

ALAN S. HENRY

THE HORTATORY INTENTION IN ATHENIAN STATE DECREES

aus: Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik 112 (1996) 105–119

© Dr. Rudolf Habelt GmbH, Bonn

THE HORTATORY INTENTION IN ATHENIAN STATE DECREES*

In publishing a decree concerning the supply of grain to Athens¹ Michael Walbank commented briefly on what he there described as “a variation of the formula, common between 350 and 250 B.C., whereby the *demos* draws the attention of its other would-be partisans to its recognition of those who have realized their ambition to be of service to it; this recognition, and the advertisement of it, are to be signaled in the publication of this decree (lines 23–24) on a marble stele, presumably upon the Akropolis”.² Moreover, although he was inclined on the basis of the evident context and, to a lesser extent, of the letter-forms to ascribe the decree to the period of the well-known grain shortage of the Lykourgan era (c. 331–324), he was clearly uneasy about the formulas of the section under consideration which seemed to him perhaps more appropriate to the third rather than the fourth century.³

It was not, of course, Walbank’s purpose to set forth a fully documented analysis of the so-called “hortatory intention”,⁴ and so he confined himself to a footnote⁵ very briefly outlining the history of the development of what he calls the formula ὅπως ἂν εἰδῶσιν πάντες κτλ., *vel. sim.* But even the brief details he gives there are somewhat misleading and deficient, since what we are dealing with here is not simply variations on one single theme but several formulations, each admitting of numerous variations of detail in terms of vocabulary and construction as well as providing on occasion wordings which overlap with each other. My chief purpose here then will be to remedy this deficiency and to provide a detailed account which will be of value both to the restorers of similar documents and to those who are forced to turn to formulae in order to narrow the possible dates of undated texts. It may also serve to ease the doubts which Walbank held about his own restoration.

But first a word about the initial sentence of Walbank’s note 14: “The formula ὅπως ἂν εἰδῶσιν πάντες κτλ., *vel. sim.* first occurs in *IG II*², 183 (*ante a.* 353/2 *a.*); I have traced its career down to the middle of the 3rd century B.C. (*IG II*², 798, 823), but a complete list of its occurrences and variations is

* The following works are referred to by short title:

Henry, *Miscellanea* = A. S. Henry, ‘Miscellanea Epigraphica’, *ZPE* 108 (1995) 72–76 and *ZPE* 110 (1996) 301–305 (corrected version)

Pečírka, *Enktesis* = J. Pečírka, *The Formula for the Grant of Enktesis in Attic Inscriptions*, Prague, 1966

Rhodes, *Boule* = P. J. Rhodes, *The Athenian Boule*, Oxford, 1972

Tracy, *Letter-Cutters* = Stephen V. Tracy, *Attic Letter-Cutters of 229 to 86 B.C.*, UCP, 1990

Woodhead, *Agora* = A. Geoffrey Woodhead, *The Athenian Agora XVI The Decrees*, Princeton (forthcoming, ?1996). I have been greatly privileged to have had access to this valuable and important work throughout its gestation, and I should here like to record my deep-felt gratitude, ὅπως ἂν ὑπόμνημα ἧι τῆς εἰς ἐμὲ εὐνοίας τε καὶ φιλίας.

I also employ the following abbreviations:

D = decree (used in referring to the citizenship decrees of Osborne’s collection: M. J. Osborne, *Naturalization in Athens*, vol. I, Brussels, 1981

H = *Hesperia* (references to inscriptions in the form H.32.15/16.14.5–8 = *Hesperia* vol. 32, pp. 15/16, number 14, lines 5–8. When citing pages of articles in *Hesperia*, I use the normal conventions.)

MT = B. D. Meritt and J. S. Traill, *The Athenian Agora XV Inscriptions, the Athenian Councillors*, Princeton, 1974 (references to inscriptions in the form MT 49.52–55 = number 49, lines 52–55)

PM = W. K. Pritchett and B. D. Meritt, *The Chronology of Hellenistic Athens*, Cambridge Mass., 1940

S = *Supplementum Epigraphicum Graecum* (references in the form S.24.119.14–17 = *SEG* vol. 24, number 119, lines 14–17)
W = A. Geoffrey Woodhead, *The Athenian Agora XVI* (as above) (references in the form W. 194 = inscription number 194 in that collection).

¹ *Hesperia* 49 (1980) 251–255 (SEG 30.65).

² Art. cit., 253.

³ Walbank further acknowledges (art. cit., 255) that there is no exact parallel for the wordings of this section of his decree as he has given them.

⁴ The term is Geoffrey Woodhead’s: see Henry, *Miscellanea* note 1.

⁵ Art. cit. (note 1 above), 253 note 14.

too long to be given here.” And indeed it is. But an examination even of these few details will put us on our guard even before we attempt to fill out the fuller picture, and will demonstrate the dangers inherent in too superficial a citation of the evidence.

In the first place not only is *IG II² 183* a doublet of *IG II² 517* and now assigned the vague dating ‘s. iv’,⁶ but, more importantly, the formula in question is almost entirely within a restoration.⁷ Similarly, *IG II² 798*⁸ belongs to a somewhat different category of expression, whose basic form is “in order that it may be a matter of emulation among . . . in the knowledge that the demos etc.”, and likewise *IG II² 823* offers yet another formulation, if indeed the wording of the almost totally restored text can be accepted.

My purpose here, however, is not to carp at inadequate documentation to illustrate a point, but rather to draw attention to the fact that the hortatory intention lends itself to a wide variety of formulations which can be divided into sub-categories and analysed from the point of view of wording and of chronological distribution. This I will now attempt to do.

It is fairly clear that it was indeed somewhere around the early part of the second half of the 4th century B.C. that the fashion became established to include clauses of exhortation addressed to a variety of audiences and inserted in a variety of positions in the overall structure of the document in question. These clauses, while displaying many common features of form and wording, fall into three main categories:

Category A: in which future potential benefactors are encouraged by their *knowledge* that the Athenian People knows how to express its gratitude for services performed

Category B: in which stress is laid on *publicising* the evident fact of the Athenian People’s gratitude

Category C: in which the intention is to provide a *reminder* either of the service which led to the honour or privilege bestowed or of the People’s gratitude.

A complete listing of every example would not only be inordinately lengthy but would also be problematical since not all texts are completely preserved. I have endeavoured therefore to set out the evidence where appropriate in a series of Tables, which will give an overview of the chronological distribution of the various forms of the hortatory intention, as well as indicating the point of insertion of these formulations in the overall document and the basic wording employed in each case to express the nature of the People’s expression of its gratitude.⁹ I have not attempted a full analysis of the various wordings used to describe the various groups cited as beneficiaries of the People’s gratitude, since these are very varied and often specific rather than general.

CATEGORY A

In this category there are three principal formulations, with the common factor of encouraging future benefactors on the strength of their sure knowledge (εἰδῶσι, εἰδότες) that the People will respond with fitting gratitude:

1. *in order that all may know that (εἰδῶσι ὅτι) the Demos [of the Athenians]/Boule*¹⁰ . . .

⁶ See D. Peppas-Delmousou, *AJA* 69 (1965) 151 (cf. S.22.99).

⁷ A restoration admittedly not unreasonable but nonetheless a restoration, and therefore not entirely desirable as an illustrative example.

⁸ This text has been assigned by S. V. Tracy (*Hesperia* 57 [1988] 320) to his ‘Cutter of *IG II² 788* (c. 255–235/4)’, and has most recently been re-edited by Michael Osborne (*ZPE* 78 [1989] 235–236), who assigns the document to the year of Kleomachos, whom he places in 251/0 or, possibly, 253/2. Cf. S.39.125 (where the *ZPE* volume number is wrongly given as “87”). Meritt (*Hesperia* 50 [1981] 82, 87) placed Kleomachos in 240/39.

