



Attic Inscriptions
Online

Notes on Inscriptions of the Marathonian Tetrapolis

S. D. Lambert

AIO Papers no. 1

February 2014

Revised: July 2014

Links added: May 2016

AIO Papers

Published by Attic Inscriptions Online, 97 Elm Road, Evesham,
Worcestershire, WR11 3DR, United Kingdom.

Editor: Dr. S. D. Lambert

AIO Advisory Board: Professor P. J. Rhodes (Durham)
Mr. S. G. Byrne (Melbourne, Australia)
Dr. P. Liddel (Manchester)

© Attic Inscriptions Online 2014

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted, in any form or by any means, without the prior permission in writing of Attic Inscriptions Online, or as expressly permitted by law, or under terms agreed with the appropriate reprographic rights organisation. Enquiries concerning reproduction should be sent to Dr. S. D. Lambert at the above address or via the contact given at www.atticinscriptions.com.

ISSN 2054-6769 (Print)
ISSN 2054-6777 (Online)

Preface

As this is the inaugural publication of *AIO Papers*, readers may welcome a word of explanation as to the purpose of the series. The primary objective of *Attic Inscriptions Online* is to make available English translations of Attic inscriptions, based on the most accurate and up-to-date Greek texts. The authoritative publications of the Greek texts are *Inscriptiones Graecae* vol. I (before 403 BC) and vol. II (403 BC - AD 267), new editions of which appear at infrequent intervals. When an inscription is included in a recently published volume of *IG*, such as the third edition of *IG II* (*IG II*³), the first fascicules of which appeared in 2012, identifying “the most accurate and up-to-date” Greek text can be quite straightforward. In other cases, however, there can more of an issue. It can often be addressed by including one or more references to the review of epigraphical scholarship which is published every year in the *Supplementum Epigraphicum Graecum* (*SEG*). However, a simple reference to *IG*, *SEG*, or occasionally to another publication, is not always sufficient. *SEG*, for example, records textual proposals with a degree of indiscrimination which may mislead the inexperienced user. In the process of reviewing the textual literature while preparing a translation for *AIO* translators may see potential for textual improvements which require explanation and justification. The first purpose of *AIO Papers*, therefore, is to supply a forum in which the texts underlying the translations published in *AIO* may be clarified.

Second, it is part of *AIO*'s purpose to communicate Attic inscriptions to students and researchers who may lack the background knowledge, of the languages, culture and institutions of the Greek world in general, and of Athens and Attica in particular, that is needed to understand a translated inscription in its raw state. *AIO Papers* will publish essays intended to equip the user of *AIO* with such background knowledge. One such paper is currently in preparation: a companion to the translations of the inscribed Athenian laws and decrees of 352/1-322/1 BC, texts of which were published in *IG II*³ 1, fascicule 2.

AIO Papers will also publish other papers consistent with the objectives of *AIO*. This includes translations of important articles written by scholars in languages other than English but which, in the editor's opinion, deserve a wider circulation among an Anglophone readership. *AIO Papers* no. 2 and 3, translations of two papers originally published in Italian by Enrica Culasso Gastaldi, fall into this category.

NOTES ON INSCRIPTIONS OF THE MARATHONIAN TETRAPOLIS¹

S. D. Lambert

The preparation of English translations for *Attic Inscriptions Online* supplies an occasion to review recent work impacting on the texts of the inscriptions of the Marathonian Tetrapolis, and to make a few fresh observations.

In 2000 I published a new edition of the most important Tetrapolis inscription, the fourth-century sacrificial calendar (no. 2 below), together with some remarks on a fragmentary fifth-century list of sacrifices and perquisites, which also perhaps originated in the Tetrapolis region (no. 1 below).² Since then there has been a continuous flow of relevant publications. Particularly notable among studies of the fourth-century calendar are Ekroth 2002, 150-169, pointing out the prevalence of heroes in the calendar, and Humphreys 2004, 165-177, a thoughtful if not wholly convincing treatment of the calendar as a whole. Works on broader topics have also contained valuable observations on the Tetrapolis inscriptions. These include Parker 2005, on the inscriptions as evidence for Attic cults and festivals; Ismard 2010, 239-251 and 435-441, on the topography of the fourth-century calendar, with useful map, p. 441, and on the Tetrapolis as case-study of the characteristically complex and multi-faceted Attic system of associative networks; McInerney 2010, on cattle in the fourth-century calendar; and Papazarkadas 2011, on the inscriptions in the context of a study of Attic sacred and public land. My 2000 article was primarily textual in focus, and a full, up-to-date, historical study of the fourth-century calendar is still needed. In the meantime, in January 2014 I gave a paper on the financial aspects of the calendar at a conference at Utrecht University on “Feasting and Polis Institutions”; and I hope to address some of the religious aspects shortly elsewhere.

1. Sacrificial Calendar with Perquisites. Ca. 430 BC. [IG I³ 255](#). [Sokolowski, LSCG 11](#).

This fragmentary inscription contains details of sacrifices on one side, probably in calendrical order, and a list of priestly perquisites on the other. Though found in Chalkis, it appears to originate in the region of the Marathonian Tetrapolis. See my remarks at *ZPE* 130 (2000), 71-75 ([SEG 50.54](#), cf. 52.817bis). The *IG* text at ll. 10-11 is:

¹ I am grateful to Peter Liddel for valuable comments on a draft. I use the following abbreviations: Ekroth 2002: G. Ekroth, *The Sacrificial Rituals of Greek Hero-Cults*, *Kernos* Suppl. 12 (Liège). Humphreys 2004: S. C. Humphreys, *The Strangeness of Gods* (Oxford). Ismard 2010: P. Ismard, *La cité des réseaux. Athènes et ses associations VI^e - I^{er} siècle av. J.-C.* (Paris). Kearns 1989: E. Kearns, *The Heroes of Attica* (BICS Supplement 57, London). Lambert 2002: S. D. Lambert, “The Sacrificial Calendar of Athens”, *ABSA* 97 (2002), 353-399. Liddel 2003: “The Places of Publication of Athenian State Decrees from the 5th century BC to the 3rd Century AD”, *ZPE* 143 (2003), 79-93. McInerney 2010: J. McInerney, *The Cattle of the Sun. Cows and Culture in the World of the Ancient Greeks* (Princeton). Papazarkadas 2011: N. Papazarkadas, *Sacred and Public Land in Ancient Athens* (Oxford). Parker 1996: R. Parker, *Athenian Religion. A History* (Oxford). Parker 2005: R. Parker, *Polytheism and Society at Athens* (Oxford).

