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THE HORTATORY INTENTION IN ATHENIAN STATE DECREES

In publishing a decree concerning the supply of grain to Athens, Michael Walbank commented briefly on what he then 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 signalized in the publication of this decree (lines 23–24) on a marble stele, presumably upon the Akropolis.” 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.

It was not, of course, Walbank’s purpose to set forth a fully documented analysis of the so-called “hortatory intention,” and so he confined himself to a footnote very briefly outlining the history of the development of what he calls the formula ὁποῖος ἀνείδοσην 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 ὁποῖος ἀνείδοσην πάντες κτλ., vel. sim. first occurs in IG II², 183 (ante a. 353/2 a.); I have traced its career down to the middle of the 3rd century B.C. (IG II², 798, 823), but a complete list of its occurrences and variations is

* The following works are referred to by short title:
Pečírka, Enktesis = J. Pečírka, The Formula for the Grant of Enktesis in Attic Inscriptions, Prague, 1966
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, ὁποῖος ἀνείδοσην πάντες κτλ., vel. sim. first occurs in IG II², 183 (ante a. 353/2 a.); I have traced its career down to the middle of the 3rd century B.C. (IG II², 798, 823), but a complete list of its occurrences and variations is

1 Hesperia 49 (1980) 251–255 (SEG 30.65).
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.
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’, but, more importantly, the formula in question is almost entirely within a restoration. Similarly, IG II² 798 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. 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 (εἰδοῦσι, εἰδότες) that the People will respond with fitting gratitude:

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

---


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 Ἄθηναίων οἱ ὁ δῆμος κι ο θεοῦ θεοῦ βουλή.
2. in order that all (the others) may strive earnestly (φιλοτιμάντα) in the knowledge that (εἰδότες ὃτι)\(^{11}\) . . .

3. in order that it may be a matter of emulation (ἐφάμαλλον) to all (usually plus infinitive) in the knowledge that (εἰδότες/εἰδότας ὃτι)\(^{12}\) . . .

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference(^{13})</th>
<th>Point of insertion</th>
<th>Significant wording</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ii(^2) 223A.13–14</td>
<td>introducing publication provisions</td>
<td>ἐπίσταται χάριτας ἀποδιδόναι</td>
<td>343/2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii(^2) 276.15–18</td>
<td>concluding isoteleia grant</td>
<td>τιμᾶτι ὁ δήμος τοὺς ἄνδρας τοὺς [ἅγι]αθοὺς</td>
<td>c. 342</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii(^2) 233b (Tod 175) 18–23</td>
<td>concluding financial arrangements for Tenedos</td>
<td>ἐπίπλησαν[τὰ] δυκάκιος</td>
<td>340/39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii(^2) 423.2–5</td>
<td>introducing probouleumatic formula (PF)</td>
<td>τιμήσει[τὶ] αὐτοὺς ὁ δήμος κατὰ τὴν ἀξίαν ἐκάστου(^{14})</td>
<td>336–318</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D22 (ii(^2) 222) 11–16</td>
<td>introducing citizenship award</td>
<td>ἀποδίδουσιν χάριτας με[ι]γάλλας</td>
<td>c. 334</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D38 (ii(^2) 448.II) 82–85</td>
<td>concluding reference to epimeleia provision</td>
<td>οὐέτει δεῖν τιμᾶν καὶ μεμνήσατε ὃν ἂν ἐν πάθη</td>
<td>318/17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.24.119.83–86</td>
<td>introducing PF</td>
<td>μέμηνται τῶν εὐεργεσίαντων ἐκατὸν καὶ χάριν ἐκάστος ἀποδίδουσιν</td>
<td>270/69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii(^2) 908.7–8</td>
<td>introducing PF</td>
<td>εὐχάριστος ὃν διατείλει</td>
<td>181–170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii(^2) 909.8–10</td>
<td>introducing PF</td>
<td>εὐχάριστος ὃν διατείλει</td>
<td>170</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

We see here a chronological spread from just after the middle of the fourth century to c. 170\(^{15}\), 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 (μεμνήσατει), and continuing gratefulness (εὐχάριστος ὃν διατείλειν), or as a combination of two or more of these: cf., e.g., D38 (ii\(^2\) 448.II) 82–85 (318/17):


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 [ἅγι]αθοὺς ii\(^2\) 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 ii\(^2\) are to be interpreted as IG ii\(^2\).