⁹ For obvious reasons I shall confine myself here (except in a few instances where significant information is to be gleaned from fragmentary texts) to examples whose dates and readings are open to little or no dispute. For reasons of economy of space I have not always given the full text of examples cited under Significant Wording.

¹⁰ The subject of the ὅτι clause may be ὁ δῆμος, ὁ δῆμος ὁ Ἀθηναίων or ὁ δῆμος καὶ ἡ βουλή.

2. *in order that all (the others) may strive earnestly* (φιλοτιμῶνται) *in the knowledge that* (εἰδότες ὅτι)¹¹ . . .

3. *in order that it may be a matter of emulation* (ἐφάμιλλον) *to all* (usually plus infinitive) *in the knowledge that* (εἰδόσι/εἰδότας ὅτι)¹² . . .

Table 1 (εἰδώσι(v))

Reference ¹³	Point of insertion	Significant wording	Date
ii ² 223A.13–14	introducing publication provisions	ἐπίσταται χάριτας ἀποδιδόναι	343/2
ii ² 276.15–18	concluding <i>isoteleia</i> grant	τιμᾶι ὁ δῆμος τοὺς ἄνδρας τοὺς [ἀ]γ[α]θοὺς	c. 342
ii ² 233b (Tod 175) 18–23	concluding financial arrangements for Tenedos	ἐπι μελεῖ]ται δικαίως	340/39
ii ² 423.2–5	introducing probouleumatic formula (PF)	τιμήσει [ι αὐτοὺς ὁ δῆμος κα]τὰ τὴν ἀξίαν ἐκάστου ¹⁴	336–318
D22 (ii ² 222) 11–16	introducing citizenship award	ἀποδίδωσιν χάριτας με [γ]άλας	c. 334
D38 (ii ² 448.I) 17–20)	introducing citizenship award	ἀποδίδω σι χάριτας τοῖς εὐεργέτ[αις ἀξίας τῶν εὐεργετημᾶ]των	323/2
D38 (ii ² 448.II) 82–85	concluding reference to <i>epimeleia</i> provision	οἴεται δεῖν τιμᾶν καὶ μεμνήσθαι ὧν ἂν εὖ πάθῃ	318/17
ii ² 555.9–12	introducing provision for bronze statue	μέμνηται κα [ι χάριν ἀποδ]ίδωσιν ὑφ' ὧν ἂν εὖ πάθῃ καὶ τιμ[αῖ ἐν] [παντὶ] κ[αι]ρῶι ἀξίως τῶν εὐεργεσιῶν	307–303
S.24.119.14–17	concluding <i>enktesis</i> grant	τιμ[αῖ τοὺς ἐν] δεικνυμένους αὐτῶι τὴν εἴ υνοῖαν κα τὰ τὴν ἀξίαν ἐκάστου	301/0–295/4
S.28.60.83–86	introducing PF	μέμνηται τῶν εὐεργετησάντων ἑαυτὸν καὶ χάριν ἐκάστοις ἀποδίδωσιν	270/69
ii ² 908.7–8	introducing PF	εὐχά]ριστος ὧν διατελεῖ	181–170
ii ² 909.8–10	introducing PF	εὐχάριστος ὧν δια [τελεῖ	c. 170

We see here a chronological spread from just after the middle of the fourth century to c. 170¹⁵, and we note that in these clauses the People's gratitude is advertised in terms of duly granting or repaying favours (χάριν/χάριτας ἀποδιδόναι), conferring honour (τιμᾶν), being mindful of benefactions (μεμνήσθαι), and continuing gratefulness (εὐχάριστος ὧν διατελεῖν), or as a combination of two or more of these: cf., e.g., D38 (ii² 448.II) 82–85 (318/17):

ὅπως ἂν εἰδώσι πάντες [ὄ]τ[ι ὁ δῆμ] stoich. 41
 ος ὁ Ἀθηναίων, ἔαν τις εὖ (π)οήσῃ αὐτὸν οὐ μόνον αὐτ[ο]
 ὑς τοὺς ποήσαντας ἀλλὰ καὶ τοὺς τῶν εὐεργετῶν παῖ
 δας οἴεται δεῖν τιμᾶν καὶ μεμνήσθαι ὧν ἂν εὖ πάθῃ

We may also note that, although the hortatory intention is associated with several different types of honour or provision, it is noticeably common introducing the probouleumatic formula.

The recipients of the People's favours may be referred to in a variety of ways, including, e.g.
 τοὺς ἄνδρας τοὺς [ἀ]γ[α]θοὺς ii² 276.17–18 (c. 342)

¹¹ There is also a small sub-group without εἰδότες (see note 23 below).

¹² There is also a small sub-group without the participle (see Table 3 below).

¹³ From here on I omit the letters *IG* in making reference to texts from the Corpus. Thus references introduced by ii² are to be interpreted as *IG* ii².

¹⁴ There is some doubt about the reading here as compared with the certainty of ἐκάστου in S.24.119 (see lower in Table). If one wishes to reconcile the two one can read in ii² 423 ἐκάστου|[ς δεδόχθαι instead of ἐκάστου |[ἐ]νηφίσθαι.

¹⁵ An even later example is the fragmentary ii² 1038.8–9 (c. 130) – for the date, see Tracy, *Letter-Cutters* 242 – where the presence of the hortatory intention is assured by the words ὅπως ἂν εἰδώσιν ἅπαντε|[ς. The clause there rounds off an ἐπαινέσαι plus στεφανῶσαι provision.

τοῖς εὐεργετοῦσιν εἰαυτοῖ[ν καὶ] διαμένουσιν ἐπὶ τῆς εὐνοία[ς το]ῦ δήμου D22 (ii² 222)14–16
 (c. 334)
 τοῖς εὐεργέτ[αις D38 (ii² 448.I)19 (323/2)
 τοὺς ἐν]δεικνυμένους αὐτῶι τὴν ε[ύνοϊαν S.24.119.15–16 (301/0–295/4)
 τῶν εὐεργετησάντων ἑαυτὸν S. 28.60.85 (270/69)
 τοῖς εἰς ἑαυτὸν φιλοτιμουμένοις ii² 908.8 (181–170)
 cf. το]ῖς εἰς ἑαυτὸν φιλοτιμουμένοις ii² 909.10 (c. 170)
 τοῖς φιλοτιμουμέ[νοις εἰς ἑαυτὸν ii² 1038.8–9 (c. 130)
 and sundry further qualifications may be included, e.g.
 ἀξίως τῶν εὐεργεσιῶν ii² 555.12 (307–303)
 κα]τὰ τὴν ἀξίαν ἐκάστους¹⁶ S. 24.119.16–17 (301/0–295/4).

