



Attic Inscriptions
Online

Inscribed Athenian Decrees of 229/8-198/7 BC (*IG II³ 1, 1135-1255*)

S. D. Lambert

AIO Papers no. 4
July 2014

Minor corrections and 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)

Professor J. Blok (Utrecht)

Dr. A. P. Matthaiou (Athens)

Mr. S. G. Byrne (Melbourne)

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)

INSCRIBED ATHENIAN DECREES OF 229/8-198/7 BC (*IG II³ 1, 1135-1255*)¹

S. D. Lambert

Introduction

The second edition of the Berlin Academy's corpus of the decrees of the city of Athens of

¹ This paper reviews the inscriptions edited by V. N. Bardani and S. V. Tracy, *Inscriptiones Graecae* II-III, Editio Tertia, Pars I, Fasciculus V, I-II ([1135-1255](#)) (Berlin, De Gruyter, 2012). I also refer to fascicule 2 of the same publication (2012), edited by the present author ([292-572](#), 352/1-322/1), and the forthcoming fascicule 4, edited by M. J. Osborne and S. G. Byrne ([844-1134](#), 299/8-230/29). I am very grateful to Josine Blok and Utrecht University, and to Christian Witschel and the Humboldt Foundation for facilitating extended visits in 2014 to the Universities of Utrecht and Heidelberg (the latter in the context of project EAGLE), during which both the translations and this paper were written. I thank Lina van't Wout and Feyo Schuddeboom for their help with the translations, Peter Rhodes, Angelos Matthaiou and Sean Byrne for acute comments on drafts of the translations and of this paper, and Peter Liddel, Nino Luraghi, Laurence Totelin and Vivian Nutton for discussion and advice on particular points. I alone am responsible for opinions expressed. Dates are BC unless otherwise specified. I use the following abbreviations:

Blok and Lambert 2009: J. H. Blok and S. D. Lambert, "The Appointment of Priests in Attic *Gene*", *ZPE* 169 (2009), 95-124.

Chanotis 2010: A. Chanotis, "[Illusions of Democracy in the Hellenistic World](#)", [Athens Dialogues. Democracy and Politeia. Period Two](#).

Habicht 1982: C. Habicht, *Studien zur Geschichte Athens in hellenistischer Zeit* (Göttingen).

Habicht 1997: C. Habicht, *Athens from Alexander to Antony* (Harvard).

IALD: S. D. Lambert, *Inscribed Athenian Laws and Decrees 352/1-322/1 BC. Epigraphical Essays* (Leiden, 2012).

Lambert 2010: S. D. Lambert, "A Polis and its Priests: Athenian Priesthoods before and after Pericles' Citizenship Law", *Historia* 59, 143-75.

Lambert 2011: S. D. Lambert, "Some Political Shifts in Lykourgan Athens", in V. Azoulay and P. Ismard eds., *Clisthène et Lycurgue d'Athènes. Autour du politique dans la cité classique* (Paris), 175-90.

Lambert 2012: S. D. Lambert, "The Social Construction of Priests and Priestesses in Athenian Honorific Decrees from the Fourth Century BC to the Augustan Period", in M. Horster, A. Klöckner eds., *Civic Priests. Cult Personnel in Athens from the Hellenistic Period to Late Antiquity* (Berlin), 67-113.

Lambert 2014: S. D. Lambert, "Accounts of Payments from the Treasury of Athena in 410-407? BC ([IG I³ 375](#) and [377](#))", *AIO Papers* no. 3.

Lambert forthcoming: S. D. Lambert, "Another Look at the Sacrificial Calendar of the Marathonian Tetrapolis", in the proceedings of a conference, Feasting and Polis Institutions, Utrecht, January 2014. In 2014 available in draft on academia.edu.

Liddel 2003: P. Liddel, "The Places of Publication of Athenian State Decrees from the 5th Century BC to the 3rd Century AD", *ZPE* 143 (2003), 79-93.

Oetjen 2014: R. Oetjen, *Athen im dritten Jahrhundert v. Chr.* (Duisburg).

Parker 2005: R. Parker, *Polytheism and Society at Athens* (Oxford).

Perrin 2007: E. Perrin-Saminadayar, *Éducation, culture et société à Athènes. Les acteurs de la vie culturelle athénienne (229-88). Un tout petit monde* (Paris).

Tracy 1990: S. V. Tracy, *Attic Letter-Cutters of 229-86 BC* (Berkeley).

Whitehead 2009: D. Whitehead, "Andragathia and Arete", in L. Mitchell and L. Rubinstein eds., *Greek History and Epigraphy. Essays in honour of P. J. Rhodes* (Swansea), 47-58.

Note that links to [IG II³ 1, 1256-1461](#) will become active as these translations are added to AIO.

the years 229/8-168/7 BC was published during the first European cataclysm of the twentieth century;² now, nearly a hundred years later, there is good reason to celebrate the appearance of the third edition, for, among other things, it is a fine monument of international collaboration. Since the 1930s, the American School of Classical Studies at Athens has been responsible for the excavations of the Athenian agora, excavations that have resulted in the most substantial accrual of new inscriptions since the second edition, and have provided the basis on which a strong tradition of North American epigraphy has flourished. If the major western European traditions, the German, the French and the Italian,³ grew out of a primarily philological approach to inscriptions as, in the first place, texts to be edited, American epigraphists have tended to treat inscriptions from a more archaeologically informed background and perspective, as physical objects. Stephen V. Tracy, the senior editor of this volume, is one of the finest representatives of this tradition, extremely thorough, circumspect in epigraphical restoration, lucid and concise in expression and conservative in interpretation, he has devoted a major part of his life's work to studying the cutters of Attic inscriptions, establishing, by painstaking and meticulous analysis, verifiable criteria for the identification of the masons who cut many hundreds of Athenian inscriptions in the years 340-88.⁴ Here we are in the territory of his masterpiece, his study of the cutters of 229-86.⁵ Identifying cutters is not a matter of antiquarian curiosity, it impacts on two of the prime concerns of the Attic epigraphist.⁶ If one identifies the hand, one can date an inscription to within a generation, a matter of great importance in periods such as the third century BC, when other dating criteria, such as a firmly established archon list, have been lacking. Second, identifying the cutter narrows the pool of inscriptions from which joins can be made. Tracy's method has facilitated hundreds of new joins, and not a few disjoins of fragments incorrectly associated by earlier scholars, transforming the landscape of the study of Athenian inscriptions in periods to which he has directed his attention. He is specifically responsible as named editor for about 60 of the 327 lemmata in the new *IG*, but his fundamental contributions run like a golden thread throughout the work.

The publication of the inscriptions from the agora is an ongoing task, and this new *IG* also contains four important, previously unpublished inscriptions, for which the former director of the excavations, T. L. Shear Jr., is responsible as named editor, two of them dating to 229/8-198/7 (the prytany decrees [1144](#) and [1162](#)). Shear sensibly involved Tracy and Bardani in the preparation of the lemmata and the result is a fine collaborative effort.

The inscriptions of the greatest city of ancient Greece, and the only one for which we have evidence of sufficient quality and quantity to enable history to be written in the depth

² *IG II²* Pars 1, Fasc. 2, ed. J. Kirchner, published in 1916.

³ Much of the Attic epigraphy done in Oxford and Cambridge the 20th century, of which D. M. Lewis, lead editor of the latest edition of the pre-403/2 corpus, *IG I³*, was the most notable exponent, but which also included figures such as R. Meiggs, H. T. Wade-Gery and A. G. Woodhead, can be seen as an offshoot of American work on the inscriptions from the agora, under the aegis of B. D. Meritt.

⁴ He is currently extending this approach to fifth-century inscriptions, with significant results. His most recent paper, "Down Dating some Athenian Decrees with Three-bar Sigma: a Palaeographic Approach", *ZPE* 190 (2014), 105-15, characteristically modest and understated, hammers the nail in the coffin of the old doctrine that three-bar sigma and tailed rho do not appear in Athenian decrees after ca. 450.

⁵ Tracy 1990.

⁶ "Attic" because, given the vast quantity of material, the issue of joins tends to be much more important in Attic, specifically Athenian, epigraphy, than in most other regional epigraphies. Most other cities do not have the critical mass of material needed to support identification of hands by Tracy's methods. The issue of potential joins is also one of the factors that induce Attic epigraphists to take small fragments more seriously than they appear to be taken by non-Atticists. I shall note an example or two below.

and across a span of time that is otherwise usually only possible for modern polities, are historical and cultural documents of major importance. They belong to the common heritage of Europe;⁷ but they belong also specifically to the heritage of Greece, and Greek scholars have made significant contributions to their study. In the half-century between Greek independence and the appearance of the first edition of the corpus under review here (U. Koehler ed., *IG II Pars 1*, 1877), they played an important role in pioneering the study of the large number of Athenian inscriptions that were becoming available, principally from the clearance of the Athenian acropolis. Among many, I name three who contributed both to the editing of inscriptions in this fascicule, and more broadly. K. Pittakis was not trained as a classical scholar, and his texts are full of mistakes, but he did the study of Athenian inscriptions a great service in publishing the first edition of many hundreds of inscriptions from the acropolis and, above all, in recording diligently their findspots. A. R. Rangabé built on Pittakis' work, often being the first to establish the sense in which a passage of text ought to be restored, even if, in detail, his specific proposals were to be superseded by the work of, mainly, German scholars of the next generation. S. A. Koumanoudes published numerous first editions, with an accuracy and judgement that exceeded that of either Pittakis or Rangabé, and made important observations on epigraphical methodology.⁸ In the present day V. Petrakos has made an outstanding contribution to Attic epigraphy in his corpora of Oropos and Rhamnous, while A. P. Matthaiou is recognised by his peers as the most skilled Attic epigraphist of his generation, and we look forward with eager anticipation to the publication of his edition of the Athenian laws and decrees of 403/2-353/2 (*IG II³ 1 fascicule 1*). It is Voula N. Bardani, however, a scholar previously less well-known outside Greece, who achieves with the fascicule under review the accolade of first Greek to be a named editor of the premier regional corpus of ancient Greece. She is primarily responsible for 263 of the lemmata in this edition, and there is scarcely an inscription that has not benefited from her acute epigraphical judgement, as, time and again, she makes significant textual contributions. Her skills complement admirably those of Tracy; the collaboration seems to have worked seamlessly, and may be judged a great success.

In the second half of the 19th century and the first half of the 20th German-speaking scholars were responsible for the most significant progress in the study of Attic inscriptions. W. Dittenberger, F. Hiller von Gaertringen, H. von Prott, A. von Velsen, U. von Wilamowitz-Moellendorf are some of the scholars of high calibre who were attracted to devote some of their working lives to this important body of documents. Among a distinguished crowd, two men stand out for the number and quality of their contributions: Ulrich Koehler and Adolf Wilhelm, the first responsible for introducing order and light into the Attic corpus in his first edition of *IG II*, in my view by a wide margin the greatest work of Attic epigraphy ever to be published, and the second responsible for much of what was best in the second edition. Klaus Hallof and his colleagues at the Berlin Academy have applied themselves with prodigious energy to bringing to bear the strengths of this great tradition on the current enterprise. Whether the style of presentation of inscriptions that prevailed in the 19th century is still appropriate for the 21st is a topic on which different opinions may be held. The use of the Latin language, the absence of translations into a modern European language and the extremely spare style of apparatus and commentary will continue to be debated; but a tradition which aspires to maintain the highest standards of scholarship, and to promote them

⁷ This has been recognised by the launch of the Europeana Ancient Greek and Latin Epigraphy (EAGLE) Best Practice Network, which plans shortly to launch a portal through which readers of this paper will have access to translations on AIO alongside other material on Greek and Latin inscriptions. See <http://www.eagle-network.eu/search-inscriptions/>.

⁸ He might appropriately have been included among the 19th-century Greek scholars named in Bardani and Tracy's preface.

above the dictates of “market forces”, is a rare thing in the modern world, and should be cherished; the indices of this fascicule (and of fascicule 2), of which Klaus Hallof is the named compiler, are, despite a few unfortunate slips, scholarly tools of great utility; and this edition of *IG II* is the first of an Attic corpus to be accompanied by a full set of photographs, an extremely welcome development. Moreover, there are other ways to make Attic inscriptions accessible to a wider readership, as this website seeks to demonstrate.

There is now a fair degree of consensus among Attic epigraphists on some important issues of methodology. Since these are not always well understood by labourers in non-Attic epigraphical vineyards, let alone non-epigraphists, it is perhaps worth stating some of the salient points, which arise from long collective experience, including of the unfortunate results that can occur when the principles of good Attic method are not applied. Autopsy, squeezes, and photographs all have important roles to play when editing an inscription, as does study of early transcripts, especially for stones now lost. Squeezes⁹ reproduce accurately, without distraction of colour and lighting, the indentations in the stone, facilitating the task of distinguishing between deliberately inscribed and casual marks; and when, as in the case of the squeezes in the Berlin Academy’s collection, they were mostly made over a century ago, they may preserve traces of letters no longer visible at autopsy, especially where a stone has been stored in the open air or in a city, such as Athens, that has suffered from serious air pollution. However, a high proportion of Athenian inscriptions are fragmentary and badly worn; in such circumstances squeezes do not unusually enable one to determine where the original edges of the stone, or the original surface of the stone, are preserved, features that are essential for establishing an accurate text. Moreover, with abraded stones, letters are quite often legible not from any remaining surface indentation apparent on a squeeze, but from (usually) brown discolouration (created by paint or oxidisation) along the path of the letters. Squeezes also generally provide inadequate evidence for determining whether fragments join or should be associated as from the same inscription. For these reasons it is essential, wherever possible, for the editor to supplement the evidence of squeezes with autopsy of the stone, which enables an inscription to be studied fully in three dimensions and under different lighting conditions. Photographs, the third aid generally at the disposal of an editor, reproduce an accurate visual image of the surface of a stone, under particular lighting conditions. They are a valuable tool, and may supply a useful point of view on a difficult reading, especially where one has multiple digital (or conventional) photographs at one’s disposal, taken under different lighting, but they have, so far in the history of scholarship, mostly been two-dimensional, and such images generally supply insufficient evidence on which to base an edition of a three-dimensional object. An important principle, which is breached too often, is that, except for the detection of crude mistakes, such as the omission of a word or line, a single published photograph should not be used to “second-guess” the judgement of an editor who has formulated an opinion on a difficult reading based on a fuller range of the evidence available. The development of 3-D photography and other new techniques of image-capture and analysis offer a promising way forward in the study of fragmentary and abraded stones, but until these techniques can be systematically applied to Athenian inscriptions (a task which presents administrative and practical challenges as well as technological ones), photography will continue to be secondary to autopsy and squeezes as a tool for editing Attic inscriptions. In the meantime, if Attic epigraphists have tended in recent years to emphasise the primacy of autopsy, it is because they know from experience of dealing with *IG I*³ and *IG II*² that the absence of

⁹ Impressions of the surface of an inscription, usually made on filter paper. The major collections of Attic squeezes are held by the Berlin Academy, the Institute for Advanced Study, Princeton (especially for agora inscriptions) and the Centre for the Study of Ancient Documents, Oxford.

systematic autopsy, and overreliance on squeezes, was a serious flaw in those works. In *IG II³* we have sought to deploy systematically the full range of evidence available, autopsy, squeezes, photographs and original transcripts.

