

EDWARD M. HARRIS

IG I<sup>3</sup> 227 AND THE SO-CALLED PEACE OF EPILYKOS

aus: Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik 126 (1999) 123–128

© Dr. Rudolf Habelt GmbH, Bonn



IG I<sup>3</sup> 227 AND THE SO-CALLED PEACE OF EPILYKOS

The inscription IG i<sup>3</sup> 227 records a decree awarding honors to a certain Herakleides. The decree grants Herakleides the titles of πρόξενος and εὐεργέτης (lines 9–10) for his services to Athens (lines 10–14). The name of Herakleides' native city is not preserved (line 8). A rider to the main decree proposed by Thucydides proposes an award of ἔγκτησις γῆς in addition to the normal privileges granted to a *proxenos* (lines 19–22). Herakleides deserves these honors because the ambassadors coming from the king announce that he has cooperated with them in negotiations for a treaty (lines 15–18: [. . . οἱ πρέσβεις][οἱ παρὰ βασιλέως ἤκ[οντες ἀγγέλλοσι Ἡ][ρακ]λείδην συμπράτ[τεν ἑαυτοῖς προθύ][μωσ] ἕς τε τὰσπονδὰς [τὰς πρὸς βασιλέα . . .]).

The prescript of the decree is fragmentary and does not allow us to date the decree, but the lettering of the inscription is Ionic, which indicates it was inscribed after 403 BCE. Koehler argued, however, that the Herakleides honored in the decree must be Herakleides of Klazomenai, who was later elected general (Plato *Ion* 541d), proposed increasing pay for attending meetings of the Assembly to two obols and was nicknamed “the King” (*Ath. Pol.* 41.3).<sup>1</sup> Koehler further proposed that Herakleides received these honors for helping to conclude the treaty with the Great King of Persia mentioned by Andocides (*On the Peace* 3.29) and that this treaty was concluded with King Darius in 424. Koehler's identification of the treaty mentioned by Andocides and the peace treaty mentioned in line 16 has won the assent of many scholars. Russell Meiggs went so far as to declare: “Few things are more certain in fifth-century history than that the decree honours Heraclides of Clazomenae for helping an Athenian embassy on which Andocides' uncle Epilycus, a member of the Boule, served to negotiate a treaty with King Darius in 424–23.”<sup>2</sup>

Meiggs' confidence should not intimidate us. It is possible to identify the Herakleides honored in the decree with Herakleides of Klazomenai and restore τὸν Κλαζομένιον in line 6. But the identification still depends on a restoration.<sup>3</sup> If the honorand is to be identified with the Herakleides of Klazomenai who was later elected general, we must further assume that the honorand received citizenship sometime after this decree in order to be later elected general. Second, it is possible to assume that the original decree dated to 424/3 and that the inscription is a copy made after 403 because the original was destroyed under the Thirty. This would explain the Ionic lettering, but this is no more than a possibility; it is not a certainty. Third, even if we allow the possibility that the inscription is a copy of a fifth century decree, nothing in the decree compels us to accept a date of 424/3. This is a *possible* date; it is not certain. Fourth, it is also possible to accept the evidence of Andocides *On the Peace* and believe that Epilykos went on an embassy to King Darius in 424 and negotiated a treaty. Yet it is also possible to accept the doubts of Harpocration and Dionysius of Halicarnassus about the authenticity of the speech<sup>4</sup> and to reject the evidence found in it as unreliable.<sup>5</sup> Finally, Herakleides

<sup>1</sup> U. Koehler, *Hermes* 27, 1892, 68–78. All dates in this article are BCE.

<sup>2</sup> R. Meiggs, *The Athenian Empire*, Oxford 1972, 135. For detailed discussion of the inscription with references to earlier scholarship see R. Meiggs and D. Lewis, *A Selection of Greek Historical Inscriptions*, Oxford 1969, 201–3 and above all Michael B. Walbank, *Athenian Proxeny of the Fifth Century B.C.*, Toronto and Sarasota 1978, 258–68. Cf. E. Badian, *From Plataea to Potidaea: Studies in the History and Historiography of the Pentekontaetia*, Baltimore and London 1993, 196: “The document should now be regarded as firmly attached to the renewal (with the help of Herakleides) of the peace of Callias, by an embassy that included Epilycus.”

