos which granted the decree. Among the privileges granted were epinomia (ἐπινομία) grazing rights, and epixylia (ἐπίξυλια) an almost unique proxeny right granting the privilege of gathering wood; this right is known elsewhere only at Thisoa (IG., V. 2.510). The rights extended to Kleoxenos and to his offspring in war and in peace. It was also to be announced at the Nemean games and at the Soteria in Megalopolis that Kleoxenos was awarded a golden crown and bronze statue because of his services. The Grammatous of the Synedroi was to set up the decree beside a temple of
Zeus in Orchomenos.

For another example of the opening formula, see IG., V.2.263 a decree of Orchomenos in which an individual made the motion as was done in 1 and 2 above. Woodward also cites IG., IV.749, 751, and 756. These are decrees of Troizen and in each case the individual made the original or preliminary motion.

22. 86. A large fragment of gray marble. The decree is assigned by Woodward and L. Robert to a city of Asia Minor (Tralles) based on the style of the opening formula and the appearance there of the phrase, apparently common in the inscriptions of Tralles, στραταγών γυνόμου. This is followed by the names of the eleven Strategoi. The decree was for proxeny honors for a Spartan citizen. No estimate of the kind of honors given is possible, nor can one read the honored man's name or his services to the city in question. Letter forms suggest a date in the second or first century B.C.

23. 87. A very small fragment of white marble considered by Woodward to have been a decree honoring officials sent from Sparta to another city. The city in question is judged by Woodward and L. Robert to have been Demetrias in Thessaly. The attribution was made on stylistic grounds. The inscription is probably from the second or first century as the letters indicate.
INSCRIPTIONS LISTED AS DOCUMENTA PUBLICA
BY KOLBE BUT OMITTED BY WOODWARD

24. IG. V. 1. 2. A very small fragment written boustrophedon on white marble. The stone was found at Mistra and was dated by Tod (nr. 599) to the close of the sixth century B.C. on the basis of letter forms. The stone is very badly broken and the class to which the inscription belongs seems very uncertain even though it has been assigned by Kolbe to the public decrees of Sparta.

25. _____3. A fragment of a treaty between Sparta and another city. The stone was found on the east side of Sparta and belongs to the end of the third century. The type of stone is not specified.

26. _____8. A fragment of blue marble. A copy of a letter sent by the Strategoi of another city to the Ephors and Polis of the Lacedaemonians. The familiar phrase in which men to be honored make a motion in their own behalf is repeated here. This time the motion is made before the Boule and Ekklesia of the city granting the decree.

Tod (nr. 241) suggest a date before 226 B.C. because of the address to the Ephors. Kolbe rightly places the decree in mid-second century. The dating of certain Spartan
inscriptions by the presence or absence of the Ephors is discussed elsewhere (p. 253). Reasons are given in my chapter on Spartan coinage (p. 293) for dating these decrees after 151 and probably after 146 B.C. The details of the honors, the deeds to be honored, and the name of the city passing the decree have all been lost.

27. 9. A fragment of a blue marble stele found built into a house in Sparta. A letter to the Ephors of Lacedaemonians and Polis, attributed by Kolbe to the first century B.C. It is too badly mutilated to yield any details.

28. 10. A fragment of a white marble stele, found built into the wall of the refectory of a monastery near Sparta. A letter was addressed to the Ephors and Polis of the Lacedaemonians. Another example of a copy of the record of a business transaction by a foreign city being requested by the Spartans (cf. 15). The text is badly broken but the following can be read: "I (the grammateus?) have sent ...... a copy ...... to the Ephors and Polis of the Lacedaemonians." No date is suggested by Kolbe but the letter forms are similar to those in the preceding inscription and others of the second or first century B.C.
29.____16. A fragment of a letter on unidentified stone, found built into the church of the monastery of the 40 martyrs. The inscription is badly broken but seems to have recorded a letter from either the Proconsul of Achaea or from an Emperor. Kolbe suggests that it was sent by Augustus or Tiberius. The letter appears to have been concerned with the settlement of some dispute and someone apparently was driven out of town ἐξεγέρσεως.

30.____17. A fragment of an Imperial letter written to the Boule and Demos of the Lacedaemonians. The type of stone is not identified and no date is suggested but letter forms and the fact that it is an Imperial letter suggest a date in the first century B.C. or first century A.D.

31.____21. A fragment of a blue marble block found at Mistra. The inscription, written in two columns, seems to be of the second century A.D. It is part of an Imperial rescript regulating the buying and renting of land and is also concerned with the rights of appeal in certain disputes. The officials who are to judge these disputes are the Synedroi.
32. A fragment of a marble stele bearing what is apparently part of a letter. Tod (nr. 250) dates the inscription to the first century B.C., Kolbe to the second century A.D. because of the carelessly made apices of the letters. The wide difference of opinion shows the difficulty of dating Spartan inscriptions on the basis of letter forms alone. I find it impossible to choose one date over the other.

33. A fragment of a statue base with a dedication. The stone was found near the temple of Athena in Sparta. The type of stone is not identified by Kolbe, nor does he suggest a date. The second or first century B.C. seems suitable for the letter forms.

34. A small fragment, very badly broken. Kolbe suggests that it was a decree concerned with setting up a statue but offers no date. The letter forms suggest a later date than that of the above, perhaps the first or second century A.D.

35. A large stele of white marble found near Sparta. A decree of the Obe of Amyclae containing praise of the three Ephors, regulations about the cost of the decree and praise of the Ephors' secretary.
From the first or second century B.C. The officials in charge of setting up the decree are four men known as decree-writers (Δογματογραφοί) who wrote it on behalf of the people of Amyclae. Honored are Pasiteles, Euthymos, Damiades, the three Ephors during the eponymous year of the Patronomai Nikeas. The men were honored because they performed their duties every day without pay for a year. They are to have a part in a religious function (for Apollo?) for life so that the Obe will always be mindful of their services. The decree is to be set up in the temple of Alexandros and another copy is to be placed elsewhere according to law. The Obe is to provide the expense of the decrees and the κατασταθέντες are to keep a record of the expense. The decree closes by ordering the Grammateus of these Ephors, Kallikles, to be praised.

This inscription provides additional evidence for the existence of a center for keeping records. In this case the center is located in a Laconian village and it is reasonable to assume that other villages and towns were similarly equipped. A copy of this decree might well have been sent to Sparta to be set up on stone there, but instructions to that effect are not given in the inscription.

36.____27. Another decree of an Obe, longer than the
preceding but very badly mutilated. The decree seems to have been honorary but it is difficult to make out exact details. The type of stone is not specified and no date is suggested but the late second century B.C. seems likely to judge from the letter forms. It is for Aristotle and several others whose names are not preserved. They have been pious to the gods and zealous on behalf of men. They are to get all the honors of the Obe for themselves and their offspring and they will be given public maintenance in the prytaneum. Apparently more than one copy of this decree was to be set up and the Tamias was to pay for them. It is not possible to determine any more details about reasons for the award or the identification of the public officials involved.

PUBLIC DOCUMENTS PASSED BY SPARTA
BUT SET UP ELSEWHERE

37. IG., V.1. 1564. A fragment of an inscription on a white marble stele set up on Delos by the Spartans at the end of the fifth century B.C. Kolbe suggests that since none of the Ephors here were mentioned by Xenophon for the years 432/1–404/3, the decree must have been set up after 403. The decree apparently restored liberty
and the guardianship of the temples to the Delians.

The letters are mixed in form. The Θ form of theta occurs twice in the first six lines, but Θ occurs in line 10. Line 5 have τόν for τόν but line 15 has ἄνηθυ.

38. A fragment of a round statue base of black limestone. The stone was set up at Olympia and bears a metrical inscription for Kyniska who won a chariot race at Olympia and the inscription makes the claim that she was the only woman ever to win that crown. She was the daughter of Archidamas II and sister of Agesilaus, both kings. Pausanias (6.1.6) says that he saw a statue of Kyniska at Olympia and that it was the work of Apelles. The artist is listed on this stone as Apelles, son of Kallikles. The statue must belong to the beginning of the fourth century B.C. and the letter forms seems appropriate for this date.

39. A fragment of a copy of a decree passed in Sparta and sent by the Ephors and Polis of the Lacedaemonians to the Archons and Polis of Delphi. The Delphians have perhaps requested the copy from the archives of the Spartans. The stone was set up during the Archonship of Polemarcho in Delphi and is dated by Kolbe to about 29 B.C.
Of the nine decrees actually passed by Sparta (three inscriptions are part of a single enactment), six are honorary decrees of some type from the second or first centuries B.C., one concerns financial affairs and is from the first century B.C. One concerns regulations related to the Leonidea and is of the first century A.D., and one is a fifth century decree set up on the island of Delos; it is concerned with political and religious matters.

The total number of decrees set up in Sparta which were enacted elsewhere is twenty-nine, including those not listed by Woodward. This total might be reduced to twenty-eight by omitting nr. 24, a very small fragment from the end of the sixth century B.C. which seems too small to identify with certainty. Of the twenty-eight or twenty-nine decrees, seventeen are honorary and date from the second century B.C. or later. Nine are letters from foreign states to the Spartans, some of which were copies of decrees passed by the foreign states and requested by the Spartans. These range in date from the third century B.C. to the second century A.D. There is one fragment of a treaty from the third century B.C. and the list of war contributions from the end of the fifth century B.C.

The count has so far revealed nothing very surprising. The Spartans during the period of their greatest power had
very little interest in setting up public decrees. In fact there are only two earlier than the third century B.C. One of those was set up outside Sparta and the other is the contribution list which, though a public document, is not a decree. If treaties like the treaty of Nicias of 421 were regularly inscribed on stone in Sparta, all have perished. The existence of one fragment of a treaty shows the possibility that it was sometimes done, but the number was probably never large as I attempt to show elsewhere (p. 210 ff).

Perhaps it would be best to make a survey of all other inscriptions before commenting further on the small number of public decrees. Inscriptions of other types, such as lists of magistrates, inscribed pottery, religious dedications, and other types of honorary inscriptions, are very numerous. Commentary on these inscriptions will be more limited than on public decrees. Most are short and call for little explanation; others such as the lists of magistrates which are complex enough to require a separate work will be discussed more fully. These inscriptions will generally be listed by date rather than by class, but inscriptions of a single class will be grouped together when they are from the same general period. Dates given are in nearly every case those of the editors, who do not always give the reasons for their dating. In the case of the very early inscriptions
dates are usually assigned on the basis of letter shapes; in the later ones letter shapes are important but internal evidence plays a larger role, especially in the late lists of magistrates in which the same individuals are found in several inscriptions or in many instances where a family member such as grandfather or grandson may be recognized. Many inscriptions have been published with no indication of date and most of these have been placed in a separate section where they are listed as of unknown date. For a very few, I have suggested dates on the basis of the letter forms. These inscriptions will generally be listed by date rather than by class, but inscriptions of a single class will be grouped together when they are from the same general period. Many inscriptions, especially the grave stelae, are impossible to date. These will be listed separately.

INSCRIPTIONS OF THE SEVENTH AND SIXTH CENTURIES

40.IG., V. 1,215. A stele of limestone with a figure in relief and the same Wanaxibios (FANAXIBIOS), inscribed. The stone was found in the remains of the temple of Athena Chalkioikos and it seems likely that it was a dedication to her. The figure (apparently female) is shown holding unidentifiable objects, one in an upraised right hand and another in her left. She is depicted in an attitude of worship and doubtless the objects are votive offerings
of some sort.

41. 216. A fragment of white marble broken on all sides. The stone was found in the same temple as the preceding and must also be a dedication to the goddess. It has part of a single name preserved. Jeffery, p.199, dates it to ca. 550-525 B.C.

42. 222. Stele of gray marble with ram's-horns sculpted in relief above the inscription. The inscription is a metrical dedication to Apollo (τοῦ Καρπείου) by Aiglatas. The dedicator has won five victories in the race known as the dolichos, and three victories in the race known as the makros. He has apparently won some victories in Athens as well but the inscription is broken. Jeffery, p.201 dates this inscription to the years ca. 530-500 B.C.

43. 224. A dedicatory inscription on a small piece of sandstone. The stone is complete on all sides but the inscribed name appears to be incomplete. Woodward (B.S.A., XV [1909], p.87, nr.91) suggests the name was contained on another stone. The writing is very crude, but the dedication seems to have been for Artemis. The stone shows an Alpha formed from a previously written Mu (or the reverse) (Ἀ). The inscription was found outside Sparta near the sanctuary of Menelaus.
and was dated by Kolbe to the seventh or sixth century B.C.

44.____ 225. Bronze cymbal inscribed with a dedication (property of) the Limnian (Λιμναίοις) on interior. L. Jeffery, p. 200, dates it to the sixth century.

45.____ 226. Exterior of cymbal described above. The dedication is by Prianthis (Πριάνθις) to the Limnian (ταῖς Λιμναίοις). Strabo (7.363) says that Artemis was worshipped by that name in Messenia and in Sparta and that there was a temple for her in Sparta.

46.____ 231. A bronze vessel (βράχοβουλιώς) dedicated by Chalkodamans (Χαλκοδάμανος) to the gods (θεῶν). Perhaps it was for the Dioscuri. The name is an interesting one for the dedicator of a bronze object. Jeffery, p. 183, says that Π is not attested in Laconian except in a sixth century abecedarium found in France and attributed to Laconia. Kolbe suggests an Argive origin for this bronze vessel because of the letter forms and dialect.

47.____ 234. A fragment of gray marble restored by Woodward (B.S.A., XV [1909], p. 88, nr. 86) to read [Ἰ]ελε[ναί]. This is likely enough since the stone was found at the Menelaion. From the sixth century B.C.
48.____238. Fragment of blue marble (Tod, nr. 611, says it is white) found in a house in Magoula. The stone is badly broken but it seems to be a dedication by a victorious athlete. The dedication is to Zeus Aigiochos. Sixth century.

49.____244. A fragment found in a Byzantine tomb near Sparta with the name Chilon (ΧΙΟΝ) inscribed. Woodward (B.S.A., XV [1908/9], p. 80, nr. 86) and Kolbe interpret it as a dedication to the hero of that name since a figure (a hero) is shown in relief. Pausanias (3.16.4) says that a cult of the hero existed in Sparta. Jeffery, p. 200, dates it to ca. 525 B.C.

50.____252. A dedication by Panidas (Πάνις) to Orthia (.tokenize) written in crude letters on soft stone of unspecified type. The dedication is in the form of a plaque with a horse in bas-relief. The letters are cut into the horse.

51.____252a. A dedication to Orthia (Ταῖς Φοιντάς) written on a six-sided die. From the sixth century.

52.____252b. The famous ivory dedication to Orthia. It has a representation of a ship with men in it. Jeffery, p. 198, assigns this piece to the late seventh century.

53.____357. The dedication is written retrograde in very
crude letters on gray marble. Jeffery, p. 201, dates it to ca. 500 B.C. and suggests that it was a list of names. Kolbe describes it as a dedication to Zeus, but the fragmentary condition of the stone makes reliable interpretation impossible.

54. 362. Two fragments of a vessel (περιπαντηρίου) made of marble. The fragments were found built into a wall of the Roman circus. Woodward, who edited the fragments (B.S.A., XIV [1907/8], p. 111, nr. 8) interprets the letters to be part of an instruction for a ritual "pour twice with wine..."

55. 457. A dedication on gray marble. A youth is portrayed in relief, standing, spear in left hand, fruit in right hand extended to a serpent. The dedicators call themselves "the Koroi" (τοιοι χοροι) which seems to be equivalent to "The Knights" (οι ιππείς). Perhaps the youth pictured is the Theocles named in the dedication. For some reason, his fellow soldiers have chosen to honor him in this way. Jeffery, p. 200, dates the stone to ca. 510-500.

56. 699. A limestone stele found near the Menelaion, edited by Woodward (B.S.A., XV [1908/9], p. 86, nr. 89. Perhaps a grave monument. A single name is recorded. The letter forms similar to those of 48 indicate a date in the
sixth century.

57. 700. Another limestone grave stele written retrograde in very crude letters.

58. 720. A marble stone found in Sparta and now in the Athens museum. The inscription is difficult to interpret but seems to indicate that this is a funeral stele set up for Kalas (Καλας) son of Anthis or Anthida. The name of the stone mason may have been given in the last line but this is very uncertain. From the end of the sixth century.

59. 823. A small marble tablet bearing the name Technarchos (Τεχναρχος). The letters are written retrograde and appear to be of the sixth century. This stone has been attributed by Kolbe to a class of funeral inscriptions but he is doubtful. Jeffrey, p. 200, attributes it to a class of graffiti and identifies the name as that of a mason. She dates the inscription to ca. 510-500 B.C. The name must be similar to those found in (46, 86 and 139).

60. 824. Fragment of gray marble which Kolbe reconstructs as a metrical grave stone. Found at Mistra. Kolbe has not suggested a date but it seems to belong to the sixth century. Jeffrey, p. 184, cites the inscription as providing an example of the Υ epsilon. She dates it
to the late Archaic period but for some reason does not list it in her catalogue.

61.____826. Marble fragment bearing only two roughly inscribed letters written retrograde. (\(\lambda\)). Tod, nr. 626, notes that the form \(\lambda\) is otherwise unattested in Laconian and maintains that the inscription is complete. The right and bottom edges of the stone are complete, but additional letters could have appeared in the broken portion of the stone on the left side. Tod himself acknowledges this possibility. Kolbe lists the fragment with grave stones, but does so doubtfully. Tod offers no interpretation and Jeffery does not list the inscription in her catalogue. It seems possible and in fact likely that this is simply another example of a grave inscription similar to 135 which contains only the word \(\lambda \varepsilon \gamma \omicron \omicron \) and 972 which preserves the same word together with a feminine name \( \nu \gamma \tau \pi \lambda \lambda \varepsilon \gamma \omicron \omicron \). The name is lost in 135 but was probably on another block which joined on the right side with the inscription retrograde. The direction of writing in 61 is also retrograde and I suggest that it read 10\(\pi\) 3\(\lambda\) 3\(\nu\) 3\(\delta\) \(\omicron\) when complete. The \(\lambda\) lambda is not known elsewhere in Laconian but examples from Arkadia, Sikyon, Corinth, Elis, Achaea, Aetolia, and other
nearby towns and territories are plentiful.

62. 828. Fragment of white marble found near the tomb of Leonidas. The stone is complete along top and right edge, broken on left and below. The inscription is retrograde and difficult to interpret. Tod, nr. 200, says "The inscription remains an unsolved riddle." Kolbe lists it under the heading "Varia et Incerta." Jeffery does not include it in her catalogue.

63. 830. A small fragment found at Mistra. Only six archaic letters are preserved, two letters in each of three lines. No interpretation is given by Kolbe but he adds "Sacrale videtur Hillero." I see no convincing evidence for Hiller's opinion.

64. 919. Stele of gray marble, found at Sellasia. The inscription is below a relief of the Dioscuri. It is a dedication by Plestiades to the Dioscuri. Jeffery, p. 200, dates it to ca. 525 B.C.

65. 1561. A fragment of a bronze plate with dedication written boustrophedon. The dedication was made by an unknown person who identified himself as a Spartiate. His name cannot be read. The inscription was found at Olympia. Jeffrey, p. 199, assigns it to the first half of the sixth century.
66. ___ 1497. A bronze disc of uncertain origin. Kolbe lists it under the heading "Loci Incerti." H. Roehl, *Imagines Inscriptionum Antiquissimarum* (1907), ed. 3, nr. 61, attributed it to Laconia since it was dedicated to The Limnian (τῷ Λιμνᾶτι). Several shrines for Artemis Limnatis were known to have existed there and in Messenia. The letter forms, especially the A are appropriate for Laconia. Jeffery, p. 199, dates the stone to ca. 550-525.

67. ___ 1562. Dedication of a round marble statue base found at Olympia. The statue was dedicated to Olympian Zeus.

68. ___ 1563. Two fragments of a bronze vessel found at Olympia. It seems to say that some Spartiates dedicated the vase to Olympian Zeus. From the late sixth or early fifth century B.C.

69. ___ 1570. Panathenaic amphora found near the temple of Athena Chalkioikos in Sparta. A dedication to Athena. A date is not suggested by Kolbe but Dickins (*B.S.A.*, XIII [1906/7], p. 150) conjectures the middle of the sixth century. The vase is finely painted showing a scene of Athena Promachos with spear and shield. A four-horse chariot finishing a race is depicted on the other side of the vase. Dickens says the vase "is of the finest work-
manship, and bears comparison with any now in the museums of Europe in material, in preservation, and in painting."

If Kolbe's reading is correct both forms of theta appear in the inscription θ and θ.

70. 1574. Four fragments of a vase found in Amyclae with a dedication. No date is suggested by Kolbe. If he is correct both forms of the aspirate are used (𐀅 and 𐀇) as well as both forms of epsilon (𐀉 and 𐀊) and two forms of sigma (𐀋 and 𐀌). Jeffrey, p. 200, reports the former sigma occurs in even the earliest of inscriptions and that the later form also occurs occasionally in early inscriptions but becomes regular only after the middle of the fifth century. The writing runs in both directions but it is not strictly boustrophedon. Perhaps the inscription should be dated near the end of the sixth or sometime in the first half of the fifth century.

71. B.S.A., XXVII (1925/26), p. 249, nr. 37. Part of a base of gray marble. The boustrophedon writing is done with guide lines and has the first line of writing inverted. The inscription may be a commemoration of an athletic victory, since the first line seems to read [..vi]άσα. The letter forms are hard to date accurately but Woodward suggests the end of the sixth century B.C.

72. 39. Halter of gray marble, dedicated to Athena by
Paitiadas. The name is unknown elsewhere and Woodward suggests intervocalic sigma has been omitted from the name Paitiadas. He dates the inscription to the sixth century on the basis of letter forms, especially the curved top stroke of Π (ᚠ).

73.____40. A small fragment of soft, fine-grained limestone. The letters are scratched into the stone in most places but two lines are deeper and may have been cut with a chisel. The inscription is a list of eight names on eight lines. The names are arranged in pairs with dividing lines after every second name. Woodward suggests they designate fathers and sons. If so the Patronymic seems to come first in the combination, e.g. Domoxenida Alkípos. Woodward also suggests that each pair of names was inscribed or scratched onto the stone by a separate individual. This seems reasonable to judge from the different styles of writing, for there is variation not only in letter shapes but also in the size and depth. Lines 5 and 6 appear to have been cut more deeply and probably by a more skilled person than lines 7 and 8, or 1 and 2. Woodward assigns the inscription to the sixth century B.C.

74.____38. Four-sided stele of gray marble. It is a dedication to Athena and dates from the first years of the
fifth century or the end of the sixth.

75. B.S.A., XXIX (1927/28), p.5, nr. 69. A fragment of a gray marble stele inscribed on three sides. The letters are written boustrophedon with incised guide lines. Woodward dates the stone to the sixth century. It is a metrical dedication to Athena, perhaps a hymn, very neatly cut. Woodward suggests that it is one of the earliest from Sparta and conjectures that it might have been composed by a poet of note, such as Alcman or Gitiadas. Jeffery, p. 199, thinks it might have been part of a victory dedication and dates it to ca. 530-500.

The following inscriptions of archaic date are from the sanctuary of Orthia and are published by A.M. Woodward and J.J. Hondius in B.S.A., XXIV (1919-21) p.88-144.

76. Fragment of soft stone with head of horse (or unicorn?) preserved in relief. The letters preserved are $F_0 \ldots$. The inscription is probably from the seventh century.

77. Soft stone plaque complete. A horse is shown in relief with the letters $\Theta \iota \omicron \kappa \omicron \omicron \rho \mu \iota \varepsilon \zeta \, \tau \alpha \, F\sigma[p]$. The sigma has seven stokes.

78. Fragment of plaque of soft limestone. A horse's head is shown in relief, the body broken away. The inscript-


ion written retrograde is a dedication to Orthia, and may be dated to the end of the seventh century.

79.____5. Fragment of horse carved in the round. The inscription which may be complete preserves the words Γαρέας ἔποιε. Γαρέας was apparently the maker's name. Thus we have evidence for a literate stone worker at the end of the seventh century.

80.____6. A very small fragment of a limestone plaque. The fragment has a portion of relief sculpture, perhaps a leg of a horse. The inscription is very badly broken but was apparently a name.

81.____7. A fragment of a votive slab with a lion in relief showing the hole by which the object was hung in the sanctuary. The name of the dedicator was Trouthos (Τροῦθος). The fragment may belong to the last years of the seventh century.

82.____8. A votive slab with wild boar in relief. The slab is complete and has a hole for hanging. The name of the dedicator is difficult (Θουθος) and even the direction of the writing cannot be ascertained beyond doubt, but Woodward thinks it might be Trouthos as in
the preceding and dates it to the same period. Woodward notes that, if his reading is correct, the dedicator forgot to cross his T and did not finish his own name. The dedication was, like the preceding, made by a man who was only semi-literate. J. Hondius, the co-editor with Woodward, gives the reading $\Theta\omicron\omicron\pi\omicron$. If Hondius' reading is correct, we must read left to right and accept the reversed Rho (9).

83.____9. Slab broken all around. Relief seems to show lion crouching to right. Like the two preceding slabs, it has a hole in top for hanging. The name written above the lion is difficult (3A01M131Y); Woodward reads it as $X\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron$. The inscription is from the sixth century (Laconian uses $\Upsilon$ for Chi through the fifth century).

84.____10. A small fragment of a votive slab broken at bottom. The remains of the relief are impossible to identify; the name of the dedicator is clear. His name Kopris ($\Kappa\omicron\omicron\pi\omicron\omicron\omicron$), was apparently that of a slave (see P. Perdrizet, Revue des Etudes Anciennes, XXIII [1921], pp. 85-94). Such names are said by Perdrizet to be Macedonian or Egyptian in origin. The name also occurs in Melos (IG, XII.3.484). Unusual characteristics are the omicron with dot in center, and the seven stroke sigma.
Hondius, the co-editor, suggests irregularities are to be expected in informal inscriptions of this type, especially when the dedicator was not highly skilled as a writer.

85. Fragment of a votive slab with incised representation of a bird identified by Hondius as an eagle. The bird holds a circular object in its beak, perhaps a wreath. It is difficult to tell the direction of the writing. The name is complete and is either Σοίξις or Σιμίς or Σοίγις, depending on the direction of the writing and the use of the letter υ. Normally this sign represents Chi in Laconian down to the end of the fifth century, but Hondius cites examples from Melos (IG. XII. 3. 811; XII. 3, Suppl. 1324, 1465) where the sign stands for Υ. From the sixth century.

86. A fragment of a votive slab complete at top, but broken on the right and left sides and below. An obscure object is shown in relief. Hondius suggests it might be a ship under full sail but upside down. The name of the dedicator, written retrograde, is PRIXINOS. From the sixth century.

87. A fragment of a votive slab broken on the right and at the top. The stone has an incised female
head with long hair and some kind of head dress. Incribed retrograde is the name Praxinos (\(\Sigma\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\Sigma\alpha\alpha\omicron\omicron\)) apparently the same name as in the preceding inscription.

88.____14. A fragment very badly broken. Only a few letters of a name survive and Woodward reads Chartylos (\(\chi\alpha\rho\tau\upsilon\lambda\alpha\zeta\)). From the sixth century.

89.____15. A votive plaque almost complete. Scene in relief shows nude man facing woman dressed in long chiton. The woman has some kind of long handled tool in her hand. It is shoulder high and is possibly a rake or some such agricultural implement. Both figures have long hair. The name of the dedication is broken at the beginning but seems to be something like \(\lambda\upsilon\tau\delta\alpha\varsigma\). From the early sixth century.

90.____16. Fragment of stone broken on all sides. Only three letters of a name are preserved (\(\xi\delta\upsilon[\zeta]\)). From the sixth century.

91.____17. A small fragment of stone broken on all sides. From the seventh century.

92.____18. Another small fragment preserving the letters \(\Lambda\Lambda\) which Woodward reads \(\Lambda\Lambda\) (?). He interprets it as a dedication to Orthia in the dative. If
this reading is correct, it is a very unusual form for alpha which is perhaps the most regularly formed letter in Laconian inscriptions. Perhaps the dedication is another by a barely literate person. Probably from the first quarter of the sixth century.

93.____20. Fragment with relief figure interpreted by Woodward as belonging to distyle temple (?). Only two letters are inscribed (uably), but the inscription is apparently complete. From the early sixth century.

94.____21. A fragment complete on the right but broken elsewhere showing the lower part of a female figure in relief. The letters qy are carved retrograde on the right edge. From the early sixth century.

95.____22. A small statuette of a woman, perhaps a priestess. The letters inscribed on the breast read Ἀρτέο... and on the back ἑρπτεπ... The reading is made difficult by the scratches covering the piece. From the sixth century.

96.____24. A bronze die inscribed ἔλευ. This must be for Ἐλευσία. Hondius and Woodward show that the sanctuary of Eileithyia was next to and perhaps part of that of Orthia. Stamped tiles and figurines showing scenes of
childbirth tend to confirm this. The question of the appropriateness of dice for either goddess has not been solved. Pausanias (2.20.3) says dice were dedicated by Palamedes at Corinth. No other mention is made in literature of such a dedication.

97. 26. Fragment of ivory flute with the name Achraidaios (Ἀχραίδαῖος). From the very early sixth century.

98. 27. A fragment of an ivory flute dedicated to Orthia (Ὄρθια). There is no trace of a final iota, but for similar omissions see B.S.A., XXIV (1919/20), nrs. 3, 4, 18 (?), and 25.

99. 28. A fragment of a platter; the inside is black with a purple center. The letters are well made in dark paint. Two holes for hanging the dedication are preserved. This platter must belong to the seventh century just before the year 600, since J.P. Droop (B.S.A., XIV [1907/8], p. 34), assigns it to Laconian II period because of its position in the excavation level. The spelling of the name (Φοσασιά) is unknown elsewhere.

100. 29. A small fragment of pottery with black glaze. Only 3 letters are preserved (ἀός). Hondius and Woodward suggest Ὄρισθος. From the end of the seventh century.
101. ______30. A terra-cotta platter similar to 99, but with a white edge. The inscription is written in white paint. Apparently the dedication was made by a woman named Worithisa (?) (Φιθεσα) according to Woodward. The spellings used in the rest of the dedication suggest that the unusual form of the name is due to the semi-literate state of the dedicator. The spelling ά[νέ]οικε and Χιρόν (=Χιρόν) is unknown in other Dorian inscriptions. From the end of the seventh century.

102. ______31. A small fragment of pottery with dedication to Orthia in pink paint. From the early sixth century.

103. ______70. A fragment of a Panathenaic amphora. The letters are incised on the body of the vase below painted scenes. Part of the name Athena is preserved. Woodward dates the piece before 500 B.C.

104. ______71. A fragment of a vase with the single letter A.

105. ______72. A fragment of a vase with the letters AI.

106. ______94. A small fragment from a cup. Letters written with pen and ink preserve part of the name Athena.

107. ______95. Small fragment of a cup. The letters were written with a pen and ink and are similar in style and size (.005) to those of the preceding example. They were
probably written by the same person. The dedication was to Athena.

108. 96. A fragment from moulded rim of a large platter. The letters (.008) were written with pen and ink, apparently by the same person responsible for the two preceding. The entire name Athena is preserved. Woodward dates it shortly before 500 B.C.

109. 97. A small clay loom-weight. The piece is complete but only has two letters incised (B A). Woodward dates it before 500 B.C.

110. 98. A fragment from the rim of a platter. The letters in dark brown paint preserve part of the name Athena. Woodward dates it to the sixth century.

111. 73. Fragment of a black glazed vessel, perhaps a bowl. The letters are small (.008) and very roughly scratched into the bowl from right to left. The remains of the dedication (...but ἄνεθεσε) probably belong to the sixth century.

112. 81. A small fragment from rim of vase (black-glazed) with the letters ΒΑΖΙΑΝ preserved. Woodward dates it to the sixth century on the basis of the three stroke sigma (Ω).

113. 82. A small fragment from rim similar to 112 with
the letters $A\beta\lambda\epsilon$ preserved. Perhaps the dedicator was the same as the dedicator of the preceding, though in this fragment the name has $\square$ for sigma. The following two examples have the same spelling. Probably from the sixth century.

114. 83. A small fragment from a black-glazed cup, with the letters $\beta\lambda\epsilon$ preserved. From the sixth century.

115. 84. A small fragment from the rim of a cup with the letters $\beta\lambda$ preserved.

116. 99. A fragment from a black-glazed cup with the letters $\beta\lambda\epsilon\lambda[\omega\alpha]s$ preserved. The piece is contemporary with the four preceding pieces, and perhaps all were dedicated by the same person.

120. 31. A large bronze plaque of rectangular shape. The plaque measures $0.41 \times 0.08 \times 0.002m$. The letters range from $0.055 - 0.06m$. The single word $\gamma\nu\lambda\kappa\epsilon\tau\alpha$ is preserved but the plaque is cut off on the left end and may have had more writing there. Nail holes are preserved and Woodward suggests that the plaque was nailed to a wooden platform or altar on which were placed bronze votive offerings. He notes that the word must be the plural of $\gamma\nu\lambda\kappa\epsilon\tau\omega$ which normally means work-shop, but states that here it must mean bronze objects. He cites no parallels for such a meaning and Liddell-Scott gives no parallels.
It is possible, then, that the plaque could be something else, perhaps a workshop sign? The size of the letters (the largest from Sparta) would be appropriate for this use. The inscription is from the very end of the sixth century.

124. Ἀρν. Ἐπ. 1919, p.33, nr.3. A white marble slab, perhaps a tombstone, inscribed with the name Damokrinios. A. Skias, the editor, dates it to the sixth century.

125. A white marble slab with the name Hiasis. Skias dates it to the sixth century.
INSCRIPTIONS OF THE FIFTH CENTURY

126. IG, V.1.213. The famous Damonon inscription, on a stele of white marble preserved in two fragments. The first half was found by Leake in the monastery of the Forty Martyrs, and the second half was found in the foundations of a late Roman building on the acropolis near the site of the temple of Athena Chalkioikos. Woodward dates the inscription to the middle of the fifth century. On historical grounds it is clear that it must be either before or after the Peloponnesian war, since the three Ephors named in the inscription are not named by Xenophon (Hellenica 2.310) or Thucydides for the war years. Comparison with other fifth-century inscriptions leads one to prefer the mid-fifth century. The list of victories by Damonon and his son is preceded by a dedication to Athena in hexameters.

127. 214. Blue marble chair-statuette, found at Magoula. A man is seated in the chair with animals at each side. Tod, nr. 600, identifies the figure as a Cthonian deity enthroned. He dates the inscription to the sixth century, Kolbe to the fifth. Kolbe reads the inscription as Hades (Ἄδης).
128. 217. Base of limestone inscribed with rude letters found in the temple of Athena Chalkioikos. Woodward (B.S.A., XIV [1907/8], p.137, nr.63) reads ΚΥΡΑΠΟΣΕΙΟΝ. Ψ is not attested in Laconian except on an abecedarium on a bronze krater found in France and attributed to Laconia (Joffroy, Revue de Philologie, XXVII [1953], p.175 ff). Woodward suggests that the Syracusans made the dedication and had it set up in the temple of Athena Chalkioikos.

129. 218. Lower part of a gray stele found in the temple of Athena Chalkioikos. It is simply a dedication to Athena. The date is fifth or fourth century B.C.

130. 219. Fragment of white marble badly broken on all sides. It was found in the temple of Athena Chalkioikos. Woodward (B.S.A., XIV [1907/8], p.135, nr.61), the first editor, is not able to offer an interpretation of the stone but dates it in the fifth century. Jeffery, p.201, suggests it may be part of Θ above but this is quite impossible, and one is led to suspect a typographical error. The weightiest argument against Jeffery's suggestion is that Θ is on blue marble.

131. 696. Oblong block of blue marble found built into the wall of a house at Mistra. The builder's mark
is from the fifth century. The word επιέχει is preserved.

132._____701. Tablet of gray marble found at Magoula. The inscription is a grave stone for a soldier who died in battle. The stone is roughly carved in very large letters. Jeffery, p. 201, dates it to 431-403 B.C.

133._____702. Stele of gray marble. Another grave marker for a fallen soldier. It is cut roughly with very large letters; Jeffery, p. 201, dates it to 431-403 B.C.

134._____706. An unspecified type of stone found built into a wall near Sparta and copied by Fourmont. The inscription is difficult, but may be another grave stone for a fallen soldier. Especially difficult is line one; line two has the name Deinagoras written retrograde; Kolbe has interpreted ίζολλώ of line 3 as [ε]μ [πολ]εμ[ω].