Table 2 (φιλοτιμῶνται + εἰδότες¹⁷)

Reference	Point of insertion	Significant wording	Date
ii ² 425.9–14 ¹⁸	concluding <i>enktesis</i> grant	χά]ριτας ἀπολ[ή]φονται ἀξίας] τῶν εὐεργε[σιῶν	c. 375–350?
S.40.70 (ii ² 257+300) 7–10	concluding decree, after provisions for publication	ὁ δῆμος χάριτας ἀποδ[ί]δωσιν τοῖς εἰς ἑαυτὸν φιλοτι[μο]υμένοις	c. 350
ii ² 360.IV.63–65 ¹⁹	concluding ἄλλο ἀγαθόν provision	τιμᾶι καὶ στεφανοῖ ἢ βουλή τοὺς φ[ι]λοτιμου- μένους	330/29
MT 49.52–55	concluding ἐπαινέσαι + στεφανῶσαι provision	χάριτας αὐτοῖς ἢ βουλή ἀπο[δ]ώσει τὰς ἀξίας ἐκάστωι ὧν ἂν εὐ(ε)ργετή]σωσιν	328/7
ii ² 509.7–11	concluding provision for publication and setting up on acropolis	χάριτας ἀπολήφονται παρὰ τ[ο]ῦ δήμου ἀξίας τῶν εὐ]εργετημάτων	post 307/6
ii ² 488.19–22	concluding provision to grant funds for sacrifice and dedication	τιμ]ηθ[ή]σο]ν[ται] ὑπὸ [τῆς βουλῆς] καὶ [τοῦ δή]μου	303/2
D75 (ii ² 652) 26–29	between enrolment and second vote in citizenship award	χά]ριτας ἀπολήφονται ἀ]λλ[ξίας τ]ῶν εὐεργετη- μάτων ²⁰	paullo post 286/5

It would appear from the above that this is an earlier²¹ form of the hortatory intention, which did not much survive the end of the fourth century. The only extant example from the third century is D75 (ii² 652) 26–29, where Osborne offers the following text:

ὅπως καὶ οἱ] stoich. 38–42

[ἄλλο]ι φιλοτιμῶνται ἀγωνί[ζεσθαι ὑπὲρ τοῦ δήμου]
 [τοῦ Ἐ]θηναίων εἰδότες ὅτι χά]ριτας ἔξουσιν κατα]
 [ξίας τ]ῶν εὐεργετημάτων·

¹⁶ Cf. the comment in note 14 above.

¹⁷ S.21.336 (ii² 514+) 12–20 (307/6–302/1, sed vix post 306/5?) appears to have a combination of εἰδῶσιν and φιλοτιμῶνται. Woodhead, in his commentary on this text (see W. 112; cf. also his discussion of the date), notes: “the encouragement to emulation of the honorand, and the proclamation of the public response to those who advise the people well, are unusually fulsome”. In S.28.60 (H.Suppl.17.2/4) 83ff. (cf. Table 1 above) we find the wording ὅπως ἂν οὖν εἰδῶσι πάντες [οἱ βολ]υόμενοι φιλοτιμεῖσθαι πρὸς τὴν πόλιν διότι κτλ. (This latter is the only example of διότι rather than ὅτι.)

¹⁸ For the relation between this text and ii² 64 and 293, see now S.39.69.

¹⁹ In vv. 75–77 of the same document we have, also after an ἄλλο ἀγαθόν provision, a quite unique form of the hortatory intention: ὅπως | ἂν καὶ οἱ ἄλλοι ἐθέλωσι [ἐτοιμ]ῶ[ς εὐεργετεῖν τὴν βου]λήν καὶ τὸν δῆ[μο]ν ὀρῶντες | τοὺς φιλοτιμουμέ[νους] - - .

²⁰ For the wording see immediately below.

²¹ However, certainly not as early as the end of the fifth century, as Kirchner and Hiller thought in restoring i² 113.37. David Lewis was wise to leave this line uncompleted in i³ 113.

but I would be inclined to read $\chi\acute{\omicron}[\rho\iota\tau\alpha\varsigma \acute{\alpha}\pi\omicron\lambda\eta\psi\omicron\nu\omicron\tau\alpha\iota \acute{\alpha}|\xi\acute{\iota}\alpha\varsigma$, this being a well-attested wording, here with the potential benefactors as subject. $\tau\iota\mu\eta\theta\acute{\eta}\sigma\omicron\nu\omicron\tau\alpha\iota$ also occurs (ii² 488), and sometimes the subject of the clause is the Boule or the Demos.²²

The most noticeable feature of this formulation is that it appears to be employed with a great range of provisions. Moreover, unlike our previous group, there is no example here introducing the probouleumatic formula.²³

Table 3 (ἐφάμιλλον + εἰδόσι/εἰδότας)²⁴

Reference	Point of insertion	Date
D47 (ii ² 558) 11–14*	introducing citizenship award	c. 303/2
D74 (ii ² 663) 33–36	concluding citizenship award	286/5
D87 (ii ² 808) 22–25	concluding citizenship award	280s ²⁵
H.2.156.16–17*	introducing PF	275/4
H.6.445/6.2.B4–5*	introducing motion formula for demos (MFD) ²⁶	255/4? or 253/2? ²⁷
S.39.125 (ii ² 798) 22–26	introducing PF	251/0? (or 253/2?) ²⁸
PM 25 (W.217) 13–15*	introducing PF	242/1 or 241/0 or 240/39 ²⁹
ii ² 786.15–17	introducing PF	?c.225 ³⁰
ii ² 847.33–36	introducing PF	215/14
ii ² 931.10*	introducing PF	c. in. s. ii
ii ² 984.5–8	introducing PF	med. s. ii
ii ² 1008.II.64–65*	introducing PF	118/17
ii ² 1011.II.45*	introducing PF	106/5 ³¹

Table 3 thus reveals evidence of this form from the end of the fourth century down to the end of the second,³² and indicates a strong association with citizenship provisions and with the probouleumatic formula.

The variations in wording are too extensive (and the evidence often too fragmentary) to allow detailed analysis of every example, but various trends may be singled out for comment:

(a) ἐφάμιλλον is normally construed with an infinitive, e.g. D47 (ii² 558) 11–14 (c. 303/2):

²² I also suspect that we should read ὅπως ἄν rather than ὅπως alone in I.26 (there is adequate room), especially in view of I.14, where we find ὅπως ἄν οὖν: cf. Henry, *Miscellanea* section II, and *CQ* 16 [1966] 291–3). I concede, however, that it appears that ὅπως alone must be restored in D74 (ii² 663) 33 (286/5).

²³ ii² 338.21–24 (333/2) ὅπως ἄν καὶ οἱ ἄλλοι οἱ ἀεὶ χειροτονούμενοι ἐπὶ τὰς κρήνας φιλοτιμῶνται ἕκαστοι εἰς τὸν δῆμον, and ii² 641.23–25 (299/8) ὅπως ἄν ὡς πλείστοι φιλοτιμῶνται χρεῖαν παρέχεσθαι ἐ[π]ὶ τὰ συμφέροντα τῷ δήμῳ, both of which conclude a στεφανῶσαι provision, have no εἰδότες phrase. Nor does D29 (S.21.310) 40–42 (319/18) ὅπως ἄν καὶ οἱ ἄλλ[οι πάντε]ς φιλοτιμῶνται ποεῖν [ἀγαθὸν ὅτι ἄν] | ἐξ[α]σ[τ]ος δύνηται τὸν [δῆμον], which concludes a grant of citizenship.

²⁴ Those examples which lack the participle are marked with an asterisk.

²⁵ For the date see my article in E. M. Craik ed., *Owls to Athens. Essays on Classical Subjects Presented to Sir Kenneth Dover*, Oxford (1990) 179–189.

²⁶ See Rhodes, *Boule* 65.

²⁷ For the year of the archon Athenodoros, see the relevant excursus in Woodhead, *Agora*.

²⁸ See note 8 above.

²⁹ For the year of the archon Kydenor, see the relevant excursus in Woodhead, *Agora*.

³⁰ For the date, see Pečírka, *Enktesis* 106–110, and cf. Tracy, *Letter-Cutters* 46.

