GREEK HISTORICAL INSCRIPTIONS 404–323 BC
The first volume of M. N. Tod’s *Selection of Greek Historical Inscriptions* (following earlier selections by E. L. Hicks and G. F. Hill: published in 1933, second edition 1946) was superseded by the volume compiled by Russell Meiggs and David Lewis in 1969 (revised 1988). David Lewis had hoped to produce a volume to supersede Tod’s second volume (published 1948): he first considered in 1977 what might be included, and again in 1991–2 he consulted a number of colleagues including both of us; but after he had finished editing *Inscriptiones Graecae, 1*, he saw work on the tablets from Persepolis as his highest priority. After his death in 1994 Rhodes, as his literary executor, invited Osborne to join him in persevering with the project; and this volume, which we dedicate to the memory of David Lewis, is the result.

Our collection stands in the tradition of Tod and of Meiggs and Lewis in being aimed primarily at historians, and we have retained *Greek Historical Inscriptions* as our title. There is, of course, a sense in which all inscriptions are historical documents, but some make a greater contribution in their own right than others to the questions which historians are interested in asking; and it is on inscriptions of that kind that we, like our predecessors, have concentrated. We took as our starting-point Lewis’ 1991–2 list of candidates for inclusion and the responses to it of ourselves and the others whom he consulted, and we continued the process of consultation before settling on the collection of texts assembled here. Significant new texts have been found since Tod’s collection was published, and there have been significant new fragments and new interpretations of some which he included; beyond that, while adhering to the aim of presenting texts which are important not just as typical of their genre but in their own right, we have aimed to broaden the thematic range and to include a greater selection of material from outside Athens. We hope that our collection will offer a way in to all aspects of fourth-century history: political, institutional, social, economic, and religious. We have therefore endeavoured to make our commentaries accessible to those unfamiliar with the areas in question, and have translated all our texts. Since inscribed stones and bronzes are physical objects, whose nature and appearance is important for their impact, we have included a number of photographs.

All that Lewis found time to do towards this volume after his consultation of 1991–2 was to type into his computer a few texts and translations; we have studied these, but for the sake of stylistic uniformity we have made our own translations of the texts in question. More importantly, over many years he had compiled and circulated among students and teachers of fourth-century Greek history in Oxford notes on significant work concerning Tod’s inscriptions subsequent to the publication of his volume, and texts of some additional fourth-century inscriptions; and these were invaluable to us when we embarked on our work.

One of us accepted the primary responsibility for each of the texts included here: attentive readers may detect different styles of thinking, and of writing, but each of us has read and commented on all that the other has written, each of us has responded
constructively to the comments of the other, and we accept joint responsibility for this book in its final form. Like Meiggs and Lewis, ‘we . . . compliment one another, for we have found a surprising measure of agreement and our few differences of opinion have never escalated’.

Beyond that, we have many thanks to express. At the institutional level, Rhodes thanks the University of Durham for research leave in 1998, when we were starting work, and in 2001, when we were finishing our text; All Souls College, Oxford, for a visiting fellowship in 1998; and Corpus Christi College, Oxford (which awarded him a visiting fellowship in 1993), for continuing hospitality. Osborne thanks Corpus Christi College, Oxford, where he was Tutorial Fellow in Ancient History when this work was done; and the British Academy, for a Research Readership in 1999–2001. We both thank the staff of the Bodleian Library and the Ashmolean – Sackler Library in Oxford for providing almost all the publications which we needed to consult. Though neither of us is now based in Oxford, almost all of this book was written there.

We should like to thank a great many individuals, but they are not to be blamed for what we have done in response to their advice. Our list must begin with Dr S. D. Lambert, who has been exceptionally generous with his time and expertise, and his colleagues Dr A. P. Matthaiou and Dr G. J. Oliver, who are re-editing fourth-century Athenian decrees for the first phase of a third edition of *Inscriptiones Graecae, II,* and who generously checked readings, scrutinized our drafts, and showed us their drafts. Others who have helped us include Mr D. J. Blackman; Dr H. Bowden; Professor J. Buckler; Professor J. McK. Camp; Professor A. Chaniotis; Mr G. T. Cockburn; Dr C. V. Crowther, of the Centre for the Study of Ancient Documents in Oxford; Dr B. Currie; Professor P. D. A. Garnsey; Professor P. Gauthier; Dr K. Hallof, of *Inscriptiones Graecae* in Berlin; Dr M. H. Hansen; Professor P. Hellström; Dr H. King; Mrs E. Matthews, of the *Lexicon of Greek Personal Names;* Professor A. Morpurgo Davies; Mr N. Papazarkadas; Professor R. C. T. Parker; Miss J. M. Reynolds; Dr I. Ruffell; Dr M. Sayar; Professor A. C. Scafuro; Professor S. Scullion; Dr J. Shear; Professor R. S. Stroud; Professor D. Whitehead; Dr G. M. Williamson; and Dr P. J. Wilson.
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INTRODUCTION

Nowadays inscriptions on stone or metal are used in two main contexts: on public buildings (to announce the identity of the building, or to record the laying of the foundation stone or the formal opening of the building), and on tombstones, war memorials, lists of officials or benefactors and the like. In the ancient world, with no printing or duplicating, or other modern means of communication, inscription was used not only for these purposes but for many others as well. Public announcements could not be made in the newspapers or delivered to individual members of the public: either a proclamation had to be made at a meeting attended by large numbers of the citizens, or a text would be set up in the centre of the city in the hope that members of the public would come and read it. Temporary notices—lists of candidates for office, proposals for new legislation and so on—were written on whitewashed boards, and have not survived for us to read; for permanent publication bronze or wood was sometimes used, but the normal medium was stone. For example, texts of a city’s religious calendars, of its laws and decrees, and of its alliances with other cities; schedules of work on a public building project, and accounts of public expenditure on the project; inventories of precious objects in the temple treasuries or of ships in the dockyards; epigrams commemorating a famous victory; honours voted to a native or foreign benefactor; lists of office-holders and benefactors—all these and comparable documents might be inscribed on stone for members of the public to see. However, by far the largest number of inscriptions are texts set up by private individuals—mostly dedications and funerary monuments—and these no less than public inscriptions provide information of importance for historians (for private inscriptions in our collection see 7, 30, 65, 92).

We have deliberately used the verb ‘see’ rather than ‘read’. Though in theory the purpose of a published text is that it should be available to be read, some texts were published in such a way that they were not easy to read, and the purpose of a lengthy inventory of items received by one board of treasurers from its predecessors and transmitted to its successors may have been to serve as a symbolic demonstration that the board had done its duty as much as to furnish material for an investigator who wanted to check that none of the items had disappeared. Nevertheless, some other texts were laid out in ways designed to aid intelligibility (e.g. 45, where the lines containing the total for the year project beyond the left-hand margin of the column); and we think it would be a mistake to make too much of the symbolic aspect of inscription and too little of the notion that texts were published so that they could be read.

1 Expressions such as ‘Write up . . . so that all other men also may know . . .’

1 On the symbolic aspects of publication see, e.g., J. K. Davies and D. Harris in Ritual, Finance, Politics . . . D. Lewis, 201–12 and 213–25; on this and on other aspects of publication see Rhodes, G&R xlviii 2001, 33–44, 136–53.
Very large blocks of stone were sometimes used for extensive documents or series of documents (in this collection, 22 measures about 1.93 x 0.45 x 0.14 m. = 6' 4" x 1' 6" x 5/16", 64 measures about 2.17 x 0.55 x 0.16 m. = 7' 1" x 1' 10" x 1/6"), but Greek inscriptions were not necessarily 'monumental'. Very often the stele would be a slab of stone no larger than a modern tombstone (71 measures 0.5 x 0.3 x 0.05 m = 1' 8" x 1' x 2", 77 0.54 x 0.43 x 0.08 m. = 1' 9" x 1' 5" x 3/14"), and both on these and on the larger steles the text was usually inscribed in letters 0.005—0.01 m. = 0.2—0.4" high. Documents emanating from the public authorities were normally published at public expense; but sometimes a man who had been honoured would himself pay for the publication of his honours, and see on 35 for the suggestion that that text of ephemeral significance was published by the Eleusinian officials. Publication was not cheap. In Athens in the fourth century it became common to specify in advance how much the state would spend on the stele: 22, a large stone (cf. above), cost 60 drachmas; 30 drachmas were allowed for the even larger 64 (cf. above) and for the elaborate 70 (but see commentary), and also for the small 77 (cf. above); surprisingly, only 20 drachmas were allowed for two copies of 79, though the stone containing our surviving copy measures about 1.57 x 0.42 x 0.11 m = 5' 2" x 1' 5" x 4 1/4" and has at the top a sculptured relief. The stele would be set up in a public place, commonly the acropolis (the rocky citadel) or the agora (the main square) of the city. Sometimes texts would be inscribed not on a separate stele but, e.g., on a building: 86 comprises the first two of a series of texts inscribed on a temple at Priene, in Asia Minor.

Although there had been earlier attempts on a small scale, the view that for Athens, with its unusually large body of texts, it should be possible to identify the work of particular stone-cutters from their particular idiosyncrasies was first seriously advanced by S. Dow, and has been followed up most thoroughly by S. V. Tracy. In Athenian Democracy in Transition he seeks to identify cutters whose activity falls at least partly within the period 340—290, and of the texts in our collection he assigns 31, 34, 41 (one cutter), 72, 81 (one cutter), 91, and 100 to cutters. Identifications cannot always be certain, and Tracy himself remarks that in this period 'many of these cutters inscribed letters which are very much alike' (p. 2). He claims to have been conservative in his assignments (ibid.); some might still be challenged; but he has pursued investigations of this kind more thoroughly and systematically than anybody else, and only a scholar who had been equally thorough and systematic could reject his assignments with confidence.

Sometimes more than one copy of a text would be published—an alliance, naturally, would be published in each of the cities participating; 69 was published in two (or,

2 Exceptionally, 7. B, a grave stone, has letters 0.04 m. = 1/3" high; 86. A, on a temple wall, has letters 0.052—0.057 m. = 2—2/3" high. Some epigraphists use the Greek stele as the technical term for a comparatively thin slab and cippus (the Latin term for a marker, particularly of a grave or a boundary) as the technical term for a block which is more nearly square in cross-section, but the words were not used in antiquity in accordance with that distinction.

as restored by some editors, three) places within Athens, and 79 in two places within Athens; the dossier 40 was published in Athens, and the decrees of the individual Cean cities were published in the city in question—and where more than one copy of a text has been found it has become apparent that the Greeks lacked our notion of word-for-word accuracy: instead they seem to have had the potentially dangerous belief that, as long as the sense was correctly recorded, small differences in wording did not matter. In spite of that, however, it was the inscribed text rather than the original text in the archives which was in some sense the official text of a public document: thus the Thirty in Athens in 404 ‘took down from the Areopagus’ the laws of Ephialtes and Archestratus (Ath. Pol. 35. ii), and in the prospectus of the Second Athenian League Athens undertakes that if for cities which join ‘there happen to be unfavourable stelai at Athens, the council currently in office shall have power to demolish them’ (22.31—5; cf. 39. 31—3).4

Some stelai have survived intact—unbroken and completely legible. Far more often, however, only part of the original stele survives, some letters even on the part that does survive are hard or impossible to read, and modern scholars have had to do their best to reconstruct the text. Where only a few letters on the edges of a stele are missing, restoration is easy, often inevitable; where large parts of the text are illegible and/or missing, reconstruction is far more difficult. If the historical context to which a document belongs can be identified, this may provide clues as to what the lost parts of the text should have contained. If a piece of standardized documentary language can be recognized, this can be reconstructed by comparison with other documents (though the Greeks could not retrieve a standard clause from a data-base, and variations tend to be found even within ‘standard’ formulaic expressions: compare, for instance, the different forms of the Athenian probouleumatic formula in 24, 31, 33, 38, 95 §§iv, v). If two or three lines can be reliably restored, the approximate length of the lines is fixed, and this limits the possibilities of restoration in the rest of the document. In this period most Athenian decrees, and some decrees of other states, were inscribed in a style known as stochedon (a genuine Greek word, though not used of inscriptions in any ancient text), with the letters regularly spaced on a grid, precisely the same number of letters in each line, and little or no punctuation: this, though it made the stelai more attractive as monuments, cannot have made for easy reading, but for us it has the advantage that very often a formulaic expression can be found which allows enough reconstruction at one point to reveal the exact number of letters to be restored in each line. With a few exceptions, where a text is fragmentary but of sufficient importance to deserve inclusion, we have limited ourselves in this collection to inscriptions where a substantial stretch of continuous text survives or can be reconstructed.

Beyond that, we have tried to choose texts which are both important in themselves and give an indication of the range available; and readers whose interests are thematic can use our texts and commentaries to study not only the main narrative thread of fourth-century history but such matters as political institutions and administrative organization; religious cults and religious financing; coinage, building funds and

---

4 Cf. Rhodes with Lewis, 3—4 with n. 4.
regulations, trade agreements, and other economic matters. Geographically, we have material from Athens and other states of the Greek mainland, from the Aegean islands, from Macedon, Thrace, and the Cimmerian Bosporus, from western Asia Minor, and from Cyrene (and among the Athenian texts we have one concerned with Sidon, in Phoenicia)—but not from the Greek states of Italy and Sicily, which produced very few inscriptions at any date, though we include some texts from mainland Greece concerned with Sicily. Many of our documents are inter-state treaties, or laws or decrees of single states (especially Athens, which in the fifth and fourth centuries inscribed public documents on a much larger scale than other states). However, our material includes texts from bodies within a state (demes, 46, 63; gentilicial groups, 1, 5, 37, 61, 87; a contingent of ephebes, 89, cf. Athens’ ephebic oath, 88) as well as from the state itself; from Athens we have documents issued by the poletai (36) and by the epistatai of the dockyards (100); from Athens and from elsewhere we have such items as commemorations of men who died in war (7, 30; cf. a celebration of victory, 74); religious regulations of various kinds (1, 62, 73, 81, 97; cf. 37, 63, 87); accounts of sacred treasurers (28), financial records of different kinds (28, 45, 60, 66, 67; cf. 100); a lease of sacred land (59); a record of donations of grain (96); accounts of people cured of diseases at Epidaurus’ sanctuary of Asclepius (102).

II

Since many of our texts are public documents of the Athenian state, and since other Greek states had constitutions which, whether democratic or oligarchic, were similar in their general pattern though different in their detail and their balance, some information on the mechanics of the fourth-century Athenian constitution will help to make the texts intelligible.

Since the reforms of Cleisthenes (508/7) the citizens of Athens had been organized in ten phylai (‘tribes’). In what for some purposes was an official order, these were:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I</th>
<th>Erechtheis</th>
<th>VI</th>
<th>Oeneis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>II</td>
<td>Aegaeis</td>
<td>VII</td>
<td>Cecropis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III</td>
<td>Pandionis</td>
<td>VIII</td>
<td>Hippothontis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV</td>
<td>Leontis</td>
<td>IX</td>
<td>Aiantis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>Acamantis</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Antiochis</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Each tribe consisted of three trittyes (‘thirds’), in different parts of Attica; and the trittyes consisted of one or more demoi (‘demes’: local units), of which there were 199 altogether. To be a citizen of Athens a man had to belong to a deme and to the trittyes and the tribe of which that deme formed a part (membership of these units was hereditary, and by the fourth century not all Athenians lived in the deme in which they were registered). Demes and tribes, though perhaps not trittyes, acted as independent decision-making bodies, and sometimes published their decrees (bodies outside this structure, such as phratries, made and published their decisions in the same way: 5, 37, 46, 63). Beyond that, a good deal of Athens’ governmental machinery was based on this structure.
The body with the ultimate right of decision in most matters was the *ekklesia* ('assembly'), open to all full (i.e. adult male) citizens, which had forty regular meetings a year and could probably have extraordinary meetings in addition (see on 64 and, for the *ekklesia kyria*, 98); for certain categories of business, affecting a named individual, a quorum of 6,000 was required. Since there are limits to what can be done by a large body meeting infrequently, day-to-day affairs were in the hands of the *boule* ('council') of five hundred. This body comprised fifty members from each tribe; within the tribe seats were allocated to demes approximately in proportion to their size, so that in the fourth century several small demes had one member each but the largest deme, Acharnae, had twenty-two. Appointment was made by lot from those who stood as candidates; service was for one year at a time, and no man could serve for more than two years in his life. Within the council, the fifty members from each tribe in turn served as the *prytaneis* ('prytany': standing committee) for a tenth of the year, in an order fixed by lot; all business went to them in the first instance; each day one of their members was chosen, again by lot, to be *epistates* ('chairman'), and for twenty-four hours he and some of his colleagues were permanently on duty. In the fifth century one of the duties of the prytany and its chairman had been to preside at meetings of the council and assembly. By the beginning of the 370s they had been relieved of this duty, and meetings were instead presided over by a board of *proedroi*—nine members of the council, one from each tribe except the current prytany, and one of them designated *epistates*, picked by lot for one day (for the change see on 22).

In the fourth century most decisions of the Athenian state (but not all; see below) were embodied in a *psephisma* ('decree') of the assembly. Every matter on which the assembly was to make up its mind was first discussed by the council, which drew up the assembly's agenda (if a new matter was first raised in the assembly, it would be referred to the council, with instructions to bring the matter back to a later assembly: e.g. 69). On each matter which it sent forward to the assembly the council issued its *probouleuma* ('preliminary deliberation'). Sometimes the *probouleuma* contained a positive recommendation, which the assembly might if it chose accept as it stood (e.g. 24, which contains a version of the 'probouleumatic formula': 'bring them forward to the people, and contribute the opinion of the council that the council resolves'); on other occasions the council put a question to the assembly without making any recommendation of its own (as in 91, where we have first the *probouleuma*—'contribute the opinion of the council to the people that the council resolves that the people shall listen . . . and deliberate as they think best'—and then the resultant decree of the assembly); sometimes the council made its own recommendation up to a point but left certain details open (e.g. 2. 49-50, 60-1. The *probouleuma* was read out at the beginning of the debate in the assembly; then—whether it had contained a positive recommendation or not—members were free to propose alternative motions, to propose amendments to a motion already before the assembly (if an amendment was carried, it was published after the original motion which it modified, and sometimes but not always the text of the original motion was modified in the light of the amendment (see, e.g., on 2), or to amend a motion by taking it over and rewriting it (usually this can be reliably detected only in the rare cases where the original motion
has been published with the final version, e.g. 95, but see also on 41, 64). When the assembly approved a recommendation of the council, in a ‘probouleumatic decree’, from the beginning of the 370s the council’s probouleumatic formula was often left in the published version of the text (the earliest example in our collection is 24); and the Athenians also continued using the fifth-century enactment formula which mentioned the council. In ‘non-probouleumatic decrees’, when the assembly did not approve a recommendation of the council (either because the council made a recommendation which it rejected or because the council made no recommendation) the Athenians in the fourth century took to using enactment and motion formulae which did not mention the council (cf. below, pp. xix–xx, and Rhodes, Boule, 66–78).

The alternative to a decree of the assembly in fourth-century Athens was a nomos (‘law’). At the end of the fifth century the accumulation of nearly two hundred years’ decrees since the codification of the law by Solon (594/3) had produced a great deal of confusion, and an attempt was then made to assemble all currently valid enactments in an organized code of laws. Thereafter, in principle, matters which were permanent and of general application were to be dealt with by laws while matters which were ephemeral and/or of particular application were, as before, to be dealt with by decrees, and decrees were to rank below laws in importance and validity. There are uncertainties about the application of the principle and the working of the new law-making procedure (nomothesia). A revised code of laws was completed in 400/399. Any subsequent enactment which would change or add to that code of laws should itself have taken the form of a law; the procedure for enacting new laws was set in motion by the assembly but the final decision lay not with the assembly but with a special board of nomothetai (‘law-enacters’); references in speeches of the fourth century suggest that the procedure should have resembled that of a law-court, with the nomothetai sitting in judgment on the rival merits of the current law and the new proposal; but the surviving texts of laws (in our collection 25, 26, 79, 81.1) have introductory material which matches that of decrees as closely as possible (the proedroi and their chairman in 79 are proedroi of the board of nomothetai). In practice, although this new procedure seems except in occasional crises to have been used on those occasions when it ought to have been used—with the proviso that, because there were no such matters in the new code of laws, all decisions in the area of foreign policy, even on treaties intended to last for all time, were embodied in decrees—the record of surviving texts suggests that it was not used very often (one matter for which it was used was modification of the annual budget, on which see below). It presumably conferred extra importance and solemnity on an enactment; but it was more cumbersome than the procedure for making decrees, and the Athenians continued to take most of their decisions by decree. 

See Rhodes, 7HScix 1991, 87–100, and other works cited there.

On nomothetai, juries, and assemblies see Rhodes, Qf ii 2003, 124–9.

On the distinction between laws and decrees see M. H. Hansen, GRBS xix 1978, 315–30, 88 1979 27–53 = Ecclesia (1), 161–76(7), 175–205(6), believing that the Athenians adhered to the principle; Rhodes, in L’educazione giuridica, v. ii. 5–26 at 14–15, suggesting that a law was needed to change the code of laws. For a list of inscribed laws see Stroud, The Athenian Grain-Tax Law, 15–16, to which S. D. Lambert, 7PE cxxv 2001, 51–62
By the fourth century the layout of an Athenian decree or law had become more or less standardized. Not every text contains every possible element, but in a complete text we should find the following:\(^8\)

(i) The *stèle* is often surmounted by a pediment or a horizontal moulding, and sometimes has a sculptured relief, often set in an architectural frame, above and/or below the text (70 has a relief above the text and another relief below; 79 has a pediment and a relief above). The style and detail of the sculpture can sometimes help to indicate the date of the inscription (cf. 88).

(ii) **Invocation**: ‘Gods’—perhaps reflecting the prayer with which proceedings in the assembly began (e.g. 31, 35).\(^9\) The four letters \(\text{θ ε ο} \) are regularly spread across the full width of the *stèle*, and may (for instance) be inscribed on the moulding above the main inscribed surface.

Some other states also mention (good) fortune in this position (e.g. Helisson and Mantinea, 14; Arcadian federation, 32). When the Athenians mention good fortune they do so in the main text of the decree (e.g. 22, 7–9).\(^10\)

(iii) **Heading**, in larger letters (for easy identification of text):\(^11\)

- archon and/or secretary of the year (e.g. 11; 18; cf. 10, with the beginning of the prescript presented in the style of a heading);
- subject of decree (e.g. 6; 11).

(iv) **Prescript** (formal details taken from the secretary’s records):

- archon of the year (since we know the names of all the archons from 481/0 to 292/1, this provides us with the most reliable means of dating a decree: for a list of archons from 403/2 to 323/2 see p. 543);
- prytany: the name of the tribe and its number in the year’s sequence of prytanies;
- secretary;
- date: eventually specific to the day, both within the prytany and within the month;
- chairman, who ‘put to the vote’;
- enactment formula: for a decree of the assembly, either ‘resolved by the people’ or ‘resolved by the council and the people’ (for the significance of the two formulae cf. above, and see, for instance, 22, 41, with commentary); for a decree of the council, ‘resolved by the council’ (for decrees of the early fourth century which mention only the council but may be decrees of the assembly see on 10); for a law, ‘resolved by the nomothetai’;
- proposer, with the verb *eipen* (literally ‘spoke’).

\(77\) and \(94\) are among those which contain all these elements.

---

\(^8\) Cf. Rhodes, *Boule*, 64–5; Rhodes with Lewis, 4–5.


\(^11\) For a study of variations in headings and prescripts see Henry, *Prescripts*. 
Main text:
often beginning with an invocation of good fortune (cf. above);
motivation clause, in its fully developed form in two parts, the first beginning
‘since . . . ’ and the second beginning ‘so that . . . ’ (no example of that in our
collection; but the first part e.g. 11, 23, the second part e.g. 4, 22);
motion formula: either ‘be it resolved/decreed by the people’ in a non-
probouleumatic decree or the probouleumatic formula in a probouleumatic
decree (cf. above and see, for instance, 22, 41, 95, with commentary);12 ‘be it
resolved/decreed by the nomothetai’ in a law;
and then the positive proposals, commonly ending with an invitation to the
_prytanecion_ (town hall) for envoys or the recipients of honours;
orders for the publication of the text.

Amendments:
were published after the original motion. They normally begin with:
proposer of amendment (omitted in 70);
either ‘in other respects in accordance with the council’, when what is amended is
a motion contained in the _probouleuma_, or ‘in other respects in accordance with
[name of proposer]’, when it is not (see in particular on 64).
(A decree could also be amended by rewriting it [cf. above]; when the clauses of a
decree are presented in an illogical order, that has led some scholars to suppose
that the misplaced clauses are the result of ‘concealed amendments’, for which
see on 20, 44, 64.)

Athenian administration was based on the principle that any good citizen could and
should play a modest part in the running of the state: large numbers of annual boards
were set up (mostly of ten men, one picked by lot from the candidates in each tribe),
and were given strictly limited jobs to do; all worked under the general supervision
of the council, which also had judicial powers in matters concerned with the running
of the state. In the course of the fourth century there was a move away from the fifth-
century democracy’s principle of equal participation, towards entrusting greater
powers to men of proved ability, but in matters illustrated by the texts in this collection
there was little change.

The collection of taxes was not made by state officials, but was farmed out to
contractors. The contract (like other state contracts, e.g. for rentals or public works) was
auctioned to the highest bidder or syndicate of bidders, in the presence of the council,
by the _poletai_ (‘sellers’: _Ath. Pol._ 47. ii–iv; for a document published by the _poletai_ see 36);
the record of the contract was kept by the council; and in due course the contractors
had to pay the sum agreed (irrespective of the amount they had actually collected) to
the _apodektai_ (‘receivers’), again in the presence of the council ( _Ath. Pol._ 47. v–48. ii); if
they defaulted they would be pursued by a board of _praktores_ (‘exacters’: e.g. law _ap._}
And. i. Myst. 77–9; for an instance of default on a tax-collecting contract see Agora xiv P 26, 462–98. In the fifth century all revenue was paid into a central treasury, and all state payments were made from that treasury—by yet another board, the kolakretai ('ham-collectors').

In the fourth century the apodektai made a merismos ('allocation') to various spending authorities (first attested in 19, of 386): amongst these authorities were the assembly, which had an expense account, 'the people's fund for expenditure on decrees' (first directly attested in 367/6: e.g. 35, but its treasurer, the 'treasurer of the people', is first datably attested in 29, of 372, and the fund was probably created c.376), and the council, which had a similar expense account. Two other funds, over which there was some controversy between the 350s and the 330s, were the stratiotic (military) fund and the theoric fund: the latter was established to make grants to cover the cost of citizens' theatre tickets at festivals, but its activities were extended beyond that. The year's allocations to the spending authorities were fixed by a law and could only be altered by a law: in 64 the cost of crowns for the Bosporan princes is accepted for the future as a charge on the assembly’s expense account (which will have to be given an increased allocation for the purpose), but for the current year the apodektai are to provide the money 'from (what they would otherwise allocate to) the stratiotic fund'.

One area in which the fourth century saw an increase in professionalism was the office of secretary. Until the 360s the principal state secretary, who kept the records of the council and assembly, and was responsible for publishing documents when required, was a member of the council, from a tribe other than the current prytany, serving for one prytany (i.e. one tenth of the year) only. Between 368/7 and 363/2 there was a change: the office was detached from membership of the council, and service was now for a whole year. Curiously, it is almost certain that after this change two different titles, the old 'secretary to the council' and the new (but more appropriate to the old system) 'secretary by the prytany' were used indiscriminately to denote the same official.

Each Greek state had its own calendar. Years were not counted from any real or imagined fixed point (the Olympic records, counting from a supposed first festival in 776, could be used to correlate the systems of different states; but their four-yearly basis was inconvenient, and the system did not pass into everyday use), but were identified by reference to an eponymous official, usually an annual official who gave his name to the year in which he served. In Athens the eponymous official was the archon (though it did not become standard practice to date decrees by the archon until c.420), and the year began with the first new moon after the summer solstice: thus the year which we call 378/7 (c. July 378–June 377: the year in which 22 and 23 were enacted) was to the Athenians the year of Nausinicus' archonship. In Athens, as in most states, the year was not a solar year of c.365 days, but was based on lunar months, of 29 or 30 days. In an 'ordinary' year of 12 months there were c.354 days; in an 'intercalary' year a thirteenth month was added and there were c.384 days (and because of this

13 Rhodes, Boule, 102 with n. 5.
discrepancy interest was commonly reckoned by the month rather than by the year). Decisions as to how long particular months were to be, and how many months there were to be in a particular year, seem to have been taken on an ad hoc basis, not in accordance with a fixed rule; and what was decided one way in Athens might be decided differently elsewhere. Because of these irregularities it is rarely possible to give the exact equivalents in our calendar of dates in a Greek calendar. The names of the months at Athens were:

i Hecatombaeon  v Maemacterion  ix Elaphebolion
ii Metageitnion  vi Posideon  x Munychion
iii Boedromion  vii Gamelion  xi Thargelion
iv Pyanopsion  viii Anhestierion  xii Scirophorion

Hecatombaeon corresponded roughly to our July, and so on. In an intercalary year the extra month was usually a second Posideon, added after the first. Within the month the days were counted in three decades: after ‘new moon’ (νομημία) came the ‘second of the rising (month)’ (δευτέρα ἑσταμένου) and so on; in the middle decade ‘eleventh’ and ‘twelfth’ were followed by ‘third on top of ten’ (τρίτη ἐπὶ δέκα) and so on; and in the last decade there was a backward count from the ‘tenth of the waning (month)’ (δέκατη φθίνοντος) until the last day, which was designated ‘old and new’ (ἐνὶ και νέῳ).

The council worked to a calendar of its own, in which the year was divided into ten prytanies, in each of which one of the tribal contingents in the council acted as standing committee; and there were four regular assemblies, with their own items of business, prescribed for each prytany (cf. above, and for the regular assemblies and their business see *Ath. Pol.* 43, iv–vi). Until the late fifth century the council’s year was a solar year independent of the archontic calendar, but thereafter the council used the archontic year as its year of office. As prescripts of decrees became increasingly detailed in the course of the fourth century, dates tended to be given both by prytany and by month (cf. on 29, 77).

The same names were used in different states for units of money, but the values of the different currencies varied in accordance with the weights of precious metal (usually silver) to which the names were applied in each state. The scale used in Athens was:

\[
\begin{align*}
6 \text{ obols} &= 1 \text{ drachma} \\
100 \text{ drachmas} &= 1 \text{ mina} \\
60 \text{ minas} &= 1 \text{ talent}
\end{align*}
\]

15 On the count of days in the last decade see Meritt, *The Athenian Year*, 38–51.
16 On the Athenian calendar see Samuel, *Greek and Roman Chronology*, 57–64. There has been much controversy over the regularity of ‘intercalary’ years (with a thirteenth month) and of ‘hollow’ 29-day and ‘full’ 30-day months in the archontic calendar and of the lengths of prytanies (an ‘ordinary’ 12-month year of 354 days will have required four prytanies of 36 days and six of 35: according to *Ath. Pol.* 43, ii the first four prytanies were the long ones). For summaries with references see Rhodes, *Boulê*, 224–9; Comm., *Ath. Pol.* 518–20: we believe with B. D. Meritt against W. K. Pritchett that in an area where there must have been irregularities of various kinds it is unwise to insist on scrupulous adherence to the pattern stated in *Ath. Pol.* (though we do not rule out the possibility that what *Ath. Pol.* states is what the laws stated).
Sums of money were often expressed in talents, drachmas, and obols, without the use of a mina as an intermediate unit. The word 'stater' is often used to denote the standard coin of a state, irrespective of its value on a scale like the above: in Athens (which did not use the word of its own coins) the stater was a 4-drachma coin, weighing c.17.2 grammes (c.0.6 oz.). For exchange rates used to convert sums in one currency to another, see 45, 57; for measures of capacity, again different in different states, see 45.

In the second half of the fourth century, payments for attending meetings of public bodies in Athens (juries, the council, the assembly, etc.) varied between $\frac{1}{2}$ drachma (for juries: not increased since the 420s) and 1½ drachmas a day (Ath. Pol. 62. ii). At this time an unskilled labourer could earn 1½ drachmas a day, a skilled 2 or 2½ drachmas.17 A man was regarded as rich enough to be liable for such burdens as the trierarchy or a festival liturgy if his total property was worth 3–4 talents or more, while liability for the property tax known as eisphora perhaps extended a little further down the scale (cf. commentary on 21, 100), and he would have been one of the richest Athenian citizens if his property was worth as much as 15 talents. In 341 Demosthenes claimed that in the past few years the annual revenue of Athens had increased from 130 talents to 400 talents (Dem. x. Phil. iv. 37–8), whereas in 431, at the beginning of the Peloponnesian War, her annual revenue was about 1,000 talents (X. Anab. vii. i. 27; Thuc. ii. 13. iii claims 600 talents tribute from the Delian League, but the tribute lists suggest not more than 400 talents).

III

The use of inscriptions as evidence by historians goes back to Herodotus (e.g. inscriptions at Thermopylae, vi. 228; inscriptions commemorating the conquests of the Egyptian king Sesostris, some of which Herodotus had seen, u. 102–6; the story of Nitocris’ inscriptions in Babylon, i. 187). Thucydides used inscriptions more in the modern academic manner (e.g. Pausanias’ arrogant inscription on the Serpent Column at Delphi, subsequently deleted and replaced by a list of Greek states which resisted the Persian invasion, i. 132. ii–iii; an inscription whose lettering he described as faint, and an inscription cited to show that Hippias was the eldest son of Pisistratus, vi. 54. vii–55. i). In the fourth century Theopompus argued that the inscription recording the alleged Peace of Callias between Athens and Persia was a forgery, because it used not Athens’ local alphabet but the Ionic alphabet which Athens adopted at the end of the fifth century (FGrH 115 F 153–5; he also rejected the authenticity of our 88 §ii). In the third century Craterus (FGrH 342) made a collection of Athenian decrees; in the second Polemon of Illyium collected epigraphic texts and was called a ‘glutton for stelai’ (stelokopas: Ath. vi. 234 D). On the use of inscriptions by Pausanias, the traveller of the second century A.D., cf. on 102.18


18 And see Habicht, Pausanias’ Guide to Ancient Greece, 84–94 ch. iii.
In the modern world, inscriptions have long been found and recorded by explorers
and archaeologists. The first work planned explicitly as a corpus of Greek inscriptions
was A. Boeckh's *Corpus Inscriptionum Graecarum*, published between 1828 and 1877.
Towards the end of the nineteenth century, responsibility for a corpus of Greek
inscriptions from Europe was accepted by the Berlin Academy, which undertook
and is still continuing publication of the work which came eventually to be known as
*Inscriptiones Graecae*, the first part of which appeared in 1873 (some parts have reached
a second or third edition, others have yet to appear in a first edition, and in some cases
planned volumes have been rendered unnecessary by volumes published under other
auspices). Responsibility for Asia Minor was accepted by the Vienna Academy, which
issued the first volume of the series *Tituli Asiae Minoris* in 1901. Other series devoted to
Asia Minor are *Monumenta Asiae Minoris Antiquae*, begun in 1928; and *Inschriften griechischer
Städte von Kleinasien*, begun in 1972 and proceeding very rapidly. Many inscriptions are
first published in classical and archaeological periodicals; and, when a large number
of inscriptions are found on one site, often one or more volumes of the excavation
report for the site are devoted to a corpus of the site's inscriptions.

Every year sees the discovery of new inscriptions, and the publication of new
inscriptions, new fragments of inscriptions already known, and new contributions to
the reading and interpretation of familiar texts. Keeping up to date with the stream of
publications is rendered easier by chronicles of new work. *Supplementum Epigraphicum
Gracum* was founded by J. J. E. Hondius in 1923 with a survey of work published in
1922, continued by A. G. Woodhead, and after an interruption resumed by a team
of editors who have produced annual surveys of work published since 1976–7: this
commonly reprints new and revised texts if they have been published otherwise than
in a major corpus. For each text in our collection, the references in our introductory
rubric include publication in a major corpus and/or in *SEG*, which will enable
treatments in *SEG* to be traced through its indexes. The *Revue des Études Grecques*
regularly includes a Bulletin épigraphique: between volumes li 1938 and xcvi 1984
this was the work of J. & L. Robert, who were renowned for their vast knowledge and
ability to make connections, and for their trenchant opinions; from vol. c 1987 this too
has been continued by a team, with different members focusing on different themes
or geographical areas. An epigraphical bulletin on Greek religion is published in the
periodical *Kernos* by A. Chaniotis. More general chronicles of classical work, which
include Greek epigraphy, are *L' Année Philologique*, begun in France with a volume for
1924–6*21 and again now produced by an international team; and the Bibliographische
Beilage published in the periodical *Gnomon* (from vol. i 1925). The periodical *Lustrum*
is devoted to bibliographical surveys of work on particular classical topics (from vol.
i 1956).

Information on individual Greeks may be found in the *Lexicon of Greek Personal

---

19 Each volume of *SEG* has concordances covering the major collections; an index volume is now being produced for each decade.

20 Plans for the continuation of the Bulletin were announced by P. Gauthier in *REG* xxix 1986, 117–18.

21 Only the first part, *Auteurs et textes*, was published of a backward projection into *Dix Années de bibliographie classique* (1914–1924).
Names (regional volumes: names with collections of references). For Athens what was known a century ago is presented, with source references and Latin text, in Kirchner's Prosopographia Attica; more recent, and with more discussion, but limited to those attested as rich and paying more attention to their wealth and their families than to their careers, is Davies's Athenian Propertied Families.22 Traill's Persons of Ancient Athens is an exhaustive collection of testimonia organized under short rubrics.23 For Sparta Poralla's Prosopographie der Lakedaimonier, of 1913, was reissued in 1985 with an appendix by A. S. Bradford.

The best general introduction to Greek inscriptions is Woodhead, The Study of Greek Inscriptions; Cook, Greek Inscriptions, is a short book written at a more popular level; on what can be learned from different kinds of inscription see Bodel, Epigraphic Evidence: Ancient History from Inscriptions (which makes more use of Roman than of Greek examples).

IV

The texts in this collection are arranged in approximate chronological order, but we have taken advantage of the fact that not all texts can be precisely dated to do some thematic grouping.

We have not fully re-edited the Greek texts; but our texts are our own, in that we have reconsidered the texts of our predecessors and have made changes wherever we have thought it necessary; we have tried to verify readings where we thought it would be profitable to do so, but not otherwise. In the introductory rubric for each text we mark with an asterisk the edition whose text has served as the basis for ours; our critical apparatus is selective, and we have not felt bound to provide a full history of the text and attribute every reading or restoration to its originator, but the apparatus includes a note on any point at which our text differs from that of the asterisked edition (except that we have restored original spellings without comment where Tod substituted standard spellings). Where the sign = is used, the references before and after the sign are to editions of the same inscription, but not necessarily to editions printing exactly the same text. Where the sign ~ is used, the edition cited before the sign gives a Greek text, the edition cited after gives an English translation.

We number every fifth line in the Greek texts, the line corresponding with the beginning of each of our paragraphs in the translations. Practice is different in some older editions, but like most more recent editions ours uses dots and brackets in the Greek texts in accordance with the 'Leiden system':

\[
\begin{align*}
\alpha\beta & \quad \text{letters which survive in part, but not sufficiently to exclude alternative readings} \\
[a\beta] & \quad \text{letters not now preserved which the editors believe to have been inscribed}
\end{align*}
\]

22 This too is now somewhat dated; a new edition is in preparation.
23 For an account of the project and of the computer-searches which it allows see J. S. Traill & P. M. Wallace Matheson, ἠρίων ηῆς 1989, 53–75.
letters inscribed in error by the cutter and deleted by the editors
letters supplied by the editors either because the cutter omitted them
or because the cutter inscribed other letters in error
letters supplied by the editors to fill out an abbreviation in the
inscribed text
[aβγδεζ] a passage which has been erased and can [or cannot] now be read
[ . . . ], [------] lost letters which cannot be restored, of the number
indicated
--- a lacuna or space of indeterminate size
h aspirate, when this is indicated by an inscribed character in the
original text
vacat one letter-space uninscribed

Features peculiar to a single inscription are explained in the rubric to that
inscription

Numerals. The Athenian system of numerals was acrophonic, the symbol being taken
from the first letter of the word represented (e.g. Γ = πεντε = 5, Η = εκατον = 100).
Some intermediate symbols were constructed by combining two others (Φ = 50, Π =
500). Complex numerals were produced by aggregation, the largest always appearing
first. The basic scheme is therefore:

\[
\begin{align*}
\Lambda & = 1 \\
\Pi & = 2 \\
\Pi & = 3 \\
\Pi & = 4 \\
\Gamma & = 5 \\
\Gamma & = 6 \\
\Delta & = 10 \\
\Delta & = 20 \\
\Gamma & = 50 \\
\Gamma & = 60 \\
\Pi & = 100 \\
\Pi & = 500 \\
\Pi & = 1,000 \\
\Gamma & = 5,000 \\
\mathcal{M} & = 10,000 \\
\Gamma & = 50,000 \\
\end{align*}
\]

The basic numerical system is regularly used to indicate sums of between 5 and
5,999 drachmas. Sums in talents are indicated by the symbol Τ and its compounds
(Τ, Δ, Φ, Η). For sums of 1-4 drachmas the sign Η (or at Tegea, see 60, η) is used; I is
used to indicate 1 obol. Halves and quarters and eighths of an obol are indicated by
the signs Η (at Tegea Ε), Τ, and Χ. Outside Athens it is in some places the practice to
use drachmas only up to 99 dr. and to indicate larger sums in minas (Μ, see 60).
Since readers can see in the Greek texts how much is preserved, in the translations we have not distinguished between what is preserved and what is not, except to attach question marks to restorations about which we are seriously uncertain. While in the translations we have not strayed unnecessarily from the word order of the Greek, we have not felt bound to keep to it when to do so would produce unnatural or obscure results. We have not thought it necessary invariably to use the same English word for the same Greek word and a different English word for a different Greek word, but we have done that except when there was good reason to do otherwise.

The rendering of Greek words and names in the Roman alphabet has been a matter of controversy for a long time: rigid adherence either to Latinized forms or to direct transliteration tends to produce some results which are widely regarded as unacceptable, and most scholars take refuge in an awkward compromise. We have tended, though not with complete consistency, to use English or Latinate forms for names of persons and places and familiar words which we print in Roman letters (Athens, Corinth, Olynthus; Callistratus, Lycurgus; drachmas, talents), transliteration for some names, including epithets of deities, and for words which we print in italic letters (Zeus Eleutherios; eisangelia, proedroi, prytaneion).
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THE INSCRIPTIONS
Law of the phratry (?) of the Labyadai, Delphi, fifth/fourth century

Block inscribed on all four faces, broken at top, found in a late-antique wall in front of the Portico of the Athenians at Delphi. Now in the Museum at Delphi. Phot. BCH xix 1895, pls. xxi–xix; C. Delphes, i, pls. v–viii.

Script includes Σ and Η (eta) and aspirates indicated by Β; ου sometimes represented as o with a dot in the middle. Stoichedon 20 (A and C), 18 (B), 19 (D).

Homolle, BCH xix 1895, 5–63; Buck 52; C. Delphes, i 9*; Koerner 46. See also V. Sebillotte, Cahiers du Centre Gustave-Glotz viii 1997, 39–49.

A

ΟΣ[

1 έστως `ταγευ[v]σέω δι[κ]α[ως κ]-

2 α[τ]α τούτων γόμος [τ]άσ [π]ο[λ]λα-

3 ος και το[ν]των Λαββάνατ[α]ν-

4 πέρ τών α[τ]πελλ[α]ίων και [τά]-

5 ν δαρατάν καὶ τά χρήμ[α]τα[ι]α-


7 [ι]καί[ω]ς τοίς Λαββάνατ[α]ίων[κ]-

8 α[υ]τε κλεφτέω ο[υ]τε βλα[υ]φ[ω]-

9 [ο]ο[υ]τε τέσσαρα ο[υ]τε μαχαίρα-


11 [τ]ων καὶ τοῦ ταγοῦ[υ]ν εὖ[ς]αξέ-

12 ω τῶν ἱόρκων τοίς έν[ν]ν[η]εο[τ]-

13 α κάτ τά γεγραμμένα. ἱόρκ-

14 ος: 'Ηπίοχομαι ποι τοῦ Δ[ι]-

15 ὅς τοῦ Πατρώωνοι εὐφρίκεα-

16 ρυυ μὲν του φαγάθα εὖ[η]ι, αἱ [θ]'

17 εὐφρικύει[μοι]. κ[α]κόν[τ]α[?] τά κ[α]-

18 κα ἀντι τῶν αγ[α]θών. πακα

19 ἐδοξε Λαβ[υ]άδαις Βούκατ-

20 ην μηνός δεκ[ά]ται, ἐπὶ Κ[ά]-

21 μπου, ἐν ταῖς [δ]λισι[ς], σύμ[ψ]α[φ]-

22 οις ἰκανοῖς ν ὑγιοῦκοντ[α]

23 δου[υ], τοῦ[ς] ταγούς μη δέκ-

24 ενοῖς μὴ δαρατάν γάμη-

25 λα μὴπ ταυδία μη[ν]' [απελ]-

26 λαία, α[ι]α[μ]ή τος πατρι[μ]ας επ-

27 ανευόσας τᾶς πληθώς έ-

28 ξάς κα ἡνι, α[ι]δὲ τι κα πάρ ν[ο]-

μον κελεύςαντι, τῶν κελε-

υσάντων ο[ς καίδυνος εστ[ω].

τὰ δ[έ]ι απελλαίαι αγεν Ἀπε[λ]-

λαίας, καί μη θα[λ]αίαι [δ]μερά[ι]

μήτε αγεν τούς αγο[ν]τας, μη-

ήτε τους ταγ[ο]ν[υ]ς δέκεσθα-


[ά]μεραι ἡ Ἀπελλαίαι, ἀποτε-

[ι]σάως Ε̱καστος δέκα δρα-

χάμας. ο[ δ] χρήμ[ῶ]ν καταγο-

ἐν τῶν δεξαμενῶν, ἐπὶ τῶ-

ν ἑστορεῖ τῶν ταγού καταγο-

ῥεῖτω ἐν ταῖς αἰαίς τὰς με-

[τ]ὰ Βουκάται, αἰ[κ]’ ἄμοιλλε-

γωντὶ τοι ταγοῦ τοι δεξα-

μενοι. α[ι]γεν δὲ ταπελλαία

ἀντι ἡτεος καὶ τὰς δαρά-

τας φέρειν. ἱόστις δὲ κα [μη]

ἀγημ παπελλαία ἡ τῶν δαρ-

αταν μη φερεί, ἀμοῖνον κ-

αθέτειο στατήρα ἐπί ἑκα-

τέομ τῶν δὲ ἑστορεῖ ἡτ-

τεί αγετῶ ταπελλαία καὶ

τα[ν] δαραταν φερετω α[ι]δέ

κα μη αγημ, μηκετί δεκέθ-

ων ἀμοῖνα, ἀλλʼ ἡ [θ]εότητω ἀπ-

ελλαία, ἡ ἀποσείωτος Ἐκ-

ατι δραχαίας ἡ ἵπτωγραφα-

μενοι τόκιομε φερετω καὶ


II on stone.
let the oath be: 'I will serve as officer justly, according to the laws of the city and those of the Labyadai, as regards offerings of sacrificial victims and of cakes. I will exact money and will publish accounts justly for the Labyadai and I will not steal nor do any harm by any means or device to the property of the Labyadai. I will make the tagoi for next year swear the oath according as it is written.'

13 Oath: 'I promise by Zeus Patroios. If I keep my oath may good things happen to me; if I break my oath, may evil result from evil rather than good.'

Resolved by the Labyadai. On the tenth of the month Boukatios, at the Assembly, by 182 votes. The tagoi are to receive no cake offerings on the occasion of marriages or for children, and no sacrificial victims unless the collectivity of the patria from which the person making the offering comes endorses the offering. If they order anything that breaks the law let the risk be on those who gave the order.

31 Sacrificial victims are to be brought at the Apellai and those who bring them are not to bring them, and the tagoi are not to receive them, on any other day. If they do receive them on a day other than the Apellai, each of them is to pay a fine of 10 drachmas. Whoever wishes to accuse those who have received the sacrificial victims should bring his accusation under the succeeding tagoi, at the assembly after Boukatia, if the tagoi who received the victim dispute the accusation.

44 The sacrificial victims are to be brought and the cakes offered in the same year; anyone who does not bring the sacrificial victims or offer the cakes is to deposit a stater in each case. In the following year he is to bring the sacrificial victims and offer the cakes. If he does not bring, no deposit is to be accepted: either he is to bring the victims or he is to pay 20 drachmas, or he is to be listed and pay
I. LAW OF THE PHRATRY(? ) OF THE LABYADAI AT DELPHI

B

[άτω ———— ————]
laxima

1

... H ............... .

. P1AΣAI. .....

[π]ατρωτας[ς πάντες δέ τι]

5 οι Λαβυάδαι[ι .............]

σ περί τινό δα[ρατάν ἐπι]-

κρυθώντων καὶ Μάσλαι
is περί τῶν ἀπελλαίων,

5 ταρεόντες μη μείω[σ he]

yός καὶ λεκατόν· τά[ν δέ]

φάσον φερόντων αλι[δ εξ]

δέμων το τῷ Απόλλων[ι]—

ος καὶ τοῦ Ποτειδάνος

tοῦ Φρατρίου καὶ τοῦ Δ—

νὸς Πατρώων δικαίως

οἰσεῖ καὶ τὸν νόμο

5 τῶν Δελφῶν· κήπευσθ—

ω δικαίως τὰν φάσον φ[ξ]

γοντὶ πολλ’ ἀγαθὰ τοὺς

θεοῦ δο[δόμων, αι δὲ δ[ι]

ικός, τά κακά. τοῦτα δέ τι—

οί ταυοὶ ἐπιτελεύτων—

καὶ τώι δεσμέωι συν-

αγόντων τοῦ Λαβυάδα—

5 σ. α’δε καὶ μη ποιώντι κα—

τα γεγραμμένα ἡ μη το—

ν’ς ταυοῦ τῶν ἱρόκων ἐ—

παγάνωντι, ἀποτελεύτ—

ω] Ρέκαστος ἐπ’ Ἐκετά—

30 χω χέκαρια. ἡστ—

[ι]ς δε καὶ μη ὁμοσύ, μη τα—

γενεῖτο, αι δε κ’ ἀνώμοστο—

ς ἡμεῖς, πεντήκοντα
dραχμάς ἀποτελεύτω.]

35 α’δε καὶ δεξιώνται τοι τι—

αγοὶ ἡ γάμελα ἡ παιδὴ—

α παρ τὰ γράμματα, ἀπο—

τεισάτων πεντήκοντα δρα—

χαμάς Ἐκαστος τῶν δε—

ξαμένων, α’δε κα κ’ ἀποτέλ—

σαμας ἤντε κ’ ἀποτελ—

είσαμεν. καὶ ὡς καὶ δεξιών
tαι ἡ δαράται ἡ ἀπελλαία

παρ τὰ γράμματα μη ἐστι—

ω λαβυάδας μηδε κουν

νεῖτω τῶν κουνῶν χρημ—

50 τῶν μηδε τῶν θεματῶν.

α’δε τις κα τῶν ταυῶν κ’

καταγορητοι πονοῦσι τι τι

ἀρ τὰ γράμματα, ὡς δὲ ἀν
tομοὶ, τοι ταυοὶ ἐν ταῖ—

vacat

C

[———17] AΤ[.]—

[———13] δικ]άζου[ν]—

[τι μεν δικαίως (?) ἐπι]χέο[θ]—

[ω πόλλ’ ἀγαθὰ το]ς θεοῦ[ς δ]—

[ιδομένει, αι δ’ ἐδιδορκείει κα—

[κά, α’δε κα μη δικαζὴ]ς ἡαι—

[πρεθεὶς, ἀτοπεισάτω πέντ]ε
dραχμαί], ἀλλον δ’ ἀνθελ—

[και τι]νι δικαν τελεύτ—

[ων, ἡ]ς στις δε κα παρ νόμον

[τι]ς ποιοῦντα τα δικαι hé—

λης, τo ἡμισον εχέτων, το—

δε ταυοι τω καταγορεύτω—

ντε ταυ δικαν ἐπιτελεύτ—

15 των’ αδε μη, το διπλον [F]ἐκα—

στος ἀποτεισάτω, ἠστι—

ς δε κα ζαμαν ωφελης, ἀτ—

μος ἐστω ἤντε κ’ ἀποτελ—

σης.” ἡδο’ ο τεθμοι περ τω—

20 ν εντοφημων’ μη πλεον πέγ—

B. 5–6 Λαβυάδαι[εικοσία]κ’ Ηομολλε.
interest. And he is to offer the cakes in the following year or else pay a fine of . . .

B

members of the patria. All the Labyadai are to decide about the cake offerings and at the Apellai about the sacrificial victims, provided that not less than 101 are present. They are to vote after they have promised by Apollo and Poseidon Phratrios and Dionysos Patroios that they will vote justly according to the laws of Delphi. Everyone is to pray that, if he votes justly, the gods will give him many good things, and, if he votes unjustly, evil. The tagoi are to accomplish this, and if anyone asks them they are to gather the Labyadai together. If they do not act according to what has been written or do not make the tagoi swear the oath, each of them is to pay a fine of 10 drachmas for each offence.

Anyone who does not swear may not be a tagos. If someone serves as a tagos without swearing he is to pay a fine of 50 drachmas.

If the tagoi receive the marriage or childbirth offerings contrary to what is written, let each of those who received the offerings pay 50 drachmas. If he does not pay he is to lose his rights among the Labyadai, both in this case and in the case of other penalties, until he pays the fine. The person whose cake offering or sacrificial victim they receive contrary to what is written is not to be a member of the Labyadai nor share the common funds or institutions.

C

making just judgements, let him pray that the gods give many good things, and if he breaks his oath, evil. If he is elected but does not pass judgement, let him pay a fine of 5 drachmas, and let them elect another and complete the case.

Whoever is responsible for the conviction of anyone doing something contrary to the law is to have half (the fine). The tagoi are to bring this to pass for the person who brought the accusation. If they do not each of them is to be fined double. Anyone who owes a penalty is to lose his rights until he pays.

This is the law about things to do with
6 LAW OF THE PHYRATY(

O) OF THE LABYDAI AT DELPHI

burials. No more than 35 drachmas to be spent, either on articles bought or on things from the house. The thick shroud is to be brown. Anyone who breaks any of these rules is to pay a fine of 50 drachmas, unless he denies on oath at the tomb that he spent more.

29 One mattress is to be put underneath and one pillow placed at the head. The corpse is to be carried covered up, in silence, and is not to be put down anywhere, even at the corners of the road, and there is to be no wailing outside the house before they have come to the tomb, and there let there be . . . until the . . . are brought.

39 At the tombs there is to be no lamenting or wailing over those who died earlier, but everyone is to go away homewards except members of the immediate household, paternal uncles, fathers- and brothers-in-law, descendants, and sons-in-law.

46 There is to be no groaning or wailing at the second-day commemoration, the tenth-day commemoration or the annual commemoration. If anyone transgresses any of these written rules . . .

D

2 These are the customary feasts: Apellai and Boukatia, Heraia, Daidaphoria, Poitropia, those on the seventh and the ninth of Busios, Eukleia, Artamitia, Laphria, Tho-xenia, Telchinia, Dioskoureia, Mag-alartia, and Herakleia, and if anyone sacrifices a victim himself, and if he is present at childbirth, and if foreigners with him sacrifice victims and if he is serving in the five-day office.

17 If any of these written rules is broken, the damiorgoi and all the other Labyadai are to exact a fine and the Fifteen are to enforce it. If anyone disputes the fine, he is to swear the customary oath and be released.

25 If, when they hold an assembly, a magistrate is absent, let him pay a fine of one obol, and if he disrupts it let him pay a fine of one obol.

29 The following regulations have been written also at Panopeus on the rock inside. Phanotos gave this as dowry to his daughter Boupyga: a half-sheep and a goat from the sacrifice of twelve victims and the skins in the sanctuary of Pronaia and the skins for (Apollo) Lykeios, and the beautiful calf.

38 The man who offers preliminary sacrifice and consults the oracle, whether in public or private capacity, is to provide the items recorded in writing to the Labyadai.

43 These are the sacrifices of the Labyadai: in the month Apellaios to Dionysos, at the feast of the Boukatia to Zeus Patroos and first fruits to Apollo; and the Labyadai drink together. The other feasts to be held in their season.
The surviving, lower, part of this block gives us part of the regulations of a Delphic gentilicial group. The group never identifies itself as of a particular type, and modern identification of it as a phratry depends upon Hesychius s.v. Laphryadm (A 436) identifying that group as a phratry at Delphi. As Sebillotte has pointed out, there were many different names for gentilicial groups in different Greek cities, and use of the name phratry for the Labyadai may be unduly Athenocentric, but the functions that they perform are broadly similar to those of phratries at Athens, and they include Poseidon Phratrios among the gods by whom they swear oaths (see 5, 61; on the variety of gods termed ‘Patroos’/’Phratrios’ see Plato, Euthydemus 302 b–d, Lambert, Phratries, 205 ff.).

Gentilicial groups often traced themselves back to a single eponymous figure, in this case Labys, said by the scholiast on Plato, Philebus 43 c, to have been a eunuch temple-servant at Delphi who invented the proverb “Know yourself” (Chilon and Thales were also credited with that proverb). An inscription carved into a rock above the road from Arachova to Delphi also mentioned the Labyadai (RA 1969, i. 47–56), and two further versions of at least part of the regulations inscribed here survive, one (recording what is here lines D. 10–23) from Delphi (C. Delphes 9 bis) and one (recording what is here lines D. 31–8), recently discovered and to be published by John Camp, from Panopeus. The other Delphi version is in late sixth- or early fifth-century lettering and was presumably the text which this block replaced; the Panopeus version is presumably that mentioned in D. 30. What survives of the late archaic inscription seems to be word for word the same as this inscription, but we cannot know whether the earlier law was simply reinscribed on this block or whether this block incorporated the earlier law into more extensive regulations. The text on the block seems to have been at least partly up-dated in its language and orthography, and this up-dating, together with the letter forms, suggests a late fifth-century or early fourth-century date. The inscription provides a striking example of the common difficulty of deciding what is new in a surviving inscription and what is taken over from earlier texts.

This text gives us a rare glimpse of a gentilicial group at work outside Attica. It offers instructive parallels to and contrasts with not only the Attic inscription of the Demotionidai (5), and inscriptions from Tenos and Chios (61, 87), but the sacrificial calendars of Athenian gene and demes (compare here 37 and 63), and the late fifth-century funeral regulations from Geos (IG xii. v. 593=SIG3 1218). The Labyadai clearly constituted an important part of the Delphian citizen body: the 182 votes recorded here (A. 22–3) are to be compared with the 454 and 353 votes recorded in two fourth-century records of decisions by the Delphian citizen body (F. Delphes, iii. i 194; RPh xvii 1943, 62–86), and this law raises important issues about the relationship between Labyadai and state.
Sides A and B concern the role of the tagoi, who appear to be the main officers of the Labyadai, in particular with regard to the sacrifices and offerings which were the mark of admission to the group. Side C opens with regulations about the settling of disputes and proceeds with regulations about burial. Side D is concerned with the calendar of festivals, although much on this side is obscure.

The Labyadai seem to have quite a complicated administrative structure. We do not know how many tagoi there were in office at once, but they are the executive officers and have a very wide remit. (Although the name tagos has been taken to be a sign of Thessalian influence, the word seems to have been widely used for magistrates over the whole of central Greece: see Helly, L’Etat thésalien, 27–9.) Decisions are taken by the Labyadai as a whole at an assembly (άληθα; the Delphians refer to their assembly in this period as an ἀγορά (τελείος)), which holds at least some stated meetings and which can be summoned by a single phratry member (A. 42–3, B. 23–4). The Labyadai record the number of votes by which a motion was passed (A. 22–3) and have a quorum (B. 9–10 cf. 99). They also apparently form a court before which cases involving group business are heard, and which has the power to remove membership rights and to impose fines. In addition, the inscription mentions damiorgoi, a term of disputed meaning (see Rhodes with Lewis, p. 137 and n. 17) which perhaps covers all group officials (D. 19–20), pentamaritai (‘five-day officials’ D. 16) who appear to have sacrificial responsibilities, and ‘the Fifteen’ (D. 22) who are here made responsible for collecting fines. Whether these are all officials of the Labyadai is not entirely clear: part of the oath of new members, which they swear by Apollo the god of Delphi as well as by Poseidon Phratrios, is to vote according to the laws of Delphi (B. 10–17); this implies a close relationship between entry to the phratry and entry to political life at Delphi, and it may be that one or more of the magistracies mentioned is Delphian rather than Labyad.

Like many early laws, these regulations lay great stress on controlling the officers —so much so that the admissions procedure is not itself clearly laid out. Indications in the text and parallels from phratries elsewhere (Lambert, Phratries, ch. iv) suggest that there are three points of admission to the Labyadai. Offerings of cakes (called here daratai) are made to mark some sort of recognition by the group of children and wives—recognition probably of boys only at birth or in their early years, and of wives at marriage. Then at maturity boys (probably) become full members by offering a sacrificial victim (called here apellaia). In all cases permission for the offerings to be made has to be given at a quorate meeting (B. 5–8), and then confirmed by the particular patria (sub-group of the Labyadai) to which the new member will belong (A. 23–8). The offerings are to be made within a year of the decision, and the offering of apellaia has to happen at the festival of the Apellai (the Delphic equivalent of the Ionian festival of the Apaturia: compare 5). The offerings can be postponed for one
year on payment of a stater deposit (the word ἀμμόνων occurs only here), but for one year only (A. 46–58).

Side C opens with the end of regulations about the bringing and hearing of complaints which begin at the end of B. Too much is lost for it to be at all clear what is at issue here. C then continues with regulations about burial (on such regulations see Engels, Funerum sepulcorumque magnificentia, and R. Garland, BICS xxxvi 1989, 1–15). Here the point is extremely clear: funeral expense and funerary display are being strictly limited. This law is closely comparable both to laws mentioned in literary sources (e.g. regulations of burial attributed to Solon at Athens, Plutarch, Solon 21. v–vii, [Dem.] xliii. Macartatus 62, and the regulations collected by Cicero, De Leg. ii. 62–6) and to other epigraphic laws, especially those from late fifth-century Iulius on Ceos and from third-century Gambreion (LSAM 16 = SIG 1219); all are concerned to limit the possibility of turning a funeral into a display of wealth and power (compare the interesting remarks of SeaforD, Reciprocity and Ritual, ch. iii). At Iulius no more than three funerary vestments were allowed, and they had to be white and cost less than 300 dr. At Gambreion the clothes of the mourners are regulated: brown for women, and brown or white for men. Here three vestments are mentioned, and although the specification of the thick shroud perhaps implies that there might be a thin shroud also, the spirit of the legislation appears to be that the only item visible would be the brown shroud. The monetary limit is very low, by comparison not just to Ceos but to the regulations in Plato’s Laws (xii. 959 B), which allow 100 dr. for a member of the fourth class, 500 for a member of the highest class. This raises the question of whether the sums here, as perhaps elsewhere in the inscription, where the level of fines is also very low, were not brought up to date when the old regulations were reinscribed. These regulations share the Gean insistence on processing in silence, but by comparison with Ioulis, which is interested in consumption of wine and food at the tomb and with purification of the house of the dead, and Gambreion, which is interested in the length of mourning, the Labyadai are notable for their interest in limiting lamentation and in controlling exactly who can remain at the tomb. In this the closest parallel is with Solon’s legislation (see also Plato, Laws xi. 960 α). The various visits to the tomb subsequent to the burial are not forbidden here, as the thirtieth-day commemoration is at Iulius, but lamentation is banned.

Side D is the most difficult to understand. The matter ought to be straightforward: we have here a list of festivals giving rise to group feasts. (On sacred calendars generally see on 62.) But into this list are inserted two almost incomprehensible clauses. The opening list gives (civic) festivals in chronological order (the Delphic year, like the Athenian, began in midsummer). Many of them bear the name of the month that they fall in, and this enables us to see that the distribution is not even. Five fall in the first half of the year (one in each month except the third month, Boaithos); no festival occurs in the seventh month, Amalios, and none in the last month, Ilaios, but ten in the intervening four months (roughly February to May). Of the fifteen festivals mentioned, eleven are not otherwise known at Delphi, and many cannot even be attributed to a particular deity, but they certainly include a wide range of deities (Hera, Artemis, the Dioscuri, Heracles, Demeter, almost certainly Dionysus)
and several of them have titles paralleled by festivals elsewhere. With the exception of the Apellai, the festivals seem to be festivals celebrated generally at Delphi, to which a feast of the Labyadai is attached. But the Labyadai do not feast on the occasion of all the city festivals: they celebrate the festival of the birth of Apollo on 7th Bysios, traditionally held to have been originally the only day of the year on which the Delphic oracle could be consulted (Plutarch, *Quaestionesisque* 292 E–F), but do not themselves mark the Pythia, which fell in the month Boukatos (August). (For an attempt to show that the Labyadai celebrate a coherent annual cycle of festivals see E. Suarez de la Torre, *Kernos* x 1997, 153–76 at 164–7 and 175–6.)

At the end of the main list of civic festivals which are occasions for feasts (D. 2–11) is a list of other occasions when Labyadai sacrifice (D. 12–17). What is the point of this list? Two interpretations are possible. On one, this is an addition to the list of festivals: that is, the group also feasts whenever a member sacrifices, is present at a birth, entertains foreigners, and so on. On the other, this is a list of invalid excuses for not taking part in the group feasts: giving a strong sense to *koautwr* , one is to join the Labyadai feasts at the festival even if one is otherwise sacrificing oneself, present at a birth, entertaining foreigners, and so on. The first interpretation renders the potential number of group feasts very large indeed (cf. Ath. iv. 173 E on Delphi in general), and the potential number of people turning up to a private sacrifice equally large (note the 182 voting members at A. 22–3); the latter presupposes that the group feasts are occasions to which members are obliged to go. On the former interpretation the fines for contravention of the regulations would presumably be levied on someone who failed to make the group members welcome at a sacrifice which they were holding; on the latter interpretation the fines would be levied on a person who failed to attend group feasts. The latter interpretation has the advantage of explaining why the regulations immediately move to clauses about non-attendance (and misbehaviour) at the assembly, regulations which seem to have nothing to do with religious festivals. But despite the difficulties, we favour the view that this law obliges group members to admit other members who wish to attend to feasts on the occasion of private sacrifices, rather than the view that all Labyadai were obliged to attend every feast; penalizing non-attendance at a feast would be surprising given that an officer’s non-attendance at an assembly brings only a one obol fine (D. 26–8).

There follow provisions for enforcement (D. 17–29). In the middle of these, reference is made to what is inscribed inside a rock at Panopeus and we are told about the sacrificial animals and perquisites which Phanotos gave to his daughter Boupyga (D. 29–38). We are then told that the stated items are to be given to the Labyadai by any individual or representative of a city who sacrifices in advance of consulting the oracle (D. 38–43). The inscription ends with a curiously brief list of Labyad sacrifices and feasts (D. 43–51).

Of the various problems that this sequence of items raises, one has recently been solved: it is now known what was inscribed at Panopeus, since the inscription has been found. That text, as John Camp has kindly informed us, resolves one question of reading: the character who gave the sacrificial animal and perquisites to his daughter is now revealed as Phanotos, presumably the eponymous hero of Panopeus/Phano-
teos. These gifts seem to form the basis and precedent for the offerings demanded of oracular consultants. Scholars have doubted whether every party consulting the Delphic oracle can have been expected to provide animals and perquisites on this scale to a Delphic phratry, and the identity of the giver as Phanotos offers some support to restriction to consultants from Panopeus, suggested by Vatin (C. Delphes, pp. 80–1).

The final list makes it clear that the Labyadai sacrifice on the occasion of the first two feasts mentioned at D. 2–11 and specifies the deities honoured, but what the statement that ‘feasts are held in their season’ adds to that earlier list is quite unclear.

The puzzles posed by D turn on precisely the area about which the inscription is in other ways most revealing: the relationship between this group and the city. Civic sub-groups, as many other inscriptions in this volume will show, frequently have institutional structures and concerns closely parallel to those of the city as a whole. But here at a number of points we find ourselves not at all clear as to the limits of Labyad authority. Is admission to the Labyadai at maturity also admission to civic life at Delphi? Does the group have judicial rights over its members, or do Delphic officials have a role in group regulation? Why are the Labyadai regulating funerals at Delphi when parallel legislation elsewhere is issued by the whole civic body? (or is this

2

Athens honours loyal Samians, 403/2

Three contiguous fragments of the lower part of a stele, of which the upper part contains M&L 94 ~ Formara 166; at the top of the stele are a relief showing Athena and Samian Hera clasping hands, and a heading relating to the whole dossier. These fragments found between the theatre of Dionysus and the odeum of Herodes Atticus in Athens; now in the Acropolis Museum. Phot. Kern, Inscriptiones Graecae, Taf. 19; Schede, The Acropolis of Athens, pl. 101 (cf. pp. 114–16); Kirchner, Imagines 1, Taf. 19 Nr. 43; Meyer, Die griechischen Urkundenreliefs, Taf. 10 A 26;

M. J. Osborne differs from earlier edd. at a few points on how many letters can be read.
the Delphian law, adopted and reiterated by the Labyadai? Do the Labyadai have a privileged interest in Delphic civic festivals and the sacrificial activities that surround the Delphic oracle? In the past gentilicial groups have sometimes been thought of as pre-polis institutions, or at least as institutions which became increasingly sidelined by the growth of civic institutions. The reinscription, and perhaps revision and expansion, of the regulations of the Labyadai, along with the parallel activities of the Demotionidai in Attica at about the same time (5), remind us that institutions which traced their history into the distant past, and which in some of their rituals continued to repeat actions which had already been going on for centuries, continued to assert their place in the life of the Greek city in the fourth century.

The inscription contains various dialectal features which mark it out from Attic, some of which are general features of (North-)West Greek dialect and some of which are particular to Delphi. These include ἄντι for ἀντί (B. 44), -οτι for -οντι, infinitive in -έν rather than -έν (A. 31 etc.), use of κα rather than ἀρ, use of τοί and ταί for the plural of the article, use of both ποτ (C. 31) and ποί (A. 14, C. 30) for ποίος; the apocope of παρά (A. 28 etc.), the assimilation of final ν and final 5 (A. 3, 10, 57 etc.), crasis of and to (B. 17, D. 7 etc.), α for αι in φασώτος (C. 24) and ο for α in ἐντοφήμων.

Lawton, Reliefs, pl. 38 no. 71 (last three top of stele, with relief; our Pl. 1.

Attic-Ionic, mostly retaining the old ε for α and ο for ας; see also Shipley, History of Samos, 131–5.

Resolved by the council and the people. Pandionis was the prytany; Aggrrhius of Colytus was secretary; Euclides was archon [409/2]; Callias of Oa was chairman. Cephasophon proposed:

41

Praise the Samians because they are good men with regard to the Athenians; and everything shall be valid which the people of Athens decreed previously for the people of Samos. The Samians shall send to Sparta, as they themselves demand, whoever they themselves wish; and, since in addition they ask the Athenians to join in negotiating, choose envoys in addition, and these shall join with the Samians in negotiating whatever benefit they can, and shall deliberate in common with them. The Athenians praise the Ephesians and the Notians because they received enthusiastically those of the Samians who were outside. Bring the Samian embassy before the people to do
Samos loyally supported Athens, and served as Athens’ principal base in the Aegean, from 412 to the end of the Peloponnesian War in 404; it continued to hold out against Sparta after the capitulation of Athens; but eventually it submitted to Lysander, who expelled the pro-Athenian democrats (or at any rate some of them), restored the anti-Athenian oligarchic exiles (cf. Thuc. viii. 21, referring to 412), and installed a governor and a decarchy, a ruling clique of ten men (X. H. iii. 6–7, D.S. xiv. 3 iv–v). In 405/4, before either city had surrendered to the Spartans, in the first decree recorded on this stele (M&L 94 ~ Fornara 166) the Athenians awarded citizenship to the Samians, promised them independence and the freedom to choose their own form of government, and undertook to join them in negotiation with Sparta. If that
business if they ask for anything. And also invite the Samian embassy to dinner in the pryta
neion tomorrow.

§ iii

51 Cephisophon proposed: In other respects in accordance with the council; but the
Athenian people shall decree that there shall be valid what the people of Athens
decreed previously for the people of Samos, as the council in its probouléma brought
before the people. And invite the Samian embassy to dinner in the pryta
neion tomorrow.

§ iii

56 Resolved by the council and the people. Erechtheis was the prytany; Cephisophon
of Paeania was secretary; Euclides was archon; Python from Kedoi was chairman.
Eu— proposed:

58 Praise Poses of Samos because he is a good man with regard to the Athenians; and, in
return for the benefits which he has conferred on the people, the people shall give him
a grant of five hundred drachmas for the making of a crown: the treasurers shall give
the money. Bring him before the people, and he shall find from the people whatever
benefit he can. The book of the decree the secretary of the council shall hand over to
him immediately. And invite the Samians who have come to hospitality in the pryta
neion tomorrow.

64 —— proposed: In other respects in accordance with the council; but praise Poses of
Samos and his sons because they are good men with regard to the people of Athens.
And what the people of Athens decreed previously for the people of Samos shall be
valid; and the secretary shall write up the decree on a stone stele, and the treasurers
shall provide the money for the stele. The people shall give Poses a grant of a thousand
drachmas for his goodness towards the Athenians, and from the thousand drachmas
shall make a crown, and shall inscribe on this that the people crown him for his good-
man-ship [andragathia] and for his goodness with regard to the Athenians. Praise the
Samians also because they are good men with regard to the Athenians. And if they
want anything from the people, the pryta
neis shall bring them forward to the people
always first after the sacred business. The pryta
neis shall also bring forward the sons
of Poses before the people at its first session. Invite also to hospitality in the pryta
neion Poses and his sons and those of the Samians who are present.

decree was inscribed in Athens at the time, the stele was probably demolished by the
oligarchy of the Thirty.¹ This stele has a heading naming Cephisophon as the secre-
tary— which he was when the last of these decrees was enacted (§ iii: II. 56–7): the three
decrees were inscribed together after the enactment of the last; the relief stresses the
continuing friendship between Athens and Samos. How many Samians took up the
offer of Athenian citizenship and migrated to Athens, we do not know; Shipley sees

¹ For demolition by the Thirty and republication afterwards cf., e.g., Tod 98; the same was to happen at the
end of our period, when a decree for Euphron of Sicyon enacted in 323/2 was demolished by the subsequent
oligarchy and republished with a further decree in 318/17 [IG ii² 448].
Sparta’s imposition of a decarchy as a sign that the bulk of the population stayed in Samos and needed to be controlled in the Spartan interest.

In the second decree (i.e. §11, the first printed here) the secretary, Agyrrhius, was one of the leading politicians in Athens in the late fifth and early fourth centuries, inter alia being the man who introduced payment for attending the assembly (Ath. Pol. 41. iii), and was the uncle of another leading politician, Callistratus (for Agyrrhius cf. on 26; for Callistratus cf. on 31); Cephasophon, the proposer, is presumably the man who was secretary when the last decree was enacted, and according to X. H. ii. iv. 36 was one of the envoys sent to Sparta ‘from the private citizens in the city’ before the restoration of the democracy in 403 (see APF, 148). The provisions of the first decree are reaffirmed (cf. below). The Samians whose demand is granted here will be the pro-Athenian exiles; joint negotiation with Sparta had been promised in the first decree (ll. 24–5); the negotiation now envisaged presumably concerns the return of these exiles to Samos, and Athenian involvement may help because of the links established with Pausanias and others when the democracy was restored at Athens. Ephesus and Notium, on the Asiatic mainland north-east of Samos, will have been natural places of refuge for men driven out of Samos (A. Andrewes suggested that at the time they were in the hands not of Lysander but of the Persian Tissaphernes: Phoen. xxv 1971, 214). The council had responded to the Samians’ requests with the proboukuma which it sent to the assembly; the clause about access to the assembly, which has several parallels, is in effect an open clause in the proboukuma, in which the council invites the assembly to add to the benefits which it is itself recommending (cf. Rhodes, Boule, 281–3). The hospitality offered to honorands is regularly called xenia (‘hospitality’) when offered to foreigners but deipnon (‘dinner’) when offered to Athenians, who are not xenoi (cf. Rhodes, ZPE lvii 1984, 193–9; and in our collection notice particularly 31, 70)—and as a result of the first decree the Samians are now Athenians. Invitations for ‘tomorrow’ are almost invariable; but two fifth-century decrees invite for ‘the customary time’ (IGr 11, 165), and one of 369/8 invites for ‘the third day’ i.e. the day after tomorrow, presumably because some special observance made the usual day impossible (SIG 3.158 = I. Delos 88).

The proboukuma is supplemented by an amendment, proposed in the assembly by the same man, Cephasophon, with the formula which indicates that the proposal being amended was contained in the proboukuma. It was common Athenian practice both to correct the original proposal in the light of the amendment and to publish the amendment after the corrected proposal (M&L 90 ~ Fornara 160 provides a particularly clear example); but in the last of these decrees, below, the original proposal is not corrected. Here the proboukuma has been corrected: it is possible that both of the items mentioned in the amendment had been omitted from the proboukuma (the first, because reaffirmation of the first decree was thought unnecessary—and the Samians may have taken advantage of the open clause to ask for it; the second out of inadvertence); another possibility is that the inadvertence corrected in the second item was not omission of the invitation but failure to remember that the Samians ought to be invited to deipnon rather than xenia (cf. Rhodes 1984—but see also below).

In the final decree (§iii) Cephasophon appears as secretary; Python, the chairman,
is the earliest known member of a family attested over seven generations (APF, 485–6); a possible proposer, both of the original motion and of the amendment (though this is far from certain, and indeed the same man need not have proposed both), is Euripides, a major figure of the 390s (APF, 202–4). Characteristically, we are not told what Poses’ particular benefits to Athens were; we know nothing else about him. Giving him ‘a grant . . . for the making of a crown’ is an unparalleled formulation: commonly honorands are awarded a crown of a specified value (e.g. 33), and from the mid fourth century the decree sometimes specifies who is to have the crown made (e.g. 64): see Henry, Honours and Privileges, 22–8, 34–6. A crown of 1,000 drachmas was awarded in M&L 85 ~ Fornar 155. There is no exact parallel for an amendment’s increasing the value of the crown, but in IG II² 223. A the council awards a crown of 500 drachmas on its own account and in a probouleuma invites the assembly to award a crown of 1,000 drachmas. ‘The treasurers’, who make the payments prescribed here and in other decrees of the early fourth century, are the treasurers of Athena and the Other Gods, from 406 to 385 a single board (cf. Rhodes, Boule, 103 n. 7). ‘The book (biblion) of the decree’ will be a text written on papyrus (byblos). On this occasion, apparently in the original proposal and certainly in the amendment, the Samians are invited to xenia (to explain this, some have suggested that only Samians who were in Athens by a certain date received citizenship; but perhaps here we have an oversight which was not rectified).

The amendment extends the honours to Poses’ sons, and increases the value of the crown. What is reaffirmed is probably what was voted to the Samians in the first and second decrees, and this clause is to be read with the publication clause which follows: this is an oblique way of ordering the publication not only of the decree for Poses but of the whole dossier. The Samians are now granted priority access to the assembly on subsequent occasions if they have any request (‘first after the sacred business’, which had absolute priority; cf. Rhodes with Lewis, 14 with n. 19, 543 with n. 40). Elsewhere hedra (‘session’) is used of meetings of the council rather than the assembly (e.g. M&L 85, 100, though B. D. Meritt restored hedra of the assembly in an adventurous reconstruction of SEG x 87 = IG II² 90): linguistic usage was fluid in the fifth century, and it would be procedurally more appropriate if here Poses’ sons were to be brought before the assembly, as in the original decree Poses himself was to be brought before the assembly.

We do not know what resulted from the negotiations with Sparta; but there is evidence of enthusiasm for Lysander among those who remained in Samos, Samos remained under a pro-Spartan régime at least until 398/7 and probably until the battle of Cnidus in 394, and it was recovered by Sparta for a time c.391 (see Shipley, 134–5).
Sparta liberates Delos, 403 or shortly after

Two fragments of a stele found on Delos; now in the Epigraphical Museum in Athens. Phot. a+b BCH boxi–boxii 1947–8, 417 fig. 30; REA ciid 2001, 253 fig. 1, 254 fig. 2; b LSAG, pl. 38.
a and b: 1–6 are in Laconian Doric, in a script old-fashioned for the date (LSAG, 198); 7–16 are in Attic-Ionic, in a smaller Ionian script. Both sections stucktogether.

IG v. 1 1564; Choix Delos 8; SIG* 1192 Tod 99; LSAG 407 no. 62 (all these b only); I. Delos 87*; the promised full publication of a never occurred; F. Prost, REA ciid 2001, 241–60 at 253–60.

The two fragments do not join: it is not certain how far apart on the stele they were.  b. 1–3, J. Tréheux, op. C. Vial, Delos indépendante, 92 n. 12.  b. 7–8 added later Prost.  b. 16 Tréheux, REA xxxi–xxxii 1949, 1023 n. 11: Lewis read [Δ]ΝΑ[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[-[83]0

Delos and its sanctuary of Apollo (‘the god’) were under Athenian influence throughout the duration of the Delian League; in particular, the Athenians ‘purified’ Delos in 426/5; expelled the Delians in 422; allowed them back in 421 (Thuc. iii. 104 with S. Hornblower’s commentary ad loc.; v. 1 cf. viii. 108. iv; v. 32. i). This inscription must be later than 404/3 (since none of the ephors appears in the list of eponymous ephors in X. H. ii. 10. ii, but earlier than ε.400, when king Agis died: the Spartans after defeating Athens have sent dues (tele: offerings to which they have committed themselves in the agreement) to Delian Apollo and presumably have acknowledged the Delians’ right to control their precincts, sacrifices, temples, and sacred monies. The inscription begins with a Spartan text in Laconian Doric (e.g. θωάς for θεός; the characters include Ε and Δ = δ), hiάλε is the aorist passive of ἴάλλεων: the same form is found on
3. SPARTA LIBERATES DELOS, 403 OR SHORTLY AFTER

a  

God.
2 The dues of the Spartans were sent to Delos in accordance with the agreement as in accordance with the other mutual pacts [symbola].

b  

... of the precincts and the sacrifices and the temples and the monies of the god.
7 The kings were Agis, Pausanias. The ephors were Thyionidas, Aristogenidas, Archistas, Sologas, Phedilas.
In Delos the archon was Androicus.

a fifth-century lead tablet from Himera, in Sicily, where it has been interpreted as aorist passive or aorist active (Dubois, Inscriptions grecques dialectales de Sicile, 13–14 no. 1; contr. R. Arena, ΖΕΠ ιπ ιι 1994, 157–8). The note of the Spartan kings and ephors and of the Delian archon (b. 7–18) has presumably been added by the Delians, since it is Attic-Ionic (nothing is known about the men other than the Spartan kings: the normal spelling of the last ephor would be Pheidilas). The Delian records include dedications by the Spartans Lysander and Pharax (IG xi 161. B. 59, 92; 87). For the further history of Delos see 28.

The meaning of symbola in l. a. 10 is discussed by Gauthier, Symbola, 380–1. Sparta is not otherwise known to have entered into judicial conventions (cf. his pp. 85–9), and here the reference must be to agreements concerning the sacred treasures.
Rewards for men who had fought for democracy at Athens, 401/0

Five fragments of a stele inscribed on both faces: (a) found on the Athenian Acropolis, now in the Epigraphical Museum; (b + c) found on Aegina, now in the Epigraphical Museum; (d) once in the Piraeus Museum, now lost; (e) found in the Agora. Phot. BSA xlvii 1952, pl. 27 (b + c); Hesp. xlii 1994, pl. 38 (e). Facs. BSA 1952, 103 fig. 1 (a), 105 fig. 2 (b + c), 106 fig. 3 (d, from a squeeze).

Attic-Ionic, the decree normally retaining the old e for α and o for ω. In the decree, ll. 1–2 are in larger letters, ll. 3 seqq. stoicheion δη (in the reconstruction here followed); below the decree there were four columns of names, and on the back seven (in this reconstruction), with tribe-names in larger letters than men’s names.

IG ii* 10; SIG* 120; Tod 100 (all these a only); IG ii* 2403 (d only); D. Hereward, BSA xlvii 1952, 102–17 (full

FRONT: top

[Ἀυσιάδης ἐγ]ραμμάτευε·
[Σειναίνετ]ος ἤρξε.
[ἐδοξεν τῇ βολῇ καὶ τοῖς δήμοις. Ἰπποδουντῖς ἐπρυτάν]ευε· Ἀυσιάδης ἐγραμμάτευε·
[Δημόφιλος ἐπ[εστάτε. Θρασύβ]-
[ολος εἰπε· ὅπως ἄν ἄξιας χάρισων κομίσωνται οἱ ἕξεν ὁ συνυκατήλθον ἀπὸ
Φυλῆς ὧ τοῦ κατελ[θόσα συνελάβ]-
[οντο ἐς τὴν κάθοδον τὴν εἰς Περαιά, περὶ μὲν τοῦτον] ἐφησιόθηκα Αθηναίων ἐναι
[πρῶτος καὶ ἐκγόνοι πολιτεί]-
[αν· καὶ νέμαι αὐτὸς αὐτίκα μάλα ἐς τὰς φυλὰς δέκαχα; νόμωσι δὲ τοὺς αὐτοῖς περὶ
αὐτῶν τὸς ἀρχαῖς χρήσιθαι ὡς κ]-
[αἱ περὶ τῶν ἄλλων Αθηναίων, ὃ ὅσι δὲ ἤλθον ύστερον], συνεμάχοντας δὲ τὴν
μάχην τὴν Μονεχίας, τὸν δὲ [Περαιά δ]-
[νέωσαν, ὅσι δὲ παρέμενον τῶν ἐμ. Περαιεὶ δήμοι ὃς αἱ διαλαγαί ἐγένοντο, καὶ
ἐποίω τὰ προς τῇ τούμενα, τῆ]-
[ότοις ἑναὶ ἰσοτελεῖαν οἰκίσα Αθηναίων κατὰ τὴν δοθείαν ἐγγύησαν καθάπε[μ]
Ἀ]θηναίων. ὃ τὸς δὲ [———-]

FRONT: below

col. i should have begun:

[o tête συνυκατήλθον ἀπὸ Φυλῆς]

col. iii (perhaps Pandionis):

[s ————-]

col. i should have included:

[o tête συνεμάχοντας τήμ]

[β]ραση

[mάχην τῆμ Μονεχίασων]

[κάνη]

5 [κ]αρυστό

On the reconstruction of the decree, and of the three categories of beneficiary in the list, see commentary.

We number the columns continuously, so that the first column on the back is v. For convenience we follow M. J. Osborne’s numbering of lines within columns, with the warning that the placing of the fragments is only approximate: in cols. iii and iv l. 1 is the first line of which any text survives (iv. 1 being probably lower than iii. 1), but in v–viii l. 1 is the first line of each column, whether preserved or not.

**FRONT: top**

Lysiades was secretary; Xenaenetus was archon [401/0].

3 Resolved by the council and the people. Hippothontis was the prytany; Lysiades was secretary; Demophilus was chairman. Thrasybulus proposed:

4 So that worthy gratitude may be obtained by the foreigners who joined in returning from Phyle or who joined with those who had returned in coming back to Piraeus: concerning these, be it decreed by the Athenians that there shall be citizenship for them and their descendants; and distribute them immediately into the tribes tenfold; and the officials shall use the same laws concerning them as concerning the other Athenians.

7 Those who came later, joined in fighting the battle at Munichia and made the Piraeus safe, who remained with the People in Piraeus when the reconciliation took place, and were doing what they were instructed: for these there shall be *isoteleia* if they live in Athens, in accordance with the pledge given (?), as for the Athenians. The – – –

**FRONT: below**

In accordance with the decree there should have been three lists, each organised in tribal sections. The first list, beginning at the top of col. i, should have been headed:

The following joined in returning from Phyle.

The second list, beginning in the course of col. ii, should have been headed:

The following joined in fighting the battle at Munichia.

The following fragments will have belonged to the second list:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>col. iii (perhaps Pandionis (III))</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>tanner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>retailer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nut-seller</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4. REWARDS FOR SUPPORTERS OF DEMOCRACY AT ATHENS

Σωσίβιος σκυτόπως
Σάμιον αμαξέφορος
Ιερών λαχαιροποι
Βλέπων τραπε
Απόλλωνίδης Σ... [---]

--- [---

8 γ]εωρ

Λεωντιάδος
κρομμισσός
αμαξαφόρος
Απολλο[...]

--- [---

... γ[---

col. iv:

8 γ]εωρ

Λεωντιάδος
κρομμισσός
αμαξαφόρος
Απολλο[...]

--- [---

... γ[---

BACK

col. vi includes (Aiantis):

Χαιρεθμος γεωρ
Λεπτής μαγε
Δημήτριος τέκτ
Ευφορίων δρέωκ
Κ[...]

--- [---

... γ[---

5 ησίας κηπορ

--- [---

... γ[---

and, lower down (Anthochis):

--- [---

... γ[---

vi. 8 The stone has έλαιον.
4. REWARDS FOR SUPPORTERS OF DEMOCRACY AT ATHENS

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Occupation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>——</td>
<td>barley-groat-seller</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>——</td>
<td>sailmaker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>——</td>
<td>leather-worker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>——</td>
<td>sackcloth-maker/seller</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Socrates</td>
<td>table-maker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Sosibius</td>
<td>——</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Hermon</td>
<td>——</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Gerys</td>
<td>vegetable-seller</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Blepon</td>
<td>table-seller</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Apollonides</td>
<td>——</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Apollodorus</td>
<td>fuller (?,)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>col iv</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>——</td>
<td>farm-worker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>——</td>
<td>as</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>——</td>
<td>saw</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>——</td>
<td>barley-groat-seller</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Apollodorus</td>
<td>fuller (?)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

Back

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Occupation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>——</td>
<td>farm-worker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chaeredemus</td>
<td>farm-worker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Leptines</td>
<td>butcher/cook</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>CECROPIS (VII) (?)</td>
<td>trader</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Demetrius</td>
<td>carpenter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Euphorion</td>
<td>muleeteer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Des</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hegesias</td>
<td>gardener</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Epaminon</td>
<td>ass-herd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>——</td>
<td>——</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Glauclus</td>
<td>farm-worker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>——</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dionysius</td>
<td>farm-worker</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

And, lower down (Antiochis (X))

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Occupation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Aristo</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dexius</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Charon</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Heraclides</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
During the oligarchic regime of the Thirty in Athens, in 404—403, Thrasybulus with about seventy supporters set out from Thebes and occupied Phyle, in the north-west of Attica (X. H. ii. iv. 2); he attracted more supporters, while attempts to dislodge him failed; when his numbers had reached about a thousand he moved to the Piraeus, occupied the hill of Munichia and defeated the oligarchs in a battle (§§10—22); after that he remained at the Piraeus, attracting further supporters (§§24—7); and eventually a reconciliation was arranged.

References to rewards for those who had supported Thrasybulus are plentiful but hard to fit together. For further detail on the items listed see Rhodes, Comm. Ath. Pol., 474—7.

(a) After the battle of Munichia the democrats promised *isoteleia* to any *xenoi* who would join them in the struggle (X. H. ii. iv. 25).

(b) Thrasybulus proposed, and Archinus attacked in a *graphe paranomon*, a measure to give Athenian citizenship to all who ‘joined in the return from the Piraeus’ (Ath. Pol. 40. ii).

(c) Thrasybulus proposed to give citizenship to the orator Lysias, and this was approved by the assembly but successfully attacked in a *graphe paranomon* by Archinus (Plut. X Or. 835f—836a).

(d) Two other texts allude to Archinus’ attacking Thrasybulus in a *graphe paranomon* (P. Oxy. xv 1800, frs. 6—7; Aesch. iii. Cles. 195).

(e) By a decree of Archinus the ‘men of Phyle’ were awarded an olive crown and a
40 Epigene s  
Glaucias  
Antidotus  
Dicaeus  
Andreas  
Sosibius  
Phanus  
Glaucias  
Astyages  
Dexandrides  
Sotaerides  
Sota[[—]]  
Pamphilus  
Crithon  
Corinthiades  
Cnips  

45  

50  
Sosibius  st  
Phanus  porter  
Glaucias  x—  
Astyages  hired labourer  
Dexandrides  ———  
Somaerides  ———  
Pamphilus  a—  
Crithon  sk—  
Corinthiades  ———  
Cnips  farm-worker  

55  

Then follow the heading and the beginning of the third list:  

56–7 The following remained with the People in Piraeus.

sum of money (Aesch. iii. Ctes. 187–90; Hesp. x 1941, 284–95 no. 78).

(f) By a decree of Theozotides the legitimate sons of citizens who died fighting for the democracy became, like war-orphans, the responsibility of the state and were given a grant of 1 obol a day (P. Hib. i 14, frs. a–b = Lys. fr. vi Gernet & Bizos; Hesp. xi 1971, 280–301 no.7).

(g) Non-citizens who died fighting for the democrats at the Piraeus were given a public funeral and ‘the same honours’ as the citizens (Lys. ii. Epit. 66)

(h) The decree in our collection, probably not enacted until 401/0, probably gives rewards falling short of citizenship to some if not all of the beneficiaries.

(b), (c) and (d) may all be interpreted as references to the same, general proposal (Lysias was far more distinguished than most of the potential beneficiaries, so a general proposal could easily have been remembered as a proposal for Lysias). (e), (f), and (g) are three independent but compatible measures; and our text, (h), is best not identified with (bed) or with (e) but regarded as a fourth measure together with (e), (f), and (g).

We now know that there were at any rate three categories of honorand in this document: ‘those who joined in the return from Phyle’ and ‘those who joined in fighting the battle at Munichia’, preserved in the text of the decree, and ‘those who remained with the People in Piraeus’, preserved as the heading of the list which begins in col. vi. M. J. Osborne has reconstructed the inscription so as to include all three categories in the decree and to have three tribally-organized lists corresponding to those categories, with c.70–90 names in the first list, c.290 in the second and c.560–580 in the third. He
supposes that those in the first category were given citizenship (nothing at all survives of the first list); and the second and third categories were both given *isoteleia*, 'equality of obligations' with the citizens in terms of taxation and military service (regarded as higher than standard metic status, for which see on 21), in accordance with the promise after the battle of Munichia mentioned in X. H. ii. iv. 25. *(Engyesis* in l. 9 of the decree has usually been interpreted to refer to rights of inter-marriage with citizens (*engethe* is the regular term for 'betrothal'), but Osborne follows those who refer it to that 'pledge' or promise.) However, Krentz argued that all the honorands received *atelēia* ('freedom from obligations'), and Whitehead argued that all received citizenship. Osborne restores as the proposer of the decree Thrasybulus, who wanted generous honours for his supporters; since the name of the archon ended -os (an alternative reconstruction by Krentz is highly improbable), the only likely archon available is that of 401/0.

Men granted citizenship would have to be assigned to a deme and to the *tritys* and tribe of which that deme formed a part. In the second and third lists, at any rate, the men are listed by tribe but not by *tritys* or deme, and (typically for non-citizens) they are identified not by patronymic but by occupation. Since the Athenian army was organized by tribes, *isoteleis* who were to serve with the citizens in the army will probably have needed a tribe affiliation though not a deme affiliation (but

---
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Athenian phratry decrees from Decelea, 396/5 and after


Attic-Ionic but retaining the old *o* for *ow* regularly, and *e* for *ex* irregularly, in lines 1–113. *Stoichedon* ll. 2–12; 30 (ll. 13–113) (in both cases occasionally violated after erasures, see apparatus); *non-stoichedon* ll. 113–26.


*Face A*

§1

Διὸς Φρατρίο.

ἰερεύς [[[[Θεόδωρος]] Ευφα[ντίδο]] ὁ ἐν- ἔγραψε καὶ ἔστησε τὴν στήλην. 5

ἀδε· ἀπὸ τὸ μείῳ κωλή, πλευρὸν, δ- σ, ἀργυρίῳ III. ἵν ἀπὸ τὸ κορείῳ κωλή-

2 For the two consecutive erasures after ἱερεύς see commentary below.
Whitehead disputes this; and two bearers of rare names can be identified with men who are described as isoteleis in their epitaphs: Dexandrides (vi. 49 cf. IG n° 7864 with SEG xviii 112) and Gerys (iii. 13 cf. IG n° 7863).

It was important on such an occasion to have a public list, both to publicize the honours and to avoid any dispute about who received what (cf. 14).

In the surviving parts of these lists, the occupations of the honorands are consistently humble (whereas the metics of whom we hear in law-court speeches are often of higher status); many of the names are unremarkable Greek names, but some, such as Cnips (vi. 55) and Egersis (vii. 6), are unparalleled; and others, such as Abdes (vi. 60: Semitic), Gerys (iii. 13: Thracian), Idyes (vi. 62: Carian?) and Psammis (vii. 5: Egyptian), are non-Greek, and their bearers are likely to have been slaves or freedmen before they were made isoteleis. Cf. the remark of Ath. Pol. 40. ii that some of those who returned from the Piraeus were 'palpably slaves', and the remark of X. H. n. iv. 12 that Thrasybulus' force in the battle of Munichia included many light-armed men from there. For comparable lists of non-citizens and their occupations see the lists of phialai exeleutherikai, silver bowls dedicated by manumitted slaves in the late fourth century, IG n° 1553–78, with D. M. Lewis, Hesp. xxviii 1959, 208–38, xxxvii 1968, 368–80 (re-editing and adding new fragments to 1554–9: cf. SEG xviii 36–50, xxv 178–80).

---

Face A
§1

Of Zeus Phratrios.

2 The priest, Theodorus son of Euphantides, inscribed and set up the stele.

4 The following are to be given as priestly dues to the priest: from the meion a thigh, a rib, an ear, 3 obols of money; from the koureion a thigh, a rib, an ear,
v, πλευρόν, ὦς, ἔλατηρα χουκια-ιόν, ὦν ἡμίχουν, ἀργυρίῳ τ. ******

5. ATHENIAN PHRATRY DEGREES FROM DECELEA

8 I Hedrick, in error. 19 and 22 have extra letters squeezed into them. 42 The erasure here seems simply to follow an initial error by the cutter.
a cake weighing one choinix, half a chous of wine; 1 drachma of silver.

§ii

9 The following was resolved by the phraters when Phormio was archon among the Athenians [396/5], and when Pantacles of Oion was phratriarch.

13 Hierocles proposed: Those who have not yet undergone adjudication in accordance with the law of the Demotionidai, the phraters are to adjudicate about them immediately, after swearing by Zeus Phratrios, taking their ballot from the altar. Whoever is judged to have been introduced, not being a phrater, the priest and the phratriarch shall delete his name from the register in the keeping of the Demotionidai and from the copy. The man who introduced the rejected person shall owe 100 drachmas sacred to Zeus Phratrios: this sum of money shall be exacted by the priest and the phratriarch, or they themselves shall owe it.

26 The adjudication is to take place in future in the year after that in which the koureion is sacrificed, on the Koureotis day of the Apaturia. They shall take their ballot from the altar. If any of those who are voted out wishes to appeal to the Demotionidai, that shall be permitted to him: the oikos of the Deceleans shall elect as advocates in their cases five men over thirty years old, and the phratriarch and the priest shall administer the oath to them to perform their advocacy most justly and not to allow anybody who is not a phrater to be a member of the phratry. Whomever the Demotionidai vote out after he has appealed shall owe 1,000 drachmas sacred to Zeus Phratrios: this sum of money shall be exacted by the priest of the oikos of the Deceleans, or he himself shall owe it; it shall also be permitted to any other of the phraters who wishes to exact it for the common treasury.

44 This shall apply from the archonship of Phormio. The phratriarch is to take the vote each year on those who have to undergo adjudication: if he does not take the
5. Athenian Phratry Degrees from Decelea

69—73 This major erasure marks the replacement of what was initially inscribed by a longer text resulting in **stoicheion irregularities**; further stoicheion irregularities occur in lines 100 and 106.

---

Face B

60 ἔρευς προγράφη, ἐνθαῦθα ἄγεν τα μεῖα καὶ τὰ κόρεα. προγράφην δὲ προσέπητα τῆς Δορπίας ἐν πυκνίῳ λελυκμε-ένοι ἢ ἀλτον ἢ σπιθαμαία ότο ἄν Δ-εκελεῖση προσφοτώσων ἐν ἀστεί. τὸ δ-

65 ἐ ψφίσσωµα τὸ τέλε ι καὶ τὰ ἱερεώσνα ἁναγ-ράψαι τὸν ἱερὰ ἐν στήλη λεθήνη πρ-όθεν τὸ βαμοῦ Δεκελεῖσαι τέλεις το-

ις ἐαυτοῦ.

---

§ιι

Νικόδημος εἶπε, τὰ μὲν ἄλλα κατ-

70 [[ἀ τὰ πρότερα ψφίσσωµα α κέται περὶ τ—]]

[[ἐς εἰσαγωγής τῶν παιδῶν καὶ τῆς διαδ—]]

[[ἐκασίας. τὸς δὲ μάρτυρας τρές ὡς εἰρήν—]]

[[τα ἐπὶ τῆς ἀνακρίσει παρέξεσθαι ἐκ τ—]]

[[οὐ ἐαυτὸ θαυμαστῶν μαρτυρῶν τα ὑπερωτώμενα]]

καὶ ἐπομνύω τὸν Διὰ τὸν Φράτριον.

75 μαρτυρεῖν δὲ τὸς μάρτυρας καὶ ἐπομνύ-

ναι ἔχομενος τὸ βαμοῦ. ἐὰν δὲ μὴ ἀσί ἐν τ—

ὁ(κ) θλάσκοι τότε θλάσκοι τῶν ἄμαθῶν, ἐ-

κ τῶν ἄλλων φρατέρων παρέχεσθαι, ὅταν

δὲ ἢ ἡ διαδικασία, ὁ φρατριαρχὸς μὴ π—

ρότερον διδότω τὴν ψήφον περὶ τῶν παί-

δων τοῖς ἀπασφάλερης πρὶν ἀν ὑπὲ-

τὸ τὸ εἰσαγομένῳ θαυμάζει κρύβοθν ἀ-

πὸ τὸ βαμοῦ φέροντες τὴν ψήφον διαφηβ—
vote he shall owe 500 drachmas sacred to Zeus Phratrios; the priest and any other who wishes shall exact this sum of money for the common treasury.

52 In future the meia and the koureia shall be taken to Decelea to the altar. If he [sc. the phratriarch] does not sacrifice at the altar, he shall owe 50 drachmas sacred to Zeus Phratrios: this sum of money shall be exacted by the priest, or he himself shall owe it. (lacuna)

Face B

59 . . . but if any of these things prevents it, wherever the priest gives notice, the meia and the koureia shall be taken there. The priest shall give notice on the fifth day before the Dorpia on a whitewashed board of not less than a span, at whatever place the Deceleans frequent in the city.

64 This decree and the priestly dues shall be inscribed by the priest on a stone stele in front of the altar at Decelea at his own expense.

§iii

68 Nicodemus proposed: In other respects in accordance with the previous decrees which exist concerning the introduction of the boys and the adjudication. But the three witnesses, who it is specified are to be provided for the anakrisis, shall be provided from the members of his own thiasos to give evidence in response to the questions and to swear by Zeus Phratrios. The witnesses shall give evidence and swear while holding on to the altar. If there are not that number in this thiasos, they shall be provided from the other phraters.

78 When the adjudication takes place, the phratriarch shall not administer the vote about the boys to the whole phratry until the members of the introducer’s own thiasos have voted secretly, taking their ballot from the altar. The phratriarch shall count the ballots
\textbf{ATHENIAN PHRATRY DEGREES FROM DECELEA}

5. Athenian Phratry Degrees from Decelea

\textit{Isontai. Kai tas philei tas totwn evan-
tion ton apantown frateron ton paran-
ton en tí i agorai o fratriarchos dia-
phiemou kata kai anagorevmeno upóter' an-
phiséontai. Ean de phileuménon ton the-
aisotwn einai autois fratera o allo-

1. Frateres apophisontai, defeilont-
on ekaton draxmas ierai ton Di to
fratéron otheisotai, plín osoi an ton
thiasotôn katthérai h evantimoi
phainontai ein ton diadikasiai. Ean de
apophisontai otheisotai, o de idia-
gon ephi eis to apantasa, tois de apas-

dizei einai fráter, enghraphétho eis te-

ciná grammatéia. Ean de apophisón-

tai o apantases, defeleitou ekaton dra-

2. Xmas ierai ton Di to fratéron. Ean de
apophisamonon ton thiasotôn me ephi-

ei eis to apantasa, kuría éstas h apophi-

3. Mou is to thiasotôn, o de thiasotai me-
ton allofrateron me pheronton tin

4. Philei peri ton paídon ton tek to thia-

ton evantas. To de phileisma tode prosanag-

5. Rafat ton iereías eis ton sthliar ton

6. Orkos maartérou epí tó eisagoge-

7. Geyi ton paídon maartérou oin eisagágei ean-

8. Utopi ton einai toton xeníovon en kámer-

9. Allyth tàuta tή ton Dia tò ton Fratérou-

10. Eukrêcos (t) ménoi pollla kai agathá énu-

11. [tai, el δ'] episkopoi, tainatía. vacat 7

\textbf{Siv}

Menevénos elíten deodomai tois frateres peri-
tis eisagogis tois paídon to mévol ka-
ta to protera phisismata, ópopos d' an eidois ois
frateres tois melílonos eisagésetai, apó-
graphestai tois prwton étai h de an to koúres-

12. S metropo patrðhetai kai toú [δ'] hmuo pro to
fratriarchon, toú de fratria ρχον apographi -

13. Mívenon anagraphtai ék [tibéna ópopo an δek] -
elieis prosfotówai, ékthi[énai de kai toí lepéa]
of the introducer’s *thiasos* in the presence of the whole phratry present at the meeting, and shall announce which way they vote. If the members of the *thiasos* vote that the candidate should be a *phrater* of theirs, but the other *phrateres* vote him out, the members of the *thiasos* shall owe 100 drachmas sacred to Zeus Phratrios, apart from any members of the *thiasos* who accuse him or are obviously opposed to him in the adjudication. If the members of the *thiasos* vote him out, but the introducer appeals to everyone and everyone decides that he is a phratry member, he shall be inscribed on the common registers. But if everyone votes him out, he shall owe 100 drachmas sacred to Zeus Phratrios. If the members of the *thiasos* vote him out and he does not appeal to everyone, the unfavourable vote of the *thiasos* shall stand. The members of the *thiasos* shall not case a ballot with the other *phrateres* in connection with boys from their own *thiasos*.

106 The priest is to inscribe this decree in addition on the stone *stele*.

108 The oath of the witnesses at the introduction of the boys: 'I witness that this candidate whom he is introducing is his own legitimate son by a wedded wife. This is true, by Zeus Phratrios: if I keep my oath, may there be many benefits for me, but if I break it, the opposite.

§iv

114 Menexenus proposed: That it should be resolved by the *phrateres* concerning the introduction of the boys in other respects in accordance with the previous decrees. But, so that the *phrateres* may know those who are going to be introduced, they shall be recorded with the phratriarch in the first year after which the *koureion* is brought, by name, father’s name and deme, and by mother and her father’s name and deme; and, when they have been recorded, the phratriarch shall display the record at whatever place the Deceleans frequent, and the priest shall inscribe the record on a
Classical Athens had strict criteria for citizenship: from 451/0 onwards, only those born of an Athenian mother and an Athenian father were citizens. But there was no central register of births, and the effective responsibility for policing membership of the citizen body fell upon the demes and the phratries. Every Athenian citizen had to be recognized by his deme as fulfilling the birth and age criteria for active citizenship (Ath. Pol. 42). Although no text explicitly states that recognition by a phratry was also required of citizens, phratry membership is regularly included in Athenian citizenship grants to individuals (but not to groups: Lambert, Phratries, 51-4), would-be archons were asked about their ancestral shrines of Apollo Patroos, which was probably tantamount to asking about their phratry membership (Ath. Pol. 55 iii with Rhodes ad loc.), and Athenians repeatedly used membership of a phratry to bolster claims to citizenship when challenged in the courts (e.g. Dem. 174. Euboulides 54.), or disputed phratry membership to undermine status (e.g. And. 1. Mysteries 125—6). Phratries were themselves legally required to accept as members those who had been recognised by phratry sub-groups (Philochorus, FGrH 328 F 35a), which further implies that phratry membership was something that had consequences for the city as a whole. Phratries explicitly demanded that the father and mother were properly married (see lines 109—111 here), though that did not mean that false infiltration into phratries was not suspected (Isoc. viii. Peace 88). (On whether legitimacy was demanded for citizens see Rhodes CQ 2 xxviii 1978, 89—92, Ogden, Bastardy, ch. iv.)

Much evidence for phratries outside Athens concentrates on their cultic activities (cf. 1, 87). Athenians enjoyed an active religious life as members of demes (46, 63), of gene (37), and of other religious associations; members of Athenian phratries appeared as witnesses for one another in court, borrowed money from the phratry (36. 16—35), held phratry meetings, and honoured each other, but our evidence for phratry religious life centres on the phratry festival of the Apaturia and the ceremonies introducing children to the phratry at that festival (see generally Lambert, Phratries; note also Jones, Associations, ch. vii).

This inscription, which is by far the longest and most informative Attic phratry inscription (the only other substantial document is a lease of land by the phratry Dyaleis, IG ii¹ 1241), is further testimony to the importance of phratry membership. After a brief list of the perquisites due to the priest, it records a decree passed in 396/5 and two further decrees which declare themselves to be amendments to earlier decrees, and which have no separate enactment formula. The first amendment was perhaps passed not long after 395, for it is inscribed by the same hand although on a very slightly different stoichedon grid; the second amendment was passed rather later, and inscribed by a different hand in larger letters not in a stoichedon arrangement; on
white tablet and display it in the sanctuary of Leto. The priest is to inscribe the phratry decree on the stone stele...
this strongly implies that it was only after the *koureion*, and not after the earlier *meion* sacrifice, which perhaps normally happened in the first three or four years of a boy’s life, that names were inscribed on the phratry register.

The third decree adds the provision that the names of those who are going to be introduced be written up in advance and displayed, both by the phratriarch and by the priest.

The decrees reveal a good deal about the organization of these *phrateres*. They have one phratriarch (the Dyaleis had two), and since he is treated as a chronological reference point (ll. 11—12) he presumably served for a year. The phratriarch is solely responsible for conducting the scrutiny of candidates, overseeing the voting, and conducting the sacrifices. They also have a priest who, remarkably, has to bear the cost of inscribing not only the list of his perquisites, but also at least the first two, and most probably all three, decrees. The name of Theodorus son of Euphantides which appears in line 2 of the inscription is the third priest’s name to be inscribed in that line, implying that every time a decree was added to the stone, the name of the priest was updated, but that does not necessarily mean that the priesthood was an annual office. As well as responsibility for the inscription of the decrees, the priest is charged with deciding the location of the sacrifices (lines 59—60) and with collecting fines. Together with the phratriarch, he is responsible for expunging names from the phratry register, collecting fines from those who introduced any who are expelled, and administering the oath of the *synegoroi* appointed to make the phratry case. At the point at which the priest is charged with collecting fines from those who have appealed to the Demotionidai and had their appeal rejected (ll. 41—2), he is named priest of the *oikos* of the Deceleans.

The relationship between the *oikos* of the Deceleans and the Demotionidai has excited much scholarly controversy. The decrees are decrees of the *phrateres*, but they do not make it clear whether ‘the *phrateres*’ are ‘the Demotionidai’ or ‘the *oikos* of the Deceleans’. The *oikos* of the Deceleans not only provides the priest but is the body which elects advocates (*synegoroi*) to argue the case against admission to the phratry when a rejected candidate appeals. The Demotionidai, on the other hand, are responsible for the law under which the adjudication is carried out, keep the principal copy of the register of phratry members, and vote on appeals. If the Demotionidai are the phratry, what is the *oikos* of the Deceleans and why does it and its priest have a special role? If the *oikos* of the Deceleans is the phratry, why is it the law of the Demotionidai that it operates under? The phratry has sub-groups known as *thiasoi* (mentioned many times in the second decree); if either the Demotionidai or the *oikos* of the Deceleans are themselves a phratry sub-group, how do they relate to these *thiasoi*? Are we dealing with a long-term arrangement, or are we seeing a phratry in the process of change, with one group of *phrateres* beginning to differentiate themselves from the rest as a prelude to splitting from the rest of the phratry altogether (so Lambert, *Phratries*; cf. 37 for fission in a *genos*).

The question of the identity of *phrateres* and the relationship between the Demotionidai and the *oikos* of the Deceleans is important because of its implications for the structure of both archaic and classical Athenian society. If the Demotionidai are the phratry and the *oikos* of the Deceleans are a sub-group of the phratry (so Hedrick,
following Wilamowitz), then a particular phratry sub-group could evidently play a dominating role within a phratry. This would imply some hierarchy within the phratry. We would then have, within democratic Athens, the existence of phratry sub-groups with privileged roles—roles presumably inherited from an earlier period but crucial in determining a question that might affect a man’s citizenship. (For the nature and role of the genos see 37.)

The form of the two names does not solve the question. The -idai patronymic ending is found in other phratries, but so is the -eis ending (as with the Dyaleis). Oikos is not a term used technically elsewhere at Athens (cf. MacDowell, *CQ* 39, 1989, 10–21), but it is used of phratries elsewhere in the Greek world (Geos, *IG* XII. v 1061. 16 etc.). One possibility is that the term oikos is used here in order to distinguish this group of Deceleans from the members of the deme Decelea (and from members of a phratry who belonged to the deme Decelea but not to this phratry). (It is very likely that the priest Theodorus son of Euphantides was of the deme Decelea, but evidently some in the phratry were not: the phratryarch is from Oion (Dekeleikon), the neighbouring deme.)

In the end the issue rests on whether it is more plausible that the phratryarch and the priest, who do so much together, belong to different groups or to one group, whether it is more plausible that the same body hears the appeal as initially voted against the candidate or that appeal be entrusted to some group within the phratry, and whether it is more plausible that championing the phratry’s initial vote be entrusted to elected members of the whole phratry or to men elected by some group within the phratry. We regard it as more plausible that phratryarch and priest come from the same group, that the body hearing the appeal is not the whole phratry, and that advocates are elected by the phratry as a whole; in other words, that the oikos of the Deceleans is the phratry (so Wade-Gery). The statement of Philochorus cited above attests to legal interference to reinforce the opinion on a candidate’s membership credentials of a group that was not the phratry itself, in a way exactly comparable to the role which, on this interpretation, is played by the Demotionidai. The Demotionidai surely must have cut across the thiasoi rather than being one of them, and it is perhaps most plausible to identify them as a genos, that is, a descent group independent of the phratry structure and probably distinguished by a priestly function (cf. 37). We take them to be a group known for the rigour of their own membership criteria, whose practices the phratry as a whole chose to adopt, perhaps in the face of concern at some laxness in the past, and to whom the phratry then entrusted the ultimate policing of their own rules.

Why was this phratry so much concerned with membership procedures in the early fourth century? Pericles’ citizenship law had been re-enacted with the restoration of democracy in 403 after a period during which the law seems to have been allowed to sleep. A number of references are made in fourth-century authors to demes failing to observe the rules strictly (Dem. xlv. *Leochares* 35–9, lvii. *Eubulides* 49, 55, 59; Anaxandrides fr. 4. Harpocratio (*TT* 86) Potamos (Menander); Whitehead, *Demes*, 292–3). The demise of Athens’ empire had reduced the opportunities for profiting from service as an Athenian magistrate, but the introduction of payment for
attending the Assembly created a new source of income restricted to citizens alone. Was there a particular issue at Decelea? According to Lysias' speech against him, Panceleon claimed to be a citizen by virtue of being a Plataean, and when challenged to state his deme it was identified as Decelea. He turns out, so the speaker alleges, to be unknown to the Deceleans who meet at the barber's shop near the Stoa of the Herms. We do not know why Panceleon chose to claim Decelea as his deme, but the likelihood that the meeting-place of the Decelean mentioned by Lysias (xxiii. Panceleon 2–3) is
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Alliance between Boeotia and Athens, 395

Two fragments of a stele: (a) found on the Athenian Acropolis, now in the Epigraphical Museum; (b) found in the Agora, now in the Agora Museum. Phot. (b) Hesp. viii 1939, 2.

Attic-Ionic, sometimes retaining the old ε for ει and ο for οι. ll. 2–3 in larger letters; ll. 4 sqq. stoichedon 30.

IG vii 14; SIG 122 (these a only); E. Schweigert, Hesp. viii 1939, 1–3 no. 1; Tod 101; Sot. 223; Agora, xvi 34*.

Trans. Harding 14. A.

---

[---] ot [---]

vacat

[συμ]πασχει Ὑπω[τών καὶ Λ]θηρᾶ[ῶν ἐς τὸ]-

[ν ἀεὶ] ῥώπονον. vacat

[ἐάν τις ἐμ ἐπ'] Λ[θηρᾶιος ἐπ] [τοὺς πολέμους]

[κατὰ] γῆν ἔκατ[ές ἃ ἄλατται]ν, βοηθόν Ὑ[οι]-

[εἰς ἄ] ἐπὶ [Βοιωτός ἐπὶ πολέμου] κα- [-]

[τὰ γῆν] κατα [θάλατταν], βοηθόν Λ[θηρᾶ]-

[ος παντὶ οθένει καθότι | ἄν ἐπαγγέλλα] [οι]-

[οῖ Βοιωτοῖ κατὰ τό δυνα] τῶν. ἐὰν δὲ τὰ [δ]-

[οκχῖ ή προσθεῖναι ἄθελε] Ὕ[πραι]-

[εἰ καὶ Βοιωτῶι κοινῇ] βουλευομένῳ]-

[? (?) ---]

1. U. Koehler, IG vi 6: [be] of Koehler, Hermes 1987, 1; but A. G. Woodhead (Agora, xvi) stresses that that word is normally centred on or displayed across the full width, so that this is more probably the last line of another text: see commentary.
the same as is mentioned in this decree (63-4) raises the possibility that he was trying to take advantage of the ambiguity between being a member of the deme Decelea and a member of the oikos of the Deceleans. Decelean residence patterns are likely to have been particularly disrupted during the latter part of the Peloponnesian War when the Spartans established their garrison there, and that, along with the increased attractions of citizenship in the 390s, may account for the particular timing of these decrees.

2 Alliance of the Boeotians and Athenians for all time.

4 If any one goes against the Athenians for war either by land or by sea, the Boeotians shall go in support with all their strength as the Athenians call on them, as far as possible; and if any one goes against the Boeotians for war either by land or by sea, the Athenians shall go in support with all their strength as the Boeotians call on them, as far as possible.

11 And if it is decided to add or subtract anything by the Athenians and Boeotians in common deliberation
In 395 the Corinthian War developed out of a dispute in which Sparta supported Phocis and Boeotia supported Locris; Boeotia was joined by other Greek states hostile to Sparta, including Athens, Corinth, and Argos [X. H. iii. v. 1–17, Hell. Oxy. 18 Bartoletti/McKechnie & Kern = 21 Chambers, D.S. xiv. 81. i–iii]. Boeotia was at this time a federal state, centred on Thebes (see especially Hell. Oxy. 16. iii–iv = 19. iii–iv).

This is the copy of the alliance published in Athens: the text that survives gives simply a subject-heading and the treaty, without the decree by which the Athenians approved it, but if our interpretation is correct it is probable that the decree was inscribed above the treaty (cf. below); for this pattern cf. Tod 124 ~ Harding 38, of 377; for the more usual practice, by which the heading precedes the decree, cf. Tod 103 ~ Harding 2, of 394.

The subject-heading includes the provision ‘for all time’, which is not included in the surviving text of the treaty which follows: alliances made for all time rather than for a specified period are known from the sixth century (cf. M&L 10 ~ Fornara 29), and at Athens from the fifth century (cf. M&L 63, 64 ~ Fornara 124, 125). The alliance is a standard defensive alliance, in which each party undertakes to respond to the call of the other if attacked (but it is called a symmachia: the Greeks do not always distinguish a defensive alliance as an epimachia, as in Thuc. i. 44. i). Provision for amendment by

---
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Athenian casualties in the Corinthian War, 394

A. The upper part of a stele found in the Outer Ceramicus; now in the National Museum (No. 754). Under an ornate anthemion is an epistyle, on the left-hand half of which the text is inscribed; below it there will have been a relief, now lost. Facs. AM xiv 1889, 407; phot. Möbius, Die Ornamente der griechischen Grabstelen, Taf. 9. d (right-hand half); Bugh, The Horsemen of Athens., fig. 11a (text not legible).

Attic-Ionic, but twice (for different kinds of ending) using the form -ερε, for which see Threatte, The Grammar of Attic Inscriptions., ii. 183, 188, 239–42. The final column appears to be a subsequent addition to the original text.

SIG* 131; IG iv 5222*; Tod 104. Trans. Harding 19. B.

A

οἷς ἵππεῖς ἀπέθανον ἐν Κορίνθωι: Μηλησίας, Ὀυντορίδης, Λυσίθεος, Πάνθιος, Νικόλαιος, ἐν Κορωνείᾳ.

φύλαρχος Λυτφάνης,

Θέαγγελος, Φάνης, Δημοκλῆς, Δεξίλεως, Ἐνδήλος, Νεκλείδης.

B

Δεξίλεως Λυσανίος Θορίκος.

ἐγένετο ἐπὶ Τεισάνδρον ἀρχιντὸς,

ἀπέθανε ἐπὶ Εὐπολίδο, ἐγ Κορίνθωι τῶν πέντε ἱππέων.

---
agreement of both parties, conjecturally restored in ll. 11 sqq., is a common feature of inter-state documents (cf. Rhodes with Lewis, 517).

There also survives, in a similar script and with similar formulation, an alliance between the Athenians and the Locrians (Tod 102 ~ Harding 16). In that case there was definitely a text, very probably the Athenian decree, before the subject-heading and the treaty. Unfortunately, the treaty is simply with the ‘Locrians’, and does not enable us to resolve the disagreement between X. H. iii. v. 3 (the eastern, Opuntian Locrians) and Hell. Oxy. 18. ii = 21. ii, Paus. iii. 9, ix (the western, Ozolian Locrians): both were to fight on the anti-Spartan side in the war; but the eastern Locrians adjoined the Boeotians, and the Boeotians would be more likely to support them in a dispute with the Phocians (cf. J. Buckler, in Tuplin (ed.), Xenophon and His World, forthcoming, suggesting a valley in the north-east of Phocis as the disputed territory).

The Corinthian War was ended by the Peace of Antalcidas (the King’s Peace) in 386, one consequence of which was the dissolution of the Boeotian federation with which Athens had made this alliance. It is possible that immediately after that dissolution Thebes still considered itself to be an ally of Athens, but renounced the alliance after the Athenian Thrasybulus of Collytus was involved in an unsuccessful plot (Lys. xxvi. Evand. 23, Aristid. Panath. 173 Dindorf = 294 Behr, with schol. [iii. 280 Dindorf], discussed by E. Schweigert in Hesp. viii 1939).

B. A gabled stele found in the Ceramicus outside the Dipylon Gate; now in the Ceramicus Museum (P 1130). The text is inscribed below a relief showing a cavalryman striking a fallen enemy with a spear. Phot., e.g., Bury & Meiggs, 340 ill. 12. 1; Sealey, History of the Greek City-States, 391; Bugh, fig. 12; Spence, The Cavalry of Classical Greece, pl. 11; Osborne, Archaic and Classical Greek Art, 14 pl. 3.

Attic-Ionic, retaining the old o for ou; inscribed in letters 0.04 m. (= 1½ in.) high.

SIG* 130; IG ii 6217*; Tod 105. Trans. Harding 19. G.

See in general Brueckner, Die Friedhof am Eridanos, 57–64 (B); E.Pfuhl, AA 1932, 1–7 (B); Clairmont, Patmos Nomos, 212–14 no. 68b (A); id., Classical Attic Tombstones, ii, no. 2.209 (B); S. Ensoli, MAL xxix 1987, 155–329 (B); G. Németh, ZPE civ 1994, 95–102; Osborne, Archaic and Classical Greek Art, 13–16.

A

The following cavalrymen died at Corinth: Melesias, Onetorides, Lysitheus, Pandius, Nicomachus, at Coronea: the phylarch Antiphanes, Theangelus, Phanes, Demodces, Dexileos, Endelus, Neocides.

B

Dexileos son of Lysanias of Thoricus. Born in the archonship of Tisandrus [414/13]; died in that of Eubulides [394/3], at Corinth as one of the five cavalrymen.
The appearance of Dexileos in A as well as B allows us to date both monuments to the same year, and we can associate with them a third monument of which a fragment survives, a list in tribal columns of those who died ‘in Corinth and Boeotia’, including at least two generals (IGII² 5221 ~ Harding 19. A, cf. Clairmont, Patris Nomos, 209–12 no. 68a, noting that the texts of this and A are the work of the same mason), inscribed below a relief (see below: phot. Bugh, fig. 11b; Spence, pl. 13, Osborne, 13 pl. 2). Paus. i. 29. xi mentions the tomb of those who died ‘around Corinth’.

In the second year of the Corinthian War, 394, the Spartan regent Aristodemus was victorious at the River Nemea, near Corinth, in the early summer (X. H. iv. ii. 9–23, D.S. xiv. 83. i–ii), and then king Agesilaus, recalled from Asia, was victorious at Coronea, in Boeotia, in late August (X. H. iv. iii. 13–23, Ages. ii. 6–16, D.S. xiv. 84. i–ii, Plut. Ages. 18. i–19. iv). It is likely that the battle of the Nemea was fought at the end of 395/4, that IGII² 5221 and A refer to the whole campaigning season of 394, and that Dexileos’ death ‘at Corinth’ in 394/3 was not in the major battle (e.g. Beloch, GG², iii. ii. 217–18, arguing from X. H. iv. iii. 1, on Agesilaus’ return, Aristid. Four 286 Dindorf = 578 Behr, probably meaning to date the battle to 395/4), but many believe that the major battle was fought at the beginning of 394/3 and that Dexileos did die in that battle (argued fully by E. Aucello, Helikon iv 1964, 31–6).

There remain uncertainties about the scope of A, with eleven cavalrymen including Dexileos killed ‘at Corinth’ and one at Coronea, and about the body of five cavalrymen to which Dexileos belonged. According to Diodorus, about 2,800 on the anti-Spartan side were killed at the Nemea and over 600 at Coronea; according to X. H. iv. ii. 17 there were 600 Athenian cavalry at the Nemea, but Németh casts doubt on Xenophon’s figures for this battle. If in the major battles most of the fighting was done and most of the casualties were suffered by the infantry, it is conceivable that very few of the Athenian cavalry were killed in 394 and that A lists all the Athenian cavalry killed in that campaigning season. Dexileos, of Thoricus, belonged to the tribe Acamantis; it is possible though far from certain that the Mantitheus of Lys. xvi. Mant. belonged to the same tribe (cf. Davies, APF, 364–5), and his tribe suffered particularly heavy losses at the Nemea, but he appears to have been fighting as a hoplite (§§15–16 cf. 13). Certainly, A contains no indication that it is limited to members of one tribe, and probably it lists all the cavalrymen killed that year (cf. Pritchett, Studies . . . Topography, ii. 83; Németh). There have been various guesses about the body of five men to which Dexileos belonged: men who cooperated in some particular exploit (Dittenberger, SIG); an elite group, of the kind recommended in X. Hipparch. viii. 23–5 (Pfuhl, 4–7); or, less probably, a group of officers (Brueckner, JDAI x 1895, 204–7), or
those of the cavalrymen killed at the Nemea who belonged to Acamantis (Bugh, dating that battle to 394/3; Németh).

The phylarchs were the commanders of the tribal cavalry regiments (Ath. Pol. 61. v). Nothing is known about the men listed in A other than Dexileos; Endelus is the only bearer of that name attested in Athens (LGPN, ii). Dexileos belonged to a family which has left us a number of funerary monuments, placed with B in a single enclosure (see Pa 3229 or IG ii² 6217 for a stemma, and cf. Bruckner, Die Friedhöfe am Eridanos; S. Humphreys, JHS c 1980, 119; R. Garland, BSA lxxvii 1982, 135–6. A 1; his brother Lysistratus is mentioned in Dem. xl. Boe. Dowry 52 (a speech concerned with a family to which the Mantitheus mentioned above possibly belonged) as lending money, and Lysistratus’ son Lysanias is listed as his tribe’s member of a board of ten men (IG ii² 2825).

After their involvement in the oligarchy of the Thirty 404–403 the cavalry were under suspicion (cf. Lys. xvi. Mant., and Ath. Pol. 38. ii with Rhodes ad loc.), and it has been suggested that they took advantage of this campaign to demonstrate that they too had fought and died for Athens (Bugh, Spence). B, uniquely, gives both Dexileos’ year of birth and his year of death, and that may have been done in order to stress that he was too young to have been involved in the misdeeds of the oligarchy (lecture by C. N. Edmondson, cited by Bugh). It may be a further indication of the politics of this memorial that one of the five pots buried with Dexileos’ monument bears images of the tyrannicides (E. Vermeule, JDAI lxxxv 1970, 94–111).

On the reliefs see Pfuhl, 1–4; Robertson, History of Greek Art, i. 369; Clairmont; Osborne. Images of a mounted cavalryman rearing over a fallen naked enemy soldier, such as are found both on Dexileos’ relief and on IG ii² 5221, and closely related scenes, appear also on other reliefs, both from public and from private memorials, in the late fifth and early fourth centuries (Clairmont, GRBS xiii 1970, 49–58 with plates; Spence, app. 2 nos. 12, 14, 25, 26, 27, cf. 10, 13, 23, 29). The peculiarity of Dexileos’ monument appears particularly clearly from comparison with a monument for —ylus of Phlya executed ten or twenty years earlier (IG ii² 7716; Classical Attic Tombstones, ii. 130; Spence, app. 2 no. 14); although the iconography is very similar and the stele were originally of much the same width, the Dexileos composition has been elongated, and, whereas the earlier monument has two elegiac couplets neatly written in small letters above the relief, Dexileos’ monument has its much more starkly informative inscription in unusually large letters below the relief. The skilful way in which Dexileos’ monument has been constructed to suit its, very prominent, site is explored by Ensoli.

See also P. Low, PCPS xlviii 2002, 102–22.
Erythrae honours Conon, 394

The upper right part of a stele, found in the church of the Theotokos near Erythrae; now lost. Phot. *Ik Erythrai und Klaizomenai*, Taf. iii (squeeze).

Ionic, with iota adscript omitted in l. 1 and at least one instance each of the old ε for α and ο for ω (cf. on l. 16); sometimes η is used where Attic uses long α, but in 6 the Athenian spelling is taken over with the Athenian technical term δέλεα (J. Wackernagel, *AM* xvii 1892, 143). *Scheideler* 17–20, ending each line with the end of a word or syllable.

SIG² 1265; Tod 106; *Ik Erythrai und Klaizomenai* 6*. Trans. Harding 12. D.

[Dittenberger, SIG² 65: δοσιν ἀν δόξη τί 'also possible' Tod; δοσιν ἀν δόξη ΙΚ, cf. Bechtel, *Die Inschriften des ionischen Dialekts*, no. 199, but that is one letter too long.]

Conon of Athens escaped after the battle of Aegospotami in 405, went first to Evagoras of Salamis in Cyprus, and then entered the service of Pharnabazus, the satrap of Hellespontine Phrygia. Erythrae, on the mainland of Asia Minor opposite Chios, had been a member of the Delian League, but was one of the first to revolt against Athens in 413/12 (*Thuc. viii. 5. iv – 6, 14. ii*); an Erythraean is probably to be restored in the description of Lysander’s ‘navarchs monument’ at Delphi (*Paus. x. 9. ix with Rocha-Pereira’s apparatus*), and it remained allied to Sparta after the Peloponnesian War. But when in 394, after their naval victory at Cnidus, Pharnabazus and Conon toured the Aegean, detaching states from Sparta and promising them autonomy, Erythrae is one of the states mentioned by Diodorus as having responded (*X. H. iv. viii. 1–2, D.S. xiv. 84. iii–iv*).
Resolved by the council and the people.

2 Write up Conon as a benefactor and proxenos of the Erythraeans; and he shall have a front seat at Erythrae and immunity [ateleia] for all commodities, both for import and for export, both in war and in peace; and he shall be an Erythraean if he wishes. This shall be both for him and for his descendants.

13 Make a bronze, gilded likeness of him, and set it up wherever Conon resolves.

Erythrae here uses a standard enactment formula but does not identify men in office or the proposer of the decree. The honours are typical of those awarded by a Greek state to distinguished foreigners: the rank of benefactor and proxenos (the latter technically a representative in his own state of the interests of the other state, but in this case, as often when combined with the former, an honorific rather than a functional appointment (cf. F. Gschnitzer, RE Supp. xiii. 651–2); for a striking extension of the idea cf. 55); a front seat in the theatre at festivals; immunity from taxation (ateleia); citizenship; the extension of the honours to his descendants. Conon is given not immunity from taxation in general but immunity from a particular tax which was particularly likely to impinge on him as a non-resident. Some drafters of decrees were more skilful than others in the phrasing of their texts: here ll. 7–9 offer a remarkable
string of genitives used in different senses.

The erection of statues of leading figures seems to be a phenomenon which spread after the Peloponnesian War, and there was perhaps competition between friends of Sparta who honoured Lysander and friends of Athens who honoured Conon. Paus. vi. 3. xvi mentions statues of Conon at Ephesus and Samos; and Conon was the first Athenian to be honoured publicly and in his lifetime with statues in Athens (Dem. xx.

Rebuilding of Piraeus walls, 394—391

Two blocks of masonry built into the hellenistic wall at Eetionea (Piraeus): A now lost; B now in the Piraeus Museum. Paus. BCH xi 1887, 131–15; phot. Maier, Griechische Mauerbauschriften, Taf. 5 Nr. 11 (B).

Attic-Ionic, retaining the old o for oe.

SIG*: 124–5; IG ii² 1656–7; Tod 107; Maier 1–2*. See in general P. Funke, ΖΠΕ lliii 1983, 148–89.

A  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>οποφάντο αρχων-</th>
<th>οποφάντο αρχων-</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>τος, (Σ)κυροφοριώνος</td>
<td>άπο το σημιδό αρξάμε-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>μνός, ε[σ] τα κατ' Ἡ-</td>
<td>νον μεξρ' το μετώπ-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>μέραν ἐργα- ξεύγ-</td>
<td>ο των πυλών των κατά</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| εσι τός λίθος ἀγοσι | τό Αφροδίσιου επί δεξ-

B  

| άπο το σημιδό αρξάμε- |
| νον μεξρ' το μετώπ- |
| ο των πυλών των κατά |
| άπο το σημιδό αρξάμε- |
| νον μεξρ' το μετώπ- |
| ο των πυλών των κατά |

A. 2 The stone has τος κυροφοριώνος.  B. 8 Maier, cf. the α[σ]τικος of P. Foucart, BCH xi 1887, 131–2; there were alternative conjectures before Maier confirmed the reading.

One of the conditions imposed on Athens at the end of the Peloponnesian War was the destruction of the long walls and the Piraeus walls (X. H. ii. 10–23, cf. Ath. Pol. 34. iii with Rhodes ad loc.). In the negotiations with Sparta in 392/1 one of the improvements of which Andocides boasted was that Athens was again allowed to build walls (iii. Peace 11–12, etc.). Our literary sources tell us that, when Conon came to Athens in 393, he brought money from Pharnabazus and made the crews of his ships available to help with the wall-building (X. H. iv. viii. 9–10, D.S. xiv. 85. ii–iii); the first of these inscriptions, dated to the last month of 395/4, shows that the Athenians, after declaring themselves independent of Sparta by joining in the Corinthian War, were at work on the walls even before Pharnabazus and Conon defeated the Spartan fleet at Cnidus (dated 394/3 by Lys. xix. Arist. 28, cf. X. H. iv. iii. 10, mentioning the eclipse of 14 August).
8. ERYTHRAE HONOURS CONON, 394

Lept. 68–70, Isocr. ix. Evag. 57, Paus. 1. 3. i; 24. iii with Tod 128). See in general on the awarding of major honours to benefactors Gauthier, Les Cités grecques et leurs bienfaiteurs; and for statues in Athens of Chabrias and of Conon’s son Timotheus see on 22.

For Erythrae’s relations with Athens and with Persia shortly before the Peace of Antalcidas see 17.

---

A

In the archonship of Diophantus [395/4], in the month Scirophorion, for the daily-paid work.

4 For yoke-teams bringing the stones: payment 160 dr.

7 For iron tools: payment 53 dr.

B

In the archonship of Eubulides [394/3].

2 Beginning from the sign, as far as the metopon (central pillar?) of the gates by the Aphrodisium on the right as one goes out: 790 dr. Contractor Demosthenes of Boeotia, with the actual bringing-up of the stones.

---

Other texts concerned with this programme have been found, covering the years 394/3–392/1: IG II² 1658–64 = Maier 3–9, to which can be added SEG xix 145 and xxxii 165: they are inscribed on stelai and were set up by tribal boards of teichopoi (‘wall-builders’). Conon is a common name at Athens, and it is not likely that the Conon who appears as a contractor in IG II² 1658 is the famous Conon (U. Koehler, AM iii 1878, 52–3; generally agreed; contr. J. Buckler, CP xciv 1999, 210 n. 1).

In B ‘the sign’ will be a marker set up to indicate the starting-point of the work; the metopon perhaps a ‘central pillar’; and ‘the gates’ the Eetionea Gate (cf. Maier). ‘The Aphrodisium’ may be the Aphrodisium established by Conon (Paus. 1. 1. iii; cf. schol. Ar. Peace 145 = FGrH 370 F 1 and SEG xxxvi 121 (revision of IG II² 1093), 45–6), planned but not yet built, while the attribution of an Aphrodisium in the Piraeus to Themistocles by Ammonius FGrH 361 F 5 may simply be wrong (cf. Funke). Scirophorion
(4. 2) was the last month of the Athenian year, and Funke has suggested that Conon arrived shortly before that, not later than the ninth prytany of 394/3. He notes (p. 187) that this part of the fourth-century wall did not follow the line of the fifth-century wall but was a new wall, running further south and excluding the *Kophos Limen* (cf. Hammond, *Atlas*, map 10b).

We have a mixture of daily-paid work, in A, and piece-work, in B: cf. the varying
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**Athens honours Dionysius of Syracuse, 394/3**

The upper part of a stele, with a relief showing Athena, with shield and snake, holding out her right hand to Sicily (?), holding a torch. Found in the Theatre of Dionysus in Athens; now in the Epigraphical Museum. Phot. K. F. Strohecker, *Dionysios I* (Wiesbaden: Steiner, 1958), Taf. v; J. Lawton, *Reliefs*, pl. 9 no. 16; our Pl. 2.

Attic-Ionic, retaining the old o for ow; ll. 1–4 in larger letters; ll. 5 sqq. *stoichedon* 34.

| έπι Εὐβολίδο άρχοντος. επὶ τῆς [ινδιο]- | νίδος έκτης πρυτανευσύςσης: vacat |
| ήμι Πλάτων Νικοχάρος Φλυκό[ς ἔγγα]- | μμάτευε. vacat |
| εδοξεν τῇ βολή. Καυνοίας επε- π[ερ ὠν Αν]- | δροιθένης λέγει, επινέσαι Δι[ο]ύνυον τὸ- |
| [ν] τὸν Διονυσιο[ν ο καὶ Πολύ]σενον τ[ὸν κνδεστή]- | 10 [ν τὸν Διονυσίο — — — —] |

In the course of the fourth century there was an increase in the amount of information provided in the headings and prescript of Athenian decrees: this is the earliest surviving decree which identifies the prytany not only by tribe but also by number; in this instance, rather than having a separate heading, it presents the beginning of the prescript in larger letters, in the style of a heading, and then continues in normal *stoichedon* lettering (cf. Henry, *Prescripts*, 24–5, and see Introduction, p. xix); the sixth of the ten prytanies will have been about January–February 393.

It is striking that this decree honouring an eminent foreigner is formulated as a decree of the council, not of the assembly. The same is true of some other Athenian decrees of the early fourth century, including Athens’ alliance with Eretria in the same year (Tod 103), and *Hell. Oxy. 6* Bartoletti/McKechnie & Kern = 9 Chambers shows that the council could try to act on its own account in the 390s; but it does not seem credible to us that the council on its own should have made that alliance or
methods of payment used for the building of the Erechtheum in the late fifth century (IG IV 474–9 with R. H. Randall, Jr., AJA lvii 1953, 199–210). It is appropriate to find a Boeotian contractor (B. 6–8), since Xenophon and Diodorus single out the Boeotians among those who helped with the work (whereas in 404 they had wanted Athens to be totally destroyed; e.g. X. H. ii. ii. 19 with Krentz ad loc.). Cf. 94, where a Plataean contributes yoke-animals for a building project in Athens.

In the archonship of Eubulides [394/3]; in the sixth prytany, of Pandionis; to which Platon son of Nicochares of Phlya was secretary.

Resolved by the council. Cinesias proposed:

Concerning what Androsthene says, praise Dionysius the archon of Sicily and Leptines the brother of Dionysius and Thearides the brother of Dionysius and Polyxenus the brother-in-law of Dionysius — —

have honoured Dionysius, without gaining the approval of the assembly: in this case either the wrong formula has been used in l. 5 or the council honoured Dionysius and commended him to the assembly for further benefits (cf. 2. 49–50, 60–1), after which the assembly enacted a further decree which will have been inscribed below that of the council (cf. Rhodes, Boule, 82–5). Androsthenes was probably not a member of the council but a man who had been in touch with Dionysius and exercised his citizen’s right of access to the council to raise the question of honouring Dionysius, or else raised the question at an earlier assembly, which referred it to the council (cf. Rhodes with Lewis, 12, 27–9).

Dionysius, first heard of as a supporter of the Hermocrates of Syracuse known from Thuc. iv. 58–65, vi–viii, seized power in 405 in the course of a war against Carthage and formed marriage alliances with Hermocrates’ family; Sparta gave him some support; in the late 390s he was in a relatively strong position against Carthage, and was
ambitious to control the toe of Italy as well as Sicily. Politically, these honours represent an attempt to win over Dionysius’ support from the Spartan to the anti-Spartan side in Greece: according to Lys. xix. Arist. 19–20, at the instigation of Conon (and therefore slightly later than this decree) an Athenian embassy urged him to form a marriage alliance with Evagoras of Salamis (cf. 11) and to support Athens against Sparta, and did persuade him not to send ships to support Sparta. Lawton, 90–1, notes that the subject of the relief is more appropriate to an alliance than to an honorific decree, and wonders if the complete document contained inter-state agreements of some sort; but that does not seem very likely.

Nothing is known about Plato, the secretary, or Androsthenes; but the proposer Cinesias, since the name is rare, is almost certainly the dithyrambic poet of that name, mocked as thin and unhealthy by Aristophanes from *Birds* (1373–1499) to *Ecclesiazusae* (329–30) and by others. He could have proposed these honours for purely political reasons (he must have been a member of the council this year); but, since he was a poet, since this *stèle* was set up in the Theatre of Dionysus, and since Dionysius
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Athens honours Evagoras of Salamis, 394/3

Three fragments of a *stèle*, with a relief: (a) found in the Athenian Agora, now in the Agora Museum; (b) acquired by the Marquess of Sligo in 1810, now in the British Museum; (c) found on the south slope of the Acropolis, now in the Epigraphical Museum. Phot. *Hesp.* xlviii 1979, pls. 60–1; Lawton, *Reliefs*, pl. 44 no. 89 (a only).

Attic-Ionic, retaining once (l. 4) the old ε for ϵι and commonly ω for οω; ll. 1–2 in larger letters; ll. 3 sqq. *staidon* 50.

*IG* ii² 20; Tod 109 (these (c) only); D. M. Lewis & R. S. Stroud, *Hesp.* xlviii 1979, 180–93. See also P. Funke, *PE* liii 1983, 149–89, esp. 152–61.

[(a)]

\[
[\text{Ε}ναγόρα το Σαλαμίνιον.
\]

[\text{Αριστοκλῆς} \text{σιος ἐγραμμάτευε.}
\]

[\text{έθαξεν τὴν βολήν καὶ τῶν δήμων. Αἰαντίς / Λεωντῖς ἐπιτάνευε. Αριστοκλῆς ἐγραμμάτευε: Ἐθβαλλᾶς ἤρχεται.}] \text{πεστάτε. Σύλφιλος ἐπί-
\]

[\text{πε: ἐπειδὴ ἄνηρ ἄγαθός ἐστιν περὶ τὸν δήμον τὸν Ἀθηναίων καὶ ν-}
\]

[\text{ὅν καὶ ἐν τῷ πρόσθεν χρόνῳ Εὐαγόρας ὁ Σαλαμίνιος βασιλεύς}
\]

\[
[\text{ι περιφθέντας ὑπὸ}]
\]

[\text{ς ὅ ὑ τῆς πόλεις ὧς.}]

[\text{τῷ .}]

3 *Aiaντίς/Lεωντῖς* Funke (the only tribe-names of the right length). 4 *Εθβαλλᾶς* Funke; see commentary.
himself was a poet (cf. D.S. xiv. 109, xv. 6. 7. ii, 74. i–iv), it is likely that Dionysius
had prompted the hope that Athens might win his support by entering one or more
of his compositions in a competition at Athens. One of Athens’ dramatic festivals,
the Lenaea, was celebrated in the seventh month, Gamelion, about the time of this
decree.

Dionysius is given the same title, archon of Sicily, in the later Athenian decrees for
him: presumably he had made it clear that this was his preferred title (cf. D. M. Lewis,
CAH2, vi. 136–8). His brothers Leptines and Thearides appear in the literary sources
as his subordinates, often as his admirals; Leptines quarrelled with him later, but died
in his service. Polyxenus, the brother of Hermocrates’ wife, married Dionysius’ sister
Theste (D.S. xiii. 96. iii): he too served Dionysius as a subordinate, but eventually
quarrelled with him and went into exile. Such use of relatives was a common feature
of tyrannies, particularly in Sicily.

For later relations between Athens and Dionysius, see 33, 34.
Some people in Cyprus used the Greek language from at least the end of the Bronze Age, and Cypriots claimed kinship with Greeks in their foundation myths; but Greeks tended to regard Cyprus as a distinctly foreign place (Reyes, Archaic Cyprus, 11–13). In the fifth century both the Persians and, intermittently, Athens and the Delian League had laid claim to it. Evagoras, of a dynasty which claimed descent from Teucer and Aeacus of Aegina, after a period of exile established himself as ruler of Salamis under the Persians in 411. In this inscription he is given the title basileus, ‘king’: cf. Lys. vi. And. 28, though in Isoc. ix. Evag. 27 etc. he is called ‘tyrant’. Not long after 411 he was honoured by the Athenians, in a decree which refers optimistically to his services to ‘Athens, the King and the other allies’ and mentions the satrap Tissaphernes (IG ii 113 = M. J. Osborne, Naturalization, D 3, quoting lls. 35–7). That is probably the occasion
10 --- Greeks Evagoras --- proclaim --- contends --- king of Salamis --- on behalf of Greece Greek --- shall proclaim --- the secretary of the council --- in front of the image --- praise also the ---

26 --- prytany --- Conon --- praise --- crown. The herald --- when the tragedians --- Evagoras --- to the Athenians --- himself and his descendants --- all the --- write up ---

when he was awarded Athenian citizenship (Isoc. ix. Evag. 54, cf. [Dem.] xii. Ep. Phil. 10). Conon took refuge in Salamis after the battle of Aegospotami in 405 (X. H. ii. i. 29, D.S. xiii. 106. vi), and it was with Evagoras’ support that he became admiral of the satrap Pharnabazus’ fleet (Isoc. ix. Evag. 55–6, cf. D.S. xiv. 39. i–ii). Although the victory over Sparta at Cnidus in 394 was technically a Persian victory, Athens honoured both Conon and Evagoras with statues afterwards (Isoc. ix. Evag. 56–7, Paus. i. 3. ii: cf. commentary on 8), though there is no evidence that Evagoras himself visited Athens. At Conon’s instigation the Athenians urged Dionysius of Syracuse not only to become an ally of Athens but to form a marriage alliance with Evagoras (Lys. xix. Arist. 20–1, cf. commentary on 10).

What we have here is presumably the decree which awarded Evagoras his statue
and other honours after Cnidus (cf. the mention of Conon in l. 27); since fragments (b) and (c) appear to have been similar in content but different in grammar, it is likely that (c) contained a substantial amendment to the original proposal. L. 15 seems to have claimed that (although in fact in Persian service) Evagoras was fighting as a Greek on behalf of Greeks (cf. Isoc. ix. Evag. 56, 68: as a result of the battle the Greeks gained freedom/autonomy in place of slavery); 18 and 29 sqq. both refer to the proclamation of the honours; 20–1 probably referred to the publication of the text in front of the ‘image’ of Zeus Eleutherios in the Agora, a location chosen to emphasize the view of Evagoras as a champion of Greek freedom (cf. 22, 63–72 with commentary), since by the fourth century agalma is not used for statues of human beings and so would not refer to the statue of Evagoras.

Subsequently Evagoras’ power in Cyprus and beyond came to be perceived by
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Alliance between Amyntas III of Macedon and the Chalcidians, 390s–380s

The upper part of a stele, inscribed on both faces; found at Olynthus; now in the Kunsthistorisches Museum, Vienna. Phot. Hatzopoulos, Une Donation du roi Lysimaque., pls. xiv–xv; id., Macedonian Institutions, pls. i–ii. Facs. AEMÖ vii 1883, Taf. i.

Euboean-Ionic, with some Atticisms; ending each line with the end of a word or syllable.

SIG* 135; Tod 111; Pouilloux, Choix, 25; Std. 231; Hatzopoulos, Macedonian Institutions, no. 1*. Trans. Harding 21. See in general Beloch, GG*, iii. ii. 57–8; J. R. Ellis, Makedonien ix 1969, 1–8; Zahrnt, Olynth und die Chalkidier, 122–4; Hammond [& Griffith], 172–7; D. A. March, Hist. xiv 1995, 257–82.

Front

αυθήκαι πρὸς Ἀμύνταν τῶν Ἑρριδαίος.
αυθήκαι Ἀμύνται τῶι Ἑρριδαίου
καὶ Χαλκιδέωι. συμμάχους εἰν
ἀλλήλους κατὰ πάντας ἀνθρώπους[8]

5 ἐσεα πεντήκοντα, εἶν τις ἐπ’ Ἀμύν-
ταν ἐν ἕπι τῇ χώρῃ ἐπὶ πολέμου
[9] ἐπί Χα[λκιδέως, βοηθῆ] εἰν Χαλκιδέ-
[8] Ἀμύνται καὶ Ἀμύνταν Χαλκιδέους

Back

ἐξ[ἰ]αγωγῆ δ’ ἔστω καὶ πίσσησι καὶ ξύλων
οἰκοδομητηρίωι πάντων, ναπτηγη-

9 ἐξαγωγῆ J. Arnett in 1845, ἐξαγωγῆ edd., Σ carved originally but changed to Σ Hatzopoulos, but cf. ἐξαγωγῆ in l. 13.
the Persians as rebellion, and Athens' support for him was an embarrassment (see especially X. H. iv. viii. 24). Evagoras was eventually made to submit to the Persians; he survived as ruler of Salamis until assassinated in 374/3 (D.S. xv. 47. viii); for his son Nicocles Isocrates wrote ix. *Evagoras* as an encomium, and also two works of advice, ii. *To Nicocles* and iii. *Nicocles*; the dynasty remained in power until 310. On the dynasty's coinage, increasingly Greek in style, see Kraay, *Archaic and Classical Greek Coins*, 308.

Sophilus, the proposer of this decree, was the proposer of another honorific decree in 394/3 (IG ii² 19 = M. J. Osborne, *Naturalization*, D 7); probably this decree belongs to the same year, perhaps even to the same meeting (Funke), and he proposed both as a member of the council. A Sophilus is listed among the democrats who occupied Phyle in 404/3 (*SEG* xxviii 45, 53), but the name is not rare.

---

**Front**

Agreement with Amyntas son of Errhidaeus.

2 Agreement between Amyntas son of Errhidaeus and the Chalcidians.

3 They shall be allies of one another in respect of all men for fifty years. If any one goes against Amyntas, into his land for war, or against the Chalcidians, the Chalcidians shall go to support Amyntas and Amyntas the Chalcidians.

**Back**

9 There shall be export of pitch and of all building
According to Diodorus, after the death of Archelaus of Macedon in 400/399, a period of instability led to the accession of Amyntas III (xiv. 37. vi, 84. vi, 89. ii), who reigned until 370/69 (xv. 60. iii). Under 393/2 he reports that Amyntas was expelled by the Illyrians, made a gift of land to the Olynthians, but was restored by the Thessalians; ‘some say that’ when Amyntas was expelled Argeus ruled for two years (xiv. 92. iii—iv); under 383/2 he reports that Amyntas was defeated by the Illyrians and made a gift of land to the Olynthians, but he recovered unexpectedly and they refused to return the land, so he urged Sparta to make war on the Olynthians (xv. 19. ii—iii). In X. H. v. ii. 12–14 Cleogenes of Acanthus tells the Spartans that Olynthus has tried to liberate the cities of Macedon from Amyntas and is occupying various cities including Pella, and Amyntas has been virtually expelled from the whole of Macedon. According to Isoc. vi. Archid. 46 Amyntas once lost the whole of Macedon but recovered it within three months. With Beloch, we do not think the differences between Diodorus’ two accounts are such as to make it certain that the references are to two episodes rather than to one in the 380s, just before Sparta’s war against Olynthus (but against see Ellis, Hammond, March).

Olynthus, immediately to the north of the western prong of Chalcidice, aspired to be the centre of a Chalcidian state (e.g. Thuc. i. 58. ii). The cities which it had absorbed ought to have recovered their independence after the Peace of Antalcidas in 386, but either they did not or Olynthus rapidly set about absorbing them once more: for Xenophon the excuse for Sparta’s war against Olynthus was that Olynthus was forcing neighbouring cities to sympoliteiai (‘share citizenship’: on sympoliteia cf. 14) with it, and had taken over much of Macedon, but Acanthus and Apollonia wanted to retain their independence and appealed to Sparta for support (cf. above). The war lasted from 382 to 379, and ended in victory for Sparta and presumably the dissolution of the Chalcidian state. For the Chalcidians later see 22. 101–2; 50.
timbers, and of shipbuilding timbers except firs, whatever is not needed by the koinon, and for the koinon there shall be export even of these, on telling Amyntas before exporting them and paying the dues that have been written. There shall be export and transport of the other things on paying dues, both for the Chalcidians from Macedon and for the Macedonians from the Chalcidians.

With the Amphipolitans, Bottiaeans, Acanthians, and Mendaeans friendship shall not be made by Amyntas nor by the Chalcidians apart from the others; but with a single opinion, if it is resolved by both, they shall attach them jointly.

Oath of the alliance: I shall guard what has been established by the Chalcidians; and if any one goes against Amyntas, into his land for war, I shall go to support Amyntas.