\(^{14}\) There is some doubt about the reading here as compared with the certainty of ἐκάστους in S.24.119 (see lower in Table). If one wishes to reconcile the two one can read in ii\(^2\) 423 ἐκάστου[τὶ] ἐς διδότθη τις instead of ἐκάστου[τὶ] ἐς διδότθη τις.

\(^{15}\) An even later example is the fragmentary ii\(^2\) 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 εἰδόσιν ἄπαντες[τὶ]ς. The clause there rounds off an ἐπανέστησις plus στεφανώσατε provision.
tois euergetoousin eiautov[n kai] diameneusin epi tis eunouia[z to]u demou D22 (ii² 222.14–16 (c. 334)

tois euerget[ais] D38 (ii² 448.19) (323/2)
tois en[di]skenuménous autóto tin e'ounia S.24.119.15–16 (301/0–295/4)
tan euergethsánton éauton S. 28.60.85 (270/69)
tois eis éauton filotimouménous ii² 908.8 (181–170)
cf. tois eis éauton filotimouménous ii² 909.10 (c. 170)
tois filotimouménous eis éauton ii² 1038.8–9 (c. 130)
and sundry further qualifications may be included, e.g.

áξíωs ton euergeteion ii² 555.12 (307–303)

Table 2 (φιλοτιμώνται + ειδότες17)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Point of insertion</th>
<th>Significant wording</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ii² 425.9–1418</td>
<td>concluding enktesis grant</td>
<td>χάριτας ἀποδ[η]γοντος αξίας] tων ευρέγεσιστων</td>
<td>c. 375–350?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.41.70 (ii² 257+) 300 7–10</td>
<td>concluding decree, after provisions for publication</td>
<td>ὁ δήμος χάριτας ἀποδ[η]δωσεις τοις ε[ις] ε[αυ]τον [φιλοτιμομένους</td>
<td>c. 350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii² 360.IV.63–6519</td>
<td>concluding ἀλλο ἀγαθὸν provision</td>
<td>τιμαί καὶ στεφανοί ἢ βουλή τοὺς φιλοτιμομένους</td>
<td>330/29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MT 49.52–55</td>
<td>concluding ἐπανάσεις + στεφανοῦσα provision</td>
<td>χάριτας αὐτούς ἢ βουλή ἢ ἀποδ[η]δοσαί ὑπὸ ἄξιας ἕκαστου ἢ ἄν εὑρετηθήσασιν</td>
<td>328/7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii² 509.7–11</td>
<td>concluding provision for publication and setting up on acropolis</td>
<td>χάριτας ἀπολογίζονται παρὰ τού δήμου ἄξια τῶν εὐρέγετημάτων</td>
<td>post 307/6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii² 488.19–22</td>
<td>concluding provision to grant funds for sacrifice and dedication</td>
<td>τιμ[ηθήσασθαι] ὑπὸ τῆς βουλῆς καὶ τοῦ δήμου</td>
<td>303/2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D75 (ii² 652) 26–29</td>
<td>between enrolment and second vote in citizenship award</td>
<td>χάριτας ἀπολογίζονται ἢ]</td>
<td>[εἰδόται εἰρέγετημάτων</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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:

[ἄλλοι] φιλοτιμοῦνται ἄγων[ῖς ἕξοθοι ὑπὲρ τοῦ δήμου] [τοῦ Ἠθον περὶ εἰδότας ὅτι χάριτας ἐξουσία κατα] [εἰς τὸν εὐρεγετήματων] 

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 εἰδόσιν and φιλοτιμοῦνται. 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 ἢ νῦν εἰδόσι πάντας [ὁ Δῆμος] καὶ τού δήμου ἄξιας καὶ το[ῦ δήμου] ἀξιόσιν ἐκεινὸι [ἐξουσία κατα] [εἰς τὸν εὐρεγετήματων] 

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 ἀγαθὸν provision, a quite unique form of the hortatory intention: ὅπως [ὁ Δῆμος] ἀξιόσιν [ἐνεργετέειν τὴν βουλὴν καὶ τον δήμον] ὅρφαντες [τοὺς φιλοτιμομένους] . . .