<sup>3</sup> The assumption might appear to receive some support from Walbank's proposal IG i<sup>3</sup> 227 to join with IG ii<sup>2</sup> 65 (*ZPE* 51, 1983, 183–4). But note that Wilhelm maintained the latter inscription was non-stoichedon and restored [Ἐρχο]μενίο. Foucart, *BCH* 12, 1888, 163–9 identified the honorand as Herakleides of Byzantium, who was awarded the title of *proxenos* (*Dem.* 20.60).

<sup>4</sup> See Harpocration s.v. Ἑλληνοταμίαι. Ἀνδοκίδης ἐν τῷ Περὶ τῆς Εἰρήνης (3.38) εἰ γνήσιος, ὅτι ἀρχὴ τις ἦν οἱ Ἑλληνοταμίαι . . . ; s. v. νεώρια καὶ νεώσοικοι. μήποτε νεώρια λέγεται ὁ τόπος ἅπας εἰς ὃν ἀνέλκονται αἱ τριήρεις καὶ

receives a grant of ἔγκτησις γῆς along with the title and rights of *proxenos*. It was not unusual for these two rights to be awarded together in the fourth century, but there is no parallel for such an award in the 94 proxeny decrees from the fifth century.<sup>6</sup> Pace Meiggs, nothing could be less certain than his assertions about the historical circumstances surrounding the decree for Herakleides.<sup>7</sup>

Amid all these conjectures, one matter is reasonably certain: the ambassadors mentioned in lines 15–16 ([. . . οἱ πρέσβεις | οἱ παρὰ βασιλέως ἤκοντες . . .]) cannot be the alleged Athenian embassy on which Epilykos went to negotiate a treaty with the Great King of Persia. This article will show that this phrase must refer to an embassy sent by the Great King. In Attic inscriptions of the fifth and fourth centuries B.C., embassies that are described as “coming” to Athens (ἤκοντες or ἤκων) are always foreign embassies arriving in Athens, not Athenian embassies returning to Athens. Furthermore, embassies or envoys that are described as “coming from” a foreign power (οἱ πρέσβεις οἱ παρὰ τινὸς ἤκοντες) are always embassies sent by a foreign power, not Athenian embassies sent to a foreign power. When an Attic decree mentions an Athenian embassy sent abroad returning home, it uses some form of the verb πέμπω (e.g., τοὺς πρέσβεις τοὺς πεμφθέντας ὑπὸ τοῦ δήμου).<sup>8</sup>

It is best to begin with several decrees where foreign ambassadors who “have come” (ἤκοντες *vel. sim.*) to Athens are clearly differentiated from Athenian ambassadors, who have been “sent” out (πεμφθέντες *vel. sim.*) by the Assembly and have returned to Athens.

1) IG ii<sup>2</sup> 31 (386/5), lines 17–24 (= Tod *GHI* no. 117)

[. . . ἐλέσθαι δὲ ἄ]νδ[ρα]ς τρεῖς ἐξ Ἀθ[η]να[ίων]  
 ἀπάντ[ων οἴ]τινε[ς] ἀπαγγέλῳσι [π]ρ[ὸς Ἐβ]-  
 ρύ[ζε]λμιν [τὰ ἐ]ψηφι[σ]μένα τῶι δ[ή]μ[ωι, ἀπ]-  
 αγ[γέ]λῳσι δὲ κ[αὶ] περὶ τῶν νεῶν [τ]ῶ[ν περ]-  
 ἰ Πλ[. . . . καὶ] περὶ τῶν ἄλλων ὧ[ν] αἰ[τ]ῶσ-  
 ιν οἱ πρέσβ[ε]ς οἱ παρὰ βασιλέω[ς] Ἐ[β]ρυζ]-  
 ἐλμ[ι]δο[ς] ἤκοντες τῶι δήμωι τῶ[ι] Ἀ[θηνα]-  
 ἴων.