² “The Sacrificial Calendar of the Marathonian Tetrapolis: a Revised Text”, *ZPE* 130 (2000), 43-70; “Two Notes on Attic *Leges Sacrae*”, 71-80 (“1. [IG I³ 255](#) and Marathon” at 71-75).

[. . .]οι Ποσιδέοις τ- - - - -
[Δι] Τροπαίοι ἐν Κυνο[σούραι . . .

“ . . . at the Posidea . . .
for [Zeus] Tropaios on Kynosoura . . .”

In 2000 I made a case for rejecting this and proposed instead:

[. . .]. οι Ποσιδέοις τ[- - - - Ἀπόλλωνι]
[Ἀπο]τροπαίοι ἐν Κυνο[σούραι . . .

“ . . . at the Posidea . . . for [Apollo]
[Apo]tropaios on Kynosoura . . .”

Kynosoura in this case will be the promontory at the northern end of Marathon bay; compare the offering to [Apollo] Apotropaios, perhaps on Kynosoura, at A1, 26, cf. A1, 18, of the fourth-century calendar, no. 2 below.³ As I noted, 72 n. 10, the closest Attic parallel to a coastal location of cult of Apollo Apotropaios would seem to be *IG II² 5009*, an altar of Apollo Apotropaios from the caves (the “Serangeion”) close to the shore in Piraeus (cf. R. Garland, *The Piraeus* (1987), 159). N. Robertson, “Athenian shrines of Aphrodite, and the early development of the city”, in E. Greco ed., *Teseo e Romolo. Le origini di Atene e Roma a confronto: Atti del Convegno Internazionale di Studi: Scuola Archeologica Italiana di Atene, 2003* (Athens, 2005), 43-112, at 100-101 (*SEG 55.57*) prefers [Ποσειδῶνι | προσ]τροπαίοι, by which he understands, “To Poseidon to whom suppliant rites are addressed”. προστροπαίος is attested in this sense in literary sources, as for example Antiphon 4.1.4: τῶ μὲν ἀποθανόντι οὐ τιμωροῦντες δεινούς ἀλιτηρίους ἔξομεν τοὺς τῶν ἀποθανόντων προστροπαίους (“failing to punish the dead man, we will have terrible avengers in those powers to whom the dead turn for support”).⁴ However, the adjective apparently occurs nowhere in Greek, let alone Attic, epigraphy. More importantly it seems never to occur as a descriptor or epithet of Poseidon, or any other named deity. Robertson’s suggestion should be rejected.

Since it was missed by *SEG I* draw attention to the reading from the stone which I noted, among other minor new readings, at 71 n. 2, δει]πνιστερίο φορ- (νιστερ[.]οφορ-*IG*), in the list of perquisites at B4. In 2000 I dotted the pi and iota, but as will be clear from my description of the traces, the readings would seem to be certain. This confirms Sokolowski’s reading at this point, against *IG*’s (understandable) doubts. It is a pity further context is lacking, since these lines might have cast some light onto the obscure topic of post-sacrificial dining.⁵

³ See now also Stroud’s remark at *SEG 55.14*.

⁴ The other references in *LSJ* s.v. προστρόπαιος II are of a similar character.

⁵ Cf. Parker 2005, 66-67.

2. The Sacrificial Calendar of the Marathonian Tetrapolis. Ca. 375-350 BC? [IG II² 1358](#); [Sokolowski, LSCG 20](#); [SEG 50.168](#).

[SEG 50.168](#) is the primary reference text, based on my new edition at *ZPE* 130 (2000) 43-70, and taking account of S. Scullion, *ZPE* 134 (2001) 117-119 and Lambert, *ABSA* 97 (2002), 398.

In the calendar for Marathon (annual sequence) at A2, 5-6, we have:

Βοηδρομιῶνος ὕπρὸ Μυστ[η]ρί[ων - - ca. 8-17 - -]
βῶς ὕπρὸ ΔΔΔΔ οἶς ΔΗ- ὕπρὸ Κουροτρόφω[ι οἶς ΔΗ-^{vacat?}]

Boedromion, before the Mysteries . . .

a bovine, 90 dr., a sheep, 12 dr., for Kourotrophos [a sheep, 11 dr.?)

