GEI044

Iasos. Decree for Distribution of Ekklesiastikon

Description: engraved white marble stele, now lost. At the time of its discovery it was almost intact on the right side and damaged on the left, upper and lower sides. Dimensions: h: 0.44 m w: 0.545 m d: 0.10 m

Layout: writing from left to right, not stoichedic. Lines are of a very irregular length and the text layout respects the division of words

Letters: no peculiarities. Hellenistic koine

Origin: Iasos

Dating: early 3rd century BC

Findspot: found in 1879 by B. Haussoullier in the Turkish village of Dourvanda (present-day Torba, near Bodrum). The stele was inserted in the wall of a modern house

Current location: Unknown, lost. Haussoullier's squeeze is currently kept at the Institut Courby in Lyon

Reference Edition: P. Gauthier, BCH 114, 1 (1990), 435 (cf. SEG 40.959), with changes

Other Editions: Haussoullier 1884, 219-220 (editio princeps); Hicks 1887, 104-105 (Hicks 1); Hicks 1887, 117-118 (Hicks 2; from a W. R. Paton's drawing); Michel, Recueil 466, 345-346; Blümel, I. Iasos 20; Rhodes-Osborne, GHI 99

Photographs: Gauthier 1990, 419-422

Translations: Jones 1987, 332-333 (English); Gauthier 1990, 435 (French); Rhodes-Osborne, GHI 99, 511 (English)

Bibliography: Haussoullier 1884, 218-222; Hicks 1887, 83-118; Michel, Recueil 466; Blümell. Iasos 20; Jones 1987, 332-333; Gauthier 1990, 417-443; Delrieux 2001, 160-189; Rhodes-Osborne, GHI 99, 508-512; Fabiani 2010, 467-482; Konuk 2010, 59-67; Vacante 2011, 322-336

[- - -]
[- - - ἵνα - - - τ]ὸ ἐκκ[λησιαστικὸ]ν διδ[ῶται(?)]
nomen [Εὐ]θυδήμου, Ἐπικρά[της Ἑρμο]κρέοντος,
nomen [Ἡρα]κλείτου, Ἑστιαῖος Ἀπολλωνίδου,
nomen [Μι]ννίωνος, Φορμίων Ἱεροκλέους· (vac.) τοὺς μὲν
5 [ταμίας διδόν]αι τοῖς [ν]εωῃ̣οία<ι>ς ἑκάστου μηνὸς τῆι νουμηνία[ι]
[δραχμὰς(?) ἑκα]τὸν ὀγδοήκοντα ἐκκλησιαστικόν, τοὺς δ[ὲ]
[νεωποίας] ἑκάστου μηνὸς ἕκτηι ἱσταμένου καὶ ταῖς (vac.)

© Laboratorio SAET - Scuola Normale Superiore

[ἀρχαιρ(?)]ε̣σίαις ἐκτιθέναι ἅμα τῆι ἡμέραι κεράμιον μετρητιαῖον
[ὕδατο]ς πλήρες, τρύπημα ἔχον κυαμιαῖον ἀπέχον ἀπὸ τῆς γῆς
[μὴ ἔλασ]σον ποδῶν ἑπτά· ἀφίεσθαι δὲ τὸ ὕδωρ ἅμα τῶι ἡλίωι
[ἀν]ατέλλοντι καὶ τοὺς νεωποίας καθῆσθαι καὶ παρακεῖσθαι
[ἑκά]στωι κιβώτιον ἐσφραγισμένον ὑπὸ τῶν προστάτων, ἔχον
[. c. 10-13.] σ̣τό[μ]α μῆκος διδάκτυλον πλάτος (vac.)
[δάκτ]υλον̣ καὶ ἐπιγεγράφθω τῶι κιβωτίωι τῆς φυλῆς τοὔνομα·
[τῶν δ]ὲ εἰς τ[ὴν ἐκκλησί]αν πορευομένων διδότω ἕκαστος πεσσὸν
[τῶι νεωπ]οί[ηι] τῆς αὐτοῦ φυλῆς, ἐπιγράψας τὸ αὐτοῦ ὄνομα (vac.)
[πατρ]όθε[ν καὶ . 10.]· ὁ δὲ νεωποίης ἐμβαλλέτω [τὰ πεσσὰ(?)]
[εἰς τὸ κιβώτιον καὶ γρα(?)]φέ̣σθω τὰ ὀνόματα πατρόθεν [. c. 5-7.] vel (vac.)
[- - -]ΣΘ̣ΩΝ πεσσὸν παραχ[ρῆμα(?) - - -]
[- - - τ]ὰς [σφρα(?)]γῖ̣[δ]ας τῶν κιβωτ[ίων - - -]
[- - -] κ[ιβ]ωτίου [- - -]
[- - -]

Apparatus criticus: N.B. In the same paper Hicks gives two different editions of this inscription, the first based on Haussoullier's drawing alone, the second corrected according to Paton's one. In order not to overcomplicate the apparatus, it has been chosen here to present the readings of Hicks (1) only for the sections of the text not covered by Hicks (2).

