ATHENIAN PROXENIES OF THE FIFTH CENTURY B.C.

by

MICHAEL BURKE WALBANK

B.A., University of Bristol, 1954

M.A., University of British Columbia, 1965

A THESIS SUBMITTED IN PARTIAL FULFILMENT OF
THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF
DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

in the Department

of

Classics

We accept this thesis as conforming to the
required standard

THE UNIVERSITY OF BRITISH COLUMBIA

October, 1970

In presenting this thesis in partial fulfilment of the requirements for an advanced degree at the University of British Columbia, I agree that the Library shall make it freely available for reference and study.

I further agree that permission for extensive copying of this thesis for scholarly purposes may be granted by the Head of my Department or by his representatives. It is understood that copying or publication of this thesis for financial gain shall not be allowed without my written permission.

Department of Classics

The University of British Columbia
Vancouver 8, Canada

Date October 13th, 1970

ATHENIAN PROXENIES OF THE FIFTH CENTURY B.C.

ABSTRACT

There is no exact parallel for the ancient office of the proxeny: the closest analogy is found in the modern consulate.

Proxenoï were citizens of one state appointed by a second state to serve its interests in their home-state; in return for these services they received various honours and privileges. These were enumerated in the decrees appointing the proxenoï, or in subsequent decrees passed after a period of service. At Athens it appears that the inscription of such decrees, usually at public expense, upon marble stelai that were then set up on the Akropolis, was itself a privilege not granted to every proxenos. There is some evidence that, in the fifth century at least, these stelai were erected near the Erechtheion.

One hundred and fourteen fragments have survived from the fifth century; this study contains critical editions of the sixty-nine proxeny-decrees that they comprise, including the first publication of four fragments, together with a survey of the privileges therein enumerated.

Since it is seldom possible to date these documents upon other criteria, an analysis of the changes that occurred in Attic letter-shapes during the fifth century forms a major part of the study.

Also included are photographs of all but five of the fragments studied, many of which have never before been photographed.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

My especial thanks are due to Professors Malcolm F. McGregor and C.W.J.Eliot of the University of British Columbia who supervised this thesis and throughout the time that I have been engaged upon it have been ready with advice, criticism and encouragement.

Professor Donald W.Bradeen of the University of Cincinnati, both in Athens in 1967/8 and in Vancouver in the Summer of 1969, was of the greatest assistance to me and has since given me valuable advice and information in correspondence.

Professor Eugene Vanderpool, Professor of Archaeology at the American School of Classical Studies in Athens, introduced me to the authorities of the various museums in Athens and was always ready to help and advise me when I encountered problems of any sort.

Mrs Ntina Peppas-Delmouzou, Director of the Epigraphical Collection of the National Archaeological Museum in Athens, gave me access to all the facilities of the Collection, allowed me to take photographs and advised and assisted me continually, as well as introducing me to her colleagues in the National Archaeological Museum and the Akropolis Museum.

These five individuals have taught me most of what I know of Greek Epigraphy and my debt to them cannot be measured.

The University of British Columbia and the H.R. MacMillan Family Fund of Vancouver, the Canada Council, whose Doctoral Fellowship I held in 1967/8 and 1969/70, and the American School of Classical Studies in Athens, whose Wheeler Fellowship I was awarded for 1967/8, made it possible for me to spend two years in Athens and a further year in Vancouver during the research for and preparation of this dissertation.

I am deeply grateful to the staffs of the following institutions:

The American School of Classical Studies in Athens, in particular, its Director, Professor Henry S. Robinson, its Secretary until 1968, William R. Biers, and its Librarian, Mrs Mary Zelia Pease Philippides;

The Agora Excavations at Athens, especially the Field Director, Professor T. Leslie Shear, Jr., and the Secretary, Mrs Poly Demoulini;

The Epigraphical Collection of the National Archaeological Museum, Athens;

The Akropolis Museum, Athens;

The Agora Museum, Athens;

The Graeco-Roman Collection of the British Museum, London;

The FitzWilliam Museum, Cambridge;

The Institute for Classical Studies at the University of London.

The following individuals have helped me at various times with advice, criticism or encouragement: at the University of British Columbia, Mrs Ann McCallum, Mrs Elizabeth Bongie and Mr Phillip Harding, as well as my colleagues Massimo Ciavolella, Gary Ferngren, Agnès Vandersypen and George West; Alan L.Boegehold, Paul A. Clement and Benjamin D.Meritt, Visiting Professors at the American School of Classical Studies in Athens; also in Athens, Professors Colin Edmondson, Evelyn B.Harrison, Donald R.Laing, Jr., W.Kendrick Pritchett and Evelyn L. Smithson, and my colleagues John S.Traill and Stella Grobel; Miss L.H.Jeffery of Lady Margaret Hall, Oxford, and her student Susan Sherwin-White; A.G.Woodhead of Corpus Christi College, Cambridge; David M.Lewis of Christ Church, Oxford; John Smart of the University of Leeds.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Pages

Bibliography and Abbreviations	1-44
Part I: Proxeny and Proxenos	45-101
1. Introduction	45-50
2. The Stelai: (a) Materials	51-56
(b) Physical Characteristics	
of the Stelai	57-62
(c) Criteria for Dating	63-86
3. The Evidence and its Meaning	87-101
Part II: The Decrees	102-645
Introduction	102-110
The Edited Texts	111-645
Index of Inscriptions Cited	646-665
Plates	666-682

LIST OF TABLES CONTAINED IN THE TEXT	Pages
1. Proxeny-Decrees catalogued according to their Line-Lengths	62
2. Letter-Shapes at Athens	74
3. Letter-Shapes found in dated Fifth-Century Inscriptions	75-84
4. Chart depicting the Appearance or Disappearance of Key Shapes	85-86
5. Athenian Proxemies of the Fifth Century known solely from Literary Sources	103
6. Athenian Proxeny-Decrees of the Fifth Century on Stone	104-110

LIST OF PLATES

The quality of these photographs varies; they are intended to assist the reader in identifying the documents here edited and to give some idea of the appearance of the fragments, but they should not be used to check readings of the texts.

Plate	Decree #	Page
I, 1	1 (<u>I.G.</u> , II ² , 5224 on right)	666
2	1, base	
3	2	
4	4 <u>a</u> , <u>b</u>	
5	4 <u>a</u>	
6	4 <u>b</u>	
II, 1	3 <u>a</u> , <u>b</u> , <u>c</u>	667
2	3 <u>a</u> , <u>b</u>	
3	5	
4	6	
5	7	
6	9 <u>a</u> , <u>b</u>	
III, 1	8	668
2	10	
3	11	
4	12 <u>a</u>	
5	12 <u>b</u> , <u>c</u>	
6	13	

Plate	Decree #	Page
IV, 1	14 <u>a</u> , <u>b</u>	669
2	23	
3	16	
4	17 <u>a</u> , <u>b</u> , <u>c</u>	
5	15 <u>a</u>	
6	15 <u>b</u>	
V, 1	18	670
2	19	
3	20	
4	21 <u>a</u>	
5	21 <u>b</u>	
6	21 <u>c</u>	
VI, 1	22 <u>a</u> , <u>b</u> , <u>c</u>	671
2	22 <u>a</u>	
3	25	
4	28 <u>a</u>	
5	28 <u>b</u>	
6	28 <u>c</u>	
VII, 1	24	672
2	27	
3	26 <u>a</u> , <u>b</u> , <u>c</u>	
VIII, 1	29	673
2	34	
3	30	
4	35	

Plate	Decree #	Page
VIII, 5	32	673
6	33	
IX, 1	31	674
2	37	
3	38	
4	39	
5	42	
6	43	
X, 1	36	675
2	40	
3	41	
4	44 <u>a</u>	
5	44 <u>b</u>	
6	44, left lateral, <u>b</u> , <u>d</u> , showing foliation	
XI, 1	44 <u>c</u>	676
2	44 <u>d</u>	
3	44, suggested arrangement of fragments <u>a</u> , <u>b</u> , <u>c</u> , <u>d</u>	
XII, 1	45	677
2	46	
3	47, fragments <u>b</u> , <u>c</u> , <u>d</u> , <u>e</u>	
XIII, 1	47 <u>f</u>	678
2	47 <u>g</u> , <u>h</u>	
3	48	
4	49	

Plate	Decree #	Page
XIII, 5	51	678
6	52	
XIV, 1	53	679
2	54	
3	56	
4	55 <u>a</u> , <u>b</u>	
5	57	
6	59	
7	63	
XV, 1	61, appendix	680
2	62	
3	61	
XVI, 1	64 <u>a</u>	681
2	64 <u>b</u>	
3	64 <u>c</u>	
4	60 <u>b</u> , <u>c</u> , <u>d</u> , <u>e</u> , <u>f</u> , <u>g</u>	
XVII, 1	65	682
2	69	
3	66 <u>a</u> , <u>b</u> , <u>c</u>	
4	67	
5	68	

B.T.. Bibliotheca Teubneriana.
F.A.C., F.G.H., F.H.G.. See bibliography of modern authorities.
O.C.T.. Oxford Classical Texts.
Aineias Taktikos, Aeneae Tactici de obsidione toleranda commentarius, edited by R.Schoene (B.T., Leipzig, 1911).
Aischines, Aeschinis Orationes, edited by F.Blass (B.T., Leipzig, 1896).
Andokides, Andocidis Orationes, edited by F.Blass and C.Fuhr (B.T., fourth edition, Leipzig, 1913).
Andocides: On the Mysteries, edited by D.M.MacDowell (Oxford, 1952).
Androtion, F.G.H., III B, pp. 60-77, #324.
Antiphon, Antiphontis Orationes et Fragmenta, edited by F.Blass and T.Thalheim (B.T., Leipzig, 1914).
Aristophanes, Aristophanis Comoediae, edited by F.W. Hall and W.M.Geldart (O.C.T., 2 volumes, second edition, Oxford, 1906-1907).

- Aristophanes, Scholia, edited by G.Dindorf (4 volumes, Oxford, 1838).
Fragments: F.A.C., I, pp. 572-793.
- Aristotle, Ἀθ. Πολ. : Aristotelis Atheniensium Respublica, edited by F.G.Kenyon (O.C.T., Oxford, 1920).
Politics: Aristotelis Politica, edited by W.D.Ross (O.C.T., Oxford, 1957).
- Athenaios, Athenaei Naucratis Dipnosopistae, edited by G.Kaibel (B.T., 3 volumes, Leipzig, 1887-1890).
- Demosthenes, Demosthenis Orationes, edited by S.H. Butcher and W.Rennie (O.C.T., 3 volumes, Oxford, 1903-1931).
- Diodoros, Diodori Bibliotheca Historica, edited by F.Vogel and C.T.Fischer (B.T., 5 volumes, third edition, Leipzig, 1888-1906).
- Diogenes Laertios, Diogenis Laertii Vitae Philosophorum, edited by H.S.Long (O.C.T., 2 volumes, Oxford, 1964).
- Dionysios Halikarnassios, Dionysii Halicarnasei Antiquitates Romanae, edited by C.Jacoby (B.T., 4 volumes, Leipzig, 1885-1905).
- Douris, F.G.H., II A, pp. 136-158, #76.
- Ephoros, F.G.H., II A, pp. 37-109, #70.
- Eupolis, F.A.C., I, pp. 310-447.

- Eustathios, Eustathii Commentarii ad Homeri Iliadem,
edited by M.Devarius (3 volumes, Leipzig,
1827).
- Herodotos, Herodoti Historiae, edited by K.Hude
(O.C.T., 2 volumes, third edition, Oxford,
1927).
- I.G., see bibliography of modern authorities.
- Isokrates, Isocratis Orationes, edited by F.Blass
(B.T., 2 volumes, Leipzig, 1889-1898).
- Livy, Titī Livi ab Urbe Condita, edited by R.S.
Conway, C.F.Walters, S.K.Johnson and A.H.
McDonald (O.C.T., 5 volumes, Oxford,
1914-1965).
- Lysias, Lysiae Orationes, edited by K.Hude (O.C.T.,
Oxford, 1912).
- Pausanias, Pausaniae Graeciae Descriptio, edited by
F.Spiro (B.T., 3 volumes, Leipzig, 1903).
- Philochoros, F.G.H., III B, pp. 97-160, #328.
- Phrynichos, F.A.C., I, pp. 310-447.
- Pindar, Pindari Carmina cum Fragmenta, edited by
B.Snell (B.T., second edition, Leipzig,
1955).
- Plato, Platonis Opera, edited by J.Burnet (O.C.T.,
5 volumes, Oxford, 1903-1910).
- Pliny, C.Plinii Secundi Naturalis Historia,
edited by L.Ian and C.Mayhoff (B.T., 5
volumes, Leipzig, 1892-1909).

- Plutarch, Plutarchi Vitae Parallellae, edited by K.Ziegler (B.T., 3 volumes, third edition, Leipzig, 1964).
- [Plutarch] , Vit.X Orat.: Vitae Decem Oratorum (Moralia, 832b), in Plutarch's Moralia, X, edited by H.N.Fowler (Loeb Classical Library, Cambridge, Mass., and London, 1960).
- Polemon,, F.H.G., III, pp. 108-148.
- Polybios, Polybii Historiae, edited by T.Buettner-Wobst (B.T., 5 volumes [volume I, second edition, 1905, volumes II-V, first edition, 1889-1905] , Leipzig, 1889-1905).
- Suidas, Suidae Lexicon, edited by A.Adler (B.T., 5 volumes, Leipzig, 1928-1938).
- Theopompos, F.G.H., II B, pp. 516-517, #115.
- Thucydides, Thucydidis Historiae, edited by H.S.Jones and J.E.Powell (O.C.T., second edition, Oxford, 1942).
- Xenophon, Xenophontis Opera Omnia, edited by E.C. Marchant (O.C.T., 5 volumes, Oxford, 1900-1920).

BIBLIOGRAPHY AND ABBREVIATIONS

MODERN AUTHORITIES

- A.H.R. American Historical Review.
- A.J.A. American Journal of Archaeology.
- A.J.P. American Journal of Philology.
- A.T.L. see B.D.Meritt, H.T.Wade-Gery and M.F.McGregor,
The Athenian Tribute Lists.
- Abh.Berlin. Abhandlungen der preussischen Akademie der
Wissenschaften: philosophisch-historische
Klasse.
- J.d'André, La Proxénie: Contribution à l'Étude du Droit
International Grec (Toulouse, 1911),
- A.Andrewes, "The Generals in the Hellespont," J.H.S.,
 LXXIII (1953), pp. I-9.
 "Thucydides and the Persians," Historia, X
 (1961), pp. 1-18.
- Ant.Class. Antiquité Classique.
- Anzeiger Ak.Wien. Anzeiger der philosophisch-historischen
Klasse der Akademie der Wissenschaften in
Wien.
- Arch.Epigr.Mitt. Archaeologisch-epigraphische Mitteilungen
aus Oesterreich ungaben.
- Ath.Mitt. Mitteilungen des kaiserlich-deutschen

archaeologischen Instituts: athenische Abteilung.

Austin, Stoichedon (1938), see next item.

R.P.Austin, The Stoichedon Style in Greek Inscriptions
(Oxford Classical and Philological Monographs,
Oxford, 1938).

"Across and Down," G.R., VIII (1939), pp.
137-138.

E.Balogh, Political Refugees in Ancient Greece (Witwaters-
rand, 1943).

W.Bannier, "Zu attischen Urkunden des V.Jahrhunderts,"
Ath.Mitt., XXVII (1902), pp. 301-304.

"Zu attischen Inschriften. I,"

B.Ph.W. (1911), pp. 853-854.

"Zu attischen Inschriften. V,"

B.Ph.W. (1916), pp. 1067-1072.

"Zu attischen Inschriften. VI,"

B.Ph.W. (1917), pp. 91-96.

"Zu attischen Inschriften. VII,"

B.Ph.W. (1917), pp. 344-351.

"Zu attischen Inschriften.VIII,"

B.Ph.W. (1917), pp. 1216-1224.

"Zu attischen Inschriften. IX,"

B.Ph.W. (1917), pp. 1342-1349.

"Zu attischen Inschriften.X,"

B.Ph.W. (1918), pp. 449-456.

- W.Bannier, "Zu attischen Inschriften. XII,"
B.Ph.W. (1921), pp. 307-312.
 "Zu attischen Inschriften. XIII,"
B.Ph.W. (1922), pp. 835-839.
 "Zu attischen Inschriften. XIV,"
B.Ph.W. (1925), pp. 861-864.
 "Zu attischen Inschriften. XV,"
B.Ph.W. (1927), pp. 667-671.
- B.C.H. Bulletin de Correspondance Hellénique.
- Beazley, Red-Figure, see next item.
- J.D.Beazley, Attic Red-Figure Vase-Painters (3 volumes,
 second edition, Oxford, 1963).
- Bechtel, Personennamen, see next item.
- F.Bechtel, Die historischen Personennamen des
Griechischen bis zur Kaiserzeit (Hildesheim,
 1964; reprint of 1917 edition).
- Beiblatt. Jahreshefte des oesterreichisch archaeolo-
gischen Instituts in Wien, Beiblatt.
- Beloch. Gr.Gesch., II.1² (1913), see next item.
- K.J.Beloch, Griechische Geschichte, II, bis auf die
sophistische Bewegung und den peloponnesischen
Krieg, I (second edition, Berlin and Leipzig,
 1913).
- Bengtson, Staatsvertraege, II (1962), see next item.
- H.Bengtson, Die Staatsvertraege des Altertums, II, die

Vertraege der griechisch-roemischen Welt von 700 bis 338 v. Chr. (Muenchen, 1962).

Beulé L'Acropole, I, II (1853/4), see next item.

E.Beulé, L'Acropole d'Athènes (2 volumes, Paris, 1853/4).

A.Billheimer, "Amendments in Athenian Decrees," A.J.A., XLII (1938), pp. 456-485.

Binneboessel, Urkundenreliefs (1932), see next item.

R. Binneboessel, Studien zu den attischen Urkundenreliefs des 5. und 4. Jahrhunderts (Leipzig, 1932).

B.M.C. A Catalogue of the Greek Coins in the British Museum (London, 1873-1927).

A.Boeckh, "Athenische Inschriften," Intelligenzblatt (1835), p. 32.

B.Ph.W. Berliner Philologische Wochenschrift.

O.Broneer, "Excavations on the North Slope of the Akropolis in Athens, 1933-1934," Hesperia, IV (1935), pp. 109-188.

B.S.A. Annual of the British School at Athens.

C.D.Buck, "The Interstate Use of the Greek Dialects," C.P., VIII (1913), pp. 133-159.

Busolt, Gr.Gesch., III.I (1897); III.2 (1904), see next item.

G.Busolt, Griechische Geschichte bis zur Schlacht bei Chaeroneia, Band III, Tome I: die Pentekontaetie (1897); Band III, Tome 2: der

peloponnesische Krieg (1904: Handbuecher der alten Geschichte, II Serie, erste Abteilung (Gotha, 1897 and 1904).

"Ueber den Volksbeschluss CIA IV 2, Nr. 35c," Philologus, L (1891), pp. 583-606.

C.A.H. The Cambridge Ancient History (Cambridge, 1932).
Capps Studies (1936), Classical Studies Presented to Edward Capps on his Seventieth Birthday (Princeton, 1936).

C.I.G. Corpus Inscriptionum Graecarum. Pars II, Inscriptiones Atticae, edited by A. Boeckh (Berlin, 1828).

C.J. Classical Journal.

Collitz and Bechtel, Sammlung, III.2 (1905), see next item.
H. Collitz, F. Bechtel and O. Hoffmann, Sammlung der griechischen Dialect-Inschriften, III.2 (Goettingen, 1905).

Conze, Att. Grabreliefs (1890), see next item.

A. Conze, Die attischen Grabreliefs (Berlin, 1890).

Cornell Cl. St. Cornell Studies in Classical Philology.

C.P. Classical Philology.

C.Q. Classical Quarterly.

C.R. Classical Review.

C.R.A.I. Comptes Rendus de l'Académie des Inscriptions et de Belles-Lettres.

- C.Curtius, Archaeologische Zeitung (Berlin, 1871).
- Curtius, Gr.Gesch., II (1888), see next item.
- E.Curtius, Griechische Geschichte, II: bis zum Ende des peloponnesischen Krieges (Berlin, 1888).
- D.A. Δελτίον Ἀρχαιολογικόν or Ἀρχαιολογικὸν Δελτίον.
- Diller, Race Mixture (1937), see next item.
- A.Diller, Race Mixture among the Greeks before Alexander (Illinois Studies in Language and Philology, XX.1-2, Urbana, Illinois, 1937).
- Dinsmoor, Archons (1931), see next item.
- W.B.Dinsmoor, The Archons of Athens in the Hellenistic Age (Cambridge, Mass., 1931).
- Observations on the Hephaisteion, Hesperia, Supplement V (1941).
- W.Dittenberger, "Kritische Bemerkungen zu griechischen Inschriften," Hermes, XVI (1881), pp. 161-200.
- "De Menelai Pelagonis Titulis," Satura Sauppe (1879), pp. 43-60.
- Dittmar, Coronis (1890), see next item.
- A.Dittmar, De Atheniensium More Exteros Coronis Publice Ornandi Quaestiones Epigraphicae (Leipziger Studien, XIII [Leipzig, 1890], pp. 65-248).
- Dohrn, Attische Plastik (1957), see next item.
- T.Dohrn, Attische Plastik vom Tode des Phidias bis zum Wirken der Grossen Meister des IV.Jh.v. Chr. (Krefeld, 1957).

- S.Dow, "The Purported Decree of Themistokles: Stele and Inscription," A.J.A., LX (1962), pp. 353-368.
- "The Lists of Athenian Archontes," Hesperia, III (1934), pp. 140-190..
- E.Drerup, "Ein athenisches Proxeni edekret fuer Aristoteles," Ath.Mitt., XXIII (1898), pp. 369-381.
- D.-S. Daremberg-Saglio, Dictionnaire des Antiquités Grecques et Romaines (Paris, 1877-1919).
- A.Dumont, "Deux Bas-Reliefs Athéniens Datés," B.C.H., II (1878), pp. 559-569.
- U.K.Duncan, "Notes on Lettering by some Attic Masons in the Sixth and Fifth Centuries B.C.," B.S.A., LVI (1961), pp. 179-188.
- E.A. Ἐφημερίς Ἀρχαιολογικὴ or Ἀρχαιολογικὴ Ἐφημερίς. (published in three series: I, 1837-1843, 1852-1860; II, 1862-1874; III, 1883-. Series I and II are each paged continuously, in consecutively-numbered folios; inscriptions in each series are also numbered consecutively. Series III has separate pagination for each volume).
- EM. Epigraphic Museum, Athens.
- Ehrenberg Studies. Ancient Society and Institutions: Studies Presented to Victor Ehrenberg on his seventy-fifth Birthday, edited by E.Badian (Oxford, 1966).

- Eranos Vindobonensis. Festschrift zur 42. Versammlung deutscher Philologen und Schulmaenner in Wien, dargebracht von der philologisch-archaeologischen Gesellschaft in Wien (Vienna, 1893).
- F.A.C. The Fragments of Attic Comedy, edited by J.M.Edmonds (3 volumes, Leiden, 1957).
- Ferguson,, Treasurers (1932), see next item.
- W.S.Ferguson, The Treasurers of Athena (Cambridge, Mass., 1932).
 The Athenian Secretaries, Cornell Cl.St., VII (1898).
 "The Constitution of Theramenes," C.P., XXI (1926), pp. 72-75.
 "The Condemnation of Antiphon," Mélanges Glotz, I(1932), pp. 358-366.
- Festgabe Regelsberger Festgabe Ferdinand Regelsberger zu seinem Doktor-Jubilaeum ueberreicht von der rechts- und staatswissenschaftlichen Fakultaet der Universitaet Zuerich (Zuerich, 1907).
- F.G.H. Die Fragmente der griechischen Historiker, edited by F.Jacoby (Berlin and Leiden, 1923-1958).
- F.H.G. Fragmenta Historicorum Graecorum, edited by C.Mueller (Paris, 3 volumes, 1848-1883).

- J.V.A.Fine. Horoi: Studies in Mortgage, Real Security and Land Tenure in Ancient Athens, Hesperia, Supplement IX (1951).
- P.Foucart, "Fragment de Décret Athénien," B.C.H., I (1877), pp. 80-81.
 "Décret de Proxénie," B.C.H., I (1877), pp. 303-307.
 "Décrets Athéniens du IV^{me} Siècle," B.C.H., XXI (1888), pp. 153-179.
 "Décrets Athéniens," Rev.Phil., XXVII (1903), pp. 215-220.
- H.Francotte, De la Législation Athénienne sur les Distinctions Honorifiques (Louvain, 1900).
- Fraser and Bean, Peraea (1954), see next item.
- P.M.Fraser and G.E.Bean, The Rhodian Peraea and Islands (Oxford, 1954).
- G.Fredrich, "Skiathos und Peparethos," Ath.Mitt., XXXI (1906), pp. 99-128.
- Friederichs and Wolters, Gipsabguesse (1885), see next item.
- C.Friederichs and P. Wolters, Die Gipsabguesse antiker Bildwerke in historischer Folge erklart. Bausteine zur Geschichte der griechisch-roemischen Plastik (Berlin 1885).

- G.H.Frogen, The Change from the Attic to the Ionic Alphabets in Athenian Decrees (circa 570 to 317 B.C.) (Diss., U. of Minnesota, 1955).
- Fuks, Ancestral Constitution (1953), see next item.
- A.Fuks, The Ancestral Constitution: Five Studies in Athenian Party Politics at the end of the Fifth Century B.C. (London, 1953).
- E.Gebhard, "Αὐτὸ, Inscriptiones Graecae, I², 56,3," Muenchener Studien, XXII (1967), pp.21-24.
- G.Gerlach, Griechische Ehreninschriften (Halle, 1908).
- J.Gerlach, Ἀντὶ Ἀγαθός (Muenchen, 1932).
- G.Gilbert, Beitraege zur innern Geschichte Athens im Zeitalter des peloponnesischen Krieges (Leipzig, 1877).
- The Constitutional Antiquities of Sparta and Athens (translated by E.J.Brooks and T.Nicklin, London, 1895).
- G.G.A. Goettingische Gelehrte Anzeigen.
- E.Gjerstad, The Swedish Cyprus Expedition, IV.2 (Uppsala, 1948).
- Goldstaub, Ἀδελίας (1889), see next item.
- M.Goldstaub, De Ἀδελίας Notione et Usu in iure publico Attico (Breslauer Philologische Abhandlung, Band 4, Heft I, Breslau, 1889).

- Gomme,, Commentary, I (1945); II (1956); III (1956), see next item.
- A.W.Gomme, A Historical Commentary on Thucydides, I: Introduction and Commentary on Book I (Oxford, 1945).II; The Ten Years' War, Books II-III (Oxford, 1956).III; The Ten Years' War, Books IV-V 24 (Oxford, 1956).
 "Athenian Notes. 1, Athenian Politics, 510-483 B.C.; 2, The Treaty of Callias," A.J.P. LXV (1944), pp. 321-339.
- H.Grégoire and R.Goossens, "Les Allusions Politiques dans L'Hélène d'Euripide; L'Épisode de Teucros et les Débuts du Teucricle Évagoras," C.R.A.I. (1940), pp. 206-227.
- G.R. Greece and Rome.
- G.R.B.S. Greek, Roman and Byzantine Studies.
- Haggard, Secretaries (1930), see next item..
- P.Haggard, The Secretaries of the Athenian Boule (Missouri, 1930).
 "The Secretaries of the Athenian Boule in the Fifth Century," P.A.P.A., LVII (1926), pp. xxxi-xxxii.
- Hartel, Studien, II (1878), see next item.
- W.Hartel, Studien ueber attisches Staatsrecht und Urkundenwesen, II (Vienna, 1878).

- J. Hatzfeld, Alcibiade: Étude sur l'Histoire d'Athènes à la Fin du V^e Siècle (Paris, 1951).
- Heichelheim, Wirtschaftsgeschichte, I (1938), see next item.
- F.M.Heichelheim, Wirtschaftsgeschichte des Altertums, I (Leiden, 1938).
- Hermes, Hermes. Zeitschrift fuer klassische Philologie.
- N.Herz and W.K.Pritchett, "Marble in Attic Epigraphy," A.J.A., XLVII (1953), pp. 71-83.
- E.L.Hicks, A Manual of Greek Historical Inscriptions (Oxford, 1882).
- Hicks and Hill, Manual² (1901), see next item.
- E.L.Hicks and G.F.Hill, A Manual of Greek Historical Inscriptions (second edition, Oxford, 1901).
- C.G.Higgins and W.K.Pritchett, "Engraving Techniques in Attic Epigraphy," A.J.A., LXIX (1965), pp. 367-371.
- Hignett Constitution (1952), see next item.
- C.Hignett A History of the Athenian Constitution to the End of the Fifth Century B.C. (Oxford, 1952).
- Hill Sources² (1951), see next item.

- G.F.Hill, Sources for Greek History between the Persian and the Peloponnesian Wars (second edition, edited by R.Meiggs and A.Andrewes, Oxford, 1951).
- F.Hiller von Gaertringen, "Attische Inschriften, I. Oiniadai," Sitzungsb.Ak.Berlin (1921), pp. 436-438.
- G.F.Hill, A History of Cyprus, I (Cambridge,1940).
- Historia, Zeitschrift fuer alte Geschichte.
- H.F.Hitzig, "Altgriechische Staatsvertraege ueber Rechtshilfe," Festgabe Regelsberger (1907), pp. 70-122.
- T.Homolle, "Nouvelles et Correspondance," B.C.H., I (1877), pp. 51-53.
- Hondius, N.I.A. (1925), see next item..
- J.J.E.Hondius, Novae Inscriptiones Atticae (Leiden,1925).
- "Novae Inscriptiones Atticae," Mnemosyne, XLIX (1921), pp. 201-204.
- R.J.Hopper, "Interstate Juridical Agreements in the Athenian Empire," J.H.S., LXIII (1943), pp. 47-51.
- H.S.C.P. Harvard Studies in Classical Philology.
- H.S.C.P., Suppl., I Harvard Studies in Classical Philology, Supplementary Volume I: Athenian Studies Presented to William Scott Ferguson (Cambridge, Mass., 1940).

Inscr.Cos (1891). The Inscriptions of Cos, edited by
W.R.Paton and E.L.Hicks (London, 1891).

Inscr.Cret., IV (1940). Inscriptiones Creticae, IV: Tituli
Gortynii, edited by M.Guarducci
(Rome, 1950).

I.G. Inscriptiones Graecae.

I.G., I. Inscriptiones Atticae Anno Euclidis
Vetustiores, edited by A.Kirchhoff (Berlin,
1873; supplements in 1877, 1886 and 1891).

I.G., I². Inscriptiones Atticae Euclidis Anno
Anteriores, editio minor, edited by
F.Hiller von Gaertringen (Berlin, 1924).

I.G., II, 1-5. Inscriptiones Atticae Aetatis quae est
inter Euclidis Annum et Augusti Tempora,
edited by U.Koehler (Berlin, 1877-1895):
fasc. 1 (1877); 2 (1883); 3 (1888);
4 (1893); 5 (1895).

I.G., II², 1-3. Inscriptiones Atticae Euclidis Anno
Posteriores, editio minor, edited by
J.Kirchner (Berlin, 1913-1940): fasc. 1
(1913); 1, addenda et index (1918); 2.1
(1927); 2.2 (1931); 3.1 (1935); 3.2 (1940).

I.G., V, 2. Inscriptiones Laconiae, Messeniae, Arcadiae,
edited by F.Hiller von Gaertringen (Berlin,
1913).

- I.G., IX, 1. Inscriptiones Graeciae septentrionalis Voluminibus VII et VIII non comprehensae, I: Inscriptiones Phocidis, Locridis, Aetoliae, Acarnaniae, insularum maris Ionii, edited by W.Dittenberger (Berlin, 1897).
- I.G., XI, 4. Inscriptiones Deli, IV: Inscriptiones Deli liberae. Decreta, foedera, catalogi, dedicationes, varia, edited by P.Roussel (Berlin, 1914).
- I.G., XII, 1. Inscriptiones insularum maris Aegaei praeter Delum, I: Inscriptiones Rhodi, Chalce, Carpathi, cum Saro, Casi, edited by F. Hiller von Gaertringen (Berlin, 1895).
- I.G., XII, 2. II: Inscriptiones Lesbi, Nesi, Tenedi, edited by W.Paton (Berlin, 1899).
- I.G., XII, 8. VIII: Inscriptiones insularum maris Thracici, edited by C.Fredrich (Berlin, 1909).
- I.G., XII, Supplementum. Inscriptiones Graecae insularum maris Aegaei praeter Delum, edited by F.Hiller von Gaertringen (Berlin, 1939).
- I.G., XIV. Inscriptiones Siciliae et Italiae, additis graecis Galliae, Hispaniae, Britanniae, Germaniae inscriptionibus, edited by G.Kaibel (Berlin, 1890).
- Index Ac.Goett. Index Scholarum publice et privatim in Academia Georgia Augusta per Semestre aestivum habendarum, Goettingen.

- Intelligenzblatt. Archaeologisches Intelligenzblatt der allgemeinen literarischen Zeitschriften.
- W.Janell, Ausgewahlte Inschriften (Berlin, 1906).
- Jahreshefte. Jahreshefte des oesterreichischen archaeologischen Instituts in Wien.
- Jeffery, Local Scripts (1961), see next item.
- L.H.Jeffery, The Local Scripts of Archaic Greece; A Study of the Origin of the Greek Alphabet and its Development from the Eighth to the Fifth Centuries B.C. (Oxford, 1961).
- J.H.S. Journal of Hellenic Studies.
- Kahrstedt, Magistratur (1936), see next item.
- U.Kahrstedt, Untersuchungen zur Magistratur in Athen (Studien zum oeffentlichen Recht Athens, Teil 2, Stuttgart, 1936).
- Staatsgebiet und Staatsangehoerige in Athen (Goettinger Forschungen, Heft 4, Stuttgart and Berlin, 1934).
- "Untersuchungen zu athenischen Behoerden, IV. Bemerkungen zur Geschichte des Rats der Fuenfhundert," Klio, XXXIII (1940), pp. 1-12.
- P.-W., R.-E., VIII,1 (1912), 457:67-458:31, s.v. Herakleides (1).
- G.Kaibel, Epigrammata Graeca ex Lapidibus Conlecta (Berlin, 1878).

- P.Kavvadias, "ἐκ τῶν περὶ τὴν Ἀκρόπολιν ἀνασκαφῶν," E.A.(1898), pp. I-22.
 "Ἐπιγραφικά. Προσθηκαί. Α΄," E.A.(1898), p. 135.
- B.Keil, "Amtsjahre und Kalenderjahre im V. Jahrhundert," Hermes, XXIX (1894), pp. 32-81.
- Keil, Anal.Epigr., see next item.
- C.Keil, Analecta Epigraphica et Onomatologica (Leipzig, 1842).
- Kern, Inscr.Gr. (1913), see next item.
- O.Kern, Inscriptiones Graecae (Bonn, 1913).
- A.Kirchhoff, "Mittheilung," Monatsb.Ak.Berlin (1861, publ.1862), pp. 601-608.
 "Ueber das Bruchstueck eines attischen Psephisma," Sitzungsb.Ak.Berlin (1886), pp. 303-314.
 "Inscripfen von der Akropolis zu Athen aus der Zeit nach dem Jahre des Archon Eukleides," Sitzungsb.Ak.Berlin (1887), pp. 1059-1074, 1185-1205.
 "Inscripfen von der Akropolis zu Athen," Sitzungsb.Ak.Berlin (1888), pp. 239-254.
- Kirchner, P.A., see next item.
- J.Kirchner, Prosopographia Attica (2 volumes, second edition, Berlin, 1913)
- Kirchner, Images¹ (1935);²(1948), see next item.

- J. Kirchner, Imagines Inscriptionum Atticarum, ein Bilderatlas epigraphischer Denkmäler Attikas (Berlin, 1935; second edition edited by G. Klaffenbach, Berlin, 1948).
- Klio. Klio, Beiträge zur alten Geschichte.
- U. Koehler, "Zur Geschichte des Nikiasfriedens," Ath. Mitt., I (1876), pp. 171-172.
 "Die attischen Grabsteine des fünften Jahrhunderts, I," Ath. Mitt., X (1885), pp. 359-379.
 "Herakleides der Klazomenier," Hermes, XXVII (1892), pp. 68-78.
 "Attische Inschriften des fünften Jahrhunderts," Hermes, XXXI (1896), pp. 137-154.
- W. Kolbe, "Zur athenischen Marinerwaltung," Ath. Mitt., XXVI (1901), pp. 377-418.
- Koumanoudis, A. E. E. (1871), see next item.
- S. A. Koumanoudis, Ἀττικῆς Ἐπιγραφαὶ Ἐπιτύμβιοι (Athens, 1871).
 "Ἀττικὰ ψηφίσματα," Ἀθηναίων (1876), pp. 74-106, 164-191.
 "Ἐπιγραφαὶ ἐκ τῶν περὶ τὸ Ἀσκληπιεῖον τόπων," Ἀθηναίων, VI (1877), pp. 127-148.
 "Ἀττικαὶ Ἐπιγραφαί," Ἀθηναίων, X (1881), pp. 68-75.
 "Ψηφίσματα Ἀττικά," E. A. (1883), pp. 170-171.

"Δύο δωδεκάδες Ἀττικῶν ψηφισμάτων," E.A. (1886),
pp. 97-115.

S.N.Koumanoudis, "Ἐπιγραφαὶ ἀνέκδοτοι," Νέον Ἀθήναιον,
II (1952), pp. 31-32.

P.Kretschmer and E.Locker, Rueckläufiges Woerterbuch der
griechischen Sprache (Goettingen, 1963).

A.Kuenzi, Epidosis: Sammlung freiwilliger Beiträe zu
Zeiten der Not in Athen (Bern, 1923).

Lambrechts, Proxeni decreten (1958), see next item.

A.Lambrechts, Tekst en Uitzicht van de Atheense Proxeni decreten Tot 323 v.C. (Brussels, 1958).

Larfeld, Gr.Epigr., II (1902), see next item.

W.Larfeld, Handbuch der griechischen Epigraphie, II: die
Attischen Inschriften, I (Leipzig, 1898-1902).

Larfeld, Gr.Epigr.³ (1914), see next item.

W.Larfeld, Griechische Epigraphik (third edition, Muenchen,
1914).

LeBas and Reinach, Voyage (1888), see next item.

P.LeBas and S.Reinach, Voyage Archéologique en Grèce et en
Asie Mineure, I: Attique (Paris, 1888).

T.Lenschau, P.-W., R.-E., XIX, 1 (1941), 907:32-911:28, s.v.
Phrynichos (3).

"Die Vorgaenge in Athen nach dem Sturz der Vier-
hundert," Rh.M., XCI (1941), pp. 24-30.

B.Leonardos, "Décret Athénien de 320/9," D.A. (1915), pp. 195-
224.

- Lerat, Locriens, I (1952), see next item.
- L.Lerat, Les Locriens de l'Ouest, I: Topographie et Ruines (Bibliothèque des Écoles Françaises d'Athènes et de Rome, Fasc.176, Paris, 1952).
- D.M.Lewis, "Notes on Attic Inscriptions," B.S.A., XLIX (1954), pp. 17-50.
- "Apollo Delios," B.S.A., LV (1960), pp. 190-194.
- J.H.Lipsius, Das attische Recht und Rechtsverfahren, I (Leipzig, 1905).
- H.W.Litchfield, "The Attic Alphabet in Thucydides. A Note on Thuc. VIII, 9.2," H.S.C.P., XXIII (1912), pp. 129-154.
- R.Loeper, "Ἀποσπασμα κατάλογον πρυτάνεων," E.A., III (1893) p.210.
- G.Loeschcke, De Titulis Aliquot Atticis Quaestiones Historicae (Bonn, 1876).
- H.G.Lolling, "Ἐπιγραφαὶ ἀνακοινώσεις: εὗρεσις ἐπιγραφῶν ἐν τῇ Ἀκροπόλει," D.A. (1890), pp.37-42.
- "Εὗρεσις ἐπιγραφῶν ἐν τῇ Ἀκροπόλει," D.A. (1888), pp. 110-115.
- "Ἀνασκαφαὶ καὶ εὐρήματα. δ): ἐπιγραφαὶ ἐν τῇ Ἀκροπόλει," D.A. (1888), pp. 205-209.

- C.P.Loughran and A.E.Raubitschek, "Three Attic Proxeny Decrees," Hesperia, XVI (1947), pp. 78-81.
- L.-S.-J., 9/(1940). A Greek-English Lexicon, edited by H.G. Liddel and R.Scott (ninth edition edited by H.S.Jones and R.McKenzie, Oxford, 1940).
- S.Luria, "Zur Geschichte der Praeskripte in den attischen voreuklidischen Volksbeschlüssen," Hermes, LXII (1927), pp. 257-275.
- W.A.McDonald, "A Linguistic Examination of an Epigraphical Formula," A.J.A., LIX (1965), pp. 151-155.
- MacDowell, Mysteries (1962), see next item.
- D.M.MacDowell, Andokides: On the Mysteries (Oxford, 1962).
- M.F.McGregor, "The Genius of Alkibiades," Phoenix, XIX (1965), pp. 27-46.
- H.B.Mattingly, "Two Notes on Athenian Financial Decrees," B.S.A., LXII (1967), pp. 13-17.
- "Athenian Imperialism and the Foundation of Brea," C.Q., XVI (1966), pp. 172-192.

- H.B. Mattingly, "Periclean Imperialism," Ehrenberg Studies (1966), pp. 193-224.
- "The Growth of Athenian Imperialism," Historia, XII (1963), pp. 257-273.
- "The Peace of Kallias," Historia, XIV (1965), pp. 273-281.
- "Athens and Aigina," Historia, XVI (1967), pp. 1-5.
- "Athens and Euboea," J.H.S., LXXXI (1961), pp. 124-132.
- "The Financial Decrees of Kallias (I.G., I², 91/2)," P.A.C.A., VII (1964), pp. 35-55.
- "Athens, Delphi and Eleusis in the late 420's," P.A.C.A., X (1967), pp. 61-76.
- M.H.E. Meier, Commentatio de Proxenia sive de Publico Graecorum Hospitio (Halle, 1842).
- R. Meiggs, "A Note on Athenian Imperialism," C.R., LXIII (1949), pp. 9-12.
- "The Dating of Fifth-Century Attic Inscriptions," J.H.S., LXXXVI (1966), pp. 86-98.
- Meiggs and Lewis, G.H.I. (1969), see next item.
- R. Meiggs and D.M. Lewis A Selection of Greek Historical Inscriptions to the End of the Fifth Century B.C. (Oxford, 1969).

Mélanges Glotz, I, II (1932). Mélanges Gustave Glotz

(2 volumes, Paris, 1932).

Mélanges Nicole, II (1905). Mélanges J. Nicole, II

(Paris, 1905).

B.D.Meritt,

The Athenian Calendar in the Fifth Century, Based on a Study of the Detailed Accounts of Money Borrowed by the Athenian State, I.G., I², 324 (Cambridge, Mass., 1928).

Athenian Financial Documents of the Fifth Century (University of Michigan Studies, Humanistic series, XXVII, Ann Arbor, 1932).

Epigraphica Attica (Martin Classical Lectures, IX, Cambridge, Mass., 1940).

"An Athenian Treaty with an Unknown State," A.J.P., LXVIII (1947), pp. 312-315.

"Notes on Attic Inscriptions," A.J.P., LXIX (1948), pp. 70-72.

"Archelaos and the Deceleian War," Capps Studies (1936), pp. 246-252.

"Greek Inscriptions," Hesperia, V (1936), pp. 355-430.

"Greek Inscriptions," Hesperia, VII (1938), pp. 76-146.

- B.D.Meritt, "Greek Inscriptions," Hesperia, VIII (1939), pp. 48-82.
- "Notes on Attic Decrees," Hesperia, X (1941), pp. 301-337.
- "Greek Inscriptions," Hesperia, XI (1942), pp. 275-303.
- "Greek Inscriptions," Hesperia, XIII (1944), pp. 210-268.
- "Attic Inscriptions of the Fifth Century," Hesperia, XIV (1945), pp. 61-133.
- "Greek Inscriptions," Hesperia, XV (1946), pp. 169-253.
- "Greek Inscriptions," Hesperia, XXI (1952), pp. 340-380.
- "Greek Inscriptions," Hesperia, XXIX (1960), pp. 1-77.
- "Greek Inscriptions," Hesperia, XXXII (1963), pp. 1-56.
- "An Athenian Decree," Robinson Studies, II (1953), pp. 298-303.
- B.D.Meritt and H.T.Wade-Gery, "The Dating of Documents to the Mid-Fifth Century, I," J.H.S., LXXXII (1962), pp. 67-74.

B.D.Meritt and H.T.Wade-Gery, "The Dating of Documents to the Mid-Fifth Century, II," J.H.S., LXXXIII (1963), pp. 100-118.

B.D.Meritt, H.T.Wade-Gery and M.F.McGregor,, The Athenian Tribute Lists, I (Cambridge, Mass., 1939).

II(Princeton, 1949).

III (Princeton, 1950).

IV (Princeton, 1953).

Meyer, Forschungen, II (1899), see next item.

E.Meyer, Forschungen zur alten Geschichte, II: zur Geschichte des fuenften Jahrhunderts v. Chr. (Halle, 1899).

G.d.A., III, IV (1901), see next item.

Geschichte des Alterthums, III: das Perserreich und die Griechen... bis zu den Friedensschluessen von 448 und 446 v. Chr. (Stuttgart, 1901).

IV: das Perserreich und die Griechen... Athen (vom Frieden von 446 bis zur Capitulation Athens im Jahre 404 v. Chr.) (Stuttgart and Berlin, 1901).

A.T.F.Michaelis, Der Parthenon (2 volumes, Leipzig, 1870-1871).

Michel, Recueil (1900), see next item.

- C. Michel, Recueil d'Inscriptions Grecques (Brussels and Paris, 1900).
Recueil, Supplément (1912), see next item.
Recueil d'Inscriptions Grecques,
Supplément (Brussels and Paris, 1912).
- P. Monceaux, Essai sur les proxènes athéniens (Paris, 1882).
Les Proxénies Grecques (Paris, 1886).
D.-S., IV.1 (1907), pp. 732-740, s.v. Proxenia.
- Monatsb. Ak. Berlin. Monatsberichte der Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Berlin.
- O. Mueller, Untersuchungen zur Geschichte des attischen Buerger- und Eherechts, Neue Jahrbuecher, XXV, Supplement (1899), pp. 663-866.
- Muenchener Studien. Muenchener Studien zur Sprachwissenschaft.
- K. D. Mylonas, "Ἐπιγραφαὶ Ἀττικόν," B.C.H., XII (1888), pp. 129-152.
 "Ἐπιγραφαὶ ἐκ τῆς Ἀκροπόλεως," B.C.H., XIII (1889), pp. 152-155.
- Nachmanson, H.A.I.² (1931), see next item.
- E. Nachmanson, Historische Attische Inschriften (Kleine Texte fuer Vorlesungen und Uebungen, 110, second edition, Berlin, 1931).
- Neue Jahrbuecher. Neue Jahrbuecher fuer classische Philologie.

- Num.Chron. Numismatic Chronicle.
- O.G.I. Orientis Graeci Inscriptiones Selectae,
edited by W.Dittenberger (Leipzig, 1903-1905).
- J.H.Oliver, "Selected Greek Inscriptions," Hesperia,
II (1933), pp. 480-518.
"The Monument with the Marathon Epigrams,"
Hesperia, V (1936), pp. 225-234.
- P.A.C.A. Proceedings of the African Classical
Association.
- P.A.P.A. Proceedings of the American Philological
Association.
- A.A.Palaios, "Ψήφισμα τειχισμού καὶ φρουρήσεως τῆς
Ἐλευσίνος," Πόλεμον , I (1929), pp. 174-
180.
- U.E.Paoli, Studi di Diritto Attico (Pubblicazioni
della r. Università degli Studi di Firenze,
Facoltà di Lettere e di Filosofia, n.s. IX,
Florence, 1930).
"Il Processo di Agorato," R.F.I.C., X
(1932), pp. 289-308.
- Pečírka, Enktesis (1966), see next item.
- J.Pečírka, The Formula for the Grant of Enktesis in
Attic Inscriptions (Acta Universitatis
Carolinae: Philosophica et Historica
Monographia, XV, Prague, 1966).

- J. Pečírka, "Land Tenure and the Development of the Athenian Polis," Thomson Studies (1963), pp. 183-201.
- W. Peek, Kerameikos. Ergebnisse der Ausgrabungen, III: Inschriften, Ostraka, Fluchtafeln (Berlin, 1941).
- J. Penndorf, De Scribibus Reipublicae Atheniensium (Leipziger Studien, XVIII, Leipzig, 1897).
- P. Perdrizet, "Παράσσηα de Villes sur des Stèles de Proxénie," B.C.H., XX (1896), pp. 549-562.
- S. Perlman, "A Note on the Political Implications of Proxenia in the Fourth Century," C.Q., VIII (1958), pp. 185-191.
- Philologus. Philologus: Zeitschrift fuer das klassische Altertum.
- Pittakys, L'Ancienne Athènes (1835), see next item.
- K.S. Pittakys, L'Ancienne Athènes, ou La Description des Antiquités d'Athènes et de ses environs (Athens, 1835).
- E.A. (from 1837 to 1862 Pittakys published continuously in this journal, numbering the inscriptions consecutively throughout each of Series I and II).
- Pohl, Medicis (1902), see next item.
- R. Pohl, De Graecorum Medicis Publicis (Berlin, 1902).

- H.Pomtow, "Delphische Neufunde, III," Klio, XV (1918), pp. 303-338.
- Pope, Foreigners (1947), see next item.
- H.Pope, Foreigners in Attic Inscriptions (Philadelphia, 1947).
Non-Athenians (1935), see next item.
Non-Athenians in Attic Inscriptions (New York, 1935).
- W.K.Pritchett, Review of Austin, Stoichedon, in A.J.A., XLIII (1939), pp. 534-536.
 "Epigraphica Restituta," A.J.P., LXXXV (1964), pp. 40-55.
 "Expenditures of Athena, 408-406 B.C. and the Hellenotamiai," B.C.H., LXXXVIII (1964), pp. 455-481.
 "Greek Inscriptions," Hesperia, XI (1942), pp. 230-249.
 "The Attic Stelai, I," Hesperia, XXII (1953), pp. 225-299.
 "The Attic Stelai, II," Hesperia, XXV (1956), pp. 178-317.
- P.-W., R.-E. Pauly- Wissowa-Kroll, Real-Encyclopaedie der classischen Altertumswissenschaft, (Stuttgart, 1894-).
- Rangabé, A.H., I (1842); II (1855), see next item.

- A.R.Rangabé, Antiquités Helléniques ou Répertoire d'Inscriptions et d'autres Antiquités Decouvertes depuis l'Affranchissement de la Grèce (2 volumes, Athens, 1842 and 1855).
- A.E.Raubitschek, "The Mechanical Engraving of Circular Letters," A.J.A., LV (1951), pp. 343-344.
 "The Treaties between Persia and Athens," G.R.B.S., V (1964), pp. 151-159.
 "Greek Inscriptions," Hesperia, XII (1943), pp. 12-88.
P.-W., R.-E., XIX.2 (1938), 1591:13-1591:45, s.v. Phainippos (2).
P.-W., R.-E., XIX.2 (1938), 1786:2-1786:53, s.v. Phanosthenes.
- Raubitschek, Dedications (1949), see next item.
- A.E.Raubitschek and L.H.Jeffery, Dedications from the Athenian Acropolis. A Catalogue of the Inscriptions of the Sixth and Fifth Centuries B.C. (Cambridge, Mass., 1949).
- B.Rayet, "Communication," Bulletin de l'École Française en Athènes, I (1871), p. 246.
- R.E.A. Revue des Études Anciennes.

- R.E.G. Revue des Études Grecques.
- R.F.I.C. Rivista di filologia e di istruzione classica.
- Rev.Phil. Revue de Philologie de Littérature et d'Histoire ancienne.
- Rh.M. Rheinisches Museum fuer Philologie.
- J. and L.Robert, "Bulletin Épigraphique," R.E.G., LVII (1944), pp. 175-241.
- "Bulletin Épigraphique," R.E.G., LIX-LX (1946-1947), pp. 298-372.
- "Bulletin Épigraphique," R.E.G., LXII (1949), pp. 92-162.
- "Bulletin Épigraphique," R.E.G., LXV (1952), pp. 124-202.
- "Bulletin Épigraphique," R.E.G., LXXVII (1964), pp. 127-259.
- "Bulletin Épigraphique," R.E.G., LXXXI (1968), pp. 420-549.
- L.Robert, Monnaies Grecques (Centre de recherches d'histoire et de philologie:hautes études numismatiques, 2, Paris and Geneva, 1967).
- Roberts and Gardner, Epigraphy, II (1905), see next item.
- E.S.Roberts and E.A.Gardner, An Introduction to Greek Epigraphy, II:
 The Inscriptions of Attica
 (Cambridge, 1905).

- Robinson Studies, II (1953). Studies Presented to David Moore Robinson on his Seventieth Birthday, II, edited by W.C.Korfmacher (St.Louis, Missouri, 1953).
- H.Roehl, "Zu Lysias XX 19, Andocides II 23, Lysias XIII 72, Corpus Inscr. Atticarum 59," Hermes, XI (1876), pp. 379-381.
- L.Ross, Kunstblaetter, XXVII (1835), pp. 105-106. Archaeologische Aufsätze, I (Leipzig, 1855-1861).
- P.Roussel, "L'Amende de Chios (Aristophane, Paix, V. 169-172)," R.E.A., XXXV (1933), pp.385-386. "Rémarques sur un Discours d'Antiphon (περὶ τοῦ Ἀρπύδιου φόρου) ," Mélanges Glotz, II (1932), pp. 813-822.
- G.de Sanctis, "Contributi epigrafici alla cronologia della guerra deceleica," R.F.I.C., LXIII (1935), pp. 205-213.
- Satura Sauppe (1879). Satura Philologica Hermanno Sauppio Obtulit Amicorum Conlegarum Decas (Berlin, 1879).
- Sauppe, Proxenis (1877), see next item.
- H.Sauppe, Commentatio de Proxenis Atheniensium (Index Ac.Goett., Goettingen, 1877).
- Scala, Staatsvertraege, I (1898), see next item.

- R.von Scala, Die Staatsvertraege des Altertums, I
(Leipzig, 1898).
- A.Schaefer, Demosthenes und seine Zeit (3 volumes,
Leipzig, 1885, 1886 and 1887).
- H.Schaeffer, "Beitraege zur Geschichte der attischen
Symmachie," Hermes, LXXIV (1939), pp.
225-264.
- R.S.Schlaifer, Review of A.T.L., I, in A.H.R., XLV (1939-
1940), pp. 369-371.
"Notes on Athenian Public Cults," H.S.C.P.,
LI (1940), pp. 233-260.
- E.Schlesinger, Die Griechische Asylie (Giessen, 1933).
- W.Schmitthenner, De Coronarum apud Athenienses Honoribus
Quaestiones Epigraphicae (Berlin, 1891).
- R.Schoell, "Der Prozess des Phidias," Sitzungsb.Bayr.
Ak. (1888), pp. 1-53.
- R.Schoene, Griechische Reliefs aus Athenischen Samm-
lungen (Leipzig, 1872).
- J.G.Schubert, De Proxenia Attica (Leipzig, 1881).
- E.Schweigert, "Inscriptions from the North Slope of the
Akropolis," Hesperia, VII (1938), pp.
264-310.
- Schwyzzer, D.G. (1923), see next item.
- E.Schwyzzer, Dialectorum Graecarum Exempla Epigraphica
Potiora (Leipzig, 1923).

- S.E.G. Supplementum Epigraphicum Graecum (Leiden, 1923-).
S.E.G., III (1927-1929), edited by J.J.E.Hondius.
S.E.G., X (1949), edited by J.J.E.Hondius and
A.E.Raubitschek.
S.E.G., XI (1954), edited by J.J.E.Hondius and
A.G.Woodhead.
S.E.G., XII (1955), edited by A.G.Woodhead.
S.E.G., XIV (1957), edited by A.G.Woodhead.
S.E.G., XVI (1959), edited by A.G.Woodhead.
S.E.G., XVII (1960), edited by A.G.Woodhead.
S.E.G., XVIII (1962), edited by A.G.Woodhead.
S.E.G., XIX (1963), edited by A.G.Woodhead.
S.E.G., XXI (1965), edited by A.G.Woodhead.
S.E.G., XXIII (1968), edited by A.G.Woodhead.
S.E.G., XXIV (1969), edited by A.G.Woodhead.
- Serta Hoffileriana (1940). Serta Hoffileriana: Hoffilerov
Zbornik (Zagreb, 1940).
- S.I.G., I² (1898), I³ (1915). Sylloge Inscriptionum
Graecarum, I, edited by W.
Dittenberger (second edition,
Leipzig, 1898; third edition,
Leipzig, 1915).
- Sitzungsb.Ak.Berlin. Sitzungsberichte der koeniglich
preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaft
ten zu Berlin.

- Sitzungsb.Ak.Wien. Sitzungsberichte der Akademie der Wissenschaften in Wien.
- Sitzungsb.Bayr.Ak. Sitzungsberichte der Bayerischen Akademie der Wissenschaften.
- Sonderschr.Wien Sonderschriften des oesterreichischen archaeologischen Instituts in Wien.
- K.Spyridakis, Evagoras I von Salamis (Stuttgart,1935).
 Κύπριοι Βασιλεῖς τοῦ 4 Αἰ. π. Χ. (411-311/10 π. Χ.) (Leukosia, 1963).
- G.E.M. de Ste.-Croix, "Notes on Jurisdiction in the Athenian Empire," C.Q., LV (1961), pp.94-112.
 "The Constitution of the Five Thousand: III. Ath.Pol. 30-31 and Contemporary Decrees," Historia, V (1956), pp.1-23.
- D.M.Stockton, "The Peace of Callias," Historia,VIII (1959), pp. 61-79.
- R.S.Stroud, Drakon's Law on Homicide (University of California Publications:Classical Studies, Volume 3, Berkeley and Los Angeles,1968).
- H.K.Suesserot, Griechische Plastik des 4. Jahrhunderts vor Christus; Untersuchungen zur Zeitbestimmung (Frankfurt, 1938).
- Svoronos, A.N.M. (1903-1937), see next item.
- I.N.Svoronos, Das Athener Nationalmuseum (Athens,1903-1937).
- H.Swoboda, P.-W.,R.-E., VI.2 (1907), 820:43-828:59, s.v. Evagoras (8 and 9).

- H.Swoboda, "Bemerkungen zur politischen Stellung der athenischen Strategen," Rh.M., XLV (1890), pp. 288-310.
- L.von Sybel, Katalog der Skulpturen zu Athen (Berlin, 1881).
- E.Szanto, Untersuchungen ueber das attische Buergerrecht (Wien, 1881).
- T.A.P.A. Transactions of the American Philological Association.
- Thomson Studies. Γέρας : Studies Presented to George Thomson on the Occasion of his Sixtieth Birthday (Prague, 1963).
- P.Thraemer, P.-W., R.-E., II.2 (1896), 1642:50-1697:33, s.v. Asklepios (2).
- C.Tissot, Des Proxénies Grecques et de leur Analogie avec les Institutions Consulaires Modernes (Dijon, 1863).
- Tod,, G.H.I., I¹ (1933); I² (1946), see next item.
- M.N.Tod, A Selection of Greek Historical Inscriptions to the End of the Fifth Century (Oxford, 1933; second edition, 1946).
- "A Note on the Spelling of ἐξάμου = ἐκ Σάμου," A.J.P., LXVII (1946), pp. 329-333.
- "The Progress of Greek Epigraphy 1935-1936," J.H.S., LVII (1937), pp. 160-218.

- J.S.Traill, "Two New Prytany Inscriptions from the Athenian Agora," Hesperia, XXXVIII (1969), pp. 418-431.
- J.Ullrich, De Proxenia (Berlin, 1822).
- J.L.Ussing, Inscriptiones Graecae Ineditae (Copenhagen, 1846).
- I.M.J.Valeton, "de Inscriptionis Phrynichaeae Partis ultimae Lacunis explendis," Hermes, XLIII (1908), pp. 481-510.
- H.T.Wade-Gery, "Studies in Attic Inscriptions of the Fifth Century B.C.," B.S.A., XXXIII (1932/3, published 1935), pp. 101-136.
 "The Peace of Kallias," H.S.C.P., Suppl. I (1940), pp. 121-156.
 "The Financial Decrees of Kallias (I.G., I², 91-92)," J.H.S., LI (1931), pp. 57-85.
- Walter, Beschreibung (1923), see next item.
- O.Walter, Beschreibung der Reliefs im kleinen Akropolis-museum in Athen (Wien, 1923).
 "Neugewonnene Reliefs der Athenischen Museen," Beiblatt (1911), pp. 57-61.
 "Zu Attischen Reliefs," Beiblatt (1915), pp. 87-98.
 "Ein Beitrag zur Aussprache des Griechischen," Serta Hoffileriana (1940), pp. 101-103.
- A.B.West,, "Prosopographical Notes on the Treaty between

Athens and Haliai," A.J.P., LVI (1935),
pp. 72-76.

E.Weston, "New Dating for some Attic Honorary Decrees,"
A.J.P., LXI (1940), pp. 345-357.

U.von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, Curae Thucydideae (Index
Ac.Goett., 1885).
Aristotles und Athen (2
volumes, Berlin, 1893).

A.Wilhelm, Att.Urk., see next item.

Attische Urkunden, I-V (1911-1942).

Att.Urk., I (1911): "Iphiades von Abydos und
Archonides von Herbita," Anzeiger Ak.Wien, XIV
(1911), pp. 170-179.

Att.Urk., III (1925): Sitzungsb.Ak.Wien, CCII.5
(1925).

Att.Urk., IV (1939): Sitzungsb.Ak.Wien, CCXVII.
5(1939).

Att.Urk., V (1942): Sitzungsb.Ak.Wien, CCXX.5
(1942).

Beitraege (1909): Beitraege zur griechischen In-
schriftenkunde: Sonderschr.Wien, VII (1909).

N.Beitraege, VI (1921): Neue Beitrage zur
griechischen Inschriftenkunde, VI: Sitzungsb.Ak.
Wien, CLXXXIII.3 (1921).

Urk.Dram. (1906): Urkunden dramatischer Auffuehr-
ungen in Athen: Sonderschr.Wien, VI (1906).

"Urkunden des attischen Reiches," Anzeiger Ak.Wien,
X (1909), pp. 41-58.

- A. Wilhelm, "Zu griechischen Inschriften," Arch.-Epigr. Mitt., XVII (1894), pp. 35-45.
- "Inscription aus Thasos," Ath. Mitt., XXVIII (1903), pp. 437-448.
- "Bürgerrechtsverleihungen der Athener," Ath. Mitt., XXXIX (1914), pp. 290-291.
- "Epigraphischer Bericht aus Griechenland," Beiblatt (1898), pp. 41-50.
- Review of Kirchner, P.A., I, in B.Ph.W. (1902), pp. 1089-1101.
- "Communication: Note sur un Fragment d'Inscription trouvé sur l'Acropole d'Athènes," C.R.A.I. (1900), pp. 524-532.
- "Zur Geschichte von Thasos," Eranos Vindobonensis (1893), pp. 241-252.
- Review of Michel, Recueil, fasc. I, II (1897), in G.G.A. (1898), pp. 201-235.
- Review of Dittenberger, S.I.G., I² (1898), in G.G.A. (1903), pp. 769-798.
- "Attische Psephismen," Hermes, XXIV (1889), pp. 108-152.
- "Der Friedensbund der Hellenen," Jahreshefte, III (1900), pp. 145-162.
- "Die Lokrische Mädcheninschrift," Jahreshefte, XIV (1911), pp. 163-256.
- "Fünf Beschlüsse der Athener," Jahreshefte, XXI-XXII (1923-1924), pp. 123-172.

- A.Wilhelm, "Ein Beschluss der Athener," Mélanges Nicole, II (1905), pp. 597-602.
Review of E.Ziebarth, Kulturbilder aus griechischen Staedten in Z.oest.Gymn., VIII-IX (1913), pp. 673-693.
- A.G.Woodhead, The Study of Greek Inscriptions (Cambridge, 1959).
"Peisander," A.J.P., LXXXV (1954), pp. 131-146.
"Greek Inscriptions," Hesperia, XVII (1948), pp. 54-60.
- E.Ziebarth, Beitraege zur Geschichte des Seeraubs und Seehandels im alten Griechenland (Hamburg, 1929).
- Z.oest.Gymn. Zeitschrift fuer die oesterreichischen Gymnasien.
- L.Zgusta, Kleinasiatische Personennamen (Prague, 1964).

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

The subject of this study is the series of decrees issued at Athens in honour of foreigners who served the city's commercial and political interests during the fifth century B.C., the period during which Athens, having formed the Confederacy of Delos among the Greek states as a means of attacking the Persian Empire, herself became an imperial power and reduced her Confederate allies to the status of vassals.

One of the tools by which this change was effected was the office of the proxenia. We possess today fragments of some sixty-nine inscriptions found in Athens that record grants of proxeny or the award of further privileges to existing proxenoi. Literary sources add the names of another nine men, so that we know in all of seventy-eight proxenies granted during the fifth century at Athens. For the fourth century the volume of evidence, both inscriptional and literary, is much greater, but this period lies outside the scope of the present study.

My examination of the Attic proxenies is primarily epigraphic and is based upon autopsy throughout. The analytic essay that forms Part One is based upon the editions of the texts that comprise Part Two.

Modern studies of the proxenia are of three kinds: general examinations of its meaning and functions, whether at Athens

alone or throughout Greece; monographs upon specific terms or formulae found not only in proxeny-decrees but also in other types of Greek inscriptions; and analyses of the law-codes of Athens and of other Greek states. To these should be added the discussions of individual decrees in the Corpora and other collections of Greek inscriptions.

I append a bibliography of these studies, listed in chronological order; those that retain significance are preceded by asterisks.

J.Ullrich, De Proxenia (Berlin, 1822).

*C.I.G., edited by A.Boeckh (Berlin, 1828-1856); Part II of Volume I contains the inscriptions of Attica; the greatest value for the study of proxenies lies in Boeckh's discussion of Lakonian and Böiotian proxenies in Parts IV and V of Volume I.

*K.S.Pittakys, passim, E.A. (1837-1862); Pittakys edited many fragments of Attic proxenies after their excavation on the Akropolis and elsewhere in Athens.

M.H.E.Meier, Commentatio de Proxenia sive de Publico Graecorum Hospitio (Halle, 1842).

A.R.Rangabé, A.H., I and II (1842 and 1855).

C.Tissot, Des Proxénies Grecques et de leur Analogie avec les Institutions Consulaires Modernes (Dijon, 1863).

* I.G., I, edited by A.Kirchhoff (Berlin, 1873-1891); Attic inscriptions of the fifth century.

G.Loeschke, De Titulis Aliquot Atticis Quaestiones Historicae

(Bonn, 1876).

*I.G., II, edited by U.Koehler (Berlin, 1877-1895); Attic inscriptions of the fourth century and later.

H.Sauppe, Commentatio de Proxenis Atheniensium (Index Schol.Goett., 1877); a critical index of Attic proxenies.

*J.G.Schubert, De Proxenia Attica (Leipzig, 1881); investigates the formulae found in Attic proxenies.

E.Szanto, Untersuchungen ueber das griechische Buergerrecht (Wien, 1881).

P.Monceaux, Essai sur les Proxènes Athéniens (Paris, 1882).

*P.Monceaux, Les Proxénies Grecques (Paris, 1886); an expansion of his earlier essay; this remains the most comprehensive and valuable general study available, though it is now much out of date. It takes little account of epigraphical problems.

M.Goldstaub, De Ἀδείας Notione et Usu in Iure Publico Attico (Breslau, 1889).

*A.Dittmar, De Atheniensium More Exteros Coronis publice ornandi Quaestiones Epigraphicae (Leipzig, 1891): this contains many new restorations and is therefore of considerable value.

W.Schmitthenner, De Coronarum apud Athenienses Honoribus Quaestiones Epigraphicae (Berlin, 1891).

*A.Wilhelm, passim, 1889-1942 (see bibliography, pp. 42-44); Wilhelm published several fragments of Attic proxenies for the first time and made valuable comments upon many others;

he never attempted a single comprehensive study, though his Attische Urkunden, IV (1939) is largely concerned with fifth-century proxeny-decrees.

H.Francotte, De la Législation Athénienne sur les Distinctions Honorifiques (Louvain, 1900).

J.H.Lipsius, Das attische Recht und Rechtsverfahren, I (Leipzig, 1905)

G.Gerlach, Griechische Ehreninschriften (Halle, 1908).

J.d'André, La Proxénie: Contribution à l'Étude du Droit International Grec (Toulouse, 1911).

*I.G., II², edited by J.Kirchner (Berlin, 1913-1940); Attic inscriptions of the fourth century and later.

*I.G., I², edited by F.Hiller von Gaertringen (Berlin, 1924); Attic inscriptions of the fifth century.

A.Kuenzi, Epidosis (Bern, 1923).

*S.E.G. (Leiden, 1923-); the indispensable epigraphic bibliography.

J.Gerlach, Ἀντὶ Ἀγαθός (Muenchen, 1932).

E.Schlesinger, Die Griechische Asylie (Giessen, 1933).

U.E.Paoli, Studi di Diritto Attico (Florence, 1930).

U.Kahrstedt, Staatsgebiet und Staatsangehoerige in Athen (Stuttgart, 1934).

*B.D.Meritt, passim, Hesperia (1936-); first editions of fragments discovered in the excavation of the Athenian Agora conducted from 1932 onwards by the American School of Classical Studies at Athens. Meritt also discusses other proxeny-decrees

here and elsewhere (see bibliography, pp. 27-29), but has not so far attempted a single comprehensive study.

*A.Lambrechts, Tekst en Uitzicht van de Atheense Proxenedecreten Tot 323 v.C. (Brussels, 1958); an attempt to synthesize all previous work on the Attic proxenies, unfortunately, she relies too much on the work of her predecessors and too little upon autopsy.

*J.Pečírka, The Formula for the Grant of Enktesis in Attic Inscriptions (Prague, 1966); an extremely valuable study, based throughout upon autopsy and furnished with excellent photographs.

In none of the works here listed are the texts of all extant proxy-decrees available: the Corpora, it is true, are complete for their times, but do not separate proxenies from other decrees; I.G., I² is now forty-five years old and so does not include material from the excavation of the Athenian Agora (a new edition is in preparation but is not expected to be available for several years). It is the aim of the present study to provide a complete edition of all fifth-century Attic proxy-decrees so far published.

The fragmentary nature of nearly all these documents limits the conclusions that can be drawn from them; moreover, the surviving decrees are likely to be only a small fraction of the total number of proxenies granted; thus, attempts to draw conclusions from them are hazardous.

The second and third chapters of Part One are a discussion of the physical aspects of the stelai and an analysis of the various formulae found in the decrees. The second chapter establishes tentative criteria for the dating of Attic inscriptions of the fifth century.¹ Discussion of the historical significance of individual decrees will be found in the critical notes accompanying each text.

1. In 1967-1968, which I spent in Athens, D.W. Bradéen and M.F. McGregor were working on Attic letter-shapes of the fifth century. I have had full access to their notes and manuscripts.

CHAPTER TWO

THE STELAI

aMaterials:

The materials employed in the publication of decrees varied from place to place according to availability and cost. At Athens, where there was an abundant supply of good marble, bronze does not seem to have been used to any extent, though the non-survival of bronze inscriptions may be merely an accident of preservation.¹

1. Bronze could be melted down, so that obsolete decrees would be likely to disappear entirely, whereas fragments at least of marble documents might easily survive. The two extant examples of fifth-century bronze decrees known to me are both inscribed in very small letters, not suited to the monumental character of all known fifth-century proxy-decrees (S.E.G., XXI, 14, and an unpublished fragment now in the Akropolis Museum; the latter is an honorific, but apparently of a religious nature, while the former seems to be a lex sacra). Literary references are few.

Several of the extant decrees of the fifth century contain a publication-clause that specifies a stone stele. In every case the decree is inscribed on marble, not poros or any other stone, though poros was sometimes used, especially in the archaic period, for the inscription of private dedications and religious documents. Many of the proxenies and honorific decrees contain a publication-clause of this sort.²

The marble used in the fifth century is in nearly every case that known as Pentelic, or what I believe to be a variant of Pentelic. Hymettan marble is employed for dedications and private documents; there are a few decrees inscribed in a marble that is very similar to that known as Hymettan, but that I believe to derive from the Pentelic quarries.³

2. ##3,4,5,6,7(?),10,11,12(?),13,14,15,16,17(?),19(?),20,21,23(?),25(?),26,28,30,32,33,34,35,36,38,39,40,41,43,44,47,48,49,50,51,52,53,54,56,58,59(?),61,62,64,65,66,67,68,69; honorifics: I.G., I², 110,113,117 and 160.

3. Hiller (I.G., I²), when he describes the marble, uses three categories: Pentelic, white and blue; he also differentiates Parian and Hymettan marbles from Pentelic. I believe that his white and blue marbles are Pentelic variants.

Herz and Pritchett⁴ have emphasized that, physical appearances to the contrary, there is no chemical difference among the various types of Attic marble found in epigraphical study: so-called "Hymettan" marble may come from the same quarry as "Pentelic" on either Mt. Pentele or Mt. Hymettos. This I have confirmed from personal observation.

However, the terms "Hymettan" and "Pentelic" are useful short-hand labels, saving much tedious and irrelevant discussion, and I propose to employ them in this study, first defining what I mean by them. It must be emphasized that they are labels, not full geological and petrographical identifications.

"Hymettan" marble, when freshly broken, is white, with a slightly chalky appearance. Its crystals are small, hardly visible to the naked eye, and the stone will take a high polish. The pattern of foliation is usually unclear. It

4. A.J.A., XLVII (1953), pp. 71-83, especially pp. 75-77. Their discussion is very full and enlightening, but the standards they lay down are surely beyond both the abilities and the needs of most epigraphists. With their requirement that the description of marbles should be based on four factors (p. 77), the colour of the marble, the grain-size, structures visible in the marble and the presence of accessory minerals, I find no fault; it is a system that I intend to follow in this study.

rapidly weathers to a dull grey and is at all times, even when fresh, darker and less bright than "Pentellic." It is most common in inscriptions after the middle of the fourth century.

"Pentellic" marble, as generally employed in public documents of the fifth century, is creamy-white (not "snow-white," the term used by Herz and Pritchett, op.cit., p.75), the crystals usually apparent to the naked eye, its foliation often clearly visible. It frequently contains bands and streaks of greenish-blue mica and other discolorations resulting from impurities. It does not take as high a polish as Hymettan, and it weathers usually to a pale creamy-yellow, often with rusty-red patches. This rusty-red weathering is found particularly in the letters on the inscribed surfaces.

There are two other varieties of marble found in fifth-century public documents. Both, as I have said, I believe to be variants of Pentellic, though it is hard to distinguish them, in their weathered state, from Hymettan.

One, when freshly broken, is extremely white, its crystals small and hard to distinguish, but without the chalky appearance of Hymettan. It weathers to a pale blue-grey with pinkish-red patches. The foliation is usually extremely marked; when a stele has been broken it frequently splits along these planes of foliation, producing flakes of

regular thickness. Impurities in the planes of fracture, between flakes, are often deep pink in colour. This is the marble called marmor caeruleus by Hiller.⁵

This blue-white marble seems not to have come into vogue before the late 420's; there exist a few examples from the mid-fifth century, but these do not seem to have the very marked foliation of the later documents.⁶

The second variant is also extremely white, but with very noticeable small crystals. It weathers with a faint blue tinge, but no trace of red, never acquiring the dull grey tone of Hymettan, and lacking the latter's chalky appearance when freshly broken. This marble has indistinct foliation and few, if any, impurities. Hiller calls it albus.⁷ He has another category, candidus,⁸ which is really no different from albus.

5. I.G., I², 31 (#8).

6. Proxeny-decrees are ##8, 11, 13, 23, 24, 37, 38, 39, 41, 43, 44, 45, 46, 49, 61, 63, 64, 67, 68. An incomplete list of other fifth-century decrees includes I.G., I², 29, 48, 50, 62, 101, 110, 120, 123, 131, 133, 136, 138 and 172.

7. I.G., I², 6; 40/41; 46; 56(#13); 70(#28); 91/92; 102; 106a(#68); 188; 301; 399.

8. I.G., I², 93a and b(##34 and 35); 308; 945. Hiller cites I.G., I², 5 (which I have not seen) and the Hekatompedon inscription(I.G., I², 3/4) as examples of "Parian" marble. I.G., I², 3/4 is inscribed on marble first employed in the

In this study, therefore, I intend to employ the following terms to describe the colour of the marble: Hymettan; Pentellic; blue-white; white; to each I shall add notes, where relevant, about discolorations, bands and streaks, foliation and crystalline structure.

metopes of a mid-sixth century temple; as such, it may well be island marble, though in appearance it seems little different from white Attic marble.

b.Physical characteristics of the stelai

Proxeny-decrees of the fifth century were usually engraved with care, with the letters well-spaced and arranged stoichedon.⁹ Some stelai have relief-panels, either recessed into the face of the stele,¹⁰ or set above horizontal mouldings and fascias;¹¹ others have merely mouldings and fascias,¹² or triangular gables.¹³ Several have plain tops.¹⁴ No decree whose top is preserved can be dated earlier than 430 B.C., but this is probably merely an accident of survival.

Many decrees begin with a heading containing the name (and sometimes the demotic) of the secretary of the Boule at the time when the decree was passed; sometimes this heading contains the name of the eponymous archon; sometimes

9. ## 3, 8, 10, 36 are non-stoichedon; #61 is partly stoichedon.

10. ##9 and 66.

11. ##22, 29, 47 and probably #55.

12. ##26, 46 and 60.

13. ##33 and 48.

14. ##25, 31, 62, 63 and possibly #54.

the names of both the secretary and the archon are included.¹⁵

More often, a stele will bear a title in which the name of the proxenos is set out with his ethnic and patronymic;¹⁶ sometimes a stele will have both title and heading.¹⁷ The title is inscribed on the upper face of the stele, or on the projecting fascia below the relief, or on the horizontal member of the gable. The heading is generally found below the title, on the face of the stele, above the official preamble.¹⁸

15. ##8, 33, 47 and 60 have headings containing the secretary's name alone; ##50 and 63 have headings with the names of the secretary and the archon; #66 has a heading containing the archon's name alone.

16. ##1, 4, 9, 22, 29, 36, 45(?), 47, 48, 55, 63, 65(?), 66.

17. ##47, 63, 66 (the latter has its heading set above its title, both on the face of the stele).

18. In the view of Lambrechts (Proxeniedecreten [1958] , p. 36) most stelai bore either a relief, with or without a gable, or a gable alone; the horizontal member of the gable bore the title of the proxenos. This may have been so in many cases, but at least three examples survive of a completely plain stele, without gable, relief, crowning moulding, title or heading (##25, 31 and 54; #26 may also fall into this category; #62 has nothing but an invocation inscribed at the top of an otherwise plain stele).

Below these there may appear the invocation $\Theta\epsilon\omicron\iota$, above the preamble.¹⁹

The stelai vary in width, height, chequer- and letter-size. The sole feature common to all is their monumental aspect, in keeping with the atmosphere of the Akropolis, where, it appears, they were intended to be set up.²⁰

In the fifth century the letters of the text were generally between 0.008m. and 0.011m. in height, while those of the title and heading were larger.²¹ Line-length, in the majority of cases extant, is between twenty-two and thirty-three letters, with another group between thirty-eight and forty-two letters. There does not seem to be any correlation between the date of the stele and the letter-size or

19. ##31 and 62 have nothing but an invocation; #60 has both a heading and an invocation.

20. See pp.100-101, below.

21. Some eleven proxeny-decrees (out of a total of sixty-nine) have letters of height greater than 0.012m. (##3, 5, 6, 11, 12, 14, 22, 26, 32, 38 and 47; #1, not a decree but a grave-stele, also has large letters. Only ##3 and 14 have letters exceeding 0.016m. in the body of the decree).

line-length.²²

The stelai, as a rule, were inscribed on one face only; the only exception to this rule is #17, which bears upon its reverse the text of a second and later decree (I.G., II², 150) whose content appears to be in no way connected with that of #17; in this case, I think, the stele became obsolete and was re-used for the later decree.²³ In the fifth century opisthographic stelai are uncommon, except for public accounts and leges sacrae.²⁴

The backs of the stelai are generally rough-picked, sometimes flat, sometimes with a curved horizontal profile. I do not know of any case in which the original back is cut by dowel-holes or other incisions by which the stele might have been fastened to a wall; it appears that these stelai were intended to be free-standing monuments. The rough condition of the backs suggests that they were set up close to a wall, so that their backs would not be visible. Several stelai are wider at the bottom than at

22. See Table One, page 62.

23. #15 may have been opisthographic, but the text on the reverse, if there was one, has not survived.

24. I.G., I², 10/11/12/13(?); 34/35; 40/41; 46; 75; S.E.G., X, 37. I.G., I², 88/89 and 91/92 deal with financial matters, while I.G., I², 24/25 are religious in character.

the top, or have projections at the top where the relief or gable begins; apparently each stele was set up independently of the others. The relatively finished appearance of the sides is an argument in support of this hypothesis.

TABLE ONE

PROXENY-DECREES CATALOGUED ACCORDING TO THEIR LINE-LENGTHS

Line-length	<u>15</u>	<u>16</u>	<u>20</u>	<u>21</u>	<u>22</u>	<u>23</u>	<u>24</u>	<u>25</u>	<u>27</u>	<u>28</u>	<u>29</u>
-------------	-----------	-----------	-----------	-----------	-----------	-----------	-----------	-----------	-----------	-----------	-----------

Decree #	14	16	58	33	35	5	3	48	9	6	11
----------	----	----	----	----	----	---	---	----	---	---	----

				34	40	13	19	52	18	7	45
--	--	--	--	----	----	----	----	----	----	---	----

					15?	16	21	3?	39	20	53
--	--	--	--	--	-----	----	----	----	----	----	----

						27	29		47	25	
--	--	--	--	--	--	----	----	--	----	----	--

						54			49	41	
--	--	--	--	--	--	----	--	--	----	----	--

						62			50	46	
--	--	--	--	--	--	----	--	--	----	----	--

									67	57	
--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	----	----	--

											59
--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	----

Line-length	<u>30</u>	<u>31</u>	<u>32</u>	<u>33</u>	<u>36</u>	<u>38</u>	<u>40</u>	<u>41</u>	<u>42</u>	<u>45</u>	<u>46</u>
-------------	-----------	-----------	-----------	-----------	-----------	-----------	-----------	-----------	-----------	-----------	-----------

Decree #	22	17	15	23	61	32	8	12	4	10	44
----------	----	----	----	----	----	----	---	----	---	----	----

	56	30	24	64	27?	55	31		28	8?	
--	----	----	----	----	-----	----	----	--	----	----	--

	37?	38				66	68		36		
--	-----	----	--	--	--	----	----	--	----	--	--

		65				69			51		
--	--	----	--	--	--	----	--	--	----	--	--

Line-length	<u>47</u>	<u>50</u>	<u>55</u>	<u>58</u>	<u>70</u>
-------------	-----------	-----------	-----------	-----------	-----------

Decree #	27?	60	2	43	63
----------	-----	----	---	----	----

					2?
--	--	--	--	--	----

					10?
--	--	--	--	--	-----

					36?
--	--	--	--	--	-----

Note: the queries indicate documents for which two or more line-lengths are possible; the less likely lengths are queried. #1 consists of two couplets and so is not included.

cCriteria for dating

In theory, inscriptions may be dated by one or more of several means: reference within the text to a known historical event; firm archaeological evidence; analysis of the sculptural style or form of the stele; study of the evolution of technical terms, formulae and orthography; letter-shapes.

Unfortunately, the series of extant fifth-century Attic proxeny-decrees offers little unambiguous reference to known historical events: archon-dating is rare;²⁵ dating by secretary alone is inconclusive, as are other

25. Seven such proxeny-decrees survive, none earlier than 421/0 B.C.: ##33 (Aristion, 421/0 B.C.), 54 (Charias, 415/4 B.C.), 55 (Kallias, 412/1 B.C.), 62 (Euktemon, 408/7 B.C.), 63 (Euktemon or Antigenes, 408/7 or 407/6 B.C.), 65 (Antigenes, 407/6 B.C.), and 66 (Alexias, 405/4 B.C.); in addition, there are four decrees that probably contained archon-formulae, but the names of the archons cannot be restored with any certainty: ##4 and 8 (ca 460-445 B.C.) and ##31 (post 421/0 B.C.?) and 67 (ca 405/4 B.C.?).

attempts to employ prosopography as an aid;²⁶ contextual references are, for the most part, speculative.²⁷

Archaeological evidence is here of little value: no proxeny-decree has so far been uncovered in the excavation of uncontaminated fifth-century deposits.²⁸

26. Of the list in note 25 above #63 lacks the name of the secretary; in the rest, the date of the secretary is confirmed by the name of the archon. I do not know of any other proxeny-decree of the fifth century in which the secretary's date is certain. Other prosopographical references depend upon termini post or ante quem non, and thus are too vague to be of any use.

27. Exceptions are #32 (dated by reference to it in the securely-dated #33, though it is not absolutely certain that this is the decree mentioned in the text of #33), #56 (whose preamble dates it to the period of the oligarchy of 411/0 B.C.), and #61 (dated by the return to Athens in 407 B.C. of its proposer Alkibiades, after the fall of Selymbria, arrangements for which are embodied in this decree; see Xenophon, Hellenika, I, 3.10; Plutarch, Alkibiades, 30; Diodoros, XIII, 66.4).

28. Possibly, one of those decrees annulled by the Thirty in 404/3 B.C. may one day be discovered in a fifth-century context; one such document may exist (#46), but it was found in a relatively modern context. For a list of such decrees see Part Two, Appendix Ib.

Stylistic criteria, despite the claims of some art-historians, are found, upon examination, to be at best vague, at worst based upon dubious historical "evidence."²⁹ Attempts to chart the evolution of technical terms and formulae are similarly unhelpful:³⁰ in practice, these criteria, unless the document is already securely dated by other means, are valueless. Changes of orthography are likewise of little assistance, since there does not seem

29. The most recent comprehensive work of this sort is that of Binneboessel (Urkundenreliefs [1932]).

30. Lambrechts (Proxeni edicta [1958]) attempts a synthesis of all dating criteria, especially those of form, style and text. Her analysis is too often based upon insecure restorations, and she does not appear to have any first-hand experience of the stones themselves; too often she allows preconceived ideas to alter her view of the facts and to warp her judgement: as when, for example, she suggests that #32, a document inscribed throughout in Attic characters, should be placed in the early fourth century (when Ionic script was the rule), because it does not fit in with her ideas about the width of stelai (p. 32).

to be a clearly defined terminus post or ante quem non for any form.³¹

There remains the study of letter-shapes.

In the course of the fifth century there was considerable

31. Wade-Gery (J.H.S., LI [1931], pp. 78-83) catalogued the variant forms of the first declension dative plural (-ασι , -αισι , -εσι and -αις), concluding that the older disyllabic forms tended to go out of use in the 420's. Mattingly (Ehrenberg Studies [1966] , pp. 196-203) made a similar catalogue of the variant forms of the present middle and passive imperative (-οσθω , -οσθων and -εσθω , -εσθων) and of the prefixes $\chi\sigma\upsilon\nu$ - and $\sigma\upsilon\nu$ -. His conclusion was that here too the 420's were a period of transition during which the newer forms began to intrude alongside the old and that the older forms went out of use ca 420 B.C. While both Wade-Gery's and Mattingly's catalogues provide some support for the view that the older forms died out after 420 B.C., I do not think that they are of much use in establishing a terminus ante quem non for the newer forms. The use, or non-use, of the daseia has been suggested as another criterion for dating; however, though there seems to be a period in the 450's and 440's in which it was frequently omitted, there is no discernible pattern of gradually increasing use or disuse. The same is true of the substitution of Ionic -ου- for Attic -ο-; the most that can be said is that the Ionic orthography becomes more common towards the end of the century.

variation and evolution of letter-forms; in a few cases only (Attic gamma, delta, iota and tau; Ionic gamma, lambda, xi and psi) is the change so slight as to be negligible as a criterion for dating. For the remaining letters of the Greek alphabet as it was employed at Athens in the fifth century I have listed at least three, often more, basic changes of shape that can be used, singly or in combination with other letters, to provide termini post or ante quem non.³²

One absolute and undoubted criterion is the disappearance of Attic script from public documents after 403/2 B.C. as a result of the Law of Archinos.³³

Before this time, there is a period of transition, 411/0 to 403/2 B.C., during which several dated documents were inscribed throughout in Ionic script,³⁴ or in a mixture of Attic and Ionic characters;³⁵ before 411/0 B.C. there are very few dated documents employing Ionic script in whole or in part.³⁶ Documents of a private nature follow no rules; in the case of public documents the use of Ionic

32. See Table Two, p. 74.

33. Theopompos (fragment 115), quoted by Douris (fragment 76).

34. I.G., I², 110a; 124; 298; A.T.L., II, A 13; ##62 and 66.

35. I.G., I², 108; 120; 123; 304c; 305; #61.

36. I.G., I², 359 (mixed); 377 (Ionic, now lost); ##54 and

55 (Ionic). I.G., I², 57 (A.T.L., II, D 3-6) has some Ionic forms.

script before 411/0 B.C. seems to depend upon the subject-matter,³⁷ while the use of mixed script is apparently a whim, or a habit, of the secretary (not the mason).³⁸

There is a tendency to disregard variations of letter-shapes upon a single stele as being of minor importance. On the contrary, these variations can be of cardinal significance, in that they may point to the replacement of a more by a less experienced or progressive mason, or vice versa, thus indicating the existence, side by side, of two different schools of engraving that had hitherto been thought to

37. I.G., I², 16 (Phaselis); 17 (Eretria); 117 (Klazomenians at Daphnous); 377 (Delphic Amphiktyony); ##1, 15, 16, 24, 34, 35, 54 and 55. In all these cases the text may have been drafted originally in an Ionic-speaking area, as was I.G., II², 55 (A.T.L., II, D 21, for Aphytis and Poteidaia). I.G., I², 38 is a lex sacra; the stele contains two decrees, the second of which is in Ionic script; the date is not certain, but the character of the letter-shapes suggests a date in the last years of the fifth century, if not later. S.E.G., XV, 27 and 28 are both late fifth-century accounting-records.

38. I.G., I², 14/15; 34, 57; 71; 80; 126; 177; 189; 303; 314; 316; 328; 369; 373; 377; ##36; 47; 60; 61 and 69. The Coinage-Decree (A.T.L., II, D 14) was surely inscribed originally in Attic characters, but the copies erected in Aphytis, Odessa, Syme, Siphnos and Smyrna are in Ionic script; the Kos fragment is in Attic script.

flourish at different times. Such changes rarely occur within a single decree,³⁹ but are common in series documents whose texts were inscribed year by year upon the same ste-
lai.⁴⁰ The evidence of dated documents of the fifth century does not support the view that the contract for any one year was awarded to a single mason..

It will be instructive to compile a list of fifth-century inscriptions whose date is beyond reasonable doubt, and to examine the letter-variations found in them. I have therefore drawn up a chart depicting the major variations of letter-shapes found in Athenian inscriptions of the fifth century, giving to each variant a number.⁴¹ I have also compiled a

39. Casualty-lists are an apparent exception; however, when two or more hands are seen to have been at work in a single list, the second is probably the result of a later accession of names: see I.G., I², 928, 929 and 943, for example. The prescripts of the tribute quota-lists are sometimes inscribed in a different script from the accounts, perhaps as a form of decoration or flourish.

40. Tribute quota-lists, building-accounts; inventories; accounts and audits.

41. Table Two, p. 74. I have based the numeration and selection of variants upon those of M.F.McGregor and D.W.Bradeen, which they have kindly made available to me..

chronological list of securely-dated documents,⁴² and have noted in it the letter-variations by number. Such a list was drawn up by Meiggs,⁴³ but it was limited to the period 460-430 B.C. and to the letters beta, rho, sigma and phi. Using this as a base, I have drawn up a list covering the period 460-403 B.C., including in it all the letters of the alphabet except gamma, delta, eta, iota, kappa, tau, xi and psi. From this I have compiled a chart indicating such appearances or disappearances of letter-variations as seem to have significance.⁴⁴ I have included in Table Two shapes, obviously of the period 480-460 B.C., that do not occur in the dated documents but that I consider to have significance for the development of the shapes of the mid-fifth century. I have not attempted, as Meiggs did, to carry this analysis to those documents whose dating is insecure, but intend to apply my findings to the examination of the proxeny-documents that forms the subject of this study. Though Ionic omega is not found in dated inscriptions earlier than 415/4 B.C., it occurs in several documents whose dates may be set with some probability in an

42. Table Three, pp. 75-84

43. J.H.S., LXXXVI (1966), p. 92

44. Table Four, pp. 85-86

earlier period;⁴⁵ I have therefore included its variants in Table Two.

The results of this analysis in general support the orthodox view that the three-barred sigma was not employed after 440 B.C.: the latest-dated occurrence of this variant is 443/2 B.C.⁴⁶ The four-barred sigma appears in the Erechtheid Casualty-List,⁴⁷ but, although the main text must be dated to 460 B.C., or very soon after, this form of sigma, in company with an equally advanced rho, is found only in the postscript, cut in a different hand and probably a late addition to the list.

Nevertheless, the four-barred sigma makes an undoubted appearance in 453/2 B.C.,⁴⁸ and its use thereafter is increasingly frequent. As late as 443/2 B.C., both the three- and the four-barred sigma are found together in the same document.⁴⁹

45. I.G., I², 16 (ca 465 B.C.); 17 (ca 450 B.C.); 80 (ca 450 B.C.?; possibly in the 420's); 25 (ca 424/3 B.C.); I.G., II², 55 (ca 428-423 B.C.); ## 1, 15, 16, 34 and 35 (all before 415/4 B.C.).

46. I.G., I², 343.

47. I.G., I², 929.

48. A.T.L., II, List 2.

49. I.G., I², 343.

Another early variant is the tailed rho. Type 3 is not found after 445 B.C., but type 7, with rounded, not angular loop, exists for more than a decade, from 451/0 down to 438/7 B.C., and is also found in the postscript of the Erechtheid Casualty-List.⁵⁰ Types 3 and 7 are found together in 451/0 B.C.⁵¹ Both are found in company with the more advanced untailed, rounded rho from the 450's onward. This phenomenon, of advanced and primitive letter-forms being found in the same inscription, occurs throughout the fifth century; the epigraphist should be wary of dating any document on the evidence of a single letter, the more so when the inscription is small and fragmentary and contains few letters.

No absolute dating is possible, though one may arrive at an approximate date by comparing documents inscribed over a period of years by a single mason. A pattern of minor changes in the letter-shapes can sometimes be detected in dated documents by the same mason that enables undated documents by the same hand to be placed at the beginning, middle or end of such a series.⁵²

50. I.G., I², 929.

51. A.T.L., II, List 4.

52. I believe that ##49 and 63 can be so dated by their appearance in a series the earliest document in which is I.G., I², 87 and the latest I.G., I², 47.

The probable existence of schools of masons complicates the matter, however: a pupil might be expected to imitate his master's style at the beginning of his career, and to develop his own style later. I believe that many instances of hands that appear to differ only in the shapes of one or two letters may be attributed to this cause.

Another factor that may lead to variations of letter-shapes is the gradual wearing-down of tools; there is no way of detecting this when one is comparing two or more documents, but occasionally variations in the shapes of certain letters within one document may prove to be the result of a change of tools rather than of masons.