135._____713. A grave marker of blue marble. Only one word ΟΧΕΛ is preserved suggesting that the stone is a grave marker for someone who died in bed. Kolbe suggests that it is for a woman who died in childbirth and compares it with 972 which has a woman's name. Nr. 61 may be another example, but neither Tod, nr. 626, nor Kolbe note this.
136. Tablet of white marble broken on top and on right side. It seems to have been a metrical grave marker for a soldier killed at Tanagra in 457. The inscription is written boustrophedon. One strange entry in line six seems to refer to a person (ἐρταιως). Kolbe, following Hiller, suggests the ἐρταιως were Cretans. This seems correct since ἐρταιος was apparently a poetical word for "Cretan" and was not rare as a proper name in Crete. For examples of the name see Inscriptiones Creticae, I (1935), nr.33, and IV (1950), nr. 243, edited by Margherita Guarducci.

137. A fragment of a metrical dedication written on a column of an unspecified type of stone. Not enough of the inscription remains to be sure of its purpose. Line 3, if the reading (ἂς ἡθεα μὲ χέραν) is correct, seems to suggest that only a part of a more elaborate grave inscription is preserved.

138. Two small pieces of white marble, each of which is inscribed with a name. Hiller, quoted by Kolbe, suggests the stones went near or with a base on which the
sacred bird of Athena was placed. Tod, nrs. 785 and 786, points out that, since the inscribed surface was left in the rough, it was not meant to be seen and therefore must be a mason's mark. The stones read Γλαδύς and Ἀρμύς. Jeffery, p. 200, agrees that they are masons' names and dates them to the sixth century.

139. _____825. A fragment of gray marble with the single name Polleion (Πολλεῖον) written in crude letters. Jeffery, p. 200, suggests that 138 together with this stone were architectural blocks from the throne of Apollo at Amyclae and identifies the name as that of a mason. This seems preferable to Kolbe's view that it was a grave stone.

140. _____1571. Fragment of a vase. The dedication is to Orthia.

141. _____1572. A fragment of ivory with a dedication to Orthia.

142. _____1589. A block of gray marble found in Sparta in a private house. The inscription seems to be a metrical dedication but its purpose is difficult to determine since only two names and the word πατέρ are preserved entire.

143. _____1590. A dedication on an unspecified type of stone said to be fissilis (a stone of poor quality and easily split
or broken). The inscription bears the names of what seem to be father and son (Δεσπόσιςς Παλαμοίςς) or master and slave.

144. B.S.A., XXIV (1919-21), p. 101, nr. 19. A small fragment of limestone on which are preserved a few rough letters. The scratched surface makes interpretation difficult. From the early fifth or perhaps the sixth century.

145. 32. A fragment of a cup. The inscription is in pink paint. A dedication to Orthia. From the fifth century.

146. 33. A fragment of a clay vessel with one letter (o) preserved. It was doubtless a dedication to Orthia, since it was found in her shrine. From the fifth century.

147. 34. Three fragments of a vase. There seems to have been an inscription in two lines. Only four letters are preserved and it is not possible to recover any sense from them. From the fifth century.

148. 35. A fragment of a black-glazed cup with an inscription in pink paint. Part of a word is preserved. (άνέτ[εξε]) where Τ=Θ.

149. 36. A fragment of a large vase, black glazed and
with letters in pink paint. Part of the name Orthia is preserved.

150. 37. Another fragment of a cup. Letters in pink paint preserve part of the name Orthia.

151. 38. A fragment from the rim of a cup. The letters in pink paint preserve the last two letters of the dedicator's name and part of the name Orthia.

152. 39. A fragment of a cup. The letters in pink paint preserve part of the name Orthia.

153. 40. Two fragments with remains of the rim of the cup. The paint is buff colored; part of the name Orthia is preserved.

154. 41. A small fragment from a clay vessel with incised letters.

155. 42. A small sherd with two uncertain letters incised. The letters are large (over .04 cm.).

156. 43. A fragment of a shallow cup. The letters in pink paint preserve part of the name Orthia.

157. 44. A fragment of a cup with dark brown glaze. The first letter of a name Orthia is preserved.
158. A fragment of a cup. The letters in white paint preserve part of the name Orthia.

159. A fragment of a cup with part of the name Orthia.

160. A fragment of a cup; letters in pink paint preserve part of a dedication to Orthia.

161. A small fragment of clay vessel with letters in white paint. Part of an inscription to Orthia is preserved.

162. A fragment of a large vase, with remains of a large letter.

163. A fragment of a cup with letters in pink paint preserving part of the name Orthia.

164. A fragment of dark-brown-glazed vessel. The "rather careless" letters preserve part of a dedication.

165. Two fragments of a cup. A letter in white paint is preserved.

166. A fragment of a cup with part of a dedication to Orthia.

167. A fragment of a cup. The letters in white paint
preserve part of the name Orthia.

168.

A fragment of clay vessel with a few very small letters of the name Orthia.

169.

A fragment from the rim of a cup. Two incised letters from the name Orthia are preserved.

170.

A fragment with two letters of a dedication to Orthia. The incised letters are poorly made by a person barely literate.

171.

(a, b, c) (a) The stem and part of the center of a kylix. The inscription, (TPA) is apparently complete.

172.

(b, c) Two more small fragments from the same kylix found together. They are similarly inscribed, and like the fragment seem to be complete. If the inscriptions are complete they pose something of a mystery. Hondius and Woodward, the co-editors, suggest that they represent a shortened form of a name. The only name known from Laconia beginning with those letters is TRACHALOS, but this could not be the same man since the known Trachalos was a Spartan serving at Delphi in the fourth century.

173.

A bronze bell found in the sanctuary of Athena Chalkioikos. The bell was dedicated by Feipava in the fifth century (= IG.V.1.1509).
174. Another bell from the fifth century. The inscription preserves part of a dedication to Athena.

175. Another bell, much corroded. The letters are very badly preserved but seem to indicate a dedication to Athena.

176. A bronze cow. The letters are very small and difficult, if not impossible to make sense of. Hondius and Woodward, the co-editors, give different readings. They agree that the letters may contain the name Athena but regard even this conjecture as "reckless."

177. Five fragments of a black-glazed platter. The name Athena is preserved complete. From the early fifth century.

178. A small fragment of another platter. Two letters from the dedication are preserved.

179. A small fragment of a platter. One letter is preserved. The preserved letter is incised and accidentally lengthened by a slip of the tool (ヶ月). There are scratches which may be parts of other letters.

180. A small fragment of a clay vessel with two doubtful letters.

181. A small fragment with one letter preserved.
182. Two adjoining fragments from the rim of a black-glazed bowl. Only four letters are preserved (...ολαν ...). Dated to the fifth century on the basis of an old form of Μ.

183. A fragment of a platter. The letters λα are preserved in brown paint and may be part of same name preserved in 182. Probably from the fifth century.

184. A small fragment of the rim from a black-glazed vessel. Only one letter is preserved in white paint.

185. A small fragment from the base of a vase. The incised letters preserve part of the name Athena. The letter shows the inscription to be no later than the fifth century.

186. A fragment from the rim of a black-glazed platter. A single letter is preserved in black paint.

187. A small fragment of a platter with the single letter painted. Date very uncertain but perhaps fifth century.

188. A fragment of a platter with the letter painted.

189. A fragment of a black-glazed platter with
incised letters.

190. 123. A circular base of blue marble found at the Hyperteleaton. Probably to be dated to the first half of the fifth century on the basis of letter forms. The inscription is metrical (hexameters) and the artist who made the statue was a Cyrenaian (Κυραναῖος) who apparently dedicated the statue in honor of his wife.

191. 120. A fragment of blue stone. Probably a base of a statue of Heracles and part of his name is preserved. From the mid-fifth century.

192. 121. A fragment of a relief showing a soldier standing beside a horse. The dedication is to Kastor and the letter forms suggest the fifth century date.

193. B.S.A., XXIX(1927/28), p. 54, nr. 81. A fragment from a blue marble stele. The inscription is badly broken but was a list of names for some unknown purpose. Perhaps from the late fifth century.

195. 32. Bronze mirror complete and unbroken. The inscription is a dedication to Athena by Euonuma.

196. 33. A bronze bell from the sanctuary of Athena Chalkioikos. The inscription on the bell is to Athena by Empedokles. From the early part of the fifth century.

197. B.S.A., XXVII (1925/6), p. 250, nr. 38. A stele of Laconian marble. The inscription is a dedication to Athena.

198. Ἄργ. Τέθ. (1919), p. 33, nr. 2. A fragment of white marble with a few letters which A. Skias, the editor, reads as Ἕρμαρανάν.

199. 6. A white marble fragment preserving four letters.

200. 7. A white marble fragment with the letters λοφ. This is almost identical with 42.57 of the sixth century which preserves the letters λοφ.
INSCRIPTIONS OF THE FOURTH CENTURY

201. IG., V. 1, 239 (a, b). Two fragments of gray marble. Fragment a was found in Magoula, fragment b near the altar of Artemis in Sparta. Tillyard (B.S.A., XII [1905/6], p. 440, nr. 3) dates the stones to the beginning of the fourth century and thinks the two are part of the same inscription. The dating is in some doubt because it depends on the accuracy of LeBas' copy of fragment a (Revue Archéologique, I [1844], p. 705). The stone no longer exists making it impossible to check the letter forms of fragment a. The fact that the fragments were not found together rules against identifying them as part of a single inscription, though, as Kolbe, following Hiller, notes, the stone found at the altar of Artemis (fragment b) could have been carried there.

202. Fragment of a gray marble stele. The inscription is a metrical dedication to Artemis Orthia by Arixippos who won some contests in the boys' contests. An uninscribed fragment found later joins this stone at the bottom and this new fragment has cuttings for five sickles, no doubt to indicate five victories. Woodward (B.S.A., XIV [1907/8], p. 101, nr. 48) places the stone in the fourth or very early third century on the basis of the use of digamma and intervocalic h for sigma. Other letter forms
confirm an early date.

203. 649. Fragment of a blue marble base found near the theatre in Sparta. The stone seems to have the name of one or two Olympic victors.

204. 689. Marble found built into house. The stone bears a single word Hiareon (Hiapèwv) The use of Η as aspirate and the shapes of the letters attest a date in the fourth century. The word apparently refers to a temple, or residence of religious officials.

205. 703. Blue marble grave marker. The inscription, cut or scratched onto stone in very crude letters, is another example of a grave marker for a soldier fallen in battle. Here Η is used both as aspirate and as the letter Ετα. AΙΝΗΗΙΑΣ.

206. 704. Another stele of blue marble found near Sparta. Woodward (B.S.A., XIV [1907/8], p. 139, nr. 69), dates the stone to the fourth century B.C. Νικασίκες (ΝΙΚΑΗΚΛΕΣ) has fallen in battle.

207. 705. Stele of gray marble. A grave stone of a soldier fallen in battle.

208. 715. A gravestone for a Boeotian. The stone is
blue marble according to Kolbe and white according to Tod, nr. 266.

209. 716. Fragment of a marble grave stele, for a Megarian.

210. 718. A gray marble grave stele for Aeschines the Theban.

211. 719. Fragment of gray marble found built into a house, near the museum. It may be the grave stone for a citizen of Tegea.

212. 1564a. A fragment of a round limestone statue base honoring Kyniska (Κυνίσκα) daughter of Archidamas II and sister of Agisilaus. The inscription honors her for being the only woman to win the chariot race at Olympia. Xenophon ( Agesilaus 9.6) says that Agisilaus persuaded his sister to enter a team of horses in the race so that she would be living proof that such a victory is no real sign of manly virtue; even a woman could win. From the very beginning of the fourth century; erected at Olympia.

213. 235. A part of a Doric capital inscribed with the name Kyniska. This was probably the same woman honored in the preceding inscription; the inscription must have been on a monument set up in Sparta to match the statue erected
at Olympia.

214. 1565. A round marble base found in the temple of Apollo at Delphi. It is a dedication by Landridas (Ἄνδριτας) the Lacadaemonian. Kolbe suggests this could be the Landrida expelled from Sparta by Epaminondas after the battle at Leuctra (Diodorus 15.54.1).

215. 1565a. A base made of limestone now broken in two parts. Pausanias set it up as a memorial for his son Agesipolis who died in 380 (Xenophon Hellenica 5.3.18). Kleon the Sikyonian made the statue.

216. 1591. A small poros grave stone for a soldier who died in battle.

217. 253. Fragment of a blue marble stele from the fourth century. Too little remains to permit accurate interpretation.

218. 717. A grave stone of blue marble from the fourth or third century.

219. 723. A blue marble block broken on the left end but complete otherwise. The inscription is a metrical grave stone for an unknown citizen of a Laconian village.

220. 857. (a) A building tile, perhaps from a temple
of Athena.

(b) Another building tile from the same building.

221. 863 (a, b, c). Building tiles from the temple of Apollo at Amyclae.

222. *B.S.A.*, XXIV (1919-21), p. 131, nr. 111. Base of white marble with the name Epistatos. Woodward says this form of the name does not occur elsewhere and that it is a type of name derived from administrative duties.

223. 119. A base of slate. The inscription preserves the name Zeus Teleios. It is from the fourth century and established the fact that Zeus was worshipped there as Teleios.

224. *B.S.A.*, XXVI (1923-25), p. 233, nr. 25. Top of white marble stele found on the acropolis. The inscription is a dedication to Athena and was made by Aineidas while he was a member of the Gerousia. Probably from the mid-fourth century.


226. (1919), p. 34, nr. 8. A white marble stele inscribed with a victory dedication to Apollo by Agis.
INSCRIPTIONS OF THE THIRD CENTURY B.C.

227. IG. V. 1. 236. A base of blue marble. The inscription is a dedication by the tyrant Machanidas (210-207) to Eleusiai.

228. 458. A chair of blue marble. The inscription was set up between the years 225 and 222 by Kleomenes III in honor of the occasion when he absorbed both kingships into his own family by associating his brother Eukleides with himself as king. Plutarch (Kleomenes 7 - 11) gives an account of the episode, adding that Kleomenes then removed all the chairs of the Ephors except one, which he then took over for his own use.

229. 724. A funeral inscription for a mercenary soldier from Arkadia who died in Sparta. Perhaps he was in the service of the tyrants.

230. 917. Two roof tiles inscribed ἔποι Εὐκλείδης.

231. 918. Stele of gray marble. The inscription is a grave marker for a soldier killed in battle.

232. B.S.A., XXIV (1919/20), p. 110, nr. 59. A fragment from the rim of a bowl said by Woodward and Hondius to be of Hellenistic style. The name of the dedicator cannot be read but the dedication seems to have been for Eiloithia, a fact which suggests close proximity of her temple to the
temple of Orthia.

233. 60. A fragment from the rim of a cup. Seven small incised letters are preserved (...αυξηίς). Apparently inscribed by the dedicator of the preceding cup.

234. 61. A fragment of a small black-glazed bowl, nearly complete. The inscription is neatly incised on the rim. The dedication was made by Chilonis (Χιλωνίς) to Orthia.

235. 62. A fragment from the rim of a bowl dedicated by Chilonis to Orthia.

236. 63. A large fragment of a bowl, dedicated by Chilonis, to Orthia.

237. 63. A fragment of a large bowl. Once again the incised dedication to Orthia is by Chilonis.

238. 64. A small fragment of a bowl similar to 232 and 233 which may belong to one of those fragments. The dedication is to Orthia.

239. 65. A small fragment of a bowl. The dedicator is Chilonis again and the inscription is incised in letters similar to those of two other dedications by Chilonis. The letters on all three are about the same size. Woodward and
Hondius, the co-editors, suggest that the name Chilonis was limited to members of one of the Spartan royal families, except for the daughter of the wise man Chilon. During the Hellenistic period there were three women so named: the daughter of Kleomenes II, the daughter of Leotychidas, and the daughter of Leonidas II.

240. 79. A fragment of a black-glazed vessel. Part of a name is preserved followed on another line by several letters (ETYΣY). Woodward and Hondius interpret the inscription as 'Ετυμ[σ]η[λής κατὰ συγ-[γραφάν] or perhaps as 'Ετυμ[σ]η[λής ὁ συγ[γραφέως. It is from the fourth or third century gray marble stele. The inscription is badly broken but the words 'Α πόλις are visible in line 3 and perhaps the words τ]οι πόλ[ε] in line 4. If these readings are correct, the inscription might have been a letter from Sparta to another city. This is far from certain however. Woodward suggests the letter forms are like those of the Hellenistic decree 20 from the third century B.C. This inscription belongs to the same general period.

242. 83. A fragment of a Herm-shaft of gray marble. The inscription is broken but the phrase σετώι ὑπὸ Πομπ[λ] is
preserved. The letter forms suggest a Hellenistic date, perhaps the end of the third or beginning of the second century. Woodward says he has "found no satisfactory interpretation of this fragment."
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243. IG., V. 1. 864. A building tile from the sanctuary of Orthia. The inscription is ἶρεως Ἐποθείας.

244. 865. A building tile from the sanctuary of Orthia.

245. 869. A roof tile from a building used to house visiting Roman emissaries. It is inscribed κατάλυμα τῶν Ῥωμαίων καὶ δικαστῶν. Wace (B.S.A., XIII [1906], p. 39, nr. 46) dates the tiles to the second century B.C. The second half of the century seems a more likely date for the building.

246. 885 a, b, c. Three tiles from the early second century, from an unknown building erected by King Nabis; the inscription reads

247. 886. Building tiles from the city wall dated by Wace (B.S.A., XII [1906], p. 25, nr. 36) to the second or first century.

248. 888. A building tile from the city wall perhaps from the second century.

249. 889. Building tiles from the city wall dated by
Wace (B.S.A., XIII [1906/7], p. 23, nr. 22) to the second or first century.

250. 890. Another tile from the city wall and perhaps from the second century.

251. 891 a, b. Tiles from the city wall and from the second or first century.

252. 892. Tiles from the city wall from the second or first century.

253. B.S.A., XXIV (1919-21), p. 130, nr. 108. A tombstone of blue marble. From the second or first century B.C.

254. 118. A base of blue marble with a name.

255. 122. A tombstone on blue marble. Perhaps from the first or second century B.C.

256. B.S.A., XXVI (1923-25) p. 289, fig. 5, 1. A fragment from a "Megarian bowl" signed by the potter Sosimos.

257. p. 287, fig. 4, o. A fragment of a Megarian bowl signed by the potter Philokles.

258. p. 287, fig. 4, m. Another fragment of a Megarian bowl signed by a potter whose name ended with the letters (τιων).
It was scratched into the clay with a sharp object while the clay was still soft. The usual practice was to use a stamp.

259. p. 289, fig. 5, c. Another fragment of a Megarian bowl with only two letters preserved.

260. B.S.A., XXIX (1927-28), p. 52, nr. 78. A small fragment of red stone. The inscription is very badly broken and Woodward dates it to no later than the second century B.C. Nothing can be known with certainty about this inscription but if Woodward's guess ἡν ἀγαθὴς φιλίαν for line 4 is correct, it might have been a copy of a treaty or some other such public decree. This is very uncertain.
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261. IG. I. 48. Stele of white marble. The inscription is a list of six Patronomoi followed by a board of six Synarchoi. At the end of the inscription is the name of the Grammateus, his assistants the Hypogrammateis, and another servant.

262.____49. A fragment of gray marble. The inscription was a list of Ephors. Only three names are preserved.

263.____50. A block of gray marble inscribed on two sides. The inscription is badly broken but was apparently a list of Ephors and Nomophylakes.

264.____92 and 93. A large stele bearing two lists of Gerontes. The first list has eleven names preserved with space for about five or six more. The second list is broken but the total number of names appears to have been twenty-three.

265.____94. A marble stele with a list of members of the Gerousia. The stone is complete but some names are partly lost. The stone has a total of twenty-four members listed.
266. 95. Another list of members of the Gerousia. This inscription has 18 names with room for about five more.

267. 96. A stele of white marble. The inscription is a list of names probably members of the Gerousia.

268. 123. A base of blue marble inscribed επὶ πρατονίκου πεδιανόμοι. The actual list of names was doubtless on another stone placed on top of the base.

269. 124. A stele of gray marble. The inscription is a list of magistrates, covering a period of at least three years. Three men who held the office of Agoranomos (Ἀγερανόμος) under three different Epynomos Patronomes are listed together with three boards of Synarchoi consisting of five men each.

270. 125. A marble stele inscribed with a list of Agoranomoi. The stone is broken but five names were once present and perhaps six. These were followed by a list of Synarchoi now completely lost. The Agoranomoi were from different years.

271. 126. Stele of white marble broken at the top. The inscription was a list of Agoranomoi and Synarchoi.

272. 127. A marble stele inscribed with the name of the Agoranomos and with six Synarchoi. The stone is broken
below and there may have been more names. This inscription raises the possibility that there may have been more than the six men on a board of Agoranomoi as indicated by 269.

273. 128. (372,500,568). Four fragments of a gray marble stele. The inscription listed at least one Agoranomos with board of Synarchoi which may have numbered eight. Also listed was the πρεσβύς of the φειδείτευ followed by a number of ξυσείτει.

274. 133. A blue marble block broken below. The inscription was a list of members of a board of Epimeletes. Timarchos is listed as Epimeletes Ἐπιμελετής, followed by the names of at least 7 Synarchoi.

275. 134. A marble slab. The inscription was set up by the Epimelete Ἐπιμελετής Nikostatos. He lists three Synarchoi after his own name.

276. 135. A marble stele. The Epimelete Agesinikos has set up the inscription and lists five Synarchoi associated with him.

277. 136. A slab of white marble. The inscription, badly broken, was a list of Biduoi (Βίδουι). There were at least six names on the stone. The Biduoi are not
well known but Pausanias (3.11.2) says they were responsible for ephebic contests. He also says they worked as a board of five. The inscriptions show six members.

278. A stele of gray marble. The inscription was a list of Hierothytaei (Ἴεροθύτατι) inscribed in three columns. This board had its own set of officials and specialists. Of these only the secretary (γραμματεὺς) the seer (Μάντις) , and the cook (Μαγίς) are preserved.

279. A large gray marble slab. The inscription is another list of 'Ιεροθύτατι.

280. A marble block. The inscription gives the names of three Spondophoroi (Σπόνδωφοροι). Each name is for a different year and each is surrounded by a decorative wreath.

281. A marble block inscribed with the names of three Spondophoroi.

282. A marble stele. The inscription is very badly broken but was a list of magistrates, perhaps Epistatai (Ἐπίσταται).

283. A list of Sitethentes.
Apparently each board of magistrates supplied one of its members for this honorary office. The present inscription is broken, but the men listed include a member from the Biduoi, one from the Gerousia, one of the Ephors, a Nomophylax, the Grammateus of the Boule, and two others apparently not serving in another capacity.

284. 207. A stele of white marble. The inscription was the heading for another list of Σιτηθέντες. The actual list was apparently on another stone.

285. 208. A blue marble stele. The inscription is another list of Sitethentes. Each name in this list was followed by an entry describing each man's special position on the board. Preserved are the names of a wood carver (γλυ[φεύς]), a wreath maker (ψιλι[νοποίος]), a dyer (βαφεύς), a secretary (γραμματεύς), a servant (ὑπηρετας), and a cook (μάγευρος τὸ γ'). The cook was serving for the third time.

286. 209. A stele of white marble. The inscription is another list of Sitethentes. Included in this list is a priestess and priest (Ἰέρ[σια], Ἰερεύς), a member from the boards of the Biduoi, the Gerousia, the Ephors, the Nomophylakes, and the Gynaikonomoi. The special
craftmen include a messenger (Καρύς), a prophet or seer (Μάντις), a flute player (Αδλητής), a harpist (Κιθάριστας), a teacher (Διδάσκαλος), a builder or supervisor (Ἀρχιτέκτων), a carver (Γλυφεύς), a gold worker (Χρυσωτάς), a victor in the Carneian games (Καρνεοείκας), a spinner (Κλωστάς), a paean singer (Παιάνιας), a wreath-maker (Ψυλλινοποιός), a scribe (Γραμματέως), a dyer (Ρογεύς), a reader (of the sacred books?) (Ἀναγνώστας), a supply attendant (Πάροχος), a bread maker (Ἀρτοχέως), a wreath-seller (Στεφανομάλις), a cook (Μάγιρος), and the final entry is something of a mystery (Διακλής κυρίας καλλισθενίας ἄφατείν).

The line may mean that Diodes is to oversee the secrecy of the affair, but the verb ἄφατείν is unattested elsewhere.

287.____210. A large stele inscribed with a list of Tainaroi (Ταίναριοι), persons in some way in charge of the celebration of the rites of Poseidon at Tainarion.

288.____211. A large stele inscribed with another list of Tainaroi.

289.____212. A large stele bearing another list of
Tainarioi. In all, three offices already known from the lists of Sitethentes are present, including a seer, a secretary, messengers, a flute player, and paean singers. In addition, the lists of Taenarioi include an oil supplier (σιν φέρων Ἀγιέλης), an official known as Koaktēr (Κοακτήρ), a keeper of sacred books (?) (ἐπὶ γραφῶν Σωίνιχος), two types of cooks (μάγειρος and ὀψικοῖος), and a bath attendant (βαλινεῦς).

290.____294. A marble chair inscribed with the cursus honorum of Soixiades, son of Arikrates. It was set up as a votive offering to Orthia.

291.____296. Six fragments of a stone with a distyle temple represented in relief. The inscription commemorates the victory of a boy in the music contest. Woodward (B.S.A., XII 1905/6, p.380, nr. 47) places this inscription in the second century.

292.____296. A stele of gray marble dedicated to Orthia. The inscription commemorates the victory of Damippos in some boys' games. He may also have been victorious in the Moa.

293.____296. A stele of marble commemorating the victory
of Aristokrates in the Moa. This victory was won when Damippos (victor in the preceding) was Patronomos. The stele is dedicated to Orthia.

294.____265. Fragment of gray marble. The inscription commemorates the victory of Lachares in the boys' games.

295.____266. Two fragments of gray marble with another victory inscription for a winner in a boys' competition.

296.____274. Stèle of gray marble with another victory inscription, this time in the Καθηρατόριν a hunting contest.

297.____326. A fragment of a gray marble stele. The stone is broken too badly to permit certain interpretation, but it is probably another victory inscription.

298.____373. A small altar of white marble inscribed with a dedication to Augustus.

299.____374. A marble stele or base. The inscription written both in Latin and Greek seems to have listed the names of Agrippiastae, celebrants of Agrippa worship. From the years 18-12 B.C.

300.____578. An honorary inscription set up by the Polis
in honor of a citizen.

301. 580. An honorary inscription, perhaps a statue base. Poplios Pratolas and his wife set it up in honor of their daughter.

302. 740. A grave stone from the end of the first century B.C. or beginning of the first century A.D.

303. 871 - 881. Roof tiles from a building known as the Parathesis (Παράθεσις).

304. 887. Roof tile from the city wall.

305. B.S.A., XXIV (1919-1921), p. 126, nr. 105. A slab of blue marble broken on the right and on the bottom. It is an honorary inscription set up by a military company for one of its members (ο σωστός) who has done things worthy of honor.

306. 110. A gray marble tombstone.

307. 114. A slab of blue marble broken on the right and on the bottom. The inscription was honorary and was dated by the name of a Laconian month and by the name of Strategos of the Eleuthero-Laconian League, both of which have been lost. The opening words are ἐπὶ στρατ[αγώ]. The decree must be later than 146 when the Eleuthero-Laconian
league was formed; see Pausanias (3.21.7) and Swoboda in *Klio*, XII (1912), pp.21ff.

308. ___115. A slab of blue marble broken on the right and on the bottom. The inscription is near in date and may be some type of honorary decree. The first word would fit some of the usual formulas. No other restoration is possible.

309. ___116. A slab of blue marble, broken on all sides. The inscription was a list of names but it is not possible to see its purpose.

310. ___122. A tombstone on blue marble.

311. *B.S.A.*, XXX (1929-30), p. 221, nr. 12. An architrave block inscribed with the name of Polydamos a priest of Phoibos. Woodward notes that this block is not necessarily from the theatre structure, even though it was found in a late Byzantine wall just above the stage.
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312. A very large marble stele inscribed with a list of Seiteithentes Ephoroi, and a list of Seiteithentes Nomopylakes.

313. A stele inscribed with another copy of the preceding. At the end of this copy the name of the Grammatophylax has been added.

314. A marble stele inscribed in two columns with lists of Nomophylakes (col. A) and Ephors (col. B). The inscription is from the end of the first century or the very beginning of the second A.D.

315. A stele of gray marble inscribed with a list of members of the Gerousia. Twenty-three men are listed together with a grammetus, and a cook. Another name is inscribed along the edge of the stone. If the last three were members of the Gerousia, the total was twenty-eight for this year. The inscription is from the end of the first century A.D.

316. A stele of gray marble. The inscription is a victory commemoration dedicated to Orthia.

317. Another victory inscription for a winner of
the boys' music contest.

318._____273. A stele of gray marble inscribed with another victory commemoration. The stone is dedicated to Artemis Orthia.

319._____275. A stele of gray marble set up by Gaios Iulios Charexenos who has won the boys' music contest. This is one of a great number of inscriptions concerning this prominent man. End of the first century or early second century A.D.

320._____277. Stele of gray marble with two separate inscriptions set up by Primos who in one year won the music contest and, in another, won the riding contest (Keloia).

321._____278. Stele of white marble recording the victory of Eukleides in the boys' hunting contest.

322._____280. A slab of blue marble inscribed with a victory dedication to Artemis Orthia by a winner in the boys' Keloia. Woodward (B.S.A., XII [1905/6], p.371, nr.31) dates it to the time of Claudius. Kolbe prefers the second century A.D.
323. Stele of red marble inscribed with the victory dedication of another winner in the boys' Keloia.

324. Stele of white marble broken at the bottom and along the left side. The inscription was a set of regulations concerning quantities of various types of offerings to be used in the cult ceremonies involved in the worship of Zeus Taleitita and Ausesia and Damoia.

325. An honorary inscription for Germanicus Caesar set up by the Polis.

326. A small statue base, inscribed with an honorary dedication for Nero.

327. Another statue base in very badly broken but apparently inscribed with an honorary dedication for Claudius, or perhaps for Nero.

328. A dedication to the deified Emperors and to Lacedaimon.

329. Two fragments of a blue marble stele. The inscription is an honorary dedication for Sek. Pom. Theoxenon, the most eminent Gymnasiarch. The Polis authorized the inscription and the family of the honored man paid for it.
330. 467. An honorary inscription for a distinguished citizen, T. Flavius Charixenos, a member of the famous family.

331. 482. A statue base of gray marble bearing an honorary inscription for a citizen.

332. 488. An honorary inscription for a citizen who is said to be the descendant of Krios, Megasta, and Skopelos.

333. 496. A statue base with honorary inscription.

334. 659. A statue base with the victory dedication of G. Seios Magian ( Γ[άιος] [Σ]ήος Μαγίων a Corinthian.

335. 661. A large statue base with a victory inscription.

336. 667. A block of marble with a victory inscription set up by victors in the newly established athletic contests in honor of Nerva. From about 97 A.D.

337. 679. A fragment of a marble slab inscribed with victors in games. The stone is badly broken but the inscription was apparently for ball players (σφαίρεις).

338. 691. An epistle inscribed in honor of Vespasian.

339. B.S.A., XII (1905/6), p. 440, nr. 36. Two fragments from a slab of blue marble. The inscription seems to
record the repair or construction of some structure in honor of the Dioscuri. Woodward suggests that the structure was the dokana (δοκάνα) a gallows like structure well known in Sparta. From the beginning of the first century.

340. B.S.A., XXIX (1927/28), p. 41, nr. 64. A fragment of a gray marble statue base. The inscribed letters still have traces of bright red paint. The Polis has dedicated a statue of Pratomelidas, a victor in the Olympic games. The man is known from several other inscriptions; this one is from about 50 A.D.

341. A small rectangular altar dedicated to Zeus Hypsistos. A woman has made the dedication in honor of her daughter. The letters are unevenly cut and it is not easy to suggest a date for the inscription. Perhaps first or second century A.D.

342. B.S.A., XXX (1929/30), p. 209, nr. 1. An architrave block inscribed with dedication of a building of Vespasian. The inscription is from the year 78 A.D.

343. A fragment of an Ionic architrave block. The inscription is from the middle of the first century A.D.
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344. I.G., V.1.32. A marble building block. The inscriptions in two columns list public offices for two citizens.

345. 33. Fragment of a white marble slab. The inscription is a *cursus honorum* of C. Iulius Charixenos. The stone is badly broken on all sides.

346. 34. A marble slab. The inscription is a *cursus honorum* for Sextus Ulpius Severus.

347. 36. The stone is broken on top. Inscription is *cursus honorum* for two individuals.

348. 37. A large base of blue marble. The inscription is a *cursus honorum*. The name of the individual is lost.

349. 38. Another *cursus honorum*.

350. 39. Another *cursus honorum*.

351. 40. A stele of unspecified type. The inscription is another *cursus honorum*.

352. 41. A *cursus honorum*.

353. 43. A *cursus honorum*. 
354. 45. A cursus honorum.


356. 47. A cursus honorum on blue marble.

357. 53. The inscription, on a type of stone unspecified by Kolbe, is a list of Ephors, and Nomophylakes, and Spandophoroi (here a group of five men). The last person listed is described as Ensitos ("Ενσίτος").

358. 54. A fragment of blue marble. The inscription is a list of Ephors, if Kolbe's restoration is correct. The stone is too fragmentary to be certain of all the readings given by Kolbe.

359. 55. A marble stele broken on three sides inscribed with a list of Ephors. Close in date to above, since the head of the Ephors in 357 is listed here as Patronomos.

360. 56. Fragment of white marble. The inscription is a list of Ephors.

361. 57. A fragment of a marble base. The inscription is a list of Ephors and Nomophylakes.

362. 58. A base of marble. The inscription is a list of Ephors.
363. 59. A block of stone the type unspecified. The inscription is a list of Ephors and Nomophylakes.

364. 60. A large architectural block. The inscription is a list of Ephors and Nomophylakes.

365. 61. Stone fragment of unspecified type. The inscription is a list of Ephors and Nomophylakes.

366. 65. A list of Ephors and Nomophylakes. This list is of more than usual interest because of the details given about one member of the board of Nomophylakes. A certain Sosikrates has what appears to be his complete cursus honorum included. This is unusual but not unique. The inscription ends with mention of three persons listed as Enseitoi.
367. 66. A block of marble inscribed with two lists of Ephors and Nomophylakes.

368. 67. A fragment of white marble inscribed with a list of Ephors. The date is somewhat less certain than the preceding examples and is not suggested by Kolbe, but it seems likely that it belongs to the second or third century.

369. 68. A list of Ephors and Nomophylakes. The type of stone is not specified by Kolbe.

370. 69. A list of Ephors and Nomophylakes on the same stone with 339.

371. 70. A fragment of unspecified stone containing a second copy of the list of Ephors in 370.

372. 71. A large stone bearing four columns of writing. The inscriptions are not all of the same date but vary from the late first century A.D. to the mid second century A.D. Column 1 has already been listed as 345 above; column 2 is listed as 411 below. Column 3 is an expanded copy of the list of Ephors and Nomophylakes found in 370 and 371 above. Here the cursus honorum of each man is given in detail. Column 3 also contains a separate list of Nomophylakes. This list has a cursus honorum for one member and closes with the
name of a single Ephor who is identified as the good Ephor, for reasons now unknown

373.____ 72. A stele of blue marble. The inscription is a list of Ephors.

374.____ 73. A block of unspecified stone now badly broken. The inscription is a list of Ephors.

375.____ 74. A block of stone inscribed on two sides. The inscription is a list of Ephors. Side B has already been listed as 350 above.

376.____ 75. A stone of unspecified type inscribed in two columns. Column B is a list of Ephors. Column A is a list of Nomophylakes and is listed as 379 below.

377.____ 76. Two fragments of blue marble very badly broken. One side was inscribed with a list of Ephors; the other side is unknown. Kolbe suggests no date but the stone would fit well with the very long series of such lists from the second century A.D.

378.____ 77. A small fragment from a list of Ephors. This too might belong to the second century but the date is not very certain.

379.____ 78. A list of Nomophylakes on the same stone as 375 above.
380.____80. A stele of blue marble, inscribed on three sides. The three inscriptions have nothing to do with each other and are not all from the same date. Side A is a votive inscription and is listed as 2147; Side C is a list of Gerontes listed as 394. Side B is a list of Nomophylakes.

381.____82. A base of unspecified stone. The inscription was a list of Nomophylakes.

382.____83. A list of Nomophylakes.

383.____85. On same stone with 357 and 384. This inscription is a list of Nomophylakes.

384.____86. The same stone as 357 and 383. The inscription is another list of Nomophylakes.

385.____87. A blue marble slab. The inscription is a list of Nomophylakes.

386.____88. A fragment of an unspecified type of stone. The inscription is a list of Nomophylakes. The date is uncertain since no names are fully recognizable.