³¹ Other certain, but more fragmentary, examples include D71 (ii² 721) 2–5 (295/4 or 291–286); D78 (ii² 667) 11–13 (266/5); ii² 700.18–20 (257/6?); S.26.98.27–29 (204/3); S.15.104.II.90–92 (127/6), all introducing the probouleumatic formula. So too H.32.15/16.14.5–8 (c.170) [cf. S.21.419 and W. 285], but I suspect that the text there should be revised to read ὅπως οὖν ἐφάμιλλον | [ἦ] ἅπασιν τοῖς φιλοτιμουμένοις εἰς τὰς κοινὰς | [χ]ρεῖας εὐεργετεῖν εἰδόσιν ὅτι κτλ. (see Henry, *Miscellanea* section IV).

³² The fragmentary ii² 1045.2–4 is evidence for the occurrence of the form in the *first* century also.

στοιχ. 27

ὅπως δ' ἄν ἐφάμιλλο(ν) ἦι πᾶ
[σι συναγωνίζ]εσθαι ἀπροφασίστω
[ς τῆι τε τῶν] βασιλέων προαιρέσει
[καὶ τῆι τῶ]ν Ἑλλήνων ἐλευθερία

cf. φιλοτιμε[ῖσθαι D87 (ii² 808) 23 (280s)
τὴν][ἀρ]χὴν ταύτην ἄρχε[ιν PM 25 (W.217) 14–15 (242/1 or 241/0 or 240/39)³³
εὐεργετε[ῖν ii² 786.15 (?225)
φιλοδο[ξεῖν] ii² 931.10 (c. in. s. ii).³⁴

It is also possible to find a formulation without an infinitive, e.g. ii² 847.33–36 (215/14):

ὅπως ἄν
οὖν ἐφάμιλλον εἶ τοῖς φιλοτιμουμένοι[ς]
εἰδόσιν ὅτι χάριτας ἀξίας κομιοῦντα[ι³⁵ ὦν]
ἄν εὐεργετήσωσιν

(b) in the combinations which include the participle we may find either the accusative, e.g. D74 (ii² 663) 33–36 (286/5):

στοιχ. 30

ὅπως ἐφάμιλλον ἦι πᾶσι χρει[ας παρ]
[έχεσθαι τῶι δ]ήμωι εἰδότας ὅτι [κομιο]
[ῦνται χάριτα]ς καταξίας τῶν εὐε[ργ]ε[τ]
[ημάτων]³⁶

or the dative, as in ii² 847.33–36 (215/14), quoted above.

(c) with regard to those examples which stand without the participle εἰδότας/εἰδόσι, the following specific observations are perhaps worth making:

(i) in D47 (ii² 558) the lines quoted in (a) above are immediately – and, to my knowledge, uniquely – followed by a genitive absolute, which explains *why* everyone should feel such a sense of emulation:

τ
[ιωμένω]ν ὑπὸ τοῦ δήμου κατ' ἀξίαν
[τῶν ἀπο]δεικνυμένων τὴν εἰς τὰ πρ
[άγματ]α εὔνοιαν

This effectively replaces the emphasis on what potential benefactors should *know* about the Athenians' reaction to good services.

(ii) in the very fragmentary H.6.445/6.2.B4–5 (255/4? or 253/2?), a decree honouring *sitophylakes*, where there is clearly no room for the inclusion of the participial phrase, Margaret Crosby offered a restoration which, at first sight, might appear suspect because, as construed by her, the hortatory intention is expressed with an *articular* infinitive:

στοιχ. 50

ὅπως ἄν ο]ῦν ἐφάμιλλο[ν]
[ἦι τὸ φιλοτιμεῖσθαι προθύμως καὶ δικαίως ἄρχ]ε[ιν τὴν ἀρχήν [ν]³⁷

However, although the overall reconstruction can by no means be regarded as certain, this particular aspect is unobjectionable, being paralleled by ii² 798.23–25, a decree honouring an *agonothetes*, now re-edited by Michael Osborne:³⁸

³³ For date see note 29 above.

³⁴ For the rare verb φιλοδοξεῖν in the hortatory intention in Athenian state decrees cf. S.21.452 (W.292) 15 (169/8?); ii² 1045.4 (ante med. s.i); and, in non-state documents, ii² 1304.40 (paullo post 211/10), and ii² 1227.21 (131/0).

³⁵ For this common wording cf. also S.39.125.24–25 (251/0), ἀξίας κομιοῦ[ντ]αι χάριτας, and D74, as quoted in (b) below.

³⁶ Cf. also D87 (ii² 808) 24 (280s).

³⁷ The text is repeated in W. 194, with the minor adjustment of ἦι for εἶ, although Woodhead concedes that, at this period, either form is possible.

³⁸ See note 8 above.

ἐφ]άμιλλον εἶ τὸ φιλοτ[ι] stoich. 42

[μεῖσθαι εἰδόσιν ὅτι παρὰ τοῦ δή]μου ἀξζίας κομοῦ[ντ]
[αι χάριτας

What is perhaps more surprising is the apparent total omission, in the dative case, of any reference to those to whom the appeal is directed. This would be unparalleled, and could perhaps be remedied (*exempli gratia*) by reading as follows:

ὅπως ἄ[ν ο]ῦν ἐφάμιλλο[ν]

[ἦ]ι ἅπασιν τοῖς ἄρξουσιν φιλοτίμως ταύτην ἄρχ]ειν τὴν ἀρχήν [ν]

This would reflect the wording of both PM 25 (W. 217) 13–15, a decree honouring *agoranomoi*

ὅπως] stoich. 38

[ἄν] οὔν ἐφάμιλλον [ἦ]ι ἅπασιν τοῖς ἄρξουσιν τὴν
[ἀρ]χὴν ταύτην ἄρχε[ιν κατὰ τοὺς νόμους

and H.2.156.5 (W. 185) 16–17 (275/4), a decree in honour of *taxiarchs*

ὅπως ἄν οὔν ἐφάμιλλον ἦι τοῖς ἄρξουσι] stoich. 43

ν τὴν ἀρχὴν ταύτην φιλοτίμ[ως καὶ δικαίως ἄρχειν

All three examples would thus express the encouragement of emulation among officials in the performance of their duties: cf. also the similar encouragement of *kosmetai* in ii² 1008.II.64–65 (118/17):

καὶ π]ᾶσιν ἐφάμιλλον ἦ τοῖς ἐπὶ ταύτην

τὴν ἀρχὴν καθισταμένοις δικαίως καὶ τὸν αὐτὸν [τρόπον διεξάγειν

and ii² 1011.II.45 (106/5):

καὶ πᾶσιν ἐφάμιλλον ἦ τοῖς ἐπὶ ταύτην τὴν ἀρχὴν καθισταμένοις δικαίως καὶ
[τ]ὸν αὐτὸν τρόπον διεξάγειν

both of which likewise lack the participle εἰδότας/εἰδόσι³⁹ and are also combined with a preceding φαίνωνται clause⁴⁰ introduced by ἵνα⁴¹.

(d) normally the potential benefactors are the subject of the ὅτι-clause dependent on the participle, as can be seen yet again in ii² 847, although we find quite a different formulation in ii² 786.15–17 (?c. 225):

ὅπως ἄν οὔν ἐφάμιλλον εἶ[ι] εὐεργετε[ῖν πᾶσιν εἰδό]

σιν ὅτι καὶ ὁ δήμος καθάπερ αὐτῶ[ι πάτριόν ἐστιν, ἀπο]

δώσει τὴν προσήκουσαν ἐκάστο[ις χάριν

where the stress is laid on the favour coming from the People.

CATEGORY B

As an alternative to the various forms of Category A formulations which we have just examined there also exists an extensive group of parallel formulations which employ either the adjective φανερός (personally or impersonally) or the verb φαίνεσθαι. All of these essentially express the hope that the People's gratitude to benefactors may be manifestly obvious to all and sundry.