Initio: [Ἔδοξεν τῆι βουλῆι καὶ τῶι δήμωι· πρυτανέων γνώμη· | περὶ ὧν ἐπῆλθον οἱ νεωποῖαι ἐπερωτῶντες] Hicks (1). l. 1: [- - - τ]ὸ ἐκκ[λησιαστικὸ]ν διδ[όναι] Haussoullier; [πῶς δεῖ καὶ πότε τ]ὸ ἐκκ[λησιαστικὸ]ν διδ[όναι] Hicks (1); διδ[ώσιν] vel διδ[ώται] Gauthier. l. 2: [τ]οῦ δήμου Haussoullier; [Εὐ]θ̣υδήμου Hicks (1); [Εὐθ]υδήμου Michel; ΕΠΙΙΡΑ ΚΡΕΟΝΤ Haussoullier in apographo; Ἐπι<κ>ρά[της] Κρέοντο[ς] Hicks (1), sed lac. longior est; Ἐπικρά[της] Κρέοντο[ς] Michel. l. 3: ΚΛΕΙΤΟΥ Haussoullier, in apographo; ΙΙΕΣΤΙΑΙΟΣ Paton in apographo; Ἰστιαῖος Hicks (1). l. 4: ΝΝΙΟΝΟΣΦΟ Haussoullier in apographo; ΝΝΙΩΝΟΣΦΟΡΜΙΩΝ Paton in apographo; [Μι]νν̣ίωνος Hicks (1); τοὺς μὲν Hicks (2); τοὺς μὲ[ν] Gauthier, sed Haussoullier et Paton ΜΕΝ legerunt. l. 5: ΑΙΤΟΙΣ[.. ? ..]ΕΟΙΟΙΑΣ Paton in apographo; [πρυτάνεις(?) κ]αὶ το<ὺ>ς [ν]ε<ωπ>οίας Hicks (2); [ν]εω̣ποία<ι>ς vel [ν]εω̣ποία[ι]ς Gauthier; νουμηνί[αι] Haussoullier. l. 6: ΤΟΣ Haussoullier; [λαβεῖν δραχμὰς ἑκα]τὸν Hicks; [ὀγ(?)]δοήκοντα Haussoullier; τοὺς δ[ὲ ἄλλους] Hicks (2). l. 7: [- - -]ἑκάστου Haussoullier; ΣΤΟΥ Paton; [τριώβολον(?) ἑκά]στου Hicks (2); [τριώβολον(?)] Michel; [τριώβολον] Blümel apud I. Iasos. ll. 7/8: [συγκλήτοις ἐκκλη]σίαις Haussoullier, sed spatium deest ; [ἐκκλη]|σίαις Hicks (2). l. 8: [ἐκκλη]σίαις Blümel apud I. Iasos. ll. 8/9: μετρητιαῖον | πλήρες Haussoullier; [ὕδ|ατο]ς πλήρες Michel. l. 10: [ἐ]φ' [ὅ]σον ποδῶν ἐπ<τ>ά Hicks (2); [ἐ]φ' [ὅ]σον ποδῶν ἐπ[τ]ά Blümel; ἀφιέσθαι Haussoullier; ΑΦΕΣΘΑΙ Paton in apographo; ἀφέσθαι Hicks (2). ll. 10/11: [ἀν]|ατέ<λλ>οντι Hicks (2); [ἀν]|ατέλλοντι Michel. ll. 11/12: [ἑκά]|στωι Hicks (2). l. 13: [ὕψος.. ? ..]α Haussoullier; [ἕκαστον ε]ἰσ[βολὴν(?)] Hicks (2); [ἐπὶ τοῦ ἐπιθήματος] vel [πώματος] Gauthier. ll. 13/14: [.. ? ..|δάκ]τυλον Haussoullier; [οὐ μείζονα | κυά(?)]μου Hicks (2). l. 14: [- - -]ΜΟΥ Paton in apographo; [καὶ ἐπιγεγ]ράφθω Haussoullier. ll. 14/15: [τῶν | δ]ὲ εἰς τ[ὴν ἐκκλησί]αν Hicks (2). l. 15: [τῶν δὲ πολιτῶν] Haussoullier; ΕΕΙΣΤ Paton in apographo. ll. 15/16: [τῶι | νεω]<π>οί<ηι> Hicks (2); [τῶι | νεωπ]οί[ηι] Michel. l. 16: [ἔχοντα τὴν σφραγίδα] Haussoullier. ll. 16/17: [πατ|ρ]όθε[ν· - - -] Hicks (2). l. 17: ΟΘΕ[- - -]Ο̣[.. ? ..]Ρ Paton in apographo; [πατρ]όθε[ν· - - -] Blümel. l. 18: [καλεί]σθω Haussoullier; ΦΕΣΘΩ Paton in apographo; [γρα]φέσθω Hicks (2). l. 19: [- - -]ων