387.____89. A slab of white marble. The top part of the stone is missing but probably had a list of Ephors at one time. The name of one of the Enseitoi is preserved followed by the names of two Spondophoroi and a complete list of
Nomophylakes.


389.____100. A fragment of blue marble. A list of members of the Gerousia.

390.____103. A base of blue marble. A list of members of the Gerousia.

391.____105. Type of stone not specified by Kolbe. A list of members of the Gerousia.


393.____108. Type of stone unspecified. A list of members of the Gerousia.

394.____109. Type of stone unspecified. A list of members of the Gerousia.

395.____111. A base of gray marble. A list of members of the Gerousia. If Kolbe is correct they are called [γερουσία] rather than the usual Γερουσία.

396.____112. A column of blue marble. The inscription was a list of members of the Gerousia.
397.  Type of stone unspecified. The inscription was a list of members of the Gerousia.

398.  A column of marble. A list of members of the Gerousia.

399.  Type of stone not specified. A list of magistrates.

400.  Type of stone unspecified. A list of members of the Gerousia.

401.  A fragment from a marble stele. The inscription was a list of members of the Gerousia.

402.  A fragment of blue marble. A list of magistrates.

403.  Four fragments from a blue marble slab. An Agoranomos is mentioned followed by the fragmentary names of several Synarchoi. There is no indication of the identity of the other magistrates but perhaps they were Nomophylakes, since these often are listed together with Synarchoi.

404.  Type of stone unspecified by Kolbe. The inscription records the tenure of G. Ioullos Aristeas as
Agoranomos. Listed as his assistants are eight Synarchoi and one Ensitos.

405.____130. A large block of blue marble. The inscription from the very end of the century, states that M. Aurelios Klearetos fought in the forces of Aurelius Euelpistus and that he was head of the board of Agoranomoi. His Synarchoi are listed.

406.____138. Type of stone not specified by Kolbe. The fragmentary inscription preserves the names of two secretaries, three assistant secretaries, two servants, the names of six biduoi, and what appears to have been a mention of another secretary at the bottom of the stone.

407.____139. A fragment of white marble. A list of biduoi.

408.____144. A block of blue marble. The inscription names three members of a family occupying the hereditary office of Spondophoros. The inscription is contained in three garlands.

409.____147. Inscribed on the same stone as 372. A list of names perhaps of Ephors or Nomophylakes.

410.____152. A slab of blue marble. A list of seven mag-
istrates, and one secretary. The identity of the board is unknown and the number seven does not correspond with the membership of the regular boards of magistrates in Sparta.

411.____153. On the same stone as 372 and 409. A list of names for an unknown magistracy.

412.____154. Type of stone not specified by Kolbe. A list of names of an unknown magistracy. Preceding the names are the words τὸ ψηφισμ[...] καὶ τὴν πρόδο[δον]. This suggests that some type of decree might have been present as a part of the inscription but was lost when the top of the stone was broken.

413.____155. A stele of white marble. A list of names.

414.____160. A fragment of stone unspecified type. A list of names.

415.____161. Type of stone unspecified. A list of names.

416.____162. Type of stone unspecified. A list of names, whose office is unknown but the bottom part of the stone lists several Spondophoroi. Side B gives another lists of names.

417.____163. A fragment of blue marble. A list of magistrates or religious officials.

418____165. A very small fragment of unspecified type of stone.
A slab of white marble. The inscription records the names of several Spondophoroi and makes mention of an official known as Ἰροστάτης τῆς Ἀναθέσεως apparently a temple servant or official in charge of votive offerings.

The type of stone is unspecified by Kolbe. The inscription records names of religious officials (Ἁρεμνήμονες). Mention is also made of a grammateus and an eisagogeos (ἐἰσαγωγέως).

Fragment of blue marble. The inscription preserves parts of several names. It also preserves a date written ΤΚΔ, the interpretation of which is not a matter of general agreement. It may be either the 324th year from 146 B.C. or from the year 11 A.D. The letter forms and content offer no help in interpretation.

A stele of white marble. The inscription records the tenure of Aurelios Kalemer Agathokles as Gynaikonomos. He has five Synarchoi to make up a board of six.

A fragment of white marble. The inscription records a name of an official and the name of the Patronomos.

A fragmentary list of magistrates.

Apparently another fragment of the preceding.
Type of stone unspecified. A list of officials. The magistracy is unknown but had its own secretary (γραμματεύς) and servant (ὑπηρέτης).

A fragment of white marble. A list of names for some unknown office.

Three fragments of marble. The inscription is very badly broken but appears to have been concerned with religious affairs. Mention is made of the offices of Ἱερομνήμων and Ἀγωνοθέτης.

A slab of blue marble. A religious dedication.

A block of stone of unspecified type. The inscription records the name of a religious official.

An exactly similar block found together with 429. It records the name of a priestess.

A slab of stone. The inscription, an elegiac distich records votive dedication.

Fragment of gray marble. The inscription records a votive offering to Artemis Orthia by the winner of the Moa (Μῶα). The name of the winner is not given; just the fact that he was Boagos (Βοαγός). when
Kallikrates (Καλλικράτους τοῦ Ρούφου) the eponymous Patronomos.

433. 279. Stele of blue marble. The inscription records the winner of the hunting contest (κασσηράτωριν). No mention is made of the Patronomos. The stone was fitted with the winner's scythe.

434. 282. Type of stone not specified. The inscription records the winner of the boys' contest (χελοιαί). The dedication is to Artemis Orthia.

435. 283. Stele of white marble. The winner of the hunting contest made the dedication to Artemis Orthia.


437. 285. A fragment of a marble stele. The dedication is for victory in an athletic contest, the name of which is lost.

438. 286. A slab of blue marble. The dedicator has won the Moa.

439. 287. Stele of red marble. The dedicator has won the Keloia.
440. 288. Slab of blue marble. The dedicator has won the Katharatorion.

441. 289. Stele of gray marble. The inscription records the names of three cousins who won the Katheratorio. They were all Bouagoi and made this joint dedication to Artemis Orthia.

442. 290. Two fragments of red marble. The winner of the contest for endurance (τῶν ταῖς καρτέριαις ἀγώνα) has made the dedication to Artemis Orthia.

443. 291. A fragment of red marble. The inscription recorded victories by several brothers in the Moa and Keloia.

444. 292. A slab of blue marble. The dedicator has won the Katharatorion. The dedication is to Artemis Orthia.

445. 293. A slab of gray marble. The dedicator has won the Moa. The dedication is to Artemis Orthia and has the heading Ἀγαθῆς Τύχη.

446. 295. A fragment from a stele of unspecified material. A dedication by a winner of a contest the name of which is lost.

447. 296. A stele of marble. The dedicator has won the Keloia, the Moa (twice mentioned) and the Katharatorion.
He has also won a wrestling contest for boys at the games of Poseidon and Athena. The dedication is for Artemis Orthia.

448. **298.** A stele of blue marble. The dedicator has won the Kathêratorion. The inscription was fitted with a scythe.

449. **299.** A stele of white marble. The dedicator has twice won the Keloia.

450. **300.** A fragment of gray marble. Another victory dedication for an unknown contest.

451. **301.** A stele of white marble. Several persons have made a joint dedication to Artemis Orthia after winning all three of the boys' contests.

452. **302.** Two fragments of white marble. Another victory dedication for an unknown contest.

453. **303.** A slab of marble. The dedicator has won all three contests. The stone has a cutting for the scythe. The dedication is to Artemis Orthia.

453. **304.** Two fragments of white marble. A victory
dedication for an unknown contest.

455. 305. A slab of red marble. The dedicator has won all three contests. The dedication is to Artemis Orthia. The stone has the heading 'Αγαθὴ Τύχη.

456. 306. A fragment of white marble. A winner of the Katharatorion contest has made the dedication to Artemis Orthia.

457. 307. A stele of blue marble. Two brothers have made a joint dedication to Artemis Orthia after winning the Moe.

458. 308. A fragment of a white marble stele. The winner of the hunting contest has made the dedication to Artemis Orthia.

459. 309. Stele of unspecified stone. The winner of the Keloia has made the dedication to Artemis Orthia. The stone has a cutting for a scythe and has the heading 'Αγαθὴ Τύχη.

460. 310. Two fragments of a gray marble slab. The winner of all three contests has made the dedication.

461. 311. A fragment of blue marble. The stone is too badly broken for certainty but the inscription was probably
another victory dedication. The dedication or the victory was during the fourth Patronomate of the deified Lycurgus. P. Mem. Pratolaus was Epimelete for Lycurgus.

462. 312. A stele of gray marble. The victor of all three contests has dedicated the offering to Artemis Orthia. The Patronomos was the divine Lycurgus for the eleventh time.

463. 323. A fragment of a red marble stele. The inscription was a victory dedication for an unknown contest.

464. 325. Small fragment of blue marble. The inscription was a victory dedication for an unknown contest.

465. 329. A slab of blue marble. The inscription honors the winner of the Moa. This inscription is simplified in form and makes no mention of the Patronomos or of Artemis. The stone has a cutting for a scythe.

466. 358. A fragment of blue marble. The stone is too fragmentary to be certain of its purpose but it seems to have been a dedication of some sort. The preserved fragment shows that the dedicator was a member of the Gerousia three times, president of it once, and that he had held all other offices.
467. 359. A fragment of white marble. A somewhat similar dedication by a Spartan who had been both a member and president of the Gerousia.

468. 380. Type of stone unspecified. The inscription is broken on the bottom but seems to have recorded some public benefit for a gymnasium during the reign of Trajan.

469. 381. Fragment of marble base. The inscription is an honorary one for Hadrian.

470. 382. A large white marble vase. The inscription is in honor of Hadrian.

471. 383. Type stone unspecified. The inscription is in honor of Hadrian.


474. 386. Base or altar of white marble. For Hadrian.

475. 387. Stone unspecified. For Hadrian.

476. 388. Blue marble stele. For Hadrian.

477. 389. White marble. For Hadrian.
478. 390. Base or altar of marble. For Hadrian.
479. 391. White marble altar. For Hadrian.
480. 392. Fragment of marble. For Hadrian.
481. 393. Stone unspecified. For Hadrian.
482. 394. Base of white marble. For Hadrian.
484. 396. Column of blue marble. For Hadrian.
485. 397. A small altar. For Hadrian.
486. 398. Base of gray marble. For Hadrian.
487. 399. Stone unspecified. For Hadrian.
488. 400. Base or altar of blue marble. For Hadrian.
489. 401. Fragment of white marble. For Hadrian.
490. 402. A small altar of white marble. For Hadrian.
491. 403. A small base of gray marble. For Hadrian.
492. 404. A marble base. For Hadrian.
493. 405. Stone unspecified. For Hadrian.
494.____406. A square base, perhaps for Hadrian.

495.____407. A gray marble block. The inscription is one of about forty dedications to the Emperor Antoninus.

496.____408. Type stone unspecified. Another honorary inscription for Antoninus.

497.____409/ Stone unspecified. For Antoninus.


499.____411. A small altar of white marble. For Antoninus.

500.____412. An altar of unspecified stone. For Antoninus.

501.____413. A stele of blue marble. For Antoninus.

502.____414. Altar of blue marble. For Antoninus.

503.____415. White marble. For Antoninus.

504.____416. Gray marble base. For Antoninus.

505.____417. Stele of blue marble. For Antoninus.

506.____418. A fragment of column or altar. For Antoninus.

507.____419. Stele of blue marble. For Antoninus.

508.____420. Stele of white marble. For Antoninus.
509. 421. Stone unspecified. For Antoninus.
510. 422. Column of white marble. For Antoninus.
511. 423. Slab of unspecified stone. For Antoninus.
512. 424. Base of white marble. For Antoninus.
514. 426. Altar of white marble. For Antoninus.
515. 427. Stone unspecified. For Antoninus.
516. 428. Altar of white marble. For Antoninus.
517. 429. Stele of white marble. For Antoninus.
518. 430. Stone unspecified. For Antoninus.
519. 431. Stone unspecified. For Antoninus.
520. 432. Slab of white marble. For Antoninus.
521. 433. A marble block. For Antoninus.
522. 434. Blue marble. For Antoninus.
523. 435. Stele of white marble. For Antoninus.
524. 436. Stele of blue marble. For Antoninus.
525. 437. White marble base. For Antoninus.
526. Stone unspecified. For Antoninus.

527. White marble base. For Antoninus.

528. White marble stele. For Antoninus.

529. Blue marble stele. For Antoninus.

530. White marble base. For Antoninus.

531. White marble stele. For Antoninus.

532. Marble slab. For Antoninus.

533. Blue marble column. For Antoninus. To this inscription the additional title Ὀλυμπίος has been added.

534. A marble column. The inscription is an honorary one for Titus Aurelius Verus Caesar. The honor is granted by the Polis through the Nomophylakes.


536. A base of limestone. An honorary inscription for Carcalla dedicated by members of the Gerousia.

537. A marble block. An honorary inscription for a certain Teisamenos, set up by the Polis.
538. A blue marble base. The inscription honors Nymphodotus because of his moderation and education (χοσ - μιστατους και παιδειας ένεκα). The expense of the dedication is to be met by a son and neico. The Polis grants the honor.

539. A marble slab. An honorary inscription for Alexandros, perpetual gymnasiarch.

540. A limestone base. Another honorary inscription for a citizen.

541. A base of unspecified stone. A honorary inscription for a father by his children.

542. A marble base. Honorary inscription for a citizen by the Polis. P. Mem. Spartiatikos is a descendant of Herakles and Rhadamanthus. He is also forieth in descent from the Dioscuri.

543. A slab of marble. The Polis authorized the honorary inscription for a citizen. This one is paid for by the honored man's Boagos.

544. Slab of marble. Another honorary inscription for a citizen.

545. Base of unspecified stone. Another honorary
inscription for a citizen. Here a brief cursus honorum is given. The man was Grammateus of the Boule among other honors. His fellow office holders paid for the inscription.

546.____480. A base of unspecified stone. The inscription is honorary for a citizen. It was granted by the Polis through his Synarchia.

547.____481. Base of white marble. The inscription is honorary for a citizen. It is set up by the son of the honored man.

548.____483. Gray marble base. The inscription is honorary. The Polis granted it and the wife of a friend paid for it because of his friendship.

549.____485. Limestone base. The inscription is honorary. The Polis granted it.

550.____486. A base of unspecified stone. The inscription is honorary. The Polis granted it for public service.

551.____487. Blue marble base. The inscription is honorary for a citizen.

552.____489. Fragment of stele of unspecified stone. The inscription is honorary.
553. 490. Base of unspecified stone. The inscription is honorary.

554. 492. Stone unspecified. The inscription is honorary.

555. 493. A Herm of an unspecified type of stone. An honorary inscription in verse set up by the synepeboi of the honored man.

556. 494. A marble base. The inscription is honorary.

557. 497. A base of unspecified stone. The inscription is an honorary one for a citizen who served as commissioner of roads (ἀγορασμον ἐπὶ τὰς ὁδοὺς).

558. 498. A slab of marble. The inscription is honorary for a citizen.

559. 499. Statue base with part of a statue of a woman. The base is inscribed with an honorary inscription for the woman by her father.

560. 500. Blue marble. The honorary inscription was set up by a board of teachers of lycurgan customs([οἱ δὲ]-ἀσκαλοὶ ἀμ[φί] [τὰ Λυκοῦργοι]α ἔθη).
561. 501. A base of unspecified stone. The inscription was honorary.

562. 502. Type of stone unspecified. The inscription is honorary.

563. 503. Fragment of unspecified stone. The inscription is honorary.

564. 504. A base of unspecified stone. The inscription is honorary for a citizen of Trapezus and Lacedaimon. Sparta (Ἡ Σπάρτη) granted the honors.

565. 505. A marble base. The inscription is honorary.

566. 506. A base of unspecified stone. The inscription is honorary.

567. 507. Type of stone unspecified. The inscription is honorary.

568. 525. Gray marble base. The inscription is honorary.

569. 526. Gray marble base. The inscription is honorary.

570. 527. A base of unspecified stone. The inscription is honorary.
571. 528. A base of unspecified stone. The inscription is honorary.

572. 529. A base of unspecified stone. The inscription is honorary.

573. 530. Type of stone unspecified. The inscription is honorary.

574. 531. Type stone unspecified. The inscription is honorary.

575. 532. Base of unspecified stone. The inscription is honorary.

576. 533. Base of unspecified stone. The inscription is honorary.

577. 534. Base of unspecified stone. The inscription is honorary.

578. 535. Blue marble base. The inscription is honorary.

579. 536. A large base of white marble. The inscription is honorary.

580. 537. A base of unspecified stone. The inscription is honorary.
581.____ 538. A column of unspecified stone. The inscription is honorary but affords much more information than others of this class. The honored man held many offices and honors at Rome; he did work on the Gereousia building and performed other public works of a similar nature. The artist's signature follows.

582.____ 539. A Herm of blue marble. The inscription is honorary. The signature of the artist follows the dedication. The artist is the same as in 581.

583.____ 540. A Herm of blue marble. The honorary inscription is metrical. A daughter, likened by the poet to a new Penelope, has set up the Herm in honor of her father. The artist is the same as in 581 and 582.

584.____ 541. Base of unspecified stone. The honorary inscription was set up by the honored man's fellow office holders. These Synarchoi were probably associated with him as Patronomoi to judge from the number of members.

585.____ 542. Five fragments of a gray marble base. The inscription is honorary and was set up by the οικομάγοι of some local games.

586.____ 543. Base of unspecified stone. This honorary in-
scription was set up by some unknown competitors in unknown games. Mention is made of a teacher (τοῦ διδασκάλου); but his identity is unknown. Perhaps he was a teacher of Lycurgan customs, since the man was honored because of his support of the Lycurgan customs ([τ]η[ς] π[ερι] [τά]

587. 544. Base of gray marble. The honorary inscription was set up by the honored man's fellow office holders (οί συνάρχοι) who were Patronomoi, because of his devotion to the laws of Lycurgus.

588. 545. Stone unspecified. The inscription is honorary, granted by the Polis and paid for by the honored man's wife.

589. 548. A base of unspecified stone. The honorary inscription, granted by the Polis and paid for by a brother, seems to have been set up after the man's death.

590. 552. A base of unspecified stone. The Polis of the Lacedaimonians granted the honor, and a citizen paid for it. The honored man Klaudios Bassianos, is described as τοῦ κράτιστον ὑπατικόν and was a Roman official.

591. 554. A statue base of unspecified stone, in-
scribed on two sides. Side B gives a *cursus honorum* for the honored man whose statue may have been on the base. Among other offices he is described as ἐξηγητὴς τῶν Λυναύργειων ἔόνv.

592.____556. Side A. of 591 above. The inscription is honorary, was granted by the Polis, and was paid for by the honored man's synarchoi.

593.____555a,b. A marble base, published as two separate fragments. The inscription is honorary, was granted by the Polis, and paid for by Po. Al. Damocratidas.

594.____558. A Herm of unspecified stone. The fragment-ary inscription was honorary.

595.____559. A fragment of a Herm shaft of unspecified stone. The inscription is honorary.

596.____562. A fragment of white marble. The honorary inscription was granted by the Polis and paid for by synarchoi of the honored man.

597.____567. A base of unspecified stone. Only the bottom of the inscription survives saying that the father of the person honored paid for the monument. The artist's
signature follows with the verb in the imperfect tense as often.

598.____574. A square base. Part of name is preserved, probably the same as in 597.

599.____575. Fragment of unspecified stone. The inscription was in honor of a woman.


601.____581. Block of unspecified stone. The inscription is honorary for a woman. It was set up by her husband.

602.____582. Stone unspecified. The Polis granted the honor for a woman. It was paid for by persons whose names are now lost.

603.____587. A block of blue marble. The honorary inscription for a priestess was granted by the Polis and paid for by her sons.

604.____589. A base of unspecified stone. Another honorary inscription for a priestess. It was paid for by her son.

605.____590. A round base of unspecified stone. The honor-
ary inscription for a priestess was granted by the Polis.

606. 591. A fragment from a base of unspecified stone. The inscription is an honorary one for a woman and was granted by the Polis.

607. 592. Two fragments of a marble base. The Polis granted the honors and a bronze statue. The husband of the honored woman paid for it.

608. 593. A base of unspecified stone. The honorary inscription was granted by the Polis and paid for by the woman's children. This seems to have been a type of funeral honor to judge from the words [μν]ημος χάριν. Kolbe does not suggest this interpretation.

609. 646. A base of unspecified stone. The inscription is very badly broken and not a single word can be made out with certainty. Kolbe dates it to the second century and classes it as a sacred inscription of some type. This is based on the restoration of the words [μν]ημος [καλ χά]ριν.


611. 653a. Stone unspecified. This is another honorary inscription for a citizen who had distinguished him-
self in local athletic contests. The Bouagoi paid for it.

612. 653b. A base of unspecified stone. The honorary inscription is an expanded form of the same honor granted in 610. The mother of the Bouagos paid for it.

613. 660. A large base of unspecified stone. The inscription granted by the Polis, honored the winner of the funeral games for Leonidas and Pausanias and for other heroes.

614. 663. A slab of marble. The inscription is honorary for the winner of a wrestling contest.


616. 674. A stele of gray marble. The inscription records the victory of a team of ball players (σφαιρείς οι νικασαντες τὰς ὀθόνες). The name of fourteen members are listed.

617. 676. A large marble stele. The inscription records the victory of the Sphaireis of the Limneans.

618. 677. Blue marble stele. The inscription honors another team of ball players.

619. 680. A marble stele. The inscription honors a team of ball players of the Neapolitan oie.
620. 681. The inscription honors a team of ball players of the Kynosurian obe.

621. 685. A fragment of a white marble stele. The inscription honors ball players of the Pitanatian obe.


623. 692. A slab of marble. The inscription records the dedication of a stoa by a citizen.

624. 711. A small Doric epistyle of unspecified stone. Kolbe lists it as a grave marker.

625. 726. An epistyle of unspecified stone. The inscription is a very elaborate elegiac epigram set up by a man in memory of his mother, daughter, and son.

626. 730. A gray marble stele. Another metrical grave stele.

627. 734. A metrical grave stele of marble.

628. 748. A grave stele of gray marble.

629. 815. A grave stele of red marble.

630. 816. Stone unspecified. A grave stele for a
soldier who died while fighting the Parthians. He was probably in the army of M. Aurelius.


633. — 819. A marble slab. A grave stele for a soldier who had fought the Parthians.

634. B. S. A., XXVI (1923-1925), p. 160 ff. The inscribed east parodos wall of the theatre will be listed here as a single unit, though the wall contains more than one text. The wall as it now exists preserves fifteen meters of inscriptions. Twenty-eight documents make up the wall and another twenty-four documents are inscribed on stones fallen from the wall. Three similar fragments were found near the west parodos wall suggesting that it too was covered with inscriptions at one time. The marble facing of this wall is completely lost, however, and proof of the existence of inscriptions is lacking. Similar records were inscribed on stones forming part of a water channel running around the orchestra. Five such stones were found during the excavations of 1924. These include a cursus honorum and four lists of Nomophylakes. All texts of this series
are of the types familiar from many other inscriptions. Most are lists of magistrates but there are some individual cursus honorum.

635. 3. A base of white marble. The inscription states that the Polis dedicated the statue.

636. 5a. A base of gray marble. The statue was of G. Iulius Eurykles, high priest of the Emperor's cult during the reign of Trajan and Hadrian.

637. 5b. A later inscription on the same stone. An incomplete list of magistrates, whose office is unknown.

638. 6. A block of blue marble. The inscription lists a cursus honorum for G. Iulius Boiotios, also known from the wall inscriptions.

639. 7. Five adjoining fragments of gray marble. The Polis has granted honors and the statue.

640. 8. A fragment of a statue base. The honors are granted by the Polis.

641. 9. A base containing a list of five Gynaikonomoi.

642. 10. A fragment of gray marble. The statue was granted by the Polis.
643. 12. A fragment of a bronze tablet found in a Byzantine wall near the theatre. The inscription was a list of victors in various contests, together with the prize money won by each. A bronze stele on which the accounts were to be engraved is also mentioned.

644. 13. A very small fragment of a bronze tablet. Woodward suggests that it was a list of regulations for some festival.

645. 14. A very small fragment of a bronze tablet broken on all sides. The piece is very difficult to interpret, but seems to mention a bronze stele. No date is suggested but its similarity to 644 above suggests that it too might belong in the second century.

646. 15. A fragment of a bronze tablet. The inscription honors the holder of an Imperial priesthood.

647. 16. A small cylindrical altar of white marble. The dedication is to Zeus Hypsistos.

648. 17. A small rectangular altar of gray marble. The dedication is to Zeus Hypsistos.

649. 18. A large rectangular altar of gray marble. Inscribed on all four sides, the dedication is by Aphrodeisios the slave of Klaudios Pratolaas. The dedication is to Zeus Hypsistos. Together with the dedication is a three
line epigram, two hexameters and a pentameter in which the
dedicator expresses the wish that any one looking upon
this evidence of his character might say that even such
men as he thrive. The last line appears to Woodward to be
a quotation from some unknown source.

650. 20b. A list of names of members of a board of
public officials. Nikandridas is listed as Bouagos (cf.
370 and 371 where his cursus honorum is given).
The inscription must be from the mid-second century A.D.
The board of officials has a secretary whose name is not
preserved.

651. 20c. A list of Patronomoi. None of the names is
known elsewhere. A secretary is listed. In addition,
this board had an official known as ὑπερέτης γραμματείας, a
title new to Spartan inscriptions.

652. 29. A fragment of a blue marble slab inscribed
on two sides. A list of members of the Gerousia from the
time time of Hadrian.

The following are from B.S.A.,XXVII (1925-1926), p.210 ff.
Excavation of the theatre was finished in 1926. As ex­
pected, more fragments of the inscriptions from fallen
blocks from the parados wall were found. The wall of the
bastion carrying the outer staircase was found inscribed with four texts still in place. Since most inscriptions found in 1926 were fragments not in place, they will be listed here individually even though they may be part of the inscribed wall. Numerous fragments belonging to previously listed blocks are not listed again here.


654. E29. A large fragment incomplete at the top but preserving at least six names of what must have been a list of the Gerousia.


656. E31. A large block inscribed with a list of Nomophylakes during the Patronomate of G. Iulius Charixenos.

657. E32. A large block with a list of Nomophylakes.


659. E34. A small fragment of a list of Nomophylakes.

660. E35. A large block inscribed with a list of Biduoi.
661. _E36._ Two small fragments of a list of Bidouci.

662. _E37._ A very small fragment with contents unknown.

663. _E38._ A small fragment with unknown contents.

664. _E39._ A small fragment with unknown contents.

665. _E40._ A small fragment with unknown contents.

666. _E41._ A small fragment with unknown contents.

667. _E42._ A small fragment with unknown contents.

668. _E43._ A small fragment with unknown contents.

669. _E44._ A complete block with honorary dedication granted by the Polis. The stone is from the wall and the recipient is otherwise unknown.

670. _E45._ A small fragment with only three letters preserved.

671. _E46._ A small fragment with unknown contents.

The following inscriptions are from the east end of the supporting wall of the staircase. The texts were first published in _B.S.A._, XXVI (1923-25), p. 160ff. and _B.S.A._, XXVII (1925-26), p. 210ff.

672. _Fl._ A list of Ephors.
673. **F2.** A *cursus honorum* for Varius Phosphorus. The *cursus* is presented as a dedication to the state.

674. **F3.** A large block inscribed with the *cursus honorum* of C. Ioullos Theophrastos. The text is in two columns totaling 18 lines. This *cursus* was dedicated to the gods as if it were a votive offering. Theophrastos had a long and full career; his *cursus honorum* is one of the most interesting of all the Spartan inscriptions of this class.

675. **F4.** The *cursus honorum* of C. Ioullos Arion. A very interesting entry in this inscription is the line ἐφόρος ἐπὶ τῶν νεωτερίσμων (Ephor during the revolution). Woodward suggests there was no epynomous Patronomos that year. But what revolution? Woodward suggests that it must have occured in the reign of M. Aurelius.


677. **32.** A fragment of a blue marble slab. The top part preserves two names of a list of magistrates. The lower part of the stone contains a broken list of Nomophylakes. Woodward suggests the top half of the stone was
678.____33. A massive statue base which is inscribed on one side with 385. The present text was concealed by the rubble wall into which it was built until 1926. The inscription is for a statue of C. Pomponios Aikastos, a well known Spartan citizen. Numerous inscriptions from the second quarter of the second century A.D. refer to him.

679.____34. A statue base of blue marble. The statue, of C. Iulius Charixenos, was set up by his grandmother. The honored man is well known from other inscriptions.

The following inscriptions were first published in B.S.A., XXIX (1927-1928), p.2ff. where the publication of the theatre inscriptions is continued. Additional texts from the east parodos wall and from the orchestra drain were published. These fragments are the last of the inscriptions from the east parodos wall. The fallen blocks represent a total of forty-nine separate texts, thirty of which are complete or nearly so, and nineteen of which are smaller fragments. In addition, the many small fragments from other blocks represent a number of other texts which Woodward judges to have numbered at least twenty-seven. But the exact number is impossible to determine. Several of the last finds
are fragments of previously published blocks. These are not repeated here.


681. E48. A small fragment. The purpose of the inscription is unknown.

682. E49. A small fragment with two inscriptions. One was probably the usual list of names or an independent cursus honorum. The other was probably a result of reusing the block after it had fallen. Both are too fragmentary to classify.

683. E50. A fragment of a block containing the remains of a list of names. The office is not recoverable.

The following are from blocks lining the orchestra drain. For these see also B.S.A., XXVI (1923-25), p. 200ff. The present texts add nine new lists of magistrates inscribed on seven blocks. In addition, two more blocks were inscribed, but nothing can be recovered from their badly weathered surfaces.

684. 2 (A) Nothing could be read from this block.

685. 2 (B) A list of Nomophylakes.

686. 2 (!!) Three lists of Nomophylakes, the first of which
is another copy of 678.

687.____2 (J) A list of Nomophylakes, another copy of 673.

688.____2 (K) A list of Ephors, another copy of 678.

689.____2 (L) A list of Ephors, another copy of 678.

690.____2 (M) A list of Ephors.

691.____2 (N) A list of Ephors.

692.____2 (O) A list of Ephors, very badly worn.

693.____41. Two fragments of white marble stele. The names are from a list of Ephors of an unknown year.

694.____42. A fragment of a gray marble block. Two sides are inscribed and each may at one time have had lists of Nomophylakes and Ephors since side b preserves part of a list of Enseitoi which commonly follows the Nomophylakes in such lists.

695.____43. A large stele of blue marble. The surface is much damaged but the inscription was a list of Nomophylakes followed by the Enseitoi and Spondophoroi.

696.____44. A fragment of gray marble. The inscription
was probably a list of Nomophylakes but the stone is too badly broken to permit positive identification. The date is uncertain but it seems to belong to the first or second century A.D. because of its likeness to others of this type.

697.____45. A slab of blue marble. Probably a list of Ephors followed by a list of Nomophylakes. Another inscription ran along the top edge of the stone and three letters are preserved there. The date is uncertain but perhaps it is first or second century.

699.____49. A fragment of gray marble. The inscription was a list of names but the magistracies involved are unknown. The stone is probably from the first or second century.

700.____50. A small fragment of gray marble. The identity of the magistrates listed is unknown. First or second century.

701.____51. A fragment of a gray marble column. Woodward suggests the inscriptions was a list of Patronomoi. The date is uncertain but probably it is first or second century.

702.____52. A block of blue marble. The stone was set up
by Sossius Epaphrodeitos, Hierothete for the second time about 150 A.D.

703. 53. A fragment of gray marble. The inscription is badly broken, but was set up by an individual and records that he was Gymnasiarch. Woodward suggests the stone refers to a visit of Hadrian in 125 or 128 and bases his restoration on that assumption.

704. 54. A fragment of a large white marble base. The stone is broken too badly for positive readings. The date is uncertain but perhaps it belongs to the first or second century.

705. 56. A large statue base. Traces of red paint remain in the letters. The inscription is an honorary one granted by the Polis for Q. Aufidenus. He was apparently a professional teacher and is called τὸν φιλοσόφον in the inscription, but the title could also refer to his father. The only other Spartan to be so described was Enseitos of the Gerousia about 170 A.D.

706. 59. Three fragments of a long white marble from a re-used architrave block. This inscription is broken too badly for confident restoration but it seems to have been a dedication of a pair of statues, one of a woman and one
of Klaudius Seimedes. The dedication was made by Tiberios Klaudios Herodes (the sophist?). Klaudius Seimedes is also known from several other inscriptions.

707. 60. A large fragment of a statue base of blue marble. Traces of red paint remain in the letters. The inscription was a dedication of a statue for M. Aurelius Phillipus. This inscription belongs to the very end of the second century or to the early third.

708. 61. A fragment of a statue base of gray marble. The inscription is in honor of M. Aurelius Nikephorus Philenida. The date is sometime around 200 A.D.

709. 62. A small fragment of a statue base. Little can be read. Woodward dates it to the Antonine years or after.

710. 63. A fragment of a statue base of gray marble. The Polis dedicated the statue for a victor in the Aktian games in Nikopolis. The inscription is from the time of Hadrian or perhaps slightly earlier.

711. 65. Three fragments of a blue marble stele. The letters have traces of red paint. The inscription lists athletic victories. The victor's name is lost but has been restored by Woodward as P. Aelius Alkandridas, son of the
man who paid for the inscription. The person honored won the stadion race for boys at Nemea twice, the stadion for men at the Isthmian games twice, the stadion for men at Olympia twice, the diaulon for men at the Pythian games twice, and the race in full armour as well as other unspecified victories. The date is uncertain but the stone probably belongs to the first or second century.

712.____66. A slab of white marble composed of some dozen fragments. The inscription preserves several names of athletic victors or perhaps a single victor with citizenship in several places including Selge in Pisidia, Tyre(?), Sparta, and Nikopolis (?). The date is uncertain but the stone is probably from the first or second century.

713.____67. Three fragments from a slab of gray marble. The victor was a citizen of Athens, Laodikea, and Sparta, and perhaps elsewhere. His name is lost. The inscription probably dates from the first or second century.

714.____68. A fragment from a base of gray marble. The inscription is very badly broken but Woodward suggests that it probably referred to an athlete. The date is uncertain but perhaps it belongs to the first or second century.

715.____70. A fragment of a rectangular altar or base.
The inscription records the fact that Eukrates was Agoranomos. The stone is dedicated to the Dioscuroi.

716. 72. A small fragment from stone with a relief. A right hand holding a thunderbolt is preserved. The inscription reads from top to bottom. The dedication was to Zeus Hypsistos and was probably from the first or second century A.D.

717. 73. A small fragment of a white marble tile found in the early sanctuary on the acropolis. It gives some evidence for the location of a temple of Zeus Hypsistos there. No date is suggested but it may belong to the first or second century.

718. 74. A small base of coarse marble. The dedication is to Zeus Soter. There are about forty similar dedications from Sparta (see 495).

719. 75. A small fragment. The inscription is badly broken and very poorly cut. It seems to have been a dedication for Antoninus Pius.

720. 76. A fragment from a white marble stele. The inscription was a votive offering to Hadrian. For others of this class see nrs. 469-494.

with frieze from a building of the late second century. The inscription is a dedication by a priest of the Imperial cult.
INSCRIPTIONS OF THE THIRD CENTURY A.D.

722. IG. V. 1. 101. A fragment of a marble slab. The inscription with a dedication to the Dioscuroi is a list of the Gerousia.

723. 140. A fragment of stone of unspecified type. A list of Biduoi.

724. 313. Four fragments of a stele of white marble. A victory dedication by a winner of the Moa, the Keloia, and the Katharatorion. The dedication is to Artemis Orthia.

725. 314. Five fragments of a blue marble stele. A victory dedication by a winner of the Katharatorion to Artemis Orthia.

726. 449. Upper part of a column of blue marble. A dedication to the Emperor Florian. The date is 276 A.D.

727. 450. A column of an unspecified type of stone. A dedication for Constantius Chlorus from the end of the third or from the early fourth century.

728. 546. The type of stone used is unspecified. The inscription is honorary for a Roman Procurator of the Imperial cult.

729. 547. A slab of blue marble. The inscription is
a dedication of one of twelve statues in honor of a citizen which are to be paid for by the man's family. Another copy of this dedication was found in the British excavations of 1927 (see 752 below). At one time there must have been a total of twelve such inscriptions.

730. A slab of white marble. The inscription is an honorary one for a citizen.

731. A marble base inscribed with an honorary dedication for a citizen who distinguished himself as Gymnasiarch and in other lesser offices.