Ekroth 2002, 160 n. 138 (*SEG* 52.137), written without the benefit of my new edition, suggests that the missing recipient at the end of l. 5 was Demeter, “since the Mysteries are concerned and Demeter is linked with Kourotrophos also in lines B43-46”,⁶ but the offering of a 12 dr. (male) sheep, οἶς, (i.e. a wether), rather than an 11 dr. (female) one (a ewe), indicates a male recipient, cf. Lambert 2000, 58 (though admittedly in l. 44 Kore exceptionally receives a ram, κριός), and the offering to Kourotrophos in 46 is perhaps independent of the previous offering to “Eleusinia” and Kore (43-45), which concludes in 45 with specification of ἱερεῶσυνα (“priestly dues”) and extras. One might add that it is by no means clear that there must be a thematic connection between the offerings made on this occasion and the Mysteries. As Jameson remarks in connection with a similar specification in the *Lex Sacra* of Selinous (A7), where sacrifices are to be performed “before the Kotytia (festival) and the (Olympic) truce” (πρὸ Φοτυτίων καὶ τῶς ἐχέχειρίας), since the Kotytia and the Olympic truce can scarcely have coincided, “before” here ought to mean not “on the eve of” (and therefore thematically connected with), but “some time before”, the “community’s interest” being presumably “in having the rituals completed before major events in its religious calendar”.⁷ Certainly, in the other reference of this type in the Marathon calendar, “before the Skira”, πρὸ Σκίρων (in the annual sequence, A2, 30-33, and the posterior biennial sequence, A2, 51-53), a women’s festival which, like the Mysteries, also seems to have involved Demeter and Kore, there is no obvious connection between the offerings and what (admittedly little) we know of the festival.⁸ Offerings to heroes are especially common in this calendar, and it may not be coincidental that, in both entries “before Skira”, the first offering listed is to a hero: Hyttenios (eponym of the Tetrapolis under its old name, “Hyttenia”), 30 (followed again by Kourotrophos); Galios (unknown), 51; and

⁶ “Demeter” appears in this calendar only under the guise of epithets (Achaia, A2, 27, Eleusinia, A2, 43 and 48, Chloe, 49), or in the alternative manifestation, Daira, A2, 12 (on whom see Kearns 1989, 153).

⁷ M. Jameson, D. R. Jordan and R. D. Kotansky, *A Lex Sacra from Selinous* (GRBS Monographs 11, Durham, North Carolina, 1993), 26.

⁸ For an extremely cautious account of the Skira see Parker 2005, 173-177 (perhaps add my remarks, 2000, 50-51, on A1, 10-12 of the Tetrapolis calendar, which may indeed have been on the eve of the Skira and thematically connected). Annually the “before Skira” offerings were the (unpriced) “annual offerings” (*horaia*) and a sheep for Hyttenios, and a piglet for Kourotrophos (30-31), and (apparently connected) a sheep for the Tritopatreis and the (obscure) Akamantes (32-33). Every two years these were enhanced by a ram for the (obscure) hero Galios, 6 dr. for the “well” (or “Well?”), and a table for the Tritopatreis (supplementing, it seems, the sheep offered every year).

I note that the same combination of bovine and 12 dr. sheep was also offered in the Marathon calendar annually to the hero Aristomachos (A2, 19-20). Probably a male hero was also the recipient at A2, 5.

On Kourotrophos see now the excellent treatment of V. Pirenne-Delforge, “Qui est la Kourotrophos athénienne?”, in V. Dasen ed., *Naissance et petite enfance dans l’antiquité*. Actes du colloque de Fribourg, 2001 (Fribourg and Göttingen, 2004), 171-185, (Tetrapolis calendar at 176-177). This divine “entity”, “Nurturer of the Young”, is normally worshipped in Attica in conjunction with other divine powers, and may be seen as orienting the “sphere of intervention” of the divinities with whom she is associated.⁹

Ekroth’s supposition that the recipient at A2, 7-8 was a hero, since the next sacrifice was to a heroine, is clearly correct (cf. my remarks, p. 58).

Humphreys 2004, 165-177 (*SEG* 54.216) speculates on the supplements in the tantalisingly fragmentary, A col. 1. Since her remarks have been given a favourable wind in places,¹⁰ it would seem to be necessary to address them.

Col. 1 begins with a group of sacrifices dated to the fourth quarter of the year (A1, 4-12, “Unit A”). These are followed by:

B	[- - max. ca. 7-15 - -] τάδε τοῦ τῶν ἐν [- - ca. 5-12 - -] ἐνιαυτοῦ ἕκαστον 15 [- - ca. 6-13 - -] α ἕξῃς ὡς γέγραπται [- - ca. 7-14 - -] τον τὸν ἐν ταῖς [στήλαις ? π]αρὰ τὸ Ἐλευσίσιον [ἐν τῶι βωμῶι] ἐν Κυνοσοῦραι [καὶ τῶι ? παρ]ὰ τὸ Ἡρακλεῖον	[. . .?] the following in the year of the - in(?) . . . each . . . in order as is written . . . the one on the [stelai?] by the Eleusinion, [on the altar?] in Kynosoura, [and the one?] by the Herakleion.
B1 20	[- - max. ca. 8-15 - -] τετάρτης [τριμήνο ὕ Μο]υνηχιῶνος [- - ca. 8-15 - -] νου ὕ οἷς ΔΗΗ	[. . .?] fourth [quarter], Mounichion, . . . a sheep, 12 dr.;
B2	[- - max. ca. 8-16 - -] πρώτης [τριμήνο ὕ Ἐκ]ατομβαιῶνος 25 [- - ca. 5-11 - -] ἱστα]μένου [Ἀπόλλωνι? ὕ Ἀπ]οτροπαίωι ὕ αἶξ ΔΗΗ [δευτέρας τρι]μήνο Πυανοψιῶνος [- - ca. 8-16 - -] ὦν οἷς κυοῦσα ΔΓΗΗ [τετάρτης τρι]μήνο Μουνιχιῶνος	[. . .?] first [quarter], Hekatombaion, on the [date], [for Apollo?] Apotropaios, a goat, 12 dr. ; [second] quarter, Pyanopsion, . . . a pregnant sheep, 17 dr. ; [fourth] quarter, Mounichion,
30	[- - ca. 8-15 - -] ῶι αἶξ: ΔΗΗ [- - ca. 8-15 - -] εἰον: ΔΗΗ	. . . a goat, 12 dr., . . . 12 dr.;
B3	[- - max. ca. 9-16 - -] τετάρτης [τριμήνο ὕ Μο]υνηχιῶνος [- - ca. 8-16 - -] αἶωι αἶξ ὕ ΔΗΗ 35 [- - ca. 9-17 - -] ηἰ οἷς ΔΗΗ [- - ca. 10-17 - -] νει οἷς ΔΗΗ [- - ca. 9-15 - -] Σ[- ca. 2 -] οἷς ΔΗΗ	[. . .?] fourth [quarter], Mounichion, . . . -aios, a goat, 12 dr., . . ., a sheep, 12 dr., . . ., a sheep, 12 dr., . . ., a sheep, 12 dr.;
C	[- - ca. 9-16 - -]	. . .