© Laboratorio SAET - Scuola Normale Superiore

πεσσὸν παρα[- - -] Michel. l. 20: E[.. ? ..]ΑΣΤΩΝ Haussoullier in apographo; ΙΓΙΑΣΤΩΝ Paton in apographo; [σφρα]γῖ[δ]ας Hicks (2).

Translation:

[- - -] so that the ekklesiastikon may be given: | [- - -] son of Euthydemos; Epikrates son of Hermokreon; | [- - -] son of Herakleitos; Hestiaios son of Apollonides; | [- - -] son of Minnion; Phormion son of Hierokles. The || treasurers shall give to the neopoiai on the first day of each month | 180 drachmas (?) as ekklesiastikon. The | neopoiai, on the sixth day of each month and on the | archairesiai (?), shall set out at daybreak a pot of one metretes | full of water, with a hole the size of a bean at a distance of not less than seven feet from the ground. | The water shall be released as the sun || rises and the neopoiai shall be seated and an urn sealed by the prostatai shall be placed | beside each one (of the neopoiai), having | [- - -] a slot two fingers long and | one finger wide, and shall be inscribed on the urn the name of the tribe. || Each of those going to the assembly shall give a token | to the neopoies of his tribe, having inscribed on it his name, | patronymic and [- - -]. The neopoiai shall insert the tokens (?) | into the urn, and shall be written (?) the names and the patronymics [- - -] |[- - -] a token immediately [- - -] ||
[- - -] the seals (?) of the urns [- - -] |
[- - -] of the urn [- - -]

Commentary:

This decree from Iasos regulates the distribution of ekklesiastikon, the public pay awarded to citizens who attended the meetings of the assembly, and provides one of the only indications of this practice in the Greek world outside Athens (for a survey on this subject see de Ste. Croix 1975, 48-52).
The inscription has a rather complex editorial history: it was found by Bernard Haussoullier in 1879 in a village on the ancient island of Karyanda, southeast of the Gulf of Iasos, in Turkey. Together with a very cautious critical edition, with few suggestions for additions, the French scholar published a drawing of the text. This drawing – and that of the Scottish William Paton, reproduced in Hicks 1887, 116 – was used by later commentators, since the stone was dispersed at an unspecified time and is still lost. For many years, therefore, the standard edition was that of Edward L. Hicks, which was also included in the first of the two volumes dedicated to Iasos of the Inschriften griechischer Städte aus Kleinasien edited by Wolfgang Blümel. In 1987, however, a squeeze of the inscription made by Haussoullier was discovered, which allowed Philippe Gauthier to correct numerous errors in Hicks' drawing and additions (for a detailed discussion see Gauthier 1990, 425-435).

Despite the absence of any geographical indication in the decree, its Iasian origin is almost certain, due to the mention of the assembly on the sixth day of the month, that of neopoiai and prostatai – magistrates well known in the Carian city (see below) – and some onomastic and prosopographic parallels (Haussoullier 1884, 222; Hicks 1887, 105; Blümel I. Iasos, 38; Rhodes-Osborne GHI, 510). As for chronology, the complete lack of dating elements and the loss of the inscription make even the allocation of a century difficult: Hicks had initially proposed the 2nd century BCE (Hicks 1887, 101), later changing his mind to the 4th-3rd century BCE (Hicks 1887, 117, a hypothesis supported in Blümel I. Iasos, 38). Gauthier, as part of his reinterpretation of the decree, suggested a date in the last third of the 4th century, showing a certain preference for the age of Alexander (330-325; Gauthier 1990, 423-425). This proposal found wide support and was later linked to the restitution by the