Here we have an alliance made by the state which describes itself as 'the Chalcidians' and as a koinon ('community': a term applied both to units larger and to units smaller than a single polis) with Amyntas of Macedon. This text was found at Olynthus, and the first line of the heading and the first clause of the oath are formulated from the viewpoint of the Chalcidians; but a second heading has an impartial formulation: this is curious, but not so much so as to justify Zahrnt's view that this heading (along with the back) was inscribed later, after the balance of power had changed. On the front is the beginning of a standard defensive alliance (cf. 6), made for fifty years; on the back are clauses to the advantage of the Chalcidians, allowing them to export even ship-building timber from Macedon as long as they notify Amyntas and pay customs dues, and binding each party not to make friendship with neighbour states of Olynthus (evidently outside and hostile to the Chalcidian state) without the concurrence of the other. ‘Transport’ (diagoge; ll. 15–16) refers to the carriage through the territory of goods destined for a third party. Amyntas is in control of at least part of Macedon, but agrees to terms favourable to the Chalcidians: it seems unwise to us to guess at a precise date between Amyntas’ accession and 383. Later in his reign Amyntas was to make an alliance with Athens (Tod 129).

Of the hostile states, the Bottiaeans lived to the north of Olynthus, but none of the others was very near: Mende was on the western prong of Chalcidice, Acanthus north of the eastern prong, and Amphipolis 50 miles (75 km.) north-east of Olynthus. If Olynthus was a threat to all of these, it was indeed powerful.

Fir was the preferred timber for ship-building, and Macedon was one of the best sources of it; pitch was important for waterproofing ships and other timber structures (Meiggs, Trees and Timber, 118–32; 467–8). Timber for building as well as for ships is
12. ALLIANCE BETWEEN AMYNTAS III AND THE CHALCIDIANS

mentioned. The guarantee of export rights to the Chalcidians is an indication that such rights might have been refused: Amyntas does not want his ship-building timber to get into the hands of potential enemies. For regulations concerning trade and customs dues, cf. the recently-discovered inscription from Pistirus, on the Hebrus (Maritza) west of Philippopolis (Plovdiv): SEG xliii 486 = IGBulg. v (pp. xliii–xliv) 5557
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Dedications of the Lycian dynast Arbinas, c.390–c.380

Found in the Letoon of Xanthus (between the city and the coast); now in the depot there.

A. A statue-base subsequently reused in a Roman portico, with Greek texts on the front (i, ii) and right (iii), and Lycian texts on the rear and left (iv, v). Phot. CRAI 1975, 144 fig. 2 (i, ii); F. Xanthos, ix, pls. 72–9.

J. Bousquet, CRAI 1975, 138–48 (i, ii); GEG 888; F. Xanthos, ix, 149–57.

B. A statue-base with Greek texts on the front (i, ii) and a Lycian text on the left (iii). Phot. CRAI 1975, 141 fig. 1; F. Xanthos, ix, pls 74. i (i, ii), 76. 2 (iii).

A. i

[- ω-ω- Αρβίνας παίς Γέργυ[τος -ω-ω-ω-]
[- ω-ω-ω-] ἀρετῆς οὐνεί[ω-ω-ω-ω-]
[- ω-ω- έικόνων] δὲ ἤδε ἐστίν μνῆμα θ[εάσθωμ (?)]
[- ω-ω- ἀρ] ξας συνέσαι δυνάσαι τε κ[ράτιστος]


17 The stone has κεχαριμένα.

A. ii

Σύμμαχος Εὐθείδεος Πελλανεῖς μάντις ἀ[μῦσον]
dówon ἐνευε ἐλεγήμα Ἀρβίνας εὐσινη[τω]ς.

Among the Euboean features of the language is εἰναί for εἴναι (3 etc.); but in contrast with Euboean φιλίπτρ (20) the text has Attic μιᾶς (21).

---

A. i

Arbinas son of Gergis — courage — — — this likeness has been set up as a memorial to gaze on (?) — — — he ruled, mightiest in intelligence and power. At the beginning of his prime he sacked in a month three cities, Xanthus and Pinara and well-harboured Telmessus, and inspiring fear in many of the Lycians he was a tyrant.

8 The memorial of these things he has set up by pronouncement of the god Apollo. Having consulted Pytho, he has set me up as a likeness of himself, whose appearance makes manifest the might of his deeds.

For he killed many, making famous his own father; he sacked many cities, and a fine reputation throughout all the land of Asia Arbinas has left for himself and his forebears, pre-eminent among all in all the things that wise men know, in archery and courage and knowing the pursuit of horses. To the end from the beginning, Arbinas, having accomplished great deeds, to the immortal gods you have dedicated welcome gifts.

---

A. ii

Symmachus son of Eumedes, of Pellana, blameless seer, wrought these elegies as a gift to Arbinas with good intelligence.
Lycia, to the east of Caria in south-western Asia Minor, was on the edge of the Greek world in the fifth century, but easily accessible, and sometimes, though not regularly, penetrated by the Athenians (e.g. Thuc. ii. 69); in the late fifth and early fourth centuries, when Caria was under Persian control, it managed to remain effectively independent of both Athens and Persia. The family with which we are concerned here used some Iranian names (Harpagus, Arbinas), but absorbed a good deal of Greek cultural influence: here we see it not only employing Greek poets to advertise its achievements to a Greek-reading audience, but also worshipping Greek gods and consulting the Delphic oracle. Sculpture influenced by Greek works is known from Xanthus from the middle of the sixth century, and contact with the East Greek world seems to have increased during the period when Lycia was controlled by Persia. The earliest sculpture comes from tombs, but during the fifth century sculpture appears also on buildings which may have had cult purposes, and is increasingly hellenized in iconography as well as form.

The most striking of the hellenizing monuments, the so-called Nereid Monument, dated c.380 (now in the British Museum) is perhaps a monument to Arbinas. A tomb in the form of an Ionic temple on a podium which bears two sculpted friezes one above
A similar dedication by the son of Harpagus, whose name can now be restored as Gergis, has been known for some time (on the 'Xanthus stele': Greek text M&L 93, CEG 177); these stones were found in 1962 (B) and 1973 (A). Gergis (Kheriga) the son of Harpagus (Arppakhu) ruled c.440–410; he was succeeded by his brother (?) Kherēi (not mentioned in the Greek texts, but known from his coinage and from the Lycian texts on the Xanthus stele), who ruled c.410–c.390; Arbinas (Erbina) ruled c.390–c.380.
Despite the extravagant claims which they make, these rulers seem to have been powerful only in the western part of Lycia, adjacent to Caria, and Arbinas at the beginning of his reign—when he was only twenty years old: A. iii. 4–6—had to conquer Xanthus, Telmessus, and Pinara.

This family attracted the services of at least two Greeks, the ‘trainer’ of B, and Symmachus of Pellana in Achaea, the composer of A. i–ii. For the motif of the poet’s gift of his poetry to the honorand cf. Kurke, The Traffic in Praise (on Pindar), esp. 135–59 ch. vi. There were ships from Pellana in the Peloponnesian fleet in 412/11, which went to Caunus, in eastern Caria (Thuc. viii. 3. ii, 39. iii): it is possible that that is how Symmachus made contact with the Lycians. ‘Archery, courage and . . . the pursuit of horses’ (A. i. 15) reminded Robert (CRAI 1975) of the remark of Her. 1. 136. ii that Persian education concentrated on ‘horse-riding, archery, and telling the truth’, and Herrenschmidt tried to develop the idea that the inspiration of these verses was Persian. However, arete was not the same as telling the truth (we translate it here as ‘courage’), and it is generally agreed that these verses are Greek in background as well as in language (though among the Greeks we should expect ‘justice’, dikaiosyne, rather than ‘archery’, toxosyne, in A. i. 15): in particular, the poets remembered the Iliad (including its Lycian passages), and what is said of these dynasts matches what is said in Greek about other monarchs (see especially Savalli). The fact that the virtues ascribed to these rulers are rather old-fashioned Greek virtues may be due simply to the models used, or it may be more deliberate. The language is a dialectal mixture, with phrases remembered from Homer and other early poetry. The verses are metrically correct hexameters and pentameters, with the proviso that syllables of Lycian names can be treated as long or short in accordance with metrical need.
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Helisson becomes a kome of Mantinea,
early fourth century

The upper part of a stele found at Mantinea; now in the museum at Tripolis. Phot. BCH cxi 1987, 168 fig. 1.
Arcadian, with — as a punctuation mark between paragraphs.

[θεό][σ]. τύχα [ἀγα][θά].
[πά]γοσ. ἐδοξε τοῖς Μαντινείσιν καὶ τοῖς Ἐλιασάοισι[σ]. τόσ [Ἐ]λ[ι]-

2–3 [τῆς δοξής τα]ς P. Gauthier & Dubois.
A. i. 4: cf. Thuc. vi. 54. v, attributing to the Pisistratid tyrants of Athens the combination of arête and intelligence (xynesis). A. i. 5, 12: cf. Hom. II. ii. 660, Tlepolemus ‘sacked many cities (astea)’, and the Xanthus stele, M&L 93. 7-8; in the classical period that was something done by the Persians (e.g. Aesch. Pers. 65-6) rather than the Greeks; and lists of wars fought and enemies defeated are a common feature of texts set up by near-eastern monarchs (see, for instance, the Babylonian and Assyrian historical texts in Pritchard [ed.], ANET³, 265-317); we do not know what acts of destruction lie behind these claims. A. i. 6: Robert remarked that Fethiye, the port of Telmessus, is one of the finest harbours in the eastern Mediterranean (JS 1978, 26-30). A. i. 7: for rulers inspiring fear cf. Thuc. i. 9. iii (Agamemnon), vi. 55. iii (Hippias of Athens); ‘tyrant’ has not yet become the irredeemably pejorative term which it is to be made by Plato and Aristotle, and it can be used unashamedly of Arbinas. A. i. 11: cf. II. v. 679, Odysseus ‘would have killed even more of the Lycians’. A. i. 11-12: cf. Her. vii. 220. ii, ‘a great reputation (kleos) was left’ for the Spartan king Leonidas after the battle of Thermopylae. A. i. 14: ‘wise men’ (sophoi andres) in an old-fashioned sense, cf. e.g. Her. vii. 130. i. A. i. 17: cf. II. vi. 151, ‘many men know it’. A. i. 17: cf. II. xx. 298-9, Aeneas ‘always gives welcome gifts to the gods’. A. ii. 1: cf. II. i. 92, Calchas a ‘blameless seer’. A. iii. 20 sqq. (not included here) contained a comparison with the heroes of the Trojan War. B. i 6: cf. X. Cyr. i. ii. 1, Cyrus was ‘fairest in form and [various superlatives] in soul’. B. i, iii: Artemis retains in Lycian her Greek name (Ertemi), and therophonos, ‘slayer of beasts’, is a traditional epithet of Artemis (and Apollo) in Greek poetry; whereas other gods are assimilated to Lycian gods.

God. Good fortune.

1 Agreement between the Mantineans and the Heliswasians for all days.
2 Resolved by the Mantineans and the Heliswasians.
3 The Heliswasians shall be Mantineans, equal and alike, sharing in all the things in
This is perhaps the earliest surviving text relating to the kind of synoikismos by which a lesser community makes a pact of sympoliteia ('joint citizenship') with a greater, it is absorbed into the greater community, and its citizens become citizens of the greater community. Other instances include Buck 21 = Sot. 297 = IPArk. 15, revised by S. Dusanić, BCH cii 1978, 333–46, by which Euememon was similarly absorbed into Arcadian Orchomenus, perhaps c.378 (to be cited below as Orchomenus); OGIS 229 = Sot. 492 = IK Magnesia ad Sipyllum 1 ~ Austin 182, by which Magnesia ad Sipyllum was absorbed into Smyrna, in Asia Minor, after 243 (to be cited as Smyrna); IG ix. 32 = SIG3 647 = Buck 56, by which Medeon was absorbed into Stiris, in Phocis, 2nd century (to be cited as Stiris); a recently discovered agreement by which Pidasa was absorbed into Latmus, in Asia Minor, 323–313/12, calls the arrangement upohteuma (EA xxix 1997, 135–42 = SEG xvii 1563, to be cited below as Latmus: pohteuma 11. 32—3, 41).

Before this inscription was found, the 'Elisphasians' were known from a coin and from Polyb. xi. 11. vi: Helisson was one of the Maenalian communities south-west of Mantinea.1 Mantinea was originally synoecized c.470 (Str. 337, viii. iii. 2 with S. & H.

---

1 For the site (slightly more than half-way on a straight line from Megalopolis to Orchomenus) see I. A. Pikoulas, hopos xiii 1999, 97–122 at 125–6 with 113–14 maps 1–2, cf. in Nielsen & Roy, 262–3, 312 (but Barrington...
which the Mantineans share too, conveying their land and their polis to Mantinea to the laws of the Mantineans, the polis of the Heliswasians remaining as it is for all time, the Heliswasians being a kome of the Mantineans.

8 There shall be a religious delegate (theares) from Helisson as for the other polis.

9 The sacrifices shall be sacrificed at Helisson and religious delegations (theartai) shall be received in accordance with tradition.

10 Lawsuits shall be pursued by the Heliswasians and the Mantineans against one another in accordance with the laws of the Mantineans, from the time when the Heliswasians have become Mantineans, for the future: earlier matters shall not be justiciable.

13 Whatever contracts the Heliswasians happen to have had, themselves with themselves, before they became Mantineans shall be valid for them in accordance with the laws which they themselves had when they were going to Mantinea.

16 All the Heliswasians shall be registered with the epimeletai by father in accordance with their age, within ten days from when the stele-engravers come. Those who have been registered shall be reported by the epimeletai to Mantinea, and shall be registered for the thesmotoaroi during the demiurgeship of Nices, and the thesmotoaroi shall write them on whitened boards and publish them to the council-house.

21 If any one declares that one of those who have been registered is not a Heliswasian, it shall be permitted to him to make an emphasis to the thesmotoaroi in the year after that in which Nices was damiorgos, and the man who is the subject of the emphasis shall have the case tried for him before the Three Hundred in the second (?)/next (?) month after the emphasis is made, and if he is victorious he shall be a Mantinean, but if not he shall owe to the god(dess) - - -

Hodkinson, BSA Ixxvi 1981, 239–96 at 256–61; it was interested in neighbouring communities in the late fifth century (Thuc. iv. 134, etc.); it was split into its component villages by Sparta in 385 after the Peace of Antalcidas (X. H. v. ii. 5, 7, D.S. xv. 5. iv. 12. ii) but reunited in 370 (X. H. vi. v. 3–5). Helisson will not have been one of the original component villages, but will have most probably been absorbed into Mantinea either shortly before 385 or shortly after 370 (Te Riele prefers the former; but Thür & Tauber in IPArk. date this text c.350–340 (?) and Orchomenos c.360–350); according to Paus. viii. 27. iii. vii, it was one of the communities incorporated into the new city of Megalopolis in the 360s, but it appears to have been independent in the hellenistic period and many disbelieve in Pausanias' list (e.g. T. H. Nielsen in Hansen & Raaflaub [edd.], Studies in the Ancient Greek Polis, 85 n. 16).

II. 3–10 have figured prominently in the discussions of the Copenhagen Polis Centre about the significance of the words polis and kome. We believe that what is

Atlas, map 58, has a site further to the north-west). Mantinea, Helisson, and Orchomenus are all shown in Nielsen & Roy, map 3; the location of Euaemon is unknown.

meant here is that the Heliswasians are to convey their polis to Mantinea in such a way that politically the polis of Helisson will become a kome (constituent village) of the polis of Mantinea, but in other respects the polis of Helisson will remain unchanged as a distinct community. We deliberately avoid giving a cut-and-dried answer to the question whether Helisson was still a polis after its absorption into Mantinea. Strictly, at the point when this agreement was made, the absorption should not yet have taken place: what is described in 3 as ‘resolved by the Mantineans and Heliswasians’ may in fact have been resolved separately by the two communities.

For the ‘equal and alike’ status of the Heliswasians as Mantineans (4) cf. Orchomenus 4–6, Smyrna 44, Stiris 12; also the grant of Samian citizenship to Gorgus and Minnion (90. B. 27–8). It is also an expression used in connection with colonial foundations (e.g. M&L5 ~ Fornara 18. 27–8, with A. J. Graham, JHSxxx 1960, 94–111 at 108); here the implication is not that all should have equal shares of land but that new citizens and old citizens of Mantinea should have the same legal status. Thearoi (theoroi) are commonly religious delegates; in Thuc. v. 47. ix Mantinea has theoroi who with the polemarchs administer to the appropriate Mantinean officials the oath to the alliance of 420 with Athens, Argos, and Elis; presumably each polis which was constitutionally a kome of Mantinea supplied one theoros. As a distinct community, Helisson was to retain its own religious observances, and the right to receive religious delegations to them from outside Helisson: cf. Orchomenus 6 sqq., Stiris 18–24, 51–4; the Pidasans were guaranteed a share in all the rites of Latmus-with-Pidas (Latmus 10–13). P. Perlman in Hansen (ed.), Sources, 113–64 at 108, concludes that ‘communities which had lost other aspects of their former status maintained a place in the list of invitees to the panhellenic festivals and in the itinerary of the theoroi sent out to announce their celebration’.

Judicial arrangements (10–16) are straightforward. Procedures for registering Heliswasians as Mantineans and for challenging any one who falsely claims to be a Heliswasian (16 sqq.) are likewise straightforward, but include some interesting details: the closest parallel is Smyrna 45–52. Identifying men by their patronymic is common practice; their age will be needed to determine their civic rights and obligations (including military obligations); no mention is made of indicating their

---
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Grants of citizenship by the Triphylians, c.400–c.370


A

A bronze plaque, with holes for pinning it to a wooden board, found in a temple at Mazi, c.6 km. (4 miles) south-east of Olympia; now in the museum at Olympia. Phot. Triante, ὁ γλυπτός διάκοσμος τοῦ ναοῦ από Μάζι.
wealth, which might also be relevant in that connection. Helisson apparently does not have resident stele-engravers (so does not set up public inscriptions often), but has to send for them (from Mantinea?). The connection of this with registration suggests that a permanent list of those registered was to be inscribed, probably below this agreement: the purpose of that will have been to avoid disputes about who had been registered (cf. 4).

Epimektai, 'overseers', are found with a variety of responsibilities; Nielsen argues that these are officials of Helisson (Hansen (ed.), Introduction to an Inventory of Poleis, 159–60 n. 56), but this inscription seems to have been set up in Mantinea. Thesmotoaroi (from themos and terein) are 'guardians of the laws', equivalent to themophylakes elsewhere (e.g. Elis, Thuc. v. 47. ix: F. M. J. Waanders ap. Te Riele 189). For damiorgoi as principal magistrates (Nices was presumably the eponymous damiorgos in Mantinea in the year of the enactment) cf. Thuc. v. 47. ix (where Mantinea has a plurality of damiorgoi); also 32. Whitened boards, on which texts were written in charcoal, were a common medium for the display of temporary notices (e.g. Ath. Pol. 47. ii).

For imphasis cf. phasis and endeixis, Athenian judicial procedures initiated by 'exposing' or 'indicating' men exercising rights or otherwise doing things to which they are not entitled (e.g. Harrison, The Law of Athens, ii, 218–32; Hansen, Apagoge, Endeixis and Ephegesis; D. M. MacDowell and Hansen, in Symposium 1990, 187–98 and 199–201, showing that in Athens phasis was used primarily of objects and endeixis of persons; for imphasis at Tegea see 60. 24–5, and for phasis at Athens see 22, 25, 40). The Three Hundred are perhaps the council of Mantinea: cf. the body of the same size in (smaller?) Tegea, 60. A. 8. For nikan ('to be victorious') cf. 82. 13.

Distinctive features of the Arcadian dialect to be seen here include νο in the participle (6) and the 3rd person plural (18); ν for ο (4, 12, 16, etc.); ιν for εν, both normally (22) and in place of ελ (3: ημαρ for ημέρα is largely poetic, but ιν ηματα πάντα is a standard expression in Arcadian inscriptions); πο and πος for προς (14, 21). πατριάδι (17) has not been found elsewhere; βουλήσι (21) is an Arcadian form of βουλείων, used in some places as equivalent of βουλευτήριον. However, άν δέ τείς (21) is Attic, where we should expect ελ άν τείς; and this inscription does not use κας instead of και, as the earliest Mantinean inscriptions do (IG v. ii 261, 262).
Triphylia was the region on the west coast of the Peloponnesse between Elis and Messenia, bounded by the R. Alpheus on the north and the Neda on the south; it was reduced to perioecic status by Elis in the fifth century (cf. Her. iv. 148. iv, mentioning Macistus as one of the cities), though a text of c.450–425 concerning Scillus suggests that cities here could retain a degree of autonomy (I. Olympia 16: date Jeffery, LSAg, 220 no. 17; discussion Osborne, Classical Landscape with Figures, 126; Roy, 296–7). As a result of Sparta’s war against Elis at the end of the fifth century, this region was detached from Elis (X. H. iii. ii. 21–31, mentioning Macistus; D.S. xiv. 17. iv–xii, 34.1). There then appears to have been created a Triphylian state, which took the decisions recorded in our texts; that is last mentioned when Elis objected to the common peace treaty of autumn 371 because it guaranteed the autonomy of the Triphylians and
A
Resolved by the Triphylians.

1 As many as have been inscribed on the tablet shall be Macistians. If any one robs them of their citizenship, or excludes them from offices when they are living as citizens justly and in accordance with the law, let him be impious before Athena.

8 Daimachus being damiorgos, Catacous, Agesidamus; in the month Dius.

10 Lysiadas, Menalces, Agemoneus, Philippus, Syleus, Apellis, Hetaericibus, Pronoa, Philicus, Charops, Daîmenes, Python, — —

B
Gods.
The Triphylians gave to Pyladas and Gnathon and Pyrus citizenship and immunity from all obligations, to themselves and their issue.

Damiorgoi Olympiodorus and colleagues.

others (X. H. vi. v. 2); soon afterwards Triphylia joined the new Arcadian federation (cf. X. H. vii. i. 26), and whether within the federation there continued to exist an entity called Triphylia is uncertain (cf. 32, where among the damiorgoi are not 'Triphylians' but 'Lpreans').

A was found at Mazi, south-east of Olympia; probably that is the location of Macistus and the site of Scillus is south-west of Olympia (cf. Pritchett, Studies . . . Topography, vi. 64–70, 78; map in Nielsen (ed.), Yet More Studies, 130), though formerly scholars located Macistus on the coast further south and Scillus at Mazi, while Siewert has regarded Mazi as an isolated sanctuary site. The sculptures of the temple there are dated to the first quarter of the fourth century, i.e. to the period of Triphylia's independence (cf. Osborne, Archaic and Classical Greek Art, 213 with fig. 129, identifying Mazi with Scillus).
It is remarkable that in this decree the regional unit, the Triphylians, asserts the right to award citizenship in one of its constituent cities, Macistus: normally when there is a federation of cities (like Boeotia) as opposed to a larger city composed of demes (like Athens) the right to award citizenship rests with the individual cities (cf. Rhodes in Hansen (ed.), Sources, 91–112 at 102–12); for another exception to that rule notice the third-century League of Islanders (e.g. IG xi. iv 1039). A few other fragmentary plaques have been found which may be from documents of the same kind.

B was probably found close to the site of Scillus and not far from Mazi, and must belong to the same thirty-year period, but it awards citizenship not in a constituent city but in Triphylia.

Neither of the texts tells us anything about the men given citizenship apart from their bare names (most of the names are otherwise attested elsewhere in the Peloponnese but not in Elis). B reads as a standard grant of citizenship to distinguished and beneficent foreigners (cf. 8); the use of a discus for the text may point to a connection with the Olympic games, control of which had been disputed in the war which led to Triphylia’s independence (X. H. ii. ii. 31). A concerns a larger number of men who

16

Arbitration between Miletus and Myus, 391–388

Two fragments of a stele, found in the council-house at Miletus: location of upper fragment unknown; lower in the Antikensammlung, Staatliche Museen, Berlin. Phot. Sb. Berlin 1900, 112; Piccirilli, Gli arbitrai internazionali 22, tav. iv (both b).

Ionic, normally using the old o for ou; stoicheion 27–9.


\[
\begin{array}{cccccccccccc}
\text{Διονυσιός} & \text{μπων Αξιός} & \text{εξωμπρός} & \text{σήσ διεφ} \\
\text{εροντο περί τῆς γῆς τῆς γιόν} & \text{αι Μαιάνδρῳ} & \text{οι πεδίων} & \text{γενέσθαι} \\
\text{αμφικυβητης} & \text{ας τῆς πόλεως} & \text{ασπαι καὶ σ} \\
\text{Στροφήν, Ὑπὲρος} & \text{ως ὦ τῶν Ηλίων} & \text{δικασταὶ σύνεξαί συν} & \text{ναῦ[τ}] \\
\text{λαμπα} & \text{δη[ς}] & \text{γι[ν]ς} & \text{γι[ν]ς} \\
\end{array}
\]
live or are going to live in Macistus and may hold offices there, and may belong to the process of setting up the independent Triphylia and its constituent cities.

In Α Καρακόω (I. 9) is best interpreted as a proper name, with Triante (cf. another instance of the name, I. Olympia 141. 10), so that we have a board of three damiorgoi. The month Dius is otherwise attested on the Greek mainland only for Aetolia (e.g. SGDI 1853), though it is widespread in and to the east of the Aegean.

Siewert compares A with Olympian texts and uses it to distinguish between Olympian and (south) Triphylia dialects; but A. Striano in Rizakis (ed.), Ἀρχαῖα Ἀχαια καὶ Ἡλεία, 139–43, cf. SEG xli 400, argues against the idea of a separate Triphylia sub-dialect. B is closer than A in language to koine: it has αὐτοῖς whereas A (in ll. 1–8) has the Elean features of ρ for final s and accusative plural ending -οι (i.e. -οις).

Sylan ('seize', A. 3-4: cf. on 75) with citizenship as object is a striking expression: Dubois cites passages in tragedy where the verb is used with the genitive of πατρα, 'fatherland', and other passages in tragedy where ἀποστέλλειν, used in A. 4-5 to mean 'exclude' from office, is used of banishment from one's country.
This inscription illustrates the involvement of Persia, and Persia’s use of Greek institutions, among the Asiatic Greeks at a time when Persia was claiming but had not yet achieved control of them. Miletus and Myus, both now inland (Myus is about 10 miles (16 km.) north-east of Miletus), were in antiquity situated on the Latmian Gulf on the coast of Asia Minor, into which the River Maeander flowed; they are two of the twelve cities listed by Her. 1. 142 as sharing in the Ionians’ sanctuary of Poseidon, the Panionium. At the end of the Ionian Revolt, in 494, Miletus was captured and destroyed by the Persians; and in 493 the satrap of Lydia, Artaphernes, required the Ionian cities
15 Of the Erythraeans: — son of —anes, Dicholeos son of Pedieus, — son of Apollas, Epicrates son of —, Pythes son of Anacritus.

18 Of the Chians: Sostratus son of Clinias, Angeles son of Hipponax, Ctesippus son of Euptolemus, Phanon son of Hermomachus, Alexandrus son of Hicesius.


28 Of the Ephesians: Polycles son of Theodorus, Pythocides son of Dionysius, Euermus son of Athenaeus, Euaeon son of Hermias, Theodorus son of Heracides.

31 The lawsuit having been undertaken by the Milesians and Myesians, the witnesses having witnessed for each party and the boundaries of the land having been displayed, when the jurors were about to judge the suit, the Myesians abandoned the suit. The prodikastai wrote this and gave it to the cities which were judging the suit, to be a witness. When the Myesians had abandoned the suit, Struses the satrap of Ionia heard the Ionians' jurors and made the final decision that the land should belong to the Milesians.

44 Prodikastai of the Milesians: Nymph— son of —, Baton son of Diocl—, ——

To make treaties with one another providing for the settlement of disputes (Her. vi. 42. i). In the time of the Delian League Miletus had recovered sufficiently to be one of the major Ionian cities in terms of tribute paid (commonly 5 tal.); Myus was one of the cities granted to the exiled Athenian Themistocles by Persia (D.S. xi. 57. vii, Plut. Them. 29. xi), but it appears in the tribute lists as a payer of 1 tal.

Now, at a time when Sparta was at war with the Persians on behalf of the Asiatic Greeks but was not doing well, Miletus and Myus were sufficiently under Persian influence to refer their dispute to King Artaxerxes II, and he delegated it to Struses,
presumably the man whom our literary sources call Struthas, the King’s chiliarch or grand vizier, who between 391 and 388 was also satrap, probably of Lydia, not just of ‘Ionia’, and defeated and killed the Spartan Thibron in the Maeander valley (X. H. iv. viii. 17–19, v. i. 6). Struses in turn arranged for the dispute to be heard by a jury of fifty, comprising five men from each of the remaining states sharing in the Panionium (the jurors from Phocaea, Teos, Colophon, Samos, and Priene will have been listed

His authority over Ionia was what was relevant to this document: Lewis, *Sparta and Persia*, 118–19 n. 75. For Struses’ position see T. Petit, *BCH* cxii 1988, 307–22 at 309–12; a different view S. Hornblower, *CAH* vii. 77–8).

---

### 17

Athenian decree for Erythrae, shortly before 386

Fragment of a *state* found at Erythrae; now in the museum at Izmir. *Belletrum* xl 1976, facing 570.

Attic-Ionic, with iota adscript omitted in l. 5, the old o for ov in l. 6, ε for α in l. 105 *stoichedon* 20.


---

For the relations of Erythrae, Pharnabazus, and Conon after the battle of Cnidus in 394 cf. 8. This decree must belong to the end of the period between c.390, when Thrasybulus re-established an Athenian presence in the Aegean, and 386, when the
Before the jurors could vote, the representatives of Myus abandoned the case: the prodikastai will be the advocates acting for Miletus, who called on the jurors to note that Myus had withdrawn; the jury then reported in favour of Miletus to Struses and he confirmed the decision.

In a world of many small states disputes about boundaries were frequent, and resort to external arbitrators was a frequent means of resolving them: Piccirilli assembles and comments on attested instances down to 338, and there are many more in later Greek history; for another example in our collection see 78; for the use of foreign judges in disputes internal to a single city see 101.

It shall not be permitted to any of the generals to make a reconciliation with those on the Acropolis without the consent of the people of Athens; nor shall it be permitted to any one to reinstate in Erythrae any of the exiles whom the Erythraeans drive out, without the consent of the people of Erythrae.

Concerning not giving up Erythrae to the barbarians, reply to the Erythraeans that it has been resolved by the people of Athens.

‘giving up . . . to the barbarians’ of the Asiatic Greeks, which had been a possibility since 392, finally happened as a result of the Peace of Antalcidas. Antalcidas’ first attempts at making peace with Persia, in 392/1, had signalled the possibility of
reconciliation between Sparta and Persia; after the failure of those attempts, Persia replaced the pro-Spartan Tiribazus with the pro-Athenian Struses (cf. on 16); but the activities of Thrasybulus led to the reinstatement of Tiribazus (cf. S. Hornblower, CAH vii 74–8). In this inscription Athens responds to a party in Erythrae which does not want to be ‘given up to the barbarians’, and in 18 it gives generous treatment to Clazomenae. Activity by Athenian generals in the region of Erythrae and Clazomenae at this time is not reported by our literary sources. When the Peace of Antalcidas was made, Erythrae and Clazomenae were both ceded to Persia—and 19 is evidence for recriminations among the Athenians after a trick had placed them in a weak position.

18

Athens honours Clazomenae, 387/6

Three contiguous fragments of a stele, with a relief showing two bulls facing each other: found on the south slope of the Athenian Acropolis; now in the Epigraphical Museum. Phot. Kern, Inscriptiones Graecae, Taf. 23; Kirchner, Imagines ii, Taf. 25 Nr. 49; Lawton, Reliefs, pl. 9 no. 17 (relief and ill. 1–11).

Attic-Ionic, sometimes retaining the old ε for ε and ο for οι. L. 2 sqq. steickdon 42.


A few letters were read by earlier editors but are bracketed in IK; IK in error prints 8 α[πωδῶν], 11 Αθηναίων, 23 ἄλλα. 11 There is one space too few for the obvious supplement.
There is a group of dissident Erythracans ‘on the Acropolis’ of Erythrae (for which this decree uses the old term polis: in decrees ordering publication on the Athenian Acropolis, en akropolei replaced en polei c.386 (cf. on 19)), with whom Athens will not let its generals come to terms without obtaining authorization from Athens; other dissidents are being driven into exile, and Athens undertakes that these will not be reinstated without the consent of ‘the people’, presumably a democratic group controlling the outer city, of Erythrae; and it is presumably that democratic group which is pro-Athenian and has expressed anxiety about being given up to the barbarians (who may inter alia support the oligarchs). For the provisions for dealing with the dissidents, cf. the decree for Clazomenae (18).

Theodotus was archon [387/6]; Paramythus son of Philagrus of Erchia was secretary.

1 Resolved by the people. Theodotus was archon; Cecropis was the prytany; Paramythus was secretary; Daiphron was chairman. Poliagrus proposed:

4 Praise the people of Glazomenae because they have been enthusiastic towards the city of Athens both now and in the time past.

6 Concerning what they say, be it resolved by the people: that, if the Clazomenians pay the five-per-cent tax imposed under Thrasybulus, then concerning a treaty or the refusal of a treaty with those at Chytum, and concerning the hostages whom the Clazomenians have from those at Chytum, the people of Clazomenae shall have power, and it shall not be permitted to the people of Athens either to restore the exiles without the consent of the people of Clazomenae or to remove any of those who have remained.

13 Concerning a governor and a garrison, the people shall vote immediately whether they ought to establish them in Clazomenae or whether the people of Clazomenae are to have authority in these matters, whether they wish to receive them or not.

17 For the cities from which the Clazomenians import corn—Phocaea, Chios (?) and
Clazomenae was on an island just off the south coast of the Gulf of Smyrna in Asia Minor (now joined to the mainland by a mole), and Chytum was on the mainland facing it (Eph. FGrH 70 F 78, Arist. Pol. v 1303 b 7–10, Str. 645. xiv. i. 36). It was explicitly awarded to the Persians by the Peace of Antalcidas in 386 (X. H. v. i. 31), so this must be a short-lived agreement made a few months earlier (P. J. Stylianou, Hist. xxxvii 1988, 466–7 with n. 15, suggests the first or second prytany of 387/6). Clazomenae was evidently one of the states won for Athens by Thrasybulus in his Aegean campaign of 389 (X. H. iv. viii. 25–30, D.S. xiv. 94, 99. iv), and here the Athenians decide to treat it generously in order to retain its support. However, they are responding to an embassy from Clazomenae; since this is a non-probouleumatic decree (cf. below), the council either made some other recommendation which was rejected in favour of what we have here or (as in 91) it made no recommendation; and the proposer of this decree left the assembly to decide whether to send a governor and a garrison, without himself making a recommendation on that point (13–17: for this procedure for making and recording a separate decision cf. Rhodes, Boule, 75): this suggests divided opinions in Athens.

Thrasybulus’ five-per-cent tax is mentioned also in connection with Thasos (IG ii² 24. a. 3–6): cf. the five-per-cent harbour tax which the Athenians substituted for the tribute of the Delian League from 413 (Thuc. viii. 28. iv), probably until 410/09. For
Smyrna—it shall be within their treaty rights for them to sail into their harbours (?).

20. The generals with Dionysius/Leontichus (?) shall take care that there shall be the same treaty with Pharnabazus (?) for the Clazomenians as for the Athenians.

22. The people voted that they shall pay no other dues and not receive a garrison or receive a governor but shall be free like the Athenians.

25. Concerning —— the King shall have power (?) —— decree ——

the provisions for dealing with the dissidents at Chytum, cf. the decree for Erythrae, 17. Aikyo suggests that the Athenians are less interventionist in their dealings with Clazomenae than with Erythrae because Clazomenae had a better record of loyalty to Athens. Whether Clazomenae’s sources of corn are Phocaea, Chios, and Smyrna (Wilhelm) or Chios, Miletus, and Smyrna (Ziebarth), it is striking that they are nearby cities, not the distant sources of which Athens has accustomed us to think (cf. 64, 95, 96).

It has been suggested that in ll. 25 sqq. the Athenians were careful to acknowledge the Persian King’s rights on the Asiatic mainland (Ryder, *Koine Eirene*, 34 with n. 5); on the other hand, they may have been more optimistic than that (cf. the decree for Erythrae), and Rudzicka stresses the importance of the Gulf of Smyrna to Persia’s preparations for the war against Athens’ friend Evagoras of Salamis (cf. D.S. xv. 2. ii) and Persia’s insistence on recovering Clazomenae in the Peace of Antalcidas.

This decree has enactment (2) and motion (6–7) formulae mentioning only the people, not the council and the people: from the beginning of the fourth century the Athenians used these formulae to mark out those ‘non-probouleumatic’ decrees in which, for whatever reason, what was enacted by the assembly had not been recommended by the council in its *probouleuma* (cf. Introduction, pp. xvii–xviii, xix–xx).
Athens honours Phanocritus of Parium, 386

The bottom of a stele found in Athens; now in the Louvre, Paris.

Attic-Ionic, retaining occasionally the old ε for η and usually ει for ηι and ο for ου; stoichedon 28.

This text is important for the light which it throws both on a particular historical episode and on Athens’ financial organization in the early fourth century.

In 387 a Spartan fleet under Niccolochus was blockaded at Abydus, on the Asiatic side of the Hellespont, by an Athenian fleet under Iphicrates and Diotimus. Antalcidas reached Abydus by land and took out the Spartan fleet at night, spreading a rumour that he was going to Calchedon but in fact going only a short distance, to Percote. The Athenians, with four generals, followed, and passed the Spartans. The Spartans then returned to Abydus, and caught a further squadron of Athenian ships under Thrasybulus of Collytus; they were then themselves joined by reinforcements and gained full control of the Hellespont (X. H. v. i. 25–8; cf. Polyaen. ii. 24, according to
hand over for his message, if it is resolved by the people also, and write up his benefaction on a stone stele on the Acropolis.

4 Invite him to hospitality in the prytaneion tomorrow.

6 Cephalus proposed:

6 In other respects in accordance with the council; but Phanocritus of Parium shall be written up as a proxenos and benefactor, himself and his descendants, on a stone stele and it shall be placed on the Acropolis, by the secretary of the council, because he passed over to the generals a message about the passage of the ships, and if the generals had believed him the enemy triremes would have been captured: it is in return for this that he is to receive the status of proxenos and benefactor.

16 And invite him to hospitality in the prytaneion tomorrow.

18 The said sum of money shall be allocated by the apodektai from the funds being deposited, when they make the allocations required by the laws.

whom Antalcidas hid in the territory of Cyzicus). It will have been in connection with that trick that Phanocritus of Parium, on the Asiatic coast where the Hellespont opens into the Propontis, gave the information which the Athenians to their cost did not believe (on the problems of reconciling this with the details of Xenophon’s account see Tuplin, The Failings of Empire, 174–5). He must then have gone (not necessarily alone) to Athens to tell his story; the council in its probouleuma will have recommended honours for him, but in fairly bland terms (and it included a cautious clause stressing that the honours were not valid unless approved by the assembly also [l.1–2], on which see Rhodes with Lewis, 517–18). In the assembly an amendment spelling out precisely why Phanocritus was to be honoured (as the original decree must not have done: for
the significance of this see Osborne in Goldhill & Osborne (edds.), Performance Culture and Athenian Democracy, 341–58 at 351–2) was proposed by Cephalus, a leading figure in Athenian politics from his defence of Andocides in 400 (And. 1. Myst. 115, 150) and his eagerness for war against Sparta in the 390s (Hell. Oxy. 7. ii Bartoletti/McKechnie & Kern = 10. ii Chambers, Paus. iii. 9. viii) to his support for the liberation of Thebes from Sparta in 379/8 (Din. 1. Dem. 38–9) (he will appear as an envoy to Chios in 20).

Given that original motions may be rewritten to take account of amendments (cf. 2), and that here only the end of the original motion survives, we cannot be sure what other changes were made by Cephalus’ amendment (cf. Rhodes, Boule, 278–9). It is possible, but by no means certain, that the original motion gave Phanocritus the status of benefactor but not of proxenos (2 would favour that, and Osborne, loc. cit., supports it, but 15–16 would not), and/or that it did not extend the honour to his descendants. It is possible that the original motion did not include an invitation to the prytaneion, but more likely that it did and that the amendment is simply repeating that invitation. ‘The said sum of money’ (18–19) will have been either the payment for the inscription of the stele or else an award to be spent on a crown (for the latter cf. 2), and it may well be that the original motion did not specify as the amendment does where the money was to come from.

In the fifth century Athens’ revenues were received by the apodektai (‘receivers’) and paid into a central treasury; expenditure was made from that central treasury on the

20

Alliance between Athens and Chios, 384/3

Five fragments of a stele, with a relief: found on the Athenian Acropolis (but finding-place of fr. ε, the top of the stele, unknown); now in the Epigraphical Museum. Phot. Meyer, Die griechischen Urkundenreliefs, Taf. 14 A 43; Lawton, Reliefs, pl. 10 no. 19 (both reliefonly).

Attic-Ionic, sometimes retaining the old ε for ει and ο for οις stockdon 30, with irregularities.
16 ν’ 34; SIG’ 142; Tod 118*, Pouilloux, Chois, 26, 2048. Trans. Harding 31. See also Accame, La lega ateniese, 9–14, 34–5.

[τ]ρέφος ἀρχιντ[ος ἐπὶ τῆς Πποδοθεντίδα]-
[ος] πρόωτης πρυτ[αις ἑώραμάτευς ———]-
[. . .]άνοις ε[ξ] Ὤ[ν ἐγραμμάτευς ———]—

lacuna

5 [. . .] ο [———]

ταῦτα με[———] τῶν κο[———]

Readings verified by Dr. A. P. Matthaiou, who reports that some letters read earlier cannot be read now: we note differences from earlier readings only when they lead to a different reconstruction of the text. 2–3 Πποδοθεντίδιος is the only tribe-name of the right length. 3–4 Matthaiou: ——— Σ[τράδ]άνω[ι] eedd. 6–7 κο[ι]νῶν δ[γαθ]ών Matthaiou, reading ΑΘΗΓΩΝ on the stone.
authorization of the assembly, until c.411 by the kolakretai (‘ham-collectors’), after the amalgamation of the treasuries of the city and of the Delian League by an enlarged board of hellenotamiai (‘Greek treasurers’). This decree is our earliest datable evidence for the system of devolved budgeting adopted in the fourth century, by which the apodektai made a merismos (‘allocation’: this decree uses the verb merizein) of funds, in accordance with a law, to separate spending authorities, who were free to spend the money allocated to them as long as they submitted satisfactory accounts at the end of the year (cf. Ath. Pol. 48. 1–ii with Rhodes ad loc.: that uses the same verb, kataballein, ‘deposit’, as is used in i. 20). In this text and in Tod 117 ~ Harding 29, of 386/5, the apodektai are instructed to make an allocation for a particular payment (whereas normally in the early fourth century payments for inscription were made by the sacred treasurers: cf. 2); that suggests that c.386 Athens was short of funds and the apodektai had to make a supplementary allocation to cover the payment as soon as they were able to do so (cf. Rhodes, Boule, 98–101; A. S. Henry, Chiron xii 1982, 104–7; and see also 64; but for another discussion, suggesting that this is a sign not that there was a crisis but that the Athenians could be careful to observe proper procedure even for a small change in the merismos, see W. E. Thompson, A. Class, xxii 1979, 149–53).

This is also one of the earliest Athenian decrees in which the word akropolis replaces the older polis in publication orders (A. S. Henry, Chiron xii 1982, 91–118).

---

Alliance of the Athenians and Chians.

1 In the archonship of Diotrephes [384/3]; in the first prytany, of Hippothontis; to which —— son of Stephanus (?) from Oion was secretary;

6 —— these —— the common discussion (?)
20. Alliance Between Athens and Chios, 384/3

υών λόγων (?) [τών γεγενημένων τοῖς Ἑλλαδικοῖς] μέμνην [ταὶ διαφυλάξειν καθάπερ]
Ἀθηναίοι τὴν εἰρήνην καὶ τὴν φιλίαν

10 [κ]αὶ τὸς ὄρκον καὶ [κ]αὶ τὸς ὁσίους συνθήκας,
[ὁ]σμοσει βασιλείως καὶ Ἀθηναίοι καὶ
Λακεδαιμόνιοι καὶ ᾗς ἱλικίου Ἑλληνες,
καὶ ἦκοσι ἄγαθα [ἐπαγγελλόμενοι τῷ]
δήμῳ τοῦ Ἀθηναίων καὶ ἀπάσημῳ τῇ Σικελίᾳ

15 λαδί καὶ βασιλείας, [ἐπήθησαν τῷ δῆμῳ] ἔστω,
ἐπανέσωμεν μεῖν τὸν δήμον τῶν τῶν Χίατον καὶ τὸς πρέσβεις τὸς ἢκον] τὰς ὕπαρξιν δὲ τὸν ἔρημον καὶ τὸς συνθήκας ταῖς τῶν ὀφανῶς συμμάχοις δὲ συν-

20 [ἐ]ρ[θ]αίας [Χίος] ἐπ’ ἐλευθερίας καὶ αὐτονομίας,
μὴ παραβαίνοντι τῶν τῶν ἐν τοῖς στήλαις γεγραμμένων [πρ]ερ μής ἔρημης
Χῖος παντὶ σηκεῖ [καὶ] ἐν τοῖς τῷ [ἐπ]ταῖς τῶν 

25 [καὶ τὰ] τὸ δυνατόν, ὡμοῖος [δ]ὲ τοὺς [ῆκοσι] [ν 
Χῖος] μὲν τῆς 
[Β]ολῆν καὶ 
[
καὶ 
τὰ] ἔχουσιν έγ[Χῖω] 

29 [καὶ τὸ] ἄνθρωπος ἀρχάς, ἐξαντίον 

30 [καὶ τὸ] ἄλλους ἀρχαῖος, ἐξαντίον 

35 [κ]άραν τῷ τῇ 

39 [κ]άραν τῷ 

40 [λο]θεύσει, — ἦν Λασπεκήθεν, Αἰούς οἱ ..]
[—ἐνοικο] Φρεάρρος, Δημοκρίτης[i] 

which took place among the Greeks, have remembered to preserve, like the Athenians, the peace and the friendship and the oaths and the existing agreement, which were sworn by the King and the Athenians and the Spartans and the other Greeks, and have come offering good things to the people of Athens and to all of Greece and to the King; be it decreed by the people:

Praise the people of Chios and the envoys who have come; and there shall remain in force the peace and the oaths and the agreement now existing; and make the Chians allies on terms of freedom and autonomy, not contravening any of the things written on the stelai about the peace, nor being persuaded if any one else transgresses, as far as possible.

Place a stele on the Acropolis in front of the image; and on it write up that, if any one goes against the Athenians, the Chians shall go in support with all their strength as far as possible, and if any one goes against the Chians, the Athenians shall go in support as far as possible.

The oath shall be sworn to the Chians who have come by the council and the generals and the taxarchs; and in Chios by the council and the other officials.

Choose five men who will sail to Chios and administer the oath to the city of Chios.

The alliance shall remain in force for all time.

Invite the Chian embassy to hospitality in the ptylaneion tomorrow.

The following were chosen as envoys: Cephalus of Collytus, —— of Alopece, Aesimus of ———, ——— of Phrearrhii, Democrides of ———.

The following were the Chian envoys: Bryon, Apelles (?), Theocritus (?), Archelaus.
The large island state of Chios remained one of the ship-providing members of the Delian League until it defected to Sparta in 413/12 (Thuc. viii. 5. iv–14); in the last years of the Peloponnesian War it was torn between pro-Athenian and pro-Spartan factions, but the Chians fought on the Spartan side at Aegospotami in 405 (Paus. x. 9. ix). However, they were among those offended by Sparta’s conduct after the war, and after the battle of Cnidus in 394 they expelled a Spartan garrison and defected to Pharnabazus and Conon (D.S. xiv. 84. iii); they were allied to Athens in Thrasybulus’ Aegean campaign of c.390 (D.S. xiv. 94. iv). According to Isoc. xiv. Plat. 28, after the Corinthian War ‘the Chians, Mytilenaeans, and Byzantines remained on our side’; cf. D.S. xv. 28. iii and 22 with commentary.

This is the earliest known Athenian alliance with a Greek state subsequent to the Peace of Antalcidas of 386. The Peace had stipulated that outside Asia, with the exception of the islands of Lemnos, Imbros, and Scyros, conceded to Athens, ‘the other Greek cities, both small and large, should be autonomous’ (X. H. v. i. 31, D.S. xiv. 110. iii). After Sparta had invoked this principle to break up the Boeotian federation and the merged state of Argos and Corinth (X. H. v. i. 32–4), and probably had invoked it again to split Mantinea into its component villages (X. H. v. ii. 5, 7, D.S. xv. 5. iv, 12. ii), there must have been some uncertainty as to what forms of association were still possible. Here the Athenians make a defensive alliance with Chios, ‘on terms of freedom and autonomy’, and explicitly within the framework of the Peace; and in the 370s this will serve as a model for the Second Athenian League (cf. 22). They are responding to an embassy from Chios, which offers ‘good things to the people of Athens and to all of Greece and to the King’ (13–17) at a time when the Athenians were overawed by the Peace but scarcely pleased with it; there is perhaps an allusion to ‘the common discussion which took place among the Greeks’ (6–8), presumably when they swore to the Peace, and perhaps it was the Chians who had advanced the idea that defensive alliances were compatible with the Peace.

Ll. 11–12 state that ‘the King and the Athenians and the Spartans and the other Greeks’ swore to the Peace. From our other evidence we should not expect the Persian King to swear as an equal partner with the Greeks, and in spite of what is stated here

---

21

Athens honours Strato of Sidon, ϕ.378–ϕ.376 (?)
we may doubt if he did (cf. E. Badian, *JHS* cvii 1987, 27 = From Plataea to Potidaea, 41–2; *Georgica* . . . G. Cawkwell, 37–9). Nor, though the Peace was intended to apply to all the Greeks, can we be sure how many of them swore to it (cf. Badian, *Georgica*, 39–40, 43). ‘The image (agalma)’ will be that of Athena Promachos, the great statue facing those who entered the Acropolis through the Propylaea. It is surprising that the formulation of the alliance as a defensive alliance comes only after the publication clause (26–30), and that the specification that it is to be a permanent alliance comes later still (35–6). Departures from natural order have led tidy-minded scholars to suspect that such misplaced clauses were originally omitted and have been added to the original motion by way of a ‘concealed amendment’, even when as here there is no formal record of an amendment: that is possible, but it is equally possible that the proposer on his own simply put down the various items as he thought of them and did not afterwards rewrite his material in a more logical order (cf. Rhodes, *Boule*, 73–4).

Different collections of officials swear to different treaties in fourth-century Athens (cf. D. J. Mosley, *PCPS* vii 1961, 59–63); the taxiararchs were the commanders of the tribal infantry regiments (*Ath. Pol.* 62. iii). In the list of Athenian envoys to Chios, for Cephalus cf. 19; Aesimus led the democrats in their return from the Piraeus in 403 (Lys. xiii. Agor. 80–2); unlike Cephalus, he with Thrasybulus did not wish to risk trouble with Sparta in 396 (*Hell. Oxy.* 6. ii Bartoletti/McKechnie & Kern = 9. ii Chambers); and he was to be involved in the admission of Methymna to the Second Athenian League in 377 (23). It does not follow from Aesimus’ being opposed to Cephalus in the 390s that the same was true in the 380s, but it was not unusual for opponents to be appointed to the same board when each had a substantial body of supporters (cf., most notoriously, the appointment of both Alcibiades and Nicias to command the great Sicilian expedition of 415, and see Mitchell, *Greeks Bearing Gifts*, 92–5, cf. 106). On the possible Chian envoys see Dušanić: Theocritus was the father of the atomist Metrodorus, and another Metrodorus was a teacher of a younger Theocritus (Berve, *Das Alexanderreich*, ii. 176–7 no. 364), of whom a biography was written by a younger Bryon.
Strato, vassal king of Sidon within the Persian empire, is said to have been the rival in luxury of Nicocles of Salamis in Cyprus, who succeeded Evagoras (11) in 374/3 (Anax. *FGrH* 72 F 18, Thp. 115 F 114, ap. Ath. *xii. 531 a–e, Ael. *V.H.* vii. 2). In the Satraps' Revolt he gave refuge to the deposed Tachos of Egypt, after which he died violently,
21. ATHENS HONOURS STRATO OF SIDON, c. 378–c. 376(?)

— of the Athenians, and has taken care that the envoys to the King whom the people sent should travel as finely as possible.

4 And reply to the man who has come from the king of Sidon that if in the time to come he is a good man with regard to the people of Athens there is no possibility that he will fail to obtain whatever he needs from the Athenians. Also Strato the king of Sidon shall be proxenos of the people of Athens, himself and his descendants.

12 This decree shall be written up by the secretary of the council on a stone stele within ten days and set down on the Acropolis: for the writing-up of the stele the treasurers shall give to the secretary of the council 30 drachmas from the ten talents.

18 Also the council shall make tokens (symbola) with the king of Sidon, so that the people of Athens shall know if the king of Sidon sends anything when in need of the city, and the king of Sidon shall know when the people of Athens send any one to him.

25 Also invite the man who has come from the king of Sidon to hospitality in the Prytaneion tomorrow.

Menexenus proposed: In other respects in accordance with Cephisodotus; but as many of the Sidonians, living in Sidon and enjoying civic rights, as are visiting Athens for purposes of trade, it shall not be permitted to exact the metic tax (metoikion) from them or to appoint any of them as choregos or to register them for any eisphora.


The beginning of this decree is lost, and its date is disputed. There are two details which have been used as pointers to different dates. The publication of the text is to
be paid for by ‘the treasurers’ (plural: i.e. of Athena) from ‘the ten talents’ (ll. 16–18: cf. 22). Various arrangements for funding publication are found in the early fourth century; but, if we assume that at any one time this payment should be made by one official or board from one source, this decree should be dated c.378/7–c.377/6 (W. B. Dinsmoor, AJA xxxvi 1932, 158–9): A. S. Henry rejected that principle (Chiron xii 1982, 91–118, esp. 110–12); and it must be admitted that no Athenian embassy to the King in those years is otherwise attested. L. 14 states that the publication is to be done ‘within ten days’, other instances of that formula are to be dated between c.357 and c.336 (Austin, JHS), and most scholars have thought it easier to find an occasion in the 360s when Strato might have helped such envoys (on account of which Rhodes, Boule, 103 n. 7 was undecided). Tod followed the earlier scholars who associated this text with the peace negotiations of 367—but they were not negotiations with whose outcome the Athenians were pleased. Austin (JHS) thought that Athens supported those rebelling against Persia in the Satraps’ Revolt at the end of the 360s and connected this text with that—but Athens probably did not support the rebels then (cf. 42), and in any case when Strato was involved in the Revolt he will hardly have helped Athenian envoys bound for the King. Moysey suggests that Athens may have sent an embassy in 364, and have sent it via Sidon because of the turmoil in western Asia Minor, and that may be the occasion when the King recognized Athens’ claim to Amphipolis and the Chersonese (see on 38)—which is at any rate a more plausible scenario than the others (and an embassy then might be accepted even if we did not follow Moysey on Amphipolis and the Chersonese). However, a requirement to publish within ten days could more easily float in time than the source of payment for the publication. In the early 370s Pharnabazus was in Phoenicia, with the Athenian Iphicrates under him, preparing for one of Persia’s attempts to reconquer Egypt (D.S. xv. 41. iii), and it is not inconceivable that there should have been an Athenian embassy to the King which travelled via Sidon at that time, perhaps to reassure the King that Athens was still friendly and he had nothing to fear from the foundation of the Second Athenian League. Our current inclination is to follow Dinsmoor in dating the decree 378–376 (cf. D. Knoepfler, in Frézouls & Jacquemin [edd.], Les Relations internationales ... 15–17.vi.1993, 309–64, at 329–30).

The original decree was proposed by Cephisodotus, apparently as a non-probouleumatic decree since he rather than the council is mentioned in the amendment formula (cf. Rhodes, Boule, 71–4). Cephisodotus is a common name, but this is very probably the politician, ‘second to none as a clever speaker’ (Dem. xx. Lept.
21. ATHENS HONOURS STRATO OF SIDON, c. 378–c. 376 (?)

150), who was among Athens’ envoys to Sparta in 371 (X. H. vi. iii. 2) and was afraid that Athens’ alliance with Sparta in 369 would give too much power to Sparta (X. H. vii i. 12–14); he is also the proposer of 35, and remained active in the 360s and 350s. The amendment was proposed by one Menexenus: there are too many possible identifications to make any one of them likely.

The symbola of ll. 18–25 will be the two halves of a token, separated by a unique jigsaw cut so that authenticity is guaranteed when they are successfully fitted together (Gauthier, 76–85). For another use of such symbola see M&L 46 ~ Fornara 98. 11–18; also, perhaps, IG n² 207. bed. 6 (on which see M. J. Osborne, BSA lxvi 1971, 297–321 at 312). The reason for this exceptional provision is perhaps that Athens and Sidon were not in frequent contact with each other, and that the Sidonians were not merely non-Greek but non-hellenized; the Athenians may have been affected also by the Phoenicians’ (and specifically the Sidonians’) reputation for trickery (Hom. Od. xv. 415–84), though the charge of Phoenician perfidiousness (e.g. Polyb. m. 78. i, Sall. Bell. Jug. 108. iii, Liv. xxi. 4. ix) seems to have become a specifically Roman charge, made specifically against the Carthaginians.

Probably all free non-Athenians who visited Athens for more than a certain period (perhaps a month) were required to regularize their position by registering as metics (metoikoi) (Whitehead, 7–10), after which they would normally be subject to various burdens, including those from which the amendment exempts Sidonians ‘visiting Athens for purposes of trade’ (ll. 30–6). The metoikion was a poll tax levied on metics, 12 dr. per annum for a man, 6 dr. for an independent woman; rich metics could on some occasions be required to perform the liturgy of choregia, accepting general and in particular financial responsibility for a team performing in a festival; and when the property tax known as eisphora was levied metics were required to pay a contribution which could be described as ‘the sixth part’ (Dem. xxi. Andr. 61, IG n² 244. 20): see Gauthier, 118–23; Whitehead, 75–82; and cf. 77. More generous treatment in general for metics in Athens was to be recommended by Xenophon in the 350s (Ways and Means, ii). What the status in Sidon was which the Athenians could identify with ‘enjoying civic rights’ (politewomenoi: ll. 31–2) we do not know, but there is evidence that at any rate the upper-class inhabitants might have opinions which the king had to take into account (F. G. Maier, CAH², vi. 323).

Prospectus of the Second Athenian League, 378/7

Twenty fragments of a stele, inscribed on the front and on the left-hand side: found in the Athenian Agora; now in the Epigraphical Museum. Phot. Kirchner, Imagines', Taf. 23 Nr. 59; Accame, La lega ateniese, tavv. i–ii; Hesp. xxxvi 1957, pl. 30 (these all partial); Sealey, History of the Greek City-States, 413; Chimni xi 1981, Taf. 4; Anc. W. ix in 1984, 41–2; our Pl. 3.

Attic-Ionic, retaining the old ε for η in ll. 121, 128, and ο for ω normally; ll. 1–6 in larger letters; ll. 7–77

Front

ἐπὶ Ναυσινίκο ἄρχοντος·

κατ

Καλλίβιος | Κηφισοφώντος

Παιανεύς | ἐγραμμάτευεν·

κατ

ἐπὶ τῆς Ἡπειρωτικῆς ἔρημης πρυτα-

νείας, ἐδοξεὶ τῆς βολῆς καὶ τοῦ δήμω-

ντο Χαρίνος Λαμνών [ἐν τῇ ἐπ].

Ἀριστοτέλης ἐ[πεν]—[τοι]· ἡ ἀγαθὴ τῆς Ἀ-

θηραίων καὶ τῶν Ἀθηραιῶ-

ντῶν ὀποῖος ἄν Λακεδαιμόνιοι ἔοσι τὸς Ἑλλη-

νικὸς ἔλευθερος καὶ αὐτονόμοις ἴσοις ἄγεν

τὴν χώραν ἔχοντος ἐπὶ βεβαιών τῆς

[ν] ἐναυτῶν πάσης, [καὶ] [δι] [ου]

καὶ τῶν συμμιᾶχων, ἐξεῖναι αὐθ[τῆς]—

[τῆσ]. ἐδήλω. σιν τοῦ δήμου: ἐάν τις βόλ-

[ης τοῦ Ἐλληνίδος] τῶν βαρβάρων τῶν ἐν

[Ἑρωπητὶ] ἐν οἰκοτόνοι τῶν ηττομικῶν, ὀσ-

[ο]ι μη βασιλέως εἰσίν, Ἀθηραιῶν σύμμαχ-

[οι] εἰσί καὶ τῶν συμμιᾶχων, ἐξεῖναι αὐθ[τῆς]—

[ὁ] ἐλευθέρος ἄν ὁ ποι καὶ αὐτονόμως, πολυ-

[τ] [του] ἐντος ἐπιτείς ἐν ἄν ἐβόλησι, μή-

[τε] [φρέω] ἐν ἐπιστομικῶν μήτε ἄρχοντα

ὑπὸ [τε] ὁμονοιοῦ μήτε φόρον φέροντι, ἐπὶ

dὲ τοῖς αὐτοῖς ἐφ’ ὁποῖς Χιττ καὶ Θήβαι—

12–15 The text within the erasure was reconstructed by Accame, 51: his reconstruction has been doubted (e.g. by Cawkwell, 1973, 66 n. 1; Cargill was sceptical about many of the readings), but study of squeezes and enhanced photographs in Oxford supports most of his readings (cf. C. V. Growther, forthcoming); meanwhile CSAD Newsletter Spring 1996, 4–5: here undotted and dotted letters outside brackets represent P.J.R.’s readings, unlined [ ] and ( ) not read by Growther, underlined and dotted letters inside brackets represent letters read undotted and dotted by Growther but not by P.J.R. 12 restored Accame. 13 restored Growther (suggesting as alternative [ην]ρόθης ἐπὶ εἰρήνης): [μη]ν εἰς ἀν η κωὴ εἰρήνη ἤν τοῦς Ακαμε. 14 restored Accame. 17 Ἑλιστῆς Wade-Gery op. Tod, addenda: ζητείρων other edd.
For the good fortune of the Athenians and the allies of the Athenians. So that the Spartans shall allow the Greeks to be free and autonomous, and to live at peace occupying their own territory in security, [and so that the peace and friendship sworn by the Greeks and the King may be in force and endure in accordance with the agreements,] be it decreed by the people:

If any of the Greeks or of the barbarians living in Europe or of the islanders, who are not the King's, wishes to be an ally of the Athenians and their allies, he may be — being free and autonomous, being governed under whatever form of government he wishes, neither receiving a garrison nor submitting to a governor nor paying tribute, on the same terms as the Chians and the Thebans and the other allies.
PROSPECTUS OF THE SECOND ATHENIAN LEAGUE, 378/7

25 οἱ καὶ οἱ ἄλλοι σύμμαχοι, τοῖς δὲ ποιησαμένοις συμμαχίαις πρὸς Αθηναίος καὶ τῶν συμ[μ]αχών αφείναν τὸν δῆμον τὰ ἐγκτήματα ὀποσ' ἂν πυμάνη ὢντα ἡ ἱδίαι[η] -

30 μένον τὸν συμμαχίαν καὶ περὶ τούτων πι[στῶν δόναι Αθηναίοι. ὅτι δὲ τῇ υψηλότητῃ τῶν πόλεων τῶν ποιμάνων τὰν συμμαχίαν πρὸς Αθηναίοις ἰδίαις ὑδατομησια ν ἀνεπετήθειοι, τῇ μὲν βολὴ τῇ δὲ βολήν

35 ύσον κυρίων ἢ [θω] καθαρεῖν. ἀπὸ δὲ Ν[αυανίκο άρχον] τοῦ μὴ ἐξείλαι μῆτε ἰδιωτίαν χώρας μῆτε Ῥωμαῖοι 

40 νυν μῆτε ὑποθεμενοί 

45 [δ]όμενοι ἀπὸδοντον τὸ μὲν ἡ μοιζυοῦ το[ι] άφηναι τὸ δὲ ἅλα καὶ τὸν τῶν συμμαχίων ἄξων. ἐπὶ δὲ τις ἐπί τοὺς πολέμους ἐπὶ 

50 τοῦτοι καὶ κατὰ γῆν καὶ κατὰ δᾶλασταν παντὶ σκέψει κατὰ τὸ δυνατόν. ἐὰν δὲ τις ἐπ' ἥ ἐπιφανείᾳ ἢ ἀρχῶν ἡ ἱδωτὴ 

55 παρὰ τὸ τῆς ψυχῆς ὀς λέει τι δεὶ τῶν ἐν τούτων τοὺς ψυχόμασιν εἰρημεῖν[ον, ὑ]- 

παρχέτῳ μὲν αὐτῶι ἀτίμωι εἰσίν καὶ τα[ξ] 

[ἔρ]méα[τα αὐ]τὸ τὸ δημοσία ἐστι καὶ τῆς δ[ε] 

[τ]ῆς ἐπίδ[έ]κτος, καὶ κρινότισθοι ἐν Αθηναίοις καὶ τοῖς συμμαχοῖς ὑπὲρ διαλύου τὴν συμμαχίαν. ζ [. . .] 

60 ἡ φυγὴ δι' περὶ Αθηναίοι καὶ οἱ σύμμαχοι 

For those who make alliance with the Athenians and the allies, the people shall renounce whatever Athenian possessions there happen to be, whether private or public, in the territory of those who make the alliance, and concerning these things the Athenians shall give a pledge. For whichever of the cities which make the alliance with the Athenians there happen to be unfavourable stelai at Athens, the council currently in office shall have power to demolish them.

From the archonship of Nausinicus it shall not be permitted either privately or publicly to any of the Athenians to acquire either a house or land in the territory of the allies, either by purchase or by taking security or in any other way. If any one does buy or acquire or take as security in any way whatever, it shall be permitted to whoever wishes of the allies to expose it to the synedroi of the allies; the synedroi shall sell it and give one half to the man who exposed, while the other shall be the common property of the allies.

If any one goes for war against those who have made the alliance, either by land or by sea, the Athenians and the allies shall go to support these both by land and by sea with all their strength as far as possible.

If any one proposes or puts to the vote, whether official or private citizen, contrary to this decree that any of the things stated in this decree ought to be undone, the result shall be that he shall be deprived of his rights, and his property shall become public and a tenth belong to the Goddess, and he shall be judged by the Athenians and the allies for breaking up the alliance. He shall be punished with death or with exile from wherever the Athenians and the allies control; and, if he is assessed for death, he shall not be buried in Attica or in the territory of the allies.

This decree shall be written up by the secretary of the council on a stone stele and set down beside Zeus Eleutherios; the money for the
θέριον τὸ δὲ ἃρ[γ]υρ[ί]ον δόναι εἰς τὴν ἀν-
αγραφὴν τῆς στ[ή]λης ἔγκομοι δραχμὰς
ἐκ τῶν δέκα ταλ[ά]ντων τὸς τὰμιὰς τῆς θε-
οῦ, εἰς δὲ τὴν στήλην ταυτὴν ἀναγρά-
70 φεῖν τῶν τε οὐ[ν] ἀνέμοις συμμαχικῶν τι-
ά ὀνόματα καὶ ὑπὸς ἀν ἄλλη σύμμαχος γι-
(γ)ινηται. ταῦτα μὲν ἀναγράφαται, ἐλέεθαι δι-
ἑ τὸν δήμον πρέσβεις τρεῖς αὐτικὰ μάλ-
75 [α] εἰς Ὁ[ῆ]βας, [ο] ἰτιες πείσοσι Ὁ[ῆ]βαῖος ὁ 
[τ]ὶ ἂν δύναννυ ται ἀγαθὸν. ἀδε ἀπιθησαν. 
[Μ][ριωτοτέλης Μαραθώνιος, Ἅρραμδρο-
σ Αναφλύς[τ]ιος, Ὁ[ρασύβολος Κολλυτέις. 
Ἀθηναῖοι πόλεις αἰδὲ σύμμαχοι. 
Χῖοι Τενέδοι Θῆβαιοι. 
80 Μυντήν[α]ιοὶ Χαλκιδῆς 
[Μ][ηθο[υ]ν[α]ιοὶ Ερετρῆς 
Ῥόδιοι Ποιήσαιοι Ἀρεόθοιοι 
Βοξάντιοι Καρύστιοι 
Πειρήνθιοι Ἰκιοι. 
85 Πεπαρήθιοι Παλλ[—] 
Σκιάθιοι [—] 
Μαρανθίται [—] 
Δῆς [—] 
Πάρ[λ]ιοι Ὄ[—] [—] 
90 Ἀθηναῖοι Π[—] [—] 
Ἀριστοτέλης εἶπει: [—]—ἐπει—
δὲν πρῶτον [σχηματίζοι—ἐφη]—
ἐκόντες π[ρο][σχωρώσι] [—]—ἐφη—
φισμένα τοῖς δήμοις καὶ τ[—]—
95 νῦςοι εἰς τὴν συμμ[αχίαν]—
τοὺς τῶν ἐφηφα[σμενων]—

---

Left-hand side
beginning level with l. 7, more widely spaced vertically than the
text on the front, ending level with l. 62:

[Πυρ]παίων [ο δ]ήμος 
[Ἀβδη]πάται [Θάσι]οι 
[Χαλκ]δῆς

writing-up of the stele shall be sixty drachmas, given from the ten talents by the treasurers of the Goddess. On this stele shall be inscribed the names of the cities which are allies and any other which becomes an ally. This is to be inscribed.

The people shall choose immediately three envoys to Thebes, who are to persuade the Thebans of whatever good thing they can. The following were chosen: Aristoteles of Marathon, Pyrrhandrus of Anaphlystus, Thrasybulus of Collytus.

For the list of allies see below. Underneath the names of allies inscribed on the front is the beginning of another decree:

Aristoteles proposed: — — — since first — — they come forward willingly — — decreed by the people and — — of the islands into the alliance — — to those of the things decreed — —

We give the names of the members in the order in which they seem to have been inscribed.

In the same hand as the decree:

Chios; Mytilene; Methymna; Rhodes; Byzantium.

In the same hand again, heading a second column:

Thebes.

In a second hand, below Thebes in the second column:

Chalcis; Eretria; Arethusa; Carystus; Icus.

Perhaps all in a third hand, below Byzantium in the first column:

Perinthus; Peparethus; Sciathus; Maronea; Dium.

Other names on the front:

Tenedos (inserted beside Chios);
Poecessa (inserted beside Rhodes);
Paros; O——; Athenae (Diades); P——;
Pall(?)——; ———; ———; ———; ———.

On the left-hand side, beginning level with the list on the front:

The People of Zacynthus in Nellus.

On the left-hand side, beginning level with the normal-size text of the main decree:

The People of Pyrrha; Abdera; Thasos; the Chalcidians from Thrace; Aenus;
According to D.S. xv. 28 (misplaced under the year 377/6), after the liberation of Thebes from Sparta (which in fact occurred in winter 379/8) the Athenians sent envoys to the cities subject to Sparta, urging them 'to hold on to the common freedom'; this secured a response first from Chios and Byzantium, then from Rhodes, Mytilene, and some others of the islanders, and as the movement grew many cities joined. The Athenians set up a synedrion of the allies, to meet in Athens with each
Samothrace; Dicacopolis; Acarnania; of Cephalenia: Pronni; Alcetas; Neoptolemus; Andros; Tenos; Hestiaea; Myconus; Antissa; Eresus; Astraeus; of Ceos: Iulis, Carthaea, Coresia; Elaeus; Amorgus; Selymbria; Siphnus; Sicinus; Dium from Thrace; Neapolis.

member state having one vote, and all members were to be autonomous, with the Athenians as hegemones. The Thebans were in alliance with Athens and the members of the synedrion. After devoting 29, i–iv to Persia’s war against Egypt, Diodorus continues with the raid of the Spartan Sphodrias (whom he calls Sphodriades) on the Piraeus while Spartan envoys were present in Athens, and his acquittal despite protests from Athens. Then he mentions the admission of the Thebans to the synedrion and a decision
by the Athenians to give up all cleruchies and to forbid Athenians to farm land outside Attica (29, v–viii). Xenophon mentions the various stages in Thebes’ liberation from Sparta, including the raid of Sphodrias, but does not mention the foundation of the Second Athenian League (the nearest he comes to it is H. v. iv. 34, after the raid of Sphodrias). We have, however, a rich collection of inscriptions to illustrate the foundation and early history of the League: see also 23, 24, and the other texts cited in the commentaries on them.

The major decree here, enacted in spring 377, is a prospectus, inviting states outside the area reserved in the Peace of Antalcidas for Persia to join an already existing League. It spells out the objective of the League: a defensive alliance, within the framework of the Peace of Antalcidas, to resist encroachments on the freedom of the Greeks by Sparta. (Sparta cannot at this date have presented a serious threat to island states, as most of the members listed were; but perhaps perception lagged behind reality, and what seems clear to us now may not have seemed so clear before Sparta’s weakness was revealed at Leuctra in 371.) It spells out what is to be understood by freedom and autonomy, in effect promising that Athens will not do to the members of this League various things which it had done in the fifth century to the members of the Delian League. It threatens with penalties any one who attempts to change the basis of the League. It does not, however, provide a constitution of the League (probably an earlier document, not now extant, did that); nothing is said about Athens’ powers as hegemon; and nothing is said about the working of the synedrion, though there is an incidental mention of it in ll. 43–4. It provides for, and the stele includes, a list of members to which names were added on various occasions during the early years of the League; it provides for further negotiations with Thebes; and below the names inscribed on the front of the stele is the fragmentary beginning of another decree.

Diodorus’ absolute dating is certainly wrong; but many scholars have believed in his relative dating, with the original foundation of the League before Sphodrias’ raid but the full incorporation in it of Thebes and the renunciation of Athenian property overseas after (e.g. Cawkwell 1973; Cargill, 57–60; contr., e.g., Accame, 26–31; D. G. Rice, YCS xxiv 1975, 95–130; Badian, 89–90 n. 34). Diodorus may well be right to distinguish two stages: Chios alone is the model for Byzantium (Tod 121 ~ Harding 34), but Chios and Thebes are models here; Thebes, though inscribed by the first hand, heads a second column in the list of members, and further negotiations with it are planned in ll. 72–7; and it is from the year 378/7 that Athens renounces overseas possessions. However, Athens was very careful to comply with the Peace of Antalcidas, and would not be likely to found an anti-Spartan League before the raid of Sphodrias had put Sparta clearly in breach of the Peace; and it is striking that by spring 377 the League still had only six members. We think Diodorus was wrong in placing the foundation of the League before the raid.

4–6: In the prescript of the main decree the deme of the chairman is given, and it is not a deme which belongs to the tribe in prytany. In this and some other decrees until c. 340 the old formula, ‘X was chairman’, is still used, rather than the new formula, X of the proedroi was putting to the vote’ (for which see, e.g., 33: cf. Henry, Prescripts, 27–8 n. 32), but the presiding body in the assembly must nevertheless be the proedroi,
one councillor from each tribe except the tribe in prytany (cf. *Ath. Pol.* 44. ii–iii), and not the *prytaneis*. The earliest attestation of the *proedroi* is now *CSCA* v 1972, 164–9 no. 2 (*SEG* xxxii 50), of 379/8: for discussion of the date and purpose of the change see Rhodes, *Boule*, 25–8 with (1985 reissue) 306. This is one of several decrees from the first half of the fourth century which combine the enactment formula ‘Resolved by the council and the people’ with the motion formula ‘Be it resolved/decreeed by the people’ (1. 15, below). This was the time when the Athenians were beginning to distinguish between decrees which did and decrees which did not ratify a recommendation of the council (cf. Introduction, pp. xvii–xviii, xix–xx); in the second half of the fifth century the enactment formula mentioning the council had been standard for all decrees. Probably the motion formula is the more reliable and this and other such decrees are non-probouleumatic (cf. Rhodes, *Boule*, 75–8). On this occasion, then, the council will either have made no recommendation or have made a recommendation which was supplanted by this decree.

7: Aristoteles, the proposer of the main decree, reappears below as one of the envoys to Thebes and as the proposer of the second decree. He is mentioned by Diog. Laert. v. 33 as a writer of law-court speeches; and he may be the father of Aristonicus, proposer of a law and joint proposer with Lycurgus of a decree in the 330s (*Agora* xvi 75, *IG* ii 2 1623. 276–83, with A. M. Woodward *ap. D. M. Lewis, Hesp.* xxviii 1959, 241 = *Selected Papers*, 255).

9–12: The Peace of Antalcidas was based on the principle of autonomy for all cities: here it is made clear that Sparta is now seen as a threat to the autonomy of the Greeks. 12–15: A passage has been deleted: Accame claimed to see traces, and recent investigation supports him, allowing the reconstruction of a favourable reference to the Peace of Antalcidas (this peace and its renewals are often referred to as the ‘common peace’ because they embodied terms which were common to all the Greeks: the expression is first used in And. iii. *Peace* 17). The deletion presents an insoluble problem: the Athenians are not likely to have deleted such a passage until 367, when the Thebans won Persian support for terms unfavourable to Athens (X. H. vii. i. 33–40: this is championed as the occasion for the deletion by Ryder, *Koine Eirene*, 81 n. 9, cf. Cargill, 31–2; 31 and 33 show Athens still supporting the Peace of Antalcidas in 369/8)—but since from 369 Athens had been an ally of Sparta (X. H. vii. i. 1–14) we should have expected 11. 9–12 to be deleted also. Presumably the deletion reflects a sudden feeling of anger against the Persians.

15–46: Athens promises not to indulge in various practices in which it had indulged in the Delian League. It is useful to review those practices and the extent to which Athens kept her promises. Imposition of a constitution: Chares was to discredit Athens by intervening in Corecyra (D.S. xv. 95. iii: 361/0), and see 39. Garrisons and governors: see commentary on 24. Tribute: there was no collection of ‘tribute’ (phoros) from this League, but by 373 at the latest ‘contributions’ (syntaxes: cf. Thp. *FGrH* 115 F 98 ~ Harding 36) were being collected; in 72 it is the synedrion, the council of the allies, which assesses syntaxes. This clear promise suggests that at first it was perhaps thought that each member would pay for its own forces and no common funds would be needed, and/or that *ad hoc* arrangements would suffice (e.g. Cawkwell 1963. 91–3;
At the same time the Athenians revised their own arrangements for collecting the property tax called *eisphora* (Philoch. *FGH* 328 F 41). Athenian-owned property: Diodorus’ renunciation of all cleruchies is wrong; Lemnos, Imbros, and Scyros did not join the League and were not affected; it is not clear how much Athenian-owned property in members’ territory there was to be given up. The promise for the future likewise applies to states which join the League, and as far as we know it was not broken in the case of states included in the list of members, but from the 360s Athens did establish some cleruchies elsewhere (e.g. Samos, taken from the Persians in 365; D.S. xviii. 18. ix; Potidaea, taken from the Chalcidians e.364/3: Tod 146 ~ Harding 58). Demolition of stelai: the published text of a decree, though not the original text and not necessarily a complete and verbatim copy of it, was in some sense the official text, so to annul a published decree the Greeks would demolish the *stole* on which it was inscribed (see 2, Rhodes with Lewis, 3 with n. 4, and cf. the importance of inscribing lists of citizens in 4, 14). Badian, 91, sees a threat, that Athenian property will be given up and that stelai will be demolished, for states which join but not for states which do not; but again it is unlikely that at this date there were many stelai which potential members might want to have demolished. ‘Expose’ in ll. 43, 45, is a technical term (*phainein*, with the cognate noun *phasis*: see on 14, and cf. 25, 40): since the provision about property is one which could be committed only by Athenians against the allies, charges are to be tried by the allies’ *synedrion*, and in this way if not yet in any other it is envisaged that the allies as a body can acquire funds. The prospect of gaining half of the property concerned (which was normal in such cases: cf. 25) would be a strong incentive to citizens of allied states to ‘expose’ breaches of the rule (cf. 40).

46–51: It is made clear, belatedly, that the alliance is to be a standard defensive alliance (whereas the Delian League had been a full offensive and defensive alliance: *Ath. Pol.* 23. v).

51–63: Proposals to depart from the prospectus could presumably be made by an Athenian in the council or assembly or by a *synedros* in the *synedrion*, or perhaps by a citizen of an allied state in his own state. In theory a meeting of an assembly could reverse decisions taken at previous meetings: on ‘entrenchment clauses’, intended to protect decisions against reversal, see D. M. Lewis, *Φόρος* . . . *B. D. Meritt*, 81–9 = *Selected Papers*, 136–49; Rhodes with Lewis, 16–17, 524–5. Here charges are to be tried ‘by the Athenians and the allies’: though some have envisaged a joint court (e.g. Tod), more probably the *synedrion* and an Athenian body would try the case separately (Larsen, *Representative Government*, 63–4): Lewis compared *eisangeliai* in Athens for major offences, on which the assembly might have the last word, and suggested that the *synedrion* might act as an extra chamber of the Athenian state for this purpose as it did for decision-making purposes (*Φόρος* . . . *B. D. Meritt*, 88–9 with n. 39 = *Selected Papers*, 147–8 with n. 39; and see 33, 41). For a possible instance, in the 340s, see 69. In the Delian League, Athens on its own had claimed the right to exile from the territory of Athens and the allies (M&L 40 ~ Formara 71. 31).

63–72: The statue (and the Stoa, but the reference in this form is more probably to the statue; for treating the statue as the god see R. L. Gordon, *Art History* ii 1979,
5–34) of Zeus Eleutherios—the god of freedom, appropriate to the declared aim of the League (cf. 12)—were towards the north on the west side of the Agora (cf. Paus. i. 3. ii–iii and Camp, *The Athenian Agora*, 105–7). Until c.330 the normal payment for inscribing an Athenian decree was 20 or 30 drachmas: 60 drachmas here represent an exceptional payment for an exceptional stele (cf. Loomis, *Wages, Welfare Costs and Inflation*, 122–66 ch. viii).1 This is one of a number of decrees of about this date which stipulate that the payment for inscription is to come from a fund of ten talents (see on 21); the treasurers of 'the Goddess' are those of Athena, separated once more from those of the Other Gods in 385 (Ferguson, *Treasurers of Athena*, 14).

72–7: There have been various suggestions as to the purpose of the further embassy to Thebes: perhaps to persuade the Thebans to accept membership of the League as 'Thebans' rather than 'Boeotians' (Accame, 69; Cawkwell 1973, 48–9). 'Persuade ... of whatever good thing they can' is standard language, and we need not suspect deliberate vagueness. Of the envoys, Aristoteles is the proposer of the decree (cf. above); Pyrrhandrus is an envoy to Byzantium in Tod 121 ~ Harding 34, and the proposer of Tod 124 ~ Harding 38, both connected with the League; Thrasybulus of Collytus was a leading figure from 406 (Plut. *Alc*. 36. i–ii) to 373/2 (when he was general: *Hesp.* viii 1939, 3–5 no. 2). Aesch. mi. *Ctes.* 138–9 mentions the last two among men who were pro-Theban and served on embassies to Thebes.

91–6: Nothing significant can be reconstructed of the second decree. It was presumably enacted and inscribed after names of members had been inscribed on the front of the stele but before they were inscribed on the side.

List of members: The decree prescribes that the list is to be added to as members join (69–72), and for a time that was done. The first group of names was inscribed by the same hand as the decree, and therefore contains states which were members by spring 377: it comprises the states mentioned in D.S. xv. 28. iii, and Methymna, for which see 23.

The second hand added a group of Euboean cities and nearby Icus, which must have joined by the end of 378/7 (see Tod 124 ~ Harding 38, cited in the commentary on 23). Arethusa, inscribed in ii. 82 between Eretria and Carystus, we should expect to be in Euboea, and there was a well-known spring of that name near Chalcis (e.g. Eur. *L. A.* 170, Str. 449. x. i. 13). Only Steph. Byz. *s.n.* refers to a city of that name; and Accame, 72–3, is among those who have thought the city referred to must be the one north of Chalcidice, perhaps a colony of Chalcis (Str. 331. viii. fr. 36: in favour of that see also D. Knoepfler, *BCH* xcvi 1971, 223–44 at 239 with n. 43; P. Flensted-Jensen & M. H. Hansen in Hansen & Raafat (edd.), *More Studies in the Ancient Greek Polis*, 158). But geographically that seems unlikely, and we think it more likely that at this date a Euboean city of Arethusa was deemed to be independent of Chalcis. There exists also a small fragment of an Athenian decree concerning Arethusa (*Agora* xvi 43). Other Euboean cities appear in i. 88, i. 90 and 114. For Hestiaea's delay in joining cf. D.S. xv. 30. i: according to the literary sources its name had been changed to Oreus, but it

1 An unpublished dissertation by B. T. Nolan, 'Inscribing Costs at Athens in the Fourth Century B.C.' is summarized at *SEG* xlv 257.
continued to call itself Hestiaea on inscriptions and coins; by the 350s it had absorbed Dium and Athenae Diades (only four Euboean cities are mentioned in 48, and in [Scyl.] 58).

Those inscribed by the third hand (but for doubts about the unity of this group see Cargill, 34, 38–9) were won by Chabrias in 377 (D.S. xv. 30. v, mentioning Peparethus and Sciathus). The other names on the front of the stele, though not a block inscribed by one hand on one occasion, could all have been added in the course of 376 (for Chabrias’ campaign that year, which included the defeat of a Spartan fleet off Naxos, see X. H. v. iv. 60–1, D.S. xv. 34. iii–35. ii). Of the cities of Ceos, Poessa appears as an insertion in l. 82, the others appear as a block in 119–22. It is noteworthy that these cities are listed separately, while some of the Ceanes would have preferred Ceos to be treated as a single entity; see on 39.

On the left-hand side of the stele, ll. 131–4 are placed level with the first names on the front, so that they are a long way below and are best considered to be earlier than the other names on the side (Woodhead, 371 n. 15; but the view that they are the latest entry has been reasserted by C. M. Fauber, Ath. 587 1999, 481–506 at 494–6). This entry must be connected in some way with Timotheus’ campaign of 375: these democratic exiles are likely to be the men who fought for him at Alyzea, and whom he enabled to occupy a fort on the island after the Peace of Antalcidas had been renewed; but it is possible that the Nellus of our inscription was not that fort (which Diodorus calls Arcadia), but was on the mainland and was occupied by the exiles before Timotheus’ campaign, and that this entry belongs to the beginning rather than the end of 375 (X. H. v. iv. 63–6, vi. ii. 2–3; D.S. xv. 36. v–vi, 45. ii–iv [apparently regarding the exiles as oligarchs]: Cawkwell 1963, 88; Mitchell).

The remaining names begin with another democratic faction (ll. 97–8). This used to be restored as belonging to Corcyra, with reference to Tod 127 ~ Harding 42 (cited in the commentary on 24); but Coleman & Bradeen showed that there is no room for more than three letters at the beginning of the name. They restored Thera, and it is credible that Thera should have become democratic and should have joined the League not long after the battle of Naxos, but there is no positive evidence; Scuccimarra suggests Pyrrha, on Lesbos, which is known to have been a member of the League (cf. 31. 29) but is not listed either with Mytilene and Methymna on the front or with Antissa and Eresus on the side, and that is a better conjecture (but see below on Astraeus, 1.118).

In ll. 101–2 we should expect ‘the Chalcidians from Thrace’ to be the state centred on Olynthus. That was defeated and presumably dismantled by Sparta in 379 (X. H. v. iii. 26, D.S. xv. 23. iii, stating that Olynthus was made a subordinate ally of Sparta but not stating what became of the federation); but it is clear from the coinage that a state called ‘the Chalcidians’, though much reduced, did continue to exist in and after 379 (Robinson & Clement, Excavations at Olynthus, ix, 141, 157–8; U. Westermark, Studies in Ancient History and Numismatics Presented to R. Thomsen, 91–103, suggests a revision of their chronology but does not challenge their view of the continuing existence of ‘the Chalcidians’ after 379), and (unlike Tod) we should accept that it is that state, defecting from Sparta, which is referred to here. An inscription recording Athens’ alliance with
22. PROSPECTUS OF THE SECOND ATHENIAN LEAGUE, 378/7

the western Chalcidians from Thrace' (Tod 119) perhaps belongs to this occasion (see Accame, 87–9; Zahm, Olynth und die Chalkidier, 95–100, 124–7).

In 1.111 is a deletion: Jason, the tyrant of Pherae in Thessaly, has often been restored below his ally (X. H. vi. i. 7) Alcetas, and Alcetas’ son Neoptolemus, of the Molossi in Epirus; but Woodhead has confirmed earlier protests that the erasure is too long for the traditional interpretation to be plausible (see critical note). In 374 Jason is represented as claiming that Athens would like him as an ally but he sees Athens as a rival (X. H. vi. i. 10); but in winter 373/2 Alcetas and Jason went to Athens to speak for Timotheus at his trial, and a speech describes both as allies of Athens ([Dem.] xl.ix. Tim. 10, 22). It would be epigraphically possible to restore Jason in the deletion if the vertical at the end were regarded as the edge of the deletion rather than as part of a letter; but we do not claim to know what was in this deletion.

Astraeus (1. 118) is not otherwise known: P. Brun, ZPE cx xi 1998, 103–8, rejects the restoration of Pyrrha in 1. 98 and suggests that Astraeus was an alternative name for Pyrrha, which would appropriately be inscribed with Antissa and Eresus from Lesbos (11.116–17).

Some of the names on the left-hand side certainly belong to 375: for Abdera cf. D.S. xv. 36. i–iv; for Acarnania and Cephalenlia cf. 24. Some, including Tod, have associated the later names with Timotheus’ campaign of 373 (X. H. vi. ii. 10–13, D.S. xv. 47. ii–iii), but it is more likely that all these names belong to 375 (Cawkwell 1963, 91 n. 61; 1981, 42–5). After this set of names was completed, although there was room for further additions, no more were made. Sealey suggested that there were later accessions to the League, but the promises made in the prospectus were not extended to them (Phoenix. xi 1957, 107–9); Gargill goes beyond that to argue that, although various forms of alliance were made thereafter, there were no later additions to the membership of the League. But to reach his conclusion he forces the evidence (cf. on 24): it is better to believe that the membership of the League was not closed, and the application of the promises was not formally limited, yet for some reason the practice of adding names to the list on this stele ceased (Cawkwell 1981, 45–6). About 58 members were listed on this stele (we do not know the reason for the deletion in 1.111; Alcetas and Neoptolemus should perhaps be counted as one ‘member’); but D.S. xv. 30. ii mentions 70 members, and Aesch. n. Embassy 70 mentions 75.

As a result of their campaigns during the early years of the League Chabrias and Timotheus were both honoured with statues in the Agora (as had been Timotheus’ father Conon: cf. on 8). For Chabrias see Aesch. iii. Ctes. 243, Arist. Rhet. iii. 1411 b 6–7, Nep. xii. Chab. i. iii, D.S. xv. 33. iv, cf. Dem. xx. Lept. 75–86: the inscribed statue base (A. P. Burnett & C. N. Edmondson, Hesp. xxx 1961, 74–91) records honours awarded by various bodies resulting from his campaigns of 376 and 375, including the demos of Mytilene and ‘soldiers’ (another Athenian garrison?) at Mytilene. For Timotheus, whose honours followed his victory at Alyzea, see Aesch. iii. Ctes. 243, Nep. xiii. Tim. 2. iii, cf. Dem. xx. Lept. 84–5, and Tod 128; he and Conon were honoured in other places too, and C. Vatin has read texts referring to him and the year 375/4 on the base of the ‘dancing girls’ column north-east of the temple of Apollo at Delphi (CRAI/1983, 26–40, cf. SEG xxxiii 449).
Methymna joins the Second Athenian League, 378/7

A stele broken at the top: found on the Athenian Acropolis; now in the Epigraphical Museum.

Attic-Ionic, retaining the old ε for οι in l. 3, ο for ou regularly: ll. 5 sqq., stoichedon 28 (29 letters in l. 22).

IG ii 42; SIG* 149; Tod 122*; Sit. 258. Trans. Harding 37. See also V. Ehrenberg, Hermes iv 1929, 322–9; G. L. Cawkwell, CQ xxiii 1973, 50–1; Cargill, The Second Athenian League, esp. 102–3, 107 n. 24.

[θυεξεν τῷ βολήμι καὶ τῶν δήμων. ———]

[. . . ἢ ἐπτριαὶανενεκ. Καλ[λομ — Αλω]-]

πεκϊθεν ἐγραμματευεν. Σίμωνον [——] —ιος ἐπεσατε. Λοστύφιλος εἰπεν. περὶ ὁν οἱ Μηθυμναῖοι λέγονεν, ἐπειδ—

5 ἡ σύμμαχοι εἰσι καὶ εὖνοι τῷ πόλη-]

i τῷ Μηθυμναϊοι Μηθυμναῖοι, ὅπως ἂν καὶ πρὸς τὸς ἄλλον συμμάχος τὸς Αθ—

ηναϊοι ἢ αὐτοῖς ἡ συμμαχία, ἀναγρ—

άψαι αὐτὸς τὸν γραμματέα τῆς βολῆ—

5, δοσπερ καὶ οἱ ἄλλοι σύμμαχοι ἀναγ—

ἐγραμμένοι εἰσιν ὁμός δὲ τὴν πρ—

εσβείαν τῶν Μηθυμναϊον τὸν αὐτὸν ὁρκον ὀμπερ καὶ οἱ ἄλλοι σύμμαχοι ὁμοσαν, τοίς τε συνέδροις τῶν συμμ—

άχων καὶ τοῖς στρατηγοῖς καὶ τοῖς ἵππαρχοις ὁμός δὲ τοῖς Μηθυμνα—

ιοῖς τὸς τε συνέδρος τῶν συμμάχων τοῦ καὶ τὸς στρατηγὸς καὶ τὸς ἵππαρχο—

ς κατὰ ταθα. ἐπιμεληθῆσαι δὲ Αἵραι—

10 ἡμων καὶ τὸς συνέδρος τὸς ἐπὶ τῶν [1ε]—

ών ὅπως ἂν ὁμόσωσι αἱ ἄρχαι αἱ Μ[ηθ—

υμαῖοι καθάπερ οἱ ἄλλοι σύμμαχοι [ι]. ἐπαινέσαι δὲ τῇ πόλιν τὴν Μηθυμναι—

αῖοι καὶ καλεσά τὸς πρέσβεις τῶν

25 Μηθυμναῖον ἐπὶ ξένα. vocat

the stone has σύμμαχοι. 20–1 [ε]ει Suappe, Ausgewählte Schriften, 807–9 (item first published 1890), ε[ε]ει A. Wilhelm, AM xxvii 1892, 191–3: no trace of the first letter can be seen on two squeezes in Oxford, but the restoration is greatly preferable to any other that has been suggested.

In addition to the prospectus of the Second Athenian League (22), we have a number of inscriptions concerned with the admission of individual member states to the League during the 370s: we include two of these in our collection, and cite the others in the commentaries.
Resolved by the council and the people.
— was the prytany; Call— of Alopece was secretary; Simon of —— was chairman. Astyphilus proposed:

Concerning what the Methymnaeans say, since the Methymnaeans are allies and well disposed to the city of Athens, so that their alliance may be with the other allies of Athens also, they shall be written up by the secretary of the council, as the other allies have been written up also.

The embassy of the Methymnaeans shall swear the same oath as the other allies have sworn, to the synedroi of the allies and the generals and the hipparchs; and the synedroi of the allies and the generals and the hipparchs shall swear to the Methymnaeans in the same way.

Aesimus and the synedroi on the ships shall take care that the officials of the Methymnaeans swear like the other allies.

Praise the city of Methymna and invite the envoys of the Methymnaeans to hospitality.

'The first who obeyed the call to defect (from Sparta) were the Chians and Byzantines, and after them the Rhodians and Mytilenaeans and some others of the islanders' (D.S. xv. 28. iii). For a general discussion of the chronology of the League's institution, see the commentary on 22. An Athenian decree of 379/8, restored as honouring a
man called Euryphon in connection with ‘the Athenian envoys for the alliance’ \([\tau\dot{\omega} \nu \tau\acute{o} \rho\acute{e} \beta\zeta \nu \tau\omega\nu \nu \tau\dot{\omega} \nu \tau\acute{o} \rho\acute{e} \nu \n
overall commanders of the cavalry (Ath. Pol. 61. iv). For Aesimus cf. 20: presumably he
and the founder synedroi are visiting actual and potential recruits to the League.

Thebes is another member inscribed in the list of 22 by the original hand, at the
head of a second column; when the main decree of that inscription was enacted,
negotiation with Thebes was not yet complete (ll. 72–7). A very fragmentary inscription
contains an amendment to a decree concerning Thebes (IG ii² 40: cautious text
and discussion Cargill, 52–6; trans. of a speculative reconstruction, Harding 33): that
is likely to belong to some stage in the negotiations between Athens and Thebes in
378/7.

Tod 124 ~ Harding 38 belongs to the same year (378/7) as, but is later than, 22. It
accepts the offer of Chalcis in Euboea to join the League; and it gives a specification
of the terms of membership based on the specification of 22, but it qualifies, as 22
does not, the list of impositions to which Chalcis will not be subjected with the words
‘contrary to the resolutions of the allies’ ( Parrat t`a dýgamat[a t`óv sýmmá`xov]: ll. 25–6)
—which could mean either ‘because these would be contrary . . .’ or ‘except when
authorized by . . .’, or could originally have been intended to mean the first but have
been exploited to mean the second. The addition of the cities of Euboea to the
League is mentioned by D.S. xv. 30. i, and Chalcis and three of the other cities are
added below Thebes by a second hand in the second column of the list of 22.

In all of these documents the decision to admit a member to the League is made
simply by Athens: in the case of Methymna the allies are involved in the oath-taking,
and if IG ii² 40 is concerned simply with Thebes a Chian and a Mytilenaean were
involved with Thebes; but there is no sign of allied involvement in the case of Byzan-
tium, or in the case of Chalcis, where the heading before the alliance proper reads,
‘Alliance of the Chalcidians in Euboea and Athenians’ ([sýmmá`x]i`a Χαλ[κιδ]έων t`óν
év Eú[b]óiai [ka]l Αθηναίων: ll. 20–1). Even when they were trying to be conciliatory,
the Athenians did not think such language would be offensive.
The secretary named in the heading is different from the secretary named in ll. 3–4: presumably the complete stele contained a dossier of two or more documents, the last document ordered the inscription of the whole dossier, and Philocles was secretary when that last document was enacted. (At this date secretaries served for one prytany; see commentary on 39). In ll. 11–13 we have the earliest example in this collection (but the earliest example known is in CSCA v 1972, 164–9 no. 2 = SEG xxxii 50, of 379/8) of the ‘probouleumatic formula’, the form of words by which the council in its probouleuma makes a recommendation to the assembly, which is frequently retained in the wording of the assembly’s decrees from the 370s onwards (cf. Introduction, pp. xvii–xviii, xix–xx).
Philodectes of —— son of —— was secretary.

In the archonship of Hippodamus [375/4]; in the second prytany, of Antiochis; to which Phylacus son of —— of Oenoe was secretary. Critias proposed:

Concerning what is said in the council by the envoys of Corcyra and Acarnania and Cephallenia, praise the envoys of Corcyra and Acarnania and Cephallenia because they have been good men with regard to the people of Athens and the allies both now and in the time past. So that what they need may be done, bring them forward to the people, and contribute the opinion of the council that the council resolves:

The names of the cities that have come shall be written up on the common stele of the allies by the secretary of the council.

And the oaths shall be given to the cities that have come by the council and the generals and the cavalry; and the allies shall swear the oath likewise.

When this has been done there shall be valid for the future whatever is resolved by the common body of the allies. Choose three/five men who shall receive the oaths from the cities, and they shall be written up on the common stele where the allies have been written in.

Also synedroi shall be sent by each of the cities to the synedrion of the allies in accordance with the resolutions of the allies and of the people of Athens.

Concerning the Acarnanians consider in common with Aeschylus and Evarchus and Eury— and ——us and G—— and Rhysiades

This document concerns the addition of north-western states to the League, as a result of the campaign of Timotheus in 375 (X. H. v. iv. 62–6, mentioning Corcyra; D.S. xv. 36. v, mentioning Acarnania and Cephallenia). All three had been allied to Athens during the Peloponnesian War, but c.388 Acarnania, on the mainland, had been forced to make an alliance with Sparta (X. H. iv. vii. 1, Ages. ii. 20). Timotheus’ campaign in 375 was ended by a renewal of the Peace of Antalcidas (X. H. vi. ii. 1, D.S. xv. 38); in further campaigning involving Athens and Sparta in 374–372 Athens defeated Sparta, retained its hold on Corcyra, supported its friends in Acarnania, and, in the face of some opposition, gained control of Cephallenia (X. H. vi. ii. 5–39, D.S. xv. 45. ii – 46. iii, 47. i–vii).
Since there is no doubt about the date of this inscription, and names were still added to 22 in 375, we should expect to find Corecyra, Acarnania, and Cephallenia all included in the list of members there; but in fact, though Acarnania is present (l. 106), it is followed by only one of the four cities of Cephallenia (107–8), and the names of the others are not preserved or likely to have been inscribed (Corecyra is not to be restored in 97).

A separate inscription, undated, contains an alliance and oaths for Corecyra (Tod 127 ~ Harding 42): it is formulated as a defensive alliance between Corecyra and Athens, but includes the clauses, ‘It shall not be permitted to the Corecyraeans to make war and peace without the Athenians and the mass of the allies; they shall do the other things in accordance with the resolutions of the allies’ (πόλεις εἰς καὶ ἐκάθεν μὴ ἔχεται Κορευραίοις πολισσασθαι [ἀ]ν Αθηναίων καὶ [τοῦ π]λήθους τῶν συμμάχων: πολιεῖ δὲ καὶ τὰλλα κατὰ τὰ δόγματα τῶν συμμάχων: ll. 11–15, cf. the corresponding clauses in the oaths); and despite the arguments of Cargill this supports the view that by this alliance Corecyra became a member of the League (Tuplin, 553–61). From the absence of Corecyra from 22 we may conjecture that the admission of Corecyra to the League was completed not in 375/4 before the resumption of the war but in 372/1 when the war in the north-west had ended (contr. C. M. Fauber, CQ$^2$ xlvi 1998, 110–16, who thinks Corecyra and the missing Cephallenian cities were inscribed on 22). Reference to democracy in Tod 127 is perhaps not as emphatic as has

Athenian law on approvers of silver coinage, 375/4

 desarroll was found in the Athenian Agora (built into a wall of the Great Drain, in front of the Stoa of the Basilisk); now in the Agora museum. Phot. Hesp. xliii 1974, pls. 25–7; JWG xxxvi 1986, Taf. 3. 1.

Attic-Ionic, usually retaining the old ο for ον, and ε for ει must be restored in I. 53; ll. 1–2 in larger letters; ll. 3 sqq. stoichedon 39, with ει cut in a single space in I. 55 in order to finish the text at the end of a line.


3-4 εἰρήσεως at R. Kassel, H. Wankel, ΖPE iii 1983, 71 n. 15: δευκάγλης at Stroud.
sometimes been claimed, given that it is paralleled by reference to democracy in Athens, but it is undoubtedly there—e.g. ‘into the land of Gorcyra or against the People of Gorcyra’ (e[[2]]r τ[η]γ χώραν τηγ Κορκυραίων η επι τόν δήμου τηγ Κορκυραίων. ll. 2–4): Timotheus in 375 did not ‘change the laws’, so presumably left an oligarchy undisturbed (X. H. v. iv. 64), but a rising against a democracy led to Sparta’s intervention in 374 (D.S. xv. 46. i).

In the light of the literary evidence it is not surprising that only one Cephallenian city is listed in 22. A fragmentary text, presumably to be dated to 372, appends to an alliance between Athens and Cephallenia clauses concerning the deletion of texts, garrisons, and the sending of three Athenian epimeletai to Cephallenia for the duration of the war (IG ii² 98 + Hesp. ix 1940, 321–4 no. 33 = Svī. 267 = Agora xvi 46). Those measures presumably had the approval of those Cephallenians who were pro-Athenian, and may also have been authorized by the synedrion of the League: they were nevertheless contrary to the unqualified promise of 22, as was the installation of a garrison in Abdera in 375 (D.S. xv. 36. i–iv). For governors and garrisons in the 350s see 51, 52.1

1 IG ii² 5224 is the epitaph, in lettering of the early fourth century, of two Gorcyraean envoys who died ‘by accident’ (kara avt évêv) in Athens and were given a public funeral. It used to be associated with the admission of Gorcyra to the Second League; but further investigation has shown that the inscription belongs to a fourth-century restoration of a grave of the third quarter of the fifth century: the envoys probably died in 433 (U. Knibbe, Ἀ.Α. 1972, 591–605).

Resolved by the nomothetai. In the archonship of Hippodamas [375/4]. Nicophon proposed:

3 Attic silver shall be accepted when it is found to be silver and has the public stamp.

4 The public approver (dokimastes) shall sit between the tables and approve on these terms every day except when there is a deposit of money, but then in the bouleuterion. If any one brings forward foreign silver having the same stamp as the Attic — — — , he shall give it back to the man who brought it forward; but if it has
EKrea.d by A. P. Matthaiou:

10 ἄποδιδότο τῶι προσενήγοντι· εάν δὲ ὑπ’αιλκον
η ὑπομιλισθον ἰайтеθον, διακοστήτως πα[μαντικόν]—
α καὶ ἕστο ἰερόν τῆι Μιτρός [τ]ῶι ᾠθών Καὶ κ[αταβαλ]-
λέτῳ ἐς τῆι βολήν· εάν δὲ μὴ καθήπτα[i] ὁ δοκ[μαστίς],
μὴ δοκιμάζῃ κατά τόν νόμον, τυπ[τ]ῶι ὄντων {αὐτῶν ὅν}
τό δήμῳ συλλογής πεντήκοντα πληγάς τῇ ἴμαστῃ—
γι. εάν δὲ τις μὴ δέχηται το ὡ[ρ]γ[ρι]ον ὁ τ[ι] ἰ ὁ δοκ[—
μαστίς] δοκιμάσῃ, στερείσθω ὁν ἢμ [π]ολη[ἔν ἑκάτῳ]—
ἵ τῇ ἴμερᾳ. φαίνει δὲ τά μεῖ ἐν [τ]ῶι ζ [τ]ῶι πρός
τός στοιβάζει, τά δέ ἐν τῇ ἀγορᾷ κ[α]ί [ἐν τοῖς ᾨ-
λοίς ἀστρεῖ πρὸς τοὺς τὸ δήμῳ συλλογῆς[ας], τά [ἐν ἐν τώι]—
i ἐμπορίῳ καὶ τῶι Πει[ρ]ι[ι]ι[ιε]ι[πρὸς τοῦς ἐπιμελητί-
τῇς τοῦ ἐμπορίῳ πλήν ἐν τὸν σῖτον, τά δὲ [ἐν τοῖς οἱ]
tῶι πρὸς τοὺς στοιβάζει. τῶι δὲ φανήθηντα [οπόθ], ὑπ’
σα μὲν ἢ ἐν ἐν τοῖς ἀρχαῖοι κύριοι [ἐντον ο [.α]—
χρωτες διαγιγομένου, τά δέ ὑπ’[η] [κ]α [δραχαίμιας]
ἐσαγώνωσι το εἶ δικαστήριοι. οἱ δὲ θε[σμ]οθ[έτῃς] πι—
arχοντων αὐτοῖς ἑπικληροντες δικα[στήριο]ν ὁ—
ταρ παραγγέλλον οὐ εἰςύνεσθαι ν [Χ(?)] δραχ[μαίς]. τοι—
de φάνεται μετεστῶ ὁ τ΄ [μ] [ἐ] [α] [ν] ο[ν ήμνη]
30 εάν δὲ δόλος ἢ το πωλόν ἢ δόλη, ὑπα[ρχέτοι μ] [ἐν αὐτῷ]
tύπτεσθαι Γ' πληγάς τῇ μάστιγι ὑπὸ [τῶι ἀρχόντων]
ν ο[ς ξ] [κ] [αστα] προστέτακται. εάν δὲ τις [τ]ῶι [ἄρχοντω]
[ν] μὴ ποιήθη κατά τὸ γεγραμμένα, εἰσαγ[γελήτω] πο—
v εν τῆι βολήν Αθηναίων ὁ βολόμενος αἰς [ἐξεστών]
εάν δὲ ἄλοι ὑπάρχηστο μεν αὐτοὶ πεπανθάναιν ἀρχόν]—
tι καὶ προστημάτῳ αὐτῶι γ[β] βολή μέχρι [Γ' δραχαίνων]. [δ]—
pως δ’ ἢ ἢ καὶ ἤμεν Πειραει[κ] δοκιμάστης [τοις ταυτι—
ληροι καὶ τοις ἐμπόροις καὶ τοῖς Ἀλλα[ε] πάνω,
καταστηματί[ν] ἡ βολή ἐκ τῶι δημοσίων ἔβ]ν ὑπάρχη]
40 ἥ εσπρισθάθω, τήν δὲ τίμην οἱ ἀπόδεκται [μερίζοντο]
ων. οἱ δὲ ἐπιμεληται τοῦ ἐμπορίῳ ἐπιμελε[σ] κ[θ]ν [ἔποτι—
[ως] ἄν καθίσθαι πρὸς τῇ στήλη τοῦ Ποσειδώνιος, κα—
τὸ χρήσθων τῶι νόμων καθάπερ περὶ τό ἐν [ἀστε][[π]οκ]—
μαστό ἐφητή κατά τατήτα. ἀναγράψα τά δὲ ἐν στῆι]—
45 ἦ λιθήνῃ το νόμων τόνδε καὶ καταβεβάζειν ἐν [άσο].

a bronze core or a lead core or is counterfeit, he shall cut through it immediately and it shall be sacred property of the Mother of the Gods and he shall deposit it in the council.

13 If the approver does not sit, or does not approve in accordance with the law, he shall be beaten by the conveners of the people (συλλογεῖς του δημοῦ) with fifty lashes with the whip. If any one does not accept the silver which the approver approves, he shall be deprived of what he is selling on that day. Exposures (phasis) shall be made for matters in the corn-market to the corn-guardians (σιτοφυλάκες), for matters in the Agora and the rest of the city to the conveners of the people, for matters in the import-market to the overseers of the import-market (επιμεληταὶ τοῦ ἐμπορίου) except for matters in the corn-market, and for matters in the corn-market to the corn-guardians. For matters exposed, those that are up to ten drachmas the archontes shall have power to decide, those that are beyond ten drachmas they shall introduce into the jury-court. The thesmothetai shall provide and allot a jury-court for them whenever they request, or they shall be fined 1,000 (?) drachmas. For the man who exposes, there shall be a share of a half if he convicts the man whom he exposes. If the seller is a slave-man or a slave-woman, he shall be beaten with fifty lashes with the whip by the archontes commissioned in each matter. If any of the archontes does not act in accordance with what is written, he shall be denounced (εἰςαγγελεῖν) to the council by whoever wishes of the Athenians who have the right, and if he is convicted he shall be dismissed from his office and the council shall make an additional assessment up to 500 drachmas.

36 So that there shall also be in the Piraeus an approver for the ship-owners and the import-traders and all others, the council shall appoint from the public slaves if available or shall buy one, and the apodektai shall make an allocation of the price. The overseers of the import-market shall see that he sits in front of the stele of Poseidon, and they shall use the law in the same way as has been stated concerning the approver in the city.

44 Write up this law on a stone stele and put it down in the city between the tables and in Piraeus in front of
This is not a decree (psephisma) enacted by the council and assembly but a law (nomos) enacted by the nomothetai (cf. Introduction, p. xviii). Edoxe (without final η) is rare (Stroud, 161; Threatte, Grammar, i. 642).

On one or more occasions in the fifth century Athens tried to require all members of the Delian League to use Athenian silver coinage (M&L 45 ~ Formara 97, cf. Ar. Birds 1040–1; Figueira, The Power of Money, has recently challenged the standard doctrine that Athens went so far as to forbid the members to issue silver coinage of their own): this law was enacted for a world in which Athens had to counter not reluctance to use Athenian silver coinage but a temptation to imitate it in non-Athenian, and less pure, silver. For the ‘approval’ (dohmasia) of silver coins cf. the dohmasia of men appointed to offices, of the cavalry’s horses and special units, and of invalids claiming a maintenance grant (Ath. Pol. 45. iii, 55. ii–iv: 49. i; 49. iv). There already exists an approver of coins for the city, and this law adds one for the Piraeus (ll. 36–44): normally the city approver works ‘between the tables’ (l. 56 cf. 46), presumably those of the bankers and money-changers in the Agora, but on days when there is a ‘deposit of money’, i.e. a payment of revenue made in the presence of the council (cf. Ath. Pol. 48. i) he works in the bouleuterion to check the coins tendered there. For foreign coins of Athenian design see below; for examples of the cutting-through of coins which he rejects as base or counterfeit see Stroud’s pl. 25. It appears that the bronze coins mentioned by Aristophanes (Frogs 718–37 with schol. 725, Eccl. 815–22), issued in the last years of the Peloponnesian War, were in fact silver-plated coins with a bronze core (reasserted by J. H. Kroll, GRBS xvii 1976, 329–41, against Giovannini, GRBS xvi 1975, 185–90). The approver is subject to flogging if he fails in his duty because he is a demosios, a public slave (cf. ll. 36–41).

The sylloges ton demon were three members of the council from each of the ten tribes (Rhodes, Boule, 21, 129–30): this is probably the earliest mention of them; their duties here have no connection with their other attested duties. For phasis (‘exposure’), a means of initiating legal proceedings in connection with objects, used inter alia in connection with breaches of trading regulations, see on 14; and cf. 22, 40. For the
the stele of Poseidon. The secretary of the council shall commission the contract from the poletaí, and the poletaí shall introduce it into the council.

49 The salary payment for the approver in the import-market shall be in the archonship of Hippodamas from when he is appointed, and the apodektai shall allocate as much as for the approver in the city, and for the time to come the salary payment shall be from the same source as for the mint-workers.

55 If there is any decree written on a stele contrary to this law, the secretary of the council shall demolish it.
4), but his translation is 'report the price to the Poletai'. For the poletai ('sellers') as makers of public contracts see 36 and Ath. Pol. 47. ii—v: except in this text all references to a contract for publication are earlier than c. 400 (e.g. M&L 85, 86 = IG i 102, 104 ~ Formara 155, 15. B). Since no decree could have greater validity than a law (e.g. And. i. Myst. 87); any decree that would conflict with this new law will be rendered invalid by it, and so ll. 55–6 order the demolition of any stelai on which such decrees are inscribed (for demolition of stelai cf. 22).

What has provoked the most controversy in the interpretation of this law is the question of how the Athenians reacted to 'foreign coined silver having the same stamp as the Attic' [ll. 8–9]. Stroud believed that if imitation coins were as good as Athenian they were approved (cf. Giovannini, Rome et la circulation monétaire en Grèce, 39; H. Engelmann, ZPE lx 1985, 170–3); a majority view has developed that such coins were neither approved like good Athenian coins nor defaced and confiscated like base or counterfeit coins but simply returned to those who tendered them, to use in whatever way they could, i.e. wherever they could gain acceptance for them (e.g. Giovannini, GRBS xvi 1975, 191–5; Stumpf; Martin, 26–7); but the fact that there would be no way to distinguish subsequently between coins which were approved and coins which were returned but not approved is an obstacle to that, and we prefer Stroud's view.

Martin concentrates on the appointment of slaves as approvers: he suggests that for this specialized task it will have been appropriate to use men who could be disciplined without the due process to which free men were entitled, but more probably, as with other demosioi, slaves were used here as men possessing a particular skill but not one associated with free men. For another decree on local and foreign coinage, in Olbia in
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Athenian law taxing Lemnos, Imbros, and Scyros, 374/3

A complete marble stele found in the east wall of the Great Drain in Athens, near the north-east corner of the Stoa Basileios in 1986, now in the Agora Museum (Agora inv. no. I 7557). Above the moulding on which the inscription begins is a slightly recessed panel with irregular contour at top: this may have had a painting, possibly of heaps or sacks of grain, although no traces survive. Phot. Stroud, The Athenian Grain-Tax Law, figs. 1–4.

Attic-Ionic, but retaining the old ε for ο in lines 8, 11, 14, 19, 40, and 55, and ε for ι in lines 42 and 46. Strickerion 31 except in line 58 which has 32 letters.


(θ)εοί.

ἐπὶ Σωκρατίδο ἄρχοντος

νόμος περὶ τῆς δοθεκάτης τοῦ σίτου "

τῶν νήσων. vacat

1, 23, 24, 25, 26, 29, 34, 37, 55, 60, 61: supplements occasioned by failure to cut crossbars etc.
the fourth century, see \textit{SIG}² 218 = \textit{CIRB}² 24 = \textit{IK Kalchedon} 16 \sim Austin \& Vidal-Naquet, 330–3 no. 103. \textit{IG} XII, ii 1 \sim Tod 112, now thought to belong to the fifth century, contains the end of an agreement by which Mytilene and Phocaea were to alternate in the issuing of electrum coins.

Clearly before the enactment of this law the Athenians had already been conscious of problems in connection with imitation, base, and counterfeit coins, and with the rejection of genuine coins by the over-suspicious, and they had appointed the city approver: the development of the Second Athenian League had perhaps added to the problems, and so in 375/4 they appointed a second approver to work in the Piraeus. We cannot tell how far what is said about the city tester is repeated from an earlier law and how far it represents an addition to or modification of an earlier law: S. Alessandri, \textit{Ann. Pont} xiv 1984, 369–93, cf. xii 1982, 1239–54, suggests that it is repeated from a law for which an appropriate context would be c.402–399 (a box of counterfeit coins appears in the \textit{Hekatompedon} inventories from 398/7 \cite{IG II 1388. 61–2}, though there is no suggestion that they have been cut as required by this law, and it is not likely that, as suggested by Stroud, 176–7, the Lacon from whom the box was received was the approver); Stumpf, thinking that Athens will not have needed to make provision for imitations of Athenian coinage before the institution of the Second Athenian League (cf. on 22) and of the symmories for \textit{eisphora}, suggests that it is repeated from a law of c.378. The clause requiring the \textit{poletai} to contract for the publication of the text (ll. 47–9) is not otherwise found after c.400 (cf. Stroud, 183–4 with n. 107), and that supports Alessandri’s date for the earlier law.

---

Gods. In the archonship of Socratides. Law concerning the one twelfth of the grain of the islands.
120

5 Ἀγύρριος ἔστεν· ὅπως ἄν τῶι δήμωι αἰ[το]-
6 ἵ ἐν τῶι κοινῷ, τὴν δωδεκάτην πωλεῖ-
7 τὴν ἐν Λήμνῳ καὶ Μῆμβρῳ καὶ Σκύρῳ[ι κ.]-
8 αἱ τὴν πεντηκοστῆν σῶτο· ἡ δὲ μερίς ἐκ[ὲ]-
9 στη ἔσται πεντακόσιοι μέδιμνοι, πο[ῖο]-
10 μὲν έκατόν, κριθῶν δὲ τετρακόσιον[ι κο]-
11 μεῖ τὸν οίτων κυκλῶν τῶι ἕαυτον ὁ π[ὶ]-
12 ἁμένοις εἰς τὸν Πειραιαῖ καὶ άνακομιμ[ε]-
13 εὶς τὸ άστυ τὸν οίτων τέλεσαν τοῖς α[ῦ]-
14 τῷ καὶ κατανήσει τὸν οίτων εἰς τὸ Ἄθικ[α]-
15 ειν· στέγων δὲ καὶ τεθυραμμένοιν παρε[ξ]-
16 εἰ τὸ Αιάκουν ἡ πόλεις καὶ ἀποστῆσαι[ε] τ-
17 ὁν οίτων τῇ πόλης τριάκοντα ήμερῶν[ὲ]
18 πραμένοις, ἐπειδὴ ἀνακομίσατε εἰς[άσπ-
19 τυ, τέλες τοῖς αὐτῶ· ἐπειδὴ δὲ ανακ[λομ]-
20 ἵσιεί εἰς τὸ άστυ, ἐνοίκιοι νῦν πράξει[η π]-
21 όλις τούς πραμένους· τοὺς πυρῶν θ[πο]-
22 στήσεις ὁ πραμένος ἐλκομαστείν πάντει[ξ]-
23 τῇ(ς) πόλει τῶι τάλαντον, τάς δε κρι[θ]άς ἐλκο[ῦ]-
24 (ς) τῶι μέδιμνοί πόλεις τέλειον ἔγραφα ἀποστῆσαι[π]-
25 ἔσει καθαρὰς αἰρῶν, τὸ(ν{η})κοιμα ἔπι τῇ[ι ζ]-
26 ϊ(ν{η}) στηκώσαι, καθάπερ οἱ ἄλλοι εἰς[πορό]-
27 ι· προκαταβολὴν ωθείς ο[ἰ] πράμα[μ]οῦ[ς]
28 λαβέναι καὶ περιστεραὶ κατὰ τὴν[με]ρο[δ]-
29 α ἐκ(ο)σι δραχμὰ(ς)· ἐγγυητ(α)ς καταστήσω[φ]-
30 ὁ πραμένος δύο κατὰ τὴν μερίδα ἀξίς[ξ]-
31 χρεως, οὐδὲν ἐν ἡ βουλὴ δοκιμάση· συμμ[υρ]-
32 ἔσται ἡ μερίς τριακούλιον μέδιμ[ου],
33 ἐξ άνδρες· η πόλις πράξει τὴν συμμορ[ι]-
34 τὸν οίτων κ(α) παρ’ ἐνῶς καὶ παρ’ ἀπάν[πω]-
35 τῶι ἐν τῇ συμμορίᾳ ὅτεν, ἐνω ἄν τὰ α-
36 ϊτης ἀπολάβην· αἱρετόθεν δὲ ὁ δήμος ἕκ-
37 (ς) τῶι ἐν τῇ συμμορίᾳ ὅταν, ἐνω ἄν τὰ α-
38 ὁ δὴ ἐπιστήσησαι πρότερον τοῦ Ανθεό[τ]-
39 τηριῶνος μηνίς· ὁ δὲ δήμος ταξάτῳ τῇ[τ]-
40 μὴ τῶι πυρῶν καὶ τῶι τριάκοντα ὄποσον χρ[π]-

19 punctuation, Lambert (personal communication). 25 ēni TH[π...ΩΝ{Η}/ Stroud suggesting either ζ[δωκ(η)] ὁ or ξ[δωκ(η)] (‘funnel’).
Agyrrius proposed: in order that the people may have grain publicly available, sell the tax of one twelfth at Lemnos, Imbros, and Scyros, and the tax of one fiftieth, in grain.

Each share will be five hundred medimnoi, one hundred of wheat and four hundred of barley. The buyer will convey the grain to Piraeus at his own risk, and will transport the grain up to the city at his own expense and will heap up the grain in the Aiakeion. The city will make available the Aiakeion covered and with a door, and the buyer will weigh out the grain for the city within thirty days of whatever the date when he transports it to the city, at his own expense. When he transports it to the city, the city will not exact rent from the buyers.

The buyer will weigh out the wheat at a weight of a talent for five hekteis, and the barley at a weight of a talent for a medimnos, dry and clean of darnel, arranging the standard weight on the balance, just as the other merchants.

The buyer will not make a down payment but will pay sales taxes and auctioneers' fees at the rate of 20 drachmas per share. The buyer will nominate two creditworthy guarantors, whom the Council has scrutinized, for each share.

A symmory will consist of six men, and the share 3000 medimnoi. In the case of a symmory the city will exact the grain from each and all of those who are in the symmory, until it recovers what belongs to it.

Let the people elect ten men from all the Athenians in the assembly, when they elect the generals, to have oversight of the grain. When these officials have the grain weighed according to what has been written, let them sell it in the Agora at whatever moment the people decide is right; but it is not to be possible to put to the vote the question of selling before the month of Anthesterion.

Let the people set the price at which those elected must sell the wheat and the barley. Let the buyers
This law, passed in the year after Nicophon’s law on silver coinage (25) and in the wake of the renewal of the King’s Peace, is important both for its form and for its content. It legislates for the collection of the tax of one twelfth from the islands of Lemnos, Imbros, and Scyros, and introduces the collection of that tax in grain. Lemnos, Imbros, and Scyros had been long in the possession of Athens, were occupied by Athenians, and after being released from Athenian control at the end of the Peloponnesian War had been regained by Athens in 393 and confirmed as Athenian in the King’s Peace. Their importance for Athens lay in their position as stepping stones for grain ships from the Black Sea bound for Athens, but their own contribution to Athenian needs for grain was itself significant.

The law was moved by the veteran politician Agyrrhius (APF 278). Active before 405, when he combined with Archinus to reduce the payment to comic poets at the Dionysia and Lenaea (Ar. Frogs 367 and scholiast), he was a secretary to the council in the first year of restored democracy (403/2, see 2. 41—2), farmed the tax of one fiftieth on imports and exports in 402/1 (And. i. Myst. 133—4; see further below), was responsible for introducing assembly pay and then raising it to 3 obols per meeting (Ath. Pol. 41. iii), and gained a reputation in the 390s as a man of the people (he is much mocked in Ar. Eccl.). After serving as general c.389, he was for a long time imprisoned for illegal possession of public money, perhaps between 388 and 374 (Dem. xxiv. Tim. 134—5). This law is the only evidence for his political activity after release from prison.

The most important feature of the law is not in doubt: tax payments in money are changed into payments in grain. Henceforth the tax income comes from city officials selling the tax grain at a price fixed by the assembly rather than directly from tax-farmers who have made their payments in coin. The advantages of the new system
of the twelfth transport the grain before the month Maimakterion. Let the men elected by the people exercise oversight so that the grain is transported at the stated time.

51 When those who have been elected sell the grain, let them render their accounts before the people and let them come before the people carrying the money and let the money raised from the grain be stratiotic.

55 The Receivers are to allocate the down-payment from the islands and as much of the fiftieth tax as was last year brought in from the two tenths; on this occasion it is to be for the financial administration, in future the two tenths are not to be taken away from the moneys deposited.

are succinctly stated at the beginning of the law (I. 5–6; compare 81. A. 5–7 and the further parallels in Stroud, p. 25), in a clause which, by giving the aims of the law, anticipates the preambles that Plato gives to his legislation in Laws: ‘in order that the people may have grain publicly available’. The implication seems to be that Athens suffers from being unable to secure grain at a price that the people are willing to pay. The law ensures that the grain taxed on Lemnos, Imbros, and Scyros will come to Athens, rather than being sold elsewhere. The Athenian state still ends up with a cash income, but that income comes from selling the grain to Athenians rather than others. Other evidence shows that Athens in these years suffered from piratical attacks (X. H. vi. ii. 1); such attacks will have deepened any crisis in grain supplies but this problem will not have been solved by this law.

If the aim of the law is tolerably clear, the precise mechanisms that it sets up are far less clear. The heading of the law and most of its text seem to concern ‘the twelfth of the grain of the islands’, although both at the beginning (1. 8) and the end (1. 57) a second tax, the fiftieth, is also mentioned (for which, see below). Harris has argued that the twelfth is a twelfth of the grain in transit through the islands, which form a string between the Hellespont and southern Greece. A twelfth is indeed a very similar proportion to the tenth which the Athenians are known at various times to have levied as a transit tax at the Hellespont. It was not in Athens’ interest, however, to do anything to divert grain ships coming to southern Greece, and a transit tax imposed at any point east of the Hellespont would seem in danger of being counter-productive. Merchants who faced such a tax would be more likely to seek markets in Asia Minor or to take longer routes via Lesbos, Chios, and Samos before crossing the Aegean, routes which might lead them never to cross to southern Greece at all. The
natural way to understand ‘the grain of the islands’ (ll. 3–4) is ‘grain produced in the islands’, and the timetable laid down in the inscription is tied into the harvest season (not the same as the marketing season). This argues that this is a tax on produce, even though produce taxes are not otherwise known in classical Athens. That one-twelfth of capital value was a very common level of rent may have encouraged the choice of this tariff.

Those who bid to collect the tax are expected to bid in fixed amounts of grain. The law stipulates that bids are to be made in set units of 500 medimnoi, each unit consisting of 100 medimnoi of wheat and 400 of barley. In the event of a number of individuals grouping together as a ‘symmory’ to put in a bid, as we know to have happened with some other taxes, the group apparently has to consist of six men, the unit of bidding has to be 3,000 medimnoi (presumably 2,400 medimnoi of barley and 600 medimnoi of wheat) and the members of the symmory are regarded as their own guarantors. The figures for the first-fruits of wheat and barley sent by these three islands to Eleusis in 329/8, preserved in IG ιουσι 1672, suggest that the largest of the islands, Lemnos, did produce about four times as much barley as wheat (56,750 medimnoi of wheat, 248,525 of barley—a twelfth of the harvest would be about fifty 500-medimnoi shares), but that Imbros produced very much more wheat than barley (44,200 medimnoi wheat, 26,000 barley); we cannot know how typical the figures for that year are, but the case for the harvest of Lemnos, Imbros, and Scyros having been comparatively normal is strong: see Garnsey, Famine and Food Supply. The proportion of barley to wheat that makes up a bid seriously over-estimates the proportion of barley grown, at least in 329/8 when for the three islands the proportion of barley to wheat was 2.74:1 (303,325 medimnoi barley, 110,550 medimnoi wheat). This emphasizes the concern of the law with provision of a cheap staple food: barley was less desirable food, but it generally retailed for not much more than half the price of wheat. It was, of course, open to successful bidders to sell wheat that they had collected and buy barley (or vice versa) in order to render to the city the exact quantities of each promised in their bid. One reason for organizing the bidding in this way was presumably the scale of the operation. The region for a twelfth of the grain produced in which bids were made must have been specified, and since no sub-divisions are referred to we conclude that each island was the object of a single bid. Bids for the grain tax from Lemnos could be expected to be in the region of 50 even of these large units. Given Agyrrhius’ own background in working the tax-farming system to his own profit we might also suspect that the size of the bids was also to discourage competition: to increase a bid by one unit required one to reckon the harvest 6,000 medimnoi (two shiploads) greater (roughly 2% greater in the case of Lemnos, but over 8% in the case of Imbros, and 15% in the case of Scyros).

The medimnos is a unit of capacity (approximately 52.5 litres (see on 45)), but the buyers of the tax are required not to measure out but to weigh in their grain, at a rate of 5% of a medimnos per talent for wheat and a medimnos per talent for barley. The insistence on weighing causes us to prefer to read κρίων (literally ‘belt’), which we understand as a reference to the fulcrum of the balance, rather than χριων (literally ‘funnel’), which implies measurement, at ll. 25–6. Weighing rather than measuring avoids the problem that grain newly poured into a measuring vessel does not compact
and therefore the city is likely to sell itself short (the Eleusis first-fruit payments, which are measured rather than weighed, require additional measures to be supplied to counter this problem (IG II² 1672. 254, 281, 285)). The probable weight of an Athenian talent in this period is 27.47 kg., so 400 medimnoi of barley would weigh 10,987 kg.; and 100 medimnoi of wheat would weigh 3,296 kg. Theophrastus (CP iv. 9, vi) says that Lemnian wheat was heavy but the weights given here for a medimnos of barley (27.47 kg.) and a medimnos of wheat (32.96 kg.) are very significantly lower than the weights that can be derived from other ancient sources: the lightest weight given by Pliny, NH xvm. 66–70 works out at 39.3 kg. /medimnos. It is implausible that weights of grain increased so much during the 400 years that separate this inscription from Pliny, but it is very puzzling that the Athenians should build in profit for the tax farmers by counting less than a medimnos of grain as a medimnos. Were wheat and barley indeed as light as they are reckoned to be here this would have a marked effect on the nutritional value of standard Greek grain rations (for which see H. Forbes and L. Foxhall, Chiron xii 1982, 41–90).

The whole process with regard to the twelfth seems to be as follows. At a date in the Athenian year which is never stated, but which must have been close to, but in advance of, the harvesting of the grain on the islands, an auction was held in Athens at which individuals and groups put in bids for the right to collect one twelfth of the grain of each of the islands. They made such bids in the knowledge of the previous year’s bids and what they knew of the profit or loss made by the bidders, and of the season and prospects for the harvest in the current year. The successful bidders, those referred to as ‘the buyers’ in this law, had to supply guarantors to back their bids (and such guarantors could indeed be forced to pay up, as can be seen from Hesperia v 1936, no. 10). They also had to pay a sales tax and auctioneer’s fee of 20 drachmas per 500-medimnos share (I. 28–9), which amounts to around 1% if we assume a value of 6 dr. per medimnos for wheat and 3 dr. for barley (Stroud, p. 63). The buyers of the tax then went off to the islands, endeavoured to extract one twelfth of the grain produced as efficiently as possible, no mean task, and arranged for the shipment to Athens of the amount of grain they had bid before the end of Pyanopsion (October). The costs of shipment and of subsequent transport from Piraeus to Athens will have had to be met through the sale of that grain which they collected which was in excess of the amount that they had bid. What was left after the bids had been fulfilled, and these expenses met, was the tax-farmer’s profit.

Meanwhile, at some date not before the seventh prytany (March), when the generals were elected (the precise date depended upon securing good omens: Ath. Pol. 44. iv), ten officials had been elected to oversee the tax grain and its sale. The decision to elect such men, rather than choose them by lot, is remarkable. The lot was the regular way of choosing magistrates at Athens, and election was otherwise used only to select men to perform offices which required that every individual be skilled (primarily military officials, but later also some with financial responsibilities). The duties given to these ten men, who are never given a title, seem very comparable to those of the allotted poleis and do not require individual skills (they act together as a board); the decision to hold an election was perhaps made in order to stress the importance of the task.
Athens already had officials known as *sitophylakes* at this time, who oversaw the sale of grain, but they were chosen by lot (25. 18–23; *Ath. Pol.* 51. iii).

Although elected in the spring, the ten men probably came into office only at the start of the civil year: certainly their only duty before the spring of the following year was to ensure that the amounts of grain the buyers of the taxes had contracted to bring were actually transported to the Aiacheion in time. The assembly is forbidden by this law to vote before Anthesterion (February) to sell the grain that has been brought in. Once the assembly has voted to sell it, and fixed the prices of the wheat and barley, the elected officials oversee the sale and publicly hand over the money raised at a meeting of the assembly. That money—which might amount to 15–20 talents, depending on the price set for the grain—is paid into the stratiotic fund, this being the earliest surviving mention of such a fund (for which see 64).

The final lines of the inscription instruct the Receivers (*apodektai*) on what to do with the down-payment from the islands and with the fiftieth, stipulating that for the current year it is assumed to be the same as the two tenths last year, and for the future the two tenths are not to be separated from the moneys deposited. Harris has argued convincingly that the two tenths refer to the standard proportion of a tax bid that had to be made in advance; since under the new law there are no down-payments, this down-payment is presumably one already promised under the old arrangements in which bids were in money and is direct to the general fund because that is where proceeds from the tax had previously gone. It remains unclear why the same amount as last year’s two tenths is involved, and not two tenths of whatever the bid actually was in the current year. Conceivably the old arrangements in fact already took *bids* in amounts of grain, with those amounts only translated into money when grain prices became known at harvest.

These final lines are the second occasion when the fiftieth tax is mentioned. A fiftieth tax on imports and exports is widely attested—it was this tax that Agyrrhius had farmed in 402/1. The fiftieth tax mentioned here has to be paid in grain, and it is therefore likely that it was a tax on grain. We do indeed hear in a speech by Apollodorus of a ‘fiftieth tax on grain’, usually assumed to be a tax on grain imports, at Athens in 368, just five years after this law was passed ([Dem.] LIX. *Neaira* 27), but that tax is paid in money and paid in instalments. At both its mentions in this inscription the fiftieth tax is distinguished from ‘the twelfth tax on Lemnos, Imbros, and Scyros’ or ‘the advance payment from the islands’, and could therefore be a tax at Athens. If the tax mentioned in Apollodorus’ speech is the same tax legislated for here then Agyrrhius’ law was repealed or replaced after being only briefly in operation, but that is not necessarily unlikely.

A veteran politician, himself very familiar with the tax-farming system, might be expected to display his expertise in the drafting of his law. In some respects this is true: as Stroud has suggested, the unique succession of future tenses in the section of the law dealing with the buyer of the tax (ll. 8–36) seems to reflect the linguistic patterns normal in commercial contracts; and the ‘artless’ way in which both individual words and whole phrases are repeated in successive clauses seems also to reflect a desire for the maximum clarity. In other respects, however, the drafting of the law leaves much
to be desired, and as a result it is very hard to reconstruct exactly what the law intends. This is partly because, although it enacts a permanent rule for the future (see above on 25), the law revises a system already in operation, rather than setting up a new system from scratch, but it is also because the order of presentation, and the consequences of the change that the law effects, have not properly been thought out. The clause requiring the buyers of the tax to transport the grain before Maimakterion (November) (ll. 46–8) is not included in the section in which the buyers are instructed, but in the section on the duties of the officials elected to oversee the sale of the grain. The final clause of the law, which very inappropriately for a permanent rule makes reference to ‘last year’, seems written on the assumption that in the future, as in the past, the tax revenue will be paid in instalments of money, when this law both substitutes grain for money and replaces the ten annual instalments by an annual transportation of the grain. The law does not stipulate that it is to be inscribed or where it is to be set up. From its findspot it is safe to deduce that it was set up in the Agora, perhaps at the Aiakeion (see below).

The desirability of passing this law shows two important things (for the background to both see Garnsey, Famine and Food Supply, ch. ix). First, it confirms that the guarantee of a large market at Athens was not enough to deter merchants from either taking their grain to places where the price was higher or charging high prices and risking selling smaller quantities at Athens itself (compare X. Oec. xx. 27–8). Other fourth-century sources attest two laws which the Athenians applied to merchants: any citizen or metic living at Athens who was engaged in the grain trade, either directly or by lending money for the purchase of cargoes of grain, had to bring that grain to Athens, and any merchant who brought grain to Athens could re-export only one third of it. Our evidence for these laws all comes from the 330s or later (Dem. xxxiv. Phormio 37 (327/6), xxxv. Lacr. 51 (pre-338) and Lyc. Leoc. 27 (330) for the former, Ath. Pol. 51. iii for the latter), and we cannot know whether this grain-tax law was, when passed, additional or alternative to those other measures. Even our earliest evidence for Athens electing grain buyers (sitonai) to secure supplies by purchase elsewhere dates to the 350s (Dem. xx. Leptines 33–4).

The second important thing that this law shows is that the city was prepared to make a very major intervention in the food supply. The figures for grain production on the three islands which can be extrapolated from the returns of first-fruits of wheat and barley that they made to Eleusis in 329/8, and the dimensions of the Aiakeion, which we believe Stroud is correct in identifying with the rectangular structure in the south-west of the Agora sometimes thought to be the Heliaea, both indicate that Athens could reckon on something over 30,000 medimnoi of grain a year from this tax. That quantity of grain would sustain perhaps 6,000 individuals for a year, or around 70,000 individuals for a month. This law made a month’s grain available to all adult Athenians in the spring, when prices were rising as home-grown supplies became exhausted, at whatever price the people chose (ll. 44–5; compare the assembly fixing the price at which the first-fruits of grain collected at Eleusis were sold, IG ii² 1672. 282–3, 286–7). Politically the law is a masterstroke: who would vote against a measure that promised to ensure there was grain enough on the market in the lean months of
every year? Those who wished to curry favour with the poor would be particularly
keen to support it since the annual vote on the price at which the grain would be sold
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Cult of Amphiaraus, Oropus, 386–374

A marble stele broken into three pieces, found at the Amphiparum and now in the Amphiparum Museum [A 235]. Phot. Petkou, o Ωμπραος και το ιερον του Άμφιαρου, pl. 60, GRBS xxii 1981, pls. 2–4.

Enoeic Ionic. Stoichedon 35.

IG vii 235; SIG1004; Buck 14; LSCG 69; Petkou, Ωμπραος, no. 39; A. Petkou, GRBS xxii 1981, 42–57 (= SEG xxxi 416), Petkou, οι εγγορφοσ του Ωμπραος (Athens, 1997), no. 277*. Trans. Petkou, 50. See also Le Guen-Pollet, La Vie religieuse, 40.

Erasures in lines 6, 22, 30, 37 after Petkou. 17 The ν of ἄνθρα was initially omitted and then inserted between the lines. 22 ΕΛΑΤΤΩΝ on stone.
would give them a chance to show their populist colours by proposing a low price (albeit to the detriment of Athens' war finances; see Stroud, p. 75).

Gods. The priest of Amphiaraus is to frequent the sanctuary from when winter has ended until the season of ploughing, not being absent for more than three days, and to remain in the sanctuary for not less than ten days each month. He is to require the keeper of the temple in accordance with the law to look after both the sanctuary and those who come to the sanctuary.

9 If anyone commits an offence in the sanctuary, either a foreigner or a member of the community, let the priest have power to inflict punishment of up to five drachmas and let him take guarantees from the man who is punished, and if he pays the money let him deposit it into the treasury when the priest is present. The priest is to give judgement if anyone, either a foreigner or a member of the community, is wronged privately in the sanctuary, up to a limit of three drachmas, but let larger cases take place where it is stated in the laws for each. Summons to be issued on the same day in the case of offences in the sanctuary, but if the defendant does not agree let the case be completed on the following day.

20 Whoever comes to be cured by the god is to pay a fee of not less than nine obols of good silver and deposit them in the treasury in the presence of the keeper of the temple. (Lacuna) The priest is to make prayers over the offerings and place them on the altar if he
The earliest evidence for cult activity at the sanctuary of Amphiaraus in the territory of Oropus, which lay on the east coast of the Greek mainland between Attica and Boeotia, dates to the last quarter of the fifth century. In 414 Aristophanes put on a play entitled *Amphiaraus,* and it seems likely that this reflects the establishment of the cult at Oropus (rather than the cult at Thebes). Originally closely linked with Eretria (ForHyjd 374), and preserving traces of that origin in its dialect (see below) and indeed its name (plausibly derived from the river Asopos via rhotacism), Oropus was under Athenian control from some time before the middle of the fifth century (IG i 3 41. 67–71) until 411 (Thuc. viii. 60); Athenian promotion of a cult site for Amphiaraus to rival that at Thebes may have had political motives (Parker, *Athenian Religion,* 146–9). Thebes took over control in 411 and seems initially to have used a light touch, but civil strife in Oropus led to more direct Theban control (D.S. xiv. 17. i–iii), which contin-
is present; but whenever he is not present the person sacrificing (is to do so) and each is to make his own prayers for himself at the sacrifice, but the priest is to make the prayers at the public sacrifices.

29 The skin of every animal sacrificed in the sanctuary is to be sacred. Any animal anyone wishes may be sacrificed, but there is to be no taking meat outside the boundary of the sanctuary. Those who sacrifice are to give to the priest the shoulder of each sacrificial animal, except on the occasion of the festival; on that occasion let him receive the shoulder of each of the victims at the public sacrifices.

36 Whoever needs to incubate in the sanctuary [-----] obeying the laws. The keeper of the temple is to record the name of whoever incubates when he deposits the money, his personal name, and the name of his city, and display it in the sanctuary, writing it on a board for whoever wants to look. Men and women are to sleep separately in the dormitory, men in the part east of the altar and women in the part west [-----] those incubating in the dormitory [-----]

ued until the Thebans were forced to give Oropus up under the terms of the King’s Peace. For just over a decade after that Oropus was independent before being taken over by the Athenians in perhaps 374 (Isoc. xiv. Plat. 20; on the date see D. Knoepfler, Chiron xvi 1986, 90 f). The Athenians held it until in 366 some Oropians whom they had exiled seized the territory with Eretrian help, and the Athenians ceded it to Theban control (X. H. vii. iv. 1; D.S. xv. 76. 1; Aesch. iii. Ctes. 85–6 with schol. (186 Dilts)). On the history of Oropus see Knoepfler, Dossier/Histoire et archéologie xciv May 1985, 50–5. For subsequent events see on 75.

This sacred law is most plausibly dated to the period of Oropus’ independence between 386 and c. 374. The Oropians refer to themselves as demotai rather than politai; even under Athenian domination Oropus was never an Attic deme, although in 329/8 grain ‘from the area around the Amphiaraoon’ was brought to Eleusis by a man
described as ‘demarch’ who was a native of Sounion (Whitehead, ΖPE xlvi 1982, 40–2, suggests demarch of Sounion, but see Osborne, Demos, 75 n. 28). Although it has the opening invocation of the gods that is standard in decrees at Athens and elsewhere, this, like many sacred laws, admits to no issuing authority and makes no attempt to date itself (in a brief period of independence from 338 to 335 Oropian decrees refer to decisions of the ekklesia: see 75 and Rhodes with Lewis, 116). Times of the year are defined seasonally rather than according to a sacred calendar, perhaps because of the political implications of using either Attic or Theban calendars.

The law gives a rare glimpse into the operation of a relatively minor sanctuary in a community so small as to have no stable independent existence. Pausanias (1. 34. ii) claims that it was the Oropians who first worshipped Amphiaraurus as a god, and it appears that it was only with the foundation of this sanctuary that Amphiaraurus became not merely a source of dream oracles but of healing. This sacred law reveals a sanctuary set up for healing; with provision for sleeping in the sanctuary overnight, but served simply by a non-resident priest and a caretaker. Since in other decrees the priest is used in dating formulae, the priesthood seems to be an annual appointment, but the caretaker, who is always present, is likely to be a long-term fixture. The priest has to deal with minor offences (compare the role of the hieropoioi in 81. 34); more major offences are referred to the courts described ‘in the laws’, with the implication that what precisely the arrangements were would be varied depending on the judicial agreements between Oropus and the home city of any foreigner involved. Between them the priest and the temple-keeper act as treasurer, overseeing the payment of fines and of fees (for the role of the temple-keeper as treasurer compare Antike Kunst xli 1998, 101–15, on Eretria; for priests imposing fines compare IG ii2 1362). A decree from the brief period of Athenian domination (c. 374–c. 366) has itself paid for from this treasury (Petrakos, op. cit., no. 290) and also refers to money from shops/booths; it also shows that during this period an Athenian, a citizen of Decelea, was the priest and control of the sanctuary was entirely in the hands of Athenian citizens.

This decree is one of the clearest pieces of evidence for priests not being required for sacrifice (compare also LSS 129, LSAM 24. A. 27–30). If the priest is present he is in charge of the sacrifice and prays over the offerings, but if he is not the sacrifice goes on without him and each man makes his own sacrificial prayer (ll. 25–8). For the question of what is placed on the altar, see van Straten, Hiera Kala, 118–44.

The law allows the sacrifice of any animal, and the priest is rewarded not, as regularly, with the skins but with a shoulder; a votive relief (Petrakos, δ Ὑπεράποις, pl. 41a) shows a ram and a pig, but only ram skins were used for incubation. The destination of the skins is one of a number of aspects of the law that were altered subsequent to its initial inscription. The provision that the skins should be sacred (i.e. belong to the sanctuary) was chiselled out, though no substitute clause was inserted. Under Lycurgus the Athenians went in for selling the skins of sacrificial beasts (see IG ii2 1469 = SIG3 1029 of 334/3), and IG ii2 333, 21 provides for money from the ‘dermatic fund’ to be spent on the Amphiareum; it seems likely that by this time skins from Amphiareum sacrifices were among those sold though whether this was a new practi-
tice enabled by altering this the law is uncertain. Pausanias (i. 34. v) claims that those seeking healing at the Amphiareum first sacrificed a ram and then slept on its skin, and this is shown on various reliefs (see Petropoulou in Roesch and Argoud, *La Béotie antique*, 169–77) of c. 400 B.C.; one relief shows similar incubation on a ram skin occurring in the Asclepieum and it has been suggested that practice there was influenced by practice at Oropus. For incubation generally see Ar. *Plutus* 653–747 and 102. The provision that the meat cannot be taken out of the sanctuary is not uncommon in sacred calendars (see 62. A. 57–62); here one effect is to ensure that every sacrifice by a person seeking healing creates a group occasion to which, presumably, the officials at the sanctuary could be expected to be invited to take part.

Of the three other erasures in the decree, one involves the amount of the fee (eparche) to be paid (where nine obols seems to have replaced one drachma), but nothing can be read or deduced of the content of the two longer clauses erased in lines 24–5 and 37–8. The presence of such erasures implies that this law remained in force for a substantial period, and underlines the fact that what was written on this stone mattered: it is the stone which is the law in a very strong sense (compare Thomas, *Oral Tradition*, 46–60). By contrast the lists of names of those incubating seem to have been temporary records, the equivalent of the ‘whitened boards’ used at Athens for temporary notices (Rhodes on *Ath. Pol.* 47. ii; Davies in *Ritual, Finance, Politics . . . D. Lewis*, 205–7). The word used for the board here (peteuron) is used similarly on Delos but not at Athens; it is otherwise used simply to refer to a plank, and in particular to an acrobat’s springboard.

The Amphiareum is extremely well preserved (Travlos, *Attika*, s.v.). The law mentions an altar and a sleeping place. Other inscriptions and archaeology reveal that there were at this time a small temple, a fountain, and a theatrical area, and that the sleeping-place was perhaps wooden. All these facilities were clustered at the west end of the later sanctuary. The concern with good order among the visitors may reflect their increasing numbers at the time this law was made (compare *LSCG* 83=SIG* a* 1157. 8 ff. regulating behaviour at the oracular shrine of Apollo Coropeus at Corope c.100 B.C.) The Athenians invested in repair and building work in the period 374–366 (Petroukos, *Oi επιγραφές*, no. 290), and in the middle of the century, while under Theban control, the sanctuary was greatly elaborated and extended east: a stoa some 110 m. long was built (see Coulton, *BSd* lxiii 1968, 147–83) along with a larger temple, a stadium, and perhaps a theatre; further building and refurbishment occurred when the Athenians regained control in the 330s. The growing popularity of the sanctuary is also indicated by the survival of fourth-century votive reliefs which show the healing process; most famous is the relief of Archinos (Osborne, *Archaic and Classical Greek Art*, fig. 127) dated on stylistic grounds to the first quarter of the century. The famously cold baths at the Amphiareum feature in X. *Mem.* iii. xiii. 3.

The festival for which victims are provided at public expense (lines 34–5) is presumably the Amphiaraia, and is the earliest extant reference to this festival. In the late 330s and early 320s the Athenians much enlarged the Amphiaraia, partly at least on the initiative of the Atheniographer Phanodemus, instituting a procession and athletic and equestrian competitions (*IG* vii 4253–4, *Ath. Pol.* 54. vii with Rhodes’s note; cf. 4252
in which Amphiaraoa himself is given a 1000 dr. gold crown for his services to Athens; Parker, Athenian Religion, 149).

The dialect of this inscription, which offers the best evidence for the first dialect used at Oropus, is very similar or identical to the west Ionic of Eretria (see e.g. εἰρήτα and ἐντὸθα, 17; δημορίων 35; compare 73). Later inscriptions from Oropus use Boeotian or Attic dialect depending on the period (see further A. Morpurgo Davies in E. Crespo et al. (edd.), Dialectologia Graeca, 261–79 at 273–8). The mason’s use of empty
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Accounts of the Athenian Amphictyons of Delos, 377–373

Two fragments of a marble stele found in Athens. Fr. a, the Sandwich marble, now in Fitzwilliam Museum, Cambridge, preserves the top of the stele; it has on its obverse A. 1–40 and on its reverse B. 1–41; fr. b, in the Epigraphical Museum at Athens (EM 8022) and found on the right bank of the Ilissus, has a lower part, but not the bottom, of the stele with A. 41–110 on its obverse, B. 42–52 on its reverse.

Attic-Ionic, retaining the old α for ω throughout. Smidt 51 (A(a)); 52 (A(b)), 44 (B(a)).


\[\theta]ει[\zeta].

τάδε ἐπαραξάν Αμφικτόνες Αθηναίων ἀπὸ Καλλέω άρχοντος μέχρι το Θαργηλιώνος μηνός τὸ ἐπὶ Τιπποδάμαντος άρχοντος Αθήνησι, ἐν Δῆλοι δε ἀπὸ Εσιγένος άρχοντος μέχρι το Θαργηλιώνος μηνός τὸ ἐπὶ Πιπό άρχοντος, χρόνον ὅσον ἐκαστὸς αὐτῶν ἦρξεν, οἷς Διό-

5
do-

κοροῦς Οὐλυπποδόρον Σκαμβωνίδης ἐγραμμάτευε, ἀπὸ Χαριανδρό-

ο άρχοντος Υπάτης Θεογένος Αχαρνεὺς μέχρι τὸ Εκαστομβιῶνο-

σ μηνός τὸ ἐπὶ Τιπποδάμαντος άρχοντος, Σωσιγένης Σωσιάδο Συνε-

ταιοῦ ἐναυτὸν ἐπὶ Καλλέω άρχοντος, Ἑπιγενὴς [S M] ἐνάγειν ἐκ Κο-

νηῆς, Αὐτίμαχος Εὐθυνάμως Μαραθώνιος, Ἐ[π]ικρά[της] Μενεστράτῳ Π-

αλληγεύ. αἰδὲ τῶν πόλεων τῇ τόκο ἀπείδο[σ]αι. Μυκόνης ΧΝΗΔ, Σύ-

10

ρων ΧΧΗΗΗ, Τῦτοιν Τ., Κεῖοι [Γ]ΗΗΗ[Η]ΗΓΔΗΗΗΗΗ, Σερίφων ΧΓΗ, Σάφυνιο 

[Γ]ΗΗΗ[Η]ΗΓΔΗΗΗΗΗ, Τῦται ΓΗΗΗ, [Πάροι]ο ΧΧΓΗΗΗΗΗΔ, Οὐναῖοι ἐξ Τκάρω Χ

[Χ]ΧΧ, Θερμαῖοι έξ Τκάρω ΗΗΗΗΗ ἐν σεβάλαιον τόκο παρὰ τῶν πόλεων ΤΤΤ-

15

Θ[Γ]ΧΧΓΗΗΗΗΗΔΗΗΗΗΗΙ. αἰδὲ τῶν ὄρα[σ]ῶν τὸ τόκο ἀπείδοσαι. Αριστο-

[ν] Δήλως ὑπὲρ Ἀπολλοδόρῳ Δήλῳ ΓΗΗΗΗ. Α[ρ]τύσ[λ]ης Δήλως ὑπὲρ

Παυκέτου Δήλῳ ΓΗΗΗ. Ψυκτέλης Δήλῳ ΧΗΗΗΗΗΗΗΗΗΗ. Αγασ[ι]λῆς Δή-

[δ]υς ὑπὲρ Θεοκόδος Δήλῳ ΑΗΔ[Δ]Η. Θεογένης Δήλως ὑπὲρ Ψυκτέλης Δήλ-

10

[ο] ΗΗΗΗΗΗΗΗΗΗ. Αὐτιμάχος Δήλως ὑπὲρ Ψυκτέλης Δήλῳ ΗΗΗΗΔΗΗΗΗΗΗΗΗ.

[

II] III. Τῦτοιν ὑπὲρ Μ...μένου Τῦτοιν ΗΗΗΗΗ. Λευκίνου Δήλο-

A. 6–10 the punctuation of these lines is uncertain. A. 15 ΔΗΩΝ on stone.
spaces as punctuation is found at Athens, but not otherwise at Oropus; the subsidiary punctuation with three dots is otherwise only a feature of Attic inscriptions at Oropus; and the writing of ε as ηι before a vowel in δεώμενος for δεώμενος in line 36 could be an Attic or a Boeotian dialect feature (Threatte, i. 147—59, Buck §9. 1). Lines 17 and 19 display mason’s errors where letters have been omitted and have subsequently had to be squeezed in between other letters, and ἀπικατεμένων at line 8 is more likely to be a mistake than a curious dialectal feature.