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 i² 113.
but I would be inclined to read χάριτας ἀπολήγονται ἅξιος, this being a well-attested wording, here with the potential benefactors as subject. τιμήθησονται 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 (ἔφάμιλλον + εἰδόσει/εἰδόταις)²⁴

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Point of insertion</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>D47 (ii² 558) 11–14*</td>
<td>introducing citizenship award</td>
<td>c. 303/2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D74 (ii² 663) 33–36</td>
<td>concluding citizenship award</td>
<td>286/5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D87 (ii² 808) 22–25</td>
<td>concluding citizenship award</td>
<td>280c²⁵</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H.2.156.16–17*</td>
<td>introducing PF</td>
<td>275/4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.39.125 (ii² 798) 22–26</td>
<td>introducing PF</td>
<td>251/0? (or 253/2)?²⁸</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PM 25 (W.217) 13–15*</td>
<td>introducing PF</td>
<td>242/1 or 241/0 or 240/3²⁹</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i² 786.15–17</td>
<td>introducing PF</td>
<td>c. 225³⁰</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i² 847.33–36</td>
<td>introducing PF</td>
<td>215/14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i² 931.10*</td>
<td>introducing PF</td>
<td>c. in. s. ii</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i² 984.5–8</td>
<td>introducing PF</td>
<td>med. s. ii</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i² 1008.Π.64–65*</td>
<td>introducing PF</td>
<td>118/17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i² 1011.Π.45*</td>
<td>introducing PF</td>
<td>106/5³¹</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

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

²³ i² 338.21–24 (333/2) ὅποιος ἄν καὶ οἱ ἄλλοι οἱ ἄλλοι χειροτονοῦμεν ἐπὶ τῶν κρήνης φιλοτιμώμεναι ἐκοστοὶ εἰς τῶν δήμων, and i² 641.23–25 (299/8) ὅποιος ἄν ὡς πλείστοι φιλοτιμώμεναι χρείαν παρέχοντα ἑπὶ τὰ τῶν δήμων, both of which conclude a stefan«sai provision, have no εἰδότες phrase. Nor does D29 (S.21.310) 40–42 (319/18) ὅποιος ἄν καὶ οἱ ἄλλοι πάντες τῶν φιλοτιμώμεναι πολέμου ἐγείθον ὅτι ἄν] ἐξετοιπεῖτο δύνητα τὸν [δήμων, which concludes a grant of citizenship.

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


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 Pecirka, 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); i² 700.18–20 (257/67); S.26.98.27–29 (204/3); S.15.104.Π.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 ὅποιος σὺν ἔφαμιλλον] ἢ ὅποιος τῶν φιλοτιμουμένων εἰς τὰς κοινότητας | [χρείας εὐφρενεῖτε εἰδότοις ὅτι κτλ. (see Henry, Miscellanea section IV).

³² The fragmentary i² 1045.2–4 is evidence for the occurrence of the form in the first century also.
It is also possible to find a formulation without an infinitive, e.g. ii² 847.33–36 (215/14):

\[ \text{όπως ἂν ἐν ἑνάμιλλον ἠμῶν ἐπὶ τῶν φιλοτιμοῦμένων,} \]

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

(c) with regard to those examples which stand without the participle εἰδοῦς/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:

\[ \text{τῇ Ἰπῦ τοῦ δήμου κατ' ἐπειδὴ ἐὰς ᾧτι πάσιν κριὸν καὶ ἕνωσιν.} \]

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:

\[ \text{ὁπως ἂν ὁ ἑνάμιλλον ἠμῶν ἐπὶ τῶν φιλοτιμοῦμένων.} \]

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.

---

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), ἄξιος κομίον ἄρχειν καταξίας, 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 ἦν for εἶ, although Woodhead concedes that, at this period, either form is possible.

