

71-24,052

LALONDE, Gerald Vincent, 1938-
THE PUBLICATION AND TRANSMISSION OF GREEK
DIPLOMATIC DOCUMENTS. [Portions of Text in
Greek, Latin and German.]

University of Washington, Ph.D., 1971
History, ancient

University Microfilms, A XEROX Company, Ann Arbor, Michigan

© 1971

GERALD VINCENT LALONDE

ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

THE PUBLICATION AND TRANSMISSION OF
GREEK DIPLOMATIC DOCUMENTS

by

INCIDENT
GERALD V. LALONDE

A dissertation submitted in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for the degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

UNIVERSITY OF WASHINGTON

1971

Approved by Colin N. Edmonson
(Chairman of Supervisory Committee)

Department of Classics
(Departmental Faculty sponsoring candidate)

Date March 4, 1971

UNIVERSITY OF WASHINGTON

Date: February 18, 1971

We have carefully read the dissertation entitled The Publication and Transmission of Greek Diplomatic Documents

Gerald V. Lalonde submitted by Gerald V. Lalonde in partial fulfillment of the requirements of the degree of Ph.D. and recommend its acceptance. In support of this recommendation we present the following joint statement of evaluation to be filed with the dissertation.

This dissertation is an extremely capable work of original scholarship which exhibits superior analytical ability, mastery of highly specialized and technical data and skills, and mature judgment in reaching sound conclusions. The candidate has thoroughly and efficiently digested the scholarly literature related to his topic, and with the addition of new information, has been able to reach conclusions significantly advancing our knowledge of important aspects of ancient Greek politics and history.

DISSERTATION READING COMMITTEE: Colin N. Edmonson
McGammell
Sierra A. MacKen

Doctoral Dissertation

In presenting this dissertation in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the doctoral degree at the University of Washington, I agree that the Library shall make its copies freely available for inspection. I further agree that extensive copying of this dissertation is allowable only for scholarly purposes. Requests for copying or reproduction of this dissertation may be referred to University Microfilms, 300 North Zeeb Road, Ann Arbor, Michigan 48106, to whom the author has granted "the right to reproduce and sell (a) copies of the manuscript in microform and/or (b) printed copies of the manuscript made from microform."

Signature

Ernest S. Salmons

Date

Nov 4, 1991

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	PAGE
PREFACE	iv
CHAPTER	
I THE LOCAL PUBLICATION OF DIPLOMATIC DOCUMENTS	1
I. THE STATE CONTROL OF PUBLICATION	3
II. THE SECRETARY, SCRIBAL PROCESS, AND THE ARCHIVES	12
III. TEMPORARY PUBLICATION AND ARCHIVAL DEPOSITS	26
IV. PERMANENT PUBLICATIONS	34
V. THE LOCATION OF PERMANENT PUBLICATIONS	52
VI. THE FINANCING OF PUBLICATIONS	67
II THE TRANSMISSION OF INTERSTATE CORRESPONDENCE	76
I. THE FORM AND MATERIAL OF INTERSTATE DOCUMENTS	77
II. THE USE OF STATE SEALS	84
III. AMBASSADORS, HERALDS, AND COURIERS	108
IV. TRAVEL ALLOWANCES AND PER DIEM	125
V. THE MOBILITY OF ENVOYS	132
VI. PASSPORTS AND VISAS	139
VII. THE RECEPTION AND ENTERTAINMENT OF EMBASSIES	143
CONCLUSION	150

CHAPTER	PAGE
III INTERSTATE PUBLICATION OF DIPLOMATIC DOCUMENTS	152
I. THE LEGAL APPROVAL OF ALIEN DOCUMENTS	154
II. THE REQUEST AND GRANT OF <u>TOPOS</u>	159
III. THE PHYSICAL TASK OF PUBLICATION	169
VI. DIPLOMATIC PUBLICATIONS AT ALTERNATE SITES	173
V. DIPLOMATIC PUBLICATIONS IN PANHELLENIC SANCTUARIES	178
IV THE TREATMENT OF DIALECT IN INTERSTATE DOCUMENTS	188
I. INTEGRITY OF DIALECT AND SCRIBAL INTRUSIONS	189
II. TRANSLATION OF DIPLOMATIC DOCUMENTS	202
CONCLUSION	215
NOTES	
CHAPTER I	220
CHAPTER II	234
CHAPTER III	246
CHAPTER IV	253
APPENDIXES	257
BIBLIOGRAPHY	289
VITA	298

PREFACE

The subject of this dissertation evolved from a graduate course in which I first faced the mysteries of Greek epigraphy by working with squeezes and photographs of Agora I 6420, a fragment of a decree of Thespiai inscribed in the dialect of third-century Boiotia but published in the Athenian Agora. This unusual inscription and the small number of other "imported" documents found at Athens prompted my original thesis proposal of ahistorical and political commentary on interstate documents. But I soon ruled this out when a survey of inscription from other sites showed that such interstate documents were far more numerous than the few cases at Athens had suggested, and furthermore, that these foreign copies of diplomatic texts could not be treated apart from the more numerous local counterparts. From this initial study, however, I became interested in the more limited question which became the subject of this dissertation: the technical procedures involved in the publication and transmission of these diplomatic documents.

The bulk of evidence for this investigation comes from the ancient sources, particularly inscriptions of treaties of alliance and peace, commercial pacts, arbitral agreements, and grants of proxeny, citizenship, asylia, and other honors. Interstate funerary inscriptions and dedications are not official diplomatic texts in the same sense as these others, and with the exception of special cases, I have excluded them from the study. The best epigraphical evidence for the handling of

diplomatic documents consists of the rubrics for publication, dispatch, and finance which are so often included in the inscribed texts. Besides textual content, the material evidence of the stele, its letter-forms, dialect, and provenience are frequently clues to the methods of publication and transmission. The literary and historical traditions, although generally unconcerned with such technical matters, have occasionally furnished valuable corroborative evidence, or enlightened us on points where the inscriptions were lacking. Official documents on papyrus have provided little information on this subject, since those which survive deal primarily with the internal interests of Ptolemaic and Roman Egypt. Papyrus, of course, played an important role in the correspondence between Greek states, but the northern Mediterranean climate has preserved none of these documents, and we must learn about them primarily from our literary and epigraphical sources. The necessary attention to secondary sources on a great number of points will be obvious from the notes and bibliography. In most areas of Classical study there are treatises which stand out as prerequisites to any advanced work in the field. For this study I would single out the basic works of Wilhelm and Klaffenbach in the area of epigraphical procedures, and Buck's work on the interstate use of Greek dialects; my attention and indebtedness to their scholarship will be apparent in the first and fourth chapters of this thesis.

The inscriptions which form the basis of this study are the diplomatic decrees and letters from the mainland and islands of Greece which

are found in Inscriptione Graecae and the separate publications from the Athenian Agora, Corinth, Delphi, Delos, Olympia, and Krete. Outside these geographical limits I have made no systematic survey of the diplomatic texts but have frequently referred to relevant inscriptions, particularly from the sites in Asia Minor. With the help of Supplementum Epigraphicum Graecum I have tried to keep abreast of new inscriptions and the current interpretations of older ones.

The chronological extent of this investigation is essentially the Classical and Hellenistic eras. The late-sixth or early-fifth century is a logical anterior limit of the study since only then do we begin to get significant evidence of interstate dealings from stone and bronze stelai. For the years after the capitulation of Greek independence to Roman rule, I have referred only occasionally to diplomatic procedures between Greek cities which do not show the interference of Rome.

For the study of technical procedures, I found the topical approach more effective than a treatment by document or type of inscription. The method used here involved some repetition of examples in the gathering of evidence from so many sources, but the result is clearer than analysis by genre would be. The general plan is as follows: Chapter I discusses the legal, secretarial, archival, technical, and financial problems involved in the local processing of diplomatic documents. The second chapter treats a number of aspects of the transmission of documents from one state to another, including types of envoys and their payment, the use

of seals, passports, visas, safe conduct, and the official reception of ambassadors. Chapter III deals with the question of publication of documents at foreign sites insofar as it differs from the subject of local publication treated in Chapter I. The fourth chapter discusses the use of dialect in diplomatic documents both at local and foreign sites. Appendixes A and B are studies which, while not fitting into the development of the other chapters, are closely related to the general subject.

Admittedly there has been some risk of generalization in treating under such broad topics various genres of diplomatic documents, so many different states, and so lengthy a span of time as four centuries. But by paying attention within each topic to chronological, geographical, political, and generic distinctions, and recognizing the limitations of the evidence, I hope that I have been able to avoid generalized or misapplied conclusions. Despite the broad chronological and geographical scope of the study it finds a surprising degree of standardization in many details of interstate correspondence.

While recognizing that the terms 'diplomatic' and 'interstate' are not strictly synonymous, I use them somewhat interchangeably. Thus, when instead of 'diplomatic,' the word 'interstate' is applied to documents, it may refer not simply to decrees or letters which are dispatched from one state to another, but also to a state's copies of its own documents which are concerned with relations with other states. Although there is no neat term to denote the unique relations of poleis and confederacies

of ancient Greece, I have opted for 'interstate' because it seemed more than 'international' to be suggestive of political rather than ethnological differences.

It is not the purpose of this dissertation to study the historical or political effects of diplomatic procedures, their success or failure in achieving the ends for which they were intended, but rather, to examine from a more technical viewpoint the methods and means by which independent states communicated. It is not history, but the less romantic science of piecing together from scattered and fragmentary evidence a picture of procedures which the ancients took for granted and did not see fit to describe for us. Although such studies of methods and institutions are not history, they are important for historical studies, for often a proper understanding of the mere way in which things were done can lead to a clearer interpretation of historical events.

CHAPTER I

THE LOCAL PUBLICATION OF DIPLOMATIC DOCUMENTS

The practice in ancient Greece of exhibiting permanent copies of important diplomatic documents is closely associated with the machinery of democratic constitutions, not only practically but also historically. It is not just coincidence that in Athens and other states, the fifth century marks the beginning of both the institution of strong participatory democracy, and the practice of publishing extensive official documents on monuments of stone and bronze. Such expressions as σκοπεῖν τῶι βουλομένωι and ἵνα πάντες εἰδῶσιν in the fifth-century publications of Athens suggest the democracy's strong sense of responsibility in giving its citizens access to the records of public affairs. Nor is it a coincidence that at this same time the Greeks first began to utilize the potential of stone as material for lengthy written texts. As a medium of publication, the stone stele answered a political need. Its introduction required a number of innovations in legal, scribal, and fiscal procedures, but in many respects, the use of the stele was incorporated into the existing chancery system which had been publishing state documents on wooden boards and axones since the time of Solon and the very beginning of democracy.

Athens of course is the focal point of any discussion of inscriptions dealing with foreign affairs, since that city has yielded more epigraphic and literary evidence on the subject than any other, and its

extant decrees are extraordinary in their consistent inclusion of detailed formulas for the recording, transmission, publication, and financing of the texts. The extensive but less unified evidence from outside Attica shows above all that there were many remarkable consistencies in the procedures of state publication throughout the Hellenic world. For the publication of some particular types of decrees such as arbitration or *asylia*, the non-Athenian sources are often more illuminating, and even where they do not reflect or supplement the system at Athens, they serve to illustrate some interesting contrasts in scribal procedures and institutions.

In the following analysis of the process of publishing local diplomatic documents, most of the examples naturally will be drawn from the sphere of interstate politics. Nevertheless, many of the same procedures and institutions were employed in the setting up of important records of internal affairs, and except where discussion deals with points peculiar to interstate business, much of the commentary is applicable to the process of official publications in general. The limitation of examples to diplomatic documents does not weaken the validity of conclusions about the process of publication, since from practically every major site and period of Classical and Hellenistic Greece, the decrees and letters related to foreign affairs constitute the largest single class of published state documents, and these most often contain the valuable evidence of detailed instructions for their

own publication. In this treatment of the process by which the Greek states and confederacies published their own diplomatic enactments, the following points will be considered in as many subdivisions; the state control of publications, the scribal and archival process, the exhibition of temporary copies, the engraving of the stelai, their location in public precincts, and the financing of these operations.

I. THE STATE CONTROL OF PUBLICATIONS

In most independent Greek states, the ratification and publication of interstate business was the strict competence of the highest deliberative body, usually the Assembly or some analogous group of citizens. This jurisdiction covered both the documents received from other states,¹ and the interstate dealings ratified in the local legislature. At Athens, the Assembly had control of the publication of diplomatic documents not only by virtue of its authority over foreign affairs, but also because many publications entailed the expenditure of public money, and all of them the occupation of state property. The provisions for publication which were frequently included in the texts of decrees and inscribed on the stelai should provide some idea of the parliamentary process by which the Assembly decided which documents were to be permanently exhibited.

The control of the publication of diplomatic documents can best be explained as part of the wider context of authority in diplomatic legislation. In every city-state or confederacy one body of men, usually

the primary assembly of citizens or a representative synedrion, was invested with absolute authority (κυρία or αὐτοκρατία) in dealing with foreign states and individuals. In the democratic constitution of Athens, this body was the Assembly. The Athenian Council customarily received foreign envoys, and considered diplomatic proposals such as treaties, alliances, and grants of proxeny, citizenship, and other honors, but for such matters to become law, they had to be submitted to the Assembly and ratified by that body.² In the course of its ratification of interstate business, the Assembly further decided which of these diplomatic enactments were to be given special promulgation by temporary or permanent publication in the sacred or public precincts of the city, and whether at public expense or at the expense of private parties interested in their publication.

At least by the end of the fifth century, and probably earlier, records of all acts of the Athenian Assembly were deposited in the state archives, frequently transcripts on perishable material were given to concerned local or foreign parties, and sometimes copies were exhibited temporarily on wooden boards. The complete loss of all these documents on papyrus and wood creates the common illusion that inscriptions were the usual form of publication. But as A. Wilhelm has shown, permanent publication on stone or bronze ensued only in a minority of special cases on the basis of a special order or approval of the legislature.³ It is not surprising then that most of the extant

decrees from the Athenian Acropolis are treaties and proxenies, and that in other states as well, the majority of official documents singled out for the elaborate and costly publication on stone concern foreign affairs. The durability of the stele was particularly suitable for the publication of alliances and other treaties, which were usually contracted for many years or — especially after the fifth century — in perpetuity. For decrees of proxeny and citizenship, which were often hereditary honors, the stele provided the ideal medium for the honored family to keep its honor and perquisites ever before the public eye. Even in the Hellenistic age when the expanded use of archives caused a reduction in the proportion of civil records on stone,⁴ the stele enjoyed increased favor in interstate transactions as attested by the state of inscribed arbitral documents, decrees of asyilia, theoretic proclamations, and royal correspondence. But even in the realm of diplomatic transactions, which dominate the corpus of surviving decrees, Wilhelm's findings apply, and the texts transmitted to stone represent only a select minority of such acts ratified by the Assembly.

The jurisdiction of the Demos in determining which diplomatic documents were to be singled out for permanent publication rested partly on its autokratia in interstate business. But there were also two important points of law which necessitated the Assembly's formal consideration and vote on each proposal of publication on stone or bronze. First, according to the proposals of many diplomatic decrees,

they were to be published with moneys from a special fund of the Treasury of the Demos which could only be disbursed by order of the Assembly.⁵ But in at least as many other extant inscriptions, it is either explicitly stated, or implied in the absence of any fiscal provision, that the cost of publication was borne by a private party, either local or foreign. In decrees of proxeny and other honors especially, the payment for publication was most often the burden of the recipient.⁶ The state often studiously avoided the expense of lengthy publication on stone or bronze and simply gave a transcript to the honored to do with what he pleased,⁷ and deposited another in the local archives, or merely added the name of the honored to a published list.⁸ But even in these cases in which the decreeing state did not finance a publication, there was no allowance in the mere ratification of the decree that an interested party could set up its own stele at will; in these and in all proposals for publication, a second legal point had to be considered: the occupation of state property.

The sanctuaries and agoras of Greece were the property of the cities in which they lay, and in order to place a stele or any other monument in these precincts, the interested party had to obtain the grant of a small piece of property, or topos, through a decree of the Assembly or other accredited body.⁹ The grant of topos as a legal requirement quite distinct from the approval of the decree itself is perhaps best illustrated by the case of a decree published a long time after its

ratification — but only by a further decree of approval by the Demos. The Athenian decree of 353/B. C. honoring a certain Aristokratis (?) (IG II² 195, vv. 7 ff.) has this provision:¹⁰

. . . The former decree, which was published [probably in a temporary copy] for him in front of the Bouleuterion, the Secretary, when he has inscribed it on a marble stele, is to erect it on the Acropolis, and add to it the inscription of this decree.

Another indication of the state's strict control of publication on its property is the fact that lost or destroyed stelai, although legally published at one time, could be replaced only with new legislative approval. The obvious examples from Athens are the decrees which were re-inscribed after the original stelai had been destroyed by the Thirty. (See, for example, IG I² 126, II² 6, 9, and perhaps 405.) Especially noteworthy is II² 6 which is simply a brief decree addressed to Eurypylos, one of those honored in the original decree, granting permission for the renewal of the stele. Since Eurypylos is paying for the new inscription, this decree of approval has nothing to do with the fiscal responsibilities of the Assembly. It may be in some sense a reaffirmation of the original honors, but it is also certainly a renewal of the original grant of topos.

If it can now be admitted that the states were quite selective in their allowances for permanent publications, the question of the motives and criteria of this selectivity naturally follow. Since this chapter is concerned only with a state's publication of its own diplomatic enactments, there can be no question of national security or the intrinsic worth of a document as there would be in the consideration of foreign documents imported for publication. The most obvious and practical

motive for selectivity in local publication must have been the spatial limitations of the sanctuaries and agoras. The very number of inscriptions from the Athenian Acropolis and Delphi indicate that those sites were cluttered with stelai by the third century. Since these inscriptions represented only a relatively small part of all legislation, on what basis was public topos allocated to them rather than other documents? The numerous inscriptions of laws and important financial accounts indicate that documents affecting all citizens and requiring special public scrutiny received high priority in the allotment of money and public space for stelai. A high percentage of the important decrees of interstate treaties and alliance and arbitrations were published for reasons both legal and propagandistic.¹¹ As for the multitude of honors which a state decreed for citizens and foreigners, publication must have been allowed on a much more selective basis, with the priority given to decrees of outstanding honors, especially those of proxeny and citizenship.

The best source of knowledge of the parliamentary procedures by which the legislative body approved or directed publication of their decrees is the set of instructions to the scribal officers which was very often included in the text transmitted to the stele. The Athenian decrees are by far the most consistent in the inclusion of these provisions for publication. Of the ninety-eight Athenian diplomatic decrees discussed in Appendix A, only one definitely never contained a provision for local

publication.¹² Even where the official directive is lacking, as it commonly is in non-Athenian inscriptions, it cannot be assumed that formal approval was not passed in the legislature and that the recipient of the decree took it upon himself to set up the stele on state property. The official provision for publication was simply not an essential part of the published text, but nevertheless the act of official approval must have preceded all publications on state property.

The common formula for authorizing the publication of Athenian decrees has the form of an instruction to the Secretary of the Council, expressed either in oratio obliqua or the third-person imperative. It appears as a minor provision at the end of the decree, but is usually not distinctive in form, position, or syntax from the essential provisions of the decree proper. An abbreviated form of the decree with the formula for publication would be as follows:

(name) εἶπεν . . . ἐπειδὴ . . . (the circumstances and essential proposals of the decree). . . τὸ δὲ ψήφισμα τὸδε ἀναγράψαι τὸν γραμματέα τῆς βουλῆς ἐν στήλῃ λιθίνῃ καὶ καταθεῖναι . . . (provision for location).

This clause was sometimes followed by a further directive for publication of a copy of the decree in a foreign city, and, if either of the publications was to be financed by Athens, a provision for the disbursement of funds from the Treasury of the Demos.

The position and syntax of these provisions as they appear on the stelai, would suggest that they were ratified along with the major terms of the decrees as parts of single psephismata. But on reflection

this impression seems naive in the light of Wilhelm's conclusion that only a minority of decrees were singled out by the Assembly for permanent publication. If the texts on the extant stelai do in fact reflect the form and order of the preliminary draft, or probouleuma, as it was put to a vote in the Assembly, then we have to envision an extremely cumbersome process of vetoes or substitute motions by which the Assembly might — as it must have in the majority of cases — endorse the proposed decree itself without endorsing its permanent publication. It is more reasonable to assume that the proposal of publication was put to a separate vote after the approval of the decree proper, and if ratified, it was incorporated for the sake of economy into the body of the decree in the draft which the Secretary made for the stonemason. This hypothesis is bolstered by the exceptional form of one Athenian inscription, a decree of proxeny of 349/8 B. C. for a certain Theogenes of Naukratis (IG II² 206). The decree as it appears on the stele includes the proposal of proxeny in the form of a probouleuma ratified by the Assembly (vv. 5-25), and a further proposal for publication on the Acropolis, followed by a grant of xenia to Theogenes, these last two provisions being quoted in the form of an amendment before the Assembly (vv. 26 ff.). Since the same man is named as the proposer of both motions, it is hard to see the amendment as simply an afterthought, or the correction of an oversight in the original proposal before the Council. It is more likely that the irregular form of this inscription, which seems to

represent the Secretary's first unaltered draft of the decree, reflects a regular legislative procedure, in which bids for publication were submitted and put to a vote as amendments after the ratification of the actual decree. There is strong parallel evidence for such a procedure in a second-century decree of Minoa on Amorgos honoring Nikolaos of Rhodes (IG XII (7) 288). In the regular fashion, the proposals for local publication and the dispatch of a copy to Rhodes are included in the body of the decree following the main proposal of honors. However, the inscription ends with an additional and separate formula of ratification of the publication and dispatch (vv. 27-29):

. . . It is decreed by a vote of the Demos (διαχειροτονήσαντι τῷ δήμῳ) to publish[the decree], and if a copy should be sent to Rhodes, it is so decreed.

The provision for publication as it exists within the body of the decree falls under the formula for ratification which must have preceded the proposal but is now lost. If the "show of hands" by the Demos, mentioned at the end of the inscription, is the same vote which approved the main proposal of honor, then it is peculiarly redundant. It is more likely that this postscript, referring as it does only to the publication and dispatch, reflects the actual procedure of a second vote on these matters. In the final draft for publication, the secretary at Minoa apparently incorporated these measures into the regular context of the decree, and then created the redundancy by adding the second vote, probably from an earlier working draft. ¹³

It was also a practice of uncertain frequency at Athens to introduce the proposal for publication to the Assembly within the original motion for a decree, but as contingent upon approval by a second decree: the conditional proposal could then be rephrased or struck from the final draft of the decree as permanent publication was approved or denied. This procedure is suggested in IG II² 149 (= IG II 89) (before 355 B. C.), an Athenian decree of proxeny for certain Euboians in which such a conditional proposal happens to have survived (vv. 16 ff.):

ἐὰν καὶ τῶι δῆμ[ωι δοκῆι, τὸν γραμμ]ατέα τῆς /
βουλῆς ἐν στήλῃι λ[ιθίνῃι καὶ στησαι] ἐν ἀκρόπολει
/ δέκα ἡμερῶν.

It is clear from the context of this formula, that the conditional element refers to the ratification of the stele and not the proxeny.¹⁴ But in its conditional form, the proposal for publication could not have been approved in the ratification of the proxeny itself, but must have been submitted to a subsequent vote. As the surviving inscription indicates, this second decree approved the publication. Again the irregular form of this provision has probably resulted from the Secretary's submitting the original draft to the stonemason without bothering to rewrite it in terms of the subsequent decree of approval.

II. THE SECRETARY, SCRIBAL PROCESS, AND THE ARCHIVES

The volume of legislation and diplomacy handled by the typical city-state or confederacy of ancient Greece entailed far more clerical work than the simple appearance of extant inscriptions would indicate.

From the records formulated during the process of ratification in the legislative bodies, stemmed any number of copies (ἀντίγραφα) for the local archives, for purposes of temporary or permanent publication, and for transmission to interested individuals or foreign states. At Athens, these scribal procedures were the responsibility of the Secretary of the Council and his staff.

The titles of civil officials in charge of the drafting and handling of state documents vary considerably among the Greek states, and probably in no two cases are the offices or duties of these corresponding officials exactly the same. Because the Athenians customarily referred to their secretary in two or three formulas in their decrees, far more is known of the office at Athens than in any other state. In the fifth and early-fourth centuries, the scribal official of the Council and the Assembly was referred to as ὁ γραμματεὺς τῆς βουλῆς or simply ὁ γραμματεὺς, and was elected from the Bouleutai to serve for a term of one prytany. But at sometime between 368/7 and 363/2 B. C., the office was reformed, and thereafter, the Council had two secretaries, both apparently chosen annually, by lot, and not from the members of the Council. In subsequent decrees of the Council and the Assembly, these two are distinguished by the familiar title γραμματεὺς τῆς βουλῆς and a new title γραμματεὺς ὁ κατὰ πρυτανείαν.¹⁵ It is the secretary with the latter title whom Aristotle describes as being in charge of scribal procedures after the reform of the office (Ath. Pol. 54.3):

They (the Council) also elect the one who is called Secretary for the Prytany, who is in charge of the documents and keeper of the decrees that have been ratified, and has copies made of all transactions, and sits in the sessions of the Council. Formerly this office was elected by show of hands, . . . ; but now it has been made an office by sortition.

In this description, Aristotle clearly views the official with the new title as performing the duties of the traditional single office of secretary. From this it must be concluded that the title γραμματεὺς τῆς βουλῆς after the mid-fourth century designates the new secretary,¹⁶ despite the seeming perversity that the new official has the old title, and the old official the new one. This view of the dichotomy of the secretariat is the prevalent and current position of scholars,¹⁷ although some have held that there was no creation of a new secretary, and that the two titles were simply variant designations for the same functionary.¹⁸ This latter view does not seem very probable in light of the fact that the two titles frequently appear side by side in the same inscriptions, in some cases designating men who perform distinctly different functions. For example, IG II² 120 (358-6 or 354-2 B. C.) instructs the γραμματεὺς κατὰ πρυτανείαν and the other secretaries in charge of state documents to arrange the treasures in the Khalkotheke according to the nationality of the donors, to register the number, and make transcripts of the lists so registered; in the same context, the γραμματεὺς τῆς βουλῆς is to inscribe the lists on a stone stele and set it up in front of the Khalkotheke. The subsequent epigraphical history of the two titles also suggests that there were two separate

secretaries; about four decades after the reform, the γραμματεὺς τῆς βουλῆς ceases to be mentioned (the last certain appearance is in IG II² 448, the decree of honors for Euphron of Sikyon, after the overthrow of the oligarchy in Athens.), presumably at the demise of the office, while the γραμματεὺς κατὰ πρυτανείαν continues long into the Christian era. ¹⁹

Perhaps the most puzzling aspect of the Athenian secretariat after its reform in the 360's is the use of the expression κατὰ πρυτανείαν to designate one who serves for a full year. Aristotle's phrase, ". . . the one who is called Secretary for the Prytany," suggests that by his time the description was used when it no longer applied. But the inscriptions are more definite in indicating that the Secretary for the Prytany was an annual officer at least shortly after the reform. The earliest mention of this secretary by title is in IG II² 120 (358-6 or 354-3 B. C.), but there is no indication of the term of office. The first secretary known to have held office for a year rather than a prytany is a certain Nikostratos in 362 B. C. (IG II² 111, v. 2). Although there can be no certainty that this man or every secretary mentioned in the pre-script of a decree by name, but not title, was the Secretary for the Prytany rather than the Secretary of the Boule, this is generally believed to be the case. ²⁰ A rare case in which such an identification is demonstrable is provided by IG II² 222 (344/3 B. C.) where a Kleostratos is mentioned by name and by title (v. 34), and is also named in

the prescripts of other decrees of the same year (Syll.³ 227, v. 34 and n. 20.). The epigraphical evidence therefore shows that the Secretary for the Prytany was an annual official at least by 343, and possibly by 362 or earlier. It may well be that the γραμματεὺς κατὰ πρυτανείαν was so called, beginning with the reform, in order to distinguish him from his new colleague, but it seems highly paradoxical that his annual term and the designation "for the Prytany" should be introduced at one and the same time. To explain the new title as one which gives the secretary some recognizable continuity with his predecessor is not satisfactory, since the title would be descriptive of the old secretary but not his successor, if the latter were from the beginning of the reform, an annual officer. A plausible explanation, which may be substantiated or disproved only by further epigraphical evidence from the 360's, is that for some short time after the office was reformed by the creation of a new secretary of annual tenure and the change from election to sortition in one or both positions, the successor to the traditional secretary continued to hold office for a single prytany. In such a hypothetical circumstance, it would be understandable that the one secretary should take on the designation κατὰ πρυτανείαν in order to be distinguished from his new colleague, and then maintain it for tradition or convenience even after his term had become annual.²¹ Another possible explanation of the title lies in a peculiar meaning of πρυτανεία, "an office held by rotation," which is suggested by Herodotus' (6. 110)

use of the word to describe the command at Marathon.²² It is remotely possible then that the expression *κατὰ πρυτανείαν* could refer to the fact that this office, after it had become an annual and allotted position in the fourth century, was filled from each of the ten tribes in turn, strictly in their official order,²³ as distinct from the earlier system by which each secretary was elected by his fellow tribesmen in the Council, in a random order determined by lot.

There is very little evidence that the duties of the two secretaries for the Council were sharply distinguished, for throughout the period of their coexistence in the fourth century, their titles are mentioned with equal frequency in the inscribed instructions for the publication of decrees. Nevertheless, the *γραμματεὺς τῆς βουλῆς* is associated exclusively with the task of publication and the copying of transcripts from *stelai*, and there is no proof that he had any other function. Since the naming of the secretary in the prescript, which is taken to be a guarantee of the official status of the decree,²⁴ can only be connected with certainty to the *γραμματεὺς κατὰ πρυτανείαν*, it is likely that he was the chief scribal officer, and that his function as publisher of state documents was shared by the new *γραμματεὺς τῆς βουλῆς*. Such a hierarchy of positions and responsibilities seems to be attested in IG II² 120, where the *γραμματεὺς τῆς βουλῆς* has the less critical duties of publishing and transcribing, after the *γραμματεὺς κατὰ πρυτανείαν* arranged, numbered, and recorded the treasures of the Khalkotheke.

Since practically all evidence for the duties of the Secretary²⁵ comes from the inscriptions, most is known about his responsibility in the publishing of documents on stone and bronze.²⁶ Only occasionally are there allusions in the inscriptions and literary sources to the many other tasks of the Secretary, which included the recording of all the ratifications of the Council and the Assembly, the depositing of copies in the public archives, and the drafting of other copies for temporary publication on whitened boards, for publication abroad, or for distribution to any number of interested parties. Further, he had occasionally at the bidding of the Council or Assembly to reinscribe documents, to make copies from those already inscribed, and to collate others.

In view of the manifold tasks assigned to the Secretary, and the great volume of business handled by the Athenian legislative bodies, particularly during the height of the Delian and Maritime Confederacies, the Secretary could not have done much scribal work himself, but must have served in a supervisory capacity, directing and checking the work of a staff of subordinates. In the archaic or early democratic era of Athens, the prototype of the *Grammateus*, as the name suggests, may have personally written up the relatively light business of the state. By the fifth century, however, the instructions to the Secretary "to publish the proxeny on a whitened board in front of the *Bouleuterion*," or "make a copy for deposit in the archives," were not to be taken in the literal sense that the Secretary do these things himself, but that he "see that

they are done" by his staff. The circumstantial proof that the Secretary was an executive more than a scribe lies in the sheer workload of the office, and the short term and restrictions in tenure of the office. As Ferguson has said in regard to the Grammateus:²⁷

There was no possibility of there existing at Athens such a thing as a professional class of secretaries; for no individual could hold office more than twice in a period of twenty years, and as a matter of fact, in the whole period of Athenian history, there is not a single instance of the same person holding the office a second time.

Further, in Aristotle's description (Ath. Pol. 54. 3) of the Secretary as ὁ δὲ τῶν γραμματέων ἐστὶ κύριος, the word κύριος implies a supervisory rather than a technical role, and might well be translated 'in charge of'. Finally, the division of the office of Secretary in the 360's suggests that by that time, even the executive responsibilities had become too much for one man. Since nearly all of the clerical instructions in Athenian decrees are addressed to the Secretary himself, practically nothing can be known of the size of his subordinate staff, their civic status, term of duty, or specific activities. There is some hint of a rank of subordinate civil scribes in IG II² 120, in "the other secretaries in charge of the state documents" who assist the γραμματεὺς κατὰ πρυτανείαν in recording the treasures of the Khalkotheke. Much of the simple copying of documents and other tasks of the chancery were probably performed by state slaves; from Demonsthenes (De Falsa Legat. 129) we learn that in the mid-fourth century they handled the archival documents in the Metroön, and so Wilhelm associates the

public slave with the operation of the archives in the Metroön in his restoration of IG II² 463, v. 28: καὶ εἰς τὸ Μητροῶιον πρὸς τὸν δημ[όσιον].²⁸

In his most important function, the Secretary "attended the sessions of the Council" (Ath. Pol. 54, 3) and the Assembly, where he was responsible for the recording of all legal transactions. By collating the transcriptions of the προβούλευμα, the ψηφισμα with its amendments and riders ratified in the Assembly, and the data forming the prescript, the Secretary produced an official master copy (autographon) of the decree, which would serve as the archival copy and as the archetype for all necessary transcripts (antigrapha). As noted above,²⁹ the smooth and integrated arrangement seen in the inscribed texts of decrees does not necessarily reflect the order of business in the Council and Assembly. Further, in many cases, the copy of the decree which was produced on stone did not represent the full wording of the legal transactions, but, as Wilhelm first demonstrated, the inscription was often only an abbreviated abstract of the original text which was preserved in the archive and had the official legal authority.³⁰ These abbreviated texts on stelai, particularly in the fifth century as compared with the more verbose and detailed documents of the Hellenistic period, should probably be attributed above all to the costliness of publication on stone.³¹

If the document placed in the state archives was the authoritative copy, then the formulation and deposit of this exemplar was the most important duty of the Secretary in regard to the Council and the Assembly. That archival depositions were the responsibility of the Secretary is clearly attested by Aristotle's statement (Ath. Pol. 54. 3) that "he preserves ($\phi\upsilon\lambda\acute{\alpha}\tau\tau\epsilon\iota$) the decrees that have been passed." This verb clearly refers to the keeping of documents in the archives, as similar usages in the inscriptions show. An inscribed decree from Leros (Michel 372) closes with the provision that the Grammateus . . . "is to preserve ($\delta\iota\alpha\phi\upsilon\lambda\acute{\alpha}\sigma\epsilon\iota\nu$) this decree with the other documents," and one of the commonest words for "archive" is $\gamma\rho\alpha\mu\mu\alpha\tau\omicron\phi\upsilon\lambda\acute{\alpha}\chi\iota\omicron\nu$ (IG V (2), 516, v. 30ff.; XII (7), 49, v. 19/20). Although the Secretary at Athens was probably in charge of all scribal duties connected with the archives, the ultimate authority over state documents and their accreditation was undoubtedly the daily Chairman of the Prytaneis, whom Aristotle tells us (Ath. Pol. 44. 1) held the state seal and the keys to the public archives.

In some states outside Athens, other officials were responsible for transmitting and depositing documents in the archives: The Prytanes on Samos (Syll. ³ 976, v. 13 ff.: 2nd c. B. C.), the Exetastai at Priene (I. v. Prience, 64, vv. 9/10) etc.; sometimes the magistrates cooperated with the secretary in the task, as on Paros, "the Archons . . . with the Grammateus. . . ." (IG XII (Suppl.) 200, v. 12ff. 2nd

c. B. C.). Some states had officials who from their titles would seem to have been strictly archivists rather than general secretaries to the legislative bodies; for example, the Bibliophylax at Didyma, (I. v. Didyma, 492, v. 13, 287-247 B. C.) and Delos (C. B. Welles, Royal Correspondence, 19, 14, (254 B. C.) and Appendix, s. v. βυβλιοφύλαξ), and perhaps the "Grammatophylax of the Boule and Demos" at Magnesia (OGI 229, v. 86 mid-third c. B. C.).

Archives throughout the Hellenic states were designated by a variety of terms, none of them used with perfect consistency in a given location. A number of these terms are simply descriptive: γραμματοφυλακτον (IG V (2) 516, v. 30ff. A. D. 42.); γραμματοφυλάκιον (IG XII (7) 49, v. 30ff. Christian era); γραμματεῖον³² (CIG 2943 (Nysa, end of 1st c. B. C.)); νομοφυλάκιον (I. v. Magn. 33, v. 26). Other terms are derived from the magistracies in charge of the archives, and/or the public buildings in which the political bodies met and the documents were lodged:³³ ἀρχεῖον (Recherches Thasos II, No. 240, v. 32ff.); ἀρχεῖα (Ibid. No. 53, v. 36ff.); βουλευτήριον (I. Delos, 509; Delphinion 149 (Miletos)); βουλεῖον (Syll.³ 1011 (Khalkedon, 3rd-2nd c. B. C.)). Finally, in some cases the archive was referred to by the proper name of the temple in which the documents were stored, as in the case of the Metroön at Athens.

One of the commonest expressions throughout Greece for the state archive or its collective documents was τὰ δημόσια γράμματα

or simply τὰ δημόσια . For a long time the correct association of this term with the archives was not recognized because of Wilhelm's convincing argument that archival deposits were a self-evident requirement which as such would not be ordered in decrees; for this reason he interpreted the frequent instructions to secretaries "to inscribe (or place) the decree in the δημόσια γράμματα" as provisions for temporary publications on λευκώματα.³⁴ Klaffenbach, however, has recently set the record straight in a thorough and convincing treatise on the subject in which he concludes (Bemerkungen, p. 19):

In der Tat es ist so: die Deutung von τὰ δημόσια γράμματα als die im Archiv aufbewahrten öffentlichen Urkunden oder als das Archiv bewährt sich an allen mir bekannten Stellen, wo ihrer Erwähnung geschieht.

Although Wilhelm was wrong in his conclusion about the δημόσια γράμματα, most scholars agree with his premise that the filing of all public records in a state archive was the canonical practice in many states as early as the fifth and fourth centuries. In fourth-century Athens, the efficient archival practice which Aiskhines praised, must have been a matter of law (On the Embassy, 89):

You have a practice which I think is most useful to those in your midst who are victims of slander: You preserve for all time in the public archives your decrees together with their dates and the name of the officials who put them to vote.