732. A base of white marble. The inscription honors a citizen distinguished as Gymnasiarch.

733. A marble base. The Polis set up this honorary inscription for P. Aurelius Chrysogonus. He was priest of a goddess whose name was left out by error; he distinguished himself as Gymnasiarch and was a protector of the customs of Lycurgus.

734. A base of unspecified stone. The inscription is honorary for a citizen who was Gymnasiarch.

735. A base of unspecified stone. The inscription
is honorary for a citizen.

736. 564. A base of marble. The inscription is honorary for a citizen, who was president of his tribe (πρέσβυν τῆς φυλῆς). The date is uncertain but the third century or the end of the second seems appropriate. It is not earlier than the time of M. Aurelius.

737. 565. A base of unspecified stone. The inscription is honorary for a citizen and is not earlier than the time of M. Aurelius.

738. 566. A base of unspecified stone. The inscription is honorary for a citizen.

739. 568. A base of marble. The inscription is honorary for a citizen.

740. 569. A base of unspecified stone. The inscription is honorary.

741. 570. A base of unspecified stone. The inscription is very badly broken but the name seems to have been the same as in 740. The honored man in both these inscriptions seems to have been a Roman citizen.

742. 571. A fragment from a blue marble base. The inscription is very badly broken but was an honorary in-
inscription for a Spartan citizen. The date is uncertain and it could belong to the second century as well as to the third.

743. 572. A base of unspecified stone. The inscription is honorary for a citizen and was set up after 239 A.D.

744. 601. A base of unspecified stone. The inscription is honorary for a woman. It was apparently set up by her husband as a memorial after her death.

745. 602. Type of stone unspecified. The inscription is honorary for a priestess of Artemis Orthia and other gods. The dedication was set up by the mother of the Priestess.

746. 666. Type of stone unspecified. The inscription is in honor of an athletic victor.

747. 682. Type of stone unspecified. The inscription honors the victors in some ball games.

748. 683. Type of stone unspecified. Another inscription honoring ball players.

749. 684. A stele of unspecified stone. Another inscription in honor of a team of ball players.
750.-759. A stele of blue marble. The inscription indicates a tomb stone.


752. B.S.A., XXIX (1927/1928), p. 34, nr. 57. A rectangular statue base. The inscription, an exact duplicate of 547, is for the most part concerned with persons who will pay for the twelve statues of the honored man.

753.-80. A fragment from a gray marble slab. The inscription is not well preserved but interesting as one of the very few Latin inscriptions from Sparta. Woodward suggests this inscription might have been a copy of an Imperial rescript from the third or fourth century.

754. B.S.A., XXX (1929-30), p. 210, nr. 3. An architectural block bearing a fragmentary inscription from the end of the third century or the beginning of the fourth. Woodward suggests that when complete the inscription may have included the names of the Emperors Diocletian and Maximian.

755.-10. A mason's name (Ἀλέξάνδρου) on an abacus of a late Doric capital. Woodward suggests it might have been a dedication by or to an athletic victor.
because of the palm and wreath shown in relief. The inscription is later than 200 A.D.

756. 11. A mason's name, the same as in 755 above, on a moulded block.
INSCRIPTIONS OF UNKNOWN DATE

757. IG., V. 1. 67. A white marble fragment. A list of Ephors. The letter forms suggest the second or first century B.C.

758. 76. Two fragments of blue marble. A list of Ephors. No date is suggested but if Kolbe is correct in restoring the name 'Iouliou', an Imperial date is likely.

759. 77. A fragment of unspecified stone. A list of Ephors.

760. 84. A list of Nomophylakes. The letter forms suggest a late date.

761. 118. A fragment of white marble. A list of officials one of whom was the grammateus of the Boule. No indication of date.

762. 120. A slab of poros stone. A list of officials.

763. 121. A fragment of white marble. A list of officials.

764. 122. A slab of white marble broken on all sides. A list of officials.

765. 131. A fragment of white marble. The inscription records the office of Agoranomos.
766. Fragment of white marble stele. A list of magistrates.

767. Fragment of a base. A list of magistrates of unknown office.

768. A fragment of white marble column. A list of magistrates.

769. A stele of blue marble. A list of magistrates.


771. A fragment of unspecified stone. A list of magistrates.

772. A very large stone inscribed with a list of Ephebes.

773. A fragment of unspecified stone. A list of magistrates.

774. A fragment of a white marble stele. A list of magistrates.

775. A fragment of blue marble. A list of officials.

776. Fragment of unspecified stone. A list of officials.
777. Type of stone unknown. A list of magistrates.
778. Type of stone unknown. A list of magistrates.
779. A square base. A list of magistrates.
780. A fragment of a blue marble slab. A list of magistrates.
781. A fragment of a blue marble slab. A list of magistrates.
782. Type of stone unknown. A list of magistrates.
783. Type of stone unknown. A list of magistrates.
784. A marble slab. A list of magistrates.
785. A fragment of blue marble. A list of magistrates.
786. Two fragments of gray marble. A list of magistrates.
787. Fragment of a white marble column. A list of magistrates.
788. A fragment of a blue marble stele. A list of magistrates.
789. 194. Type of stone unknown. A list of magistrates.


791. 196. A fragment of marble. A list of magistrates.

792. 197. A fragment of blue marble. A list of magistrates.

793. 198. A fragment of a base of white marble. A list of magistrates.

794. 199. A fragment of blue marble. A list of magistrates.

795. 200. A fragment of marble. The stone is inscribed in two columns perhaps of different dates. List or lists of magistrates.

796. 201. A fragment of marble. A list of magistrates.


798. 203. A fragment of gray marble. Perhaps a list of magistrates.

799. 204. A fragment of marble. A list of magistrates.

800. 205. A fragment of blue marble. Perhaps a list of
magistrates.

801. 207. A stele of white marble decorated with relief of Helen standing between the Dioscuri. A list of Sitethentes.

802. 221. A fragment of a marble slab. A dedication to Apollo Delphidius.


804. 228. A small altar inscribed as votive offering.

805. 230. A small marble altar, dedicated to Δεσποίνας.

806. 237. Small altar dedicated to Hermes.

807. 238. A fragment of blue marble, apparently a religious dedication by an athletic victor.

808. 240. Upper part of marble altar dedicated to Zeus Hypsistos.

809. 241. Stone unspecified; dedicated to Poseidon.

810. 242. An altar set up for the safety of the Emperors. The dedication is to Τύχη ἐπηκόω.
Small marble altar dedicated to the Graces (Χάρις). Pausanias (3.14.6; 18.6 and 9.35.1), gives evidence of their worship in Sparta.

A small marble altar. The inscription is complete but does not name the god in whose honor it was set up.

A slab of blue marble. Another votive offering. Letter forms suggest a late date.

A fragment of black stone. The inscription indicates a votive offering, or perhaps a grave stone.

A marble base. The inscription is a votive offering for an unknown goddess and was made by a woman.

A slab of white marble. The stone has a cutting for a scythe. The inscription is metrical and was set up by a winner of the Moa. The lines are so arranged that the letters in each, if added up according to their numerical value, equal 2730. The sum is given in the margin following each line (ΒΦΑ). The dedication is for Orthia.

Three fragments of a white marble slab. The inscription is metrical and is a dedication to Orthia by a winner of the Keloia. A scythe was dedicated but the
stone does not preserve the cutting for it.

818. 297. A stele of gray marble set up by a victor of the Moa.

819. 315. A small fragment which Kolbe describes as religious. Not enough is preserved to be certain. The honored man or the dedicator seems to have been described as a song writer ( ὅμνοτοκ[ος] ). See also Nonnus Dionysiaca 26.203.

820. 316. A fragment of blue marble. The inscription is a dedication of a scythe to Orthia.

821. 317. Three fragments of blue marble. A dedication to Orthia.

822. 318. A fragment of gray marble. A dedication to Orthia.

823. 319. A fragment of white marble. A dedication to Orthia.

824. 320. A fragment of blue marble. A dedication to Orthia.

825. 321. Three fragments of a marble stele. Traces of a cutting for a scythe are preserved. A dedication to Orthia.
826. A fragment of a marble stele. A dedication to Orthia.

827. A fragment of stele. The inscription is a dedication by an athletic victor.

828. A fragment of marble. The stone preserves part of a cutting for a scythe. A dedication by an athletic victor.

829. A fragment of red marble with a cutting for a scythe. The name Philippos is preserved.

830. Four fragments of a gray marble stele. The dedication is to Orthia by a winner of the hunting contest.

831. A fragment of a stele. An athletic dedication.

832. A fragment of a red marble stele. An athletic dedication.

833. A fragment of gray marble. The inscription is a religious dedication.

834. A fragment of a gray marble slab. A dedication by a victorious athlete.

835. A fragment of a marble stele. A dedication
by a victorious athlete.

836. 338. A fragment of a red marble stele. A dedication by a victorious athlete.


839. 341. A fragment of a blue marble stele. A dedication to Orthia by a victorious athlete.

840. 342. A fragment of gray marble. A dedication by a victorious athlete.

841. 343. A fragment of blue marble. A dedication by a victorious athlete.

842. 344. A fragment of red marble. A dedication by a victorious athlete.

843. 345. A fragment of stone slab with traces of a cutting for a scythe. A dedication by a victorious athlete.

844. 346. A fragment of white marble. A dedication by a victorious athlete.
845. 347. A fragment of gray marble. A dedication by a victorious athlete.


847. 349. A fragment of a stone slab. A dedication by a victorious athlete.

848. 350. A fragment of a white marble stele. A dedication by a victorious athlete.

849. 351. A fragment of red marble. A dedication by a victorious athlete.

850. 352. A fragment of gray marble. A dedication by a victorious athlete.


852. 354. A fragment of a stele. Only four letters of a name are preserved. Kolbe lists the inscription as a religious dedication. It is probably of Imperial date to judge from the name.


854. 356. Three fragments of a stone slab. A votive
offering of some unidentifiable type.

855.____364. A marble chair. The inscription is a long list of sacrifices to be made to numerous goddesses.

856.____365. A column of white marble. The inscription is an arrangement of the alphabet into six vertical columns. It is probably magical.

857.____366. A fragment of a blue marble block. The inscription is a part of the alphabet (alpha - iota) arranged in a semi-circular pattern.

858.____367. A boundary stone for a temple. The numeral \( \alpha' (200) \) ends the inscription.

859.____368. A boundary stone of white marble. The number given is \((7)\).

860.____369. A boundary stone of a temple. The numeral given is \((11)\).

861.____370. A boundary stone.

862.____372. A small fragment of stone. Only a few letters are preserved but the inscription suggests a boundary stone for a temple of Zeus.
863. Type of stone unspecified. The inscription is a dedication to Thynnaros, a hero of the Phrygian city Synados. The dedication was made in the interest of good will between cities. To judge from the names, the inscription is of the Imperial age and not earlier than the first century A.D.

864. A dedication of unknown type dating from the Imperial age.

865. A base of blue marble. The inscription is honorary for a citizen. The inscription is in hexameters with partial quotes from Homer.

866. A base of unspecified stone. The inscription is metrical and was in honor of an individual.

867. A fragment of a white marble stele. The inscription seems to have been an honorary one of Imperial date.

868. Type of stone unspecified. The inscription was honorary and was set up by the Polis. The names suggest a date in the Imperial age.

869. A fragment of a blue marble base. The inscription is honorary and was set up privately.
870. A base of blue marble. The inscription set up by the Polis of Gortyn, honors a Spartan described as Proxenos.

871. Stone unspecified. The inscription is honorary for a citizen who was ambassador to Rome. The inscription is from Imperial times to judge from the names.

872. Stone unspecified. An honorary inscription of Imperial times.

873. A fragment of a base or small altar. Only a name is preserved.

874. Type of stone unspecified. The inscription appears to have been religious in nature. The priests of Apollo are mentioned.

875. An honorary decree for a priest of the Imperial cult.


877. Stone unspecified. The inscription is honorary for citizens.

878. A stele of unspecified stone. The inscription is in honor of a citizen described as Epimeletes.
of the Amyklians, Messenians, Argives, Patreans, Korinthians, Sikyonians, Eph..., Megalopoleitans and other foreigners residing in Amyclae.

879.____516. A base of marble. An honorary inscription of Imperial date to judge from the names.

880.____517. A base of unspecified stone. The inscription is honorary.

881.____518. A round base. An honorary inscription set up by a man for his daughter. The inscription is of the Imperial age.

882.____519. A fragment of an honorary inscription.

883.____520. A block of blue marble. An honorary inscription set up by a woman for her husband. It is from the Imperial age.

884.____521. An honorary inscription set up by a man for his wife. From the Imperial age.

885.____522. An honorary inscription set up by a woman for her son and father.

886.____523. An honorary inscription. Part of an artist's signature is preserved suggesting originally the existence of a statue.
887. An honorary inscription set up by the citizens of Patrae for a Spartan who had done them some good service apparently as an administrator.

888. A base of white marble. The inscription is honorary for a citizen and is from the Imperial age.

889. A marble base. The inscription is honorary set up by a private citizen for his daughter who is a priestess.

890. An honorary inscription for a citizen but dedicated to Demeter and Kore by the Polis (Δήματρι καὶ Κόραι).

891. A marble base. The inscription is honorary set up by the Polis for a priestess or mistress of banquets of Demeter and Kore (τὴν σωφρονεστατὴν Ξεναρίαν τὴν Θυναμόστριαν καὶ ἑστίαν πόλεως).

892. A base of blue marble. The inscription is honorary for a priestess as in 891.

893. Stone unspecified. The inscription is honorary for a woman.

894. A base of unspecified stone. The inscription is honorary for a woman described as having the right of children (τέχνων δίκαιον). This must mean the
Roman privileges to parents of three children. From the Imperial age.

895.____594. A slab of unspecified stone. The inscription is an honorary one for a woman. From Imperial times.

896.____595. Stone unspecified. An honorary inscription for a woman, probably a priestess.

897.____600. A base of unspecified stone. The inscription is honorary for a woman. It is of imperial times to judge by the names.


899.____605. A base of white marble. An honorary inscription for a woman.


901.____607. A base of blue marble. The inscription is honorary for a woman.

902.____608. A base of blue marble. The inscription is honorary for a woman who is a priestess and who has the right of children.
903. 609. Stone unspecified. The inscription is honorary for a citizen.


907. 613. A fragment of white marble. The inscription is too badly broken for identification.

908. 614. Two fragments of an epistyle. Inscription is honorary.

909. 615. A base of blue marble. The inscription is honorary for a woman said to be a daughter of Ephors and Kings of the city.

910. 616. Stone unspecified. The inscription is honorary, apparently for a Macedonian.


912. 618. Stone unspecified. Part of a name is preserved. Perhaps the inscription is honorary. The name seems to have been M. Aurelios suggesting a second century date.
913. 619. An honorary inscription but very badly broken. If Kolbe's restoration is correct a bronze statue was awarded.

914. 620. A fragment of white marble. Too badly broken for identification.

915. 621. A fragment of white marble. An honorary inscription.

916. 622. Five fragments of a blue marble base. An honorary inscription for an athletic victory.


918. 624. A marble fragment. An honorary inscription.


920. 626. A fragment of gray marble. Too badly broken for identification.

921. 627. Apparently a dedication to the gods in memory of the dedicator's parents.


923. 629. Fragment of gray marble. Very badly broken
but seems to have been for an athletic victor.

924.____630. Stone unspecified. An honorary inscription.


926.____632. Fragment of gray marble. An honorary inscription of the Imperial age to judge from the name.

927.____633. A fragment of white marble. Only five letters are preserved, too broken for identification.

928.____634. Fragment of marble too badly broken for identification.

929.____635. Stone unknown. An honorary inscription.

930.____636. Fragment of base. An honorary inscription.


932.____638. Fragment of white marble base. Too broken for identification.


934.____640. Fragment of white marble. Too broken for positive identification. Kolbe suggests that it was
part of an inscription identifying a statue.

935. 641. Fragment of marble. Honors an athletic victor.

936. 642. Fragment of white marble. Too broken for identification.

937. 643. Fragment of white marble stele. The inscription is very badly broken but appears to be honorary.

938. 644. Fragment of a base or stele of white marble. Too badly broken for positive identification.

939. 645. Stone type unknown. Inscription very badly broken but appears to honor an athletic victor.

940. 647. A base of gray marble. Badly broken but probably honorary.

941. 648. Too badly broken for identification.

942. 649. Fragment of a blue marble base. The inscription records the name of an Olympic victor and priest.

943. 650. Stone unspecified. Two religious officials are named.

944. 655. A fragment of blue marble. The inscription
is honorary for an athletic victor.

945.____668. Stone unspecified. The inscription is honorary for an athletic victor.

946.____651. Stone unspecified. Only a name is preserved. The man is described as

947.____652. A white marble base. The inscription is honorary, set up by the Polis and paid for by brothers of the honored man.

948.____654. Stone unspecified. Inscription is honorary for a citizen. It was set up by the Polis and paid for by the wife of the honored man.

949.____656. Stone unspecified. Three victory wreaths are inscribed with the names of athletic contests (ξένωθερια, Ποσειδαία, Ἐρωτίδα).

950.____657. Stone unspecified. The stone is inscribed with the names of three athletic contests each within a wreath.

951.____659. A base of unspecified stone. The inscription honors a Corinthian who has won several athletic victories.

952.____662. A stele of marble. The inscription was
granted by the Polis of Smyrna in honor of one of its own citizens who has won numerous contests including contests in tragedy (νεικήσαντα τραγωδιώς Οδρονίάδα γ'). He is described as being a citizen in all of Greece, Macedon and Thessaly.


954.____667. Stone unspecified. No text is given.

955.____668. Stone unspecified. Honorary for athletic victor.

956.____669. A marble slab. The inscription, from the Imperial age, is honorary for a citizen of Ephesus, Antinoos, and Athens. The honored man was an athletic victor and was a life long overseer of the gymnasium colonnade and Imperial baths.


959.____672. A fragment of a statue base. Honorary for an athletic victor.

961. An epistyle of unspecified stone. The inscription states that Kleon the Lacedaemonian was architect.

962. Epistyle of blue limestone. The inscription was a workman's signature.

963. Type of stone unspecified. A name is preserved, perhaps of an artist or stone mason.

964. An epistyle of unspecified stone. A name is preserved.

965. A fragment of a statue of white marble. The inscription is the signature of an Athenian artist named Apollonios. The verb (ἐνοίησ) is in the imperfect as often.

966. Stone unspecified. The inscription seems incomplete, and is unreadable for the most part.


968. A stele of blue marble. The inscription
is a grave stele for two soldiers who fell in battle. One of them was an Olympic victor.


970. A fragment of red marble. The inscription was a grave marker for a soldier fallen in battle.

971. Stone unspecified. The inscription is probably a grave stone for someone who died in childbirth ( λέγοι ).

973. A fragment of a column of unspecified stone. The inscription was a metrical grave marker.


975. Stone unspecified. The inscription is a metrical grave marker.


977. Stone unspecified. The inscription is a metrical grave stone. It is badly broken but the remains
are of some interest. The honored man's name is lost but he is described as a Lacedaemonian. It is also stated that he went on an expedition, was given a gift of freedom, and a grave on the acropolis. Kolbe suggests the expedition was with M. Aurelius. The man in question must have gone to war as a slave and then gained his freedom for services performed.

978. 731. A small marble base. The inscription is a four line epigram used as a grave marker.

979. 732. Two fragments of marble. The inscription is a metrical grave marker for a woman.

980. 733. A marble slab. A metrical grave marker.


983. 737. Stone unspecified. The inscription was a grave stone.


985. 739. Stone unspecified. The inscription was probably a metrical grave marker perhaps for a child since it
mentions the word twelve (i.e. 12 years of age).


987. A slab of white marble. A grave marker from Roman period.

988. Stone unspecified. A grave marker from Roman period.

989. Blue marble. A grave marker from Roman period.

990. White marble. A grave marker from Roman period.

991. Blue marble. A grave marker for two persons.

992. A slab of black stone. The name Timokles is preserved.

993. Stele of red stone. Grave stele for two persons.


996.____752. A grave stone of blue marble.

997.____753. A white marble grave stone.

998.____754. A grave stone of gray marble.

999.____755. A base of unspecified stone. The inscription is a grave marker.

1000.____756. A blue marble grave stone.

1001.____757. A marble grave stone of the Roman Period.

1002.____758. A grave stone of red marble. It is of Imperial times perhaps first century A.D.


1004.____761. A marble grave marker.

1005.____762. A marble grave marker.

1006.____763. A marble grave marker.

1007.____764. A marble grave marker.

1008.____765. A marble grave marker.

1009.____766. A marble grave marker.

1010.____767. A marble grave marker.
1012.____769. A marble grave marker.
1015.____772. A red marble grave stone.
1016.____773. A marble grave marker.
1017.____774. A marble grave marker.
1018.____775. A marble grave marker.
1019.____776. A marble grave marker.
1020.____777. A marble grave marker.
1021.____778. A marble grave marker.
1022.____779. A marble grave marker.
1023.____780. A marble grave marker.
1024.____781. A white marble grave marker.
1025.____782. A marble grave marker.
1026.____783. A marble grave marker.
1027. 784. A marble grave marker.
1028. 785. A white marble grave marker.
1029. 786. A blue marble grave marker.
1030. 787. A marble grave marker.
1037. 794. A blue marble grave marker.
1044.____801. White marble. A grave marker.
1045.____802. A marble grave marker for two persons.
1046.____803. A marble grave marker.
1047.____804. A marble grave marker.
1048.____805. A marble grave marker.
1049.____806. A marble grave marker.
1050.____807. A grave marker of red marble.
1051.____808. A grave marker of red marble.
1052.____809. A grave marker of red marble.
1053.____810. A white marble grave marker.
1054.____811. The inscription seems to have been a grave marker. Four names can be read but the transcription of Fourmont seems confused.
1055.____812. A grave marker set up by a woman for herself, her husband and son. The stone is marble.
1056.____813. Stone unspecified. A large grave marker.
providing for penalties to be paid to the Polis, to the treasurer and to the dead men's club. This seems to be the first mention of such societies in Sparta though we have seen honorary inscriptions set up by military societies on behalf of their members. A copy of this inscription was to be set up elsewhere.

1057. 814. Stone unspecified. The inscription may have been a grave marker though it is too badly broken for certainty.

1058. 815. A red marble grave stone.

1059. 816. A marble grave marker.

1060. 820. A grave marker, apparently for a Christian. The deceased is described as a servant of God.

1061. 821. A marble grave marker. The deceased was a Christian. The inscription calls upon the passer-by not to dig up the grave and not to put any other marker on it. The request is made in the name of God and Jesus Christ. Mention is made of the fiery wrath of God against the disturber of this grave. The Christian symbol (✝)
is shown in the lower right corner.

1062. A marble grave marker. The inscription is somewhat similar to 1061, and is for a Christian. Five crosses decorate the stone.
CHAPTER TWO

LITERACY IN SPARTA

It has been suggested that a high degree of illiteracy might be a possible reason for the small number of inscriptions in Corinth and that a corresponding high rate of literacy might partly explain the large number of public inscriptions set up in Athens. There would be little reason for setting up decrees and other types of inscriptions if the public was too ignorant to read them. The point is made in a recent treatment of the question of literacy by F. D. Harvey who then discounts much of his argument by saying that an Athenian could easily have requested some other person to read the inscriptions for him.

Harvey limits his own inquiry to the fifth and fourth centuries, and believes that there is not much possibility of drawing more precise conclusions about literacy in terms of chronological development. However, the period under consideration is of crucial importance. When speaking of literacy in Sparta it makes a great deal of difference whether one is speaking of the Sparta of the fifth century, independent and largely isolated from outside contacts, or the Sparta of the more cosmopolitan
Roman world when a special hotel was built to house visitors from abroad and when many Spartan delegates were sent abroad for various diplomatic purposes. Common sense should lead one to suspect that literacy in the later period would be more widespread than in the earlier.

The question of literacy in Sparta has proved to be a difficult one and it is not possible to conclude that a certain percentage of the people were literate or illiterate. Nor is it possible in many cases to determine the extent of literacy in individuals. Some were at least literate enough to scratch their names onto votive offerings, while others evidently were capable of much more. The problem, however, may be approached indirectly by means of a study of every indication of the use of the written word in Sparta during all periods. For the purpose of this study, I have divided the abundant and widely scattered evidence into several categories and sub-categories.

I. The literary evidence beginning from the fifth century B.C. (pp. 190-242).
   A. Written laws in Sparta (pp. 190-203).
   B. The use of letters in personal and official correspondence in Sparta (pp. 203-211).
   C. The records of treaties in Sparta (pp. 211-216).
D. The ownership of books and treatises in Sparta (pp. 216-228).

E. Minor writers who were Spartan citizens (pp. 228-239).

F. Foreign writers who went to Sparta (pp. 238-242).

II. The inscriptions.

A. As evidence for wide-spread literacy among citizens of all social classes (pp. 243-253).

B. As evidence for a large scale bureaucracy and extensive collections of records in Sparta (pp. 255-273).

III. Final Summary and conclusions (pp. 273-279).

In so far as possible the literary and epigraphical evidence is kept separate and is discussed in a proper chronological order. But this has not been possible in all cases since some late writers such as Plutarch and Pausanias provide a good deal of information about the earlier history of Sparta. Nor has it been possible (or desirable) to achieve a total separation of literary and epigraphical evidence since each must supplement the other. This is especially true in the case of evidence concerning the use of written laws and records in Sparta, a theme which is closely related to all other considerations in this chapter.
THE LITERARY EVIDENCE

Written Laws in Sparta

The evidence from ancient writers concerning the use of written records and laws by the Spartans is contradictory and sometimes confused. Plutarch states that Lycurgus had forbidden the use of written laws in Sparta including his own.

Lycurgus made no use of written laws and in fact one of his so-called rhetra prohibits them.

Regarding minor legal affairs, business contracts, and circumstantial needs which vary from time to time, he thought it would be better to avoid the use of written requirements and rules which are unchangeable. In their place he provided that the educated citizens should make decisions to meet each need. (Lycurgus 13.1)

If Plutarch is correct in saying that the Spartans did not have written laws and contracts of any kind, this
passage would provide persuasive evidence of a very low rate of literacy in Sparta. The impression of widespread illiteracy is heightened when this passage is considered in the light of Plutarch's statement (Moralia 237A) that the Spartans learned to read and write for practical reasons only and that all other forms of education were excluded. They learned their letters for practical purposes, but excluded all other forms of education, written works and men (foreign teachers?) alike.

It is at once apparent that the practical needs of the Spartans must have been very slight if the use of written documents formed no part of the machinery of government or of their commercial relationships. Yet this is what Plutarch's statement clearly implies. Before accepting these remarks as factual evidence for illiteracy, it is necessary to examine them in greater detail together with other existing evidence.

Herodotus (6.57.4) makes brief mention of the fact that records of oracles were kept by Spartan Kings and by the Pythaistai. No details were given by Herodotus because he is interested only in showing that records of a particular
oracle existed in Sparta and that the records were trustworthy. Other sources do not shed much light on the subject but the existence of the rhetra quoted by Plutarch (Lycurgus 6) may support the statement of Herodotus. The rhetra was traditionally thought to be an oracle from Delphi and the version of Tyrtaeus 4 tends to confirm the tradition.

\[\text{The preservation of the rhetra does not in itself prove that it was ever a part of a collection of oracles either in its present form or in a form earlier than Tyrtaeus, but I cannot agree with K.M.T. Chrimes who believes that it is very unlikely that it or others like it were written down at an early date.}^{5}\]

She bases her opinion partly on the statement of Plutarch (Lycurgus 13.4) that Lycurgus had forbidden the use of all written laws in Sparta.

The history of the rhetra of Lycurgus is a complex and difficult subject in its own right and will not be considered separately here since for my purposes I need only argue that written rhetra could have been known to Tyrtaeus and that oracles of this general type are exactly what Herodotus meant when he said that the Kings and Pythaistai had charge of the Delphic oracles. It seems certain that written records of this kind existed when Herodotus was
writing and very likely that they existed even earlier.
Positive evidence that collections of oracles did exist in Sparta from very early times is provided by Plutarch himself in *Against Colotes* 17, where the statement is made that the Spartans kept the oracle concerning Lycurgus in their most ancient chronicles (Ἀκεδαμόνιοι τον περὶ Λυκόδρυγον χρησμὸν ἐν ταῖς παλαιοτάταις ἀναγραφαῖς ἁχοντες...).

Plutarch's statement about the ancient chronicles of the Spartans does not give any clue to the actual age of the collection. It is clear, however, that the collection had a reputation among the Spartans of being very ancient and that Plutarch accepted this reputation as true. The earliest date to which an actual written collection of oracles in Sparta may be traced is to the very end of the sixth century (508/7). Herodotus (5.90) says that King Cleomenes, while occupying the Acropolis of Athens, found there the collection of oracles compiled by Hippias the son of Pisistratus. These he confiscated and carried away to Sparta where we may assume (but Herodotus does not actually say), he preserved them together with an already existing collection of oracles pertaining to Sparta. If so, this collection probably formed at least a part of the ancient chronicles mentioned by Plutarch. It is also possible, but less certain, that the incident related about Lysander and
his edition of oracles (below p. 226) was in some unknown way related to this ancient collection.

Parke and Wormell postulate, as a reason for the preservation of the oracles in Sparta and possibly other cities, the possibility of future application of the oracles. This theory is entirely plausible. But regardless of the reasons for the collections, one must exercise great caution in regard to Plutarch's statement that Lycurgus had forbidden the use of all written laws. In fact Plutarch seems at times to contradict himself on this point.

In Moralia 221B Plutarch relates an incident in which someone inquiring of Zeuxidamos (fl. 480 B.C.) why the Spartans kept the laws concerning bravery unwritten rather than having them available for the young men to read, was told that youth in Sparta learned such things by physical application, and that this was better for them than learning through written materials.

Zeuxidamos υπεθανομένου τινὸς δία τὸ τοῦς περὶ τῆς ἄνδρειας νόμους ἀγράφους τηροῦσι καὶ τοῖς νέοις ἀπογραφόμενοι οὐ διδάσκιν ἀναγιγνώσκειν. "Οτι" ἐφη "συνεθίζεσθαι δὲν ταῖς ἄνδραγαθίαις κρείττον ἄν ἢ ταῖς γραφαῖς προσέχειν."

A reader's first impulse might be to blame differing sources for this apparent contradiction, but the sources are not necessarily at fault here. Plutarch's use of
sources is nearly always difficult and nowhere more so than in the *Moralia*. For the *Lycurgus* we have Plutarch's own statement of principle regarding his sources.

Οδirectional καί περιστασιών της ιστορίας περισσότερο στοιχεία τους βραχυτάτας ἔχουσιν ἀντιλογίας ἢ γνωριμωτάτους μάρτυρας ἐπόμενοι τῶν γεγραμμένων περὶ τοῦ ἀνδρὸς ἀποδοῦναι τὴν διήγησιν.

However, although the history of these times is such a maze, I shall try, in presenting my narrative, to follow those authors who are least contradicted, or who have the most notable witnesses for what they have written about the man. (*Lycurgus* 1.3)

In addition Plutarch identifies at least a dozen sources and often refers to unnamed writers as "others" or "some." Of these writers the most important for Plutarch's discussion of the rhetra and constitution of Lycurgus were Aristotle and Sphaerus of Bosporos (*Lycurgus* 6.7). Since Plutarch is referring to Sphaerus just before quoting the rhetra of Lycurgus it is possible that Sphaerus is the source used for the rhetra itself (but Aristotle is probably more likely). The question of sources for the Lycurgan prohibition of written laws in chapter 13.1 is a more difficult one, and Plutarch provides no clues. Nor is there any evidence for the source of the Zeuxidamos story. Philip Stadter cautions against expecting to find precise sources
for stories in the *Mulierum Virtutes* or for other similar collections of stories. He also points out that Plutarch made notes intended for use in his compositions, but that he often neglected these notes and relied on his memory which often must have been the direct "source" used by Plutarch. Obviously this practice encourages mistakes and contradictions. Plutarch himself refers to these notes in *De Tranquilitate Animi* 464 F-D, and *De Cohibenda Ira* 457 D. Stadter suggests that this tendency is more discernable in Plutarch as story teller than as historian.

If true this peculiarity of Plutarch could easily explain the discrepancy between the passages cited in *Lycurgus* 13.1 and *Moralia* 221B. Plutarch knew and used many sources which shared to some degree the tradition of the unwritten constitution of Lycurgus. In *Lycurgus* 13.1 he simply overstates the actual situation and applies the generally accepted tradition of an unwritten constitution to all types of legal documents and laws. In *Moralia* 221B, he is more specific and applies the prohibition against writing only to the laws concerning bravery. One more slight inconsistency in the account of the unwritten rhetra is found in *Lycurgus* 6.4 where Plutarch says that the Kings Polydorus and Theopompus made an addition to the rhetra which resulted in the expanded version known from *Tyrtaeus*. 
Polydorus and Theopompus the Kings wrote the following into the rhetra: "But if the people make a crooked decision, the Elders and Kings (ἐραγέτας) are to dismiss the assembly."

Here the word παρενέγραψιν clearly implies a written document to which written additions could be made. But perhaps it is best not to take Plutarch too literally on this point; nor is it necessary to do so since my purpose here is not so much to reconcile these discrepancies in Plutarch's narrative, as to demonstrate the unreliability of Plutarch's statements as evidence of a total prohibition of written laws and contracts in Sparta.

While it is impossible to reconcile the Zeuxidamos story with the statement that Lycurgus had forbidden written laws of all types, it may be possible to see some truth in both traditions. Some written laws (such as the oracle-rhetra of Lycurgus) must have existed by the beginning of the fifth century and Herodotus is correct in saying that written collections of Delphic oracles existed even before his own
time. The tradition of unwritten laws must refer only to the Lycurgan system of education for bravery and to the general constitutional structure of the Spartan government. The Spartan ἀγωγή was understood by Plutarch as Lycurgan legislation, but it was more than a single legal enactment; it was a traditional way of life of great antiquity and was observed more in the practice than in the written record. Chrimes attributes the rhetra forbidding written laws in Sparta (Plutarch Lycurgus 13.4) to about 600 B.C. and suggests that it was made in reaction to the gradual development of written law codes in other Greek states: "its purpose was to safeguard the time-honoured method of introducing modifications in the code, by making it impossible to convict the innovators of deception." Plutarch (Lycurgus 13.1) had a somewhat similar approach but reached a conclusion nearly the opposite of Chrimes. He says the real strength of a system of unwritten laws is that the basic constitution will be less likely to undergo change, but that minor legal affairs and civil contracts will be free to develop with changing circumstances. For Plutarch, all of this depends for its success on the moral education (ἀγωγή) of the Spartan people.

In Laws 793B Plato provides us with a good description of the ancient concept of the relationship between written
and unwritten laws. The Athenian stranger gives the following speech:

Λ. "Ὅτι ταύτ’ ἐστὶ πάντα, ὡσα νῦν διεξερ-χόμεθα, τὰ κολούμενα ὑπὸ τῶν πολλῶν ἄγραφα νόμιμα καὶ ὁποῖα πατρίως νόμοις ἐποιημέζονσιν."

Β. Όσκ ἄλλα ἐστὶν ἡ τὰ ταύτα ξύμπαντα. καὶ ἐτι ᾣὲ ὅ νῦν δῆ λόγος ἤμεν ἐπιγνωθείς, ὡς ὁποῖε νόμους δεῖ προσαγορεῖαι αὐτὰ ὡς ὁποῖε ἡμέτα ἐάν, εἰρήτα καλῶς· δεσμῷ γὰρ ὤτοι πίσις εἰσὶ πολιτείας, μεταξὺ πάντων ὅστε τῶν ἐν γράμμαις τεθείτων τε καὶ κεφάλαιον καὶ τῶν ἐτὶ τεθησαμένων ἀτεχνώς ὅλων πάτρωσι καὶ παντύπασιν ἀρχαία νόμιμα, ἀ καλῶς μὲν τεθέντα καὶ ἐθισθέντα πίσι πολιτείας περικαλύπτεται ὅρις τοὺς τάτου γραφέντας νόμους.

Ο. Ὁν δ’ ἐκτὸς τοῦ καλοῦ βαῖνη πλημμέλος, ὅλων τεκτῶν ἐν οἰκοδομήσαν εἰρήματα εὐ μέσου ἑπορῆσαν, συμπίπτειν εἰς ταύτων ποιεῖ τὰ ξύμπαντα κείσθαι τὸ ἄλλα ὅρι ἑτέρω, αὐτὰ τε καὶ τὰ καλῶς ὑστερον ἑποικοδομεῖται, τῶν ἀρχικῶν ὑποτεθέντων. ἀ δ’ δὴ διανοούμενος ἢμις, ὡς Κλεινία, σαὶ δὲ τὴν πάλιν καιρὴν ὀδηγὼν πάντη ἔνθεδει, μήτε μέγα μήτε σμικρὸν.

