The following discussions constitute a *parergon* to a wider-ranging analysis of the so-called ‘hortatory intention’,¹ which I hope to publish in due course. They all demonstrate the importance in the sphere of restoration of a thorough knowledge not only of the variety of formulations exhibited by Athenian inscriptions but also of the basics of Greek itself.

I. *Hesperia* 47.274/5.5 (c. 333 B.C.)²

In his *Addenda* to *The Athenian Agora*, Vol. xv, *Inscriptions: The Athenian Councillors* John Traill publishes *inter alia* a new prytany decree and catalogue of the tribe Leontis. The provisions for the publication of the decree conclude with an incitement to others to emulate the treasurer here honoured because he does and says what is best for the People. The relevant lines (vv. 29–30) are restored by Traill as follows:³

\[
\text{̔πωκ ἄν ἐφάμιλλοι ὤκι καὶ οἱ ἄλλοι λέγειν χορητας ἂξιας ἀπολήσωνται παρά [της] βόλην [ης] καὶ [ι] πρυτάνεων}
\]

This restoration is, however, certainly incorrect. Although ἐφάμιλλον ὤκ + infinitive – “in order that it may be an object of contention to . . .” – is frequently encountered,⁴ the personal use of ἐφάμιλλος + infinitive in the sense “engage in rivalry to do . . .” does not occur. The *mot juste* for this type of encouragement is φιλοτιμώνται, and this must be substituted here.

In line 30, where it is most unlikely that the article is absent with πρυτάνεων, an examination of Plate 73 leads me to believe that the letters read by Traill as ΠΡΥ are, in fact,ΙΤ followed by traces of Ω and Ν.

I would therefore restore as follows:

---

¹ As in so many other respects I am indebted to Geoffrey Woodhead for the felicitous coinage of the expression ‘hortatory intention’ to cover, as he puts it in his forthcoming volume of *The Athenian Agora: vol. xvi The Decrees*, formulae “indicating the wider purpose of the inscription in the general sense of encouraging others to emulate the honorand or to publicize the community’s readiness to show gratitude to those who serve it well.”

² See also SEG 28.52.

³ Although the decree is inscribed stoichedon 27, in the last three lines (28–30) the stoichedon pattern is abandoned altogether.

⁴ Cf. e.g., *I.G. ii²* 847.33–36 (215/14): ὀποκ ἄν ὅν ἐφάμιλλον εἰ τοῖς φιλοτιμοῦμένοις καὶ εἰδότιν ὅτι χαρίτας ἂξιας κοιμοῦνται ἄν ἐνεργεῖταικαίν.
In my epigraphical youth some thirty years ago 6 I sought inter alia to explain away as a mason’s error the unparalleled word-order ὃπως ὃν ἐν in line 14 of the decree in favour of Aischron son of Proxenos of Delphi.7 I had not then been aware that the reading on the stone actually was the normal ὃπως ὃν ἐν.8

More significantly, I also cast doubt on Koehler’s restoration of the continuation of line 14, as printed in I.G.:

φ[ανεροὶ ὅσις καὶ οἱ Ἀθηναῖοι]

For not only is the overall formulation unparalleled in this far from uncommon advertisement of the Athenian People’s propensity to honour ‘the good’, but, in particular, the article with Ἀθηναῖοι is quite unacceptable.9 Hence I ventured an alternative restoration along the lines φ[ανεροὶ καὶ ἡ βουλὴ καὶ ὁ δῆμος], although I now realise, grâce à Osborne, that Wilhelm had already anticipated me.10

Osborne, however, claims that this suggestion is impossible, since the top of a left upright stroke can be read in stoichos 17, just before the stone breaks off. The text which he prints, therefore, is essentially identical to that offered in I.G., except that he also reads the alpha between the phi and the nu; thus

ὁπως ὃν ὃν φανεροὶ ὅσις καὶ οἱ Ἀθηναῖοι.

Maturity, however, still inclines me to reject this solution, principally because of the unparalleled οἱ Ἀθηναῖοι in such a clause. Given that in line 27 the letters TIM occupy only

---


7 See art.cit., p.293.

8 Lapidem non videram. See now Osborne, op.cit., vol. I, p.163 (note on line 14).


10 See Osborne, loc.cit. (note 8 above). (For the verb preceding the subject, unusual in these formulations, cf. I.G. ii² 682.64–66 (?259/8):

ὁπως ὃν

ν ὃν φαίνεται καὶ ὁ δῆμος τιμῶν τοὺς ἀγαθούς ἄνδρας καὶ ἀνδρίσις μνήμης

For the date of this inscription see my article in Chiron 22 (1992) 27–33.
2 stoichoi and the ‘numerous crowding of letters in vv. 35–36’, it is more than likely that in line 14 the ‘top of a left upright stroke’ is, in fact, the top of iota, not nu, cut to the left of the stoichos to allow it to be squeezed up with the following nu.