By the Hellenistic Period, when the institution of state archives was almost universal, there is explicit evidence that the preservation of some public records was required by law. At Magnesia, for example,

we read that the Grammatophylax is instructed to record copies of a treaty with Smyrna in the local archive κατὰ τὸν νόμον (OGI 229, v. 29, 85/6); likewise, in FD III, ii, 89, v. 14/15, the Delphian secretary is directed to record the proxeny for Apollodoros of Athens in the Bouleion κα[τὰ τὸν νόμ]ον.

From the end of the fifth century at Athens, there are a number of references in inscriptions to the transfer of documents to and from the Metroön, which was probably instituted as the central record-office about 403 B. C. Whether there were earlier state archives at Athens is a much-debated question, but the weight of scholarly opinion now rejects the idea that before 403, publications on stone or wood were the only official documents in lieu of archives,³⁵ and favors the view that there were at least less centralized archives before 403, among them the Bouleuterion.³⁶ Perhaps one of the strongest arguments for the existence of state archives in fifth-century Athens is that which rests on the political circumstances; it is well presented by Jacoby in the following passage (Atthis, pp. 383f., n. 27):

. . . it is obvious that the inner administration of the Empire from 478/7 B. C. onward, could not have been achieved without records (which may be distinguished, as the more general concept, from documents proper), and the records had to be kept somewhere. — From the time when Kleisthenes made the Council the supreme executive, the archive of the Council was that of the greatest importance, and the contents of it probably were simply transferred to the Metroön in 403/2 B. C.

Further, the absence of state archives in the fifth century seems especially implausible in view of the known inscriptions which were

carved or re-carved years after the enactments of their contents. A good example is IG I² 57, which consists of three Athenian decrees concerning relations with Methone and Macedonia, datable to 429, 426, and 424 B. C. The appearance in the preamble at the head of the stone of the name of Phainippos, the Secretary for 424/3 B. C. indicates that all of the decrees were inscribed on the stele in that year. As Tod has noted (GHI 61), the end of the stele (now lost) probably contained a fourth decree passed in 424/3 with a directive that Phainippos engrave all four documents together. Apparently after five years of diplomatic dealings with Methone an important conclusion was reached (perhaps the settlement of the complaints of Methone against Perdikkas of Macedon, which are mentioned in the second decree), and the Athenian Assembly voted to publish the entire dossier of the affair. It is difficult to envision the possibility of this type of delayed publication without reference to a system of documents preserved on some material such as papyrus or wood.³⁷ As a concluding argument for the existence of the fifth-century Athenian archives, the conclusion of Wilhelm is again worth mentioning,³⁸ that the inscribed decrees were often only abbreviated versions of the original documents. In the case of these abstracted publications on stone, there would necessarily be complete official records of the transactions preserved in archives of some kind, particularly for important interstate treaties.

III. TEMPORARY PUBLICATIONS AND ARCHIVAL DEPOSITS

Another responsibility of the Secretary of the Council at Athens and his counterparts elsewhere was to inscribe and exhibit temporary copies of official documents at the direction of the magistrates and legislative bodies. The whitewashed wooden boards or shingles (λευκώματα, σανίδες, πίνακες, δέλτοι, etc.) and plastered walls (τοιχοὶ ἀλειφόμενοι) used for these temporary copies had been the standard media of publications in archaic times; after the introduction of the stone stele, they were maintained in common use for promulgations which neither required the permanence, nor warranted the expense, of stone or bronze.³⁹ Such temporary publications in ancient Greece must have been far more common than the use of stelai, but as in the case of the archival documents, the loss of these perishable materials has left little evidence of temporary publication except for occasional references in the extant inscriptions. The story of these boards and plastered walls is obscured further, as will be seen, by an unavoidable confusion between the practice of temporary publication and the placement of documents in the archives.

When, as sometimes happened, duplicate copies of the same document were ordered to be set up in different locations on wood and on stone, the temporary copy served either for wider promulgation or some more practical purpose. In Athens in particular, the placement of duplicate wooden copies of proxy decrees, in or near the

Bouleuterion in the Agora, unless they were strictly archival copies, would seem to have been motivated by the desire to supplement the permanent text on the Acropolis with added exposure in the crowded civic center.⁴⁰ An alternate possibility is that these wooden copies were set up to serve as interim publications while the stelai were being prepared. The Athenian Coinage Decree provides a possible example of a more practical reason for the temporary publication, but the example is weakened by some textual uncertainty. The provision for publication of the decree reads (IG XII (Suppl.), addendum 480):

. . . The magistrates in each city are to engrave this decree on a stone stele and set it up in the agora of each city, and the Epistatai in front of the mint.

As in many formulas which call for a second copy on wood, the phrase "on a stone stele" does not necessarily refer to the second part of the directive addressed to the Epistatai of the Athenian mint; a temporary copy of the decree would seem more fitting for exhibition in front of the mint during the exchange of Attic coinage for foreign currency which is ordered elsewhere (v. 18 ff.) in the same decree. In these latter fragmentary lines, which order a further publication by the Epistatai of the accounts of the exchange, Tod (GHI 67 v. 23) accepted the restoration of Wilhelm to the effect that these publications in front of the mint were to be *on λευκώματα*. However, Meiggs and Lewis (No. 45 (14)) accept the version of ATL (ii D 14) that the accounts were published on a stone stele. One bit of evidence which seems to favor the version of

Wilhelm and Tod is the use of the phrase σκοπεῖν τῷ βου[λομένῳ] in reference to the published accounts; this formula suggests a type of public scrutiny more often associated with temporary documents subject to revision, as in the case of the revision of the Athenian laws in 403, and the decree of Teisamenos which gave this instruction (Andokides, 1.83):

. . . the needed amendments are to be inscribed on boards by the Nomothetai elected by the Council, and they are to be exhibited in front of the Eponymoi for anyone who wishes to examine them (σκοπεῖν τῷ βουλομένῳ). . . .

The lack of distinct terminology in formulas ordering the temporary publication of documents and their deposit in the archives has in many cases made the recognition of these separate procedures very difficult. Klaffenbach has gathered convincing evidence that all of the variously termed wooden boards used for temporary publications were also used for archival deposits.⁴¹ This use of wood should not be surprising, since papyrus, although well known and used as writing material as early as the fifth century, was quite expensive, one sheet costing as much as eight obols.⁴² It is also not hard to imagine that the λεύκωμα was a type of thin shingle which could be just as conveniently stacked in an archive as exhibited in public. Beyond this lack of distinction in terms for the forms of the documents, the problem is further complicated by the use of various compounds of γράφειν and τίθημι to describe archival deposits as well as publications. For example, the verb ἀναγράφειν⁴³ is used in a number of Delian

inscriptions (E. g. IG XI (5), 746, v. 13ff.) to describe the consignment of copies of decrees to both the Sanctuary of Apollo, and the local Bouleuterion. While there was no question that the copies for the Sanctuary were on stelai, Wilhelm interpreted ἀναγράφειν as always meaning "to publish," and assumed that the copies for the Bouleuterion were exhibited on λευκώματα.⁴⁴ Subsequently, it has been clearly shown that the Bouleuterion was the public archive of Delos,⁴⁵ and that the duplicates assigned to it were archival deposits.

The problem of the correct interpretation of provisions for the disposing of state documents is even more complicated with fifth-century Athens, where the Bouleuterion or its immediate environs was a site for permanent and temporary publications and apparently archival deposits.⁴⁶ In IG I² 76, v. 26-30, the Hieropoioi are instructed to inscribe a record of the amount of grain collected from each several deme and city ἐ[μ] πινακίοι and to place ([κ]αταθέντων) these records in the Eleusinion at Eleusis and in the Bouleuterion. Although the verb here admits of no certainty, its general meaning of "deposit," and the comparison with other compounds of κατὰ referring to archival deposits,⁴⁷ suggest that these records on πινακία are meant to be archival records rather than publications.⁴⁸ Another example of ambiguity in regard to documents in the Bouleuterion is found in Andokides' call for the reading of a decree which he says (2.23) "even now ἐγγέγραπται in the Bouleuterion." The verb here could be used of any type of publication or

archival record. Nor is its location "in" the building very informative, since, as Wilhelm has shown, wooden boards and even stone stelai could be exhibited in the entrance hall to the meeting-room of the Bouleuterion, as well as in front of the building proper.⁴⁹ The hazard of a strict interpretation of the prepositions is suggested by Andokides' (1.95) and Lykourgos' (Against Leokrates, 124, 126) respective descriptions of the famous anti-tyranny law as being on a stele ἐμπροσθεν τοῦ βουλευτηρίου and ἐν τῷ βουλευτηρίῳ.⁵⁰

Even in the cases which Klaffenbach believes to be definite reference to temporary publication, there are possible arguments to the contrary. An Athenian proxeny decree has the following provision (restored in part by Pritchett, Hesperia, XI (1942) pp. 230/1, No. 42, v. 6ff.):

. . . The Secretary of the Council is to inscribe the proxenoi and benefactors on a stone stele on the Acropolis, and in the Bouleuterion ἐς σανίδα, at their own expense.

Klaffenbach argues⁵¹ that this document on wood is a publication since Athens would hardly have required payment for the preparation of an archival copy. However, it is not at all clear that the mention of payment by the proxenoi refers to the wooden document as well as the stele, for frequently in such provisions, secondary orders for foreign dispatches, publications etc., intrude between the order for the local stele and the formula for its finance. Further, there is no precedent for Athens specifying the payment for temporary publications, whether

by private individuals or by its own treasury; if there were such provisions for the payment for temporary publication, one would just as well expect mention of disbursements from the public treasury for archival copies, since as Klaffenbach himself shows, they were often in the same form on wood and would cost the same.⁵² The *σανίς* then, is as likely as not, the official archival copy answering to the permanent publication of the decree which the proxenoi have secured at their own expense. A similar problem of interpretation is presented by the order for publication of a law of the Khalkedonians (Syll.³ 1011, v. 15ff.):

. . . (the law) is to be carved in recessed letters (*κοῦλα γράμματα*) on a wooden board (*εἰς σανίδα*), and on a stele; the stele is to be erected (*στᾶσαι*) in front of the sanctuary, and the wooden board in the Bouleion.

Klaffenbach so trusted in the restoration of *στᾶσαι*, that he claimed that this verb shows that we are dealing here not with an archival deposit, but an exhibition of the *σανίς* for public information.⁵³ But does the verb really preclude a reference to some method of stacking wooden boards in an archive? And we could just as well restore *θεῖναι* to describe both the erection of the stele and the consignment of the wooden board as an archival document. It is even plausible that the verb, whatever it was, was only applicable to the stele, and that some other verb would be understood for the deposit of the wooden board in the Bouleion.⁵⁴ It is perhaps worth noting the unusual specification that the *σανίς* be carved in relief (*κοῦλα γράμματα*), apparently with the object of achieving a more durable text than would be afforded

by the usual practice of simply painting the surface so that it could be easily erased and reused.⁵⁵ This type of durability could be desirable for a long-term publication or for an archival document of some importance. It is even possible that this and many other texts on wooden boards served both as publications and as archival documents, being successively exhibited for some time, and then filed away as permanent records.

Another medium for temporary publication in the Greek states, which undoubtedly was far more common than present evidence suggests, was the plastered or whitewashed wall, either free-standing or that of a building. The provisions for publication on walls in many cases have an ambiguity which equals that of the provisions for wooden boards. The common instruction for recording a text on a τοῖχος may refer just as well to a temporary publication on an ἀλειφόμενος τοῖχος as to a permanent inscription on a stone wall. But Klaffenbach is certainly right in his assertion that the use of plastered walls was a far more frequent procedure than publication on stone walls,⁵⁶ and that such plastered walls were probably provided as official public bulletin boards near the archives, which as a rule were in the focal point of the city.⁵⁷ Perhaps it should not be ruled out that texts on plastered walls even served as archival records of some duration, particularly when they are mentioned as being published on walls inside the archival buildings, and as the only other text besides the permanent publication.

Note, for example, the provision of a decree of Delphi granting asylum to the city of Smyrna and its sanctuary of Aphrodite (FD III. iv. 153, v. 17/18):

. . . This decree is to be inscribed in the sanctuary of the God, and the letter (of Seleukos) in the Archeion, on the wall.

Or the provision in a dikast decree of Kerkyra (IG IX (1), 692, v. 14ff. ; as restored by Wilhelm: vid. Beiträge, p. 266):

. . . so that the judgements may be evident, they are to be published on a stone stele, and on the wall in the Damosion.

In addition to these walls associated with the central archives, there were evidently many others of lesser importance maintained by different administrative bodies in the state.⁵⁸

With the relatively few references to documents on wooden boards and plastered walls, extant in inscriptions and other sources, it is even difficult to form a general idea of the relative frequency of use of these media for temporary publications and archival deposits. And yet there is a scholarly tendency in this and many other problems to establish a rigid system on the basis of the limited terminology and other evidence, into which every case will fit. The hazard of this penchant for neatness should be especially evident in the problem of the wooden boards and whitened walls, for their various forms could serve either as temporary publications or archival documents, and in some cases they may well have served both purposes, either simultaneously or successively.

IV. PERMANENT PUBLICATIONS

From the great number of inscribed decrees which survive from Athens, and the detailed directions to the Secretary which were incorporated in their texts, it is possible to form a somewhat detailed picture of the process by which these texts were permanently published, usually on stone stelai. As in the tasks of documentation on papyrus, wood, and whitened walls, the Secretary of the Council was charged with the supervision of permanent publication of state documents, but in this process he required the services not only of other civil functionaries, but also of private contractors to engrave and erect the stelai. This administrative responsibility in seeing that the publication was properly carried out was delegated by the Demos to the Secretary, in the stereotyped formula which appears at the end of most inscribed decrees: "The Secretary of the Council is to inscribe this decree on a stone stele and set it up in the Acropolis (or some other precinct)."

Besides the formula just mentioned, there are two other customary references in inscribed decrees to the Secretary, both of which afford some less explicit evidence of this official's role as publisher of documents on stone. These are not references to the Secretary by title, but both by name with the demotic and/or patronymic in the expression δ δεῖνα ἐγραμμάτευε. One such reference occurs in the prescript of all official copies of decrees along with the name of the tribe in prytany, the Chairman moving the decree, the proposer of the

decree, and often the eponymous Archon for the year. The other reference occurs in the so-called title which sometimes occurs in large letters at the head of the stele preceding the prescript and the body of the decree, and names persons or states affected by the decree, or the subject of the decree, and/or the name of the Secretary, or the Archon, or both. The Secretary is named, off and on, in these titles from the very earliest inscribed decrees until 356/5 B. C. just a few years after the reform of the secretariat from an elective office to an office of sortition. It is these names in the title that Aristotle refers to as evidence that the process of election produced officers of a nobler sort (Ath. Pol. 54. 3):

Formerly he [the Secretary for the Prytany] was an elected officer, and they [the Council] used to elect by a show of hands the most reputable and trustworthy men. For he is inscribed on the stelai above the decrees of alliances, proxenies, and citizenships. But now he is chosen by lot.

Since all decrees published by the authority of the state, before and throughout Aristotle's own lifetime, name the Secretary in their prescripts, he must be referring here rather to the names in the titles, which are limited with very few exceptions to the types of diplomatic decrees mentioned by Aristotle.⁵⁹ Why should the Secretary be named at the heads of stelai, and particularly those inscribed with decrees of alliance, proxeny, and grants of citizenship? It is noteworthy that the stelai with decrees on interstate affairs are those most often embellished with relief sculpture, and where such sculpture exists, there is usually

a title with the Secretary's name. This circumstance and the fact that the Secretary's name in the title is almost always written out in over-size letters, led Ferguson to the conclusion that the presence of the Secretary's name in the title was due entirely to motives of ostentation.⁶⁰

If this explanation is correct — and it gains further credence from the redundancy of the name in the title with that in the prescript — then it may cast some light on the relative authority of the Secretary before and after the reform of the office in the 360's B. C. For why does the Secretary's name cease to appear in the title of the inscriptions shortly after his office is changed from an elective one to one filled by lot? If the Secretary's name in the title was a matter of willful ostentation, then this officer, when elected by the Council, must have had considerable freedom in deciding the form of the inscription, and possibly the stele, even to the anaglyph as a fitting backdrop for his name. The object of sortition in the reform of the secretariat was probably to secure the supremacy of the Demos over an office which, with its tenure increased to one year, would otherwise be liable to even greater aristocratic and personal control. With the ensuing loss of executive power and prestige in the office, there was consequently less freedom and less reason for the Secretary to use the state publications for his self-promotion. This view of the evidence corroborates the conclusion of Ferguson that:

Aristotle is proving his point [that the earlier secretaries were more noble and trustworthy] by the presence of the secretary's name, in documents, in which the mere fact of its presence, demonstrated the esteem and confidence in which each individual secretary was held by his fellow citizens; and indeed this is the only conclusion for which there is any warrant in the text of Aristotle.⁶¹

The more common occurrence of the Secretary's name with the description ἑγραμμάτευσ is found in the official heading or prescript of decrees. Hartel, in his pioneering study of the technical aspects of Attic epigraphy, proved that this reference to the Secretary was a certification that the inscription was an official copy, published at the instance of the state.⁶² The inscriptions discovered since Hartel's time have substantiated his findings and have refuted his opponents who considered the naming of the Secretary a dating convention: none of the extant decrees known to be official copies published at the instance of the state lack the name of the Secretary in the prescript; all copies made from official published or archival drafts, but published by private individuals or foreign states, lack the name, but like the official copies, they have the Archon's name as the regular convention of dating. The importance of this guarantee of the official status of the inscribed decree is seen in the fact that later decrees could incorporate or assume as law, parts of earlier decrees which were certified by the Secretary's name. For example, the Athenian charter-decree for its colony at Brea stipulates (IG I² 45, v. 13ff.):⁶³

If the colonists' land is attacked, the cities [of the district] are to come to their aid as keenly as possible according to

the agreements concerning the cities of the district of Thrace carried when [NAME LOST] was Secretary [of the Council].

Ferguson augmented Hartel's findings with a claim that a secondary reason for the presence of the Secretary's name in the title "is the guarantee thereby given, that the published copy is word for word as the resolution passed by the state assemblies."⁶⁴ This theory, however, is contradicted by two facts mentioned above:⁶⁵ that the inscribed documents, in some cases at least, represented a modification of the order and form of the legislative acts, and that in many cases they are abstracts of the contents of the official draft. Ferguson was undoubtedly correct in his feeling that there should have been some kind of guarantee of the authenticity of published versions of Athenian decrees, but it would not have been a guarantee of the ipsissima verba of the legislative act, but rather an assurance that the published text faithfully represented the essential points of the decree. Nor could Ferguson be right in associating this guarantee with the presence of the Secretary's name in the title, for this would limit the official check on authenticity to the official publications of the Athenian Demos. Certainly those inscribed decrees which were set up at the request and expense of foreign states and private individuals — hence without the Secretary's name — would also have had to receive the official imprimatur of the state. A case in point is IG I² 39, the Athenian decree regulating the affairs of Khalkis in 446/5 B. C. According to Hartel's theory, the lack of the Secretary's name in the prescript indicates that

it is not an official publication initiated by the Athenian Demos; further the stele was set up on the Acropolis "at the expense of the Khalkidians" (v. 60/61); yet "the Secretary of the Council at Athens is to inscribe this decree and oath on a stele and erect it in the Acropolis" (v. 57-60). It is surely this last formula, the common instruction to the Secretary by title, which denotes his responsibility in overseeing and approving the publication, whether official or unofficial, of all state documents on public property.

The absence of the Secretary's name in the prescript is the only certain indication of an unofficial publication of an Athenian decree. The provisions for financing the stele tell little about the authority of the publication, since in some cases foreign parties were assessed for official publications at Athens, and at least in the case of foreign payment, these provisions were not essential to the published text, and were frequently omitted.⁶⁶ The publications made on state property at the expense and request of private parties were probably not only inspected by the Secretary but also contracted and set up under his supervision, and there is no known case of the private or foreign party actually physically executing a publication on Athenian public land. Nevertheless, an unusual case in this regard is IG II² 337, the Athenian decree granting permission to Kitian merchants to found a temple on Attic soil, probably near the port of the Peiraeus where the stele was found. The absence of the Secretary's name in the prescript of the

decree indicates that it was published at the instance of the Kitians, but the lack of any provision for publication by the Secretary, in conjunction with the seemingly dialectal inconsistencies of spelling,⁶⁷ strongly suggests that the Kitians themselves carved the stele. Since it was erected on their newly acquired land which was in effect private property, there is no need to assume that the final publication was subject to the inspection and approval of the Athenian Secretary or other magistrates.

A careful inspection of publications at Athens is implicit in the instructions to the Secretary and evident in the texts of the decrees proper, but a somewhat more liberal policy is occasionally seen in the inscriptions of other states. A very unusual example is an honorary decree from Nesos on Lesbos which gives the recipient Thersippos a free hand in making his own unofficial additions to the published text of the decree (IG XII (2), 645, v. 44ff.):

Herakleitos and his colleagues the treasurers are to inscribe the decree on a marble stele of marble from Therma, and set it up wherever it should please Thersippos near the sanctuary of [Apollo] Pornopias; Thersippos may also have the decree set up elsewhere in any sanctuary that he chooses and add to it a statement of any of his other benefactions.

The corrections and revisions frequently evident on extant stelai are further substantive evidence that there was some form of final inspection and approval of documents for publication, even after the inscriptions were carved. In an important article on the process of engraving as evidence for the history of inscriptions, Robert stressed

the point that, at least in important state documents, corrections reflect not merely the scruple of stonemasons, but a systematized inspection:

Ces révisions peuvent être le fait d'un lapicide consciencieux. Mais on est assuré qu'il y a eu révision par une autre personne pour les inscriptions publiques, telles par exemple que décrets honorifiques et actes administratifs, et ces groupes forment la partie la plus développée et la plus importante à tous égards de l'épigraphie. C'est là un fait dont on peut s'informer facilement; ce n'est pas une vue de l'esprit. Les décrets grecs comportent, dès qu'ils sont assez développés, une formule disant ceci: le secrétaire s'occupera de faire transcrire ce décret sur une stèle de pierre et de la faire exposer dans tel ou tel endroit. La gravure de la stèle est donc confiée aux soins d'un fonctionnaire responsable et compétent, un spécialiste des écritures, des archives et des pierres, Ce peut être aussi un autre magistrat.⁶⁸

Although Robert prefers to view the engraving and checking of the stele as a duty of a specialist in the field of documents and publications, and something outside the competence of the secretary, the Athenian decrees give no indication of any authority other than the Secretary of the Council, although he may have had such specialists as members of his staff.

In non-Attic decrees the evidence of officials and persons named as responsible for publications tends to confirm the view that they were non-professional supervisors who directed and checked the work of professionals, either civil servants or private contractors. If the titles of some of these supervisors, such as Strategos, Archon, Epistates, and Epimeletes, are indicative, it would seem that in some states their offices were broader than that of a secretary or publisher of documents. It may be inferred from this that in some states the supervision of

publication was not always a full-time job, and this is demonstrably the case in instances where separate committees or individuals were specially chosen to oversee the publication of specific documents. In IG VII 4135-7, a decree of the Pylaio-Delphic Amphiktyony concerning the cult of Apollo Ptoös, a certain Ptoiokles is ordered (v. 16ff.):

. . . to inscribe the decree on stelai, and to erect one in Delphi in the hieron of Apollo, another in Akraiphia in the hieron of Ptoios, another in Pylai; also in other sanctuaries wherever the location seems best.

Ptoiokles has no official title in this provision, and seems to be less a secretary or specialist than a roving ambassador in charge of publishing this one decree. IG XII (5), 653 from Syros has the following provision (v. 59ff.):

. . . A man is to be elected who will contract the stele, and set it up, and will take the responsibility (ἐπιμελὲς ποιῆσαι) that this decree be engraved.

This text ends (v. 67): "Kyrtilos son of Akryptos has been chosen to let the contract." Since Kyrtilos is appointed for the publication of the single decree and his appointment is by election, he is probably, like the Secretary at Athens, an overseer rather than a technical specialist. The ad hoc delegation of such local supervisors, and of envoys to oversee the publication of documents abroad,⁶⁹ suggests that there was no expertise required in letting contracts, checking the inscribed decrees, and supervising the erection of stelai in public precincts, although the local supervisors may have been chosen because some experience with architecture or the stonemason's trade. Further, as was the case with

the Secretary at Athens,⁷⁰ there is no evidence that those who were instructed to publish decrees took part in the actual working of the stele. In fact the contrary can be proved in the case of an inscription from Arkesine on Amorgos (IG XII (7) 8-11). Four decrees of the same period (Late 4th or early 3rd. c.) were cut on the same stele by four different hands. A certain Alexandros was "in charge of the engraving" of Nos. 8 and 9, and a Pheidoleon of Nos. 10 and 11. The lack of correspondence between the men named as responsible for the inscriptions, and the hands which carved them, shows that Alexandros and Pheidoleon were delegated as overseers and not masons. Yet the particular artistry of these inscriptions makes them obviously the work of professional craftsmen.⁷¹ Of course an alternate possibility remains that the two men named were proprietors of shops commissioned to carve the stelai, but such a letting of contracts directly from the legislature would be quite unusual. In any case there is no compelling evidence that these ad hoc supervisors of publications were the kind of official specialists envisioned by Robert,⁷² although they may well have employed such specialists in the course of their tasks.

On the island of Delos, there was the somewhat unusual practice, at least with a number of diplomatic decrees, of delegating the responsibility for records in the archives and publications in the main sanctuary to the respective authorities in charge of these locations, rather than to a legislative secretary. For example in IG XI 681/682,

decrees of proxeny and a crown for Autokles of Khalkis, the Boule is instructed to record the archival copy in the Bouleuterion, and the Hieropoioi, as guardians of the sanctuary, are charged with publishing the decrees on a stele in the hieron of Apollo.⁷³ At Athens also there is some evidence of a similar division of secular and religious authority over official documents, but only after the Secretary had discharged his responsibility by consigning them to their appointed places. We have already noted that the Secretary deposited documents in the Athenian archives, but thereafter they were under the ultimate authority of the Chairman of the Prytaneis who kept the keys to the archives. There is even some reason to believe that the official stelai, when they were approved and set up on the Acropolis by the Secretary, became the responsibility of the Treasurers of Athena as keepers of that sanctuary: IG I² 106, vv. 21-23 (dated about 411-408 B. C.) directs that the Treasurers of the Goddess strike from a stele on the Acropolis things concerning a certain Timanthes.⁷⁴ In IG II² 116 (360/1 B. C.), the Boule and Demos instruct the Treasurers of the Goddess to remove the stele recording the alliance with Alexander of Pherai because the pact had been broken by his acts of hostility toward Athens and her allies. Considering the little distinction between the civil and religious spheres in Greek states, it may well be that the publications on stelai, like regular dedications, became the property of the deities in whose precincts they were set up, and thus fell under the jurisdiction of the

sanctuary authorities. Of course the assignment these duties to the Treasurers of Athena may have had simply pragmatic reasons, if the sanctuary authorities had their own equipment and crews for erecting, removing, and maintaining monuments.

While the Secretary of Athens had the overall responsibility for publishing documents of the Boule and Demos, the physical task of carving the texts on stelai or walls was contracted to private stone-masons. During the fifth and early fourth centuries, the official intermediaries between the state and these masons were the Poletai or 'Vendors', who according to Aristotle (Ath. Pol. 47.2) were responsible for letting all public contracts.⁷⁵ In the inscribed decrees of this period, the duties of the Poletai, and the Kolakretai who disbursed payment for the contracts, are usually stated in a clause directly after the instructions to the Secretary: "The Poletai are to let the contract (ἀπομισθωσάντων) for the stele; the Kolakretai⁷⁶ are to give the money for it." Even after the Hellenotamiai replace the Kolakretai as disbursers of public funds in 411 B. C., the Poletai continue to be mentioned as letting the contracts for stelai until the second quarter of the fourth century, about the time when the amount paid for engraving state documents seem to have been controlled by the state.⁷⁷ About the time of this apparent official price-fixing and the disappearance of the Poletai, there seems to have been a consequent simplified process of letting contracts, which was added to the duties of the Secretary.

From then on the contracting masons apparently were paid the set fee directly by the Secretary from money received from special publishing funds allotted by the Treasurers of the Demos. This method of payment is clearly indicated in the provision of the Athenian honorary decree for Strato of Sidon in 367 B. C. (IG II² 141, v. 12-18):

. . . The Secretary of the Council is to inscribe this decree on a stone within ten days and erect it in the Acropolis; for the inscription of the stele, the Treasurers are to give to the Secretary of the Council 30 drachmas from the Ten Talents.⁷⁸

In a number of states outside Attica, there were also special officials analogous to the Athenian Poletai, who were charged with the letting of contracts for state publications. For example, in a Lakonian decree (IG V (1) 5, v. 11ff.) we read that "the Ekdoter ('the one who lets contracts') in cooperation with those whom the law prescribes, is to let the contract for a marble stele." (Cf. and official by the same title in Corinth VIII (1) 5, v. 5ff.) Rhodes, like Athens, employed officials called Poletai (IC III. iii, 3A, v. 95ff.).⁷⁹

The terminology and provisions for the contracting and financing of publications clearly indicate that at Athens and some other states, the engraving of the stelai was farmed out to private masons rather than executed within the civil-service system. Further evidence for such a procedure is the observation of A. E. Raubitschek that the same stonecutters can be identified in both public and private documents on the Acropolis.⁸⁰ Further, the precision of engraving in a variety of

hands indicates many more skilled craftsmen than could have existed in the exclusive employ of the state. R. Meiggs has asserted that early in the fifth century there would be no specialists who worked exclusively or primarily for the state, because very few public records were cut on stone. Nevertheless, he expresses some doubt about the situation after the middle of the century when state publications became very common:⁸¹

When after the radical reforms of Ephialtes, the publication on stone of decrees, accounts, and inventories became common form, there would have been scope for specialisation; but if it was customary to select specialists one would expect the same mason to be employed in successive years on such records as the tribute lists and building accounts; instead the hand normally changes from year to year.

This frequent change of hands in state publications must reflect the manner in which they were contracted and budgeted: The contracts for decrees would be let as piece work, but others would be let according to the foreseeable duration of the job (for example, not more than one year for the tribute lists), and/or within the tenure of the officers responsible for the publication fund, since such financial accounts were audited and closed for each successive year at the last session of the Council (Ath. Pol. 48). Unfortunately it is very difficult to get a detailed picture of the method of contracting and financing, since accounts were never made on stone of the receipts and expenditures which the Secretary and other public officials in Athens submitted to the Logistai and Dikasts for audit at the expiry of their terms.

The same evidence for different masons employed on a job-to-job basis, as well as the contracting and budgeting of individual inscriptions, would indicate a system of contract-farming to private craftsmen, not only after the mid-fifth century, but also for the greater volume of publications in the fourth century. As the demand for state inscriptions became heavy, this doubtless produced in Athens a much greater number of skilled masons (but not necessarily civil servants) from whom the state could choose its contractors. It must have been an inflation resulting from the growing need for state publications, in conjunction with the situation of "tight money" created by the depletion of the financial reserves on the Acropolis, which forced the regulation of prices paid for inscribed stelai in the fourth century. Had the carving of stelai at this time become the task of civil servants, there would have been no need for price-regulation, since all publications could have been executed at the basic cost of materials and wages.

In the absence of detailed accounts of the expenditures for publications at Athens, it is difficult to determine whether the contract was made with one party who took care of the purchasing of materials, and all steps of the process, or whether the job was divided among several different contractors. The fact that the payments for publications of decrees in the fourth century are quoted in round figures, suggests, but does not prove, that the total amount was paid to a single contractor who either did the entire job himself, or subcontracted parts of it to

others. With the proximity of good marble and the volume of business at Athens, it is possible that a stonemason's shop could afford to be so diversified as to import its own stone from the quarry, cut, finish, and inscribe the stele, and erect it in its designated location. Such a system would be in marked contrast to that of third-century Delos, known from extant public accounts (IG XI (2), 161A, v. 17ff.; 199C, v. 66f.).⁸² These records of separate sums paid to different individuals for the transporting of stone, the fashioning of stelai, the inscribing and erecting of the texts, and the purchase of materials such as lead, wood and stone, show that the state dealt with several contractors and vendors in the course of each publication. But again in contrast to Athens, the lack of native marble and other resources and a lesser volume of business on Delos may well have necessitated such a cumbersome system of contracts and accounts.

Had the ancient Greek stonemasons consistently added signatures to their work, the list of such names would be of more than little value to modern epigraphists and historians. Unfortunately they maintained such detachment in their work that we do not know the name of a single epigraphic artist with any certainty. When such rare expressions as $\delta \delta \epsilon \tau \nu \alpha \epsilon \pi \omicron \tau \eta \sigma \epsilon$ are found on inscriptions of decrees, it is often difficult to tell whether they designate the mason who carved the text, a sculptor who carved the anaglyph or an accompanying relief, or even the craftsman who executed the stele. In the lists of proxeny decrees

comprising IG VII 238 and 382, the signature Σίμαλος ἐπόησε, which occurs in each set of texts, more likely refers to the mason since there is no sculpture associated with the stele, but certainty is impossible. Equally ambiguous are signatures with ἔγραψε. For example, ἔγραψε Φέστας Εὐσαμεῖτος in IG XII (2), 15, v. 37 could be the stonemason's signature, or the verb could just as likely refer to an official's having "published" the decree, or a scribe's having "drafted" it. Klaffenbach has noted that such expressions may even refer to the person who has commissioned the publication.⁸³ But even if the exact meaning of these types of signatures were known, their occurrences are so few and far between that they would not add greatly to the study of epigraphy. A method of possibly greater potential for distinguishing the engravers of inscriptions is the identification of their hands, or unique styles of carving.⁸⁴ If this method of study can be refined and pursued to the extent that a significant number of inscriptions and their hands are accurately classified, it may yield some valuable results in the collating and dating of full and fragmentary texts.

In a number of fourth-century Athenian diplomatic decrees, the directive to the Secretary of the Council includes the provision that the document is to be published within a certain period of time, usually ten days. From their sporadic appearance, these stipulations seem to be applicable only to the inscriptions in which they appear, and do not reflect any statutory deadline for publications. Nor are they limited to

the official publications of the Demos, but are found as well in inscriptions sponsored and financed by private and foreign parties. For example, the ten-day stipulation is given in IG II² 141, the publicly sponsored and financed decree honoring Strato, king of Sidon, and also in IG II² 130, an Athenian proxeny for Lakhares of Apollonia, published at the expense of Lakhares himself.⁸⁵ A less definite, but apparently more urgent, order for quick publication is that in the Athenian decree of alliance with Lokris in 356/5 B. C. (IG II² 148, v. 6ff.):

For the inscription of the synthekai, the Treasurer of the Demos is to give to the Secretary of the Boule 20 drachmas so that the stele may be erected as quickly as possible (ὡς τάχιστα).

In inscriptions outside Athens, such deadlines for publication are most often stipulated in the case of arbitral decisions, sometimes in the preliminary agreements to arbitration. In an arbitration between Thebes in Phthiotis and Halos, the award as well as the preliminary agreements were to be published in the neutral sanctuaries at Delphi and Larisa before the expiration of the year in which the arbitration took place.⁸⁶

Even more unusual than the mere mention of a deadline for publication is the added provision of a fine to enforce it, as in the inscription of a treaty between Thronion in Eastern Lokris and an otherwise unknown party, the Ἐγγατοί⁸⁷ (FD III. iv (2), 159, v. 1ff.):

. . . Let the Ἐγγατοί make the inscription of the agreement at Delphi in the month of Hermanios according to the reckoning of Skarphe. . . . If the E. should not inscribe the agreement in the prescribed time, let them be under indictment to the city of the Thronians for two talents of silver.

All of the preceding examples emphasize the importance to the Greeks of publishing certain diplomatic documents on stone, but in no case is there any indication that the validity of a transaction is at stake in the publication; the official archival copies would have served the purpose of legality. A specific intention behind the stipulation of time-limits may have been to avoid procrastination and the eventual overlooking of the publication, which must have occurred in more cases than can be known. One such case of oversight at Athens is known from IG II² 844, an inscription comprising two decrees of 217/16 and 209/8 B. C. honoring Eumaridas of Kydonia, and a third decree of about 200 B. C. in the archonship of Phanarkhidas, honoring Eumaridas' son Kharmion. Although the first decree has a provision for publication on a stele, all three were cut by the same hand at the time of Kharmion's visit to Athens as a theoros on his way to Delphi. He reminded the Council of his father's as well as his own benefactions to the people of Athens, and although the evidence of a final provision for publication is missing from the bottom of the stele, he probably reminded the Council that the provision for the publication of his father's honors had never been carried out; thus the record was set straight with the publication of all three decrees together at the later date. ⁸⁸

V. THE LOCATION OF PERMANENT PUBLICATIONS

When Greek states inscribed their diplomatic documents on stone or bronze stelai, they generally set them up in the most important local

sanctuary. At Athens, for example, the great majority of inscriptions dealing with international questions were erected on the Acropolis, while those dealing with civil affairs were usually exhibited in the Agora. Of the ninety-eight Athenian diplomatic decrees selected at random for discussion in Appendix A,⁸⁹ at least eighty-five were originally published on the Acropolis as indicated by their provenience or the surviving instructions for their publication.⁹⁰

While the reason for publishing internal affairs in a civic center is fairly obvious, the local exhibition of diplomatic documents in the chief religious precincts is not so easily explained. Although the sanctuaries were under the control of the local states, it may be that the Greeks felt that because of the international character of their religion, the sanctuaries made a logical "common" ground for diplomatic publications. In the cases of sanctuaries which could be locked up, such as the Acropolis at Athens, the protection provided for the documents was another consideration. But even more significant in the minds of the Greeks may have been the protection which would have accrued to the stelai from their mere presence in a religious precinct. There were obviously legal sanctions attached to the disfigurement or removal of these texts, but by their dedication in a hieron, they probably acquired sacred character in themselves,⁹¹ and at least shared the inviolability of the sanctuary. This type of reasoning is evident in provisions for publication which stipulate that the stele be placed in

"the inviolable (ἄσυλον) sanctuary."⁹² Finally, for the purposes of promulgation or propaganda, the important sanctuaries provided a high degree of exposure of the documents both to local persons and foreigners who frequented the religious shrines as pilgrims or tourists.