A second principle applied to the editing of *IG II³*, and one which again arises from the collective experience of Attic epigraphy, is the thorough review of early bibliography, in particular of the work of early Greek scholars, whose contributions were not always accorded the recognition they deserved in earlier *IG* editions. This is particularly important in relation to the accurate recording of original findspots of inscriptions, where this edition of *IG* is more careful than its predecessor.

The extent to which one should restore text not preserved on the stone is one of the most discussed issues in epigraphy, and this is not the place to do it full justice,¹⁰ but it is, I think, fair to say (and is indeed apparent from some of the early comment on fascicules of *IG II³* by those who are not Attic specialists), that stricter standards prevail now in Attic epigraphy than in some other regional epigraphies. This is partly because long experience, and the often bitter controversies that have raged around specific restorations, not to mention the frequent cases where discovery of a new fragment has demonstrated the error of restorations proposed by distinguished epigraphists and generally accepted, on their authority, as cogent (I shall allude to one or two such cases below), have demonstrated to Atticists the unwisdom of pressing those restorations which go beyond obvious completions of words or phrases and of formulae and expressions that are well-paralleled, preferably in Attic usage. Partly, however, this also has to do with the background and approach of the epigraphists concerned. Those from a “Classics” background, a more textually oriented bias, and with a less historical or archaeological outlook, have often treated the restoration of an epigraphical text almost as an exercise in Attic prose composition, seeking a form of words that will fit elegantly every lacuna, no matter, sometimes, how little text is actually preserved. The epigraphist who seeks to be primarily a historian (as, for example, in my own case) is all too aware of the danger of writing “history from square brackets” and is much more cautious, usually only filling extensive lacunae where text is formulaic and this can be justified from parallels. Introduction of entities, including names of people or places not mentioned or strictly implied by the surviving legible text is a particular bugbear;¹¹ and it is something to

¹⁰ For a recent worthwhile discussion of the topic in relation to fifth century Attic inscriptions see A. P. Matthaiou, *Studies in Attic Inscriptions and the History of the Fifth Century BC* (PhD dissertation, La Trobe University, 2009), 7-14. Matthaiou cites with approval per ep. the dictum of S. A. Koumanoudes (Ἀττικῆς ἐπιγραφαὶ ἐπιτύμβιοι, 1871, 10): “Συμπληρώσεις δὲ τῶν χαινόντων ἢ λίαν δυσαναγνώστων χωρίων ἔδωκα εἴτε ἐξ ἄλλων ἐκδοτῶν προτέρων εἴτε ἐξ ἐμοῦ τὰς ἀναγκαιοτάτας καὶ βεβαιοτάτας, ἀποσχὼν τῶν μόνον πιθανῶν, ὧν οὐκ ἔστιν ἀριθμὸς, καὶ οὐδὲν σχεδὸν τὸ ὄφελος, ἀλλ’ ἐπίδειξις ματαία εἰκαστικῆς εὐφυΐας.” (“I have supplied only the most necessary and certain restorations of missing or hardly legible passages suggested by other earlier editors or by myself, keeping away from the restorations which are only possible, of which the number is great, and the profit almost none, being only a vain show of intelligence in guess-work”. Trans. Y. Lollos, slightly adapted).

¹¹ Rather than generate emotion by citing a contentious example, I illustrate the point first with a relatively minor one, viz. the misleading impression created in the minds even of epigraphically literate historians by a speculative restoration (by Wilhelm) of [IG II² 1243](#) so as to imply that, in the hellenistic period, the Marathonian Tetrapolis had plural “archons” (Lambert, “Notes on Inscriptions of the Marathonian Tetrapolis”, *AIO Papers no. 1, 9-11, no. 5*. The restoration of “archons” is entirely within square brackets and is not implied by the surviving text). Notable in this context is the criticism by Wilamowitz (*Hermes* 37, 1902, 310-12) of Wilhelm’s restoration (*CRAI* 1900, 524-32) of the very fragmentary [IG II² 211](#), tentatively followed by Kirchner in *IG II²*, but demoted by me to the apparatus in [IG II³ 1, 503](#), to yield a decree providing for the reception of exiled Olynthians at Athens following

which the present generation of Attic epigraphists is strongly averse. That does not mean that there is no scope for discussion of the correctness or otherwise of individual restorations; marginal cases abound, and in what follows I shall take issue with some of the restorations accepted by Bardani and Tracy into their texts; but in general I endorse the more conservative approach to restoration that they have adopted, including the demotion to the apparatus or indeed out of the fascicule altogether of more speculative restorations, whoever their author may be; and I have adopted a similar approach in fascicule 2.

The fourth principle which the history of Attic epigraphy has encouraged the editor of a modern Attic corpus to adopt, is that they should have regard to the *communis opinio scholarum* as well as to their own judgement, and in particular should avoid promoting views which are strongly personal or belong to a narrow school of thought. This was also a flaw with *IG I³*, which, remarkable achievement though it was, promoted the views of a small group of scholars centered around B. D. Meritt, many of which, in relation, for example, to dating, have turned out to be erroneous, at the expense of those of other serious epigraphists of the day (in this case, for example, on different issues, W. K. Pritchett and H. B. Mattingly), which have subsequently, at least in some respects, been vindicated. It is in this area that the rigorous *Redaktion* of draft texts at the Berlin Academy by an epigraphist and philologist of the stature and experience of Klaus Hallof has an important role to play. It is the easiest thing in the world to persuade oneself of the rightness of a new supplement, or other epigraphical theory, which has floated into one's brain. Human nature being what it is, even those who adhere theoretically to the doctrine of cautious restoration can easily deceive themselves into belief in the cogency of their own supplements, or of those of their friends (or mentors). The rigorous editorial process, carried out by the Berlin Academy, helps to winnow out ill-founded ideas and speculations, and to relegate to the apparatus those restorations which are uncertain. Of course the process is not guaranteed to prevent every misjudgement, but it reduces them to smaller proportions than would otherwise have been the case.

Finally, it is perhaps worth pointing out that Part 1 of *IG II³* is in the first place a single corpus, not a series of separate corpora. The division into fascicules follows historical points of division where these lie readily to hand, but for the period 403/2-322/1 the starting

the capture of Olynthos by Philip II in 348 (much later, in 1940, converted by Wilhelm into exiles from Methone in 354; see my discussion at *ZPE* 159, 2007, 101 = *IALD* 139, n. 6): “scheint mir das Spiel solcher Ergänzungen zwar sehr gut, damit man *in corpore vili* das Handwerk lernt; weiter hat es keinen Zweck; man kann ja nur hinlesen, was man so schon weiss.” (“it appears to me that the game of such restorations is on the one hand very good, in that one thereby learns the craft on a body of material that is of little account; further than this it has no purpose; one can only restore what one already knows”). The designation of fragmentary inscriptions as “*corpus vile*” betrays some prejudices which the modern epigraphist would not share, including the assumption that inscriptions are only valuable to the extent that they supply specific factual information (it may tell us just as much about the historical situation in the 340s that there are many decrees recording the reception at Athens of exiles, regardless of which specific cities the exiles may be from) and perhaps (the implication here is unclear, but the assumption was, and still is, quite common) the subordination of epigraphical to literary texts as objects of study. The modern epigraphist would wish to emphasise that inscriptions have their own value as, and supply their own distinctive perspective on, the past, independently of literary sources; but Wilamowitz' observation that one can only restore what one already knows, is wholly apt. For a similar example of overrestoration by Wilhelm that continues to mislead historians, in this case involving the insertion of Sinope into a text entirely by restoration, see [IG II² 409 = IG II³ 1, 440](#), with discussion at *ZPE* 159, 2007, 114-15 = *IALD* 158-61, no. 82. It is partly for this reason that I would rank more highly the contribution to Attic epigraphy of Koehler, who was more of a historian, and took a more disciplined approach to epigraphical restoration, than Wilhelm (Koehler's text of [IG II² 1243](#), for example, had no “archons”), however numerous, brilliant, and in many cases unexceptionable, were Wilhelm's textual contributions.

point for the later fascicule, 352/1, edited by the present author, was determined by purely practical considerations, i.e. (a) by the desirability of producing two fascicules of approximately equal length. No historical turning point lies to hand in the late 350s, which is where the division had to be made to achieve this, and it would have been disingenuous to pretend that the choice of 352/1 was driven by some historical factor, when this was not the case; (b) the existence, in the years immediately preceding 352/1, of unpublished inscriptions and joins, which were important to include in *IG*, but were not yet available for inclusion at the point when fascicule 2 was ready for publication. As it happens, 352 is the year of the earliest decree in the literary record proposed by Demosthenes,¹² and this is indeed significant when it comes to historical discussion of the inscribed decrees of the period; but this was not the reason why 352/1 was selected as the starting point of fascicule 2.

To return to the inscriptions that are the subject of this paper, 229-198 is a period when the literary evidence for the external history of Athens is extremely thin (and rather biased),¹³ for its internal history practically non-existent, and the richness and historical potential of the material edited with such skill by Tracy and Bardani can not be fully comprehended in a review.¹⁴ I have not indeed attempted a systematic review. In what follows I shall merely discuss a number of points that occurred to me while translating for AIO the 121 inscriptions in their fascicule which date to the 31 years that followed the “liberation” of Athens from Macedonian control in 229, i.e. the decrees included in their sections 1 and 2.¹⁵ The acute reader will have noticed that this period corresponds in length with the 31 years covered by fascicule 2 of this corpus (352/1-322/1), a comparison which I hope to develop from a historical perspective more fully elsewhere.¹⁶

¹² Providing for an expeditionary force and a smaller permanent force to operate against Philip II, Dem. 4.13-29, 30, 33. Apparently the decree was not passed; see D. MacDowell, *Demosthenes the Orator* (Oxford, 2009), 215.

¹³ The extent of the anti-Athenian bias of Polybios, for example, is apparent from the narrative account of Athenian history in this period given us by Habicht 1997, chapter 7, “Freedom and Neutrality”, 173-93.

¹⁴ I do not intend to review or footnote systematically here the historical bibliography on this period of Athenian history. Habicht 1997, chapter 7, provides an accessible conventional narrative, focussing almost exclusively on Athens’ external relations, and the same author has published numerous valuable more detailed studies, among them Habicht 1982. Chaniotis 2010 is a stimulating survey of hellenistic “democracy”, including some references to Athens, though adopting a somewhat uncritical approach to literary sources such as Plutarch, and, in treating the hellenistic world as a single historical unit, leaving scope for articulating more clearly significant differences between places and times. Perrin 2007 is a study of Athenian cultural life in the period after 229, including a treatment of the ephebate (see the review by N. Kennell, *BMCR* 2009.9.43). Most recently Oetjen 2014 examines the political history of third-century Athens (again with a focus on external relations) from the point of view of the inscribed record of the garrison demes, especially Rhamnous. These works, as well as bibliographies to individual lemmata in the new *IG*, may conveniently be consulted for references to other relevant bibliography.

¹⁵ “31” years rather than 32, because there is no extant decree firmly datable to 229/8. 105 of these are discussed below. 16 are too fragmentary to yield significant information about their substantive content, viz. [1142](#), [1143](#), [1156](#), [1157](#), [1163](#), [1172](#), [1173](#), [1174](#), [1175](#), [1191](#), [1210](#), [1250](#), [1251](#), [1252](#), [1253](#), [1255](#).

¹⁶ To save space I generally avoid repeating in this paper extensive factual information about the content of individual inscriptions. I assume that the reader has online access to the translations on AIO.

Decrees Honouring Foreigners

About a third (ca. 42) of the 121 inscribed decrees of this period honoured non-Athenians. Though a few are drawn to other locations, the default place for erecting such decrees at this period remains, as it always had been, the acropolis (though it is not uncommon for fragments to have wandered down to the acropolis slopes or the agora prior to discovery).¹⁷ They tend to cluster in small groups around particular historical episodes or themes. Three award honours to men who had rendered service in connection with the “liberation” of Athens from Macedonian control in 229 and the subsequent harbour works in the Piraeus: [1135](#), of 228/7, for Timosthenes of Karystos; [1140](#) and [1141](#), of about the same time, respectively for Aristokreon and for Apollas [of Kolophon?]. This liberation had not been achieved by military action, but by bribing Diogenes, the commander of the Macedonian garrison in the Piraeus, and his soldiers, to vacate Attica;¹⁸ and the contributions of these men were, it seems, entirely financial. Fragmentary though they are, this is clear enough from the texts of [1140](#) and [1141](#). Almost nothing of the relevant passage of [1135](#) survives, but the decree seeks rhetorically to “big up” the contribution of Timosthenes by a long preface referring, albeit obliquely, to the exploits of the honorand’s grandfather, who had been honoured on the re-establishment of democracy in 306/5 for services rendered apparently during the Lamian War (*IG II² 467*). The preface includes a lengthy citation of the “laws” requiring the city to look after the descendants of those who had been honoured by the city for “(1) setting up trophies, whether by land or sea, or (2) re-establishing liberty, or (3) putting their private resources towards the collective preservation ...”. The younger Timosthenes, we may assume, had done (3), and thereby contributed to (2), in circumstances which, the rhetoric seeks to suggest, find parallels in the failed (but glorious) attempt to re-establish liberty after the death of Alexander in 323 (the Lamian War), and the successful one when Demetrios of Phaleron was ousted in 307; but he is highly unlikely to have achieved (1).

There is much more that could be said about these three decrees; for the time being I note here two further points. The first is that [1135](#) is the only inscribed decree of this period which sets out explicitly to bring the relatively distant past into resonance with the present, a practice that had become a feature of inscribed decrees (though only ever a small number of them) in the period of attempted revival in the 330s and 320s between the battle of Chaironeia and the Lamian War. In that period, the fifth century had been the object of attention, particularly the glory days of the early years of the Peloponnesian War.¹⁹ Lykourgos’ was the guiding spirit behind this practice, and it is maintained during the century or so that intervened between Lykourgos’ death in 325 and the “liberation” of Athens in 229, with various points of reference, including an explicit attempt to revive the spirit of the Persian wars in Chremonides’ decree announcing the alliance of Athens and Sparta for the liberation of Greece from the Macedonians in 269/8 ([912](#) = *IG II² 686* + *687*). That venture had ended

¹⁷ On the acropolis as historical “default” location for inscribed Athenian decrees, see Liddel 2003.

¹⁸ Diogenes himself was apparently awarded the Athenian citizenship and he or a descendant married into the Eteoboutadai. He is named, together with Lykourgos, as ancestor of Philtera, priestess of Athena Polias ca. 130 BC, *IG II² 3474*. See Blok and Lambert 2009, 107. The decree for Diogenes, however, does not survive.