© Laboratorio SAET - Scuola Normale Superiore

Macedonian king to Iasos of the so-called Little Sea (cf. I. Iasos 24+30), which would have ensured for the Carian city the necessary financial resources for this measure (Delrieux 2001, 160-189; Vacante 2011, 322-336). Recently, however, Roberta Fabiani has convincingly lowered the date to the first years of the 3rd century BCE: she has linked the palaeography of the squeeze to that of a group of Iasian engravers (the 'palaeographic group 3'), whose chronology is based on the presence in four inscriptions of the name of Eukrates son of Menon, appointed proxenus and euergetes in Miletus in 265/4 (Milet I 3, 96). As we will see, moreover, this decree mentions a certain Epikrates son of Hermokreon, a name that appears in three other inscriptions also attributed by Fabiani to the same palaeographic group (see below). Conversely, I. Iasos 24+30, certainly dating to the age of Alexander, seems to present an older palaeography (Fabiani 2015, 168-169; 256-259). The decree, therefore, would have been promulgated at a time when Iasos was an ally of Ptolemy I, who had granted it freedom, autonomy and exemption from tribute (as proven by I. Iasos 2 of 309-305, on which cf. Bagnall 1976, 89-92; Mastrocinque 1979, 28-32; Giovannini 2004, 69-87; Migeotte 2005, 195-208). This historical context fits well with a democratic regime such as the one revealed by this inscription. On the contrary, the traditional assumption that the city during Alexander's reign was a democracy has recently been questioned (Faraguna 2020, 258-259; contra Nawotka 2003, 15-41).

The first part of the prescript is completely missing. All that remains is the indication of the subject of the decree (the distribution of the ekklesiastikon, l. 1) and a list of six names in two columns. Hicks had claimed that those were the members of the board of neopoiai, mentioned several times in the text, from which the report that would later produce the current motion would have originated (Hicks 1887, 104-105). Gauthier, while rejecting the details of the procedure assumed by Hicks, seems less inclined to refuse the identification of the six people with the neopoiai (Gauthier 1990, 425-426; 436). As clearly appears in the following lines of this inscription, however, these magistrates had a close numerical connection with the tribes. Recently it has been pointed out that the tribes of Iasos were not six as traditionally believed (Hicks 1887, 105-106; Swoboda 1890, 72; Bilabel 1920, 120; Jost 1935, 36; Cassola 1957, 249 n. 76; Ehrhardt 1983, 99; Gauthier 1990, 436-437, n. 56; Rhodes-Osborne GHI, 512), but four in the Hecatomnid period and five subsequently (five were, in the Hellenistic period, the prostatai, the strategoi and probably the archontes, cf. Fabiani 2010, 477-480; Fabiani 2017, 170-171; cf. also Vacante 2011, 328). The six names that occur in ll. 2-4 of the decree, therefore, are most likely those of the prytaneis (so en passant Jones 1987, 332; Fabiani 2010, 469 n. 22) who had the task of convening and chairing the assembly and, from the 4th century onwards, proposing motions to the demos. The number of prytaneis found in Iasian inscriptions is variable – probably being related not to the tribes, but to the number of assemblies during the semester (Fabiani 2015, 281-282; 297-299) – but often the lists of prytaneis found in the decrees are composed of six members (e.g. I. Iasos 1; 37; 53; 56; SEG 41.932 and 933; Maddoli, Iasos 22). As for the identity of the named individuals, the only one attested elsewhere is the above-mentioned Epikrates son of Hermokreon (the correct restoration of the patronymic is in Gauthier 1990, 424), who also appears – but with different colleagues – in I. Iasos 37; 53 and Maddoli, Iasos 12B. Whether the Minnion father of the unknown magistrate in l. 4 is the famous Minnion brother of Gorgos of I. Iasos 24+30 is not demonstrable, since that was a common name in the Carian city, although, as we have seen, it would be chronologically acceptable.