At Athens enactments of a diplomatic nature were sometimes published outside the Acropolis when another precinct was particularly appropriate to the subject or person concerned. For example, honors for physicians were customarily published on stelai in the Asklepieion,⁹³ or decrees concerning commerce or foreign merchants might be published in a sanctuary in the vicinity of the Peiraeus.⁹⁴ The placement of permanent texts of diplomatic business in the Agora was quite uncommon, but in the third and second centuries the sanctuary of Demos and the Graces north of the Hephaisteion became a popular location for honorary decrees to foreigners.⁹⁵

As the ultimate authority in the disposing of state property, the legislative assembly had the right to specify not only which documents could be published, but also in which specific sanctuaries the stelai could be erected, and even the exact topos within the precinct. Athens had definite laws regulating the erection and positioning of stelai in public precincts,⁹⁶ which may explain the absence of definite specifications in the usual instructions for publication; the duty of seeing that the stelai were properly placed was probably a cooperative responsibility of the Secretary and the sanctuary authorities. Within the limits of the

law and interested party could presumably request and receive permission to publish in a certain sanctuary or even a specific spot, and many of the places mentioned in the Assembly's instructions to the Secretary may have been favorable answers to such requests. The fact that most diplomatic decrees were published on the Acropolis is not evidence to the contrary, since that location would have been preferred by most parties. An example of both the liberality and restrictiveness of Athens in granting public topos is found in IG I² 450, which stipulates that the honored may erect his statue "wherever he wishes in the Agora, except near the statues of Harmodios and Aristogeiton."⁹⁷ Other inscribed provisions, particularly in decrees of honors, show that Athens was not entirely dogmatic in its assignment of locations for stelai: IG I² 70, a proxeny decree of 423 B. C. for a certain Potamodoros, has a fragmentary prescription allowing P. to locate the stele wherever he wishes.⁹⁸ A much later example, and one which indicates the authority of the Demos in the location of stelai, is the previously mentioned IG II² 844 honoring Eumaridas of Kydonia in Krete. Athens had originally decreed that his statue and stele be set up on the Acropolis, but Eumaridas, apparently dissatisfied with the site, succeeded by the intervention of the two Athenians, Eurykleides and Mikion, in having a decree passed changing the granted site to one in the temenos of Demos and the Graces.⁹⁹ Still there is no evidence from Athens of the degree of freedom granted to the honored Thersippos

by the Lesbian city of Nesos, by which he was allowed to erect stelai in any different sanctuaries he should wish.¹⁰⁰

In some states outside Attica the specific placement of stelai on public property was decided by particular magistrates, while in others it was set by local statute. A Kerkyrean grant of proxeny for Philistion of Lokris (IG IX (1), 685, v. 16ff.) prescribes that the decree "be inscribed on bronze, and erected wherever it seems best to the Probouloi and the Prodikoi to have (it)." A Lakonian decree indicates that the contracting of the stele, and its particular location within the shrine as well, were regulated by nomoi (IG V (1), 5 v. 11ff.):¹⁰¹

. . . The Ekdoter in cooperation with those whom the law prescribes is to let the contract for a marble stele, and when the decreed matters have been inscribed on it, it will be dedicated in the sanctuary of Athena of the Bronze House in the place in which the law orders it to be set up, according to the draft which the Arkhitekton shall write.

In every independent Greek state, the use of state property would have been controlled either by the Demos, particular magistrates, or a set of laws; thus the general failure to mention these authorities in provisions for publication indicates that they were self-evident rather than that they did not exist.

If the state controlled the placement of stelai within public precincts, one might ask whether the inscriptions were arranged there generically, chronologically, or in some other logical order. But because no significant number of stelai are found in situ, and because the inscribed instructions for publication are so general in their

statement of the topos, the argument for such order is very tenuous. At Athens, practically all of the inscriptions are simply assigned to the Acropolis or some other general precinct. One of the few exceptions is IG II² 643 (299/8 B. C.), a decree of citizenship for two men, Aristolas and Sostratos, which directs the Secretary "to publish this decree on a stone stele in the Acropolis, next to the other stele on which those formerly receiving citizenship are inscribed." The reference to the second stele is probably to a published list of new citizens, but the juxtaposition of the two stelai suggests some tendency to generic arrangement. Another less specific case is IG II² 34, a record of the alliance of Athens and Chios of 384 B. C., which prescribes that "the stele be erected in the Acropolis, in front of the statue." Tod (GHI 118), for unstated reasons, possibly the military tenor of the agreement, asserted that "the statue" was that of Athena Promachos, but this and any other references seem too isolated to suggest any particular grouping of stelai within the Acropolis.¹⁰²

From some few sites outside Attica, the evidence of a logical arrangement of diplomatic inscriptions within a precinct is tempting but inconclusive. A fragmentary decree from Epidauros Limera in Lakonia has the following provision (IG V (1), 932, v. 13-20, as restored by Wilhelm):

. . . publish the proxeny on a marble stele and erect it in the sanctuary of Apollo Hyperteleatas; let the incumbent ephors also publish [it] in the city where the law prescribes the other

proxenies [be published], and let them send the second copy of this proxeny to the city of the Boians.

The second part of this provision indicates that official copies of all proxenies were recorded in a special place in the city, but here again the reference may be to an official list of abstracts of decrees or simply names of the proxenoi.¹⁰³ The best site for a study of the grouping of diplomatic publications is the sanctuary at Delphi where many of the inscriptions still survive in situ on the walls of buildings and ponderous monument-bases. But even here the evidence does not show a very strict arrangement of the inscriptions. In only a few places does there seem to be even a rough grouping according to genre, as on the bases in front of the Stoa of the Athenians, nearly all of which are inscribed with decrees of proxeny (FD III. iii (1), 117-129).¹⁰⁴ More marked than the generic arrangement at Delphi is the grouping of the local Delphian publications according to the nationality of the recipient foreign party. Since this arrangement simply entailed the cutting on the walls of the appropriate treasury buildings and other monuments the decrees which concerned the states represented by these structures, the practice may have stemmed more from convenience than from a proclivity for order on the part of the Delphians. The Base of the Boiotians contains only Delphian decrees of proxeny for Boiotians (FD III. i (1), 3-46), and a similar situation prevailed on the Monument of the Messenians (FD III. iv (1), 1-35). But there are also many exceptions, as with the case of the Athenian Treasury (FD III. ii (2)) where the inscriptions include

Delphian decrees of manumission, and Delphian proxenies for Kleandros of Kolophon (75), Alkinos of Thesprotia (83), and Philinos of Miletos (88). The mixture of documents here may be due in part to the fact that the building was not used for inscriptions until the second quarter of the third century; by this time the shortage of desirable locations for inscriptions would probably have resisted the exclusive use of the Treasury for publications related to Athens. The fact that Athenian publications are found on other buildings, such as the Siphnian Treasury, concurrent with the use of the Athenian Treasury, would support this hypothesis.

Occasionally the formula directing the publication of a document, instead of naming a precinct or some more specific location for the stele, will simply direct that it be set up "in the most conspicuous location" (ἐν ἐπιφανεστάτῳ τόπῳ). This and similar unspecific designations are most often found in decrees which have been dispatched to a foreign city for publication, where they constitute requests on the part of the decreeing states for favorable locations in territory where they have no authority, and perhaps no familiarity with the sanctuaries.¹⁰⁵ As inscriptions do not commonly survive in situ there is no certainty that the publications with this formula were in fact given preferential locations. One of the rare uses of such a formula in a local publication is found in a proxeny decree of the Delphians (FD III. iii (1), 125, v. 10-12; c. 157 B. C.), which directs that the inscription be "set up in the

hieron of Apollo, in the most conspicuous place."¹⁰⁶ The location of this inscription on a base in front of the Stoa of the Athenians, facing the Sacred Way, indicates that at least in this case the directive was taken seriously. But it is puzzling why such a formula should appear in a local publication of the Delphians, since as keepers of the shrine, they might have used any location they wished. It may be that at this time the authorization of grants of topos was the exclusive province of the Amphiktyony.¹⁰⁷ Another plausible explanation is that the wording of the text reflects a prior request of the proxenos or his sponsor for a preferred location. Although the placement of inscriptions may reflect to some degree the caprice of the magistrates or even the masons, the relative positions and dates of certain inscriptions at Delphi indicate that there was some preference shown to certain foreign patrons by the placement of their publications in the more prominent locations.¹⁰⁸ In the case of Delphi, and other major shrines as well, it is not difficult to envision the local officials or masons selling the best locations for some personal gratuity.¹⁰⁹

Although it was the general practice of Greek states to inscribe each of their decrees on a separate stele, occasionally, for different reasons, related, and even unrelated documents were engraved on the same stone. An example from Athens of an understandable grouping of related documents is IG I² 57,¹¹⁰ comprising four decrees concerning Methone, which were inscribed at one time on the same stele.

A similar grouping of related documents on the same stone, but in this case on consecutive occasions, is attested in the treaties of the Kretan cities of Hierapytna and Priansos (IC III. iii, 4 v. 5ff.):

. . . The Hierapytnians and the Priansians have agreed to these matters, and have given common consent to one another, having affixed them to the preexisting stelai, on the one common to the Gortynians and Hierapytnians, and on the one common to Gortyn, Hierapytna, and Priansos. . . .

Other cases of multiple decrees on a single stone may concern different persons and states but represent the same genre. This situation is best exemplified in the publication of proxenies at Oropos where multiple decrees of different date, and in different hands, are commonly found in various faces of the same stele (IG VII 236 ff.). A similar generic grouping of arbitral documents is found in IG IX² (1) 177. In IG IX², 3A & B, decrees of arbitration and alliance from different dates were carved on the same stele, probably because the same states, Aitolia and Akarnania, are the common parties to both enactments. In some cases, the motive for carving more than one decree on the same stele may have been to economize space in overcrowded sanctuaries and public places, but the chief consideration must have been financial economy.¹¹¹ Money must have been the chief consideration in the engraving of completely unrelated diplomatic decrees together on the same stone, a practice which was infrequent throughout Greece,¹¹² and apparently non-existent in Attica. Cutting an inscription on a stele already devoted to some foreign state or personage, particularly if that party had paid for it, must have been at least offensive, if not illegal.

For their official publications, Greek states frequently made use of free-standing stone walls and the walls of civil and sacred buildings instead of stelai. The use of walls for permanent publication varies from one site to another; the sanctuary at Delphi affords an extreme example of the practice, but at Athens, where excellent marble for stelai was plentiful, the buildings were relatively free of inscriptions before the Christian period. Although the inscribing of stone walls probably evolved from the older practice of painting texts on plastered walls,¹¹³ there were more practical reasons than archaism for inscribing them rather than stelai. It was much cheaper to publish a text on an already standing and dressed surface than on a separate slab of stone which had to be quarried, trimmed, transported, and set into a bedding. The financial differential was compounded in areas where stone suitable for inscribing had to be imported from a distance. Another factor, undoubtedly considered in such a crowded sanctuary as that at Delphi, was the economy of space afforded by the use of existing walls rather than free-standing stelai. Further, in some cases such buildings were of imported stone which for the purposes of engraving was far superior to the local products. The predilection of Delphian masons for walls instead of stelai is obvious in the case of three Amphiktyonic decrees concerning Thebans, which comprise FD III. i (1), 351. The provision for publication explicitly prescribes that the decrees be inscribed on a stele at Delphi, yet they were carved on the wall of the Theban treasury.¹¹⁴

In addition to the advantages of spatial and monetary economy, the use of existing walls allowed unity and uniformity in the publication of extended texts such as law-codes, and series of related documents.¹¹⁵ Only the desire for such unity and uniformity can account for the creation of special walls for extensive publications. A notable example is the Athenian "walls of stelai" erected in the Royal Stoa in the Agora. On these marble slabs were inscribed the laws, among them the trierarchic laws and the sacrificial calendar, republished by Nikhomakhos and his fellow Anagrapheis sometime before 404 B.C., and apparently further revisions made in accordance with the decree of Teisamenos in 403 after the expulsion of the Thirty.¹¹⁶

One of the more enigmatic practices in the publication of documents, particularly those on diplomatic business, was the placement of more than one permanent exemplar in the same city, and in some cases, in the same sanctuary. Some of these cases are known from the survival of parts of both stelai, but more often from the provision for publication in the text of a single extant copy. One of the most vexing of the latter cases is the fragmentary provision preserved in the Athenian decree regulating aid to Eretria during the Second Athenian Confederacy (IG II² 125, v. 17ff.):

ἀναγράψαι δὲ τὸ [ψήφισμα ἐ' στήλῃ λι]/θύνηι καὶ
 στήσαι ἐν ἀκροπ[όλει καὶ ἐν τῇ ἀγορᾷ]/καὶ ἐν
 τῷ λιμένι

Despite the singular "stele", Kirchner, who published this restoration

in IG, supposed that there were three copies on stone, the one in the Agora, supposedly to be erected next to the Confederacy Charter at the Altar of Zeus in front of the Royal Stoa. Wilhelm,¹¹⁷ however, took the singular literally, and restored the second gap to the effect that the second of only two copies was a whitened board to be temporarily exhibited in the harbor.¹¹⁸ Whether on wood or on stone, whether in the Peiraeus or Eretria, the purpose of the second copy "in the harbor" must have been to provide special notice to seafaring states of the decreed sanctions to be visited on any city for attacking Eretria.¹¹⁹

Among the less common cases of duplication in which fragments of both stelai survive is IG II² 17, an Athenian honorary decree of 394 B. C. for Sthorys of Thasos, which was published both on the Acropolis and in the Pythion (v. 8ff.). The text gives no clue to the reason for two stelai, but it may be conjectured that Sthorys had a special devotion to Apollo, and undertook a separate publication in the shrine of that god in addition to the customary copy on the Acropolis. From Itanos in Krete, there are two extant copies of a decree honoring Patroklos of Macedon, which were published in the local sanctuaries of Athena and Asklepios (IC III. iv. 2&3). A comparison of the two exemplars which are nearly completely preserved, shows that there was no strict effort to match the form of the two texts, although they are perfectly consistent in their content. The editor, M. Guarducci, in commenting on the letter-size of No. 3, says: "Litterae. . . ., eadem fere sunt quae in

titulo antecedenti." However, she does not indicate whether both inscriptions were carved by the same hand. The lineation of the two inscriptions is slightly different, No. 2 averaging twenty letters per line, and No. 3, twenty-two per line. It is probably not coincidental that most of the duplicate publications are of honorary decrees, which were exploited for personal propaganda in addition to more tangible benefits. If an honored proxenos or his sponsor could afford it and the state would allow it, wider publication would have been an easy means of enhancing the element of personal publicity. In many cases the second copy must have represented a privately sponsored copy of the honored state or person, set up in addition to the official copy of the decreeing state.¹²⁰

Still more puzzling is the seemingly redundant publication of two permanent exemplars of the same text in one sanctuary. An example from Athens is the treaty of alliance with Chios in 384 B. C. of which one copy was to be erected (IG II² 34, v. 20ff.) "on the Acropolis, in front of the statue,"¹²¹ while what is clearly another copy of the same decree (IG II² 25) seems also to have been published on the Acropolis.¹²² The editors of IG note that there is a similar inconsistent representation of the diphthongs ei and ou in both texts. Since the relative positions of corresponding words in the texts indicate that the layout of the two stelai was different, the similar use of the diphthongs in both texts may be due to the archival copy rather than the mason.

But IG does not indicate whether the inscriptions were carved by the same or different hands. In any case this and most other cases of duplicate texts suggest that the layout of the text on the stone was essentially the province of the stonemason rather than a matter of official canon.

Another vexing case is IG I² 93a & b, an Athenian decree of proxeny for Lykon of Akhaia. The extensive fragment a is matched word for word in the lines which survive in the smaller fragment b. Fragment a has the complete provision for publication of a single stele on the Acropolis, and b has the same wording except for the loss of ἐμ πόλει. Wilhelm, rather than explaining the inscriptions as duplicates, considered the possibility that they were honorary decrees for different men cast in the same wording.¹²³ This conjecture is plausible because the name Lykon appears only in fragment a; however, the appearance of Ἀχαΐας at the same position in both fragments requires the further, but not impossible, coincidence that the proxenos of b was a compatriot of Lykon. It is possible that two Akhaians were honored with proxeny at the same time, but with separate decrees and stelai rather than the customary common publication. Wilhelm also noted that the length of lines in the two inscriptions was different, but he did not indicate whether they were cut by the same or different hands.¹²⁴ The factors of propaganda and wider promulgation, which are logical explanations of the cases of city-wide duplication, cannot satisfactorily

account for such apparent duplication of a text in single sanctuary. It seems that little more can be said about these anomalies unless a closer study of the stones and comparison of the hands may yield further evidence.

VI. THE FINANCING OF PUBLICATIONS

The history of finance in ancient Greece is largely the history of Athenian finance, for of all the Greek states, Athens alone has bequeathed the historian significant records of its monetary dealings. The unique attention of Athens to fiscal data is particularly evident in the matter of payment for the publication of decrees, especially those dealing with foreign affairs. Other states have left sporadic references in their inscribed decrees to the financing of the stelai. But the Athenian Boule and Demos very often followed their directions for publication with a provision for the payment of the stele, including such details as the public or private source of funds, the financial officers involved in the case of public payment, and the cost of the publication. In the cases of disbursement from the public treasury, for publications, the formal approval of the Demos was certainly necessary, but the provisions for these expenditures, whether public or private, were not essential parts of the decrees, and need not have been included in the published text; in fact they were sometimes left out of inscribed Athenian decrees, particularly those published at the instance of private parties, as they usually were in other states. Their usual inclusion in the published

texts at Athens may be ascribed to the refinement of the Athenian democracy in giving public notice of the expenditures from the civil treasury.

The formulas for payment in Athenian decrees show that the specific funds from which public money was expended for the inscriptions changed from time to time. The fifth-century inscriptions do not mention a specific fund at all for state publications, and it is possible that none existed, the *Kolakretai*, and later the *Hellenotamiai*, simply drawing on a general fund from the state treasury for this purpose. Throughout the fourth century, the Treasurer of the Demos generally pays for publications from "money spent by the Demos for matters according to decrees" (*ἀργυρον εἰς τὰ κατὰ ψηφίσματα ἀναλισκόμενον τῷ δημῷ*).¹²⁵ The same fund is referred to intermittently in the same period as the "Ten Talents" administered by the Treasurers of Athena, a term which apparently signifies the total annual disbursement to this fund. For example, the Athenian decree of honors for Strato of Sidon in 367 B. C. prescribes (*IG II² 141, v. 16-18*):¹²⁶

. . . for the inscription of the stele, the Treasurers are to give to the Secretary of the Council 30 drachmas from the Ten Talents.

The fund *εἰς τὰ κατὰ ψηφίσματα* shows up less often in provisions for publication in the third century when the Military Fund¹²⁷ is used increasingly for the same purpose. In this same era, the source of payment is designated in at least two instances by unusual phrases

which are general instead of designating precise funds: IG II² 354, v. 29 directs that the stele be paid for ὅθεν οἱ νόμοι κελεύουσι [ν, probably a reference to any financial source which was allowed for civil use, such as the psephismatic fund still in general use at this time; the expression ἐκ τῶν κοινῶν χρημάτων used in IG II² 558, a decree of citizenship for Oxythemides of Larisa, seems to be a reference to the public treasury in general.

The responsibility for disbursing money for state publications was held by a succession of financial officers throughout Athenian history. Until late in the fifth century, these expenditures were handled by the Kolakretai, as indicated by the succinct formula in decrees of this time: οἱ δὲ κωλακρέται δόντων τὸ ἀργύριον. This office was apparently abolished in the revolution of 411 B. C. and the duties of the Kolakretai, including the disbursal of public money for inscriptions, were handed over to the Hellenotamiai.¹²⁸ About 374 B. C., Athens created a new officer, the Treasurer of the Demos, who was given charge of the accounts formerly held by the Hellenotamiai. This Treasurer is named throughout the fourth century as the disburser of money for state publications, but occasionally the Apopektai are mentioned in inscriptions of this same period, as transferring money to the Secretary for the payment for publications. (See, for example, IG II² 31, the decree of 386/5 B. C., honoring King Hebryzelmis of the Odrysai.)¹²⁹ No extant inscriptions mentioning the Treasurer of the

Demos as being in charge of funds for publication can be dated after the beginning of the third century. From that time on, political instability produced frequent changes in financial offices and officers, and a number of titles appear, not in clear succession, but almost indiscriminately.¹³⁰ Inscribed provisions mention ὁ ἐπὶ τῆς διοικήσεως ("the one in charge of financial administration") (IG II² 507 is perhaps the earliest example in a diplomatic decree.),¹³¹ and the Treasurer of the Military Fund. (See, for example, IG II² 809.) The officials who are to pay for the publication of IG II² 793 are designated by the rather vague title of "Treasurers of the Profane Money," presumably distinguishing them as civil treasurers from the Treasurers of Athena and The Other Gods who were in charge of sacred moneys.¹³²

There is no indication in the provisions for inscriptions, or from any other accounts, of the cost of publications on stone in the fifth century, but the artistry of the engraved letter-forms and the stoichedon style suggests that they were quite expensive. In the fourth century however, the inscribed provisions for payment usually specified the exact amount of money to be paid for the engraving and erection of the stelai. These quoted prices are always in divisions of tens of drachmas, usually ranging from ten to fifty.¹³³ If there were no other evidence, the mere uniformity of these figures would suggest that the cost of contracts for publication of official documents was set by the state at this time. But these figures would have to have been based on a predetermined

scale, if, as it seems, they were incorporated in the provisions of the official drafts before any contracts were let.¹³⁴ The provision in one decree explicitly indicates that its stated cost of publication was fixed by Athenian law, and the same is probably true of the other quoted costs. The decree in question, one honoring a man at Philip's court, directs the Secretary:¹³⁵

. . . to inscribe the proxeny on a stone stele and set it up in the Akropolis; the Treasurer is to pay the statutory (κατὰ τὸν νόμον) price of 30 drachmas for the inscription.

Direct control of the cost of official publication at Athens must have been prompted to some degree by the depressed state of finances after the Peloponnesian War, and perhaps a coincident inflation in the cost of stelai resulting from the increased use of permanent publications by the state in the late-fifth century and thereafter. The noticeable deterioration in the quality of inscribed documents in the fourth century is very likely a side effect of the official institution of fixed prices. Occasionally in the third century, probably as another symptom of the administrative upheaval noted in connection with the financial offices and public funds, the specification of definite amounts paid for publication, gives way to the uninformative expression, τὸ γενόμενον ἀνάλωμα. (See, for example, IG II² 570; cf. Dow, Prytaneis, No. 64, vv. 15, 42.)

Ironically, the most detailed individual accounts of the cost of official publications are not from Athens, but in two unique inscriptions from third-century Delos. IG XI, 161A, v. 117ff. (279 B. C.) records

the breakdown of its own cost as: stele construction 25 dr., lead 5 dr., wood 1 dr., transport $1\frac{1}{2}$ dr., engraving 100 dr., erection $2\frac{1}{2}$ dr., total 135 dr.; IG XI, 199C, v. 66ff. (274 B. C.): cost of stele 24 dr., engraving $126\frac{2}{3}$ dr. With the number of letters of the second inscription estimated at 38,000, the stone mason receives about a drachma per 300 letters, which is a rise in cost from the earlier inscription, to judge from similar calculations of its length and cost of engraving.¹³⁶ Because of variations in the cost of materials and workmanship, and the general economy, at different times and places, there is little validity in extrapolating these figures to conjecture the cost of other inscriptions. A comparison of the Delian figures with those from the fourth-century Attic stelai indicates a slightly higher rate per letter at Athens, but again the results are not very informative because of the great lapse of time, and the fact that the Athenian expenditures are not broken down into separate figures for materials and phases of the contract. Further, the quoted rates at Athens are fixed by law, while those recorded on the Delian stele may have been the result of open bidding. In any case the constant use of round figures in divisions of ten, and the inconsistent correspondence of length with the quoted prices,¹³⁷ would preclude a rigid scale of cost per letter at Athens. It can only be conjectured that a characteristically inflated economy in a large city would have tended to make the cost of publication at Athens somewhat higher than in most other cities, but

this tendency must have been counteracted to some degree by the high volume of business.

It was the custom at Athens to pay for official publications of decrees dealing with other independent states, and for the foreign state to finance its own publication at home if it so wished. The obvious examples are matters of reciprocal nature such as treaties, which each of the interested states ratified and published in its own version. Of the eight treaties dealt with in Appendix A which have extant provisions for the payment of publication, Athens pays for its own stele in all but one case.¹³⁸ Curiously, however, under the Athenian Empire tributary allied states often paid for the stele at Athens as well as their own. For example, the inscriptions IG I² 14-15, 16, 60, 108 and 116 all have directions to the Secretary to take charge of the publication, and in those cases where the prescript is extant, the Secretary's name indicates that they are official publications sponsored by Athens; nevertheless, each of these texts has the formula τέλεσι τοῖς δεῖνα charging the cost of the Athenian stele to the foreign party. F. Busolt noted this curious procedure (although the treasurers were not the Hellenotamiai, as he writes, but the Kolakretai), but he seems to have inferred that it was natural for the members of the Confederacy to pay for publications at Athens, because they were interested parties:¹³⁹

. . . Die Steine mit Beschlüssen, welche einzelne Bundesstädte betrafen, wurden von diesen als Interessenten bezahlt, Steine mit Verträgen mit auswärtigen Staaten seit der Ueberführung der Reichskasse nach Athen von den Hellenotamien.

It was completely abnormal for a second state, even as a confederate state and/or an interested party, to pay for a publication which was ordered and officially undertaken by the decreeing state in its own territory. But the Athenian decrees published in this manner were not agreements between equal members of a confederacy, and in some cases they were enforced regulations to which the allied states were unsympathetic. The unique practice of shifting the burden of payment for the local publication of such documents may be simply another instance of aggressive Athenian imperialism, characteristic of the latter half of the fifth century.

In the Athenian decree of proxeny, citizenship, and other honors for foreign states and individuals, the Demos in some cases added to the honors by financing from the public treasury a local copy of the decree on stone, while in other cases, unofficial copies were published at the request and payment of the honored foreign parties or their sponsors. Of the fifty-four Athenian decrees of honor studied in Appendix A,¹⁴⁰ in thirty-four cases Athens paid for the local copy alone; the foreign party in two cases paid for an Athenian copy only, and in four cases, for both Athenian and foreign copies; in two cases, Athens paid for both the local and foreign copies; in one case, each party paid for its own copy; in six cases of fragmentary texts there were no extant provisions; in seven cases, it is evident that there were no provisions for payment in the text as originally inscribed. These statistics

correspond roughly to those of A. G. Woodhead in a survey which dealt with proxeny alone, and was limited to decrees before 377 B. C. For the purpose of comparison, his data and conclusions are worth quoting:¹⁴¹

Paul Monceaux, Les Proxénies Grecques (Paris, 1886), pp. 82-83, says that the majority of proxeny-stelai appear to have been charged to the candidate for honor or to his native city, but later remarks that the demos usually bore the cost. In fact in almost half of the proxeny-decrees of this period, no indication is given of who is to pay. Down to 377 B. C., of 46 such decrees in IG I² and II² and from the Agora in which survive the instructions given to the grammateus to have the stele inscribed, (i) twenty-two give no more precise commands; (ii) four certainly set the charge to the proxenos with four likely additions; (iii) fourteen with two likely additions, definitely instruct that payment be made from a state fund, and name the disbursing officers. Of group (ii) the majority name the proxenos himself, and not his city as paying the cost of the stele.

From these statistics it is again worth noting the responsibility of the Secretary to direct the publication of decrees, even when they are financed by private parties. A significant number of the decrees, both in Appendix A and in Woodhead's survey, gave no indication of who was to pay for the stele. A provision for finance, which was not essential to the stele-text, was nearly always included in the official publications authorized and financed by the Athenian Demos. Consequently, it might be assumed with some justification that most of the honorific decrees in which there was no mention of payment were published at the instance and expense of the recipients. If this is the case, then private financing would have accounted for the majority of inscriptions recording proxeny and other honors at Athens.

CHAPTER II

THE TRANSMISSION OF INTERSTATE CORRESPONDENCE

An important and complex part of the process of diplomacy among the Greeks was the transmission of information, either verbal or documentary, between independent states. Homer told primarily of societies which communicated orally through their heralds and ambassadors, but he may also have given us a hint of the dawning of literacy and its use in interstate correspondence in his tale of the baneful signs inscribed on a folded tablet which Bellerophon took from Argos to Lykia (Iliad 6. 168/169). As the developing states of archaic Greece became increasingly engaged in diplomatic and economic dealings with one another, there must have been a greater use of their new-found literacy to give accuracy and efficiency to their communications, a practice which in turn gave further momentum to the spread of literacy. By the time more advanced states such as Athens were publishing their laws and decrees on wooden tablets and axones in the seventh and sixth centuries before Christ, writing on some portable material such as papyrus, leather, or light wooden tablets must have been regularly employed for official diplomatic communications.

The transition in the fifth century to the use of durable materials such as stone and bronze for important political publications would have required no change in the existing system of interstate communications, for documents continued to be transported on light material, and if they were to be permanently published abroad, the inscriptions were

generally executed in the recipient states. However, since none of the perishable material of these dispatches survives, our investigation of the process of transmission, like that of the chancery and archives, must rely heavily upon the evidence of documents on stone, primarily those provisions for dispatch abroad which were often included in both the local and foreign inscription of official documents. Early inscribed decrees, such as those from fifth-century Athens, are usually very cryptic about communications abroad, as they are in all details of process. The whole process of appointing envoys and dispatching copies was often to be understood in the simple order that an inscribed stele was to be erected at the foreign site. With the fourth century these provisions become increasingly explicit, with details about the preparation of the intended copy, the couriers or envoys in charge of the mission, and the disbursement of funds for their travelling expenses.

I. THE FORM AND MATERIAL OF INTERSTATE DOCUMENTS

When the citizen body or the magistrates of a Greek state determined that a state document should be dispatched to a foreign party, a copy would be made from the archival original (autographon) on some light material, and this would be handed over to the appointed envoys or a visiting member of the foreign state. Many of the actual decrees which survive on stone at sites removed from their point of legal origin are preceded on their stelai by letters of introduction from the decreeing states. This introductory epistle was often a simple greeting which

mentioned the reason for the dispatch, and included a request for the publication of the decree. The fact that the copy of the decree was often referred to in these letters with some form of the verb ὑπογράφειν (E. g. IC, II, xxiii, 1, a fragment of a Theban decree from Polyrhenia in Krete), indicates that they were written above the transcript of the decree on the same piece of material, and that this document was given to the mason for publication in the same form. It is likely, that most decrees dispatched for foreign publication contained such letters of introduction, as a matter of courtesy, but that in many cases they were excluded from the stelai as irrelevant to the official document.

The preparation of transcripts for dispatch abroad, like that of official copies for the law-courts and for local publication, was the responsibility of the chief secretary of the local government. Athenian decrees always charge the Secretary of the Council with the sending of foreign copies, although the actual writing of the document was probably delegated to lesser members of the scribal staff whose work was then checked by the Secretary. Documents of special importance which were to be transmitted under the state seal were subject to the final approval of the Chairman of the Prytaneis as keeper of the seal and the keys to the archives.¹

The commonest expression among the Greeks for the perishable "copy" of a document intended for a foreign site or elsewhere was the technical word, ἀντίγραφον. A much rarer technical usage, apparently

for the same form of document, was χειρόγραφον ("manuscript") or the shortened (perhaps abbreviated) form, χεῖρ.² In the fifth and fourth centuries the transcript is generally referred to in less precise terms such as ψήφισμα, δόγμα, or ἐπιστολή, which refer to the genre of the document rather than the form in which they were sent. Extremely rarely was the term antigraphon used to designate a document inscribed on stone;³ in almost all of the instances in which the word antigraphon is used, one would expect a text on light material such as papyrus, wood, or leather, and there is some evidence which explicitly relates antigrapha to papyrus. For example, in IG V (1), 30, Pheneas, the Secretary of the Arkadians writes to the Lakedaimonians (vv. 5-8): ". . . I have written you an antigraphon of the decrees on papyrus (ἐν βυβλίῳ) in the archives." By the fifth century, papyrus was probably the commonest material used for state records, and for official foreign correspondence as well. The word βιβλίον (which seems to have arisen in Attic as an assimilation of βυβλίον from βύβλος ("papyrus") meant by metonymy "book," because βιβλία were made of papyrus. In Aristophanes' lines about "foraging in the βιβλία" (Birds, 1287-1289), an obvious jibe at the Athenian preoccupation with political business, the pun is meaningless unless the word still has both meanings, "papyrus" and "document." Herodotus (5. 58. 3) noted that in his time the Ionians called papyrus "skins," a hangover from earlier times when papyrus was scarce and they used the skins of goats and sheep for

writing material. It is tempting to infer from this and his further remark, that many Barbarians still wrote on skins, that in Herodotus' day that there was no scarcity of papyrus and that it was generally used by the Greeks for writing. Even at this time, however, papyrus was quite expensive, one sheet costing as much as eight obols (IG I² 374, vv. 279-281),⁴ and there is no reason to doubt that in cities at least, hides and wooden tablets continued to be used for interstate communications.⁵ The skytale which was used by the Spartans in classical times, mainly for its cryptographic value, may have been a hangover from an early practice, perhaps common throughout Greece, of dispatching messages on leather wrapped around a core of wood.⁶

When a Greek state wished to publish a document abroad, it was almost universal practice that the text was dispatched on some such portable material as papyrus, and that the engraving of the stele was contracted to a mason native to the foreign site. There is a great deal of evidence for this procedure in the language and provisions of the inscriptions themselves. Foreign copies of documents are very often characterized by minor intrusions of the lettering and spelling of the recipient state which can only be interpreted as the lapses of a native mason. Further, the common provision for the sending of an antigraphon "sealed with the state seal" could practically apply only to a document on light material such as papyrus, leather, or wood. The practice of transmitting a text in the form of an inscribed stele must have been

extremely rare. Beyond the impractical aspects of shipping the heavy stone, there was no certainty that the recipient state would allow the publication on its property until its legislature or magistrates had been petitioned and an official grant of topos made.⁷ The inscriptions are the best evidence that the Greeks were aware of the presumption of anticipating the foreign grant. Grants of topos, when they are found on foreign publications, almost always appear first on the stele, indicating that the main document could not be engraved until permission had been given to the visiting emissaries. This general rule of the prior position of the grant of topos on the stele is well stated by Dittenberger in his commentary on a Milesian arbitral decree published at Olympia at the request of the Messenians (Ol. 52, p. 108, n.):

Die Reihenfolge, in der die drei Dokumente auf unserem Stein stehen, ist die umgekehrte der Entstehungszeiten. Das erklärt sich aus der allgemeinen Sitte, wonach, wenn, eine besondere Anordnung über die Eingrabung eines Dokumentes vorliegt, diese immer dem Texte deselben vorangeschickt wird.

Because of its departure from this rule, a Karian decree found on Delos (IG XI (4), 1054) appears to be one of the exceptional cases of a text imported as an inscribed stele. Its provision for publication is ambiguous in this regard, but the Delian grant of topos has been added to the stele below the decree.

Occasionally archaeologists and epigraphists decide from the qualities of marbles and limestones whether inscriptions were imported or carved locally. But there is a high risk of error in such

judgements, because there is no reliable scientific technique for tracing stone to its place of origin with any precision. The Koan fragment of the Athenian Coinage Decree, because of its Attic lettering and superficial resemblance to Pentelic marble, was believed for many years to have been brought inscribed from Athens to Kos. But after a rigorous examination of the fragment, W. K. Pritchett and Prof. Georgiades, a distinguished mineralogist, have declared the stone to be "almost certainly Parian."⁸ Another dubious case of a purported travelling stele is the Delphian copy of an ordinance of Tegea of 324 B. C. concerning the return of its exiles (IG V (2), 1, pp. xxxvi-xxxvii). Tod (GHI 202) stated that the stele "appears to have been brought from Tegea to Delphi," but the only evidence which he offered was that it is "dark grey limestone with white veins, probably of Arkadian origin." Unfortunately the later lines, which might have included some illuminating provision for publication, are missing from the stone. The problem of identifying the origin of documents from their stelai is further complicated in those areas where the lack of suitable native stone necessitated the importing of unengraved slabs for epigraphical purposes. A noteworthy example is Olympia, where, because of the lack of good local marble or limestone,⁹ nearly all of the early inscriptions were engraved on bronze, and in the few cases when local sandstone was used (for example, Ol. 53), the texts are badly deteriorated because of the fragile composition. The editors of the Olympia inscriptions have

identified many of the stelai of the later centuries as Pentelic or Parian marble while most of the documents thereon have nothing to do with Athens or Paros¹⁰ — clear evidence that the marble was imported for the use of the Olympian stonecutters.

A final point on the question of exported stelai arises from the suggestion of R. P. Austin that the stoichedon style spread from Athens in the following way:¹¹

It might arise directly, through the copying of an Attic original, for it often happened that two copies of an Athenian document were made, one for Athens itself, and one to be set up in a foreign city which was concerned in the document. Thus the foreign city would have an Attic model at hand.

If Austin is suggesting that Athens exported antigrapha executed in the stoichedon style, and that the same pattern of letters was transferred to the stele by the foreign mason, he may be right about a limited number of Attic documents published in the stoichedon style in states which did not normally use it. However, cases like the Athenian Coinage Decree, of which some foreign copies are stoichedon, and others not, show that such a policy was haphazard at best. Furthermore, the majority of duplicate inscriptions found either in the same or different cities, show that Greek scribes and masons had generally little concern for maintaining a consistency of form or lineation in their copies.¹²

Austin can hardly mean that the Athenians sent their own masons abroad who would then have created the stoichedon models, for this practice seems to have been quite rare.¹³ The wording of Austin's

remark really seems to reflect a belief that carved stele, and hence stoichedon models, were sent abroad from Athens, but there is little evidence for such a belief, either in Austin's work, or elsewhere. There are, of course, other possible explanations for the spread of the stoichedon style from Athens. It may have been advanced by the emigration of Athenian stonecutters to work in other cities,¹⁴ and, according to a more likely alternative suggestion of Austin,¹⁵ by the visits to Athens of foreigners who observed the stoichedon models and carried the fashion to their native cities. In conclusion, the evidence from inscriptions and other sources shows that interstate documents were almost always dispatched on light portable material such as papyrus, wood, or leather, even when they were intended for permanent publication abroad. Further, the formal details of the text on stone, such as stoichedon order and lineation, were not likely derived from the antigrapha.

II. THE USE OF STATE SEALS

A considerable number of diplomatic decrees from the end of the fourth century and later include in the provisions for the dispatch of their transcripts abroad, the order that certain local officials seal the documents with the state seal (δημόσια σφραγίς). It is unlikely that the appearance of such a detail at this time reflects an innovation in clerical procedure; instead it seems to be simply another manifestation of the common tendency of official documents in Hellenistic times to spell out

in greater detail the diplomatic processes which by that time had a long tradition. In other words, the order that the document be sealed with the state seal is only an elaboration of the simpler instructions for processing foreign copies, already implicit in the earliest provisions that copies be set up abroad.