38 See note 8 above.
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:

\[ \text{όπως ὁν \ φιλόμελλον} \]

\[ \text{[η \ άπασιν τοῖς \ ἀρξουσιν \ φιλοτήμος \ ταύτην \ ἀρχεῖν \ τὴν \ ἀρχὴν \ ν]} \]

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

\[ \text{όπως} \]

\[ \text{[οὖν \ φιλόμελλον \ ή \ άπασιν τοῖς \ ἀρξουσιν τὴν]} \]

\[ \text{[ἀρξέον ταύτῃν \ ἀρχεῖν \ κατὰ \ τοὺς \ νόμους \ and \ H.2.156.5 \ (W. 185) 16–17 (275/4), a decree in honour of **taxiarchs**} \]

\[ \text{όπως ἦν \ οὖν \ [φιλόμελον \ ή \ τοῖς \ ἀρξουσι]} \]

\[ \text{[n \ τὴν \ ἀρχὴν \ ταύτην \ φιλοτήμως \ καὶ \ δικαιῶς \ ἀρχεῖν \ All three examples would thus express the encouragement of emulation among officials in the performance of their duties: cf. also the similar encouragement of **kosmetai** in ii2 1008.II.64–65 (118/17):} \]

\[ \text{καὶ \ πάσιν \ φιλόμελλον \ ή \ τοῖς \ ἐπί \ ταύτῃν} \]

\[ \text{[τὴν \ ἀρχήν \ καθισταμένως \ δικαιῶς \ καὶ \ τὸν \ αὐτὸν \ γεγένετε} \]

\[ \text{[πάσιν \ φιλόμελλον \ ή \ τοῖς \ ἐπί \ ταύτῃ \ τὴν \ ἀρχήν \ καθισταμένως \ δικαιῶς \ καὶ} \]

\[ \text{[τὸν \ αὐτὸν \ τρόπον \ διεξάγειν \ both of which likewise lack the participle \ eἰδόστας/εἰδόστι\textsuperscript{39} and are also combined with a preceding φαῖνονται \ clause\textsuperscript{40} introduced by \ ίνα\textsuperscript{41}.} \]

(d) normally the potential benefactors are the subject of the \ οτι\textsuperscript{−}clause dependent on the participle, as can be seen yet again in ii2 847, although we find quite a different formulation in ii\textsuperscript{2} 786.15–17 (\textit{c.} 225):

\[ \text{όπως ἦν \ οὖν \ φιλόμελον \ [εἰ] \ εὐφρενήστε \ [πάσιν \ εἰδό} \]

\[ \text{σιν \ ήτι καὶ \ δὴ \ δῆμος \ καθαπέρ \ αὐτῶι \ πάτριον \ ἑστιν, \ ἀπο} \]

\[ \text{δοθέ \ τὴν \ προσήκουσαν \ ἐκάστο\textsuperscript{τι}ς \ χάριν \ where the stress is laid on the favour coming from the People.} \]

**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 φαῖνερός (personally or impersonally) or the verb φαῖνεσθαι. 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: \textit{in order that it may be evident (φαῖνερόν) to all that the Demos/Boule and Demos of the Athenians . . .}
We may note
(a) the infrequency of this type
(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):

Here the personal construction with φαινονται 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 examples and sufficiently heterogeneous as to warrant full and individual citation.

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

(a) D83 (ii2717) 6–8 (c. 286–262):

Here φανερός 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.

(b) ii2791 (W. 213) 24–25 (245/4 or 244/3), a decree calling for voluntary contributions to a defence fund:

Although this belongs in this group it is very much sui generis. One cannot do better than quote the words of Woodhead: ‘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 (ii2805) 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 (ii2652) 14–15 (paullo post 286/5), introducing the probouleumatic formula, is not to be restored with φαινονται καὶ οἱ Ἀθηναῖοι. The reasons are given in Henry, Miscellanea section II, where I suggest the reading φαινονται καὶ οἱ θυσίαι καὶ οἱ βουληθηκόντες.