¹⁹ I have written about this in relation to the 4th cent. BC in: “Connecting with the Past in Lykourgan Athens: an Epigraphical Perspective,” in L. Foxhall, H.-J. Gehrke and N. Luraghi eds., *Intentional History. Spinning Time in Ancient Greece* (Stuttgart, 2010) 225–38; and “Inscribing the Past in Fourth-Century Athens”, in J. Marincola, L. Llewellyn-Jones and C. Maciver eds., *Greek Notions of the Past in the Archaic and Classical Eras: History without Historians* (Edinburgh, 2012), 253-75. See also Lambert 2011, 187-90.

in failure; now, after the successful “liberation” achieved not by force of arms, but by financial means, the texts have ceased to evoke the fifth-century glory days of genuine independence; instead, in [1135](#), the backward reference stretches no further than to a period when Athens had first learnt how to accommodate herself to existence in a world dominated politically and militarily by Alexander and his successors.

Second, it is worth pausing for a moment to consider the virtues that are attributed to these three men in the texts of the decrees. For the classical period the study of value-terms in Athenian decrees has been placed on a sound footing above all by the excellent work of Chryssoula Veligianni-Terzi, *Wertbegriffe in den attischen Ehrendekreten der klassischen Zeit* (Stuttgart, 1997), the textual value of which can be gauged by the frequency with which it is cited in *IG II³ 1* fascicule 2; and in a succession of fine, more historically oriented, papers by David Whitehead.²⁰ The hellenistic decrees present much more virgin territory in this regard, and work on them (as on so much else) will be immensely facilitated by the excellent indices to *IG II³ 1, 5*, provided by Klaus Hallof, in this case by the lemma, ἔνεκα, pp. 262-63, which is much richer in content and potential than its modest head-word might suggest. *Philotimia* (“love of honour”) enters the regular language of Athenian honorific decrees as a desirable virtue in the 340s at the same time as “hortatory intention” clauses (clauses explicitly stating that honours are being awarded to encourage others to behave in a similar “honour-loving” way), as Athens strove purposively, in the face of insecurities generated by the growing threat posed by Philip of Macedon, to direct her inscribing activity to encouraging foreigners and Athenians alike to act in the interests of the city.²¹ By the late third century the praise and encouragement of *philotimia* are commonplaces of decree language that, through long use, have become formulaic and perhaps less charged with intention. One still expects virtues praised to suit the case, however; and, as in the classical period, *philotimia* sits easily with the catch-all virtue of “good will”, *eunoia*.²² The relevant part of the text of [1135](#) is almost completely lost, but it is no surprise at all to read -φιλοτιμ- at l. 29, or that, in [1141](#), Apollas is crowned for his *philotimia* and his *eunoia* (24). At l. 23 of [1140](#), however, Bardani and Tracy supply text which purports to inform us that Aristokreon is to be crowned with a foliage crown “for his excellence (*arete*) and love of honour (*philotimia*) towards the Athenian Council and People”:

θαλλοῦ στεφάν[ωι ἀρετῆς ἔνεκεν καὶ] non-stoich. c. 38
 φιλοτιμίας τῆς εἰς τὴν βουλ[ὴν καὶ τὸν δῆμον τὸν]
 25 Ἀθηναίων·

The supplements are due to Wilhelm. *Arete* (“excellence”) is a much more highly charged virtue than *eunoia*, one which, like *philotimia*, has aristocratic connotations which the city did not embrace until well into the 4th century.²³ A glance at Veligianni-Terzi’s work (p. 274) reveals that it is never paired unrestored with *philotimia* in city decrees of the classical period. There is now a possible exception in the very fragmentary, [IG II³ 1, 560](#), of ca. 350-300,

²⁰ See especially his “Competitive Outlay and Community Profit: *Philotimia* in Democratic Athens”, *C&M* 34 (1983), 55–74; “Cardinal Virtues: the Language of Public Approbation in Democratic Athens”, *C&M* 44 (1993), 37–75; Whitehead 2009, 47–58.

²¹ Cf. Lambert 2011, 176-78. See also my “What was the Point of Inscribed Honorific Decrees in Classical Athens”, in S. D. Lambert ed., *Sociable Man. Essays on Ancient Greek Social Behaviour in Honour of Nick Fisher* (Swansea, 2011), 193-214.

²² For this pairing in relation to foreign honorands in the classical period see Veligianni-Terzi, 275-76.

²³ See Whitehead 2009.

where at 3-5 the text reads:

ἀρε[.]τῆ[ς ἔνεκα καὶ φιλοτιμίας καὶ] stoich. 32

στεφανῶσαι [χρυσῶι στεφάνωι ἑκάτερον]

5 [α]ύτων [ἀ]πὸ 3 [δραχμῶν -²⁴

3 Lambert, 4-5 Koehler.

The stoichedon arrangement makes φιλοτιμίας the likely restoration, but the 500 dr. crown hints that this may be a decree of a local group, rather than of a state body.²⁵ Hallof's index to *IG II³* 1, 5, shows us that, in 229-168, the pairing of ἀρετή with φιλοτιμία is similarly exceptional. At [1281](#), 4, and [1392](#), 12 the combination is also restored, and may be abandoned, replacing *arete* with *eunoia*.²⁶ The only exception is again a rather special case. In [1390](#), 6-8, Milesian *theoroi* are crowned with a gold crown:

εὐσεβείας τε ἔνεκεν] non-stoich. 48

[τῆ]ς πρὸς τοῦ[ς θεοὺς καὶ ἀ]ρετῆς καὶ φιλοτιμία[ς τῆς εἰς τὸν δῆμον]

[τὸ]ν Ἀθηναίω[ν καὶ τὴν ἑαυ]τῶν πατρίδα,²⁷

[1390](#) is an Athenian citizenship decree inscribed and erected in Miletos, a circumstance that perhaps has something to do with this non-standard formulation, unusually combining three virtues exercised in three different directions. As in the classical period, the normal pairing was not *arete* + *philotimia*, but *eunoia* + *philotimia*. Apart from [1141](#), Hallof's index lists twenty or so instances of this pairing. That we should also restore a reference to *eunoia* at [1140](#), 23 is confirmed by the wording a few lines further on, where the circumstance is envisaged that the honorand might continue in the future to display the same virtues that he has shown in the past, and where Bardani and Tracy give us a text which reads:

ὑπ[άρχειν δὲ αὐτῶι καὶ εἰς] non-stoich. c. 38

τὸ λοιπὸν τὴν τε εὐνοίαν [καὶ τὴν - - -^{c. 12} - -]

30 παρεχομένωι καὶ ἄλλο ἀγ[αθὸν εὐρέσθαι παρὰ]

τῆς βουλῆς καὶ τοῦ δήμου . . .²⁸

29 ἀρετὴν ἴσην] Wilh., Koe., Ki; nonne πᾶσαν χρεῖαν]? (cf. *I. K.* 15 [Ephesos V], 1447, 4-5)

It is questionable method in this kind of formulaic context to seek parallels from outside Attica. The number of Athenian honorific decrees is so large that, probably, if there is no

²⁴ “. . . for their excellence and love of honour, and crown each of them with a gold crown of 500 dr.”

²⁵ Cf. *ZPE* 159, 2007, 127 = *IALD* 178, n. 148 (s.v. [IG II² 544](#)).

²⁶ [1281](#), 4 would therefore read ν[όμον εὐνοίας ἔνεκα καὶ φιλοτιμίας], [1392](#), 12-13 νόμο[ν εὐνοίας ἔνεκα καὶ | φιλοτ]ιμίας.

²⁷ “. . . for their piety towards the gods and excellence and love of honour towards the Athenian People and their own fatherland.”

²⁸ “It shall be possible for him, on displaying also in the future good will and -, to obtain other benefits from the Council and People”.

Athenian parallel, the restoration is not in the Attic idiom. Simple solutions are also always preferable, and the correct restoration at 29 fin., I suggest, lies much closer to home: φιλοτιμίαν. In other words we have, straightforwardly, the same two virtues being both recognised in the present and anticipated in the future:

θαλλοῦ στεφάν[ωι εὐνοίας ἔνεκα καὶ] non-stoich. c. 38
 φιλοτιμίας τῆς εἰς τὴν βουλ[ὴν καὶ τὸν δῆμον τὸν]
 25 Ἀθηναίων.²⁹

and
 ὑπ[άρχειν δὲ αὐτῶι καὶ εἰς]
 τὸ λοιπὸν τὴν τε εὐνοίαν [καὶ τὴν φιλοτιμίαν]
 30 παρεχομένωι καὶ ἄλλο ἄγ[αθὸν εὐρέσθαι παρὰ]
 τῆς βουλῆς καὶ τοῦ δήμου . . .³⁰

Another small group of inscriptions concerns Athens' uneasy relations with the Antigonids, and with the Aitolians, who were at war with the Antigonids for part of this period: [1136](#); [1147](#) for the philosopher favoured by Antigonos Doson, Prytanis of Karystos, erected, as if Prytanis were an Athenian citizen, not on the acropolis, but in the agora;³¹ [1148](#), however, convincingly brought down by a century by Tracy from the date ascribed to it by Kirchner (*IG II² 443*), and identified by him as a fragment of a decree honouring the same Prytanis, is from the acropolis; [1181](#).

Much more positive in tone are the decrees cultivating good relations with the Ptolemies, Athens' major royal patrons at this period ([1146](#) for Kastor, friend of Ptolemy, [1185](#), for Thraseas, honorary member of the Athenian deme Phlya of the tribe Ptolemais, and high official of the Ptolemies, [1227](#)?); and with other cities that, like Athens, were Ptolemaic satellites, such as Ephesos. [1150](#) documents an exchange of crowns with the Ephesians and, it seems, recognition of a (revived?) Ephesian festival and appointment of Receivers of official visitors, *theorodokoi*. Uniquely, but unsurprisingly given the Ephesians' patron deity, it was erected in the agora "beside the altar of Artemis Boulaia". It is complemented by [1215](#), apparently of somewhat later date, which awards the Ephesians en masse the Athenian citizenship. The text is substantially filled out by an important new join of Tracy, from which it becomes clear that the citizenship award followed the reception at Athens of Ephesian official visitors, *theoroi*; this, together with the erection of the decree "by the Eleusinion", suggests that mutual recognition of, and presumably in the case of visitors and residents from the respective "partner" cities, initiation into, the Eleusinian and Ephesian Mysteries, played a central role in cementing this political relationship.³²

²⁹ ". . . with a foliage crown for his good will and love of honour towards the Athenian Council and People."

³⁰ "It shall be possible for him, on displaying also in the future good will and love of honour, to obtain other benefits from the Council and People."

³¹ It is not clear that Prytanis had been awarded the Athenian citizenship (we shall see below that at least one other honorary citizen at this period was given an Athenian demotic in an honorific decree), but it may also be relevant that Prytanis is invited to "dinner", *deipnon*, usually a preserve of the citizen, rather than to the "hospitality", *xenia*, usual for foreigners.

³² The sort of factors that could induce cities at this period to exchange citizenship, including "encouragement" from hellenistic monarchs designed to boost populations and to confirm mutual solidarity within their spheres of influence, are vividly illuminated by the letters of Philip V to Larisa (217-215), *Sylloge*³ 543. Cf. Chaniotis 2010, "The Castration of Sovereignty by Kings". For all we

Thanks again to Tracy's redating we now know that [1179](#), awarding the proxeny apparently to two Rhodians, belongs not, as Kirchner had thought ([IG II² 1024](#)), to the end of the 2nd century, but in a context of promoting good relations with the Ptolemies and Ptolemaic satellites in the late 3rd century.³³ The word Rhodes or Rhodian are not preserved unrestored in this text, and, on the principles of restoration adumbrated above, a degree of caution is in place, but Bardani and Tracy judge the circumstantial evidence, from the names of the honorands (Olymp(i)odoros and Didymarchos, attested in Kamiros on Rhodes³⁴), the mention of Ptolemy, and the reference to the island of Hydrea, off Hermione in the Peloponnese and not far from Attica, which Habicht takes to be part of a system of bases for the Ptolemaic fleet,³⁵ to be sufficient basis for maintaining this identification, first proposed by A. Salač in 1923 (cf. *SEG* 2.12). Somewhat disconcerting, however, at first sight, is the state of the beginning of this text:

<p>[ἐπειδὴ Ὀλυμπόδωρος καὶ Διδύμαρχος] [Ῥόδιοι εὐνοῦς τέ εἰσὶν κοινεῖ τ]ε τῶι δῆ- [μωι καὶ κατ' ἰδίαν τοῖς ἀφικ]νουμένο[ις] [τῶν πολιτῶν εἰς - ^{c.10} -]ν, διατελο[ῦ]- 5 [σιν δὲ . . .³⁶</p>	<p>non-stoich. c. 30</p>
--	--------------------------

1-2 are due to Salač, 3-4 to Bardani. That Ῥόδιοι (2) ought perhaps more properly have been demoted to the apparatus is confirmed by the state of the text in l. 4, from which it is apparent that spacing does not compel restoration of a reference to Rhodes. A little progress can perhaps be made, however. The only supplement registered in the apparatus, πολιτῶν ἡμῶν εἰς Ῥόδο]ν (“those of our citizens coming to Rhodes”) (Hallos), is, again, not in the idiom of Athenian decrees. I suggest τοῖς ἀφικ]νουμένο[ις | τῶν πολιτῶν ἀεὶ οἰαίει εἰς Ῥόδο]ν, “those citizens always coming to Rhodes”, or less likely perhaps, but not impossible in light

know, similar “encouragement” by the Ptolemies may lie in the background to the “networking” among Ptolemaic satellites apparent in these decrees.

³³ On this decree see especially C. Habicht, “Athens and the Ptolemies”, *ClAnt.* 11 (1992), 68-90, at 88-90.

³⁴ See *LGPN* I. The key point is noted by Habicht, i.e. that a Polycharmos son of Philokrates and adopted son of Didymarchos was (significantly perhaps) priest of Athena in Kamiros, ca. 226-224 BC (*Tituli Camirenses* 5 col. II ll. 48-51; *ASA* 11-13 [1949-51 (1952)], 167). Cf. ll. 24-26 where our Didymarchos was son of Poly- (ἐπαινέσαι Ὀλυ[μπόδωρον - - Διδύμαρχοι Πολυ[^{ca. 4}-⁴-⁴ Ροδίου]).

³⁵ “Hydrea seems to have been a link in the chain connecting Egypt by sea with Greece, and especially with Athens”, Habicht, 90. At l. 10 I suggest πλέον]τες εἰς Ὑδρέλ[αν. Compare [367](#), where Herakleides of Salamis was brought to land and deprived of his sails by the Herakleots while sailing to Athens, πλέων Ἀθή|ναζε (36-37) and where Dionysios, tyrant of Herakleia, is to be urged not in future to harm τῶν Ἀθή|ναζε πλεόντων (41); [393](#), where, if my supplements are correct, the honorands take care of those sailing to Achaia, ἐπιμελοῦ]νται τῶ[ν πλεόντων εἰς] Ἀχαία[ν; and [414](#), where a city is honoured for taking measures against those interfering with ships trading with Athens, and where everyone is to know, ὅτι ὁ δῆμος ὁ Ἀθηναίων] στεφανοῖ τ[οὺς - -] πλεοντ[-
- -].