The sparse evidence for the earlier use of state seals, particularly at Athens, has been responsible in part for some excessive doubt about their existence. W. P. Wallace contested the existence of a state seal in Athens before the mid-fourth century.¹⁶ This claim was subsequently refuted by D. M. Lewis, who cited, among other evidence, the Hekatompedon inventories of the Treasurers of Athena of 397 B. C. (IG II² 1408), where it is said of the receptacle which held the dies and anvils for minting gold coins (vv. 12/13): σεσήμαντ[α]ι τῆι δημοσίαι σφραγίδι.¹⁷ The great bulk of evidence in addition to that treated by Lewis¹⁸ is enough to show that the Athenians of the fifth century were so thoroughly familiar with the use of seals in public and private business that the Demos itself must have had an official sphragis with which to certify its own documents, particularly those sent outside its borders. As for the lack of reference to a state seal in the earlier interstate dispatches, it seems a far more reasonable argument e silentio to attribute it to the customary economy of detail in inscriptions of the Classical Period than to the non-existence of such a seal.

It is certain, then, from IG II² 1408, that the state seal was already in use in 397 B. C., and, since there was no break in the administration of the temple-treasures, it is likely that it was used at least in the later years of the fifth century.¹⁹ In the fourth century, and even for the entire Classical and Hellenistic periods, there seem to be no references in Athenian inscriptions to interstate documents sealed with the $\delta\eta\mu\acute{o}\sigma\iota\alpha$ $\sigma\phi\rho\alpha\gamma\acute{\iota}\varsigma$. But this function of the state seal must logically be taken for granted if we can judge from its numerous other public usages and references in the fourth century and later. Aristotle tells us that the state seal was kept in the possession of the daily Chairman of the Prytaneis (Ath. Pol. 44.1). So in 352/1 B. C. it is the Chairman who according to IG II² 204, vv. 37f., wields the $\delta\eta\mu\acute{o}\sigma\iota\alpha$ $\sigma\phi\rho\alpha\gamma\acute{\iota}\varsigma$ in sealing up the gold and silver amphoras of which the oracle at Delphi was to choose the one which contained the correct advice as to whether the Athenian should cultivate certain sacred lands. As if the security of the state seal were not enough, a further provision of the same decree allows that any citizen could add his own seal to the amphoras. Although this use of the state seal is a bit anomalous, it corroborates Aristotle, and makes it not unlikely that the Chairman, in conjunction with his other responsibility as guardian of the state archives, was responsible for the official sealing of transcripts of state documents which were prepared and presented to him by the Secretary of the Council. Lewis' exploration of the terminus post quem non of the state seal at

Athens²⁰ has found the latest reference to be IG IV² 83, v. 19, in a letter of condolence from the Areopagos to the city of Epidaurous about A. D. 40 or 65. In this late case a keryx is in charge not only of the dispatch of the document, but also of the affixing of the public seal. Lewis has suggested that the functional use of the public seal had diminished by this time;²¹ it may well have been a consequence of this lesser use that what in earlier times was the preserve of the Chairman of the Prytaneis was now extended to lesser functionaries.

Documents from states other than Athens are more informative for the actual process of sealing interstate dispatches. A detailed example is provided by the inscribed fragment of a Theraan decree granting honors to citizens of Knidos (IG XII (3), 322, vv. 1-6; + IG XII (Suppl.) p. 84):

. . . so that the Knidians may be aware of the things that have happened, let certain men (The text is deficient at this point; the letters -μεν[οι might be restored as ἡρημένοι, "the elected" couriers or envoys.), taking the decree from the Grammateus, dispatch it to the Prostatai and the Demos of the Knidians, after the Tamiai have sealed it with the public seal. . . ."

This is probably a fair indication of the process which was followed by most states in their use of the state seal on foreign correspondence.

The transcript is drafted by the Secretary and his staff, and then sealed by the officials in charge of the δημόσια σφραγίς; in this case the Tamiai, and at Athens (at least in the latter half of the fourth century) the Chairman of the Prytaneis; the sealed document is then handed over to

the couriers for delivery to its foreign destination. In nearly all states where inscribed evidence of these details survives, the officials who sealed the documents and handed them directly to the couriers or envoys seem from their titles to have been officials of rank commensurate with that of the Chairman at Athens.²²

From the related archaeological evidence for the use of state seals and marks on weights and tokens, and from the sketchy and cryptic references to such seals in literature and inscriptions, it is difficult if not impossible to determine the precise form of the seal, and how it was attached to diplomatic documents. To begin with the inscriptions, the language used in the provisions for the sealing of antigrapha is so succinct and ambiguous that it allows generous speculation, but limited enlightenment. The formula of a Tenian decree honoring a citizen of Rhodes is typical (IG XII (5), 833, vv. 11-15):

And so that the Rhodians may know the things decreed for Argeios, (it is decreed further) that the Archons are to send to Rhodes an antigraphon of this decree which they have sealed (σφραγισαμένους) with the public seal.

Occasionally, in such formulas, instead of σφραγίζομαι, some form of σημαίνομαι is used, with or without the word σφραγίς. It would be convenient for our understanding of the state seal, if these two verbs denoted distinct processes, one the simplest marking of a document, and the other the sealing of it in a roll or tablet. Unfortunately, the meanings of both verbs have become so extended by the time such provisions appear on inscriptions, that the same numerous interpretations

of the process are possible with either. Σφραγίζω is perhaps related to φράσσω (Cf. LSJ, s. v. σφραγιδός = φραγιδός) with the basic meaning "to fence in, enclose, protect," and was thus used of the process of protecting something by sealing it up. However, the term eventually came to be applied to practically any form of certification. Σημαίνω, a denominative verb from σῆμα (basically, any sign or mark), seems to have broadened its meaning progressively in the direction of σφραγίζω until it too has the full range of uses from "signify by a mark" to "seal or lock up" (See LSJ, σημαίνω, B, II.). There is some doubt whether as early as the fifth-century treasury accounts at Athens, σημαίνομαι, used with reference to the sealing of receptacles, means much more than "lock."²³

While it is true that the cryptic language of inscribed orders for sealing antigrapha tells us little about the nature of the operation, a consideration of the probable purposes of the state seals, in conjunction with a bit of archaeological evidence, may lead to some profitable speculation. First of all, it must be determined for different cases whether the sealing was simply a process of certification in which the impression of the sphragis was stamped onto some adhesive material attached to the surface of the document, or whether the sealing was somehow affixed to a roll or tablet for the purpose of insuring that the document could not be opened without detection. It is also possible that in some cases these two processes were somehow combined or employed

separately on the same documents. In Classical times, Herodotus (2. 38) mentions a type of adhesive clay which the Egyptians used to stamp with a seal ring, and Aristophanes (Lys. 1189) refers to clay used for similar purposes as ῥύπιος.²⁴ One method of enclosing documents with a seal could have been to tie them up with thread or string, and to attach a seal in such a way that the string could not be broken without breaking the seal. M. Crosby considers that it is barely possible that some of the stamped clay tokens found in the Athenian Agora "could have been glued or stamped in some way to papyrus roll."²⁵ However, she rightly favors the opinion that their use as sealings is improbable, since they were fired (and in some cases glazed) after stamping, and that they were probably used as tokens of identification. Excavations have turned up a few definite cases of terracotta seals pierced for strings by which they could be attached to documents or goods, but only one, from Larissa, was found on the Greek mainland. Nevertheless, the more practical type of outer seal would seem to be one of soft clay molded around the nexus of the binding string, and stamped while still soft. One would not expect archaeological evidence of such seals since they were destroyed by the opening of the documents.

There is some evidence that the seals which were used to enclose documents were no foolproof insurance against their being opened without detection, and hence, that they were not absolutely suited for situations where the strictest security was needed. In the fifth century,

Aristophanes (Thes. 425) and Thucydides (1.132) allude to the fact that seals, perhaps even public seals, were not hard to imitate, and that duplicates could be purchased for a small sum. Much later, Lucian (Alex. 21) describes a method for removing seals. The provision in Plato's Laws (XII, 941 A) for the punishment of ambassadors bearing false documents may be a reflection of the ease of falsification, and a real Athenian law directed against the practice.

The generally pacific tone of most Greek treaties, and the great number of honorary decrees between the Greek states would suggest that most interstate dispatches were not occasions for great secrecy. Nevertheless, in many cases such as the instructing by magistrates of their foreign-based envoys, or the sending of military correspondence between allied states, it must have been desirable to insure the secrecy of communications. A sphere of correspondence of an unofficial nature, but one which required the greatest precaution, was that of local or international intrigue. Certainly the most bizarre episode in this regard is that which Herodotus tells (5.35) of the ingenious Histiaios, who urged Aristagoras of Miletos to revolt, in a message sent from Susa pricked on the shaven head of his most trusted slave.²⁶ Simple forms of cryptography such as letter-substitution²⁷ were known and employed by the Greeks, but the method of secret communication of which we have most knowledge is the skytale used particularly by Spartan magistrates during the time of war.²⁸ Each of the correspondents had

sticks of the same size and shape, so that a message written on a strip of leather wrapped around one became illegible when unwrapped for dispatch, but could be read again when the strip was rewound on the recipient's stick. Generally it was impossible for the Greek city-states and confederacies, by virtue of their constitutions, to negotiate any kinds of secret treaties or agreements. This is particularly obvious in strongly democratic states such as Athens, where there were no diplomatic engagements except by decision of the Demos.²⁹ But once two states were committed to negotiations, and envoys were given plentipotentiary status, there must have been considerable use of secret correspondence for the purpose of national security, just as there was in time of war. Even if a state employed no system of cryptography, the conveyance of such messages under seal, by heralds whose inviolability was recognized in theory by all Greeks, would have insured, albeit not infallibly, that the documents in transit were safe from forgery and alteration, and their contents kept secret.

Whether the Greeks used seals on the inside or outside of their documents is the subject of a long-standing argument. One of the important chapters in this debate was written by Bonner, who took issue, and certainly rightly, with the statement of Gneist³⁰ that neither among the Greeks nor the Romans can the use of a subseal (Untersiegel) be proved, and that the cases for which we have evidence are outer seals (Verschlussiegel). Bonner effectively shows that the Greeks used

both types of seals, but in doing so he denies any possible distinction of purpose in such different methods of sealing. He writes that "the position of a seal on a document had no bearing whatever on its legal effect, which depended entirely on the intention of the person who affixed the seal," and adds that the outer seal was simply more popular because it afforded better protection against fraud. He concludes (p. 407):

The Greek seal then corresponds exactly to the common-law seal which was not accompanied by a signature. This similarity is in no wise affected by the fact that the Greeks usually placed the seal on the outside of the document.

But, in fact, the similarity is greatly affected, if the outer seal was the type described above which would be destroyed in the opening of the document, and such seals must have been used in the cases of many important diplomatic dispatches where the purpose of the seal was not simply to identify, certify, or "sign," but to insure the integrity of the legal text while it was in transit from one official body to another. Bonner seems to create unnecessary difficulty by suggesting an outer seal which can be maintained on the document as a legal symbol. If the seal is not broken in the opening of the document, how can it serve the purpose of insuring the integrity of the text? If it is broken, then its legal function ceases, as Bonner himself asserts.³¹ In trying to combine the purposes of both types of sealings in his outer seal he seems to lose the essential characteristic of the Verschlussiegel, that is the "closing seal."

There should be no doubt that the seals affixed to legal documents such as those placed in the archives, or legal depositions taken

or delivered before a court,³² were inner seals, for these had to be preserved and displayed with the texts in order to accredit them. But some caution must be used in identifying this type of seal necessarily or exclusively with that mentioned in the case of interstate dispatches. In speaking of the inner seal, Bonner states (p. 406):

A person who received such a discharge must be able to display the seal intact. So too, the Milesian award sent to the Messenians certified by the state seal could not serve to protect them in the possession of the property in dispute unless it could be exhibited without destroying the seal.

Firstly, and importantly, the document referred to by Bonner (Syll.³ 633 = Ol. 52) is not "the Milesian award sent to the Messenians." but an antigraphon of the Milesian award given to the Messenian envoys at their request to be taken under seal to the Archons and Synedroi of the Eleans for publication at Olympia; this is clarified in detail both in the Elean grant of topos carved at the head of the stele (vv. 1-29), and the introductory letter from the Milesians to the Eleans which was sealed also, as indicated by the statement of the Milesians that they have "arranged the judgement beneath the letter" (vv. 37/38). If the sole purpose of the Messenians' having the arbitral document sent to Olympia was to have it published — and the Elean decree of topos indicates that this was the only purpose —, then the continuing legal significance of the seal, as Bonner sees it, is meaningless, since it is not, and could not be, transmitted to the stele.

The stelai erected by foreign states at such pan-Hellenic shrines as Olympia, were not official documents, but rather, extra copies placed there as propaganda, to make known and to justify to the world the matters they contained.³³ Moreover, the Milesian arbitral document sent to Olympia, or the inscription which was copied from it, could not, as Bonner says, "protect them in the possession of the property in dispute." The very act of international arbitration, as defined by Tod and others, depends entirely on the mutual agreement of the disputants to abide by the arbitral decision.³⁴ The continuance of the agreement was strictly a matter of mutual good faith, a factor often short-lived, as the chronic dispute of the Spartans and Messenians over this same territory indicates. If mutual good faith in the decision collapsed, there was no international court where the offended party could present a copy, whether official or unofficial, of the arbitral documents for legal redress, although the official copies kept by the arbitrating state served as the valid reference, if any point of the decision were called into question. It is true that the notoriety which an arbitral decision gained by publication at Olympia, would increase pressure on the concerned parties to abide by that decision. But that is the realm of propaganda, not law, and the presence of the seal is irrelevant.

What then were the purpose and nature of the seal attached to the arbitral documents sent from Miletos to Olympia? It is noteworthy

that the numerous inscriptions which survive from ancient sanctuaries suggest that there may have been some correlation between the general respect for the integrity of their texts, and their publication in holy places. The Greeks could trust the documents which they read in the sanctuaries because the local officials in charge of these shrines were concerned with the integrity of the texts they allowed to be set up there. Since, as Tod notes in regard to the same Milesian documents,³⁵ the only official and authoritative copy of an arbitral award was that retained by the arbitrating state, it is only reasonable that the Eleans would accept as a reliable and publishable version, only that received under seal from Milesians. This fact was clear also to the Messenians, who had their envoys bring the special copy from Miletos to Elis, knowing that if they presented their own archival copy, it might be suspect as coming from an interested party. It must have been to assure the Eleans of the integrity of the text, that it was sealed from the time it was dispatched by the Prytaneis of the Milesians until it was handed over at Elis. The only seal which could insure this integrity was an outer seal which would enclose the documents in such a way as to make it very difficult to open without detection. This is not to exclude in this case or others the possibility of an additional inner seal used to accredit documents, but for interstate dispatches requiring some guarantee of integrity or secrecy, we must in most cases be dealing with provisions for outer seals of the closing type.

The provisions in published documents are not concerned exclusively with the sealing of those dispatches which were eventually transmitted to stone, but in some cases they attest to the use of state seals on important preliminary texts meant only for temporary use or archival deposit. Here again the most fruitful document for discussion involves a case of international arbitration. In the second or first century B. C., a Knidian court settled a dispute over money lent by two citizens of Kos to the state of Kalymna. The Kalymnians, after it was ruled that they had paid the debt and were no longer obligated, inscribed on stone in their state a series of documents related to the case, including directions regarding the conduct of the trial and the presentation of evidence to the two litigants prior to the trial, and to the Knidian court itself. In this inscription (Syll.³ 953)³⁶ the first of three sets of instructions which mention the use of seals is that concerning the presentation before the tribunal of required documents from the archives of the respective states (vv. 10-15):

The decrees and the challenges (προκλήσεις), and any other document which is brought, if required, from the public archives, shall be laid before the court by each of the contestants, sealed with the public seal of their respective states, in accordance with the decrees which those states may pass, and shall be handed to the generals (i. e. the Knidian Strategoi who are in charge of the tribunal of 204 of their citizens: see Syll.³ 953, n. 8), and the generals shall open and lay before the court all the documents submitted by both the contesting parties.

Presumably the originals of the documents in question would be left in the local archives, and copies of these would be sent to Knidos, for, as

we have seen, the technical differentiation is often not made in these formulas between the documents themselves by their generic names — in this case, decrees and challenges — and the antigraphon. But, again we must address ourselves to the question of what kinds of seals were affixed to these antigrapha. Although there is little definitive evidence one way or the other, it is a logical assumption that the official copies of decrees and other documents in the state archives were stamped with the state seal; otherwise they could easily have been counterfeited. These seals would naturally have been subseals, since the documents had to lie open for consultation by the councils, assemblies, lawcourts, and other government offices. Whether the mark of the public seal was also affixed to the duplicates used outside of the archives is another question. The use of a subseal on a document presented in a foreign court of arbitration would have been especially desirable for certifying its official source, preventing fraud, and easily distinguishing it from the many other documents presented in such cases. But it also seems likely that outer seals would have been attached as a further precaution to safeguard the integrity of the documents in transit. We know that the dispatches to the Knidian court were to be enclosed in some manner from the phrase (v. 15): "and the generals shall open and lay before the court all the documents submitted by both the contesting parties." The verb, λῦσαντες, used for "opening" suggests an act of untying, and whatever the bindings were, it is at least probable that they were held

by an outer seal. If there were no particular concern that the documents reach the arbiters enclosed with a seal, there would certainly be no need for the seemingly precautionary instruction that the Strategoi of the arbitrating state open and present them to the court.

The second and more problematical part of this text (vv. 23-43) deals with the dispatch from Kos and Kalymna of depositions taken before the presidents of the respective assemblies from witnesses who are unable to attend the trial. There seem to be three separate sets of copies dispensed here, of which the first is mentioned in Lines 28-32:

The witnesses shall swear the customary oath to their depositions, namely, that their witness is true and that they are unable to attend the court in person, and the presidents shall seal with the public seal the depositions taken before them, and any of the contesting parties who so desires shall add his own seal.

Although it is not specifically stated, this first set of sealed depositions must be the official copies referred to in Lines 15-16, which would have to be sent to the court at Knidos. Again it is a matter of speculation as to whether the seals involved here are Unterseigel or Verschlusssiegel. The public seal which is applied by the presidents of the respective states could reasonably have been a subseal which, like that of a modern notary, would simply certify that the deposition had been properly taken. But coming as it did from an interested party to the arbitration, this certification would not be very significant. Furthermore, the appearance of the seals of the contesting parties as

subseals seem even less likely, since this would probably be construed as supporting or seconding the testimony in the manner of modern co-signatures — something which the opposing parties would not likely be qualified, let alone willing, to do.³⁷ There is no doubt, however, that the contesting parties were concerned that their own depositions and those of their opponents should reach the Knidian tribunal intact. The best assurance of this would be outer seals which showed that the documents had not been opened until presented to the judges, and the addition of their own seals would give to both parties further confidence in the integrity of the depositions. If these seals of the contesting parties were in fact applied as outer seals, the verb (παρᾶσῃ ἀνέσθω: "let him add [his] seal)" would indicate that the public seal had already been applied, also as an outer seal.

The other two sets of documents issued at the taking of depositions at Kos and Kalyrna are referred to as "copies of the depositions" (ἀντίγραφα τῶν μαρτυριῶν) clearly distinguishing them from the official originals sent to the tribunal at Knidos. The first of these sets is dispensed with in this brief statement (vv. 32/33): "Copies of these depositions shall at once be handed to the contesting parties by the presidents." These are the private copies given to those who have chosen to attend the taking of depositions. They require no seal since they are only intended for the contestants to whom they are given, probably for their own preparation of their cases, and they have no

purpose as official depositions to be introduced in court, or as deposits for the archives of Kos or Kalymna.

The official archival copies for these states must be the second set of ἀντίγραφα τῶν μαρτυριῶν which the Koan and Kalymnian Prostatētai are to send one another within twenty days of the taking of the depositions (vv. 33/42):

The presidents shall send copies of all the depositions witnessed in Kos, some sealed with the public seal and others unsealed, to the presidents in Kalymna within twenty days from the date at which they are witnessed, and similarly the presidents in Kalymna shall send copies of all the depositions witnessed before them, some sealed with the public seal and others unsealed, to the presidents in Kos within twenty days from the date at which they are witnessed, and the presidents shall carry out with regard to the depositions all the other steps required of the presidents in Kos.

Copies of all the depositions taken are to be sent in these dispatches, but, odd, some of these are to be sent sealed with the public seals and others unsealed. There seems to be little evidence in the account of these procedures which would explain this dichotomy. The same depositions which are sent to the arbitral board at Knidos are all sealed with the public seals of the respective states. Perhaps some of the copies intended for the archives are of the depositions of local magistrates, and have a jurisdiction which is indicated by the public seal, while others contain the testimony of private citizens which would not merit or require such official certification. This suggestion might be more creditable if the seals in this case were subseals. But this is simply a further unknown, and, as we have seen, the dispatches sent to Knidos

from these hearings suggested the use of closing seals. It is also plausible that we are dealing here again with outer seals and that it is considered crucial in the case of some depositions more than others that they reach the opposing states intact. But such a precaution seems a little groundless as far as the security of the trial itself is concerned, since the court already has its own official copies under seal, and the contesting parties have not only had the opportunity to hear the testimony when given, but, at the same time, they received their own copies which could be used as a check. Or, finally, a clue to the reason for this discriminating use of seals for the archival depositions is perhaps to be found in the earlier distinction of the witnesses (vv. 22-25):

The witness who is able to attend (the arbitral trial) in person shall give his witness in person before the court, while those of the witnesses who are unable to appear before the court shall give their witness in absence before the presidents. . . .

Since it appears from the process of depositions that there is a general exchange of evidence by both sides prior to the trial, it is reasonable to assume that depositions were also taken of those witnesses who would testify in person before the Knidian court, and that archival copies would be exchanged by Kos and Kalymna. If so, these could have been the documents sent without seal, for the verbal testimony before the court would serve as a ready check of the accuracy of the archival copies.

Tod has noted the similarity between the instructions given in cases of interstate arbitration and the procedures followed in the Attic

courts of civil law.³⁸ It is clear that, whenever they could, the Greeks applied to their diplomatic dealings the practices which were familiar to them from private and civil business, including various uses of the seal. For example, wills, contracts, and other civil and private documents were usually sealed and deposited with trustworthy persons to prevent fraud. This practice of submitting a document to a neutral depositary was apparently carried over on occasion to the process of interstate treaty-making. An inscription found in Stiris in Phokis (IG IX (1), 32) tells of an agreement between two neighboring cities of the Stirians and Medeonians. Following the provision for publication in the local sanctuaries (vv. 65ff.), we find the order that the sealed agreement is to be deposited with a private citizen of a third city, a certain Thrason of Lilaeia.

Much of the confusion of modern scholars in dealing with the subject of seals results from the difficulty in distinguishing between seals proper, and passports or tokens of identification.³⁹ The problem in its simplest form is the frequent confusion by both ancient Greeks and modern scholars of the σφραγίς and the σύμβολον, and their functions. Wallace has taken considerable pain to show that the creation of symbola by Athens in 447 B. C. on the motion of Kleinias to facilitate the delivery of tribute to Athens proves that there was no public seal in Athens at this time.⁴⁰ For the discussion of the decree in question, published in Hesperia 13 (1944), pp. 1-15,⁴¹ the following lines (11-18) are crucial:

ξύμβολα δὲ ποιήσασθαι π/ρὸς τὰς πόλεις, ὅπως, ἄμ μὴ
 ἐξ/ῆ ἀδικεῖν τοῖς ἀπάγουσι τὸν φόρον. γράψασα δὲ ἡ
 πόλις ἐς // γραμματεῖον τὸν φόρον, ὄντιν ἂν ἀποπέμπῃ
 σημη/ναμένη τῷ ξυμβόλῳ ἀποπεμπέτω Ἀθηναίε. τοῦς
 δ' ἀ/ πάγοντας ἀποδοῦναι τὸ γραμματεῖον ἐν τῇ βουλῇ
 ἀ/ναγνῶναι ὄταμπερ τὸν φόρον ἀποδιδώσι.

Although Wallace's argument is groundless unless these ξύμβολα did in fact have the purpose and function of seals, he assumes this point without question. Lewis, in his response to Wallace,⁴² tries to ascertain the meaning of σύμβολον. He correctly observes that the word normally involves a two-sided relationship, and it is true that in many inscriptions the word is used, sometimes interchangeably with συμβολή to describe an agreement or contract. But it is easily conceivable that the word σύμβολον could be used of the impression of a seal which could be recognized and honored by another party in the manner of a token of identification. Likewise the word σφραγίς could be used to denote some sign of identification less concrete than an actual seal or mark, as, for example, a name in the favored interpretations of Theognis' famed line (19-26):⁴³

Κύρνε, σοφιζομένῳ μὲν ἐμοῖ σφρηγίς ἐπικεῖσθω /
 τοῖσδ' ἔπεσιν,

Lewis, in his awareness of the basic distinction of the two words, wonders why symbola, and not ordinary sphragides, are used in the sending of tribute to Athens. He has solved this puzzle by a theory which he himself admits is "perhaps a little abnormal," namely, that the symbolon as used here has aspects both of the seal and the σύμβολον

τετυμήμενον,⁴⁴ and is a jagged tally which is used to make an impression in clay on the tablet recording the tribute, which can be checked with the corresponding half of the symbolon at Athens. He gets around the obvious problem that the impressed symbolon would make a reverse image of itself into which the Athenian half could not possibly be made to fit, by suggesting that "when the tablet arrived at Athens, the sealing would be checked by putting the corresponding half beside the impression."⁴⁵ There is no parallel for this conflation of the functions of the sphragis and symbolon, and there is no other undisputed case where the word σύμβολον is used for the seal which is affixed to, or encloses, a document. But it must be remembered also that at this early date in the fifth century, there is not only a lack of developed terminology for the use of seals in international dealings, but no other reference to them in epigraphical sources.

Since it is possible as early as the Kleinias decree that symbolon could have referred to the mark of a seal, or even the seal itself, a closer look at the text may show that the symbola here have both the functions of sealing and identifying, somewhat in the manner, if not in the form, suggested by Lewis. First of all, the purpose of the creation of the symbola, if I read the text correctly, is (vv. 12-13) "so that it not be permitted that those bringing the tribute do it harm." This insurance could be achieved only by a closing seal, either on the letter which quoted the amount of tribute, or on the container of tribute, which held

the amount quoted in the letter. The relative pronoun $\delta\upsilon\tau\iota\nu'$ (v. 15), the object of $\acute{\alpha}\pi\omicron\pi\acute{\epsilon}\mu\pi\eta$, must have its antecedent in $\epsilon\phi\acute{\omicron}\rho\omicron\nu$, a masculine noun, and not in $\gamma\rho\alpha\mu\mu\alpha\tau\epsilon\iota\omicron\nu$, as both Wallace and Lewis imply.⁴⁶

Therefore it is the tribute which is sealed rather than the letter of record, according to the crucial lines which would read in translation (vv. 14-16):

When the city has recorded in a letter the tribute, having sealed with the symbolon whatever [tribute] it is sending, let it send it to Athens.

But contrary to Wallace's insistence that the symbola here function only as seals created especially for the allies because the Athenian public seal was yet unknown,⁴⁷ we must agree with Lewis that there is some two-sided relationship and process involved in the use of these devices. It also seems inappropriate to view as prototypes of Athenian state seals, devices used on dispatches coming to Athens from states which are, at least ostensibly, independent. The creation of special sealing devices for the occasion must have served the secondary purpose of allowing the dispatch to be identified and credited by the Athenian officials who had some tally which could be matched with that used by each of the tributary states. It is probably from this function more than that of sealing that the devices are here designated as symbola.

Another noteworthy use of symbola in Athenian international correspondence was on the occasion of negotiations with the King of Sidon about 367 B. C. (IG II² 141), for which special symbola were

created. Wallace here too claimed that the ad hoc creation of these devices proved the lack of a public seal at this time in Athens,⁴⁸ but Lewis nullified this claim by pointing to the mention of the Athenian state seal in the Hekatompedon inventory of 397 B. C.⁴⁹ Lewis rightly expressed some doubt that these symbola were seals affixed to the Athenian-Sidonian correspondence rather than tokens shown to prove the bona fides of the messenger, that is, tesserae hospitales, as they have usually been interpreted.⁵⁰ Besides the fact that the inscription explicitly states that the purpose of the symbola is the mutual identification of messages or messengers, these devices can no longer be interpreted as seals of any kind; for if a seal were required in this situation, Athens would certainly have employed its own state seal which existed for at least thirty years before this time.

While, according to the Kleinias decree, the symbolon seems to have served at one time the function of a sphragis, it is even more likely that the sphragis on occasion was used as a simple passport, tessera hospitalis, or token of identification, objects usually referred to as symbola. Such a use of the seal, or its impression, was probably the case in the dispatch of a letter from Philip V of Macedon to the island of Nisyros about 200 B. C. (IG XII (3), 91). Beneath this letter, inscribed at the head of a stele found on Nisyros, appears the responding decree of the island state, which begins (vv. 12ff.): "Since Kallias is present bearing the letters from King Philip, and the sphragis of the king,"

If the people of Nisyros had wished to convey the idea that the letters were delivered under seal, by all standards they should have written some such formula as τὰ γράμματα σφραγισμένα τῆ σφραγίδι τοῦ βασιλέως. Although it is risky to base arguments on epigraphical syntax, it is at least plausible that the use of "and" in the phrase in question, was meant to convey the fact that Kallias carried, separate from the letters, the impression of the seal as a sign that he was the accredited envoy of the king. It is also possible that the words of the decree are to be taken literally, and that Kallias carried on actual seal from the Macedonian court which might be described as σφραγῖς τοῦ βασιλέως, but it is most unlikely that he was entrusted with Philip's personal signet ring.

III. AMBASSADORS, HERALDS, AND COURIERS

The transcripts of treaties, proxenies, arbitrations, and other important diplomatic decrees and letters which survive on stone were generally conveyed to foreign states by special envoys, while the majority of less known and less illustrious dispatches were sent by professional couriers or heralds. Since there was in ancient Greece no system of permanent embassies, diplomatic missions required the appointment or election of ad hoc ambassadors, and in many cases, the dispatch of documents was a necessary and crucial part of the task of these men and their retinues as they travelled back and forth between their own and foreign capitals for the purpose of negotiations or the

giving and taking of oaths. Even in essentially unilateral dealings such as the decreeing of proxeny, where the only concern might be for a duplicate publication and a proclamation in the state of the proxenos, an official appearance before the foreign legislature to read the decree and obtain permission to publish it would require not simply a courier, but a capable spokesman. The varying responsibilities of missions would determine the type of functionary chosen to carry the dispatches, and, consequently, the subject of interstate correspondence necessarily encompasses all ranks and kinds of envoys, messengers, and couriers.

In interstate decrees, provisions for the selection and instruction of envoys generally appear near the end of inscriptions as adjuncts to the orders for foreign copies. Like the resolutions for local publication, discussed above,⁵¹ the procedure for choosing the envoys was usually not included in the ratification of the decree itself, but was effected afterward by a secondary provision and vote, which was then in some cases incorporated as a minor resolution of the decree, with the names of the elected envoys often being added as a postscript to the whole text. The general rule for appointing embassies is perhaps proved by the exceptional case in which the secretary did not incorporate the separate resolution into the body of the decree. An inscribed decree of Spalauthra in Thessalian Magnesia (IG IX (2), 1111) honoring a certain Lysias of Demetrias has a minor provision that two

men carry the antigraphon abroad, but the mention of the elected men at the end of the stele is in the form of a separate resolution introduced by the formula "Ἐδοξεὶν καὶ."⁵² As with all other provisions for the handling of diplomatic documents, those for the appointment of embassies become increasingly detailed after the fifth century, when they are only implied in the provision for a foreign stele, through Hellenistic times, when they often include elaborate instructions to the appointed envoys.

The manner in which ad hoc embassies were chosen must have varied not only in different states and confederacies according to local custom and law, but also with the varying gravity of different missions, from the important treaty-making process to the mere conveyance of more trivial documents to foreign magistrates for their publication. In Athens, where there are enough surviving documents to allow reasonable inferences, the general rule for choosing embassies seems to have been election by the Assembly, but in individual cases there are some apparent inconsistencies both in the particulars of the method and in the rank of the citizens chosen. The verbs used to describe the acts of selecting envoys, ἀρεῖν in most cases, χειροτονεῖν in others, and sometimes both together, have no fine distinction of meaning in these formulas, ἀρεῖν possibly denoting any method of appointment or election, and χειροτονεῖν, only election.⁵³ The contextual details surrounding these verbs of "election" are in some cases more

informative clues to the actual process employed in choosing the envoys. The fact that the appointment of embassies appears as a provision of public decrees is a fair indication that the actual election was carried out in the Assembly, and in some cases the Demos is explicitly named as the elector. (See, for example, IG II², 43, vv. 72ff.: ἐλέσθαι δὲ τὸν δῆμον; ibid. 116, v. 21: ἐ[λ]έσθα[ι τὸ]ν δῆμον πέντε ἄν[δρ]ας ἐ[ξ] Ἀθηναίων ἀπάντων.) Even in these cases, the motion for election could well have been formulated in the Council as part of the standard probouleuma, but the actual election not have taken place until after the ratification of the decree in the Assembly.⁵⁴ The most obvious reason for this sequence is of course the practical necessity of approving the decree before the election of men to transport it to other cities. But even if a slate of envoys were elected in the Council, it was a matter of constitutional law that this measure would have required the ratification of the Demos as part of a decree.

Embassies selected for common diplomatic duties such as the delivery of documents, making proclamations, and petitions for publications, or even the more critical mission of administering oaths of alliance to foreign parties, were not generally filled by experienced statesmen to the exclusion of the general citizenry. In at least two cases, Athenian inscriptions tell us of rather important embassies being chosen in the Assembly ἐξ Ἀθηναίων ἀπάντων,⁵⁵ a phrase which indicates the eligibility of all the Athenian citizens. A general election from all of

the citizens, or even all those in the Assembly, seems somewhat impractical, and it is more likely that the final ballots were cast among a number of candidates nominated, sometimes according to tribe, in the Assembly, a method not inconsistent with the phrase ἐξ Ἀθηναίων ἀπάντων. Proof of the frequent use of this democratic method of appointment is the fact that the names of men chosen for less critical missions cannot as a rule be identified with persons known to be seasoned diplomats. But at the same time, this procedure left room for the election of experienced diplomats for missions in which special expertise was necessary.

The envoys whom the Demos elected for important negotiations, particularly those whom it invested with plenipotentiary powers (αὐτοκρατορες or τέλος ἔχοντες), could have been the products of election "from all the Athenians," or a system of nomination for which all members of the Assembly were eligible. Even by so democratic a selection, Athens could have weighted its embassies with such effective orators and diplomats as we find, for example, in Philokrates, Aiskhines, and Demosthenes in the mission of peace to Macedon in 346 B. C. Although this embassy also included, probably as a gesture to equalitarianism, a number of men who were otherwise unknown, it can be inferred from a remark of Aiskhines (2. 18-19) regarding his own appointment, that all ten members were elected from nominees (προβληθέντες) more than likely chosen by the Demos. But it is also possible that a degree of

selectivity in the nominations was achieved by making them in the Council, although not from the Councilors,⁵⁶ and then submitting them to the Assembly for election. Whatever the origin of the nominations for the mission to Philip II in 346 B. C., the "stacking" of the slate with illustrious — yet antagonistic — statesmen reflects some influence of differing political interest groups upon the Assembly. There is certainly a hint of factional activity in the fact that two of the envoys to Macedon were elected on the nominations of their fellows, Demosthenes by Philokrates, and Aiskhines by Nausikles.⁵⁷ Further, the same ten envoys were sent back to Macedon to administer the final oath of the treaty, a task which was usually delegated to a different group of ambassadors. It may also be symptomatic of factional lobbying in the choice of this embassy that the usual democratic restriction of tribal distribution of appointees was lifted, an inconsistency which had precedents in the missions to Sparta in 445, to King Hebrzymelmis in 386/5, to Byzantium in 378, to Neapolis in 355, and to Thessaly sometime before 353/2 B. C. (IG II² 175).⁵⁸

D. Mosley has determined that the size and composition of embassies, at least for the critical missions where the mixture of eminent statesmen and lesser known citizens is found, were determined in part by the political forces which were current in Athens,⁵⁹ but the precise method of their selection still remains unclear. The apparent manipulation of appointments which produced these "mixed" embassies could

certainly have been carried out in the Assembly, but an easier method, and probably that used in a number of cases, would have been nomination in the Council for election in the Assembly, or outright election in the Council with subsequent ratification by the Demos. Such a procedure is attested in the provision for an embassy to administer oaths in connection with the alliance of Athens and Eretria in 394 B. C. (IG II² 16, vv. 15-20):

The Council is forthwith to choose ten men as ambassadors: five from the Council and five from private citizens, who will receive the oaths from the Eretrians. . . .

Even if the Council did not merely nominate, but elected or appointed the envoys, as the provision clearly states, nevertheless the approval of the Demos would have been necessary. The fragment, which consists only of the upper part of the stele, shows the text of a decree of the Council (vid. Line 3, ἔδοξε τῇ βουλῇ without the usual καὶ τῷ δήμῳ), indicating that the proposal for this embassy was initiated in that body and not in the Assembly. However, as Tod states,⁶⁰ this decree must have received ratification as a psephisma in the Assembly. There are a number of constitutional reasons for this aside from the probability that the Council could not make the final appointment of an embassy: restored as they are, the first lines of this probouleuma contain an approval of the alliance, which could only be legalized by the Demos; the allocation of public money, both for the travelling expenses of the envoys and for the publication of the text in Athens, also required the approval

of the Demos. It can be assumed then that the lower part of this stele, now missing, contained a statement of ratification by the Demos, probably in the form of a rider introduced by the formula τὰ μὲν ἄλλα καθάπερ τῆ βουλῆ, and in addition, some such formula as ἔδοξε τῷ δήμῳ, since the final draft for publication was not modified in the prescript to include the sanction of the Demos, the original probouleuma being used apparently verbatim.⁶¹ Since the Kleisthenic Boule was chosen by lot from a panel nominated by each tribe,⁶² the envoys elected from its membership would reflect a fair cross-section of the Athenian citizen body. Although this particular case of the administration of oaths was not a very critical mission, the other half of the provision, that five of the envoys be chosen from private citizens, may well have provided the type of legal loophole by which political interest groups and demagogues could further influence the Council to choose their spokesmen. The embassy chosen in this manner could be the type which is apparent in many diplomatic missions, a balanced mixture of rank and file citizens and experienced statesmen of varying political interests.