A

Gods. These are the actions of the Athenian Amphictyons from the archonship of Calleas (377/6) until the month of Thargelion in the archonship of Hippodamas (375/4) at Athens, and from the archonship of Epigenes until the month of Thargelion in the archonship of Hippias on Delos, during the time when each of them held office, their secretary being Diodorus son of Olympiodorus of Scambonidae: Idiotes son of Theogenes of Acharnae, from the archonship of Charisander until the month of Hetatombaion in the archonship of Hippodamas; Sosigenes son of Sosiades of Xypete, for the year under Calleas as archon; Epigenes son of Metagenes from Koile; Antimachus son of Euthynomus of Marathon; Epicerates son of Menestratus of Pallece.

Of the cities, these paid interest: Myconos 1,260 dr.; Syros 2,300 dr.; Tenos 1 talent; Ceos 5,472dr. 4½ obols; Scriphos 1,600 dr.; Siphnos 3,190 dr. 4 obols; Ios 800 dr.; Paros 2,970 dr.; the Oinaians from Icaros 4,000; the Thermaian from Icaros 400: total interest from the cities 4 talents, 3,993 dr. 2½ obols.

Of individuals, these paid interest: Ariston of Delos, on behalf of Apollodorus of Delos 960 dr.; Artysilos of Delos on behalf of Glaucetos of Delos 700 dr.; Hypsocles of Delos 300 dr.; Agasicles of Delos on behalf of Theocides of Delos 690 dr.; Theognetus of Delos on behalf of Hypsocles of Delos 312 dr. 3 obols; Antipater of Delos on behalf of Hypsocles of Delos 287 dr. 3 obols; Poly…s of Tenos on behalf of M…menus of Tenos 400; Leucinus of Delos on behalf of Cleitarchus of Delos 935 dr., Leophon of
 ACCOUNTS OF THE ATHENIAN AMPHICTYONS OF DELOS

A. 55 restored by Koehler.
Delos on behalf of Pistozenus of Delos 350 dr.; Patrocles of Delos on behalf of Hypsocles of Delos 300 dr., Aristeides of Tenos on behalf of Oinades of Tenos 210 dr.: total of interest from individuals 5,325 dr.

Following denunciation 380 dr. were exacted from Episthenes of Delos. Following denunciation 1,100 dr. were exacted from Python of Delos. From the pledges of those who have lost court cases, total value 1,845 dr.

Rents of sacred properties from Rheneia in the archonships of Charisander and Hippodamas at Athens and of Galaios and Hippias on Delos: 2 talents 1,220 dr. Rents of sacred properties on Delos in the same archonships: 2,484 dr. Rents of houses during the archonship of Hippodamas at Athens and Hippias on Delos: 297 dr.

Total income 8 talents 4,644 dr. 2½ obols.

From this the following was spent: a crown as prize of honour for the god, including pay to the craftsman, 1,500 dr.; tripods as victory prizes to the choruses, including pay to the craftsman, 1,000 dr. +; to the leaders of the theoria 1 talent; for transport for the theoroi and the choruses, to the triarch Antimachus son of Philon of Hermios, 1 talent 1,000 dr.; number of cows bought for the festival 154, price of these 1 talent 2,419 dr. Gold leaves and payment to the goldsmith 126 dr. For the preliminary sacrifices at the festival... Transport of tripods and cows and one fiftieth tax and food for the cows and price of wood for... and price of...

(several lines at start of (b) illegible or missing at this point)

The Amphictyons did this from the month of Scirophorion in the archonship of Hippodamas until the archonship of Socratides at Athens (374/3), and from the month Panemos until the archonship of Pyrraithus on Delos, their secretary being Diodorus son of Olympiodorus of Scambonidae. The Athenian amphictyons were
A. 66 restored by Kent.
A. 68, 76 restored by Coupry.
A. 87, 94, 98-9 restored by Coupry.
A. 78 EHI on stone.
— son of — dos of Oe, Nikomenes son of Hieron of Halai, Epigenes son of Megagenes of Koile, Antimachus son of Euthynemos of Marathon, Epicrates son of Menestrates of Pallene; the Andrian amphictyons were Damales son of Damales, — son of —, — son of Leogoridos, Theoteles son of Androcritus, and Me — son of —.

64 Rents of sacred properties from Rheneia: 1 talent 350 dr.+. Rents of sacred properties from Delos 1,522 dr. Rents of houses 297. From the pledges (?) —

67 Total income 1 talent 3,012 dr.

67 From this the following was spent: on monthly sacred expenses and the musical and gymnastic contests and the Hyperborean rites and to the trumpeter and herald and assistant — 1,672 dr. 5½ obols; for building the wall — — and repair of the office and of the building of the Andrians, and for the dedication of the crown and to the men sent to the allied cities by the Council to plead cases in court: 105 dr. + — — 550 dr. To the Athenian Amphictyons for necessary supplies and to the secretary and under-secretary 2,658 dr. To the Andrian Amphictyons for necessary supplies 2,100 dr. Total expense: 1 talent 1,129 dr. 5½ obols. Surplus of income over expenditure: 1,882 dr. ½ obol. Total surplus, including that from the earlier account: 1 talent 5,861 dr. 1 obol.

78 From this money we made loans to the following Delians on the same conditions as others had borrowed from the sacred money of Delian Apollo: 3,000 dr.; they owe this as borrowers, — son of Apollodoros, Coibon son of Telemnestus, Arist — son of —, — son of — kleidos, Atysileos son of Nicarchus, — son of —, — son of —, Eutychides son of Dionysodorus, — son of —, — son of — ostratos, Pa — son of —, — son of —, Pistotimos son of —, — son of —, — son of —, Euthycrates son of —. And another loan, 1 talent; they owe this as a loan — son of —, Democles son of —, — son of —, Demophanes son of De —, — son of —, — son of — dos, Ariston son of A —, — son of —, — son of — es, Tynnon son of The —, — son of —, — son of —, Patrocles son of —, — son of — es, Timonax son of —, — son of —. To the people of Seriphos — 300 dr. We handed over to the Andrian Amphictyons, Damales and his fellow magistrates — —. To the hieropoios Pyth — and to — 800 dr. Total of expenditure along with the money which we lent and handed over: 3 talents...

100 — rents of the following sacred lands, in the archonship of Charisander at Athens and
140 28. ACCOUNTS OF THE ATHENIAN AMPHICTYONS OF DELOS

| o ἀρχοντὸς Αθήνης, εν Δ [ήλις δ[ε] Γαλαῖο, [ 20 |
| | 20 | Γ’, εγγυητῆς Νικ[ ] 20 |
| 20 | επὶ Ἡπποδάμιον τὸς ἀρχοντὸς Α[θήνης, εν Δήλιν δέ Ἡππίο] |
| 22 | αμβρότος Δ[ήλιος - 8 εγγυητῆς] |
| 20 | Δήλιος, τὸ χαρ[ίω?] 18 |
| 20 | ος ΗΗΡ, εγγυητῆς[ ] 20 |
| 16 | ο Ἡ[?] Ἐπισθενός Γο[ ] 22 |
| 19 | εγγυητῆς Νικη[ ] 22 |
| [... ἐπὶ Σωκράτιδο ἀρχοντὶς Αθήνης, εν Δήλιν δέ Πυρράθο 5] |
| 21 | ρος [ ] 28 |

B[α]

of Galaios on Delos —5 dr., surety Nic— — — In the archonship of Hippodamas at Athens and of Hippias on Delos, — — son of —simbro tus of Delos —, surety — of Delos; the land — — — 250 dr., surety — — son of Episthenes; — — surety Nic— — — In the archonship of Socratides at Athens and of Pyrraethus on Delos

\[ B(a) \]

1 Of the cities these failed to pay the interest that they should have paid during our magistracy and did not pay during the four years: the people of Ceos 4,127 dr., 1½ obols; the people of Myconos 420 dr.; the people of Syros 4,900 dr.; the people of Siphnos 2,089 dr. 2 obols; the people of Tenos 2,400 dr.; the Thermians from Icaros 400 dr.; the people of Paros 4 talents 1,830 dr.; the Oinaians from Icaros 1 talent 80 dr. Of the cities these did not pay the interest during the four years of our magistracy during the archonships of Calleas, Charisander, Hippodamas and Socratides at Athens and of Epigenes, Galaios, Hippias, and Pyrraethus on Delos: the people of Naxos, 1 talent 3,600 dr.; the people of Andros 2 talents; the people of Carystus 1 talent 2,400 dr.

Rasura

10 Of individuals, the following did not pay the interest due in our magistracy during the archonships of Calleas, Charisander, Hippodamas, and Socratides at Athens and of Epigenes, Galaios, Hippias, and Pyrraithos on Delos: Agatharchus son of Ariston of Delos, 400 dr., Agades son of Hypsocles of Tenos, 200 dr.; Euphraenetus son of Euphantus of Delos 110 dr.; Alcmeonides son of Thrasydaeus of Athens 510 dr., Glauicippus son of Cleitarchus of Delos 400 dr., D—on of Carystus(? 200 dr., Skyllias of Andros 200 dr., Hypsocles son of Theognotos of Delos 400 dr., Prianeus son of Syris of Galessos 48 dr., Heracleides son of Thrasymnades of Delos 52 dr., Habron son of Thrason of Sphettos 280 dr., Laches son of Laches of Steiria 700 dr.; Maisiades son of Nymphodorus of Delos 140 dr., Thrason son of Habron of Sphettos —, Aristeides son of Deinomenes of Tenos on behalf of Oinados son of Cleo— of Tenos 220 dr.

24 The following fines were imposed on those Delians found guilty of impiety during the archonship of Charisander at Athens and of Galaios on Delos and also sentenced to perpetual exile because they dragged the Amphictyons from the temple of Delian Apollo and struck them: Epigenes son of Polycrates, 1,000 dr.; Pyrraethus son of Antigonus, 1,000 dr.; Patrocles son of Episthenes, 1,000 dr.; name erased. Aristophon
Temple accounts of various sorts survive from the Greek world (compare e.g. the accounts from the Hekatompedos, M&L 76, the accounts of the Treasurers of Athena, M&L 81, and the accounts of Nemesis at Rhamnous, M&L 53). Surviving fourth-century accounts of Athenian amphictyons at Delos are collected at Debs 96-104-33 (replacing Gil 2163-53). These accounts of the Amphictyons at Delos are of particular interest because they reveal something of the nature of Athenian control of that sanctuary and reactions to that control. This particular inscription appears to have been erected in the sanctuary of Apollo Pythios at Athens (Matthaiou). (For a guide to the inventory aspect prominent in later accounts see Hamilton, Treasure Map.)

The Athenians had controlled the sanctuary at Delos from at least the middle of the fifth century onward. The earliest inscribed records of such control date to 434/3 (M&L 62), and the Athenians, a board of four, running the Delian sanctuary first call themselves Amphictyons in 410 (I. Délos 93). Athens lost control of Delos when defeated by Sparta in 404 (3) but regained it in the late 390s (IG I² 1634 = I. Délos 97, with Athenian amphictyons assisted by amphictyons from some other city, perhaps, but not certainly, Andros), probably to lose it again in 386 when the King’s Peace was
son of Leucippus, 1,000 dr.; Antiphon son of Tynnon, 1,000 dr., Odoiteles son of Antigonus, 10,000 dr.; Telephanes son of Polyarces, 10,000 dr.

Sacred houses of Delian Apollo: on Delos: house at Colonus which used to belong to Euphantus, the neighbour of which is Alexus; pottery which used to belong to Euphantos, the neighbour of which is the bath of Ariston; at Pedios: a house which used to belong to Leucippus, the neighbour of which is Agesileos; a house, which used to belong to Episthenes, the neighbour of which is the road; a bronze foundry, which used to belong to Leucippus, the neighbour of which is the buildings of the —deis; a house — — a house, which used to belong to Episthenes, the neighbour of which — — which used to belong to Leucippus, the neighbour of which — — the neighbour of which is the buildings — — which used to belong to Euphantus — —

B(b)

--- upper room — and fuller’s shop — and building — — were Episthenes’ — — whose neighbour was Dei — — — neighbour — doros. House which was — — which was Leukippos’ — — neighbour Caibon — —.

signed. This inscription seems to be the first in a series marking renewed Athenian control: the Athenian amphictyonso inherit no ‘float’ and there are no arrears of payments of interest. An unpublished inscription from shortly before this date seems to record the Chians repaying a debt to Delian Apollo via the Athenians, and the Delians paying a sum of money to the Athenians (see Lewis, Gnomon xlvii 1975, 718–19). Athenian control survived the upheavals associated with Alexander’s restoration of exiles (see 101), but Delos gained its independence in 314 and retained it until 166 when Rome handed the island back to Athens.

Five Athenian amphictyons, from the last five Athenian tribes in the official Athenian tribal order, are named for the period 377–374, but one of them serves only for the first year and a second only from the second year onwards; but for 374/3 five Athenians serve, three identical to those serving during the previous three years and two new but chosen from the same tribes as those they replace, and five Andrians are added; the Athenian Diodorus serves as secretary throughout the period (an under-secretary is mentioned but not named). In subsequent years there is no trace of official tribal order among Athenian amphictyons although when, in 367 or shortly afterwards, the office becomes annual (and the Andrians disappear) the secretary (also
annual) follows first inverse and then regular tribal order. The form of record changed with the change to annual magistrates (see I. Delos 104), to include records of dedications as well as of financial transactions, and from 359 a second board of Athenians, naopoioi, also appears. The rate of pay for amphictyons is given by Ath. Pol. 62. ii as one drachma a day; the preserved payments here for 374/3 (A. 75–6) amount to 420 dr. for each of the Andrian amphictyons and 2,658 dr. for the Athenian amphictyons along with the secretary and under-secretary. This appears to be a rate of a drachma a day for a year of 420 days (i.e. including two intercalary months) for the amphictyons themselves and the secretary, and 2 obols a day for the under-secretary.

These accounts show the amphictyons responsible for lending money to cities and individuals and claiming interest payments (at 10% per annum: see M&L 62. 12) on the loans; leasing sacred land on Rheneia and buildings on Delos; receiving money from confiscated estates and distraint on goods; exacting fines from men condemned for impiety; providing for the various Delian festivals, in particular the great quadrennial festival of Delian Apollo celebrated in this case in 375/4 (A. 32–40); and looking after the buildings of the sanctuary.

Most of the loans to cities are to other Cycladic islands, but two separate communities on Icaros are also recorded. Athens does not borrow from Delos. Of the 13 cities borrowing money (A. 11–14, B. 3–10), only two, Seriphos and Ios, pay all the interest due, and three cities, including Andros, fail to pay any interest at all. Are the cities suffering severe economic pressure, or are they taking advantage of an Athens too keen to court goodwill in the Aegean to press these claims? Almost all the loans seem to have been of round sums, although the payments made are not always round sums. So the Caneis, recorded as a single body (contrast 22, 39, 40), pay interest of 5,472 dr. 4½ obols, and are recorded as owing a further 4,127 dr. 1½ obols, but this makes the total interest of 9,600 dr. or 2,400 dr. a year, which is the interest on a 4-talent loan. Similar calculations show the other loans to have been (in descending order): to Paros 48 talents, to Andros 5 talents, to the Oinaians from Icaros 4 talents 1,520 dr., to Naxos 4 talents, to Tenos 3½ talents, to Carystus 3½ talents, to Syros 3 talents, to Siphnos 2 talents 1,187 dr. 2 obols, to Myconos 4,200 dr. (they seem to have failed to pay one annual instalment of interest); to Seriphos 4,000 dr., to Ios 2,000 dr., to the Thermaians from Icarus 2,000 dr. Both the capacity and willingness of the Delian sanctuary to loan sums as large as 48 talents to Paros and the need of islands like Seriphos or Ios to borrow sums of less than a talent are to be noted. This wide variation is comparable to the variation in the amount of tribute that the Athenians demanded from different islands in the fifth century: Paros seems regularly to have paid 18 talents, Seriphos 1 talent, and Ios half a talent (see further Nixon and Price in Murray and Price, The Greek City). In 341/0, when the Delian amphictyons agreed to make Paros a further loan of 5 talents (I. Delos 104–28. b.4. 21), Paros passed a decree in their honour (IG xii. v. 119).

Just as most of the loans to cities are local, so the loans to individuals are to men from Delos itself, from Athens, Andros, Carystus, Galessos on Syros, and Tenos. The largest loan is of 4,000 dr., to Hypsodes of Delos: he himself pays interest of 300 dr., three other Delians pay sums of 312 dr. 3 obols, 287 dr. 3 obols, and 300 dr. on his
behalf, and he is still held to be owing 400 dr. of interest. The smallest loan from which interest is due is one of perhaps 120 dr., to the man from Syros, who failed to pay any interest during the four-year period. But the fragmentary record of moneys newly loaned seems to include loans of 25 and 37 dr. Only 6 of 24 individual borrowers pay any interest, and all who pay are from either Delos or Tenos; all the Athenians who borrow money fail to pay any interest.

The largest single item of income is the rent from sacred properties on Rheneia and Delos; these properties seem normally to have been leased for a ten-year term. The rents of the estates on Rheneia and Delos for 376–373 and the rents of the buildings on Delos for 375–373 come to just over 4 talents, the largest part (2 talents 1220 dr. for 376–374, 6,350 or a drachma or two more in 374/3) coming from the estates on Rheneia (A. 26–31, 64–5), with 4,006 dr. coming from the Delian estates. The buildings on Delos seem to be a new item for 375/4, although the record of their leasing is not recorded on the surviving part of the stone; they bring in just 297 dr. a year. One new estate lease is recorded for 376/5 and two for 375/4 (A. 100–9); the total sum of money paid for the Rheneia estates suggests that the new rents may have been slightly lower than the old. Certainly the Rheneia estates raised significantly less in 374 than in 432, when the annual income from them had been 7,110 dr., and there was a marked further decline in rents between 374 and 359/8 (J. Délis 104–11; see J. Tréheux in Mélanges d’archéologie... Picard, 1017); this may be another sign of economic crisis. In this inscription no names and ethnicities of lessees are preserved, but in the middle of the century some inscriptions reveal more lessees to be Athenian than Delian (particularly in the case of houses), and after 375/4 none of the 23 guarantors are certainly Delian and 16 are certainly Athenian. The very end of the inscription seems to be a catalogue of the buildings, including a bronze foundry and a pottery next to a bathhouse; the identification of these buildings by the names of their former owners points to their origin in property confiscation. Two of the buildings listed (B. 35, 37) were once owned by Episthenes, who is presumably to be identified as the man recorded paying a fine of 380 dr. at A. 24–5 and who is also likely to be the father of the Patrocles fined 10,000 dr. (see further below).

The list of expenditure gives a good idea of the particular expenses of putting on a big festival on Delos. Alongside the 8,419 dr. spent on 109 cows for sacrifice (compare on 81), the 125 dr. spent gilding their horns, and the 2,500–3,000 dr. spent on a gold crown for Apollo and tripods for victors, the Delians spend 13,000 dr. on supporting and transporting the theoroi, the official pilgrims sent to the festival.

One entry in these accounts is not routine. This is the exaction of fines from seven men who had been found guilty of impiety in 376/5 and condemned both to a fine and to perpetual exile (B. 24–30). Their offence had been to drag the Amphictyons from the temple of Delian Apollo and beat them up. This is an important incident both for our understanding of what might be included in a charge of impiety and because of its implications for relations between Athens and Delos. Those implications become particularly fascinating if the Epigenes son of Polycrates involved is the man who had been Delian archon in 377/6, and still more so if the Pyrraethus son of Antigonus involved is the same Pyrraethus who was elected archon of Delos in 374/3 (B. 8–9)
which case he would have been elected and have served in absentia. In both cases the name occurs on Delos in the fourth century only in this inscription, although there are several separate occurrences in the much richer third-century epigraphy of Delos. There was clearly one violent anti-Athenian incident on Delos in the very period when cities were joining the Second Athenian League in large numbers and well before any of the indicators conventionally regarded as indicating renewed Athenian imperialism occurred. If the Epigenes is the Epigenes who had been archon, the riot would appear to have an official aspect; if Pyrraethus the rioter is the Pyrraethus who became archon, then the Delians were clearly unrepentant about the episode. The admission of Andrians to be Amphictyons may be a way in which the Athenians made
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Paros and the Second Athenian League, 372

A fragment of a stele, found on the south slope of the Athenian Acropolis; now in the Epigraphical Museum. Phot. AJA x 1936, 462 fig. 2; Dreher, Hegemon und Symmachoi, Taf. 1.

Attic-Ionic, retaining the old ο for ο sometimes and (restored) ε for ει in l. 5; stoichedon 30.

J. H. Oliver, AJA x 1936, 461–3 no. 2; A. Wilhelm, Ἀθηναί. Βερε. 1939, xxii. 3–12 = Akademieschriften, iii. 15–24; Accame, La lega ateniese, 229–41; Dreher, Hegemon und Symmachoi, 109–54 (cf. SEG xvi 121); C. V. Growther, forthcoming; meanwhile CSAD Newsletter ii Spring 1996, 5.

Where the reconstruction of the text is agreed we show outside brackets all letters which have been read by Accame, Dreher, or Growther.

1 XI Growther, cf. Oliver: ΧΗ Accame. 2 γηγη Dreher, γηγη Growther: —|ρηη Accame. 5 μυκείαν Growther: considered by Accame, used of offerings at the Panathenaea in Ἀθηναί. 5. 5: Accame preferred ἀρακέοιν, comparing Dem. xxi. Ανδρ. 72 = xxi. Τιμ. 180, but that is a less good parallel. 6 δήμου Accame, apparently a simple slip. 8 Dreher: [δ]s ιτη[νστοντο] Accame. 9, 13 At the ends of these lines the stone has Γ. 10 Growther: ἀνναγραφήν Accame. 14 J. Shear ap. SEG xiv 47: [αρ]ω ... Χ[ε]τ[ο] ἀρχοντος Accame.
the Amphictyony look more respectable, and the repair of the Andrian oikos (A. 71 if correctly restored) may have been the price exacted by the Andrians. We may wonder whether the Athenians moved, in or after 367, to an annual board rather than a five-year term because the Delians made the life of an Athenian Amphictyon unattractive. The Delians certainly continued to argue against Athenian overlordship: in the 340s they took their case to the Delphic Amphictyony (and lost: Demosthenes xviii. Cronon 134–6); in the 330s the Athenians honoured with citizenship and maintenance a Delian who had maintained the Athenian cause against opposition (IG ii² 222 with M. J. Osborne, Eratos lxxii 1974, 175–84).

---

§i

in accordance with tradition, and to the Panathenaea a cow and panoply, and to send to the Dionysia a cow and phallus as a commemoration, since they happen to be colonists of the people of Athens.

7 Write up the decree and the reconciliation which the allies have decreed for the Parians, and place a stele on the Acropolis: for the writing-up of the stele the treasurer of the people shall give 20 drachmas.

12 Also invite to hospitality in the prytaneion tomorrow the envoys of the Parians.
The Athenian decree which is inscribed first (§i) will be the later of the two, and the decision of the allies which follows (§ii) will be the ‘reconciliation’ referred to in ll. 7–8. There has been civil war in Paros (Dreher was the first to stress that the reconciliation is between parties in Paros, not between Paros and Athens); probably in 373 Timotheus’ failure to act promptly against the Spartans in the west (X. H. vi. ii. 11–13, D.S. xv. 47. ii–iii) encouraged an anti-Athenian party there; as Athens gained the upper hand in the west the pro-Athenian party in Paros gained the upper hand there. The synedron of the allies has been invoked, and has imposed terms of reconciliation limiting the vengeance that is permitted (cf. the reconciliation in Athens on the restoration of the democracy in 403: Ath. Pol. 39); and Athens treats Paros as a colony, requiring it to send offerings to Athenian festivals as in the fifth century it required offerings from colonies (M&L 40 ~ Fornara 71. 3–8; 49 ~ 100. 15–17) and ultimately from all members of the Delian League (M&L 46 ~ Fornara 98. 41–3; 69 ~ 136. 55–8). For the offerings the closest parallel to this decree is provided by Athens’ decree setting up a colony at Brea (M&L 49 ~ Fornara 100: a cow and panoply at the Panathenaea, a phallus at the Dionysia). According to one tradition, Paros was colonized from Arcadia ([Arist.] fr. 611. 25 Rose [Teubner] = Heraed. fr. 25 Dills); but according to another tradition the Cyclades were colonized from Athens (Thuc. i. 12. iv, Isoc. xii. Panath. 43), and two texts mention Paros in that connection (schol. Dion. Perieget. 525 [ii. 451 Müller], Vell. Pat. i. 4. iii). On the payment for the inscription see Rhodes, Boule, 101 n. 3, 103 n. 7; A. S. Henry, Chiron xii 1982, 91–118: the assembly’s expense account, receiving an allowance in the merismos and managed by the treasurer of the people, was probably instituted c.376 (though Henry gives a more complex account of financial developments in the early fourth century); this is the earliest securely dated mention of the treasurer; there is no surviving reference to the account itself until 367 (cf. 35).
§ii

14 In the archonship of Asteius [373/2]; on the last day of Scirophorion; with —— of Thebes putting to the vote. Resolved by the allies:

17 So that the Parians shall live in agreement and nothing violent shall happen there (?);

18 If any one kills any one unjustly (?), he shall be put to death; and those responsible for the death shall pay the penalty (?) in accordance with the laws. —— or exiles any one contrary to the laws and this decree, ——

§ii is our only surviving document of the synedrion of the league. It dates by the Athenian archon, and by month and day, here the last day of the year (but not by prytany and day, since the synedrion is not convened by members of the Athenian council); Athenian decrees do not habitually give month and day as well as prytany and day until the second half of the century. It is almost certain that Athens was not represented in the synedrion (the only texts which might suggest otherwise are Dem. xxiv. Tim. 127, 150); here we have evidence that the synedrion was presided over not by an Athenian but by one of its own members; and it is striking to find a Theban acting in this capacity as late as 372, when both Thebes’ lack of support for the League (X. H. vi. ii. i) and its growing power in Boeotia and central Greece, marked especially by the destruction of Plataea (X. H. vi. iii. 1, cf. Isoc. xiv. Plat.) were causing disquiet in Athens.

After ‘Resolved by the allies’, this document launches very abruptly into the substance: ll. 7–8 lead us to expect the full text of their resolution, not just an extract; perhaps allies with less experience of decree-drafting than the Athenians had actually did produce a very abrupt document. For the exception of murderers from the amnesty imposed on Paros cf. Athens in 403 (Ath. Pol. 39. v). The laws referred to in ll. 21–2 will be those of Paros. This enactment calls itself a ‘decree’ (psophisma: ll. 22–3); for that cf. X. H. vi. v. 2; but the word more commonly used of decisions of the allies is ‘resolution’ (dogma): e.g. Tod 127. 14–15, 33. 10–11, Dem. xix. Embassy 15.

Footnote:
1 First dated instances IG ii² 229, 341/0 (day specified but not month; but again in fact the last day of the year); SEG xvi 59, 339/8 (restored with month but not day); 77, 338/7 (month and day: see commentary); see Henry, Prescripts, 37–8; but Henry overlooks E. Schweigert, Hesp. viii 1939, 14 n. 1, on IG ii² 122 (an unreliable fragment, restored with a date of 357/6) and 404 (for whose dating c. 356–55 see on 39).
A Theban monument after Leuctra, 371

A limestone block found in a suburb of Thebes; now in the museum there. Phot. K. Demakopoulou & D. Konsola, Archaeological Museum of Thebes: Guide, 31 fig. i.

In a mixed dialect (see commentary); ll. 1–3 in larger letters.


Ξενοκράτης,
Θεόπομπος,
Μνασάλαος.

ἀνίκα τὸ Σπάρτας ἐκράτει δόρυ, τυράκις εἶλεν
Ξενοκράτης κλάρως Ζηνὶ τρόπαια φέρειν,
οὐ τὸν ἀπ’ Ἐυρώπας δείασα στόλον οὐδὲ Λάκωνῶν ἀσπίδα. “Θηβαίοι κρείσσονες ἐν πολέμῳ”,
κάρυσαι Λεύκτρως νικαφόρα δοὺρ τρόπαια,
οὐδ’ Ἐπαμεινώνδα δεύτεροι ἐδράμομεν.

Since it appears that nothing stood on it, and there is no indication in the text that it is a dedication, this is almost certainly a gravestone. The three men presumably died on the same occasion, either in the battle of Leuctra (altogether 47 Boeotians are said to have died in the battle (Paus. ix. 13. xii: D.S. xv. 56. iv has 300)) or in some later episode. There is no convincing explanation of the text’s first naming three men but then mentioning an achievement of just one: perhaps this was the best that the versifier could manage. The dialect is mainly literary Doric, but with epic elements (e.g. κρείσσονες, l. 7), coming close to the language of Pindar: it enables Xenocrates’ name to be given the long first syllable which the metre requires.

Xenocrates was one of the Boeotarchs, the senior officials of the Boeotian federation, in 371, named as one of those who supported Epaminondas’ plan for an immediate attack on the Spartans at Leuctra (Paus. ix. 13. vi–vii cf. D.S. xv. 53. iii). Four texts contain stories in which, in one way or another, the Boeotians were encouraged by the oracle of Trophonius at Lebadea to fight at Leuctra (Callisth. FGH1 124 F 22 [a] ap. Cic. Div. 1. 74, D.S. xv. 53. iv, Polyena. II. 3. viii, Paus. iv. 32. v–vi). In Pausanias’ story the Thebans were instructed to demoralize the Spartans by setting up before the battle a trophy bearing the shield of the seventh-century Messenian hero Aristomenes. That has often been associated with these verses; Beister has argued that it is in fact a distortion of a story alluded to in them, that they were to carry a trophy into the battle (his interpretation of pherein in l. 5; it is not a normal verb for setting up a trophy). The Messenian dimension of the story is surely an invention subsequent to the liberation
Xenocrates, Theopompus, Mnasilaus.

When the Spartan spear was dominant, then Xenocrates took by lot the task of offering a trophy to Zeus, not fearing the host from the Eurotas or the Spartan shield. ‘Thebans are superior in war’, proclaims the trophy won through victory/bringing victory by the spear at Leuctra; nor did we run second to Epaminondas.

of Messenia by Thebes and others in 370/69 (D.S. xv. 62. i–66. i). Beyond that, it would be remarkable if the story about Leuctra postulated by Beister were true but had subsequently been replaced by a less vivid story, when there is no direct trace at all of Beister’s story, and no trace of the less vivid story in any literary text earlier than Pausanias. Tuplin argues convincingly that (whatever may be the origin of Pausanias’ story) in spite of the unusual verb it is easier to interpret the verses as referring to the ordinary erection of a trophy after the battle. Strictly, it was when he was drawing lots that Xenocrates did not fear the Spartans; that would be appropriate whether the lots were drawn before the battle or after the victory, when some of the Spartans wanted to contest the erection of the trophy (X. H. vi. iv. 14). If he died in the battle, we must assume that the lots were drawn before and he did not live to carry out the task.

‘When the Spartan spear was dominant’ (l. 5) probably refers to the era ended by the battle of Leuctra rather than to the particular time when the lots were drawn. Trophies were often connected with Zeus (Tuplin, 106 n. 104). For ‘proclaims’ (karyssei) with direct speech cf. Anth. Pal. vii. 431 = Sim. lxv (Page, Epigrammata Graeca). Not running second to the Theban commander Epaminondas could mean either literally, that Xenocrates or the three men were not behind him in running to attack the Spartans or, metaphorically, that he/them did not perform less well than him; there is no need to suppose, as Tod considered possible, that this is ‘a veiled protest against the undue glorification of that general’.
Athenian decrees for Mytilene, 369/8 and 368/7

Four fragments of a stele one found south of the Athenian Acropolis, the others in the north of the city; now in the Epigraphical Museum.

Attic-Ionic; ll. 1–6 in larger letters (3–6 stoichedon 26); 7–34 non-stoichedon; 35 seqq. stoichedon 31. This is the work of Tracy’s Gutter of IG i2 105 (cf. 34, 41); Athenian Democracy in Transition, 67–70.

IG i2 107, SIG * 164; Tod 131*. Trans. Harding 53. See also T. A. Tonini, Acme xlii 1989, 47–61.

§

[θ]eoi.


[Ναυσία]γίνεσθι ἵρχειν Αιαντίς ἐπρον-


[v]έπει[ο]τάτει. vacat

vacat


[μ]ου τῶι δρόμου προεδρεύειν εἰς τὴν πρῶ[τ]η[ν]


[σ] ἤτιος τῆ[ν] δήμοι[ν] τῶι Αθηναίωι καὶ ένα[ι] 


Gods.

2 Of the Mytileneans.

3 Nausigenes was archon [368/7]; Aiantis was the prytany; Moschus of Cydathenacum was secretary; Aristyllus of Erchia was chairman.

7 Resolved by the council and the people. Diophantus proposed:

8 Concerning what is said by the envoys who have come from Lesbos, be it decreed by the council: The proedroi to whose lot it falls to preside in the first assembly shall bring them forward to the people; and contribute the opinion of the council to the people, that the council resolves:

12 Since the Mytileneans have been good men with regard to the people of Athens both now and in the time past, praise the people of Mytilene for their goodness towards the people of Athens; and if they need anything there shall be access for them to the council or the people first after the sacred business.

17 Praise also Hieroetas because he is a good man with regard to the people of Athens and of Mytilene.

18 This decree shall be written up by the secretary of the council on a stone stele and placed on the Acropolis. There shall be written up also on the same stele the decree which the people gave in reply to the envoys of Mytilene with Hieroetas. For the writing-up of the stele the treasurer of the people shall give to the secretary of the council 20 drachmas.

24 Praise the envoys who were sent to Mytilene and invite them to dinner in the prytaneion tomorrow. Also invite the synedroi of Mytilene to hospitality in the prytaneion tomorrow. Also invite
The decree which is inscribed first (§i) is the later of the two, and orders the inscription of both. (B. T. Nolan in an unpublished thesis, reported in SEG xlv 36 cf. 257, has observed that 1. 7 conforms to the stochedon grid used for §ii but the remainder of §i is inscribed in an erasure: apparently when it was first inscribed the amendment was omitted; §ii was then inscribed; and the original text of §i had to be erased and replaced with a version in more crowded lettering which did include the amendment.)
the synedroi of Methymna and Antissa and Eresus and Pyrrha to hospitality in the prytaneion tomorrow.

30 Autolycus proposed:
30 In other respects in accordance with the council; but praise the envoys who were sent to Lesbos, Timonothus and Autolycus and Aristopites, and invite them to dinner in the prytaneion tomorrow.

§ii

35 In the archonship of Lysistratus [369/8]. Resolved by the council and the people. Callistratus proposed:
37 Praise the people of Mytilene because they joined well and enthusiastically in fighting the war that is over. Reply to the envoys who have come, that the Athenians fought the war for the freedom of the Greeks; and when the Spartans were campaigning against the Greeks, contrary to the oaths and the agreement, they themselves went in support and they called on the other allies to go and render the support due to the Athenians, abiding by the oaths, against those contravening the treaty.

49 They claim — — in the time past — — the people of Mytilene — the people of Athens — —

It is a conventional honorific decree, and was presumably prompted by a favourable response from Mytilene and the other cities of Lesbos to the reply (contained in the other decree) which Athens had given to the embassy of Hieroetas and his colleagues. The purpose of the amendment is uncertain: Tod thought that the envoys ‘to Lesbos’ [ll. 31–2] were sent to the cities other than Mytilene and were different from those sent to Mytilene; Rhodes (Boule, 279) that there was one embassy, and the purpose of the
amendment was to have the envoys named and/or to read ‘Lesbos’ for ‘Mytilene’; another possibility is that there was one embassy, it was not mentioned in the original motion, and the reference in ll. 24–6 has been added as a result of the amendment. It is in any case striking that Autolycus proposed the amendment in favour of an embassy of which he was a member (in M&L 49, 73 ~ Fornara 100, 140, amendments refer the proposers of the amendments to the council; in 22 Aristoteles is proposer and an envoy elected under his decree). The series of invitations to the prytaneion is a good illustration of the rule that non-citizens were invited to xenia (‘hospitality’) but citizens to deipnon (‘dinner’); cf. on 2. On this occasion no envoys had come from Lesbos to Athens, so Athens took the unusual step of inviting the synedroi present in Athens to the prytaneion.

The earlier decree (§ii) is the more important of the two, and it is exceptionally frustrating that the preserved text ends where it does. The Second Athenian League had been founded, within the framework of the Peace of Antalcidas, to oppose the threat presented by Sparta to the freedom of the Greeks; Mytilene had been a founder member, and the other cities of Lesbos had joined too (22). However, after the battle of Leuctra in 371 the Athenians came to see Thebes as a greater threat than Sparta, and this change of stance was confirmed by an alliance between Athens and Sparta in 369 (X. H. vii. i. 1–14, D.S. xv. 67. i). Sparta had ceased to be a threat to the other Greeks as well as to Athens; Thebes, itself a founder member of the League, was presumably no longer a member after Leuctra, but was not at this stage a threat to the island Greeks who formed most of the League’s membership; yet Athens kept the League in being, as it had kept the Delian League in being when it gave up regular warfare against Persia in the middle of the fifth century. Members might well be puzzled or indignant; and Mytilene evidently was. Athens replied that it had led the opposition to

### 32

The Arcadian federation honours an Athenian, 369–367

A tapering stele with a relief showing Fortune (Tyche) holding a helmet and touching a trophy; found at Tegea; now built into the wall of a church and inaccessible. Facs. AM xxxvi 1911, Beilage zu 351; IG v. ii; SIG* 183; Tod 132*. Trans. Harding 51 (ll. 1–9 + names of cities and numbers of damnarii). See also J. Roy in Brock & Hodkinson (edd.), Alternatives to Athens, 308–26.

*θεός: Τύχη.*

*ἐδοξέν τῆν βουλήν τῶν*

*Ἀρκάδων: καὶ τοῖς*
Sparta when the Spartans were breaking the Peace of Antalcidas and threatening the
Greeks; unfortunately what was said about the new state of affairs has not survived.
Tonini stresses the importance of the decision to publish this decree with the later one,
in 368/7; that was the time when Thebes began to show signs of wanting to follow
its challenge to Sparta with a challenge to Athens, and when Athens might well have
wanted to reinforce its links with its Aegean allies.

Moschus, secretary in 368/7, was to be treasurer of Athena in 366/5 (IG ii 1428.5–6). Diophantus, restored as the proposer of the first decree, is probably Diophantus
of Sphettus, a politician active until the 340s, and probably with Eubulus creator in
in the same prytany he proposed honours for a Spartan (Tod 135). Autolycus may be
the man who was a respectable spokesman for the Areopagus in 346 (Aesch. i. Tim.
81–4) but was condemned after the battle of Chaeronea in 338 (Lyc. Leocr. 53). Callis-
tratus will be the leading politician, nephew of Agyrrius (Dem. xxiv. Tim. 135), who
was influential in Athens during the anti-Spartan 370s, but made the crucial speech
at the peace conference in Sparta in spring 371 (X. H. vi. iii. 10–17, cf. D.S. xv. 38. iii
(writing of 375)) and here defends Athens’ change of policy. He remained influential
during the 360s, but was condemned in 361 (we do not know why), went into exile, and
was put to death when he later attempted to return (Lyc. Leocr. 93).

§1 of our text has the unique ἐχ Αέαβου (l. 8) but Tod 135, proposed by the same man
in the prytany served by the same secretary, has ἐγ Λακεδαίμονος (l. 7); ours the unique
εὐβάλλεσθαι (l. 11) but Tod 135 ἔωβάλλεσθαι (l. 10); ours indicative δοκεῖ, a use of ἦ
for ἦν which is increasingly found from c.360 but rare earlier (l. 12), but Tod 135 δοκεῖ
(l. 11) (on these phenomena see Threatte, Grammar, i. 586–7, 637, 356). The scope for
variation between texts which we should expect not to vary is considerable.

1 God; Fortune.
2 Resolved by the council of the
Arcadians and the Ten Thousand.
Mantinea, in eastern Arcadia (cf. 14), was split into its component villages by Sparta in 385 (X. H. v. ii. 5, 7, D.S. xv. 5. iv, 12. ii), but reunited in 370 (X. H. vi. v. 2—5). That was followed by further stages of Arcadian synoecism: the uniting of the separate states of Arcadia in a federation (X. H. vi. v. 6, D.S. xv. 59. i), and the amalgamation of communities in southern Arcadia to form a new great city, Megalopolis (D.S. xv. 72. iv, 368/7; Paus. viii. 27. i–viii, 371/0; on the date see S. Hornblower, BSA lxxv
4 Phylarchus son of Lysicrates of Athens shall be proxenos and benefactor of all the Arcadians, himself and his descendants.

9 The following were damiorgoi:

i. 10 Tegeates:
   Phaedreas, Aristocrates, Nicarchus, Xenopithes, Damocratidas.

i. 16 Maenalians:
   Hagias, Eugitonidas, Xenophon.

i. 20 Lepreates:
   Hippias, Gadorus.

i. 23 Megalopolitans:
   Ariston, Blysas, Archepsius, Atrestidas, Gorgeas, Sminthis, Plistierus, Nicis, Laarchus, Polychares.

i. 34 Mantineans:
   Phaedrus, Wachus, Eudamidas, Daistratus, Chaeridas.

ii. 10 Cynurians:
   Timocrates, Callicles, Laphanes, Sais, Sais.

ii. 16 Orchomenians:
   Eugiton, Amyntas, Pamphilus, Pausanias, Callias.

ii. 22 Clitorians:
   Telimachus, Alman, Aeschytes, Damagetus, Proxenus.

ii. 28 Heraeans:
   Alexicrates, Simias, Theopompus, Hagias, Hipposthenes.

ii. 34 Thelphusians:
   Poleas, Alexias, Echias, Pausanias, Lycius.

1990, 71–7; J. Roy, CAH², vi. 193). Orchomenus, Heraea, and Lepreum (on the last see below) were forcibly incorporated in the federation in the course of 370 (X. H. vi. v. 10–22, D.S. xv. 62. i–ii). In 363, however, the federation split into opposing factions, with Mantinea on one side and Tegea and Megalopolis on the other (X. H. vii. iv. 33–40, D.S. xv. 82. i–iii); and after the battle of Mantinea, in 362, some of the people who had been drafted into Megalopolis tried to return to their old homes
but through Theban intervention were forced to remain in Megalopolis (D.S. xv. 94. i–iii).

The date of this inscription has been much disputed, but it must surely belong to the 360s, when the federation included Mantinea and Tegea, Orchomenus, Heraea and Lepreum, and also Megalopolis. No northern city is listed except Clitor, whereas Stymphalus was a member and provided the federation’s general in 366 (X. H. vii. iii. 1), so the date is most probably c.367 or slightly earlier (M. Cary, JHS xlii 1922, 188–90), though J. Roy suggests that the northern states were members but were not represented at this meeting (Hist. xx 1971, 569–99 at 571–2), in which case a date as late as c.363 would be possible. Since the inscription was set up at Tegea and the damiorgoi of Tegea are listed first, it is likely that the meeting which enacted this decree was held at Tegea. Nothing is known about the Athenian honorand. The decree is very austere in its wording, but that is not unusual for proxeny decrees.

Of the federal institutions, this inscription mentions the damiorgoi (fifty in all, ten or five or three plus two according to the size of the unit); the council (presumably a more numerous body than the damiorgoi), and the Ten Thousand (D.S. xv. 59. i, cf. e.g. X. H. vii. i. 38: the number suggests that they were the citizens satisfying a property qualification but not a high one, perhaps all those of hoplite rank and above (cf. Rhodes with Lewis, 507)). The damiorgoi were not merely a federal college but the principal
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Athens begins negotiations with Dionysius I of Syracuse,

369/8

A fragment of a stele found in Athens; now in the Epigraphical Museum and in very poor condition.

Attic-Ionic, retaining the old e for ai in l. 16 and o for ou-sometimes; sfoichedon 31.

IG ii 103; SIG* 159; Tod 133; M. J. Osborne, Naturalization, D 10*.

[ἐπί Ἀ]υστράτῳ ἄρχοντος· ἐπὶ τ[ῆς Ἐρεχ]·
[θη[δ]]ος δεκάτ[ης πρωτανείας·] Ἐξη[κεα]·

5 [——5. ἐδοξεν τῇ βουλῇ καὶ τῷ δήμῳ.]

[Πά]υδιος ἐπιη[ν· περὶ δὴν οἱ πρέσβεις ο[ἱ π]·

corona
corona

The stone has deteriorated greatly since it was first seen: we enclose within brackets only those letters which no scholar has been able to read.

3–4 Osborne: ἐγγραμμ[άτε]· earlier edd.; our restoration: —λι— earlier edd.; patronymic and demotic followed by ἐδοξεν τῶν δήμων Osborne; but demotic only is normal for secretary (Henry, Prescripts, 27, 32), and for this decree with probouleumatic formula we should expect the longer enactment formula which mentions the council.
magistrates of the individual units (cf. 14); they may be the same as the archontes of X. H. vii. iv. 33–4.

Of the units which provide damiorgoi, most are cities. However, the Maenalians (west of Mantinea and Tegea) and the Cynurians (west of the Maenalians) were tribal units with towns within them. Lepreum is problematic. It was in Triphylia, the coastal region between Elis and Messenia which Elis sought to control. It participated independently in the Persian War of 480–479 (Her. ix. 28. iv, M&L 27 ~ Fornara 59. 11). Subsequently, for protection against Arcadia, it accepted a position of dependence on Elis, but in and after 421 Sparta championed it against Elis (Thuc. v. 31. i–v, 34. i, 49–50). Lepreum and its neighbours joined Sparta in its war against Elis c.402–c.400, and were left free at the end of that war (X. H. iii. ii. 25, 30–1; in the early fourth century there is evidence for a Triphylian federal state (cf. 15); but in this inscription it is not ‘Triphylia’ but ‘Lepreum’ which forms part of the Arcadian federation (cf. also X. H. vi. v. 11). It is not clear whether Lepreum is to be distinguished from the Triphylian federation, or was regarded as equivalent to it by the Arcadians. See T. H. Nielsen in Nielsen (ed.), Yet More Studies in the Ancient Greek Polis, 129–62; also J. Roy in Hansen (ed.), The Polis as an Urban Centre and as a Political Community, 282–320.

For another, fragmentary decree of the federation of the 360s see SEG xxii 339 → xxix 405 → xxxii 411. For the Arcadians after the battle of Mantinea see 41.

---

6 Pandius proposed: Concerning what is said by the envoys who have come from Dionysius, be it resolved by the council:

8 Concerning the letter which Dionysius sent about the building of the temple and
This is the earliest Athenian decree in our collection which contains the new formula identifying the chairman as one of the proedroi (the earliest surviving is Tod 124 ~ Harding 38): for the survival of the old formula, ‘X was chairman’, see on 22. The same man, Pandius, proposed this as a probouleumatic decree in 369/8 and 34 as
the peace, the allies shall bring out a resolution to the people, whatever seems best to them in their deliberation.

13 The proedroi shall bring them forward to the people at the first assembly, inviting the allies also, and shall deal with the matter about which they speak; and contribute the opinion of the council to the people, that the council resolves:

18 Praise Dionysius the archon of Sicily, and the sons of Dionysius, Dionysius and Hermocritus, because they are good men with regard to the people of Athens and the allies, and come in support of the King’s Peace, which was made by the Athenians and the Spartans and the other Greeks.

26 Send to Dionysius the crown which was voted by the people; and crown each of the sons of Dionysius with a gold crown of a thousand drachmas for their good-man-ship [andragathia] and friendship.

30 Dionysius and his sons shall be Athenians, themselves and their descendants, and of whichever tribe and deme and phratri they wish. The prytaneis of Erechtheis shall give the vote concerning them in the assembly concerning their citizenship.

36 And they shall have access to the council and the people first after the sacred business: the generals and the prytaneis shall take care that these things happen.

40 This decree shall be written up by the secretary of the council.

---

a non-probouleumatic decree in 368/7: presumably he had a particular connection with or at least interest in Dionysius, and was a member of the council in 369/8 (cf. Rhodes, Boule, 70).

This text throws light on Athenian foreign policy in the aftermath of Leuctra and
on the working of the Second Athenian League. Despite an attempt to win him over
to the Athenian side in 393 (10), Dionysius of Syracuse remained an ally of Sparta,
sending ships to Corcyra which were defeated by the Athenians in 372 (X. H. vi. ii.
33–6, D.S. xv. 47. vii), and soldiers to fight in the Peloponnese in the early 360s (X. H.
vi. i. 20–2, 27–32, D.S. xv. 70. i). After Athens and Sparta had become allies, in 369
(cf. on 31), the way was open for Athens and Dionysius to become allies. For Dionysius
as ‘archon of Sicily’ see on 10.

‘The building of the temple and the peace’ the council refers to the synedrion of the
Second Athenian League, which in an additional stage of probouleusis is to submit a
resolution to the assembly, which will make the final decision: contrast 41, where the
synedrion takes the initiative and then refers the matter to the council. The temple is
that of Apollo at Delphi, which had been damaged by fire and/or earthquake in 373/2
(Marm. Par. FGrH 239 A 71, Macrob. Sat. iii. 6. vii); a proposal to set up a building
fund was perhaps made after the peace of spring 371 (X. H. vi. iv. 2); for the arrange-
ments that were eventually made see 45. The peace must be the King’s Peace, which
Dionysius is said to support (ll. 23–6), and what is referred to the allies must be the
question of admitting Dionysius to the League, which was based on the King’s Peace.
Since in 34 an alliance is made between Dionysius and Athens, with no involvement
of the League, the synedrion must have decided that it wished to have nothing to do
with Dionysius, and Athens will have been sufficiently attentive to the will of the allies
to accept their decision.

The council forwards directly to the assembly, for an immediate decision, matters

34

Alliance between Athens and Dionysius of Syracuse,
368/7

A fragment of a stele found on the Athenian Acropolis; now in the Epigraphical Museum. Phot. Kirchner,
Images², Taf. 26 Nr. 53; Woodhead, The Greeks in the West, pl. 45 (both ll. 9–28); Tracy, Athenian Democracy in
Transition, 68 fig. 1 (squeeze of ll. 7–13).

Attic-Ionic, occasionally retaining the old o for ou; skichedon 33. This is the work of Tracy’s Gutter of IG ii 105
(= this text; cf. 31, 41): Athenian Democracy in Transition, 67–70.

IG ii 105 + 523; SIG*163; Tod 136*; Strohler, Dionysios I, 145–50 with 239 n. 17; Buckler, The Theban Hegemony,
234–7.

[ἐπὶ Ναυσεγέ]ιος ἄρχ[οντος ἐπὶ τῆς Ἁθηναίων / Ολυμπίων]-
[ὁς δευτέρας (?) πί]ρεταν[εἰάς—][13]

1–3 Following Lewis, we have restored ἐπὶ τῆς Ἁθηναίων / Ολυμπίων δευτέρας (?) πί]ρεταν[εἰάς, and have not
restored the secretary: earlier edd. restored Αἰαντιδεσ ἐδόμη πί]ρεταν[εἰάς: Μόσχος Κοδαθηγανεία, to match
Tod 135; but see commentary.
which concern Athens only (but the members of the synedrion are invited to attend: ll. 14–15). A crown has already been voted to Dionysius (presumably recently, since it has still to be sent); crowns for his sons are added (for the award of crowns cf. on 2); and all three are awarded Athenian citizenship (Dionysius’ citizenship is mentioned in [Dem.] xii. Ep. Phil. 10) and the right of priority access to the council and assembly. Dionysius II and Hermocritus were Dionysius’ sons by Doris, his wife from Locri; he had two other sons, Hipparinus and Nysaeus, by Dion’s sister Aristomache, but they appear to have been much younger (Plut. Dion 3. vi).

This is the earliest surviving text in which a grant of citizenship cannot be made by a single decree but requires ratification at a second meeting of the assembly—with a quorum of 6,000 voting in a secret ballot (cf. [Dem.] lxxix. Neer. 89–90; and see M. J. Osborne, BSA lxvii 1972, 129–58 at 132–40; M. H. Hansen, GRBS xvii 1976, 115–34 = Ecclesia (I), 1–20 (–23), at 124–30 = 10–16; M. J. Osborne, Naturalization, iii–iv. 161–4 (suggesting that the requirement was introduced in or soon after 385/4)). Osborne notes also that from this decree onwards explicit inclusion of the honorand’s descendants in a grant of citizenship is standard practice (BSA 140 with n. 49; Naturalization, iii–iv. 150–4). Dionysius and his sons are to be admitted to ‘whichever tribe and deme and phratry they wish’ (ll. 32–3): choice of a deme would entail membership of the trittyes and tribe of which that deme formed a part (trittyes are never mentioned in this connection); choice of phratry (‘brotherhood’: a body based on supposed kinship: cf. 5) was subjected to some restrictions from c.334 (Osborne, BSA 132–43; Naturalization, iii–iv. 176–81).

In the archonship of Nausigenes [368/7]; in the second prytany, of Aeges /
We have restored ἔγραμμάτευςν πέμπτη / ἐβδόμης earlier edd. restored ἔγραμμάτευς [deutérai, and τεταρτήαi also would fit that space; but ἔγραμμάτευς is more usual: see M. H. Hansen, GRBS xxiii 1982, 338 with 341 = Ecclesia(l) 90 with 93, 23—4, 27 ἔπειτα Ἀννίπpeus Lewis, CQ x 1961, 64 n. 1: ἐπειτε [earlier edd., which is one letter too short. 28 The stone has ΤΟΥΕΚ. 35—7 A. Wilhelm phil. Michel 1452, followed by other edd., restored τοῖς ἀρχονταῖς καὶ τῷ [βούλη] τῶν Συμακοσιών καὶ στρατηγοὺς καὶ την] ἀρχοντάσι; but Stroheler has shown that that and other proposed restorations are dubious.
Oeneis (?); — of — was secretary; on the thirty-fifth/thirty-seventh day of the prytany; of the proedroi — son of Daippus of Marathon was putting to the vote. Resolved by the people.

6 Pandius proposed: For the good fortune of the Athenians; be it resolved by the people:

7 Praise Dionysius the archon of Sicily, because he is a good man with regard to the people of Athens and the allies.

10 He and his descendants shall be allies of the people of Athens for all time on the following terms. If any one goes against the territory of Athens for war either by land or by sea, Dionysius and his descendants shall go in support as the Athenians call on them, both by land and by sea with all their strength as far as possible; and if any one goes against Dionysius or his descendants or what Dionysius rules for war either by land or by sea, the Athenians shall go in support as they call on them, both by land and by sea with all their strength as far as possible.

23 It shall not be permitted to Dionysius or his descendants to bear arms against the territory of the Athenians for hurt either by land or by sea; nor shall it be permitted to the Athenians to bear arms against Dionysius or his descendants or what Dionysius rules for hurt either by land or by sea.

30 The oath about the alliance shall be received by the envoys who have come from Dionysius, and shall be sworn by the council and the generals and the hippocarchs and the taxiarchs. It shall be sworn by Dionysius and the — — — of Syracuse — — — rarchs. Each party shall swear its lawful oath. The oaths shall be received by the Athenian envoys sailing to Sicily.
For the background to this alliance see 33, proposed by the same man in 369/8. If we are right in dating this to 368/7 (cf. below), the synedrion of the Second Athenian League will have refused to accept Dionysius as a member (but contr. G. L. Cawkwell, JHSc 1981, 50, who suggests that this alliance is all that was proposed to the allies and they gave it their blessing). Here Dionysius is still said to be ‘a good man with regard to the people of Athens and the allies’ (ll. 9—10), but what follows is a simple defensive alliance between Athens and Dionysius; to the usual clause about supporting each other if attacked is added a clause about not attacking each other (pemone, ‘hurt’, is otherwise a poetic word, but for its use in this context cf. the treaties of Thuc. v. 18. iv; 47. ii = Tod 72 = IG i 83. 4). It is clear that, apart from Dionysius himself, some body or bodies swore on behalf of Syracuse, but we cannot recover the details: it is likely enough that Dionysius maintained an appearance of constitutional government in Syracuse, but we are not attracted to the view of Caven that there was a formal division between the citadel of Ortygia ruled directly by Dionysius and the outer city with constitutional government (Caven, Dionysius I, 156—9, 163—5).

The dating of the alliance has been much discussed. Even the year depends on restoration, and there are other archons whose names have the correct number of letters and the correct ending; but we think Buckler, who will not even decide between Dionysius I and Dionysius II, carries scepticism much too far and the usual year of 368/7 should be accepted. Apart from IG i 227bis = SEG xli 9, a decree of 422/1 included on a stele inscribed at the end of the fifth century (for which see M. H. Hansen, AJP cxiv 1993, 103; Sickinger, Archives and Public Records in Classical Athens, 89—90), this happens to be the earliest surviving decree which specifies the day within the prytany (Henry, Prescripts, 27); there are four possibilities, not far apart (see critical note); nothing hangs on the decision.

35

An Athenian protest to the Aetolian League, 367/6

Three contiguous fragments of a stele, found in the Athenian Agora near the Eleusinium; now in the Agora museum, Phot. Hesp. viii 1939, 6 (frs. a + b only); Agora, xvi, pl. 4.

Attic-Ionic, retaining the old ο for ω in ll. 2, 5; ll. 2—3 in larger, clumsier letters; ll. 4 sqq. stoichedon 32 (in l. 22 vocav occupies four spaces).
This decree shall be written up by the secretary of the council and placed on the Acropolis; and for the writing-up the treasurer of the people shall give 30 (?) drachmas.

More importantly, the tribe and number of the prytany, and the name and demotic of the secretary, are wholly restored. This is the last year in which each secretary is known to have served for one prytany only (contrast Tod 134, 135; and see on 38). Editors have seized on the fact that the space available can be filled by making this a decree of the seventh prytany, of Aiantis, to match Tod 135, but that gives rise to problems. To give the chairman’s patronymic was unusual (Henry, Prescripts, 27, 32), but there is no doubt that it was given here; since Daippus is a rare name, and no deme other than Marathon is attested for a bearer of it, the restoration of the chairman’s demotic is very probable (there are sufficient parallels about this time for the use of an abbreviation: Buckler, 236, and see on 36)—but Marathon belongs to the tribe Aiantis, so now that the chairman is one of the proedroi (cf. on 22) the tribe in prytany cannot be Aiantis. Moreover, there is a story that at the Lenaea of 368/7 Dionysius won the first prize for his tragedy, The Ransom of Hector, and that his death was caused by excessive celebration of that victory, thus fulfilling an oracle that he would die when he had defeated his betters (D.S. xv. 74. i–iv): the story is more likely to have arisen if Dionysius did in fact die shortly after the Lenaea; but that festival occurred in Gamelion (the seventh month, roughly equivalent to the sixth prytany), so Dionysius is likely to have been dead by the last days of the seventh prytany. Maltezos proposed the sixth prytany, to place the alliance about the time of the Lenaea; but we should not expect the synedron to take long to reject Dionysius, and ought to look for the earliest possible date in the year. The first prytany is not possible (tribe + number has the right number of letters but secretary + demotic has one letter too few: IG II² 104), but the second is possible, and we restore that.
There was a truce of fifty-five days for the Lesser Mysteries in the spring and for the Greater Mysteries in the autumn (IG i 6 = Formara 75. B); another inscription (Agora, xix, P 5, 60) indicates that Oeneis held the third prytany of 367/6, so this text is concerned with the truce of autumn 367. ‘Forthwith’ (autika mala) is often used of action to be taken by the enacting body on the occasion of enactment; but there is no reason why it should not be used of any action to be taken as soon as a decree has been enacted (Rhodes, Boule, 75, 280), and it was common practice for heralds to be dispatched by the council (op. cit., 94 with n. 4). Heralds (kerykes), as opposed to envoys (presbeis), were sent to proclaim rather than to negotiate, and by ‘the common laws of the Greeks’ (i.e. generally accepted convention) were regarded as inviolable.
Gods.

2 Demophilus son of Theorus from Cephalé was secretary.

4 Resolved by the council and the people. Oeneis was the prytany; Demophilus son of Theorus from Cephalé was secretary; Philippus of Semachidae was chairman; Polyzelus was archon [367/6]. Cephasidotus proposed:

8 Since the Aetolians of the koinon have accepted the truce for the Mysteries of Eleusinian Demeter and of Kore, but those of the Eumolpidae and Kerykes announcing the truce, Promachu and Epigenes, have been imprisoned by the Trichonians, contrary to the common laws of the Greeks, the council shall forthwith choose a herald from all Athenians, who on arrival at the koinon of the Aetolians shall demand the release of the men and judge so that Aetol—Eumolpidae and Kerykes—for travelling expenses the treasurer of the people 30 drachmas from the people’s fund for expenditure on decrees.

This inscription reveals the existence of an Aetolian League, which Athens held responsible for the misconduct of one of its member cities (Trichonium, in the southwest of Aetolia, north of Calydon), half a century before its first appearance in a literary text (D.S. xix. 66. ii, 314/13). Thucydides wrote of the Aetolians as living in villages and comprising three ‘parts’ (iii. 94. iv–v, cf. 96. iii); again, in 335 the Aetolians sent embassies ‘by peoples’ to Alexander the Great (Arr. Anab. i. 10. ii), and in 322 they abandoned their unfortified poleis and moved their non-combatants and property to the mountains for safety (D.S. xviii. 24. ii). Bosworth has argued from Thp. FG2H 115 F 235, unemended, that the Aetolians captured Naupactus in 338/7 after Chaeronea and that in retaliation Philip of Macedon drove them out in 337 and broke up the
koinon attested in this inscription.\(^1\) D.S. xv. 57. i mentions the Aetolians among the peoples of northern Greece who became friends of Thebes after Leuctra; that is compatible with this attested existence of the League; but it would be fanciful to follow Tod in supposing that the influence of Thebes, and of Epaminondas in particular, led to the foundation of the League.

Philippus, the chairman, is perhaps to be identified with the proposer of Tod 146 – Harding 58. For the proposer Cephisodotus cf. 21. Of the men arrested, Promachus may be the father of —lus of Eleusis (IG ii\(^2\) 3126), and Epigenes may be the Epigenes of Eleusis whose tombstone is known (IG ii\(^2\) 6031). However, while the Eumolpidae claimed an Eleusinian origin the Kerykes did not (cf. Rhodes, Comm. Ath. Pol. 637), and of all the Eleusinian sacred officials known, of either \textit{genos}, only one is attested as belonging to the deme of Eleusis (the third-century hierophant Chaeretius: IG ii\(^2\) 1235; see Clinton, \textit{The Sacred Officials of the Eleusinian Mysteries}, 8), so we cannot be confident in identifying Promachus and Epigenes as men of Eleusis.

\(^1\) Another Athenian decree referring to the Aetolian \textit{koinon}, SEG xxii 326 (IG ii\(^2\) 358), is probably to be dated not in Alexander’s reign but 307/6 (Bosworth, 167–8).

---

### 36

\textbf{Sales of public property at Athens, 367/6}


Attic-Ionic, retaining old \textit{o} for \textit{oe}. \textit{Skeikiden} 39.

M. Crosby, \textit{Hesp.} x 1941, 14–27 no. 1; SEG xii 100; \textit{Agora}, xix P5*. Trans. Crosby 17–19.

\epi\ Πολυζήλου ἄρχοντος πωληταί
Πολύκεκτος Λαμπρεῖτος, Δεμίας Ἑρχείος, Θαῖος Παυανείος, Θεότιμος Φρεάρριος, Ἀριστογένης Ἰφισιᾶδης, Γλαύκων Λακάδης, Κηφισοκλέης Πειραίειος, Νικοκλέης Ἀναφλύστος, οἱ Ἑξήκεστος Κοβωκίδης ἐγγαμμάτευν, τάδε ἄπειδον παραλαβόντες παρά τῶν ἐνδεκα Φαίακος Ἀφιδναίο καὶ συναρχόντων Ἐνυχιών δεκάτη ἰσταμένα, Θεόμνησιος Δεισιθέου Ἰωνίδης ἀπέγραφεν Θεοσέβος τοῦ Θεόφιλο Ἐπεσταῖος οίκιαν Ἀλκατείχους δημοσίαν ἑδραί, ἦ γείτων ἑορρά: ἢ ὀδὸς ἢ ἐς τὸ Δαιδάλειον φέρουσα καὶ τὸ Δαιδάλειον, νοτόθεν: Φίλιππος Ἀγγυρλή, ἀλόντος Θεοσέβος ἓρεσιλιάς καὶ οὐχ ὑπομενόντος τῷ κρίσιν ὅσιοι πλεῖον ἀξία ἢ ὑπόκειται Σμυκῶν Τειχρασίων: ἩΡ δραχμῶν, κλητήρ Δι-
For 'the people's fund for expenditure on decrees' cf. on 29: the fund, and the treasurer who administered it, were probably instituted c.376, but the earliest datable references to the fund are in decrees of this year (cf. Tod 135). Here the fund is used to pay not for the publication of the decree but for travelling expenses authorized by the decree (cf. 44, 48, 95): it could be alleged (then as now) that men sent on missions abroad were lavishly supported (e.g. Ar. Acharn. 61–89), but 30 drachmas for the arduous journey to Aetolia were hardly great riches. The decree does not in fact contain a clause ordering its publication: that in itself could be accidental (the Athenians were erratic in such matters, and absence of the clause from the published text does not prove that it was absent from the original text or that publication was not intended); but, coupled with the fact that the inscription seems to have been set up in the Eleusinum, it suggests that it may have been the Eleusinian officials who chose to publish this text: their interest would make it easier to understand why a decree of such an ephemeral nature should have been published in permanent form.

Travelling expenses preserved or to be restored in fourth-century Athenian inscriptions range from 5 drachmas in 95. 43 to 50[?+] in IG II 207. 24, so 30 drachmas here is the likeliest 3-character restoration.

In the archonship of Polyzelus (367/6) the poleis Polyeuctus of Lamptrae, Deimias of Erchia, Theacus of Paeania, Theotimus of Phraerhii, Aristogenes of Iphistiai, Glacon of Laciadae, Cephsicles of Piracus, and Nicoles of Anaphystus, to whom Execestus of Cothocidai was secretary, sold the following, having taken them over from the Eleven—Phaecax of Aphidna and his fellow magistrates.

On the 10th of Mounichion Theomnestus son of Deisitheus of Ionidae registered as public property the house of Theosebes son of Theophilus of Xypete at Alopece, of which the neighbours are, on the north, the road leading to the sanctuary of Daedalus and the sanctuary of Daedalus, and, on the south, Philippus of Agyrle, since Theosebes had been convicted of theft of sacred property and had not awaited judgment; the amount at issue being the excess of the sale once the loan of 150 drachmas from Smicythus of Teithras secured on the property was paid.
SALES OF PUBLIC PROPERTY AT ATHENS, 367/6

ογείτων Ἀλωπεκήθεν, Φιλοίτις Ἰωνίδης. Κυκλο-
δης Διογείτονος Γαργήτ καὶ κοινὸν φρατέρων Ἔ-
δοτιδῶν ἐν ἡττησάματο ἐνοφειλεσθαι εαυτοῦ κ-
αὶ τὸς φράτερος ἐν τῇ ὕκινᾳ τῇ Ἀλωπεκήθειν Ἡ-

20 ραχίας, ἣν ἀπέγραψεν Θεόμυγχος Ἰωνὶ Θεοσέβους ἐναι Συπτετα ἦν γείτων βορρὰ ἢ ὅδος ἢ ἐς τὸ Δαιδά-
λεος(ου) φέρουσα καὶ τὸ Δαιδάλεον, νοτόθεθην Φιλιπ-
πος Ἀγκυιλη, ἀποδομέα ἐμο(ι) καὶ τοῖς φράτεροις τῇ-
ν ὑκίναι τοῦτον Θεοφίλου Ἐνυπε: τὸ πατρὸς τοῦ Θεο-

25 σέβος. ἔδοξεν ἐνοφειλεσθαι. Ἰσαρχος Πήλων Ἐνυπ-
τε[;] ται ἀμφισβήτηει ἐνοφειλεσθαι ἐαυτῷ εἰ ἔν 

30 τῇ ὕκινᾳ τῇ Ἀλωπεκήθειν ἦν ἀπέγραψεν Θεόμυγχος Δε-
ἰσθέο Ἰωνίδης, θάμαντος ἐμὸ Θεόφιλον δ ἢν ἡ ὕκι-
να καὶ τῷ γυναῖκᾳ τῷ Θεοφίλῳ, ΔΔΔ: δραχμάς, ἔδοξεν 

35 ἐνοφειλεσθαι. Ἀλαχίς Μελετέ(υς) καὶ κοινοὶ ὁ-

40 ρεώνον ἐνεπεκτάμαντο ἐν τῇ ὕκινᾳ ἦν ἀπέγρα-
ψεν Θεόμυγχος Ἰωνίδης ἐνοφειλεσθαι ἐαυτοῖς:

40 ΔΗΗΗ δραχμάς, προμενόν Ἠμῶν τῇ ὕκινᾳ τοῦ 

45 παρά Θεοφίλου τοῦτο τὸ ἄργυρον ἐπὶ λύσει. ἐδ-

50 οξεὶ ἐνοφειλεσθαι. άνητής, Λυσανίας Παλαθώνο-

55 Σακίτ ΓΓΔΓ: τοῦτο τῇ προκαταβληθῆ τὸ πέμπτον 

60 μέρος ἤχει ἡ πόλις καὶ τὰ ἐπώνομα καὶ τὰ κηρύκεια 

65 καὶ Σμίκυθος Τεθράσιος τοῦ πεντήκοντα καὶ ἐκ-

70 ατοῦν ἄθροι κατὰ τὴν ἀπογραφὴν. vacat

21-2 Δαιδάλεον on stone. 23 Ἡμω on stone. 30 Μελετε on stone. 49 Ῥασαῦλοι on stone.

Ἀναγράφει on stone. 50 τῆστηθε ἐν stone.
Witnesses to the registration: Diogeiton of Alopecce and Philoetius of Ionidae. Cichonides son of Diogeiton of Gargettus and the group of the phrateres of the Medontidae put in a prior claim that there was a debt of 100 drachmas to himself and the members of the phratry on the house at Alopecce which Theomnestus of Ionidae registered as public property, on the grounds that it was the property of Theosebes of Xypete of which the neighbours were, on the north, the road leading to the sanctuary of Daedalus and the sanctuary of Daedalus, and, on the south, Philippus of Agryle, ‘Theophilus of Xypete the father of Theosebes having sold (i.e. mortgaged) this house to me and to the members of the phratry’. It was decided that the debt was owed. Isarchus son of Philo of Xypete claimed a debt of 30 drachmas owing to him on the house at Alopecce which Theomnestus son of Deisitheus of Ionidae registered as public property, ‘having buried Theophilus, whose house this was, and the wife of Theophilus’. It was decided that the debt was owed. Aeschines of Melite and the group of orgones put in a prior claim on the house that Theomnestus of Ionidae registered as public property that a debt was owing to the m of 24 drachmas, ‘we bought this house upon redemption from Theophilus for this money.’ It was decided that the debt was owed. Purchaser: Lysanias son of Palathio of Laciadae for 575 dr. The city has the fifth part of this as deposit along with the sales tax and herald’s fee, and Smicythu of Teithras has the 150 dr. In one payment in accordance with the registration.

40 Mines sold during the first prytany, of Hippothontis: (1) Dexiakon at Skopiai in Nape, the neighbour of which on all sides is Nicias of Cydanidae, purchaser Callias of Sphettus, 20 dr.; (2) Diakon at Laurium, the neighbour of which, to the east, is the land of Exopius, to the west, the mountain, purchaser Epiteles from Cerameis, 20 dr.; (3) at Sunium on the property of the sons of Charmylus, the neighbour of which, on the north, is Cleocritus of Aigilia, on the south, Leucius of Sunium, purchaser Pheidippus of Pithus, 20 dr.; (4) Poseidoniakon in Nape, one of those on the stele, on the property of Alypetus, the neighbours of which are Callias of Sphettos and Diocles of Pithos, purchaser Thrasylochus of Anagyrus, 1,550 dr.; (5) Hagnostiakon, one of those on the stele, purchaser Telesarchus of Aixone, 1,550 dr.; (6) Artemisiaton, one of those on the stele, purchaser Thrasylochus of Anagyrus, 150 dr.

52 In the second prytany, of Antiochis, (7) at Laurium (the mine) itself and the cuttings, the neighbour of which, on the north, is Diopethes of Euonymon and the furnace of Demostratus of Cytherrus, on the south, the workshop of Diopethes and the waggon road and the Thoricians’ torrent, purchaser Cephisodotus of Aethalidae, 20 dr.; (8) Demetriakon
Ath. Pol. 7. iii claims that Athens had poletai (‘sellers’) from the time of Solon. Their fourth-century duties are laid out at Ath. Pol. 47. ii–iv (see further Rhodes ad loc. and Langdon, Agora, xix, pp. 57–60) as selling (= leasing) mines (‘working’ mines (ergasima) for three years, and ‘conceded’ mines for [seven] years), selling taxes and recording payments each prytany, selling confiscated property and the property of those condemned in court (Ath. Pol. also implies, but does not explicitly state, that the poletai leased sacred property, something confirmed by IG i 384).

The records of the sale of the property of those convicted of mutilating the Hermis and profaning the Mysteries in 415 B.C. (the ‘Attic Stelai’, extract M&L 79) were the responsibility of the poletai, but the inscription of those records in permanent form and their display in the Eleusinium in Athens seems to be an extraordinary rather than a routine matter, connected with the religious nature of the offences. By contrast the present stele is the earliest surviving of a series of fourth- and early third-century
on the property of Timesius in Nape, the neighbour of which is Nicias of Cydantidae, on the south, Diocles of Pithos, purchaser Demon of Agryle, 20 dr.; (g) at Maroneia Heraikon, the neighbour of which is Diophanes of Sunium, purchaser Philinus of Sunium, 20 dr.

In the third prytany, of Omeis, (10) at Laurium the Theognideion, from the stele, the neighbour of which is the land of Exopius, purchaser Callias of Lamprææ, 50 dr.

In the fourth prytany, of Cecropis, (11) at Sunium in Nape Pyrrheion, the neighbour of which, on the east, is Callias of Alpece, on the west, Nicias of Cydantidae, purchaser Callias of Sphettus, 20 dr.; (12) at Thoricus the Archegeteion on the property of Demophilus, the neighbour of which, on the north and south, is Demophilus, purchaser Cephisophon of Syb-ridæ, 20 dr.; (13) in Nape on the lands of the wife of Charmylus, the neighbour of which is the land of the wife of Alypetus, on the north, Teleson of Sunium, on the east, the land of Teleson of Sunium, on the west, Epicrates of Pallene, purchaser Epicles of Sphettus, 20 dr.

In the fifth prytany, of Aigeis, (14) Archegeteion and the cuttings, lacking a stele, at Besa on the property of Cephisodotus and Callias, the neighbour of which, on the east, is the tower and house of Callias of Lamptrææ, on the north, the workshop of Cephisodotus, on the south, the shrine of the Archegetes, purchaser Cephisodotus of Aithalidae, 20 dr.

In the seventh prytany, of Leontis, (15) at Sunium at Thrasymos, Kerameikon, the neighbour of which is Diopeithes of Eutonymon, purchaser Aleximachus of Peleces, 20 dr.; (16) at Sunium in Nape on the property of the sons of Charmylus, the neighbour of which, to the north, is Pyrrhacus of Aegilia, on the south, Leucius of Sunium, purchaser Pheidippus of Pithus, 20 dr.

In the ninth prytany, of Erechtheis, (17) at Sunium, Leukippeion, one of those on the stele, at Besa, purchaser Chaeredemus of Hagnous 150 dr.

The surviving inscribed records of the poletaï record only some of their activities (see Davies in Ritual, Finance, Politics . . . D. Lewis, 209–11): the selling of confiscated property
and the leasing of mines are recorded but not the sale of taxes, and although there are epigraphic records of leases of sacred lands from the later 340s onwards (Agora, xix L 6, 9–12, 14) these leases never appear on the same stones as the mining leases and property sales and the inscribed examples may not in fact be the responsibility of the poletai. Why did the poletai record only some of their activities in permanent form? Those who rented sacred land and those who leased mines were in exactly parallel positions, and both would have an interest in there being a permanent record of their entitlement to the facilities for which they were paying. Equally it was in the public interest to know that the person collecting a particular tax was indeed the man who had been granted the privilege of doing so. The tendency of the Athenians to inscribe lists that had religious relevance as a way of showing the gods that they were doing their duty might explain the inscription of the names of offenders whose property had been confiscated, since religious offences figure among those for which confiscation was the penalty, but it should also lead to inscribing leases of sacred property. The absence of permanent records of tax contracts may result from those contracts being re-leased annually, leaving no legacy from one board of poletai to another; the decision to inscribe leases of mines and sales of confiscated property and not leases of sacred land may result from the greater public interest in the first two activities or the involvement of the basileus as well as the poletai in the latter activity.

This poletai list opens with the names of the members of the board for the year of the archonship of Polyzelus (367/6). Eight names are listed, each from a different tribe. Ten names would be expected, but either ten volunteers could not be found or only eight survived to the end of their term of office. Offices with financial responsibilities may not have been popular, and it is possible that there was a property qualification for service as poletes (but see below). The poletai declare the property they sold to have been handed over to them by the Eleven (I. 7). Ath. Pol. 52. i (with Rhodes ad loc.) records among the responsibilities of the Eleven the bringing to court of registrations of property that was forfeit (because of debt or judicial condemnation); once the registration had been recognized as valid, and prior claims to the proceeds of the sale had been agreed, the poletai then oversaw the actual sale. Here, as in later records, sales of confiscated property are dated by the day of the month, whereas leases of mines are dated by prytany; this is presumably because the former were random events, but the latter had a regular slot which, since the council was involved, was related to the council year. The sale itself was conducted by a herald (hence the ‘herald’s fees’ [kerukeia] deducted, I. 37), by auction (see M. Langdon, Ritual, Finance, Politics... D. Lewis, 253–65), and the city took both what was left of the proceeds and a sales tax (eponia) of perhaps 1/100th (see Lambert, Rationes Centesimarum, 270 and n. 209).

The one case of property confiscation in this year concerns the house of a man found guilty of temple robbery. Robbery from temples was an offence for which it was open to any Athenian to prosecute. It was perhaps an offence which priests and those closely involved with temples were particularly likely to be charged with (cf. Hierodex, hyp. to Dem. xxv), and here that the convicted man is one Theosebes son of Theophilus raises the possibility that he was from a family with cult links. The man
registering the property for confiscation, Theomnestus son of Deisitheus, has similar godlike associations in his nomenclature and we may suspect that he also was involved in the cult from which the theft has been made; he may also have been the man who prosecuted Theosebes for the crime. On theophoric names see R. Parker in PBA civ 2000, 53–79.

The house confiscated, which must be the sole property of the condemned man, lies immediately south of the sanctuary of Daedalus. This inscription provides the only direct evidence we possess for the cult of Daedalus at Athens, although the deme name Daedalidai affords possible indirect evidence (see Morris, Daidalos, ch. x, esp. 258–9). It is possible that this was the cult from which the theft was made. The house is situated in Alopece, a deme just outside the south-east corner of the city wall, and the small deme of Daedalidae may indeed have been right next to it (Traill, Demos and Tritys, 135). Similarly it is possible that the property immediately to the south of Theosebes’ house was in the neighbouring deme of (Upper) Agryle, to which its owner belonged.

Whatever Theosebes’ relationship to the cult of Daedalus, he certainly had connections with other groups: both the phratry of the Medontidai and a group of orgeones claim to have lent him money on the security of the house, and it is likely, though not necessary, that he was a member of both. The group of orgeones may have been a subgroup of the phratry of the Medontidai, although it appears that ‘orgeones’ was a title that might be given to any group with a cultic focus (see Lambert, Phratries, 75–7 on orgeones, 314-20 on this case; he collects texts relevant to the Medontidai as T 7–10). The evidence for corporate groups (demes, phratries, religious associations) lending money is copious (see also on 63), and the scale of the funds they had available to lend was large (Millett, Lending and Borrowing, 171–8) although lent in small sums. The loan by the orgeones here is in fact smaller than any loan recorded on a horos.

The three loans on the security of the house show how it was possible for citizens to raise multiple loans on real estate in Attica. Most of our evidence for mortgaging of property comes from the boundary stones (horoi) erected to give notice to potential buyers (and other potential lenders) that the property was already encumbered. Some horoi mark security for orphan estates that are leased out or for land that is given as a dowry (the so-called pupillary and dotal apotimemd), the rest divide between those that describe the transaction involved as hypotheke and those that describe it as ‘sale upon redemption’ (prasis epi lysei): most probably these are two different ways of describing the same arrangement (see E. M. Harris, CQ xxviii 1988, 351–81 at 377–8). In this case the debt to Smicythus is described in the terminology of hypotheke, but those to the phratry and orgeones are described in the language of sale upon redemption (although the qualification epi lysei is omitted in the record of the claim from the phratry as it is also in similar references in law-court speeches). Horoi mostly (but note Finley SLC nos. 107–8) record loans taken out on a single occasion, although sometimes with more than one creditor (compare Finley, SLC nos. 11, 13, 19, 22, 32, 35, 41, 46, 97, 146, 147, and table p. 173). Here we have good evidence for a single property bearing multiple charges which seem independent of one another: the debt to Smicythus seems to be known at the moment when the property is registered for confiscation, the debts to the phratry and the orgeones only appear in the course of the court consideration. This
is the clearest case of a number of separate loans being secured by the same piece of property, and is crucial to our understanding of the nature of mortgage transactions (see M. I. Finley in Studi . . . V. Arangio-Ruiz, iii. 473–91, and more briefly SLC nos. 111–13). It indicates clearly that the owner of real estate used as security for a loan retained an interest in the excess value: the property did not stand as a substitute for the loan, it was collateral security (compare Cohen, Athenian Economy and Society, 212 n. 132, E. M. Harris, CQ’ xxxviii 1988, 366–7).

One further claim allowed on the property was not formally secured by the property at all. This is the claim by Isarchus of Xypete for 30 drachmas spent burying Theosebes’ father and mother. The order of events is not entirely clear, but it would appear that both parents had died in the interval between Theosebes’ fleeing the country and the time when the property was registered for confiscation (there is perhaps more to this story than merely temple robbery?). The house that is here confiscated had then been inherited by Theosebes, who seems otherwise to be propertyless. The man who took responsibility for the burial is a fellow demesman of Theosebes, and Lambert (Phratries, 318–19) has suggested that he may have been demarch of Xypete and carrying out his duty to bury the dead not buried by their relatives (see law ap. Dem. xliii. Macartatus 58); but note that this house, in which Theophilus and his wife were presumably living at the time of their death, is in Alopece, not Xypete. The figure of 30 dr. for the burial is ten times lower than lowest of a number of figures for the expense of burials which are found in literary sources (APF xix n. 3). This may represent only the outstanding balance of a larger sum, but it is more plausible that it represents the total cost of the burials and associated rituals and offerings, perhaps done on the cheap by the demarch, but does not include any memorial stone. Some larger sums recorded for burials explicitly relate to a memorial, but the cost of simple memorial stones is disputed by modern scholars (see G. J. Oliver in Oliver (ed.), The Epigraphy of Death, 59–80).

The second half of this record of poleis activities for 367/6 is the earliest surviving epigraphic record of mine leases (we simply do not know the procedures involved in operating the mines before this). Mines are leased in seven of the ten prytanies of this year, including each of the first five prytanies, with six of the seventeen mines leased in the first prytany. Just as Ath. Pol. 47. ii divides mines into two categories, ‘working mines’ and ‘conceded mines’, so here there seem to be two groups of mines: those ‘from the stele’ and others. The twelve ‘others’ are uniformly leased out at 20 dr., while of those ‘from the stele’ two are leased at 1,550 dr., two at 150 dr., and one at 50 dr. Later poleis records describe mines as ‘from the stele’ in the archonship of ‘X’, and the most plausible interpretation of ‘from the stele’ is that these are active working mines which are being leased again immediately on the expiry of an earlier lease. The potential of such mines would be known and the different rents would reflect competitive bidding (1,550 dr. looks like an auction price); the 20 dr. leasings, by contrast, are of mines that are not currently active, whose working is much more speculative. That those mines have, in eight cases, established names suggests that they may be mines formerly worked which have gone out of use. Later poleis lists (Agora, xix P 2–51) have three categories of mines, ‘working mines’ (ergasima) ‘new cuttings’ (kainotomiai), and
‘(old) piled-up mines’ ((palaia) anasaxima), dividing the non-current mines into two groups depending on whether they were previously worked. (The above interpretation is that argued by Hopper, BSA xlviii 1953, 200–54; in the standard account of the physical remains from Laurium and the mining process Conophagos, Le Laurium antique, 428–37, offers a different interpretation which depends upon ‘conceded’ mines not appearing in the poletai lists at all.)

Neither the poletai records nor Ath. Pol. indicate the frequency with which lease payments were made: were the sums recorded on this stele paid once a prytany, once a year, or once in a lease? The small size of the smallest rents makes it unlikely that we are dealing here with one payment for a seven-year lease; the large size of the largest rent suggests that the output of the most productive mines must have been very considerable indeed if payment once a prytany is involved. Recording the prytany in which the mine is leased makes most sense if annual payments which become due in different prytanies are at issue. The question is difficult to resolve because we do not know whether there were other ways also in which the city profited from the mines; fifth-century epigraphic texts talk of payments ‘from the treasurers of the Hephaestic fund from Laurium’ (M&L 60.14), a later poletai record mentions a fifteenth tax ‘in the works’ (Agora, xix P 26, 474–5), and the Souda (ad Δραμαίων μετάλλου δίκη), perhaps relating to a much later period, mentions a standard charge of 1/24th of the yield. If the sums here are payments per prytany then in a full year the city stood to gain 6 talents 900 dr. a year in rent; if payments are once a year then only 3,690 dr. (Note also the discussion in Shipton, ἘΠΕ.xxx 1998, 57–63.)

The poletai records regularly locate the mines and often, although not invariably, indicate whose land the mine is on. Later inscriptions referred to that land as edaphe. The city claimed the right to lease out the sub-surface, but the surface was in private hands. Some landowners are also lessees, but others never feature as lessees. Although the public records never reveal it, it seems likely that lessees also had to negotiate with landowners who would expect some monetary return for allowing access to the sub-surface, and individuals known from literary sources to have made their fortunes in mining all appear as landowners as well as lessees (see Osborne, Demos, 115–18). One mine (II. 67–71) here is located on the land ‘of the wife of Charmylus’ and land neighbouring it belongs to ‘the wife of Alypetus’. Women might carry property with them at Athens, but they were not free themselves to dispose of that property and it would normally be listed under the name of a husband. It appears that we have two cases here of women widowed recently enough not yet to have passed into the control of a man (see further L. Foxhall, CQ² xxxix 1989, 22–44).

The mines on this inscription are simply listed as they are leased. Later poletai records lay out the procedure more fully: the would-be lessee first registers the mine, its position is then described, and the amount that the mine is leased for recorded. It was presumably possible for someone else to outbid the registrant, but if this happened it is not recorded in surviving inscriptions.

It is clear that mining was not happening on a very large scale in 367/6. That only five mines have their lease renewed and that only one stele is referred to (by contrast to later records) suggests that mining may only just have begun again after the decline
occasioned by the Peloponnesian War. This would conform to the implications of Xenophon’s discussion of the mines in *Poroi*, which was written a decade later than this record. The mines operating in 367/6 also seem to have been largely concentrated in one area: locations are recorded for fifteen mines, of which eight are in Sunium, with six of the eight located at Nape and one at Thrasymos; one is at Maroneia, site of the mines that gave famous profits early in the fifth century (*Ath. Pol. 22. vii*), three at Laurium, two at Besa, and one at Thoricus. Nape hardly features in later leases, but Thrasymos is frequently mentioned, and two sites which do not appear at all here appear later, Aulon and Bambideion.

*Poletai* lists show that by the 340s many more mining concessions were being leased (*Agora*, xix P 26 has traces of at least 45 leases in 342/1, and must originally have had well in excess of that number), although, curiously, surviving figures for rents tend to be low (20 and 150 dr.). A number of notorious court cases from the later fourth century, some of which seem to have been politically motivated, indicate both that individuals were making enormous profits out of the mines and that they were known to be doing so (see especially Hyp. in Against Euxenippos 34-6, [Plut.] X Or. 843 d). Our records are rich enough for us to be able to say something about the social and geographical origins of those who profited from silver mining and about what activities led to the greatest profit (see Osborne, *Demos*, ch. 6).

Four of the nine different individuals who lease mines and eleven of the nineteen different owners of land or plant in the mining district named in this inscription are men otherwise known to be wealthy because they or their family performed liturgies (see *APF*, pp. xx–xxiv). This high frequency of men from known wealthy families contrasts with the circles revealed in the first half of the inscription. Although two of the *poletai* and their secretary are from known wealthy families, not one of those named in connection with the confiscation of Theosebes’ property comes from such a family.

__Decree of the Athenian genos of the Salaminioi, 363/2__


Attic-Ionic, retaining occasional **stoechēdon** 38 (lines 2—68), **quasi-stoechēdon** 39–41 (lines 69–79), **non-stoechēdon** 79–102 (lines 80–97)

The following individuals are particularly notable for the other activities which we know them or their families to have engaged in. Nicias (II) of Cydantidae (APF, p. 406) [landowner, ll. 41–2, 58, 64–5] is a grandson of the fifth-century general Nicias son of Niceratus who is recorded by Xenophon (Poroi iv. 14) to have had 1,000 slaves whom he hired out to work in the mines at 1 obol a day (yielding 10 talents a year from a capital of around 15–20 talents: 1,000 slaves at 100 dr. a slave = 16 2/3 talents capital tied up in slaves). Leucius of Sunium (APF 9057) [landowner, ll. 46, 80] gave land for a new agora for his deme in around 330 because the old one had become overcrowded (IG n2 1180). (For the location of the agora see Goette, AM cx 1995, 171–4). Thrasylochus of Anagyrous (APF, pp. 385–6) [lessee of two mines, ll. 49 and 51–2] was the (older) brother of Demosthenes’ antagonist Meidias (Dem. xxi) and himself challenged Demosthenes to an antidosis in 363 over a syntrierarchy (Dem. xxvii. 17). He appears as owner of a workshop in the mines in the 350s and again as a trierarch at an even later date. Diophanes of Sunium (APF, pp. 167–8) [landowner, ll. 59–60] was the brother of the archon of the Salaminioi (37. 69) of 363/2. Callias of Alopece (APF, p. 269) [landowner, l. 64] belongs to the notoriously wealthy and politically involved family one of whose fifth-century members, Callias (II), was said to have been worth 200 talents and to have had 600 slaves working in the silver mines (X. Poroi iv. 15, cf. Nepos, Cimon, r. iii). Both literary and epigraphic sources show that Callias vaunted his pedigree both in his political and in his equestrian activities (X. H. vi. iii. 4, SEG xlii 466). He appears later purchasing confiscated property from the poletai in 342/1 (Agora, xix P 26. 455) and was active on Delos. Epicrates of Pallene (APF 4909) [landowner, l. 70], is either identical or related to the Epicrates alleged, when prosecuted in the 320s, to have made a profit of 300 talents from the mines in three years (Hyp. iv. Euxenippos 35), and the Epicrates who proposed the ephebic law (see on 88).
The mason, the same throughout, inscribed long strokes first and frequently failed to return to inscribe the short strokes; these omissions are not generally recorded here, but can e.g. obliterate the difference between the sign for a drachma and that for an obol, and on five occasions lead to a space being left for a letter that does not involve long strokes but that letter never being inscribed. (ll. 2, 72, 88, 89, 91).
Gods. In the archonship of Chariclides at Athens [363/2], the arbitrators Stephanus of Myrrhinous, Cleagorus of Acharnae, Aristogeiton of Myrrhinous, Euthycrates of Lamptrae, and Cephisodotus of Aithalidae settled the disputes between the Salaminioi of the Seven Tribes and the Salaminioi from Sunium on the following terms, both parties being agreed with one another that the proposal was good:

8 The priesthoods shall be common to both for all time, namely those of Athena Sciras, of Heracles at Porthmus, of Eurysaces, and of Aglaurus and Pandrosus and of Kourotrophos. An allotment is to be made jointly from both groups when one of the priestesses or priests dies, and those who obtain the office by lot shall serve as priests on the same conditions as the earlier priests served.

16 The land at the Heraclium at Porthmus and the saltpan and agora at Koile shall be divided into two equal parts for each party, and each party shall set up boundary markers of its own land.

19 All (the sacrificial victims) that the city provides at public expense, or that the Salaminioi happen to receive from the oschophoroi or from the deipnophoroi, these both parties are to sacrifice in common and divide the raw meat, half for each party; but all (the sacrificial victims) that the Salaminioi have been wont to sacrifice from the income from rents they are to sacrifice from their own resources in the ancestral manner, each party contributing half for all the sacrifices.

27 The perquisites prescribed here are to be given to the priests and priestesses. To the priest of Heracles, as dues, 30 drachmas; for pelanos, 3 drachmas; each party is to contribute half of these sums. Of the victims which he sacrifices for the whole group he is to take the skin and the leg of a victim that has been flayed, the leg of a victim that has been singed; but in the case of a cow he is to take nine pieces of flesh and the skin. To the priest of Eurysaces, as due, 6 drachmas; for pelanos for both cults 7 drachmas; in place of the leg and skin in the Eurysacium 13 drachmas; each party is to contribute half these sums. Of the victims sacrificed to the hero at the saltpan he is to take the skin and the leg. A portion from each party is to be distributed to the priests and priestesses in the shrines where each are priests. They are to distribute the loaves from Sciras in the following way, once they have taken out from the total number those which it is ancestral custom to exempt: a loaf for the herald, a loaf for the priestess of Athena, a loaf for the priest of Heracles, a loaf to the priestess of Pandrosus and
ereaias en tois ierous sto ai ekastoi ierewon-tai meida para ekateron tois arstos en Skirados v-emein kata ta tadhe, afelontas eis apantwn tois nomi-zomévous afaireithai kata ta pattria khrwnei ar-toton, Athnías ereai aartton, Asklepios ierai arton, v, Pindrosis kai Agyiaro iereai aartoton, Korotropo-fou kai kalathphorou arton, kópsi aartoton tois de a-llwn nemeoithai ta hmiése ekateros arxonta de k-leroin eme rei para ekateron óstis katastheiai tois óskoforoi kai tais deixiphoroi meta this ier-eiai kai to khrwkon kata ta pattria taute de an-agrafai es sthli kounhí amforéros kai sthiai eivn tois ierw tois Athnías this Skirados toin de aut-ton iereia einai tois Eurgaskei kai tois khrw toin ep tis alhí dei de ti dei episkenevasei tois ier-ei-rov, episkenevazouven kounhí suymbalal(Al)omévous to hmi-vn ekateros epit Xarikleidó arxontos oi ek toin ep ta phywn parésochon arxonta. ta de grammatetin kouina einai amforéron apantain thn de ypin eragá-zeithai tos meleisthoomenon eis an exelithi o chróni-os dein emeublásato, apodidontai thn hmiésean mi- thous ekaterous to de prothima to amillo eme-rei ekateros katazhesei tois de krevon th miése- a ekateros laumavanei kai tois dermaton thn de iereiwsunthi to khrwkon einai Thrasuleos kata t- á pattria toin de allwn ékklamatos apánton afe-ziathai tois te idik(w) kai tois kovn ein toin othd-roimivna mura toin epit Xarikleidó arxontos. vacat


Arxineous eipen ópos an Salamuni nó ta ierá thwos aie tois theois kai tois khrwsei kata ta pattria kai

80 Arxineous Dow, Lambert ΖPE cxxv 1999, 100 n. 7, Arxineous Ferguson.
Aglaurus, to the basket-bearer of Koutrotrophos also a loaf; to the oarsmen a loaf; of the rest each party is to have a half share.

They shall allot an archon in turn from each group to join with the priestess and the herald in appointing the oschophoroi and deipnophoroi in the ancestral manner. Both groups are to write these things up on a common stele and set it up in the temple of Athena Sciras. The same man is to serve as priest for Eurysaces and for the hero at the saltpan. If there is any need to do building work in the shrines, they are to do it jointly, each group contributing half the costs.

In the archonship of Charicletes, the Salaminioi of the Seven Tribes provided the archon. All the written records are to be common to both. The lessee is to work the land until the time for which he leased the land expires, paying half the rent to each group. Each group is to undertake in turn the preliminary sacrifice before the contest. Each is to take half the meat and the skins. The dues of the herald are to belong to Thrasycles according to ancestral custom. All other claims, whether against individuals or groups, up to the month of Boodromion in the archonship of Charicletes are to be dropped.

When Diphilos son of Diopeithes of Sunium was archon of the Salaminioi, the following of the Salaminioi from Sunium swore the oath: Diopeithes son of Phasycides, Philoneos son of Ameinonicus, Chalcideus son of Andromenes, Charides son of Charicles, Theophanes son of Zophanes, Hegias son of Hegesias, Ameinius son of Philinos. When Antisthenes son of Antigenes of Acharnae was archon of the Salaminioi, the following took the oath from the Seven Tribes: Thrasycles son of Thrason of Boutadae, Stratophon son of Straton of Agryle, Melittius son of Execestides of Boutadae, Aristarchus son of Democles of Acharnae, Arceon son of Eumelides of Acharnae, Chlaerestratus son of Pemelides of Epicephisia, Demon son of Demaretus of Agryle.

Archeneos proposed: in order that the Salaminioi may always make the holy sacrifices to the gods and heroes in the ancestral manner and that what is done may conform to the terms on which the arbitrators reconciled both parties and to which those elected swore oaths, be it decreed by the Salaminioi that Aristarchus the archon shall inscribe all the sacrifices and the prices of the victims on the stele on which are the settlement terms, in order that those who are archons at any time in the future from both groups may know what money is necessary for each to contribute for all the sacrifices from the rent
This is the longest of all extant documents from an Athenian genos, and as such vital evidence in the disputed questions of the origins, nature, and functions of the genos (see Parker, Athenian Religion, 56–66, S. D. Lambert, CQ² slix 1999, 484–9 at 484–7). We know of more than fifty Athenian gene, and some twenty-five can more or less certainly provide priests for city cults. It is not improbable that all gene in fact had cultic
of the land at the Heraclium, and to set up the stele in the Eurysacium.

85 In Mounychion: at Porthmus, to Κούρωτροφος a goat, 10 dr.; to Ιόλαυσ a sheep burnt whole, 15 dr.; to Αλκμένη a sheep, 12 dr.; to Μαία a sheep, 12 dr.; to Ηρακλῆς an ox, 70 dr.; to the hero at the saltpan a sheep, 15 dr.; to the hero at Αντισαρᾶ a piglet, 3½ dr.; to the hero Επιπυργίδιος a piglet, 3½ dr.; to Ιόν to sacrifice a sheep every other year. Wood for the sacrifices including those for which the city gives money according to the kyrbeis, 10 dr. On the eighteenth to Eurysaces a sow, 40 dr. Wood for the sacrifices and for other purposes, 3 dr.

88 In Hecatombaion: at the Panathenaea, to Αθηνᾶ a sow, 40 dr. Wood for the sacrifices and other purposes, 3 dr.

89 In Metageitnion: on the seventh to Απόλλων Πατροίος a sow, 40 dr.; to Λετό a piglet, 3½ dr.; to Αρτέμις a piglet, 3½ dr.; to Αθηνᾶ Αγελαᾶς a piglet, 3½ dr. Wood for the sacrifices and for other purposes, 3½ dr.

90 In Boedromion: to Ποσείδων Ηππόδρομιος a sow, 40 dr.; to the hero Φαίαξ a piglet, 3½ dr.; to the hero Τεῦκρ a piglet, 3½ dr.; to the hero Ναυσίρου a piglet, 3½ dr. Wood for the sacrifices and for other purposes, 3½ dr.

92 In Pyanopsion: on the sixth to Θησεύς a sow, 40 dr.; for other things, 3 dr.; at the Apaturia to Ζεύς Φρατρίως a sow, 40 dr. Wood for the sacrifices and for other purposes, 3 dr.

93 In Maimakterion: for Αθηνᾶ Σκιράς a pregnant ewe, 12 dr.; for Σκίρος a sheep, 15 dr.; wood for the altar, 3 dr.

94 Total that it is necessary that both spend on all the sacrifices, 530 dr. 3 obols. They are to sacrifice these in common from the rents of the land at the Heraclium at Sunium, each party contributing money for all the sacrifices.

95 If anyone makes, or if any archon puts to the vote, a proposal to rescind any of these or diverts the money elsewhere, he is to be liable to scrutiny by the whole genos and the priests on the same basis, and privately also to prosecution by any of the Salaminioi who wishes.

responsibilities (and that all archaic public priests were provided by gene). Gene were certainly descent groups; most had names of the patronymic form, ending in -idai (as with the Eumolpidai who were jointly responsible for cult at Eleusis with the Kerykes). Some names related to function (so the Kerykes, ‘heralds’), a link which suggests a group formed initially to perform a particular duty. Aristotle treats gene primarily as
communities (Pol. 1. 1252 B 17–18 with Philochorus FGrH 328 F 35), and the Salaminioi share with just two other firmly attested gene, the Colieis and the Cephisieis, a name with geographical reference. It may well be that not all gene had the same origin.

The Colieis probably were responsible for a cult connected to the locality to which their name referred, the cult of Aphrodite Colias, but the Salaminioi are responsible for four cults, located not on Salamis but in central Athens (the sanctuary of Eurysaces on the hill just west of the Agora where the inscription was erected, l. 85, seems to be their main meeting place), at or near Phaleron, and perhaps at Sunium. There is no certain evidence that any of their cult activities took place on the island of Salamis, although Eurysaces, as son of Aias, was associated with that island and the name Scira was apparently another name for Salamis: Herodotus viii. 94 notes a cult of Athena Sciras on Salamis, but the sacrifices to Athena Sciras mentioned here were held at her shrine at Phaleron as is shown by their close association with the Oschophoria (ll. 41–52). In literary texts ‘Salaminioi’ is used to denote a person from the island rather than a member of the genos, and the existence of two different bodies of people with the same name is unexpected (but compare the Deceleieis, 5), but the evidence for any links between members of the genos and the island remains tantalisingly slight (see Lambert in ΖPE cxxv).

The link with festivals more or less certainly of great antiquity argues for an origin that is at least pre-Cleisthenic, but the genos’s conception of itself had changed subsequently: the Salaminioi here have two branches, Salaminioi who belonged to the deme Sunium, and Salaminioi who were scattered over much of the rest of Attica and belonged to seven tribes, that is, presumably, seven out of the ten Cleisthenic tribes. Each branch has its own archon (69–70, 74), and this inscription records the formal division by arbitrators of rights, duties, and property between the two branches.

I. 1–67 record the identity of the arbitrators, and then their proposal. It must have been inscribed in consequence of a genos decision, but in this case the decision to inscribe is not itself recorded (contrast ll. 80–2). Five arbitrators are named, their number a measure of the importance of the judgement: private arbitrations recorded in the orators use one, two, three, or four arbitrators (Scafuro, 130). The arbitrators, who come from four different demes, are unlikely to be themselves Salaminioi since none is from Sunium, but one is from Acharnae, a deme from which some Salaminioi ‘of the Seven Tribes’ came. The arbitrators decide that genos priesthoods, which are evidently held for life, should continue to be allotted from both branches and on the existing conditions, which are subsequently set out in detail, but they order genos property to be divided equally between the two branches. Each branch is to contribute equally to sacrifices for which the genos pays, but both branches are to enjoy in common the sacrifices paid for by the city. Genos admission procedures (for which see [Dem.] LIX. Νεωρα 59, And. 1. Myst. 127), are evidently not subject to dispute. The names of the seven members of each branch who took oaths to abide by the decisions of the arbitrators are recorded, and then the proposal of one Archeneos to inscribe the calendar of the traditional sacrifices (already partly assumed in the arbitrators’ listing of priestly perquisites), and that calendar. (On sacred calendars generally, see on 62.) The inscription concludes with an ‘entrenchment clause’ (see above, p. 102)
threatening scrutiny of and court action against anyone who proposes or puts to the vote breaking the agreement or diverting money to other purposes.

The description of the duties of the genos reveals the complexity of ritual responsibility. There are some religious events which are internal to the genos, others that the genos performs for the city and at city expense. Among the former are the sacrifice of a pig on the occasion of the Panathenaea (88–9), a sacrifice on the occasion of the phratry festival of the Apaturia, and sacrifices to Poseidon Hippodromius, Hero Phaiax, Hero Teucer, and Hero Nausirus, perhaps on the occasion of the Cybrenesia at Phalereon (see Parker, 314–15). We should perhaps envisage the sacrifices by this genos at the Panathenaea being held at the Euryseceum in Athens. Athenians needed to be together with their fellow demesmen at the occasion of the main Panathenaic sacrifice if they were to receive their festival payment or their share of the meat (Dem. xlv. Leochares 37, 81. 24), and members of this genos clearly came from many different demes. In the case of the Apaturia, this was celebrated at different locations by different phratries, and to make a common sacrifice practical this genos must have been a sub-group of a single phratry descent group; this implies either that it was historically later in formation than the phratry descent group or that it or/and the phratry was a fictive creation not originally formed from common descent.

The sacrifices which the genos performs at public expense must be deduced from the differences between the list of priesthoods and the list of ancestral sacrifices. The genos selects and provides ‘oschophori and deipnophori’ (47–50), and indeed receives money through their agency (21). The Oschophoria celebrated the return of Theseus after slaying the Minotaur, and we know quite a lot about its rituals (see Jacoby, FGrH iii. b. Supplement i. 286–9, for the evidence, Vidal-Naquet, Black Hunter, for its interpretation); it began with a procession from Athens to the shrine of Athena Sciras made up of boys and led by two boys disguised as girls and carrying the branches (the oschophori referred to in 49); it also included a race in which two youths from each tribe competed and for which the victor was rewarded with a drink made of oil, wine, honey, cheese, and flour. The festival ended with a revel back to Athens. Yet the only sign of the festival in the sacrificial calendar here is a ‘pre-sacrifice’ (61) either that of a pig to Theseus at what has been regarded as the most probable date for the festival in Pyanopsion (92), or that of a pregnant sheep to Athena Sciras at a conceivable alternative date in Maimacterion (see Parker, 315–16); all else must have been financed by the city. Similarly, in the case of ‘the priestess of Pandrosus and Aglaurus’ and ‘the basket-bearer of Kourotrophos’, we hear of loaves being given (45–6) but of nothing more in the way of sacrifices than a goat to Kourotrophos: the substantial sacrifices to these deities were evidently funded entirely by the city. Curiously our later evidence for city cult differentiates between the three deities and makes no mention of any Salaminian connection (see Parker, 311; Lambert, ÆPE cxxv).

The Salaminioi meet and sacrifice on at least seven or eight occasions in six different months of the year (there may have been further meetings for city-funded sacrifices). It was presumably on such an occasion that they agreed to this arbitration and conducted the business of renting properties (cf. 58–60), allotting priesthoods (12–16), electing archons, and admitting and honouring members (as in IG ii2 1232 from the
mid fourth century). The biggest genos-only occasion is in Mounychion (April) when they hold multiple sacrifices, including the sacrifice at Porthmus of an ox to Heracles, the only occasion when the priest of Heracles sacrifices for the genos itself. The location of Porthmus is disputed. It has traditionally been located near Sunium (AD xxxii 1977, Mel. 266–7; xxxiv 1979, Mel. 161–73) but Lohmann has recently argued for a location near Piraeus, a location which would mean that the genos never certainly met in Sunium. On the 18th of the same month the genos assembles again, this time in the city centre, to sacrifice to Eurysaces, again the only annual duty of the priest of Eurysaces for the genos. Two months later the genos sacrifices to Athena at the Panathenaea, and in each of the following two months (August and September) sacrifices a sow and piglets. The two months after that see two further pig sacrifices and the sacrifice of two sheep. Two of the sacrifices in this four-month period take place at Phaleron, but the location of the other three is not known. The genos did not meet or sacrifice at all, at least not at its own expense, in December to March inclusive. The Salaminioi calculate their annual expenditure at 530 dr. 3 obols (or perhaps 533 dr.) (94), and reckon to pay for this from the rents of land (24–5, 94). Some 59 dr. of this is the cost of the priestly perquisites, the rest the cost of the 22 (23 every other year) sacrificial animals. The assumption here, as in some other sacrificial calendars, of a fixed price for livestock to be noted, as is the comparison with the number of animals sacrificed by demos: Erchia sacrificed 56 animals in a year, Thoricus something over 42. (On sacrificial animals see further on 81.)

The tendency for private disputes in Athens to run on and on has been much commented on by scholars recently (Scafuro, 129–31). This dispute is no exception. A century after this inscription was erected the Salaminioi put up another stele in the sanctuary of Eurysaces recording another agreement between what had now become not branches of a single genos but separate gene. It is clear that during the classical and
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Athens honours Menelaus the Pelagonian, 363/2

The upper part of a stele with a relief at the top, found on the Athenian Acropolis; now in the Epigraphical Museum. Phot. Kern, Inscriptiones Graecae, Taf. 23; Kirchner, Imagines 2, Taf. 25 Nr. 54; Meyer, Die griechischen Urkundenreliefs, Taf. 17 A 56; Lawton, Reliefs, pl. 12 no. 23 (the last two, relief and II. 1–8 only). Attic-Ionic, retaining the old a for ow once in l. 22; II. 1–3 in larger letters. IG ii¹ 110; SIG* 174; Tod 145*; M. J. Osborne, Naturalisation, T 56.

[M]ενελαος Πελαγων ευεργέτης.
ἐπὶ Χαρικλείδου ἅρχοντος ἐπὶ
tῆς Ὀλυνθοεσ ἐκτης πρυτανείας.
ἐδοξεν τῷ βουλῆ καὶ τῷ δῆμῳ. Οἶνεις ἐπρυτάνευν. Νικ-
[ὁ]στρατος ἐγραμμάτευν. Χαρικλῆς Λευκονοῦς ἐπεστά-
early hellenistic period the two groups of the Salaminioi were growing increasingly apart: but how did the two groups form in the first place?

Scholars have offered various speculations about the early history of the Salaminioi. Two aspects of the genos cause particular surprise: that a genos linked to marginal Salamis should be central in the cult life of the city, and that it should have a large and distinct part of its members linked to Sunium. Some scholars reject all links between the Salaminioi and Salamis (so Taylor, as earlier Ferguson and Robertson). Scholars who accept that there is a link differ as to whether they think it more plausible that the genos was made up of men who originated in Salamis, had moved, perhaps as early as the Dark Ages, to Attica (so e.g. Humphreys, Osborne), and had become settled by the end of the sixth century in various demes, or of men who originated in various parts of Attica but moved to Salamis (so Lambert). The former view makes it possible to believe that the genos was truly a kin group, descended from a relatively small number of ‘original’ members. The latter view would give a striking case of the creation of a genos in the sixth century, and would involve families that settled on Salamis taking pre-existing cult responsibilities with them, transferring them to the new group of which they became part, but never ceasing to think of themselves as groups connected to their place of origin. Our inability conclusively to resolve this argument is a measure of our ignorance about both gene and Salamis.

Of the 18 certain or probable members of the genos (Lambert, ΖΡΕ cxxv. 109-14) Hegias son of Hegasias of Sunium, brother of two rich and famous fourth-century politicians Hegesandrus and Hegesippus (see APF 6351), is the only one from a known wealthy family. There has been some speculation that Alcibiades was a member of this genos, since Plato has him say that his family traces its descent to Eurysaces, but no other member of the deme Scambonidae is known to have been a member of this genos.

Menelaus the Pelagonian, benefactor.

2 In the archonship of Chariclide [363/2]; in the sixth prytany, of Oeneis.

4 Resolved by the council and the people; Oeneis was the prytany; Nicostratus was secretary; Charicles of Leuconoe was
In 368 Athens began a war in the north, to recover Amphipolis (colonized in 437/6 after earlier attempts but lost in 424/3) and the Chersonese (in which Athens had had an interest since the mid sixth century, but where Athens was encountering rivalry from the Thracian king Cotys). The Athenians were to claim that the Persian King and all the Greeks had recognized their claim to Amphipolis and the Chersonese (e.g. Dem. xix. Embassy 137, ix. Phil. ii. 16): it is hard to find an occasion or occasions when that might have happened, but it is possible that one or more of the common peace treaties stated that the participants were ‘to possess what belonged to them’ (ἐξευν τὰ ἐαυτῶν: cf. e.g. Isoc. vii. Peace 16) and that what we read in Athenian speeches is a tendentious interpretation of that. A much-reduced form of the Chalcidian state based on Olynthus had joined the Athenian League in 375 (Cargill, The Second Athenian League, 168). Timotheus, the son of Conon, who was general frequently from 378/7 until he was condemned after refusing to fight at Embata in 355, succeeded Iphicrates in the western sector of the war in 365/4. He did not capture Amphipolis (which Philip of Macedon was to take for himself in 357) or Olynthus, but he did take several cities of Chalcidice, in particular Olynthus’ near-neighbour Potidaea (D.S. xv. 81. vi, cf. Dem. xxiii. Arist. 149–51, Isoc. xv. Antid. 108, 113: for Athens’ cleruchy at Potidaea see Tod 146 ~ Harding 58). This decree belongs to the winter of 363/2, and presumably results from the campaigning season of 363.

Pelagonia was part of Upper Macedonia, north-west of the Thermaic Gulf. Menelaus was probably related to P—king of the Pelagonians, whom the Athenians hon—
chairman. Satyrus proposed:

6 Since Timotheus the general demonstrates that Menelaus the Pelagonian is both joining in the war himself and providing money for the war against the Chalcidians and against Amphipolis, be it decreed by the council: Bring him forward to the people at the first assembly, and contribute the opinion of the council to the people, that the council resolves:

12 Praise him because he is a good man and does what good he can to the people of Athens. Also the generals who are in the region of Macedoﬁna shall take care of him, so that if he needs anything he may obtain it; and it shall be possible for him to ﬁnd from the people of Athens any other beneﬁt if he can.

18 Also invite Menelaus to hospitality in the prytlaneion tomorrow.

20 Satyrus proposed:

20 In other respects in accordance with the council; but, since the forebears of Menelaus also were benefactors of the people of Athens, Menelaus also shall be a benefactor ———

oured apparently in 371/0 (IG ii 190: date D. M. Lewis, BSA lxxi 1954, 38–9; P[atraus] suggested by Papazoglou, Les Villes de Macédoine à l’époque romaine, 276–9). Soon after the enactment of this decree he probably fled to Athens and received Athenian citizenship, and is the ‘Menelaus son of Arrhabaeus of Athens’ honoured by Ilium in Tod 149, and the Menelaus mentioned as a commander of cavalry against Philip in Dem. iv. Phil. i. 27.1 For the period in which the Macedonians cooperated with Athens in their northern war cf. Dem. ii. Ol. ii. 14, Polyaen. iii. 10. xiv.

Satyrus’ probouleuma provided for Menelaus to receive ‘any other beneﬁt’ from the people (ll. 17–18), and Satyrus himself added the title of benefactor in an amendment (cf. Rhodes, Boule, 278–9; this decree should have been mentioned with SEG x 276 on p. 279).

This decree is interesting from a secretarial point of view. Until at earliest 368/7 the principal secretary of the Athenian state was a member of the council, serving for one prytany, and appointed from a tribe other than the current prytany in such a way that each tribe provided one secretary during the year (cf. on 34); from at latest the year of this decree, 363/2, the secretary was not a member of the council and served for a whole year (this decree and 39 were enacted in different prytanies but have the same secretary); the change in the method of appointment from election to sortition (Ath.

1 Beloch identiﬁed as his father the Arrhabaeus of Arist. Pol. v. 1311 A 12 and as his grandfather the Arrhabaeus of Thuc. iv. 79, ii etc. (GG 2, iii. ii. 76–7); but Thucydides’ Arrhabaeus, at any rate, was king of Lyncestis, to the south of Pelagonia, Arrhabaeus is a common name in the region, and Hammond was right to protest against this further identiﬁcation (Hammond [& Griffith], ii. 19–20, cf. Osborne, Naturalisation, iii–iv. 61 n. 74).
Pol. 54. iii presumably took place at the same time; ironically the title ‘secretary by the prytany’ (γραμματεύς κατὰ πρυτανείαν), used in Ath. Pol., is attested as an alternative to ‘secretary of the council’ only after the change (e.g. 48). The change to a longer term of office and to appointment from all citizens is presumably to be seen as a small step in the direction of greater efficiency. See Rhodes, Boule, 134–8.

The secretary responsible for the publication of this decree, Nicostratus, belonged to a family with a tradition of public service (see stemma Pa, ii. p. 390; but IG ii² 1700.

39

Athenian arrangements for Iulis, 363/2

The upper part of a stele, found on the south slope of the Athenian Acropolis; now in the Epigraphical Museum.

Attic-Ionic, sometimes retaining the old ε for η and ο for ου (but πολε at the end of l. 7 is ‘probably a careless omission or abbreviatory shortening’; Threete, Grammar, i. 391). II. 2–56 stoichedon 43; 57 sqq. stoichedon 45.


θεοί.

195–7 = Agora, xv 43. 209–11, shows that the younger Philostratus was the son of Nicostratus, not of his brother Philotades). Nicostratus, one of the first secretaries of the new kind, seems to have had a distinctive style in the formulation of decrees: K. J. Dover has pointed out that ll. 16–17, deferring the finite verb of a clause until after an inserted sub-clause, are paralleled in another decree of the same year, 39. 17–19 (TPS 1981, 1–14 at 8–11 = his Greek and the Greeks, 31–41 at 35–9, cf. SEG xxxii 60); see further on 39.

2 In the archonship of Charicletes [363/2]; Aiantis was the prytany; Nicostratus of Pallene was secretary; Philittius of Butadae was chairman. Resolved by the council and the people. Aristophon proposed:

5 Since the Iulietans whom the Athenians reinstated demonstrate that the city of Iulis owes to the city of Athens three talents from the money calculated in accordance with the decree of the people of Athens proposed by Menexenus, be it resolved by the people:

9 The Iulietans shall give back this money to the Athenians in the month Scrirophorion in the archonship of Charicletes. If they do not give it back in the time stated, it shall be exacted from them by the men elected by the people to exact from the islanders the money that they owe, in whatever way they know, and there shall also join with them in the exaction the generals of Iulis Echetimus and Nicoleos and Satyrus and Glaucon and Heraclides.

17 So that the oaths and the agreement may have force which Chabrias the general agreed and swore to the Ceans on behalf of the Athenians and those of the Ceans whom the Athenians reinstated, they shall be written up, by the generals of Iulis who were stated in the decree to join in exacting the money, on a stone stele and placed in the sanctuary of Pythian Apollo, as they have been written up in Carthaea. They shall be written up also
39. Athenian Arrangements for Iulis, 363/2

Kaundouna Hille von Gaertringen ap. IG ii 2, approved LGPN, i: Α[γ]ιοίωνα Hille von Gaertringen ap. SIG, taking his ekklados bolh to be not the Athenian council but a joint court of Athenians and allies, but ді κέω should be balanced by Athens as a whole, and bolh would not be used as he supposed.
by the secretary of the council on a stele in the same way and placed on the Acropolis, and for the writing-up the treasurer of the people shall give 20 drachmas from the fund for expenditure on decrees.

27 Since those of the Iulietans who broke the oaths and the agreement and made war against the people of Athens and the Cceans and the other allies, and when they had been condemned to death returned to Ceos and overturned the stelai on which were written the agreement with Athens and the names of those who had contravened the oaths and the agreement; and of the friends of the Athenians whom the people had reinstated they killed some and condemned others to death and confiscated their property contrary to the oaths and the agreement (the latter being Satyrrides and Timoxenus and Miltiades), because they had spoken against Antipater when the Athenian council had condemned him to death for killing the Athenian proxenos Aeson contrary to the decrees of the Athenian people, and contravening the oaths and the agreement:

The shall be exiled from Ceos and Athens and their property shall be public property of the people of Iulis; and their names shall be declared forthwith in the presence of the people to the secretary by the generals of Iulis who are visiting Athens.

45 If any of those declared assert in dispute that they are not among those men, it shall be permitted to them to establish guarantors with the generals of Iulis that they will submit to trial within thirty days in accordance with the oaths and the agreement, in Ceos and in Athens the city of appeal.

51 Satyrrides and Timoxenus and Miltiades shall return to Ceos to their own property.

Praise those of the Iulietans who have come, Demetrius, Heraclides, Echetimus, Calliphantus; praise also Satyrides and Timoxenus and Miltiades; praise also the city of Carthaca and Aglocritus; and invite them to hospitality in the Prytaneion tomorrow.

57 The following was agreed and sworn by the Athenian generals with the cities in Ceos and by the allies:

58 I shall not harbour grudges for what is past against any of the Cceans, nor shall I kill or make an exile any of the Cceans who abide by the oaths and this agreement, but I shall bring them into the alliance like the other allies. But if any one commits an act of revolution in Ceos contrary to the oaths and the agreement, I shall not allow him by any craft or contrivance as far as possible.

64 If any one does not wish to live in Ceos, I shall allow him to
On Ceos, the first substantial island to the south-east of Attica, there were four cities: Carthaea, Coreisia, Iulis, and Poeessa. Fifth-century texts regularly refer to Ceos as a whole; but it could be argued that the principle of the Peace of Antalcidas that all islands and cities should be independent ought to be applied to the individual cities of Ceos. In the list of members of the Second Athenian League, Poeessa appears on its own on the front of the stele while the other three appear on the side under the rubric ‘of Ceos’ (22, i. 82 insert, 119–22); but ‘the Ceans’ incompletely repaid a Delphic loan in the 370’s (28, 12, 113 = I. Dèlos 98. A. 12, B. 3), and perhaps c.364, in the period of rebellion against Athens which precedes our text, ‘the Ceans’ established rights of iso-

poiètèia with Histiaea and Eretria, and had a federal council and officials (Tod 141 = Svt. 287; SEG xiv 530 = Sot. 292). A list of names in IG xii. v 609 is interpreted by Ruschenbusch as representing a short-lived amalgamation of coastal Coreisia and inland Iulis c.360, by Brun as representing the federation of all the cities c.364. In a decree whose content suggests a date about the time of Athens’ Social War, 356–355 (but see on 29), Athens was to insist that ‘the Ceans shall be governed by cities’ (πολιτείαι K[είων] κατὰ πόλεις; IG π 404. 13 = SEG xxxix 73. 14 (suggesting a date of 363/2)); and in dealing with Ceos on a commercial matter, probably in the 350’s, Athens treated the
live wherever he wishes in the allied cities and enjoy his own property.

66 To this I shall be steadfast in my oath, by Zeus, by Athena, by Poseidon, by Demeter: to him who keeps the oath there shall be much good, but to him who breaks the oath ill.

69 Oaths and agreement of the cities in Geos with the Athenians and the allies and those of the Cеans whom the Athenians reinstated:

71 I shall be an ally of the Athenians and the allies, and I shall not defect from the Athenians and the allies myself nor shall I allow another as far as possible.

73 All private and public lawsuits against Athenians I shall make subject to appeal in accordance with the agreement, as many as are for more than a hundred drachmas.

75 If any one dares to wrong those of the Cеans who have returned, or the Athenians or any of the allies, contrary to the oaths and the agreement, I shall not allow him by any craft or contrivance, but shall go in support with all my strength as far as possible.

79 To this I shall be steadfast in my oath, by Zeus, by Athena, by Poseidon, by Demeter: to him who keeps the oath there shall be much good, but to him who breaks the oath ill.

82 This was sworn by those of the Cеans whom the Athenians reinstated:

82 I shall not harbour grudges for anything that is past, nor shall I kill any of the Cеans — — —

cities separately, with no mention of Poeessa (40). It appears that after the Peace of Antalcidas Athens preferred to deal with the cities separately but some of the Cеans preferred to think of themselves as belonging to a single community; the usage of our text is conditioned by the fact that the first round of trouble could be represented as involving Geos as a whole but the second was limited to Iulis.

The background to this decree is probably to be sought in the Theban naval programme mentioned under 364/3 by D.S. xv. 78. iv—79. i (cf. Isoc. v. Phil. 53). The Thebans will have encouraged opponents of Athens in Geos; an initial revolt (involving at any rate Carthaæa (l. 11); the other cities are not mentioned) was dealt with by the Athenian Chabrias, and the agreement of ll. 57 sqq. was set up in Carthaæa and Iulis. There was no further trouble in Carthaæa (cf. ll. 54—5), but in Iulis men who had gone into exile returned, demolished the text of the agreement and secured judicial verdicts which Athens could regard as infringing the original settlement (ll. 27—41). After Athens had again recovered control, with the support of its sympathizers, Aristophon, who (though in his seventies: APF) had been to Geos as a general (schol. Aesch. i. Tim. 64 (145 Dilts) cf. Hansen, Sovereignty, 31 no. 10), proposed the further settlement embodied in this decree.
The title of the men elected to exact money from the islanders (ll. 12–14) suggests that Ceos’ debt was part of a larger phenomenon, perhaps outstanding syntaxis due to the League (cf. the similar language in 52. 16–17). The stipulation that an outstanding debt is to be paid in Scirophorion, the last month of the Athenian year, suggests that this decree is to be dated towards the end of 363/2. That suggests a very tight timetable: if Diodorus’ date for the Theban naval programme is right, the initial revolt may have been earlier than that; alternatively, Diodorus’ date may be wrong.

For problems which could arise from the return of exiles cf. in general 84, 85, 101; and on how states dealt with the rival claims to property of former owners who had been exiled and new owners who had bought the property in good faith R. Lonis in Goukowsky & Brixhe (edd.), Hellenika Syymiktà, 91–109: in this case opponents of Athens lose their property, supporters who are reinstated recover their property. For difficulties in Athens after the democratic restoration of 403 see P. Oxy. xiii 1606. 1–238 = Lys. fr. i Gernet & Bizos; Isoc. xviii. Call. 23; cf. Ath. Pol. 39. iii–iv, 40. iii. For trouble caused when returning exiles try to change the political stance of their state cf. e.g. Megara in 424, where the democrats would rather have given in to Athens than take back the exiles, but their plot miscarried, and the exiles returned and established an extreme oligarchy (Thuc. iv. 66–74); Phlius in the 380s, where pro-Spartan exiles secured first Spartan pressure to obtain their reinstatement and then Spartan military intervention when they claimed that they were unfairly treated on their return (X. H. v. ii. 8–10, iii. 10–17, 21–5). For the killing of a proxenos cf. an episode in Corcyra in 427, where an Athenian proxenos called Peithias was first put on trial but after he was acquitted he and others were murdered (Thuc. iii. 70. iii–vi).

The original settlement, after the first crisis, imposed a general amnesty and allowed men who felt insecure in Ceos to live in any member state of the League. However, Antipater, the man who killed the Athenian proxenos, was condemned to death by the Athenian council (ll. 37–41): the council could not sentence an Athenian citizen to death; probably there was no specific statement of its powers with regard to non-citizens, and if the council had been ‘made kyria’ (given authority, without a clear statement of how great its authority was) to investigate the killing that may have increased the uncertainty; but in any case in a crisis legal safeguards might fail to work (cf. Rhodes, Boule, 180). Also all lawsuits against Athenians were to be made ‘subject
to appeal’ (i.e. to Athens: ll. 73–5) (for the Athenian distinction between private and public lawsuits, dikai and graphai, see on 40). There is more that we should like to know: was Antipater taken to Athens and tried and executed there?

After the further trouble in Iulis, Athens still punished only a limited number of dis-sidents and gave them the opportunity to plead that they had been wrongly identified as such. Those who did so were to be tried ‘in Ceos and in Athens the city of appeal’ (l. 49). ‘Declared’ in ll. 42, 45, is an allusion to the procedure of apographe, ‘declaration’, of property to be confiscated, and to a law-suit in connection with confiscations (cf. Harrison, The Law of Athens, ii. 211–17; Osborne, JHS ev 1985, 40–58 at 44–7). The word ekkletos, referring to appeal or transfer, appears also in IG ii2 404. 17 = SEG xxxix 73. 18, and in a decree for Naxos (IG ii2 179. 14); the regular Athenian term ephesis appears in 40. 21, and the adjective ephesmos in IG ii2 179. 16. Transfer of lawsuits is not specifically renounced in the promises of 22. 20–41, but it was a practice for which the Athenians were notorious in the Delian League (e.g. [X.] Ath. Pol. i. 16—18), and the revival of the practice here will surely have been seen as a breach of the promise of freedom and autonomy (despite Cargill, 136–40).

Aristophon, the proposer of the decree, was a leading figure in Athens throughout the first and second thirds of the century (cf. Hyp. iv. Eux. 28; see APF, 64–6): he was particularly active as a proposer of decrees, and claimed to have been prosecuted unsuccessfully in seventy-five graphai paranomon (Aesch. E. 64 (145 Dilts) unemended he was successfully prosecuted by Hyperides); he appears in a list of proxenoi of the Cean city of Carthaea (IG xii. v 542. 43). For Menexenus, the author of the earlier decree cited in ll. 8–9, see 21. Chabrias (APF, 560–1) was frequently general between 390 and 356, when he died at Chios (see on 48): it is possible, but far from certain, that he is to be restored as another proxenos of Carthaea (IG xii. v 542. 40). For Nicostratus, the secretary responsible for the publication of this decree, see 38. We may note in addition that ll. 27–42 contain ‘the most formidably complex sentence so far to be found in classical Athenian decrees’ (K. J. Dover, TPS 1981, 1–14 at 8–11 = his Greek and the Greeks, 31–41 at 35–9, cf. SEG xxxii 60).

In fact the proposer or the secretary or the stone-cutter lost control of that complex sentence, and in l. 40 παραβάντος has been inscribed where the grammar requires παραβάντος.
Athenian regulation of Cean ruddle export, mid fourth century

Two joining fragments of a bluish marble stele found on the Acropolis, now in the Epigraphical Museum.

Attic-Ionic, retaining old o for oo in ὀλυμπίαν (ll. 25, 26, 37). Non-stoichedon 63–73 letters a line, as restored, average 68.

Idm 1128, xii. v 1277; Tod 162*. Trans. Austin and Vidal-Naquet, Economic and Social History, no. 86 (ll. 9–24 only); Meijer and van Nijf, Transport, no. 47 (ll. 9–24 only). See also J. F. Cherry et al. in Cherry, Davis, & Mantzourani, Landscape Archaeology, 295–303; E. Photos-Jones et al., BSA xciii 1997, 359–72; R. Osborne in Hunter and Edmondson, Law and Social Status, 75–92.

[ .. ] Ε_]---------------------------------------------------------------]
[ .. ] ε’εγαγον[τ]-------------------------------------------------------τά τι]-
ντι καὶ ε[ι]ν [υ]ν------------------------------------------------------]
[ Αθηναιων κι]-
αι Κορησίων τὰ περὶ τῆς μιστῶν, εξάγεις εἰς πλοῖον ὅ[ι]ν [Α]θηναίων ἀποδεξίωσιν, ἐν
[ .. ] δὲ πλοῖον μηδενί, ναύλλον δὲ τελειών ὅβολον τοῦ [τα]λάντου ἐκάστου τοῖς ναυκλήροις]
[ .. ] [ν]ς εργαζομένους· εἰν ὅ[ι]ν ἐν ἄλλου πλοῖον εξάγει[ης, ἐνοχον εἰνα] ει[να]-[16]
[ .. ] [α]ν ἄγαρασα δὲ τὸ τεῦχος ἐς στήλη λαμάνη καὶ[ι] καταβείναι εἴ}[τι]-
[ .. ] [ο]υ Ἀπόλλωνος, καὶ τὸν νόμον καθάπερ πρότερον εἴ][τι κύριον εἰναὶ. τὴν δὲ εἴδιειν
e[ν]-
[ .. ] αἰ πρὸς τοὺς ἄστυνόμους, τοὺς δὲ ἀστυνόμους δοῦναι[τ]ῇ τὴν ψήφων περὶ αὐτῆς]
[ .. ] τριάκοντα η]Τερμών εἰς τὸ δικαστήριον· τοῖς δὲ φήναιντι ἡ εἴδειας[τι]
[ .. ] σ[ε]ων· εἶν ὅ[ι]ν δὲ δοῦλος ὁ ἐν εἴδειας, ἐὰμ μὲν τῶν ἐξαγών[τον ἢ, ἐλευθερος ἐστω καὶ]
[ .. ] τὰ τρι]-
exporting . . . , the prosecutor . . . even if . . . the Carthaeans have decreed . . . summon the Athenians to hospitality at the prytaneion. In order that . . . as has been written, . . . are to take care . . . whatever good they can . . .

Theogenes proposed: be it resolved by the council and people of the Goresians: with regard to what those from the Athenians say, the export of ruddle shall be to Athens . . . as it was previously. And so that the decrees of the Athenians and Goresians about ruddle that were made previously shall be valid, it is to be exported in whatever vessel the Athenians single out and in no other vessel, and those who work it are to pay to the shipowners as a shipping-charge a fee of one obol per talent. If anyone exports it in any other vessel he is to be liable . . . Write up this decree on a stone stele and deposit it . . . of Apollo, and the law as it was previously shall be valid. Indication (endeixis) to be to the astynomoi and the astynomoi are to give the vote about it to the court within thirty days. To the man who makes the exposure (phasis) or indication (endeixis) . . . of the halves. If a slave brings the indication, if he is slave of the exporters let him be free and receive a third; if he is the slave of
The general background of Athenian relations with Ceos is set out in the commentary on 39. This inscription records Athenian action to secure a monopoly in the ruddle trade with three of the cities of Ceos. The top and right-hand side of the stone have been lost, and the text is heavily restored; in detail the restorations are insecure, but the general content is beyond dispute and shows this to be both a puzzling and a revealing document. It is puzzling because we know of no obvious reason why Athens should want a monopoly on Gean ruddle. It is revealing because it shows both the extent to which Athens was prepared to interfere in allies' activities and their policing of them, and the degree of flexibility that was allowed in allies' responses.

As ll. 39ff. of the inscription reveal, this is an Athenian decree recording Athens' decision to send five (probably, ll. 40–41) envoys to Ceos in order to persuade the cities there to submit the ruddle trade to closer controls. It incorporates parts of three
someone else let him be free and . . . Whoever makes the exposure or indication is to have right of appeal to Athens. If the Athenians pass any other decree about the security of the ruddle, the decree is to be valid once received. The producers are to pay the fiftieth tax to the collectors of the fiftieth tax. Invite the Athenians to hospitality at the prytaneion tomorrow.

25 Be it resolved by the council and people of the Iulietans: with regard to what those from the Athenians say, the export of ruddle shall be to Athens and nowhere else, from this day. If there is any export elsewhere, the vessel and the property in the vessel are to be public. Half to go to the person who makes the exposure or indication. If the informant is a slave, let him be free and . . . have a . . . share of the money. Whoever exports ruddle from Ceos is to do so in the vessel which the Athenians single out. If anyone exports it in any other vessel, he is to be liable . . . If the Athenians pass any other decree about the security of the ruddle, what the Athenians decree is to be valid. There is to be exemption from taxes . . . from the month Hermiaion. Invite the Athenians to hospitality in the prytaneion. Indictment at Athens is to be to the Eleven, in Iulis those responsible for introducing the case are to be the prostatai. All who are adjudged to be exporting contrary to the law, half their property is to belong to the people of the Iulietans and half to the person making the exposure. The council is to write up this decree and place it at the harbour.

39 The following were chosen: Andron from Cerameis, Lysia . . . , . . . from Phlya, Euphrosynus from Paecania.

---

Cean decrees passed in consequence. Was there also a decree of the fourth Cean city of Poesssa on the lost part of the stele? The relative independence of Poesssa from the other three cities (compare 22. 82 and 119ff.), and the absence of ruddle sources from its territory, suggest there may not have been need or occasion for intervention at Poesssa. At Coresia it is clear that this was not the first such intervention, since previous Athenian and Coresian decrees are mentioned and apparently reaffirmed. To judge from the actions of the three cities, the major Athenian concerns were: that particular vessels be identified as the only ones in which ruddle is to be exported; that prosecution of offenders be encouraged by the offering of rewards to prosecutors; and that agreement be secured to accept future Athenian decisions related to the security of the ruddle trade.

The context of the Athenian intervention is not clear. There is no internal date,
and letter forms do no more than indicate that the decree belongs somewhere in the middle of the fourth century. The one man who is otherwise attested, Euphrosynus of Paeania, appears in a list of members of the se of Heracles dated to the middle of the fourth century (\textit{ZEPE} cxxv 1999, 98–9). We do know quite a lot about Athenian relations with the cities of Ceos in the first half of the fourth century (see above on 39), but not enough to place this decree precisely.

\textit{Miltos}, translated here as ruddle, was the word used for ochres, characteristically but not only for red ochre (red iron oxide mixed with clay and sand). Theophrastus, \textit{On Stones}, viii, 51–4, identifies Cean ruddle as the best, although later in antiquity more reference is made to ruddle from Sinope. It was used to impart (red) colour to a variety of objects, from pottery, to stones used in building (\textit{SIG}³ 972. 155), to the rope used to gather Athenian citizens from the Agora into the Pnyx for the Assembly in the fifth century (\textit{Ar. Aich.} 21–2, \textit{Eicl.} 378–9) to triremes (\textit{Her. m.} 58; but it was pitch not ruddle that made triremes watertight), and it was also used for medical purposes (\textit{Dioscorides, De Mat. Med.} v, 96, 126, v). The accounts from Eleusis for 329/8 (\textit{IG} ii 2 1672) show expenditure of 14 dr. 3⅓ obols, 7 dr., and 2 dr. 3 obols on ruddle in three separate prytanies; the one supplier named is a non-Athenian, but his origin is unknown; the price varies between 3 dr. and 3 dr. 3 obols per stater (a stater weighed just over 100 g.).

Recent work (\textit{Photos-Jones et al.}) has shown that ochres of various colours (yellow and purple, as well as red) were available on Ceos, and that the red ochre from Orkos in north-east Ceos (close to the border between the territory of Iulis and the territory of Carthaea) had very good staining power. Nevertheless, the Athenians also derived ochre from the Laurium mines, and, even allowing for the higher quality of Cean ochre, it is hard to see any functional necessity for Athenian import of ochre from Ceos.

We do not know how the Athenian envoys persuaded Carthaea, Coresia, and Iulis to conform to their demands. It is hard to see how the agreement to export ruddle only to Athens and in specified vessels could be presented as in the Cean interest, except as a way of avoiding even more direct interference. But the Athenians seem to have obliged the Cean cities to agree to these measures without actually dictating their laws to them. The decisions of Coresia and Iulis are not verbally identical, and while this is in part the consequence of reference being made at Coresia to earlier Athenian decrees, which may not have applied in the case of Iulis, not all the differences can be accounted for in that way. Clauses appear in different orders, substantive items appear in one decree that do not appear in the other, and the cities choose different types of location for the display of their decision. Neither decree is well framed. The Coresia decree has its publication clause, illogically, in the middle, before setting out the details of the legal procedures. The Iulis decree resumes substantive matters after recording the invitation of the Athenian envoys to hospitality, and proceeds to repeat in slightly greater detail matters already dealt with (compare 36–7 with 28–9).

The legal procedures which are referred to by Coresia and Iulis bear names which
are familiar from Athens. On *phasis* and *endeixis* see on 14. It is more likely that Athenian and Cean law shared closely similar procedures than that the Athenians stipulated the procedure to be employed. At Athens a slave could not be the person responsible for an *endeixis*, but whether the possibility of slave *endeixeis* at Coreisia (19) indicates that *endeixis* meant something slightly different there, or whether it simply indicates that the Corerians (unlike the Iulietans, who refer simply to slave informers (29)) did not fully understand what *endeixis* meant, is not clear. The two cities name different magistrates as responsible for dealing with cases, but we cannot tell how far other variations reflect differences in pre-existing legal structures. Certainly the variations between the procedures set up by the two cities (Coreisia distinguishes between slaves owned by the exporter and those owned by others, Iulis does not) once more suggest that Athens did not simply supply a blueprint to be adopted.

The Athenians here effectively impose legislative changes upon the Cean cities, which those cities are expected to adopt at a single assembly meeting. But the Athenians themselves after 403/2 distinguished between laws and decrees and passed legislation for themselves not at a single meeting of the assembly but only through the lengthier deliberations of the *nomothetai* (see Introduction, and see 63 for the divergent practices of demes). More importantly, the legislation passed by the Cean cities includes a provision, unparalleled in Athenian law, that slaves who inform on their masters will be rewarded with freedom (as well as with part of the value of the goods confiscated). The Athenians did reward prosecutors in some commercial cases (e.g. in the *phasis* procedure), but they seem to have offered freedom to slave informers only in cases which involved religious offences (Osborne). To offer a reward as attractive as freedom to a slave in return for the slave's giving information against his master is potentially subversive in the extreme. Hunter has argued (*Policing Athens*, esp. ch. 3) that in any circumstances slaves' knowledge of their masters' activities acted to police citizens' behaviour; rewarding slave informers with freedom will have powerfully increased the citizen's sense of being under surveillance.

The highly subversive way in which Athens seeks to enforce its ruddle monopoly, and the likelihood that Athens had no vital need for ruddle from Ceos, indicate this Athenian intervention in the affairs of the three Cean cities to be extremely high-handed (comparable indeed with M&L 45). Putting these visible signs of the Cean cities submitting to Athenian orders on display on this *stele* on the Acropolis made this exercise of Athenian power highly visible. It is the more frustrating, therefore, that no precise date or political context can be established. This intervention goes directly against the spirit, if not the letter, of 22. Whether the proximity of Ceos made the Athenians particularly obsessive in their control, or whether the interventions in the cities of Ceos are prominent in the record of the Second Athenian Confederacy merely by fluke of epigraphic survival, cannot currently be established. The worst that modern scholarship has to say on the decree ('here is another piece of evidence to show that Athens was very ready to seize any opportunity of lessening the rights of the members of the Confederacy to her own advantage' Marshall, *Second Athenian Confederacy*, 50) markedly understates the situation.
Two fragments of a stele, (a) found between the theatre of Dionysus and the odeum of Herodes Atticus in Athens, (b) found on the Acropolis; now in the Epigraphical Museum. At the top of fr. a are the remains of a relief showing Zeus enthroned, approached by Peloponnesus (?) but Lawton, 94, suggests Hera, with Athena standing behind. Phot. Svoronos, Das athener Nationalmuseum, Taf. cxi Nr. 1481 (fr. a); Meyer, Die griechischen Urkundenreliefs, Taf. 17 A 58; Lawton, Reliefs, pl. 13 no. 24 (the last two, top of fr. a, with relief and ll. 1–6).

Attic-Ionic, occasionally retaining the old ο for ω̣, l. 1 in larger letters; ll. 2 sqq. stakedon 40. This is the work of Tracy’s Cutter of IG ii 105 (cf. 31, 34): Athenian Democracy in Transition, 67–70.

IG ii 112; SIG* 181; Tod 144*; Set. 290. Trans. Harding 56. See also L. J. Bliézetz, ΑΠΕ ΕΚΚ 1979, 237–40.

Alliance between Athens, Arcadia, Achaea, Elis, and Phlius, 362/1

ἐπὶ Μόλονος ἀρχοντος.

συμμαχία Ἀθηναίων καὶ Ἀρκάδων καὶ Ἀχαιών καὶ Ἡλείων καὶ Φλειασών. ἐδοξεὶ τὴν βουλήν καὶ τοῖς δήμουσις, Ὀλυμπίας ἐπρυτάνευεν. Ἀγάθαρχος Ἀγαθάρχος Ὀδῆθεν· ἐγραμματέων Ἐρμίεως ἐπεστατέ. Περίσσαις εἶναι εὔξησαί μεν τὸν κύρικα αὐτόκεις μείζοντο τῶν Διήμερων καὶ τῆς Ἀθηναίας τῆς Πολιάδος καὶ τῆς Δήμητριας καὶ τῆς Κόρης καὶ τοῖς Διώδεκας Ἠοῖς καὶ ταῖς Σεμναίαις Θεαῖς, ἐὰν συνενεγκηκή Α[θηναίων].

τῷ δήμῳ τὰ δόξαντα περὶ τῆς συμμαχίας, θυ[—]—

[στίχος και] πρόσοδον ποιήσασθαι, τελουμένοι τοίτων τῶν καὶ τὰ μεν ἔχουθαι[α] ἐπει[—]—

δὲ οἱ συμμαχίαις δόμιμοι εἰσήγησι εἰς τὴν βουλήν·

ἐχεσθαι τὴν συμμαχίαν καθὰ ἐπαγγέλλονται 0—

Ἰ[δι] καὶ Χαὶ καὶ Ἡλείων καὶ Φλει[άιοι καὶ Τοί]—

[i] ὅ[βο]υλη προβολεύσαντες κατὰ τωτὴν δήμον[τὸν δήμου]—

[ήμων] ἐναι συμμαχίαις τοῖς ἁγαθοῖς τῶν δήμων καὶ τῶν συμμάχων—

[χος καὶ Α]ρκάδ[ας καὶ Χα[]ιων καὶ Η]λείων καὶ Φλει[—]

[στίχος και] πρόσοδον ποιήσασθαι, τελουμένοι τοίτων τῶν καὶ τὰ με[—]

[εραμεν] μερής—

[ἐν τῷ στήλῃ] τοι[τιμητε] ἐὰν δὲ τῶν ἑπὶ τῆς Ἀττι—

[κάτω] νὴ τῶν δήμων καὶ τῶν Ἀθηναίων νὴ τύραννον—

[καὶ] θυσία νὴ ὀλυμπίας, βοσθεῖν Ἀρκάδας καὶ Ἀχαίας—

[ὁ]ς καὶ Η]λείων καὶ Φλειασών Ἀθηναίους παριστά—

[θε]ρεῖ καθότι ἐν ἐπαγγέλλοσιν Ἀθηναίων κατὰ τὸ δὴ—

[τὸν Α]ττικὸ καὶ ἐὰν [τίς ἑπὶ τούτος τῶν] πόλεως τῶν—
In the archonship of Molon [362/1].

2 Alliance of Athens and Arcadia and Achaea and Elis and Phlius.

4 Resolved by the council and the people. Oeneis was the prytany; Agatharchus son of Agatharchus from Oe was secretary; Xanthippus of Hermus was chairman. Periander proposed:

6 The herald shall vow forthwith to Zeus Olympios and to Athena Polias and to Demeter and to Kore and to the Twelve Gods and to the August Goddesses, that, if what is resolved about the alliance is to the advantage of the people of Athens, a sacrifice and procession shall be made on the accomplishment of these things as the people shall resolve.

12 That is to be vowed. And, since the allies have brought in a resolution to the council, to accept the alliance as offered by Arcadia and Achaea and Elis and Phlius, and the council has made a probouleuma on the same terms, be it resolved by the people:

17 For the good fortune of the people, the people of Athens and the allies and Arcadia and Achaea and Elis and Phlius shall be allies for all time —— on this stele.

24 If any one goes against Attica or overthrows the people of Athens or sets up a tyrant or an oligarchy, the Arcadians and Achaeans and Eleans and Phliasians shall go in support of the Athenians with all their strength as called on by the Athenians as far as possible; and if any one goes against those cities,
In 365 a war had broken out between Elis and Arcadia; but in the course of it a split occurred between a pro-Theban faction in Arcadia led by Tegea and an anti-Theban faction led by Mantinea, and in 363/2 the Mantinean faction made peace with Elis and appealed for support to Sparta (X. H. vii. iv. 12–v. 3, cf. D.S. xv. 77. i–iv, 78. ii–iii, 82. i–iv). The battle of Mantinea, between Thebes and her allies and Sparta and her allies, was fought at the end of the Athenian year 363/2 (Plut. X Or. 845 E, cf. Plut. Glor. Ath. 350 A, X. H. vii. v. 14). In that battle the Mantinean faction within Arcadia (cf. on 32), Elis, and Achaea fought on the Spartan side, and so did Athens, but Phlius, which together with Corinth had made peace with Thebes in 365 (X. H. vii. iv. 10–11) is not mentioned (X. H. vii. v. 1–3). Athens at that stage had alliances with Sparta (since 369) and with Arcadia (since 366: X. H. vii. iv. 2–3). This alliance of 362/1 therefore belongs to the period after the battle, when a common peace treaty had been made from which Sparta was excluded, and the Mantinean faction was claiming to be ‘Arcadia’ (D.S. xv. 89. i–ii: on the chronology see Buckler, The Theban Hegemony, 260–1). Phlius has now joined the Peloponnesians who fought on the Spartan side (it is striking to see this small city listed along with three regional states), and they have made a joint approach to Athens and the League. The alliance cannot be placed within the year, and may be a response either to the battle and the treaty which followed it or to the return of the Thebans to the Peloponnese in 361 to support the Megalopolitan faction in Arcadia (D.S. xv. 94. i–iii).

In 33 the Athenian council took the initiative and referred business to the synedrion of the League to submit its opinion to the assembly: here the synedrion has taken the initiative in recommending the alliance, and the council in its probouleuma has added its own recommendation. However, the motion must to some extent have been rewritten in the assembly, since, although the decree has the longer enactment formula which mentions the council (ll. 3–4), it has the shorter motion formula which does not mention the council (ll. 16–17), and it refers to the probouleuma in a way in which the probouleuma itself ought not to have done (see Rhodes, Boule, 68–9 cf. 70–8). The proposer of the decree, Periander, will be the man, a member of a prominent family (APF, 461–4) who reformed the trierarchic system in 358/7 ([Dem.] xixii. Ev. & Mnes. 21), and was himself a trierarch in 357/6 (IG ii² 1611. 292, 1953. 5).
or overthrows the people of Phlius or overthrows or changes the constitution of Achaea or Arcadia or Elis, or exiles anybody, the Athenians shall go in support of these with all their strength as called on by those who are being wronged as far as possible.

34 Each shall have the leadership in their own territory.

35 If it is resolved by all the cities to add anything else, whatever is resolved shall be within their oath.

37 The oath shall be sworn in each city by the highest officials of the Peloponnesians, and of the Athenians by the generals and the taxiarachs and the hipparchs and the phylarchs and the cavalry.

The vow of a sacrifice and procession is paralleled in Tod 146 ~ Harding 58, of the same year, and in IG ii² 30 = Agora, xvi 41 of 387/6. The August Goddesses are the Erinyes, worshipped euphemistically in Athens under that title (cf. Paus. i. 28. vi). Bliquez is certainly right to insist that ‘as the people shall resolve’ is to be understood with the making of the sacrifice and procession; he reads the genitive absolute ‘these things being accomplished’ as a future on which that clause depends, but more probably it is present and logically misplaced, and refers to the actual making of the alliance.

The alliance is a defensive alliance; and, although the members of the Athenian League took the initiative in recommending its acceptance, and they are mentioned in ll. 18–19, they have been omitted from the clauses about mutual support. Whereas Athens’ alliances are commonly with democratic states, and each party may undertake to support the other against attempts to overthrow ‘the people’, i.e. the democracy (e.g. Athens and Corecyra in 372/1: Tod 127 ~ Harding 42, cited in the commentary on 24), of the Peloponnesian states here only Phlius is democratic, and the others are to be protected against attempts to overthrow or change the constitution (politeia, restored: ll. 29–34); in the case of Athens both tyranny and oligarchy are envisaged as alternatives to democracy (ll. 24–9; contrast 79, of 337/6, where only tyranny is envisaged). There will have been more danger of a threat to the constitution in the Peloponnesian cities than in Athens: the weakness of Sparta after Leuctra had removed a force making for stability (cf. X. H. vi. v. 2–11, D.S. xv. 40 (often referred to the period after Leuctra, though not by Stylianou, Historical Commentary, ad loc.), 57. iii–58); and in the aftermath of the battle of Mantinea the risk of constitutional upheaval will have persisted.

For the provision that each state should command in its own territory (ll. 34–5) cf. X. H. vii. v. 3 (before the battle of Mantinea): this clause too will have meant more to the Peloponnesian states than to Athens. For the provision for modification of the treaty by joint agreement (ll. 35–7) cf. 6 and, for ‘within their oath’, Thuc. v. 18. xi, 23. vi. For the restored reference to ‘the highest officials’ of the Peloponnesian states (l. 38) cf. X. H. vii. v. 3.
A fragment of a stele found at Argos, now lost.

LI. 1—17 Attic-Ionic, with the old ε for ρ retained in 1. 15; restored as non-stoicladon.

We omit a second document, apparently in Doric dialect, referring to judges and disputed territory, of which a little is preserved in 11. 18—21.

The stone has been lost, and the text transcribed contains no indication of date: all the interpreter can do is look for a context in which the text that can be reconstructed makes sense. Suggested dates have ranged from 386 (A. Boeckh, SIG 1118) to 338—334 (U. Koehler ap. SIG9). Beloch linked this with the declaration of the Athenians in 344 that they would stay at peace with the King if he stayed at peace with them, but would not help him in the recovery of Egypt (Didym. In Dem. viii. 7—26 = [e.g.] Philoch. FGrH 328 F 157, cf. D.S. xvi. 44. i [misdated to 351/0]: GG9, iii. i 534—5). Most scholars, however, have followed Wilhelm 1900 in believing that this is a response to satraps.
share in the common peace.

Show to the man who has come from the satraps that the Greeks have resolved their disputes towards a common peace, so that, being freed from the war against themselves, they may each make their own cities as great as possible and happy, and remain useful to their friends and strong. They are not aware that the King has any war against them. If, therefore, he keeps quiet and does not embroil the Greeks, and does not attempt to break up the peace that has come into being for us by any craft or contrivance, we too shall keep quiet in matters with regard to the King; but if he makes war on any who have sworn the oath or provides money for the breaking-up of this peace, either himself in opposition to the Greeks who have made this peace or any one else of those from his territory, we shall all resist in common, worthily of the peace that has now come into being and of what we have done before now.
to whom the man from the satraps went or who authorized this reply. A. Momigliano insisted because of the dialect that this must emanate from Athens, and therefore dated it to 371/0, after the common peace treaty organized by Athens, and supposed that the satraps were already then looking for support against the King (RFIC lxii = xii 1934, 494—8 = 3° Contributo, 493—6). P. Charneux has announced, but has not yet fulfilled, his intention of restoring it as a letter from Athens (BCH cvii 1983, 251 n. 3). However, ll. 2—3 point not to a letter but to a reply composed for the benefit of a man who is present (cf.
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The Boeotians honour a Carthaginian, 360s—350s

A stele found at Thebes; now lost.