Two sets of ambassadors are clearly distinguished in the passage. First, there are the three Athenians whom the Assembly will elect to report its decisions about ships and other matters to King Hebrzyelmis (lines 17–19), and, second, there are the ambassadors who have come from King Hebrzyelmis announce

παλιν ἐξ αὐτοῦ καθέλκονται ὡς ὑποσημαίνουσι Λυκούργος τε ἐν Ἀπολογισμῷ ὧν πεπολίτευται καὶ Ἀνδοκίδης ἐν τῷ Περὶ τῆς εἰρήνης εἰ γνήσιος ὁ λόγος; s. v. Πηγαί. Ἀνδοκίδης ἐν τῷ Περὶ τῆς εἰρήνης, εἰ γνήσιος. For Dionysius' opinion see Andoc. *De Pace, hypoth.*: ὁ δὲ Διονύσιος νόθον εἶναι λέγει τὸν λόγον.

<sup>5</sup> For doubts about the information in the speech about Amorges see H. D. Westlake, *Studies in Thucydides and Greek History*, Bristol 1989, 103–112 (= *Phoenix* 31, 1977, 319–29). I plan to demonstrate in a forthcoming article that the speech is a forgery, probably composed in the Hellenistic period.

<sup>6</sup> Walbank, *Athenian Proxenies* nos. 48, 85, and 93, proposes restoring the grant in IG i<sup>2</sup> 81, 106 and 107, but Mattingly rightly drew attention to the fact that the formula for the grant in IG i<sup>3</sup> 227 differs from the formula found in IG i<sup>3</sup> 102, lines 30–32, the only example of the grant securely dated before 400.

<sup>7</sup> There have been a few courageous skeptics: see A. W. Gomme, *A Historical Commentary on Thucydides, Volume I: Introduction and Commentary on Book I*, Oxford 1945, 333–4; P. J. Rhodes, *A Commentary on the Aristotelian Athenaion Politeia*, Oxford 1981, on *Ath. Pol.* 41.3 [“I fear I am not quite persuaded that there was a Peace of Epilykos.”], D. L. Stockton, *Hist.* 8, 1959, 74–79, and H. B. Mattingly, *Philol.* 119, 1975, 48–51; K. Meister, *Die Ungeschichtlichkeit des Kalliasfriedens und deren historische Folgen*, Wiesbaden 1982, 79–94.

<sup>8</sup> Cf. D. M. Lewis and R. S. Stroud, Athens Honors King Euagoras of Salamis, *Hesperia* 48, 1979, 180–93: “the only context in which this aorist passive participle (sc. πεμφθέντες) appears is as a modifier of *presbeis* sent out from Athens”. In note 11 they observe: “Ambassadors from other cities seem never to be described by the Athenians in this period as ‘sent’, πεμφθέντες, by their city of origin, but as ‘coming’, ‘ἤκοντες’.” Lewis and Stroud do not, however, collect the evidence nor notice the implications of their observation for IG i<sup>3</sup> 227.

his requests to the Athenian people (lines 22–23: οἱ π[αρ]ὰ βασιλέω[ς] Ἐ[βριζ]ἑλ[μ]ιδος ἤκοντες).<sup>9</sup> The latter are contrasted with the former and are obviously foreign ambassadors.

2) IG ii<sup>2</sup> 102 (370s), lines 5–10, 13–16 (= Tod *GHI* no. 129)

ἐ[π]αινέσαι δ[ὲ] Ἀμύντ[ι]-  
[αν] καὶ τὸς πρέσβε[ις] τοὺς ἐλθόντ[ας πα]-  
[ρ'] αὐτῷ Πτολεμαῖο[ν] καὶ Ἀντήνορα κα[ὶ] . . .]-  
σωνα. ἐπαινέσαι [δὲ] καὶ τοὺς πρέσβε[ις]  
τοὺς πεμφθέντ[ας ὑπὸ] τοῦ δήμου εἰς Μ[ακ]-  
εδονίαν περὶ τῆς συ[μ]μαχίας.

κ[αλέ]σαι καὶ ἐπὶ ξένια τοῦ[ς]  
πρέ[σ]βεις [τοὺς παρ' Ἀμύντο] καὶ τοὺς π[ε]-  
μψ[θ]έντα[ς ὑπὸ] τῷ δήμῳ ἐπὶ δεῖπνον εἰς  
τὸ πρυτανεῖον εἰς αὐ[ρ]ιον.