For important diplomatic missions, the Greek states most commonly sent delegations consisting of two, three, five, or ten men. Sparta most frequently sent three envoys, and Athens three, five, or ten for various occasions of importance.⁶³ Until recently, it had been a generally unquestioned thesis that the size of an Athenian embassy was

in proportion to the gravity and complexity of its mission. But Mosley has now shown that the number of Athenian envoys was determined not so much by the intrinsic importance of the issues at hand as by the number and variety of political factions involved in the issue.⁶⁴ Important embassies naturally were engaged in transporting documents as part of their missions, but because of their many other duties of primary political importance, their size was much greater than those whose duties were limited to what might be called diplomatic "mail." Throughout Greece, delegations chosen to carry letters and decrees to foreign cities, to negotiate for their publication, and to make other simple requests and proclamations, consisted of one, two, or rarely, three men.⁶⁵

In special cases, the restriction of a minimum age of fifty years was imposed in the composition of embassies at Athens, but never was it a general rule. The embassy proposed by Pericles to issue invitations to a Panhellenic conference was to be composed of men over fifty years of age, as was the delegation of three to Macedonia in 429 B. C. to request Perdikkas not to restrict the trade of Methone or lead troops through its territory (IG I² 57, vv. 16-23). Such restrictions of age for many offices and magistracies in Greek states (and in many other governments up to the present day) are based on the putative relation of wisdom in politics and diplomacy to age and experience; accordingly, as an ambassador, the older man was supposed to command more respect and

achieve better results in dealings with foreign powers. The restriction of age is never mentioned in the provisions for embassies of lesser import, such as those concerned primarily with communications, and it is surprising that it is not mentioned more frequently in connection with critical embassies. Nevertheless, where no restriction is mentioned or implied, there still seems to have been a hierarchy of age among the members of embassies, as Aiskhines (2. 25) indicates with regard to the envoys to Macedon in 346: "So when the older men had spoken on the subject of our mission, our turn (that is, the turn of Aiskhines and Demosthenes as the youngest of the delegation) came."

Occasionally provisions for the dispatch of foreign copies of diplomatic decrees are amplified by the stipulation that the appointed envoys depart within a given time. Because of the scarcity of such expressions of time limits, it is difficult to say whether or not the stipulated time depends on distance of the recipient state and the urgency of the particular case.⁶⁶ In the Athenian decree of alliance with Phokis in 458 B. C. (IG I² 26 + SEG 21. 6) it is specified that five envoys be sent within three days to Pylai to announce the terms of the treaty to the Delphian Amphiktyony. An Amorgian decree from the city of Minoa honoring a certain Nikolaos (IG XII (7) 288, vv. 16ff.) provides for the dispatch of an antigraphon to his native Rhodes "as soon as possible."⁶⁷ In less critical decrees such as proxeny and various other honors, the deadline for dispatch was probably more a matter of

diplomacy than legality. But in the matter of treaties, arbitrations, and other pacts entailing serious interstate obligations, the promptness of communications must often have had important legal implications. This would have been particularly true in those rarely attested cases when the validity or effect of a decree at the foreign site depended on its official publication or announcement. The clearest such case is provided by the Kean decrees on the Athenian monopoly on exports of red ochre (IG II² 1128) in an order concerning future Athenian decrees on the subject (vv. 21ff.):

If the Athenians should make any further decrees concerning the safeguarding of red ochre, they are to be legally binding when they are received.

Perhaps the greatest urgency attested in a foreign dispatch is the stipulation in the Athenian Coinage Decree for the immediate appointment by the Demos of heralds, and their dispatch ὡς τάχιστα by the Strategoi to announce the decree to the subject states (IG XII (Suppl.) pp. 215-217). In order to insure the prompt departure of the heralds, the decree provides for a fine of 10,000 drachmas to be levied on the Strategoi if they do not comply with the order.

In addition to the ad hoc appointees to interstate delegations who are generally designated as πρέσβεις or πρεσβευταί, the Greek states employed a number of officials of different titles for foreign communications. Most of these, like the πρέσβεις, were civilians appointed for specific missions, but others seem to have been professionals in the

employ of the state, and in many cases their titles seem to be associated with particular spheres of interstate correspondence or diplomatic endeavor. Some of the functionaries pertinent to this discussion are the κήρυξ ("herald"), ἡμεροδρόμος, θεωρός, and σπονδοφόρος.⁶⁸ A much less specific title is ἄγγελος which could be used as the equivalent of either keryx or presbys.⁶⁹ Herodotus termed angeloi the men sent by Athens to Persia in hopes of arranging for an alliance. In this case, however, the title may be significant in denoting their task which was to "announce" the bid for the pact, and not to engage in any negotiations.

Ambassadors in general enjoyed a recognized security among the Greek people which was often limited to the direct performance of their duties among the foreign states with which they were dealing, and sometimes this character was openly violated.⁷⁰ Common law, however, reserved the highest degree of sacrosanctity among interstate delegates for the heralds, who sometimes served as messengers to foreign communities.⁷¹ They enjoyed their inviolability by the mere fact of being appointed to the office, and this character was recognizable by the staff, or wand, which all heralds carried as the symbol of their office. The antiquity of the sceptre as a symbol of the authority of kings, councillors, and priests, as well as heralds, is evident in Homer's numerous references to its use (e. g. Iliad I, 14ff., 234ff., VII, 277). An Amphiktyonic decree (FD III. iii (2), 190 vv. 19-20) provides for the giving of the herald's wand to certain honored visitors to Delphi, presumably

as a guarantee of safe conduct on their journey home. Since the men are not officials of the Amphiktyony, their inviolability as heralds followed not from any special status of their own, but simply from their possession of the wand. Diodoros (30. 18. 2) mentions the inviolability of the herald as being among those laws which prevail even in wars which are conducted in a manner offensive to human law and equity, but even this privilege was not always honored, as we learn from Herodotus' account (7. 130) of the cruel treatment of the Persian heralds of Darius by the Athenians and Spartans.⁷²

It has often been assumed that heralds were only employed between states which were at war with one another.⁷³ A more accurate statement might be that they were employed in situations which were potentially hostile and where an agreement or understanding of safe passage did not exist. Heraldry commonly made the initial overtures for treaties between states which might or might not be at war with one another. Presumably because of the possibility of encounter with hostile forces from other cities in Boiotia, Athens used a herald as messenger to its ally, Plataia, after that city had resisted a takeover by Thebes.⁷⁴ Athens also used heralds in dealing with her subject allies, as in the case of the re-assessment of tribute in 425/4 B. C. (IG I² 63, v. 50), and in the publication of the Coinage Decree (IG XII (Suppl.), pp. 215-217, add. No. 480, vv. 31ff.), but both of these measures were coercive and not without hostile overtones. Similarly, Athens employed

a herald in 432/1 B. C. to announce to Eretria a decree (IG I² 49 + SEG 10.49, v. 13) controlling its judicial procedures. Another instance not involving tributary allies nor opponents in war was the Athenian decree of 367 B. C. (GHI 137) directing the Council to select a herald ἕξ Ἀθηναίων ἀπάντων to carry a protest to the Aitolian League and to demand the return of the sacred Spondophoroi arrested during the sacred truce of the Eleusinian Mysteries. In all of these references in Attic diplomacy, the heralds, like the presbeis, were elected either in the Council or the Assembly for the particular mission on which they were sent, and were not therefore civil servants or professionals.⁷⁵ In outward appearance, they would have been indistinguishable from ordinary ambassadors if they had not carried the herald's wand. But more important is the distinction of their missions: they are more messengers than diplomats or negotiators, and are more often employed in situations of actual or potential hostility.

There were many occasions in ancient Greece, as elsewhere, when it was necessary to dispatch messages over considerable distances as quickly as possible. In these instances, when the need was stamina rather than diplomatic experience, the Greeks used professional long-distance couriers whom they called hemerodromoi, "day-runners," or as Livy (31. 24) later explained them "hemerodromos vocant Graeci ingens die uno cursu emetientes spatium."⁷⁶ Inscribed diplomatic decrees tell us little of these functionaries since they were not regularly

engaged in carrying the type of formal document which was sent abroad for publication.⁷⁷ They were probably employed regularly by Greek states in routine postal service and the dispatch of military communiques. But from the brief accounts of the office in the historians and orators we learn of the hemerodromoi in connection with prodigious feats of running such as Pheidippides' run from Athens to Sparta and back just prior to the battle of Marathon.⁷⁸ An hemerodromos of Alexander the Great, Philonides, is known both from the extant dedication which he set up at Olympia (Ol. 277 =GHI 188) and from Pliny's account of his feats.⁷⁹ We know that Alexander employed a staff of men like Philonides who were both runners and "steppers" (bematistai), that is, route-measurers,⁸⁰ but even in Classical times, these specialists must have been professionals in the service of the state. Pheidippides seems to have been in the employ of the Athenian state or its army, and a similar arrangement among the Argives might be inferred from the statement of Herodotus (9. 12) that "they found the best of the hemerodromoi and sent him as keryx into Attica"⁸¹ to warn Mardonios of the movement of the Spartan army prior to the battle of Plataia. We can divide the ambassadors referred to as theoroi, into two main classes, although the Greeks later ignored the distinction in their use of the term. The original and chief theoroi were those sacred ambassadors who travelled in great pomp to observe (as the Greek word implies) and to participate in the various Panhellenic festivals, and to consult the oracles on behalf

of their states. Later, the title, theoroi, was applied in a separate sense to interstate messengers who announced forthcoming festivals, and in the third century, to those who issued notice and invitations to foreign states to participate in newly-created festivals and games; finally the title came to signify any envoy employed on a mission of sacred character. The latter of the two general classes, which are distinguished by Ch. Michel as theores-spectateurs and theores-herauts,⁸² was more closely involved in the kind of interstate communication under discussion. Aside from the religious nature of their dispatches, they acted and were treated as regular envoys, and in some cases the men who fulfilled the same sacred missions were referred to by the common title of presbeis or presbeutai.⁸³ Like the regular ambassadors, and unlike the theores-spectateurs who were generally chosen from illustrious families,⁸⁴ the theores-herauts apparently were appointed on a more democratic basis, to judge by the process on Khios in the mid-third century, where the theoroi are chosen "from all of the Khians," (FD III. iii (2), 215, vv. 26ff.). There are a great many such inscribed provisions for the democratic selection of theoroi to carry the news and invitations concerning various Panhellenic festivals and games.⁸⁵ Two or three men are usually chosen, and either they serve as equals, or one of them is elected architheoros.⁸⁶ Each group of men, with travel allowances granted by the decree which delegated it, covered a number of cities on a given itinerary, carrying

multiple transcripts of the decree proclaiming the festival, and invitations to it, with appropriate headings for the inscriptions which were generally erected in each city at the expense of the decreeing state.⁸⁷

The title of theoroi was not commonly used in the particular cases of those sacred ambassadors who announced throughout Greece the quadrennial festival at Olympia, and the celebration of the Greater Mysteries at Eleusis. These men were nearly always referred to as spondophoroi, a title which denoted their chief function of announcing the sacred truce (σπονδαί) which was in effect during the period of these festivals.⁸⁸ As its etymology suggests, the name spondophoroi (and the use of "spondai" for "truce") was derived from the performance of libations or drink-offering which apparently accompanied the proclamation of the truce. The spondophoroi, as sacred envoys, were considered especially inviolable in the tradition of the Greeks, particularly within the boundaries of states which were party to the truce. An Athenian decree of 367 B. C. (GHI 137) strongly censures the Aitolian League, a signatory to the Eleusinian truce, because one of its member towns, Trikhonion, had arrested the Attic spondophoroi "contrary to the common laws of the Greeks" (vv. 13/14). Plutarch (Quaest. Graec. 59) mentions the case of certain Peloponnesian theoroi who were maltreated by Megarians while on the way to Delphi to consult the oracle. The case was brought before the Amphiktyonic Council on the grounds that the missions of such ambassadors had a sacred character and that

their persons were inviolable. The offenders were convicted of sacrilege, and some were condemned to death and others to banishment. The sacred ambassadors could be identified by the letters of accreditation which they carried, and like the heralds, their inviolable status could be recognized by outward signs of their office such as staves and garlands.⁸⁹ The close association of heralds and the spondophoroi or theores-herauts can be further inferred from a remark of Xenophon (Hell. 4. 7. 3) that the Argives sent out crowned or garlanded heralds to plead a truce in connection with the Nemean games.

The choosing of the spondophoroi at Eleusis and Olympia was a much more exclusive procedure than any known in the case of regular theoroi. The spondophoroi for the Mysteries were always chosen from the priestly clans of the Eumolpidai and Kerykes.⁹⁰ These families were supposedly descended from the mythical Eleusinians, Eumolpos and his son Keryx, but it is likely that the second family gained its name from an ancestral service as sacred heralds or ambassadors connected with the cult at Eleusis from very early times. At Olympia, if we may judge from a series of late inscriptions,⁹¹ the spondophoroi were chosen every four years, in groups of threes, from the sons and nephews of the Olympia priests called theokoloi.

IV. TRAVEL ALLOWANCES AND PER DIEM

All envoys and couriers on official state missions abroad received compensation from the state treasury for travel and living

expense. The process is best attested in Athens, which consistently included details of public finance in its decrees, but to judge from the occasional provisions in non-Attic decrees, the process of financing embassies, like so many other diplomatic procedures, seems to have been fairly consistent throughout the Hellenic states. The listing on Athenian inscriptions of such specific details of ambassadorial finances as the amount, fund, and treasurers involved, appears in the early fourth century, about the same time as detailed orders for the financing of stelai. And like the provisions for publication, those for embassies at this time generally mention the allotments in divisions of tens of drachmas, the Treasurer of the Demos as the disburser, and the ἄργυρον εἰς τὰ κατὰ ψηφίσματα as the fund from which the envoys are paid.⁹²

The commonest word for the travel allowances mentioned in inscriptions is ἐφόδια, with the occasional use of its singular ἐφόδιον, and less frequently πορεία or its plural πορείαι. The peculiar use of ἐφόδιον καὶ πορείαν in IG XII (7), 506, v. 53 suggests the possibility that each of these words denotes a distinct set of expenses. If the compound usage is not simply a tautology, ephodion may refer to the necessary provisions for travel,⁹³ and poreian to the monetary allowances for expenses incurred en route. By way of exception to this terminology, the compensation for the heralds sent by Athens to announce the re-assessment of tribute in 425/4 B. C. is called μισθός (IG I² 63,

vv. 50/51), which suggests that these men may have been professionals hired by the state.

It is difficult to say whether the compensation for couriers and envoys was strictly for travelling expenses, as the terminology implies, or whether it constituted a wage commensurate with the current cost of living. Much of the problem in assessing the real value of the allotments stems from the paucity of information about income and living expenses at different times in the fourth and third centuries.⁹⁴ Further, the many variations and unknown factors among individual provisions for ephodia make it difficult to determine any standard allotment per period of time. But as nearly as they can be calculated, the grants do not depart radically, either way, from a drachma per day, or what might be considered an average wage. Generally the allocations seem to have been on a per diem basis, but the duration of the mission and the amount granted are not always mentioned in the same examples. This situation is understandable when the inscribed provision is looking forward to a mission of undetermined duration. The Athenian ambassadors to the Peloponnese in 266/5 B. C. were granted by the decree prior to their dispatch (IG II² 686, vv. 6ff.), "ephodia from the time they depart, whatever is voted by the Demos," but there is no mention of the number of days or the amount per day. Presumably the amount was set by a separate vote of the Demos which did not warrant recording on the inscription of the decree. Similarly, we find the amount not listed in a

decree of Lampsakos (IG XII (Suppl.) (Thasos) 354, vv. 35-37, where an envoy commissioned to carry a copy of an honorary decree to Thasos is to be given a travelling allowance "for thirty days" by the officers of finance. In other cases, the allocation is decreed after the mission, and the exact amount is listed, supposedly after calculation of the time lapsed and the rate of allowance. Of the Athenian ambassadors returning from their mission of administering the oath of alliance to Euboian cities in 357/6 B. C. (IG II² 124), those to Karystos were given ten drachmas, and those to Khalkis and Eretria, which are about twice as far from Athens as Karystos, received twenty drachmas. The delegates to Hestiaia, which is further yet, also were given twenty drachmas, but their additional journey was possibly covered by boat without an appreciable increase in cost or time. In missions such as these which entailed no indefinite negotiations, the allotments could be calculated from the proportionate distance travelled on land by each group. But more common in Athenian decrees are the provisions which specify the exact amount of the allotment before the ambassadors set out.⁹⁵ Since these disbursements are mentioned in the same decree as the orders for the election and dispatch of the men, it must be assumed that the Assembly or its presiding officers were able to calculate in some instances the duration of the missions, and thereby, the required cost of the embassy, before it set out.

Allowances for travel in all cases had to be ratified by decrees of the Assembly. Even after differences of distance are taken into account, it is to be expected that the allotments varied in their amounts sometimes from other less tangible factors, such as the current state of the economy, the sympathy of the Demos, the difficulty and duration of the mission, and the status of the ambassadors.⁹⁶ Consider, for example, the disparity of two grants of the late-fourth century: In 330/29 B. C., Athens sent a single envoy with an allowance of five drachmas to the island of Heraklea to retrieve the stolen sails of a certain Heraklides of Kypros (IG II² 360, vv. 35ff.). About two decades later, three Athenian envoys were allotted fifty drachmas each to go to Byzantium and request the proclamation of a gold crown and the erection of a bronze statue which had been awarded to a certain Asklepiades of that city (IG II² 555, vv. 29ff.). The difference in the amounts is too great to be dismissed as simply a fluctuation of the economy. The embassy to Byzantium covered a greater distance, but its mission as stated could just as easily have been covered by one man rather than three. On the face of it, the envoy to Heraklea would seem to have had a more difficult task of diplomacy, but even if he had completed it in the quickest possible time, he could not have realized a drachma per day from his small allowance. Certainly the larger allotment and the greater number of envoys to Byzantium may reflect an anticipated diplomatic problem, but this seems less likely in view of the honorary character of the decree.

It seems more reasonable that the size, the subsidy, and probably the prestigious rank of the embassy, together with the opulence of the honors decreed, were designed to impress the kingdom of Byzantium and its influential citizens, whose good will was vital to Athenian shipping through the Hellespont.

If a state summoned a delegation from another state strictly for its own benefit, it probably was expected in most cases to pay the travel expenses and per diem. This procedure seems to have occurred most frequently in the cases of visiting arbitrators or dikasts. For example, a decree of Eresos (IG XII (Suppl.), pp. 45-47, 139C, vv. 102ff.) orders the award of fifty Alexandrian drachmas to each of its visiting dikasts for the return trip to their native city of Miletos. It was extremely rare, however, for a state to award financial compensation to an embassy coming on its own initiative. One such award of poreia was given by Athens to the ambassadors from Samos in 405 B. C. when that island was the only subject state which did not revolt after the Athenian defeat at Aigospotami (IG I² 126 + II² 1 = GHI 96, v. 34).⁹⁷ Athens, whose traditionally oppressive financial policy toward its subjects must have been a prime factor in the general revolt, seems to have reacted to the fidelity of the Samians with a kind of pathetic gratitude of the vanquished, which is apparent not only in the award of poreia but also grants of citizenship which were rare in Athens in the fifth century.

Local Greek governments sometimes avoided the expense of envoys or couriers by sending dispatches abroad via returning foreign envoys when the opportunity arose and it was diplomatic to do so. This utilisation of foreign embassies usually occurred in the cases of superior states answering requests from their inferiors. The situation is seen most frequently in the requests for grants of asylia from the Aitolian League and from the cities of Krete, where the answering decrees of these powerful states were dispatched with the returning embassies of the weaker petitioning states.⁹⁸ States could also avoid employing their own envoys if a document happened to be an especially favorable one such as an honorary decree, but even such cases depended on the not so common circumstance that an appropriate foreigner happened to be in the honoring state and ready to leave at the time the decree was ratified and dispatched. A Delphian proxeny decree honoring the Athenian priestess Khrysis (IG II², 1136) is prefaced by a letter to the Athenian Demos which mentions that the antigraphon has been given to the returning Khrysis to carry to Athens for publication. This procedure was very common in the case of visiting dikasts who were generally honored for their judgements when departing the host state, and carried home the decrees and requests for their publication.⁹⁹

V. THE MOBILITY OF ENVOYS

Much of the success of diplomatic communications among the Greek states depended on a highly developed and generally accepted set of "ground rules" which governed the entry and travel of messengers in the territory of both corresponding states and those which had to be crossed en route. When two nations were on good terms, the security of their envoys was taken for granted, and they entered one another's territory without the intercession of heralds and without special decrees of permission, but with some simple sign of accreditation such as a letter or token of identification. However, when a state of war, or, in some cases, hostile or potentially hostile conditions existed between the corresponding states, the herald with his special inviolability was employed to maintain desired communications between the opposing states, and to introduce any new diplomatic procedures which required the use of regular ambassadors. This difference in the formalities of international correspondence during peace and war is clearly illustrated by Thucydides' comments on the breakdown of the Thirty Years Truce and the outbreak of hostilities between Athens and Sparta just prior to the Peloponnesian War (1. 146):

These were the grounds of complaint and the causes of disagreement on both sides before the war, and they began to appear immediately after the affair of Epidamnos and Kerkyra. Nevertheless, the two parties maintained communication with one another during these recriminations and visited each other without heralds, though not without suspicion; for the events

which were taking place constituted an actual annulment of the treaty and furnished an occasion for war.

And during the war itself (2. 1):

While it [the war] continued, they ceased having communications with one another except through heralds, and when once they were at war, they waged it without intermission.

During war, even though the herald was recognized as inviolable by the common law of the Greeks, and was not to be treated as an enemy under any conditions, his reception within the opposing state, and his appearance before its assembly, were subject to approval by a decree of the people. The deliberations of the Demos usually ensued when an attempt was made to open negotiations for peace, and its decision constituted a judgement of the good faith of the side making the bid. When the Spartan army was already on the way to its first invasion at Attica in the spring of 431 B. C., Arkhidamos, in the hope of averting war, sent Melesippos to make last-minute overtures to the Athenians, but he was not allowed to enter the city, or address the people "for a motion of Perikles had already been carried not to admit herald or embassy after the Lakedaimonians had taken to the field" (Thuc. 2. 12). Melesippos was escorted immediately to the borders of Attica without being allowed to communicate with anyone, and was informed that the Spartans should withdraw their army within their own borders if they wished to send further embassies to Athens. A century later, Aiskhines (2/13) tells of a more favorable case, when before the negotiations with Macedon in 346 B. C., a motion of Philokrates was passed by a unanimous

vote of the people that Philip be allowed to send a herald and ambassadors to treat for peace. By an alternate convention of diplomacy, which is still common in our time, a state, instead of employing its own herald, might make known its wish to begin negotiations with its enemies by using the services of a third state already engaged in diplomatic communications with them. This was the initial procedure used by Philip in contacting Athens before the negotiations of 346, as we learn from a remark of Aiskhines (2. 12):

. . . the ambassadors from Euboia, after they had discussed with our assembly the question of making peace with them, told us that Philip also had asked them to report to you that he wished to come to terms and be at peace with you.

When bids for negotiations were made through heralds or intermediaries, one of the first tasks of the legislatures of both parties was the approval of preliminary terms by which the negotiations could be conducted by the respective embassies. One of the prerequisites was either a general truce or a simple grant of safe conduct for the ambassadors and their retinues. For example, one of the preliminary provisions of the Athenian-Spartan truce of 423 B. C. stated (Thuc. 4. 118):

There shall be a safe conduct both by sea and land for a herald with envoys, and any number of attendants which may be agreed upon, to make arrangements about the termination of the war and about the arbitration of disputed points.

Here, as presumably in most negotiations for the cessation of war, the herald apparently continued to accompany the embassies until the treaty of peace was ratified.

What rights of passage did envoys and diplomatic messengers have in states which lay between their own territory and the state which was their objective? The little evidence which we have for the practice of the Greeks in this regard indicates that customs varied somewhat with locale and circumstances. In wartime, of course, any citizen who entered the territory of a hostile state, even if only in transit to another state, would be treated as an enemy. The passage of an army through any neutral state traditionally depended on the permission of that state, as Athens in 429 B. C. reminded its ally, Perdikkas of Macedonia in regard to the territory of Methone (IG I² 57, vv. 16-23). But anywhere in peacetime, and in neutral territory during time of war, accredited envoys enjoyed the customary security in states through which they passed in the pursuance of their duties. Expiation was demanded of anyone who violated their privilege status, and failure to expiate such an offense was considered a just cause for war. Violators were also liable to legal sanctions insofar as the offended nation or its allies had the power to prosecute them. One body with such power was the Delphic Amphiktyony which, in 117/116 B. C. in a decree honoring the Athenian Artists of Dionysos (IG II² 1134, 32ff. & 43ff.), provided for a fine of 200 staters to be levied on any city, official, or private citizen hindering the priest and envoys appointed to announce the honors throughout the cities of Greece.¹⁰⁰ It was a further privilege of envoys that they themselves were not amenable to any jurisdiction except that of their own state.¹⁰¹

The numerous grants of asphaleia and personal asylia in Greek decrees of honor suggest that interstate travel for general citizens and merchants was sometimes unsafe and unprofitable. But in general the policy among the states for admitting foreigners, and envoys in particular, was one of liberality tempered with various controls. One control which was probably not uncommon was the collection of tolls from foreign travellers and emissaries. The widespread use of these levies is implied in the extant treaty of the Phokians and Boiotians which provides for mutual passage between the two states without toll (IG IX (1), 98, vv. 2/3). An allusion in Aristophanes' Birds (187-193) seems to indicate that the Athenian emissaries to Delphi, despite their status, had to pay phoros for the right to pass through Boiotia, and it may be that in other territories as well embassies were not exempt from tolls. It is difficult to say whether Aristophanes was alluding to a perennial control of the Sacred Way which prevailed in time of peace, or to conditions at the time the Birds was written, that is, during the war. Phokis and Boiotia could effectively have kept Athens from sending embassies to Delphi during the war, but the exclusion was probably not general, and there is good evidence for continuing relations between Athens and Delphi in 431/421 B. C.¹⁰² It may be that some kind of toll or tribute paid to Boiotia and Phokis allowed Athens to send missions to Delphi during the war. Nevertheless, it is improbable that the practice was continual and without problems, and the fact that both of the

first articles of the Spartan-Athenian truces of 423 and 421 B. C. (Thuc. 4. 118. 1; 5. 18. 2) provided for safe passage of all missions to the common sanctuaries indicates that there was trouble, especially in Athenian access to Delphi, for the latter treaty mentions Delphi specifically. Since Boiotia and Phokis refused to ratify these treaties, Sparta could not therefore guarantee access to Delphi, but presumably she intended to exert pressure on her allies to comply with the agreement.¹⁰³ The routine missions to Delphi and specifically the types mentioned in the agreement of 423 B. C. (offering sacrifice, consulting the oracles, and sending theoroi to the festivals) would not have been covered in peace or war by sacred truces such as those which attended the celebrations of the quadrennial festival at Olympia or the Greater Eleusinia, but must have relied on a working agreement between the two states, and the traditional sacrosanctity of the envoys, which would have kept them from harm, but would not necessarily have allowed them passage in every instance.

A truce or safe conduct for ambassadors to carry on negotiations for peace had to be ratified not only by the chief warring parties, but also by at least those allied states through which the negotiators had to pass. We know that envoys were treated with traditional respect and hospitality while they were resident in the host city, but evidence for similar treatment from opposing allied states en route is sparse. One such reception which may have been more than typically hospitable

occurred during the Athenian mission to Sparta in 421 B. C. to negotiate the Peace of Nikias. A certain Athenian, Thrasykles, whom Thucydides (5.19.2) mentions as one of the envoys who administered the oaths to the Lakedaimonians, proposed in the same year decrees of proxeny for Asteas of Alea in Arkadia and Polystratos a Phliasian (IG I² 82 & 83.). Since Arkadia and Phlius, both members of the Peloponnesian alliance, were situated on the route from Athens to Sparta, it seems almost certain, as Koehler first suggested,¹⁰⁴ that the reason for the honors was that the Athenian legates had been hospitable received by these men as they passed through their cities.

In the case of dikasts who visited foreign states to judge private cases or to arbitrate interstate disputes, special care in the form of a bodyguard was often provided by the host state for their protection while resident abroad, and for safe conduct in their travels. The common title for the functionary appointed to conduct judges on their journey was dikastagogos.¹⁰⁵ In the case of international arbitration, Akraiphia sent a dikastagogos to accompany the Larisaian arbiters summoned to settle disputes between itself and neighboring states in Boiotia (IG VII 4130, vv. 9/10). The duties of this man would have included guarding the dikasts en route and insuring their comfort by making arrangements for their accommodations along the way. Sometimes a litigant state appointed one of its own citizens as dikastagogos after it had received the award of the judges, the purpose of such an appointment presumably

being to protect the dikasts against possible maltreatment at the hands of the state which had received the unfavorable judgement.¹⁰⁶

When dikasts were honored by a decree of their host state, the man chosen to convey the decrees to their state for publication sometimes served the added role of dikastagogos, accompanying the honored judges on their homeward journey.¹⁰⁷

VI. PASSPORTS AND VISAS

Although evidence for the use of passports in Greek diplomatic missions and correspondence is somewhat sparse and scattered, it is clear that some system of identification was employed on special occasions during peacetime, and in general during time of war. Devices of different sorts which correspond to the Roman tesserae hospitales were sometimes used by envoys and messengers to establish their identity and right to entry, reception, and hospitality in their host state.¹⁰⁸ For a token of identification the Greeks commonly used the term symbolon, a designation which was more generally applied to any mark or sign of legalization as well as to the devices used as tesserae hospitales (above, pp.104-5). A well known type, but one which cannot definitely be attested in interstate use, was the $\sigma\upsilon\mu\beta\omicron\lambda\omicron\nu\ \tau\epsilon\tau\mu\acute{\eta}\mu\epsilon\nu\omicron\nu$ which consisted of the halves of a jagged-cut piece of terra-cotta which the bearers could match together.¹⁰⁹ But the word symbolon could be used so loosely as to apply to any object which served as a credential,

as for example, the golden cup which Demos the son of Ppyrilampes told Lysias (De bonis Aristophanis 25) he received as a symbolon from the Great King.

The symbolon is usually interpreted as a token of identity or "passport," but it really seems to have two distinct uses, one of which resembles that of a modern passport, the other that of a visa. The symbola which are recognizable as ambassadorial passports or credentials were those created and maintained by two or more states for the purpose of identifying their envoys when they entered one another's territory. The clearest case of the use of specially created symbola for interstate communications is that of the Athenian negotiations with Strato, King of Sidon in 367 B. C. mentioned in IG II² 141,¹¹⁰ and a provision for similar symbola seems to have been ratified by Athens in a decree honoring Orontes of Mysiai about 348 B. C.¹¹¹ It may be significant that these uses of symbola as ambassadorial credentials, as well as the cup of the Persian King given to Demos, involved cases of Athenian relations with non-Hellenic monarchies. The use of symbola for the delivery of tribute to Athens as provided by the Kleinias Decree is rather exceptional,¹¹² and it may well be that, for the reception of Hellenic ambassadors, the letter of accreditation with the state seal served the same function as the symbolon;¹¹³ but in the less frequent relations with non-Greeks, who were alien to the mutual amity and constitutions of the Greek-speaking peoples, a predetermined set of tokens

would have averted suspicion and red tape in attesting the authorization of diplomatic envoys.

When the symbolon involved no mutual exchange of tokens, but was issued by an individual state not only to envoys but all entering foreigners, and its possession was required during their residence in the host state, it had a closer resemblance to the modern visa; this system however, may have been employed only in time of war. Such a use of the symbolon as a visa of entry or residence is not attested in historical sources, but it is strongly suggested by Aristophanes in his Birds (1211-1215), where Iris, the messenger of the gods, is confronted after her illegal entry into the newly established city of Nephelokokkygia:

PISTHETAIROS. Alright, you bloody wench. . . by which gate did you get in here?

IRIS. By Zeus, what would I know about gates!

P. Did you get that? She's playing dumb! Did you apply to the captain of the jackdaws? No? Do you have a sphragis from the storks?

I. What is this?

P. You didn't get one?

I. Are you sure you're okay?

P. You mean to tell me no bird-magistrate put his symbolon on you?

While the comical allusion cannot be pressed too far, some information about the handling of aliens might be gained from what is apparently a satire on Athenian process. The passage suggests that foreigners were

required to register upon entering the city gates and to receive some sort of stamped certificate from the sentries and a visa from the local magistrates. Because of the infrequent distinction of the two terms, it is difficult to say whether the mention of both sphragis and symbolon is simply a poetic tautology, or whether Aristophanes is alluding to separate practices. Although a sphragis might in some cases have been brought from abroad as a token of identification,¹¹⁴ here it is administered by the host state. This use of the sphragis may refer to something like the stamp of a customs guard, affixed to a clay token or piece of papyrus which the resident alien would have to present upon demand, or attached to his goods as a certificate of clearance. Earlier in the same play, Aristophanes jokes about a similar "application" of the sphragis to foreigners (Birds 558-560):

. . . καὶ τοῖσι θεοῖσιν ἀπειπεῖν διὰ τῆς χώρας τῆς
 ὑμετέρας ἐστυκόσι μὴ διαφοιτᾶν, ὥσπερ πρότερον
 μοιχεύσοντες τὰς Ἀλκμήνας κατέβαινον καὶ τὰς
 Ἀλόπας καὶ τὰς Σεμέλας. ἦνπερ δ' ἐπίωσ', ἐπιβάλλειν
 σφραγῖδ' αὐτοῖς ἐπὶ τὴν ψωλήν, ἵνα μὴ βινῶσ' ἔτ'
 ἐκεῖνας.

Here the allusion may be to the kind of seal which closed goods so that they could not be opened, or perhaps to a mark of identification, such as the brand of a slave, which would render the foreigner incapable of disguising himself. The reference to the symbolon in Aristophanes' episode involving Iris suggests a practice of applying to a magistrate for a visa after entering the city. The uncertainty of the relationship of this symbolon to the sphragis in the same passage is further

compounded by the poet's use of the verb ἐπιβάλλειν to describe its application, a verb which is more commonly used of the "affixing" of a sphragis, as, for example, in the other passage from the Birds quoted above.¹¹⁵ If the verb is significant, the process was probably one of affixing the impression of a seal, here termed a symbolon, to some token given to the foreign visitor. In any case, the legal implications of being caught without these symbola are extended in Pisthetairos' later remark (vv.1222-1223) that Iris is liable to be arrested and put to death. This penalty, which would be assessed for illegal entry only during war, is in perfect context here, since the founders of Nephelokokkygia have declared war on gods and men. One is reminded of the strengthening of the sentry posts at Athens in 405 B. C. just after the disaster at Aigospotami, probably a move to control the entrance of dangerous persons through the city gates.¹¹⁶ In conclusion, it seems likely that passports or visas were required of all foreign visitors to a Greek city only when that city was engaged in war,¹¹⁷ but were issued regularly to messengers and envoys in order to facilitate their meetings with local magistrates and legislators.

VII. THE RECEPTION AND ENTERTAINMENT OF EMBASSIES

The independent states and confederacies of Greece followed essentially similar procedures in officially receiving and extending hospitality to foreign envoys. When a newly arrived embassy wished to bring business before the assembly or chief legislative body it would

first notify certain local magistrates who would grant them a preliminary audience and, upon approving the request for a public hearing, convoke the assembly of citizens or other appropriate lawmaking body. In Sparta, visiting emissaries were obliged to report their arrival to the Ephors,¹¹⁸ while at Athens in the fourth century, they were first received before the Proedroi who gave them a preliminary hearing and accepted their dispatches. In their role as presidents of the Assembly, the Proedroi then probably introduced them to the Assembly during one of the two of four meetings each prytany which were required by law to include three audiences for heralds and envoys.¹¹⁹ Honorific decrees occasionally bestowed on ambassadors and other distinguished foreigners the privilege of front seats (προεδρία) in the public Assembly, and the right of first access (πρόσδοσις) to the Assembly after the customary sacrifices. An early example of the latter honor is found about 427/6 B. C. in an Athenian decree honoring Apollophanes of Kolophon (IG I² 59, vv. 17ff.):

. . . and (it is further decreed that) he is to have access to the Prytaneis, and the Council, and the Demos, first after the sacrifices, whenever he is in need of anything.

Presumably the ambassadors who had this privilege would be able to avoid the usual red tape involved in formal application for an audience with the Council or Assembly.

A great number of decrees signifying the completion of favorable diplomatic dealings include provisions inviting the visiting ambassadors

to public hospitality (ξένια). It is clear that xenia in most of these formulas refers only to a state dinner, for, when the honor is given to local citizens, the term δεῖπνον is invariably found in precisely the same context. That the different terms distinguish the recipients as citizens or foreigners is especially evident from the instances where both words are used in the same provision. For example, in IG II² 102, vv. 13ff. there is a single formula for the invitation of visiting Macedonian envoys to xenia and the Athenian embassy returning from Macedon to deipnon. The Athenian decree (IG II² 226, vv. 28ff.) honoring Arybbas the Molossian with citizenship invites him to deipnon, but his suite to xenia. Similarly, in IG II² 1. v. 37, Eumakhos, the leader of the Samian embassy, having become under the terms of the decree a citizen of Athens, is invited to deipnon rather than xenia.

Foreign envoys were customarily entertained in the syssition or public dining hall where the local magistrates and heroes were maintained at public expense. The relevant Athenian decrees always specify that the visitors honored with xenia are invited to the Prytaneion, one of the three local syssitia.¹²⁰ The city of Koresos on Keos likewise had a syssition called the Prytaneion, where, according to IG II² 1128, the Athenian ambassadors were invited to xenia. In non-Attic decrees, however, the more common, but less explicit, expression to describe the place of entertainment is "at the common hearth." For example, the Lakonian decree, IG V (1) 4, vv. 22/23, provides that the Hierothytai

are to invite a foreign guest to hospitality ἐπὶ τῶν κοινῶν ἐστῆων.

In the Elean decree (Ol. 52, vv. 25-27) granting the Messenians topos at Olympia for the publication of their arbitral victory over the Lakadaimonians, the Treasurer is ordered to give the visitors xenia and to invite them and the Archons ἐπὶ τὰς κοινῶν ἐστῆων.¹²¹ Such expressions must refer to the usual and logical presence of the ancestral hearth in the public place of hospitality, that is, the sysstition. With no special reference to Athens, Pollux (IX, 40) specifies that the Prytaneion is associated with the hearth, beside which meals were provided for those who came on official embassies. As for the Athenian Prytaneion specifically, there is considerable testimony that it contained a hearth where a perpetual fire was kept burning.¹²² This hearth as a place of hospitality is undoubtedly to be associated with the cult of Hestia whose statue Pausanias (1. 18) observed in the Prytaneion of Athens. A similar association of the public hearth with a sysstition of the same name is attested at Akraiphia in Boiotia where a decree found near the Ptoön (IG VII, 4130) invites Larisaian dikasts to hospitality "in the Prytaneion at the common hearth."

