

DAVID WHITEHEAD

IG I³ 174 AND 175: ONE DECREE OR TWO?

aus: Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik 118 (1997) 165–169

© Dr. Rudolf Habelt GmbH, Bonn

IG I³ 174 AND 175: ONE DECREE OR TWO?I³ 174 (stoich. 21):

[ἔδοξεν τῆι βολῆι καὶ τῶι δ]-
 [ήμωι· . . . ηῖς ἐπρυτάνευε, Θ]-
 [ε]αῖος ἐγ[ρα]μ[μά]τευε, Ἄρι[σ]τ]-
 αῖνετος ἐπεστάτε, Πείσαν-
 δρος εἶπε· Λύκωνα τὸν Ἀχαι-
 ὄν, ἐπειδὴ εὖ ποεῖ Ἀθηναί-
 [ς], ἀναγραψάτω πρόξενον κα-
 ῖ εὐεργέτην Ἀθηναίων ἐν σ-
 τήλῃ λιθίνει ἐμ πόλει ὁ γρ-
 αμματεὺς ὁ τῆς βολῆς καὶ κ-
 αταθέτω ἐμ πόλει. τὴν δὲ να-
 ῦν ἦν δέεται ἐκκομίσασθαι

ἐξ Ἀχαιῶας ἐκκομισάσθω κ-
αὶ ἐξῆναι αὐτῶι πλὲν καὶ χ-
ρήματα ἐσάγεν ὅσης Ἀθηνα-
ῖοι κρατῶσι, καὶ ἐς τὰ Ἀθην-
[α]ίων φρόρια· ἐς δὲ τὸν κόλπ-
[ον μ]ῆ ἐξέ[ναι . . .] / [αὐ]τῶι

I³ 175 (stoich. 22):

[- - - λιθ]-
[ίνει ἐμ πόλει ὁ γραμ]ματεὺ[ς]
[ὁ τῆς βολῆς καὶ κατ]αθέτω ἐμ
[πόλει· τὴν δὲ ναῦν ἦ]ν δέται ἐ-
[κκομίσασθαι ἐξ Ἀχ]αιῶας ἐκ-
[κομισάσθω καὶ ἐξ]ῆναι αὐτῶ-
[ι πλὲν καὶ χρήματα] ἐσάγεν ὅ-
[σης Ἀθηναῖοι κρατ]ῶσι, καὶ ἐ-
[ς τὰ Ἀθηναίων φρόρια· ἐς δ]ὲ [τ]-
[ὸν κόλπον - - - - -]

These two stones have generated much discussion over the years, chiefly concerning their date (between c. 430 and 410) and their geographical point(s) of reference: Peloponnesian ‘Achaia’ and the ‘Gulf’ of Corinth, or else ‘Achaia’ Phthiotis and the Malian ‘Gulf’.⁸ Here, as my title indicates, I (briefly) address the issue not of substance but of form.

Advocates of 174 and 175 being two copies of the same decree⁹ rely on internal evidence: the fact that 175 appears to be identical, word for word, with 174.9 ff., and in not merely the formulaic phraseology but also the substantive, *ad hoc* sections (174.11–18 = 175.4–10). The newer view – argued by Michael Walbank and approvingly presented by David Lewis in IG I³ – that these are two separate decrees for two different Achaian honorands has invoked external as well as internal evidence. Walbank writes (on I³ 175, his no. 51): ‘the evidence of find-spots is that both stelai were erected upon the Akropolis . . . and I cannot conceive of any reason why the Athenians should erect duplicate stelai on the Akropolis (the letter-forms of the two stelai are virtually identical, slight differences in height and shape resulting, I believe, from the difference in chequer and consequent wider spacing in #51: the two stelai are thus of the same date)’. Lewis takes a different tack: ‘si litteras numerabis, unius litterae discrepantiam invenies, quod fortasse erroris lapidariae, ut in v. 9 tituli prioris, debetur; sed fortasse etiam Achaeus alter, cuius nomen una littera longius erat, in hoc titulo honoratus est, ut monet Walbank’.