³⁶ “Since Olympodoros and Didymarchos | of Rhodes are well disposed collectively to the | People and individually to those citizens | coming to Rhodes, and continue to be . . .”

of l. 10, εἰς Ὑδρέα]ν, “to Hydrea”. The expression finds good parallels in Athenian decrees. Compare [1336](#), 11-13, where, as the first editor, Lolling, realised, the short word [ἀε(ἰ)] is a compelling restoration in this non-stoichedon text for the two-letter lacuna after ἰδίαν:

κοινεῖ τε τῶι δήμῳ λέγωγ καὶ π[ρά(τ)]των ὑπὲρ τῆς πόλεως ἀγ[αθὸν]non-stoich c. 46
 ὅ τι ἂν δυνατὸς ἦι, καὶ κ(α)τ’ ἰδίαν [ἀε(ἰ)] τοῖς ἐντυγχάνουσιν αὐ[τῶι ν]
 τῶμ πολιτῶν εὐχρηστον ἑαυτ[ὸν] παρασκευάζει . . .³⁷

Clearer still is the second-century decree for -enodoros son of Eumenes of Trinemeia, *Agora* XVI 310, 6-7:

καὶ εὐσχημ[όνως καὶ κοινῆι τῶι δήμῳ καὶ ἰδίαι τῶν]
 πολιτῶν ἀεὶ [τοῖς ἀφικνουμένοις εἰς Ἀντιοχείαν],³⁸

Another interesting pair of decrees, to which Bardani and Tracy again make important contributions, deal with relations with Kydonia in Crete. [1137 I](#), of 228/7, and [II](#), of 211/0, provide for the rare honour of a statue for Eumaridas of Kydonia in recognition of his help rescuing Athenians captured in raids on Attica and shipped to Crete, and in taking action in Crete to prevent similar problems arising in future. Thanks to an important new reading of Tracy and Bardani, [1190](#), honouring the city of Kydonia, and a work of Tracy’s “Cutter of *IG II² 1706*”, ca. 229/8-c. 203, seems to belong in a comparable context of anti-piratical endeavour.³⁹ According to the most recent text before the new *IG*, published by two young scholars, N. Papazarkadas and P. Thonemann, *Hesperia* 77 (2008), 73-85, the Kydonians had “written” to the Council and People about “the benefactions which had been accomplished towards each other”:

ἐπεστά]λκασιν τῆι βουλῆι κα[ἰ]
 [τῶι δήμῳ περὶ τῶν πε]πραγμέν[ω]ν πρὸς ἀλλή-
 [λους εὐεργεσιῶν

Now, following Bardani’s autopsy, among some other adjustments to Papazarkadas and Thonemann’s suggested text, the more experienced *IG* editors read that the Kydonians had “reported” to the Council and People about “their accomplishments towards the Illyrians”:

ἀπηγγέλ]κασιν τῆι βουλῆι κα[ἰ]
 [τῶι δήμῳ περὶ τῶν πε]πραγμέν[ω]ν πρὸς [Ἰ]λλυ-
 [ριούς

³⁷ “Collectively for the People saying and doing on behalf of the city whatever good he may be capable of, and individually to those of the citizens who always encountered him, he made himself useful . . .”

³⁸ “. . . and decently, both collectively for the People and individually for the citizens always coming to Antiocheia . . .”

³⁹ I note in passing that considerations of prose rhythm suggest that (and the reader may confirm this easily by consulting the PHI database), where Bardani and Tracy print (ll. 9-10), ἐ[π]ειδὴ Κυδωνι[ᾶται ὄντες φίλοι καὶ σ]υγγενε[ῖς] τοῦ δήμου, the word order would in fact have been Κυδωνι[ᾶται φίλοι ὄντες καὶ σ]υγγενε[ῖς] (as correctly, Papazarkadas and Thonemann).

Some features here, however, cause the reader to pause. ἀπαγγέλλω is used of oral reports from those who are present in person (as in the parallel given by Bardani and Tracy, [1147](#), 22-23, of Prytanis of Karystos), which can scarcely have been true of the Kydonians en masse. Papazarkadas and Thonemann would seem to be right that ἐπιστέλλω is to be expected of written communication by those who are absent.⁴⁰ The rest of the sentence does seem to work more satisfactorily in the *IG* version, and raises the possibility that these accomplishments stand in some relation to Athens' first encounters with Rome in Rome's Illyrian Wars of 228 and 219.⁴¹ One is left wondering, however, on precisely what basis ΑΛΛΗ has been transformed into [Ι]ΛΛΥ. The new reading looks plausible from the photographs reproduced on p. 75 of Papazarkadas and Thonemann's study and at table XXIII of the new *IG*, but, as noted above, a printed photograph is not a sound basis on which to judge a difficult or contentious reading. In my own fascicule I supplied notes on readings in the prolegomena, collected as *IALD*. It is not normal *IG* style to supply such notes; but a fuller note on a transformative new reading such as this was desirable somewhere.

In [1137 I](#) Eumaridas had been awarded a statue on the acropolis. From **II** it is apparent that this was never put into effect and the statue was instead now to be erected, on the initiative of Eurykleides and Mikion, the leading Athenians of this period, in the precinct of the cult that they seem to have founded in commemoration of the "liberation" of 229, that of the People and the Graces. It was located in the agora, by the Kolonos Agoraios,⁴² but there is no explicit mention of the agora in the text.

This is not the place for extensive historical analysis, but I note that these two decrees between them account for about half the total number of substantively preserved non-probouleumatic decrees of this period (i.e. decrees which do not, in form, merely rubber stamp proposals from the Council),⁴³ a complete reversal of the situation which, as I shall show elsewhere, prevailed in the last phase of the classical democracy, when the Assembly predominated in determining the content of inscribed decrees.⁴⁴ Two points are significant about these two decrees in this context: (a) the Assembly was actively involved patently because the issue, raids on Attic territory resulting in the kidnapping of Athenian citizens, was of broad public interest (and the same factor would seem to apply also in the background to [1190](#)); and (b) what the Assembly decides in decree I, i.e. the erection of a bronze statue,

⁴⁰ The distinction is clearly made at [298](#), 8-9, where both terms are used (the rulers of the Bosporan kingdom have sent a letter and their envoys have reported in person). I am grateful to Angelos Matthaiou for discussion of this point.

⁴¹ Bardani and Tracy date [1190](#) to "ca. 215", but as in some other cases where inscriptions are dated wholly or mainly by one of Tracy's cutters, it is more helpful to the historian to date the text to the range of the cutter's dates, in this case ca. 229/8- ca. 203. (This is the policy I adopted in such cases in fascicule 2).

⁴² M. C. Monaco, "Contributi allo studio di alcuni santuari Ateniesi I: il *Temenos* del *Demos* e delle *Charites*", *AS Atene* 79 (2001), 103-50.

⁴³ The other two are [1146](#) for Kastor, and [1190](#) for Kydonia. I exclude from this calculation the Assembly decrees of prytany inscriptions, which are non-probouleumatic as a matter of form.

⁴⁴ P. J. Rhodes, *The Athenian Boule* (Oxford, 1972), 78-81, already noted a shift, after 262, in the balance between probouleumatic and non-probouleumatic decrees, away from the latter and towards the former, but his finding, on the basis of information then available, that, in the period 403/2-322/1, there was a fairly even division between probouleumatic and non-probouleumatic decrees, now requires revision. The Assembly was much more predominant in the period 352/1-322/1 than Rhodes' analysis suggested. Another significant development in this regard (also noted by Rhodes, 80) is the falling off, after 322/1, in the number of inscribed amendments to decrees passed in the Assembly. No decree of our period is followed on the stone by an inscribed amendment. This can be taken as another indicator of a docile Assembly. See further below at nn. 65 and 71.

is not carried out; is only in fact implemented when, some years later, the Assembly returns to the topic, and not in essence, because the Assembly wants it done, but because Eurykleides and Mikion think it right (ἄξιόϋσι) that it be done. There could be no clearer indication of the impotency of the Assembly at this period and of the distance Athens has travelled, since 322/1, in an oligarchic direction.

The only other decree of this period awarding the rare honour of a bronze statue is the extremely fragmentary [1214](#) of “ca. 210” (the date does not seem to be well-defined) for one Therson, whose identity, even whether he was a foreigner or an Athenian, and the circumstances of whose benefaction, are obscure. (The reference to his piety towards the gods, however, in l. 8, might suggest a donation connected with a festival or religious construction work). Here Tracy (named editor of this lemma) follows the first editor, Meritt, *Hesperia* 29 (1960), 12-13, no. 15, in restoring:

στήσαι δὲ αὐτοῦ τὸν δῆμο]ν εἰκόνα non-stoich. c. 48

[χαλκῆν ἐν ἀγορᾷ -^{ca. 8}- ἀναγράψαι δὲ τόδε τὸ ψήφι]σμα τὸν
 [γραμματέα τὸν κατὰ πρυτανείαν ἐν στήλῃ λιθίνῃ καὶ] στήσαι ἐν
 15 [ἀγορᾷ -^{ca. 17}-.

In the light of [1137](#), where the statue was to be erected first “on the acropolis” and later “in the precinct of The People and the Graces”, but never “in the agora”, the restoration of the place of erection of statue and stele as “in the agora” is questionable, and might more appropriately have been demoted to the apparatus.⁴⁵

The fundamental importance of Tracy’s contribution in dating by cutters is everywhere apparent. It is one of the virtues of his method that, where the date is indicated by general style only, and where he is not able to identify a specific hand, he does not press it (unlike his predecessors, including Kirchner, who were quite often led astray by vague stylistic datings). Thus [1238](#), honouring Eris of Byzantium and other Byzantine trierarchs, is conventionally dated to the Second Macedonian War, in which the Byzantines, along with Attalos, the Athenians and Rhodians, were allies of the Romans against Philip V. Dating the decree “ca. 200” (a “?” would have been justified), Bardani nevertheless prudently notes that the decree can not be dated securely and that, in Tracy’s judgement, the letter forms indicate rather a date in the mid-2nd century. One might compare [519](#), also perhaps honouring a Byzantine, and speculatively ascribed by earlier editors to the context of the siege of Byzantium by Philip II in 340/39, but dated by the present author more cautiously to the second half of the 4th century. Given its location, Byzantium was perpetually significant for Athenian maritime interests, in both war and peace.

Numerous decrees bear witness to the limited (by the standards of classical Athens) hellenistic modes of interstate diplomacy, or “networking” (to use the fashionable term), in a world dominated politically and militarily by the hellenistic monarchs, where the scope for independent action by any individual polis was severely curtailed. Thus [1171](#) (224-192) honours the Lamians for their successful arbitration in a dispute between Athens and Boeotia,

⁴⁵ The agora findspot of the inscription is not a decisive indicator; it is quite common for inscriptions originally erected on the acropolis to be found there. In [1281](#), of 187/6, for a cavalry commander, Bardani and Tracy are more prudent, leaving the place of erection of the statue unspecified in the text (ll. 37-38, στήσαι αὐτοῦ] | εἰκόνα χαλκ[ῆν -) and restricting speculation on possible supplements to the apparatus. The statue of king Pharnakes and queen Nysa was to be erected on Delos ([1258](#), 35-37, of 196/5). In this fascicule it is only in [1292](#), of 184/3, for the Athenian, Kephisodoros, that a bronze statue was to be erected “in the agora”, though in this case it was accompanied by a second statue “in the Piraeus in the market” (52-53, cf. 32-34).

a generation or so after a similar successful arbitration in 251/0 (cf. [997](#) and [998](#) = *IG II² 778* and [779](#)); and the decrees are full of mutual recognition of festivals, of the appointment, reception and honouring of “bearers of the truce”, *spondophoroi* (i.e. officials charged with proclaiming to other cities truces to mark the Panathenaia and other festivals for which Athens claimed Panhellenic status), “official visitors (in connection with festivals in other cities)”, *theoroi*, and “receivers of official visitors”, *theorodokoi*. For example, [1137 III](#), of 193/2 (strictly outside our period) honours Charmion son of Eumaridas of Kydonia, son of the Eumaridas we have already met, who had, among other things, served on an Athenian *theoria* to Delphi; while [1145 II](#), an Athenian decree of c. 225 which survives in a copy from Gonnoi, provides for a mass grant of proxeny status to those *theorodokoi* who had given a positive reception to Athenian *spondophoroi*. Shortly after 217, the Athenians recognise the Lykaia festival, recently revived by Megalopolis ([1184](#)). Here Bardani and Tracy wisely print a continuous restoration of ll. 1-7 by L. Robert (*BCH* 50, 1926, 495-96) in full in the apparatus. It is suggestive, and helpful to the reader, but, like some of Wilhelm’s restorations, introduces wording and entities that are not strictly implied by the surviving text or by parallels. In 208/7 the Athenians recognise the festival of Artemis Lykophryene, in response to an “official visitation” from Magnesia on the Maeander ([1170](#)). [1170](#) is also the first Athenian decree to award the official status of “inviolability” (*asylia*) to a foreign city. [1178](#), work of a cutter active between c. 229/8 and c. 203, and perhaps to be dated to 202/1, goes one step further in awarding not only inviolability, but also a mass grant of citizenship, to another Carian city, Antioch (Alabanda), a grant which, as we have seen, parallels that made to the Ephesians in [1215](#). [1242](#), an inscription from Miletos which apparently contains a summary of an Athenian decree, and dated by Tracy and Bardani “c. 200”, seems also to be a record of the renewal of an already existing mass citizenship grant, for the benefit of a number of named Milesians resident at Athens.⁴⁶

In the Lykourgan period, which in some ways parallels this one, there is a series of Athenian inscriptions (mainly laws) recording measures taken specifically to boost the city’s own religious and festival life;⁴⁷ and [1160](#), the decree honouring Eurykleides, suggests that, apart from the new cult of “The People and the Graces”, there were similar enhancements at this period (note especially the reference to the introduction of a competition at l. 24). Inscribed decrees (or laws) providing for such enhancements, however, are lacking in this period. Bardani and Tracy’s brief comment on the very fragmentary [1183](#), “tit. spectat ad sacra et caerimonia Euryclide et Miciona auctoribus post a. 229 a. rediviva” (“the inscription relates to a religious revival led by Eurykleides and Mikion after 229”) - it is a work of Tracy’s “Cutter of Agora I 7181”, 224/3-188/7, and dated in *IG* “ca. 200” - raises the possibility that it might be an exception; but the rather slight surviving text would seem consistent with this belonging in a context of mutual recognition of festivals, similar to those decrees just mentioned.⁴⁸

It is a very welcome development in this *IG* that copies of Athenian decrees erected outside Attica are included; among other things this makes it less likely that they will be overlooked by Attic specialists. I have already mentioned the important decree from Gonnoi, [1145](#), and from Miletos, [1242](#). [1239](#), of perhaps ca. 200 (though Tracy has not in this case identified the hand and the date can not therefore be pinned down with any confidence) honouring envoys from Priene sent to the Panathenaia (renewing, it seems, a tradition initiated in 326/5, see W. Blümel and R. Merkelbach eds., *Die Inschriften von Priene*, Bonn, 2014, no. 5), is another important case. Here Bardani and Tracy’s edition is valuably

⁴⁶ On mass grants of citizenship in this period cf. above n. 32.