The expenditure of public moneys for entertainment and hospitality extended to honored foreigners was apparently controlled by local statute at Athens and elsewhere in Greece. In fourth-century Athens these expenditures, like those for publication and travel allowances, could be ordered by the Demos, but the allocations were somehow controlled by

nomoi, probably those of the code revised by the restored democracy in 403 B. C. Such legal control of expenses for hospitality is [suggested] by the exceptional provision of an Athenian decree of 344 B. C. (IG II² 222, vv. 35ff.) honoring Peisitheides of Delos with an allowance of one drachma per day until his return to Delos. Apparently the amount, duration, or nature of this grant was beyond the statutory limit of the psephismatic fund (ἄργυρον εἰς τὰ κατὰ ψηφίσματα. . .),¹²³ for the decree further orders the Proedroi and the Chairman of the Nomothetai to pass an additional law (προσνομοθετήσαι)¹²⁴ requiring the Apodektaï to allocate the required money annually to the Treasurer of the Demos, who is to pay Peisitheides each prytany. The sanction of a fine of a thousand drachmas is then decreed for the Proedroi and the Chairman of the Nomothetai if they fail to pass the law. It seems that it was necessary for the Demos to order this additional statute in order to avoid breaking the existing laws controlling the allocation of per diem. Similar legal control of grants for hospitality is attested at Olympia, where in the mid-second century the Messenian envoys who brought their arbitral award for publication were honored with the "greatest xenia allowable by law" (Ol. 52, vv. 25-27), and at Mytilene on Lesbos, where about 199 B. C. envoys from Magnesia were decreed "as much ephestion and xenia as is extended by law to the Theoroi announcing the Pythia" (IG XII (Suppl.) 38, vv. 31ff.). From this last case it is not necessarily to be inferred that there were legal controls of the xenia extended to other embassies besides that announcing the Pythia.

The common formula that envoys be invited to xenia "on the morrow" indicates that in most cases the hospitality was a rather pro forma offering of a single dinner in the local syssition. During the rest of their stay, the visitors' room and board would have been covered by their own expense accounts or perhaps in some cases by their proxenos. There were, however, exceptional occasions when the host state took upon itself the full burden of hospitality. For example, arbitrators in interstate disputes not only travelled at the expense of the litigant states, but understandably enjoyed exceptional hospitality during the course of their investigations. They were provided with lodging at public expense, and in some cases, special Xenodokoi were appointed to entertain them. Excavations at Sparta have yielded a roof tile inscribed in letters of the second century which indicates at least in that city that a public building was especially provided for the lodging of visiting Roman officials and judges from other states.¹²⁵ Like the visiting arbitral boards, the sacred embassies which announced the celebration of religious festivals were also received and lodged in some states by special public hosts called Theorodokoi.¹²⁶ The sacred embassy from Magnesia to Mytilene just mentioned, with its grant of hospitality equal to that of the Pythian Theoroi, obviously enjoyed more generous accommodations than the mere gift of meals; the unusual combination of the terms ephestion and xenia, if they are not simply redundant, should perhaps be interpreted as a reference to "room and board."

Ambassadors were sometimes rewarded for good service to their host with the privileged status of proxenos or benefactor, or more tangible honors such as statues or valuable crowns. Although these honors were bestowed in most cases on such exceptional visitors as theoroi, dikasts, or plenipotentiary negotiators, they were sometimes extended even to those whose duties seem to have been little more than delivering messages and making proclamations.¹²⁷ In all such cases of foreign benefaction, the recipient had to be aware of situations which might amount to bribery or be so construed by his fellow citizens. Quintilian (Inst. Orat. 7. 4. 36) mentions that a common question in the frequent prosecutions related to Greek embassies was whether it was permissible for envoys to act contrary to their instructions after the delivery of their message, which in many cases constituted the completion of the mission. Clearly, the acceptance of honors by envoys on friendly missions to friendly states must have been looked on with much less objection than those bestowed on men engaged in serious negotiations with hostile powers. It is noteworthy that most of the cases of prosecution of Greek ambassadors for bribery involved missions to non-Hellenic states, particularly Macedonia and Persia.¹²⁸ Besides chronic hostility toward these kingdoms, a further factor in the disproportionate prosecution of Greek embassies to them was the presumed lack of scruple of non-Hellenic states in attempting to woo envoys with bribes and luxuriant treatment, and the consequent

suspicion with which the Greeks scrutinized their embassies to Barbarian cities.¹²⁹ Conversely, the Greeks probably tended to consider most of the giving and receiving of honors by embassies among their own states not as suspicious behavior, but as part of the common Hellenic custom of hospitality.

CONCLUSION

The division of Greece into many independent states created great demands in the area of diplomacy which were met by the early development of an elaborate but effective process of interstate communication. Even in the fifth century when the first brief provisions for the staffing, financing, and outfitting of diplomatic missions appear in inscriptions on stone and bronze, it is evident that many of the details of this process are already highly developed. The use of heralds, civil and sacred ambassadors, and the manner of their choice, the payment of travel allowances, the bestowal of diplomatic hospitality, and the use of state seals to certify and enclose interstate documents are all attested in official documents of the fifth century, and some of them must go back to the early stages of writing and beyond. Another striking disclosure of the study of provisions in diplomatic inscriptions, and further evidence of a long tradition of development, is the uniformity of procedures of communication among the Greek states. Like the form of the diplomatic decrees and the manner of their publication, the sending of transcripts, the use of various types of couriers and envoys, and much

of the terminology describing these procedures became highly standardized throughout Greece. By the fourth century most interstate communication was already so systematized that there was little subsequent change in procedures, although a general increase in their use and the detail with which they are spelled out in the inscriptions.

It was this uniformity and refinement of diplomacy among the numerous Greek states which allowed a system of communication which was adaptable to conditions of hostility as well as peace. By contrast, some of the methods employed in communications with non-Greek nations such as Macedon and Persia, and the frequent recriminations which followed some of these missions, reflect a prevailing approach of caution and presumed hostility. It becomes apparent from the study of Greek diplomatic documents that both the need and realization of such an elaborate and effective system of interstate correspondence was uniquely possible in the Hellenic world with its many independent and democratic states existing in close proximity to one another and sharing a common heritage of language, religion, and customs.

CHAPTER III

INTERSTATE PUBLICATION OF DIPLOMATIC DOCUMENTS

The practice of Greek states in setting up records of their own diplomatic enactments in foreign territory involved more complicated procedures than those entailed in local publication. When envoys arrived in a foreign state where they were commissioned to publish their dispatches, it was necessary for them to receive legal authorization for publication from the local assembly or magistrates and to secure the grant of a site on which to erect the stele. After these official hurdles were surmounted, there were the further practical problems of having the text properly engraved and erected by native craftsmen. Most such cases of interstate publication involved individual states publishing copies of their decrees in other interested states, but there are other instances of one party or another erecting a stele at a neutral site, or providing further publication at one or more of the major Panhellenic shrines. The types of documents which comprise the bulk of foreign publications are those decrees which were enacted unilaterally and then dispatched to a foreign site, mainly honorary decrees (chiefly proxenies) and grants of asylia. Except for additional publications at such sanctuaries as Olympia and Delphi, these interstate documents do not include treaties and arbitral awards, since the participants in those proceedings customarily published their own drafts rather than exchanging copies.

It should be emphasized at the outset that the documents published abroad on stone and bronze were only a fraction of the diplomatic material

which passed between Greek states, most of which was destined only for deposit in the archives. If governments were discriminating in the local publication of their own diplomatic decrees,¹ they were even more selective in sponsoring and financing expensive copies abroad or allowing the publication of imported documents on their own property. The epigraphical evidence from any of the larger Greek cities will verify this assertion. In Athens, for example, more than 200 inscriptions of local decrees dealing with foreign states have been uncovered, but there are very few copies of foreign decrees.² The infrequency with which Athens subsidized publications abroad is indicated by the dearth of provisions for such publications in its own diplomatic inscriptions. Twenty-five of the ninety-eight decrees listed in Appendix A (below, pp. ff) are too fragmentary for consideration, but, of the remaining seventy-three, only seventeen have provisions for publication outside Athens. Eleven of these have provisions for the financing of the foreign stelai, with the recipient states being charged for nine of them, and Athens for only two.³ This local partiality in diplomatic publications is especially apparent in the realm of honorary decrees. Of the fifty-two Attic decrees of proxeny and other honors cited in Appendix A (below, pp. 257 ff.), only five have provisions for publication abroad, with Athens paying only for two, and these in the third and second centuries. It will be noticed that most of the inscriptions cited in the following discussion date from the Hellenistic period. This chronological disposition of the interstate documents

reflects an increased emphasis and spending by Hellenistic states in the publication of diplomatic business, particularly decrees of honors, grants of asylia, and arbitral awards, at the same time that a reduced economy was limiting the records of internal affairs more and more to the archives.⁴

I. THE LEGAL APPROVAL OF ALIEN DOCUMENTS

By virtue of the independent character of Greek states and confederacies, the legal procedures necessary to secure the publication of a document at a foreign site were not as simple as the procedures for publication in one's own state. As shown above in Chapter I, the ratification of an act by a local assembly, and, the question of its publication in a local precinct, were generally handled at the same time. However, for a publication abroad, the process was complicated not only by the distance, but also by the separate jurisdiction of the recipient state. State A, or some interested party had to transmit a copy of the document to state B and negotiate with its legislature or accredited magistrates for permission to publish and for a site for the inscription. These negotiations might be conducted in writing by courier-dispatched letters, or verbally by special envoys, for whom brief instructions were often included in the text of A's decree. It appears from the surviving evidence that a formal decree of B was required in answer to the request of A. When the requests were approved, the decree of permission of the recipient state was usually filed in the local archives, but on occasion it was

engraved on the same stele with the imported document of state A.⁵ Presumably a denial of permission to publish in the foreign territory would consist simply of a non-ratification of the motion for publication, and would be communicated verbally or in writing to the visiting envoys, but since there was no reason to record such negative decisions on stone, there can be no certainty about the frequency of such exclusions.

The jurisdiction of any independent state over the publication of the documents which it received from abroad rested on two legal premises: First, the placing of an inscription in a foreign city generally entailed the occupation of state-owned property (this point is discussed separately below, pp. 158-168). Secondly, in the states of ancient Greece, as in many modern nations, the regularly accepted freedoms of speech and publication in regard to legal resolutions were usually limited to the local citizens and privileged resident-alien; it was an international understanding that any independent state had the a priori right arbitrarily to allow or deny the promulgation of any foreign enactments within its own territory. Although the types of amicable decrees generally sent abroad for publication were welcome propaganda rather than risks to local security, nevertheless, their formal clearance by the recipient state was not merely an act of diplomacy, but a legal requirement. The frequently inscribed requests and grants of pieces of public land for stelai must in many cases have presupposed the broader question of permission to publish. Yet the legal approval of foreign publication transcended the

mere securing of a location for the stele, as is shown by the provisions of many inscriptions which ask only for the publication of a document, leaving the selection of a site to the host state, or to separate negotiations.⁶ A decree of Allaris in Krete honoring the Parians for their grant of asylia clearly implies that the legal approval by the recipient state of the substance of the imported document was a prerequisite to publication (IC II, i, 2B, vv. 19/20):

. . . If these things should be subscribed to by the Demos of the Parians, let each city engrave and erect a stone stele, the Parians in the sanctuary of Demeter, and the Allarians in the sanctuary of Apollo.

The conditional formula, ἐὰν δὲ συνδοκεῖ ταῦτα τῶι δῆμῳι τῶι Παριῶν, is not mere protocol on the part of the Allarians, but must refer to a legislative approval of the decree prior to its publication at Paros. Similarly, a decree of the Methymnians of Lesbos (IG XII (Suppl.) 139 (B), vv. 50ff.) requests "the reception of the matters of the decree" as well as their publication by the Milesians. A final argument for the necessity of the formal approval of the promulgation of an imported document as something distinct, although not necessarily separate, from the question of its occupying state property, may be drawn from the cases of decrees which request permission for their proclamation in foreign states.⁷ Whether or not some of these documents were also published abroad, there is always a separate request for permission to proclaim the document aloud at a public gathering, indicating that all foreign promulgations, regardless of their form, were subject to the legal censorship of the host state.

Some departures from the exercise of jurisdiction by local governments over foreign publications occurred when the two states involved were not completely independent. One of the most frequent variations in this aspect of interstate publication was the practice of more powerful states in forcibly publishing their decrees in states which they controlled or strongly influenced. The treatment by Athens of her subject allies in the Delian and Maritime Confederacies is particularly notable. In its decree settling the affairs of Khalkis in 446/5 B. C. (IG I² 39), Athens directed the Council of Khalkis to inscribe and set up a copy in its own sanctuary of Zeus Olympios, and to pay for it as well as the stele in Athens. Although the imperative phrasing of this provision for publication does not differ from that found in many interstate documents among independent states, the domineering tone of the decree, and the one-sided burden of payment suggest that it was a coercive publication. But there are other cases in which Athens departed from the common formula for publication and left no doubt that she was forcing her decrees upon the recipient states. In the fifth-century Coinage Decree,⁸ Athens directs her tributary states to set up their own copies of the law, with the provision that if they refuse, she will erect the stelai herself. In 363/2 B. C., after putting down the revolt of Iulis against the Maritime Confederacy, Athens ordered the Kean city to set up a permanent copy of her decree.⁹ This practice of coercive foreign publications was also common among the Hellenistic monarchies which

often so strongly influenced states that they were only ostensibly independent. In one case at the end of the third century, Philip V of Macedon recommended that certain decrees be ratified and published by Larisa concerning the granting of Thessalian citizenship to other Greeks. The commanded decree was ratified and first published below the letter of Philip, but was later expunged by dissident citizens. This act elicited a second set of documents which have survived (IG IX (2) 517), including another letter of Philip strongly censuring those responsible, and a second decree of Larisa ordering the republication of the original documents along with the additional letter and decree.¹⁰

As we have seen above, the most common occurrences of interstate publication were those in which state A sought publication of its own documents in state B, which then authorized or denied these requests. But conversely, there were less usual circumstances when state A exercised a jurisdiction over its own documents when a foreign state wished to publish them in its own territory. Such occurrences were most common among the weaker states of the Aegean during the third and second centuries when they secured decrees of asylia from the privateering cities of Krete and Aitolia. In these circumstances the recipient states actively sought enactment of the decrees through their own ambassadors, and if successful, obtained transcripts for publication in their own sanctuaries at their own expense.¹¹ In such privileged grants from more powerful to weaker states, the provisions for publication in the weaker

states, as they are stated within the decrees, constitute a permit to publish rather than a direction or request by the decreeing state. The unusual situation of one state formally requesting permission to publish another's decree lies at the root of IC I, viii, 6, an inscribed decree of Knossos found at Miletos. Included on the stele is a statement by Knossos, in response to a Milesian embassy, permitting the Milesians to publish the decree, concerning the legality of slave-trading, in their own sanctuary of Apollo, because a fire in the temple at Knossos had destroyed the copy there. The object of the Milesian publication was presumably to insure continued attention and adherence to the decree in lieu of its publication in Krete. This unusual example shows that the decreeing state exercised some control of the right to publication of its own enactments, and, if another interested party wished to publish these, it was a matter of diplomacy, if not law, that it make a formal request of the decreeing state.

II. THE REQUEST AND GRANT OF TOPOS

In the discussion of the local publication of diplomatic documents (above, pp. 6-8, 54-56), it was emphasized that only the local government, as owner of its public sanctuaries, could dispose of the property within them for the placement of stelai, statues, or other monuments. If this strict control of public property applied to the publication of local documents, a fortiori it was exercised in the cases of documents imported from other states for publication. If state A wished to erect a

stele in the territory of B, it had to secure from the assembly or accredited magistrates of B the grant of a specific topos, or site.¹² This process of securing a piece of property in a foreign sanctuary is known chiefly from two sources: 1) The decrees of A containing expressions of its wishes for publication, addressed either to its envoys or to the Demos or magistrates of B; 2) Decrees of B either expressly granting the requests of A, or otherwise alluding to the negotiations with A.

A common formula providing for foreign publication, particularly in the earlier less detailed inscriptions, is the simple direction that the magistrates or envoys of A are 'to inscribe and set up the stele in B,' or, 'in B, in the hieron of such and such a god.'¹³ In the dealings between independent states, such imperative expressions cannot be taken at face value, for the decreeing state had no right to dispose of property in the state where publication was intended. These formulas must be understood as instructions of state A either to its magistrates or its envoys, to convey a copy of the document to state B, request permission to publish it there, and negotiate a site for the stele. That this is the proper interpretation of these provisions seems to be proved by the other cases in which the instructions appear in the same imperative form, but are followed by the further order that the envoys are to make a formal request of the recipient state for a grant of topos.¹⁴ A good example of such a compound formula is found in the second of two third-century Kimolian decrees inscribed together at Geraistos in Euboea, and

honoring Kharianthos of Karystos for his work as a dikast (Hesperia 37 (1968) 189-191. vv. 37-49):¹⁵

. . . and [it is resolved] to inscribe this decree on a stone stele, both in Kimolos, in the sanctuary of Athena, where he rendered his judgements and reconciled others, and at Geraistos, in the inviolable sanctuary of Poseidon Geraistios, and the archons, Arkhidamos, Damophanes, and Xenarkhidias are to take care of the setting up of a stele with inscription in Kimolos, and the ambassador chosen by the people — who is to accompany Kharianthos — is to take care of the setting up of a stele with inscription at Geraistos; further, the Treasurers, Ktasikleidas, Timophilos, and Ariston, are to defray the expense of these things. The ambassador is to request of the Council and the Demos of the Karystians a place in the inviolable sanctuary of Poseidon Geraistios where it may be set up.

If the imperative forms in these decrees were "shortened forms of requests" to the recipient states rather than directives to local officials and envoys, then the added instructions for making the request for publication would certainly be redundant, but it seems very unlikely that Tarn's interpretation is correct. Although these instructions addressed to the officials and envoys of A may include a reference to the formal request to be made to B, the instructions themselves are not the requests.

The formal request of topos was generally made verbally by the envoys of the decreeing state before the Council and Assembly of the host state. But the reference to the envoys and provisions for the request, while instructive, was not an essential component of the decree which was sent abroad for publication. Whether these instructions were mentioned only briefly or excluded altogether, the formal request of a grant of property must have taken place. As strict as Athens must have

been about permitting foreign publications in its sanctuaries, not a single one of the foreign inscriptions found there,¹⁶ specifically mentions a request for permission to publish.¹⁷ A decree of Mylasa (I. Delphinion, 146) gives detailed instructions to its envoys to publish a copy at Miletos, but makes no mention of a request for a site for the stele. A decree of Kalymna dispatched to Iasos (Michel 417) does not even mention envoys or the erection of a stele at Iasos, but the inscribed reply of Iasos (Michel 462) shows that Kalymnian envoys in fact went to Iasos and requested "the most conspicuous spot" for their stele. Similarly, a decree addressed to Syros by an unknown city (IG XI (4) 1057) was published on Delos, yet the negotiations required to secure this place of publication are not mentioned in the text. These cases show that provisions for embassies and their negotiation for topos abroad were not inalienable parts of the inscribed texts, but that these instructions and negotiations could be done verbally or in separate written form.¹⁸

In some cases of interstate publication, state A did not even employ an embassy, but dispatched its request for publication and the grant of a site in a letter. This practice is known from the occasional references to these letters in published text such as IG VII 4131, a mid-second century decree of Akraiphia honoring Larisa and its dikasts (vv. 23ff.):

. . . The Polemarchs and the Polis are also to write to the city of the Larisaians with the notion that it is fitting for that city to inscribe the decree and erect it in the sanctuary of Apollo Ptoös.

A similar allusion in a separate letter to a request for publication is found in a decree of Gonnoi in honor of dikasts from Monda ('Εφ. 'Αρχ., 1914, p. 180, No. 240):¹⁹

[It is further decreed] to write by letter to the Tagoi and the city of the Mondaians, so that, accordingly, the proxeny might also be inscribed among them on a marble pillar, and set up in the sanctuary of Themis.

In these cases, the letters and the antigrapha of the decrees were probably delivered to the recipient states by their returning dikasts, but such dispatches could also have been made by couriers of the decreeing state who would not have the responsibility for negotiations usually delegated to special envoys.

When interstate documents refer to the publication at a foreign site without the mention of a specific location for the stele, it must be assumed either that the request for a specific site was conveyed verbally, or that the choice of a site was left to the discretion of the legislators or magistrates of the recipient state. The possibility of the latter procedure in many of these cases is suggested by a number of other foreign inscriptions which state explicitly that their exact location was left up to the native authorities. For example, a Parian decree found at Eresos on Lesbos, which honors the Eresians for their service as dikasts, instructs the Parian officials (IG XII (Suppl.) 121 (I), vv. 12 ff.):

. . . to request the Eresians that the articles of the decree be inscribed by the Demos [of the Eresians] on a stele, and set up among them in the place indicated by the Demos.

Similarly, a second-century dikast decree of Peparethos found on Andros (IG XII (Suppl.) 258) instructs the Strategoi of Peparethos to send the decree to Andros sealed with the state seal (vv. 19/20) "so that the decree may also be inscribed among the Andrians on a marble stele and set up wherever it should suit them."²⁰

Often the directions of the decreeing state to its embassy mention, with varying degrees of exactness, a location desired for the stele at the foreign site. Perhaps the least exact of these formulas, one which leaves the final choice of the site to the recipient state but at the same time suggests a plea for a preferred location, is the type which mentions "the most conspicuous location" (τὸν ἐπιφανέστατον τόπον) or some such specification. One of the many examples of this type of provision is found in a second-century Theran decree honoring certain Knidians (IG XII (3) 322), where Thera directs her envoys to request the Knidians to proclaim the honors and (vv. 11ff.):²¹

to point out the most suitable and conspicuous place in which the honors given by the Therans to Androthemis . . . might be set up.

Tarn asserted that such expressions as τὸν ἐπιφανέστατον τόπον, which he would interpret as "please do your best for us." leave it in the hands of the recipient state exactly where to put the stele.²² But again it must be kept in mind that the imperative provisions in which these expressions occur are addressed to the officials or envoys of the state which is issuing the decree, and that they speak of, or imply, "requests," never "demands," of the recipient state. By a general expressions such

as τὸν ἐπιφανέστατον τόπον, the decreeing state is in effect directing its envoys to go to the foreign state and 'request the best possible site', which might well involve the request of an exact spot once the envoys had reached their destination. But in any case the final decision to grant any request was the understood legal prerogative of the host state. Thus it is difficult to see how the decreeing state's asking for a specific location would constitute a breach of interstate diplomacy.²³

Tarn has further argued that if A, instead of leaving the choice to B, asked for a specific site for its stele, B might have been gravely embarrassed because of its laws regulating the erection and position of stelai, and that the courtesies of interstate relations forbade this embarrassment.²⁴ Tarn's argument turns upon his expression, "a particular site," which he takes to refer only to an exact position within a precinct, as, for example, "beside the statue of so and so." But this definition is too narrow. The naming of a particular sanctuary must also be accepted as constituting a reference to a "particular site," since the laws governing publication on state property pertained to the public precincts in their entirety as well as to any specific locations within them.²⁵ Yet there are many cases in which the decreeing state directs its representatives to request publication within a certain sanctuary, usually the chief precinct of the foreign city.²⁶ If it had been a breach of diplomatic courtesy to request the right to publish a document on a particular spot within a precinct, it would have been

equally undiplomatic to specify the sanctuary itself. But this line of argument is secondary to the important realization — which seems to have eluded Tarn — that the "request" for a topos, whether specific or general, was a courteous and diplomatic act in itself.

There is further evidence that interstate publications could be requested at a particular site, in the parallel procedures of local publication, in which the decreeing state often bowed to the request of citizen and foreigner alike for a specific topos within its territory. Tarn insisted that this was only possible in the internal affairs of a state, and that the examples of this procedure "involve no questions as between different cities."²⁷ Since, as Tarn himself shows,²⁸ the formal request for a site was demanded by state ownership of the public precincts, there must have been no fundamental difference between the process of acquiring topos locally and acquiring it in a foreign city. Although the negotiation of foreign publication was complicated by the distance involved and perhaps the greater selectivity by the host state in regard to alien documents, the legal process of requesting a site was essentially the same for foreign and local publications. This lack of difference can be demonstrated by two inscriptions from Aigiale on Amorgos honoring the same man, and other cases of local publication of diplomatic documents. The first inscription from Aigiale, IG XII (7) 388, a decree of the neighboring city of Minoa honoring Kritolaos of Aigiale, provides that (vv. 29ff.):

. . . envoys be chosen who, going to Aigiale, will hand over the decree to the Polis and ask the Aigialeans, since

they are friendly and well-disposed, to inscribe this decree on a marble stele in their city, and set it up wherever Kritolaos should choose.

Tarn explains this presumed privilege of Kritolaos in choosing a spot for the foreign inscription as "only a further compliment to a leading man, who may in any case have been one of the magistrates of Aigiale to whom the choice would normally be entrusted; it has no bearing on the question of interstate courtesy."²⁹ Here Tarn argues in circular fashion, for he first infers from the fact that Kritolaos might choose his own site that he may have been a magistrate, and then supposes from the inference that this case was exceptional. Tarn's conclusion that "This is only a further compliment to a leading man" indicates that he views Kritolaos' privilege at Amorgos as a fait accompli, although in fact we are dealing only with the request of Minoa which we cannot be sure was even granted. If Kritolaos "normally" had the right to choose the location of stelai at Aigiale, there would have been no need of a special embassy from Minoa to request this privilege. This case, which in effect involves the request for a specific site, is apparently not exceptional, and does bear on the question of interstate courtesy. But again it is difficult to see how a request to the Aigialeans as "friendly and well-disposed" people, is in any way a discourteous or undiplomatic act, since it does not at all presume to infringe on the legal prerogatives of the host state. Nor does the second inscription involving Kritolaos (IG XII (7) 389) show that he had a standing right to choose sites for publications at Aigiale, or that the procedures for granting topos for

publication of internal affairs were essentially different from those for interstate publications. This decree of Aigiale honoring Kritolaos and his brother Parmenion for building a temple, provides that they may set up stele (vv. 39ff.) "on whichever of the public sites they choose." If the choice of a specific site were a normal prerogative of these men either as magistrates or local citizens, there certainly would have been no need of a special provision in the decree granting them this right. Although there is no indication in this case that the honored men made a request for the privilege granted them, there are similar cases which show that an interested party, whether local or foreign, might come before the local assembly with a request for a definite site for a stele. In the late-third century, Athens had decreed that a statue and inscription honoring Eumaridas of Kydonia in Krete be erected on the Acropolis, but the surviving inscription (IG II² 844) shows that Eumaridas, apparently dissatisfied with the site, succeeded by the intervention of the Athenians, Eurykleides and Mikion, in having a decree passed changing the site to one in the temenos of Demos and the Graces (v42): καθάπερ αἰτοῦνται αὐτῷ Εὐρυκλείδης καὶ Μικίων. Similarly, the provision of a decree from Kalymnos (GDI 3569), αὐτῷ τῶν τόπων τὸν ποτὶ τῷ θεάτρῳ ὄν αἰτεῖται, shows that the honored man Autokritos had previously made a specific request for a site 'near the Theatre.'³⁰ These examples show, contrary to Tarn's opinion, that essentially the same legal procedures are involved in approving the requests of citizens and foreigners alike, for sites either in local or foreign states.

In interstate publication of Greek diplomatic documents, the legal prerogatives of the host state apply equally to the request to publish in a specific sanctuary or an exact spot within a sanctuary. In either situation, the provisions for publication are always requests, courteous gestures which do not infringe on the legal prerogatives of the host state, and there is no evidence for presuming a kind of supersensitive protocol which would make the request for a specific spot a breach of diplomacy. If the inscribed references to requests of topos are more general for foreign publications, this may reflect a deference to the host state, but not one which was absolutely necessary. There may even have been a fair degree of indifference as to the site of publication beyond the specification of a particular sanctuary; after all, there are relatively few references to exact spots ('next to the statue of so and so') even in the provisions for local publications. Finally, the use of more general terms in the provisions for foreign publications may have been due in part to a lack of familiarity of the decreeing state with the exact spots available in a foreign sanctuary, so that it left the specific request for on the spot negotiations. But there is little evidence for attributing the more general terms in these cases to any fundamental difference in diplomatic procedures.

III. THE PHYSICAL TASK OF PUBLICATION

When state A employed special envoys to carry its correspondence to state B, besides negotiating permission for publication and a site for

the stele, they were probably responsible for overseeing the actual business of publication. This responsibility would have involved letting a contract for the engraving of the stele, checking and approving the inscribed text in some cases, and seeing that the stele was erected at the approved location. As for the physical work involved in the publication, it seems an almost invariable practice that the decreeing state, rather than sending its own masons abroad, contracted with native craftsmen of the foreign state for the carving of a stele. The probability of such a practice would be arguable on the basis of its economic advantages to both of the interested states, but much more positive evidence of the customary system may be found in the inscriptions which were set up in states with dialects and scripts different from those of the decreeing states. Although it was the general policy for the mason to copy the text as it appeared on the antigraphon and maintain the dialect of the decreeing state, occasional minor intrusions of the local orthography and script of the recipient state indicate that its masons were hired to carve imported documents. To cite only one example here, in the previously mentioned (above, p. 160) Kimolian dikast decrees honoring Kharianthos of Karystos, the instructions given to the Kimolian ambassador (vv. 43ff.) "[to take care of] the setting up [of a stele] and the inscribing at Geraistos" indicate that he is to oversee every step of the process of publication; but, the numerous intrusions of Ionic in the Doric Kimolian text show that the ambassador commissioned a Euboian mason to carve the stele at Geraistos.

A more limited type of evidence for the practice of employing stonecutters of the recipient state in interstate publications is the use of the stoichedon style of engraving in certain texts. The most valid observations can be made at Delphi, where the stoichedon style was adopted in the fourth century and where its use ranked second only to Athens. The appearance there of the characteristic Delphic stoichedon in a number of publications by foreign states which did not use stoichedon in their local stelai shows that those who brought foreign transcripts for publication at Delphi generally hired masons of that city to carve inscriptions.³²

Interestingly it is from an inscription in the Delphic sanctuary that we know of one rare instance of a mason who travelled there to do a job. With the accurate identification of his style of engraving,³³ an Athenian mason, Hand "B" of IG II² 2336, has been detected in the Record of the Pythias of 98/97 B. C. on the Athenian Treasury at Delphi as well as in numerous inscriptions from Attica. Since "B" was frequently employed by the chancery at Athens, he was probably sent on the special commission to Delphi as a man of exceptional favor or talent. In the absence of other examples, the travel of "B" must be considered an exceptional practice which might be compared in some ways to the dissemination of Athenian sculptural talent which can be adduced from the appearance of Athenian artists' signatures in a number of works outside Attica.³⁴ In the case of foreign publications which have no trace of the hand of a foreign mason, we must be dealing in the main either with

very accurate transcriptions or documents involving two corresponding states with the same dialect. For these cases, one should still argue on the basis of practicality, economy, and lack of evidence to the contrary, that the decreeing state rarely dispatched its own stonecutter to carve the inscription abroad.

On some occasions the state which received a foreign document for publication not only performed its official duties of approving the publication and granting a topos, but also took charge of the actual tasks of inscribing and setting up the stele. In the instances when no envoys were sent by the decreeing state but the document was conveyed to the second state by its own citizens (e. g., returning dikasts) the responsibility for publication was probably undertaken by these citizens as interested parties. But in other similar cases, the inscribed provisions for publication suggest that the engraving and erection of the stele was taken care of by the foreign government itself. Thus a decree of Stratos in Akarnania (IG IX² 417) provides for publication in Miletos by directing that its own Archons are (vv. 10ff.):

. . . to give the antigraphon of the decree to the [returning] dikasts, and that the Demos of the Milesians is to be requested by the city of the Stratians that it inscribe this [decree] in the sanctuary of Apollo and in that of Apollo Didymos.

Even in some cases where envoys were sent to request the right to publish and the grant of topos, formulas such as "take the responsibility" or "hand over the decree" in reference to the recipient state suggest that the physical task of publication was relinquished by the embassy. A

decree of Mytilene found at Erythrai (IG XII (Suppl.) 137, pp. 43-44) gives these directions for its publication in the latter city:³⁵

A man is to be elected from all the citizens, and, when he is chosen, he is to carry the decree to the Erythraians, and when he has made clear the good will which the Demos has toward them and [has mentioned] the affairs settled by the dikasts, he is to ask them to take the responsibility (ἐπίμε- λες ποιήσασθαι) that the crowns be proclaimed among them, and that the antigraphon of the decree be inscribed on a stele and erected in the most conspicuous place, and he is to make it clear that by doing these things they will be showing favor to the Demos.

In these provisions it is made very clear that the apparent shifting of the responsibility for publication is not an intrusion or a demand, but a polite request based on the good relations of the two states.

IV. DIPLOMATIC PUBLICATIONS AT ALTERNATE SITES

In some cases of diplomatic correspondence among the Greek states, the provenience of inscriptions or their provisions for publication show that permanent copies were set up at sites other than the capital cities of those states which were interested parties. The majority of such cases come from the widespread practice (to be discussed in the final section of this chapter) of placing extra copies of important diplomatic documents in the major Panhellenic sanctuaries. But there are also some less frequent and less comprehensible instances of individual states or confederacies making permanent publications at sites other than, or in addition to, their own local sanctuaries. Although it was not uncommon for a federation to send "courtesy copies" of its decrees to

all member-states for deposit in their local archives,³⁶ we rarely find that these copies were intended to be carved on stone as permanent publications. Such, however, was the case with the second-century decree of the Delphian Amphiktyony (IG VII 4135) granting asylia to the sanctuary of Apollo Ptoös at Akraiphia; in addition to publications at Delphi, Pylai, and Akraiphia, it orders that (vv. 16ff.) "stelai are to be set up in the other sanctuaries [of the Amphiktyony] in the locations which should seem to be best." The exceptionally wide publication of this decree is perhaps to be explained in terms of the Aitolian Confederacy which although not a member, manipulated the Amphikyonic League at this time by the control of some of its constituents. Further, as the chief haven of piratical bands in mainland Greece, Aitolia was one of the chief recipients of requests for grants of immunity at that time.³⁷ Thus, if Aitolia was not the actual sponsor of the Amphikyonic decree of asylia, it was probably its strongest guarantor, and as such may have prescribed or permitted its publications in all the member-states of the Amphiktyony.

Whether or not a confederacy or league sent copies of its diplomatic dealings to all of its member-states, and regardless of publication elsewhere, the official copy was almost invariably erected in the principal sanctuary of the capital city of the league. But a most unusual exception to this practice is found in the diplomatic publications of the Akarnanian League, whose capital was at Stratos until about 230 B. C., and thereafter at Leukas until about 167 B. C.³⁸ The surviving

inscriptions of the League show that while internal affairs were nearly always published in the respective capitals, important diplomatic documents were always published at the sanctuary of Apollo at Aktion, which was traditionally under the control of a single league-member, Anaktorion. For example, the Aitolian copy of Aitolian-Akarnanian treaty of about 280-270 B. C. was set up according to custom in the Aitolian capital of Thermon (IG IX² (1) 3A), but we learn from this extant inscription that (vv. 14ff.) the Akarnanian copy was to be set up in the hieron of Apollo at Aktion rather than at the capital city of Stratos. Similarly, an inscription from Magnesia on the Maeander datable to 207 B. C. , and from its subscribed list of signatories recognizable as a decree of the Akarnanian League recognizing the newly-established Magnesian festival of Artemis Leukophryene, provides for the sole Akarnanian publication at Aktion, not at Leukas.

The importance to the Akarnanian League of the sanctuary of Apollo at Aktion is borne out by a more recent epigraphical find which tells of the League's takeover of that shrine as its common possession from the government of Anaktorion. The decree in question (IG IX² (2) 583, the copy set up, and found, at Olympia), variously dated between 217 and 196, or 189 B. C. , definitely falls in the period when Leukas was capital of the League, and its text shows that officials from Leukas play a prominent part in the operation of the League at this time. But this decree and most subsequent diplomatic publications of the League

continued to be set up at Aktion as the League's official copies.³⁹ The explanation of the takeover of the sanctuary of Apollo at Aktion may lie in part in the provision of IG IX² (2) 583 that the League instead of Anaktorion was thereafter to receive the profits of the shrine. But the League must have been more generally motivated by a desire to take official possession of what it has always considered the most prestigious sanctuary in its realm, and one which, by virtue of its age, prominence, and geographical location, provided the optimum advertisement of its important diplomatic documents.