Δ. ὅρων παραλειπόμενας εἰς δύναμιν ὅπως νόμους ή ἐθε τὶς ὅ ἐπετηθέντα καλεῖ· πίσι γὰρ τοὺς τοιούτους πάλας ἐνθείεται, ἀνευ δὲ ἄλλων ἑκάτερα ταύτων οἰκὸς ἐκεῖ μόνιμα, ὡστε εῦ κρῆ λαμψίξειν ἐὰν ἤμεῖ τοῖς πάλαι ἄρα καὶ σμικρῇ διο-κουσίτα εἶναι νόμιμα ἢ καὶ ἐξίσου ἐπιρήσειον μακροτέρως τοῖς τούς νόμους.

Κ. 'ΑΛΛΗ δὲ ὅρθος σὺ τὸ λέγεις ἡμεῖς τοῖς ἐν τούτῳ διανοούμενα.

ATH. That all the regulations which we are now expounding are what are commonly termed "unwritten laws."

And these as a whole are just the same as what men call "ancestral customs." Moreover, the view which was recently impressed upon us, that one should neither speak
of these as "laws" nor yet leave them without mention, was a right view. For it is these that act as bonds in every constitution, forming a link between all its laws (both those already enacted in writing and those still to be enacted), exactly like ancestral customs of great antiquity, which, if well established and practised, serve to wrap up securely the laws already written, whereas if they perversely go aside from the right way, like builders' props that collapse under the middle of a house, they bring everything else tumbling down along with them, one thing buried under another, first the props themselves and then the fair superstructure, once the ancient supports have fallen down. Bearing this in mind, Clinias, we must clamp together this State of yours, which is a new one, by every possible means, omitting nothing great or small in the way of laws, customs, and institutions; for it is by all such means that a state is clamped together, and neither kind of law is permanent without the other. Consequently, we need not be surprised if the influx of a number of apparently trivial customs or usages should make our laws rather long.  

The foregoing discussion of Plutarch on unwritten law in Sparta is intended to show that his comments should be applied only to the Spartan training for bravery (ἀγωνία) and to the development of the Spartan political
system. Plutarch's remarks should not be taken literally to mean that no laws or legal documents of any kind were ever committed to writing. To summarize my arguments so far: Plutarch's statements concerning writing and written laws in Sparta are very strong evidence for a low rate of literacy if true, since the Spartans would then have made no use of legal documents of any kind. But it has been shown that written collections of oracles existed in Sparta from an early time, and we learn from Plutarch himself that the rhetra concerning Lycurgus was included in the most ancient chronicles of Sparta.

It is now possible to turn to a discussion of more positive evidence of written laws in Sparta. A.J. Beattie in an article in which he re-examined the text of 62.137 offers a convincing argument in favour of interpreting the inscription as a sacral law of the Obe of Arkalon (otherwise unknown). The inscription is from the very early fifth or perhaps the late sixth century. If Beattie is correct we have direct evidence that the Spartans, like others, wrote down at least some types of laws from a very early date.

Plato (Laws 721E) provides additional evidence of the use of written laws in Sparta. Here Megillus the Spartan considering two versions (a long and a short) of a law pro-
posed by the Athenian stranger says that he would choose the longer version for enactment in writing and that he would do the same in the case of every law in which these alternatives were offered.

In Laws §91 the Cretan Clinias recommends that legal ordinances be put into writing so that even difficult problems can be understood by everyone including the stupid-est of citizens.

In Laws §91 the Cretan Clinias recommends that legal ordinances be put into writing so that even difficult problems can be understood by everyone including the stupid-est of citizens.

Megillus the Spartan expresses complete agreement which indicates an acceptance, by Plato, of the idea of the Spartans making routine use of written records and laws of some kinds. It does not seem reasonable to believe that Plato would have introduced such a scene if it had been common knowledge that most of the Spartans were illiterate and that they made no use of written laws.

Pausanias (3.11.11) provides an additional hint that the Spartans made use of written laws and public business records. After mentioning the fact that he had seen a statue of King Polydorus the son of Alcamanes, he adds that the Spartan magistrates use his image to seal anything which needs to be
sealed. Pausanias is not specific enough in this passage and it seems difficult if not impossible to determine a date for the origin of the custom. Since he sets his remarks in the present tense, we may conclude that the practice existed in his own day and that it could have originated any time after the kingship of Polydorus (fl. first Messenian war). There is no doubt, however, that Pausanias is referring to the use of seal stones and that they were probably used to seal written documents of all kinds. If Pausanias is correct and if the practice was a frequent one, it is curious that none of these stones seem to have survived.

It must be admitted that the evidence regarding the use of written laws and other documents in early Sparta is slight and does not permit one to determine the extent of the practice. But on the positive side it can be stated with something like certainty that the Spartans did make use of written laws and other documents, and that such use was not uncommon even in the fifth century. The evidence, slight though it may be, leads to this conclusion.

THE USE OF LETTERS IN PERSONAL AND OFFICIAL CORRESPONDENCE IN SPARTA

Of the late fifth century, the most important literary
evidence for literacy in Sparta is from Thucydides, who relates several incidents in which Spartans send and receive letters and prepare written copies of treaties. In 1.128.3 - 134.4 he records an interchange of letters between Pausanias and Xerxes and one letter from the Ephors to Pausanias. Two of these, the first letter from Pausanias to Xerxes (1.128.7) and Xerxes' reply (1.129.3), are quoted in full. Unfortunately there are serious doubts as to the authenticity of the letters, a fact which limits their use as evidence for literacy. I believe that Beloch is correct in not accepting the letters, but I do not go so far as Beloch in dismissing them as pure nonsense. Nor do I think his arguments based on the absurdity of Pausanias asking for the Great King's daughter as a wife are necessarily valid. Pausanias could well have made such a request regardless of the chances of it being granted, and the reply of Xerxes does not specifically mention the daughter. Still there is much in the story that is hard to accept, and Beloch does well to show that Herodotus (5.32) gives an alternate version of the story which he did not seem to believe (εἴ δὴ ἀληθῆς γέ ἐστι ὁ λόγος). A more serious objection to the letters is the difficulty of explaining just how Thucydides managed to see them.
Gomme thinks the use of the word *táς* instead of *τοιάς* may indicate that Thucydides was quoting the actual letter word for word. He also points out that Beloch's dismissal of the letter as nonsense does not solve the problem. M.J. Balcer in a more recent article, also rejects the letters and interprets them as forgeries created by the Ephors for the purpose of justifying the sacrificial death, by starvation, of Pausanias in the sanctuary of Athena Chalkioikos. This interpretation is plausible enough and is based on the assumption of a long power struggle between Pausanias and the Ephorate.

Since the problem concerning the authenticity of the letters is so difficult and perhaps incapable of solution, I have not for my present purposes, counted them as of equal value with the following letter quoted by Xenophon. The letter was sent by the Admiral Hippocrates to Sparta but was intercepted and brought to Athens:

"Ερρει τα καλα. Μινδαρος άπεσσα. πεινώνι τωνορες. ἀπορίομες τι χρη δραν.

The ships have been lost; Mindaros is dead; the soldiers are starving; we do not know what to do. (Hellenica 1.1.23)

It should be noted that most of the difficulties surrounding the letter in Thucydides do not apply to this one. Xenophon could easily have seen the letter since it was
intercepted and brought to Athens; the letter has at least one Laconian word ("δαυμοκε") ; it is written in a style similar to many letters quoted by Plutarch; and thus it has all the appearance of genuineness lacking in the letters quoted by Thucydides. The latter have no Laconian forms whatsoever, and this fact taken together with other objections leads me to believe that the text as we have it is not likely to have been what Pausanias wrote, if indeed he wrote anything at all.

The letter from the Ephor to Pausanias (1.131.1) was sent by means of the Spartan messenger staff ("σκυτάλη") described below, but curiously the letter quoted by Xenophon was not so sent, or if it was the device was a complete failure in this instance. This device must have been widely used by the Spartans and is mentioned by Aristophanes (Lysistrata 991). This reference is important not for the information it gives about the "σκυτάλη" but because the line shows that Aristophanes could trust the audience to understand the joke. It was well understood that the Spartans commonly sent letters by this means.

Still earlier we find a reference to the device in Pindar (Olympian 6.91 written perhaps in 468 B.C.). In this ode Pindar boldly refers to the chorus leader as his message-carrier of the Muses ("σκυτάλα Μοισάν"). Farnell supposes that Pindar entrusted the chorus leader with his
The following is a description of the σκυτάλη.
Whenever the Ephors send out an admiral or general they first fashion two pieces of wood so that they are exactly equal in length and thickness. They keep...
one and give the other to the man being sent out. They call these pieces of wood σκυτάλη.

Whenever they wish to send some very important and secret message, they prepare a papyrus (βιβλίον). in the shape of a leather strap, long and narrow. They then wrap the σκυτάλη with this strip of papyrus being careful to cover the entire surface and to leave no gaps. Having done this, they write whatever they wish on the papyrus just as it is shaped around the σκυτάλη. After they have written their message they remove the papyrus from the σκυτάλη and send it, without the wood, to the general.

He after receiving the message and having no other means of reading the letters in their now confused order, wraps the papyrus around his own σκυτάλη. The result is that after the exact shape of the rolled papyrus has been restored, the letters are once again in their proper sequence and the message can be read. The papyrus is also called σκυτάλη being named after the wood just as anything that is measured may be named after the measure.
OTHER LETTERS PRESERVED BY PLUTARCH

Plutarch, in scattered anecdotes has preserved numerous letters of doubtful authenticity. One large section of the *Moralia* (240 B.C. - 242) contains a number of letters said by Plutarch to have been written by Spartan women to their sons and husbands away at war. These letters have the ring of pure fiction about them and may be nothing more than anecdotes which had by the time of Plutarch, become a part of the Spartan legend of bravery and curtness of language. Harvey \(^{21}\) dismisses them by saying that they are not to be taken seriously at all. He could be right but the letters at least show that the idea of such letters was not incredible to Plutarch. Besides many such letters actually do exist on papyrus written by mothers and fathers in Egypt to sons serving with Roman armies. \(^{22}\) The chief difference between the real letters and the letters quoted by Plutarch is that most of the former are entirely serious and often deal with such critical matters as the birth of a child, money, and other family problems. Others are letters of friendship, loneliness, fear and the like. The letters quoted by Plutarch are for the most part concerned with matters of personal conduct and family disgrace. An example is the letter sent by Teleutia to her son who had been accused of misconduct.
Mother to Paedaretus: either do better or stay there and forget about a safe home-coming to Sparta. (241E)

It might be argued that a letter such as this would not have had the urgency or importance of most of the letters from Egypt. It might be further argued that considering the frequent difficulties involved in sending letters in the ancient world, and the uncertainty of its delivery, it is hard to believe that many letters of this type were sent.

In other places scattered throughout the *Moralia* Plutarch quotes letters from Ephors, generals, and Kings. Of these one example may serve well enough. The following is the complete text of a letter sent by the Spartans to Philip V.

"In reply to what you ask: No. (Moralia 235B)

In general I believe that all of these letters quoted by Plutarch should be taken with a good deal of skepticism, but in view of the fact that letters were frequently written to soldiers by Greeks in Egypt, I think we are not entitled to dismiss them as completely worthless. Never-
theless our evidence from the letters is just as slight as the evidence regarding the use of written laws and documents in Sparta. The evidence of the letters and the legal documents taken together, however, re-inforce each other and show that the Spartans made extensive use of writing for the conduct of their legal, military, and we may assume, their business affairs. This is by no means to imply that all Spartans had equal skills in the writing of such letters. It should be obvious that commanders of armies and government officials must have developed their writing skills to a greater degree than the average citizen. On the other hand we should note that it is assumed that Pausanias' messenger was (whether the story is true or false) perfectly capable of reading the letter entrusted to him.

THE RECORDS OF TREATIES IN SPARTA

Additional and more detailed evidence for the use of written documents in Sparta is provided by Thucydides who gives the texts of several treaties made by the Spartans (5.18.10;23;77;79). The question of the authenticity of each of these treaties is not of primary concern here since for my purpose it is important only to show that the Spartans made common use of such written treaties and that they
inscribed some of them on stone.

It seems likely that the Spartans preferred to set up inscribed copies of such documents in Sparta only in the most important cases or perhaps only when the erection of a public monument was a part of the agreement. In Thucydides 5.23.5, such a requirement is specified by the terms of a treaty sworn between Athens and Sparta.

στήλην δὲ ἐκατέρωθς στῆσαι τὴν μὲν ἐν Λακεδαιμονίῳ παρ’ Ἀπόλλωνι, ἐν Ἀμυκλαίῳ τὴν δὲ ἐν Ἀθήναις ἐν πόλει παρ’ Ἀθηνᾷ.

Each party (to this agreement) is to erect a stele inscribed with the terms of this treaty. One stele is to be set up in Lacedaemon near the temple of Apollo in Amyclae, the other near the temple of Athena on the Acropolis in Athens.

A similar specification is found in Thucydides 5.18.10 where it is stipulated that stelae are to be set up in Olympia, the Isthmus, and Delphi, as well as in Sparta and Athens.

No copies of any of these treaties have ever been found inscribed on stone in Sparta, and no public decree of any kind has been found there. The contribution list (18.8) is from the fifth century but it cannot be called a decree or treaty. Still it must have been considered a matter of special importance since the contributions were for a war fund. Another fifth century inscription (33.37)
is a decree passed by the Spartans but it was found on Delos and it is not possible to determine if a similar stele was erected in Sparta. Doubtless the original was written on papyrus, leather, or wooden tablets and kept in some local depository regardless of whether or not an inscribed copy was set up for public display.

Alan Boegehold in an important new article has convincingly shown that an official central archive was established in Athens in the Metron sometime between the years 409/8 and 406/5. As a reason for the establishment of a central archive, Boegehold postulates the necessity for establishing order to replace the long standing confusion caused by the preservation of documents in many scattered places in Athens. I find Boegehold's conclusions completely convincing and note the striking similarity of the situation in Athens before the establishment of the central archive, to the confusion which must have prevailed in Sparta until somewhat later times.

It seems probable that the Spartans never set up very many decrees at any time even though they frequently made treaties with other states. In some cases because of the terms of the agreement, the Spartans inscribed the document on stone for public display; but this was not always
done. The almost total lack of decrees from the fifth century does not in any way suggest an inability, because of illiteracy, to make regular use of such written documents. It suggests rather the natural tendencies of a non-democratic government and a rather secretive society. Almost certainly, the Spartans possessed written copies of treaties and agreements made with other states. There is no other way Spartan authorities could expect to remember the terms, or even to know if the treaty was being kept by the other side.

Thus it seems most likely that these documents were for the most part, kept in some local depository or depositories; perhaps in the houses of the Kings, as were the books of oracles mentioned by Herodotus (6.57.4). Copies of treaties were also kept in the houses of generals, and Plutarch (Moralia 212C; 229F) relates an incident in which Agesilaus, after the death of Lysander, went to his house to consult a written copy of the terms of an important alliance. A dispute had developed within the alliance and Agesilaus, had to consult the text of the agreement.

When, some time after the death of Lysander, a dis-
pute arose over the details of an alliance, Agesilaus went to his house to examine the text of the agreement. For Lysander kept the document in his own house. (Moralia 229F)

Interestingly, Agesilaus did not consult a copy of the agreement inscribed on stone; doubtless because there was none. Yet there is no reason to believe that this particular agreement was in any essential way different from the treaties quoted by Thucydides. The two treaties in which the erection of inscribed stelae were required (Thucydides 5.23.5;18.10) were also agreements for alliance with another city (Athens). Nor is it possible to believe that the treaty of Lysander (Moralia 221C;229F) was recorded or handled differently because the Spartan methods of keeping records changed with the passing of time. In fact all three treaties must have been very nearly contemporaneous since the treaties quoted by Thucydides were made in 422/21 and Lysander was killed at Haliartus in 395 B.C.

In summary: The Spartans made many treaties and agreements with other states as a regular practice. All or most of these were recorded in written texts and were kept in various places in a haphazard manner. The collections of oracles and perhaps other items were kept in the houses of Kings; and, at least in the present instance, a
copy of a treaty was kept in the house of a general. It was only later that the Spartans established anything like the central archive which existed in Athens. In Sparta it was probably called the γραμματοφυλάκιον and is discussed in more detail below (p. 256). A very small number of these documents were inscribed on stone and set up for public display near the temple of Apollo at Amyclae, either because of the specifications of the agreement, or because of some other circumstance, now unknown, which required special treatment of documents such as the list of contributions for the war fund (18.8) or the decree erected on Delos (33.37).

THE OWNERSHIP OF BOOKS AND TREATISES IN SPARTA

The most important of the fourth century sources are Plato and Isocrates both of whom were cited by Harvey as strong evidence for a very low rate of literacy in Sparta. But Harvey's interpretation of this evidence is far from compelling.

In Hippias Maior (284-285) Socrates leads the sophist through a discussion of educational values of his teaching methods and humorously suggests that the training of Hippias would almost of necessity be better for Spartan
youth than that which they receive from their fathers. Hippias readily acknowledges the truth of the suggestion not realizing its irony. Hippias adds the information that the Spartans would not even tolerate lectures on the stars and other celestial phenomena. Not only do they not tolerate such lectures, they would not understand them since many Spartans cannot even count. They are not interested in grammatical studies either but they do have a keen interest in hearing lectures on ancient history.

The statement made by Hippias that the Spartans cannot even count is taken by Harvey as evidence for a low rate of literacy and educational accomplishment in Sparta. But it is important to realize fully the context of irony in which the entire scene is cast. Plato is not making a serious statement about the ignorance of the Spartans; he is being playful with the sophist Hippias and with his sophistic methods of education. Hippias is discomfited and is dumbfounded because the Spartans do not appreciate his methods. These remarks on Spartan education should be understood for what they are, good humour at the expense of Hippias. Even the sophist himself qualifies his remark about the Spartans' ability to count and thus admits that he is exaggerating:

οὐδ'igm ἐπεὶ οὐδ' ἀριθμεῖν ἑκείνων
tὸς ἐπος ἐπείτων; πολλοὶ ἐπίστανται.
Never! since many of them, as one might say,
do not even know how to count.

A far more serious work of Plato which is relevant for the question of literacy in Sparta is Laws (680C-D). Here there is no irony involved and no hint that any participant means anything other than what he actually says. Clinias, in reply to a quotation from Homer by the Athenian stranger, says that the Cretans have read (διεληλθομεν) some of Homer's verses and even some verses of other poets, but in general the Cretans do not have much use for foreign poetry. At this point Megillus the Lacedaemonian breaks in and says that the Spartans enjoy (χρώμεθα) foreign poetry a good deal and consider Homer the best of them all:

*Χρώμεθα δ’ οὖ ν γράμματα μὲ ν κα λ ἔ οικε γς

κράτειν τῶν τοιούτων ποιητῶν.

While it is true that these lines may refer to oral recitation of poetry, it is also true that they directly refute Plutarch's allegation that foreign teachers and literature were prohibited in Sparta (above p. 191). That there was a tradition that written copies of Homer existed in Sparta is shown by Plutarch himself in Lycurgus 4.4, where he says that while in Asia, Lycurgus became acquainted with Homer and that he eagerly copied and edited the poems so that he could take them to Sparta (ἐγράψατο προθύμως καλ συνήγαγεν). Plato's information is brief but serious and
direct. It leaves no doubt in the reader's mind that enjoyment of poetry in Sparta is neither ridiculous or even surprising.

Isocrates, on the other hand, appears to be entirely skeptical about the literacy of the Spartans. He says more on the subject than Plato but all of his testimony is negative. The important questions concerning Isocrates, though, are how seriously should we take him? and did he really mean exactly what he said at all times? Harvey takes him seriously and uses his evidence without question. This is an unproductive approach and after repeated readings, I have become convinced that we must not take these hostile statements of Isocrates at all seriously. Isocrates did not, as I attempt to show below. Furthermore it is of the greatest importance to take into account the entire context in which the negative statements are placed.

In Panathenaicus 209, Isocrates claims that the Spartans are even more backward than the barbarians, and that they do not even know how to read and write (οἶδε γράμματα μανθάνει). This is so obviously an exaggeration that it should not be taken literally as evidence for illiteracy in Sparta even if there were no contrary evidence from the pages of Isocrates.

It may often happen that a reader searching for small clues in a great variety of writings might in his quest pass
too quickly over the entire context of a relevant passage or even ignore it completely. In the case of the present passage from Isocrates, comprehension of the entire speech is the key to proper interpretation. The remark about Spartan illiteracy was made by Isocrates in reply to a student who had been defending the Spartans against previous accusations that their manner of education made them overly aggressive and untrustworthy allies. A few days after this exchange between student and teacher, the latter began to have second thoughts about the speech. Isocrates then states that he had read and studied the speech carefully and that he was not troubled by what he had written about Athens but that he was very disturbed by what he had said about the Spartans:

...ἐπὶ δὲ τοῖς περὶ Λακεδαιμονίων ἐλυπήθην καὶ βαρέως ἑφερον· οὐ γὰρ μετρίως ἐδόκουν μοι διαλέγειαι περὶ αὐτῶν οὐδ' ὀμοίως τοῖς ἄλλοις· ἀλλ' ὀλιγύρως καὶ λίαν πικρῶς καὶ πανταπασιν ἀνοήτως.

...but concerning what I had written about the Spartans I was troubled and felt badly; for I realized that I had not spoken about them in a spirit of moderation nor on equal terms with other cities. Instead, I spoke of them contemptuously, with excessive bitterness, and altogether without reason. (Panathenaicus 212)

He adds that he was several times on the point of blotting
out or burning the entire speech.

At this point Isocrates called back the students who had heard the speech before, with the intention of seeking their advice as to whether or not he should destroy it. The speech was then read aloud and applauded by all except the original dissenter. After some hesitation, the latter delivered a rather long-winded speech of his own in which he was more successful than before in defending the Spartans. This success he achieved by a very complex trick of sophistry which explained Isocrates' censure of the Spartans as, in reality, concealed praise. He claimed that Isocrates' purpose was to avoid offending anti-Spartan sentiment in Athens, and then went on to show that Isocrates had been very clever in using words of double meaning in the speech, thus satisfying everyone and offending no one (ζητῶν δὲ τὰ τοιαῦτα βαδίως εὑρεῖν λόγους ἀμφίβολους).

The student continued:
...but it is my opinion that the best thing for you to do, if you are able, is to reveal as soon as possible to the rest of the world and to the Lacedaemonians, your true intentions when you composed this speech. Concerning the Lacedaemonians, you have written many speeches in the past; some of them were just and respectful, but others were malicious and hostile.

Now if someone were to show them a speech of this latter kind before I had a chance to explain its true meaning to them, they would certainly hate you as a slanderer. But as it is, I believe the majority of the Spartans will remain firm in their ancestral traditions as they always have in the past and will attach no more importance to what is written in Athens than to what is said beyond the pillars of Heracles. Nevertheless, the most intelligent of them have and admire some of your works. Nor would they fail to appreciate the true meaning of these speeches if they had someone to explain them, and if they had the leisure to study them carefully among themselves.

The first thing that should be noted is that the student is not referring to an oral presentation since he says that if anyone should show (ἐπέδειξεν) them a speech they would understand it. This can mean only
a written copy, and it is clearly implied that the Spartans could read it.

It is also very important to understand exactly what the speaker meant when he said that the Spartans would not object to the present speech or to similar speeches, if he could explain it to them in advance. He obviously means that he would explain it to them in the same complicated sophistic terms used in his speech to Isocrates. With this properly understood, the student's remarks in section 250 can be more easily interpreted and it will not be necessary to suppose that he meant that the most intelligent of Spartans had copies of some of Isocrates' works but needed to find someone to read them because they were illiterate. In fact it would be hard to imagine a more absurd situation then the Spartans collecting the literary works of Isocrates, and we may suppose others, if they were unable to read them.

The key word in this passage, is of course, ἀναγνωστόμενον which I have translated as "explain." Its use here is difficult and I have found no exact parallel for my translation; but Herodotus (5.106) uses the word in the sense of "persuade." In the present passage it may have been augmented with appropriate commentary, and hence the meaning "explain." Certainly it does not have the simple meaning "read."
Understood in this way the statement that many of the Spartans were eager to read and to study the books of Isocrates (σίτιον δ' εἶναι καὶ τοῦ πολλοῦς ποθεῖν ἀναγνώσαι καὶ διελθεῖν σῶτας), is not difficult to accept literally and is not in conflict with any previous statement of this speaker. In short the student believed that the Spartans had these particular books and that they were able to read them and were even eager to do so. They did, however, need an interpreter (the student) in order not to misunderstand the subtle double meanings which the speaker saw concealed beneath the surface of the speech.

The student ended his speech at 264 and was greeted with the unanimous applause of all present including Isocrates himself who conceded the point.

Admittedly there is not much evidence concerning the specific details of Spartan education or reading ability, but there is no evidence at all of illiteracy as a general condition among the Spartans. Isocrates' speech supports the sensible and reasonable contention that many (πολλοῦς) could read and write well enough to conduct their own affairs.

The sources of the fifth century are unanimous on this point with the single exception of the anonymous Δίκσοι Λόγοι which states (2,10) that the Spartans were not only illiterate, but that they were proud of the fact that they did not
teach their children music or letters. This statement
does not seem to be ambiguous in any way. It was meant
to be taken literally, but the weight of the other evidence
shows that it is wrong.

The important evidence of Isocrates has already been
discussed. To summarize: Some of the most intelligent of
the Spartans had some of Isocrates' writings; they could
read them and were eager to do so. Plato's Laws has been
cited to show that the Spartans read or at least made use of
Homer and other poets. Moreover Plutarch in Lycurgus 4.4
says that written texts were brought to Sparta by Lycurgus.
This is not to be taken at face value, of course, but it
does show that a tradition of written texts existed in Sparta.

Accounts of other written
documents in Sparta

In Moralia 212C; 229F, Plutarch gives two accounts of
the visit of Agesilaus to the house of the recently de­
ceased Lysander. While searching the house for documents
relating to a treaty (above p. 214 ) he found a copy of
a book concerning the constitution of Sparta, which he
considered to be subversive. In 212C Plutarch names Cleon
of Halicarnassus as the author of a speech which Lysander
had left behind in a book.
In 229F Plutarch says that Agesilaus found in the house of Lysander, a book written by (or for) Lysander.

This seems to involve a contradiction which disappears if the dative is understood as one of interest. The book was written not by Lysander, but for him.

In Lysander 25, Plutarch gives some details of an alleged conspiracy involving Lysander and says that Lysander tried to win over the citizens by memorizing a speech written by Cleon of Halicarnassus. He also says that he made an edition of Delphic oracles in his favor and that he tried to corrupt the Pythian priestess. For this information Plutarch cites Ephorus as his source.

In Lysander 30, the story of the discovery of the book after the death of Pausanias is again repeated in terms similar to Moralia 229F and once again the source is Ephorus.
It now seems obvious that Plutarch was guilty not so much of self-contradiction as of unclear composition. The writing in question must have been a speech written for Lysander by Cleon. Lysander then filed the speech away with other materials including his collection of Delphic oracles, thus giving rise to the story that he had written a book. There probably was a book and perhaps there were many books in Lysander's possession but he did not write the book or the speech in question.

The meaning of the incident for the question of literacy in Sparta is clear. It contradicts any idea that written documents were not used in Sparta and it shows that each of the men who went to Pausanias' house that day could read the document. The incident adds more weight to what has already been said about the books of Isocrates, the preservation of Delphic oracles, and the use of written treatises.

Anecdotes

The story recorded by Plutarch in *Moralia* 214E of
Agesilaus giving encouragement to his troops by writing the word NIKH backward on his hand and then transferring the writing to the liver of a sacrificial animal does not by its very nature inspire much belief. A similar story is related by Frontinus (Strategemata 1.11.14) about Alexander. True or not it does show that Plutarch (and his source) took it for granted that Spartan soldiers could read.

There are numerous anecdotes scattered throughout the Moralia of a somewhat similar nature. They are too numerous to discuss here and their evidence is so questionable that it would add little or nothing to my argument.

MINOR WRITERS WHO WERE SPARTAN CITIZENS

It may now be possible and desirable to reinforce the conclusions reached above about the existence in Sparta of written books and other documents. One limited but valuable source of evidence for this purpose is our small knowledge of the existence and activities of Spartan writers. I do not include the early Melic poets active in Sparta because they disappeared at an early date and their activities
do not necessarily provide evidence for literacy among the population. Their songs were for public or private performance by trained singers and chorus. They also served the practical purpose of marching songs for Spartan soldiers. The presence in Sparta of scholars interested in writing history is a very different matter.

Exact identities and dates for these writers are very difficult and in some cases impossible, but the earliest known to me is Thibron. He is mentioned by Aristotle (Politics 1333b) as a historian who wrote about the constitution of Sparta. The only thing certain about his date is that he was earlier than Aristotle, but he may have been identical with the Thibron mentioned by Xenophon (Hellenica 3. 14-18; 4.8.17-19) and Diodorus Siculus (4. 36, 38, 99) as a Spartan general serving in Asia Minor in 400/399 B.C.

The identification of Thibron the historian with Thibron the general is far from certain but since the historian must be earlier than the mid-fourth century, his chronology coincides with that of the general. In a society with as few citizens as Sparta had at this time or any time, the existence of two well-known men with the same name at the same time seems unlikely. We have no other evidence for this
name in Sparta. Aristotle (Politics 1333b) mentions others who had written on the subject of the Spartan constitution but he gives us no indication of whether or not they were Spartan citizens.

Sosibius the grammarian is the next writer identifiable as coming from Sparta. Suidas says that he was a Laconian. His identity is confirmed by Clement of Alexandria (Stromateis 1.141 Syll.) who quotes him as a source for dating Homer. Diogenes Laertius (Vitae Philosophorum 1.115) and Athenaeus (Diepposophistae 3.78) also call him a Laconian. Plutarch (On Isis and Osiris 28) says that he was active during the reign of Ptolemy Soter (306-284 B.C.) and that he was brought to Egypt by Ptolemy for consultation on a strange dream.

Sosibius appears to have been one of the most productive of the Spartan writers. He wrote a book on chronology quoted by Clement (1.141 Syll.) and Athenaeus (24.635F). The book was apparently important for dating festivals such as the Carnea and other events of major importance. He also wrote a book on sacrifices of the Spartans quoted by Athenaeus (15.674) and the scholiast to Pindar (Olympian 6.46; 7.66; Pythian 2.127), a work on the poet Alkman in at least three books quoted by Athenaeus (3.115), a book on likenesses (Ὁμοιότητας) quoted by Athenaeus.
(4.170E), and other works quoted by numerous authors and scholiasts which are unnamed, but appear to have been concerned with similar antiquarian interests.

Cornelius Nepos (Hannibal 100.13) says that a certain Sosilus accompanied Hannibal on some of his military campaigns and that he was Hannibal's Greek teacher. Mentioned together with Sosilus is Silenus who may have been another historian and seems to have been a Spartan.

Polybius (3.20) mentions Sosilus the Lacedaemonian together with Chaereas and says both could more correctly be described as common gossipers than as historians. Diodorus Siculus (26.4) mentions a writer named Sosilus but calls him ο Ιλιεύς. It is not certain whether the two are different individuals or not. The identity of Chaereas is not known though it is possible that he too was a Laconian.

Aristocrates, the son of Hipparchus, is called a Spartiate by Plutarch (Lycurgus 100.4). He wrote a book on Laconian curiosities and appears to have lived in the late second or early first century B.C., though there is no certainty about his date. He seems to have used source material not found elsewhere and of an exotic nature. He is cited by Plutarch (Lycurgus 100.4) as the only historian who knew that Lycurgus had gone to Libya, Spain, and India. Plutarch cites him again (Philopoemen 100.16) because of his different account of the return by Philopoemen, of the
exiles to Sparta and the murder of eighty Spartan citizens. Aristocrates gives the number as 350.

Diogenes Laertius (8.84) says that there were two writers named Hippasos, one a Metapontine and the other a Laconian. The latter is said to have written five books on the Spartan constitution. Diogenes mentions nothing about the contents of the books and gives no indication of the date of this writer. Athenaeus (1.14d) quotes the same author on the subject of games. At least part of Hippasos’ book seems to have been concerned with anecdotes and curiosities such as the discovery of various popular games.

Diophantos is even less well known than the others so far mentioned. Fulgentius (Mythology 50.1) says that he wrote fourteen books on antiquarian subjects "Diophantus, Lacedaemonum auctor, libros scripsit Antiquitatum quattuordecim." There is no clue to his date.

Pausanias, another writer of unknown date is identified by Suidas as a Laconian historian and five titles are listed under his name. Two of these are on Laconian subjects Λακωνικά and Περί τῶν ἐν Λάκωσιν ἐορτῶν.

Nicocles the grammarian is quoted by Athenaeus (4.140b, 141a) as the author of a work on Spartan antiquities, which seems to have contained a collection of miscellanea on the Spartan festivals, communal dinners, and similar matters.
The scholiast to Pindar Nemean 2.1, says he named Hesiod as the first rhapsode. His date is uncertain but Müller quoting Fabricius says he may have been identical with the Nicoles who was a grammarian at the time of Julianus (193 A.D.).

"Hunc Nicolem Fabricius eundem esse statuit cum Nicocle Lacone, grammatico, Juliani imperatoris praeceptore, ut tradit Socrates III, l.p.165."

The foregoing list of writers known to have been Spartan citizens is as far as I can ascertain complete. It is not an impressive list when compared with the number of writers known from Athens, and the accomplishments of these writers seem to have been slight, and in most cases even trivial by comparison. Most of them belong to quite late times but the earliest goes back at least to the very beginning of the fourth century. Except for the Melic poets, no Spartan writer is earlier than Thibron the historian, but it seems unlikely that he suddenly appeared out of a vacuum or that he had no predecessors. Surely there were others even though their names have not been preserved.

In discussing written documents, books, and treatises in Athens for evidence of literacy among the population there, Harvey seems to believe that it is impossible to be certain about the identity of the intended audience or readers. This applies to histories and political tracts, notice boards,
and inscriptions quite as much as to drama and other forms of literature obviously meant primarily for oral and visual presentation. If we accept this cautious attitude we must admit that the existence of large or small numbers of writers and written materials of all kinds does not mean that correspondingly large numbers of people were able to read them. Harvey argues that a person could have a neighbor read a written notice for him, he could ask a bystander to fill out his ostrakon, or to read an inscription. Books are even more questionable, since it is possible to assume that they were intended for a very limited audience of educated people. One cannot be sure. While the necessity for caution in assessing the evidence cannot be denied, an overly cautious attitude does not seem to me to be productive. Moreover a more detailed investigation of all the literature shows that too much caution on Athenian literacy is unnecessary, and it would not be far wrong to assume that most people could read and write. Harvey reaches this conclusion, but only after denying the usefulness of much of his evidence.

Xenophon in his treatise on the art of horsemanship (Περὶ Ἰππικῆς 10.11.14) tells us exactly whom he had in mind when he wrote the book. It was for any person
intending to buy a horse.

III. "Οταν γε μὴν ἵππαζομένον ἁυταὶ τις,
ὑπομνήματα γράψομεν, ἐπὶ καταμαθάνειν τῶν
μέλλωντα μὴ ξεπατάσθαι ἐν ἱππείᾳ.

We will now write up some notes which anyone intending to buy a previously broken horse must learn if he is to avoid being cheated.

In case this is not specific enough he adds the information that these notes were written for the private citizen and that he had already written a more detailed book for the specialist.

Xenophon took it for granted that the average person could read. The contrary would not have occurred to him. Even so, in the interest of caution, it might be argued that a person who could buy a horse was not average and that such a person would have been a part of a small and better educated minority. That this argument does not disprove the basic premise of wide-spread literacy among quite ordinary people is shown by one other remark made in the same treatise. Xenophon recommends that young men of the upper classes should not spend time breaking their own horses. They should occupy themselves with more fitting activities useful to their future careers as cavalrymen. Nor should older men do such jobs for themselves. They
should be attending to their estates. Therefore, he suggests that horses be sent out to professional horse breakers and trainers. Then he adds that in order to be sure of success in such dealings, one must put all his desires in writing so that the trainer can have the notes as a constant reminder of what he is to do.

Surely no one could argue that the horse trainers of Athens were a part of an upper class minority which alone had access to sufficient education to enable them to read and write. There could be no more average citizen than the horse trainer who must be placed closer to the bottom of the social order than to the top. Yet Xenophon once again takes it for granted that a reasonable and useful ability to read exists even among the most average of citizen classes.

The date of the treatise is uncertain but it is later that the Hipparchicus which was written about 365 B.C. By this time Xenophon's exile was already over (ca. 369 B.C.) and he was probably living in Corinth, though his sons had
returned to Athens. Thus it is possible that the treatise was written with a non-Athenian readership in mind. But this is very uncertain.