⁴⁷ See [348](#), [355](#), [447](#), [448](#), [449](#), [551](#).

⁴⁸ Tracy’s fuller remarks, 1990, 66 (on *IG II² 994*) are more nuanced.

supplemented by a still more recent edition of this same inscription, [I Priene 99](#), which is fuller, more helpful, and as regards the history of the text, more accurate than that in the new *IG*. It also rightly demotes some of the restorations accepted by Tracy and Bardani into their text, to the apparatus. In particular Blümel and Merkelbach are wisely more cautious in ll. 6-7, where, according to the *IG* text (which, as Blümel and Merkelbach make clear, but the *IG* does not, goes back to Wilamowitz in Hiller’s old edition of the inscriptions of Priene, *Inschriften von Priene*, 1906, no. 45), the Athenians “resettled” the Prienians, “after their [removal under Cyrus]”, ἀλνώ]ικισαν αὐτοὺς Ἀθηναῖοι μετὰ τὴν ἐπὶ [Κύρου ἀνάστασιν]. This creates a reference to the enslavement of the Prienians back in the sixth century under Cyrus the Great recorded in Hdt. 1.161 (an important reference which Tracy and Bardani curiously omit to supply).⁴⁹ Here Blümel and Merkelbach print: κατῶ]ικισαν αὐτοὺς Ἀθηναῖοι μετὰ τὴν ἐπὶ [- - -], supplying good parallels for κατῶ]ικισαν, “settled”.⁵⁰ One can indeed speculate further on the precise wording that might be restored here;⁵¹ but there is an important higher level point, which even Merkelbach and Blümel’s more cautious approach does not fully account for. There seems, in fact, to be no evidence, independent of this text, for exactly what the Athenians did with the Prienians, precisely when, and in what circumstances.⁵² Moreover, a mention of Cyrus would introduce a specific reference to a very distant historical event of a kind that would be unique in this group of decrees. There is a serious danger here of “history from square brackets” in a rather strong sense. I would print:

-ῶ]ικισαν αὐτοὺς Ἀθηναῖοι μετὰ τὴν ΕΠΙ[- - -]

register the various alternative restorations that have been suggested in the apparatus (ΕΠΙ may, of course, be the initial letters of a noun), and note in the commentary that Herodotos 1.161 records the enslavement of the Prienians in the 6th century in the context of the conquest of Asia Minor under Cyrus the Great, and that we seem here to have evidence that, ca. 200, there was a tradition that the Athenians had taken some action in relation to the (re)settlement of the Prienians, which is defined as having taken place after some event. That might have been their enslavement under Cyrus, but it might have been some later event in closer proximity to the (re)settlement.

One restoration that was not demoted from the text by either pair of editors, but should have been, occurs at the beginning of the motion, where we read that “since the Prienians, being friends and kinsmen from olden times . . .”,

⁴⁹ Μαζάρης δὲ μετὰ ταῦτα ἐστρατεύετο ἐπὶ τοὺς συμπολιορκήσαντας Τάβαλον, καὶ τοῦτο μὲν Πριηνέας ἐξηνδραποδίατο, τοῦτο δὲ Μαιάνδρου πεδῖον πᾶν ἐπέδραμε λήϊν ποιεύμενος τῷ στρατῷ, Μαγνησίαν τε ὤσαύτως. “After this Mazares [general under Cyrus] campaigned against those who were participating in the siege of Tabalos, and on the one hand he enslaved the Prienians, and on the other overran the whole plain of the Maeander gathering booty for the army, and Magnesia similarly.”

⁵⁰ Angelos Matthaiou per ep. adds Thuc. 5.35.7.

⁵¹ Angelos Matthaiou suggests per ep. that one might also register in the apparatus the possibilities [συγκατῶ]ικισαν (cf. Thuc. 6.8.2) and, as being closer to Herodotos’ wording, [Κύρου ἀνδραπόδισιν] (cf. Xen. *Apol. Socr.* 25).

⁵² Blümel and Merkelbach record Hiller’s speculation that Priene was refounded at the time of the Athenian Empire.

5 [- -^{ca. 6} - - ε]ἴπεν· ἐπειδὴ Πριηνεῖς φίλο[ι καὶ συγγενεῖς ὑπάρ]- non-stoich. c. 41
[χοντες] ἐκ παλαιῶν χρόνων με[τ?]- -

The language here derives from *I Priene* 5, 5-6, where the Prienians send a panoply to Athens as a “memorial of the kinship and friendship which existed from the beginning for us towards them”,

μνημεῖον τῆς ἕξ ἀρχῆς συγγενείας καὶ φιλίας
ἡμῖν ὑπαρχούσης πρὸς αὐτούς·

but there is, in truth, little reason to suppose that our Athenian decree will follow, in its detailed expression, a Prienian one of a century earlier, and the restoration of [1239](#), 4-5, awkwardly lacks the expression, normal in such cases in Athenian decrees, of who the Prienians are friends and kinsmen of. Preferable is the formulaic Athenian phrase in this position:

ἐπειδὴ Πριηνεῖς φίλο[ι τοῦ δήμου τοῦ Ἀθηναίων]
[ῶντες] ἐκ παλαιῶν χρόνων

Retaining syllabification at the end of the line (it is unclear whether that is appropriate in this text), this makes l. 4 45.5 letters long, counting iota as a half letter. Compare l. 10, 45 letters long as restored; and for the language e.g. [1170](#), 7-8:

ἐπειδὴ Μάγνη-
τες οἱ ἐπὶ Μαϊάνδρῳι οικεῖοι καὶ φίλοι τοῦ δήμου τοῦ Ἀθηναί-
ων ὄντες

Other comparanda can easily be traced via the index p. 283, s.v. φίλος.

It ought also to be possible to do more with the fragmentarily preserved account of what exactly the Prienian envoys had done. According to both pairs of editors, the Prienians “sent ambassadors to the Panathenaia, who [verb] the [feminine noun] . . . which [neuter] there was for Athena Archegetis and Polis-holder of the polis”,

10 [ἀπεσ]τάλκα[σιν πρεσβευτὰς]
[εῖς Π]αναθήναι[α] τοὺς μεθ^{-ca. 5}- ας τὴν Ἀ- - - - -
^{-c.4}-v τὸ γενόμενον τεῖ Ἀθην[ᾶ]ι τεῖ Ἀρχη[γέτιδι καὶ πο]-
[λιούχ]ωι τῆς πόλεως·

Suppl. von Prott ap. Hiller. 10 fin. Tracy.

and both note that the letter traces are not consistent with Wilhelm’s suggested restoration (*WSt* 29, 1907, 10 = *Kl. Schriften* II 5, 290), τοὺς [ἀποίσιοντα]ς τῆ[ν πανοπλίαν καὶ τὸ ἀριστεῖο]ν, with Merkelbach and Blümel recording also Hiller’s reading of a dotted vertical after the theta and Q after Ἀ. For the time being I note that Athena elsewhere in the third century is indeed Archegetis at the Panathenaia or the related Chalkeia festival, at which the

process of weaving the *peplos* was initiated;⁵³ see [911](#) ([SEG 28.60](#)), of 270/69; and indeed at [900](#) (= [IG II² 674](#) = [Agora XV 78](#)), of 273/2, ll. 16-17, we have a close parallel for the phraseology of this decree:

ὅπως ἄν δὲ καὶ τὰ Χαλκεῖα θύσωσιν τῆ<ι> Ἀθηνᾶι τεῖ Ἀρχη[γέτιδι τ]-
ῆς πόλεως⁵⁴

but that καὶ πολιοῦχ]ωι seems doubtful. Πολιοῦχος is, of course, a well-known poetical epithet of Athena (as e.g. ὦ πολιοῦχε Παλλάς, Ar. *Knights* 581), but the repetition of the idea of “of the polis” in “polis-holder of the polis”, aside from questions about whether “polis” here signifies the acropolis or the city, is awkward and unidiomatic in Attic epigraphic prose.⁵⁵ Less awkward would be “key-holder of the polis”, κλειδοῦχ]ωι,⁵⁶ which, with its resonance of the priestess, might be in place in connection with the *peplos*, if indeed we have to do with the *peplos* here; but in the absence of close parallels in Attic inscriptions we had better admit that we do not know what stood in the text at this point. Bardani and Tracy can be forgiven for not supplying a full new edition of an inscription from Priene, but they did trouble to examine the old squeeze in Berlin, and there was perhaps scope for a more critical approach.⁵⁷

Two decrees in this set are said to honour doctors. In the case of [1240](#), an Athenian decree from Cos, and assumed to honour a Coan doctor named Kleom-, this may be right, but there is no wording in the decree that definitely implies the honorand’s profession (that he “made himself useful” is consistent with, but does not necessarily imply, it), the ethnic is completely restored and the identification rests on the apparent fact (there seems to be some uncertainty) that the decree derives from the Asklepieion at Cos. In the no less fragmentary [1213](#) there is much more explicit wording. We have reference to “bodily health” (σωμάτων ὑγείας), and “prescribed foods” (ταχθείσας τροφὰς) and, more obscurely, “introductions” (καὶ τὰς εἰσαγωγὰς) and Tracy and Bardani loyally assert the rightness of Kirchner’s view ([IG II² 931](#)) that the decree honours a doctor who fulfilled an Athenian office (this seems to be the implication of ll. 9-10), though they do not address the possibility that the honorand might in that case actually have been a public doctor. In truth, however, the wording of this decree would seem unparalleled, for doctors or anyone else, and a more cautious approach to interpretation would have been advisable.⁵⁸ It seems obvious from the lack of proper medical-historical bibliography on these two decrees (and, I might add, from my own work on the

⁵³ See Parker 2005, 464-65.

⁵⁴ “In order that they may sacrifice also the Chalkeia to Athena Archegetis of the city . . .”

⁵⁵ Such epigraphic parallels as there are for this adjective seem to be non-Attic, as e.g. τὰν Ἀθαναίαν τὰν | Πολιοῦχον καὶ τὸν | Ἀπέλλωνα τὸν Ποίτιον, A. Chanotis, *Die Verträge zwischen kretischen Poleis in der hellenistischen Zeit* (Stuttgart, 1996), 196 no. 7, 22-24, and/or verse (Epidaurus: *IG IV² 1*, 128, 16; W. Peek, *Neue Inschriften aus Epidaurus* [Berlin, 1972], no. 91).

⁵⁶ . . . ἡ πόλιν ἡμετέραν ἔχει | καὶ κράτος φανερόν μόνῃ | κληδοῦχος τε καλεῖται. “. . . who alone holds our city and whose power is manifest and is called key-holder”. Ar. *Thesm.* 1140-42.

⁵⁷ As Merkelbach and Blümel point out, pp. 245-46, the *IG* incorrectly ascribes to D. McCabe restorations proposed by Hiller in his Appendix, p. 310; and it ascribes to Curbera the articulation of the name Ἀρκεφῶντος (25), in fact originally suggested by Hiller (p. 51).

⁵⁸ Vivian Nutton raises per ep. the possibility that the decree honoured an ephobic official. I am also grateful to Laurence Totelin for her advice on this inscription.

two decrees for the doctor, Euenor, [324](#)⁵⁹) that a systematic treatment of inscribed Athenian decrees relating to, or thought to relate to, the medical profession, is a desideratum.⁶⁰

This set of decrees includes a number of more or less fragmentary inscriptions honouring foreigners where the circumstances of the honours are unclear: [1159](#) with its striking reference, highly unusual at this period, to a military context (-ις στρατευομε[- - ἐφ' ἡγεμονίας; Bardani and Tracy sensibly relegate Wilhelm's suggested supplements to the apparatus); [1216](#) for the People of Kyme (now datable, thanks to Tracy's identification of the hand, to 226/5-190); [1217](#), a fragmentary proxeny, again dated by hand to ca. 210;⁶¹ [1218](#), a citizenship decree now datable ca. 210-200; [1230](#) for a man from Taras, dated "after 272 BC" in previous *IG* editions, but now dated by its hand to 224/3-188/7; [1241](#) for a Dionysios son of Simi-, dated by Tracy from the lettering style to ca. 200 BC; [1243](#) (= *IG* II² 893bc) for an Eretrian, datable to ca. 200 and thanks to Tracy's work already in 1978 dissociated from *IG* II² 893a.⁶² On [1186](#), for Androkydes of Berenikidai, and [1187](#), for Nikon, see further below.

Decrees Honouring Athenians: Introduction

The majority of decrees in this group honour Athenian citizens. A genre of decree which began to be inscribed regularly only in the 340s, it had evolved so that, by this period, the inscriptions fall, with a very small number of exceptions, into three more or less formulaic subsets. In order of surviving numbers of inscriptions they are: those honouring the Council prytany, i.e. the 50-member tribal contingent of the Council that acted as its executive committee for, in this period, either a twelfth or a thirteenth of the year.⁶³ Conventionally the inscriptions consisted of a Council decree honouring the officials of the prytany and a decree of the Assembly honouring the prytany as a whole. The second category is those honouring the young men who underwent the official regime of military training and citizen acculturation, the ephebes; and the third, those honouring the managers of the Eleusinian Mysteries. This trio is highly significant for the idea of itself (an idea which can be traced back at least as far as Pericles' funerary oration) that the city wished to convey, to itself and to outsiders: a political show-case, a paideutic beacon, and a festival centre sans pareil.

From the classical democracy there is just one inscribed prytany decree extant ([417](#), of 340-325); the genre did not become established until after the re-introduction of "democracy" in 307/6.⁶⁴ As we have already seen, though there has been for many years some awareness of the extent to which the Council became dominant over the Assembly as

⁵⁹ Cf. the somewhat later decree awarding citizenship to the same man, *IG* II² 374 = E. Samama, *Les médecins dans le monde grec. Sources épigraphiques sur la naissance d'un corps médical* (Geneva, 2003), no. 6.

⁶⁰ Samama, nos. 1-27 prints 27 Attic texts referring to doctors. This is a useful starting point, albeit that the collection appears to be incomplete (I could trace no mention of either of our two decrees, though the absence of an index makes this work somewhat difficult to use) and the epigraphical references are in places outdated.

⁶¹ Where Bardani and Tracy print (l. 7) -ΓΕ-^{ca. 3}- τῆς πόλ[εως, one might think of εὐερ]γέ[τη . τῆς πόλ[εως.