© Laboratorio SAET - Scuola Normale Superiore

From l. 4 begins the description of the distribution of ekklesiastikon: on the first day of each month the treasurers had to hand over 180 units of an unreadable coin standard to the neopoiai. Before Gauthier's paper this sum was generally considered the monthly pay for the neopoiai, different from that given to the participants in the assembly (Hicks 1887, 117; Swoboda 1888, 307; Brandis 1905, 2170-2171), but the French scholar has correctly pointed out that the use of the term ἐκκλησιαστικόν clearly indicates that this was the same money the neopoiai had to distribute to the citizens (Gauthier 1990, 427-429). On assembly day, which in Iasos was usually the 6th of the month (for a list of Iasian decrees promulgated on the 6th day see Rhodes-Lewis 1997, 333-338), and for the archairesiai (see below) the neopoiai before sunrise displayed a clepsydra filled with one metretes of water at a height of seven feet above the ground, probably so that it would be more visible and allow the water to flow unimpeded. When the sun rose, the clepsydra was opened and the neopoiai placed themselves next to the urns bearing the name of their tribe sealed by the prostatai. At this point, the citizens heading for the assembly lined up in front of the urn of their phyle, handed the neopoiai a token with their name on it, which was inserted into the urn, as proof of their participation in the meeting. This procedure would evidently continue until the water in the clepsydra ran out. We do not know exactly what capacity had the metretes used in Iasos, but taking the Attic one as an example– about 40 litres – Gauthier has calculated that the duration of the whole process must have been slightly more than half an hour (Gauthier 1990, 436). The text here becomes very fragmentary, but it is probable that at the end of the assembly the neopoiai handed over the ekklesiastikon to those who had given them the token and whose names were recorded. Also, there were most likely instructions for the prostatai to verify the regularity of the operations.

As the text shows, the two archai most involved in the distribution were the neopoiai and the prostatai. The former were magistrates widespread in many Greek poleis, with duties related to the material and financial care of the sanctuaries (see Schultheß 1935, 2433-2439). At Iasos, as is also apparent from this decree, in addition to their traditional religious domains (on which cf. I. Iasos 219, ll. 9-12, commented by Robert-Robert 1973, no. 425, 163-164) they also had tasks related to the financial and institutional spheres of the community's life: from the Classical age onwards, for example, it was the responsibility of the neopoiai to take care of the material tasks of publishing the decrees in stone in city sanctuaries and the agora (e. g. Maddoli, Iasos 4, ll. 13-17; I. Iasos 2, ll. 59-61; 38, ll. 6-7; 42, ll. 8-9; 43, ll. 12-13; 44, ll. 3-4; 46, ll. 7-8. Cf. Hicks 1887, 105-106; Oikonomos 1920-1921, 301-304 [non vidi]; Gauthier 1990, 436-437; Fabiani 2010, 470-472; Fabiani 2015, 284). It also seems likely that they had a close connection with the treasurers who, according to the restoration of ll. 4-5 of this inscription proposed by Gauthier, had to provide them with the money (see Fabiani 2010, 471 n. 34). These aspects, combined with their responsibilities in the distribution of the ekklesiastikon, show that in Iasos the role of the neopoiai went further than the mere religious sphere and was central to the financial life of the city. This actually has parallels in other Greek cities, where the neopoiai performed administrative and financial functions regarding the activities of the sanctuaries (as is the case of the sanctuary of Zeus Temenites in Amorgos, cf. Pernin, Baux ruraux 131). As for the prostatai, their economic role is less marked: in the Carian polis they «appear to have been magistrates to whom was assigned the specific task of watching over, guaranteeing and protecting, the interests of the entire citizen body, thus closely following the name's original meaning» (Fabiani 2010, 473). That, in this case, consisted in sealing the urns in which the

© Laboratorio SAET - Scuola Normale Superiore

πεσσός was inserted with the demosia sphragis and, more generally, in overseeing that every aspect of the procedure was carried out correctly.