44 Whether or not ii2845.9–11 (paullo post 249?) also introducing the probouleumatic formula, is similarly an example of οἱ δήμος 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.
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(c) S.21.435.9–10 (187/6), introducing publication details:

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:

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:

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 (ό δήμος φαίνεται)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Point of insertion</th>
<th>Significant wording</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>D86 (ii² 716) 6–8</td>
<td>introducing PF</td>
<td>διατηρῶν τὰς διδομένας τίμιας</td>
<td>s. iv/iii</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii² 672.10–11</td>
<td>introducing MFD</td>
<td>τιμῶν τοὺς πρὸς εαυτὸν φιλοτιμομένους</td>
<td>279/847</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii² 682.64–66</td>
<td>introducing PF</td>
<td>τιμῶν τοὺς ἀραθοῦς καὶ ἄξιοὺς μνήμης</td>
<td>259/848</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii² 776.20–22</td>
<td>introducing commen- dation and crown</td>
<td>τιμῶν τοῖς περὶ πλῆθος νομοῦμενος τῆς εἰς τοὺς θεοὺς εὐσεβείαν</td>
<td>263/2 or 259/8 or 256/549</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii² 844.1.20–22</td>
<td>introducing MFD</td>
<td>τιμῶν τοὺς ἀποδεικμένους ἢ ἔχουσιν ἀξίησιν ἢ παντὶ καιρῷ</td>
<td>229/8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.25.106.25–27</td>
<td>introducing PF</td>
<td>ἐπὶ παντὶ καιρῷ μεμνημένον φαίνεται τῶν ἐκτενῶς τὰς χειρὰς αὐτῶν παρηκτημένων</td>
<td>226/5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.29.116.23–25</td>
<td>introducing PF</td>
<td>τιμῶν</td>
<td>214/13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.25.112.3841</td>
<td>introducing PF</td>
<td>τιμῶν τοὺς ἀραθοῦς ἄνδρας</td>
<td>196/5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D106 (ii² 922) 2–4</td>
<td>introducing PF</td>
<td>τιμῶν</td>
<td>c. 190–165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii² 891.8–1052</td>
<td>introducing MFD</td>
<td>χάριτας ἄξιοι ἀποδιδοῦσι τοῖς εἰς ἐαυτὸν φιλοτιμομένοις</td>
<td>188/7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D108 (ii² 981) 2–3</td>
<td>introducing PF</td>
<td>τιμῶν τοὺς ἄξιοὺς ὀντάς</td>
<td>c. 15053</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

47 See S.38.74.
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 ὃποιος ἂν εἴδοσιν clause encouraging emulation in others. On this ‘doubled’ form, see W. 261, commentary on vv. 38–41.
52 There is also a ὑπόνυμης 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 (ii2 853)18–20 concluding publication provisions τιμὸν τῶν ἁγαθῶν τούτων ἀποδείκτηκεν ἀνεύρισκον τὸν εἰμένους c. 150 vel postea

D107 (ii2 945.16–17) introducing PF τιμὸν τῶν ἁγαθῶν τούτων ἀποδείκτηκεν τῷ πρὸς ἐκεῖνον εὐφιλίαν 168/7

S.38.112 (ii2 937)37–38 introducing PF τιμὸν τῶν ἁγαθῶν τούτων ἀποδείκτηκεν τῷ πρὸς ἐκεῖνον εὐφιλίαν 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 εὐρυόν ὁπῶς δὲ ἄν ὑπὸ καὶ ὁ δῆμος αἰτεί] μεμινθήσει φαίνεσθαι τῶν ἐν

But this cannot be correct: we need either δὲ ὁ ὑπὸ 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 δὲ.58

(ii) Boule alone:

Table 6 (ἡ βουλὴ φαίνεται)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Point of insertion</th>
<th>Significant wording</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ii2 487.10–12</td>
<td>introducing MFB</td>
<td>ἀξίαν χάριν εἰκάσεως τῶν περιοτιμήτων</td>
<td>304/3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MT 261.49–51</td>
<td>introducing MFB</td>
<td>ἀπονέμουσα τῶν καὶ θηρίων ἐπαγόμενα</td>
<td>143/2762</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.22.110 (ii2 1039)12–13</td>
<td>concluding commendation and crown provisions</td>
<td>τιμὸς</td>
<td>80/79?84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ibid. 43–44</td>
<td>concluding provision to erect stele with names and decrees</td>
<td>τιμὸς τῶν ἁγαθῶν τῶν</td>
<td>80/79?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ibid. 58–59</td>
<td>introducing MFB</td>
<td>ἀποδεχομένη τὴν τῶν ἔφηβων ἀρέτην καὶ πρὸς τὰ κληρονομικά φιλοτιμημένα</td>
<td>80/79?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ibid. 66–68</td>
<td>concluding decree</td>
<td>τιμῶσα τοὺς ἀπὸ τῆς πρώτης ἡλικίας τῶν</td>
<td>80/79?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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 II 1606’ , 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 ὁπῶς 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.


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 γίνομεν δὲ καὶ ἔτεροι ἐπὶ τῶν ὀμοίων τῶν ἐν ἡλικίας τῶν | ὀμοίων. Cf. ii2 1042.d.18–19 (c. 40/39), ii2 1043.58–60 (37/6?) has the slightly different word order τῶν ὀμοίων ζηλωθεῖται.
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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 δήμος φαίνηται/φαίνονται 66)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Point of insertion</th>
<th>Significant wording</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S.14.64 19–20</td>
<td>introducing PF</td>
<td>φαίνηται τιμῶν τοὺς χρήσεις αὐτῶν 67</td>
<td>271/0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii² 677.7–8</td>
<td>introducing MFB 68</td>
<td>φαίνηται διαφυλάττων τοὺς εὐεργέτας τῶν χάριτας</td>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii² 788.15–18</td>
<td>introducing PF</td>
<td>φαίνονται χάριν ἀποδιδόντες τῖς φιλοτιμουμένοις</td>
<td>235/4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii² 785.20–22</td>
<td>introducing PF</td>
<td>φαίνηται τιμῶν τοὺς εὐεργέτας καὶ χάριτας ἀξίων ἀποδίδοντος</td>
<td>196/569</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii² 992.6–8</td>
<td>introducing PF</td>
<td>φαίνονται τιμῶν καὶ φιλοφρονούμενοι</td>
<td>c.170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii² 956.22–24</td>
<td>introducing PF</td>
<td>μημονευνόντων φαίνεται τῶν εἰς ἐντούς φιλοτιμουμένοι καὶ ἐποίησε διδόντων εἰ[ hiatus τῆς ἐπιμελείας</td>
<td>161/0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.21.469.17–19</td>
<td>introducing PF</td>
<td>φαίνονται κτλ. 72</td>
<td>129/8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii² 1006.I.37–38</td>
<td>introducing PF</td>
<td>φαίνονται τοὺς μὲν ἐξίους καὶ πειθ[αρχαύντας τοὺς τε νόμους κτλ. 74</td>
<td>122/1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii² 1008.II.63–65</td>
<td>introducing PF</td>
<td>φαίνονται τοὺς ἀναστραφέντας εἰ[ hiatus τῶν ἐξίους καὶ ἀπὸ παντὸς τοῦ βελτίστου τῆς καθηκονίας τιμῆς ἀξιούντες 75</td>
<td>118/17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii² 1009.I 10–12</td>
<td>introducing PF</td>
<td>φαίνονται τιμῶν τοὺς πειθαρχοῦντας τοὺς τε νόμους καὶ τοὺς φιληρίζοντας 76</td>
<td>116/15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ibid.II.45–47</td>
<td>introducing PF</td>
<td>φαίνονται τοὺς ἄγαθοὺς τῶν ἀνδρῶν καὶ καλῶς καὶ δικαίως ἀναστραφέντων τιμῶν τοὺς καθηκούσαστας δορεάς</td>
<td>116/15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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 διαστραφέντας τὰ πάτρια, ἄλλα καὶ προσεχεῖς[εύ]ξοντες | τὰς τε θεσίας καὶ τὰς τιμὰς καλῶς καὶ εὐσέβεις, ἵνα καὶ παρὰ τῶν θεῶν[ν] κτλ. The full wording of some of these longwinded ephebic texts.