TABLE TWO

LETTER-SHAPES AT ATHENS, 480-403 B.C.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Α	Α	Α	Α	Α					
Β	Β	Β							
Γ	Γ								
Δ	Δ								
Ε	Ε	Ε	Ε	Ε					
Η	Η	Η							
Θ	Θ	Θ	Θ						
Ο	Ο	Ο	Ο						
Κ	Κ								
Λ	Λ	Λ	Λ	Λ	Λ				
Μ	Μ	Μ	Μ	Μ					
Ν	Ν	Ν	Ν	Ν	Ν	Ν	Ν	Ν	Ν
Ξ	Ξ	Ξ	Ξ	Ξ	Ξ	Ξ	Ξ	Ξ	Ξ
Π	Π	Π	Π	Π	Π	Π	Π	Π	Π
Ρ	Ρ	Ρ	Ρ	Ρ	Ρ	Ρ	Ρ	Ρ	Ρ
Σ	Σ	Σ	Σ	Σ	Σ	Σ	Σ	Σ	Σ
Τ	Τ								
Υ	Υ	Υ	Υ	Υ	Υ	Υ	Υ		
Φ	Φ	Φ	Φ	Φ	Φ	Φ	Φ	†	
Ψ	Ψ	Ψ	Ψ	Ψ	Ψ	Ψ	Ψ		
Ω	Ω	Ω	Ω	Ω	Ω	Ω	Ω		

Full

Drilled

Half

Regular

Third

Odd

Round

Oval

Oval

Flat

Inscription	Date	A	B	E	Z	Θ	Λ	M	N	O	Π	P	Σ	Υ	Φ	X	Ω	Subject	
I.G., I ² , 929	Body	460 ?	2	1	3	2	2	2	2	4	2	1	3	1	2	1	3	-	Erechtheid casualty-list
			3				4		3	7				3	3				
			4							8									
										9									
	Postscr.		2	-	-	-	4	2	-	5	2	1	4	1	1	4	-	-	
			3				4			7				5	2	7			
			4							8				6	4				
														7	8				
A.T.L., II, 1	Prescr.	454/3	3	-	4	-	4	2	3	3	1	-	1	2	-	-	2	-	Tribute quota-
										2				4					list # 1
	Text		3	1	4	3	4	2	3	1	1	1	1	1	7	1	3	-	
										3	2		9	2		3			
										5									
										7									
	Postscr.		-	-	4	-	4	-	-	2	2	-	8	1	7	-	3	-	
													9						
A.T.L., II, 2	Prescr.	453/2	-	-	4	-	-	4	-	-	-	-	9	7	6	-	-	-	Tribute quota-
	Text		3	2	4	-	4	1	2	2	1	1	4	1	5	3	3	-	list # 2
			4					2					9	2	7	4			
														4	8				
	Postscr.		3	1	4	-	4	4	2	10	2	1	1	1	7	-	3	-	
													4						
A.T.L., II, 3	Prescr.	452/1	4	-	4	-	2	-	-	5	1	-	8	1	-	-	-	-	Tribute quota-
	Text		4	2	4	1	2	2	2	3	1	1	4	1	2	4	3	-	list # 3
			3?				4	3	5	2		8	4	4					
										7				5					
										10									
A.T.L., II, 4	Prescr.	451/0	4	-	4	-	3	2	2	-	1	-	3	1	-	-	2	-	Tribute quota-
					3?						2		5	2					list # 4
													7						
	Text		4	2	4	3	3	4	2	3	1	1	1	2	7	3	3	-	
								3					4	4					
													5						
A.T.L., II, 5	Prescr.	450/49	4	-	3?	-	-	-	2	-	-	-	3	1	-	-	-	-	Tribute quota-
														4					list # 5
	Text		1	1?	4	3	3	2	2	2	2	1	1	1	7	2	3	-	
			3	2				4	3	7		3	4	2	8	3			

Inscription	Date	A	B	E	Z	Θ	Λ	M	N	O	Π	P	Σ	Υ	Φ	X	Ω	Subject
<u>A.T.L.</u> , II, 7	Prescr. 448/7?	3	-	3	-	-	4	5	2	-	-	8?	-	2	-	-	-	Tribute quota-
		4						2	3									list # 7?
	Text	4	2	4	2	2	2	1	7	2	1	1	7	2	4	3	-	
				3?			4	2	10			5	8	4				
														5				
														6				
														7				
	Col. 4	3	2	3	3	3	4	2	7	2	1	3	5	5	-	2	3	-
		4		4					2?			5	10	6				
<hr/>																		
<u>A.T.L.</u> , II, 8	Prescr. 447/6?	4	-	3	-	4	-	-	1?	2	1	-	1	-	-	-	-	Tribute quota-
				4					10									list # 8?
	Text	4	2	3	2	4	4	2	1	1	1	4	1	4	4	3	-	
				4			2		10	2		5	2	5				
												6		7				
<u>I.G.</u> , I ² , 339	447/6	4	-	4	-	2	2	2	7	2	1	5	7	6	-	-	-	Parthenon a/c 1
		5					3						8	7				
							4											
<u>I.G.</u> , I ² , 361	447/6	4	2-3	4	-	3	-	-	7	2	-	-	7	-	-	2	-	Parthenos a/c 1
		5																
<hr/>																		
<u>A.T.L.</u> , II, 9	446/5	3	2?	4	1	3	2-4	2	1	1	1	6	8	2	4	3	-	Tribute quota-
		4	3					3	5	2	3	8	9	5				list # 9
									7			9	10	6				
<u>I.G.</u> , I ² , 340	446/5	3	-	4	-	3	2	2	7	1	1	5	5?	3	-	2	-	Parthenon a/c 2
		4				4			2			6	7	6				
<u>I.G.</u> , I ² , 360	446/5	5	-	4	-	3	2	2	6	2	-	-	7	3	-	-	-	Parthenos a/c 2
									7	3			10					
<hr/>																		
<u>A.T.L.</u> , II, 10	Prescr. 445/4	-	-	4	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	10	7	-	-	-	Tribute quota-
	Text	3	2	4	1	3	2	2	2	2	1	5	8	4	4	3	-	list # 10
		4	3			4			7			6?	10	6				
												8						
<u>I.G.</u> , I ² , 341	445/4	-	-	4	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	7	-	-	-	Parthenon a/c 3
<u>I.G.</u> , I ² , 359	445/4	4	3	4	-	3	4	3	7	2	1	2	7	6	4	2-3	-	Parthenos a/c 3
												6		7				
												8						
<hr/>																		
<u>A.T.L.</u> , II, 11	Prescr. 444/3	4	-	4	-	3	-	2	-	1	-	9	10	6	-	-	-	Tribute quota-
		4	3	3	-	4	2	2	5	2	1	6	8	4	4	2	-	list # 11
				4			4	3	7				10	7		3		
									8									
									10									
<u>I.G.</u> , I ² , 342	444/3	3	3	4	-	3	2	2	7	2	1	6	5	2	-	2	-	Parthenon a/c 4
		4											6					
<u>I.G.</u> , I ² , 356	444/3	5	-	4	-	2	2	3	7	1	1	8	9	6	-	3	-	Parthenos a/c 4
													10					

Inscription	Date	A	B	E	Z	Θ	Λ	M	N	O	Π	P	Σ	Υ	Φ	X	Ω	Subject
<u>A.T.L.</u> , II, 12 Prescr.	443/2	4	-	4	-	-	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	Tribute quota- list # 12
		4																
Text		3-4	2	4	1	4	4	1	5	1	1	1	7	4	5	3	-	
									10	2		5		5				
												6		6				
Postscr.		-	-	-	-	-	-	-	9	-	-	-	-	-	-	3	-	
<u>I.G.</u> , I ² , 343	443/2	3	3	4	-	3	2	2	7	2	1	6	2	6	4	2-3	-	Parthenon a/c 5
		4							6?			9	5	7				
													8					
<hr/>																		
<u>A.T.L.</u> , II, 13 Prescr.	442/1	-	-	4	-	4	4	1?	7	2	-	6	8	6	5	-	-	Tribute quota- list # 13
								2				8		7				
Text		3	3	4	1	4	4	1	7	2	1	6	8	5	5	2	-	
		4										8		6		3		
														7				
<u>I.G.</u> , I ² , 344	442/1	-	-	4	-	3	4	-	7	2	1	5?	8	3	-	2	-	Parthenon a/c 6
												8		7				
<u>I.G.</u> , I ² , 358	442/1	4-5	3	4	-	3	4	2	7	1	1	8	5	5	4	2	-	Parthenon a/c 6
										2	2?		8					
<hr/>																		
<u>A.T.L.</u> , II, 14	441/0	3	2	4	-	4	4	2	3	2	1	5	7	4	4	2	-	Tribute quota- list # 14
		4							6	3		6	8	7				
<u>I.G.</u> , I ² , 345	441/0	-	-	4	-	3	-	2	-	2	-	-	-	-	5	3	-	Parthenon a/c 7
<hr/>																		
<u>A.T.L.</u> , II, 15 Prescr.	440/39	3	-	4	-	3	4	2	-	1	1	8	6	4	4	2	-	Tribute quota- list # 15
		4											7					
													8					
Text		3	3	4	-	4	4	3	7	2	1	8	7	6	4	3	-	
		4							8				8	7	5			
<u>I.G.</u> , I ² , 50	440/39	4	3	4	-	4	2	2	5	2	1	8	5	4	-	3	-	Samian decree
						3	4		6				7	7				
									7				8					
									8				9					
<u>I.G.</u> , I ² , 293	440/39	4	-	4	-	4	-	2	7	2	3	6	8	7	4	3	-	Samian War a/cs
												8		5				
<u>I.G.</u> , I ² , 346	440/39	3	-	4	1	2	3	2	6	2	1	6	5?	3	-	2	-	Parthenon a/c 8
		4					4						10	4				
		5												5				
														7				
<u>I.G.</u> , I ² , 355	440/39	4	-	4	-	2	2	1	7	1	2	6-8	6	7	5	3	-	Parthenon a/c 8
		5				3		2		2		9	10					
<hr/>																		
<u>A.T.L.</u> , II, 16	439/8	3	-	4	-	4	-	2	7	2	1	5	5	-	-	-	-	Tribute quota- list # 16
		4											8					
<u>I.G.</u> , I ² , 347	439/8	4	-	4	1	3	3	2	7	2	1	5	5	3?	5	3	-	Parthenon a/c 9
		5					4						6	7	7			
													9	10				

Inscription	Date	A	B	E	Z	Θ	Λ	M	N	O	Π	P	Σ	Υ	Φ	X	Q	Subject
<u>I.G.</u> , I ² , 354	439/8	4	3	3-4	-	2	4	3	7	2	3	7	7	7	-	3	-	Parthenos a/c 9
											4		9?					
<u>A.T.L.</u> , II, 17 Prescr.	438/7	-	-	-	-	-	-	3	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	Tribute quota-
Text		4	3	4	-	4	2	-	-	2	-	6	-	-	-	-	-	list # 17
<u>I.G.</u> , I ² , 348	438/7	4	-	4	1	3	2	2	7	2	1	6	7	2	4	3	-	Parthenon a/c 10
		5					4		9			7	9	6				
												8	10					
												9						
<u>I.G.</u> , I ² , 349	437/6	4	3	4	2	3	4	2	7	2	1	6	5	2?	-	3	-	Parthenon a/c 11
									9				7	6				
<u>I.G.</u> , I ² , 363	437/6	4	-	4	-	3	1	2	7	1	1	5	8	2	5	2	-	Propylaia a/c 1
		5					4		2			8		3				
<u>A.T.L.</u> , II, 19	436/5	3	-	-	-	4	2	-	7	1	-	8	7	-	-	-	-	Tribute quota-
		4																list # 19
<u>I.G.</u> , I ² , 350	436/5	4	3	4	-	4	4	2	7	2	1	8	5	6	4	-	-	Parthenon a/c 12
								3?	10				10	7				
<u>I.G.</u> , I ² , 364	436/5	4	3	4	-	3	4	2	7	2	-	6	6	7	-	-	-	Propylaia a/c 2
		5																
<u>A.T.L.</u> , II, 20 Prescr.	435/4	3	-	4	-	-	-	2	-	-	-	6	-	5	-	3	-	Tribute quota-
Text		4																list # 20
		4	3	4	1	4	2	2	7	1	3	6	7	4	2	3	-	
			2?						2			8	8	7	4			
												9						
<u>I.G.</u> , I ² , 351	435/4	4	-	-	-	4	-	2?	-	2	-	-	5	9	-	-	-	Parthenon a/c 13
<u>I.G.</u> , I ² , 365	435/4	4	2-3	4	-	3	4	2	7	2	2-3	5	6	2-7	-	3	-	Propylaia a/c 3
												6	10					
<u>A.T.L.</u> , II, 21 Prescr.	434/3	4	-	4	-	3	-	2	7	2	1	8	6	7	-	2	-	Tribute quota-
Text													7					list # 21
		4	3	4	-	2	4	2	7	1	1	6	7	6	2	2	-	
									2			8		7	4			
<u>I.G.</u> , I ² , 232	434/3	4	-	5	-	3	-	2	7	2	1	6	7	5	-	2	-	Pronaos inv.
		5										2	8		7	3		
<u>I.G.</u> , I ² , 256	434/3	4	-	4	-	2	2	2	7	2	1	8	7	7	-	2	-	Hekatomp. inv.
												2?						
<u>I.G.</u> , I ² , 276	434/3	4	-	4	-	4	2	3	7	2	1	8	7	7	4	2	-	Parthenon inv.
									8				8	8				
									9									
<u>I.G.</u> , I ² , 352	434/3	4	3	4	-	3	4	2	7	2	1	6	5	5	5	3	-	Parthenon a/c 14
								3	8			8	10	6				
<u>I.G.</u> , I ² , 366	434/3	4	3	4	-	4	2	3	7	2	1	6	8	2	4	2	-	Propylaia a/c 4
							3?					8	10	6				

Inscription	Date	A	B	E	Z	Θ	Λ	M	N	O	Π	P	Σ	Υ	Φ	X	Ο	Subject
<u>A.T.L.</u> , II, 22 Prescr.	433/2	3	-	4	-	3	2	-	7	2	-	6	7	5	-	-	-	Tribute quota-
										3		8	8					list # 22
Text		3	3	4	1	3	2	2	7	2	1	8	7	4	4	3	-	
		4								3		9		6				
														7				
<u>I.G.</u> , I ² , 51	Preamble 433/2	3	-	4	-	4	4	3	7	2	1	8	8	4	24	3	-	Rhegion decree
		4		5					8									
									9									
<u>I.G.</u> , I ² , 52	Preamble 433/2	3	3	4	-	4	4	2	7	1	1	8	8	4	4	3	-	Leontinoi decree
		4						3	8									
<u>I.G.</u> , I ² , 233	433/2	3	-	5	-	3	-	-	9	2	1	8	9	7	-	3	-	Pronaos inv.
<u>I.G.</u> , I ² , 257	433/2	4	3	4	-	2	4	3	7	2	1	8	7	7	5	2	-	Hekatomp. inv.
									8									
<u>I.G.</u> , I ² , 277	433/2	3	-	4	-	4	2	-	8	2	1	8	7	4	4	2	-	Parthenon inv.
		4		5					9					7	6?			
<u>I.G.</u> , I ² , 295	433/2	4	3	5	-	4	2	2	7	2	1	6	7	7	5	3	-	Kerkyra War a/cs
									9				8					
<u>I.G.</u> , I ² , 353	433/2	4	3	4	-	4	4	2	7	2	1	6	7	6	4	3	-	Parthenon a/c 15
									8			8			5			
<u>I.G.</u> , I ² , 366	433/2	4	3	4	-	3	4	2	7	2	1	8	7	6	4	3	-	Propylaia a/c 5
		5										9	8	7				
<hr/>																		
<u>A.T.L.</u> , II, 23 Prescr.	432/1	3	-	4	-	4	2	2	-	1	-	6	7	-	-	3	-	Tribute quota-
		4								2		8						list # 23
Text		3	2?	4	-	3	2	2	7	1	1	6	7	2?	4	3	-	
		4	3				4			2		8		4				
<u>I.G.</u> , I ² , 294	432/1	4	-	4	-	3	-	3	7	1	1	8	7	7	5	3	-	Pronaos inv.
									2									
<u>I.G.</u> , I ² , 258	432/1	3	-	4	-	2	-	3	7	2	1	8	6?	5?	4	3	-	Hekatomp. inv.
		4							8			8	7					
<u>I.G.</u> , I ² , 278	432/1	4	-	4	-	4	4	3	8	2	1	6	7	7	-	3	-	Parthenon inv.
												8						
<u>I.G.</u> , I ² , 296	432/1	3	-	4	-	4	4	3	2?	2	1	8	7	6	4	-	-	Military a/cs
												8	7					
<u>I.G.</u> , I ² , 367	432/1	4	-	3	-	3	5	2	7	2	1	5	7-10	3-7	-	2	-	Propylaia a/c 6
		5					6					9						
<u>I.G.</u> , I ² , 945	432/1	4	-	4	-	3	4	1	7	2	2	8	7	7	4	3	-	Poteidaia epigram
												9		5				
<hr/>																		
<u>I.G.</u> , I ² , 235	431/0	4	-	4	-	3	4	3	7	2	1	8	7	6	4	2	-	Pronaos inv.
		5								1		8	7					
<u>I.G.</u> , I ² , 259	431/0	3	-	4	-	4	4	3	7	2	1	8	7	6	4?	2	-	Hekatomp. inv.
		4							8?			8	7	5				
<u>I.G.</u> , I ² , 279	431/0	3	-	4	-	4	4	3	7	2	1	8	7	5	4	2	-	Parthenon inv.
									8			8	6					
														7				

Inscription	Date	A	B	E	Z	Θ	Λ	M	N	O	Π	P	Σ	Υ	Φ	X	○	Subject
<u>A.T.L.</u> , II, 25	430/29	3	3	4	-	3	2	2	7	2	2	8	7	7	4	3	-	Tribute quota-
		4						3					8					list # 25
<u>I.G.</u> , I ² , 236	430/29	4	-	4	-	3	4	3	7	2	1	8	9	7	4	2	-	Pronaos inv.
		5									4	9						
<u>I.G.</u> , I ² , 260	430/29	4	-	3?	-	4	3	-	2	2	1	8	8	-	-	-	-	Hekatomp. inv.
		5																
<u>I.G.</u> , I ² , 378	430/29	4	-	4	-	3	4	2	7	2	-	-	8	-	-	-	-	Accounts
<u>A.T.L.</u> , II, 26	429/8	3	-	4	-	3	4	4	7	2	1	6	7	7	4	2	-	Tribute quota-
		4		5														list # 26
<u>I.G.</u> , I ² , 237	429/8	4	-	3	-	3	2	2	7	1	1	8	5	6	4	3	-	Pronaos inv.
				4			4			2	2	9	8	7				
													9					
<u>I.G.</u> , I ² , 261	429/8	4-5	-	4	-	2	4	2	7	2	-	8	6	6	4	2	-	Hekatomp. inv.
													8	7				
<u>I.G.</u> , I ² , 310	429/8	4-5	3	4	1	3	4	1-2	7	2	2	8	8	6	4	3	-	Other Gods a/cs
							5					9?	10					
<u>A.T.L.</u> , II, 27	428/7	4	3	4	3	4	4	2	4	2	1	8	7	7	4	2	-	Tribute quota-
												8	3	2		8	3	list # 27
<u>I.G.</u> , I ² , 238	428/7	4	3	3	-	3	4	2	7	1	1	8	7	6	4	2	-	Pronaos inv.
				4						2		9	7	5				
<u>I.G.</u> , I ² , 262	428/7	3	-	4	-	3	2	1-2	7	1	2	8	7	-	4?	2	-	Hekatomp. inv.
		5		5						2						5		
																8		
<u>I.G.</u> , I ² , 60	427/6	4	3	4	-	3	4	2	7	2	1	8	7	3?	5	3	-	Lesbos decree
													8	7				
<u>I.G.</u> , I ² , 239	427/6	4	-	3	-	3	4	2	7	2	1	9	9	7	6	3	-	Pronaos inv.
		5		4						3								
<u>I.G.</u> , I ² , 263	427/6	4	-	4	-	3	-	-	8	3	2	8	10	-	4	3	-	Hekatomp. inv.
		5							9									
<u>I.G.</u> , I ² , 297	427/6	3	-	4	-	4	-	-	7	2	-	8	7	6	-	-	-	Military a/cs
									8									
<u>I.G.</u> , I ² , 240	426/5	4-5	-	4	-	3	2	3	7	1	1	8	8	7	5	3	-	Pronaos inv.
								4	10?	2			9					
													10					
<u>I.G.</u> , I ² , 368	426/5	4	-	4	-	3	2	2	7	2	1	8-9	7	7	-	2-3	-	Victories a/c
							4-5						10					
<u>A.T.L.</u> , II, A 9	425/4	3	3	4	1	4	2	2	7	1	1	6	7	7	4	3	-	Tribute assess-
		4					4?			2		8	8					ment # 9
												9?						
<u>I.G.</u> , I ² , 241	425/4	4	-	4	-	3	2	2	7	2	1	8	7	7	4-5	3	-	Pronaos inv.
							4		9?		2							

Inscription	Date	A	B	E	Z	Θ	Λ	M	N	O	Π	P	Σ	Υ	Φ	X	Ω	Subject
<u>I.G.</u> , I ² , 57	424/3	4	3	4	1	4	2	2	9	2	1	8	9	7	4	3	-	Methone decree
								3						8				
<u>I.G.</u> , I ² , 87	424/3	3	3	4	-	4	4	1	7	2	1	8	9	7	4	3	-	Halieis decree
		4					5		9		3	9						
<u>I.G.</u> , I ² , 242	424/3	4	-	4	-	3	4	4	7	2	1	8	7	5?	4	3	-	Pronaos inv.
									9					7				
<u>I.G.</u> , I ² , 243	423/2	3?	3	4	-	4	4	4	7	2	2	6	7	7	4	3	-	Pronaos inv.
		4								3		8						
<u>I.G.</u> , I ² , 244	423/2	4																
		5	3	4	5	-	4	4	2	7	2	1	6	7	7	4	3	- Logistai a/cs
									3	8	3		8					
									9									
<u>I.G.</u> , I ² , 264	422/1	4	-	4	-	3	2	2	7	2	2	8	7	-	-	-	-	Hekatomp. inv.
<u>I.G.</u> , I ² , 280	422/1	4	5	3	4	-	4	5	2	7	2	1	6	8	7	8	4	2 - Parthenon inv.
												2	8					
												9						
<u>A.T.L.</u> , II, 34	421/0	4	3	4	-	3	4	4	7	3	1	6	7	7	4	2	-	Tribute quota-
												8	8					list # 34
<u>A.T.L.</u> , II, A 10	421/0	4	3	4	-	2	4	4	7	2	1	8	7	7	4	-	-	Tribute assess-
													8					ment # 10
<u>I.G.</u> , I ² , 82	421/0	4	3	4	-	4	2	4	1	7	2	1	6	7	7	5	2	- Proxeny # 33
									2	9?	3		8		8?			
												9						
<u>I.G.</u> , I ² , 84	421/0	4	3	4	3	4	2	2	7	2	1	8	7	3	5	3	-	Hephaistion
									3	9	3			7				
<u>I.G.</u> , I ² , 265	421/0	4	-	4	-	3	5	4	7	2	1	8	7	7	4	3	-	Hekatomp. inv.
										3	2							
<u>I.G.</u> , I ² , 281	421/0	4	-	4	-	3	4	3	7	1	1	8	9	7	8	7	-	3 - Parthenon inv.
										2								
<u>I.G.</u> , I ² , 86	420/19	3	3	4	-	4	2	2	7	3	2	8	7	7	-	3	-	Argive treaty
		4							9									
<u>I.G.</u> , I ² , 266	420/19	4	-	4	-	3	5	2	7	2	2	8	7	5?	4	3	-	Hekatomp. inv.
								4		3				7	5			
<u>I.G.</u> , I ² , 282	420/19	4	-	4	-	3	4	2	7	2	1	2	8	7	5	4	3	- Parthenon inv.
							5							10	7	5		
<u>I.G.</u> , I ² , 379	420/19	4	-	4	-	3	4	2	7	2	2	8	7	7	5	3	-	Vasa pompilia a/cs
<u>I.G.</u> , I ² , 267	419/8	4	-	4	-	3	5	4	7	2	2	8	7	7	5	3	-	Hekatomp. inv.
<u>I.G.</u> , I ² , 283	419/8	4	-	4	1	3	2	2	7	2	1	8	7	7	4	3	-	Parthenon inv.
								4		3		9			5			
<u>I.G.</u> , I ² , 311	419/8	3	3	5	1	4	2	2	7	1	1	8	7	7	2	3	-	Eleusis a/cs
		4					4		8	2					4			

Inscription	Date	A	B	E	Z	Θ	Λ	M	N	O	Π	P	Σ	Υ	Φ	X	Ω	Subject
<u>A.T.L.</u> , II, 33 (now 37)	418/7	4	-	4	-	4	-	-	8	3	-	8	7	7	4	5	-	- Tribute quota- list # 37
<u>I.G.</u> , I ² , 94	418/7	4	3	4	1	4	4	3	7	1	1	6	7	7	5	3	-	- Neleion decree
									9	2		8	9					
										3								
<u>I.G.</u> , I ² , 95	418/7	4	3	4	-	4	4	2?	4	2	2	8	7	8	-	-	-	- Hyperbolos' amend- ment
								5	3	5			8					
									7									
<u>I.G.</u> , I ² , 244	418/7	4	-	4	-	3	4	2	7	1	1	8	7	7	4	3	-	- Pronaos inv.
										2	2	9	8					
<u>I.G.</u> , I ² , 268	418/7	4	-	4	-	3	-	1	7	2	1	8	7	5	-	3	-	- Hekatomp. inv.
								2				9	7					
<u>I.G.</u> , I ² , 302	418/7	3	3	4	1	4	4	1	7	2	-	6	7	7	4	3	-	- Athena a/cs
		4		5				2	9			8						
												9						
<u>I.G.</u> , I ² , 96	417/6	3	3	4	-	3	1	2	7	2	4	8	8	7	4	3	-	- Argive treaty
		4					2	3	8			9	9		5?			
							4		9									
							5											
<u>I.G.</u> , I ² , 245	417/6	4	3	4	-	3	2	3	7	1	2	8	7	7	4	3	-	- Pronaos inv.
		5								2			8					
													10					
<u>I.G.</u> , I ² , 269	417/6	4	-	4	-	3	2	2	7	2	1	8	7	7	-	3	-	- Hekatomp. inv.
							4						8?					
<u>I.G.</u> , I ² , 302	417/6	3	3	4	1	4	4	2	7	2	-	6	7	7	4	3	-	- Athena a/cs
		4							9			8						
												9						
<u>I.G.</u> , I ² , 98/9	416/5	3	3	4	1	4	2	2	7	2	3	8	7	7	5	3	-	- Sicilian War a/cs
		4						4	9	3								
<u>I.G.</u> , I ² , 246	416/5	4	-	4	-	3	2	2	7	2	2	8	7	7	4	5	3	- Pronaos inv.
									9			9	10					
<u>I.G.</u> , I ² , 270	416/5	4	-	4	-	3	-	-	7	2	1	8	7	7	4	3	-	- Hekatomp. inv.
<u>I.G.</u> , I ² , 370	416/5	4	3	4	-	3	5	2	7	2	1	8	7	7	5	2	3	- Athena and Hephaistos a/cs
		5																
<u>S.E.G.</u> , X, 111	415/4	4	3	4	-	3	-	2	7	2	1	8	7	4	3	2	2	Proxeny # 54
<u>I.G.</u> , I ² , 247	415/4	4	-	4	-	3	2	2	7	2	-	8	7	7	4	3	-	- Pronaos inv.
									8			9						
<u>I.G.</u> , I ² , 271	415/4	4	-	-	-	3	-	1	7	2	-	8	7	-	-	3	-	- Hekatomp. inv.
								2										
<u>I.G.</u> , I ² , 302	415/4	3	3	4	2	4	4	1	7	2	1	6	7	7	4	3	-	- Athena a/cs
		4						2	9			8			5			
												9						

Inscription	Date	A	B	E	Z	Θ	Λ	M	N	O	Π	P	Σ	Υ	Φ	X	Ω	Subject
I.G., I ² , 116	408/7	4	3	4	-	4	3	1	5	1	1	8	8	7	4	3	4	Proxeny # 61
								2	7	2								
								10										
I.G., I ² , 118	408/7	4	3	4	-	3	-	3	7	2	1	8	7	7	4	2	-	Proxeny # 62
								4?					8					
I.G., I ² , 120	408/7	-	-	4	-	3	-	-	7	1	-	-	-	7	-	3	-	Decree
I.G., I ² , 254	408/7	4	-	4	-	3	4	1	7	2	1	8	8	7	4	3	-	Pronaos inv.
								2				9	9	8				
I.G., I ² , 374	408/7	4	3	4	1	4	2	2	7	1	1	8	7	7	4	3	-	Erechtheion a/cs
							4		9	2	4	9			5			
<hr/>																		
I.G., I ² , 123	407/6	4	-	4	-	-	2	3	7	-	-	8	8	-	-	-	-	Decree
				5					9			9	9					
I.G., I ² , 255	407/6	3	-	4	-	3	4	1	7	2	1	8	8	7	4	5	3	Pronaos inv.
		4						2					9					
I.G., I ² , 275	407/6	4	-	4	-	3	4	-	7	2	1	8	7	7-8	5	3	-	Hekatompedon inv.
							5						8					
I.G., I ² , 304a	407/6	4	3	4	-	4	4	2	7	2	1	8	8	7	4	5	3	Athena a/cs
								3	9		2	9?	9	8?				
											3							
I.G., I ² , 304b	407/6	4	3	4	-	4	3	2	7	2	4	8	7	7	7	3	-	Athena a/cs
				5			4		9					8				
							6											
<hr/>																		
I.G., I ² , 124	406/5	4	-	4	-	4	-	-	7	2	-	8	8	7	-	3	1	Decree
									9			9						
I.G., I ² , 255	406/5	4	-	4	-	3	3	1	7	2	1	8	6	7	5	3	-	Pronaos inv.
				5			4						7	8				
I.G., I ² , 305	406/5	3	3	4	1	4	2	2	7	1	-	8	7	7	4	3	-	Athena a/cs
		4							9									
		5																
<hr/>																		
I.G., I ² , 125	405/4	3	3	4	-	4	-	2	7	2	1	8	7	7	4	3	3	Proxeny # 66
		4		5					9			9						

Note: the entries under theta designate the shapes of both theta and omicron; the entries under omicron designate the sizes of both omicron and theta. Hyphenated numbers indicate transitional shapes.

TABLE FOUR

CHART DEPICTING THE APPEARANCE OR DISAPPEARANCE OF KEY SHAPES

Not before		Not after	Exceptions *	Remarks
450 B.C.				
-		A 1,2	AA	449 B.C.
-		B 1	B	449 B.C. ?
-		Σ 3	Σ	
-		Y 1	V	
-		Φ 1	⊕	
445 B.C.				
A 5	A	-		446 B.C.
B 3	B	-		451 B.C. ? 446 B.C. ?
-		Z 3	I	427 B.C. 420 B.C.
M 1	M	-		447 B.C.
-		N 1	N	Never found alone
-		N 2	N	449 B.C. 429 B.C. Not alone after 447 B.C.
-		N 3	N	440 B.C. Not alone after 450 B.C.
N 6	N	-		Found alone only in 439 B.C.
N 8	N	-		460 B.C. Alone only after 431 B.C.
N 9	N	-		460 B.C.
⊙ 3 (size)		-		Not alone before 421 B.C.
-		P 3,4	P P	
-		Σ 1,4	Σ Σ	
Σ 5	Σ	-		447 B.C.
Σ 7	Σ	-		452 B.C.
Σ 8	Σ	-		460 B.C.
Σ 9	Σ	-		
Σ 10	Σ	-		
-		Φ 3	⊕	414 B.C.
Φ 5	Φ	-		

* Exceptions include doubtful readings or the appearance of a certain letter-shape at a time when the great majority of variants of this letter are of another type. The term "not alone" indicates the presence of other variants within the same inscription.

Not before		Not after	Exceptions	Remarks
440 B.C.				
-		B 2	B	
Π 2	Π	-		
Π 4	Π	-		Not alone before 416 B.C.
-		P 1	P	
-		P 2	P	Never found alone
-		Σ 2	Σ	
Σ 6	Σ	-		
435 B.C.				
E 5	E	-		Except once in 433/2 B.C., alone only after 418 B.C.
-		Z 2	I	415 B.C.
-		N 5	N	417 B.C. 408 B.C.
-		N 6	N	
-		N 10	N	425 B.C. ? 408 B.C. Alone only in 452 B.C.
-		P 7	P	
430 B.C.				
-		Θ O 2 (drilled)		428 B.C. 420 B.C.
-		P 5	P	
-		Σ 5	Σ	428 B.C.
-		Y 2,3	Y Y	420 B.C.
-		Y 4	Y	414 B.C.
-		Y 5	Y	419 B.C. 417 B.C.
Φ 6	Φ	-		432 B.C. ?
Φ 8	Φ	-		
425 B.C.				
-		E 3	E	Not alone after 431 B.C.
Λ 5	L	-		447 B.C. 431 B.C. 428 B.C.
M 4	M	-		428 B.C.
-		Σ 6	Σ	405 B.C.
415 B.C.				
Ω 2,4	Ω Ω	-		
410 B.C.				
Φ 7	Φ	-		
Ω 1,3	Ω Ω	-		

CHAPTER THREE

THE EVIDENCE AND ITS MEANING

There is no exact modern equivalent to the ancient proxenos: the concept of permanent official representation abroad was not known in the Greek city-states, but proxenoi gradually assumed some of the functions that today would be performed by embassies, consulates or trade-missions.

The exclusiveness of Greek city-life appears to have given rise to most of the functions of the proxenoi. There was at first no code of international law or custom; in very few cases (such as double-citizenship) did a citizen of one state have vested rights in any other state; intercourse between cities was carried on by individuals for reasons of friendship, religion or trade, or by official delegations.

Because each state reserved to its own citizens the privilege and protection of its laws, its courts and its gods, foreigners were forced to make use of citizens of the host-city to plead their causes before the courts or the Assembly, to sponsor them at religious observances, to witness documents, or to act as commercial agents.

It is not clear at what point these duties owed by an individual to some citizens of a specific state became duties owed to all the citizens of that state; however, when

certain cities developed as trade emporia, others as religious centres, the flow of visitors became so large and so regular that individuals in these cities began to be known for their preference for citizens of specific states; what had begun as private ties of hospitality evolved into public ties. Finally these were regularized in the grant of proxenia by the client-city..

While the office originated as an instrument or as the result of trade or religious intercourse, the proxenoi almost as soon must have been employed to introduce official delegations to the governing bodies of their own cities. Their success to a large extent depended upon their influence, so that naturally the most prominent individuals would be chosen as proxenoi; wealth and prestige were no hindrance to the performance of their other duties. The standing of the individual was enhanced by his selection, and he probably derived financial benefit from the commercial side of his duties as proxenos; thus, there was considerable incentive for wealthy men to put themselves forward as candidates for the proxenia, particularly that of important states such as Athens.

In return for their services the proxenoi might also receive benefits within the client-city; the basic privileges could be granted to especially deserving individuals. The more

important the client-state the fewer the privileges it needed to offer in order to attract would-be proxenoi, and the more privileges it had at its disposal as rewards for continuing or special service.

Thus, in Attic proxenies one can detect three stages: euergesia and canvass on the part of the candidate; formal award of the title proxenos (and usually euergetes); finally, the grant of privileges over and above those usually awarded, or at a later date as an addition to an earlier grant. It is possible that the erection of a stone stele on the Akropolis bearing a record of the decree that granted the proxyeny and its privileges was itself one of these extra privileges; this might explain the disparity between the number of known Attic proxyeny-decrees in the fifth century and the number of Athens' allies in the Confederacy of Delos and the later Empire: one might expect that Athens would have appointed a proxenos to serve her interests in each of the allied states as a matter of basic policy.¹

1. We possess some sixty-nine proxyeny-decrees and know of nine more from literary sources; at its height the Empire had perhaps as many as three hundred and fifty members: the register of A.T.L. lists three hundred and forty-three states; in a good year ca one hundred and sixty paid tribute (see A.T.L., I, pp. 215-460).

The office of proxenos was an ancient one, found throughout the Greek world. The etymological derivation of the word is obscure: it seems to be associated from the beginning with the concept of the προστάτης, "one who stands before or protects",² the prefix προ- seeming to indicate that the proxenos stood in place of as well as on behalf of his client the ξένος. Some sources date the office back to the period of the Trojan War,³ but the earliest records on stone or bronze belong to the late seventh or early sixth centuries B.C.⁴

The earliest Athenian proxenoi known date to the time of

2. The earliest literary references derive from the fifth century B.C., when, it is clear, the meaning of the word was well-established; etymological references are very late: see L.-S.-J., 9 (1940), pp. 1491-1492, s.v. πρόξενος; Monceaux, article on Proxenia in Daremberg-Saglio, Dictionnaire des Antiquites Grecques et Romaines, IV.1 (1907), pp. 732-740;

3. Livy, I, 1 (the Trojan Antenor); Eustathios, ad Iliadem, III, 204; IV, 377.

4. I.G., IX, 1, 868 (dated by Jeffery, Local Scripts, pp. 232 and 234, #9, to ca 625-600 B.C.?) is a Kerkyrean record of proxenoi as witnesses to wills. An inscription from Olympia records a proxenos of Elis (S.E.G., XI, 1180a) and is dated by Jeffery (op.cit., pp. 190 and 199, #15), to ca 600-550 B.C.?

the Persian Wars,⁵ but the first records on stone at Athens can be placed no earlier than the middle of the fifth century B.C.⁶

At Athens in the fifth century the title of euergetes is seldom found without the proxenia;⁷ throughout the period of Athens' independence and well into Hellenistic times the two titles are usually applied to the same honorand, implying that the proxeny was not awarded unless it had been earned by

5. Alexandros of Makedonia (Herodotos, VIII, 136; 140-143); Arthmios of Zeleia (Aischines, Ktesiphon, 258); the poet Pindar of Thebes (Isokrates, Antidosis, 166).

6. The earliest is probably #1, the grave-stele of Pythagoras of Salybria, who died at Athens and was buried in the Kerameikos at public expense. Other proxenies that probably date before 445 B.C. are ##2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7 and 8.

7. I.G., I², 110 bestows the title of euergetes on six persons involved in the murder of the oligarch Phrynichos in 411/0 B.C. I.G., II², 174 is apparently a bestowal of euergesia without the proxeny upon Epikerdes of Kyrene; his services are so outstanding that there is cause to wonder why he did not receive the proxenia as well. The decree makes no mention of a previous grant of proxeny.

euergesia.⁸ In the fifth century, where a clause relating to services performed by the candidate survives on stone, only in about half the number of decrees is the service specified.⁹

Privileges are, naturally, enumerated with care. The majority of proxeny decrees are mutilated; where complete examples survive they are quite short, lacking the full roster of privileges, and thus unsatisfactory as illustrations. No complete decree is earlier than the end of the Archidamian

8. Alexandros of Makedonia was proxenos and euergetes (see above, note 5); the latest example known to me of both titles combined is I.G., II², 892 (188/7 B.C.).

9. General praise-clauses: ##1, 4, 9(?), 12(?), 13, 25(?), 27(?), 47, 50.

Service unspecified: ##2, 5, 21, 26, 28, 34, 35(?), 38, 39, 46, 48, 54, 59, 61(?), 62, 63(?), 66.

Service to an embassy: 30, 32(?), 33(?). Service to the army or fleet: ##8, 22, 23, 31, 55, 60. Ship-building: ##44, 65.

Medical services (?): #49.

Service- and praise-clauses omitted or perished: ##3, 6, 7, 10, 11, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 24, 29, 36, 37, 40, 41, 42, 43, 45, 51, 52, 53, 56, 57, 58, 64, 67, 68, 69.

War.¹⁰ However, some idea of the normal order of privileges can be gained from them and from the several decrees whose opening clauses survive.

Virtually all decrees in which the opening clauses survive begin with the eulogy: praise of the honorand (sometimes replaced by the publication-clause) followed by enumeration of the services performed; or services followed by praise; the latter order seems to be a late feature.¹¹ Very probably the same rule was followed in those decrees whose opening clauses have perished.

The other privileges awarded to Athenian proxenoi in the fifth century follow no particular order, except that generally the invitation to the prytaneion for dinner, issued if the proxenos is in Athens at the time of passage of the

10. Complete decrees are ##33, 62 and 66. #62 is the best illustration of the form that we possess. In ##16 and 47 the decree is virtually complete, but the rider following it is incomplete. #21 has a lacuna in the text, but is otherwise complete.

11. Praise followed by services: ## 5, 8, 21, 25, 29, 31, 33, 39, 48, 59, 63.

Publication-clause substituted for praise, followed by services: ##3, 16, 20, 36.

Invitation to prytaneion precedes praise and services: #26.

Services followed by praise: ##34, 35, 47, 54, 55, 62, 65.

decree, is set at the end.¹²

One very common clause is that safeguarding the proxenos, often his family also, from civil wrong;¹³ it is usually coupled with an injunction to the officials of the state to watch over the proxenos' interests, or with a clause enabling the proxenos to seek redress in the Athenian courts.¹⁴ Sometimes the state-officials are given a separate injunction to watch over the interests of the proxenos, without any specification of the area of concern.¹⁵

The proxenos is treated, in short, as if he were an Athenian: the generals and other state-officials are often instructed to ensure that he be protected, with his family, from murder or other violence, and severe penalties are laid down against those who harm him, with compensation to be

12. ##3, 17, 19, 26, 40, 41, 42, 43(?), 60, 61, 62, 64, 68, 69. In #26 this clause precedes other clauses.

13. ##2, 5, 7, 10(?), 11, 12(?), 13, 14, 15, 17, 18, 19, 20(?), 21, 22, 24, 26, 27, 30, 31, 32(?), 36, 37, 38(?), 39, 42, 43, 44(?), 47, 50, 51, 52, 55, 56, 57(?), 58, 59(?), 60, 62, 65(?), 67, 68.

14. ##2(?), 7, 14, 15, 47. In #49 access to Athenian courts is apparently granted as a separate privilege.

15. This appears to be the case in #22; in #20 the generals and the Boule are to swear an oath, possibly to safeguard the honorand.

paid by the malefactors.¹⁶ This protection applies not only in Athens but throughout the Empire.¹⁷

A clause that is frequently included in these decrees is one assuring the proxenos that if he needs assistance from the state he will be allowed to present his case to the governing bodies; no intermediary is required, but the Boule and the prytaneis are instructed to forward his requests and sometimes are threatened with a fine if they delay this.¹⁸ Often a clause lays down that his business will take precedence over all other concerns, except the usual initial sacrifices.¹⁹

These are the commonest privileges awarded; sometimes others are enumerated, such as

16. ##5, 7, 13, 18, 24, 30, 31, 39, 47, 50, 67. In #7 the city in which the murder takes place is also to be fined.

17. Of the list in note 16 above, only #39 apparently contains no reference to the Empire..

18. ##2, 4(?), 10, 17(?), 18, 21, 22, 24, 26, 30, 31, 32(?), 39(?), 44, 47(?), 49, 50, 51(?), 55(?), 56.

In #15 a penalty is laid down if no action is taken to meet the proxenos' claims; in #28 the compulsory nature of this service to the proxenos is emphasized.

19. ## 2(?), 18, 21, 22, 26, 49.

ateleia.²⁰ Enktesis is rare and is not found before 425 B.C.²¹ Asylia is granted once in the fifth century.²²

Certain decrees contain privileges of a highly specialized nature: the right to sail and carry on trade in certain areas under Athenian blockade;²³ compensation for losses, or special payments;²⁴ exemption from taxes on the import of ship-building materials;²⁵ the establishment of a special commission to discuss a case brought by the proxenos;²⁶ guarantees that lands or moneys will be inviolable.²⁷ These are obviously the result of special pleading, and not of the sort available to the general run of proxenoi..

There are also occasional grants of full Athenian

20. General ateleia: ##14, 28, 47, 55(?), 58(?), 68.

Exemption from the metoikion: ##18, 39, 60.

Exemption from military service and garrison-duties: ##18, 21, 39..

Ateleia"of the sort granted to proxenoi": #30.

21. ##30, 32(?), 58(?).

22. #56.

23. ##34, 35, 56.

24. ##19(?), 27(?), 28, 32(?), 46, 51(?), 57(?), 64(?).

25. #44.

26. #39(?).

27. ##19, 22(?).

citizenship;²⁸ their rarity is not just an accident of preservation: citizenship was the ultimate accolade and seldom awarded while Athens was at the height of her power. Only those states whose citizenship was of little or no value to outsiders were prodigal in granting it, at least during the period of independence from Makedonia or Rome.

The proxenia and its attendant privileges were sometimes granted to several members of one family or to several individuals at once;²⁹ whether all these persons performed

28. In I.G., I², 113, Evagoras of Salamis, king in his own right and perhaps already an Athenian proxenos, is granted full citizenship. In I.G., I², 160, the honorand is apparently given citizenship; his previous status is unknown. In I.G., I², 110, Thrasyboulos of Kalydon is granted citizenship and other rights for his part in the murder of the oligarch Phrynichos; no proxeny is involved. Apollodoros of Megara may also have acquired citizenship by an associated decree, now lost. Phanosthenes, the honorand of #44, is probably the Andrian of that name who became a citizen and held the strategia in 407/6 B.C.

29. ##3, 4, 5, 7, 9, 10, 13(?), 15, 16, 18, 20, 24(?), 25, 26, 28, 29, 31, 32(?), 36, 37(?), 43, 44(?), 45(?), 48, 50, 51, 54, 55, 65.

Multiple proxenies possibly involving members of one family are ##11, 12, 23, 39, 42(?), 64 and 68.

Multiple proxenies not involving members of the same family are ##3, 8, 21, 60 and 61.

the same duties, or whether one of them was regarded as the senior proxenos, is not made clear. Sometimes, too, the proxenia is hereditary,³⁰ though whether the grant of a proxeny to a man and his sons falls into this category, or whether a specific grant "to his descendants" is also necessary is unclear.

Publication was usually at the expense of the state; sometimes the method of disbursement is indicated, sometimes not.³¹ In a few cases the proxenos is expected to pay for the stele;³² if I am correct in believing that publication

30. ##1, 3, 4, 6(?), 9, 13(?), 16, 18, 20(?), 22, 25, 26, 27, 28(?), 29, 37(?), 39, 44(?), 50, 55, 61, 62, 65. ##1, 9(?), 55, and 61 are stated to have been inherited.

31. ##1, 3, 5, 6(?), 11, 12(?), 14, 15, 17(?), 19(?), 20, 22, 23(?), 25, 26, 27, 28(?), 30, 33, 34, 35, 36, 39, 40, 41, 43, 44, 47, 48, 49, 50, 51, 52, 53, 56, 58, 59(?), 61, 62, 63, 64, 65, 66, 67, 69(?). In ##3, 22, 33, 41(?), 44 and 63 the method of payment is specified.

32. ##4, 10, 13, 16, 21, 32(?), 38, 54, 68; in #61 the city of Selymbria pays for the stele.

was itself regarded as an extra privilege, this provision would indicate perhaps that the state did not think so highly of the proxenos' claims as he himself did. In some cases, too, publication is specifically stated to be that of an already existing decree of proxeny to which new privileges are to be added.³³ In certain documents the formula "write up this decree" is used instead of "write up ... as proxenos".³⁴ I do not know whether this has any significance.

In several examples a stele carries a decree and one or more riders; on occasion, even, two decrees, with or without riders.³⁵ Since the same hand has engraved the whole stele, it must be assumed that the riders at least are the work of orators in the Assembly, adding to the privileges already voted upon. Presumably they merely reflect fresh consideration of the honorand's worth.

33. ##30, 61, 67; ##30, 56 and 67 are republications of older decrees as parts of new ones.

34. ##22, 64.

35. ##4, 10, 13, 16, 17, 19, 21, 22, 28, 30, 32, 38, 42, 44(?), 47, 49, 50, 56, 61, 62, 64. #13 contains two decrees, as does #28.

#56 contains three decrees, each of a different date.

A few documents, engraved in the early fourth century, are copies of fifth-century decrees: in some cases the originals are stated to have been erased by the Thirty Tyrants in 404/3 B.C.; the stelai merely record the restoration of the original proxenies.³⁶ Other documents are fourth-century decrees that include fifth-century texts;³⁷ yet others are fifth-century decrees inscribed throughout in Ionic script that appears to be of fourth-century character;³⁸ the reasons for inscription or re-inscription are not made clear in the surviving texts.

Publication of a proxeny-decree involved the erection of a marble stele upon the Akropolis; occasionally a sanis is also specified, to be set up in the Bouleuterion.³⁹ The exact location of these stelai is never specified, but there is some evidence to suggest that the site of most, if not all, fifth-century proxeny-stelai was in the neighbourhood

36. See Appendix Ib.

37. See Appendix Ia.

38. ##48, 67, 68, 69; the date of re-inscription of #50 is known from the decree itself (385/4 B.C.).

39. ##5, 6(?), 16, 20; #16 seems to be unique in that it is apparently to be published in the Bouleuterion only.

of the Erechtheion;⁴⁰ this building contained the shrine of Athena Polias, who would naturally be concerned in the dealings of Athens with other states. Elsewhere, the temple of the tutelary deity of the city is often specified as the place where proxeny-decrees are to be recorded.⁴¹

40. The sixty-nine documents included in this study comprise one hundred and fourteen fragments, of which the find-spots of eighty-two are known. Of these eleven are merely stated to have been found on the Akropolis. Of the rest, by far the largest number, thirty-four, seem to derive from the area of the Erechtheion. Fifteen were found in or near it; six were extracted from the foundations of the temple of Roma and Augustus, in which materials from the Erechtheion, discarded in the course of repair-work in Roman times, were included; from the same general area, east of the Parthenon, came one more fragment, while three were found between the Parthenon and the Erechtheion. Nine fragments were found in the debris scattered over the north slope of the Akropolis, below the Erechtheion. The next largest concentration of fragments derives from the south slope of the Akropolis, twelve in all, half of these from the area of the Asklepieion and the theatres of Dionysos and Herodes Atticus.

41. For instance, Anaphia, Arcadian Klitor, Delphoi, Ephesos, Kos, Kalymnos, Paros, Rhodes, Thera and Tralles.

PART TWO

THE DECREES

Introduction

In this part will be found editions of the sixty-nine Athenian proxeny-documents of the fifth century that have survived on stone, arranged in chronological order according to their dates, in so far as I can determine them. For the convenience of the reader I have compiled a chart (Table Six, pp. 104-110) in which these documents are listed, together with their numbers in I.G. or S.E.G.

I have not included amongst these proxenies that are known solely from literary sources: these latter I have arranged in a separate list (Table Five, p. 103).

After the edited texts will be found two appendices: in these are listed proxenies that were originally granted in the fifth century, but were reinscribed or reinstated in the fourth century; in the second are those decrees, other than proxenies, that involve honours granted to individual foreigners during the fifth century.

TABLE FIVE

ATHENIAN PROXENIES OF THE FIFTH CENTURY KNOWN SOLELY FROM
LITERARY SOURCES

Honorand(s)	Citizenship	Date	Reference(s)
Alexandros ¹	Makedonia	ca 482/1-480/79 B.C.	Herodotos, VIII, 136
Arthmios ²	Zeleia	ca 481/0 B.C.	Aischines, <i>Ktesiphon</i> , 258
Pindar ³	Thebes	ca 475 B.C.	Isokrates, <i>Antidosis</i> , 166
Hermesilaos ⁴	Chios	441/0 B.C.	Athenaios, XIII, 603 e-f
Nymphodoros ⁵	Abdera	431/0 B.C.	Thucydides, II, 29. 1
Nikias ⁶	Gortyna (Krete)	ca 430 B.C.	Thucydides, II, 85. 5-6
Dexandros ⁷	Mytilene	428/7 B.C.	Aristotle, <i>Politics</i> , V, 1304 a. 9
Artas ⁸	Messapia	415/4 B.C.	Polemon, fragment 89; Suidas, s.v. Ἄρτος
Thoukydides ⁹	Pharsalos	412/1 B.C.	Thucydides, VIII, 92. 8

1. See pp.90-91 note 5. The son of Amyntor, he was sent by the Persians to urge the Athenians to submit after their city had been burnt; the Athenians warned him off their territories, since they did not wish to harm one who had helped them so much in the past.

2. See pp.90-91 note 5. The Persians sent him to the Peloponnese to attempt to buy off the Spartans; the Athenians declared him *atimos* and outlawed him from their territories and that of their allies.

3. See pp.90-91 note 5. He was honoured because he praised Athens in one of his poems (fragment 76) and was given ten thousand drachmai; the reference to a proxeny is doubtful and may be a gloss on what Isokrates originally said; the gift of money is unusually large.

4. A contemporary and friend of Sophokles; Athenaios reports an anecdote of Ion of Chios about the conduct of Hermesilaos and Sophokles when the latter was serving as a general in 440 B.C.

5. The son of Pytheas and brother-in-law to Sitalkes of Thrake; the Athenians appointed him proxenos and used him to bring about an alliance with the Thracian king.

6. Nikias was perhaps a relative of Polypos, the honorand of # 66; see pp.618-619.

7. One of the Athenian proxenoi in Mytilene at the time of the revolt of Lesbos (see Thucydides, III, 2. 3: the Athenians were forewarned of the revolt by their proxenoi).

8. Tyrant of Messapia at the time of the expedition to Sicily (see Thucydides, VII, 39. 4).

9. He was visiting Athens during the oligarchy of the Four Hundred; after the murder of Phrynichos he prevented an outbreak of fighting between the moderates and the extreme oligarchs.

TABLE SIX

ATHENIAN PROXENY-DECREES OF THE FIFTH CENTURY ON STONE

Decree #	I.G. or S.E.G.	Honorand(s)	Citizenship	Date by letter-shapes	Likely date
1	I ² , 1034	Pythagoras	Salybria	<u>ca</u> 460-440 B.C.	460-440 B.C.
2	I ² , 33	[-----] [his sons ?]	[-----]	<u>ca</u> 460-445 B.C.	458/7 B.C.
3	I ² , 36 (X, 33)	[A1] thalykides Korragides Menestratos Athenaios their sons	Thespiiai	<u>ca</u> 460-440 B.C.	458/7 or 447/6 B.C.
4	I ² , 23+30 (X, 20)	Parian[os] his sons: Athenod[oros] Ikesios	[Issa ? (Lesbos)]	<u>ca</u> 460-445 B.C.	455/4 B.C.
5	I ² , 27a	A[-----] [his brothers] [his father]	[Del]phoi	<u>ca</u> 460-445 B.C.	455-450 B.C.
6	I ² , 27b	[-----]	[-----]	<u>ca</u> 460-445 B.C.	455-450 B.C.
7	I ² , 28a	Acheloi[on] his sons	[Boiotia ?]	<u>ca</u> 460-445 B.C.	455-450 B.C.
8	I ² , 31	Theram[enes] Lakedaimon[ios]	[Kypros ?]	<u>ca</u> 460-445 B.C.	449/8 B.C.

Decree #	I.G. or S.E.G.	Honorand(s)	Citizenship	Date by letter-shapes	Likely date
9	I ² ,143a	The sons of Iphiades: Arogos Amyntor Alexomenos their sons	Abydos	ca 445-435 B.C.	445 B.C.
10	X,76	Chion[?] his sons: Achilles Philippos	[----]	ca 445-430 B.C.	440 B.C.
11	I ² ,177	[----] [----] sithenes	[----]	ca 445-430 B.C.	440 B.C.
12	I ² ,158	[----] [----]	[----]	ca 445-430 B.C.	440 B.C.
13	I ² ,56	Leonides [his sons ?]	Halikarnassos	ca 440-435 B.C.	440 B.C.
14	I ² ,153	[----]	[----]	ca 440-430 B.C.	440-430 B.C.
15	I ² ,55	Aristonos his sons	[larisa]	ca 440-425 B.C.	431/0 B.C.
16	XII,41	A[ny]tos his sons	[----]	ca 440-425 B.C.	430 B.C.
17	X,50	[----]	[----]	ca 435-400 B.C.	430 B.C.
18	I ² ,143b	[----] [----] [their sons]	[----]	ca 435-425 B.C.	430 B.C.

Decree #	I.G. or S.E.G.	Honorand(s)	Citizenship	Date by letter-shapes	Likely date
19	I ² ,148	E[——]	[——]	ca 435-420 B.C.	435-430 B.C.
20	X,54	Krison his brothers Dek[——]	[Makedonia ?]	ca 435-425 B.C.	435-430 B.C.
21	I ² ,61+169+179 (X,53)	[——] [——] os [——] as	A[inoia ?] Ai[neia ?] Phe[gous ?]	ca 435-420 B.C.	429/8 B.C.
22	I ² ,59	Apollonophanes	Kolophon	ca 435-425 B.C.	428/7 B.C.
23	I ² ,62	[——] as [——] [——] [Kal]lippos	[Sicily]	ca 435-415 B.C.	427/6 B.C.
24	II ² ,38	[Eu]thykrati[des [——] [his sons ?]		ca 430-425 B.C.	426/5 B.C.
25	II ² ,71 (X,73)	[——] his sons: [——] [——] enos [——] [——]	[Salamis ?]	ca 440-420 B.C.	426/5 B.C.
26	I ² ,149	[E]uphen[os] [——] [their sons]	[P]aion[?]	ca 430-415 B.C.	425/4 B.C.

Decree #	I.G. or S.E.G.	Honorand(s)	Citizenship	Date by letter-shapes	Likely date
27	I ² ,28b	[———] [his sons]	[———]	<u>ca</u> 430-415 B.C.	430-415 B.C.
28	I ² ,70	Potamodoros his son: Eurytion other Orchomenians: Pythilles Po[———] [———] Na[———]	Orchomenos	<u>ca</u> 430-415 B.C.	424/3 B.C.
29	I ² ,145	Sotimos his sons	Herakleia	<u>ca</u> 430-410 B.C.	424/3 B.C.
30	II ² ,8	Herakleides	[Klazomenai ?]	reinscribed in 399/8 B.C.	424/3 B.C.
31	I ² ,72	E[———] [G] rabos [———] [their sons ?]	[Illyria]	<u>ca</u> 435-410 B.C.	425-420 B.C.
32	I ² ,83	Polystratos [his brother ?]	[Phleious]	<u>ca</u> 430-415 B.C.	421/0 B.C.
33	I ² ,82	Asteas	Aleia	<u>ca</u> 430-415 B.C.	421/0 B.C.
34	I ² ,93a	Lykon	Achaia	<u>ca</u> 430-410 B.C.	420 B.C.
35	I ² ,93b	[———]	[Achaia ?]	<u>ca</u> 430-410 B.C.	420 B.C.

Decree #	<u>L.G.</u> or <u>S.E.G.</u>	Honorand(s)	Citizenship	Date by letter-shapes	Likely date
36	I ² ,146	Proxenos his sons: Chal[kideus] []	[Miletos ?]	<u>ca</u> 430-405 B.C.	420 B.C.
37	I ² ,147	[] [his sons ?]	[]	<u>ca</u> 430-415 B.C.	420 B.C.
38	I ² ,150	S[o]si[st]r[atos ?][]	[]	<u>ca</u> 430-410 B.C.	420 B.C.
39	I ² ,154	[] [] [their sons]	[]	<u>ca</u> 430-410 B.C.	420 B.C.
40	I ² ,157	[]	[]	<u>ca</u> 425-405 B.C.	420 B.C.
41	I,129	[]	[]	<u>ca</u> 425-405 B.C.	420 B.C.
42	Unpublished	[] [] ?]	[]	<u>ca</u> 430-415 B.C.	420 B.C.
43	Unpublished	[] [his sons ?]	[]	<u>ca</u> 420-405 B.C.	420 B.C.
44	I ² ,122+156 (X,79+131)	Antiochides Phanosthenes other persons	[Andros]	<u>ca</u> 420-405 B.C.	420-415 or 408/7 B.C.
45	Unpublished	[] Nik[] [] os Neokr[]	[As]sos ? or [Thys]sos ?	<u>ca</u> 420-405 B.C.	420-405 B.C.

Decree #	I.G. or S.E.G.	Honorand(s)	Citizenship	Date by letter-shapes	Likely date
46	II ² ,60	Xanthip[pos]	[Kamei]ra ?	ca 420-410 B.C.	416/5 B.C.
47	I ² ,144+155 (X,108)	Proxenides	Knidos	ca 430-415 B.C.	416/5 B.C.
48	II ² ,27	Kallippos his sons: Eukratidas Hipp[-----]	Gyrton (Thessaly) reinscribed ca 400 B.C. ?		416/5 B.C.
49	I ² ,152	[fi]anax	[Kos ?]	ca 425-405 B.C.	416/5-410/09 B.C.
50	II ² ,32	Archonides Demon their sons	[Sicily ?]	reinscribed in 385/4 B.C.	416/5 B.C.
51	I ² ,159	Dorkis his wife	[Melos ?]	ca 420-405 B.C.	416/5 B.C.
52	XXI,57	[-----]	[Ionia]	ca 420-405 B.C.	415-405 B.C.
53	Unpublished	[-----]	[-----]	ca 420-405 B.C.	415 B.C.
54	X,111	And[-----] his sons	[Ephesos ?]	ca 420-410 B.C.	415/4 B.C.
55	I ² ,103	Eurytion his father: Potamodoros	Orchomenos	ca 420-400 B.C.	412/1 B.C.
56	II ² ,12	Pythophanes	[Phai]stos ?	reinscribed in 399/8 B.C.	411/0 B.C.

Decree #	I.G. or S.E.G.	Honorand(s)	Citizenship	Date from letter-shapes	Likely date
57	X,120	[—]kyses [—]?	[Asia Minor ?]	<u>ca</u> 420-405 B.C.	410 B.C.
58	XVI,10	[—]	[—]	late fifth century	late fifth century
59	X,140	Archi[—]	[—]	<u>ca</u> 430-405 B.C.	410 B.C.
60	I ² ,106	Polykles Peraieus A [rist]oboulos	[Hellespont ?]	<u>ca</u> 430-405 B.C.	409/8 B.C.
61	I ² ,116	Apollodoros [—]on[—]chos	Selymbria	<u>ca</u> 415-405 B.C.	408/7 B.C.
62	I ² ,118	Oiniades his sons	Palaiskiathos	<u>ca</u> 415-405 B.C.	408/7 B.C.
63	I ² ,119	[—]	[—]	<u>ca</u> 425-405 B.C.	408/7 or 407/6 B.C.
64	I ² ,67 (X,112)	[T]elemachos [—] [—]nos	Oi [taia ?]	<u>ca</u> 425-405 B.C.	408/7 B.C.
65	I ² ,105	[Ar]ch[e]la[s]	Makedonia	<u>ca</u> 425-405 B.C.	407/6 B.C.
66	I ² ,125	[P]olypos	[Gort]yna ?	<u>ca</u> 410-400 B.C.	405/4 B.C.
67	II ² ,73	[—]	[—]	<u>ca</u> 430-405 B.C.	405/4 B.C.
68	I ² ,106a (= II ² ,48)	[—] [—]	[—]	<u>ca</u> 420-400 B.C.	404/3 B.C.
69	II ² ,202	Epai[—]	[—]	<u>ca</u> 410-400 B.C.	404/3 B.C.

#1. Grave-stele. ca 460-440 B.C. Public burial for the proxenos Pythagoras of Salybria.

Pl. I, 1, 2

BIBLIOGRAPHY. Koumanoudis, A.E.E. (1871), 115; Rayet, Bulletin, I (1871), p. 246; Curtius, Arch.Zeit. (1871), p. 29; Kaibel, Epigrammata (1878), p. 14 #36; Schubert, Proxenia (1881), p. 69; Koehler, Ath.Mitt., X (1885), p. 366 #13; I.G., I, Supplement, p. 115 #491¹² (1886); Conze, Att.Grabreliefs (1890), 1440a; Collitz-Bechtel, Sammlung, III.2 (1905), p. 770 #5781; Michel, Recueil, Supplément (1912), p. 174 #1758; Buck, C.P., VIII (1913), pp. 144-145; I.G., I², 1034 (1924); Oliver, Hesperia, II (1933), p. 487; V (1936), pp. 225-226; Peek, Kerameikos, III (1941), p. 28; S.E.G., X (1949), 408; Lambrechts, Proxenedecreten (1958), p. 152.

PHOTOGRAPHS. Oliver (1936), p. 226; Lambrechts (op.cit.), pls. IV and V.

Fragments a and b, stele of Pentelic marble set in a marble base, standing on a three-stepped poros krepidoma in the Kerameikos Cemetery outside the Dipylon Gate of Athens. The stele is inscribed with the name of the

honorand; it may originally have borne a painted design, of which there now remains no trace. The base is inscribed in smaller letters with a metrical inscription of four lines. The monument stands where it was found in 1871 in excavation of the Kerameikos Cemetery. It was first published by Koumanoudis (loc.cit.).

Fragment a. H. 1.850m. W. 0.520m. Th. 0.250m. Letter-height 0.032m.

Fragment b. H. 0.260m. W. 0.880m. Th. 0.880m. Letter-height 0.016m.

Letter-shapes: A3 and 4, B2, E4, H1, Θ 2, K2, M3 and 5, N2 and 3, O1, Π 1, P1, 3, 8 and 9, Σ8, Y6 and 7, Φ4, X2, Q5.

Ionic script. The forms of beta and rho suggest a date after 460 B.C., but not later than 440 B.C. Sigma type 8 is found rarely before 446 B.C. in Attic inscriptions, but its appearance here in an Ionic document may not be a reliable indicator of date.

ca 460-440 B.C.

Stoich.

Πυθαγόρο

προξενίας ἀρετῆς τε χάρις προ(γ)όνων τε καὶ αὐτῷ

ἐνθάδ' Ἀθηναῖοι Πυθαγόρην ἔθεσαν

υἱὸν δημοσίου Διονυσίου, ἱππόβοτον δὲ

5 πατρίδα Σαλυβρίαν ἵκετ' ἄχος φθιμένο.

COMMENTARY.. This is the only surviving fifth-century example of the burial by the Athenians at public expense of a proxenos who had died in Athens. Ionic script is employed perhaps because the proxenos came from an area where this script was in general use. Salybria (Selymbria), on the Propontis, was a tributary of the Empire at least from 451/0 B.C. (A.T.L., I, pp. 400-401). There is no way of telling when the proxeny granted to Pythagoras and his ancestors was instituted..

Line 2. The mason inscribed pi instead of gamma here..

#2. Proxeny? ca 460-445 B.C. Honours for an unknown man and perhaps his sons. Pl. I, 3

BIBLIOGRAPHY. I.G., I, Supplement, p. 8 #22f (1877); I.G., I², 33 (1924).

PHOTOGRAPHS. None so far published.

EM 6803, fragment of slightly micaceous Pentellic marble. Its provenance is unknown; it was first published by Kirchhoff from a transcript of U. Koehler as I.G., I, Supplement, p. 8 #22f in 1877. It is broken on all sides, but the back, which is smooth-dressed, may be original. Stelai whose backs are smooth-dressed are rare; if the back is original it is possible that the stele was opisthographic, though there is no trace of any letters on the surviving part of the back.

H.max. 0.157m. W.max. 0.094m. Th. 0.059m. Letter-height 0.008m.-0.009m. Chequer 0.0118m.x 0.0127m.

Letter-shapes. A4, E4, Θ3 and 4, K2, Λ4, M4, N7, O2, P5, Σ4, Y7. Attic script; it is not certain whether or not the daseia was used. Sigma type 4 is not found in dated inscriptions after 445 B.C. Mu type 4 is not found in securely dated inscriptions before 428 B.C., but a mu of this

type is found in I.G., I², 18 which is by the same hand as the present document and which should probably be dated ca 458/7 B.C. In fact, it is possible, on a superficial examination of the stones, to make a case for putting #2 in the same stele as I.G., I², 18, but there are slight differences in the shapes and sizes of certain letters (notably sigma), and the horizontal chequer is considerably greater on I.G., I², 18 than on #2. Parts of I.G., I², 338 (dated between 465 and 455 B.C.) are also by the same hand.

ca 460-455 B.C.

Stoich.

5 [-----]! [-----]
 [-----] δὲ καὶ [-----]
 [--- ἀδὶ] κῆται [-----]
 [----- τ] ὃν δῆμο[ν -----]
 [-----] πόλις τ[-----]
 [--- πρ]ότοις [-----]
 [-----] οἱ ἀν [-----]
 [-----] κυρ[-----]
 [-----] δέο[νται ----]
 10 [-----] οσ[-----]
 [-----] θο[-----]
 [-----] ο[-----]

COMMENTARY. Not very much can be made of this document; it is clear from lines 5 and 8 that more than one person are involved, perhaps a father and his sons: therefore the singular [ἀδ:]κῆται in line 3 must refer to one of several individuals; the formula [λόπος ἄν ἀδ:]κῆται [μεδῆς αὐτῶν ὑφ' ἑνὸς] is one possible reading. Hiller (I.G., I², 33) restored lines 4-8 with a fifty-seven letter line, but his parallels are drawn from later documents (for line 4, I.G., II², 385.17, dated to 319/8 B.C.; for lines 6-7, I.G., I², 54.8 and 108.30, dated respectively to the 430's and to 410/09 B.C.); I therefore hesitate to adopt Hiller's restorations, which run as follows:

[-----τ]ὸν δῆμο[ν·δίδουσαι δὲ αὐτοῖς προεδρίαν
ἐν πᾶσι τοῖς ἄγ]-

5 [ὅσιν κοῖς κε π]όλις τ[ίθεσιν, καὶ πρόσδοτον ἔναι αὐτοῖς
πρὸς τὴν βολὴν κα]-

[ὶ τὸν δῆμον πρ]ότοις [μετὰ τὰ ἱερὰ ὅς εὐεργέταις ὄσι
Ἀθηναῖον τῷ δῆμο·τῷ]-

[ς δὲ πρυτάνες ἡ]οι ἄν [λάχοσι πρυτανεύειν δοῦναι τὴν
φσῆφον περὶ αὐτῶν ἐ]-

[ς τὴν πρότεν τῶν] κυρ[ίον ἐκκλησιῶν-----]

Hiller's version is weakened by the inconsistency with which he introduces the daseia; though his line 6 can, in

fact, be improved if one reads instead [πρ]ότοις
[μεθ' ^ἡιερά ^ῃος προχσένοις ὅσιν Ἀθηναίων τῷ δέμῳ].

Line 1. The bottom of a central vertical survives above of line 2.

Line 2-3. In accordance with well-known formulae one could restore a fifty-two letter line as follows:

[ἐπιμέλ^εσθαι] δέ καί [αὐτῶν τέμ βολέν καί τὸς πρυτάνες
[καί τὸς στρατεγῶ]-

[ς ἡος ἄν με ἄδι]κῆται [μεδῆς αὐτῶν ^ἡυφ' ^ἡενός·-----]

However, the formulae are so common and admit of so many variations that they provide very little confirmation of Hiller's line-length, or of any other.

Line 4. The Demos is evidently enjoined to take some action; I doubt whether any clause ending [πρὸς] τὸν δῆμον can be accommodated in the available space.

Line 9. One might restore, on the analogy of #28, lines 16-17: [ἐάν δέ ἄλλο το] δέδνται ἔναι αὐτοῖς ^ἡευρέσθαι ἀγαθὸν ἡὸ, τι ἄν δύνοντ|αι].

Lines 11-12. The letters ΘΘ in line 11 suggest that the mood changes here to the imperative; one might restore, on the analogy of #4, lines 21-23:

[ἐς δέ τὸ δικάστé]-
[ριον προσκαλέσ]θο [αὐτὸς Ἀθέναζε ἡο πολέμαρχος εἴκοσι
ἡεμερῶν ἀφ' ^ἡἔς]
[ἡαι κλέσες ἐχσέκ]ο[σιν ἔ εὐθυνέσθο].

I am not aware of any case where twenty days' grace are allowed; the usual time is five or ten days.

#3. Proxeny. ca 460-440 B.C. Honours for four Thespians.

Pl. II, 1, 2

BIBLIOGRAPHY. I.G., I, 27 (1873); Foucart, B.C.H., I (1877), pp. 303-307; I.G., I, Supplement, p. 9 #27 (1877); Hicks, G.H.I. (1882), pp. 31-32 #26; Hicks and Hill, Manual² (1901), pp. 62-63; Michel, Recueil, Supplément (1912), p. 3 #1429; I.G., I², 36 (1924); Gomme, Commentary, I (1945), p. 339; Loughran and Raubitschek, Hesperia, XVI (1947), pp. 78-79 #1; S.E.G., X (1949), 33; Lambrechts, Proxeni edicta (1958), pp. 29, 35, 70, 150.

PHOTOGRAPHS. Loughran and Raubitschek, op.cit., pl. XIII (squeezes).

Three joining fragments of slightly micaceous Pentellic marble. Fragments b and c were first associated by Foucart (loc.cit.). Fragment a was joined to fragments b and c by Loughran and Raubitschek (loc.cit.). Foliation is vertical and parallel to the face.

Fragment a, EM 12411, is of unknown provenance. The left edge and rough-picked back are preserved. It joins the top of fragment b. It was first published by Loughran and

Raubitschek (loc.cit.).

H.max. 0.141m. W.max. 0.216m. Th.0.100m.

Fragments b and c bear the same inventory-number, EM 6575. Fragment b was found in 1864 at the west end of the Akropolis; it was first published by Kirchhoff from a transcript of U. Koehler as I.G., I, 27 in 1873. The left edge and rough-picked back are preserved.

H.max. 0.215m. W.max. 0.275m. Th. 0.100m.

Fragment c was found on the Akropolis in excavation at the west end of the Erechtheion; it was first published by Foucart (loc.cit). The right edge and rough-picked back are preserved. It joins the right side of fragment b.

H.max. 0.240m. W.max. 0.240m. Th. 0.100m.

Combined dimensions: H.max. 0.380m. W. 0.500m. Th. 0.100m.

Letter-height 0.018m.-0.022m. Non-stoichedon; vertical chequer 0.0267m.

Letter-shapes. A3 and 4, E4 (tailed), Θ3, K2, Λ2 and 4, M2, N1, 2 and 3, O2, Π4, P6, Σ8 and 10, Y1-2, Φ5, X2-3.

Possibly Attic script, but with a strong Boiotian influence. The daseia was not employed. If it is Attic, the forms of nu and upsilon should date it in the 450's or very early 440's;

however, the four-barred sigma should be an indication of a date well after 450 B.C. The form of rho is closer to Boiotian shapes than to anything Attic. Whether Attic or Boiotian, however, the shapes are a curious mixture of late and early forms. Suitable contexts (see below) would be after the battle of Tanagra (458 B.C.), or after the battle of Koroneia (446 B.C.) I know of no other inscription by the same hand; the shapes of mu, nu, rho, sigma and upsilon are perhaps more characteristic of Boiotia than of Attica at the middle of the fifth century (see Jeffery, Local Scripts, p. 89). It is worth mentioning another document inscribed at Athens but executed by a foreign mason and relating to foreigners: this is the list of Argive casualties at the battle of Tanagra (I.G., I², 931/2). It is the existence of this document that leads me to suggest a date in the 450's for #3.

ca 460-440 B.C.

Non-stoich.
ca 24-25

a [ἔ]δοχσεν τε[ι βολεῖ καὶ τοῖ δερ]-
[οι,] Αἰαντῖς ἐπ[ρυτάνευε, ⁴⁻⁵--- ἐ]-
[γρ]αμμάτε[υε, ⁴⁻⁵--- ἐπεστάτε, ¹⁻²---]-
b, c [^{ca} 2]·λέος εἶπε·Κορ[ρα]γίδεν κα[ὶ ^{ca} 2]-
5 θαλυκίδεν καὶ Μενέστρατον κ-
αὶ Ἀθέναιον τὸς Θεσπιᾶς ἀναγρ-

ἄφσαι προχσένος καὶ εὐεργέτα-
 [ς] Ἀθηναίων καὶ τὸς παῖδας τὸς
 [αὐτῶ]ν ἐμ πόλει ἐν στέλει λιθί-
 10 [νει·οἱ δὲ] πολετ[α]ὶ ἀπομισθοσά-
 [ντον τὸν στέλεν·] τὸ δὲ ἀργύριον
 [ἀποδόντον οἱ κολακρ]ῆται·κ[αλ]-
 [ῆσαι δὲ αὐτὸς ἐπὶ χσένια ἐς τὸ]
 [κρυτανεῖον ἐς αὔριον. vacat]

vacat

COMMENTARY. Although this inscription is non-stoichedon, the restoration of the text presents few problems, since well-known formulae are involved. The average interval between letters is 0.006m.; the mason carries his text as close to the right edge as he can, so that, where there is uncut space at the end of a line, one can be certain that the next letter (at the start of the succeeding line) will be a wide one, as in lines 8 and 10.

Lines 1-4. No attempt should be made to restore the names of the secretary and the epistates. The orator's name will depend upon the length of that of the epistates, but it cannot be more than nine letters long, and probably will be of seven or eight letters, since a three-letter epistates-name is not very likely. I do not know of any Athenian name

with the termination $\text{-}\lambda\epsilon\omega\varsigma$ of less than eight letters. Before the lambda of this name there is a trace of a vertical. While it could be part of iota or upsilon, its closeness to the following lambda probably rules out upsilon; otherwise, the name Thrasyleos would be a strong candidate. Stesileos, the general who was killed at Marathon in 490 B.C., was the son of Thrasyleos; his son, if named after his grandfather, would be of the right age to be orator of a decree in the 450's or 440's (see P.A., II, 12906). Another Stesileos, perhaps a grandson of the general, was involved with Laches in the early 420's, when his unmartial behaviour made him a laughing-stock (P.A., II, 12905). However, this man was probably still a minor in the period 460-440 B.C. Another candidate is Dexileos, putative grandfather of the knight Dexileos who was killed at the age of twenty in 394/3 B.C. (P.A., I, 3229); the family was a wealthy and prominent one late in the fifth century; it would be reasonable to assume its prominence in the mid-fifth century, and to suggest that one of its members was named Dexileos at this time. Fourth-century names with the termination $\text{-}\lambda\epsilon\omega\varsigma$ are Arrhileos and Charileos.

Lines 4-10. The four honorands are not otherwise known. Loughran and Raubitschek suggest that they were partisans of Athens forced to leave Thespiæ after the disaster at

Koroneia in 446 B.C. (op.cit., p. 79). This argument is a plausible one, but the letter-forms, if they are Boiotian, are not of much chronological assistance and would probably support a date ten years earlier; I suggest that these four Thespians may have been honoured after the battles of Tanagra or Oinophyta in 458 B.C., and that the employment of an Argive mason to inscribe the list of Argive casualties at Tanagra (I.G., I², 931/2) was precedent for the inscription by a Thespian mason of this decree in honour of four Thespians. As Loughran and Raubitschek suggest (loc.cit.), the publication-formula does not mention the secretary of the Boule, who usually is named as being in charge of the inscription of public documents; yet the state is to bear the cost (lines 10-12); perhaps the honorands themselves had charge of the inscription, and so might have employed a fellow-countryman to do the work. In lines 4-5 the name of the second honorand may be Thalykides, in which case there will be a vacat of about two letters at the end of line 4. Loughran and Raubitschek suggest that the root of this name is αἰθα- or αἰθαλ-, but discount the name Aithalykides because they do not believe that there is space enough for the first two letters of this name in line 4; my measurements of the stone convince me that there is enough space, and, since the practice of this mason

is to fill up his lines to the right, I think the longer name more likely.

In line 4 the first four letters of the first honorand's name are clear; the space between fragments b and c is enough for two letters after rho, if one of them is of medium width; thus, rho-alpha can be restored with some confidence. After the break the feet of a triangular letter survive, followed by the bottom of an iota. The name is thus likely to be Κορ[ρα]γιδεν ; its root-form Korragos is found in Thessaly (see Bechtel, Personennamen, p. 254). At the right edge of the stone the left foot of alpha survives.

Line 5. The bottom of the vertical of kappa survives at the right edge..

Line 7. The apex of alpha survives at the left edge.

Line 8. The apex of alpha and the top of theta survive.

Line 9. The top of the right stroke of nu survives at the left edge.

Line 11. The right tip of the bar of tau survives at the left edge of fragment c.

Line 12. The spacing of the extant letters of this inscription suggests that there will not be room enough for [παρσχόντων] (suggested by Hiller, I.G., I², 36). The right tip of the upper bar of epsilon survives at the left edge of fragment c.

Line 13. The whole upper bar of epsilon survives on the break at the left edge; the next three letters are partially-preserved but certain. At the right edge only the top of the vertical of kappa survives.

After line 14 I have restored the stone as if there were no further provisions. The formula in line 14 is that often found concluding a decree; it is always possible, of course, that a rider was added at this point.

#4. Proxeny. ca 460-445 B.C. Honours for Parianos of
Issa and his sons.

Pl. I, 4, 5, 6

BIBLIOGRAPHY. I.G., I, 16; 22 (1873); I.G., I², 23; 30
(1924); Haggard, Secretaries (1930), p. 10 #8; Meritt,
Hesperia, XIV (1945), p. 126 note 132; Loughran and
Raubitschek, Hesperia, XVI (1947), pp. 79-81 #2; S.E.G.,
X (1949), 20; Lambrechts, Proxeni edicta (1958), pp. 27,
30, 33, 117, 150.

PHOTOGRAPH. Loughran and Raubitschek, op.cit., pl. XIII.2.

Two joining fragments of slightly micaceous Pentelic marble.
Foliation is vertical and parallel to the face; in
fragment a there is a layer of greenish mica, along which
the back has split away from the face. These fragments
were first associated by Loughran and Raubitschek (loc.cit.):
J.H. Oliver tested and confirmed the join on their
instructions.

Fragment a, EM 6566, preserves the left edge; otherwise,
it is broken on all sides. It was found in 1865 at the
east end of the Akropolis, and was first published by
Kirchhoff from a transcript of U. Koehler as I.G., I, 16

in 1873.

H.max. 0.260m. W.max. 0.172m. Th.max. 0.100m. Letter-height, lines 1-5 0.021m.; lines 6ff. 0.010m.-0.011m. Chequer, lines 1-5 0.0264m.x 0.0264m.; lines 6ff. 0.0153m.x 0.0160m.

Fragment b, EM 6570, preserves the left edge and rough-picked back. It is of unknown provenance. It was first published by Kirchhoff from a transcript of U. Koehler as I.G., I, 22 in 1873. It joins the bottom of fragment a. H.max. 0.280m. W.max. 0.166m. Th. 0.117m. Letter-height 0.010m.-0.011m. Chequer 0.0153m.x 0.0159m. Combined Dimensions: H.max. 0.528m. W.max. 0.172m. Th. 0.117m.

Letter-shapes: A3 and 4, B3, E3-4, H1, Θ2, K2, Λ4, M2, N7 and 8, O1 and 2, Π1, P6 and 8, Σ4, Υ7, Φ4, X3. Attic script, with regular use of the daseia (except, possibly, in line 5). Sigma type 4 is not found in dated inscriptions after 445 B.C.; that found in the present document is an unusual variant with a very long top stroke; it occurs also in the heading of A.T.L., II, D 11 and in the Kos fragment of the Decree of Klearchos (A.T.L., II, D 14), neither of which is by the same hand. It also occurs

in I.G., I², 19 and 29, whose hands are otherwise totally different from each other and from #4. By the same hand as #4, however, are #2 and I.G., I², 32 and 34 and S.E.G., X, 15; all these documents should probably be dated in the late 450's or early 440's. A slightly earlier date, after 460 B.C., is not ruled out.

ca 460-445 B.C.

Stoich.

a Προχσέ[νον καὶ εὐεργετῶν]

Ἀθενα[ῖον. vacat]

Παριαν[ὸ-----]

Ἀθενοδ[όρο? τῷ -----]

5 Ἰκεσίῳ [τῷ -----]

Stoich. 42

ἔδοχσεν τῷ [βολῇ καὶ τῷ δέμοι, ἡιπποθοντὶς ἐπρυτ]-

άνευεν, Δι[---- ἐγραμμάτευεν, ---- ἐπεστάτε, ---- ἔ]-

[ρ]χε, Δεμο[----- εἶπεν·----- εἰάν το δε]-

[ε]ται ἔ β[όλεται παρὰ Ἀθηναίων πρόσοδον ἔναι πρὸς τῇ]-

10 [μ] βολ[έν καὶ τὸν δῆμον·.....²⁵.....]

lacuna

b [.3.ά]ν[αγράφσαι δὲ τὸν γραμματέα τὸν τῆς βολῆς τὸ φσ]-

έφισμα τ[ὸ]δ[ε ἐστέλει λιθίνει καὶ θῆναι ἐμ πόλει τέλ]-

15 εσι τῷς αὐτ[ὸ]·ἐπαινέσαι δὲ¹⁰..... καὶ τὸς ἀπάρ]-

χας κατὰ ἴσ[αν ἥοτι εὐεργετέκασιν τὴν πόλιν καὶ ἥο]-

τι τὴν τριακ[όντερον¹⁹..... καὶ τὴν]

- πεντεκόντε[ρον κατέστελαν ἐς Λέσβον καὶ ἡὸτι τὸς σ]-
 [τ]ρατιότας ἀ[νέλαβον²⁵.....]
- 20 [.]ι ἐς Λέσβον [.....²⁶..... ἐκ τοῦ δι]-
 [κασ]τερίο ἰ[σσαιὸν· ἡο δὲ πολέμαρχος ἐς τὸ δικαστέρι]-
 [ον π]ροσκαλ[έσθο αὐτὸς Ἀθέναζε πέντε ἡμερῶν ἀφ' ἧς]
 [ἄν η]αι κλέσ[ες ἐχσέκοσιν ἔ εὐθυνέσθο·.....¹².....]
 [... δ]ἔ ἡοι ε[.....³⁴.....]
- 25 [...³...] εἶπε· τ[ἄ μὲν ἄλλα καθάπερ τῷ βολῇ·.....¹¹.....]
 [...⁴...] ολε[.....³⁵.....]
 [...⁴...] ι[.....³⁷.....]

 COMMENTARY. Loughran and Raubitschek assumed that line
 3 contained an ethnic and that the two men named in lines
 4 and 5 were men of this city sent to Athens as
 ambassadors. They restored lines 1-5 as follows:

Προ[χσένον καὶ εὐεργετῶν]
 ἈθENA[ῖον τῶν πρέσβεον τῶν]
 Παριαν[ῶν. vacat]
 ἈθENOδ[όρου τῷ nomen patris]
 5 Ἰκεσίο [τῷ nomen patris.]

Lines 6ff. they restored, I think correctly, with a
 forty-two letter line.

I find their version as a whole unsatisfactory, primarily because I do not see what connexion the ambassadors of Parion, a small state on the Hellespont, might have with the affairs of Lesbos. The conjunction that they make in line 15 between these Parian envoys and the government of Issa in Lesbos I find unsatisfactory because too abrupt, and, in any case, unconvincing.

I suggest, therefore, that the letters ΠΑΡΙΑΝ in line 3 are part of a personal name, not of an ethnic. While it is true that no such personal name is known from elsewhere, there are sufficient extant personal names derived from ethnics to make this assumption reasonable. The honorands will thus be citizens of Issa, and their connexion in line 15 with the government of Issa becomes a logical possibility. The decree, then, will be concerned with the affairs of Lesbos, and, in particular, of Issa (see lines 15, 19 and 20). It remains to restore the heading satisfactorily in conformity with this assumption.

Lines 1-2 must contain the formula Προχρεῖ[νον καὶ εὐεργετῶν] Ἀθηναίων, in the genitive, or its equivalent in the nominative or dative. Thus, the minimum inscribed width of the stele will be 0.555m., permitting a line-length in lines 6ff. of thirty-six or more letters. However, lines 6-8 contain a preamble whose formulae fix the

line-length at between thirty-seven and forty-two letters. Lines 13-15 contain a publication-formula demanding, within the limits set by the preamble, a line-length of forty or forty-two letters. I have been unable to devise suitable restorations of lines 8-10, 16-19 and 21-24 with a forty-letter line, so that I think that Loughran's and Raubitschek's forty-two letter line must stand. I think, too, that they are correct in assuming that syllabic division was observed in lines 1-5, so that we can say only that these lines contained a maximum of twenty-five letters. I suggest as a possibility that the heading be restored as follows:

Προχσέ[νον καὶ εὐεργετῶν]
 Ἀθελναί[ον. vacat]
 Παριαν[ὸ καὶ τῶν παίδων αὐτῶ]
 Ἀθελνοδ[όρο? τῶ Παριανῶ]
 5 Ἰηελίο [τῶ Παριανῶ.]

The absence of an ethnic is, at first sight, awkward, but I suggest that the ethnic would be restored in line 8, which could be restored as follows: [Ἰ|ρ]χε, Δελνο[...⁵...

εἰπεν Παριανῶι τῶι Ἰηελίοι ἐάν το δεῖ[ε]ται κατ #9 provides a parallel for this arrangement: the first five lines contain a list of the names of the sons of Iphiades of Abydos, apparently without any ethnic; then follow the regular preamble and the decree itself.

Lines 6-8. With a forty-two letter line Hippothontis is the only possible prytany. In line 7 Hiller (I.G., I², 30) suggested that the name of the secretary included a demotic; he placed the epistates-formula in line 8, reading the letters XEΔEMO as part of the name Archedemos; this man was orator of I.G., I², 19 (probably dated to 458 B.C.). However, demotics are not found in preambles before the end of the fifth century, except in very rare cases; Loughran's and Raubitschek's version, based on a suggestion of B.D.Meritt (reported by Haggard, loc.cit.), makes Archedemos the orator:

[ἀ]νευεν, Δι[ότιμος ἐγγραμμάτευεν, Καλλίας ἐπεστάτε, Ἀ]-
[ρ]χέδεμο[ς εἶπε· κτλ.]

However, it seems to me at least a possibility that this decree contained an archon-formula, and that the letters XE in line 8 are the end of the word [ἐρ]χε : while archon-formulae generally are not found in preambles before 421/0 B.C., there are at least two examples (I.G., I², 19 and 22) in the period 460-445 B.C. I suggest:

[ἀ]νευεν, Δι[όν? ἐγγραμμάτευεν, ca 5- ἐπεστάτε, ca 6- ε]-
[ρ]χε, Δεμο[ca 5- εἶπε· κτλ.]

I have tentatively restored the name Dion as that of the secretary; this man is known from kalos-inscriptions on pots of the period 480-470 B.C. (P.A., I, 4489; see Beazley,

Red-Figure, II, p. 1574) and thus would probably be of sufficient age to be a member of the Boule in the 450's. Thus, there would be left eleven letters for the names of the epistates and the archon. The latter could be any one of Habron (458/7 B.C.), Kallias (456/5 B.C.), Ariston (454/3 B.C.), Euthynos (450/49 B.C.), or Pedieus (449/8 B.C.); any longer name would make restoration of the name of the epistates difficult.

My discussion of the heading led me to believe that line 8 contained the name and ethnic of the honorand and that five, possibly six, letter-spaces remained to complete the orator's name; this space could accommodate the name Demophanes, for instance: a man of this name was demarch of Rhamnous in the period 450-445 B.C. (S.E.G., X, 210.32). Demochares, tamias in 444/3 or 443/2 B.C., is another possibility. Alternatively, one might adopt a variant of Loughran's and Raubitschek's version: they restore [Α|ρ]χέδεμο[ς εἶπε· Ἀθηνόδορον καὶ Ἰκέσιον, ἥotan το
δεό|ν]ται for the latter part of this [Παριανὸν καὶ τοῦ
παῖδας] could be substituted, though I believe that the absence of an ethnic here or in the heading probably rules this out. However, by reading [ἐάν] for [ἥotan] one could provide sufficient space for the name Demophon in the orator-formula; this man is not known in the period in

question, but the name is apparently hereditary in the family of the fourth-century orator Demosthenes (P.A., I, 3597 and stemma).

Line 9. Kirchhoff and Hiller thought that religious matters were concerned here and restored τὰ ἱερ[ά]. Meritt (loc.cit.) followed them; however, no suitable restoration has been proposed along these lines. Much more satisfactory is the version of Loughran and Raubitschek: [δεο]νται ἔβ[όλονται.....²⁹.....].

I have altered this to suit a single honorand, and have expanded it by analogy with I.G., I², 87 and #49. Of the letter read by earlier editors as a rho, and by Loughran and Raubitschek and myself as a beta, there survive the top loop and part of the vertical.

Line 10. The top of the vertical of lambda survives at the right edge.

The lacuna between fragments a and b is of two lines; a reference to the task of introducing the honorand to the Boule and to the Demos might be expected to fill the gap partially, for instance:

[προσάγειν αὐτὸν πρὸς τὴν βουλὴν]

[καὶ τὸν δεῖμον τοὺς πρυτάνεις πρότον μετὰ τὰ ἱερά· κτλ.]

It seems likely that Parianos and his sons were already proxenoi, and that this decree involved the grant of

additional privileges to them as well as praise for the government of Issa; otherwise, one might expect a reference in the text to their proxeny. It is possible, however, that the lacuna contained the grant of proxeny with a general reference to their services.

Lines 13-26. My restorations are based on those of Loughran and Raubitschek.

Line 13. The bottom of a right vertical survives here above the mu of line 14.

Loughran and Raubitschek restored an imperative here:

[... ἡ δὲ γραμματεὺς ἡ τῆς βολῆς ἀναγράφσας τὸ φσ]-
[ἐ]φισμα τ[όδε ἐστέλει λιθίνει καταθέτο ἐμ πόλει τέλ]-

This, I think clashes with the infinitive in line 15: while it is not unusual to find a change of mood in the text of a single decree, it is unlikely, I think, that there would be alternation of mood from line to line; I prefer to keep the infinitive until line 21, to avoid inconsistency.

Lines 15-16. Loughran and Raubitschek restored [ἐπαινέσαι μὲν καὶ αὐτὸς καὶ τοὺς ἀπάρ]χας κατὰ Ἴσσο[αν]. Both initial chi and the sigma at the right edge of the stone in line 16 are certain; I see no alternative to the suggestion of Loughran and Raubitschek that the city of Issa on the

island of Lesbos is here mentioned and that the letters ~~ΧΑΣ~~ in line 16 are part of the word [ἀπάρχ]ας . They derive the latter from a late and enigmatic Lesbian inscription (I.G., XII, Supplement, p. 13 #68), in which the ἀπάρχαι are mentioned along with other groups of officials. Their function is unknown; possibly they were the magistrates of the city. The publication-formula ending in line 15 may mark the termination of this decree's concern with Parianos and his sons; in this case, the praise-clause beginning in this line may refer to the government of Issa: one could therefore restore as follows:

[ἐπαινέσαι δὲ τὸν βολέν τε καὶ τοὺς ἀπάρ]-
 χας κατὰ ἴσσο[αν].

Alternatively, on the assumption that Parianos is here linked with the government of Issa, one might restore:

[ἐπαινέσαι δὲ Παριανόν τε καὶ τοὺς ἀπάρ]-
 χας κατὰ ἴσσο[αν]

or

[ἐπαινέσαι δὲ καὶ αὐτόν τε καὶ τοὺς ἀπάρ]-
 χας κατὰ ἴσσο[αν].

I do not know which version is best.

Line 17. Loughran and Raubitschek restored τριακ[όντερον καὶ τὸν τετρακόντερον] . This, as they admit, involves an unparalleled spelling. I am unable to suggest any suitable

alternative.

Lines 21-23. Loughran's and Raubitschek's restoration is surely correct in essence; it derives from #15, lines 7-10. The connexion, however, with what has been said in lines 15-20 is obscure.

They restore lines 23-24 as follows: [συνεπιμελόσθ|ον δ]ἔ
 μοι ἔπιμελεται λόπος ἄν-----]; A.T.L., II, D 8, line 47
 provides a partial analogy. In the absence of a convin-
 cing restoration for the whole passage I think that these
 lines must be left unrestored.

Line 25. A rider is introduced here, but nothing can be
 conjectured about its contents.

Line 26. [.ᾗ. β]ολε[-----] Loughran and Raubitschek. I
 am not sure that this restoration should be admitted; too
 many alternatives exist..

Line 27. The top of a central vertical survives under
 the omicron of line 26.

#5. Proxeny. ca 460-445 B.C. Honours for a family from Delphoi. Pl. II, 3

BIBLIOGRAPHY. Pittakys, E.A., 49 (1858), pp. 1788-1789 #3417; I.G., I, 21 (1873); Dittmar, Coronis (1890), pp. 117-118; Wilhelm, Beitraege (1909), pp. 236-239; Att.Urk., I, (1911), p. 7; I.G., I², 27 (1924); Haggard, Secretaries (1930), p. 10 #7; Wilhelm, Att.Urk., IV (1939), pp. 25-28 #xxiii; Meritt, Hesperia, X (1941), pp. 315-317; Pritchett, Hesperia, XI (1942), p. 231 note 5; S.E.G., X (1949), 19; Meiggs, C.R., LXIII (1949), pp. 5-12; Meritt, Hesperia, XXI (1952), pp. 346-347; S.E.G., XII (1952), 9; Lambrechts, Proxenedecreten (1958), pp. 48, 69, 74, 114, 116, 120, 127, 150; de Ste.-Croix, C.Q., XI (1961), p. 275; Mattingly, Historia, XII (1963), pp. 263-265; Robert, R.E.G., LXXVII (1964), p. 157 #120; S.E.G., XXI (1965), 15; Mattingly, Ehrenberg Studies (1966), p. 206; S.E.G., XXIII (1968), 5.

PHOTOGRAPH. Wilhelm (1939), pl. 1.

EM 6569, fragment of Pentelic marble preserving the left edge; otherwise, it is broken on all sides. It was found on November 22, 1858, in a late context in the southern part of the Parthenon on the Akropolis; it was first

published by Pittakys (loc.cit.). There is an uninscribed vertical space of 0.080m. above line 1; apparently there was a similar uninscribed space below line 17. Though the top is broken, it is roughly flat and bears a rectangular dowel-hole 0.060m. deep, 0.040m. wide, 0.135m. from the left edge, 0.110m. from the face; this may have supported a crowning member, perhaps a relief, or else it may have been used in fixing the stele to a wall. Foliation is vertical and at right angles to the face.

H.max. 0.560m. W.max. 0.318m. Th.max. 0.125m. Letter-height 0.015m.-0.016m. Chequer 0.0271m.x 0.0278m.

Letter-shapes. A3 and 4, B3 (upper loop much larger), E4, Θ3, K2, Λ2 and 3, M1-5, N7 and 8, O2, Π3, P8 (in line 3 there is one type 7, corrected from beta), Σ1, Υ7, Φ7, Χ2. Attic script, apparently without the daseia. Sigma type 1 is not found in dated inscriptions after 445 B.C. Beta type 3 is rare before 445 B.C., though doubtful examples occur as early as 451 B.C.; that found in this inscription seems to be a transitional form. The letter-forms generally seem to be transitional between those of the 450's and those of the 440's, probably closer to 445 B.C. than to 460 B.C. I.G., II², 19 (probably dated in 458 B.C.) is by a very similar hand, though lambda is generally different

and the form of sigma is not the same. A.T.L., II, D 11 (dated almost surely to 450/49 B.C.) is very close, though not identical. In #5, however, the shape of pi is highly individual; it is not paralleled until after 430 B.C., I do not know of any document by precisely the same hand, except the small and possibly related fragment #6.

ca 460-445 B.C.

Stoich.23

ἔδοχσεν τ[ῆι βολῇ καὶ τῷ δέ]-
 μοι, Λεοντ[ῖς ἐπρυτάνευε, .3.] -
 ὁστρατος [ἐπεστάτε, ...?...] -
 ράτες ἐγρ[αμμάτευε, ...?...] -
 5 χος εἶπε· Ἀ[...!0..... καὶ τῷ]-
 ς ἀδελφὸς [τὸς ἐκείνο τὸς Δελ]-
 φὸς καὶ τὸν [πατέρα ..5... ἀνα]-
 γράψαι τὸν [γραμματέα τῆς β]-
 ολῆς ἐν πόλει [ἰ ἐστέλει καὶ ἐν]-
 10 τῷ βουλευτῇ [ρίοι προχσένος]
 Ἀθηναῖον εὐ[εργετῶντας καὶ]
 λόγοι καὶ ἔρ[γοι ὅ τι ἂν δυνατ]-
 ὸν ἔι, καὶ (ἐ)άν τι [ς ἀποκτείνει τ]-
 ἰν' αὐτῶν ἐν [τὸν πόλεον ὅσον Ἀ]-
 15 θεναῖοι [κρατῶσιν, τιμορίαν].
 ἔναι [αὐτῷ ἔπερ τοῖς προχσέ]-
 νοι [ς ἐφσέφισται. vacat]

vacat

COMMENTARY. Line-length is established by the restoration of lines 1-2.

Lines 2-3. The name of the epistates will be either ten or eleven letters long, depending on whether or not [ἐπρυτάνευε] is spelt with final nu. Mattingly (1966) restores the name Nikostratos here, identifying this man with the general of the 420's; however, there was another man of this name in the 450's, the father of a candidate for ostracism (see A.E. Raubitschek, ap. Dinsmoor, Hesperia, Supplement V [1941], pp. 163-164), who is perhaps more likely. Several other names with the termination -όστρατος are possible: for instance, Demonstratos, Hippostratos, Phanostratos or Philostratos. For the secretary's name Kirchhoff (I.G., I, 21) suggested Aristokrates; Wilhelm (1909, p. 236) sought by this name to establish a connexion with #9; however, there is a host of twelve-letter names ending in -κράτης (see Meritt [1952], p. 346); since Leontis was in prytany each year, Wilhelm's "coincidence" is unremarkable. The slightly unusual order of the preamble is paralleled, for instance, in #16. No editor has sought to restore the orator's name; too many possibilities exist.

Lines 5-8. Meritt (1941, p. 315) correctly reads the letter at the right edge of the stone as an alpha; previous editors read nu. Wilhelm (1939, p. 25) restores as follows:

5

N[ικόστρατον καὶ τὸ]-

ς ἀδελφὸς [καὶ τὸς ...⁵... ἀδελ]-

φός καὶ τὸμ [πάππον ...⁵... ἀνα]-
γράφσαι κτλ.

This somewhat awkward arrangement gives two groups of honorands, Nikostratos (amended to Ἀ[λεχσομενόν] by Pritchett, loc.cit.) and his brothers, and the brothers of his cousin (Wilhelm suggests the name Nikias, exempli gratia, for the latter), together with the grandfather of both groups. It is difficult to see in this grouping any real similarity, apart from the numbers involved, to that of #9, which Wilhelm believed to be a re-affirmation of #5. Meritt (1952) revived Hiller's suggestion (I.G., I², 27) that the letters ΦΟΣ in line 7 are part of the ethnic [Δελ]φός this suggestion I believe to be correct: certainly there is no connexion with #9. It would be normal to find the ethnic immediately after the first name, in line 5; however, there is hardly space for this. Hiller's version [..... καὶ Δελ]φός is unlikely: the ethnic is always found with the article in fifth-century proxeny-decrees (see Meritt, op.cit., p. 344). In line 7 the mu of ΤΟΜ implies that the next letter will be beta, mu or pi; Kirchhoff's [πατέρα] (I.G., I, 21) is probably to be preferred to Wilhelm's [πάππον]; Hiller suggested that this word would be followed by a name; this is probably correct, though [αὐτὸν], suggested by Kirchhoff

and accepted by Meritt (op.cit., 347), is also possible.

Apart from Hiller's suggestion about the father's name, I have adopted Meritt's text for these lines.

Lines 9-12. Pittakys restored line 9 as follows: πόλε[ι
καὶ στέσαι ἐν]; I think that Kirchhoff's [ἐστέλει] is better and more in keeping with known formulae. Wilhelm (1909, p. 236) points out that this wording implies that the record kept in the Bouleuterion was not inscribed on stone, unless it was a stele bearing the names of all previous proxenoi; there is no evidence for such a stele at Athens.

The restoration of lines 10-13 is that first proposed by Kirchhoff (I.G., I, 21). Wilhelm (1939, p. 27) suggested that [εὐεργέτας] would be equally satisfactory instead of [προχσένος], but this clashes with the restoration [προχσέν] νο[ς] in lines 16-17.

Lines 13-17. The restoration is that of Wilhelm (loc.cit.); he suggests that ἄν is a shortened form of ἑάν (as, for example, in I.G., I², 4.23, 16.6, 84.27, and 189.5). However, I suspect that this is merely a case of the omission of the letter epsilon by the mason. Hiller suggested the restoration ἀντ' [εὐεργετῆν ἕκαστ]ον; apart from the obscurity of the Greek, as he himself admitted, this is one letter too long. The formula in lines 14-15 is fairly common in the fifth century (cf. #13, line 15,

and #7, lines 8-9, for early examples)..

In both lines 15 and 17 the top of iota survives at the right edge of the stone.

Since the bottom is not preserved, it is always possible that there was a rider after line 17, or that additional clauses existed; however, the formula in lines 16-17 is consistent with the end of a decree.

#6. Proxeny? ca 460-445 B.C. Honours for an unknown man?

Pl. II, 4

BIBLIOGRAPHY. See #5, until now treated as belonging to the same stele.

PHOTOGRAPH. Wilhelm, Att.Urk., IV (1939), pl. 1.

EM 56, fragment of Pentelic marble, broken on all sides. Its provenance is unknown; it was first published by Hiller in 1924 as I.G., I², 27b. Foliation is vertical and at right angles to the face.

H.max. 0.162m. W.max. 0.077m. Th.max. 0.065m. Letter-height 0.015m.-0.016m. Chequer 0.028m.x 0.028m.

Letter-shapes. A4, Θ3, Ν7, 02, Σ1, Χ2. Attic script, by the same hand as #5, except that chisels of a different width are used for sigma and chi, and that delta is cut with its left leg longer than its right.

ca 460-445 B.C.

Stoich.

[-----τ]όδ[ε-----]
 [-----]τοϛ[-----]
 [-----]ιδα[-----]

[-----]χσ[-----]

vacat

COMMENTARY. This fragment is too small to admit of certain restoration. I have been unable to contrive any restoration of less than twenty-eight letters to a line; #5 is certainly to be restored with a line-length of twenty-three letters. Previous editors have assumed that #6 was a part of #5, but were unable to offer any restoration, or to suggest where on the stele of #5 it might belong. Apart from the difficulty of restoring #6 with the same line-length as #5, I believe that slight differences in the forms of delta, sigma and chi probably indicate that #6 came from a different stele, though of the same general date.

Line 1. The left leg of a triangular letter is partially preserved at the right edge; the break is such that it is not possible to say whether or not there was a horizontal stroke at the bottom, but there is no trace of a cross-bar at the middle, so that alpha is ruled out.

Line 2. The bottom of a left hasta survives at the right edge.

Line 3. The left foot of a triangular letter survives at the right edge.

Line 5. There is no trace of any letter-stroke in the small portion of this line preserved under the chi and sigma of line 4, so that this fragment should probably be regarded as carrying the final lines of a decree. As I remarked above, I have been unable to contrive any restoration of this fragment with a line-length of less than twenty-eight letters. I offer the following exempli gratia; lines 1-3 I derive from #5, lines 7-10; lines 4-5 are not paralleled:

ca 460-445 B.C.

Stoich.28

[τὸ δὲ ψεῦσισμα τ]όδ[ε ἀναγράφσαι ἐσ]-
 [τέλει ἐμ πόλει] τὸν[γραμματέα τῆς β]-
 [ολῆς καὶ ἐσσαν]ίδα[ἐν βουλευτερίοι].
 [ἔναι δὲ τὸν προ]χσ[ενίαν τοῖς ἐγγόν]-
 [οῖς τοῖς αὐτῷ]. vacat

#7. Proxeny. ca 460-445 B.C. Honours for Achelofon and his sons.

Pl. II, 5

BIBLIOGRAPHY. I.G., I, Supplement, p. 8 #22d (1877); Wilhelm, Mélanges Nicole, II (1905), p. 601; N. Beitraege, VI (1921), p. 15; I.G., I², 28 (1924); S.E.G., III (1929), 6; Roussel, Mélanges Glotz, II (1932), p. 817 note 1; R.E.A., XXXV (1933), pp. 385-386; Austin, Stoichedon (1938), p. 42; Pritchett, A.J.A., XLIII (1939), p. 535; Wilhelm, Att.Urk., IV (1939), pp. 17-23 #xx1; S.E.G., X (1949), 23; Meiggs, C.R., LXIII (1949), pp. 9-12; S.E.G., XII (1952), 10; de Ste.-Croix, C.Q., XI (1961), p. 275; Mattingly, Historia, XII (1963), pp. 263-265; Lambrechts, Proxeni edecreten (1958), pp. 62, 77-78, 130, 150; S.E.G., XXI (1965), 16; Mattingly, Ehrenberg Studies (1966), pp. 205-206; S.E.G., XXIII (1968), 6.

PHOTOGRAPHS. None so far published.

EM 7013, fragment of somewhat micaceous Pentellic marble, broken on all sides, preserving on its reverse face part of a later decree in Ionic letters (I.G., II², 150, probably to be dated early in the fourth century) that appears to have no connexion with it. It was found in excavation of

the south slope of the Akropolis, between the theatres of Dionysos and Herodes Atticus; it was first published by Kirchhoff from a transcript of U. Koehler as I.G., I, Supplement, p. 8 #22d in 1877. Hiller (I.G., I², 28), misreading a remark by Wilhelm (1901), thought that the latter had ascribed the fragment #27 to the same stele as #7 and published it accordingly as I.G., I², 28b. The two fragments have nothing to do with each other.

H.max. 0.154m. W.max. 0.151m. Th. 0.055m. Letter-height, lines 1-11 0.009m.-0.010m.; lines 12ff. 0.010m. Chequer 0.0115m.x 0.0114m.

Letter-shapes. A4, E4 and 5, Θ4, K2, Λ4, M2, N7, O2, Π1, P8 and 9, Σ1, Y5, X2. Attic script; it is not possible to say whether or not the daseia was used. At line 12 there appears to be a change of masons: the second mason used slightly wider chisels and preferred to use the same chisel for all three strokes of nu, whereas the first employed two chisels for this letter. Sigma type 1 is not found after 445 B.C. in dated inscriptions. Epsilon type 5 is not found in dated inscriptions before 433/2 B.C., but two documents that probably should be dated in the 450's or 440's exhibit this form of epsilon (A.T.L., II, D 15 and #8); neither, however, is by the same hand as the present decree. The

almost square chequer is characteristic of many inscriptions of the period 460-445 B.C. By the same hand as #7 is one of the Agora fragments of I.G., I², 338 (Agora Inventory #I.2181, dated, probably, near to 455 B.C.). The rounded form of rho, however, should be an indication of a date ca 450 B.C. or later.

ca 460-445 B.C.