This practice of publishing at an alternate site is in some ways paralleled by a case involving two independent states. The Kimolian decrees honoring the dikast Kharianthos of Karystos (Jacobsen & Smith, Hesperia 37 (1968) 184-199), direct the appointed envoy (vv. 11ff., 37ff.) to see that the documents are set up on stone — not in Karystos, the hometown of Kharianthos — but in the sanctuary of Poseidon at Geraistos, a few miles to the east. That the decree was published as ordered is confirmed by the fact that the fragments of the stele were found at modern Porto Kastri, the established site of ancient Geraistos.⁴⁰ It is a noteworthy parallel to the later Akarnanian control of the sanctuary at Aktion, that at the time of this decree the shrine at Geraistos was owned by the Karystians, as indicated by the order to the Kimolian envoy to request a site there from the Council and Demos of Karystos (vv. 46-49). But Karystos did not always control Geraistos and its sanctuary; from

the tribute list of 427/6 B. C. (IG I² 216; cf. II² 58),⁴¹ it seems that Geraistos was a city independent of Karystos in the Athenian Confederacy. Although there are not enough extant inscriptions to determine the extent or chronology of Karystos' control of the hieron of Poseidon Geraistios, at least one document shows that Karystos did not always publish its diplomatic correspondence there rather than in its home sanctuaries. IG XII (Suppl.) p. 201, No. 3, a first-century Thessalian decree from Larisa or Krannon, also honoring Karystian dikasts, directs that the foreign copy be set up in the sanctuary of Pythian Apollo at Karystos. It is apparent then, that sometime before the Kimolian decrees were ratified in the third century, Karystos had gained control of Geraistos and its sanctuary, probably because this shrine had become the most important in the Karystia.⁴² Because of the advantages of Geraistos for the fullest display of his honors, or perhaps because of special devotion to Poseidon,⁴³ Kharianthos presumably advised the Kimolians of a preference for this site when they formulated the provision for foreign publication. Finally, another possible consideration in the choice of Geraistos was the fact, alluded to in the provision for publication, that this site has acquired the formal status of an inviolable (ἄσυλον) hieron.⁴⁴

V. DIPLOMATIC PUBLICATIONS IN PANHELLENIC SANCTUARIES

The parties to interstate transactions in ancient Greece, besides inscribing official copies of the acts in their own capital cities, sometimes set up extra publications in the great Panhellenic sanctuaries such as Olympia and Delphi. From the Archaic Age to Roman times, the states and personages of Greece and its colonies filled these shrines with dedications and inscriptions recording their treaties, honors given and received, and their victories in diplomacy, war, and athletics. Centuries after their real glory, the great sanctuaries at Athens, Olympia, and Delphi duly impressed the traveller Pausanias with their great deposits of monuments and inscriptions from all the areas and ages of Greece. Like most sightseers, Pausanias was more drawn to the sculptural and architectural monuments, but occasionally he would mention a striking epigraphical artifact which still stood in his time, such as (5. 12. 8) the bronze stele at Olympia inscribed with the treaty of alliance of 420 B. C. between Elis, Athens, Argos, and Mantinea. As important Panhellenic shrines and sites for special diplomatic publications, Olympia, Delphi, and later Delos seem to have been preeminent, with Epidauros, the Isthmian sanctuary, and Dodona of less importance. These shrines with their Panhellenic festivals and truces, like the old religious amphiktyonies, early became sites for solemn political assemblies, or panygyreis, at which both friendly and hostile states could conveniently conduct and advertise their diplomatic business. These

periodic gatherings from all Greek states, as well as the year-round official and private pilgrimages to these shrines, made them ideal sites for the permanent promulgation of interstate documents on stone and bronze.

The Panhellenic character with which the Greeks invested certain sanctuaries is evident not only in their common religious and political activities there, but also in their occasional references to such sanctuaries as κοινὰ ἱερά or κοινὰ πανηγυριστήρια. An Akhaian decree of about 104 B. C. (IG V (2) 517), honoring a certain Saon of Megalopolis in Arkadia, provides for the inscribing of the decree on the bases of statues to be erected (vv. 15ff.) ἐν τοῖς κοινοῖς τῆς Ἑλλάδος πανηγυριστηρίοις, with the specific mention of Olympia, the Isthmus, and Nemea.⁴⁵ This use of the word κοινόν and the circumstances which gave rise to its use have led some modern scholars to the mistaken inference that these sanctuaries were "neutral" in the political sense.⁴⁶ But like all other sanctuaries, they were under the sole ownership and control of the state or confederacy which held the territory in which they lay,⁴⁷ and as Thucydides observed (4. 98), their ownership passed to the victorious power when the surrounding state was conquered.⁴⁸ The Greeks, by their common religious heritage, held all "holy places" to be off limits to war and pillage, but they never conceived of them as "neutral" in the sense that they were immune from political control or the common property of all states.⁴⁹

It is now obvious that the term "Panhellenic" when applied to Olympia, Delphi, and other sanctuaries, refers only to certain religious, political, and athletic traditions which became associated with these sites, but says nothing about the political status of the shrines themselves. Just as in any other public precinct, the right to participate in the festivals at Panhellenic sanctuaries,⁵⁰ or to place any publication in them, existed subject to the sanction of the authorities who controlled these sanctuaries. Thus Athens published at Delos in the fifth and fourth centuries as freely as on its own Acropolis, and likewise, Elis at Olympia, and the Delphians, the Amphiktyonic League, and later Aitolia, at the Delphic sanctuary of Apollo. But any other states who wished to publish in these shrines had to receive permission and the grant of a site from the owners. A good illustration of this procedure survives in the arbitral documents published at Olympia by Messenia after one victory (ca. 146-137 B. C.) over Sparta in the traditional dispute over the ager Dentheliatas. The inscription in question (O1. No. 52) is comprised of: 1) an Elean decree permitting the Messenians to publish the award at Olympia, 2) a letter of certification from Miletos, the arbitrating state, 3) the official Milesian account of the arbitration.⁵¹

It is noteworthy that all three documents were published on the fifth-century statue base of the Nike of Paionios which the Messenians themselves had originally dedicated. This fact possibly emphasizes a point made above (pp. 154-158) regarding interstate publication in

general, namely, that beyond any grant of a topos, the very act of publication, and surely the text itself, was subject to the approval of the host state. For even if the Messenians, by using the base of their old dedication, did not require a new site for the arbitral documents, the Elean decree of permission to publish was nevertheless necessary. But it is more likely that even the use of the statue of Nike entailed a grant of topos, since it seems that all monuments and dedications became the property of the sanctuary and its owners.⁵²

So far, the discussion of foreign publications has not dealt much with treaties and arbitral decisions simply because these types of mutual decisions were generally drafted by each of the interested parties and hence not sent to one another for publication. However, these types of diplomatic decrees, along with those of various honors, were favorite subjects for extra publications erected in Panhellenic precincts. In keeping with the amicable and mutual nature of treaties of peace and alliance, the participant states frequently shared the responsibility and expense of erecting the extra copy of their agreement. This practice is exemplified in the third-century treaty of the Aitolians and Akarnanians (IG IX² (1) 3A) which provides (vv. 13ff.) not only that the local archons of each state are to erect copies at Aktion and Thermon, but also that 'all groups of archons in common' are to publish the treaty at Olympia, Delphi, and Dodona.⁵³ In the provisions outlined by Thucydides (5.47.11) for the publication of the alliance of Athens, Argos, Mantinea, and Elis

in 420 B. C. , it is significant that the first three parties are to put up their own copies in the usual manner, but that all of the parties "in common" are to erect the fourth copy at Olympia during the current festival games. Here the tradition of the cooperative publication of the Panhellenic copy takes precedence, even when the Olympic copy must also serve as the official local publication which Elis would otherwise provide for itself. One result of the sharing of these Panhellenic publications of treaties was a version which in wording and content represented all of the parties equally, unlike the official local inscriptions which were essentially separate decrees of ratification and resolutions formulated from the point of view of each respective party. But another, less usual, means of attaining a "common" publication can be seen in the late-third-century- treaty of Aitolia and Athens (IG IX² 176) inscribed on a stele at Delphi; rather than a common text representing both states, the single stele contains the separate final drafts of the Athenian and Aitolian decrees of ratification engraved consecutively.

The advertisement of treaties to all Greek nations through publication in the Panhellenic sanctuaries must have served a mixture of propagandistic and legal objectives. In the case of defensive alliances specifically, such publications were fair warning to hostile states, and for treaties in general, the resulting public awareness and opinion served as an added restraint against infringement of the pacts. It is true that treaties, like arbitral settlements, were not liable to international adjudication, but depended on the good faith of the signatories. But the

possibility of international censure must have been some inducement to allegiance when permanent publication and periodic proclamations and renewals of oaths were made before the entire Hellenic community. There may be some connection between this idea and the point made above (pp. 179-180) that the stelai dedicated in shrines passed from the control and ownership of their signatories to that of the sanctuary and its authorities. Why did the stele inscribed with the alliance of Argos, Mantinea, Elis, and Athens still stand at Olympia in Pausanias' time? The entente was ruined less than three years after its formation, by Agis' successful campaign in Argos (Thuc. 5. 57-75) and the consequent defection of Argos and Mantinea to the Spartan alliance (Ibid. 5. 79). One might expect then that Elis would have followed the customary practice of removing the stele, or erasing the text of a broken treaty or a nullified decree.⁵⁴ It may well be that the Eleans, as sole authorities concerning this stele, decided to leave it standing as a monument to the perfidy of Argos and Mantinea. Its survival for five centuries or more and the long-term survival of other monuments are of course not to be ascribed to motives of political propaganda, but more probably to a continuous reverence for the sanctuaries of the gods, and some recognition of the historical value of these monuments as relics.

Of the number of extant Greek inscriptions relating to the settlement of interstate disputes by arbitration, an unusually large proportion have been found at the Panhellenic sanctuaries at Olympia, Delphi,

Delos, and Epidauros.⁵⁵ As far as can be determined, the states in charge of these sanctuaries are in no way involved in the cases of arbitration. No arbitral document has ever been found in a state which lost the suit, and if they were required to be erected in these states, they were probably removed as soon as possible because of their adverse publicity.⁵⁶ Similarly, the extra copies of arbitral texts inscribed in the Panhellenic sanctuaries are in most cases clearly the handiwork of the victorious party in the dispute. The provisions of the extant decrees bear this out except in one unusual case in which the terms of publication were an agreed precondition to arbitration. An inscription found at Delphi (IG IX (2) pp. x-xi) concerning a dispute of Thebes in Phthiotis and Halos settled by Larisa, contains a preliminary agreement that the two litigant parties are to be responsible for all of the required publications and their cost (vv. 45-50):

Let both [parties] publish this judgement on four stone pillars, and set them up, one at Delphi, one at Larisa in the sanctuary of Apollo Kerdoös, one at Thebes in the sanctuary at Athena Polias, one at Halos in the sanctuary of Artemis Panakhaia, and let them do this in the year in which Damotimos is Strategos; both of the cities are to pay the cost of these things.

Since the Panhellenic copies of arbitral documents were generally the product of the victorious party rather than cooperative publications, it can be assumed that there was a certain decree of propaganda and status-seeking in these extra advertisements. But also, the international exposure of arbitral decisions was designed to bring further pressure on the losing parties to abide by the settlement. But again this pressure

was more in the realm of propaganda than law, for the maintainance of arbitral settlements, like the operation of treaties, depended solely on the good faith of the disputants. Even if the parties agreed to further litigation, this process would be based not on the Panhellenic texts, which had no legal status, but upon the official copies retained by the arbitrating state.

The other chief genre of interstate documents published in the Panhellenic sanctuaries comprises the decrees of honors such as proxeny and citizenship, and sometimes more tangible awards such as statues and crowns. Here there were no legal motives, the objective being mainly publicity and propaganda, both for the honored individuals and the honoring state, with the occasional undertone of moralization. A good example of the frequent statement of these motives in the provisions for publication is found in the epigram which the Akhaian Confederacy inscribed on the bases of statues which it erected for an Arkadian priest at Olympia, the Isthmos, and Nemea (IG V (2) 517, vv. 17-21):

The Akhaians (dedicated this statue) of Saon of Megalopolis, the son of Polykharmos and Saklea the Hierophant of the Great Gods, because of his sophrosyne and other virtues, so that, now that he is dead, through the concern of the Akhaians for find and good men, other Hellenes may gladly foster in their own life of virtue what he has clearly done worthily.

In many cases, the publicity which was given to honors by their publication on stone or bronze was further augmented by verbal proclamation of the decree, often with the awarding of a crown, at the assembly of the major festival.⁵⁷

Although political and religious considerations were often not far apart in the minds of the Greeks, it is not so likely that they erected extra inscriptions in the Panhellenic sanctuaries with an eye to the inviolability of those sites, or with the idea that some special favor would accrue to the transactions from the gods of those precincts. Although they probably believed to some extent in such mystical advantages, their enactments should already have attained many of them by virtue of their official publication in the local sanctuaries. The extra stelai at Olympia and elsewhere were not simply redundant. The chief advantage and purpose of these publications had to be the publicity and propaganda which was afforded only by those shrines which attracted large crowds of diplomats and private citizens from every corner of the Greek world. Something of this advantage must certainly have been in the mind of Philip of Macedon when, as part of his program of Hellenization, he took control of Delphi and the honor of presiding over its games by gaining the two Amphiktyonic votes of Phokis at the end of the Second Sacred War. Not long before this, Isokrates, in his Panegyricus of about 380 B. C., praised the founders of the festivals for handing down to the Greeks institutions which fostered amity and a balance of power among the Greek states by the diplomatic contacts which they allowed. The permanent publication of documents on stone and bronze in the Panhellenic sanctuaries must have been the most important and practical means by which Greek states could notify one another of their diplomatic

acts, and thus provide perennial reinforcement to this amity and balance of power from one festival assembly to the next.

CHAPTER IV

THE TREATMENT OF DIALECT IN INTERSTATE DOCUMENTS

Both before and long after Attic had become the language of literary prose, most Greek states continued to use their own dialects in the recording and publication of official documents. Since these dialects were to a great degree mutually intelligible, there was no need of a lingua franca, and as a rule, diplomatic documents were published locally or sent abroad with no concession to the dialect of the corresponding foreign party. Moreover, when these dispatches were copied or engraved by the scribes or masons of the foreign states, the dialect of the original documents was generally retained. In the following pages this general practice, and exceptions to it, will be illustrated by a number of inscriptions in an attempt to determine the underlying reason; that is, whether the maintenance of the original dialect in interstate correspondence was dictated by a concept of linguistic integrity of the documents, or simply reflected a practical lack of concern for dialectal differences. Much of this study will focus on inscriptions whose peculiarities of dialect editors and commentators have already established to be the result of foreign scribes or masons rather than any natural mixing of dialects. In other cases it will be necessary to try to judge whether the unusual dialect results from a deliberate translation for diplomatic purposes or is a peculiar form of local koine resulting from geographical or political circumstances. But a thorough linguistic analysis, particularly of the later Hellenistic inscriptions in which it is

often difficult to distinguish koine from scribal mixtures of dialects, is here neither feasible nor necessary for a valid conclusion about the customary treatment of dialects in interstate correspondence.

I. INTEGRITY OF DIALECT AND SCRIBAL INTRUSIONS

It may be stated at the outset that with relatively few exceptions the diplomatic documents of Classical and Hellenistic Greece appeared in the dialect and script¹ of the state which issued them, regardless of the recipient of the document, its place of publication, or its subject-matter. Although not widely known, and sometimes overlooked in the study of certain documents,² this rule for the interstate use of dialects was clarified long ago in an article by C. D. Buck³ and reiterated in his Greek Dialects in a summary which is worth quoting at length (p. 173):

Not only in early times, but also in most parts of Greece, long after Attic had become the norm of literary prose, each state employed its own dialect, both in private and public monuments of internal concern, and in those of a more external or interstate character, such as decrees in honor of foreigners, decisions of interstate arbitration, treaties, and in general, communications between different states. Thus for example, an honorary decree of a Boeotian city is in the Boeotian dialect, no matter whether the recipient is a citizen of Athens, Delphi, Alexandria, or Tarentum. If the Eleans honor Damocrates of Tenedos, the decree is in the Elean of the time (No. 66). If Mytilene honors Erythrae, the decree is in Lesbian, and a copy in this form is set up at Erythrae. Such is the usual practice, examples of which could be cited by the hundreds, and any departure from which is the exception.

In other words, when the secretariat of state A drafted the antigraphon of a document to be dispatched to state B, it made no concession by way

of translation to the dialect of B, nor did the scribes or masons of B translate the text into their own dialect in the process of copying it or engraving it on stone or bronze. This practice is exemplified most emphatically by those inscriptions which incorporate texts from two or more states of differing dialects. In the Olynthian copy of a decree of alliance of Philip II and the Khalkidians in 365 B. C. (GHI 158), the decree of ratification of the Khalkidians (vv. 1-11) is in their own Euboian Ionic, while the text of a Delphic oracle related to the treaty (vv. 12-16) is in the current "Northwestern Greek" of Delphi and Phokis. Here, what appears prima facie to be an intrusion into the dialect of the document is in fact a good example of the practice of retention of dialects; the text of the oracle is a foreign document — although incorporated within a local document — which was copied without change from an antigraphon received from Delphi. Similarly, in an inscription found at Larisa in Thessaly (IG IX (2) 517; ca. 215 B. C.) consisting of the decrees of that city with letters of Philip V interspersed, the decrees are in the Thessalian dialect and the letters are in the Attic koine used by the Macedonian court.⁴

If we can say that the Greeks consciously avoided changing the dialect of their interstate documents, we might further conclude that this practice rested on either of two basic considerations: dialectal characteristics as integral or official features of the documents were to be respected and consciously maintained in any transcription, or efforts at

translation were unnecessary and impractical inasmuch as the dialects were mutually legible. The first hypothesis, that the Greeks were seriously concerned with dialectal integrity in interstate correspondence, may claim only qualified support from the available evidence, which is rather sporadic and circumstantial. The many extant texts which were formulated by one state and inscribed letter for letter by another state with a different dialect are suggestive of some standard of linguistic integrity. But it could be argued also that these accurate transcriptions are simply the products of diligent scribes and masons who copy exactly from the antigraphon in the interest of professional excellence rather than purity of dialect. Moreover, as we shall see shortly, there are many interstate inscriptions in which the dialect of the authoring state is corrupted by incidental and accidental intrusions of the dialect of the foreign scribe or mason.

Evidence for the question of linguistic integrity exists in the erasures and corrections of dialectal errors in interstate inscriptions. The availability of such evidence, however, is very slight without a first hand examination of the inscribed stones, since epigraphical editors do not always note or comment on erasures and scribal corrections. Even the double bracket is not an adequate convention to describe both the correction filling a *rasura* and possible traces or restorations of the expunged letters. But possible investigations are at least suggested by two inscriptions from Athens containing corrections of apparent errors of dialect.

The first, found in the Athenian Agora (I 6420), is an unpublished fragment of a decree of Thespiiai from the second half of the third century, carved on Hymettian marble, apparently by an Athenian stonecutter, who copied quite accurately the Boiotian dialect of his antigraphon. But from a rasura in Line 4, over which was carved the second α of στρατ α γωξ, one may surmise that the engraver first carved the letters στρατη- in the familiar Attic spelling, noticed the error or was informed of it by an official,⁵ and then corrected it to the proper Boiotian form. A similar conscious effort to maintain correct foreign spelling may have occurred in IG II² 844, an Athenian decree of the late-third century honoring certain men of Kydonia in Krete. In two places (vv. 4 and 23) the Athenian stonecutter carved the name of one of the Kydonians in a semi-Attic form, Εύμαρείδας, and then upon review corrected it to the proper Kretan spelling, Εύμαρτίδας. It is noteworthy that the foreign decrees which were inscribed and set up at Athens (IG II² 1126-1137) show a minimum of dialectal intrusions by the Attic scribes or stonecutters.⁶

The apparent care with which Athens transcribed imported documents is comparable to the careful attention she paid to her own dialect in official local records and publications. In fact the Athenian practice of retaining earlier dialect characteristics in the recopying of inscriptions may reflect a conscious attempt to preserve the original language of texts. A good example of this practice is the inscription containing the

republication of Drakon's code on homicide, in which the re-engraved law itself maintains the old Attic use of the aspirate, while in the late-fifth-century decree ordering the republication, the aspirate is absent.⁷ It is possible, of course, that retention of these archaic forms may be little more than the practical result of masons or scribes simply copying what they saw as they worked from the older text. Yet, the jealousy with which Athens retained the official use of epichoric Attic until 403 B. C. in spite of the increasing prevalence of the vernacular Ionic indicates both the degree and the form of respect for local language.

This respect for local dialect may well have extended to the documents of foreign states. If such cases do reflect a conscious concern on the part of Athens for accuracy in the dialect of interstate documents, the motives for this practice are less certain. Accuracy was probably a gesture of respect and diplomacy in dealing with other states combined with the superior standards of the Athenian stonecutters and the scribes in the chancery system. There is, however, no evidence to indicate that integrity of dialect was a condition of the validity of decrees or other legal documents.

Inscriptions from other Greek states demonstrate that concern for accuracy in transcribing the dialect of foreign antigrapha was not everywhere so prevalent as at Athens. Some states allowed at least sporadic intrusions of their own dialect into the published texts of documents received from abroad. These intrusions could occur at either or

both of two stages: during the making of a copy of the document by the scribes of the recipient state for the use of their stonecutters, or during the engraving of the text. In some of these inscriptions the departures from the dialect of the authoring state are so numerous and flagrant that the resulting text has the appearance of a mixture of dialects rather than the intrusion of one dialect upon another. Before discussing some specific points in these texts and conclusions which might be drawn from them, it is worth listing and describing some of the more radical examples noted by editors and commentators of diplomatic texts in which the dialect has been corrupted by foreign scribes or masons:

IG II² 337: an Athenian decree of 333/2 B. C. found in the Piraeus permitting Kitian merchants to found a temple. The stele was apparently engraved and erected by the Kitians, which resulted in inconsistencies in spelling and other departures from the Attic dialect; cf. GHI 189 and comment.

IG V (2) 159 (= G. D. No. 70): a fifth-century Lakonian financial document set up in Tegea containing many intrusions of the Arkadian dialect.

GHI 33 (= G. D. No. 85): the local copy of a mid-fifth-century Argive document arranging a treaty between the Kretan cities of Knossos and Tylissos, written in the Argive dialect and alphabet, but also containing Kretan elements. Part of a copy also survives from Tylissos, and includes local letter-forms introduced by the Tylissos scribes or masons (See IC I, xxx, 1, p. 307.).

FD III, (2) 357: a fragment of a second-century Theban decree carved on the Theban Treasury at Delphi. The Delphian stonecutter uses Delphian and Boiotian forms interchangeably, but some of the irregularities may be due to current changes in the Delphian and Boiotian dialects (Cf. G. D. p. 157, for the erratic changes in the Delphian dialect from external influences.).

IG IX² (1) 188 & n. on vv. 1-6: the Melitean copy of an Aitolian territorial arbitration. The Delphic copy, on which the first six lines survive (BCH 49 (1925) shows some discrepancies of dialect from the Melitean inscription.

IG XII (8) 269: probably the Thasian (found at Constantinople) copy of a decree of Smyrna honoring Thasos for the service of its judges. The editor, C. Fredrich, notes that this is one of the best examples of scribal disregard for the dialect, letter-forms, and syllabification of a presumed original.

IG XII (3) 1073: a fragment of the Melian copy of a decree of the Pergaians honoring Melos and its dikasts; the text contains a number of dialectal discrepancies resulting from the copying or engraving of the document at Melos.

IG XII (Suppl.) pp. 44-45, No. 138: the Magnesian copy of a Mytilenean decree honoring Magnesia on the Maeander. In his edition of the inscription (I. v. Magn. No. 52), Kern points out the corruption of the Lesbian dialect by the Magnesian scribe.

IG XII (9) 44 + Hesperia 37 (1968) 184-189: two Kimolian dikast decrees on the same stele published at Geraistos on Euboa. Jacobsen and Smith (Hesperia, loc. cit., commentary on vv. 10-11, 34, 37-38; & nn. 26, 48) have noted apparent distortions of the Doric dialect of Kimolos by the Ionic mason of Geraistos, with the reservation that some of the irregularities may be due to the deterioration of the Hellenistic Doric at Kimolos.

In these inscriptions, as in less conspicuous examples, changes of dialect are not consistent enough to represent conscious attempts to translate entire documents. In practically all cases such scribal changes are dismissed by editors as the result either of carelessness or of a total indifference to the distinction of dialects.

A brief look at the commonest types of dialect changes in such inscriptions will show that although carelessness is probably the commonest factor, it is perhaps not the only one. A good illustration of

typical scribal corruption of dialect can be found in IG VII 19, the Megarian copy of a Lesbian decree honoring Megara for the service of its dikasts. From its similarity in genre and wording to a decree of Mytilene found at Erythrai,⁸ Dittenberger argued convincingly that the Megarian inscription also must be of Mytilenean origin. If so, the Megarian scribe or mason has corrupted the original Lesbian text to a remarkable degree. The intrusion of the Megarian dialect cannot be the result of a serious attempt at translation, for the stele still has a considerable number of Lesbian forms, and for some of the same words there is inconsistent use of both dialects suggesting a fair degree of indifference on the part of the Megarian scribe. Dittenberger was able to distinguish definitely many Doricisms in the Megarian copy by comparison with the parallel decree at Erythrai, but at the same time, he was careful to note changes which may have been influenced by the koine rather than the Megarian dialect. The commonest type of dialectal intrusion in this and other interstate publications is a simple change of spelling, usually involving a single syllable.

Although there was considerable inconsistency in local spelling throughout Classical and Hellenistic times, this cannot account for the significant number of spellings in these texts which are not attested variants in the dialects of the states which formulated the documents, or the high degree to which the variant spellings are proper to the dialect of the recipient foreign party. In the Mytilenean decree from Megara

just mentioned, the scribe or mason has introduced the Megarian form παρακαλεῖν (v. 13) where the analogous Erythraian inscription has retained the Lesbian spelling, παρακαλῆν⁹ (v. 52); also, the Megarian stele has the Doric σταῖλαν (v. 15) where the Erythraian has the Lesbian στάλλαν (v. 54).¹⁰ Other common conversions of spelling are those which entail the addition or subtraction of a single syllable, as, for example, in the Mytilenean decree at Megara, the use of -οις (vv. 14, 16) for the Dative Plural, which is probably a scribal substitution for the more common Lesbian use of -οισι found throughout the similar Mytilenean decree at Erythrai. The simplest explanation of such changes of spelling (particularly those involving such common epigraphical words as "stele") is that the scribe or mason inadvertently slipped into his own dialect as he was copying the word, just as the Athenian mason of Agora I 6420 seems to have done with the Boiotian word -στραταγῶς before he noticed his error and corrected it.

It is possible, however, that many of these dialect changes in the area of spelling may be due to a sincere but misguided concern for accuracy on the part of the foreign scribe or stonecutter. It is easy to imagine an unsophisticated Megarian taking such Lesbian forms as στάλλαν, παρακαλῆν, and Plural Datives in -οισι as spelling errors and "correcting" them to the proper Megarian forms in the process of transcription. A foreign mason in copying an imported document might also change spelling to make it conform to the phonetics of his own

dialect. The Arkadian engraver of a series of Lakonian financial documents set up in his native Tegea (G. D. No. 70) carved $\tau\zeta\epsilon\tau\rho\alpha\kappa\acute{\alpha}\tau\iota\alpha\iota$ in place of the Lakonian $\tau\epsilon\tau\rho\alpha\kappa\acute{\alpha}\tau\iota\alpha\iota$, presumably in an attempt to make the written form correspond to the Arkadian pronunciation of a sibilant before the front vowel.¹¹ It is then possible that many of the changes of spelling, which constitute the majority of dialectal intrusions in interstate documents, are the result of such intentional "correction" of imagined errors, but there is usually no way of distinguishing such intentional changes from those which are simply the result of scribal carelessness. In either case, the results point to a lack of sophisticated awareness of the difference of local dialects, and/or a lack of concern for the integrity of the dialects in which the texts were originally formulated.

Although the degree and consistency of dialectal changes in the inscriptions mentioned above clearly marks these texts as corrupted by foreign transcription, it would be naive and misleading to attribute exclusively to this cause all irregularities of dialect or any individual forms except those which are distinctively characteristic of the dialect of one state to the exclusion of the other. One phenomenon which must be considered in the study of dialects in interstate documents, to avoid mistaken attribution of "errors" and "corrections" to scribal ignorance or negligence, is the lack of standardization of spelling in local dialects. Although inconsistency of spelling was more common in private

inscriptions, it is also found in varying degrees in official publications; inscriptions from Sparta particularly reveal erratic and inconsistent spelling.¹² The care that must be exercised in distinguishing the causes of these inconsistencies may be illustrated by FD III, i (2) 357 & 358, Theban and Delphian decrees on the same subject, carved side by side on the Treasury of the Thebans sometime about the mid-second century. Throughout the Theban text, the Delphic scribe has used, inconsistently for the same words, spellings which appear to be distinctively Boiotian and Delphian (e. g. Fυκία and Fοικία). This seems to be a mixing of separate dialects by the Delphian scribe, and the editor, Bourguet, says as much when he attributes the inconsistencies to scribal negligence: "il ne faudrait pas accuser l'ignorance du lapicide delphien, mais plutot sa legerete;" Yet, when one turns to the related Delphian decree carved by the same hand, he sees that the Delphic stonecutter has employed a number of inconsistent spellings in his own dialect (e. g. ξενῶνα and ξενεῶνα ; παργινομένων and παραγινομένων), which may be due either to internal evolution, or, to the adding of elements of Northwest Greek koine which was particularly strong under the Aitolian domination of Delphi during the third and second centuries.¹³ In view of the state of flux of both the Delphian and Boiotian dialects at this time, one must seriously consider that some of the variations of dialect in the Theban decree in question may not reflect the negligence of the Delphian scribe, but real variations of spelling in the Boiotian dialect of the Theban

original. Again our example of Fύκτα and Foύκτα : although Boiotian inscriptions show that increasingly from 250 B. C. on, but not uniformly until the end of the century, $\underline{υ}$, with the approximate value of $\underline{ϋ}$, was used to denote the monophthongized $\underline{οι}$,¹⁴ it is possible that variant spellings of Boiotian words with $\underline{υ}$ and $\underline{οι}$ could have carried over to the time of our decree in the mid-second century. Thus Foύκτα as a Delphic scribal intrusion upon Boiotian Fύκτα is questionable. In the absence of standardized spelling, the use of variant forms need not indicate ignorance or carelessness, but should even be expected, particularly in an area where so many dialects were in frequent contact with one another.¹⁵

Another cause of some of the irregularities of dialect in both local and interstate documents may have been the employment of transient craftsmen, resident aliens, and even slaves¹⁶ as archival copyists or stonecutters. The migrations of such craftsmen was undoubtedly much greater during the political and economic upheavals of the Hellenistic period. Merritt has noted in the case of Athens a good example of one of these movements and its cause and effects:

The mediocre quality of work exhibited by many of the documents shortly after 307 may be attributed to lack of skill on the part of the stonecutter (see Fig. 17). The craft of stonemasonry suffered a severe blow with the imposition of the sumptuary laws of Demetrios of Phaleron, which forbade the erection of elaborate carved funeral monuments. There can be no doubt that many skilled craftsmen must have forsaken Athens in the years between 317 and 307 to seek work elsewhere in more profitable fields, leaving in the city the less talented on whom fell the burden of inscribing the

decrees of the restored democracy. In 307/6 there were few men available, and even these had little practice in lettering during the previous decade. Among the stone-cutters there was a high percentage of foreigners, and from the Hellenistic period we know the names of two who cut inscriptions, - - - -, son of Charmides, and Menodotos, son of Artemidoros, both of Tyre.¹⁷

We see in Meritt's example the working of the basic law of economics by which the best tradesmen tend to migrate to the best markets while their places are taken by their inferiors, whether local or foreign. The movement of these masons to states with dialects differing from their own could result in the types of dialect intrusions noted above in the case of some interstate documents, except that the intrusions may also involve dialects other than those of the parties to the correspondence. A Delphian decree (FD III, iii (1) 120) honoring Megalopolis for the service of its judges shows so many errors of dialect that either the scribe or mason must have been completely unfamiliar with the dialect with which he was working. A Lesbian decree found at Erythrai (GDI p. 86, n. 215) has forms which are foreign both to the Lesbian Aiolic and the Erythraian Ionic. Similarly, a letter of Ptolemy Euergetes to Apollonios in Thera (IG XII (3) 327 & n.), because of its broken-barred alphas, was considered by its editor, Hiller, to be possibly the work of a foreign scribe.

A conclusion then to be drawn from the study of dialects in interstate documents published at foreign sites is that the native dialect of the state which authored the text is retained with varying degrees of accuracy in the foreign copy, but not, apparently, as the result of a

definite policy. Even at Athens where there seems to have been some conscious concern for the dialectal accuracy of imported documents, this may have been as much scribal skill as respect for the language, but by no means was it a condition of the validity or legality of documents. When all of the cases are considered, the fact that the original dialects are generally maintained probably should not be attributed to any concerted policy, but rather to the simple fact that transcribing the text exactly as it was received seemed the easy and practical procedure. On the other hand, the maintenance of strict dialectal accuracy in published texts was not only beyond the concern of most Greek states, but unnecessary, since the dialects were on the whole mutually intelligible. The dialectal intrusions which do occur in interstate publications range from occasional minor changes to general inconsistency. Some of them are probably due to carelessness or general indifference to consistency of dialect, but others may represent misconceived attempts on the part of scribes or masons to "correct" the peculiar dialectal features of the text. Only rarely are such changes of dialect consistent enough to be considered serious attempts at translation of the documents.

II. TRANSLATION OF DIPLOMATIC DOCUMENTS

Among the hundreds of diplomatic documents which survive from ancient Greece, there are a few which appear to have been inscribed not in the dialect of the state which formulated them, but in that of the foreign

party concerned. These inscriptions present a different problem from those just discussed. Here we are dealing with texts in which the dialect, although seemingly foreign to the authoring state, is internally consistent rather than mixed. Moreover, the peculiarity of dialect in these cases cannot easily be attributed to scribes or masons of the foreign party, since practically all of the inscriptions in question were published in the states which issued them. These texts have elicited considerable controversy; are they deliberate translations from one dialect to another, or the result of other linguistic circumstances? Despite their small number, these inscriptions have even misled some scholars to the view that the translation of diplomatic documents was the rule rather than the exception.¹⁸ Most of the official state documents involved in this question are honorific decrees. The surviving inscriptions on interstate arbitration are either in accord with general practice and clearly in the dialects of the states which drafted them, or the date and place of the publications are such that any workable distinction in the dialects of the involved states has been lost through the affect of koine. Treaties also have a minor place in this discussion since nearly all of the extant examples reflect the general rule that each of the signatories drafted, ratified, and published its own separate version of the pact.

Perhaps the most controversial of the "translated" diplomatic documents is IG V (2) 1, a decree of the Arkadian League honoring Phylarkhos of Athens in 368 B. C. The inscription published at Tegea

has the decree itself in the Attic dialect with a subscribed list of Damiorgoi in the Arkadian dialect. Dittenberger,¹⁹ among others, considered the use of Phylarkhos' native dialect a gesture of special courtesy to him, but without regard for the fact that the Attic dialect is also used in a contemporary Tegean decree honoring a Thessalian (IG V (2) 11), and, in another fourth-century decree of the Arkadian city of Psophis in honor of a citizen of Naxos (Ol. 294). Buck asserted that the dialect of the Phylarkhos Decree was not to be explained as a diplomatic compliment, but that its use here and in other Arkadian decrees was the result of some broader influence:

It is evident that the occasional employment of Attic in Arcadian inscriptions (its influence upon the native dialect is apparent in the Tegean building inscription Wilhelm, Beiträge) is earlier than has been supposed. Only subsequent discoveries can determine whether this was confined to certain classes of inscriptions, such as those involving foreign relations like these two decrees, and how far it was restricted within certain narrow limits.¹

n. 1. We know that the advance of Attic influence in Arcadia was not one of uninterrupted progress. The native dialect persisted till about 200 B. C. (the decree of Megalopolis, Ditt. Syll.² 258 = Syll.³ 559, with all its mixture, is essentially Arcadian). But before this there had come into use, through the influence of the Aetolian and Achaean Leagues, a form of Doric $\kappa\omicron\iota\upsilon\eta$, and it is this, not the Attic $\kappa\omicron\iota\upsilon\eta$, which prevails in Arcadian inscriptions of the last two centuries B. C.²⁰

It may be significant that not only is a list of names in the Arkadian dialect appended to the Phylarkhos Decree, but a similar list in the local dialect accompanies IG V (2) 11, the Tegean decree in the Attic dialect honoring a Thessalian. If we had only the evidence of the

Phylarkhos inscriptions, it might be argued with more cogency that the decree was deliberately translated to the dialect of Phylarkhos while the list of names was left in the current local dialect. But the occurrence of a very similar division of dialects in a inscription honoring a Thesalian tends rather to support the view of Buck that we are dealing with a peculiar linguistic situation of the time in Arkadia, which, although its extent and chronology are imperfectly known, features the use of the Attic dialect with a conservative retention of the native versions of proper names.

A similar linguistic puzzle exists in IG VII 207, a decree of Megarian Aigosthena from the end of the third century honoring the people of Siphai in Boiotia for their ancestral eunoia. The inscription is engraved mainly in the Boiotian dialect, but includes some non-Boiotian forms which could be native Megarian. In an early treatment of this apparent anomaly, Boeckh offered two alternative explanations: The Boiotian dialect was used as a compliment to the Siphaians, or because Aigosthena was at the time of the decree a member of the Boiotian Confederacy.²¹ Dittenberger accepted the former explanation partly on the basis of a supposed parallel in the Phylarkhos Decree from Tegea, but dismissed the other alternative with the argument that the use of the Boiotian dialect is not paralleled in any other decrees of foreign members of the Boiotian Confederacy (IG VII 207 & n.):

Plebiscitum n. 207 Boeotica dialecto composita est. Quod utrum Aegosthenitae fecissent, ut Siphensibus Boeotis

gratificarentur, an quia ipsi tum Boeotorum societati ascripti essent, Boeckhius quidem (Opp. VI p. 365) dubitat. Sed eos populos, qui cum natione Boeoti non essent per aliquod temporis spatium foederis Boeotici participes erant, nequaquam propterea in actis publicis sermone Boeotico usos esse cum ex reliquis Aegosthenitarum titulis et nonnullis Megarensium (n. 27, 28, 29) tum ex permagno numero decretorum Oropiorum apparet, quae ad unum omnia Attica dialecto composita sunt (n. 237 ff.). Restat igitur prior Boeckhii interpretatio; etsi haec quoque res satis inusitata est, tamen aliquot eius generis exempla extant, veluti decretum Arcadeum quo Phylarchus Atheniensis honoribus afficitur (Syll. Inscr. Gr. 167) ipsum quidem sermone Attico compositum, cum index nominum subiunctis dialecti Arcadicae formas habeat.

Buck noted that either explanation of Boeckh supposes a practice which is admittedly unusual,²² and regarded the fact that the decree honors a Boiotian community as, at most, only a contributory factor, since Boiotian forms and expressions occur in several other inscriptions of Aigosthena during the time of her membership in the Confederacy. He concludes by committing himself to neither of Boeckh's interpretations, and suggests that the significance of the case is ambiguous.²³ But the use of Boiotian in this instance should perhaps not seem so puzzling when we consider the other decrees of Aigosthena which include Boiotian elements,²⁴ and the location of the town near the Megarian-Boiotian border. Since dialects do not strictly follow geographical or political boundaries, the relative isolation of Aigosthena from the rest of the Megarid and its proximity to Boiotia could well have brought it under the linguistic influence of the latter state, with a resulting local patois with varying degrees of Megarian and Boiotian.²⁵ Among the speakers or writers of this peculiarly mixed dialect would have been the engraver

of IG VII 207, or, more likely, the scribe who drafted the copy from which he worked.