⁶² Also honouring foreigners, but too fragmentary to yield useful information, are [1192](#) and [1228](#); [1219](#), [1244](#) and [1245](#) (citizenship grants); [1229](#) (might honour Athenians, but the acropolis findspot and the wording in l. 5 suggests that the honorands were probably foreigners).

⁶³ From 508/7-308/7 there were the ten Cleisthenic tribes; in 307/6 were added Antigonis and Demetrias making twelve; in 223/2 was added a thirteenth, Ptolemais; in 201/0 Antigonis and Demetrias were abolished and Attalis created, making twelve again.

⁶⁴ On the hollowing out of the meaning of the term "democracy" in the hellenistic period see the penetrating observations of Chaniotis 2010.

a policy-making body in the third century, the extent of the shift since the end of the classical democracy is only now coming to be recognised.⁶⁵ It seems very likely that the increased prominence of the Council in the epigraphic record of inscribed decrees reflects its increased prominence in the Athenian polity; and the prytany decrees, as a series, may be seen as a celebration by the city of its own collective leadership.

The ephebate of this period had also evolved from an institution established in the Lykourgan period, namely by Epikrates' ephebic reform law of about 335.⁶⁶ The ephebes were honoured initially by the Council and by the tribes and demes of which they were members or with which they were associated, and under the classical democracy we only know about the involvement of the central organs of the city in these honours because, in one case, the ephebes took the initiative to inscribe an honorific decree of the Council along with those of the tribe and demes on their commemorative dedication: [IG II² 1156](#) (cf. [1155](#), both translated on AIO). In that inscription the tribe Kekropis alone supplied ca. 42 ephebes, a figure fairly typical of the other ephebic inscriptions of the period;⁶⁷ and there is no indication that the ephebes were honoured by the Assembly. By our period, there have been two radical shifts: the numbers of ephebes has reduced to ca. 20-30 for the whole city (see further below), and the prominence that they are given has increased, both in that they are now honoured by the Assembly,⁶⁸ and in that the wording of the decrees has become much fuller and more extravagant. Nothing could illustrate more clearly the shift of the city's centre of gravity, over the century and more since the ephebate had been created, from a broad collective to a tiny elite.

The Eleusinian Mysteries were the most potent Athenian contribution to the Greek religious experience. It is clear from the epigraphical record of this period more broadly that they played an important role in Athens' relations with other Greek cities, in the context of the hellenistic system of "diplomacy by *theoria*", briefly sketched above. It was crucial to the good image of the city that the festival be managed efficiently and by men who were willing to donate generously of their time and resources. It is no surprise that the holders of this responsible position were, alongside the Council prytany and the ephebes, the third category of Athenian routinely honoured at this period by inscribed decree.

Decrees Honouring Athenians: Prytany Decrees (and Chronology)

No less than ca. 40 of the 121 decrees of this period are prytany decrees, roughly the same as the number honouring foreigners.⁶⁹ Erected at this period in the "prytanikon" (identified by Meritt and Traill with the *tholos* in the agora),⁷⁰ they include two, [1144](#) and [1162](#), published here for the first time. Much of the historical value of these decrees lies in the lists of names of councillors and Council officials that they supply; there are enough of them to generate meaningful statistics, and a full prosopographical and statistical analysis of these men and their socio-economic backgrounds and status is a pressing desideratum. In the meantime, of the new inscriptions, [1162](#) in particular, honouring the prytany of Aiantis in

⁶⁵ See above n. 44, and further below, at n. 71.

⁶⁶ [550](#) is evidence for the Eutaxia liturgy, which was perhaps part of the new ephebic system.

⁶⁷ See the discussion of numbers of ephebes at P. J. Rhodes and Robin Osborne, *Greek Historical Inscriptions 404-323 BC* (Oxford, 2003, revised 2007), pp. 453-56.

⁶⁸ The ephebic decrees are always probouleumatic, however; i.e. they enact unchanged a proposal from the Council.

⁶⁹ The full list is: [1139](#), [1144](#), [1149](#), [1152](#), [1153](#), [1155](#), [1162](#), [1165](#), [1168](#), [1177](#), [1180](#), [1197-1203](#), [1204?](#), [1205-8](#), [1211](#), [1212](#), [1222?](#), [1223-6](#), [1231-6](#), [1246-9](#), [1254](#).

⁷⁰ *Agora XV* p. 3. Cf. however R. E. Wycherley, *The Athenian Agora. III Literary and Epigraphical Testimonia* (Princeton, 1957), 184.

214/3, confirms the picture that has been emerging of a quite narrow ruling elite. It has become clear, thanks to the work of Tracy, of P. J. Rhodes and especially of Sean Byrne, that the classical rule that Athenians could serve on the Council only twice in a lifetime had by now been abandoned;⁷¹ and [1162](#) fills out the picture that has been emerging of men who enjoyed quite frequently iterating terms on the Council. One man, Demophon of Marathon (l. 66), also appears in the very fragmentary prytany list of Aiantis in ca. 240-230 ([1070](#) = *Agora XV* 113, 6), five men (lines 69, 71, 77, 93 and 97) also appear in the Aiantis list of perhaps eight years previously (cf. [1152](#), 54, 51, 46, 60, 58) and three names (ll. 88-89 and 112) recur in the list of 180/79 ([1307](#), 84, 86, 70). Textually, however, the decrees are quite formulaic and present few challenges of epigraphical interest. I make just a few observations.

I have emphasised the importance of Tracy's contributions to the dating of Athenian inscriptions through his work on cutters. There are, however, many other aspects to Athenian chronography, a complex topic which no editor of a corpus of Athenian decrees can avoid, since decree prescripts supply most of our evidence for the operation of the Athenian calendar, and an understanding of it in turn affects the restoration of incompletely preserved prescripts.⁷² Unlike in the period covered by fascicules 1 and 2 of this corpus (403/2-322/1), and as the chronological table presented on pp. 290-92 of the new *IG* demonstrates, there are still some years in the range 229/8-198/7 whose eponymous archon is unknown. Thanks, however, largely to the work of John Morgan, Professor in the Department of Physics and Astronomy in the University of Delaware, the known archons of this period can now be dated much more firmly.⁷³ Morgan's work is unfortunately still largely unpublished, but a note of his main finding was issued in the record of the 97th annual meeting of the Archaeological Institute of America,⁷⁴ and he has been generous in sharing his expertise with interested epigraphists and historians, including *IG* editors. He has demonstrated that the Metonic cycle (announced by the astronomer Meton in 432), whereby years were designated as ordinary or intercalary in a fixed cycle of nineteen years, twelve of which were ordinary and seven intercalary, was, in years for which we have sufficient evidence, strictly adhered to. His findings have been accepted by other labourers in this field, including Christian Habicht (for the hellenistic period in general),⁷⁵ Michael Osborne and Sean Byrne, editors of the forthcoming fascicule 4 of *IG* II³ 1 (299/8-230/29), the present author (for 352/1-322/1, the earliest period for which the operation of the cycle can be demonstrated),⁷⁶ and also by Tracy and Bardani (see p. 292 note 3 to the chronological table, on the dating of the archon Thrasymphon, the crucial piece in the jigsaw, to 220/19, rather than, as previously thought,

⁷¹ S. V. Tracy, "Antigonos Gonatas, King of Athens", in O. Palagia and S. V. Tracy, *The Macedonians in Athens, 322-229 BC* (Oxford, 2003), 56-60 at 60; P. J. Rhodes, "Classical and Hellenistic in Athenian History", in E. Dąbrowa ed., *Electrum* 11 (2006), 27-43, at 33; S. G. Byrne, "Proposers of Athenian State Decrees, 286-261 BC", in A. P. Matthaiou and G. E. Malouchou eds., *Attikai Epigraphai. Praktika ... Wilhelm*, (Athens, 2004), 313-25; and above all, S. G. Byrne, "[Agora XV 112](#) and Iteration of Council Service in Hellenistic Athens", in A. Themis and N. Papazarkadas eds., *Attika Epigraphika. Meletes ... Habicht* (Athens, 2009), 215-23. The date at which it was abandoned, however, is as yet unclear.

⁷² On the basic structure of the Athenian calendar see [AIO Papers no. 5, 2 n. 3](#).

⁷³ Also fundamental is the archon list of 229/8-213/2, *IG* II² 1706, as re-edited by S. Dow, "The List of Archontes, *IG* II² 1706", *Hesp.* 2 (1933), 418-46, with the new fragment, *SEG* 14.87.

⁷⁴ "The Calendar and the Chronology of Athens", *AJA* 100 (1996), 395. The paper, as delivered, was a tour de force.

⁷⁵ See Habicht 1997, v-vi.

⁷⁶ See my "Athenian Chronology 352/1-322/1 BC", in A. Tamis, C. J. Mackie and S. G. Byrne eds., *Philathenaios. Studies in Honour of Michael J. Osborne* (Athens, 2010), 91-102 = *IALD* 389-400.

221/0).⁷⁷ The net effect is that the years allocated to specific archons in 229/8-198/7 almost all differ from those to which they had been allocated in *IG II²*; most are downdated by a year.

Morgan has also made important progress on the range of other issues relating to the Athenian calendar, many of which were left in disorder in consequence of the irresponsible wrangling of Meritt and Pritchett; and on most issues a consensus is quietly building behind his main views. As far as this period is concerned, the other crucial observation, apparent from the table on pp. 290-92, is that the secretary cycle was in operation,⁷⁸ except, apparently, for a disruption sometime between 201/0 and 197/6, presumably connected with the abolition of the Macedonian tribes in 201/0 and the creation of Attalis.⁷⁹ One point on which Morgan has yet to publish his findings and on which there is not as yet a clear consensus is the extent to which there were irregularities in the prytany calendar. In private communications Morgan has argued strongly that, in the fourth century democracy,⁸⁰ the rule enunciated by Ath. Pol. 43.2 applied, namely that the first four prytanies of a year had 36 days, and the remaining six 35 days, and that this should be extrapolated pro rata to intercalary years, in which, under the ten tribes, there were 39 days in the first four prytanies and 38 in the others. In Morgan's view our working hypothesis should be that, at all periods, calendrical irregularities were accommodated by manipulation of the lunar calendar, not the prytanies. My own findings were consistent with this,⁸¹ and it informed my presentation of calendrical matters in fascicule 2. Bardani and Tracy, however, do not appear to have adopted a position on this point; and I note, for example that, in relation to one of Shear's new texts, [1163](#), 46-47, the editors would still account for a calendrical anomaly by assuming manipulation of the prytany calendar rather than the lunar calendar. In general, in relation to calendar equations Bardani and Tracy seem more content than I was to record previous scholars' views, relegating doubtful or controversial cases to the apparatus, rather than reworking prescripts themselves. This is reasonable enough; but it leaves scope for others to adduce new solutions. For the time being I note just one calendrical point, which happens to arise in the first prytany decree in this set, [1139](#) for the prytany of Kekropis (227/6).

The decree of the People, inscribed first on the stone, dates to intercalated 25th of intercalated Hekatombaion (Ἐκατονβαιῶνος [ύσ]πέρου ἕκκει μετ' εἰκάδας ἐμβολίμωι,

⁷⁷ It would have been helpful to the reader if the chronological table at pp. 290-92, and the equivalent in fasc. 2 at pp. 239-40, had included the information that, according to the Metonic system, the intercalary years were the 2nd, 5th, 8th, 10th, 13th, 16th and 18th of the cycle (cf. my table, *IALD* 390-92, with p. 393).

⁷⁸ That is to say, the secretary of the Council, otherwise known as the prytany secretary, named in the prescript of Athenian decrees, and in office, like the archon, for a year, was appointed from the tribes in sequence according to their official order. So: e.g. the secretary of 228/7 was from tribe IX, of 227/6 from tribe X, etc.

⁷⁹ 202/1 has a secretary from tribe X, in 196/5 the secretary is also from tribe X. The tribes of the secretaries of the intervening years are not known.

⁸⁰ We do not have relevant evidence from the period of fascicule 1, but the system perhaps started on the restoration of democracy after the fall of the Thirty, cf. Lambert 2014, 3.

⁸¹ *IALD* 398-99, where I also briefly noted the (currently uncertain) state of scholarship on other outstanding issues, in particular the sequence of full and hollow months, and the omitted day in the hollow month, where there has come to be a fair degree of consensus that it was δευτέρα μετ' εἰκάδας, the penultimate day (a view which informed fascicule 2), but where Morgan has been developing a theory that it may have varied, depending on the needs of the festival calendar. Cf. Lambert 2014, 3.

ll. 3-4). Bardani follows Dow's 1937 study of the prytany decrees⁸² in restoring the fragmentary first line of the Council's decree, the last preserved line of the inscription, as follows:

[Ἐκατονβαιῶνος ὑστέρου πέμπτ]ει μετ' εἰ[κάδας]
On the 26th of intercalated Hekatombaion

This is hazardous. [Ἐκατονβαιῶνος ὑστέρου would seem to be secured, not indeed by parallels for the relative timing of the two decrees, but by the amount of space available to the left of the surviving letters, which seems to dictate a very long month description. μετ' εἰ[κάδας] is also reasonable. The inscription is stoichedon 36 with syllabification at line-ends (and quite a few irregularities, including 37-letter lines in ll. 25-29). πέμπτ]ει, however, is insecure. Parallels suggest that it was normal for the Council decree to postdate the People's by a number of days, but there is no reason to suppose it would have been passed on what was (assuming no further irregularities) the very next day.⁸³ Dow's restoration produces a line of 37 letters, which is quite possible. One might, however, arrive at a line of 36 letters, and avoid the need to posit a stoichedon irregularity, with τρίτ]ει μετ' εἰ[κάδας] (28th). 28th Hekatombaion is the day of the Panathenaic procession, and as such would, of course, normally be avoided for a Council meeting, as probably would most of the preceding days (including 26th),⁸⁴ but this decree supplies some supporting evidence in favour of the common sense view that festivals were not normally repeated in cases where the dates on which they usually occurred were duplicated by intercalation.

One of the tribal officials conventionally honoured in these inscriptions is the priest of the eponymous (i.e. the tribal eponym) and we know that, in all tribes except Erechtheis, Kekropis and Hippothontis, the priests were members of the relevant tribe. Those three tribes had priests from *gene* which served the cults of the eponyms, and whose members did not belong the tribe itself: Eteoboutadai in the case of Erechtheis; Amyndridai in the case of Kekropis; and an unknown *genos* in the case of Hippothontis. Unfortunately our evidence is insufficient in the case of other tribes to determine what the mechanism of appointment was. In these cases the priests may have been appointed directly from the relevant tribe, or from a *genos* which had members in the relevant tribe.⁸⁵ In the fragmentary [1201](#), of ca. 215, the priest of the eponymous is named as Androkles of Sphettos (Ἀνδρο[κλ]ῆν Σφή[ττιο]ν), member of a well-known family now known to be descended from a pair of wealthy brothers, Xenokles and Androkles, sons of Xeinis of Sphettos, who were prominent and influential towards the end of the classical democracy and through into the democratic restoration after 307/6, and who can now be seen as supplying a precedent for the later wealthy pair of

⁸² S. Dow, *Prytaneis: A Study of Inscriptions Honoring the Athenian Councillors*, Princeton 1937 (*Hesperia Suppl.* 1), 29, with no explicit argument.