⁹ Kourotrophos ... “oriente la sphère d’intervention du dieu en question”, 184.

¹⁰ Notably by Ismard 2010, 241-242.

40	[προτέρα? ὕ δραμ]οσύνη [δευτέρας τριμ]ήνο Πυανοσιῶνος [- - ^{ca. 8-15} - - β]οῦς ὕ ϜΔΔΔΔ	[prior?] sequence (dramosynē), [second] quarter, Pyanopsion, . . . , a bovine, 90 dr.;
----	--	--

ll. 42-55 continue the sequence begun in l. 39

Elsewhere in this calendar sacrifices are listed by frequency, i.e. annual (A2, 54), biennial (A2, 34 and 39 and perhaps A1, 38-39). I suggested (2000) that A1, 13-19, introduced a set of sacrifices whose frequency and timing (13-15) were specified (ὥς γέγραπται) in inscribed sources of authority at the three locations named in 17-19, i.e. by the Eleusinion, in Kynosoura and by the Herakleion (all three locations in the Tetrapolis area). This nicely corresponds to the three blocks of text which follow, each beginning with an indented quarter designation preceded by a lacuna (**B1**, **B2** and **B3**). **B2** contains an offering to [Apollo] Apotropaios, which, as [IG I³ 255](#) probably indicates (see no. 1 above), was located on Kynosoura, appropriately the second-named location in 13-19. Humphreys, 168-69 n. 94, objects that such an arrangement of the text would be “implausible and confusing” and suggests that the parallel of the Athenian state calendar would indicate that each sacrifice ought to follow immediately the relevant authority citation. On my interpretation, however, ll. 13-19 would not precisely be citations of authority designed to justify the inclusion of particular sacrifices, as in the Athenian state calendar, but would be intended specifically to indicate the *timing* of the relevant sacrifices.¹¹ Just as in the rest of the calendar timing is indicated by specification of sequence (annual, prior and posterior biennial), so the purpose of 13-19 would be to stipulate that the timing of the following three blocks of sacrifices, which, significantly, lack sequence specifications, was to be as provided for on the inscriptions at the Eleusinion, on Kynosoura and at the Herakleion. The logic of the arrangement of 20-37 might have been clearer if the beginnings of the initial lines of each of the three sections had been preserved. One can not perhaps altogether rule out that these lacunae contained headings (“Eleusinion”, “Kynosoura”, “Herakleion”?).

Humphreys notes further (170 n. 99) that one might expect stelai to be set up in sanctuaries rather than by them. Inscriptions are indeed commonly set up “in” sanctuaries; several state decrees are set up “in the Eleusinion”, in the city or elsewhere in Attica;¹² but they can also be set up “by” (παρὰ) sacred locations, such as altars (*Agora* XVI 161, 6), statues (as perhaps [IG II² 43](#) = [Rhodes-Osborne 22](#), 65-66, the prospectus of the Second Athenian League, “by the Zeus Eleutherios”, παρὰ τὸν Δία τὸν Ἐλευθέριον, cf. [IG II³ 1, 377](#), 1-2; [378](#), 29¹³), temples (as e.g. [IG II² 687](#), 44, “by the temple of Athena Polias”, παρὰ τὸν νεὼ τῆς Ἀθηνᾶς τῆς Πολιάδος, cf. [II³ 1, 1189](#), 6-7), and indeed sanctuaries (albeit that the cases of the precise expression, παρὰ τὸ ἱερόν, in this context all seem to be non-Attic).¹⁴

¹¹ On the authority citations in the state calendar see Lambert 2002, 356-357.

¹² E.g. the decree of 352/1 on the boundaries of the sacred tract, [IG II³ 1, 292](#), was to be inscribed on two stelai, one at Eleusis by the [gateway of the sanctuary], the other in the Eleusinion in the city (56-57). Other references to decree stelai to be erected ἐν τῷ Ἐλευσινίῳ are collected conveniently by Liddel 2003, 91-92.

¹³ παρὰ + dative also occurs in this type of formulation, albeit post-86 BC, in [IG II² 1035](#), 15-16: on the acropolis, παρὰ [τῆι Π]ολιάδι Ἀθηνᾶι and in the Piraeus παρὰ τῷ Σωτήρι καὶ τῆι Ἀθηνᾶι τῆι Σωτείραι].

¹⁴ [IG IX 2, 1111](#), 29-30 (Thessaly, Magnesia, ca. 130-126 BC): ἀναθεῖναι δὲ τὴν στήλην ἐν τῆι ἀγοραῖ πα[ρὰ] | τὸ ἱερόν τῆς Ἀρτέμιδος τῆς Σωτείρας. *SEG* 33.679, 87-88 (Paros, ca. 175-150 BC): στήλην λιθίνην . . . θεῖναι παρὰ τὸ ἱερόν τῆς Ἐστίας. Kern, *Inscripfen von Magnesia* 35

In *Agora XVI* 123 (302/1 BC), a decree in honour of taxiarchs is to be erected πρὸς, like παρὰ, translatable in English as “by”, “the Eleusinion in the city”, πρὸς τῷ Ἐλευσινίῳ ἐν ἄ[στει] (26-27).¹⁵

Humphreys ventures her own, as she admits highly speculative, interpretation, suggesting that 13-19 introduced a set of quadrennial sacrifices, and restoring:

[πεντετηρικὰ] τάδε τοῦ τῶν ἐν-
 [αγισμάτων ἐ]νιαυτοῦ ἕκαστον
 15 [θύεται κατ]ὰ ἐξῆς ὡς γέγραπται
 [εἰς τὸν πύ]ργον τὸν ἐν ταῖς
 [πύλαις. σφάγια (οἱ) παρὰ τὸ Ἐλευσίνιον
 [Τρικορύνθ]ωι οἱ [πρὸς τῷ βωμ]ῶι ἐν Κυνοσούραι
 [καὶ τρίτον παρ]ὰ τὸ Ἡρακλεῖον

This text breaches several canons of good epigraphical practice: in challenging undotted readings made at autopsy ([- - ^{ca. 7-14} - -]τον τὸν ἐν ταῖς, 16) on the basis solely of a weak reading from a photograph on the edge of a break in the stone;¹⁶ in restoring words or expressions unparalleled in epigraphy (as e.g. ἐν[αγισμάτων, “offerings to the dead”, κατ]ὰ ἐξῆς); in failing to make sense (what does it mean to state of sacrifices that they are τοῦ τῶν ἐν[αγισμάτων ἐ]νιαυτοῦ, “of the year of the offerings to the dead”?). But what of the underlying ideas? Apart from the weakness of the reading, πύ]ργον, in 16, it is also improbable that a source of authority for sacrifices would be written “on” (or “at”?) “the tower within the gates” (ἐν ταῖς | [πύλαις, the “gates” being a legitimate term for the strip of land between Mt. Agrieliiki and the sea, Humphreys, 169 n. 98). Attic sacred regulations are invariably located in sacred places, such indeed as those described in 17-19. The idea that we might have to do with quadrennial sacrifices ([πεντετηρικὰ], 13) is not intrinsically implausible (Humphreys, 168, notes the penteteric Herakleia at Marathon, on which see Parker 2005, 473); there is no reason to suppose that the Tetrapolis limited itself to annual or biennial offerings; and sacrifices outside the annual/biennial sequences were certainly provided for in the state calendar (Lambert 2002, 356; on provision for events that did not occur at regular intervals, 370-371, Pythais). The problem, however, is that the restoration [πεντετηρικὰ] suits very poorly what follows: the following unit of text has three sets of offerings (**B1, B2 and B3**), not four (**C** is a distinct unit of text, with a sequence specification, δραμοσύνη, lacking in **B1-3**, and no quarter-specification set off to the right, as in **B1-3**).¹⁷

(iii-ii BC), 34-35: ἀναγράψαι ἐν στάλαν καὶ ἀνα[θέμε]ν [τ]οὺς ἄρχοντας ἐν ταῖς ἀγοραῖς παρὰ τὸ ἱερόν τῶν Ἀρτέμιτος.

¹⁵ Other cases of πρὸς τῷ Ἐλευσινίῳ, “by the Eleusinion” are [Agora XVI 228 = IG II³ 1, 1209](#), 7, and 239, 12-13 = [IG II³ 1, 1215](#), 22 (Liddel 2003, 92 n. 150).

¹⁶ As any epigraphist knows who has worked with stones and conventional photographs, the lack of three-dimensionality in the latter makes them normally very weak evidence for readings of letters that are small, abraded or only partially preserved, e.g. on the edge of a break.

¹⁷ Humphreys’ suggestion, 168 n. 94, that one should read πρώτη δραμοσύνη in 20, δευτέρα δραμοσύνη in 23, τρίτη δραμοσύνη in 32, and τετάρτη δραμοσύνη in 39 does not accord with the mode of specification of δραμοσύνη in col. 2, where they are introduced by much fuller wording, as 34, τάδε τὸ ἕτερον ἔτος προτέρα δραμοσύνη. Moreover, the space available in 23 is almost certainly too small to accommodate δευτέρα δραμοσύνη (see my warning against restorations close

The idea that it was sacrifices or other ritual events that were referred to in 17-19, rather than sources of authority for timing, is certainly worth considering, but we should in that case be dealing with a complete set of unpriced offerings, unparalleled in this calendar, and implausible, given that the calendar is elsewhere preoccupied solely with issues of cost.

At A2, 2-3, Humphreys, 171 n. 105, thinks of a reference to a star- or season-sign, suggesting ἐ[πειδὴν -^{ca. 5-15}- φά]ληγεται δέκα ἡμερῶν ἥρω[ι- -], “when . . . appears, the demarch is to sacrifice within ten days to the hero. . .”. ἤγεται, however, is the more likely reading for the start of l. 3 (for a description of what can be read in this place, see my p. 57).

The reference (without context) to a trittys in the dative at [IG I³ 255](#), A9 (no. 1 above), tantalises, especially as there is so little evidence for trittyes in Attica having a cultic personality, the main exception being the pre-Cleisthenic trittys, Leukotainioi, attested in the Athenian state calendar.¹⁸ It is perhaps worth reflecting on the possibility that the reference is to the trittys to which the “Four Cities” belonged. We know nothing about the relevant pre-Cleisthenic trittys; but we do know that “Tetrapolis” was also the name of a Cleisthenic trittys, which apparently contained only Marathon, Trikorynthos and Oinoe (see below on no. 4). In that case [IG I³ 255](#) might be one of the stelai referred to in our column 1, 17-19; and it might have been placed originally on Kynosoura (perhaps restoring [πρὸς τῶι βωμ]ῶι ἐν Κυνοσοῦραι in l. 18), from which it might quite easily have found its way to Euboea. If one were to follow this line of thought to its logical conclusion, one might further suppose that (part or all of) A col. 1 might have related not, as is generally supposed, to Tetrapolis-wide sacrifices, but specifically to sacrifices organised on the basis of the trittys; and the explanation for one of their notable features, the absence of *hierosyna*, might be that they were provided for separately in the inscriptions referred to in A1, 17-19, including in [IG I³ 255](#) Face B.