The opening scene of Aristophanes' *Clouds* shows one of Athens' most common citizen, Strepsiades a peasant, busily working over his account books. Obviously he is a very literate man and Aristophanes does not make any attempt to exploit any absurdity which may have been inherent in the situation of a country man being able to read and work on books.

Plato (*Laws* 689D) quotes a proverb which must have been well known in Athens, where it was doubtless used in a derogative manner, to describe a person who is ignorant of the most fundamental requirements of civilized life in Athens.

μήτε γράμματα μήτε νεῖν ἐπίστωνται.

They can neither swim nor write.

The proverb strongly suggests that some ability to read and write (as well as to swim) was a fairly ordinary achievement in Athens, and that the citizen who was illiterate was more likely to belong to a minority of the ignorant than was the literate man to a minority of the upper class intelligentsia.

Unfortunately we cannot be so definite about the question
as it relates to Sparta. It is not possible to say with certainty that the few Spartan writers known to us wrote for other Spartans of average abilities or even that they wrote for other Spartans at all. Sosilus appears to have done most of his work outside Sparta since he accompanied Hannibal. Still he, like the others, presumably was a member of the Spartan citizen body and we may conjecture that his education was not dissimilar to that received by most or all other Spartan citizens. To be sure he may have had greater need of writing skill just as Spartan generals and officials (above p.21) may have been compelled by necessity of circumstance to develop their skills far in excess of the average man. In fact it is possible that the common man, who did not have occasion to make much use of his reading skills might have forgotten most of what he ever learned.

It is not possible to learn anything about the source material available to these writers, but the existence of such materials seems assured by the activities of these writers. Doubtless it included the collections (Herodotus 6.57.4), the copies of treaties (Plutarch Moralia 229F), and the books of Isocrates kept by the most intelligent Spartan citizens.
FOREIGN WRITERS WHO WENT TO SPARTA

If there was written material available to writers of Sparta we might suspect that it would also have been consulted by outsiders interested in Spartan institutions. Foreigners did in fact travel to Sparta for the purpose of study and thus we have another argument for the existence of written sources.

Sphaerus of Bosporus, a follower of the Stoic philosopher Zeno of Citium, went to Sparta sometime in the mid-third century B.C. Plutarch (Cleomenes 2) says that he was very much impressed by the youthful Cleomenes who had not yet become King (Leonidas died in 235 B.C.; Cleomenes was born about 260 B.C.).

For some time Sphaerus was tutor not only to Cleomenes but to the Spartan youth in general (περὶ τῶν νέων καὶ τῶν ἐφήβων οὖν ἄμελῶς διατριβόντος).

At some later date he is said to have helped Cleomenes re-organize the training of the young men and to have furnished the King with most of the details for the renewal of the ἀγωγή.
The fact that Sphaerus helped Cleomenes in this way is very interesting. There is no reason to think of him as an administrator helping only with the details of organization. Sphaerus' expertise was in the area of ancient history. He was an antiquarian with broad interests in history and tradition. Much had evidently been forgotten by the men of the mid-third century and Sphaerus through his research in Sparta had made himself master of the traditions of the Spartan δικαίωμα. It is not surprising, then, that Cleomenes turned to him for help. The story is credible in itself, and a reference to Sphaerus in Athenaeus (4.141C) provides support. Athenaeus in a discussion of the Spartan common mess quotes Sphaerus as an authority on the ἐπίδικλα (ἐπιτείμια). It is now clear that Sphaerus did not go to Sparta because of his attraction to Cleomenes. His association with Cleomenes was merely a mutually beneficial by-product of his real purpose which was the study of Spartan antiquities and curiosities. It is important to keep in mind the critical fact that Cleomenes did not have the detailed knowledge of his own ancestral customs which were investigated by Sphaerus. This is the best evidence yet that Sphaerus's sources were written records stored away in scattered places around Sparta (see above p. 215). Cleomenes would have
had easier access to any and all oral traditions, but he was not a scholar and he never did the personal research done by Sphaerus. Hence the King's need for instruction by a foreign scholar, in his own traditions. In this work Sphaerus was performing a function similar to that of the ἐζευγγιτῆς τῶν Λυκυργείων ἔθων (127.591)

Using local sources at least to a considerable degree Sphaerus wrote two works on Sparta. The titles given by Diogenes Laertius (50.7.177) are Περὶ Λυκυργείων πολιτεία and Περὶ Λυκοδρόμου καὶ Σωκράτους τρία.

It is likely that there were others who went to Sparta for reasons similar to those of Sphaerus.

It is well known that Xenophon lived in Sparta for over twenty years before moving to Corinth in about 370 B.C. His purpose in going to Sparta was quite different from Sphaerus' reasons, but Xenophon could have made use of local research facilities for his very late work on the Spartan constitution. Unfortunately the work does not suggest a great deal of research into the more important aspects of Spartan history.

The evidence is slight but I think indicative. Learned men like Theognis travelled to Sparta in the sixth century. They did the same in the fourth and following
centuries, and there is no indication that they did not do likewise in the fifth. They were attracted by different interests and needs. Theognis (783-788) went there as an exile and it was only one of several places he visited. In the case of Sphaerus, we know that his purpose was study and we are justified in assuming the same motivation for at least some of the others.
The epigraphical evidence for literacy in Sparta although more abundant than the literary, is somewhat more difficult to evaluate. Harvey found this to be true in the case of Athens. It is tempting to equate large numbers of inscriptions with wide-spread literacy and it has already been noted (p. 2) that the very small number of inscriptions from Corinth may suggest the opposite. The difficulty as Harvey shows, is that we cannot be certain that the inscriptions were meant to be read by the general public; an illiterate person could always have someone else read an inscription for him.

In Sparta public documents offer much less a problem than in Athens for the question of literacy because they are so few in number and nearly all are of a comparatively late date. They fall into two very broad classes: those decrees passed elsewhere and set up in Sparta, and those passed by the Spartan state and set up either in Sparta or elsewhere. Of the former there are only twenty-nine in all; seventeen are honorary of the second century B.C. or later, nine are epistolary from the late third through the second century B.C., and one is a fragment of a treaty dating from the third century. Of the latter group
six are honorary decrees of the second or first century B.C., one is a document concerning financial affairs of perhaps the first century B.C., one concerns regulations for the Leonidea and is from the first or second century A.D., one is a decree regulating the post-war status of Delos and is from the very end of the fifth century B.C., and one is a list of war contributions from the last quarter of the fifth century B.C.

It is clear from the brief survey of public documents that we cannot make much use of them as evidence for the question of literacy. Only two documents are earlier than the third century and one of them was not even set up in Sparta so far as is known. Even in the somewhat more open and cosmopolitan world of the mid-second century and after, the number of public decrees is very small and they supply little evidence either positive or negative for the question of literacy.

Thus the problem for Sparta is simplified as compared with Athens. Harvey's concern was with the interpretation of the Athenians' reasons for setting up such large numbers of public inscriptions. Were they really meant to be read by the general public? If so does this in itself indicate a high rate of literacy? Or may we assume that smaller numbers of literate people could be relied upon to read im-
portant notices and documents to illiterates?

For Sparta these questions are almost meaningless since we are not compelled or even tempted to account for such a large number of public decrees as existed in Athens. State business was not necessarily public business in Sparta and there is little reason to think the average citizen had a great need to keep himself up on current affairs by means of public notices. We must beware however of interpreting the small number of such inscriptions in Sparta as strong evidence of the prevalence of illiteracy. A more likely explanation can be seen in the traditional secrecy and virtual isolation of the Spartans in their earlier centuries. Moreover it was not the Spartan custom to grant lavishly worded honors for public benefactors, whether local citizens or foreigners. This attitude changed only with the passing of time and the development of different needs. That grants of such honors by the Spartans were not frequent is clearly indicated by the fact that no Spartan proxeny decree earlier than the second century B.C. exists. Tod, nr. 217b, suggests convincingly that 11.1 was one of the first granted by the Spartans and that the clumsy language indicates a lack of experience in drafting such decrees. Tod had not seen 12.2 before his catalogue was published, but the languages of that decree
tends to strengthen his judgement.

It has already been suggested that the absence of such decrees before the second century should not be attributed to a prevalence of illiteracy in Sparta so much as to a lack of interest in or need for such decrees. It is not difficult to find the probable reasons for the sudden development of interest in proxeny decrees in Sparta, and the most obvious reason is the new relationship of the city with the Achaean League and with Rome. Possible Achaean League influence may be seen in the appearance in II.1 of an official known as the ἐπιδιοργόσιας office new to Spartan inscriptions (and unique) but common in Achaean cities and in the league itself (see below p.296). For Roman influence we have only to consider 1.54 in which a hotel for visiting Romans is mentioned. This is not to say that the Spartans set up proxeny decrees only for Achaeans or Romans; indications are rather of a generally changed inter-state climate for Sparta under the stimulus of Achaean League membership and especially by her ties with Rome. Surely it is no coincidence that no proxeny decrees have survived from an earlier period; if any existed earlier they must have been few in number. Therefore it seems all but certain that the absence of proxeny decrees before the second century and their small numbers in all periods is more attributable to
political requirements than to an inability through illiteracy to produce such decrees.

The public decrees of Sparta provide little evidence for literacy or illiteracy, but inscriptions of other types are more numerous and may be more helpful. In the following pages two approaches have been attempted. For the inscriptions of the earlier centuries, most of which are votive offerings of some type, an attempt is made to determine in a general way the extent of literacy among the Spartan people. For the later inscriptions an attempt is made to learn more about the probable use of writing for the keeping of records by the Spartan bureaucracy.

Thus the intent of this part of my study of literacy in Sparta is to demonstrate the existence of at least some degree of literacy in Sparta among all social classes even in the earlier centuries. The proportion of literate persons to illiterate, and the exact limits of individual achievements must unfortunately remain unknown. It should be noted at the outset that, if the traditions of a similar or identical education for all Spartan citizens is even generally correct, we may be justified in assuming that a few literate persons are to some degree representative of many or most. For purposes of this study a person is considered "literate" if he was able to inscribe his own votive
offering. Some could have done more; but many (or most) were hard pressed to do so much. It is difficult to be sure.

Most of the inscriptions from the earlier centuries are votive offerings of some type. There are also numerous grave stelae, a few artists' and masons' signatures, and a number of inscribed statue bases. Of these I have selected for discussion here only those which I consider most likely to have been inscribed and dedicated by the individual votary. In this selection as in so much else, absolute certainty as to which votive objects were actually inscribed by the individual making the offering and which were merely inscribed by the artisan is not to be expected.

Selection is partly by the process of elimination of offerings which seem most unlikely to have been hand inscribed by the dedicator. Among these I have eliminated most of the inscribed bronze objects on the grounds that the workmanship exhibited in these pieces may reasonably be considered beyond the skill of the ordinary persons; but it is recognized that there may be exceptions. Pottery sherds with painted names of deities have been eliminated since many of these pieces strongly suggest a large scale production of these objects as ready-made votive offerings. In fact many from the fifth century closely resemble each other and J.P. Droop notes that "a custom was introduced, but sparingly practised, of painting the design in yellow-
pink paint on a black ground, in which technique a considerable number of dedicatory inscriptions are found."

Once again there may have been exceptions and in some cases individuals could have painted their own offerings. Nevertheless in the interest of a conservative estimate of the extent of literacy, I have eliminated the painted sherds since on the whole they seem less likely to be the work of individuals. Unfortunately the publication of these sherds does not indicate whether the painted inscription was applied before or after firing.

Of the dedicatory inscriptions on stone I have eliminated those which seem most likely to have been produced by professionals. Examples which strongly suggest the presence of highly skilled craftsmen in Sparta even in the sixth and fifth centuries, are 46.71, a very nicely inscribed epigram dedicated by an athletic victor, and especially by 48.75 the hymn to Athena. Even the famous Damonon inscription (59.126) of the early fifth century demonstrates the abilities and techniques of professional stone workers in Sparta.

In rather striking contrast to these is a number of inscriptions so poorly written as to preclude all but the slightest probability of professional workmanship. Some of these 47.73 were not even inscribed with hammer and chisel but were merely scratched into soft limestone with a sharp
instrument. Hondius and Woodward have also noted the probability that many of these early votive offerings must have been the personal work of the "votaries to whom writing was clearly an effort."

A good example is provided by 38.43 of a literate person sometime near the very beginning of the sixth century or perhaps at the end of the seventh, who desiring to make a votive offering to Artemis tries with only modest success, to inscribe the goddess' name into the soft sandstone. He does well enough with the first three letters but seems to have been indecisive about the fourth. Uncertain whether he should write Alpha or Mu he compromised and wrote both making Alpha from Mu (\(\text{Α}^{\text{m}}\)). The dedication was roughly cut and seems surely to have been the work of an individual who, though not a professional writer, still was literate (even if just barely). Even more definitely the work of non-professionals is 47.73, a fragment of soft limestone inscribed at the end of the seventh or beginning of the sixth century. The inscription is a list of eight names which were scratched into the surface of the stone with some sharp instrument. In this piece several degrees of writing styles and skills are apparent indicating the work of more than one person. Lines 5 and 6 are the best made and the letters are inscribed much deeper than the other lines. There
is also considerable variation in letter shapes and sizes. The probability that this inscription was the work of a professional hired by illiterate customers is very slight. One might argue of course, that an illiterate customer has hired several professionals of varying degrees of competence, but such an argument would not be reasonable.

Number 42.39 has been identified without confidence by Kelbe as a funeral stone. The name is written in very crude letters retrograde. L. Jeffery\textsuperscript{38} classes it with a number of others as graffiti and says that it is a mason's name. I agree fully with Miss Jeffery. The name Technarchos (Τέχναρχος) seems to be of a type known from other Spartan inscriptions which also appear to be masons' names and which were probably nicknames or perhaps slave names taken from the individual's trade or from some other source now unknown. Another somewhat similar name, though perhaps not that of a mason, is Kopris (Κόπρις). The inscription was a votive offering and was apparently inscribed by the person making the offering. Hondius, the publisher of the stone, remarked that the person making the dedication was perhaps just barely literate. It seems more than likely that Kopris was a slave or ex-slave since this name and names like it are known from Egypt where they refer to unwanted children abandoned and raised by
others, often as slaves. The name in Egypt is probably derived from Κορίς (sewer).

The name Τέχναρχος of the mason is less obviously that of a slave but it is entirely possible that all such nicknames were given to slaves or to workers. It seems reasonable to assume that these persons were from the lower strata of society, even if it cannot be proved that they were all slaves. Other similar names are Chalkedamans (Χαλκοδάμας) from the sixth century, Glaux and Harmos (Γλαύχη Ἀρμος) from the sixth or early fifth century, and Pelleion (Πολλεῖον) from about the same period.

In 49.79 we have an example of a literate artist of the sixth century (Γαρέας ἐποίη). Numbers 49.81 and 49.82 are from the series of votive plaques and demonstrate a rather ordinary person making a votive offering who was not quite sure of himself when he wrote his own name. In 49.81 he got it right (Τρούθος-Τροῦθος) but in 49.82, this time writing it retrograde, he forgot to cross his Tau (ΤΡΟΥΘΟΣ). It is such people as Kopris and Trouthos who, though only barely literate, show that at least the possibility of learning to write and perhaps to read was not limited to a few upper-class citizens and professional scribes, but was open to society in general and apparently even to slaves and freedmen. To be sure the level of achievement was limited in most cases and it is not possible to deter-
mine precisely what individual abilities might have been. Consideration of possible reading materials might suggest, however, that reading abilities of the average person could not have been great (see below p. 278 for final summary and conclusions).

The inscriptions of the fifth century provide much the same kind of evidence for literacy in Sparta. As in the sixth century, most are votive offerings of some kind and many inscribed pottery fragments begin to appear. These sherds are even more difficult to evaluate as evidence of literacy since the words and letters of many were applied with a pink or white paint (see above p. 248). In the absence of specific information in the publication of these pieces it is not possible to determine if the paint was applied before or after firing of the pottery. If before, we have evidence only of a literate potter turning out objects for the religious use of others. In fact even this evaluation may be too optimistic since the potter need not be literate; he may have simply copied out what was set before him. It is, of course, impossible to be sure. Therefore I have eliminated these painted pieces from consideration.

The large number of sherds with incised writing is less likely to have been the work of the potter since this kind of inscription, like the ostraka in Athens, may be easily
produced with any sharp instrument. But even here certainty is not to be expected and although many of the incised inscriptions seem to be the very labored products of barely literate people (e.g. $324.1069$), others ($324.1067,1070$) are beautifully written and indicate a high degree of competence in the writer. Some, such as $324.1069.5$ which reads... $\text{xxxxxxx}$ are the work of persons who are for all practical purposes illiterate. Still others ($324.1071$) have adopted the strange practice of abbreviating the name Athena with a single capital Alpha.

Thus the evidence from the pottery sherds whether painted or incised is difficult to interpret. But it may be cautiously asserted that at least some Spartans and even non-citizens of all social levels possessed sufficient skills for the production of private votive offerings.

Evidence of individual literacy from the inscriptions of the fourth century and from following centuries is somewhat similar to the preceding and it would serve no useful purpose to list each literate artisan or dedicator of a votive offering. The principle has been established for the sixth and fifth centuries. Many people of all social classes, including slaves had at least the possibility of learning to write and perhaps to read. We cannot, however, determine the exact level of achievement of individuals.
We may say only that when writing simple dedications some were very competent and others show an evident struggle with each letter.

Another approach to the use of inscriptions as evidence of literacy in Sparta is the investigation of the existence and use of public records in Sparta. Study of the later inscriptions has led me to believe that a fairly extensive bureaucracy must have existed at least in the later years. It is difficult to determine how much of this existed earlier but I have already shown that records of several different types were being kept in the early fifth century, and that there seems to have been a good deal of irregularity permitted at that time. For we know that in at least some cases collections of oracles were kept in the houses of Kings and that in at least one case an official copy of a treaty (and apparently the only copy in Sparta) was kept in the home of a general (see above p. 214). It seems logical to assume that the later bureaucracy and the public archive or archives which were a part of the bureaucracy were not created in the later centuries, but were the result of a steady evolution from the earliest times.

The first reference to a public archive in Sparta is 17. 7. The inscription, part of a complicated enactment regulating the Leonidea, is from the first century A.D. It contains provisions for the erection of the enactment
on stone and says that the contest will be held annually according to the provisions of the rhetra, apparently a written document. The names of the winners of the contests are to be inscribed by the Grammateis and will be placed in a building called the Grammatophylakion (Γραμματοφυλάκιον). This building has not been referred to in earlier inscriptions but the official in charge of the inscriptions (the Grammatophylax), and the secretaries are well known from earlier inscriptions. The procedures outlined here must have been followed in somewhat earlier times as well. There is no reason to assume that the keeping of records was an innovation of the first century A.D., although we might expect a very great expansion of the practice under Roman influence.

Since earlier inscriptions do not mention such a building, the questions to be answered are how far back in Spartan history is it reasonable to assume the existence of public archives and how extensive were they? It does not seem at all likely that the second question will ever be answered but the answer to the first is that by at least the late sixth century and perhaps even earlier public records of some types were kept but that no central building designated as the official records office existed. For all practical purposes the houses of the Kings and even generals served
as the city archives at least through the fifth century. Since we know that the Pythaistai also had access to the written records of oracles (Herodotus 6.57.4) it may be possible that more than one copy existed and that one was kept in a temple depository just as certain inscribed treaties were erected near the temple of Apollo at Amycla (see above p. 212). The remark of Plutarch (Against Colotes 17) that the Spartans kept the oracle relating to Lycurgus in their most ancient chronicles probably supports the supposition of such a depository. But we cannot be sure that Plutarch is not referring merely to the copies kept in the homes of the Kings. Similarly the Pythaistai might have gone to the King's house to consult the books. Thucydides (5.18.10) informs us only that the Spartans were to erect a copy of a treaty on stone near the temple of Apollo in Amycla. He does not go so far as to say that other copies were written or kept in a public depository, but it is obvious that the inscribed stone was copied from an original, written on some other material presumably papyrus. Surely it is not reckless to assume that at least one copy of the original document was preserved in some appropriate place. The alternative, and in my judgement the more reckless assumption, is that the Spartans simply destroyed or threw the original away. Nor were all treaties made by the Spartans inscribed on stone, as is shown by the
incident related by Plutarch (Moralia 212C, 229F) about the treaty kept by Lysander in his own home. It was necessary for Agesilaus to go there to consult the document since there was apparently no other copy for reference; if there was an inscription, Agesilaus obviously did not regard it as authoritative. Thus the evidence for the existence of public records in the fifth century or earlier is both slight and ambiguous; but taken all together, it does suggest that public records certainly existed, that some types of records may have been kept in a public place or temple, but that the entire system was still in a primitive state open to a good deal of irregularity. The fact that even Agesilaus had to go to a private house to consult a public document warns us not to assume very much organization of records in Sparta at this time.

For the fourth century, we have a statement by Isocrates (Panathenaicus 243) which refers to contracts (συμβολαία) and to the Spartans as falsifiers of accounts (παραλογιζομένοι). Isocrates does not specify that these were written documents, and in fact a brief survey of other writers' use of the word shows no example in which the word can unambiguously be understood as "written contracts." In Thucydides 1.77 the words καὶ ἐλασσούμενοι γὰρ ἐν ταῖς ἐμβολαίαις πρὸς τοὺς ἐμμάχους δίκαιοι... seem to refer to inter-state agreements between Athens and the allies. Commercial or other re-
relationships were probably regulated by these agreements and they were enforceable in court. Euripides Ion 441 uses the word of "business transactions" and does not even hint that any kind of contract is meant. In Plato Politicus 295a the word refers to contracts and their enforcement. In Aristotle Rhetorica ad Alexandrum 1431a reference is made to contracts and law suits (ποιήσασθαι το συμβολαίον). Isocrates (Panegyricus 11) uses the word of contracts connected with lawsuits (πρὸς τὸ δόγμα τοῦ δικαίου τῶν ἴδιων συμβολαίων). The same meaning is apparent in Against Lachites 15. Most of the passages cited use the word to mean "contract" but in no case can it be stated with certainty that a written contract is meant and not merely an agreement sworn to before witnesses.

Harvey shows that even in Athens written contracts are not demonstrable for the fifth century and that the oral method of conducting business before witnesses was still prevalent. Written documents were widely used in Athens in the fourth century, however, and Harvey conjectures that since our chief source of information about them is from the fourth century orators, the existence of similar written documents in the fifth century could have gone unnoticed because of the lack of sources.

The use of written contracts among the Greeks in Egypt is well known from the many surviving examples of the
Ptolemaic period and later. Unfortunately, there is no other evidence that such written contracts were used in Sparta in the fourth century or earlier but it seems at least possible that Isocrates' use of the word *συμβολαια* may refer to written documents.

For the third century we have something rather more definite. Plutarch (Agis and Cleomenes 13.3) says that as a part of the cancellation of debts which occurred in about 242 B.C., all mortgage documents were brought together in the agora and were burned there in a great pile.

These were certainly written documents and the words of Plutarch strongly suggest that this was the regular way of recording loans. There was nothing unusual in this and therefore we may assume that these practices were not necessarily new in the mid-third century. Documents described in this context are limited to loans but even these would probably have belonged to the general category of *συμβολαια* mentioned by Isocrates, and it seems quite likely that these *συμβολαια* and the *κλάρια* were among the documents sealed with the stones mentioned by Pausanias (3.11.11).

It is perhaps significant that the word *κλάρια* is used in this sense only in this passage and that Plutarch
makes it clear that the usage is strictly Laconian and that the word is the local equivalent of γραμματεία a more common word for contracts. The fact that the Spartans already had their own word for the practice might suggest that the custom was well established. The word is the diminutive of κληρος, often used of an allotment of land. Zonas (Greek Anthology 6.98) used the diminutive in the singular but it is clear that he means only a small plot of land. A usage somewhat closer to that of the Spartans is seen in a papyrus fragment of the second century B.C. where it is used of titles or deeds.

Other than the fact that these were written documents used between citizens the most important thing about them is that they were not recorded on stone or other lasting material. Plutarch's words suggest that they were on some easily combustable material (perhaps papyrus, leather, or wood), and that they may have been kept in a public place provided for the purpose. It is possible, of course, that men in possession of the documents were merely ordered to bring them from their homes, but if Plutarch's language is taken literally, it suggests that the same men gathered the mortgages (συνενέγκατες), piled them up (συνθέντες εἰς ἑν), and then burned them (συνέσφησαν). If individuals did not bring them in, and if there was no public place where
they were kept, we must imagine the reformers raiding the homes of all the mortgage holders. We must also imagine that Plutarch passed over a rather good story.

Another document relating to the third century is the curious series of letters recorded in 1 Maccabees 12-15. The book itself was written in Hebrew in the mid-second century and survives in a Greek version. The first letter cited is from Jonathan the High Priest in Jerusalem and is addressed to the Spartans "our brothers"  ...Σπαρτιάταις τοίς ἀδελφοῖς χαίρειν  . Appended to the letter is a letter written by the Spartan King Areus (309-264 B.C.) to Onias the High Priest. In the letter Areus is quoted as saying that documents have recently come to light showing kinship of the Spartans and Jews. The document referred to by Areus (if it existed) must have been older than the King himself and must have come from the local archives mentioned in the next letter of the Spartans to the Jews (1 Maccabees 14.16-23). This letter was written on brass tablets (σέλτοις χαλκαῖς ) after the death of Jonathan and was delivered by some Jewish ambassadors who were returning to Jerusalem from a mission to Rome. The visit of the ambassadors is described and it is stated that a copy of what was said was written down and placed in the public archive for a permanent memorial.
Sidney Tedesche and Solomon Zeitlin accept the original letter of Jonathan with its appended letter of King Areus as genuine; "hence no reason to doubt the authenticity of the letter to the Spartans...Areos' original letter was purported to have been written more than 150 years before, and we see how careful the Jews were to preserve historical documents. This letter is rather an argument for the historicity of the other letters than otherwise."

They did not accept the letter from 1 Maccabees 14 as genuine, however, and suggest that the last three chapters of the book (14-16) were added sometime in the first century by persons now unknown. The appearance in the address of the letter of the phrase Σπαρτιατῶν ἄργοντες also rules against its genuineness but it should be remembered that the letter as it stands is a Greek translation of a Hebrew translation of the original Greek. Thus, much of the original correctness of form could easily be lost.

Josephus also records the series of letters and adds some interesting details not found in 1 Maccabees. To the letter of Areus, Josephus adds that Demoteles will be the messenger, that the writing is square (τὰ γεγραμμένα
* and that the seal is an eagle holding a serpent (Jewish Antiquities 12.225-228; 13.164,165,166).
To Jonathan’s letter he adds the more correct form of the address Λακεδαίμονίων ἐφόροις καὶ γεροθσίς καὶ ὅμω τοῖς ἀδέλφοῖς χαίρειν and the information that the Spartans passed a decree of friendship and alliance with the Jews.

Regardless of the authenticity of the letters or the relationship (or non-relationship) of the two peoples it is clear that Josephus or the writer of the letter did not even consider the possibility that the Spartans made no use of some type of depository for records of this kind. It was a normal part of inter-state relations. The center referred to may have been the Grammatophylakion previously mentioned.

For the second century and following the information is much more abundant and clear. Most of it is epigraphical. A second century decree (13.2) makes definite mention of written laws in Sparta (γέγραπτα ἐν τοῖς νομοῖς). These laws pertained to rights of persons granted proxeny status in Sparta. It is likely that these laws were not written on stone, but like the klaria, on some more perishable material. If many such laws had been inscribed on stone, some fragments would possible survive. None do. From 31.35 we see that in the second century B.C. a special
group of men designated οἱ καταστάθεσις Νομο]γράφοι are to write up an enactment concerning some subject we cannot identify. [Γραψάντω δὲ καὶ οἱ καταστάθεσις Νομο]γράφοι νόμον περὶ τοῦτων. Perhaps the word τοῦτων refers to the Roman envoys who are to be provided for in the inscription. The Nomographoi are not mentioned in other Spartan inscriptions but their function here seems to have been to prepare the text of the decree honoring the envoys rather than to write an actual law. It is clear from the rest of the text that whatever each of the officials does is to be done within the guidelines of already existing laws (ἐκ τῶν νόμων).

Number 23.15 sheds much light on the manner of keeping records in the second century B.C. The inscription is in the form of a letter sent by a grammateus of a Macedonian or Achaean town to the Ephors of Sparta. The grammateus says that he has sent a copy (ἀντίγραφον) of certain enactments (ψηφίσματων) which he has found written in the records of his town hall and which are in his keeping; τῶν δὲ τῶν παρ' ἐμπεμένων ἐν τῷ ἄρχειῳ ἐν βιβλίῳ ψηφίσματων γέγραφα. The rest of the inscription is lost but traces of a name survive and the word διατέλεια suggests that what followed was a copy of a proxeny decree or a copy of that city's
laws concerning such decrees. It is possible that the Spartans had requested a copy of these laws or decrees and it is likely that they had a similar office in which to keep copies like this one and originals of their own decrees. Number 22.14 provides an additional example of another city sending a copy of something to the Ephors in Sparta: [ἄντι]γραφον ... Λακεδαὶμ[ονίων] ἐφόροις. Number 34.39 provides an example of the reverse procedure in which the Spartans send a copy of one of their own decrees to the city of Delphi: [ἀποστέλλομ]εν ὑμῖν ἄντιγραφον.

All these examples are from the second century and we have none on stone from an earlier date; but the isolated bits and pieces of evidence already mentioned from the fifth, fourth, and third centuries fit nicely into the picture that has emerged from the second century. The treaty mentioned by Thucydides (1.18.10) was inscribed on stone and erected near the temple of Apollo in Amyclae, and there is no reason to think a permanent copy was not also recorded in some appropriate place. It has already been suggested that the inscribed stone was probably the exception; and that the archive copy was the regular practice (see above p. 213). The enactment mentioned in the Spartan letter of 1 Maccabees 14.23 refers to a decree similar to any other,
and the original copy of it as well as the letter brought by the Jewish envoys was placed in an archive of some kind.

Number 32.35, a decree of the obe of Amyclae, shows that in Amyclae, there existed a special board of four officials known as decree writers (Δοματογράφοι). Their sole responsibility appears to have been the writing of decrees such as this one, and they may have been officials similar to the Νομογραφοί mentioned in 15.4. Just as important is an entry providing for some unnamed officials to keep a record of the expense involved in inscribing the decree. The decree honors a group of Ephors and one of the last provisions is for the recognition of the secretary of this board, obviously for his competence and faithfulness in his duties as records keeper of the Ephors. Thus a center or what is more likely a number of centers for keeping records did exist in Sparta at least by the early third century and probably earlier than that in some form.

It now remains to try to determine something about the extent of the Spartan efforts in keeping records. This is possible for only the relatively late years when evidence becomes more abundant because of the large bureaucracy that must have developed. The inscriptions suggest that each board of magistrates kept their own records and that they were fairly extensive.

Fairly representative is 64.261, a list of six Πατρωνομοί
of the first century B.C. Also named are six Synarchoi followed by the grammateus, three assistants (ὑπογραμματεῖς), and a servant (ὑπήρετας).

We do not know the business requirements of the officials named in this inscription but we do know that the secretary and three under-secretaries named were needed to keep the records of the acts of these twelve men.

In 87.278 we learn that a board of Ἱεροθυτα of the first century B.C. had its own grammateus who kept the records of its religious activities.

Number 87.283 is a list of Sitethentes. Included in this list is a priestess and priest, and all the tradesmen necessary for carrying out the religious functions of the group. Among the individuals listed is a teacher (διδάσκαλος κατὰ νόμον) a secretary, and a reader (of sacred books?) (ἀναγνώστας). Apparently this group of religious officials not only had records kept by its own secretary, but it also had a collection of books and a special official who was in charge of giving readings from them. It is not possible to distinguish between the duties of the teacher and the reader in this inscription, but it seems reasonable to assume that the teacher was a learned man like Sphaerus (see above p. 239) who had great knowledge of the ritual traditions of the cult involved and was able to give authoritative interpretations and answers.
when needed. The reader seems more likely to have been responsible for more mechanical functions such as the recitation of cult rituals found written in the sacred books. In the absence of more detailed evidence, these interpretations cannot be proved beyond doubt, but it is clear, nevertheless, that this cult-group kept its own records, that it had a collection of books, and that is is unlikely to have been unique in Sparta. That this particular board was not unique is shown by 89.28 which names a keeper of sacred books (ἐπὶ γραφῶν Σωίνικος).

It is not possible to know the exact nature of these sacred books but it is obvious that they preserved the ancient traditions of the priesthood and it is likely that these were among the records which attracted Sphaerus and other scholars to Sparta. This is strongly suggested by Athenaeus in his many quotations from these writers on religious and social customs of the Spartans. It is also likely, but not demonstrable, that these books were a part of the same ancient tradition mentioned by Herodotus (6.57.4) and Plutarch (Against Colotes 17) where the most ancient chronicles of the Spartans are mentioned.

From the second century A.D. we have the great inscribed parodos wall of the theatre with its many lists of magistrates from the twenty-eight separate documents which
make up the wall and the twenty-four others which have fallen from it. In addition to these there are other documents inscribed on stones making up the water channel running around the orchestra and numerous fragments. It is not necessary to evaluate all of these inscriptions here in this context; the reader may refer to my chapter one p.133 for more details. The importance of these inscriptions for the question of literacy in Sparta is that they show a municipale bureaucracy by the second century made up of many different administrative and religious boards of magistrates. Many and perhaps even all of these boards had their own secretaries and we may assume they kept copious records of all their affairs. Doubtless the size of the bureaucracy and the obviously greater interest in public display of inscriptions is due in large part to Roman influence, but the books and records kept by the religious groups seem to have had a continuous development from earlier times. As another example of this increased interest in public display of inscriptions see 149.728 in which the family of Pomponius Panthales has set up twelve statues with the man's civic honors inscribed on the bases. Boards of magistrates which are known to have had their own secretaries include the Ephors 101.366, 102.368 the Nomophylakes 104.381, the Hieromnemones 109.420 the Gerontes 94.315, 105.396, 105.391, and the Tainarici
The Boule also had its own secretary (22.14) and the Dogmatographoi of Amyclae have already been described.

By the second century, a special board of magistrates existed which was charged with the preservation and interpretation of the customs of Lycurgus. In 123.560 a group of men referring to themselves as oi διδάσκαλοι ἀμφί τὰ Λυκούργεια ἔθη definitely constituted a separate board of magistrates. In 127.586 we have an example of an individual being honored as a protector of the laws of Lycurgus (τῆς περὶ τὰ Λυκούργεια ἔθη προστασίας). He was also referred to as teacher (διδασκάλου).

In 127.591 we have a cursus honorum of a late second century Spartan who held the office of ἐξεγητὴς τῶν Λυκούργειων ἔθων. Not much is known about these officials but it would appear that they acted much in the same capacity as Sphaerus (see above p. 241), with the major difference that this responsibility was by the second century, vested in an officially established board of magistrates. It seems safe to assume that the responsibilities of the board must have included the care of records and books containing the details of the ancient customs, and that these records were very similar to those described by Plutarch in Against Colotes 17. Though it cannot be proved beyond all doubt, it seems
likely that the establishment of this board was the final step in a long development of the methods used by the Spartans in keeping this particular set of records. Herodotus (6.57.4) gives brief mention of the first stage of development when he says that collections of oracles were kept in the houses of Spartan Kings. The incident related by Plutarch about Lysander (Moralia 212C, 229F; Lysander 25) serves further to illustrate, at least in the case of Spartan management of documents such as treaties, that this early stage was a crude and disorganized one. The fact that Lysander also kept copies of oracles in his home also indicates that the collections kept by the Kings were not the only ones in Sparta and that the complete body of oracles was scattered in several places. By the mid-third century, many of the Lycurgan traditions had been forgotten and we may suppose that written records of the ancient oracles and rhetra had long lain neglected. If so, it then follows that the major contribution to Spartan history made by Sphaerus was the discovery and organization of these ancient documents into some kind of usable collection. At least this much seems clear from the fact that Sphaerus advised Cleomenes on the ancient Spartan constitution, and that he wrote two books on the subject. Beyond this nothing is certain, but it is my own belief that Sphaerus created
an official collection of ancient written traditions (perhaps including the oracles) and that he brought it all together into one place. At some later date an official board of curators and interpreters of the collection was established.

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

The unavoidable impression a reader of these later inscriptions must get is of a bureaucracy very large for the size of the city it is made to serve. We know little of the actual business of the individual boards of magistrates since the records of each were kept in archives. The names of the board members, however, were apparently considered to be public business and so the membership lists were inscribed on stone. That there was a good deal of personal vanity involved in the publication of these lists is shown by the occasional inclusion of an individual cursus honorum as a part of the membership list (101.366).