Lewis’s comments, first, are baffling as they stand (now, alas, beyond clarification). What is true, as Wilhelm first noted, is that in 174.9 the mason made a mistake, in omitting the ι of πόλει; it had to be squeezed in to what then became a 22-letter line. What is not true – unless we assume, improbably, a repetition in 175.2 of the selfsame mistake¹⁰ – is that the name of the honorand in 175 is bound to be

⁸ On these matters see e.g. (for discussion and earlier bibliography) A. G. Woodhead, ‘Peisander’, *AJPh* 75 (1954) 131–46, at 135–6; H. B. Mattingly, ‘Periclean Imperialism’, in *Ancient Society and Institutions: Studies . . . Victor Ehrenberg* (Oxford 1966) 193–223, at 213–4 (now reprinted ‘with necessary corrections’ in his *The Athenian Empire Restored: epigraphic and historical studies* (Ann Arbor 1996) 147–79, at 178–9; M. B. Walbank, *Athenian Proxeny of the Fifth Century BC* (Toronto and Sarasota 1978) nos. 50 and 51, and again ‘Notes on Attic decrees’, *ABSA* 85 (1990) 435–47, at 442 (no. 11).

⁹ e.g. Wilhelm, *Hermes* 24 (1889) 110–3, no. 2; Dittenberger ap. SIG³ 92; Hiller ap. IG I² 93a–b; R. Develin, *Athenian Officials 684–321 BC* (Cambridge 1989) 194.

¹⁰ Those who have seen the stone are in no doubt that this is indeed a mistake (‘I sine spatio sua postea additum’, Lewis; ‘an iota has been inserted to correct the mason’s omission of it’, Walbank); thus it is not an example of the

‘una littera longius’. Rather, if one works back from what is preserved of 175 (see above),¹¹ it should have opened as follows:

[ἔδοξεν τῆι βολῆι καὶ τῶι δῆ]-
 [μωι . . . ηῖς ἐπρυτάνευε, Θεα]-
 [ῖος ἐγραμμάτευε, Ἀρισταίν]-
 [ετος ἐπεστάτε, Πείσανδρος]
 [εἶπε . . . ὁ . . . τὸν Ἀχαιόν, ἐπε]-
 [ιδῆ εὖ ποεῖ Ἀθηναῖος, ἀναγρ]-
 [αψάτω πρόξενον καὶ εὐεργέ]-
 [την Ἀθηναίων ἐν στήλῃ λιθ]-
 [ίνει ἐμ πόλει ὁ γραμματεὺς]

Apparently, then, the name of the honorand did occupy six stoichoi in 175 (as well as in 174). That it was a longer name is a possibility generated not, in point of fact, by Lewis’s observations but by those of Harold Mattingly in 1974. ‘In Lykon’s decree the mason curiously cut ἐμ πόλει twice [174.9 and 11], erroneously on the first occasion. I cannot readily believe that he would have repeated his mistake when cutting the second copy. The preamble of [175] then, down to and including the honorand’s name, will probably have contained six more letters than that of [174]. The decree could well have been passed on the same day, for an honorand with a name just that much longer than Lykon’.¹² It seems to me that this argument fails to distinguish between mistakes (or anomalies) in cutting and in drafting. Replication of the former – 174.9 and 175.2 in this instance – would be unlikely. Provided, though, the mason was transcribing a draft which really did say ἀναγραψάτω πρόξενον καὶ εὐεργέτην Ἀθηναίων ἐν στήλῃ λιθίνει ἐμ πόλει ὁ γραμματεὺς ὁ τῆς βολῆς καὶ καταθέτω ἐμ πόλει, that is what he would have been charged with reproducing on both of his stelai.¹³

The crux of the issue, therefore, is whether we can accept the idea of two copies of Lykon’s proxeny decree being inscribed on stone and set up on the Akropolis.

Michael Walbank’s views on this have been quoted already – with one omission: he went on to concede the possibility ‘that the second stele was simply carried up to the Akropolis at some later date’. If by ‘the second stele’ he means IG I³ 174, we may note that this devil’s-advocate suggestion had been anticipated by Mattingly in 1968: ‘it is most unlikely that both [174 and 175] were originally set up on the Acropolis, and indeed [174] may have come from almost any site in the city itself with other filling material’.¹⁴ The relevance of such a scenario when each of the two stelai record a decree to be set up ἐμ πόλει is not here spelled out, so we must return to it later.