Other recent discussions which usefully deploy this inscription, but which do not materially affect the text, are: D. Ackermann, *Les Études Classiques* 75 (2007), 111-136 (*SEG* 57.119), who presents tables of data extracted from the Tetrapolis calendar and other calendars and relating to monetary *hierosyna* (133) and prices of sacrificial victims (134-135); and on *Telete*, recipient of the mysterious offering στυ(ρί?)δία at A2, 10, F. Schuddeboom, *Talanta* 38/39 (2006/2007) [2008] 225-237; and his *Greek Religious Terminology - Telete & Orgia* (Leiden-Boston 2009) (*SEG* 57.2188), publishing a revised and expanded English edition of a Utrecht PhD thesis, C. Zijderveld, *Τελετή: Bijdrage tot de kennis der religieuze terminologie in het Grieksch* (Purmerend 1934), together with a collection of inscriptions containing the term τελετή, pp. 201-225, nos. 1-57. Nos. 54-57 are the attestations of Telete as a goddess, of which no. 54 = our A2, 10, no. 55 is an inscribed altar from Pergamum (ii AD), and nos. 56 and 57 label figures on mosaics from Zeugma (Commagene) (ii or iii AD). On p. 222 no. 54, he questions the relevance of the appearance of a basket on the relief from Thyreatis, *IG* IV 676 (= his p. 203 no. 3), on which the label ΤΕΛΕΤΗ appears, which I had adduced in support of the interpretation of the στυΔία of our inscription as στυ(ρί?)δία (“baskets”): “the parallel is problematic ... since the inscription on that relief is generally regarded to be secondary and most likely refers to the

to the maximum possible number of letters, especially where no iotas are involved, 2000, 49). As I remarked (and the previous recent editor of this text, Quinn, also observed), p. 55, the word δραμοσύνη “does not occur and can not comfortably be restored in any earlier line”.

¹⁸ Leukotainioi: Lambert 2002, F3A, 36-37. On the trittyes in cult see most recently N. Papazarkadas, *CQ* 57 (2007), 22-32, with the apt remarks of L. Dubois and S. Minon, *Bull. Ep.* 2008, 195. See also my discussion of the pre-Cleisthenic trittyes at *Phratries of Attica* (revised edition, Ann Arbor 1998), 256-257.

scene rather than the deity.” On personified *Telete* in cult see also C. Stringer, *Acme* 60 (2007) 23-30, and other works helpfully referred to in *SEG* 57.2188 ad fin.

3. Dedication to Dionysos by the Tetrapolis. Mid-iv BC. [IG II² 2933](#).

This dedication is dated by the archon of the Tetrapolis (for this official cf. A2, 39-40 of [no. 2](#), above, and no. 4, and possibly [no. 5](#), below) and lists four religious officials (*hieropoioi*), one from each of the four Tetrapolis demes. The findspot of the inscription (at Divaliaki, north of the so-called *pyrgos*, “tower”) has been used as evidence for the location of the Marathon Dionysion, which can not, however, be precisely determined (recently discussed by H. R. Goette and T. M. Weber, *Marathon. Siedlungskammer und Schlachtfeld - Sommerfrische und Olympische Wettkampfstätte*, Mainz, 2004, 37-38, with German translation; Humphreys 2004, 165-166 nn. 86 and 89; 171 n. 103; Ismard 2010, 239, 244, with map, p. 441).

4. Decree honouring the archon of the Tetrapolis. iv BC. Unpublished.

The discovery of this inscription in the fortress at Rhamnous was first reported by B. Petrakos in *Ergon* 45 (1998) [1999], 14-15 (see *SEG* 48.129), and I noted some initial reactions at *ZPE* 130 (2000), 69-70 (*SEG* 50.166). It honours a man from Probalinthos for carrying out cult duties as archon of the Tetrapolis, awarding him a seat of honour (*proedria*) in the theatre of Dionysos or the place which the Tetrapolis made use of as a theatre; the honours were to be announced “at the Dionysia in the tragedies” (presumably locally, cf. other local examples cited by P. Wilson and A. Hartwig, *ZPE* 169, 2009, 20), and the decree was to be erected “in the Dionysion” (cf. [no. 3](#) and [no. 5](#)). It remains unpublished.

This decree goes to the question of the relation of the Tetrapolis with the neighbouring deme to the north, Rhamnous, which, with its important cult of Nemesis, had a cultic identity markedly distinct from the Tetrapolis. It is a remarkable feature of the documentary record of the Tetrapolis that there is no extant inscription erected at the initiative of any of the individual Tetrapolis demes. This is not likely to be wholly due to accident of survival; it seems that local identity in the Tetrapolis region was heavily invested in the Tetrapolis itself, at the expense of the component demes. The contrast with the deme Rhamnous, with its abundant epigraphical record, could not be more marked.¹⁹ As well as being the name of the ancient cult organisation, “Tetrapolis” was also the name of a Cleisthenic trittys of the tribe Aiantis, consisting of Marathon, Oinoe and Trikorynthos, but not Probalinthos, which belonged to Pandionis. Rhamnous, however, was also in Aiantis, if not, it seems (as was once thought) in the same trittys as the three Tetrapolis demes.²⁰ As Petrakos notes, from a Rhamnousian perspective there is remarkably little to connect Rhamnous with the Tetrapolis demes. This decree stands out as exceptional; so much so that he is inclined to think that, notwithstanding the proximity of the findspot of this decree to the Rhamnousian theatre of Dionysos, it was commissioned by the Tetrapolis (for some reason) from a Rhamnousian

¹⁹ The inscriptions of Rhamnous known to the end of the 20th century fill an entire volume, viz. B. Petrakos, *Ο δήμος του Ραμνούντος. 2. Οι επιγραφές* (Athens, 1999). On the experience of being a demesman of Rhamnous see recently R. Osborne, “Local Environment, Memory, and the Formation of the Citizen in Classical Attica”, in S. D. Lambert, ed. *Sociable Man. Essays ... Nick Fisher* (Swansea, 2011), 25-43.