So read line 14 as follows:

\[\text{λέιεις: ὄπως ἀν ὀὖν φαίνεται καὶ ἦ βουλή καὶ ὁ δήμος}\]

This produces both a satisfactory text and an acceptable line of stoichedon 40.

III. I.G. ii² 570 = D89

Osborne assigned this fragment to the period 262–229 B.C. on the basis of the ‘presence’ of the Single Officer and the absence of the dokimasia from the elements of the citizenship grant. However, as I have recently argued, the irregularities in the cutting of this basically stoichedon 38 text leave open the possibility of the restoration of the Plural Board. On the other hand, given that in the referral formula ἐπιοῦσαν (8 letters) is much less likely to be accommodated in the space available in line 8 than πρόσην (6 letters), it may be that the date can be narrowed down to the first half of the third century B.C. However that may be, the restoration of lines 10–11 is certainly erroneous.

Manifestly, we do not want both δέ and οὖν. Nor is there any justification here for a resumptive οὖν; what is required is merely a connecting δέ, introducing the provisions for the publication of the decree, as, e.g., I.G. ii² 653.50–52 (285/4):

\[\text{ἐπιοῦσαν δέ καὶ ὑπόμνημα ἢ τῆς ὁικείως \[τηποκ kai τῶν δορείων τῶν προστιθεμένων αὐτῶν \[τῶν πρόσην τῶν ὑπαρχούσαις, τὸν γραμματέα κτλ.}\]

and I.G. ii² 909.19–21. (c. 184 B.C.)

---

11 See Osborne loc. cit. (I note that in I.G. Kirchner informs us that in line 35 ΠΟ (in ἀκροπόλει) and EI (in εἰ) are inscribed in 1 space, whereas Osborne appears to indicate the letters ΑΕΙ of ἀκροπόλει as 3 in 2 spaces. Neither does Osborne say anything of the apparent crowding in τῆς διοικής[εἰ].)


14 Cf. my remarks in Owls, pp. 183–186.

15 In SEG 40.89 the fragment is given the wide dating ‘3rd cent. B.C.’

16 I cite the text from the revised layout as given by Osborne in D89 (op. cit., vol. I, pp. 188–189). ὑπαρχούσαις is there wrongly accented.

17 As is always the case when the ὑπόμνημα clause introduces the provisions for the publication of a decree.

18 This text is assigned by Stephen Tracy to the hand (or atelier) of ‘The Cutter of I.G. ii² 897’, whose span of activity occupies the years 189/8 to 178/7. I have selected c. 184 B.C. merely as the mid-point of this range. See Stephen V. Tracy, Attic Letter-Cutters of 229 to 86 B.C., UCP, 1990, p. 115, and cf. Osborne, op.cit., vol. III (1983), p. 105.
The restoration ὀποκ [δ´ ἀν καὶ ὑπό-
μνημα ὑπάρχει αὐτῶι περὶ τῆς πρὸς τὸν δήμου εὐνοίας, ἀναγρά-
The restoration ὀποκ [δ´ ἀν καὶ] in *I.G.* ii² 570 is therefore inescapable. Osborne’s
case of the surface of the stone: ‘the stone is very badly worn indeed, and the letters can only be made out with
great difficulty.’ I suspect – not too uncharitably, I hope – that the original error in *I.G.*, όν, led Osborne to ‘see’ a trace
of the desired letter.