Boeotian.


\[\theta\]εἰς τὸ καθιστάναι τῷ Λιττύρῳ Πατροκλίου Νόββιον τοῦ Σατράπου Καραχάνδαντον καὶ εἰμὲν Ἰωάννου καὶ εὐκαλέστατον τὸν διάμοιον προϊέσαν εἰμὲν Ἰωάννου καὶ εὐκαλέστατον τὸν διάμοιον προϊέσαν εἰμὲν Ἰωάννου καὶ εὐκαλέστατον τὸν διάμοιον προϊέσαν εἰμὲν Ἰωάννου καὶ εὐκαλέστατον τὸν διάμοιον προϊέσαν εἰμὲν Ἰωάννου καὶ εὐκαλέστατον τὸν διάμοιον προϊέσαν εἰμὲν Ἰωάννου καὶ εὐκαλέστατον τὸν διάμοιον προϊέσαν εἰμὲν Ἰωάννου καὶ εὐκαλέστατον τὸν διάμοιον προϊέσαν εἰμὲν Ἰωάννου καὶ εὐκαλέστατον τὸν διάμοιον προϊέσαν εἰμὲν Ἰωάννου καὶ εὐκαλέστατον τὸν διάμοιον προϊέσαν εἰμὲν Ἰωάννου καὶ εὐκαλέστατον τὸν διάμοιον προϊέσαν εἰμὲν Ἰωάννου καὶ εὐκαλέστατον τὸν διάμοιον προϊέσαν εἰμὲν Ἰωάννου καὶ εὐκαλέστατον τὸν διάμοιον προϊέσαν εἰμὲν Ἰωάννου καὶ εὐκαλέστατον τὸν διάμοιον προϊέσαν εἰμὲν Ἰωάννου καὶ εὐκαλέστατον τὸν διάμοιον προϊέσαν εἰμὲν Ἰωάννου καὶ εὐκαλέστατον τὸν διάμοιον προϊέσαν εἰμὲν Ἰωάννου καὶ εὐκαλέστατον τὸν διάμοιον προϊέσαν εἰμὲν Ἰωάννου καὶ εὐκαλέστατον τὸν διάμοιον προϊέσαν εἰμὲν Ἰωάννου καὶ εὐκαλέστατον τὸν διάμοιον προϊέσαν εἰμὲν Ἰωάννου καὶ εὐκαλέστατον τὸν διάμοιον προϊέσαν εἰμὲν Ἰωάννου καὶ εὐκαλέστατον τὸν διάμοιον προϊέσαν εἰμὲν Ἰωάννου καὶ εὐκαλέστατον τὸν διάμοιον προϊέσαν εἰμὲν Ἰωάννου καὶ εὐκαλέστατον τὸν διάμοιον προϊέσαν εἰμὲν Ἰωάννου καὶ εὐκαλέστατον τὸν διάμοιον προϊέσαν εἰμὲν Ἰωάν

1 Θi. Dittenberger, IG; Δι. Dittenberger, SIG (all edd.): LGPN, iii., has five Boeotian instances of Theoteleis to one of Dioteleis. 5—6 Ἀννόβιος Clermont-Ganneau, Recueil d'archéologie orientale, iii. 142—4; Ἀξιόμπιτιος Blaß, Über die Aussprache der Griechischen, 410 = 419—i.e. Hannibal son of Hasdrubal; but, whatever the original Phoenician names may have been, it is unwise to think that the Boeotians cannot have written what R. Pococke read (and see note in SIG). 7 on Pococke's transcript: see commentary. 8 ἐπισων Pococke's transcript. 13 Διατώδαιο Wilhelm, cf. his reading of IG vii 2408. 16, and see commentary: Διατώδαιο in both inscriptions earlier edd.
but we remain uncertain before what body he was present, or why this Attic text was inscribed in Argos. I. 5–7 are striking for their praise of peace, not just as the absence of war but as a foundation for prosperity and cooperation between cities: elsewhere praise of peace is focused on benefits for the internal life of the city and for individuals within it (e.g. Ar. Acharn., Peace). For the expression ‘They are not aware . . . ’ (l. 8) cf. Thuc. iv. 78. iv: this appears to be formal diplomatic language.

God; Fortune (Tyché).

1 In the archonship of—oteles. Resolved by the people.

3 Nobas son of Axioubas of Carthage shall be proxenos and benefactor of the Bocotians; and he shall have the right to acquire land and a house, and immunity both by land and by sea, during both war and peace.

12 The Boeotarchs were: Timon, Daetondas, Thion, Melon, Hippias, Eumaridas, Patron.
This is one of three similar decrees, enacted in different but not far-separated years by the Boeotian federation. One for a Byzantine (IG vii 2408, revised Roesch, 47–8, cf. SEG xxxiv 355), has a list of Boeotarchs which includes two of the men listed in our text (Hippias and Daetondas) and Malacidas and Diogeiton, the first to be restored as Boeotarch in 371 (Paus. ix. 13. vi) and both mentioned in the context of 364 (Plut. Pel. 35. ii). The other, for Athenaeus son of Demonicus of Macedon (Roesch = SEG xxxiv 355), has a list of Boeotarchs including one of the men listed in our text (Patron), and also Damophilus (Boeotarch in 371: Paus. ix. 13. vi) and the famous Pelopidas. Epaminondas does not appear in any of the lists. Thebes is known to have been interested in Macedon in the 360s but not in the 350s: for the Macedonian decree, with Pelopidas Boeotarch but not Epaminondas, 368 is excluded by the Boeotarchs named in Paus. ix. 15. i, and 365 or early 364 look most likely. Possible years for the other two, with neither Pelopidas nor Epaminondas Boeotarch, are 365, late 364 (after the death of Pelopidas at Cynoscephalae), 363, or else some time after the death of Epaminondas at Mantinea in 362, but not 361, when the Boeotarchs included Pammene (D.S. xv. 94. ii), who is not listed in the inscriptions (on the chronology we follow Buckler, 233–62).

It was suggested by Glotz that the Carthaginian was made proxenos because Thebes needed outside skills in developing the naval programme proposed by Epaminondas (D.S. xv. 78. iv–79. ii, foreshadowed in the peace talks of 367, X. H. vii. i. 36). Many have been attracted by that suggestion, and Roesch built on it to link all three decrees with the naval programme, noting that Byzantium was among the allies of Athens whose support Epaminondas tried to win (D.S. xv. 79. i: for its support for Thebes after the Social War of the 350s see 57), and that Macedon would be important as a source of ship-building timber (cf. 12), and the honorand’s son, another Demonicus, was appointed as a trierarch by Alexander the Great in 326 (Arr. Ind. 18. iii). In that connection we may now note a recently discovered inscription in which Cnidus, on a promontory of south-western Asia Minor between Cos and Rhodes, makes Epaminondas its proxenos, and the fact that Rhodes was one of the states visited by Epaminondas (SEG xlv 901; text reprinted and discussed by Buckler, Mnem. 4 li 1998, 192–205). However, the Thebans were not without naval experience; and in view of the chronological uncertainties, and of the fact that Carthaginian traders were not a
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Alliance between Athens and the Thessalian koinon,

### 361/0

A stele with a relief at the top showing a mounted warrior, found on the south slope of the Athenian Acropolis; now in the Epigraphical Museum and in poor condition. Phot. Svoronos, Das athener Nationalmuseum, Taf. ccix Nr. 1; Meyer, Die griechischen Urkundenreliefs, Taf. 20 A 598; Lawton, Reliefs, pl. 13 no. 25 (the last two, relief and opening lines only).
great rarity in fourth-century Greece (Gsell, *Histoire ancienne de l’Afrique du nord*, iv. 152 n. 3); we agree with those who regard this reconstruction as unduly speculative (G. L. Gawkwell, *CQ* 2 xxii 1972, 272 n. 1; Buckler, 308 n. 27).

Whereas the pre-386 Boeotian federation had eleven Boeotarchs, based on eleven electoral units, and its decision-making body was a council of 660 (Hell. Oxy. 16. iii–iv Bartoletti/McKechnie & Kern = 19. iii–iv Chambers), these inscriptions show that the federation as revived in the 370s had an *archon*, an assembly to make decisions, and seven Boeotarchs (for the last cf. D.S. xv. 53. iii, Paus. ix. 13. vi–vii). It is often supposed that seven of the old units were used, with those assigned to Orchomenus and Thespiae abolished (e.g. Buckler, 23), but there are problems with that view; Knoepfler, 47–8 n. 42, has argued that all seven Boeotarchs in the new federation were Theban; and it may well be that there was no rule about the affiliation of the Boeotarchs, and Thebans managed to obtain many if not all of the appointments. Daetondas was probably an ancestor of the sculptor Daetondas of Sicyon (Paus. vi. 17. v). Knoepfler suggests also that our Daetondas should be read in place of Diagondas in Cic. Legg. ii. 37 as the author of a law forbidding nocturnal religious rites, but Vottero (130–1) thinks the legislator was a man of the Solonian period. Of the other Boeotarchs listed in this inscription Melon was one of the liberators of Thebes in 379/8 (X. H. v. iv. 2–3, Plut. Pel. 8).

A somewhat later federal decree (Roesch, *Études béotiennes*, 271–2 = *SEG* xxxii 476) has been found in the sanctuary of Poseidon at Onchestus, which became the federal administrative centre after the destruction of Thebes in 335 (Roesch, *Études béotiennes*, 265–75). It confers honours on a man from Pellana, in Achaea; the cities of the Boeotarchs are specified (the first from Thespiae, the second from Tanagra, after which the text breaks off); the names of the *archon* and of the first Boeotarch have been deleted. The error *voe* for *Foe* appears both in l. 7 of our inscription and in *SEG* xxxii 476: Vottero (121–8) suggests that we have here an Athenian model for the award of proxenies, not fully absorbed by the Boeotians: he argues for a short period of uncertainty and dates *SEG* xxxii 476 to the same period, but in view of its location and the cities of the Boeotarchs we prefer Roesch’s dating. Apart from the use of *digamma*, Boeotian features of the language include *eμεν* for *eίναι* (4, 7), and *επιπασις* (i.e. *εμπασις*) for the Attic *εγκτησις*. 

---

43. THE BOEOTIANS HONOUR A CARTHAGINIAN, 3605–3508 219
The relationship between Athens and the Thessalian Koinon is a complex one, characterized by the Attic-Ionic script and the presence of various inscriptions in both Greek and Latin. The document contains references to specific locations and historical events, such as the city of Athens and the Thessalian region. The text is rich in historical context, discussing political alliances and the role of inscriptions in recording historical events. The mention of specific inscriptions, such as IG ii 2 116 and SIG ii '- irritated', highlights the importance of these documents in understanding the historical and cultural context of the period. The integration of these inscriptions into the broader narrative provides a detailed account of the political and social dynamics of the time.
Gods.

2 In the archonship of Nicophemus [361/0].

3 Alliance of the Athenians and Thessalians for all time.

5 Resolved by the council and the people. Leontis was the prytany; Chaerion son of Charinautes of Phalerum was secretary; Archippus from Amphitrope was chairman; on the twelfth day of the prytany. Execestides proposed:

8 Concerning what is said by the envoys of the Thessalians, be it decreed by the people:

9 Accept the alliance, for good fortune, as the Thessalians offer; and there shall be an alliance for them with the Athenians for all time. Also all the allies of the Athenians shall be allies of the Thessalians, and those of the Thessalians allies of the Athenians.

14 Of the Athenians the generals and the council and the hipparchs and the cavalry shall swear the following oath: I shall go in support with all my strength as far as possible if any one goes against the koinon of the Thessalians for war, or overthrows the archon whom the Thessalians have appointed, or sets up a tyrant in Thessaly. They shall swear the lawful oath.

20 So that the Thessalians may swear to the city, the people shall appoint five men from all Athenians, who shall go to Thessaly and have Agelaus the archon and the polemarchs and the hipparchs and the knights and the hieromnemones and the other officials who hold office on behalf of the koinon of Thessaly swear the following oath: I shall go in support with all my strength as far as possible if any one goes against the city of Athens for war or overthrows the Athenian people. The Thessalian envoys who are visiting Athens shall swear the same oath in the council.

31 It shall not be permitted to put an end to the war against Alexander, either to the Thessalians without the Athenians or to the Athenians without the archon and koinon of the Thessalians.

34 Praise Agelaus the archon and the koinon of the Thessalians, because they have been doing well and enthusiastically everything concerning the city’s offer to them. Praise also the Thessalian envoys who have come, and invite them to hospitality in the prytaneion tomorrow.

39 The stele for Alexander concerning the alliance shall be demolished by the treasurers of the Goddess.
Although it is framed as an alliance for all time, this treaty resulted from a particular emergency and did not last long.

The power of the principal cities in Thessaly had been growing during the fifth and early fourth centuries, but there was still a Thessalian koinon, with an archon, and it was still possible for a military leader of all Thessaly to be appointed, with the title tagos; and Jason, the tyrant of Pherae in south-eastern Thessaly, claimed this position in the 370s (X. H. vi. i. 8—9, 12, 18—19). He was assassinated in 370, and succeeded by two brothers, Polydorus and Polyphron, of whom the second soon killed the first; in 369 Polyphron was killed and succeeded by Polydorus' son Alexander (X. H. vi. iv. 29—35; compressed account D.S. xv. 60. v, 61. i). The Thessalians opposed to Alexander appealed first to Macedon and then, when Macedonian help proved a doubtful blessing, to Thebes; and we learn from this inscription that they claimed to be the Thessalian koinon and continued to appoint an archon. Since Athens and Thebes were now enemies, in 368 Athens made an alliance with Alexander, set up a statue of him, and sent forces to support him (D.S. xv. 71. iii—iv, cf. X. H. vii. i. 28, Plut. Pol. 31. vi). In 364 the Thebans defeated Alexander, limited his power to Pherae, and made him a subordinate ally (D.S. xv. 80. vi). Alexander, not allowed to expand on the mainland and linked to a Thebes which was challenging Athenian power at sea (cf. on 39, 43), undertook naval expeditions in the Aegean: in 362 he attacked Tenos (Dem. L. Poly. 4); in 361 he attacked Paphartus and defeated an Athenian force under Leosthenes, after which he raided the Piraeus (D.S. xv. 95. i—iii, Polyaen. vi. 2; and cf. Dem. xxiii. Arist. 120).

Athens consequently approached his enemies, the Thessalian koinon: we read in ll. 8—11 that Thessalian envoys have come to Athens offering an alliance, but ll. 34—6 suggest that they did so in response to a first move by Athens. The result is a defensive alliance in which the Athenians promise their support explicitly to the koinon and its

---

1 On offices and titles in Thessaly see Helly, L'Etat thessalim, 13—68, 329—53, with M. Sordi, Topoi vii 1997, 177—82, and (reviewing Helly) Gnomon lxx 1998, 418—21. It should be accepted that archon was the normal title for the head of the koinon, and tagos referred to a military leader and the position was perhaps reinvented by Jason; but Helly's claim that tetrarch was another title for the archon and the heads of the tetrads should have been tetrarchs is less likely to be right.
To the envoys the treasurer of the people shall give for travelling expenses 20 drachmas each.

This alliance shall be written up by the secretary of the council on a stone stele and placed on the Acropolis; for the writing-up of the stele the treasurer of the people shall give 20 drachmas.

Also Theaetetus of Erchia, for speaking best and doing what good he can for the people of Athens and the Thessalians, shall be deemed to have done his duty.

archon, against the setting-up of a tyrant in Thessaly; neither party is to end the war against Alexander without the agreement of the other; to mark the ending of Athens’ alliance with Alexander, the stele on which it is inscribed is to be demolished (by the treasurers of Athena [ll. 39–40], presumably because it was on the Acropolis and they had a general responsibility for monuments there: for the demolition of stelai cf. 22).

Theaetetus, the man who is ‘deemed to have done his duty’ (ll. 45–8: for the expression cf. 64. 63–5), perhaps proposed and/or served on the Athenians’ exploratory mission to the koion. That is added almost as an afterthought: it is possible that it was added by way of a ‘concealed amendment’, although no explicit amendment is included in this text (on problems over amendments cf. 2, 19, 20, 64). Whereas in the previous year Athens had allowed the synedron of her League to make the first move towards accepting the alliance offered by Peloponnesian states (41), here Athens commits them and any other allies she has without any sign that they have been consulted or will be asked to swear.

Excecestides, the Athenian proposer of the decree, could be identical either with the envoy to Byzantium of Tod 121 ~ Harding 34. 18 or with the general of 48. 22, but despite Tod not with both, as those two men are from different demes, and the name was in any case a common one in this period (cf. APF, 175–8). Agelaus, the archon of the Thessalian koion, probably belonged to the Daochid family of Pharsalus, whose monument at Delphi names a fifth-century Agelaus (SIG³ 274 = F. Delphes iii. iv 460 = CEG 795). Bengston in Svt. follows Beloch (GG², iii. 1. 218 n. 2) in linking with this alliance IG ii² 175, which contains the end of an Athenian decree, a list of Athenian envoys, and a list of Thessalian oath-takers, beginning with four polemarchs (cf. the mention of the polemarchs after the archon in ll. 23 of our text). It would be economical to suppose that the four polemarchs replaced the four tetrarchs based on the archaic tetrarchies, units which were to be revived by Philip of Macedon c.342 (Dem. ix. Phil. iii. 26; or c.344 if δεκαδαρχίαν in Dem. vi. Phil. ii. 22 were to be emended to τετραδαρχίαν), but it is not clear how many polemarchs there were in the 450s (SEG xvii 243 with J. A. O. Larsen, CPiv 1960, 241–2). We have translated hippes in ll. 24 as ‘knights’, since it is hard to believe that all of Thessaly’s large body of cavalry would have sworn to this alliance (Larsen, Greek Federal States, 24). Hieromnemones (‘sacred remembrancers’) is the
title given to the voting representatives in the Delphic Amphictyony, two from each of
the twelve member peoples (Roux, L’Amphictyonie, Delphes et le temple d’Apollon, 20—36);
but it is also a title attested for local officials in various places including some cities of
Thessaly (e.g. IG ix. ii 459, Cranmore; 541, Larisa), and it is more likely that the hiero-
mnemones of our text were officials of the koinon (contr. Tod). For travelling expenses
(ll. 40–2) cf. 35, 44, 48, 58, 95.

Alexander survived until 358/7, when he was assassinated by his wife Thebe, the
dughter of Jason, and her brothers; he was succeeded by Tisiphonus, the eldest
brother (X. H. vi. iv. 35–7, D.S. xvi. 14. i [under 357/6]), and the Thebans used Tisi-

Contributions to the rebuilding of the temple at Delphi,

361/0

Fragments of a large slab, found on the pavement of the Sacred Way at Delphi; now in the museum there. Phot.
BCH xcvii 1903, pl. vi; F. Delphes, m. v, pl. ii; G. Delphes, ii, pl. iii fig. 3.

Mixed Phocian and Ionic dialect; a line marking the left-hand margin; stoichedon with irregularities towards
the ends of lines, ending each line with the end of a word or (occasionally) a syllable. Ll. i. 57–60 are indented
in order to avoid a damaged part of the stone; ll. ii. 25–3, containing the total for the year, project beyond the left-hand
margin of the column.

(i) ἐπὶ Αἰο[χύλου ἅ]ρχοντος,
τὰς [ἡ]μίνας Πυλαίας, τρίτας
καὶ δεκάτας, ταῖς ταῖς πο-
λίων ἦ[ν]καν τοῦ ὀδελοῦ τοῦ
δευτέρου.

Μεγαρε[τ]· Ἀνδρων· δραχμᾶς
τρισχιλίας τετρακοσίας
τεσσαράκοντα τέσσαρας.

Τροζάνα· δραχμᾶς τριακο-
σίας τρι[α]κοσίαν τέσσαρας·

ἡμικ [Φ[ι]γων.

Κυφορ[εῖ]· Κόμβος· δραχμᾶς
ἐκατ[όν ἐβ]δεμικόντα.

vacat

ταῖς πόλεις καὶ ἱδιῶται

(ii) Απολλω[ιάται].
κριθαν μεδίμνους
Φειδωνείους

τρισχιλίους· ἐκ τοῦ-
των ἐγένοντο μεδι-
μοι Δελφικοὶ
χίλιοι ὀκτακόσιοι
ἐβδεμικόντα πέντε·
τοῦτο τιμᾶ ἐγένητο
δραχμαὶ τρισχιλία
πεινακόσια ὀγδο-

κόντα ἔπτἁ, τρεῖς

δβολοί̔, ἡμιμβέλιον.

τοῦτο δὲ ἄγαγον τάἱ

αὐτῶν διατάναι εἰς

Δελφοὺς ἐπὶ τάν
θάλασσαν τοῖ̔

Ἀπολλωνιάται·

ἀγας τὸ σῖτον

Thelasikratēs Tīmokleidou,
phonous' ships against the Athenians in Euboea in 357 (schol. Aristid. Panath. 179 Dindorf = 319 Behr (iii. 298 Dindorf); for the episode see 48). However, by the late 350s Lycophron and PithoIaues were in power, and in the Third Sacred War for the control of Delphi the Phocians were supported by both Athens and the tyrants of Pherae (Isoc. Ep. vi. 3 points to an alliance between them) and opposed by both Thebes and the koinon; in 352 the tyrants were expelled from Pherae by Philip of Macedon (D.S. xvi. 35, 37. iii), and Philip was elected archon of the koinon (D.S. 352/59 (11. ii. 30—iii. 63): like Tod, we give the spring section only.

SIG* 239. 8 F. Delphes, iii. v 3; Tod 140; C. Delphes, ii 4*. Trans. Harding 60. See also Roux, L'Amphictionie, Delphes et le temple d'Apollon; J. K. Davies, Modus Operandi . . . G. Rickman, 1—14; Sánchez, L' Amphictionie, 124-32, 168.

The whole inscription is in three columns, containing the records for spring 361/0 (ll. i. i—ii. 29) and autumn 360/59 (ll. ii. 30—iii. 63): like Tod, we give the spring section only.

In the translation which follows we give sums of money in figures, although the Greek text gives them in words. The contributors marked with an asterisk are women.

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{In the archonship of Aeschylus} & \quad \text{Apollonia: 3,000 Pheidonian medimnoi} \\
\text{[361/0]} & \quad \text{of barley: from this there were 1,875} \\
\text{in the spring \textit{Pylaia}:} \text{Delphic medimnoi: the price of this} & \quad \text{was 3,587 drachmas, 3} \frac{1}{2} \text{obols. The} \\
\text{the thirteenth, the following of the cities} & \quad \text{Apolloniates brought this at their} \\
\text{brought their share of the second} & \quad \text{own expense to Delphi to the sea: the} \\
\text{obol.} & \quad \text{grain was brought by Aenesidamus of} \\
6 \text{Megara: Andron: 3,444 drachmas.} & \quad \text{Megara:} \\
9 \text{Troezen: 334 drachmas: brought by} & \quad \text{Pitheas, Aristo-} \\
12 \text{Cyphaera: Combus: 170 drachmas.} & \quad \text{telesicrates son of Timoclides, Aristo-} \\
14 \text{The following offerings were made by} & \quad \text{telesicrates son of Timoclides, Aristo-} \\
16 \text{Naxos: 350 drachmas: brought by} & \quad \text{telesicrates son of Timoclides, Aristo-} \\
\end{align*}
\]
226 45. CONTRIBUTIONS TO REBUILDING THE TEMPLE AT DELPHI

(i)

Ἀριστόδημος Αιαίμου.

Στράμβων Νάξιος: δραχμάς δύο.

Δημαίνετος Νάξιος: Ἀττικᾶς
dραχμάς δέκα: τοῦ τοῦ
Αἰγυπτίων δραχμαί ἐπτά.

Τελευκράτης Νάξιος:

δραχμάς δύο.

Ἀριστόδημος Νάξιος:

δραχμάς δύο.

Μεσοάνοι: Λυσέγενο[ς],

Φίλιη, Κ[...][θ][...], Εὐ[ρ][θ][...]

δραχμάς εἰ[δεμή]κοντα.

Σωσίδες Φαρσάλιος:

δραχμᾶν.

Ἀνδρόκος Λακεδαιμῶνος:

δραχμᾶς δύο.

(ii)

Αἰνησαθιμος Δελφῶς,

Ἀριστοκλείδας

Ἀπολλονίατας,

κεφάλαιοι λήμματος
tαῦτα τα[ς] Πυλῶν

ἐπὶ Α[λ]χύλων: δραχμαί
dκτα[κ]ισαλίαι

πεντα[κ]άσιαι

τριάκοντα, ὄβολος,

ἡμιωβελίων.

38 ἤρει inscribed over an erasure of δραχμάς; the cutter originally omitted the verb.
CONTRIBUTIONS TO REBUILDING THE TEMPLE AT DELPHI

(i)

demus son of Aesimus.

Strombon of Naxos: 2 drachmas.

Demaenetus of Naxos: 10 Attic drachmas: of this 7 Aeginetan drachmas.

Telesicrates of Naxos: 2 drachmas.

Aristodemus of Naxos: 2 drachmas.

Messene: Lysixenus, Phillis, C—th—, Eury—us: 70 drachmas.

Sosibius of Pharsalus: 1 drachma.

Andocus of Sparta: 2 drachmas.

Lygdamis of Tragilus: 6 drachmas, 4 obols.

Naukratis from Egypt: brought by Pythagoras: 350 drachmas.

Eudamus of Syracuse: 30 drachmas.

Saraucus of Arcadia: 2 drachmas.

Cottabus of Arcadia: 3 drachmas.

*Eurydice of Larisa: 2 drachmas.

*Aeschylis of Selinus: 2 drachmas.

Epicharmus of Arcadia: 1 drachma.

*Cleinoi of Phlius: 3 obols.

*Echenice of Phlius: 1½ obols.

*Cleonica of Phlius: 1½ obols.

*Philostratis of Sparta: 3 obols.

Cleogenes: 4 drachmas of Attic: of this 2 Aeginetan drachmas, 4 obols.

(ii)

Delphi, Aristoclididas of Apollonia.

Total receipt in this Pylaia under Aeschylus: 8,530 drachmas, 1½ obols.
The temple of Apollo at Delphi was destroyed by fire and/or earthquake in 373/2; a proposal to set up a building fund was perhaps made after the peace of spring 371 (cf. on 33). This was eventually done through the Amphictyony ('league of neighbours'), the body, consisting mostly of central Greek states, which was responsible both for the sanctuary of Apollo at Delphi and for the sanctuary of Demeter at Anthela (near Thermopylae: whence the name Pylaia given to the two major sessions each year). Davies surveys the different series of documents generated by this operation, and the politics behind the bureaucracy. These payments are dated by the archon of the city of Delphi.

A commission of  ναοποιοι ('temple-builders'), representing the various states within the Amphictyony, collected and spent the funds for the rebuilding of the temple. The 'first obol', a levy of 1 obol per person  (επικεφαλος οβολος) on the states belonging to the Amphictyony, was collected from spring 366 to spring 361 (the first to the eleventh Pylaiai in the numbered series), and a 'second obol' from spring 361 to autumn 356 (the eleventh to the twenty-second Pylaiai). Some member states seem to have paid the exact sums which they collected; others paid round sums; voluntary contributions were made by states outside the Amphictyony and by individuals; and the city of Delphi made available a very substantial 'credit' (οφειλήμα: C. Delphes, ii 31–2, and cf. 66. 9–16). The figures for Megara and Troezen which begin this list would reflect populations of 20,664 and 2,064 respectively. [Arist.] Oec. ii. 1346 A 5 mentions a poll tax (επικεφαλιον) as one kind of tax, and the examples of devices for raising money
61 Peisius: 4 drachmas of Attic; of this 2 Aeginetan drachmas, 4 obols.
63 Cteson: 4 drachmas of Attic; of this 2 Aeginetan drachmas, 4 obols.
67 Theodorus of Athens, actor: 70 drachmas.
70 Euteles: 2 drachmas.
71 Hegemon: 3 obols.
72 Damothemis son of Euphanes of Phaselis: 7 drachmas.
74 Ariston: 1 drachma.
75 Pancon of Thebes: 1 drachma.
76 Timeas of Apollonia: 70 drachmas.
78 Thrasybulus of Thespiae: 1 drachma.

which follow include several poll taxes.

The collection of money and work on the temple were interrupted by the Third Sacred War of 356–346 but resumed afterwards (cf. 66), and the major work was completed in 334 and the statues were placed in the pediments in 327/6. The naopoi were kept in existence for maintenance work, and continue to be attested until the mid third century.

Income is reckoned in Aeginetan currency, with 6 obols = 1 drachma and 70 drachmas = 1 mina (so that the larger payments tend to be 70 drachmas or a multiple of that). Athenian currency is converted, at 10 Athenian drachmas = 7 Aeginetan (ll. i. 21–3; cf. Ath. Pol. 10. ii with Rhodes ad loc., Plut. Sol. 15. iv) or 3 Athenian = 2 Aeginetan (i. 57–66: but contr. C. Delphes, ii 1, where the total shows that a small sum was converted at the rate of 10 = 7 and rounded up to the nearest obol). Likewise Lygdamis of Tragilus (i. 35–6) probably contributed 10 drachmas in his own currency and that has been converted at a rate of 3 = 2. Burford, The Greek Temple Builders at Epidauros, 83–5, notes that contributions both by cities and by individuals to the building fund of the sanctuary of Asclepius at Epidaurus were on the same scale as at Delphi; but the total collection of 8,530 drachmas (c.2 talents: ii. 23) in a semester pales into insignificance by comparison with the sums which Athens had collected annually in tribute from the Delian League, or with the 6,000 talents which Athens had in the treasury of Athena at the beginning of the Peloponnesian War (Thuc. ii. 13. iii).

The people of Apollonia contributed a shipment of barley, 'at their own expense
... to the sea', i.e. to Cirrha, the harbour below Delphi on the Gulf of Corinth: the Delphian named with the Apolloniate as bringing it presumably escorted it from there to Delphi. 3,000 Pheidonian medimnoi (the measures associated with the archaic tyrant Pheidon of Argos: Her. vi. 127. iii; cf. Ath. Pol. 10. ii with Rhodes ad loc.) were converted at a rate of 8 Pheidonian = 5 Delphic medimnoi, and the barley was sold, apparently for 2 Aeginetan drachmas per Delphic medimnos (half the price of wheat), with a loss of just under 4 7% of the barley in transit (J. Bousquet, BCH cix 1985, 233–4 = his Études, 123–4). The Athenian medimnos was c.52.5 l. (c.1 ½ bushels: Hultsch, Griechische und römische Metrologie, 107–8, 703; M. Lang, Agora, x. 44, 55), the Spartan half as much again (Dicaearchus ap. Ath. iv. 141 c with Plut. Lyv. 12. iii: c.72.75 l. according to Hultsch, 505); we do not know which standard the Delphians used. For the quantity cf. the consignments of corn sent by Cyrene in 96. Despite Tod, the ‘golden harvest’ of Plut. Pyth. Or. 401 f–402 a was surely a golden image and not this consignment of actual barley.

Of the less well known places, Cyphaera (i. i. 12) was in Phthiotic Achaea, in southern Thessaly; Tragilus (i. 35) near Amphipolis in Thrace; Apollonia (ii. i) near the coast of Illyria. It is noteworthy that contributors come from such distant places as Phaselis in southern Asia Minor (i. 72–3), Naucratis ‘from Egypt’ (i. 37), and Syracuse (i. 40) and Selinus (i. 46) in Sicily. ‘Arcadia’ (ll. 42–3) will be the Mantincean faction which was claiming to be the Arcadian federation (cf. 41). Among the individual
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Athenian deme decree from Halai Aixonides, c.360

Inscribed upon the front surface of a blue-grey marble cult table in the temple of Apollo Zoster at modern Vouliagmeni. In situ. Phot. AD xi 1927–8, p. 40 fig. 35; Gill, Greek Cult Tables, pi. 7.

Attic-Ionic. The inscription of the letters is unusually shallow.

K. Kourouniotis, AD xi 1927–8, 40–1 no. 4*; W. Peek, AM lvii 1942, 9–10 no. 7; Gill, Greek Cult Tables, no. 20; SEG xlii 112.
contributors six are women. The two men who brought the Naxian contribution added contributions of their own, and other Naxians made individual contributions too (i. 16–19 with 20–7); but the Apollonian who made the large individual contribution was not the man who brought his city's offering of barley (i. 76–7 with ii. 19–22). The other large individual contribution was made by Theodoros the Athenian actor (i. 67–8), who was one of the most famous actors of the time (e.g. Arist. Pol. vii. 1336 b 27–31, Rhet. iii. 1404 b21–3, Plut. Glor. Ath. 348 e; IG ii² 2325. 31 [?], 262, cf. Pickard-Cambridge, The Dramatic Festivals of Athens, 112–20: see F. Salvat in Thasiaca, 157–60): it is likely that the uncharacterized men named with him were actors and Athenians too (cf. SIG II2 239. B, n. n). The very small individual contributions will hardly have covered the cost of their inscription; but it was important to the contributors that they should be listed, and the inscription is not likely to have been costed with great precision in the late-twentieth-century manner.

Variations in spelling within the document depend on the naopoios who recorded each contribution (Bousquet, C. Delphes, ii, p. 49): notice particularly the Phocian oSeAou in i. 4 but oβολοῦ etc. regularly in the individual entries.


Resolved by the demesmen of Halai. Hagnotheus son of Ecphantides proposed: since Polyastratus, when he had been made priest of Apollo Zoster, executed his priestly duties in a fine and pious manner and worthy of the god, and equipped the temple in a way that displayed extreme love of honour, and has, with those elected from the demesmen, adorned the statues and looked after the sacrifice of the Zosteria according to the ancestral fashion, and gave account to the demesmen of his stewardship. For all this praise the priest of Apollo, Polyastratus son of Charmantides of Halai, and crown him with a crown of laurel for his piety and uprightness. And praise also those elected with him to look after the temple, and crown each of them with a crown of laurel, Theodotus son of Theodotus of Halai, Aescheas son of Phileriphus of Halai, Pantacles son of Socrates of Halai, Hagnias son of Melesias of Halai. Write up this
In almost every respect this is indistinguishable in form and content from the decree of a minor city-state. In fact it is an entirely typical Athenian deme decree (compare Rhodes, in Hansen (ed.), Sources, 91–112). The 139 Kleisthenic demes of Attica were villages or wards of the town which functioned as the smallest administrative units in classical Athens. They had various obligations to the city, notably providing a set number of representatives for the council of five hundred and assisting with military recruitment, but they also had very considerable independence. They ran their own religious calendar, raised their own finances (through local taxes, leasing of land, etc.), and honoured their own benefactors. They ran themselves in a democratic manner with more or less regular meetings (agora) of demesmen and elected officials; but unlike the city as a whole they appointed annually (by lot) a single man as demarch to run their affairs (see below 63; and generally Whitehead, Demes).

The deme which passed this decree refers to itself as Halai. Two separate demes refer to themselves as Halai, but were in different tribes and were distinguished for official purposes as Halai Aixonides, located in the area of modern Vouliagmeni and Ano Voula on the west coast of Attica, and archaeologically one of the best known of Attic demes; and Halai Araphenides, located at Loutsa on the east coast of Attica. The findspot of this inscription identifies this Halai as Halai Aixonides: it was found in the excavations of its major deme sanctuary on Cape Zoster, held to be the place where Leto loosed her girdle (zoster) before giving birth to Artemis and Apollo (Paus. i. 31. i; in Semos (FGnH 396 F 20) Apollo was actually born at Cape Zoster). Part of the residential centre of the deme has also been excavated (Osborne, Demos, 22–6, for a summary with further references; AD xxxii. B1, 40–42, xxxiii B1, 57–9, xxxiv B1, 76–81, 86–7; xxxvi B1, 48–53, xxxvii B1, 54–8, xxxviii B1, 49–52, xxxix B1, 36–43, xliv B1, 74, xlv B1, 74 for more recent discoveries), and the sanctuary of Aphrodite there has yielded further inscriptions (AM cxiii 1998, 235–48).

The majority of measures inscribed by demes, like the majority of measures inscribed by the city, are honours for individuals—members of the deme, other Athenians (as with Dercylus son of Autocles of Hagnous, honoured by the deme of Eleusis for his behaviour when general (IG ii² 1187)) or, occasionally, non-Athenians (so IG ii² 1185/6 from Eleusis). In this decree the demesmen of Halai Aixonides praise those of their number who have served them well, in this case a priest and those elected to look after the temple (for ad hoc deme committees see Whitehead, Demes, 145–7). In doing so they use the language used by honorific decrees moved by the city, but, as with decrees of other demes, they do not follow central practice slavishly. Particularly interesting here is the praise of the priest as equipping the temple ‘in a way that displayed extreme love of honour’ (Μέλι αυτος πιστεύοντας). Fifth-century Athenian decrees do not praise
decree and set it up in the temple of Apollo. Whatever expense is incurred the treasurer is to provide and to reckon it to the demesmen.

The people of Halai (crowned) Polystratus

The people of Halai (crowned) the elected officials

individuals for their love of honour, but it became common after the middle of the fourth century for men to be honoured for their love of honour and for bodies giving honours to declare that they did so to encourage love of honour (Whitehead, C&M xxxiv 1983, 55–74; Demes, 241–52). This decree is one of three deme decrees more or less securely dated before 350 (see below), which represent the earliest uses of ‘in a way that displayed love of honour’ as a term of epigraphic approbation. The particular phrase ([l]av φιλοστίμως) here is unique, which itself may suggest linguistic innovation. Arguably the coining of this new turn of phrase by a deme should cause little surprise: small groups were particularly dependent upon the good services of individuals, particularly affected by bad service, and so needed to encourage competitive acts of benefaction. More surprisingly, singling out ‘honesty’ and ‘piety’ as reasons for crowning is also a practice first attested by the sub-groups of the polis: ‘honesty’ first appears in tribal documents of the early fourth century and only from 342 in city decrees, ‘piety’ first appears at the deme level, either in this decree or in a decree of Eleusis (IG ii² 1186; see further Whitehead, C&M xlv 1993, 37–75 at 65).

All but one of the eleven inscriptions which record or result from decisions by the demesmen of Halai Aixonides seem to have some religious connection (the remaining inscription concerns the scrutiny of demarch and treasurers, requiring them to submit monthly accounts of income and expenditure; compare 63). This inscription is unusual (the closest parallel is an honorary decree of orgoanes, IG ii² 1246), in being inscribed not on a stele but on a cult table, used to lay out bloodless offerings. The cult of Apollo Zoster is also mentioned, along with cults of Artemis, Leto, and Athena, by Pausanias, but this is the only testimony to a Zosteria festival. Ancient lexica refer also to a cult of Apollo Kunneios (Parker, Athenian Religion, 304), and inscriptions testify to priestesses of Demeter Choe, Dionysus, and Heroine, and to a statue of Aphrodite. An inscription found in the Zoster excavations recording honours from the council and people of Athens for a priest suggests that at least one of the cults attracted the interest of the city as a whole. (For demes and religion see Osborne, Demos, ch. viii, Whitehead, Demes, ch. vii, R. Parker in Linders and Nordquist (edd.), Gifts to the Gods . . . 1985, 137–47, and 63).

Inscribed decrees frequently show demes spending large sums of money on honouring individuals with gold crowns (100 dr. each in two cases, 500 dr. each in 13 cases, and 1000 dr. each in 3 cases: Whitehead, Demes, 162–3; the polis regularly spends 500 dr. or 1000 dr.: see Henry, Honours, ch. ii, and 88). In the most extreme case known to us the deme of Athmonon spent half a talent honouring six of its members with gold crowns for religious services (IG ii² 1203 of 324/3). Halai Aixonides itself honoured one man, whose name is lost, with a crown to the value of 500 dr. (AM lxvii 1942, 8–9
no. 6). Foliage crowns may have been more frequently awarded than was recorded on stone. In this case the deme gives crowns of laurel (presumably because of the connection between laurel and Apollo; foliage crowns given by demes were normally of olive, although Icarion gives ivy in a Dionysiac context). The expense incurred here will therefore have been largely the expense of having the decision inscribed. Paying this money is made the responsibility of the treasurer (laimias); a treasurer, as here, or more commonly treasurers, are the most widely attested of all deme officials apart from demarchs, but in some demes the demarch himself may have had sole financial responsibility and often the demarch is involved with the treasurer(s) in financial affairs.

The priest honoured here is not otherwise known (unless he is the Polystratus of Halai whose allotment plate has been discovered (Kroll, no. 155)). We do not know how he was chosen for the priesthood; if he was a member of a priestly genos it was not, on this showing, particularly socially distinguished. By contrast three of the four epimeletai are among, or related to, members of a commission, almost certainly made up of wealthy men, responsible for erecting a statue of Aphrodite (IG 2 ii 2820). Aescheas son of Phileriphus was part of that commission and perhaps father of the
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Treaty between Athens and Thracian kings, 357

A fragment of a stele found on the Athenian Acropolis, now in the Epigraphical Museum. Attic-Ionic; stochedon 35 (length of lines guaranteed by the kings' names).

IG ii 2ους; SIG* 195; Tod 131.; ATL ii. 104, T 7823 [ll. 4–16, right-hand edge]; Str. 3074. Trans. Harding 64†. See also ATL iii. 319; Kahrstedt, Beiträge zur Geschichte der thrakischen Chersones, 28–31†; C. Velogianni, Teos àπριος i 1995, 136–70 (SEG xlv 55, 830) (largely †). (? denotes unaware of ATL text.)

\[
\begin{array}{c}
17 \text{[?]} \beta \alpha | [\eta] \theta [\epsilon] [\iota] [\nu] \\
15 \text{ka} [i] \text{oi sýmма} [\chi] [\alpha] [i] \\
11 \text{[?]} [\nu] [\mu] [\delta] [\text{do}][\kappa][\eta][?]
\end{array}
\]

\[
[4-\tau\nu\nu\delta\eta\ell\nu\delta\mu\pió\lambda\nu\delta\sigma[?\text{?}]\gamma\rho\varphi\\psi\nu\delta\nu\eta]
\]

5 ταῖσ στήλαις τελοῦσαι Βηρισαίδης [η Αιμαδόκου η Κ]-
[ερσεβλέπτης τους] φόρους καὶ Αθηνα[αιους υπάρχο] -
[νοιαί σύμμαξου, εδι[μυ] ρηποδίων Αθηναιοὺς πάσας]
[τὰς σωτάξεις, πράττειν Βηρισαίδην [καὶ Αιμαδόκου] -
[ν καὶ Κερσεβλέπτην κατά τό δυνατόν καὶ εάμα που [?] B] -

ATL pointed out that the right-hand edge of the stone is preserved and that editors have misplaced the line divisions. 4-7 ATL: ὑποστέλεται ὑπάρχουσι εὖ | ταῖσ στήλαις seems doubtful. 6-7 ATL: ὑποστέλει ὑπάρχουσι εὖ | ταῖσ στήλαις seems doubtful. 4-5 γραφήσειν εὖ | ταῖσ στήλαις seems doubtful. 4-7 ATL: ὑποστέλεται ὑπάρχουσι εὖ | ταῖσ στήλαις seems doubtful. 6-8 πάσας | τὰς σωτάξεις P.J.R.: ἀπεσαῆ τὴν σῷνταχα ἈΣ; Cawkwell, ἸΣ 1981, 45 n. 25, wondered about τὴν πρὸσοδόν (comparing Dem. xiv, Arist. ii 110) or, better, ἀπενεταὶ τὰ καθήκοντα, here and in 16; ἀλ πόλεις τὸς φόρους εὖ | ταῖσ στήλαις seems doubtful. 6-7 ATL: ὑποστέλεται ὑπάρχουσι εὖ | ταῖσ στήλαις seems doubtful. 4-5 γραφήσειν εὖ | ταῖσ στήλαις seems doubtful. 4-7 ATL: ὑποστέλεται ὑπάρχουσι εὖ | ταῖσ στήλαις seems doubtful. 6-8 πάσας | τὰς σωτάξεις P.J.R.: ἀπεσαῆ τὴν σ_MSK: περὶ δὲ τίμω εὖ | ταῖσ στήλαις seems doubtful. 6-7 ATL: ὑποστέλεται ὑπάρχουσι εὖ | ταῖσ στήλαις seems doubtful. 4-5 γραφήσειν εὖ | ταῖσ στήλαις seems doubtful. 4-7 ATL: ὑποστέλεται ὑπάρχουσι εὖ | ταῖσ στήλαις seems doubtful. 6-8 πάσας | τὰς σωτάξεις P.J.R.: ἀπεσαῆ τὴν σ_MSK: περὶ δὲ τίμω εὖ | ταῖσ στήλαις seems doubtful. 6-7 ATL: ὑποστέλεται ὑπάρχουσι εὖ | ταῖσ στήλαις seems doubtful. 4-5 γραφήσειν εὖ | ταῖσ στήλαις seems doubtful.
man who appears in the *hekatostai* inscriptions as demarch of Halai Aixonides later in the century (Lambert, *Rationes Centesimarum*, F 9A.17–18 with 175–6) selling off at least three properties, two of which together fetch four talents; Theodotus son of Theodotus is likely to be related to one or both of [Theoj]boulos son of [Th]eodotus and [Theoj]dotus son of Theaetetus; Pantacles son of Socrates might be related to Diotheides son of Socrates and his son (for whom see \^PE cxxv 1999, 121 n. 26). Hagnoteus son of Ecphantides, the proposer of this decree, is the likely father of Euphiletus son of Hagnoteus and Theodorus son of Hagnoteus who were part of that commission, his own grave *stele* may have been discovered in the Athenian Agora (*Agora*, xvii no. 52), and his grandson may be the proposer of a decree found in the Aphrodision (*AM* cxiii 1998, no. 3). The links with *IG* n 2820 provide the best evidence for the date of this decree. n 2820 is dated by the associations of those named in it, in particular Astyphilus son of Philagrus, who is known to have proposed decrees in the city in 377 and 373/2, and Nicomenes son of Hiero, who was an amphictyon to Delos in 375/4–373/2 (28) (whose presence points to a date c.360) and Euctemon son of Euthemon, syntierarch in 322, who appears along with his own father and whose presence perhaps argues for a date closer to 350 than 360.

---

4 Of the Greek cities which are written on the *stelai* (?) as paying tribute to Berisades or Amadocus or Cersuleptes and as being allies of the Athenians, if they do not give up to the Athenians all their *syntaxeis*, they shall be exacted by Berisades and Amadocus and Cersuleptes as far as possible; and if anywhere (?) they do not give to Berisades or Amadocus or Cersuleptes all their tribute, it shall be exacted by the Athenians and the generals in charge of the force as far as possible.
About the end of 360 king Gotys of the Odrysian Thracians was murdered, and his son Cersebleptes (second vowel e in inscriptions; o in literary texts, probably under the influence of ‘Chersonese’) was challenged by two rivals, Berisades and Amadocus. On this kingdom see Archibald, *The Odrysian Kingdom of Thrace*, esp. 93–125 ch. iv, 213–39 ch. ix; K. Jordanov in *Pistiros*, i. 223–40 ch. xxi. The kingdom included the north-east Aegean coast, the Chersonese, and the European coast of the Propontis. The Athenians, who were always anxious to secure their trade route from the Black Sea, had revived their interest in the region soon after the end of the Peloponnesian War, and in the 360s had begun to reassert their territorial claims there (cf. on 38). A series of agreements was attempted, which gave Athens no satisfaction: this inscription presumably reflects the final treaty, negotiated by Chares in 357 (Dem. xxiii. Arist. 163–78). It appears that essentially the kingdom was divided, with Berisades taking the western part, Amadocus the central, and Cersebleptes the eastern; but for some purposes, as in our inscription, the three were regarded as joint rulers of the whole.

There are still uncertainties of detail, though the reconstruction in *ATL* marks a great improvement on earlier reconstructions, but the general purport of the decree is clear from what survives on the stone. Kahrstedt follows P. Foucart (*MAI* xxxviii. ii 1911, 83–120 at 97–9) in thinking that ll. 4–13 and 13–18 are concerned with different groups of cities, but that need not be the case. Some Greek cities in Thrace seem to have been simultaneously tributary dependants of the Thracian kings (perhaps since the beginning of the century, which would be long enough to justify ‘traditional’
The Greek cities in Thrace, paying to Berisades and Amadocus and Cercebleptes the traditional tribute and to the Athenians the syntaxis, shall be free and autonomous, being allies of the Athenians as they swore and of Berisades and Amadocus and Cercebleptes.

If any of the allies defects from Athens, Berisades and Amadocus and Cercebleptes shall go in support as called on by the Athenians; if 

l. 15) and owing something to the Athenians, most easily interpreted as the syntaxis due from members of their League (if the syntaxis were not technically due ‘to Athens’, the language of this decree will be a sign that the Athenians were becoming careless in such matters), and each party agrees to exact what is due to the other. The cities are to be free and autonomous, in a relationship with both parties, and have sworn an oath to the Athenians. If they defect from Athens the kings are to support Athens; and probably the text continued by stating that if they defect from the kings Athens will support the kings.

Berisades, in the west, died in 357/6 and was succeeded by his sons, the eldest of whom was Cetriporis, and they joined Athens and others in an ineffectual alliance against Philip (cf. 53). Philip gradually pushed eastwards into Thrace. Amadocus, in the centre, resisted Philip in 353 (D.S. xvi. 34. i, Dem. xxiii. Arist. 183, Polyacen. iv. 4. xxii: see [Hammond &] Griffith, ii. 264–6), but in 352 his son, another Amadocus, supported Philip in a campaign against Cercebleptes (schol. Aesch. n. Embassy 81 [178 Dilts], Thp. FGrH i 115 F 101: see [Hammond &] Griffith, ii. 282–3). In 353 the Athenians under Chares captured Sestos in the Chersonese; but Cercebleptes was sufficiently alarmed by Philip to make an alliance with Athens and allow cleruchies to be established in the Chersonese (D.S. xvi. 34. iii–iv, cf. IG ii² 1613. 297–8): Philip fought against him in 352/1 and 346, and finally in 342/1 removed both him and Teres, the current ruler of the central kingdom.
Alliance between Athens and Carystus, 357/6

Three contiguous fragments of a stele fr. a (bottom left) found below the cave of Pan, on the north-west slope of the Athenian Acropolis, finding-places of frs. b and c unknown; all now in the Epigraphical Museum.

Attic-Ionic, retaining the old e for α once (l. 11) and o for oe sometimes; l. 1–17 stoichedon 45; 18 sqq. non-stoichedon.

Συναγαγόμενον τοῖς ἀθήναις, 357/6. Found below the cave of Pan, on the north-west slope of the Athenian Acropolis, finding-places of frs. b and c unknown; all now in the Epigraphical Museum.

Ἀλέξιος Κακώκωλ.
1 This decree shall be written up on the Acropolis by the secretary by the prytany: the money for the stele shall be given by the treasurer of the people from the fund for expenditure on decrees.

4 Appoint five men who shall go to receive the oaths from the Carystians. The generals who are in Athens and the council shall swear to them.

7 Praise the people of Carystus and the Carystian envoys and synedros, and invite them to hospitality in the prytaneion tomorrow. Praise also Meno the general and the envoys sent to Carystus, and invite them to dinner in the prytaneion tomorrow. They shall also be given as travelling expenses by the treasurer of the people 20 drachmas from the people’s fund for expenditure on decrees. The treasurer of the people shall also give to the envoys who served on embassies to Eretria and Chalcis and Hestiaea 20 drachmas each. Also to those who negotiated the alliance the treasurer of the people shall give 10 drachmas each.

18 The following swore: the council of the archonship of Agathocles [357/6]; the generals [Chabrias of Aexone], Cha— of ——, Iphicrates of Rhamnus, Meno of Potamus, Philochares of Rhamnus, Execestides of Thoricus, Alcimachus of Anagyrus, Diocles of Alopece.
On the history of Athens' relations with the cities of Euboea in the fourth century see Knoepfler. They had joined the Second Athenian League soon after its foundation (22. ii. 80–4, i. 88, i. 90, 114, cf. commentary on 23), but after Leuctra they were allied to Thebes rather than Athens (X. H. vi. v. 23, D.S. xv. 76. i, 85. ii); it appears from l. 16 that by now there were only four cities in Euboea (cf. on 22). In the early 350s a dispute between pro-Theban and anti-Theban factions led to an invasion by Thebes and, urged by Timotheus, a prompt response by Athens, which after a campaign of only thirty days brought Euboea back into the Athenian League (D.S. xvi. 7. ii, Dem. xxi. Mith. 174. viii. Chers. 74, Aesch. in. 47. ii. 85). Our text is the end of a document embodying a new alliance with Carystus, at the south-eastern end of Euboea, and suggesting that there are similar new alliances with Eretria, Chalcis, and Hestiaea (but not referring to the smaller cities mentioned separately in 22: for four cities in Euboea cf. [Scyl.] 58 [i. 47 Müller], of about the same date). By the time of the decree Carystus has rejoined the League, and has a synedros who can be praised (ll. 8–9).

This inscription is one element in a complicated chronological problem. Diodorus narrates the Euboean episode under the year 358/7. He narrates Athens' Social War under 358/7 and 356/5, stating at the beginning that it lasted three years and at the end that it lasted four (xvi. 7. iii–iv, 21–2), whereas Dionysius of Halicarnassus assigns the war to the two years 357/6 and 356/5 (Lys. 12. i. 21 Ush. & Rademacher = i. 44–5 Usher). In the battle of Chios, early in the war, Chares was in command of the Athenian infantry, and Chabrias was with the navy (as a general according to Diodorus; as a privatus according to Nepos, perhaps supported by Demosthenes) and was killed (D.S. xvi. 7. iii–iv; Nep. xii. Chab. 4, cf. Dem. xx. Lept. 82). Chares was also the man who negotiated the final treaty with the Thracian kings, in 357 (Dem. xxi. Arist. 173; cf. on 47).

In the list of generals in this inscription the first man named is Chabrias, and he has been deleted; the second is Ch—, whom editors have restored as Chares. We then have to construct a timetable which will allow Chares to be in Athens and to swear to the treaty, and to explain why Chabrias should have been deleted. It has come to be widely accepted that Athens' recovery of Euboea belongs to 358/7, and the beginning of the Social War, including the battle of Chios, also belongs to summer 357 (Schweigert: no discussion of this with the republication of that text as Agora, xvi 53). It is then said that Chabrias was deleted from our inscription, which belongs to 357/6 (l. 19), because he was expected to swear but was not available to do so because in the meantime he had been killed (Schweigert, Peake), or, allowing the battle to fall in 357/6 and our inscription to precede it, because he was deposed after his own attempt to negotiate with the Thracian kings (Tod: cf. Dem. xxi. Arist. 171–2); as a variant on this, Kahrstedt suggested that Chabrias' name should never have been included, was inscribed in error for Chares', and was immediately deleted (op. cit., 28 n. 80). However, it is difficult to construct a credible timetable for Chares on this assumption, and these explanations of Chabrias' deletion are less than satisfactory, so we prefer the alternative reconstruction of Cawkwell: he suggests that the second name in the list of generals was not Chares but Chabrias, inscribed twice in error and so deleted once; the recovery of Euboea is to be dated late 358/7 or early 357/6, Chares will have
been unavailable to swear because he went to Thrace immediately afterwards, and
the Social War will have occupied the Athenian years 357/6 and 356/5 and the Julian
years 356 and 355. Klaftenbach's restoration of ll. 6–7 matches the list of those who
swore the oath and explains why only seven did so.

For Chabrias cf. 39. Chares is frequently attested as general between 367/6 (X. H.
iii. ii. 17–23, D.S. xv. 75. iii) and 338/7 (D.S. xvi. 85. ii), and is said to have been in
command of the mercenary force at Taenarum, in Laconia, in 324 ([Plut.] X Or. 84.8 e).
Iphicrates is first mentioned as commander of the mercenary force established at
Corinth by Conon in 393 (Harp. ξενωκόν εν Κορίνθῳ (§ 2 Keane), Dem. iv. Phil. i.
24, cf. X. H. iv. iv. 9–12, D.S. xiv. 86. iii; in the battle of Embata, towards the end of
the Social War, he and Timotheus were not willing to fight when Chares was (D.S.
xvi. 21. iv), after which they were put on trial, and Timotheus was condemned but
Iphicrates was acquitted (Isoc. xv. Antid. 129; D.S. has both condemned). Meno, the
general praised in l. 10, had served as a general in the Hellespont in 362/1, after
which he was prosecuted but acquitted or not severely punished ([Dem.] l. Poly. 12–14
cf. Dem.xxxvi. Phorm. 53). For Execestides see on 44. Alcimachus had been general
previously in 364/3 (schol. Aesch. n. Embassy 31 (6Ja Dilts)); his generalship this year
is mentioned by [Dem.] xlvii. Ev. Μν. 50, 78; and he was perhaps general again
later (Harp. Ἀλκίμαχος (a 76 Keaney)). Diocles presumably served in Euboea,
and made a treaty with Thebes at the end of the campaign (Dem. xxii. Mid. 174); he is
attested more than once as a trierarch (APF, 157).

Whether or not Chares was listed in this inscription, he was certainly a general in
357/6. We thus know eight of the ten generals for this year: two are from the same
tribe, and indeed from the same deme (Iphicrates and Philochares), but otherwise
each is from a different tribe (the three unaccounted for being Aeges, Oeneis, and
Hippothontis). From at any rate c.440 the original principle of one general per tribe
had been retained as a norm, but at least one exception in a year had been allowed
and possibly more than one; by the time when Ath. Pol. was written, in the 330s, ten
generals were elected irrespective of tribal membership (Ath. Pol. 22. ii, 61. i, with
Rhodes ad loc.; for an up-to-date treatment of the subject see L. G. Mitchell, Klio
lxxxii 2000, 344–60). This is the last year for which we can be reasonably confident
that the system of the late fifth and early fourth centuries was still in operation. In
ll. 2–3 we have (restored, but reliably) perhaps the first surviving occurrence of the
new title, 'secretary by the prytany', for the principal secretary (cf. on 38). It is not
clear to the modern reader who 'those who negotiated the alliance' (ll. 17–18) are:
perhaps the envoys to Athens from Carystus, though it would be surprising to find
Athens paying their expenses.

Athens was to be involved with Euboea again in 348, when an attempt to support
a pro-Athenian leader misfired and Athens lost the allegiance of the Euboeans (cf. on
69); and in 343–341, when Philip of Macedon supported partisans of his but Athens
successfully supported men who favoured Athens. Of other inscriptions concerned
with Euboea, IG n° 147, a small fragment of an alliance mentioning Chalcis, and
149, an alliance with 'the Euboeans', have been dated in the 330s (but are perhaps
to be dated earlier: M. B. Walbank, BSA lxxxv 1990, 437 no. 3 (147), Knoepfler, 324–
31 [149]), and 230 (revised Knoepfler, REG xcviii 1985, 243–59 = SEG xxxv 59), an alliance with Eretria, in the late 340s (in 341, Les Relations internationales, 346–59); another

Opponents of Philip II of Macedon expelled from Amphipolis, 357/6


Euboean-Ionic (eo for eu is an East Ionic feature, found also in Amphipolis and Thasos: Buck §33; stoichedon 16.

SIG* 194; Tod 150*; Buck 12; Hatzopoulos, Macedonian Institutions, no. 40. Trans. Harding 63.

ἐδοξέων τῶν δήμων. Φίλωνα καὶ Στρατοκλέως ἄνθως ἀμφίπολιν καὶ τὴν γῆν τὴν Ἀμφίπολιν ιπολυτέων ἀειφυγίην, καὶ αὐτὸς καὶ τὸς παιδᾶς, καὶ ἤμι πὸ ἀλλισκοντα πάσχεν αὐτὸς ὡς πολεμίος καὶ νηπονεὶ τεθνάναι.

τὰ δὲ χρήματ᾽ αὐτῶν δημόσια εἰναι, τὸ δὲ ἐπιδέκατον ἵρον τὸ Ἀμφίπολον καὶ τὸ Στρατοκλῆνος. τὸς δὲ προστάτας ἀναγράφαι αὐτὸς ἀειφυγίην ἐστὶν. ἦν δὲ τις τὸ ψήφισμα ἀναφηβίζει ἤ κατάδεικται τούτος τεχνητὸς ἐπιστήμων, τὰ χρήματ᾽ αὐτὸ δημοσία ἑστὶ καὶ αὐτὸς φεογέτω Αμφίπολιν ἀειφυγίην. vacat
Resolved by the people.

1 Philon and Stratocles shall be exiled from Amphipolis and the land of the Amphipolitans for perpetual exile, both themselves and their children, and if they are caught anywhere they shall be treated as enemies and killed with impunity. Their goods shall be public, the tenth being sacred property of Apollo and Strymon.

15 The *prostatai* shall write them up on a stone *stèle*.

18 If any one reverses this decree or receives them by any craft or contrivance whatsoever, his goods shall be public and he shall be exiled from Amphipolis for perpetual exile.
Since 368 the Athenians had been trying to recover their colony of Amphipolis (cf. on 38). Philip of Macedon, when trying at the beginning of his reign to detach support from rival claimants, withdrew the garrison which Perdiccas had sent to defend it against Athens (D.S. xvi. 3. iii), and encouraged the Athenians to think that he would allow them to regain possession of it (D.S. xvi. 4. i, cf. Dem. xxm. Arist. 116, 121, it. Ol. ii. 6 with Thp. FGrH 115 F 30, [Dem.] vii. Hal. 27–8. Polyaen. iv. 2. xviii; there were perhaps secret talks but not a treaty (cf. G. E. M. de Ste Croix, CQ xxiii 1963, 110–19)). In 357, however, having dealt with his rivals, he attacked Amphipolis and, though sending reassurances to Athens, took it for himself, leaving the Athenians to feel cheated (D.S. xvi. 8. ii). There was a party in Amphipolis which had wanted an alliance with Athens; among the envoys to Athens we hear of Hierax, named in IGiv². 94. 18 as the recipient of sacred envoys (theaorodokos) in Amphipolis from Epidaurus, and Stratocles, named in our inscription, but not of Philon, the other man named in our inscription (Dem. i. Ol. i. 8. Thp. FGrH 115 F 42). Diodorus writes that after taking Amphipolis Philip ‘exiled those who were unfavourably disposed to him’, and this decree presumably shows the city passing sentences of exile on his behalf (but Errington, History of Macedonia, 272–3 n. 3, wonders if the decree is to be dated before Philip’s capture of the city).
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Alliance between Philip II and the Chalcidians, 357/6

A fragment of a block of limestone, found a short distance to the west of Olynthus; now in the museum at Thessaloniki (no. 2276). Phot. TAPA 1934, pl. 1; Hatzopoulos, Macedonian Institutions, pl. iii. Facs. TAPA 1934, 104.

Lt. 1–11 Euboean-Ionic, 12 sqq. (oracle) Delphian; irregular script, inscribed with horizontal guidelines.

D. M. Robinson, TAPA 1934, 103–22 no. 1; M. Segre, RHC kiii = xiii 1935, 497–502; Tod 158*; Sit. 308; Hatzopoulos, Macedonian Institutions, no. 2. Trans. Harding 67. See also [Hammond &] Griffith, ii. 243–52.

---

[traces]

έχοντες  

σύμμαχός κατ’  

[α τὰ ὀμολογημένα. Ἐχαλκιδέων] μὲν ὄμνυει υπὸ Φιλίππησι τὰς ἤρπες τὰς τὰς εὐνάσι καὶ τοὺς  

[ὑπὲρ τραπεσιότας (?); τοῖς δὲ Χαλκιδῶν] δεύσασι αὐτὸν καὶ ὄνδαν ἀλλοί Χαλκιδὲς κελέσωσι -  

[σι. ὄμνυεν δὲ αὐτοῦ ἄδολος καὶ ἀπεχνεω] δοὺ, μαὰ Δία, Ἰρύμ, Ἡλιομα, Ποσειδώνα, ἔως  

[κέουσι μὲν πολλὰ καὶ ἀγαθὰ γενομέναι, ἐπιορκέουσι δὲ πολλὰ καὶ κακά, ὄμνυεν  

[δὲ τάμνω-  


———

[traces]

Προσέβθετας Segre: see commentary.
It is certainly significant that formally the sentences are decreed by the city rather than proclaimed by Philip, but commentators have gone too far in remarking on ‘its democracy unimpaired’ (quotation from [Hammond & Griffith, ii. 351]). The enactment formula, ‘Resolved by the people’, is not a very strong pointer to democracy; on the other side of the balance, there is no indication of the proposer of the decree or of any responsible officials. In our translation of the entrenchment clause (cf. 22, 54) we use ‘reverses’ for anapsephizei (I. 19): the verb is found also in Thuc. vi. 14; it is not clear whether it refers here to a presiding official who puts a decree of reversal to the vote (which is how epipsephizein is used) or to citizens who propose or vote for such a decree.

Amphipolis had been colonized by Athens, but a large proportion of the settlers were not Athenians (Thuc. iv. 106. i) and it had been independent of Athens since 424/3. The dialect of our inscription is the Euboean form of Ionic, as used also at Olynthus (12, 50). In ll. 12–15 tithes are dedicated to Apollo and to Strymon; Amphipolis was situated on the River Strymon, near its mouth; Strymon already appears as a god in Hes. Theog. 339; in 480 the Magi sacrificed to Strymon when Xerxes crossed the river (Her. vii. 113. ii).

--- having --- alliance ---

2 I shall be an ally in accordance with what has been agreed.

3 Of the Chalcidians there shall swear to Philip the common officials and the envoys; to the Chalcidians, himself and such others as the Chalcidians command. They shall swear without deceit and without craft, by Zeus, Earth, Sun, Poseidon, that to those who keep the oath there shall be much good but to those who break the oath much ill. Both parties shall swear with oath-sacrifices.
Alliance Between Philip II and the Chalcidians

Philip succeeded his brother Perdiccas as king of Macedon in 359, when the Dardanian Illyrians, to the north-west of Macedon, had defeated and killed Perdiccas, and the Paeonians, to the north, were making raids on Macedon. While beginning to revive the Macedonian army he made peace with the Paeonians; but in 358 he attacked and defeated first the Paeonians and then the Illyrians. At the same time he had to deal with rival claimants to the throne: Argaeus, backed by the Athenians, to whom he suggested that he would allow them to take Amphipolis (cf. on 49), and Pausanias, backed by Berisades, the king of western Thrace (cf. on 47), whom he bought off (D.S. xvi. 2. iv—v. vii, cf. 8. i). In 357 he alienated the Athenians by taking Amphipolis for himself, after which they declared war on him; he outbid the Athenians in gaining an alliance with the Chalcidian state centred on Olynthus, eventually in 356 capturing Potidaea from the Athenians and giving it to the Chalcidians; and meanwhile, moving further east, he captured Crenides and refounded it as Philippi (D.S. xvi. 8. ii—vii: cf. 53). We learn from other sources that Philip offered the Chalcidians Anthemus (on the river which flows from the east into the Thermaic Gulf: cf. Zahrnt, Olynth und die Chalkider, 152—4) as well as Potidaea (Dem. vi. Phil. n. 20), that the war against Athens was to be waged jointly and ended jointly, and that (as in ll. 10—11 of our inscription) there was provision for amendment by agreement (Lib. hyp. 2 to Dem. i. Ol. i). This alliance will have preceded the campaigning season of 356; the surviving part of the inscription gives us not the formulation of the alliance proper but the provisions for oath-taking, publication and amendment, and the text of a Delphic oracle.
These writings shall be written on a stele, and the oracle given by the God about the alliance the Chalcidians shall dedicate in the sanctuary of Artemis at Olynthus, and Philip at Dium in the sanctuary of Olympian Zeus, and copies of the oracle and stele shall be placed at Delphi.

It shall be permitted to amend these writings by common discussion in a period of three months (?), whatever is resolved by Philip and the Chalcidians.

The God responded to the Chalcidians and Philip:

It is preferable and better to become friends and allies in accordance with the agreement. Sacrifice and obtain good omens from Zeus Teleos and Hypatos, Apollo Prostaterios, Artemis Orthosia, Hermes; and pray that the alliance will be with good fortune; and give back thank-offerings to Pythian Apollo, and remember your gifts.

If Segre and Tod were right in their interpretation of l. 3 there were ‘common officials’ of a Chalcidian state which could be distinguished from the polis of Olynthus. D. J. Mosley has objected to the restoration of ll. 3–4 that it was not normal practice for the envoys who negotiated a treaty to swear to it (PCPS 2 vii 1961, 59–63), the clearest exception being the Peace of Nicias in 421, where on each side the seventeen oath-takers seem to have included ten men who had conducted preliminary negotiations (Thuc. v. 18. ix, 19. ii, D.S. xii. 75. iv, with A. Andrewes & D. M. Lewis, JHS lxxvii 1957, 177–80). Zeus, Earth, Sun, and Poseidon (l. 5) represent Empedocles’ four elements of air, earth, fire, and water: they appear in other oaths in 53, 76. For good or bad consequences for keeping or breaking the oath (ll. 5–6) cf. 39. For oath-sacrifices (ll. 6–7) cf. e.g. M&L 32 ~ Fornara 70. 44, and in our collection 68.

For publication the Chalcidians were to use the sanctuary of a goddess (ll. 8–9), and Robinson suggested that since Apollo was prominent at Olynthus Artemis is likely to have been prominent there too. For Philip’s sanctuary of Olympian Zeus at Dium cf. Dem. xix. Embassy 192 with schol. (383 Dilts), D.S. xvi. 55. i). For publication in the participating states and in a major panhellenic sanctuary cf. Thuc. v. 18. x, 47. xii: in this case the obtaining of an oracle from Delphi made publication there particularly appropriate.

We know no good parallel for Segre’s restoration of a provision for amendment but only within three months (ll. 10–11); but an early text from Elis allows amendment up to a limit of three times (I. Olympia 7 = Buck 64). The text which Tod ‘hankered after’
would mean 'It shall be permitted to both parties to change using joint decision'; but the omicron at the end of l. 10 is clear in the photograph.

The Delphic oracle (l. 12–16) is the most striking feature of the document. States commonly consulted the oracle on religious matters (cf. 58), or else on matters which were controversial at home, in order to obtain external support for the line of action proposed (cf. R. C. T. Parker, *Crux...* G. E. M. de Ste Croix, 298–326). This consultation followed the standard form, of asking whether it was ‘preferable and better’ to do $X$ or not, or to do $X$ or $Y$; but universal silence suggests that it was not normal practice to obtain an oracle before agreeing to a treaty. Philip will not have needed external support for the policy to which he chose to commit Macedon. Segre stressed that, although Delphi gave its blessing to the making of the alliance, it was not asked to pronounce on the details, and A. D. Nock, building on that, suggested that this exceptional use of Delphi was the doing of Philip, ‘with an eye on Greek public opinion’ (*P. A. Philos.* S. lxxxv 1942, 472 n. 2 = his *Essays on Religion and the Ancient World*, ii. 534–5 n. 2). Griffith, however, thought that the consultation might have been an Olynthian device to delay the ratification of the alliance in case Olynthus might after all be offered terms which would justify an alliance with Athens instead. The Phocians’ seizure of Delphi is to be dated to 356, and the formal declaration of a Sacred War against the Phocians, in which Philip was to join though not immediately, to winter 356/5 (N. G. L. Hammond, *JHS* lvii 1937, 44–78 = his *Studies in Greek History*, 486–533; Buckler, *Philip II and the Sacred War*, 148–58, agrees on those dates). Delphi was consulted and this alliance was made earlier than that, i.e. at a time when Delphi was under Theban influence and hostile to Athens (cf. *SIG* 175 = *IG* ii 109; 176): Philip had not yet had occasion to interest himself in Delphi, but Delphi could be expected to favour this alliance. In its

---

### 51

**Arcesine honours Androtion, 357/6 (?)**

The upper part of a stele found at Arcesine; now in the museum at Syros. Phot. *IG* xii. vii. 5 (part of l. 1–7).

Attic-Ionic, retaining the old $e$ for $e$ once and $o$ for $ω$ three times; stoichedon 29, but with additional iota in l. 10 (spaces 2–3 and 9–10) and 16, 23 (at the ends of the lines).

*IG* xii. vii. 5; *SIG* 193; Tod 152*. Trans. Harding 68. See also F. Jacoby, *FGrH* 324; Cargill, *The Second Athenian League*, 155–9; Harding, *Androtion and the Aithis*.

εδοξεν τῇ βουλῇ καὶ τῶι δήμῳ τῶι

Αρκεσίνεων. ε[π]ειδὴ Αιδροτῶν ἄνὴρ

ἀγαθὸς γέγονε περὶ τῶν δήμων τῶν Ἀρ-

κεσίνεων· καὶ ἄρξας τῆς πόλεως οὐδὲ-

να τῶν πολιτῶν οὐδὲ τῶν ἔξων τῶν ἀφ-

ικουμένων εἰς τὴν πόλιν ἑλύπησε· κ-

αἰ χρῆματα δανείσας ἐγκαίρω ὡς πῆ-
response it limited itself to a direct answer to the question which must have been put to it, and to religious advice which included gratitude to Pythian Apollo.

The oracle has been reconstructed by comparison with those quoted in Dem. xx. Mid. 52, [Dem.] xliii. Mac. 66. Zeus Teleos will be the fulfiller of prayers, as in e.g. Pind. Ol. xiii. 115, Aesch. Agam. 973; in Aesch. Eum. 28 Teleios is combined with Hypsistos, ‘highest’. Apollo is appropriately supplied before Artemis: he is Prostaterios, ‘protecting’, in Dem. xxi. Mid. 52; Artemis Orthosia, ‘making straight’ (cf. Orthia, the epithet under which she was worshipped in Sparta) is found in e.g. Pind. Ol. iii. 30, Her. iv. 87. ii.

There exists also an incompletely carved stone with the text of an alliance between the Chalcidians and Grabus, king of the Grabaeans Illyrians (on whom see 53), which presumably is to be dated slightly earlier, before the Chalcidians made this alliance with Philip, and was superseded by this alliance (D. M. Robinson, TAPA lxix 1938, 44–7 no. 2 = Sst. 307).

At first Philip gratified the Chalcidians (cf. above); but the continued expansion of his kingdom inevitably posed a threat to Chalcidian independence. By the late 350s the Chalcidians ‘had made the Athenians friends and said they would make them allies’ (Dem. xxi Arist. 107–9); Philip seems to have made a move against Olynthus during his return from a campaign against the Thracian Cerseblepites in 351 (Dem. iv. Phil. i. 17, 1. Ol. i. 13); and in 349/8 he conducted a major campaign which ended with the betrayal of Olynthus to him (D.S. xvi. 53). Tod 166 has been restored as a decree by which Athens grants Olynthian refugees exemption from the metics’ tax—but the name of the Olynthians is restored, and the Methoneans (expelled when Philip captured their city in 354: D.S. xvi. 34. iv–v) have also been suggested.

Resolved by the council and the people of Arcesine.

2 Since Androtion has been a good man with regard to the people of Arcesine; and in governing the city has not distressed any of the citizens or of the foreigners arriving in the city; and lent money to the city in a crisis and
Amorgus, in the Cyclades, had three cities, all on the north-west-facing side of the island: Aegiale towards the north-east, Arcesine towards the south-west, and Minoa, with the best harbour, a short distance north-east of Arcesine (see maps in IG xii vii; Barrington Atlas, 61). It appears as a single entity in the tribute lists of the Delian League (e.g. IG i³ 279. ii. 80) and in the inscribed list of members of the Second Athenian League (22. 124); but here Arcesine functions as a separate polis, enacting its own decree, and we have earlier decrees of both Arcesine and Minoa (IG xii vii i, 3; 219); for another inscription from Amorgus see 59. Despite the promises made at the time of the League’s foundation, Arcesine has had to receive an Athenian governor and garrison, it has had to pay for the garrison itself, and Androtion as governor has behaved well in general and in particular has lent the city money without charging interest. The remark that he has not distressed any one (ll. 4—6) suggests that governors were perceived as likely to cause distress.

Androtion’s father Andron was a member of the Four Hundred in 411 but proposed the decree for the trial of Antiphon and others under the intermediate régime of 411/10 ([Plut.] X Or. 833 D—F, Harp. Ανδρόνων αί 133 Keaney)). Androtion himself was an active politician, serving twice in the council (IG ii 61. 6—7; Dem. xxii. Andr. 38), on a board concerned with the treasures of Athena, on a board collecting arrears of the property tax, eisphora, and on an embassy to Mausolus of Garia. He proposed honours for the council in which he served his second term, was prosecuted on the grounds that the council was not eligible for honours because it had not satisfied a ship-building requirement (Dem. xxii. Andr. is a supplementary speech for the prosecution), but
was willing to take no interest; and when the
city was in difficulties over the pay for the gar-
rison he advanced it from his own resources,
and on obtaining it at the end of the year he
exacted no interest; and he caused the city to
spend twelve minas less money each year;
and he ransomed those made prisoners of the
enemy whom he encountered:

16 Crown Androtion son of Andron of Athens
with a gold crown of five hundred drachmas
on account of his goodness and justice and
good will towards the city of Arcesine; and
write him up as proxenos and benefactor of the
city of Arcesine, both himself and his descend-
ants; and he shall have immunity [ateleia] of
all things.

24 Since it has also been resolved by the allies
--- likewise ---

appears to have been acquitted. He was the proposer of 64 in 347/6. He was the
author of an Atthis, a history of Athens: the latest known allusion in it is to an episode
of 344/3, where some accept a restoration that would make him the proposer of a
motion to give a cool response to Persia (Didym. In Dem. viii. 7–26 = Andr. FGrH 324
F 53: restoration accepted in Didym. ed. Pearson & Stephens, Jacoby; rejected Hard-
ing). He ended his life as an exile in Megara (Plut. De Exil. 605 c–d): it is not certain
that he was exiled because of the Persian episode or that he worked on his Atthis only
after he had gone into exile (maintained by Jacoby; rejected Harding).

The dating of this decree is bound up with the dating of his second year in the
council. The decree has been compared with 52 and has been thought appropriate to
the time of the Social War; Dem. xxii. Andr. is dated to 355/4 by Dion. Hal. Ad Amm.
4 (i. 260 Usener & Radermacher = ii. 312–3 Usher); and if that date is right Androtion
will have been a member of the council in 356/5 and his period of at least two years
[l. 14] in Arcesine will have ended not later than 357/6. If that is so, Arcesine will have
been subjected to a governor and a garrison before the outbreak of the Social War
gave Athens an excuse for taking such measures. D. M. Lewis argued that Andro-
tion’s year in the council was 359/8 (BSA xlix 1954, 43–4), in which case his period in
Arcesine could come after that and during the Social War; but his arguments have
not found favour (see R. Sealey, REG lxviii 1955, 89–92; G. L. Cawkwell, C&G xxiii
1962, 49–5).

For Athens’ original promise, unqualified, not to impose governors and garrisons,
and for breaches of it in the 370s, see 22, 21–3, and commentary on 24: for breaches at
the time of the Social War see Cargill. By not charging interest Androtion has saved Arcesine 12 minas = 1,200 drachmas each year: that points to loans of 1 talent or more

Athenian precautions for Andros, 357/6

A fragment of a stele found on the Athenian Acropolis, now in the Epigraphical Museum.

Attic-Ionic, retaining the old ε for ει in l. 5 and ο for ω in ll. 1, 6, and punctuating with : after the abbreviated demotic in l. 6; stelecheton 26 (but one space left vacant at the end of l. 2, and 37 letters crowded into l. 6, probably because τῆς, βολῆς καὶ was omitted in error when the text was laid out).

52

Andros, though close to Athens (it is immediately south-east of Euboea), did not join the Second Athenian League until, probably, 375 (22.112), and its history does not suggest enthusiastic support for Athens. In 480 it had submitted to the Persians, and after Salamis the Greeks’ attempts to extract money from it and to take it by siege were unsuccessful (Her. viii. 111–12, 121.1); in the Delian League it was subjected to
In the archonship of Agathocles [357/6]; in the ninth prytany, of Aegaeis; to which Diodotus son of Diocles from Angele was secretary; of the proedroi Diotimus of Oenoe was putting to the vote. Resolved by the council and the people. Hugesander proposed:

7 So that Andros shall be safe for the people of Athens and the people of Andros, and that the garrison in Andros shall have its pay out of the syntaxeis in accordance with the resolutions of the allies, and the guard shall not be broken off:

13 Appoint a general out of those who have been elected; the man appointed shall take care of Andros.

16 Also Archedemus shall exact the money from the islands which is due for the soldiers in Andros, and hand it over to the governor in Andros so that the soldiers shall have their pay.

a cleruchy, probably in 450 (Plut. Per. 11. v with Rhodes, CAH°, v. 60); it was on the Spartan side in 407 (X. H. i. iv. 21–3).

This decree was enacted in the early summer of 356, which falls uncontroversially within the Social War. Andros already has a garrison and a governor, but, whereas Arcesine had to pay for its own garrison, this garrison is to be paid out of the syntaxeis.
(cf. on 22) 'in accordance with the resolutions of the allies', and overdue syntaxeis are to be collected for the purpose (cf. 39, 12–14). One of the generals who have been elected, probably for the new year 356/5, is to 'take care of Andros', i.e. of its defence against dissident members of the League (cf. D.S. xvi. 21. ii) and perhaps internal dissidents too. For the chronology of the Social War and Athens' use of governors and garrisons cf. 51: in this instance Athens has the backing of the synedrion, and its declared aim is to keep Andros safe (cf. X. H. vii. iv. 4) for the Andrians, or at any rate for those of them who are pro-Athenian, as well as for the Athenians. The fact that this decree has been inscribed is remarkable: all that the surviving text does is give one of the generals a
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Alliance between Athens and Thracian, Paeonian, and Illyrian kings, 356/5

Three fragments of a stele, at the top of which was a relief showing a prancing horse: fr. a (1–14) was found on the Athenian Acropolis, b (9–24) and c (25 sqq.) between the theatre of Dionysus and the odeum of Herodes Atticus; now in the Epigraphical Museum. Phot. Svoronos, Das athener Nationalmuseum, Taf. cxv. Nr. 4 (fr. a and b only); Lawton, Reliefs, pl. 14 no. 27 (relief and ll. 1–4 only).

Attic-Ionic, occasionally retaining the old ε for ει and ο for ου οι in larger letters; ll. 2 sqq. stoicheion 44 (but l. 41 has to be restored with an additional iota at the end).

IG ii 127; SIG* 196; Tod 157*; Svt. 309. Trans. Harding 70. See also [Hammond &] Griffith, ii, 243–52.


συμμαχία Αθηναίων πρὸς Κετριπόρο [ιν τὸν Θράκικα καὶ τὸ]

υὸς ἄδελφοι καὶ πρὸς Λύσπευον τὸν [Παίονα καὶ πρὸς Γράβοι]

βοῦν τὸν Ἰλλυρίων. ἐπὶ Ἑλπίδον ἄρχον[τοσ· ἐπὶ τὴς Ἡπτομῆς]

5 [ντὸδ]ος πρῶτης πραταινείας· εἶπε[κάτη τῆς πραταινείας].

[τὸν πρό]εδρον ἐπεφήθαι[ε]ν Μηνίαρχο[ν — 8, ἐδοξεν]

[τῷ βο]λὶ καὶ τῶν δήμων. Καλλιθε[ν]ης εἶπεν ἀγαθῆ τῇ]

[χὶ τοῦ δήμῳ] τὸν Αθηναίων, δὲ[χ]εσθ[α] μὲν τὴν συμμαχίαν —

ν [ἐφ’ ὄς (?) Μονο]ύνος λέγει ἐδὲλφοις [ο]ς ὁ Κετριπόρους τὸν ἄ] —

10 [δὲ][δὸν τὸν αὐ]τὸν αὐνθεθεῖα καὶ τὸν [ἐσταλμένον παρὰ τὸ]

δήμῳ [τὸ Αθηναί]ων Κετριπόρο [τοὺς ἄδελφους καὶ Λ] -

υπε[πέλου τὸν Παῖοι] καὶ Γράβῳ [τῶν Ἰλλυρίων. τὸς δὲ πρὸ]

[ἐδρους] [οτὲ αὐ]ν λάχωσι π[ροσδρε] ὑ[ν] ἐς τὴν προτήν ἐκκήλαι —

αν προσ[ἀγαγεῖν ἐς τὸ]ν δήμ[ὸν Μονούνον τὸν ἄδελφον τ] —

15 [ὁν Κετρ]τόρόντος καὶ Πειεανάκτα καὶ τῶς πρεσβεῖας —

ας ἦκολ[ας παρὰ Λυσπεύον καὶ Γράβου καὶ — 9 τὸν]

παρὰ Χάρθητος ἦκοντα, γνώμην δὲ ἐξεμβάλλεσθαι τῆς βουλῆς —

ῆς ἐς τὸν δήμον, [ότι δοκεί τῇ βουλῇ τῇ μὲν συμμαχίαν]

1 Restored from IG ii 128.

9 etc. Μονούνον not certain.

special responsibility for Andros, and for seeing that already-existing arrangements work. Presumably at this critical time it was thought important to publicize Athens’ commitment to those of its allies who remained loyal.

For the family of the secretary see *APF*, 156–7. The proposer, Hegesander, was a brother of Hegesippus, for whom see 69. Archedemus may be one of the current year’s generals (one of the two not included in 48); there are several known bearers of the name in the mid fourth century. Aesch. 1. *Tim.* 107 alleges that at some time Timarchus paid half a talent to become governor of Andros. In 348/7 Andros was still loyal to Athens, and awarded Athens a crown (*IG II²* 1441. 12–13).
For the background to this alliance see on 50. In 357 Philip shocked the Athenians by capturing and keeping Amphipolis; he then made an alliance with the Chalcidians, and in 356 captured Potidaca and gave it to them; meanwhile, moving further east, he captured Crenides and refounded it as Philippi (D.S. xvi. 8. ii-vii). Crenides, about 9 miles (14 km.) from the sea, north-east of Mount Pangaeum, had been settled from Thasos to exploit the gold and silver mines of the region (D.S. xvi. 3. vii, under 360/59): it is probably to be identified with Datus/um, the settlement of which is attributed to the Athenian Callistratus ([Scyl.] 67 [i. 54—5 Müller], Harp. Δάτος (δ 7 Keaney) = (e.g.) Philoch. FGrH 328 F 44, cf. App. Bell. Civ. iv. 439), who was exiled in 361 (cf. on 31)—but P. Cournillon, REA c 1998, 115—24, follows [Scylax] in locating Datus, unlike Crenides/Philippi, on the coast, and E. N. Borza, in Barrington Atlas, 51, gives the label
Accept the alliance, since —— Chares —— of the Athenians
for war —— Lyppeus (?) —— the money.

Praise Cetriporis and his brothers because they are good men
with regard to the people of Athens. Praise also Monunius, the
brother who has come from Cetriporis, for his goodness and
good will, and invite him to hospitality in the prytaneion tomo-
row. Praise also Pisanax, and invite him to dinner in the pry-
taneion tomorrow. Invite the envoys who have come from the
other kings to hospitality in the prytaneion tomorrow.

If this decree needs anything in addition, the council shall have
power.

Envoys appointed: Lysicrates of Oenoe, Antimachus of ——,
Thrason of Erchia.

I swear by Zeus and Earth and Sun and Poseidon and Athena
and Ares that I shall be a friend and ally to Cetriporis and the
brothers of Cetriporis, and I shall wage the war with Cetriporis
against Philip without deceit and with all my strength as far as
possible, and I shall not put an end in advance to the war against
Philip without Cetriporis and his brothers; and the other places
which Philip holds I shall join with Cetriporis and his brothers
in subduing, and I shall join in taking Crenides with Cetriporis
and his brothers; and I shall give back ——

Daton to the valley north-west of Mount Pangacum. Philip responded to an appeal
from the city, which was under siege from the ‘Thracians’ (Steph. Byz. Φιλιππης),
probably the eastern kingdom of Cersebleptes (Collart, Philippes, ville de Macédoine,
146–56: this episode may belong to Cersebleptes’ war against the other kings, men-

When this alliance was made, the Grabaean Illyrians (cf. below) were under threat
after Philip’s defeat of their Dardanian neighbours, the Paeonians had a defeat to
avenge, Athens was feeling cheated over Amphipolis, and Cetriporis and his brothers
had been alarmed by Philip’s taking of Crenides. But nothing came of this alliance:
Athens was in the middle of the Social War (for the chronology see on 48), and Dio-
dorus records under 356/5 that the kings of the Thracians, Paeonians, and Illyrians
combined against Philip, but he appeared before they were ready to confront him and forced them to join the Macedonians (xvi. 22. iii). Plutarch reports a victory over the Illyrians won by Philip’s general Parmenio about August (Alex. 3. viii with Hamilton’s commentary on 3. v): our decree is probably to be dated 26 July.

The inscription wavers over the declension of Cetriporis’ name: his coins use the genitive Кетрипόριος [Head, Historia Nominum, 283–4]. The Paeonian Lyppeus, called Lyceus or Lycpeus on his coins (Head, 236), will have been the successor of the Agis whose death Diodorus records under 359/8 (xvi. 4. ii). Bardylis, the Illyrian king mentioned by D.S. xvi. 4. iv, was king of the Dardanians, adjoining the Paeonians on the west; Grabus, mentioned in our inscription, was ruler of the Grabaceans, between the Dardanians and the Adriatic (N. G. L. Hammond, BSAbd 1966, 239–53 = his Collected Studies, ii, 101–15). For a fifth-century Grabus see IG i3 162 = Walbank, Proxenies, 44.

Callisthenes is a common name, but it may be the same man who proposed this decree, who in 357/6 (if the speech is correctly dated to 355/4: Dion. Hal. 724. Amm. 4) had been involved in some way with corn obtained from the Bosporan kingdom (Dem. xx. Lept. 33; U. Fantasia, Amm. Pisa3 xvii 1987, 89–117, argues that he was not
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Plots against Mausolus of Caria, 367/6–355/4

A stone slab found at Milas (Mylasa); now in the Louvre, Paris. Phot. IK Mylasa, Taf. 1; our PI. 4.

Ionic with some Atticisms, usually ending a line with the end of a word.

SIG3 167; Tod 138; IK Mylasa 1–3*.

§ı
έτει τριηκοστώι καὶ ἐνάτωι Αρταξέρξει βασιλεύ-οντος Ἡλευσόλλων ξειαθραπεστόντος. Ἐδοξέ
Μυλασέων ἐκκλησίσις κυρίης γενομένης καὶ ἐπεκ-κύρωσαν αἱ τρεῖς φύλαι, ἐπειδὴ Ἀρλιασις Θυσσωλλοῦ (?)
5 ἀποσταλεῖς ὑπὸ Καρῶν πρὸς βασιλέα παρεπρέσ-βεσον καὶ ἐπέβουλεσον Μαυσσώλλων, ὦν τε ἐνεργέτη θη τῆς πόλεως τῆς Μυλασέως, καὶ αὐτῶν καὶ τῶν πατρί Ἐκατόμων καὶ τῶν προγόνων τοῖς τούτων, καὶ βασιλεύς ἀδίκων καταγγείος Ἀρλιασις ἐξημίσωσε θανάτων;
10 πράξαι καὶ τὴν πόλιν τῆν Μυλασέων περὶ τῶν κτημάτων ἐκείνων κατὰ τοὺς νόμους τοὺς πατρίως καὶ πρόσθετα ποιήσαντες Μαυσσώλλων, ἐπαρᾶς ἐποίησαντο περὶ τούτων, μήτε προτιθέναι ἐτὶ παρὰ ταῦτα μηδὲνα μήτε ἐπιφησίζειν: εἴ δὲ τὶς
15 τάντα παραβαίνου, ἐξώλη γάνεσαι καὶ αὐτῶν

4 Θυσσωλλοῦ IK: Θυσσωλλίου earlier edd., and regarded as epigraphically and onomastically possible IK.
a corn-buyer but a financial official to whom the profit from the sale of surplus corn went), and who remained active until he was accused of involvement in the affair of Harpalus in 324 (Timocles fr. 4 Kock/Edmonds/Kassel & Austin, ap. Ath. viii. 341 f–f). Pisanax, an Athenian invited to 'dinner', is presumably 'the man sent . . . to Cetri-
poris and his brothers' of ll. 10–11: he belonged to a branch of the Alcmaeonid family (APF, 378). For the activities of Chares (l. 21) at this time cf. on 48: on our chrono-
logy this decree will fall between the battles of Chios (357/6) and Embata (356/5). Of
the envoys whose appointment is appended to the decree in ll. 36–7, Thrason was the
son of a sister of Thrasybulus of Collytus (for whom see on 22): he is attested also as
proxenos of Thebes (Aesch. iii. Ctes. 138 cf. Din. i. Dem. 38), and his son Thrasybulus was
active from the 350s to the 320s (APF, 238–40).
Not surprisingly, in view of their location and their earlier dealings, Athens' con-
tact is primarily with the Thracians, and the oath which ends the inscription is that
sworn by the Athenians to the Thracians. For the combination of Zeus, Earth, Sun,
and Poseidon as deities by whom an oath is sworn cf. 50; the six deities named here recur in 76.

§1
In the thirty-ninth year of the Kingship of Artaxerxes [II: 367/6]; Mausolus being satrap.
2 Resolved by the Mylasans; there being a regular assembly; and
the three tribes ratified.
4 Since Arliissis son of Thyssolus (?), sent by the Carians to the
King, abused his embassy and plotted against Mausolus, who
has been a benefactor of the city of Mylasa, both himself and
his father and the forebears of these, and the King convicted
Arliissis of wrongdoing and punished him with death: the city of
Mylasa also shall act concerning his possessions in accordance
with the traditional laws.
12 And making them over to Mausolus they imposed curses on
these, that no one should again make a proposal contrary to
this or put it to the vote: if any one contravenes this, he shall be
utterly destroyed, both himself and all who are his.
καὶ τοὺς ἑκείνου πάντας. vacat

vacat

§ii

ἔτει τετρακοστῶν καὶ πέμπτων Ἀρταξέρξεως βασιλείων τοῦ Μαυσολίου ἔξαιθραπευτοῖς.

ἐδοξεὶ Μυλασέων ἐκκλησίας κυρίας γενομένης.

καὶ ἐπεκύρωσαν αἱ τρεῖς φυλαί. τοὺς Πελέμων παιδιας, παρανομήσαντας εἰς τὴν εἰκόνα τὴν Ἐκατόμων, ἀνθρώποι πολλὰ καὶ ἄγαθα ποιήσαντο τῆς πόλεως. τῷ Μυλασέων καὶ λόγῳ καὶ ἔργῳ, ἀδικεῖν καὶ τὰ ἱερὰ ἀναθήματα καὶ τῆς πόλεως.

καὶ τοὺς ἐνεργεύτας τῆς πόλεως. ἀδικεῖν δὲ καταγνώτες ἐξημώσαν δημεύσαι τῆς ὑσίας, καὶ ἔπωλησαν τὰ κτήματα αὐτῶν δημοσίης, ἐκτόθησαι κυρίως τοῖς πραιτέροις καὶ ἐπαράσ ρεῖσαντο περὶ τούτων, μήτε προσβιέναι μήτε ἐπινιθίζειν μηδένα· εἰ δὲ τις ταύτα[α πα]ραβαίνων, ἐξώλη γίνεσθαι καὶ αὐτῶν καὶ τοὺς ἑκείνου π[ἀν]τας. vacat

vacat

§iii

ἔτει πέμπτων Ἀρταξέρξεως βασιλείων τοῦ Πακτων ἐπιβουλεύσαντος Μαυσολίου τῶν Ἐκατόμων (ω).

ἐν τῶν ἱερῶν τοῦ Διός τοῦ Λαμβραϊνοῦ, θυσίας ἑναυσίας καὶ πανγύρους ἐδοξάσει· καὶ Μαυσολίου μὲν σωθέντος σὺν τοῖς Δίας, Ἀπάντα δὲ αὐτοῦ [τ]ήν δύκην λαβόντος ἐν χειρῶν νόμων ἐγνωσαν Μυλασέως· παρηγορημένου τοῦ ἱεροῦ καὶ Μαυσολίου τοῦ εὐεργέτεως, ἐρευναν ποιήσασθαι ἐν τοῖς ἀλλοις μετ' ἑτ[α]· χείν ἢ ἐκουσάμην τῆς πράξεως. ἐλεγθέντος δὲ καὶ Ὀυσοῦ τοῦ Συκακοῦ καὶ κριθέντος συναδείκνυ τοῖς Μαντίτας· ἐδοξῆ Μυλασέων καὶ ἐπεκύρωσαν αἱ τρεῖς φυλαί. τὰ Μαντίτα τοῦ Πακτων καὶ Ὀυσοῦ τοῦ Συκακοῦ προστεθήκατο Μαυσολίου· καὶ τὰ κτήματα ἐπάλησαν ἡ πόλις δημοσία· ἐπαράσ ρεῖσαν κυρίως· τοὺς τῶν ὅνας τοῖς πραιτέροις μήτε προσβιέναι μήτε ἐπινιθίζειν μηδένα· εἰ δὲ ταύτα παραβαίνων, ἐξώλη γίνεσθαι καὶ αὐτῶν καὶ τοὺς ἑκείνου πάντας.

26 γνώτες: οἱ inscribed originally, corrected to τ. 26—7 ἔπωλησαν (λή) Ik, but from the photograph it appears that the stone has been damaged and the letters could have been inscribed. 34 (ω) Ik: it is not clear from the photograph that there was space for the final ω. 38 νόμος: Tod and Ik print νομῶς, the dative of νομος.
§ii
17 In the forty-fifth year of the Kingship of Artaxerxes II: 361/0; Mausolus being satrap.
19 Resolved by the Mylasans; there being a regular assembly; and the three tribes ratified.
20 The sons of Peldemus, who acted illegally against the likeness of Hecatomnos, a man who did many good things for the city of Mylasa in both word and deed, are wrongdoers against the sacred dedications and the city and the benefactors of the city.
25 Convicting them of wrongdoing, they punished them with the confiscation of their property, and they sold their possessions publicly, to be possessed validly by those who bought them; and they imposed curses on these, that no one should make a proposal or put to the vote: if any one contravenes this, he shall be utterly destroyed, both himself and all who are his.

§iii
32 In the fifth year of the Kingship of Artaxerxes III: 355/4; Mausolus being satrap.
33 Manitas the son of Pactyes having plotted against Mausolus the son of Hecatomnos in the sanctuary of Zeus Lambranudos at the annual sacrifice and festival, and Mausolus being saved with the aid of Zeus, while Manitas himself received justice by the law of hands; the Mylasans decided: since illegal action had been taken against the sanctuary and Mausolus the benefactor, to hold an investigation, whether any one else had shared or been a partner in the deed.
41 Thyssus son of Syscos having been shown guilty also and judged to be a fellow-wrongdoer with Manitas; resolved by the Mylasans; and the three tribes ratified.
44 The belongings of Manitas son of Pactyes and Thyssus son of Syscos shall be made over to Mausolus; and the city sold his possessions publicly and imposed curses; that the purchases of these should be valid for those who bought them; and no one should make a proposal or put to the vote: if any one contravenes this, he shall be utterly destroyed, both himself and all who are his.
Caria, in south-western Asia Minor, was probably detached from Lydia and made a separate satrapy under the control of the local dynast Hecatomnos in 392/1 (against the view of L. Robert that Hecatomnos' father Hyssaldomus was the first satrap see Hornblower, *Mausolus*, 36 n. 6);¹ Hecatomnos' eldest son Mausolus succeeded him in 377/6. The Carians were not Greeks, but their history had been bound up with that of the Asiatic Greeks since the archaic period. Mylasa, a short distance inland, was not a Greek but a Carian city (Hornblower, 68 n. 116): it was perhaps moved to Milas from a site slightly further south by Mausolus (J. M. Cook, *BSA* lvi 1961, 98–101), and the capital was moved to Halicarnassus (Hornblower, 78–9, 188, 297–8). Here we have a series of documents showing that, although there were dissidents, the city of Mylasa officially continued to regard the Hecatomnids as benefactors, punished plots against them, and gave them the proceeds of confiscated property.

Though Carian, Mylasa here has constitutional procedures and publishes decrees (in Greek) which resemble those of Greek states. They are dated by regnal years of the Persian King and (without years) by the satrap; they do not identify any officials of Mylasa, or the proposers. They are enacted at an *ekklesia kyria* (an expression which in Athens denotes the principal assembly of the prytany but elsewhere denotes a regular assembly: Rhodes with Lewis, 13–14, 505). 'The three tribes ratified': it is not clear whether this could be done at the *ekklesia kyria* or required separate meetings; but F. Ruze has suggested that there was simply a meeting of the *ekklesia kyria*, voting by tribes (*Köema* viii 1983, 304–5). Arlissis was condemned by the King, perhaps because his offence was connected with an embassy to the King, but it was the city of Mylasa which condemned the other offenders, and which confiscated property and made over it or the proceeds from its sale to Mausolus (the first decree's failure to specify it does not prove that the property of Arlissis was not sold, though that may be the case; only the third specifies that the proceeds are to go to Mausolus). There was also a

¹ However, T. Petit, *BCH* cxii 1988, 307–22 at 313–20, notes that the Hecatomnids are styled satraps in inscriptions within their own territory but not normally in inscriptions elsewhere or in literary texts, and, using a definition of satrap which the Hecatomnids could not satisfy, argues that they were local dynasts who became exceptionally powerful and ambitious but were not technically satraps.
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**Mausolus and Artemisia award proxeny to Cnossus, mid 350s (??)**

Twelve contiguous fragments of a stele or plaque, found at Labraunda, reused in a floor; now in the museum at Bodrum. Phot. *Labraunda*, iii. ii, pl. 11.

Ionic with some Atticisms, ending each line with the end of a word. *Labraunda*, iii. ii 40*.

See also Hornblower, *Mausolus*, as cited below; Rhodes with Lewis, 354.
Carian koinon, which sent Arlissis on his embassy to the King (l. 5); there is no justification for the view that the purpose of the embassy was to complain about Mausolus (Le Bas & Waddington, commenting on the texts as their nos. 377–9: rightly rejected by Hornblower, 60 with n. 65). In parts of their text the decrees use a narrative style, with indicative verbs, rather than the usual infinitives dependent on ‘resolved’ (cf. Rhodes with Lewis, 561–2, not remarking on this early instance of the phenomenon). They use entrenchment clauses to protect their decisions against reversal (cf. on 22), and with these they combine curses (cf. 79, 83, and see E. Ziebarth, Hermes xxx 1895, 57–70; Latte, Heiliges Recht, 61–96): in the third decree the curses have been misplaced before instead of after the clause validating the purchases.

8: For likely forebears of Hecatomnos and Mausolus cf. Pixodarus son of Mausolus of Cindya and Pigres son of Hysseldomus (Her. v. 118. ii, v. 98). 20: Offences against images of a human being are not normally found in the Greek world, but cf. offences against Zeus Philippios in Eresus (83. ii. 4–5), and against statues of Roman emperors (e.g. Tac. Ann. i. 73–4, iii. 70): behind the façade of Greek political institutions the Hecatomnids had monarchical concerns. 35: La(m)braunda was about 8 miles (13 km.) north of Mylasa, linked to it by a sacred way (see Bean, Turkey Beyond the Maeander, 38–47 ch. ii, and the excavation reports, Labraunda); for the sanctuary and cult of Zeus there cf. Str. 659. xiv. ii. 23, Plut. Q.G. 45. 301 f – 302 A. 38: ‘The law of hands’ from Herodotus (viii. 89. ii, ix. 48. ii) onwards referred to violent action, particularly hand-to-hand fighting: here it presumably means that Manitas was killed on the spot without first being tried. 44: For the name Pactyes cf. Pactyes of Lydia (Her. i. 153–61) and Pactyes of Idyma in Caria (IGr 260. i. 16, one of the tribute lists of the Delian League).

For another inscription, concerning ‘men who plotted against Mausolus and the city of Iasus’ (τὴν Ἑασέων πόλιν καὶ τὴν Ἰασῶν Μαυσολόλαιον ἐπιβουλεύοντες, αὐτὸν τὸν Μαυσολόν ἀποκτήσαντες), with a list of officials and of sales of confiscated property, see SIG 3. 169 = IK Iasos 1 (which dates by the stele ephebos of Iasus). For other Hecatomnid texts see 55. 56. 79.
For Mausolus, satrap of Caria 377/6–353/2, and the sanctuary of Zeus at Labraunda, where this inscription was found, see 54. Here Mausolus and Artemisia, his sister and wife (but Mausolus is the dominant partner, and is mentioned alone in ll. 4, 7), publish a decree of their own, formulated like a decree of a Greek state (cf. e.g. the kings of the Bosporus (Crimea), SIG² 217 = CIRBr, Gassander, SIG² 332; and see Rhodes with Lewis, 544). It is common enough in a Greek decree to find honorands given the status of proxenos and benefactor, together with such privileges as immunity from taxation and the right of unhampered entry and exit: for the privileges given here cf. 8, and in particular the honours voted by Erythrae for Mausolus (coupled with Artemisia) and for Idrieus (56, and commentary citing SEG xxi 969 ~ Harding 28. B). However, the status of proxenos was regularly conferred by states on individuals, originally with the intention that they would act as representatives of the conferring state in their own state (cf. 8): here, whether from ignorance or by a deliberate stretching of the concept, the status is conferred on a whole community (cf. Rhodes with Lewis, 354)—which makes nonsense of the institution. There is a further oddity in the final sentence, which begins like a threat to punish those who inflict wrong but turns into an attempt

For Mausolus, satrap of Caria 377/6–353/2, and the sanctuary of Zeus at Labraunda, where this inscription was found, see 54. Here Mausolus and Artemisia, his sister and wife (but Mausolus is the dominant partner, and is mentioned alone in ll. 4, 7), publish a decree of their own, formulated like a decree of a Greek state (cf. e.g. the kings of the Bosporus (Crimea), SIG² 217 = CIRBr, Gassander, SIG² 332; and see Rhodes with Lewis, 544). It is common enough in a Greek decree to find honorands given the status of proxenos and benefactor, together with such privileges as immunity from taxation and the right of unhampered entry and exit: for the privileges given here cf. 8, and in particular the honours voted by Erythrae for Mausolus (coupled with Artemisia) and for Idrieus (56, and commentary citing SEG xxi 969 ~ Harding 28. B). However, the status of proxenos was regularly conferred by states on individuals, originally with the intention that they would act as representatives of the conferring state in their own state (cf. 8): here, whether from ignorance or by a deliberate stretching of the concept, the status is conferred on a whole community (cf. Rhodes with Lewis, 354)—which makes nonsense of the institution. There is a further oddity in the final sentence, which begins like a threat to punish those who inflict wrong but turns into an attempt

Erythrae honours Mausolus, mid 350s (?)
Resolved by Mausolus and Artemisia.

Since the Gnosians both privately and publicly have consistently been good men with regard to Mausolus and the affairs of Mausolus, they shall be proxenos and benefactors for all time; they shall also have immunity [ateleia], in as much territory as Mausolus rules, and the right to sail in and out inviolably and without a treaty.

If any one wrongs the Gnosians, Mausolus and Artemisia shall take care that they are not wronged, in accordance with their ability.

---

to prevent the infliction of wrong. It is striking also that Mausolus deals with a Greek state as if he were an independent ruler rather than a subordinate of the Persian King, not mentioning the King in his text, and in l. 7 referring to 'as much territory as Mausolus rules' (cf. Hornblower, 75, 153–4, 168, citing also a judicial agreement between Mausolus and Phaselis, Set. 260 = his M 7).

The community honoured is Gnossus, in Crete. In the classical period the states of Crete are mentioned only occasionally in connection with the rest of the Greek world (M&L 42 ~ Fornara 89, of the mid fifth century, is a well-known instance), but more contact is attested in the time of Philip and Alexander, and more still in the hellenistic period. On contacts between Caria and Crete see Hornblower, 135, suggesting that Mausolus may have been hoping for Cretan mercenaries: Artemisia, ruler of Halicarnassus in the early fifth century, had a Cretan mother (Her. vii. 99. ii), and Mylasa was among the states which were to have dealings with the Cretans in the hellenistic period. The most likely time for the honours is the mid 350s, when Mausolus was supporting states defecting from Athens in the Social War and taking an interest in the Aegean (cf. 56).
Erythrae, on the mainland of Asia Minor, will have passed into Persian hands after the Peace of Antalcidas (for Erythrae before the Peace see 8, 17). It seems to have acquired an oligarchic government, to judge from the fact that the honours in this text and in SEG xxxi 969 (below) are awarded simply by the council, with no mention of the people; when Alexander the Great took over western Asia Minor he restored democracies (Arr. Anab. 1. 18. ii cf. 17. x), and the change in Erythrae is reflected in SIG 3 285 = IK Erythrai und Klazomenai 21, where the enactment formula mentions the council and the people, and the people are mentioned later (but the motion formula, perhaps through carelessness, still mentions only the council). In other decrees of Erythrae proposals are made by the generals, the prytaneis, and the exestatai (e.g. SIG 3 285; epimenioi instead of exestatai SEG xxxi 969); here there are no grounds for deciding between the generals and the prytaneis.

The satrap Mausolus is described as ‘Mausolus son of Hecatomnos of Mysa’, as if he were a citizen of a Greek city. For the honours awarded compare the honours which he awarded to Cnossus (55). As in that text Artemisia is associated with him, but she receives a stone statue while his is of bronze, and a cheaper crown. By the end of the fourth century a bronze portrait statue was costing 3,000 drachmas at Athens (IG II 555), although the raw material probably cost about a tenth of that. We are less well
Resolved by the council. Opinion of the generals/prytaneis(?):

2 Mausolus son of Hecatomnos of Mylasa, since he has been a good man with regard to the people of Erythrae, shall be a benefactor of the city and *proxenos* and citizen; and shall have the right to sail in and out, both in war and in peace, inviolably and without a treaty, and immunity and a front seat. This shall be for him and his descendants.

10 There shall also be set up a bronze likeness of him in the Agora and a stone likeness of Artemisia in the Athenaeum; and Mausolus shall be crowned at a cost of fifty darics and Artemisia at a cost of thirty darics.

18 This shall be written on a stele and placed in the Athenaeum; and the *exetastai* shall take care of it (?)..

informed for marble sculpture, but the entire pedimental group at Epidaurus €.370 (about 22 figures, two thirds life size) cost only the equivalent of 4,300 Athenian drachmas (cf. Stewart, *Attika*, 109 with 113 n. 31). ‘Daric’ (from Darius) was the Greek name for the standard Persian gold coin, worth 20 silver *sigloi* or 25–27 Athenian drachmas (on Persian coinage see Kraay, *Archaic and Classical Greek Coins*, 31–4, 251; the *siglos* equivalent to 1¼ (X. *Anab.* 1. v. 6) or 1½ (lexicographers) drachmas).

For the temple of Athena at Erythrae cf. Paus. vii. 5. ix. A likely time for the award of these honours is the mid 350s, about the time of Athens’ Social War, when nearby Chios was one of the states defecting from the Second League and received support from Mausolus (D.S. xvi. 7. iii); but Hornblower, citing IG ii² 108 = *IK Erythrai und Klazomenai* 7, suggests the mid 360s as another possibility; and E. Badian insists that the text cannot be dated (*Greece and the Eastern Mediterranean . . . F. Schachermeyr*, 44 n. 6).

For Erythrae and Hermias of Atarneus see 68.

Mausolus died in 353/2 and Artemisia in 351/0, and they had no descendants to inherit these honours (Str. 656. xiv. ii. 17). Then their brother Idrieus, married to another sister, Ada, held the satrapy until Idrieus died in 344/3 and Ada was ousted by another brother, Pixodarus, in 341/0. Subsequently Artaxerxes III sent Orontobates, who became joint satrap, married Pixodarus’ daughter (another Ada), and
retained the satrapy on Pixodarus’ death in 336/5; but in 334 the older Ada, holding out in Alinda, acknowledged Alexander, was reinstated as satrap, and adopted him as her son. We now have a similar inscription in which Erythrae honours Idneus, presumably between 351/0 and 344/3 (SEG xxxi 969 ~ Harding 28. B: D. M. Lewis, followed by Hornblower, wondered if it was inscribed on the lower part of the same stele as the honours for Mausolus and Artemisia). He too is described as ‘of Mylasa’; his front seat is said to be ‘at the competitions’ (ἐν τοῖς ἀγώνισι: l. 11); he is given ‘priority trial of lawsuits’ (δίκας προδήκουσι: ll. 14–15); ‘and he shall also be a citizen if he
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Contributions to the Boeotians for the Third Sacred War,
c.354–c.352

A slab found at Thebes; now in the museum there.
Boeotian dialect, with some Atticisms, and sometimes retaining the old ε for ει.
IG vii 2418; SEG 20; Tod 160*; Buck 40. Trans. Harding 74.

[τοιχχρε]ματα συνεβ[άλλονθα ἐν τὸν πάλεμον]
[τὸν] ἐποί[μενον] Ἡμοιοτοι περὶ τῶν ἱαρῶν τῶν ἐμ Ἡμεροῖς
[προεδροῦσι]τω ὀδηγοῦσα τῷ ἱαρῷ ν τῶν Ἀπόλλωνος τῶν
[Π]ουθὼ. vacat
vacat

5 Ἀριστίωνος ἀρχοντος Ἀλεξίου [τριάκοντα μηνᾶς ένιειαν]
προσερχόμεν Χάριφυ Διάδωνος | Ἀριστ[ ]
Ἀκαταρτιέςς τριάκοντα μηνᾶς | προ[σγείες ——]
Φόρμων | Ἀρκεος Τερέως. vacat
Βοσάντιος: χρυσός Λαμψακανά στατείας

10 δηνοέκοντα πέτταρα | ἄργυριος Ητ[τικό δρα]—
χμάς δεκαετίς—σύνεδρο Βοσιάντιων [ενιειαν]
τῷ χρυσοῖς Κερκίνοις Εἰροτίμῳ, Ἀγ[ ]
Δυλόπτιχω, Λιονύσιος Εἰπάιων. vacat
Ἀλανόδωρος | Διανυσίω | Τενεδ[ ].

15 πρόξενος | Βουστόνων, χειληνάσας | δρ[αχμάς].
Νικολαίω ἀρχοντος Ἀλιξαίου
Ἀλλας τριάκοντα μηνᾶς ένιειαν
προσερχόμεν Ἀλεξίανος Θεο[ ——]
[Ἀ]λεξίανόν, Διόν Πολυ[ ——].

2 restored by comparison with 23: it is not clear why the letters were erased. 5 P. Roesch, in Cabanes (ed.), L’Itinéraire méridional et l’Épire, 182 with n. 20 = SEG xxxvii 351: unrestored earlier edd. 16 D. M. Lewis, to obtain consistency within ll. 16–19: Ἀλεξίανος, the Boeotian form, as in 5, earlier edd.
wishes, and he shall enter into whatever genus he wants’ (εἴναι δὲ γοῦτέν καὶ πολὺ τοῦ ἢν, ἐὰν βούλησθαι, καὶ ἐς γέφος ὅσι ἤν ἡπὲι τὸ ἢν θελ[η]: ll. 15–17; cf. 33, offering a choice of deme and phratry in Athens). Among the other inscriptions of the Hecatomnids, a stele found at Tegea, in Arcadia, has the names of Zeus, Ada, and Idrieus, and a relief showing Zeus Stratios of Labraunda with Ada and Idrieus standing to either side (Tod 161. A: phot. GIBM iv 950; Cook, Zeus, n. i. 523 fig. 497); and Idrieus and Ada are both named on a Milesian dedication at Delphi (Tod 161. B = F. Delphes, iii. iv 176, with phot. pl. xxvii. 1).

These contributed money to the war which the Boeotians were waging concerning the sanctuary at Delphi against those who were committing sacrilege against the sanctuary of Pythian Apollo.


16 In the archonship of Nicolaus. Alyzea: a further thirty minas: brought by the Alyzean envoys Theo— son of Alexander, Dion son of Poly—.
After Thebes had secured the imposition by the Delphic Amphictyony on Phocis and Sparta of fines which they refused to pay, in 356 the Phocians seized Delphi (D.S. xvi. 23–7 cf. 14. iii–iv), and in winter 356/5 the Thebans worked with the Thessalian koinon to obtain a declaration of a Sacred War by the Amphictyony against the Phocians; most northern Greek states supported the Amphictyony; Sparta and Athens were among the states which supported the Phocians (D.S. xvi. 28—9). The Phocians, in control of Delphi, had access to the sacred treasures, and before long if not immediately they used these to pay for mercenaries (D.S. xvi. 28. ii, 30. i–ii, 56. iii–57–iv). The Thebans had no comparable source of funding: this inscription, apparently complete, records gifts made in three years toward what is described as ‘the war which the Boeotians were waging’. The annual sections seem to have been inscribed separately; it is more likely than not that the three years are consecutive and that they fall early in the war rather than late; M. Guarducci argued for 354—352 (RFIC1viii = 8viii 1930, 321–5).

Alyzea and Anactorium were in Acarnania, north of the mouth of the Gulf of Corinth: Acarnania had joined the Second Athenian League in 375 (22. 106; 24), but adhered to Thebes after Leuctra (X. H. vi. v. 23); at Chaeronea in 338, when Thebes and Athens fought together against Philip, Acarnania fought on their side (cf. 77). Byzantium was one of the states to which Epaminondas appealed in the 360s (cf. on 43), and was one of the states which fought for its freedom in the Social War (D.S. xvi. 7. iii, 21); here it flaunts its independence from Athens by supporting the anti-Athenian side in the Sacred War (for Byzantium as an ally of Thebes cf. Dem. ix. Phil. iii, 34). Tenedos, on the other hand, an island just outside the Hellespont, remained loyal to Athens as long as the League survived (cf. 72): it has usually been thought that the Boeotian proxenos was led by his Boeotian sympathies to make a personal contribution; but 1,000 drachmas (= 10 minas) would be a large contribution from a single
In the archonship of Hagesinicus. The Byzantines contributed another five hundred Lampsacene gold staters to the war which the Boeotians were waging on behalf of the sanctuary at Delphi: brought by the synedroi Sosis son of Caraeichus (?), Parmeniscus son of Pyramus.

man, though not an impossibly large one, and D. M. Lewis thought that he had been collecting money from like-minded men. Diodorus records a much more substantial contribution, of 300 talents, obtained from the Persian King (xvi. 40. i–ii).

Philip of Macedon entered the Sacred War on the Amphictyonic side in 353, and he ended it in 346, after creating enough uncertainty about his intentions to paralyse the opposition to him. The Phocians were expelled from the Amphictyony, split into separate villages, and ordered to repay what they had taken from the sacred treasuries, while Philip was admitted to the Amphictyony in their place (D.S. xvi. 60, cf. 67).

The Byzantines’ contributions are brought by their synedroi: this is a sign that the Thebans like the Athenians had organized their allies in a league, with the members represented in a synedrion (cf. D. M. Lewis in Schachter [ed.], Essays in the Topography, History and Culture of Boeotia, 71–3, against Buckler, The Theban Hegemony, 371–362 B.C., 222–33, cf. Polis and Politics . . . M. H. Hansen, 431–46; but M. Jehne, Klio lxxxi 1999, 317–58 at 328–44, suggests that the Boeotian federation after 379 was treated as an extension of the Theban state, and Byzantium in turn as an extension of the federation). We understand from Mrs. E. Matthews of LGPN that Caratichus, given on the stone as the father of a Byzantine synedros (l. 24), is a name not otherwise attested; Caracichus, proposed by Buck, would be a version of Caracichus, attested particularly in Boeotia and also in Athens (but his version of the ending is apparently just a slip).

Unlabelled drachmas and minas are presumably Boeotian, following the Aeginetan system (cf. Kraay, Archaic and Classical Greek Coins, 114), in which 7 drachmas were equivalent to 10 Athenian drachmas (cf. 45), while the Aeginetan mina of 70 drachmas and the Athenian mina of 100 drachmas were the same weight. Lampsacus in the fourth century issued gold staters equivalent to the Persian darics (equivalent to 26 Athenian drachmas; cf. 56); see Kraay, 249. \( \pi\mu\omicron\sigma\omicron\gamma\acute{e}\epsilon\nu\varsigma(6)/\pi\mu\omicron\sigma\omicron\gamma\acute{e}\epsilon\nu\varsigma(18) \) is the Boeotian equivalent of \( \pi\rho\epsilon\sigma\alpha\beta\epsilon\iota\varsigma \): the first is the older form (Buck ad loc.).
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Athens, Delphi, and the Sacred Orgas, 352/1

A stele of Pentelic marble, found at Eleusis and now in the Epigraphic Museum at Athens.


We print extensive restorations of the text, which are mainly due to Foucart, where the general sense is secure; but the restorations are sometimes questionable in detail.

1 Lambert, E IG. 2 NEII Lambert.

12 [vos etas δήμων] IG but Scafuro points out that the procedure seems not to be diadikasia.
Nothing can be made of the first four lines.) the people to choose forthwith ten men from all the Athenians, and five from the council. Those chosen are to decide in the Eleusinion in the city about the disputed boundaries of the sacred land (orgas), after they have sworn the customary oath that they will not vote according to favour or hostility, but as uprightly and piously as they can. They are to sit continuously from the 16th of Poseideon until they reach a decision, during the archonship of Aristodemus (352/1). The basileus, the hierophant, the dadouch, the Kerykes, and the Eumolpidai, and any other Athenian who wants to are to be present in order that they may place the boundaries as piously and fairly as possible.

From this day onwards those specifically so commanded by the law are to look after the sacred orgas and all the other sacred things at Athens along with the council of the Areopagus and the general appointed by vote to be in charge of the security of the countryside and the peripolarchs and the demarchs and the council that is currently in office and any other Athenian who wants, in any way they know.

The secretary of the council is to write upon two pieces of tin which are equal and alike, on one, ‘If it is preferable and better for the Athenian people that the basileus should rent out the parts of the sacred orgas currently being cultivated outside the boundaries, for the building of a colonnade and the equipping of the sanctuary of the two goddesses’; and on the other, ‘If it is preferable and better for the Athenian people that the parts of the sacred orgas currently being cultivated outside the
boundaries be left to the two goddesses untilled'.

30 When the secretary has written, the chairman of the proedroi shall roll up each piece of tin and tie it with wool and cast it into a bronze water jug in the presence of the people. The prytaneis are to see to these preparations and the treasurers of the Goddess are to bring down forthwith two water jugs, one gold and one silver, to the people, and the chairman is to shake the bronze water jug and then take out each piece of tin in turn and put the first into the gold water jug and the next into the silver water jug, and the chairman of the prytaneis is to seal the jugs with the public seal, and any Athenian who wants can apply a counter-seal. When they have been sealed the treasurers are to carry the water jugs to the Acropolis.

42 The people are to choose three men, one from the council and two from all Athenians, to go to Delphi and ask the god according to which of the two written messages the Athenians should act with regard to the sacred orgas, whether that from the gold water jug or that from the silver water jug. When they get back from the god they are to have the water jugs brought down and read out to the people the oracular response and the writing on the tin. According to whichever of the written messages the god indicates that it is preferable and better for the Athenian people, according to that message they are to act, in order that relations with the two goddesses may be as pious as possible and in future no impiety may be done concerning the sacred land and the other sacred things at Athens.

54 The secretary of the council is now to write up this decree and the earlier decree of Philocrates concerning the sacred things on two stone stelai, and set up one at Eleusis at the propylon of the sanctuary, and the other at the Eleusinion in the city. The hierophant and the priestess of Demeter are to sacrifice a propitiatory offering to the two goddesses, and the treasurer of the people is to give them the money, thirty drachmas. He is also to give them money for the inscription of the two stelai, 20 drachmas each from the people’s fund for expenditure on decrees. And to give to each of those chosen to go to Delphi 10 drachmas as travelling expenses. And to give to those chosen (to decide) about the sacred land 5 drachmas from the people’s fund for expenditure on decrees.

65 The poletai responsible for the leasing along with the council are to provide stone boundary-markers, as many additional markers as are necessary, and the proedroi . . . are to draw up specifications for how they are to be made and see to it that the
This decree illuminates Athenian relations with Megara in the middle of the fourth century, making an important contribution to our understanding of the literary evidence, provides unusually explicit evidence for the circumstances and nature of historical consultation of the Delphic oracle, and sheds light on Athenian democratic procedure.

The Athenians and Megarians had long disputed their border. Thucydides (i. 139. ii) says that when the Spartans demanded in 432 that the Athenians rescind the decree banning the Megarians from the harbours of the Athenian empire and from ‘the Attic Agora’, the Athenians refused, citing Megarian cultivation of ‘the sacred and undefined (aoristos) land’, as well as Megarian reception of deserting slaves. This decree of 352/1 (Poseideon is the sixth month of the Attic year) belongs to a prolonged fourth-century dispute, the nature and course of which are hard to determine.

The decree indicates two different Athenian concerns. One is about the location of the boundaries of the land sacred to Demeter and Persephone and on the border between Attica and Megara. This concern is contained in a restoration at 8 but virtually guaranteed by the reference at 74 to something that has been ‘cast aside’, most easily understood as boundary-markers (and compare 15). This boundary question is repeatedly placed in a wider context of concern for sacred things in general (16–17, 53–5), which can be paralleled in Xenophon, *Pompi* vi. 2–3, also dating from the 350s. The second concern (25–7) is about whether to rent out or to leave untilled in future land currently in agricultural use. That land stands in some relation to some...
boundary-markers shall be set up on the sacred orgas in accordance with the directions given by those chosen. The treasurer of the people is to give the money for the necessary marking of the boundary-markers on the stones from the people's fund for expenditure on decrees.

74 The following were chosen to place new boundary-markers on the sacred orgas in place of those that had been removed: from the council, Arcephon of Halae, —es of Thria, — of Hagnous. From private individuals, — of —, Hippocrates of Cerameis, — of —, Chaerephon of Eedoi, Emmenides from Koile, — of Sunium, Aristides of Oe, — of —, Glaucus of Perthoidai, Phaedrus of —. To the oracle at Delphi, from private individuals, — of —, Eudidactus of Lamptrae; from the council, — of Lamptrae.

84 The following correction was made. If there is anything lacking in this decree the council has the powers to vote whatever seems to it best.
hierophant, marked out the boundaries of the *orgas*; (2) the ‘edgelands’ (*eschatiai*) were consecrated in accordance with the Delphic response that they should be untilled; and (3) the *orgas* was marked off in a circle with marble *stelai* on the proposal of Philocrates. To these actions the quotation from Philochorus adds a fourth: the Athenians entered Megara with Ephialtes the general ‘for the country’ (ἐκ τῆς χώρας, compare II. 19–20) and marked the limits of the *orgas*. (The general ‘for the country’ is first attested here: this is the beginning of the creation of regular postings for members of the board of generals (cf. *Ath. Pol.* 61. i with Rhodes *ad loc.*))

At two points the testimony of the Atthidographers appears to tie up with that of the decree. It records the result of the consultation of Delphi and the execution of the decree of Philocrates, which is mentioned at lines 54–5 of this decree and was inscribed at the same time but almost certainly on a separate stone. (Philocrates might be the politician after whom the Peace of 346 is named, but the name is common.) But on the matter of placing the boundary there is a discrepancy between decree and Atthidographic account. The decree sets up a fifteen-man Athenian commission, whose meetings the hierophant and dadouch are invited to attend, to decide the boundary. Androtion and Philochorus record that the boundary was established by the dadouch and the hierophant following express Megarian agreement to their doing it. Did the committee decide, but the Eleusinian officials do the placing (a religious act?)? Or are we to assume that between 352 and 350/49 the Megarians protested about the unilateral means the Athenians had resolved upon in this decree for deciding the boundary and had insisted that they would only accept a ruling that came from officials of the Eleusinian cult?

It is very difficult to find the gap, upon which [Dem.] insists, between what the Athenians decided and what they did. All three of the decisions recorded by the Atthidographers (the decision to act in accordance with Delphic advice over the cultivation of the sacred land, the decision, on the proposal of Philocrates, to mark out the sacred land, and the decision to place the boundary-stones in accordance with the delimitation agreed by the dadouch and hierophant) are straightforwardly put into operation, the third of them with military backing. If Didymus were right in relating the reference in [Dem.] xiii to these decisions, then [Demosthenes’] allegation that the decision was good but no action was taken would be bizarre. Didymus must surely be wrong: if [Dem.] xiii is historically well-informed then either the period of bluster and no action preceded the decree of Philocrates, and [Dem.] xiii must date before 352, or there was action subsequent to the marking out of the boundaries in 350/49 which led to further Athenian bluster, but no action, and [Dem.] xiii must date to 348 or later. However, [Dem.] xiii may be not a genuine fourth-century speech but a rhetorical exercise of uncertain date and little if any historical value (Sealey, pp. 235–7); the speech names its speaker as Demosthenes, which Demosthenes himself never does, and includes a number of passages which are closely modelled on genuine Demosthenic speeches but poorly adapted to their new context.

(Connor suggested that the episode recorded by Plutarch, *Pericles* 30, in which the Athenian herald Anthemocritus, sent to complain about violations of the sacred *orgas*, is killed, should be related rather to this fourth-century crisis than to the 430s. But
there seems no place for such an episode in the sequence of events that can be reconstructed from this decree and the Aththidographers (see further Stadter, *Commentary on Plutarch’s Pericles*, 274–6).

We suggest the following as a possible outline history of the episode. At some point, perhaps not much earlier than this inscription, the Athenians had erected boundary-stones on the previously undefined sacred orgas and allowed the cultivation of part of it. The land so cultivated was marginal (that is the implication of eschatia, and indeed of orgas, which seems to designate land in mountainous areas liable to be waterlogged), and its cultivation is one of a number of pieces of evidence for pressure on the land of Attica in the fourth century. Whether because they were annoyed at the placing of the boundary-stones, the cultivation, or for some other reason, the Megarians began to dispute the border, taking the practical action of moving the boundary-markers. When the question also arose of how to raise income for building a portico in the sanctuary at Eleusis (for which see Hintzen-Bohlen, *Kulturpolitik*, 18–21 and 143), and use of revenues from renting out parts of the sacred orgas for cultivation was suggested, the Athenians were persuaded, perhaps by Philocrates, not to proceed with this without first settling the borders and consulting Delphi over the issue of cultivation. After lengthy deliberation, or else some postponement of action, perhaps caused by Megarian opposition, the boundary-stones of the orgas were replaced and, on Delphi’s indication, the orgas ceased to be cultivated.

This decree provides the fullest of all prescriptions for the consultation of the Delphic oracle, and as such is uniquely valuable as an illustration of contemporary attitudes towards Delphi. Three aspects of the consultation are notable: the form of the question asked, the form of the oracle given, and the Athenian concern to ensure that no Delphic official knows what exactly the consequences of the oracular answer will be.

The Delphic oracle is asked whether the Athenians should act according to the instruction contained in the gold or that contained in the silver water jug. That is, the oracle’s choice is very closely limited to a choice between alternatives set by the Athenians themselves. The Athenian procedure is an elaborate means of discovering whether the oracle considers it preferable and better to cultivate the land outside the boundaries or not to do so, and indeed Androtion and Philochorus report the oracle’s reply in precisely those terms: ‘the god had replied that it was preferable and better if they did not cultivate’ the edge lands. Formulating a question to the Delphic oracle in terms of whether it was better to undertake or not to undertake a particular action seems to have been one of the two regular forms of question to an oracle, and some who used it further foreclosed the oracular options by indicating in the question the answer expected: so the Spartan king Agesipolis asked (Zeus at Olympia in this instance) whether or not ‘it was safe to reject a truce unjustly offered’ (X. *H. iv. vii. 2). The other regular form was to pose a question about a religious action connected with a more substantial initiative: the Spartans are held to have asked what god they should sacrifice to in order to get the upper hand over the Arcadians (Her. i. 67. ii), and Xenophon asked what gods he should sacrifice to in order that he might participate with success in Cyrus’ expedition (X. *Anab. iii. i. 5–7*).
All Athenian consultations of Delphi in the classical period seem to have been over religious matters: M&L 52. 64-7 makes arrangements for ‘the sacrifices prescribed by the oracle’ (not certainly Delphi) in the settlement at Chalcis after revolt; M&L 73 has the hierophant and dadouch at Eleusis and the Athenian Council ‘encourage, but not command’ the Greeks to send first-fruits to Eleusis ‘according to the oracle at Delphi’ (did the Athenians ask ‘Is it preferable and better to command the Greeks . . .’ and Delphi reply that ‘It is preferable and better to encourage but not to command . . .’?); Thucydides iii. 104. i records that the Athenians purified Delos ‘according to some oracle’, and the Athenians subsequently expelled the Delians from the island (v.1); but shortly afterwards they restored them ‘bearing in mind their disasters in battle and the oracle of the god at Delphi’ (v. 32. i). The Athenian consultation over the sacred orgas was therefore in line with what had been regular Athenian practice (and is commonly found elsewhere, compare 87. 39, LSCG 72 lines 3–8 (Tanagra, C3)). But it had not been invariable Athenian practice: in the case of the sanctuary of Codrus, Neleus, and Basile it seems that the Athenians changed the status of land from cultivated to uncultivated simply by a decision of the people (IG i 384), and indeed the land in question here was being cultivated at the time of the consultation, evidently without oracular sanction.

Consulting oracles in general, and the Delphic oracle in particular, had three potential advantages: it could solve issues not susceptible to reason (indeed Xenophon has Socrates stress that one would not use an oracle to solve a matter that was susceptible to reason: Memorabilia, 1. i. 9); it could take out of the hands of a political body a decision which was likely to prove contentious, and it gave to the decision an authority which could not normally be challenged (cf. 50). In this case the Athenians arguably needed an oracular solution on all three grounds.

What is exceptional about this consultation is the indirect approach to obtaining the god’s view. One approach to understanding why the Athenians act like this would stress avoiding manipulation. That indirect approach ensures both that the question does not imply what answer is desired and that the Delphic response cannot be manipulated by men without Athenian awareness. The Athenians clearly work on the assumption that Apollo knows what is written on the tin in both water jugs, but that Apollo’s human agents cannot know and therefore cannot be influenced to achieve a particular result. Only by giving a response not related to the question (as later in the fourth century Delphi responded to an enquiry with the statement that no answer would be given until the Athenians had paid an Olympic fine imposed in 332, Pausanias v. 21. v) could Delphi directly determine the result of her response. A second approach would explain the procedure in terms of place of revelation: the
arrangements ensure that the moment of revelation of the god's view occurs not at Delphi but in Athens, when the bound metal is removed from whichever jug the oracle has selected, the wool is unwound, the tin unrolled, and the message read. A third approach would stress that for Delphi to answer directly the question of cultivation of sacred land was politically problematic. If it is true that the Third Sacred War began in a dispute over Phocian cultivation of the sacred plain of Cirrha (as D.S. xvi. 23. iii–vi claims; for the case against see Bowden, Classical Athens and the Delphic Oracle, ch. v; see also on 57), then it is not hard to see that making the oracle pronounce on whether sacred land should be cultivated would threaten to re-open a dangerous and distracting dispute (for all that the Athenians supported the Phocians against the Boeotians).

It was characteristic of fourth-century Athenian democracy to make democratic procedure manifest through the elaboration of ritual and the involvement of a much wider range of officials than the action involved would seem to demand (see Osborne, Ritual, Finance, Politics . . . D. Lewis, 17–18; but the IG text gives improbable roles to proedroi and poletai at ll. 68–9). A high degree of redundancy was daily on display in the procedures for allocating dikasts to the courts (see Rhodes, Comm. Ath. Pol., 715); here we see redundancy in such things as the way in which it is the epistates of the proedroi who rolls up the pieces of tin but the epistates of the prytaneis who seals the gold and silver water jugs. Characteristic too is the way in which some parts of the procedure are prescribed in detail, others passed over without giving necessary information: not only do we have an official referred to simply by the title 'epistates' in the middle of a passage in which both the epistates of the proedroi and the epistates of the prytaneis are named (31–39 at 36), but when those sent to Delphi return it is specified neither who should fetch the hydrias nor who should remove the piece of tin and read it out; the seals that have been so carefully put on the jugs are never mentioned. This inconsistency of attention reflects the uneven drafting regular in Athenian decrees, and serves as a reminder of the way in which even the council was essentially amateur, made up of Athenians with limited experience and no particular chancellery skills whose abilities were somewhat tested if they had no close precedent to follow.

For the use of the public seal by the epistates of prytaneis see Ath. Pol. 44. i with Rhodes ad loc. For the People giving the council licence to make supplementary decisions see 53. For travelling expenses see 44. On punctuation see Threete, i. 73–84. Both gold and silver water jugs appear in the lists of dedications from the Acropolis; they would have weighed between 1,000 and 1,200 drachmas, 4.3–5.2 kg. For the last clause compare 100. 264–9.
Lease of sacred land from Arcesine, Amorgus, mid fourth century

A stele of blue-grey marble found at the Church of St. Onoufrios on Amorgus.

Attic koine, using : as a punctuation mark, and often ending a line with the end of a word.


.. δι[ 12] μισθωσάμενος [ 10]...

.. [ 5] εἰ... ανα...[ 5] ο.. ηστὶ σαυτὸς τοῦ μο[σκάτος],


[το] [πο] [σίων] τὸ[σ ι][εω]πο[ια]ς τὸ ἤμιο[λος καὶ α[ν]τ[ός κ[αι]]


[ετε] ἐν νο[υ] ἄροι, τρ[ι[πλ]]α[σίον ἀρότους]. ἀμπέλους δ[ὲ]


συκάς ἄπαξ. τούτων ὁ [τ] ἡ ἁν [ἱρ] ἄσπαται κατά τὴν

συγγρ[α]φήν, ἀποτεί[σ] [θ] [μ]π[ὲλον ὑ] [κ] ἄστης καὶ συκή[ς]

ἀβολόν, ἀρότου ἑκάστου ἱγνοῦ τρεῖς δραχμάς.

οἱ δ’ ἐγγυηθησαί ἐγγυναθη[σία]ς [φ] [α] [ν] ὑ[π] [π] [ν] τὸ τοῦ μυθώματος[σ]

καὶ τῶν ἐπέργων ἀπάντων [ἀπ] [δ] [τεισ] μια, εἰ[άμ] με[ι βούληται ἔχεν ὁ μισθωσάμενος[οί]. κ[ε] [δ] [ἐ] ἀρ[μ] [οι ὑ] [τ] [σιάνοις. τ] [ε] [χία τὰ πίπτων τὰ ἀφ’ αὐ[τῶν ἀνορθόσει]


δραχμήν: φράη[θ] ἐφ’ ὅδε τοι[ε] χει[α ἁπαντα καὶ πεφρ[α]−

[γ]μ[ε] [κ] [τ]αλείψει ἂπαν: κοσσυφορίας ἐμβαλει ἐκάθ’ [σ]−

τοῦ ἐναυτοῦ πενήκοντα τε καὶ ἐκατὸν μετρητίδα[σ]

ἀροί[χ] [ω] [χ] [ω] [ρ] [ο] [σ] [σ] [μ] [ο] [ν] τέσσαρα ἡμέρκαι: ἐὰν

dὲ μὴ ἐμβαλη[ς] ἀποτεί[σ] ἑκάστου ἁροί[χ] τρι[β][β] [λο][ν].

πίστων δὲ ποιηθεῖ[ς πρὸς τους νεωποιαίς, ὡ μὴν ἐμβεβλη-

κέναι τῇ [κ] πρὸν κατὰ τὴν συγγραφήν: τέγη στενά

παρέξει καὶ [κ] καταλείψει παραδώσει: τὰς ἀμπέλους τὰς

ἐκκοπτομένας ἀποδιδόσθησον[ν] οἱ νεωποιαί: τὰς τράφα[σ]


ποιῶν, τετράποδας καὶ τρίποδας, καὶ τὰ φυτὰ ἐμβαλει

παρόντων τῶν νεωποιῶν, ἀμπέλους ἐκὼσαν δι’ ὁπόσου

ἀν κελεύσων οἱ νεωποιαί, συκάς δέκα, καθ’ ἑκατον τῶν

ἐναυτῶν, καὶ ἐποικοδομῆσαι τειχίου ὑπὲρ γης: πῖθο[ν]
The lessee . . . will furnish the temple administrators with suitable sureties . . . of the whole rent, and will pay the rent in the month Thargelion every year, free of all taxes. If he fails to pay there shall be exacted from the lessee and his sureties a fine equivalent to half the rent.

7 He will plough half the land each year, and not all the land in a single year. If he ploughs fallow land there will be three ploughings. He will dig round the vines twice, first in Anthesterion and again before the twentieth of Taureon, and round the fig trees once. If he fails to do this according to the lease agreement he will pay a fine of an obol for each vine or fig tree round which he fails to dig, and 3 drachmas for each zugon he fails to plough.

14 The sureties must guarantee the whole payment of the rent and of all required additional work, if the lessee wishes to retain possession; otherwise the temple administrators are to rent it out again.

17 He will build up again at his own expense all walls that are falling down; if he does not build them up let him pay a fine of a drachma per orgia [= c.2 m.]. He will strengthen all the walls along the road and leave them strengthened when he vacates the land.

20 Each year he will apply 150 measures of manure with a basket holding 1 medimnos and 4 hemiekta. If he does not apply it he will pay a fine of three obols per basket shortfall. He will make a pledge to the temple administrators that he has applied the manure according to the lease agreement.

25 He will keep the roofs watertight, and hand them over in this condition. The vines that are cut off the temple administrators must sell.

27 He will dig the ditches in the month Eiraphion, in the places marked out by the temple administrators, 4-foot ones and 3-foot ones, and will put in the plants in the presence of the temple administrators, planting twenty vines at the spacing ordered by the temple administrators, and ten fig trees, and he will build an additional wall above the land.
A number of leases of agricultural land, with and without buildings, by religious groups or communities survive from the fourth century. This example from Amorgus is particularly important because of its detailed specification of agricultural practice.

To judge by the exemption from all taxes (5) and by the legal remedies offered (on *endeixis* see on 14), one of which may involve the council, it is the *polis* of Arcesine itself which leases out the land in question here; but the land seems either to include or to be immediately next to the sanctuary of Zeus Temenites, and it is the temple administrators who have charge over the management of the lease. Neither the area of land involved nor the term of the lease is specified in the part of the inscription that remains. Other fourth-century leases have terms varying from ten years to ‘all time’ (which is found several times). The only leases where we know the area of land involved are leases of small plots (1.8 and 0.7 ha.), but the terms in which this piece of land is discussed suggest it was rather larger.

The land includes arable, for which biennial fallow is required, vineyards, and fig trees, and there is an expectation that there will be flocks that need to be kept
He will provide security consisting of storage jars, if the wall is not built, and the lessee will make a pledge to the temple administrators.

If he does not plant the plants, let him pay a fine of a drachma per plant shortfall.

No one shall be allowed to bring flocks into the sanctuary; if anyone does bring them in, the flocks are to be sacred to Zeus Temenites. Anyone who wishes can make an indication (endeiknymi) to the council and be rewarded with half.

If the temple administrators want to plant additional fig trees . . . , they may do so.

When the farmer vacates the land, let him leave behind 150 loads of manure, and let him measure it out before the temple administrators with a basket containing a medimnos and 4 hemiektas. If he does not measure it out, let him pay a drachma per basket shortfall. Let the temple administrators exact the fine or themselves owe double.

He will dig a trench round the fallow land. If he does not dig a trench round it let him pay 20 dr. Let him hand over . . . at the same time as the rent.

Let him hand over . . . whatever is of the year, to the treasurers in the month Thargelion separately from the rent. If he does not hand it over, let him be liable to a fine equal to half to the treasurers.

Anything that is subject to dispute the temple administrators along with the farmer(?) are to sell in the agora to whoever bids most, or themselves pay double. Anyone who wishes may indicate (endeiknymi) them before the masteres and be rewarded with half.

If he plants and leaves . . . if not, he will pay . . . for each fathom.

out of the sanctuary. There are (terrace) walls to be repaired and boundary walls to be reinforced, and there are buildings whose roofs need to be kept waterproof (particularly important where walls are of mud-brick). The storage containers which serve as surety may be within a building, but there is no indication that the lessee is expected to dwell on the land. Other leases similarly suggest that buildings other than permanent dwelling houses were common in the countryside (see further Osborne, BSA lxxx 1985, 119–28), and many scatters of ancient tile and coarse pottery found in the Greek countryside by archaeological survey may come from such structures. Whether modern terrace walls are the direct descendants of ancient terraces is often impossible to assess, but the impossibility of practising agriculture on Aegean islands like Amorgus without terracing, and literary evidence for the importance of walls in the countryside (compare Dem. lv. Callicles 11), may suggest that abundant dry-stone walling was as much a feature of the Greek landscape then as now. (On the walls see Foxhall, 49–51).

The insistence on fallow can be paralleled in Athenian leases, two of which insist on
Lease of Sacred Land from Arcesine

a green fallow crop of legumes (IG II² 1241, 2493). The grammarian Moeris identifies the use of amphietes, meaning ‘annually’, as particularly Attic, and amphietes is securely restored here (7–8). It is not impossible that this lease is heavily influenced by Athenian practice. Athens had a garrison at Arcesine in the 350s (see 51), and Amorgus is one of few places outside Attica to adopt the practice of marking the mortgaging of property on boundary-stones (horoi: see on 63). It is even possible (see Jameson) that the minute concern for the details of agricultural practice here results from the direct intervention of the one Athenian known to have been governor at Arcesine, Androtion (see on 51): he was not only an important local historian of Athens but author of a work on farming.

Remarks by Xenophon and Theophrastus and the way that ‘sowing barley in the straw’ came to be a proverb show that the biennial fallow insisted on here was regarded as good husbandry. The insistence on triple ploughing of fallow, the purpose of which was to prevent growth and seeding of weeds and to cut down moisture loss, goes back to Hesiod. The insistence on the right time for particular agricultural tasks (here digging round vines in February and (early) April, planting vines and figs in December) is also reminiscent of Hesiod. The timings given here correspond to modern Greek practice (Osborne, Classical Landscape, 15 and ch. ii, Burford, Land and Labor, ch. iii, Isager and Skydsgaard, Ancient Greek Agriculture).

The insistence on manuring and the precise stipulation about the amount of manure to be applied is unique, although, just as here precautions are taken to see that the lessee does not remove all manure at the end of the lease, so in other leases the removal of manure from the land leased is forbidden (see again IG II² 2493 and compare the topsoil removal prohibition in II² 2492). It is unfortunate, given the precise information about quantity of manure, that the absence of information about the total area involved prevents us judging manuring rates, for which there is no other ancient Greek information.

One source of manure is presumably the flocks whose entry into the sanctuary of Zeus is prohibited. Concern to limit the destructive effects of animals, and their depositing dung in the wrong places, is not infrequently found in Greek inscriptions (Osborne, Classical Landscape, 47–9; see also Isager and Skydsgaard, Ancient Greek Agriculture, ch. xiv). The encouragement of third-party prosecution of offenders against
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A marble stele broken into 5 pieces, found in 1899 '10 minutes from Piali' (i.e. close to site of Temple of Athena Alea). Now in Epigraphical Museum, Athens, nos. 10284–5. Photo: IG v. ii pl. III (part of A. 34–8).

Tegean form of Arcadian dialect. New clauses marked by paragraphoi between their first and second lines.

IG v. ii 6; Buck 19 (A only); Dubois, Recherches sur le dialecte arcadien, ii. Corpus Dialectal, Té 3 (only part of B); IP Ark 3–4*. Trans. Dubois (part), IP Ark. See also Burford, The Greek Temple Builders at Epidauros.
this rule may be linked to the need to ensure that the city is seen by the gods to be taking action against those who damage only the gods’ interests.

Amongst other duties, the lessee is required to plant trees annually. Emphyteutic leases, which require a lessee to plant trees, are known from the fifth century on (IG i3 84), but seem to have become particularly frequent in later antiquity as cities attempted to stem agricultural decline. Here the penalties for failing to plant vines and figs (a drachma a plant, 35) are much more severe than the penalties for failing properly to cultivate the existing plants (an obol a plant, 12–13).

The order in which the clauses of the lease are presented is somewhat chaotic. The clause on not pasturing animals in the sanctuary (35–9) comes between the discussion of planting and the statement that the temple administrators can have additional figs planted; the requirements about fallow land in 7–8 are amplified in 45–6. This chopping and changing makes it difficult to know whether there is a connection between successive requirements. Is there, for example, any connection between the planting of vines and figs and the building of a wall in 32?

Towards the end of the lease it becomes very unclear what is happening. Earlier editors have restored the text to have the lessee pay his fines and his taxes at the same time as the rent. But (a) the payments resulting from failing to carry out particular agricultural tasks seem consistently referred to by the verb apotino and the noun apoteisma, not by apodidomi (used here only of paying rent, 4–5) and zemia; (b) paying taxes seems discordant with the earlier statement that the lessee pays no taxes; and (c) it is hard to see any connection with the following clauses about things subject to dispute being sold to the highest bidder. It is to be noted that the only payments in the whole inscription paid to ‘treasurers’ (civic officials?) rather than to the temple administrators are those paid ‘separately from the rent’ in lines 48–50. Whatever is happening here, it appears that great store is laid by it: volunteer prosecutors are encouraged by monetary rewards to ensure that the temple administrators do this selling, and they report this time not to the council but to the masteres who, to judge by Harpokration s.v. (μαστέρης), were special investigative magistrates—the closest a Greek city got to public prosecutors. We do not understand what is going on here, or whether all these clauses are connected with the further mention of planting that follows and that seems to have been the last subject mentioned.
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Concerning . . . if any trouble occurs between the contractors on the same task as regards the task.

3 The man who has been wronged is to summon the person who has committed the offence within three days from the day on which the offence occurred, and not later, and whatever those who issue the contracts decide is to be valid.

6 If war prevents the completion of any of the works that are under contract, or destroys any work that has been done, the Three Hundred are to decide what should happen. The generals are to account the income to the city, if it seems that it is war which has prevented or destroyed the work, when the sale of war booty takes place. But if someone who has taken a contract has not started the work, and war prevents work, he is to give back whatever money he has received and be released from the work, if those who have issued the contract so order. But if anyone gets together to oppose the allocation of the contracts, or does harm by destroying the work in any way, those who issue the contracts are to punish him with whatever punishment they think fit, and let him be summoned to judgment and brought into whatever court is appropriate for the magnitude of the penalty.

21 It is not to be permitted for more than two people to contract jointly for any of the works. In case of any breach, each is to be fined 50 drachmas, and the haliastai are to enforce this; anyone who wishes may make an exposure (imphainein) for a reward of half the penalty. In the same way, if anyone has contracts for more than two pieces of work, either sacred or public, in any way, to whom the haliastai have not given express and unanimous permission, he is to be penalized 50 drachmas a month for each work over two until he completes those supernumerary contracts.

31 If anyone brings litigation concerning the terms of the contract for work on any matter, he is not . . . If not, it shall not be possible for him to be a litigant anywhere other than in Tegea; if he is condemned, he is to pay double the amount for which the suit is brought, and the surety for the penalty is to be the same person as was surety for the work, for its payment.

37 If someone who has taken a contract for work also does harm to some other existing work, whether sacred or public or private, contrary to the terms of the contract, he is to make restitution.
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tὸ καταβλαφθὲν τοῖς ἱδίοις ἀναλόμασαν μὴ ἔσσον

ἡ ὑπάρχει ἐν τοῖς χρόνοι τὰς ἑργασίας: εἰ δαμ μὴ

καταστάσσῃ, τὰ ἐπιζάμα ἀπυστεῖτο, κατάπερ

ἐπὶ τοῖς ἀλλοίς ἑργασίας τοῖς ὑπεραμέροις τέτακτοι.

εἰ δὲ τις τῶν ἑργώνας ἢ τῶν ἑργαζόμενων

ἐπηρεάζειν δέστοι ἐν τὰ ἑργά ἥ ἀπειθήσαι τοῖς

ἐπιμελουμένοις ἢ κατυφροθήκη σωμάτων ἔτη

τῶν τεταμένων, κύριοι ἐόντω εἰς ἑσοδήσης

τοὺς μὲν ἑργάτας ἐσθέλλωντες ἐπὶ ἑργοί,

τὸν δὲ ἑργώνας ζωμόστασε ἐν ἑπίκρασι, κατάπερ

τοῖς ἐπισυνεσταμένοις ταῖς ἑσοδοκίαις γέγραψε[τ]οι,

ὁ τι διὰν ἐσθοθή ἑργόν εἰτε ἱερόν εἰτε δαμάσθην,

ὑπάρχειν τὰς κοινὰς σύγγραφοι ταῖς[v]ι κυρ[ια]

πῶς ταῖς ἑπίς τοῖς ἑργοὶ γεγραμμὲναι σ[υ]γγράφοι.
of what has been damaged at his own expense to a condition not worse than it was at the time he undertook the contract. If he does not make restitution, he is to pay the penalties just as is ordained for other works which are overdue.

If any contractor or workman seems to be abusive against the work or does not obey those put in charge or shows contempt for the penalties that have been imposed, those letting the contract are to have power to exclude a workman from the work and penalise a contractor in court in the same way as is prescribed for those who oppose the allocation of contracts. Whatever work is allocated, whether sacred or public, the general contract is to be valid in addition to the contract that is written with regard to the particular work.

B

56 of Aristocles — +46 dr., ½ obol; of Platias, 2 minas, 10 dr., 4 obols, 1 chalcus; — of Sacleidas 68 dr.; of Stasias — 2 chalci.

During the priesthood of Saitios, the treasurers of the generals around ——, —exias, Thrasycles, Epiteles paid out of the annual income for the year when Lison was priest, ἐπαθὴσα to the following: of—eon, 3 minas, 34 dr., 1½ obols; of Astycles — of the children, 22 dr., 4⅓ obols; of Hierocles, 31+ dr.; of ———, 1+ mina, 59 dr., 4 obols; of Leontias, 58 dr., 2⅔ obols; ——; of Aristodamus, 1 mina, 23 dr., 3 obols; of Leontichus, ——; of ——as, 1 mina, 44 dr., 1½ obol, 1 chalcus; of Aristocles, ——; of ——n, 23 dr., 3+ obols; of Cleon, 1 mina, 20 dr., 1½ obols; ——; of Aristaeus, 2 minas, 31 dr., 2⅔ obols; of Agathocles, ——; of ——amos, 56 dr., 2⅓ obols; of Ageas, 3 minas, 13 dr., 4⅔ obols.

70 During the priesthood of ——, the treasurers of the Generals around Gorgiadas, ——, —imon and Eurybiadas paid out of the annual income for the year when Saitius was priest, ἐπαθὴσα to the following: —— 17+ dr., ¼ obol, 2 chalci; to Megacles, 12 dr., ½ obols; to Gorgythus, 5+ dr.; to Cleostratus son of ——tas, 3 minas, 11 dr., 5 obols; to Tim—, ——; to ——idamus, 11 dr., 5 obols; to Antibolus, 4 minas, 60+ dr.; to ——nios 66 dr., 4⅔ obols; to Proxenus, 11½ obols; ——; to —llas, 5 minas, 1 dr., 1½ obol — 4 minas, 6 dr., 1+ obol; —— 4+ dr., 4 obols; to Polycres, 42 dr., 2⅔ obols.