1. with the adjective:

(i) impersonally: *in order that it may be evident* (φανερόν) *to all that the Demos/Boule and Demos of the Athenians . . .*

³⁹ So too probably the extremely fragmentary ii² 931.10 (c. in. s. ii).

⁴⁰ See Table 7 below, together with note 75.

⁴¹ For a discussion of conjunctions introducing final clauses in Athenian inscriptions see Henry, *CQ* 16 (1966) 291–293.

Table 4 (φανερών)

Reference	Point of insertion	Significant wording	Date
ii ² 505.41–43	introducing PF	ἐπίσταται χάριτας ἀποδιδόναι[ι κ]αταξίας τοῖς φιλοτιμουμένοις εἰ[ς] ἑα[υτ]ό[ν]	302/1
ii ² 657.50–52	introducing PF	ἐπί]σταται χάριτας ἀποδιδόναι τ[οῖς εὐεργέταις ἀξί]ας ὧν ἂν εὐεργετήσωσιν	283/2
S.25.89.19–23	introducing PF	τιμήσει τοῖς δικαίως ἄρχοντας τὰς ἀρχὰς καὶ κατὰ τοὺς νόμους	282/1

We may note

- (a) the infrequency of this type⁴²
- (b) that each example (except D84) introduces the probouleumatic formula
- (c) the parallelism in significant wording between this type and many of the examples in Table 1.

Before concluding this section we may also compare ii²1028.93–96 (101/100):

ὅπως ἄ[ν]

οὖν ἡ βουλή καὶ ὁ δῆμος φαίνονται τιμῶν[τ]ε[ς] τοὺς ἀξίους τῶν ἀρχόντων καὶ γ[ί]νεται φα]νερόν ὅτι πᾶσι τοῖς καλῶς καὶ εὐσεβῶς ἀναστραφεῖσιν ἐστὶν τιμηθῆναι κα[ταξί]ως τῶν πεπραγμένων

Here the personal construction with φαίνονται is coupled with a somewhat different impersonal φανερόν: ‘. . . and it may be evident that it is possible for those who conduct themselves in an honourable and pious manner to be honoured in a way worthy of their deeds’.

(ii) personally:

Here too there are very few examples⁴³ and sufficiently heterogeneous as to warrant full and individual citation.

Several examples convey the same idea as the impersonal type, e.g.

(a) D83 (ii² 717) 6–8 (c. 286–262):

ὅπως ἂν οὖν καὶ ὁ δῆμ[ο]ς

[ο]ς φα]νερός εἶ χάριτας ἀξίας ἀποδιδούς τῶν εἰς ἑαυτ[ὸν] εὐεργεσιῶν

Here φα]νερός is the guarantee of the presence of the personal construction, and the overall restoration must be basically correct. The clause is inserted immediately before the probouleumatic formula.⁴⁴

(b) ii² 791 (W. 213) 24–25 (245/4 or 244/3)⁴⁵, a decree calling for voluntary contributions to a defence fund:

ὅπως ἂν φανερ[ᾶ] ἅπασιν ἡ φιλοτιμία τῶν βουλομένων εὐεργετῆν τ[ὸν] δῆμ[ο]ν

Although this belongs in this group it is very much *sui generis*. One cannot do better than quote the words of Woodhead:⁴⁶ “The ‘hortatory intention’ is here attached to the publication of the decree and list as a permanent and visible record of the patriotism and generosity of the contributors, rather than to the more usual aim of encouraging future emulation or publicising the gratitude of the *demos*, and it is well tailored to the particular circumstances.” Its actual point of insertion is immediately after the provision for erecting the stone in the Agora.

⁴² D84 (ii² 805) 5–9 (286–262) is clearly another example but too fragmentary for there to be sufficient certainty over the wording. The point of insertion there is at the conclusion of a grant of citizenship.

⁴³ D75 (ii² 652) 14–15 (paullo post 286/5), introducing the probouleumatic formula, is *not* to be restored with φαυ[ε]ροῖ ὧσιν καὶ οἱ Ἀθηναῖοι]. The reasons are given in Henry, *Miscellanea* section II, where I suggest the reading φαί[ν]ονται καὶ ἡ βουλή καὶ ὁ δῆμος.

⁴⁴ Whether or not ii² 845.9–11 (paullo post 249?) also introducing the probouleumatic formula, is similarly an example of ὁ δῆμος φανερός, the article in τοὺς Ἀθηναίους in v. 10 is impossible (see Henry, *CQ* 66 [1966] 295–296). For the date of this document see S. V. Tracy, *Hesperia* 57 (1988) 320 (cf. S.38.97).

⁴⁵ For the year of Diomedon, see the relevant excursus in Woodhead, *Agora*.

⁴⁶ Commentary on vv. 24–25 of W. 213.

(c) S.21.435.9–10 (187/6), introducing publication details:

ἵνα δὲ τὰ δεδογμένα φιλόανθρωπα | τῶι δήμῳ φανερά πᾶσιν εἶ

Although the expression is clearly personal, there can be no certainty about the restoration at the end of l. 9.

(d) S.19.108 (ii² 1006) 88–90 (122/1) a long-winded ephebic document:

ἵνα οὖν καὶ ἡ βουλὴ [καὶ] ὁ δῆμος φανε-
ροὶ γίνων[τ]αι τιμ[ῶν]τες καταξίως τοὺς φιλαγαθοῦντας τ[ῶν] κοσμ[η]τῶν καὶ
ἄρχοντας δικαίως καὶ κατὰ το[ῦ]ς νόμους καὶ ἀποδε[ικ]νυμένους τὴν
εἰς ἑαυτοὺς εὖν[οιαν], γίνονται δὲ κα[ὶ] ἄλλοι ζηλωταὶ τῶ[ν] αὐτῶν

The point of insertion is immediately before the probouleumatic formula, and here the second clause urges parallel emulation from others.

(e) ii² 1072.11–12 (inter 91/2 et 97/8), a very late example, concluding a decree authorising the erection of a statue for Antonios Oxylos:

ὅπως ἂν τούτων πραττομένων
ἡ τῆς πόλεως φιλανθρωπία τοῖς καλοῖς κάγαθοῖς τῶν ἀνδρῶν ὑπάρχουσι φανερά
πᾶσι γείνηται.

2. with the verb φαίνεσθαι: *in order that the Boule and/or Demos may be clearly seen to . . .* (+ participle).

As will be seen below, this is by far the commonest form of the hortatory intention. It can be subdivided into 3 formulations:

(i) Demos alone:

Table 5 (ὁ δῆμος φαίνεται)

Reference	Point of insertion	Significant wording	Date
D86 (ii ² 716) 6–8	introducing PF	διατηρῶν τὰς δεδομένας τιμάς	s. iv/iii
ii ² 672.10–11	introducing MFD	τιμῶν τοὺς πρὸς ἑαυτὸν φιλοτιμουμένους	279/8? ⁴⁷
ii ² 682.64–66	introducing PF	τιμῶν τοὺς ἀγαθοὺς ἄνδρας καὶ ἀξιόους μνήμης	259/8 ⁴⁸
ii ² 776.20–22	introducing commendation and crown	τιμ[ῶν] τοὺς περὶ πλε[ίστου] ποιουμένο]ις τὴν εἰς το[ῦ]ς θεοὺς εὐσέβ[ειαν]	263/2 or 259/8 or 256/5 ⁴⁹
ii ² 844.I.20–22	introducing MFD	τιμῶν τοὺς ἀποδεικνυμένους ἦν ἔχουσιν αἴρεσιν ἐμ παντὶ καιρῶι	229/8
S.25.106.25–27	introducing PF	ἐμ παντὶ καιρῶι μεμνημένος φαίνεται τῶν ἐκτενώς τὰς χρεῖας αὐτῶι ⁵⁰ παρεσχημένων	226/5
S.29.116.23–25	introducing PF	τιμῶν	214/13
S.25.112.38 ⁵¹	introducing PF	τιμῶν τοὺς ἀγαθοὺς ἄνδρας	196/5
D106 (ii ² 922) 2–4	introducing PF	τιμῶν	c. 190–165
ii ² 891.8–10 ⁵²	introducing MFD	χάριτας] ἀξίας ἀποδιδούς τοῖς εἰς ἑαυτὸν φιλοτιμουμένοις	188/7
D108 (ii ² 981) 2–3	introducing PF	τιμῶν τοὺς ἀξιόυ[ς] ὄντας	c. 150 ⁵³

⁴⁷ See S.38.74.