Stoich.28

[. ²] εἶναι] δ' α[ὐτὸν πρόχσεων Ἀθηναίῳ]-
 [ν καὶ] εὐεργέτε[ν· ἐὰν δὲ ὑπὸ τινον ἄδ]-
 [ικῆτ]αι Ἀχελοί[ον τὰς δίκας λαγχάν]-
 [εν κ]ατὰ τοῦτον Ἀ[θένεσιν πρὸς τὸν π]-
 5 [ολ]έμαρχον· πρυτ[ανεία δὲ μὲ τελεῖν π]-
 [λ]έν πεντε δραχμ[ῶν¹³.....]-
 [.]· ἐὰν δέ τις ἀπο[κτένει Ἀχελοῖονα ἔ]-
 [τ]ὼν παῖδον τιν[ᾶ ἐν τῶν πόλεόν πο ὅπ]-
 [ό]σον Ἀθηναῖοι [κρατῶσιν τὴν πόλιν]
 10 [π]έντε τάλαντ[α ὀφέλεν ὅς ἐὰν Ἀθηνα]-
 [ί]ον τις ἀποθά[νει¹⁴.....]-
 [. ἔ]λαι κατὰ τ[ούτο¹⁴.....]-
 [².] θανον[.....²¹.....]

 COMMENTARY. The sense is clear: the first clause confers the proxeny and euergesia upon Achelophon; the second (lines

2-6) deals with the possibility that civil wrongs may be suffered by the honorand, and the means of redress; the third relates to action to be taken if the honorand or his sons be murdered; it has two sections: one (lines 7-11) lays down the penalty to be inflicted upon the city within which the murder has occurred; the other (lines 11-13) sets the reparation to be made by the murderer. Line-length is established by the restoration of lines 7-9; the restorations are those of Wilhelm (1939, p. 19), except in lines 2, 6 and 12-14.

Lines 1-3. Kirchhoff (I.G., I, Supplement, p. 8 #22d) restored the honorand's name as Acheloïodoros, but made no attempt to restore lines 1-4; Hiller (I.G., I², 28) followed him and restored parts of this document with a thirty-three letter line. Wilhelm (loc.cit.) restored the honorand's name as Acheloïon and restored the whole decree with a twenty-eight letter line. The names Acheloïon and Acheloïodoros sound Boiotian; the latter form is known from Tanagra (see Suidas, s.v. Κόρινθα). Wilhelm cites for comparison the names Ptoïon and Ptoïodoros.

In line 1 earlier editors reported only delta; Wilhelm, however, pointed out that the feet of an alpha were visible to the right of this; he printed this alpha without a dot.

My own examination of the stone revealed that the cross-bar

of this alpha is also partly visible. To the left of delta there is a faint vertical mark, perhaps too far to the right to be the shaft of an iota; the stone is so worn that it is impossible to say whether or not this is a letter-stroke.

In line 2, to the left of upsilon, the right tip of the bottom bar of epsilon survives. At the right edge the bottom left corner of epsilon is visible, but too little of the bottom bar survives to make this letter certain.

In line 3 Wilhelm reported part of omicron at the right edge; this is no longer visible.

Lines 3-5. The formula is a fairly common one (cf. #14 and #49). Wilhelm had restored [ὕπο τινος] in line 2;

D.W.Bradeen and M.F. McGregor (per epp.) suggest the plural [τινων] to balance the plural [κ]ατὰ τοῦτον in line 4. The letters ΠΡΥΤ in line 5 rule out the usual formula ἀνεῦ πρυτανείον ; Wilhelm substitutes τελεῖν for Hiller's κατατιθέντας to arrive at a satisfactory reading: τελεῖν is the usual word for the payment of taxes.

Lines 6-7. δραχμ[ας μεδὲ τ' ἀπιδέκατα?] Wilhelm; δραχμ[ὸν τὸν γραφσάμενον] Bradeen and McGregor. Hiller's restoration δραχμ[ας τὸν ὑπὲρ χιλίας δικοῶν] based as it is on a thirty-three letter line, is unfortunately too long and cannot be shortened satisfactorily. It seems to me, however, that

some phrase is needed to qualify the restrictive [πλ]έν; possibly [τὸν ὑπὲρ χιλιάς]. Wilhelm's restoration derives from documents remote both in time and place that clearly equate πρυτανεῖα with ἐπιδέκατα (I.G., XII, 8, 640, line 23; V, 2, 357, line 58; XIV, 432, line 8, from Peparethos, Stymphalos and Tauromenion respectively). Nowhere are these two words found together as parallel forms. He draws another parallel from A.T.L., II, D 11, line 32; however, in this document the ἐπιδέκατα are the result of confiscation of goods, probably the outcome of a major offence; the apparent connexion with πρυτανεῖα is illusory. Other occurrences of ἐπιδέκατα are in a religious context (see Demosthenes, XL, 71, and I.G., I², 39, lines 33 and 36, I.G., I², 45, lines 24-25 and #10, line 8). Bradeen and McGregor believe that a suit of this kind would be brought not necessarily by the injured honorand or his family, but by anyone who pleased, so that [τὸν γραφόμενον] is merely "the plaintiff".

Lines 7-9. This is a variant of the standard formula (cf. #9, #24, #31, #34 and #35).

Line 10. The fine of five talents is too large to be inflicted upon an individual; moreover, the surviving phraseology of lines 7-13 very strongly suggests that two categories of liability are envisaged, a public and a

private one. The direct liability of another state in the case of the murder of an Athenian proxenos is not otherwise known, except in Wilhelm's restoration of #24 (op.cit., p. 23); however, Meiggs (op.cit., p. 10) interprets a passage in Aristophanes' Peace (lines 164-172) as evidence for a somewhat similar case involving Chios ca 421 B.C.: the murder of an Athenian there had apparently led to the imposition of a fine of five talents. The situation in Chios from 427 B.C. onwards was delicate (see Thucydides, IV, 51; also my commentary on #10); and it is not hard to imagine circumstances in which an Athenian citizen or proxenos was assassinated there. Similar conditions prevailed in certain parts of the Empire in the late 450's and in the 440's; we should probably place Acheloion and his sons in one of those several states that revolted or were disaffected at the time of the Peace of Kallias (for instance, Erythrai, Miletos, Kolophon or Chalkis), or perhaps, in Central Greece at the time of Athens' expansion there in the 450's.

Line 9-13. [τὲν πόλιν π]έντε τάλαντ[α ὀφέλεν ὃς ἐὰν
 Ἀθε|ναῖον τις ἀποθάν[ει, καὶ τὰς τιμορί|ας εἶναι κατὰ
 τ[ούτο καθάπερ Ἀθεναί|ο ἀπο]θανόν[τος] Wilhelm. This

is epigraphically impossible: Wilhelm in his transcript placed the first visible letter of line 12 one space too far to the left; this letter (nu) is, in fact, under the nu

of line 11 and over the theta of line 13; thus, in Wilhelm's restoration, line 11 is too short and line 12 too long by one letter. The usual formula involves τιμωρία (cf. #13, line 6, and #39, line 12), but the space available does not permit this. It is possible to restore [καὶ τὸν τιμωρίαν εἶ]ναι, but the spelling [εἶ]ναι is unlikely in an otherwise impeccably Attic document. Alternatively, one might seek a substitute for τιμωρία in τίσις; this word is not found to my knowledge in inscriptions, but is used by both Herodotos (II, 152; VI, 84; VIII, 76; also VII, 8, where it is found with τιμωρίῃ) and Plato (Laws, 870d). With this word [τὸν δὲ αὐτὸν τίσι|ιν εἶ]ναι could be restored.

In line 12 the context makes a plural impossible, while the singular suggested by Wilhelm does not fit the available space. Perhaps one might restore κατὰ τ[οῦτο Ἀθεναίων τινος|ἀπο]θανόν[τος Ἀθένεσιν].

#8. Proxeny? ca 460-445 B.C. Honours for Theramenes
and Lakedaimonios.

Pl.III,1

BIBLIOGRAPHY. Koumanoudis, Αθήναιον, V (1876), pp. 81-82;
I.G., I, Supplement, p. 8 #22c (1877); I.G., I², 31 (1924);
Haggard, Secretaries (1930), pp. 9-10 #6; Heichelheim,
Wirtschaftsgeschichte, I (1938), p. 329; Schlaifer, A.H.R.,
XLV (1940), p. 369 note 1; Meritt, Hesperia, X(1941), p.
312; S.E.G., X (1949), 22.

PHOTOGRAPHS. None so far published.

EM 6804, fragment of blue-white, slightly micaceous marble,
broken on all sides. It was found on the south slope of the
Akropolis between the theatres of Dionysos and Herodes
Atticus; it was first published by Koumanoudis (loc.cit.).
Foliation is diagonal from top left face to bottom right
reverse. Between lines 1 and 2 is a vertical uninscribed
space of 0.019m.

H.max. 0.171m. W.max. 0.140m. Th.max. 0.057m. Letter-height,
line 1 ca 0.010m.; line 2 0.008m.; lines 3ff. 0.006m.-
0.008m. Non-stoichedon; vertical chequer, lines 2ff.
0.0102m.

Letter-shapes. A3, 4 and 5, B3, E5, Θ3 and 4, K2, Λ3 and 6, M3, N3-8, O2, Π1, P4 and 8, Σ2 and 4. Attic script; whether or not the daseia was used is uncertain. Nu type 3 is not found after 440 B.C. and is rare after 450 B.C.; sigma types 2 and 4 are not found after 442 B.C. Rho type 4 is not found after 445 B.C. Epsilon type 5, however, is not found in dated inscriptions before 433/2 B.C.; it occurs, however, in A.T.L., II, D.15, whose date is probably between 450 and 445 B.C., and which may be by the same hand as the present document, though the forms of lambda and mu are sometimes different. I.G., I², 29, also probably to be dated in the late 450's or early 440's, though it has a different form of epsilon, is almost certainly by the same hand as #8.

ca 460-445 B.C.

Non-stoich.

[vacat Ε]ϋκλ[ἔς ἐγγραμμάτευσ. vacat]
vacat

[ἔδοχσεν] τῷ βολῆικα[ῖ τῷ δέμοι, ca 8 ---- ἐπρυτά]- ca 40
 [νευε, Εϋκ]λῆς ἐγγραμ[άτευσ, - ca 9 ---- ἐπεστάτε, ca 2]- ca 40-45
 [- ca 7 -]ς εἶπε· ἐπειδὲ [ἀνὲρ ἀγαθός ἐστι περὶ τῷ δέ]-
 5 [μο καὶ τῷ] στρατῷ θεραμ[ένεν τὸν - ca 10-12 ---- ἐπαινέσ]-
 [αι λότι ὅσες σίτω ἐνδεῖ[ας ----- ca 20-25 -----]-

[ca 7]ο·Λακεδαιμόν[ιον δὲ καὶ τὸν ca 10-14]-
 [ca 10]οιτ[ca 27-32]

COMMENTARY. Previous editors have interpreted this as a decree in favour of a man from Thera who had facilitated the Athenian corn-supply in the late 450's or early 440's. There are several points that raise doubts about this interpretation, as will become clear in the course of this commentary.

Line 1. Previous editors have read kappa only in this line and have restored ----κ[λῆς ἐγραμμάτευε]. However, to the right of this kappa there is a faint diagonal mark, joined at its bottom by a fainter horizontal stroke. The photograph shows this horizontal clearly. Before kappa the stone is much abraded, but 0.005m. to the left of the vertical of kappa there is the bottom of a vertical stroke. The vagaries of the chequer are such that this could be part of either iota, tau or upsilon, or even the right hasta of a daseia. If, however, the letter after kappa is read as a lambda, as I think it must be, tau or the daseia become impossible. In line 3 the last three letters of the name of the secretary are preserved. I therefore assume that line 1 contains a secretary-formula [----]ι (or υ)κλ[ῆς ἐγραμμάτευε]. Although the inscription is non-stoichedon, the formula in

line 2 allows the position of the left margin to be calculated: the seven missing letters of this line will occupy approximately 0.075m.; thus, the secretary's name in line 1 will occupy approximately twice that space, ca 0.145m. If the name extends to the left margin it will be about 15 letters long, which is clearly too much. It must therefore be assumed that the heading was set in at some distance from the left margin, and that the uncut space on the left was balanced by a similar unscripted space on the right. However, the longer the name of the secretary, the longer will be lines 2 and 3; for instance, with a six-letter secretary-name and a six-letter prytany-name, line 2 will be thirty-eight letters long; this is probably the minimum length possible. I calculate that the final epsilon of the heading would be set approximately over the thirtieth and thirty-first letters of line 2; if the secretary's name has six letters, the initial letter will be above beta in line 2; there will then be ten letter-spaces to the left of the heading, and ten more spaces will have to be set to the right of the final epsilon of the heading to establish the right margin. This gives a length of approximately forty letters to line 2, with an eight-letter prytany. Haggard (op.cit., p. 9) regretfully abandoned a conjecture that the secretary's name might be Eukles; her

reasoning was that "there were about six letters before the K of κ[λῆς]. While the stone is mutilated, enough remains on the left side to determine the number of letters lost." This is incorrect: the left side is destroyed, together with the first seven letters of the decree in line 2, so that, as I have already indicated, there is space for 11+ letters before the kappa of line 1. Since the letter before kappa could be an upsilon, the restoration [Εὔκλ[ῆς ἑγγραμμάτευε] becomes very attractive, allowing, as it does, the heading to be centred on the stele. If any name of more than six letters is restored, the heading will be off-centre, unless the length of the prytany-name is reduced accordingly. This sets a limit of eight letters to the length of the secretary's name. A.T.L., II, D 11, dated almost certainly in 450/49 B.C., has a preamble in which the secretary's name occupies six letter-spaces and the prytany's name fills eight letter-spaces. I suggest that both A.T.L., II, D 11 and the present decree were passed in the same year and in the same prytany. In I.G., I², 940, a casualty-list dated ca 445 B.C., two men named Eukles are listed; one in the tribe Aigeis, the other in Oineis; either might be the secretary of #8.

Lines 4-5. Previous editors have regarded the letters ΘΕΡΑ in line 5 as part of the ethnic Θεραιῶ (Koumanoudis,

however, suggested that they formed part of the name Theramenes; op.cit., p. 82). Meritt (Hesperia, XXI [1952] , p. 344) has given convincing proof that in honorifics of the fifth century, if the ethnic was cited, as it almost always was, it was always accompanied by the article. If the letters ΣΤΡΑΤΟ in this line are the genitive form of a personal name, and if, despite Meritt's arguments, the ethnic Θεραίο is restored, there is the further difficulty of interpreting the letters ΛΑΚΕΔΑΙΜΟΝ in line 7 and of reconciling this apparent mention of the Lakedaimonians with an Attic honorary decree that has as its main provision the supply of corn by the honorand in a time of dearth. I suggest that the letters ΣΤΡΑΤΟ in line 5 belong to the genitive form of the noun στρατός ; while there is no epigraphical precedent from Attica for the use of this word, both Thucydides (IV, 85; VII, 71) and Herodotos (I, 53) use it, generally with a qualifying word.

After the letters ΘΕΡΑ there are traces of a letter, but off at its centre by the break in the stone; what survives is a diagonal stroke, sloping up from left to right. I therefore adopt Koumanoudis' suggestion and restore the name

Θεραμ[ένεν] here. Lines 4-6 will read:

ἐπειδὴ [ἀνὴρ ἀγαθός ἐστι περὶ τῷ δέ]-

5 [μο καὶ τῷ] στρατῷ Θεραμ[ένεν τὸν ethnic ἐπαινέσ]-
[αι ὅτι ὁ]σεσ σίτο ἐνδεΐ[ας -----].

Line 4 will thus contain forty letters, while line 5 will have ca forty-two; depending upon the frequency of narrow letters, lines 3ff. could contain as many as forty-five letters, the spacing of these lines, although fairly regular, being a little tighter than that of line 2, especially in lines 4ff.

Lines 6-7. ἐς σίτο ἐνδε[ια--] Koumanoudis; σεσ σίτο ἐνδε[ίας] or ς ἐσσίτο ἐνδε[ίαι] Kirchhoff (I.G., I, Supplement, p. 8 #22c); ς ἐσσίτο ἐνδε[ίαι] Hiller (I.G., I², 31); [ὅ]σεσ σίτο ἐνδε[ίας] Hondius (S.E.G., X, 22: "suppl. nescio quis in inv. E.M."). Of these alternatives I think that the last is the only one that will assist the process of restoration: the sense will be that Theramenes is praised because, in a time of dearth, he had been of service to the people and to the army, presumably by the provision of corn for the troops. I therefore propose the restoration [ὅτι ὅ]σεσ σίτο ἐνδεῖ[ας σίτον τῷ ἐν ca 4-6 στρατῷ π|αρεῖχετο. This gives a line-length of ca forty-five letters, an acceptable length bearing in mind the large number of narrow letters involved. After the second epsilon of ἐνδεῖ[ας] the top of iota is visible and I dot it accordingly. It is necessary, I think, to define the place where the army suffered its dearth: a name between four and

six letters long should be sought.

Lines 7-8. Of the first two extant letters only the tops survive: the upper half of omicron, followed by the top of the shaft of lambda. Between these two letters there is a small vertical stroke; this might be the top of an iota, but, if so, it is 0.002m. shorter than any other iota on the stone; it is also, probably, too close to lambda to be a letter-stroke. At the right edge of the stone the top of an omicron survives, followed by the top of the left hasta of a nu; I could not see any trace of the diagonal, but the stone is much abraded here. I believe that a second honorand is here cited, probably for services similar to those performed by Theramenes. I do not believe that any Lakedaimonian would have been the recipient of Athenian honours in the time of the First Peloponnesian War; I therefore discount the possibility that this word is an ethnic. There are precedents for the use of this ethnic as a personal name, both at Athens (P.A., II, 8964/5) and at Plataia (see Thucydides, III, 52.5), in the fifth century. I therefore restore Λακεδαιμόν[ιον δὲ καὶ τὸν ----- ἐπαινέσαι]

Line 8. Under the kappa of line 7 Koumanoudis and Kirchhoff reported a tau; Hiller omits it. The top of this letter is clearly visible, however. Before it the upper half of an iota survives. To the left of this there is the upper curve

of a round letter. I am unable to suggest any coherent restoration.

In 450/49 the Athenian fleet and navy under Kimon were besieging Kition in Kypros; Kimon died before the end of 450 B.C., and the siege was shortly thereafter abandoned because of famine (Thucydides, I, 112.3-4). It is tempting to regard these events as the context of the present decree and to restore [ἐν Κιτίῳ] in line 6. The honorands in this case would be residents of the area, perhaps natives of Kypros. The date of the decree would therefore probably be the spring of 449 B.C.

#9. Proxeny. ca 445-435 B.C. Honours for the sons of
Iphiades of Abydos. Pl.II,6

BIBLIOGRAPHY. Pittakys, E.A., 51(1859),p.1835 #3517;
I.G.,I, Supplement,p.21 #76a (1877); Wilhelm, Beiblatt
(1898), p.44; Att.Urk., I(1911), pp.170-175; I.G., I²,
143 (1924); Wilhelm, Att.Urk., IV (1939), pp.28-31
#xxiv; Meritt, Hesperia,X(1941), pp.315-317; S.E.G.,
X(1949),52; Meritt, Hesperia,XXI(1952),pp.346-347;S.E.G.,
XII(1955),24; Lambrechts, Proxeni edicte (1958),pp.48,
62-63,70,94-95,102,117,150; Mattingly, Historia,XII
(1963),pp.263-265; Robert, Monnaies Grecques (1967),p.25;
R.E.G.,LXXXI(1968), p.451 #211.

PHOTOGRAPH. Wilhelm, (1939), pl.II.

Two joining fragments of white micaceous marble now
cemented together and bearing the same inventory-number,,
EM 6820. They were first associated by Wilhelm (1898).
A third fragment, EM 5409, published as I.G.,I²,143b,
does not belong to this document (see below).

Fragment a was found in excavation of the south slope
of the Akropolis between the Theatres of Dionysos and
Herodes Atticus. It was first published by Kirchhoff.

from a transcript of Koehler as I.G., I, Supplement, p. 21 #76a in 1877. The rough-picked back is preserved; otherwise, it is broken on all sides.
H.max. 0.145m. W.max. 0.126m. Th.0.060m.

Fragment b, which joins the right side of fragment a, was found on February 20, 1859, in excavations on the Akropolis north of the Parthenon. It was first published by Pittakys (loc.cit.). The rough-picked back is preserved, as is the right edge, which was originally smooth-dressed but is now much abraded. Along the top there is a horizontal cutting, 0.007m. deep, extending to a point 0.018m. from the right edge. This appears to be the bottom of a recessed relief-panel; the relief, now totally lost, would have been framed within vertical side-pillars in the manner of I.G., II², 24.

H.max. 0.225m. W.max. 0.100m. Th.0.058m.

The marble of both fragments is foliated vertically, the planes parallel to the face (this is particularly noticeable on the right lateral, where weathering has emphasized the planation.

Combined W.max. 0.226m. Letter-height, lines 1-5 0.010m.-0.011m.; lines 6ff. 0.009m.-0.010m. Lines 1-5 non-

stoichedon; vertical chequer 0.0155m.; chequer, lines
6ff. 0.0154m.x 0.0165m.

Letter-shapes. A 4 and 5, E 4, Θ 3, K 2, Λ 3, M 2, N 7 and
8, O 1-2, Π 1, P 6, 8 and 9, Σ 5 and 9, Υ 3 and 4, Φ 3-4,
X 3. Attic script of a somewhat untidy character, possibly
without the use of the daseia; the same hand has worked
on both heading and text, but with irregular spacing and
less care in the former. Both types of upsilon found here
disappear from dated inscriptions before 430 B.C. Phi,
which is of a type intermediate between variants 3 and 4,
has a vertical stroke extending outside the oval only at
the top; type 3 is not found after 445 B.C. The form of
sigma is also transitional; it looks like a three-barred
sigma of type 4 to which a fourth bar has been added as
if by an afterthought. The latest-dated occurrence of
sigma type 5 with upsilon type 3 or 4 is 438/7 B.C. (I.G.,
I², 347); I suggest that this document should be dated
in the late 440's or early 430's.

ca 445-435 B.C.

Non-Stoich.

[-----ca 16-19-----] γοῦν[.....]⁴ γ ἰφά(δ)ο
[-----ca 15-18-----] Ἄπορος : ἰφ[ιá]δο

[-----^{ca 15-18}-----] Ἀμύντορ: ἰφ[ι]άδο

[-----^{ca 15-18}-----] Ἀλεχσομε[ν]ός: ἰφιάδο

5 [πρόχσενοι αὐτοῖ] καὶ οἱ τοῦ[τ]ον.

vacat

Stoich.27

[ἔδοχσεν τῷ βολ]ῆ καὶ π[ι] δέμοι, Λ-

[εοντῖς ἐπρυτάνευ]ε, Ἀρισ[τ]οκράτε-

[ς ἐγγραμμάτευε,⁶...]β[..³..]ς ἐπε[σ]-

[τάτε, ----- εἶπε,-----]εἰ[..²]

10 -----

COMMENTARY. I believe that Wilhelm's association of EM 5409 with this document is incorrect: the chequer of EM 5409 is different (0.0148m.x 0.0151m.); the letters are engraved with greater care and finesse, and certain letters (lambda, nu, pi, rho and sigma) are different, while theta and omicron are smaller. Sigma, in particular, is markedly different, being of the same wide and neatly-cut type as that found in #15 and in I.G., I², 57, while that of #9 is irregular and quite narrow. The foliation of the marble appears to be different as well: that of EM 5409 is vertical and at right angles to the face, while that of #9 is vertical but parallel to the face. Accordingly, I have treated EM 5409 as a separate

document, dated several years later than #9 (see below, #18).

Lines 1-5. The spacing of the letters is irregular; they are closer together than those of lines 6ff. In line 4 there are eighteen letters, including the punctuation-sign, occupying approximately the same space as thirteen letters in line 6; thus, in the missing portion of the stone to the left, where fourteen letters are required in line 6, there would be space for as many as eighteen letters in line 4.

Line 1. There are traces of ten letters in all; previous editors are unanimous in reading ι on fragment a, followed by space for five letters and a punctuation-mark. However, the first letter-stroke is not vertical but slopes down from left to right; thus, it should be read as alpha or gamma. Before the first iota on fragment b there is a faint chisel-mark, probably too high to be part of a punctuation-sign; it may be the bottom of the right hasta of a nu. The delta in this line is incomplete: the mason omitted the cross-bar. I believe that a title should probably be restored here, such as [προχσενία τῶν ἐγ]γόν[ον τῶ]ν Ἰφιδά(δ)ο, rather than the name of another son of Iphiades.

Line 2. The right foot of alpha is visible at the left edge,

as is the right corner of delta in the penultimate stoichos.

Line 3. Only the extreme left curve of phi is visible. Before delta the right foot of alpha is readable.

Line 4. The tips of both diagonals of chi survive; the right side of omicron is clear in stoichos 10.

Line 5. The restoration is that of Wilhelm (1911). There is no fifth-century parallel for this heading: the earliest proxeny-decree headed with a list of names in this manner is I.G., II², 6, dated ca. 400 B.C. The heading of the latter decree consists of five names in lines 2-3, preceded by $\Theta\epsilon\omicron\iota$ in line 1. I.G., II², 49, of early fourth-century date, lists five men of Abydos, with their patronymics; their descendants, too, are to be proxenoi. There are few multiple proxenies in the fifth century, except those cases where a man is named proxenos "together with his descendants": #5 lists a man, his brothers and his father; #3 lists four men of Thespiiai. Wilhelm (op.cit., p.171; [1939], p.31) suggested that #9 is a copy or reaffirmation of #5, but his restorations of the latter are unconvincing (see Meritt [1952]). The name Iphiades is found in several places, but in Abydos it seems to have been the family-name of a large and powerful clan: in the mid-fourth century Iphiades was a faction-leader (Aristotle, Politics, V, p.1306a.

9); it was probably he who captured Parion (Aineias Taktikos, Polior., 28.6) and was involved in the capture of Sestos (Demosthenes, XXIII, 158, 176-177); probably it was he or his son, together with Arogos, who struck coins for Abydos towards the end of the same century (Robert, Monnaies Grecques [1967], p.25). The family was still prominent at the end of the next century (Polybios, XVI, 30.7). The honorands of #9 might perhaps be the grandfather and great-uncles of the faction-leader of the mid-fourth century.

The name Amyntor, common in Makedonia, is found also in I.G., II², 6. This has always been regarded as a decree honouring the sons of Apemantos of Thasos; the evidence for this identification is cumulative and fairly convincing (see Foucart, R.P., XXVII [1903], p.218), but there is a slight chance that this document may reflect another incident in the career of the family from Abydos: it is a re-affirmation of a proxeny granted to a certain Apemantos and his descendants in the fifth century and abrogated by the Thirty in 404 B.C. However, if Apemantos were an Abydenian, of the family of Iphiades, one might expect one of his sons to be named Iphiades.

Lines 6-9. There is an uninscribed vertical space of 0.021m. below line 5.

Line 6. The right end of the top bar of epsilon survives at

the left edge of the stone, as does the right corner of delta after the break.

Line 7. Part of the right side of omicron survives. It has been suggested that this Aristokrates was also secretary when #5 was passed: in the latter decree the secretary's name is restored, only the last five letters surviving; however, #5 and #9 are several years apart, and it would be remarkable if a man were to be selected by lot to be secretary of the same tribe, Leontis, twice in his career. Many other names can be restored with equal likelihood in #5. Several men named Aristokrates are known in the fifth century: the likeliest candidate is P.A.,I,1925, who was Hellenotamias in 421/0 B.C. He would have been perhaps of the same age as Kimon's elder son Lakedaimonios, who was general in 433/2 B.C.; Kimon's second son Oulios named his son Aristokrates (P.A.,I,1915); perhaps our Aristokrates was the father-in-law of Oulios and a political ally of Lakedaimonios (the name Aristokrates is not found earlier in Kimon's family). Mattingly (1963) attempts to date #9 to the 420's, along with #5, identifying Aristokrates with the son of Skelios, "who was coming to real political prominence in the last years of the Archidamian War" (p.265). This man (P.A.,I,1904) had an active political career down to 406/5 B.C.; since the character of the script places #9

in the late 440's or early 430's Mattingly's hypothesis is untenable.

Line 8. Previous editors have identified the epistates as Nikostratos; they read the single surviving letter on fragment a as a rho. However, part of a second loop is preserved in this letter, which must therefore be read as beta. Before it there is possibly a trace of a horizontal at the top of the stoichos; this should be read, if it is part of a letter, as epsilon; I can find no appropriate name of the right length, however, and prefer to leave this stoichos blank. After beta the upper left corner of the stoichos is uninscribed, so that the likeliest letters are omicron or iota, giving a name with the ending $-\beta[\omicron\lambda\omicron]\varsigma$ or $-\beta[\iota\chi\omicron]\varsigma$. The tip of the upper diagonal of sigma survives at the left edge of fragment b. The name Kephisoboulos is attested for the tribe Leontis in the fourth century, so that the restoration $[\text{Κεφισό}]\beta[\omicron\lambda\omicron]\varsigma$ $\epsilon\pi\epsilon[\sigma\tau\alpha\tau\epsilon]$ is possible. Other names are Praxiboulos or Aristoboulos; neither is found under Leontis. At the end of the line the upper left corner of epsilon survives.

Line 9. Under the first epsilon of line 8 the top and middle bars of epsilon survive. To its right is the top of a central vertical. It would be possible to restore $\epsilon\tilde{\iota}[\pi\epsilon]$, but in this case an archon-formula would be necessary in

this line before the name of the orator. I do not think this is likely; there are a few cases of archon-formulae in the period 460-445 B.C. (I.G., I², 19; 20; 22; perhaps #4), but, generally speaking, archon-formulae are not employed before 421/0 B.C.. in the preambles of decrees (I.G., I², 51 and 52 are apparent exceptions, but both are earlier decrees brought up to date by the erasure of the first preamble and the inscription of a new one whose language is only partially formulaic).. I suggest that the surviving letters of this line are part of the text of the decree itself; perhaps one should restore [.....⁹..... εἰπε· ἐπειδ]ε ἰ[φι]άδες ἡο Ἀβυδενός -----].

#10. Proxeny? ca 445-430 B.C. Honours for Chion?

and his sons Achilles and Philippos.

Pl.III,2

BIBLIOGRAPHY. Meritt, Hesperia, XIV (1945), pp. 115-119 #10; S.E.G., X(1949), 76.

PHOTOGRAPH. Meritt, op.cit., p. 117.

Agora Inventory #I.5826. Fragment of micaceous Pentelic marble, found in excavation of the Athenian Agora on May 9, 1939; it was first published by Meritt (loc.cit.). The left edge, though very badly worn, is preserved, as is the smooth-picked back. Foliation is vertical and nearly parallel to the face, marked by layers of silvery mica. The face is very badly worn.

H.max. 0.330m. W.max. 0.205m. Th. 0.139m. Letter-height 0.009m.-0.010m. Non-stoichedon; vertical chequer 0.0143m.

Letter-shapes. A4, E4 and 4-5, Z3, HI, Θ3 and 4, K2, M2, N3 and 4, O2, Π1, P5 and 6, Σ7 and 8, Y6, Φ2, X2, Ω3 (large). Rather cramped Ionic script. Nu type 3 does not appear in dated inscriptions after 440 B.C. Zeta type 3 is very rare after 445 B.C.; it is found once in 428/7 B.C. (A.T.L., II, List 27) and once in 421/0 B.C. (I.G., I², 84). Rho

type 5 is not found after 430 B.C. The true epsilon type 5 is not found before 433/2 B.C., and is rare before 418 B.C.; the epsilon of this inscription is a variant of epsilon type 4 rather than a true type 5: the two lower bars are shorter than the top bar; thus it is not a valid indicator of date. The impression given by the letter-forms is that this is a decree of the period 445-430 B.C., probably early rather than late in this era.

ca 445-430 B.C.

Non-stoich.

[ca 9]σuai[ca 35ca 45-50]
ca 2]ν[ca 3]ιτασθαι ρ[ca 32]
 [.]αν ἔστω· τὸ δὲ ψήφ[ισμα τόδε γράψαι ἐν στήλῃ λιθίνῃ
 καὶ θεῖν]-

αι ἐμ πόλῃ τὸ γ[ραμματέα τὸν τῆς βολῆς τέλεσι τοῖς
ca 6]

5 Κλεώνυμος εἶπ[ε· τὰ μὲν ἄλλα καθάπερ τῇ βολῇ·
ca 10]

ἐξεῖναι ζημιῶν [ca 32]
 ἀνευ]

τῷ δήμῳ τῷ Ἀθηναί[ων· ἐὰν δέ τις Ἀθηναίων παραβαίνει
 τι τῶν]

πίδ[τ]ρων τὴν ζημ[ίαν αὐτῷ εἶναι· ca 17]
 καὶ τὰ χρή]-

- ματα δημόσια κα[ῖ ----- ca 29 ----- .
 ----- πρόσσο]-
- 10 δον δὲ εἶναι Ἀχιλλ[λῆι καὶ Φιλίππῳ πρὸς τῇ βολῇ
 ----- καὶ τὸν δῆμ]-
 ον καθάπερ Χίων[ι ----- ca 28 -----
 ----- Ἀχιλλ]-
 εἶα καὶ Φίλιππον [------ ca 32 -----
 ----- ἡ δὲ]
 Αἴαντις πρυ[τανεῖα----- ca 32 -----
 -----]
 [------ ca 45-50 -----
 -----]
 [------ ca 45-50 -----
 15 -----]
 -----]
 [ca 5 -----]ι[----- ca 42 -----
 -----]
 [·]μ[·]διατωδ[----- ca 39 -----
 -----]
 [ca 3 -----]ετ[·]λ[·]τ[----- ca 39 -----
 -----]

COMMENTARY. Meritt's text is unsatisfactory: the phrase [περί μὲν οὖν Αχ.^{ca. 6.} τοῦ Χίου μή] introducing the first clause of Kleonymos' rider has little epigraphical warranty: I know of only three examples in which a rider is introduced without a clause containing καθάπερ and referring back to the original decree or its proposer (I.G., I², 24.18; 39.40; 108.39). I know of no case in the fifth century in which the word οὖν is used as Meritt uses it. Furthermore, lines 10 and 11, as Meritt restores them ([πρόσο]δον δὲ εἶναι Αχ[^{ca. 5.} πρὸς τὴν βολὴν καὶ τὸν δῆμ]ον καθάπερ Χίω[ν τοῖς ἥκοσι]), make little historical sense: priority of access to the Boule and the Assembly is a privilege often granted to proxenoi as specially-honoured foreigners; as Meritt restores these lines they appear to equate the condition of the honorands to that of their fellow-Chians, who are unlikely to have been granted priority of access en masse, rather than differentiate them from other foreigners. It is my belief that the letters Χίω[ν] in line 11 must be interpreted as part of a personal name rather than as an ethnic. In this case Meritt's argument that this document was primarily concerned with the affairs of Chios dissolves, and with it the apparent

anomaly of letter-forms more suited to the early 430's being used in a decree dated to 425/4 B.C.: Meritt had argued (from his identification of $\chi\iota\omega\nu$ [---] in line 11 as an ethnic) that the context of this decree was the Athenian demand in 425/4 B.C. that the Chians pull down their walls in return for $\pi\acute{\iota}\sigma\tau\epsilon\iota\varsigma$ (Thucydides, IV, 51); his argument was given support by the word $\pi\acute{\iota}\sigma[\tau]\epsilon\omega$ in line 8. What these pledges were remains a problem: if I am correct in viewing this decree as a document of about the time of the Samian War, it may not be too far-fetched to view the honorands as citizens of some state in Ionia that had required pledges from Athens at its accession or return to the Empire. Possibly Samos itself, or Byzantion, both of which revolted in the late 440's (Thucydides, I, 117), would be candidates, though the names of the honorand's sons (Achilles and Philippos) suggest a more northern origin.

Line 1. This is not reported by Meritt, though traces of some of these letters are visible on his photograph. In addition to the letters I include in my text, there is a possible circular letter ca two stoichoi to the left of sigma, and a possible diagonal one stoichos to the right of iota.

Line 2. Meritt reported -ιτασθαί, but the nu and the rho in my text are partly visible even in his photograph. Lines 3-4. Meritt: [.3.] ἔστω·τὸ δὲ [ψ]ή[φισμα τόδε γράψαι καὶ καταθεῖν|αι] ἐμ πόλῃ· τὸν [γραμματέα τέλεσι τοῖς Χίων. ννν] . Meritt was in error in reading the last visible letter of line 4 as nu: the horizontal bar of a gamma is quite clear even in his photograph. The spelling πόλῃ is unusual; it is found also in I.G., I², 108.35. Wilhelm (per epp., S.E.G., X, 76) suggested for line 3: [ἀναγράφαντα θεῖν (or στήσ)|αι]; Raubitschek (S.E.G., X, 76 note) proposed for line 4 [τέλεσι τοῖς τῶν Χίων] (by analogy with I.G., I², 16.26-27).. In my view Χίων[--] in line 11 is the name of the honorand of the first decree, and either his name in the genitive (Χίωνος) or the pronoun αὐτῷ should probably be restored in line 4. The honorand's name might be Chion or Chionides: both are known..

Line 5. Meritt identifies Kleonymos with the well-known politician of the mid-420's (P.A., I, 8880); this identification may be correct, but, if so, this document must belong to an early stage in his career: if it is correct to say that the orator was almost always a member of the Boule or a general (and so a member ex officio), this would be a further argument for dating the decree before 435 B.C.,

since Kleonymos' membership of the Boule in 426/5 B.C. is known (he was orator of I.G., I², 57 and 65, as well as #25, in this year). I have discussed Meritt's text for this line already (see p.3, above); I think that the usual rider-formula should follow εἰπ[ε] ; I restore the first clause of the rider proper (by analogy with #22.20-22):
 [μηδενὶ δὲ μὴ] | ἐξεῖναι ζημιῶν [μήτε Χίωνα μήτε Ἀχιλλέα
 μήτε Φίλιππον ἄνευ] | τῷ δήμῳ τῷ Ἀθηναί[ων].

This is essentially what Meritt restored, but I have extended it to fit what I believe to be the true line-length.

Lines 7-9. Meritt restored: [ἐὰν δέ τις παραβαίνει τι
 τῶν] | πίσ[τ]εων τὴν ζημ[ί]αν αὐτῷ θάνατον εἶναι καὶ τὰ
 χρή[μα]τα δημόσια κ[αὶ] τῆς θεᾶς τὸ ἐπιδέκατον]. I restore
 (by analogy with I.G., I², 22.29; 39.33; 63.32; 75.44 for disfranchisement and confiscation, and with I.G., I², 45.23 for disfranchisement, confiscation and tithing): [ἐὰν δέ τις
 Ἀθηναίων παραβαίνει τι τῶν] | πίσ[τ]εων τὴν ζημ[ί]αν αὐτῷ εἶναι
 ἀτιμίαν καὶ φυγὴν καὶ τὰ χρή[μα]τα δημόσια κα[ὶ] τῆς θεᾶς τὸ
 ἐπιδέκατον τῶν χρημάτων].

Lines 9-11. Here the usual formula granting right of access to the Boule and the Assembly should be restored: I assume that the primary honorand Chion was given this right along with the proxeny in the earlier decree, and

that this was now extended to his sons. Meritt restored:

[πρόσο]|δον δὲ εἶναι Ἀχ[..... πρὸς τὴν βολὴν καὶ τὸν
δῆμ]|ον καθάπερ Χίω[ν τοῖς ἥκοσι]; I have explained

(above) why this seems unsatisfactory. Meritt suggested

that the first honorand in line 10 should be Achilles.

(Wilhelm, Att.Urk., IV [1939], p. 31, restores this

name in I.G., II², 180). Meritt's suggestion receives

support from my reading of the stone at this point: traces

of what appear to be an iota followed by the apex of a

triangular letter can be made out, though they are too

faint for certainty. I restore these lines: [πρόσο]|δον

δὲ εἶναι Ἀχιλ[λῆι καὶ Φιλίππῳ πρὸς τὴν βολὴν καὶ τὸν

δῆμ]|ον καθάπερ Χίων[ι]. The name Philippos is fairly

common.

Lines 11-12. It seems that here a new clause follows

perhaps honouring Achilles and Philippos alone..

Meritt restored: [ἀναγράψαι δὲ Ἀχ.³.]|έ[α] καὶ Φίλιπ[π]ο[ν

τὸν υἱὸν εὐεργέτας Ἀθηναίων]. In essence, I believe this

to be right; I restore [προξένος δὲ καὶ εὐεργέτας

γράψαι Ἀχιλλ]|έα καὶ Φίλιππον [τὸς Χίωνος (or an

ethnic) τὸν γραμματέα τὸν τῆς βολῆς].

Lines 12-13. Here a new clause begins [ἡ δὲ]| Αἰαντῖς

πρυ[τανεία -----]; the prytany of Aiantis is to take

some specific action regarding the honorands.

Lines 14-15 have completely perished. In line 16 there

is a single vertical stroke ca five stoichoi from the left edge. In line 17 Meritt read $\tau\omega\delta$. These are not the only letters in this line: in the second stoichos a mu is clearly visible, and, one stoichos to the right, the left side of a delta followed by iota and alpha. Meritt placed this line too high, allowing only two lines instead of three after line 13. The true relationship can be measured upon his photograph. I am unable to offer a plausible restoration.

Line 18. The tops of epsilon and tau are clear. One stoichos to the right of tau the apex of a triangular letter survives; one stoichos to the right of this there seems to be a horizontal stroke ca 0.003m. long. This could be part of tau, xi or zeta. There is no trace of any vertical.

#11. Proxeny? ca 445-430 B.C. Honours for two (?) unknown men.

Pl. III,3

BIBLIOGRAPHY. I.G., I, 103 (1873); I.G., I², 177 (1924).

PHOTOGRAPHS. None so far published.

EM 6637, fragment of blue-white, slightly micaceous marble, broken on all sides. It was transcribed in the Tower of the Winds by A.Velsen and U.Koehler, but its original provenance is unknown. It was first published by Kirchhoff in 1873 as I.G., I, 103. Foliation is vertical and parallel to the face. H.max. 0.178m. W.max. 0.168m. Th.max. 0.060m. Letter-height 0.013m.-0.015m. Chequer 0.0246m.x 0.0248m.

Letter-shapes. A4, E3, Θ3, Λ4, O2, Σ9. Attic script, probably employing the daseia. The letter-size and chequer are unusually large. By the same hand is S.E.G., XXI, 123 (dated ca 446 B.C.); the size of the letters and the presence of epsilon type 3 (not found after 430 B.C., except in the early 420's, when it alternates with type 4) are indicators of a date between 445 and 430 B.C.; the presence of four-barred sigma type 9 makes unlikely a date before 445 B.C. The marble is of a type that came into vogue ca 420 B.C., but there are a few examples of it from the 450's and 440's.

ca 445-430 B.C.

Stoich. 29

[----- ἀναγράφσαι δὲ καὶ προχσέ]-
 [νος καὶ εὐερ]γ[έτας Ἀθηναίων ...⁶...]-
 [±² καὶ ±³]σισθέ[νεν τὸν γραμματέα τ]-
 [ἔς βολῆς ἐν] στέλε[ι λιθίνει καὶ κατα]-
 5 [θῆναι ἐμ π]όλει· τα[.....!5.....]-
 [.. ἐπιμέλε]σθαι τ[ὲν βολὴν καὶ τοὺς πρ]-
 [υτάνες Ἀθέ]γεσι[ν καὶ τοὺς ἄρχοντας τ]-
 [ὅς ἐν τῷ κ]υπ[ερ]ορίαι -----]

COMMENTARY. Line 2. The left diagonal and right foot of a triangular letter survive after the second sigma of line 2; I could detect no trace of a horizontal bar, but the stone is much abraded here. Either [εὐερ]γ[έτας] or [ἀνα]γ[ράφσαι] could be restored as part of a publication-formula, but it would be normal for the object of the publication to be given, especially since the honorands are named in line 3. Alternatively, this letter could be part of a name; in which case, there might be as many as four honorands (cf. #3, a document probably a few years earlier than this one, in which four Thespians are named as proxenoi).

Line 3. The surviving letters are surely part of a name ending -σισθένης; there are several possibilities:

Phrasisthenes is found at Athens in the fourth century;

Agasisthenes is a Boiotian name; Dosisthenes is found in Thera, Erasisthenes in Syros, Sosisthenes in Delos (see Bechtel, Personennamen, pp. 399-400); positive identification is impossible.

Line 5. The right side of omicron survives at the left edge of the stone.

Lines 5-6. ἐπιμέλεσθαι normally requires a genitive case, but is found once in Xenophon (Hellenika, V, 4.4) with the accusative; thus, one might restore [τὰ δὲ ἄλλα ἐφσεφισμέ]να ἐπιμέλε]σθαι κτλ.

Line 7. The top of the right hasta of nu is barely visible in the abraded area at the left edge of the stone; if this is part of the word [Ἀθε]ν[ε]σι[v] the Boule and the prytaneis at Athens are evidently conceived of as a separate group from some other body elsewhere: the archons in Asia Minor are a likely possibility.

Line 8. The top bar of epsilon survives under the epsilon of line 7; to its right is the upper left corner of either epsilon, pi or rho.

#12. Proxeny? ca 445-430 B.C. Honours for two ? men.

Pl.III,4,5

BIBLIOGRAPHY. Pittakys, E.A., 27(1842), p.996 #1000; Rangabé, A.H., II(1855), pp.234,238 #665; I.G.,I,549 (1873); I.G.,I², 158(1924); Schweigert, Hesperia, VII (1938), pp.271-272 #6; S.E.G., X(1949), 58.

PHOTOGRAPHS. Schweigert, op.cit., p.271 fig. 6(fragments b,c),p.272 fig. 7(fragment a).

Three fragments of slightly micaceous Pentellic marble. Foliation is vertical and parallel to the face. Fragments b and c join; the join and the association with fragment a were made by Schweigert (loc.cit.).

Fragment a, EM 2456, is of unknown provenance, but its inventory-number indicates that it was an early find, probably on the Akropolis. It is broken on all sides. It was first published by Schweigert (loc.cit.) with fragments b and c.

H.max. 0.165m. W.max. 0.103m. Th.max. 0.050m. Letter-height 0.012m.-0.016m. Chequer 0.0178m.x 0.0222m.

Fragment b, EM 12930, was found in excavations on the north slope of the Akropolis; it was first published by Schweigert (loc.cit.) with fragments a and c. The right

edge is preserved, but the back bears signs of re-working and is probably not original; the re-working includes apparent anathyrosis: a smooth band 0.030m. wide runs down the edge of the back; the inner surface is rough-picked. This fragment joins the top of c.
H.max. 0.225m. W.max. 0.105m. Th.max. 0.120m.

Fragment c, EM 6685, was found in excavations of the Erechtheion on the Akropolis; it was first published by Pittakys (loc.cit.). The right edge is preserved; the rough-picked back is probably not original (see fragment b, above).

H.max. 0.178m. W.max. 0.108m. Th.max. 0.120m.

b and c combined: H.max. 0.394m. W.max. 0.108m. Th.max. 0.120m. Letter-height 0.012m.-0.016m. Chequer 0.0180m.-0.0183m.x 0.0222m.

Letter-shapes. A 3 and 4, B 3, E 4, Θ 3, K 2, M 1, N 7, O 1-2, P 6 (possibly 7), Σ 7-9, Y 4, X 3. Attic script, with slightly curved letter-strokes. The daseia may not have been used. Epsilon is distinctive, with a tendency for the vertical to project above the top bar. Upsilon type 4 is not found after 430 B.C., except for an isolated example in 414 B.C. If the rhos in lines 4 and 14 of fragments b,c are of type 7 they would indicate

a date before 435 B.C. The spacing and character of the letters suggest a date in the early 430's; the closest analogies for the script that I have been able to find date to this period: the hand of I.G., I², 365 (435/4 B.C.) is very close, and the hands employed in A.T.L., II, Lists 12 (443/2 B.C.), 22 and 23 (433/2 and 432/1 B.C.) are similar.

ca 445-430 B.C.

Stoich.

a [-----] αθο κ[-----]
 [-----] αι και [-----]
 [-----] ον τε [v -----]
 [-----] ς εκα[-----]
 5 [-----] τις [-----]
 lacuna

b [-----] α[.] ν
 [-----] μισ-
 [-----] τει β-
 [ολει -----] το εργ-
 10 [-----] ε[.3.] τ
 [-----] γκτ
 [-----] ν εαν α
 [-----] ντοιε
 [-----] εσαυτ
 15 [-----] ανες γ
c [-----] ακα

[-----]σεδε
 [-----]ε τειχ
 [-----]ρονε
 20 [-----]καταθ-
 [ἐναί -----]να μεδ
 [-----]οθειχ

COMMENTARY. I have placed fragment a above fragments b,c because it has a slightly narrower horizontal chequer, suggesting that there was some degree of tapering of the stele and that the horizontal chequer increased as the stele widened, and also because it is possible to restore in it the opening clauses of an honorary decree, while line 3 of fragments b,c can be restored as part of the formula introducing a rider. Certain features of fragments b,c, however, suggest that these latter may be part of a document dealing with provisions for a building (line 13 especially), though previous editors have attempted to restore lines 16-17 as part of a clause safeguarding an honorand from harm. The association of fragments b,c with fragment a must remain hypothetical.

Fragment a. Schweigert restored line 1 as if the letters ΘΟΚ were part of the name Agathokles, but made no further

attempt at restoration of this fragment. A few more letters can be read than he printed; I list only those that I have dotted.

Line 1. At the left edge the right foot of alpha survives, but the stone breaks below the cross-bar.

Line 4. The left foot of alpha survives at the right edge.

Line 5. Schweigert read ΕΙ; the last two letters are complete enough to be read without dots, while of the first letter only the right part of the top bar survives, cut 0.004m. from the right tip by the top of a vertical stroke. I think epsilon is unlikely here; these traces conform more closely to those of a tau. It is possible that this fragment is part of a decree honouring two men: the surviving letters of line 1 suggest a dual construction, part of a praise-formula, while lines 4 and 5 could be parts of the formula safeguarding the honorands from harm. #39 (restored by Wilhelm, Att.Urk., IV [1939], p.33) provides analogous material for lines 1-3, while #26 serves as a parallel for lines 3-5 (cf. I.G.II, 108 and #62). I suggest the following, exempli gratia; I have not been able to devise any other restoration as full and as coherent:

Stoich.41

[----- καὶ ----- τὸς -----]
[. ὅς ἄνδρες ὄντες ἀγ]αθὸ κ[αὶ ἐμ πᾶσιν εὐεργετῶντες Ἀθ]-

[εναίος ἐπαινέσ]αι καὶ [ἀναγράψαι προχσένο καὶ ε]-
 [ὑεργέτα Ἀθηναί]ον· τὲ[ν δὲ βολὲν τὲν ἀεὶ βολεύουσιν]
 5 [καὶ τὸς πρυτάνε]ς ἐκά[στοτε ἐπιμέλεσθαι αὐτῷ· ἐάν]
 [δὲ καὶ ἀδικῆται] τις [αὐτῷ -----]

Fragments b, c. Above the first line read by Schweigert there are traces of two letters: the right foot of a diagonal letter above mu, and the bottom of a left hasta above sigma.

Line 8. This can be restored, though by no means with certainty, as part of a rider-formula: [εἶπε· τὰ μὲν ἄλλα καθάπερ] τῷ β[ολεῖ].

Line 9. The second visible letter is circular, either omicron or theta; the centre is lost. In the next stoichos there are traces of a small circle; this may be part of a phi, but there is also visible the tip of what may be a horizontal bar at the top of the stoichos. Epsilon seems possible. The third letter is rho; below the loop there is the tip of what appears to be a slightly curved tail. Schweigert read the final letter as an alpha, but the horizontal bar is very doubtful; if the third letter is epsilon it may be the beginning of the word ἔργ[ον].

Line 10. The top bar of epsilon survives in the first stoichos.

Line 11. Traces of three letters survive: a left

diagonal foot; the tips of the arms of a possible kappa; and the right end of a horizontal at the top of the last stoichos; there seems to be no sign of any vertical.

I doubt whether the restoration [ἐ]γκτ[εσιν] is likely.

Line 12. The bottom of a right hasta survives on the break in the first stoichos. Possibly these letters are part of a harm-formula: ἐὰν ἄ[δικῇ τίς τινα αὐτῶν].

Line 13. The last letter is probably an epsilon; the bars are straight to the extent that they survive. Woodward restored ἐ[v] τῷ β[ολευτερίῳ] (S.E.G., X, 58, per ep.).

Line 14. The tips of the two outer arms of a sigma survive; I think they are too far apart for the arms of a kappa or a chi. In the final stoichos the left tip of the bar of a tau survives. The last three letters are probably part of some form of the pronoun αὐτός.

Line 15. Of the last letter only the left diagonal foot survives. The restoration [πρὺ]άνες is likely.

Line 16. These letters could be part of the tribal name Akamantis; perhaps one could restore [ἐπὶ τῆς] Ἀκα|[μαν-
τίδος πρυτανείας] , vel sim.

Line 18. The tip of a horizontal cut survives before tau; epsilon seems more likely than delta (which is suggested by a triangular stain resembling the apex and right leg of the letter). Some form of the word τῆχος is possible, but τῆ: χ|[όποι] is not excluded.

Line 19. Previous editors have identified the first letter as a kappa; however, if fragment a is a part of the same stele as fragments b,c, comparison of this letter with the kappas in fragment a indicates that this letter is unlikely to be a kappa: the lower arm is at quite a different angle and has the same slight upwards curve at its tip as has the tail-stroke that appears to be part of the letter rho in line 9 (see above). There is also a trace of the upper curve of this rho in line 19. These letters could form part of the word [πρότε]ρον.

Line 20. There appears to be part of a publication-formula here: [καὶ] καταθ[ῆναι ἐν πόλει].

Line 21. [ἵνα μεδ' | [ὕφ' ἐνὸς ἀδικ.(.)ται] Hiller (I.G., I², 158).

Line 22. [--- ζεμι]οθεῖ χ|[ιλίασι δραχμῇσι] Woodward (loc.cit.).

#13. Proxeny. ca 440-435 B.C. Honours for Leonides
of Halikarnassos. Pl.III,6

BIBLIOGRAPHY. Kirchhoff, Sitzungsb. Ak.Berlin(1888),
p.241 #13; Mylonas, B.C.H., XII(1888), pp.129-132 #1;
I.G.,I, Supplement, p.164 #27c(1891); Michel, Recueil
(1900), p.83 #73; Roberts and Gardner, Epigraphy, II
(1905), pp.35-36 #11; S.I.G., I³ (1915), 54; Schwyzer,
D.G.(1923), p.384 #10; I.G.,I², 56(1924); Gomme,
Commentary, I(1945),p.382; S.E.G., X(1949), 55; Meiggs,
C.R., LXIII(1949), pp.9-12; S.E.G., XII(1955), 23;
Lambrechts, Proxeni decreten (1958), pp.34,80; Gebhard,
Muenchener Studien, XXII(1967), pp.21-24; Robert, R.E.G.,
LXXXI(1968), p.450 # 209; S.E.G., XXIV(1969), 5.

PHOTOGRAPHS. None so far published.

EM 6808, fragment of blue-white marble found in November-
December,1887, in the foundations of the temple of Roma
and Augustus east of the Parthenon on the Akropolis;
it was first published from a transcript of Lolling by
Kirchhoff (loc.cit.). The crystals are small but easily
visible; foliation is diagonal from upper left front to
lower right rear. The stele is broken at top and bottom;
the rough-picked back and both edges are preserved. The
profile of the back is flat, its pick-marks horizontal. The

sides are smooth-picked, with shallow horizontal channels of stippling; they are not quite at right-angles to the face, so that the back is slightly wider than the face of the stele. There is also taper from bottom to top, and the stone is slightly thicker on the right than on the left. There is a vertical uninscribed space of 0.126m. below the last line of inscription.

H.max. 0.615m. W. (back) max. 0.278m.; min. 0.271m.; (front) max. 0.268m.; min. 0.263m. Th. (top) 0.099m. -0.101m.; (bottom) 0.105m. -0.107m. Letter-height 0.009m. -0.010m. Chequer 0.018m. x 0.0144m.

Letter-shapes. A 3 and 4, B 2-3, E 3-4, H 1, Θ 3-4, K 2, Λ 4, M 1, 2 and 4, N 7 and 8, O 1-2, Π 1, P 6, Ϝ 8 and 9, Σ 7, 8, 9 and 10, Υ 4, 6 and 7, Φ 4-5, X 2-3. Attic script with regular use of the daseia. These forms are consistent with a date in the 430's; the presence of primitive forms of beta and epsilon suggests a date near to the 440's; the narrow mu type 4 may be the result of crowding rather than of style, and thus is not a satisfactory guide to dating. I do not know of any other document by the same hand.

ca 440-435 B.C.

Stoich.23

[----- Λεονίδεν δ]-
 [ἐ] κα[ὶ τὸς παῖδας αὐτῷ μεδένα]
 ἔαν ἀδικῆν μέτε [Ἀ]θένεσι[μέτ]-
 ε ἡόσες Ἀθηναῖοι κρατῶσι· ἐ[π]-
 5 ιμέλεσθαι δὲ αὐτῷ Ἀθένεσι μ-
 [ἐ]ν τὸς πρυτάνες καὶ τῶν βολέ-
 ν, ἐν δὲ τῇσι ἄλλεσι πόλεσι ἡο-
 ίτινες Ἀθηναίων ἄρχοι ἐν τ-
 ῇς ὑπερορίαις ἡό, τι ἂν ἡέκασ-
 10 τοι δυνατοὶ ὄσιν, ἡος ἂν μὲ ἀδ-
 ικῶνται· ὅς ἔδοχσεν τῇ βολῇ
 καὶ τῷ δέμῳ, Ἀντιοχῆς ἐπρυ-
 τάνευε, Χαροιάδες ἐγγραμμάτ-
 ευε, ἡεγέσανδρος ἐπεστάτε, Χ-
 15 αἰρέστρατος εἶπε· Λεονίδεν
 ἔάν τις ἀποκτένει ἐν τῶν πόλ-
 εον ἡὼν Ἀθηναῖοι κρατῶσι, τῇ-
 ν τιμορίαν ἔναι καθάπερ ἔάν
 τις Ἀθηναίων ἀποθάνει· ἐπαι-
 20 νέσαι δὲ ἀγαθὰ ἡόσα ποιεῖ πε-
 ρὶ Ἀθηναίος Λεονίδης· περὶ [δ]-
 ἐ Λεονίδο τὰ ἐφσεφισμένα ἀ[ν]-

αγραψάτο ὁ γραμματεὺς τῆ-
 ς βολῆς τέλεσι τοῖς Λεονίδο
 25 ἐν στέλαιν δυοῖν καὶ τὴν μὲν
 ἑτέραν στῆσαι ἐμ πόλει, τὴν
 δὲ ἑτέραν ἐν ἡλικαρνασσῶ-
 ι ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ τῷ Ἀπόλλωνος·
 ἄνδρα δὲ προσελέσθο Λεονίδ-
 30 ες ὅστις ἄχσει τέστέλεν καὶ
 στέσει. vacat

COMMENTARY. Slight differences in the script might, at first, suggest that two different masons worked on this stele; however, none of the letter-variants found in Decree I is unique to it, though mu type 1 and sigma type 9 are more common in it than in Decree II, and the beta of Decree I appears to be an earlier form than that found in Decree II. It seems that Leonides himself was not present at the time that Decree II was passed, since the usual invitation to the prytaneion is omitted; however, the second decree, with its unique provision for the inscription of a second stele, is perhaps the response to a special request by the honorand. It is to be noted that provision for the publication of both decrees is contained in Decree II (lines 21-28); this supports my view (see p. 89, above) that the erection of a stele upon the Akropolis was itself

one of those extra privileges that might be granted to a proxenos. This being so, there is no way to decide the date of Decree I, although the allusion to Athenian archons (lines 8-9) suggests that Leonides was granted his proxeny in the mid-440's, when archons were established in sensitive areas (see A.T.L., III, pp. 145-146).

Lines 1-3. [Λεονίδειν μεδέειν] | ἐᾶν ἀδικῆν με[τε Ἀθένεσι μετ] |
 Mylonas (loc.cit.). Above ἐᾶν there are faint marks on the stone: in stoichos 2 a left vertical, rather low; in stoichos 3 the feet of alpha or gamma; these are too low for chi. ἀδικῶντα; in line 11 suggests that two or more persons are concerned in the decree; therefore, I have expanded Mylonas' suggestion to include the sons of Leonides in the provisions of the decree..

Kirchhoff (both in his initial publication and in I.G., I, Supplement) and Mylonas print a vertical after με in line 3. Kirchhoff also prints a diagonal in the next stoichos but one to the right, but offers no restoration. More can be read on the stone than either of these editors admits: the vertical of tau is plain, but there is no trace of its cross-bar; the lower half of the bottom bar of epsilon is visible on the break. There is no trace of alpha, but the stone breaks on the curve of theta. The lower left corner of epsilon to the right is plain, and what remains of the lower bar is completely straight, so

that beta is impossible. The bottom of the left hasta of nu survives, followed by the lower right tip of sigma; the angle of this latter rules out any other reading. The bottom of iota survives at the right edge.

Line 5. Gebhard (loc.cit.) attempts an explanation of the disparity between αὐτῷ and ἀδικοῦνται by suggesting that αὐτῷ must mean "here at Athens". This is not good Greek, though clear enough in German or English; the disparity is probably due to an error on the part of the secretary or of the mason..

Line 13. Charoiades son of Euphiletos was general in Sicily in 427/6 B.C. and died there (P.A., II, 15529); he and the secretary of Decree II may be identical. The name is also found in the fourth century in the tribe Hippothontis (P.A., II, 15530).

Line 14. Unless Hegesandros is the orator of I.G., I², 139 (a decree dated in the 430's or early 420's), he is unknown..

Line 15. Chairestratos, too, is unknown; the name is a common one, but no one with this name is attested to in the third quarter of the fifth century..

Lines 19-21. This is a unique variant of the praise-formula. In line 20 the upper left corner of epsilon survives at the right edge.

Lines 21-22. τὰ ἐφσεφισμένα refer back to Decree I.

Line 24. Not many cases are known in the fifth century where the honorand is charged with the expense of engraving the stele (see p. 98 note 32, above). This decree is unusual in specifying two stelai; perhaps this is why Leonides has to pay for the engraving.

#14. Proxeny. ca 440-430 B.C. Honours for an unknown man.

Pl. IV,1

BIBLIOGRAPHY. Pittakys, E.A., 55 (1860), p. 2048 #4084; I.G., I, 551 (1873); Kirchhoff, Sitzungsber. Ak. Berlin (1888), p. 242 #16; Wilhelm, Hermes, XXIV (1889), p. 114; Lolling, D.A. (1890), pp. 40-41 #2; I.G., I, Supplement, p. 158 #551 (1891); I.G., I², 153 (1924); Lambrechts, Proxeni edicta, (1958), pp. 77, 80, 85.

PHOTOGRAPHS. None so far published.

Two non-joining fragments of white micaceous marble now restored in plaster and bearing the same inventory- number, EM 6723. Foliation is vertical and at right angles to the face. The stele was wider at the bottom than at the top. These fragments were first associated by Lolling (loc.cit.).

Fragment a was found on August 16, 1858, in demolition of a reservoir west of the Parthenon on the Akropolis. It was first published by Pittakys (loc.cit.). The left edge and rough-picked back are preserved.

H.max. 0.271m. W.max. 0.210m. Th. 0.125m.

Fragment b was found in the foundations of the temple of Roma and Augustus west of the Parthenon (in the same general area, therefore, as fragment a); it was first published by Kirchhoff from a transcript of H.G.Lolling (loc.cit.). The right edge and rough-picked back are preserved.

H.max. 0.377m. W.max. 0. 276m. Th. 0.127m.

Combined dimensions: H.max. 0.377m. W.max. (bottom) 0.494m.; min. (top) 0.486m. Th. 0.127m. Letter-height 0.019m.- 0.021m. Chequer 0.0289m.x 0.0291m.

Letter-shapes. A4-5, B3, E4, Θ3, K2, Λ6, M2, N6, 7 and 8, O2, Π1, P8, Σ8 and 10, Y4-6 and 7, Φ4, X2. Attic script, without the daseia. Nu type 6 is not found after 435 B.C.; upsilon type 4 is found only once after 430 B.C. I know of no other document by the same hand. The general character of the script, and its size, suggest a date in the 430's; the almost square chequer, however, is more characteristic of the 440's. Perhaps a date ca 440 B.C. should be preferred.

ca 440-430 B.C.

Stoich.15

[...⁷... ἀναγρ]ᾶψ-
[αι ...⁶...]ον ἐμ πόλ-
ει [ἐν στέλ]ει λιθίν-
ει [καὶ ἀτ]έλειαν ἔν-
αι α[ὐτῷ] καὶ δίκας
ἑάν [τις] ἀδικῇ αὐτ-

10 ὄν Ἀ[θέ]νεσιν πρὸς τ-
 ὀμ π[ολέ]μαρχον ἄνε-
 υ π[ρυταν]εῖον· ὁ δὲ γ-
 ρα[μματε]ὺς ὁ τῆς βο-
 λῆ[ς τὸ φσεῖ]φισμα τό-
 ὁ[ε ἀναγράφ]σας ἐς σ-
 [τέλει λιθίνει] κατ-
 [αθέτο ἐμ πόλει].

COMMENTARY. The restorations are those first suggested by Wilhelm (loc.cit.). The lines are so short that alternate restorations are not possible.

Line 1. In the antepenultimate stoichos both feet, but not the bar, of alpha survive.

Line 2. A name should be restored here without ethnic.

Line 3. The bottom bar and part of the vertical of initial epsilon survive, followed by the bottom of iota.

Line 6. In stoichos 7 the right foot of alpha survives.

Line 7. In stoichos 3 the left foot of alpha survives before the break; after the break part of the right hasta of mu is visible.

Line 8. In stoichos 3 the left vertical and part of the horizontal of pi survive.

Line 12. In the first stoichos the apex of delta survives.

#15. Proxeny. ca 431/0 B.C. Honours for Aristonos
of Larisa.

Pl. IV, 5, 6

BIBLIOGRAPHY. I.G., II, 20 (1877); Wilhelm, Beiblatt,
(1898), p. 44; Mélanges Nicole, II (1905), p. 601;
I.G., I², 55 (1924); Wilhelm, Att. Urk., IV, (1939),
pp. 37-39 #xxvii; Meritt, Hesperia, X (1941), pp. 336-
337; S.E.G., X (1949), 50; Lewis, B.S.A., XLIX (1954),
p. 29 #iv; S.E.G., XIV (1957), 7; Lambrechts,
Proxeni edicte (1958), pp. 77, 80.

PHOTOGRAPHS. None so far published.

Two non-joining fragments of white micaceous marble,
first associated by Wilhelm and published together
from a transcript of J. Kirchner by Hiller on Wilhelm's
advice (I.G., I², 55). Wilhelm (1939) later attributed
to the same stele # 17. That this attribution was in-
correct was shown by Meritt (loc. cit.). Another fragment,
53, is wrongly listed in the inventory of the Epigraphi-
cal Museum as belonging to this stele. I do not know
who was responsible for this attribution. Foliation of
fragments a and b is vertical and diagonal, right face to
left rear, to the inscribed face.

Fragment a, EM 6919[-], is of unknown provenance;

it was first published by Koehler as I.G., II,20 in 1877. The stone is broken on all sides; the rough-picked back is possibly original..

H.max. 0.185m. W.max. 0.153m. Th.max. 0.077m. Letter-height 0.009m. Chequer, lines 1-5 0.0123m.x0.0130m.; lines 6ff. 0.0090m.x0.0130m.

Fragment b, EM 6919 [a] is of unknown provenance; it was first published by Hiller as I.G., I², 55b in 1924. The right edge is preserved; otherwise it is broken on all sides. The back is smooth-dressed and flat in profile; it may not be original (see below).

H.max. 0.190m. W.max. 0.128m. Th.max. 0.080m. Letter-height 0.009m. Chequer 0.0090m.x0.0130m.

Letter-shapes. Fragment a, lines 1-5: A3, B3, E3, H1, M1, O1, Π4, Σ7. Ionic script. The forms of alpha and epsilon suggest a date in the 440's or early 430's; pi type 4 is not found in dated inscriptions before 440 B.C.

Fragment a, lines 6ff., and fragment b: A4 and 5, E4, H1, Θ3, K2, M3, N7 and 9, Π1, P8 and 9, Σ9, Y7, Φ4, X3, Ω2, 5 and 6. Ionic script. Attic epsilon is used

once for eta (line 9). The various types of omega are not a satisfactory guide to dating, since securely-dated Ionic inscriptions are not known before 415/4 B.C.; However, type 6 is found in I.G., II², 55, whose date is probably ca. 428-423 B.C. The shape of sigma is very distinctive, being close to that found in I.G., I², 57 (A.T.L., II,D 3-6, inscribed in 424/3 B.C.); in fact the second hand of #15 may be the same as that of I.G., I², 57. The context of this decree (see below) is: probably the beginning of the Peloponnesian War; the letter-forms do not contradict this suggestion. The hand of fragment a, lines 1-5, may be the same as that of #16 (dated probably between 440 and 425 B.C.).

ca 431/0 B.C.

Stoich.23

a [----- πρόξενον]
 [δὲ καὶ εὐεργέ]τ[εν ἀναγράψαι]
 [αὐτὸν ἐν σ]τήλη[ι λιθίνῃ καὶ]
 [καταθ]ῆναι ἐμ π[όλει τὸν γραμ]-
 5 [ματέ]α τῆς βολῆς·[εἰάν δέ τις ἀδ]- Stoich.32
 [ικῇ]ι Ἀριστόνον ἢ τῶν π[αίδων τινὰ ἢ Ἀθην]-
 [αί]ων τις ἢ τῶν συμμαχ[ων Ἀθηναίων προσκ]-
 [αλ]έσθω ὁ πολέμαρχος [καὶ ἐσαγέτω αὐτὸν]

[πέ]ντε ἡμερῶν ἀφ' ἑς ἄν [αἱ κλήσεις ἐξήκωσ]-
 10 [ιν] ἢ εὐθυνέσθω χιλία[ισιν δραχμῇσι τῆς]
 [ἡμέ]ρας ἐκάστης ἕως ἃ[ν ἐσάγη· ἔαν μὴ τι τ]-
 [ῶν δημοσίῳ] γ κωλύει· τ[.....¹⁵.....]
 [.....¹³.....]ς δε[.....¹⁶.....]
 [.....¹²..... ἔαν] δ[έ τις δῆσ]ει ἢ ἀγάγε[ι]
a,b
 15 [ἢ χρήματα ἀφέλει Ἀριστόνο]ν δίκ[ας] λαγχ-
 [άνεν πρὸς τὸν πολέμαρχον] ἄνευ πρυτανε-
 [ίων· ἐπιμελέσθων δὲ αὐτῷ ἡ β]ολῇ καὶ [οἱ σ]τ-
 [ρατηγοὶ ὅπως ἂν μὴ ἀδικῇτα]ι· Ἀριστόν[ω]ι
 [δὲ ἔαν το δέηται ἐξέστω ἀπο]γράψα[σθ]αι π-
 20 [ρὸς τοὺς πρυτάνεις· προσάγ]εν δὲ ἕς τε τ[ῇ]ν
 [βολὴν καὶ ἐς τὸν δῆμον δέκ]α ἡμερῶν ἢ ε[ύ]θ-
 [ύνεσθαι ἕκαστον πρύτανι]ν χιλίαισιν δ-
 [ραχμῇσι ἐκάστης τῆς ἡμέρ]ας ἕως [ἃ]ν ἐ[σά]γ-
 [ωσι, ἔαν μὴ τι τῶν δημοσίων] κωλύει· καὶ [έ]ἄ-
 25 [ν τις Ἀριστόνον ἀποκτείν]ει ἐν τ[ῶν] π[ό]λε-
 [ων ὧν Ἀθηναῖοι ἄρχουσιν ἐν τῇ] ὑ[περορία]-
 [ι τὴν τιμωρίαν εἶναι καθάπερ ἔαν τις Ἀθη]-
 [ναίων ἀποθάνῃ -----]

COMMENTARY.. Script, letter-height, chequer (except for lines
 1-5) and marble are so alike that I think there is no
 doubt that these two fragments belong to the same stele;

however, the different treatment of their backs, if original, must be explained. Neither treatment is unusual for the fifth century; the only explanation of the disparity that is satisfactory is to suggest that the back of the stele was originally completely smooth-dressed, carrying upon its upper part another inscription; for some reason this inscription was later erased and the surface on the upper part of the stele rough-picked. Fragment a is, in fact, slightly thinner than fragment b, which suggests that this explanation is correct and places fragment b below fragment a. The change of masons at line 6 on fragment a also supports this hypothesis: alternation, from mason a to mason b and back to mason a, is hardly likely in a document of this sort, though it does occur in series documents inscribed at different times over a long period, or on certain stelai that contain several decrees and riders; the present document appears to consist of but one decree: there is no space at the end of line 5 for the insertion of a rider-formula, and I think that the first extant line of the decree must be set very near the beginning of the entire document (see below). The true explanation is, I think, that the first mason began work with a wide chequer; he was superseded by the second mason,

who abandoned the wider chequer because he feared to run out of space.

With this arrangement, fragment a above, but close to fragment b, the sense is continuous: the normal publication-formula (preceded, most probably, by a clause praising the honorand for his services to Athens) is followed by several clauses relating to wrongs likely to be suffered by Aristonos: civil injury is to be brought before the polemarch; penalties are defined if there is any delay in the action. The lacuna between fragments a and b must be very small, since the opening lines of fragment b provide remedies for specific examples of civil injury. After these comes the usual need-clause, here reinforced by fines to be levied against the prytaneis if they delay consideration of the proxenos' requests. Finally, there is a clause safeguarding Aristonos against murder.

Thucydides says very little about the circumstances of the recruitment of Thessalian cavalry in the summer of 431 B.C. (II,22.2-3); Aristonous and Polymedes of Larisa, together with Menon of Pharsalos and others, led a force made up of contingents from several cities; they took part in a brief engagement near Athens and are heard of no more, though Pausanias (I,29.6) talks

of the grave-monument set up in the Kerameikos Cemetery for the Thessalians who were killed in this battle. In the later 420's the Thessalians gave aid to Brasidas and the enemies of Athens, but Aristonous and his colleagues are not mentioned again in the literature of the time.

The names Aristonos and Aristonous are not common; the latter appears twice in Athens in inscriptions concerning foreigners: in the late fifth-century grave-stele of Hermoteles son of Aristonous of Torone (I.G., I², 1074), and in a fourth-century honorific for certain Thasians (I.G., II², 33, line 28, where the latter part of the name is restored).. The name Aristonos is not otherwise known, and I think it a reasonable hypothesis to suggest that it is an alternative spelling of Aristonous and that the honorand of this decree is the cavalry-leader from Larisa mentioned by Thucydides; if so, the proxeny should probably be dated in the summer of 431 B.C.

Lines 1-5. Hiller (1-4) : [τὸ δὲ ψήφισμα τ|ὅδε ἀναγράψαι
ἐν στ]ήλη[ι λιθ|ίνῃ καὶ καταθεῖν]αι ἐμ πόλει|τὸν γραμματέ]α
τῆς βολῆ[ς. ΥΥ]. In the first preserved line of the stone traces of one letter can be made out: the lower part of a central vertical, above the final eta of

the second line. In Hiller's supplement it would be the iota of ψήφισμα. However, use of the phrase τὸ δὲ ψήφισμα τόδε seems to be confined to the end of a decree, as in #22 and #64 and S.E.G., X,115; it appears to imply several clauses before it; in this document the presence of several other clauses of privileges suggests to me that the publication-formula stood near the beginning; perhaps the decree opened as follows: "To praise Aristonos of Larisa because ... and to write him up as proxenos and euergetes... If anyone harms him, etc." More is readable in lines 3 and 4 and 5 than previous editors have reported: in line 3, the lower part of the vertical and the right edge of tau; in line 4, both bars and the vertical of the first epsilon, followed by the lower half of nu; in line 5, the lower left angle of the last sigma.

Lines 5-6. Previous editors supposed a vacat after βολῆς in line 5, followed by a new clause in line 6. I know of no such vacat elsewhere, unless followed by a new decree or rider. The amendment-formula would require at least thirty-two letters, for which there is insufficient space here. The position of fragment a within the stele will determine the space available in lines 5 and 6; the maximum in line 5, if the fragment is set very close to

the left edge of the stele, is ca 0.147m.; if it is set close to the right edge, the space available will be smaller. I think it very likely that the change of masons occurred at the beginning of line 6 rather than in the middle or at the end of line 5; thus, with a chequer of 0.0123m. and fragment a set over to the left, there is space for a maximum of eleven letters in line 5, with one more letter, followed by iota, in line 6. Wilhelm (1905) followed by Hiller, restored [ἐάν τις ἀδικῇ]. However, δέ (or καί) is also needed, so that the complete restoration would be thirteen letters long, ~~plus~~ ^{plus} iota. Therefore, if Wilhelm's restoration is adopted, the position of fragment a must be moved over to the right, to allow ten letters in line 5 and three in line 6. Iota, which is clearly visible, will be the fourth letter of line 6; the distance from the sigma of βολῆς in line 5 to the right margin will be ca 0.125m. No other restoration seems likely.

In line 14 of fragment a the apex of a triangular letter survives. With the arrangement I have outlined above this letter will occupy stoichos 16 of the restored stele; in the likeliest restoration of fragment b, line 1, the sixteenth letter is a delta; I suggest that the top of fragment b should be level with the bottom of

fragment a, so that the triangular letter of line 14 is read as the delta in stoichos 16 of the restored text of the first line of fragment b. Between it and the first surviving letter of fragment b will be a space of ca 0.063m, enough for seven letters.

Lines 6-12. For the most part, the restorations are those of Wilhelm (lines 6-8 in Mélanges Nicole, II; lines 9-12 in I.G., I², 55). Koehler (I.G., II, 20) had suggested a possible fifth-century date for this document; Wilhelm (Beiblatt [1898] , p. 44) made the identification of the honorand as Aristonos of Larisa; his restorations, he says, are derived from mid-fourth century examples, but I have been unable to identify these. However, there are earlier parallels: the closest is # 4, lines 21-23: the wording (as restored by Loughran and Raubitschek, Hesperia, XVI [1947] , p. 79) is almost identical with lines 7-10: [ὁ δὲ πολέμαρχος ἐς τὸ δικαστήρι|ον π]ροσκαλ[έσθω αὐτὸς Ἀθέναζε πέντε ἡμερῶν ἀφ' ἧς|ἂν ἡα]ι κλέσ[ες ἐχσέκοσιν ἔ εὐθυνέσθω]. A similar clause, specifying a fine of 1,000 drachmai, is found in I.G., I², 49.7-10. Much the same may occur in I.G., I², 22.37-40., though the text of this last is very fragmentary. All these documents are several years earlier than the present decree. Line 11-12. Wilhelm (I.G., I², 55, 10-11): [εἰσαγά|γηι ἐὰν μὴ τι δημόσιον].

I have amended this, following Lewis' restorations of fragment b, lines 23-24 (loc.cit.), to avoid the inconsistency of $\epsilon\sigma$ - and $\epsilon\iota\sigma$ - in line 7 and 10 of the text in the Corpus. In most lines more can be read than previous editors have admitted: in line 6, the first iota, the vertical and part of the top of the final pi; in line 7, the first omega, the lower right side of which is clearly visible; in line 8 the right tips of the upper and lower bars of epsilon at the beginning; in line 9 the right vertical and bottom of the diagonal of the first nu, and the left hasta and part of the diagonal of final nu; in line 10, the top of the right hasta of the first eta; in line 11, the upper right curve of the first rho; in line 12, the top of the right hasta of the first nu, the top of omega, and the left end of the bar of final tau; in line 14, the top of a triangular letter in stoichos 16. In line 13 there is no trace of the first iota printed by Hiller in the Corpus; Koehler printed a left vertical here.. Lines 12-14. No satisfactory restoration comes to mind; these lines presumably contained a clause or clauses amplifying the assistance to be given to the proxenos, or perhaps a general clause such as: "the rest to be in accordance with the practice relating to proxenoi." A clause granting asyilia to the proxenos is also possible

(cf. I.G., II², 81.6-7).

Lines 14-28.. The supplements are those of Lewis (loc.cit.), but I have restored lines 27-28, left incomplete by Lewis, on the analogy of #13, lines 15-17. Lewis' supplements represent a considerable improvement on those of Wilhelm and are to a great extent confirmed by what can be read on the right half of the stone. The surface is badly abraded, as if it had been rubbed away with vertical gouges, but traces of most of the letters remain, especially in stoichoi 26,, 30 and 32. Listed here are the letters that remain doubtful of interpretation: line 14, the lower part of the vertical of each gamma; line 15, the apices of alpha and lambda; line 16, the upper right tip of upsilon; line 17, the right tip of the bar of tau; in line 18 the bar of alpha is set so low that this letter could be mistaken for an eccentrically-placed delta; I read the middle of the diagonal of nu and the top of final iota in this line as well; in line 19, the top of iota; line 20, all three bars of epsilon, and the horizontals only of tau,, epsilon and tau in stoichoi 28-30; line 21, the right side of final theta; line 22, the bottoms of both iotas; line 23,, parts of the vertical and the horizontal of gamma; there is also a right diagonal foot,, perhaps of an erased triangular letter; line 24,, the left

arm of upsilon and the bottom of iota; line 25, the left vertical of nu, the cross-bar of pi and the right leg and apex of alpha; line 26, the upper left arm and tip of the right arm of upsilon, with a trace of the bottom of the vertical. In line 20 the restoration proposed by Woodhead (S.E.G.. XIV,7), [ἐς τε τήν], is confirmed.

#16. Proxeny. ca 440-425 B.C. Honours for an unknown man. Pl.IV,3

BIBLIOGRAPHY. Meritt, Hesperia, XXI (1952), pp. 342-351 #3 (photograph pl. 88); S.E.G., XII (1955), 41.

American School Inventory #15, fragment of micaceous Pentelic marble, preserving the right edge and rough-picked back. It was found on March 18, 1945, built into a wall that had been erected ca 1925 at the American School of Classical Studies at Athens; its original provenance is not known. Foliation is vertical and parallel to the face.

H.max. 0.199m. W.max. 0.092m. Th. 0.072m. Letter-height 0.007m.-0.008m. Chequer 0.0125m.x 0. 0123m.

Letter-shapes. A 3 and 4, E 5, H 1, Θ2 and 3, K 2, N 7, O 1, Π3 - 4, P 8, Σ5 and 10, Ω2. Ionic script, rather untidy. Epsilon type 5 is not found in dated inscriptions before 433/2 B.C. and is rare before 418 B.C. Drilled theta and omicron, type 2, are not found after 420 B.C., and are very rare after 430 B.C. Sigma type 5 is not found after 428 B.C. The hand is very close to that of #15, lines 1-5, which I believe to be dated ca

431/0 B.C.. The almost square chequer is more characteristic of the 440's than of the 430's or 420's. I believe that, on this evidence, the decree should be dated between 435 and 425 B.C., though a date as early as 440 B.C. is not excluded.

ca 440-425 B.C..

Stoich.23

[ἔδοξεν τῇ βολῇ καὶ τῷ δήμ]-
 [ωι, ..⁵..ἰς ἐπρυτάνευ]ε, ἰα[.²]-
 [. ἐγραμμάτευσ, ..⁵..]ππος ἐ[π]-
 [εστάτει,⁹.....]ς εἶπεν· Α-
 5 [...⁵... γράψαι τὸν ^{±2-3}...]ιον ἐν τῷ-
 [ι βουλευτηρίῳ ἐς σαν]ίδ[α] πρό-
 [ξενον καὶ εὐεργέτη]ν Ἀθηναί-
 [ων τέλεσιν τοῖς Α.²]το· Ἰπποκ-
 [ράτης εἶπε· τὰ μὲν ἄλ]λα καθάπ-
 10 [ερ τῇ βολῇ· τὴν δὲ πρ]οξενία-
 [ν ἔναι καὶ τοῖς Α.²το] παῖσι· α-

COMMENTARY.. I have adopted the restorations proposed by Meritt (loc.cit.), with some slight changes; the line-length is established by the restoration of lines 5-8

and 9-10.

Line 2..Meritt printed the bottom halves of two letters: a central vertical, followed by both feet of a triangular letter. He suggested that these might be part of the name $\dot{\iota}\alpha[\sigma\omega\nu]$. The triangular letter is certainly alpha: part of the cross-bar can be read, as well as both feet. The letter before it may be too far to the left for iota; it is directly above the left hasta of pi in line 4. However, the alpha is also displaced somewhat to the left. Above the second pi of line 3 there is a trace of the foot of a vertical, apparently central; there is also a deeper right-angled depression, its left edge slightly to the left of pi in line 2; this may be a little low for the bottom of epsilon, but is in the correct position horizontally vis-à-vis the other two letters in this line. Epsilon, like alpha, is placed irregularly in this inscription; for instance, see line 4, where the vertical distance between the bottoms of the two epsilons is 0.001m. I therefore read $[\dot{\epsilon}\pi\rho\upsilon\acute{\alpha}\nu\epsilon\upsilon\epsilon]$, $\dot{\iota}\alpha[-----]$; this will allow the name of the tribe in prytany to be seven letters long. Three names come to mind for lines 2-3: Iasidemos, Iatrokles and Iason, the last suggested exempli gratia by Meritt. If either of the first two is chosen it must be followed by $[\dot{\epsilon}\pi\epsilon\sigma\tau\acute{\alpha}\tau\epsilon\iota]$

rather than [ἐγπαμπάρτευε] , since the name in line 3 ending -προς must have at least seven letters (I have been unable to discover any five or six-letter names except the Argive Bippos (see Bechtel, Personennamen, p. 221). Possible seven-letter names are Daippos and Ephippos, both attested for the fourth century, the one in the tribe Aiantis (P.A., I, 3101), the other in Kekropis (P.A., I, 6161). Neither Iasidemos nor Iatrokles is attested for the tribes Aiantis or Leontis, the two choices of prytanizing tribe. The name Iason is found in the fifth century in Aigeis (P.A., I, 7423; this man was a statuary working on the Erechtheion in 408/7 B.C.), and later in every tribe except Oineis, Leontis and Akamantis. Possibly this sculptor was of sufficient age and prominence to be secretary of this decree, but I think it much more likely that the secretary here is an otherwise unknown man. The name of the epistates may be eight or nine letters long, depending on whether [ἐγπαμπάρτευεν] or [ἐγπαμπάρτευε] is restored; there are at least five possible eight-letter names and several more of nine letters; it would, I think, be an idle task to attempt restoration. Similarly, the name of the orator cannot be restored. Line 5. Meritt, following Pritchett's examination of the stone on his behalf, read the final letter as a lambda;

if a cross-bar were admitted it "would have to be assumed abnormally high: there is no trace of it on the stone, and most of the left sloping stroke is preserved" (Meritt, op.cit., pp.342-343). In fact, the cross-bar is present: it is clearly visible on both the stone and the squeeze. The left diagonal of alpha is 0.0035m. long, 0.003m. of which is below this bar. This is not very different from any other alpha in this inscription: the extent of the left leg below the cross-bar varies between 0.0015m. and 0.0025m. The letter itself is set rather high in its stoichos; such irregularity of setting is a characteristic of this decree. However, although this letter is certainly an alpha, I doubt very much whether it is the initial letter of ἀ[ναγράψαι]. The name of the honorand is five letters long in its genitive form (line 11).. There is reason to believe that this genitive form of the name should also be restored in line 8, in which case the nominative form of the name will probably be six letters long, with the ending -ρος.

In line 5 the first three letters are surely the end of an ethnic. Meritt has shown (op.cit., p.343) that in honorary decrees the name and the ethnic of the man honoured are nearly always given in the initial formula (the only exception, apparently, being S.E.G., X,111[#54]). There is not enough room to restore a six-letter name, ethnic and ἀναγράψαι; consequently, the alpha in line 4

must be the first letter of the honorand's name, and γράψαι must be restored as second word in the formula (γράφαι for ἀναγράφαι is not unknown: cf. I.G., I², 45. 17-18, #20, as restored by Meritt, op.cit., p.349). The first two letters surviving in line 5 are displaced somewhat to the right; Meritt suggests that this line contained an extra letter and argues that, for reasons of space, this was probably iota or rho. This will make an ethnic of seven letters. While there are several possibilities for the ethnic, the choice of names for the honorand is limited. I have not been able to discover any suitable combination except Ἄγητος Δῆλιος (I.G., XI,4, 1067a.10, dated in the fourth century). Possible names other than this are Anytos (borne by a metic living in Skambonidai in the fourth century: I.G., II², 1672.132, spelt Ἄνυτος); Aretos (Lokrian, third century; see Bechtel, op.cit., p. 68); Aratos (Argos, Iasos and Sikyon, as well as Tenedos; see Bechtel, op.cit., p. 64). If a choice has to be made, it should perhaps fall on Anytos, since this, at least, is known to be the name of an Athenian metic, possibly a descendant of the proxenos honoured in the present decree. I believe Meritt to be correct in assuming that the initial letter of line 5 is a displaced iota rather than a nu; there is no trace

whatsoever of any other letter-stroke here.

Lines 5-6. For the formula ἐν τῷ βουλευτηρίῳ ἐς
σαν]ιδ[α]cf. #20, line 8; no trace of the last letter of
this formula survives; Meritt's [ἐν σαν]ιδ[ι]
seems an unnecessary complication, and I prefer to restore
the accusative on the analogy of #20, where the word
survives complete. Meritt's text for this line has one
letter too many; this can be remedied by restoring [βουλευτηρ-
ίῳ] instead of [βουλευτηρίῳ].

Line 8. The first two preserved letters are ΤΩ. Meritt,
influenced by Pritchett's conviction that the first
letter of the honorand's name was a lambda, restored
[ἐαυ]τῷ here, rather than the name of the honorand. This
will disappear, and the name [Ἀ.²]το be restored instead.
The last five letters of this line begin an orator's name.
Meritt restored Ἰπποκ[ράτης] ; the only other choice
seems to be Ἰπποκ[ρίτος] , but this name is not known
before the third century. The orator may be that Hippokrates
who was general in 426/5 and 424/3 B.C.. (P.A., I, 7640).
If so, he is surely the same as Hippokrates who moved a
decree in favour of the Plataians after the fall of
Plataia in 427 B.C. (P.A., I, 7628; Demosthenes , LIX,
104). Another Hippokrates was the wealthy son of Apollo-

doros mentioned by Plato (Protagoras, 310b; P.A., I, 7630). The general is the most likely candidate.

The final alpha is probably the beginning of a publication-formula, as Meritt suggested, but it could also be, for instance, the beginning of some such clause as

ἀ[τέλειαν δὲ εἶναι αὐτοῖς Ἀθηναῖσιν καὶ φοροῦσιν καὶ στρατείας], as in Wilhelm's restoration of #39, lines 15-16 (Att.Urk., IV [1939], p.33), or a clause beginning

ἀ[ν]=ἐάν)safeguarding the honorand and his sons from harm..

#17. Proxeny. ca 435-400 B.C. Honours for an unknown man.

Pl.IV,4

BIBLIOGRAPHY. Broneer, Hesperia, IV (1935), p. 161 #18;
Schweigert, Hesperia, VII (1938), pp. 275-277 #10;
Wilhelm, Att.Urk., IV (1939), pp. 37-39 #xxvii; Meritt,
Hesperia, X(1941), pp. 336-337; S.E.G., X(1949), 50.

PHOTOGRAPHS. Broneer (op.cit.), p. 162 fig. 50 (fragment a); Schweigert (op.cit.), p. 276 fig. 11 (fragments a, b, c).

Three contiguous fragments of white micaceous marble, now joined in plaster. Foliation is vertical and parallel to the face..

Fragment a, EM 12774, was found in the lower area of the excavations of the north slope of the Akropolis on October 20, 1933. It was first published by Broneer (loc.cit.). It is broken on all sides; it joins the top of fragment b.

H.max. 0.013m. W.max. 0.075m. Th.max. 0.030m.

Fragments b and c bear the same inventory-number, EM 12890. Fragment b was found on April 12, 1937, in late fill in excavations of the north slope of the Akropolis. It was first published, with fragments a and c, by Schweigert (loc.cit.). It is broken on all sides; it joins the top of fragment c.
H.max. 0.017m. W.max. 0.118m. Th.max. 0.040m.

Fragment c was found on the same day as fragment b on the north slope of the Akropolis, but in a different area of the excavations. It is broken on all sides.
H.max. 0.103m. W.max. 0.068m. Th.max. 0.040m.
Combined dimensions: H.max. 0.390m. W.max. 0.118m. Th.max. 0.040m. Letter-height 0.009m.-0.010m. Chequer: 0.0116m.x 0.0170m.

Letter-shapes. A⁴ and 5, B³, E⁴, H¹, Θ³ and 4, K², M², N⁷ and 9, O¹ and 2, Π⁴, P⁶, Σ⁹, Υ⁷, Φ⁶, Ω⁷. Ionic script. Phi type 6 is not found in dated inscriptions before 430 B.C. The shapes of the other letters provide no accurate indicator of date, but the hand is close to that of the second mason of #15 (ca 431/0 B.C.).

ca 435-400 B.C.

Stoich.31

- [.....19.....]ολ[.....10.....]
 [.....19.....]ο[.....11.....]
 [.....18.....]ελ[.....11.....]
 [.....18.....]αυτ[.....10.....]
 5 [.....18.....]αιο[.....10.....]
 [.....18.....]την[.....10.....]
 [.....19.....]νπ[.....10.....]
 [.....15.....]τ[.]ν Αθη[να...8.....]
 [.....16.....]τὸν πο[λέμαρχον? 2.]
 10 [.....15.....]τοῖς ἄλ[λοις ..6...]
 [.....13.....]ς· ἦν δὲ βια[ίῳι θανάτῳι]
 [πο ἀποθάνῃι εἶ]ναι τὴν τιμ[ωρίαν αὐτῳι]
 [καθάπερ ἦν τις] Αθηναίων [τινα ἀποκτέν]-
 [ηι· καλέσαι δὲ αὐτὸν καὶ [ἐπὶ ξένια ἐς τὸ]
 15 [πρυτανεῖον ἐς] αὔριον·[...6... εἶπε· τὰ μ]-
 [ἐν ἄλλα καθάπερ] τῇι β[ολῇι·...10.....]
 [.....12..]ταλ[.....16.....]
 [.....11.τῇ]μ βολ[ῇν? ..12.....]
 [.....11.δ]ε μαντ[.....14.....]
 20 [.....10...ψή]φισμα[.....14.....]
 [.....13.....]τῳι· ἴε[ρῳι10.....]
 [.....15.....]ς[.....15.....]
-

COMMENTARY.. Wilhelm (loc.cit.) attempted to associate this document with #15. Meritt (loc.cit.) showed that this was incorrect; neither the horizontal nor the vertical chequers of these two documents tally. Wilhelm had proposed a line of thirty-two letters; Meritt reduced this by one to thirty-one letters, though retaining Wilhelm's restorations in essence. Slightly more can be read on the stone than has been admitted by Broneer or Schweigert.

Line 1-2. Not reported by Broneer or Schweigert; in line 1 there is a faint trace of the lower half of a circular letter, followed by a right diagonal foot; in line 2 there is another circular letter, below that in line 1.

Line 3. Below the circular letter of line 2 there is the apex of a triangular letter; Broneer prints a lambda; Schweigert dots it..

Line 4. The left tip of the horizontal bar of tau survives.

Line 7. Broneer: NE ; Schweigert NE. The first letter is a certain nu. The next must be pi or gamma; it is too low for epsilon. The left upper corner is preserved..

Line 8. Schweigert dots the eta; however, the left hasta is wholly preserved and the cross-bar is quite clear.

To the left of nu the surface is totally lost, but in the next stoichos to the left the horizontal and part of the vertical of tau can be read. Both τ[ῶ]ν Ἀθη[ναίων] and [εὐεργέ]τ[η]ν Ἀθη[ναίων] are possible restorations. Schweigert reads ν Ἀθη[ναίων].

Line 9. Schweigert's upsilon is impossible: the left half of omicron is perfectly clear on the stone. [πρὸς] τὸν πο[λέμαρχον] could be restored here.

Line 10. A possible reading is [καθάπερ] τοῖς ἄλ[λοις προξένοις]. Schweigert omits the lambda, of which both feet and most of the left leg are clear.

Lines 9-10 seem to contain a variant of the formula allowing the proxenos access to the polemarch's court at Athens without payment of court-fees, but no satisfactory restoration along these lines has yet been achieved.

Line 11. Schweigert dots the alpha; however, parts of all three strokes survive. As he points out, the form ἦν for εἰς is unparalleled, but it is undoubtedly the correct reading. The sigma could be the end of the word [εὐεργέται]ς, but [καθάπερ] τοῖς ἄλ[λοις προξένοις καὶ εὐεργέται]ς is too long by two letters.

Line 12. [που] Wilhelm; [πο] Meritt; [πω] Schweigert. The third visible letter in this line has been read

hitherto as an iota. However, there is a possibility that the letter is an upsilon: the central vertical survives complete, but there are also two clear diagonal arms; perhaps the mason first engraved upsilon, then corrected it to iota. After this letter the left leg and apex of mu survive; Schweigert bracketed this letter.

Line 13. [καθάρπερ] Wilhelm; [καθάπερ] Schweigert and Meritt. [τοιοῦτον πάθη] Schweigert; [τίνα ἀποκτείνῃ] Wilhelm; [τίνα ἀποκτένῃ] Meritt.

Line 14. [εἰς τό] Wilhelm; [ἐς τό] Schweigert and Meritt.

Line 15. There is some doubt about the second and third visible letters: while upsilon and rho are clear, there are traces in the same stoichoi of nu and epsilon respectively. Apparently, the mason has here corrected a mistake, inscribing nu epsilon first.

Line 16. τῆ Wilhelm; τῇ Schweigert and Meritt. The latter reading is correct. The combination of this line and lines 11-15 fixes the line-length at thirty-one letters.

Line 17. Schweigert prints a dotted eta here. To the left of this letter is the right tip of a horizontal bar, probably that of tau, though epsilon is a possibility since the bottom of the stoichos has perished. The apex

and cross-bar of alpha are clear; I can see nothing of Schweigert's eta here. In the next stoichos the apex of a triangular letter survives.

Line 18. Schweigert brackets the lambda; however, its left leg and apex are visible. Instead of the reading [τῆ]μ βολ[ήν], [συ]μβολ[---] is also possible.

Line 21. ΤΟΙΙ Schweigert. Only the last letter is unclear: of this a left vertical survives with two horizontal strokes joining it on its right. The bottom of this letter is lost. This line might contain provisions for publication [ἐν] τῷ ἐ[ρῳ], presumably in the home-state of the proxenos (cf. #13, line 26).

Line 22. The top of a letter, not noted by Schweigert, survives here; it is a diagonal stroke, too flat to be the right arm of an upsilon, I think; it is under the first iota of line 21.

#18. Proxeny. ²³⁵ca 435-425 B.C. Honours for unknown
persons.

Pl.V,1

BIBLIOGRAPHY. Wilhelm, Beiblatt, (1898), p. 44; Att. Urk.,
I (1911), pp. 170-175; I.G., I², 143 (1924); Wilhelm, Att.
Urk., IV (1939), pp. 28-31 #xxiv; Meritt, Hesperia, X
(1941), pp. 315-317; S.E.G., X(1949), 24; Meritt, Hesperia,
XXI (1952), pp. 346-347; S.E.G., XII (1955), 24; Lambrechts,
Proxenedecreten (1958), pp. 48, 62-63, 70, 94-95, 102,
147, 150; Mattingly, Historia, XII (1963), pp. 263-265;
Robert, R.E.G., LXXVII (1964), p. 157 #120; S.E.G., XXI
(1966), 15; Robert, Monnaies Grecques (1967), pp. 24-25;
R.E.G., LXXXI (1968), p. 451 #211..

PHOTOGRAPH. Wilhelm (1939), plate II.

EM 5409, fragment of white micaceous marble, preserving
the left edge and rough-picked back. It was associated
with #9 by Wilhelm in 1898 and first published by him
in 1911. Foliation is vertical and at right angles to
face.

H.max. 0.145m. W.max. 0.078m. Th. 0.058m. Letter-height
0.009m. Chequer 0.0148m.x0.0151m.

Letter-shapes. A4, B3, E4, H1, Θ3, Λ2 and 4, N7 and 9,
O2-3, Π1-3, P8, Σ9. Attic script with apparently regular

use of the daseia. The form of sigma is distinctive; it occurs also in #15 (probably dated in 431/0 B.C.) and in I.G., I², 57 (A.T.L., II, D 3-6, inscribed in 424/3 B.C.) The letter-shapes suggest a date in the late 430's or early 420's.

ca 435-425 B.C.

Stoich. 27

[.3.]^h[.....⁸... εἶναι δὲ καὶ ἀτέλε]-
 ιαν στ[ρατείας αὐτοῖς καὶ ἐκγόνο]-
 ν τοῖς [πρεσβυτάτοις αἰεὶ πλὴν φρ]-
 ορᾶς τ[ῆς ἑαυτῶν· ἐὰν δέ τις αὐτῶν]
 5 ἀποθά[ναι βιαῖοι θανάτοι ἐν τῶν π]-
 όλεον [εἶναι αὐτοῖς τὰς τιμορίας]
 καὶ δέ[δονται Ἀθηναίοις· καὶ ἐὰν τ]-
 ι βόλο[νται λαγχάνεν παρὰ τῷ δέμῳ]
 πρόσσ[δον εἶναι αὐτοῖς -----]

COMMENTARY. This fragment was wrongly associated by Wilhelm with #9: foliation is different, being vertical and at right angles to the face, whereas in #9 it is vertical but parallel to the face; the chequer is different, particularly the vertical spacing, and the lettering of the present document is neater and more carefully cut, as well as differing stylistically (note especially the shapes

of lambda, rho and sigma, and the size of theta and omicron). My restorations are those of Meritt (1941); they are more complete and more satisfactory than those of Wilhelm (1911); Meritt and Wilhelm have the same text for lines 4-6. In certain lines a little more can be read than previous editors have admitted..

Line 1. Above the right tip of sigma of line 2 the bottom of a right hasta is preserved. There seems to be a gradual spreading of the lines towards the right below this point, so that this letter, which is directly above the iota of line 3, is also directly above the shaft of lambda in line 8; thus, while iota cannot be ruled out, the daseia is a more likely reading here.

There is a trace of what might be a left hasta 0.006m.. to the left of this stroke; however, it is probably too far to the left to be part of a daseia, while too far to the right to belong in the preceding stoichos..

Lines 2-4. Meritt's text is surely correct; it is given added support by the presence of part of tau in line 2 at the right edge. The same is true for line 4. In both cases, the left tip of the horizontal is preserved.

While there is no exact parallel, the text of #39, lines 15-16 (text published as S.E.G., X, 98) comes close to it.

Lines 4-7. In line 7 the upper left corner of epsilon

can be read. Wilhelm ([1939] , p. 29), restored *καὶ*
δ[έδονται τοῖς πολίταις -----], believing that line
 8 contained a rider to the main decree.