⁸³ Thus, to take the next four prytany decrees with well preserved prescripts: in [1153](#) (222/1), both decrees are passed in a Posideon (an intercalary month is possible), the Council decree on the second of a prytany, the decree of the People on - δ]εκάτει τῆς πρυτανείας; in [1155](#) (219/8) the prescripts are attached to the wrong decrees, but the Council decree was apparently passed on pryt. VI 4 (in Posideon), and the People's decree on pryt. V (VI on the stone) 16 (in Maimakterion); in [1162](#) (214/3) the Council's decree was passed on pryt. V 8 (in Pyanopsion), the People's decree on pryt. IV 23 (in Boedromion); in [1168](#) the Council decree was passed on pryt. IV 3, the People's on pryt. III 20+.

⁸⁴ Cf. J. D. Mikalson, *The Sacred and Civil Calendar of the Athenian Year* (Princeton, 1975), 34; Parker 2005, Table 3.

⁸⁵ On this see Lambert 2010, 150.

brothers, Eurykleides and Mikion.⁸⁶ Bardani and Tracy do not register the fact, but this should imply that the prytany in [1201](#) was Akamantis. Also, as I have noted elsewhere,⁸⁷ it makes it very likely that the same man should be identified as priest of the eponymous in the prytany inscription of Akamantis of 222/1, [1153](#), 54-55, where Tracy and Bardani register in the apparatus the supplement ἐπαινέσα[ι δὲ καὶ τὸν ἱερέα τοῦ ἐπωνύμου Ξενοκλέα Ξεῖνι]δος Σφήττιον, but neglect to note the more attractive (in the light of [1201](#)) alternative, Ἀνδροκλῆν Ξεῖνι]δος Σφήττιον.

Similarly, given that Aristonimos son of Aristonimos of Pithos (an Eteoboutad⁸⁸) was priest of the eponymous of Erechtheis in [1202](#), [1212](#), where the same man was priest, can also be identified as a prytany inscription of Erechtheis.

The ubiquity of prytany decrees in this period suggests that the very fragmentary [1248](#), of ca. 200, which contains the formulaic passage resolving that the “good things that occurred in the sacrifices” be accepted, is probably, as Tracy and Bardani entitle it, a prytany decree; but the same wording occurs at around this period in decrees honouring priests (e.g. [1020](#) = *IG II² 775+803* of 244/3, [1026](#) = *IG II² 776* of 236/5) and other officials (e.g. [995 I](#), of 252/1) who perform sacrifices, and it can not be ruled out that we have to do with such an honorand, or honorands (singular or plural is possible) in this case.

Decrees Honouring Athenians: Ephebes

There are now 12 decrees from this period honouring ephebes: [1158](#) for the ephebes of 219/8, [1161](#) for the ephebes of 216/5, and [1167](#) and [1169](#) for those of 213/2 and 209/8, are very fragmentary, as are the not precisely datable fragments, [1193](#), [1194](#), [1195](#), [1196](#) and [1237](#). [1166](#), for the ephebes of 214/3, is a good example of the efficacy of the Tracy-Bardani collaboration. Fr. a contains the bulk of the text and was first published by Tracy in 1979 (*Hesperia* 48, 174-78). Bardani now joins a small fragment (b), first published by Meritt, *Hesperia* 16, 1947, 168-69, no. 65, a good example of the phenomenon I mentioned above: a small fragment of little importance in itself, but now gaining significance from a join. In this case the fragment enables lines 29-33 of fr. a to be completed, confirming some of Tracy’s original restorations, and requiring others to be modified. There is nothing left, however, of the restorations of fr. b proposed by Meritt in his editio princeps. Independently of the new fragment, Bardani also deftly improves Tracy’s original restorations of lines 17-18, 19-20 and 22-23. Except for a convincing restoration of l. 12, proposed by Gauthier in 1985 (*Chiron* 15, 151-53), εὐσεβῶ[ς καθάπερ | παρήγγειλαν α]ὔτοῖς ὅ τε βασιλεὺς, on the basis of a good parallel ([1176](#), 12-13),⁸⁹ we have to thank Tracy and Bardani for the whole

⁸⁶ Our knowledge of the Xenokles-Androkles family has advanced significantly thanks to work on *IG II³*: see my note on [550](#), 20; *IALD* 231-33, 296-98 and 404; S. D. Lambert, “The First Athenian *Agonothetai*”, *Horos* 14-16 (2000-2003), 99-105. As Sean Byrne will shortly reveal when fascicule 4 is published, both a Xenokles of Sphettos ([1011](#), 57, formerly *IG II² 791*) and an Androkles of Sphettos (Ἀνδροκλῆς [Σ]φήτ(τιος)) appear on the inscribed list of contributors to the public subscription of 248/7 ([1011](#), 130). The topic can not be pursued here, but suffice it to note that, in the Athenian inheritance system, wealthy pairs of brothers most likely imply that their wealth was primarily inherited. Cf. the comments of Chaniotis 2010 on inherited influence, and my remarks on this topic in Lambert 2012.

⁸⁷ “Ten Notes on Attic Inscriptions”, *ZPE* 135 (2000), 51-62 at p. 58 = *IALD* 232-33. I was anticipated here by Pritchett.

⁸⁸ Cf. Blok and Lambert 2009, 98, 111, 112.

⁸⁹ Superseding J. and L. Robert, *Bull. ép.* 1981, 217, εὐσεβῶ[ς καθὼς ἀπομαρτυροῦσιν α]ὔτοῖς.

of this important text, broadly, but not precisely, similar to [1176](#), for the ephebes of 204/3.

Collaboration across the boundaries of the fascicules of this project has been of great value; witness, for example, the number of contributions by Matthaiou registered in the apparatus of fascicule 2. Byrne also contributed valuably to that fascicule (see for example [311](#)); and it is no surprise that, in [1221](#), he has also made a small, but brilliant, contribution to fasc. 5. He completely transforms a fragmentary decree, incorrectly dated (to 291/0) and incorrectly read and restored by the first editor as belonging to the top of a decree (M. Walbank, *Hesp.* 54, 1985, 321-33 no. 7 = [SEG 35.86](#)), to yield part of an ephebic catalogue from the bottom of a decree of ca. 210, displaying the characteristic erasure of the tribe names, Antigonis and Demetrias, carried through as part of the damnatio memoriae of the Antigonids in 201/0. As Tracy notes in his commentary, the list confirms the evidence of the three other extant ephebic catalogues of 229-200 ([1158](#), [1169](#) and [1176](#)) that at this period the annual number of ephebes per year was about 20-30.

In the one case where the relevant part of the inscribing clause is preserved ([1176](#), 48), the place of erection was specified no more precisely than “in the agora”, and this seems to have been normal for ephebic decrees in adjacent periods also;⁹⁰ the fragments were all also found in the agora, except for fr. b of [1176](#) itself, found in the Kerameikos, and [1161](#), found, according to Pittakis, on the acropolis, “north of the Parthenon”. This is a salutary reminder that recorded central Athenian findspots, even on the acropolis, can not invariably be taken as indicative of precise places of erection.

Decrees Honouring Athenians: Managers of the Eleusinian Mysteries

There are just three or four extant examples from this period of the decree honouring the managers (*epimeletai*) of the Mysteries, of which the most fully preserved is [1164](#), of 214/3, a document of fundamental importance not only for the ritual of the Mysteries themselves, but also for the “Lesser Mysteries” at Agrai and the Eleusinia (the others are [1182](#), [1188](#), [1138?](#), [1209?](#)). The inscription is well preserved and has been well studied, and Tracy and Bardani make no significant new textual contributions. They do, however, implicitly highlight an intriguing puzzle that remains with the inscribing clause. According to their text the inscription is to be set up in two copies, the first in the courtyard of the sanctuary at Eleusis, and the second at some other location:

καὶ στῆσαι τὴν μὲν ἐν τῆι αὐ]– non-stoich. c. 33
 λεί τοῦ ἱερο[ῦ τοῦ ἐν Ἐλευσίνοι, τὴν δὲ -^{ca. 7}-]
 55 ΟΙΕΙΣΛ- - - - -
 - - - - -

There is no note in the apparatus. One might think of a locative followed by a further local specification, as (purely exempli gratia) τὴν δὲ Φαληρ]λοῖ εἰς ἄ[λα, “at Phaleron by the sea” (cf. [IG I³ 84](#), 35; [IG II² 3811](#), 6), or -οῖ εἰς Ἄ[γραν. When, however, one looks at Clinton’s recent edition of the same text, [IEleus. 208](#), one finds something rather different:

καὶ στῆσαι τὴν μὲν ἐν τῆι αὐ]– non-stoich. c. 33
 λεί τοῦ ἱερο[ῦ τοῦ ἐν Ἐλευσίνοι, τὴν δὲ -^{ca. 6}-]
 55 ου, εἰς δ[ε τὴν ἀναγραφὴν κτλ - - - - -]

⁹⁰ See Liddel 2003, at 89 nn. 95 and 96.

54-55 ἐν ἀκροπ[ι]λό[λ]ει (εἰ)ς Koehler, ὀλει (εἰ)ς Kirchner, οἰεισα Philios.

Clinton also helpfully explains in his note on l. 55: “2nd letter: clearly epsilon; the central vertical stroke and the upper left oblique stroke are preserved. Syllabic division, maintained elsewhere in this document, also militates against Koehler’s reading.” If this is right, one would think of a locative of the type ἐν + genitive, e.g. ἐν Διονύσου, and might be inclined also to doubt the restored wording earlier in the line, τοῦ ἐν Ἐλευσῖνι, but it is a pity here that Bardani and Tracy pass over Clinton’s annotation in silence. Comparison of the new *IG* texts with Clinton’s reveal that this is not a unique occurrence; there are numerous minor differences, for example, between the text of [1188](#) and *I Eleus.* 202. This is another case where one is bound to think that the *IG* sacrifices, in its passion for concision, information on readings looked for by the reader.⁹¹ As for [1164](#), with no confirmation as to precisely what can be read at this point, we are left in a frustrating impasse.

This is the only inscription honouring the managers of the Mysteries in this fascicule found at Eleusis; [1138](#) = *I Eleus.* 199, of 227/6, also found at Eleusis, might have belonged to this genre, but only the prescript survives. No inscribing clause survives in any of the other cases in this fascicule, but circumstantial evidence suggests that, like [915](#) (= *IG II²* 661, 267/6), they were erected in the city Eleusinion. [1188](#) was previously thought to have been found simply “on the acropolis” (“in arce”, *IG II²* 807, cf. *I Eleus.* 202), but no decree honouring a (native-born) Athenian is known to have been erected on the acropolis at this period, and thanks to Bardani’s thorough researches in the early bibliography, she can give us the fuller information that it was found “on the acropolis in 1832 at the temple of (Athena) Nike”, according to Pittakis, *Eph.* 1839 no. 189, but according to his earlier work, *L’ancienne Athènes* (Athens, 1835), 146-47, on the north slope of the acropolis, “near the Anakaion,” i.e. in any case not far from the Eleusinion. [1182](#) was found to the west of the Eleusinion; [1209](#), which relates to the cult of Demeter (myrtle crown) and might have honoured the managers of the Mysteries, was also found on the north slope of the acropolis and is restored as having been erected πρὸς τῶι Ἐλε]υσι[νίωι (though the precise wording is uncertain); and [1329](#), which certainly does honour the managers of the Mysteries (though strictly outside our period) was found south-west of the Eleusinion.

[1164](#) was proposed by one Demokrates son of Sounieus of Kolonai. The occurrence of the demotic form, Sounieus, as a personal name, is duly noted by Bardani, but it is a pity that she refers, with no further comment, to Ἀφιδνα[ῖος] at *Agora XV* 61, 165 (304/3), and Σφήπτιος (*IG II²* 2083, 88) as parallels for this phenomenon. As I have noted elsewhere,⁹² given the strong aversion to using names equivalent to demotics, and by analogy with personal names in Κηφισ- (common) and the demotic, Κηφισιεύς (never used as a personal name), we should restore Ἀφιδνα- to yield a name form not equivalent to the demotic of Aphidna (so e.g. Ἀφιδνα[ῖων], Ἀφιδνά[δης]); and Σφήπτιος of *IG II²* 2083, 88, is an ephebic *epengraphos* of the late-2nd cent. AD (179/80), which supplies a rather distant parallel for a citizen name of the late-3rd cent. BC. For a discussion of the name, Sounieus, which is, in fact, the only securely attested instance of a demotic as a personal name before

⁹¹ As noted above, it was partly to forestall this kind of problem and to place my judgements on readings on record that I published a series of epigraphical prolegomena to fascicule 2, now collected as *IALD*.

⁹² “Restoring Athenian Names”, in A. P. Matthaiou and G. Malouchou eds., *Attikai Epigraphai. Praktika . . . Wilhelm* (Athens, 2004), 334-35 = *IALD* 328-29.

the Christian era, and the suggestion that it was a name of non-Athenian origin, see my “LGPN and the epigraphy and history of Attica”, in R. W. V. Catling and F. Marchand eds., *Onomatologos. Studies in Greek Personal Names Presented to Elaine Matthews* (Oxbow, 2010), 143-52, at 144-46.

[1182](#) is a tour de force of epigraphical skill on the part of Bardani. She takes an inscription first edited by M. Walbank (*Hesp. Suppl.* 38, 2008, 82-84 no. 87, now *SEG* 58.139) and completely transforms it, showing convincingly that it is another example of a decree honouring the managers of the Mysteries, and in doing so leaving just two of its seventeen lines with the same readings and restorations proposed by the first editor.

Two Decrees Honouring Individual Athenians - 1. [1160](#) for Eurykleides of Kephisia

Besides these three sets of decrees honouring boards, there are just two in this group which honour individual (native-born) Athenians, one for a well-known individual, the other for a rather obscure one.