⁴⁸ See Henry, *Chiron* 22 (1992) 25–33.

⁴⁹ For the year of the archon Alkibiades, see Meritt, art. cit. (note 8 above), 88, 93 and Osborne, art. cit. (note 8 above), 228, 237.

⁵⁰ For the problem of the indirect reflexive, see the Appendix and cf. note 67 below.

⁵¹ Although restored, the clause is almost certainly immediately joined (vv. 39–41) with a ὅπως ἂν εἴδωσιν clause encouraging emulation in others. On this 'doubled' form, see W. 261, commentary on vv. 38–41.

⁵² There is also a ὑπόμνημα formulation later at vv. 17–18 (see Table 8 below).

⁵³ This is the mid-point of the datable activity of the 'Cutter of Agora I 6006'; see Tracy, *Letter-Cutters* 149.

D107 (ii ² 853)18–20	concluding publication provisions	τιμῶν το[ὺς ἄνδρας τοὺς ἀποδεικνυμένους τὴν [ε]ῦνοιαν	c. 150 vel postea ⁵⁴
ii ² 945.16–17	introducing PF	τιμῶν τ[οὺς ἀπο]δεικνυμένους] τὴμ πρὸς ἑαυτὸ[ν εὔν]οιαν	168/7
S.38.112 (ii ² 937) 37–38	introducing PF	τι[μῶν τοὺς ἀγαθοὺς] ἄνδρας	c. 135?

It is noteworthy that, with very few exceptions, these examples introduce either the probouleumatic formula or the motion formula for the ecclesia.

Mention should perhaps also be made here of the extremely fragmentary D119 (S.16.73+) 7 (c.202–192?), where the opening words of the hortatory intention are restored by Osborne⁵⁵ as follows:

[εἰς αὐρίον· ὅπως δ' ἂν οὖν καὶ ὁ δῆμος ἀεὶ] μεμνημένος φαίνεται τῶν ἐ[ν]

But this cannot be correct: we need either δέ or οὖν but not both.⁵⁶ Since it is most unlikely that the clause is to be appended to the immediately preceding invitation to dine in the Prytaneion, we should regard this as an instance of the hortatory intention introducing a grant of citizenship⁵⁷ with the simple connective δέ.⁵⁸

(ii) Boule alone:

Table 6 (ἡ βουλή φαίνεται)

Reference	Point of insertion	Significant wording	Date
ii ² 487.10–12	introducing motion formula for boule (MFB) ⁵⁹	ἀξίαν χάρι[ν] ἐκάστωι[ς] ἀ[πο]διδοῦσα τῶν πεφίλο- τιμημένων	304/3
MT 261.49–51	introducing MFB	ἀπονέμουσα ⁶⁰ τὸγ κα[θ]ήκοντα ἔπαινον ⁶¹	143/2? ⁶²
S.22.110 (ii ² 1039) 12–13 ⁶³	concluding commendation and crown provisions	τιμ[ῶσα]	80/79? ⁶⁴
ibid. 43–44	concluding provision to erect stele with names and decrees	τιμ[ῶ]σα τοὺς ἀγαθοὺς τῶν [ἀν]δρῶν	80/79?
ibid. 58–59	introducing MFB	ἀποδεχομένη τὴν τῶν ἐ[φήβω]ν ἀρετὴν καὶ πρὸς τὰ κ[α]λὰ φιλοτιμίαν	80/79?
ibid. 66–68	concluding decree	τιμῶσ[α τοὺς] ἀπὸ τῆς πρώτης [ἡλ]ικίας τῶ[ν] [νέω]ν ἐπιδιδόντας ἑαυτοὺς ἐπὶ τὰ κάλλιστα τῶν [ἐπιτηδευ- μά]τω[ν] ⁶⁵	80/79?

⁵⁴ Osborne, *Naturalization in Athens*, vol. II, Brussels, 1982, p.193, is inclined to place this text, also the work of Tracy's 'Cutter of Agora I 6006', late in the cutter's career.

⁵⁵ In this he is followed by Woodhead (see W.239), although the latter determines a slightly wider text of c. 54–57 letters on the basis of the relatively well preserved vv. 10–13. In the *editio princeps* (H.26.58.13) Benjamin Meritt did not make this error. (We may note that he was working with an entirely different layout and with no knowledge of fragment b.)

⁵⁶ Cf. similar criticism of the reading at D89 (ii² 570) 10 (s. iii pars prima?) in Henry, *Miscellanea* section III.

⁵⁷ The overall reconstruction of this difficult text need not detain us here. For the question of the reflexive pronoun in v. 8 see the Appendix below.

⁵⁸ In D40 (ii² 438) 7 there should be no semi-colon, rather a comma, before ὅπως ἄν.

⁵⁹ See Rhodes, *Boule* 65.

⁶⁰ For ἀπονέμουσα cf. MT 254.52 (104/3), and cf. following footnote.

⁶¹ S.28.95.15–16 (c.30) guarantees the restoration.

⁶² See Habicht, *Hesperia* 57 (1988) 238–239.

⁶³ This is a long ephebic document. The examples at vv. 12–13 and 43–44 occur at the end of a section of the document. So too in the case of ii² 1043.15–16 and 58–59 below.

⁶⁴ See S.38.117.

⁶⁵ The text continues γίνονται δὲ καὶ ἕτεροι ζ[η]λωταὶ τῶ[ν] | [ὁμοί]ων. Cf. ii² 1042.d.18–19 (c. 40/39). ii² 1043.58–60 (37/6?) has the slightly different word order τῶν ὁμοίων ζηλωταί.

ii ² 1041.7–8	after publication provisions	πρόνοιαν ποιουμένη τῆς τῶν ἐφήβων ἀγωγῆς	45/4?
S.23.77.19–20	concluding decree	πλίστην πρόνοιαν ποιουμένη τῆς πρὸς τὴν θεὸν εὐσεβείας	37 vel paullo post
ii ² 1043.15–16	concluding commendation and crown provisions	τειμῶσα	37/6?
ibid.58–59	concluding publication provision	τιμῶσα [το]ὺς ἀπὸ τῆς πρώτης ἡλικίας τῶν νέων ἐπιδιδόντας ἔ[αυ]τοὺς ἐπὶ τὰ κάλλιστα τῶν ἐπιτηδευμάτων	37/6?
S.28.95.15–16	introducing MFB	τοῖς φιλαγάθ[ω]ς καὶ μεγαλομερῶς ἀναστρεφομένοις ἀπονέμουσα τὸν καθήκο[ν]τα ἔπαινον	c.30
MT 293.19–20	concluding prytany document	τὴν προσήκουσαν πρόνοιαν ποιουμένη	c.20

It is to be noted that these formulations occur mainly in ephebic and prytany documents, and there either introduce the motion formula for the boule or conclude sections of, or the whole of, each decree.