The central issue of the decree, which still has many dark points, is how the remuneration was distributed, starting with the amount of money. As already mentioned, the stone only preserves the figure (180) but not the coin standard of the monthly fund available to the neopoiai to be handed over to the assembly participants. Gauthier argued that the field could be narrowed down to silver drachmas and chrysoi, i.e. Alexander's gold staters, showing a certain preference for the former due to the small size and wealth of Iasos (Gauthier 1990, 430-431; cf. also Delrieux 2001, 178-183; Rhodes-Osborne GHI, 510; Konuk 2010, 60-61). Salvatore Vacante, on the contrary, assumed that the figure could be expressed in chrysoi – and in particular in gold hemistaters, equivalent to 1800 silver drachmas – attempting to refute the widespread opinion about the poverty of Iasos based on a passage from Strabo (Strab. 14.2.21) that mentions the low productivity of its soil (Vacante 2011, 322-336). Apart from considerations about the prosperity of the Carian polis, this position seems unlikely: Vacante calculates that about 1800 people received one drachma each as pay, but this implies both a very high salary and number of participants. One drachma, in fact, is what Athenian citizens received at the end of the 4th century in an ordinary assembly (Arist. Ath. Pol. 62.2), during a period, moreover, of considerable economic prosperity for the Attic city (Bosworth 1994, 850-851). That the remuneration was as high in Iasos as in Athens seems unlikely (such figures, moreover, would have engaged the significant sum of more than three and a half talents per year). Some Hellenistic documents give us an idea of the size of the Iasian ekklesia. On four occasions, in fact, the number of votes in favour of the motion is reported: [7]58 or [8]58, 841, 1011 and 1022 or 1122 (SEG 41.929, l. 35; SEG 41.932, ll. 13-14; Maddoli, Iasos 20B, ll. 21-22; SEG 57.1046 II, ll. 40-41; cf. Blümel 2007, 45-46; Fabiani 2012, 114; Fabiani 2015, 118; 280). Taking into account the votes against, the assembly could have counted between approximately 1000 and 2000 participants on average (since those decrees were approved, votes against were necessarily fewer). In the light of this, also the number of at least 1800 participants receiving the ekklesiastikon seems excessive. Such a figure, furthermore, would have necessitated a very rapid procedure, since it would mean that each of the five neopoiai in about half an hour had to receive, check and insert into the urn the token of 360 people, one every five seconds.
It is impossible to know precisely both the number of people who received the ekklesiastikon at each meeting of the assembly – which in any case must have varied according to the attendance – and the amount of the payment. The latter may have been indicated by the decree when it described how the money was to be handed over at the end of the meeting, but the almost total loss of the last part of the text makes it impossible to formulate concrete hypotheses. This uncertainty leads to two other problems which remain open so far: firstly, how could a constant sum of money be distributed to a variable number of citizens? Gauthier estimated that the neopoiai could receive and check the token of around 360 people, who would therefore have received three obols each (Gauthier 1990, 441-443). Following this hypothesis, however, if the number of registered citizens had been higher than this figure, not all of them would have been guaranteed the three obols of ekklesiastikon. Another possibility advanced by the French scholar is that the payment was made in bronze divisional coins, and that this made it possible to give remuneration to all those who were entitled to it (Gauthier 1990, 443; cf. also Delrieux 2001, 160-189, who

© Laboratorio SAET - Scuola Normale Superiore

claimed to have identified the bronze coins minted on this occasion, a statement later refuted by Konuk 2010, 59-67, who suggested that ekklesiastikon could be paid in silver triobols of Rhodian standard).
Another problem arises from the restoration of [ἀρχαιρ]ẹσίαις at the beginning of l. 8: Gauthier's interpretation, accepted by all later commentators, is that the ekklesiastikon was given both in the ordinary assemblies which, as mentioned, took place on the 6th of each month, and in the archairesiai – the electoral assemblies where Iasians chose the magistrates for the following year – which are also attested in the Carian polis also by other decrees (SEG 36.982B; SEG 36.983; I. Iasos 99). This means that there was one month per year in which two assemblies were held, for which the Iasian state had to pay the ekkesiastikon: the ordinary one on the 6th and the archairesiai. The text of the decree, however, does not mention an increase in the money provided by the treasurers to the neopoiai for those particular months. The problem, therefore, arises as to how the remuneration for both assemblies in the election months could be guaranteed. Fabiani's in-depth research on the number of prytaneis – which, as mentioned, probably depended on the number of assemblies – confirmed that in Iasos there were normally 13 meetings of the ekklesia per year and 14 in the years with intercalary month (Fabiani 2015, 297-299). The proposal of Rhodes and Osborne that during the months with archairesiai the ordinary assembly on day 6 was not held must therefore be rejected (Rhodes-Osborne GHI, 510-511). A possible resolution to both discussed issues could be to consider the 180 drachmas available to the neopoiai rather as an upper limit that was not necessarily fully distributed within the single meeting. Assume, for example, that those who received the ekklesiastikon were on average 900 – about one person every ten seconds received by the neopoiai – a number more aligned with the total participants mentioned above than the 360 proposed by Gauthier (as Susanne Carlsson rightly notes, such a small figure would have excluded a large part of the citizens from pay and this would have limited rather than expanded popular participation; Carlsson 2010, 180). If the ekklesiastikon had amounted to one obol per person, as the original Agyrrhios' proposal at Athens (Arist. Ath. Pol. 41.3), there would have been about 180 obols left per meeting. The surplus from all ordinary assemblies would have been more than enough to finance the compensation of the electoral assembly once a year. However, this is only a hypothesis and the absence of more solid data makes further confirmation impossible.