[1160](#), honouring Eurykleides of Kephisia, who with his brother Mikion had taken a lead in “liberating” Athens in 229 by paying off the Macedonian commander of the Piraeus garrison, Diogenes, and continued to be the most influential Athenians in the years that followed,⁹³ is the single most important “historical inscription” in this group, in the conventional sense of supplying important factual information about a prominent historical figure. It was set up, appropriately, in the Piraeus. The text presented by Tracy and Bardani is well-disciplined, with some of the more speculative restorations of Wilhelm quite properly noted in the apparatus rather than included in the text. One point in the text recounting Eurykleides’ actions after the liberation attracts attention. According to the new *IG*, Eurykleides, with his brother Mikion, repaired the walls of the city and of the Piraeus, and approached Greek cities and [kings], and as many as . . . money for the People”:

. . . ἐπεσκεύα[σε μετὰ Μικίωνος τοῦ] non-stoich. c. 41
ἀδελφοῦ, καὶ πόλεις Ἑλληνίδας κα[ὶ βασιλεῖς -^{ca. 3}- προση]-
γάγετο, καὶ ὅσο[ι] τῶι δήμωι χρήμα[τα - - - - -]

βασιλεῖς is due to Habicht (1982, 118-19, cf. 1997, 192). It harmonizes splendidly with Polybios’ dictum (5.106, 6-7) that, under Eurykleides and Mikion, the Athenians τῶν μὲν ἄλλων Ἑλληνικῶν πράξεων οὐδ’ ὅποίας μετεῖχον (“took no part in Greek affairs”) but, following the initiatives of the brothers, τοὺς βασιλεῖς ἐξεκέχυντο, καὶ μάλιστα τούτων εἰς Πτολεμαῖον (“laid themselves out before” - almost “sucked up to” - the kings, and of these, especially Ptolemy”); and it clearly yields preferable sense to the older restoration, following Koehler, συμμάχους προση]γάγετο, for Athens precisely steered clear of “alliances”, *symmachiai*, in this period. The three letter lacuna, however, gives pause for thought. I suggest συμπροση]γάγετο. In other words Eurykleides not only carried out the repair work on the walls with his brother, he also approached other Greek cities and kings together with him.

Again, extensive historical analysis is not in place here, but I note briefly that the

⁹³ An indication of this continuing influence is [1137](#) II, 36-39, where the People resolve belatedly to erect the statue for Eumaridas of Kydonia, and where the decision is said explicitly to be implementing what Eurykleides and Mikion “think right” (ἀξιούσι, 38), a unique form of words in the decrees of this period.

decree makes abundantly clear the extent to which Eurykleides exercised power by the voluntary expenditure of vast personal wealth.⁹⁴ This naked connection between personal wealth and public influence is apparent also in other inscriptions (e.g. [1164](#), applauding personal expenditure by the managers of the Mysteries, and [1176](#), stressing that the ephebes had paid for their own training). The efficacy of money in the public sphere had, of course, received the clearest possible demonstration in the “liberation” of 229. The contrast with the classical democracy, however, is again marked. For the time being I make just two points about it: (a) as I have argued elsewhere, it is a contrast not only in form, in other words of a tendency for the financial contributions of the wealthy to be underplayed in the language of decrees of the classical period, but in substance, in other words of the extent to which financial provision for public goods was organised in that period by collective means;⁹⁵ (b) an important staging post in this regard was marked by a vast programme of sales of public land to private individuals, which took place in the Lykourgan period and is recorded in the accounts known as the *Rationes Centesimarum*.⁹⁶

Two Decrees Honouring Individual Athenians - 2. [1189](#) for a Priestess of Demeter

[1189](#), honouring a priestess of Demeter (and perhaps also her husband), is the only decree in this group which honours a priest or priestess, and it was to be set up “beside the temple of Demeter”, without further specification. In 2012⁹⁷ I wrote that “the inscription was perhaps set up next to a local Attic temple of Demeter and removed to the acropolis in antiquity, or in modern times”. Bardani believes that we have to do with the priestess of Demeter in the temple of Demeter and Kore at the city Eleusinion (Paus. 1.14, 1-3, and *Agora* XVI 277, 12, albeit that the former is somewhat vague, and the latter a severely overrestored inscription which refers to Demeter and Kore, but not, in unrestored text, to a temple). My hesitation about such an identification was caused in part by the fact that, on existing restorations, the crown awarded was of foliage, whereas, for the Eleusinian Demeter, one would expect myrtle (exclusive to the Eleusinian deities, as Bardani documents in a useful note to [1164](#), 45-46); and by the apparent fact that the crown was awarded by the Council only (the Council exercised oversight functions in relation to local Attic cults⁹⁸). Bardani makes excellent progress which addresses both these points, in particular now reading the myrtle crown, στεφαν[ῶσαι μυρρί]νη[ς | στεφάνω] 1-2, in place of the foliage, and noting that we do not necessarily have the bottom of the stone;⁹⁹ in other words the one preserved citation, ἡ βουλὴ | [τῆ]ν ἰέρειαν | -v, may not have concluded the text. It is clear enough from other state decrees of this period that the city paid a good deal of attention to Eleusinian Demeter in general, and her Mysteries in particular; that her priestess should be honoured with an inscribed decree would be unsurprising. There remain, however, disconcerting features. It is common for inscribed Athenian decrees to find their way down from the acropolis, less common (though not unheard of, as we have seen) for decrees erected

⁹⁴ The point is well-made by Chaniotis 2010; the extent to which this situation differs from 4th century Athens, however, needs emphasis.

⁹⁵ See Lambert 2012, especially 81-89. See also Lambert forthcoming. The (in effect) compulsory liturgies of the classical democracy gave way, at some point during the regime of Demetrios of Phaleron (317-307), to a system of voluntary euergetism.

⁹⁶ Translated on AIO.

⁹⁷ 2012, 110 no. 13.

⁹⁸ See e.g. [292](#), 21; [IG II² 1362](#); Lambert 2010, 166-67.

⁹⁹ The lack of clarity on this point in [IG II² \(863\)](#) was a characteristic weakness of that publication and arose from overreliance on squeezes.

elsewhere in the city to make their way up to it.¹⁰⁰ Bardani helpfully registers the year and place of discovery as recorded by Pittakis: west of the Parthenon, 1840; but, as we have also seen, it is not unknown for Pittakis' findspots to be misleading, and Koehler injected a mild note of caution (*IG* II 375): “in arce repositum est et inventum esse traditur.” In other words, it was stored on the acropolis and was said to have been found there. It might indeed have wandered up to the acropolis from the City Eleusinion, but we can not rule out that it had taken a longer journey. Neither the City Eleusinion, nor the temple apparently located in it are referred to elsewhere in inscriptions simply as “the temple of Demeter”, with no mention of Kore, and no further specification of place (as e.g. “in the city” as opposed to “at Eleusis”). One should not underestimate the extent to which Attica was full of Demeters.¹⁰¹ Indeed Demeter Chloe had a sanctuary (not, it seems, known to have included a temple), near the entrance to the acropolis.¹⁰² A connection of this decree with this sanctuary, and her priestess (who had a reserved seat in the theatre, *IG* II² 5129) would better suit the apparent findspot of the inscription and the naming of the temple in it as “of Demeter” rather than “Demeter and Kore”. Patently we can not press this on current evidence; but the temptation to be overly definite is one of the less fortunate aspects of more recent *IG* tradition. It should sometimes be resisted.

Locations of Decrees and Ethnicity of Honorands

It is notable that, while decrees honouring foreigners were typically erected on the acropolis at this period, no decree honouring a native-born Athenian, or board of Athenian officials, was certainly erected in this location. [1185](#) shows that nomenclature can be misleading in this regard, for this inscription was found on the acropolis, by the Propylaia, was probably therefore (not certainly, as we have seen) erected there, and on the surface of it its honorand, Thraseas son of Aetos of Phlya, was an Athenian citizen. However, as Wilhelm had already inferred from his father's name, Aetos,¹⁰³ and as we now know in greater detail from *SEG* 39.1426, Thraseas was in fact an Egyptian, a high Ptolemaic official, who had apparently been awarded honorary Athenian citizenship in the new tribe Ptolemais shortly after its creation in 224/3. This decree in essence honours a foreigner, and sits well enough, therefore, on the acropolis.

No thought at all seems to have been given in this regard, or in any other beyond the purely textual, to the very next decree in the corpus, [1186](#), inscribed by the same cutter as [1185](#) (Tracy's “cutter of *IG* II² 1706”, 229/8-c. 203, again the main basis for dating these decrees), honouring an -ios son of Androkydes of Berenikidai. Its findspot is unknown, but in l. 15 it is restored (the text goes back only to Kirchner, *IG* II² 927) as having been erected on the acropolis, [καὶ στῆσαι ἐν ἀκροπόλει]. The father's name is not diagnostic in this

¹⁰⁰ Particularly relevant as regards apparent “wandering up” from the City Eleusinion to the acropolis is [1188](#) (see above).

¹⁰¹ On this see Lambert forthcoming.

¹⁰² There seems to be no up-to-date treatment of this sanctuary. Testimonia, including Ar. *Lys.* 835, Paus. 1.22.3, *IG* II² 1472, 39, are collected by Parker 2005, 196 n. 15; see also the still useful J. G. Frazer, *Pausanias's Description of Greece* II (London, 1898), 247. Important are *FGrHist.* 328 Philochoros F 61 (from schol. Ar. *Lys.* 835), recording that “there is a sanctuary of Demeter Chloe on the acropolis, in which the Athenians sacrifice in the month of Thargelion” and a passage of old comedy, in which a character hurries to the acropolis to sacrifice a ram to Demeter Chloe, ἀλλ' εὐθὺ πόλεως εἶμι· θῦσαι γάρ με δεῖ | κριὸν Χλόηι Δήμητρι, Eupolis, *Marikas* F 196K-A (from schol. Soph. *OC* 1600).

¹⁰³ In the helpful reference supplied by Bardani to O. Masson's discussion of this name at *BCH* 106, 13-15, the year of publication should be corrected from 1992 to 1982.

case (there are two other Athenian cases¹⁰⁴); but the deme Berenikidai was created at the same time as the tribe Ptolemais, and raises the possibility that, like Thraseas, -ios was a foreigner connected with the Ptolemies, who had received honorary Athenian citizenship. The wording of ll. 4-5, τοῖς εἰς τῶ [κ]οινῶ φιλοδο[ξ]- would suit quite well such a hybrid honorand. If, on the other hand, -ios was a native-born Athenian, the decree was probably erected elsewhere than the acropolis, perhaps in the agora. In any case the reference to the acropolis in l. 15 belonged in the apparatus, and should not have been printed in the *IG* text.

By a similar logic, the honorand of [1187](#), Nikon son of Niko-, work of the same cutter and found on the acropolis (though again the erection clause does not survive) may also have been a man of foreign origin.

Decrees Relating to Management of Dedications in Sanctuaries

Honorific decrees had always been the most commonly inscribed genre of decree; by this time they have become the only genre to be inscribed at public expense. Of the two other main categories of the classical democracy, treaties and other decrees relating to foreign relations have by now been superseded by decrees of the type outlined above, which furthered Athenian interests on the Greek stage via various kinds of networking and the international “politics of the festival”, and which invariably had an honorific component. Religious regulations, as we have seen, are entirely absent. One small genre of non-honorific decree, however, is represented: the record of the *kathairesis* of a sanctuary, that is to say the periodic melting down of small silver dedications to produce one larger dedication,¹⁰⁵ the rationale being, to make easier, for the officials responsible for the temple treasures, the task of securing and accounting for the valuable items in their sanctuaries. The most substantial representative of this genre in this group is [1154](#), from the sanctuary of the hero doctor in Athens, one of the most vivid and informative documents of Attic sanctuary management, from which we learn that the decree was inscribed not, as was normal, at public expense, but at a cost of 8 ½ drachmas, to be subtracted from the proceeds of the melting down operation. It is this that explains how what is not an honorific decree came to be inscribed. [1154](#), which dates to 220/19 (archonship of Thrasylphon, see above), is entitled in the new *IG*, clearly and accurately: “De Oenochoa heroi medico ex donariis veteribus conflanda. Sequitur donariorum inventarium” (“On the combination of old dedications to produce a wine-pourer for the hero doctor. Followed by an inventory of dedications”). *IG* II² 840 is a similar record, from a later period, from the same sanctuary. [1220](#), entitled appropriately, “De Rebus sacris reficiendis” (“On the remaking of sacred objects”), and work of a cutter operating 226/5-190, is a decree of a similar type, and also relates, it seems, to a single cult, but the findspot is unfortunately unrecorded, and we can not determine the cult. We may perhaps assume that it too was erected from the proceeds of the operation. More fragmentary still is [1151](#), but it is clear enough from the surviving text (which parallels closely *IG* II² 840 and [1154](#)) that it is again of similar type. Here the title allocated in the new corpus, “Sacrorum Curatores Honorantur”, is a slip. Correct was the title in *IG* II² 842: “De Rebus sacris reficiendis”. If the findspot is not misleading, it perhaps related to an acropolis cult.

¹⁰⁴ On this see the most complete and up-to-date resource for Attic prosopography, <http://www.seangb.org>.

¹⁰⁵ This type of decree is not wholly without precedent in the classical democracy. Cf. for example (but in a rather different context) [445](#).

Postscript: Erection clauses

Inscribed decrees typically end with a clause stipulating payment for the stele from public funds. At this period three separate actions are, or may be, covered in the relevant clause: making (ποίησις), inscribing (ἀναγραφή) and erection (ἀνάθεσις). Normally only two (sometimes only one) of the three are used, but which ones, and in which order, varies. Two of the terms terminate in -σις and all three are of comparable length such that one can not usually tell, in a non-stoichedon text, which is to be restored. Bardani and Tracy take over the often arbitrary choice as to which of the terms to restore made by earlier editors, and do not attempt to introduce order. This is a minor point, but it is not entirely trivial, and the reader should be aware that the precise restorations in such cases are often insecure. For example, at [1301](#), 45 (non-stoich. 50) Bardani and Tracy print: εἰς τὴν ποίησιν καὶ τ]ὴν ἀναγραφὴν τῆς στή[[λης. Line-spacing supplies a indecisive argument for restoring the shorter word, but as the index (p. 275 s.v. ποίησις) shows, and though this is clearly also not a decisive argument, this particular combination occurs elsewhere in this corpus only for plural stelai ([1171](#), 29, [1302](#), 24). At any rate, εἰς τὴν ἀνάθεσιν καὶ τ]ὴν ἀναγραφὴν τῆς στή[[λης is at least equally possible here, and is supported by a precise, unrestored, parallel at [1147](#), 48. Conversely, however, the other two cases of εἰς τὴν ἀνάθεσιν καὶ τὴν ἀναγραφὴν noted in the index (p. 250 s.v. ἀνάθεσις), are also insecure. At [1168](#), 57, where the whole expression is restored, we might alternatively have [εἰς τὴν ποίησιν καὶ τὴν ἀναγραφὴν τῆς στήλης], and at [1232](#), 10-11, where Tracy and Bardani print εἰς δὲ τὴν ἀνάθε]]σιν καὶ τὴν ἀναγραφὴν τῆς στήλης, we might rather have εἰς δὲ τὴν ποίη]]σιν. I have registered these specific alternatives in the translations for AIO and have deployed [] and “?” in other cases where there would seem to be uncertainty as to the precise wording that should be restored.¹⁰⁶

¹⁰⁶ This affects the following translations: [1140](#), [1141](#), [1149](#), [1153](#), [1171](#), [1177](#), [1186](#), [1211](#), [1215](#), [1219](#), [1231](#), [1233](#), [1234](#), [1243](#).