Mattingly’s change of mind between 1968 (‘fragments of *two* stone copies of Lykon’s proxeny decree survive’) and 1974 (‘[IG I³ 175] is most probably, I submit, a decree for a fellow-countryman, couched in identical language – at least as far as both happen to be preserved’) seems to have resulted partly from his view that the honorand in 175 had a name longer than Lykon but partly also from a failure to find a parallel for two stone copies of such a decree. In 1968 he had argued that IG I² 27 and 143 (now I³ 27 and 28) provided the parallel, with ἐμ πόλε[ι ἐστέλει καὶ ἐν] | τῶι βουλευτε[ρίοι in 27.9–

phenomenon of iota being deliberately grouped with the letter in the preceding stoichos. See generally R.P.Austin, *The Stoichedon Style in Greek Inscriptions* (Oxford 1938, repr. New York 1973) 38–43.

¹¹ What I have given there is the IG I³ text, which oddly prints nothing before λιθίνει (lines 1–2). Walbank no. 51 opts for restoration as full as is prompted by 174.1–9, save for the honorand’s being ...±6... τὸν ...±6...

¹² H. B. Mattingly, ‘The language of Athenian imperialism’, *Epigraphica* 36 (1974) 33–56, at 36 (= *The Athenian Empire Restored* 361–85, at 364).

¹³ Note A. S. Henry, *Honours and Privileges in Athenian Decrees* (Hildesheim 1983) 118–9: ‘I³ 174 . . . has its own individual flavour: it includes a brief clause of motivation within the proxeny formulation itself, and repeats (otiosely) the location in an additional imperatival clause introduced by καταθέτω and coordinated with καί.’

¹⁴ H. B. Mattingly, ‘Athenian finance in the Peloponnesian War’, *BCH* 92 (1968) 450–85, at 480 (= *The Athenian Empire Restored* 215–57, at 250).

10 understood to mean that the Council-House copy as well as the Akropolis copy was on stone. In 1974 this line of interpretation was formally abandoned: I³ 27 and 28 ‘should be firmly separated’, and 27’s Council-House copy ‘was probably on wood as with the other two examples of this practice’ (I³ 56.4–5 and 155.7–8).

A consequence of this is that the only demonstrable instance of a document being set up on stone in the Bouleuterion as well as on the Akropolis is IG I³ 71, the extraordinary tribute reassessment decree (and resulting schedule) of 425/4: *τένδε δὲ τ[ἐ]ν γ[ν]όμεν[α] [καὶ τὸ φσέ]φ[ισμα τόδε καὶ τὸμ φ]όρο[ν] ἡὸς ἄν ταχθ[ῆ]ι τῆι πόλει ἡεκάσται ἀνα]γρά[φ]σ[α]ς ἡο γρ[α]μματεὺς τῆς βολῆς ἐν δυοῖν στ]έλα[ι]ν λιθίναιν [καταθέτο τὲμ μὲν ἐν τῷ β]ο]λευ[τε]ρ[ί]οι τῆν δὲ ἐμ πόλει (lines 22–5).¹⁵ The differences between such a document, of universal and paramount interest at the time, and a common-or-garden proxeny decree need not be laboured. Furthermore, concerning any relevance of all this to I³ 174–5, a capital fact seems to have been obscured: the decree for Lykon does not, of itself, order the inscribing and erection of two copies. The simultaneous production and existence of two copies was apparently never envisaged. If there are, nevertheless, two copies, the appropriate parallel has to be a different one.*

Could it be afforded by Osborne, *Naturalization* D8 (IG II² 17 + SEG 15.84 + SEG 16.42)? In this award of citizenship etc. in 394/3 to the seer Sthorys of (?)Thasos the principal decree, the second on the stone, orders the preparation of a single stele, at the honorand’s expense (lines 33–36: τὸν δὲ [γ]ραμμ[α]τέα τῆς βολ[ῆ]ς ἀναγράψαι τὸ ψήφισμα τόδε [τέ]λε[σ]ι τοῖς Σθόρου[ο]ς ἐν στήλῃ ἵνα περ αὐτῷ τὰ π[ρ]ότερ[α] ψηφί[σ]ματα [ἀ]ναγέγραπται. Before it, however, a clarificatory decree of the Council provides as follows: [ἀναγράψαι Σθόρου ν ν] τὸν γραμματέα τῆς βολῆς ἐν σ[τή]λαιν λιθίναιν ἐν] πόλῃ καὶ ἐν Πυθίῳ τὰ ἐψηφισμένα περὶ Σθόρου ν] τ[ῶ]ι δήμῳ (lines 8–10). Osborne writes: ‘Presumably, the earlier decrees for Sthorys had been set up in both of these places. But the decree granting him citizenship had not made this clear, since it spoke only of *one* stele, and it did not specify the two places (though it did provide for penalties to both Athena and Apollo in the sanction clause [lines 36–38])’. He then goes on to assume, *faute de mieux*, that Sthorys met the cost of both of the stelai. (For this cf. generally IG I³ 156.22–26, where Leonidas of Halikarnassos is to pay for two stelai, one on the Akropolis and one in his home city.)