Lines 7-9. In both lines 8 and 9 the left side of
 omicron is preserved in stoichos 5. Wilhelm (loc.cit.)
 restores lines 8-9 as follows: *ἵβολ[ος εἶπε· εἶναι*
δὲ αὐτοῖσι καὶ] πρόσ[οδον κτλ. -----]. This is
 impossible, as Meritt has shown (op.cit., p. 317):

"the first clause of his proposed amendment ought not
 to contain the particle *δέ* . Even with *δέ* the line is
 so short that *αὐτοῖς* has to be given the unusual spelling
αὐτοῖσι to make up the necessary 27 letters". Meritt's
 alternative is surely the correct one.

#19. Proxeny? ca 435-420 B.C. Honours for an unknown man. Pl. V,2

BIBLIOGRAPHY. I.G., I, 83 (1873); I.G., I², 148 (1924).

PHOTOGRAPHS. None so far published.

EM 6620, fragment of slightly micaceous Pentellic marble, broken on all sides, but preserving the rough-picked back; the horizontal profile of the back is slightly convex. It was found near the Helen Tossizza Girl's School in Athens; it was first published by Kirchhoff from a transcript of U. Koehler as I.G., I, 83 in 1873. Foliation is horizontal and diagonal to the face, from obverse top to reverse bottom.

H.max. 0.234m. W.max. 0.230m. Th.max. (right) 0.140m.; min. (left) 0.135m. Letter-height 0.011m.-0.012m. Chequer 0.0143m.x 0.0173m.

Letter-shapes. A3 and 5, B3, E4, H1, Θ3, K2, Λ4, N7, O1, Π1, P8, Σ8, Y7, Φ5, X2-3. Attic script, with regular use of the daseia. The hand is very neat and distinctive; while both S.E.G., X, 44 (dated in the 430's) and I.G., I²,

77 (ca 435 B.C.) are very similar, I do not know of any document by precisely the same hand. The neatness and regularity of the script and the chequer suggest a date in the 420's or in the late 430's.

ca 435-420 B.C.

Stoich. 34

[.....²³.....]α[...¹⁰.....]
 [...⁶... καὶ καλέσ]αι ἐπὶ χσένια Ε[...⁷... ἐς]
 [τὸ πρυτανεῖον ἐς] αὔριον. ^{ννν} Ἀλ[..⁵... εἶπ]-
 [ε· τὰ μὲν ἄλλα καθάπερ τῇ βολῇ· ἡ[οι δὲ στρα]-
 5 [τεγοὶ ἐπιμέλοσθ]ον αὐτῷ ἡόπος ἄν [...⁷...]
 [...¹²..... ἐν] τοῖς χορίοις ἡδ[ς ...⁶...]
 [...¹⁴.....]τα καὶ ἡοπόσοι φ[...⁷...]
 [...¹⁴..... το]ῖς χορίοις ἡδ[ς ...⁶...]
 [...¹⁰... τοῖς ἡ]έκοσιν Ἀθ[εναί]ον ⁵...]
 10 [...⁸... καὶ πράττ]ον καὶ λέγον α[..⁷...]
 [...¹⁶.....]αι καὶ παρ' Ἀθ[εναίοις .]
 [...¹⁹..... ἄ]ποδεκ[τ...⁸...]

COMMENTARY. The stone contains the end of the decree and a rider involving additional provisions, perhaps the establishment of a guard for certain territories. There is no clue to the identity of the honorand or to his home,

or to the context of the decree. The restorations are those of Hiller (I.G., I², 148).

Line 1. Above the third iota of line 2 the left foot of a triangular letter survives; alpha is the likeliest letter, though delta is not absolutely excluded. Possibly this is part of a publication-formula: [κ]αὶ καταθεῖναι ἐμὴ πόλει· καὶ καλέσ]αι κτλ.

Line 2. The mason omitted the iota before epsilon in the second preserved stoichos; he corrected his mistake by erasing the horizontals of epsilon and inserting a new epsilon to the right before pi; thus, this line contained thirty-five letters. At the left edge the right foot of alpha survives; in stoichos 6 the upper left tip of chi survives; at the right edge the bottom left corner of epsilon is visible; part of its centre-bar is preserved on the break.

Line 3. The right foot of alpha survives, followed by the bottom of upsilon and the upper left corner of rho; the top of iota survives after the rho. There are three uncut spaces before the name of the orator; usually, where such a vacat occurs in this position, it is of one letter-space only. The second letter of the orator's name is lambda; the left hasta and part of the diagonal are preserved. There are several possible names, of which perhaps the most likely are Alkaios

(archon in 422/1 B.C.; P.A., I, 572) and Alkmeon (known from red-figure vase-inscriptions of the first half of the fifth century; P.A., I, 648); Alkides (also a kalos-name of the early fifth century; P.A., I, 608) is another possibility, as is Alexis: a man of this name shared the expense of a trireme with Diogeiton at the end of the fifth century (see Lysias, XXXII, 24-26; P.A., I, 551); Diogeiton himself was a grandfather at the time, and Alexis may have been of the same age.

Line 4. The bottom of the left hasta of the daseia survives at the right edge of the stone.

Line 5. The right side of omicron survives at the left edge of the stone; while it is possible to restore the formula [μεδ' ἡσυχ' ἡενὸς ἀδικεῖται ἐν] τοῖς χωρίαις, I prefer to leave this space blank, since I am not sure of its relation to what follows in lines 6 and 7.

Line 7. The last letter is phi; perhaps the honorand is to tell the generals how many guards (φ[ύλακες]) are required to protect the lands mentioned in lines 5 and 7. In #22, line 12, Apollonophanes is enjoined to guard land near Kolophon; perhaps a similar provision is implied here.

Line 9. The tips of the upper and middle bars of epsilon survive at the left edge; at the right edge the top of iota survives. Perhaps some mention of the honorand's services

to Athenian visitors is made here.

Line 10. See I.G., I², 108.51 for a partial parallel; this line and the next seem to be part of the clause that begins in line 9 and tells of the honorand's services to Athenians. At the right edge the left foot of alpha survives; gamma is a possible alternative reading.

Line 11. Perhaps the honorand was to receive some sort of payment, or else an additional privilege; one might restore [ἐχσεῖν]αἰ καὶ παρ' Ἄθ[εναίοις].

Line 12. Some form of the word ἀποδέκτης should probably be restored here: the tops of the letters survive, so that only pi, epsilon and kappa are certain. The apodektai were a board of ten financial officials responsible for the receipt of moneys owed to the state (see Aristotle, Ἀθ.Πολ., 48.1-2; cf. I.G., I², 94.16-17 and I.G., I², 105.6-7 = # 65. 7-8). Androtion (fragment 5) is reported (by Harpokration) as saying that Kleisthenes introduced the apodektai in place of the kolakretai; Jacoby (F.G.H., III, Supplement I, pp. 118-119; Supplement II, pp. 112-114), discussing this passage, argues that Harpokration has garbled Androtion's text and concludes, from the absence of evidence earlier than 418 B.C., that this body was instituted ca 420 B.C. If my restoration and dating of #19 are correct, Jacoby's date will have to be revised. Alternatively, one might restore here [ἀ]πὸ δὲ κ[-----].

#20. Proxeny. ca 435-425 B.C. Honours for Krison, his brothers, and another man. Pl.V,3

BIBLIOGRAPHY. Pritchett, Hesperia, XI (1942), pp. 230-231 #42; S.E.G., X(1949), 54; Meritt, Hesperia, XXI (1952), pp. 348-351; S.E.G., XII (1955), 22; Lambrechts, Proxeni edicta (1958), pp. 27, 63, 74-75, 127, 150; Duncan, B.S.A., LVI (1961), p. 186; S.E.G., XXI (1965), 39.

PHOTOGRAPHS. Pritchett, op.cit., p. 230; Duncan, op.cit., pl. 31b.

Agora Inventory #I.4977, fragment of white micaceous marble, preserving the left edge and rough-picked back. It was found on June 15, 1937, in a modern context in excavation of the Athenian Agora; it was first published by Pritchett (loc.cit.). The crystalline structure is extremely small and fine-grained, so that the foliation cannot be observed with the naked eye. The stele tapered from bottom to top. H.max.0.193m. W.max. 0.200m. Th. 0.083m. Letter-height 0.009m.-0.010m. Chequer 0.0132m.x 0.0179m.

Letter-shapes. A4, B3, E4, Θ3, K2, Λ2-4, M2, N7 and 8, O2,

Π1, P5-8, Σ6-8, Y7, Φ5, X3. Attic script; it is not possible to say whether or not the daseia was used. The shapes of rho, sigma and upsilon are very distinctive. The centre-bar of epsilon is often longer than the outside bars. Sigma type 6 is found only once after 425 B.C., in a document dated to 405/4 B.C.; rho type 5 is not found after 430 B.C. I do not know of any other document by the same hand; the character of the letters and their spacing suggest a date in the 430's or early 420's: the casualty-lists S.E.G., X, 418 (= S.E.G., XXI, 126) and I.G., I², 944 (= S.E.G., XXI, 124), both attributed to the late 430's, though not by the same hand, bear a fairly strong resemblance to the present document.

ca 435-425 B.C.

Stoich.28

[ἔδοχσεν τῷ βολῷ καὶ τῷ δέμοι, ?.] -
 [...⁴.] ἰς ἐπρυτ[άνευε, ..⁷.... ἐγγραμ]-
 μά[τε]υε, Μέλειτ[ος ἐπεστάτε, ...⁷....] -
 ν εἶπε· Κρίσονα [τὸν ...⁶... καὶ τοὺς ἀ]-
 5 δελφὸς καὶ Δεκ[...⁴... (ἀνα)γράφσαι πρ]-
 οχσένος καὶ εὐε[ργέτας ἐν στέλει λ]-
 ιθίνει ἐμ πόλει [καὶ ἐν τῷ βουλευτε]-
 ρίοι ἐς σανίδα τ[ὸν γραμματέα τῆς β]-
 ολῆς τέλεσι το[ῖς σφετέροις αὐτῶν].

10 ὁμοῖαι δὲ κα[ὶ τὸς στρατεγὸς καὶ τὲ]-
 [μ] βολὲν κ[αὶ τὸς πρυτάνες ?-----]

COMMENTARY. I have adopted Meritt's restorations (loc.cit.) in preference to those of Pritchett (loc.cit.), except in lines 4-5, where I believe neither of these editors to be correct. The line-length is established by the restoration of line 6.

Line 2.ἰ[ς] ἔκρυτ[άνευε] Pritchett. The bottom of iota survives; after it the stone breaks along the upper side of the bottom diagonal of sigma. The bottom bar and parts of the vertical and middle bar of epsilon survive, followed by the left vertical of pi and a trace of the bottom of the right vertical. Pritchett suggested that the tribe in prytany was Kekropis, since one possible identification of Meleto [s] the epistates is P.A., II, 9829, the father of the accuser of Sokrates, who was of this tribe. There were several other men of this name, however (see MacDowell, Mysteries, pp. 208-210, Appendix M); alternatively, the name could be Meleto [n], which is known in the tribe Oineis (P.A., II, 9798/9). In the absence of any other evidence no positive identification can be made.

Lines 4-6. The honorand's name is Krison rather than Krisos, though both names are known (a certain Krisos was buried at Athens ca 400 B.C.; see I.G., II², 11912).

Pritchett rejects the possibility that the second word is ἀναγράφαι, I think correctly, since it is normal in proxyen-decrees for the honorand to be identified at the start by his ethnic. These lines have attracted various attempts at restoration, none of them entirely satisfactory: Κρίσωνα [τὸν ...⁶... καὶ τὸς ἄ]|δελφὸς καὶ Δέκ[...⁴... ἀναγράφαι προ]ρχσένος κτλ Pritchett; Κρίσον ἄ[ναγράφαι καὶ τὸς ἄ]|δελφὸς καὶ Δέκ[ελον κτλ] Hondius (S.E.G., X, 54 note); Κρίσωνα [τὸν Δελφὸν καὶ τὸς ἄ]|δελφὸς κτλ. Raubitschek (S.E.G., X, 54 note); [ἄ]|δελφὸς καὶ Δέκ[ατον κτλ.] Wilhelm (S.E.G., X, 54 note); Κρίσωνα [καὶ ...¹⁰..... τὸς]|Δελφὸς καὶ δὲ (=δὴ) Κ[ιρραῖος γράφσαι κτλ] Meritt. This last suggestion has two weaknesses: there is no parallel for such a use of καὶ δὴ; nor is there any justification for a double ethnic of this sort, even though Meritt's arguments on this point are highly ingenious. Pritchett's is the only version that will withstand criticism: the ethnic must remain unrestored, as must the name of the last honorand; possibly one might expect [ἄ]|δελφός to be followed by the pronoun αὐτῷ, but this is a minor point, and I do not believe it outweighs the

very real faults of Meritt's version. In line 4 the left foot and part of the horizontal of alpha are visible at the right edge; in line 6 the lower left corner of epsilon survives.

Lines 7-8. Parallels are afforded by #5 and by #16; in the latter case, as here, a sanis is to be set up in the Bouleuterion, and the cost of inscription is to be borne by the honorand.

Line 9. [β]ολῆς τέλεσι το[ῖς τῶν..6... vacat] Pritchett; τέλεσι το[ῖς αὐτῶν..5..εἶπε] Wilhelm (S.E.G., X, 54 note); τέλεσι το[ῖς Κρίσο καὶ Δεκέλο] Hondius (S.E.G., X, 54 note); τέλεσι το[ῖς σφετέροις αὐτῶν] Meritt. Pritchett cited in support of his version I.G., I², 60, 15; τέλεσι τοῖς [Μυτιλεναίων^{XY}] ; Meritt pointed out that this reading is now superseded by the vastly better τέλεσι τοῖς σ[φετέροις αὐτῶν] (see A.T.L., II, D 22, line 23), and restored the present document by analogy with this, I think correctly; the particle δέ in line 10 "forbids categorically the assumption that ὁμοῖαι δέ etc. was the commencement of a new motion" (p. 348). In line 9 the upper left curve of omicron survives.

Lines 10-11. There is no exact parallel for this oath in proxeny-decrees: the generals, the Boule and the prytaneis are often charged with safeguarding the honorand, however

(cf. #26 for the involvement of all three sets of officials), and Meritt suggests (p. 350) that "the exceptional vigor of the clause here, with its special oath, reflects the hazards of the times." While I agree with Meritt's statement, I cannot accept this as an argument for identifying the honorands as citizens of Delphoi who are, in addition, citizens of Kirrha. The name Krison is rare: it is found in Himera in Sicily, but this ethnic cannot be restored unless an article is omitted after Κρίσονα or before [ἀ]δελφός (e.g. Κρίσονα [τὸν ἡμεραῖον καὶ ἀ]δελφός). The partial name in line 5 is also a problem: Wilhelm's Dekatos is without parallel; Hondius' Dekelos is the name of a hero and is not known to have been borne by a mortal. One possibility is the name Dekamnichos, found in the fourth century in Makedonia (see Bechtel, Personennamen, p. 520); this would entail the restoration Δεκ[άμνιχον γράψαι κτλ.] . Dekamnichos was one of the assassins of King Archelas in 399 B.C. (Aristotle, Politics, 1311b, 13); as such, this man was probably too young to be named an Athenian proxenos ca 435-425 B.C., but the name might have been borne by a close elder relative as well. If the possibility is accepted that this decree honours Macedonians, a context

might be sought in Athenian negotiations with Makedonia between 430 and 425 B.C., or in the earlier hostilities between Athens and Makedonia in which Athens supported various dissident Macedonian chieftains (see A.T.L., III, pp. 313-319).

#21. Proxeny. ca 435-420 B.C. Honours for three men.

Pl. V, 4, 5, 6

BIBLIOGRAPHY. I.G., I, Supplement, p.24 #116f(1877); Koumanoudis, Ἀθήναιον, X(1881), p.72; I.G., I, Supplement, p.69 #116u; p.129 #116y (1886); p. 167 #116u (1891); Bannier, B.Ph.W. (1921), p. 308; I.G., I², 61; 169; 179 (1924); Wade-Gery, B.S.A., XXXIII (1935), pp.131-135; Wilhelm, Att.Urk., IV (1939), pp.41-48 #xxix; Meritt, Epigraphia Attica (1940), pp.101, 147 note 26; Hesperia X(1941), pp. 334-335; S.E.G., X(1949), 53; Lambrechts, Proxeni edicte (1958), pp. 34, 75, 83, 94-95, 123.

PHOTOGRAPHS. Wade-Gery, op.cit., p. 133 fig. 16.

Three non-joining fragments of micaceous Pentelic marble, first published together by Wade-Gery (loc.cit.), who noted, however, that he was following Wilhelm: "the fact is indeed noted by him in the Museum copy of I.G., I² for 61 and 179: against 169 there is also a note in his writing which I could not understand." Foliation is vertical and parallel to the face.

Fragment a, EM 6846 [I.G., I², 179], was apparently found in Athens, where it was bought from a dealer by the

Archaeological Society; it was first published by Koumanoudis (loc.cit.). It is broken on all sides, the back having split away along the plane of a layer of reddish mica..

H.max.. 0.187m. W.max. 0.122m. Th.max. 0.088m. Letter-height 0.010m.-0.011m. Chequer 0.0132m.x0.0187m.

Fragment b, EM 6845 [I.G., I², 169], was found in excavations on the Akropolis east of the Erechtheion; it was first published by Kirchhoff from a transcript of H.G. Lolling (I.G., I, Supplement, p. 129 #116y [1886]). The right edge and pick-smoothed back are preserved.

H.max. 0.205m. W.max.. 0.121m. Th. 0.091m. Letter-height 0.010m.-0.011m. Chequer 0.0130m.x0.0186m.

Fragment c, EM 6837 [I.G., I², 61], was found in excavations on the south slope of the Akropolis and was first published from a transcript of U. Koehler by Kirchhoff (I.G., I, Supplement, p. 24 #116f [1877]). The left edge is preserved; the back is split away on the plane of a layer of reddish mica..

H.max.. 0.188m. W.max. 0.118m. Th.max. 0.087m. Letter-height 0.010m.- 0.011m. Chequer 0.0128m.x0.0186m.

While the horizontal chequer of all three fragments is fairly constant, the vertical chequer of fragment a varies, the interval between the lines fluctuating between 0.007m. and 0.009m. The average vertical chequer, however, is very close to that of fragments b and c.

Letter-shapes. A4, B3, E4, H1, Θ3, K2, Λ 4, M2, N7,, 02,, Π1, P8,, Σ 7, Υ7,, Φ 4. Attic script, with regular use of the daseia (except in line 20). The neatness and regularity of the script suggest a date in the late 430's or in the 420's. By the same hand are I.G., I², 160, S.E.G., X, 60 and I.G., I², 77; all these have been placed between 438 and 428 B.C. (see Wade-Gery, op.cit., pp. 122-135); however, I can see no strong reason for preferring a date in the 430's. The hand is very distinctive, as Wade-Gery points out; the mason is extremely consistent in his use of chisels, so that there is no variation in the shapes of letters. By the same hand may be I.G., I², 95 (dated to 418/7 B.C.; see McGregor, Phoenix, XIX [1965], pp. 43-46), though rho is flatter and upsilon less angular. The hands of I.G., I², 96 (417/6 B.C.) are very similar, though there is more irregularity in the letter-shapes; in the same group should be placed fragments a and d of S.E.G., X, 51

(dated ca 430/29 B.C. by Meritt, Hesperia, XIV [1945], pp. 94-97). There are several documents of the 420's in which great care has been given to the spacing of the letters so that each letter seems to stand on its own without interference from its neighbours; different masons have been at work, but all share the same spaciousness and legibility: such are I.G., I², 57 and 60; #22; S.E.G., X, 352 (the fifth-century archon-list); S.E.G., XXI, 126 (a casualty-list); and A.T.L., I, A 9 (the ninth tribute-assessment). To this group should be added the present decree, as well as those I have indicated above as being by the same or a very similar hand.

ca 430-420 B.C..

Stoich. 24

a

[ἔδοχσεν τῷ βολῇ καὶ τῷ δέμ]-
 [οι, ηιπ]πο[θοντὶς ἐπρυτάνευε, .]-
 [.3.]ος ἐγγρα[μμάτευε, ...⁸....]
 [ἐπεβτάτε, Αρ[ίστιον? εἶπε...⁴...]-
 5 [.3.]ον τὸν Α[ἰνεάτεν? καὶ ...⁵...]-
 [.2]αν τὸν Αἰ[νεάτεν? καὶ ...⁶...]-
 [... τ]ὸν Φε[γόντιον?, ἐπειδὲ εὔ]
 [ποιῶσ]ι Αθε[ναῖος, ἐπαινέσαι μ]-
 [ἐν καὶ ἀναγράψαι προχσένος]
 10 [καὶ εὐεργέτας -----]

Lacuna

- b [.3. ἔναι δὲ αὐτοῖσι καὶ φρο]ῤῥᾱ-
 [ς καὶ στρατείας ἀτέλεια]ν· ἡο δ-
 [ὲ γραμματεὺς ἡο τῆς βολῆ]ς ἀνα-
 [γραφσάτο ἐμ πόλει ἐστέλε]ι, λι-
 15 [θίνει· ἡοι δὲ πολεταὶ ἀπομ]ισθ-
 [οσάντων· ἡοι δὲ κολακρέται] δό-
 [ντον τὸ ἀργύριον· ἡόπος δ' ἄν] με
 [ἀδικῶνται, ἐπιμελόσθον α]ὕτῳ-
 [ν ἡοι στρατεγοὶ ἡοι αἰεὶ] στρα-
c 20 [τ]εγῶντε[ς καὶ ἐ βολέ· ἔναι] δὲ α[ὕ]-
 τοῖσι καὶ [πρόσοδον πρὸς τὴν β]-
 ολέν, ἐάν [του δέονται, καὶ τὸς π]-
 ρυτάνες [προσάγεν αὐτὸς εἰς τ]-
 ἐν βολὲν [καὶ τὸν δῆμον ἐπάναγ]-
 25 κες πρότ[ος μετὰ τὰ ἡιερά, ἐπει]-
 δὴν ἡε [βολὲ περὶ αὐτῶν ἐς τὸν δ]-
 ῆμον ἐ[χσενέγκει. vacat]

vacat

COMMENTARY. I have adopted the text of S.E.G., X,53, with some very minor changes; this text derives from that of Wade-Gery (loc.cit.), as expanded by Wilhelm (loc.cit.) and Meritt (1941). However, there are anomalies in this text that I have not been able to

resolve.

Lines 2-3. Wade-Gery restored [Κεκ]ρο[πίς] in line 2 and suggested that, while [ηιπ]ρο[θοντίς] could also be restored, it was possible to restore the whole preamble with Mnesitheos as secretary and Eupeithes as epistates, thus dating the decree to the same day and year as I.G., I², 91/2. However, there is no doubt in my mind that the first letter on the stone is a pi, not a rho: while the left vertical foot is clear, there is also a right vertical, high up 0.008m. to the right of the other vertical; this shows on my photograph, but not on that published by Wade-Gery. I therefore restore [ηιπ]ρο[θοντίς], the omicron should be dotted since only its bottom survives. In line 3 the left foot of alpha is visible at the right edge.

Line 4. There is a trace of the bottom of a left hasta at the right edge: the second letter of the orator's name will thus be kappa, nu, pi or rho. The range of possibilities is great; Wilhelm (op.cit., p.42) suggested Aristion, who was archon in 421/0 B.C.

Lines 5-7. Meritt (op.cit. p.335), following Wilhelm's recognition that the subject of this decree was not a single individual but rather a group of honorands, suggested that these lines contained the ethnics

Αἰνεάρεν (lines 5-6) and Φεγόντιον (line 7). These represent two neighbouring towns on the Chalkidic peninsula (see A.T.L., I, pp. 464 and 560 for the sites, significance and ethnics of these states). Both paid tribute to Athens from 451/0 B.C. until the beginning of the Peloponnesian War: Aineia suffered an increase in its assessment in 430/29 B.C., and is not recorded as paying tribute after 429/8 B.C., though it was assessed again in 425/4 B.C. (A.T.L., I, pp. 220-221); the Phegontians are recorded as paying tribute at least until 433/2 B.C. (their name is absent from the full panel of tributaries in 432/1 and 430/29 B.C.; see A.T.L., I, pp. 434-435). It may be, if Meritt's suggestion is correct, that this grant of proxeny reflects the events of 430/29 B.C.; perhaps movements for secession were suppressed in both cities at about this time. I know of no case in the fifth century in which men from two different cities were granted the proxeny in the same decree, but I do not see any other way in which these lines can be arranged: there is insufficient space to list each man by patronymic and ethnic; nor is there space enough in line 7 to insert a plural ethnic before the clause beginning [ἐπειδὴ κτλ.]. Alternative restorations of the ethnics in lines 5 and 6 are Αἰ[γάντιον] (from Aige, on the Pallanian peninsula; this city was a

tributary until 429/8 B.C., and was assessed in 425/4 B.C.; see A.T.L., I, pp. 218-219) and Αἰ[ολίτην] (from Aioleion, a town in the neighbourhood of Olynthos, paying tribute in the syntely of Spartolos until 434/3 B.C., and after this on its own; it withheld its tribute from 432/1 until 430/29 B.C., but resumed payment at the old rate in 429/8 B.C.; see A.T.L., I, pp. 220-221). Possibly, three separate ethnics should be restored in these lines: Α[ἰνέειν?] in line 5, Αἰ[γόντιον?] in line 6 and Φε[γόντιον?] in line 7; a date ca 430/29 B.C. would then be appropriate.

Line 8. Meritt is correct in reading ΙΑΘΕ here; Wade-Gery and Wilhelm read ΑΘ; thus, Meritt's restoration, which I have adopted, is to be preferred to Wilhelm's tentative suggestions (op.cit., p. 42).

Lines 11-12. Wilhelm's reading is [καὶ ἕνα] α[ὐτὸς προχσένος Ἀθελναίο]ν; Meritt, with whom I agree, points out that the first letter in line 11 is too far to the left to be an iota. His restoration, which, I have adopted, is made by analogy with Wilhelm's restoration of #39, lines 15-17 (op.cit., p. 33).

Lines 12-20. The restorations are those of Wade-Gery, except that, in line 14, Wilhelm's [ἐμ πόλει] has been substituted for Wade-Gery's [τὸ δόγμα].

Line 20. The apex of delta and the top bar and part of the vertical of epsilon are visible, followed by the apex only of alpha. Only epsilon, therefore, is certain. The omission of the daseia in [ἐ βολέ] seems inevitable..

Line 21. The final iota is visible on the break.

Wade-Gery read τῷ Σικαν[ῶι χρηματίσαι].

Line 22. του for το is awkward, but seems unavoidable.

Line 23. εἰς for ἐς is likewise apparently unavoidable, unless Wade-Gery's [προσάγειν αἰεὶ πρὸς] be adopted.

There are thus at least three ionicismus in this document (lines 20, 22 and 23).

Lines 22-27. Wade-Gery: *ἡ* [βολὲ πρεσβείαν ἐς τὸν δ]έμον
ἐ[χσενέγκει] . Wilhelm points out (op.cit., pp.46-47)
that the use of πρεσβείαν in this formula is coupled with
δεμόσια χρήματα, vel sim (cf. I.G. I², 114.49), and suggests
instead [περὶ αὐτῶν] . This is accepted by Meritt.

#22. Proxeny. ca 435-425 B.C. Honours for

Apollonophanes of Kolophon.

Pl.VI,1,2

BIBLIOGRAPHY. Rangabé, A.H., I (1842), pp. 346-347
 #262; Pittakys, E.A., 37 (1854), p. 1141 #2208; Beulé,
L'Acropole, II(1854),p.214;Pittakys, E.A.,I(1862), p.
 125 #117; Michaelis, Parthenon, I(1870), p.280, pl.
 XV.13; Schoene, Reliefs (1872), pp.49-50, pl.XXII.96;
I.G., I,36; 74 (1873); von Sybel, Katalog (1881), 6620;
 Friederichs and Wolters, Gipsabgusses (1885), p.382;
 LeBas and Reinach, Voyage (1888), p.65, pl. 38; Schoell,,
Sitzungsb.Bayr.Ak., I (1888) , pp.45-47; Goldstaub,
Ἀεΐας(1889), p.103; Dittmar, Coronis (1890), p.131;
I.G., I, Supplement,p.195 #116² (1891); Wilhelm,
Beiblatt (1898), p. 44; Larfeldt, Gr.Epigr.,II (1902),
 p.933; Svoronos, A.N.M., tafelbd., III (1903), pl.
 CCVII.4; Wilhelm, G.G.A. (1903), p.781; Jahreshefte,
 XXI-XXII (1923), pp.156-158 #iv; I.G., I², 59 (1924);
 Hondius, N.I.A. (1925), p.12 note 21; Binneboessel,
Urkundenreliefs (1932), pp.3,25-26 #2; Kirchner,
Imagines¹ (1935), p.17, pl.16 #35; Svoronos, A.N.M.,
 texte^{bd.},III (1937), p.665 #431.4; Meritt, Hesperia,
 XIV (1945), p.118; Pope,,Foreigners (1947), p.88;
 Klaffenbach-Kirchner, Imagines² (1948), p.17, pl.16 #36;

S.E.G., X (1949), 70; Gomme, Commentary, II (1956), p.296.

PHOTOGRAPHS. Fragment a: Svoronos (1903), pl. CCVII.4; fragments b,c: Wilhelm (1923), p. 156, fig. 57; Kirchner, pl. 16 #35; Klaffenbach-Kirchner, pl. 16 #36.

Three fragments of slightly micaceous Pentelic marble, of which b and c join and are now set in plaster. The foliation is vertical and parallel to the face. The three fragments were first associated with one another by Wilhelm (Beiblatt [1898], p.44)..

Fragment a, EM 6615, is of unknown provenance; it was first published by Rangabé (loc.cit.). The right edge, part of the top, and the rough-picked back are preserved. There are two lines of an inscription, with part of a third, above which a horizontal fascia, now much abraded, projects at right angles to the face without any intervening moulding. There is no sign of any inscription on this fascia, which is 0.044m. high, projecting 0.010m. from the face of the stele. Above the fascia is a relief-panel, its background surface in the same vertical plane as the inscribed surface of the stele. The top is flat, with no trace of a moulding.

above the relief; there is a rectangular dowel-hole in the rear of the top of the stele, its inner edge 0.125m. from the right side of the stele; this may have served for a dowel to hold in place a crowning gable, in which case there may have been a similar dowel-hole in the top of the left half of the stele, now lost. A vertical band, 0.025m. wide, runs up the side of the relief-panel, projecting 0.001m. from the background surface. The relief depicts Athena, standing at the right in three-quarter profile, her head turned to the left. Beside her is her shield, on the right, while her serpent rears up beside her on the left, its head level with her hip and turned to the left. She raises her right arm to crown a man who stands facing her in profile, his left hand apparently holding out a cake to the serpent, while his right hand is hidden in the folds of his himation. He wears an ankle-length himation and sandals. Both figures are badly mutilated; Athena's head is lost. She stands a head taller than the man whom she faces..

H.max. 0.426m. Relief-panel 0.298m. W.max. 0.365m.

Th. max. 0.138m. Letter-height 0.021m. Non-stoichedon; vertical chequer 0.0250m.

Fragments b and c bear the same inventory-number, EM 6593.

Fragment b was found in the demolition of the modern parts of the south wall of the Akropolis, by the terrace of Artemis Brauroneia; it was first published in 1891 by Kirchhoff from a transcript of Lolling (I.G., I, Supplement, p. 195 #116²). The rough-picked back is preserved; otherwise, it is broken on all sides. It joins the left side of fragment c.

H.max. 0.448m. W.max. 0.185m. Th. 0.143m.

Fragment c was found on October 20, 1860, not far from the Prytaneion to the north-east of the Akropolis; it was first published by Pittakys (1862). The right edge and rough-picked back are preserved.

H.max. 0.440m. W.max. 0.290m. Th. 0.143m.

Combined dimensions fragments b,c: H.max. 0.448m.

W.max. 0.410m. Th. 0.143m. Letter-height 0.013m.

Chequer 0.0133m.x0.0155m.

Letter-shapes. A4, B3, E4, Z2, H1, Θ3, K2, Λ2 (heading), 4(text), M1 (all strokes of same length), N8 (heading), 7(text), O2, Π4, P8, Σ9 (heading), 7(text), Υ7, Φ5, X3.

Attic script, employing the daseia inconsistently. Pi type 4 is not found in dated inscriptions before 440 B.C.; zeta type 2 is found only once (in 415 B.C.) after 435 B.C. The hand is very close to that of I.G., I², 60 (A.T.L., II, D 22, dated to 427/6 B.C.), whose chequer and spacing are likewise very similar. From letter-shapes, chequer and spacing I would judge that this document should be dated in the late 430's or early 420's.

ca 435-425 B.C.

Non-stoich.

a [Ἀπολλ]ονοφάνος τῷ 15
 [----8-2---]θος Κολοφονί[ο] ca 20-21
 [προχσένο καὶ εὐ]ε[ργέτ]ο Ἀ[θENAÍOΝ]. ca 27

lacuna

Stoich. 30

b,c [.....10.....]εν[.....18.....]
 5 [.....9....]νβ[.....19.....]
 [.....10.....]ντ[.....18.....]
 [.....10.....]βολ[.....17.....]
 [.....11.....]να[.....17.....]
 [.....10.....]αιγ[.....17.....]
 10 [·3· τὸ δὲ] φσέφ[ι]σμ[α τόδ]ε ἀνα[γράφ]ουσ[αι τ]-
 [ὄν γραμματ]έα [τ]ῆς [βο]λῆς ἐν σ[τέ]λει λ[ιθ]-
 [ίνει καὶ κα]τ[α]θῆν[αι] ἐμ πόλει. ^ν Ἀντικλ-
 [ῆς εἶπεν· τὰ μὲ]ν ἄλ[λ]α καθ(ά)περ τῆι βολῇ-
 [ι· Ἀπολλονοφ]άνε[ι δ]ὲ τῷ Κολοφονίῳ ἐ(πιγράφσαι, ἐ)-

- 15 [πείδὲ ἀνέ]ρ ἔστιν [ἀ]γαθὸς περὶ τὸν δῆμ-
 [ον τὸν Ἀ]θηναῖον καὶ τὸς στρατιώτας· τ-
 [ὃ δὲ χορ]ίῳ Διὸς ἱερῷ ἐπιμέλεσθαι αὐ-
 [τὸν τῆ]ς φυλακῆς λόπος ἂν σὸν εἴ Ἀθην-
 [αίοισι]· συνεπιμ[έλ]εσθαι δὲ αὐτῷ καὶ
 20 [τὸς σ]τρατεῦς τῶ[ς] ἀεὶ ἔοντας ὅτο ἂν δ-
 [έεται] καὶ τὴν βολ[ῆ]ν τὴν βολεύουσαν κα-
 [ὶ τὸς] πρυτάνες κα[ὶ] πρόσοδον εἶναι αὐ-
 [τῷ] πρ[ὸς] τε τὸς πρ[υ]τάνες καὶ τὴν βολέ-
 [ν καὶ] ἔς τὸν δῆμον [π]ρότοι μετὰ τὰ ἱερ-
 25 [ὰ ὅτα]ν τι δέεται [καὶ] μὲ ἐχσῆναι αὐτὸν
 [μεδεν]ὶ ζεμιῶσα[ι] ἂν]εὺ τῷ δέμο τῷ Ἀθην-
 [αίων· τα]ῦτα δὲ εἶ[ναι κα]ὶ τοῖς ἐκγόνοι-
 [ς τοῖς] Ἀπολλων[οφάνος κ]αὶ εἰάν τις τού-
 [τον τι παρ]αβαί[νει τὴν ζεμίαν αὐτῷ εἶ]-
 30 [ναι θανάτο]ν κ[αὶ τὰ χρέματα δεμόσια κ]-
 [αὶ τῆς θεῶ τὸ ἐπιδέκατον· -----]
-

COMMENTARY. The first three lines are non-stoichedon and evidently constitute a title like those of #29 or #55. Since line 1 can be restored with fifteen letters, and since the ten surviving letters corres-

pond to twelve letters in line 2, it follows that the missing portion of line 2 will contain not six but eight or nine letters (previous editors thought that there would be six letters, as in line 1). The first three surviving letters of line 2 are clearly the end of a patronymic: C.W.J. Eliot has suggested to me that a name should be sought ending either $-\piείθης$ or $-\ορνίς$; I do not know of any name with the latter ending; two examples ending $-\piείθης$ are Axiopeithes and Xenopeithes (see Bechtel, Personennamen, pp. 336-367); the former name has the genitive form Ἀχαιοπέιθος and is known to be that of a metic who lived in the Athenian deme Melite in 409/8 B.C. (I.G., I², 373.98; 374.71). Wilhelm's $[\text{Πολίαν}]θός$ is too short ([1923], p. 158). A Persian name may also be a possibility.

Line 3. There are traces of possibly three letters: below sigma in line 2 there is a vertical stroke, to the right of which the stone breaks away more or less horizontally. A letter such as epsilon is a possibility here. Below the third omicron of line 2 there is the top of omicron or theta; below and to the left of phi there is apparently the apex of a triangular letter. Between and below ON at the end of the line there is a diagonal stroke, but it slopes at too shallow an

angle to be a letter-stroke. I restore, on the analogy of #29, [προχσένo καὶ εὐ]ε[ργέρ]ο Ἀ[θεναίων].

though this restoration involves a line of twenty-seven letters, with even more constriction than in line 2, particularly towards the right.

Lines 4-9. The lacuna between fragments a and b,c cannot be accurately calculated since the subject-matter is unknown: lines 10-12 are the final clause of a decree, containing instructions for publication, and offer no guide to what has gone before. There are traces of letters corresponding to six lines above line 10.

Line 4. The bottom left corner of an epsilon, followed by a left vertical, survives. There is no trace of any horizontal stroke, but there is a possible trace of the bottom right corner of a nu in this stoichos.

Line 5. Below the epsilon of line 4 is the top of a possible beta; to the left of this there is a trace of the right corner of a nu.

Line 6. Below the beta of line 5 there is the bottom right corner of a nu, followed by tau.

Line 7. Below nu most of a beta is clearly visible, followed by a faint circular depression, probably

omicron; to the right of this the bottom of a lambda can be seen.

Line 8. Nu (read by previous editors) is clear; the left foot of a triangular letter, alpha or gamma, follows it.

Line 9. Below nu there is the top part of an iota, preceded by the right foot of alpha or gamma, and followed by a diagonal left foot with no trace of any bottom horizontal.

Line 10. The bottoms of phi and sigma can be seen, and parts of all three bars of epsilon, together with the upper left corner of this letter. The lower left foot of mu survives. At the end of the line the bottoms of phi and sigma are clear.

Line 11. The lower bar and a trace of the bottom of the hasta of epsilon (of $[\tau]\tilde{\epsilon}\varsigma$) survives; no editor except Hiller has printed - $\tau\epsilon$ - of $\sigma\tau\acute{\epsilon}\lambda\epsilon\varsigma$; these two letters are certainly not visible now; I think it likely that Hiller's text here contains a misprint (I.G., I², 59.6).

Line 12. Parts of both the vertical and horizontal of initial tau are clear (read by Wilhelm, loc.cit.). The right curve of theta survives, and the left hasta and part of the diagonal of nu. Only traces of the verticals

of epsilon and iota survive before the vacat. The bottom of the final lambda is clear. Wilhelm identified the orator as the general Antikles who served in the Samian War in 440/39 B.C. (Thucydides, I, 117). The same man was probably the orator of the second decree of I.G., I², 39, dated ca 446/5 B.C. (P.A., I, 1051). Another possibility is P.A., I, 1052, secretary to the epistatai in I.G., I², 348-353 (the Parthenon building-accounts, 438/7-433/2 B.C.). Another man of this name was a casualty in the late 410's (I.G., I², 950.50); possibly he was too young to serve as orator of the present decree.

Line 13. The mason omitted the cross-bar of alpha in $\kappa\alpha\theta(\acute{\alpha})\pi\epsilon\rho$. Only lambda of $\acute{\alpha}\lambda[\lambda\eta]$ is wholly lost; enough parts of other letters exist for certainty.

Line 14. The bar and both feet of the first alpha survive. At the end of this line Wilhelm (1903) suggested that the mason omitted the phrase $\acute{\epsilon}(\kappa\alpha\iota\nu\acute{\epsilon}\sigma\alpha\iota, \acute{\epsilon})-$. Woodhead (per ep.) suggested that what was omitted was $\acute{\epsilon}(\kappa\iota\gamma\rho\acute{\alpha}\phi\sigma\alpha\iota, \acute{\epsilon})-$ and that lines 14-16 are the text to be inserted in the earlier part of Decree I, having been omitted from the draft made out by the secretary. I find this suggestion more attractive than that of Wilhelm.

Lines 15-29. The text is that restored by Wilhelm

([1923] , p. 157). While in most lines I have been able to read more than has been seen by previous editors, I list here only doubtful letters; of the others enough survives for certainty.

Line 15. At the left edge only the bottom right side of the loop of rho survives.

Line 16. At the left edge the right side of theta survives.

Line 18. The right foot of omicron survives on the break.

Line 19. The right foot of mu survives on the break.

Line 20. At the left edge the right tip of the cross-bar of tau survives. Of the second omicron only the lower left curve survives on the break. Wilhelm placed a double bracket around the epsilon of $\epsilon\omicron\nu\tau\alpha\varsigma$; Hiller suggested that the mason inscribed $\alpha\epsilon\iota\ \epsilon\omicron\nu\tau\alpha\varsigma$ instead of $\alpha\iota\epsilon\iota\ \omicron\nu\tau\alpha\varsigma$; I think this to be correct.

Line 25. Only the top of the right hasta of nu survives.

Line 26. At the beginning of the line the top of iota survives. Before the break between the fragments the left foot of alpha is missing, but the upper part of this diagonal survives. After the break only the right tip of the top bar of epsilon survives, with a possible trace of the tip of the middle bar.

Line 27. The upper left corner of epsilon survives in

the word εἶ[ναι] .. After the break only the top of iota is left.

Line 28. The upper part of the right leg of the first alpha survives, followed by the upper left corner of pi and the right side of omicron. After the break the apex of alpha and the upper part of iota are visible.

Line 29. Only beta can be read with certainty; the apex of the first alpha, and the upper part of iota survive.

No one has attempted to restore the rest of this line.

Meritt (loc.cit.) drew attention to the similarity between lines 25-29 of this decree and lines 4-6 of #10.

In line 30 of the present document, below BA of line 29, the lower right corner of nu, followed by the top half of a kappa, can be seen; I suggest that #10 can be used as an analogy for the restoration of these lines.

The two decrees are roughly contemporary with one another and both offer protection to Ionians. Hondius (loc.cit.),

writing before he was aware that fragment b went with

fragment c, suggested that these lines be restored [κ]αὶ

εἰάν τις τοῦ/[τον τι παραβαίνει, ἐχσόλες εἴε καὶ αὐ/τὸς τὸ γένος τὸ αὐτῷ].

The surviving letters in lines 28 and 29 make this restoration impossible.

The general consensus is that this document refers to

the events of 427 B.C., when Paches re-established

Athenian control over Notion, the harbour of Kolophon, and settled the exiles from Kolophon itself there (Thucydides, III, 34). The close similarity of the script to that of I.G., I², 60, which is securely dated to 427/6 B.C., perhaps supports this conclusion. Binneboessel (op.cit., pp.25-26) agrees that the style of the relief-sculpture is consistent with a date in the 420's; she regards it as the first in a series of reliefs in which the pose of Athena is so designed; later examples of this are I.G., I², 108 and I.G., II², 165. However, she does not put forward any independent evidence about the date of the sculpture, deriving her date from the epigraphical evidence. The contextual arguments for a date in the mid-420's are plausible, but by no means conclusive.

#23. Proxeny, ca 435-415 B.C. Honours for four
Sicilians..

Pl. IV,2

BIBLIOGRAPHY. I.G., I, 116 (1873); I.G., I², 62 (1924).

PHOTOGRAPHS. None so far published..

EM 6643, fragment of blue-white, slightly micaceous
marble, broken on all sides. The foliation is vertical
and almost parallel to the face; the stone tends to break
away on the line of this foliation in large flakes;
this creates the illusion that the back is original.
It was first published by Kirchhoff as I.G., I, 116
in 1873, from a transcript made by Koehler in the
Museum of the Archaeological Society in Athens. The
original provenance is unknown..

H.max. 0.126m. W.max. 0.173m., Th.max. 0.073m. Letter-
height 0.009m. Chequer 0.01360m.x0.01720m..

Letter-shapes. A4, E4 and 5, 03, K2, A4, M1, N8, 01,
H1, Σ7, Y7.. Attic script, probably without the daseia..
Since the tendency is for the size of omicron to shrink
as the century progresses, the appearance of type 1
here should be evidence for a date before 420 B.C.

However, epsilon type 5 is not found in dated inscriptions before 433/2 B.C. and is rare before 418 B.C.. The hand is very similar to that of I.G., I², 91/2 (A.T.L., II, D 1-2, probably dated in 434/3 B.C.) and also to that of I.G., I², 75 (ca 430 B.C.). The most plausible context is ca 427-425 B.C. (see below), but a possible context exists in 415 B.C. as well and is not absolutely ruled out by the letter-shapes..

ca 435-415 B.C..

Stoich. 33

[...⁶... Κ]λε[όνυμος? εἶπε· ἐπαινέσαι δὲ .³.]
 [...⁶...]αν καὶ [...^{±9}... καὶ ...^{±10}...]
 [καὶ Κάλ]λιππον τῶς Σικελιότας? ὅς ὄντας ᾗ]-
 [νδρας ἀγ]αθὸς πε[ρὶ τὸν δῆμον τὸν Ἀθηναί]ο]-
 5 [ν καὶ προθ]ύμος π[οιῆν ὅ, τι δύνονται ἀγαθό]-
 [ν· καὶ ἀνθ']ὸν εὖ π[εποιέκασαν τὴν στρατεία]-
 [ν τὴν ἐν Σ]ικελί[αι ἀναγράφσαι αὐτὸς προχ]-
 [σένος καὶ] ε[ὐεργέτας -----]

COMMENTARY. Kirchhoff and Hiller both restored this as if a single honorand were involved; however, they were not aware of line 1 and 8 and read less in other lines than is in fact visible on the stone.. The presence

of καί in line 2, preceded by what seems to be an accusative singular, suggests to me that several names are involved. I do not believe that the space at the end of line 1 and the beginning of line 2 is sufficient for a name and an ethnic (though my restoration of line 1 is merely tentative). I therefore suggest that several persons with the same ethnic are involved and that

[Καλ]λίκρον is the last of these. There is space for at least four names in all, but not more than five.

Line 1. The bottom of lambda, followed by the bottom bar and part of the vertical of epsilon, survive here. If a name is concealed here it could begin with lambda, or it could be one of the many names in which lambda, is second letter. My choice of Kleonymos is affected by my belief that the decree is dated by its letter-shapes after 435 B.C.; the Athenians sent two expeditions to Sicily, and I believe that Hiller was correct in associating this document with that of Laches and Charoiades in 427 B.C. (see Thucydides, III, 86), at the time of Kleonymos' political ascendancy (he was the orator of I.G., I², 57 and 65, as well as of #25 in 426/5 B.C.). A connexion with the second Athenian expedition in Sicily, that of Alkibiades, Lamachos and Nikias in 415 B.C., cannot be ruled out, however, since

the evidence of the letter-shapes is inconclusive, merely excluding a date before 435 B.C.

Line 2. Neither Kirchhoff nor Hiller indicated the presence of nu; however, despite the mutilation of the surface, nearly the whole of this letter can be seen.

To the left of it is the right foot of a triangular letter, presumably alpha. I take this to be the end of a name. Only the bottom of final iota can be read.

Line 3. Kirchhoff and Hiller read only the vertical of the final letter; however, the top bar is almost complete, so that tau is a certainty. Before the first pi Hiller bracketed iota; the whole of the vertical can be made out and I have no doubt that this letter is an iota. Before it the right tip of the diagonal of lambda survives, preserved for enough of its length to make lambda certain. I restore the name Kallippos.

Lines 4-5. The formula is the usual one for honorific decrees (cf. #22, #39, #62 and I.G., I², 101). In line 5, after sigma, the left side of the vertical and a small portion of the top bar of what is probably a pi survive. I have restored this line by analogy with #62, line 9.

Lines 6-8. For the restoration cf. #33.9; #34.6; and #35.6. Instead of [τὸν στρατεῖαν τὸν] it would be equally possible to restore [τὸς στρατεῶν τὸς]. The top bar of epsilon survives in line 8.

#24. Proxeny. ca 430-425 B.C. Honours for an unknown man (and his sons?) Pl. VII,1

BIBLIOGRAPHY. Wilhelm, Eranos (1893), p. 246; I.G., II², 38 (1913); Wilhelm, Att.Urk., IV (1939), pp. 23-24 #xxii; Weston, A.J.P. LXI (1940), pp. 347-349; 351-353; Meritt, Hesperia, X(1941), pp. 335-336; S.E.G., X(1949), 73; 99; Meiggs, C.R., LXIII (1949), pp.9-12; S.E.G., XII (1955), 31; Lambrechts, Proxeni edicta (1958), pp. 28,80.

F

PHOTOGRAPHS.. None so far published.

EM 2536, fragment of blue-white micaceous marble,, broken on all sides, but preserving the rough-picked back.

The provenance is unknown; it was seen and transcribed in the Museum of the Archaeological Society by Wilhelm, who published it in 1893. (loc.cit.). The foliation is vertical and parallel to the face.

H.max.. 0.111m. W.max.. 0.118m. Th.. 0.084m. Letter-height 0.009m. -0.011m.. Chequer 0.0150m.x0.0186m.

Letter-shapes. A3 and 4,, E4,, H1, 64, K2,, N7,, 01 and 2,, Π4, P6-8. Ionic script, by the same hand (though with minor variations) as that of #25 and I.G., I², 65 and 294. The first two are dated to 426/5 B.C., the last to 428/7 B.C. present decree should be set in the same general period.

ca 430-425 B.C.

Stoich. 32

[...⁶...]ουκρατι[.....¹⁹.....]
 [...⁵... ὁ]φείλεν Ἀθ[ηναίοις ὡς ἐὰν Ἀθηναί]-
 [ων τις ἀπ]οθάνηι, τ[ὴν δὲ τιμωρίαν ἔναι πε]-
 [ρὶ αὐτῷ κα]θάπερ ἐ[ὰν τις τινα Ἀθηναίων ἐ]-
 5 [ν τῇ ὑπερο]ρίαι β[ιαίῳ θανάτῳ ἀποκτε]-
 [ίνῃι ...⁶...]ονο[.....¹⁹.....]

COMMENTARY. This document can be restored either with twenty-eight letters (Wilhelm, loc.cit. and I.G., II², 38; expanded by Weston, loc.cit.), or with thirty-two letters (Wilhelm, [1939]). I have adapted Wilhelm's 1939 text, except for lines 1 and 2, where I disagree with his reading of the stone. Weston's version is as follows:

[Ἀθηναῖ]οι κρατ[ῶσιν¹².....]
 [...⁵... ὁ]φείλεν Ἀθ[ηναίοις· ἐὰν δέ τις]
 [αὐτῶν ἀπ]οθάνηι τ[ὴν τιμωρίαν εἶνα]-
 [ι αὐτῷ κα]θάπερ ἐ[ὰν τις Ἀθηναίων ἐ]-
 5 [ν τῇ ὑπερο]ρίαι β[ιαίῳ θανάτῳ ἀπ]-
 [οθάνηι· φεύγε]ν δ[ὲ τὴν πόλιν -----]

In line 1 the visible letters are as follows: the bottom of a circular letter, followed by a central

vertical; a rather shallow diagonal stroke juts out to the right from this, and another, more sharply-angled stroke runs up to the left. I believe these marks to be parts of the letter upsilon rather than of a mutilated iota: iota in this inscription tends to be set rather more to the left than is this stroke. Kappa, rho and alpha are clear, but of the following tau only the bottom of the vertical survives. After this Wilhelm reads omicron. Of this I can see no trace, but there is a vertical cut in the stone above and slightly to the left of the apex of alpha in line 2. If this is part of a letter (it is on line with the bottom of tau in the preceding stoichos), it must be part of a centrally-shafted letter such as iota. I suggest, therefore, that Wilhelm's restoration [ἐν τῶν πόλεων ὦν | Ἀθηναῖοι κρατοῦσιν] is incorrect. What we may have here is a part of a name, such as Euthykratides. This name, in the form Euthykartides, is found in Naxos (see Bechtel, Personennamen, p. 257). I suggest the following restoration:

[ἐὰν δέ τις ἐν τῶν πόλεων ὦν Ἀθηναῖοι κρατοῦσιν ἀποκτείνῃ | Εὐ]θυκρατί[δην, τὴν πόλιν πέντε τά|λαντα ὁ]φείλεν
 Ἀθ[ηναίοις κτλ.] . The phrase [τὴν πόλιν πέντε τά|λαντα ὁ]φείλεν Ἀθ[ηναίοις] is explained by Meiggs (loc.cit.): in Aristophanes' Peace (164-172) we have a passage in

which the Athenian Trygaïos is put in peril of death when the dung-beetle on which he is flying dives down in search of food; if he is killed, Trygaïos says, the Chians will have to pay a fine of five talents. Meiggs suggests that such a fine had recently been exacted from Chios for the murder of an Athenian citizen there. One would expect this phrase to be introduced by μέν, but, as Wilhelm points out, lines 3-5 cannot be restored with the thirty-five letter line that this would bring about.

Lines 3-6. The closest parallels are #13, lines 16-18 and #30, the latter now probably to be dated in 424/3 B.C.

Line 6. Wilhelm read ONO in this line, suggesting the restoration of a phrase such as [ἡ αἴτιος φ]όνο[ι] (cf. I.G., I², 115.26; or [γένηται]; cf. Demosthenes, XXIII, 37). Meritt (op.cit., p. 336) proposed [καὶ τὸ φ]όνο[ι] [καταδικασθῆναι, vel sim.]. Weston, working from squeezes, read here the tip of a delta rather than the omicron read by Wilhelm, and saw no signs of any letter before nu; she restored [φεύγε]ν δ[ὲ τὴν πόλιν]. She was misled, I think, by the position of iota in line 5 into thinking that what she saw here was at the centre of a stoichos. As I remarked above (on line 1), iota in this inscription is generally set well to the left in its stoichos. Both omicrons in this line should be dotted,

as Meritt points out: only their tops are visible.

Both the right hasta and the diagonal of nu are clear.

25. Proxeny? 426/5 B.C.? Honours for an unknown man and his sons, possibly Salaminians. Pl. VI,3

BIBLIOGRAPHY. Pittakys, E.A., 28(1842), p. 625 #1099; Rangabé, A.H., II(1855), pp.234, 237-238 #658; I.G., II, 31(1877); I.G., II², 71(1913); Weston, A.J.P., LXI (1940), pp. 347-353; Meritt, Hesperia, XIV (1945), p. 116 note 110, p. 118; S.E.G., X(1949), 73; Lambrechts, Proxenedecreten (1958), pp. 20, 28, 34, 70, 80, 139, 151.

PHOTOGRAPH. Meritt (op.cit.), p. 118..

Agora Inventory #I.5020, fragment of micaceous Pentelic marble, found in excavations on the island of Salamis and first published by Pittakys (loc.cit.). It was brought to Athens and subsequently lost: Koehler (I.G., II,31) reported that in 1877 he was unable to find it. It was rediscovered in the excavations of the Athenian Agora and published, in association with #24, by Weston (loc.cit.); its identification as the missing I.G., II², 71 was made by E. Schweigert and communicated by him to Miss Weston. The left side and rough-picked back

are preserved; the top also may be original: it apparently exhibits anathyrosis, being rough-picked except for a smooth-dressed band 0.030m. wide along its front and left edge. There are traces of a small moulding at the top of the face and left lateral, projecting 0.005m.; the oblique face of the moulding is set at a 45° angle to the fascia, which is 0.025m. high. Along the face it has mostly been chiselled away. There is a vertical uninscribed space 0.070m. high below this moulding, while the moulding as a whole is 0.040m. high. The stele is thicker at the bottom than at the top.

H.max. 0.280m. W.max. 0.220m. Th.max. 0.092m. (moulding; also at bottom); min. (at top below moulding) 0.088m. Letter-height 0.009m.-0.011m. Chequer 0.0150m.x 0.0178m.

Letter-shapes. A⁴, B³, E⁴, H¹, Θ⁴, K², M³⁻⁴, N⁷, O¹ and 2, Π³ and 4, P⁶⁻⁸, Σ⁹, Y⁶. Ionic script, not very well-cut, with a tendency to set horizontal strokes at a slight angle, sloping down to the left. Mu type 4 is not found before 425 B.C.; the example in this document seems to be a transitional form, between types 4 and 5. The decree is probably securely dated by its preamble

(see below); the hand is the same as that of #24 (which has almost the same letter-size and chequer-pattern as well); A.T.L., II, D 8 (426/5 B.C.) and I.G., I², 294 (438/7 B.C.) are also probably by this hand. Thus, apart from the evidence of the preamble, the letter-shapes should date this document in the 420's.

426/5 B.C.?

Stoich. 28

ἔδοξεν τῇ βολῇ[ι καὶ τῷ δήμῳ, Κεκ]-
 ροπὶς ἐπρυτάν[ευε, Πολέμαρχος? ἐγρ]-
 αμμάτευε, ὕγι[αίνων? ἐπεστάτε, Κλεώ]-
 [ν]υμος? εἶπεν· [.....18.....]
 5 [.]γ καὶ τὸς π[αῖδας14.....]
 [?.]ενον κα[ὶ19.....]
 [...5...]κ[.....22.....]
 [...4...]ι[.....23.....]

COMMENTARY. Miss Weston, republishing this stone after its discovery in the Agora excavations (loc.cit.), restored #24 with the same line-length and suggested that it be considered part of the same document: both inscriptions are by the same hand and have almost the same chequer-pattern and letter-size; treatment of the face is also similar. However, while #25 is

a creamy-white Pentellic marble, #24 is more blue-white in colour; moreover, it must, if Miss Weston is correct, be set below #25, which is clearly the top part of a stele; yet #24 is thinner than the latter even at its thinnest point. On epigraphical grounds, too, the association is unlikely: the present decree must be restored with a twenty-eight letter line; #24 is best restored with a thirty-two letter line.

Lines 1-4. A.T.L., II, D 8, which is by the same hand, was passed in the prytany of Kekropis on a motion of Kleonymos; in line 4 of the present decree the end of the orator's name survives in the letters YMOΣ. I have been unable to find any other person than Kleonymos who was active in the 420's and whose name has this termination and is of suitable length; thus, the restoration [Κλεώ|ν]υμος seems reasonably certain.

In A.T.L., II, D 8 the name of the secretary is Polemarchos; it would be possible to restore this name in line 2 of the present decree. If these restorations are correct the decree will be dated in 426/5 B.C.

The name of the epistates is probably Hygiainon; I know of no other name that conforms to the traces in line 3: upsilon and gamma are clear; the top only of the iota survives. The name appears in kalos-

inscriptions of the early fifth century (P.A. II,13898).

If the orator's name is Kleonymos he is well-known and was a member of the Boule in 426/5 B.C.; he was also orator of the second Methone decree of that year (A.T.L., II, D4). Some years earlier he may have been orator of #10, though I suspect that this is another man of the same name.

Lines 4-6. After εἶπε in line 4 there is a trace of a letter: it cannot be an epsilon (as it is restored by Weston), since it seems to be slightly diagonal and to be joined at its top by part of another stroke that slopes down towards the right. It is set too far left to be alpha, delta or lambda (as well as being too near to the perpendicular); it should therefore be read as probably nu, either the end of the word εἶπεν, or the initial letter of the honorand's name. Weston restored these lines [ἐπαινέσαι!0.....|.?.] καὶ τοὺς [παῖδας καὶ ἀναγράψαι πρόξεν]ον κ[αὶ εὐεργέτην Ἀθηναίων].

If we read εἶπεν here Weston's restoration is still possible, but with one letter less for the honorand's name; the ethnic will probably be a short one, such as [Χίον] . Alternatively, one might restore [.....ethnic.....] γ καὶ τοὺς π[αῖδας ἐπαινέσαι καὶ πρόξεν]ον κα[ὶ εὐεργέτην Ἀθηναίων γράψαι.] . In line 5 the top of

the right hasta of nu and the upper left corner of pi survive respectively at the left and right edges; in line 6 the right tip of the upper bar of epsilon and the apex of alpha survive. Both Weston's and my restorations suffer in that praise is offered to several persons, while, in the same sentence, privilege is granted to a single individual. The traces of letters surviving in lines 7 and 8, the left hasta and apparently the tip of the upper arm of kappa in line 7, and the shaft of a central vertical in line 8, suggest to me the following tentative restoration:

[ν]υρος εἶπεν· [¹⁸name and ethnic]-
 5 [.]ν καὶ τὸς π[αῖδας ...^{± 9}... καὶ ^{± 2}]-
 [.²]ενον κα[ι ^{± 6}... καὶ ^{± 6}... ἐπαι]-
 [νέσαι] κ[αὶ ἀναγράψαι αὐτὸς προξέν]-
 [ος κα]ι [εὐεργέτας Ἀθηναίων -----]

This allows space for a long ethnic in line 4.

The original provenance of this document creates a problem: if Pittakys' report that it was found in excavations on the island of Salamis is accurate, there seem to be two possible solutions to the

problem of how it got there.. Either it was originally erected on the island, or it was brought to the island at some later date for some unknown purpose: the latter seems unlikely. If it was originally set up on the island the possibility arises that it was not a proxeny at all, but an honorific for some native of the island: the status of the people of Salamis is not clear; the island was an Athenian possession after ca 570 B.C., but the possible establishment of a cleruchy there at the end of the sixth century (I.G., I², 1) suggests that not all the inhabitants were Athenian citizens. It was not part of any deme, as far as we know, and a study has yet to be made of the deme-affiliations of its Athenian inhabitants. If the present document is a proxeny, it seems clear that some, at least, of the inhabitants of the island were not Athenian citizens..

Proxeny-decrees were usually erected upon the Akropolis at Athens: that this document was found in Salamis suggests that it was a copy of the original stele and that its Athenian counterpart is yet to be found.

It is just possible, despite my arguments to the contrary (above), that this document is associated with #24 and that the latter is the Athenian copy of the decree..

#26. Proxeny. ca 430-415 B.C. Honours for Euphemos
and another man and their sons. Pl. VII,3

BIBLIOGRAPHY. Pittakys, E.A., 17(1839), p.289
#337; Rangabé, A.H., I(1842), p.359 #278; Pittakys,
E.A., 36(1853), pp. 1039-1040 #1953; I.G., I, 94
(1873); I.G., I, Supplement, p.21 #76b; p. 22 #94
(1877); Schubert, Proxenia (1881), p.82 note 1;
Dittmar, Coronis (1890), pp. 117-118 note 3; I.G.,
I², 149 (1924); Haggard, Secretaries (1930), p.20
#40; Wilhelm, Att.Urk., IV (1939), pp. 80-83 #xxxiv;
Raubitschek, Hesperia, XII (1943), p.27 note 57;
S.E.G., X(1949), 105; Meritt, Hesperia, XXI (1952),
pp.344-346; S.E.G., XII (1955), 29; Lambrechts,
Proxenedecreten (1958), pp. 48, 62-63, 70, 94-95,
102,117,150..

PHOTOGRAPHS. None so far published.

Three contiguous fragments of micaceous Pentelic marble,
now joined in plaster. Foliation is almost vertical
and at right-angles to the face. Fragments b and c
were joined by U. Koehler and published together by
Kirchhoff in 1877 (I.G., I, Supplement, p. 22 #94).

Fragment a was associated with b and c by Wilhelm and published with them by Hiller in 1924 (I.G., I², 149). M. F. McGregor and D.W. Bradeen joined fragment a to fragments b,c in 1968.

Fragment a, EM 6821, was found on the south slope of the Akropolis in excavation. It was first published from a transcript of U. Koehler by Kirchhoff in 1877 (I.G., I, Supplement, p. 21 #76b). It is broken on all sides, but the rough-picked back is preserved, with a small portion of a crowning moulding. It joins the top of fragment b.

H.max. 0.292m. W.max. 0.142m. Th.0.130m.

Fragments b and c bear the same inventory-number, EM 6822. Fragment b was found on November 2, 1836, in excavations to the south of the Propylaia on the Akropolis. It was first published by Pittakys in 1839; he gives the date of discovery erroneously here as March 2, 1840. It preserves the right edge and the rough-picked back. It joins the right side of fragment c.

H.max. 0.331m. W.max. 0.240m. Th. 0.137m.

Fragment c was found on the south slope of the Akropolis

in excavation and was published from U. Koehler's transcript by Kirchhoff in 1877 (I.G., I, Supplement, p. 22 #94). It is broken on all sides, but the rough-picked back is preserved.

H.max. 0.217m. W.max. 0.160m. Th. 0.137m.

Combined dimensions: H.max. 0.581m. W.max. 0.397m. Th.

0.130m. -0.137m. Letter-height, lines 1-2 0.013m.; lines 3ff. 0.012m. Chequer, lines 1-2 0.0185m.x 0.0220m.; lines 3ff. 0.0184m.x 0.0196m.

Letter-shapes. A4, B3, E4 and 5, H1, Θ3, K2, Λ5 (possibly 4-5), M2, N7, O2, Π1, P8, Σ8 and 9, Υ7, Φ4-5, X3. Attic script, very neatly cut, with some apparent inconsistency in the use of the daseia. Lambda type 5 is found before 425 B.C. only in two documents, in both of which it occurs with other forms of lambda (I.G., I², 367 of 431 B.C.; I.G., I², 310 of 428 B.C.). Epsilon type 5 is not found before 433/2 B.C., and is rare before 418 B.C. The hand is the same as that of several documents: I.G., I², 96, dated to 417/6 B.C.; I.G., I², 944 (S.E.G., X, 415), probably to be dated close to 432/1 B.C. (see Raubitschek, Hesperia, XII [1943], p. 27); #27, of uncertain date, but probably ca 430-420 B.C.; I.G., I² 852, also of uncertain date; and EM 6140 (published incorrectly by Loughran and Raubitschek, Hesperia, XVI [1947],

p. 81, as a part of #64); the date of this last fragment should also be in the period 430-420 B.C. Although both I.G., I², 852 and EM 6140 have the same letter-size and chequer as the present document, the direction of their foliation rules out their ascription to it. A date between 430 and 415 B.C. seems thus very likely for this decree.

ca 430-415 B.C..

Stoich.25

a [ἔδοχσεν τῷ βο]λῇ κ[αὶ τῷ δέμο]-
 [ι, .3.εἰς ἐπρυτ]άνευ[ε, ...[±].⁸....]
 [ἐπεστάτε, ...[±].⁴.]ς ἐγρα[μμάτευε, .]-
 [....⁸.... εἶπε· Ε]ὕφεμ[ον καὶ .3.]-
 5 [....⁹.... τὸς Π]αῖον[ας? καλέσα]-
 [ι τε ἐπὶ χσένια ἐ]ς τὸ πρ[υτανεῖο]-
 [ν καὶ ἐπαινέσαι ἡ]ότι ν[ῦν ἄνδρε]-
 [ς ἀγαθοὶ ἐσιν περ]ὶ Ἀθε[ναῖος κα]-
 [ὶ ἐν τῷ πρόσθεν χρόνοι· πρόσσοδ]-
 10 b,c [ον δὲ καὶ ἔναι αὐτοῖσι] π[ρὸ]ς τ[ῆ]μ[
 [βολέν· προσαγόντον] δὲ [οἱ] πρ[υτά]-
 [νες οἱ αἰε]ὶ ἄν [ῥοι]ν· ἡος ἄν μὲ ἀδ[ι]-
 [κῆται τ]ούτον μεδέες, οἱ στρατε-
 [γοὶ ἡο]ὶ ἄν ῥοιν [ἐ]κᾶστοτε καὶ ἡε

- 15 [βολὲ ἡ]ε βολεῦο[σ]α καὶ ἡοι πρυτᾶ-
 [νες ἐκὰ]στοτε ἐ[πι]μελέσθον αὐτ-
 [ὄν· τὸ δὲ φ]σέφισ[μα] τόδε ἀνα[γραφ]-
 [σάπο ἡο γρ]αμμα[τε]ῦς ἡο τ[ῆς βολῆ]-
 [ς ἐν στέλει] λιθ[ίν]ει κ[αὶ καταθέ]-
 20 [το ἐμ πόλει]· ἕνα[ι δ]ὲ [καὶ εὐεργεσ]-
 [ίαν καὶ προ]χσεν[ίαν αὐτοῖσι κα]-
 [ὶ τοῖς παισὶ]ν [αὐτῶν -----]

COMMENTARY. In lines 1 and 2, whose letters are taller than those of succeeding lines, there is a slight rightwards displacement of the last extant letter in each line. However, since the right margin is preserved further down and the restoration of lines 14-16 with a line of twenty-five letters is certain, this displacement must be regarded as purely local, not affecting the chequer-pattern further down the stele. The join between fragments a and b resolves some difficulties, but creates others. Previous editors correctly recognized that fragment a contained a preamble, but were misled by the name in line 4. The majority, starting with Kirchhoff, regarded this as the name of the orator. This led to difficulties in filling the preceding space: Kirchhoff suggested that an

archon-formula be included in lines 3-4, but Wilhelm and Hiller (I.G., I², 149) preferred merely to restore the name [E]ϣφϵ[μoς] without any indication of its function. Haggard (loc.cit.), "on the basis of a tentative restoration of lines 3 and 4 suggested by Professor West", thought that Euphemos might be the archon: this meant that twenty letter-spaces were required for the secretary's name. Raubitschek (1943) pointed out that the same mason had engraved both this decree and I.G., I², 96, dated to the archonship of Euphemos; he therefore regarded Haggard's restoration as proven. Wilhelm (loc.cit.) rejected Haggard's restoration of Euphemos as archon, reverting to the view that he was the orator; however, he accepted the rest of Haggard's restorations and urged that the secretary's name be restored with a demotic. Meritt (loc.cit.) rejected the view that a demotic would be used thus so early in the fifth century: the earliest proven use of it is in 407/6 B.C. (S.E.G., X, 136). He proposed that the epistates' name be restored in lines 2-3 and that an archon-formula follow the secretary-formula in lines 3-4; he suggested either Astyphilos or Epameinon (420/19 or 429/8 B.C.). All these suggestions, however, limit the space available in lines 4-6 for the names of the honorands and their ethnics:

[τ]οῦτον in line 13 makes it clear that two or more persons are being honoured, while Meritt's suggestion that a formula granting the proxeny and euergesia to a single honorand and his sons follow line 8 is no longer viable because the join between fragments a and b reduces the available space from five lines to one. Meritt had suggested that AION in line 5 probably concealed the end of a name or an ethnic (whereas Wilhelm had restored [κ]αὶ ὄν[ασον]); he restored [εἶπε· καλέσαι μὲν ...⁵...] αἶον [τὸν ...⁵...]³ ἐπὶ χσένια ἐ]ς τὸ πρόπτανεῖο|ν κτλ], thus improving upon Wilhelm's version, which contained no ethnic. I suggest that Euphemos is, in fact, the first honorand, and that the letters AION are part of some such ethnic as [Π]αίων[ας]: this allows space for a twelve-letter name; both honorands would be citizens of the same state. The archon-formula proposed by Meritt will disappear, while the formula granting priority of access to the Boule and Assembly, proposed by Wilhelm (loc.cit.) and adapted by Meritt, can be restored in shortened form after lines 8-9. The whole restoration from line 5 to line 9 involves, as Wilhelm pointed out, an unusually early appearance of the invitation-formula, but the

letters ΣΤΟΠΠ in line 6 render any other restoration unlikely. The restoration of the ethnic [Π]αίον[ας] in line 5 is one that I put forward with some hesitation; no other ethnic with the ending -αίονας has come to my attention. Paion was a city in the Thracian Chersonese (see [Skylax], 67; A.T.L., I, p. 563; the name is incorrectly restored in I.G., I², 928.37: see A.T.L., III, p. 109); it was presumably one of those cities of the Chersonese that were included under the rubric Χερσονησιῖται ἀπ' Ἀγορᾶς in the Tribute-Quota Lists (A.T.L., I, pp. 440-441, 563). It seems to be identical with the city of Paion whose ruler Lyppeios made an alliance with Athens in 356/5 B.C. (I.G., II², 127).

Lines 9-11. In line 10 the upper chisel-cut of a horizontal stroke is preserved; this could be pi or tau; previous editors have read tau. The next two letters have perished. In the following space there is the bottom stroke, slightly angled down to the right, of a rather flat sigma. This is followed by a central vertical; previous editors read this as iota, but tau is equally possible. In the next spaces nothing is visible on either the stone or the squeezes, but in my photograph there is what appears to be a rather small delta followed by a wide epsilon, both set far to the left. The horizontals

of the apparent epsilon can be made out on the squeeze, but they seem to continue on as scratches towards the left, and I prefer not to read any letters in these two spaces. Wilhelm (loc.cit.), followed by Meritt, placed the visible letters one stoichos too far to the left; earlier publications show them in their true position, reading T..ΣΙ.. (I.G., I, Supplement, p. 22 #94; I.G., I², 149). For parallels to my restorations cf. I.G., I², 71; 108; #2; for the dative ending -οι cf. I.G., I², 77 and #21. An alternative restoration is an abbreviation of those offered by Wilhelm and Meritt:

[πρόσοφον δὲ εἶναι αὐτοῖσι πρό]τ[α]β[ι] [με|θ' ἱερά];

I can find no parallel, however, for the omission of the phrase πρὸς τὰ βολέν or πρὸς τὸν δῆμον.

Lines 11-12. The pi is clear; following it there is a trace of the upper left corner of a letter, possibly rho. In line 12, on fragment c, there is a trace of a central vertical, followed by the bottom of alpha, including part of the bar. Previous editors printed part of a circular letter here. The outline of this is visible, but it is too far to the left to be a letter, I think (Hiller, I.G., I², 149, printed nothing at all in this line of fragment c). Following alpha there are two verticals, at the left and right edges of the stoichos,

0.008m. apart. This spacing suits nu, but is a little wide for the daseia. The first visible letter on fragment c is a vertical stroke, somewhat right of centre, followed by a badly-eroded stoichos in which the right side of a daseia can be read. Wilhelm restored

[προσαγόντων] δὲ [οἱ] π[ουρά]νες οἱ ἄν ἀει] ὅ[σι·
κα]ῖ ὅς [ἄ]ν μὲ [ἀδινῆται]; this formulation will have to be amended to fit the visible letter-traces. The letters alpha, delta at the end of line 12 are partly visible: the bar of alpha survives.

Lines 12-17. For the formulae cf. #7, #13, #37, #47 and #62; in none of these are the formulae quite so full.

In line 13 the right half only of the first omicron survives. The last letter of line 14 on fragment c seems to be nu rather than a daseia: the surface is badly damaged and only the left vertical is clear; however, the join of the diagonal and the vertical can be made out at the top left corner of the stoichos; previous editors read a daseia here, but restored

[ἐκὰ]στοτε in line 16 without the daseia: the new reading removes this inconsistency. The only letter in this line entirely missing from fragment b is epsilon; parts of KA, previously bracketed, are clear enough for certainty; tau, the seventh letter from the right,

survives almost entire, though the top bar is very faint.

Lines 17-20. In line 17 the last extant letter is alpha, but only the apex is visible. In line 18 the left half of the bar of tau survives; it cannot be any other letter. In line 19 only the top of the vertical of kappa survives..

Lines 20-22. In line 20 the first three letters are clear; in the next two stoichoi nothing is visible. After these come the two upper bars of epsilon, enough being preserved to rule out zeta. In line 21, under the sigma of line 21, there is a trace of a left vertical which I restore as a nu: the cut is so small that the presence or absence of a diagonal is impossible to certify. The restoration of Wilhelm (I.G., I², 149, expanded loc.cit. [1939], p. 83) must be amended slightly to conform with the letter-trace in line 22.

#27. Proxeny? ca 430-415 B.C. Honours for an unknown man and his sons.

Pl. VII,2

BIBLIOGRAPHY. Kirchhoff, Sitzungsb. Ak.Berlin (1887), p. 1066 #3; I.G., I, Supplement, p. 195 #116⁴ (1892); Wilhelm, Mélanges Nicole, II (1905), p. 601; I.G., I², 28 (1924); S.E.G., III (1929), 6; Roussel, Mélanges Glotz, II (1932), p. 817 note 1; R.E.A., XXXV (1933), pp. 385-386; Austin, Stoichedon (1938), p. 42; Pritchett, A.J.A., XLIII (1939), p. 535; Wilhelm, Att.Urk., IV (1939), pp. 17-23 #xx1; S.E.G., X (1949), 57.

PHOTOGRAPHS. None so far published.

EM 6851, fragment of slightly micaceous Pentelic marble, preserving the right edge and pick-dressed back. It was found in excavation of the Akropolis in June, 1887, when the so-called "Tholos", to the north-east of the Erechtheion, was dismantled. It was first published by Kirchhoff from a transcript of H.G. Lolling (loc.cit.).

H.max. 0.103m. W.max. 0.141m. Th.0.065m. Letter-height 0.011m. Chequer 0.0127m.x 0.0162m.

Letter-shapes. A4 and 5, E4, Θ3, M3, N7, 02, Π4, Σ9, X3.

Attic script, possibly employing the daseia. Pi type 4 is not found in dated inscriptions before 440 B.C. the script and spacing are very reminiscent of inscriptions of the 420's; the hand is close to that of I.G., I², 57 (A.T.L., II, D 3-6, inscribed in 424/3 B.C.), and is, I think, the same as that of I.G., I², 96 (417/6 B.C.). A date between 430 and 415 B.C. is thus likely.

ca 430-415 B.C.

Stoich.

5 [-----]ι[-----]
 [-----]τῆς μισθ[οφοῦρας? ---]
 [-----]αὐτοῖς τον[-----]
 [-----]ἐ]πειδὲ ἄχσι[ο-----]
 [-----]λόπ]ος ἄμ με ἀδι[κῆται ---]
 [-μέτε]χοι καὶ]δες αὐτῷ τέ[ν βολὲν -]
 [-----]καὶ τὸ]ς πρυ[τάνες -----]

COMMENTARY. Wilhelm (1939, p. 22) restored considerably more than I have, with a line-length of thirty-three letters. However, his restorations are marked by several question-marks, and the version of lines 5-7 offered by him, from which he established his line-length, is not

the only one available. The difficulty of restoring lines 2-5 leads me to think that perhaps a longer line-length should be sought, though I cannot offer a plausible restoration of these lines. There is some doubt about how many honorands are involved: line 3 suggests that several men may have been honoured; line 6 refers to one man and his sons; line 4 could refer to one or to several persons. Wilhelm's restorations are as follows:

Stoich.33

[----- ἐπιμέλεσθαι δὲ] τῆς μισθ-
 [οφορᾶς τῆς νῦν ἐφσεφισμένες? α]ὐτοῖς τὸν
 [ἄρχοντα Ἀθηναίων ἐν?, ἐ]πειδὲ ἄχσι-
 5 [οἱ εἰσι τῆς τῷ δέμῳ βοεθείας?] ὅς δ' ἄμ με ἀδι-
 [κῆται μέτε αὐτὸς μέτε ἡοι παῖ]δες αὐτῷ, τέ-
 [ν τε βολὲν ἐπιμέλεσθαι καὶ τὸς] π[ρυτάνες].

Lines 5-7 could also be restored as follows:

Stoich.36

5 [λόφῳ δ' ἄμ με ἀδι-
 [κῆται μέτε⁸ μέτε ἡοι παῖ]δες αὐτῷ, τέ-
 [ν βολὲν τὴν αἰεὶ βολεύσαν καὶ τὸς] πρυ[τάνες]
 [ἐπιμέλεσθαι κτλ.].

Even this could be expanded, by the insertion of [ἡυφ' ἐνός]

in line 6 and of [ἐπιμέλεσθαι] in line 7, to a line-length of forty-seven letters.

Line 1. The bottom of a central vertical survives above the first sigma of line 2.

Line 2. The right foot of alpha survives at the left edge.

Line 7. The tops of four letters survive: the first two are certain; rho and upsilon, however, must be dotted.

Hiller (I.G., I², 28) published this as fragment b of #7; the two documents are in no way related to one another (see my comments upon #7, above).

#28. Proxeny, ca 430-415 B.C. Honours for Potamodoros the Orchomenian, his son Eurytion and other persons. Pl.VI,4,5,6

BIBLIOGRAPHY. Koehler, Hermes, XXXI (1896), pp. 136-141 #1; Busolt, Gr.Gesch., III.1(1897), p. 1140; Wilhelm, Urk.Dram.(1906), p.29; Bannier, B.Ph.W. (1918), pp. 450-451 note 3; I.G., I², 70 (1924); Wilhelm, Att.Urk., III (1925), p. 42; S.E.G., III (1929), 13; Haggard, Secretaries (1930), p. 15 #27; Kahrstedt, Magistratur (1935), pp. 91, 192 note 1; Raubitschek, R.-E., XIX.2(1938), p. 1591: 12-44; Wilhelm, Att.Urk., IV(1939), pp. 52-72 #xxxi; Meritt, Hesperia, X(1941), pp. 320-326; Robert, R.E.G., LVII (1944), p. 186 #45; Loughran and Raubitschek, Hesperia, XVI (1947), p. 81; Meritt, A.J.P., LXIX (1948), p. 72; S.E.G., X(1949), 84; Lambrechts, Proxeni edicta (1958), pp. 85, 94, 101, 123; Pečírka, Thomson Studies (1963), p. 198 note 56; Pritchett, B.C.H., LXXXVIII (1964), p. 481 note 5; A.J.P., LXXXV (1964), pp. 40-50; Pečírka, Enktesis (1966), pp. 1-8.

PHOTOGRAPHS. Wilhelm (1939), pls.VI, VII, VIII.

Three non-joining fragments of slightly micaceous Pentellic

marble, first published together by Wilhelm (1939); he had previously announced their association in 1906. Foliation is vertical and parallel to the face.

Fragment a, EM 5186, and fragment b, EM 8184, were both found on the Akropolis and first published by Koehler (loc.cit.). Their exact provenance is not known.

Fragment a preserves part of the rough-picked back; otherwise, it is broken on all sides.

Fragment b preserves the left edge and back. Fragment c, EM 254, appears to have been found on the Akropolis: it was seen in June, 1903, by Wilhelm in the storeroom "in the Pelargikon", when he identified it as part of the same stele as fragments a and b (loc.cit., [1906]). The back and right edge are preserved. It was first published by Wilhelm in 1939.

<u>Dimensions.</u>	H.max.	W.max.	Th.max.
Fragment <u>a</u>	0.291m.	0.163m.	0.115m.
Fragment <u>b</u>	0.328m.	0.238m.	0.116m.
Fragment <u>c</u>	0.418m.	0.168m.	0.113m.

Letter-height, all three fragments 0.009m. Chequer,

fragment a 0.01030m.x 0.01080m.; fragment b 0.01030m.-
0.01050m.x 0.01070m.-0.01080m.; fragment c 0.01033m.-
0.01075m.x 0.0110m.

Letter-shapes. A3 and 4, B3, E4 and 5, H1, Θ4, K2, Λ2
and 4, M2, N7 and 9, Π1-2 and 1, P8 and 9, Σ7, Υ7, Φ4,
X3. Attic script with irregular use of the daseia. The
neatness of the hand suggests a date in the 420's, though
the lettering is inconclusive as a guide to dating.
Epsilon type 5 is not found before 433/2 B.C., and is
rare before 418 B.C. I believe that A.T.L., II, List 27
(428/7 B.C.) is by the same hand. I.G., I², 168 (undated)
is also by this hand. A.T.L., II, List 28 (427/6 B.C.)
is very close; so are I.G., I², 167 (undated) and perhaps
I.G., I², 90 and #64 (both ca 420-415 B.C.). A.T.L.,
II, List 34 (421/0 B.C.) may be by the same hand (mu and
nu are slightly different). Perhaps all these documents,
with the present decree, are products of the same workshop,
engraved over a period of about a decade in the 420's or
early 410's.

ca 430-415 B.C.

Stoich. 42

- a [.....¹⁸.....]ε[.....²³.....]
 [.....¹⁴.....]μ[.]δ[.]α[.....²³.....]
 [.....¹⁸.....]φ[.....²³.....]
 [.....¹⁵.....]ε[.....²⁶.....]
 5 [.....¹⁴.....]ν[.....²⁷.....]
 [.....¹⁰.....]αφῆ[.³.]ιε[ι]κ[.....²².....]
 [.....⁹.....]αντε[.]ς[.²]να[.....²³.....]
 [.....⁹.....]ἐπειδᾶν δὲ [.....²⁴.....]
 [.....⁸.....]ν προσα[γ]όντο[ν αὐτὸν ἦοι στρατηγοὶ καὶ]
 10 [ἦοι πρυτάνεις πρὸς τὸν βολ[ὲν καὶ τὸν δῆμον εὐρέσθαι]
 [ἥότι ἂν δ]ύνεται ἀγαθὸν ἀν[τι ἡὸν ἔστιν ἀνὴρ ἀγαθὸς π]-
 [εὐρὶ Ἀθῆνα]ίος· τὸν δὲ στέλε[ν²⁰.....]
 [.....⁸.....]σθαί Ποταμοδορ[ο²⁰.....]
 [.³. τοῖς σ]τρατηγοῖς. ὧς Ἀρχ[έστρατος εἶπε· τὰ μὲν ἄλλα]
 15 [καθάπερ τῷ]βολῇ· ἔναι δὲ [Ποταμοδόροι καὶ τῷ]κυεῖ
 [Εὐρυτίονι κ]αὶ ἀτέλεια[ν] ἡ[όσονπερ καὶ τοῖς ἄλλοις ε]-
 [υεργέταις·]προσαγόν[τον] δ[ὲ Ποταμόδορον καὶ τὸν]κυι]-
 [ὸν Εὐρυτίο]να ἥόταν [ἐπ]ιδε[μῶσιν Ἀθένεσιν ἦοι αἰεὶ σ]-
 [τρατηγοὶ κ]αὶ ἦοι πρ[υ]τάν[εις ἦοι αἰεὶ ὄντες πρὸς τὸν β]-
 20 [ολὲν καὶ τὸν δῆ]μον· ἐ[ὰν δὲ τὸ δέονται, ἔναι αὐτοῖς εὐρ]-
 [έσθαι ἀγαθὸν ἥότι] ἂ[ν δύνονται -----]

lacunab [.³.]α[.....³⁸.....]

[Πο]ταμοδ[ορο.....²⁸..... Εύρυ]-
 τίονα δὲ ἐ[πειδὴν ἡέκει? προσαγαγόντον ἡοι πρυτάνε]-
 25 ς καὶ ἡοι στρατ[εγοὶ πρὸς τὲμ βολὲν καὶ τὸν δῆμον ἐπά]-
 ναγκες εὐρέσθαι[ι ἡό, τι ἂν δύνηται ἀγαθόν. ὕ ἔδοχσεν τ]-
 ῖι βολῇ καὶ τῷ δῆμ[οι, Ἀκαμαντὶς ἐπρυτάνευε, Φαίνι]-
b,c ππος ἐγγραμμάτευε, Ἀγα[...⁷... ἐπεστάτε, ἡ]ερμόδορο-
 ς εἶπε· ἐπαινέσαι Ποταμ[όδορον τὸν ἡερχο]μένιον καὶ
 30 τὸν ἡυόν Εὐρυτίονα ἡότι [ἐστὸν ἄνδρε ἀγ]αθὸ περὶ Ἀθε-
 ναίος καὶ νῦν καὶ ἐν τῷ πρ[όσθεν χρ]όνοι, καὶ δῶναι Πο-
 ταμοδόροι πεντακοσίας δρ[αχμὰς] τὸς κολακρέτας τὸ-
 ς ἐπὶ τῆς Ἀκαμαντίδος ἐν τ[ῇ αὐτῇ] ἡμέραι· ἡοι δὲ πρυ-
 τάνες ἐπιμελεθέντον ἡό[πος ἂν αὐτ]ῷ δῶσιν ἡοι κολα-
 35 κρέται· ταῦτα μὲν τὲμ βο[λὲν ψεφίσ]ασθαι· ἐὰν δὲ το δέ-
 εται Ποταμόδορος ἡέ[ος ἂν ζῇ ἔ Εὐρυτ]ίον ἡο ἡυὸς αὐτ-
 ῶ, πρόσοδον αὐτῷ ἐν[αι πρὸς τὲμ βολὲν] καὶ τὸν δῆμον· ἡ-
 οι δὲ στρατεγοὶ κα[ὶ ἡοι πρυτάνες ἐπ]άναγκες προσαγ-
 όντον· ἐὰν δὲ τινα[ς αἰτιᾶται ἔ Ποταμ]όδορος ἔ Εὐρυτί-
 40 ον Ἀθηναίον τῷ [χρέος? τῷ ἐν τῷ πρόσθε]ν χρόνοι ἐγγ[ε]γ-
 [υ]εμένο μὲ ἔχεν [ἀποδῶναι αὐτοῖς, τὰ ὄν]όματα αὐτῶν ἀπ-
 ογραψάντον [πρὸς τὸς στρατεγός· ἡοι] δὲ στρατεγοὶ ἐ-
 κπράττοντε[ς ἀποδιδόντον τρόποι ἡο]ποῖοι ἂν ἐπίστ-
 [ο]νται ἡόπο[ς ἂν τὸ χρέος λυθῇ? ἡε δὲ βο]λέ, ἐὰν το δέ[οντ]-
 45 [α]ι αὐτοκ[ράτορ ἔστο τὸ δέον ψεφίζεσ]θαι. ὕ Ἀρχέστρα-
 [τ]ος εἶπ[ε· τὰ μὲν ἄλλα καθάπερ τῇ βολῇ·] Εὐρυτίονι δὲ

[κ]αὶ Πο[...¹¹... καὶ ...¹¹... κ]αὶ Πυθείλλει [.]-
 [.²]να[.....²⁶.....ί]ας δραχμὰς ἐκ-
 [ά]στ[οι²⁴..... ἐν τ]ῇ καύριον ἐ-
 50 [μ]έ[ραι²⁷.....] τῇ βολῇ· [.²]-
 [.....³².....] νόπος ἄν α[.²]
 [.....³².....]αι ἐς τὲν [.²]
 [.....³⁴.....]ρο νότα[ν .]-

COMMENTARY. There are some points of difference between fragments a and b,c; the latter surely belong together, probably at about the same level on the stele, but fragment a has larger omicron and theta and slightly different mu, nu and rho; its back is much rougher than those of fragments b, c, which are smooth-dressed; its thickness, however, is slightly less than that of fragment b and slightly more than that of fragment c; since it preserves neither edge it should belong in the centre of the stele, a point borne out by its thickness: the stele was not cut with complete regularity but was thicker on the left, thinner on the right, with a flat back. On both fragments b and c the horizontal chequer is smaller at the top than at the bottom, but the margins remain constant; the horizontal chequer of fragment a is closer to that at the top of fragments b,c. Its position

therefore should be near to and above b and c; since the spread of the horizontal chequer and the constancy of the margins indicate that the stele tapered from bottom to top, fragment a cannot be set far away from fragments b, c. The difference in the treatment of the back of this fragment must be regarded as the result of damage after the stele was broken up.

The stele contained, therefore, at least two decrees (lines 1-14; 26-45) and two riders (lines 14-26; 45-53). Its length and width are unusual, but resemble those of certain other decrees of the 420's: I.G., I², 68/9; 71; 57; 58; 60 (though the full width of this last cannot be estimated accurately). All these documents deal with Athenian foreign policy or its consequences: the present document is the only proxeny-decree in the series; even this description of it can only be inferred (by reference in #55 to Eurytion and Potamodoros as proxenoi and euergetai in the early 400's or late 410's).

Line-length is established by the restoration of lines 14-15, 31-34 and 45-46; other formulae conform without much manipulation. However, like the other lengthy

documents I have referred to above, this series of decrees and riders contains many provisions that are unusual or unique, perhaps the result of ad hoc arrangements to meet an unexpected situation. That such was the case is perhaps indicated by the amount of repetition involved..

Lines 1-7. The top of this fragment is badly mutilated: traces of several possible letters can be made out, but these are so faint that I have included in my text only those about which I feel reasonably certain: of epsilon in line 1 only the bottom left corner survives, but enough of the horizontal remains to make a beta unlikely.. In line 2 mu, delta and alpha are reasonably well-preserved; in addition, before mu there is an apparent central vertical, perhaps iota. Following mu are faint traces of what may be an epsilon, but damage to the surface is so great here that no certainty is possible. After delta I thought I detected parts of a rho, again without much confidence.

In line 3 the only letter to be read with any certainty is the round letter I have designated as a dotted omicron.. To the left of it there is an apparent right vertical, perhaps part of nu or the daseia. Under the first dubious letter in line 2 (iota?) there is a single diagonal

stroke; if this is part of a letter its position and angle suggest a mu.

In line 4 the lower half of an epsilon is reasonably clear; to its right there is perhaps the top of a left vertical, followed by an apparent sigma. In the next stoichos there are two possible letter-cuts: the top of a left hasta and the bottom of a right hasta. At the left-hand edge of the stone there are two possible letters: closest to the edge is the bottom left corner of what may be epsilon, four stoichoi to the left of the epsilon I have shown in my text; the bar is perhaps too long for a letter-stroke. In the next stoichos to the right of this there seems to be the top of a left vertical.

Line 5. This corresponds to line 1 of S.E.G., X, 84 (the composite text of Wilhelm [1939] and Meritt [1941]). Wilhelm saw a vertical stroke in what would be stoichos 11, to judge by his transcript. I was unable to see any trace of a letter-stroke at this point, but saw most of a nu in the third stoichos to the right (stoichos 15). What comes next could be a phi: there is a very faint, rather small circle, transfixing by a central vertical; but there is also a diagonal right foot in the same stoichos. To the right of this is an apparent

central vertical. To the right again there is a triangular apex; in the same stoichos there is another triangular apex: these could be the top of a mu, but the angles of all these strokes suggest alphas rather than the peaks of a mu. Neither, however, is set centrally in the stoichos. I am unable to suggest any restoration that takes account of these possible letter-traces.

Line 6. Previous editors read α : all have interpreted this as α followed by a left hasta. However, the apparent iota may well be a phi: there is a circular depression corresponding to the lower half of the oval of phi; it is, however, very faint, not as deeply-cut, if it is a cut, as the vertical. The next letter is represented by the lower half of a left vertical: I believe that there is a faint trace of a central horizontal as well, and I could detect no sign of any bottom bar, though the surface at the bottom of the stoichos seems to be original. In the fourth stoichos to the right of this there seems to be the bottom of a left vertical. In the next stoichos Wilhelm saw the lower left corner of an epsilon; in fact, the whole letter is visible. One stoichos to the right of this there are traces of two joining diagonals, either the arms of a kappa or part

of a chi.

In line 7 S.E.G., X, 84 misprints the first letter as an epsilon: Wilhelm's reading of alpha is the correct one. After the fourth letter, epsilon, there is possibly part of a central vertical, followed by a clear sigma. After sigma there is perhaps the upper part of a left vertical, followed by another left vertical in the next stoichos but one. Wilhelm and Meritt do not indicate where this stroke is to be placed, but S.E.G., X, 84 prints it as a dotted iota; this cannot be right. In the same stoichos there also seems to be part of a right vertical; I read γ , but η is equally possible. To the right of this there is a confused mass of letter-strokes: at first sight this may conceal a kappa, but the upper diagonal seems to be too low and is joined part-way down by a horizontal (μ). I conclude that the vertical is a chance stroke, while the other two marks are probably the left diagonal and bar of an alpha. The stoichos to the right of this contains a faint triangular apex, perhaps part of a delta.

Line 8. $\epsilon\pi\epsilon\iota\delta[\alpha]v \eta\epsilon[\mu\epsilon\iota ?]$ Wilhelm; $\epsilon\pi\epsilon\iota\delta\alpha v \eta\epsilon[---]$

Meritt. The alpha is only partially-preserved, with no trace of a cross-bar, and so should be dotted. Of the

daseia I can see no trace, but I believe that a very faint delta exists at this point: so faint is it that it must be dotted, especially since both Wilhelm and Meritt thought they saw a daseia here. The lower bar only of the next letter is visible, but there cannot be much doubt that it is an epsilon. In the next stoichos but one to the right there is a faint diagonal stroke, possibly the top bar of a sigma.

Line 9. Of the first letter only an upper right vertical survives; S.E.G., X, 84 prints this incorrectly as a dotted iota. At the right edge the bottoms of tau and omicron survive. The formula in lines 9-12 is a variant of that found in #49, line 1 (cf. I.G., I², 39.12; 45.36; #44.22). In lines 10-12 in each case one more letter can be read than was admitted by Wilhelm: the upper part of the vertical of lambda (10), the lower part of the vertical of nu (11), and the bottom left corner of epsilon (12).

Line 12. Before Wilhelm had shown that fragment a belonged above fragment b, Köehler (op.cit., p. 137) suggested that the phrase τῶν δὲ στέλε[ν] introduced instructions for the erection of the stele wherever Potamodoros wished it to be set up. This was amplified by Hiller (I.G., I², 70). The restorations they offered no longer stand, because of the new arrangement of the

stones; however, I believe that Koehler's suggestion was basically correct; though I have not been able to reconcile the extant letters in lines 12-13 with any known formula. In line 13, before the beginning of the name Potamodoros, Koehler read $\sigma \dots$. Hiller restored $[\acute{\alpha}\rho\acute{\epsilon}]\sigma[\chi\epsilon]$ here. Unfortunately, the letters that can be read here do not conform with Hiller's restoration: the first letter is certainly a sigma (though Wilhelm and Meritt both print two parallel strokes, interpreted in S.E.G., X, 84 as the top bars of an epsilon). Following this there is a faint trace of a circular letter, followed by the top of a triangular letter: I detect no signs of Hiller's epsilon. The top half of iota is plainly visible. I suggest that the end of a verb in the infinitive, perhaps $[\sigma\upsilon\nu\epsilon\pi\iota\mu\acute{\epsilon}\lambda\epsilon]\sigma\theta\alpha$, should be read here. Lines 12-14 would then contain instructions for the erection of the stele and for Potamodoros to consult with the generals about the site. Instructions for the engraving of the stele would have been contained in the upper part of the stele, now lost.

Lines 14-20. For the orator Arcestratos see below on line 45. In line 15 the upper part of beta and the faint outline of omicron can be read. In line 16 the right side of alpha and the top of iota are visible at the left

edge; at the right edge the tops of iota and alpha survive. Of the last letter, read by Wilhelm as a dotted daseia, only the middle of the left upright and part of the central horizontal survive. In line 17 initial pi survives only in its right vertical, but rho, omicron and sigma are clear enough (not read by Wilhelm or Meritt). Almost all the final delta is preserved. In line 18 more is visible than previous editors print: initial nu, alpha and final epsilon, the latter preserving only the upper left corner. Iota before delta should be dotted since only its bottom is preserved. Similarly, in line 19, the apex of initial alpha and the bottom of iota survive. Tau and alpha at the right edge should be dotted: the right tip of the bar of tau and the apex only of alpha survive. For lines 15-17 Koehler restored ἔναι δ[ὲ Ἀθένε]σιν Π[οταμοδόροι καὶ τοῖς κνεῖ αὐτῷ ἀ]τέλε[ιαν -----]; Wilhelm restored ἔναι δὲ [Ποταμοδόροι καὶ ἔγκτεσι]ν Ἀθένεσιν καὶ ἀτέλε[ιαν] ἕως εὐεργέται γενομένοι Ἀθηναίων. Meritt amended the latter part of this: ἡ[ὅσον περ καὶ τοῖς ἄλλοις εὐεργέταις]; this was printed, with a question-mark, in S.E.G., X, 84. Pečírka (Enktesis [1966] , pp. 3-7) questioned Wilhelm's restoration: enktesis without γῆς is unparalleled; Meritt had inserted [γῆς] in line 15 instead of Wilhelm's [καί] , but Pečírka points

out that there are no instances of enktesis with γῆς alone. He reverts, therefore, to Koehler's restoration, which I have used in my text. It seems to me doubtful, in any case, whether enktesis would have been given as a matter of course to all euergetai, as Meritt's version seems to imply. Wilhelm restored line 18: --- ἡόταν [του] δ[έονταῖ παρὰ Ἀθηναίων κτλ.]. The presence of a probable iota before delta makes Meritt's version, which I have adopted, the more desirable one. Wilhelm's restoration of lines 20-21 [δὲ]μο[ν πρότος μετὰ τὰ ἡιερά] is superseded by that of Meritt, which I have adopted. Only the apex of alpha is visible in line 21.

The lacuna between fragment a and fragments b, c cannot be large: the sense of the opening clause of the latter seems to be that the general aid-clauses of lines 17-21 are particularized by reference to the honorands' arrival in Athens, an event perhaps foreshadowed in lines 8-12. Wilhelm and Meritt both felt that Eurytion alone was the object of the clause in lines 23-26. This would perhaps account for the apparent repetitions in lines 8-12 and 17-21.

Above the name in line 23 there is a trace of one letter, the left and right feet of alpha or gamma..

On fragments b and c the letters close to the margins are

badly worn and abraded but, in many cases, can be read with the aid of charcoal and water. At the broken edges of these fragments traces of letters survive unremarked by previous editors. I shall list only those letters that I have dotted in my text, though this text is considerably fuller than those of my predecessors.

Line 32, fragment b, end.. Part of the left vertical of rho survives here..

Line 41, fragment b, end. The tip of the left hasta of nu survives on the break.

Line 42, fragment c, end. The upper left corner of epsilon can be seen.

Line 43, fragment b, end; fragment c, end.. The upper left corner of epsilon and the left tip of tau survive..

Line 44, fragment b, end.. The upper left curve of omicron is visible..

Line 45, fragment c, end.. Parts of both diagonals of alpha survive..

Line 50.. The upper left corner of epsilon is visible at the bottom of fragment b.

Line 53.. At the bottom of fragment c Wilhelm read $\rho\alpha$ $\eta\acute{o}[\tau]\alpha[v]$. Meritt read $[..]\rho\alpha \eta\alpha [h]\upsilon[\acute{o}\varsigma]$. I can see no trace of Wilhelm's letter-stroke before rho, but all the

other letters printed by him are clear, except the alpha: this should be dotted since only the upper part of its left diagonal survives; it is at too sharp an angle, besides being in the centre of the stoichos, for the arm of an upsilon. Before it the top bar of a letter can be seen, possibly with part of a central vertical cutting it.