79 — of the eighth: to Aristaeus, 22 dr., 2⅓ obols; to Timi—, ——; to
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80 [-----------------] ομάδωντι ΜΜΜΚIIΕ Μαντίας Γ'II
[-----------------] Ελευτεράκης ΕΕ [Ο][μ][σμων]
[-----------------] απεδωκαν[γγ] Ευφαίης ναυτ
[-----------------] μοι ἐπ' Αθανάιαν ἐξδήμανν!! Άστι-
[-----------------] Κλεινιέτα [ΜΔ]<ΔΧΧΧΙΙΤ Πεδω-
85 [-----------------] Αγαθοκλέος ΜΔΔ<ΔΧΧΙΙΕ Πλα[τίαν]
[-----------------] Γοργίλω ΜΜΔΔΔΔ<Ε Δευτέρα[ν].
[-----------------] ΠΗ ειστεάν ΠΓ<ΔΗ Μαρ---
break

(col. ii)

κλη[σς...][Καλλίας Е[-------------------]
φυλ[α], τα[ν] επ' Αθανάιαν Ε[-------------------]

90 [...][Αμφι... πρώταν Λόγων ΔΔΙΙΙΙΙΙΠο[...έν]]<ΕΤ Αθη-
λων Π[...ΙΤ Δαμοφράκων ΔΔ<ΔΧΧΧΤ Τελεστα]υ τω Τελεσταν Γ'!!(?)
ΓΔ Τελεσταν ΔΔΓΓ Τελεσταν Ф<Ε Λυσικλής Λόγων Π[...](?)
Δ<ΚΙΘ Θήβωνος Βραχιλλω <Ε <Ε Τελεσταν ΛΔΔΓΔΕ< Δευτέραν Άρι-
στεάν ΜΡΧΙΕ άπη τοι Σαύκακω δωρ ποσεδώμεθα ΜΜΔΔΔΔ

95 Γ<ΕΙΕ ΠΗ(Ι) ὀλλάθος ΜΜΜ [-------------------]
(ἔρημος Λ[α]υλλος· τω ταλάντω τω ἄ πόλεω ἀποδίκει,
ἀπωδώσον τω ἐτευς τω ἐπι Δαμοστράτι πε[τω δι]'καστήριῳ ταμίᾳ· Βύδαμος Τιμοκρέτες
[όσω ποσε]δέωμεν τω ἐς τοι ἐτι τοι ἐπι Δαμοστρά-
τοι, ἀπωδώσον δε ἐφ' ἑρέι Αστύλλο. τοιούθε
[απεδωκαν αν τρίταν Νικερέταν ΜΜΔΔ<ΔΠΗ]
[------------] ΜΜΜΜΔ<ΔΧΧΧΧΠαντοκλέος ΔΔΓΓΓΓΓΓΓ
[-----------------] Κλέος ΜΜΔΔ<ΕΤ Τελεσα [..]ΜΜΔΔ[ΙΙΙΙ] Α-
[-----------------] τοκράτεος ΔΔΔΔΙΙΙΙΙIIΙI τετοράταιν ἐπ' Ἁνιώ:

105 [-----------------] Αλμ[η][ρ][όνος ΜΜΦΔ]. [Αμφί][τ][π][ε][λος ΔΔΓ
[-----------------] ΜΜΔΔΓ<ΕΙΕ [-------------------]
[-----------------] έσφαντω ΜΔ[...].] α[πεδωκαν]
[όσω πο]σεδώμεθα ΜΜΜΓΚ<ΚΕ [Ευδαμίου ΑθαΜΦΔ]
[ἐπὶ...].] στραταγοι ο[ι] περὶ Σαγκλήν Σώπολος

110 [-----------------] λής ΜΜΜΜΔΔ<ΙΙΧΧΧ Νικαίας ΜΜ Θπη-
[-----------------] Ω ΔΔΔ<ΔΧΧΧΤ Σωδάμω ΜΜΜΜΓΓΙΕΕ Εκ[ά]τω
[-----------------] Αμπο[σ]ταῖος Ω<ΔΧΧΧΠ Δόσων τω Δαμίαν
[-----------------] αυν Παντοκλέος ΔΔΔ<ΩΙΙΕΕ Νέω ΜΜΓΓ<Κ*
[-----------------] άρχω ΔΔΓ<ΔΕ[ξεφ]ιος Γ< Αινῆ(δαμί)ω ΚΕΕ
[-----------------] λος ΜΜΔΔΙΕΕ Σώ[πο]νος Δ<ΚΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΝικαίας ΜΜ
[-----------------] Δ<ΔΧΧΧΧΧ. απ' τοι Αμφικλέος δώρ ποσεδώ[μ][ε][θα]

115 [-----------------] Δ Αλμίω ΜΜΔΔ< Αλ[ε]ξάιος[δρω] ---------------]
---ymedon, 3 minas, 1 dr., 2½ obols; to Mantias, 5 dr., 2+ obols; — to —eiotas, 5+ dr., ½ obol; of Onasimus, 1+ obol.

83 --- granted. Euphaes --- for Athanaia, of the seventh, 3 obols; of Asti---, 1+ dr., 2 chalci; of Cleianetus, 1 mina, 12 dr., 5¼ obols; of Pedio---, 2+ dr., 1½ obols; of Agathocles, 1 mina, 23 dr., 4½ obols; of Platias, ---; of Gorgilus, 2 minas, 43 dr., 1½ obols.

86 Of the second: --- of Pleisteas, 56 dr., 4 obols; of Mar--- ---
break
Callias --- for the tribe Athanaia ---

90 Of the first: to Lyon, 20 dr., 5 obols; to Po---, ---4+ dr., ¾ obol; to Athilus, 50+ dr., 1½ obols; of Damophason 23 dr. 1¼ obols; of Telestas son of Telestas, 5 dr., 1 obol(?), 60+ dr.; of Telestas, 35 dr.; of Telestas, 52 dr., ½ obol; of Lysicles son of Dyon, 5+ dr.(?), 12+ dr. 2 obols; of Thibron son of Brachyllus, 3 dr., ½ obol; of Telestas, 41 dr., ½ obol.

93 Of the second: to Aristeias, 1 mina, 51 dr., 1½ obols.

94 From the year of Saiscus, the amount that we needed in addition: 2 minas, 48 dr., 1½ obols; of Pollis, 3 minas (erasure).

96 Priest Astyllus: of the talent which the city was missing, the treasurers of the year under Damostratus will give to the court: Eudamus son of Timocrates. The amount that we needed in addition for the year under Demostratus, they will give under the priest Astyllus. To the following they gave the third: of Nicaretas, 2 minas, 22 dr., 2 obols; of Tales, 5 dr., 1½ obols; of Pantocles, 25 dr., 5 obols; of A---, 2 minas, 64 dr., ¾ obol; of Table, 2+ minas, 20 dr., 2 obols; of A---, ---ocrates, 40 dr., 4 obols; of the fourth under Aenias: --- of Aeschrion, 2 minas, 60 drachmas+; of Aristocles, 20 dr., 1 obol; --- 1 mina, 38 dr.; --- +3 dr., 4½ obols; of Esphantus, 1 mina, 10+ dr. They paid the amount that we needed in addition: 3 minas, 8 dr.; Eudamus: 21 minas, 60 dr.

109 Under --- the generals with Sacles, Sopolis --- ---les, 4 minas, 12 dr., 3 obols, 2 chalci; Nicasias, 2 minas; of Epi---, --- 32+ dr., 3¼ obols; of Sodamus, 4 minas, 6 dr., 2½ obols; of Hecatus, ---; of Aristocles, 12 dr., 4½ obols; of Lison son of Damina, ---; of Pantocles, 34 dr., 5½ obols; of Neus, 2 minas, 58+ dr.; of ---archus, 28 dr.; of Dexon, 6 dr.; of Aenesidamus, 1 dr., 1½ obols; of ---eu, 2 minas, 10 dr., 3½ obols; of Saon, 12 dr., 2 obols; of Nicasias, 2+ minas, 13+ dr., 3+ obols.

117 From the beginning of the year of Amphicles, the amount that we needed in addition ---: of Lasius 2 minas, 12 dr.; of Alexander ---
Various aspects of architectural history are directly illuminated by inscriptions. City
decrees order the construction of buildings or honour individuals who have under-
taken building projects, contracts lay down the details of a whole project or of
particular elements of a building, committees of overseers publish accounts detailing
purchases of material and payments to contractors (extensive accounts survive from
fifth-century Athens (for the Erechtheum), from fourth-century Delos, Delphi, andEpi-
dauros, and from hellenistic Didyma; for examples see Hellmann, Choix, nos. 17—23).

This stone from Tegea was inscribed in the mid fourth century with rules of contract
on one face and accounts of the treasurers of the generals, three or four in number,
on the other in two columns. The accounts (B) are poorly preserved but some con-
nection between them and contracts for public works seems likely. We appear to have
accounts for seven different years, dated by priests (of Athena Alea, also used to date
other Tegean documents) (ll. 55—9, 59—69, 70—81, 82—7, 88—95, 96—108, 109—17). Tod
(BSA xviii 1911/12, 105) thought what was given was a subscription list, but it seems
more likely that we have lists of payments made. Payments by the treasurers (tamià)
of the generals (59—60, 70) and by the generals themselves (109) are referred to in the
third person, but there are also references in the first person plural, which seem to
refer to actions by the current board of treasurers of the generals. The treasurers seem
to be held personally liable before a court for irregularities in their accounts (96—100,
where the name Eudamus is perhaps the name of the prosecutor (compare line 108))?

What the payments recorded are for is unclear. The term epatăla, used to describe
them at 72 (and restored in 62 and 101), has been variously interpreted as salaries for
magistrates or prizes at the festival of the Aleaia, but the very miscellaneous amounts
involved do not sit well with either of those interpretations, and might better suit pay-
ments to contractors (and so a closer connection with face A). Those to whom money
is given are sometimes named in the genitive and sometimes in the dative case (and in
one case in the nominative (92)), with no apparent rationale for the change from one
case to another which at one point (90—1) occurs within a single year. From the third
year recorded onwards there are also numbered payments, with numbers in the geni-
tive case, although what survive are not in numerical order. We must admit that the
details of the transactions recorded here are beyond our understanding.

As it survives (the beginning is lost and must have contained the clauses referred
to at ll. 36—7, 43—4), the contract here is almost entirely concerned with problems
that might arise in the course of works being carried out. This puts it at the opposite
extreme from contracts like that for the Athenian arsenal designed by Philo of Eleusis
(IG ii 1668, Hellmann, Choix, no. 12), which lays down the building specifications in
detail but has no concern at all for how the building work is carried out or what is to
happen in case of default. But the extremely general nature of this Tegea contract also
separates it from other contracts, which combine rules and working instructions: the
Tegea contract is not attached to any specific instructions; instead it describes itself as
a “common contract” to be valid in addition to any work-specific contract (54—5). This
common contract seems designed to cover all public works, not simply building works
(IG xli. ix 191, a contract to drain a lake from late fourth-century Eretria, has a number
of clauses in common with this inscription). Although the findspot suggests some con-
nection between this inscription and the building, in the middle of the fourth century, of the temple of Athena Alea, under the direction of the architect and sculptor Scopas (Pausanias, viii. 45. iv), this contract is certainly not exclusive to that building.

Just how ‘general’ is this contract? Contracts from other places, including the particularly detailed contract from hellenistic Lebadeia (IG vii 3073, partly reproduced as Hellmann, no.13) often have clauses that are limited to what is relevant to their own particular concerns, and sanctions that are imposed by magistrates particularly concerned with the project in question (e.g. naopoioi in the case of building a temple). Here the clauses all concern big and transferable problems: quarrels between workers, disruption by war, damage to work, the number of contractors who can be engaged for a single job of work, and the number of contracts one contractor can be engaged for, pursuit of grievances concerning the contract in a court of law, causing damage to pre-existing work when executing a contract, and abusive behaviour by the contractor. Any of these clauses might reflect some recent incident or be designed to deal with some particular form of difficulty that was imminently expected (Tegea had seen plenty of warfare and civil strife in the second quarter of the fourth century). But the reference of grievances to standard judicial bodies (the haliastai are those who man the courts), rather than to the magistrates concerned with a particular sort of work, and the role of magistrates named esdoteres (‘those who issue the contracts’) further argues (against Burford, 92, and despite the rather random order of presentation) for the general force of this contract: it is an attempt to ensure that in future all public contracts are executed on the same basic conditions. Although the impression that contracts will lead to difficulties that have to be resolved by legal means is in part a product of the nature of the document, the document does make clear that litigiousness was not an Athenian monopoly. For the procedure implied by imphainein (24) see on 14. For the Three Hundred see IG v. ii 3 = Buck 18 = LSGG 67 = IPArk 2. 20-1, and, at Mantinea, 14.

Although this contract differs in form from other known contracts, almost all the clauses can be paralleled. Provision for quarrels between contractors is made at Athens, Delos, and Lebadeia, for war damage at Lebadeia and Eretria, for numbers of contractors and contracts per contractor at Epidaurus, and for the discipline of the workers at Lebadeia (Greek building contracts are helpfully summarized and discussed by Burford 91–102). One clause is unique: the clause barring a contractor from seeking to resolve a dispute in a court of law outside Tegea if he has taken money for doing the work. By this clause those issuing the contract make accepting pay tantamount to accepting the conditions. That such a clause was needed indicates the degree to which cities respected each other's legal standing; disputes arising between the authorities in one city and a citizen from another city could normally be taken to court in either place. Given the loss of the early part of the text no conclusions can be drawn from clauses found in other contracts but not here. It is likely, however, that more particular regulations, such as those found on Delos and at Lebadeia about numbers of workmen and the length of the working day, and those found in Athens, Delos, and Lebadeia about contract price and the inspection of work, will not have belonged to a ‘common contract’. It is notable that in some of its provisions
this contract is more restrictive than practice elsewhere: at Athens as many as seven contractors may be involved in a single piece of work, and at Delphi individuals are known to have had several contracts in a single year, though we cannot tell whether they were held simultaneously or sequentially.

The inscription shows a number of distinctive Arcadian dialectal features, and one
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Introduction of members to a phratry (?), Tenos, fourth century

A marble stele, damaged on all sides but with original margin preserved to top and left. From Kounares, Tenos, now lost.

Central Ionic, retaining old o for oo.

Graindor, RE lxix = vii 1917, 54–67 (with photograph); Haussoullier, RP 2 1926, 97–100; IG xi Supp. 303, LSS 48, Étienne, Tenos, ii 40–2 no. 2. Trans. Ogden, Greek Bastardy, 286. See also Le Guen-Pollet, 3.

A corporate body on the large Cycladic island of Tenos here regulates the introduction of new members, specifying the sacrifice that is required, the conditions under which legitimate and bastard sons are to be introduced, and the oaths to be sworn at introduction. Even by the standards of epigraphic texts this is remarkably laconic, perhaps because recording established practice (contrast 5), and in consequence it is very hard to tell whether successive clauses depend upon one another or are independent provisions. The officials in charge of admission are never named, and editors have disagreed about the nature of the group here admitting new members. It is clearly a group whose new members come from the kin (by descent in the male line or marriage) of existing members, and it is a group for which legitimacy is of some importance. We know there to have been descent groups called patrai (SEG XI 699), phatriai,
or two that seem restricted to Tegea itself. Arcadian are used in ordinary speech of ἀπός meaning summon (2) and δέαμαι for δοξέω (10), of -υ for -ο (so ἀπό, ἄλλυ, and by analogy κατο), of ἐν for εύ and πός for πρός, of -οι as dative singular ending, and -ωναί as third person plural ending. The genitive ending -αν is exclusive to Tegea. δαρχυάς for δαρχύας is also found in Boeotia, Elis, and Corecyra.

Law of introduction: a wife with a young goat; a son with a young goat.

1 No introduction before the father reaches fifty years old; if the father has died a brother from the same father is not to be refused at the age ———. It shall not be permitted to introduce a bastard; if a bastard is not rejected, introduce a bastard at the same age as for legitimate sons. Anyone who introduces a bastard, let him pay twenty-five drachmas.

6 Let him extend his hand toward the hearth and take an oath and provide two witnesses swearing that he is the putative father. Let the man introducing also swear that the person he is introducing is the son of the same father or the son of a brother; let the mother also swear.

8 Let whoever does not persuade one of those present be punished with a five-drachma fine.

and phratriai on Tenos, and it is likely that these are all alternative names for phratries (Gauthier, REG civ 1991, 509–10 no. 431 contra Étienne). In the hellenistic period those given citizenship are made members of a phratry (IG xii. v 816, 820)—and a group of the sort called a phratry in Attica seems the group most likely to have the combination of concerns recorded here (compare 1, 5, 87).

Three features of this text are notable: the admission of women into the group on marriage, the insistence on admission of sons being dependent upon the age of the father; and the provision for the introduction of bastard sons.

In Athens men seem to have given a marriage feast (gamelia) for their fellow phrateres on behalf of their new bride (cf. e.g. Dem. xvi. Eubulides 43, 69), but women did not regularly become members of their husband’s phratry (just as they were not regularly
introduced as children to their father’s phratry (Lambert, *The Phratries of Attica*, 36–7, 178–88)). In this case from Tenos no provision is made for daughters to be introduced by their father, but on marriage wives are apparently introduced to the group in exactly the same way as, and at the same price as, sons (for Athenian practice regularly being more restrictive of women than practice elsewhere cf. Schaps, *Economic Rights*). It is clearly envisaged that sons will be members of the group by the time they marry, but their admission is made dependent on their father’s age.

Age was regularly a (dis)qualification for group membership or eligibility for magisterial office or other duties, something sometimes seen as left over from an earlier age-class organization of society (Sallares, *Ecology*, ch. v esp. 275). Peculiarly, however, the age qualification here relates not to the person being introduced but to the person introducing: the father must be fifty before the son can be introduced (although the negative is restored in 1.1, it is guaranteed by the grammatical construction of 1.2). The purpose of this restriction is not clear. If Tenos observed the regular Greek pattern at which men married around the age of 30, then first-born sons would be around 20 when introduced; only in the case of unusually early marriages would this regulation delay introduction beyond entry into manhood. Some editors have thought that only elder sons could be introduced, but we see no justification for that in the text and it is hard to envisage any group flourishing with such a rule. If younger sons are admissible, on the other hand, then this regulation would seem to permit such sons, or the sons of a second marriage, to be introduced at a very young age. By allowing that once the father is fifty years old sons can be freely introduced, this group maximizes the chances that the father will still be alive when his children are introduced; given the disputes that we know from the orators to have arisen in Attica over the introduction of sons of deceased fathers (Lambert, *Phratries*, 170, 174), this

---

**Religious calendar, Cos, mid fourth century**

Four *stelai* of white marble inscribed by the same lettercutter, found near the ancient theatre and church of Aghios Ioannis, site of the sanctuary of the Twelve Gods.

Cowan Doric, with a mixture of earlier and later forms, and some Ionic influence. I and : used as punctuation mark to separate, respectively, different days and different events on the same day.


---

\[ ['καί] | έδώχων[τε] θάνατος ἐκαθάρισεν ἐς τὸν θανάτον τῶν ἀνδρῶν \]

1–2 Herzog in apparatus.
may have been the major motivation for the 'age of father' rule. It is worth noting how narrow is the range of circumstances legislated for here. There is no provision for an only son whose father has died, and there is an assumption that there will be a father's brother to take responsibility in the absence of the father.

Phratries at Athens could insist that bastard sons could not be members (compare 5.109–10; Ogden, *Bastardy*, 127–8), but other Athenian corporate bodies could be less strict (Ogden, *Bastardy*, 116–17 on the genos Kerykes). This Tenian regulation equivocates, first forbidding the introduction of bastards and then allowing their introduction for the payment of a fine, where the fine is effectively a fee. Once that fine is paid, the bastard is presumably treated like a legitimate son, and the same sacrificial victim required. Since we do not know how the group involved here related to the structures of the citizen body of Tenos, we do not know whether the concession here affected the civic rights of the bastard (for which cf. Arist. *Pol.* iii. 1278 A 26–34; on bastardy and citizenship at Athens see on 5).

The stipulation that oaths be sworn by two witnesses (for the restoration compare 5.108) does not necessarily apply only to bastards (paternity must always be a matter of opinion), and the following oaths by the introducer and the mother seem certain to apply to all sons; the father's brother presumably swears in the absence of the father himself. For the swearing towards the hearth, compare the oath at the altar in the case of an Attic phratry (And. i. *Myst.* 125–6, 5.76).

The last clause appears to allow any phratry member to black-ball an introduction by declaring that he does not believe the oath (for circumstances in which this might happen, compare again And. i. *Myst.* 125 ff., and Lambert, *Phratries*, 171). The fine is presumably in addition to rejection and designed to discourage frivolous introductions or introductions that flagrantly break these rules (compare 5.99–100).

---

*And. i.* *Myst.* 125–6, 5.76.

---

A month, Batromios

---

- - - and pray to the gods brought in to the other tribes just as to the other gods. Let the priest and the sacred guardians and the magistrates announce the annual festivals
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[30] ἐναντία ὁρᾷ ἰερεῖς καὶ ἱεροφύλακες καὶ ἱροχέου[ντ]-

28 ΕΤΑΙΡΕΙΑΝ ΗΖΕΡΓ: ΤΗΜΑΝ ΗΙΚΣ: See Sherwin-White, 323.
as a feast, and let the hieropoioi and the heralds go to each of the chiliastyes. Let them drive nine oxen, an ox from each Ninth from A—and First Pasthemidai and Nostidai. Let the Pamphyloi drive (their oxen) to the agora first, and in the agora they mix together. Let the priest sit at the table wearing the holy garment, and the hieropoioi on each side of the table. Let the Pamphyloi drive in the three finest oxen, to see if one of those may be chosen; if it is not, let the Hylleis drive three, to see if one of those may be chosen; if it is not, let the Dymanes (drive) the three remaining, to see if one of those may be chosen; if it is not, let them drive other oxen to the agora and let them drive them past in the same way, to see if one of them may be chosen. If not let them drive a third (group) in for selection in the same way. If none of those is chosen, let them select an additional ox from each chiliastys. When they have driven these, they mix them with the others and make a selection straightaway, pray, and make the announcement. Then they drive the oxen past in the same way.

It is sacrificed if it bows to Hestia. The kings’ share-taker sacrifices and provides offerings and offers in addition a half hekteus of offerings. He takes as his share the skin and a leg, and the hieropoioi take a leg and the rest of the meat belongs to the city.

The heralds lead the ox selected for Zeus to the agora. When they are in the agora, the person who owns the ox or another enabler on his behalf calls out: ‘I am providing the ox for the Goans; let the Goans give the price to Hestia.’ And let the presidents (prostatai) take an oath immediately and make a valuation, and when a valuation has been made, let the herald announce how much the valuation was. Then they drive (the ox) to Hestia Hetaireia and sacrifice it. The priest puts a fillet upon the ox and pours a cup of mixed wine as a libation in front of the ox. Then they lead away the ox and the burnt offering and seven cakes and honey and a woollen fillet. As they lead it away they call for holy silence. There they untie the ox and begin the sacrificial ritual with olive and laurel. The heralds burn the pig and the entrails upon the altar, pouring libations of honey and milk on them, and when they have washed the intestines they burn them beside the altar. And once they are burnt without wine, let him pour a libation of honey and milk upon them. Let the herald announce that they are keeping the annual festival as a feast for Zeus Polieus. Let the priest make an additional offering along with the intestines, incense, and cakes, libations, unmixed and mixed, and a woollen fillet. Then let the priest and the herald go to the hieropoioi at the public building, and the hieropoioi entertain the priest and the herald on this night. When they make libations let the priest choose one of the hieropoioi as slaughterer of the ox that is being sacrificed to Zeus Polieus and let him proclaim that the slaughterer shall be pure from woman and man during the night. And let the heralds choose whoever they want of their own number as a slaughterer of the ox and let whoever of them wishes make a proclamation to the person chosen in the same way.

On the same day: to Dionysus Scyllites, a pig and a kid. The meat of the pig not to be
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45 ὑλίται χοίρος καὶ ἐφίφος· τοῦ χοίρου οὐκ ἀποφόρα· θείες δὲ ἱερεῖς κ[αί] ἵε·

[πά] παρέχει· γέρῃ φέρει δέμα, σκέλος. ἦ λκάδι· βούς ὁ κριθεῖς θύεται Ζηρί

[Πο]λήνη; ἔνδορα ἐνδέρεται· ἐφ χ' ἐστιν ὡθεῖται αὐλητίων ἡμιέκτων, ἀρτο[ι]

[δό]ται ἔξ ἡμιέκτων, ὁ ἀτέρους τυφώδης, καὶ τὰ ἱερόν· καὶ ἑπιστείνητε ὃ ἵε[π]

εὐσ τούτος οἴνου κρατήρας τρεῖς· γέρῃ τοῦ βο̱ου τοῦ ἱερή δέμα κ[αί] σι[α]

[κε]λος— ἱερὰ ἱερεῖς παρέχει— {ε} καὶ χέλνου ἡμισυ καὶ κολλάς ἡμι[ε]

[σι] νυ· νοιφοροὶ δι τοῦ σκέλους τοῦ τῶν ἱεροποιῶν διδοται ἀκρίς ὄριην, [κάρπ]

[εῖν] ὄστον δίκρεας, ὑπόμωνα, ἀγαθόν ἀβελὸς τρικόλος, Νεστορίδα[ς]

[δέ] μότου δίκρεας, ἱατροὶ κρέας, αὐθητι κρέας, χαλκέως καὶ κεραμέ[ε]

[ν] μέ ἐκατέρως τὸ κεφάλαιοι· τὰ δὲ ἅλλα κρέα τὰς πλίσεως. ταῦτα πάντα·

55 [οὐκ] ἀποφέρεται· έκτὸς τὰς τι[ὸ] δος· ταῖς αὐταί ταν μεραί· Ἀθαναίας Πο[λι]

— διο αῖς κυνοσα· θείες δὲ ἵε[π] ρεις καὶ ἱερὰ παρέχει· γέρῃ λαμβάνει δε[ρ]

— μα καὶ σκέλος. ἦν εὔσταται· με[τί] ἵε να· Διονύσιον Σκυλλίταις χοίρος [καὶ]

ἐφιφος· τοῦ χοίρου οὐκ ἀποφόρα· θείες ἱερεῖς καὶ ἱερὰ παρέχει· γέρῃ [Α]·

ἀμβαίεναι δέμα καὶ σκέλος. οἱ βεβόμαν άνομον· ἔναι Ακτιδίας Δάμ[μι]-

60 ἀτρινὸς τέλεως καὶ τελέα κυνοσα· τοῦτоν οὐκ ἀποφόρα· κύλικες κ[αί]-

[ντα] διόι διδοται· θείες ἱερείς καὶ ἱερὰ παρέχει· γέρῃ δὲ οίκαι· έκείνος [καὶ]

[ὅν] συσ Ἡγουμένα· τοῦ χοίρου [ο] οὐκ ἀποφόρα· θείες

[θείες] παρέχει· γέρῃ λαμβάνει δέμα καὶ σκέλος

(σις, against line 8) (σις, against line 20)

tῶν ϑουρμέων

τρείς καὶ χύτρα

tαὶ Λευκοθῆς

ἀποφόρα ἐκ ἱερῶν

5

[14-15] εἰ· γέρῃ λαμβάνει δέμα καὶ σκέλη· ταῖς αὐτές·

— αἰ ἁμεράν· Ἱέρα χοίρος καὶ ἱερὰ δισεφερτοῦ τοῦ Πεδαγεῖτο[ν]

— γέρῳ τήτο· τοῦτων οὐκ ἀποφόρα· θείες ἱερεῖς καὶ ἱερὰ παρέχει· [γ]·

ἐρή λαμβάνει δέμα καὶ σκέλος. ἐκ δεκάτων· Ἡραί Ἀργείαι· Ἁλεια θαλείαι δάφ-

[νίσ] κριτώ· κρυπτόν δε μὴ ἐλάσονος {ον} ὄνημεν πεντε-

τήκοντα δραχμάδα· θείες ἱερεῖς καὶ ἱερὰ παρέχει· γέρῃ λαμβάνει

δέμα καὶ σκέλος· ταῦτα ἀποφόρα· ἐνδόρα ἐνδέρεται καὶ θύε[τα]

ἐπὶ ταῖς ἱστίαις εν τοῖ τοι ναοι τὰ ἱερά καὶ ἐλατήρι ες ἡμιέκτων [οπ]·

υρῶν· τοῦτων οὐκ ἐκφορά ἐκ τοῦ ναοῦ. ἐν δεκάταν· Ζηρί Μαχα-

[νή] βούς κρύνεται τὸ ἀτερον ἐτοι ἐφιδ οκ καὶ ἱερεῖς· ο [καὶ] ἀρμείας, καθ[θά]

— περ τοῦ βασιλικοῦ τοῦ Ζηρί τοῦ Πολιτῆς κρύβεται, κατ [αί] χοίρος προ-

κατενείπεται, καὶ προκορυφάσται καθάπερ τοῦ Πολιτῆς. ἔνδυκας [κ]·

— αὐτάν· Ζηρί Μαχανήι ὠτε τρεῖς τέλεως καὶ βούς ὁ κριθεῖς τὸ

ἀτερον ἐτοι ἐφιδ οκ καὶ ἱερεῖς· ο [καὶ] ἀρμείας· ταῦτα θείες ἱερεῖς ὁ τῶν Δυσδεκάς Θεῶν, καὶ ἱερὰ πα-

ἀρέχει τοῦτοι· προβούσται πάρ τού φοίνον, ἐν ἑροῖν Φυλεομ—
taken away. The priest sacrifices and provides the offerings. As perquisites he takes skin, leg.

46 On the twentieth: the selected ox is sacrificed to Zeus Polieus. What has to be wrapped in the skin is wrapped in the skin. On the hearth is offered a half *hektes* of barley groats, two half-*hektes* loaves, one shaped like a cheese, and the things wrapped in skin. And the priest pours three mixing bowls of wine on these as a libation. Perquisites of the ox: for the priest, skin, and a leg (the priest provides the offerings) and half the breast and half the stomach; for the thurifer the hip-end of the leg given to the *hieropolis*; for the heralds, a double portion of meat from the back, shoulder meat, a three-spit share of blood meat; for the Nestoridai, a double portion of meat from the back; for the doctors, meat; for the pipe-player, meat; to each of the smiths and potters, the brain. The rest of the meat is the city’s. All these are not taken outside the city.

55 On the same day: to Athena Polias, a pregnant sheep. The priest sacrifices and provides the offerings. As perquisites he takes the skin and a leg.

57 On the twenty-first: To Dionysus Scyllites a pig and a kid: The meat of the pig not to be taken away. The priest sacrifices and provides the offerings. As perquisites he takes skin and a leg.

59 On the twenty-third: at Alcida(?) to Demeter a full-grown sheep and a full-grown pregnant ewe. The meat of these not to be taken away. Two new cups are provided. The priest sacrifices and provides the offerings. Perquisites: ears.

61 On the twenty-fourth: To Dionysus Scyllites a pig and a kid: the meat of the pig not to be taken away. The priest sacrifices and provides the offerings. As perquisites he takes skin, leg. — — —

(side) What is sacrificed to Leucothea may be taken away to the priestess.

(side) three and a bowl.

B (month, Carneios)

2 — — As perquisites he takes skin and legs.

3 On the same day: to Rhea, a pregnant ewe and the offerings as recorded for Pedageit-nion. None of this may be taken away. The priest sacrifices and provides the offerings. As perquisites he takes skin.

5 On the tenth: to Argive Royal Hera of the Marshes, a choice heifer. Let it be chosen purchased for not less than fifty drachmas. The priest sacrifices and provides the offerings. As perquisites he takes skin and leg. Meat from this animal may be taken away. What has to be wrapped in the skin is wrapped in the skin and what is wrapped in skin is sacrificed on the hearth in the temple and a broad flat cake made from half a *hektes* of barley. None of these to be taken out of the temple.

10 On the eleventh: to Zeus Machaneus, an ox is selected every other year, the year in which the Carneian sacrifice takes place, just as it is selected during Batramios for Zeus Polieus, and a pig is burnt in advance and an advance announcement made as for the Polieus.

13 On the twelfth: to Zeus Machaneus, three full-grown sheep and the ox selected every other year, the year in which the Carneian sacrifice takes place, and in the other year three full-grown sheep. The priest of the Twelve Gods sacrifices these and provides
αχιδαι, ἀδότων ἡμείκτων, οὖν τετάρταν γέρη δὲ Φυλεωμε- 
άχιδαις δίδοται τοῦ βοὸς ὅπλα, ταρσός, τῶν δὲ οὗν τὸ ἄμυλον,
20 εὖς οὗ θεομοιρὰ τάμεται καὶ [τὸ] ἔνει[χος]· γέρη λαμβάνει ὁ ἰα-
ρεὺς σκῆλι καὶ δῆμοντα: τὰι αὐτῶν ἁμέραι Ἀθαναίας Μαχα[ν] —
διά δάμαλος κριτὰ τὸ ἄτερον ἐτος ἐφ᾽ οὖ κα ἐσωτε Καρυεία[τ], τ —
ὁ δὲ ἀτερον ἐτος οἷς τελέα· θύει ἵληρες καὶ ἀποφοβάνει ταθλ-
άσαν· τοῦτων οἷς ἀποφοβά· ἀποφοβὰ δίδοται τὰι θεοῖ εὐλα[ο] —
25 τέτορες κοτύλει, οὖν τετάρταν, πρόχοι καὶ καῖς κυλὶ —
κες καὶ τερείς· τοὺς de Καρυεΐς οἷς τὰμ πόλει ἀνισοθεῖ δαμὶ —
[λιν ἡ ἐλασσονος πεντήκοντα] δραμαχαι· ταύταν [———] —

C

[———]i. 1 εἰνατει ἐξ ἰκάδος—
[———]ναι αἰς τρεῖς τέλεωι. [θύ]οριται κατὰ φυλ-
[άς], δὲ μὲν τῶν Ἄκλεων παρὰ τὸ Ἀρκλεων, ὁ δὲ τῶν Δυμά-
νον παρὰ τὰ Αναζύλεα, δὲ τῶν Παμφύλεων ἐν Εἰτεί —
5 παρὰ τὸ Δαμίτρων· [ἐ]πὶ τοῦτων ἐκάστων ἱερὰ ὀυδομέτ-
ροιν], ἡμείκτων ἐκάστωρν, καὶ κύλικες καὶ τερείς ἐ-
[κάς]τω καὶ πίναξ ἐκάστων· ταύτα παρέχοντι τοι ἵ-
[ποποιοι] καὶ θοῦσι. 1 τρίται ἀνοιμένον Ἰπάκλεοι ἐς Κο —
[———]ν τοῦ ἄρτην καυτός: ταὶ αὐτὰ ἀμέραι· Ἰπάκλεοι —
10 [ἐς ..]σαλούν βοῦς· τοῦτον θύει ὁ ἰερεύς· τῶ δὲ —
[θεοὶ ἐφ] ἱερὰ δίδοται κρῆταν τρία ἡμέραμα καὶ σπυ-
ρῶν τρεῖς τεταρτήσις καὶ μέλιτος τέτορες κοτύλ-
ει καὶ τυριοὶ οἰσι δυνάμεα καὶ ἵππος καὶ νοῦ καὶ φρ —

νάνων ἄχθος καὶ ξύλων ἄχθος καὶ οἶνου τρία —
15 ἡμίχωα.
vacat
vacat


D

[———] εἰς — 1 ἑπτακαιδεκάτα· Χαπόλλω[ν] διαλώς[?] οἷς —
[τέλεως· τοῦ ἱεροῦ] ἀποφοβά· θύει ἱαρεύς καὶ ἱερὰ π[αρέ] —
[χεῖ] γέρη φέρει δ[έ]μα καὶ σκέλος: ταὶ αὐτὰ ἀμέραι —
[Λαστι οἷς τελέα· τα]ύτας ἀποφοβά· ἱερὰ ἱαρεύς παρέ —
5 [χεῖ] γέρη δέμα. 1 πρά]ται πρὸ εἰκάδος· Χάρισων αἰὲ —
[θύει δὲ ἱαρεύς ὁγ] καὶ κέλιωνται τοῦ ἱαροποίου· ταύτ —
[ας ἐς τὸ αἷμα τοῦ] φραίνει τὸ ἱερᾶ τρίς μεί τοῦ τοῦ —
[βωμοῦ, τὸ δὲ τέταρτον ποτὸ τόλῳ τοῦ ἐν ταῖς ἐλ —
αίαις κείμενον· οἷν] νομὶ δὲ δῦνον κοιλήσατε —
5 πρα]ται Κλαίλενβαχ; ἑπτάται Ηρζογ. 9 ἡμβ' ψοντι Ηρζογ in commentary; ἰσωρ' ψοντι Ηρζογ in text; ἐπθ' ψοντι LSCG.
the offerings for them. A half hekteus of barley groats and a quarter measure of wine, which the Phyleomachidai provide, is first offered at the common altar. As perquisites the Phyleomachidai are given the horns of the ox, the hooves, and the shoulder of the sheep, from which the sacred portion is cut, and the muzzle. As perquisites the priest takes legs and skins.

21 On the same day, to Athena Machanis, a selected heifer every other year in which the Carneian sacrifice takes place and in the other year a full grown sheep. The priest sacrifices and is sprinkled with sea water. None of these may be taken away. The following are given to the goddess without burning: four kotylai of olive oil, a quarter measure of wine, two new ewers, and three new cups. For the Carneia the city is to buy a heifer for not less then 50 drachmas. This—-

C (month, Pedageitnion(?))
On the twenty-first: to (gods or heroes) three full-grown sheep. They are sacrificed by tribes, that of the Hylleis beside the sanctuary of Heracles, that of the Dymanes beside the sanctuary of Anaxilas, on behalf of the Pamphyleis at Eitea beside the sanctuary of Demeter. For each of these sacrifices the offerings are: a vessel for the sacred grains, half a hekteus of each (sort of grain), three new cups for each and a plate for each. The hieropoioi provide these and sacrifice.

8 On the twenty-eighth: to Heracles at Go—, a burnt lamb.

9 On the same day, to Heracles at —ssalos, an ox. The priest sacrifices this. As additional offerings the god is given three half-mdimnoi of wheat and three quarters of barley and four kotylai of honey and twelve sheep's cheeses and a new stove and a weight of brushwood and a weight of wood and three half choes of wine.

D (month, unknown)
— On the seventeenth: to Delian (?) Apollo a full-grown sheep. The meat from this may be taken away. The priest sacrifices and provides the offerings. As perquisites he takes the skin and leg.

3 On the same day: a full-grown ewe to Leto. The meat from this may be taken away. The priest provides the offerings. As perquisites the skin.

5 On the nineteenth: a goat to the Graces. Whichever priest the hieropoioi order sacrifices. The priest sprinkles the blood of this animal thrice on the altar and a fourth time on the stone lying in the olives. They take an oath when they have made two sacrificial
As many earlier documents in this collection have demonstrated, sacrifice was the central religious activity in the Greek city (for the debate about the origins and theology of sacrifice see Bremmer, *Greek Religion*, 40–3). Individuals might make dedications or prayers on their own, but sacrifice was always a group activity, and sacrificing together a way of marking the existence and identity of a group. Sacrifice was also the major occasion for the consumption of meat, since it is unclear how far meat, except from hunted animals, was otherwise available. A calendar of sacrifices to be made by the city, not only on the Acropolis but in various locations in Attica, was already a feature of Solon’s ‘Lawcode’ (Ruschenbusch, *Σόλωνος νόμοι*, FF 83–6 cf. FF 81–2; Parker, *Athenian Religion*, ch. iv), and part of the Athenian state calendar survives from the writing up of Athenian laws undertaken in the last decade of the fifth century (see Parker, 43–4 n.3, and SEG xlvii 71). The nature, destination, and frequency of sacrifices remained a potentially important political issue in the classical city (see Lysias xxx with Todd in Foxhall and Lewis (edd.), *GmLaw*, 101–31, 81).

Religious calendars survive from many parts of the Greek world from the fifth and fourth centuries, recording the sacrificial practices of cities and other corporate groups. They give an invaluable glimpse into the religious life of citizens of Greek cities, showing something of the variety, frequency, and expense of sacrifices. But it is only a glimpse: every citizen belonged to not one but a number of corporate bodies with separate sacrificial schedules—the city, a phratry or equivalent (1, 5), a local community (e.g. deme at Athens, 63), perhaps a *genos* (37), other religious associations small and large—and in addition might engage in further sacrifices within the context of the family (for what may be a private family calendar found carved into the rock in the countryside of southern Attica see SEG xxvi 137) and/or in an *ad hoc* way.

The calendars display many common features. The structure of the entries normally involves listing against a given date some or all of the following: whether the sacrifice is annual or less frequent, the location of the sacrifice, the god or hero to whom the offering is made, the priest and/or other official responsible, the nature
portions, one of meat and (one) of entrails, and they place the sacrificial portions
on the altar. Where they place the accustomed offerings to Asia, first offering some
of the entrails on the altar, they also touch the stone in the olives as they take the
oath. They first taste the entrails on the altar and then those on the stone and those
from the stone. The extremities, horns, and skin are burnt. The hieropoioi provide
the offerings.

17 On the twentieth: a perfect sheep and perfect ewe to Apollo Karneios and Artemis.
The priest of the Twelve Gods sacrifices. The priest provides the offerings. He
takes as perquisites skin and leg.

(species and sex) of the sacrificial animal(s) and/or of other offerings, any special
details of the ritual, the amount of money to be spent and the source of that money,
what is to happen to the meat, and the nature of the perquisites given to the officials
involved.

Different calendars put emphasis in different places. In some calendars the key
thing appears to be regulating the price paid for sacrificial victims, but other calen-
dars, like this one, make little or no reference to expense. In some calendars the
priest’s perquisites are carefully detailed, in others they are ignored. Some calendars
are very particular about the sex, age, and condition of the animal sacrificed, others
are content with the broadest of categories. Some calendars, like this one, detail the
other offerings that accompany the sacrifice. These and other differences are partly
a consequence of the different contexts in which the calendars came to be inscribed:
some seem to have been written up in the context of laying down the duties of an
official (so 63. 32–9; Solon’s calendar seems to have been divided according to official
responsible), others seem concerned primarily to ensure that the correct victim is pro-
vided (so the fifth-century calendar from Thoricus (i256 bis), others again to stipulate
the amount that can be spent, and and/or make clear the funding responsibilities (see
37. 82–3; the calendar from the deme of Erchia in Attica (SEGxxi 541, LSCG 18) is laid
out in five columns each of equal cost).

These four stelai from Cos are part of what must originally have been a set of twelve,
one for each month of the year. They record the central Coan festivals as celebrated
in the years following the synoecism of the island in 366 (D.S. xv. 76. ii) when the town
from which these stelai come was built. Probably (see below) only festivals that were
new or altered at that stage are recorded (compare the explicit statement in SIG3 1024.
3–5, the calendar of Myconus following its third-century synoecism). They show little
concern for price (only B. 27) but an exceptional concern for procedure (most notably
in A, to which later months make reference back (see B. 12)).

Priests, heralds, and hieropoioi are regularly mentioned throughout the calendar,
but only in the case of the festival of Zeus Polieus are other major state magistrates named (on Coan magistrates see Sherwin-White, 187–205). The tribal and sub-tribal divisions of the city are also employed as the basis for the organization of the major festival of Zeus Polieus, and in particular to provide the sacrificial victim. Cos had the regular three-tribe structure of Doric cities, and those tribes seem to have been split into three sub-units known as chiliastyes; the inscription also mentions ‘Ninths’ (enatai), and scholars have debated whether these Ninths are ninths of a tribe or ninths of the citizen body (i.e. alternative names for chiliastyes). Since there are nine oxen involved and one ox is said to be from each Ninth, this inscription has been taken as good evidence that the Ninths were identical with, rather than subdivisions of, the chiliastyes (see Sherwin-White, 159–61); however, this does leave A.15ff., in which the chiliastyes are a source of further cattle which are mixed with the cattle supplied by the enatai, very hard to understand. Few other corporate groups, whether of a local or of a cult basis, are mentioned (we have only the Nestoridai of A. 52–3 and the Phyleomachidae of B. 17). Since details of location are also rarely given, implying that most of the rituals listed here took place in the same sanctuary of the Twelve Gods, it seems likely that this is only a sub-set of the sacrifices in which Coans were involved. Religious activity by tribes, tribal sub-groups, and thiasoi is well attested by later Coan inscriptions.

Stele A, as is clear from B. 12, related to the month Batramios, a month apparently equivalent to the Athenian month Gamelion (approx. January, see Introduction, p. xxii; see further Trümper, Untersuchungen). As preserved, the calendar opens with an elaborate ritual devised to select the ox to be sacrificed to Zeus Polieus which ensures both that there are many oxen available from which a suitable one can be chosen and that the ox is not always provided by the same group. Three groups seem to have been named in line 6, which ought to be names of chiliastyes/enatai but which if they are imply that the chiliastyes/enatai of each tribe had the same names. Special selection of sacrificial animals is often hinted at by the adjective ‘choice’ in sacred laws, but the details of the care taken over the choice here are unparalleled (for the closest comparison see the later law from Bargylia, Chiron xxx 2000, 451–85), and raise the issue of the role of written instructions in creating and preserving rituals. What exactly the ox had to display or do in order to be selected is not explicit, but showing interest in some sacred cakes is perhaps the most likely thing (Scullion, 84 n. 20, comparing Porphyry, De Abst. ii. 30. iv).

The selection of the ox for Zeus on the day before it is to be sacrificed is described in A. 5–19. Preliminary rites, involving the sacrifice of a pig and the selection of the slaughterer, are then described in A. 22–46. In A. 19–22 what appears to be a further sacrifice is described. Traditionally this has been understood to be a sacrifice to Hestia, with line 19 translated as ‘It is sacrificed to Hestia, if it bows its head’. Burkert, however, has pointed out that the Greek would more naturally be translated ‘It is sacrificed (sc. to Zeus), if it bows its head to Hestia (i.e. turns towards the state hearth)’. The involvement of Hestia in the Zeus Polieus festival is entirely appropriate, given her civic role and that this is the biggest civic festival of the year (see Gernet, The Anthropology of Ancient Greece, 322–39, esp. 330–1 and 334), and in any case is further stressed at l. 28 (where, however, both the epithet ‘Hetaireia’ and the verb ‘sacrifice’ are quite
uncertain). What is problematic, however, is the following brief description of who sacrifices and what perquisites are received. For Burkert this brief description is an anticipatory doublet of the full description that will follow at A. 46ff. But we would not otherwise understand from that later description that 'the Kings' Share-receiver' was responsible for the sacrifice (the Kings seem to have become obsolete, their role perhaps subsumed by the monarchos [Sherwin-White, 199], and this is the only ritual in which mention is made of them). And the brief description of perquisites awards the skin to 'the Kings' Share-receiver', whereas at A. 49 the skin goes to the priest. Whichever way we construe this section, the drafting leaves something to be desired, but ancient readers did not need to be told much that we need to know. If there was a separate sacrifice to Hestia its practical function will have been to feed those already gathered for the festival of Zeus: the meat which the city gets (A. 22) would be likely to amount to something like 100 kg., enough to feed perhaps 6,000 people (Jameson in Whittaker (ed.), Pastoral Economies, 95). Given the probable population of Cos (9,000 citizens if the chiliastyes really had 1,000 members each, but probably they did not: Sherwin-White, 164—5), it is surprising that even for Zeus Polieus only one ox is sacrificed, in contrast to the multiple victims sacrificed at, for example, the Panathenaea (81) (but see further below).

The description of the ritual involved in the sacrifice to Zeus Polieus is one of the most explicit in any ancient source. Some of the features described seem regular, but rarely spelt out. So, for example, the specification that the victim should bow the head (see Porphyry, De Abst. n. 9 and Detienne in Detienne and Vernant, Cuisine, 9—10). Others, such as the treatment of intestines, may be regular but we lack the evidence to show this. Other features again are unusual, most notably the way in which the preliminaries are held on the previous evening. Unusual too is the private provision of the ox. The proud owner is given the task, exceptionally—other announcements are made by a herald—of declaring that he gives the ox and at the same time calling on the Goans to give the price of the ox to Hestia. The price of the ox, as evaluated by the chief magistrates, the prostatai, is then paid to Hestia, making concrete the notion of sacrificing to Zeus ‘from the hearth’ (Sherwin-White, 323). But the ox remains privately provided, a form of liturgy.

Although modern scholars often attempt to give a synthetic account of animal sacrifice (compare Burkert, Greek Religion, 56—7), this inscription reveals nicely the high degree of variation. The presence of a holocaust sacrifice and of sacrifice without offering of wine in the preliminaries perhaps indicates chthonic elements in the cult of Zeus Polieus, who has close connections with earth and with the products of agriculture (compare IG I* 241, Scullion, and, for a collection of wineless altars, Henrichs, HSCP lxxxvii 1983, 92 n. 21, 100 n. 67), but it can also be seen as a solemn contrast to the main sacrifice, with wine libations, that follows (Graf, esp. 218—19). The prohibition in the sacrifice to Athene Machanis on taking the meat away from the sanctuary (compare 27. 32) seems to be a compromise between the potential inclusion of anybody in ordinary Olympian sacrifices and the exclusion of all humans involved in holocaust sacrifices; insisting that the meat is eaten on site and so only available to those who have participated in the ritual is particularly frequently attested in the
Those responsible for sacrifices are regularly required to provide the various offerings (hiera) that accompanied the victim, and in return they received various perquisites. This calendar is unusual in the extent to which it specifies the offerings: grain and bread or cakes are regular, together with wine except in the case of the preliminary wineless holocaust sacrifice of a pig for Zeus Polieus (A. 32–5); notable here is the frequent specification of new cups and other ‘tableware’ (paralleled in another Coan inscription, LSCG 159, 10–13). These presumably became permanent votive offerings in the temple. That the priest took in return the skin and legs as perquisites seems to have been regular (compare e.g. M&L 44). Variation occurs here only when there is prohibition on taking meat away from the sanctuary: so in the case of the sacrifices to Demeter (A. 59–60) the priest takes the ears, and from the sacrifice to Rhea he takes the skin (B. 3–5). In several cases no perquisites are specified, and this seems to be a systematic omission in cases where the hieropoioi are heavily involved (so A. 23–44, C. 1–8, D. 5–17). In two cases the perquisites extend beyond the priest: in the case of Zeus Polieus A. 46–55), the priest receives an enhanced share (half breast and half stomach as well as leg and skin) and further portions go to the hieropoioi, heralds, doctors (Cos was the home of the Hippocrates), pipe-players, smiths and potter, and Nestoridai (compare 81). Most of the parts given as perquisites to officials here can be paralleled elsewhere, for priests or others (cf. e.g. LSS 10, 77, 93). A third-century inscription (LSS 156) shows the priests of Zeus Polieus to have come from the Hippiadai, a subdivision of a tribal ‘Thirtieth’ whose name is not there preserved but which is likely to have been the Nestoridai (Sherwin-White, 156), which would explain why that group is singled out. The recognition of the pipe-players in this distribution reminds us of the aural element of sacrificial ritual, apparent also in representations of sacrifice on pots (for which see van Straten, Hiera Kalai); why smiths and potters receive special attention is not clear. The ‘three-spit share of blood meat’ (A. 52) may be deliberate imitation of Homeric practice, with reference to the pempobela of the sacrifices at Iliad i. 463 and Odyssey iii. 460 (see A. E. Furtwängler in Tania . . . R. Hampe, 81–98). In the case of the sacrifice to Zeus Machaneus (B. 13–21: Machaneus is a common epithet of Zeus in the Dorian world), another major festival where the ritual follows the lines of that for Zeus Polieus, the Phyleomachidai, who provide some of the non-animal offerings, receive certain parts of the ox, probably including the horns although the text is not altogether clear.

Only in the case of the sacrifice to Zeus Polieus is the role of the slaughterer, essential in any sacrifice, especially mentioned. Just as the ox, so too its slaughterers are specially selected and a special proclamation made about them (A. 40–4). This emphasis on the slaughterer is reminiscent of the myth of the Bouphonia at Athens, but the separation of slaughterer from priest was common (see Berthiaume, Mageiros), and there is no particular trace of anxiety about the killing itself here. The insistence on the sexual purity of the slaughterers is unusual, a mark of the high dignity of the
occasion, and this is the only early text that specifies that the purity should be from homosexual as well as from heterosexual intercourse (the text is not clear but the sense is not in doubt; see Parker, *Miasma*, 86 and 94 n. 81). Other purity rituals in this calendar include the sprinkling of the priest with sea-water (held to wash away all evils, Euripides *Hymy*, cf. the funerary law from Ceos, *LSCG* 97 = *SIG* 1218. 14–15) at the sacrifice to Athena Machanis (*B*, 23–4)—where despite the order of the words the sprinkling may precede the actual sacrifice.

Purification is also involved in the sprinkling of blood in the fourth fragment of the calendar (*D*, 7–8), where in the context of the sacrifice to the Graces of a goat (their usual victim *LSCG* 4. 3 but contrast 114, *B*, 1) and the further offering to Asia, who is perhaps the mother of the Graces, the altar and then 'the stone in the olives' receive blood. The combination of an annual sacrifice to the Graces, who are very much associated with the nurturing of the young (Pausanias, ix. 35. i–vii, who records that Athenians call them Thallo and Auxo, who figure in the ephebic oath, 88), a stone, often recipient of oaths, and the location 'in the olives' (compare again 88) suggested to Herzog that an oath ceremony, involving touching the stone (compare *Ath. Pol* 55. v), was at issue here and his restorations make that explicit. This remains speculative, given the extent of damage to the stele, but it is clear that a peculiar ritual is employed here, for which ephebic initiation of some sort seems a plausible explanation (see further Pirenne-Delforge).

The extant calendar fragments cover the whole or part of a period of probably 20 days. During that period at least 20 sacrifices took place, yielding approximately 920 kg. of meat in years when the Carneia was celebrated, 110 kg. less in years when it was not. At this rate, and we have no reason to think the surviving fragments of the calendar atypical, the sacrifices recorded on these stones will have generated something like 18 tonnes of dressed meat a year. And this is unlikely to be an exhaustive list of Coan sacrifices. Public sacrifices at Athens produced 20 tonnes of meat annually, and the sacrifices in the calendar of the Attic deme of Erchia 796 kg. (Jameson in Whittaker [ed.], *Pastoral Economies*, 105; see further on 81, and compare Rosivach, *Sacrifice*, and Isager and Skydsgaard, *Agriculture*, fig. 12.1). Jameson (106) has drawn attention to the fact that 'feeding and slaughtering animals for meat is far less economical than growing cereals for food' and that large-scale sacrifice was a social and political (and, we may add, symbolic—Homerian heroes eat meat) choice reflecting economic prosperity.

Older Doric linguistic forms mix with later developments, some of them under Ionic influence, in this inscription. The older forms include κήνος for κεῖνος, δῆλοναί for βούλομαι; both older αἱρέσθω and newer αἱρέσθω are found, along with both earlier ἱροποιοί and later ἱεροποιοί. Distinct Ionicisms include τέλεως for τέλης, and κυέων (B. 3) (contrast κυέοσα, A. 56, 60). Use of 'Pedageitnion' (B. 3) for the month known elsewhere as Metageitnion is found in Cos, Calymnos, Rhodes, and also in Sicily and Magna Graecia, although none of these areas otherwise used τεδά for μετά. Features general to West Greek dialects but unfamiliar in Attic include use of τόλ for ὁ, third person plural endings in -ωντι, and ποτί for πός.
Athenian deme decree from (?) Hagnous, third quarter of fourth century

Two joining pieces of a marble stele, top and bottom broken off, found at Dardiste near Markopoulo in the Mesogea and now in the Epigraphic Museum.

Attic-Ionic. Stickhedon 16.

Michel 190; IG ΙΙ 1183*.

[A few letters at the right-hand end of seven lines remain]
'neither I myself nor anyone else on my behalf, nor with my knowledge by any other manner or means. And if he seems to me to be in the wrong I shall condemn him at the scrutiny and punish him as the offence seems to me to deserve. By Zeus, by Apollo, by Demeter, if I keep my oath may many blessings fall to me, but if I perjure myself the opposite.' The reckoner also shall swear the oath, 'to reckon what appears to me to have been spent', and the advocates 'to advocate what is just for the deme and to vote as seems to me most just'.

It shall not be permitted for the scrutineer to bring the scrutiny to an end unless it is approved by a majority of the elected ten voting secretly. Let the new demarch give the ballot and exact an oath from them in the presence of the demesmen. There shall be right of appeal for him to all the demesmen. If anyone appeals, let the demarch exact an oath from the demesmen and give out the ballot, provided that there are no fewer than thirty men present. If the demesmen condemn him, let him owe half in addition to what he had already been condemned to pay by the elected ten. The demarch shall not be permitted to release the demesmen until the previous demarch submits to the scrutiny and completes the rest of the business prescribed in the decree. If he does release them let him owe (?) drachmas.

If anyone needs money, the priests may lend money on satisfactory security of land or house or tenement house, and shall place a boundary-stone on which they shall inscribe the name of the god to whom the money belongs. If the priest does not so place a boundary-stone, he shall owe money to the god of whom he is the priest, and his property shall be mortgaged to the god of whom he has been made priest.

On the fifth of the month the demarch is to hold the sacrifice of the Plerosia in honour of Zeus at a cost of 500 drachmas, and to distribute the meat on the seventh of the month to those present, those who join in the meeting, and those who join in offering
This is part of a decree of one of the 139 Attic demes (see above on 46). The findspot of the inscription, at Dardiste at the southern end of the Mesogeia, suggests that the deme in question here is Hagnous (Traill, *Demos*, 192, correcting his *Political Organization*, 42; traditionally this inscription has been regarded as from Myrrhinous, situated at modern Merenda). Hagnous was a moderately sized community which returned five men annually to the council of 500 in the fourth century and therefore had a population of c.1% of the total population of Athens (i.e. perhaps c.300 adult male citizens). The quorum of 30 men required here would represent c.10% of the total number of demesmen, and compares with the quorum of 6,000 for the Athenian assembly (c.20% of the total citizen body in the fourth century). Other evidence also suggests low attendance at deme meetings (Dem. LVII. Eubulides 9, 13). Not all men registered in a deme because of the inaugural registration of their family with that deme in the late sixth century also resided there (cf. Osborne, *OJA* x 1991, 231—52). Philocrates son of Pythodorus, after whom the Peace agreement of 346 is named, belonged to this deme and the record of the confiscation of his property shows that he continued to own land here, even though he also had a house in the town deme of Melite (see *Agora*, xix, P 26. 368ff., 450ff., Osborne, *Demos*, 52—3).

The document seems to have been concerned with the duties of the demarch, the man allotted charge of the deme for a year, and the only official that the city required demes to have. It covers three quite separate matters: the scrutiny of deme officials (to l. 27), the lending of deme money (27—32), and deme sacrifices for which the demarch is responsible (32 on). In passing general rules at a single meeting of the assembly the deme here acts in the fourth century in the way that the Athenian assembly acted in the fifth century, but not the fourth century (see Introduction, p. xviii, for the Athenian distinction between laws and decrees, 46 for a deme decree). In other ways, however, the deme of Hagnous can be seen here broadly to follow the practices of the city as a whole as it lays down procedures for the scrutiny of its officers at the end of their term of office (see further Whitehead, *Demes*, 119). How many officers this deme had is uncertain; two of the officials mentioned here, the scrutineer and the reckoner, seem to have existed solely for purposes of the scrutiny, and the same may be true of the advocates. Apart from the demarch some demes had permanent finance officers also, but if Hagnous had one he has left no trace (see generally Whitehead, *Demes*, 56—62, and ch. v; Osborne, *Demos*, 74—9). The disproportion between the number of officers active during the year and the number of officers appointed to scrutinize them may be
security. On the nineteenth day of the month Posideon business concerned with the Dionysia shall be dealt with and all the other things . . . dealt with except . . . on the same day the demarch . . . owe 100 drachmas.

real and not just a product of the peculiar sample of evidence surviving. The scrutiny procedures here can be paralleled in central scrutiny procedures: *Ath. Pol.* 48. iv–v describes the appointment of scrutineers who received charges that any citizen wished to lay against any magistrate and if they found that a *prima facie* case had been made, forwarded the case to a court. *Ath. Pol.* 54. ii further describes how ‘reckoners’ brought the financial accounts of magistrates before courts at the end of the magistrate’s office. In this deme the double process of a general and a financial scrutiny is reflected in the involvement of both scrutineer and reckoner (compare the procedure at Halai Aixonides revealed in *IG* i² 1174), but advocates are also involved who appear not to be paralleled in the city’s scrutinies (but compare 5. 32). The role of the court in the city appears to be taken here by the elected committee of ten, from whom appeal can then be made to the whole body of demesmen (compare the appeal procedure in 5), although mysteriously the advocates themselves vote, secretly, at some stage. Secret voting was normal in Athenian courts (*Ath. Pol.* 68. ii–v, and compare 5. 82), and was adopted by the council for some judicial and quasi-judicial matters, but the assembly normally voted by show of hands (cf. Rhodes, *CQ* liii 2003, 124–9 at 125–7).

All the officials involved in the scrutiny procedure here are obliged to swear oaths (lines 8–21) that they will perform their task properly. The opening oath, which also involves a brief curse, is surely that of the scrutineer himself. Taking oaths from magistrates when they entered office was a regular Athenian practice, and in particular oaths were exacted from all involved in judicial proceedings—arbitrators, presiding magistrates, and dikasts (but not normally witnesses; *Ath. Pol.* 55. v; Dem. xxiv. *Timocr.* 150). The sacred calendar from Thoricus provides for a sacrifice over which the oaths at the deme scrutiny were solemnized (*SEG* xxxiii 147 = *IG* i² 256 bis. 12 (cf. 52); Whitehead, *Demos*, 117 n. 158). Public curses are well known elsewhere in the Greek world (see M&L 30), are parodied by Aristophanes, feature in the Plateaea oath (88), and may not have been at all unusual at Athens.

The Athenians normally punished offenders in one of three ways: by death, by removal of civic rights (*atimia*), and by fining. Only fining is within the powers of the deme. Here, as in the city’s ‘assessed cases’, there is a process of evaluation (*timesis*), in which the body sitting in judgement opts for either the level of penalty asked by the prosecution or that suggested by the offender. The deme also levies a fine of 100 drachmas on a demarch who fails to perform particular duties (compare *Hesp.* viii 1939, 177–80, lines 18–21, from Eleusis). The city also used fines to ensure that
demarchs did the duties the city imposed upon them (such as seeing to the burial of any corpse: [Dem.] xliii. Macartatus 38, compare 36. 27–9 with commentary). Fines for non-performance, non-payment of rent, or for making an illegal proposal were one potential source of income for the deme, just as they were for the city (see Agora, xix. P 26).

The second part of the inscription as preserved concerns a quite different matter, the lending of deme funds. Funds are made available by the priests to those (deme members only?) who have need for them. The sudden appearance of priests at this point in connection with finance, together with the subsequent appearance of the demarch as the man charged with seeing that sacrifices happen appropriately, indicates nicely the absence of separate categories of the sacred and the secular in Greek cities. Although three boundary-stones like those envisaged here have been discovered which indicate only a deme as the source of the loan which the property so bounded secured (Millett, Lending, 172–3), it is sanctuaries within demes that seem to have had the most funds available for loan (M&L 53, IGII 3 258, Whitehead, Demes, 165–9). (The sacred funds of the Athenian Acropolis sanctuaries, by contrast, seem to have been available only to the city as a whole and not to private individuals.) No boundary-stone survives on which the identity of the god worshipped by the religious group making the loan is specified in the way demanded here; instead, religious groups identify themselves on boundary-stones by their collective names—the Decadistae, for example, or the ‘thiasothai with χ’ (Finley, SLC nos. 32 and 43). That the deme insists on real estate as security is consistent with a similar insistence by the city in cases where orphans’ estates are leased out by the archon: no other form of security seems ever to have been envisaged by public bodies.

The final part of the inscription is a fragment of a sacred calendar, laying down the sacrificial duties of the demarch (compare ΖΠΕ xxx 1999, 45–7, Lambert’s much improved text of IGII 3 1358). (On calendars generally see on 62 above.) Demarchs are widely attested offering sacrifices, distributing meat from sacrifices, and even receiving the perquisites from them (SEGxxi 541. 558 for the latter). When the Panathenaea was held in the city the demarchs organized the feast, at which the meat was distributed deme by deme (Souda (δ 421) s.v. δημαρχοι. 81). The Solonian lawcode apparently recorded a (state) sacrifice to Leos at Hagnous (Steph. Byz. s.v. Ἰηρωδαίς), but none of the sacrifices recorded here is at city expense.

The first sacrifice mentioned here, the Plerosia, is widely attested, though with minor variations on the name (Prerosia, Proerosia, Proeresia). As some of those other forms suggest, it seems to have been a pre-ploughing ritual (R. Parker in Linders and Nordquist (edd.), Gifts to the Gods . . . 1985, 137–47 at 141–2, Whitehead, Demes, 188–9, 196–7). The most prominent of Proerosia rituals was that at Eleusis: on the 5th of
Pyanopsion (approximately October) the deme of Eleusis sent the hierophant and the sacred herald to Athens to proclaim the Proerosia which took place on the following day (SEG xxiii 80, 3–7). At Thoricus (SEG xxxiii 147 with Parker, ‘Festivals’) there seem to have been two Proerosia sacrifices, in Hecatombaion and Boedromion (roughly July and September), the latter apparently a sacrifice to Zeus Polieus, just as the Hagnous sacrifice was to Zeus; elsewhere, at Paeania, Eleusis, and Piraeus the sacrifice seems to have been to Demeter. The day of the month is specified at Hagnous, but not the month itself; this seems to be a matter of omission, and we do not believe that all the sacrifices mentioned here should be attributed to the month Posideon (roughly December) mentioned in l. 36, or thought of as monthly. As restored here, the decree provides for sacrifice on the fifth of the month, but distribution of the meat only on the seventh of the month; such a delay between sacrifice and distribution seems to be unparalleled: is the prospect of meat a bribe to get people to attend whatever sort of meeting is referred to in 35? (It would be possible to restore the seventh as the date of the sacrifice, but in this case the repetition of the date would be curiously inept even for this inelegant document.) It is striking that the deme spends so large an amount of money on this sacrifice: fourth-century prices for cows are normally 70–100 drachmas, so 500 drachmas would buy five to seven cattle, yielding 500–700 kg. of meat (Jameson, ‘Sacrifice’). This is around 2 kg. of meat per male citizen of Hagnous, an amount which makes us suspect that visitors from outside the deme are included in the unparalleled and obscure phrase in l. 35, which perhaps covers those involved in credit transactions with the deme. (On meat from sacrifices see further 62, 81.)

The Dionysia about which there is to be business on Posideon 19 (around mid-December) is the Rural Dionysia (Whitehead, Demes, 212–22, Pickard-Cambridge, Dramatic Festivals, 42–56). This festival involved a procession and competitive events, sometimes including dramatic productions which rich individuals who were members of or resident in a deme might be required to finance (compare IG i3 254 and n2 1178 from the deme of Icaria). There is evidence for the celebration of the rural Dionysia from at least fourteen demes, but although they appear all to have celebrated the festival in the same month they did not all celebrate it on the same day, and it was possible to move from the theatrical performances in one deme to those in another (Plat. Rep. iv. 435 d). We know of more than a dozen demes that had theatres, but not whether the deme of Hagnous had one.

Earlier editors of this inscription have remarked on the carelessness with which the letters are inscribed. Although a regular stoichedon arrangement is kept, and the letter forms are quite standard, there are frequent mistakes in orthography. Deme documents rarely rise to the level of the best state inscriptions, but errors are not usually so frequent.
Athens honours Spartocus and his brothers, of the Cimmerian Bosporus, 347/6

A stela, with a relief showing Spartocus and Paerisades enthroned and Apollonius standing beside them; found near the main harbour at the Piraeus, now in the National Museum at Athens. Phot. BCH v 1881, pl. v; Meyer, Die griechischen Urkundenreliefs, Taf. 20 A 88 (these two the relief and ll. 1–2); Lawton, Reliefs, pl. 18 no. 35 (relief only).

Attic-Ionic, twice retaining the old o for ou. LL. 1–2 in larger letters; 3–7 stechedon 24; 8 sqq. stechedon 34 (35 in 16).

IG ii³ 212; SIG² 206; Tod 167*. Trans. Harding 82. See also C. Tuplin, ΖΕΠ xix 1982, 121–8; H. Hein in Carlier (ed.), Le IVe siècle av. J.-C., 357–68, esp. 361–3.
For Spartocus, Paerisades, Apollonius, sons of Leucon.

In the archonship of Themistocles [347/6]; in the eighth prytany, of Aegeis; to which Sosidemus of Acharnae was secretary; Theophilus of Halimus was chairman. Androtion son of Andron of Gar- gettus proposed:

Concerning the letter sent by Spartocus and Paerisades and the report of the envoys who have come from them: reply to them that the people of Athens praise Spartocus and Paerisades, because they are good men and offer to the people of Athens to take care of the sending-out of the corn as their father took care of it and to minister enthusiastically to whatever the people need; and the envoys shall report to them that if they do this they shall fail to obtain nothing from the people of Athens.

Since they give to the people of Athens the grants which Satyrus and Leucon gave, there shall be for Spartocus and Paerisades the grants which the people gave to Satyrus and Leucon; and each of them shall be crowned regularly at the Great Panathenaea with a crown of a thousand drachmas. The athlothetai shall have the crowns made in the year before the Great Panathenaea in accordance with the decree of the people decreed previously for Leucon; and proclaim that the people
The region of the Cimmerian Bosporus, centred on Panticapaeum at the eastern extremity of the Crimea, was colonized by Milesians and other eastern Greeks; and a kingdom was ruled by members of the Spartocid dynasty, bearing Greek
of Athens crown Spartocus and Paerisades the sons of Leucon on account of their goodness and good will towards the people of Athens.

Since they offer to dedicate the crowns to Athena Polias, the *athlothetai* shall dedicate the crowns in the temple, adding the inscription, ‘Spartocus and Paerisades sons of Leucon dedicated to Athena, having been crowned by the people of Athens’.

The money shall be given to the *athlothetai* for the crowns by the treasurer of the people from the allocation to the people for decrees; but for now the *apodektai* shall hand over the cost of the crowns from the stratific fund.

This decree shall be written up by the secretary of the council on a stone *stele* and placed near the *stele* of Satyrus and Leucon, and for the writing-up the treasurer of the people shall give thirty drachmas.

Praise the envoys Sosis and Theodosius, because they take care of those arriving from Athens at the Bosporus, and invite them to hospitality in the *pylànèion* tomorrow.

Concerning the money owing to the sons of Leucon, so that they shall recover it, the *prooedroi* to whose lot it falls to preside in the people on the eighteenth shall deal with the matter immediately after the sacred business, so that they shall recover the money and not have a complaint against the people of Athens.

Give the ships’ officers for whom Spartocus and Paerisades ask. The envoys shall report the names of whichever officers they take to the secretary of the council. Those whom they report shall be deemed to have done their duty if they do what good they can to the sons of Leucon.

Polyeuctus son of Timocrates of Crioa proposed:

In other respects in accordance with Androtion; but crown also Apollonius the son of Leucon from the same source.

433/2, perhaps ruling jointly with Seleucus until 393/2, and Satyrus was succeeded by his son Leucon in 389/8; towards the end of his reign Leucon associated his sons with him (Tod 163); when he died in 349/8 he was succeeded by his two eldest sons, Spartocus II and Paerisades I; when Spartocus died in 344/3 Paerisades continued to rule until 311/10 (succession and dates of rulers corrected from D. S. by R. Werner, Hist. IV 1955, 412–44; other schemes have been proposed, e.g. M. J. Osborne, Naturalization, III–IV 41–4 T 21; for some doubts see Tuplin, esp. 127–8). In this decree the rulers are given no title; in local inscriptions they are given the titles archon of Bosporus and Theodosia and basileus of various peoples (Tod 115. B, C; archon is used by Dem. xx. Lept. 29, when defending the award of honours, but elsewhere the orators call them tyrants [e.g. Aesch. iii. Ctes. 171, Din. i. Dem. 43]. For the use of archon cf. Dionysius of Syracuse (io, 33, 34). For later awards to members of this family see Osborne, Naturalization, D 25 = Agora. xvi 94 (fragments disaggregated by S. D. Lambert, ZPE cxxvi 2001, 65–70); IG II 653, included in Osborne’s T 21.

The region was important to Athens as a source of corn (specifically, bread wheat, not grown in Attica: Sallares, The Ecology of the Ancient Greek World, 323–32), and Athens was anxious to maintain good relations with the rulers. Our inscription refers to the ‘grants’ given to the Athenians by Satyrus and Leucon and by the Athenians to them (ll. 20–4): we learn from the orators that Athens had priority rights to purchase Bosporan corn and exemption from the 1/30 export tax, while the rulers received Athenian citizenship and ateleia (Dem. xx. Lept. 29–40, using the same word, ‘grant’; [Dem.] xxxiv. Phorm. 36); subsequently statues were to be set up of Paerisades and his sons (Din. i. Dem. 43); our inscription implies that Leucon like his sons regularly received a gold crown (ll. 24–9). How often such crowns awarded by Athens stayed in Athens as dedications we do not know (see Harris, The Treasures of the Parthenon and Erechtheion, 104–5); a crown dedicated by a Spartocus is mentioned in inventories of the end of the fourth century (IG II 1485, 21–4, 1486. 14–16 with S. M. Burstein, ZPE xxxi 1978, 181–5). Tuplin argues that Isoc. xvii. Trapezicus points to ad hoc arrangements, and that the regular arrangements attested in the later texts were instituted after that speech, c. 390. According to Dem. xx. Lept. 31–2 Athens imported 400,000 medioi (c. 210,000,000 litres, or 577,000 bushels: cf. on 45) of corn from the Bosporus, as much as from all other sources together, while Str. vii. iv. 6 states that ‘they say’ Leucon sent 2,100,000 medioi. P. D. A. Garnsey in a study suggesting that Athens’ dependence on imported corn has been exaggerated (but himself perhaps over-reacting) warns that 400,000 medioi, which would have fed 90,000 people for a year, might be not normal but the quantity imported in an exceptional year (Crux . . . G. E. M. de Ste Croix, 62–75 = Garnsey, Cities, Peasants and Food in Classical Greece, 183–95 [–200]); for a response to the minimizing view see M. Whitby in Parkins & Smith (edd.), Trade, Traders and the Ancient City, 102–28.

Our decree was enacted in the spring of 346, soon (but, if Werner’s chronology is correct, not immediately) after the death of Leucon. An outstanding item of business is to be dealt with on ‘the eighteenth’, and it can be calculated that that date must be 18 Elaphebolion, the first of two consecutive dates eventually fixed for deciding on the Peace of Philocrates with Philip of Macedon, and that our decree was enacted at
the meeting on 8 Elaphebolion which ordered the meetings on the 18th and the 19th (A. Schaefer, RM² xxxiii 1878, 418–33 at 431–2, cf. D. M. Lewis, BSA 1955, 25–6).

‘The eighteenth’ is specified rather than ‘the first assembly’ (e.g. 31. 10–11) because the first assembly after that on the 8th was devoted entirely to the conduct of the Dionysia (Dem. xxi. Mid. 8–9 with Aesch. n. Embassy 61). It would be interesting to know whether discussion of the Peace supplanted or had to follow this and other business assigned to that day. The assemblies of this prytany have been discussed in connection with the question whether at this time the Athenians could hold more assemblies in a prytany than the four regular assemblies specified in Ath. Pol. 43. iv–vi (see M. H. Hansen, GRBS xxiii 1982, 335–7 = Ecclesia (I), 87–9. GRBS xxviii 1987, 35–50 = Ecclesia II, 177–92 + 193–4; E. M. Harris, CQ xxvi 1986, 363–77, AJP cxii 1991, 325–41; Pritchett, Athenian Calendars and Ecclesias, 192–201: we agree with Harris and Pritchett that they could).

The proposer of our decree is Androtion, for whom see on 51. In the course of his work to reorder the temple treasures and make them more accessible as a financial reserve, he had ordered the melting-down of various old dedications (Dem. xxi. Andr. 69–78), but here he proposes the continuing award of gold crowns which will be dedicated to Athena: D. M. Lewis ‘almost detects a wry tone in ll. 36–9, as he carefully drafts the honorary inscription for the Bosporans, as if to show that he is not quite as insensitive to such things as Demosthenes might suggest’ (BSA xlix 1954, 49).

The proposer of the amendment, Polyeuctus, was the son of Timocrates, a political associate of Androtion (cf. Rhodes, G&R xxiii 1996, 25, and in Cartledge et al. (edd.), Kosmos, 158–9).

In ll. 24–36 we have a series of verbs in the present tense, appropriate to the repeated award of crowns (the aorist is regularly used for a single award, e.g. 33. 27–8): we have included ‘regularly’ in our translation of the first of these, in l. 24. The award of crowns regularly, rather than on a single occasion, was an unusual and expensive honour, for rulers whose continuing support for Athens was highly valued—but the crowns were to stay in Athens, and, if the wholesale price of corn was 3 drachmas per medimnos, exemption from the 1st tax on 400,000 medimnoi would be worth 40,000 drachmas (for attested prices for corn in the fifth and fourth centuries, which are not wholesale prices but retail prices in Athens, see Stroud, The Athenian Grain-Tax Law of 374/3 B.C., 74). Normally the payment for the crowns is to come from the assembly’s expense account, but 346 is a year of the Great Panathenaea (the festival was celebrated on this larger scale every four years), and on this occasion, when the crowns have to be ready in four months’ time, the money is to be provided at least in the first instance by the receiving officers, the apodektai (cf. 19) from (what they would otherwise allocate to) the stratiotic fund (ll. 39–44). On some other, slightly later, occasions a decree which laid an additional burden on the assembly’s expense account ordered the nomothetai to modify the law so as to allow for that (e.g. IG II² 222. 41–6): perhaps that was eventually done on this occasion too (cf. Rhodes, Boule, 101). The stratiotic, i.e. military, fund, was in existence by 374/3 and at first received any surplus revenue after the requirements of the merismos had been met; after the creation of the theoric fund in the 350s that fund received surplus revenue except in a war-time emergency (for our view of
these controversial matters see Rhodes, *Boule*, 105–7, 235–40; the stratiotic fund is now attested in 26, of 374/3).

The *stelē* inscribed with our text was to be set up ‘near the *stelē* of Satyrs and Leucon’ (ll. 46–7): it was found in the Piraeus, and that fits the statement of Dem. xx. *Lept.* 36 that *stelai* for Leucon were set up at the Bosporus, the Piraeus, and *hieron* (the last being a sanctuary on the Asiatic side of the Thracian Bosporus, through which ships travelling between the Cimmerian Bosporus and Athens had to pass). This would be an appropriate location to impress men arriving from the Bosporan kingdom (for another text published at the Piraeus see 69), though the normal location in Athens for honorific decrees was the Acropolis (e.g. 19).

The rulers’ envoys are men who themselves ‘take care of those arriving from Athens at the Bosporus’, but unlike the rulers they have not been awarded Athenian citizenship, since they are invited not to ‘dinner’ but to ‘hospitality’ (ll. 49–53: cf. on 2).

There has been argument about the nature and status of the men for whom the rulers asked Athens, identified by the abstract noun *hyperesiai* (ll. 59–65). It used to be thought that they were oarsmen of some kind (e.g. Tod and LSJ); but almost certainly they were not oarsmen at all but the skilled officers who together with the trierarch made up the full crew of a ship and could be regarded as the ‘assistants’ of the trierarch (Dover in Gomme *et al.*, *Hist. Comm. Thuc.* iv. 294; J. S. Morrison, *JHS* civ 1984, 48–59). The cognate verb *hyperetein* is used in l. 16, where we translate it ‘minister’.

65

**Dedications in the Cimmerian Bosporus, c.344/3–c.311/10**

A base found at Kerch (Panticapaeum); now in the museum there.

Ionic, with the old ο for ω in l. 3.

*IOSPE* ii 8; SIG* 213; Tod 171. A; *CIRB* 9*.

3 There is no room on the stone for a longer line, which would allow Βοστάρων καί Θεοδόσιος as in B–D (A. Schaefer, *RM* xcviii 1883, 310–11); *CIRB* prints [Θεοδό]σιος, but for the spelling cf. B–E. 5 The missing portion is reported as an erasure in *IOSPE*, but not in *CIRB* for the restoration cf. B, D, E.
64. Athens Honours Spartogus and his Brothers

For ‘deemed to have done their duty’ in ll. 63–4 cf. 44.45–8.

The text ends with an amendment (ll. 65–8): since it is an amendment to the proposal of ‘Androtion’ rather than ‘the council’, the original decree should be a non-probouleumatic decree; the text inscribed contains neither enactment formula nor motion formula, but the order to the proedroi to raise a matter on the eighteenth (ll. 53–9) is very similar to the language used in the council’s probouleumatic formula. Androtion cannot have been a member of the council in 347/6, as he had already served his two permitted terms: a decree proposed by him must indeed have been technically non-probouleumatic, but he may in fact have taken over and rewritten a probouleuma which already contained ll. 53–9 (cf. Rhodes, Boule, 73–4). The clauses in ll. 53–9 and 59–65 both look like afterthoughts, and some have suspected them of being ‘concealed amendments’: it is possible that they were added by way of amendment (53–9 in the council, before the matter reached the assembly), but that is not necessarily the case (cf. on 20). As for the explicit amendment, we have seen that the original text is sometimes but not always revised in the light of an amendment published after it (cf. on 2): here the youngest brother Apollonius has found his way into the relief (but standing, while the other two are seated) and into the heading (l. 2) but not into the actual decree. The relief, described by Lawton as an ‘outstanding example of official flattery’ (p. 33, cf. 61), is a lavish composition, portraying the Bosporans as regal and non-Greek.

---

A

Dedication of Phaenippus on behalf of his brother Artem—son of—chus; Paerisades being archon of Theodosia and king of the Sindoi and Maïtai (?) and Thatéis.
B

A base found at Kerch (Panticapaeum); now in the museum there. Ionic, with the old o for oe in l. 3.

IOSPE ii 10; Tod 171. B; CIRB 104*.  

[Σ]ατυρίων Παταίκου ἱερησάμενος
[ἀ]νέθηκεν Απόλλων Υπτρώι:
[ἀ]ρχοντος Παιρισάδους Βοστάρο
καὶ Θευδοσίης καὶ βασιλεύοντος
5 [Σιν]δών καὶ Μαίτων πάντων.

C

Three contiguous fragments of a base found near Phanagoria: one was lost soon after discovery; the others are now in the museum at Krasnodar. Ionic.

IOSPE ii 344; SIG* 214; Tod 171. C; CIRB 1014*.

Σενοκλείδης Πόσιος ἀνέθηκε
tὸν ναὸν Ἀρτέμιδι Ἀγροτέραι;
ἀρχοντος Παιρισάδους τοῦ
Λέυκους Βοστάρου καὶ Θευδο-
sίης καὶ βασιλεύον Σινδών
καὶ Τορετῶν καὶ Δανδαρίων.

5 βασιλεύον inscribed in error for βασιλεύοντος.

D

A base found near Phanagoria, now in the Hermitage, St. Petersburg. Ionic.

IOSPE ii 346; SIG* 216; Tod 171. D; CIRB 1015*; SEG xlv 1016.

Κομοσαρή Γοργίσπου θυνάτηρ, Παιρισάδους [γ]υνή, εὐξαμένη
ἀνέθηκε λαχυρῶν θεῶν Σανέργει καὶ Αστάραι ἀρχοντος Παιρισάδους
Βοστάρου καὶ Θευδοσίης καὶ βασιλεύοντος [Σιν]δών καὶ Μαίτων πάντων]
kαὶ Θατέων.

E

A base found near Phanagoria, now in the Hermitage, St. Petersburg. Ionic.

IOSPE ii 347; SIG* 214 n. 1; Tod 171. E; CIRB 072*.

Κασσαλία Πόσιος ἀνέθηκε Αφροδίτης
Οὐρανίη ἀρχοντος Παιρισάδους
Βοστάρου καὶ Θευδοσίης
[k]αὶ βασιλεύοντος Σινδών, Μαίτων,
[Θ]ατέων, Δόσχων.
B
Satyrion son of Pataecus when he served as priest dedicated to Apollo the Healer; Paerisades being *archon* of Bosporus and Theodosia and king of the Sindoi and all the Māttai.

C
Xenocles son of Posis dedicated the temple to Artemis Agrotera; Paerisades son of Leucon being *archon* of Bosporus and Theodosia and king of the Sindoi and Toretae and Dandarioi.

D
Comosarye daughter of Gorgippus, wife of Paerisades, after vowing dedicated to the strong god Sanerges and Astara; Paerisades being *archon* of Bosporus and Theodosia and king of the Sindoi and all the Māttai and the Thateis.

E
Cassalia daughter of Posis dedicated to Aphrodite Urania; Paerisades being *archon* of Bosporus and Theodosia and king of the Sindoi, Māttai, Thateis, Doschoi.
For the Spartocid dynasty of the Cimmerian Bosporus see 64. In these texts we have a sample of dedications made during the reign of Paerisades: the verbs used are entirely typical of Greek dedications, but the coupling with dedications of this kind of references to the ruler is not. A comparable mixture of Greek and non-Greek elements is found also in the art of the region (Boardman, *The Diffusion of Classical Art*, 194–214).

Of the dedicators, Xenocles (C) and Cassalia (E) are presumably brother and sister; Comosarye (D) is the wife of the ruler Paerisades, and her father Gorgippus was Paerisades’ uncle. Of the deities to whom dedications are made, Apollo the Healer (B) received a dedication in the reign of Leucon (Tod 115, B), and so too did Aphrodite Urania (E: Tod 115, C); Her. iv. 59 lists Apollo and Aphrodite Urania among the gods worshipped by the Scythians (according to Hes. *Thog.* 176–206 Aphrodite was born from the genitals of Uranus, but Hom. *Il.* v. 370–417 has an alternative account). There is no direct evidence in this region for Artemis Agrotera (C: ‘wild’, an epithet of Artemis as huntress); however, Agamemnon’s daughter Iphigenia was said to have been threatened with sacrifice to but saved by Artemis; Iphigenia was identified with a virgin goddess worshipped by the Tauri of the Crimea (Her. iv. 103); and in Euripides’ *Iphigenia in Tauris* she was taken there to become a priestess of Artemis. There is no other evidence for Sanerges and Astara (D: a connection with Syrian Sandon and Astarte was suggested by Boeckh, *CIG* 2119, after Koehler, but doubted by Hiller von Gaertringen, *SIG* 216, n. 5); *ischyros*, ‘strong’, as a divine epithet is found in Semitic texts but not in Greek.

66

**Accounts of the Delphian *Naopoioi*, 345/4–343/2**

Six substantial and some small fragments of a limestone slab, found in the pavement of the Opisthodomos Court at Delphi; now in the museum there. Facs. *BCH* xxii 1898, pl. xiv. Phot. F. Delphes, *iv*, pl. iv (largest fragment); II 4–45; G. Delphes, *ii*, pl. viii, fig. 14; (II i. 50–66).

Phocian (but as in 45 using ἐπὶ Αἴαξ etc. rather than ἔδεικνυσι, 23, but often increased to as many as 26, regularly beginning a paragraph and sometimes beginning a word at the beginning of a line.


(i) [εἰσιντάματα ἐπὶ Αἴαξ Σέλεων]
[ἀρχοντος, ἱππών Ἡλειάς].
πάρ ταύρα παλαιάς τῶν Δελφῶν,
ἀφ’ ὀσταύρων τοῖς ναοποιοῖς
5 τοῖς ἐν τάξεις τοιούτοις ἄν Ἀριήνων].

(ii) [ἀρχοντος, ἵππων Ἡλειάς].

Lines are numbered as by J. Bousquet in *G. Delphes*. 
Like Leucon earlier in the century (Tod 115, B, C), Paerisades is entitled archon of Bosporus (omitted in A) and Theodosia and king of various peoples. The capital of the Bosporan kingdom was at Panticapaeum, on the Crimeaeon side of the Bosporus (cf. 64). Theodosia, on the south coast of the Crimea nearly 60 miles (100 km.) from Panticapaeum, was captured by Leucon in a war against Heraclea Pontica, after his father SatyruS had failed to take it (Dem. xx. Lept. 33; Harp. Θεοδοσίαν [θ 18 Keaney]; various episodes in the war are mentioned by [Arist.] Οἱ. π. 1347 B 3–15 and Polyain. v. 23, 44. i, vi. 9. iii–iv; discussion by S. M. Burstein, Hist. xxiii 1974, 401–16, cf. his Outpost of Hellenism, 42–5). Of the peoples mentioned in our texts the Sindoi, with their capital at Gorgippia, were on the east side of the strait; the MaiTai, otherwise known as the Maiotai, in a broad sense comprised all the peoples to the east of the strait (Str. 495. xi. ii. 11 includes among them some of the other peoples mentioned in these texts); the MaiTai in a narrower sense were perhaps inland from the peoples named separately; the Toretai were on the coast south-east of the Sindoi; the Dandarioi were on the coast north-east of the Sindoi; the Thateis were north-east of them, towards the extreme north-east of the Sea of Azov; and the Doschoi were between the Dandarioi and the Thateis (see maps in Talbert, Atlas, 50; Barrington Atlas, 84; discussion by J. R. Gardiner-Garden, Hist. xxxv 1986, 192–225). We believe it is unlikely that the expansion and contraction of the Spartocids’ kingdom can be reliably plotted from the names included in or omitted from the different dedications.

In the translation which follows we give sums of money in figures, although the Greek text gives them in words.

(i) Receipts in the archonship of Damoxenus [345/4], in the spring Pylaia.

(ii) Archon [344/3], in the autumn Pylaia.

3 From the city of Delphi, from what the naopoioi in the war handed over: from 3,404 Aeginetan drachmas,
τρακατίαν τετόρων, [ὕβολοι], ἐκομισάμεθα δ[ραχύ]ις [Αὐγίν]-
αίας χιλίας δ[ικατακαί]ς ἐβδομηντος. [ἐπάνω]

εμικοντα ἐπτά, ὑβόλοις [πέντε]. πάρ τάς πόλεως τῶν Δελφῶν, [ἀθ' ὁ ὁφειλοῦ]

τοὺς ναοποιοὺς, δὸ -

πῶς δραχμάν Αἴγιν[ν]ιναίν ἐπτά[κ],

ἰαμωπίν τετρακοσιχιλίαν ε-

ξακατὰ ἐβ[δ]εμικοντα, ὑβόλ-

ων διων, ἡμ[ι]οβελ[ί]ου, ἐκομισά-

μεθα Αἴγιναι τὸν ἐκα-

tον πέντε. vacat

κεφάλωμα εἰσιστάματος ταῦτ-

ης τῆς Πυλαίας: Αἴγιναι οἱ δρα-

χαίς χίλιαι εικασ[τ]αι. ὡς ὁδι-

οκ[ν]όντα δύο, ὑβολοὶ πέντε. eisistatamata epit Arxwos

vacat (c.2½ lines)

ἀναλώματα ἐπί Δαμοζέων ἀρ-

χοτος, ὑποκρίνας Πυλαίας: ίερομνημονεύων τῶν μετὰ

Κορίττοφου καὶ Κολοσίμου.

dárfna: ὑβόλος, ἡμιοβελόν.

κάννας: ὑβολοὶ τέτορες, ἡμι-

βέλον.

φυλακᾶς προβατῶν ὑβ-

ολῶν, ἡμιοβελόν. μαγίρως τ-

ῶν ἑρείπων μισθὸς δραχμαί
treis, ὑβολοὶ δύο. vacat

κεφάλωμα ἀναλώματος ταύτης

ης τῆς Πυλαίας: Αἴγιναι οἱ δρα-

χαίς τέτορες, ὑβολοὶ treis,

ἡμιοβελόν. vacat

ἐπί Δαμοζέων ἀρχοτος, ἀν-

αλώματα τός ἡμιως Πυλαίας.

Praxiāni, Άριστανδρω, Τεγ-

άαις λιθαγωγεῖς, ποιῶν ἀπὸ

θαλασσών εἷς τῶ ἱερῶν, σελί-

δῶν τετράκοντα εἷς τῶν περί-

σtauon, ἀπὸ τοῦ ἐπισκόπουν ἐ-

[δραχυ]ίος μισθὸς χιλιας τε-

ενάποστολος οἵτινες τους τετράκοντα [τῶν Πυλαίων].

Ὁριζόντων γειτοναίς χριστιανοῖς.
66. ACCOUNTS OF THE DELPHIAN NAPOIOI, 345/4–343/2

(i)  
1 obol, we received 1,877 Aeginetan drachmas, 5 obols.

From the city of Delphi, from the credit which they provided to the naopoioi: from 74,670 Aeginetan drachmas, 2½ obols, we received 105 Aeginetan drachmas.

Total receipt in this Pylaia: 1,982 Aeginetan drachmas, 5 obols.

Receipts in the archonship of

(ii)  
--- drachmas --- four. (?) From Simylio of Delphi --- from the --- of Corinth.

--- 

24 Expenditures in the archonship of Damoxenus, in the autumn Pylaia; when those with Cottyphus and Colossimus were hieromnamonos.

25 Total expenditure in this Pylaia: 199 Aeginetan drachmas, 3 obols.

28 Laurel: 1½ obols. Reed: 4½ obols. Guarding the sacrificial animals: 1½ obols. Stipend for the cooks of the victims: 3 drachmas, 2 obols.

29 In the archonship of Archon, expenditures in the spring Pylaia.

30 Diverting the water around the temple: 1½ obols. Laurel: 1 obol. Guarding the sacrificial animals: 3 obols. Stipend for the cooks of the victims: 3 drachmas, 2 obols. Stipend for a herald: 2 drachmas. To Xenodorus the architect, stipend from Pylaia to Pylaia: 360 drachmas. Stipend for a secretary: 40 drachmas.

40 To Praxion and Aristandrus of Tegea, stone-transporters of limestone [poros] from the sea to the sanctuary, for forty ceiling-beams for the colonnade: from the tenth we gave 1,400 drachmas. To Pa-
66. ACCOUNTS OF THE DELPHIAN NAPOEIOI, 345/4-343/2

(i) [traktatías. Παγκράτ.]τε[ι Α]ργ[έ]ων, στήλην έξι των έκ Κορινθίων, από τού ἐπιδεκάντου εὐκομήμεν δραχμής διακατίας σε 

(ii) [ἐπί Κλέωνος ἀρχοντος, ἀναλώλος]—

[mετά τάς ὁπωρών τις Πυλαίας]ς.

dάφνας, ἀμεράμ φυόν]ν [ο[θ]οι δύο,

[χαλκοὶ τέτορ]ές. φυλάκας προβάτων ὄβολοι τέτορες, ήμου-

[βέλον. κάντα τιμή δραχμία]

[μαγιρίς τῶν ἱερείων μιθός δραχμία τρεῖς, ὄβολοι δύο.

Εὐκράτει, στάλας ἀποξέσαι 

ἐν ὄντι ναυποίδος δραχμία δύο. 

Εὐκράτει, τὰ βαθρὰ ἐξαγαγεῖν 

τὸ Οὐναρχίου καὶ Φιλομήλου 

καὶ τὰς εἰκόνας ἔξω ἱεροῦ 

δραχμία οκτά, ὄβολοι τρεῖς.

Κλέωνοι, τοὺς ἱπποὺς ἀνελεῖν 

καὶ τοὺς ἀνθρώπους, καὶ τὸ ὑ-

δωρὸ τὸ περί τοῦ ναὸν ἐξαγαγεῖν 

δραχμία ἐπτά. Αθανογείτων 

Βουιστίων, τοὺς Λίθους περι-

καθάραι τοὺς ποτὶ τοῦ ναὸν 

δραχμία ἐκατ. κάρυκι μιθός δραχμία δύο. 

Σενοδόρων ἀρχιτέκτων, μιθός ἐκ Πυλαίας 

ἐλι Πυλαίαν δραχμὶ τρικά-

τιαν ἐξήκοντα. γραμματιστὴ 

μιθός δραχμὶ τετράκοντα.

Αθανογείτων Βοιωτίων ἐδέ-

ἐπὶ τοῦ τοιμάν ἐκ Κορίνθου 

τῶν διεθναμένων λίθων, ἐπι-

στυλίους ἐξ, τριγλυφητά δέκα 

ἐπὶ τετράκοντα, ἱερακῶν ἐπτά, 

δραχμίων ἐπὶ 

τῶν χαλκῶν τριάκοντα ἐξ τού-

τοι ἐδόκομεν, τὸ ἐπίδεικτον 

ἀφελῶν τε, δραχμίας ἐνακοτι-

ας τριάκοντα τα μίαν. Ἀγαθώ-

[μοι Κορίνθ]ιος ἐδέξατο τῶν ἄλλων.

[γυναῖκαν ἀπὸ τοῦ] λατομῶν 

[i. 46—7 [Παγκράτ.]τε[[ι Α]ργ[έ]ων, cf. e.g. C. Delphes, cf. e.g. C. Delphes, ii 47. A. ii. 7, D. i. 5: [Νικοδάμων Αργεῖ]on earlier 

edd., cf. e.g. C. Delphes, ii 31. 97. i. 68 ἐνεά C. Delphes: πέντε previous edd. i. 71-2 [θα[κάτις]α] 

tετράκοντα τρεῖς C. Delphes: [δεκακατάκης] τετράκοντα πέντε previous edd. i. 76-80 architect 

and secretary restored C. Delphes, but they will not necessarily have been the first entries in this semester. 

ii. 46 Κλέωνος P. Marchetti, Εταιρείες, 67—83 at 67—9, 77—83 (dating all the archons of this inscription one 

year earlier than here), C. Delphes: Θαβαγόριος P. Bourguet in F. Delphes; Εὐαγόρας ορ Εὐμαιόντα (and Thebagonas 

dated 'after 373') Daux, Chronologie delphique, 10, 13. ii. 81 sqq. C. Delphes: ταύτα [τανταγον τὸς λατομίας 

(γ)] Ἐλι[ε]υσίαν καὶ Κέρμαν — F. Delphes]
Crates of Argos, quarryman, for the cutting of six ceiling-beams from Corinth: from the tenth we gave 245 drachmas. To Xenodorus the architect, stipend from Pylaia to Pylaia: 210 drachmas. The price of a chest in which the tablets are: 22 drachmas, 5 obols. For mending a chest: 1 drachma, 3 obols. Laurel: 2 obols. Stipend for the cooks of the victims: 3 drachmas, 2 obols. Tablet: 1 obol, 3 chalkoi. Stipend for a secretary: 40 drachmas. Stipend for a herald: 2 drachmas. To Teledamus of Delphi, for three benches on which the naopoioi sit: 9 drachmas. To Eucrates of Delphi, for a stele on which the naopoioi (are listed): 9 drachmas, 3 obols.

Total expenditure in this Pylaia: 1,943 Aeginetan drachmas, 4 obols, 3 chalkoi.

46 In the archonship of Cleon [343/2], expenditures in the autumn Pylaia.

48 Laurel for two days: 2 obols, 4 chalkoi. Guarding the sacrificial animals: 4½ obols. Price of reed: 1 drachma. Stipend for the cooks of the victims: 3 drachmas, 2 obols. To Eucrates, for smoothing a stele on which the naopoioi (are listed): 2 drachmas. To Eucrates, for removing out of the sanctuary the bases of Onomarchus and Philomelus and their likenesses: 8 drachmas, 3 obols. To Cleon, for taking up the (statues of) horses and the human statues and removing the water around the temple: 7 drachmas. To Athanogeiton of Boeotia, for cleaning the stones by the temple: 20 drachmas. Stipend for a herald: 2 drachmas. To Xenodorus the architect, stipend from Pylaia to Pylaia: 360 drachmas. Stipend for a secretary: 40 drachmas. Athanogeiton of Boeotia accepted (the contract for) the cutting from Corinth of (replacements for) the destroyed stones, six architraves, fourteen triglyphs, seven coping-stones, for 1,036 drachmas: after deducting the tenth we gave him 931 drachmas. Agathonymus of Corinth accepted (the contract
For the fourth-century rebuilding of the temple of Apollo at Delphi, the naopoioi who collected and spent the funds, and the biannual Pylaiai, cf. 45. These accounts, from a series of slabs which formed a continuous wall, are the first from the period of resumed collection and work after the Third Sacred War of 356–346: £.315–310 a geographically-arranged list of naopoioi (SIG* 237. i, n. B,D,E = C. Delphes, ii 119, 120) was begun (119) on a block above the one bearing our text, and to make room for its continuation (120) a first column of our text, perhaps containing accounts of the war period (cf. below) and/or of income in autumn 345/4, was erased (see fig. 1).

The only record of income preserved for these years is at the beginning of the text, the income of spring 345/4, the year in which normal activity was resumed after the disruption of the Sacred War. We learn from other inscriptions that the naopoioi ‘did not meet’ in 355 or 354; in spring 353 the city of Delphi made its ‘first payment to the (naopoioi) in the war’, and there were further meetings, attended by representatives of states on the Phocian side, until spring 351; after that the record of the city proceeds directly to autumn 345/4, when ‘since peace had been made, they met’ (SIG* 241. A–B. = C. Delphes, ii 31. 67–71; C. Delphes, ii 33 is restored to attest a poorly-attended meeting in spring 346/5). Money collected during the war had to be deposited with the city of Delphi, because the Amphictyony was opposed to those who were currently in possession of Delphi, and this money seems not to have been touched by the Phocians (see on 67): in C. Delphes, ii 31. 67 their total receipts for this period are given as 46 minas, 28 stater = 3,276 drachmas, as compared with 3,404 drachmas, 1 obol here: the difference is presumably to be explained as money which the wartime naopoioi had taken over from their predecessors. For the ‘credit’ made available by the city of Delphi (opheilema: C. Delphes ii 31–2) cf. on 45: the amount from which 105 drachmas = 1½ minas was now paid had been reduced from 85,000 drachmas by expenditure between 357 and 351, and may originally have been 150,000–200,000 drachmas (c.36–48 talents).

At the top of our two columns we have income of 345/4 and 344/3; below the vacant space we have expenditure from 345/4 to 343/2. The first post-war Pylaia is dated not only by the archon, an official of the city of Delphi, but also, perhaps in order to stress that Delphi was once more in the hands of the Amphictyony, by the hieromnai, mone. There were two of these from each of the twelve ethne which made up the Amphictyony, and they were the voting members of the Amphictyonic council. The two named here are the Thessalians, who occupied the senior position in the Amphictyony and who therefore serve as eponyms to identify the board (cf. 67. 21–36, etc., where they head complete lists): Gottyphus was from Pharsalus and the
(ii) for the bringing of these stones from the quarry from Lechaenum, for 594 drachmas: after deducting the tenth we gave him 534 drachmas.

Fig 1. C. Delphes, ii 34 = No. 66 in its physical context
city of Colosimmus is unknown; they continued to represent Thessaly until 337; it was Cottyphus who persuaded the Amphictyony to embark on the Fourth Sacred War, against Amphissa, in 340/39, and who commanded the Amphictyonic forces in the first campaign of that war (Aesch. i. Ctes. 124–9, Dem. xviii. Crown 151). The Amphictyonic council could also be attended by non-voting experts, called pylagoroi in literary texts and agoratroi in inscriptions. (See Roux, 20–36, Lefèvre, L’Amphictyonie, 205–14, Sanchez, 496–507; and Aesch. i. Ctes. 115–24.) Much of the expenditure here is normal expenditure of a sanctuary and its building works, and some of the sums spent are very small (there were twelve chalkoi [‘coopers’] to the obol). Laurel was needed for decorating altars and temples, and sacrificial victims; reed for pens to be used by the secretaries; chests, as stated in i. 54–5, for the storage of documents. Heralds and cooks, paid small sums, will have had only a limited amount of work to do at each Pylaia. The secretary’s pay was to rise from 40 drachmas per semester to 90 later in the series.

Items connected with the building works are mostly self-explanatory. Poros (i. 41) was the ordinary building stone used in Greece in contexts which did not call for marble; as for ‘diverting’ or ‘removing’ the water around the temple (ii. 30–2, 51–2), Tod quoted the observation of Bourguet that ‘after heavy rains . . . the water still lies on the paved platform which surrounds the temple on three sides’ (F. Delphes, iii. v, p. 112). The architect seems to have received seven months’ pay at 30 drachmas per month in spring 345; six months’ pay at 60 drachmas per month in subsequent semesters. The ‘tenth’ was a proportion of a contracted sum, withheld until the completion of the contract: in i. 40–50 contracts have been completed and tenths are paid (in i. 47 ‘six’ is an error for ‘fifty-one’, Fl in an earlier document having been misread as Fl (P. Charneux ap. Bousquet, Études, 151); in autumn 356 1,000 drachmas were paid to Praxion and Aristandrus from the Delphians’ credit (SIG³ 241. A = C. Delphes, ii 31. 14–15), and 11,600 drachmas must have been paid from the funds which the naopoioi had to hand; in ii. 72 sqq. men have agreed to contracts and are paid nine tenths in advance (fractionally under, in fact). For thrinkoi as coping-stones, overhanging to protect the frieze, see A. Jannoray, BCH lxiv–lxv 1940–1, 38–40. Lechaeum (ii. 82–3) was the harbour of Corinth on the Corinthian Gulf: Peloponnesians are prominent both among the contractors and among the attested naopoioi, and Davies, 12, suggests ‘an attempt by the Peloponnesian Dorians to compensate, via their assiduity, for their
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Payments of Phocian reparations to Delphi, 343/2–341/0

Three fragments from the lower part of a slab, found at Delphi; now in the museum there. Phot. F. Delphes, iii. v, pl. i fig. 3 (all); Bousquet, Études, 156 (all); C. Delphes, ii, pl. vii fig. 11 (beginning of col. i).

Phocian; stoichedon, 27, but with some condensation and almost always ending a line with the end of a paragraph or a word.
Otherwise marginal status within the Amphiktyony and its management of Delphi.

Other items reflect the disruptive effect on Delphi of the war. New benches were needed for the naopoioi to sit on at their meetings (i. 63–6). The stones that had to be cleaned (ii. 64–5), and the stones that were destroyed (ii. 73–7), will have been brought to the site before the war and neglected during it; the six architraves and twelve of the fourteen triglyphs had been delivered and were paid for in autumn 356 (SIG³ 241. A. = C. Delphes, ii. 31. 28–30). However, it would be surprising if the naopoioi waited until 343 to indulge in a damnatio memoriae of Philomelus and Onomarchus, the first two Phocian leaders in the war, and some Phocian dedications from the war survived to be seen by the traveller Pausanias in the second century A.D., so H. Pomtow argued that their statues were simply moved out of the actual sanctuary of Apollo (ii. 56–9), because they were in the way of the building works, and that Cleon’s job was to detach the statues from their bases to allow for that move (ii. 60–1) (SIG³ i, p. 400 n. 25).

For the sums of money spent, in total and on particular contracts for particular jobs within the whole programme, compare for example the accounts for work on the Acropolis at Athens in the fifth century (IG 1³ 433–97; samples M&L 54, 59, 60 ~ Fornara 114, 120, 118. B) and for work in the sanctuary of Asclepius at Epidaurus in the fourth and third centuries (IG ivδ. i 102–20, 743–4, with subsequent revisions and additions), with the discussion (not limited to these sites) of Burford, _The Greek Temple Builders at Epidaurus_, esp. 81–118. It has been estimated that in fifth-century Athens the marble Parthenon might have cost c.460–500 talents, and the Propylaea c.200 talents rather than the 2,000 of Heliodorus (FGrH 373 F i ap. Harp., Sud. προπύλαια ταύτα ~ Fornara 118. A, retaining the manuscripts’ 2,012) (R. S. Stanier, _JHS_ lxxiii 1953, 68–76); at Epidaurus the temple of Asclepius, built in just under five years c.375–370, cost slightly over 23 talents (IG ivδ. i 102), and Burford, 81–5, estimates the cost of a century’s work at the sanctuary as c.240–290 talents. On the other hand, according to Her. ii. 180, i. the Alcmaeonids contracted to build the sixth-century limestone temple at Delphi for 300 talents. Stanier, 73, suggests that that high figure can be explained by the very high costs of transporting heavy materials from distant sources to Delphi (in fourth-century Delphi the cost of transporting stone is more than ten times the cost of quarrying it, whereas in Athens and Epidaurus it is a third or less of the cost of quarrying it).
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SIG* 230; F. Delphes, ii n. v 14; Tod 172. A; Bouquet, Études, 155–65; C. Delphes, ii 36*. See also P. de la Coste-Messelière, BCH lxiii 1949, 201–47, esp. 202–5; Roux, L’Amphictionie, Delphes et le temple d’Apollon, 164–72; Sánchez, L’Amphictionie, 134–49.

(i)

[ἀκομονος] 12
[ἀμοι] 12
[ὑνι] 12
[κοινος]

[Πολιας ἤρινας]
[ταλαντα τριακοντα]

[τε ταρτα καταβαλα των ιερων]

[Χαιαων] Παμποδορου,
[Αγα] [α] ουκρατου
[Μαρι] ιτων Αγγεπτολος, Φιλανατη
[Αθ] ιαν Αγγελαου, Κλεουμενος
[Μαλ] ιεων Ψακδαρου Πηρακλεωτα,
[Σ] ς επεδαμον Λαμιεος.

Περραιδων–

[Δο] λοπων Ασανδρου, Φαικου.

(ii)

[ἐπι τουτων απηγεγκαι οι Φωκεις]
[Πολιας ἤρινας]
[ταλαντα τριακοντα]

χρηματων.

ἐν Δελφοις των ιερων

ἐπι τουτων απηγεγκαι οι Φωκεις

Πολιας ἤρινας

ταλαντα τριακοντα. οφιτη

ἐπι Κλεωνος ἄρχοντος

ἐπι τουτων απηγεγκαι οι Φωκεις

Πολιας ἤρινας

ταλαντα τριακοντα. οφιτη

ἐπι Κλεωνος ἄρχοντος

ἐπι Κλεωνος ἄρχοντος

ἐπι τουτων απηγεγκαι οι Φωκεις

Πολιας ἤρινας

ταλαντα τριακοντα.

ἐπι τουτων απηγεγκαι οι Φωκεις

Πολιας ἤρινας

ταλαντα τριακοντα.

[θεους Ιω] 10

[θεους] 10

[θεους] 10

[i] 6, 32 Αγακρατους but Αγακρατους in ii. 20.

ii. 14 (cf. 35) Πθωνος Bouquet: Πθωνος also possible but see commentary; [A]κρατως earlier edd.
PAYMENTS OF PHOCIAN REPARATIONS TO DELPHI

In the presence of the following the Phocians brought back in the spring Pylaia thirty talents.

Fourth payment of the sacred monies.
In the archonship of Chaerolas [342/1] at Delphi.

The 

The hieromnai were the following:
Thessalians Cottytphus, Colosimmus; from Philip —us, Python; Delphians ——, Damon; Dorians ——, —nes; Ionians ——, Polycritus; Perrhaebians & Dolopian Asandrīs, Phaeus.

Second payment of the sacred monies. In the archonship of Cleon [343/2] at Delphi.

The 

The hieromnai were the following:
Thessalians Cottytphus, Colosimmus; from Philip —us, Python; Delphians ——, Damon; Dorians ——, —nes; Ionians ——, Polycritus; Perrhaebians & Dolopian Asandrīs, Phaeus.

In the presence of the following the Phocians brought back thirty talents.

Fifth payment of the sacred monies.

— — —; Ionians —— of Histiaea, Mnesilochus of Athens; Boeotians Dionysius, —us; Locrians Charinus, Dameas; Achaean Mythodorus, Agasictatus; Magnesians Agesipolis, Philonautus; Aenianians Agelaus, Cleomenes; Malikans Psedarius of Heraclea, Sthenedamus of Lamia; Perrhaebians & Dolopian Asandrīs, Phaeus.

In the presence of the following the Phocians brought back in the spring Pylaia thirty talents.

Second payment of the sacred monies. In the archonship of Cleon [343/2] at Delphi.

The 

The hieromnai were the following:
Thessalians Cottytphus, Colosimmus; from Philip —us, Python; Delphians ——, Damon; Dorians ——, —nes; Ionians ——, Polycritus; Perrhaebians & Dolopian Asandrīs, Phaeus.

In the presence of the following the Phocians brought back thirty talents.

Fifth payment of the sacred monies.
When the Phocians occupied Delphi in 356 and sparked off the Third Sacred War, they originally proclaimed that they would not touch the sacred treasuries, but before long they did help themselves to the treasures in order to pay for mercenaries (D.S. xvi. 23. i–31. v at 24. v, 27. iii–iv, 28. ii; contr. 14. v, 28. iv, 30. i–ii, in which they coveted the treasures from the beginning). At the beginning of 347 the current Phocian leader, Phalaecus, was deposed, an enquiry was set up, and the first Phocian commander, Philomelus, was judged innocent, but his successors and some other men were judged guilty (56. iii–57). The settlement imposed by the Amphictyonic council in 346 after the Phocians had surrendered to Philip of Macedon included the following provisions: that the Phocians were to be expelled from the Amphictyony and Philip admitted in their place; that the Phocians were to be split into villages of not more than fifty houses each; that they were to repay the sacred treasures that they had taken at the rate of sixty talents a year; and that their horses and weapons were to be disposed of, and they were not to possess horses or weapons until the repayment had been completed (59–60).

This is part of an inscription which recorded the first five of the Phocian payments. The payments were also recorded on a set of steleï set up in the sanctuary of Athena at Elatea, in north-eastern Phocis: six of them are known, referring to payments made between 342/1 and 319/18 (?) (IG ix. i 110–15 = SIG³ 231–5 = C. Delphes, ii 37–42: Tod printed the first of these as 172. B). Reconstructing the history of the payments depends on establishing the dates of Delphian archons; as an aid to that it was seen by de la Coste-Messelière (230–1, cf. table facing 242 and Ellis, Philip II and Macedonian Imperialism, 132–3 table 3) that the Delphian πρυτανεῖς and the hieromnaomones of Delphi and the Metropolitan Dorian served for one Delphian year without the possibility of immediate reappointment, while the hieromnaomones of the Peloponnesian Dorians, the Euboean Ionians, and the Boeotians served for a Julian year, covering the spring semester of one Delphian year and the autumn semester of the next (and in the other groups the same men could serve for several successive years).
lochus of Athens; Perrhaebians & Dolopians Phaecus, Asandrus; Boeotians Daetadas, Olympion; Locrians Pleistias, Theonmnestus; Achaeans Agassicrus, Pythodorus; Magnesians Philonautas, Epicratidas; Aeolianians Agelaus, Cleomenes; Malians Anti-machus of Heraclea, Democrats of Lamia.

On what currently seems to be the best reconstruction, the Phocians made their first payment in the autumn of 343/2; they paid 30 talents each semester in 343/2 and 342/1; then the burden was halved, and they paid 30 talents each year (except 338/7, when they made no payment); either in 336/5 or in 335/4 there was a further reduction, to 10 talents each year; the last attested payment was in 319/18 (?). By which time they will have paid c.400 talents (whereas according to D.S. xvi. 56. vi the total amount taken was more than 10,000 talents).

To place the figures in perspective, we may note that in the Delian League of the fifth century the highest payments of tribute attested before the Peloponnesian War were 30 talents, paid by Aegina and from 443 by Thasos; in 425 Thasos was perhaps assessed for 60 talents and Abdera with Dicaea for 75 talents. The Phocians had no significant non-agricultural resources, and would have found the earlier payments very heavy. Attempts to link the changes in their payments with the general history of relations between Macedon and the Greeks are not very profitable if the dates currently accepted are correct; the delay before the first payment may well be a sign that Philip was less vindictive than the Boeotians would have wished; there is no particular event in 341 which would explain the first reduction; non-payment in 338/7 can be linked with the Chaeronea campaign, for which according to Pausanias the Phocians were restored (sc. to their cities) by Athens and Thebes and fought on their side (x. 3. iii–iv: this can be true only of the more southerly Phocians); but the second reduction now seems to be too late to be associated with Philip's settlement of Greece immediately after Chaeronea. The Phocians were included in Philip's League of Corinth (76. 31), but while it is likely that the restoration of their cities did go ahead membership of the League need not indicate any improvement in their status.

The prytaneis were officials of the city of Delphi; they were eight in number (Lefèvre, L' Amphiictionie, 261; Sánchez, 140), but probably only seven witnessed the payment of 342/1 (ii. 7–10). The hieronmnamones (cf. 66) were twenty-four in number, two from each of the twelve ethne which made up the Amphictyony, and lists like those in this
inscription show how the Amphictyony was articulated in the years after 346. The Thesalians are named first (for Cottyphus and Colosimum cf. on 66). Second come the two men named not as Macedonians but as from Philip, who in his own person (despite Paus. x. 8. ii) took over the two votes previously held by the Phocians; among his representatives, Eurylochus (i. 23) is a known envoy of his (Dem. ix. Phil. iii. 58), and Python of Byzantium (ii. 14. 35) is another (e.g. [Dem.] vii. Halon. 20. 23). Third come the Delphians, given voting status perhaps in the fifth century (Sánchez, 118–20) or perhaps in 346, with the Perrhaebians and Dolopians combined in a single group to make room for them (Aesch. ii. Embassy 116 has a list of the twelve ethne in 346, where the manuscripts give eleven names, editors insert Dolopians as a distinct unit from Perrhaebians, and the Delphians are not mentioned). After that the normal order continues with Dorians, Ionians, Perrhaebians & Dolopians*, Bocotians, Locrians.
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Alliance between Erythrae and Hermias of Atarneus,

6350–6342

A fragment of a stele, found at Erythrae, now in the British Museum. Phot. of squeeze IK Erythraei und Klazomenai, Taf. ii.

Attic koine; stealheinai 27.

SIG x 229; Tod 165*; Sest. 322; IK Erythraei und Klazomenai 55; IK Adrmyttouion 45. Trans. Harding 79. See also Berve, Die Tyrannis bei den Griechen, i. 332–5, ii. 688–9; [Hammond &] Griffith, 517–22; S. Hornblower, CAH vi. 94. 220.

[. . . ἐὰν δὲ Ἐρυθραίοι ἐκτιθῶνται τῇ]-
[i ἐς] τῇ Χώραι 
[epam] μι[ϊου και τῶν ἐ]-
[πῃρον πολέμου ζύνεκεν, εἰ ἔναν 
λέα πάντα καὶ τὰ ἐκ τοῦτ[ων] [γενμέ]-
[v]α, πλὴ[ν δὲ σ'] ἀν τις ἀποδόται. [τῶν δὲ π]-
[πειδάν δὲ εἰρήνη γένηται, ἀπάγεσιν]-
[θα’ ἐν τριήκοντα ήμέραις. ἐὰν δὲ μ]-
[ῃ ἀπάγεσιν, τελείω τῷ τελ[-] ἐσθαὶ δὲ ἐπαγγελλάντας δι’ α[καισ].

ι. ἐναὶ δὲ καὶ Ἐρμίαι καὶ τὸ[ις ἑταί]-
[ροις, ἐὰν τι βούλησιν ταῦτα ἐκτ’ ἔθεσθαι]-
[κατά ταῦτα ὀμόσας δὲ Ἐρυθροια[ν]-
ς Ἐρμίαι καὶ τοῖς ἑταῖροις. ὅ δὲ ὁρ]-
[kα οὐτῶ διδεῖ βοηθήσω Ἐρμί[α]ι καὶ τῇ]-

0–1 Waddington, in Le Bas & Waddington 1536: δὲ δὲ Ἐρυθραίοι ἐκτιθῶνται | εἰς] IK E.u.K, but we should expect ες as in ll. 32, 33. 3. The stone has TOYTON. 11. The stone has BOYΔΟΝΤΑΙ.
(Phthiotic) Achacans*, Magnesians*, Aenianians*, and Malians* (but in the first list in our inscription the Perrhaebians & Dolopians were omitted in their normal place and added at the end). All except Philip and the Dorians and Ionians are central or northern Greek peoples; Thessaly proper and its dependencies (asterisked above) account for twelve of the twenty-four votes, and probably accounted for fourteen before the admission of the Delphians. Athens had one of the two Ionian votes (and was not deprived of it in 346 in spite of having supported the Phocians in the Sacred War), and the Euboeans had the other; the Dorian votes were divided between the Metropolis, i.e. Doris in central Greece, and the Dorians of the Peloponnese (the Spartans, who like the Phocians had refused to pay a fine, were expelled from the Amphictyony in 346, but they seem never to have exercised the vote of the the Peloponnesian Dorians: later they sometimes exercised the Metropolitan vote).

---

If the Erythraeans deposit anything in the territory of Hermias and his companions on account of war, everything shall be exempt from taxes [ateleia] and the offspring of them, except for whatever any one sells; but for what is sold let him pay a fiftieth. When peace is made, he shall remove them in thirty days; and if he does not remove them let him pay the dues. They shall deposit after giving notice justly. It shall also be for Hermias and his companions, if they want to deposit anything, on the same terms.

The Erythraeans shall swear to Hermias and his companions. The oath shall be the following: 'I shall go to support Hermias and his companions
This text gives the end of a defensive alliance between Erythrae and Hermias, which in addition to the regular provisions allows each party to deposit its belongings, and in particular its flocks, which would be kept outside the city (cf. what is said of offspring in ll. 3–4), in the territory of the other in time of war without paying import duty. Compare Athens’ depositing of animals in Euboea during the Peloponnesian War (Thuc. ii. 14. i). Import duties were widespread in the Greek world (cf., e.g., for Athens, And. 1. Myst. 133–6); for sales taxes elsewhere see Andreades, A History of Greek Public Finance, i. 144–5.

For Erythrae, on the Asiatic mainland opposite Chios, cf. 9, 17, 56; Atarneus was about 60 miles (100 km.) further north, opposite Mytilene. The evidence for Hermias is analysed by D. E. W. Wormell, TCS v 1935, 55–92: he was a eunuch who studied in Athens, became a partner of Eubulus, the Bithynian banker who gained control of Atarneus and other places in north-western Asia Minor at the time of the Satraps’ Revolt, and succeeded him on his death c.350. At Assus, opposite the north coast of Lesbos, he set up a philosophical school whose members included Aristotle and Xenocrates, and Aristotle married his niece. Later, Aristotle went to Macedon to be tutor of Alexander the Great, and a friendly relationship was established between Philip and Hermias; but in 341 Hermias was arrested by the Persians’ commander Mentor of Rhodes, sent to Susa and eventually, after he refused to talk under torture, put to death. See especially Dem. x. Phil. iv. 32 with schol. (9 p. 152 Dilts), Didym. In Dem. iv. 47–vi. 18 ~ Harding 90, [Plat.] Ep. vi, D.S. xvi. 52. v–vi, Str. 610. xiii. i. 57.
both by land and by sea with all my strength as far as possible, and I shall accomplish the other things in accordance with the agreement.'

The generals shall take care of it. The oath shall be received by messengers going from Hermias and his companions with the generals in Erythrae (?) with full-grown victims; the victims shall be provided by the city.

Likewise also Hermias and his companions shall swear through messengers that they will go to support the Erythraeans both by land and by sea with all their strength as far as possible, and will accomplish the other things in accordance with the agreement. They shall swear by the gods who watch over oaths.

This shall be written on a stone stele, and placed by the Erythraeans in the sanctuary of Athena and by Hermias in the sanctuary of Atarneus.

In the 350s Erythrae had been under the influence of Mausolus of Caria (cf. 56), and so had Chios, as one of the states which rebelled against Athens in the Social War (D.S. xvi. 7. iii). This inscription shows Erythrae making a defensive alliance with Hermias, and Hermias also was involved in some way with the territorial interests of Chios and Mytilene (Thp. FGHi 115 F 291 ap. Didym.: new restorations in Didym. ed. Pearson & Stephens). As late as 351/0–344/3 Erythrae was still on good terms with the Carian dynasts. It appears that local dynasts were weakening the control of Persia itself in western Asia Minor, and the Persian King is perhaps the enemy envisaged in this defensive alliance: that perhaps suggests a date late rather than early in the 340s when the Persian king was regaining lost ground in the west of his empire.

Erythrae seems to have had an oligarchic government at this time (cf. 56), and the provision in ll. 18–19 for the generals rather than a larger body to take care of the implementation of the alliance is compatible with that. With the 'companions' (hetaira-roi) of Hermias we may compare those of Philip and Alexander, an informal council of the king's favourites (and by extension the cavalry who were the king's companions in battle); Hammond [& Griffith], 158–60. Here it is striking that the companions are explicitly associated with Hermias in his rule (cf. W. Schmitthenner, Seculum xix 1969, 43). For sacrifices accompanying the swearing of oaths cf. 50. For the sanctuary of Athena at Erythrae cf. 56; Atarneus, in whose sanctuary Hermias was to set up his stele, was a legendary king of Mysia and founder of the city of Atarneus (Himerius, Or. vi. 6).
Athenian penalties for attacks on Eretria, 343 (?)

A fragment of a stele found on the Athenian Acropolis now in the Epigraphical Museum.

Attic-Ionic; stoichedon 39 but 40 letters in ll. 12, 14, 15, 20, if editors are right to assume that this text never used the old o for ou.


[.] [max. 11] vacat

[εθοέν τῶν δ’ ἵμων. Ἡγήσας ὑπ’ ὅς Ἡγήσιον Σων ἐπεν (?)]

[δπως ἄν τῶν] [συμμάχων] μηδεῖς [16]

[—— 7] [μηδεῖς, μῆτε ἔνοια μή;] [τε ἀστός, ἀδικεῖ (?) τ’]

[———] [ἐν συμμάχων μή;] [δένα, ὄρμωμεν.] [14]

[τῶν π’] [πόλεων τῶν συμμαχίων μηδéric[6 or 7], δεδόχθαι/ ἐφθασάθαι.]

[i τ’] [ὑα δήμουν; περὶ μὲν τῶν ἐπιστρ[ατευσάλτων ἐπ’ ἔκ]], [τη] [χώραν τῆς Ἑρετρείας, τῆς βουλ[ήν προσβαλέσα] —

[σαν ἐξεπετυχθῆνει] [κεῖς] [ HttpServletResponse με] [τὸ πρῶτον ἐκκ] —

[κληριάν, ὅπως ἄν δ’] [μὴν δύον κατὰ [τοῖς νόμοις (?), ἔλα] —

[δε τις τοῦ λοιποῦ χρόνου ἐπιστρατήσει ἐπὶ Ἑρήμου] —

[τριαν ή ἔν άλλῃ ταύτα τῶν συμμαχίων πόλεων, Ἀθήνας τῆς τῶν συμμάχων τῶν Ἀθηναίων, ατόμων αυτοῦ] —

[κατεγερώθησαν, καὶ τά χρήματα δ’] [ἡμίσια ἐναὶ καὶ τ’] —

[ἡ’] [θεῖο τὸ ἐπιδικάτον καὶ ἐναὶ τά χρήματα αὐτοῦ]

[άγωνίμα εξ ἀπάσον τῶν πόλεων τῶν συμμαχίων ἔλα] —

[δε τις ἀφελίστα τόπος, ὀφείλει] [ἐν τοῖς συνεθρώ. (?) τ’] —

[ἀ] [σμαχίων. ἀναγράφαι δε τοῦ ἐπιστράτηγας άλλῃ —

[θήσει καὶ στήσαι ἐν ἀκρωτίᾳ] [ὁλο] [14]

[καὶ ἐν τοῖς λίμεν] —

[τοῦ ἀρχύριον] [δόθαιν] [ἐναὶ τῶν ἔλα] —

[ναγραφθῇ τοῦ ταμίαν τ’] [οῦ δήμου. ἐπιστρατεύεται δε καὶ τ’] —

[οὺς βοηθό] [ας ὑπ’ ἔκ τρεῖν αἰχμαλωτά καὶ Κα] —

[ροσίους καὶ Καλλίαν Χαλκίδα] [τῶν Ἐβδομάδων (?) στρ’] —

[α] [πηγά] [32]

[εξαι] [28]

[.] [ε] [36] —

Resolved by the people. Hegesippus son of Hegesias of Sunium proposed (?)

1 So that no one of the allies of Athens ——— no one, neither foreigner nor citizen,
shall wrong (?) any of the allies, setting out ——— the allied cities, be it resolved/
decreed by the people:

6 Concerning those who have campaigned against the territory of Eretria, the coun-
cil shall make a proboleuma and bring it forth to the people at the first assembly, so
that they shall render justice in accordance with the laws (?)

9 If any one in the future campaigns against Eretria or against any other of the
allied cities, whether one of the Athenians or of the Athenians’ allies, he shall be
condemned to loss of rights, and his goods shall be public and the tenth part shall
belong to the Goddess [Athena]; and his goods shall be liable to seizure from all the
allied cities; and if any city expropriates them it shall owe them to the synedron (?)
of the allies.

17 The decree shall be written up on a stone stèle and placed on the Acropolis ———
also in the harbour; the money for the writing-up shall be given by the treasurer
of the people.

20 Praise also those who have gone to support the Eretrians, namely the Chalcidians
and Carystians and Callias of Chalcis the Euboean (?) general ——— and praise
This decree lacks a full prescript (l. 1 is certainly the beginning of the decree: Knoepfler suggests that another text was inscribed above and that explains the abbreviated prescript, as in 95), and it can be dated only from its content. Eretria has apparently been attacked by Athenians and citizens of member states of the League; the Athenians are afraid that such incidents may occur again, in connection with Eretria or with other members; and so they resolve to punish those who have attacked Eretria and threaten with penalties any who offend in the future.

Editors have regularly linked this with Athens' recovery of Euboea in 357 (cf. 48); but it is hard to think of Athenians or members of the League who could be accused of attacking Eretria then. Eretria may have been among the cities attacked by dissident members of the League during the Social War (cf. D.S. xvi. 21. ii), but its position on the side of Euboea facing the Greek mainland does not make it a likely target. Knoepfler therefore refers this text to Athens' controversial involvement with Eretria in 348, when it could have been alleged by those who disapproved of the venture that some Athenians had attacked the territory of Eretria (Plut. Phoc. 12. 1–14. ii, cf. Dem. xxi. Mid. 132–5, 161–8, 197, v. Peace 5). The immediate upshot of that episode was that Euboea passed out of the Athenian orbit, so a decree containing reassurances for Eretria is not likely to have been enacted then. Knoepfler dates the decree to 343, when the proposer Hegesippus (see below) was at the height of his influence and Athens was trying to regain the support of the Euboeans, and he suggests that the trial of Eubulus' cousin Hegesileos for his involvement in the episode was recent when mentioned in 343/2 by Dem. xix. Embassy 290 (cf. schol. 153 Dilts). Dreher suggests that it was Hegesileos' involvement which provoked the decree, and that both it and the trial are to be dated 348. Either of these is a more convincing context for the

---
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Athens grants asylum to Arybbas the Molossian, 343/2

One fragment (a: top: in the National Museum at Athens, No. 2648), and three joining fragments (b = 3–38, c = 37–end + left of lower relief, d = right of lower relief: found on the Acropolis and now in the Epigraphical Museum), of a tall, thin stele, with reliefs at the top and below the text and crowns showing chariots. "JEAIxxiii 1940 has facs. (1 Abb. 1), phot. of lower relief (3 Abb. 2: still lacking one frag.), phot. of upper relief (11 Abb. 4), reconstruction of whole (18 Abb. 6). Subsequent photos. Ad xxviii 1973, iii, tav. 7 (whole of lower fragments); Meyer, Die griechischen Urkundenreliefs, Taf. 30 A 97 (crowns and lower relief); Hep. bxi 1992, pl. 67, b (whole of lower fragments); Lawton, Reliefs, pl. 65 no. 122 (reliefs); our Pl. 5 (a–b).

Attic-Ionic, twice in subjunctives retaining the old Attic e for η (cf. Thraete, Grammar, i. 380). II. 3 sqq. "stoichedon 21 with irregularities.

IG ii2 226; SIG 228; Tod 173; M. J. Osborne, Naturalization, D 14. See also O. Walter, "JEAIxxii 1940, 1–24 (identifying upper relief); R. M. Errington, GRBS xi 1975, 41–59; D. Peppas-Delmonzou, Ad xxviii 1973, β, 11 (publ. 1977: on fragment of lower relief); [Hammond &] Griffith, ii. 304–8, 504–7; J. Heskel, GRBS xxix 1988, 185–96; Lawton, Reliefs, 134–5 no. 122 (reliefs).
decree than c.357; and the emphatic tone of the decree (especially ll. 2–5) better suits the heightened tension of this later period and perhaps reflects Hegesippus' personal style.

Hegesippus (nicknamed Krobylos, ‘top-knot’, from his old-fashioned hairstyle) was active in public life from 365 (Diog. Laert. iii. 24) to 337 (77), and was still alive in 325/4 (IG ii2 1629, 543): in particular, he was one of the leading opponents of Philip of Macedon in and after 346. His brother Hegesander was the proposer of 52: for the family see APF, 209–10; Lambert, ΖPE cxxv 1999, 93–130 at 111–12. To publish this decree both on the Acropolis and in the Agora, as well as ‘in the harbour’, seems to us excessive; and we prefer a version of the publication clause limited to two copies: Wilhelm thought that the the second text would have been a temporary publication on a whitewashed board. Publication in the harbour (for another instance see 64) is perhaps to serve as a direct warning to men who may be about to embark on a forbidden expedition.

This is a non-probouleumatic decree (l. 1), in which the assembly orders the council to produce a probouleuma for the next meeting of the assembly on the past offence (ll. 6–9), but the probouleuma which led to the decree was such that the assembly could immediately lay down a general rule for the future (cf. Rhodes, Boule, 68, 81). Athens threatens with loss of rights and confiscation of goods, presumably by Athens, any Athenian or ally who attacks one of the allies (N. Toogood, CQ2 xlvii 1997, 295–7, stresses Athens’ willingness to legislate for non-Athenians as well as Athenians); but, if the restoration is right, if a city expropriates goods which are to be confiscated those goods then go to the allies. The decree is framed so as to benefit the allies, although it is thought that either the Athenians or other allies may offend against them.
θε[ο].
lacuna
[--- ἐπειδὴ ---]

η πολυτ.
εια ἡ δοθ[ε]ι σα [τι τοι πατρι κα]-
i τοι πάππου κα[ι αι ἄλλαι δ]-
ωρειαι ὑπάρχα[ο]υ[ι και α]-
ὐτῶ καὶ τοῖς ἐγγόνοι[ε]ς κα-
δε Αρύββου ὅπως ἀμ μηδ[ε]ν ἀ-
δικήτα τὴν βουλήν τὴν ἀε-
ι βουλεύονσαι καὶ τούς στ-
ρατηγοὺς τοὺς ἀεὶ στρατη-
γούσας καὶ ἐὰν τις ἄλλο-
ς ποὺ Αθηναίων παρατυχά-
ναι. εἰναὶ δὲ αὐτοὶ πρόσωδ-
ν καὶ πρὸς βουλήν καὶ πρὸς
δήμου ὅταν δέχεται, καὶ τοῦ-
σ πρωτάνεις οὐ ἢ πρωτανε-
ύσων εἰπμελείσθαι ὅπως
ἀν προσόδου τυγχάνει. ἀνα-
γράφαι δὲ τὸ τόπον τὸ στη-
τὸν γραμματέα τῆς βουλῆ-
ς ἐν στήλη βιούσι καὶ κα-
ταθείναι ἐν ἀκροπόλει. εἰς
δὲ τὴν ἀναγραφὴν τῆς στή-
λῆς δότω ὁ ταμίας τοῦ δήμου
ΔΔΔ δραχμάς ἐκ τῶν κατὰ ψη-
φίσματα μεριζομένων τοῖς
dήμοι. καλέσαι δὲ Αρύββων
ἐπὶ δειπνὸν εἰς τὸ πρωτα-
νέος ἐς αὐριον. εἰς τὰ καὶ
tούς μετ’ Αρύββων ἡκοι-
τας ἐπὶ ξένα εἰς τὸ πρωτα-
νεων ἐς αὐριον. ἱμπατι-
σαι δὲ καὶ περὶ τῶν ἄλλων ὁ-
v Αρύββως λέγει. τὰ μὲν ἄλλα-

Lines are numbered as by Tod and M. J. Osborne: in earlier editions our l. 3 was l. 1. Osborne reads (but usually dots) a few letters not read by earlier editors, but does not read a few letters read by earlier editors. The text appears to have been sketched on the stone before it was carved: cf. Osborne, i. 59–60, who suggests that the cutter failed to realize that he had not carved the ρ in l. 40, and that other vacant spaces and crowdings of two letters into one space can be explained on the basis of a faulty prior sketch. Osborne points out that the name could be nominative, genitive, or dative, and could have been followed by patronymic and/or ethnic in subsequent lines. The stone has ΚΥΗΑΙ; last σ read by S. D. Lambert.
Gods.

2 Arybbas.

3 Since — — — the citizenship given to his father and his grandfather and the other grants apply both to him and to his descendants and are valid: care shall be taken of Arybbas, that he may suffer no injustice, by the council currently in office and the generals currently in office and any other of the Athenians who may happen to be present anywhere. He shall have access both to the council and to the people whenever he needs, and the prytaneis in office shall take care that he obtains access.

19 This decree shall be written up by the secretary of the council on a stone stele and set down on the Acropolis. For the writing-up of the stele let the treasurer of the people give 30 drachmas from the fund allocated to the people for decrees.

28 Invite Arybbas to dinner in the prytaneion tomorrow; also invite those who have come with Arybbas to hospitality in the prytaneion tomorrow.

33 Deal also with the other matters of which Arybbas speaks.

35 In other respects in accordance with the
Arybbas had been king of the Molossi, one of a number of states in Epirus (north-western Greece). His father Alcetas and elder brother Neoptolemus joined the Second Athenian League, probably in 375 (22.109–10). On Alcetas’ death Arybbas challenged Neoptolemus’ claim to succeed him; the upshot was that Arybbas married Neoptolemus’ daughter Troas, and they ruled jointly (Paus. i. 11. iii, Plut. Pyrrh. i. v, Just. vii. 6. x–xi) until Neoptolemus died in the late 360s or early 350s, after which Arybbas ruled alone. Neoptolemus’ daughter Olympias was married in 357 to Philip of Macedon and bore him a son, Alexander the Great, and a daughter, Cleopatra. At some point Philip intervened in the kingdom, expelling Arybbas in favour of Olympias’ brother Alexander, who immediately before that had himself been in Macedon (D.S. xvi. 72. i, Just. vii. 6. xii, viii. 6. iv–viii, cf. Trog. Prol. viii); Arybbas fled to Athens, and in this decree we have the Athenian response to his arrival.
council; but if any one kills Arybbas by a violent death, or any of the sons of Arybbas, there shall be the same penalty as there is concerning the other Athenians.

42 Also the generals who are in office shall take care that Arybbas and his sons recover their ancestral realm.

In an olive crown: Olympic (Games) with a chariot drawn by full(-grown horses)

In a laurel crown: Pythian (Games) with a chariot drawn by full(-grown horses)

In an olive crown: Olympic (Games) with a chariot drawn by full(-grown horses)

Diodorus records not Arybbas’ expulsion but his ‘death’, after a reign of ten years, under the year 342/1: it has usually been assumed that this is a mistaken allusion to his expulsion, which must in fact belong to 343/2 (Philip’s intervention is mentioned in [Dem.] vii. Halon. 32, but is not mentioned in Aesch. ii. Embassy, Dem. xix. Embassy; the ten-year reign will then be simply wrong). However, Errington has argued that death ought not to be the same as expulsion, and has sought to link the expulsion with Philip’s attack on Arybbas mentioned in Dem. i. Ol. i. 13, of 349/8; and Heskel has built on Errington’s arguments to reconstruct the history of the 350s and date the expulsion of Arybbas in 351/0. We follow Griffith and M. J. Osborne in preferring the traditional interpretation. [Dem.] Halon. (and the absence of any mention of the change of king in earlier speeches) and Trog. Prol. favour a date in the late 340s; so too does an Athenian undertaking to restore a ruler expelled by Philip, since from the prosecutions of Philocrates and Aeschines in 343 Demosthenes’ policy of hostility to Philip was gaining increasing acceptance. The error which has to be attributed to Diodorus is well within his capabilities; and the history of the east Thracian king Cersobleptes (cf. on 47) reminds us that Philip need not have expelled Arybbas the first time he attacked him (but the suggestion of Hammond, Epirus, 540–6, that a break in the Molossian bronze coinage began after Philip’s first intervention and ended after his second is hazardous).

Heskel, 193–5, suggests that Arybbas’ Olympic victories were in 360 and 352 (Philip was the victor in 356: Plut. Alex. 3. viii), and his Pythian victory in 358 or 354 (but her own Pythian dates are, erroneously, a year later): if we maintain the traditional dating of this inscription those dates are possible but not necessary.

This decree will have reaffirmed Arybbas’ entitlement to citizenship, and the sur-
viving text begins with conventional honours appropriate to a distinguished visiting foreigner (on the original award to Arybbas’ grandfather see M. J. Osborne, Naturalisation, Osborne, iii–iv. 29–30. T6, dating it c. 428–424. Just. xvii. 3. xi tells us that Tharyps was educated in Athens, and Thuc. ii. 80. v writes of him as a minor in 429). It was common practice to combine the generals with the council as the authorities who were to protect honorands from injustice (Rhodes, Boule, 43). The invitation to the Prytaneion distinguishes between ‘dinner’, offered to Arybbas as an Athenian citizen, and ‘hospitality’, offered to the non-citizens who have come to Athens with him (cf. on 2). The probouleuma ends with an open clause, calling on the assembly to deal with Arybbas’ other business but not offering a recommendation from the council (cf. Rhodes, Boule, 279).

That open clause is followed up in the amendment, where (frustratingly for us, but presumably accidentally, though Osborne suggests the same man as the original proposer) the name of the proposer has been omitted. Athens’ commitment to Arybbas is now considerably strengthened. It is spelled out that, appropriately for an Athenian citizen, if Arybbas is murdered his murderers are to be punished as the killers of an Athenian citizen (for the distinction in Athenian law between the killing of a citizen and the killing of a non-citizen see Ath. Pol. 57. iii with Rhodes ad loc.; S. Koch, ΖRG cvi 1989, 547–56. in connection with Dem. xxiii. Arist. 91 collects and discusses sixteen instances of this undertaking from the fifth (especially) and fourth centuries; see also Henry, Honours and Privileges, 168–71); and the Athenians promise to restore Arybbas to his ancestral realm, which is credible for those Athenians who were militantly opposed to Philip in the late 340s.

The complete stele will have been the largest known from Athens for an individual honorand (what is preserved is c. 2.85 m. = 9 ft. 4 in. high, and the whole must have
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Athens honours Elaeus, 341/0

A stele found on the Athenian Acropolis; now in the Epigraphical Museum. Phot. Kirchner, Imagines*, Taf. 29 Nr. 61.

Attic-Ionic; stoichedon 26.

IG VI² 228; SIG* 255; Tod 174*; M. J. Osborne, Naturalisation, D 15. Trans. Harding 94.

[ἐπὶ] Ἡνικομάχου ἄρχον τοσ' ἐπὶ τῆς

[II]αἰδιοιδος εὐδόμης [προτανεί]-

[α]ς' ἐνάτη καὶ εἰκοστη τῆς πρ[οτ]-

αιας τῶν προέδρων ἐπεφηβίζ[ε]-

5 ν Αριστόμαχος ἐξ Οἰκου Ὀνῆσιππο-

ς Αραφήνιος ἐγραμμάτευεν ἐδοξ-
been considerably higher), and was exceptionally elaborate (yet, as Osborne remarks, 'it was felt necessary to correct tiny errors at the expense of aesthetic appearance'). It had two reliefs, at the top (identified by Walter) and underneath, with scenes of chariots commemorating Arybbas' Olympic and Pythian (i.e. Delphic) victories (cf. Lawton, 32–3); and also immediately below the text it had crowns commemorating those victories (the prize at Olympia was an olive crown and the prize at Delphi was a laurel crown). The incorporation of crowns unrelated to the content of the decree is most unusual: normally when crowns were represented on a stele this was to commemorate crowns awarded by the assembly to the honorand (e.g. 33). Whatever the dates of the victories (cf. above), they may well have been won in competition against Philip, and that may be partly why attention is drawn to them, so exceptionally, on this stele. It may be also that Arybbas, no less than Philip, as a man from the margin of the Greek world was anxious to emphasize his Greekness. As Tod remarked, it is likely that Arybbas will have had to add considerably to the 30 drachmas provided by Athens to cover the cost of the stele—but until e.330, except in the case of 22 (see commentary), it was normal for the state to provide 20 or 30 drachmas.

The promise to restore Arybbas was not kept (Just. vii. 6. xii remarks that he grew old in exile). In 337 Philip repudiated Olympias and took a wife from the Macedonian nobility, in response to which Olympias retired to Epirus (Satyrus ap. Ath. xiii. 557 D–E, Plut. Alex. 9. v–ix, Just. ix. 5. ix, 7. xii); in 336, to placate the family, he married Cleopatra, his daughter by Olympias, to Olympias' brother Alexander, and it was at the celebration of that marriage that Philip was murdered (D.S. xvi. 91. iv–g4, Just. ix. 6–7). Alexander was killed in a war in Italy c.330 (Livy, viii. 24 cf. 3. vi–vii, Just. xii. 2. i–xv). Subsequently the power of the Molossi grew until there was a more unified state calling itself Epirus.

In the archonship of Nicomachus [341/0]; in the seventh prytany, of Pandionis; on the twenty-ninth of the prytany; of the proedroi Aristomachus from Oion was putting to the vote; Onesippus of Araphen was secretary;
In 353/2 Cercebleptes, king of eastern Thrace, had ceded to Athens all the cities of the Chersonese except Cardia (on the isthmus), and the Athenians had sent out cleruchs to ensure that the Hellespont was kept safe for ships trading with Athens. In the spring of 346, while the Peace of Philocrates was being negotiated between Athens and Philip of Macedon, Cercebleptes was defeated by Philip and reduced to the status of a vassal king; he tried without success to join the Second Athenian League in time to be included in the Peace. In 342 Philip intervened in eastern Thrace again and finally deposed Cercebleptes; Athens, to protect her interests, sent out reinforcements to the cleruchies, accompanied by an army under Diopithes. Diopithes came into conflict with Cardia, named in the Peace as an ally of Philip; in Athens, in 341, his actions were condemned by some but defended by Demosthenes; further incidents involving Athens and Macedon occurred in the region of the Chersonese and elsewhere, and Philip protested to Athens; in the summer of 340 (rather later than this decree) Philip began an attempt to capture Perinthus and Byzantium, which he was to abandon without success in the following year, and after Philip had captured a fleet of Athenian merchant ships Athens declared war. For the sequel see on 72.

Elaeus, near the south-western tip of the Chersonese, joined the Second Athenian League, probably in 375 (22.123), and was consistently loyal to Athens (cf. Dem. xxiii. Arist. 158); we have the beginning of an Athenian decree of 357/6 for Elaeus (Agora, xvi 53); and in 346/5 Elaeus awarded a crown to Athens (IG ii² 1443.93–5, cf. Dem. xviii. Crown 92; perhaps an Athenian response, Hesp. viii 1939.172–3). The precise significance of this decree is unclear. II. 8–11 refer to the Elaeans and the Chersonesians; II. 13–16 to the Elaeans and the Athenians in the Chersonese: the most economical interpretation would be that, despite the different formulations, the
resolved by the people. Hippostratus son of Etearchides of Pallene proposed:

There shall be for the Elaeans the same as the Athenians decreed for the Chersonesians. The general Chares shall take care of them in the same way, so that the Elaeans, possessing their own property rightly and justly, may live with the Athenians in the Chersonese.

And invite the Elaeans to dinner in the prytaneion tomorrow.

Chersonesians of the first clause are identical with the Athenians in the Chersonese of the second. This view is supported by M. J. Osborne, who notes that the Elaeans are invited to ‘dinner’ (the appropriate term for Athenian citizens: cf. on 2) and supposes that the Chersonesians are the cleruchs and this decree assimilated Elaeus to cleruch status. Tod, however, took the Chersonesians of the first clause to be the non-Athenian inhabitants of a group of cities, so that Athens was now decreeing for Elaeus what it had already decreed for them concerning their coexistence with the Athenian cleruchs, and concluded from the invitation to ‘dinner’ that the Elaeans had already been rewarded for their loyalty with Athenian citizenship. Another possible explanation of the invitation would be that Elaeus’ envoys were men who had been granted Athenian citizenship as individuals—but in that case we should expect them to be named.¹ The decision is not easy, but we are inclined to prefer the first, economical interpretation of this decree.

For Chares cf. on 48. Demosthenes’ defence of Diopithes in 341 was successful enough for Chares to be sent to reinforce him; the merchant fleet which Philip captured in 340 was awaiting Chares’ return from discussions with the Persians to escort it through the Bosporus and Hellespont; subsequently the Byzantines distrusted him and refused to admit him, and he was superseded in the north-east by Phocion.

This decree has irregularities in its prescript (cf. Henry, Prescripts, 36 with n. 17, 42) and no publication clause: it is possible that it was published on the initiative and at the expense of the Elaeans.

¹ A. S. Henry, Antichthon xv 1961, 100–10 at 104–10, cf. his Honours and Privileges, 271–5, suggests that occasionally the Athenians bent the rules, but it is clear that the distinction between ‘dinner’ and ‘hospitality’ was normally upheld, and better to base our explanation on the rules if we can.
Two joining fragments of a stele, found on the Athenian Acropolis; now in the Epigraphical Museum.

Attic-Ionic; stoichedon 37, with an extra letter in ll. 8 and 9 if the restorations are correct. This is the work of Tracy's gutter of IG ii² 334 (cf. 81): Athenian Democracy in Transition, 82—95.


Readings verified by S. D. Lambert. Lines are numbered as by Lambert: SIG² and Tod split his l. 12 into l. 12 at end of first fragment, l. 13 at beginning of second; IG ii² numbers the lines separately in the two fragments.

12 a horizontal in the upper part of the stoichos before τινα. 13 η Lambert: 14—15 Lambert: δαυικήκαυν τοις δήμοις ήμών Μηγεωτίνον εκδ. 15 ἄρχοντας Migeotte. 17—18 Koehler, Lambert: ΤΕΝΔΕΙΟΝ τοις ήμών Μηγεωτίνον εκδ. 23 ATNYTA corrected to ATAYTA Lambert: είκα διαφορα ταύτα διαφορα εκδ., ταύτα D. M. Lewis.
In the archonship of Theophrastus [340/39]; resolved by the people; Cecropis was the prytany; on the eighth of the prytany; of the proedroi — of —— put to the vote; the secretary was Aspetus son of Demostratus of Cytherrus. Callicrates son of Charopides of Lamptrac proposed:

5 Concerning what the Tenedians say: praise the people of Tenedos for their goodness and good will towards the people of Athens and the allies, and for their support in time past and for coming in support now (?) ——

13 So that the Tenedians may convey the money which was requested (?) —— —— under Theophrastus’ archonship —— to the people for the support —— all, be it resolved by the people:

—– the general after Theophrastus’ archonship —— the syntaxis that was decreed —— and for the regular administration —— in the year after the archonship of Theophrastus they shall convey to Tenedos —— the same until they convey all the money.

24 During this time it shall not be permitted either to a general or to anybody else to exact either coinage or anything else; nor shall it be permitted to the synedroi to assess during this time, until the Tenedians convey all the money which they have lent, so
In the summer of 340 Philip of Macedon sent a fleet into the Propontis, and laid siege to Perinthus, which was inclining towards Athens; part of his force was detached to besiege Byzantium when it sent help to Perinthus (and perhaps part also to besiege Selymbria: [Hammond & Griffith, 574]); when Philip captured a fleet of Athenian merchant ships Athens formally declared war (for the background cf. on 71). The appearance of Philip’s forces here alarmed Persia and many Aegean cities, including those which had left the Athenian orbit through the Social War of 356–355 (cf. on 48), and Athens received considerable support for the defence of the besieged cities: in the spring of 339, having made no progress, Philip tricked the Athenian commanders into letting him withdraw his forces (D.S. xvi. 74. ii–76. iv, 77. ii–iii, but his peace treaty is probably a fiction; Just. ix. 1, 2; x; Philoch. FGrH 328 FF 53–5).

Tenedos is an island lying a short distance outside the Aegean entrance to the Hellespont: it had a long record of loyalty to Athens, and joined the Second Athenian League, probably in 376 (22. 79); it was a Tenedian, Aglaocreon, who represented the synedrion as an additional member of the Athenian embassies sent to Philip in 346 (Aesch. ii. Embassy, 20, 97, 126). Perhaps Tenedos provided money and other support during Philip’s attack on Perinthus and Byzantium (Lambert’s text of II. 14–15 would be consistent with this); and this expression of gratitude and promise that Tenedos will be free from all exactions until the money has been repaid (?) perhaps belong to the summer of 339, after Philip’s withdrawal (we do not know when in the year 340/39 the prytany of Cecropis was).

This inscription is our last evidence for the functioning of the Second Athenian League, which passed out of existence when Philip organized Athens and the other
that for the time to come the allies and any one else who is well disposed to the people of Athens may know that the people of Athens take care justly of those of the allies who act in the interests of the people of Athens and the allies.

Praise the people (?!) of Tenedos, and crown them with a gold crown of a thousand drachmas for their goodness and good will towards the people of Athens and the allies.

Praise the synedros of the Tenedians, Aratus, and crown him with an olive crown. Praise also --- the synedroi ---

mainland Greeks in the League of Corinth in 338/7 (cf. 76): it shows that member states still sent delegates to the League’s synedron, and that the synedron assessed the syntaxeis to be collected from the members (cf. on 22), but that Athens now granted an exemption to Tenedos on its own authority.

We have also another Athenian decree for Tenedos and Aratus (IG II 2 232). Its prescript, and therefore its date, are lost; it is a probouleumatic decree whereas ours is a non-probouleumatic; it praises Tenedos and Aratus and his brothers, awarding to each of them an olive crown, and praises and invites to hospitality ‘the man who has come from Tenedos’. There is no pointer in the surviving text to a specific context, and any attempt to relate it to our decree must be speculative.

There are unusual features in the prescript, which remind us that the Athenians did not use exactly the same form of words on every comparable occasion: with the chairman we have the aorist ‘put to the vote’ rather than the normal imperfect ‘was putting . . . ’; the verb precedes rather than follows the name of the secretary. For the secretary and his family see APF, 139 (they had mining interests, and the secretary’s son Demosthenes served as a trierarch); the proposer Callixrates was proposer of a probouleumatic decree, and therefore a member of the council, in 346/5 (IG II 2 215), and is listed among members of his deme who made a dedication to Apollo (IG II 2 2967. 6). ‘The regular administration’ (enkyklios dioikesis), recoverable without context in 1. 20, is used in Ath. Pol. 43. 1 to denote the day-to-day civilian administration of the state; but dioikesis was particularly used with reference to finance, and the title ‘in charge of the administration’ (epi tai dioikesei) was first given to a major treasurer when that post was held by Lycurgus in the 330s–320s (cf. Rhodes, Boule, 107–8).
Regulations for the Artemisia, Eretria, c.340

A marble stele found near Aulonari, Euboea (see commentary). Now in Eretria Museum (inv. no. 1208).

Eretrian Ionic.


[θ]eo[ί].

Ἐξήκεστος Διοδόρου εἶπεν· ὅπως ἄν τὰ Ἀρ-

τεμέρια ὡς κάλλιστα ἁγιωμεν καὶ θύωριν ὡς π-

λείστα, ἐδοξέεν τε βουλεύ να καὶ τοι δήμουν.

5 [[[.]] τίθεν τιμὸν ἀγώνια μονακίς ἀπὸ χιλίων

δραχμῶν τεὶς Μεταξᾶ καὶ τεὶς Φυλάκες καὶ παρέχει-

ν ἀρνας τεῖς πρὸ τῶν Ἀρτεμιρίων πεντε ἡμέρας, τ-

ούντων δὲ δύο ἑγκρίτους εἶναι. ἄρχεεν δὲ τῆς μο-

νακίς τετράδα φθίνουτος τοῦ Ἀνδρεπη-

ώνος μηνός, τῷ δὲ μονακίς τιθεὶν ῥαφωδοῖς,

 αὐλωδοῖς, κυθαρισταῖς, κυθαρωδοῖς, παρωδοῖς,

τοὺς δὲ τῷ μονακίς ἁγιωμενοῖς πάντα[ς]

ἀγιωμεθνὰ προσόδον τεῖς θυσίαι ἐν τεῖς ἀνθέε ἐ-

[χοῖνες] τῆν σκευὴν, ἡμπερ ἐν τοῖς ἀγώνι ἔχουρ[ι].