Once again we find two sets of ambassadors clearly differentiated. On the one hand, there are the three Macedonian ambassadors who have come from Amyntas, Ptolemaios, Antenor, and a third, whose full name has not been preserved (lines 6–7: τὸς πρέσβε[ις] τοὺς ἐλθόντ[ας παρ'] αὐτῷ). The language used to describe these foreign ambassadors is very similar to that found in the previous decree except for the substitution of ἐλθόντας for ἤκοντες.<sup>10</sup> On the other hand, there are the Athenian ambassadors sent by the Assembly to Macedon (lines 8–10: τοὺς πρέσβε[ις] | τοὺς πεμφθέντ[ας ὑπὸ] τοῦ δήμου εἰς Μ[ακ]εδονίαν). The ambassadors who have come from Amyntas (lines 13–14: τοὺς πρέ[σ]βεις [τοὺς παρ' Ἀμύντο]) are foreigners and are thus invited to *xenia* (line 13: κ[αλέ]σαι καὶ ἐπὶ ξένια). The ambassadors sent by the Assembly (lines 14–5: τοὺς π[ε]μψ[θ]έντα[ς ὑπὸ] τῷ δήμῳ) are Athenians and are by contrast invited to *deipnon* (line 15: ἐπὶ δεῖπνον).<sup>11</sup>

3) IG ii<sup>2</sup> 107 (367), lines 8–16, 20–22, 24–26, 31–34

[Διό]φ[αντος] εἰπεν. [περὶ] ὧν οἱ πρέσβεις οἱ ἐχ Λέσβου ἤκοντ[ες] λέ-  
[γο]υσιν, [ἐψηφ]ίσθαι τῆι βουλῆι προσαγαγεῖν αὐτοὺς εἰς τὸν δῆ-  
[μον] τοῦς προέδρους οἱ ἂν λάχωσιν προεδρεύειν εἰς τὴν πρώτ[η]-  
[ν] ἐκκλησίαν, γνώμην δὲ ξυββάλεσθαι τῆς βουλῆς εἰς [τὸν] δ[ῆ]μο-  
[ν] ὅτι δοκῆι τῆι βουλῆι, ἐπ[ε]ιδὴ Μυτιληναῖοι ἄνδρες [ἀγαθοί] ε-  
[ἴ]σι π[ε]ρ[ὶ] τὸν δῆμον τὸν Ἀθηναίων, κα[ὶ] νῦν κα[ὶ] ἐν τῷ[ι] πρόσθεν χ[ρ]-  
[όν]ῳ ἐ[π]α[ι]νέσαι τὸν δῆμον τὸν Μυτιληναίων ἀρετ[ῆ]ς ἕνεκα [τῆ]-  
[ς] ἐς τὸν δῆμον τὸν Ἀθηναίων, καὶ εἶναι πρόσδο[ν] αὐτοῖς [ἐάν] το-  
[υ] ἐς δέωνται πρὸς τῆ[ν] βουλῆν ἢ τὸν δῆμον πρώ[τοις] μετ[ὰ] τ[ὰ] ἰ[ε]ρά.

[ἀν]αγράψαι δὲ κα[ὶ] τ[ὸ] ψήφισμα] ε-  
[ἴς] τὴν αὐτὴν στήλην ὃ ἀπε[κρ]ίνατο ὁ δῆμος τοῖς πρέσβεσι

<sup>9</sup> Note Tod's interpretation: "Three citizens are to be chosen to report its contents to the king, to tell him of the ships (..) and about the other requests brought by his envoys."

<sup>10</sup> Note the same participle is used in IG i<sup>3</sup> 40, lines 12 and 17 to describe an embassy of Chalcidians coming to Athens and at line 37 to describe an embassy of Athenians coming to Chalcis.