(iii) Boule and Demos

Table 7 (ἡ βουλὴ καὶ ὁ δῆμος φαίνεται/φαίνονται⁶⁶)

Reference	Point of insertion	Significant wording	Date
S.14.64 19–20	introducing PF	φαίνεται τιμῶν τοὺς χρεῖας αὐτῶι ⁶⁷ παρεχομένου	271/0
ii ² 677.7–8	introducing MFB ⁶⁸	φαίνεται διαφυλάττων [τοῖς εὐεργέταις] τὰς χάριτας	c.250
ii ² 788.15–18	introducing PF	φαίνονται χάριν ἀποδιδόντες τοῖς φιλοτιμουμένοις	235/4
ii ² 785.20–22	introducing PF	φαίνεται τιμῶν τοὺς εὐεργέ[τ]ας καὶ χάριτας ἀξίας ἀποδιδούς	196/5 ⁶⁹
ii ² 992.6–8	introducing PF	φαί[ν]ονται τιμῶντες καὶ φιλοφρον[ο]ύμενοι	c.170 ⁷⁰
ii ² 956.22–24 ⁷¹	introducing PF	μνημονεύοντες φαίνονται τῶν εἰς ἑαυτοὺς φιλοτιμουμένων καὶ ἐτοίμως διδόντων εἰ[ς] τὰς ἐπιμελείας	161/0
S.21.469.17–19	introducing PF	φαίνονται κτλ. ⁷²	129/8
ii ² 1006.I.37–38	introducing PF	φαίνονται ⁷³ τιμ[ῶν]τες τοὺς ἀξίους καὶ πειθαρχοῦν[τ]ας τοῖς τε νόμοις κτλ. ⁷⁴	122/1
ii ² 1008.II.63–65	introducing PF	φαίνονται τοὺς ἀναστραφέντας ἐ[ν] [τ]αῖς ἀρχαῖς καλῶς καὶ ἀπὸ παντὸς τοῦ βελτίστ[ου] τῆς καθήκουσης τιμῆς ἀξιοῦν[τ]ες ⁷⁵	118/17
ii ² 1009.I 10–12	introducing PF	φαίνονται τιμῶντες τοὺς πειθαρχοῦν[τ]α[ς] τοῖς τε νόμοις καὶ [τοῖς ψ]ηφίσμασιν	116/15
ibid.II.45–47	introducing PF	φαίνονται τοὺς ἀγαθοῦς τῶν ἀνδρῶν καὶ [καλῶς] καὶ δικαίως ἀναστρεφόμενους τιμῶντες ταῖς [καθη]κο[ύ]σαις δωρεαῖς	116/15

⁶⁶ Both singular and plural occur. Moreover, the participle, when singular, is regularly masculine. Cf. Woodhead (commentary on v. 19 of W. 187 [= S.14.64]: “Boule and demos (together the ‘administration’) are counted as a singular collective noun.”

⁶⁷ For the problem of the indirect reflexive, see Appendix, and cf. note 50 above.

⁶⁸ Probably in error for the PF.

⁶⁹ For the date of the archon Charikles, see the relevant excursus in Woodhead, *Agora*. Woodhead rejects attempts to place Charikles in 184/3 (see Tracy, *Letter-Cutters* 73 and 142 note 5).

⁷⁰ See Tracy, *op. cit.*, 101 and 262.

⁷¹ The wording of ii² 958.18–21 (153/2?) is identical. For the date of this latter text, see Habicht, *Hesperia* 57 (1988) 240.

⁷² The full wording is φαίνονται οὐ μόνον διατηροῦντες τὰ πάτρια, ἀλλὰ καὶ προσεπ[α]ύξον(τες) | τὰς τε θυσίας καὶ τὰς τιμὰς καλῶς καὶ εὐσεβῶς, ἵνα καὶ παρὰ τῶν θεῶν | κτήσονται τὰς καταξίας χάριτας.

⁷³ Contrast vv. 88–90 (see S.19.108 [p. 113 above]): φανεροὶ γίνων[τ]αι τιμ[ῶν]τες κτλ.

⁷⁴ I have refrained from giving here the full wording of some of these longwinded ephebic texts.

⁷⁵ The formulation is continued with an ἐφάμιλλον clause (vv. 64–65). ii² 1008 and 1011 are very similar (cf. Table 3 and p. 111 above).

ii ² 1011.I.22–23	introducing PF	φαίνωνται τιμῶντες τοὺς πειθαρχοῦντας τοῖς τε νόμοις καὶ ψηφίσμασιν καὶ τῷ κοσμητεῖ	106/5
ibid.II.43–45	introducing PF	φαίνωνται τοὺς ἀνεστραμμέν[ους] ἐν ταῖς ἀρχαῖς καλῶς καὶ ἀπὸ παντὸς τοῦ βελτίστου καὶ ἀδωροδοκίῳ τῆς προσηκούσης τιμῆς ἀξιοῦντες ⁷⁶	106/5
ii ² 1028.I. 42–44	introducing PF	φαίνωνται τιμῶντες τοὺς π[ειθα]ρχοῦντας τοῖς τε νόμοις κα[ὶ] ψηφίσμασιν ἐκ τῆς πρώτης ἡλικίας	101/100
ibid.II.93–96	introducing PF	φαίνωνται τιμῶν[τ]ες τοὺς ἀξίους τῶν ἀρχόντων ⁷⁷	101/100

This formulation, which seems to be confined to introducing the probouleumatic formula, appears not to ante-date the first half of the third century. However, it is certainly employed beyond the end of the second century, fragmentary examples occurring throughout the first century.⁷⁸

CATEGORY C

1. *in order that there may be a record/reminder* (ὑπόμνημα) of . . .

Table 8 (ὑπόμνημα)⁷⁹

Reference	Point of insertion	Significant wording	Date
H.9.104/5.20.21–23	concluding commendation and crown provisions	ὑπόμνημα εἰ τῆς ἐπιμελείας α[ὐ]τῶν	302/1
ii ² 653.50–52	introducing publication provisions (PP)	ὑπόμνημα ἥι τῆς οἰκειό[τητος κ]αὶ τῶν δωρειῶν τῶν προστιθεμένων αὐ[τῶ]ν πρ[ὸς] ταῖς ὑπαρχούσαις	285/4
S.28.60.104–105	introducing PP	ὑπόμνημα [δ]ιαμένει τῶν πεφιλολιμημένων εἰς τὸν δῆμον	270/69
ii ² 891.17–18 ⁸⁰	introducing PP	ὑπόμνημα ὑπάρχει τῶν γε[γε]γονότων [αὐτῶ]ν ὑπὸ τοῦ δήμου φιλανθρώπων	188/7
D100 (ii ² 954b) 19–20	introducing PP	ὑπόμνημα ὑπάρχει τῆς γεγονείας παρὰ [τοῦ δήμου] τιμῆς	181/0 (or 190/89 or 169/8) ⁸¹
ii ² 908.17–18 ⁸²	introducing PP	ὑπόμνημα ὑπάρχει αὐτῶν περὶ τῆς πρὸς τὸν [δ]ῆμον εὐνοίας	181–170
ii ² 909.19–20	introducing PP	ὑπόμνημα ὑπάρχει αὐτῶν περὶ τῆς πρὸς τὸν δῆμον εὐνοίας	c.170

This is clearly a favoured formulation from the early third century on for the introduction of the final publication provisions of decrees.