73 Contrast vv. 88–90 (see S.19.108 [p. 113 above]): φαινομένων μεταμόρφωσαι τοὺς θεοὺς κτλ. The formulation is continued with an ἐρώμελλον clause (vv. 64–65). ii² 1008 and 1011 are very similar (cf. Table 3 and p. 111 above).
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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Point of insertion</th>
<th>Significant wording</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>H.9.104/5.20.21–23</td>
<td>concluding commendation and crown provisions</td>
<td>ὑπόμνημα εἰ τῆς ἐπιμελείας α[φ]}τ[ῶν]</td>
<td>302/1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D100 (i² 954b) 19–20</td>
<td>introducing PP</td>
<td>ὑπόμνημα ὑπάρχει τῆς γεγο[να]ς παρά</td>
<td>[τοῦ δήμου τιτ[ῆ]]ς</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i² 909.19–20</td>
<td>introducing PP</td>
<td>ὑπόμνημα ὑπάρχει αὐτ[ῶ] περὶ τῆς πρός τὸν δήμου εὐνο[ι]ας</td>
<td>c.170</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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.
78 Cf., e.g., i² 1029.26–27 (96/5); S.111.31–33 (45/4).
79 For the correction of the reading at D89 (i² 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 ἄν [ο]ὐν εἴδοσιν ὑπόντες ὅτι κτλ.). The same is true for vv. 8–10 of i² 909. (See Table 1 above).
It would seem inescapable that Walbank’s restorations must be accepted, except, perhaps, that we might choose to see a reflexive, rather than a non-reflexive, at the end of v.21. The text would then run as follows (vv. 20–23):

\[\text{δόσως ἄν εἰδωσίν πάντε} \quad \text{stoich. 23}
\[\text{[ς ὁτὶ ὁ δῆμος τοῖς χρείας αὐτ \[\text{[ὁι παρεχομένοις ἐπίσταται \[\text{[χάριν ἀποδιδόναι}
\]

It concludes an ἔπαινέσσαις στεφανώσσαι provision, which, as we have seen, is by no means unparalleled.

Moreover, the variety and chronological spread of the forms and wordings which we have considered above leave little doubt about the suitability of Professor Walbank’s restorations even in the last third of the fourth century.

Monash University/St Andrews University Alan S. Henry

APPENDIX

The indirect reflexive

In examining the body of evidence for the hortatory intention I have become aware that, in those examples where the Demos (or the Boule and Demos) is represented as showing its gratitude to those who are zealous in its interests (φιλοτιμείσθαι) or confer benefits on it (ἐφέργετείν) or display goodwill towards it (ἐνοία), there is some variation – and inconsistency – on the part of editors in deciding as between ἐαυτὸν, αὐτὸν or αὐτόν when restoration is required, and between αὐτ- and αὐτ- where the stone actually preserves the letters AYT.

The constraints of a stoichedon layout would virtually confirm, where appropriate, the restoration of the longer form with αὐτ-. But where 1 space less is available or when the text is non-stoichedon, how can we decide whether to restore αὐτ- or αὐτ?-? Similarly, in cases where the letters AYT actually stand on the stone, are we to interpret them as αὐτ- or αὐτ-?

Certainty is doubtless unachievable, since, en principe, both the reflexive and the non-reflexive pronouns can be used as indirect reflexives. Moreover, in the material here under consideration, there is no example where a preceding aspirated consonant would ensure that αὐτ- must be read. How then are we to proceed?

I suggest that a thorough examination of the available evidence will demonstrate that, whereas there are many examples of ἐαυτ- on the stone, there is no instance where we are obliged to interpret AYT- as αὐτ- or to restore the non-reflexive form.

1. Extant examples of the reflexive form ἐαυτ-:

(a) φιλοτιμείσθαι εἰς: this is a very common expression, e.g.