<sup>11</sup> For the Athenian practice of inviting foreign ambassadors to *xenia*, see Dem. 19.234–5. For a collection of testimonia for these invitations see S. G. Miller, *The Prytaneion*, Berkeley 1978, Appendix A with the additions of M. J. Osborne, Entertainment in the Prytaneion in Athens, *ZPE* 41, 1981, 154, note 4. For an explanation of the exceptions to the rule see Osborne, *op. cit.* 154–7 and especially P. J. Rhodes, ΞΕΝΙΑ and ΔΕΙΠΝΟΝ in the Prytaneum, *ZPE* 57, 1984, 193–99, who adds evidence from outside Attica to support "the Athenian principle that ξένια is for non-citizens". Rhodes' arguments provide an effective answer to the doubts of A. S. Henry, *Honours and Privileges in Athenian Decrees*, Hildesheim and Zurich 1983, 262–71 ("no hard and fast rule was rigidly applied").

[τοῖς Μυ]τιλην[αί]ων τοῖς μετὰ [Ἰε]ροίτ[α . . .  
 ἐπαινέσ]αι δὲ τοὺς πρέσβεις τοὺς  
 [πεμφ]θέντας εἰς Μυτιλήνην καὶ καλέσαι ἐπὶ δεῖπνον εἰς  
 [τὸ πρυ]τανεῖον εἰς αὖριον.

ἐπαινέσαι δὲ τοὺς πρέσβεις  
 [τοῦ]ς πεμφθέντας εἰς Λέσσον Τ[ι]μόνοθον καὶ Αὐτόλυκ-  
 [ον κ]αὶ Ἀ[ρ]ιστοπείθην καὶ καλέσαι ἐπὶ δεῖπνον εἰ-  
 [ς τ]ὸ πρυτανεῖον εἰς αὖριον.

The ambassadors in line 8 who have come from Lesbos (οἱ ἐχ Λέσβου ἦκοντ[ε]ς) must be foreign ambassadors because they require permission from the Council to gain admission to the Assembly.<sup>12</sup> They also receive the right to address the Council and Assembly in the future, a right which Athenian ambassadors would not need (lines 15–6). In fact, in lines 21–2 they are actually identified as “ambassadors of the Mytilenians”. They are contrasted with the Athenian ambassadors who were sent to Lesbos (τοὺς πρέσβεις τοὺς [πεμφ]θέντας εἰς Μυτιλήνην), praised in lines 24–26 and in the rider of lines 31–34, and invited to *deipnon*, not *xenia*.

There is a close parallel to this decree in IG ii<sup>2</sup> 103 (368). Here ambassadors coming from Dionysius (lines 6–7: οἱ πρέσβεις οἱ [π]αρά Διονυ[σ]ίο ἦκοντ[ε]ς) must be foreign ambassadors since they require a vote of approval from the council before they can address the Assembly (lines 13–17).

4) IG ii<sup>2</sup> 141 (376–60), lines 1–9, 25–28 (= Tod *GHI* no. 139)

Ἀθηναί[ων κ]αὶ ἐπεμελ[ήθη] ὅπως ὡς  
 κάλλιστα πορευθήσονται οἱ πρέσ-  
 βεις ὡς βασιλέα, οὓς ὁ δῆμος ἔπεμψ-  
 εν. καὶ ἀποκρίνασθαι τῷ ἦκοντι π-  
 ἀρὰ τῷ Σιδωνίων βασιλέως ὅτι καὶ  
 ἐς τὸ λοιπὸν χρόνον ὦν ἀνὴρ ἀγαθ-  
 ὸς περὶ τὸν δῆμον τὸν Ἀθηναίων οὐ-  
 κ ἔστι ὅ τι ἀτυχῆσει παρὰ Ἀθηναίω-  
 ν ὦν ἂν δέηται.  
 καλέσα-  
 ι δὲ καὶ ἐπὶ ξένια τὸν ἦκοντα παρὰ  
 τῷ Σιδωνίων βασιλέως ἐς τὸ πρυτα-  
 νεῖον ἐς αὖριον.

The decree praises Strato, the King of the Sidonians, for looking after the ambassadors whom the Assembly has sent to the Great King (lines 1–4). It is important to note the phrase used here to denote Athenian ambassadors sent to the Great King (οἱ πρέσβεις ὡς βασιλέα, οὓς ὁ δῆμος ἔπεμψεν) and how it differs markedly from the phrase found in IG i<sup>3</sup> 227 ([οἱ πρέσβεις] [οἱ π]αρά βασιλέως ἦκοντες). The Athenian ambassadors are contrasted with the envoy who has come from King Strato, who is instructed to convey a message to him (lines 1–4). This envoy is clearly a foreigner since he is invited to *xenia*, not to *deipnon* (lines 25–28).