In conclusion, therefore, let us return to our starting-point viz. Michael Walbank's decree honouring, *inter alios*, persons involved in the purchase of grain. Walbank wished to place this document in the era of Lykourgos and the well-known grain shortage. He was satisfied that the letter forms were compatible with a date either in the late fourth century or in the early third, but had some concern that the formulae he restored fitted better in the third century rather than the fourth.

⁷⁶ Cf. preceding note.

⁷⁷ The formulation continues with καὶ γ[ίν]ηται φα[ν]ερὸν ὅτι κτλ. Cf. p. 110 above.

⁷⁸ Cf., e.g., ii² 1029.26–27 (96/5); S.111.31–33 (45/4).

⁷⁹ For the correction of the reading at D89 (ii² 570) 10–11 (?pars prima s. iii), where we cannot have both δέ and οὖν, see Henry, *Miscellanea* section III.

⁸⁰ There is a prior hortatory intention in vv. 8–10 of the same text.

⁸¹ For a discussion of the date of this document, see W. 276.

⁸² There is also a hortatory intention in vv. 7–8 of the same document, introducing the probouleumatic formula (ὅπως ἂν [ο]ῦν εἰδῶσιν ἅπαντες ὅτι κτλ.). The same is true for vv. 8–10 of ii² 909. (See Table 1 above).

- τοῖς φιλοτιμουμένοις εἰς ἑαυτὸν
 ii² 505.43 (302/1)
 τῶν εἰς ἑαυτοὺς φιλοτιμουμένων
 ii² 956.23–24 (c.161/0); ii² 958.19–20 (153/2).
- (b) εὐεργετεῖν: e.g.
 τοῖς εὐεργετοῦσιν ἑαυτὸν D22 (ii² 222) 14–15 (c.334); D74 (ii² 805) 9–10 (286–262)
 τοῖς εὐεργετεῖν ἑαυτὸν βουλομένοις S.19.80 (ii² 835) 16 (paullo post 229/8)
 τῶν εὐεργετησάντων ἑαυτὸν S.28.60.85 (270/69)
- (c) εὕνοια:
 τὴν πρὸς ἑαυτὸν εὕνοιαν ii² 945.17 (168/7)
 τὴν εἰς ἑαυτὸν εὕνοιαν S.19.108 (ii² 1006) 89–90 (122/1)

2. Examples where the letters AYT- are extant on the stone:

- (a) interpreted as αὐτ-:
- (i) S.30.65.21–22 (c.331–324?): Walbank (H.49.251/2.1) read τοῖς χρεῖαν αὐτ[ῶι παρεχομένοις].
 - (ii) S.24.119.15–16 (inter 301/300 et 295/4): Pečírka followed Meritt (H.13.242/3.7) in reading τοὺς ἐν]]δεικνυμένους αὐτῶι τὴν ε[ὔνοιαν. In this they are followed by Woodhead (W. 164).
 - (iii) S.14.64.20 (271/0): Dinsmoor (H.23.228/90.182) read τοὺς χρεῖας αὐτῶι παρεχομένους. So too Woodhead (W. 187).
 - (iv) S.25.106.26–27 (226/5): Meritt (H.4.525/7.39) read τῶν ἐκτενω̄ς | τὰς χρεῖας αὐτῶι παρεσχημένων. So too Woodhead (W. 224).

- (b) interpreted as αὐτ- :

In W. 239 (D119; S.16.73) 7–8 (f. s. iii)⁸⁵ we find τῶν [ἐν] | τοῖς πρότερον χρόν[οις εὐεργετηθ]ἐ[ντων εἰς αὐτόν. Osborne concedes that εὐεργετηθέντων would fit the available space, but rejects the possibility because the traces which Woodhead interprets as epsilon, Osborne sees as sigma. He might also have remarked that εὐεργετεῖν is never found as a passive deponent, nor is it construed with εἰς + accusative. What one would expect here would be φιλοτιμουμένων, and this is perhaps what we should read (φιλοτιμουμ]ἐ[νων).

3. Examples of restoration:⁸⁶

- (a) ii² 269 (=515) 11–12 (352–336) is restored τοῖς φιλοτι[[μουμένοις εἰς ἑαυτὸν . . .]. Although the text is cut stoichedon 30 there is clearly no compulsion to read the reflexive form in the lacuna. It may well, however, be the correct restoration.
- (b) D31 (ii² 392+586; S.26.83) 6–7 (321/0 – 319/18). Here Osborne follows Chara Karapa-Molisani in restoring τοῖς] φιλο[τιμου]μένοις πρὸς αὐ]τό[v. In view of the examples in 1(a) above it would be equally possible – and perhaps even preferable – to read, in this stoichedon text, εἰς ἑαυ]τό[v.
- (c) In D77 (H.9.353.48) 3 (286/5 vel paullo post) we find τοὺς εὐε[[ργετο]]ῦντ[ας αὐτόν. Here a form with only four letters is virtually guaranteed by the stoichedon layout, although, in the line in question, the letters ΠΓΕΤΟ are crowded into four letter-spaces.⁸⁷ Schweigert, the original editor, Osborne and Woodhead (W. 173) all read the contracted reflexive.

⁸⁵ I prefer to print Woodhead's text here, rather than Osborne's. Woodhead points out that the text must be defined as non-stoichedon c. 54–57, slightly wider than Osborne's c. 51–54. While refraining from a full restoration of v. 8, Osborne too prints εἰς αὐτόν.

⁸⁶ This is not an exhaustive list.

⁸⁷ Osborne also detected a shallow *rasura* at this point.

- (d) In D83 (ii² 717) 7–8 (286–262), stoichedon 41–43, Osborne follows the Corpus in reading τῶν εἰς ἑαυτ[ὸν] εὐεργεσιῶν.
- (e) ii² 672.10–11 (279/8), stoichedon 67, offers τοῖς πρ[ὸς] ἑαυτὸν φιλοτιμουμένοις.
- (f) In ii² 836.12 (c.224/3), non-stoichedon 35–40, we find τοῖς εὐεργ[ετοῦσιν] αὐτόν.
- (g) In D106 (ii² 922) 3–4 (c.190–165) Osborne follows the Corpus in reading, in this non-stoichedon text with a wide variety of length of line, τοὺς παρεχομένους] | [χρείας αὐ]τῶι. In ii² Addenda p. 668 we see that Wilhelm (AE [1912] 248) had proposed τοὺς γνησίως παρεχομέ[[νους] ἑαυ]τῶι, but Osborne rejects this as ‘less well suited to the available space’. The phrase is also unparalleled. For our purposes here, however, the interest lies in Wilhelm’s choice of the reflexive, on which Osborne does not comment.
- (h) ii² 966.13 (c. 150)⁸⁸ is restored, again by Wilhelm, to read τῆς εἰς [ἑαυτὸν] φιλοτιμίας. The text is non-stoichedon.
- (i) In D109.6 (c. 140) Osborne follows Tracy, the original editor (H.48.178.2), in reading [τοῖς εἰς ἑαυτὸν] φιλοτιμο]υμένοις in this non-stoichedon text.
- (j) In ii² 1038.9 (c.130), another non-stoichedon document, we find τοῖς φιλοτιμουμέ[νοις] εἰς ἑαυτόν.

This survey thus reveals a sizeable sample of examples of ἑαυτ- extant on the stone, a tendency on the part of editors to interpret the letters AYT as αὐτ- rather than αὐτ-, and an inconsistency of approach in the sphere of restoration as regards the choice of the aspirated or unaspirated form. In view of the large number of indisputable instances of ἑαυτ-, my own inclination would be to read the reflexive pronoun in every case.

⁸⁸ The date given is the mid-point in the range of the work attributed by Tracy to the Cutter of Agora I 6006 (see Tracy, *Letter-Cutters* 146–162).