There is the further problem of the unlikely vacat posited at the end of line 10 in order to
bring the stoichedon tally up to 38. παρά, instead of υπό, would remedy the situation – and be
grammatically feasible – but παρά τοῦ δήμου normally means ‘from the people’ in
expressions of similar kind: cf., e.g., *I.G.* ii² 509.7–11 (post 307/6)

| ὀποκ ἀν κα[ὶ οἱ ἄλλοι ἄπαντες]  |
| ὑπάρχει κατὰ τοῦ[ς νόμους καὶ ύπὲρ τῆς]  |
| δημοκρατίας ἑθέλωκα πάντα πράττειν εἰδότες ὅτι]  |
| χάριτας ἀπολήψονται παρά τ[ού δήμου ύζιας τῶν εὐ]- |
| εργετημέτων:  |

To read ὑπὸ τοῦ[dήμου γεγενημέ]νης in *I.G.* ii² 570 could be paralleled by *I.G.* ii² 891.17–18 (188/7)

| ῥνα δὲ καὶ υπόμνημα υπάρχη τῶν γε[γε]γονότον  |
| αὐτῶι ὑπὸ τοῦ δήμου φιλανθρώπων  |

but this would increase line 10 to 39 letters without offering the possibility within the
restored section of combining two letters in one stoichos.

But, alternatively, could the iota and upsilon of κα[ὶ] ὑπό[ ] have been squeezed together? If such a possibility can be entertained then one might venture the following restoration:

| [. . . . . . . .] ὀποκ [δ´ ἀν κα] ὑπό[μνημα τῆς υπὸ τοῦ]  |
| [δήμου γεγενημέ]νης διορθῶ ὑπὸ[ρχὴ αὐτῶι.  |

IV. *Hesperia* 32.15–16.14

Woodhead retains Meritt’s original text of lines 5–8 of this inscription, now dated c. 170:

| ὅ]ποκ σὺν ἐφάμ[ίλλον]  |
| ὑπὸ τοῦ ἑσυχοῦς φιλατμομυθένοις εἰς τάς καὶ[να]κε

---

21. See also SEG 21.419.
However, ἕκαστος, which must be construed with παρέχεσθαι, sits somewhat uncomfortably between τοῖς and φιλοτιμοῦμένοις, and must surely be wrong. The text indeed appears to be an unsuccessful amalgam of several common – and individually acceptable – elements. Thus, for example, we find in I.G. ii² 641.23–25 (299/8)

\[\text{ὅπως ἄν ὡς πλεῖστοι φιλοτιμοῦμένται χρείαν παρέχεσθαι ἐ-}\\[\text{[π] τά συνφέροντα τῷ δήμῳ.}
\]

and Meritt himself cited I.G. ii² 847.33–36 (215/14)

\[\text{ὅπως ἄν}\\[\text{οὖν ἐφάμιλλον εἴ τοῖς φιλοτιμοῦμένοις, εἰδότες ὧ-}\\[\text{τι χάριτας ἀξίας κομιοῦνται ἃν ἄν εὐεργετεῖσθαι.}
\]

and I.G. ii² 1329.19–22 (175/4)²⁴

\[\text{ὦν οὖν}\\[\text{ἐφάμιλλον ἣ τοῖς ἂνι φιλοτιμοῦμένοις, εἰδότες ὧ-}\\[\text{τι χάριτας ἀξίας κομιοῦνται ἃν ἄν εὐεργετεῖσθαι.}
\]

But none of these will quite justify the reconstruction in the text under review.

I suggest that we may better restore along the following lines:

\[\text{ὅπως οὖν ἐφάμιλλον}\\[\text{[η ἅπασιν τοῖς φιλοτιμοῦμένοις εἰς τάς κρι[νά]ς}\\[\text{[κρείας εὐεργετεῖσθαι εἰδότας ὧτι κτλ.}
\]

“so, in order that it may be an object of contention to all those who show patriotic zeal towards the common needs to do good deeds in the knowledge that . . .”

For φιλοτιμεῖσθαι εἰς cf. I.G. ii² 338.21–24 (333/2):

\[\text{ὅπως ἄν καὶ οἱ ἄλλοι οἱ ἂνι χειροτονοῦμενοι ἐ-}\\[\text{πὶ τὰς κριῆς ψευδοτιμοῦμένται ἐκαστοὶ εἰς τὸν δήμου.}
\]

and for εὐεργετεῖσθαι used absolutely cf. I.G. ii² 786.15–17 (c. 215)²⁵

\[\text{ὅπως ἄν οὖν ἐφάμιλλον εἴ[ἵ] εὐεργετεῖ[ἱν πᾶς εἰδό}-\\[\text{τε[ν ὧτι καὶ ὁ δήμος, καθάπερ σύντορ[ι πάτριον ἔστιν, ἄπο}-\\[\text{δῶ[ε] εἰς τὴν προσήκουσαν ἐκάστο[ι χάριν}
\]
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---

²⁴ Though not a state decree but a document of ὄργεον.