While several aspects of the decree remain rather obscure so far, its general framework is clear. This measure aims to encourage popular attendance at ekklesia meetings through a double incentive: the first is apparently the remuneration itself, the modest size of which, indeed, was likely to attract mainly members of the lower classes. This aim is also achieved by the strict time limitation given by the clepsydra, which might seem to put a curb on participation. Actually, as Gauthier has recognised, hurrying the procedure as much as possible ensured that the meeting started very early, shortly after dawn, and that the discussion did not take up too much of the day. In this way, work activities would not be excessively compromised and this would allow for a extensive participation of the less wealthy citizens (Gauthier 1990, 439). It is clear that such measures should be ascribed to a democratic context and, indeed, according to Aristotle a typical instrument of democracies to stimulate political participation was precisely payment for citizens who attended the assembly (Arist. Pol. 4.1296a; on the ideological and institutional role of public participation to ekklesia in the Athenian system see Ober 1989, 132-138; Canevaro 2019, 339-381). In

© Laboratorio SAET - Scuola Normale Superiore

this respect, it is fitting a comparison with Athens, where the handing over of the misthos ekklesiatikos followed a similar pattern, encouraging the rapidity of operations. This is confirmed by several passages in Aristophanes' Ecclesiazusae, where the characters rush to the Pnyx, crowding in to receive their pay and not be left empty-handed (Aristoph. Eccl. 282-284; 289-298; 378-381; cf. Tuci 2007, 111; for Athenian misthos in general see Gallo 1984, 395-440; Markle 1985, 265-297; Hansen 1991, 150).
In conclusion, the decree for the distribution of ekklesiastikon offers a picture of remuneration for political participation in a Hellenistic polis, in a context different from the much better known Athenian case. From this point of view this document is absolutely peculiar, since Iasos is one of the only known examples of this practice in the Greek world and it can give concrete support to Aristotle's statements on the close connection between democracy and payment for political activity, which would otherwise remain without parallels and restricted only to literary testimony.

Bagnall, R. (1976), The Administration of the Ptolemaic Possessions Outside Egypt, Leiden
Bilabel, F. (1920), Die ionische Kolonisation. Untersuchungen über die gründungen der Ionier, deren staatliche und kultliche Organization und Beziehungen zu den Mutterstädten, Leipzig
Blümel, W. (1985), Die Inschriften von Iasos I, Bonn
Blümel, W. (2007), 'Neue Inschriften aus Karien III', EA 40, 41-48
Bosworth, A. B. (1994), 'Alexander the Great Part 2: Greece and the Conquered Territories', in D. M. Lewis et al., The Cambridge Ancient History. 2nd Edition. Vol. VI. The Fourth Century B.C., Cambridge-New York, 846-875
Brandis, K. G. (1905), 'Ἐκκλησία', in G. Wissowa (Ed.), Paulys Realencyclopädie der classischen Altertumswissenschaft. Neue Bearbeitung. V, 2, Stuttgart, 2163-2200
Canevaro, M. (2019), 'La délibération démocratique
à l'Assemblée athénienne. Procédures et stratégies de légitimation', Annales HSS 74, 2, 339-381
Carlsson, S. (2010), Hellenistic Democracies. Freedom, Independence and Political Procedure in Some East Greek City-States, Stuttagart
Cassola, F. (1957), La Ionia nel mondo miceneo, 1957
Delrieux, F. (2001), 'Iasos à la fin du IVe siècle a.C. Les monnaies aux fruits de mer, des fils de Théodotos au versement de l'ekklesiastikon', REG 114, 1, 160-189
de Ste Croix, G. E. M. (1975), 'Political Pay outside Athens', CQ 25, 1, 48-52
Ehrhardt, N. (1983), Milet und seine Kolonien. Vergleichende Untersuchung der kultischen und politischen Einrichtungen, Frankfurt am Main
Fabiani, R. (2010), 'Magistrates and Phylai in Late Classical and Early Hellenistic Iasos', in J.-M. Carbon, R. van Bremen (Eds.), Hellenistic Karia, Pessac, 467-482
Fabiani, R. (2012), 'Dedochthai tei boulei kai toi demoi: protagonisti e prassi della procedura deliberativa a Iasos', in C. Mann, P. Scholz (Eds.), "Demokratie" im Hellenismus. Von der Herrschaft des Volkes zur Herrschaft der Honoratioren?, Mainz, 109-165
Fabiani, R. (2015), I decreti onorari di Iasos. Cronologia e storia, München
Fabiani, R. (2017), 'Suddivisioni civiche: organizzazione, magistrature e culti. Un nuovo decreto di una phylé di Iasos', StudEll 31, 165-204
Faraguna, M. (2020), 'Alexander the Great and Asia Minor. Conquest and Strategies of Legitimation', in K. Trampedach, A. Meeus (Eds.), The Legitimation of Conquest. Monarchical