These fragments contain the end of Archestratos' amendment to the first decree, followed by a second decree to which one and possibly two riders are appended. My text follows closely Meritt's adjustment of that put forward by Wilhelm; in several cases the extra letters I have been able to read confirm Meritt's suggestions. Lines 26-29. The prytany of Akamantis must be restored here: this tribe is proven to be in prytany by the reference to it in line 33. The name of the secretary has been restored as Phainippos (see Koehler, op.cit., p. 138): there are, of course, many other nine-letter names ending -ππος, but I do not know of anyone else bearing a name with this ending and of the right length who was prominent in the period 430-415 B.C.. Phainippos (P.A., II, 13979) was secretary to the Boule in 424/3 B.C., when I.G., I², 57 was inscribed and when the tribe

Akamantis was in prytany (see Thucydides, IV, 118.11-14, quoting the text of the Truce between Athens and Sparta); it was the eighth prytany of the year (I.G., I², 324.9-12). The defeat at Delion had taken place at the beginning of winter 424/3 B.C. (Thucydides, IV, 89-102); it seems probable that Potamodoros, Eurytion and the other persons honoured (see lines 46-48) were exiled from Boiôtia after this defeat. Thucydides mentions several exiles from Boiotia who had urged that Athens turn her attention to Boiotia; their leader was a certain Ptoiodoros from Thebes, whose name is remarkably similar to that of the senior honorand of this decree (Thucydides, IV, 76); is it possible that the text of Thucydides, as we have it, contains a faulty reading? After Delion these exiles would have seen all their hopes of return to their homes destroyed; their patrons at Athens would have had to take measures for their protection and assistance; such measures might well have taken the form of ad hoc arrangements of the sort found in this series of decrees and amendments. If the secretary's name was Phainippos, P.A., II, 13979 is not the only candidate: another man of this name was hellenotamias in 407/6 B.C. (I.G., I², 304.68), but the earlier date seems more

likely in the light of both suggested context and letter-forms..

Line 28. The name of the epistates could be, for instance, Agathandros; a man of this name is listed on a casualty-stele dated ca 409 B.C. (I.G., I², 964.66 = S.E.G., XXI, 131). There are other possibilities. The orator Hermodoros is not otherwise known; he may be the man of that name listed as a casualty ca 412/1 B.C. (I.G. I², 952.19).

Line 32. Gifts of money are not common in fifth-century honorific decrees; the only other examples known to me are #64, of approximately the same date as the present decree, and I.G., II², 1, dated in 405/4 B.C.; in the latter case the money is to be used for the making of a crown. If Potamodoros was leader of the exiles from Orchomenos in Athens such a gift of money, for the support of himself and his followers after the collapse of their expectations at Delion, would be a natural result of Athenian concern..

Line 33..ἐν τ[ῇδε τῇ] ἐμέραι Wilhelm; ἐν τ[ῇ αὐτῇ] ἐμέραι Meritt. Both restorations involve omission of the daseia; however, though the daseia is employed most of the time in this document, its use is not the rule (cf. line 26, for example).. Meritt argues that Wilhelm's

restoration is unnecessarily restrictive: if the payment was to be made on the very same day that the decree was passed why was it necessary to specify that the kolakretai of Akamantis should make the payment? Meritt's restoration, which I believe to be correct, implies that "at the time when the Council was deliberating this provision as a part of its probouleuma the actual date upon which the provision was to be ratified by the Demos lay somewhere in the future; and the phrase ἐν τ[ῇ αὐτῇ] ἡμέρᾳ as used in connection with the grant of money means that the grant was to be made on the same day that the vote of praise was ratified by the Demos" (p. 325).

Line 35. Meritt argues that "the phrase ταῦτα μὲν τῶν βουλευσάμενων ἀποφασίσθαι is not a historical record which indicates that the preceding provisions were a decree of the Council and that those which follow were not. The use of the infinitive here implies that a motion was being made that the Council should pass the provisions just outlined" (p. 324). Hence, the provisions of lines 24-26 "were originally put forward by someone whose name is no longer preserved to us", and taken over by Hermodoros, whose own additions then followed (lines 29-40). I think that this argument is likely to be correct.

Line 36. If this restoration by Meritt is right, the implication is that Potamodoros was already well advanced in years; possibly Eurytion was, by now, factually the head of the house (as line 47 implies, if Eurytion here is named before Potamodoros). Wilhelm's restoration ἡ Ε[ὐρυτίον] [ἔ] Εὐρυτ[ίον] ἡο ἡυὸς αὐ[τ]ῷ implies not only a mason's error but also use of Ionic eta, for which there is no precedent in this inscription. Lines 39-42. While this restoration may not be absolutely correct, I believe it to convey the sense intended by the decree. Meritt and Wilhelm both suggested that the word at the end of line 40 was ἐγ[γεγ]υε]μένο; this is now confirmed and adds weight to the remainder of their suggestions. Wilhelm's restoration in line 41 ἔχε[ν πρόνοιαν αὐτοῖς?] is, I believe, less likely to be correct than one based on Meritt's suggestion that some form of the verb ἀποδίδωμι is to be repeated. Line 45. The name Arcestratos is a common one in the fifth century; Kirchner (P.A., I, 2411) suggested that the orator of I.G., I², 39, the general of 433/2 B.C., and the man whose laws regarding the Areiopagos were abolished by the Thirty (Aristotle, Αθ.Πολ., 35.2), were one and the same man as the Arcestratos who moved the riders in the present document. I think it very possible that this may be correct, though, if I.G., I²,

39 is correctly dated to 446/5 B.C., I am not sure that this Archestratos should be considered the same as the orator of the present document whose date is the 420's or later. Another Archestratos was a tamias in 429/8 B.C. (I.G., I², 237.54). The name recurs in the last years of the fifth century: P.A., I, 2430 was general in 407/6 B.C.; another man of this name (P.A., I, 2402) was a member of the Boule in 405/4 B.C. Perhaps we should posit three men of this name active respectively in the 440's, in the 430's and 420's, and in the 400's; the orator of #28 would be the second of these, probably general in 433/2 B.C., perhaps tamias in 429/8 B.C., and possibly author of the decree about the Areiopagos. He might also be the father of that Chaireas who was general in 411 B.C. (see Diodoros, XIII, 50.7).

Lines 46-50. The rider is concerned with further monetary payments: Wilhelm restores Εὐρυτίονι δ[ἐ]καῖ Πο[ταμοδόροι τοῖς ἑρχομενίοις καὶ Πυθίλλει [δ]οῦνα[ι τὸς κολακρέτας ἑκαῶστοι χιλί?]ας δραχμᾶ[ς ..|.].ετ[-----
 -26----- ἐν τ]ῇ καύριο[ν ἡ|μέραι].

Meritt improved on this, removing Wilhelm's supposed mason's error in line 48: Εὐρυτίονι δ[ἐ]καῖ Πο[ταμοδόροι τοῖς ἑρχομενίοις καὶ Πυθίλλει [δ]οῦνα[ι τὸς κολακρέτας ἐκ δημοσίου χιλί?]ας δραχμᾶς [ἐκ|ά]στοι -----²⁴
 -- ἐν τ]ῇ καύριο[ν ἐ|μέραι].

This still leaves the awkward ionicism [δοῦ]ν[αι].

Raubitschek (S.E.G., X, 84, note) suggested what seems to be an improvement in lines 47-50: [ἐ]π[ά]να[γκες
δοῦναι ἐκ δημοσίου πεντακοσί]ας δραχμᾶς [ἐκ]ά[στ]οι τὸς
κολακρέτας ἐν τῇ αὐτῇ ἔ ἐν τ]ῇ χαύριο[ν ἐ]μέραι].

This removes the ionicism and brings the sum of money granted into agreement with the earlier grant of line 32. Wilhelm suggested the possibility that in line 47, instead of the ethnic, there might be another name, and that it would be possible to restore a different name from Potamodoros here: he cited, for instance, the name Potamon. I believe this to be correct: Potamodoros has already received a grant; now his son Eurytion and other persons are to be given assistance. This would explain why Eurytion is named first. One might restore as follows: Εὐρυτίονι δὲ|[κ]αὶ Πο[.....^{± 11}..... καὶ^{± 11}.....
κ]αὶ Πυθίλλει [κ]αὶ] Να[.² τοῖς ἑρχομενίοις δοῦναι
χιλί]ας δραχμᾶς ἐκ|[ά]στ[οι τὸς κολακρέτας ἐν τῇ
αὐτῇ ἔ ἐν τ]ῇ χαύριο[ν ἐ]μέραι].

Substitution of [τοῖς Ποταμοδόρο] for [τοῖς ἑρχομενίοις] would allow two more letters for the last name. I suspect that, whatever restoration is adopted, any that place the

ethnic or even a patronymic in line 47, without a corresponding ethnic or patronymic after Pythilles' name, will be incorrect. Perhaps the best restoration would involve four recipients in lines 46-47, with Raubitschek's restoration of lines 47-50. If the ethnic is restored its spelling is a problem: in #55 it is spelt Ερχουέντος, but since this last is an Ionic decree it is not a reliable guide to spelling; in inscriptions and on coins from Boiotia it seems always to be spelt without a daseia; however, in line 29 of the present document the daseia seems unavoidable. Probably the spelling of the ethnic in line 29 should be taken as model for its restoration elsewhere in this inscription, despite the secretary's inconsistent use of the daseia.

Line 50. Meritt has argued against a further rider here: one would expect such a rider to refer to the previous orator rather than to the Boule's decision. I think this to be a reasonable argument, but am unable to suggest any alternative restoration involving τῇ: βολῇ.

Line 51. Perhaps this is part of a clause enjoining some positive action upon an organ of government. The harm-clause frequently found in honorifics is excluded because of the absence of any negative after ἄν.

Line 53. Perhaps the name [Ποταμοδό]πο should be restored here.

#29. Proxeny. ca 430-410 B.C. Honours for Sotimos of Herakleia.

Pl.VIII,1

BIBLIOGRAPHY. Ross, Kunstblaetter, XXVII (1835), pp. 105-106; Pittakys, L'Ancienne Athènes (1835), p. 333; Boeckh, Arch. Intell. (1835), p. 32; Pittakys, E.A., 19(1840), p. 348 #426; Rangabé, A.H., I(1842), pp. 345-346 #260; Beulé, L'Acropole, II (1854), p. 204; Ross, Arch.Aufs., I. 1(1861), p. 85; Keil, Anal.Epigr. (1862), p. 129; Schoene, Reliefs (1872), p. 27, pl. IX.52; I.G., I, 65 (1873); Dumont, B.C.H., II (1878), pp. 563-564; Le Bas and Reinach, Voyage (1888), p. 64, pl. 36.2; Ferguson, Cornell Cl.St., VII (1898), p. 15; Svoronos, A.N.M., Tafelbd., III (1903), pl. CCVII.2; I.G., I², 145 (1924); Haggard, P.A.P.A., LVII (1926), p. xxxi; Secretaries (1930), pp. 17-18 #34; Binneboessel, Urkunden-reliefs (1932), pp. 5, 36-37 #13; West, A.J.P., LVI (1935), pp. 72-76; Svoronos, A.N.M., Textebd., III (1937), p. 664 #431.2; Wade-Gery, H.S.C.P., Supplement, I (1940), p. 129; S.E.G., X(1949), 82; Lambrechts, Proxeni edicte (1958), pp. 36-39, 42, 122, 151.

PHOTOGRAPHS. Svoronos, (1903), pl. CCVII.2.

EM 6609, fragment of slightly micaceous Pentelic marble, found in excavations on January 11, 1835, and first published by Ross (1835); Pittakys (1835) also published it, but gives a different find-spot: Ross says it was found south-west of the Parthenon; Pittakys says it was found south-east of the Parthenon "à côté du tombeau d'Erechthée". The latter is probably correct since several other proxeny-stelai have been found near the Erechtheion, or in rubble deriving from it.

The left and right edges are preserved, as well as the rough-picked back. Above the inscribed surface is an ovolo moulding 0.035m. high, projecting 0.021m. Above this is a vertical uninscribed fascia 0.036m. high. Both moulding and fascia carry on above the left and right laterals of the stele with the same projection. Above the fascia is a relief-panel, broken at the top, with the seated figure of Athena at the left in profile, facing right. At the right-hand side of the relief is the standing figure of Herakles, while between these two is the smaller figure of a man wearing himation and sandals. Athena is seated on a throne, her right arm hanging down and her shield behind her; her figure is broken off at the waist; Herakles' figure is broken off at the knees; his legs are bare, his pose frontal with the

weight on the right leg, so that his body was probably turned towards Athena. By his left foot is the base of his club. The male figure between Athena and Herakles is also in a frontal pose, but the folds of his himation indicate that he too was turning to look towards Athena. The pose of Herakles seems to be identical with that of the relief of I.G., II², 164, which I believe to be a fifth-century stele re-used in the mid-fourth century. This latter stele was surmounted by a triangular gable; it is possible that the same was the case with the present document. The relief-panel can be restored with an estimated height of ca 0.380m.

H.max. 0.360m.; inscribed face 0.154m. W. 0.415m.; inscribed face 0.380m. Th. 0.110m.; inscribed portion 0.089m. Letter-height, lines 1-3 0.016m.; lines 4ff. 0.010m.-0.011m. Lines 1-3 non-stoichedon; vertical chequer 0.0250m. Chequer, lines 4ff. 0.0152m.x 0.0165m.

Letter-shapes. A3, 4 and 5, B3, E4 and 5, H1, Θ 3, K2,, Λ 3 and 4,, M3, N7 and 8,, O1 and 2, Π 1, P8, Σ 9, Υ 6-8, X3. Attic script, with regular use of the daseia. The letter-

shapes in the heading are in some cases different from those of the body (alpha, epsilon, omicron and lambda), but the same mason seems to have inscribed both heading and text of the decree. Epsilon type 5 is not found in dated inscriptions before 433/2 B.C., and is rare before 418 B.C. Lambda type 3 is rare at all times, but appears also, in the heading only, in I.G., I², 68/9, a document plausibly dated to 424/3 B.C. The script is very close to, and may be by the same hand as that of A.T.L., II, A 9 (425/4 B.C.). Several documents of the late fifth or early fourth centuries may be by the same mason or workshop: these are I.G., I², 113 (ca 410/09 B.C.), I.G., II², 72 and 87 (both undated) and I.G., II², 174 (405/4 B.C.), as well as the unpublished fragment EM 5216..

ca 430-410 B.C.

Non-stoich.

Σοτίμο κεραικλειότο κ-
αἰ ἐκγόνον προχσένο κ-
αἰ εὐεργέτο Ἀθηναίων.

vacat

Stoich.24

5 [ἔδοχ]σεν τῇ βολῇ καὶ τῷ ὁ[έρ]-
[οι, .4...ἰς ἐπρυτάνε]με, Νε[.4...]-
[---- ἐγραμμάτευε, ---- ἐπεστάτε,]
[---- εἶπε. -----]

COMMENTARY. The bulk of the early bibliography is concerned with the relief. Rangabé (loc.cit.) associated this decree with I.G., I², 129; this identification is incorrect: though the letter-sizes are roughly the same, the hand is different. The dating of the relief is difficult: Binneboessel (op.cit., pp. 36-37) places it between 415 and 410 B.C., though allowing that it could be dated as early as 420 B.C. She compares the pose of Athena with that in the Nike Balustrade and in the relief of #66, and concludes that it lies between these and slightly later than the relief of I.G., I², 96 (417/6 B.C.). I am not convinced that such certainty is possible, however. The identification of Sotimos' home might provide some clue to dating; however, the name Herakleia (or Herakleion) was a common one, borne by several cities. The two likeliest candidates are Herakleia on the Euxine, used in 424/3 B.C. by Lamachos as a base for tribute-collection and first assessed tribute in 425/4 B.C. (A.T.L., II, A 9; see A.T.L., III, pp. 78, 89, 116), and Herakleion in Pieria, probably acquired by Athens from Makedonia after 430/29 B.C. and assessed for tribute in 425/4 B.C. (A.T.L., II, A 9; see A.T.L., III, pp. 218, 324). The former had the ethnic Ἡρακλειῶται, while the latter is shown in the tribute quota-lists as Ἡράκλειον. West (loc.cit.), following

Ferguson's suggestion (loc.cit.) that the secretary's name should be restored as Νε[οκλείδης], has put forward a convincing argument for dating this decree to the prytany of Aigeis in the secretaryship of Neokleides and the year 424/3 B.C. Neokleides was secretary of I.G., I², 87 in this year, when Aigeis was in prytany; the same name is borne by the epistates of #30, whose date may also therefore be 424/3 B.C.. Sotimos would thus have been honoured for assistance given to Lamachos in the collection of tribute in the area of Herakleia, when Lamachos' fleet was wrecked there in the summer of 424 B.C.. Eupolis (fragment 218) is probably referring to this expedition when he accuses a certain Simon of peculation of cash from Herakleia. West suggests that this Simon was the secretary of #30.

Line 5. In stoichoi 5-12 only the tops of the letters survive; similarly, at the end of the line only the apex of delta can be seen.

Line 6.. Before EN the right arm of upsilon survives; after nu the top left corner of an epsilon can be seen.

#30. Proxeny. ca 424/3 B.C. (inscribed in 399/8 B.C.?).

Honours for Herakleides (of Klazomenai?).

Pl. VIII,3

BIBLIOGRAPHY. Foucart, B.C.H., XII (1888), pp. 163-169; Kirchhoff, Sitzungsb.Ak.Berlin (1887), p. 1060 #2; Wilhelm, Hermes, XXIV (1889), p. 116 note 1; Koehler, Hermes, XXVII (1892), pp. 68-78; Wilamowitz, Aristoteles und Athen, I (1893), p. 188 note 4; I.G., II, 5. 5c (1895); Scala, Staatsvertraege, I (1898), p. 61; Meyer, G.d.A., IV (1901), p. 390; Kahrstedt, P.-W.-B.-E., VIII. 1 (1912), pp. 457-458; I.G., II², 8 (1913); Beloch, Gr. Gesch., II. 1² (1914), p. 377 note 4; S.I.G., I³ (1915), 118; I.G., I², p. 291 (1924); Haggard, Secretaries (1930) pp. 17-18 #34; West, A.J.P., LVI (1935), pp. 72-76; Wilhelm, Att.Urk., IV (1939), p. 23; Weston, A.J.P., LXI (1940), p. 346; Wade-Gery, H.S.C.P., Supplement, I (1940), pp. 128-130; Gomme, A.J.P., LXV (1944), pp. 321-339; Commentary, I (1945), p. 333; S.E.G., X (1949), 83; Lambrechts, Proxeni decreten (1958), pp. 28-29, 31, 56, 59, 77, 85, 87, 89, 90, 92, 102, 116, 119, 123-126, 133, 152; Stockton, Historia, VIII (1959), pp. 75-79; S.E.G., XIX (1963), 16; Andrewes, Historia, X (1961), p. 3; Bengtson, Staatsvertraege, II (1962), pp. 102-103 #183; Raubitschek, G.R.B.S., V (1964), pp. 155-

157; S.E.G., XXI (1965), 43; Mattingly, Historia, XIV (1965), p.273 note 2; Pečírka, Enktesis (1966), pp. 22-25; Meiggs and Lewis, G.H.I. (1969), pp. 201-203 #70..

PHOTOGRAPHS. Pečírka, op.cit., pl. I.

EM 6882, fragment of slightly micaceous Pentelic marble,, broken on all sides, but preserving the rough-picked back. It was found in excavations on the Akropolis at Athens in the ruins of the Chalkotheke, and was first published by Foucart (loc.cit.).. It is thicker at the bottom than at the top and also thicker on the right than on the left. Foliation is vertical and diagonal to the face, from left front to right rear.

H.max. 0.321m. W.max. 0.225m. Th.max. 0.108m. (bottom right); min. 0.092m (top left).. Letter-height 0.010m.. Chequer 0.0125m.x 0.0135m..

Letter-shapes. A4, B3, E4 and 5, H1, Θ3 and 4, K2, M2,, N7, 01 and 2, Π2, P6, 8 and 9, Σ5-9 and 10, Υ6 and 7, Ω3.. Ionic script rather untidily cut with letter-strokes occasionally omitted.. The shape of sigma is very characteristic, with almost flat base, but it cannot be used as an indication of date.. Omega type 3 is

found in I.G., I², 25 (probably dated in 424/3 B.C.), as well as in other documents of later date. Epsilon type 5 is not found before 433/2 B.C., and does not become common until after 418 B.C. The hand is the same as that of #56, which is dated by its prescript to 399/8 B.C.; its character seems more suited to the early fourth century than to the last quarter of the fifth century (see below). It is possible to restore the preamble to fit the date 424/3 B.C., and a good historical case can be made out in favour of this date.

ca 424/3 B.C. (inscribed ca 399/8 B.C?) Stoich. 31

ἀναγράψαι τὸν γ[ραμματέα τῆς βολῆς κα]-

ὶ θῆναι ἐν πόλει. [vacat]

vacat:

ἔδο(ξ)εν τῇ βολῇ καὶ τῷ δήμῳ, ...⁶...]-

5 [.]ἰς ἐπρυτάνευσεν, Σ[...⁴... ἐγραμμάτευσεν,]

[Ν]εοκλείδης ἐπεστ[άτει,¹².....]

[εἶ]πεν· Ἡρακλείδην [.....¹⁶... ἀν]-

[αγρ]άψαι τὸν γραμμ[ατέα τῆς βολῆς πρόξ]-

[ενο]ν καὶ εὐεργέτη[ν καθ' ὅτι ἂν τῷ δήμῳ]-

[ι δο]κῇ καὶ θῆναι ἐ[ν πόλει, ἐπειδὴ εὖ ἐπ]-

10 [όησ]εν τὰς Ἀθηναίω[ν¹⁵.....]

[...³...] ἀνὴρ ἐστὶ ἀγαθ[ὸς εἰς τὸν δῆμον τὸν]

[Ἀθην]αίων. Θεοκυδίδης εἶπε· τὰ μὲν ἄλλα κα]-

[αθα]περ τῇι βολῇι· ἐπ[ειδῇ δὲ οἱ πρέσβεις]
 [οἱ π]αρ(ᾶ) βασιλέως ἦκ[οντες ἀγγέλλοσι ἦ]-
 15 [ραν]λεῖδην συμπράτ[τεν ἑαυτοῖς προθύ]-
 [μως] ἔς τε τὰσπονδᾶς [.....¹⁵.....]
 [...³] ἄλλο ὅτι ἐπαγγέλ[ειαν, ἔναι Ἡρακλε]-
 [ίδηι] γῆς ἔγκτησιν κα[ὶ οἰκίας Ἀθήνησι]-
 [ν καὶ ᾶ]τέλειαν καθάπε[ρ τοῖς ἄλλοις πρ]-
 20 [οξένο]ις· καὶ ἑὰμ πο βία[ίωι θανάτῳ ἀπο]-
 [θάνηι, ἔναι] περὶ αὐτῷ τ[ῇν τιμωρίαν ...³]-
 [.....¹⁴.....]εν[.]ι[.....¹³.....]

COMMENTARY.. Line 1.. Only the bottoms of the letters survive in the last five stoichoi.

Line 2.. Previous editors have presumed that there was a vacat after πόλει; however, some such phrase as [τέλεσι τοῖς αὐτῷ] could be restored here.

Line 3, beginning.. The top bar of epsilon survives.. The vertical of xi is omitted..

Line 11, beginning. The bottom of the right foot of alpha survives..

Line 12,, end.. Only the bottom of the left hasta of eta survives..

Line 14,, beginning.. The bottom of the right foot of alpha survives.. The bar of the second alpha is omitted..

Line 16, beginning. Only the tips of the three bars of

epsilon can be seen..

Line 17,, beginning. The bottom of the right foot of alpha survives. At the right the left foot of lambda is visible..

Line 19, end. Only the bottom left corner of epsilon is visible..

Line 21, beginning. The horizontal and part of the right vertical of pi survive, but only the top bar and part of the vertical of epsilon are visible..

Line 22.. Under alpha of line 21 there is a horizontal stroke 0.003m. long, its right end under the right end of the bar of alpha.. Below and to the right the stone breaks away on a curve. The letter here may be a slightly displaced epsilon or gamma, or, less likely (because the curve does not join the horizontal), part of an untidy beta or rho (these letters are cut very raggedly in this inscription, with several short straight chisel-cuts). The top third of nu is clear, but nothing is visible in the stoichos to the right of it.. Under omicron of line 21 there appears to be a left vertical, with no trace of horizontal bars.. This document has aroused a great deal of comment, but two schools of thought prevail: the majority-view is that the honorand was Herakleides of Klazomenai, who became an Athenian citizen and was elected general (Plato, Ion,

541d), was nicknamed ὁ βασιλεύς, and was responsible for raising the pay for attendance at the Ekklesia from two to three obols (Aristotle, *Αθ.Πολ.*, 41); he is assumed to have taken part in or assisted Athenian negotiations in 425/4 and 424/3 B.C. to bring about a treaty of friendship with Persia, and to have been honoured by this decree in the latter year; later, he was given citizenship and the decree, whose original stele had somehow been destroyed (perhaps by the Thirty), was re-engraved upon the same stele as that carrying the decree of citizenship. The minority-view (Foucart, Wilhelm, Wilamowitz, Beloch, together with Mattingly and Stockton) is that the honorand was Herakleides of Byzantion; this man assisted Thrasyboulos in the capture of Byzantion in 389 B.C. (Demosthenes, XX, 58). The assumption is that he took part in the negotiations leading to the King's Peace of 387 B.C., though Stockton puts forward the suggestion that he assisted Thrasyboulos to obtain the alliance with the Thracian kings Seuthes and Medokos that was negotiated in 390 B.C. Raubitschek, while accepting a fifth-century date and identifying Herakleides as a Klazomenian, suggests that the negotiations were for a hypothetical and short-lived alliance in

415 B.C., part of Athens' attempts to secure her rear and raise money before her attack on Sicily. In my opinion, the majority-view is the correct one, largely because of the very close similarity between this stele and that of #56. The latter document is a decree of 411/0 B.C., inscribed on a stele that contains parts of probably two other decrees.. The last of these is dated by archon-formula to 399/8 B.C.. This inscription not only has the same letter-shapes as the present document, but its letter-sizes and chequer are almost identical.. Even the marble used is very similar, with the same foliation and the same thickness, though there is a slight difference in estimated width. I do not believe that #30 and #56 were originally inscribed on the same stele, however, since the resulting document would have been of exceptional height; in any case, the slight difference in estimated width militates against this view (the stele of #30 would have been ca 0.400m. wide, while that of #56 would have been ca 0.380m. wide).. Both documents, then, would be fifth-century decrees, re-engraved on stelai containing early fourth-century decrees; it is very likely that the original stelai were destroyed by the Thirty (we have other decrees of the early fourth century that are re-enactments of fifth-century proxenies without any additional privileges: I.G., II², 6 and 9 and Agora Inventory

I.788; #30 and #56 seem to involve the grant of new honours as well as the re-engraving of the original stele). Lines 1-2. These lines contain the publication-formula that often concludes a decree; probably this first decree authorized the re-engraving of the decree that follows at line 3; what else it contained can only be conjectured: possibly it included the grant of citizenship to Herakleides.

The formulae have been restored by Koehler (loc.cit.) as follows: [τὸ δὲ ψήφισμα τὸδε καὶ τὸ πρότερον γινόμενον Ἡρακλείδῃ] ἀνα[γ]ράψαι κτλ. Kirchner (I.G., II², 8) follows Koehler, but omits the introductory [τὸ δέ].

Lines 3-6. There is a gap of one line between the two decrees; it is possible, but, I think, unlikely, that this signifies a complete break in sense: that the decree on the upper part of the stele had nothing whatever to do with that on the lower part..

The restoration of the preamble depends to some extent upon the date of the embassy referred to in lines 13-17: Koehler (op.cit., pp. 68-78) made a strong case for the embassy being that in which Epilykos, the uncle of Andokides, served (Andokides, III, 29) and identifying it with that sent out in 425/4 B.C. (Thucydides, IV, 50). This embassy got as far as Ephesos, where it learned of the death of King Artaxerxes and turned back. Koehler assumes that it was sent out again after King Dareios'

accession to the throne was secured and that the decree honouring Herakleides was passed after its return in the summer of 424/3 B.C. The prosopographical arguments in favour of this view were put forward by Haggard (loc. cit.), amplified by West (loc. cit.), and given force by Wade-Gery (loc. cit.). They revolve about the restoration of the name of the epistates as [N]εοκλείδης and his identification as that Neokleides who was secretary of the Boule in 424/3 B.C. (I.G., I², 87 and, probably, I.G., I², 25). From this identification followed West's suggestion that the secretary of the present decree was Σ[ίμων] and that this man was identical with that Simon (P.A., II, 12686) who was lampooned by Aristophanes (Clouds, 351, 379) and Eupolis (fragment 218). There were other men of this name in the fifth century (P.A., II, 12687 - 12689); other restorations are also possible. We know that in 424/3 B.C. Phainippos was secretary in the prytany of Akamantis (Thucydides, IV, 118.11); thus, if the identification of Neokleides is correct, and if the year is 424/3 B.C., the prytanizing tribe in the present decree must be Pandionis; if the year is 423/2 B.C., which I think, is the latest possible date for a treaty made at the beginning of Dareios' reign, the tribe in prytany will likewise be Pandionis, since it is known that the secretary of Akamantis in that year was Demetrios (I.G., I², 324. 37-38). However,

there are no attested occurrences of the name Neokleides in Pandionis, while there are two instances of this name under Akamantis in the fourth century. Foucart (op.cit., p. 165) suggested either [Θ]εοκλείδης or [Ν]εοκλείδης as the name of the epistates. Neokleides is a common enough name; if it is restored here, it could be that of another man than the secretary of I.G., I², 87: for instance, it could be that of the man lampooned by Aristophanes (Ploutos, 665, 716, 747; Schol. Ekklesiazousai, 254, 398) early in the fourth century; likewise, even if he were the secretary of I.G., I², 87, he could have been epistates in another year, since it was possible to serve in the Boule twice in a lifetime¹. In this case, the restoration of the prytanizing tribe could be left open, though with now a better case for restoring Akamantis than Pandionis (see above).

¹Aristotle (Αθ.Πολ., 62.3); Hignett (Constitution [1952], pp. 152, 228) argues that consecutive terms were not permitted; Traill (Hesperia, XXXVIII [1969], p. 423 note 14) suggests that the euthynai would prevent a councillor from serving two years in succession; he cites three

The argument of Raubitschek (loc.cit.), that Epilykos' embassy was sent out in 415 B.C. to negotiate a new treaty of friendship (which the Peace of Kallias, the renegotiation of which is the presumptive reason for the embassy of 425/4 B.C., certainly was not), resolves one other technical difficulty: the first secretary in 424/3 B.C. was named Epilykos and very possibly is to be identified with the uncle of Andokides (I.G., I², 324.26); if the embassy went out in 425/4 and again in 424/3 B.C. with this man a member both times, I wonder whether his duties as an ambassador would not have conflicted with his membership of the Boule; if he had already served as a prytanis at the time when he was sent on the embassy, there would, of course, be no

extant pairs of consecutive lists in support of this argument. Kahrstedt (Magistratur [1935], p. 136) thinks that the terms imposed by Athens upon Erythrai in the mid-fifth century may be a reflexion of Athenian practice at the time (see A.T.L., II, D 10.12): bouleutai are here forbidden to hold this office twice inside four years. He mentions also a decree of Erythrai itself that lays down a ten-year interval between terms as bouleutes, but this document has no relevance for Athens.

conflict. The point is a minor one for which there seems to be no evidence either way. In any case, Raubitschek's hypotheses have no evidence to support them and are therefore weaker than Koehler's arguments. Lines 6-12. The honorand has been identified as being either from Byzantion (Foucart, loc.cit.) or from Klazomenai (Koehler, loc.cit.). Whatever the date of the treaty, the King referred to in line 14 must surely be the King of Persia: only he, I think, would be named as "the King", whereas any other king would be mentioned by name, despite Stockton's arguments (op.cit., p. 78) for Seuthes or Medokos of Thrake (arguments weakened by I.G., II², 21, which is the document recording the alliance with Seuthes in 390 B.C. to which Stockton refers; in this Seuthes is mentioned by name; see also Xenophon, Hellenika, IV, 8.26; Demosthenes, XIV, 94.2). If the treaty was with Persia, I suspect that the route followed by an Athenian embassy would lie to the south, through Klazomenai, rather than to the north, through the Hellespont and Byzantion. The restoration [τὸν Κλαζομένιον] proposed by Koehler fits the required space exactly, whereas the ethnic [τὸν Βυζάντιον] is too short; [τὸν ἐκ Βυζαντίου], suggested by Stockton (op.cit., p.75)

is epigraphically unlikely: *-ou-* is written *-o-* throughout the extant portions of this decree. Mattingly's [τὸν ἀπὸ Βυζαντίου] (loc.cit.) fits the space available, but both his and Stockton's suggestions seem to come from the counsel of despair; I know of no examples of such a prepositional ethnic. Another objection to identifying the honorand as Herakleides of Byzantion is Demosthenes' reference to him (XX, 58) as proxenos and euergetes with full *ateleia*; the reference is so full that one would expect mention of the *enktesis* granted in lines 18-19 of the present decree as well. A third, otherwise unknown, Herakleides is a somewhat remote possibility.

Line 8. [καὶ ὅτι ἄν] Foucart; [καθ' ὅτι ἄν] Kirchner.

Line 10. [στρατιάς καὶ ἐν πᾶσιν] Foucart; [πρεσβείας καὶ ἐν πᾶσι] Koehler. Mention of the embassy in lines 13ff. makes Koehler's the more likely restoration, but the hiatus after [πᾶσι] is uncharacteristic of this document.

Line 12. Weston (loc.cit.) identified the orator as Thoukydides (P.A., I, 7271) who was treasurer of Athena in 424/3 B.C. Androtion (fragment 57) names four men prominent in the fifth century bearing this name: of these, two were probably too old (P.A., I, 7272, general in 440/39 B.C.; P.A., I, 7268, Perikles' opponent

the son of Melesias); the third, the historian and general (P.A., I, 7267), was away from Athens in the winter of 424/3 B.C., and shortly thereafter was exiled (Thucydides, IV, 105.1). P.A., I, 7271, the treasurer, remains the likeliest candidate if the decree be dated ca 424/3 B.C.

Lines 13-20. The restorations are those of Koehler.

Lines 16-17..[καὶ τὴν εἰρήνην καὶ ἐς ἄλλο Foucart;
[τὰς πρὸς βασιλέα ἔ]ς τε ἄλλο Koehler; [τὰς γενομένας
καὶ εἰς] ἄλλο Wilamowitz (loc.cit.). Koehler's use of
[τε] is, as he admits, unparalleled except in metrical
inscriptions (cf. I.G., II², 3138 and 11162); Wilamowitz'
[εἰς] is not so unique as Pečírka (op.cit., p.23) thinks;
both ἐς and εἰς (the latter in an apparently inevitable
restoration, line 11) are found in this document;
perhaps Wilamowitz' restoration is to be preferred to
those of Foucart and Koehler..

Lines 18-19. The grants of enktesis and ateleia are to Herakleides alone; there is no mention of his descendants. If the date 424/3 B.C. is correct this is the earliest extant grant of enktesis; the formula is that commonly used in the fourth century..

Line 20-22..καὶ ἑὰν πο βι[ασθῇ: ----- π]ερὶ αὐτῷ
[τ-----] Koehler; καὶ ἑὰν πο βι[ασθῇ: ὧν Ἀθηναῖοι
κρατοῦσιν π]ερὶ αὐτῷ τ[-----] Wilhelm (1889); καὶ

ἐὰν πο βι[αίῳ θανάτῳ ἀποθάνῃ, ἔναι π]ερὶ αὐτῷ
 τ[ὴν τιμωρίαν καθάπερ κτλ.] Wilhelm (1939)..

Line 22..[καθάπερ Ἀθηναίοις ἀ]γαγ[έγραπται]

Meiggs and Lewis (op.cit., p. 202); this "would fit, but is unparalleled." In fact, the reading γαγ in line 22 is incorrect, thus invalidating Meiggs' and Lewis' restoration; the letters visible here are εν[.]ι ; these could be part of the word [προξ]έν[ο]ι[ς], but I have been unable to find a suitable restoration.

#31. Proxeny. ca 435-420 B.C. Honours for a family
of Illyrians (?). Pl.IX,1

BIBLIOGRAPHY. Kirchhoff, Sitzungsb.Ak.Berlin (1888),
p. 242 #15; Wilhelm, Hermes, XXIV (1889), p. 116
note 1; Dittmar, Coronis (1890), pp. 93-94; I.G., I,
Supplement, p. 194 #116z; Wilhelm, Beiblatt (1898), p. 45;
Mélanges Nicole, II (1905), p. 600; Bannier, B.Ph.W.
(1917), pp. 1220-1221; Hiller, Sitzungsb.Ak.Berlin
(1921), pp. 437-438 #11; I.G., I², 72 (1924); Haggard,
Secretaries (1930), p. 16 #29; Wilhelm, Att.Urk.,
IV (1939), pp. 39-41 #xxviii; Weston, A.J.P., LXI
(1940), p. 352; S.E.G., X (1949), 88; Meritt, Hesperia,
XXI (1952), p. 344; Lambrechts, Proxeni edicta (1958),
pp. 33, 62, 151.

PHOTOGRAPH. Wilhelm, (1939), plate IV.

EM 6848, fragment of slightly micaceous Pentellic marble,
preserving the back and part of the top. It was found
in 1887 in excavation of the foundations of the temple
of Roma and Augustus east of the Parthenon on the

Akropolis; it was first published by Kirchhoff from a transcript of H. G. Lolling (loc.cit.). The top is smooth-dressed; the back is rough-picked and has a convex vertical profile. Foliation is vertical and parallel to the face.

H.max. 0.398m. W.max. 0.147m., Th. 0.093m. (top); 0.106m. (bottom). Letter-height 0.011m. Chequer 0.0154m.x0.156m..

Letter-shapes. A3 and 4-5, B3, E4 and 5, Θ4, K2, Λ4 and 5, M1, N4 and 7, O2, Π1, P8, Σ6 and 7, Υ7-8, X2-3. Attic script, well-cut and spaced, probably without the daseia. Lambda type 5 is not found in dated inscriptions before 431/0 B.C., and is rare before 425 B.C.; sigma type 6 is found only once (in 406/5 B.C.) after 428/7 B.C. Epsilon type 5 is not found before 433/2 B.C., and is rare before 418 B.C. Otherwise, the evidence of letter-shapes is inconclusive, but the neatness of the hand and the careful engraving are characteristic of the 420's. On the other hand, the almost square chequer suggests an earlier date. The hand is very close to that of I.G., I², 53, closer yet to that of I.G., I², 78; both these documents

probably date in ca. 430 B.C. I believe that the hand is the same as, or very close to, that of S.E.G., XXI, 37 (= I.G., I², 128), to be dated ca. 432/1 B.C. Lewis (B.S.A., LV [1960], p. 190) ascribes to this hand I.G., I², 52 (the preamble dated to 433/2 B.C.) and I.G., I², 97 (dated by Meritt, Robinson Studies, II[1953], pp.298-303, in the early years of the Archidamian War). While the latter ascription is, I think, correct, I doubt whether Lewis is right to assign the preamble of I.G., I², 52 to this hand: the shapes of alpha, mu, nu, sigma and upsilon are different, and theta and omicron are smaller. Another document of the period ca. 430 B.C., I.G., I², 127, is engraved in a hand strikingly similar to that of the present document. Thus, a date between 435 and 425 B.C. seems very likely if the letter-shapes are taken as the sole guide. However, this decree should almost certainly be restored with an archon-formula in its preamble; I do not know of any decrees between 445 and 421 B.C. that are so dated (see my remarks, above, on #9, p.175) whereas after 421/0 B.C. archon-formulae are a frequent occurrence; therefore, a date as late as 420 B.C. should

not be excluded on the basis of letter-shapes alone..

ca 435-420 B.C..

Stoich. 40

[θ ε ο] ί.

- [ἔδοχσεν τῷ βολῇ καὶ τῷ δέμοι], Ἀντιοχίς [ἐπρυτά]-
 [νευε, .±.5. ἐπεστάτε, .±.6. ἐγρ]αρμάτευε, [...6.]-
 [.±.5. ἔρχε,±.11. εἶπε· ἐπ]αινέσαι Ε[.....6.]-
 5 [.±.5. τῷ±.8. καὶ δῶναι αὐ]τῷ προχσ[ενίαν κ]-
 [αὶ εὐεργεσίαν· ἐπαινέσαι δὲ καὶ Γ]ράβοι κα[ὶ ..5.]-
 [.±.4. τοῖς±.11. ἀδελφοῖς?] ὅς ὃσι ἀν[δράσι ἀ]-
 [γαθοῖς ἐς Ἀθηναῖος καὶ προθύμο]ις ποιῶν ὃ [τι ἂν δυ]-
 [νατοὶ ὃσι ἀγαθὸν τὲν τε πόλιν τὲν] Ἀθηναίο[ν καὶ τὲ]-
 10 [ν στρατιὰν τὲν Ἀθηναῖον· ἐὰν δέ τί]ς τινα αὐ[τῶν ἀπο]-
 [κτένει βιαῖοι θανάτοι ἐν τῶν πό]λεόν πο ὅσ[ον Ἀθην]-
 [αῖοι κρατῶσι τὲν τιμορίαν ἔναι] καθάπερ ἐ[ὰν Ἀθην]-
 [αῖον τις ἀποθάνει· ἐπιμέλεσθαι] δὲ αὐτοῖς καὶ τοῖ]-
 [ς παισὶ αὐτῶν ὅς ἂν μεδὲ ἕς μεδὲ ἔ]να ἀδικῇ[ι τὸς τε σ]-
 15 [τρατεγὸς οἱ ἂν αἰεὶ ὃσι καὶ ἐάν τι]ς ἄλλος π[οτὲ παρα]-
 [τυγχάνει καὶ τὲν βολὲν τὲν αἰεὶ βο]λεύουσ[αν καὶ τὸς]
 [πρυτάνες ἐκάστοτε -----]

COMMENTARY. Line-length is fixed by the restoration of lines 10-12.

Above the final sigma of the preamble, line 2, the top of an iota can be made out. In a forty-letter line this will be set above the thirty-fourth letter. I restore the invocation [$\Theta\epsilon\sigma$] ι , placing the first three letters respectively above the seventh, sixteenth and twenty-fifth letters of line 2.

Lines 2-3. Hitherto the preamble has been restored with a space of nineteen letters for the name and demotic of the secretary. However, the first instance of the use of the demotic in the secretary-formula in dated inscriptions is in 407/6 B.C. (S.E.G., X, 136). Meritt (1952) suggested that line 2 therefore contained an archon-formula as well. However, I can find no fifth-century precedent for the archon-formula in this position; when it does occur it generally immediately precedes the orator-formula, though sometimes the epistates-formula also follows it (as, for instance, in I.G., I², 20 and #63 and #65). I suggest, therefore, that line 2 contained the epistates-formula. Thus, there will be eleven letter-spaces available for the names of the epistates and the secretary. I have

remarked above that the hand employed in this document is very similar to that of I.G., I², 127 and S.E.G., XXI, 37; in the latter case the prytanizing tribe is also Antiochis, but, as this has so far been restored, the secretary's name is eight letters long, too long for the present decree (Schlaifer suggested a restoration involving a five-letter secretary-name, but the supplements upon which his line-length depends have proven inadequate in other lines, thus invalidating his suggestion: H.S.C.P., LI [1940], p.234 note 2; see Lewis, op.cit., pp. 190-192). The preamble of I.G., I², 127 can be restored with Antiochis in prytany and with a six-letter secretary-name (see S.E.G., X, 59). It is possible that it and the present decree were passed in the same prytany of the same year, though on different days (the name of the epistates of I.G., I², 127, Aineas, is one letter too long for #31).

In lines 2-3 the space available for the names of the archon and the orator is twenty-two letters long; names of more than fourteen letters are extremely rare: the orator's name is thus likely to be not more than fourteen letters in length; by the same token, the archon's name will be not less than eight letters long. In the period under consideration there is no archon-name longer than eleven letters, so that the orator's

name cannot be less than eleven letters long. One possible candidate as orator is Drakontides, who moved a decree in 430/29 B.C.. (P.A., I, 4551; see Plutarch, Perikles, 32); in this year the archon was Apollodoros, so that the restoration [Ἀπολλόδορος ἔρχε, Δρακοντίδης εἶπε] is theoretically possible.

However, this arrangement conflicts with the theory that archon-formulae were not employed in decrees before 421/0 B.C., except in the period 460-445 B.C. (see above).. While the character of the script seems better-suited to the late 430's or early 420's it is not impossible that a mason active before 430 B.C. was still employed occasionally in the late 420's. Thus, one might restore the name of the archon Aristion (421/0 B.C.), or that of Astyphilos (420/19 B.C.); I doubt whether any later date should be considered, though either Antiphon (418/7 B.C.) or Arimnestos (416/5 B.C.) would fit the available space.

Line 4-10. Dittmar (loc.cit.) was the first to attempt a restoration of these lines; the text of lines 7-10 is as he restored it; he was not able to suggest a complete restoration of lines 4-7. Hiller (1921) realized that the name of the honorand in line 6 was probably Grabos;

the name is found in Illyria, where it is borne by the ruler of that state in the mid-fourth century (I.G., II², 127, an Athenian alliance with Grabos and others).. He suggested that the honorand of the present decree might be an ancestor and namesake of the fourth-century ruler of Illyria.. His restoration is certainly preferable to Kirchhoff's [Α]ράβοι or [Κα]ράβοι (I.G., I, Supplement, p. 194 #116z), the one of which is mythical, the other an Athenian nickname. He linked this decree with events in the winter of 423 B.C. (see Thucydides, IV, 125.1). However, I believe that this date may be too late; if Grabos is an Illyrian the context could be the third alliance between Athens and Perdikkas of Makedonia beginning in 431 B.C.; several embassies were sent to this area between 430 and 425 B.C. (see A.T.L., III, p. 323 and I.G., I², 57). Hiller restored lines 4-6: [ἐπ]αινέσαι Ε[...⁶.../...⁵... τῷ ἱλλυριοῖ καὶ δοῦναι αὐτῷ προχσ[ενίαν· ἐπ]αινέσαι δὲ καὶ τοῖς παισὶ αὐτοῦ Γ]ράβοι καὶ ...⁵...] (I.G., I², 72).. Wilhelm (1939, p. 40) suggested the restoration of line 6 that I have employed: I think that the probable mention of the sons of the honorands in line 14 makes it more likely that the honorands are three brothers rather than a father and two sons. However, Wilhelm restored [h]ος

in line 7; I do not believe the daseia was used at all in this inscription (see line 11) and therefore have increased the third honorand's name by one letter. Wilhelm also suggested that the first honorand's name might be Euryptolemos.

Line 9-10. Instead of [τῇ ν στρατείᾳ τέν] one could also restore [τῷ ς πρέσβεις τός].

Lines 10-13. Wilhelm (1905) suggested the restoration have employed for lines 10-12; he restored [ἄρχουσιν] in line 12; Bannier (loc.cit.) amended this to [κρατῶσιν ἔναι περὶ αὐτῷ τέν τιμορίαν] .. Hiller (I.G., I², 72) restored [ἄρχουσιν, ἔναι τέν τιμορίαν]. Wilhelm expanded this to restore the rest of line 12 and line 13 ([1939], p.40); Weston (loc.cit.) questioned the restoration [ἄρχουσιν] and restored [κρατῶσι, ἔναι τέν τιμορίαν κτλ.] because κρατῶσι seems to be the usual word during the Empire. I have adopted this version, with a slight change of order. The formulae for these lines are very common (for variants see #7, #13, #24, #30, #34 and #67).

Lines 13-17.. The restoration I have adopted is basically that of Wilhelm (op.cit., pp. 39-41), but I have amended it by removing his daseiai from lines 14-15 where he restored [λόπος ἄν μεδὲ ἡῆς μεδὲ ἔ]να ἀδικῇ[ι, τὸς στρ|ατεγὸς μοι ἄν αἰεὶ ὄσι καὶ ἐάν τ]ις κτλ. The

combination [καῖσι αὐτῶν] in line 14 is rough, but parallellled, I believe, in lines 10, 13 and 14, where there is no sign of elision or attempt to avoid the clash of end-vowels. Wilhelm offers no parallel for his restoration of these lines. For lines 14-16 he finds a parallel in I.G., II², 226; however, the restoration he provides for line 16 has only thirty-nine letters. This could be remedied by spelling π[ου] instead of π[ο] in line 15, but since I have used the shorter αῖ rather than αῖσι in line 15 I think this short form will also be necessary in line 16. In any case, π[ου] would be an ionicism for which there is no parallel in this document. π[ότε] is a possible solution to the difficulty. I restore [καὶ τὸς|πρυτάνες ἐκάστοτε ----] in lines 16-17 on the analogy of #26, line 14.

#32. Proxeny. ca 421/0 B.C. Honours for Polystратos

(of Phleious?) and his family?

Pl.VIII,5

BIBLIOGRAPHY. Pittakys, E.A., 28(1842), pp. 611-612 #1068; Rangabé, A.H., I(1842), p. 368 #298; I.G., I, 44 (1873); Sauppe, Proxenis (1877), p. 5; I.G., I², 83 (1924); Austin, Stoichedon (1938), p. 33; Wilhelm, Att.Urk., IV (1939), pp. 78-80 #xxxiii; Meritt, Hesperia, X(1941), pp. 326-327; S.E.G., X(1949), 91; Gomme, Commentary, III (1956), p. 68; Lambrechts, Proxeni decreten (1958), pp. 32, 90, 121-122, 124, 152; Pečírka, Enktesis (1966), pp. 8-12; S.E.G., XXIV (1969), 10.

PHOTOGRAPH. Pečírka (op.cit.), pl. 2.

EM 6581, fragment of micaceous Pentelic marble, preserving the right edge only. It was found on November 17, 1839, in excavations east of the Parthenon on the Akropolis; it was first published by Pittakys (loc.cit.). It is very badly abraded and the left side of the face is almost completely obliterated. The foliation is vertical and parallel to the face, marked by layers of mica, along the plane of which the back has split away. H.max. 0.460m. W.max. 0.288m. Th.max. 0.070m. Letter-

height 0.012m. Chequer 0.0204m.x 0.0173m..

Letter-shapes. A⁴-5, E⁴, H¹, Θ³, K², Λ⁴, M¹, N⁹, O¹-2, Π¹, P⁸, Σ⁷, Υ⁷; Attic script, with possibly inconsistent use of the daseia. It is very close to, but not quite the same as that of #33 (alpha is wider, omicron larger and better-cut, the daseia and nu are narrower, and the shapes of mu, nu and rho do not exhibit the same variety as those of #33; sigma is more open and regular. The spacing is wider and the letter-height greater; this may account for some of the differences). While the evidence of the letter-shapes is inconclusive, the neatness and regularity of the script are consistent with a date in the 420's; there is also a good contextual case for dating the decree in 421/0 B.C. (see below). I.G., I², 163 is by the same hand, as is the unpublished EM 293 (#42), but neither can be attributed to this stele. This is one of very few documents in which the horizontal chequer is larger than the vertical (see Austin, loc.cit.).

ca 421/0 B.C.

Stoich. 38

[.....³²..... ἄ]γα[θόν?]

[.....³³.....]καὶ [.?]]

[.....³³.....]ι[.]α[.?]]

- [.....²⁹.....κατ]ᾶ ταῦτα·
- 5 [.....³⁴.....]ἄνδρ-
- [.....³⁴.....]καὶ ε-
- [.....³³.....τ]οῦτο-
- [ν?³⁴.....]οσα
- [.....³³.....κ]ρυτά-
- 10 [νες?³¹.....]ται ἡ-
- [.....³⁴.....]μενο
- [.....³².....ἐ]πιμέλ-
- [εσθαι³⁰.....]ν ἀπ-
- [.....³².....ᾶ]ποδον-
- 15 [.....³³.....]ιοντο
- [.....²³.....ἀναγράψαι?]δὲ καὶ
- [.....³².....]ἐν στέλ-
- [εἰ λιθίνει καὶ καταθεῖναι ἐμ πόλει τὸν] γραμματ-
- [ἔα τὸν τῆς βολῆς τέλεσι τοῖς αὐτῷ?⁴.....]εἶπε· τὰ μ-
- 20 [ἐν ἄλλα καθάπερ τῇ βολῇ·¹⁰.....] Πολυστρ-
- [ατ.....²⁹.....]Ἀθηναίο-
- [.....²⁹.....]ἔγ]κτεσιν Ἀ-
- [θένεσιν?.....²⁰.....ὅτ]ο ἂν δέτα-
- [ι³¹.....]οῖς στ[.]
-

COMMENTARY. The mutilated condition of the stone makes restoration a hazardous procedure. Above the first clearly visible letters (of line 4) there is space for perhaps four lines, but I could detect no letter-traces where the first line should be. In the next five lines (lines 1-5 in my text) there are traces of letters that have been variously interpreted as follows:

Pittakys. Rangabé. I.G., I, 44 (Kirchhoff, Koehler); (Velsen).

1	...5...	...5.	...5...	.<.4...
2	..τ...	...5.	.καί..	νκαί..
3	σαπ..	..απ.	ιϣλγ.	..ιϣλγ.
4	.τα....	.ταστα	.ταυ-λ	αταυ-λ
5	.σαιδρ	..ΛΓδρ	..α.δρ	..σανδρ

Velsen's readings were followed by Hiller (I.G., I², 83). From my examination of the stone it appears that several of these traces, if they ever existed, have suffered damage or have disappeared over the years. In line 1 I was able to detect two diagonal legs, neither resembling any part of the sigma seen by Velsen; the first is above the letter identified by Velsen as a nu,, the second is above the kappa. Both seem to be right diagonals, so that the reading [ᾰ]γα[θόν] might be possible. In line 2 Velsen saw a nu before καί : the

legs of this letter seem to slant inwards, and I believe that there is a trace of a diagonal sloping up to the right between them, so that this letter might be a mu; if it is, it is unlike any other mu on the stone, being both taller and more upright. In line 3 all trace of kappa and the second iota is lost, but the cross-bar of alpha is partly visible. In line 4 there is no doubt about any of the letters seen by Velsen, and part of the vertical of tau is clear in the penultimate stoichos. [κατ]α̣ ραῦτα , marking the end of a clause, is a possibility. In line 5 I can see no trace of Velsen's sigma, or even of the faint marks read by Koehler. What Velsen apparently read as sigma is a triangular abrasion whose apex points to the right and is considerably above the mid-point of the stoichos: in the rest of the inscription the placing of the letters is extremely regular, and I do not believe that a high sigma is likely here. I shall put forward a restoration of line 5 after my discussion of lines 6-9.

Lines 6-9. Visible today on the stone are those letters that were read by Hiller and Koehler, except that in line 9 there is visible all but the lowest part of a rho before upsilon. My tentative restoration of lines 5-10 is based on known formulae, but I have been forced to assume

that the use of the daseia in this document is irregular. There is only one daseia preserved on the stone, in line 10: this is absolutely clear and readable. I have also assumed that the letters OYTO in line 7 are part of the plural [τ]ούτο[v], so that several honorands might be involved in this part of the stone. The letters ANAP in line 5 suggest that here we have part of a praise-formula (cf. I.G., I², 101; 108; #22; #39; #62), either in the singular, in an oblique case, or in the plural or the dual. in line 6 could be a part of the phrase [πρόχσεν(-ος;-οι)] καὶ ε[ύεργέτ(-ες;-αι)], in any case, or the phrase [καὶ νῦν] καὶ ἐ[ν τῷ πρόσθεν χρόνῳ], to mention only two possible readings. ΟΣΑ in line 8 is likewise open to many interpretations; the proximity of PYTA in line 9, surely part of the word [π]ρυτά[v---], suggests that here we have parts of the clause enjoining the Boule, prytaneis and generals to safeguard the proxenos from harm. I restore tentatively as follows:

5[Πολυστράτο δὲ καὶ τῷ ἀδελφῷ αὐτῷ ὅτι ἐσιν] ἄνδρ-
 [ες ἀγαθοὶ περὶ Ἀθηναῖος τε καὶ πρόχσενοι] καὶ ε-
 [ύεργέται Ἀθηναῖον ἐπιμέλεσθαι ὅς ἂν μὲ τ]ούτο-
 [ν μεδεῖς ἀδικῆται τὲμ βολὲν τὲν αἰεὶ βολεύ]οσα-
 [ν καὶ τὸς στρατεγὸς οἱ ἂν αἰεὶ ὅσι καὶ τὸς π]ρυτά-
 10[νες -----]ται ἡ-

For this restoration cf. #26, lines 14-19, which is a close parallel of lines 7-10 of my restoration.

Lines 10-16. I can offer no coherent restoration of these lines, nor has any previous editor attempted the task. In line 11, Velsen, followed by Hiller, read the lower half of a sigma before mu. I can detect no trace of this. If it ever existed, this line must be interpreted either as part of a balancing clause [το(ι)]ς μὲν ο- , or of some such word as [ἐφσεφί]σμενο-

The letters in line 12 are surely part of the verb ἐπιμέλεσθαι. In line 13 Hiller printed ν.π ; Velsen read ν\π , which I believe to be correct. Only the right diagonal is visible.

In line 14 the letters ΠΟΔΟΝ should be, as Hiller surmised, part of the verb ἀποδίδωμι , perhaps [ἀ]ποδοῶν[αι].

In line 15 Velsen, Hiller and I read ΙΟΝΤΟ : this might be part of a verb, or of a phrase involving money, such as [τὸ δὲ ἀργύρ]ιον τ[όδε] ; possibly, the proxenoi received a gift of money (cf. #28 and #64, both perhaps dated to this period).

Lines 16-19 certainly involve some variant of the publication-formula. Kirchhoff and Hiller restored lines 17-19 as follows: ἐν στέλει λιθίνει -----τόν

γραμματ[ῆα τῆς βολῆς καὶ καταθεῖναι ἐμ πόλει] . They made no attempt to establish the line-length. Wilhelm (1939) restored lines 16-19 coherently, but his text exhibits some anomalies: [ἀναγράφσαι] δὲ καὶ [πρόξενον καὶ εὐεργέτην Ἀθηναίων] ἐν στέλ[λει λιθίνει καὶ θεῖναι ἐμ πόλει τὸν] γραμματ[ῆα τὸν τῆς βολῆς]. This gave a line-length of thirty-four letters. Meritt (loc.cit.) increased the line-length to thirty-five letters, in order to remove Wilhelm's Ionic xi from line 17; to achieve this, however, he had to use the ionicism [θεῖναι] in line 18. A weakness in both cases is that καταθεῖναι is the more common word in such publication-formulae; a greater weakness is the extreme length of the name to be restored for the proposer of the rider which begins in line 19: fourteen letters in Wilhelm's case, fifteen in Meritt's. I have restored a thirty-eight letter line, which allows the phrase [τέλει τοῖς αὐτοῖς] to be included in line 19, leaving four letters for the name of the orator.

Line 17 I restore by analogy with #13, lines 19-21.

Lines 19-20. Obviously a rider must be restored here. An alternative form might be τὰ μ[ὲν ἄλλα καθάπερ!ῆ.....] with the name of the previous orator in the blank space. This may be better than the Boule-formula, since it also allows use of the normal word [εἶναι] in the formula gran-

ting enktesis and ateleia. δεδούσθαι is found occasionally, but not earlier than 257/6 B.C. (I.G., II², 802).

Lines 20-24. Wilhelm restored these lines as follows:

[ἔναι δὲ Π]ολυστρ[άτοι ὅς ὄντι προχσένοι (oder εὐεργέται?)
τῷ δέμῳ τῷ] Ἀθηναίῳ[ν ἔαν βόλεται καὶ γῆς καὶ οἰκίας
ἔγ]κτεσιν Ἀ[θένεσιν, εὐρέσθαι δὲ καὶ ἄλλο ἡότῃ ἄν
δῶτα[ι ἀγαθόν· συνεπιμέλεσθαι δ' αὐτῶν? τ]οῖς σ[τρατεγοῖς
κτλ.]. Meritt improved slightly upon Wilhelm's version:

[εἶναι δὲ Π]ολυστρ[άτοι ἡος ὄντι προχσένοι τῷ δέμῳ τῷ]
Ἀθηναίῳ[ν αἰτεσαμένοι καὶ γῆς καὶ οἰκίας ἔγ]κτεσιν Ἀ[θένεσιν,
ἡευρέσθαι δὲ καὶ ἄλλο ἡότ]ο ἄν δῶτα[ι ἀγαθόν παρὰ τῷ δέμῳ
ἀποφαίνοντα τ]οῖς σ[τρατεγοῖς -----].

Pečírka takes exception to both versions: Wilhelm's line 22 has thirty-five, not thirty-four letters and Meritt's thirty-six; what should be read in line 22 is

[ἔγ]κτεσιν Ἀ-. Previous editors differed: Pittakys read ETEΣINA; Rangabé TEΣINA ; Koehler and Kirchhoff TEΣINA ; Velsen ITEΣINA ; Hiller [ἔγ]κτεσιν Ἀ , but without stating which part of the doubtful kappa was preserved. The surface is extremely worn at this point.

I entirely agree with Pečírka's comment (p.9): "The surface of the stone has flaked away at that point and in the resultant hollow a discolouration of the stone shows the letter E ; it is visible even in the photo-

graph. Its cross-bars slope down towards the right, however, which conflicts with the form of epsilon used elsewhere in this inscription. When carbon is used the cross-bars of epsilon are practically invisible, while something like a faint trace of the lower sloping hasta of a K appears. It can be seen on the squeezes, too, although it is a little too long and starts a little too high if compared with the kappa in line 16. The squeezes do not exclude the possibility of the reading E, but the lower cross-bar and part of the middle one are lacking." He goes on to note that Pittakys "had good reason for his reading ETEΣINA, however, whereas Wilhelm's and Meritt's reading [ἔγ]κτεσιν, without marking the kappa as doubtful, is not borne out by the stone." The letter between Σ and Ν in this line is universally read as iota; yet it is well to the left of centre and the reading E is not impossible: Pečírka believes, I think correctly, that the apparent horizontals here are chance faults in the stone: iota in line 19 is also set to the left of centre. Pečírka restores lines 20-23 as follows, with a thirty-four letter line: [ἔναι δὲ Π]ολυστρ[άτοι ὅς ὄντι προχσένοι τῷ δέμο τῷ] Ἀθηναίῳ[ν καὶ εὐεργέται γῆς καὶ οἰκίας ἔγ]κτεσιν Ἀ[θένεσιν]. If I am correct in assuming a thirty-eight letter line, it is necessary to expand Pečírka's version. I suggest, on the

analogy of I.G., II², 83.9, that the grant of isoteleia be included in the extra privileges given to Polystratos (the initial pi of his name is partially preserved on the stone: the right vertical and part of the horizontal survive):

τὰ μ-

20 [ἐν ἄλλα καθάπερ!2.....· ἔναι δὲ] Πολυστρ-
 [άτοι ὅς ὄντι προχσένοι καὶ εὐεργέται] Ἀθηναίο-
 [ν καὶ ἰσοτέλειαν καὶ γῆς καὶ οἰκίας ἔγ]κτεσιν Ἀ-
 [θένεσιν· ὑπάρχειν δὲ εὐρέσθαι ἄλλο ὅτ]ο ἄν δεῖτα-
 [ι ἀγαθὸν παρὰ τῷ δέμῳ!5.....]οῖς στ[.]-

In line 23 the first omicron is clear on the squeeze.

In line 24 the letters appear as follows: .

Previous editors, with whom I am inclined to agree, regard them as part of the phrase [τ]οῖς στ[ρ]ατηγοῖς]. However, the vertical stroke in the second stoichos is not quite centered and might be the upper part of a lambda: the diagonal to the right of this is rather sharply-angled and set possibly a little too far to the right, so that the reading [Π]ολυστ[ρ]ατ[---] is not completely unlikely.

In #33, lines 14-16, reference is made to the proxeny and euergesia of Polystratos of Phleious, the terms of whose proxeny are to extend also to Asteas of Aleia. In

my discussion of #33 I have accepted the view of previous editors that Asteas and Polystratos were honoured for their services to Athenian embassies negotiating the Peace of Nikias in 422/1 B.C. Since the ethnic does not appear in the present document, it is not possible to state categorically that this is the decree referred to in #33; even with what is preserved in #32 it is obvious that its terms are vastly different from those of #33. This discrepancy is what, I think, has led Lambrechts to suggest that #32 is a renewal dated to the early fourth century (op.cit., pp. 32-33); however, Attic script was not used after 403/2 B.C.; nor, in my view does the general appearance of the lettering warrant a date much later than 420 B.C. Perhaps, if this is the document referred to in #33, the reference is merely to the grant of proxenia and euergesia. The other provisions of this document, then, would be of a special nature, perhaps occasioned as a result of Corinthian hostility to the terms of the Peace and to Polystratos for the part he had played in the negotiations. Possibly he was forced into exile by this hostility: Phleious is much closer geographically to Corinth than is Aleia; thus, Asteas was not victimised as Polystratos may have been.

#33. Proxeny. 421/0 B.C. Honours for Asteas of Aleia. Pl.VIII,6

BIBLIOGRAPHY. Pittakys, E.A., 51(1859), pp. 1852-1853
 #3555; I.G., I, 45 (1873); Koehler, Ath.Mitt., I(1876),
 pp. 171-172; Wilamowitz, Index Schol.Goett. (1885), p.15;
 Wilhelm, G.G.A. (1898), p. 220; Jahreshefte, III (1900),
 p. 147 note 4; Michel, Recueil (1900), p. 86 #76; Roberts
 and Gardner, Epigraphy, II (1905), pp. 51-52 #18; Kern,
Inscr.Gr. (1913), p.xi #17; I.G., V. 2, p. 74, vi; S.I.G.,
 I³, (1915), pp. 109-110 #85; Schwyzer, D.G.³ (1923), p.
 386 #12; I.G., I², 82 (1924); Nachmanson, H.I.A.² (1931),
 pp. 17-18 #15; Austin, Stoichedon (1938), p. 33; S.E.G.,
 X (1949), 92; Gomme, Commentary, III (1956), p. 680;
 Lambrechts, Proxeni decreten (1958), pp. 56-57, 108-109,
 117, 119, 136, 151.

PHOTOGRAPH. Kern (loc.cit.), pl. 17 (left).

EM 6582, fragment of slightly micaceous Pentelic marble,
 preserving both edges, the rough-picked back and the top.
 It was found on August 12, 1859, beside the north end of
 the Parthenon on the Akropolis; it was first published
 by Pittakys (loc.cit.). The top is decorated with a
 triangular gable, without a moulding; at each corner there

was a triangular akroterion (that on the left is now broken away), and there may have been a similar akroterion at the apex of the gable. The stele tapers slightly from bottom to top, but the width of both margins remains fairly constant, so that the horizontal chequer increases towards the bottom. There is a vertical uninscribed space of max. 0.030m. below line 20.

H.max. 0.467m. W.(top) 0.240m.; (bottom) 0.246m. Th. 0.104m. Letter-height 0.010m. Chequer, lines 3ff. 0.0105m.- 0.0106m.x 0.0144m; lines 1-2 non-stoichedon; vertical chequer 0.0150m.

Letter-shapes. A4, B3, E4, H2, Θ4, K2, Λ2 and 4, M1 and 2, N7 (9?), O2 and 3, Π1, P6, 8 and 9, Σ7, Y7 (8?), Φ5, X3. Attic script, well-cut but fairly crowded, in a distinctive hand, with wide daseia, mu,, nu and sigma.

The daseia is used inconsistently.. The preamble dates this decree to 421/0 B.C. I know of three other documents engraved in this hand: I.G., I², 76b, I.G., I², 84 and #41. The first two are dated, the former securely, close to 421/0 B.C.; #41 is dated ca 425-405 B.C. Several other documents are inscribed in a very similar hand: I.G., I², 64 and 71; #32 and S.E.G., X, 87. All have been dated

to the last years of the Archidamian War; the hand, differing really only in the shape of mu and the width of nu and pi and the diameter of omicron, is so close to that of the present document that, in my view, all may be the work of the same mason, or, at any rate, products of the same workshop.

421/0 B.C.

Non-stoich.

Προκλέες Ἀτάρβο Εὖον-

υμεῦς ἐγγραμμάτευσ.

vacatStoich.21

5

ἔδοχσεν τῷ βολῇ καὶ τῷ

δέμοι, ἡιπποθοντῖς ἐπρυτ-

άνευσ, Προκλῆς ἐγγραμμάτε-

υσ, Τιμίας ἐπεστάτε, Ἀριστ-

ίον ἔρχε, Θρασυκλέες εἶπε·

ἐπαινέσαι Ἀστέαν τὸν Ἀλε-

όν, ἡότι εὖ ποεῖ Ἀθηναῖος κ-

10

αὶ ἰδίαὶ καὶ δεροσίαι τὸν ἄ-

φικνόμενον καὶ νῦν καὶ ἐν

τῷ πρόσθεν χρόνοι, καὶ ἀν-

αγραψάτο πρόχσενον καὶ

εὐεργέτεν Ἀθηναῖον καθά-

15 περ Πολύστρατον τὸν Φλει-
 άσιον ἐστέλει λιθίνει ὁ γ-
 ραμματεὺς ἡο τῆς βολῆς κα-
 ὶ καταθέτο ἐμ πόλει· τὸ δὲ ἀ-
 ργύριον δόντον ἡ(ο)ι κολακρ-
 20 ἔται. vacat

COMMENTARY. This document is complete; its date, the summer of 421/0 B.C., is given by the mention of the archon Aristion in the preamble. The Peace of Nikias, between the Athenians and the Lakedaimonians, was concluded immediately after the City Dionysia in 422/1 B.C.. Shortly after this, the fifty-year alliance between Athens and Sparta began (Thucydides, V, 18-24). The archonship of Aristion followed these events, and the proxeny of Asteas must therefore be placed fairly early in that archonship, if his connexion with the Peace of Nikias be accepted. The grounds for assuming this connexion are as follows: the proposer of this decree, Thrasykles, was probably also one of those who swore on behalf of Athens to both the Peace and the alliance; Thucydides includes this name in his text of both documents (V, 19.2; 24.1), and it is reasonable to assume that the orator and the oath-taker are one and

the same. Also mentioned in this decree for a man of Aleia is Polystratos of Phleious, whose proxeny is to provide the exemplar for that of Asteas. Both Aleia and Phleious are on one of the overland routes to Sparta from Athens; probably, as Koehler first suggested (loc. cit.), Asteas and Polystratos gave hospitality and assistance to the Athenian embassies that negotiated the Peace and the alliance (note the reference in lines 9-11 to both public and private assistance to visitors). The two decrees are not parallel: #32, the decree for Polystratos, is badly mutilated and largely obscure, but what survives of its text is certainly very different from and much more complex than that of #33. There has been some discussion over the route taken by the Athenian embassies (see Gomme, loc. cit.), whether they went by sea to Argos and then overland, or whether their journey was entirely by land, through Megara and Corinth. I do not believe that this affects the standing of either of these decrees, but think that Gomme's suggestion of an overland route is the more likely, despite the probable unfriendliness to an Athenian embassy of both Megara and Corinth. Phleious lies well to the north of Argos, on the road south from Corinth, while Aleia is north-west of Argos, over the mountains, so that, if the embassy passed through both on

its trip to Sparta, its route must have been somewhat roundabout. Possibly there were several journeys before both Peace and alliance were concluded..

It is very likely that Prokles, the secretary of this decree, is identical with that Prokles who was one of the swearers of both the Peace and the alliance (Thucydides, V, 19.2; 24.1; see P.A., II, 12206). His name is spelt in line 1 with double epsilon; in line 5, however, it is spelt with one epsilon only.. Thrasykles' name, in line 7, is spelt with double epsilon; in each case the Ionic form of the name ends - $\lambda\tilde{\eta}\varsigma$; thus, it seems that the spelling in line 5 is an oversight on the part of the mason or the secretary himself..

Thrasykles is perhaps the same man as the general of 412/1 B.C. (see Kirchner, P.A., I, 7317)..

Line 19. The mason engraved $h\iota$ for $ho\iota$.

#34 and 35. Proxeny. ca 430-410 B.C. Honours for

Lykon of Achaia; honours for another man?

Pl.VIII,2,4

BIBLIOGRAPHY. Kirchhoff, Sitzungsb.Ak.Berlin (1887), p. 1192 #21; Mylonas, B.C.H., XII (1888), pp. 133-135 #3; Kirchhoff, Sitzungsb.Ak.Berlin (1888), p. 246 #24; Curtius, G.G., II, 6(1888), p. 883; Wilhelm, Hermes, XXIV (1889), pp. 110-113 #11; I.G., I, Supplement, pp. 165-166 #53b (1891); Wilhelm, G.G.A. (1903), p. 776; Michel, Recueil, Supplément (1912), p. 6 #1433; S.I.G., I³ (1915), #92; I.G., I², 93 (1924); Woodhead, A.J.P., LXXV (1954), pp. 135-136 note 12; S.E.G., XIII (1956), 11; Lambrechts, Proxeni edicta (1958), pp. 28, 84, 117, 151; Mattingly, Ehrenberg Studies (1966), pp. 205, 213-214; S.E.G., XXIII (1968), 19.

PHOTOGRAPHS. None so far published.

Two fragments of white, slightly micaceous marble. There is no question of joins: one is a copy of the other.

Fragment a, EM 6814, was found at the end of 1887 in excavations of the foundations of the temple of Roma and Augustus east of the Parthenon on the Akropolis. It was

first published from a transcript of Lolling by Kirchhoff (Sitzungsb. Ak. Berlin [1888], p. 246 #24). The right and left edges, as well as the rough-picked back, are preserved; the horizontal profile of the back is slightly convex; its right and left edges have been trimmed at an angle of 45° . The stele is wider and thicker at the bottom than at the top. Foliation is vertical and diagonal to the face from left rear to right face. The stele is thicker on the left than on the right.

H.max. 0.260m. W. (top) 0.301m.; (bottom) 0.306m. Th.(top) 0.080m.-0.083m.; (bottom) 0.093m.-0.096m. Letter-height 0.010m.-0.011m. Chequer 0.0136m.x 0.0140m.

Letter-shapes. A5 (some 4), B3, E4 (one 5), H1, Θ3 (some 4), K2, M1 and 2, N7, O1-2, Π1-4, P8, Σ7, Υ7, Φ6, X3, Q3. Ionic script with generally rather wide letters, somewhat crowded. Omega type 3 is not found in dated inscriptions earlier than 410 B.C., but it occurs in I.G., I², 25, which has been dated plausibly to the 420's. Phi type 6 is not found before 432 B.C..

Fragment b, EM 6816, was found in the north wall of the Akropolis in excavations near the Erechtheion; it was first published from a transcript of Lolling by Kirchhoff

(Sitzungsb.Ak.Berlin [1887], p. 1192 #21). The right edge and part of the rough-picked back are preserved. Foliation is vertical and almost parallel to the face.

H.max. 0.169m. W.max. 0.108m. Th.0.066m. Letter-height 0.011m.-0.012m. Chequer 0.0137m.x 0.0144m.

Letter-shapes. A⁴ (some 5), E⁴, Θ³, K², M², N⁷, OI-2, Σ⁷, Υ⁷, Ω³. Ionic script, less well-cut and more widely-spaced than fragment a. The hand is similar, but not, I believe, identical, though differences may be the result of the wider spacing in fragment b. Of neither fragment can the date be inferred with any accuracy: the style of engraving and the letter-shapes suggest a date after 430 B.C., probably ca 420 B.C., but a later date cannot be ruled out (see below, on lines 4-5 and 15-18 of fragment a).

ca 430-410 B.C.

Stoich.21

a

[ἔδοξεν τῇι βολῇι καὶ τῷι δ]-
[ῆμωι, .±.5. ἐπρυτάνευε, ±.2]-
[.]αῖτος ἔγρ[α]μ[μάτευε, .2.]λε[.]
αῖνετος ἐπεστάτε, Πείσαν-
5 δρος εἶπε· Λύκωνα τὸν Ἀχαι-

10 ὄν, ἐπειδὴ εὖ ποεῖ Ἀθηναί-
 [ς] ἀναγραφάτω πρόξενον κα-
 ῖ εὐεργέτην Ἀθηναίων ἐν σ-
 τήλῃ λιθίνει ἐμ πόλει· ὁ γρ-
 αμματεὺς ὁ τῆς βολῆς καὶ κ-
 αταθέτω ἐμ πόλει· τὴν δὲ να-
 ῦν ἣν δεῖται ἐκκομίσασθαι
 15 ἐξ Ἀχαιΐας ἐκκομίσασθω κ-
 αὶ ἐξῆναι αὐτῷ πλεῖν καὶ χ-
 ρήματα ἐσάγεν ὅσης Ἀθην-
 αῖοι κρατῶσι καὶ ἐς τὰ Ἀθην-
 αίων φρόρια· ἐς δὲ τὸν κόλπ-
 [ο]ν [μ]ῇ [ἐξ]ῆ[ναι ...⁵...]ν [αὐ]τῷ

ca 430-410 B.C.

Stoich. 22

b [ἔδοξεν τῇ βολῇ καὶ τῷ δῇ]-
 [μῳ, ...⁵... ἐπρυτάνευε, ...⁴...]-
 [αῖος ἐγγραμμάτευε, ? .λε.αίν]-
 [ετος ἐπεστάτε, Πείσανδρος]
 5 [εἶπε· ...⁶... τὸν ...⁶..., ἐπε]-
 [ιδὴ εὖ ποεῖ Ἀθηναῖος, ἀναγρ]-
 [αψάτω πρόξενον καὶ εὐεργέ]-

[την Αθηναίων ἐν στήλῃ λιθ]-
 [ίνει ἐμ πόλει ὁ γρα]μματεὺς
 10 [ὁ τῆς βολῆς καὶ κατ]αθέτω ἐμ
 [πόλει· τὴν δὲ ναῦν ἥ]ν δέτα· ἐ-
 [κκομίσασθαι ἐξ Α]χαιΐας ἐκ-
 [κομισάσθω καὶ ἐξ]ῆναι αὐτῷ-
 [ι πλεῦν καὶ χρήματα] ἐσάγειν ὅ-
 15 [σης Αθηναῖοι κρατ]ῶσι καὶ ἐ-
 [ς τὰ Αθηναίων φρόρια· ἐ]ς δὲ [τ]-
 [ὸν κόλπον μὴ ἐξῆναι ..⁵..]η[.]
 [αὐτῷ -----]

COMMENTARY. That one fragment is a copy of the other there can be no doubt: restoration of fragment b with a different preamble is no doubt possible, but the coincidence that the otherwise unique formulae of lines 11ff. of fragment b appear to repeat exactly those of fragment a, lines 9-16, without any anomalies of spacing except the correction of the mason's error in line 9 of fragment a (where he has twenty-two letters in twenty-one stoichoi), seems too strong to overlook. That lines 1-8, including the preamble, of fragment b can be restored by direct analogy with lines 1-9 of

fragment a, but with a line-length of twenty-two letters, is a happy coincidence. Why there are two copies, in Athens, of apparently the same inscription is another matter: we know of one other proxeny in the fifth century of which two copies were inscribed (#13); in this example the second stele is to be set up in Halikarnassos; we possess only the Athenian copy (there are also two cases, #5 and #20, in which a stele and a sanis are ordered to be set up at Athens). An alternative is to assume that the two stelai related to different proxenoi, but that the terms of their proxenies were identical. As it happens, we do possess two such stelai (#32 and #33), inscribed at the same time and both erected in Athens, but the language of the one apparently does not repeat that of the other, and it also contains a clause referring to the other. In the present case such a clause has not survived and the language is identical. Both documents appear to have been set up on the Akropolis; both were later used as building-stones in construction or repair-work, but their original site, like that of so many other proxeny-stelai, seems to have been near the Erechtheion (see chapter 1, above p101). It is possible that the second stele was merely a practice-piece,

or was broken by accident, but the evidence of the find-spots suggests that this is unlikely and that both stelai actually were erected. Therefore, I think it is most likely that here we have two separate proxeny-decrees, passed at the same time, in favour of two persons, perhaps both of them Achaians, couched in identical terms. The hands are different, but sufficiently close that the same date can be posited for both. A search of decrees dated between 430 and 410 B.C. has failed to produce any that are engraved by the same hands; however, I.G., I², 25, #64 and S.E.G., X, 77 all exhibit certain close similarities with both fragments a and b; only I.G., I², 25 is engraved in Ionic script. All probably date to the late 420's or early 410's. I.G., I², 108 (410/09 B.C.) is also close. Mattingly (op.cit., p. 214) suggests that the date of #34 and #35 should be before 420 B.C., because of the absence of an archon-formula in the preamble; I am not sure that this is a valid argument: while it is true that documents whose preamble does contain an archon-formula are generally found after 421/0 B.C., the reverse is not true: at least eight documents securely dated after 420 B.C. do not contain such an archon-formula in their preambles (I.G., I², 99, 101, 111 and 113; in I.G., I², 104, 115,

123 and #66 an archon-formula is inscribed separately as a heading to the stele). Since the top of the stele is not preserved in either fragment it is impossible to say categorically that neither contained an archon-formula. A terminus post quem non may be provided by the name of the orator, Peisandros (lines 4-5): if this man is identical with the friend of Alkibiades who promoted the oligarchy of 411 B.C., he cannot have moved this decree after 411 B.C., when he was condemned and exiled with the fall of the Four Hundred. Woodhead (loc.cit.) suggests that a date around 415/4 B.C. is most likely, though one as early as 425 B.C. or as late as 411 B.C. is not impossible; Peisandros seems to have held public office between 415 and 413 B.C. (see Aristophanes, Lysistrata, 490), but was also active in the late 420's, when he served as epistates for the statues of Athena and Hephaistos (I.G., I², 370.3), and perhaps was an opponent of the Peace of Nikias (see Aristophanes, Peace, 394-395). Mattingly (loc.cit.) suggests that the homeland of Lykon may have been not the Peloponnesian Achaia but Achaia Phthiotis; in this case the Gulf referred to in lines 17-18 of fragment a would be the Gulf of Pagasai. Athens occupied Pteleon, just inside the Gulf of Pagasai,

some time before 422 B.C. (Thucydides, V. 18.7; see Gomme, Commentary, III [1956], p. 674); Mattingly (loc. cit.) suggests that the fortification of this site was a response, in 424/3 B.C., to the Spartan occupation of Herakleia Trachinia in 426 B.C. and the subsequent threat to the security of Euboea. If this argument holds good, then the proxy of Lykon presumably was awarded in 422/1 B.C., since Pteleon was abandoned under the terms of the Peace of Nikias in 421 B.C., and a blockade could not have been imposed during the period of the Truce that preceded the Peace (423 spring to 422 spring). Mattingly's arguments are persuasive but not conclusive: if Herakleia Trachinia is the place being blockaded, the Gulf into which entry is not permitted must surely be the Mälian Gulf rather than that of Pagasai (as Mattingly recognized); but one would expect so important a point to be spelled out: the decree refers merely to "the Gulf"; a much better-known Gulf, and one not likely to lead to ambiguities when cited merely as "the Gulf" is the Gulf of Corinth. I believe that this is far more likely to be the gulf referred to than that suggested by Mattingly: the Athenians blockaded it early in the Archidamian War, in 429/8 B.C., and possibly again in 426 B.C., but do not

seem to have been active again in this area until 419 B.C., when Alkibiades blockaded the Gulf (Thucydides, V, 52.2). It was closed again in 414/3 B.C. and the winter of 413/2 B.C. (Thucydides, VII, 17.2; 19.5; 31.4; 34.1; 36.2).

Lines 2-3. Wilhelm restored the name of the secretary as [Θε]αῖος. If this is correct, the date of the decree may be 421/0 B.C., since Theaios was orator of I.G., I², 81, securely dated to that year by its correlation with I.G., I², 311.8-9. There are other possible names of five or six letters, but Theaios seems the likeliest. The bottom of initial alpha can be read; to the left of this, perhaps rather too low, is the tip of what seems to be a right diagonal foot; if this is part of a letter it will be a lambda and the name Laios must be read: this is known in the fourth century (P.A., II, 8961), but only in the tribe Pandionis. Of gamma and rho only the bottoms of the verticals survive; the bottom of the right foot of mu and the right foot of lambda can be seen; the lower bar and part of the vertical of epsilon are clear. The name of the epistates is probably Polemainetos: a man of this name is known as a soothsayer early in the fourth century (P.A., II, 11879). In line 3 only the right foot

of initial alpha survives.

Line 5. Dittenberger (S.I.G., I³[1915], 92) suggested that the honorand was the Achaian mercenary leader mentioned by Xenophon (Anabasis, V, 6.27; VI, 2.4): if so, this would make it almost certain that "the Gulf" in line 17 is the Corinthian Gulf.

Line 9. Between epsilon and omicron an iota has been inserted to correct the mason's omission of it.

Line 17. Only the apex of alpha can be seen.

Line 18. Only the tops of the letters can be seen in this line: the top of the right hasta of nu, the top of the right hasta of eta (the left has disappeared but was read by Lolling; see Kirchhoff [1888]), and the upper left corner of the second epsilon. Lolling (loc. cit.) also saw the upper left corner of the first epsilon and the top bar of xi, but these have now disappeared.

Under the tau of line 17 Lolling saw a diagonal stroke: such a stroke survives, but it is too high and too far to the right for a letter. In the next stoichos to the right he saw a right vertical, whose tip still survives. This could be nu or eta: Dittenberger (loc. cit.) suggested that the missing word was [ἐσπλῆ]ν; this seems very likely but not certain. The bar and part of the vertical of tau are clear, but only the tops of omega and iota are

visible..

Fragment b, line 9. Only the bottoms of these letters survive.

Line 12. The tips of both diagonals of chi can be seen at the right edge of the stoichos..

Line 14. The presence of alpha before the first epsilon is confirmed by the absence of any cutting in the preserved upper right corner of the stoichos..

Line 16. The tops only of sigma and delta survive.

Line 17. Below epsilon the tip of the right hasta of a possible eta is visible; if this is a letter it will make impossible Dittenberger's suggested [$\epsilon\sigma\kappa\lambda\epsilon$]v (see fragment a, line 18).

It is clear that Lykon, a friend and benefactor of Athens, asked for and received certain trading privileges in an area blockaded by Athenian forces, including the right to trade with Athenian garrisons there and elsewhere.

The possible identification of Lykon with the mercenary leader of the early fourth century is persuasive: Lykon, as a friend of Athens, might well find it advisable to leave the Peloponnese and seek his fortunes elsewhere after the fall of Athens. If so, "the Gulf" must be the Corinthian Gulf, and the context is more likely to be that of the Athenian operations in 414/3 and 413/2 B.C.

than any operations late in the 420's: the expedition of Alkibiades in 419 B.C. seems to have been of fairly small scope and was apparently limited in its effect because of the counter-measures initiated by the Corinthians (Thucydides, V, 52.2).

#36. Proxeny. ca 430-405 B.C. Honours for Proxenos,
citizen of an unknown state. Pl. X,1

BIBLIOGRAPHY. Kavvadias, E.A. (1898), p. 12 #5; Wilhelm, Mélanges Nicole, II (1905), p. 601; I.G., I², 146 (1924); Pope, Non-Athenians (1935), pp. 50 note 36, 200, 230; Woodhead, Hesperia, XVII (1948), pp. 57-58; Robert, R.E.G., LXII (1949), p. 104 #42; Fraser and Bean, Peraea (1954), p. 144 note 4; S.E.G., XII (1955), 36; Lambrechts, Proxeni edecreten (1958), pp. 30, 34-35, 70, 151.

PHOTOGRAPHS. Kavvadias (op.cit.), pl. I ; Woodhead, (op.cit.), pl. 24 (squeeze).

EM 8119 (also numbered EM 55 in the inventory), fragment of micaceous Pentelic marble, preserving the top and left edge, as well as the rough-picked back. It was found in 1896/7 in excavations on the north slope of the Akropolis in a building within the Cave of Apollo; it was first published by Kavvadias (loc.cit.). The foliation is vertical and apparently parallel to the face. The top is pick-dressed; the face is smooth-dressed, but the marks of the rasp are still visible.

H.max. 0.166m. W.max. 0.195m. Th. 0.080m. Letter-height 0.010m.-0.012m. Non-stoichedon; vertical chequer, lines 1-3 0.0173m.; lines 4ff. 0.0186m.

Letter-shapes. A⁴-5, B³, E⁴ (top bar sometimes shorter), H¹-2, Θ⁴, K², Λ², M², N⁷ and 9, O¹-2, Π¹ and 2, P⁸, Σ⁸ and 10, Υ⁷, X³. The heading (lines 1-3) is partly in Ionic script (but XΣ for Ε); lines 4ff. are in Attic script. It is impossible to tell whether the daseia was used or not. The cutting is very inexpert and careless, with several mistakes untidily erased and corrected. Letter-shapes and sizes are inconsistent, but the character of the letters suggests a date after 430 B.C., while the combination of Attic and Ionic scripts makes a date near the end of the fifth century likely. I know of no inscription by the same hand; the hand of I.G., I², 111 is not greatly different, though much neater and more carefully cut. The first hand of I.G., I², 25 is very close to that of the present decree; so is that of I.G.², 112. The closest resemblance is borne by the hand of I.G., II², 57, a document of the early fourth century; there are also points of similarity in the script of the British Museum fragment of I.G., I², 310, dated to 429/8 B.C. The unpublished

fragment EM 5171 may be by the same hand as the present document, but does not belong to the same stele. None of the documents cited above is earlier than 430 B.C.

ca 430-405 B.C.

Non-stoich.

Πρόχσενος Χαλκ[-----] ca 40-41
 εὐεργέτης Χαλ[-----]
 ίδες.

vacat

[ἔδ]οχσεν τῷ βολῇ κα[ὶ τῷ δέμοι, -----] ca 50-52
 -----]

5 [πρό]χ(σ)ενον τὸν [-----] ca 42-44
 -----]

[.² ἐν στ]ῆλει ἐν πό[λει -----] ca 45-46
 ----- καὶ]

[τὸς παῖδα]ς τὸς τοῦ[το -----]
 -----]

[.....!!.....] ἐπιμ[έλεσθαι -----]
 -----]

COMMENTARY. The irregular spacing and shaping of the letters makes this a very difficult document to interpret and restore. Clearly, lines 1-3 constitute a heading, naming the honorand and identifying either his city or the state that he serves. It has been suggested that the letters XAAK in line 1 and XAA in line 2 identify either the state or the man; whether he was an Athenian appointed proxenos by a foreign state, or a foreigner appointed proxenos by Athens, is one of the many uncertainties of this decree. The various interpretations of lines 1-3 are as follows:

Kavvadias (loc.cit.):

Πρόχσενος Χαλκ[ιδέον ὁ δεῖνα καὶ]
 εὐεργέτης Χαλ[----- αὐτὸς καὶ οἱ πα]-
 ῖδες.

Kavvadias also restores line 1 in another way:

Πρόχσενος Χαλκ[ιδέος? πρόχσενος καὶ]

Wilhelm (loc.cit.):

Πρόχσενος Χαλκ[ιδέως πρόχσενος καὶ]
 εὐεργέτης Χαλ[εεὺς? καὶ οἱ τοῦτο πα]-
 ῖδες.

Hiller (I.G., I², 146) follows Wilhelm, but restores

Χαλκ[ιδέος] in line 1 and Χαλ[εἰεὺς] in line 2.

Woodhead (loc.cit.) questions the restoration Χαλκ[ιδέος] in line 1 and restores Χαλ[κιάτης] in line 2; in other respects he follows Wilhelm and Hiller. The interpretation to be given to these lines depends on that of the decree itself; I therefore postpone discussion of them until I have dealt with lines 4ff.

Line 4. The opening of this line is very cramped, perhaps because the mason wished to place the word Προχόμενον at the beginning of line 5, and thus had to fit the whole preamble into one line. If this is so, the inscription must have been of considerable width. The first two letters have disappeared, and only the top of the third letter (omicron) survives; from the placing of this, however, it can be calculated that this line began about half a stoichos-width to the left of the initial letters in lines 1-3. The fourth letter (chi) is set very high and is rather small; it was evidently omitted from the text and inserted later. The mason made more mistakes further on: lambda and epsilon were left out of the word βολῆ; they were added later after partial erasure of iota and kappa, which were then recut so that four letters now occupy the space intended for two. Previous editors have regar-

ded this line as containing an abbreviated preamble and have restored [ἐδ]οχσεν τῷ βολῇ κα[ὶ τῷ δέμοι· ἀναγράφσαι πρόχσ]ενον , placing the end of line 4 either after [ἀναγράφσαι] (Hiller), between rho and omicron of [πρ|όχσ]ενον (Woodhead), or between omicron and chi (Kavvadias). I think Hiller is correct in his estimation of the end of the line.

Line 5. The first five surviving letters of the line are very widely-spaced. This suggests that the word here is the name of the honorand, given special prominence; it thus, probably, began at the start of the line; the article τὸν following this word reinforces my conclusion. Before epsilon at the left edge there are two intersecting diagonals, clearly parts of a chi rather than of a sigma. I think that, once again, the mason made a mistake, omitting sigma from the word [πρό]χ(σ)ενον. Kavvadias restores this line as follows:

[πρ|όχ]σενον τὸν [Χαλκιδέον τὸν δεῖνα ἐστέλει λι]-

Hiller's version runs as follows:

[πρόχσ]ενον τὸν [Χαλκιδέος Χαλειέα ἐστέ]-

Woodhead has a different and, I think, more satisfactory text:

[πρ|όχσ]ενον τὸν [Χαλκεάτεν ἐστέλει].

The ethnic, however, cannot be restored with any certainty (see below).

Kavvadias thus views this document as a copy of a Chalkidian decree in which an Athenian citizen is named proxenos; Hiller regards the proxenos as a citizen of Chaleion, on the Corinthian Gulf, while Woodhead thinks him to be a citizen of Chalke; a reference to the south-eastern Aegean "suits the political probabilities, as well as the epigraphical requirements, very much better" (op.cit., p. 57). Chalke is a small island off the west coast of Rhodes. Fraser and Bean (loc.cit.) and Robert (loc.cit.) are sceptical of this suggestion. However, Chalke was a member of the Confederacy from the beginning (see A.T.L., I, pp. 436-437; the ethnic was variously Χαλκεῖται, Χαλκειᾶται and Χαλχιᾶται).

Line 6. If the line-length is to be established at all, it must be as a result of the restoration of lines 5-6. The first two letters of line 6 are only partly preserved; Kavvadias regarded the cuttings here as parts of an iota and a nu; later editors omit them. However, parts of both letters are still visible: before epsilon there is a vertical, set a long way to

the left of it; below and to the right the stone is abraded, but the tip of a diagonal can be seen in this area between the vertical and epsilon. The letter is thus a lambda. To the left of this, at the top of the stoichos, there is a small vertical cut, so short that it could be regarded as either the top of a vertical stroke or the end of a horizontal. Its left side is lost, but I think that this must be part of the top bar of an epsilon: the surviving letters of this line surely are part of the formula [έν στ]έλει έν πό[λει]; there is no trace, except in lines 1-3, of ionicisms in this document; so that an eta here is unlikely. The formula

[ἀναγράφαι ----- πρόχσενον καὶ εὐεργέτην (Ἀθηναίον)
τὸν γραμματέα (τὸν) τέξ βολῆς έν στ]έλει έν πό[λει]
is clearly called for in lines 4-6, though the order and the exact relationship to it of the words surviving in lines 5 and 7 are not so clear.

Line 7. The tip of a diagonal survives at the top of the stoichos before the first tau. Hiller suggested that the phrase [καὶ τὸς παῖδας τ]ὸς τοῦ[το] should be restored here; this is borne out by the survival of this diagonal stroke, which should thus be interpreted as the top stroke of a sigma. Woodhead restored [καὶ]τὸς τοῦ[το παῖδας].

Line 8. The tops of four letters survive, of which the first only is doubtful; the top bar and part of the vertical survive, making the reading of an epsilon probable. Woodhead restores [ἡόπος δ' ἄν με ἀδικῶνται] ἐπιμ[έλεσθαι τέν τε βολέν τέν αἰεὶ βολεύουσιν καὶ τοὺς πρυτάνεις καὶ τοὺς στρατηγούς]. This is probably correct in essence.

No interpretation so far put forward does justice to the surviving letters in lines 4ff., and to their spacing. My own view is that a longer line is required than has hitherto been proposed. I restore the following, which seems to me a plausible reconstruction:

[ἔδ]οχσεν τῷ βολῷ κα[ὶ τῷ δέμῳ, ca 11-13
 εἶπεν· ἀναγράψαι]
 5 [Πρό]χ(σ)ενον τὸν [ca 9-11 τὸν γραμματέα τὸν
 τῷ βολ]-
 [ἔς ἐν στ]έλει ἐν πᾶλει πρόχσενον καὶ εὐεργέτην
 αὐτὸν καὶ]
 [τὸς παῖδας] τὸς τοῦ[το ca 8 καὶ ca 10
 ἡόπος δ' ἄν]
 [με ἀδικῶνται] ἐπιμ[έλεσθαι κτλ.]

The gap in line 7 is too large to be filled by any

extension of the publication-formula, such as [τέλει τοῖς αὐτοῖς] , and I suggest that Proxenos' sons are here named. The length of line 6 is limited by that of line 5: it could be a little longer, so that instead of [αὐτόν] one might restore [Ἀθηναίον], but this would make the ethnic in line 5 even longer: the ethnic [Χαλκεδόνιον] is possible; Chalkedon was an original member of the Confederacy, but seems to have revolted in 411 B.C. (A.T.L., I, p. 439). Woodhead's [Χαλκεάτην] is equally plausible, but, in fact, I doubt very much whether we have any part of the ethnic preserved in lines 1-2, so that almost any ethnic is possible, provided it is of suitable length and relevant to the Empire between 430 and 405 B.C. The heading (lines 1-3) has, on the surviving part of the stone, thirteen letters compared to the fourteen to be restored in line 6; thus, if my restoration of lines 5-6 is correct, each line of the heading should contain between forty and forty-four letters. At this point, however, the oddity of the heading becomes even more striking: if my interpretation of line 5 is correct, the honorand's name is Proxenos; if the letters **XAAK** in line 1 are

part of an ethnic one would expect the article to be used; since it is not, I suggest that Woodhead is right and that these letters are part of a patronymic, perhaps Χαλκ[ιδέος], and that the order of the heading was as follows:

Πρόχσενος Χαλκ[ιδέος ὁ ~~ca~~ 9-11--- πρόχσενος καὶ]
εὐεργέτης. Χαλ[κιδεὺς καὶ ~~ca~~ 10----- οἱ Προχσένο πα]-
ῖδες.

This would explain the otherwise very odd appearance of the letters XAA in line 2. The elder of the two sons would have been named after his paternal grandfather. I do not believe that an ethnic would be found in this position without an article. The name Chalkideus is found in Athens and Sparta, while Proxenos is found in Thebes, Knidos and Miletos in the fifth century, and in one of the states of the Delphic Amphiktyony in the third century.

The ethnics [Κνίδιος] and [Μιλήσιος] are both of a length suitable for restoration in lines 1 and 5; if we assume that the honorand was from Knidos a possible connexion can be made with another fifth-century proxeny-decree, #47, (dated between 430 and 415 B.C.), which honours Proxenides son of Proxenos the Knidian. However,

I believe that the date of #47 is the late 420's, so that the chronology becomes rather awkward: Knidos revolted from Athens in 412/1 B.C.; thus, both decrees would have to be dated between 430 and 412 B.C. Multiple proxenies are not unknown in the fifth century (cf. #9, honouring the sons of Iphiades), but I think it unlikely that two men of the same family would perform all the actions of a proxenos at the same time; rather, the junior members of the family would assist the head, and one of them would succeed him at his death, even though all might bear the title of proxenos.

Miletos revolted from Athens at about the same time as Knidos (Thucydides, VIII, 17.3; A.T.L., I, pp. 331, 343, 419; the date was 413/2 B.C.), so that in this case, too, the choice of a date for the present decree is limited.

#37. Proxeny. ca 430-415 B.C. Honours for an unknown man.

Pl. IX,2

BIBLIOGRAPHY. I.G., I, Supplement, p. 25 #1161 (1877);
I.G., I², 147 (1924); Lambrechts, Proxenedecreten (1958),
pp. 34, 81.

PHOTOGRAPHS. None so far published.

EM 6832, fragment of blue-white, slightly micaceous marble, broken on all sides. It was found on the Akropolis near the Erechtheion and was first published by Kirchhoff from a transcript of R. Schoell as I.G., I, Supplement, p. 25 #1161 in 1877. The foliation is diagonal, from top right face to bottom left reverse. There is a vertical uninscribed space of 0.068m. below the last line.

H.max. 0.192m. W.max. 0.133m. Th.max. 0.112m. Letter-height 0.009m.-0.010m. Chequer 0.0120m.x 0.0155m.

Letter-shapes. A5, E4, G4, K2, M1, N7, O2, Π1, Σ 10 (?), Y7.

Attic script; whether or not the daseia was used is uncertain. The letter-shapes and the spacing suggest a date in the late 430's or in the first half of the Peloponnesian War. Mu type 1 is found as early as 445 B.C., but is most common after

430 B.C.: alpha type 5 is frequently used in the late 430's and early 420's; sigma type 10 is most common in the 430's. I.G., I², 368 (426/5 B.C.) is by a very similar hand. The marble is of a type that seems to have come into vogue ca 420 B.C.

ca 430-415 B.C.

Stoich.

[-----]υγ[-----]
 [-----h]όπο[ς -----]
 [-----α]δικῆ[ται -----]
 [-----ε]πιμέ[λεσθαι -----]
 5 [-----τὸς ἀρχ]οντα[ς -----]
 [-----τὸς στρατ]εγὸς [-----]
 [-----]τινι [-----]

vacat

COMMENTARY. The only restoration so far attempted is that of Hiller (I.G., I², 147); he restores lines 2, 4 and 5 with a line-length of twenty letters. It is possible to restore with a sixteen-letter line as well, or with one of thirty letters (see below).

Line 1. In addition to the upsilon read by previous editors there are both feet of a triangular letter, either alpha or gamma.

Lines 2-3. [ἡ]όπο[ς δ' ἄν μεδ' ἡυφ' ἡενὸς|ἀ]δικῆ[ται -----¹²-----]

Hiller. Since the broken left side of the stone extends a considerable distance to the left of the first visible letter, Hiller's arrangement must be altered and the line-break moved at least five spaces to the left. For the gap Hiller suggests [μεδὲ οἱ παῖδες?].

Lines 4-6. [ἐ]πιμέ[λεσθαι αὐτὸ τὸς ἄρ|χ]οντα[ς καὶ τὸς ἐκεῖ στρα|τ]εγὸς[-]Hiller.

Line 7. The first complete surviving letter is iota; before it is the right end of the horizontal of tau.

Line 8. There is no trace of any letter here below line 7.

Exempli gratia I append two alternative restorations of lines 2-6. There is no doubt that Hiller's restorations are basically correct, but in lines 2-3 the honorand should be designated, probably by the pronoun αὐτός, while in line 5 the location of the archons should surely be indicated, since Athens maintained such officials in several parts of the Empire. I restore as follows:

Stoich.16

[...⁵...]υγ[...⁹...]

[...³.ἡ]όπο[ς δ' ἄν με αὐτ]-

[ὸς ἀ]δικῆ[ται ἡυφ' ἡεν]-

[ὸς ἐ]πιμέ[λεσθαι τὸς]

5 [ἄρχ]οντα[ς καὶ τοὺς στ]-
 [ρατ]εγὸς [...⁹....]
 [...]_{τινι} [...⁸....]
 [-----] vacat

Alternatively:

Stoich.30

[...⁵...]υγ[.....²³.....]
 [.³._h]όπο[ς δὲ ἄμ μεδ'ἡυφ'ἡενὸς μέτε αὐτ]-
 [ὸς ἄ]δικῆ[ται μέτε μεδὲς τῶν παίδων αὐ]-
 [τῷ ἐ]πιμέ[λεσθαι καὶ τὴν βολὴν καὶ τοὺς]
 5 [ἄρχ]οντα[ς τοὺς ἐν⁹.... καὶ τοὺς στ]-
 [ρατ]εγὸς [τοὺς αἰεὶ στρατεγῶντες ...⁶....]
 [.³.]_{τινι} [.....²³.....]
 [-----] vacat

In this latter version the location of the archons could be restored, for example, as [Ἀβδέροις]. The formulae in both versions are well-known.