Having studied these four inscriptions in detail, we can deal with several other inscriptions more briefly. There is a similar contrast between foreign ambassadors who have come to Athens in two other inscriptions. In IG ii<sup>2</sup> 116 (361/0) [= Tod *GHI* no. 147] the ambassadors who have come to Athens (line 37: τὸς ἦκον[τας]) are Thessalians; they are foreigners since they are invited to *xenia* (lines 38–9).

<sup>12</sup> Note the similar phrase in IG ii<sup>2</sup> 106 (368/7) lines 6–9. The ambassadors in line 7 (οἱ ἐχ Λακεδαίμονος ἦκοντες) ought therefore to be Spartan ambassadors, not Athenian ambassadors returning from Sparta.

These ambassadors are to take the oaths for the alliance from the Athenians in the Council (lines 29–31) and are contrasted with the men whom the Athenians will elect to go to Thessaly and take the oaths from the Thessalians (lines 20–26). In IG ii<sup>2</sup> 34 (384/3), lines 12–3, the ambassadors who have come to Athens (τὸς πρέσβεις [τὸς ἤκον]τας) are there to take the oaths for a treaty from Athenian magistrates (lines 26–28) and are contrasted with the men whom the Assembly will elect and instruct to sail to Chios to take the oaths for this treaty from that community (lines 29–31).<sup>13</sup>

In the following inscriptions ambassadors who have come to Athens (ἤκοντας *vel sim.*) must be foreign since they are invited to *xenia*, not *deipnon*.

- 1) IG ii<sup>2</sup> 111 (363/2), lines 51–56 (= Tod *GHI* no. 142)
- 2) IG ii<sup>2</sup> 127 (356/5), lines 12–16, 28–34 (= Tod *GHI* no. 157)<sup>14</sup>
- 3) IG ii<sup>2</sup> 212 (347/6), lines 8–11, 49–53 (= Tod *GHI* no. 167)<sup>15</sup>
- 4) IG ii<sup>2</sup> 226 (circa 342), lines 26–31 (= Tod *GHI* no. 173)
- 5) IG ii<sup>2</sup> 264 (ante 336/5?), lines 15–8<sup>16</sup>
- 6) IG ii<sup>2</sup> 232 (340/39), lines 15–18 (restored)

A handful of inscriptions refer just to Athenian ambassadors sent by the Assembly to a foreign *polis* or ruler. In each inscription these ambassadors are described as “having been sent” (πεμφθέντας) after their return to Athens with the exception of the first example, where we still find the same verb but in the aorist active (πέμψαι).<sup>17</sup> In IG i<sup>3</sup> 61 (423) lines 16–18 (= Tod *GHI* no. 61 and Meiggs and Lewis no. 65), the ambassadors sent to Perdikkas to convey a message from the Athenian Assembly to Perdikkas, the King of Macedon (π[ρέσβεις] δ]ὲ τρεῖς πέμψαι ὑπὲρ πεντέκοντα ἔτε γεγον[ότα]ς] ἡο]ς Περδίκκα[ν]), the king of Macedon, are obviously Athenian ambassadors.<sup>18</sup> In three other inscriptions Athenian ambassadors who have returned to Athens and are paid by the Treasurer for their travel expenses (ἐφόδια) are described not as coming to Athens (ἤκοντας), but as having been sent out (πεμφθέντας).

- 1) IG ii<sup>2</sup> 124 (357/6), lines 10–13
- 2) IG ii<sup>2</sup> 149 (ante 355), lines 11–12, 14–17
- 3) IG ii<sup>2</sup> 207 (360s?), lines 23–26<sup>19</sup>

These examples show that the language of Athenian decrees is careful and consistent when describing Athenian and foreign ambassadors: the latter are described as those “who come from” (ἤκων,

<sup>13</sup> An invitation to *xenia* for these ambassadors has been restored in lines 32–34 and would fit the stoichedon arrangement better than an invitation to *deipnon*. IG ii<sup>2</sup> 35 appears to be a copy of the same decree but is more fragmentary.