10 [τὰ δὲ ἄλλα δίδοσθαι κατὰ τάδε· ῥαφωδοῖ ἐκατὸν εἰ-

κοσι, δευτέροι πεντήκοντα, τρίτοι εἰκοσι· αὐλωδοῖ παιδὶ πε-

νήκοντα, δευτέροι τριήκοντα, τρίτοι εἰκοσι· ἀνδρὶ κυθα-

ριστεί ἐκατὸν δέκα, δευτέροι ἐβδομήκοντα, τρίτοι πεντή-

κοντα τέντες· κυθαρωδοῖ δηικόδαι, δευτέροι ἐκατὸ

15 πεντήκοντα, τρίτοι ἐκατὸν. παρωδοῖ πεντήκοντα, δευ-

τέροι δέκα. στηρέον αὐτὸ διδόσθαι τοῖς ἁγιωμενοῖς

τοῖς παραγενομένοις δραχμῆν τῆς ἡμέρης ἐκάστοι ἁρ-

ξαμένοις μη πλεόν τρισά ἡμέρας πρὸ τοῦ προὰγονοι, μέ-

χρι ὁ ἀγών γένηται. τὸν ἐν ἄγωνι τιθύνων οἱ δήμ-

20 αρχοί ὡς ἄν δώσωται δικαίωται καὶ ἦμισθοῦντων

tὸν ἀτακτῶν κατὰ τὸν νόμον. παρέχεον δὲ καὶ τοὺς

χῶρους ιερά κρίτα, βοῦς, πάντα τὰ ἐτή, συντελεῖ δὲ

τοὺς χωρεῖς εἰς τὰ κρίτα καθὰπερ Ἰπρίας, τὰ δὲ δέ-

25 ματα λαμβάνει τῶν ἱερείων τοὺς τὰ κρίτα παρέχ-

30 ντασ. τοὺς δὲ τῶν ἱερῶν ἐπιστάτας κρίμεν τὰ ἱερὲα

κατὰ τὸν νόμον καὶ ἂπτομαθοῦν, ἀν τις μὴ παρέχει τ-

ων χώρον. πωλεῖ δὲ ἐν τοῖς ἱεροῖς τοῦ βολόμενον ὅτι
Gods. Excecestus son of Diodorus proposed: in order that we may celebrate the Artemisia as finely as possible and that as many people as possible may sacrifice, resolved by the council and people. The city is to arrange a competition in music with a budget of 1,000 drachmas to the Moderator and Guardian and provide lambs there for five days before the Artemisia, two of them being choice animals.

The 27th of the month Anthesterion is to be the first day of the music, the music competition is to be for rhapsodes, singers to the pipes, lyre-players, singers accompanying themselves on the lyre, and singers of parodies, and those participating in the musical contest are to compete in the processional hymn for the sacrifice in the court with the paraphernalia which they have in the contest.

Prizes are to be given in the following way: to the rhapsode 120 (drachmas), to the second 50, to the third 20; to the boy singer to the pipes 50, to the second 30, to the third 20; to the adult lyre-player 110, to the second 70, to the third 55; to the singer accompanying himself on the lyre 200, to the second 150, to the third 100; to the singer of parodies 50, to the second 10.

Maintenance is to be granted to the competitors who are present of a drachma a day for each of them, beginning not more than three days before the pre-competition event and continuing until the competition takes place.

Let the demarchs arrange the competition in the fairest way they can, and let them punish any behaving irregularly according to the law.

The districts are to provide choice victims, an ox, every year, and the districts are to contribute to the choice victims as for the festival of Hera.

Those who provide the choice victims are to take the skins of the victims;

The officials in charge of the sanctuaries are to judge the victims according to the law and put the provision out to tender if one of the villages does not provide.
In 341 the people of Eretria were liberated by the Athenians from the ‘tyrant’ Clitorachus who had installed himself with Macedonian support (Philochorus, FGH 328 Fr59–60), and made an alliance with Athens (IG ΙΙ 290, see Knoepfler n. 23 and Knoepfler in Frézouls and Jacquemin, Les Relations internationales, 346 ff.; on the complexities of Euboean history in the 340s see also P. Brunt, CQ xix 1969, 245–65, and G. L. Cawkwell, Phoenix xxxii 1978, 42–67). The emphatic final clause of this decree suggests that they celebrated that liberation by elaborating their festival of Artemis, perhaps the most important deity at Eretria after Apollo Daphnephoros. Artemis seems to be referred to here as ‘Guardian’ and ‘Moderator’ (l. 6, with Knoepfler), perhaps with particular reference to her assistance in the liberation. This festival, also known as the Amarysia after Artemis’ cult title, was the most important of all Eretrian festivals and already before this date seems to have featured a procession with 3000 hoplites, 600 cavalry, and 60 chariots (Strabo 448. x. i. 10 with Knoepfler, 392 and n. 299; see also Ringwood, AJA xxxiii 1929, 387 ff.); after the Eretrians created a new ephebeia, probably in the 330s or 320s in imitation of events at Athens (SIG 3 714 with Chanowski, DHA xix. 2 1993, 17–44; for Athens see 89), the ephebes too were incorporated into this festival. Just over 30 years later they seem similarly to have celebrated a subsequent restoration of democracy by expanding their festival of Dionysus (LSS 46=SIG 3 323).

Competitive festivals were a regular part of the life of every Greek city, involving individual and team competitions in athletics and/or poetry and music. At least eighteen competitive festivals a year can be counted at Athens, even without including competitive events (such as the dramatic competitions of the rural Dionysia, for which see 63) found in the Attic demes. As arranged in this decree, the Artemisia at Eretria is to be marked by cultural rather than athletic competition, with performances of poetry, sung and recited, and of instrumental music. It does not include drama or any choral events, but it does include, perhaps as a cheaper substitute for comedy,
Anyone who wants is to sell whatever he wants in the sanctuary, without tax and not paying any duty, and neither are the hieropoioi to exact any tax from the sellers.

The demarchs are to organize the procession in the market-place, where the sacrificial beasts are sold, public victims and the prize beauty first, then the choice victims, then the victims provided by private individuals, if any individual wants to join in the procession.

Let the competitors in the music contest all join the procession to ensure that the procession and sacrifice are as fine as can be.

The decree is to be written up on a stone stele and stand it in the sanctuary of Artemis, in order that the sacrifice and the musical festival for Artemis shall happen in this way for all time, while the people of Eretria are free and prosper and rule themselves.

parodies of Homer. This is the only record of an institutional place for parodies, but according to Athenaeus they became objects of competition at Athens in the late fifth century (Ath. xv. 699 A). Athenaeus’ examples suggest that the skill of the parodist lay chiefly in applying unchanged or minimally changed Homeric lines to quite different situations, a technique also familiar from Attic old comedy.

The competition holds pride of place in the inscription and more than absorbed the 1,000 dr. which the decree sets as the budget: the prizes total 1,035 dr. without allowing for the expenditure on maintenance. It is to be suspected that an original proposal which met the target budget (at least as far as prize money is concerned) has been invisibly amended without account being taken of that in the overall budget figure. Cash prizes, or prizes that could be converted to cash, were normal outside the ‘crown games’ of the Olympic, Pythian, Nemean, and Isthmian competitions in which victors were rewarded with a crown of foliage. Competitors seem to be expected to arrive several days before the festival begins (compare the month which competitors at Olympia had to spend there before the games began). To entice them the city ensures the sacrifice of sheep in the five days preceding the festival, and offers maintenance of a drachma a day for three days before the proagon, which (like the proagon in Athenian dramatic festivals) was probably an occasion to display the performers rather than a preliminary competition. The insistence by the city that competitors take part in the processional hymn and in the procession may indicate that there was some tendency for competitors to take part in the competition only, skipping the rest of the festival.

The prizes here may be compared with those awarded by the Athenians in the parallel competitions at the Great Panathenaea as recorded in an early fourth-century list (IG II 2 2311 = SIG² 1055), where the musical competitions alone receive cash prizes (Table 1).

In the two strictly comparable events, lyre-playing and song accompanied by lyre, the prizes at Eretria are generally only about a fifth or a sixth of their equivalents in
Table 1. *Comparison of Cash Prizes*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Position achieved</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Eretria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>singing to the pipes</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>(boy)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>(boy)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>(boy)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lyre-playing</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>song accompanied by lyre</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Athens (except that Eretria is proportionally more generous to the third-placed lyre-player), but it rewards the boy singer to the pipes at around a third of the rate the Athenians gave to the adult singer to the pipes. In neither place is there any consistent arithmetical relationship between the amounts of the first, second, and third prizes.

Just as the Olympic games involved a long procession from Elis to Olympia and the Panathenaea was marked by the Panathenaic procession (and its culminating sacrifices, see 81), so too here the ordering of the procession and sacrifice are clearly important (on processions see A. Kavoulaki in Goldhill and Osborne, *Performance Culture*, 293–320). If the cattle market from which it begins is in the town of Eretria itself then this is a long procession, for the sanctuary of Artemis Amyrisa at Amyrynthos lay some 10 km. east along the coast (for the site see Knoepfler, *CRAI* 1988, 382–421). The importance of such processions between town and outlying sanctuaries in stressing the integrity of the city as both town and countryside has recently been much emphasized (de Polignac, *Cults*, Osborne, *Demos*, 170–72, Alcock and Osborne, *Placing the Gods*), and such integrative action may have been particularly important in the wake of civil strife. However, the presence of the sacrificial victims in the procession may indicate a rather shorter procession in this case. Processions were both something to join and something to view; here as often there is stress on the fine appearance to be
achieved (1.2, 37): compare Plato’s remarks on the fine procession for Bendis at the opening of Republic (1.327a).

The selection of animals for slaughter, both in the days leading up to the festival (7-8) and at the festival itself (27-32), can be compared to the provision for the festival of Zeus Polieus on Cos (62.A), but whereas on Cos it is tribes and their sub-units which provided the oxen for sacrifice, here it is chôroi (compare LSS 46 = SIG 323). Eretria had a structure of tribes, ‘districts’, and demes which we know best from various lists of soldiers (see Knoepfler; Euboean Histiaia also had demes, at least 30 in number, Tod 141). A list of soldiers from c.300 records men from some 20 demes (around 50 demes are known altogether) and shows that the demes were organized into five regions, one of which has the name Mesochoros (‘Middle chôros’). This suggests that the chôroi here are the ‘districts’ (see F. Cairns, ZPEliv 1984, 163-4). Whether the ‘districts’ had officials of their own we do not know, but it is the chief magistrates of the demes, the demarchs, who are given various responsibilities here, as also in the earlier sacred law from Tamynai (IG xii ix 90 = LSCG 90); compared with the role of Athenian demarchs at the Panathenaea (schol. Ar. Clouds 37, 81).

The gathering of people at a major festival represented a good commercial opportunity. There is archaeological evidence that from the eighth century onwards the Olympic games attracted craftsmen who made and sold dedications, and there can be no doubt that purveyors of less durable merchandise were also present. This is the earliest inscription which makes explicit provision for the market aspect of the festival by promising that commercial activities shall be free of all taxes and tariffs. Such a provision becomes common in the hellenistic and Roman periods (see e.g. Welles, Royal Correspondence, 47 (with M. Feyel, REA xlii 1940, 137-41) and 70 line 12), and there is evidence for the city market magistrates, the agoranomoi, controlling festal transactions too (LSS 43.31-6, SIG 596.15). These occasions had all the throng of a fair, and the accompanying dangers of disorder.

Although the inscription provides for its erection at the sanctuary of Artemis, it was in fact found at Aulonari, some 20 km. NE of Amarynthos, and provides a good example of a ‘pierre errante’—a stone whose find-spot is distant from the point at which it was set up.

The inscription shows the characteristic features of the Eretrian dialect, rhotacism of intervocalic sigma (θώρηρ, Αρτέμιριον, even θπωρ αν; cf. Plato, Cratylus 434 c), use of -ει and -οι as dative endings, and βόλομαι for βούλομαι.
Commemoration at Corinth of victory in Sicily, c.340

Fragments from two adjacent blocks, apparently the two central blocks of four, from a statue base, found at Corinth, now in the museum there. Phot. Hesp. xxii 1952, pl. 2; facs. op. cit., p. 12 fig. 1; Corinth, vui. iii 23, pls. 3, 51. 

Koine; quasi-stoikheion (Hesp., p. 11). 
B. D. Meritt, Corinth, vui. i 23 (left block only); J. H. Kent, Hesp. xxii 1952, 9–18; id., SEG xii 1986; id., Corinth, vui. iii 23; CEG 809 (eschewing restoration). See also Talbert, Timoleon and the Revival of Greek Sicily, 76–7; Moreno, Lágro, 44, 58–62, no. 5.

[? ἔθνος, ἑλευθερία, ἀθάνατος, πάνω, ἔτη, ἀρχαῖοι, ἔπεβησαν, ἀπὸ τῶν, πολεμίων, ἐθνικῶν, τόδε, κτιστήρια Κόρινθων, ἐβρακῶν].

5 [τάδε, πόλεις, τραυματισμοί] Χρησάμενη

[? Συρακοῦσιοι, ἐμπρακτικῶς ὡταί, Κόρινθιοι, ἔφηκαν].


Corinth has been exceptionally unproductive of inscriptions, but one which survives in part is a statue base dedicated by Corinth's western colonies, presumably in celebration of their victories over the Carthaginians in the 340s. After the death of Dionysius I of Syracuse in 367 (cf. on 34), power passed to his son Dionysius II; in 357–355 Dionysius and his son Apollonocrates were ousted by Dion and Heraclides; after a series of short-lived régimes Dionysius returned and recovered control of Syracuse in 346. In conjunction with Hicetas, a Syracusan currently ruling in neighbouring Leontini, the Syracusans appealed to their mother city, Corinth, but Hicetas also made contact with the Carthaginians, who had established a strong position in the west of the island at the end of the fifth century and had not been dislodged from it (cf. on 10). Corinth sent a force under Timoleon, a citizen who had been living in an awkward limbo since his involvement in the killing of a tyrant, his own brother, c.365. Timoleon went to Sicily in 344; by a combination of trickery and fighting he obtained the surrender of Dionysius, who was sent into exile in Corinth, he liberated other Greek cities from 'tyrants' (while himself occupying a powerful position in Syracuse), and he defeated the Carthaginians, notably at the battle of the River Crimissus (flowing to the south coast near Selinus) c.340; but a treaty of 338 left Carthage in posses-
The Syracusans, Leucadians, Ambraciots, Corcyraeans, Apolloniates (?) dedicated to Isthmian Poseidon (?) from the enemy.

These cities, cultivating (?) their founder Corinth, using ---, --- embarked on freedom, --- these [sc. grants vel sim.].

sion of the western part of the island. Timoleon retired after that and died not much later.

After the battle of the Grimisus Timoleon sent back spoils to Corinth, according to Plutarch for a dedication by ‘the Corinthians and Timoleon the general’ (Plut. Tim. 29. v–vi, cf. D.S. xvi. 80. vi). Our monument was dedicated by the Corinthian colonies, so it cannot be the monument mentioned by the literary texts (which has not been found): on the base stood a bronze statue, of Corinthus personified (K. K. Smith, AJA xxiii 1919, 362–72 at 368–9; Moreno) or of Poseidon (Kent, Hesp. 15–18, suggesting that this was the statue by Lysippus mentioned by Lucian, Zeus Trag. 9); and so long a base is likely to have held other statues too (Moreno).

Of those other than the Syracusans, the Leucadians and Corcyraeans are mentioned among those who contributed to Timoleon’s forces by D.S. xvi. 66. ii, Plut. Tim. 8. iv, but the others preserved or to be restored are not (if we assume that the Apollonia in question is not the Sicilian city of D.S. xvi. 72. v, Plut. Tim. 24. ii, but the city south of Epidamnus in Illyria): this Corinthian enterprise on behalf of Syracuse must have been more widely supported by Corinth’s other colonies, and Timoleon himself must have been more strongly supported by Corinth, than our literary sources
suggest. Corinth has a reputation for maintaining exceptionally close ties with its colonies (though Corecyra, mentioned here, had been resistant in earlier centuries: Thuc. i. 13. iv, 24–55). On this occasion, as in the Peloponnesian War (Thuc. vi. 34. iii,

**75**

Oropus honours Macedonians, 338–335

Two *skfai* (A broken at the top and bottom, B complete) found in the Amphiarau m at Oropus; now in the museum there (nos. 257 and 250). Phot. Petrakos, *a c t i o n e s t o i Υφισταν, p l. 1 nos. 1–2.

Euboean-Ionic with the Boeotian ἐλεῖε and some Atticisms, ending each line with the end of a word or (B. 4, 5) syllable.

IG vii 4251 (A), 4250 (B); *SIG* 258; Tod 164*; Petrakos, 1–2. See also J. R. Ellis, *JHS* xci 1971, 15–24; R. M. Errington, *JHS* xciv 1974, 25–8; Hammond & Griffith, 208–9, 702–4 (Griffith), 551 (Hammond); D. Knoepfler, in Piërart (ed.), *Aristote et Athènes*, 291 with n. 36, 295 with n. 50.

A

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>[θέο]ς.</th>
<th>[Δρ]μών ἐλεῖε. ἔδοξε</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[τ]εί ἐκκλησίαι, ἀγαθεῖ τῦχει</td>
<td>τεί ἐκκλησίαι, ἀγαθεῖ τῦχει</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| [Ἀ]μινταν Περδίκκα Μακεδόνα | Ἀμινταν Ἀντιόχου Μακε-
| 5 | δόνα πρὸξενον ἐν Ὥρσπι-
| [κ]αὶ εὐργέτην, ἀτέλειαν δὲ | 
| ἐν καὶ ἀσυλίαν καὶ πολέμοι | 
| καὶ εἰρήνης, καὶ γῆς καὶ οἰκίας | 
| ἐνκτησιν, αὐτὶ καὶ ἐκγόνοις. | ἐνκτησιν, αὐτίκαὶ ἐκγόνοις. |

A. Petrakos places dots under some letters read by earlier editors; earlier editors placed the first ρ in l. 5 inside the brackets but he saw part of it. A. 2. 4. the letters underlined have been inscribed over erasures.

These decrees are in themselves typical short proxeny decrees of a kind published by many states, with minimal prescript and a bare record of the decision, and with no indication of the reason for it, order for publication, or the like (cf. Rhodes with Lewis, 5–6). The two decrees have been formulated in the same words by the same proposer but inscribed by different stone-cutters. Of the honours combined with the status of proxenos and benefactor, for ateleia cf. 8; asylia is immunity from the violent seizure of property (sylan) to which a foreigner might otherwise be exposed (for recognition of the asylia of a sanctuary or city see Riggsby, *Asylia*; for Athenian instances of the conferment of asylia on an individual see IG ii 81 [restored], 286), and for a Delphic instance in our collection see 92; the right to acquire land and a house is a right which states commonly reserved for their own citizens but might additionally confer on non-citizens whom they wished to honour (cf. 77, 94; also 91 and Pečírka, *The Formula for the Grant of Enktesis*, Henry, *Honours and Privileges*, 204–40).
Commemoration at Corinth of Victory in Sicily

73. ii), Syracuse had appealed to Corinth; and from this inscription we see that other Corinthian colonies had joined in supporting Syracuse and were joining in celebrating their link with Corinth.

A

God.

2 Drimon proposed. Resolved by the assembly, for good fortune:

4 Amyntas son of Perdiccas of Macedonia shall be proxenos and benefactor of the Oropians, and there shall be immunity [ateleia] and inviolability [asylia] both in war and in peace, and the right to acquire land and house, for himself and his descendants.

B

God.

2 Drimon proposed. Resolved by the assembly, for good fortune:

4 Amyntas son of Antiochus of Macedonia shall be proxenos and benefactor of the Oropians, and there shall be immunity [ateleia] and inviolability [asylia] both in war and in peace, and the right to acquire land and house, for himself and his descendants.

Beyond that, we need to identify the two Macedonians honoured and to find a time when Oropus could have conferred these honours on them. ‘Amyntas son of Perdiccas’ will be the son of Perdiccas III, the king of Macedon who died in 359; at that time Amyntas will have been very young; the statement of Just. vii. 5. viii–x that Perdiccas’ brother Philip was originally regent for Amyntas used to be widely believed, but no other text supports that, and in particular Demosthenes never alleges that Philip was not the rightful ruler of Macedon, so more probably Justin is wrong (Ellis, cf. his Philip II and Macedonian Imperialism, 46–7 with 250 n. 10; Cawkwell, Philip of Macedon, 28; Griffith; but contr. Hammond). Philip let him live, and he married Philip’s daughter Cynane; whether justifiably or not, he was perceived as a threat by Alexander and put to death in 336 or 335 (Arr. Succ. fr. 1. xxii, Polyae. viii. 50, Just. xii. 6. xiv, cf. Plut. Fort. Alex. i. 327 c); an inscription from Lebadea, concerning payments by those who consult the oracle of Trophonius, refers to him as ‘king (basileus)
of the Macedonians' (IG vii 3055 = SEG xlii 414. 7–8). Amyntas son of Antiochus fled from Macedon at the beginning of Alexander's reign, is first found on the Persian side at Ephesus in 334, appears in one version of the stories concerning Alexander of Lyncestis, escaped after the battle of Issus in 333, and was eventually killed in Egypt (e.g. Arr. Anab. i. 17. ix, 25. iii, ii. 13. ii–iii; D.S. xvii. 48. ii–v).

Awards of proxeny by an assembly point to an independent Oropus. Oropus, facing Euboea, between Attica and Boeotia, tried to maintain its independence from both but was not often successful (for its history earlier in the century see on 27). There are texts which state that Oropus was returned to Athens by Philip after Chaeronea ([Demad.] XII Ann. 9, Paus. i. 34. i, schol. Dem. xviii. Cron. 99 [176 Dilts]; there is ample evidence for its being in Athens' hands during the reign of Alexander, but Knoepfler argues that it was not returned to Athens until 335. Oropus could have awarded proxenies between 366 and 338 if, as in the hellenistic period, it was treated as a free entity within the Boeotian federation; but Knoepfler argues that it was then not a free entity but a possession of Thebes. It could have done so between 338 and 335 if, as Knoepfler believes, it was then independent, but it could not if it was already a possession of Athens. After 335 the son of Perdiccas was dead, the son of Antiochus had joined the Persians, and Oropus was certainly a possession of Athens.

Earlier editors suggested a date about the middle of the century, for our inscriptions and for IG vii 3055. Ellis adduced another inscription, a dedication at Oropus by Aristomedes of Pherae, another man who fought for the Persians against Alexander (SEG xxiv 350, cf. Arr. Anab. ii. 13. ii), and suggested that all three men were involved in a challenge to Alexander after Philip's death and that Amyntas son of Perdiccas
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Common Peace and League of Corinth, 338/7

Two non-joining fragments of a stele, found in Athens (a on the Acropolis, find-spot of b unknown), now in the Epigraphical Museum. Phot. Kern, Inscriptions Graecae, Taf. 30; Heissner, Alexander, 10–11 pls. 2–3.

Attic-Ionic, retaining the old o for oo in a. 12; a steichedon 33 with irregularities in ll. 19–21; b steichedon.


a

b [36]

[ö]ρκος, δανύω (?), Δία, Τιρήνος, Ποσατίτες, Εθνος, Ποσανάκα

\[v, \lambda, \nu \rho θ ς π α ν τ ς κ α ρ π α ς ς \] εμεινώ [εν τῇ]

\[a \ We omit the left-hand edge (never more than four letters surviving) of a second column, preserved to the right of ll. 6–21.

2 Ποσάν [εν τῇ] read and restored Wilhelm.
then used the title ‘king’ (but he rightly rejected the suggestion [Dittenberger on IG vii 4250 (sic)] that ‘of Macedon’ inscribed over an erasure in A was a replacement for ‘king’; 17 n. 26). Errington objected that Arístomédes was already in Persian service by 340 (Didym. In Dem. ix. 43–52 = Thp. FGrH 115 F 222), and that basileus in the Lebadeia inscription is likely to have been an informal description rather than a title claimed by Amyntas; but he accepted Ellis’s late date for our inscriptions and suggested that the two Amyntases were sent to Oropus by Philip with news of his settlement. Griffith accepted Errington’s interpretation of ‘king’, but wanted a slightly earlier date for all the inscriptions; Hammond dates IG vii 3055 to the early 350s when he believes Amyntas was king. For the use of the title ‘king’ cf. on 76. If Knoepfler is right, Oropus could have awarded proxenies between 338 and 335 but not between 366 and 338, and the Amyntases are likely to have visited it in connection with its liberation from Thebes. That seems to us the best context for our inscriptions; if Alexander saw these Amyntases as a threat, their being honoured by Oropus might help to explain his decision not to leave Oropus independent but to return it to Athens. However, the dedication of Arístomédes must be earlier; and Amyntas’ consultation of the oracle of Trophonius need not be linked with the other inscriptions.

As for the language, oξῆμ is Euboean, and εὶν and τεύκρει are distinctively Eretrian, but some Eretrian features (e.g. the use of ρό in place of σίγμα) are absent. A. Morpurgo Davies remarks (in Crespo et al., Dialectologia Graeca, 261–79 at 273–8) that the earliest Oropian inscriptions are linguistically Euboean; these two are transitional; subsequent inscriptions are Attic, even at times when Oropus formed part of the Boeotian federation.

---

2 Oath. I swear by Zeus, Earth, Sun, Poseidon, Athena, Ares, all the gods and goddesses: I shall
76. COMMON PEACE AND LEAGUE OF CORINTH, 338/7

3–4 Schwahn: τῇ συνθήκας Ἡλίππων καὶ ἵππη τῶν ὁθηθηκαὶ ταῖς [σ πρ]-
5 ὥς Ὁλίσπων καταλήγωσ, (?); οὔτε ὅπλα ἐποίη[σω ἐ]-
[πι πημηνή ἐπ' οὐδένα τών] ἐμμενόντων ἐν τῇ-
[οίς ὅρκοις (?) οὔτε κατὰ γῆν] οὔτε κατὰ θάλασ-
[σαν· οἶδε πόλιν οἴδε φρο]ύμον καταλήψαμι-
[ιν οἴδε λιμένα ἐπὶ πολ]λοῖς οἴδενός τῶν τῇ-
[ἢς εἰρήνης κοινομυντὶ]ων τέχνην οἴδεμι-
[οί οἴδε μηχανήν οἴδε τῇ ἄλας ἄλας ἀρραβών [τῇ ὑπ'] Ἡ-
[λίσπων καὶ τῶν ἐκγόνων] ἐν καταλήγωσ, διέ τὰ-
[γειστεῖας τῶν οшедшα] παρ' ἐκάστοις ὁτὲ τῇ-
[οίς ὅρκοις τοὺς περὶ τῇ]ς εἰρήνῃς ὁμονων
5 ὥς οίδε' οἰδέν οὔπεναι τινὸς ταύτες ταῖς
[συνθήκαις πορσιω οὗδ' ἄλ]λως ἐπιστρέφως εἰς
[δύσαμον. ἂν δὲ τίς ποίη τι] παράσπονθο διε-
[πε' τᾶς συνθήκας, βοηθήσω] καθότι ἂν παραγ-
[γέλλωσιν οἱ ἀδικομένοι (?)], καὶ πολεμήσω τῶ-
[ὶ τὴν κοινὴν εἰρήνην (?) παραβάσσων καθότι
[ἄν δοκῇ τῶι κοινὼι συνεδρίῳ καὶ ὁ ἐρμεῖω-
[v παραγγέλλης, καὶ οὐκ ἐγκ]αταλέψω τῇ[. . ]

23] ἀκ[23]

b

abide by the peace (?); and I shall neither break the agreement with Philip (?) nor take up arms for harm against any of those who abide by the oaths (?), neither by land nor by sea; nor shall I take any city or guard-post nor harbour, for war, of any of those participating in the peace, by any craft or contrivance; nor shall I overthrow the kingdom of Philip or his descendants, nor the constitutions existing in each state when they swore the oaths concerning the peace; nor shall I myself do anything contrary to these agreements, nor shall I allow any one else as far as possible.

17 If any one does commit any breach of treaty concerning the agreements, I shall go in support as called on by those who are wronged (?), and I shall make war against the one who transgresses the common peace (?) as decided by the common council (synedrion) and called on by the hegemon; and I shall not abandon ——

b

———:

————: 5.

———— Thessalians: 10.

—ans: 2.

—iots: 1.


—ans: 2. Ambraciots: [1 (?).

———– from Thrace and

——— Phocians: 3. Locrians: 3.

——— Oet]aeans and Malians and

10 [Aenianians ——— Ag]ræans and Dolopians: 5.


——— Zacynthu]s and Cephalenian: 3.
After his defeat of Athens, Thebes, and their allies at Chaeronea in 338, Philip’s supremacy was accepted by all the states of mainland Greece except Sparta (Just. x. 5. iii, cf. Arr. Anab. 1. 16. vii, Plut. Alex. 16. xviii; D.S. xvi. 3. iv–v has Arcadia for Sparta). He first made individual treaties with a number of separate states (discussed by C. Roebuck, CP xliii 1948, 73–92 = S. Perlman (ed.), Philip and Athens, 209a–218); this involved a number of territorial adjustments, and also the final dissolution of the Second Athenian League (explicitly stated Paus. 1. 25. iii). This was followed by one or more meetings at Corinth (in general, D.S. xvi. 89, Just. ix. 5), in which Philip united the Greeks in a common peace treaty ([Dem.] xvii. Treaty with Alexander 2, etc.), created an organization, known to modern scholars as the League of Corinth, which had a synedrion (‘council’: [Dem.] xvii. 15) and in which he held the position of hegemon (‘leader’: cf. Dem. xviii. Crow 201, Polyb. ix. 33. vii, Plut. Inst. Lac. 240 a), and gained approval for a campaign against the Persians, which he was to command (cf. Aesch. m. Ctes. 132, P. Oxy. i 12 = FG 255. iii. 9–13). This is the stage to which our inscription belongs.

In 336 he sent out the first forces of this campaign (D.S. xvi. 91. ii–iv, xvii. 7), but in the same year he was assassinated (D.S. xvi. 91. iv–94). Alexander the Great succeeded first to the throne of Macedon, then to the archonship of Thessaly (cf. on 44), and finally to the leadership of the League of Corinth and the command of the campaign against the Persians (D.S. xvii. 3–4, Arr. Anab. 1. 1. i–iii, etc.). Belonging to the period of Alexander’s leadership we have another inscription (discussed below) and a speech preserved with the Demosthenic corpus ([Dem.] xvii. Treaty with Alexander, dated to the beginning of Alexander’s reign by a scholiast [p. 196 l. 18 Dilts]; but 333 by W. Will, RM 2 cxxv 1982, 202–13, Athen und Alexander, 67–70 cf. 62–3; 331 by G. L. Cawkwell, Phoen. xv 1961, 74–8; 330 by [Hammond &] Griffith, 627, without discussion) which accuses Alexander of breaking the promises made to the Greeks. In 319 Polyperchon in the name of ‘the kings and the leaders’ proclaimed a renewal of the dispensation of Philip and Alexander, which had effectively lapsed in the Lamian War of the Greeks against Antipater in 323–322 (D.S. xviii. 55–6); and in 303/2 a revived league was founded by Antigonus Monophthalmus and Demetrius Poliorcetes (D.S. xx. 102. i, Plut. Demetr. 25. iii, cf. D.S. xx. 46. v (307)), from which we have substantial fragments of a long inscription (cited below).

Wilhelm established that our two fragments are from the Athenian copy of a document which was probably published in many or all of the participating states: fr. a contains part of the oath sworn by the participants, fr. b part of a list of participants with numerals against them. The general sense of fr. a is clear; in its language this treaty generally echoes earlier treaties, though at some points the vocabulary in which it is expressed is not certain: in accepting restorations of eirene (‘peace’) in ll. 3, 10, and (koinē eirene: ‘common peace’) 20, and of synthekai (‘agreement’) in ll. 16 and 18, we have been guided by the fact that the words eirene and synthekai are preserved on the stone, in ll. 14 and 4 respectively, and are used repeatedly in [Dem.] xvii, whereas symmachia/symmachos (‘alliance’/‘ally’) are not. In the list on fr. b we have avoided adventurous restorations.

The arrangements of 338/7 have been much discussed, often in excessively legalis-
tic terms. It is clear from [Dem.] xvii that the Greeks swore oaths which made them participants in a common peace treaty (§§2, 6), and that the treaty stipulated that the Greeks were to be free and autonomous (§§8), with their stability guaranteed in various respects (§§10, 15, 16). They were represented in a synedrion (§15), and they were in a relationship with the king of Macedon, such that interference by him in Greek states could be considered a breach of the agreement (§4, etc.), but the king was not a member of the organization on equal terms with the Greek states: Philip will have been the hegemon, working with the synedrion (our inscription, a. 20–2), and oi ἐπὶ τὴν κοινὴν φυλακὴν τεταγμένοι ('those put in charge of the common protection', §15: cf. the Committee of Public Safety [Comité de Salut Public] established in France in 1793) will have been a board of agents appointed by Alexander to act for him while he was away on campaign (Ryder, 156–7; [Hammond &] Griffith, ii. 639–46; against Wilcken, Sb. Wien 1932, 139–40; Cawkwell, Philip of Macedon, 171–2). The words symmachia/symmachos are not attested (cf. above); but the provision for common action against any one who broke the peace (a. 18 sqq.; [Dem.] xvii. 6, 10), as in at least some of the earlier common peace treaties (cf. below), means that the participants were in fact bound together by a defensive alliance, whether that language was used or not (on the avoidance of the term ‘alliance’ in conjunction with a common peace cf. Ryder, 72–3), and by committing themselves to the campaign against the Persians they were in fact committing themselves to an offensive alliance (Arr. Anab. iii. 24. v; the Greeks taking part in that campaign are frequently referred to as ‘allies’, e.g. Arr. Anab. i. 24. iii). The decision to campaign against Persia probably belongs to a later occasion than the original establishment of the League (esp. D.S. xvi. 89, Plut. Phoc. 16. v–vi): Hammond [& Walbank] believes that an alliance was made at that stage, but Ryder and [Hammond &] Griffith do not.

The gods named as those by whom the oath was sworn are plausibly restored as those named in 53 (cf. Set. 446, cited below). The early part of the undertaking is a standard formulation for a peace treaty (cf. e.g. the Peace of Nicias in 421: Thuc. v. 18. iv), and is alluded to in [Dem.] xvii. 16. More striking is that the participants were guaranteed not only freedom and autonomy ([Dem.] xvii. 8: not in our inscription) but also the preservation of the constitution which they had when they swore to the peace (ll. 12–14). ([Dem.] xvii gives the impression of reproducing the actual clauses of the treaty, though it may sometimes be enlarging on them for the author’s polemical purposes, and we need to remember, for instance, that ‘tyrant’ in the fourth century may be no more than a pejorative term for a party leader to whom the user of the term is opposed: §15 spells out a ban on illegal execution and exile, confiscation of property, redistribution of land, cancellation of debts or liberation of slaves ‘for revolution’; §§4, 7, exempts tyranny from the preservation of constitutions. For a fear of tyranny in Athens at this time cf. 79.) The participants in turn swore allegiance to the kingdom of Philip and his descendants (as Athens had made the Peace of Philocrates with Philip and his descendants in 346: Dem. xix. Embassy 48). (There has been argument as to whether Philip used the title ‘king’. Whatever may have been the case in Macedon earlier [cf. on 75], the word basileia ['kingdom'] is preserved on the stone in a. 11, but this is not enough to prove that Philip used the title: see Borza, Before Alexander, 12–15.)
The obligation to support participants who were wronged was included in at any rate the later of the previous common peace treaties (Ryder, 72–3); but the previous common peace treaties had not provided a mechanism to give effect to that obligation, whereas this treaty, with a synedrion and a hege

mon, does.

Attempts to reconstruct the list of members on fr. 346 are too speculative to be worth pursuing. The numerals presumably indicate the number of units assigned to a state or group of states, and their representation in the council and their military obligations were probably in proportion to these. What survives comes from the end of the list: those named are largely from the north, but are not given in a logical geographical order: [Samothrace and] Thasos, islands of the northern Aegean, follow the Thessalians (or some of them), but precede the Ambraciots, from the west, some community or communities from Thrace, in the east, then peoples of northern Greece including those on the borders of Thessaly, and the list ends with islands off the west coast of Greece. None of the voting units here is a single city, if editors are right to combine Samothrace with Thasos (proposed by Wilhelm on the grounds that they are adjacent islands and would appropriately account for two units), but we cannot be sure that that would be true of the complete list. Schwahn guessed that there may have been about a hundred synedroi altogether.

What Philip has done in this treaty is combine several strands in recent Greek diplomacy, to dress up his control of mainland Greece in clothes which would be acceptable to the Greeks. A common peace treaty settles outstanding disputes and tries to guarantee the stability of the present state of affairs; the apparatus of a hege

mon and a synedrion, as in such leagues as the Second Athenian League, provides a mechanism for enforcing the peace, which previous common peace treaties had lacked; proportional, rather than equal, representation was used in the Boeotian federation of the late fifth and early fourth centuries. But behind this façade lies Philip’s supremacy: the Greeks swore to uphold not only the constitutions of the member states but also the kingdom of Philip and his descendants; however much the synedrion might be independent of Philip in theory (cf. below), he as hege

mon would in practice be responsible for identifying breaches of the peace and ordering action in response to them; and, whether the League was reinforced by a full alliance or not, in undertaking the war against Persia it became an instrument of Philip’s policy.

When the Peace of Philocrates had been made in 346, Athens prompted by the synedrion of the Second League had wanted a common peace open to all the Greeks, but Philip had rejected that and had insisted on a bilateral peace and alliance (Aesch. ii. Ctes. 68–72); later, when he offered to renegotiate the Peace of Philocrates, Philip
was prepared to accept a common peace ([Dem.] vii. Halon. 30–2). This peace, and its league of participants, at first included all the mainland Greeks except Sparta; it was extended, probably in 336, to the Greeks of the Aegean islands (78, 84); in 334 the Greeks of the Asiatic mainland were liberated and made allies of Alexander but were probably not incorporated in this league (86).

The fragment of a treaty with Alexander (from Athens: IG ii² 329 = Tod 183 = Sot. 403. II = Heisserer, 3–26 ~ Harding 102) refers to the sending of troops and their provisioning: this may refer to the contribution which Athens was required to make to the campaign (Heisserer, Alexander, 20–3); cf. the syntaxis of 86. It appears to end with instructions for publication at Pydna by ‘those put in charge of the common protection’ (ll. 12–14: title largely restored). Alexander used the league to condemn Thebes for its revolt in 335 (Arr. Anab. i. 9, ix); the rising of 331–330 led by Sparta was referred by Antipater, Alexander’s commander in Europe, to the league and by the league to Alexander (D.S. xvn. 73. v–vi). Alexander’s order in 324 that the Greek states were to take back their exiles (cf. on 101; otherwise D.S. xvii. 109. i, xviii. 8. ii–vii; Curt. x. ii. 4–7; Just. xii. 5. ii–v) was a breach of the league’s guarantee of constitutional stability, but probably by then he had long since ceased to care about the rules of the league.

Fragments survive of a detailed inscription concerning the revival of the league in 303/2 (best text Sot. 446; trans. Harding 138, Austin 42 [both iii only]; cf. Plut. Demetr. 25. iv). How many of the details are new and how many have been repeated from the original league we cannot tell, but among points worth noting are: the oath is probably sworn by the same deities (139–40 = v. 23–4); what is sworn to can be restored as an alliance with Antigonus and Demetrius and their descendants (140–2 = v. 24–6: sym—preserved), with an undertaking not to make war on participants or to overthrow the kingdom of Antigonus, Demetrius, and their descendants (142–7 = v. 26–31); the synedrion is to be presided over by five proedroi, to be appointed by lot when the war is over (76–83 = iii. 21–8) but until then appointed by the kings (91 = iii. 36); its meetings are to be summoned by ‘the proedroi and the king or the general designated by the kings’ (sic) until the war is over, and thereafter at the major festivals (70–3 = iii. 15–18; in an earlier formulation of this, 66–70 = iii. 11–15, the general is described as ‘the general left by the kings in charge of the common protection’); decisions are to be binding, there is to be a quorum of over 50%, and synedroi cannot be called to account in their own cities for the decisions of the synedrion (73–6 = iii. 18–21); cities are to be fined if they fail to send synedroi, except when the synedroi are absent through illness (91–4 = iii. 36–9); the synedrion is to have judicial powers (e.g. 66, 81–3 = iii. 11, 26–8).
Athens honours loyal Acarnanians, 338/7

A stele found on the Athenian Acropolis, now in the Epigraphical Museum: the inscribed surface is complete but badly worn.

Attic-Ionic; stoichedon 41, with a 42nd letter in ll. 26 (\^r), 35, 37.

IG ii² 237; SIG² 255; Tod 178; M. J. Osborne, Naturalization, D 16; Schwenk 1*. Trans. Harding 100. See also Dany, Akarnanien im Hellenismus, 24–5, 249–50.
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In the archonship of Chaerondas [338/7]; in the tenth prytany, of Pandionis; to which Philippus son of Antiphemus of Eire-sidae was secretary; on (?) the penultimate day of Thargelion [xii], the sixth of the prytany; of the prœdroi —— of Erchia was putting to the vote; resolved by the people. Hegesippus son of Hegesias of Sunium proposed:

6 Concerning what is said by the Acarnanians Phormio and Carphinas who have recently come, be it resolved by the people:

8 Since Phormio and Carphinas are hereditary friends of the Athenian people, and preserve the good will towards the Athenian people which their forefathers handed on to them, and have now come in support with a force and were mustered together with the Athenians as called on by the general; praise them on account of their goodness and crown each of them with a gold crown.

15 And, since the Athenian people made Phormio the grandfather of Phormio and Carphinas an Athenian, and his descendants, and the decree in accordance with which this was done has been inscribed on the Acropolis, there shall be valid for Phormio and Carphinas and their descendants the grant which the people gave to their grandfather Phormio. They shall choose the tribe and deme and phratry to which they wish to belong.

22 Praise also the other Acarnanians who have come in support with Phormio and Carphinas; and there shall be for them until they return the right to acquire whatever houses they wish while they live at Athens, exemption from the metic tax (metoi-
This apparently simple decree is of interest in several respects. Acarnanians who are honoured in 338/7 for coming in support with a force and being mustered together with the Athenians must have fought with the Athenians against Philip at Chaeronea in 338/7 (it is not clear who was ‘the general’ of ll. 12–13: there were in fact three Athenian generals at Chaeronea, Chares, Lysicles, and Stratocles (Develin, 343)). The Acarnanians, on the west coast of Greece north of the Gulf of Corinth, had a long-standing connection with Athens (cf. below); for their joining the Second Athenian League in the 370s but taking the side of Thebes in the 360s and 350s see on 24, 57; they obtained support from Athens against Philip in 342 (Dem. XVIII. OLYMP. 24–6), and in return promised support to Athens in 340 (Aesch. NIH. CES. 97–9, cf. 256); however, they are not mentioned among the allies of Athens in the Fourth Sacred War (Dem. XVII. CROWN 237, 244), and the men mentioned in this inscription appear to have come as volunteers who fought in the Athenian ranks. After Philip’s victory they will have been exiled (katelthein, ‘return’, in ll. 24–5, is used particularly of returning from exile) and have taken refuge in Athens; others fled to Aetolia (D.S. XVII. 3. i). Phormio and Carphinas were able to activate a grant of citizenship made to their grandfather Phormio (but presumably not taken up by him, since they are invited to choose their tribe, dème, and phratry (for which cf. on 33)). That is likely to have been c.400 (M. J. Osborne, Naturalization, III–IV. 44, T 25); his name probably passed into the family from a connection of xenia, or even of marriage, with that of the Athenian Phormio, who made an alliance with Acarnania before the Peloponnesian War and was much liked there (Thuc. II. 68. VI–VIII, cf. III. 7. i). (On such connections see Herman, Ritualised Friendship and the Greek City: he does not discuss this case in detail.)

The other Acarnanian exiles receive not full citizenship but isoteleia, ‘equality of
and the right to give and receive justice on the same terms as the Athenians and to pay the eisphorai, if there are any, with the Athenians. And care shall be taken of them by the council currently in office and the generals currently in office, so that they shall not be wronged.

This decree shall be written up on a stone stele by the secretary of the council and placed on the Acropolis. There shall be written up also on the same stele the names of the Acarnanians, adding the cities in Acarnania to which each belongs. For the writing-up of the stele the treasurer of the people shall give to the secretary of the council thirty drachmas from the people’s fund for expenditure on decrees.

The last three lines of the text of the decree form a left-hand column, to the right of which is inscribed: in a crown in a crown The people The people (crowned) Phormio (crowned) Carphinas

obligations’ with the citizens (cf. on 4), and only until they are able to return home (as for other exiles: IG ii² 218, 545). Here the word isoteleia is not used, but various components of that status are spelled out. Normally only citizens could own land and houses in a state’s territory: commonly privileged foreigners are granted the right to own both, but for exiles envisaged as temporary residents only houses would be needed (cf. the two inscriptions cited above, with Pečirka, The Formula for the Grant of Enktesis, 16, 46–51, 81–4; Henry, Honours and Privileges, 205–7). This decree is unique in specifying ‘whatever houses they wish’, but that need not imply that otherwise their choice would have been restricted (the earliest dated instance of a grant kata ton nomon, ‘in accordance with the law’ which may but need not imply some restriction, is 95.19, of 325/4). In access to the law ordinary metics were at a disadvantage vis-à-vis citizens (how great a disadvantage is uncertain: see Whitehead, The Ideology of the Athenian Metic, 89–96); there is no direct parallel to this decree, but some earlier decrees stipulate that proxenoi are to have access as plaintiffs to the polemarch’s court (fourth-century examples IG ii² 13, 19, 53; subsequently this was taken for granted as a right of all proxenoi: Henry, Honours and Privileges, 164–8). For metics and eisphora see on 21.

The decree ends with an order for the publication not only of the decree but also, on the same stele, of the names of the temporary isoteleis. Osborne in ΖPE conjectured that there had been at least two lines of names below the surviving text, but in Naturalization, i. 64, he merely considers the possibility that the cutter intended to add names (he and Schwenk both connect the unusual disposition off l. 38–40 with that possibility).

One aspect of the increasing provision of details in the precepts is the giving of precise dates, in both the ordinary (archontic) and the bouleutic calendars: apart from a couple of possible fragments of before 350, this is the earliest surviving decree which
gives the date in full in both calendars (cf. on 29). There has been much controversy over details of the Athenian calendar (cf. Introduction, pp. xxi–xxii with n. 16). In this inscription, Haussoullier’s restoration would fit *Ath. Pol.* if the year were ordinary and Thargelion [xi] were a full month and Scirophorion [xii] a hollow; but an assembly on the penultimate day of Thargelion 338/2 is known from Aeschines and another only

78

Trilingual inscription of Pixodarus from Xanthus, 337

A stele found at the Letourn of Xanthus, with texts in Lycian and Greek on the two main faces and in Aramaic on one side; now in the museum at Fethiye. Phot. *F. Xanthus*, vi; our Pl. 6.

We give the Greek text: largely in an atticing koine (*F. Xanthus*, vi, 41); *stichedon* 26.

All three texts and French trans. *CRAI* 1974, 82–93 (Greek), 115–25 (Lycian), 132–49 (Aramaic); *F. Xanthus*, vi*.


ἐπεὶ Λυκίας ξαδράπης ἐγένετο Πι-ιξόδωρος Ἐκατόμων ὕσι· κατέστη-σε ἀρχοντας Λυκίας Τέρωνα καὶ Μ-πολλόδοτον, καὶ Σάρνθον ἐπιμελη-τὴν Ἀρτεμιδίαν, ἐδοξε δὴ Σαινθίοι-ς καὶ τοῖς περιόικοις· ἰδρύσασθαί βοημὸν Βασιλεὶς Καννίων καὶ Ἀρ-κεσίμα, καὶ εἶδοντο ἱερὰ Συμί-αν Κονδορασος ὅν καὶ ὅσ ἃ Συμ-ίαι ἐγγυάτατο ὅ τοι ἄπαντα χρό-νον· καὶ ἔδοσαν αὐτῶι ἀτέλειαν τ-ιῶν ὅπων· καὶ ἔδωκαν ἡ πόλις ἄγρα-ν δὲ Κεσινήλης καὶ Πιγρής κατη-ργάσατο καὶ ὅσον πρὸς τῶι ἄγραν· καὶ τὰ οἰκήματα εἶναι Βασιλέως Καννίων καὶ Ἀρκεσίμα· καὶ δίδοτ-αι κατ’ ἐκαστὸν ἔναυτων τρία ἦμ-μαναν παρὰ τῆς πόλεως· καὶ ὅσοι· ἃ ἀπελεύθεροι γένοσται ἀποτί-νεν τῶι θεῶι δύο δραχμάς· καὶ ὅσ-α ἐν τῇ στήλῃ ἐγγέγραπται κατ-ιερόθη πάντα εἶναι Βασιλέως Κα-ννίων καὶ Ἀρκεσίμα· καὶ ὅτι ἃ ἐξ-φόριον ἐκ τούτων γίνεται θεῶι· κατ’ ἐκάστην νομηρίαν ἱερεῖον, καὶ κατ’ ἐναυτῶν βοῶν· καὶ ἐποιή-

77. ATHENS HONOURS LOYAL ACARNANIANS, 338/2
When Pixodarus son of Hecatomnos was satrap of Lycia; he appointed as archontes of Lycia Hieron and Apollodotus, and as curator (epimeletes) of Xanthus Artemelis.

5 Resolved by the Xanthians and their peri-oikoi.

6 Establish an altar to the Caunian King and Arkesimas. And they appointed as priest Simias son of Kondorasis and whoever is closest to Simias for all time; and they gave him immunity (ateleia) for his property; and the city gave him the land which Kesindelis and Pigres had worked, and as much as adjoins the land, and the buildings, to belong to the Caunian King and Arkesimas; and there is given to him each year one and a half minas from the city; and as many as become freedmen are to pay two drachmas to the god; and all that has been inscribed on the stele has been consecrated to belong to the Caunian King and Arkesimas; and whatever produce comes from these is to be sacrificed as an offering each new moon, and each year an ox.
For Lycia, to the east of Caria, and the city of Xanthus cf. 12. This text is published as a decree of 'the Xanthians and their periōkoi', the latter being residents of outlying communities as opposed to the city of Xanthus (Wörle, 236–46; F. Xanthos, vi. 37–8); mention of periōkoi as part of the enacting body is found in other Lycian cities too (Rhodes with Lewis, 444). The Xanthians are not entirely at home with the idioms of Greek decrees: in the prescript they use indicatives (as in the Lycian text) where we normally find genitive phrases, often with ἐπί; after the enactment formula they first use the normal infinitive (ἵδρωσασθαί, 'establish', ll. 6–7), but they then revert to indicatives (again, as in the Lycian text: cf. the decrees of Mylasa in Caria, 54), but with infinitives in ll. 19–20 and 24. The entrenchment clause at the end takes the form of a curse (cf. again 54, also 83; and for this formulation of the curse see Wörle, 239–6; cf. in particular TAM II 520) and uses imperatives. The Greek text begins by translating the Lycian precisely; towards the end the correspondence becomes slightly less close, and immediately before the oaths the Greek omits, 'It is to be Simias who sacrifices, and those who succeed Simias'. The Aramaic text states before the oath that 'Pixodarus has inscribed the law'; it omits much of the detail that is in the other two versions, but records what was important from the viewpoint of the Persians (A. Dupont-Sommer, CRAI 1974, 138).

Pixodarus was the last of the sons of Hecatomnos to rule as satrap of Caria, from 341/0 to 336/5, towards the end jointly with the Persian Orontobates (cf. on 56). The Aramaic text dates this decree to the month Siwán (c.June–July) in the first year of Artaxerxes—who must be Artaxerxes IV, i.e. the Arses who succeeded when Artaxerxes III was killed by the grand vizier Bagoas in 338/7 but was himself killed by Bagoas in 336/5 (D.S. xvii. 5: see E. Badian, in Greece and the Eastern Mediterranean . . . F. Schachermeyr, 40–50; Hornblower, Mausolus, 46–9). Here the Greek and Lycian texts call him satrap of Lycia; the Aramaic calls him satrap of Caria and Lycia: he has appointed men with Greek names (but probably Carians: cf. below on the priest) as archontes of the province and a man with a Carian name (Hornblower, 76, 139) as epimeletes of Xanthus—probably in fact garrison-commander (Hornblower, 147, com-
26 And the Xanthians and their periokoi made oaths to do completely what is inscribed on the stele for these gods and the priest, and not to change anything nor allow any one else to do so: if any one does change, he shall be a sinner against these gods and Leto and her descendants and the Nymphs. Pixodarus shall have authority.

paring X. H. iii. ii. 11, SIG³ 534. A. 6). Neither his position nor the appointments need be new (cf. above on the significance of the indicatives): cf. Lucian, Dial. Mort. 29. i Macleod, of Mausolus, where we should emend to Αυκιών ἐρίων with Judeich (Hornblower, 2 n. 3; cf. Keen, Dynastic Lycia, 172–4, citing further evidence). The final clause of the decree states that he ‘shall have authority’, not in a wider sense, to validate the city’s decree (F. Xanthos, vi. 41, 133) or as the supreme judicial authority in Xanthus (Hornblower, 150, 167) but specifically to enforce this decree and its entrenchment clause (P. Briant, lecture at Oxford, 20. v. 1998, cf. C.S.A.D. Newsletter vii Spring 1999, 7, comparing the Aramaic text).

The Caunian King and Arkesimas are gods: the first is found also in I. Cos 53, and ‘lord χβίδεννι’ in the fifth-century TAM i 44, c.8–9 may be the same in Lycian; in Caunus itself he is simply King (Basilus) (JHS lxxiv 1954, 95–7 no. 37 with commentary, 97–105 no. 38); and Arkesimas may be Carian too. It is striking that under a Carian satrap the Xanthians are adopting Carian deities (cf. Dupont-Sommer, CRAI 1974, 142–4; Hornblower, 115). For another altar at Xanthus associated with Pixodarus see TAM i 45. 11–12, where Hornblower, 279 n. 56, reads [Πιξδόθ]άρων βασίλευον. The man appointed as priest is a hellenized Carian, who himself has a Greek name but whose father had a Carian name (Hornblower, 76); of the previous occupants of the land, Kesindelis is Lycian (F. Xanthos, vi. 113) but Pigres is Carian (Hornblower, 355).

In the oath, Leto as a principal deity of Lycia is an obvious goddess to invoke; her ‘descendants’ are her children, Apollo and Artemis (Hes. Theog. 918–20: Artemis in particular had a cult at Xanthus); the Nymphs of Lycia are not otherwise attested. The Lycian text makes it clear that the payment of 1½ minas is not an offering but the priest’s salary. In funding a cult partly from the income from land and partly from taxation (money from the city, and an earmarked tax on manumissions), Xanthus is behaving in the same way as a Greek city. For a levy on manumissions cf. the phialai exeleutherikai, silver bowls dedicated by manumitted slaves in Athens in the late fourth century, cited at the end of the commentary on 4.
Athenian law threatening the Areopagus in the event of a plot against the democracy, 337/6

A stele found (not in its original location but in a third-century fill) in the north-east of the Athenian Agora, now in the Agora museum. At the top is a relief interpreted as showing Demos being crowned by Demokratia. Phot. e.g. Hesp. xxi 1952, pls. 89–90; Agora, xiv, pl. 53. a; Meyer, Taf. 30 A 97, and Lawton, pl. 20 no. 38, show the relief and ll. 1–2; our Pl. 7.

Attic-Ionic, with the old o for ϒ in l. 19; stoichedon 36 (35 letters in l. 15).

\[
\text{ἐπὶ Φρυνίχου ἄρχοντος· ἐπὶ τῆς Λεωνίδος ἐν·}
\]

\[
\text{άτης πρυτανείας· ἡ Χαρέστратος Ἀμεινίου}
\]

\[
\text{Ἀχαρείνους ἐγγαμμάτευεν· τῶν προδρόνοι ἐπεφή·}
\]

\[
\text{φίλεν Μενέστρατος Ἀτιδώνου· Ἐκκράτης Ἀρα·}
\]

\[
\text{τοτίμου Πειραιείδες ἐπεν· ὧν ἔσπερ ἀγαθή· τόχυ τοῦ δ·}
\]

\[
\text{ήμου τοῦ Ἀθηναίων· δεδόχθα τοῖς νομοθέταις· ἐὰν δ·}
\]

\[
\text{ἐπαναστήτη τῶν δήμου εἴπτυ τυραννίδα· ἡ τῆς·}
\]

\[
\text{τῆς τυραννίδας συνκαταστήσῃ· ἡ τῶν δήμου τ··}
\]

\[
\text{ῶν Ἀθηναίων· ἡ τῆς δημοκρατίας τῆς Ἀθ·}
\]

\[
\text{ήνης αὐτές· ἐς Ἀρείου Πάγου μηδὲ αὐτή·}
\]

\[
\text{κοπ. τέχνης ὅσος ἐστω· µὴ ἐξείναι δὲ τῶν·}
\]

\[
\text{βουλευτῶν τῶν τῆς Βουλῆς τῆς ἐς Ἀρείου Πάγου καταλ·}
\]

\[
\text{ελμεύεται τοῦ δήμου ἡ τῆς δημοκρατίας τῆς Ἀθ·}
\]

\[
\text{ήνης αὐτές· ἐς Ἀρείου Πάγου μηδὲ αὐτή·}
\]

\[
\text{κοπ. τέχνης ὅσος ἐστω· µὴ ἐξείναι δὲ τῶν·}
\]

\[
\text{βουλευτῶν τῶν ἐς Ἀρείου Πάγου· ἐς Ἀρείου Π·}
\]

\[
\text{άγου· συνκαταβήσῃ· ἐς τῶν συνεδρίων· ἐς·}
\]

\[
\text{πέρι τῶν· ἀτίμος ἐστω καὶ αὐτὸς καὶ γένος·}
\]

\[
\text{τὸ ἐς ἐκεῖνον· καὶ ἡ ὅσσος δημοσία ἐστω αὐτῶ·}
\]

\[
\text{καὶ τῆς Θεοῦ τὸ ἐπι dikατον· ἀναγράφαι δὲ τῶν·}
\]

\[
\text{δὲ τῶν νόμων ἐν στήλαις λιθίναις δοὺς τῶν γ·}
\]

\[
\text{ραμματητέρης τῆς βουλῆς καὶ στήσει τῆς· μὲν ἐπὶ τ··}
\]

\[
\text{ἡς εἰσόδου τῆς· ἐς Ἀρείου Πάγου τῆς· ἐς τὸ·}
\]

\[
\text{παρακατήριον εἰσόδοι, τῆ· δὲ ἐν τῇ· ἐκκλησία··}
\]

\[
\text{ἐς· ἐς τὴν· ἀναγραφῆς τῶν στήλων τῶν ταμάων·}
\]

\[
\text{﹤vocal}
\]
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11 The stone has KIEINIH. 13 S. D. Lambert: EAYNENOY edd. There are also places where the cross-stroke of Α has been omitted.
In the archonship of Phrynichus [337/6]; in the ninth prytany, of Leontis; to which Chaerestratus son of Amelias of Acharnae was secretary; of the proedroi Menestratus of Aexone was putting to the vote. Eucrates son of Aristotimus of Piraeus proposed:

5 For the good fortune of the people of Athens, be it resolved by the nomothetai:

7 If any one rises up against the people for a tyranny or joins in setting up the tyranny or overthrows the people of Athens or the democracy at Athens, whoever kills the man who has done any of these things shall be undefiled.

11 And it shall not be permitted to any of the councillors of the Council of the Areopagus, if the people or the democracy at Athens is overthrown, to go up to the Areopagus or to sit together in the meeting (synedrion) or to deliberate about anything at all; and if when the people or the democracy at Athens has been overthrown any of the councillors of the Areopagus does go up to the Areopagus or sit together in the meeting or deliberate about anything, he shall be without rights (atimos), both himself and his descendants, and his property shall be made public and the tithe given to the Goddess.

22 This law shall be written up on two stone stelai by the secretary of the council, and placed one at the entrance to the Areopagus as you enter the council-house (bouleuterion) and the other in the assembly; for the writing-up of the stelai the treasurer of the people shall give 20 drachmas from the people's fund for expenditure on decrees.
Like 25, 26, 81, this Athenian document is not a decree enacted by the assembly but a law enacted by a board of nomothetai. In this case the prescript names the chairman of the proedroi, who must be not the proedroi of the council but the nomothetai’s own proedroi (see esp. IG ii² 222. 48–52: Rhodes, Boule, 28; accepted by M. H. Hansen, C&M xxxii 1971–80, 103 n. 17). Probably there were ten proedroi, one from each tribal contingent of nomothetai: in our inscription the chairman is from Cecropis, but in a law ap. Dem. xxiv. Tim. 71 the chairman is from the same tribe as the current prytany (noted by Hansen).

The Council of the Areopagus, of which all former archons became members as long as they passed their euthynai, was deprived of those of its judicial powers which were of political importance in 462/1 by Ephialtes (Ath. Pol. 25. i–ii; Plut. Cim. 15. ii, Per. 9. v). For a century after that it was politically unimportant; though the Thirty in 404/3 annulled Ephialtes’ laws (Ath. Pol. 35. ii): the restored democracy will have reinstated them; in 403 it was instructed to ensure that the officials observed the new code of laws (decree ap. And. i. Myst. 84), though there is no sign of its acting on that instruction. However, by the middle of the fourth century those who contrasted the Good Old Days of Athens’ past with the inglorious present associated with the past a powerful Areopagus (e.g. Isoc. vii. Areop., of c.355). In 352/1 the Areopagus was mentioned first in a list of those who were to be responsible for the Athenian sanctuaries (58. 16–23). By 345 the Areopagus had started using a right to submit ‘reports’ (apophaseis) to the assembly on matters of public concern, either on the assembly’s initiative or on its own (Din. i. Dem. 50–1); in that year it reported on a proposal of Timarchus to clean up the area of the Pnyx (Aesch. i. Tim. 81–4; c.345–343 it secured a reopening of the case against Antiphon, accused by Demosthenes of plotting to burn Athens’ dockyards for Philip and defended by Aeschines (Dem. xxviii. Crown 132–3 with schol., Din. i. Dem. 63, Plut. Dem. 14. v), and it secured the replacement of Aeschines by Hyperides as the man to defend before the Amphictyonic council, against a complaint from Delos, Athens’ control of the sanctuary of Apollo on Delos (Dem. xviii. Crown 134–6, cf. Hyp. frs. 71–9 Sauppe = 67–75 Jensen/Kenyon, [Plut.] X Or. 850 A); and in 338, after the battle of Chaeronea, it was responsible for the appointment of Phocion rather than Charidemus to Athens’ chief command (Plut. Phoc. 16. iv). After Chaeronea the Areopagus also acted as a lawcourt to try some of the men accused of cowardice or treason (Lyc. Lecr. 52–4, Aesch. iii. Ctes. 252), in doing which it was probably acting on a decree proposed by Demosthenes which gave it new judicial powers (Din. i. Dem. 62–3).

Not only had Demosthenes proposed that decree: the Areopagus’ decisions seem consistently to have been in favour of Demosthenes and his supporters (except in its preference for Phocion, experienced but opposed to Demosthenes, over the extremist Charidemus). After Chaeronea, attitudes changed frequently in Athens, according to whether Philip’s latest move seemed favourable or unfavourable. In the early summer of 336, when this law was enacted, Philip was launching his campaign against the Persian empire (cf. on 76), and the mood in Athens was pro-Philip: Athens voted a crown to Philip in celebration of the marriage of his daughter Cleopatra to Alexander of Molossis (D.S. xvi. 92. i–ii: see on 70). Aeschines began his prosecution of
Ctesiphon for a proposal to honour Demosthenes (put aside after Philip’s murder and brought to trial in 330: Aesch. iii. Ctes., Dem. xvii. Crowe), and in the tenth prytany Demades proposed honours for a Macedonian (Tod 181 = Schwenk 7). Euclates, the proposer of this law, is otherwise known only from a dismissive allusion to him and his bad end in [Lucian], Dem. Enec. 31: those mentioned with him there were opponents of Macedon in the Lamian War of 323–322 (Plut. Dem. 28. iv, cf. [Plut.] X Or. 849 a–c), so B. D. Meritt (Hesp. xxi 1952), and Ostwald supposed that he was on the side of Demosthenes in 336 and was afraid of Macedonian intervention; but more probably he was at this time an opponent of Demosthenes, and the purpose of this law was to warn Demosthenes and his supporters that the revival of the Areopagus was perceived as undemocratic (cf. Sealey, Wallace): Demosthenes’ opponents represented him as undemocratic, while he represented them as unpatriotic, and tended to identify democracy with freedom from external control (Hansen, Sovereignty, 56–8; Rhodes, LCM iii 1978, 207–11).

Various laws to guard against the overthrow of the constitution and the establishment of a tyranny are known from Athens (see Ostwald): they share the disadvantage that after a successful revolution the new régime would be able to set such laws aside, but they serve as a warning to potential revolutionaries. Ath. Pol. 8. iv attributes to Solon eisangeliai to the Areopagus against ‘those who join together for the overthrow of the people’ (cf. ll. 8–10 of our inscription), and 16. x quotes a ‘traditional ordinance’ that ‘if men rise up for tyranny, or if any one joins in establishing the tyranny (cf. ll. 7–8), he and his issue shall be without rights (cf. ll. 20–1)’ (cf. also decree of 410/09 ap. And. 1. Myst. 96–8; law of eisangelia ap. Hyp. iv. Eux. 7–8). In our inscription probably ll. 7–11 reaffirm the existing law, and then ll. 11–22 add to it the threat against the Areopagus: the enactment of a law rather than a decree will have been formally necessary because this law was permanent and of general application (cf. on 25), and had the effect of modifying the law safeguarding the constitution in the existing code of laws, and the proposer will no doubt have welcomed the greater solemnity of this form of enactment.

The League of Corinth gave its members a guarantee against constitutional change, though the Athenians were to complain of changes imposed by Alexander (cf. on 76, with the citation of [Dem.] xvii. Treaty with Alexander); despite this law, there is no sign that the Athenian democracy was actually in danger in the 330s, though it was to be overturned by the Macedonians in 321 after Athens had led the Greeks against Macedon in the Lamian War of 323–322. There was, however, an emphasis on the cult of Demokratia in the 330s (cf. A. E. Raubitschek, Hesp. xxxi 1962, 238–43 = his The School of Hellas, 223–8; Parker, Athenian Religion, 228–9, 236–7): in 333/2 the council of five hundred set up a statue of her (IG ii² 2791; but in Coulson et al. (edd.), The Archaeology of Athens and Attica under the Democracy, 113–22, O. Palagia abandoned her earlier suggested identification of the statue); in the next two years the generals sacrificed to her (IG ii² 1496. 131–2, 140–1); and this may be linked with such measures to revive the Athenians’ morale in the post-Chaeronea world as the reform of the ephobes (cf. on 88, 5–20) and the building programme of the 330s–320s (cf. on 94). On the relief at the top of our stele see especially Lawton, 31–2, 56–9.
hosios (‘undefiled’) means that the killer of a revolutionary will not be polluted (or, a fortiori, liable to prosecution); see MacDowell, *Athenian Homicide Law*, 128–9; the same provision is found in the decree quoted by Andocides. 14, 17–19 ‘go up (animal) to the Areopagus’ was the expression used of a retiring archon’s joining the Areopagus (e.g. Ath. Pol. 61. iii, law ap. Dem. xxiv. Tim. 22), but that is not its significance here. 15, 19 synedrion we take to mean any meeting of the Areopagus, in whatever meeting-place (for bouleuterion see below). 20 atimos means ‘without rights’: originally this denoted the loss not only of civic rights but also of personal rights, vis-a-vis the person or the community against whom the atimos had offended, in effect outlawry; as the scope for legal remedies was enlarged and that for self-help was reduced, atimia tended to be tamed and to imply loss of civic rights only, though full civic atimia would include loss of the right to go to law to protect one’s personal rights; but we believe that the original sense of the term did not vanish, and that what is intended here is outlawry (see Harrison, *The Law of Athens*, ii. 169–76; Hansen, *Apagoge, Endeixis and Ephegesis*, 75–82; Rhodes, *CQ* xxvii 1978, 89–92 at 89–90, *Comm. Ath. Pol. 158*).

22 ‘the Goddess’ is Athena, as regularly in Athens.

The law was to be published in two copies: the findspot of ours, in the north-east of the Agora, is less far from the Areopagus, south of the Agora, than from the assembly’s meeting-place on the Pnyx, south-west of that, but still not very near to it. 20 drachmas is a surprisingly small sum for our stele, with its sculptured relief, and for a second copy—but until c. 330, except in the case of 22 (see commentary), it was normal for the

---
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The Delphic Amphictyony honours Aristotle and Callisthenes, 337–327

A fragment of a stele, found in a well near the south-west corner of the precinct at Delphi; now in the museum there. Phot. *F. Delphes* iii. i, p. 237 fig. 39; *CSCA* xi 1978, Miller’s pl. 2.

Attic-Ionic; *stichedon* 15.

E. Bourguet, *F. Delphes* iii. i 400; *SIG* 275; Callisthenes *FGH 124 T* 23; Tod 187*. Trans. Harding 104. See also Pritchett, *Greek Archives*, *Cults and Topography*, 28–33.

[μάχου Σταυρώτης]-
[καὶ Καλλισθένης Δ]-
[αμοτύμου Ολύμπιο]-

We report with thanks readings communicated by Dr. G. J. Oliver (but he is not to be held responsible for any restorations).

*Init. T. Homolle, BCH* xxii 1898, 260–70; a different reconstruction by H. Pomtow in *SIG*.
state to provide 20 or 30 drachmas. We take *bouleuterion* in ll. 25–6 to be the ‘council-house’ of the Areopagus, probably sited below the north cliff of the Areopagus (Wallace, 215–18). It is obvious enough why this text should be set up at the entrance to the Areopagus; the unusual placing of a copy on the Pnyx may be seen as a warning to the assembly to be alert in the protection of the democracy.

After this law was carried, something still remained of the Areopagus’ new prestige, though in the end Demosthenes’ trust in the Areopagus recoiled on him. Nothing seems to have resulted from the Areopagus’ commission in 335 to investigate allegations concerning Demosthenes and Persian money (Din. 1. *Dem.* 10; cf. 18, Aesch. 3. *Ctes.* 239, D.S. xvii. 4. vii–viii). However, in 324, after Alexander’s treasurer Harpalus had come as a suppliant to Athens but half the money he had brought with him disappeared and he subsequently escaped, the Areopagus was again commissioned to investigate, on the proposal of Demosthenes, but when it produced its report Demosthenes’ name headed the list of offenders: he was condemned in the trial which followed, and went into exile, but after Alexander’s death and the outbreak of the Lamian War he was enabled to return (D.S. xvii. 108. iv–viii, Plut. *Dem.* 25–6, *Phoc.* 21. iii–v, [Plut.] X *Or.* 846 a–d; Hyp. v. *Dem.* and the three surviving speeches of Dinarchus were written for the trials). To have been used in a third-century fill our *stele* must have been demolished before then, presumably in one of Athens’ changes of régime in the late fourth century or early third.

---(?) Since Aristotle son of Nicomachus of Stagira and Callisthenes son of Damotimus of Olynthus have drawn up the cata-
Enough survives to make it clear that the fragment is from a decree praising Aristotle and his nephew Callisthenes for compiling their record of the Pythian victors—cited in antiquity as Aristotle’s *Pythionikai* [Arist. frs. 615–17 Rose, Teubner; the list of Aristotle’s works in Diog. Laert. v. 26 includes *Πυθινικαί Μουσικής*, *Πυθικός*, *Πυθινικών Ἐλεγχος*, *Pythian Victors in Music, Python. Examination of Pythian Victors*]; and no other text mentions Callisthenes in connection with this work. The one uncertainty in the text concerns l. 2: on the normal restoration the compilation began with the refounding of the Pythian Games in the archonship of Gylidas, at the end of the First Sacred War; Witkowsky proposed ‘both’ Pythian Games, i.e. both the musical and the athletic contests, but there is no parallel for that usage; Bousquet revived Preuner’s suggestion, ‘from eternity’, and, showing that this would contribute to a balanced pairing of what is said about the victors and about the organizers, in various respects corresponding but not the same (e.g. *άπ’ αἰώνας* considered by Preuner, *Ein delphisches Weihgeschek*, 96 n. 53, adopted by J. Bousquet, *REG* xxvii 1984, 374–80). Miller considers various kinds of supplement, including the name of the first victor.

The beginning and the end of the text are lost. Most editors have followed Homolle in regarding this as a decree of the city of Delphi (cf. Bourgue in *F. Delphes*); but Pomtow (*SIG* 3) considered it to be a decree of the Delphic Amphictyony, and since the decree orders the Amphictyony’s treasurers to pay for publication we believe that view to be correct, though we do not attempt to restore the prescript. The *tamiai* were instituted in 337/6 (*C. Delphes*, ii, pp. 146–9); records of their paying a man called

---

1 Oliver: *σοῦ* e d d .
2 ΤΩΝ Oliver (if also possible): Τῶν e d d . Bottom of a vertical in l.h. side of 6th *stichos*, consistent with Γ, Η, Κ, Ν, Π, Ρ, S. G. Miller, *CSCA* xi 1978, 141–4, confirmed Oliver; as A. Chaniotis points out to us and the photographs confirm, the cutter often placed I to the left of its *stichos*, so that cannot be ruled out; but all restorations hitherto proposed seem excluded: δ[π]οι Πολιού [391/0] Homolle, e dd ., but that is one letter too long; Πολιού Τ. Lenschau, *Philol.* xcii 1936, 398; εμφάνισα S. Witkowsky, *PW* xix 1899, 516–18; δ[π’ αἰώνας] considered by Preuner, *Ein delphisches Weihgeschenk*, 96 n. 53, adopted by J. Bousquet, *REG* xxvii 1984, 374–80. 3 Oliver (with ‘traces of what can only be an α’); [ότ]οι e d d .
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logue of those who have been victors in the Pythian Games from —— (? ) and of those who organized the contest from the beginning, praise Aristotle and Callisthenes and crown them.

9 The treasurers [tamiai] shall set up the catalogue in the sanctuary, copying it on to stele (? ).

Dinomachus for the inscription of the Pythionikai, on the orders of the hieromnemones, i.e. of the Amphictyony (cf. on 66), survive in 327/6, the first payment attested but not necessarily the first made, 2 minas; in 327/6, best restored as 5 minas 31 staters for 41,200 letters at 1 drachma per 100; in 326/5, restored as 2 minas; in 324/3 (C. Delphes, ii 97, 42–3; 98. B. 5–7; 99. A. 9–10; 102. i. 44–6); 1 drachma per 100 letters is the higher of two rates attested elsewhere in the fourth-century Delphic accounts. Not a single fragment of the Pythionikai has been found, but this must have been a very extensive text. Pritchett discusses the use of pinax to refer to this text, and argues, perhaps optimistically, that archives reaching back to the sixth century existed and were used in the compilation.

Our decree must have been voted between 337, when the tamiai were instituted, and 327, when we first have evidence for the inscription’s being done. A. B. Bosworth looks sceptically at the traditional view of Callisthenes’ close involvement in Aristotle’s school (Hist. xix 1970, 407–13). Callisthenes wrote a Hellenica and a book on the Third Sacred War, from 334 he accompanied Alexander on his campaign as official historian (e.g. Arr. Anab. iv. 10, ii); but he quarrelled with Alexander over proskynesis (e.g. Arr. Anab. iv. 10–12), and the ‘conspiracy of the pages’ in 327 led to his downfall and death (e.g. Arr. Anab. iv. 13–14). Aristotle set up at Delphi a statue of his patron Hermias of Atarneus (cf. 68) after Hermias’ death in 341 (Diog. Laert. v. 6); but in the aftermath of Alexander’s death Delphi rescinded its honours for Aristotle (Ael. V.H. xiv. 1); presumably it was then that this inscription was demolished and the surviving fragment of it was thrown into the well.
Athenian law and decree on the Little Panathenaia, c. 335

Two fragments (A and B) of a stele found in the Agora and on the Acropolis and now in the Agora Museum and the Epigraphical Museum at Athens respectively. Phot: of A, Hesp. xxvii (1959) pl. 43, Lewis, Selected Papers, pl. 4, Agora XVI pl. 7, Tracy, Athenian Democracy in Transition, ig fig. 2 (squeeze of B 22–23). Ionic writing. After line 2, "stoichedon 42 (with slight variation probable in B. 9–10). This is the work of Tracy’s Cutter of IG iv 334 (= this text); Athenian Democracy in Transition, 82–95.

A

Athenian law and decree on the Little Panathenaia, c. 335

Two fragments (A and B) of a stele found in the Agora and on the Acropolis and now in the Agora Museum and the Epigraphical Museum at Athens respectively. Phot: of A, Hesp. xxvii (1959) pl. 43, Lewis, Selected Papers, pl. 4, Agora XVI pl. 7, Tracy, Athenian Democracy in Transition, 82–95.

**A**

1 Gods. In the archonship of . . .

3 Aristonicus son of Aristoteles of Marathon proposed: for the good fortune of the Athenian people, in order that the sacrifice to Athena at the Little Panathenaea may be as fine as possible and the income for the *hieropoioi* be as great as possible, be it resolved by the *nomothetai*.

7 Let the *poletai* lease out the Nea ten days before the N . . . for ten years in two sections to the highest bidder in the year before that in which . . . they take guarantors for the lessees.

11 The *poletai* are also to sell the tax of a fiftieth in the Nea separately from the other taxes. The *prytaneis* are to prescribe a sitting of the council explicitly for the purpose of the leasing of the Nea and the sale of the tax of one fiftieth on the land in the Nea apart from . . . so that the income may amount to two talents . . . of the property in the Nea . . . belong to Athena. This . . . during the Little Panathenaea . . . the *apodektai* are to allocate it to the *hieropoioi* for this purpose . . .

**B**

. . . in order that piously . . . annually, and the sacrifice takes place as well prepared as possible for Athena every year on behalf of the Athenian people, and all the other things that are needed for the festival held for the goddess are well
These two fragments give us the beginning of a law and part of an attached decree concerning income from ‘Nea’ and its use to purchase animals for sacrifice at the annual Panathenaic festival. The combination of law and decree on the same stele is
administered by the **hieropoioi** for all time to come, be it decreed by the people, in other respects in accordance with the council, but the **hieropoioi** are to sacrifice two sacrifices, both the sacrifice to Athena Hygieia and the sacrifice sacrificed in the old temple, as previously, and when they have distributed five portions of meat to the *peytaneis* and three to the nine archons and one to the Treasurers of Athena and one to the **hieropoioi** and three to the Generals and taxiarchs and the usual distribution to the Athenians who are part of the procession and to the *kanephoroi*, they are to divide the rest of the meat into portions for the Athenians.

16 The **hieropoioi** along with the cattle-buyers, when they have bought the cows from the 41 minas rent from the Nea and have sent off the procession for the goddess, are to sacrifice all these cows on the great altar of Athena after they have selected one of the most beautiful cows for sacrifice on the altar of Nike, and when they have sacrificed them to Athena Polias and Athena Nike, let them distribute the meat from all the cows bought from the 41 minas to the Athenian people in the Ceramicus as in the other distributions of meat. They are to distribute the portions to each deme according to the numbers of members of the procession that each deme provides.

27 For the expenses of the procession and the butchers' fee and the adornment of the great altar and all the other necessary expenditures for the festival and the all-night celebration they are to give 50 drachmas. The **hieropoioi** who administer the annual Panathenaea are to make the all-night celebration as fine as possible for the goddess and to dispatch the procession at sunrise, punishing those who do not obey orders with the punishments according to the laws. The People is to choose — men from all the Athenians who...
the month Hekatombaion (see generally Parker, *Athenian Religion*, 89–92; Neils, *Goddess and Polis*). It had been the major Athenian religious festival from at least 566/5 when the Great Panathenaea, a grander celebration once every four years including athletic events, was invented to give Athens a festival which rivalled the great events of Panhellenic festival circuit (the Olympic festival and the newly created festivals at Delphi, Isthmia, and Nemea). As well as the competitions for individual athletes, the Great Panathenaea came by the fourth century to include tribal events and rhapsodic competitions. Athletes were rewarded with the famous ‘panathenaic amphoras’ of oil, but other competitors received cash prizes of up to 600 dr., gold crowns of up to 1000 dr. in value, or prizes of animals, as is clear from a surviving prize list from the early fourth century (*IG* ii² 2311, see also on 73). At the heart of every Panathenaea was a grand procession to the Acropolis, where sacrifices were offered; at the Great Panathenaea this procession also presented a new peplos to the statue of Athena Polias. The frieze of the Parthenon shows excerpts from the procession at the Great Panathenaia.

The law recorded on this inscription was moved in the 330s and is part of the marked interest in religious matters manifested during the Lycurgan period (Parker, *Athenian Religion*, 242–53). The proposer, Aristonicus of Marathon, is a well-known politician of the period, and probably the son of the Aristoteles who proposed 22. He is celebrated as a lawgiver in a comedy by Alexis (frs. 130–1 K&A (where, as in Arnott, *Alexis*, 363, he is given the wrong PA no.; the correct no. is 2028)), where a law on food is ascribed to him, and he appears in *IG* ii² 1623, 280–3 as jointly responsible with Lycurgus for a decree on a naval matter. The precise date of this law is uncertain: the archons’ names for 337/6, 336/5, 335/4, and 332/1 would best fit the space available, but several other years cannot be ruled out. Tracy, *Transition*, 82–3, identifies the work of ‘The Cutter of *IG* ii² 334’ on inscriptions ranging in date from c.345 to c.320. More precise dating would be possible if we could identify the source of the new funding.

The opening fragment of the law orders the leasing of Nea or the Nea, in a procedure broadly in accordance with that prescribed in *Ath. Pol.* 47. ii–iv (10 years was the standard term for leases of sacred land). Both the size of the rent expected (*A.* 16 seems to envisage income in excess of two talents) and the rent actually procured, 4,100 dr. (*B.* 16–17), imply that this was a substantial piece of land, and this presumably accounts for the stipulation that it be leased in two lots (*A.* 9). The rent from all the sacred land on the island of Rheneia came to 7,110 dr. in 432 (M&L 62.24), and, with due allowance for our ignorance about the factors influencing size of rent and how these varied from place to place and time to time, we might expect this land to be perhaps half the size of the Rheneian lands. This militates against Lewis’s original suggestion that we are dealing with a piece of land that had been fallow (compare *veós* in 59. 45–6). We know of one new area of territory which the Athenians came to possess in the 330s: the territory of Oropus which Philip of Macedon took away from the Boeotians and granted to the Athenians. (Pausanias i. 34. i; see on 75). If the territory of Oropus is at issue here, we should probably restore a date in 335/4 for the law. However, we know from *Hypereides iv Euxenippus* 16 that the territory of Oropus was divided up between the Athenian tribes, and that can only be reconciled with this law if we suppose that
the tribes took the mountains and that the coastal plain is at issue here. No evidence supports this assumption, and the identity of the Nea with Oropus cannot be taken as proven. Scholars continue to look for another possible ‘New Land’, but other suggestions, such as that it might be an island which had newly emerged in the Aegean (M. K. Langdon, *Hesp.* lvi 1987, 55–8), are equally speculative. Whether the tax of one fiftieth that is mentioned is the familiar import and export tax (see 26) or some other tax at the same rate will depend upon the identification of Nea.

Between the moving of the law described in the first fragment, and the detailed provisions for the use of the money contained in the decree in the second fragment, some time must have passed, for the amount of the rent from the Nea is now known (*B.* 17). The second fragment covers how the income from Nea is to be used. It takes the form of an amendment to the *probouleuma* of the Council (*B.* 7–8). The amendment formula is placed, unusually, after the enactment formula, but this is more probably an oddity of drafting than of procedure. The amendment orders the *hieropoioi* (a special board of *hieropoioi* was responsible for the Great Panathenaea, see *Ath. Pol.* 54, vii, but the reference here may be to the annual *hieropoioi*) to whom the money has been entrusted at *A.* 20 to make two sacrifices in accordance with past practice, one to Athena Hygieia and one at a location which has been variously restored as ‘in the old temple’, ‘in the old sanctuary’, ‘in the sanctuary of the Archegetis’, and ‘in the Arrephoreion’. The division of the meat from these sacrifices is then prescribed.

The detailed prescription for the division of meat makes it clear that democratic equality did not extend to equal division of sacrificial meat (compare *IG* ii² 47.35 ff. and 62). Ninety-nine magistrates have their numbers of portions specified (we do not know the size of a ‘portion’): the fifty *pytaneis* get five, the nine archons three, the ten *tamiai* and ten *hieropoioi* one each, the ten generals and ten taxiaarchs perhaps three between them. Distribution ‘as usual’ is then specified for ‘those who are part of the procession’ (whether the carriers of water jars, carriers of branches, and so on, shown on the Parthenon frieze took part in the Little Panathenaea we do not know). Who else is mentioned in line 15 is uncertain: the restoration of the *kanephoroi*, the (perhaps 100) young women who carried the *kanoun* (sacrificial basket), is conventional, but why the young women carrying baskets should be separately mentioned is unclear.

At *B.* 16 a new sacrifice is ordered. From the 41 minas from the rent of Nea the *hieropoioi* with the ox-buyers are to buy cows, add them to the procession, and sacrifice them on the Great Altar of Athena, except for one sacrificed to Athena Nike. Cows distributed as prizes at the Panathenaic games were budgeted at 100 dr. each in the first half of the fourth century (*IG* ii² 2931. 71 ff.); the Salaminioi (37) budget 70 dr. for sacrificial cows (compare *IG* ii² 1635. 35–7, where 109 cows cost 8,419 dr. or just over 77 dr. each). It could therefore be expected that 41 minas would buy around 50 cows. Each cow is likely to have yielded 100–120 kg. of meat, giving a total of 5,000–6,000 kg. of meat. This meat is then to be distributed to the Athenian people at the Ceramicus (if the suggested restoration is correct), ‘as in the other distributions of meat’. This is the only occasion when we know meat to have been distributed by deme, just as this is the only procession which we know demarchs to have had a role in marshalling (schol. Ar. *Clouds* 37) and at which the *theorikon* also seems to have been distributed.
through the agency of the demes ([Dem.] XLIV Leochares 37). It cannot be ruled out that
the distribution was managed through the intermediary agency of the ten tribes, as
Brulé has suggested; if so this would increase the parallels between the mustering here
and the mustering for army service—perhaps not inappropriately, given the strong
army presence in the representation on the Parthenon frieze (compare Ath. Pol. 18. iv)
and the on-going Athenian desire to have allies bring full sets of armour for the Pan-
athenaia (see 29 [372], I. Priene 5 (after 326) and IG ii² 456. b. 6 (307/6), and compare
The second fragment concludes with a clause setting aside 50 drachmas to cover
expenses involved in the procession, butchery, decoration of the Great Altar, and rest
of the festival, and with an injunction to the hieropoioi to see that the Pannukhis, held
on the night after the procession on 28th Hekatombaion (see Eur. Heraclidae 777ff.),
is as fine as possible and that the procession depart at dawn, and to punish those who
disobey orders. A number of citizens are then selected for a purpose which we cannot
reconstruct.
The difficult issue to determine is what is new in this decree—and indeed what
is new in the amendment that was not already in the probouleuma (compare 2). Cer-
tainly the employment of income from Nea for the Panathenaia is new, but is that
new income used to fund the traditional sacrifices, as most scholars have believed,
or to fund additional sacrifices, as Rosivach has argued? The order of exposition
makes this question very hard to answer. B. 16–27 introduce a sacrifice separate from
and additional to those described in B. 8–16, and it is natural to take this sacrifice to
be an innovation. However B. 24–31, which apply to the whole festival, are close-
ly attached to that additional sacrifice. Our view of whether the law establishes an
additional sacrifice hangs on two issues, the identity of the altar at B. 9–10, and our
expectations about the scale of the annual Panathenaia. The main Panathenaic sac-
rifice must surely have been made at the Great Altar, as the sacrifice at B. 19–20 is.
Whatever the lost beginning of B. 10 said, it did not specify the Great Altar; and so
unless the Great Altar was concealed in some periphrasis, the sacrifice at B. 9–10 can-

Argos arbitrates between Melos and Cimolus, after 336 (?)
not be the main sacrifice. (Brulé, defending the text printed here, suggests that it was a sacrifice to Erechtheus and that because of Erechtheus' chthonic connections it was indeed carried out inside the 'old temple', a phrase used in the fourth century to refer to what we know as the Erechtheum.)

Our whole understanding of mid-330s Athens is affected by the answer to this question of what is new. Did the Athenians take advantage of new income to relieve central funds of part of the burden of a major festival, or to increase the amount of meat available for distribution to Athenian citizens? That relieving central funds is conceivable is suggested by a decree (IG n² 47) providing that the preliminary offerings at the festival of Asclepius be funded from the income from renting a quarry, and by Isocrates' complaint (vii Areopagiticus 27 of c.357) that some traditional sacrifices have to depend on rents while the state supports newly created festivals directly. In general, however, Lycurgan Athens seems to have been inclined to enhance festivals rather than to economize. In the fifth century, a rather more populous Athens sacrificed a cow from every allied city (at least 220 at the height of the empire), at the Great Panathenaea. In the fourth century we hear of 118 cows being sacrificed for Theseus in 332/1, of 105 animals being sacrificed to Zeus Soter, and of 81 sacrificed at the City Dionysia (see Rosivach, The System of Public Sacrifice, 69–70). The 5,114 dr. available for sacrifice at the Great Panathenaea of 410/9 (M&L 84. 6–7) may have bought a hecatomb (100 cows) at late fifth-century prices. The 50 or so animals bought with the 41 minas, together with the animals sacrificed at B. 8–10, did not constitute a sacrifice on that scale, but they would nevertheless have provided each of 20,000 people with 275 g. of meat. Given the limitation of the distribution to citizens, increasing the amount of meat distributed by 275 g. per person seems excessive, but it may be that such an increase was held to be justified by the transfer of funding. If the pattern of sacrifice here is traditional, and only the funding is novel, it is possible that the procession on the north frieze of the Parthenon, which shows two cows and two sheep being led to sacrifice, represents the sacrifice first described, and the procession on the south frieze of the Parthenon, which shows only cows, represents the second sacrifice described.
This short text records the result of an arbitration performed by Argos in a claim to three adjacent islets by Melos and Cimolus, neighbouring islands in the south-west Aegean (for maps see IG xi. iii, p. 197; Barrington Atlas, 60 inset: Polyaega is a substantial islet to the south-east of Cimolus, the other two are probably very small islets in the vicinity). As the name Polyaega suggests, the islets may have been desirable for pasturing goats: cf. Robert, Hellenica, vii. 161–70, who focuses on the rival interests of agriculturalists and pastoralists in the island of Heraclea, south of Naxos, as revealed in IG xi. vii 509. The arbitration was performed in accordance with a resolution of what must be the council of the League of Corinth (cf. 76): Melos and Cimolus may have applied to it as a suitably impartial and authoritative body, but it is possible that they applied because, like other island states, they had become members of the League as a result of the campaign of Parmenio and Attalus in 336 (cf. D.S. xvi. 91. ii–iv: cf. on 84). For the use of arbitrators invited from outside two disputing states cf. 16, and for the use of foreign judges in disputes internal to a single city see 101; in the mid fifth century Argos had been involved, in more than just arbitration, in the affairs of Cnossus and Tylissus in Crete (M&L 42 + Stt. 147–8 ~ Fornara 89).

In Argos, reference to the ‘people’ (damos) suggests that the body which ruled in favour of Cimolus was the assembly; the chairman (denoted by the verb arheue, perhaps from ana + rhetor [Buck, p. 55]) and secretary (gropheus), sometimes as here said to be ‘of the council’, are the two officials regularly named in decrees of Argos (e.g. ISE
The people of Argos judged in accordance with the resolution of the council (synedron) of the Greeks (the Melians and the Cimolians having agreed to abide by whatever verdict the Argives gave about the islands), that Polyaega, Heterea, and Libea should belong to Cimolus. Their verdict was that the Cimolians should be victorious.

Leon of Posidaum was chairman of the second council; Perillus of Pedium was secretary of the council.
The kings of Macedon and tyrants at Eresus, 336 and after

Fragments of two steleai, perhaps the second and third of a set of three, found at Eresus; now in the museum there. Phot. Heisserer, Alexander, 36 pl. 4, 49 pl. 5, 41 pl. 6, 49 pl. 7.

Aeolic dialect (but §§iv—v are in koine apart from the headings added to the kings' responses by the Eresians), inscribed in Ionic lettering; stoichedon (with some irregularities) 34–8 on the main faces (42 in y. back 35), 14–18 on the sides, with horizontal and vertical guidelines, ending each line with the end of a word or syllable.

IG xi. ii 526; OGIS 8; Tod 191; Heisserer, Alexander, 27–78 ch. ii*. Trans. Heisserer; Harding 112. See also

a

Heisserer postulates a first stele,
which has not been found: see commentary.

β. front

text irrecoverable.

β. side. §i

vacat

[παρ]ήλετο τὰ ὁπλ[α καὶ]
[ἐξ]εκλαίον ἐκ τῶν [πό]-
[λο]οις πανδάμιοι, ταῖ[ς]
[δὲ] γύναικας καὶ τ[αις]
5 [θ]υγατέρας συνλάβ[εω]
[ἡ]ρεῖ εἷς τῶν ἀκρόπ[εω]
[λῶ]ν καὶ εἰσέπραξε
διαχλόιοι καὶ τρι[α]-
κοσιοὺς στάτηρα(ς) τ[α]ν
10 δὲ πόλιν καὶ τὰ ἵππα [δι]-
[α]πεξεις μετὰ τῶν
[λ]αισταν ἐνέερθη[σον]
[κ]αὶ συγκατέκαυσε
σώματα τῶν πολ[λῶν].
15 [κ]αίρησα μὲν αὐτὸν
[κ]αὶ ρήματα ψάφισα[ν]
[τ]ὰ τῶν διαγράφαν τ[ῶ]
[β]απιλεῖος Αλεξάνδρ[ο]
[κ]αὶ τοῖς νόμοις· [α]ὶ δὲ
20 [κ]αὶ ταφαφίοις[ν]
[τ]ὰ αὐτῶν θάνατος, ὃ[ντι]ν

§i vacat

a omitted. 18 [β]απαθέως Kiepert, Conze; [β]απαθέως IG, SIF, Tod; not now clear Heisserer, but the text uses other koine forms.
Each stele was inscribed on the two main faces and one side, but on \( \beta \) only the side can be read. We follow Heisserer's arrangement of the text (as does Harding); previous editors supposed that \( \beta \) formed the upper part and \( \gamma \) the lower of a single stele. Different documents were inscribed at different times; Heisserer identifies one stone-cutter for §§i–ii, a second for §§iii–v, and is unsure whether §vi is the work of the second cutter or of a third.

\[ \beta. \text{side.} \, \text{§i} \]

--- he seized their arms and shut them all out of the city, and he arrested their women and their daughters and confined them in the acropolis; and he exacted two thousand three hundred staters; and he looted the city and the sanctuaries with the pirates and set fire to them and burned the bodies of the citizens.

Try him by a secret ballot according to the transcript [diapraphke] of King Alexander and the laws; and, if he is condemned
THE KINGS OF MACEDON AND TYRANTS AT ERESUS

[τᾶμασσαμένω Ἐδρὺσι]-
[λὰμιάν τᾶν δευτέραν [κρῆ]-
[σῶν ποίησανταὶ διὰ]

25 [χειροτονίασ, τᾶν]
[τὸ]ρόπον δεῖει αὐτόν [α]-
[ποθάνην. λάβεσθαι δ[ε]-
[κ'αι συναγόροις τᾶν]
[πὸλιν δέκα, οίτεν ίπ]

30 [δ]ομοσαντες Ἀπολλ[αν]-
[ν]α Λύκειον ὁ[μα]σ[ι[υνα]-
[γ]ορήσοις [τᾶ πόλι ὅπ]-
[π]ως κε δύναι[νται — — —]

31 δ[μ]α (= δμα) IG, Heisserer: δ[π]α (= δπα) OGIS, ὧν Tod.

β. back

text irrecoverable.

γ. front. Σιλ

[τᾶς πολυπρόκλητας]
[λιτα]ίσ διαμορφῶσι στάτησα εἰσέπραξε [καὶ]
[το'[ς] Ἑλλάνας ἐλαύξετο[ο] καὶ το[ίς βάμοις δ[ν]-

5 [σ]καφε τῶ Δίως τῶ [Φ]ιλιππᾶ[ίω] καὶ πόλεμον εξε[ν]-
[κ]άμενος πρὸς Ἀλέξανδρον καὶ το[ίς Ἑλλάνας]
[τοίς μὲν πολιταίς παρελόμενος τὰ ὅπλα εξε-

κλάδος ἐκ τῶν πόλιον [πα]νδάμι, ταῖς δ' ἐκ νόμα[ι]-

καί καὶ ταῖς θυγάτερας συλλάβων καὶ ἔρξα[ίς]

10 ἐν τὰ ἀκρόπολις τρισχιλίοις καὶ διακοσίοί[ις]
στάτησα εἰσέπραξε τῶν δὲ πόλιν καὶ τὰ ἱ[ρ][α]-
[διαράξας μετὰ τῶν] [λα]ίστων ἐνέπρησε καὶ[ι]
[σ]υγκατέκαυσε σώματα [τῶν] πολιτῶν καὶ τὸ [τέ]-

15 λεύσανον ἀφικόμενος πρὸς Ἀλέξανδρον κατ[ε]-

ψευδότω καὶ διεβαλλέ τοῖς πολῖταις. κρίνω[ι]
[μ]έν αὐτόν κρύπτων ψάφηγεν ὁμοσαντας περ[ι]-
[θ]ανάτοις α' δὲ καταφαίβοθα θάνατος, ἀντιτ[ι]-
[μασαμ' ε'νω Ἀγανίππῳ τὰς δευτέρας διαφόραις]
[ποίησαντας, τίνα τρό[π]ν] ὃν δεῖ αὐτόν ἀπόθα-

20 νηρ. α' δὲ κακάληθε[ν] το[ς Ἀγανίππῳ τὰ δίκα]
κατάγη τὰ τοῦ οὐν Ἐριδών ἔπει ἤ πρόθη-
27 The city shall take ten advocates [syn-agoroi], who shall swear by Apollo Lykeios that they will perform their advocacy for the city as best they can — —

γ. front. §ii

— — he — — those who had been besieged in the acropolis; and he exacted twenty thousand stater from the citizens; and he committed piracy against the Greeks; and he dug up the altars of Zeus Philippios; and he made war on Alexander and the Greeks, and from the citizens he seized their arms and shut them all out of the city, and he arrested their women and daughters and confined them in the acropolis; and he exacted three thousand two hundred stater; and he looted the city and the sanctuaries with the pirates and set fire to them and burned the bodies of the citizens; and finally he arrived before Alexander and told lies against and slandered the citizens.

15 Men on oath shall try him on a secret ballot for death; and, if he is condemned to death, when Agonippus has made his counter-assessment the second disputation shall be held, on the manner by which he is to be put to death.

20 If, when Agonippus has been convicted in the trial, any one restores any of Agonippus' family or speaks or makes a proposal concerning return or the restoration of possessions, he shall be accursed, both himself and his descendants, and in
Before IG(ἐκλησία), Heisserer.  5–6, 8–9 ungrammatical plurals after τῶν.
other respects he shall be liable to the law against one who destroys the stele about the tyrants and their descendants.

26 A solemn prayer shall be made in the assembly immediately, that it may be well with one who judges and supports the city with a just vote, but with those who cast their vote contrary to justice the opposite of these things.

30 It was judged: eight hundred and eighty-three (voters); of these seven (votes) acquitted, the others condemned.

§iii

33 The people decided.

33 Concerning what is reported by the envoys sent to Alexander, and Alexander sent back his transcript; when there arrived before him the descendants of the former tyrants, Heroidas son of Theticon son of Heraeus and Agesimenes son of Hermesidas, and they offered to Alexander that they were willing to submit to judgment before the people concerning the charges:

41 For good fortune be it resolved by the people: Since ———

γ. side. §iii concluded

——— A solemn prayer shall be made in the assembly immediately, that with one who is just and supports the city and the laws with a just vote it may be well, both with him and with his descendants, but with one who judges contrary to the laws and justice the opposite.

9 The citizens who are judging shall swear: ‘I shall judge the case, as far as it lies within the laws, according to the laws, and in
16 Ηείσερμεν [ποιάς.

[μο]ίς, τὰ δὲ ἄλλα ἐκ [φιλό]-
[π]οιάς ὅς ἄριστα κ[αι]
[δ]ικαὶ(ὁ)τατα' καὶ τιμᾶ-
[σ]ων, αἰ κε κατάγνω, ὑβρ[ω]ς
καὶ δίκαιος, οὖν πο[ήσω

20 ναὶ μὰ Δία καὶ Α[λ]ιον.

§ ἰν

va. Φιλίππων. va.
αἱ μὲν κατὰ τῶν φυγά-
δων κρίσεις αἱ κριθ[ε]ι-
σαι ὑπὸ Ἀλεξάνδρου

25 κύριοι ἐστῶσαν καὶ
[γ]έτωσαι μὲν, ἀγώγιμο[ι]
δὲ μὴ ἐστῶσαν. va.

§ν

πρότασης Μελίδωρος.

30 βασιλεὺς Ἀντέγονος
Ερεσίων τῆς βουλῆς
καὶ τῶν δήμων χαίρειν.
παρεγένοντο πρὸς ἡ-
μᾶς οἱ παρ' ὑμῶν πρ[ε]-
εἰς καὶ διελέγοντ[ο],

φάμενον τῶν δήμων
κομισάμενον τὴν παρ' ἡ-
μῶν ἐπιστολὴν ἢ ἐγρ[ά]-
[ψ]αμεν ὑπὲρ τῶν Ἀγωνί-

40 [π]οιν ὑμῶν ζήφισμα τε π[οι]-
[ήσ]υμεθα, δ' ἀνέγνωσα[ν]
[ἡμᾶ]ν, καὶ αὐτοὺς ἀπε-
[σταλκέναι]. λο[σ][

16 Heisserer misprints [ποιας.

γ. back. §ν concluded

[23]ιπ' Ἀλεξάνδρων ἐν-

§νι

[ε]ν[ω δάμος. περὶ ὧν ἄ βο][λα] προεβόλλε[ν η ἔδο]-
5 [ε]τέδ[ος τα βόλλα, καὶ α][νδ[ρ]ει χειροτομ[-
other respects industriously, as well and as justly as possible; and if I condemn I shall assess rightly and justly. I shall do this, by Zeus and Sun.'

§iv

21 Of Philip.
22 The trials of the exiles tried by Alexander shall be valid; and those whom he condemned to death shall be exiled but shall not be liable to seizure.

§v

29 Prytanis Melidorus.
30 King Antigonus to the council and people of Eresus, greetings.
33 The envoys from you came before us and made speeches, saying that the people had received from us the letter which we wrote about the sons of Agonippus and had passed a decree, which they read to us, and had sent them — — —

γ. back. §v concluded
— — — people — — — you encounter Alexander (?) — — —
Farewell.

§vi

4 The people decided.
4 Concerning the matters about which the council made a preliminary consultation [proboleuma], or
It will be convenient to set out in one place an outline of the manoeuvring of the Aegean and Asiatic Greeks between the Macedonians and the Persians in the 330s, with which several of our texts are connected.

Philip's advance forces against the Persians were sent out in 336 (D.S. xvi. 91. ii),...
the council made a resolution or a revised resolution, and the men who have been elected produce all that has been written against the tyrants, both those who lived in the city and their descendants, and convey the documents to the assembly:

9 Since previously also King Alexander sent back a transcript and ordered the Eresians to hold a trial concerning Agonippus and Eurysilaus, as to what should be done to them; and the people heard the transcript and set up a law-court in accordance with the laws, which sentenced Agonippus and Eurysilaus to death, and that their descendants should be liable to the law on the stele, and their belongings should be sold in accordance with the law;

18 And when Alexander sent a letter also about the family of Apollodorus and his brothers Hermon and Heraeus, who were previously tyrants over the city, and their descendants, that the people should decide whether it resolved that they should journey back or not; and the people heard the transcript and convened a law-court for them in accordance with the law and the transcript of Alexander, which decided after speeches had been made on both sides that the law against the tyrants should be valid and that they should be exiled from the city;

28 Be it resolved by the people: That there shall be valid against the tyrants, both those who lived in the city and their descendants, the law against the tyrants that is written on the old stele and the transcripts of the kings against them and the decrees previously written by our ancestors and the votes against the tyrants.

35 If contrary to this any of the tyrants, either those who lived in the city or their descendants, is caught setting foot on the land of Eresus --- the people shall deliberate and ---

and it appears that the cities of Lesbos, including Eresus, were among those which they won over (cf. below); Chios was probably won over too (cf. on 84). In 335 Memnon of Rhodes campaigned successfully on behalf of the Persians (D.S. xvii. 7): the off-shore islands probably went over to him then, but transferred their allegiance to Alexander
in 334 (here perhaps belong the two inscriptions concerning Chios, 84, and at any rate the first from Mytilene, 85, A). In 334 after his victory at the Granicus Alexander took over the cities on the Aegean coast of the mainland (Arr. Anab. i. 17–23, D.S. xvn. 22–7; for Priene see 86).1

In 333 as Alexander went eastwards through Asia Minor the Persians campaigned in his rear: Chios was betrayed to Memnon; when the other cities of Lesbos went over to him, Mytilene did not; he began a siege, and after his death it made overtures to his nephew PHarnabazus, agreeing to become ‘an ally of Darius in accordance with the peace made in the time of Antalcidas’, but the Persians installed a garrison and a ‘tyrant’ (on the use of this term see the cautionary note in the commentary on 76); Tenedos is mentioned as another island taken over by the Persians (Arr. Anab. ii. 1–2, D.S. xvii. 29). The Persians gained cities on the mainland also, no doubt including Priene. PHarnabazus and his colleague Autophradates installed a garrison in Chios, and when they heard of Alexander’s victory at Issus they were afraid that it might revolt (Arr. Anab. ii. 13. iv–vi, Curt. iv. i. 34–7). Probably about the same time the Athenian Chares, operating as a freelance mercenary commander (cf. Polyaein. v. 44. iii), was installed in Mytilene with a force of two thousand Persians. In 332, however, Hegelochus recovered for Alexander what had been lost to the Persians; in Chios he was invited by the demos despite the Persian garrison, and the leaders of the revolt were arrested and sent to Alexander; and Mytilene (after a siege) and the other cities of Lesbos were among those which he recovered (Arr. Anab. iii. 2. iii–vii, Curt. iv. v. 14–22: the second inscription from Mytilene, 85, B, will belong here if not earlier). The coastal cities of the mainland will have been recovered too (for Priene cf. 85, B; and Antigonus the One-Eyed (Monophthalmos) as satrap of Phrygia (Arr. Anab. i. 29. iii) began a long and difficult campaign in the interior of Asia Minor.

Earlier interpretations of this dossier, based on the assumption that β and γ were the upper and lower parts of a single stele, have been rendered obsolete by Heisserer’s work, which changes the order in which the fragments are to be read. To reconstruct the sequence of events it is best to begin by working backwards. Eury silaus and Agonippus, whose cases are separate but parallel, were ‘tyrants’, and were overthrown and were condemned to death by local courts, in the reign of Alexander (i. 15–16, ii. 5–6, 13–15, cf. §VI); they had demolished, but evidently had not destroyed, a ‘stèle about the tyrants and their descendants’ (ii. 24–6), which is presumably to be identified with ‘the law against the tyrants that is written on the old stèle’ (vi. 32–3); this is the lost stèle α postulated by Heisserer. On another occasion men were condemned to exile by Alexander (§IV). Before the tyranny of Eury silaus and Agonippus there had been a tyranny

1 That the offshore islands went over to Philip’s forces in 336 and were recovered by Memnon in 335 has been doubted by some (e.g. Bosworth, Comm. Arr. Anab., i. 175; K. Rosen, Gnomon liv 1982, 353–62, reviewing Heisserer; contr. Labarre), but in the light of D.S. xvn. 7, if this need not be excluded from a campaign on which we have little evidence. The most credible reconstruction which does exclude it is that of Lott, who suggests that the first tyranny in Eresus came to power c.338, was accepted or even supported by Philip, set up the altars to Zeus Philippios, and survived until Alexander took over western Asia Minor in 334. Lott, 32, wishes, perhaps mistakenly, to press the wording in [Dem.] xvn. Treaty with Alexander and concludes that Anissa and Eresus with their tyrants were included in the common peace treaty in 338/7.
of Apollodorus and his brothers (vi. 18—21), men old enough for it to be their grandsons who in 324/3 (cf. below) appealed to Alexander for reinstatement (iii. 35—40).

We should follow Heisserer in making Apollodorus and his brothers tyrants in the reign of Philip (after the Social War of 356—355, for which see on 48, had weakened Athens' hold on the Aegean). They will have been overthrown, and Eresus will have been admitted to the League of Corinth and will have instituted a cult of Zeus Philippios (cf. ii. 4—5), on the arrival of Parmenio and Attalus in 336 (cf. the setting-up of a statue of Philip in the temple of Artemis at Ephesus: Arr. Anab. i. 17. xi). They will have been reinstated by Memnon in 335; but overthrown again, and exiled on the orders of Alexander, in 334 (cf. Chios: 84. A. 10—15). In 333 Memnon did not restore them again but installed Eury silicaus and Agonippus: they demolished the altars of Zeus Philippios; for their exaction of money (i. 7—9, ii. 10—11) cf. Diogenes in Mytilene (Arr. Anab. i. 2. iv), for their use of pirates (i. 9—14, ii. 11—13) cf. Aristonicus of Methymna (Arr. Anab. ii. 2. iv), and for the demolition of a stele (ii. 24—6) cf. Mytilene (Arr. Anab. ii. 1. iv). They will have been overthrown and condemned to death in 332 (§§i, ii), for the use of local courts see Arr. Anab. iii. 2. vii. Heisserer notes that [Dem.] xvii. 7 refer to Alexander's expulsion of tyrants from both neighbouring Antissa and Eresus, and suggests that there was some kind of sympoliteia between the two cities, that the tyrants ruled both, and that this explains why there was a plurality of altars to Zeus Philippios (one in each city — but in §ii Agonippus is said to have dug up plural altars) and why there are separate documents concerning Eury silicaus and Agonippus (§§ii and i). The cause of Alexander is identified with the cause of the Greeks, so that (Eury silicaus and) Agonippus can be said to have 'committed piracy against the Greeks' and to have 'made war on Alexander and the Greeks' (ii. 3—6).

It will have been in 324/3, after Alexander had issued his order for the return of exiles, with certain exceptions, to the Greek states (D.S. xvii. 108. i; cf. 101) that the grandsons of the first tyrants (Agesimenes is perhaps a grandson of Apollodorus or Hermon) appealed to Alexander to be reinstated in Eresus and offered to stand trial: they will have been among the men defending themselves mentioned in D.S. xvii. 113. Alexander decided that they should be tried in Eresus (§iii), and they were not allowed to return (vi. 18—28). In 319 a further order for the return of exiles was issued in the name of Alexander's half-brother, Philip Arrhidaeus (D.S. xviii. 55—6), and they tried to take advantage of that; but the response was that the sentence of exile passed on them was to remain in force but they were no longer to be liable to seizure (§iv). Finally, after 306 (since in §v he uses the title king, which he adopted in that year), the sons of Eury silicaus and Agonippus made an appeal to Antigonus: his first letter to Eresus elicited a response, and in §v we have the beginning and the end of his reply to that. In §vi we have the final decree of the city of Eresus, which refers to both sets of tyrants, to the episode of 324/3 and to 'the transcripts of the kings', and decides to uphold the earlier sentences. In §vi. 4—5 'the council made a resolution or a revised resolution' is striking: the verb for changing one's mind (metadokeirien) occurs a few times in the literature of the classical period, but this is the only epigraphic instance of it known to us: we cannot tell whether its use here reflects a general desire to cover all possibilities or consciousness of some particular revised resolution which was relevant here.
While it is possible, if Heisserer is right to suppose that both Antissa and Eresus are involved, that 2,300 staters were exacted from one city (i. 8–9) but 3,200 from the other (ii. 10–11), it is also possible that the same sum is being alluded to in both documents and that one document is wrong. We use ‘transcript’ as the direct Latinate equivalent of the Greek diapraphe (i. 17 etc.), for responses by Alexander and his successors (cf. restoration in 85. 20, 29); in the Roman empire a response by an emperor was to be called a rescriptum (e.g. Tac. Ann. vi. 9), so that scholars often use ‘rescript’ here; C. B. Welles, AJA xliii 1938, 254–60, interprets diapraphe and diagramma 101 as polite terms for ‘ordinance’. The procedure in §§i and ii is similar to but not identical with the Athenian procedure in an agon timetos; in Athens the first vote was on the guilt or innocence of the accused, for the second the prosecutor and defendant proposed alternative penalties, between which the jury had to choose; here the death penalty has already been prescribed, and the second vote concerns only the manner of execution. The secret ballot for the substantive decisions (i. 16, ii. 16; contr. i. 24–5) may or may not reflect normal local practice; here it will presumably have been intended to protect minority voters against intimidation (it is not clear even in §i whether this had been demanded by Alexander); for ballot on the question of guilt or innocence followed by show of hands on penalty, cf. a case in the Athenian council, [Dem] xlvii. Ev. & Mnes. 42–3. Abuse of citizens’ wives and daughters (i. 3–9, ii. 8–11) is a crime with which tyrants are often charged (e.g. Periander of Corinth, Her. v. 92. η. i–iv); the allegation here is specific enough to seem authentic, but it will also have served to authenticate this régime as a tyranny.

On Apollo Lykeios (i. 30–1) see M. H. Jameson, Ἀρχαίοι Νεωσία i 1980, 213–36, esp. 223–35: Lykeios is probably derived from lykos (‘wolf’); the cult is thought to

Alexander the Great and Chios, 334

A stele found at Ververato, south-west of Chios town, now in the museum at Chios. Phot. Heisserer, Alexander, frontisp., 82 pi. 8.
Attic koine with some East Ionic orthography, omitting iota adscript in l. 10, using o for oe in l. 16; ending each line with the end of a word or syllable.

\[\begin{align*}
\text{ἐπὶ} & \text{ Δεισιθέου πρυτάνεως. παρὰ βασιλέως Ἀλε[ξάνδρ]ον Χίων τῷ] \\
\text{δήμων.} & \text{vacat} \\
\text{τοὺς φυγάδας τοὺς ἐκ Χίου κατείναι πάντας, πολέτουμα δ’ ε[?]υ[?] -} \\
\end{align*}\]

3 δ’ ε[?]υ[?] - apparently intended by Heisserer (after W. G. Forrest), cf. his photograph; δ’ [ε?] - printed by Heisserer, δ’ [ε?] - previous editors.
have spread from the Peloponnese (Apollo Lykeios was the chief god of Argos). For an entrenchment clause combined with a curse (ii. 20—6) cf. 54, 79. Solemn prayers before a meeting, like those mentioned in ii. 26—9, iii. 0—9, must have been frequent in practice and are sometimes mentioned (cf. the parody in Ar. *Thesm.* 295—351). For the oath to be sworn by jurors (iii. 9—20) compare the Athenian jurors’ oath, quoted by Dem. xxiv. *Tim.* 149—51; I. *Cret.* iv 51 (Gortyn, early C5; [Zeus], Apollo, Athena, and Hermes); for oaths sworn by Zeus and Sun cf. 50, 53, 76. We have a small number of texts which give voting figures for an assembly or law-court: often, as here (ii. 30—2), when the vote is not unanimous it is nearly so (cf. Rhodes with Lewis, 14, 59, 510—12, 531). In their procedural language the cities of Lesbos are further than many from the pattern which began in Athens and became widespread (e.g. ii. 33, vi. 4, but vi. 28 is in the Athenian manner), but the same procedure, including *proboleusis* by a council (vi. 4), lies behind the language.

Aristotle’s successor Theophrastus came from Eresus, and he and his compatriot Phanias are said to have freed Eresus from tyrants (e.g. Plut. *Non Posse* 1097 b, *Adv. Col.* 1126 f: ‘twice’ in the latter passage); these and other texts are discussed by Heisserer, 73–7, with a new interpretation of Diog. Laert. v. 37. Heisserer suggests that they need not have been present in Eresus and directly involved, but that they may have made approaches to Alexander in the 330's and in 324/3.

Lesbian features of the language include accusatives in -ας and -ους (e.g. β. *side.* 3–5); doubled consonants as in κρόναί (β. *side.* 15), δ'ππως (β. *side.* 32–3), κατεδίκασσαν (γ. *front.* 31–2), φάφεγγι for ψηφίσο (e.g. β. *side.* 16); δεῦε for δεῖ (e.g. β. *side.* 26); βαθοεῖν for βοηθεῖν (e.g. γ. *side.* 2–3).

---

1. From King Alexander to the people of Chios.
2. All the exiles from Chios shall return, and the constitution in Chios
Four fragments of a stele, found in the nineteenth century in and near the church of Hag. Nikolaos at Tourlotti in Chios town, of which a (top right) and b (bottom left) survive and are now in the museum at Chios but c and d (bottom centre and right) have been lost. Phot. a, b *Klio* 1969, 206; Heisserer, 102 pl. 9, 105 pl. 10.

East Ionic dialect, but with some koine forms; *stichedon*, restored 28 Forrest, Heisserer (but misprinted as 20 Heisserer, 101); 31 Wilhelm, Piejko.


The restoration is speculative (we follow Forrest as modified by Heisserer), and in particular the exact relationship of a (ll. 1–18) and b–d (ll. 19–29) is uncertain. The problem of greatest importance for the interpretation of the text is whether Alcimachus is to be prevented from doing something to somebody else (Vlastos, Lenschau, Heisserer) or others are to be prevented from doing something to him (Wilhelm, Forrest, Piejko; cf. Bosworth).

2–3 ἀρεστὰ π[αρ] ἀλαμβάνειν παρ’ αὐτῶν and other possibilities suggested Forrest.
shall be a democracy. Law-writers [*nomographoi*] shall be elected, who shall write and correct the laws, so that nothing shall be contrary to the democracy or to the return of the exiles; what is corrected or written shall be referred to Alexander.

8 The Chians shall provide twenty manned triremes at their own expense, and these shall sail as long as the rest of the Greek fleet sails with us.

10 Of those who betrayed the city to the barbarians, those who have already left shall be exiled from all the cities sharing in the peace, and shall be liable to seizure in accordance with the resolution of the Greeks; those who have been left inside shall be taken and tried by the council [*synedron*] of the Greeks. If there is any dispute between those who have returned and those in the city, in connection with this they shall be tried before us.

17 Until the Chians are reconciled, there shall be a garrison among them from King Alexander, as large as is sufficient; this shall be maintained by the Chians.

---

**B**

3 Those who do not provide guarantors for the penalties which the people fix, let the authority guard them bound with fetters. If any of them runs away, the *archontes* shall pay the fines.

8 None of the other Chians shall be brought to justice on a charge of
For the general context see on 83. We first read of Chios in the literary sources when it was betrayed to Memnon in 333 (Arr. Anab. ii. 1. i, D.S. xvii. 29, ii); Pharnabazus and Autophradates installed a garrison there (Arr. Anab. ii. 13. iv–vi, Curt. iv. i. 34–7); but in 332 Alexander’s commander Hegelochus was invited by the demos, and the leaders of the revolt were arrested and sent to Alexander (Arr. Anab. iii. 2. iii–vii, Curt. iv. v. 14–17). Earlier editors therefore dated \( A \) to 332; but it is probable that Chios like other cities was won over by Philip’s forces in 336, changed its allegiance to Memnon in 335 and then changed to Alexander in 334, and Heisserer has shown that \( A \) fits the context of 334 better. In particular, in \( A \) the anti-Macedonian leaders are to be tried by the symdrion of the Greeks, whereas those of 332 were sent to Alexander; and in \( A \) the Chians are to supply twenty triremes ‘as long as the rest of the Greek fleet sails with us’, but Alexander dismissed his Greek fleet in 334 before the siege of Halicarnassus (Arr. Anab. i. 20. i cf. 18. vi–ix, D.S. xvii. 22. v–23. i). It could hardly have been predicted that Alexander would dismiss his fleet so soon, but if he was already thinking of conquering not just Asia Minor but the heart of the Persian empire he would realise that he could not take the fleet with him so far. Prescribing a democratic constitution
barbarism, nor any of the resident foreigners [\textit{paroikoi}: Heisserer's alternative restoration would mean 'apart from the traitors'] (or similar word).

Neither let Alcimachus prosecute (?) ———, since he has given evidence that he did not go out voluntarily to the barbarians: he is a friend of mine and was enthusiastic for the mass of you [alternative restorations have essentially the same meaning]; for he tried to restore the exiles and to free your city from the oligarchy which had previously been established among you by the barbarians. I therefore ask you, in return for the good that he did on behalf of the people and for his cooperation in the struggle concerning you, that the city should invalidate what was voted against his father, and give back to him first of those who have come [sc. back from exile] what it took away, and honour him and his friends and trust him as a man loyal to the city.

By doing these things you will gratify me, and if you were to request anything from me I should be more enthusiastic towards you.

and arranging for the revision of the laws matches the prescription of democratic constitutions and a restoration of laws (the latter probably more symbolic than real) in mainland Asia Minor in 334 (\textit{Arr. Anab.} i. 17. x, 18. ii: notice that \textit{B.} 17–19 describes the previous régime as an oligarchy imposed on Chios by the barbarians).

In \textit{A} the future of Chios has been referred to Alexander, and his response is strongly interventionist: he prescribes that exiles are to return, the constitution is to be a democracy (for the change of constitution cf. on 87), changes in the laws are to be submitted for his approval, and Chios must both provide ships for his fleet and receive and pay for a garrison. Beyond that, the significance of \textit{A} lies in the reference to the \textit{synedrion} of the Greeks: this is our clearest evidence that Chios, and presumably the other island states, became members of the League of Corinth. There is no reason to think that they joined the League at its foundation (\textit{pace} A. B. Bosworth, \textit{Comm. Arr. Anab.} i. 178; and in Settis (ed.), \textit{I Greci}, ii. iii, 63 with n. 57), but it is likely enough that they were won over by Philip's forces and joined in 336. On the other hand, it is probable that the Greek states of the Asiatic mainland were not incorporated into the League. See on 76, 78, 86.
$B$ is a letter to the Chians from a powerful ruler, presumably Alexander. It is dangerous to assume that any reference to a common name must be to a well-known bearer of that name; but there is a well-known Alcimachus, probably the man who was honoured in Athens after Chaeronea (cf. Hyp. fr. 77Jensen = Kenyon; IG ii² 239 = Schwenk 4), whom Alexander sent to the Aeolian and Ionian cities in 334 after he had gained the allegiance of Sardis and Ephesus (Arr. Anab. i. 18. i–ii), but about whom no more is heard afterwards (cf. Berge, Das Alexanderreich, ii. 23 no. 47); it is possible that he is the Alcimachus of l. 10, and that he is to be prevented from doing something to somebody else (though in that case Alexander will be using the Chians to control one of his own officers). Heisserer accepts that possibility—but, even if he is wrong on that point and the Alcimachus of $B$ is an otherwise unknown man who has supported Alexander and is to be protected against ill treatment, the rest of Heisserer’s interpretation can stand. $B$ is in any case best located in the aftermath of

85

Reconciliation in Mytilene, 334 and after

$A$

A stele found on the floor of a building of the third century A.D. in Mytilene; now in the Archaeological Museum there. Phot. $AD$ xxix 1973/4, 8, pl. 644 a, $ZE$ biii 1986, Taf. II. A, III. A.

Aeolic dialect with Ionic lettering, stelechosis 35, with horizontal (double) and vertical guidelines.


A small fragment, 16 xu. ii 8, may be part of the same stone or an associated stone: see Heisserer, Alexander, 140–1; Heisserer & Hodot, $ZE$ biii 1986, 115–16 (SEG xxxvi 750).

\[\text{[\epsilon]υ\nuo βόλλα καὶ δάμος. περὶ τῶν ῥής L[ ]}\]
\[\text{[ε]ἰσαγησται ὅσ κεν οἱ πόλειαι οἴκει[εν τὰς π.]}\]
\[\text{[δὲ]ν εἶ διαμερισταὶ τὸμ πάντα χρόνον [ἐχον]}\]
\[\text{[τ]ίς πρὸς ἀλλάλους ὅσ εὐνοώτατα: τόχαι ὅγ[άθ]}\]
\[5 \text{αι, εὐξασθη} μὲν τὰμ βόλλαν καὶ τὸν δάμον ἡ[α]\]
\[\text{ίς Θέοις τοῖς Δυναστείᾳ καὶ τῶν Διῶ τῶν Η-
\text{ραῖων καὶ Βασίλειας καὶ Ὁμονοιαὶ καὶ τῶν Ὀμο-
\text{νοιαὶ καὶ Δίκαιαι καὶ Επιτελεῖας τῶν Ἀγάθων,}
\text{ἀž κε συνενέκε τῶν δάμων τῶν Μυτιληνῶν τῆ-
\text{ά δὲξαντα, θυσίας καὶ πρόσοδοι πούσσασθαι τῆ-
\text{ελεομένων τῶν Ἀγάθων καὶ ἵπτι καὶ καὶ τῶν δάμω-
\text{φαινήται. ταίσα μὲν ἡρξασθὲν ἀγάθως δὲ τόχαι
\text{τῶν δάμων τῶν Μυτιληνῶν}, εὐξασθη} μὲν τοῖς βόλλα\]

1 Perhaps [πιμάνου]; [o] [Πρότασθαν] Hodot, Le Dialecte Æoliens d’Arie, 202, but that seems incompatible with the photographs.
A: tension has arisen between supporters of the pro-Persian leaders (themselves now in exile or sent to the Greek synedrion) and the returned exiles; some of the former have been tried on charges of 'barbarism' (equivalent to the more familiar 'medism': the cognate verb is used in X. H. v. ii. 35), and Alexander is trying to limit the vengeance of the returned exiles, and in particular to prevent the prosecution of one friend of his; either Alexander's general Alcimachus has been supporting the prosecutions or the friend of Alexander is a Chian called Alcimachus. Compare what happened in Ephesus in 334 (Arr. Anab. i. 17. ix–xii).

For problems which could arise from the return of exiles cf. in general 39, 85, 101; and on how states dealt with the rival claims to property of former owners who had been exiled and new owners who had bought the property in good faith R. Lonis in Goukowsky & Brixhe (edd.), Hellēnικα Συνμικτα, 91–109: in this case Alexander's friend is to have priority in the restoration of his property.

A

The council and people decided.

2 Concerning what the —— have introduced: So that the citizens may live in the city in democracy for all time, having the greatest possible good will towards one another:

4 For good fortune, the council and the people shall vow to the twelve Gods and to Zeus Heraios and to Queen and Homonoios and Agreement and Justice and Fulfilment of Good Things, if what is resolved benefits the people of Mytilene, to hold a sacrifice and procession when the good things are being fulfilled, in whatever way the people resolve.

12 Vow this; and for the good fortune of the people of Mytilene, be it decreed by the council and people:
Two joining fragments of a stele, found at Mytilene, now in the Archaeological Museum there. Phot. EAC v 1976, pl. IV, a–b; Heisserer, Alexander, 120 pl. 13. ZPE 1986, Taf. II, B, III, B.

Aeolic dialect with Ionic lettering; stechedon 49–52, with horizontal (double) and vertical (double at the right-hand margin) guidelines.


The details are uncertain, and many restorations are speculative, but the general sense is clear enough. Earlier editors largely repeated the restorations of Dittenberger in OGIS; we generally follow Heisserer & Hodot (who make their more tentative suggestions only in their commentary), without listing all the differences between their restorations and earlier restorations.

[τῶν κατεληθόθον]ν τῶν μὴ ἐμεί[νεν ἐν ταῖς διαλα[κε]οται τα[υτίας,]
[ποὶ πληκτοὶ ἀποκυκλοῦσα]ς ἐκέχεα πάρ τάσι πόλις κτ[ήματος μηδὲνος, μή[δε θέτο]—

5 [εἰς]τόὶ[ν] ἐπὶ μὴ[ν] δεν τοῖς παρεχώρησαν αὐτοῖς οἱ ἐν ταῖς πόλις πρό[θε]
[ἔοντος. οἱ δὲ τέ[ις] παρεχώρησαν τὰ[κτήματα οἱ παρεχώρησαν τὰ [κτήματα]
[ὅς μὴ συναλλαγμένος τῶν κατεληθόθοντος, καὶ οἱ βασιλεῖς προστίθε]

10 θεόν τῶν ἐν τῷ τῶ]πολί πρόσθε[έοντος ὁς τέχνην τεχναμεῖν τῶ κα-
[τεληθόθοντος, μὴ]’ αἱ καὶ τίς δίκαιον γράφθαι περὶ τοῦ]ν[τον, μὴ εἰσά-
[γεγραμμένον τοῖς] διακατοπτο τοῖς μὴ]’[άρχα μηδένει.

5 Πεπιθέλεσθαι δὲ] τοὺς στροτάγοις καὶ τοῖς βασιλεῖς καὶ τοῖς πε-
[ριθρομοίς καὶ] τῶς δικασκόποις καὶ ταῖς [Ἀλλα]ς ἀρχαῖς, αἱ κα

[τῶν ἀθέτευτος τι τῶν ἐν τῶν ψαφαίματι γεγραμμένον, ὃς μὴ μηδέ
[ἐν ο] ντέοις πρόσθε[έοντος ἀλλὰ ὁμόνων καὶ διαλε[λύμενοι πάντες πρὸς ἀλ-
[λάδοις πολιτεύωντο ἀνεπιβολλεῖς] ὅτως καὶ ἐμμένους ἐν ταῖς ἀ—

The details are uncertain, and many restorations are speculative, but the general sense is clear enough. Earlier editors largely repeated the restorations of Dittenberger in OGIS; we generally follow Heisserer & Hodot (who make their more tentative suggestions only in their commentary), without listing all the differences between their restorations and earlier restorations.
14 If any one has been exiled from the city or killed after a lawsuit has been held in accordance with the law, the law shall be applied. If in any other way any of the Mytilenaecans or those living in Mytilene should, in the prytany of Ditas son of Saonymus, have been deprived of his rights and exiled from the city or killed, [? those owing money to any of these— — —

---and the basileis favour the man who has returned on the grounds that the man who was previously in the city was guilty of craft. If any of those who have returned does not abide by this settlement, let him no longer recover (?) from the city any possession, nor enter on any of the possessions made over to him by those who were previously in the city; but let those who made over these possessions, from those who were previously in the city, enter on them, and let the strategoi transfer the possessions again to the man who was previously in the city on the grounds that the man who returned has not been reconciled, and let the basileis favour the man who was previously in the city on the grounds that the man who returned has been guilty of craft. If any one brings a lawsuit concerning these matters, let it not be introduced by the peridromoi or the dikaskopoi or any other authority.

13 The strategoi and the basileis and the peridromoi and the dikaskopoi and the other authorities shall take care (?), if all the things are not done as has been written in the decree, to condemn the man who set at naught any of the things written in the decree, so that there shall be nothing/nobody — — — with regard to those who were previously in the city, but they may all be citizens with one another in a state of agreement and settle-
For the general context see on 83. Mytilene like other island states probably gave its allegiance to Philip’s advance forces in 336, to Memnon in 335, and to Alexander in 334. We first read of it in the literary sources when it refused to go over to Memnon in 333 and was besieged by him, but after his death it made overtures to Pharnabazus,
The people shall elect twenty arbitrators, ten from those who have returned and ten from those previously in the city. Let these guard zealously (?) and take care that there shall be nothing contrary for those who have returned and those who were previously in the city, on either side, and concerning the possessions disputed by those who have returned (?), both with those in the city and with one another, that everything shall be settled, or, if not, they shall be as just as possible, and all shall abide by the settlement which the king adjudged in the transcript, and live in the city and the territory in agreement with one another.

And concerning money, that it is to be available for implementing the settlement as far as possible, and concerning the oath which the citizens are to swear, concerning all of these whatever they agree with one another the men elected shall bring before the people, and the people shall hear it and if it appears beneficial let them deliberate: if — — what they agree with one another to be beneficial, there shall be valid also for those (?) who returned in the prytany of Smithinas whatever was voted for the others (?).

If there is anything lacking in the decree, concerning this the judgment shall rest with the council.

When the decree has been ratified by the people, the people shall pray on the twentieth of the month Maimakter (?) to all the gods that the settlement shall be for the salvation and happiness of all the citizens for those who have returned — — and for those in the city. All the publicly appointed priests and priestesses shall open the temples and the people shall come together for prayer. The rites which the people vowed when they sent out the messengers to the king shall be rendered by the basileis — —. There shall be present at the sacrifice the arbitrators and the messengers sent to the king both by those in the city and by those who returned.

This decree shall be written up by the treasurers on a stone stele and placed in the sanctuary — —

agreeing to become ‘an ally of Darius in accordance with the peace made in the time of Antalcidas’, but the Persians installed a garrison under Lycomedes of Rhodes and made a restored exile, Diogenes, ‘tyrant’ (Arr. Anab. ii. 1, D.S. xvii. 29. ii: the reference to the peace of Antalcidas presumably guaranteed that Mytilene as an island state
was to be an ally and not a subject). The Athenian Chares, who had been operating as a freelance mercenary commander (cf. Polyaen. v. 44. iii), was perhaps won over by Memnon, and after this he was installed in Mytilene with a force of two thousand Persians; but in 332 Mytilene was one of the states recovered for Alexander by Hegelochus (Arr. Anab. iii. 2. vi–vii, Curt. iv. v. 22).

Heisserer & Hodot, noticing the emphasis on democracy and the attempt to achieve reconciliation rather than vengeance, compare Chios (84. A) and Ephesus (Arr. Anab. i. 17. x cf. 18. x) and associate A with the events of the 330s. B has been associated by many editors, from Boeckh (CIG 2166) onwards, with Alexander's order for the restoration of Greek exiles in 324 (cf. on 101); but before the discovery of A a date in the 330s had been preferred by C. B. Welles (A742 xliv 1938, 258 n. 4) and others, most recently by Heisserer. There is ample evidence in the literary sources for upheavals in Mytilene in the 330s; and the discovery of A strengthens the case for an early date for B. Heisserer originally proposed dating B to 332 (cf. Worthington); Heisserer & Hodot do not offer a specific date for either text, but think that A and B belong either to the same year or to consecutive years. The emphasis on democracy in A points to 334 as the most likely date for that; B could belong either to a later stage in the settlement of 334 or to the settlement of 332. The restoration of exiles would inevitably lead to rival claims to property, from those in possession of it before they went into exile and from those who had acquired it thereafter (see Lonis, 98–9; cf. 39, 84, 101; in 322/1 when Athens changed from democracy to oligarchy those who remained citizens were allowed to retain their property [D.S. xviii. 18. v]).

---

86

Alexander the Great and Priene, 334 and after

The first two texts from a series inscribed on one anta and the adjoining wall of the pronaos of the temple of Athena Polias at Priene: these two were at the top of the front of the anta. Now in the British Museum (apart from a fragment containing part of B, 4–5, which is in the Antikensammlung, Staatliche Museen, Berlin, and the fragment containing B. 17–22, which is in situ at Priene). Phot. I. Priene 156 (A), 1 (B. 1–10); Heisserer, Alexander, 143 pl. 14 (A), 147–53 pls. 15–24 (B. 1–16); Chron. xxxvi 1966, 241 pl. 4 (B. 17–22). Facs. Heisserer, 145 fig. 7 (B. 1–10).


A

Koine with Athena's name left in East Ionic form; inscribed in letters 0.052–0.057 m. (= 2–2 1/4 in.) high, ending each line with the end of a word.


βασιλεύς Αλέξανδρος
ἀνέθηκε τὸν ναόν
Αθηναίη Πολιάδι.
The divinities to whom the vow is made in A conclude with a remarkable set of personifications; as for the beginning of the list, we have no other evidence for Zeus Heraios or for Queen (Basile) on Lesbos; Zeus 'of Agreement' (Homonoios) appears in an inscription of Assus (facing Lesbos on the mainland) of the Augustan period (IK Assos 15.2), and Homonoia is an epithet of Artemis in a dedication at Mytilene (IG xii. ii 108), but there is no certain evidence for a cult of Homonoia earlier than the last third of the fourth century (G. Theriault, LEC bxv 1996, 127–50, discussing this inscription 145–7; cf. Thériault's Le Culte d'Homonoia, 19–20). Fulfilment of Good Things, included apparently in an attempt to avoid any impediment to fulfilment, is discussed by E. Voutyras in Christides & Jordan (edd.), γλῶσσα καὶ μαγεία, 94–103 (cf. SEG xlvii 2354): the closest parallel (but without personification) is a late-fourth-century inscription of Colophon, AJPlvi 1935, 358–72 no. 1. In B a remarkable act of corporate prayer is prescribed (which by the time l. 46 is reached has come to involve a sacrifice); for discussion of what this may have meant see Pulleyn, Prayer in Greek Religion, 173–8, citing Thuc. vi. 32. i–ii, D.S. xx. 50. vi and other texts.

The prytanis by whom Mytilene dates was presumably an annual official; of the other officials mentioned in B the basileis ('kings': e.g. IG xii. ii 18. 10) and the strategoi (e.g. 15.13) recur elsewhere, but we have no other evidence for the peridromoi ('runners around') or the dikaskopoii ('considerers of justice').

In addition to the linguistic features noted on 83, notice ἄνω for ἄπο [e.g. A. 15], στράτηγοι for στρατηγοί (B. 7).

A

King Alexander dedicated the temple to Athena Polias.
Priene, north of Miletus on the Asiatic mainland (see maps in Heisserer, 159; *Barrington Atlas*, 61 with inset), is not mentioned by the literary sources for Alexander's campaign in Asia Minor, but he is likely to have visited it in 334 between his arrival in Ephesus and his attack on Miletus (*Air. Anab.* 1.18. ii–iii). The city of Priene was left inland by the silting-up of the Maeander (cf. Str. 579. 5n. viii. 17): the nineteenth-century German excavators, finding nothing pre-hellenistic, supposed that the city was founded on a new site about the third quarter of the fourth century, and there have been various attempts to date the refoundation (see e.g. Hornblower, *Mausolus*, 323–30; Sherwin-White, 88–9); Demand has argued that the excavated site was after all the original site and there was no refoundation (cf. her *Urban Relocation*, 140–6); Botermann, noting that the excavated city was laid
Of King Alexander.

Of those living in Naulochum, as many as are Prienians shall be autonomous and free, holding all their land and houses in the city and the countryside like the Prienians themselves.

And the land of the Myrseloi and the Pedieis, and the countryside around, I determine to be mine, and those living in these villages shall pay the tribute [phoroi]; but I exempt the city of Priene from the contribution [syntaxis], and I allow you to introduce the garrison into the acropolis (?).

Out on a regular grid, suggests that there was a refoundation, but on the original site (cf. below). See J. J. Coulton, CAH^2, plates v–vi, 77–8 no. 81 (on the city, accepting a refoundation), 68–9 no. 73 (on the temple).

Sherwin-White emphasizes that these two texts are the first two from a large dossier of documents, ranging from the time of Alexander to the late second century. A was inscribed first, presumably not long after Alexander’s offer to dedicate the temple was accepted or the part on which the text is inscribed was completed. B, she argues, was inscribed not in the time of Alexander but in the time of Lysimachus, together with the documents inscribed below it which refer to events of 287/6; it may be an extract, chosen as suitable for inscription in the 280s, from a longer document, which would explain its abruptness.
We cannot be sure how far the building of the temple had advanced in 334: the most that we can infer from A is that when Alexander’s offer to dedicate the temple was made (perhaps, but not necessarily, in 334) the temple had recently been built or was currently being built. Pythius, the architect of the temple, was architect also of the Mausoleum at Halicarnassus (Vitruv. i. i. 12 with vii. praef. 12). Botermann sees this temple as a sequel to the Mausoleum and to the temple of Zeus at Labraunda, and suggests that the Hecatomnids provided the original initiative and finance for the refoundation of Priene and that after an interruption Alexander enabled the work to be continued. The completion of the temple is referred to (though the whole project had not yet been completed) in I. Priene 3 (dated 296/5 by Growther, who argues that the phrase Προφέων αὐτονόμων ἔντον, ‘the Prienians being autonomous’, which appears in that text was used not only after Priene’s liberation from the Persians but again after a period of tyranny). The cult statue was particularly admired (Paus. vii. 5. v).

This boldly inscribed dedicatory inscription follows a precedent set by the Hecatomnids at Labraunda (Labraunda, iii. 13–19; the temple of Zeus, dedicated by Idrieus, 16). The Prienians’ allowing Alexander to dedicate their temple may be contrasted with what we are told about the Artemisium at Ephesus: Alexander instructed the Ephesians to pay to Artemis what they had previously paid as tribute to the Persians (Arr. Anab. i. 17. x); but they allegedly declined his offer to pay the full cost of the temple and dedicate it (Str. 640–1. xiv. i. 22, with an anachronistic reference to Alexander as a god). For a dedication by Alexander at Xanthus, in Lycia, see SEG xxx 1533.

B has traditionally been regarded as belonging to Alexander’s settlement of 334, but it was not inscribed at the same time as A, and need not reflect the same occasion as A. The land of the Myrseloi and the Pedieis, and the countryside around, presumably had been domains of the Persian king and are here said to be domains of Alexander; those living in the villages, like other non-Greeks in Asia Minor, used to pay ϕάρος to the Persian King and now pay it to Alexander; Greeks in Asia Minor, like those of Priene itself, were exempt from ϕάρος (Arr. Anab. i. 17. i, vii, 18. ii, cf. 17. x), but as allies of Alexander they could be expected to pay a σύνταξις, the term first devised for the Second Athenian League (cf. on 22), which might be as burdensome as the old ϕάρος (cf. Arr. Anab. i. 26. iii, v, 27. iv—not using σύνταξις, and in the last passage using ϕάρος), and Badian has argued persuasively that Priene’s exemption from the σύνταξις in B is better interpreted as a revision of an earlier settlement under which Priene did

---
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A marble stele, complete but damaged at top and sides. Found at Kato Aigialos, now in Chios Museum (Inv. 119). Photo of part, BSM Iv 1960, pl. 49b.
have to pay a *syntaxis*. He supposed that *syntaxis* implies a league, and that the Greeks of the Asiatic mainland like those of the islands (cf. 78, 84) must have been added to the League of Corinth. That does not follow, and there is no other evidence to support it. At the other extreme, Bosworth thinks that the Greeks of Asia were not made allies but, although ‘liberated’ from Persia, became subjects of Alexander to be treated at his discretion; he notes that the cities later offered by Alexander to Phocion included the undoubtedly Greek Cius (Plut. *Phoc.* 18. vii–viii, Ael. *V.H.* 1. 25)—but Alexander’s attitude to the Greek states at the end of his reign may not be good evidence for his attitude at the beginning. We believe that apart from incorporation in the League of Corinth Badian’s interpretation is to be accepted: Priene will have been made an ally of Alexander and have had a *syntaxis* imposed on it in 334; in the subsequent troubles in Alexander’s rear the Prienians remained loyal while the non-Greeks in Naulochum did not; and so c.332 Naulochum was firmly attached to Priene and the Greeks were rewarded (including those living in Naulochum:1 although *phoros* and *syntaxis* were collected from communities, personal exemption could be conferred within a non-exempt community), but the territory of the non-Greeks was—probably remained—royal land and they had to pay *phoros*. In the hellenistic period the inhabitants of royal land, *chora basilike*, came to be referred to as *laoi* (a word meaning ‘people’), but that language is not used here (cf. Papazoglou, *Laoi et paroikoi*, 66–8). The fact emphasized by Sherwin-White, that this text was inscribed not at the time but later, and may be an excerpt rather than a complete document, does not invalidate the argument that exemption from *syntaxis* makes best sense as a modification of an earlier settlement in which *syntaxis* was imposed; and the other texts in our collection are sufficient evidence that Alexander often intervened in a place more than once.

Naulochum was the harbour town of Priene, perhaps to the south-west (*Barrington Atlas*, 61; cf. Plin. *N.H.* v. 113). The ‘city’ of l. 6 will be Priene (accepted by most commentators, though some have argued for Naulochum and have tried to draw strange conclusions from that). An Argive list of *thea rodokoi* (hosts of sacred envoys) dated c.330 names a man in Naulochum but none in Priene (*SEG*xxiii 189. ii. 10)—but this reflects the man’s residence, not his citizenship: it similarly names a man in the harbour town Notium and not one in Colophon (ii. 7).

1 Botermann, 183–7, suggests that while the new Priene was being built all the citizens of Priene were living in Naulochum.


\[\text{Σι} \]

\[\nu] \text{τίδαις} \varepsilon [... \text{έν τῷ}] \iota \text{τεμένει} [\text{τῶν} \text{Κ}]
\[\lambda] \text{υπίδων} [\text{o}] \text{ἐκ} \text{τεμένιον} \iota \varepsilon \rho \varepsilon \text{ο[κ]}]
\[o] \text{δομήσασθαι} \text{καὶ} \text{τὰ} \iota \varepsilon \rho \alpha \text{τὰ} \text{κοινά} [\varepsilon]
\[k] \text{τῶν} \text{ἰδιωτικῶν} \text{οἰκίων} \text{eις} \text{τῶν} \text{κο[ι]}]
\[v] \text{όι} \text{οἰκον} \text{ἐνεγκεῖν}. \text{θυσαμένοις} \varepsilon [k]-
\[a] \text{αλλιέρησεν} \text{οἰκοδομήσασθαι} \text{καὶ} [\tau]-
\[\alpha] \text{ιερὰ} \text{τὰ} \text{κο[ι]νά} \varepsilon [k] \text{τῶν} \text{ἰδιωτικῶν} \text{ο[ι]}-
\[k] \text{ίων} \text{eις} \text{τῶν} \text{κο[ι]νον} \text{οἰκον} \text{ἐνεγκε} [i]-
\[v].

\[\text{Σιι} \]

\[\varepsilon \pi \text{πρωτάνεως} \sigma \text{Φο} \text{άιν[κο]} \text{s}, \text{Πλωτη[ρ]}-
\[\iota] \text{ώνοις} \text{τετράδις}, \varepsilon \gamma \nu \omega \text{ως} \text{Κλωτίδαι} \text{θ}]-
\[\varepsilon \] \text{σασθαί} \text{περὶ} \text{τῶν} \text{ιερ[ω]ν} \text{πότερον} \text{δε} \text{α}[δ]-
\[\delta] \text{τῶν}, \text{α[ε]ισ} \text{τῶν} \text{ο[ι]}-
\[o] \nu \text{δὲ} \text{Κλω[τ]} \text{ίδαι} \text{κατὰ} \text{μαντ[ε]ιαν} \text{ο[ικ]}-
\[\delta] \text{ομήσαστο} \text{φέρεσθαι} \text{τῇ} \text{μέραιρ} \text{η[i]}
\[\gamma] \text{νε[ται} \text{θυσία, τόν} \text{δὲ} \text{ἀ]λλον} \text{χρόν[ο]}
\[v] \text{παρὰ} \text{τοῖς} \text{ιδιώταις[σ]} \text{φυλάσσεσθα} [i]-
\[k] \text{αθα[περ} \text{καὶ} \text{πρότερον, η[δία} \text{παντὸς} \text{α}-
\[\delta] \text{α} \text{κει]σθαι} \text{εν} \text{τοί} \text{ο[ικ]ων}. \text{θυσαμέν[ο]}
\[\varepsilon] \text{κακάλιερ[ησεν} \text{διά} \text{παντὸς} \text{τὰ} \text{ε[ρ][ο]-}
\[\varepsilon \kappa] \text{ει[σθαι} \text{εν} \text{τοί} \text{ο[ικ]ων}.\]

\[\text{Σιιι} \]

\[\varepsilon \pi \text{πρωτάν[ε]}-
\[\omega] \text{σ} \text{Κλεοκόδους, Ποσιδεώνοις} \text{τετάρ[τ]}-
\[\eta] \varepsilon \text{εικάδος,} \varepsilon \gamma ν \text{ωσαν} \text{Κλωτίδαι} \text{τό[ι]}
\[\varepsilon \iota] \text{ερ[ω]οι} \text{ο[ικ][ων} \text{τῶ} \text{Κλωτίδων}, \text{εν} \text{δὶ} \text{τὰ} [\tau]-
\[\alpha] \text{πρώια} \text{ιερὰ} \text{καθηται, καὶ} \text{τῶ} \text{χώροι[ε]}
\[\tau] \text{μο[ς} \text{τῶν} \text{ο[ικ][ων} \text{χρησ[θαι} \text{Κλω[τ]}-
\[\alpha] \text{ς κοινῆ, φρατριάν} \text{δὲ} \text{μ[αθ} \text{ιο[δίωττ[η][ν]}
\[μ] \text{ἡθέα} \text{τῶν} \text{ο[ικ][ων} \text{τούτων} \text{χρήσθαι} [μ]-
\[\eta] \text{δὲ} \text{ἀ]λλοι} \text{δού]ναι} \text{χρήσασθαι} \text{μηθε[ν][ν]}
\[\varepsilon] \text{δὲ} \text{δὴ} \text{ἄν} \text{παρά} \text{τοῦ} \text{η[ε][ό]τος} \text{χρήσθη[τα]} [\alpha]}
\[i] \text{τῶ} \text{ο[ικ][ων} \text{η}[ε] \text{τέρων} \text{δο[ι} \text{χρήσασθαι[ε]}[i],
\[\alpha] \text{ποδό[τω} \text{καθ’} \text{ἐκάστην} \text{χρήσαν} \text{η[δία[ε]}.]
§i

elders . . . whether the Klytidaï should build a sacred sanctuary building in the sanctuary of the Klytidaï and bring the sacred things held in common out of the private houses and into the common building. When they sacrificed the sacrifice proved favourable to building and bringing the sacred things held in common out of the private houses and into the common building.

§ii

10 In the prytany of Phoenix, on the fourth of Plynterion, the Klytidaï decided to sacrifice about the sacred things of the Klytidaï which were in private houses, whether they should bring them to the building which the Klytidaï had built in accordance with the sacrificial consultation on the day on which the sacrifice takes place, but for the future keep them safe in private houses as previously, or whether they should be placed in the building for all time. When they sacrificed the sacrifice proved favourable to the sacred things being placed in the building for all time.

§iii

22 In the prytany of Cleocydes, on the twenty-sixth of Posideon, the Klytidaï decided that the Klytidaï should use the sacred building of the Klytidaï, in which the ancestral sacred things are placed, and the land about the building, in common, and that neither phratry nor individual is to use this building or to grant to any other to use it. Whoever either himself uses the building contrary to these injunctions or grants to another to use it, let him pay to the Klytidaï
This stone records three decisions taken, the second decision in April or May and the third in around December (presumably but not certainly in the same year), by a corporate body called the Klytidai about the construction and use of a sacred building within their temenos. The first two decisions, about whether to construct the building and whether to put the ancestral sacred objects, which may be statues, in it, follow consultation of a god through sacrifice. The third decision, about who should be able to use the building, is taken without further consultation. The interest of the inscription lies in what the group is, what is at stake in these decisions, and the relationship of these decisions to other reforms on Chios.

Consultation of the gods about matters related to cult was common, but most commonly takes the form of oracular consultation (as in 58). Here sacrificial divination is practised: a seer (mantis) interprets the entrails of the animal sacrificed (presumably to Zeus Patroios, compare l. 35; on ‘patroos’ gods see 1). Such a form of divination is familiar from tragedy (compare Soph. Antigone 1005—11) but historically best attested in military contexts (e.g. X. H. iii. iv. 15, An. vi. iv. 12, vi. v. 2). The repeated consultation, and the number of separate decisions, suggest that there were strongly held divergent opinions among the Klytidai on the matters in question. Leasing out cult buildings is well attested elsewhere (e.g. IG ii² 2499 records the leasing by the orgones of Egretes in Attica in 306/5 of their hieron and buildings, requiring only that the lessee ensures that, when the orgones sacrifice to the hero once a year, the building in which the hieron is located is open and roofed, and the kitchen, benches, and tables are available for use; see also 37). The significance of the decision to limit use to the Klytidai as a group depends upon identification of the Klytidai.

Except in the first case, where a single line of text appears to be lost (so Haussoullier), the decisions (gnomai) are prefaced both with a calendrical date and a reference to a prytanis; prytanis dating is found in earlier records of decisions by the state of Chios (SIG² 986) and has plausibly been restored in other inscribed records of decisions by subdivisions of the polis. The third decision here refers to curses ‘from the laws’, presumably a reference to the Klytidai’s own rules (compare 5.14). The Klytidai possess epimeletai (36–7) and also an archon, as we learn from an earlier fourth-century lease of extensive tracts of land by the Klytidai (PEP Chios 75, U. Fantasia, Ann. Pisa vii 1977, 27–55). The form of the name Klytidai indicates that it is a group deriving from an eponymous figure, and indeed there is a famous family of Klytidai known from Elis.
for each use or grant of use 1,000 dr. sacred to Zeus Patroios, and let him be liable to the curses prescribed in the laws. The overseers are to write up the decisions that have been made about the building and the sacred things and also the sacrificial consultations on a stone stele and stand it by the entrance of the building.

(see Her. xi. 33; Paus. vi. 17). Scholars have debated whether the phrase at l. 28 should be translated ‘the phratry but not an individual’ or ‘no phratry or individual’; we believe that the latter is the best construal of the Greek, and in that case the refusal to permit use of the building to any phratry or individual militates against the Klytidai’s being a phratry. What, then, were they?

The Klytidai are generally considered to have been a tribe (Forrest, 179; Jones, 193–4). We know quite a lot about the rather complicated tribal arrangements that prevailed on the island in the last quarter of the century (Forrest, 172 ff.). Those arrangements have been thought to stem from sweeping reforms in Chios around 325, perhaps in the wake of Alexander’s insistence on the re-establishment of democracy in 334 (84). It is indeed because the reforms seem to leave little room for a tribe like the Klytidai that this document has been dated to the 330s—as pre-reform in content but late fourth-century in letter forms. Aristotle, Pol. v. 1319 B 19–27, remarks, with allusions to Cleisthenes at Athens and to Cyrene, that one useful democratic resource is to create new and more numerous tribes and phratries and to bring sacred things that were private into a few communal locations. Does this inscription attest to something of that sort happening on Chios?

The case for the late fourth-century reform’s affecting or even abolishing the Klytidai is quite strong, but the case for the Klytidai’s being a tribe is weaker: the prohibition on phratry use could as well be the banning of a superordinate as of a subordinate group. Indeed, given other evidence for gentilicial groups below the level of phratry on Chios (SEG xix 581), the failure to prohibit use of the building by such groups might indeed argue for the Klytidai’s being themselves such a group. In that case this inscription records not a tribe usurping from phratries or other gentilicial groups the traditional privilege of confining cult objects to private houses (so Jones, 193–4), but an independent decision by a small gentilicial group to invest in a cult building and house its sacred objects there. This may be, like the earlier lease, good evidence for the lively communal life of the Klytidai and for on-going debate about the best use of their resources, rather than good evidence for wholesale reform of all sub-polis groups in a democratic reform.