#38. Proxeny? ca 430-410 B.C. Honours for an unknown man.

Pl. IX,3

BIBLIOGRAPHY. Koumanoudis, E.A. (1886), p. 96 #2; I.G., I, Supplement, p. 68 #116p (1886); Larfeld, Gr. Epigr., II² (1902), p. 934; I.G., I², 150 (1924); Wilhelm, Att.Urk., IV (1939), pp. 90-91 #xxxix; S.E.G., X (1949), 97.

PHOTOGRAPHS. None so far published.

EM 6827, fragment of blue-white micaceous marble, found, apparently, in Athens and purchased there by the Archaeological Society. It was first published by Koumanoudis (loc.cit.). It is broken on all sides, but there is a slight chance that the left edge may be original. Foliation is vertical and parallel to the face.

H.max. 0.155m. W.max. 0.178m. Th.max. 0.059m. Letter-height 0.013m.-0.014m. Chequer 0.0180m.x 0.0216m.

Letter-shapes. A3 and 4, E4 and 5, H1, Θ3 and 4, K2, Λ4, M2, O2, H1, P8, Σ7, Y8. Attic script, with some variations in size, but generally well-cut and spaced. Use of the daseia seems to be regular. Epsilon type 5

is the only indicator of date: this form is found as early as 433/2 B.C., but is rare before 418 B.C. By the same hand may be I.G., II², 91 (identified as an Ionic decree of the fourth century, but possibly to be re-dated to the fifth century) and I.G., I², 68/9 (probably dated ca 424/3 B.C.) The spacing and general appearance of this document suggest a date in the late 420's, but the script does not rule out slightly earlier or later datings. The marble is of a kind that appears to have come into vogue ca 420 B.C.

ca 430-410 B.C.

Stoich.31

[-----ἀνθ'ὅν εὖε]-
 ργέτεκε[ν Ἀθηναίος, ἀναγράφαι τὸν γρ]-
 αμματέα τ[ῆς βολῆς ἐν στέλει ἐμ πόλει τ]-
 ἔλεσι το[ῖς αὐτῷ...⁵... εἶπε· τὰ μὲν ἄλλα]
 5 καθάπερ ἔχ[...⁷... τὸς δὲ στρατεγὸς κ]-
 αὶ τὲμ βολῆ[ν τὲν βολεύσαν ἐπιμέλεσθ]-
 αὶ αὐτῷ ἡ[ποσ²⁰.....]
 σ[.]σι[.2]ρ[.....²⁴.....]

COMMENTARY. Larfeld (loc.cit.) restored this document with a thirty-eight letter line; I have based my

restorations on those of Wilhelm (loc.cit.), however, whose version contains fewer problems. Larfeldt's restorations are as follows:

[-----εὐε]-
 ργέ[τ]ε[κε· τὸ δὲ φσέφισμα τόδε ἀναγράφσαι τὸν γρ]-
 αμματέα [τῆς βολῆς ἐν στέλει λιθίνει ἐμ πόλει τ]-
 ἔλεσι το[ῖς¹⁶.....εἶπε· τὰ μὲν ἄλλα]
 5 καθάπερ Ε[.....¹⁵.....·τὸς δὲ στρατεγὸς κ]-
 αὶ τὲμ βολ[ἐν τὲν αἰεὶ βολεύσαν συνεπιμέλεσθ]-
 αὶ αὐτῷ ἡό[πος -----]

The principal weakness of this lies in the use of the verb [συνεπιμέλεσθ]αι in lines 6-7: if the generals and the Boule are to co-operate in the care of the honorand one would expect either the simple form ἐπιμέλεσθαι or συνεπιμέλεσθαι with one of the co-operating parties in the dative; if the generals and Boule are to co-operate with the honorand (as in #22, line 14 and I.G., I², 88.19) one would expect αὐτῷ in line 7, not αὐτῷ (see L.-S.-J.,⁹[1940], p. 1710). The names of the first and second proposers in lines 4 and 5 of Larfeldt's version will both be very long, that in line 5 probably impossibly so. Wilhelm's version avoids these difficulties. In line 7 Wilhelm

restored $\eta\acute{o}[\pi\omicron\varsigma \alpha\mu \mu\epsilon\delta' \upsilon\phi' \acute{\epsilon}\nu\omicron\varsigma \acute{\alpha}\delta\iota\kappa\epsilon\tau\alpha\iota]$; the visible letter-traces in line 8, which I believe to be parts of a name, make this restoration slightly awkward; these traces, which have escaped the notice of previous editors, are as follows: in the first stoichos there is the tip of a diagonal, correctly placed for that of the top stroke of a sigma. In the third stoichos most of the top diagonal of another sigma survives; in stoichos 4 there is the top of a central vertical. In stoichos 7 the upper left corner of a letter survives: the horizontal appears to curve down at its right end. These traces could be parts of the name $\Sigma[\omicron]\sigma\iota[\sigma\tau]\rho[\alpha\tau\omicron$
 -----] which would probably be the first word of a new sentence: thus Wilhelm's restoration in line 7 would be one letter short; a solution would be to read $\eta\acute{o}[\pi\omicron\varsigma \alpha\mu \mu\epsilon\delta' \eta\upsilon\phi' \acute{\epsilon}\nu\omicron\varsigma \acute{\alpha}\delta\iota\kappa\epsilon\tau\alpha\iota]$. The name Sosistratos was borne by a citizen of Andros in 389/8 B.C. (I.G., II², 1634.5).

There are in other lines traces of letters not noted by previous editors: in line 2 the first five visible letters make some form of the noun $\epsilon\upsilon\epsilon\rho\gamma\epsilon\tau\eta\varsigma$ or the verb $\epsilon\upsilon\epsilon\rho\gamma\epsilon\tau\epsilon\acute{\iota}\nu$ inevitable; the confused traces of letter-strokes in the penultimate stoichos could be interpreted as parts of kappa or nu (alpha and gamma are etymologi-

cally impossible). The presence in the last stoichos of an epsilon makes nu unlikely, since the only restoration that comes to mind is [εὐεργέτην ἐ[ν στέλει λιθίνει], the latter phrase of which is surely called for in line 3. Koumanoudis saw the base of a left vertical after stoichos 7; this is no longer visible, but, if Koumanoudis' report is accurate, it supports the restoration of a nu here.

Line 5. In the final stoichos the tips of two diagonal strokes are visible: they could be parts of a sigma, but I was unable to detect any sign of angle-strokes joining them, so that chi seems the likelier reading. The name Echekrates would fit this space; it is probably to be restored in the casualty-list I.G., I², 964.107 (S.E.G., XXI, 131; dated at some time after 410 B.C.). If the casualty there mentioned is the same man as the orator of the present decree, a date after 410 B.C. would be impossible.

#39. Proxeny. ca 430-410 B.C. Honours for two unknown men.

Pl. IX, 4

BIBLIOGRAPHY. Koumanoudis, *Ἀθήναϊον*, VI (1877), p. 130 #1; *I.G.*, I, Supplement, p. 23 #116a (1877); Wilhelm, *Beiblatt* (1898), p. 45; Bannier, *Ath.Mitt.*, XXVII (1902), p. 304 #7; Larfeldt, *Gr.Epigr.*, II²(1902), p. 933; Wilhelm, *Jahreshefte*, XIV (1911), p. 215; Bannier, *B.Ph.W.* (1921), pp. 307-308; *I.G.*, I², 154 (1924); Wilhelm, *Att.Urk.*, IV (1939), pp. 32-36 #xxvi; Meritt, *Hesperia*, X (1941), pp. 330-331; Meiggs, *C.R.*, LXIII (1949), p. 12; *S.E.G.*, X (1949), 98; *S.E.G.*, XII (1955), 30; Lambrechts, *Proxeni edicta* (1958), pp. 60, 72, 78, 85, 87, 94-95, 114, 136, 151.

PHOTOGRAPH. Wilhelm (1939), pl. III.

EM 6842, fragment of blue-white micaceous marble found on the south slope of the Akropolis in the area of the Asklepieion and first published by Koumanoudis (*loc.cit.*). It is broken on all sides. Foliation is vertical and parallel to the face.

H.max. 0.268m. W.max. 0.181m. Th.max. 0.128m. Letter-

height 0.007m.-0.008m. Chequer 0.01038m.x 0.01306m.

Letter-shapes. A3 and 4, B3, E4 and 5, H1, Θ 3, K2, M1, N7, O1 and 2, Π 1 (rather wide), P8 and 9, Σ 6 and 7, Y8, Φ 5, X3. Attic script with apparently regular use of the daseia. Epsilon type 5 is not found in dated inscriptions before 433/2 B.C. and is rare before 418 B.C.; sigma type 6 is not found before 440 B.C. The hand is fairly distinctive, nu and pi being particularly noticeable; it seems quite close to the hand of I.G., I², 274 (410/09 B.C.), and not far from that used on some of the stelai recording confiscations from the Hermokopidai in 414/3 B.C. (I.G., I², 325-334). I believe that a date subsequent to 420 B.C. but perhaps not after 410 B.C. is likeliest, though the letter-forms do not rule out the period 430-420 B.C. The marble is of a type that seems to have come into vogue ca 420 B.C.

ca 430-410 B.C.

Stoich. 27

[.Ᾱ.]λε[.....ᾹᾹ.....]

[.]υτοτα[.....ᾹᾹ.....]

[ο]ς ὄντε ἀν[δρε ἀγαθὸ ἐς τοὺς στρατι]-

[ό]τας καὶ ἐμ π[ᾶσιν εὖνο περὶ τὸν δέ]-

- 5 [μο]ν τὸν Ἀθηναί[ον· ἀνθ' ὃν δὲ ἄνδρε ἐ]-
 [στὸ]ν ἀγαθὸ καὶ δ[ικαί]ο καὶ αἰεὶ ε]-
 [ὕπ]εποέκατον Ἀθεν[αίος, ἀναγράφσα]-
 [ι] αὐτὸ προχσένο κ[αὶ εὐεργέτα Ἀθε]-
 [να]ίον καὶ τὸς ἐκγ[όνος καὶ εἰάν τί]-
 10 [ς τ]ινας αὐτὸν ἀπ[οκτένει β]ιαίοι θ]-
 [αν]άτοι ἔ δέσει ἔ [ἄγει, εἶναι αὐτοῖ]-
 [ς τὲ]ν τιμορίαν κ[αθάπερ Ἀθηναίοι]-
 [ς ἐφ]σέφισται, κα[ὶ ἐὰν βλαβῶσι, τὲν]
 [βλάβε]ν ἰᾶσθαι δ[ικλῆν· καὶ μετοικ]-
 15 [εἰς? ἀτέ]λειαν εἶνα[ι αὐτοῖν Ἀθένεσ]-
 [ιν? καὶ φ]ρορᾶς καὶ [στρατείας καὶ ε]-
 [σαγογὲν?] ἡόθεμ βό[λεσθον ...⁷...]
 [...⁷...] τατῆς β[ολῆς ...¹⁰...]
 [...⁸...] ἡοῖα [...¹⁵...]
-

COMMENTARY. The above restoration is largely that put forward by Wilhelm (1939). While a little more can be seen on the stone than previous editors admit, I comment only where my readings differ or where a letter is uncertain.

Line 1. Wilhelm saw a vertical here, followed by a

horizontal at the bottom of the stoichos; enough survives of other strokes to make the reading ΛE certain, perhaps part of $[\beta o] \lambda \epsilon [--]$ or $[\pi o] \lambda \epsilon [--]$.

Line 2. The first letter survives only in a diagonal stroke at the top of the stoichos; as it stands it could be part of upsilon or sigma, but the stone below it seems to be uninscribed, thus ruling out sigma. The feet of a triangular letter are visible in the last stoichos; alpha is more likely than gamma.

Line 4. Two joining diagonal strokes survive, followed by the upper left corner of a letter. I interpret these as parts of a mu followed by a pi, but upsilon followed by epsilon would also be possible.

Larfeldt (loc.cit.) restored this line $\theta \epsilon \upsilon \epsilon [\rho \gamma \epsilon \tau \tilde{o} \nu \tau \epsilon \alpha \iota \epsilon \iota \tau \tilde{o} \nu \delta \tilde{\epsilon} \mu | o] \nu$, but I think the meaning a little forced and prefer the reading I have adopted.

Line 5. Only the bottom of iota survives at the end of the line.

Line 6. The final delta must be dotted; its bottom is lost.

Line 7. The bottom of the left hasta of final nu survives.

Line 8. The top of the vertical of kappa is visible.

Line 9. Almost the whole left leg of gamma is visible.

Line 15. The left foot of final alpha survives.

Line 17. The left upper curve of final omicron survives.

Line 18. The first letter could be epsilon or tau; the tip of the top bar survives; at the end of the line the lower left corner of beta is visible; not enough is preserved to rule out epsilon.

Line 19. Wilhelm read IOIA ; Meritt (loc.cit.) rightly pointed out that the final letter was incomplete and that the single vertical tip visible was more likely from its position to be part of a daseia; in Wilhelm's text these letters are placed one stoichos too far to the left. Since only the tops of these letters survive each must be dotted.

Bannier (1921) associated this inscription with #44, arguing that each document dealt with two persons and that the chequer is the same; this attribution is incorrect: the letters of #44 are larger and exhibit different forms. Wilhelm (1911) associated this decree with #49. This attribution, too, must be rejected, though the chequer and letter-sizes are almost identical: the forms of mu and sigma are markedly different; moreover, the present decree, though its original back is not

preserved, is thicker than #49, whose back is preserved.

Lines 3-5. The restoration of Wilhelm (1939), which I have adopted, derives from his recognition that the first visible letter in line 3 is sigma, not epsilon. He was led by his belief that #49 might be a part of this decree to suggest that the letters alpha-sigma at the beginning of line 4 could form the end of the phrase $[\kappa\epsilon\rho\iota\ \tau\omicron\varsigma\ \nu\omicron\sigma\omicron\nu\tau]\mu\varsigma$, but offered no alternative restoration involving this idea. The version he gives derives, in part, from #22, lines 9-10, though the phrase $\epsilon\pi\ \pi[\alpha\sigma\iota\nu\ \epsilon\upsilon\nu\omicron]$ is not paralleled in the fifth century.

Lines 5-9. There is no exact parallel for these formulae, but they seem warranted by the letters surviving on the stone.

Lines 10-13. This restoration was first put forward by Larfeldt (loc.cit.); it is paralleled in #13 and #50 and #67, the first example being less close than are the latter two. There seems to be no way to avoid the form $[\epsilon\iota\acute{\alpha}\nu]$ in line 9: Wilhelm tries to make a parallel for it in I.G., I², 53.6 (see text in S.E.G., X [1949], 46), but it conflicts with the spelling $[\epsilon\acute{\alpha}\nu]$ in line 13, which also seems unavoidable, unless Wilhelm's

earlier reading is accepted for lines 13-14: κα[¹⁴
 ἄν τι πάθοσι, τὲν βλάβει]ν ἰᾶσθαι δ[ιπλεῖν] (1911).
 I can find no parallel for either version of lines
 13-14.

Lines 14-17. The restoration is Wilhelm's (1939). The
 word-order in lines 14-15 is unparalleled, but no
 other restoration would fit the available space; the
 usual order would be καὶ ἀτέλειαν τῷ μετοικίῳ (cf. #60).
 Wilhelm's suggestion [ἔσαγογὲν] ἥοθεν β[όλονται] is based
 on #34, but the connexion seems a little forced; I have
 changed his β[όλονται] to the dual form β[όλεσθον]
 to conform with the usage of this document.

Lines 17-19. β[όλονται].^{XY} τὸν δὲ γραμματέ]α τῆς [βολῆς
 ἀναγράφσαι ἐστέλει λ]ι[θ]ί[ναι] Larfeldt (loc.cit.) and
 Hiller (I.G., I², 154); Wilhelm reads line 19: [ἐν στέλει]ι?,
 οἱ δ[ὲ] πολεταὶ ἀπομισθοσάντων κτλ.].

Meritt objected to the presence of two vacant spaces in
 both versions and suggested instead [οἱ δὲ πρυτάνες με]τὰ
 τῆς βολῆς κελύσθον τρεῖς ἄνδρας] ἡοι ἄ[ν -----] on the
 analogy of I.G., I², 24.16-17 and I.G., I², 39.64-67."I
 suggest here a provision for the selection of a special
 committee of three who were to carry out an assignment
 the precise nature of which we do not know" (p. 331).

#40. Proxeny. ca 425-405 B.C. Honours for an unknown man.

Pl.X,2

BIBLIOGRAPHY. Hondius, Mnemosyne, XLIX (1921), p. 201 #1; I.G., I², 157 (1924); McDonald, A.J.A., LIX (1955), p. 154; S.E.G., XIV (1957), 34; Lambrechts, Proxenedecreten (1958), pp. 62, 151.

PHOTOGRAPHS. None so far published.

EM 2842 (also bears inventory-number 62), fragment of white marble found on the Akropolis and first published by Hondius (loc.cit.). The right edge and rough-picked back are preserved. Foliation is vertical and parallel to the face.

H.max. 0.173m. W.max. 0.170m. Th. 0.122m. Letter-height 0.009m.-0.010m. Chequer 0.015m.x 0.018m.

Letter-shapes: A4, B3, E4 and 5, H1, Θ3, K2, Λ5, M1-2, N7, O2, Π1, P8, Σ7 and 8, Y7, Φ4, X3. Attic script, with apparently regular use of the daseia. Ionic ου-is used in line 5 instead of Attic -o-. Lambda type 5 is rare before the 420's; epsilon type 5 is not found before 433/2 B.C., and is rare before 418 B.C. The hand is closest to

that of I.G., I², 87 (dated in 424/3 B.C.). I believe that I.G., I², 87 is the earliest of a series of documents inscribed over a period of twenty years by a single mason (see my remarks on # 49). The close resemblance of the script of #40 to that of I.G., I², 87 should place it in the late 420's, though the appearance of Ionic - ου may be a mark of lateness.

ca 425-405 B.C.

Stoich.22

[.....¹⁸.....]! [.³.]
 [.....¹⁰..... καὶ ἐν]αι πρόχσ-
 [ενον καὶ εὐεργέ]τεν ἈθENAÍ-
 [ον αὐτόν· ἀναγρα]ψάτο δὲ ἡο
 5 [γραμματεὺς ἡο τ]ῆς βουλῆς ἐ-
 [στέλει λιθίνει] καὶ τὸ ψέφ-
 [ισμα τόδε κατα]θῆναι ἐμ πόλ-
 [ει· καλέσαι δὲ κ]αὶ ἐπὶ χσέν[ι]-
 [α αὐτόν ἐς τὸ πρυ]τανεῖον ἐ[ς]
 10 [αὔριον -----]

COMMENTARY. The restorations are those of Hondius (loc. cit.), based on standard formulae.

Line 1. Above the rho of line 2 the bottom of a left vertical survives.

Line 3. At the left edge the bottom of the vertical of tau survives.

Line 7. At the left edge the right curve of theta survives; the change to the infinitive here is unusual and awkward: it is perhaps to be explained by the frequency with which these formulae occur in inscriptions in the infinitive.

Line 8. At the left edge the right foot of alpha survives.

Line 9. At the right edge the left corner of epsilon survives. This formula is generally found at the end of a proxy-decree, if the honorand is in Athens when the decree is passed.

#41. Proxeny. ca 425-405 B.C. Honours for an unknown man.

Pl. X,3

BIBLIOGRAPHY. Schweigert, Hesperia, VII (1938), p. 274 #8; Wilhelm, Att.Urk., IV (1939), pp. 70-71; S.E.G. X (1949), 129.

PHOTOGRAPH. Schweigert, op.cit., p. 274, fig. 9

EM 12904, fragment of slightly micaceous blue-white marble, broken on all sides, but preserving the rough-picked back. It was found on the north slope of the Akropolis on June 4, 1937, and was first published by Schweigert (loc.cit.). Foliation is vertical and parallel to the face. H.max. 0.091m. W.max. 0.086m. Th. 0.035m. Letter-height 0.009m.-0.010m. Chequer 0.0110m.x 0.0138m.

Letter-shapes. A5, E4, H1, Θ3 and 4, K2, N7, O1-2, Σ8,, Y7, X3. Attic script, with perhaps a redundant use of the daseia (see line 5). While there is nothing clearly dateable in the script, its character and spacing suggest a date in the late 420's or the 410's. I have been unable to find any document by precisely the same hand, but I.G., I², 71 (probably 423/2 B.C.), 84 (421/0 B.C.), 97 (416/5

B.C.) and 114 (410/09 B.C.) are all very similar. Closest of all is #33 (421/0 B.C.); indeed, this may be by the same hand. The marble is of a type not common before 420 B.C., though frequently used in the 410's and 400's.

ca 425-405 B.C.

Stoich. 28

[.3. ἀναγράφω]αἰ [ἐν στέλει λιθίνει]
 [πρόχσενον] καὶ εὐε[ργέτην· τὸ δὲ ἀργ]-
 [ύριον παρα]σχόντο[ν ἡοι στρατεγοί·]
 [καλέσαι δὲ α]ὐτὸν κα[ὶ ἐπὶ δεῖπνον ἐ]-
 5 [ς τὸ πρυτανεῖ]ον ἐς ἡ[αύριον -----]

rasura

rasura

COMMENTARY. The surviving letters of line 2 seem to be part of the publication-formula of a proxeny-decree. Line 4 confirms that only one man is involved, and lines 4-5 seem to contain the usual invitation to the prytaneion issued when the honorand is in Athens. Lines 4-5 were restored by Wilhelm (op.cit., p. 71), but with [χσένια] not [δεῖπνον] . Raubitschek (S.E.G., X, 129, footnote) restored lines 1-3 with a line-length of twenty-seven letters; his restorations can be improved if expanded to fit a

twenty-eight letter line; indeed, his line 3 contains twenty-eight letters. The use of [δεῖπνον] rather than [χσένια] in a proxeny-decree is unusual; I have avoided its restoration in another proxeny-decree of somewhat similar date (#26, line 6). It is more common in decrees honouring Athenian citizens in the fourth century; its only certain appearance in the fifth century is in I.G., I², 95 (418/7 B.C.), a document whose precise terms and intent we do not know.

Line 1. The feet of alpha and iota survive.

Line 2. At the left edge the lower arm of kappa survives; the bottom left corner of epsilon is visible at the right edge.

Line 3. Schweigert read a dotted upsilon at the left edge; however, the surviving diagonal stroke is too flat for upsilon and should probably be read as part of a sigma; its angle should be compared with that of the diagonal stroke at the left edge of line 4, whose sharper angle indicates that it is probably an upsilon. For the formula cf I.G., I², 39.69; an alternative to [τὸ δὲ ἀργύριον] would be [τὸν δὲ στέλεν] (cf. I.G., I², 45.18). However, with this latter formula it would be necessary to revert to a twenty-seven letter line and to omit the daseia of [hoi]; one might restore lines 1-5 as follows:

[.3. ἀναγράφαι [ἐμ πόλει ἐστέλει]
 [πρόχσενον] καὶ εὐε[ργέτεν· τὲν δὲ σ]-
 [τέλεν παρα]σχόντο[ν οἱ στρατεγοί·]
 [καλέσαι δὲ α]ὐτὸν κα[ὶ ἐπὶ χσένια ἐ]-
 5 [ς τὸ πρυτανεῖ]ον ἐς ἡ[αύριον -----]

Lines 6-7. What was in the rasura cannot now be ascertained: the surviving letter-traces indicate that there were at least two lines after line 5, the letters slightly taller and more widely-spaced than those of lines 1-5. (the chequer is 0.012m.x 0.015m. approximately). In line 6 I detected the top of a possible sigma under the omicron of line 5, with the top of another possible sigma under the daseia. In line 7 the top of a vertical survives, with a possible sigma well to the left of it. I am unable to suggest any restoration of these lines.

#42. Proxeny? ca 430-415 B.C.. Honours for unknown persons.

Pl.IX,5

EM 293 (unpublished), fragment of slightly micaceous Pentellic marble, broken on all sides. Its provenance is unknown. Foliation is vertical and diagonal to the face, from left front to right rear.

H.max. 0.211m. W.max.0.092m. Th.max. 0.074m. Letter-height 0.011m.-0.012m. Chequer 0.0197m.x 0.0175m.

Letter-shapes. A4-5, E4, Θ 3, K2, N7, 01-2, Σ 8. Attic script, neatly cut in a rather distinctive hand. #32 is by the same hand, but the marble is not the same.. I.G., I², 949 is probably also by this hand.. Both these documents are dated in the 420's..

ca 430-415 B.C..

Stoich.41

[.....⁹..... ηο]· δ[ἐ στρατηγοὶ ἡοι ἀεὶ στρατεγῶντες]
 [καὶ ἡε βολεῖ ἡε] ἀεὶ [βολεύουσα καὶ ἡοι πρυτάνες ἐπιμε]-
 [λόσθον αὐτοῖ]ν· καλ[ῆσαι δὲ⁸..... ἐπὶ χσένια ἐς τ]-
 [ὸ πρυτανεῖον].^υ Καθ[.....⁴... εἶπε· τὰ μὲν ἄλλα καθάπερ τε]-
 5 [ι βολεῖ· ἐπιμέλ]εσθ[αι²⁴.....]
 [...¹³.....]ον[.....²⁶.....]

COMMENTARY. For reasons of space I assume that two men were honoured; I have been unable to contrive any restoration with the genitive plural [αὐτῶ]ν in line 3, unless it be assumed that in each of lines 1 and 2 one daseia was omitted. In my version, one of the two honorands was not in Athens at the time that the decree in his favour was passed, so that the invitation to the prytaneion is for one man only (lines 3-4).

Line 3. The top part of the vertical of lambda survives on the break..

Line 4. The last letter on the stone is probably sigma: chi is physically possible, but otherwise unlikely.

The presence of a vacat in this line suggests that a rider began at this point: the letters KΑΣ thus constitute the beginning of an orator's name. No suitable name comes to mind..

Line 5. The last letter is only partially preserved, but the reading is certain..

#43. Proxeny? ca 425-405 B.C. Honours for an unknown man and his sons.

Pl.IX,6

EM 2483 (unpublished), fragment of blue-white micaceous marble, broken on all sides, but preserving the rough-picked back. The provenance is unknown. Foliation is vertical and parallel to the face.

H.max. 0.102m. W.max. 0.057m. Th. 0.038m. Letter-height 0.010m. Chequer 0.0131m.x 0.0150m.

Letter-shapes. A4, E4-5, H1, Θ3, O2, Π1, P8, Σ9, Y7.

Attic script with apparently regular use of the daseia.

The hand is the same as that of A.T.L., II, D 3-6 (424/3 B.C.; S.E.G., X, 145c is also by this hand and could possibly be part of D 3-6; neither of these have the same marble as the present document). The marble is of a type that seems to have come into vogue ca 420 B.C.

ca 425-405 B.C.

Stoich. 58

[...4.] α[.....53.....
.....]

[.3.] ι αὐ[τ.....51.....
.....]

[.3.] νόπο[ς δὲ ἄμ με ἀδικῆται μέτε αὐτὸς |

μέτε ἡοι παῖδες αὐτῷ ἐπιμέλεσθα]-

[ι αὐ]τῷ τ[ὸς στρατεγὸς ἡοι ἄν αἰεὶ ὅσι καὶ τὲν βολὲν

τὲν αἰεὶ βολεύσαν κα]-

5 [ι τ]ὸς πρ[υτάνες· γράψαι δὲ αὐτὸν καὶ τὸς

παῖδας αὐτῷ προχσένος καὶ εὐερ]-

[γέ]τας ἐ[ν στέλει τὸν γραμματέα τὸν τῆς

βολῆς καὶ θῆναι ἐμ πόλει....?....]

[δὲ κα]λ[έσαι ἐπὶ χσένια ἐς τὸ πρυτανεῖον ἐς

αὔριον· -----]

COMMENTARY I have based my restorations on the text
of #22, but the formulae are well-known.

#44. Proxeny (?) and euergesia. ca 420-405 B.C. Arrangements for the provision of oars for ships; honours for Antiochides, Phanosthenes and other men (from Andros?).

Pls.X,4,5,6; XI,1,2,3

BIBLIOGRAPHY. I.G., I, 78 (1873); I. G., I, Supplement, p. 129 #116x (1886); Bannier, B.Ph. W. (1921), pp. 307-308; I.G., I², 122; 156 (1924); Ferguson, Treasurers (1932), p. 45 note 1; Schweigert, Hesperia, VII (1938), pp. 269-270 #4; Raubitschek, P.-W.-R.-E., XIX.2 (1938), 1786:3-53; Wilhelm, Att.Urk., IV (1939), pp. 83-87 #xxxv; Meritt, Hesperia, X (1941), pp. 331-332; XIV (1945), pp. 129-132 #16; S.E.G., X (1949), 79; 131; Lambrechts, Proxeni edecreten (1958), pp. 75, 117; Mattingly, Ehrenberg Studies (1966), pp. 198-200; S.E.G., XXIII (1968), 20.

PHOTOGRAPHS. Schweigert, op.cit., p. 270 fig.4 (fragments c and d); Meritt (1945), p. 131 (squeezes of fragments a and b).

Four non-joining fragments of blue-white marble. Foliation is very clear, almost vertical and parallel to the face: on fragments b, c and d the back has split away from the

face along the plane of foliation. Fragments a and b were first associated with each other by Meritt in 1945 on the advice of Raubitschek. Fragments c and d were first associated by Schweigert (loc.cit.). The association of all four fragments with one another was made by me in November, 1968.

Fragment a, EM 13374 (= Agora Inventory #I.419), was found in a modern context in excavation of the Athenian Agora on February 10, 1933. It was first published by Meritt (loc.cit. [1945]). The rough-picked back is preserved; otherwise, it is broken on all sides.

H.max. 0.335m. W.max. 0.358m. Th. 0.130m. Letter-height 0.010m.-0.011m. Chequer 0.0136m.x 0.0140m.

Fragment b, EM 6616, is of unknown provenance. It was first published by Kirchhoff from a transcript of U. Koehler as I.G., I, 78 in 1873. The left edge is preserved; otherwise, it is broken on all sides.

H.max. 0.265m. W.max. 0.263m. Th.max. 0.073m. Letter-height 0.010m.-0.011m. Chequer 0.0133m.-0.0136m.x 0.0140m.

Fragment c, EM 12948, was found on the north slope of the Akropolis, in excavations of the area north-west of the

sanctuary of Eros and Aphrodite on April 12, 1937. It was first published by Schweigert (loc.cit.). It is broken on all sides.

H.max. 0.078m. W.max. 0.095m. Th.max. 0.017m. Letter-height 0.010m.-0.011m. Chequer 0.0136m.x 0.0140m.

Fragment d, EM 6847, was found in excavation of the Erechtheion on the Akropolis and first published by Kirchhoff from a transcript of H.G. Lolling as I.G., I, Supplement, p. 129 #116x in 1886. The left edge is preserved; otherwise, it is broken on all sides. There is a vertical uninscribed space of 0.110m. under the last line of inscription.

H.max. 0.240m. W.max. 0.280m. Th.max. 0.076m. Letter-height 0.010m.-0.011m. Chequer 0.0133m.x 0.0140m.

Letter-shapes. A3 and 4, B3, E5, Z 1, H1, Θ 3 and 4, K2, Λ 4, M2, N7, O2, Π 1-2, P9, Σ 9, Y7, Φ 6-7, X3. Attic script, with regular use of the daseia. On fragment d there is a unique punctuation-mark, in the form of a cross with five small circles, one at each point, and one at the centre. The hand is very close to that of #59 (ca 420-405 B.C.); that of I.G., I², 109 (410/09 B.C.) is very close, but phi is different. Also very similar is the hand of I.G., I², 123 (407/6 B.C.), but the mason of this latter document used curved chisels: there is, however, one example in the present document (on

fragment c) of a sigma cut with curved chisels. #45 (not securely dated) is by the same hand. Of the letter-shapes found in #44 epsilon type 5 is found as early as 433/2 B.C., but is rare before 418 B.C.; phi type 6 is not found before 432 B.C., while type 7 does not occur before 410 B.C. in dated inscriptions; the phi in this inscription is closer to type 7 than to type 6. The letter-shapes thus suggest a date after ca 420 B.C., perhaps after 410 B.C. The context (see below) suggests a date between 424 and 414 B.C., or after 410 B.C. I do not know of any public document dated later than 407/6 B.C. that is inscribed in Attic script, though a date as late as 405/4 B.C. is not absolutely excluded.

ca 420-405 B.C.

Stoich.46

a [.....¹⁰]α[.....³⁵]
 [.....¹⁰...γ]ρ[α]μμα[τε.....²⁸]
 [.....⁷... Ἀν]τιοχίδει καὶ [Φανοσθένει?¹⁶]
 [.....⁹...]ῖς Ἀθηναίοις καὶ [.....²³]
 5 [.....¹⁰...]ορας καὶ τὰ ἄλλα ἡότ[ι?¹⁹]
 [.....⁹...] τὸν δῆμον τὸν Ἀθηναί[ον¹⁸]
 [.....¹³...] καὶ νῦν αὐτὸς καὶ [.....¹⁹]
 [ἡόπος ἂν ἡο δῆμο]ς ἡος περὶ πολλῷ ποιῶ[ν φαίνεται
 τὸς ἐσάγ]-

b [οντας κο]πέας [κα]ῖ χάριν ἀποδόσον τὸ λ[οιπόν·
 ἀξέμιος δὲ τό]-

10 [κο ηεκ]ατοστῷ τ[ὸς] κοπέας hos ἔγαγον ο[ἴκοθεν
 δόντον τοῖς]

[τρι]εροποιοῖς κ[αῖ] λοι τριεροποιοὶ ε[ὐθὺς
 παραλαβόντες]

[τιθ]έντον ἐς τὸ να[υ]πέγιον καὶ ἐὰν δέ[ονται
 ἄλλο τινὸς λοι]

[στ]ρατεγοί, χρόσθο[ν φρ]άζοντες τῇ β[ολῇ] καὶ
 ἅμα ἀποδιδ]-

[όν]τες τὲν τεταγμέν[εν] τιμέ[ν]. καὶ λο[ι
 ναυπεγοὶ λογιζόσθο]-

15 [ν το]ῖς τριεροποιο[ῖς τὰ τε]ταγμέν[α· ἐπειδὲ
 οὖν Ἀντιοχίδε]-

[ς καὶ] Φανοσθένης τὸ[ν δῆμον τὸν Ἀθηναῖον εὖ
 ποιῆτον καὶ π]-

[ερὶ αὐ]τῷ λο ηελλενοτ[αμίας²⁴...
]

[...⁶...]ς χρῆσθαι ἐς τ[ὸν πόλεμον?²⁰...
]

[...⁴ αὐτ]οῖν ἀγαγόντ[οιν²⁷...
]

20 [...⁸...]οραι, ἐπαιν[έσαι μὲν Ἀντιοχίδεν καὶ
 Φανοσθένε]-

[ν ἥοτι ἐδι]ακονεσάτε[ν²⁸...
]

c [...¹⁰.....] προσάγ[εν αὐτὸ ἐς τὸν δῆμον τὸς!
 π]ρ[υτάνες ἐς τ]-
 [ἐν πρότεν ἐκ]κλεσία[ν·¹⁶..... τὲ]ν
 βολ[ἐν ...⁵...]
 [...¹¹..... ἄ]λλο [...¹⁷..... τ]ὸ δ(ἐ)
 φσέ[φισμα τό]-

25 [δε ἀναγράφαι τὸν γραμματέα τὸν τῆς βολ]ῆς ἐν
 στ[έλει λιθ]-
 [ίνει καὶ καταθεῖναι ἐμ πόλει· ἀπομισθῶσα]ι δὲ
 τὸς [πολετάς].

[----- lacuna. 1 or 2 lines -----]

d τι· ἐπαι[νέσαι³⁵.....
]
 ι εὐεργέτας ἐν [στέλει· ἔναι δὲ αὐτοῖς κευρέσθαι
 ἡδὺν ἂν δέ]-
 30 ονται παρὰ Ἀθεν[αίον·²⁵.....
 ἐμ πό]-
 λει εὐεργέτας Ἀθ[εναίον ἐν στέλει τὸν γραμματέα
 τὸν τῆς]
 βολῆς ✕

vacat

COMMENTARY. There is no physical join among these fragments; however, their positions in the stele can be calculated with some accuracy. The marble is of a type that breaks off very easily into large flakes; the plane upon which the stone was cut is slightly different from that of the foliation, both horizontally and vertically, so that the flake that includes the obverse face of the stele is thickest at the top and on the left: fragment c is a piece of this flake; fragment b consists of two flakes which have split apart in modern times and have been cemented together; fragment d consists of two flakes not yet split apart. Fragment a, preserving the back of the stele, consists of three parallel flakes, the foliation being very obvious. By observation of the foliation fragments a and b can be set ca 0.002m. apart; this positioning is confirmed by restoration of the text: there is a gap of one letter at line 12. Since the left edge is preserved on the rearmost flake of fragment b, the gap between fragments b and d can be calculated with a straight-edge as ca 3-4 lines.

The position of fragment c is more difficult to calculate: however, since it is 0.017m. thick on the left and 0.016m. thick on the right it must be set near the right margin of the stele; the same flake on fragment b is 0.020m.

thick on the left, 0.018m. on the right. The letters extant upon fragments c and d preclude their being placed side by side: since fragment d contains the conclusion of the inscription, fragment c must be placed somewhere above it. Thus, the only possible arrangement, one that can be supported by restoration, is to set fragment c slightly below fragment b, but well to the right of it, and above fragment d, with a gap of one or two lines between its last line and the first line of fragment d. The horizontal chequer of fragment c supports this arrangement: whilst, on average, it is the same as that of fragment a and the right side of fragment b, it, in fact, exhibits certain irregularities of spacing between letters that are not found on either fragment a or fragment b. Previous editors have not reported the survival of the left edge on fragment b.

I believe that this inscription was probably the second decree upon the stele: if my restoration of fragment d is correct, fragments a, b and c comprise a decree or amendment, while fragment d is a further amendment. The subject-matter is the importation of oars for ships (lines 10 and 11), free of the one-percent harbour-tax, and their delivery to the trieropoioi. Two men concerned in the importation

are accorded honours by the state (lines 15-24). In the final amendment other persons are honoured in two groups (lines 25-32). Meritt (1945) rightly pointed out that two men are being honoured (see the dual forms in lines 19 and 21); one of these men is named in line 3 (Antiochides), the other in line 16 (Phanosthenes); both are probably named in line 20. Meritt accepts the identification of Phanosthenes as the Andrian of that name who came to Athens ca 411 B.C. and was an Athenian general in 407/6 B.C. (see Raubitschek, [loc.cit.] and Ferguson [loc.cit.]). This decree, in any case, is probably earlier than 407/6 B.C. because of the use of Attic script (see above); furthermore, if the identification of Phanosthenes is correct, it must predate his acceptance of Athenian citizenship: lines 23-24 contain formulae normally used only when foreigners are being granted honours. The context of the decree could be the same set of circumstances that gave rise to #65 (dated probably in 407/6 B.C.), a decree honouring Archelas of Makedonia for his help to the Athenians in the construction of a fleet to be used to ferry troops to Ionia. The verb διακονεῖν in line 21 suggests that Phanosthenes was in a position of responsibility "less easily defined than that of a general" (Meritt, op.cit., p. 130). Another clue to the date of this document may be pro-

vided by the mention in lines 9-10 of a one-percent harbour-tax: such a tax existed from ca 424 to 414 B.C., when it was presumably superseded by the general five-percent harbour-tax that replaced the imposition of tribute between 414 and 410 B.C. Meritt argues that, when tribute was re-imposed in 410 B.C., the harbour-tax reverted to its pre-414 level. Mattingly (loc.cit.) argues against this reversion: he provides evidence for the probable continuance of the five-percent tax to 405 B.C. (see Aristophanes, Frogs, 363), and suggests that the present decree should be placed between 420 and 415 B.C., when Athens was unable to get timber from Makedonia because of the unreliability and eventual hostility of King Perdikkas. He argues, further, that the use of the spelling $\chi\rho\acute{o}\sigma\theta\omicron$ [v] in line 13 indicates a date not much later than 420 B.C.: the form $-\acute{o}\sigma\theta\omicron\nu$ died out and was replaced in the last twenty years of the century by the form $-\acute{\epsilon}\sigma\theta\omicron\nu$. I am not sure that there is sufficient evidence to support Mattingly's arguments.

Lines 1-7. The surface of the stone is very friable: Meritt notes (p. 132) that letters have been lost since the stone was first dug up; my observations show that two lines survive above the first line reported by Meritt, and that in other lines parts of several other letters are visible but were not reported by him. I shall comment upon these only

where there is doubt about the identification of an individual letter.

In line 1 there is a complete alpha. Under it and one stoichos to the right, in line 2, there is a fragmentary rho, followed by a better-preserved mu one stoichos to the right. In the next two stoichoi to the right are a mu and an alpha. It would be tempting to regard these as part of the preamble of a decree and to restore

[ἐγ]ρ[α]μμα[τευε] , but the presence of alpha in line 1, in such a position that it cannot be part of the opening formula of a preamble, rules this out, unless we have here the end of one decree and the beginning of a second, both in line 1 (as, for instance, in I.G., I², 57). Thus, line 2 is more likely to contain a phrase such as [τὸ γ
γ]ρ[α]μμα[τέα τεῖς βολῆς] than part of a preamble.

In line 3, in addition to those letters reported by Meritt, there is the bottom of a central vertical at the right, where he restores iota. Antiochides is not otherwise known: the name is found at Athens in the fifth century, but not, so far as I am aware, elsewhere. Meritt restores the name of Phanosthenes as well in line 3: there is a fairly strong case for regarding him as one of the two persons honoured, since his name occurs in line 16, in a context where reference is made to the duties carried out by him and another

man, and in lines 20-21 his name and that of Antiochides exactly fit the available space in a formula praising two men for their services to the state.

In line 4 Meritt restores [το]ῖς Ἀθηναίοις [κ]αὶ [-----]; only the top of the first iota survives, and it should therefore be dotted, as should the last iota, of which only the bottom survives. The kappa bracketed by Meritt is fragmentary but certain. I am somewhat doubtful about Meritt's [το]ῖς : to find the Athenians mentioned with the article is extremely unusual.

Line 5. Of the last letter on the stone only the central vertical survives: iota is no less likely than tau; $\eta\acute{o}\tau[ι]$ is Meritt's suggestion. The letters ΟΡΑΣ may be part of some such word as [φρ]ορᾶς or [χ]ορᾶς ; Meritt points out that the same word may occur in line 20.

Line 7. At the end of this line Meritt reports "a lower left vertical stroke as of K, N, Π, etc." However, he prints an undotted pi here and restores $\pi[\alpha\tilde{\iota}\delta\alpha\varsigma \alpha\acute{\upsilon}\tau\omicron\nu \eta\acute{\upsilon}\sigma\tau\epsilon\rho\omicron\nu \eta\acute{o}\pi\omicron\varsigma \grave{\alpha}\nu \eta\omicron \delta\epsilon\mu\omicron\varsigma]$. I can see no trace at all of this letter; moreover, I am sceptical of the restoration $\pi[\alpha\tilde{\iota}\delta\alpha\varsigma \alpha\acute{\upsilon}\tau\omicron\nu]$ without the article.

Lines 8-16. The restoration is that of Meritt; lines 8-9 and 10-15 establish the line-length: though the formulae

are unparallelled, I do not think that these lines can be

restored in any other way.

Line 10. Meritt bracketed alpha and dotted tau in stoichoi 6 and 7; the right foot of alpha is visible, however; the vertical and part of the horizontal of tau also survive. Thus, any other word denoting percentage is ruled out.

Line 11. Meritt read iota after the break between fragments b and a; this is no longer visible, and I bracket it accordingly.

Line 13. Only the vertical and the extreme left parts of the horizontals of the last letter survive; as it stands, it could be beta or epsilon; the context demands beta.

Line 17. The left tip of the horizontal of tau survives at the edge of the stone; one might restore *ho hellenotamias* [αμίας εὔ λέγει] , or perhaps some phrase denoting location. Since the hellenotamias is apparently reporting upon the conduct of the honorands, it is tempting to suggest that he might be the proposer of the rider that starts in line 27.

Line 20. Before the letters OPAI there is a diagonal mark previously read as part of a chi; if anything, it is better-suited to sigma than to chi. Its position, however, is probably too far to the right; as Meritt suggests, it is more likely to be a random scratch.

Line 21. Before kappa the apex of alpha survives.

Lines 21-23. Hiller (I.G., I², 122) restored these lines as part of the formula granting citizenship, but he misread the first visible letter of line 23 as a

fragmentary upsilon, rather than as a kappa. Meritt restored [τὸν δῆμον τὸν Ἀθηναίων καὶ] προσάγ[εν αὐτὸ τοὺς πρυτάνες ἐς τὸν δῆμον ἐς τὴν πρότεν ἐκ]κλησί[αν]. The first letter of fragment c appears in line 22: of it only the left vertical survives, above the beta of line 23. A mark to the right of this vertical is, at first sight, a letter-stroke; however, it is probably too far to the right to be part of this letter, and too far to the left to belong in the next stoichos. I restore a rho and alter the order of Meritt's restoration accordingly. It might be possible to restore lines 21-22 as follows: [ν ὅτι ἐδι]ακονεσάτε[ν τὰ τεταγμένα· ἐὰν δέ τινὸς δέεσθον παρὰ τῷ δέμῳ] προσάγ[εν αὐτὸ τοὺς πρυτάνες κτλ.].

In line 22, fragment b, only the apex of gamma survives.

In line 23 my observations confirm that the first visible letter is kappa, not upsilon; in stoichos 15 iota is certain, while, in the next stoichos, the apex of alpha survives.

Line 24. The first visible letter-stroke is a left vertical in stoichos 13, followed by a lambda and part of an omicron

in stoichoi 14 and 15. I suggest the following restoration for lines 23-24:

[ἐκ]κλεσίᾱ[ν·πρόσοδον δὲ ἔναι ἐς τὲ]ν βολ[ῆν καὶ ἐς]
[τὸν δῆμον ἐὰν ᾗ]λλο [τίνος ἀγαθὸ δέεσθον·τ]ὸ δ(ἐ) φσέ[φισμα κτλ.]

It is clear at this point that, if the honorand

Phanosthenes was the same man who became an Athenian general, at the time of this decree he was not yet an Athenian citizen: as a citizen he would have needed no intermediary in the Assembly.

In line 24 the epsilon of δ(ἐ) lacks its middle bar.

Lines 24-27. The text is that first proposed by Schweigert (loc.cit.), expanded from a forty-two letter line to one of forty-six letters by the addition of [τόδε] in lines 24-25 and of [κατα-] in line 26. Wilhelm (1939, p. 84) and Meritt (loc.cit.) had suggested that lines 23-24 contained the formula [ἐπιμέλεσθαι δὲ αὐτῶν τὲ]ν βολ[ῆν καὶ τὸς στρατεγὸς λόπος ἂν μὲ ἀδικῶνται]; I have been unable to expand this from a forty-two to a forty-six letter line while conforming to the position of the letters extant in these lines on fragment c.

Lines 27-28. The first two letters of line 28 (fragment d) have always puzzled commentators. Meritt, expanding upon Wilhelm's suggested restoration of line 30 (see below), thought that these two letters might be part of a place-

name in the dative, such as [ἐν Σιδῶν]τι. This may be correct. Alternatively, however, they might be the last letters of an amendment-formula:

[..... εἶπε· τὰ μὲν ἄλλα καθάπερ ἐν τῷ προτέρῳ ψέφισμα]-
[τι· ἐπαῖ[νέσαι κτλ.].

I know of no parallel for this formula, however. Restoration of a man's name or an ethnic, as part of the praise-formula depending on ἐπαῖ[νέσαι], is very difficult; it becomes impossible to restore the rest of this line, since there is not enough space for any sort of qualificatory formula, such as [ὅτι ἄνδρες ἀγαθοὶ ἐσιν περὶ τὸν δῆμον], nor can the praise-formula be expanded here. Thus, it is almost certain that ἐπαῖ[νέσαι] is the first word of a new sentence.

Several restorations of line 28 are possible:

1. ἐπαῖ[νέσαι μὲν Ἀντιοχίδην καὶ Φανοσθένην καὶ γράψα]|ι
2. ἐπαῖ[νέσαι δὲ ^{Φανοσθένην} Ἀντιοχίδην]τε καὶ τοὺς παῖδας καὶ γράψα]|ι
3. ἐπαῖ[νέσαι δὲ τοὺς παῖδας καὶ ἀναγράψαι προχσένος κα]|ι
4. ἐπαῖ[νέσαι δὲ τοὺς παῖδας τοὺς ^{Φανοσθένο} Ἀντιοχίδο]καὶ ἀναγράψα]|ι

The fourth seems the most likely to be correct; the first is surely superfluous, since this has been said already, in effect, in lines 20ff.; the same, to a lesser extent, applies to the second example. The third surely needs a patronymic to identify the sons who are being honoured. Only the fourth

makes good sense and is most in accord with the language of the rest of the inscription: the repetition of [τός] is characteristic, as is the use of [ἀναγράφαι] rather than [γράφαι]. I cannot find any suitable alternative to the restoration ἐπα[νέσαι] though only the epsilon is certain.

Line 29. The restoration is that proposed by Hiller (I.G., I², 156), expanded by the addition of [στέλει]. Hiller restored εἰ[ναι κτλ.], but the last visible letter is certainly nu, not iota.

Line 30. Again, the problem of selecting honorands arises. The available space is probably ten, perhaps thirteen letters (depending on whether [καί] is omitted or included: [ἀναγράφαι δὲ (καὶ)¹⁰..... ἐμπό]λει. This is insufficient for two names, too much for such a phrase as [τός παῖδας], which, in any case, would probably need to be qualified by a patronymic. Wilhelm's suggestion (op.cit., p. 85) seems the best: an ethnic such as [Σιδουσίος] is required. It was not unknown for Athens to praise a whole state rather than individuals (cf. I.G., I², 110a, which honours the Halikarnassians). [τός Ἀνδρῖος] would fit, but I doubt whether the article would be used here.

#45. Proxeny. ca 420-405 B.C. Honours for the sons of
an unknown man.

Pl.XII,1

EM 5928 (unpublished), fragment of blue-white micaceous marble, broken on all sides but preserving the rough-picked back. The provenance is unknown. Foliation is vertical and parallel to the face. There are vertical uninscribed spaces of 0.020m. and 0.065m. respectively above and below the inscription. The stele was thicker at the bottom than at the top.

H.max. 0.141m. W.max. 0.135m. Th. (top) 0.058m.; (bottom) 0.060m. Letter-height 0.010m.-0.011m. Chequer 0.014m.x 0.014m.

Letter-shapes. E⁴ and 5, Θ³, K², N⁷, O², P⁸, Σ⁹. Attic script, probably by the same mason as #44. It would be tempting, in fact, to regard this as part of the same stele, were not the honorands of #44 known to be Phanosthenes and Antiochides. The date, however, must be very much the same.

ca 420-405 B.C.

Stoich.29vacat

[πρόχσενοι καὶ εὐ]εργέτ[αι Ἀθελναίον]

[.....¹³.....]σσίο: Νικ[.....⁹.....][.....¹³.....]ος: Νεοκρ[.....⁹.....]vacat

COMMENTARY. This looks more like the heading than the post-script of a decree. The first four letters of line 2 could be part of an ethnic in the genitive. The rest of this line and line 3 contain probably four names. I suggest that the father is named in line 2 and that the other names are those of his sons (cf. #9). In this case the following restoration of lines 2-3 is possible:

[.....^{±9}... τῷ ^{±2}]σσίο: Νικ[.^{±5}...: .^{±4}][.^{±5}...: ...^{±8}...]ος: Νεοκρ[.....⁹.....]

The father is thus identified by this ethnic. Ethnic with this ending are rare; personal names even more so. However, there are two possible candidates for the ethnic: [ἡ]σσίο, from Assos in the southern Troad, and [Θυ]σσίο, from Thyssos, on the south shore of the promontory of Mt. Athos. Assos was an original member of the Confederacy and was assessed for tribute down to 410/09 B.C. (A.T.L., I,

pp. 280-281). Thyssos was also a tributary of the Empire, but revolted in 424/3 B.C. (Thucydides, IV, 109.5); it was captured by the Chalkidians in 421/0 B.C. (A.T.L., I, pp. 286-287). The names of the honorands are of little use in identification of their ethnic: that in line 3 might be Νεοκρ[οντίδες] ; this is found at Delos. Also from Delos are two possible candidates for the name at the end of line 2: Νικ[ένωρ] and Νίκ[αρχος] , though many other names with this opening exist.

An alternative restoration of this fragment would be as follows, all the names being in the genitive:

[προχσένων καὶ εὐ]εργέτ[ων Ἀθηναίων]
 [..^{±9}.....^{±2}σσίο: Νικ[..^{±5}...: ..^{±4}.]
 [..^{±5}...: ..^{±8}.....]ος: Νεοκρ[.....⁹.....]

#46. Proxeny. ca 420-410 B.C. Honours for Xanthippos.

Pl.XII,2

BIBLIOGRAPHY. Pittakys, E.A., 34 (1853), p. 831 #1346; Rangabé, A.H., II (1855), p. 975 #2287; Pittakys, E.A., 50 (1858), p. 1819 #3485; I.G., II, 26 (1877); I.G., II², 60 (1913); Pope, Non-Athenians (1935), pp. 188, 229; Lambrechts, Proxeni decreten (1958), p. 73.

PHOTOGRAPHS. None so far published.

EM 6921, fragment of blue-white micaceous marble, found on the Akropolis and first published by Pittakys (loc. cit. [1853]). The smooth-picked back is preserved, as well as the top and the right edge. Foliation is vertical and parallel to the face. The stele was thicker at the bottom than at the top. There are traces of a crowning moulding, probably below a vertical fascia. The height of the moulding (and fascia) is 0.046m. Its preserved projection from the face is 0.003m.

H.max. 0.178m. W.max. 0.251m. Th.(top) 0.087m.; (bottom) 0.089m. Letter-height 0.007m.-0.008m. Chequer 0.0101m.x 0.0107m.

Letter-shapes. A3, 4 and 5, B3, E4, H1, Θ 3 and 4, K2, M1, N7, O1, Π1, P8, Σ8, Y6, Φ 4, Ω3. Ionic script.

Upsilon-type 6 is uncommon at any time, but occurs with greatest frequency in the decade 421-410 B.C. By the same or a very similar hand is I.G., I², 101 (ca 411 B.C.); I.G., I², 38b (date unknown) is perhaps also by this hand; I.G., I², 333 (414/3 B.C.) is very close in style. The marble is of a type that seems to have come into vogue ca 420 B.C.; it is very uncommon before 425 B.C., but I do not know how frequent was its use in the fourth century. The orthography suggests a fifth-century or very early fourth-century date, and the formula in lines 7-8 is one found in three fifth-century documents (#33 [421/0 B.C.] ; I.G., I², 113 [411/0 B.C.] ; #62 [408/7 B.C.]); it occurs only once in a fourth-century document (I.G., II², 206 [349/8 B.C.]). The preamble contains an archon-formula; the name of the archon will be six letters long; archon-formulae are very rare before 421/0 B.C., but became normal practice after this date (see #9 above); thus, in the fifth century, the likeliest dates are 419/8 B.C. (Archias) and 415/4 B.C.

(Charias). The next suitable name is Pytheas (380/79 B.C.), but I do not believe the letter-shapes can be dated so late.

ca 420-410 B.C.

Stoich. 28

[ἔδοξε]ν τῇι βολῇι κα[ῖ τῶ]ι δῆμῳι, ο[ῖν]-
 [ῆις ἐπ]ρυτάνευεν, Ἀμφικράτης ἐγ[ρα]-
 [μμάτευ]εν, Πιστοκλέης ἐπεστάτε, [.²]-
 [.⁴... ἦρχε]ν, Εὐξίθεος εἶπε· Ξανθίπ[π]-
 5 [ωι τῶι ...⁵...]ρεῖ ὡς ὄντι ἀνδρὶ ἀγα[θ]-
 [ῶι ἐς τὴν πόλι]ν τὴν Ἀθηναίων καὶ π[ρ]-
 [οθύμῳι ποιῆν ὅ, τ]ι δύναται ἀγαθὸν [τ]-
 [ὅς ἀφικομένος Ἀθη]ναίος, ἐπαινέ[σα]-
 [ι καὶ δῶναι δωρεὰν ἢ]μ πράττετα[ι· ἔν]-
 10 [αι δὲ καὶ κυρίας τὰς πρ]ότερο[ν αὐτῶ]-
 [ι δεδομένας δωρεάς· ...⁴...]οη[...⁶...]

COMMENTARY. The restorations are those of Koehler (I.G., II, 26) for lines 1-7 and Kirchner (I.G., II², 60) for lines 8-11, with a slight correction in line 7. I identify this honorand with Xanthippos, grandfather of three men who successfully sought revival of a proxeny that had been abrogated by the Thirty in

404/3 B.C. (I.G., II², 52). Xanthippos himself had died before the proxy was revived, as, presumably, had his son. The present decree will thus be a fragment of the original stele broken up by the Thirty. I have already commented upon the archon-formula in lines 3-4 (see above); two fifth-century dates seem most likely: 419/8 B.C. and 415/4 B.C. The names of the other officials in the preamble are of no assistance in establishing the date: the epistates Pistokles is unknown; the orator Euxitheos could perhaps be the donor of a statue at Eleusis in the second half of the fifth century (I.G., I², 807); otherwise, he is unknown. Amphikrates the secretary might be the son of Amphidemos who was killed in 401/0 B.C. on the march of the Ten Thousand (Xenophon, Anabasis, IV, 2.13; 17).

There are several choices for the ethnic of Xanthippos; all but one are in the south-eastern Aegean. The most likely may be Kameiros on the island of Rhodes; this was an Athenian tributary until 412/1 B.C., when the whole island revolted (A.T.L., I, pp. 296-297; the ethnic is Καμειρῖος). We possess another restored proxy relating to the island of Rhodes (Hesperia, XVII [1948], p. 54 #65: the sons of a man from Ialysos sought restoration of

a proxyeny erased by the Thirty). Woodhead, in his edition of this document, suggested that it, together with #47 (for Proxenides of Knidos), #54 (for an unknown Chian?), I.G., I², 113 (for Evagoras of Cypriote Salamis) and I.G., I², 110a (for the Halikarnassians), might be part of Athens' efforts to secure her position in the south-eastern Aegean (op. cit., p. 55). The proxyeny of Xanthippos could be part of the same diplomatic effort, in which case the date 415/4 B.C. would be very suitable. Other possible ethnics are [Τερμε]ρεῖς, [Κίλλα]ρεῖς and [Γαργα]ρεῖς. Termara, near Halikarnassos, was a tributary until at least 415/4 B.C. (A.T.L., I, pp. 420-421); Killara, inland from Halikarnassos, was a tributary in 454 B.C., and perhaps as late as 440 B.C., and was still being assessed in 425/4 B.C. (A.T.L., I, pp. 310-311); Gargara, in the southern Troad, was a tributary at least until 428/7 B.C. (A.T.L., I, pp. 254-255). The best candidates, since the presence of an archon-formula suggests a date after 421/0 B.C., are thus Kameiros and Termara, both conforming with Woodhead's suggestions regarding a diplomatic offensive in the south-eastern Aegean.

The name Xanthippos is fairly common: Pope (loc.cit.) thinks it to have been the name of a fourth-century proxenos from Chios (I.G., II², 23, restored), and suggests that I.G., II², 23, 52 and #46 all deal with the same family; her arguments are based on not very convincing restorations of I.G., II², 23 and 52.

Line 1. There is no trace of epsilon before nu at the left edge; Kirchner dots nu and tau, but both are certain. At the right edge the outline of omicron is visible in the antepenultimate stoichos, thus confirming that the prytanizing tribe was Oineis.

Line 2. The upper curve of rho survives at the left edge.

Line 4. The top of the right hasta of nu survives at the left edge; at the right edge the top left corner of pi survives.

Line 5. The upper loop and part of the vertical of rho survive at the left edge; there is uncut stone at the bottom of the stoichos on the right, thus eliminating beta as a possibility.

Line 6. The top of the right hasta of mu survives at the left edge; the vertical and part of the horizontal of pi survive at the right edge.

Line 9. The apex of alpha survives at the right edge.

Line 10. The top of omicron survives at the left edge.

Line 11. The top of a circular letter is visible under epsilon of line 10, followed by the tops of two vertical hastae in one stoichos, so that the reading omicron-eta is very likely.

#47. Proxeny. ca 430-415 B.C. Honours for Proxenydes

the Knidian.

Pls. XII,3; XIII,1,2

BIBLIOGRAPHY. Pittakys, L'Ancienne Athènes (1835), p. 262; E.A., 28 (1842), p. 599 #1051; Rangabé, A.H., I (1842), p. 368 #299; Pittakys, E.A., 38 (1854), p. 1172 #2265; 54 (1860), p.2007 #4014; I.G., I, 73; 89 (1873); I.G., I, Supplement, p. 69 #116t (1886); Kirchhoff, Sitzungsb.Ak. Berlin (1887), pp. 1185-1186 #2; I.G., I, Supplement, p. 196 #116⁸ (1892); Bannier, A.M., XXVII (1902), pp. 302, 304; Svoronos, A.N.M., Tafelbd., III (1903), pl. CCVI. 1; Wilhelm, Beitraege (1909), p. 7; Walter, Beiblatt (1911), p. 59; I.G., II², 66 (1913); Walter, Beschreibung (1923), pp. 10-12 #11; I.G., I², 144; 155 (1924); S.E.G., III (1929), 21; Binneboessel, Urkundenreliefs (1932), pp. 4,29 #6; Svoronos, A.N.M., Textebd., III (1937), p. 664 #430.1; Meritt, Hesperia, VIII (1939), pp. 65-69 #22; Wilhelm, Att.Urk., IV (1939), pp. 20, 35-36; Meritt, Hesperia, X (1941), pp. 328-330; Meritt, Wade-Gery and McGregor, A.T.L., II (1949), pp. 77-78, D 23; S.E.G., X (1949), 108; Meritt, Hesperia, XXI (1952), p. 344; Lewis, B.S.A., XLIX (1954), p. 50; S.E.G., XII (1955), 33; XIV (1958), 40; Lambrechts, Proxenyedecreten (1958), pp. 36, 51, 56, 78-79, 86, 151; Mattingly, J.H.S., LXXXI (1961), pp. 128-129; S.E.G., XXI (1965), 50; Mattingly,

P.A.C.A., VII (1964), pp. 53-54; B.S.A., LXII (1967), p. 140.

PHOTOGRAPHS. Svoronos (1903), pl. CCVI.1 (fragments b, c, d, e); Walter (1923), p. 11 fig. 11 (fragments a, b, c, d, e); Meritt (1939), p. 66 (fragments b, c, d, e); p. 68 (fragments g, h); A.T.L., II, pls. XIV, XV (reprints of Meritt's photographs); Lambrechts, op.cit., pl. 1 (reprint of Walter's photograph).

Eight fragments of micaceous Pentelic marble, preserving the top, crowning relief, inscribed fascia, left and right edges and rough-picked back. Foliation is vertical and almost at right angles to the face. The stele is wider and thicker at the bottom.

Fragment a joins the top of fragments c, d and e; fragment b joins the left side of fragment c, while fragment f fits at the bottom of fragments b and c, to the left of fragment d. Fragments g and h are contiguous, but do not join any other fragment; fragment g joins the top of fragment h. The top of the stele is flat, with a projecting vertical fascia over an ovolo moulding; below these there is a relief depicting a man between two taller women. On the left a woman clad in a himation stands in profile, facing right, her

hands extended to place a wreath upon the head of the man. Her himation is draped over her left arm. The man also wears a himation, and is bare-headed, wearing sandals; he stands in profile, facing right. His right leg is slightly advanced, and he stretches out his right hand to grasp that of the woman to his right; his left hand is enfolded in his himation. The woman on the right wears a helmet and holds the head of an upright spear with her raised left hand. She wears a himation and stands full-face, her head turned to the left and her right hand stretched out to hold that of the man beside her. These three figures must represent the patron-goddesses of Knidos and Athens, Aphrodite on the left and Athena on the right, with the honorand Proxenides between them. The top left corner of the relief is broken away; the top right corner is badly mutilated, but the full width is preserved at the bottom of the relief. The full height of the relief with crowning moulding and fascia is 0.250m.; its width is 0.420m. I have not seen fragment a; the measurements are those given by Walter (1923).

Fragments b, c, d, e each contain parts of the lower projecting fascia and ovolo moulding, as well as part of the inscribed face of the stele, while the bottom of the relief survives on fragments c, d and e.

The lower vertical fascia is the widest part of the entire stele (0.650m.), projecting on both sides as well as over the face of the stele. It is inscribed with the title of the decree and projects 0.014m. from the inscribed face.

The combined height of fascia and moulding is 0.085m. The inscribed face of the stele is wider than the relief portion, and bears at its top a heading, above the text of the decree itself. Combined dimensions, fragments a-f: H.max. 0.710m. W.max. 0.650m. (fascia); 0.605m. (top of inscribed face of stele). Th.max. 0.097m. (fascia); 0.083m. (top of inscribed face).

Fragment a, Akropolis Museum Inventory #2996. Its provenance is unknown, but is presumed to be the Akropolis. The top, back and right edge are preserved. It was first published by Walter (1911), joined to fragments b, c, d and e.

Fragment b, EM 2634, preserves the top and left edge of the lower fascia, together with the left edge and back of the inscribed face. Its provenance is unknown. It was first published by Walter (1911), joined to fragments a, c, d and e. H.max. 0.180m. W.max. 0.080m. Th.max. 0.097m.

Fragment c, EM 2635, preserves the back, part of the lower

inscribed fascia and the inscribed face, as well as the lower left edge of the relief. Its provenance is unknown; it was first published by Walter (loc.cit.).

H.max. 0.235m. W.max. 0.115m. Th.max. 0.097m.

Fragments d and e bear the same inventory-number, EM 6854.

Fragment d preserves parts of the relief and lower inscribed fascia, and a large, though badly mutilated, portion of the inscribed face. The back is preserved; otherwise, it is broken on all sides. It was found by the north wall of the Akropolis, beside the Erechtheion, and was first published by Kirchhoff (loc.cit.) from a transcript of H.G. Lolling. Bannier (loc.cit.) joined it to fragment e.

H.max. 0.502m. W.max. 0.295m. Th.max. 0.097m.

Fragment e preserves part of the relief, lower fascia and inscribed face; the right edge and back survive. It was found on December 12, 1857, to the north of the Propylaia in a modern context; it was first published by Pittakys in 1860.

H.max. 0.295m. W.max. 0.265m. Th.max. 0.083m.

Fragment f, Agora Inventory #I.2806, preserves the left

edge and back of the body of the stele. It was found on April 19, 1935, in a modern context during excavation of the Athenian Agora, and was first published in 1939 by Meritt, joined to fragments b, c, d, e and associated with fragments g and h.

H.max. 0.242m. W.max. 0.198m. Th.max. 0.083m.

Fragment g, EM 6829, preserves the left edge of the body of the stele, but is otherwise broken on all sides. It was found on the Akropolis, in the ruins of the Chalkotheke, between the Parthenon and the Propylaia; it was first published by Kirchhoff in 1886 from a transcript of H.G.Lolling (I.G., I, Supplement, p. 69 #116t). Meritt (loc.cit.) joined it to the top of fragment h.

H.max. 0.203m. W.max. 0.151m. Th.max. 0.098m.

Fragment h, EM 6626, preserves the left edge and back. It was described by Pittakys in 1835 as being in situ on the Akropolis east of the Erechtheion, and was excavated on November 17, 1839 (Pittakys, 1842). Wilhelm (1909) first associated it with fragments b and c, and it was republished in 1924 as I.G., I², 144c.

H.max. 0.379m. W.max. 0.234m. Th.max. 0.108m.

Combined dimensions, fragments g, h; H.max. 0.548m. W.max.

0.234m. Th.max. 0.108m.

Letter-height, all fragments, line 1 0.022m.; line 2 0.018m.; lines 3ff. 0.012m.-0.013m. (except in lines 3 and 4 on fragment b, where the letters are 0.010m. high).

Chequer, lines 3-19 0.0225m.x 0.0222m.; lines 20ff.

0.0220m.x 0.0195m.

Letter-shapes. A4, E4 and 5, H1, Θ4, K1 and 2, Λ4-5, M2, N5-7, O1, 2 and 3, Π1, P8, Σ8, Υ1 and 8, Φ4-5, X3. Line 1 is in Ionic script; line 2 has Ionic eta and lambda, as well as Attic gamma; lines 3ff. are in Attic script with apparently regular use of the daseia. The hand is very close to that of I.G., I², 85 (dated, probably, in the late 420's), and closer, to, if not the same as, that of #26 (probably dated in the late 420's). The mason of #26 also inscribed I.G., I², 96 (417/6 B.C.), and I.G., I², 852 and 944 and #27 (all dated between 430 and 415 B.C.).

ca 430-415 B.C.

Non-stoich.

a, b, c, d, e Προξε[νί]δο Προξένο τῷ Κνιδ[ί]ο.
 Αρχικλῆ[ς] Ἀλαιοῦς ἐγγραμμάτευεν.

Stoich. 27

ἔδοχσεν [τ]ῆι βολῆι κα[ῖ] τῷ δέμοι, Ἀ-
 κα[μ]αντ[ῖς] ἐπρυτάνευε, Αρχικλ[?]ῆς ἐ-

- 5 [γ]ραμμά[τευε, Ἀντικράτες?] ἐ[πε]στάτ[ε]
 ε, Δεμος[.....²¹.....]-
 ει Προχσ[ενίδες¹⁴.....]-
 [.] Ἀθελναί[ος καὶ νῦν καὶ ἐν τῷ πρόσ]-
 [θ]εν χρόν[οι ἐπαινέσαι τε αὐτῷ κα]-
 10 [ἰ ἀνα]γρ[άφσαι αὐτὸν ἐστέλει λιθί]-
 [νει πρόχσενον καὶ εὐεργέτην Ἀθε]-
 [ναίον καὶ καταθέναί ἐμ πόλει .³.]
 [-----²⁷-----]
 [.....¹².....]ερ[.....¹³.....]
 15 [-----²⁷-----]
 [-----²⁷-----]
 [-----²⁷-----]
 [-----²⁷-----]

lacuna

- 20 f τὸν δὲ [ἀποκτείναντα ἐνέχεσθαι τ]-
 οῖς αὐ[τοῖς ἡάπερ ἡυπὲρ Ἀθελναίον]
 ἐφσέφ[ισται, ἐάν τις ἀποθάνει βια]-
 ἰοι θαν[άτοι¹⁷.....]
 το αὐτο[.....²¹.....]
 25 ι προχσ[εν.....¹⁹.....]
 ις πολι[.....²¹.....]
 εται· ἐὰ[ν δὲ ἀδικῇ τις ἔ Ἀθελναίον]
 ἔ τῶν [σ]υ[μμάχον τῶν Ἀθελναίον κατὰ]

h [τ]ούτον λ[αγχανέτο τὰς δίκας πρὸς]
 30 τὸν πολέ[μαρχον Ἀθένεσιν ἄνευ πρ]-
 υτανείο[ν· ἄλλον δὲ ἀτελὲς ἔστο, τὰ]
 δὲ τέλε τ[οῖς ἐκλογεῦσι τελέτο ἡ]α]
 δεῖ Κνιδί[ος ἐς τὸν φόρον τελεῖν κα]-
 θάπερ ἡοι [ἄλλοι Κνίδιοι· καλέσαι]
 35 δὲ αὐτὸν κ[αὶ ἐπὶ χσένια ἐς τὸ πρυτ]-
 ανεῖον ἐς [αὔριον·!!..... εἴ]-
 πε· τὰ μὲν ἄ[λλα καθάπερ ...⁹.....]-
 ς· ἡοι δὲ τ[.....²⁰.....]-
 σας στρεσ[.....²⁰.....]-
 40 θας καὶ τ[.....²⁰.....]-
 ντον[.....²⁰..... προ]-
 χσενο[.] δ[ἐ¹⁹.....]
 [.]^h[.....²⁵.....]
 [.]ⁱ[.....²⁵.....]

COMMENTARY. The margin gradually increases: at line 8
 it is 0.012m. wide; at line 21 it is 0.018m.; at line
 41 0.020m. This suggests that fragment g should be set
 fairly close to the bottom of fragment f; the shapes of
 the breaks down the sides of fragments g, h and fragment
d also suggest a fairly close connexion, but no join is

possible. I have therefore set fragments g, h apart from the rest, though the lacuna may not be so great as I have indicated. There is space for about ten lines on fragments d, e, below line 10.

Line 1. The right corner of delta is visible.

Line 2. The seventh letter is clearly eta, not epsilon; there is no trace of a lower bar, though the surface of the stone is preserved to the right of the hasta. Only the bottom of the right foot of alpha survives after the break on fragment d. Archikles was also secretary to the prytany Akamantis in the decree #48; a further coincidence is that the space available for the name of the epistates, ten letters, is exactly suited to the name of Antikrates, who was the epistates of #48; thus, if the suggestion of Meritt (1939, p. 68) is correct, both these documents were put before the Assembly on the same day of the same year; however, ten-letter names are so common that to restore Antikrates' name here would be hazardous. Meritt suggests that the year of both decrees was 416/5 B.C., since the restoration Δεμόσ[τρατος] for the orator in line 6 is possible: a man of this name was orator of the decree authorizing the Sicilian Expedition in 416/5 B.C. (P.A., I, 3611; see Plutarch, Alkibiades, 18.2). Other names are

possible: Meritt himself suggested Δεμοσ[θενίδες] in 1952; in any case, there is no reason why this orator should have confined his activities to the year 416/5 B.C.

Lines 3-5. With the aid of carbon and water the faint traces of the final letters of these lines can be made out.

Lines 6-7. Δεμός[τρατος εἶπε· ἐπειδὲ εὖ ποι]εῖ Προχ[σενίδες
 ἡό, τι ἂν δυνατός ε[ἴ] Αἰενα[ίος] Meritt (1939); Προχ[σενίδες
 ἡο Κνίδιος ἀεὶ τὸ]ς Αἰενα[ίος] Meritt (1952); he also

proposed in 1952 the alternative restoration Δεμοσ[θενίδες
 εἶπεν· ἐπειδὲ δοκ]εῖ Προχ[σενίδες ἡο Κνίδιος εὖ πο]εῖ
 Αἰενα[ίος].

None of these versions is entirely satisfactory; in only one fifth-century honorific (#54) is the ethnic of the honorand omitted, so that Meritt's earliest version is suspect on this point. However, his later offerings are also doubtful: in the one the use of the article before Αἰενα[ίος], in the other the entire formula, are without parallel. Perhaps the best reading is Meritt's earliest; support for this view is given by #54, which is probably of much the same date as the present decree and may also have had an inscribed fascia with the name, patronymic and ethnic of the honorand upon it.

Line 8. Enough survives of the second alpha and following iota for this reading to be certain. In line 9 the right tip of the top bar of epsilon survives at the left edge, while

the top of the left hasta of the final nu is also visible. In line 10 only the apex of gamma survives. The formulae are standard, but possibly there ought to be mention of the secretary of the Boule, perhaps at the end, or after [Ἀθηναίων] in line 12.

Line 14. There are faint traces of letters here: the upper left corner of an epsilon is followed by the top of a beta of rho. There is space for four lines below this.

Lines 20-23. Meritt (1939) read line 20 as $\iota\omicron\nu\delta$ [---] and offered no restoration for lines 20-21. He restored lines 21-23 as follows: [παρὰ τὰ] | ἐφσεφ[ισμένα ἔ ἀποκτένει τις βία] | [οἱ θαυ[άτοι ἔ δέσει ἔ ἀπάγει -----].

In 1941 he accepted but corrected the readings and restorations offered by Wilhelm (1929); it is this version that I have adopted: my reading of the stone confirms that the first letter of line 20 is a tau, and also that the bottom left corner of an epsilon survives in stoichos 5. Partial parallels are afforded by I.G., I², 115.29 (for lines 21-22) and #9, line 13 (for lines 22-23).

Lines 23-27. [τὸν δὲ τιμορίαν κατὰ] | τὸ αὐτὸ [ἔναι ἔάν τις δέσει ἔ ἀπάγει] | Προχσ[ενίδεν ἡέπερ Ἀθηναίων το] | [ς πολί[ταις ἐν τῶν πόλεον προείρ]εται Meritt (1941). The Greek is awkward and the phraseology unparalleled, but I can offer no viable alternative.

Lines 27-31. The restoration is that of Meritt (1941); Wilhelm (op.cit., p. 20) restored λ[αρχάνειν] in line 29 and added the phrase [καὶ ἐπιδεκάτον?] in line 31. This latter seems unwarrantable (see my remarks on #7, lines 6-7, where Wilhelm proposed the same restoration). The reading of line 28, where the fragments join, is very difficult: Meritt at first (1939) read τῖοτ.ι ; after re-examining his squeeze and photograph, he admitted that the reading could equally well be εῖο[...]υ (1941). My own examination of the stone confirms and expands the latter reading: in the first stoichos a horizontal survives, with no trace of a vertical stroke under it at the centre or at its right end, so that epsilon is certain. In stoichos 2 the horizontal stroke of tau is quite clear, but the vertical is very faint. In the third stoichos the upper curve of omicron survives, but the lower two-thirds of this letter are lost. In stoichos 4 the top of the left hasta of nu survives, but there is no sign of the diagonal; the stone is much abraded here. Nothing survives in the fifth stoichos; in stoichos 6 only the bottom of a central vertical is visible. Meritt's restoration of lines 26-31 is thus rendered virtually certain; this is the reading that I have adopted, except that I have transposed [τὰς δίκας] and [Ἀθένεσιν] to put the former in line 29 and the latter in line 30.

Lines 31-34. The restoration is that of Meritt (1939). There is no exact parallel, but Meritt's arguments are convincing: Proxenides, offered benefits that were "applicable to him in residence at Knidos ..., was free from all other taxes to Athens, but ... was not put in the invidious position of having an exemption from his share in the payment of the Knidian tribute. This money was gathered by the Knidian ἐκλογεῖς and its assessment on individuals and collection from individuals was not a matter with which Athens had any immediate concern or over which she exercised any direct control ... From all other levies he was to be exempt" (p. 69).

Lines 34-36. This formula is commonly found at the end of a decree.

Lines 36-37. A rider follows, but, in view of what occurs in line 38, [τῷ βολῷ] cannot be restored; instead, the name of a proposer is needed, showing that the lost or damaged portion of the decree between lines 12 and 20 contained an earlier rider. Meritt (op.cit.) suggested that there was a gap of one letter before the rider-formula in line 36; this is regular, but by no means universal, usage: the proposer's name will thus be ten or eleven letters long, ending in sigma..

Line 38. The first letter is a fragmentary sigma, the end

of the name of the proposer of the second rider. One might possibly restore this line in part as $\kappa\omicron\iota\ \delta\epsilon\ \tau[α\acute{\iota}\alpha\iota]$; perhaps payment for the stele was being arranged.

Line 39. Meritt read $\sigma\alpha\varsigma\ \sigma\tau\iota[---]$ (op.cit.). However, another sigma can be read with the aid of charcoal and water after the sixth letter; the vertical of this sixth letter is perhaps too far left for an iota, and I suggest that it is part of an epsilon, in which case some part of the verb $\dot{\iota}\sigma\tau\eta\mu\iota$ might be restored here. All the other letters are clear.

Line 41. Use of charcoal and water brought up the first nu; these letters are thus probably part of an imperative or a participle, or of a noun in the genitive followed by $\tau\tilde{\omicron}\nu$.

Line 42. The faint outlines of the first five letters can be made out with charcoal and water; the sixth letter has disappeared, while the delta in stoichos 7 is clear. Perhaps members of Proxenides' family are here being honoured with the proxeny; one could restore, for instance: $[\pi\rho\omicron]\chi\sigma\acute{\epsilon}\nu\omicron[ς]$ $\delta[\acute{\epsilon}\ \acute{\epsilon}\nu\alpha\iota\ -\ -\ -\ -\ -]$.

Line 43. The only certain letter is a faint daseia in stoichos 2.

Line 44. In stoichos 2 there is a faint central vertical.

Meritt (op.cit.), arguing from his identification of the orator as Demonstratos, suggested that this document be dated

ca 416/5 B.C. Mattingly(1961, p. 128) linked Meritt's restoration of [ἐκλογεῦσι] in line 32 with the establishment of this group of officials in 426/5 B.C. (see A.T.L., II, D 8), and suggested that the date of the present decree should be ca 426/5 B.C.; with neither date are the letter-forms at variance. Unfortunately, neither the prosopography nor any other internal detail of this decree affords a clue to the date beyond these conjectures; Knidos revolted from the Empire in 412/1 B.C. (A.T.L., I, p. 315; see Thucydides, VIII, 35.1); surely Proxenides' honours antedate this revolt. Possibly there had been earlier disaffection in the city, during which Proxenides had rendered special service to Athens; in which case Meritt's date, being closer to the final revolt, is the more attractive. Mattingly later suggested the date 422/1 B.C. (1964, p. 53); this date depends upon Meritt's identification of Archikles as the secretary of both this decree and #48; Mattingly proposed that a suitable context for #48 would be the refusal of Athens' Thessalian allies to allow Spartan reinforcements to pass through Thessaly after the death of Brasidas (Thucydides, V, 13). If Meritt's restoration of the preamble of the present decree is correct, thus placing both it and #48 in the same year, I feel that the likeliest date is in the late 420's: Athenian involvement in Thessaly after the

Peace of Nikias seems to have been minimal (see #48, above). However, Meritt's suggestions about the date of #47 gain some support from Woodhead's arguments that it, together with ##36 and 54 and I.G., I², 110a and 113, was part of Athens' diplomatic offensive in the south-eastern Aegean just before she embarked upon the expedition to Sicily (Hesperia, XVII [1948], p. 55 ; see #46, pp. 452-453 above). While the arguments for a date in the 420's are stronger in the case of #48, there is not sufficient information to rule out a date in the 410's for it. Thus, on balance, it seems preferable to adopt Meritt's suggested date for both #47 and #48 rather than that of Mattingly.

#48. Proxeny. ca 430-415 B.C. Honours for Kallippos
of Thessalian Gyrtou.

Pl. XIII,3

BIBLIOGRAPHY. Mylonas, B.C.H., XII (1888), p. 142;
Kirchhoff, Sitzungsber. Ak. Berlin (1888), p. 244 #20;
Wilhelm, Hermes, XXIV (1889), p. 113 note 2; Swoboda,
Rh. Mus., XLV (1890), p. 299; I.G., II, 5 #11e (1895);
Michel, Recueil, Supplément (1912), 84; I.G., II², 27
(1913); S.I.G., I³ (1915), 70; Kirchner, Imagines¹
(1935), 47; Meritt, Hesperia, VIII (1939), pp. 65-69
#22; Wilhelm, Att. Urk., IV (1939), pp. 79-80; Weston,
A.J.P., LXI (1940), p. 346; Klaffenbach-Kirchner,
Imagines² (1948), p. 17 #39; S.E.G., X (1949), 109;
Mattingly, P.A.C.A., VII (1964), p. 53.

PHOTOGRAPHS. Kirchner, #47; Klaffenbach-Kirchner, pl.
17 #39.

EM 6897, stele of white micaceous marble, its bottom
section broken off. It was found in 1887 on the Akropolis
in the foundations of the temple of Roma and Augustus
east of the Parthenon; it was first published by Mylonas
(loc. cit.). The top of the stele is surmounted by an

ornamental triangular gable whose face is flat. At each corner and at the centre there are akroteria, that at the centre larger than those at the corners. These are triangular, with curved sides. Below the gable is a moulding, flat in profile, at 45° to the face of the stele. The corners of the gable project 0.0125m. to either side of the stele. The stele itself is tapered, being widest at the bottom. Foliation is vertical and at right angles to the face, marked by very noticeable vertical streaks on the face of the stele. There is a vertical uninscribed space 0.202m. high between lines 1 and 2; no trace of paint or carving exists in this space today, nor is any reported by the first editors of this document. H.max. 0.625m. (height of gable 0.207m.). W.max. 0.343m. (width of inscribed face 0.318m. at the top, 0.328m. at the bottom). Th.max. 0.138m. (top of inscribed face 0.118m.). Letter-height, line 1 0.017m.; lines 2ff. 0.009m.-0.011m. Chequer, lines 2 ff. 0.0116m.x0.0160m.

Letter-shapes. A3 and 4, B3, E4 (centre bar sometimes longer), H1, Θ3 and 4, K2, M2 and 3, N7, O1 and 2, Π1, P8 and 9, Σ7, Y3, 6 and 7, X3, Φ5 and 7. Ionic script, rather untidy. The shapes of the letters do not provide

any useful clue to the date: upsilon type 3 (in line 3 only) is not found in dated inscriptions after 420 B.C., but this example may merely be an instance of careless cutting. I believe that the same hand is found in the epitaph of Myrrhine, priestess of Athena Nike (S.E.G., XII, 80), and I.G., II², 20; both these documents are dated early in the fourth century; the hands of #30 and #56 (inscribed in 399/8 B.C.) and of I.G., II², 1392 (398/7 B.C.) are very close. Thus, on the evidence of letter-shapes alone, a date very near the end of the fifth century should be preferred. However, the preamble of this document places it in the same year and prytany as #47, which is dated by its letter-shapes between 430 and 415 B.C. and by content probably in the late 420's or early 410's (see below). Therefore, either the evidence of the letter-shapes should be disregarded or this document must be included in the list of those decrees that were passed in the fifth century but inscribed in the fourth century. The latter view is probably the correct one.

ca 430 -415 B.C. (inscribed ca 400 B.C.?)

Καλλίππο Θετταλῷ

vacat

Stoich.25

ἔδοξεν τῇ βολῇ καὶ τῷ δήμῳ,
 Ἀκαμαντὶς ἐπρυτάνευε, Ἀρχικλ-
 ῆς ἐγραμμάτευε, Ἀντικράτης ἐπ-
 5 εστάτε, γνώμη στρατηγῶν· Κάλλι-
 ππον τὸν Θετταλὸν τὸν Γυρτῶνι-
 ον ἐπαινέσαι ὅτι δοκῇ εἶναι ἀν-
 ῆρ ἀγαθὸς περὶ τῇ πόλιν τὴν Ἀθ-
 ηναίων καὶ ἀναγράψαι αὐτὸν ἐσ-
 10 τήλῃ λιθίνῃ πρόξενον καὶ εὐ-
 εργέτην Ἀθηναίων αὐτὸν καὶ τὸ-
 ς παῖδας τοὺς Καλλίππο καὶ κατα-
 [θῆναι ἐν πόλει]ι. Εὐκρατίδας, ἱππ-
 24 [.....]τ

COMMENTARY. The secretary and prytanizing tribe are the same as in #47 (ca 430-415 B.C.); moreover, the name of the epistates can be restored in the preamble of #47 as [Ἀντικράτης] so that there is a strong possibility that both decrees were passed in the same year and on

the same day. Mattingly (loc.cit.) points out that the phrase $\gamma\nu\omega\mu\eta$ στρατηγῶν is also found in the preamble of I.G., I², 71 (where [$\gamma\nu\omega\mu\epsilon$] is restored; see S.E.G., X, 86.47); this decree is dated probably in 423/2 B.C. Mattingly argues that the occasion for honouring Kallippos was the sequel to the death of Brasidas, when Spartan reinforcements were denied passage through Thessaly from the south by Athen's allies in the area (see Thucydides, V, 13). Gyrton had sent cavalry to Athens in 431 B.C. (Thucydides, II, 22.3). Meritt (op.cit., p. 60) restored the name of the orator of #47 as Δεμόσ- [τρατος], identifying him with the man who moved the decree authorizing the Sicilian Expedition in 416/5 B.C. (P.A., I, 3611), and suggested that #47 (and consequently the present decree as well) should therefore be dated ca 416/5 B.C. The honours granted to Proxenides in #47 include an exemption from taxes paid to Athens but not from the Knidian tribute, and a very convincing restoration by Meritt (op.cit., p. 66) refers to the ἐκλογεῖς, a body that was established in 426/5 B.C. (see A.T.L., II, D 8); this reference led Mattingly to suggest a date nearer to 426/5 for #47 and the present decree..

Lines 3-4. The secretary Archikles is known from #47

(see above); he may be identical with that Archikles who was a casualty after 410 B.C. (I.G., I², 964.58). The name is also found in a naval casualty-list of the late fifth century (I.G., I², 950.28), and is common in succeeding centuries. The epistates Antikrates is not otherwise known; his name has been restored in #47 (see above; the suggestion is that of Meritt, op.cit., p. 68). The phrase γνώμη στρατηγῶν is not found elsewhere, except in restoration of I.G., I², 71 (see above); a somewhat similar phrase γνώμη Κλεόφοο καὶ συμπρυτάνεων is found in I.G., II², 1.5, dated to 405/4 B.C. It seems to be evidence for the intervention of the generals in the debates of the Boule or of the Assembly, probably the former (see Swoboda loc.cit.). The honorand Kallippos of Gyrtion is not otherwise known, nor is there any clue, except in the fact that the decree was moved by the generals, to the services that he had performed for Athens. Another Thessalian of this name was honoured by Athens in the second half of the fourth century (I.G., II², 186); his home, however, was probably Pharsalos. Gyrtion is in northern Thessaly, close to the southern entrance to the valley of Tempe; thus, the services, presumably of a military nature, performed by Kallippos, may have concerned access to and through the valley; Mattingly's

suggestion that these services occurred in 422/1 B.C. is plausible; Athenian involvement in this area was not very marked after the Peace of Nikias.

Line 12. Of the first six letters in this line only the tops survive; thus, only the second letter, pi, is certain.

Line 13. The restoration is that of Wilhelm (1889). He suggests, I think correctly, that Eukratides and Hipp-- are the sons of Kallippos. In this line only the tops of the letters survive, except in the last five stoichoi. Eukratides is not otherwise known; the other name might be, for instance, $\dot{\iota}\pi\pi[\text{o}\delta\acute{\alpha}\mu\alpha\varsigma]$; a man of this name was hieromnamon for Thessaly at Delphi ca 278/7 B.C. (I.G., II², 1132.4); another possibility is $\dot{\iota}\pi\pi[\text{o}\kappa\rho\acute{\alpha}\tau\eta\varsigma]$; a man of this name was a representative of Thessaly at the swearing of a treaty between Athens and Thessaly at some time in the second quarter of the fourth century (I.G., II², 175.13)..

#49. Proxeny. ca 425-405 B.C. Honours for [T1] manax.

Pl.XIII,4

BIBLIOGRAPHY. Pittakys, E.A., 54 (1860), p. 1960
 #3806; I.G., I, 81 (1873); Wilhelm, Beiblatt (1898), p.
 44; B.Ph.W., (1902), p. 1099; Larfeldt, Gr.Epigr., II²
 (1902), p. 933; Pohl, Medicis (1902), p. 17; Bannier,
B.Ph.W. (1921), pp. 307-308 note 1; I.G., I², 152
 (1924); Lambrechts, Proxenedecreten (1958), pp. 34,77,
 87.

PHOTOGRAPHS. None so far published.

EM 6619, fragment of blue-white, slightly micaceous
 marble, found on the Akropolis on September 18, 1858,
 at the north end of the Propylaia; it was first pub-
 lished by Pittakys (loc.cit.). The left edge and rough-
 picked back are preserved. Foliation is vertical and
 parallel to the face. The stele was thicker on the left
 than at the centre; the horizontal profile of the back
 may have been concave.

H.max. 0.237m. W.max. 0.123m. Th. (left) 0.122m.;
 (right) 0.115m. Letter-height 0.008m.-0.009m. Chequer

0.0101m.x 0.0130m.

Letter-shapes. A4 and 5, B3, E4 and 5, Θ3 and 4, K2, Λ5, M3 and 4, N7, O2, Π2, P6-8, Σ8, Y8, Φ4-5, X3. Attic script, probably employing the daseia regularly. The shapes of mu and sigma are very distinctive. Epsilon type 5 is rare before 418 B.C., though found as early as 433/2 B.C. Lambda type 5 is found once in 447 B.C., and then not again until 431 B.C.; it is rare before 425 B.C. Mu type 4 is not found before 430 B.C. Upsilon type 8 is found in the late 450's, and then not again until 435 B.C.; it is rare before 425 B.C. These letter-shapes suggest a date in the late 420's or after. I believe that four other documents are by the same or a very similar hand: I.G., I², 87 (424/3 B.C.), which has a different upsilon and a more rounded rho; I.G., I², 68/9 (probably 424/3 B.C., though possibly later), which has two types of upsilon, one of them identical with that of the present decree; lambda, mu and sigma are identical. I.G., I², 110 (410/09 B.C.) is possibly by this hand, as may be #64 (between 425 and 405 B.C.). #63 (ca 408/7 B.C.) differs only in the shape of its sigma, while I.G., I², 47 (=S.E.G.,

X, 136; probably 407/6 B.C.) has lambda, sigma and upsilon identical with those of the present document.

There are several other documents that exhibit characteristics found in #49: I believe them to be the work of masons influenced by the mason of #49. These are I.G., I², 25 (probably dated in 424/3 B.C.), S.E.G., X, 77 (ca 425 B.C.), ##34 and 35 (both dated in the late 420's or early 410's), ##68 and 69 (late work, I believe, of the mason of ##34 and 35, dated ca 404 B.C.), I.G., I², 110a (410/09 B.C.), I.G., I², 108 (410/09 B.C.) and I.G., I², 117 (407/6 B.C.). These documents I believe to be the work of a school of masons, perhaps pupils of the mason of I.G., I², 87; the career of this master-mason lasted for some twenty years. The present decree seems fairly late in the sequence of documents by this man, perhaps in the late 410's.

ca 425-405 B.C.

Stoich. 27

[.]ις· [προσαγῆν δὲ αὐτὸν εἰάν το δέ]-
[ε]ται πρὸς τὸν βολὴν καὶ τὸν δῆμον]
τὸς πρυτ[άνες πρῶτον μετὰ τὰ ἱερ]-
ά, καὶ τὰς [δίκας εἶναι Ἀθένεσι πρὸς]

- 5 [τ]ὸμ πολέ[μαρχον καὶ τ' ἄλλα ἡόσα πρ]-
 οχσένοις κ[αὶ εὐεργέταις ἐστί· τὸ]
 δὲ φσέφισμ[α τόδε ἀναγράφσαι τὸν]
 γραμματέα τ[ῆς βολῆς ἐστέλει λιθ]-
 ίνει καὶ κατ[αθῆναι ἐμ πόλει? YYYV]
 10 Δερμοκλείδες [εἶπε· τὰ μὲν ἄλλα καθ]-
 ἄπερ τῆι βολ(ῆ)[ι·¹³..... Τι?]-
 μάναντα τὸν Ἀσ[κληπιάδην? ..⁶....]-
 ο δερμοσιεύει [...¹⁶.....]
 [.]ρο[..⁴...]μ[.....¹⁹.....]

COMMENTARY. The line-length, as suggested in lines 10-11 in the first place, is confirmed by the restoration of lines 6-9. The reconstruction of lines 1-6 is that first proposed by Larfeldt (loc.cit.); that of lines 6-11 was first put forward by Kirchhoff (I.G., I, 81). Wilhelm (1911) associated #39 with this document; Bannier (loc.cit.) showed that this ascription was incorrect: #39 deals with two persons, whereas the present decree honours only one man. Wilhelm's association of

these documents was made on the basis of similarity of marble, letter-sizes and chequer; though the marble is the same, there are slight differences in size and chequer, and certain letter-shapes (mu, nu, sigma and phi) are markedly different.

Line 1. There are traces of two letters in this line: in the second stoichos there is a faint vertical, slightly left of centre; in stoichos 3 there is a diagonal stroke, sloping down from left to right, its bottom end directly over the apex of alpha in line 2. Though it is rather steeply-angled, I believe this to be part of a sigma: the angle at which the bottom stroke of sigma is set varies considerably in this inscription. These two letters could be part of a dative plural, such as [αὐτ|ο]ῖς; thus, one could perhaps restore [πρόσδοον δὲ πρὸς τῷ βολὲν εἶναι αὐτ|ο]ῖς, adjusting the restoration of lines 1-3 to suit several persons rather than a single honorand, on the analogy of #21, lines 21-25; however, the position of [αὐτ|ο]ῖς at the end of the sentence is awkward and unparallelled for this formula. Moreover, the rider in lines 10ff. suggests that only one person was being honoured: it is not impossible that the rider refers to one of

several persons who had been honoured in the main decree, but I do not think that the dubious restoration that I have constructed around these two letters warrants such an assumption, particularly since the reading of iota in stoichos 2 is so doubtful.

Line 3. Of the initial tau only the right tip of the horizontal survives; of tau at the right edge only the left tip of the horizontal is visible.

Line 9. Kirchhoff restored [ἐν πόλει. ~~XXXX~~], but noted that [ἐν ἀκροπόλει] would fit the available space: this phrase is not found in publication-formulae before 387/6 B.C., though it appears in the fifth century in A.T.L., II, D 10 (line 75) with reference to parallel publication of the decree in the city of Erythrai; the Akropolis, rather than the Polis, is referred to in two other fifth-century decrees (I.G., I², 92 and 109), but in rather special circumstances that do not have any bearing upon the present document. In the proxeny-decrees here edited, in every case where its restoration is possible an alternative and better restoration is possible.

Line 10. The orator Demokleides is not otherwise known: Wilhelm (1902) identifies him with the founder of the colony at Brea in the 440's (I.G., I², 45.8), but I think

that this involves probably too long a career, particularly since we hear nothing else of Demokleides' political activities in the time subsequent to the founding of Brea. The name is found in at least four different families in the fourth century, which suggests that it was fairly common. At the end of the line the lower apex of sigma is visible on the stone.

Line 11. The centre-bar of the epsilon is omitted.

Line 12. Wilhelm restores the name [Τι]μάνακτα and suggests that this man was a public physician, restoring the pseudo-patronymic Ἀ[σκληπιάδην] in the same line. The latter restoration is given some substance by the survival on the stone of a partial diagonal stroke, 0.003m. to the right of the toe of alpha; the stone is very much abraded, but I believe that there is a faint trace of another diagonal stroke joining this, thus forming the lower apex of a sigma. The name Timanax is not known except in Rhodes in the first century after Christ (I.G., XII.I, 46), but, in the form Timonax, it is found in Kypros in the sixth century (Herodotos, VII, 98) and in two fourth-century Athenian inscriptions dealing with foreigners (I.G., II², 1635.93, dated 374/3 B.C.; I.G., II², 2376.10, dated before 350 B.C.); it is also found in Kos (Paton-Hicks, Inscr. Cos., index p. 385). Other possible names are Damanax and Hermanax: the former is found, with the

spelling Damonax, in Kyrene (Bechtel, Personennamen, p. 45); the latter occurs in the sixth century in Miletos, spelt Hermonax (Bechtel, op.cit., p. 46). There is a considerable body of inscriptions from Delphi that deal with the office of public physician; many of the physicians honoured in these documents are identified by the pseudo-patronymic Asklepiades, which seems to have been borne by physicians whether or not they were natives of Kos (Pomtow, Klio, XV [1918], pp. 303-338; Thraemer, R.-W.-R.-E., II, 2.1683:59-1685:3; Pohl, loc.cit.). The appearance in line 13 of the word δημοσιεύει further supports Wilhelm's suggestion; though this verb can have the meaning "to make common or public" or "to confiscate", it is also used intransitively in the sense "to be in the public service"; in this it particularly applies to public physicians (cf. Aristophanes, Acharnians, 1030; Plato, Gorgias, 514d; I.G., II², 483.18). It is found also in this sense in an inscription from Kos (S.I.G., I³, 943.7).

Line 13. At the right edge the stone breaks away on a slightly-canted vertical stroke. Whilst epigraphically this could be read as part of a mu, I believe that it must be iota: the word δημοσιεύει would not have been contracted in Attic to δημοσιεύε. The omicron at the beginning of the line is a problem: it might be part of the relative [h]ο ,

but I do not see how this would fit and am unable to suggest any plausible restoration.

Line 14. Though the tops of several letters appear in this line, the only letters I can identify are beta (or rho) in stoichos 2, omicron (or theta) in stoichos 3, and mu in stoichos 8. In stoichos 7 there appears to be the tip of a high right hasta, suggesting that the letter here is a nu: there are traces of what may be the top of the left hasta 0.008m. to the left of this; the gap between these strokes is wider than that found in any other nu in this inscription, however, and there is also an apparent diagonal tip crossing this left hasta at the angle appropriate to the left arm of an epsilon. In the centre of stoichos 6 there is a trace at the top of what could be a central vertical: if the letter in stoichos 7 is epsilon, not nu, we might read $\varphi\upsilon\mu$ in stoichoi 6-8. I am unable to suggest any suitable restoration for lines 11-14.

#50. Proxeny. ca 435-415 B.C. (re-inscribed in 385/4 B.C.). Honours for Archonides and Demon the Sikels..

No photograph available.

BIBLIOGRAPHY. Koumanoudis, E.A. (1886), pp. 97-98; Foucart, B.C.H., XII (1888), pp. 169-172 #4; Wilhelm, Hermes, XXIV (1889), pp. 115-119 #5; I.G., II, 5. 14d; 33b (1895); Wilhelm, Att.Urk., I (1911), p.9; I.G., II², 32 (1913); Lambrechts, Proxeni decreten (1958), pp. 52-53, 65, 74, 76, 79, 118, 123, 127, 154.

PHOTOGRAPHS. None so far published.

Two non-joining fragments of slightly micaceous Pentellic marble, first associated by Wilhelm (1911).

Fragment a, EM 6906, was first published by Koumanoudis (loc.cit.). It was one of several stones purchased by the Archaeological Society and said to have been found in Athens. The left edge is preserved; otherwise, it is broken on all sides..

H.max. 0.150m. W.max. 0.110m. Th.max. 0.080m. Letter-height, lines 1-2 0.010m; lines 3ff. 0.008m. Chequer, lines 1-2 0.0137m.x0.0180m.; lines 3ff. 0.0104m.x0.0135m.

Fragment b, EM 6927, was found on the Akropolis and first published by Foucart (loc.cit.). The left edge may be original; otherwise, it is broken on all sides. Below the last line of the inscription there is a vertical uninscribed space of 0.052m.; there is a gap of 0.023m. between lines 25 and 26.

H.max. 0.330m. W.max. 0.250m. Th.max. 0.090m. Letter-height, lines 6-26 0.008m.; line 27 0.010m. Chequer, lines 6-25 0.0104m.x0.0104m.; lines 26-27 non-stoichedon.

Letter-shapes. A4, B3, E4 and 5, H1, Θ3 and 4, K2, M3, N7, O2, Π1, P8, Σ9, Υ7, Φ5, Χ3, Ω3. Ionic script, somewhat untidy, dated by the archon-formula in line 1 to 385/4 B.C. The text, however, includes that of a fifth-century decree (see below). The hand is the same as that of Hesperia, VII (1938), p. 91 #11.

385/4 B.C.