These inscriptions and the centers for records they reveal prove that a great deal of written work was carried out by the various boards of officials. This does not in itself reveal anything about the rate of literacy in the city, but is the small size of the Spartan population is kept in mind it becomes apparent that most full Spartan citizens must have served on one of these boards at some time in their
lives (perhaps even as grammateus) and this in turn suggests that at least in these very late years, literacy was probably the rule among Spartan citizens. It is not possible to have so clear an indication of its extent for the earlier centuries but it has already been shown that even in the sixth century B.C., the possibility of some degree of literacy was available to many.

One question now remains. What did Plutarch mean when he said that the Spartans learned to read and write for practical reasons only? This is the most difficult question of all, for Plutarch probably did not have specific standards of achievement in mind. He was making a general observation (probably based on what he considered common knowledge) and simply meant that they learned enough to get along. Plutarch does not distinguish between social classes but it should be obvious that requirements varied greatly among individuals and that there must have been a steady increase in the requirements of Spartan leaders, corresponding to the increase in diplomatic activity of the second century and later. In short we can expect their requirements for writing skills to have been less in the early centuries when they were relatively isolated politically and extremely conservative in their customs. This does not imply a social or political vacuum of course;
and it has already been shown that they made numerous treaties with other cities. It is only to say that Sparta was a comparatively closed and secretive society in contrast with Athens. But even for that early period there is some evidence.

Thucydides (1.128; 8.33.3, 38.4, 40) relates numerous incidents in which Spartan commanders send and receive letters. These letters have already been discussed as evidence for the frequency of such communications and it was suggested that the exchanges described by Thucydides were the ordinary and regular Spartan practice; there was nothing unusual about it, and Thucydides did not regard it as especially note-worthy that a Spartan commander was literate. It was also shown above (p. 212) that the use of written treaties was a regular feature of Spartan diplomacy in the fifth century and perhaps even earlier. But how much was enough for practical purposes? There is no direct answer in the evidence, but we may assume that letters of the type mentioned by Thucydides, to be of any use to Spartan commanders, must have provided details of troop strength and troop movements to meet the ever changing needs of the military and political situation. The letter sent by the Ephors to Pausanias (Thucydides 1.131) was simple and merely ordered him to return to Sparta;
the letter quoted in 1.128 was somewhat more complicated but still basically simple. It is impossible to determine the details of the exchange of letters between Pedaritos, Astyochos, and the authorities in Sparta, but the letter described in Thucydides 8.33.3 (412 B.C.), must have been complex enough to describe the movements of ex-captives coming from Samos to Erythrae and the military and political implications of the situation. We may also assume with some confidence that the letter sent by Pedaritos to Sparta (8.38.4) must have given enough detail about the political activities of Astyochos to have some chance of convincing the Ephors that the charges against him were true. Obviously then, the requirements of literacy for a Spartan military commander were considerable; he had to be able to express in writing any need which might come up and to read complex military language.

It has been argued that since all Spartan citizens received the same education from boyhood, presumably all learned to read and write. This may be true but the critical point is that some developed their skills to a high level, whereas the vast majority probably did not have occasion for such development and we may assume that many probably forgot all they ever knew.

The inferences drawn from the probable contents of
letters sent and received by Spartan generals provide some hints about the reading and writing skills of this class. The treaties quoted by Thucydides (5.77;5.18.10) are also suggestive. These treaties are complex and it is clear that the Spartan leaders must have developed into skilled diplomats and that they possessed the required degree of literacy.

It is obvious that these are only hints and I do not believe that it will be possible in the absence of other evidence to discover precisely how well the average Spartan could read and write. We may, however, get some hint of his skills by consideration of the question: What did the ordinary Spartan have to read? The answer for the earlier centuries is: Not much if anything. It has been shown that the Kings had collections of oracles in their homes, but it is unlikely that ordinary citizens saw or read them. Choral poetry was popular in Sparta from an early date, but this was a matter of public performance rather than private reading. Homer was appreciated but this too was probably through public recitation as far as the average citizen or inhabitant was concerned. It has been shown (above p. 213) that public decrees and inscriptions of all types were extremely rare in Sparta and in fact only two (18.8 and 33.37) are earlier than the third century. Of these only one (18.8) was set up
in Sparta and the very awkward language of it does not suggest much experience in writing such decrees. For some of the most intelligent of the Spartans there were works by Isocrates and perhaps by others but this does not necessarily mean that the ordinary person in Sparta had or could use such books. The specification that the most intelligent Spartans had the books probably refers to persons like Lysander who also collected oracles and had at least one political tract written for him by Cleon of Halicarnassus. It also refers to the Kings and to other leaders such as the military commanders and the Ephors. What then does this leave for the ordinary citizen to write or read? Probably nothing but his own votive inscriptions and perhaps the more elaborate inscriptions of persons such as Damonon (59.126).

Nevertheless the impression which has emerged is consistent from the sixth century on, and as far as the ordinary or average citizen is concerned, that impression is rather grim. He did learn his letters and to a degree was literate but his "literacy" was probably limited to writing votive offerings consisting of his name and the name of the deity (often both misspelled or barely legible). Others were more skilled as writers and produced beautiful work; still others were almost completely illiterate but did not realize it (as in the case of the man who when
making a votive offering knew that it was appropriate to write something on it, but being a man of little learning wrote all he knew how to write - a series of eight Kappas and one Eta (xxxxxxx). In short literacy among the people had more breadth than depth. In the centuries prior to the Roman period. But the evidence of the activities of the later bureaucracy suggests that during the years of Roman influence the Spartans experienced a steady and rapid growth in the amount of written work done by the magistracies. The same period saw a great proliferation of publicly displayed *cursus honorum* and other honorary inscriptions which serve to illustrate the generally changed climate in the city, which was now so much more open to travellers and was engaged in so many diplomatic enterprises.

Plutarch was right. The Spartans did learn to read for practical purposes, but the needs of Kopris or the Kappa writer were far different from those of Lysander and the men of his class.
CHAPTER THREE

CONSTITUTIONAL QUESTIONS 188-146 B.C.

In efforts to date several of the proxeny decrees of Sparta, scholars have depended heavily on the fact that the Ephors are not listed as addressees or as issuing authorities. The reasoning is that if the office of the Ephorate had existed at the time of the issue of the decrees, either as a position of real power at the head of the Spartan magistracy, or even as a mere figure-head, the Ephors should have been the addressees. This is certainly true in many cases (e.g., 16, 23, 15, 28, 26, 29, 27, and 29, 28). Some inscriptions have been broken too badly to show whether the Ephors were mentioned or not and others (e.g., 18, 8) would have no reason to give this information. Thus in actual practice, the method of dating inscriptions with reference to the Ephorate has not yielded satisfactory results.

The chief difficulty is that the removal of the Ephors from the office during the period of Sparta's membership in the Achaean League has not been proved. Some scholars do not even believe that any basic political change occurred as a result of Sparta's entry into the league (see below p. 290). Therefore it seems desirable to make a fresh examination of all the evidence pertaining to the Spartan constitution during the first half of the second century
B.C. For this purpose I have devoted the following chapter to a summary of Sparta's relations with the Achaean League and to a discussion of the Spartan constitution with emphasis on the Ephorate. For convenience and clarity the chapter is divided into three parts:

1. The Literary Evidence (pp. 281-293)
2. The Epigraphical Evidence (pp. 293-297)
3. The Numismatic Evidence (pp. 297-323)

THE LITERARY EVIDENCE

In 192 the tyrant (or king) Nabis was killed by a group of Aetolian conspirators and a new age opened for Sparta (or an old one closed). Immediately upon hearing the news of Nabis' death Philopoemen, the Strategos of the Achaean League, rushed to Sparta and joined it in some way to the league (Pausanias 7.8.4).

The position of Sparta in the Achaean League after 192 is somewhat obscure, but it was not, apparently, a normal one. In the late fall or early winter of 189, Sparta made a second attack against the coastal regions near Gytheum and captured the town Las. The inhabitants, subdued at first, drove the Spartans out the next day. The object of the attack was to secure an outlet to the sea, and to get at the Spartan exiles living there and in other coastal
towns (Livy 38.7).

The results of the attack were far reaching. Philopoemen, when the league was called on for help, took the side of the exiles and said the treaty of 195 (between Flamininus and Nabis) guaranteed the freedom of the coastal towns under the protection of the Achaeans.

The cities asked for the help of the league and Achaean messengers were sent to demand the guilty parties. The Spartans, fearing that Philopoemen intended to turn the city over to the exiles, killed all Achaean sympathizers in Sparta and appealed to Rome for protection.

Despite Roman efforts to settle the affair, the Achaeans declared war on Sparta and sent out an army in the spring of 189. The advance troops of the army were chiefly Spartan exiles, a deliberate provocation against the city. Not wishing to fight, a large number of Spartans were sent out under truce, but were killed by the exiles and Achaeans without regard to the terms of the truce.

The city was forced to surrender on Achaean terms which included:

1. Destruction of the city walls
2. Expulsion of all foreign soldiers serving for pay;
3. Expulsion of slaves freed by Nabis; and
4. Annulment of laws and customs of Lycurgus and adherence to those of the Achaean League. (Livy 34.1)
This harsh settlement, instead of solving the Spartan problems, created new ones and a new group of exiles. The act was generally disapproved in Rome but it was an accomplished fact before proper interest was taken there.

In the following years, Rome was besieged by a constant stream of exiles begging for help and by embassies from the league and Sparta arguing their cases.

Polybius (23.4) says that in the first year of 01.149 (184/3) the greatest number of Greek missions yet seen came to Rome. At one time there were four separate groups from Sparta alone.

1. Lysias appeared on behalf of the old exiles and demanded that they should be restored with all their property.

2. Areus and Alcibiades, two of the exiles who had been restored by the Achaeans in 188, demanded that they should receive their property back only to the extent of one talent.

3. Serippus demanded that affairs should remain as they were when Sparta was a member of the Achaean League.

4. Chaeron and others appeared on behalf of those killed and exiled by the Achaeans in 188. He
demanded their recall and restoration of the old constitution (καὶ τὴν πολιτείαν ἀποκαταστῆναι τοιαύτην...[text broken]).

The senate appointed a commission to look into the matter. The commission, consisting of Flamininus, P. Caecilius, and A. Claudius, agreed about the return of the exiles and property of those who were driven out and killed in 188. They also agreed that Sparta would stay in the Achaean League, but disagreed about the property of the old exiles. A written agreement was drawn up and the representatives affixed their seals.

In 182, Sparta was able to bring back the exiles of 189/188 by decree of the Roman Senate, but they appear to have been driven out again soon after their return.

It appears that at least some of the Lycurgan constitution was restored at this time. This probably included at least the ephetic training, but the full extent of restoration is uncertain. Pausanias (7.9.5) says the walls were rebuilt.

In the second year of 101/100, more embassies came to Rome on behalf of the exiles, but the Romans, waiting to see how the Achaeans would handle the Messenian revolt, were not interested. At this point Polybius (23.17.5) is somewhat confusing, for he says that Lycortas, strategos of the Achaean League, summoned a meeting at Sicyon, AFTER the affairs of Messene were settled, and proposed a re-
solution to receive Sparta into the Achaean League. He told them of the Roman reply that the affairs of Sparta did not concern them and that the present rulers wished to join the league. He also claimed that two advantages would result. The Spartans in sympathy with the league would be included in it, and the old exiles who had acted with ingratitude would be excluded since they had been driven from the city by the others. It was decided to admit those old exiles who had not been ungrateful to the Achaean. The terms of the new association were inscribed on a stele.

By this decree, Sparta definitely became a member of the league, but the question of her status between 192 and 182 remains unanswered, and the obscure language of Polybius in his description of the four groups of Spartan ambassadors of the first year of this Olympiad remains unexplained.

The most reasonable explanation seems to be that Sparta was not a full member of the league after 192 but was almost a subject state, especially after 188. This possibility is supported by the speeches of Areus and Alcibiades made during an embassy in 186 (Polybius 22.11.6). They claimed that the power of Sparta had been destroyed by the forced expulsion of many citizens, and that those who
remained had neither security, nor freedom of speech, because the population was small and the walls had been pulled down. They also said that they had to obey Achaean decrees, and individuals were subjected to any governors appointed by the Achaeans.

Sometime in 181, the Roman Senate tried to intercede on behalf of the exiles and the attempt led to a real split among leaders of the Achaeans. The faction led by Callicrates wanted the league to go to any length to please Rome, even to the extent of breaking local customs, laws, and treaties. The other faction led by Lycortas (following Philopoemen), held the view that the Achaeans should maintain friendship with Rome and yet act with as much local independence as possible in order to avoid a position of complete servitude.

In the assembly of the league in that year, the views of Lycortas prevailed and an embassy was dispatched to explain their position on the return of the exiles. Unwisely, the embassy was headed by Calliorates, who, instead of presenting the views of the league, told the Romans of the divided opinions at home and advised them to favor men such as himself, and to be firm in their relations with the Achaeans.

The Romans said that all Greeks should be like Callicrates and demanded that the exiles be returned at once.
The spirits of the Achaeans were crushed and Polybius saw this as the turning point in relationships between Rome and the Achaean League. From his point of view it was no longer a matter of cooperation and friendship between two near equals, but a master-servant relationship. (Polybius 24.8-10).

The old exiles were finally brought back in the following year, and they set up a statue of Callicrates at Olympia. The inscribed base (Dittenberger Syll. 3634) survives.

Thus the problem of the refugees was settled by the Romans, but at a cost of strengthening anti-Roman sentiment among certain classes of Achaeans. Among others there was a sense of despair that would, in the end, drive them to the extremist point of view. This feeling was greatly strengthened after the battle at Pydna when the Romans took away over a thousand Achaeans (whose names were supplied by Callicrates) without trial to Italy. They were kept there until 151 when they were judged to be too old to cause trouble (Pausanias 7.10.12).

The years between 179 and 151 were relatively peaceful as far as Sparta and the Achaeans were concerned. There was a territorial dispute with Megalopolis and another with Messene in 150. The former was settled in favor of Megalopolis but the latter proved to be more troublesome. As
usual, embassies were sent to Rome by both sides.

The Spartan representative was a certain Menalcidas, who had been Strategos of the league during the previous year. Pausanias (7.12.2-3) says that Menalcidas used his position, with the help of Callicrates, to influence the Achaeans to intervene on the side of Oropus in a dispute with Athens. Menalcidas is said to have received a bribe of ten talents, of which half was promised, but not delivered to Callicrates.

Callicrates then brought charges against Menalcidas, saying that on his recent embassy to Rome he had worked against the Achaeans by trying to separate Sparta from the league. Menalcidas gave three talents to the demagogue Diaeus, his successor as Strategos, who then saved him.

The ambassadors to Rome in the current territorial disputes were told that all but capital cases should be dealt with in league courts. Diaeus, the Achaean representative, told the Achaeans that the Romans had given them the right to try Lacedaemonians on capital charges if necessary. The Spartans did not accept this, and tried to send another embassy to Rome. The league blocked the attempt on the pretext that member states were not permitted to send out individual delegations.

By 149/8, these disputes led to the outbreak of host-
ilities between the league and Sparta. Diæus led an army into Laconia that year. To avoid actual fighting, Sparta condemned twenty-four men, designated by the Achaean, and sent them into exile with the expectation that they would soon be restored by Rome. New embassies went to the senate which decided to send a delegation to enquire into the matter.

The dispatch of these envoys was delayed long enough for Diæus to deceive the Achaean further into believing that Sparta had been subjected to them, and for Menalcidass to deceive the Spartans into believing that they had been set free of the league.

In spite of the advice of the Romans, especially of Metellus, the Achaean League commenced open warfare against Sparta in 149/8, and tried to enlist the small Laconian villages against the Spartans.

When the Roman delegation finally arrived, it was decreed that not only Sparta but Corinth and several other cities should be detached from the league. Upon hearing this, the Achaean immediately attacked and arrested all Spartans dwelling in Corinth. Further attempts by the Romans to mediate between Sparta and the league were thwarted by the new Strategos, Critolaus, who then incited the league to declare war on both Sparta and Rome.
The Spartan Constitution After 189/8

The actual status of the Spartan constitution during the years after 189/8 is generally obscure. Livy (38.34) says that the laws and customs of Lycurgus were taken away and those of the Achaean League substituted. The essential questions here are: what changes (if any) occurred? and how long did they last? If the testimony of Livy is taken at face value it should mean that the entire Spartan constitution was overthrown and replaced by a system conformable to the organization of the Achaean League. Polybius (2.37.10) says that the cities of the Achaean League had the same laws, weights, measures, coinage, magistrates, senates and courts. There is obviously much truth in this statement since all Achaean League cities are known to have struck a special coinage according to the Achaean League standard (see below p. 298). But Polybius' statement should not be understood as absolute since individual cities continued striking an autonomous coinage and we may assume that they kept other local customs.

Chrimes² argues that the only constitutional upset to occur in 188 was the replacement of the traditional Spartan and ephebic training. In this argument she sees that the replacement of the training of Lycurgus would in time, amount to the same thing as a complete constitutional change.
Such was its importance. Doubtless this would have been true if the change had been permanent but it lasted only a few years and 183 or 179 it was repealed with Roman help as Chrimes notes. She also realizes that the chance remark by Polybius (29.7) about certain officials described as ὑδόχιμαςτήρες τῶν κοινῶν κατὰ τοὺς νόμους might suggest something outside the normal constitution, but that this in itself is not conclusive. To arrive at this position Chrimes has interpreted the words of Livy "Lycurgi leges moresque abrogarent; Achaeorum adsuescerent legibus institutisque" (38.34) as a mistaken version of a decree passed by the Achaean League and presumably quoted or paraphrased by Polybius in a part of his history now lost. She supports the theory by citing Plutarch and Pausanias.

ἀναίλε γὰρ καὶ διέφθειρε τὴν Λυκούργειον ἀγωγὴν ἀναγκάσας τοὺς παιδας αὐτῶν καὶ τοὺς ἐφήβους τὴν Ἀχαικὴν ἀντὶ τῆς πατρίου παιδείαν μεταβαλέν ὡς οὐδέποτε μικρὸν ἐν τοῖς Λυκούργου νόμοις φρονήσοντας.

Ὁ (Philopoemen) overthrew and abolished the Lycurgan agoge and forced Spartan youths to participate in Achaean training in place of their ancestral discipline. (Philopoemen 16.5)

καὶ τὰ ἐς μελέτην τοῖς ἐφήβοις ἐκ τῶν Λυκούργου νόμων καταλύσαντες ἐπέταξαν τοῖς Ἀχαιῶν ἐφήβοις τὰ αὐτὰ ἐπιτηδεύειν.

He declared to the ephebes that they were not to be concerned with the laws of Lycurgus, but
to be trained in accordance with the same laws pertaining to Achaean ephebes. (Pausanias 8.51.3)

Chrimes also notes the remark in Plutarch's Comparison of Philopoemen and Titus 1.3 that Philopoemen destroyed Sparta's constitution διέφθειρε τὴν πολιτείαν. She reconciles the statement with her general premise by saying that "the abolition of the Lycurgan ἀγογή meant in fact the changing of the whole πολιτείας". Certainly Chrimes is correct in showing the importance of the replacement of the Lycurgan ἀγογή and she is correct in assuming that in time it would have resulted in more complete constitutional changes. Nevertheless I do not believe she is correct in limiting the changes of 188 to the ἀγογή. There is no reason to believe that other changes were not made at the same time.

Nor is there any reason to attribute this degree of subtlety to the leaders of the Achaean League. The events of 188 grew out of long standing military conflicts and occurred at some time when the Achaeans had the upper hand. Moderation is not to be expected. Indeed Plutarch's remark in Philopoemen 16 suggests that moderation was the furthest thing from Philopoemen's mind. For after destroying the walls of the city, annexing some of its territory to Megalopolis, and removing or enslaving several thousand new Spartan citizens, he arrogantly erected a stoa in Megalopolis with
the money from the sale. Plutarch then adds that his treatment of the Spartan constitution was carried out in a spirit of hate and anger.

The aim of the Achaeans in changing the Spartan ephetic training was to institute a system of military reform and preparation of youths which would make their assimilation into the Achaean League organization much easier and which would render them less independent. That is to say less Spartan. Changes in the structure of the Spartan government was a separate matter altogether and could have been accomplished as quickly as the change in the Lycurgan agoge.

THE EPIGRAPHICAL EVIDENCE

It has already been suggested that the absence of any mention of the Ephors in several proxeny decrees suggests that some basic constitutional change may have occurred.

The decrees (11.1 and 11.2) make no mention of the Ephors at all. The Synarchia with the Demos is mentioned in 12.2. Authorization of such decrees would seem to be the proper function of the Ephors if they were in office. This is certainly the case in the letter sent by the Spartans to Larissa (IG., IX.2.518; 326.1074) which
is dated to about the mid-second century B.C. It is also true in a letter to the archons and city of Delphi (34,39) which has been dated to about 29 B.C. Decrees and letters originating outside Sparta were normally addressed to the Ephors and Demos of the Lacedaemonians as in 16.6, 28.26, 29.27, 29.28 all from the first century B.C. That this was the regular practice needs no further demonstration here, though other examples are readily available.

The assumption that the presence or absence of any mention of the Ephors in these decrees has served as a basis for dating several of them. The results obtained by this method of dating depend largely on different understandings of the questions: What changes (if any) occurred? When did they occur? and How long did they last?

Thus Tod has dated 28.26 (addressed to the Ephors) to the period before 226 B.C. when Cleomenes temporarily crushed the Ephorate. Tod realized that the office was restored later but reasoned that since it was never again a source of real power, the Ephors should not be the addressees in this inscription. Kolbe refuted this by showing that other inscriptions of the mid-second century are so addressed and that the letter forms are more appropriate to the later date. Kolbe is correct but his arguments are
not conclusive owing to the great difficulty of dating Spartan inscriptions by letter forms.

The dating of 11.1 and 12.2 was argued along similar lines. Foucart dated 11.1 to about 220 B.C. Swoboda postulating a second abolition of the Ephorate placed the inscription a little after 188. He assumed of course, that the Ephors were restored in 184 or 183. In all these cases inscriptions were dated largely on the basis of the absence of any mention of the Ephors.

Kolbe, who also included the evidence of the letter forms in his dating of the inscriptions, was vague but probably correct in assigning them to the mid-second century; Swoboda was more precise than the evidence seems to permit when he dated 11.1 to shortly after 188, and was probably incorrect. Tod 217b and Foucart nr. 17b were mistaken because they attributed the absence of any mention of the Ephors in these inscriptions to the act of Cleomenes in 226. Chrimes denies that the presence or absence of the Ephors is necessarily meaningful. She suggests that the formula used in addressing decrees to the head (or titular head) of the Spartan government was not necessarily an officially correct one known to all external issuing authorities.

The question regarding the Ephorate must be regarded
as still open. Was it abolished for a second time after 188 and if so when was it re-established? Perhaps no final answer acceptable to all can be reached; but there is still some evidence to be discussed.

We know from Polybius (2,37,10) that membership in the Achaean League required individual cities to have the same laws (at least as an ideal) weights, measures, coinage, magistrates, senates, and courts. The chief magistrates of the cities of Achaea were the boards of the ten Damisourges which corresponded very roughly to the board of Ephors in Sparta. The office was carried over into the league on the federal level as a board of ten under the Strategos and was second in power only to him. From the federal level it must have been adopted by individual members even though they were not Achaean cities. Livy (38.30.4) says that they were the chief magistrates of individual cities "et sub adventum consulis damiurgis civitatium, qui summiss magistratus, Aegeum evqcanibus Philopæmen prætor tum erat-Argos conventum edixit."

Perhaps the most significant thing about 12.2 is the provision for setting up the decree on stone. An official called the Epidamisourgos (Ἐπίδαμμιοργός) is instructed to provide funds for the inscription. He is thus identified with financial affairs in Sparta and it
seems likely from his title that the Epidamisourges is simply the leading member of a board of Damisourgoi, much as an eponymous Ephor.

Since the existence of the Ephors cannot be proved at Sparta during the years of Achaean League membership, it seems reasonable to think that they were not in power at all at that time, and that their position was filled by a board of Damisourgoi (perhaps ten) as at other cities. This would be the normal thing under the rules of the league as given by Polybius and in the absence of evidence to the contrary, very probable.

THE NUMISMATIC EVIDENCE

It has already been stated (above p.290 ) that the coins of Sparta seem to provide some further evidence which tends to confirm the suggestions outlined above that the constitution of Sparta underwent changes in 188 more extensive than the removal of the agoge. These more practical changes remained in effect until Sparta's real separation from the Achaean League sometime around 151 B.C. No separation occurred in 184 as Wace contends, only the restoration of the traditional ephebic training and the rebuilding of the city walls. It was in fact only at about this time, perhaps 182 or 181 that Sparta really became a member of the league. Before that she was more in the position of a subject state. Because of the importance of the
coins as evidence for Spartan history during the first half of the second century, I have devoted the following division of this chapter to their study with a view toward establishing dates and evaluating them as evidence.

THE COINAGE:

ACHAEAN LEAGUE SILVER

All silver coinage issued by Sparta with Achaean League types followed a slightly reduced Aegenetan Standard and as in the case of other league cities, all coins were of a single denomination, the tri-obol. The average weight of the coins is slightly less than 2.5 grms. (about 2.29 for the coins in the British Museum collection). Most Achaean League cities also struck a bronze coinage which regularly had the name of the city and of the Achaean League spelled out in full, as in AXAIΩΝ ΚΟΠΙΝΩΝΙΩΝ and AXAIΩΝ ΣΙΚΥΩΝΙΩΝ. Not all cities produced a bronze coinage with league types. Percy Gardner notes "it is a curious fact that Lacedaemon is, with Patrae, one of the few minting cities belonging to the Achaean League which did not issue federal copper money; and this may indicate that the Spartans retained some iron money, for small change, until the dissolution of the Achaean League." The federal coinage of Sparta is generally dated between the years 192 and 146 B.C. But reasons have already been given above to show that the relationship of Sparta
to the Achaean League between 191 and 182 was not that of a normal member. Because of the unsettled conditions in Sparta after 191, it seems likely that the first federal issues came shortly after 182, rather than before.

The results of a recent die-study suggest that this first issue was a very small one, perhaps no more than a token issue to establish a precedent for Sparta as a minting city.

All coins examined from this small group were struck from only two obverse and three reverse dies. The two obverse dies are completely different in style and there are two different monograms on the reverses (ME and EY pl. 1.1). The total number known to me is sixteen. The style and workmanship of these coins is much finer than any of the coins from later years. This is true for certain other cities as well as Sparta, and has led to speculation that the later workmanship is merely degenerate and that the degeneracy developed gradually through a series of annual issues. The coinage of Elis has been arranged chronologically partly on this basis.

This does not seem to have been the case at Sparta (or at Elis) and there certainly was no long series of annual issues there. The coins bear the monograms ME, EY, NY, Μ, Π, Ρ, Ρ, Χ, Ε, Ω. If each of these monograms is understood to represent a different annual issue, there were seven or
eight such issues. The monograms $\gamma$, $\tilde{m}$, $\Lambda$ are probably variations on a single monogram since differences in style and quality between several coins with the letters $\text{EY}$ are too great to suppose that they represent a single issue.

Careful observation of the obverse sides suggest that the coins fall into at least two groups, widely separated in time. The first is represented by a small number of coins bearing the marks $\text{EY}$ and $\text{ME}$ on their reverses. These are characterized by very fine workmanship and are far superior to all others. The reverses of these coins have the letters $\text{AA}$, and do not show the monogram which appears on all other Spartan coins with Achaean League types. Hoard evidence (especially from the Olympia hoard) shows that these coins have considerably more wear than the others, and suggests that they were probably in circulation longer.

A wide variety of styles and great differences in workmanship exists in the later groups of coins, but the similarity is great enough between many of them to suggest that they were probably struck within a fairly short period of time. Some examples are very crude and almost barbarous, (pl.1.2), while others, though not of especially high artistic merit, are at least well made. This great
difference in style and quality exists among coins bearing the same monograms (Μ, Κ, ΕΥ, Ω pl.1. 3-6), and great similarity in style and workmanship is in no case limited to coins within a single monogram group (Χ, Ε pl.1.7). Thus an individual coin in the Χ group may be almost identical in style with one in the Μ group, but completely unlike all others within its own group. Similar examples are common to all groups.

The evidence weighs against the possibility of a long period of degeneration such as has been proposed for the coins of Elis. The great differences in style and quality between some of these coins, and the great similarity between others shows rather, that several die cutters, probably four or five, were at work at the same time.

A die study made with available material shows that this issue (or issues) was a comparatively large one, since there are very few links between dies within the series. Thus the existence of so many die cutters at work at the same time is confirmed. Furthermore it would seem that the coins were produced in a hurry, in a time of great need.
It is possible then, that all Achaean League coins of Sparta are products of only two or three issues, one small one immediately after joining the league, and a large one some years later.

In my historical sketch (p.287 ff.) it was shown that by about 150 B.C., Sparta was moving rapidly toward war with the Achaean League, and that actual fighting broke out in 149/8.

According to Pausanias and Polybius both Sparta and the Achaean League were desperately short of money at this time and a large coinage would have been needed for both sides. The only difficulty with assigning the entire series to the years 150-147/6, is that the purpose of the coinage would then seem to be to finance a war against the Achaean League. Furthermore, there is no indication that serious fighting lasted beyond 148.

Another possibility is that all were struck as a single issue in 151 when Menalcidas, the Spartan Strategos of the Achaean League, provoked an expedition to help Oropus against Athens. This adventure came too late to be of any help to Oropus and turned back without a fight. Even so, a fully equipped and armed expedition put in the field with the intention of meeting the Athenian army would represent a large expenditure, even though it did not fight after reaching Attica.
AUTONOMOUS SILVER

The autonomous silver coinage of Sparta was struck on the same standard as the coins of the Achaean League, and like them the entire output consists of tri-obols.

The obverse type is a bearded head of Heracles, crowned with laurel or ivy. The reverse has an amphora, sometimes entwined with serpents, the caps of the Dioscuri, the letters ΛΔ, and other letters either singly or combined into monograms. All but one of the known examples are enclosed in a laurel wreath. The single exception has a border of dots.

The series of letters and monograms on the autonomous silver coins is longer and more complicated than that of the league coins. It does not seem possible to say with certainty, whether or not a particular variation of a monogram represents a separate annual issue. For example in the series (ΔΜΕ, ΔΜΟ), do the letters ΜΟ and ΜΕ indicate separate annual issues, or a single issue in which two secondary officials have been employed? I think the latter possibility is the most reasonable, but reference to the tabulation below (p. 305) will show the complexity of the problem.

The letters and monograms appear to represent the names of the magistrates responsible for the coins, as before. In at least one case, I believe it may be possible to
identify, with something like certainty, the name represented by the monogram. In the series marked with the monograms and letters $\text{API}$, $\pi\kappa$, it may seem at first sight that the monogram is unrelated to the $\pi\kappa$ monogram which appears to represent a name starting with the letters $\text{KAP}$ or $\text{KPA}$. However further study has led me to believe that the two represent the same name and that the name can be worked out with the aid of epigraphical and other evidence.

The existence of coins struck from the same obverse die but bearing the apparently different monograms $\pi\kappa$ and $\pi\kappa$ (pl.1.8) shows that the coins were struck at the same time and that even if the monograms represented different names, they still did not necessarily represent separate annual issues (they may be successive issues of course). The obverses of other coins bearing the letters $\text{API}$ are so similar in style to the $\pi\kappa$ and $\pi\kappa$ (pl.1.8) coins, that they seem likely to have been made by the same die cutter, and at about the same time.

If these three combinations of letters represent variations on the first letters of a single name, the name must start with the letters $\text{APIK}$ in order to use all letters contained in $\pi\kappa$, $\text{API}$ and $\pi\kappa$ (?). It is assumed, of course, that the iota of $\text{API}$ is not separate, as it is so prominently in the bronze coins, and that the vertical stroke of the $\pi\kappa$ also serves as the iota. That such
dual use is easily possible can be seen in a later parallel on a coin issued by Timaristos. The coin bears the monogram Θ in which the entire name Timaristos is represented. This monogram clearly shows the intent of the Spartan die cutter to include as many letters of the name as possible.

Does any known Spartan name begin with the letters ΑΠΙΚ? There is only one known to me from Sparta 'Ἀρικράτης (90.290). The first six letters of a man's name ΑΠΙΚΑΠΑ are all represented in the monogram Θ. Further evidence is provided by another autonomous silver coin bearing the monogram Θ which appears to be a further complication of Θ by the simple addition of a horizontal stroke to yield ΑΠΙΚΡΑΘΣ.

It now remains to show that the 'Ἀρικράτης of the inscription was contemporary with the issue of the coins in question. The inscription can be dated with reasonable certainty to about the middle of the first century B.C., and perhaps as early as 60 B.C. The text is as follows.

Σακιάδας Ἀρικράτεος Ἀνέθηκεν Ὀρθὴν
γεροντεύσας τρὶς καὶ πρέσβυς γενὸμενος ὅλῳ κατὰ τὸ ἔξης ἐπὶ Καλλικράτεος καὶ Τιμοστρᾶτοῦ
The inscription was set up by Soixiades the son of Arikrates as a dedication on a marble bench to Artemis Orthia. Fortunately some details of the dedicat...
it can be seen that Soixiades was probably born sometime around 126 B.C. or approximately 20 years after the latest possible date for the issue of the coins (146 B.C.). If Arikrates held his office at the age of twenty-five or thirty, he would be only forty-five—fifty years old at the birth date of Soixiades. These dates for Arikrates are not in any way difficult, and if Soixiades was in his seventies at the time of the dedication, his father might have been only about thirty-five at the time of his birth. The customary age for a Spartan male to start a family was, of course, about thirty.

The rarity of the name Arikrates and the probability that he was from a political family, combined with the certainty that he was at the prime of his youth about 146 B.C. seems to add up to fairly strong evidence that his is the name represented in the monograms $\kappa, \kappa, \kappa$ and in the letters $\alpha \pi$. To these coins may be added two others with the monograms $\lambda \pi \kappa$ in which $\lambda = \kappa$ (?), from the bronze series, and $\pi \kappa$ in which Arikrates may be a secondary official, from the autonomous silver. This evidence seems to outweigh objections based on the prominence of $\kappa$ in the monogram $\kappa$.11

In other cases it is not easy to find an explanation for the monograms and there does not appear to have been
been a systematic usage. Some, such as \( \text{KAELN} \) may be a single name spelled out completely, while in other cases, it is not possible to determine whether one name or two is represented as in \( \text{TAX} \) and \( \text{T1} \) (where the two letters clearly do not belong to a single name). Still others \( \Delta, \Delta \text{ME}, \Delta \text{MO}, \Delta \text{KH} \) appear to be closely related, but in an uncertain way.

Another difficulty is encountered in determining the number of issues. Did each monogram with its variations indicate an issue for a specific year? If so, were the coins marked \( \text{TAX} \) and \( \text{T1} \) and even \( \text{TECIN} \) part of one issue or did they make up two or three separate issues? It does not seem possible to determine the exact number of issues on the basis of monograms alone. There could, however, have been as many as ten or eleven (p. 21).

Like the Achaean League silver, most of the issues in the autonomous silver coinage seem to have been fairly large and some show great differences in style within a single issue or group, though the differences in style within a single issue may not be as marked as in the federal coinage. This is not true of all issues however, and it has already been noted that all coins examined from the \( \text{AR, K, API} \) group are very similar to each other in
style and workmanship.

Some issues are probably not large. There is only one obverse die for the $\mathcal{KH}$ group, and several issues are represented by only one example each ($\mathcal{KH}$, $\mathcal{KR}$, $\Phi\Lambda\Omega\Pi\Lambda\Pi\alpha\Gamma\Omega$).\textsuperscript{14} Hoard evidence suggests that most of the autonomous silver, like the Achaean League silver, was struck shortly before 146 B.C. Lübbecke\textsuperscript{15} described the Spartan autonomous silver as the most recent coins of the Casserta hoard and says that they show no wear at all. The Casserta hoard contained examples of $\Delta\Pi\kappa, \Delta\Pi\kappa, \Delta\Pi\kappa, \Delta\Pi\kappa, \Delta\Pi\kappa, \Delta\Pi\kappa$, $\Delta\Pi\kappa$. The coins of the Olympia hoard tend to substantiate the evidence from Casserta.

**BRONZE COINAGE**

It has generally been assumed that Sparta enjoyed the privilege of maintaining a mint after 146 B.C., and that she not only produced an abundant supply of bronze after that date, but that all of the bronze coinage up until Imperial times was produced then. The reason for this assumption is the appearance of several coins of known date, with types assumed to be identical with all other bronze coins.