The East Ionic dialect of this inscription is marked by the use of ao for aw in e.g. ἀδέτος (14, 31).
The Athenian ephebic oath and the ‘oath of Plataea’, mid fourth century

Marble stele found at Akharnai (formerly Menidi) together with a fourth-century deme decree of Acharnae (SEG xxi 519) relating to the altars of Ares and of Athena Areia. Now at the French School in Athens (inv. no. I 7). In the pediment above the inscription a large round shield flanked by helmet and greaves on one side, cuirass and (?)mantle on the other. Phot. Siewert, Der Eid von Plataiai; G. Daux, Charisterion A. Orlandos, i. pis. I–II; (relief) Lawton, Attic Document Reliefs, pl. 92 no. 177; our Pl. 8.

\[\text{sio.}\]
\[\text{ieru}v\ \text{A}ρεος\ \text{kai}\ \text{Aθηνας} \]
\[\text{Aρείας Διόν Διανος Χαρ-} \]
\[\text{νευς άνέθηκεν. vacat}\]

\[\xiu\]
5 ὦρκος ἐφήβων πάτρως, ὃν ὄμνυνα δεὶ το ἐφήβως. \[\text{οὐκ αἰσχυνόν τὰ ἱερὰ ῥησ-} \]
\[\text{λα οὔδὲ λείψα τὸν παραστάτην ὅπου ἂν σ-} \]
\[\text{τειχήσατο. ἄμνω δὲ καὶ ὑπὲρ ἱερῶν καὶ ὀσ-} \]
\[\text{ίων, καὶ ὁκ ἐλάττων παραδόσω τὴν πατρίδ-} \]
10 α, πλείω δὲ καὶ ἄρειω κατὰ τε ἐμαυτόν κα- \[\text{μετὰ ἀπάντων, καὶ ἐνηκοήσων τῶν ἄει κρ-} \]
\[\text{ανότων ἐμφρόνως καὶ τῶν θεσμῶν τῶν} \]
\[\text{δρυμένων καὶ ὦν ἄν τὸ λοιπὸν ἱδρύσα-} \]
\[\text{ναι ἐμφρόνως: εἶν ἔ τις ἄναιρει, οὐκ} \]
\[\text{πτερέσων κατὰ τε ἐμαυτόν καὶ μετὰ πάντ-} \]
15 ων, καὶ τιμήσω ἱερὰ τὰ πάτρια. ἔστορες [[0]] \text{θεοὶ Ἀγλαύρων, Ἑστία, Ἐνυκε, Ἐνυαίνους, Αρ-} \]
\[\text{ης καὶ Αθηνᾶ Ἀρεία, Ζεῦς, Θαλλώ, Αἴξω, Ἡγε-} \]
\[\text{μόνη, Ἡρακλῆς, ὅρου τῆς πατρίδος, πυροί,} \]
20 κριθαί, ἄμπελοι, ἐλαίι, αὐκαί. vacat

\[\text{vacat}\]

\[\xiu\]
5 ὦρκος ὃν ὀμοσαν Αθηναίοι ὑπὲ ἕμελλον \[\text{μάχεσθαι πρὸς τοὺς βαρβάρους.} \[\text{Siewert does not indicate vacats.} \]

7–8 \[\text{άφειχθω} on stone, \text{ο}ρδυχε\] Siewert after Robert (comparing Poll. vii. 105).

9 \[\delta\] on stone; \text{οδω} Siewert after Robert: ‘perhaps due to a careless omission’, ‘probably a careless mistake’ Theate, Grammar, i. 352 n. 2, 256 n. 5, but N.B. \[\delta\] in IG ii 236. a. 12 in the context of an oath, firmly dated to 338.
Gods. The priest of Ares and Athena Areia, Dioson of Dio of Acharnae has dedicated this.

§5

The ancestral oath of the ephebes, which the ephebes must swear. I shall not bring shame upon the sacred weapons nor shall I desert the man beside me, wherever I stand in the line. I shall fight in defence of things sacred and profane and I shall not hand the fatherland on lessened, but greater and better both as far as I am able and with all. And I shall be obedient to whoever exercise power reasonably on any occasion and to the laws currently in force and any reasonably put into force in future. If anyone destroys these I shall not give them allegiance both as far as is in my own power and in union with all, and I shall honour the ancestral religion.

§16

Witnesses: the Gods Aglaurus, Hestia, Enyo, Enyalios, Ares and Athena Areia, Zeus, Thallo, Auxe, Hegemone, Heracles, and the boundaries of my fatherland, wheat, barley, vines, olives, figs.

§21

Oath which the Athenians swore when they were about to fight against the barbarians.
Despite the inscription of ‘Gods’ on the cornice of the pediment of the stele, in a manner reminiscent of decrees, this stone is a dedication by Dio, priest of the cult Ares and Athena Areia at Acharnae. We know nothing more of the priest, but a further inscription found together with this one records the decision by the deme of Acharnae, following an oracular consultation, to build an altar to Ares and Athena before the sacrifice of the Areia ‘in order that the Athenians and the Acharnians may be pious toward the gods’ (SEG xxi 519), and we may take the dedication of the text of these oaths to be a further way of manifesting Athenian piety. SEG xxi 519 is headed by a relief showing Athena, with aegis, helmet, and shield, crowning Ares who is shown in hoplite armour (Lawton, Attic Document Reliefs, no. 143, pl. 76). Acharnae, the largest of Athenian demes, contributing 24 of the 56 ephebes enrolled by the tribe.
23 I shall fight while I live, and I shall not put life before being free, and I shall not desert the taxiararch nor the enomotarch, neither while they live nor when they are dead, and I shall not depart unless the leaders lead the way, and I shall do whatever the generals command, and I shall bury in the same place the dead of those who were allied, and I shall leave no one unburied.

31 And when I have been victorious fighting against the barbarians, I shall (totally destroy and) dedicate a tenth of the city of the Thebans, and I shall not raze Athens or Sparta or Plataea or any of the other cities that were allied, and I shall not overlook those who are oppressed by hunger and I shall not keep them from running water, whether they are friends or enemies.

39 And if I keep true to what has been written in the oath may my city be free from sickness, if not, may it be sick; and may my city be unravaged, but if not may it be ravaged; and my (land) bear, but if not, may it be barren; and may the women bear children like their parents, but if not, monsters; and may the animals bear young like the animals, but if not, monsters.

46 They swore these oaths, covered the sacrificial victims with their shields and at the sound of the trumpet made a curse: if they transgressed what was sworn and did not keep true to what had been written in the oath, a curse was to be upon the very people that had sworn.

Oineis in 330/29 (Reinmuth, no. 12), had a fifth-century reputation for belligerence (Ar. Aeh., esp. 204-36; Thuc. ii. 20. iv). Ares is widely attested as a god by whom oaths are sworn, and these two inscriptions suggest that the cult of Ares, which is attested in no other Attic deme, was promoted in connection with ephebic service by the deme of Acharnae with the support of the Athenians as a whole. The letter forms of the two inscriptions indicate a date in the middle of the fourth century, the similar sculptural treatment of the two cuirasses links the two reliefs, and the relief on the deme decree is closely related to other reliefs securely dated to the third quarter of the fourth century.

The interpretation of the inscription is tied up with the question of the genuineness of the two oaths which it records: do lines 5–21 indeed record the 'ancestral oath of the
ephbe's' and lines 22–51 the oath which the Athenians took when they were about to fight against the Persians (at Plataea in 479), or are they a product of the invention of tradition and the rewriting of history by the Athenians in the fourth century?

The oath ‘which all citizens swear when they are inscribed into the lexarchikon grammateion and become ephebes’ and the oath given ‘at Plataea by all the Greeks when they were about to draw themselves up and fight against the force of Xerxes’ were quoted in succession by Lycurgus in his speech Against Leocrates (76–8 and 80–2) of 331/0. The context in which the orator quoted these oaths shows the sort of history of which they were a crucial part (see also Parker, Athenian Religion, ch. xi, esp. 251–5).

Lycurgus, in urging the unacceptability of Leocrates’ fleeing Athens in the wake of the defeat at Chaeronea in 338, cites a series of incidents from past Athenian history, going back to the sacrifice of Praxitha by Erechtheus in the face of the invasion of Eumolpus and the Thracians. Lycurgus supported his claim about Praxitha with a long quotation from Euripides’ Erechtheus, and some other claims by appeals to Homer and the ‘Athenian’ poet Tyrtaeus. But in a number of cases he appealed to decrees to support his claims about past history. Thus he appealed to Critias’ decree condemning Phrynichus, post mortem, as a traitor (112–15); to the decree ordering the destruction of the bronze statue of Hipparchus son of Charmus (grandson of the tyrant Hippias) for treachery, and the creation from it of a stele on which his name and the names of all future traitors were to be recorded (117–18); to the decree condemning those Athenians who deserted to the Spartans at Decelia during the final stages of the Peloponnesian war, ordering the summary execution of any who was captured; to the decree of the Athenian council at Salamis in 480 about the man who tried to betray the city by what he said and whom they killed with their own hands (122); to the decree in the council chamber moved after the restoration of democracy after the Thirty and absolving from guilt anyone killing a man who aimed at tyranny, betrayed the city, or subverted democracy. For good measure he rounded off this series with a Spartan law against those failing to fight for their country.

One decree quoted by Lycurgus seems certain to be historical: [Plut.] X Or. 834 B quotes in full what seems to be a genuine decree condemning Antiphon and Archeptolemus for treachery in 411, and that decree refers to ‘the bronze stele on which also the decrees about Phrynichus’ were inscribed; Craterus too recorded that decrees against Phrynichus were written on a bronze stele (FGrH 342 F 17; cf. also M&L 85). Lycurgus alone ascribes the decree against Phrynichus to Critias, but that is not incredible.

In other cases some elaboration of historical decrees can be suspected: Her. ix. 5 records the incident in which one of the Athenian council, Lycidas, suggests accepting Persian conditions and has Athenians from within and outside the council join together in stoning him; any decree would have to be retrospective; listing political and religious offenders on bronze stelai is quite well attested (schol. Ar. Lys. 273 those who collaborated with Cleomenes; Melanthios, FGrH 326 F 3 offenders against the Mysteries; cf. Thuc. vi. 55–1, a stele listing the Peisistratids), but that a stele on which traitors were recorded was made from melting down the statue of Hipparchus son of
Charmus seems unlikely: the tyrannicides apart, bronze statues of individuals were not a feature of late sixth- or early fifth-century Attic sculpture.

Aeschines had earlier read out the ephebic oath in a similar list of past Athenian precedents reeled off in a speech of 348 (Dem. xix. Embassy 303). On that occasion it was not the Plataea oath that accompanied it, but references to a decree of Miltiades urging the Athenians to provision themselves and march to Marathon (cf. Arist. Rhet. iii. 1411 a; cf. Nepos, Milt. 4. iv, Plut. Quaest. Conv. 1. 628 e) and a decree of Themistocles evacuating Athenians to Troizen in 480 (cf. M&L 23). The historicity of these decrees, each in the mouth of the man held most responsible for the subsequent victory, is very doubtful. Aeschines and Lycurgus show clearly the tendency evident in Athens in the middle of the fourth century to elaborate texts around known historical circumstances, and to elaborate historical circumstances around texts.

If the orators provide the general context for the quotation of fifth-century decrees in the middle of the fourth-century, it is clear that they did not supply the actual texts which appear on the stele from Acharnae. The text of the Plataea oath that Lycurgus quoted survives along with a very similar text quoted by Diodorus from the mid-fourth-century historian Ephorus as the oath sworn by the Greeks gathered at the Isthmus (D.S. xi. 29. ii–iii.; Her. vii. 132. ii mentions only an oath at Thermopylae). The text of the ephebic oath read by Lycurgus does not survive, although his introductory paraphrase has some implications for its wording, but Pollux viii. 105–6 and Stobaeus xi.iii. 48 do quote it in full, almost certainly from the texts of orators.

The literary versions of the ephebic oath differ from the inscription in various respects: both turn phrases round to put the important object, rather than the verb, first (e.g. τὴν πατρίδα ο دقائق ἐλάττων παραδώσω), and both avoid making persons and things joint subject (gods and borders, etc.) or object (laws and magistrates) of verbs; Stobaeus rearranges to ὑπλα τὰ ἱερά in ll. 6–7, so avoiding elision; both Stobaeus and Pollux have the more euphonious καὶ μόνος καὶ μετὰ πολλῶν/πάντων instead of κατὰ τε ἔμαυτον καὶ μετὰ ἀπάντων, and place its first occurrence before rather than after the clause about increasing the fatherland; Pollux introduces at that point a clause to ‘sail(?) and plough (πλεύσω δὲ καὶ καταράω) all the land I receive’; Stobaeus makes the laws not a second object of εἰνηκοήσω (which Pollux changes to συνήσω) but introduces the standard classical verb of obedience (πείσωμαι, compare IG ii² 1028. 43 praising ephebes for their peitharkhia) to govern behaviour towards the laws (and similarly introduces disobedience as a second offence besides annulling the laws), and both he and Pollux have τὸ πλὴθος rather than unexpressed κραύγοντες as the source of law and add a promise to defend, as well as not to allow destruction of, the laws. Stobaeus omits the list of deities and other witnesses altogether, Pollux ends it at Hegemone and omits Hestia, Enyo, and Athena Areia of the deities mentioned before Hegemone on the stone.

Almost all these differences point to ways in which the inscribed version of the oath was and seemed old-fashioned in the fourth century. The political arrangement envisaged is not only expressed in archaic language (κραύγοντες is an archaic term little enough understood to become κραύγοντες in Pollux and Stobaeus); it implies magisterial rather than popular responsibility for law, and refers to laws by the archaic
term *thesmos* rather than as *nomoi* (for which see generally Ostwald, *Nomos*). The partial up-dating in Pollux and Stobaeus at best brings the language (*plethos* rather than *demos*, cf. *IG* i 105) and procedure (people not *nomothetai* responsible for law) into line with fifth-century rather than fourth-century practice, although it does add the idea, best attested in fourth-century orators, of the citizen actively defending the laws (e.g. Lyc. *Leocr. 149*). The abbreviation of the list of witnesses may be seen in a similar way: appeal to crops and land could be regarded as extraordinary in fourth-century Athens (Plut. *Dem. 9. iv, X Or. 845 b*), and sits uncomfortably with appeal to deities, and those deities are very short of Olympian gods and, even as reported by Pollux, include several ‘functional’ deities (Thallo, Auxo) not known to have received cult in classical Attica (but see Pausanias, ix. 35) and not paralleled in the otherwise similar ephic oath from third-century Drerus (Austin, *Hellenistic World*, 91). However, the pride of place enjoyed by Aglauros, the daughter of Cecrops who threw herself from the Acropolis to save the city, reflects fourth-century realities: it was in the sanctuary of Aglauros, on the slope below the east end of the Acropolis (see G. Dontas, *Hesp.* lii 1983, 48–63) that the ephebes, similarly called upon to save the city (Kearns in Murray and Price, *The Greek City*, 330), took their oath (as Pollux records).

The literary versions of the Plataea oath vary from the inscription more extensively. The opening clauses are generally abbreviated, balance introduced, and elision avoided; the threat to destroy and dedicate a tithe is extended to all medizing cities, not restricted to Thebes, and put after the promise not to uproot loyal cities, which again is not limited to named cities. Support for loyal cities in famine and the undertaking not to withhold their supply of running water (for which compare the Amphictyonic oath, Aesch. ii. *Embassy 115*) is omitted, as is the curse which supports the oath (for public curses at Athens see 63; for the Amphictyonic curses see Aesch. ii. *Embassy 116, iii. Cies. 110*). Literary versions add a clause not to rebuild the temples burnt by the barbarians but to leave them as a memorial.

In the case of the Plataea oath it is easier to see Lycurgus’ and Diodorus’ versions as literary paraphrases than to find clear markers of an earlier date in the inscribed version (Siewert, *Eid*, ch. ii does his best), which is as one would expect given the fifth-century date claimed for the oath. Thus the taxarch and enomotarch (a specifically Spartan officer) become vague ‘leaders’ in the literary versions, and curses are not things that can be read out casually since to read them is to make them. But there are elements unique to the inscribed version which are more problematic. The naming of Thebes as the city to be tithed and the picking out of Athens, Sparta, and Plataea as the cities not to be razed, is hard to find justification for in the historical situation just before the battle at Plataea; the former contrasts with the general threat to tithe all cities that voluntarily sided with the Persians found in Herodotus’ report of the Greek oath before Thermopylae (vii. 132), and the latter with the listing of all who fought against the Persians on the Serpent Column (M&L 27) erected immediately after the war (where the list is headed by the Spartans, Athenians, and Corinthians).

Particularly vexed is the question of what to make of the inclusion in the literary versions, and omission from the inscribed version, of a clause not to rebuild burnt temples (for which compare Isoc. iv. *Panegyricus* 156, Cic. *De Rep.* iii. 15 and Paus.
x. 35. ii). Such an undertaking not to rebuild was so firmly part of later historical tradition that Plut. Per. 17 has a detailed account of Pericles passing a decree to send ambassadors out to the whole Greek world to summon representatives from cities to a congress to consider allowing rebuilding of the temples burnt, and of that initiative's being fruitless because of Spartan opposition (for discussion see Stadter, *Commentary on Plut. Per.* 201–9). Archaeologists still dispute whether or not the Athenians began replacing any damaged cult building before the 440s, and incontrovertible evidence that they did is lacking (see Mark, *The Sanctuary of Athena Nike*, 98–104), but Athens certainly did rebuild temples and cult sites burnt and demolished by the Persians in the years following 447, when the Parthenon was begun on the site of the earlier Parthenon whose construction had been interrupted by the Persian sack. But the curious decision to leave the major Acropolis ruin, the temple of Athena Polias, as a ruin and to build the Erechtheum to house its cult next to it rather than on top of it, along with the delay until still later in restoring cult sites in the Athenian Agora, cast doubt over whether there was a single moment at Athens at which it was resolved to abandon any undertaking there may have been not to rebuild damaged shrines. Arguably whether one chose in the fourth century to refer to the oath of Plataea and point to the ruin of Athena Polias as a mark of Athenian piety in keeping it, or whether one chose to ignore the oath, or tell of its rescinding, and point to Athenian piety in restoring the gods' shrines, was a matter of convenience. It cannot be excluded that the clause against rebuilding has simply been edited out of the Acharnae inscription.

Both texts have certainly received editorial attention. Both are given 'titles' on the stone, and at the end of the Plataea oath there is a description of how the oath was sworn; additionally Athena Areia may have been added to the list of witness deities in the ephebic oath because it was by her priest and in her sanctuary that it was inscribed. Comparison between the oaths on the stone and their literary counterparts suggests that the texts on the stone were not themselves literary creations and that they did not derive from literary versions. That they have not been tidied up for rhetorical effect, however, does not mean that they have not been subject in any way to deletion or addition; neither the presence on the stone of mention of specific cities in the Plataea oath, nor the absence from that oath of the undertaking not to rebuild damaged shrines can be taken as good evidence that the documentary version from which the stele derived shared those features.

Judgement upon the authenticity, as a whole or in detail, of the two oaths depends upon the view taken on how they came to be inscribed at Acharnae at all. Nostalgic reference to fifth-century successes and the rewriting of Athenian history were a constant feature of fourth-century Athens, already satirized in Aspasia's spoof Funeral Oration, Plato's *Menexenus*. Concern to improve military training was not new in the 330s (see 89) but can be traced already in Xenophon's *Ways and Means* of the 350s (iv. 51–2). But there is little doubt that it was the struggle against Philip, the new 'barbarian' invader from the north', that stimulated concentrated reference to the fifth century, and to the Persian Wars in particular (and stimulated also Theopompus' hostile reaction to the Athenian version of Marathon and denial of the Plataea oath and Peace of Callias (FGrH 115 F 153–4)). The earliest known quotation of the ephebic
oath is Aeschines’ in 348 in the context of urging action against Philip. The Acharnac stele seems to fit neatly into this context, representing an attempt by a member of the largest Attic deme to encourage his fellow demesmen into military action by reminding them of their ancestral undertakings. Dio did not derive the texts which he had inscribed on his dedication from the orators, however, but from documentary sources whose versions he may have edited but did not rewrite.

If this reconstruction is correct, the Acharnac stele will antedate the reform of the ephebeia by Epicrates in the 330s and be part of the background activity that made that reform timely and ensured that it was enthusiastically embraced. Who exactly became ephebes at the time the oath was inscribed is not clear. The arrangement recorded by Lycurgus and Pollux, whereby the oath was sworn when young Athenians were registered on the lexiarchikon grammateion (which Pollux places at the end of their ephebic service) seems likely to be the post-Epicrates arrangement, and the clear allusion to the oath in Arist. Nic. Eth. v. 1130 a 30 may reflect that new situation. That the oath was being sworn before Epicrates and that it had been sworn ever since
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[Name of a deme: probably Halai]
The sixth century does not tell us who exactly was expected to swear it, but the (faint) echoes of the ephebic oath which Siewert has detected in Aesch. Pers. 955–62, Soph. Ant. 663–71, and in Pericles’ speeches in Thuc. i. 144, iv and ii. 37, iii imply that the wording of the oath was not unfamiliar to a fifth-century audience (Plut. Alb. 15. vii, if genuine, would imply rather stronger familiarity).

The Acharnæ stele is important because it establishes that documentary versions of the ephebic and Plataea oaths existed in the mid fourth century, and because it shows that the sentiments expressed in the Athenian assembly and lawcourts were not restricted to the strictly political arena or to the discourse of town society but were being forcefully expressed also in the Attic demes and in religious contexts. The version of the ephebic oath which the stele preserves confirms beyond reasonable doubt the antiquity of that oath; the version of the Plataea oath shows that texts attributed to past occasions, which were not, unlike the ephebic oath, guaranteed by repeated ritual performance, were subject to substantial editing. On current evidence the historicity of a Plataea oath can be neither proved nor disproved.
Καλλικράτης Αίγωνεύς έπεν· ἐπείδη οἱ ἐφῆβοι οἱ τῆς Κεκροπίδος·

Πρωτίας έπεν· ἐφῆφισθαί τοῖς δημόταις, ἐπείδη καὶ ζωῇ καὶ φίλῳ

Εὐφρόνιος έπεν· ἐφῆφισθαί τοῖς δημόταις, ἐπείδη οἱ ἐφῆβοι οἱ ἐπὶ Κητσικλέους ἀρχοντες ἐγκατατοῦσιν καί καὶ ζωῇ καὶ φίλῳ·

Διδυμᾶς· Τενασμένος Κέρων

Ἀδοκίλης Χαριττος
—nus son of Phyromachus, Chaerestatus son of Chaerion, —otus son of Demetrius, —genes son of Sabon, Anthisthenes son of Antiphates; from Daedalidae: Philoxenos son of Philonomus.  

Epicrates son of Eucrates; from Xypete, Nicias son of Euctaeus, Xenophon son of Mnesiades; from Pithus, Tisamenus son of Cirus, Autoles son of Charippus.

§i

[Tribe] Callicrates of Aixone proposed: since the ephebes of Cecrops in the archonship of Ctesicles [334/3] show good discipline and do all that the laws ordain that they should and obey the sophronistes elected by the people, praise them and crown them with a gold crown from 500 drachmas for their good order and discipline. And praise the sophronistes Adeistus son of Antimachus of Athmonon and crown him with a gold crown of 500 drachmas because he has looked after the ephebes of the Cecropid tribe well and with love of honour. And inscribe this decree on a stone stele and set it up in the sanctuary of Cecrops.

§ii

[Council] Hegemachus son of Chaeremon of Perithoidae proposed: since the ephebes of Cecrops established at Eleusis look after all that the council and people commands them well and with love of honour and show themselves well disciplined, praise their good order and good discipline and crown each of them with a crown of olive, and praise their sophronistes Adeistus son of Antimachus of Athmonon and crown him with a crown of olive when he gives his scrutiny, and inscribe this decree additionally on the dedication which the ephebes of Cecrops dedicate.

§iii

[Eleusis] Protias proposed: be it decreed by the demesmen, since the ephebes of Cecrops and their sophronistes Adeistus son of Antimachus of Athmonon look after the guarding of Eleusis well and with love of honour, praise them and crown each of them with a crown of olive, and inscribe this inscription on the dedication which the ephebes of Cecrops in the archonship of Ctesicles dedicate.

§iv

[Athmonon] Euphronius proposed: be it decreed by the demesmen, since the ephebes inscribed in the archonship of Ctesicles show good discipline and do all that the laws ordain that they should, and the sophronistes elected by the people shows that
Athenians became liable to be called up for military service from the moment when they were enrolled into the citizen body at the age of eighteen. Thucydides refers at several places to the military duties of ‘the oldest and youngest’ as distinct from those of the main body of citizen hoplites (i. 105. iv, ii. 13. vii; cf. iv. 125. iii), and it seems at some point to have become conventional to train young soldiers by using them primarily for garrison duty. Aeschines offers to provide his ‘fellow-ephebes’ and the magistrates in charge as witnesses that ‘When I was released from the ranks of children, I was *uperipolos* through the land of Attica for two years’ (n. Embassy 167; cf. X. Ways and Means iv. 52).

Whether or not this evidence justifies the claim that prior to the 330s all Athenians, or all Athenians of hoplite class, underwent compulsory military training when they came of age is not clear. The stories told to explain the name of the phratry festival, the Apatouria (for which see 5), do so with reference to a single combat between an Athenian champion and the Boeotian king in which the Athenian is victorious through deception; this reversal of hoplite values (hoplites do not fight alone, and deception was alien to hoplite battle) would be most appropriate if the Apatouria was the occasion on which young men entered military ranks (see Vidal-Naquet, *Black Hunter*, 83–156; but cf. Lambert, *Phratries*, 144–52). But neither this mythology, nor indeed the Ephebic oath (88), if either is genuinely pre-fourth-century, shows that there was systematic training of young men as hoplites.

This dedication was made in 332, at the end of their ephebic service, by the ephebes of the tribe Cecropis who had been enrolled in 334, and was set up in the tribal sanctuary of Cecrops on the Athenian Acropolis. It records their names (1–25) and the honours they received from their tribe (26–35), from the Athenian council (36–44), and from the demes of Eleusis (45–51) and Athimonon (52–63). It is the earliest in a series of surviving inscribed records of ephebic dedications listing the ephebes of a particular tribe in a particular year. These dedications reveal that, at least from 334/3
they are obedient and do everything else with love of honour, praise them and crown them with a gold crown of 500 drachmas for their good order and discipline; and praise their sophronistai, Adeistus son of Antimachus of Athmonon, and crown him with a gold crown from 500 drachmas because he has looked after the demesmen and all the others of the Cecropid tribe well and with love of honour; and inscribe this decree on the dedication which the ephebes of Cecropis and the sophronistai dedicate.

64 The tribe The council The Eleusinians The Athmoneis.

onwards, the arrangements described in Ath. Pol. 42 prevailed, according to which when boys of 18 years of age had had their deme membership, and hence their Athenian citizenship, confirmed, they were given two years of military training at public expense under the supervision of a kosmētes and of ten tribal sophronistai. Their training involved visiting sanctuaries, doing garrison duty in the Piraeus and in the countryside, and being educated in the use of hoplite weapons, bow, javelin and catapult. This highly regulated ephebic training was almost certainly initiated in the middle of the 330s, partly in response to the Athenian defeat at Chaeronea in August 338 (cf. 80). The lexicographer Harpocratus (ἐπικράτης) records a mention in a speech by Lycurgus of an Epicrates who was honoured with a bronze statue for a law about the ephebes. Epicrates’ law may well be the most relevant of the laws referred to here (28, 54), but it cannot be precisely dated.

No fewer than eight ephebic inscriptions survive from the period 333–329 which list the ephebes for a particular year from a particular tribe, three of them relating to the tribe Cecropis (Reinmuth 2 and 5, Traill, Demos and Tritys, pp. 1–13 (SEG xxxvi 155) (but see also SEGxlii 47); the others are Reinmuth 8, 9, 10, 12, and 13 and SEGxxxii 162). In three cases the list of ephebes survives almost complete, in the other cases it is possible to estimate from the extant portion the extent of the original list. The numbers of which we can be confident are the 52 ephebes of Cecropis of 333/2, the 48 ephebes of Erechtheis of 333/2, and the 56 ephebes of Oineis of (?330/29. Two estimated figures are similar (42 for this inscription, 44 for Leontis in 333/2), two (both for Pandionis) are smaller (37 for 333/2, 30 for (? 332/1), and one is larger (65 for Cecropis in 332/1). This larger figure is paralleled by one later list, that for Leontis in 323/2, but the list for all tribes from 305/4 (a less good guide to numbers in the 330s and 320s) totals only ρ.372 names.

The numbers of names on the lists are important for two reasons. They are the major basis for determining whether all Athenians were put through ephebic service,
as the *Ath. Pol.* and *Lyc. Lector*, 76, suggest, or only those of hoplite status served. And they offer some guide to how the quota of councillors sent to the council of 500 by each deme related to the population of that deme. On the basis of model life tables for pre-modern and third-world populations, 18-year-olds can be expected to have been about 3.5% of the total of those 18 and over, that is, of the citizen population (see Hansen, *Demography and Democracy*, 9–13). The certain and estimated totals for individual tribes from the 330s and 320s average 49.55:496 18-year-olds correspond to just under 15,000 citizens, and to c.8,000 citizens aged 20—39 (those most liable to be called up for military service). Unless one regards the Athenians as very lax in applying the law requiring ephebic service, it is hard, even allowing for the disabled, to reconcile this figure with the probable later fourth-century citizen population of something close to 30,000. We therefore consider these figures good evidence that only those of hoplite status (and above) had to serve as ephebes, and that something in excess of, but not greatly in excess of, half the Athenian male population was of hoplite status and above. (For further discussion see Rhodes, *ZPE* xxxviii 1980, 191–201, and Rhodes, *Thucyides II*, Appendix [against Ruschenbusch, *ZPE* xxxv 1979, 173–80; cf. *ZPE* lxxv 1988, 194–6, Hansen, *Demography and Democracy*, 47–50).

Comparison of the number of ephebes from a deme with the number of men it sent to the council of 500 is more problematic because we do not have a large enough sample of figures for any particular deme. Nevertheless, surviving figures may be tabulated as follows in Table 2:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tribe</th>
<th>Deme</th>
<th>Bouleutic Quota</th>
<th>No. of ephebes</th>
<th>References</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Erechtheis</td>
<td>Euonymon</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Reinmuth 13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Agryle (Upper and Lower)</td>
<td>2+3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kedoi</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kephisia</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pergase (Upper and Lower)</td>
<td>2+2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Phegous</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Themakos</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lamptrai (Upper and Lower)</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Anagyrous</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pambotadai</td>
<td>1/0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sybridai</td>
<td>0/1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leontis</td>
<td>Skambonidai</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Reinmuth 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Halimous</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Leukonoion</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kettos</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Upper Potamos</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lower Potamos</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The existence of three published lists from Cecropis gives some idea of the annual variation (by a factor of more than two in some cases) in the number of ephebes from a single deme. Variation from the bouleutic quotas seems to be of roughly the same order, and the general picture offered supports the suggestion that bouleutic quotas
remained reasonably close to population distribution even in the late fourth century. This may have implications for the date at which the fourth-century quotas were settled; see further Osborne, *Greece in the Making*, 302–3.

The precise wording and order in which things are mentioned by the four bodies which honoured the ephebes varies significantly from one decree to another: although the later decrees were passed in the knowledge of the earlier, the drafting and the decision as to the scale of the honour to be given look to have been independent. The language in general, however, shows little variation and the various corporate bodies involved think and act in exactly parallel ways. The qualities of the ephebes which are praised here arguably reveal something of Athenian priorities in reforming the *ephebeia*. Their good order, both military (*eutaxia*) and civil (*kosmiotes*), is repeatedly picked out (for the possibility that *eutaxia* relates to particular drill competitions see Lambert, *ZPE* cxxv 2001, 56–7), and their services as a garrison that the deme of Eleusis emphasized (a few years later Eleusis was joined by the northern border forts of Phyle and Rhamnous in honouring ephebes of the tribe Pandionis (Reinmuth 10): presumably those ephebes served as garrison troops at all three places). The very names of the officials (*sophronistes, kosmētes*) relate closely to the virtues of *sophrosyne* and *kosmiotes*, virtues which the Athenians seem particularly to have encouraged in youths, women, and foreigners (*IG II² 1186. 3, 16–17, 23–4; see Whitehead, *C&EM* lv 1993, 37–75 at 71–2).

The eagerness for honour of both ephebes and their *sophronistes* are commemorated in a formula which encourages others also to compete for public approval. The way in which the tribe, the council, the deme in which the ephebes served as garrison troops, and the deme of the *sophronistes* compete to honour these ephebes suggests, along with the number of ephbic dedications from these years immediately after Epicrotes' law, that competition between year-groups within tribes and between the tribes themselves was indeed rapidly established; Leontis in 331 gave their *sophronistes* a crown worth not 500 but 1000 dr. (Reinmuth 9. i. 17, iii. 16), but competition did not
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Iasus and Samos honour Gorgus and Minnion, 334–321

A
One of the texts inscribed on three blocks found by R. Chandler at Chios, to which they had been taken as ballast from Iasus; now lost.

*Koine* with some Ionicisms; ending each line except 1 and 4 with the end of a word.


[ἐπειδὴ δὴ Ἡρώων Θεοδότην
ου καὶ Μανιῶν Ὀδυσσῆην
περὶ τῆς πόλεως,
further escalate and in other cases the honour seems to have been an olive crown (on crowns see 46). As well as this inscription two further fragmentary dedications survive from this year, in one of which the deme of Eleusis was certainly involved, joining with the council in honouring the ephebes from the tribe Hippothontis to which Eleusis itself belonged (IG ii² 1189 = Reimnuth 3).

Of those in charge of the ephebes, the honours given here involve only the sophronistes. Since he is honoured by Eleusis, where, on the pattern recorded in Ath. Pol., the ephebes would have served only in their second year, this inscription establishes that the ephebic magistrates, like the ephebes themselves, had a two-year term (Rhodes, Comm. Ath. Pol. 504). The sophronistes was chosen by the people from a short list of three men put forward by the fathers of the tribal contingent of ephebes in question; he was the manager responsible for day-to-day arrangements, but not for the training, which was in the hands of expert instructors (Ath. Pol. 42. iii). It was a requirement of sophronistai, as of the choregoi of boys’ choruses, that they be over forty years old. The kosmetes, who was not attached to a single tribe but had oversight of the whole year of ephebes, receives no mention here, but other inscriptions of this decade honour the kosmetes and instructors (didaskaloi) and also lochagoi. Honours for the paidotribes appear for the first time only c. 300 (IG ii² 585, 9–11).

Of the individual ephebes named, only in the case of Nicias son of Euctaeus of Xypete do we know significantly more about the family (APF 407–8). Euctaeus is himself named again, along with Euctaeus son of Nicias, a probable cousin, in a catalogue of cavalry on Salamis c. 320 (IG ii² 1955). Earlier in the century another son of a Euctaeus is found as proxenos of the Cean (IG xii. v 542. 42). A further connection with the wealthy family to which belongs Nicias son of Nicodemus of Xypete, a victorious choregos at the boys’ dithyramb at the Dionysia of 320/19 (IG ii² 3055, i) and probably brother to a man who acquired property in the Lycurkan public land sales (Lambert, Rationes, F 9. B. 5), is likely. The presence of Nicias son of Euctaeus here is one sign that potential cavalrymen as well as potential hoplites served as ephebes.

Since Gorgus and Minnion sons of Theodotus have been fine and good [kaloi k'agathoi] with regard to the community
INNΩN (the cutter began to carve Ε but corrected it); INNEΩΝ edd.
of the city, and have acted well to
many of the citizens individually, and con-
cerning the little sea have talked to King
Alexander and have conveyed it and given
it back to the people: they and their descen-
dants shall be given exemption from taxes
[ateleiz] and a front seat [proedria] for all
time.

The decree shall be written up in the vesti-
bule in front of the office [archeion].

Resolved by the council and people. Epic-
curus son of Dracon proposed:

Since Gorgus and Minnion sons of Theo-
dotus, of Iasus, have been fine and good
[kaloi k'agathoi] with regard to the Samians
in their exile; and Gorgus in spending time
with Alexander displayed great good will
and enthusiasm with regard to the people
of Samos, striving that the Samians should
recover their fatherland as quickly as pos-
sible, and when Alexander proclaimed
in the camp that he was restoring Samos
to the Samians, and the Greeks crowned
him because of this, Gorgus crowned him,
and wrote to the officials in Iasus that
the Samians living in Iasus, when they
returned to their fatherland, should export
their belongings with immunity from duty
and that transport should be provided for
them, the city of Iasus bearing the cost;
and now Gorgus and Minnion offer to do
whatever good they can to the people of
Samos; be it resolved by the people:

To give them citizenship on equal and
Iasus occupies a peninsula on the coast of Caria (maps Heisserer, 175; Barrington Atlas, 61: it is described as a nesos by Str. 658. xiv. ii. 21, but may not have been an island even in antiquity [Heisserer, 174 n. 10]). Gorgus appears only once in a literary text (Ephippus, FGrH 126 F 5 ap. Ath. xiii. 538 a-b: a custodian of arms, hoplophylax, who honoured Alexander in 324), and his brother Minnion not at all; but they appear in several inscriptions. Gorgus is the stephanephoros (literally, ‘crown-wearer’: the eponymous official) in a fragmentary prescript of a decree (IK Iasos 24: Heisserer, *Alexander*, 179–82); Minnion is the stephanephoros in another fragment (IK Iasos 27: not in Heisserer); and there are fragments of two epigrams from Epidaurus, one honouring Gorgus and his son for [military] deeds [learned] in Cos and for loyalty to the king, the other honouring Gorgus and including the word hoplophor—, ‘arms-bearing’ (IG iv. 2. 1616–17; IK Iasos TT 50–1 [with W. Peek’s later restorations]; CEG 817 [the first only: eschewing restoration]: Heisserer, *Alexander*, 194–202 [with Peek’s earlier restorations]). Other bearers of both names are attested in Iasus: Minnion is regularly spelled thus there, though in the Samian decree the cutter made a mistake and corrected an error in l. 4 and omitted a μυ in l. 24; a son of a Minnion appears in 99.

In a Gorgus and Minnion have spoken to Alexander and have recovered for Iasus the ‘little sea’: this is best identified not as the large gulf from Didyma to Telmessus or as a particular bay within it, but as a lake which has subsequently become a marshy area near the mouth of the Sari Çay, south-east of Iasus, which had perhaps fallen under the control of inland Mylasa (Hiller von Gaertringen in SIG 3; Heisserer, *Alexander*, 174–7, where ‘south-west’ is an error). The lake was probably important to Iasus for its fish (cf. Str. 658. xiv. ii. 21; Archestratus fr. 156 Suppl. Hell. ap. Ath. iii. 105 E). The archeion in whose vestibule this text was to be published will have been the office of the principal officials (archontes, as in B. 17–18) of Iasus.

In 334 Iasus supplied a ship to the Persians for the siege of Miletus, but will have been one of the cities won over by Alexander immediately afterwards (Arr. *Anab.* 1. 19. xi, 20. ii). It may be, as Heisserer supposes, that Gorgus and Minnion were involved in Iasus’ change of allegiance, and obtained the ‘little sea’ for Iasus shortly afterwards.
like terms, both to themselves and to their descendants; and to allot them to a tribe, a 
chiliastys, a hekastostys and a genos; and they shall be written up into whatever genos they 
are allotted to, just like the other Samians, and the five elected men shall take care of 
the writing-up.

This decree shall be written up on a stone 
stele and placed in the sanctuary of Hera, 
and the treasurer shall minister.

as a reward for the change; but this episode could be later, after the brothers had had 
more time to build up their influence with Alexander.

In B the two men are honoured by Samos for supporting Samians who were exiled 
when the Athenians captured the island from the Persians and then occupied it with 
cleruchs, in 366–365 (cf. on 22), and whose return to Samos in 322/1 was one conse-
quence of Alexander’s edict of 324 ordering the restoration of exiles (e.g. D.S. xvii. 
109, i, xviii. 8). Some of these Samians had been living in Iasus, and Gorgus had 
ensured that they could export their belongings without paying duty and that trans-
port should be provided for them at Iasus’ expense (poreia in l. 21 is probably feminine 
singular and abstract, rather than neuter plural, denoting transport ships).

Like the many other men granted citizenship by the restored state of Samos, Gorgus 
and Minnion are apparently to be incorporated in four units (cf. the grant of Athenian 
citizenship to some of those who helped towards the restoration of the democracy 
at Athens, 4: there only tribes are specified but to join a tribe the men will have had 
to join a deme and a trittys which formed part of that tribe). There were two tribes, 
Astypalaieis and Chesieis, and the name of the first (‘those of the old city’) suggests that 
they may have been located in the city and the countryside respectively. The 
chiliastys and hekastostys (‘thousands’ and ‘hundreds’) seem not to have been subdivisions of the 
two tribes, though the hekastostys probably were subdivisions of the chiliastys. Gene are 
shown by decrees for other honorand s which end by reporting the result of the allot-
ment not to be units of a fourth kind but to be an alternative name for the 
hekastostys. The appearance of the chiliastys in various contexts shows that these were the most 
important subdivisions of the citizen body. See Jones, Public Organization, 197–202. 
Given Gorgus’ assistance in their return, we should expect him and Minnion to be 
among the first men to be honoured by the restored Samos: the series of honorific 
decrees shows a number of changes in formulation, particularly in the identity of the 
officials responsible for registering the new citizens, and the pattern which we find in 
this decree, including registration by ‘the five elected men’, appears to be the earli-
est (C. Habicht, AM lxxii 1957, 152–274 at 261–6). The final clause is an abbreviated
form of what we find in some of the other decrees: τὸν δὲ ταμίαν εἰς τὸ ἀνάλομα ὑπηρετήσαι ("and the treasurer shall minister to the expenditure").

Kaloi k’agathoi ("fine and good": A. 2, B. 4–5) is used particularly of men who display virtues of a traditional, aristocratic kind (Bourriot, Kalos k’agathos—kalagathia, succeeds in showing that the expression is not found before the late fifth century, but does
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Athens allows Citian merchants to acquire land for a sanctuary; 332/2

A stele found at the Piraeus; now in the Epigraphical Museum in Athens. Phot. Tracy, Athenian Democracy in Transition, 113 fig. 7 [squeeze of ll. 36–44].

Attic-Ionic, with old-fashioned features and inconsistencies in the spelling: stouchedon 20. This is the work of Tracy’s Cutter of IG ii² 337 (= this text): Athenian Democracy in Transition, 112–16.

not succeed in showing that it began as a formal title at Sparta), but here it is used simply as the equivalent of such expressions as ‘have been good men with regard to’ or ‘have acted well towards’. For ‘equal and like terms’ (B. 27–8) cf. the incorporation of Helisson in Mantinea (14. 4).

§

Gods.

2 In the archonship of Nicocrates [333/2]; in the first prytany, of Aeges; of the proedroi Theophillus of Phegus was putting to the vote; resolved by the council. Antidotus son of Apollodorus of Sypalettus proposed:

9 Concerning what the Citiens say about the founding of the sanctuary to Aphrodite, be it decreed by the council: The proedroi to whose lot it falls to preside in the first assembly shall bring them forward and deal with the matter, and contribute the opinion of the council to the people that the council resolves that the people shall listen to the Citiens concerning the foundation of the sanctuary and to any one else, of the Athenians, who wishes, and shall
This straightforward text is interesting in several respects.

From the later 350s it had been Athens’ policy (associated at first with Eubulus, and reflected in Xenophon’s *Ways and Means*) to try to restore Athens’ prosperity after half a century of difficulties, *inter alia* by making Athens more attractive to visiting traders. One means of doing that was to be more generous in granting to *metics* the right, normally limited to citizens, to own land and houses in Attica (*Xen. W. & M. ii. 6; a special instance, 77*), and in this text we see an extension of that policy, granting to communities of non-Athenians the right to acquire land for sanctuaries of their own gods (see Simms, stressing the economic motive for this religious concession to non-Athenians). The admission of foreign cults to Athens was of course not new: as early as the 420s Bendis was worshipped not only by Thracians but also by Athenians (*Plat. Rep. i. 327 A with ii. 354 Α, cf. IG i³ 136, 369 = M&L 72. 68, 348. 143*). On foreign cults in general see Garland, *Introducing New Gods*; Parker, *Athenian Religion*, 152–98 ch. ix, and for Lycurgus 243.

Citium was in Cyprus, an island important as a means of contact between Asia and the Mediterranean (for Athens’ interest in Cyprus in the fourth century cf. 11). Aphrodite was said to have been born in Cyprus (e.g. Hes. *Theog.* 188–200); a dedication to Aphrodite Ourania by a woman from Citium, of uncertain date, has been found at
deliberate in whatever way seems best to it.

§ii

26 In the archonship of Nicocrates [333/2]; in the second prytany, of Pandionis; of the proedroi Phanostratus of Philaidae was putting to the vote; resolved by the people. Lycurgus son of Lycophron of Butadae proposed:

33 Concerning the resolution that the Citian merchants were making a lawful supplication in asking the people for the right to acquire a plot of land on which to found the sanctuary of Aphrodite, be it resolved by the people: Grant to the merchants of Cium the right to acquire land on which to found the sanctuary of Aphrodite, just as the Egyptians have founded the sanctuary of Isis.

the Piraeus (IG ii² 4636). It is not clear what significance should be seen in the fact that in our text Aphrodite is not given the epithet Ourania, as she commonly is in her oriental manifestation (cf. Parker, 160–1, 196–7—in the latter place giving references for what has been identified, controversially, as an altar of Aphrodite Ourania, erected c.500 in the north-west corner of the Agora, between the Stoa Poikile and the Stoa of the Basileus). Our text has an abbreviated prescript and no publication clause: it was set up at the Piraeus, probably at the site of the new temple and on the initiative and at the expense of the Citians.

Isis (whom the Greeks identified with Demeter: Her. ii. 59. ii) was among the deities whom Alexander the Great provided for when founding Alexandria in Egypt (Arr. Anab. iii. 1. v); for Egyptians worshipping her in Eretria about the same time see IG xii Supp. 562 (dated 350–320 by Fraser, Ptolemaic Alexandria, i. 260 with ii. 410 n. 525); Athenian commanders had gone to support the Egyptians against the Persians on various occasions in the fourth century, and at this time when corn supplies were often insufficient (cf. on 95) the Athenians will have been glad to grant privileges to Egyptian traders visiting Athens (the precedent cited in ll. 42–5 is probably recent).

This inscription is important also for the light which it sheds on Athenian decision-making procedure. Normally all that is inscribed is the decree of the assembly
which ended the process, though every decree of the assembly had to be preceded by a *probouleuma* of the council which placed the subject on the assembly’s agenda (cf. Introduction, pp. xvii–xviii). Here we are given the *probouleuma*, as §1, followed by the assembly’s decree, as §ii; *IG m² 338* shows that at least one assembly intervened between the passing of the *probouleuma* and the assembly’s passing of §ii. Here the *probouleuma* is of the open kind, not containing a recommendation but simply inviting the assembly to make up its own mind (which perhaps suggests that Lycurgus may have been more interested than the average councillor in granting privileges to foreign traders); the assembly’s decree has the shorter formulae, ‘Resolved by the people’ and ‘Be it resolved by the people’, not mentioning the council, which from the fourth century were proper to decrees which for any reason did not enact a recommendation of the council. See Rhodes, *Boule*, 67–8; Rhodes with Lewis, 26; 95, below.

We have another piece of standard procedural language in ‘Concerning the resolution that the Cithian merchants were making a lawful supplication in asking . . . ’ (ll. 33–5). A supplication [*hiketeria*] is a request by some one who is not exercising a right but appealing to the mercy of the person or body supplicated (see esp. J. Gould, *JHS* xcii 1973, 74–103); there was regular provision for supplication to the assembly by citizens (*Ath. Pol.* 43. vi with Rhodes *ad loc.*); all fourth-century epigraphic instances, like this, are of supplications by non-citizens (see Rhodes, *Boule*, 54–6, 72–3; Rhodes with Lewis, 29). Reference to supplication is in fact one of a range of ways in which requests by non-citizens (who have no rights *vis-à-vis* the citizens) may be mentioned; in this case the *probouleuma* refers to ‘what the Cithians say’; the assembly’s decree refers to a ‘lawful supplication’ and to ‘asking’; and R. Zelnick-Abramowitz shows that we
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**Honours at Delphi for Archon of Pella, 333/2 and after**


Delphian, but *παρήγαγός* in §ii. 2.


*block a §i (upper left)*

[? σον κατά, ἄνοιξε] ἱερὸν τέμενος, κλυτότοξε, συνωρίς
[? ἐστεφεῖν Ἀρχ]ονος Δελφίδικα κράτα διάφανα,
[δς Ἁββολω]να ἱερὰν κραίνων χθόνα, πολλὰ δὲ δίων

1 Bousquet, Ebert: unrestored *CEG*. 
should not postulate different procedures according to the words used on different occasions (Mnem. 4 li 1998, 554–73).

The proposer of the _probouleuma_ must have been a member of the council: he was to serve again in 328/7 (Agora, xv 49. 26), but nothing else is known about him. The proposer of the assembly’s decree is the leading politician Lycurgus. He belonged to the _genos_ of the (Eteo)butadae, which took the prefix Eteo-, ‘genuine’, after the name was given to the Cleisthenic dème north-west of the city, and which held the two major priesthoods on the Acropolis. Possible earlier members of the family are the Lycurgus who was leader of the men of the Plain at the time of the rise of Pisistratus (Her. i. 59. iii, _Ath. Pol._ 13. iv, Plut. _Sol._ 29. i); and a Lycurgus in the late fifth century, perhaps a grandfather of our Lycurgus, who was characterized by the comedians as Egyptian (e.g. Ar. _Birds_ 1296, schol. 1294), and it may be that our Lycurgus had supported the Egyptians as he here supports the Gitians. He was born c.390, is first attested as an anti-Macedonian politician in the late 340s–early 330s (cf. on 94), and is best known as Athens’ leading financial expert in the 330s and 320s, with a major interest in buildings (cf. 94) and in religion (e.g. _IG_ ii² 333 = Schwenk 21); there are indications of links with Eubulus and Diophantus, the financial experts of the 350s–340s (F. W. Mitchel _ap. M. B. Walbank, Hesp._ lli 1983, 228 n. 124; Lambert, _Rationes Centesinarum_, 280–91 esp. 288–90, _SPE_ cxxxv 2001, 51–62 at 58). See [Plut.] _X Or._ 841 b–844 a, with the decree of Stratocles 851 f–852 e (parts of inscribed version _IG_ ii² 457); with _APF_, 348–53; Rhodes, _Boule_, 105–8; F. W. Mitchel, _Lectures . . . Semple, ii_, 163–214; Lewis, _Selected Papers_, 212–29. His inscribed decrees and laws are listed by Rhodes, _Boule_, 269, with 1984 Addenda 309.

In your sacred precinct, lord, famous for the bow, the pair of horses crowned with Delphic laurel the head of Archon, who was ruler of the sacred land of Babylon, and with divine Alexander set up many trophies
The earliest of the texts on block a is §ii, commemorating Archon’s victories in the games (cf. 80) when his father is still alive. The decree, §iii, was enacted when his father was dead but he himself was still alive, and must be restored with the name of the Delphic archon of 333/2 (argument set out by Bousquet). §i refers in the imperfect tense to Archon’s governorship of Babylon: he first appears in the literary sources as a trierarch in the fleet which Alexander built in 326 to sail from the Hydaspes to the mouth of the Indus (Arr. Ind. 18. iii), and was governor of Babylon at the time of Alexander’s death in 323 (D.S. xviii. 3. iii, Just. xiii. 4. xxiii). In 321 he was killed fighting against Docimus, sent by Perdiccas to take over Babylon from him (Arr. FG/H 156 F 10 = Succ. fr. *24 Roos, iii—v).

Other blocks, now lost, may have borne the names of Cleinus and his other sons.
of the spear. For that reason he erected these forms of his parents and brothers, and his fatherland Pella bears witness to the fame of his courage.

block a §ii

Archon, blessed for your good reputation, crown — — —, having been victorious at the Isthmian and Pythian Games in horsemanship. He is admired by his father Cleinus — — — and his fatherland Pella — — — to be remembered for ever.

block a §iii

The Delphians granted to Synesis, Archon, and his brothers, sons of Cleinus, Macedonians from Pella, to themselves and their descendants proxeny, priority in consulting the oracle [promanteia], exemption from taxes [ateleia], inviolability [asyla], priority in trials [prodikia], possession of rights [epitima], and all the other things granted also to the other proxenoi.

5 The archon being Damocrates [333/2]; the councillors Megacles, — — —

block b §iv

Isocrates son of Cleinus.

block c §v

Synesis wife of Cleinus.

It appears that the monument of which we have fragments was created after 321, and that §i, in the upper left-hand part of block a, is strictly the dedicatory epigram of that monument; §§ii—iii will have been copied, and the sculpture accompanying them (a two-horse chariot with Archon himself) moved, from an earlier monument or group of monuments. §§iv—v, and perhaps statues of other members of the family, will have been added when this monument was created. For a study of family group monuments in Greece see B. Hintzen-Bohlen, JDAI ev 1990, 129–54.

The decree in §iii is typical of the short decrees in which many Delphic grants of proxeny are recorded, lacking a prescript (but naming the archon and councillors at the end) and a motivation clause, but including an extensive list of the privileges
accompanying the status of *proxenos*. Each of the privileges mentioned here is mentioned in one or both of two Delphic awards of before 350: *F. Delphes* III, i 391 = *SIG* 155, a (for a man from Selinus), 392 = 195 (for the sons of the Thracian ruler Cersobleptes); *prostaneia* is a distinctively Delphic privilege; *proedria* and *ateleia* are frequently mentioned throughout Greece; for *asylia* cf. 75; *prodikia* is spelled out in the award to Cersobleptes’ sons as being in lawsuits ‘against Delphians’. *Epitim(i)a* is ‘possession of rights’, in contrast to *ahmia*, ‘deprivation of rights’ (for which see on 29); it is not clear what rights are at issue, but since this decree does not award citizenship they presumably fall short of the full rights of a citizen.

Archon is from Pella, the capital of Macedon: for the double ethnic ‘Macedonians from Pella’ cf. ‘Cretan from Chersonesus’ in *I. Olympia* 276 = Tod 188 ~ Harding 110 (Cretans are frequently identified thus; on double ethnics see Hansen in Hansen & Raafelub [edd.], *More Studies in the Ancient Greek Polis*, 169–96 at 174–6, 187–90). When a man is honoured, it is common for the honour to be extended to his descendants, and

### Relations between Olbia and Miletus, c.330 (?)

A *stele* with moulding at the top and bottom, found in the Delphinion at Miletus; now in the Antikensammlung, Staatliche Museen, Berlin.

Attic *koiné* but with some final consonant assimilation; ‘very beautiful and careful script’ (Tod), ending each line with the end of a word or syllable.


2a24 Όλβη πόλεις Sst. 15 The stone has no c. 31 Sst.
that is done in §iii; more unusually, Archon’s honours are extended also to his brothers and their descendants, and even to his mother, Synesis (‘Intelligence’). Hers is a rare name, of which LGPN records about a dozen instances altogether (this and one other from Macedon, one from Thessaly, and one from Thrace). A. Wilhelm, Sb. Wien ccxx. 5 1942, 54–7 = Akademieschriften, i. 670–3, noted a number of instances from Delphi and northern Greece of honours for women, but none as early as the fourth century: this text thus foreshadows the greater prominence which some women were to achieve in the hellenistic and Roman periods.

Another high-ranking Macedonian who died in 321 was the general Craterus, killed fighting against Eumenes in Asia Minor (D.S. xviii. 29–32 cf. 37. i). He too had an elaborate monument at Delphi, representing a celebrated hunt in which Alexander took part: it was begun in the 330s and completed after his death (Plut. Alex. 40. iv–v with Hamilton ad loc.; ISE 73 = CEG 878).

The following are traditional for the Olbiopolitan and Milesians.

2 The Milesian in Olbiopolis shall sacrifice like an Olbiopolitan at the same altars and frequent the same public religious rites in the same way as the Olbiopolitans.

6 There shall be exemptions from taxes [ateleiai] for the Milesians as there were before; but, if he wishes to take part in office-holding, let him go to the council, register, and take part, and let him be liable [enteles] just as the other citizens are.

11 They shall also have a front seat [proedria], and shall be proclaimed as competitors in the contests, and shall make the prayers on the thirtieth, as they make them in Miletus also.

14 If any dispute concerning obligations arises for the Milesian in Olbia, let him have a trial and let him be brought in five days before the people’s law-court.
Olbia (also known as Borysthenes), at the mouth of the Bug, which joins the Dnieper in reaching the north coast of the Black Sea west of the Crimea, was colonized from Miletus (Her. iv. 18. i, 78. iii; Str. 306. vii. iii. 17); Eusebius’ date is 647/6 (Hieron. p. 95b Helm), and the earliest Greek pottery there is of the second half of the seventh century, but many think the first settlement was later (see A. J. Graham, *CAH* 2, iii. 124—9; J. Hind in Nielsen (ed.), *Yet More Studies in the Ancient Greek Polis*, 106—7; G. R. Tsetskhladze, J. Boardman, S. Sovolev in Tsetskhladze (ed.), *The Greek Colonization of the Black Sea Area*, 10—22, 201—4, 205—25). It is striking that in this document the two cities deal with each other on an equal basis, and there is no sign that Olbia is a colony of Miletus.

This document, which lacks the prescript of a decree, announces itself as the reaffirmation of a traditional relationship (cf. ‘as there were before’, ll. 6—7), but that does not exclude the possibility that details were changed or added on the occasion of this reaffirmation. Seibert regarded ll. 1—6 and 20—4 as old; H. H. Schmitt (Sot.) ll. 1—6 only; but so mechanical an approach may not be right, and it is possible that, although the relationship already existed, the rules governing it had not previously been written down.

Although the word is not used, this document in fact combines *isopoliteia* (full rights of citizenship for those who migrate) for Milesians who wish to settle in Olbia, in which case they are treated as Olbian citizens and lose their immunity, with religious rights, immunity (sc. from import and export taxes: Gauthier), and if necessary prompt trial of lawsuits (cf. the quick commercial lawsuits introduced in Athens in the 340s: *Ath. Pol.* 59. v with Rhodes ad loc.) for Milesians who merely visit—but the immunity is not extended to Milesians who (by virtue of another *isopoliteia* agreement) are living and behaving as citizens in some other city. The elements involving *isopoliteia* are perhaps likely to be innovations, since such agreements are not attested before the fourth century—but it is conceivable that without the use of that language the principle of reciprocal rights between a mother city and a colony was older, and Graham thought that for Miletus and its colonies the principle went back at least to the fifth century. The provisions of the document begin with the religious, as business in the assembly...
All the Milesians shall be exempt from taxes, except for those who live as citizens and take part in offices and law-courts in another city.

In the same way the Olbiopolitans shall be exempt from taxes in Miletus, and the other things shall apply in the same way to Olbiopolitans in Miletus as to Milesians in Olbiopolis.

at Athens and elsewhere began with the religious (cf. 2), and the judicial aspect comes towards the end.

We have other Milesian treaties which appear from their lettering and dialect forms to be of about the same date as our text: a treaty of friendship and asylia with Sardis (Milet, i. iii 135 + Sbt. 407 ~ Harding 117); a treaty of isopoliteia with Cyzicus (Milet, i. iii 137 = Sbt. 409); a renewal of a treaty of isopoliteia with Phyrgela, south of Ephesus (Milet, i. iii 142 = Sbt. 453). C. Habicht thought that the time of Alexander the Great looked about right (AM lxxii 1957, 259–61); P. Charneux suggested that the Asiatic cities could have had a degree of autonomy under Persian rule between 386 and 334 which would make such agreements possible; S. A. Žebelev, Bull. Acad. Sci. U.S.S.R. 1929, 427–36 at 435 (in Russian; cited by Graham, 99), tried to associate this text with the democratic revolution following Olbia’s defeat of Alexander’s commander Zopyrion (Macrob. Sat. i. xi. 33: Zopyrion’s appointment to Thrace is dated 328 by Heckel ad Just. xii. 2. xvi–xvii), but there is no need to invoke such an occurrence to explain this agreement.

The provisions for mutual recognition begin with sacrifices, participation in which is a major way of marking out those who belong (cf. IG n² 1214. 11–17, where some sacrifices in Piraeus are limited to members of the deme; in 14 sacrifices offered at Helisson are to continue after its absorption into Mantinea). The ‘prayers on the thirtieth’ are prayers to or for the dead on the last day of the month: Bilabel, Die ionische Colonisation, 138–9, citing Ath. vii. 325 α, Harp. τριακές (τ 23 Keaney: 30th day after death). Seibert, 184–5, inferred that these prayers were not normally offered in Olbia but Milesians present in Olbia were to be permitted to offer them.

A symboolaion is a dispute concerning obligations (Gauthier, 160–1). Gauthier suggests that here the ‘people’s law court’ (demotikon dikasterion) is not to be contrasted with a xenikon dikasterion, in the sense either of a special court to try cases involving foreigners or of a court manned by foreign judges (for which cf. 101), but is a ‘people’s court’ with a jury representative of the people in contrast to a court in which magistrates pronounce verdicts on their own.
Athens honours Eudemus of Plataea, 330/29

A stèle found on the Athenian Acropolis, now in the Epigraphical Museum. (In the first century the top was reworked, and another text, IG ii' 4233, was inscribed on the back.)

Attic-Ionic, retaining the old o for ou in l. 3, and using a two-point punctuation mark in l. 5; ll. 2 sqq. stoichedon 19-25 (but sometimes placing stèle in the same stoichos as another letter), ending each line with the end of a word or syllable.

IG ii' 351, and a fragment from top left 624; SIG* 288; Tod 198; Pouilloux, Choix, 6; Schwenk 48*. Trans. Harding 118. See also Pečirka, The Formula for the Grant of Enktesis, 68–70; Hintzen-Bohlen, Die Kulturpolitik des Eubulos und des Lykurg, 21–39.

Of Eudemos of Plataea.

2 In the archonship of Aristophon [330/29]; in the ninth prytany, of Leontis; to which Antidorus son of Antinous of Paeania was secretary; on the eleventh of Thargelion [xĭ], the nineteenth of the prytany; of the proedroi Antiphanes of Euonymum was putting to the vote; resolved by the people. Lycurgus son of Lycophron of Butadæ proposed:

11 Since Eudemos previously offered to the people to make a voluntary gift [epididonai] towards the war of 4,000 (?) drachmas if there were any need, and now has made a voluntary gift towards the making of the stadium and the Panathenaic theatre of a thousand yoke of oxen, and has sent all these before the Panathenaeæ as he promised, be it resolved by the people:

21 Praise Eudemos son of Philurgus of Plataea and crown him with an olive crown on account of his good will towards the people of Athens; and he shall rank among the benefactors of the people of Athens,
This is another decree of Lycurgus (cf. 91; also 81); like 91 it has the shorter formulae appropriate to a decree which does not enact what was recommended in a probouleuma, but this time we have no indication of what the relevant probouleuma contained.

Eudemus offered a voluntary gift [ἐπίδοσις] (such gifts were solicited particularly from the middle of the fourth century: for Athens’ attempt at financial recovery cf. on 91) of 4,000 (?) drachmas ‘towards the war if there were any need’. Though Tod preferred to see an allusion to the Fourth Sacred War of 340—338, in a decree of 330/29 the war in question is likely to be the rising against Macedon in 331—330 led by King Agis of Sparta, in which Athens did not in the end join, and which was put down by Antipater (D.S. xiv. 48. i, 62. vi–63. iv, 73. v–vi; Curt. iv. i. 38–40; vi. i. lacuna–21; cf. Arr. Anab. ii. 13. iv–vi, iii. 6. iii, 16. x; for Athens Aesch. iii. Ctes. 165–7, Din. i. Dem. 34–6, Plut. Dem. 24. i, Præc. Ger. Reip. 818 E; on the chronology see E. Badian in Ventures into Greek History (… N. G. L. Hammond), 258–92). Lycurgus is first attested in 343/2 as an anti-Macedonian politician (Dem. ix. Phil. iii. 72 some MSS, [Plut.] X Or. 841 ε); in 330 he prosecuted Leocrates for deserting Athens at the time of Chaeronea in 338 (Lyc. Leocr., cf. Aesch. iii. Ctes. 252); most of the men active in Athenian politics between the mid 330s and the mid 320s were men such as Demades, who could accept Macedonian supremacy, but Lycurgus’ prosecution of Leocrates and his mention of the war here suggest that he had not abandoned his hostility to Macedon but would have liked Athens to join in the war. It was in 330, after Agis’ defeat, that Aeschines finally brought to court his prosecution of Ctesiphon for a proposal to honour Demosthenes in 336, but he was overwhelmingly defeated [Aesch. iii. Ctes., Dem. xviii. Crown, with Plut. Dem. 24. [Plut.] X Or. 840 c–d]; sympathy for resistance to Macedon remained alive in Athens.

The gift which Eudemus did make was of a thousand yoke of oxen ‘towards the making of the stadium and the Panathenaic theatre’. Both the Panathenaic Stadium
himself and his descendants, and he shall have the right to acquire land and a house, and to perform military service and to pay eisphorai with the Athenians.

33 This decree shall be written up by the secretary of the council and placed on the Acropolis, and for the writing-up of the decree the treasurer of the people shall give — drachmas from the people’s fund for expenditure on decrees.

and the Theatre of Dionysus were among the building projects associated with Lycurgus (cf. [Plut.] *X Or.* 8.41 v; and see Travlos, *Pictorial Dictionary*, 498–504, 537–52). Those who have wanted to save the text, e.g. Tod, have suggested that ‘the Panathenaic theatre’ means the spectators’ seats in the Panathenaic Stadium; but more probably the secretary or the stone-cutter has been careless, and has attached ‘Panathenaic’ to the wrong noun. (He has also made an error with the date: it can be demonstrated that this ought to be either 11 *Thargelion* = 29th of prytany or, less probably, 1 *Thargelion* = 19th of prytany; see *IG* n.2 352 and Meritt, *The Athenian Year*, 91–4.) The suggestion of D. G. Romano that the reference here is not to the well-known buildings cited above but to buildings on the Pnyx (*AJA* 21 xlviii 1985, 441–54) has been answered by G. R. Stanton & P. J. Bicknell (*GRBS* xxviii 1987, 88–9), but Romano pursues the matter further in Forsén & Stanton (edd.), *The Pnyx in the History of Athens*, 71–85. As for the usefulness of Eudemus’ gift of oxen, cf. e.g. *IG* n.2 1673. 64 sqq., where from twenty to forty or more yoke of oxen are used to pull individual column drums from the quarry to Eleusis; Plataea, on the edge of the Boeotian plain (and with a long history of friendship to Athens), is likely to have been better supplied with cattle than much of Attica (cf. 10). Lycurgus had honoured another Plataean in 332/1 (*IG* n.2 345 = Schwenk 36).
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Athens honours Heraclides of Salamis, 330/29 and 325/4

A stele found on the Athenian Acropolis; now in the Epigraphical Museum.

Attic-Ionic, sometimes using two-point punctuation marks with numerals; II. 2–65 stoichedon 39 with irregularities; 66–end non-stoichedon. S. D. Lambert reports paragraphoi after §i and §iii.

IG ii² 360; SIG² 304; Schwenk 68*. See also Rhodes, Boule, 66–7; Isager & Hansen, Aspects of Athenian Society, 200–8; Rhodes with Lewis, 24–5.

We number the five documents i–v in order of inscription, and letter them a–e in chronological order.

§i/e

\[ \text{theo[i].} \]

\[ \text{έπ' Ἀντικλέους ἄρχοντος· ἐπὶ τῆς Ἀλγείδος πέμπτης πρυτανείας· ἤ Ἀντιφῶν Κοροιβοῦ Ἑλεωῦ[νος] εγραμμένει· ἐνδεκάτης, τετάρτης καὶ τριακοστῆς τῆς πρυτανείας· τώρ πρεσβυρῶν ἐπεσφημεῖν Φίλυλλος Ἑλεωῦ[νος].} \]

\[ \text{Δημοκλέους Δημοκλέους Λαμπτρεύς εἰπέν· ἐπειδὴ Ἡ Ἡρακλεῖδης Σαλαμίνος διατελεί φιλοτιμούμενος πρὸς τὸν δήμον τὸν Ἀθηναίων καὶ ποιῶν ὁ τι δύναται ἄγαθον, καὶ πρότερον τὸ ἐπέδωκεν ἐν τῇ s-πανοσιτίᾳ: XXX: μεδίμνους πυρῶν: Γ': δράχμους πρῶτος τῶν καταπλευσάντων ἐνπόρων· καὶ πάλιν ὅτε αἱ ἐπιδύσεις ἦσαν ἐπέδωκε: XXX: δραχμὰς εἰς σιτωνίαν· καὶ τὰ ἄλλα διατελεῖ εὔνους ἄνω καὶ φιλοτιμούμενος πρὸς τὸν δήμον· δεδύχθαι τῶν δήμων· ἐπανεύσασα Ἡρακλείδην Ἡρακλεῖδον Σαλαμίνιον, καὶ στεφανάσαι χρυσῶν στεφάνων εὐνουχία ἐνεκα· καὶ φιλοτιμίας τῆς πρὸς τὸν δήμον τὸν Ἀθηναίων.} \]

\[ \text{ἐνιαὶ δ' αὐτὸν πρόεξον καὶ εὐδεργέτην τοῦ δήμου τοῦ Ἀθηναίων αὐτὸν καὶ ἐγγόνους· εἴναι δ' αὐτοῖς} \]

\[ \text{καὶ γῆς καὶ οἰκίας ἐγκητήσαν κατὰ τὸν νόμον, κα} \]

\[ \text{στρατεύεθαι αὐτοὺς τὰς στρατείας καὶ εἰσφέρων τὰς εἰσφορὰς μετὰ Ἀθηναίων· ἀναγράφει δὲ τόδε τοῦ ψηφίσμα τὸν γραμματέα τὸν κατὰ πρυτανείαν καὶ τοὺς ἄλλους ἐπιάνοις τοὺς γεγενημένους αὐτοῖς ἐν στήλης λιθίνης καὶ στήσας ἐν ἀκρόπολει, εἰς δὲ τὴν ἀναγραφὴν τῆς στήλης δούλων τῶν ταμιῶν ΔΔΔ δραχμὰς ἐκ τῶν εἰς τὰ κατὰ ψηφίσματα ἀναλισκομένων τῶν δήμων.} \]

Readings verified by S. D. Lambert.
In the archonship of Anticles [325/4]; in the fifth prytany, of Aegeis; to which Antiphon son of Coroebus of Eleusis was secretary; on the eleventh, the thirty-fourth of the prytany; of the proedroi Philyllus of Eleusis was putting to the vote. Demosthenes son of Democles of Lamptreae proposed:

Since Heraclides of Salamis continues to be ambitious towards the people of Athens and to do what good he can; and previously he made a voluntary gift [epididonai] in the corn shortage of 3,000 medimnoi of wheat at a price of 5 drachmas, as the first of the merchants to sail in; and again when there were the voluntary gifts [epidoseis] he made a gift of 3,000 drachmas for corn-buying; and in other respects he continues to be of good will and ambitious towards the people; be it resolved by the people:

Praise Heraclides son of Chariclides of Salamis, and crown him with a gold crown on account of his good will and ambition towards the people of Athens. He shall be a proxenos and benefactor of the people of Athens, himself and his descendants; and there shall be for them the right to acquire land and a house in accordance with the law, and they shall serve on the campaigns and pay the eisphorai with the Athenians.

This decree shall be written up by the secretary by the prytany, and the other praises which there have been for him, on a stone stele and placed on the Acropolis, and for the writing-up of the stele the treasurer shall give 30 drachmas from the people's fund for expenditure on decrees.
§II/c

Τηλέμαχος Θεαγγέλου Αχαρνεύς εἶπεν· ἐπειδὴ Ἡρακλείδης Σαλαμίνος ἐπέδωκεν τὸν αὐτὸν τοῦ δήμου πεντάδραχμον πρῶτος τῶν καταπλευσάντων ἐκμόριον ἐπὶ Ἀριστοφάντως ἀρχοντὸς ἐφηφίσθαι τῷ δήμῳ ἐπανέσαε Ηρακλείδην Χαρικλεῖδον Σαλαμίνος, καὶ στεφανώσαε αὐτὸν χρυσῷ στεφάνῳ φιλοτήμια ἐνεκα τῆς εἰς τὸν δήμον τοῦ Ἀθηναίων. ἐπειδὴ δὲ καταχεῖς ὑπὸ Ηρακλεστών πλέον Ἀθηναῖον παρειρέθη τὰ ἱσταὶ ὑπ’ αὐτῶν, ἔλεγον τῇ προσβεβευτῇ ἐνα ἄνδρα ἐξ Αθηναίων [ἀπάντων, δότις ἀφικόμενος] εἰς Ἦρακλεῖον ὡς Διονύσιον ἀξιώσει ἀποδοῦναι τῷ ἱσταῖ τῇ Ἡρακλεῖου καὶ τῷ λοιπῷ μηδέν’ ἀνυποτότον Αθηναίοις πλέον καὶ ταῦτα ποιοῦν τὰ τε δικαία ποιήσει καὶ οὔθεν ὡς ἄτυχος ὑπεύξει τοῦ δήμου [τῶν] ἰσταί τῶν δικαιῶν. δοῦναι δὲ τῷ αἱρεθέντω προσβεβευτῇ εἰς ἐφόδιον τὸν ταμίαν τοῦ δήμου: Γ’ ἐκ δραχμῶν κατὰ δικαιομένων τῶν δήμου. εἰρήνη προσβεβευτῆς Θηβαγένης Ελευσίνος. vacat

§III/a

Τηλέμαχος Θεαγγέλου Αχαρνεύς εἶπεν· ἐφηφίσθαι τῷ δήμῳ τῇ μιᾷ βουλή προσβουλεύσασαν ἐξενικεύειν εἰς τὴν πρώτην ἐκκλησίαν περὶ Ἡρακλεῖου καθήλου. vacat

§IV/b

Κηφυαῖδος Εὐαρχίδου Αχαρνεύς εἶπεν· περὶ ὀν τὸν δήμον προσέταξεν τῇ βουλῇ προσβουλεύσασα περὶ Ἡρακλείου τοῦ Σαλαμίνος, διδάγχαε τῇ βουλῇ Ἡρακλείδης καταπλευσάει Αθηναίοις ἐπὶ τοῦ δήμου τρισχλίους μεδίμνους πεντή δραχμῶν ἐκαστῶν, τοῖς προέδρους οἱ ἐν λάχωσαν προεδρεύον εἰς τὴν πρώτην ἐκκλησίαν προσαγαγείς Ἡρακλείδην πρὸς τὸν δήμον καὶ χρηματίσας, εἰς τὴν βουλὴν ἐκ τοῦ δήμου· ἐν ἔνα τῇ δικαιομένων τοῦ δήμου καὶ εὐθυγράμμων vacat

Erasures: 42—3 τοῦ Ἀθηναίων original text erased; elsewhere text inscribed after erasure. The cutter was correcting his errors.

Telemachus son of Theangelus of Acharnae proposed:

Since Heraclides of Salamis has made a voluntary gift of corn to the people at five drachmas, as the first of the merchants to sail in in the archonship of Aristophon [330/29]; be it decreed by the people:

Praise Heraclides son of Chariclides of Salamis, and crown him with a gold crown on account of his ambition towards the people of Athens.

Since he was brought to land by the Heracleots while sailing to Athens and deprived of his sails by them, elect an envoy, one man from all the Athenians, who shall go to Dionysius in Heraclea and ask him to give back Heraclides' sails and in future not to wrong any of the men sailing to Athens; and by doing this he will be doing justly and shall not fail of anything that is just from the people [of Athens]. The man who is elected as envoy shall be given for travelling expenses by the treasurer of the people 50 drachmas from the people's fund for expenditure on decrees.

There was elected as envoy Thebagenes of Eleusis.

Telemachus son of Theangelus of Acharnae proposed: Be it decreed by the people:

The council shall make a probouleuma and bring it forth to the first assembly concerning Heraclides, so that he may find what good he can from the people of Athens.

Cephisodotus son of Euarchides of Acharnae proposed:

Concerning the people's instruction to the council to make a probouleuma concerning Heraclides of Salamis, be it resolved by the council:

Since Heraclides, on sailing to Athens bringing corn, made a voluntary gift to the people of three thousand medimnoi at five drachmas each, the proedroi to whose lot it falls to preside in the first assembly shall bring forward Heraclides to the people and deal with the matter, and contribute the opinion of the council to the people that the council resolves:

Praise Heraclides son of Chariclides of Salamis and crown him with a gold crown of 500 drachmas; and it shall be possible for him also to
This large dossier is important both for what it tells us about Athenian decision-making procedures and for its contribution to our evidence for corn shortages and responses to them in the 330s and 320s. Unlike 91 (which was probably published at the beneficiaries’ expense), this was published officially, at public expense (lines 22–8); but, unusually, the instruction in the final decree, §5/ε, to include ‘the other praises which there have been for him’ has resulted in the inscription not only of two decrees of the assembly, §§ι/ε, ιι/ε, but also of two probouleumata, §§ιυ/β, ν/δ, and of one short decree in which the assembly commissioned the first probouleuma, §§ιιι/α.1 Osborne in Goldhill & Osborne (edd.), Performance Culture and Athenian Democracy, 341–58 at 352–4, notes that this enabled Heraclides’ honours to be advertised more emphatically. Beyond that, what emerges from a reading of these texts is surprising.

(§ιι/α). We cannot tell under what kind of probouleuma Telemachus was first able to raise the question of honouring Heraclides in 330/29 (there must have been some probouleuma under which Telemachus was able to make his proposal), but it clearly did not allow an immediate decision, and so he carried a motion that the council should

1 The two paragraphs separate the second final decree of the assembly (§ι) from the first (§ιι), and the decree commissioning a probouleuma (§ιιι) from the resulting probouleuma (§ιυ).
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find from the people what good he can, so that the others also may be ambitious, knowing that the council honours and crowns those who are ambitious.

§v/d

67 Phyleus son of Pausanias of Oenoe proposed:

Since Heraclides of Salamis on sailing to Athens bringing corn in the archonship of Aristophon [330/29] gave the people a voluntary gift of 3,000 modii at 5 drachmas, and because of this the people decreed for him that the council should make a probouleuma and bring it forth to the people so that he should find what good he could from the people of Athens, and again in the archonship of Euthycritus [328/7] he made a voluntary gift to the people for corn-buying of 3,000 drachmas;

Be it resolved by the council:

72 The proedroi to whose lot it falls to preside in the principal assembly [kyria ekklesia] shall bring Heraclides forward to the people and deal with the matter, and contribute the opinion of the council to the people that the council resolves:

74 Praise Heraclides son of Charicides of Salamis and crown him with a gold crown of 500 drachmas; and it shall be possible for him also to find from the people whatever good he may be resolved to be worthy of, so that the others also may be willing to be ready benefactors of the council and people, seeing that those who are ambitious — — the people — — all — —

In a crown: In a crown: In a crown: In a crown:
The people The people The council The council
draw up an appropriate probouleuma and bring it to the next assembly: 'so that he may find what good he can from the people of Athens' [ll. 49–51] is a standard expression, used particularly in the fourth century as a kind of open clause inviting the formulation of whatever honours are thought appropriate (cf. Rhodes, Boule, 281–3, where the clauses in §§iv/b, v/d were noted but this was not).

(§iv/b). In the council Cephisodotus mentioned decree iii/a and Heraclides’ benefaction to Athens, recommended to the assembly that he should be praised and given a gold crown, and added ‘it shall be possible for him also to find from the people what good he can’ [ll. 63–4]—in effect inviting the assembly to add to the honours recommended by the council.

(§ii/c). In the assembly Telemachus made the proposal again (he was presumably not a member of the council: Cephisodotus, who proposed §iv/b, was a member of the same deme, Acharnae, and Telemachus will have made use of him as an acquaintance who was a member of the council [Osborne, Demos, 67]); and the text that we have does not ratify the honours of the probouleuma and add further benefits by way of an amendment (cf. Introduction, pp. xvii–xviii), but instead it has the short motion formula appropriate to a decree which does not ratify the probouleuma, and does not
mention the *probouleumata*. In spite of that, it does begin by ratifying it (but does not repeat from it the value of the crown); it then goes on to refer to the theft of Heraclides’ sails by the people of Heraclea Pontica, and arranges for the appointment of an envoy to go and remonstrate with the tyrant Dionysius and for the payment of the envoy’s travelling expenses. A note at the end records the name of the man elected as envoy.

The remaining two documents give us a comparable phenomenon a little later, but this time with no equivalent of §iii/a.

(§v/d). In the council Phyleus refers to Heraclides’ first benefaction and to the fact that in response to that the assembly had commissioned a *probouleuma* from the council; he then refers to a second benefaction, in 328/7, and as in §iv/b recommends praise and a gold crown, and adds, ‘It shall be possible also for him to find from the people whatever good he may be resolved to be worthy of’. This, like the final decree, presumably belongs to 325/4: there is no indication of why Heraclides was not honoured for his second benefaction in 328/7 but was honoured for it (and not for anything subsequent) in 325/4.

(§i/e). Demosthenes son of Democles (see below) in the assembly uses the short motion formula, and does not mention the *probouleuma* but does in fact begin by ratifying it (without repeating from the *probouleuma* the value of the crown). He then goes on to give Heraclides the status of *proxenos* and benefactor, spelling out some respects in which he is to be raised above ordinary metic status (cf. on *isoteleia* in 4). The addition of ‘in accordance with the law’ to the right to acquire land and a house is normal from £.330 (cf. Pečírka, *The Formula for the Grant of Enktesis*, chronological table pp.152–9): we do not know what the law in question stated. The decree ends with the order for the publication of this decree and ‘the other praises’—at a cost of 30 drachmas for an exceptionally long text, though after £.330 that maximum was sometimes exceeded (cf. on 22).

The stone ends with the representation of four crowns: the two awarded by the people, and also two awarded by the council, though in the surviving text the council did not award separate crowns (even olive) of its own but merely recommended gold crowns to the assembly.

It is remarkable not only that such an extensive dossier has been inscribed but also that the two decrees of the assembly, §§i/e and ii/c, have been formulated in a way which disguises their origin: there is nothing in those two documents to indicate that *probouleumata* are being ratified and added to (but the earlier *probouleuma* §iv/b, does indicate that it is a response to the order from the assembly, §iii/a); and if, in accordance with normal practice, the inscription had ended after §ii/c, we should have supposed that these two decrees did not ratify *probouleumata*. In how many other cases a similarly misleading formulation has been used, we cannot tell.

For decree i/e we are given the day within the month but not the name of the month: the 11th of the month can coincide with the 34th day of the fifth prytany if we assume that this is an intercalary, thirteen-month year, the month is the added month, a second Posideon, and of the first four prytanies two had 39 days and two had 38 (Meritt, *The Athenian Year*, 102–4: cf. Introduction, p. xxii). On the frequently mentioned ‘ambition’ (*philotimia*, literally love of honour) see D. Whitehead, *C&M*
xxxiv 1983, 55–74, and cf. 46: what was originally considered a good quality came to be perceived as dangerous to a city, but was eventually judged acceptable if harnessed for civic purposes; the term begins to appear in Athenian decrees about the 340s.

Of the Athenians named in the inscription, Philyllus has a rare name, so the Treasurer of the Other Gods from the same deme in 418/7 (IG i² 472. 17) is probably an ancestor; this Demosthenes was proposer of a decree concerned with the Amphiarrea in 329/8 (IG vii 4254 = Pettrakos, οἵ ἐν τῷ Δαιμόνιο θεῷ, 298); Telemachus makes a few epigraphic appearances between c.340 and the end of the century, inter alia proposing honours for Lycurgus (IG ii² 3207. 25–7), and also appearances in fragments from the comedian Timodes (frs. 7, 17, 21 Kock = Edmonds = 7, 18, 23 Kassel & Austin, ap. Ath. ix. 407 d–f); Cephisodotus or a homonymous grandson was honoured as exestates in charge of the soldiers at Sunium in 298/7 (IG vii 4254 = Petrakos, οἵ ἐν τῷ Δαιμόνιο θεῷ, 298); Phyleus was honoured as an elected official of 336/5 (IG ii² 330 = Schwenk 18; for other members of the family see LGPN ii, under Phyleus of Oenoe). Nothing is known about Heraclides of Salamis (in Cyprus: cf. on 11) except what we read in this inscription.

In 330/29 in a corn shortage (ll. 9–10) he was the first of the merchants to sail in (an emporos is a merchant, strictly one who travels on a ship owned by somebody else: Isager & Hansen, 64–6), and he ‘made a voluntary gift’ of 3,000 medimnoi of the more valuable wheat (ll. 10: c.160,000 litres, or 4,330 bushels) at a price of 5 drachmas per medimnos—which implies that in this crisis he could have obtained a significantly higher price: cf. [Dem.] xxxiv. Phorm. 38–9, reporting that Chrysippus and his brother sold more than 10,000 medimnoi at the same price. In 328/7, ‘when there were the voluntary gifts’ (ll. 12), he made a donation of 3,000 drachmas to a corn-buying fund: cf. [Dem.] xxxiv, loc. cit., reporting that Chrysippus and his brother made a donation of 1 talent (i.e. 6,000 drachmas).

The epigraphic evidence is reviewed by Tracy, Athenian Democracy in Transition, 30–6. There had been an earlier crisis in 335/4 ([Dem.] xxxiv, loc. cit., cf. IG ii² 408 with Tracy, 33–4 and n. 20); Dionysius of Heraclea (cf. below) was involved on the same two occasions as our Heraclides (IG ii² 363 = Schwenk 67, with Schwenk’s dating). Other evidence from the 320s includes the inscription in which Cyrene lists the consignments of corn which it sent to Greece (96); Athens’ dispatch of a colony to the Adriatic in 325/4 to protect the western trade route (100); permission to indebted trierarchs to set donations for corn-buying against fines which they had incurred (IG ii² 1628. 346–9, 363–8, etc.). Alexander’s treasurer Harpalus earned gratitude from Athens by sending corn (D.S. xvii. 108. vi cf. Python, Snell’s TGFi. 91 F 1 ap. Ath. xiii. 586 D, 595 E–596 B). There was further trouble in the years after Alexander’s death (IG ii² 342 = SEG xxxv 70 [333/2 Walbank; but 320s possible, Walbank ap. Schwenk], 369, 398. a. 400, 401). It appears that at this time there were crop failures in and near the eastern Mediterranean, and that the situation was worsened by the activities of such men as Cleomenes, who had made himself governor of Egypt under Alexander and tried to exploit the crisis ([Arist.] Oec. ii. 1352 A 16–23, B 14–20).

We do not know when Heraclides was allegedly robbed of his sails by the Heracleots, of the Megarian colony Heraclea Pontica on the south coast of the Black Sea (ll. 36–46). A dynasty of tyrants there began with Plato’s pupil Clearchus, who ruled
from 364/3 to 353/2; he was succeeded by his brother Satyrus, until 346/5; Satyrus by Clearchus’ sons Timotheus and Dionysius as joint rulers; after Timotheus’ death in 338/7 Dionysius ruled alone until 306/5 (Memnon, *FGH* 434 FF 1–4, viii). For

96

Corn from Cyrene, *c.330–c.326*

Inscribed on the right side of a white marble block found in two pieces in the Small Baths at Cyrene on the front and left of which 97 is inscribed; the back is left blank. Now in Cyrene Museum, inv. no. 51. Phot. Oliverio, figs. 5–6, Marasco, *Economia e storia*, pl. 1–3; our Pl. 9(d).

Cyrenaean Doric. Deep cut letters with *paragraphe* drawn from the left margin under first letters of lines 21, 23, 38, 40, and 42 (but not 55 and 57) to indicate where two successive lines form a single entry.


\[\text{[iapε]itos τωισ Ἱωσᾶς Κα[λιά]δα.}\]

\[\text{[δί]σσοις στοῖν ἑδωκε ᾧ πόλις,}\]

\[\text{ὀκα ἀ στπδεῖα ἐγένετο}\]

\[\text{ἐν ταῖς Ἑλλᾶς.}\]

5 \(\text{Ἀθαναῖος δέκα μυριάδας,}\

\(\text{Ὀλυμπιάδι εξ μυριάδας,}\

\(\text{Ἀργεῖος πέντε μυριάδας,}\

\(\text{Λαρισαῖος πέντε μυριάδας,}\

\(\text{Κορνηλίος πέντε μυριάδας,}\

10 \(\text{Κλευπταρχίς πέντε μυριάδας,}\

\(\text{Ῥοδίοις τρῖς μυριάδας,}\

\(\text{Σικυονῖοις τρῖς μυριάδας,}\

\(\text{[Μ]ελθοέσσι δύο μυριάδας,}\

\(\text{[Με]γαρέσσι δύο μυριάδας}\

15 \(\text{[Τε]πί τοι δύο μυριάδας,}\

\(\text{Λεσ[.]]τριώροι πεντακικῆλοί,}\

\(\text{Θηράιως μ[u]ρόις πεντακικῆλος,}\

\(\text{Οἰκταρεσίου μ[u]ρίοις πεντακικῆλος,}\

\(\text{Λιμφρακίων μ[u]ρίοις πεντακικῆλος}\

20 \(\text{Λευκάδιοι μυρίοι [πεντακ]είχε[χηλίον],}\

\(\text{Καρποτίοις μυρίοις πε[ντακικῆλος],}\

\(\text{Ὀλυμπιάδι μυρίοις δισ[χηλίον]}\

\(\text{ἐξακατίος,}\

\(\text{Θεσσαλῶν Ατραγίοις μυρίοις,}\

2 [δί]σσοι Dobias, [σί]σσοι Oliverio. 15 [τε]πί τοι Oliverio; but reading and form are doubtful (Tod, Brun). 16 Λεσ[.]]τριώροι Oliverio; but form is doubtful (Tod, Brun).
travelling expenses (ll. 43–5) cf. 35; also 44, 48; and see Loomis, *Wages, Welfare Costs and Inflation*, 203–19 ch. xii.

Priest: Sosias son of Kallias. These are those to whom the city gave grain during the grain shortage in Greece.

5 To the Athenians 100,000;
   to Olympias 60,000;
   to the Argives 50,000;
   to the Larisans 50,000;
   to the Corinthians 50,000;
10 to Cleopatra 50,000;
   to the Rhodians 30,000;
   to the Sicyonians 30,000;
   to the Meliboeans 20,000;
   to the Megarians 20,000;
15 to the Tenians (?) 20,000;
   to the Lesbians (?) 15,000;
   to the Therans 15,000;
   to the Oetaeans 15,000;
   to the Ambraciots 15,000;
20 to the Leucadians 15,000;
   to the Carystians 15,000;
   to Olympias 12,600;
   to the Atragians of Thessaly 10,000;
This text records the distribution of 805,000 medimnoi of grain to cities and rulers in mainland Greece and the islands during a grain shortage. But this apparently straightforward text is in almost all respects obscure. We do not know how much grain was involved because we do not know whether the Attic or Aeginetan/Laconian medimnos is being employed, and the Aeginetan/Laconian medimnos was 50% larger (see on 45). We do not know what grain was involved, wheat or barley. We do not know whether the grain was sent in a single year or more than one year. We do not know in which
25 to the Cythnians 10,000;  
to the Opuntians 10,000;  
to the Cydoniates 10,000;  
to the Coans 10,000;  
to the Parians 10,000;  
30 to the Delphians 10,000;  
to the Cnossians 10,000;  
to the Boiotian Tanagraeans 10,000;  
to the Gortynians 10,000;  
to the Eleans 10,000;  
35 to the Palairaeans of Acarnania 10,000;  
to the Megarians 10,000;  
to the Meliboeans 8,500;  
to the Phleiasians 8,000;  
40 to the Hermionians 8,000;  
to the Oetaeans 6,400;  
to the Troizenians 6,000;  
to the Plataeans 6,000;  
45 to the Cean Ituletans 5,000;  
to the Aiginetans 5,000;  
to the Astypalaeans 5,000;  
to the Cythereans 5,000;  
to the Hyrtacinians 5,000;  
50 to the Aiginetans 5,000;  
to the Cean Carthaecans 4,000;  
to the Cythereans 3,100;  
to the Ceans 3,000;  
to the Illyrians (?) 3,000;  
55 to the Cean Corsesians 3,000;  
to the Ambraciots 1,500;  
to the Icetyrians 1,000;  
to the Cnossians 900.

year or years the grain was sent. We do not know whether the grain was indeed a gift or was simply supplied at less than the current market price. We do not know why Cyrene sent the grain.

By explicit mention of grain shortage the inscription implies that relief of the shortage motivated the sending of the grain, but why did relief of the shortage seem so important to Cyrene? Questions of date and interpretation are closely bound up with one another. The inclusion of large quantities of grain for both Olympias, mother of
Alexander the Great, and Cleopatra, Philip II’s daughter who had been married to Alexander of Epirus, indicate a date between 335 and 323 and show that the grain distribution was, at least in part, politically motivated. But precise interpretation depends upon the specific date.

Interpretation of the sending of grain entirely in terms of the pursuit of pro-Macedonian policies by Cyrene depends upon a date prior to Agis III’s revolt in 331/30 since some of Agis’ allies (notably Elis and cities of Crete) are recipients of grain, as is the Spartan-controlled island of Cythera. Kingsley has argued that the sending should be associated with Harpalus’ leaving his post of Treasurer of Alexander shortly before the battle of Issus (332/1). Arrian, our sole source for the episode, treats Harpalus’ departure as flight consequent upon his having been ‘led astray’ by one Tauriscus (Arrian, Anab. iii. vii. ii), but modern scholars have often tried to find some good reason for Harpalus’ departure from and then return to his post as Treasurer (see Heckel, The Marshals of Alexander’s Empire, 215–17), and Kingsley suggests that keeping the cities of Greece sweet by provision of subsidized grain was part of Harpalus’ mission. She sees evidence for this in some lines from Python’s satyr-play Age (itself performed after 325) quoted by Athenaeus (xiii. 596 a–b), which refer to Harpalus’ sending hundreds of thousands of medimnoi of grain to Athens. This suggestion seems implausible for two reasons: the quantities of grain involved are large, and there is no evidence that 332–331 was a time of grain shortage; in 331/30 ambassadors from Cyrene had met Alexander on his way to consult the oracle at Ammon and had given him, according to Diodorus, three hundred war horses and five four-horse chariots (xvii. 49. ii, cf. Curtius, iv. vii. 9), and it is hard to understand this action if Cyrene had already been in such close relations with the Macedonians as to have Harpalus engineer grain shipments on this scale from there.

The major grain shortages known during this period are those which occasions the generosity of Heraclides of Salamis at Athens (95), that is, those of 330/29 and 328/7 (compare Dem. xxxiv. Phormio 38–9 and see Garnsey, 154–62, and Tracy, Athenian Democracy in Transition, 30–36). The major factor in these shortages is likely to have been climatic, but warfare in Italy (an important source for west Greece) and Thrace may also have contributed to the problems (Marasco, 45, 49), and 330/29 may have been the year in which Cleomenes banned grain export from Egypt (Arist. Oec. ii. 1352 a 16–23, Marasco, 55). It is conceivable that some of the contributions listed may have been made in one of these years, some in the other. Multiple grants are made to eight of the recipients: Aegina, Ambracia, Cnossus, Cythera, Megara, Meliboea, Oeta, and Olympia (Alexander’s mother). In some cases one of the two gifts is much smaller than the other, but in the case of Cythera the two gifts are of similar size (5,000 and 3,100 medimnoi). This suggests that the gifts may have been made not in a single year but in at least two different years. The order in which the recipients appear is determined by the size of the grant, not by the order in which the gifts were made. The inscribed text would seem to be constructed from records of grants made, rather than from the record of decisions taken by a political body.

The inscription reveals Cyrene as agriculturally extremely rich. If Cyrene used the Attic medimnos, as she used the Attic weight standard for her coinage, the surplus of
805,000 medimnoi can be directly compared with the total grain production of Lemnos, Imbros, and Scyros in 329/8, as reconstructed from the record of the return of first-fruits to Eleusis in *IG ii²* 1672, of c.350,000 Attic medimnoi. This emphasizes the size of Cyrene's territory, the favourable climate it enjoyed (see Osborne, *Greece in the Making*, 59–60, Horden and Purcell, 65–74), and the way in which its wealth rested on very much more than just the production of silphium. Curiously we have no other evidence for Cyrene as a source for grain for the cities of classical Greece, though it is possible that supply of grain lies behind the Athenian proxeny grant in the middle of the fourth century to some men of Cyrene who have helped Athenians in Cyrene (*IG ii²* 176; and compare Theophrastus, *H. Pl.* viii. 4).

Even given its agricultural wealth, the amount of grain sent is remarkable. Was Cyrene in a position to give away grain probably worth in the region of 400–700 talents, not allowing for the increased prices in a corn shortage? Or does 'gave' here simply mean 'provided' (at a subsidized rate)? (contrast the explicit 'give as a gift' in 64. 20–21)? If the market rate in 329/8 was three times the 'normal' price, as is quite probable, providing the grain at the normal price would mean forgoing some 800–1,400...
talents of income. (‘Gave’ can hardly mean simply ‘provided at the market rate’ since that would hardly be something worth commemorating on a marble block.) Cyrene had an oligarchic government at this period, but under what circumstances would the advantages of making these gifts seem to justify the enormous tax which giving away this much grain would have amounted to? The gifts to Alexander show that the government of Cyrene was capable of lavish generosity when it thought this was in its political interests, but the scale involved here is quite different. By 324 political conflict had broken out in Cyrene between democrats and oligarchs (conflict that ended by giving an opportunity to Ptolemy I to take overall control of Cyrene), but even if the gifts recorded in this inscription are linked to the need of a régime under pressure to court support, the scale remains surprising. Did the government of Cyrene jump, or were they pushed?

The inscription itself tells us nothing about the background to the decision to distribute this grain. Pressure to make the distribution might have come from two different sources, the Macedonians and appeals from Greece. In the latter case, we might imagine that most, if not all, of the forty-one different recipients of grain made contact with Cyrene, some of them more than once, to ask for assistance, either because they were in any case in regular commercial or diplomatic contact or because they quickly heard what Cyrene had done for other communities. Cyrene had, from its foundation or soon afterwards, attracted settlers from many different parts of Greece, and we have other evidence (M&L 7) that Thera, one of the beneficiaries, sought at this period to remind Cyrene of its role in Cyrene’s foundation, with an eye to enjoying some of the benefits of Cyrene’s prosperity.

In deciding between these alternatives the distribution of the cities to which grain is sent is crucial. In some parts of Greece almost every city receives grain (so with the belt of cities across the Isthmus of Corinth—Sicyon, Corinth, Megara, Plataea, Athens, Tanagra). In other parts few cities are recipients, although those that do receive grain may receive large amounts: this is particularly notable in Thessaly where Larisa receives 50,000 and Atrax 10,000 but no other city receives anything (unless it is the Thessalian Meliboea that is meant), and in Boeotia where Plataea and Tanagra get significant grants but no other city receives anything.

It is harder to explain the pattern by supposing Macedonian initiative. Various recipient cities, including Rhodes, are known at various times to have opposed the Macedonians, but the crucial case is that of Elis. Philip’s intervention in favour of the oligarchic group at Elis (Paus. iv. 28. iv–vi) led to a long history of resistance to Macedon: Elis ‘moved to recover its freedom’ (D.S. xvii. 3. v) on the death of Philip,
sent troops in response to the appeal from Thebes when Thebes was besieged by Alexander (D.S. xvn. 8. v–vi), and was involved in Agis’ revolt and consequently fined by the League of Corinth (Gurtius, vt. i. 20). Agis’ revolt was over at latest by spring 330 (Bosworth, *Conquest and Empire*, 200 n. 14) and whether the grain was sent in 330/29 or 328/7 it must have been sent in knowledge of Elis’ behaviour. Yet it receives grain; it is indeed the only Peloponnesian recipient of grain not from the north-east corner of the Peloponnesian. If the initiative behind the supply of grain from Gyrene was Macedonian the presence of Elis among the recipients is hard to explain. What is more, if Olympias mother of Alexander and Cleopatra his sister were both in Epirus, as is possible, then the only Macedonian recipient is Meliboea—if it is the Macedonian and not the Thessalian Meliboea that is meant (for the evidence on the whereabouts of Olympia and Cleopatra see Marasco, 28–30). (For further arguments against political explanations of the distribution see Marasco, 77–99.)

Two patterns can be perceived. There is a general correlation between the probable size of a community and the amount of grain that it receives (so Athens, with around 30,000 citizens, receives by far the largest amount, and the tiny Cean city of Coresia, with perhaps 200 citizens, receives only 3% of the Athenian amount). And recipient communities lie for the most part along plausible shipping routes from Gyrene—either to Rhodes and then across the Aegean to Athens, or to Crete, Cythera, and then up the west side of the Peloponnesian to north-west Greece. But community size and trade routes can hardly be the only factors: Epirus was not densely populated, and Cleopatra is known to have been able to export grain in the 330s (Lyc. Leocr. 26, 152), yet between them she and Olympias receive 122,600 *medimnoi*. If the idea that Gyrene is under Macedonian orders is improbable, some political motivation seems nevertheless certain.

The presence of Olympias and Cleopatra demonstrates that political factors are at work in this distribution, but the case of Elis makes the politics difficult to read. We should allow a good deal for the rather haphazard distribution of *proxenoi* in determining the distribution. That said, the geographical concentration of recipients makes it reasonable to suspect that the inscription gives us at least an approximate picture of the differential vulnerability of different Greek cities to grain shortage (Garnsey, pp. 159–61). It is the areas of south-east Greece with the lowest rainfall that are most frequently in receipt, but areas further north are not entirely unaffected, and this inscription confirms evidence from the Roman period and modern climatic data which suggest that Thessaly, although sometimes able to produce large grain surpluses, was not infrequently itself subject to severe shortages (compare *JRS* lxxiv 1984, 30–44).
Sacred law from Cyrene, late fourth century

Inscribed on the front and left side of a white marble block found in two pieces in the Small Baths at Cyrene on the right side of which 96 is inscribed; the back is blank. Now in Cyrene Museum, inv. no. 51. Phot. Ferri, figs. 14–17, Oliverio, figs. 1–4; our Pl. 9.

Cyrenaean Doric. Separate clauses are marked out

97

[97] [Α]πόλλων ἔχρη[σε].
[ἐς ἀ]εὶ καθαρμοῖς καὶ ἄγνημας κρ[ί δε]—

κατ' ἰδίαν γραμμένοι τῶν Λεβάναν οἰκ[ίαν].

(i) [ἀ]ι καὶ ἐπὶ τὰν γὰρ ἡ ἐπὶ τὰμ πόλιν ἐπειθη νόσο[ς ἡ λί]—

5 [μο]ι ἦν ἡμὰς τὸν ἐμπροσθε τὰμ πυλὰ, [ἐναντὶ]-

[ιν]ὸν τὸ Αποτροπαίον, τῶν Ἀπόλλωνι τοῦ Ἀποτρὸπ[όπ]—

χάμαρον ἐρυθρὸν.

(ii) [κ]ἀλὸν ἔν ἱφτανοι πεφυκός· α[π] κα τῶν θεῶν τῶν τιμᾶν
[ἐ]πειθεὶς, τῶν κάλοις χρηστῇ καὶ ἐς ἱρὰ καὶ ἐς βα[β]α[ν]—

10 [λα] καὶ ἐς μιαρά.

(iii) [ἀπ]ὸ γυναικὸς ἀνήρ τῶν νύκτα κοιμαθὲς θυσεὶ ὁ [τ]—

[ι κα]ὶ ἁλητὴς· τῶν δὲ ἀμέραν κοιμαθὲς λωσάμεν[ος]

[...........] ἐ[πὶ] ὅπι καὶ δήλ[η]τα[e], πλαν ἢ ἐς [...]—

[--------------] τῶν τῶν τῶν [−3 4 −]

15 [-------]

(iv) [ἀ]ὶ λεχων ὁροφομ μιανεί· τὸν μ[ἐν ὑπόροφον μιανεὶ, τὸν]

[δ' ἐ]ξόροφον οὐ μιανεί, α[ἰ καὶ μὴ ὑπέθημ]. ὁ δ' ἐξ[τρ]θρ[—

[ω] σος, ὁ κα ἐνθο[δ], α[ἰν]τ[ὸς] μὲν μιαρὸς τέντα[i ἀμ]—

[ἐ]ρας τρις, ἄλλον δὲ οὐ μιανεί, οὗδε ὅπι καὶ ἐν[η] ὁ ο[—

20 ὅτος ὁ ἄνθρωπος.

(v) [Α]καματίων ὅσια παντὶ καὶ ἄγνων καὶ βαβάλω[ι],

πλαν ἀπ' ἄνθρωπος Βάττω τῶ {τω} ἀρχαγέτα καὶ Τιμωπατήρων καὶ ἀπὸ Ὀνυμάστω τῶ Δελφῶ [τι],

ἀπ' ἄλλω, ὅπη ἄνθρωπος έκαμε, οὐκ ὅσια ἄγνω[ι],

25 τῶν δὲ ἱαρῶν ὅσια παντὶ.

(vi) α[ἰ κα ἐπὶ βομβίῳ θύσῃ ἱαρήνην, ὃ τι μὴ νόμος θύει, τ[δ]—

ποτιπάμμα θελέν ἀπὸ τῶ βωμῶ καὶ ἀποπλήθω-

ας καὶ τὸ ἄλλο λίμα ἄνελεν ἐκ τῶ ἱαρῶ καὶ τῶν ἱκ-

τῶν ἀπὸ τῶ βωμῶ καὶ τὸ πῦρ θελέν ἐς καθαρὸν·
Apollo issued an oracle: [the Cyrenaecans] shall inhabit Libya for ever, observing purifications and abstinences and tithes.

(i) If sickness or famine or death visit the land or the city, sacrifice a red billy goat in front of the gate, opposite the Shrine of Aversion, to Apollo the Averter.

(ii) Wood growing in a sanctuary: provided that you pay the god the price, you may use the wood for sacred and for secular and for unclean purposes.

(iii) A man coming from a woman, having slept with her by night, may sacrifice whatever he wishes. If he has slept with her by day, once he has washed, he may go — wherever he wishes, except to — —

(iv) The woman who gives birth pollutes the house. She pollutes anyone within the house, but she does not pollute anyone outside the house, unless he comes inside. Any person who is inside will be defiled for three days, but he will not pass on the pollution to another, no matter where this person goes.

(v) Right to participate is granted to anyone, either pure or profane, with regard to Akamanties. Except in the case of the man Battus the founder, and the Tritopateres and in the case of Onymastus the Delphian, in the case of any other man that has died there is no right to participate for a pure man; but in the case of the sacred ones, there is a right to participate for anyone.

(vi) If someone sacrifices at an altar a victim which it is not customary to sacrifice, he is to remove from the altar the fat that remains and wash it away, and remove from the sanctuary the rest of the filth, and take away the ash from the altar and the fire to a pure place, and
καὶ τόκα δὴ ἀποψιμένοις, καθάρας τὸ ιαρόν καὶ  
ζαμίαν θύσας βοτὸν τέλευν, τόκα δὴ θυεῖν ὡς τόμοις).
(vii) οὐκόκυμος μέστα ἐς ἀδελφεῖν τέκνα.
(viii) αἱ καὶ δέκατος ἦν ἀνθρωπος ἤματας, καθάρας αἱ—  
[τὸ] ἀτύμον αἵματι, καθαρεῖ τὸ ιαρόν καὶ πολη—  
[θ] ἐς ἐν ταῖς ἄγορας ὀπόσσας καὶ πλείστων ἄξιος ἡ[η].  
προθυσεὶ πρὸ τὰς δεκάτας ζαμίαν βοτὸν τέλε—  
[η]ν, οὐκ ἀπὸ τῶς δεκάτας, καὶ τόκα δὴ ὑπεί τῶς  
[δ] ἐκάταν καὶ ἀποτεισὶ ἐς καθαρόν αἱ δὲ μή, τῶν αἱ—  
(ix) ὑγός, αἱ μή τί καὶ ἐκόμιο μιαί, ἀποχρεῖ καθάρας[θ]—  
[κ] αἱ ἀτύμον καὶ ζαμίας οὐ δεῖ: αἱ δὲ καὶ ἐκόμιο μιαί, κα[θα]—  
[θ] ραῖ τὸ ιαρόν καὶ ζαμίαν προθυσεὶ βοτὸν τέλευν[ν].
(x) ἣν καὶ χρήματα δεκάτα ἦν, ἐκτιμᾶσας τὰ χρήματα—  
[κ] αῖ, καθαρεῖ τὸ ιαρόν καὶ τὰ χρήματα δίχα καὶ τόκα  
50 [δ] ὑποθυσεὶ ζαμίαν βοτὸν τέλευν οὐ τὰς δεκάτ—  
[α]ίς, καὶ τόκα δὴ ὑπεί τὰς δεκάτας καὶ ἀποτείς ἐς  
[κα] θαρόν. αἱ δὲ μή, τῶν αἱτῶν ὑπεί. τῶν ὁ χρήμα—  
[τ]αίς, ἃς καὶ δεκάτα ἦν, ἐντόφον οὐκ ενθήσεὶ οὐδ[ε]—  
[π] οὐδέ ἐν, οὐδὲ χύτρα οἰσεὶ πρίγη] καὶ τῶι θεῶι ἀπὸ[δε]—  
[kate] οἰσεί. αἱ δὲ καὶ χύτρα ενήκει ἡ ἐντόφοι ενθήμια, κα—  
[θα] ραῖ τὸ Ἀπολλώνιον ζαμίαν προθυσεί κατὰ τὰς  
[ἀμ] ζς τῶν βουτὸν τέλευν.
(xi) αἱ καὶ δέκατος ἦν ἀνθρωπος αποθάνη, κατακομβί—  
[ει] τοῖς τῶν ἀνθρωποῖ ταῖς μὲν πρατόστα ἀμέραι  
55 [ἐπ] θησεῖ δὲ τί καὶ δῆληται ἐπὶ τὸ σάμα, δεῦτερον δ—  
[ἐ] οὐδέ ἐν, πρὶν καὶ ἀποδεκατευκέοι τοῖς θεοῖς, καὶ ο[υ]—  
[δ] ὁ θεῶι] ἀπὸ οὐδ' ἐπί τὸ σάμα εἰπί. ἐκτιμάσαντι δὲ ὁ [ός]—  
[σω] πλ' εἰσόντων άξιος ής, κοινὸς ἡμῶν τῶι θεῶι, καθαρά[ς]—  
[δ] ἐν τῶι Ἀπολλώνιον καὶ τὰ χρήματα δίχα, προβοθά[ς]—  
60 [σ] αὐτής ζαμίαν βουτὸν τέλευν οὐκ ἀπὸ τὰς δεκάς τρ—  
[α] σι προβοσίμων, θυεὶ τῶς δεκάτας προβοσίμων [κα]—  
[i] ι ἀπο] οἰσεὶ χαθαρῶν αἱ δὲ μή, τῶν αἱτῶν ὑπεί.
(xii) αἱ καὶ ἀπ' οθάνη δέκατος ἦν καὶ τὰ τέκνα καταλ[πι]—  
[η] διν καὶ τὰ μὲν ζώι, τὰ δὲ ἀποθάνη, ἐκτιμάσας τὰ [δ]—  
65 [παλλεῖ]μενα, ὀπόσαν καὶ πλεῖστον άξια ής, καθάρας [τ]—  
[ὁ Απολλώνιον καὶ τὰ χρήματα δίχα, προβοσίζει ζαμίδα—  
[ν] τῶι ή] βασά προβοσίμων καὶ τόκα δὴ θυεῖ τῶι δε—  
[κάταν προ] βοσίμων. τῶι δὲ καὶ θαράς αὐτοῦ αὐτόδ]—  
[v ἀμάτι κ] αὐτὸ τὸ ιαρὸν δίχα, πωληθέντας ἐν ταῖς ἄγοραις—  
70 [νοεῖ] τῶι τῶι ἦματ ζαμίαν βουτὸν τέλευν καὶ τόκα [α]—  
[ἡ θυεῖ τά] πν' δέκατα καὶ ἀποτείς ἐς καθαρῶν αἱ [δε]
then, when he has washed himself and purified the sanctuary and sacrificed as a penalty a full-grown animal, let him sacrifice according to custom.

(vi) A man is obliged as far as his brother’s children.

(vii) If someone who is of adult age is subject to a tithe, once he has purified himself with blood he is to purify the sanctuary, and once he has been sold in the marketplace for the highest price he will fetch he is first to sacrifice, before the tithe, a full-grown animal as a penalty, not one from the tithe, and then when he comes to sacrifice the tithe he is to carry it away to a pure spot. But if he does not, the same measures will be needed. Everyone who sacrifices is to bring a vessel.

(ix) If a boy is accidentally polluted, it is sufficient for him to purify himself but no penalty is needed. But if he is polluted by his deliberate action, he is to purify the sanctuary and sacrifice a full-grown animal as a penalty.

(x) If property is subject to a tithe, the owner is to assess the value of the property and purify the sanctuary and the property separately, and then he is to sacrifice a full-grown animal as a penalty, not one from the tithe, and then he is to sacrifice the tithe, and carry it away to a pure spot. But if he does not, the same measures will be needed. No one is ever to make any funerary offerings from the property which is subject to tithe, and no one is to bring libations before he pays the tithe to the god. If he brings libations or makes funerary offerings, he is to purify the sanctuary of Apollo and then sacrifice a full-grown animal determined by the nature of the offence.

(xi) If a person who is subject to tithe dies, when they have buried the person, the heir is to place whatever he wants on the grave on the first day. But subsequently he is not to place a single thing before he pays the tithe to the god, and he is not even to sacrifice or to go to the grave. They are to assess him for the most he was worth, being a partner of the god. When he has purified the sanctuary of Apollo and the property separately, and has sacrificed a full-grown animal as a penalty, not one from the tithe, in front of the altar, he is to sacrifice the tithe before the altar and carry it away to a pure spot. But if he does not, he will have the same obligations.

(xii) If someone who is subject to a tithe dies and leaves children and some live and some die, he (the heir?) is to assess those who have died for the most that they were worth, purify the sanctuary of Apollo and the property separately, and sacrifice the penalty of an adult man before the altar and then sacrifice the tithe before the altar. But in the case of the living descendant, he is to purify himself with blood and then purify the sanctuary separately; once he has been sold in the marketplace he is to sacrifice a full-grown animal as the penalty of an adult man and then he is to sacrifice the tithe and carry it away to a
4Q8 97. SACRED LAW FROM CYRENE, LATE FOURTH CENTURY

[μή, τῶν αὐτῶν δὴσει.

(xi) [ἐ]otencei.]n ἐπεί καὶ ἀρξέται, θύεν κατὰ νόμον. [ἐ]

[θημ, τὸ λοιπὸν θυσεὶ ὅποικα καὶ δήλη[ται]

η, καθαρμὸς ἀποχρεῖ, ὡς[.....] 71ς [ἐ]

καθάραι οὐ δεῖ, αἱ δὲ καὶ δήληται [ἐ]

προβόμοιον, οἰσεὶ ὡς[.....] 711

N.ΡΩ[ἐ] XA.ΛΣΕ[ἐ] 111

3 further lines cannot be read

B

(xiv) [νύμφ]ήμα μη [ἐν], πρὶν ἠμὲν τὸ κοινατήριον, ζ[.....] 85

ος τῶν ἀνδρί τένται οὐδὲ μιαοῖει, μέστα κα

[ἐς] Αρταμων ἐνθήνη: ἀ δὲ κα ταῖσαι μη ποιήσαοι [-

σα μια έκασσά, καθάραισα τὸ Αρταμιτίον ἐπ[ι] -

θεὶ νοεί ζαμίαν βοτόν τέλεν, καὶ τόκα δή εἶτ-

τὸ κοινατήριον αἱ δὲ κα μὴ έκοίσα μιαί, κα-

αρεῖ τὸ ἱαρόν.

(xv) [ν]υμφαν δὲ τὸ νυμφήμον ἐς Αρταμων κατ[εν] -

[θεὶ] εἰ δεῖ, ὀπόκα καὶ δήληται Αρταμιτίους, [ὡς κα]

τά ἄγαστα δὲ λαίον: α δὲ κα μη κατενθήνη, δ[πολ] -

υνοεῖ ταὶ Ἀρτάμιτι ἀ κ[α δήλητ]μ[α] τοῖς [δὲ] Αρταμιτί -

οις, μη καθελεύειν [θυία] δὲ καθαρεῖ τὸ Ἀρταμίτι -

ν καὶ ἐπιθυσει ζ [αμίαν βοτόν τέλεν]

(xvi) [γυνά κούοσα πρὶν τεκέν κατε]τι τὸ νυμφή[ιν] 85
[ἐς Αρταμων] τῇ ἄρκοι δουσει πόδας κα

τῶν κεφαλῶν καὶ τὸ δέρμα: αἱ δὲ κα μη κατ[εν] 

θεὶ πρὶν τεκέν, κατοικει σύμ βοτῶν τέλεων: ἀ δ[ἐ]

κατάσσα άγνευσει ἐβδομαν καὶ θηὺδων καὶ 

ἡράτων, καὶ ἀ μη καθελεύθυνα άγνι-

ευσει ταύτας τῶς άμέρας: αἱ δὲ κα μιαί, καθα-

ραμένα αὐτὰ καθαρεῖ τὸ ἱαρόν καὶ ἐπιθυσει[ἐ]

ξαμίαν βοτόν τέλεν.

(xvii) αἱ κα γυνὰ[λήμη, αἱ μέγα κα διάθηλον ἡμί, μη] 100
[καίνοις ἂσπερ ἀπὸ θανόντος, αἱ δὲ κα μη 

διάθηλον ἡμί, μαίνεται αὐτὰ τὰ οἰκία καθάπε[ρ]

ἀπὸ λεχοῦ.

(xviii) ἱκεσίων.

(xviii) ἱκεσίων ἐπακτός: αἱ κα ἐπισεμφῆ ἐπί τῶν 110

οἰκίαν, αἱ μέγα κα ιόαι ἀφ’ ὀτιὸν αἰ ἡλθα, ὄ-

νυμασει αὐτῶν προειπὼν τρῖς άμέρας: αἱ δ[ἐ]

κα τεθνάκην ἐγγυαμε ἄλλη πη ἀπολολήσε[ε],

αἱ μέγα κα ιόαι τὸ δίνμα, ὄνυματι προερεί, αἱ
pure spot. But if he does not, he will have the same obligations.

(xiii) Whenever s/he begins to —, sacrifice is to be made according to the law. — for the future s/he is to sacrifice, whenever s/he wishes — purification is sufficient, wherever anyone — there is no need of purification, but if s/he wants — an offering before the altar, s/he shall bring — — — —

B

83 (xiv) A bride before she goes to the bedchamber must go down to Artemis, but she herself will not be under the same roof as her husband and will not be impure until she comes to Artemis. But whoever has not done these things and deliberately incurs pollution, when she has purified the sanctuary of Artemis she is to sacrifice as a penalty a full-grown animal, and then go to the sleeping chamber. But if she incurs pollution accidentally, she is to purify the sanctuary.

(xv) It is necessary that a bride should go down to the bride room to Artemis, whenever she wants at the Artemisia, and the sooner the better. Any bride who fails to go down is to make an additional sacrifice to Artemis as ordained at the Artemisia. And because she has not gone down she is to purify the Artemision and additionally sacrifice as a penalty a full-grown animal.

97 (xvi) A pregnant woman is to go down to the bride room to Artemis before she gives birth and she is also herself to give to the bear the feet and the head and the skin. If she does not go down before giving birth, she is to go down with a full-grown animal. She who goes down is to be pure on the seventh and eighth and ninth, and she who does not go down is to be pure on those days. But if she incurs impurity she is first to purify herself and then purify the shrine and sacrifice additionally as a penalty a full-grown animal.

(xvii) If a woman miscarries, if it is distinguishable, they are polluted just as from someone having died; but if it is not distinguishable, the house itself is polluted as from childbirth.

Of Suppliants/Visitants.

(xviii) Suppliants/Visitants sent by spells. If a suppliant/visitant is sent to the house, if (the householder) knows from whom he came, he shall make a proclamation and name him for three days. And if he has died in the land or has perished somewhere else, if he knows his name, he is to call out by name, but if he does not know (he is to pro-
This important sacred law gives us a glimpse of the daily concerns and anxieties of a classical Greek community and reminds us of how much of the religious practice of Greek cities we have limited understanding. The combination of common sense and ritual elaboration is particularly striking. Although the letter forms suggest that it may be a little later in date than 96, which is inscribed on the same block, its provisions seem unlikely to contain much that is new and we do not know why it was written up at this time. Some peculiarities may be a result of local Gyrenaean practice, but the parallels that can be found in very different parts of the Greek world suggest that this factor should not be over-emphasized. Rather we need to acknowledge the extent of our ignorance of Greek beliefs and practices with regard to purification.

The structure and organization of the law are not easy to understand. On Side A the lower part consists of a series of clauses about people subject to a tithe, but the topics...
claim): 'O person, whether you are a man or a woman'. He is to make figurines, a male and a female, either from wood or from clay, and give them hospitality, offering them a portion of everything. When you have performed the customary rites, carry the figurines and the portions to an unworked wood and deposit them.

122 (xix) Second suppliant/visitant, initiated or uninitiated, who has sat down at the public sanctuary. If there is a pronouncement, for however much is pronounced, let the ritual be performed. If there is no pronouncement, let there be a sacrifice of the fruit of the earth and a libation annually for ever. But if he omits it, then twice as much. If a child forgets and omits and there is a pronouncement to him, whatever is told him when he consults the oracle, he is to pay this to the god and make sacrifice at his ancestral tomb, if he knows where this is, and if not to ask the oracle.

132 (xx) Third suppliant/visitant, murderer. He is to present the suppliant/visitant to the magistrate and the three tribes. When he announces that he has come, having set him down on the threshold on a white fleece, wash and anoint him and go out to the public road, and all to be silent while they are outside, obeying the announcer. The one presented as a suppliant is to go — — and those who follow — — sacrifices — — — —

of the early clauses are very diverse. Side B has clauses about women's reproductive lives, and about 'suppliants', clearly separated by a heading, but the three categories of suppliant seem quite different (see below). The lack of clear structure, along with the variations in phrasing and dialect, might suggest that this inscription simply copied an earlier text in which different clauses had been recorded at different times, but the absence of clearly archaic words and the conflation of two alternative ways of saying the same thing at B. 93–5 imply at least a degree of fourth-century editing and the recurrent pattern of ten-line sections in A. 42–82 seems unlikely to be coincidental.

Delphic Apollo, whose name begins the text, had a special place at Cyrene because the establishment of the settlement by a group led by Battos from Thera was held to have been ordered by his oracle (compare M&L 5, which also dates to the fourth century). Apollo and Artemis also had a particular connection with purification,
perhaps because they were senders and healers of diseases. Ascription to the Delphic oracle lends authority to a law, and is most familiar in the case of the Lycurgan laws at Sparta (Her. i. 65). Although Delphi was not infrequently consulted over purification, this is the only known example of a purity law that declares itself to be an oracular pronouncement.

(i) The opening clause deals with the classic circumstance in which purification was felt to be required: widespread sickness, famine (probably), and death (compare the link between plague at Athens and the purification of Delos according to D.S. xn. 58. vi–vii). In Iliad i it is Apollo who sends the plague, and he was its pre-eminent averter. Sacrifice of a goat to avert plague was enjoined upon the people of Cleonae by Delphi (Paus. x. 11. v), and Apollo Apotropaios frequently receives sacrifices of a goat, though not normally a red one. The placing of the sacrifice and, if this interpretation of the text is correct of ‘the Shrine of Aversion (Aapotropaion)’, in front of the gates symbolizes the exclusion of the evil from the city.

(ii) The commercial approach to wood from the sanctuary accords with the way in which taking wood from a sanctuary is elsewhere treated as an offence against property rights rather than an act of sacrilege (LSS 81 and commentary, Parker, 165), but sometimes wood from sanctuaries was specifically reserved for sanctuary use (LSCG 150. B). The categorization ‘sacred’ (hieros), ‘profane’, ‘polluted’ is unique to this inscription; in clause v we meet ‘pure’ and ‘profane’ as apparently exhaustive categories.

(iii) Although Herodotus (n. 64) takes it as a mark of being Greek (or Egyptian) that one washes between enjoying sexual intercourse and entering a sanctuary, and this is supported by numerous sacred laws, here washing is enjoined only following daytime intercourse; elsewhere what makes a difference is whether the woman involved was a virgin, a wife, or a prostitute (Parker, 74–5 n. 4, for a summary). The lost lines of text presumably specified particular shrines or classes of shrine.

(iv) The later consideration of miscarriage (B. 108–9), which refers back to this clause, says that it is the oikia that is polluted. The specification of ‘roof’ in this passage suggests that the pollution is linked to the physical place and not acquired by kinship with the new mother.

(v) This is an extremely obscure clause, where the structure, grammar, and meaning of individual terms are all debated (see Brune, whose interpretation is, however, not entirely followed here). The clause concerns the circumstance in which participation in certain categories of cult pollutes or does not pollute. The issue is what those cultic categories are. Crucial is the interpretation of ‘of the Akamanties (or Akamantia)’. We know of sacrifice to the Akamantes at Marathon in Attica in the fourth century (where also they are associated with the Tritopatores) (ZPE cxxx 1999, 45–7, B. 92; on Tritopatores see also FGrH 325 F 6), and of what appear to be Akamantiaid days, associated with the dead, in another inscription from Cyrene (Supp. Cirenaico 144). The use of the verb κατάμενα in l. 24 of death further supports the idea that the Akamantes should be those unwearied because dead, although a connection with Akamas, second son of Antenor, cannot be ruled out: the sons of Antenor did receive cult at Cyrene. The parallels with persons in ll. 22–4 make it more likely that the Aka-
mantles are a category of the dead than that they are a category of shrine. In that case this clause defines the difference between ordinary dead, participation in whose rites pollutes (renders those who were pure, 'profane'), and the special dead, Akamant(i)es and hieroi, participation in whose rites does not pollute.

Exactly how the Akamantes relate to either the special dead (Battus, the Tritopaters, and Onymastus) or the ordinary dead is not clear. That the special dead are called hieroi may find support in the treatment of the Tritopaters as collective ancestors at Selinus: they are removed from the normal dead and assimilated in some respects to heroes (Jameson, Jordan, & Kotansky, Lex Sacra, A. 9–17; Georgoudi in Hoffmann (ed.), Les Pierres de l'offrande . . . C. W. Clairmont, 153–63). It fits less well with the insistent reference to Battus as 'the human Battus' when Battus the founder of Cyrene was normally treated as a hero (we know nothing of Onymastus the Delphian). Earlier in our inscription (A. 9–10) uses of wood are classified as sacred (hieros), profane (bebelos, 'suitable to be trodden on'), and polluted (miaros); here a group of people is classified as holy (hagnos) or profane (bebelos). This use of hagnos to refer to a class of people is unique, and may be a consequence of avoiding hieros of living people in a clause where it is used of a particular class of the dead.

(vi) The treatment of sacrificing a non-customary victim as an act of pollution nicely illustrates the way in which pollution resides not in things themselves but in their use in the wrong context, where the wrong is established by the existence of contrary customs.

(vii) This brief pronouncement has no clear relation to questions of purity, and although the abbreviation of nomos at the end of l. 31 is unparalleled we do not believe the paragrapchos separating this clause off to be in error. The clause is best understood as part of the necessary legal background to the clauses that follow, and in particular to clause xii, and seems to be the equivalent of the Athenian law (Dem. xliii. Macartatus 58) by which all descendants of a man were held responsible for his debts to the gods.

(viii–xii) These clauses concern tithes (tenths, dekatai), and seem to assume a great deal of prior knowledge on the part of the reader, knowledge which we simply do not have. The payment or 'sacrificing off' of tithes (of crops, booty, etc.) by individuals and cities to Apollo was widespread, and is particularly well attested at Cyrene. But the tithes with which this inscription is concerned are in various respects extraordinary: they may be had by persons or property, are obligatory, hereditary, and can lead to a person's being 'sold', in some sense at least, in the agora. It is very unclear what sort of thing could be acquired by either a person or a property and could, if tithes are at issue in ix, be acquired by a boy by accident. One thing is clear, that tithes and pollution go together: if a man has a tithe then he needs purification, and the placing of the clause suggests that the pollution of the boy in ix is to be the boy's equivalent to having a tithe. What is not clear is whether the tithe is the cause or the consequence of pollution.

There are two main problems with considering the tithe to be the consequence of pollution. The first is that this whole law is concerned with pollution of various kinds, but a tithe is never mentioned as a consequence of any of the types of pollution discussed; the only clue to the type of pollution involved is the provision in ix that a boy
may acquire the pollution by accident. The second problem is that if the tithe is itself a penalty it is not clear why additional penalties are also required. Taking the tithe (that is, presumably, failing to pay a tithe) to be the cause of pollution has the advantage of making it possible to relate the successive clauses to the different consequences of non-payment for those with and those without property. But for a tithe to be the cause of the pollution is unprecedented and the idea that a debtor pollutes a shrine by his debt seems extreme. The absence of any indication that defaulting on tithes is at issue weighs in favour of the view that the tithe is a consequence rather than a cause of pollution. But it remains entirely unclear what the source may be of the pollution that causes person or property to have a tithe.

Clause viii dictates that any grown man who acquires a tithe must be sold. This ‘sale’ appears to be a way of establishing the value of a tenth of his person, and must be in some sense fictional. In ix, where no tithe is mentioned, the place of the clause in the law suggests that a boy has incurred pollution of a sort that would result in a tithe in an older man, but that boys cannot be tithed. There seem to us no grounds for following Maas and making the boy’s pollution the result of some sexual act (see Parker, 342). Note that the boy’s pollution may be involuntary whereas involuntary offences are not envisaged for the tithed man. Clause x deals with tithes acquired by property rather than persons. The (income from) the property becomes ineligible for use for sacred or funerary purposes until the tithe is paid. Clauses xi and xii begin in the same way: what is the difference between them? In clause xi a (sole) heir is mentioned, but not children. The heir of clause xi, who is not a descendant, is obliged to pay the tithe (valued at the most the man would have been worth) but does not inherit it as such, whereas the descendant in clause xii inherits the tithe itself, and hence it is his value that needs to be assessed by ‘sale’ in the market.

(xiv–xvi) ‘This section illustrates as effectively as any text the way in which it is through ritual performances that social change is articulated and expressed’ (Parker 345). Artemis was very widely associated with rituals associated with the maturation and marriage of young girls. Girls about to marry are here obliged first to spend the night in a specially designated room (‘sleeping room’) in the sanctuary of Artemis. Brides then go to a bridal chamber (nymphheion). Expectant mothers then revisit that nymphheion. Elsewhere in the Greek world we are told about the requirement on girls to perform certain rituals before marriage, but here we have the full structure and in each case there is a penalty attached to failure to perform. In the case of the ritual before marriage the law allows that failure to perform may be either accidental or deliberate. Deliberate failure presumably refers to the case of a bride’s going ahead with a formal marriage ceremony without a prior visit to Artemis’ sanctuary. Accidental failure is more difficult to construe: is this a case of cohabitation before marriage? The reference to the priestess as ‘bear’ in B. 98 links the rituals here to those at the sanctuary of Artemis at Brauron in Attica, where ‘playing the bear’ was part of a rite of passage for
young girls (see Bremmer, *Greek Religion*, 69 with refs.). We do not know enough about other rituals surrounding birth in Cyrene to know the significance of the ‘seventh, eighth, and ninth’ days after birth, but in Athens there was an association between the tenth day after birth and the naming ceremony (Ogden, *Greek Bastardy*, 89), and the choice of days may be linked to a similar event in this case.

(xvii) The issue here is whether the foetus is a person or not, but from a religious rather than an ethical point of view. The distinction is drawn on grounds of whether the foetus itself is distinguishable. Aristotle (*Pol.* vii. 1335 b 12—26) similarly notes that it is whether a foetus has sensation and life that affects its religious status. (For legal issues surrounding deliberate abortion see Harrison, *The Law of Athens*, i. 72—3).

(xviii—xx) The final surviving section of the law is headed with a word which etymologically means ‘comers’ but which we would normally translate ‘Suppliants’, and deals with three separate categories of ‘comers’. The second and third categories seem to be comprehensible as ‘suppliants’: the second concerns persons who seek refuge at public sanctuaries and the on-going religious obligations that they thereby incur unless ritually accepted (compare the initiation of Heracles, Parker, 284—5); the third concerns persons (from abroad) who seek refuge at a sanctuary having killed someone, and in this case the acceptance of the suppliant seems to depend upon there being a sponsor to announce the killer’s arrival and take part with the suppliant in the rituals. Much more problematic, in terms of ‘suppliancy’, is the first case. In this case much light is shed by the recently discovered sacred law from Selinus. Section B of that law concerns persons who need to be purified from *elasteroi*, that is avenging spirits. The parallels between that section of the Selinus law and clause xviii of this law confirm the arguments of Stukey that the first ‘suppliant’ here is a ‘visitant’, and the person visited subject to magical attack (Stukey and Burkert consider all three categories of ‘comers’ here to be visitants, but this is much harder to understand for the second and in particular the third categories). Although the Selinus law is not altogether easy to interpret, it seems likely that the avenging spirit is there offered a meal and salt (see also Burkert in *Polis and Politics . . . M. H. Hansen*, 207—16); at Cyrene figurines are made and are offered shares of everything, in both cases being treated in ways parallel to the ways in which visiting gods are treated in *theoxenia* rites. The making of figurines is reminiscent of the wax figurines which feature in the oath of the founders of Cyrene (*M&L* 5), but use of wax figurines was evidently widespread (Plat., *Laws* xi. 933 a—b).

The Cyrenaean version of the Doric dialect differs from Attic in a variety of ways and from all or most other versions of Doric in some ways. Note particularly: genitives in -οω, replacement of ι by ν in ἐνθημι for ἐλθημι and τενται for τελεσαι (= ἐσεσαι), κα for ἀν, τόκα for τότε, δῆλομαι for βούλομαι, ἐνίκει as aorist subjunctive of θέρω, α for ω in πρατιστος, ο for α in ἐντόφων, alternative forms ἐκασα and ἐκοῦσα for ἐκοῦσα, infinitives in -εν and -μεν, εν for εο in τελεν, and βάλαλος for βέβηλος (normal Doric form βέβαλος).
Athens honours Memnon of Rhodes, 327/6

The upper part of a stele, where found unknown, now in the Epigraphical Museum.

Attic-Ionic, retaining the old η for ω in l. 6; stelechism 20 (21 in l. 35, 18 in l. 36).

IG ii¹ 336; Tod 199; Schwenk 58*. Trans. Harding 119. See also P. A. Brunt, RFIC ciii 1975, 22–34.

Only isolated letters survive in ll. 12–22

2–3 τέτερα |πτήσις J. Kirchner (IG ii¹), Tod, though that has one letter too many; τέτερα |πτήσις Dinsmoor, The Archives of Athens, 371–2; τέτερα |πτήσις Pritchett & Neugebauer, The Calendars of Athens, 52–3.

4 B. D. Meritt, Hesp. iii 1934, 4–5 no. 5, publishing the text which = Schwenk 59 = Αγορα xvi 85; Φιλίππον Kirchner, Tod.

8 The stone has KYPA.
In the archonship of Hegemon [327/6]; in the —— prytany, of Hippothontis; to which Autocles son of Autias of Acharnae was secretary; on the penultimate day [of the month], the twenty-sixth of the prytany; principal assembly [kyria ekklesia]; of the proedroi —— was putting to the vote; resolved by the people.

Since Memnon ———

should encounter; and previously his forebears Pharnabazus and Artabazus continued to act well to the people of Athens and were useful to the people in the wars; and Mentor the father of Thymondas saved those of the Greeks who were campaigning in Egypt, when Egypt was taken by the Persians:

Praise him and crown him with a golden crown for his goodness ———
The Memnon who is honoured here cannot be the famous Memnon who served the Persians in Asia Minor and the Aegean from 335 to 333 but died in 333 (Arr. Anab. ii. 1. iii), but appears to be a member of the same family. Pharnabazus will be the satrap of Dascylium from 413 to 387; when he was transferred to an attempt to recover Egypt he was originally succeeded there by his son Ariobarzanes, and the attempt to transfer the satrapy to another son, the Artabazus of our inscription, led Ariobarzanes into what became the Satraps’ Revolt of the 360s. Pharnabazus was supportive of Athens in the 390s, when Sparta was fighting against the Persians (cf. on 9, 10, 12); the only known time when Artabazus could be described as supporting Athens is when the Athenian Chares supported him in his revolt and he then gave Chares money, c.354 (D.S. xvi. 22. i). Artabazus married a sister of the Rhodian mercenary commanders Mentor and Memnon; he had eleven sons and ten daughters (D.S. xvi. 52. iii–iv), among them the Pharnabazus who succeeded Memnon as the Persians’ commander in Asia Minor in 333 (cf. on 83) and Barsine, whom Mentor and Memnon married in turn, and who bore a son, Heracles, to Alexander the Great (Plut. Alex. 21. vii–viii, Eum. 1. vii). The Memnon of our inscription is unlikely to be a son of Thymondas (Kirchner in IG, after K. J. Beloch), since he ought to be older, and our text names Mentor only as father of Thymondas; he might be a son of Mentor’s brother Memnon by Barsine, mentioned but not named by Curt. iii. xiii. 14 (Berve, Das Alexanderreich, ii. 253–4 no. 498); but to have performed substantial services to Athens he must have been born while Mentor was still alive; so it is easiest to suppose that he is a son of Artabazus, a brother of the younger Pharnabazus and of Barsine (Brunt). E. Badian, Hermes xcv 1967, 170–92 at

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Pharnabazus I} &= \text{Apame} \\
\text{Artabazus} &= \text{sister of Mentor and Memnon I} \\
\text{Pharnabazus II} \\n\text{Memon II} \\n\text{?? = (1) Mentor (2) = (1) Barsine (2) = (2) Memon I (1) = ??} \\
\text{Thymondas}
\end{align*}
\]
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Assembly pay at Iasus, after c.330

A stele built into a modern wall on the island of Caryanda; now lost. Phot. of B. Haussoulier’s squeeze, BCH cxiv 1990, 419 n. 1, 422 fig. 2. Könc as far as can be verified, ending each line with the end of a word.

Michel 466; IK Iasoi 20; P. Gauthier, BCH cxiv 1990, 417–43 (SEG xl 959)*. See also G. E. M. de Ste Croix, CQ xxv 1975, 48–52.
179–80, proposed to identify him with the Memnon who was Alexander’s governor of Thrace in the late 330s and early 320s, (D.S. xvii. 62. iv–vi, 63. i; Curt. ix. iii. 21), but that is rejected as unlikely by Bosworth, *Conquest and Empire*, 201 n. 15.

Mentor’s service in Egypt was as a mercenary commander for the Persians in their successful campaign of 343/2, in which he won over many of the Egyptians’ Greek mercenaries (D.S. xvi. 42–51, misdated); his son Thymondas commanded Greek mercenaries for Darius at Issus in 333 and escaped afterwards (Arr. *Anab.* ii. 13. ii; Curt. iii. iii. i, viii. i, ix. 2, calling him Thimodes). Artabazus after his revolt had fled into exile in Macedon, but Mentor after his success in Egypt was able to secure his recall (D.S. xvi. 52. iii); he was then loyal to Darius, and fled with him after Gaugamela in 331 (Arr. *Anab.* iii. 21. iv); but in 330 he and most of his sons went over to Alexander (Arr. *Anab.* iii. 23. vii, Curt. vi. v. 1–5); he was made satrap of Bactria in 329 (Arr. *Anab.* iii. 29. i, Curt. vii. v. 1), and is last heard of as governor of the Rock of Arimazes, in 327 (Curt. vii. xi. 29). There is thus nothing remarkable about Athens’ honouring a son of his in 327/6; what was said about Memnon himself is unfortunately lost, but identifying Mentor as the father of Thymondas was not calculated to please the Macedonians, and suggests that hostility to them in Athens was still alive (cf. 94).

Placing the prytany in the year is bound up with the problem of what kinds of irregularity in the Athenian calendars are credible, and is not helped by the stonecutter’s omission of the name of the month: for a review of the issues see Schwenk; nothing further hangs on the precise dating of this decree. The ‘second of the waning sc. month’ was in principle the penultimate day of the month (cf. Introduction, p. xxii). The patronymic of the secretary was revealed by another decree of the same year: the careers of his grandfather and his son suggest that he was fairly young when he served in this position (cf. A. E. Raubitschek, *Hesp.* xi 1942, 305). The expressions *ekklesia* [‘assembly’] and *ekklesia kyria* [‘principal assembly’] are found in the prescripts of Athenian decrees from 340/39. The title *ekklesia kyria* given to one assembly in each prytany was perhaps a survival from the time when that was the only regular assembly in the prytany: major recurrent items of business were assigned to it, and in the time of the *Ath. Pol.* payment for attending it was at a higher rate than for other meetings (see Henry, *Prescripts*, 38–9; *Ath. Pol.* 43. iv–v, 62. ii, with Rhodes *ad loc.*; Rhodes, *Chiron* xxv 1995, 187–98; and cf. on 99).
We know that at Athens payment for attending the assembly was introduced shortly after the Peloponnesian War, increased by the time of Aristophanes’ Ecclesiazusae, in the late 390s, and further increased by the time of the Ath. Pol., and that the payment was not necessarily made to all who attended, but it was possible to arrive too late to qualify (Ath. Pol. 41. iii, 62. ii; Ar. Eccl. 186-8, 289-93). There is a little evidence of similar payments in other states (discussed by de Ste Groix), one of the most important items being this inscription.

The inscription was found on an island in the Gulf of Iasus, and the appearance of neopoiai (literally, ‘temple-makers’, but they had various financial duties) and of regular assemblies on the 6th day of the month points to Iasus as the place of origin: decrees of Iasus are commonly dated either to the 6th of the month (e.g. IK Iasos 24, 32) or to the presumably annual archairesiai, whose date is not given (e.g. SEG xxxvi 952. B, 983), which is the basis for Gauthier’s restoration ofl. 8. A fixed sum of 180 drachmas per month was provided (which will present problems for the month of the archairesiai

Since Gauthier had the advantage of Haussoullier’s rediscovered squeeze, we do not chronicle the different readings and restorations of previous editors. 2 Or διδ[ώσω] Gauthier. 5 Or [φιλο]σω Gauthier (i.e. the missing ι may have been inscribed between α and ς). 6 Or, but less likely, χρυσοίς Gauthier. 13 [καὶ τὰ παρθένα] would be appropriate, but there are traces of ν at the end, Gauthier. 17 [καὶ τὰ παρθένα] fits the space more easily than masculine [τοὺς παρθένους] (both plurals exist).
so that the assembly payment [ekklesiastikon] may be given (?), son of Euthydemus, Epicrates son of Hermocrates, son of Heraclitus, Hestiaeus son of Apollonides, son of Minnion, Phormion son of Hierocles.

4 The treasurers shall give to the neopoiai each month on the first day of the month one hundred and eighty drachmas (?) as assembly payment.

6 The neopoiai each month on the sixth and at the elections [archairesiai] (?) shall set out at daybreak a pot of one metretes, full of water, with a hole the size of a bean, not less than seven feet from the ground. The water shall be released at sunrise, and the neopoiai shall be seated, and beside each of them shall be placed a box sealed by the prostatai, having a mouth two fingers long and one finger wide, and let there be inscribed on the box the name of the tribe. Let each of those who make their way to the assembly give a token [pessos] to the neopoies of his tribe, having inscribed his own name, patronymic and — —. Let the neopoies insert the tokens (?) into the box, and let the names be written (?) by father — — token immediately (?) — — the seals (?) of the boxes — — box — —

unless, whether on the 6th or not, that was the only assembly in that month).

The men named at the beginning are probably either the formal proposers or the men in response to whose approach to the authorities the formal proposal was made: other fourth-century decrees of Iasus are proposed by one named individual or collectively by the prytaneis (less often the archontes); Epicrates son of Hermocrates (l. 2) was one of a board of prytaneis who proposed IK Iasos 37 and 53 (dated by Gauthier to the last third of the fourth century); the Minnion of l. 4 could be, but is not necessarily, the Minnion of 90. From 323 to 314/13 the cities of Caria were directly controlled by the satrap Asander (D.S. xix. 75, 1): this decree is more likely to belong shortly before that period or shortly after it than during it.

Most of the decree is devoted to the mechanism of payment. A water-clock [klepsydra] is to be used, a pot with a capacity of 1 metretes, with a hole the size of a bean, sc. at the bottom, set up at least 7 feet above the ground so that the flow of water will not be impeded. The Athenian metretes was c. 39 litres (68 ½ imp. pints: M. Lang, Agora, x.
58), and an Athenian klepsydra holding 6.4 litres (11 ¼ imp. pints) emptied in 6 minutes (S. Young, Hesp. viii 1939, 274–84; illustration 278 fig. 2); we cannot be sure of the size of the Iasian metretes or of the hole, but we should think in terms of about half an hour. There are as many neopoiai as there are tribes, probably six (Jones, Public Organization, 332–4). Each citizen arriving for the assembly gives to the neopoioi of his tribe a special token bearing his name, his patronymic and (some further identifier) (cf. the pinakia used by fourth-century Athenian candidates for allotment: Ath. Pol. 63–6 with Rhodes ad loc.), and the neopoioi inserts this into a slot in a sealed box (sealed to hinder tampering with the process: the prostatai who seal the box are officials who play some part in decision-making procedures). A ‘finger’ was ¼ of a Greek foot: according to the standard being used, c.18.5–21 mm. (¾ in.). Presumably when the klepsydra was empty no more tokens were accepted, and at the end of the meeting those who had been listed and whose tokens were in the boxes were called up by name, and reclaimed their tokens together with their payment (cf. Athenian jurors: Ath. Pol. 69. ii).

L. 8 shows that the assembly met ‘at daybreak’. That was the case in Athens too: Hansen, The Athenian Assembly, 33 (cf. Ar. Thesm. 375; Eccl. 20–1, 84–5, etc.; M&L 68. 291). 15 refers to the citizens ‘who make their way to the assembly’: we do not know how far from the city centre a citizen of Iasus might live; but if at this time the assem-

---
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Athenian naval list with decree for a colony in the Adriatic, 325/4

A marble stele found in the Piraeus; now in Epigraphical Museum, Athens, broken at the left-hand side and at the bottom, and inscribed in five columns, four across the front and one on the right-hand edge.

Attic-Ionic. The lines reproduced here come from the lower part of the first column and the upper part of the second. Not stichedon. This is the work of Tracy’s Gutter of IG ii 354: Athenian Democracy in Transition, 104–11.


1 But Fornara 134 translates tóu'tóς simply as ‘tomorrow’.
bly met on the peninsula but most men lived on the mainland (cf. Bean rev. Mitchell, *Turkey Beyond the Maeander*, 57) most citizens will have had a psychological journey if not one of a great distance.

In Iasus as in Athens, it is possible to arrive too late to qualify for payment: this suggests that the intention was to encourage not merely attendance but punctual attendance: cf. for Athens Gauthier in Piérart (ed.), *Aristote et Athènes*, 231–50. In Athens payment was at a fixed rate per recipient per meeting (by the time of the *Ath. Pol.*, 1 drachma for other meetings but 1½ drachmas for the *kýria ekklêsia* (cf. 98) of each prytany); it has always been assumed that payment was made to a fixed number, but there is no evidence to support that assumption. For Iasus this inscription gives us a total monthly sum, and a limit on recipients determined not by numbers but by time of arrival, and we are left to guess how a fixed sum of money was apportioned between a variable number of recipients. The citizen population was estimated at c. 800 by E. Ruschenbusch (*ZPE* liii 1983, 142); Gauthier in republishing this text supposed that 360 citizens might receive 3 obols each, but since then inscriptions of the third or second century have been found which record attendances of 800–900 (*SEG* xli 929, 932).

---

128 Triaconter — era, work of Chaerion. Trierarch, Diopeithes son of Diocleides of Phrearrhii and syntrierarch Phrynæus of Athmonon. He has its wooden equipment complete, of the rigging they took two of the trireme-type undergirding
135 [τὼν ἐ]γλυθέντων δύο
[ἐλαβὼν κατὰ ψήφισμα
[δήμου], ὃ εἶπεν Ἀγιω-
[νίδης] Περγασσηθεν·
[ταυτη] τὴν τριακόν·
140 [τορον κ]αι τὰ σκεύη
[παρέλαβεν] Ἔιεν Μελιτιάδης
[Λακιάδης]: ὃ οἰκιστῆς
[κατὰ ψή]όφισμα δήμου,
[ὃ εἶπεν Κη]θισαφών Χολαργ·
145 [τριακόν]τοιρος αἰχμάλωτος
[.........], Ἐβδικοῦ ἔργας
[τριήμα]ροι δημοκλῆς
[Κράτης]ιος Μελιτεύς
[καὶ σω]ντριήμαρχοι
150 [Ἐθθυκρ]άτης Χαρίων
[Κυναθῆ]: σκεύη ἔχει
[ἐξικα]υτὸς κρεπτης
[μαστα]ὸ πασῶματα τρι-
[ης]τω ὣ τῶν ἐγλυθέν-
155 [τῶν δὲ] ἐλαβον κατὰ
[ψῆφισ]μα δήμου, ὃ εἶπε
[Ἀγιω]νίδης Περγασσηθεν·
[ταυτη] τὴν τριακόν·
[τορον κ]αι τὰ σκεύη πα-
160 [ρελα]βει Μελιτιάδης
[Λακιά]δης: ὃ οἰκιστῆς
[κατὰ] ψήφισμα δήμου,
[ὃ εἶπε] Κηθισαφών
[Χολα]ργεύς·
165 [ψῆφισ]μα καθ᾽ ὃ παρέλαβε
[Μελ]ιτιάδης τὰς τριή-
[ρεις] καὶ τετρήρεις
[καὶ τὰς τριακοντόρους
[καὶ] τὰ σκεύη·
170 [Κηθισά]θιν τοιούτων
[Χολα]ργεύς εἶπεν· ἄγα-
[θή] τὸν ἱ οῦ τοῦ δήμου τοῦ
[Ἀθην]ῶν, ὅπως ἄν τὴν
[ταχία] τὴν πράττηται
175 [τὰ δὲ] συμβοῦν τῶν δήμων
[περὶ] τῆς εἰς τὸν Ἀθρίαν
[ἀπο]λίκαι, ἐφηβίσθαι τῶν
ropes released in accordance with the decree of the people which Hagnonides of Pergase proposed. Miltiades of Laciadae, the founder, took over this triaconter and its equipment in accordance with the decree of the people which Cephisophon of Cholargus proposed.

Captured triaconter ——, work of Eudicus. Trierarch, Democles son of Crates of Melite and syntrierarchs Euthyocrates son of Charias of Cydathenaeum. He has its wooden equipment complete, of the rigging they took two of the trireme-type undergirding ropes released in accordance with the decree of the people which Hagnonides of Pergase proposed. Miltiades of Laciadae, the founder, took over this triaconter and its equipment in accordance with the decree of the people which Cephisophon of Cholargus proposed.

Decree in accordance with which Miltiades took over the triremes and quadriremes and triaconters and their equipment. Cephisophon son of Lysiphon of Cholargus proposed: for the good fortune of the Athenian people, in order that what the people have resolved concerning the colony to the Adriatic may be done as quickly as possible, be it decreed
[δήμι]οι, τούς μὲν τῶν νε-
[ωρέ]ιον ἐπιμελητὰς πα-
180 [ραδό]ιναί τοῖς τριηράρχ[χ]ι-
[οις τ]ὰς ναῦς καὶ τὰ σκεύη
[κατὰ τ]ὰ δεδομένα τοῖς δή-
[μοι, τοῖς δὲ τριηράρχοι]
[τούς καὶ] διευθυνόμενα παρα-
185 [κομίζει]ν τὰς ναῦς ἐπὶ τὸ
[χώμα] ἐ]ν τῶι Μονυχωῖ
[μηνί π]ρὸ τῆς δεκάτης
[ισταμέ]νου καὶ παρέχειν
[παρεσ]κεναιμένας εἰς
190 [πλοῦτι]. τὸν δὲ πρῶτον πα-
[rakoμί]σαντα στεφάνωσα-
[τῶι ο]ἱὸς Χρυσώμε ν στεφά-
[νω]ι ἀ]πό : Γ' : δραχμῶν,
[τὸν δὲ] δεύτερον ἀπό : ΗΗΗ
195 [δραχμ]ῶν, τὸν δὲ τρίτον ἀ-
[πό : ΗΗΗ] : καὶ ἀναγορεύσα-
[τῶι ο]ἱὰς τῆς Βουλῆς Θαρ-
[γηλῶν] τοῖς ἀγώνι τοὺς στε-
[φάνους], τοὺς δὲ ἄποδεκτας
200 [μερίσα]ι τὸ ἀργύριον τὸ
[εἰς τοὺς] στεφάνους, ὅπω-
[ς ἐ]ν ἕ]να φανερὰ ἡ φιλοτι-
[μία ἡ ε]ῖς τὸν δήμον τοῖς
[τριηράρχοις. ὅπω]ς δ' ἀν
205 [καὶ] αἰ σκύψεις εἰσαχθάσι,
[το]ὺς θερμοθέτας παρα-
[πληρώσα]ι δικαστήρια εἰς
[ἐν]α καὶ διακοσίους τοὺς
[στ]ρατηγῶν τῶι ἐπὶ τὰς συμ-
210 [μοι]ρίας ἡρμηνεύον ἐν τῶι
[Μ]ονυχωί μυρὶ τῆι δευ-
[τ]ῇ ἐραί ισταμένου καὶ τῆι
[πι] ἐμπιτη ισταμένου, τοῦν
[δὲ μυσθὸν διδόναι τοῖς
215 δικαστηρίους τοὺς ταμι-
[α]ς τῶι τῆι θεων κατὰ τῶι
[ῥ]μον. ὅπω μὲν ὑπάρχει
[τῶι] ὁ δήμων εἰς τῶι ἄπαντα
[χρ]ῶν ἐμπορία οἰκεία καὶ
220 [στ]ομί, καὶ ναυσιτήμο
[οἰκ]είον κατασκευασθέιν.
by the people that the officers in charge of
the shipyards are to hand over the ships
and the equipment in accordance with
the decree of the people, and that the tri-
erarchs who have been appointed are to
bring the ships up to the jetty in the month
Mounichion before the 10th of the month
and are to provide them equipped for sail-
ing.

The people are to crown the first man to
bring his ship with a gold crown of 500 dr.
and the second with a crown of 300 dr.
and the third with a crown of 200 dr., and
the herald of the council is to announce
the crowns at the contest of the Tharge-
lia, and the apodektai are to allocate the
money for the crowns, in order that the
competitive zeal of the trierarchs towards
the people may be evident.

In order that pleas for exemption may be
heard, the thesmothetai are to man courts
with 201 men for the general elected to
be in charge of the symmories on the 2nd
and 5th of the month Mounichion. The
treasurers of Athena are to provide the
money for the courts in accordance with
the law.