τοῖς εἰς ἐαυτὸν φιλοτιμομένοις
S.40.70 (ii² 257+300) 9–10 (c.350); D71 (ii² 721) 3 (295/4 or 291/0–286); ii² 891.9 (188/7);
ii² 908.8 (181–170); ii² 909.10 (c.170)

---

83 See Appendix below.
84 For reasons of economy of space I have not troubled in 1 to cite exact transcriptions of each example. The reader is assured, however, that in each case the reflexive is certain.
(a) interpreted as αυτ-:
   (i) S.30.65.21–22 (c.331–324?): Walbank (H.49.251/2.1) read τοῖς χρείαν αὐτ[η]παρεχομένοις.
   (ii) S.24.119.15–16 (inter 301/300 et 295/4): Pečírka followed Meritt (H.13.242/3.7) in reading τοῖς ἐν[δε][ικυμένοις αὐτῶι τὴν εἴσοδαν. In this they are followed by Woodhead (W. 164).
   (iii) S.14.64.20 (271/0): Dinsmoor (H.23.228/90.182) read τοῖς χρείας αὐτῶι παρεχομένωι. So too Woodhead (W. 187).

(b) interpreted as αἴτ-:
   In W. 239 (D119; S.16.73) 7–8 (f. s. iii)\textsuperscript{85} we find τῶν [ἐν] | τοῖς πρότερον χρόνοις ἐνεργηθήτεντας ἐν τοῖς κρίνοις τῶν ἐπάθοις. Osborne concedes that ἐνεργηθήτεντας 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 ἐνεργηθήτεντας is never found as a passive deponent, nor is it construed with εἰς + accusative. What one would expect here would be φιλοτιμομένωι, and this is perhaps what we should read (φιλοτιμομεν[ἐν]ωι).

3. Examples of restoration:\textsuperscript{86}

(a) ii\textsuperscript{2} 269 (=515) 11–12 (352–336) is restored τοῖς φιλοτιμομενοῖς εἰς ἐκατόν . . .]. 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 (ii\textsuperscript{2} 392+586; S.26.83) 6–7 (321/0 – 319/18). Here Osborne follows Chara Karapa-Molisi in restoring τοῖς φιλοτιμομενοῖς πρός αὐτόν. 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 ἐπιτρόπην.

(c) In D77 (H.9.353.48) 3 (286/5 vel paullo post) we find τοῖς εὔτερον ὄντες ἐπιτρόπην. Here a form with only four letters is virtually guaranteed by the stoichedon layout, although, in the line in question, the letters ΠΤΕΤΟ are crowded into four letter-spaces.\textsuperscript{87} Schweigert, the original editor, Osborne and Woodhead (W. 173) all read the contracted reflexive.

\textsuperscript{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.

\textsuperscript{86} This is not an exhaustive list.

\textsuperscript{87} Osborne also detected a shallow rasura at this point.
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(d) In D83 (ii 717) 7–8 (286–262), stoichedon 41–43, Osborne follows the Corpus in reading τῶν εἰς ἔαυτη]||ν ἐνὶ|ρεσίων.
(e) ii 672.10–11 (279/8), stoichedon 67, offers τοῖς πρὸς ἔαυτὸν φιλοτιμομένοις.
(f) In ii 836.12 (c.224/3), non-stoichedon 35–40, we find τοῖς εἴρη|τοῦσιν αὐτὸν.
(g) In D106 (ii 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, τοῖς παρεχομένοις | | [χρείας αὐτῶν. In ii Addenda p. 668 we see that Wilhelm (AE [1912] 248) had proposed τοῖς γνησίως παρεχομένους ἔαυτῶν, 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) ii 966.13 (c. 150)88 is restored, again by Wilhelm, to read τής εἰς ἔαυτὸν 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 ἔαυτὸν φιλοτιμομένοις in this non-stoichedon text.
(j) In ii 1038.9 (c.130), another non-stoichedon document, we find τοῖς φιλοτιμομένοις εἰς ἔαυτόν.

This survey thus reveals a sizeable sample of examples of ἔαυτη- extant on the stone, a tendency on the part of editors to interpret the letters ΑΥΤ as ἀντ- rather than ἀντ-, 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 ἔαυτη-, 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).