Stoichedon.

a ἐπὶ Δεξι[θέο ἄρχοντος].
 Φιλόξεν[ος ἐγγραμμάτευε].

ca 435-415 B.C.

vacat

Stoich.27

 ἔδοξεν τῇ[βουλῇ, ἱπποθωντίς ἐπ]-
 [ρυ]τ[άν]ευε, Φ[ιλόξενος ἐγγραμμάτευ]-
5 [ε,]⁶:[----- ἐπεσάται, ---]-

lacunab

- [Ἀρχωνίδην ----- πρόξενο]-
 [ν καὶ εὐεργέτ]η[ν] Ἀθ[ηναί]ων [ἀναγρά]-
 [ψαι ἐμ πόλει ἐ]στ[ήλη] λιθίνῃ [τὸν]
 [γραμμα]τέα τῆς β[ουλ]ῆς· καὶ εἰάν [τις]
 10 [αὐτῷ]ν ἐν τῷ πόλεω[ν ὅσων Ἀθηναῖο]-
 [ι κρατ]ῶσ[ι]ν δ[ή]σῃ [ἢ ἄγῃ ἢ ἀποκτεί]-
 [νῃ] βιαίῳ θανά[τῳ, τὴν τιμωρίαν]
 [εἶν]αι α[ὐτ]ῷ καθά[περ εἰάν τις Ἀθην]-
 [αίων] τοιοῦτό[ν] τι [πάθῃ, καὶ ἐπιμέ]-
 15 [λε]σθαι τῇ βο[υ]λῇ [αὐτῷ τῇ]ν ἀε[ῖ βο]-
 [υλ]εύουσιν εἰάν το δέ[ηται κα]ὶ τὸ[ς στ]-
 [ρα]τηγὸς καὶ τὸ[ς] π[ρυτάνες] ὥς ὅ[ντο]-
 [ς ἀ]νδρὸς ἀγαθὸ πε[ρὶ τὴν πό]λιν [τὴν]
 [Ἀθ]ηναίων. Φράσσω[ν εἶπεν· τ]ὰ μὲν [ἄλ]-
 20 [λα] καθάπερ τῇ βο[λῇ· ἐπαι]νέσ[αι δ]-
 [ὲ κα]ὶ Δήμωνα τὸν ἀδ[ελφὸν] τὸν Ἀ[ρχω]-
 [νίδ]ο καὶ ἀναγράψαι καὶ τοῦτο[ν κα]-
 [ὶ τ]ὸς ἐκγόνο[ς] τὸς Ἀρχωνίδο κα[ὶ Δῆ]-
 [μω]νος προξένος καὶ εὐεργέτα[ς κα]-
 25 [ὶ τὰ] ἄλλ[α καθά]πε[ρ Ἀ]ρχωνίδην.

vacat

[Φιλό]ξενος [Δ]ημαινέτος [Θορ]ίκιος
 [ἐγγραμ]μ[ά]τ[ευξ]. vacat

COMMENTARY. The gap between fragments a and b is of unknown size; it ought to be large enough to include the text of a complete decree, whose preamble begins at line 3, in which the reasons for the re-inscription of the decree of fragment b would have been set out. Fragment b contains the text of a fifth-century decree and a rider, probably of the same date, honouring Archonides and his brother Demon and their progeny. The last two lines of fragment b contain a postscript with the name, patronymic and demotic of the secretary under whose charge the whole stele was inscribed in 385/4 B.C. There is no doubt in my mind that the two fragments are parts of the same stele, despite the difference in the vertical chequers of lines 3-5 and lines 6-25. I think that the first decree was inscribed with a somewhat greater vertical spacing, which was abandoned when the second decree and its rider were inscribed.

Wilhelm (1911) suggested that Archonides and Demon were the Sikel dynasts of those names: he identified Archonides with the dynast of Herbita whose enmity towards Dionysios of Syracuse led to his exile from Herbita in 403 B.C.; he then went to Halaisa and founded the city of Halaisa

Archonideia (Diodoros, XIV, 16). I suggest that Archonides was, in fact, the father or grandfather of the founder of Halaisa: the normal Greek rule that a first son was named after his paternal grandfather may not apply in the case of a family of Sikel dynasts. If this is so, Archonides was probably that friend of Athens whose death is reported in 414 B.C. by Thucydides (VII, 1.4); after his death the Sikels, previously well-disposed towards Athens, went over to the Syracusans.

It was probably this man also who helped Douketios to found a Sikel colony at Kale Akte in the late 440's (Diodoros, XII, 8.2; 29.1). The original of #50 should thus date probably to the 420's or early 410's; it might be as early as 433/2 B.C., when Athens renewed her treaties with Rhegium and Leontinoi (I.G., I², 51 and 52). Demon, the brother of Archonides, is probably the dynast of Kentoripe (Diodoros, XIV, 78.7) who was at war with Dionysios of Syracuse in 396 B.C. Perhaps Archonides the Younger and Demon sought the revival of the proxeny awarded to the elder Archonides and his brother in the period after the Peace of Antalkidas of 386 B.C.; this peace was forced on the Athenians at least in part because of the machinations of Dionysios of

Syracuse, the opponent for much of his career of the Sikel rulers.

The restorations that I have adopted derive from those of Foucart (loc.cit.) and Koehler (I.G., II, 5.14d).

In some lines slightly more can be read than has been admitted by previous editors; I comment only where the identity of a letter is uncertain.

Line 1. The bottom of the vertical of iota survives at the right edge..

Line 5. In the eighth stoichos the top of a central vertical survives, part of the name of the epistates.

Line 19. The orator Phrasmon is not otherwise known; his rider is probably an amendment to the original fifth-century decree rather than to that of 385/4 B.C.

Line 21. The bottom of the vertical of tau survives.

Line 22. The right foot of alpha survives..

Line 26. The right tips of the upper and middle bars of xi survive at the left edge. The name Philoxenos is fairly common, but this man is not otherwise known.

His demotic shows him to have been of the tribe Akamantis; thus, in 385/4 B.C. the rule that the secretary be chosen from a tribe other than that in prytany was still in force.

#51 Proxeny? ca 420-405 B.C. Honours for Dorkis and his wife.

Pl.XIII,5

BIBLIOGRAPHY. Pittakys, E.A., 54 (1860), p. 1963 #3815; I.G., I, 88(1873); I.G., I², 159 (1924).

PHOTOGRAPHS. None so far published.

EM 6625, fragment of micaceous Pentelic marble, found north of the Parthenon on the Akropolis on September 30, 1858; it was first published by Pittakys (loc.cit.). The rough-picked back is preserved; the right edge is probably original. The stone is much damaged.

H.max. 0.327m. W.max. 0.133m. Th. 0.097m. Letter-height 0.008m. Chequer 0.0096m.x 0.0142m.

Letter-shapes. A3 and 4, E4, H1, Θ 3, K2, Λ 4, M2, N7, O2, Π 1 and 2, P8, Σ 8, Y7. Attic script with irregular use of the daseia. P1 type 2 is not found before 440 B.C.; otherwise, the letter-forms are no guide to dating; however, I.G., I², 114 (410/09 B.C.) is probably by the same hand; thus, this document is likely to belong to the years following the Peace of Nikias, rather than to those preceding it.

ca 420-405 B.C.

Stoich. 42

- [.....³².....]σι ἔ στρα[τεγ]-
 [.....²⁸..... ἀπο]δόντων ἦοι στ-
 [ρατεγοὶ²⁴.....]ποτερος αὐτῷ-
 [ν³⁰.....]ιαν· ἡόπος δ' ἄν
 5 [μεδ' ὑφ' ἐνὸς ἀδικῆται μέτε Δόρκις μέθ' ἐ] γυνὲ ἐ Δορκίδ-
 [ο ἐ βολὲ ἐ αἰεὶ βολεύουσα καὶ οἱ πρυτάνε]ς ἐπιμελέσθο-
 [ν αὐτῶν· ἐὰν δὲ Δόρκις δέεται ἄλλον τῶν ἀγαθ]ῶν προσαγό-
 [ντων οἱ πρυτάνες ἐς τὸν δῆμον· τῷ δὲ στ]έλ[ε]ι Δόρκι[ς] λ-
 [.....³⁰..... ἀ]ποδοῖναι δὲ [τὸ]
 10 [ἀργύριον?²⁴.....]ομε! [.3.]ο[.3.]
 [.....⁴².....]
 [.....⁴².....]
 [.....⁴².....]
 [.....³⁵.....]με[...5...]
 15 [.....⁴².....]
 [.....³⁶.....]ελ[...4...]

COMMENTARY. What this decree is about I do not know; the honorand's name suggests that his home might have been one of the Dorian states: the one that comes to mind is Melos, which was reduced in 416/5 B.C. If Dorkis was the Athenian proxenos in Melos, he is likely to have gone into exile with his family when his homeland refused allegiance

to Athens; perhaps this document made provision for his support and protection in exile: it is possible that line 2 may involve a payment by the generals, while lines 9-10 perhaps contain the procedure for the provision of these funds.

Line 1. Only the bottoms of these letters survive; thus, the first letter, sigma, is certain, while iota following it must be dotted; epsilon and sigma are certain, but tau must be dotted; rho is certain. Only the left foot of alpha survives.

Line 3. Only the bottom of the vertical of tau survives.

Lines 4-5. The restoration is that suggested by Hiller (I.G., I², 159).

Lines 6-8. The formula is one frequently found in honorifics.

Line 8. While epsilon is clear, though abraded, the lambda is very fragmented. The next letter has perished, but in the last stoichos there survives a clear left hasta, with no trace of any cuttings to the right of it. The bottom of this hasta is lost.

Line 10. In the fourth stoichos from the left edge the top of a left hasta survives. I can see no trace of any cuttings to the right of this; a very small area of uncut stone survives at the top of the stoichos, so that rho must be ruled out. Four stoichoi to the right is the top of a

circular letter.

Lines 11-13 have perished.

Line 14. Mu is certain, seven stoichoi from the end; next to it on the right is part of a left vertical; the top has perished, and the stone is abraded just above its centre so that it cannot be said with any certainty what letter it is.

Line 15 has perished.

Line 16. The bottom of epsilon survives in the sixth stoichos from the end; next to it is the top of a left vertical, with no trace of cuttings to its right.

Below line 16 there is room for four more lines, but they have perished, if they were ever inscribed.

#52. Proxeny. ca 420-405 B.C. Honours for an unknown
Ionian.

Pl.XIII,6

BIBLIOGRAPHY. Meritt, Hesperia, XXXII (1963), p. 39 #38;
S.E.G., XXI (1965), 57.

PHOTOGRAPH. Meritt, op.cit., pl. 2.

Agora Inventory #I.6923, fragment of micaceous Pentelic marble, preserving the right edge. It was found on June 12, 1959, in late fill in excavation of the Athenian Agora; it was first published by Meritt (loc.cit.). The back is not original; it seems to have split away on the line of two vertical dowel-holes, 0.020m. apart, 0.090m. long, and 0.040m. from the inscribed face; they are parallel to the right edge, the nearer on 0.041m. from it. H.max. 0.115m. W.max. 0.080m. Th.max. 0.046m. Letter-height 0.007m.-0.009m. Chequer 0.0085m.x 0.0148m.

Letter-shapes. A4, E4 and 5, Θ3 and 4, K2, Λ4, M1, N7, O2, P8, Σ7 and 10, Φ4-5, X3. Attic script, with very distinctive sigmas. It is not possible to say whether or not the daseia was used. Epsilon type 5 is rare before

418 B.C. and is not found before 433/2 B.C.; there is no other feature of the letters that can be used as a guide to dating. The hand is that used in the Erechtheion building-inscription of 409/8 B.C. (I.G., I², 372= S.E.G., X, 268); the restoration of line 9 includes an Ionic spelling that is less anomalous in the last decade of the fifth century than earlier.

ca 420-405 B.C.

Stoich.25

[.....!6.....]ον καὶ ἡο[.2]
 [.....!4..... ἐπ]ιμέλεσθαι
 [δὲ αὐτῷ τέν τε βολέν] τὴν Ἀθηναί-
 [ον καὶ τὸς στρατεγὸς] τὸς ἀεὶ στ-
 5 [ρατεγῶντας καὶ τὸς ἄ]ρχοντας τ-
 [ὸς ἐκ τῶν πόλεον τῶν ἐ]ν Ἰονίαι· τ-
 [ὃ δὲ φσέφισμα τόδε ἀνα]γράφσαι
 [τὸν γραμματέα τῆς βου]λῆς ἐν στ-
 [έλει λιθίνει -----]

COMMENTARY. The restorations are those of Meritt. Line-length is established in lines 4-5.

Line 1. The lower right curve of the omicron is preserved at the left edge. The last two letters of the line have

perished, and interpretation of the letters after $\kappa\alpha\iota'$ is difficult. Iota in this inscription is generally placed left of centre: thus, the vertical stroke in the fourth stoichos from the end is properly-placed for an iota; however, there is a faint mark on the stone 0.004m. to the right of this that might be read as a letter-stroke; this mark is too low for the right hasta of a nu, but it might be that of a daseia; there is no example of a daseia in this inscription with which to compare it; the mason, however, who inscribed this document also worked on I.G., I², 372; here, he used both a wide and a narrow daseia, in combination with wide and narrow forms of nu; the width of nu in the present document likewise varies (cf. lines 5 and 6). I conclude, therefore, that the letter in the fourth stoichos from the end of line 1 could be either iota or a daseia. In the next stoichos to the right there is a faint trace of the bottom of a curved letter: if the letter before it is an iota, this is probably either omicron or theta; if the preceding letter is a daseia, this letter will be omicron.

Line 2. The top of iota survives in the final stoichos.

Line 3. See below, line 8.

Line 6. The top of the right hasta of nu survives at the left edge, adding weight to Meritt's suggested restoration

of this line.

Line 8. The tops only of the last four letters survive; of final tau only the left tip of the horizontal can be seen. Before the first epsilon the top half of the stoichos is preserved uncut, confirming that the letter inscribed here was a lambda, and that the word [βου]λῆς should be restored. The ionicism is unusual. The fact that [βου]λῆς not [βο]λῆς is virtually certain here makes me wonder if Meritt's restoration of line 3 is correct: one might restore line 3 as follows, allowing for several honorands:

[ὁ ἐ αὐτῶν τὴν βουλὴν] τὴν Ἀθηναί[ων].

The archons in Ionia are attested to in several cities (see A.T.L., III, pp. 145-146). One of their tasks was the protection of Athenian partisans (cf. #13, lines 2-9, for instance).

#53. Proxeny? ca 420-405 B.C. Honours for an unknown man.

Pl.XIV,1

EM 2505 (unpublished), fragment of micaceous Pentellic marble, broken on all sides. The provenance is unknown. Foliation is vertical and parallel to the face. A note in the inventory of the Epigraphical Museum ascribes it to #15; neither the foliation nor the letter-shapes support this attribution.

H.max. 0.071m. W.max. 0.050m. Th.max. 0.011m. Letter-height 0.010m. Chequer 0.0134m.x 0.0135m.

Letter-shapes. A4, E5, @3, K2, N7, O2. Attic script?

Epsilon type 5 does not occur before 433/2 B.C., and is rare before 418 B.C. The square chequer pattern suggests a date fairly late in the fifth century: such square chequer-patterns are found in the 440's and in the last twenty years of the century, but the character of the script rules out the earlier date. Several documents are by hands very similar to that of #53, though this fragment is so small that it is risky to make any definite attributions. Perhaps the closest hand is in # 59 (ca 420-405 B.C.). The hand of Hesperia, VII (1938), p. 91 #11 is also very similar; this latter document is in Ionic script and has been dated ca 398-390 B.C.

B.C. Since #53 can be restored with the same formulae using Ionic orthography, and since there is nothing in these formulae of specifically fifth-century character, a date in the first decade of the fourth century cannot be ruled out.

ca 420-405 B.C. (possibly ca 400-390 B.C.) Stoich.29

[----- ἀναγραφά]-
 [το δὲ καὶ αὐτὸν πρόχσεν]ον [καὶ εὐεργ]-
 [έτεν Ἀθηναίων ὁ γραμμ]ατε[ὺς τῆς βολ]-
 [ἔς ἐστέλει λιθίνει κα]ῖ κα[ταθέτο ἐμ]
 5 [πόλει·¹⁴.....]ον[...⁷...]
 [.....²⁰.....]να[.....⁷.]

COMMENTARY. I have restored this document according to well-known formulae.

Line 5. The last visible letter is a nu; after it there is part of a left vertical on the break; the restoration

[αὐτῷ δ' ἐπιμελέσθ]ον ἐ [βολέ τε κ]αὶ οἱ στρατηγοὶ οἱ ἄν
 ὄσι]ν α[ῖεῖ--] is also possible; if admitted, it would confirm that this document is inscribed in Attic script.

Alternatively, these letters could be part of the formula inviting the honorand to the prytaneion; if so, the survi-

ving letters in line 5 may be part of his name, e.g.:

[καλέσαι δὲ ...⁵...]ον ἐ[πὶ χσένια ἐς τὸ πρυτανεῖον];

however, the full formula, using [ἐς αὖριον] cannot be accommodated in the available space.

#54. Proxeny. 415/4 B.C. Honours for a citizen of
Ephesos ? and his sons.

Pl. XIV, 2

BIBLIOGRAPHY. Meritt, Hesperia, V (1936), pp. 381-382 #5;
Wilhelm, Att.Urk., IV (1939), p. 39; S.E.G., X (1949), 111;
Lambrechts, Proxeni decreten (1958), pp. 27, 56, 70, 151;

PHOTOGRAPH. Meritt, op.cit., p. 381.

Agora Inventory #I.1674, fragment of micaceous Pentelic marble, found in the wall of a late Roman building in the Athenian Agora on March 25, 1934; it was first published by Meritt (loc.cit.). The left edge and rough-picked back are preserved. The foliation is vertical and at right-angles to the face, marked by two parallel bands of silvery mica. There is a vertical uninscribed space of 0.115m. above line 1.

H.max. 0.245m. W.max. 0.226m. Th. 0.073m. Letter-height 0.008m.-0.009m. Chequer 0.0119m.x 0.0119m.

Letter-shapes. A4, B3, E4, H1, Θ 3, K2, M2, N7, O1 and 2, Π 1, P8, Σ 8, Y7, Φ 4, X3, Ω 2. Ionic script. This document is securely dated by the archon-formula in line 4. By the same hand is the third stele of the casualty-list I.G., I²,

954 (409 B.C.?). The unpublished EM 5394 may also be by the same hand, while the hand of I.G., I², 171 (of uncertain date) is very similar.

415/4 B.C.

Stoich. 23

[Ε]δοξεν τῇ βολῇ καὶ τ[ῶι δήμ]-
 ωι, Ἀντιοχὶς ἐπρυτάν[ευε, .3.]-
 οφράδης ἐγγραμμάτευ[ε, .5.]-
 άδης ἐπεστάτε, Χαρία[ς ἦρχε, K]-
 5 αλλισθένης εἶπε· Ἀνθ[...6.]-
 ν καὶ τὸς παῖδας ἐπε[ιδὴ εὖ πο]-
 [ι]εῖ τὴν πόλιν καὶ Ἀθ[ηναῖος ἀ]-
 ναγράψαι πρόξενον [καὶ εὖερ]-
 [γ]έτην Ἀθηναίων ἐν σ[τήλῃ λι]-
 10 [θ]ίνῃ· τέλεσιν [το]ῖ[ς] ἑαυτοῦ· 2.]-

COMMENTARY. The prytany of Antiochis was eighth in 415/4 B.C. (I.G., I², 302.71-77), the year of the archon Charias. Wilhelm (loc.cit.) restores the name [Κλε]φφράδης as secretary in lines 2-3; the name is not otherwise known, except as that of a man in whose honour the red-figure Kleophrades-painter inscribed his pots ca 500 B.C., as Wilhelm points out. No other Attic name of this length

and termination comes to mind. There are several possible choices for the name of the epistates (Alexiades, Kalliades, Meixiades, Philotades and Tharriades are all listed under the tribe Antiochis); there is not much point in attempting a restoration, but Philotades, of the tribe Antiochis, was hellenotamias in 430/29 B.C. (A.T.L., II, List 25) and might conceivably be found as a bouleutes in 415/4 B.C. The orator Kallisthenes is not otherwise known; a man of this name was sent as ambassador to Tiribazos in 392 B.C. (P.A., I, 8088; see Xenophon, Hellenika, IV, 8.13) and is conceivably the same person.

Line 5. It seems impossible to restore a name and ethnic here, in which case this document is an exception to the rule that foreign honorands were always identified by ethnic. Perhaps the top of the stele, now lost, bore a title giving the name and ethnic of the honorand, as in the case of #47. The corner of the third letter of the honorand's name survives on the stone; of this the diagonal is clear, but the stone breaks away in such a manner that it is not certain whether there was a horizontal stroke as well: the fact that the stone has broken away more or less horizontally makes a delta more likely than an alpha in my view. The name will therefore be $\Delta\nu\delta[\dots^6\dots]\varsigma$; possibilities are Andromachos (known from Miletos, but very late) and Andronikos

(Thessalian, fourth century; see I.G., II², 109.16).

Meritt noted that in 415/4 B.C. an Athenian general was at Eph--- in the eighth prytany (I.G., I², 302.79); the restoration is very probably Ephesos; he suggests that the honorand of the present decree was an Ephesian who had rendered some service to this general early in the eighth prytany and was honoured by the grant of proxeny; however, there may not have been sufficient time for all this to have occurred within one prytany; if Meritt's suggestion be accepted, I think that the honorand's services would have preceded the arrival of the general in question. Ephesos went over to Tissaphernes in 412/1 B.C.; this proxeny might thus represent Athenian attempts to strengthen her following in a city already wavering from its allegiance. The honorand was presumably from an area employing Ionic script, though not necessarily from Ionia itself: witness the case of #48, which Meritt has recently shown to be dated to about the same period as the present document (see, Hesperia, VIII [1939], pp. 65-69); this is a decree honouring a Thessalian.

Line 10. Only the tops of the letters survive in this line, but the reading can be made with some confidence since the formulae are well-known.

#55. Proxeny. 412/1 B.C. Honours for Eurytion of Orchomenos and his father Potamodoros.

Pl.XIV,4

BIBLIOGRAPHY. Pittakys, E.A., 34(1853), pp. 847-848 #1368; Rangabé, A.H., II (1855), p. 977 #2296; I.G., II, 21 (1877); Loeper, E.A., III (1893), p. 210; I.G., II, 5 #35b (1895); Koehler, Hermes, XXXI (1896), pp. 140-141; Wilhelm, Urk.Dram. (1906), p. 216; Bannier, B.Ph.W. (1921), pp. 308-309; I.G., I², 103 (1924); Bannier, B.Ph.W. (1927), pp. 667-668; Wilhelm, Att.Urk., IV (1939), pp. 72-78 #xxxii; S.E.G., X (1949), 114; Lambrechts, Proxeni edicte (1958), pp. 28-29, 33, 57, 69, 85-86, 123, 126, 136, 151; Mattingly, J.H.S., LXXXI (1961), p. 129 note 39; S.E.G., XXI (1965), 53; Pečírka, Enktesis (1965), pp. 2-4.

PHOTOGRAPHS. None so far published.

Two joining fragments of slightly micaceous Pentelic marble, now cemented together and set in plaster. They were first associated by Wilhelm (1906). Foliation is diagonal, from top right to bottom left, and at right angles to the face. Fragment a, EM.6915 was found on April 8, 1848, on the site of the old Metropolitan Church of Athens, west of the Akropolis; it was first published by Pittakys (loc.cit.).

It preserves the left and right edges, as well as the rough-picked back. The top, which probably bore originally a crowning relief, is broken away above a moulding and vertical inscribed fascia. The fascia is wider than the rest of the stele, and it and the moulding continue at the top of both lateral faces. The height of the fascia is 0.036m. and it is 0.453m. wide. The moulding is 0.034m. high. The fascia projects 0.013m. from the face and 0.009m. from each lateral face. The body of the stele bears a heading in large letters, with a vertical uninscribed space of 0.018m. above the first line of the preamble. The stele tapered from bottom to top, the margins increasing towards the bottom of the stele, so that the horizontal chequer remains constant.

H.max. 0.283m. W.(below moulding) 0.438m. Th. (below moulding) 0.142m. Letter-height, line 1 0.019m.; line 2 0.016m.; lines 3ff. 0.009m. Chequer, lines 3ff. 0.0109m.x 0.0162m.

Fragment b, EM 6930, was first published by Koehler (I.G., II, 5 #35b) in 1895. Its provenance is not known. The left edge is preserved; otherwise, it is broken on all sides.

It joins the bottom left corner of fragment a.

H.max. 0.138m. W.max. 0.173m. Th.max. 0.116m. Letter-height

0.009m.

Combined max.height, fragments a and b 0.360m.

Letter-shapes: A3 and 4, B3, E4, H1, Θ3 and 4, K2, M2, N7, 8 and 9, O1 and 2, Π1, P8, Σ8, Υ7, Φ4, X3, Ω4 and 5. Ionic script, with some irregularity in orthography (O for OY; E for EI). The decree is dated by the archon-formula in line 5 to 412/1 B.C. (see below). I do not know of any other document by precisely the same hand.

412 B.C.

Stoichedon

a [Εὐ]ρυτίωνος ἔρχομεν[ίο]
προξένο καὶ εὐεργέτο.

vacat

Stoich.38

ἔδοξεν τῇ βολῇ καὶ τῷ δήμῳ, ἱπποθωντὶς ἐπρυ-
τάνευε, Αἰσχύλος ἐγραμμάτευε, Κηφισόδωρος ἐ-

5 πεστάτε, Καλλίας ἦρχε, Μενετέλης εἶπεν· ἐπειδὴ
Εὐρυτίων καὶ ὁ πατὴρ αὐτοῦ Ποταμόδωρος καὶ οἱ π-
ρόγονοι αὐτῶν πρόξενοί τε εἰσὶν Ἀθηναίων κα[ῖ]

[εὐεργέται καὶ ἄνδρες ἀγαθοὶ ἐν τε τῇ στρ[ατιᾷ]-

[ι ἐγένοντο] ἐς τὴν πόλιν τὴν Ἀθηναίων κ[αὶ ἐπιτή]-

b 10 [δε]ιοὶ εἰσὶν καὶ ἰδίαὶ καὶ δημοσίαι[ι τῷ δήμῳ τῷ]-
ι Ἀθηναίων, ἐπαιν[έσαι τε] αὐτ[οῖς ...⁸..... ἐπαν]-

ιῶσιν? ἔναί τε αὐτ[οῖς οἰκῶσι? Ἀθήνησιν? ἀτέλεια]-
 ν? ἀνδραγαθείας ὅ[νεκα καὶ φιλοτιμίας, ἣν ἐν τοῖς]
 | κατὰ τὸν πολέμο[ν ἀγῶσι διὰ παντὸς ἐνεδείξαντ]-
 15 ο, ποιεῖσθαί τ[ε²⁶..... κα]-
 ἰ τὸς πρυτ[άνες καὶ τὸς στρατηγὸς τὸς ἀεὶ στρατ]-
 ηγ[ὸ]ντ[ας -----]

COMMENTARY. The restorations are those of Wilhelm (1939), with some minor changes.

Lines 1-2. Eurytion, with his father Potamodoros, was honoured, probably in the 420's soon after the battle of Delion (see #28); special arrangements were made for them and for other exiles from Boiotia, and grants of money allocated (see also I.G., I², 68/9, perhaps arranging a colonial settlement for the Thespians and other individual Boiotians). However, in #28 there is no reference to a proxeny or euergesia in the extant portions of the decree; since the present document refers to the honorands as being already proxenoi, as had been their ancestors before them, the proxeny must be regarded either as having been renewed in the lost part of #28, or as being a hereditary one not requiring confirmation from generation to generation. In line 1 only the first two and the last two letters are

completely lost.

Line 4. Aischylos was secretary in I.G., I², 104, (whose preamble has been restored with the name of the archon Kallias in the archon-formula). His name is also restored in I.G., I², 318 (perhaps as one of the board of epistatai), a document dated ca 424 B.C.; a man of the same name and tribe was secretary to the hellenotamiai in 437/6 B.C. (I.G., I², 363). The poet Aischylos was of the deme Eleusis and thus, possibly, the grandfather of the secretary Aischylos. The name of the epistates, Kephisodoros, is fairly common; this man cannot be identified more closely.

Line 5. There were three archons of this name in the period 415-375 B.C. The archon of 377/6 B.C. is usually known as Kalleas (though Diodoros lists him as Kallias; see XV, 28). Kallias, who was archon in 406/5 B.C. is designated in I.G., I², 124 by his demotic to distinguish him from his namesake of 412/1 B.C. Thus, the present decree is almost certainly to be dated in 412/1 B.C. The orator Meneteles may be the son of Menetes who was a choregos early in the fourth century (P.A., II, 10023).

Lines 5-17. I comment only upon doubtful letters, though in some instances I read more than has been admitted by previous editors.

Line 8, end. The right tip of the horizontal of tau is visible, followed by the upper curve of rho. This shows Hiller's $\sigma[\tau\eta\lambda\eta\iota]$ to be incorrect (I.G., I², 103). Wilhelm (op.cit., p. 73) argues that $\sigma[\tau\rho\alpha\tau\acute{\epsilon}\alpha\iota]$ (munitions) rather than $\sigma[\tau\rho\alpha\tau\iota\tilde{\alpha}\iota]$ (army) should be restored here. I do not believe that Wilhelm's reading makes sense; however, with $\sigma\tau\rho[\alpha\tau\iota\tilde{\alpha}\iota]$, the sentence can be translated satisfactorily. The scribe was inconsistent in his orthography (see lines 10, 12 and 15, and, perhaps, 16), so that there is no virtue in arguing that the word "munitions" would be written $\sigma\tau\rho[\alpha\tau\epsilon\acute{\iota}\alpha\iota]$ rather than $\sigma\tau\rho[\alpha\tau\acute{\epsilon}\alpha\iota]$.

Line 9, beginning. Only the bottom of iota survives. At the end the tops only of iota and alpha are visible. For the formula see I.G., I², 82.10 (#33).

Line 11. The tops of alpha, upsilon and tau survive; upsilon is more likely than chi in this context. Wilhelm rejects Bannier's (1927) restoration: $\acute{\epsilon}\pi\alpha\iota[\nu\acute{\epsilon}\sigma\alpha\iota\ \alpha\upsilon\tau\omicron\iota\varsigma\ \kappa\omicron\varsigma\ \acute{\alpha}\gamma\alpha\theta\omicron\iota\varsigma\ \alpha\upsilon\delta\rho\acute{\alpha}\sigma\iota]$; $\tilde{\omicron}\sigma\iota\nu$ as having too many letters, as well as employing the Attic daseia. Hiller (I.G., I², 103) hesitantly suggested the restoration $[\acute{\Lambda}\mu\phi\iota\kappa\tau\iota\tilde{\iota}\omicron\sigma\iota\nu]$ for lines 11-12, but there does not seem to be any way to accommodate this. Wilhelm's own restoration $[\acute{\epsilon}\varsigma\ \acute{\Lambda}\theta\eta\nu\alpha\varsigma\ \acute{\alpha}\pi\alpha\nu]$; $\tilde{\omicron}\sigma\iota\nu$ was suggested by analogy with I.G., I², 1085.6 ($\acute{\epsilon}\kappa\ \Pi\alpha\gamma\tilde{\alpha}\nu\ \acute{\alpha}\gamma\alpha\gamma\tilde{\omega}\nu\ \delta\iota\tilde{\alpha}\ \text{Βοιωτ}\tilde{\omega}\nu\ \acute{\epsilon}\varsigma\ \acute{\Lambda}\theta\eta\nu\alpha\varsigma$) and #56, line 20 ($[\kappa\alpha\iota\ \acute{\alpha}] \nu\iota\acute{\omicron}\nu\tau\iota\ \kappa\alpha\iota\ \acute{\alpha}\pi\iota\acute{\omicron}\nu\tau\iota$).

He admits that some other topographical reference, such as ἐκ Σικελίας, ἐγ Βοιωτίας, or even ἐκ τοῦ πολέμου, is possible, and I suspect that this is more likely to be correct: Ἀθήναζε is the normal non-poetic usage, not ἐς Ἀθήνας. Mattingly (loc.cit.) suggests [ἐκ Χαλκίδος] or [ἐξ Ἐρετρίας]. He implies that Potamodoros and Eurytion settled in Euboea after the collapse of their hopes in 424 B.C., but that growing political discontent in Euboea made it necessary for them to move again in 412 B.C. (see Thucydides, VIII, 60 and 95 for events in Euboea at this time). There is no proof, of course, that they, or the other Boiotian exiles, ever were settled in Euboea, though Wilhelm (op.cit., pp. 74-75) suggests it as a possibility (I.G., I², 68/9 may involve the settlement of these exiles wherever in Euboea they wished; see lines 6-7 of that document).

Line 12, end. The left tip of the cross-bar of tau survives here. If Wilhelm's restoration is correct (αὐτ[οῖς οἰκῶσι Ἀθήνησιν ἀτέλεια **τ**), this line involves a second grant of ateleia to Potamodoros and possibly to Eurytion (see #28, line 16). Koehler (loc.cit.) suggested that the present decree was a re-affirmation of the proxeny and euergesia to Eurytion, but this interpretation is based on the view that Potamodoros was dead by this time; I think that lines 9-10 show that he was very much alive, though the subordinate

position in which he is named suggests that he was by now very old. Wilhelm also suggests, instead of [ἀτέλεια]_v , [ἰσοτέλεια]_v , but this will be one letter too long, unless [Ἀθηῆναι] be restored instead of [Ἀθηναίων]. For the grant of ateleia in proxeny-decrees cf. #30 and I.G., II², 53; 180; 195; 265; 285. I.G., II², 109 involves the grant of both isoteleia and ateleia; the latter in a phrase very close to that restored by Wilhelm.

Line 13. Wilhelm restores ὅ[νεκα](=ἐ[νεκα]) by analogy with I.G., I², 1037.2 and I.G., II², 2943.8; οὐνεκα is found often also in the orators. Bannier (loc.cit.) suggested ὅ[τι ----].

Line 14, end. The left edge of omicron survives here.

Wilhelm's restoration is by analogy with the Pergamene inscription O.G.I., 332.57 (and Diodoros, XXX,15:

ὄντες ἄπειροι τελείως τῶν κατὰ πόλεμον ἀγώνων).

He suggests either [διὰ παντός] or [τῶι δῆμῳ] (cf. I.G., II², 507.34), though the former is more likely.

Line 15. ο ποεῖσθαί τε [ἐκκλησίαν εὐθύς(?) τὸς στρατηγὸς κα]ῖ κτλ. Bannier (loc.cit.). This has one letter too many (as well as being written in Attic script) and Wilhelm rightly views the juxtaposition so contrived as unprecedented. His own restoration is also unique in that

it employs the phrase ποεῖσθαι ἐπιμέλειαν instead of ἐπιμέλεισθαι, which is the normal formula.

Line 16. Wilhelm's restoration here has one letter too many: this can be corrected by reading πρυτ[άνες] for πρυτ[άνεις].

Line 17. The top left corner of gamma is visible, but the next letter has entirely disappeared. Only the tips of the verticals of nu survive, but part of the vertical as well as the horizontal of tau can be seen. This confirms Wilhelm's conjecture that the verb στρατηγέειν is involved here.

#56. Proxeny. 411/0 B.C. (renewed in 399/8 B.C.). Honours for Pythophanes (of Phaistos?).

Pl.XIV,3

BIBLIOGRAPHY. I.G., II, Addenda, pp. 396-397 #1c (1877); Wilhelm, Beiblatt (1898), p. 43; Hartel, Studien, II (1878), pp. 159-160; I.G., II², 12 (1913); Leonardos, D.A. (1916), p. 213; Wilhelm, Jahreshefte, XXI-XXII (1924), pp. 147-152 #11; Ferguson, C.P., XXI (1926), pp. 72-75; S.E.G., III (1929), 71; Weston, A.J.P., LXI (1940), pp. 345-346, 356-357; Kahrstedt, Klio, XXXIII (1940), p. 12; Lenschau, Rh.M., XC (1941), pp. 24-30; Klaffenbach-Kirchner, Imagines² (1948), p. 18 #44; S.E.G., X (1949), 116; Hignett, Constitution (1952), pp. 375-378; de Ste-Croix, Historia, V (1956), pp. 17-19; Meiggs and Lewis, G.H.I. (1969), pp. 247-250 #80.

PHOTOGRAPHS. Klaffenbach-Kirchner, op.cit., #44.

EM 6875, fragment of slightly micaceous Pentelic marble, preserving the left edge and rough-picked back. It was found in 1877 on the south slope of the Akropolis, between the theatres of Dionysos and Herodes Atticus; it was first published by Koehler (I.G., II, Addenda, pp. 396-397 #1c). Foliation is vertical and diagonal to the face, from left

face to right rear.

H.max. 0.411m. W.max. 0.276m. Th. 0.108m. Letter-height
0.008m.-0.010m. Chequer 0.0122m.x 0.0125m.

Letter-shapes. A3 and 4, B3, E4 (centre bar sometimes longer) and 5, H1, Θ 3 and 4, K2, M2, N7, O2, Π1, P8 and 9, Σ 8 and 10, Y3, 6 and 7, Φ 5, X3, Q 5 and 7. Ionic script, rather uneven. I noted (above) that #30 seems to be by the same hand and that the hand of #48 is very close. Each of these documents contains the text of a fifth-century decree, but the present inscription contains as well a securely-dated fourth-century decree inscribed by the same hand; this hand is very close to that of certain other securely-dated fourth-century documents (I.G., II², 20 and 1392; S.E.G., XII, 80); I am therefore convinced that #30 is an early fourth-century copy of an earlier decree; #48 might also fall into this category, but could perhaps be work done by the mason of #56 at the beginning of his career, if a date in the late 420's or early 410's is accepted for it. As far as the hand of #30 and #56 is concerned, minor differences in the letter-shapes may be the result of careless inscription rather than stylistic changes.

411/0 B.C. (renewed in 399/8 B.C.).

Stoich.30

- [...⁷...]σὴν τ[...¹⁹...]
 [...⁶...]ῆριν τε [...¹⁸...]
 [...⁶...]άτης ἱκα[ριεὺς ἐγραμμάτευεν],
 [βολῆς ἐπεστάτε, [...¹⁷...]
 5 [.²] καὶ μετ' αὐτῷ π[...¹⁶...]
 [. Ξ]υπεταίων, Δίων[...¹⁶...]
 [.²] Κεφαλῆθεν, Καλ[...¹⁶...]
 [., ἰ]ππομένης εἶπεν· [Πυθοφάνει τῷ .³.]
 στίωι, ἐπειδὴ πρόξ[ενός ἐστι Ἀθηναίω]-
 10 ν καὶ εὐεργέτης κα[ὶ εὖ ποεῖ ὅ τι δύνατ]-
 αι τὴν πόλιν τὴν Ἀθ[ηναίων⁹....]-
 στίων τὸ ψήφισμα τ[ὸ πρόψηφισμένον α]-
 ὑτῷ ἀναγράψαι ἐν σ[τήλει λιθίνῃ τὸ]-
 ν γραμματέα τῆς βολ[ῆς τὸν νῦν γραμμα]-
 15 τεύοντα καὶ καταθεῖν[αι ἐμ πόλει· τὰ δὲ]
 χρήματα, ἃ ἐστὶν Πυθοφά[νει Ἀθήνησιν]
 ἢ ἄλλοθί πο ὧν Ἀθηναῖοι κ[ρατοῦσιν, καὶ]
 περὶ τῆς νεῶς ἃ λέγει καὶ [περὶ τῶν χρη]-
 μάτων, μὴ ἀδικῆν μηδένα κ[αὶ ἀσυλίαν ἔ]-
 20 ναι αὐτῷ καὶ τοῖς χρήμα[σι αὐτῷ καὶ ἀ]-
 νιόντι καὶ ἀπιόντι· ταῦτ[α μὲν ἔστω ἐψ]-
 ηφισμένα ὅσης Ἀθηναῖοι [κρατοῦσι πᾶσ]-
 ι τοῖς Πυθοφάνος κατὰ τα[ύτά· ὅπως δ' ἂν]

- 25 ταῦτα γίγνηται, τοὺς στ[ρατηγὸς τὸς α]-
 ἰεὶ στρατηγῶντας ἐπιμ[έλεσθαι καὶ τ]-
 [ῆ]ν βο(λ)ῆν τὴν αἰεὶ βολεῦ[οσαν· προσανα]-
 [γ]ράψαι δὲ καὶ τόδε τὸ ψή[φισμα ἐς τὴν α]-
 [ύ]τὴν στήλην τὸν γραμμα[τέα τῆς βολῆς].
 ΥΥ ἐπὶ Ἀριστοκράτος ἄ[ρχοντος.ΥΥΥΥΥ]
 30 [ἔδ]οξ[εν] τῇ βολῇ, κεκρο[πὶς ἐπρυτάνε]-
 [υε, ...?... ἔγρα]μμάτ[υεν, Ἀριστοκρά]-
 [της ἦρχε, ...?...]ς ἐπε[στάτε, ...?...]
-

COMMENTARY. There are three decrees upon this stele: decree II is complete and includes provision for the inscription of an earlier decree honouring the proxenos Pythophanes; possibly, this earlier decree, represented on this stele by line 1 and perhaps line 2, was the one conferring the proxeny upon him. Decree III, of which only the title and the opening of the preamble survive, is dated by the archon-formula in the title to 399/8 B.C. The bulk of the bibliography is concerned with the preamble and date of decree II.

Lines 1-2. Wilhelm (1898) held that lines 1-2 are the concluding lines of the first decree; Lewis (ap.de Ste.-Croix, op.cit., p. 18) suggested that the preamble of

decree II begins in line 1. Four letters only survive in this line: the lower stroke of a sigma, followed by clear eta and nu; the last extant stoichos contains the bottom of a central vertical. No satisfactory restoration comes to mind.

Wilhelm's (1924) restoration [τῇ γνώμῃ] τε [ισάμενος εἶπεν vac.] led Weston (op.cit., pp. 356-357) to identify this document with #67, which also quotes a decree of Teisamenos, and accordingly to restore the name of the honorand in #67 as Pythophanes. Lewis (loc.cit.) restores [ἔδοξεν τῇ βουλῇ· ἦν τε [τάρτη τῆς πρυτανείας]. This brings the prescript into line with that of the decree of Andron (quoted by [Plutarch] , Vit.X Orat., 833d: ἔδοξεν τῇ βουλῇ, μιᾷ καὶ εἰκοστῇ τῆς πρυτανείας· Δημόνικος Ἀλωπεκῆθεν ἐγραμμάτευε, Φιλόστρατος Παλληνεὺς ἐπεστάτει, Ἄνδρων εἶπε·), but there is no exact parallel. This seems to me to be the better of the two restorations so far offered.

Line 3. While the letter in stoichos 6 has perished, enough of the bottom right corner of the stoichos survives undescribed to rule out most letters: only gamma, pi or rho are possible here, so that a name ending -κράτης becomes statistically likely. If Lewis' restoration is correct, this name will be ten letters long: the name Antikrates is found in the deme of Ikaria in the fourth century (P.A., I, 1084);

another possibility is Polykrates: a man of this name was a comrade of Xenophon in the march of the Ten Thousand (P.A., II, 12006; see Xenophon, Anabasis, IV, 5.24; V, 1.6; VII, 2.7); perhaps this man was a proponent of oligarchy whose political sympathies caused him to leave Athens after the restoration of democracy; if so, he becomes a plausible candidate for office in 411/0 B.C., when the earlier oligarchic constitution, under which the present decree was passed, was in force. The restoration of lines 3 and 4 is that proposed by Wilhelm (loc.cit.); it is not elsewhere paralleled. The end of line 4 will contain the name of the first of the proedroi.

Line 5. $\pi[\rho\acute{o}\epsilon\delta\rho\epsilon\upsilon\omicron\nu]$, or $\pi[\rho\acute{o}\delta\rho\epsilon\upsilon\omicron\nu]$, or $\pi[\rho\acute{o}\epsilon\delta\rho\omicron\iota\ \eta\sigma\alpha\nu]$ Wilhelm (loc.cit.); $\pi[\rho\upsilon\tau\acute{\alpha}\nu\epsilon\varsigma]$, or $\pi[\rho\upsilon\tau\acute{\alpha}\nu\epsilon\varsigma\ \eta\sigma\alpha\nu]$ Kahrstedt (loc.cit.).

Line 6. The restoration is Wilhelm's (loc.cit.). He suggested several possibilities for the name beginning $\Delta\iota\omega\nu$ - : Dion, Diondas, Diondes, Dionides. If Dion, he could be the orator mentioned by Plato (Menex., 234b; see P.A., I, 4490), though Plato mentions him in the company of the democratic statesman Archinos. The last extant letter of this line is definitely a nu, not a pi (pace Meiggs and Lewis, op.cit., p. 248).

Line 7. The choice of names beginning Καλ- is embarrassingly

large; we should, however, look for names of men with known or suspected oligarchical sympathies: the likeliest candidates are Kallistratos, Kallias and Kallaiskros.

Kallistratos was a follower of the Thirty, killed in 403 B.C. in the Peiraeus by the democrats (P.A., I, 8150; see Xenophon, Hellenika, II, 4.27); his oligarchic sympathies might be expected to have shown themselves in the time of the earlier suspension of democracy. Several men named Kallias were active late in the fifth century (P.A., I, 7808-7815); perhaps the likeliest, in view of the probable oligarchic origin of this decree, are Kallias son of Alkmeon (P.A., I, 7822) and Kallias son of Telekles (P.A., I, 7840), both accused as mutilators of the Hermai in 415 B.C. (see Andokides, I, 47; 68); the accusation presumably, in part at least, derived from their known political sympathies. Kallias of Skambonidai, archon in 412/1 B.C. (P.A., I, 7887), is another possibility. Kallaiskros was tamias in 413/2 B.C. (P.A., I, 7760; see I.G., I², 249).

There are thus five names to be restored in the preamble of this decree in lines 4-7; these have been identified as five proedroi and the decree dated accordingly to the oligarchy of 411/0 B.C. Opinion is divided whether these proedroi were in office during the rule of the Four Hundred or in that of the Five Thousand, and the problem is further complicated

by the identification of Pythophanes' home: it has generally been accepted that he was from Karystos; if this be true, the revolt of that state during the rule of the Five Thousand (Thucydides, VIII, 95.7) will date this decree to the earlier rule of the Four Hundred (so argue Lenschau, op.cit., p. 27, and de Ste-Croix, loc.cit.); Lenschau suggests that Pythophanes was one of those Karystians who aided the Four Hundred (see Thucydides, VIII, 69.3). If so, however, it seems unlikely that a decree in his honour would have been revived by the democracy of the post-Euklidean period (see Meyer, Forschungen, II, p. 430: the decrees of the Four Hundred were reversed after their fall; see Thucydides, VIII, 68.2). Indeed, the mere fact that Pythophanes was honoured by the democracy of 399/8 B.C. makes less plausible Lenschau's theory that his services had domestic Athenian political overtones (despite the amnesty declared in 399 B.C.); moreover, it is by no means certain that Pythophanes was a Karystian: the restoration of this ethnic in lines 11-12 seems impossible without an extra letter in line 11, whilst it can be avoided altogether in lines 8-9 if one reads εἰπεν·[Πυθοφάνει] rather than εἰπε·Π[υθοφάνει] (as suggested by Meiggs and Lewis, op.cit., p. 249). Thus, whether Pythophanes was honoured by the Four Hundred or by the Five Thousand remains an open question;

the presence among the proedroi of men from different tribes confirms that the normal tribal prytany-system was not in operation, and thus sets the date of the decree between the autumn of 411 B.C. and the summer of 410 B.C., but does not permit greater precision: Thucydides (VIII, 67.3) confirms that the Four Hundred had five proedroi; so, too, had the Five Thousand, if Aristotle (Ἀθ.Πολ., 30.4) refers to the actual constitution of this body and not merely to an advance programme (see Ferguson, loc.cit.; Fuks, Ancestral Constitution, pp. 23, 108-109; Hignett, op.cit., pp. 376-377): this matter has not been resolved.

Line 8. Hippomenes is otherwise unknown, Koehler (loc.cit.) restored εἶπε· [Πυθοφάνει τῷ|σ]πῶι, suggesting that the ethnic should be [Καρϕ|σ]τίωι; this has won general acceptance, but Meiggs and Lewis showed (loc.cit.) that this ethnic could not be restored in lines 11-12 and suggested that the ethnic should be [Φα|σ]τίωι (see above). My reading of the stone indicates that their restoration εἶπε[ν] is at least possible: the left hasta of a letter survives after εἶπε; this could be either nu or pi. No possible ethnic of eight letters comes to mind other than [Φα|σ]τίωι.

Lines 9ff. Unless otherwise stated the restorations through-

out the remainder of this document are those of Koehler (loc.cit.).

Line 9. Part of the bottom stroke of initial sigma survives; it is too flat for chi, too low for kappa, and not flat enough for epsilon.

Line 10. The left foot of alpha survives at the right edge. This line was first restored by Kirchner (I.G., II², 12).

Line 11. Ἀθ[ηναίων τήν τε Καρυ]στίων Kirchner (loc.cit.); [καὶ τήν Καρυ]στίων Wilhelm (1924, p. 151); [καὶ τήν Φαι?]στίων Meiggs and Lewis (loc.cit.), on the grounds that Kirchner's restoration is "stylistically impossible".

Line 12. τ[ὸ καὶ πρότερον ὄν α]- Koehler; τ[ὸ πρόηφισμένον α]- Wilhelm, followed by Meiggs and Lewis; this latter reading seems the more logical.

Line 15. Previous editors left four vacant spaces after [πόλει] . Wilhelm (op.cit., p. 151) agreed, but put forward as a possible alternative [ἀκροπόλει] ; this is unlikely: there is no attested case of ἀκροπόλει for πόλει before 387/6 B.C. (see above, #49). I believe the restoration of Meiggs and Lewis, which I have adopted, to be the correct one.

Line 17. The phrase ποῦ ὦν Ἀθηναῖοι [κρατοῦσι] , and the similar phrase in line 22, are further evidence that this document belongs to the fifth century, when Athens still had her

Empire (see Weston, op.cit., p. 346).

Line 18. καὶ [τῶν ἄλλων χρη]- Koehler; καὶ [περὶ ἐμπολῆ]-
Kirchner and Wilhelm. I have adopted the restoration of
Meiggs and Lewis: lines 16 and 20 suggest that moneys rather
than merchandise are meant here. Koehler's version seems
to me stylistically less satisfactory.

Line 25. The top of initial iota survives, confirming the
reading_a[τὸς ἀ]ῖεῖ.

Line 26. The mason inscribed an alpha instead of a lambda
here. Koehler and Kirchner restored this line with seven
uninscribed stoichoi at the end; I have adopted by preferen-
ce the version of Wilhelm (op.cit., p. 150).

Lines 31-32. Meiggs and Lewis, in my view correctly, restore
the archon-formula here, allowing eight letters for the name
of the epistates; otherwise, the epistates-formula would have
to include a demotic or patronymic, which would be at varian-
ce with the unadorned name of the secretary in line 31.

#57. Proxeny? ca 420-405 B.C. Honours for two (?) unknown men.

Pl.XIV,5

BIBLIOGRAPHY. Meritt, Hesperia, XIV (1945), p. 128 #14;
S.E.G., X (1949), 120.

PHOTOGRAPH. Meritt, loc.cit.

Agora Inventory #I.1611, fragment of micaceous blue-white marble, broken on all sides. It was found on March 16, 1934, in excavation of the Athenian Agora, and was first published by Meritt (loc.cit.). Foliation is vertical and almost parallel to the face.

H.max. 0.177m. W.max. 0.141m. Th.max. 0.086m. Letter-height 0.010m.-0.011m. Chequer 0.0138m.x 0.0153m.

Letter-shapes. A4, E5, Θ3, K2, M2, N7 and 8 (very wide), 02, P8, Σ9, Y7. Attic script; whether or not the daseia was used is uncertain. Epsilon type 5 is not found before 433/2 B.C., and is rare before 418 B.C. The shape of sigma is very distinctive: it is found in several inscriptions, but I know of no document combining this sigma with the very wide mu and nu found in this inscription. Perhaps the closest resemblance is borne by the hand of A.T.L., II, A 13, the

tribute-assessment of 410/09 B.C. #44 is also close, but mu and nu are narrower. On the basis of the letter-shapes a date after 420 B.C. thus seems likely. The marble is of a type that seems to have come into vogue ca 420 B.C..

ca 420-405 B.C.

Stoich.

[-----X]αρικ[λῆς?-----]
 [-----]ν ἐὰν μ[ὲ-----]
 [-----]το· ἐὰν δ[ὲ-----]
 [-----]κυσεσ[-----]
 5 [-----]εν]αι καθά[περ-----]
 [-----]ις· τὰ μ[ὲν-----]
 [-----]ἐμερῶ[ν-----]
 [-----]ιε[-----]
 [-----]τ[-----]

COMMENTARY. Not very much can be made of this document: Raubitschek (S.E.G., X, 120 note) suggested that line 1 might contain the name Charikles. In line 4 part of another name is preserved; it is probably non-Greek. Lines 3-6 seem to contain the formula providing for reparation if the honorand is murdered. Lines 6-7 seem, perhaps, to involve some sort of payment, possibly with a time-limit.

Line 2. The left foot of mu survives at the right edge.

Line 3. The first letter is apparently a tau: the horizontal is badly abraded and therefore doubtful. This could be part of the word [αὐ]τῶ or of the indefinite article τῶ.

I restore lines 3-6 tentatively as follows:

Stoich.28

[-----]το· ἐὰν δ[ὲ βιαῖοι θανάτοι]
 [ἀποθάνει .?]κυσεσ [ἔ ...?..... τὲν]
 5 [τιμορίαν ἔν]αι καθά[περ ἐὰν ἀποθάν]-
 [εἰ Ἀθηναῖον τ]ις· τὰ μ[ὲν κτλ.-----]

In this restoration two men will be involved; the line-length depends upon lines 5-6.

Line 4. The name here is probably an Asiatic one, but I have been unable to restore it.

Line 5. The left foot of alpha survives at the right edge.

Line 7. The upper left curve of omicron survives at the right edge.

Line 9. The right tip of the bar of tau survives at the left edge, below the iota of line 8.

#58. Proxeny. Late fifth century B.C.? Honours for an unknown man. No photograph available.

BIBLIOGRAPHY. Koumanoudis, Νέον Ἀθήναιον , II (1952), pp. 31-32; S.E.G., XVI (1959), 10.

PHOTOGRAPHS. None so far published.

Fragment of Pentelic marble found in the area of the Akropolis and now said to be in the Akropolis Museum. I was unable to find it in 1969. It was first published by Koumanoudis (loc.cit.). The left edge is preserved. The dimensions given by Koumanoudis are as follows:
H.max. 0.09m. W.max. 0.13m. Th.max. 0.04m. Letter-height 0.007m. (omicron); 0.011m. (iota). Koumanoudis does not give the chequer but says that the space between stoichoi is 0.005m.; this should give a chequer measuring approximately 0.014m.x 0.016m.

Letter-shapes: Koumanoudis says that the letter-shapes are characteristic of the late fifth century. The formulae, as far as I have been able to restore them, support this opinion. Koumanoudis' text is as follows:

Late fifth century B.C.

Stoich.20

[----- τὸν γρα]-
 μμα[τ]έα [τῆς βολῆς ...⁶...]
 καὶ ἀτε[.....¹⁴...]
 5 ίοις αὐτῷ[ι καὶ ἡόπος ἄν μ]-
 ἐ ἀδικῆτα[ι ἐπιμέλῃσθαι]
 αὐτῷ τὲν β[ολὲν τὲν ἀέ(ι) βολ]-
 εὔοσαν [-----]

COMMENTARY. The letters *ίοις* in line 4 suggest the ending of the word [*Ἀθελνα*]*ίοις* ; *ατε-* in line 3 should probably be part of the word *ἀτέ*[*λειαν*] or *ἀτε*[*λές*] . By analogy with I.G., I², 110.28-33, I have made the following tentative restoration:

Stoich.21

[----- τὸν γρα]-
 μμα[τ]έα· [οἴκεσιν δ' Ἀθελνεσι]
 καὶ ἀτέ[λειαν ὅμπερ Ἀθελνα]-
 5 ίοις αὐτῷ[ι ἔναι· ὅπος δ' ἄμ μ]-
 ἐ ἀδικῆτα[ι ἐπιμελεῖσθαι]
 αὐτῷ τὲν β[ολὲν τὲν ἀεὶ βολ]-
 εὔοσαν [-----]

It would be possible to restore line 2 as follows:

[*ἔγκτεσιν δ' οἰκίας*] , but there is no parallel for the

combination of formulae that would thus result. I.G., I²,

110 honours a certain Apollodoros, among others, but the actual decree for Apollodoros is not included in the text of that inscription, which is virtually complete. It is possible that the present document may be represent the decree passed in favour of Apollodoros, who was later said by Lysias (XIII,71) to have been made a citizen, as was his co-conspirator Thrasyboulos. The text of Lysias' speech is thought by many editors to be corrupt at this point, however. The formulae as I have restored them imply not citizenship but euergesia, at most involving a grant of proxeny. The ionicism [ἐπιμελεῖσθαι] in line 5 is awkward: I cannot see any way of restoring a line of twenty letters (thus permitting the Attic form [ἐπιμέλεσθαι]), unless we follow Koumanoudis and assume the omission of a letter by the mason in the missing portion of line 6; some form of the verb ἐπιμελέομαι seems to be demanded by the context at this point.

#59. Proxeny. ca 430-405 B.C. Honours for an unknown man.

Pl. XIV, 6

BIBLIOGRAPHY. Meritt, Hesperia, XIV (1945), pp. 132-133 #17; S.E.G., X (1949), 140; Lambrechts, Proxenie-decreten (1958), p. 151.

PHOTOGRAPH. Meritt (op.cit.), p. 133.

Agora Inventory #I. 5296, fragment of micaceous Pentellic marble, broken on all sides, but possibly preserving the original rough-picked back. It was found on March 8, 1938, in excavation of the Athenian Agora, and was first published by Meritt (loc.cit.). Foliation is vertical and diagonal to the face from right face to left rear. H.max. 0.156m. W.max. 0.124m. Th. 0.058m. Letter-height 0.009m.-0.010m. Chequer 0.0138m.x 0.0137m.

Letter-shapes. A4-5, E4, @ 2, K2, N7-9, O2, Π 1, P8-9, Σ 9, X3. Attic script; it is impossible to say whether the daseia was used or not. None of these letter-shapes allows any close attempt at dating; the neatness and regularity of the script might suggest a date not far

from the beginning of the Peloponnesian War. However, certain other documents are by the same or a very similar hand, of which the shapes of alpha, beta, nu, rho and sigma are particularly characteristic. These are #44 (probably to be dated after 420 B.C.); I.G., I², 109 (410/09 B.C.), in which the shape of sigma is slightly different; I.G., I², 123 (407/6 B.C.), in which the sigmas have slightly curving strokes; and the unpublished fragments EM 2505 (#53) and EM 5928 (#45). The hand thus suggests a date in the last decade of the Peloponnesian War; this view is reinforced by the probable appearance of a demotic in the preamble (see below).

ca 430-405 B.C.

Stoich.28

[ἔδοχεν τῷ βολῇ καὶ τῷ] ὁ[έμοι, .²]-
 [----- ἐπρυτάνευε, -----]αικ[...⁶...]
 [.....¹⁸..... Ἀ]νακα[ιεύς .]
 [.....¹⁸.....]ε· Ἀρχι[...⁵...]
 5 [...⁷... ἀναγράφσαι? πρ]όχσεν[ον κα]-
 [ἰ εὐεργέτην Ἀθηναίων ἐ]πειδὲ [περὶ]
 [τὴν πόλιν τὴν Ἀθηναίων] ἐστίν [ἀνὲρ]
 [ἀγαθὸς καὶ πρόθυμος κατ]ὰ τὸ [δυνατ]-

[ὄν¹⁹.....] βο[λε .³.]

COMMENTARY. Meritt restores lines 1-4 as follows:

[ἔδοχσεν τῷ βολῇ καὶ τῷ δέμοι, .².]
 [.†.⁶... ἐπρυτάνευε, Πάτ]αικ[ος? .†.⁴.]-
 [.². ἐγγραμμάτευε, .†.⁵. Ἀ]νακα[ίεϋς ἐ]-
 [πεστάτε,⁸..... εἶπε].

This restoration must be amended (see below); it is, in any case, by no means the only possible one, even when it is amended.

Line 1. There is a small, much-abraded part of this line preserved above the kappa of line 2 and in the next stoichos to the right. In the latter nothing can be seen, but above the kappa part of a right diagonal is preserved. I restore this as a possible delta.

Line 2. The vertical of kappa is well-preserved; much of the lower arm also survives, while there is a small trace of the middle of the upper arm as well. Nothing can be read elsewhere in this line, apart from alpha and iota. There are few restorations possible, except the name [Πάτ]αικ[ος] tentatively suggested by Meritt. Pataikos was the name of a tamias in 390 B.C. (P.A.,

II, 11680). Pataikion is another possibility; it is known in the fourth century (P.A., II, 11675); Phalaikos, found in the third century, is also possible (P.A., II, 13986). Apart from these, Kaikosthenides is known in the second century (P.A., II, 7743). Kaikos is not definitely attested to for Athens: it has been tentatively restored in a casualty-list of 409 B.C.? (S.E.G., X, 424, VI, 112: [Κά]ϊκος) , and is also found in Mytilene (I.G., XII, 2, 96, I, 4). If Meritt is correct in regarding the surviving letters in line 3 as part of the demotic Anakaieus, the restoration of Pataikos' name will not be possible in line 2, unless the usual order of preambles is reversed and he is regarded as the epistates, not the secretary: Anakaia was a deme of the tribe Hippothontis, for the restoration of which there is insufficient space in lines 1-2 if [Πάτ]αικ[ος] is restored in line 2. Meritt's formulae are possible only if a shorter name is restored in line 2, e.g.:

[ἔδοχσεν τῷ βολῇ καὶ τῷ] δ[έμοι, ἱπ]-
 [ποθοντὶς ἐπρυτάνευε, Κ]αῖκ[ος ἔγρα]-
 [μμάτευε,!!..... Ἀ]νακα[ιεὺς ἐ]-
 [πεστάτε, κτλ.].

In the only fifth-century examples known to me in which

the epistates-formula contains a demotic (I.G., I², 126 and #66, both dated in 405/4 B.C.), the secretary is also identified by demotic: it is just possible to restore lines 2-3 with a demotic: [Κ]αί[ος ...⁺₆... ἐγραμμάτευε, ...⁺₅... Ἀ]νακα[ιεὺς ἐπεστάτε]. Alternatively, keeping Meritt's [Πάτ]αικ[ος] , one could restore, as I have suggested above:

[ἔδοχσεν τῷ βολῇ καὶ τῷ] ὁ[έμοι, .⁺₂]-
 [...⁶... ἐπρυτάνευε, Πάτ]αικ[ος ἐπεσ]-
 [τάτε,¹⁴... Ἀ]νακα[ιεὺς ἐ]-
 [γραμμάτευε, κτλ.].

Again, a demotic could be included in the epistates-formula, and probably should be, since fourteen-letter names are extremely rare.

Lines 4-6. Meritt restores:

[πεστάτε,⁸... εἶπε]· Ἀρχι[...⁺₄ τ]-
 [ὄν ...⁺₅... ἀναγράφσαι πρ]όχ[σ]εν[ον κα]-
 [ὶ εὐεργέτην Ἀθηναίων ἐ]πειδ[ὲ κτλ.]

While this restoration is possible whatever version be adopted for the preceding lines, again, it is not the only possibility. The presence on the stone of parts of all three horizontals of the first epsilon does not change the issue: an archon-formula can be included

with some slight alteration of Meritt's formulae for lines 4-5, e.g.:

[πεστάτε, Ἀλεχσίας ἔρχ]ε, Ἀρχί[ας εἶπ]-
 [ε· .±.⁴ τὸν .±.⁴ ἔναι πρ]όχ[σ]εν[ον κα]-
 [ἰ εὐεργέτεν κτλ.].

I believe, however, that this is less likely than the version offered by Meritt, since I know of no document dated in 405/4 B.C. that is inscribed in Attic letters, but it cannot entirely be ruled out.

Lines 6-9. The restorations are those offered by Meritt; the order is somewhat unusual, but the formulae are unexceptional and no other suitable restoration comes to mind. After the omicron in line 8 there is apparently the lower part of a diagonal stroke; this may be part of a delta, but is probably too close to the omicron in the previous stoichos to be a letter.

Line 9. Traces of two letters survive in this line: under the tau of line 8 there is the upper loop of beta or rho; there is a faint mark below it, stemming from the joint of this loop with the vertical: this could be the beginning of the lower loop of beta, though its angle is rather sharp. To the right of this the stone breaks

away in a curve, preserving the outline of an omicron.

A possible restoration is as follows (cf. #26, etc.):

[ὄν εὖ ποῖν τὴν πόλιν· τὴν δὲ] βο[λὲν κα]-

[ἰ τὸς πρυτάνες καὶ τὸς στρατεγὸς ἐ]-

[πιμέλεσθαι αὐτῷ ὅπως ἂν μὲ ἀδικῇτ]-

[αι κτλ.].

#60. Proxeny? ca 410-405 B.C. Honours for three exiles from the Hellespont.

Pl.XVI,4

BIBLIOGRAPHY. Pittakys, E.A., 51(1859), p. 1835 #3518; I.G., I, 87; 105; 106 (1873); Kirchhoff, Sitzungsb.Ak. Berlin (1887), p. 1185 #1; I.G., I, Supplement, p.196 #116⁵ (1891); Wilhelm, Beiblatt (1898), p. 44; C.R.A.I. (1900), p. 525 note 5; G.G.A., (1903), p. 774 #26; Jahreshefte, XXI-XXII (1923), pp. 152-156; I.G., I², 106 (1924); Wilhelm, Att.Urk., IV (1939), p. 82; Walter, Serta Hoffileriana (1940), pp. 101-103; Meritt, Hesperia, XXI (1952), p. 343 note 4; Andrewes, J.H.S., LXXIII (1953), p. 8; S.E.G., XII (1955), 39; McDonald, A.J.A., LIX (1955), pp. 151-152; Mac Dowell, Mysteries (1962), p. 86; Pećírka, Enktesis (1966), pp. 13-17; S.E.G., XXIV (1969), 16.

PHOTOGRAPH. Walter, op.cit., p. 101 (fragment a).

Seven fragments of slightly micaceous Pentelic marble, of which fragments b,c,d,e,f and g are now set in plaster and cannot be examined in detail. The attribution of fragment a is doubtful. Fragments d,e,f and g

join one another.

Fragment a, EM 2622, is of unknown provenance. It was published by Wilhelm (1903) and first associated with the other fragments by him in 1923. The left edge and top are preserved, with part of a crowning moulding below a vertical inscribed fascia. The moulding projects ca 0.014m. above the left lateral and face of the stele, and is ca 0.032m. high. The fascia is ca 0.045m. high. The top is flat with no trace of any crowning relief. I have not seen this fragment; I give its dimensions as listed by previous editors or calculated from the photograph published by Walter (loc.cit.).

H.max. 0.135m. W.max. 0.183m. Th.max. 0.065m. Letter-height, line 1 0.021m. Horizontal chequer, line 3 ca 0.0130m.

Fragment b, EM 6624, was found on the north slope of the Akropolis, near the Stoa of Eumenes, on July 22, 1858; it was first published by Pittakys (loc.cit.). The right edge is preserved; otherwise, it is broken on all sides.

H.max. (obverse) 0.089m. W.max. (obverse) 0.103m. Th.
max. (right lateral) 0.005m. Letter-height 0.010m.-0.
011m. Chequer 0.0130m.x 0.0133m.

Fragment c, EM 6624 [a], was found north-east of the
Akropolis and first published by Kirchhoff from a
transcript of U. Koehler as I.G., I, 106 in 1873. It
is broken on all sides.

H.max. (obverse) 0.080m. W.max. (obverse) 0.120m. Letter-
height 0.010m.-0.011m. Chequer 0.0133m.x 0.0133m.

Fragments d, e, f and g all bear the same inventory-
number, EM 6604. The association of these fragments with
each other, and with fragments b and c, was first made
by Wilhelm in 1898; they were first published together
by him with fragment a in 1923.

Fragments d and e are of unknown provenance; they were
published as one stone by Kirchhoff from a transcript
of U. Koehler as I.G., I, 87 in 1873. Presumably they were
cemented together as soon as they were discovered. Both
are broken on all sides. Fragment d joins the top of e.
Fragment d. H.max.(obverse) 0.072m. W.max. (obverse)

0.018m. Letter-height 0.010m.-0.011m. Chequer 0.0133m.
x 0.0133m.

Fragment e. H.max. (obverse) 0.018m. W.max. (obverse)
0.018m. Letter-height 0.010m.-0.011m. Chequer 0.0133m.
x 0.0133m.

Combined height (obverse) 0.174m. Width (obverse) 0.192m.

Fragment f is of unknown provenance and was first published by Wilhelm in 1923; he had announced its attribution to this stele in 1898. It is broken on all sides. It joins the right side of fragments d, e and the left side of fragment g.

H.max. (obverse) 0.163m. W.max. (obverse) 0.242m. Letter-height 0.010m.-0.011m. Chequer 0.0133m.x 0.0133m.

Fragment g was found by the north wall of the Akropolis, near the Erechtheion, and was first published by Kirchhoff from a transcript of H.G.Lolling in 1887. The right edge is preserved; otherwise, it is broken on all sides. H.max. 0.401m. W.max. 0.235m. Th.max. 0.140m. Letter-height 0.010m.-0.011m.; line 29 0.022m. Chequer 0.0133m. x0.0133m.

Combined dimensions, fragments d, e, f and g: H.max.

0.401m. W.max. 0.620m. Th.max. 0.140m.

There is a vertical uninscribed space of 0.142m. between lines 28 and 29 on fragment f, with a further uninscribed space of 0.120m. below line 29.

Letter-shapes. A4, B3, E4 and 5, Z1, H1, Θ3 and 4, K2, Λ4, M2, N7 and 9, O1 and 2, Π1 and 2, P6 and 8, Σ7, 8 and 10, Y5, 7 and 8, Φ4 and 5, X3. Attic script, but with Ionic xi twice (lines 22 and 23) and Ionic ου for ο once (line 23). Hiller reports an Ionic lambda in line 14; this is incorrect. Use of the daseia is irregular. The letter-shapes do not serve as a guide to dating, except to place this document between 430 and 405 B.C. However, this inscription is by the same hand as #67 (late fifth century, but perhaps inscribed ca 398 B.C.) and I.G., I², 398 (408/7 B.C.) Probably also by this hand are I.G., II², 54 and 58 (both dated early in the fourth century). The letter-shapes thus suggest a date in the last years of the Peloponnesian War; the context most suited to the text is 409/8 B.C. (see below).

ca 410-405 B.C.

Stoichedon

a

Ναῦπο[ν ----- ἐγγραμμάτευσ].

ca 22-23

Θ[ε ο ι].

Stoich. 50

[ἐ]δοχ[σεν τῇ βολῇ καὶ τοῖ δέμοι, ---]---
ἐπρυτάνευσ, Ναύπον ἐγ]-

- b [ραμμάτευε, ...⁵... ἐπεστάτε, ...⁵... εἶπε· ἐπειδὲ
 ἄνδρες ἀγ]αθο[...]-
- 5 [ἴσιν Πολυκλῆς καὶ Περαιεὺς καὶ Ἀριστόβολος καὶ
 ἔργ]οι καὶ λ[ό]-
- [γοι περὶ τὸν δῆμον τὸν Ἀθηναῖον καὶ νῦν καὶ ἐν
 τῷ πρό]σθεν χρό-
- [νοι καὶ ἀποφαίνοσι αὐτὸς οἱ στρατηγοὶ ὄντας
 προθύμ]ος ποιῆν
- [ὅ, τι δύνανται ἀγαθὸν Ἀθηναῖον τὴν πόλιν καὶ
 τὸν δῆμο]ν καὶ τῇ
- [στρατιᾷ χρесίμος ὄντας, ἔναι μὲν αὐτοῖς
 Ἀθένεσι ἀτ]έλειαν τ-
- 10 [ὃ μετοικίο,³⁵.....
]ς Ἀθένε-
- [σι -----⁴⁸-----]
- lacuna
- c [...²⁰.....]ις τ[..²⁷.....
]
- [.....¹⁵..... νομ]ιζόμενα ι[...²⁴.....
]

[.....17.....] ἐπιμέλεσθ[αι δὲ αὐτῶν τὲν
βολὲν τὲν αἰ β]-

15 [ουλεύσαν καὶ τὸς στρ]ατεγὸς οἱ [ἄν αἰ
στρατεγῶσιν⁸.....]

[.....¹⁹.....] Ἀθηναιο[.....²⁴.....
.....]

[.....²¹.....]οναν[.....²⁵.....
.....]

d,elacunafg

[.....⁴¹.....]

τι[.....⁴.....] ηα[.]

[..⁵..]ς αἰ ε[..⁴..]ι[.]ε[..⁴..]ς περ[ι] ἡ[όπος ἄν
hos ἄρ]ιστα ἔχει ἄνφο-

20 [τέρω]ις· ἐς δὲ Ἑλλέσπον[τον] ὃς τὸς στρατεγὸς
[ἀπ]οστελάντον Πολ-

d [υκλέ]α καὶ Περαιᾶ καὶ Ἀ[ριστ]όβολον ἡοι
ἐνθάδ[ε] στρατεγοὶ hos ἄ-

[ν δύν]ονται τάχιστα κα[ὶ ἀσφ]αλέστατα ἐπὶ
τριέρως συνπράξοντ-

[ας καὶ] ξυνβουλεύσοντ[ας] ἡό, τι ἄν δύνονται
ἀγαθὸν Ἀθηναίοις· τ-

e [ὃ δὲ φσ]έφισμα τόδε ἀναγ[ρ]άψαι τὸν γραμματέα
τῆς βολῆς ἐν στέ-

25 [λει λι]θίνει καὶ καταθεῖναι ἐν πόλει· τὰ δὲ
περὶ Τιμάνθος γεγρα-

[μμένα] ἐν πόλει ἐκκολαφσάντων ἡοι ταμίαι ἡοι

τῆς θεῶ ἐκ τῆς στ-

[έλες· κα]λέσαι δὲ Πολυκλέα καὶ Περαιᾶ καὶ τὸς

μετ' αὐτῶν καὶ ἐπὶ

[χσένια εἰ]ς τὸ πρυτανεῖον ἐς αὔριον.

vacat

vacat

[τῶν ἐξ? ----- ἐξελ]ελυθότον.

Non-stoich.

vacat

COMMENTARY. Hiller (I.G., I², 106), apparently by an oversight, omitted fragment a (though he speaks of six fragments, counting fragments d, e as one stone). Opinion is divided about Wilhelm's attribution of fragment a to the same stele as fragments b-f. I was not able to find this fragment in the Epigraphical Museum, so that my comments and measurements are made as a result of examination of the photograph published by Walter (op.cit., p. 101). The positions of fragments b and c are not known for certain; however, the extant letters of fragment b suggest that it should be set near the beginning of the decree: it begins with praises and goes on to speak of services performed; these formulae frequently appear at the opening of an honorary decree. The right margin and chequer add weight to

this argument: the margin on fragment b is 0.016m. wide, while on fragment g it ranges from 0.021m. to 0.022m., from top to bottom. The horizontal chequer of fragment b is slightly less than that on fragments c or d,e,f and g. Fragments d,e,f and g contain the end of the decree, while the only line of fragment c that can be restored with any confidence contains a formula generally found fairly near the end of honorary decrees.

I calculate the width of the stele at the top as ca 0.680m., with margins of ca 0.015m. This is slightly less than that calculated by Pečírka (op.cit., p. 14), and considerably less than that calculated by Walter (op.cit., p. 101). The moulding and fascia extended ca 0.014m. on each side above the stele, so that its greatest width was ca 0.706m.

Line 1. The inscription on the fascia seems to name the secretary of the Boule. The name Naupon is rare, but we possess a funerary monument of the mid-fourth century that names Theodoros son of Naupon of the deme Lamptrai (I.G., II², 6672). Wilhelm identifies this man as the son of the secretary of #60; in I.G., I², 232/3 and 257 Krates son of Naupon of the deme Lamptrai is named as secretary to the tamiai of the Pronaos and the Hekatompedon in 434/3 B.C. Wilhelm (1903) identifies him as father of the secretary of #60. By my calculations there was space on the fascia of the

stele for ca 22-23 letters; thus, there is not enough space to restore Naupon's name with a demotic; I suggest that the restoration Ναύπο[ν Κράτο έγγραμμάτευσ] is satisfactory, though a demotic would be more usual. The restoration Ναύπο[ν έγγραμμάτευσ] proposed by Wilhelm in 1923 (p. 155) is much too short. The first letter of this heading is cut directly above the first letter of line 3; unless it is assumed that the last letter was similarly inset from the edge we have no means of estimating the number of letters in this line. The third letter was originally cut as omicron; upsilon has been cut over this, perhaps by another hand.

Line 2. This line almost certainly contained the invocation Θ[εοί]. These four letters would have been set respectively over stoichoi 8, 20, 31 and 43 of line 3.

Line 3. From the photograph it appears that the tops of the first seven letters survive; however, Wilhelm, Walter and Pečírka accept only the tops of delta, omicron and chi as certain letter-cuts. If I am correct in assuming that the first line of fragment b was also the first line of the decree after the conclusion of the preamble, there will be insufficient space to restore an archon-formula in the preamble.

Lines 4-11. The restorations are those of Wilhelm (1923, p.

155), except that of line 7. Line-length is established by the restoration of fragments d, e, f and g.

Line 4. The bottoms of alpha, theta and omicron survive on the break.

Line 5. The names are restored from lines 21 and 27.

Line 7. Wilhelm's line here is fifty-two letters long:

I have adjusted it by reading [ἀποφαίνουσι] and [οἱ] instead of Wilhelm's [ἀποφαίνουσιν] and [ἡοι].

Line 10. Wilhelm restored: [ἀτ]έλειαν τ[ὸ μετοικίον, ἐὸς ἂν κατίουσιν, καὶ ἔγκτεσιν γῆς καὶ οἰκία]ς Ἀθένε[σι].

Pečírka agrees that this is possible (op.cit., pp. 15-16),

but notes that no parallel exists for such a temporary grant of both house and land; the parallels adduced by Wilhelm (I.G., II², 218; 236; 545, all of the fourth century) refer only to grants of houses, as is natural in the case of temporary exiles. The sigma in line 10 should be dotted; only the tip of the upper diagonal survives today, but Pittakys (loc.cit.) recorded an almost complete sigma, and neither Wilhelm nor Hiller dotted it.

The lacuna between lines 11 and 12 is of unknown extent; however, the vertical distance between fragments b and f can be estimated from the increase in the right margin: since the margin increases by ca 0.001m. in four lines, ca sixteen lines should be set between the bottom of frag-

ment b and the top of fragment f.

Lines 12-17. Not very much can be made of these lines; Wilhelm (op.cit., p. 156) restored lines 14-15 according to a common formula; because of the spelling $\xi\upsilon\nu-$ $\beta\omicron\upsilon\lambda\epsilon\acute{\upsilon}\sigma\omicron\nu\tau[\alpha\varsigma]$ in line 23 I suggest that $[\acute{\alpha}\epsilon\acute{\iota}$ $\beta\omicron\upsilon\lambda\epsilon\acute{\upsilon}\sigma\alpha$ may be preferable to $[\acute{\alpha}\acute{\iota}\epsilon\acute{\iota} \beta\omicron\lambda\epsilon\acute{\upsilon}\sigma\alpha]$.

Line 12. In the last stoichos the bottom of a central vertical survives.

Line 13. The bottom of iota survives at the left edge. After alpha there is the bottom of a central vertical on the break.

Line 14. The right tip of the upper bar of epsilon survives at the left edge of the stone.

Line 15. At the right edge the bottom of a central vertical survives.

Line 16. In the penultimate stoichos only the top of iota survives.

Line 17. At the end of the line, after alpha, the left side of a left hasta survives.

Line 18. At the top of fragment g there are traces of four letters: above alpha and epsilon of line 19 are two central verticals; in the third stoichos from the end is the bottom of a right hasta followed in the next stoichos to the right by the feet of a triangular letter, either alpha or gamma.

Since there is no trace of any diagonal stroke in the stoichos before this, I suggest that these letters are

ηα.

Line 19. There are traces of letters at the tops of fragments d and f; several complete letters are extant on fragment g. On fragment d the traces are very slight: the bottom parts of sigma, alpha, epsilon and iota above -σεσ δε in line 20. Five stoichoi to the right is the bottom of a central vertical; one stoichos to the right of this is part of a horizontal bar, perhaps that of an epsilon, though delta is not impossible. On fragment f there is an almost complete sigma, followed by a left hasta; then comes the bottom of an epsilon, followed by another left hasta; then comes the bottom of an epsilon, followed by another left hasta. Of the next letter nothing remains, but in the stoichos to the right of this is a left hasta; the stone has perished at the right side of this stoichos.

Wilhelm restored -ς [π]εῖς ὁπός ἄν ἡος ἄρ]ιστα here; only the bottom of iota survives at the left edge of fragment g. The remaining letters in this line are clear.

Line 20. Of the first iota only the bottom survives.

Wilhelm read ἐς ηε [-]λλέσπο[ντον] in this line; this is incorrect: the letter he reads as a daseia is a rather abraded

delta, overlaid by several vertical scratches. The initial epsilon of ἑλλέσπον[τον] is faint but readable; the absence of the daseia is not remarkable in this document. Before the break the left side of nu survives. At the right edge of fragment f the tip of the lowest stroke of sigma survives, while the right curve of a circular letter is visible at the left edge of fragment g.

Line 21. The three honorands are not otherwise known; the name Blykles is restored from line 27; it is found in Delos and in Kyrene (for Delos see I.G., II², 1638a; for Kyrene see Bechtel, Personennamen, p. 378); Peraieus is found in the early sixth century in Thera (Bechtel, op.cit., p. 542), while Aristoboules is known in Delos in the fourth century, in Knidos in the second, and is restored in two fourth-century Attic inscriptions honouring foreigners (I.G., II², 10, for a Thespian; I.G., II², 240, perhaps for a Macedonian). It seems likely, however, from the reference to the Hellespont, that these three men are natives of that area; they are to be given a trireme in order to help and advise the generals there, where, presumably, their local knowledge will be of use. Wilhelm (op.cit., p. 154) dated the decree between 411 and 408 B.C., during which time the Athenians were attempting to restore their position in the Hellespont; Andrewes (loc.cit.) deduces from the reference to two sets of generals

(*hoi enothod[ε]* and those *es Ellēspōn[τον]*) that there was still a political separation between Athens and the Hellespontine fleet; thus, the date must be 409/8 B.C., when the regular general Thrasyllōs joined the fleet in the Hellespont. This seems to me a very plausible argument.

Line 22. At the left edge of fragment d the right half of omicron survives.

Line 23. At the left edge of fragment f the bottom of the right hasta of a daseia survives.

Line 24. At the right edge of fragment d the left foot of gamma survives.

Line 25. Timanthes is not otherwise known; Hiller (I.G., I², 106) identified him with the man of this name who was accused in 415 B.C. of mutilating the Hermai (see Andokides, I, 35; P.A., II, 13607); MacDowell (loc.cit.) suggests that if the Timanthes of #60 is the same who was accused in 415 B.C., the reference to him in this decree appears to mean that he was pardoned at this time, for what reasons it is not clear; alternatively, the Hermokopid may be a different Timanthes. What his connexion with the honorands of #60 may be is obscure; since the rest of the document, as far as it can be restored, seems to be concerned with honours and arrangements for exiles, perhaps it is better to regard Timanthes as a foreigner possibly also from the Hellespontine

area, rather than as an Athenian. It may be that the reference to him that is to be erased from a stele by the tamiai is a record of a surety lodged by him or a debt owed to the state by him on behalf of the three honorands. Line 26. Only the right tip of the upper bar of epsilon survives at the left edge of fragment d.

Line 28. Wilhelm restored ἐπὶ [χσένια εἰς] τὸ πρυτανεῖον; this is the normal formula for invitations extended to foreigners; ἐπὶ [δεῖπνον ἐ]ς τὸ κτλ. is also possible, but this seems to be a formula that applies more to citizens than to foreigners; the spelling [εἰ]ς for [ἐ]ς need not surprise us in an inscription in which other Ionicisms are found so often. The tip of the bottom stroke of sigma survives. Hiller (I.G., I², 106) restores [εἰς]ς

Line 29. This presumably was a phrase referring to the home of the honorands: [τῶν ἐκ (τῶν)

ἐχσελ]ελυθότων as Wilhelm restores it; I calculate the number of letters to be restored as ca 15-16; thus, the name of the honorands' home is probably at most seven letters long, and then only if Ionic xis are used, e.g.:

[τῶν ἐξ ~~ca 6-7~~ ἐξελ]ελυθότων. Sestos, Kyzikos or Abydos are among the possibilities; the first was an Athenian base in 411/0 B.C.; the second had revolted in 411 B.C.; the third

was base for the Spartans and their naval allies at this time.

There is no mention in the extant portions of this decree of either proxenia or euergesia; whether these were granted by this decree or not cannot be guessed; however, the extant sections suggest that these honorands either were already Athenian proxenoi or hoped by their assistance to the Athenians to earn this honour. At any event, the purpose of this document seems not merely to confer honours upon these foreigners, but to set in motion events that will result in an Athenian recovery in the Hellespont and so enable Athens' friends to return to their homes.

#61. Arrangements for Selymbria. ca 408/7 B.C. Proxeny for Apollodoros and another citizen of Selymbria. Pl.XV,1,3

BIBLIOGRAPHY. I.G., I, 113 (1873); Koumanoudis, Ἀθήναιον, VI (1877), pp. 513-516 #1; I.G., I, Supplement, p. 18 #61a (1877); Sauppe, Proxenis (1877), p. 11; Dittenberger, Hermes, XVI (1881), p. 188 #5; S.I.G., I² (1898), 53; Scala, Staatsvertraege (1898), p. 93 #87, p. 226; Wilhelm, Beiblatt, (1898), p. 44; Kavvadias, E.A. (1898), p. 135; Hicks and Hill, Manual ² (1901), 77; Meyer, G.d.A., III (1901), p. 624; Wilhelm, Ath.Mitt., XXVIII (1903), p. 445; G.G.A. (1903), pp. 778-779; Busolt, Gr.Gesch., III² (1904), p. 1557; Roberts and Gardner, Epigraphy, II (1905), pp. 69-71 #26; Hitzig, Festgabe Regelsberger (1907), #5; Michel, Recueil, Supplément (1912), pp. 10-11 #1437; S.I.G., I³ (1915), 112; Wilhelm, Jahreshefte, XXII-XXIII (1923), p. 154; I.G., I², 116 (1924); Ferguson, Treasurers (1932), p. 45 note 1; Tod, G.H.I., I¹ (1933), pp. 217-219 #88; Austin, Stoichedon (1938), pp. 51-53; Wilhelm, Att.Urk., IV (1939), p. 89 #xxxvii; Meritt, Hesperia, X (1941), pp. 327-328; Hopper, J.H.S., LXIII (1943), pp. 47-48; Gomme, Commentary, I (1945), pp. 239-240; Tod, G.H.I., I² (1946), pp. 217-219 #88; S.E.G., X (1949), 132; Hatzfeld, Alcibiade (1951), pp. 283-284; Andrewes, J.H.S., LXIII (1953), p. 8; S.E.G., XII (1955), 40; Lambrechts,

Proxenidecreten (1958), pp. 28-30, 33, 35, 62-63, 66, 69, 98, 151; Bengtson, Staatsvertraege, II (1962), pp. 148- 150 #207; S.E.G., XXI (1965), 50; Meiggs and Lewis, G.H.I. (1969), pp. 267-269 #87.

PHOTOGRAPHS. None so far published.

EM 6603 and 6603 [a], four joining fragments of blue-white micaceous marble, of which fragments b, c and d were all found in the area of the Asklepion on the south slope of the Akropolis and first published by Koumanoudis (loc.cit.). Fragment a was found on the Akropolis and first published by Kirchhoff from a transcript of U. Koehler in 1873 (I.G., I, 113). Its association with fragments b, c and d was recognized by Wilhelm (I.G., I², 116) in 1924, and it was subsequently joined to the top of fragment b by the staff of the Epigraphical Museum. The foliation is vertical and diagonal to the face, from top left face to right rear bottom.

Fragment a, EM 6603 [a], preserves the right edge, but is otherwise broken on all sides.

H.max. 0.108m. W.max. 0.116m. Th.max. 0.103m.

Fragment b preserves the right edge and rough-picked back.

H.max. 0.686m. W.max. 0.386m. Th. (top) 0.208m.; (bottom) 0.219m.

Fragment c preserves the left edge and rough-picked back; it joins the left side of fragment d.

H.max. 0.252m. W.max. 0.129m. Th. 0.220m.

Fragment d preserves the bottom, right edge and rough-picked back. It joins the bottom of fragment b. Also preserved on this fragment is a rectangular tongue that would have fitted into a slot in the base of the stele. This tongue is 0.230m. wide and 0.080m. high.

H.max. 0.413m. W.max. 0.374m. Th. 0.220m.

Combined dimensions: H.max. 0.987m. W. 0.510m. Th. (top) 0.208m.; (bottom) 0.220m. Letter-height 0.009m.- 0.011m.

Chequer 0.0132m.-0.0141m x 0.0176m.-0.0184m. (the stele tapered from bottom to top while the right margin altered, but not quite in the same ratio, being 0.015m. wide at the top and 0.018m. wide at the bottom; the vertical chequer also varies, being greatest at the bottom. The horizontal chequer begins to break down at line 30).

Letter-shapes. A4, B3, E4, H1, Θ 4, K2, Λ 3, 4, 5 and 6, M1 and 2, N5, 7 and 10, O1 and 2, Π1, P8, Σ8 and 9, Y7, Φ2, 4

and 9, X3, 05. Attic script with some Ionic intrusions (lambda, eta and omega). The daseia is used inconsistently. The document is dated by its context to ca 408/7 B.C. (see below). I have been unable to find any other published document by the same hand, but the small unpublished fragment EM 2496 seems to be by this hand, is of similar marble and exhibits the same vacillation between Attic and Ionic letter-shapes: I do not know whether this fragment is part of the same stele as #61 (see appendix to #61, below).

ca 408/7 B.C.

Stoich. 36

a [.....³¹.....] προσα-
 [.....³⁰.....] γραφεν
 [.....³⁰.....] εισαγο-
 [.....³¹.....] ν καὶ ε-
 5 [.....³³.....] ν σε-
b [.....²².....] γελλ[³...] Ἀθεν[³]
 [.....²².....] κ] ατάλογον κατα[.]
 [.....²⁰.....] νο] μέρος δὲ hos ἔχο[σ]-
 [ιν Ἀθηναῖοι ἀποδοῖναι, τὸ δὲ] λοιπὸν μὲ λαμβάν-
 10 [εν, καταστέσασθαι δὲ Σελυμ] βριανὸς τὲμ πολι-
 [τείαν αὐτονόμος ...⁷...] ἡότοι ἂν ἐπίστοντ-
 [αι¹⁷.....] ὄφ] ελε τὸ κοινὸν τὸ Ση-

[λυμβριανῶν ἔῃδιοτῶν τι]ς Σελυνβριανῶν τοι
 [.....¹⁸.....] εἴ το χρέματα ἐδεδέμε-
 15 [υτο ἔῃ τις τῷ κοινῷ]· ὄφελεν ἔῃ τις ἐτίμοτ-
 [ο¹².....τοῖ]ς φεύγοσι Σελυμβριανῶν
 [.....¹⁵.....]ος πολεμῖος δὲ καὶ φιλῖος
 [.....¹⁴.....] ἃ δὲ ἀπόλετο ἐν τῷ πολέμοι
 [χρέματα Ἀθηναί]ον ἔ τῶν συμμάχον ἔῃ τι ὄφελ-
 20 [όμενον ἔ παρακ]ατεθέκεν ἔχοντός το ἔπραχσα-
 [ν οἱ ἄρχοντε]ς, μὴ ἔναι πρᾶχσιν πληγ γῆς καὶ οἰ-
 [κίας· ὅσα δὲ ἄ]λλα χσυμβόλαια προτῶ ἐν τοῖς ἰ-
 [διόταις π]ρὸς τὸς ἰδιότας ἔ ἰδιώτει πρὸς τὸ κ-
 [οινὸν ἔ κο]ινῶι πρὸς ἰδιότεν· ἔ ἔάν τι ἄλλο γίγ-
 25 [νεται, δια]λύεμ πρὸς ἀλλέλος· ὅ τι δ' ἂν ἀμφισβη-
 [τῶσι, δίκῃ]ς ἔναι ἀπὸ χσυμβολῶν. τὰς δὲ χσυνθέκ-
 [ας ἀναγράφ]σαντας ἐς στέλεν θῆναι ἐς τὸ κιερό-
 [ν τὸ ...?...]ς. ὤμοσαν Ἀθηναῖον οἱ στρατηγοὶ
 [καὶ οἱ τριέραρχ]οι καὶ ἡοι κοπλῖται καὶ εἴ τι-
 c,d 30 ς[ἄλλος Ἀθ]ην[αῖον] παρῆν καὶ Σελυμβ[ι]ριανοὶ π-
 [ά]ντες.[^ΥἈλ]κι[βιάδ]ης εἶπε· καθὰ χσυνέθεντο Σε- semi-stoich.
 [λυ]μβρι[α]νοὶ πρ[ὸς Ἀ]θηναῖος, κατὰ ταῦτα ποιῆν 36-38
 καὶ καταθέναι ἐμ[πόλ]ει ἀναγράφσαντας τὸ στ-
 ρατε(γ)ὸς τὰς συνθέκας μετὰ τῷ γραμματέος τ-
 35 [ἔς]-βολῆς [[rasura ca 17-18]] ἐν στέλει λιθί-
 νει τέλεσι τοῖς αὐτῶν καὶ τὸ ψέφισμα τόδε.
 [Ἀπ]ολλόδορον δὲ τὸν Ἐμπέδο ἐπαινέσαι καὶ ἀφῆν-

[α]ῖ αὐτὸν τῆς-ὁμερέας καὶ ἐχσαλεῖψαι τὰ ὀνόμα-
 [τα] τὸν ὁμέ[ρ]ον τὸν Σελυμ[β]ριανὸν καὶ τὸν ἐγγυε-
 40 [τὸν] αὐτὸν [α]ῦριον τὸν γραμ(μ)α[τ]έα τῆς βολῆς ὅπο-
 [ἐσὶ ἀν]αγεγ[ρ]αμμένοι ἐναντίον τῶμ πρυτάνε-
 [ων· 2-3]ὄμ[1-2]χον δὲ τὸν Σελυμβ[ρια]νὸν ἀναγρ[ά]-
 [ψαι ἐν τ]ῇ [αὐ]τῇ στέλει πρόχσεν[ον Ἀ]θηναίων·
 [ἔναι δὲ κα]ῖ Ἀπολλοδόροι τῶμ προ[χσε]νία[ν κα]-
 45 [θάπερ τῷ] πατρὶ αὐτῷ· τὸς δὲ πρέσβε[ς καὶ Ἀπολ]-
 [λόδορον κ]αλέσαι ἐς πρυτανεῖον ἐπ[ὶ χσένια ἐ]-
 [ς αὔριον]. vacat

COMMENTARY. This inscription is at first carefully-
 inscribed; however, towards the end the stoichedon-
 pattern breaks down and the number of letters to a line
 varies, especially from line 30 onwards. There are seve-
 ral cases of Ionic substitutions for Attic letters: eta
 for epsilon in lines 12, 21 (twice), 25 and 30 (twice);
 lambda in lines 13, 24 (twice), 30, 40, 43 and 46; omega
 for omicron in lines 23, 28 and 41. In line 34 Attic lamb-
 da is once used instead of gamma.

This document is in two parts: the second of which is a
 rider, moved by Alkibiades in the summer of 407 B.C.,

ratifying the settlement whose text comprises the first part of the decree. The settlement is that arrived at by Alkibiades and the other Athenian commanders after the capture of Selymbria in 408 B.C. (Xenophon, Hellenika, I, 3.10; Diodoros, XIII, 66.4; Plutarch, Alkibiades, 30); lines 8-10 involve restoration of hostages and an undertaking to take no more in the future; lines 10-12 guarantee autonomy for Selymbria; lines 12-14 perhaps allow for cancellation of debts owed to Athens; lines 14-18 guarantee a general restitution of civil rights for exiles and disenfranchised persons; in lines 18-22 Athens and the allies abandon claims for property, other than real estate, lost in Selymbria; by the terms of lines 22-26 all cases in dispute are to be settled by agreement or in special courts; lines 26-28 provide for publication of the settlement, while lines 28-31 specify that all the Selymbrians and those Athenians there at the time swore to the terms of the settlement. The rider of Alkibiades ratifies the settlement and provides for its publication (lines 31-36). In lines 37-38 Apollodoros son of Empedos is honoured and taken off the list of hostages; in lines 38-42 the names of the hostages are to be deleted along with their sureties; in lines 42-43 another man is honoured. In lines 44-45 Apollodoros is granted the

proxeny that had been his father's. Finally, in lines 45-47, the ambassadors of the Selymbrians and Apollodoros are invited to dinner at the prytaneion.

Since lines 1-31 are not concerned with the proxeny, I comment on them only where the text of Meiggs and Lewis (loc.cit.), the most recent comprehensive edition of this document, is incomplete, or where I differ from their reading of the stone.

Lines 1-5. No editor has as yet attempted restoration of these lines. In line 1 Meiggs and Lewis read $\epsilon\rho\omicron\sigma\alpha$; the first letter should be pi: the second vertical is clearly visible, though there are two horizontal strokes below and to the left of this that may have misled M. and L. One might restore, for example, $\pi\rho\omicron\sigma\alpha$ [[$\gamma\alpha\gamma\tilde{\epsilon}\nu$].

Line 2. $\alpha\iota$ $\acute{\alpha}\theta\epsilon\nu$ - M. and L. The right foot of the first gamma survives; the fourth letter may been cut originally as a theta, but the mason altered it to phi by adding a long central vertical stroke. The reading is perhaps [$\acute{\alpha}\nu\alpha$] $\gamma\rho\alpha\phi\tilde{\epsilon}\nu$.

Line 3. $\epsilon\chi\sigma\alpha\gamma\omicron$ M. and L. The second letter is iota: a diagonal mark cutting this at the centre is not a letter-stroke. The fourth letter is definitely alpha. Perhaps some form of the verb $\epsilon\iota\sigma\acute{\alpha}\gamma\omega$ should be restored here.

Line 4. $\nu\kappa\ldots\iota\epsilon$ M. and L. There is space for one letter only between kappa and iota: of this the right diagonal survives.

The correct reading should thus be ν καὶ ε-.

Line 5. $\sigma\epsilon$ M. and L. Before sigma there is the top half of a nu; after sigma the two upper horizontals of epsilon survive, with part of the vertical. One should perhaps read: [τὸ]ν Σε|[λυμβριανὸν].

Line 6. [ἄν ἐπαγ]γέλλ[οσι] Ἀθεν[αῖσι] Kirchhoff (I.G., I, Supplement, p. 19 #61a); [--]ελλ[...] Ἀθεν[...] M. and L. The right foot of gamma is visible before epsilon; in consequence, I think that Kirchhoff's restoration is very likely to be correct. I could detect no trace of an iota before alpha.

Line 7. After KAT the left foot of a diagonal survives.

Line 8. After chi at the end of the line only the left edge of a circular letter survives.

Line 11. The right hasta and part of the bar of the first daseia survive. M. and L. restore [τρόποι] in the gap, but I think that seven, not six, letters are required.

Line 12. [αἱ δίκας δὲ εἶναι περὶ ὧν ὅφ]ελε Wilhelm (ap. Michel, loc.cit.). M. and L. reject this (as well as Wilhelm's restoration of line 14) as "excessively vague"; the sense "will overlap with 11.22-5" (p. 268). They offer no alternative.

Line 13. Σελυμβριανὸν M. and L. The upper loop of rho is partly visible; there is no trace of any cutting in the

bottom right half of the stoichos, while the vertical is clear. No dot is necessary. The mason inscribed nu instead of mu here.

Line 14. [ς πρόσθε ἐν τῇ πόλει ἔ] εἴ Wilhelm (loc.cit.).

See line 12, above.

Line 15. The bottom of the first iota is visible before omicron.

Lines 16-18. [ο. καθόδον δ' ἔναι τῷς] φεύγουσι Σελυμβριανῶν⁴⁶
[ἐγομένοις τὸς αὐτ]ὸς πολεμῖος δὲ καὶ φιλῖος [τῷς ἐν τῇ
πόλει] Wilhelm (loc.cit.). M. and L. do not restore these lines: "we would prefer νομίζουσιν, but do not understand the use of δέ" (p. 268). The top diagonal tip of a sigma survives in line 16 before phi.

Line 18. M. and L. dot the first alpha; however, part of the bar, as well as the right diagonal, survives here.

Line 21. The tip of the bottom stroke of sigma survives at the beginning, before mu.

Line 23. The bottom of the vertical of rho survives here before omicron.

Line 24. As M. and L. point out, [τῷ κο]ινῷ would be too long by three letters.

Line 25. Since what survives of lambda at the beginning is part of its diagonal stroke, I cannot see what other letter could be restored here; M. and L. print a dotted lambda here.

Line 26. The tip of the upper diagonal of sigma survives before epsilon.

Line 28. [ν τὸ Ἀπόλλωνο]ς? Kirchhoff (loc.cit.). M. and L. point out that this is too long by one letter; they had "thought of Ἐρακλέος, but the coins (BMC Thrace, 170, nos. 2-4) which prompted the guess have been reassigned to Dikaia (Num.Chr., 1965, 3f.)." (p.268).

Line 30. Part of initial sigma survives unmistakably on fragment c; on fragment d the bottom of the right hasta of eta is followed by the bottom of the left hasta and part of the right hasta of nu. The mason inscribed $\Sigma\epsilon\lambda\upsilon\beta\epsilon\rho\iota\alpha\nu\tilde{\omicron}\nu$ in this line. The rho is quite clear, though bracketed by M. and L..

Line 31. All but the bottom stroke of sigma survive in stoichos 5; of the last two letters of Alkibiades' name only the right tip of the uppermost bar of epsilon survives, but most of the sigma is clear (both are bracketed by M. and L.).

Line 32. In stoichos 3 the right hasta and part of the third stroke of mu survive; the bottom, including part of the curve, of rho is visible in stoichos 5, while only the bottom part of iota survives in the next stoichos. The left diagonal and part of the bar of alpha are visible, but nu has entirely disappeared. The upper right curve of theta

survives before epsilon in [Ἀ]θεναίος : the space before this, after ΠΡ, is really enough for three, not two, letters, but the stoichedon-pattern is no longer stable on this part of the stone, so that the reading πρ[ός Ἀ]θεναίος seems secure enough.

Line 33. ἐν [πόλ]εῖ M. and L. Of the letter read as nu, only the left leg and part of a diagonal survive; the left leg is canted over to the right, so that I think that the reading of nu is justified here.

Line 34. [τ]ὰς συνθε[ῖ]κας M. and L. The left tip and part of the vertical of tau survive; both the right diagonal and part of the horizontal of alpha are visible. The bottom of the left vertical of kappa survives, as does the right diagonal of alpha. Sigma is wholly visible, though abraded.