²⁰ On this see J. S. Traill, *Demos and Trittys* (Toronto, 1986), 103 no. 13, 138. For the older view see Traill, *The Political Organization of Attica* (Princeton, 1975).

stone-mason, and (for some reason) never delivered. In *ZPE* 130 I noted the epigraphical evidence from the Tetrapolis side, fairly slight, but not entirely negligible, for connections with Rhamnous. This, together with the reference to “the theatre ... or the place which the Tetrapolis made use of as a theatre”, and the absence of other evidence for a Marathonian *theatre* of Dionysos, lends some support to an alternative to Petrakos’ theory, namely that, at least at the time this decree was passed, and possibly over a longer period, the Tetrapolis made use of the theatre of their neighbours and fellow-tribesmen, the Rhamnousians, and that this decree may accordingly have been erected in the Rhamnousian “Dionysion” rather than the Tetrapolis one.

5. Decree of the Tetrapolis. Ca. 190 BC. [IG II² 1243](#). Date: Tracy, [ALC 71](#).

The text of this decree requires some attention. First published from autopsy in exemplary fashion by Köhler, with some important, but disciplined, supplements, as *IG II* 601, it was republished by Wilhelm, *Eph. Arch.* 1905, 228-231 no. 7 (sic, no. 8 incorrectly in *IG II²*), with more adventurous, but in some cases questionable, restorations. Kirchner’s edition for *IG II²* is based largely on Wilhelm’s text.

A single chief, or “eponymous”, archon of the Tetrapolis is attested for the fourth century in [no. 2](#), [no. 3](#) and no. 4 above. “Archon” can also be used in a general sense in inscriptions to mean “official”, and indeed both senses can occur in the same inscription (as for example in the arbitration settlement of the genos Salaminioi of 363/2 BC, [Rhodes-Osborne 37](#)). Wilhelm (followed by Kirchner) restored “archons” (in the more general sense?) at three places in this inscription, at ll. 10-12:

ἔξορ[κοῦν δὲ τοὺς ἀεὶ ἄρχοντας Τετρα]-
πόλεων καὶ τοῦ[ς ἐπ]εισιόντα[ς ἄρχοντας μηδὲ αὐτοὺς καταλύ]-
σειν τὰ προστ[ετα]γμένα

and l. 17:

ἐπιμελεῖσθαι δὲ τ[οὺς ἀεὶ ἄρχοντας τοῦ κοινοῦ?]
Τετραπόλεων καὶ τοῦ εὐθύ[νου - - - - -]
δέηται ἀναλίσκει καὶ ἀναφ[έρει τῶι κοινῶι ἐν τῶι ? λόγῳ].

and this restoration has been implicitly accepted by historians.²¹ Köhler had been more prudent, leaving the title of the officials unrestored. Since plural “archons” are nowhere attested for the Tetrapolis (the only plural domestic officials are the four *hieropoioi* known from no. 3 above),²² I follow Köhler. Indeed it is not clear that, in l. 17 we must be dealing with the same official(s) as in ll. 10-12 (in l. 17 we might have a singular official).

The inscribing clause also presents uncertainties. [IG II² 1243](#), 20-22 reads:

ἀναγράψαι δὲ τόδε τὸ ψήφισ[μα ἐν στήλαιν δυοῖν καὶ τήν]
μὲν μίαν στήσαι ἐμ Μαραθ[ῶνι ἐν τῶι ἱερῶι τοῦ Διο]-

²¹ E.g. Parker 1996, 331-32: “An annual archon was appointed (and apparently, by the second century, more than one)”.

²² *Theoroi* and *pythaistai* are attested for the late second - early first century by *Syll.*³ 696A, 697B, 711 D1, 41, 728 C/D1, but these seem unlikely to be relevant here.

νύσου, τὴν [δ]ὲ ἕτεραν ἐν ἄ[σται].

This follows Wilhelm, except ἐν ἄ[σται], due to Wilamowitz. Wilhelm had ἐν Ἀ[θήναις ἐν ἀκροπόλει], following at this point Köhler, who restored:

ἀναγράψαι δὲ τόδε τὸ ψήφισ[μα ἐν στήλαις δυσι καὶ τὴν]
μὲν μίαν στήσαι ἐμ Μαραθ[ῶνι ἐν τῷι τεμένει τοῦ Διο]-
νύσου, τὴν [δ]ὲ ἕτεραν ἐν Ἀ[θήναις ἐν ἀκροπόλει].

It matters not for the sense whether the dual was used in 20, but the difference between Köhler and Wilhelm in l. 21 reminds us that we can not be certain that the inscription was erected precisely in the *sanctuary* of Dionysos. Athenian state decrees were erected variously ἐν τῷι θεάτρῳ τοῦ Διονύσου (*IG II³ 1, 416*, 39), παρὰ τὸν νεῶ τοῦ Διονύσου (*II² 657*, 70), ἐν τῷι τεμένει τοῦ Διονύσου (668, 35-36, 780, 23, 896 = *IG II³ 1, 1284*, 19 and 55) or ἐν τῷι Διον]υσίῳ (648, 11-12 = M. Osborne, *Naturalization in Athens* [1981], D69); and the only Attic inscriptions set up specifically ἐν τῷι ἱερῷ τοῦ Διονύσου are those of Rhamnous, e.g. *I Rham.* 1, 21-22 (356/5 BC), 8, 20 (mid-iii BC), 58, 5 (iii BC).