© Laboratorio SAET - Scuola Normale Superiore

Representation and the Art of Government in the Empire of Alexander the Great, Stuttgart, 243-262
Gallo, L. (1984), 'La democrazia ateniese del IV sec. a.C. e la paga dei funzionari pubblici', ASNP 14, 2, 395-440
Gauthier, P. (1990), 'L'inscription d'Iasos relative à l'ekklesiastikon (I.Iasos 20)', BCH 114, 1, 417-443
Giovannini, A. (2004), 'Le traité entre Iasos et Ptolémée Ier (IK 28,1, 2–3) et les relations entre les cités grecques d'Asie Mineure et les souverains hellénistiques', EA 37, 69-87
Hansen, M. H. (1991), The Athenian Democracy in the Age of Demosthenes. Structure, Principles and Ideology, Oxford-Cambridge (MA)
Haussoullier, B. (1884), 'Inscription de l'île de Karyanda', BCH 8, 218-222
Hicks, H. L. (1887), 'Iasos', JHS 8, 83-118
Jones, N. F. (1987), Public Organization in Ancient Greece. A Documentary Study, Philadelphia
Jost, G. (1935), Iasos in Karien, ein antike Stadtbild, Hamburg
Konuk, K. (2010), 'The Payment of the Ekklesiastikon at Iasos in Light of New Evidence', in J.-M. Carbon, R. van Bremen (Eds.), Hellenistic Karia, Pessac, 59-67
Maddoli, G. (2007), 'Epigrafi di Iasos. Nuovi supplementi I', PP 62, 3-5, 193-372
Markle, M. M. (1985), 'Jury Pay and Assembly Pay at Athens', HPTh 6, 1-2, 265-297
Mastrocinque, A. (1979), La Caria e la Ionia meridionale in epoca ellenistica, Roma
Michel, C. (1900), Recueil des inscriptions grecques, Bruxelles
Migeotte, L. (2005), 'Iasos et les Lagides', in F. Duyrat, O. Picard (Eds.), L'exception égiptienne? Production et échanges monétaires en Égypte hellénistique et romaine (Alexandrie, 13-15. April 2002), Le Caire, 189-203
Nawotka, K. (2003), 'Freedom of Greek Cities in Asia Minor in the Age of Alexander the Great', Klio 85, 1, 15-41
Ober, J. (1989), Mass and Elite in Democratic Athens, Princeton
Oikonomos, G. P. (1921–1922), 'Ναοποιοὶ καὶ Ἐσσῆνες', AD 7, 258-346
Pernin, I. (2014), Les baux ruraux en Grèce ancienne. Corpus épigraphique et étude, Lyon
Rhodes, P.J., Lewis, D.M. (1997), The Decrees of the Greek States, Oxford
Rhodes, P.J., Osborne, R. (2003), Greek Historical Inscriptions. 404-323 BC, Oxford
Robert, J., Robert, L. (1973), 'Bulletin épigraphique', REG 86, 409-410, 48-211
Schultheß, O. (1935), 'Νεωποιοί', in G. Wissowa, W. Kroll (Eds.), Paulys Realencyclopädie der classischen Altertumswissenschaft. Neue Bearbeitung. XVI, 2, Stuttgart, 2433-2439
Swoboda, H (1888), 'Über griechische Schatzverwaltung', WS 10, 278-307
Swoboda, H. (1890), Die griechischen Volksbeschlüsse. Epigraphische Untersuchungen, Leipzig
Tuci, P. A. (2007), 'Polluce VIII 104 e i funzionari addetti al controllo della partecipazione assembleare' in C. Bearzot, F. Landucci, G. Zecchini (Eds.), L'Onomasticon di Giulio Polluce. Tra lessicografia e antiquaria, Milano
Vacante, S. (2011), 'Alexander the Great and the Polis of Iasus: Salt and Democracy? Notes on the 'Little Sea' Inscription (IIasos 24+30) and the Ekklesiastikon Decree (IIasos 20)', Klio 93, 2, 322-336

Author: Alessandro Perucca

Last update: March 2023

© Laboratorio SAET - Scuola Normale Superiore

DOI: 10.25429/sns.it/lettere/GEI044

© Laboratorio SAET - Scuola Normale Superiore