Line 35. The rasura here has prompted various restorations but it seems clear, as Meritt points out (op.cit., p. 328), that this is a case merely of the erasure of a mistake, rather than of damnatio memoriae. If a restoration must be attempted, he suggests, [καὶ τὸ ψέφισμα τόδε] is more likely than Wilhelm's [καὶ τῶν Σελυμβριανῶν] (1939). M. and L. agree with Meritt.

Line 36. The right side, including part of the diagonal, of the first nu is preserved; M. and L. read αὐτὸν καὶ in the middle of the line; however, the left side and part of the

diagonal of nu are preserved: this letter need not be dotted. Only the right side of kappa survives and it should be dotted.

Line 37. The pi of ἑμπέδο should be dotted: only the left vertical survives.

Line 38. The top of the first iota is visible; in stoichos 9 only the right tip of the upper bar of epsilon survives.

Line 39. M. and L. dot the first epsilon (in stoichos 8), but the whole letter is visible, though abraded.

Line 40. The apex of the first alpha is preserved. In this line the mason omitted one mu in the word γρα(μ)ματ[ε]α.

Line 41. The right foot of alpha survives in stoichos 6.

Line 42. There is space for two or three letters at the beginning of the name of the second honorand. After OM there is room for one or two letters, so that this name could be [2:3]όμ[αρ]χον or [2:3]όμ[α]χον . I have been unable to find any name with the ending -όμαρχος , but there are several names ending -όμαχος , though I have not been able to find any example connected with Selymbria.

Line 43. Only the top of iota survives in stoichos 9. The left side of nu survives in the word πρόχσεν[ον].

Line 44. The bottom of iota survives in stoichos 9. At the end of the line only the top of the right hasta of nu survives, followed by the tops of iota and alpha.

Line 45. M. and L. dot the pi in stoichos 8; however, parts of all three strokes survive.

Line 46. Only the vertical and part of the horizontal of pi survive at the right side of the stone on the break.

In lines 39-46 the right edge of the stone has apparently been destroyed in modern times: in the first publication of the stone (Koumanoudis, loc.cit.) and in Koehler's transcript (I.G., I, Supplement, p. 18 #61a) these letters were printed without brackets: line 39 [χσε']νίαν κα-; line 40 [καί] Ἀπολ- ; line 41 [χσέν]ια ἐ-.

Selymbria was captured by Alkibiades with the help of traitors within the city; the second honorand (and possibly Apollodoros as well) was perhaps involved in this treachery.

APPENDIX.

A small fragment of blue-white marble, EM 2496, of unknown provenance, but now in the Epigraphical Museum at Athens, may prove to be part of the same stele as #61.

It exhibits the same letter-shapes and the same vacillation between Attic and Ionic letter-forms. It is broken on all sides.

H.max. 0.099m. W.max. 0.076m. Th.max. 0.032m. Letter-height 0.010m.- 0.011m. Non-stoichedon; vertical chequer, lines 1-2 0.0150m.; lines 3-7 0.0175m.

Letter-shapes. A4, E4, Θ4, Λ4, M2, N7, O2, Σ8, X3, O5.

Ionic and Attic script mixed (see my remarks, above, on the letter-shapes of #61).

ca 408/7 B.C.?

Non-stoich.

[-----]α[-----]
 [-----]ενα[-----]
 [-----]ωνο[-----]
 [-----]ιλος[-----]
 5 [-----]αισχ[-----]
 [-----]ος[-----]
 [-----]μ[-----]

COMMENTARY. If this fragment is a part of #61, the vertical chequer suggests that it should be placed above the existing fragments of this stele; I am unable to suggest any coherent restoration, but offer the following conjectures and observations.

Line 1. The left foot of alpha or gamma (or Ionic lambda) survives here.

Line 2. The right tip of the upper bar of epsilon survives here; at the right edge the bottom of a central vertical is visible. [Αθ]ενα[ο---] could be restored here.

Line 4. What appears to be the lower apex of a sigma survives here.

Line 5. At the right edge the left side of a chi survives on the break.

#62. Proxeny. 408/7 B.C. Honours for Oiniades the
Palaioskiathian.

Pl. XV, 2

BIBLIOGRAPHY. Lolling, D.A. (1888), pp. 206 - 207 #2;
Mylonas, B.C.H., XIII (1889), p. 152; Dittmar, Coronis
(1890), pp. 91-92; I.G., I, Supplement, pp. 166-167
#62b (1891); Meyer, Forschungen, II (1899), p. 117;
Michel, Recueil (1900), pp. 88-89 #79; Larfeld, Gr.Epigr.,
II² (1902), p. 445; Wilhelm, G.G.A. (1903), p. 779;
Fredrich, Ath.Mitt., XXXI (1906), p. 103; Janell, Ausge-
waehlte Inschriften (1906), pp. 20-21 #20; Kern, Inscr.Gr.
(1913), p. 4 #18; S.I.G., I³ (1915), 114; I.G., XII, 8,
p. 167 (1919); Schwyzer, D.G. (1923), p. 386 #13; I.G.,
I², 118 (1924); Haggard, Secretaries (1930), p. 22 #47;
Nachmanson, H.I.A.² (1931), p. 23 #20; Tod, G.H.I., I
(1933), pp. 221-222 #90; Kirchner, Imagines (1935), 39;
Austin, Stoichedon (1938), p. 101; Meritt, Wade-Gery and
McGregor, A.T.L., I (1939), p. 580, T 78; Austin, G.R.,
VIII (1939), pp. 137-138; Meritt, Hesperia, X (1941), p.
314 note 52; Tod, G.H.I., I² (1946), pp. 221-222 #90;
Klaffenbach-Kirchner, Imagines² (1948), pp. 17-18 #41;
S.E.G., X (1949), 134; Meritt, Wade-Gery and McGregor,
A.T.L., II (1949), p. 103; A.T.L., III (1950), p. 145 note
23; Lambrechts, Proxeni edicta (1958), pp. 28-29, 56-57,

60, 80, 96, 105, 151; Meiggs and Lewis, G.H.I. (1969), pp. 275-277 #90.

PHOTOGRAPHS. Janell, op.cit., pl. 20; Kern, op.cit., pl. 18; Kirchner, op.cit., pl. 39 (= Klaffenbach-Kirchner, op.cit., pl. 41); Austin, Stoichedon, pl. 10 (= G.R., VIII [1939], pl. IV).

EM 6796, stele of Pentellic marble, found in November, 1888 in excavations on the Akropolis on the site of the so-called temenos of Athena Ergane (on the site of the Chalkotheke), west of the Parthenon. It was first published by Lolling (loc.cit.). The stele is complete except for the bottom left corner and base. The back is rough-picked, as is the top. The stele tapers from bottom to top, but the horizontal chequer does not widen, so that the margins increase towards the bottom. There is a vertical uninscribed space of 0.020m. above the first line, and a space of 0.115m. below the last line. The unevenness of the top suggests that the stele may at one time have borne a crowning relief, despite the absence now of any trace of such a relief or of a moulding.

H.max. 0.635m. W.max. 0.284m. (at line 26); min. 0.283m. Th. 0.103m. Letter-height 0.007m.-0.011m. Chequer 0.0109m.

x0.0159m.

Letter-shapes. A⁴, B³, E⁴, H¹, Θ³, K², M³⁻⁴, N⁷, O², Π¹, P⁸, Σ⁷ and 8, Υ⁷, Φ⁴, Χ³, Ω⁴⁻⁵. Ionic script, very well-cut and neatly arranged. The stone is dated by the archon-formula in line 5; none of the letter-shapes is inconsistent with the date 408/7 B.C. I.G., I², 110_a is inscribed by a hand very close to that of the present document, but alpha and gamma spread more and nu is slightly wider; I.G., II², 4 (placed, perhaps incorrectly, ca 403/2 B.C.) is by a hand so close as perhaps to be identical. I.G., I², 304_b (dated 407/6 B.C.) differs only in the slightly more wide-spreading mu.

408/7 B.C.

Stoich.23

Θ ε ο ι

ἔδοξεν τῇ βολῇ καὶ τῷ δήμ-
 ω, Ἀντιοχὶς ἐπρυτάνευε, Εὐκ-
 λείδης ἐγραμμάτευε, Ἱεροκλ-
 5 ῆς ἐπεστάτε, Εὐκτῆμων ἥρχε, ὕ-
 Διειτρέφης εἶπε· ἐπειδὴ ἀνὴρ
 ὅς ἐστι ἀγαθὸς Οἰνιάδης ὁ Παλ-
 αισκιάθιος περὶ τὴν πόλιν τ-
 ῆν Ἀθηναίων καὶ πρόθυμος πο-
 10 ιεὲν ὅ, τι δύναται ἀγαθόν, καὶ ε-

ὅ ποιεῖ τὸν ἀφικνόμενον Ἀθη-
 ναίων ἐσκίαθον, ἐπαινέσαι τ-
 ε αὐτῷ καὶ ἀναγράψαι αὐτὸν
 πρόξενον καὶ εὐεργέτην Ἀθη-
 15 ναίων καὶ τὸς ἐκγόνοσ αὐτοῦ, κα-
 αὶ ὅπως ἂν μὴ ἀδικῇται ἐπιμέ-
 λεσθαι τὴν τε βολὴν τὴν αἰ β-
 ουλεύουσιν καὶ τοὺς στρατηγ-
 ῶς καὶ τὸν ἄρχοντα τὸν ἐν Σκι-
 20 αῶνι ὃς ἂν ᾖ ἐκάστοτε. τὸ δὲ ψ-
 ῆφισμα τόδε ἀναγράψαι τὸν γ-
 ραμματέα τῆς βολῆς ἐν στήλῃ-
 ι λιθίνῃ καὶ καταθεῖναι ἐν π-
 ὄλει. καλέσαι δὲ αὐτὸν καὶ ἐπ-
 25 ἰ ξένια ἐς τὸ πρυτανεῖον ἐς α-
 ὕριον.^v Ἀντιχάρης εἶπε· τὰ μὲ-
 ν ἄλλα καθάπερ τῇ βολῇ· ἐς δ-
 [ἐ τ]ῇ γ γνῶμην μεταγράψαι ἀντ-
 [ὶ τοῦ, Σ]κιαθίου, ὅπως ἂν ᾖ γεγρα-
 30 [μμένο]ν, Οἰνιάδην τὸν Παλαισ-
 [κιάθιο]ν. vacat

COMMENTARY. In lines 31 and 32 there are traces in each case of a nu at the left edge; in line 31 the tip of the left hasta and rather more of the right hasta survive; in line 32 the tip of the right hasta is visible.

In lines 5 and 26 the orator's name is preceded by a vacat of one letter-space (cf. I.G., I², 24.5; 94.11).

The amendment of Antichares (lines 26-32) was evidently put forward from the floor of the Assembly after the decree had been proposed as a probouleuma; it was adopted, and the secretary adapted his text of line 8 accordingly before the stele was inscribed: this apparent inconsistency has led some commentators to believe that this stele is a copy of the original document, engraved after 403/2 B.C., and one (Mylonas, loc.cit.) even suggested that Antichares' rider should be dated to the time of the re-engraving of the stele. I think, however, that the wording makes it clear that the rider was meant to correct a scribal error, not one perpetuated on stone.

Lines 1-6. The secretary Eukleides may be the man of that name who was general in 410-9 B.C. (P.A., I, 5672; Kirchner suggests that this man was one of the Thirty; see P.A., I, 5680). Alternatively, he may be the archon of 403/2 B.C. (P.A., I, 5674). The epistates Hierokles is not otherwise known. The orator Dietrephes could be he who was general

in 414/3 and 412/1 B.C. (P.A., I, 3755), but his involvement in the overthrow of the Thasian democracy in 411 B.C. makes this unlikely (see Thucydides, VIII, 64).

Line 18. Here the secretary lapsed momentarily into developed Ionic orthography; he returned to the earlier orthography in line 19.

Line 19. The archons of Athens who were established in the allied states had, among other duties, the task of protecting Athens' friends; elsewhere, the generals were charged with this care (cf. I.G., I², 108 and #13; possibly also I.G., I², 68/9; the archons are attested to in several cities: see A.T.L., III, p. 145).

Line 26. Antichares is not otherwise known. Possibly, he was a friend or business-acquaintance of Oiniades; the latter seems to have been anxious to have it made clear that he was of the old city of Skiathos, a subtle distinction perhaps indicating a second settlement in Skiathos; there is no evidence for an Athenian klerouchy. Skiathos was a tributary of the Empire as early as 454/3 B.C. (A.T.L., I, pp. 408-409).

#63. Proxeny? ca 425-405 B.C. Honours for an unknown man.

Pl.XIV,7

BIBLIOGRAPHY. Pittakys, E.A., 34 (1853), p. 891 #1426; Rangabé, A.H., II (1855), p. 218 #557; pp. 943-944 #2249; Pittakys, E.A., 42 (1856), p. 1370 #2738; I.G., I, 62 (1873); Dittenberger, Satura Sauppe (1879), p. 56 note 2; Wilhelm, Anzeiger, X (1909), p. 51; Bannier, B.Ph.W. (1911), p. 853; (1916), p. 1069; I.G., I², 119 (1924).

PHOTOGRAPHS. None so far published.

EM 6606, fragment of blue-white, slightly micaceous marble, found on December 4, 1853, on the Akropolis east of the Erechtheion; it was first published by Pittakys (loc.cit. [1853]). The right edge and flat, smooth-picked top are preserved. The stone has been re-used; its back has been sawn off. Foliation is diagonal, top right to bottom left, and at right angles to the face.

H.max. 0.161m. W.max. 0.182m. Th.max. 0.061m. Letter-height, lines 1-3 0.018m.-0.019m.; lines 4ff. 0.009m.- 0.010m. Lines 1-3 non-stoichedon, vertical chequer 0.022m.; chequer lines 4ff. 0.010m.x 0.0137m.

Letter-shapes. A3 and 4, E4 and 5, H1, Θ3 and 4, K2, Λ4 - 5, M2-4, N7, O2, Π1, P6 and 8, Σ9, Y8, X2 and 3. Attic script, with apparently regular use of the daseia. The hand is the same as that of I.G., I², 47; 68/9; 87; 133; #49; and S.E.G., X, 135, a series of documents dated between 424 and 406 B.C. (see above, #49). The preamble and heading contain an archon-formula that dates it either to the late 420's or to 408 or 407 B.C. In my view, the letter-forms have more in common with I.G., I², 47, the latest in the above series of documents, than with I.G., I², 87, which is probably the earliest. Wilhelm (loc.cit.) attributed I.G., I², 133 to the same stele as the present decree; Lewis and Woodhead (per epp.) believe that the association with I.G., I², 133 is not proven, but attribute to the present decree the fragment S.E.G., X, 135. I think that the foliation precludes both attributions, and that the slightly uneven chequer found in both I.G., I², 133 and S.E.G., X, 135 is a further argument against the association of either with this document, though it may be evidence for the attribution of S.E.G., X, 135 to the stele of I.G., I², 133. The right margin of I.G., I², 133 is considerably wider than that found on #63; however, if the stele was a large one, as its width suggests, and if it tapered, the difference in margins may not be as strong an

argument against the association of I.G., I², 133 and #63.

ca 425-405 B.C.

Non-stoich.

[--- ca 14-15 ---]ίλο.

ca 17-18

[--- ca 12-13 ---]έγραμμ]άτευε.

ca 23-24

[--- ca 8-9 ---]έρ]χε.

ca 12-13

[ἔδοχσεν τῷ βολῇ καὶ τῷ δέμοι, ‡.8..... Stoich. 70

ἐπρυτάνευε, ‡.8..... ἐγ]ραμμάτευε, Εὐκτέμο-

5 [ν{ἐρχε
ἐπεστάτε}, ----{ἐπεστάτε}, ----- εἶπε.

ἐπαινέσαι ---- τῷ ----]ι hos ὄντι ἀν[δρὶ ἀγα]-

[θῶι περὶ τὸν δῆμον τὸν Ἀθηναίων καὶ νῦν καὶ ἐν

τῷ πρόσθεν χρόνοι καὶ προθύ[μοι ποῖν hό,]

[τι δύναται ἀγαθὸν⁴¹.....]

.....]φεγ[.....¹¹.....]

[.....⁵⁷.....]

.....]τυ[.....¹¹.....]

COMMENTARY. The line-length is probably seventy letters: while lines 5-6 could be restored with, for instance, forty-seven or fifty-nine letters, either of these restorations would conflict with line 4, whose minimum length will be sixty-three letters, unless either the Boule

or the Demos is omitted from the preamble: this is highly unlikely; in any case, the spacing of lines 2 and 3 provide further arguments against a shorter line.

Lines 1-3 constitute a heading, of which lines 1-2 may name the secretary by patronymic and demotic, and line 3 names the archon. Previous editors thought that line 1 contained the name of the honorand: Kirchhoff restored [προχσενία ---]ίλο(I.G., I, 62); he was followed by Hiller (I.G., I², 119). Bannier (1911) argued that the abstraction προξενία does not occur in the fifth century; later (1916) he suggested a heading like that of #47:

[name, patronymic, ethnic] . If this is correct, the secretary's name will fall entirely in line 2; there is space here for ca 12-13 letters, which means that the secretary was identified by a short demotic: line 4 requires that the secretary's name be not more than nine letters long. The alternative is that proposed by Woodhead (per ep.): line 1 contained the name and patronymic, and line 2 the demotic of the secretary: for instance, [Λυσικλῆς Ἐργοφ]ίλο | [Κυδαθηναιεύς ἔγραμμ]άτευσ. This sort of heading is perhaps more common in the fourth than in the fifth century; however, it is found in 421/0 B.C. (I.G., I², 84 and #32), in 417/6 B.C. (I.G., I², 96) and in 410/09 B.C. (I.G., I², 109); the earliest fourth-century example is I.G., II², 18 (394/3 B.C.).

If, on the other hand, the first line names the honorand, there is little choice of ethnics; I know of three states with whom Athens had dealings in the fifth century whose ethnic might end -ίλος : Prasilos, Traïlos and Silos. The last-named was a Karian city; it is not known to have paid tribute after 440/39 B.C. (A.T.L., I, pp. 404-405). Traïlos (Traïllos or Tragilos) was in Makedonia, near Amphipolis; it was assessed for tribute in 425 and 421 B.C. (A.T.L., I, pp. 426-427, 556). On coins, however, its ethnic was Traïlios. Prasilos (Prasillos, Prastilos) in Bottiaia, near Olynthos, is the strongest candidate: it paid tribute in 421/0 B.C. and was a member of the Bottic syntely (A.T.L., I, pp. 386-387, 542). However, the restoration of lines 1-2 must remain an open question and with it the identity of the honorand and of the secretary.

Line 3. The full width of the stele was ca 0.710m. This is sufficient for the restoration of eleven letters in the missing portion of line 3; if it was centered on the stele, the space available would be enough for ten or eleven letters, depending on spacing. Thus restoration of either an eight or a nine-letter name is possible, though I think that the latter is more likely. Previous editors have restored

[Εὐκτέμων ἔρ]χε from line 4. Woodhead (loc.cit.) suggests

[Ἀντιγένης ἔρ]χε as more in keeping with the available space;

Euktemon in line 4 will be epistates, not archon. He argues that the order secretary-archon-epistates is less likely than secretary-epistates-archon; in fact, however, there are at least four examples in the fifth century of the former order (#65 [407/6 B.C.] and I.G., I², 126, I, II and III [405/4-3-2 B.C.]), and several in the fourth century, so that this cannot be used as an argument for or against the restoration of the name of Euktemon in line 3. I agree with Woodhead that the years 408/7 B.C. (Euktemon) or 407/6 B.C. (Antigenes) are more likely for this decree: the next lowest available dates are 421/0 B.C. (Aristion) and 420/19 B.C. (Astyphilos); however, the evidence of the letter-shapes does not exclude the earlier date, while the marble used in this stele is of a type that seems to have come into vogue in the last twenty years of the fifth century, though it is more common after 410 B.C. Even if the restoration of a Macedonian ethnic in line 1 were admitted, this would not help, since Athens was active in the north-east both in the late 420's and in the 410's.

Line 4. The top of rho is preserved at the left edge of the stone, while at the right edge both nu and omicron are readable, though abraded; the right margin is 0.002m. wide. Line 5. The top of iota at the left edge and the left upper arm of nu at the right edge of the stone survive. I have

already commented upon the possibility that Euktemon was epistates, not archon: if so, he is not identifiable, since several men of this name are known late in the fifth century (P.A., I, 5780-5783; 5798-5799). The name of the honorand and his ethnic should be restored here in the dative, leaving room for a short-named orator and the archon/epistates. The restoration is that of Kirchhoff (I.G., I, 62).

Line 6. The right foot and part of the bar of alpha survive at the left edge.

Line 7. There are traces of two letters as well as a complete epsilon: at the left there is part of a small curved letter, probably phi, since the curve is too small or too low for omicron or for rho or beta. To the right of epsilon is the left diagonal of alpha or gamma.

Line 8. Under epsilon is the top of a tau, followed by the left arm of upsilon; it is probably too flat for the arm of a chi.

I am unable to suggest any coherent restoration of lines 7 and 8.

#64. ca 425-405 B.C. Proxeny? Honours for Telemachos

and two other men.

Pl. XVI, 1, 2, 3

BIBLIOGRAPHY. Homolle, B.C.H., I (1877), pp. 51-52 #3; Foucart, B.C.H., I (1877), pp. 80-81; I.G., I, Supplement, p. 24 #116e (1877); Larfeldt, Gr. Epigr.³ (1914), p. 394.233; I.G., I², 67 (1924); Schweigert, Hesperia, VII (1938), pp. 270-271 #5; Loughran and Raubitschek, Hesperia, XVI (1947), p. 81 #3; S.E.G., X (1949), 112.

PHOTOGRAPHS. Schweigert, Hesperia, VII (1938), p. 271 fig. 5 (fragments b and c); Loughran and Raubitschek, Hesperia, XVI (1947), pl. XIII #3 (squeezes of fragment a with EM 6140).

Three non-joining fragments of blue-white marble, first associated by Schweigert (loc.cit.). Foliation is vertical and parallel to the face. A fourth fragment, EM 6140, was erroneously associated with this document by Loughran and Raubitschek (loc.cit.); they give its inventory-number wrongly as EM 6130; this is a piece of Pentelic marble and so cannot belong to the same

stele as fragments a, b and c.

Fragment a, EM 6838, was found in excavations near the Erechtheion on the Akropolis; it was first published by Homolle (loc.cit.). The right edge and rough-picked back are preserved.

H.max. 0.238m. W.max. 0.200m. Th. 0.082m. Chequer 0.0173m.-
0.0177m.x 0.0186m.

Fragment b, EM 12949, and fragment c, EM 12900, were both found on June 10, 1937, in excavations on the north slope of the Akropolis; both were first published by Schweigert (loc.cit.) and are broken on all sides.

Fragment b: H.max. 0.086m. W.max. 0.063m. Th.max. 0.035m.
Chequer 0.0178m.x 0.0186m.

Fragment c: H.max. 0.090m. W.max. 0.080m. Th.max. 0.041m.
Chequer 0.0171m.x 0.0186m.

Letter-height, all fragments, 0.011m.

Letter-shapes. A3 and 4, E4 (centre-bar longer), H1, Θ3, K2, Λ4, M1 and 2, N7, O2 and 3, Π1, P8, Σ7 and 8, Y7, X3. Attic script with regular use of the daseia.

There is nothing in the shapes of the letters themselves to indicate any specific date between 440 and 400 B.C.;

the neatness and regularity of the letters and the chequer suggest perhaps the 420's. I believe that the hand is very close to those of I.G., I², 25 and S.E.G., X, 77, as well as, perhaps, those of #34 and #35. The first two are dated probably in the late 420's. Another group of documents, of the period 411-406 B.C., is by a very similar hand (I.G., I², 47, almost identical in chequer and marble; I.G., I², 108 and 110, the latter having very similar marble). A possible context for the present document is the late 410's or early 400's (see below).

ca 425-405 B.C.

Stoich.33

a [. τὸ δὲ ψέφισμα τόδε ἀναγράψαι τὸν γρα]-
 [μματέα τὸν τῆς βολῆς ἐν στέλει λιθί]νει κ-
 [αθ' ἡότι ἂν τῷ δέμοι δοκῇ καὶ θεῖνα]ι ἐμ πό-
 [λει· ἡοι δὲ πολεταὶ ἀπομισθοσάντ]ον τὲν σ-
 5 [τέλεν· ἡοι δὲ κολακρέται δόντον] τὸ ἀργύρ-
 [ιον· καλέσαι δὲ καὶ αὐτὸς ἐπὶ χσ]ένια ἐς τὸ
 [πρυτανεῖον ἐς αὔριον, ...?...]ας εἶπε· τ-
 [ἃ μὲν ἄλλα καθάπερ τῇ βολῇ· Τ]ελεμάχοι δ-
 [ὲ καὶ ...^{± 10}... καὶ ...^{± 7}...]μοι τοῖς Οἰ-
 10 [...⁶... δοῖναι ἡεκάστοι πεντα]κοσίας δρα-

[χμας τος *ἡ*ελλενοταμίας καὶ τὸ]ς παρῆέδρ-
 [ος²⁸.....]ι δε

b [-----]ια[-----]
 [-----]οις[-----]
 [-----]τον[-----]
 [-----]ταπ[-----]
 5 [-----]π[-----]

c [-----]ιεννα[-----]
 [-----]οσι *ἡ*[-----]
 [-----]ιαννα[-----]
 [-----]μι[-----]
 5 [-----]ν[-----]

COMMENTARY. The two smaller fragments, b and c, almost certainly belong to the same stele as fragment a, but their position cannot be determined. On fragment a there appears to be a gradual widening of the horizontal chequer towards the bottom, suggesting that the stele tapered from bottom to top; however, the

right margin here actually decreases slightly towards the bottom of the stone; perhaps the mason was a little careless in his draughting of the chequer-pattern. The horizontal chequer of fragment b is closer to that of the bottom of fragment a, while that of fragment c is a little less than that at the top of fragment a. Thus, fragment c was perhaps the uppermost fragment, while b was nearer the bottom of the stele. Fragments b and c, however, are so small that accurate computation of the chequer is difficult.

Fragment a, lines 1-2. The restoration is that of Foucart (loc.cit.), with the addition of a second [τόν] in line 2. In line 2 the top of the right hasta of nu survives.

Line 3. κ[αθάπερ? ---- καὶ καταθεῖνα]ἰ ἐμ πό[λει]Foucart;
 κ[αθ᾿ἀπερ τὸ πρότερον, καὶ καταθεῖνα]ἰ ἐμ πό[λει]Hiller
 (I.G., I², 67); κ[αθ' ὅτι ἂν τῷ δέμοι δοκεῖ καὶ θεῖνα]ἰ
 ἐμ πό[λει] Loughran and Raubitschek (loc.cit.). Hiller's version has two faults: the phrase κ[αθ᾿ἀπερ τὸ πρότερον] is peculiar and unexplained, and the spelling is paralleled only once to my knowledge (I.G., I², 108.43) and is not supported by the certain restoration [καθάπερ] in line 8. Loughran's and Raubitschek's version is based

on the similar phraseology of #30, line 8 (now dated 424/3 B.C.).

Lines 4-6. The change of moods here is curious, but seems certain.

Line 7. The orator's name will have ten letters only, unless there was, as frequently occurs, a vacat at the end of the first decree. Ten-letter names ending -ιας are hard to find; one possibility is Laispodias (P.A., II, 8963); he was general in 415/4 B.C. and ambassador in 411 B.C.; he had, apparently, a reputation as a warmonger (see Phrynichos, fragment 16). Nine-letter names are a little more common: a possible candidate is Pleistias (P.A., II, 11864), ambassador to Perdikkas in 426/5 B.C. and secretary to the Boule in 425/4 B.C. Unfortunately, no trace of the letter preceding iota survives.

Lines 8-10. Foucart suggested that the letters OI in line 9 were beginning of a patronymic. Hiller (1921) thought that, since the honorands were foreigners (line 6), this word ought to be an ethnic; he suggested two possibilities, Oί[ταίοις] and Oί[νιάδαις]. Oitia's hostility to the Dorian Metropolis led in 426 B.C. to the

foundation of Herakleia Trachinia (Thucydides, III, 92); this decree might thus memorialize Athen's efforts to use this hostility as a means of establishing herself in the Euboian Gulf (see Thucydides, III, 93.1); if Mattingly's conjectures about #34 and #35 are correct (Ehrenberg Studies [1966], p. 214: he suggested that #34 and #35 deal with Achaia Phthiotis rather than with Peloponnesian Achaia and should be dated in 422/1 B.C.), we should thus have two instances of Athenian political trafficking in this area. Hiller himself preferred Oiniadae as a candidate: we know from Thucydides (III, 7.4; 77.2) that it became a reluctant ally of Athens in 424/3 B.C.: the decree would thus honour and reward the leaders of the "Anschluss" within the city. Unfortunately, the restoration creates an epigraphical problem: the surviving letters in line 10, ΚΟΣΙΑΣΔΡΑ, are most plausibly restored as part of the phrase [δῶναι πεντα]-κοσίας δρα[χμᾶς] with the phrases [ἡεκάστοι] and perhaps [ἐκ δημοσίου] included at some point (cf. #28). Whatever the ethnic, Hiller's [δῶναι ἡεκάστοι πεντα]κοσίας δρα[χμᾶς] seems to be correct; however, with the ethnic οἱ [νιάδαις] the daseia of [ἡεκάστοι] must be omitted: yet it seems from lines 4, 5 and 11 that the scribe employed

the daseia regularly in this inscription and that [ἡεκάστοι] is the correct reading. On epigraphical grounds, therefore, οἱ[ταίοις] is preferable. Loughran and Raubitschek attempted to solve the problem by reading [τρια]μοσίας instead of [πεντα]μοσίας, but I do not know of any parallel for this sum: #28 is the only fifth-century example of such a gift of money to a foreigner; here, one gift is certainly of five hundred drachmai, while the other involves the grant to several persons of either five hundred or one thousand drachmai each. To argue from this one case is dangerous; nevertheless, it seems to me on the analogy of #28 that the occasion for this gift should be sought not in a successful but in an unsuccessful "Anschluss", or in the loss of an ally and the subsequent expulsion of Athens' partisans, when Athens might feel bound to recompense these persons for their losses. In the case of both Oitia and Oiniadai such an occasion is more likely to have arisen in the 410's rather than in the 420's, as Loughran and Raubitschek suggest, pointing out the close similarity of the hand of the present document to that of I.G., I², 110 (dated 410/09 B.C.). However, if a date in the 410's be allowed there are other candidates for the ethnic of

Telemachos and his friends: the register of Athens' allies in the islands (A.T.L., I, pp. 360-361) includes Oia1 on Rhodes (included in the tribute paid by Lindos, which revolted in 412/1 B.C.; see Thucydides, VIII, 44.2) and Oine on Ikaros (a regular tributary at least until 425/4 B.C., but probably in Spartan hands in 411/0 B.C.; see Thucydides, VIII, 99). Both these states have seven-letter ethnics and, with Oitia, would be more satisfactory epigraphically than would be Oiniada1. The possible involvement of the hellenotamiai also suggests a fairly late date: they seem to have taken over many of the functions of the kolakretai after 411 B.C.; the latter, apparently, are involved only in line 5 of the present document, but in #28 it is they who have to pay out the funds voted to the honorands (see my remarks on #28, above).

Fragment b, line 1. The bottom of a central vertical survives, followed by a left diagonal leg. Schweigert restored gamma here, but there is possibly a trace of the cross-bar of an alpha.

In line 5, under the pi of line 4, Schweigert restored a rho; however, most of the top bar of a letter survives here and seems absolutely straight, so that rho is out

of the question; there is also a trace of a right vertical, so that pi should be read here.

Fragment c, line 1. Only the bottom of a central vertical survives in the first stoichos; in the last stoichos both the left foot and part of the bar of alpha can be seen.

In line 3 the whole stroke of iota survives; there is no trace of any other cutting in this stoichos. To the right of this parts of all three strokes of alpha survive (Schweigert reads nothing in this stoichos). The lower part of the left diagonal of alpha survives, with part of the cross-bar at the right edge.

In line 4 there is a clear iota at the right edge; in line 5 the tip of a right hasta survives under mu of line 4; it is too high for a daseia.

#65. Proxeny. 407/6 B.C.? Provision for shipbuilding in Makedonia; honours for King Archelas of Makedonia. Pl.XVII,1

BIBLIOGRAPHY. Pittakys, L'Antienne Athènes (1835), p. 321; E.A., 28 (1842), pp. 583-584 #1020; Rangabé, A.H., I (1842), pp. 360-361 #281; I.G., I, 82 (1873); Loeschke, Titulis (1876), p. 36; Koumanoudis, E.A., I (1883), pp. 170-171 #2; I.G., I, Supplement, p. 65 #35e (1886); Kirchhoff, Sitzungsb. Ak.Berlin (1886), pp. 303-314; Dittmar, Coronis (1890), p. 92; Busolt, Philologus, L (1891), pp. 583-606; Hicks and Hill, Manual² (1901), #58; Kolbe, Ath.Mitt., XXVI (1901), p. 415 note 2; Wilhelm, G.G.A. (1903), pp. 774-775; Beitraege (1909), p. 250; Z.oest.Gymn. (1913), p. 679; S.I.G., I³ (1915), 104; Wilhelm, Jahreshefte, XXI-XXII (1923), pp. 123-247; I.G., I², 105 (1924); Ferguson, C.P., XXI (1926), p. 75; Haggard, Secretaries (1930), pp. 20-21 #43; Ferguson, Mélanges Glotz, I (1932), p. 358 note 3; Treasurers (1932), p. 42 note 1, pp. 147-148; Meritt, A.F.D. (1932), pp. 109-115; Tod, G.H.I., I¹ (1933), pp. 222-224 #91; de Sanctis, R.F.I.C., XIII (1935), pp. 205-213; Meritt, Capps Studies (1936), pp. 246-252; Lenschau, Rh.M., XC (1941), p. 24; Tod, G.H.I., I² (1946), pp. 222-224 #91; S.E.G., X (1949), 138; de Ste-Croix, Historia, V (1956), p. 14; S.E.G., XV (1958), 13; Lambrechts, Proxeni edecreten (1958), pp. 30,

33, 61, 70, 151; Mattingly, Ehrenberg Studies (1966), p. 200; S.E.G., XXIII (1968), 21; Meiggs and Lewis, G.H.I. (1969), pp. 277-280 #91.

PHOTOGRAPH. Wilhelm, (1924), p. 123 fig. 56.

Two joining fragments of slightly micaceous Pentelic marble, bearing the same inventory-number, EM 6644. They were first associated by Wilhelm (1898) and published together by him in 1923. Foliation is vertical and diagonal from left face to right rear.

Fragment a was found in Athens and acquired from a private collection by the Archaeological Society in November, 1882; it was first published by Koumanoudis (loc.cit.). The right edge and rough-picked back are preserved.

H.max. 0.250m. W.max. 0.170m. Th. 0.095m.

Fragment b was found in excavation east of the Erechtheion on November 22, 1840; it had earlier been reported in situ by Pittakys in 1835. The right edge and rough-picked back are preserved. It joins the bottom of fragment a. On the back of both fragments there is a drafted edge 0.020m. wide,

possibly the result of later re-working.

H.max. 0.171m. W.max. 0.145m. Th. 0.095m.

Combined dimensions: H.max. 0.392m. W.max. 0.250m. Th. 0.095m.

Letter-height 0.007m.-0.008m. Chequer 0.0097m.-0.0099m. x 0.0965m.

Letter-shapes. A⁴ and 5, B³, E⁴, Z², H¹, Θ³, K², Λ⁴, M², N⁷ and 9, O¹ and 2, Π¹, P⁸, Σ⁷, Υ⁷⁻⁸, Φ⁴, X³. Attic script, employing the daseia regularly. The mason used chisels with slightly curved blades, so that straight letter-strokes appear curved (as in sigma), or have narrow waists and widen at each end (especially in verticals); I have been unable to find any other document having similar letter-shapes except I.G., II², 174 (405/4 B.C.), which employs a similar technique. Zeta type 2 is found in an inscription dated in 415 B.C., but is not common after 435 B.C. In other respects the letter-shapes are consistent with a date in the late 420's or in the 410's. The contents and context of this decree, however, place it after 414/3 B.C. and probably as late as 407/6 B.C. (see below).

407/6 B.C.?

Stoich. 31

- [.....²³.....]χ[.]λα[.⁴...]
- [ἔδοχσεν τῷ βολῇ καὶ] τ[ὸ]ι δέμοι, Ἀκαμ[α]-
 [ντὶς ἐπρυτάνευε, Φελ?]λεὺς ἐγγραμμάτ[ευ]-
 [ε, Ἀντιγένης? ἔρχε, Σι]βύρτιος ἐπεστά[τε],
- 5 [....!¹⁰.... εἶπε? ἐς τ]ὲν ποίεσιν τῶν γ[ε]-
 [ὄν δανεῖσαι τὸς στρα]τεγὸς τὸς μετὰ Πε-
 [ρικλέος? ἀργύριον παρ]ὰ τῶν [[τῶν]] ὄντων ἀ-
 [ποδεκτῶν τοῖς ναυπεγ]οῖς· ἡ δ' ἂν δανεί-
 [σοσιν, ἀποδόντων αὐτο]ῖς κάλιν ἡοι τρι-
- 10 [εροποιοί· τὸς δὲ τεταγ]μένος πλεν ἐπὶ τ-
 [ὲν πλέροσιν τῶν νεῶν ἡ]ος τάχιστα ἀποσ-
 [τελάντων ἡοι στρατεγ]οί· εἰ δὲ μέ, ἐσαγό-
 [σθον προδοσίας ἐς τὸ δ]ικαστέριον· ἡο[ι]
 [δὲ στρατεγοὶ περὶ τῷ] μὲ ἐθέλοντος ἀπι-
- 15 [εῖναι ἐσαγόντων· τῆς δ]ὲ κομιδῆς τῶν νεῶ-
 [ν, ἡς ἂν ἡοι ναυπεγοὶ] ἐγ Μακεδονίας στ-
 [έλλοσι, τὲν βολὲν ἐπὶ]μελεθῆναι, ἡόπος
 [ἂν σταλῶσιν ἡος τάχιστα] Ἀθέναζε καὶ π-
 [λεροθῶσι καὶ ἐπὶ Ἰονί]αν κομίζεται ἡε
- 20 [στρατὶα φυλάχσοσα φυ]λακὲν τὲν ἀρίστ-
 [εν· εἰ δὲ τις μὲ ποέσει] κατὰ ταῦτα, ὀφέλ-
 [εν ...³...ίας δραχμὰς αὐτὸ]ν ἡιεράς τῷ Ἀθ-
 [εναίαι· τῷ δὲ πρότοι ἐλθ]όντι καὶ κομ[ι]-

[σαμένοι ναῦν δοῦναι δορεᾶν] καθάπε[ρ δο]-
 25 [κῆι τῷ δέμοι· ἐπειδὲ δὲ Ἀρχέ]λα[ς καὶ νῦ]-
 [ν καὶ ἐν τῷ ἐμπρόσθεν χ]ρῶνοι ἐστ[ιν ἀν]-
 [ἔρ ἀγαθὸς περὶ Ἀθηναί]ος τὸς τε ἐκπλ[εύ]-
 [σαντας ναυπεγὸς ἀνέλ]αβεν καὶ ἐς το[.²]
 [.....¹⁸.....] ἀπέπεμψεν καὶ
 30 [.....¹⁷.....τ]ὸ στρατόπεδον κ-
 [αὶ ἔδοκεν αὐτοῖς χούλ]α καὶ κοπέας καὶ
 [ἄλλα ὅσον ἐδέοντο παρ']αὐτῷ ἀγαθὰ, ἐπα-
 [ινέσαι Ἀρχέ]λαι ἡος ὄν]τι ἀνδρὶ ἀγαθῷ
 [καὶ προθύμοι ποιῆν ἡό]τι δύναται ἀγαθ-
 35 [όν, καὶ ἀνθ'ὄν εὐεργέτε]κεν τέν τε πόλιν
 [καὶ τὸν δῆμον τὸν Ἀθηνα]ῖον ἀναγράφσα-
 [ι αὐτὸν καὶ παῖδας προχσένο]ς καὶ εὐερ-
 [γέτας ἐμ πόλει ἐστέλεν λιθίνε]ν κα[ὶ ἐπ]-
 [ιμέλεσθαι αὐτὸν -----]

COMMENTARY. This document is in two parts: after a
 preamble (lines 2-5), the first section (lines 5-25) deals
 with arrangements for the construction in Makedonia of a
 number of ships, and for their despatch to Athens to be
 fitted out; penalties are laid down for non-performance
 and a reward is to be given to the first shipwright who

completes and brings back a ship to Athens. The ships, when they reach Athens, are to be used to ferry an army across to Ionia; hence the need for haste. The reconstruction of these lines I have based on that printed in the most recent publication of this document, that of Meiggs and Lewis (loc.cit.). Where necessary I indicate points of difference between their readings of the stone and mine. The general sense of these lines, however, is clear; since it does not affect the interpretation of lines 25 ff., I shall not comment upon it at any length. The final section (lines 25ff.) contains the acknowledgment of King Archelas' assistance to Athens in this matter of ship-building and the grant to him and to his sons of a proxeny and euergesia. With this I shall deal at greater length below.

The bibliography is largely concerned with the date of this document: the preamble contains space for an archon-formula (line 4); before the involvement of King Archelas was known, Kirchhoff (loc.cit.) restored the name of the archon Epameinon (429/8 B.C.). Once Archelas' involvement as principal was known (first suggested by Loeschke, loc.cit.), any date before his accession to the throne became impossible. His accession was probably in 414 B.C., certainly no later than 410 B.C. (see Beloch, Gr.Gesch., III, 2 [1923], p. 55). Wilhelm (1903) referred this document to the events of 411/0

when Theramenes gave assistance to Archelas in the neighbourhood of Pella (Xenophon, Hellenika, I, 1.2; Diodoros, XIII, 49.1). From the preamble of this decree, however, it can be inferred that the democracy was in power in Athens: if the year is 411/0 B.C. (with the name of Theopompos restored in the archon-formula in line 4) the prytanizing tribe would have been either Aiantis or Aigeis: only two tribal prytanies were possible in that part of the year in which Theopompos held the archonship after democracy was restored (see Meritt [1932], pp. 106-110; I.G., I², p. 298). Since part of the tribal name Akamantis is preserved in line 2, the year 411/0 B.C. is thus ruled out. Meritt (1936) suggested that the name of the archon Antigenes (407/6 B.C.) be restored in line 4. The only other archon-name possible is Euktemon (408/7 B.C.), and then only if we restore [ἐρχεν] rather than [ἐρχε] in the archon-formula. Line 1. Faint traces of what may be letter-strokes, which have not previously been reported, appear above the first line of the preamble. What they are it is impossible to say with certainty: above the first mu surviving in line 2 there is the foot of a left diagonal; it seems a little too far to the right and perhaps too high to be part of an alpha or a gamma; it could, however, be part of a chi. In the next

stoichos but one to the right is the bottom of a left hasta; in the next stoichos to the right is the toe of a right diagonal. I suggest that these letters are chi, lambda and alpha and that parts of the name Archelas appear here. This line might thus be the final line of a heading, perhaps ending with the names of Archelas' sons who are also granted the proxenia (see line 37). The whole heading might then be something like that of #36, e.g.: [Ἀρχέλας Περδίκκο
 ὁ Μακεδὼν πρόχσεν|ος καὶ εὐεργέτης Ἀθηναίων. -----
 καὶ -----οι Ἀρ]χ[ε]λ[α][ο]. Alternatively, these
 letters might be part of the end of an earlier decree.

Line 2. Part of the left hasta of a mu survives on the break. This line establishes the line-length for the whole decree, providing that the preamble began at the left end of the line (see below).

Line 3. [Φελ]λεὺς was first restored by Wilhelm (1923); the only occurrence of this name is in a fourth-century funerary inscription (I.G., II², 4221). There are faint traces to the left of lambda that could be the tip of another lambda.

Line 4. I have already discussed the restoration of an archon-formula in this line (see above); there are so few instances of archon-formulae before 421 B.C. that the appearance of one here would be a reasonable argument for a date after 421/0 B.C., when archon-formulae became common,

even if the restoration of the name of King Archelas in line 33 did not preclude a date before 414 B.C. (see below). The restoration of the name [Σι]βύρτιος was first proposed by Kirchhoff (loc.cit.). The right-hand side of beta is preserved on the break. The upper and lower apices of the final sigma of this name are preserved, as are the tips of all three horizontals of the following epsilon.

Line 5. Meritt (op.cit., p. 249) restores the name of Alkibiades as proposer, since this man was in Athens in the summer of 407 B.C. and much concerned with the defence of Ionia. However, any ten-letter name is possible, as for that matter, is any nine-letter name, since one may restore either [εἶπε] or [εἶπεν].

Lines 5-10. The text adopted by Meiggs and Lewis is that put forward by Kirchhoff (loc.cit.) and improved by Wilhelm in 1924. In line 5 the bottom of the first upright of the final nu is visible. In line 6 the bottom left corner of epsilon survives, making the restoration of the name of Perikles the Younger attractive; the full roster of generals for 407/6 B.C. is not known, nor is it otherwise known whether Perikles was general in this year; he was, however, elected general in the following year, 406/5 B.C. (Xenophon, Hellenika, I, 5.16; Diodoros, XIII, 74.1). Wilhelm (op.cit., pp.146-147) pointed out that the letters ΜΕΤΑΠ could be read as either μετὰ Π- or μετ' Ἀπ-; Hiller (I.G., I², 105)

suggested the restoration of the name Perikles. In line 7 all previous editors read τὸν ν[ῦ]ν ὄντων ; in fact, the letter read as the first nu of this phrase is a tau, the central vertical and part of the horizontal being quite clear. The stoichos to the right of this is badly abraded, but in a roughly circular pattern. I conclude that the mason inscribed τὸν twice here.

Lines 10-21. Wilhelm (op.cit., pp. 144-145) amended Kirchhoff's incomplete text. His readings were adopted by Hiller (I.G., I², 105), except in line 14, where Wilhelm and Kirchhoff read [πρυτάνεις] and Hiller read [ἡλιασταί]; Meritt's [στρατεγοί] is better (loc.cit.), and is adopted by Meiggs and Lewis. In line 18 Hiller's [σταλῶσιν ἡος] is preferable to Wilhelm's [κομισθῶσι ὅς].

At the left edge in lines 14, 15 and 16 the right sides of letters bracketed by previous editors survive. In line 17 the second epsilon, though abraded, is readable.

Lines 21-24. Once the join with fragment b was made, Wilhelm was able to expand Kirchhoff's text (loc.cit.). Meritt's reading of line 25 is preferable to Wilhelm's κομ[ῆσαντι κοπέας] . In line 22 Kirchhoff proposed [χιλίας] , while Wilhelm and Hiller preferred [μυρίας] . Either is possible. In line 24 the tip of the upper arm of kappa survives, followed by the apex of alpha. Theta, alpha and pi are unquestionable, though broken away at the bottom. The upper left corner of epsilon survives. My reading of line 25, in

which previous editors have read nothing, necessitates a change from the aorist [ἔδοχσεν] to the present [δοκῇ].

There is nothing in the decree before this to suggest that the demos had laid down a reward, so that the present tense is perfectly satisfactory: the size of the reward will be decided when the ships arrive.

Lines 25-39. Loeschke (loc.cit.) first suggested the restoration of Archelas' name in lines 25 and 33.

In line 25 there are traces of two letters: above the iota of line 26 there is part of the diagonal of a lambda: there are, in fact, two parallel strokes here, of which the longer is too low to be part of a letter; the upper is correctly positioned and at the right angle for lambda. Above the epsilon of line 26, to the right of lambda, there is a right diagonal foot; there are several confused marks in this stoichos, above and below this stroke, but none of them is correctly placed for a letter-stroke. I think that these two letters are part of the name [Ἀρχέ]λα[ς]. The restoration of these lines previously put forward can still be fitted in, if [ἐμπροσθεν] rather than [πρόσθεν] be read in line 26: this word is restored by Lewis in I.G., I², 101, line 16 (B.S.A., XLIX [1954], p. 30); I have been unable to find any other parallel, but neither have I been able to improve upon Lewis' text for I.G., I², 101. Alternatively,

one might follow Wilhelm (loc.cit.) [$\nu\tilde{\upsilon}\nu$ τε καὶ ἐν τῷ
 πρόσθεν χρ]ό[ν]οι ; this would produce the restoration
 [καὶ $\nu\tilde{\upsilon}\nu$ τε καὶ ἐν τῷ πρόσθεν χ]ρόνοι , in which the
 first καί (or τε) is tautological. The bottom of the
 vertical of rho and the lower curve of omicron are visible.
 At the end of this line the bottom of the vertical of tau
 survives.

Line 27. Only the right side of the first omicron and the
 lower part of the vertical, with perhaps a trace of the
 diagonal, of final lambda can be seen.

Line 28. Wilhelm (loc.cit.): ἐκ[λεύσαντας Ἀθηναίων].
 [ναυπεγός] , proposed by Meritt (op.cit., p. 248), is per-
 haps better: these men were already in Makedonia, and it
 is for his help to them that Archelas is being praised.
 The right toe of the first alpha is visible at the left
 edge of the stone.

Lines 28-30. καὶ ἐς τὸ [ἐπὶ Πύδναι στρατόπεδον] ἀπέπεμψεν
 κα[ῖ] εὖ ἐπόεσεν Ἀθηναίων τ]ὸ στρατόπεδον Wilhelm
 (loc.cit.); καὶ ἐς τὸ [νεόριον τὸ ἐν⁹] ἀπέπεμψεν
 κα[ῖ] κατέστειλεν ἐς τὸ αὐτ]ὸ στρατόπεδον Meritt (loc.cit.).

Meiggs and Lewis do not restore these lines. Wilhelm's
 restoration of the name of Pydna was occasioned by his
 selection of the date 411/0 B.C.: he believed that this
 section referred to events in the neighbourhood of Pydna,

when Theramenes assisted Archelas there (see above, p. 605). The lowering of the date to 407/6 B.C. makes the restoration of Pydna much less likely. I think Meritt to be probably on the right track: he implies by his restoration that "the shipwrights had been received by Archelaos, and sent on to the dockyard at-----, and located by him at his own army quarters" (p. 248 note 8). He suggests either Herakleion or Bormiskos as possible sites for the dockyard. Only the right sides of alpha and omicron survive at the left edge of the stone in lines 29 and 30 respectively. Lines 30-39. This restoration was first made by Wilhelm (loc.cit.). In line 33 the right tip only of the horizontal of tau is visible; likewise, in line 34. In line 35 the tip of the bottom arm of kappa survives. In line 36 the top of iota is preserved at the left edge. In line 37 the tops of the last three letters survive, though the loop of final rho has broken away. In line 38 previous editors (except Wilhelm) restored [ἐστέλει λιθίνει] ; my reading of the stone confirms Wilhelm's [ἐστέλεν λιθίνην], since the top left corner and part of the right hasta of nu survive. The top of kappa is visible next to it, followed by the tip of the apex of alpha.

#66. Proxeny. 405/4 B.C. Honours for Polypos of Gortyna
(or Gortys).

Pl.XVII,3

BIBLIOGRAPHY. I.G., II, 200 (1877); Svoronos, A.N.M., Tafelbd., III (1903), pl. CCXXVII.2; Wilhelm, Urk.Dram. (1906), pp. 32-33; Walter, Beiblatt (1911), p. 59; Beiblatt (1915), p. 98; I.G., I², 125 (1924); Haggard, Secretaries (1930), p. 23 #51; Ferguson, Treasurers (1932), p. 34 note 2; Binneboessel, Urkundenreliefs (1932), pp. 7,43 #20; Svoronos, A.N.M., Textebd., III (1937), p. 671 #457.2; S.E.G., X (1949), 144; Dohrn, Attische Plastik (1957), p. 33; Lambrechts, Proxeni edcreten (1958), pp. 28-29, 33, 36, 38, 43, 48, 62, 126, 152.

PHOTOGRAPHS. Svoronos (1903), pl. CCXXVII. 2 (fragment b); Wilhelm, op.cit., p. 32 (fragment c). No photograph has so far been published of fragment a or of the three fragments together.

Three congruent fragments of Pentelic marble, now set in plaster. They were first joined by Walter (1911). The foliation is at right angles to the face, running diagonally from top right to bottom left, marked by bands of dark and light stone. Fragments a and b preserve parts of a relief that survives to about half its full height;

they also contain part of the heading of the decree.

Fragment c, which joins fragment a at bottom right and fragment b at bottom left, preserves part of the heading and the text of the decree. Fragments a and b join laterally, above fragment c. The scene depicted in low relief is of three figures only: on the right is a male figure, in profile, clad in a himation, apparently shoeless. His weight is on his left foot; his right leg is slightly flexed, only the toes resting on the ground behind the left foot. Facing him, also in profile, is the seated figure of Athena. Her shield lies beside her, resting against the edge of her throne. Between these two figures, neither of which is preserved above the middle, are the feet of a third person who stands in profile, facing right towards Athena. This, presumably, is the honorand Polypos, while the figure at the left must represent the patron-deity of Polypos' city: either Apollo, patron of Gortyna in Krete, where he had an oracle, or the hero Gortys, eponym of Gortys in Arkadia. The preserved height of the relief is 0.150m.

There is no moulding between the bottom of the relief and the inscribed face: the relief is cut directly into the face of the stele, a narrow vertical band of stone being left uncut at the left edge; presumably there was a similar band at the right edge. The inscribed face bears a heading

in large letters containing the name of the archon Alexias (405/4 B.C.). Below this is an uninscribed space 0.060m. high. Two further lines carry the title, naming the honorand; below these there is a vertical uninscribed space 0.028m. high, before the text of the decree begins.

Fragment a, EM 3169, was copied by Koehler in the Tower of the Winds and first published by him in 1877 as I.G., II, 200. Its original provenance is unknown. The left edge and back are preserved.

H.max. 0.270m. W.max. 0.232m. Th. 0.125m.

Fragment b, EM 255, is of unknown provenance. It was first published by Walter (loc.cit.), who joined it to fragments a and c. Part of the back is preserved; otherwise, it is broken on all sides.

H.max. 0.325m. W.max. 0.365m. Th. 0.125m.

Fragment c, EM 2792, is of unknown provenance. It was first published by Walter (loc.cit.). Part of the back is preserved; otherwise, it is broken on all sides.

H.max. 0.240m. W.max. 0.240m. Th. 0.125m.

Combined dimensions: H.max. 0.420m. W.max. 0.595m. Th. 0.125m.

Letter-height, line 1 0.018m.; lines 2-3 0.013m.-0.014m.;

lines 4ff. 0.010m.-0.011m. Chequer, lines 4ff. 0.0162m.x
0.0163m. Lines 1, 2 and 3 are non-stoichedon; the vertical
chequer between lines 2 and 3 is 0.0128m.

Letter-shapes. A3 and 4, B3, E4 and 5, H1, Θ3 and 4, K2,
M2, N7 and 9, O2, Π1, P8 and 9, Σ7, Υ7, Φ4, Χ3, Ω3. Ionic
script, dated by the archon-formula in line 1 to 405/4 B.C.
By the same hand may be I.G., II², 87, a decree whose date
is uncertain; it is certainly earlier than 385 B.C.,
however.

405/4 B.C.

Relief

Non-stoich.

Ἀλεξίας: ἦ[ρχε].

vacat

[Π]όλυπος Μενεσθέως [ὁ? Γορτύνιος]

[πρ]όξενος καὶ εὐεργέτης [Ἀθηναίων].

vacat

Stoich. 38

[ἔδοξε]ν τῇ βολῇ καὶ τῷ [δήμῳ, Αἰγῆις ἐπρυτάν]-
5 [εὐε, Πο]λυάρατος Χολαργ[εὺς ἐγγραμμάτευε, ..⁵...]-
[..³. Ἀρ]αφήνιος ἐπεστ[άτε, ...⁶... εἶπεν· ἐπειδ]-
[ὴ πρόξ]ενός ἐστιν Ἀθη[ναίων καὶ εὐεργέτης Πολυ]-
[πος ὁ? Γορτ]ύνιος κα[ὶ εὖ ποῖ Ἀθηναίος, ἀναγράψα]-
[ι ἐστήληι λι]θίνῃ[ι τὴν προξενίαν αὐτῷ καὶ θεῖν]-
[αι ἐμ πόλει τ]ὸν γ[ραμματέα τῆς βολῆς·⁹....]

COMMENTARY. Line-length is established by the restoration of lines 4-9.

Line 1. Between the name and the eta there are two punctuation-dots, not previously recorded. I do not believe that there is enough space to restore $\tilde{\eta}[\rho\chi\epsilon\nu]$ rather than $\tilde{\eta}[\rho\chi\epsilon]$. The space between sigma and eta is considerably less than that between the letters of the name, indicating that the remaining letters of this line were cramped together. I calculate the approximate full width of the stele as 0.620m., allowing a space of ca 0.140m. for the letters $[\rho\chi\epsilon]$: the distance between sigma and eta is 0.045m.; this spacing would be too great even for the three letters $[\rho\chi\epsilon]$, and I suspect that the interval between these letters was ca 0.035m.; this is the distance between the punctuation-sign and eta.

Line 2. The fifth letter of the honorand's name is clearly pi, not beta: the top bar is complete with no sign of curving down, and a small part of the right vertical stroke survives at right-angles to this horizontal. The spacing of this line grows progressively less towards the right, so that I think that there will be room enough for the article as well as the ethnic: the space available is ca

0.190m. Hiller (I.G., I², 125) restores without the article. The initial letter of the honorand's name has always been restored as a pi; I have been unable to find any other name of this length and termination having a different initial letter. The name Polypos is not otherwise known.

Line 3. Hiller prints the first two letters of this line without brackets; this is incorrect. The upper apex of sigma is visible at the right edge of the stone on the break.

Line 4. The top of final iota is visible. The tribe of the epistates is known from the demotic in line 6; thus the name of the prytany of Aigeis must be restored here (see Ferguson, loc.cit.; Haggard, loc.cit., is muddled and incorrect in her attributions for this year).

Line 5. Polyaratos of Cholargos was hellenotamias in 410/09 B.C. (I.G., I², 304.21). His tribe was Akamantis.

Line 6. The left tip of the horizontal of tau is visible at the right edge.

Lines 6-10. Except for the honorand's name in lines 7-8 (restored by Walter [1915]), the restoration of these lines is that of Wilhelm (1906).

Line 8. The tip of the right arm of upsilon is visible on the break at the left edge, thus confirming Wilhelm's suggestion (loc.cit.) that the correct restoration is probab-

ly [Γορτ]ύνιος . The nu following it is broken away at the bottom, but parts of all three letter-strokes survive. The restoration [Κορτ]ύνιος is also possible; this is the ethnic of the town of Kortys in Arkadia, a few miles north-west of Megalopolis: its name is also spelt Gortys.

Line 9. The top of the left hasta of eta can be read at the right edge.

Line 10. The right upper curve of omicron survives, followed by the top of nu and the upper left corner of gamma.

The honorand is either a Cretan or an Arcadian. From the text of this inscription it is clear that he was already a proxenos at the time that he was honoured; thus, the date of the original grant of proxeny is not ascertainable.

While the grant of a new proxeny in Arkadia at this late point in the war is unlikely, the grant of additional honours to an Arcadian, perhaps because he was now in exile, is not to be ruled out as a possibility. There exists a dedication of the early fifth century by a certain Thraix Kortynios (I.G., I², 488); whether this man was a Cretan or an Arcadian is unknown: both Arcadian Kortys (Gortys) and Cretan Gortyna had the ethnics Κορτύνιος and Γορτύνιος .

While no evidence exists for Athenian involvement in the affairs of the Arcadian city, we do know, however, of an earlier connexion with the Cretan state: in 429 B.C. a certain

Nikias, Athenian proxenos in Gortyna, persuaded Athens to send a force of twenty ships to attack the territories of another Cretan city, Kydonia; these ships were intended to reinforce the general Phormion in his operations in the Gulf of Corinth, but their diversion to Krete prevented their arrival in the Gulf until after the battle of Naupaktos (Thucydides, II, 85.5-6).

It is, in my opinion, very possible that Nikias' proxeny was an hereditary one and that the Polypos of the present document was a relative: Gortyna was the site of an oracle of Apollo; in such oracular centres hereditary links between certain families and specific foreign states were a frequent occurrence.

What exactly were the services rendered to Athens at this late date in the War is unknown, but it seems likely that, like many other Cretans, Nikias and Polypos were merchants, possibly in the grain-trade; as such, they would have had ample opportunity to be of assistance to Athens.

#67. Proxeny. ca 430-405 B.C. Honours for an unknown man.

Pl.XVII,4

BIBLIOGRAPHY. Pittakys, E.A., 28(1842), p. 592 #1039; Rangabé, A.H., II (1855), p.208#528; I.G., II, 33 (1877); Wilhelm, Hermes, XXIV (1889), p. 116 notes 1 and 2; I.G., II², 73 (1913); I.G., II², Addenda (1916), p. 657 #73; Weston, A.J.P., LXI (1940), pp. 354-357; Raubitschek, Dedications (1949), p. 190; S.E.G., X (1949), 117; Lambrechts, Proxeni edecreten (1958), pp. 77, 79-80; S.E.G., XII (1955), 35.

PHOTOGRAPHS. None so far published.

EM 6926, fragment of blue-white marble, broken on all sides, but possibly preserving part of the original rough-picked back. It was found on November 18, 1830, in excavations east of the Erechtheion on the Akropolis and was first published by Pittakys (loc.cit.).

Foliation is vertical and parallel to the face.

H.max. 0.205m. W.max. 0.235m. Th.max. 0.067m. Letter-height 0.008m.-0.010m. Chequer 0.0124m.x 0.0156m.

Letter-shapes. A3 and 4, B3, E5, H1, Θ3 and 4, M1-2, N7 and 9, O1 and 2, Π1, P8, Σ8, Y7 and 8, Φ4, Ω2.

Ionic script, the letters having slight serifs at the ends of straight strokes. The hand is distinctive, with upwards-curving rather than level horizontal chequer-guides. The letters vary in size, tau especially being shorter than other letters. There is nothing in the script to suggest that this decree was inscribed in the fifth century, though lines 8-9 establish that the text was indited at a time when Athens still possessed an empire (see below). I believe that I.G., II², 58 is by the same hand; its date is unknown, but the use of a demotic in its preamble to identify the secretary suggests that it should be placed after 404/3 B.C. The neatness and clarity of these inscriptions, however, are better-suited to the early years of the fourth century than to the period after 385 B.C. The hand is also the same as that of I.G., I², 398 and #60 (both dated to 408/7 B.C., the former securely). I.G., II², 54 (dated before 385 B.C. by its content) is by a very similar hand.

ca 430-405 B.C. (possibly inscribed ca 400 B.C.) Stoich.27

[...¹¹.....]ξ[.....¹⁵.]
 [...⁹.....]καλλικ[.....¹².]
 [. ἐγγραμμ]άτευε, θεοφα[.....¹¹.....]
 [...⁴ κ]αὶ προσγράψαι[.....¹¹.....]
 5 [...³.]ἰ ἐν τῇ στήλῃ γ[.....⁹..... τὸ]
 [ν γ]ραμματέα τῆς βολ[ῆς τὸ ψήφισμα]
 [Τ]εισαμενοῦ· ἐάν τις [.....⁹..... ἀπ]-
 [ο]κτείνῃ βιαίωι [θ]αν[άτῳ ἢ δόσῃ]
 [ἢ ἄγ]ῃ ἐν τῶν πόλεων π[ο ὧν Ἀθηναῖο]-
 10 [ι κρατοῦσιν] εἶναι αὐτὸ[ν⁹.....]
 [.....⁷.. Ἀθ]ηναίων τ[.....¹⁰.....]

COMMENTARY. The line-length is given by the restoration of a well-known formula in lines 7-10. These lines establish that the original decree was indited in the fifth century, while Athens still had her empire.

Lines 1-4. These lines seem to contain a preamble: from the probable restoration of lines 4-7 it appears likely that this was not the first decree engraved on this stele: my interpretation of these lines is that Teisamenes had proposed a decree awarding honours, perhaps the proxeny itself, to the honorand who is named

in line 7; at the request of this man, and at a later date, a clause was added by decree of the [Boule and] People guaranteeing his person against violence (lines 7-12). Thus, there is no particular reason why the decree authorizing the addition of this clause should start at the beginning of a line, though it would be possible to restore a preamble in this way:

405/4 B.C.

[ἔδοξεν {τῷ δῆμῳ
τῇ βολῇ}, ἱπποθωντὶς ἐπρ]-
[υτάνευεν, Ἀλε]ξ[ίας ἤρχεν, ...?.....]-
[. ἐπεστάτε,]Καλλικ[.....!?......]-
[. ἐγγραμμ]άτευε, Θεοφα[---- εἶπεν· κτλ.]

Alternatively, the full formula [ἔδοξεν τῇ βολῇ καὶ τῷ δῆμῳ, κτλ.] could be restored, starting in the middle of a line, as, for example, in I.G., I², 57. Another alternative is to read the single letter in line 1 as part of the name of the epistates, who would be identified by demotic, as is the secretary. Such a formulation is found only at the end of the fifth century, in #66 (405/4 B.C.) and I.G., I², 126 (405/4-403/2 B.C.); the earliest example in the fourth century in

which both secretary and epistates are identified by demotic occurs in 386/5 B.C. (I.G., II², 31), though in I.G., II², 16 (394/3 B.C.) the secretary alone is identified by demotic (and patronymic).

Line 1. There is a very clear horizontal stroke here, above the first lambda of line 2. It begins well to the left of the vertical of epsilon in line 3 below it, and there is no trace of any vertical stroke at its left end. Unfortunately, the stone breaks away just left of the centre of this stoichos, but there is a faint horizontal stroke 0.004m. above this stroke: this interval corresponds to that between the middle and lower bars of epsilon in this inscription. I therefore read a dotted xi here. It is unlikely, because of its position, to be part of the opening formula of a preamble; it is probably, therefore, part of a name or demotic: [Ἀλε]ξ[ία]ς ἡρχεν,....?.... ἐπεστάτε] is one possible restoration, providing the date 405/4 B.C. The only fifth-century examples, in the time of the Empire, in which the epistates is identified by demotic are also dated to 405/4 B.C. (I.G., I², 126,I, and #66). Thus, there is a reasonably strong possibility that, even if the restoration of an archon-formula is avoided, the identification of the

epistates by demotic thus ensuing will place this decree in 405/4 B.C.: we possess several dated decrees of the decade prior to 405/4 B.C.; in none of them is the epistates identified by demotic. On historical grounds, too, 405/4 B.C. is an attractive date: the general uncertainty of Athens' position could well have prompted one of her partisans to seek additional reassurances at the beginning of this year, when Athens, though weak, still possessed a fleet capable of punishing those who had harmed her friends. After Aigospotamoi, of course, this was no longer the case.

Line 2. The bottom of the lower arm of a kappa survives at left edge. Possible names here are Kallikles, Kallikratides, Kallikydes and Kallikrates; the last name was borne by the orator of I.G., II², 1138/9, dated a little after 403/2 B.C. (P.A., I, 7949).

Line 3. The bottom of the right foot of alpha survives at the left edge. as does the left foot of alpha at the right edge. Weston (op.cit., p. 356) restores Θεοφ[.... εἶπε] This, I am sure, is basically correct: the names Theophanes and Theophantos are both possible restorations, but only Theophanes will fit Weston's version. A man of this name is listed in a catalogue of

thiasiotai dated at the beginning of the fourth century (I.G., II², 2343).

Lines 3-4. Kirchner (I.G., II², 73) restores Θεόφ-
[.....!!.....].³. εἶπε· προσγράψα[ι κτλ.] Wilhelm (I.G., II², Addenda, p. 657) follows Kirchner. Weston's restoration is Θεοφ[...⁴... εἶπε· ἐξεῖναι κ]αἰ προσγράψα[ι κτλ.].

My reading of the stone confirms that of Weston, whose restorations in part I have therefore adopted. I do not know of any name that would permit the adoption of Kirchner's version. I believe, however, that the restoration [εἶπεν· ἐξεῖναι κ]αἰ is better: see line 10, where the spelling is εἶναι rather than εἶναι.

Lines 4-6. προσγράψα[ι εἰς τὸ ψήφισμα τὸ] ἐν τῇ στήλῃ
γ[εγραμμένον τὸν γ]ραμματέα τῆς βολ[ῆς τὸ ψήφισμα]
Τ]εισαμενοῦ Kirchner; προσγράψα[ι πρὸς τοῖς πρότερον]
ἐν τῇ στήλῃ γ[εγραμμένοις τὸν γ]ραμματέα τῆς βολῆς
[τὸ ψήφισμα τὸ Τ]εισαμενοῦ Wilhelm; προσγράψα[ι εἰς
τὰ ἄλλα ἃ ἐστὶ] ἐν τῇ στήλῃ γ[εγραμμένα τὸν γ]ραμματέα
τῆς βολῆς τὸ ψήφισμα Τ]εισαμενοῦ Weston; προσγράψα[ι
πρὸς τ' ἄλλα κτλ.] Wilhelm (S.E.G., X, 117 note). Wilhelm's emendation of Weston's restoration seems to imply that he had abandoned his earlier suggestions; certainly, the version he first put forward removes the anomaly at the

end of line 6 (the absence of a second $\tau\acute{o}$),
 but his resulting twenty-nine letter line forces him
 to adopt an unparalleled formula in lines 8-9
 (see below) and curious orthography in lines 10-11.
 I think Weston's text to be the best so far offered.
 Lines 7-10. The formulae here are well-attested
 for proxy-decrees of the fifth century; the
 restoration is that of Kirchner. Weston (loc.cit.)
 identified Teisamenos as the orator of a similar
 document incorporated in #56 (dated 411/0 B.C.), as
 restored by Wilhelm (Jahreshefte, XXI-XXII [1923] ,
 pp. 149-150). This decree is in favour of a certain
 Pythophanes; Weston therefore restored the name of
 Pythophanes in line 7 of the present document;
 Teisamenos' decree would thus have been that naming
 Pythophanes as proxenos. I think this conjecture
 to be unlikely; I have already argued for
 the possibility that the stele of the present decree

contained Teisamenos' original motion, as well as that here extant; the restoration offered by Wilhelm for line 1 of #56 is by no means certain; in fact, I believe that Lewis' version is better (ap. de Ste.-Croix, Historia, V [1956], p. 18): this removes Teisamenos from the running. Moreover, if Weston's conjectures are right, then surely the wording of both #56 and the present decree implies that both were to be inscribed on the same stele. This is certainly not the case: the decrees are on two different stelai. The name Teisamenos is fairly common: Andokides (I, 83) quotes a decree that was moved by a man of this name in 403/2 B.C. (see P.A., II, 13443); he may well be the orator of the original decree of #67. Other candidates are P.A., II, 13447 (tamias in 414/3 B.C.) and P.A., II, 13444 (tamias in 375/4 B.C.). The name of the honorand cannot be restored: it is possible, in fact, to restore the end of line 7 without a name: ἐάν τις [τινα αὐτῶν ἀπ]- , though I believe that a name is more likely here.

In line 8 Weston read the first kappa without a dot; only the bottom of the lower arm of this letter survives, thus making the reading of kappa uncertain. At the end of this line the bottom of the left hasta of nu survives.

In line 9 the bottom of the right hasta of eta survives. Wilhelm (I.G., II², Addenda, p. 657) restores lines 7-11: ἔάν τις [.....!1..... ἀπρ]κτείνῃ βιαίῳι
[θ]ανάτῳι ἢ δῆσῃι ἢ εἴρῃῃι ἐν τῶν πόλεων π[ο ὅσων
Ἀθηναῖοι κρατῶσιν], ἔναι αὐτὸ[ν πολέμιον τοῦ]δήμου τῷ Ἀθη[ναί]ων.

This enables him to use a twenty-nine letter line, but [εἴρῃῃι] is unparalleled in this formula; moreover, nothing in the extant portion of the decree warrants the spelling [τοῦ δήμου]. I have therefore adopted the text of these lines first proposed by Weston (loc.cit.) For lines 10-13 the restorations of Kirchner and Weston are the likeliest so far put forward:

10 [-----] ἔναι αὐτὸ[ν πολέμιον, φ]-
 [εὐγεν δε Ἀθη]ναίῳ[ν τὴν πόλιν καὶ τ]-
 [ἄς ἄλλας πόλεις ὅσαι Ἀθηναίων ἐσὶ]-
 [ν σύμμαχοι].

In line 10 the top of the right hasta of eta survives before nu at the left, while at the right the top of the right hasta of nu is visible, followed by the left half of the horizontal and part of the vertical of tau. The formulae are unparalleled, but no other suitable restoration comes to mind.

#68. Proxeny. ca 420-400 B.C. Honours for two political exiles.

Pl.XVII,5

BIBLIOGRAPHY. I.G., II, 5 #73¹ (1895); Wilhelm, Beiblatt (1898), p. 45; I.G., II², 48 (1913); I.G., II², Addenda, p. 657 (1918); Wilhelm, Jahreshefte, XXI-XXII (1923), pp. 153-154; I.G., I², 106a (1924); Lambrechts, Proxeni edecreten (1958), pp. 27, 31, 85, 87, 102, 117, 123, 125, 152; Pečírka, Enktesis (1966), pp. 17-18; S.E.G., XXIV (1969), 17.

PHOTOGRAPHS. None so far published.

Two joining fragments of blue-white marble. They were joined by Wilhelm (1898), but fragment a was soon afterwards lost. Foliation is vertical and parallel to the face, marked by alternate layers of dark and light stone.

Fragment a is of unknown provenance; it was first published by Koehler as I.G., II, 5 #73¹ in 1895. It was reported as being broken on all sides, but its dimensions were not recorded. According to Wilhelm (loc.cit.), it joined the left side of fragment b. The text of both fragments was first published by Kirchner in 1913 (I.G., II², 48) from Wilhelm's transcript.

Fragment b, EM 2626, is also of unknown provenance. It is broken on all sides, but may preserve part of the original back. It was first published by Kirchner in 1913 (loc.cit.). There is a vertical uninscribed space of 0.210m. below the last preserved line of this fragment. H.max. 0.335m. W.max. 0.245m. Th.max. 0.133m. Letter-height 0.011m. Chequer 0.0127m.x 0.0146m.

Letter-shapes. A5, E4, Θ2, K2, N7, O2, Π1, P8, Σ8, Y7, Ω3. Ionic script, very well-cut, employing chisels of two sizes only (0.011m. and 0.007m. wide); the hand is thus very regular and distinctive. Drilled omicron type 2 is rare after 430 B.C.; the latest dated example known to me occurs in 420 B.C. (see table 4, p. 86). Omega type 3 is found rarely in the mid-420's and early 410's (see I.G., I², 25 and #34 and #35); thereafter it becomes common. I know of no inscription whose hand is identical that of #68, but the hands employed in #34 and #35 are very similar and may represent early work by the same mason or from the same workshop; I.G., I², 110a (410/09 B.C.) is by an almost identical hand (differing only in the size of omicron and the shape of nu); I.G., II², 13 (399/8 B.C.) is very similar, and two undated early fourth-century documents, I.G., II², 24 and 1151,

are quite close. The context of #68 suggests a date late in the fifth century (see below), but the letter-shapes do not exclude a date as early as 420 B.C.

ca 420-400 B.C.

Stoich.40

- a [...⁸... τ]έλεσι [τοις αὐτῶν προξένω καὶ εὐεργέτ]-
[α Ἀθηναίων] ἀναγρά[ψαι καὶ καταθεῖναι ἐμ πόλει· ..³]-
- b [...⁸...]ν καὶ ἀτέ[λει]α[ν¹⁷..... τῇν]
[δὲ βολὴν τῇ]ν ἀεὶ βο[λε]ύσαν κ[αὶ τὸς πρυτάνες καὶ τ]-
5 [ὸς στρατη]γὸς ἐπιμ[έ]λεσθαι αὐ[τῶν ὅπως ἂμ μὴ ἀδικ]-
[ῶνται, καὶ τ']ἄλλα [αὐτ]οῖν ἔναι κατὰ [τὸ πρότερον ψήφ]-
[ισμα ὃ ..⁵...]πος ε[ἴ]πε περὶ τῶν εὐεργ[ετῶν τῷ δέμο τ]-
[ῶν πρότερον] ἐξεληλυθότων ἐκ τῶν π[όλεων, ὅπως ἂν α]-
[ὕτῳ τε διασώζων]ται καὶ οἱ ἄλλοι εὐ[εργέται τῷ δή]-
10 [μο· καλέσαι δὲ αὐ]τῷ καὶ ἐπὶ ξένια ἐς [τὸ πρυτανεῖον]
[ἐς αὖριον].

vacat

COMMENTARY. The restorations are those of Wilhelm (reported in 1913 in I.G., II², 48 and amended in 1924 in I.G., I², 106_a).

Lines 1-2. From line 6 we know that two persons were involved; presumably the opening lines of this sentence included reference to the secretary of the Boule and named

the two proxenoi. The word-order is a little unusual, but no other coherent restoration of these lines comes to mind. This restoration was first published in 1924 (loc.cit.).

Lines 2-3. [οἰκία|ς ἔγκτησι]ν καὶ ἀτέ[λειαν αὐτοῖν καὶ ἐκγόνοις] I.G., II², 48; [ἔνα|ι δὲ αὐτοῖ]ν καὶ ἀτέ[λειαν τῷ μετοικίῳ Ἀθήνησι] I.G., I², 106a; [ἔνα|ι δὲ αὐτοῖ]ν καὶ ἀτέ[λειαν καὶ ἔγκτησιν? οἰκίας] Pečírka (op.cit., p. 18).

The first restoration is rendered impossible by the restoration of lines 1-2, which allows too little space for it; Pečírka's restoration exhibits two weaknesses, of which he was well aware: he had to omit two phrases, [τῷ μετοικίῳ] and [Ἀθήνησι], "the second of which is very common in grants of enktesis down to the middle of the fourth century B.C."; this inclined him, as it inclines me, "to favour Wilhelm's restoration and to make the granting of enktesis very improbable."

Lines 3-5. The formulae here are those commonly found in honorific decrees.

Lines 5-6. ἐπιμ[ε]λεσθαι αὐ[τῶν, εἰάν το δέωνται· καὶ πάντα τὰ] ἄλλα α[ὐτ]οῖν ἔναι καὶ α[-----] I.G., II², 48. This seems inferior to the reading of I.G., I² 106a, which I have adopted: αὐ[τῶν] for αὐ[τοῖν] is awkward, if not without parallel. The surviving letters in line 7 indicate that

there is no rider here, so that the phrase [δ° .. δ° ..] $\pi\omicron\varsigma$ ϵ [ι] $\pi\epsilon$ should logically refer to something already mentioned. My examination of the stone shows that the reading of the last four visible letters in line 6 should be $\kappa\alpha\tau\acute{\alpha}$ (not $\kappa\alpha\iota$ α), as printed in the text of I.G., I², 106a. Line 7. There are several possible restorations of the name of the orator here: the likeliest are Menippos (P.A., II, 10034), who is known to have proposed a decree in 415 B.C. (see Andokides, II, 23) and Philippos (P.A., II, 14407), secretary to the Boule when I.G., I², 109 was passed in 410/09 B.C.; another possibility is Archippos, the accuser of Andokides ca 402 B.C. (P.A., I, 2542; see [Lysias], VI, 11-12). Others known at the end of the fifth century are Bathippos, Dexippos, Euxippos and Sosippos.

Lines 7-8. These lines make it virtually certain that the honorands are political exiles; the likeliest time for their flight to Athens is at the end of the Peloponnesian War, when the Spartans forced Athenian nationals to return home (Xenophon, Hellenika, II, 2.2). The wording of lines 7-10 suggests that several other friends of Athens had already been assisted by the decree of [δ° .. δ° ..] $\pi\omicron\varsigma$, and that the two men here honoured were late-comers.

$\epsilon\kappa$ $\tau\tilde{\omega}\nu$ π [$\acute{\omicron}\lambda\epsilon\omega\nu$] recalls the phraseology of fifth-century

honorifics in which the Empire is referred to as "the cities".

Lines 8-10. The restorations that I have adopted here are those first put forward by Wilhelm in 1923.

Lines 10-11. This is the usual formula for ending an honorific decree when the honorand is present in Athens.

There is little to choose between the spellings [πρυτανεῖον] and [πρυτανεόν] ; both forms are found in the fifth century in decrees inscribed in Attic letters, while the longer form is more common in the fourth century. I believe that the longer form is appropriate here, though previous editors have restored the shorter.

#69. Proxeny. ca 410-400 B.C. Honours for an unknown man.

Pl. XVII, 2

BIBLIOGRAPHY. Pittakys, E.A., 36(1853), p. 1054 #1979; Rangabé, A.H., II (1855), pp. 233, 237 #629; I.G., II, 103 (1877); I.G., II², 202 (1913).

PHOTOGRAPHS. None so far published.

EM 13217, fragment of white micaceous marble, preserving the left edge; otherwise, it is broken on all sides. It was found on the Akropolis in 1839 and first published by Pittakys (loc.cit.). Foliation is vertical and parallel to the face. There is a vertical uninscribed space of 0.132m. below the last line.

H.max. 0.286m. W.max. 0.267m. Th.max. 0.098m. Letter-height 0.010m.-0.012m. Chequer 0.0137m.x 0.0205m.

Letter-shapes. A4, E5, H1, Θ3, K2, N7, O2, P8, Σ10, Y7.

Ionic script with one Attic daseia (line 5). #68 is by the same hand, though inscribed with greater care. I.G., I², 117 is by a similar hand. Both these documents are dated between 410 and 405 B.C., though the script seems closer to fourth-century modes than to those of the fifth

century. The use of an Attic daseia in the present document suggests that it was inscribed in the fifth century.

ca 410-400 B.C.

Stoich.38

[.....!2..... ἀναγράψαι δὲ αὐτὸν πρόξενον κα]-
 [ἰ εὐεργ]ῆτην ἐ[ν στήλῃ ἐμ πόλει τὸν γραμματέα τ]-
 [ῆς βολ]ῆς· δὲνα[ι δὲ24.....]
 [.3.]ἰ κατὰ τὰ [...4.]ε[.....23.....]
 5 [.3.]α· καλέσαι δὲ ἔπαι[..5.. ἐπὶ ξένια ἐς τὸ πρυτ]-
 [α]νεῖον ἐς χαύριον. vacat
vacat

COMMENTARY. Line 1. The surface of the stone has perished and nothing can be read here.

Lines 2-6. I read considerably more in these lines than has been admitted by previous editors. The surface is very much abraded, but the faint outlines of letters survive.

Line 2. Only the bottoms of these letters survive, so that nu alone is certain.

Line 3. The right vertical of eta survives; the stone breaks horizontally at about the level where the horizontal of eta would occur.

Line 4. The bottom of a central vertical survives at the left edge.

Line 5. Though much abraded the first four letters of the

honorand's name can be made out. In I.G., II², 33.28 (385 B.C.) a certain Thasian exile is listed; the Corpus restores his name as [Ἐπαίβε]τος, but, presumably, [Ἐπαίβε]τος would be just as likely epigraphically; if so, the Thasian might be the honorand of the present decree. The name Epainetos is also found in Thessaly: a man of this name swore to a treaty with Athens on behalf of the Thessalians in the second quarter of the fourth century (I.G., II², 175 = S.E.G., III, 81). This honorand, like those of #68, may be one of those persons exiled from his native land after the Spartan victory at Aigospotamoi in 404 B.C. Line 3 may possibly contain provisions for his financial support. The mention of his name in the invitation to the prytaneion in lines 5-6 suggests the possibility that several honorands were concerned in the earlier part of the decree; of these, only this man would have been actually in Athens at the time that the decree was passed.

APPENDIX I.

Proxeny originally granted in the fifth century, but reinscribed or reinstated in the fourth century.

a

Stelai containing two or more decrees, one of which includes provisions for the reinscription of an earlier fifth-century decree on the same stele.

#30. Original proxeny dated ca 424/3 B.C. Honours for Herakleides, perhaps a Klazomenian. Reinscribed perhaps ca 400 B.C.

#49. Original proxeny granted ca 435-415 B.C. Honours for Archonides and Demon the Sikels. Reinscribed in 385/4 B.C.

#56. Original proxeny dated 411/0 B.C. Honours for Pythophanes, perhaps a Phaistian. Reinscribed in 399/8 B.C.

In each of these cases part or all of the later decree survives on the stone. There are certain other documents, inscribed in Ionic characters, whose text and context are entirely suited to the fifth century, but that previous editors have attributed to the fourth century. I have

included these documents in the appropriate place in the main text (see ## 48,67,68 and 69).

b

Proxeny-decrees of the fifth century whose stelai were destroyed or broken up by the Thirty Tyrants in 404/3 B.C. These documents were revived in the fourth century; their texts were not reproduced in toto.

I.G., II², 6. Original date unknown. Honours for the five sons of the Thasian Apemantos. One of these sons was later listed as an exile from Thasos after the expulsion of Athenian partisans from Thasos by the Spartans in 385 B.C. (I.G., II², 33). The revival of the proxeny is thus earlier than the Peace of Antalkidas. This is the only complete stele in this category of inscription. Its text indicates that one of Apemantos' sons came to Athens to ask for the revival of the proxeny, for the inscription of which he had to bear the cost.

I.G., II², 9. Original date unknown. Several persons are honoured, but the date of the revival of the proxeny is not known: the letter-shapes suggest a date early in the fourth century.

I.G., II², 52. Original date perhaps in 419/8 B or 415/4 B.C. Honours for the three grandsons of Xanthippos, who had died at some time after the erasure of the original decree in his favour. #46 may be part of the original stele; the home of this family of proxenoi may have been the city of Kameira, on the island of Rhodes, or Gargara, in the southern Troad (see above, #46). The date of the revival of the proxeny is unknown, but should be in the early part of the fourth century, either ca 400-390 B.C., or very soon after 395 B.C..

Hesperia, XVII (1948), p. 54 #65. Original date unknown, but before 412 B.C. Honours for the sons of a citizen of Ialysos, on the island of Rhodes. This man had died before his proxeny was revived. The date of renewal is probably after 395 B.C.: the island of Rhodes remained hostile to Athens between 412 and 395 B.C., so that a renewal of a proxeny from this island before 395 B.C. is unlikely.

I.G., II, 66c. Original date unknown. The text is so fragmentary that it is not even certain whether this is a proxeny. The city of Kaphya in Arkadia is mentioned. The date of the revival should be in the first twenty years of the fourth century, to judge by the letter-shapes.

c

Honours granted in the fourth century to the sons of men who had held the proxeny in the fifth century.

I.G., II², 52 and Hesperia, XVII (1948), p. 54 #65 are included in this category as well as in category b.

I.G., II², 17. Citizenship for Sthorys the Thasian and his descendants. His ancestors had held the proxeny, as, probably, had he. He received his citizenship in 394/3 B.C. There is no indication of the time at which this hereditary proxeny was instituted.

APPENDIX II

Honours granted to individual foreigners in the fifth century, not involving the grant of proxeny.

I.G., I², 160. ca 440-430 B.C. Citizenship for Korinthis-
[akos?] and his sons. The formulae are those commonly found
in proxeny-decrees of the period, but the grant of citizen-
ship appears certain. The services performed by this man
included assistance to the army, but the context is not
known. I think that it is a reasonable assumption that the
honorand was already a proxenos at the time that he per-
formed these services, but there is no reference to a
proxeny in the extant portion of this decree.

I.G., I², 113. ca 411/0 B.C. Citizenship for Euagoras King
of Salamis in Kypros. He was honoured, probably, for his
services as a go-between when the Athenians negotiated with
the Persian satrap Tissaphernes at Aspendos in 411/0 B.C.

I.G., I², 101. ca 411 B.C. Regulations for the island of
Samos after its oligarchy had been ejected. An unknown
Samian is praised for his part in the revolt.

I.G., I², 110. 410/09 B.C. Honours for the assassins of the oligarch Phrynichos. The actual murderer, Thrasyboulos of Kalydon, was made an Athenian citizen and given a golden crown. His accomplices, seven in number, were named as euergetai and given enktesis of house and land at Athens. The role of an eighth man, Apollodoros of Megara, was the subject of dispute, and a commission was set up to examine his claims. In a possibly corrupt passage in a speech by Lysias (XIII, 71) Apollodoros is said to have received the same honours as Thrasyboulos. I have suggested above that #58 might possibly be a fragment of the companion-decree to I.G., I², 110, that honouring Apollodoros.

I.G., II², 174. 405/4 B.C. Honours for Epikerdes of Kyrene. This man provided one hundred minai to save the Athenians captured in Sicily in 413 B.C. from starvation; he later gave a talent of silver to the city towards the war-effort. For the former service he was granted ateleia; for the latter he was crowned and proclaimed as a benefactor at the city Dionysia (see Demosthenes, XX, 41-48). A new fragment of this document has recently been found in the excavations of the Athenian Agora and will be published by Meritt in a forthcoming issue of Hesperia. The date of the decree is confirmed by an archon-formula in the preamble. Again, though

no reference to an existing proxeny is made in the surviving portions of this document, it is quite possible that Epikerdes was already an Athenian proxenos at the time that he performed these services.

INDEX OF INSCRIPTIONS CITED

Documents edited in this study are indicated by numbers; cross-references to them are not indexed.

Documents edited in A.T.L., II are indexed by their A.T.L. numbers, with the I.G. number shown in brackets.

S.E.G. numbers are shown in brackets after the I.G. numbers where new fragments have been added or where I have referred in my text to the S.E.G. numbers.

<u>Inscriptiones Graecae</u> , I ² :	Page reference
1 (<u>S.E.G.</u> , X, 1)	288.
3/4	55; 56.
5	55.
6 (<u>S.E.G.</u> , X, 6)	55.
16	68; 71; 144; 181.
18	115.
19 (<u>S.E.G.</u> , X, 7)	129; 133; 140; 141; 175.
20	175; 353.
23; 30 (<u>S.E.G.</u> , X, 20)	#4.
24	60; 179; 417; 580.
25	60; 71; 336; 342; 378; 383; 391; 482; 591; 631.
27a	#5
27b	#6
28a	#7

I.G., I²

28b

29 (S.E.G., X, 21)

31

32 (S.E.G., X, 13)

33

34/35

36

38

40-43; 48 (S.E.G., X, 37)

45 (S.E.G., X, 34)

46

47 (S.E.G., X, 136)

49

51

52 (S.E.G., X, 48)

53 (S.E.G., X, 46)

55

56

58

59

61; 169; 179 (S.E.G., X, 53)

62

67 (S.E.G., X, 112)

68/69

Page reference

#27.

55; 129; 158.

#8.

129.

#2.

60; 68; 129.

#3.

68; 450.

55; 60.

154; 182; 225; 315; 423; 485.

55; 60.

72; 294; 353; 481; 583; 591.

216.

79; 175; 493.

79; 175; 351; 493.

350; 416.

#15.

#13.

310.

#22.

#21.

#23.

#64.

310; 331; 407; 481; 513;

516; 581; 583.

I.G., I²

Page reference

70

#28.

71 (S.E.G., X, 86)

68; 310; 372; 421; 477; 478.

72

#31.

75

60; 182; 274.

76

372.

77

239; 240; 253.

78

350.

80

68; 71.

81

386.

82

#33.

83

#32.

84

81; 144; 176; 372; 421; 585.

85

462.

86

81.

87 (S.E.G., X, 80)72; 80; 135; 333; 342; 343;
419; 481; 482; 583.

88/89

60; 408.

90

306.

93a

#34.

93b

#35.

94

82; 243; 580.

95

82; 253; 423.

96 (S.E.G., X, 104)82; 253; 291; 294; 301; 332;
462; 585.

97

351; 421.

I.G., I^2

Page reference

98/99

82; 383.

101

55; 276; 364; 383; 609; 643.

103

#55.

104

383; 514.

105

#65.

106

#60.

106a (I.G., II^2 , 48)

#68.

108

67; 83; 116; 179; 181; 192;
272; 364; 383; 482; 581;
591; 593.

110

52; 55; 83; 91; 97; 481; 534;
535; 591; 596; 644.

110a

67; 83; 445; 453; 472; 482;
578; 631.

111

383; 391.

112

83; 391.

113

52; 97; 331; 383; 450; 453;
472; 643.

114

83; 259; 422; 495.

115

83; 280; 383; 467.

116

#61.

117

52; 68; 482; 636.

118

#62.

119

#63.

<u>I.G.</u> , I ²	Page reference
120	55; 67; 84.
122; 156 (<u>S.E.G.</u> , X, 79; 131)	#44.
123	55; 67; 84; 384; 431; 537.
124	67; 84; 514.
125	#66.
126 (<u>I.G.</u> , II ² , 1)	68; 322; 478; 540; 587; 623; 624.
127 (<u>S.E.G.</u> , X, 59)	351; 354.
128 (<u>S.E.G.</u> , XXI, 37)	351; 354.
129	332.
131	55.
133	55; 583; 584.
136	55.
138	55.
139	201.
141/142 <u>b,c,d,e</u> ; 174 (<u>S.E.G.</u> , X, 51)	253; 254.
141/142 <u>a</u> ; 87 <u>f</u> (<u>S.E.G.</u> , X, 77)	383; 482; 591.
143 <u>a</u>	#9.
143 <u>b</u>	#18.
144; 155 (<u>S.E.G.</u> , X, 108)	#47.
146	#36.
147	#37.
148	#19.
149	#26.

I.G., I²

Page reference

150	#38.
152	#49.
153	#14.
154	#39.
157	#40.
158	#12.
159	#51.
160	52; 97; 253; 643.
163	360.
167	306.
168	306.
171	507.
172	55.
177	#11.
185 (<u>S.E.G.</u> , X, 60)	253.
188	55.
189	68; 144.
232	78; 551.
233	79; 551.
234	79.
235	79.
236	80.
237	80; 325.
238	80.
239	80.

I.G., I^2

Page reference

240	80.
241	80.
242	81.
243	81.
244	82.
245	82.
246	82.
247	82.
248	83.
249	83; 525.
250	83.
251	83.
254	84.
255	84.
256	78.
257	79; 551.
258	79.
259	79.
260	80.
261	80.
262	80.
263	80.
264	81.
265	81.

<u>I.G.</u> , I^2	Page reference
266	81.
267	81.
268	82.
269	82.
270	82.
271	82.
274	412.
275	84.
276	78.
277	79.
278	79.
279	79.
280	81.
281	81.
282	81.
283	81.
286	83.
287	83.
288	83.
293	77.
294	277; 284.
295	79.
296	79.

I.G., I²

Page reference

297	80.
298	67; 83.
301	55.
302	82; 507; 509.
303	68.
304 _a	84; 578.
304 _b	84; 321; 578; 617.
304 _c	67; 578.
305	67; 84.
308	55.
310	80; 291; 391.
311	81.
314	68.
316	68.
318	514.
324	81; 321; 342; 344.
325-334 (<u>S.E.G.</u> , XIII, 12-22)	68; 412; 450.
338 (<u>S.E.G.</u> , X, 243)	115; 151.
339	76.
340	76.
341	76.
342	76.
343	71; 77.
344	77.

I.G., I^2

Page reference

345	77.
346	77.
347	77; 168.
348	78; 269.
349	78; 269.
350	78; 269.
351	78; 269.
352	78; 269.
353	78; 269.
354	78.
355	77.
356	76.
358	77.
359	67; 76.
360	76.
361	76.
362	76.
363	78; 514.
364	78.
365	78; 190.
366	78; 79.
367	79; 291.
368	80; 403.
369	68.

<u>I.G.</u> , I ²	Page reference
370	82; 384.
372 (<u>S.E.G.</u> , X, 268)	500; 501.
373 (<u>S.E.G.</u> , X, 271-278)	68; 266.
374 (<u>S.E.G.</u> , X, 279-296)	84; 266.
377	67; 68.
378	80.
379	81.
398	547; 621.
399	55.
488	618.
807	452.
852	291; 292; 462.
928	69; 296.
929	69; 71; 72; 75.
931/932	121; 124.
940	161.
943	69.
944 (<u>S.E.G.</u> , X, 415; XXI, 124)	245; 291; 462.
945	55; 79.
949	425.
950	269; 478.
952	322.
954 (<u>S.E.G.</u> , X, 424)	506; 507; 539.
964 (<u>S.E.G.</u> , XXI, 131)	322; 410; 478.

I.G., I²

Page reference

1034

#1.

1074

213.

1085

515.

Inscriptiones Graecae, II²:

4

578.

6

171; 172; 340; 640.

8

#30.

9

340; 640.

10

556.

12

#56.

13

631.

16

624.

17

642.

18

585.

20

475; 520.

21

345.

23

454.

24

167; 631.

27

#48.

31

624.

32

#50.

33

213; 638; 640.

38

#24.

I.G., II²

Page reference

49	171.
52	452; 454; 641; 642.
53	517.
54	547; 621.
57	391.
58	547; 621.
60	#46.
66c	641.
71 (<u>S.E.G.</u> , X, 73)	#25.
72	331.
73	#67.
81	218.
83	369.
87	331; 615.
91	407.
109	509; 517.
127	296; 356.
150	149.
165	272.
174 (<u>S.E.G.</u> , X, 115)	91; 214; 331; 601; 644; 645.
175 (<u>S.E.G.</u> , III, 81)	479; 638.
180	183; 517.
186	478.
195	517.

I.G., II²

Page reference

202	#69.
206	450.
218	553.
226	358.
236	553.
240	556.
265	517.
285	517.
385	116.
507	517.
545	553
802	367.
892	92.
1037	517.
1132	479.
1138/1139	625.
1151	631.
1392	475; 520.
1634	409.
1635	486.
1638 _a	556.
1672	225.
2343	626.
2376	486.

I.G., II²

Page reference

2943	517.
3138	347.
4221	606.
6672	551.
11162	347.
11192	247.

Inscriptiones Graecae, V, 2:

357	154.
-----	------

Inscriptiones Graecae, IX, 1:

868	90.
-----	-----

Inscriptiones Graecae, XI, 4:

1067a	225.
-------	------

Inscriptiones Graecae, XII, 1:

46	486.
----	------

Inscriptiones Graecae, XII, 2:

96	539.
----	------

Inscriptiones Graecae, XII, 8:

640	154.
-----	------

Inscriptiones Graecae, XII, Supplementum:

p. 13 #68

137.

Inscriptiones Graecae, XIV:

432

154.

Orientis Graeci Inscriptiones Selectae:

332

517.

Supplementum Epigraphicum Graecum, X:

15

129.

44

239; 240.

50

#17.

54

#20.

76

#10.

87

372.

111

#54.

129

#41.

135

583; 584.

140

#59.

145c

427.

210

134.

352

254.

418 (S.E.G., XXI, 126)

245.

Page reference

Supplementum Epigraphicum Graecum, XI:

1180a 90.

Supplementum Epigraphicum Graecum, XII:

41 #16.

80 475; 520.

Supplementum Epigraphicum Graecum, XV:

27 68.

28 68.

Supplementum Epigraphicum Graecum, XVI:

10 #58.

Supplementum Epigraphicum Graecum, XXI:

14 51.

57 #52.

126 254.

Sylloge Inscriptionum Graecarum, I³:

943 487.

Hesperia, VII (1938), p. 91 #11 490; 503; 504.

Hesperia, XVI (1947), p. 81 #3d 291; 292; 589; 590.

Hesperia, XVII (1948), p. 54 #65 340; 341; 452; 453; 641;
642.

<u>Athenian Tribute Lists, II:</u>	Page reference
List 1	75.
2	71; 75.
3	75.
4	72; 75.
5	75.
7	76.
8	76.
9	76; 331.
10	76.
11	76.
12	77; 190.
13	77.
14	77.
15	77.
16	77.
17	78.
19	78.
20	78.
21	78.
22	79; 190.
23	79; 190.
25	80; 508.
26	80.
27	80; 176; 306.
28	306.

A.T.L., II

Page reference

List 33 (now 37)

82.

34

81; 306.

Quota-lists (general)

69; 89;

A 9 (I.G., I^2 , 63)

80; 182; 254; 332.

10 (I.G., I^2 , 64)

81; 372.

13

83; 530; 531.

D 1-2 (I.G., I^2 , 91/92)

55; 60; 256; 274; 485.

3-6 (I.G., I^2 , 57)

67; 68; 80; 169; 182; 209;

236; 254; 275; 286; 301; 310;

320; 356; 427; 439; 623.

8 (I.G., I^2 , 65)

138; 182; 275; 277; 284;

285; 477.

9 (I.G., I^2 , 109)

431; 485; 537; 585; 634.

10 (I.G., I^2 , 10-13)

60; 344; 485.

11 (I.G., I^2 , 22)

128; 133; 141; 154; 161;

175; 182; 216.

14 (Coinage decree, Athens)

68.

14.I, IV (Syme)

68.

14.II (Kos)

68; 128.

14.III (Aphytis)

68.

14.V (Siphnos)

68.

14.VI (Smyrna)

68.

14.VII (Odessa)

68.

A.T.L., II

Page reference

D 15 (I.G., I², 14/15)

68; 150; 158.

16 (I.G., I², 17)

68; 71.

17 (I.G., I², 39)154; 179; 182; 315; 324;
325; 417; 423.18 (I.G., I², 50; 102)

55; 77.

19 (I.G., I², 54)

116.

21 (I.G., II², 55)

68; 71; 209.

22 (I.G., I², 60)

80; 248; 254; 264; 272; 310.

23 (S.E.G., X, 108)

#47.

Unpublished stones

Akropolis Museum #6474

51.

Epigraphical Museum:

EM 293

#42.

2483

#43.

2496

#61 Appendix.

2505

#53.

5171

392.

5216

331.

5394

507.

5928

#45.

Plate I

1

2

#1 (I.G., II², 5224 on right)

#1, base

3

#2

4

#4 a, b

5

#4 a

6

#4 b

667
Plate II

1

2

#3 a, b, c

3

#5

5

#7

#3 a, b

4

#6

6

#9 a, b

668

Plate III

1

2

3

#8

#10

#11

4

5

6

#12 a

#12 b,c

#13

Plate IV

1

#14 a,b

2

#23

3

#16

4

#17 a,b,c

5

#15 a

6

#15 b

Plate V

2

3

#19

#20

4

5

6

#21 b

#21 c

671

Plate VI

1

2

3

#22 a, b, c

#22 a

#25

4

5

6

#28 a

#28 b

#28 c

1

#24

2

#27

3

#26 a, b, c

673
Plate VIII

1

2

#29

#34

3

4

#30

#35

5

6

#32

#33

674
Plate IX

1

#31

2

#37

3

#38

4

#39

5

#42

6

#43

Plate X

1

#36

3

#41

5

#44 b

2

#40

4

#44 a

6

#44, left lateral, b, d,
showing the foliation

1

#44 C

2

#44 d

3

#44, suggested arrangement of fragments a, b, c and d

677

Plate XII

1

#45

2

#46

3

#47 b,c,d,e

678

Plate XIII

1

#47 f

2

#47 g, h

3

#48

4

#49

5

#51

6

#52

Plate XIV

1

2

3

#53

#54

#56

4

5

#55 a, b

#57

6

7

#59

#63

1

#61, appendix

2

#62

3

#61

681

Plate XVI

1

#64 a

2

#64 b

3

#64 c

4

#60 b, c, d, e, f, g

Plate XVII

1

#65

2

#69

3

#66 a, b, c

4

#67

5

#68