<sup>14</sup> Note also that in lines 33–4 the phrase [. . . καλέσαι δὲ ἐπὶ ξένια τοὺς πρέσβεις τοὺς ἤ]κοντας παρὰ τ[ί]νων ἄλλων βασιλέων . . .] is plausibly restored. The phrase [. . . ἤκων παρ]ἰὰ τοῦ δήμου [τ]οῦ Σικυωνίων is likewise restored in IG ii<sup>2</sup> 448, lines 7–9 and applied to Euphron, who is obviously a foreigner since the decree identifies him as a Sicyonian.

<sup>15</sup> Note also that the ambassadors who have come to Athens are commended for looking after those who come from Athens to the Bosphoran kingdom (lines 49–50), which indicates they are Bosphoran subjects.

<sup>16</sup> The Iatrocles who sent the ambassador to Athens in this decree must be a foreign leader since his ambassador is invited to *xenia*. Koehler’s attempt to identify him this Iatrocles with the Athenian captured after the fall of Olynthus (Aeschin. 2.15.16) is therefore not convincing. Besides, Aeschines says that the news of his Iatrocles’ capture was brought to the attention of the Assembly not by an ambassador but by his relatives.

<sup>17</sup> Professor Habicht observes that in the Hellenistic period we find the verb ἀποστέλλειν instead of πέμπειν in *Hesp. Suppl.* 17, 1978, p. 96, no. 12, lines 7 and 12–3 (= no. 13, lines 1 and 8). Cf. IG ii<sup>2</sup> 1236, lines 1–2, where L. Robert *Hellenica* 11–12, 109, note 3, restores [ἀποστελλομένοις παρὰ τοῦ δήμου πρὸς τοὺς βασιλεῖς πρεσβευταῖς . . .].

<sup>18</sup> Lines 50–51 appear to refer to three sets of ambassadors: [ἡ]οι παρὰ Περδίκκο should be Macedonian ambassadors sent by Perdikkas in response to the Athenian invitation in lines 24–25 while [οἱ τ]ε μετ[ὰ] Πλειστίο οἰχόμενοι καὶ οἱ μετὰ Λεογόρο ought to be the Athenian ambassadors sent to Perdikkas mentioned in lines 16–18. Note that the verb used to express their return to Athens is ἀπαντήσωσι, not ἤκωσι (lines 49–50). But the identification of the Athenian ambassadors in lines 16–8 with those in lines 24–25 depends on the date of the decree in lines 3–33. Meiggs and Lewis *GHI* no. 65 date it to around 429 but Mattingly *CQ* 11, 1961, 154–65, more plausibly suggests 427/6.

<sup>19</sup> Note also the demotics after the names of the ambassadors who have been “sent out” indicate they are Athenians. For problems involved with dating the decree see M. J. Osborne, Athens and Orontes, *ABSA* 68, 1971, 297–321.

ἤκοντας, etc.) a foreign king or community, while Athenian ambassadors are referred to as those “sent” (πεμφθέντας). This means that the embassy coming from the king in lines 15–18 of IG i<sup>3</sup> 227 (whoever he may be) must be a foreign embassy sent by this king and cannot be an embassy sent by the Athenian Assembly. And since this cannot be an Athenian embassy, the lines cannot therefore refer to the alleged embassy of Epilykos mentioned in the *De Pace* attributed to Andocides.

Our conclusion has two significant implications for Athenian history in the late fifth century. First, the evidence of IG i<sup>3</sup> 227 cannot be used to confirm the information found in the *De Pace* about the so-called Peace of Epilykos. Second, the evidence of IG i<sup>3</sup> 227 cannot by the same token be used to confirm the authenticity of the *De Pace* attributed to Andocides. With one of the main arguments for the *De Pace*’s authenticity now removed, it is time to re-examine the other arguments made in favor of attributing the speech to Andocides.<sup>20</sup>

City University of New York  
Institute for Advanced Study

Edward M. Harris

---

<sup>20</sup> I would like to thank Professor Angelos Chaniotis and Professor Christian Habicht for reading over a draft of this essay and offering helpful suggestions for improvement. I would also like to thank Professor Werner Eck for his constructive criticisms and advice. None of these men should be held responsible for any remaining errors.