Gardner represents this standard point of view and thus is worth quoting at length.\textsuperscript{16} "Few questions have been
discussed more fully, or with more learning, than the character of the Roman dominion in Greece after the destruction of Corinth in B.C. 146. As the result of the discussion, it appears that we have no evidence that Achaia was formed into a Roman province at that date, as was supposed by the older writers; but Mommsen has shown that Achaia remained under the control of the Roman Proconsul of Macedonia, and was first constituted a province by Augustus. The Greek cities thus lost the greater part of their freedom of action, and came formally under the protection of Rome ....

"The highest degree of freedom, according to the testimony of ancient writers, was accorded to the Athenians and Lacedaemonians ...and as the striking of coins was one of the most characteristic privileges of autonomy; it becomes important to examine the numismatic evidence on the subject...."

"...Two cities, however, Sparta and Patrae, issue abundant and important series of copper coins. This may be easily proved. The portrait of Augustus which they bear, gives us a fixed date for certain coins struck at Sparta with the type of an eagle, and the coins of Atratinus, which resemble them, were issued about B.C. 32. But these latter types bear the same monograms as some of the pieces
with the head of Lycurgus (p. 123, n. 21), and others of these again are by the letters in the field shown to be contemporary with the small copper coins which bears the heads of Herakles and of Pallas (pp. 124-5, nos. 41-46). Thus the whole of the late copper issues of Lacedaemon, with a few exceptions (p. 125, nos. 47, etc.), hangs together in a chain of which no link can be fairly separated from that which precedes it; and it must all be given to the period B.C. 146 to 31."

Gardner is right at least in realizing that the numismatic evidence is important in determining the nature of the Roman dominion in Greece after 146 B.C. If it is true that these bronze issues all belong to the period 146-31 B.C., Sparta would certainly appear to have been favoured far above the other Peloponnesian cities at the time. If it is not true, it may be necessary to revise current ideas about the special status of Sparta during those years.

The bronze coinage in question (p. 309), consists of five distinct types and denominations.
TYPES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Types</th>
<th>Max.</th>
<th>Av.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Head of Lycurgus bearded//club,caduceus</td>
<td>8.9g</td>
<td>7.6g</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Head of Apollo//Eagle standing</td>
<td>7.5g</td>
<td>4.7g</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dioscuri jugate//two amphorae with serpents</td>
<td>4.3g</td>
<td>3.8g</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Head of Heracles//club</td>
<td>2.5g</td>
<td>2.3g</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Head of Athena//owl</td>
<td>1.9g</td>
<td>1.4g</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The value of these coins is unknown, but Gardner suggests that they may stand in a relation to each other of 6,4,3,2,1 units in value, and that the unit was the Chalcus, or eighth of an obol.

Single letters or letters combined into monograms, or both, appear on the reverses of these coins together with the letters ΑΑ. It was by the coincidence of several of these letter combinations, one of which is of known date, with general types such as the Lycurgus coin, that Gardner was able to establish the chain tied to the year 31B.C.

More than sixty years have passed since the catalogue of the British Museum was published, and now that many more coins are available, it is possible to test this chain more carefully.

It is certain that the autonomous silver coins, struck on the same standard as the Achaean League coins, were produced before 146 B.C., and nearly every variety has been found in hoards buried in, or shortly after that date. If
a chain linking some of this autonomous silver and bronze together, on the basis of identical monograms and letters could be established, it might be possible to get a more accurate date for the bronze.

Arrangement of the bronze coins into groups on the basis of monograms and letters is not difficult in most cases. There are difficulties in interpreting the meanings of these monograms. The second group listed in the chart on page 315 consists of coins bearing the initial monogram \( \alpha \) which I interpret as the first two initials of the name of the magistrate in charge of this issue. This person was probably Arikrates, as argued, above. Other letters on the same coins (\( I, K, \tilde{E}, \Phi \)) are apparently secondary officials, and some coins have the initials of three officials (\( R\tilde{E}, R\tilde{E}I, R\Phi I \)).

It is necessary to comment on the strange prominence of the letter iota. It is clearly a separate letter wherever it occurs. The long series with \( I, A, H \), etc. are alone enough to suggest this. More positive evidence is given by coins in the \( R \) series where the iota may change positions freely (\( R\tilde{E}I \) for \( R\tilde{E} \)). The coins with the letters \( I \) may offer further evidence since it is not likely that a Spartan name would start with the letters \( I \). The meaning of this iota is not certain but the long list
of coins bearing this letter have the appearance of an alphabetical progression. This is all the more possible, since at least one of these examples is unique (ΓI). If this coin had been lost, as it could easily have been, the ΓI would be unknown. This raises the question about the possible one time existence of series in ΑΙ, ΒΙ and others which might give definite order to these coins. In the absence of such evidence it may be more likely that the iota is the first initial of a very busy secondary official or perhaps it represents an issuing authority rather than a name. The position of the letter in ΑΙΕ and ΑΕΙ may favour this possibility.22

If this is true it means that nearly all of the bronze coinage must have been produced within the term of office of a single individual. Other evidence that the coins were produced within a short time is abundant.

It has already been shown that all coins bearing the monogram Α must be parts of a single issue. To this we can probably add Α which I think is ΑΡΙΚ rather than ΑΡΓ. An almost identical parallel can be seen on many coins of Arcadia in the monogram Α for ΑΡΚΑΔΙΚΩΝ.
The series marked with \( \Delta, \Delta H \) and \( \Delta (?) \), was produced almost at the same time as the \( \Delta \) series. This may be proved by a coin in each series, with the head of Apollo, struck on the same obverse die (pl.1.9). Other groups may be linked to the first two by their monograms as follows.

\[
\begin{align*}
\{ \Delta \} \quad & \text{---with } H, \Phi \dot{E} H, \Phi \dot{E} H, \dot{E} H, i \dot{H} \\
\{ \Delta H \} \quad & \text{---die link, } \Delta H \quad H ! \\
\{ \Delta K \} \quad & \text{---with } \Phi \dot{E} H, \Phi \dot{E} H, \dot{E} H \quad \{ \Delta \text{ does not equal } \Delta P \} \text{ of course, } \text{but } \Delta P + 1. \\
\{ \Delta K \} \quad & \text{---with } \Phi \dot{E} H, \Phi \dot{E} H, \dot{E} H, \Phi \dot{I} \dot{A} \dot{I} \quad \{ \Delta \text{ PIKHATHC} \}
\end{align*}
\]

\( \Delta K \quad \text{Probably } \Delta K \)

\[
\begin{align*}
\{ \Delta A \} \quad & \text{---with } E \dot{A} \text{ and indirectly with all coins having } E \\
\{ \Delta E \} \quad & \text{---with } E \dot{A}, \Phi \dot{E} H \text{(?)} \\
\{ \Delta \} \quad & \text{---all related to each other, and with } \Delta \text{ series by letter } 1.
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
\{ \Phi \dot{E} H \} \quad & \text{---with } \Phi \dot{E} H, \dot{E} H, \Phi \dot{E} H, \dot{E} H (\text{?}) \\
\{ \Phi \dot{I} \dot{A} \} \quad & \text{---with } \Phi \dot{I} \dot{A} \dot{I} \dot{A} \dot{I} \dot{I} \\
\{ \Phi \dot{E} H \} \quad & \text{---with } \Phi \dot{E} H, \dot{E} H, \Phi \dot{E} H, \dot{E} H (\text{?})
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
\{ \dot{E} \dot{A} \} \quad & \text{--- } \Phi \dot{E} H, \dot{E} H, \Phi \dot{E} H \text{ (?). Hunter collection publication also has } \\
\{ \dot{E} \dot{A} \} \quad & \text{--- } \Phi \dot{E} H, \dot{E} H, \Phi \dot{E} H \text{ (?)}
\end{align*}
\]

\( \dot{E} \dot{A} \quad \text{with all coins having } \dot{E} \dot{H} \text{ and } H \). Indirectly with \( \Delta \) series through \( \Delta H \) and \( \dot{E} \). Nearly all bronze and even silver connected with this issue at least indirectly.
The direct links between these coins is fairly obvious, but it must be noted that many are also linked indirectly. Thus since $\Phi \check{E} H$ is linked with $\check{E} \Delta$, it is also linked indirectly with $\Delta \check{E}$. This is also true in numerous other cases.

If the arguments presented are correct in most details, it is clear that all bronze coinage of the five types described above belongs together chronologically, and that it is distinct from coinage known to have been struck in the mid-first century and later. It also seems clear that this coinage was struck within a short period of time. The die link between the $\Delta H$ group and $\check{R} I$ places these two issues at virtually the same time, and the appearance of the same letters and monograms on all groups shows that they were at least produced within the term of office of a small number of men. The similarity of the obverse type on a coin with $N J$ to two coins with $\check{S} H$, and $\check{R} I$ adds further weight to the argument for a short production time. The coins in question have a head of Apollo on the obverse. Two of them have already been mentioned and were struck from the same die. The third is so much like them as to suggest that it was made by the same artist. All are characterized by an unusual roundness of the head and are completely unlike any other image of
RELATION OF BRONZE TO SILVER

It is now necessary to see if the bronze coinage can be tied to the silver. There seems to be a strong possibility, and it can be done most easily in outline form as before.

ACHAEAN LEAGUE SILVER AND BRONZE

\[ \text{EY} \text{ with } \phi \text{E, } \alpha \text{E, } \epsilon \text{ } \Delta \text{ } \] (indirectly with \( \Delta \epsilon \) and back to \( \epsilon \) in Achaean League silver by \( \Delta \epsilon \) ?

\[ \epsilon \text{ with } \Delta \epsilon \text{ and as above.} \]

\[ \alpha \text{ with } \phi \text{ etc? (this is very questionable but remotely possible. The iota of } \phi \text{ is separate, of course).} \]

AUTONOMOUS SILVER WITH BRONZE

\[ \text{Connected with the entire } \alpha \text{ series, and indirectly with } \epsilon \text{ and } \phi \]

\[ \text{with } \Delta \epsilon, \Delta \alpha \text{, indirectly with } \epsilon \Delta \text{ and others.} \]
TI with TI (represented on four of the five bronze types._
KEY with AK ?
ΛΚ with Λ and indirectly with Α series.
ΦΙΑΟ with Φ (?) and ΑΦ (?)
ΝΙΚΟ with Ν ?

Once again the indirect relations between these coins should be stressed and one example should suffice. If the Α series of the autonomous silver is directly related to the Α of the bronze, then it is indirectly related to ΦΕΗ (through Ε ), ΗΙ (by Η ) and ΦΕΗ . It is also connected with ΕΔ ΕΔΑ and ΔΕ (by Δ of ΕΔ ). Also by ΔΕ to Ε in the Achaean League silver, and finally with the Δ series back to the autonomous silver (again by ΔΕ ). Other letters such as Φ, Η and Ε which occur in so many places tend to confirm this complicated relationship and the die link between ΑΗ and Ε coins in the bronze series adds further evidence. The above seems to be fairly conclusive proof that the bronze coinage in question is very closely related to the Achaean League and autonomous silver coinage, and is therefore exactly contemporary with it. Since the silver coinage was struck before 146 B.C., so was the bronze. If more evidence is desired, stylistic grounds can be
supplied by the small Heracles coin of the bronze series. The head of this Heracles is exactly the same as those on the silver coins, and many of the letter combinations are identical. The coin is the same size as the silver. Gardner realized this and said that it was a violent step to separate it from the silver.

It now remains to review the chain by which Gardner linked the whole mass of bronze to the type with Atratinus of 32 B.C. One of the basic links in this chain is a coin with a bust of Atratinus on the obverse and the letters $\phi/\Delta/$ on the reverse. These letters also appear on several coins bearing a head of Lycurgus. For this reason, Gardner connected all coins with Lycurgus to the coins of Atratinus, and since some Lycurgus coins have other letters $\left( T1, N1, R1, \phi, \epsilon, \delta, \epsilon, \chi \right)$, all coins sharing those letters were also dated to the period after 146 B.C.

Three different coins have the letters $\phi/\Delta/$. They are the Lycurgus coin, the Atratinus coin, and a coin with Artemis and Apollo. Surely the appearance of the same letters on these coins is a mere coincidence. The Lycurgus coin must belong with others of its own type and not with those which are clearly of a much later date. A similar coincidence occurs with the $T1$ series which appears on both bronze and silver before 146 B.C., and a
much later coin bearing a likeness of \textit{ΡΩΜΑ} on the obverse and \textit{Τ} and \(\mathcal{K}\) among other letters on the reverse.

The other link in this chain consists of coins having "letters in the field shown to be contemporary with the small copper coins which bear the heads of Herakles and of Pallas."\textsuperscript{27} It is not very clear how these coins are connected with the late period, but the letters in question are \(\Delta\varepsilon\alpha\iota\) and \(\mathcal{A}\). These are, of course, all closely connected with the entire mass of bronze coinage issued prior to 146 B.C., and there is no longer any reason to associate any of it with a later period. The chain never really existed.

CONCLUSIONS

By far the most likely conclusion in regard to the date of the bronze coinage is that all of it was contemporary with the federal and autonomous silver issues of the years 192-146 B.C., a conclusion precisely the opposite of commonly held views. The great bulk of the coinage seems to have come at the end of that period and may be in some way related to the war with the Achaean League.

It is now necessary to return briefly to the constitutional question raised earlier. What was the status of the Ephorate during the years 192-146 B.C.? and what
was the extent of the Lycurcan restoration of 182 B.C. if any? It now seems possible to say with more confidence that the Ephors were never in power during the Achaean League years, and according to the rules and customs of the league, this would have been expected.

It has been suggested above that the board of Δμιργοι probably occupied the Ephors' place as chief magistrates, and would assume many of their powers and responsibilities, though it would not necessarily correspond in every detail.

It has been shown that in later times when the Ephors were in office, they were responsible for authorizing and receiving inscriptions of the type discussed in the historical summary above. An examination of later Spartan coinage shows that an Ephor was responsible for a large proportion of it even though some coins may bear the name of some other board. For example a coin with the inscription ΠΕΠΟΝΤΩΝ also has the monograms Φ Ρ for the Ephor Timaristos.

It was shown in 12.2 that a magistrate called Επίδμιργος was responsible for certain financial affairs. Therefore it seems very likely that a board of Δμιργοι was responsible for the coinage of Sparta during the Achaean League years when the Ephorate was in abeyance.
The probable last issue of bronze coins in Sparta before 146 B.C. was a series bearing the monograms $\Phi\epsilon\mu$, and was obviously produced by an Ephor AFTER Sparta was safely separated from the Achaean League. This would have been the logical and only possible time for the Spartans to remove all traces of Achaean League influence in their government. Therefore, this issue probably marks the return of the Ephorate to the head of the Spartan magistracy. There is no reason to think that this occurred in 162 B.C.

This coin, very definitely tied to the years immediately following 150 B.C., provides the first positive evidence of this important restoration.

Finally, it may be necessary to modify certain views concerning "the nature of the Roman dominion in Greece after 146." That the Spartan mint ceased to operate after 146 B.C. is certain, since all the bronze of the five types discussed has been shown to belong to a very tightly knit body of coinage ending at that time. The Spartans started striking coins again at a later date, probably shortly before the Augustan period, or perhaps after Achaea was incorporated as a province. At this time, all types and even coin sizes were completely different. Thus after 146 B.C., Sparta was in no way different from other Peloponnesian cities as far as coining privileges were concerned.
The purpose of this study of Spartan coinage was to discover and evaluate any possible evidence relating to questions specifically concerning the Spartan constitution, and in a more general way to evaluate evidence relating to other aspects of Spartan history in the mid-second century. It was suggested that the series of coins with the monograms ΘΕΗ was struck sometime around the year 150 B.C. and that it represents the restoration of the Ephorate which had been in abeyance since Sparta's entry into the Achaean League. It was also suggested that the relatively large numbers of coins struck shortly before 150 B.C. reflect an emergency preparation for war and that they give visual evidence of Pausanias' testimony (7.7) that Sparta's great weakness at the outbreak of the war was a shortage of money.

Finally it was suggested that Sparta's independence after 146 B.C. may not have been as great as has sometimes been supposed.
ADDENDA ET CORRIGENDA

OMIT NUMBERS: 117, 118, 119, 122, 123, 972.

ADD NUMBERS:


1064. The top of a votive stele of island marble. The stele at one time supported a bronze dedication of some type. The inscription is a single name written retrograde (ΨΙΒΙΣ). Woodward suggests 520-480 as a date on the basis of the letter shapes.

1065. *Revue de Philologie*, XXVII (1953), p. 175. A large bronze crater dated to the sixth century. The crater has a frieze around its neck attached in several pieces by rivets. The order of the individual parts was important and correctness was assured by the incision of letters of the alphabet onto each part with corresponding letters on the body of the crater. The crater has been attributed to Laconia on the basis of letter shapes, but the otherwise unattested Koppa also appears on the crater.

2067. fig. 2. Nineteen fragments of black-glazed ware. The inscriptions are incised in very fine style suggesting considerable skill in the dedicator or potter. Most date from the fourth or third century.

2068. fig. 3. Twenty fragments of black-glazed ware with incised inscriptions from the fourth and third centuries.

2069. fig. 4. Thirteen vase fragments with incised inscriptions. Most of this group show much less skill and one (nr. 5) consisting of the letter Eta and eight Kappas appears to have been written by an illiterate person. The fragments date from the late sixth to the fourth century.

2070. fig. 5. Twenty-three fragments of small jugs and cups. The inscriptions are incised on a black-glazed surface and date from the fifth century through the fourth. Most of these pieces are inscribed in a very fine style and demonstrate considerable skill.

2071. fig. 6. Twenty-eight fragments with eighteen inscribed and ten painted inscriptions. The painted
inscriptions are very well made. Some of the incised inscriptions consist merely of the letter Alpha interpreted by Woodward as an abbreviation of the name Athena.

1072. fig. 7. An iron blade with incised inscription on bronze inlay. Woodward does not suggest a date but the letter forms are archaic showing the form of sigma; digamma is also written.

1073. fig. 8. A fragment of a marble shield with reliefs and the letters ΠΟΔΑΜ. The piece is probably from the sixth century according to Woodward.

1074. IG.,IX,2518. A white marble stele badly broken. The inscription is a letter from the Ephors of the Lacedaemonians to the Tagoi and Demos of Larissa. It concerned the dispatch of ambassadors. Otto Kern the editor does not suggest a date but the decree is similar to others of the first century B.C. or later.
APPENDIX

THE INSCRIPTIONS OF CORINTH

Attention has already been called to the striking epigraphical situation in Corinth where barely 100 inscriptions in Greek have been found from the earliest times down to the refounding of the city as a Roman colony in 44 B.C. Some of the attempted explanations are as follows:

1. J. H. Kent has suggested that partly for the sake of economy, the Corinthians used wooden tablets such as those employed elsewhere. Although these tablets are known only from Athens and Delos and no ancient testimony suggests their existence in Corinth, Kent's explanation is a convenient one and cannot be refuted since such tablets would naturally have disappeared if they had once existed.

Somewhat similar is the suggestion that clay tablets were used. But no clay tablets have been found; since they are all but indestructable, some should have been found if they ever did exist as in the case of the Penteskouphia tablets. Even in the absence of the discovery of complete tablets it would be reasonable to expect fragments to turn up.

Both of the above suggestions are based not only on the
absence of inscriptions, but also on the contention that marble was not generally available to the Corinthians. But a very fine blue marble could have been obtained from the quarries just north of Sparta and marble from Athens or the islands could have been imported in times of peace. Besides, there was a good grade of local limestone available. It might be argued that the limestone was unsuitable for epigraphical use. The objection to the possibility of the Corinthians using their local limestone seems to be without reasonable foundation. In actual fact other cities made free use of various types of limestone and the list of Spartan inscriptions in chapter one affords many examples. More than half the Greek inscriptions catalogued by Kent were on poros, a very soft and flaky stone, much less suitable for inscriptions than the limestone of Acrocorinth. The few surviving inscriptions from Corinth show that the Corinthians did make some use of their locally available limestone.

3. There were once many more inscriptions but they were carried off by Sicyonians and others to be used as building materials. Re-use of old materials is common enough throughout Greek history but there is no evidence of such re-use of inscriptions in Sicyon and even if this did occur we should expect to find numerous fragments and perhaps whole inscriptions. Sicyon has not been excavated as fully as Sparta or Corinth, but inscriptions and ancient building
materials do turn up with or without excavations. Some are built into modern houses or churches. My list of Spartan inscriptions in chapter one offers many examples.

4. A very common belief is that there were originally many more inscriptions but they were destroyed by Mummius in 146 and by the later sackings of the Herulians in 267 A.D. and of Alaric in 395. The destruction by Mummius doubtless had some effect but even so we should expect some fragments to have survived. It seems doubtful to me that the Herulians or Alaric are greatly responsible for the loss of many inscriptions. If they were, why did they spare so many Latin inscriptions?

5. Similarly it is suggested that there were once more, but they were burned for lime. The chief objection to this theory is that Latin inscriptions on marble make as good a lime as Greek.

6. There were once more but they have not yet been found. Charles Williams, field director for the excavations at Corinth, and others have expressed the opinion to me that considerable numbers of inscriptions from the Greek period will be found when and if the ancient Greek section of the Agora is more fully excavated. Only time then, can provide a final answer; but it should be remembered that Greek inscriptions are regularly found in large numbers in and around other cities even without excavations. This is certainly
true for Athens and even Sparta provides many examples.

7. The Corinthians did not set up very many inscriptions. This is the view of S. Dow which I follow to a large degree; it may also be shared by others. The study of the inscriptions of Corinth and of Sparta has led me to believe that there were never very many inscriptions in either city. L. Robert in a review of Kent's publication of the inscriptions of Corinth, also suggested that not all cities necessarily set up so many inscriptions as Athens. He also suggests that the century-long exposure of the city to the weather and to plunderers must have accounted for the loss of many inscriptions still existing in 146. Robert does not take into account the types of materials used for inscriptions in Corinth.

It has already been noted that more than half the inscriptions of Corinth from the Greek period catalogued by Kent were on a very soft and easily damaged poros stone and that others were on a soft limestone. The inscriptions of Corinth published earlier by B.D. Meritt show a roughly similar proportion of poros and limestone to marble.

There are not many inscriptions on poros just as there are not many on any material, but the interesting and significant thing about this high proportion of poros and soft limestone to marble is not to be found in the total number of inscriptions of either type. The most striking
thing is that such a high proportion of the total number of inscriptions is on such soft and fragile material. The breakdown by materials of Corinthian inscriptions of the Greek period is roughly as follows:

Marble of all types........28
Poros..........................28
Limestone.....................20
Sandstone....................03
Bronze..........................01
Total..........................80

One could reasonably expect the inscriptions on the more delicate materials to perish much more readily than those on the more durable materials. At first glance the surviving inscriptions may indicate that this expectation was not fulfilled in Corinth, but more consideration has led me to believe that it was. The inscriptions on the more fragile materials must have perished in greater numbers, and for the present high proportion of poros inscriptions to have survived there must once have been many inscriptions on poros for each inscription on marble. What we have from Corinth then, must be a relatively small proportion of what was once a fairly large number of inscriptions on poros, and a large percentage of what was once a very small number of inscriptions on marble. The Corinthians must have made very extensive use of poros. Even from the few surviving
inscriptions it seems clear that the Corinthian practice was to rely heavily on the use of poros for epigraphical purposes.

A number of the poros inscriptions from various periods show the Corinthian practice in more detail. Inscriptions M. 26 and M. 27 are from the sixth century B.C. and still preserve traces of the very fine Corinthian stucco in common use at that time. Number M. 61 of uncertain but early date preserves the stucco with traces of red paint. The use of the finest quality stucco is said by Meritt to have ended with the close of the sixth century B.C., but it is clear that the practice of setting up inscriptions on poros and then covering it with stucco of as good quality as was possible existed in all periods. This is shown by M.69 of the first century A.D. which was once covered with a limestone-base stucco of lower quality than was used in the sixth century. Other examples of poros inscriptions but without surviving stucco exist from other centuries.

The result of the Corinthian practice must have been the erection of a considerable number of inscriptions on the lowest quality stone with no sacrifice of attractiveness. The historical result was far less desirable, ending as it must have, in the loss of many of these poros inscriptions. The loss came through natural destruction
by weather and exposure of the fragile material, and through the practice of re-use of the stone by the Corinthians themselves and perhaps by others who may have carried them away whenever opportunity arose. Number M.61 preserves clear traces of cuttings for Z-clamps showing that the practice of re-use of inscriptions did exist even in early times. It seems probable that, because of the softness of this stone, and the ease with which it is split or broken, many inscriptions and bases of inscriptions could have been re-used in such a way that all traces of the original writing would be lost; thus we can understand why chance finds have not turned up more such re-used inscriptions.

In summary it is my own belief that at one time there were many more inscriptions in Corinth on poros stone beautified with stucco and paint. Smaller numbers existed on better quality and a few on inferior stone such as sandstone. Of those on poros, most have perished because of the delicacy of the stone and its vulnerability to all forms of abuse. Those poros inscriptions which survive must represent a comparatively small percentage of the original numbers and the approximately equal number of inscriptions on marble must represent a somewhat higher percentage of the original number on marble. This follows from the necessity of supposing that of any given number
of inscriptions of all types exposed to the same hazards and chances for the same length of time, those on the more vulnerable material must decay at a faster rate. Since the present numbers are almost the same for poros and marble, the former must once have existed in considerably greater numbers. This use of poros was deliberate and as has been shown, the results must have been as esthetically pleasing to the Corinthians as marble for which this practice was a substitute.

Another possible explanation for the paucity of inscriptions in Corinth and other cities is the prevalence of wide-spread illiteracy. This is not an easy proposition to test in the case of Corinth but there is more evidence for the question of literacy in Sparta and Athens. I have devoted much work and a complete chapter in this dissertation to the question of literacy in Sparta and its possible relation to the numbers of inscriptions erected there. I believe that I have demonstrated at least a degree of literacy was fairly widespread in Sparta and that a presumption of extensive illiteracy cannot account for the small number of public decrees there.
NOTES TO INTRODUCTION

1. See my appendix on Corinth for a brief summary of the views of others and a detailed statement of my own position.


NOTES TO CHAPTER TWO

LITERACY IN SPARTA

1. See Appendix on Corinth (p.349 note 1).
3. The building was probably erected in the mid-second century B.C. and is known only from a number of stamped roof tiles. They read: κατάλυμα τῶν Ρομάιων καλ δικαστῶν. See p. 15 for a discussion of this building and its roof tiles.
9. See Stadter, p.138 for Plutarch's comments on his
own notes. For more on Plutarch's sources see:


M. Haug, Die Quellen Plutarch's, In Den Lebensbeschreibungen Der Griechen (Tubingen; Verlag Der Osiander'schen Buchhandlung, Franz Osiander, 1854).

10. The Kings are apparently meant but Herodotus 1.65 interprets the word to mean Ephors. See Chrimes p. 419 for a discussion.


14. Chrimes, p. 428, dates the practice to the period immediately following the first Messenian war, but Pausanias, whom she cites, is not so specific.

15. The documents called χάριται are an obvious example. Other documents would have been sealed as well. See above p. 260 for a discussion of these documents.

16. The British excavations in Sparta have uncovered eighteen complete seal-stones and eight fragments, all of
which belong to the end of the eighth and beginning of the seventh centuries. Thus the date of the stones is appropriate for Polydorus, but the images on the seals do not correspond well with the statement of Pausanias. Most of the seals represent fabulous animals or birds, and only two could possibly represent Polydorus.

The reader is referred to the official publication:

The Sanctuary of Artemis Orthia at Sparta; Excavated and Described by Members of the British School At Athens, 1906-10, ed. R.M. Dawkins (London; Macmillan and Co., Ltd., 1929), 228 (pls. CXXXIX-CXLVII).

Plate CXXXIX. (o), shows a frontal view of a man's face. He is long-haired, bearded, and has a grotesque expression. The other possibility is pl.CXXXIX (I) which shows a Spartan warrior walking with shield. It might be argued that not many seals of this kind are to be expected since they were for official use and each seal would last for many years. Old ones, like old and broken coin dies, were probably destroyed.


22. The letters are very numerous and are published in very many different collections. See the individual volumes of *Michigan Papyri* (Ann Arbor; University of Michigan Press), for examples.


24. The public practices of a democratic society is the major point of Harvey's article (above note 2).

25. It should be remembered that some of these treaties were supposed to be in effect for as long as fifty years.


29. Other writers are known but it cannot be proved that they were Spartans. Among these were Polycrates who wrote a history of Sparta quoted by Athenaeus 4.139, and Molpis who wrote a history of the constitution of Sparta quoted by Athenaeus 4.139-140. The writers discussed here are referred to in the text by citing the ancient authority by whom the writer is quoted. The following table gives the references in Müller and Jacoby. The names are listed in the order in which they appear in the text of this chapter.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Writer</th>
<th>Müller (pages)</th>
<th>Jacoby (numbers)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Thibron</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>IIIB.581</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sosibius</td>
<td>II.625</td>
<td>IIIB.595</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sosilus</td>
<td>III.99</td>
<td>IIIB.176</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aristocrates</td>
<td>IV.332</td>
<td>IIIB.591</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hippasos</td>
<td>IV.430</td>
<td>IIIB.589</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diophantos</td>
<td>IV.396</td>
<td>IIIIC.805</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pausanias</td>
<td>IV.467</td>
<td>IIIB.592</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nicocles</td>
<td>IV.465</td>
<td>IIIB.587</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sphaerus</td>
<td>III.20</td>
<td>IIIB.585</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Molpis</td>
<td>IV.45</td>
<td>IIIB.590</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


31. Harvey, _op. cit._ p.586.
33. I do not mean total isolation; I merely suggest that Sparta was not open in the sense that Athens was.
34. Number 25.18 has been dated by Woodward to the late third century on the basis of letter forms, but it did not originate in Sparta and there is no real assurance that it does not belong to the second century.
36. Ibid.
37. Ibid.
41. Harvey, op. cit. pp. 606-615.
42. B.P. Grenfell, An Alexandrian Erotic Fragment and Other Greek Papyri Chiefly Ptolemaic (Oxford, 1896), 14.11.
43. S. Tedesche and S. Zeitlin, The First Book of Maccabees An English Translation by Sidney Tedesche, Introduction and

44. Harvey, op. cit. p. 625.
NOTES TO CHAPTER THREE

CONSTITUTIONAL QUESTIONS 188-146 B.C.

1. The historical summary of this period has been compiled almost entirely from the ancient sources especially Polybius, Plutarch (Philopoemen), Pausanias 3 (Laconia), and Livy. More precise references are indicated in the appropriate places in the text of the summary.


6. A.J.B. Wace, B.S.A.,XIII (1906/7), p. 40 ff. Wace who published some roof tiles stamped with the words κατάλυμα τῶν Ῥομάιων καὶ δικαστῶν writes that since the Spartans had no close relations with Rome until "she was separated from the Achaean League by Roman intervention after 184 (or 178) when she was restored to her former autonomy, we cannot suppose that any κατάλυμα existed till that time, and this date fits in very well with that given above (184)." Wace is not clear enough about what he means by Sparta's "former autonomy" but if he means that after 184 Sparta was no longer a member of the Achaean
League, he is almost certainly mistaken as I attempt to show (above: p. 287 ff.). On the basis of this statement Wace dated both the stamped roof tiles and the building in question to about 184. Kolbe following Wace, had dated nr. 14.3 to about the same date, on the basis of the phrase έπιμελητα]τού 'Ρωμαιου καταλόγου.

7. Average weights of coins and results of my die study are approximate since only coins in the collection of the American Numismatic Society and those published with adequate plates were available for study. It is hoped and expected that coins studied have provided a representative sample of the total.

A die study is made by careful comparison of all available samples of a particular coin. The object is to detect points of similarity sufficient to determine whether the coins were made from the same or from different dies. A large number of die links (coins struck from the same die) suggests a relatively small issue (see p. 316 and plate 1.1) since all or most coins were struck on a single die which has a limited life expectancy. The existence of many coins showing few or no die links suggest a relatively large issue since many individual dies were in use, each of which can be assumed to have struck a number of coins.

9. Pausanias 7.7; Polybius 38.15.

10. The sudden change in monogram form is very strange, and there is still room for doubt about $\alpha\varepsilon$ . The monogram $\alpha\varepsilon$ of the bronze series $\beta\alpha\varepsilon$ is much less doubtful, and Arikrates still stands for the $\alpha\Pi$ and $\beta$ regardless of how $\alpha$ and $\beta$ are interpreted. The possible objection is that in the monogram $\alpha\varepsilon$ the letters $\kappa\alpha$ may seem to be dominant. But compare the monogram $\pi\alpha$ which represents the full name Timaristos; here the letter Mu is dominant even though the name begins with Tau. Nevertheless there is room for doubt.

11. This monogram clearly shows that the intent of the Spartan die cutter was to include as many letters of the name as possible.

12. The date is Woodward's with Kolbe assenting. For this see Woodward, B.S.A., XIV (1907/8), p.103, nr. 1. He bases his date on letter forms and on the appearance of Arikrates in other inscriptions.

13. The language of the inscriptions suggests that membership in the Gerousia was not for life at this time. Chrimes (op.cit. p. 43 ff.) argues that even the age requirements may have been changed before this time but there seems to be no real evidence for such a change.

14. This suggests the possibility that many could be lost
17. φιΔι
18. ΑΕ.ΞΙ.Α
19. The weight samples are those of the British Museum collection and are intended merely to indicate the relative sizes of this group of coins.
20. Gardner, op. cit. xlix
21. The numbering of the groups is, of course, arbitrary, and is not intended to be chronological. Evidence will be given below for placing ΦΕΗ as the last issue.
22. I still have doubts, and a coin with the letters φιΔι increases the problem. The letters φι and Δι also appear on individual coins. Does φιΔι equal φι and Δι taken separately? If so, why does Iota appear twice on φιΔι?
23. There is an obvious need for moderation and caution here since it is possible at any time for a new official to appear with the same name or initial as a previous one. It is impossible to be certain in many cases and some groups are marked with a question mark. For example is the Ε of ΕΑΥ the same as the Ε of ΦΕΗ and ΦΕΗ? Perhaps
so, but it is difficult to be certain.

24. Miss Margaret Thompson of the American Numismatic Society suggested in a private conversation that the monogram \( \wedge \) represents the letters \( \phi \). This seems most unlikely since the coins bearing this monogram are the only coins from this period which do not have either the letters \( \wedge \wedge \) or the name \( \Lambda A K E A I M O N I N \) spelled out in full. No coin with the letters \( \wedge \wedge \) have the monogram and no coin with the monogram have the letters. The vertical stroke through the monogram seems to have been intended to indicate that \( \wedge \) was a monogram and not simply the letter Alpha (\( \wedge \)).

25. Once again, the need for caution in any connections as intricate as these, is obvious. A false attribution could occur at almost any point, but the general nature of the interconnections seems clear enough.

26. The proof of very close relationships between all bronze and silver does not, of course, necessarily depend on every detail given in this complicated list.

NOTES TO APPENDIX

1. Most of the possible explanations for the paucity of inscriptions from Corinth's Greek period have been described and dismissed by Sterling Dow in his article "Corinthiaca," Harvard Studies in Classical Philology, LIII (1942), 113-119.


3. The Penteskopuphia tablets were found in 1879 in a sanctuary of Apollo on Pente Skouphia hill to the southwest of Acrocorinth. The discovery comprised a large number of painted votive plaques many of which were inscribed. They date from before 625 B.C. and continue through the sixth century. The plaques together with inscribed pottery, have provided much of our knowledge about the early Corinthian script. One of the tablets provides an early Corinthian abecedarium important for our knowledge of the order of the Corinthian alphabet. For this plaque see Jeffery, p. 116 and plate 20, nr. 16. See also: H. Payne, Necrocorinthia, A Study of Corinthian Art in the Archaic Period (Oxford; At the Clarendon Press, 1931), pp. 19-113.
4. Dow, op. cit. p. 117. see also: G.R. Lepsius, Grieche Marmorstudien (Berlin, 1890), p. 34 ff.
11. The total does not equal the full number of inscriptions from the Greek period because no date was suggested for a number of inscriptions in Meritt's publication (op. cit.). It seemed best not to include these in my tabulation.
12. The inscriptions M.26, M.27 etc. refer to the numbers 26, 27 etc. as listed in Meritt (op. cit.).
13. The inscription M.22 was found in situ and complete on the bottom side. It did not have a base other than the lower part of the stone itself. This suggests the possibility that this method of erecting the stones was common and that the absence of bases for stelae cannot
be taken as a good argument against the suggestion outlined above concerning the numbers of poros inscriptions set up in Corinth.
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