The inscription was found and transcribed by Köhler on the Acropolis of Athens, and though it can not be ruled out that that was not its original location, most inscriptions found there were originally set up there. It is not surprising that, following the shifts in settlement patterns that Attica had experienced since the fourth century (the main feature of this region seems to have been an increasing concentration of population in Rhamnous²³) the Tetrapolis should choose to erect a copy of its decree in the city. Already in the fourth century the Dekelean branch of the phratry Demotionidai (if that is what it was) had posted notices at “the place which the Dekeleans frequent”, a barber’s shop in the city by the Herms, as well as in their local sanctuary of Leto,²⁴ and the deme Halimous held its meetings in the city rather than in the deme (Demosthenes 57). Though it was not common, there are also precedents for local Attic groups erecting their inscriptions on the Acropolis, though in such cases a specific Acropolis location, appropriate to the group in question, is usually named,²⁵ and it is difficult to think that we have to do with such a specific location in this case. There is a broader question here about the extent to which there may have been a relaxation in the Hellenistic period in access to the Acropolis by local groups for the erection of inscriptions; but that takes us beyond the scope of this note. On the textual point, Wilamowitz was right that, from the perspective of a place in Attica, the city of Athens is not ἐν Ἀθήναις, but ἐν ἄσται (a specification in this sense is needed to counterbalance the erection of the other copy ἐμ Μαραθῶνι); but, as Köhler and Wilhelm implicitly saw, it was the practice in inscribing clauses to specify places of erection more precisely than “in the city”. There are plenty of parallels for inscriptions being erected at named sanctuaries or other specific locations ἐν ἄσται (see on no. 2 above), not infrequently (as in *IG II³ 1, 292*) counterbalancing another copy to be erected locally. The absence of a parallel for the Acropolis being referred to in this way indicates caution, but ἐν ἀ[κροπόλει ἐν ἄσται] or ἐν ἄ[σται ἐν ἀκροπόλει] seem quite likely in l. 22 of our inscription.

²³ See G. J. Oliver, *War, Food and Politics in Early Hellenistic Athens* (Oxford, 2007), 100-110.

²⁴ [Rhodes-Osborne no. 5](#), 122-123, cf. Lys. 13.2-3.

²⁵ Thus for example decrees of the tribe Pandionis, ἐν ἀκροπόλει ἐν τῷι ἱερῷ τῷ Πανδίωνος, *IG II² 1144*, 1148 etc., and those of the tribe Kekropis, ἐν τῷι τοῦ Κέκροπος ἱερῷ, *IG II² 1156* etc.

It may be helpful, in conclusion, to print the full text which is the basis for the translation on AIO (I take the opportunity to note also some other adjustments to the text in *IG II²*):

...⁶...ς δ- ----- non-stoich.
...⁵...σας ΙΛ- -----
...⁶...σθαι -----
...⁷...λλε. ...⁶...ν εὐο[ρ]κοῦ[ντι] μὲν μοι εὖ εἶναι, ἐπιорκοῦντι]
5 [δὲ τὰ]ναντία· μὴ [ἐ]ξεῖ[να]ι δὲ αὐτῶν μη[θενὶ τὰ χρήματα ταῦτα]
[εἰς ἄλ]λο τι μετε[νε]γκεῖν ἢ καταχ[ρή]σασθαι ἢ ἀναλῶ]-
[σαι? ἐ]κ τῶν καταλ[ει]πομένων, ἀλ[λὰ] πάντα ἀκίνητα ἔστω· εἰ]
[δὲ μ]ή, ὅ τε εἶπ[ας] καὶ] ἐπερωτήσ[ας] καὶ ἐπιψηφίσας ὀφείλ]-
10 [όν]των ἑκατὸν [δραχμ]ὰς ἱεράς [- - - - - θεοῖς τοῖς κατέ?]-
χουσιν τὴν Τετ[ράπ]ολιν· ἔξορ[κοῦν] δὲ τοὺς - - Τετρα]-
πόλεων καὶ τοῦ[ς] ἐπ[εισιόν]τα[ς] - - - μηδὲ αὐτοὺς καταλύ]-
σειν τὰ προσ[ετα]γμένα διὰ π[αντὸς] μηδὲ ἄλλωι ἐπιτρέ]-
ψειν καταλῦσ[αι] κατὰ μηθένα [τρόπον, ὅπως ἂν τούτων ὄντων]
15 κυρίων καὶ σ[υντε]λουμένων φ[ιλοτιμ]ῶνται καὶ οἱ ἄλλοι]
ἀποδείκνυσ[θαι] τῆ[ν εἰ]ς τὸ κο[ινὸν] Τετραπόλεων εὐνοίαν]
εἰδότας ὅτι χά[ρι]τας ἀξίας κ[οιμ]οῦνται ὧν ἂν εὐεργετήσωσιν?]
αὐτούς· ἐπιμελεῖσθαι δὲ τ[ο- - - - -]
Τετραπόλεων καὶ τοῦ εὐθυ[ν- - - - -]
20 δέηται ἀναλίσκει καὶ ἀναφ[έρει] ? - - - - -].
ἀναγράψαι δὲ τόδε τὸ ψήφισ[μα] ἐν στήλαις δυσὶ καὶ τὴν]
μὲν μίαν στήσαι ἐμ Μαραθ[ῶνι] ἐν - - - - - τοῦ Διο]-
νύσου, τὴν [δ]ὲ ἑτέραν ἐν ἄ[στει] ἐν ἀκροπόλει?].

Suppl. 8 fin., 15, 20-21, Koe., 4-8 in., 10-14, 16 Wilh. partly after Koe. || 9 [τῶι Διονύσῳ καὶ τοῖς <ἄλλοις θεοῖς τοῖς> κατέ]χουσιν Wilh. || 10 ἀεὶ ἄρχοντας Τετρα]πόλεων Wilh. Perhaps rather νῦν - Τετρα]πόλεων || 11 ἐπ[εισιόν]τα[ς] ἄρχοντας, 17 τ[οὺς ἀεὶ ἄρχοντας τοῦ κοινοῦ?], 18 εὐθύ[νου], 19 ἀναφ[έρει] τῶι κοινῶι ἐν τῶι? λόγῳ Wilh. || 21 ἐν τῶι τεμένει (ἱερῶι Wilh.) τοῦ Διο]νύσου Koe. || 22 fin. Lam. (see above).