In order that the people may for all future
time have their own commerce and trans-
port in grain, and that the establishment
of their own naval station (naustathmos)
[το]ς ὑπάρχει φυλακὴ ἐπὶ
[Ὑπόρφιος, καὶ Μιλτιά-
[δὴς] ὁ ὀίκιστής καὶ οἱ ἐποι-
[κοι ἐξ]ωσιν χρήσθαι οἰκεῖ-
[ωι ναυ] τικώι, καὶ τῶν Ἐλ-
[λήρων] καὶ βαρβάρων οἱ
[πλέοντε]ς τὴν θάλασσαν
[καὶ αὐτοὶ] ἐ]σπλέοσιν εἰ-

230 [σ τὸ ναύσταθμον τὸ Ἀθηναίων,
[πλοιά τε ἔξοι]τες καὶ τὰ ἄλ-
[λα ἐμ βεβαιῶν, εἰς]τες ὁτι
lacinia

col. ii εἶναν δὲ τις μὴ ποίησει οἷς
ἐκαστα προστέτακτα, ἦ

235 ἀρχῶν ἡ ἡμιώνης, κατὰ τὸν
tὸ ψηφίσμα, ὀφειλέτων ὁ μὴ
ποίσας μυρίας δραχμὰς
ἐρῶς τῷ Ἀθηναίῳ, καὶ ὁ εὐ-
θυνος καὶ οἱ πάρερποι ἐ-

240 πάναγκες αὐτῶν καταγι-
γνωσκόντων ἡ αὐτοῖ ὀφει-
λόντων· τὴν δὲ βουλὴν τοις
Γ΄: ἐπιμελεῖσθαι τοῦ ἀπο-
στόλου κολάζουσαν τοὺς

245 ἀπακτούντας τῶν τριη-
ράχων κατὰ τοὺς νόμους:
tοὺς δὲ πρυτάνεις ποεῖν
βουλής ἔδραν ἐπὶ χώματι
περὶ τοῦ ἀποστόλου συ-

250 νεχῶς, ἐως ἃν ὁ ἀπόστο-
λος γείνηται, ἐλέασθαι δὲ
καὶ ἀποστολέας τὸν δή-
μον δέκα ἄνδρας ἥξι Ἀ-
θηναίων ἀπάντων, τοὺς

255 δὲ αἱρεθόντας ἐπιμε-
λεῖσθαι τοῦ ἀποστόλος,
καθάπερ τῇ βουλείς προσ-
tέτακτα, εἶναι δὲ τῇ
βουλεῖ καὶ τοῖς πρυτάνε-

260 σιὶ ἐπιμεληθείον τοῦ
ἀποστόλου στεφανωθῆ
ναι ὑπὸ τοῦ δήμου χρυσῶν

Bresson, SEG xliii 1320, xlv 149.
may result in a guard against the Tyrrhenians, and Miltiades the founder and the settlers may be able to use their own fleet, and those Greeks and barbarians who sail the sea and themselves sailing into the Athenians' naval station will have their ships and all else secure, knowing that . . .

(lacuna)

233 . . . but if anyone to whom each of these things has been commanded does not do them in accordance with this decree, whether he be a magistrate or a private individual, the man who does not do so is to be fined 10,000 dr. sacred to Athena, and the euthynos and paredroi are of necessity to condemn them or themselves owe the money.

242 The council of five hundred is to look after the dispatch, punishing any lack of discipline among the trierarchs in accordance with the laws. The prytaneis are to arrange for the council to be in session continuously on the jetty in connection with the dispatch, until the dispatch occurs. The people are to choose from the whole body of Athenians ten men as ‘Dispatchers’, and those chosen are to look after the dispatch as the council has ordered.

258 It is to be possible for the council and the prytaneis, when they have looked after the dispatch, to be crowned by the People with a gold crown of 1,000 drachmas.
στεφάνων ἀπὸ Ἐλλήνων.

265

τὸ ψήφισμα τῶν περὶ τῶν

ἀπόστολον, τὴν βουλήν

κυρίαν εἶναι ψηφίζεσθαι

μὴ λύσοναι μηθὲν τῶν

ἐψηφισμένων τῶν δήμων.

270
tαύτα δὲ εἶναι ἀπαντά

εἰς ψυλλίσει τῆς χώρας.

τετρήρη ἔδομεν κατὰ ψήφισμα βουλῆς δὲ

ἐπὶ τῷ Αθηναίῳ ἔδρα.

275
tετρήρης Ἐδέστρα, Ἀρχέτειν ἔργαν τῶν

ἐπὶ Εὐδικράτου ουσίας ἢν ἐποίησα Πολυκράτης Ἀθη.

δόκι, διάζευξις

τριάρχος Χαρισίαν: Φίλα καὶ σκεύη ἔχει

κρεμαστά ἐντελῆ καὶ ὑπο-

τάδε παρελαβόμεν καὶ

280

ἀποστελλόμεν κατήγητον

ξύλινα ἐν νεωρίῳ:

ἐν νεωρίῳ παρελαβόμεν

τὰρροῦ ἐπὶ ναῦς: ΗΗΡ

ΔΔΔΔΓΠΙ: καὶ ἐπισημών ἔ

285

τριάρχος ταρροῦ: κόσμος

ἐκάστης ἘΔ,

πλὴν κατὰ ΠΠ

ἐν νεωρίῳ παρέδομεν

[ψ]ήφο-

ταρροῦ ἐπὶ ναῦς

ΗΗΡΔΔΔΓΠΙΙΙ: καὶ ἐπισημών

290

δή-

γοῦ μᾶς κόσμος: ΗΔ

τούτων θριήδεστα

δὲ ἐπὶ

καὶ ἱδόκιμα (κατ.

πηδάλια εἰς νεωρίῳ

295

παρελαβόμεν σὺν τοῖς

τῆς ἐπισήμου ἐπὶ ναῦς

ΗΗΡΠΙΠΙ: καὶ πηδάλιον ἐν

ἐν νεωρίῳ παρέδομεν

πηδάλια ἐπὶ ναῦς: ΗΗ

ΔΔΔΔΓ: καὶ πηδάλιον ἐν

τούτων θριήδεστα

καὶ ἱδόκιμα (κατ.).
264 If there is anything lacking in this decree about the dispatch, the council is to have authority to pass a decree, provided that it does not annul any of the measures decreed by the People. All this is to be for the defence of the country.

272 We issued a quadrireme according to the decree of the council which Alcimachus from Myrrhinoutta proposed: quadrireme Eueteria, work of Archencos, one of the ships built in the archonship of Euthycritus, which Polycrates of Aphidna had made; approved, fitted with thwarts; trierarch, Aristogenes son of Charistander of Philaidae; it has complete rigging and two of the undergirding-ropes released according to the decree of the People which Hagnonides of Pergase proposed.

279 We took over and accepted the following wooden equipment in the shipyards: in the shipyards we took over sets of oars for 297 ships; and the sets of oars of three horse-transporting vessels, 60 oars in each set, minus 7 oars. In the shipyard we handed on sets of oars for 289 ships, and the oars of one horse-transporting vessel, 60 oars. Of these (no number inscribed) were worm-eaten and unserviceable.

294 In the shipyards we took over sets of steering oars for 254 ships, including those of the horse-transporting vessel plus one individual steering oar. In the shipyards we handed on pairs of steering oars for 245 ships, plus one individual steering oar. Of these (no number inscribed) were worm-eaten and unserviceable.
This is an extract from the accounts of the curators (epimeletai) of the dockyards for the year 325/4. Although the council of five hundred had overall responsibility for the Athenian navy (Ath. Pol. 46. i), ten men, one from each tribe, were chosen annually to look after the ships of the navy and their tackle. Various forms of words are used in inscriptions to refer to this board, but all stress the responsibility for the dockyards. The date at which the office was created is not known: the earliest epigraphic trace of a board looking after the shipyard ([οι επίμελεις] λαμβάνον το ναυτίο) is in IG I² 153. 18, dated to the 430s or 420s. The name epimeletai first survives in association with the shipyards in an inscription of 410–404 (IG I² 236. 5–6). Ath. Pol. does not mention this board, and we do not know how the curators were chosen, but it is probable that like most Athenian officials they were chosen by lot from volunteers. Known curators are not randomly distributed over the trittyes: 27 of the 55 men known came from coastal trittyes, and this may mean that men who were otherwise involved with the sea were particularly inclined to offer themselves for this office (Jordan, 31).

Accounts of curators survive from the second quarter of the fourth century down to 323/2 (IG I² 1604–32). These accounts record the receipt of ships from, and the handing over of ships to, trierarchs, the equipment which each ship had, and the condition the ship and the equipment were in. They list debts of trierarchs, and the responsibility of trierarchs for replacing lost ships and equipment. They also record decisions by the assembly which required action from the curators (it was, for example, the assembly which decided to withdraw useless ships from service, as in ll. 722 ff. of this inscription). In every fourth year the curators published a full inventory of all the ships and equipment belonging to the city. On the basis of these records we are able to trace the increasing size of the Athenian navy. Reduced from its complement of 300 triremes (not all in commission at the same time) in 432 (Thuc. ii. 13. viii) to just 12 triremes by the terms of the peace treaty of 404, the Athenian navy mustered 60 and 83 ships on two occasions in the 370s (D.S. xv. 34. v, X. H. vi. ii. ii). Diodorus (xiv. 21. i) records an Athenian fleet of 120 in 356 but by 353/2 she had 349 hulls, full sets of rowing oars for 291 and steering oars for some 280 (IG I² 1613. 284–310). Tetrereis (conventionally translated here as quadriremes) are first recorded being built by Dionysius tyrant of Syracuse in 398 (D.S. xiv 42. iv). They first appear in Athenian naval records in 330: Athens then had 18 of them (10 at sea) as against 492 trireme hulls. By 325/4 (l. 811) Athens also boasted seven pentereis (‘quinqueremes’). Whereas triremes had three banks of oars, each oar pulled by one man and a total of 170 rowers, quadriremes seem to have had two banks of oars, each oar pulled by two men, and a total of 176 rowers, and quinqueremes three banks of oars, in two banks each oar pulled by two men and in the third bank each oar pulled by one man (see Morrison with Goates, Greek and Roman Oared Warships, 268–71).

The scale of the curators’ responsibilities by the 320s is well indicated by this inscription. Ll. 783 ff. record 360 triremes, of which 32 are at sea, and 50 quadriremes, of which 7 are at sea. In addition, the receipt of gear for 9 triacconters is recorded as taken over, and gear for five is handed on (91 ff., 330 ff.), implying that four were dispatched to the Adriatic, but triacconters are curiously not counted in the stock (Gabrielsen, 128–9). The totals were book-keeping figures, and do not measure the naval potential:
Athens could not man all these hulls, and it is hard to conceive of a circumstance in which she would need to. Of the 328 triremes not at sea, some have been lost and compensatory payments made by the trierarchs; some have been lost in storms and the trierarchs exempted from paying compensation (796–9); some have been lent to the Chalcidians some 15 years previously (516–43, 799–800; see Gabrielsen, 205–6); and some have been lost in action. A significant proportion of the naval lists is made up of records of moneys and fines owed by trierarchs and by various officials for ships and equipment which they have damaged or absconded with (Gabrielsen, 149–62): initiating legal action to oblige debtors to pay up was the responsibility of the curators, but, unlike other public debtors, defaulting trierarchs seem only to have been fined and never to have been imprisoned or to have lost their civic rights.

The extract from the 325/4 accounts given here is in many ways typical, but exceptionally it concerns a particular Athenian enterprise, the founding of a settlement in the Adriatic. Ships detailed for that expedition are listed and the decree which ordered the ships to be put at the disposal of the man in charge of setting up the settlement, Miltiades, is quoted. It is typical in as far as the careful record of the state of each ship and who was responsible for it is the standard form in these records.

The ships listed here are recorded as having full wooden equipment (that is they have oars, spare oars, rudders, ladders, poles, mast and mast partners, and sailyards), and full ‘hanging equipment’ (tackle), including not only the standard items (sail, rigging, canvas awnings and screens (to protect the rowers from enemy missiles), ropes, anchors, and leather sleeves for the lowest oarports) but also (extra) undergirding ropes in accordance with the particular decree of Hagnonides of Pergase (the man who later proposed the decree honouring Euphon of Sicyon passed in 318/17 (IG11² 448. 39–40)). No armament is recorded on the ships themselves, but the inscription also records a brief inventory of the Great Warehouse at the Gates which records both a quantity of lead and catapults and catapult tubes, etc. (976–1003). This inscription also provides the only attestation of a tamias kremaston (‘rigging treasurer’: 464–6, Jordan, 58–9).

The extract begins with two entries typical of all the entries from the beginning of the stone (there are seven earlier entries, three for triremes, two for horse transports, and two for triaconters). This must be just the end of the list of the ships detailed to join Miltiades since the decree quoted refers to quadriremes also (167). Each of the ships in the list is classified (trireme, horse transport, triaconter), named, its builder identified, and the principal trierarch listed by his full name (personal name, patronymic, and demotic); any syntrierarchs are also listed, but sometimes less fully. Three syntrierarchs are very common in the lists, including here, and four not infrequent; there are two examples of five and one example each of seven, nine, and ten. Five of those listed in this inscription as syntrierarchs have responsibility for more than one ship: thus Dercippus of Coprus shares responsibility for three triremes, in one case with one colleague and in the other two cases with two colleagues (1–63); Phrynaeus of Athmonon similarly has responsibilities for three triaconters, one as sole trierarch and two jointly with one colleague (92–144). The effect of such multiple syntrierarchies was to distribute the risks more evenly than in the earlier system in which individuals
had normally had sole responsibility for a single ship, without reducing the overall financial burden on individuals (Gabrielsen, 208–9).

L. 165–271 (with a lacuna in the middle where the bottom of the stone is lost) record the decree of Cephisophon (of Cholargus) according to which the ships were handed over to Miltiades. (Cephisophon was a politically active man, serving on the council, and curator of the Amphiarai at Oropus in 329/8.) This is not itself the decision to establish a settlement (that decision is referred to at 175–7), but a measure designed to ensure the rapid and effective execution of that decision. These measures focus particularly on the trierarchs. As the Athenian navy and naval activity grew in the fourth century so did the burden on those called upon to bear a ship’s running expenses for a year (Gabrielsen, 182–213). C. 357 a law of Periander had extended financial responsibility from individuals and pairs of individuals to the body of 1,200 richest citizens corporately, divided into twenty ‘symmories’ ([Dem.] xlvi. Eurg. and Mnes. 21–2, 29, 44). In 340 Demosthenes had enacted a further reform which made the rich contribute in proportion to their wealth (Dem. xvii. Crown 102–9). Distribution of particular ships to particular trierarchs was, by the time of the Ath. Pol., at least, in the power of the ‘general for the symmories’ (Ath. Pol. 61. i), one of the specialist positions now given to generals (see 58 comm.). Demosthenes had complained in the First Philippic of 351 (iv. 36) both about the process of appointing trierarchs and about hearing their pleas for exemption only after an expedition has been decided upon (Gabrielsen, 76–7). Here the trierarchs’ pleas for exemption (sképseis, compare Ath. Pol. 56. iii) are to be heard by courts presided over by the ‘general over the symmories’, on two specific days, the latter 5 days before Mounychion 10 (early May), the due date for the departure of the ships; they are also offered prizes as an incentive to rapid deployment.

The urgency and importance of the dispatch are underlined by both carrot and stick. The carrots consist of crowns for the first, second, and third trierarchs to bring their ship to the jetty, and the possibility of a further, and larger, crown for the council and prytaneis. (For the clause about demonstrating philotimía see on 46.) The stick is a fine of 10,000 dr. for any private individual or magistrate who does not do as ordered, and the council is also given power to impose unspecified punishments on any that are unruly.

The decree requires the council to sit continuously on the jetty until the dispatch occurs. It was not unusual for the council to meet elsewhere than in the council chamber in the Agora (other meetings are known in the Piraeus and at Eleusis) but it is perhaps doubtful whether all five hundred councillors could in fact be expected to maintain continuous session on the jetty. The ‘Dispatchers’ mentioned here seem to be an extraordinary board, brought into being from time to time in the fourth century when circumstances demanded their existence: we first hear of them in 357/6 ([Dem.] xlvii. Eurg. and Mnes. 26, 33; Jordan, 54–5).

The clause at the end of the decree classifies it as a decree about the defence of the country. This certainly brought it into the category of matters discussed at the first assembly meeting of the prytany (Ath. Pol. 43. iv), and it may be associated with the earlier clause which gives the council the right to supplement the assembly’s decision
The entry immediately after the decree, in which the curators record that they handed over a quadrireme ‘according to the decree of the council’, may well refer to a council decree passed under this provision.

The decree emphasizes that the purpose of the settlement is to provide the Athenians with their own commerce and grain transport and, through the provision of their own naval station, defend themselves and other Greeks and barbarians sailing the sea against the Tyrrhenians. As we have seen [95, 96], Athens, along with other parts of the Greek world, experienced grain shortages in the early 320s. On the basis of the surviving evidence, Athens had been diversifying her sources of grain in the second half of the century, and in particular had been looking to import grain from Sicily (such imports are mentioned in Dem. xxxii. Zenothemis, [Dem.] lvi. Dionysodorus 9, and in Hesp. xliii 1974, 322–4 no. 3, a grain merchant from Acragas is honoured with proxeny [see Garnsey, p. 153]). Athens had long been involved in trade in the Adriatic: Lysias, xxxii. Diogeiton 24, refers to a loan made on a vessel travelling to the Adriatic some time in the last decade of the fifth century. There were particularly strong links with Spina, a site at which very large numbers of Athenian pots have been excavated. It is unlikely that grain was the only item being traded. It may be more appropriate, therefore, to stress the role of piracy (see De Souza, Piracy, 38–41, 50–53). Guarding against the Etruscans (Tyrrenians) is explicitly mentioned here, we know of two [lost] speeches that are likely to date to this period, Dinarchus’ Tyrrenian Speech, and Hyperides’ On defence against the Tyrrenians, and the naval list of 334/3 (IG ii² 1623. 276–308) has occasion to mention guarding against pirates.

If recent piratical activity in the Adriatic more easily explains the urgency of the decree and its Adriatic focus than does the need to contribute another source to the Athenian grain supply, the degree to which the grain supply dominated Athenian politics in the twenties is, nevertheless, made clear later in the inscription. For here (ll. 859 ff.), as in the naval list for the previous year (IGu ii 1628. 339–95.) the fines imposed on trierarchs are reduced if they or their close associates have been responsible for gifts of grain in 328/7.

The Athenian decision recorded here remains very surprising. This is the only reference we have to this settlement: no trace of it has been found, and we cannot be certain that it was in fact dispatched (compare the problems of the Brea decree, M&L 49). Moreover, the language used of this settlement seems anachronistic. The term apoikia is restored in l. 177 to describe the settlement and the settlers are termed epoikoi (a term used interchangeably with apoikoi, compare Thuc. iv. 102. i–ii and H. Maeno, Kodai viii–ix (1997–8), 11–29 at 18–20; Cargill, 136). These are words strongly associated with Athenian imperial activity in the fifth century. In the fourth century Athenians had indeed been settled abroad, but the terminology employed was normally that of cleruchies. Miltiades is repeatedly called oikistes, another term associated with the establishment of permanent settlements abroad in the fifth century (e.g. Amphipolis) and earlier, although it also occurs in an earlier fourth-century naval list, IG ii² 1613. 297–8, referring to ‘the oikistai to the Chersonese’ (Cargill, 26, 141). These echoes of past grandeur make it likely to be more than just a coincidence that the man chosen to found this settlement comes from the family that had given Athens the Miltiades
who had ruled the Chersonese for Athens, the Miltiades responsible for victory at Marathon, and Cimon the architect of the growth of the Delian League. Although it is not otherwise known to have been politically prominent in fourth-century Athens, this family was evidently still of high status: the daughter of this Miltiades, Eurydice, was married twice, once to Ophellas, the companion of Alexander who became independent ruler of Cyrene, and after his death to Demetrius Poliorcetes (Davies, APF 309). Cargill (33) suggests that the timing of the expedition in 324 should be related to the degeneration of relations between Athens and Alexander which were to take a decisive turn for the worse later in that year with the harbouring of Harpalus and the promulgation of the Exiles Decree.
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Restoration of exiles at Tegea, 324/3

A stela found to the east of the sanctuary at Delphi, now in the museum there. Phot. BCH xxxviii 1914, 103 fig. 1, pl. I–II; Heisserer, Alexander, 204 pl. 28; facs. BCH facing p. 102

Arcadian dialect and lettering, with some koine forms; stoichedon 40.


[_________________________]

12 ἐπες δὲ τοῖς ἀ πόλεις ἀ πέστειλε τὸς πῖς
[ρέσθεας, καὶ ταύς κράτοιν ἀ πέπεμψε πὸς ἦ[μεα ό βασι]
[λεσι νάθρος, τὸ διάγρα[μμα γραφήμαι κατὸ τὰ ἐ-
[πάνω]θέσαντι ἀ πόλεις τὰ ἐν τῷ διαγράμματι ἀντιλ-
εγόμενα, τὸς φυγάδας τὸς κατειθύντας τὰ πατρίω
κομιζέσθαι, ἐς τοῖς ἐφευγοῦν, καὶ τὰ ματριώα, ὅσα
ἀνέστησαν τὰ πάματα κατήχον καὶ οὐκ ἐπίγγανον ἀδ-
elphεὺς πεπαμέναι. εἰ δὲ τωι ἐνδοθένιοι συνέπει-
εν δὲ δὲνδέθεν ο οινόκτοις ἀπόλεοσθα-
να καὶ τα[λ]ινι ματρίαν ἥναν, ἀνάστερον δὲ μηκέτι ἥνα. ἐ-
πες δὲ τοῖς οἰκίαις μίαν ἐκαστον ἔχεν κατὸ τὸ διά-
γραμμα. εἰ δὲ τις ἔχει οἰκία κάποι τὸς αὑτὰ τι, α[λλ'] ὠνυ-
Hibernate λαμβανέτων εἰ δὲ ποις τὰ οἰκίας μὴ πόσει κάποις, ἐ-
ζαντιαὶ θ' ἐστὶν ισόθεν πλέθρῳ, λαμβανέτω τὸν κάποιον εἰ
dὲ πλέον ἀπέχουν ὁ κάποι ἐστὶ πλέθρῳ, τοιοὶ ἐν ἡμ-
σον λαμβανέτω, ὠπετέρ καὶ τῶν ἄλλων χοριῶν γεγρα-
patia. τὰν δὲ οἰκίαν τιμᾶν κομιζέσθαι τῷ οἴκῳ ἐκαστ-

0–1 Heisserer.

2 Κάσσαρ[νάθρος] considered by Heisserer; see commentary.


11 The stone has AMON.
The shadow of Athenian imperialism may also be seen in the motivation for the action. Back in the 470s the Athenians had used the complaint that Scyros harboured pirates as an excuse for expelling its population and replacing them with Athenian settlers. Throughout her various vicissitudes in the wake of defeat in the Peloponnesian war, Athens had clung to Lemnos, Imbros, and Scyros as the vital stepping stones that guaranteed her grain supply (see also 26). Here her decision to establish a settlement in order to prevent piratical activity in the Adriatic, although advertised as for the benefit of Greeks and barbarians, has to be seen as motivated by economic considerations. (For fourth-century Athenian willingness to intervene in more than just the grain trade, compare 40.)

--- With reference to the things about which the city sent the envoys and King Alexander sent back his judgment to us, the transcript [diagramma] shall be written according to the corrections made by the city of what was spoken against in the transcript.

4 The exiles who are returning shall recover their paternal possessions from which they went into exile, or their maternal possessions, i.e. in cases when women were not remarried and held their property and did not possess brothers. And if it has happened to any remarried woman that her brother, both himself and his descendants, have perished, here too the man shall have the maternal possessions but no longer those from further back (?).

9 With reference to the houses, each [sc. returned exile] shall have one in accordance with the transcript. If a house has a garden adjacent to it, let him not take another; if there is not a garden adjacent to the house, but there is one nearby within a plethron, let him take the garden; if the garden is more than a plethron distant, let him take the half of this, as has been written also for the other plots of land. Let [sc. the men to whom property is returned] receive as the price [tima] of the houses two minas for each room (?), and the assessment [timasia] of the
36 Plassart: the stone has TAININ.
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houses shall be as the city considers; but for the garden he shall receive double the valuation \([\textit{timane}]\) in the law. The city shall discharge the money \(\text{[for the compensation]}\) \(?\), and shall not exempt from taxation \(?\) either the exiles or those previously living at home as citizens.

With reference to the general festivals from which the exiles have been absent, the city shall deliberate, and whatever the city deliberates shall be valid.

The foreign court shall give judgment for sixty days. As many as are not adjudicated in the sixty days, it shall not be possible for them to go to law in the foreign court with reference to property, but always in the city’s court: if they find anything later, in sixty days from the day when the court is established; and, if it is not adjudicated in this period, it shall no longer be possible for him to go to law. If any return later, when the foreign court is no longer in existence, let him register the property with the \textit{strategoi} in sixty days, and if there is any defence against him the court shall be Mantinea; and, if it is not adjudicated in these days, it shall no longer be possible for him to go to law.

With reference to the sacred money in general together with the debts to the Goddess, in cases which the city has set right, let him who has the property give the half to the returned exile like the others. As many as themselves owed pledges to the Goddess or otherwise, if it appears that he who has the property has set the obligation right with the Goddess, let him give the half to him who has returned, like the others, leaving nothing aside; but, if it does not appear that he has given back to the Goddess, let him give back to him who has returned the half of the property, and with the \(\text{[sc. other]}\) half let him himself settle the obligation. If he does not wish to settle, let him give back to him who has returned the whole property, and let him convey it and settle the whole obligation to the Goddess.

As many wives of the exiles or daughters as have remained at home and married, or went into exile but subsequently married in Tegea, and bought their release by remaining at home, these shall not be subject to examination over their paternal or maternal possessions, nor their descendants; but as for those who did not go into forced exile after (their marriage) and who are now creeping back on the present occasion, themselves or their children, they shall be examined, both themselves and their descendants, in respect of their paternal and their maternal possessions in accordance with the transcript.

I swear by Zeus, Athena, Apollo, Poseidon, that I shall show good will
Although almost every letter has been read except at the beginning and the end, the
dialect and the lack of specific references make translation and interpretation
difficult. The document, found at Delphi (where this copy was presumably deposed
to strengthen the guarantee that it would be enforced) is concerned with Tegea (ll.
50—1), and stipulates that if one kind of problem arises neighbouring Mantinea is to
serve as a lawcourt (ll. 31—5): that itself is remarkable, since when last heard of, at
the end of the 360s, Tegea and Mantinea were on opposite sides in a divided Arcadia (cf.
on 41); for building regulations at Tegea see 60. [King Alex] ander has been restored
as the source of the *diagramma* (ll. 1-2: equivalent to *diagraphe* in 83, 85). No other text
mentions that Tegea was affected by his order of 324 for the return of exiles (cf. on 83),
but that it should have been is likely enough: on Tegea in Alexander’s reign we have
only the remark that, with the exception of the ringleaders, the city was pardoned for
joining in Agis’ rising of 331—330 (for which see on 94: Curt. vi. i. 20): those ringleaders
may well have become a body of exiles who would benefit from Alexander’s order.
Heisserer notes that in 319 the proclamation made by Polymperchon in his rivalry with
Cassander included another restoration of exiles (D.S. xviii. 56. iv), and in 317 Cas-
sander was besieging Tegea but came to terms with it (D.S. xix. 35. i), so that would
provide another possible context for our inscription; but although it is not certain the
usual dating to 324/3 is likely to be right (for arguments in support see Worthington).

As in Athens in 403 and in Chios and Mytilene in the 330s (cf. on 84, 85; also 39),
the return of exiles was bound to lead to problems with property which was claimed
both by the returned exiles and by those who had acquired it after they had gone into
exile. Tegea’s solution is a partial restoration of property to the returned exiles, with
compensation at the state’s expense for property not restored. It had raised objections
to the first royal transcript (for the procedure cf. D.S. xvii. 113. iii), and had secured
revisions (ll. 2—4). What we have here must have been read in the light of earlier deci-
sions not recorded on this stone: for instance, the existence of ‘the foreign court’ is
assumed.

For sixty days disputed cases are to be tried by this foreign court, i.e. a court consist-
ing of judges from outside Tegea. This was to be an increasingly common institution
in the hellenistic period, based on the assumption that, although each Greek state had
its own code of laws, there was enough general similarity between the laws of different
to those who have returned whom the city resolved to receive back, and I shall not harbour grudges against any of them for what he may have plotted (?) from the day on which I have sworn the oath, nor shall I hinder the safety of those who have returned, neither in the city nor in the community of the city towards those who have returned — the city — — the things written in the transcript for — — nor shall I give counsel against anybody.

states that in cases where there might be a fundamental division within the citizen body judges from elsewhere would gain more from lack of local involvement than they would lose from lack of local knowledge (cf. C. V. Crowther in the rather inaccessible JAC vii 1992, 13–48, summarized APPh lxiii 1992, 132–43, and SEG xlv 1708; cf. the use of external arbitrators to settle disputes between cities, 16, 78). Heisserer and others have assumed from l. 35 that the ‘foreign court’ was manned by men from Mantinea, which is possible but not certain. For the importance of time limits to prevent disputes from being prolonged and the reconciliation from being impeded, cf. Ath. Pol. 39. iv, 40. i (on Athens in 403).

There are some places where the meaning of the text is not certain. Lonis, studying this decree in the general context of provision made for returning exiles, argues that at 4ff. what is granted is not paternal property to men and maternal to women (e.g. Tod) but ‘each exile could claim only his father’s estate, or one of which his mother had been, or had become, epikleros’ (Schaps, Economic Rights of Women, 42–3; cf. Lonis, 99–100; also Maffi, 113–23); the suggestion that the women mentioned are distinguished according to whether they had not or had remarried after the death of their first husband is due to Maffi, who compares I. Cret. iv 72. viii. 20–36. In l. 9 anoteron ought to mean ‘further back’ (sc. than the maternal in the female line: Hiller von Gaertringen in SIG3). In ll. 16–19 tima should be the sum paid by the state in compensation for property which is not returned (Lonis, 100–3; the interpretation of oikos as ‘room’, sense 1. 2 in LSJ, is due to G. Klaßenbach, DLZ lxix 1948, 503; a flat rate of 2 minas per house would be remarkably low (cf. W. K. Pritchett, Hesp. xxv 1956, 261–76, on Athenian house prices; but it is accepted by Lonis), but the meanings of timasia and timana are unclear. In ll. 19–21 the meanings of apheosthai and apylonai are unclear: we adopt the suggestions of Lonis, 100–3. In ll. 53–7 it is not clear who are the women who ‘went into exile later under compulsion and who are now creeping back on the present occasion’, whose claims have to be submitted to examination [dokimasie]: Maffi, 124–32, argues that they are those who did not go into exile after their marriage but who claim to have been married while in exile and whose claim would need to be checked.

ll. 11–19 provide one of our few references to gardens and their relationship to houses. Greek gardens were places of intensive labour, sometimes including irrigation, more than of leisure: they were found next to houses and temples, and tended
to be enclosed (see further R. Osborne, in Hunt (ed.), Garden History, 373–91). The careful specification here that only one garden may be claimed and that a plot may be claimed as a garden only if it is next to or very close to the house seems designed to prevent returning exiles from classifying fields as gardens so as to reclaim the whole rather than just half of the land involved. It suggests that gardens distant from residences were too unusual to merit consideration.

A plethron was 100 Greek feet: according to the standard being used, c.29.5–33.3 m. (32–36 yds.). ‘The Goddess’ in l. 38 etc. is Athena Alea, the patron goddess of Tegea. The four tribes at Tegea, in what appears from inscriptions to have been a standard order, were: Athaneatis, Apolloniatis, Krariotis (named after Zeus Krarios).

Acts of healing, Asclepieum, Epidaurus, c.320

One of 4 stelai recording cures surviving from the Asclepieum at Epidaurus. Phot. P. Kavvadias, τὸ λεπόν του Ἀσκληπιοῦ ἐν Επίδαιρῳ, between pp. 256 and 257.

Argolic Doric with some Atticisms. 1–119 generally more or less stecheden but ending line at syllable division; 120–6 smaller letters, less regularly spaced.


 Ancient Greek text...

θῆς ναυτή τοξα [άγ]αθα.
[i] [Kl]εώ πενθ’ ἔτη έκήψε. ἀστα πέντ’ ἔναιμων ἠδὴ κνοῦσα ποί τοῦ
[θε]λον ικέτις ἀφίκετο καὶ ἑνεκάθευδε ἐν τῶν ἀβάτων ὡς δὲ τάχιος
[τα] ἐξήλθε έξ αὐτοῦ καὶ ἐκ τοῦ ιάρον ἐγένετο, κόρον ἔτεκε. ὦς εἴ-
[θ] ος γενόμενοι αὐτοῖς ἀπὸ τὰς κράνας ἐλυόται καὶ ἀμα ταῖς ματρί
[π] ἐρήμης. τυχούσα δὲ τοῦτων ἔπλε το ἀνθέμα ἐπεγράφατο· "οὐ μέγε-
[θο] σ πίνακος θαυμαστέον, ἀλλὰ τὸ θεῖον, πένθ’ ἔτη ὡς έκήψε ἐγνα-
τυ Κλέω βάρος, ἔστε ἐγκατεκμολάθη καὶ μιν έθηκε ἑγγύς". (ii) τρήτης
[φο] πά τὸ Ἱπποκάτα Πελλαϊν ἀφήκετο εἰς τὸ ιάρον ὑπὲρ γενεάς. ἐγ[κατα]-
[κοι]μαθεΐᾳ δὲ ὄψιν εἴδε· ἑδόκει αἱτείθαι τὸν θεῖον κυψίαι κό-
[παν], τῶν δ’ Ἀσκληπιοῦ φάμεν ἐγκύνον ἐσσείσθαι νῦν, καὶ εἰ τι ἄλλο
[α] ντεί, καὶ τούτῳ οἱ ἐπιτελείν, αὕτη δ’ οὐθένοις φάμεν ἐπὶ ποι-
[δε] σθαι. ἐγκύνος δὲ γενομένα ἐγνατήρι εἴρει τρία έτη, ἐστε πα-
[ρέβαλε τοῦ] τῶν ικέτις υπὲρ τοῦ τόκου ἐγκατακομβαθείας δὲ ὀψί[ν] εἴδε· ἑδόκει ἐπεροτή νῦν τῶν θεῶν, εἰ οὐ γένοιτο αὕτη
[πάντα ὅσα αἰτήμαστο καὶ ἐγκύνοις εἰς· υπὲρ δὲ τοῦ τόκου ποιθεῖν

[νῦν οὐθέν. καὶ ταύτα πυθανομένου αὐτοῦ, εἰ τινὸς καὶ ἄλλου δέ-
and Hippothoitis (Jones, Political Organization, 139–42; cf. Paus. viii. 53. vi, ix); so if we may postulate a cult of Poseidon in Hippothoitis the gods by whom the oath is sworn will be the eponymous gods of the four tribes at Tegea (Plassart, 161–2). ‘Not to bear grudges’ is a standard expression for an amnesty: cf. Ath. Pol. 39. vi, 40. ii, and other texts cited by Rhodes ad § 39. vi.

Among the Arcadian features of the language are πάμα for κτήμα (6 etc.); the demonstrative forms ταυτί etc. (9 etc.); ἐπές = ‘with reference to’ (9–10 etc.); ἐξαντία = ‘nearby’ (12–13; but the true Arcadian form should be ἐσαντία: Buck ad loc.); ἄπυλωναι equivalent to ἄπολευεν (20: Buck §162. 10); εἰκ ἄν, where the Κ is a survival from ΚΕ equivalent to ΚΕ (34: Buck §134. 2. a).

God. Good Fortune.

2 Acts of healing of Apollo and Asclepius.

3 (i) Cleo was pregnant for five years. When she had already been pregnant for five years she came as a suppliant to the god and slept in the Abaton. As soon as she went out from the Abaton and was clear of the sanctuary she bore a son who, immediately he was born, washed himself in the fountain and crawled around beside his mother. In return for this good fortune she wrote on her dedication: ‘It is not the size of the tablet that should cause wonder, but the divinity, since Cleo was pregnant with the burden in her womb for five years until she slept in the sanctuary and the god made her healthy.’

9 (ii) A three-year carrying of a child. Ithmonica of Pellene arrived at the sanctuary seeking offspring. She lay down to sleep and saw a dream. It seemed to her that she begged the god that she might be pregnant with a daughter, and Asclepius seemed to say that she would be pregnant, and that if she were to ask for anything else, he would bring that about for her too, but she said that she had no further needs. She became pregnant and carried a child in her womb for three years until she came to the god as a suppliant about giving birth. She lay down to sleep and saw a dream. It seemed to her that the god asked her whether all that she had begged for had not come to pass and
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she was not pregnant? About the birth of the child she had added nothing, although he had asked her whether she needed anything else and said that he would do this too. But since now she had come to him as a suppliant about this, he said that he would manage this for her too. After this she left the Abaton hurriedly and when she was outside the sanctuary gave birth to a daughter.

22 (iii) A man who had no strength in any of the fingers of his hand except one came as a suppliant to the god. Contemplating the tablets in the sanctuary he did not believe the cures and gently mocked the inscriptions. When he slept in the sanctuary he saw a dream. It seemed to him that as he was playing knucklebones close by the temple and was about to throw the knucklebone, the god appeared to him, seized his hand and stretched out his fingers. When the god moved away, he seemed to bend his hand and then stretch out his fingers one by one. When he had straightened them all out the god asked him if he still did not believe the inscriptions on the memorials in the sanctuary, and he said that he no longer disbelieved. ‘Well, because you once disbelieved things that are not incredible,’ he said ‘in future let your name be Disbeliever (Apistos)’. When day came he departed healthy.

33 (iv) Ambrosia from Athens, blind in one eye. She came as a suppliant to the god. As she walked around the temple she laughed at some of the records of healing on the grounds that they were unbelievable and impossible, that lame and blind people should become healthy simply having seen a dream. She went to sleep and saw a dream. The god seemed to her to stand by her and say that he would make her healthy, but that as payment he would require her to dedicate in the sanctuary a silver pig as a memorial of her ignorance. Having said this he cut open her sick eye and poured in some drug. When day came she departed healthy.

41 (v) A dumb boy. This boy came to the sanctuary for a voice. When he had made the preliminary sacrifice and performed the accustomed rites, after this the acolyte who carried fire for the god gave orders, looking at the boy’s father, to promise to sacrifice in a year in commemoration of healing if he obtained what he had come for. The boy suddenly said ‘I promise.’ The father, shocked, told him to speak again, and he spoke again. From this time on he was healthy.

48 (vi) Pandarus the Thessalian had marks on his forehead. He slept in the sanctuary and saw a dream. The god seemed to bind his marks with a bandage and to order him, when he left the Abaton, to take off the bandage and dedicate it in the temple. When day came he stood up and took off the bandage and saw his forehead free of marks. He dedicated the ribbon in the temple, having on it the marks from his forehead.

54 (vii) Echedorus took the scars of Pandarus in addition to those he had. This man took money from Pandarus to make a dedication to the god at Epidaurus on his behalf, but did not pay the money over. As he slept he saw a dream. The god seemed to stand by him and ask him if he had some money from Pandarus from Euthenai for a dedication in the sanctuary. He denied that he had taken any such money from him, but said that if he were to make him healthy he would dedicate
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[xi] Αἰασάνας ἐγκεκομισμένους ὅδη τῶν ἠκτιῶν ἐπὶ δευρέοντι τοῦ ἀμβας ὑπερέκτυεν εἰς τὸ ἀβάτον. καταπτέον ὅν ἀπὸ τοῦ δευρέον περὶ ὁκολοποίης των τοῦ ἀβάτου ἀμφεπαινει κακῶς δε δια- κείμενος καὶ τυφλὸς γεγενημένος καθικετεύσας τοῦ θεοῦ ἐνε- κάθευθεν καὶ ἤγης ἐγένετο. vasiat

[xii] Ἐνυπόστος λόγχαν ἐτή ἐφόρησε εξ ἐν τῶν γνάθων ἐγκατασθέντος δοτοῦ ἐξελοι τῶν λόγχαν ὁ θεός εἰς τό κεῖρας οἱ ἐκωκε· ἀμέρας δὲ γενομένας ἤγης ἐξήρης τῶν λόγχα τοῦς χεραίν ἔχονων. [xiii] ἀνίψ Τορούναϊος δεμελέας, ὁτοὺς ἐγκαθιδρόν ἐνυπόστων εἴδη· ἐδοξε δὲ τοῦ θεοῦ τὰ στέρνα μαχαῖρα ἀναχώσαντα τὸς δεμε- λέας ἐξελειν καὶ δόμινοι οἱ εἰς τῶν κείρας καὶ συνίσταται τὸ στή- θη· ἀμέρας δὲ γενομένας ἐξῆλθε τὰς θηρία ἐν τῶν χεραίν ἔχουν καὶ ἦγης ἐγένετο· κατέπιε δοτα δωλεθεὶς ὑπὸ ματριάν ἔγνυ- καὶ ἐμβεβηλιμένας ἐκποιήσε.
an inscribed statue. After this the god bound Pandarus' bandage round the scars and ordered him to leave the Abaton, take off the bandage, wash his face in the fountain and look at himself mirrored in the water. When day came he left the Abaton and took off the bandage, which did not have the marks on it. Looking into the water he saw that his own face had received Pandarus' marks in addition to his own scars.

68 (viii) Euphanes, a boy from Epidaurus. This boy slept in the sanctuary suffering from stone. The god appeared to stand beside him and say 'What will you give me if I make you healthy?' And he said 'Ten knucklebones.' The god laughed and said that he would cure him. When day came he departed healthy.

72 (ix) A man came to the god as a suppliant so deficient in one eye that he had only eyelids and there was nothing between them but just a quite empty hole. Some of those in the sanctuary mocked the naivety of the man, that he should think that he would see when he had none of the makings of an eye but only the place. A dream appeared to him as he slept in the sanctuary. It seemed to him that the god prepared some drug and then, pulling the eyelids apart, poured it into them. When day came he departed seeing with both eyes.

79 (x) Cup. A porter, on his way to the sanctuary, fell over when he was ten stades away. When he got up he opened his bag and looked at the broken vessels. When he saw the cup from which his master was accustomed to drink broken he was troubled and sat down and put the sherds together. A traveller who saw him said 'Poor man. Why are you wasting your time putting the cup together? Even Asclepius at Epidaurus could not make it whole'. When he heard this, the slave put the sherds into the bag and went to the sanctuary. When he arrived he opened the bag, took out the cup which had been made whole, and told his master what had been said and done. When he heard this he dedicated the cup to the god.

90 (xi) Aeschines, when the suppliants were already asleep, climbed up a tree and tried to peer into the Abaton. He fell from the tree among some stakes and injured both eyes. In a sorry state and gone blind, he became a suppliant of the god, slept in the sanctuary and became healthy.

95 (xii) Euippos had a spearhead in his jaw for six years. When he slept in the sanctuary the god removed the spear and put it into his hands. When day came he departed healthy with the spear in his hands.

98 (xiii) A man from Torone with leeches. He slept in the sanctuary and saw a dream. It seemed to him that the god cut his chest with a knife, removed the leeches and put them in his hands, and stitched up his breast. When day came he departed with the creatures in his hands and was made healthy. He had swallowed the leeches after being tricked by his step-mother who had dropped them into a cocktail he was drinking.
Asclepius appears as a son of Apollo who is a ‘blameless physician’ in the Iliad and multiple variant stories about him seem to have been current already by the sixth century B.C. But the growth of sanctuaries of Asclepius as centres of healing cults seems to have been a feature of the fifth and fourth centuries. Epidaurus and Cos were the most important of these centres, and it was from Epidaurus that the cult of Asclepius was introduced into Athens in 420/19 (Parker, Athenian Religion, 175—85, K. Clinton in Hagg [ed.], Ancient Greek Cult Practice, 17—34).

The Sanctuary of Asclepius at Epidaurus lay just below the older sanctuary of Apollo Maleatas some 7 km. inland from the town of Epidaurus itself. During the fourth century the sanctuary was massively developed with the construction of a temple with elaborate sculptural decoration, a theatre, a highly decorated circular building, and the abaton, a place in which the sick slept (compare the provision at the Amphitheatre at Oropus, 27, and the discussion of incubation in the commentary to that inscription). We are exceptionally well informed about the fourth-century build-
A man with a stone in his penis. He had a dream. He seemed to be having sexual intercourse with a beautiful boy, and having a wet dream he cast out the stone, took it up and departed with the stone in his hands.

Hermodicus of Lampsacus, whose body was crippled. The god healed this man as he slept and told him to go out and carry into the sanctuary the biggest stone that he could. He brought the stone lying in front of the Abaton.

Nicanor, a lame man. As this man was sitting some youth in broad daylight snatched his stick and ran away. He stood up, ran after him, and from that time was made healthy.

A man whose toe was healed by a snake. This man was in a terribly bad way from a malignant wound in his toe. During the day he was carried out by the temple servants and sat upon a seat. Sleep took him during which a snake came out from the Abaton and cured his toe with its tongue and then retreated back into the Abaton again. When he woke up and was healthy he said that he had seen a dream in which a handsome young man seemed to put a drug on his toe.

Alcetas of Halieis. This blind man saw a dream. The god seemed to him to come and open his eyes with his fingers and he saw first the trees in the sanctuary. When day came he departed healthy.

Heraieus of Mytilene. This man had no hair on his head, but a great deal on his chin. He was ashamed of this because he was mocked by others, and slept in the sanctuary. The god anointed his head with a drug and made him have hair.

Lyson of Hermione a blind boy. He during the day had his eyes cured by one of the dogs in the sanctuary and departed healthy.

Individual inscribed memorials of cures are common at healing sanctuaries, and were indeed a feature of the Epidaurus sanctuary (see Strabo 374. viii. vi. 15 and ll. 7–9, 23–5, 30–1, 60–1 above), but extensive listing of healing stories at the initiative of the sanctuary itself is a phenomenon restricted to sanctuaries of Asclepius. It is known from Lebena near Gortyn in Crete (Creti. xvii 8–12), and from the Asclepius sanctuary on Tiber island at Rome, to which Asclepius had been brought in 291 B.C. (IGUR 148). The Epidaurus records of acts of healing, of which this stele, dated to the 320s on the basis of letter forms, is one of four surviving (IG iv². i 121–4), attracted the attention of Pausanias, who writes: 'Stelai stood inside the enclosure; there used to be more of them but in my time there were six. On these are written the names of men and women cured by Asclepius, along with the sickness which each suffered and how each was healed. They are written in the Dorian dialect' (ii. 27. iii). Later in his account.
of the Argolid (ii. 36. i) Pausanias mentions the inscriptions again, and in a way that shows that he had read them: he refers to them as the only place he knows in which the deserted city of Halike (= Halieis) is mentioned.

Pausanias was perhaps the ideal visitor, for these texts are unusual in needing to be read. For although the sight of a series of large stelai (this one is 1.7 m. high and 0.76 m. wide) recording past acts of healing was no doubt itself an encouragement to the ailing who visited the sanctuary, the records could have full force only if read. They advertise the powers of Asclepius, precondition pilgrims to the shrine to expect healing, and explain the background to votive objects in and other features of the sanctuary (107–10 explain the presence of a large rock outside the abaton, though the inscription on that rock (IG iv. ii 125) actually post-dates this inscription), giving the impression that remarkable acts of healing lie behind even the humblest votive (compare ii. 39, 53, 89).

The accounts are written in a straightforward style which makes for easy reading. But although the prose has little literary merit and incorporates some very poor verses (ll. 7–9), the claim that "There are no traces of rhetorical art in them; the accounts are artless and popular" (Kee, 122, following Herzog, 58) is misleading. The ordering of the cures is certainly not random (see also LiDonnici, 24–30), and the accounts do much more than simply record large numbers of individuals healed by the god, although the organizational principles of the collections differ from stele to stele. The stories on the first of the stelai seem to be arranged to give the god a personality and suggest a link between faith in Asclepius (though the god is powerful enough to heal doubters, as in iii and iv), moral uprightness in relationship to the god, paying up, and being made well.

The text printed here is from the first of the stelai (IG iv. i 122 simply continues with no further heading). After an initial story which offers an extreme case of a common problem (difficulties with a pregnancy), the second act of healing gives a further instance of the same kind, but one which brings out the idea of health being a matter of entering into a relationship with the god which is entirely straightforward on both sides. That then leads to the first of several cases where the person cured is initially sceptical of the power of the god: in this case the act of healing is itself much less striking, but the lesson of the god’s willingness to interact even with those whose credulity is stretched by what they read is timed precisely to dispel the doubts of the increasingly sceptical reader, and the story is confirmed with reference to a separate inscribed monument. Later in the text we might note in particular the punishment of Echedorus—named for the part (see SEG xdi 299)?—who fails to make the votive offering he has been asked to make (ll. 54-68) and of Aeschines who attempts to snoop at the sleeper (ll. 90–94). Patterns of sin, sickness, repentance, cure are familiar from other ancient texts also (see A. Chaniotis in van der Eijk et al., (edd.), Ancient Medicine, ii. 323–44).

It is made very clear throughout the stelai that Asclepius expects to be rewarded in some way. Although some stories here stress that the size of the reward is immaterial (i, viii), several stories on the second stele emphasise that healing depends on paying the fees (iatra) (in xxii Hermon is re-blinded for not paying), or that even if the healing
is subsequent to the incubation an offering to Asclepius is required (as xxv Sostrata who is healed when being carried home from the sanctuary is enjoined to make an offering there). Payment, and the importance of getting the payment right, seem to have figured particularly prominently in the fragmentary stelai.

Clement of Alexandria and Porphyry both report that the link between purity and healing was stressed in an inscription at the entrance to the Epidaurus sanctuary, which read 'The person who enters the fragrant temple must be pure, and purity involves thinking what is holy.' Such a link was also made in the Hippocratic oath, which included the clause 'I will guard my livelihood and my art in a pure and holy way' (see H. von Staden, *Journal of the History of Medicine and Allied Sciences*, li 1996, 404–37). Although the god is happy to deal with problems of a sort that would normally pollute, the pollution of birth and death is kept out of the sanctuary (ll. 5, 21) and in most cases the active surgery is restricted to the dreamworld (but one cure on the second stele [xxvii] leaves the floor of the abaton dripping in blood) (see further A. Chaniotis in Assmann and Sundermeier (edd.), *Schuld*, 142–79). As with the Hippocratic case histories, so here causes of illness (beyond the obvious, as with the man with the spearpoint in his jaw, 95–7) are rarely indicated, although one wicked stepmother does put in an appearance (102–3).

The record of the acts of healing stresses the range of Asclepius' healing powers: he cures the childless, the dumb, the blind, the crippled and lame, those infested with lice, leeches, worms, those suffering from sores, growths, abscesses, ulcers, headaches, epilepsy, dropsy. It stresses also the sanctuary's geographical pulling power: men and women come from all over the Peloponnese and from a number of other parts of Greece, some of them not at all close to Epidaurus: Aegina, Argos, Athens, Caphyiae, Ceos, Chios, Cirrha, Cnidus, Epirus, Euthenae (perhaps), Halieis, Hermione, Lampsacus, Messene, Mytilene, Pellene, Pherae, Sparta, Thasos, Thebes, Thessaly, Torone, and Troezen. More acts of healing of men than of women are recorded (33 to 13). Since women as well as men are found among the doubters it seems unlikely that men figure more prominently because more in need of persuasion. In the case histories in the Hippocratic *Epidemics* men also outnumber women by two to one, and we may be dealing here with a genuine asymmetry in access to health care, either because of the expense involved or because women preferred less public forms of medicine (King, 109).

The Asclepius of these acts of healing is occasionally a wonder-worker who acts unseen (as in the cases of the pregnant women, 1–22, or in repair of the broken cup, 79–89) or through his familiar animals, the snake and the dog (so 113–17, 125–6), but he is more normally a doctor whose healing acts make physical sense. The dreams in the course of which cures are effected (30 out of 46 acts of healing involve dreams) are most commonly dreams of medical intervention, involving drugs or surgery. In doing so they explain how health is restored, even though the surgery is such as would normally kill and the drugs have properties of no known substance. The language in which the maladies and the acts of healing are described is not the language of the Hippocratic treatises: no technical knowledge of physiology in terms of humoral balance is required to understand what happens. In general there is no apparent
conflict between Asclepius and the doctors: as in xvii, where the boy dreams of being treated with a drug when in fact he is licked by Asclepius' snake, visiting a doctor and sleeping in a temple appear as complementary rather than alternative ways of regaining health. But one later cure does have the god appear to stop an episode of cauterization and insist on incubation instead (stèle iii, ll. 30-3, for which see SEG xxii 280).

Scholars have been much exercised over the truth of these accounts. Some have dismissed them as fraudulent products of the temple authorities, and others have sought to rationalize the events described in them, either in general—seeing the sanctuary of Asclepius as a sort of health spa or the dreams as a product of hypnosis—or in particular, e.g. explaining long pregnancies in terms of amenorrhoea. As King (104–5) points out, such approaches desacralize medicine and convert it into something else. Arguably, what these healing stories offer is not just illustrations of the power of the god, some to be believed and ascribed to 'faith-healing' and others incredible because it was 'inevitable that the god was credited with fantastic cures' (Dillon, 257), but also the means to health, because they enabled individuals to come to terms with their condition in terms not of the reciprocity of the wet and the dry but of a reciprocal relationship with the gods in which they could help themselves.

Linguistically the inscription is in the Argolic version of the Doric dialect, but with some Attic influence. Both αἱ and εἰ are used to introduce conditions (on one occasion [60] αἱ is used with the optative; contrast 69–70), χηρῶς appears along with χειρῶς, and αὐτῆς is used (52) not αὐτῆς. One hybrid form is ἐκάρη (66) with an Attic beginning and a Doric ending. The use of μέντοι for μέντοι is an Epidaurian peculiarity. Local usage is also found in ἐρποι (and compounds) for 'go', ὀπτὶς(λ)ος for ὀφθαλμός, and δεμελέις (‘leeches’). More general Argolic features include the apocopé of ἀνά and παρά, and the use of τοῦ as the accusative singular as well as the nominative (69).
ATHENIAN ARCHONS, 403/2–323/2

All the archons for this period are recorded by D.S. at the beginning of his account of the year in question; for further references see Develin.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Archon</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>403/2</td>
<td>Euclides</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>402/1</td>
<td>Micon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>401/0</td>
<td>Xenaenetus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>400/99</td>
<td>Laches</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>399/8</td>
<td>Aristocrates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>398/7</td>
<td>Euthycles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>397/6</td>
<td>Suniades</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>396/5</td>
<td>Phormio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>395/4</td>
<td>Diophantus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>394/3</td>
<td>Eubulides</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>393/2</td>
<td>Demostratus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>392/1</td>
<td>Philocles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>391/0</td>
<td>Nicoteles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>390/89</td>
<td>Demostratus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>389/8</td>
<td>Antipatrus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>388/7</td>
<td>Pyrgion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>387/6</td>
<td>Theodotus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>386/5</td>
<td>Mystichides</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>385/4</td>
<td>Dexitheus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>384/3</td>
<td>Diotrephes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>383/2</td>
<td>Phanostratus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>382/1</td>
<td>Euandrus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>381/0</td>
<td>Demophilus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>380/79</td>
<td>Pythecas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>379/8</td>
<td>Nicon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>378/7</td>
<td>Nausinicus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>377/6</td>
<td>Calleas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>376/5</td>
<td>Charisandrus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>375/4</td>
<td>Hippodamas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>374/3</td>
<td>Socratides</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>373/2</td>
<td>Asteius</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>372/1</td>
<td>Alcisthenes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>371/0</td>
<td>Phrasiclides</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>370/69</td>
<td>Dysnicetis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>369/8</td>
<td>Lysistratus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>368/7</td>
<td>Nausigenes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>367/6</td>
<td>Polyzelus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>366/5</td>
<td>Cephisodorus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>365/4</td>
<td>Chion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>364/3</td>
<td>Timocrates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>363/2</td>
<td>Charicles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>362/1</td>
<td>Molon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>361/0</td>
<td>Nicophemus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>360/59</td>
<td>Callimedes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>359/8</td>
<td>Eucharistius</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>358/7</td>
<td>Cephisodotus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>357/6</td>
<td>Agathocles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>356/5</td>
<td>Elpines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>355/4</td>
<td>Callistratus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>354/3</td>
<td>Diotinus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>353/2</td>
<td>Thudemus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>352/1</td>
<td>Aristodemus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>351/0</td>
<td>Theelus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>350/49</td>
<td>Archias</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>349/8</td>
<td>Callimachus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>348/7</td>
<td>Theophilus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>347/6</td>
<td>Themistocles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>346/5</td>
<td>Archias</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>345/4</td>
<td>Eubulus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>344/3</td>
<td>Lyciscus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>343/2</td>
<td>Pythodotus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>342/1</td>
<td>Sosigenes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>341/0</td>
<td>Nicomachus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>340/39</td>
<td>Theophrastus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>339/8</td>
<td>Lysimachides</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>338/7</td>
<td>Chaerondas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>337/6</td>
<td>Phrynichus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>336/5</td>
<td>Pythodelus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>335/4</td>
<td>Euaenetus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>334/3</td>
<td>Ctesicles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>333/2</td>
<td>Nicocrates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>332/1</td>
<td>Nicetes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>331/0</td>
<td>Aristophanes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>330/29</td>
<td>Aristophon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>329/8</td>
<td>Cephisophon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>328/7</td>
<td>Euthycritus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>327/6</td>
<td>Hegemon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>326/5</td>
<td>Chremes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>325/4</td>
<td>Anticles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>324/3</td>
<td>Hegesias</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>323/2</td>
<td>Cephisodorus</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CONCORDANCE OF STANDARD EDITIONS

Under IG the reference is to vol. n except where otherwise stated, and where a text appears both in n and in another volume we give the reference to n only. Under ‘other’ we have been highly selective, and it should not be assumed, for instance, that where no reference to SEG is given no text has been published in SEG. With those exceptions, we have aimed at completeness for the editions which we cite.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>R&amp;O</th>
<th>IG</th>
<th>SIG³ or OGIS</th>
<th>Tod</th>
<th>other</th>
<th>Harding (or Fornara)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>Buck, 52; C. Delphes i 9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>v. i 1564</td>
<td>119a</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>L. Délós 87</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>10, 2493</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>Osborne, Naturalization, D 6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1237</td>
<td>921</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>Set. 223; Agora, xvi 34</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>5222, 6217</td>
<td>130-1</td>
<td>104–5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>106</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>1656–7</td>
<td>124–5</td>
<td>107</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>108</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td>109</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>111</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>114</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>116</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>34–5</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>118</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>139</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>123</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>122</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>126</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>1004</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>1635</td>
<td>125</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>vii 235</td>
<td>1004</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>vii 2462</td>
<td>130</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>131</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>v. ii 1</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>132</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Buck, 14; LSCG 69
L. Délós 98
Accame, Lega, 229–44;
SEG xxxi 67
CEG 632
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>R&amp;O</th>
<th>IG</th>
<th>SIG⁵ (or OGIS)</th>
<th>Tod</th>
<th>other</th>
<th>Harding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>Set. 280</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>105, 523</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>Agera, xvi.48</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>Set. 290</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>Set. 293</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>239</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>C. Delphes ii.4</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>Set. 303</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>Set. 304</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>Buck, 12</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>Set. 308</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>789</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>Buck, 5; IK'Etr. u. Kl. 8</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>963</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>Buck, 19</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>1183</td>
<td>206</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>CIRB 9, 10, 922, 1014, 1015; 1015 = SEG.xiv.1016</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>213, 214, 216</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>C. Delphes ii 34</td>
<td>84</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>244</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>Set. 322; IK'Erythrai und</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>172, A</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>KLazomenai; IK'Adranyttion 45</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>229</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>LSCG 92</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>228</td>
<td>255</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>SEG xi 126a; CEG 809</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>233</td>
<td>256</td>
<td>175</td>
<td></td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>xii. vii 5</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>152</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>155</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>157</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>158</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>158</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>789</td>
<td>155</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>vii 2418</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>160</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>244</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>165</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>172, A</td>
<td>154</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>229</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>154</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>xii Supp.</td>
<td>303</td>
<td>154</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>206</td>
<td>167</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>213, 214, 216</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>CIRB 9, 10, 922, 1014, 1015; 1015 = SEG.xiv.1016</td>
<td>81</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>244</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>165</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>172, A</td>
<td>154</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66</td>
<td>229</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>154</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
<td>228</td>
<td>255</td>
<td>174</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68</td>
<td>233</td>
<td>256</td>
<td>175</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R&amp;O</td>
<td>IG</td>
<td>SIG(^a) (or OGIS)</td>
<td>Tod</td>
<td>other</td>
<td>Harding (or Fornara)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>4250–1</td>
<td>258</td>
<td>164</td>
<td></td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76</td>
<td>236</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>Șet. 403. I</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77</td>
<td>237</td>
<td>259</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>Schwenk, 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>F. Xanthos vi; SEG xxviii 942</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SEG xi 87; Schwenk, 6;</td>
<td>101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Agora, xvi 73</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td>275</td>
<td>187</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81</td>
<td>334</td>
<td>271</td>
<td></td>
<td>F. Delphi iii, 1400</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82</td>
<td>xn. iii 1259</td>
<td>261</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>Schwenk, 17; Agora, xvi 75</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83</td>
<td>xn. ii 526</td>
<td>OGIS 8</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>Buck, 86</td>
<td>112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84, A</td>
<td></td>
<td>283</td>
<td>192</td>
<td></td>
<td>107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84, B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85, A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85, B</td>
<td>xn. ii 6</td>
<td>OGIS 2</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>Buck, 26; SEG xxxvi 752</td>
<td>113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86, A</td>
<td></td>
<td>277</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>I. Priene 156</td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86, B</td>
<td></td>
<td>OGIS 1</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>I. Priene 1</td>
<td>106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87</td>
<td>987</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>LSG 118</td>
<td>109; Fornara, 57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88</td>
<td></td>
<td>204</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89</td>
<td>1156</td>
<td>957</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90, A</td>
<td></td>
<td>307</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>IK Iasos 30</td>
<td>127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90, B</td>
<td>xn. vi 17</td>
<td>312</td>
<td></td>
<td>IK Iasos T 50</td>
<td>111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91</td>
<td>337</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>Schwenk, 27</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>93</td>
<td>286</td>
<td>195</td>
<td></td>
<td>Milet, i. iii 136; Șet. 408</td>
<td>118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>94</td>
<td>351, 624</td>
<td>288</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>Schwenk, 48</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95</td>
<td>360</td>
<td>304</td>
<td></td>
<td>Schwenk, 68</td>
<td>116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>96</td>
<td></td>
<td>196</td>
<td></td>
<td>SEG ix 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SEG ix 72</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>98</td>
<td>356</td>
<td>199</td>
<td></td>
<td>Schwenk, 58</td>
<td>119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IK Iasos 20; SEG x1 959</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>1629</td>
<td>305</td>
<td>200</td>
<td></td>
<td>121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101</td>
<td>v. ii pp.</td>
<td>306</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>Buck, 22</td>
<td>122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>102</td>
<td>iv. i 121</td>
<td>1168</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Articles in periodicals are cited in sufficient detail in the course of this book. Here we give
details in §1 of collections of inscriptions, and in §2 of other books cited (entered under title or
author/editor according to the abbreviation used, with a cross-reference under the abbrevia-
tion when that is far distant in alphabetical sequence from the main entry); where necessary,
we give in square brackets at the right-hand margin the abbreviations by which we cite the
books. In §2, Festschriften are listed under the names of the honorands; except in a few special
cases other collective volumes are listed under the names of the editors. Some books could
have been cited in either section: if a book is not found in one section, look in the other.

I. COLLECTIONS OF INSCRIPTIONS

texts before 337 see under PICCIRILLI.)

The Athenian Tribute Lists, ed. MERITT, B. D., WADE-GERY, H. T., & McGREGOR, M. F., 4 vols.

AUSTIN, M. M. The Hellenistic World from Alexander to the Roman Conquest: A Selection of Ancient
Sources in Translation. C.U.P., 1981. [Austin]

— & VIDAL-NAQUET, P. Economic and Social History of Ancient Greece: An Introduction. London:
Batsford, 1977. [Austin & Vidal-Naquet]

BAGNALL, R. S., & DEROW, P. Greek Historical Documents: The Hellenistic Period [translations].
Chico, Calif.: Scholars P. for Society of Biblical Literature, 1981. [Bagnall & Derow]

BEGHTEL, F. Die Inschriften des ionischen Dialekts. Göttingen: Dieterich, 1887. [Buck]

Carmina Epigraphica Graeca, ed. HANSEN, P. A. Berlin: De Gruyter, 1983–. [CEG]

[Choix Délis]

COLLITZ, H., & BEGHTEL, F. See under Sammlung der griechischen Dialekt-Inschriften.

Princeton: A.S.C.S.A., 1931–. [Corinth]

Corpus des inscriptions de Delphes. Paris: De Boccard for École Française d' Athènes 1977–.
[G. Delphes]

[CIG]

[CIRB]

1923–. [FGH]

DUBOIS, L. Inscriptions grecques dialectales de Sicile. (Coll. Éc. Fr. Rome exix.) Rome: École
Française de Rome, 1989. [Finley, SLC]

Rutgers U.P., 1952 [Finley, SLC]
Foulles de Delphes, vol. III. Paris: Fontemoing → De Boccard for École Française d’ Athènes, 1909–85. (See also under DAUX in §2.)

Foulles de Xanthos. Paris: Klincksieck for Institut Français d’ Études Anatoliennes, 1958–.


**Monumenta Asiae Minoris Antiquae**, Manchester U.P. for Am. Soc. for Arch. Research in Asia Minor → Society for Promotion of Roman Studies, 1928–63. [MAMA]


PICCIRILLI, L. *Gli arbitrati interstatali greci*, i [to 338 B.C.] Pisa: Marlin, 1973. (For continuations see under Ager and Magnetto.)


PUGLIESE CARRATELLI, G. See under Supplemento epigrafico Cirenaico.
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APF. See under DAVIES.
OTHER BOOKS

—— *A Historical Commentary on Arrian's History of Alexander*. O.U.P., 1980—.
[Bousquet, *Études*]
—— *CAH*]
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Dittmar, A. *De Atheniensium More Externos Coronis Publice Oraundis Quaestionum Epigraphicarum. LSKP xiii 1890, 63–248.*
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[Henry, Honours and Privileges]
HORNBLOWER, S. A Commentary on Thucydides. O.U.P., 1991–.
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LSAG. See under Jeffery.
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PA. See under KIRCHNER.

PAPAZOGLOU, F. Looi et paraioi. (Etudes d’Histoire Ancienne i.) University of Belgrade, Faculty of Philosophy, Centre for Epigraphic and Numismatic Studies, 1997.


— Greek Archives, Cults and Topography. Amsterdam: Gieben, 1996.
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INDEX I

PERSONS AND PLACES

(Figures in ordinary type refer to pages; figures in bold type refer by number to inscriptions.)

Abdera:
  and Athens 97, 105, 113
  tribute of 341
Abydus 80
Acarnania:
  and Athens 99, 105, 24, 77
  foreign relations of 270
  and Philip II: 382
  and Second Athenian League 328
  and Sparta 111
  and Thebes 270, 382
Achaea:
  allies with Athens 41
Acharnae xvi
Acarnae xvii
  altar of Ares and Athena at 442, 447, 448, 449
Acrasias, merchant from honoured 525
Acropolis, Athenian, building on 337
  dedications on 281
  tribal sanctuary of Cecrops on 452
Ada, of Halicarnassus 267-9
Adeistus son of Antimachus 451, 453
Adriatic, Athenian colony in 100
Aegiale 250
Aegina:
  given grain by Cyrene 488, 490
  person from healed at Epidaurus 541
  tribute of 341
Aegospotami, battle of 44, 53, 86
Aenetus, and Athens 99
Aeschynelos son of Philheripus of Halai 231, 234-5
Aeschines, Athenian orator, use of texts
  by 445, 448
Aesimenes son of Hermesidas 411, 417
Aeschines, Athenian orator, use of texts
  by 445, 448
Aesimenes son of Hermesidas 411, 417
Agesipolis, king of Sparta, consultation of
  oracle by 279
Agis II, king of Sparta 18, 19
Agis III, king of Sparta, revolt of 476, 490, 493, 530
Agis of Paeonia 258
Aegina:
  given grain by Gyrene 488, 490
  person from healed at Epidaurus 541
  tribute of 341
Alcetas (Molossian) 99, 105, 352
Alecimachus, Athenian 239, 241, 421, 424-5
Alysgeon 259
  at Delphi 337
Alexander of Lyncestis 372
Alexander of Molossians/Epirus 390, 489
Alexander of Pherae 221, 222-3, 224
Alexander son of Neoptolemus 352, 355
Alexander the Great 218, 467
  accession of 376
  and Ada 968
  and Aetolians 171
  and Alexandria 465
  and Amynatas 371, 373
  and Archon of Pella 468
  and Athens 526
Alexander the Great (cont.):

and Barsine 508
and Callisthenes 395
and Chios 83, 430
and Cyrene 490, 492
and democracies 266
and Eresus 407–19
exiles’ decree of 143, 379, 417, 423, 425, 430, 461, 526, 101
and Gorgus and Minnion 459, 460, 461
hetairoi of 345
hunt of 471
and Iasus 460–1
and League of Corinth 376, 377, 379, 391
and Mytilene 428, 430
and Priene 86
son of Olympias 352
taught by Aristotle 344
and Thebes 379, 492–3
and Thessaly 376
Alyzea, battle of 104, 105
and Third Sacred War 269, 270
Amadocus, Thracian 235–7
Amynthos 366, 367
Ambracia:
given grain by Cyrene 487, 488, 490
and League of Corinth 375, 378
and Sicily 369
Amorgus:
and Athens 99, 250–3
land lease from 59
see also Arcesine
Amphiaraia 133–4
Amphiaraus, regulations for cult of at Oropus 27
Amphiareum, at Oropus 538
Amphipolis:
and Athens 90, 104, 194, 195, 244, 245, 246
democracy at 245
expulsions from 49
and Macedon 57
and Philip II: 194, 49, 246, 256
Amynatas III:
alliance with Chalcidians 12
and Athens 57
reign of 56
Amynatas son of Antiochus, honoured by Oropus 371, 372
Amynatas son of Perdiccas III, honoured by Oropus 371–3
Anactorium, and Third Sacred War 269, 270
Andocides:
and peace negotiations 46
defence of 82
Andron, father of Androtion 250
Andros 139, 141, 142, 143, 144, 146–7
and Athens 52, 99
and Persia 252
and Sparta 253
Androsthenes 49, 50
Androtion, son of Andron, and
Amorgus 286
honoured by Arcesine 51
proposing honours for Spartocus 319, 321, 323
on sacred orgas 277–8, 279
Antalcidas, Spartan 80–1
see also Index of Subjects, Peace of Antalcidas
Anthena 228
Anthemocritus 278
Anthemus 246
Antigonus Monophthalmus 376, 379, 413, 416, 417
Antipater 199, 202, 379
puts down Agis’ revolt 476
Antiphon, member of Four Hundred 444
Antiphon, tried for attempt to burn dockyards 390
Antissa 153
and Athens 99, 104, 105
expulsion of tyrants from 417, 418
Apaturia 29, 34, 35
Apellai, festival of 3, 5, 7, 9, 11
Aphrodite:
Colias 190
at Halai Aixonides 232, 234, 235
at Piraeus 47
Urania 327, 328, 463, 464–5
Apollo 234
at Amphipolis 243, 245
at Corea 204
Coropaeus 133
on Cos 305
at Cyrene 495, 497, 501, 503
Daphnehoros 364
Delios, accounts relating to 28
at Delos, 18
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INDEX OF PERSONS AND PLACES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>at Delphi</strong> 5, 7, 9, 11, 164, 228, 334</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>deme dedication to 361</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>at Epidaurus 533</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Iatros 327, 328</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Karneios 307</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>in Lycia 387</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lykeios 7, 407, 418–19</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Maleatas 532</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>at Olynthus 247</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>in oath 313, 529, 532-3</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Patro(i)os 34, 189</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Prostaterios 247, 249</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pythios 197, 247, 249, 269, 495, 501–2</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Zoster 231, 232, 233</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Apollodorus of Eresus 415, 417</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Apollonia:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>and Olynthus 56</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>and Sicily 369</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>and temple at Delphi 225, 229, 230, 231</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Apollonius son of Leucon, honoured by Athens 64</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Aratus, and Athens 361</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Arbinas, Lycian dynast, dedications by 13</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Arcadia:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>and Athens 32, 41, 212</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>disputes within 530</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Federation of xix, 69, 32, 230</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>and League of Corinth 376</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>and Paros 148</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>and Sparta 279</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Arcesine:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>honours Androtion 51</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>land lease from 59</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Archedemus, Athenian 253, 255</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Archegetes, shrine of 177</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Archelaus of Macedon 56</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Archeneos, Athenian 187, 190</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Archeptolemus, Athenian 444</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Archinus, Athenian 24, 122</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Archon of Pella, honoured at Delphi 92</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ares:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>at Acharnae 441, 442, 443</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>oath by 257, 373, 441</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Arethusa, and Athens 97, 103</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Argaeus of Macedon 56, 246</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Argos:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>allies with Athens and Elis 66</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Apollo Lykeios at 419</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>arbitrates between Cnossus and Tylissus 404</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cimonus 82</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>constitutional arrangements at 404–5</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>and Corinth 86</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>and Corinthian War 40</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>given grain by Cyrene 487</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>person from healed at Epidaurus 541</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ariobarzanes, and Satraps' Revolt 508</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Aristomedes of Phere 372-3</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Aristomenes of Messenia 150</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Aristonicus son of Aristoteles of Marathon 397, 400</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Aristophon, Athenian 197, 201, 203</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Aristoteles of Marathon 93, 97, 101, 103, 156</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Aristotle 344, 419</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>honoured 80</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Arkesimas 387</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Arliiss 259, 262</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Arrephoreion 399, 401</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Artabazus:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>and Alexander 506</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>and Menmon of Rhodes 507, 508</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Artaphernes 72</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Artaxerxes II: 73-4, 259, 261</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Artaxerxes III: 261</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>and Caria 267–8</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Artaxerxes IV: 386</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Artemis 63, 189, 232, 233</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Agrotera 327, 328</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Amarysia, at Eretria 73</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>on Cos 307</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>at Cyrene 499, 501, 504</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>at Ephesus 413, 434</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Homonoia, at Mytilene 431</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>in Lycia 387</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>at Olynthus 247</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Orthosia 247, 249</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ourania, in Athenian Agora 465</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Artemisia:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>awarding proxeny 55</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>honoured by Erythrae 56</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Arybbas the Molossian, given asylum at Athens 70</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Asander, satrap of Caria 511</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Asclepius:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>cult of xvi, 133</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>at Epidaurus 337, 102</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Aspasia 447</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Aspetus son of Demostratus 359, 361
Assus:
philosophical school at 344
Zeus Homonoios at 431
Assyria, historical texts of 63
Astara 327, 328
Astracus, and Athens 99, 104, 105
Astypalaea, given grain by Gyrene 488
Astyphilus son of Philagrus 235
Atarneus, see Hermias of Atarneus
Athena 201, 233, 392
Agelaas 189
Alea, at Tegea 294, 295, 529, 532
Areia, at Acharnæ 441, 442, 445, 447
at Elatea 340
at Erythrae 267, 345
Hygieia 399, 401
Machanis 395, 396, 311, 399, 401
in oath 257, 373, 529
Polias, at Athens 189, 192, 211, 321,
323, 397–9, 403, 447; on Cos 303; at
Priene 431
Promachos 87, 185, 187, 189, 190, 191
Athena Diades, and Athens 97, 104
Athens:
and Abdera 97, 105, 113
and Acarnania 99, 105, 24, 77
and Adriatic 525
and Actelian League 35
and Alexander the Great 526
and Alexander of Pheræ 222–3
allies with Arcadia, Achaia, Elis, and
Philus 41; with Argos and Elis 66;
with Boeotia 6; with Carystus 48;
with Cephallenia in 372; 113; with
Chios 20; with Corcyra 112–13;
with Eretia 48; with Sparta 156,
164, 212; with Thessalians 44; with
Thrace 47; with Thracian, Paeonian,
and Illyrian kings 53
and Amorgus 250–3, 286
and Amphipolis 194, 195, 244, 245, 246,
256, 257
and Andros 52
and Arcadia 32, 212
archons at 543
and Arybbas 70
and Asclepius 538
boards of magistrates at xx
building at 294, 295–6, 337, 447, 476–7
and Byzantium 86, 97, 98, 100, 103,
107, 108, 109, 223, 357
and Carystus 97, 100, 48, 347
and Ceos 99, 104, 196–209
and Chalceians 99, 104–5, 194, 195,
249, 543
and Chersonese 194, 356–7
and Chios 20, 93, 97, 98, 100, 107, 108,
109
and Citian merchants 91
and Clazomenae 76, 18
constitution of xvi–xxiii
and Corcyra 101, 104, 24
and Corinthian War 40–2, 46
and Cycladic cities 144, 146, 148
and Cyprus 11, 464–5
and Delos 28, 399
and Delphi Anmphiictyony 339, 343
and Delphi oracle 279–81
demography of 454
and Dionysus of Syracuse 10, 33, 34,
213
display of inscriptions at xv
ephebeia at 88
and Epidaurus 535, 541
and Eresus 99, 104, 105
and Eretria 69
and Erythrae 44, 46–7, 17, 79
and Eu-Boea 239, 240, 241–3, 348
exiles restored at 530
finances of xx–xxi, xxiii, 80, 82–3, 90,
103, 126, 128, 148, 323, 403
fortifications of 46
Four Hundred at 250
given grain by Gyrene 487, 492, 493
and Hellespont 80–1
honours Acarnanians 77:
Clazomenae 18; Dionysius of
Syracuse 10; Eleaus 71; ephesia 89;
Eudemus of Plataea 94; Evagoras
of Salamis 11; Heracleids of
Salamis 94; Memnon of Rhodes 98;
men of Cyrene 491; men who
fought for democracy 4; Menelau
the Pelagonian 38; Phanocritus
of Parium 19; Samians 2;
Spartocles 64; Strato of Sidon 21;
Tenedos 72
imperialism of 52–7
and Iulis 39
Athens (cont.):
and Jason of Pherae 105
and Lemnos, Imbros, and Scyros 26
and Lycia 60
law on coinage 25; on Little Panathenaea at 81; on tax 26; on tyranny 79
and Macedon 194–5, 246, 476, 509
and Megara 276–9
and Methymna 97, 103, 104, 23, 108
and Mytilene 86, 97, 98, 104, 107, 109, 31
naval list from 100
and Oropus 130–5, 372, 373
and Paros 29
and Persia 52, 86, 90, 101, 156, 194, 214, 251, 357
and Pharmazus 508
and Philip II: 257, 349, 354, 356, 357, 360, 376, 382, 390–1, 447
regulating ruddl e trade 40
and sacred orgas 58
and Samos 2, 102, 461
and Satraps’ Revolt 214–16
sending colony to Adriatic 485, 100
and Sestos 237
and Sparta 39, 46, 91, 98–100, 111, 148, 156, 164
and Thebes 24, 93, 97, 99–100, 101, 103, 109, 130–1, 149, 156–7, 249, 241
and Third Sacred War 225, 270
and Thrace 27, 240, 241, 244
use of special commission at 277, 278
winning battle at Corcyra 164
see also Index of Subjects, Areopagus;
assembly; council, of five hundred;
generals; governors; liturgies; lot;
Second Athenian League; secretaries;
stratiotic fund; theoretic fund; Thirty;
treasurers; tribe; tyrant

Athmonon:
honouring ephes 451, 452
spending of on honours 233

Atrax, given grain by Cyrene 487, 492
Attalus 404, 417
August Goddesses 211, 213
Autolycus, Athenian 155, 156, 157
Autophradates, and Greeks of Asia 416, 422
Auxo 311, 441, 446

Babylon:
Archon as ruler of 467, 468
historical texts of 63
Bactria 509
Bagas 386
Bardylis of Illyria 258
Bargyia 308
Barsine 508
Basil 280, 425, 431
Battus, founder of Cyrene 495, 501, 503
Benid 367, 464
Berises 235–7, 246
Besa 177
Black Sea, as source of grain 122
Boeotia:
and Athens 6, 49
and Corinthian War 40, 41, 42
and Opuntian Locris 41
and Oropus 372, 373, 400
and Third Sacred War 57
honours Byzantine 218;
Carthaginian 43; Macedonian 218
see also Thebes
Boeotian federation, 40, 70, 150
boeotarchs 150, 218
constitution of 219, 271, 378
split up 41, 86
Bosporan kingdom 258, 264, 320–9
dedications from 65
Bottiaea, and Macedon 57
Bouphonia, at Athens 310
Brauron, rituals at 504–5
Brea 148, 525
Bryon 83, 87

Byzantium:
and Athens 86, 97, 98, 100, 103, 107, 108, 223, 357
citizen of honoured by Boeotians 218
and Philip II: 356, 360
and Third Sacred War 269, 270, 271

Calchedon 80
Callias of Alopece, Peace of 447
Callias of Sphettus 175, 177
Callibius of Paeania 93
Callocrates son of Charopides 359, 361
Callisthenes, Athenian 255, 258–9
Callisthenes, nephew of Aristotle, honoured 80
Callistratus, Athenian 16, 157, 256
Calymnos, month names on 311
Caphyiae, person from healed at Epidaurus 541
Caraechus 271
Cardia 356
Caria 262–3, 511
Carians at Athens 27
and Crete 265
government of 386
and Persia 60
see also Iasus; Mausolus of Caria
Carneia, on Cos 303, 305, 311
Carphinas, Acarnanian 381
Carthaea:
and Athens 99, 197, 199, 200, 201, 203, 204
given grain by Cyrene 488
Carthage 49
citizen of honoured by Boeotians 43
and Sicily 368
Carystus:
and Athens 97, 103, 48, 347
borrowing from Delian Apollo 141, 144
given grain by Cyrene 487
Cassalia 327, 328
Cassander 264
and Tegae 526, 530
Caunian king 385, 387
Cecrops, tribal sanctuary of 452
Ceo:
and Athens 99, 104, 196–209
borrowing from Delian Apollo 141, 144
display of inscriptions on xv
funeral regulations on 8, 10, 311
given grain by Cyrene 488
person from healed at Epidaurus 541
phratries on 37
political arrangements in 200–1
see also Carthaea; Coreia; Iulis; Poessa
Cephallenia:
and Athens 99, 105, 24
and League of Corinth 375
Cephalus, Athenian 81, 82, 85, 87
Cephasis 190
Cephisodotus of Acharnæ 481, 483, 485
Cephisodotus of Cnemis 89, 90–1, 171, 172
Cephisophon of Cholargus 515, 524
Cephisophon of Paeania 13, 15, 16
Ceramicus 399, 401
Cersebleptes 233–7, 249, 257, 353, 356
sons of honoured at Delphi 470
Cetriporis 237, 255, 257, 258, 259
Chabrias 203
campaigns of in 377: 104
and Carystus 293
and Ceos 197, 201, 203
in Egypt 215
honoured by Athenians 47, 105
as mercenary commander 241
and Social War 240, 241
Chaeonae, battle of 157, 171, 270, 341, 372, 376, 382, 390, 405, 444, 453
Chalcidians 194, 195
alliance with Amyntas III: 12
and Athens 99, 104–5, 194, 195, 249, 523
and Grabus 249
organization of 246–7
and Philip II: 256, 50
and Potidaea 102
Chalcis, and Athens 97, 103, 239, 241, 280, 347
Chares 101, 255, 259
and Artabazus 508
at Chaeronea 382
and Elaeus 357
as mercenary commander 416, 430
and Social War 240
and Thrace 236, 237
Chariclide, Athenian archon 185, 187, 193, 197, 543
Charidemus, Athenian general 390
Charmillus, Athenian 175, 177
Chersonese, and Athens 90, 194, 356–7
Chios 73, 79, 82, 123, 203
and Alexander the Great 83
and Athens 20, 93, 97, 98, 100, 107, 108, 109
battle of 240, 259
and Hermias 345
Klytidai on 87
in League of Corinth 423
and Macedon 415–16, 417
and Mausolus 345
person from healed at Epidaurus 541
restoration of exiles at 530
and Social War 267
Chytum 78
INDEX OF PERSONS AND PLACES

Cimolus, arbitration of dispute with Melos 82
Cimon, and Delian League 526
Cinesias, dithyrambic poet 49, 50
Cirra, person from healed at Epidaurus 541
Citium, merchants from 91
Cius 435
Clazomenae 73
and Athens 76, 18
Clearchus of Heraclea Pontica 485–6
Cleigenes of Acanthus 56
Cleisthenes, reforms of xvi, 439
Cleomenes, governor of Egypt, and grain supplies 485, 490
Cleomenes I, king of Sparta 444
Cleoneae, plague at 502
Cleopatra, given grain by Cyrene 487, 488, 493
Clistarchus, tyrant of Eretria 364
Clitarchus, tyrant of Eretria 364
Cnidos, battle of 17, 44, 46, 53, 54, 74, 86
makes Epaminondas proxenos 218
person from healed at Epidaurus 541
Cnosus:
dispute with Tyris 404
given grain by Cyrene 488, 490
and Mausolus 55
Codrus, sanctuary of 280
Colias 190
Colophon 74, 431, 435
Comosarye daughter of Gorgippus 327, 328
Conon:
and Dionysius 50, 53
establishes mercenary force 241
and Evagoras 50, 53, 54
honoured 8, 46, 53, 105
and Pharmabazus 44, 53, 74, 86
Corcyra 164, 202
and Athens 101, 104, 24, 213
and Corinth 369–70
oligarchs and democrats on 112–13
and Sicily 369
Corcesia:
and Athens 99, 200, 204, 207, 208, 209
given grain by Cyrene 488, 493
Corinth:
and Argos 86
and Corcyra 369–70
and Corinthian War 40, 41, 42
given grain by Cyrene 487, 492
and Persian War 446
and Sicily 74, 368–71
and Thebes 212
see also Index of Subjects, League of Corinth
Coronca, battle of 41, 42
Cos:
Asclepieum at 598
festival of Zeus at 62, 367
given grain by Cyrene 488
religious calendar from 62
Cotyphus of Pharsalus 331, 334, 336, 339, 341, 342
Cotys, king of Thrace 194, 236
Craterus 444
collection of inscriptions by xxiii
death and commemoration of 471
Crenides 246, 256, 257
Crimisus, river, battle of 368–9
Critias 444
Cydonia, given grain by Cyrene 488
Cynuria 159
Cyphaera, and temple at Delphi 225, 230
Cyprus:
and Athens 464–5
and Greece 52, 54–5
and Persia 52, 55
see also Evagoras of Salamis
Cyrene:
and Alexander the Great 490, 492
democracy at 439
inscriptions from xvi
provision of grain by 230, 485, 96
sacred law from 97
Cyrus, expedition of 279
Cythera, given grain by Cyrene 488, 489, 490, 493
Cynthia, given grain by Cyrene 488
Cyzicus 81
relations with Miletus 473
Daedalus, sanctuary of at Athens 173, 175
Daetondas, Boeotarch 217, 218, 219
Daippus of Marathon 167, 169
Dandarioi 327, 329
Darius III, and Greeks of Asia 416, 429
Datus/um 256–7
Decadistae 316
Decelea:
  Decelean war 35, 39
deme of 26, 31, 38–9, 190
desertion to Spartans at 444
  man from priest at Oropus 132
Deceleans, oikos of 5, 190
Delos:
  accounts of Amphictyons 28
  and Athens 142–3, 390
  building at 294, 295
  purification of 18, 280, 502
  and Sparta 3
  see also Index of Subjects, Amphictyons;
  Delian League
Delphi 394
  accounts of nauphoinoi from 66
  Daochid monument at 223
  dedications at 269
  festivals at 10–11
  given grain by Cyrene 488
  honouring individuals 105, 92
  Labyadai at 1
  loaning money 200
  ‘navarchs monument’ at 44
  Phocian reparations to 67
  proverb at 8
  Pythian games at 353, 355, 365
  Serpent Column at xxiii
  size of citizen body of 8
  Tegean document at 530
  temple building at 164, 45, 294, 296, 66
  and Third Sacred War 225, 269–71
  see also Index of Subjects, Amphictyons;
  hieromnamones, at Delphi; oracle, of
  Delphi
Demades, honouring a Macedonian 391
Demeter 201, 275, 276
  in Attica 317
  Chloe 233
  on Cos 303, 305, 310
  oath by 313
  see also Index of Subjects, Eleusinian mysteries
Demetrius Polorcetes 376, 379, 526
Demokratia, cult of 391
Demosthenes son of Democles 479, 484, 485
  Demosthenes son of Demosthenes, and
  Areopagus 390
  and Persia 393
  Demosthenes, of Boeotia 47
  Demotionidai 8, 13, 5
  Dercylus son of Autocles of Hagnous 232
  Dexandrides 25, 27
  Dexileos son of Lysanias of Thoricus 7
  Dicaeopolis, and Athens 99
Didyma 460
  building accounts from 294
  Dio son of Dio of Acharnae 441, 442, 448
  Diodes, Athenian general 239, 241
  Diodorus son of Olympiodorus of
  Scambonidae, secretary of
  Amphictyons 195, 137, 143
Dion of Syracuse 165, 368
Dionysius I of Syracuse:
  ambitions of 49–50
  and Athens 20, 33, 34, 368
  building tetereis 522
  and Conon 33, 34, 164
  and Sparta 49–50, 164
Dionysius II of Syracuse 163, 165, 168, 368
Dionysius, tyrant of Heraclea Pontica 481,
  484, 485, 486
Dionysus 233, 234
  Patroios 5
  Scyllites 301, 303
  theatre of 50–1, 477
Diopithes, Athenian general 38
  Dium (Macedonian), and Athens 97, 247
  Dium (Thraco), and Athens 99
  Dolopians 341, 342–3
  and League of Corinth 375
Doschoi 327, 329
Drerus, ephebic oath from 446
Dylais 34, 37
Earth, oath by 254, 247, 257, 259, 373
Egretes 438
Egypt:
  and Athens 465, 467
  and Persia 99, 214–15, 465, 507, 509
  worship of Isis in 465
Egyptians, at Athens 27
Elaeus, and Athens 99, 71
Eleusinum, at Athens 173, 176, 273, 275, 277
Eleusis xiv
accounts from 208
bridge at 477
building of portico 279
council sitting at 524
first-fruits at 124, 125, 127, 131, 280, 491
honouring ephesians 451, 452, 456, 457
honouring general 232
honouring non-Athenians 232
Proerosia at 316—17
see also Index of Subjects, Eleusinian mysteries
Elis 161, 247
allies with Athens and Argos 66
allies with Athens 41
and Arcadia 212
given grain by Cyrene 488, 489, 492—3
Klytidae at 498—9
and Sparta 68, 70, 161
and Triphylia 68
Embata, battle of 194, 241, 259
Empedocles 247
Enyalios 441
Enyo 441, 445
Epaminondas 172, 218
and Byzantium 270
at Leuctra 150, 151
Ephesus 13, 16, 73, 424, 430, 432, 434
honours Conon 46
statue of Philip at 417
Ephialtes 278, 390
Epicrates (Athenian) 448, 453, 456
Epicrates son of Hermocreon of Iasus 511
Epidauros:
Asclepieum at xvi, 229, 337, 102
building at 294, 295
epigram mentioning Gorgus at 460
sculpture at 267
theatrodokoi from 244
Epigenes of Eleusis 171, 172
Epigenes son of Polycrates of Delos 141, 143, 145—6
Epipyrgidius 189
Epirus 490, 493
Olympias retires to 355
person from healed at Epidaurus 541
Episthenes 137, 143, 145
Erchia, calendar from 192, 307, 310, 311
Erechtheum at Athens, 49, 294, 403, 447
Erechtheus 493, 444
Eresus 153, 263
and Athens 99, 104, 105
tyrants of 83
Eretria 200
Artemisia at 73
and Athens 97, 103, 239, 242—3, 69, 364
drainage of lake at 294, 295
Egyptian worship of Isis at 465
and Oropus 130—1, 134
temple finances at 132
tribes, 'districts', and demes at 367
Erythrae 73
allies with Hermias of Atarneus 68
and Athens 44, 46—7, 17, 79
honours Conon 8; Idrieus 56;
Mausolus and Artemisia 264, 56
and Persia 47, 266
and Sparta 44
Eteocubutadae, genes of 467
Euaemon, and Orchomenus 64, 65, 66
Euboea:
Athens and 239, 240, 241—3, 348
in 3603 and 3508 240, 241
in 3408 241—3
see also Carystus; Chalcis; Eretria;
Hesitia
Eubulus, Athenian 157, 348, 464, 467
Eubulus, Bithynian 344
Euclides, Athenian archon 13, 15, 543
Eucrates son of Aristotimus of
Piraeus 389, 391
Eudemus of Plataea, honoured by
Athens 94
Eumolpidae 171, 172, 189, 273
Eumolpus 444
Euhron of Sicyon 15
Euphron (II) of Sicyon 523
Euphrosynus of Paenia 207, 208
Euripides, use of 444
Eurydice, daughter of Miltiades 526
Euryphon, honoured by Athenians 108
Euryphus 185, 187, 189, 190, 191, 192, 193
Eurytus of Eresus 497, 415, 416, 417
Evagoras of Salamis 44, 50, 11, 79, 88
honoured with statue 53—4
Excecestides, Athenian 221, 223, 239, 241
Galessos, on Syros 141, 144
Gambreion, funerary regulations from 10
Gaugamela, battle of 509
Gergis son of Harpagus 61—2
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Gerys 23, 27
Gorgus of Iasus 66, 90
Gortyn:
  given grain by Cyrene 488
  oath of jurors at 419
Grabus, Illyrian king 249, 255, 258
Graces 905, 311
Granicus, battle of 416
Hagnonides of Pergae 515, 521, 523
Hagnotheus son of Ecphantides of
  Halai 231, 235
Hagnous, decree from 63
Halai, deme named 232
Halai Aixonides 315
  decree of 46
Halicarnassus 262, 265
  siege of 422
Halicarnassus 262, 265
Halieis, person from healed at
  Epidaurus 539, 540, 541
Hannibal 216
Harpalus 259
  at Athens 526
  and Demosthenes 393
  deserting Alexander 490
  sending grain to Athens 479, 485
Hecatomnids 434
  see also Mausolus of Caria
Hecatomnos 261, 262, 263
Hegelochus, Alexander’s commander 416,
  422, 430
Hegemone 441, 445
Hegesander son of Hegesias of
  Sunium 253, 255, 349
Hegesileos, of Athens 348
Hegesippus son of Hegesias of
  Sunium 255, 347, 348–9, 381
Hegias son of Hegesias of Sunium 187,
  193
Hekatompedos 142
Helisson xix
  and Mantinea 14, 463, 473
Hellespont:
  Athenian interest in 356, 357
  Spartans defeat Athenians at 80–1
  transit tax at 123
Hera 393
Heraclea (festival) 7
Heraclea Pontica 481, 484, 485–6
Heraclea, near Naxos 404
Heracles 441
  on Cos 395
  initiation of 505
  at Porthmus 185, 189, 192
  thiasoi of 208
Heracleides of Salamis, honoured by
  Athens 95, 490
Heraea 159, 160
Heraea (festival) 7
Heraeus of Eresus 415
Hermes 447
Hermias of Atarneus 267
  allies with Erythrae 68
  statue of at Delphi 395
Hermione:
  given grain by Cyrene 488
  person from healed at Epidaurus 539,
  541
Hermocrates of Syracuse 49, 51
Hermocritus son of Dionysius 163, 165
Heron of Eresus 415, 417
Herodotus, use of inscriptions by xxiii
Heroidas son of Theticon 411
Heroine, cult of 233
Hesiod, on agricultural practice 286
Hestia 441, 445
  Hetaireia 301, 308–9
  Hestiaea/Histiaea 200, 367
  and Athens 99, 103–4, 239
Hicetas 368
Hierocles, Athenian 29
Hieroetas, and Mytilene 153, 155
Himera 19
Hipparchus son of Charmus 444–5
Hippias son of Pisistratus xxiii, 444
Homer:
  appeals to 444
  imitation of 310, 311
  parodies of 396
Homonoia, cult of 431
Homonoios 425, 431
Hypsicles of Delos 135, 137, 141, 144–5
Hyrtacina, given grain by Cyrene 488
Iasus:
  honours Gorgus and Minnion 90
  payment of assembly at 99
Icarion 234
Icaros 135, 141, 144
Icetyra, given grain by Cyrene 488
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Icus, and Athens 97, 103
Idrieus of Caria, 267–9, 434
honoured by Erythrae 264, 268
Illyrians:
alliance with Athens 53
Dardanian 257, 258
expel Amyntas 56
given grain by Cyrene 488
Grabaean 257, 258
and Macedon 246, 258
Imbros 86, 527
and Athens 102, 26
grain production on 124, 491
Iolaus 189
Ion 189
Ionia, revolt of 72
Ios, borrowing from Delian Apollo 135, 144
Iphicrates 80, 194, 241
and Carystus 239
and Pharnabazos 90
Iphigenia 328
Isis 465
Issus, battle of 372, 416, 490, 509
Isthmia, games at 469
Italy, as source of grain 490
Iulis:
and Athens 99, 39, 207, 208, 209
funerary regulations from 10
given grain by Cyrene 488
Jason of Pherae 222
and Athens 105
Kerykes 171, 172, 189, 273, 299
Kesendelis 387
Klytidai, on Chios 87
at Elis 438–9
courotruthic deities 311
Kourotruthos 185, 187, 189, 191
Labraunda 263, 269, 434
Labyadai:
law of 1
sacrifices of 10–11
Labys 8
Lampsacus:
coinage of 271
person from healed at Epidaurus 539, 541
Larisa, given grain by Cyrene 487, 492
Latomus, and Pidas a 64, 66
Laurium 175, 177
as source of ochre 208
Lebadea 150
building contract from 295
Lebedus 73
Lebena, Asclepieum at 539
Lemnos 86, 491, 527
and Athens 102, 26
Leocrates, Athenian 444, 476
Leonini 368
Leos, sacrifice to 316
Leosthenes, Athenian general 222
Lepreum 69, 159, 160, 161
Leptines, brother of Dionysius of Syracuse 51
Leptines, law of 477
Lesbos 123
deities worshipped on 431
given grain by Cyrene 487
and Macedon 415–16
see also Antissa; Eresus; Methymna;
Mytilene; Pyrrha
Leto 189, 232, 233, 305
in Lycia 387
Leucas, and Sicily 369
given grain by Cyrene 487
Leuciust of Sunium 175, 177
Leucon 319, 321, 322, 324, 328, 329
Leucothea 303
Leuctra, battle of 100, 150–1, 156, 163, 172, 213
Locris:
and Corinthian War 40, 41
and League of Corinth 375
Lycia 58–63
inscription from 78
see also Xanthus
Lycidas, stoning of 444
Lycomedes of Rhodes, at Mytilene 429
Lycurgus son of Lycomphorion 101, 400,
444–5, 446, 448, 464, 465, 496, 497
building activities 477
in charge of administration 361
proposing honours 475, 476
Lycurgus, Spartan, laws of 502
Lydia 72, 74
and Caria 262
Lygdamis of Tragilus 227, 229
Lyppus, Paesnoni 255, 257, 258
Lysander 44
    dedication by at Delos 19
    and Samos 14, 16, 17
    statues erected for 46
Lysias, orator 24, 25
Lysicles, general at Chaeronea 382
Lysimachus 433
Lysippus, statue by 369
Lysistratus son of Lysanias of Thoricus 43

Macedon:
    and Athens 104–5, 246, 276, 509
    citizen of honoured by Boeotians 218
    and Euboea 364
    and Illyrians 246, 258
    inscriptions from xvi
    and Lesbos 415–16
    and Molossians 352
    and Oropus 75
    and Persia 372–3, 414–16, 422
    as source of timber 218
    and Thessaly 222
    and tyrants of Eresus 83
    see also Alexander the Great; Amyntas
    III; Philip II
Macistus, in Triphylia 68, 69, 70
Macander 432
Maenalia 159, 161
Magnesia ad Sipyllum, and Smyrna 64, 66
Maia 189
Maitai 325, 327, 329
Manitas son of Pactyes 261, 263
Mantinea xix, 290, 295
    and Arcadian federation 159, 160, 161
    battle of 161, 212, 213, 215, 218
    and Helisson 14, 463, 473
    judging Tegean exile cases 529, 530, 531
    reuniication of 158
    and Sparta 86
    synoecism of 64–5
    and Thebes 212
Mantitheus, Athenian 42
Marathon 445
    Akamantes at 502
    and Athens 97
    battle of 445, 447, 526
Maroneia 175
Mausoleum at Halicarnassus 434
Mausolus of Caria 387
    Athenian embassy to 250
    awarding proxeny 55
    and Erythrae 345
    honoured at Erythrae 56
    plots against 54
Mazi 69, 70
Medon, and Stiris 64, 66
Medontidae, phratry 175
Megalopolis:
    foundation of 65, 158–60
    and Thebes 212
Megara 251
    and Athens 276–9
    and exiles 202
    given grain by Cyrene 487, 488, 490, 492
    Athens’ fifth-century Megarian
decree 276
    and temple at Delphi 225, 228
Meliboea, given grain by Cyrene 487, 488, 490, 492, 493
Melon 217, 219
Melaos, arbitration of dispute with
    Cimolus 82
    Memnon of Rhodes 415, 417, 422, 428–30
    honoured by Athens 98
    Memnon, governor of Thrace 509
    Mende, and Macedon 57
    Menelaus the Pelagonian, honoured by
    Athens 38
    Menexenus, proposes decree about
    Ceos 197, 203
    Menexenus, proposes honours for
    Strato 89, 91
    Menexenus, proposes phratry decree 33
    Meno, Athenian general 239, 241
    Mentor of Rhodes 344, 507, 508, 509
    Messenia 150–1, 161
    person from healed at Epidaurus 541
    and temple at Delphi 227
    Methymna 87, 153
    and Athens 97, 103, 104, 23, 108
    and Sparta 108
Metrodoros 87
Miletus 79
    and Alexander the Great 432
    arbitration with Myus 16
    colonizing Cimmerian Bosporus 320
    and Cyzicus 473
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Context</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>dedication of at Delphi</td>
<td>269</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and Olbia</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and Phygela</td>
<td>473</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and Sardis</td>
<td>473</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miltiades, general at Marathon</td>
<td>445</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miltiades of Laciadice</td>
<td>515, 519, 523, 524, 525-6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minnion of Iasus</td>
<td>66, 511</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>honoured by Iasus and Samos</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minoa</td>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Molossians</td>
<td>352-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monunius</td>
<td>255, 257</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moschus of Cyclatheneaeum</td>
<td>153, 157, 164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother of the Gods</td>
<td>115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Munichia, battle of</td>
<td>21, 24, 25, 26, 27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Myconus:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and Athens</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>borrowing from Delian Apollo</td>
<td>135, 141, 144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>calendar from</td>
<td>307</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mylasa</td>
<td>268, 460</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and Crete</td>
<td>265</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>decree from</td>
<td>386</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and Mausolus</td>
<td>259-6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Myrrhinous, decree possibly from</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mytilene:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and Athens</td>
<td>86, 97, 98, 104, 107, 109, 31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>coinage agreement with Phocaea</td>
<td>119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and Hermias</td>
<td>345</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>honours Timotheus</td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and Macedon</td>
<td>416</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>person from healed at Epidaurus</td>
<td>539, 541</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>reconciliation at</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>restoration of exiles at</td>
<td>539</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Myus, arbitration with Miletus</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Naucratis, and temple at Delphi</td>
<td>227, 230</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Naulochum</td>
<td>433, 435</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Naupactus</td>
<td>171</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nausigenes, Athenian archon</td>
<td>153, 165, 543</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nausinicus, Athenian archon</td>
<td>xxi, 93, 95, 543</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nausirus, hero</td>
<td>189, 191</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neapolis, and Athens</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neleus, sanctuary of</td>
<td>280</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nellus</td>
<td>97, 104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nemea, River, battle of</td>
<td>42-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nemesis, at Rhamnous</td>
<td>142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neoptolemus (Molossian)</td>
<td>99, 105, 352</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nestoridai</td>
<td>303, 308, 310</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nicias of Cydantidae</td>
<td>175, 177</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nicias son of Eucteaus of Xypete</td>
<td>451, 457</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nicias son of Niceratus</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nicoles son of Evagoras of Salamis</td>
<td>55, 88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nicodemus, proposes phratry decree</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nicolocharus, Spartan</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nicomenes son of Hiero</td>
<td>139, 235</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nicophon, Athenian</td>
<td>113, 122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nicostratus of Pallene</td>
<td>193, 196-7, 203</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nobas of Carthage</td>
<td>217</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notium</td>
<td>13, 16, 435</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Odrysian Thrace</td>
<td>236</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oeta, given grain by</td>
<td>487, 488, 490</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Olympia:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>given grain by Cyrene</td>
<td>487, 488-9, 490</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Olbia</td>
<td>118-19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>relations with Miletus</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Olynthus and Amyntas</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and Chalcidians</td>
<td>56-7, 194</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and Philip II</td>
<td>104, 246, 248</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Onchestus, sanctuary of Poseidon at</td>
<td>219</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Onomarchus</td>
<td>333, 337</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Onymastus, Delphian</td>
<td>495, 593</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ophellas, ruler of Cyrene</td>
<td>526</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opous, given grain by Cyrene</td>
<td>488</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opuntian Locris</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orchomenus (Arcadian)</td>
<td>159, 160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and Euaemon</td>
<td>64, 65, 66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orchomenus (Boeotian) and Boeotian federation</td>
<td>219</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oreus</td>
<td>103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orgas, sacred, Athens and</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Orontobares 267, 386
Oropus:
and Athens 400–1
and Boeotia 130–3, 372, 373, 400
cult of Amphiaraurus at 27, 524, 238
history of 190–1
independence of 372
and Macedonians 75, 376, 400
Ozolian Locri 41

Pactyes 261, 263
Paecania, sacrifices at 317
Paeonia:
allies with Athens 53
and Macedon 246
Paerisades son of Leon 325, 327, 328, 329
honoured by Athens 64
Panathenaic stadium, building of 476–7
Panceon 38
Pandius, Athenian 161, 162–3, 167
Pandrosus 185, 191
Pangaeum, Mount 256–7
Panionium, sanctuary of Poseidon 72
Panopeus 7, 8, 11–12
Pantacles of Oion 29
Pantacles son of Socrates of Halaï 231, 235
Parium 81
Parmenio 258, 404, 417
Paros:
and Athens 97, 29
borrowing from Delian Apollo 135, 141, 144
given grain by Cyrene 488
Parthenon:
building of 447
cost of 337
and Panathenaeum 400, 401, 402, 403
Patrocles, claimant to Macedonian throne 246
Pausanias, king of Sparta 16
Pausanias, Periegete, use of inscriptions by xxiii
Peithias, Athenian proxenos in Corcyra 202
Pelagonia 194–5
Pella 56
Archon of 92
Pellana 62
citizen of honoured by Boeotians 219
Pellene, person from healed at
Epidaurus 533, 541
Pelopidas 218
Peparethus 222
and Athens 97, 104
Percote 80
Perdiccas, brother of Philip 246
and Amphipolis 244
Perdiccas, takes over Babylon from
Archon 468
Periander, Athenian 211, 212
law of 524
Periander of Corinth, and abuse of
women 418
Pericles:
buildings associated with 447, 477
citizenship law of 37
Perithous:
and Athens 97
attacked by Philip II 356, 360
Perrhaebi 341, 342–3
and League of Corinth 375
Persia:
and Andros 252
and Athens 52, 86, 90, 156, 194, 214, 251, 357
and Caria 60
and Cyprus 52, 55
and Demosthenes 393
education in 62
and Egypt 99, 214–15, 465, 507, 509
and Erythrae 47, 266
and Greek institutions 72
and Greeks 86–7
and Greeks of Asia 72, 79, 345, 434, 473
and Hermias of Atarneus 344
and Iasus 460
and Lycia 60
and Macedon 372–3, 414–16, 422
and Mylasa 262–3
and oath of Plataea 444
and Philip II 360, 376, 377, 389, 414–15, 422, 423, 428
sacking cities 63
and Samos 102, 461
and Satraps’ Revolt 88–90, 42, 344, 508
and Second Athenian League 93
and Sidon 88–9
and Sparta 73, 86, 508
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and Thessaly 372–3
and Third Sacred War 271
see also General Index, King’s Peace;
Peace, of Antalcidas
Phaix, hero 189, 191
Phalaeus 340
Phaleron, and Salaminioi 189, 192
Phanias of Eresus 419
Phanocritus of Parium 80–1
Phanodemus, and Amphiarais 133
Phanetics 7, 11–12
Pharnabanus, satrap of Hellespontine
Phrygia 44
and Conon 44, 53, 74, 86
and Greeks of Asia 416, 422, 428
in Phoenicia 90
Pharnabanus II:
commanding Persian fleet 508
and Memnon of Rhodes 507, 508
Pharsalus 223
Phaselis 230
and Mausolus 265
Pheidon of Argos 229
Phereas 222, 225
person from healed at Epidaurus 541
see also Jason of
Philip Arrhidaeus, and Eresus 413, 417
Philip II:
assassination of 355, 376, 391
and Acarnania 392
and Aetolians 171–2
and Amphipolis 104, 49, 246, 256
and Arybbas 352–3
and Athens 257, 349, 356, 357, 360, 367, 382, 390, 447
and Byzantium 356, 360
and Cerebelepes 353, 356
and Chaeronea 270
and Chalcidians 50, 256
and Delphic Amphictyony 339, 341, 342
and Elis 492
establishment of power by 246
and Euboea 241
and Hermias of Atarneus 344
hetairai of 345
and League of Corinth 76
marriages of 352, 355
and Olynthus 246, 248, 104
and Oropus 372, 400
peace of Philocrates with Athens 322–3
and Persia 376, 377, 378, 390, 414–15, 422, 423, 428
and Phocis 340
and Propontis 356, 357, 360
statue of at Ephesus 417
and Thessaly 223, 225
and Third Sacred War 271
and Thracians 237, 257–8
use of title ‘king’ 377
Phaliphi 246, 256, 257
Philippus of Semachidae 171, 172
Philo of Eleusis, Athenian architect 294
Philocharis, Athenian general 241
Philochorus, on sacred orgas 277–8, 279
Philocrates, son of Pythodorus 275, 278, 279, 314
see also Index of Subjects, Peace of
Philocrates
Philomelus 333, 337
Philyllus of Eleusis 479, 485
Phlius:
allies with Athens 41
democratic 213
and exiles 292
given grain by Cyrene 488
Phocaea 74, 79
coinage agreement with Mytilène 119
Phocion, Athenian general 357, 390, 435
Phocis:
and Corinthian War 40, 41
and Delphi 334, 337
and League of Corinth 375
reparations to Delphi 67
and Third Sacred War 225, 248, 270, 271, 281
Phoenicia 90, 91
see also Sidon
Phormio, Acarnanian 381
Phormio, Athenian archon 29, 395–6
Phrynichus 444
Phygela, relations with Miletus 473
Phylarchus son of Lycurgus 159
Phylarchus son of Lycurgus 159
Phyle 24, 25, 55, 456
Phylemachidai 305, 308, 310
Phyleus of Ocnoe 483, 484, 485
Pisana, and Latmus 64, 66
Pigres 263, 387
Pindar, language of 159
Piraeus 21, 24, 25, 121, 125
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Piraeus, (cont.)
- attacked by Alexander of Pherae 222
- coin-tester in 115
- council sitting at 524
- Cypriot worship of Aphrodite at 464–5
- ephesians as garrison of 453
- and events of 403: 87
- fortifications of 9
- location of Porthmus at? 192
- Pisianax, Athenian 255, 257, 259
- publication at 324, 349
- raid attempted by Sphodrias 99
- sacrifices at 317, 473
- Sidonians in 91
- walls of 9

Pistirus 58–9

Piloxadus 263, 267–8, 78

Plataea 38
- destruction of 149
- given grain by Cyrene 488, 492
- oath of 315, 88

Plato, funerary regulations in Laws 10

Pnyx 208
- building on 477
- proposal to clean up 390
- publication of inscription on 392–3

Poecessa, and Athens 97, 104, 200, 201, 207

Polemon of Ilium, stelokopas xxiii

Polyaega 404

Polyeuctus son of Timocrates 323

Polyperchon:
- and common peace 376
- restores exiles 530

Polystratus of Halai 231, 234

Polyxenus, brother of Dionysius of
- Syracuse 51

Porthmus 185, 189, 192

Poseidon 115, 201
- Hippodromios 189, 191
- oath by 245, 247, 257, 259, 373, 529, 533
- Panonian sanctuary of 72
- Phratrros 5, 8, 9
- sanctuary of at Onchestus 219
- statue of 369

Poses 15, 17

Potidaea:
- Athenian cleruchy at 102
- and Philip II: 246, 256
- taken by Timotheus 194

Praxithea 444

Priene 74
- and Alexander the Great 86
- and Macedon 416

Promachus of Pherae 171, 172

Propylaean, of Athenian Acropolis 337

Ptolemy I, and Cyrene 492

Pyrraethus son of Antigonus of Delos 141, 143, 145–6

Pyrrha 153
- and Athens 97, 104, 105

Pyrrhantrus, Athenian 97, 103

Pythius, architect 434

Python of Kedoi 15, 16–17

Rhamnous:
- honouring ephesians 456
- sanctuary of Nemesis at 142

Rhea 303, 310

Rheneia 139, 145
- lease of land on 400

Rhodes:
- and Athens 97, 98, 107
- given grain by Cyrene 487, 492, 493
- month names on 311
- visited by Epaminondas 218

Rome:
- Asclepieum at 539
- and Delos 143

Salaminioi 37, 401

Salamis:
- decree concerning 444
- and Salaminioi 190, 193

Salaminis, on Cyprus, see Evagoras

Samos 74, 123
- administrative divisions on 461
- and Athens 2, 102, 461
- citizens honoured by Athens 2
- grant of citizenship by 66
- honours Conon 46; Gorgus and
- Minnion 90
- and Persia 102
- record in Ionian War 14
- and Sparta 14, 16, 17

Samothrace:
- and Athens 99
- and League of Corinth 375, 378

Sanerges 327, 328

Sardis 424
- relations with Miletus 473
Satyrus, Athenian 195
Satyrus, of Bosporus 319, 321, 322, 324
Sciathus, and Athens 97, 104
Scillus 68, 69, 70
Scirus 189
Scopas, at Tegea 295
Scyros 86, 527
and Athens 102, 26
grain production on 491
Scythians 328
Selinus 230
man from honoured 470
sacred law from 503, 505
Selymbria:
and Athens 99
attacked by Philip 360
Seriphos, borrowing from Delian Apollo 135, 139, 144
Sestos, and Athens 237
Sicyon, given grain by Cyrene 487, 492
Sidon:
and Corinth 74
as source of grain 525
see also Syracuse
Siculus, and Athens 99
Sicily:
and Corinth 74
as source of grain 525
see also Syracuse
Sicinus, and Athens 99
Sicyon, given grain by Gyrene 487, 492
Solon:
Athens honours xvi, 21
and Persian War 277
and Methymna 168
and Olynthus 104
and Persia 73, 86, 508; see also Index of Subjects, Peace of Antalcidas
person from healed at Epidaurus 541
and Phlius 202
position of after Leuctra 150, 213
and rebuilding of temples 447
revolt of from Alexander 379
and Samos 14, 16, 17
Third Sacred War 270
Spartocids 320–3, 328
Spartocus, honoured by Athens 64
Sphodrias 99, 100
Spina, and Athens 525
Stiris, and Medeon 64, 66
Strato, king of Sidon 88–90
Stratocles of Diomeia 467
Stratocles, general at Chaeronea 382
Stratocles, of Amphipolis 243, 244
Struthas (Struses) 71, 73–4, 76
Strymon, as divinity 243, 245
Syracuse:
consultation of oracles by 279
and Corcyra 113
and Corinthian War 40, 42
decarchies of 14, 16
and Delos 3
and Dionysius I of Syracuse 49–50, 164
and Egypt 215
and Elis 68, 70, 161
and Erythrae 44
fear of in 3708 100, 156
and Greeks of Aegean 93, 101
and Hellespont 80–1
and League of Corinth 376, 279
loss of territory after Chaeronea 405
and Mantinea 65
and Megarian decree 276
and Methymna 168
and Olynthus 104
and Persia 73, 86, 508; see also Index of Subjects, Peace of Antalcidas
person from healed at Epidaurus 541
and Phlius 202
position of after Leuctra 150, 213
and rebuilding of temples 447
revolt of from Alexander 379
and Samos 14, 16, 17
Third Sacred War 270
Spartocids 320–3, 328
Spartocus, honoured by Athens 64
Sphodrias 99, 100
Spina, and Athens 525
Stiris, and Medeon 64, 66
Strato, king of Sidon 88–90
Stratocles of Diomeia 467
Stratocles, general at Chaeronea 382
Stratocles, of Amphipolis 243, 244
Struthas (Struses) 71, 73–4, 76
Strymon, as divinity 243, 245
Symphalos 160
Sun, oath by 254, 247, 257, 259, 373, 411, 419
Sunium 175, 177
demarch of 191
and Salaminioi 185–93
Symmachus of Pellana 62
Synesis, mother of Archon of Pella 469, 471
Syracuse 239
  and Athens 48–51
  and Corinth 368–71
  under tyrants 368
see also Dionysius I and Dionysius II of
Syracuse
Syros, borrowing from Delian Apollo 135,
141, 144, 145
Tachos of Egypt 88, 215
Taenarum, 241
Tanagra:
  and Boeotian federation 219
  given grain by Cyrene 488, 492
Tauri 328
Tegea 159, 160, 161
  and Hecatomnids 269
  regulation of public building at 60
  restoration of exiles at 101
  signs for amounts of money at xxvi
  supporting Thebes 212
Telemachos of Acharnai 481, 482–3, 485
Telemessus 62, 63, 460
Tenedos:
  and Athens 97, 72
  and Persia 416
  and Third Sacred War 269, 270
Tenos 135, 137, 141, 144, 145, 222
  and Athens 99
  given grain by Cyrene 487
  phratry (?) regulations from 8, 61
Teos 74
Teres 237
Tenes 189, 191
Thallo 311, 441, 446
Thasos 256
  and Athens 97
  and League of Corinth 375, 378
  person from healed at Epidaurus 541
  tribute of 341
Thateis 325, 327, 329
Theaetetus of Erchia 223
Thebes:
  and Acarnania 270, 382
  and Aetolia 172
  and Alexander the Great 379, 492–3
  and Arcadia 160, 212
  and Athens 24, 93, 97, 99–100, 101, 103,
  109, 130–1, 149, 156–7, 240, 241
  and Boeotian federation 219, 271
  and Byzantium 270
  commemorates victory at Leuctra 30
  and Corinth 212
  cult of Amphiaras at 130
  and Delphi 248
  and Euboea 240
  and Messenia 151
  naval programme of 201, 202, 218, 222
  and Oropus 130–3, 372, 373
  and Persia 101
  person from healed at Epidaurus 541
  and Philip II: 376
  revenge on, after Persian War 443, 446
  and Social War 218, 224
  and Sparta 82, 86, 98, 100, 150, 156–7
  and Thessaly 222, 224–5
  and Third Sacred War 225, 270
  threat to Greeks from after Leuctra 156
Thelphusa 159
Themistocles 73
  decree of 445
Theocritus 85, 87
Theodorus, actor 229, 231
Theodorus son of Euphantides 27, 36, 37
Theodosia 327, 329
Theodotus son of Theodorus of Halai 231,
235
Theomnestus son of Deisitheus of
Ioniae 173–5, 179
Theophrastus, of Eresus 419
Theopompus, on Peace of Callias xxiii
Theosebes son of Theophilus of
Xypete 173–5, 178, 179, 180
Theozotides 25
Thera:
  and Athens 104
  given grain by Cyrene 487, 492
  seeks privileges from Cyrene 492
Thermopylae:
  battle of 63
  oath of 445, 446
Theseus 189, 191
  sacrifice to 493
Thespiae, and Boeotian federation 219
Thessaly:
  and Alexander the Great 376
  and Amyntas 56
  and Delphic amphictyony 334–6, 342,
  343
  and grain 492, 493
influence on Delphi 9

delphic koinon of 222, 223, 44, 270

and League of Corinth 375, 378

person from healed at Epidaurus 535, 541

Thibron 74

Thorius 177

calendar from 192, 307, 315, 317

Thrace: allies with Athens 47, 53

and Athens 27, 240, 241, 444

inscriptions from xvi

and League of Corinth 375, 378

and Philip II: 223, 225

as source of grain 490

worship of Bendis by 464

Thrason of Erchia 257, 259

Thrasylbulus of Steiria 21, 24, 26, 27, 87, 74-5

Thrasylbulus of Collytus 41, 80, 86, 97, 103, 259

Thucydides, use of inscriptions by xxiii

Thymondas son of Mentor 507, 508, 509

Thysseus son of Syscos 261

Thrasybulus of Conon 194, 195, 240, 241

campaigns of 375: 104, 105, 111, 113

campaign of 373: 105, 148

honoured with statue 47, 105

Thribazus, 76

Thissaphernes 16, 52

Toreai 327, 329

Torone, person from healed at Epidaurus 537, 541

Tragilus 227, 230

Trichonium 171

Triphylia 161

grants of citizenship by 15

Tritopateres/Tritopatores 495, 502, 503

Trozeen 445

given grain by Cyrene 488

person from healed at Epidaurus 541

and temple at Delphi 225, 228

Trophonius, oracle of 150, 371–2, 373

Twelve Gods 303, 307, 308, 425

Tyris, dispute with Cnossus 404

Tyrrenians, threat from 519, 524

Tyrtacus, use of 444

Xanthus 58, 60, 61, 62, 63

dedication by Alexander at 434

inscription from 78

Xenocles of Bosporus 327, 328

Xenocles of Sphettus, bridge of 477

Xenocrates, philosopher 344

Xenocrates, Theban 150-1

Xenophon, consultation of oracle by 279

Xerxes, crossing Styron 445

Zacynthus:

and Athens 97

and League of Corinth 375

Zeus 201, 441

at Dium 247

Eleutherios 54, 95, 102-3

Heraios 425, 431

at Labraunda 263, 264, 434

Machaneus 303, 310

oath by 245, 247, 257, 259, 313, 373, 411, 419, 529, 532

Olympics 211

oracle of 279

Patroios 3, 7, 438

Philippios 263, 409, 417

Phratrios 27, 29, 31, 33, 189

Plerosia festival of 313

Polieus 301, 303, 308-9, 310, 317, 367

Soter 403

Stratios 269

Teleos 247, 249

Temenites 284, 285

and trophies 151

Zopyrion, defeated by Olbia 473

Zosteria 231, 233
abbreviations, use of 177
accounts:
  of Amphictyons of Delos 28
  of building projects 294
  of Delphic naxpoidoi 66
  of Eleusis 268
  of ephimeletai of dockyards 100
  of temples 142
actor, contributing at Delphi 231
age, as qualification/disqualification 297–8
Agora:
  of demes 232
  as term for assembly 9
  used by Salaminioi 185
  see also Index of Persons and Places,
Agora, at Athens
agoratroi 336
agriculture 284–7
Aleaia, festival at Tegea 294
alliance:
  between Athens and Arcadia, Achaea, Elis, and Phlius 41
  between Athens and Alexander 389
  between Athens and Argos and Elis 66
  between Athens and Boeotia 6
  between Athens and Carystus 48
  between Athens and Cephallenia in 372: 113
  between Athens and Chios 20
  between Athens and Corinth 112–13
  between Athens and Dionysius of Syracuse 34
  between Athens and Eretria 48
  between Athens and Locris 41
  between Athens and Sparta 156, 164, 212
  between Athens and Thessaly 44
  between Athens and Thracian kings 47
  between Athens and Thracian, Paeanian, and Illyrian kings 53
  between Chalcidians and Amyntas

III: 12
between Erythrac and Hermias of Atarneus 68
defensive 57, 164, 213, 377; see also symmachia
inscription of xvi
length of 40
multiple copies of xiv–xv
between Philip II and Chalcidians 50
of Philip II after Chaeronea 376
provision for amendment of 40–1
relation to state decrees 40, 41
alphabet, at Athens xxiii
Amarysia, at Eretria 364
amendment:
  concealed xx, 87, 223, 325
to decrees xvii–xviii, xx, 16, 17, 54,
  81–2, 91, 154, 156, 195, 325
to phratry decree 34
time limit for 247
amnesty:
  on Ceos 202
  on Paros 148–9
Amphiaraia, at Oropus 524
Amphictyons, of Delos, accounts of 28, 390
Amphictyons, of Delphi 147, 224, 228, 231, 334–7, 349–3
curses of 446
honouring Aristotle and Callisthenes 80
oath of 446
and Third Sacred War 270, 271
amphoras, Panathenaic 400
animals, movement out of war zone 344
antidosis 183
Apaturia 9, 189, 191, 452
apodektai at Athens xx–xxi, 82–3, 115, 117, 126, 323
apographe 203
appeal, Athenian provision for allies 202–3
calendar (cont.):
of demes 232
differing from state to state xxi–xxii
inscribed xiii
at Oropus 132
of sacrifices 8, 9, 10–11, 133, 190, 306–7, 315
casualties, in battle 150
catapults, at Athens 523
cavalry, Athenian 40–3, 116, 457
Thessalian 223
choria at Athens:
performed by metics 91
of boys’ choruses 457
chthonic cult 309
citizens, at Athens xvi–xvii, xx, 34, 49
killing of treated differently 354
and military service 452
citizens, in general:
lists of inscribed 4, 14
and phraternity membership 297
property qualification for 160
registration of 66–7
and sympoliteia 64
citizenship:
attractions of 39
award of 13, 17, 4, 24, 34, 53, 64, 15, 165, 268–9, 77, 354, 353–4, 357, 459–61
law of Pericles on 37
civil strife:
at Cyrene 492
on Paros 148
at Tegea 295
cleruchies:
on Andros 253
Athenian 237, 357, 525
Athenian renunciation of 100, 102
on Lemnos, Imbros, and Scyros 122
clothing, regulation of 10
coinage:
Aeginetan standard 229
denominations of xxii–xxiii, 271
electrum 119
of Elisphasians 64
Athenian law on 25, 122
Molossian 353
Persian 267
plated 116
problems with counterfeits 119
of Salamis on Cyprus 55
colonies, of Athens 194, 485, 100
common peace 215, 216
of 362: 212
of 338/7: 76
see also King’s Peace; Peace of Antalcidas; and Index of Persons and Places, Antalcidas
confiscation of property 178, 261, 262, 263, 349
of exiles 243
constitution, preservation of 213, 377, 391
contract, common 294–5
corporate groups, relation to state 8–9, 10–11, 12
see also deme; genos; gentilicial groups; phratries
council of five hundred at Athens xv, xvii
acting as court for allies 202
dispatching heralds 170
empowered to make supplementary decisions 257, 281 cf. (Mytilene) 429
enactment formulae and xviii, xix
expense account of xx
honoured 250
honouring ephes 451, 452
and navy 522, 524–5
organization of 195
probouleumae formulae of xv, xvii–xviii, xx, 16, 110
proportional representation on 454–5
powers of 48–9, 117
receipt of money by 116
repeated service on 251, 325
responsibilities of xx
sitting at Piraeus 524
council at Mantinea 67
court xviii
dealing with building disputes 295
foreign, establishment of 530–1
reference of cases to 117
see also synedron
cows, price of 401
craftsmen, at festivals 367
crowns 17
awarded to Athens 356
awarded at games 353, 355, 365, 400
for council 524
honorific 165, 233–4, 322, 323, 483
for sophronistes 456
for trierarchs 524
value of 17, 233–4
cult:
foreign, admission of 464
funding of 387
see also calendar, of sacrifices; law, sacred
curators, of dockyards, accounts of 100
curses 259, 261, 263, 315, 419, 446
Cybernesia, at Phaleron 191
dadouch 278
damiorgoi/demiourgoi 9, 67, 71
in Arcadia 160–1
dating, systems of xxi–xxii, 383–5
death, and purification 502
as penalty 315, 418
debt, cancellation of 377
decree:
Athenian fund for 173
combined with law 398–9
compared to law xviii, 116, 118, 127,
209, 314, 390, 391
dating of 149
of deme 46, 63
honorific xiii, 2, 4, 8, 10, 11, 18, 19,
21, 147, 155, 38, 43, 217, 46, 232, 51,
56, 64, 70, 71, 72, 77, 80, 391, 89,
90, 94, 95, 491, 98, 525
layout of xix–xx
dedications 306, 310, 322, 323, 442
from Cimmerian Bosporus 65
by ephebes 452–3
records of at Delos 144
required by Asclepius 540
delian League:
Amorgus in 250
Andros in 252–3
and Athenian festivals 148
Chios in 86
Erythrae in 44
financing building in Athens 477
fourth-century renunciation of 100,
101–2
judicial powers in 102
and Miletus 73
and Myus 73
as offensive and defensive alliance 102
position of Delos during 18
profits from for Athenians 37
regulation of silver coinage in 116
replacement of tribute in 78
tribute in xxiii, 229, 341
treasury of 83
demarch 233, 235
duties of 132, 180, 314, 315–16
at Eretria 363
and Panathenaea 367, 401
sacrifices by 316
deme:
admission of citizens to 26, 37, 70, 165,
269
and Amphiareum 131
at Athens xvi, xvii, 232
decree of 46, 63
erception of altar by 442
at Eretria 367
at Histiae 367
loaning of money 179
making laws 314
meetings of 314
officers of 314–15
quotas of for council 454–5
relationship to phratri 37
reliant on individuals 233
and religious activity 34, 232, 233;
401
sacrificial calendar of 8, 306
democracy:
Alexander and 422–3, 430, 439
changing nature of at Athens xx
restoration of at Athens 4
and ritual 281
dialects, combination of on single stone
18–19
dionysia:
assembly's discussion of 323
Athenian colonies' offerings at 148
celebrated in demes 315, 317
at Eretria 364
rural 317, 364
divination, sacrificial 438
dockyards:
responsibility for at Athens 522
dockyards (cont.):
  threat to burn 390
  doctors:
    and Asclepius 539-42
    on Cos 310
dokimasia 116
dossier of decrees xv, 2, 17, 110, 416, 433, 482, 484
drafting:
  clumsiness in 45-6
  of decrees 197, 263, 281, 287, 309, 317
  of document of synedron of Second Athenian League 149
  irregularity of 264-5, 361, 386
  of law 126-7, 309
  obscurity of 213
  variations in 208-9, 456
dreams, and healing at Asclepieum 541, 542
eisangelia at Athens 102, 117
eisphora at Athens xxiii, 91, 102, 119, 250, 477, 479
  and metics 383
ekklesia, kyria:
  at Athens 509, 513
  at Mylasa 262
  see also assembly
elections:
  at Athens 125-6, 195
  at Iasus 510
Eleusinian mysteries:
  officials of 277, 278, 280
  offenders against 176, 444
  truce associated with 170
Eleven 178
embassy:
  from Athens to Thebes 103; to Lesbos 155-6
  from Caria to Persia 263
  see also envoys
endeixis 208-9
enge 26
enktesis 370, 383, 464, 477, 479, 484
entrenchment clauses 102, 190-1, 245, 263, 386, 387, 419
envoys:
  sacred from Epidaurus 244
  sending of by Athens 266
swearing to peace 247
ephhebes:
  Athenian, 364, 391
  at Eretria 364
  honours for 89
  inscriptions of xvi
  law on 183, 311, 88
cphors, at Sparta 18, 19
epigrams, inscribed xiii
epimeletai:
  Athenian 67
  in deme 234
  of dockyards, accounts of 100
  of Klytidai 438
tou emporion 117
  use of in Second Athenian League 113
  of Xanthus 386
epistatai at Athens xvi
epitima, grant of 469, 470
erasure, in inscription 92, 101, 132, 154, 355
ethnics, double 470
eunuch 344
exile:
  Alexander and 143, 379, 417, 423, 425, 430, 461, 526
  from Amphipolis 49
  limit on in Peace of Corinth 377
  political 14, 16
  problems from return of 202
  protected by Athens 383
  at Tegea 101
  of tyrant 368
  export, tax on 57
fallow 40
  use of 285-6
famine, and purification 502
federations, and citizenship 70
festivals:
  civic 10
  colonies contribute to 148
  competitive 364-6
  on Cos 307-11, 367
  expense of on Delos 145
  as moments for meetings 379
  of phratry 10-11
  regulations for 73
figurines, use of in ritual 595
finances, of Cycladic cities 144, 145
see also Index of Persons and Places, Athens, finances of
fine:
for disobeying decree 524, 525
exact by deme, 315–16
exact by phratry 9, 10, 299
impose by officials 117, 132, 144
first-fruits, at Eleusis 124, 125, 127, 131, 280, 491
fish, from lake important 460
foetus, status of 505
fortune, invoke in decrees xix, xx
freedmen, at Athens 27, 387
freedom:
of Greeks 156
of Greeks of Asia 75–6
of Greeks in League of Corinth 377
language of 54
offered to slaves 209, 379
and Second Athenian League 203, 237
see also autonomy
funerals:
regulation of 8, 9, 10, 12–13
public 25
and purity 311

gardens, nature of 531–2
garrisons 250, 251, 253–4
Athenian use of 78, 101, 113
generals:
Athenian, and tribes 241
death in battle of 42
at Erythrae 266, 345
‘for the country’ 278
preventing injustice 354
at Tegea 294
genos:
admission to 190, 269
at Athens 8
decree of 37
fission of 36
nature of 37, 188–90, 193
sacrificial calendar of 306
see also gentilicial groups
genilicial groups:
eponymns of 8
inscriptions of xvi, 1
varieties of 8, 436–9
girls, rites of passage for 504–5
goats:
pasturage for 404
sacrifice of for purification 502

governors, Athenian use of 101, 113

grain:
and Adriatic colony 525
Athenian laws on shipping of 127
from Bosporan kingdom 258–9
donation of xvi, 96
importance of at Athens 117, 322
and Lemnos, Imbros, Scyros 26, 527
measures of 124–5
payment of tax in 26
shortages of 465, 482, 485, 486–93, 525
sources of 79, 322
grapheta paranomia, at Athens 24
gravestone:
commemorating Theban who fought at
Leuctra 30
of Dexileos 7
guarantors, on Delos 145
harbours, exclusion from 276
healing:
at Amphiareum 132
at Asclepieum at Epidaurus 102
heiresses 531
Hekatompedon, inventories of 119
hekatoostai inscriptions 235
hellenotamiai 83
heralds 170, 178, 189, 309, 317, 336
Hermes, mutilation of 176
hieromnamones/hieromonemos 223–4
at Delphi 331, 334, 339, 340, 341–2, 395
hieropoioi 485
and Panathenaica 401, 402
hipparchas, cavalry commanders at
Athens 108–9
homicides, ritual treatment of 505
homosexuality 311
honours:
competition in honouring 456
cost of 233–4
publication of 27
see also decree, honorific
hoplites:
list of 367
relation of ephes to 452, 453–4
horns, marking loan 179, 316
horses:
  banned in Phocis after 346: 340
  ships for transporting 523
  see also cavalry
hospitality, official xx, 16, 82, 156, 195,
  208, 324, 331, 354: 357
houses:
  leases of 144, 145
  value of 531
Iliad, influence of in Lycia 62–3
  see also Index of Persons and Places,
  Homer
illegitimacy, of birth 296, 297, 299
  see also legitimacy
imphasis, see phasis
impiety 144, 145
incubation:
  at Amphiareum 132, 133
  at Asclepieum 133, 538
inflation, ignored 10
inheritance, laws on at Cyrene 503–4
inscription:
  carelessness of 317
  cost of xiv, 103, 148, 231, 355, 392–3,
  395, 402, 404
  deliberate destruction of xv, 15, 102,
  223, 393, 416, 417
  forgery of xxiii
  interlinear letters in 94, 128
  legibility of xiii
  modern study of xxiv–xv
publication of xiv–xx, xxv–xxvi, 8,
  17, 93, 87, 90, 102–3, 117–18, 119, 127,
  133, 143, 173, 177, 190, 208, 254–5,
  324, 349, 357, 376, 392, 460
  rupestral 306
  size of xiv, 354–5
  updating of 36, 133
  see also stonecutter
interest, on Delian loans 144–5
invalids, testing of 116
inventories, inscribed xiii
isopoliteia 472, 473
isoteleia, grant of 4, 382–3, 484
Isthmian Games 469
kansphoroi 401
king:
  as title of Philip II: 371–3, 377
  as title of Antigonus 417
King’s Peace 41, 122, 142, 164, 194
  see also Peace of Antalcidas
kainon, of Chalcidians 57
kolakretai 83
kosmetes, of ephes 453, 456
koureion 35, 36
Lamian War 376, 391, 393
land:
  redistribution of 377
  royal 435
  sacred, cultivation of 59, 276–80
  see also lease, of land
language, documentary formulae xv
laurel, use of 336
law:
  combined with decree 398–9
  compared to decree xviii, 116, 118, 127,
  209, 314, 390, 391
  of deme 63
  on ephes 453
  inscribed xiii, xvi, xviii, xix–xx, 306
  on Little Panathenaeia 81
  making of at Athens xviii
  of phratry 1, 5, 61
  preambles to 123
  procedural emphasis in 9
  sacred 27, 132, 73, 97
  on silver coinage 25
  on tax on Lemnos, Imbros, and
  Scyros 26
  on tyranny 79
  unity of Greek law 530–1
  see also nomothetai
  ‘law of hands’ 263
  lawsuits, privileges with regard to 472
  see also prodikia
League of Corinth 76
  Eresus in 417
  fines Elis 493
  and Greeks of Asia 423, 435
  protects constitutions 391
  synedrion of 404, 422–3, 425
League of Islanders 70
lease:
  of cult buildings 438
  by Delian Apollo 144, 145.
  by deme 232
  by genos 191
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INDEX OF SUBJECTS</th>
<th>587</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>of houses</td>
<td>144, 145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>of land</td>
<td>xvi, 34, 144, 145, 176, 178, 59, 400, 438</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>legitimacy, of birth</td>
<td>25, 34, 296, 297</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>of quarry</td>
<td>403</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>see also</td>
<td>illegitimacy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lenaea, festival, victory of Dionysius</td>
<td>at 169</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>letters, inscribed, size of xiv</td>
<td>lexiarchikon grammateion 448</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>literacy, extent of</td>
<td>xiii</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>liturgies:</td>
<td>at Athens xxiii</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>deme 317</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>performed by metics 91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>performers of active in mines 182</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>loans:</td>
<td>of providing sacrificial victim 309</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to cities by individuals</td>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>by corporate groups</td>
<td>179</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>by Delphi</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>by Delos</td>
<td>144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>by deme</td>
<td>314, 316, 317</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>multiple on single property</td>
<td>179–80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sources of</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>see also</td>
<td>horos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lot, use of</td>
<td>at Athens xvii, 125–6, 195, 512</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>magic, treatment of victims of</td>
<td>505</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>magistrates, shortage of supply of</td>
<td>178</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>manumission, 27, 387</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>see also</td>
<td>freedmen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>manuring</td>
<td>386</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>market, for grain at Athens</td>
<td>127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>marriage:</td>
<td>age of 298</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>between communities 26, 382</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>of parents demanded by phratry 34, 296, 297</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>political 49, 51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>rituals associated with at Cyrene 504</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>and women’s property rights 531</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>measures:</td>
<td>varieties of xiii</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>of weight and volume 124–5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>meat, sacrificial:</td>
<td>distribution of 316, 317</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(non-)removal of from sanctuary 133, 309–10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>quantities of</td>
<td>309, 311, 317</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>medicine, Hippocratean and temple</td>
<td>539–42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>see also</td>
<td>healing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>medism</td>
<td>425, 446</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>see also</td>
<td>illegitimacy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mercenaries:</td>
<td>under Chabrias 241</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>under Chares 416, 430</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>under Conon 241</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>fighting for Darius 509</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>in Third Sacred War 270, 340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>merismos (allocation of funds) at Athens</td>
<td>xxix, 83, 117, 148, 323–4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>metics:</td>
<td>at Athens 91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>attitude to 464</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>disabilities of 484</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>and the law 386</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>metoikion 91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>status of 26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mines, leases of 36</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>miscarriage, and pollution 502, 505</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>money, recording system for sums of xxvi</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>see also</td>
<td>coinage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>months:</td>
<td>at Athens xxii</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>at Cos 62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>at Delphi 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>murderers, excluded from amnesty in Paros 149</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>music:</td>
<td>competition in 394</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>performances of 364–6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>names:</td>
<td>given to newborn 505</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>study of xxiv–xxv</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>naepeioi:</td>
<td>Athenian at Delos 144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Delphic, accounts of 66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>naval list, Athenian 100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>navy, Athenian, size of 522–3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>of Alexander 422</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nereid monument 60–1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nomothetai at Athens xviii, 209, 390, 446</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>notices, temporary xiii, 133, 177</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>numerals, acrophonic system of xxvi</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Panathenaeae 148, 189, 191, 192, 309, 316, 400
law on Little 81
prizes at 365–6
procession at 366
publicizing honours at 319, 323
pannychis, at Panathenaea 402
pastoralism 284–5, 286–7
subject of treaty 344
patrai 296
see also phratries
patria, of Labyadai 9
pay:
for public office xxiii
of Amphictyons 144
see also assembly

Peace:
of Antalcidas 41, 47, 56, 65, 75–6, 78, 86, 100, 101, 108, 111, 156, 200, 201, 266, 416, 429; see also King’s Peace
of Nicias 247, 277
of Philocrates 322–3, 356, 377, 378
peace, description of benefits of 217
Peloponnesian War:
conditions of peace 46
Corinth in 370–1
effect on silver mines 182
penalties, in law 117
pentereis 522
peripolos 452
phasis 67, 102, 115, 116–17, 208–9, 295
phoros 434
phratriarch 36, 37
phratries:
admission to 9–10, 12, 5, 34, 165, 269
assembly of 8, 9, 11
calendar of 8, 9, 10–11
as court 9, 12
and citizenship 34
decree of 1, 5
and demes 37
fines imposed by 36
functions of 8
and other gentilicial groups 87
gods of 8
loaning money 179
and military service 452
names of 8, 37, 494
organization of 36
priest of 36, 37
register of 35, 36
religious activity of 34, 191, 306
size of 8, 11
sub-groups of 34, 35, 36–7
(?) on Tinos 61
see also gentilicial groups
pirates 123, 417, 525, 527
pitch 57, 208
Plerosia, festival 313, 316–17
poetry:
gift of by poet 62
performances of 364–6
polemarchs, in Thessaly 223
poletai:
at Athens xvi, xx, 118, 119, 125, 275
records of 36

oath 199–201
of Amphictyon 446
ephic xvi, 311, 452, 88
of founders of Cyrene 505
Hippocratic 541
of jurors 419
to keep law 387
of magistrates 313, 315
of peace treaty 86–7, 373–5, 376, 377
of phratry members 9, 296, 299
of Plataea 315, 88
over returning exiles 529–31
of synegoroi 36
oikos as phratry subdivision 36, 37
oligarchy:
at Cyrene 492
at Erythrae 266, 345
fear of at Athens 213
oracle:
at Amphipolaeum 132
at Corope 133
of Delphi 11, 12, 246, 247, 248–9, 276, 279–81, 438, 501, 502
and sacred orgas 58
of Trophonius 150, 371–2, 373
of Zeus 279
organisms 179
of Egretes 438
Oschophoria 185, 190, 191
oxen, use of in building work 476–7

peace:
of Antalcidas 41, 47, 56, 65, 75–6, 78, 86, 100, 101, 108, 111, 156, 200, 201, 266, 416, 429; see also King’s Peace
of Nicias 247, 277
of Philocrates 322–3, 356, 377, 378
peace, description of benefits of 217
Peloponnesian War:
conditions of peace 46
Corinth in 370–1
effect on silver mines 182
penalties, in law 117
pentereis 522
peripolos 452
phasis 67, 102, 115, 116–17, 208–9, 295
phoros 434
phratriarch 36, 37
phratries:
admission to 9–10, 12, 5, 34, 165, 269
assembly of 8, 9, 11
calendar of 8, 9, 10–11
as court 9, 12
and citizenship 34
decree of 1, 5
and demes 37
fines imposed by 36
functions of 8
and other gentilicial groups 87
gods of 8
loaning money 179
and military service 452
names of 8, 37, 494
organization of 36
priest of 36, 37
register of 35, 36
religious activity of 34, 191, 306
size of 8, 11
sub-groups of 34, 35, 36–7
(?) on Tinos 61
see also gentilicial groups
pirates 123, 417, 525, 527
pitch 57, 208
Plerosia, festival 313, 316–17
poetry:
gift of by poet 62
performances of 364–6
polemarchs, in Thessaly 223
poletai:
at Athens xvi, xx, 118, 119, 125, 275
records of 36
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pollution:
and Asclepieum 541
of house of dead 10
law on 310–11, 97
of murderer 392
nature of 503
population:
of Athens 454–5
of cities 228
of Cos 309
pottery, lease of 145

praktore, at Athens xx–xxi
prayer:
at assembly xix
corporate 431
before meeting 419
public 473
role of priest in 132
pregnancy, difficulties with 540, 541, 542
priests:
and deme finance 316
honours for 46
perquisites of 34, 36, 132, 309, 310
provided by gene 188, 190
regulations about 27
and temple robbery 132
at Xanthus 387
prizes, in festivals 355–6, 400
procession:
at Dionysia 317
at Eretria 364, 366–7
of Panathenaica 400
vow of 213

prodikia, grant of 469, 470
proedria, grant of 469, 470, 471
proedroi:
at Athens xvii, xviii, 162
earliest appearance of 100–1

Proerosia, see Plerosia
promanteia, grant of 469, 470
property:
confiscation of 36, 314, 377, 425, 430
and exiles 202, 530, 531
as qualification for magistracy 178
prosecution:
reward for 207, 209
by third party 286–7
see also phasis

prosopography, study of xxv

proxami 82, 259
Athenian politician as 203
as envoys 269, 270–1
honours for 469, 470, 479, 484, 491
murder of 202
privileges of 386
proxyen, grant of 218, 219, 32, 55, 56, 75, 264

pyraneion, see hospitality

pytany:
at Athens xvii, xix, xxii
form of record in decree prescript 48
public property, sale of at Athens 36
punctuation 135, 177
purification, see pollution

pylagori 336
Pythian games 353, 355, 394–5, 469
quarry, lease of 403
quarrying, of stone 337
quorum 379
for assembly xvii
at deme meetings 314
of phratry 9

ransom, of prisoners 253
reconciliation, at Mytilene 85

records:
on papyrus 17
temporary 133, 177
see also inscription

relief:
on decree/law xix, 12–13, 15, 48, 50, 76, 82, 118, 192, 210, 218, 254, 318, 325, 348, 355, 388, 391, 440, 442, 443
connected with Amphiaras 132, 133
above war memorial 40, 42

religion:
inscriptions relating to xxiv
offences against 209
priority of 472–3
regulations relating to xiii, xvi
see also law, sacred

rent, level of land rent 124
revolution, political, threat of 213, 79

ruddle:
export regulated 40
uses of 208
Sacred War:

Third 57, 225, 228-9, 248, 281, 334, 337, 340
Fourth 336, 382, 476

sacrifice:
accompanying oaths 247, 345
calendar of 1, 37, 62, 63
choice of animal for 132, 191, 192
of deme 314, 315, 316
for divination; 438
division of meat from 401
at festival 366
frequency of 192
holocaust 309
nature of 306, 308-10
of phratry 10-11, 12, 13, 34, 35, 36, 296, 299
prescribed by oracle 279
provided by city 190, 191-2
provided by gens 190, 191-2
role of priest in 132
scale of 11, 145, 311, 403
importance of sharing 473
vow of 213

sale, of person, fiction of 504
sanctuary:
finances of 132
of gentilicium group 438
for healing 102
lease of 438
placing of 366
treatment of wood from 502

satrap:
of Cari (Idrieus) 264, 267-9, 434
of Cari (Mausolus) 259-62, 264-5
of Cari (Pixedanes) 386
of Phrygia 44, 416
Satraps' Revolt 88-90, 42, 344, 508
scrutiny, of officials 314-15, 390
sculpture:
in Lycia 60-1
on temple at Mazai 69
on tombstones 43
see also relief

Second Athenian League xv
and Acarnania 270
admission of member states 22, 23, 24
and Amorgus 250
and Andros 252

Athenian interference with allies in 206, 208-9
Athenian popularity in 146
and Ceos 200
and Cercephaleps 356
and coinage 119
constitution of 378
continues after Leuctra 156
defensive alliance only 102
dissolution of 376
and Eretria 348
and Euboea 240
formation of 98-100, 107-8
governors and garrisons in 250-4
judicial cases within 102, 202-3
members leaving 194
and Paros 29
and Persia 90
prospectus of 22
syntax in 202, 235, 237, 253-4, 361, 434
and Tenedos 27
and Thebes 149
see also Social War

secretaries:
at Athens 110, 195-6
'by the prytany' 241
to council and assembly xix, xxi
influence of on drafting 157
term of office of 169
seer 438
semnai theai, see Index of Persons and Places, August Goddesses

settlement:
of countryside 285
of Phocis 340
sexual intercourse, and pollution 310-11, 502, 504
shipping, regulation of 207, 208
ships:
crews of 32
merchant, threatened by Philip 356, 357, 360
routes for across Aegean 123-4
size of 124
timber for 57-8
sickness, and purification 502
see also healing
sylphium, of Cyrene 491
sin, and sickness 540
sitonai 127
sitophylakes 115, 117, 126
skins, of sacrificial victims 132–3
see also priests, perquisites of slaves:
advantages of 118
deserting 276
encouraged to inform on masters 209
liberation of 209, 377
in mines 183
opposing Thirty 27
public 117, 118
punishment of 115
see also freedmen
stasis:
at Clazomenae 79
at Erythrae 76–7, 79
statue, honorific 46, 53, 105, 222, 266–7, 395, 417, 469
offences against 263
stepmother, wicked 544
stonecutter:
and grammar 203
identification of xiv, 42, 152, 164, 210, 358, 396, 400, 492, 512
need to import 67
stratotic fund, at Athens xxi, 126, 129, 323–4
sumptuary laws 10
suppliants, at Cyrene 501, 505
sylogais tou daimou 115, 116
symbola 19, 91
symbolaion 473
symmachia, meaning of 40
see also alliance
symmories 119
for tax bids 124
for trierarchy 524
synpolitia:
of Chalcidians 56
of Eresus and Antissa 417
of Mantinea and Helisson 14
synedrion, see Second Athenian League;
League of Corinth
synegoroi 35, 36, 37
synoikismos, see sympoliteia
syntaxis under Alexander 389, 433, 434–5
see also Second Athenian League
table, cult 239, 233
tagos:
of Labydai 9
in Thessaly 222
taxes:
at Athens, sold by poletai 176
collection of xx–xxi 250
diemes 232
in Delphic amphictyony 228
exemption from 251, 264, 267, 284, 322, 367, 461; see also ateleia
farmers required to provide guarantors 125
in grain from Lemnos, Imbros, and Scyros 26
on import/export 45, 78, 122, 126, 322, 344, 401, 472
imposed by Thrasybulus 78
on manumission 387
on mines 180
on movement of goods 57–8, 123
poll tax 228
privileged status with regard to 383; see also isoteleia
on produce 124
on property at Athens, see eisphora
records of 178
on sales 125, 178, 344
taxiarchs 87
temple:
building of at Epidaurus 538–9
temple (cont.):
  grant of land for 91
  rebuilding of after Persian war 446–7
  robbery of 178
Ten Thousand, in Arcadia 160
terraces, agricultural 285
tetereis 522, 525
theadarodai, see envoys
theatre:
  in deme 317
  of Dionysus in Athens 50–1, 477
  front seat in as honour 45, 469, 470,
  471
  tickets for xxi
theophoric names 178–9
theoric fund, at Athens xxi, 401–2
theoi 66
  at Delos 145
theoxenia, rites of 505
thesmophylakes 67
thesmothetai 115, 117
thiasos, as sub-group of phratry 36
Thirty, at Athens:
  and Arcopagus 390
  restoration of democracy after 4, 444
  demolishing inscriptions xv, 15
  involvement of cavalry with 43
  opposition to 24
Three Hundred, at Tegea 289, 295
timber:
  movement of 57–8
  for ships 218
tithe, people subject to at Cyrene 500,
  503–4
  see also first-fruits
torture 344
trade:
  and Adriatic colony 525, 527
  of Athens with Black Sea 236
  Carthaginian involvement in 218–19
  at festivals 367
  regulated 57–8, 49
  see also taxes
traders:
  conciliatory attitude to 464, 465, 466
  special allowance for 91
tradition, invention of 444
training, military, see ephebes
transport:
  of grain 124
  of stone 337
  of timber 57–8
travelling expenses 173, 224, 241, 275, 281,
  487
treason, trial for before Areopagus 390
treasurers, Athenian 97, 103
  of Athena 17, 142, 157, 223
  of demes 233
  of people 148
  for rigging 523
treasurers, outside Athens:
  records of xvi
  of Delphic Amphictyony 394–5
  of the generals at Tegea 294
treasury, sacred, use of in war 270, 340
treaty, see alliance
triacerton 522
tribe, at Athens xvi, xvii, xx, xxii
  and army 26, 87
  and cavalry 43
  decrees of 233
  enrolment of new citizens in 26, 165
  and ephebes 442–3, 451, 452, 453
  in lists of supporters of democracy 25
  and Panathenae 400, 402
  and Salaminioi 190
  and teichopoioi 47
  and war memorials 42
tribe, outside Athens:
  and Amphictyons 143–4
  on Chios 439
  on Cos 301, 305, 308, 367
  at Eretria 367
  at Iasus 512
  at Mylasa 262
  on Samos 461
  at Tegea 532–3
trierarchy at Athens xxiii, 183, 212, 485,
  522–3
tripods, given to victors 145
triemes:
  Athenian 522–3
  rendering watertight 208
tritories, at Athens xvi
Trojan War 63
tyrant:
  at Athens 63
  at Corinth 368
  at Eresus 83
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tyrant (cont.):
  Evagoras as 52
  fear of 213, 377
  law against 79
  and Persia 416
  provisions against in alliance 223
  in Syracuse 368
  use of family members by 51
  use of term 63, 377, 416
  see also Index of Persons and Places,
  Dionysius I and Dionysius II
  of Syracuse
villages, of Argos 404
  see also Index of Significant Greek
  Words, κόιμη
violence, to Amphictyons 145–6
volume, units of 124, 229–30, 448
votes, numbers of 8, 419
  see also ballot, secret

war:
  and building work 295
  memorials of xvi, 7
  treatment of orphans from 25
water-clock, use of:
  at Athens 512
  at Iasus 511
wheat:
  relation to barley 124, 230
  variable weight of 125
  see also grain
white boards, use of for temporary
  records xiii, 177
wine, consumption of regulated 10
women:
  abuse of 418
  and healing 540, 541
  and honours 471
  and phratry membership 297–8
  and political power 267–9
  and property ownership 181, 531
  regulation of behaviour of 500–1,
  504–5
wood, sacred, treatment of 502
  see also timber
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ἀγαλμα 54, 87
ἀγνός 503
ἄλα 9
ἀμφιετής 286
ἀποκια 525
ἀρετή 62, 63
ἄρχων 117, 322
see also Index of Subjects, archon
αὐτικα μάλα 170

diagraφή 418
diagophή 57
dioikesis 361

ἐδρα 17
ἐκκλησ 203
ἐπιθαλα 294
ἐσχατια 277–8, 279
eutaxia 456

θρεγκολ 336

ἐκτηρια 466
ἐκήσου 505

ἰσος και ὁμοίος 66
ἰσχυρός 328

καλὸς και ἀγαθός 462–3
κάμην 502
κόμη 65–6

μαστήρες 287
μεταδοκειν 417
μιλτος 208

ἄργας 279
δοιας 392

πέτευρον 133
πημονη 164
πόλεις 65–6, 77, 83, 171
πρυτανεία (κατὰ πρυτανείαν) xxii p. 14

στέμμα 310
συλαν 71

ὑπηρεσία 324

φιλοτιμία 232–3, 456, 484–5, 524