The differences between all this and IG I³ 174–175 are therefore significant. The latter make no mention of inscribing at private expense – from which the only reasonable inference is that the expense was to be public; they include no hint, of the kind detected by Osborne in his D8.36–38 (above), that the public erection of two stelai was envisaged all along; and they involve no location other than the Akropolis. (In D8 the second site is the Python, outside the city walls to the south east.)

The parallel we need is one where a single Akropolis copy of an honorific decree was inscribed and erected at public expense, and a second copy – identical even to the extent of not proclaiming itself as such – was arranged by the honorand. For this see IG II² 479–480. Despite their poorly preserved state, they have always been regarded as two copies of the same (late-fourth-century) honorific decree for Pyr[-] of Heraklea.¹⁶ Both were found on the Akropolis, yet only one was ordered to be put up there: ἀ]ναγράψαι δὲ τόδ[ε] τὸ ψήφισμα ἐν στήλῃ λιθίνῃ τὸν γραμματέα τὸν κατὰ πρυτανείαν καὶ

¹⁵ With this we may generically associate other decrees which explicitly order the erection of two stelai in different locations: IG I³ 78 (Eleusinian first-fruits, ?c.422), 48–51 (one in Eleusis, one on the Akropolis); IG II² 204 (the *hiera orgas*, 352/1), 54–7 (one in Eleusis, one in the city Eleusinion); SEG 34.94 (re-edition of IG II² 1707: honouring of fiscal magistrates, 181/0), 19–22 (one near the Council House, one in Peiraieus); SEG 26.121 (re-edition of IG II² 1035: restoration of Attic sanctuaries, late first century BC), 14–6 (one on the Akropolis, one in Peiraieus). The assertion of T. L. Shear, Jr., ‘Bouleuterion, Metroon and the Archives at Athens’, in M. H. Hansen / K. Raaflaub (eds.), *Studies in the Ancient Greek Polis, Historia Einzelschriften* 95 (Stuttgart 1995) 157–90, at 186 with n. 73, that two marble stelai are prescribed in IG I³ 68.55–8 is incorrect. For IG II² 17+ (Osborne, *Naturalization in Athens* D8) see below.

¹⁶ For this orthodoxy see e.g. Austin, *Stoichedon Style* (n. 5 above) 54, and latterly M. B. Walbank, ‘A *lex sacra* of the State and of the deme of Kollytos’, *Hesperia* 63 (1994) 233–9, at 238. (The overlap between 479, cut non-stoichedon on Hymettian-type marble, and 480, cut stoichedon on Pentelic-type marble, is between lines 1–8 of the former and 18–24 of the latter.)

στήσαι ἐν ἀκροπόλει (479.25–27). It was to be paid for out of public funds (479.27–29); its twin was thus, presumably, the product of private initiative. As such, the latter's original location is indeterminable; but in making its eventual way to the Akropolis it might have been following in the footsteps of IG I³ 174.¹⁷

¹⁷ Another instance of the double inscription of an honorific decree used to be seen (since A. M. Dittmar, *De Atheniensium more exteris coronis publice ornandi quaestiones epigraphicae* (Leipzig 1890) 80–1) in IG II² 344 and 368.1–18; but this was challenged by M. B. Walbank, 'An ill-fitting doublet? IG II² 344 and 368', *ZPE* 48 (1982) 264–6, and his arguments were taken further still by C. J. Schwenk, *Athens in the Age of Alexander: the dated laws and decrees of 'the Lykourgan era' 338–322 BC* (Chicago 1985) 177–81 (no. 33) and 401–7 (no. 82).