Following IG VII 207 on the same stele is a decree of Aigosthena (No. 208) granting proxeny to a citizen of Khaleion in Lokris. The text contains some Boiotian forms mixed with the Megarian dialect, but fewer than No. 207 honoring the Siphaians. Since No. 208 has nothing to do with Boiotia, its dialect cannot, like that of No. 207, be explained as a complimentary gesture to the honored party. Since Dittenberger accepted this explanation for No. 207, he interpreted the Boiotian elements in the Khaleion decree as an unwitting carryover by the scribe from his work on the earlier document (IG VII 208 & n.): "Vice versa in decreto Dorico no. 208 nonnulla Boeotica insunt, quae in animo scribae ex eis quae paullo ante exaraverat haesisse videntur." There are some problems with this suggestion, aside from the fact that it does not explain the similar presence of Boiotian in other inscriptions of Aegosthena from the same period. There is no compelling reason to believe that both decrees were drafted or copied by the same scribe or at the same time, since their only relation seems to be their presence on the same stele.²⁶ But even if these circumstances were the case, it is difficult to imagine a scribe's being so influenced by his prior work with a foreign dialect that he was unable to exclude its forms from a subsequent text in his native idiom. It is more likely that the dialectal mixtures in both decrees are to be attributed to the scribes of Aigosthena employing

a mixture of neighboring dialects natural to this area and period. The varying consistency of Boiotian in IG VII 207, 208, and other decrees from Aigosthena may itself be the result of a reasonable variation in the local mixture of dialects among individuals.

Another apparent exception to the regular use of dialects in diplomatic documents is IG IV 1, a mid-second-century decree of the Demos of Aigina honoring Kleon, a Pergamene prefect of that island. This copy from Aigina, and presumably a copy dispatched to the king of Pergamon (vv. 45 ff.), were drafted and published in the koine which was the official language of the Pergamene court, although official documents of Aigina at this time and even later were usually written in the local Doric dialect. Fraenkel explained this irregular use of the koine as a concession to Attalos II as recipient of a copy of the decree (IG IV 1 & n.):

Vulgari eum esse dialecto conceptum, sed recentiore n. 2 Dorica, non est quod miremur, nam populiscitum nostrum ad regem, ut probaretur, erat mittendum (vs. 51 sq.), conformatus igitur est sermo ad eius consuetudinem, nam reges Pergamēnos koinen semper adhibuisse constat e titulis eorum.

The original draft of the decree must have been made by a scribe who, if not himself a Pergamene, was thoroughly familiar with the koine, perhaps from its use in the prefecture at Aigina. It is uncertain whether Kleon was still in Aigina after sixteen years of service (vv. 6-7) when the decree was ratified, but the consistent use of the aorist in reference to his actions would suggest that this tenure of office there had ended. If it could be determined that he was still in Aigina, it would be tempting

to suppose that the unusual appearance of the koine in a local decree reflects some contrivance by the prefecture in securing the Aiginetan honor to enhance Kleon's standing with Attalos. The failure to lend authenticity to such a contrived document by publishing it in the Aiginetan dialect would not be surprising considering the general unconcern of the Greeks for dialectal accuracy.²⁷ But since there is nothing in the form or content of the text to suggest that the decree was other than a valid and sincere act of the Demos of Aigina, it is more prudent to concur with Fraenkel and view this case as an exception to the rule that documents were published in the dialect of the state which issued them. Furthermore, the supposition that the dialect of the recipient was employed as a diplomatic courtesy is more plausible in this case between subject state and governing monarchy than in the previously discussed cases involving independent states.

The question of dialects in interstate documents does not often involve treaties because of the standard manner in which these texts were formulated and published. Treaties were drafted and published separately by each of the signatories and they normally consisted of terms of agreement (συνθήκαι) framed within a local decree ratifying these terms, usually, the oath of the local party, and, sometimes, the oaths of the corresponding parties. Each of the separate publications of the treaty would in accord with the general rule appear in the dialect of the state which set it up. Even though the internal συνθήκαι of the

treaty were the products of mutual negotiations, they almost invariably appear in the dialect of the state whose decree of ratification accompanies them. Such exceptional consistency of dialect was allowed by the method by which treaties were normally formulated: As the terms of agreement were worked out by the envoys of both parties, the accompanying secretary of each state made a separate draft of the terms in his own dialect to be submitted to the local legislature for ratification and publication.

Even when state A included the oath of a state B in its published version of a treaty, this oath generally appeared in the dialect of A. Again, this consistency of dialect was probably the result of A's transcription of the oath as it was delivered orally by the officials of B, either when it was actually sworn, or during the process of negotiation. If the signatories had given one another written copies of their oaths, the appearance of these foreign oaths in the inscriptions would more likely be in the dialect of the states which swore them. There is a noteworthy exception to this treatment of dialects of published oaths in IG II² 97, the Athenian copy of the terms and oaths of its treaty of alliance with Kerykra in 375 B. C. ; here there is considerable substitution of Doric for Attic forms in the text of the Kerkyrean oath. It is clear from some of the errors in the Doric forms that we are dealing here with an Athenian attempt to simulate the language of the Kerkyreans.²⁸ This unusual effort to achieve dialectal accuracy by translating the oath into Doric may be connected with the somewhat coercive nature of this and

other alliances of the Maritime Confederacy.²⁹ The fact that the θεοὶ ὄρκιοι of the Kerkyrean oath are the same as those of the Athenian oath rather than the chief deities of Kerkyra as would be customary, further suggests that the oath, if not the treaty itself, was concocted by the Athenians. The bumbling translation of the Kerkyrean oath may represent a feeble and misguided effort by Athens to obscure with a semblance of linguistic accuracy the fact that they had formulated the document on their own and presented it to the Kerkyrean envoys as a fait accompli. Finally, the inability of a sophisticated state such as Athens to compose a few lines in the local dialect of Kerkyra further discredits the idea that Greek states often did, or could, with their own resources, translate their diplomatic documents into the dialect of a foreign party.

As we have just seen, the fact that extant copies of treaties are generally in the dialect of the states which published them can be attributed to the standard method by which each of the parties drafted its own version of the terms and oaths. But a departure from this manner of negotiation and formulation could be expected to produce a different result in the dialect of at least one of the public texts. Such an exceptional case of formulation of a treaty is found in IG V (2) 419, an agreement of mutual-citizenship and intermarriage concluded by Messenia and Phigaleia under the mediation of the Aitolian League. The surviving text is the copy set up at Phigaleia in southern Elis, but the text embodies the decree and terms as they were drawn up and transmitted by the Messenians to Phigaleia (vv. 1-20), with the decree of

ratification of the Phigaleans added at the end (vv. 21-22). According to the general rule for the retention of the dialect of the authoring party, we should expect the body of this inscription to be in the Messenian dialect, and the two-line formula of ratification in Elean, but unfortunately this unusual example is inconclusive, since at this late date there is little to distinguish the dialects of the two parties. Another anomalous case involving treaties, though not itself a treaty, is IG IV 556. This document, an inscribed resolution to announce a peace agreement between a number of Greek states, probably after the Battle of Mantinea in 362 B. C., was found at Argos, but is in the Attic dialect. Buck, in discussing this case, rejected Wilhelm's explanation that the Attic dialect had by this time come to be the general medium for interstate communications, and agreed with Fraenkel's opinion that the resolution was drafted by Athens as the leading state.³⁰ Thus, this case also would fit the general practice of retaining the dialect of the authoring state when the document is published elsewhere.

The discussion of treaties in this study would not be complete without broaching the question of the use of dialect in those extra copies of pacts which were published by all parties in common at the important Panhellenic sanctuaries.³¹ There are enough fragments of inscribed treaties from Olympia, Delphi, and Delos to show that these common copies were not translated into the local dialects of these shrines. But here also, as in the case of arbitral decrees, the extant examples are

generally so fragmentary or late that there are no cases which provide comparable differences in the dialects of the involved states. A particular desideratum for the study of dialects in these common publications would be the copy of the alliance of 420 B. C. between Argos, Athens, Mantinea, and Elis, which Pausanias (5. 12. 8) observed at Olympia. Although this inscription was, according to Thucydides (5. 47. 11), the common publication of all the signatories, it must have served in addition as the official Elean copy for which there is no other provision. Buck, in commenting on the opinion of Kirchhoff and Grundy that this copy must have been in the Elean dialect, claimed that if this was the case, it was solely because of the inscription's second function as the home version of the Eleans.³² Buck based this opinion on the broader assertion that if we had copies of treaties between parties of distinctively different dialects published in their common name, they would show the dialect of the party through whose channels they reached publication. This must be the correct opinion in view of the fact that Greeks were not particularly concerned with the kind of accuracy which would reflect the source of documents,³³ and if they were, there would be no practical means of achieving such accuracy in a common publication. It is a fair deduction then, that the copies of treaties erected at the Panhellenic shrines were rendered in the dialect of the state whose version was used as a model.

This chapter has been concerned with the discussion of a number of exceptional texts which help to demonstrate the rule that Greek states

normally issued diplomatic correspondence in their local dialects, and that these dialects were retained in the copies made by recipient foreign parties. There is some evidence that the Arkadian decree honoring Phylarkhos of Athens (IG V (2) 1) and the decree of Aigosthena for Siphai (IG VII 207) which have been interpreted as "translations" made as complimentary gestures to the foreign parties, more probably derived their dialects from the peculiar usages current in Tegea and Aigosthena. Nevertheless, there were undoubtedly some true exceptions to the customary use of dialects, as, for example, the Aiginetan decree in honor of Kleon of Pergamon (IG IV 1) drafted in the Pergamene koine, apparently out of deference to Kleon or Attalos II. But the significance of such cases in this study of diplomatic procedures is that they are exceptions, and rare ones. The reasons for the retention of original dialects in interstate documents does not seem to have been a concern for dialectal accuracy, nor, in most cases, does the practice suggest any express policy. By Classical times the degree of mutual intelligibility of Greek dialects would have made translation unnecessary, and, if we may judge from some of the errors in the transcription of texts and the failure of the rare attempts by scribes to simulate foreign dialects, accurate translation would have been at best very difficult. The safest conclusion is probably that the practice of issuing and copying diplomatic documents without change of dialect was more than anything else a matter of simple practicality.

CONCLUSION

The study of diplomatic communications embodied in the preceding chapters has been largely a task of synthesis — bringing together disparate but related evidence to produce some intelligible view of the procedures and institutions involved in the formulation, publication, and transmission of interstate documents. For Athens in particular the formulas and provisions of extant inscriptions tell of a complex and well developed system in which the Demos by virtue of its authority over foreign affairs, the use of state property, and the local budget, decided which of these affairs were to be given permanent exhibition on stone. The Secretary of the Council with the help of his staff of civil scribes collated and transcribed the documents and oversaw the job of publication, although the stelai were carved and erected by private contractors, as the inscribed rubrics for financing show. In the fifth century these contracts were let by the Poletai and the stonemason's fee seems to have been determined by bid, but changes in the financial formulas early in the fourth century suggest economic reforms which fixed the amounts allotted for publication and made the allocation of contracts a further duty of the Secretary.

Further sets of instructions incorporated in diplomatic decrees show that states employed professional couriers on an ad hoc basis but not in anything like a postal system, and that important interstate dispatches were delivered by envoys specially chosen for the occasion. These dispatches were sent on light material such as papyrus rolls

which were often sealed with the state seal. At least for the documents which were intended for publication abroad, these seals were mainly of a type which sealed the dispatch in order to guarantee its integrity in transit. The conclusion that interstate documents intended for publication abroad were not normally sent as carved inscriptions is based on considerable evidence in addition to the obvious practical and economic considerations involved. The sending of inscribed monuments would imply a presumption of the host state's grant of permission to publish. When such grants are inscribed on the same stele, they usually appear in the first position on the stone, indicating that the entire inscription was cut after permission has been secured. The frequent appearance in foreign publications of elements of the host state's dialect is further evidence that the visiting envoys contracted for the carving and the stele with local masons. From the evidence of the use of heralds, passports, visas, truces, and grants of safe conduct it can be observed that the Greek system of diplomatic communications was highly adaptable to conditions of war as well as peacetime.

With very few exceptions, the extant diplomatic inscriptions show us that they were not translated, but appeared essentially in the dialect of the states which issued them wherever they were published. Although many documents published abroad show sporadic corruption of the original dialect by the foreign scribe, we can attribute these to carelessness or a misconceived effort to 'correct' the peculiar dialect rather than

serious effort at translation. Of the few diplomatic documents which have been considered as drafts in dialects other than those of the authoring states, most are the result of peculiar and misleading dialectal situations. Since most of the Greek dialects were mutually intelligible in the Classical period, the practice of retaining the original dialect was probably more a matter of practicality than the result of any concern for dialectal integrity.

Although there is no single conclusion to be drawn from all of the numerous aspects of diplomatic communication covered in this study, the investigation acquires unity of a sort in the remarkable degree of uniformity observed in the methods employed by so many independent states. This standardization of technical procedures is a natural corollary of the uniformity of the entire diplomatic system which was itself required and made possible by the common heritage of the Greeks. Diplomatic contacts as extensive and efficient as those of the Greek world would have been impossible without a common language. The diplomatic advantage of a common religion is implicit even in such practices as dedicating copies of diplomatic documents in sanctuaries, sealing treaties with sacred oaths, and employing heralds or sacred envoys thought to be under the protection of gods. But even more than religious and linguistic identity, the basis of Greek diplomacy and all its procedures was a common political ideal. This ideal was the generally shared concept of the polis or sovereign state with limits of area and population which best

served its citizens. The Greeks were very cognizant of the fact that they held so many practices and ideals in common, and they sometimes referred to them as koinoi nomoi. Although there is nothing of the idea of codified international law in this phrase, the function of international law was well served in an ad hoc fashion by the diplomatic conventions and methods of the Greeks, and by the equity of the koinoi nomoi which were the basis of this diplomacy.

This entire study of diplomatic procedures and their relation to the common law and custom of the Greeks bears directly on the much broader question of the intent and effectiveness of Greek diplomacy, and conversely, the Greek attitude toward war. Whether war or diplomacy was the natural condition of the ancient Greeks has been widely debated without achieving significant agreement. While the present study does not itself establish the success or failure of Greek diplomacy, the evidence does suggest that the Greeks were highly conscious of diplomacy as an alternative to war. Scholarly publications have occasionally contended that Greek diplomatic procedures were ineffective or deceitful and provided no successful alternative to war. Quite recently one scholar has mustered quotations from ancient authors to show that the Greeks themselves were aware that war was their normal condition, and he concludes that "the whole of Greek history testifies to lack of restraint and political common sense."

Admittedly Greek states were often at war, and their diplomatic agreements were often shortlived. But many of the pessimistic views are exaggerated and most of them are not balanced by close attention to the case for diplomacy. There is a great deal of evidence in the diplomatic documents that institutions such as proxeny, treaty-making, and interstate arbitration were not simply diversionary propaganda disguising an unscrupulous Realpolitik. The important relationship of published versions of civil laws to the functioning of democracy has often been pointed out, and the publication and communication of diplomatic enactments clearly bear a similar relationship to the Greek ideals of juridical equality and common rights among the independent states. We have in the extant inscriptions only a fraction of the evidence for ancient Greek diplomatic conventions, but even these texts both individually and collectively bespeak a serious attention to diplomatic alternatives to war.

NOTES: CHAPTER I

¹ See below, Chapter III, for the publication of documents imported from foreign states.

² On the relative jurisdictions of the Athenian Council and Assembly in foreign affairs, see J. A. O. Larsen, Representative Government, pp. 14-17 and n. 38. Larsen discusses the chronological development of the supremacy of the Assembly, particularly the limitation of the power of the Council which is outlined in IG I² 114, an inscription of the latter half of the fifth century which Larsen takes to be a transcription of a post-Kleisthenic decree of about 501/0 B. C. Cf. Klaffenbach, Gr. Epigraphik, p. 73.

Occasionally, with the approval of the Council, foreign legates brought questions directly before the Assembly. IG II² 103, vv. 8ff. (Cf. GHI 133 and note.) tells of the Council receiving the envoys of Dionysios and his letters, and approving their appearance at the next session of the Assembly where they themselves are to introduce the question of the rebuilding of the Delphic sanctuary.

³ Wilhelm, Beiträge, p. 235.

⁴ Klaffenbach, Bemerkungen, pp. 36-37.

⁵ For the cost and fiscal process involved in the publication of state documents on stone, see below, pp. 67-75.

⁶ See Wilhelm, Beiträge, pp. 260 ff.

⁷ E. g. Syll. ³ 715; Michel, 553, 554; Cf. Wilhelm, Neue Beiträge 4, p. 54 (Perge).

⁸ This became the practice at Delphi after 197 B. C. (See Syll. ³ 585.) probably because of the crowded condition of the sanctuary as well as the high cost of publication in full.

⁹ See below, Ch. III, pp. 158-168 for further discussion of the state control of sanctuaries and the required grant of topos in the case of foreign publication.

Even subdivisions of the Polis, such as Demes, could own their own hiera, and exercise the same control over them as the state did over its property; cf. also the peculiar case of Gythion's sale of its own temple to two of its own citizens with the provision that they and their descendants should be its priests and owners forever (IG V (1) 1144). If this sale were unknown, the extant request of Gythion for a grant of topos in the local temple (IG V (1) 1146) would be unintelligible.

¹⁰As restored by Wilhelm, Beiträge, p. 236; cf. IG II² 583, v. 5 and Wilhelm, Beiträge, p. 230.

¹¹The question of the significance of the permanent publication of diplomatic documents is only alluded to here, but I hope to treat it elsewhere in detail.

¹²See Appendix A, below, p. 267, No. 74, and pp. 279-280; The lack of a directive for publication in 74 is usually explained on the supposition that the stele was put up privately by the Kitian merchants who by the decree had secured permission to build a temple in the Peiraeus (Cf. GHI 189 and note.). It cannot be assumed that this decree would give them the right to publish wherever they wished. Since the inscription was found in the Peiraeus, it is logical to assume that it was published at the site of the temple, and that permission to publish there would be implicit in the grant of topos for the temple.

¹³A parallel to this practice of incorporating motions for publication in the body of the decree for the published draft, can be seen in Athenian Secretary's handling of amendments. The most noted example is IG I² 118, the Athenian decree honoring Oiniades of Skiathos. In last position on the stele is an amendment in the form of a resolution that Oiniades should be described in the decree as being not of Skiathos, but of Old Skiathos. The use of "Old Skiathos" in the decree proper shows that the Secretary has acted on the amendment in his draft for publication.

On the function and procedure of amendments, see Klaffenbach, Gr. Epigraphik, pp. 72-3; Woodhead, Greek Inscriptions, p. 39 and n. 5. Woodhead notes that the full record of amendments was discontinued in Attica from 275 B. C. or so onwards, and that outside Attica they are unusual in any case. Since amendments were always used, it must be that in Attica after 275 B. C. and generally outside Attica, the substance of the amendments was incorporated into the body of the decree before publication, without any reference to the secondary resolution. This would be the same procedure here posited for the separate resolutions for publication.

¹⁴Cf. Schulthess, S. V. "Grammateis" RE VII, 1716, (1912).

¹⁵On the date of the reform and the introduction of the new secretary, see W. B. Dinsmoor, The Athenian Archon List in the Light of Recent Discoveries (New York, 1939) p. 5, n. 8; W. K. Pritchett, Hesperia 10 (1941) pp. 266-268. For a long time, most scholars thought that the title γραμματεὺς ὁ κατὰ πρυτανείαν existed as early as the fifth century as ὁ γραμματεὺς ὁ κατὰ πρυτανείαν τῆς βουλῆς, a

redundant title which Köhler restored in the inscribed copy of Drakon's law on homicide (IG I² 115, vv. 6/7), and that the usual designation $\gamma\rho\alpha\mu\mu\alpha\tau\epsilon\delta\varsigma$ τῆς βουλῆς was in the fifth and early-fourth centuries simply a shortened version of the "full title" (Cf. Schulthess, RE VII, 1720/21). However, the new study of I² 115 by R. Stroud (Drakon's Law on Homicide, (Berkeley and Los Angeles, 1968) pp. 8, 29/30) has produced new readings which invalidate Köhler's supplement and show definitely that the publication of the law was to be carried out by the Anagrapheis "after receiving it from the Basileus, with the assistance of the $\gamma\rho\alpha\mu\mu\alpha\tau\epsilon\delta\varsigma$ τῆς βουλῆς." Nearly decisive proof that the introduction of the title $\gamma\rho\alpha\mu\mu\alpha\tau\epsilon\delta\varsigma$ κατὰ πρυτανείαν is contemporary with the reform of the office, is the fact that all of the inscriptions mentioning the title, including many recent finds from the Athenian Agora, are dated after the mid-fourth century (See Stroud, p. 30 and n. 51).

¹⁶ See Schulthess, RE VII, 1721, 51ff.

¹⁷ E. g. Schulthess, RE VII, 1721/22; Gomme, OCD s. v. "Grammateis;" Stroud, Drakon's Law, p. 30.

¹⁸ E. g. Ferguson, Athenian Secretaries (Cornell, 1898) pp. 8-11, 63.

¹⁹ For the relative chronology of the two titles, see Ferguson, Athenian Secretaries, pp. 8 and 10; In keeping with his belief in a single secretary, Ferguson (p. 11) assumes that the period of the two titles, between 358-6 or 354-2 B. C. and 318/17 B. C. is a transitional stage which ends with one name superceding the other. Not only is the period unduly long for a transition, but as Ferguson himself shows, the two titles are mentioned with equal frequency throughout.

²⁰ See Gomme, OCD, s. v. "Grammateis."

²¹ Ferguson's explanation (Athenian Secretaries, p. 36) was to translate the epithet κατὰ πρυτανείαν as 'prytany after prytany.' But this seems an awkward expression to describe an annual tenure.

²² Herodotus used the word πρυτανίη to speak of the command which he believed to change every day; although the word is not used in the same sense elsewhere, this system of daily change of command at Marathon is confirmed by Plutarch (Arist. Ch. 5), and the same system is attested by Diodoros (13, 97. 106) for the battles of Arginusai and Aigospotami. Herodotus may have had in mind a rotation of the command according to tribe. Cf. further, How and Wells, Commentary, 6. 110.

²³Ferguson, Athenian Secretaries, p. 34.

²⁴See the discussion below, p. ff.

²⁵Hereafter, the secretaries will be distinguished by title, only when the distinction is critical to the discussion.

²⁶See below, Section IV., p. 34-52 .

²⁷Athenian Secretaries, p. 36.

²⁸Beiträge, p. 232.

²⁹pp. 9-12.

³⁰Wilhelm, Beiträge, pp. 275-284; cf. L. Robert, Épigraphie, p. 495: "Les documents sur pierre ne sont pas les archives; ils peuvent être des copies des archives, mais non l'original. Ces copies sont parfois intégrales, parfois abrégées, plus ou moins radicalement, et il faut y penser quand on en fait l'étude diplomatique."

³¹See S. Dow, "The Athenian Law Codes," Proceedings of the Massachusetts Historical Society, 71 (1953-1959), p. 16. On the cost of inscriptions, see below, pp. 70-73.

³²On the use of this word as designating either a room or a building, see Wilhelm, Beiträge, p. 255.

³³Cf. Klaffenbach, Bemerkungen, p. 13 and n. 2.

³⁴Beiträge, pp. 235, 253, 258ff.

³⁵See U. Kahrstedt, Klio, 13 (1938) pp. 25-32; followed by Hignett, HAC, p. 14.

³⁶For the evidence of the use of the Bouleuterion as an archive, a thesis first expounded by Wilamowitz (Phil. Unters. I. 205 ff.), see H. A. Thompson, Hesperia 6 (1937) pp. 215ff. to which should be added IG I² 91, v. 11; cf. A. R. W. Harrison, JHS 75 (1955) pp. 27ff.; W. E. Gwatkin, Hesperia 26 (1957) p. 139; Klaffenbach, Bemerkungen, pp. 23-25, 29/30.; D. W. Bradeen, Hesperia 32 (1963) p. 205, n. 88; C. B. Welles, "Isocrates' View of History," The Classical Tradition, Literacy and Historical Studies in Honor of Harry Caplan (Ithaca, 1966) pp. 10/11; Stroud, Drakon's Law, pp. 28-29.

³⁷ Cf. the case of IG I² 25 (424/3 B. C.) which was re-inscribed, apparently when part of the text on stone had been weathered beyond visibility.

³⁸ Cf. above, p. 20 and n. 30.

³⁹ The fullest documentation of the material, preparation, cost, and use of temporary publications at a single site is still Th. Homolle's Les archive de l'intendance sacree de Delos, 13; Cf. Wilhelm Beiträge, pp. 239-249, a summary of the evidence from a number of states. For the use of wood in various forms as the predecessor of publication on stone, see L. H. Jeffery, Local Scripts, pp. 51-53.

⁴⁰ See IG I² 27; Hesperia 11 (1942), p. 230, No. 42; IG II² 195; cf. below, Appendix A, 8, 25, 66, and pp. 275-276.

⁴¹ Bemerkungen, pp. 21-22.

⁴² See IG I² 374; cf. Jeffery, Local Scripts, pp. 56-57 for the history of papyrus as a writing material in Greece.

⁴³ For the common meaning of ἀναγράφαι as "to publish" as well as "to inscribe," see the investigation of its epigraphical contexts by Wilhelm, Beiträge, pp. 257-264. But Klaffenbach has shown (Bemerkungen, p. 20), contrary to Wilhelm, that it can be also used as a synonym of καταχωρίζαι and other terms for the "depositing" of documents in archives.

⁴⁴ Beiträge, p. 268.

⁴⁵ First, by V. von Schoeffer, s. v. "Delos" RE IV 2486 (1901); cf. Klaffenbach, Bemerkungen, p. 24.

⁴⁶ For a duplicate copy on stone "in the Bouleuterion," see the heavily restored provision in the decree of Tribute Reassessment of 425/4 B. C. (IG I² 63 v. 23-25). For the Bouleuterion as an archive, see above, p. 24 and n. 36.

⁴⁷ E. g. καταχωρίζειν and καταγράφειν, in Syll. ³ 976, v. 13ff.; cf. Klaffenbach, Bemerkungen, p. 20.; But καταθεῖναι is frequently used of the erection of Athenian stelai on the Acropolis.

⁴⁸ This interpretation would further argue against Dittenberger's (Syll. ³ 83, n. 8) proposed emendation of v. 29 to καὶ Ἐλευσῖνι for Ἐλευσῖνι καὶ by which he would have the records intended for the

Eleusinion at Athens and the Bouleuterion in Eleusis. While inscriptions were certainly set up in or near the Athenian Eleusinion, there is no evidence for its use as an archival depository, as there certainly is for the Bouleuterion. Further, the Eleusinion at Eleusis would be the more logical place to keep the records of the First-Fruits.

⁴⁹ Wilhelm, Beiträge, p. 236; cf. the additional examples cited by Klaffenbach, Bemerkungen, p. 25.

⁵⁰ Of course it may be that the stele was given public prominence in the period after the Thirty, then moved inside the Bouleuterion where it resided in Lykourgos' time.

⁵¹ Bemerkungen, p. 24.

⁵² Although there are no figures for the cost of temporary publications at Athens, a mid-third century account on Delos (BCH 27, p. 85, v. 197ff.) shows that the cost of making and inscribing a δέλιος was about six dr.

⁵³ Bemerkungen, p. 25.

⁵⁴ It is common in the abbreviated and often crabbed style of epigraphical language to find verbs governing more than one object syntactically, but only one of them logically. Cf. above, p. 28-29 and n. 44 and the use of ἀναγράφαι for the disposition of both the stele and the archival copy. Cf. also such expressions as "to publish the proxenos" (E. g. p. 30 above.).

⁵⁵ Cf. Wilhelm, Beiträge, p. 242; J. & L. Robert, Bull. Epigr. 1953. This carving of letters in relief must have been the method employed in the "permanent" wooden publications such as the axones at Athens prior to the development of the stone stele for lengthy texts.

⁵⁶ For the use of the stone wall in permanent publications, see below, pp. 62-63.

⁵⁷ Klaffenbach, Bemerkungen, p. 23; cf. Wilhelm, Beiträge, p. 264.

⁵⁸ See Wilhelm, Beiträge, p. 264ff.

⁵⁹ Ferguson (Athenian Secretaries, p. 28) mentions four cases of the title with the Secretary's name in decrees not concerned with foreign affairs (cited here according to IG, (Editio Minor), rather than

C. I. A.) : IG I² 196, 202, and 212, all concerned with Athenian tribute; IG I² 115, the republication of Drakon's Law; To these should now be added IG I² 76, the decree of the First-Fruits, and IG II² 10, the decree honoring the expellers of the Thirty.

⁶⁰ Athenian Secretaries, p. 30.

⁶¹ Athenian Secretaries, p. 28.

⁶² Hartel, Studien, pp. 29, 37, 119; cf. Ferguson, Athenian Secretaries, pp. 30-31; Schulthess, RE VII, 1713, 1-20.

⁶³ The avoidance of ambiguity in such a system of reference to former decrees by the Secretary's name was allowed by the limitation of the secretariat to two terms in a lifetime, although the real purpose of this limitation was to keep the office in the control of the Demos.

⁶⁴ Athenian Secretaries, p. 31.

⁶⁵ pp. 9-12 ; 20 and n. 30.

⁶⁶ For the discussion of this point, see below, pp. 73-75.

⁶⁷ See GHI 189 and note.

⁶⁸ L. Robert, "Épigraphie et Paléographie," Comptes rendus de l'Académie des Inscriptions (1955), p. 212; pp. 213/214 for examples of inscriptions showing significant corrections and revisions; cf. also Klaffenbach, Gr. Epigraphik, pp. 48-49.

⁶⁹ See below, pp. 168-172 : the envoys were responsible for publications in foreign states, but generally contracted the engraving of the stelai to native masons. Since their primary obligation was to negotiate permission for publication and a place for the stele, they were most likely chosen more for their diplomatic than technical skills.

⁷⁰ See below, pp. 45 ff.

⁷¹ See Loewy, Inchr. griech. Bildh. 531.

⁷² See above, p. 41.

⁷³ Cf. also IG XI, 746; Klaffenbach, Bemerkungen, p. 23; cf. also above pp. 28-29.

⁷⁴If this was the same Timanthes incriminated as one of the Hermokopidai (Andokides I, 35), it is not clear whether a favorable inscription is finally being removed because of his guilt, or incriminating matters are being expunged because he has been pardoned.

⁷⁵For the Poletai, see Th. Lenschau, s. v. RE XXI (2), 1359 (1952).

⁷⁶For the Kolakretai, see J. Oehler, s. v. RE XI, 1068 (1921).

⁷⁷See below, pp. 70-71.

⁷⁸For the "Ten Talents," see below, p. 68.

⁷⁹In this decree, the cost of the publication is referred to as a εὔρον, a term used to indicate the price of bid which secures a contract; cf. Syll.³ 966, v. 36.

⁸⁰Dedications From the Athenian Acropolis (Cambridge, Mass. 1949), p. 436.

⁸¹R. Meiggs, JHS 86 (1966), pp. 89-90.

⁸²Cf. Wilhelm, Wien. Anzeiger, XIV-XVII (1930), pp. 98ff.; also, below pp. 71-73.

⁸³Klaffenbach, Gr. Epigraphik, p. 49; cf. J. & L. Robert, REG 72 (1959), p. 261.

⁸⁴See the work of S. V. Tracy with "Hand B" of IG II² 2336: "A Letter-Cutter of Classical Athens," (Ph. D. diss., Harvard University, 1967).

⁸⁵Cf. also IG II² 274, a decree honoring the people of Sestos.

⁸⁶IG IX (2), p. x = Tod, Intl. Arb. XL; cf. also the thirty-day deadlines in the arbitration between Latos and Olous: IC I, xvi, 4 = Intl. Arb. LIII.

⁸⁷Whether or not the enigmatic "Ἐγγατοῦ" represent a city, as the Thronians do, they must be Eastern Lokrians, for they use the calendar of the town of Skarphe in Eastern Lokris (v. 2); See the commentary in FD, loc. cit. with Flaceliere's discussion of the word and its possible interpretations.

⁸⁸Cf. Appendix B for the most notorious cases of failure to carry out prescribed publications of diplomatic documents, involving the grants of asylia by cities of Krete in the third and second centuries B. C.

⁸⁹Below, pp. 271-280, especially pp. 275-276 for the comparison of the original location and modern provenience.

⁹⁰In the formulaic directions to the Secretary for the location of the stelai, the term ἐμ κ'λει is generally used in the fifth century, but gives way to ἐν ἀκροπόλει after the archonship of Eukleides (See Syll. ³ 92, n. 5; cf. Foucart, BCH 12 (1888), p. 166), except in some sacrificial inscriptions of which the most recent is a little after 390 B. C. (IG II² 24). The expression ἐν ἀκροπόλει is in general use after the Peace of Antalkidas in 387/6 (See IG II² 30b, v. 2).

⁹¹See IG XII (Suppl.) (Lesbos, No. 142), an arbitral decree of Pergamon, dating from sometime before 138 B. C. which speaks of καθιερω[ω]μένων στηλῶν ("dedicated" or "consecrated" stelai) in the sanctuaries at Ilion, Delos, and Ephesos; One is reminded of the custom of the ancient Greeks of dedicating their literary and scholarly compositions in religious sanctuaries, possibly with some intention of their preservations (See the numerous instances collected by W. H. D. Rouse in The Votive Offerings (Cambridge, 1902) p. 64); cf. also GHI 23, a series of solemn curses against lawbreakers, engraved on two stelai at Teos, and dating from about 470 B. C. The final curse (vv. 35-41) is directed against anyone who breaks, defaces, or makes away with these stelai; There is a further religious sanction against the defilement of the publications of treaties implied in the solemn oaths of the signatories. See, for example, a decree of the Akhaian Confederacy (IG V (2) 344) found at Orkhomenos in Arkadia, in which the oath of allegiance of the member states reads (vv. 8ff.): "I swear by Zeus. . . and all the gods to abide by all the things on the stele, the agreements and the decree of the Akhaian Confederacy etc.;" cf. the examples in Phillipson, International Law i, pp. 118, 388, and 414. It is not unusual that in Greece, the breaking of the treaty, and consequently the oath, came to be described by the figurative expression καθελεῖν τὰς στήλας (See Demosthenes, For The Megalopolitans, 27; cf. Arrian, Anab. II, 1, 4; 2, 2; Dem. In Lept. 37).

⁹²See Jacobsen & Smith, Hesperia 37 (1968), pp. 184-199, v. 40/41 of the inscription; cf. the discussion below, p. 176 and n. 44.

⁹³E. g. IG II² 304; cf. R. Hubbe, Hesperia 28 (1959) pp. 169-201; see also Appendix A, below, p. 277.

⁹⁴ See Appendix A, p. 279.

⁹⁵ For the Agora, see Appendix A, p. 277 ; for the temenos of Demos and the Graces, see below, p. 55 , and Appendix A, p. 278.

⁹⁶ See IG II² 1006, v. 96, 1008, v. 72, 1009, v. 57.

⁹⁷ Cf. the same restriction in IG II² 646; however, an exception was apparently made for the statues of Antigonos I and Demetrios.

⁹⁸ Cf. also IG II², 450, 1041.

⁹⁹ Nevertheless, the publication for Eumaridas was not carried out for another generation: see above, p. 52 ; cf. Appendix A, No. 90 and p. 279.

Athenian officials who wished to set up stelai, probably enjoyed considerably more freedom in their choice of sites than the private citizen or honored foreigner. IG II² 1048 and 1049 show that when an official of the Prytaneis was honored, the Prytaneis themselves were allowed to choose the site for his stele; cf. Dow, Prytaneis, No. 88 (= IG II² 977) which allows that the stele be set up οὗ δὲ ἐπιτηδεύον εἶναι φαίνονται. Cf. the Epebic inscriptions, IG II² 1041, 1048-1051 which show that the proposers of the decrees were granted by the Demos sites which they had chosen beforehand.

¹⁰⁰ IG XII (2), 645, v. 44ff., quoted above, p. 40. Cf. also IG VII 190, XII (3), 170, 249, XII (5), 129, 604, XII (7), 23, 24, 229, 231.; also Wilhelm, Neue Beiträge 6 (1921), pp. 63-68.

¹⁰¹ Cf. also: IG V (1) 932 (Epidauros Limeria); OGI, 299, v. 30 (Smyrna); Wilhelm, Beiträge, p. 261.

¹⁰² Cf. also IG II² 448, an inscription of two decrees in honor of Euphron of Sikyon, with its unilluminating provision that the stele be erected "in the Acropolis, next to the temple of Athena Polias."

¹⁰³ See the restoration and commentary of Wilhelm, Beiträge, pp. 293-295; cf. Klaffenbach, Bemerkungen, p. 10; Since the verb used in the provision is ἀναγραφάτω, it may be that the second copy required by law is an archival deposit (See above, pp. 28-29.); this interpretation is especially appealing in the light of the last clause which speaks of a "second copy" being sent to a foreign city, apparently that of the honored.

¹⁰⁴ Cf. the heavy grouping of manumission decrees in the theatre and in the Exedre de l'Aire (FD III. iii (1), & vi.). Since most of these

inscriptions date from the last two centuries B. C. and later, when publication of manumissions was required by law (See Klaffenbach, Bemerkungen, pp. 38ff.), the grouping may simply result from these areas being available at this time.

¹⁰⁵ For a discussion of this phraseology in foreign publications, see below, pp. 163-164.

¹⁰⁶ Cf. IG IX² (1), 417, v. 10ff. where the Stratians of Akarnania direct that their decree of proxeny for certain Milesian dikasts be published ἐν τῷ ἐμφάνει.

¹⁰⁷ Cf. n. 109, below; however, a common decree of the Amphiktyony and the Polis of the Delphians (FD III i (2) 357) settling a dispute over the use of the Theban Treasury seems to indicate that at that time (219-218 B. C.), the League and city shared the control of sanctuary property.

¹⁰⁸ See the commentary on FD III. ii (2), p. 121.

¹⁰⁹ The authority of secretaries and other officials in determining the form, content, and placement of inscriptions may have made them candidates for bribery. There is some hint of this in the oath of the Secretary in the Amphiktyonic laws published at Athens in 380/79 B. C. (IG II² 1126, v. 9-11.): "I promise. . . never to accept gifts;"

¹¹⁰ Above, p. 24-25.

¹¹¹ The same economizing is evident in the publication of civil and religious records. Ferguson (Treasurers, p. 33 and n. 3) notes the practice of the Treasurers of Athena in the financial squeeze of the Peloponnesian War in inscribing their accounts on the space left blank on the stelai of their predecessors. Cf. ibid. p. 69, and the practice of the Treasurers beginning in 414 of using the backs of the earlier stones for the inventories of the Hekatompedon and the Pronaos; cf. also during the War, the reengraving of IG I² 25 on the reverse of a stele inscribed with the related decree, IG I² 24.

¹¹² Examples are IG VII 207-209; IX² (1) 4a-d.

¹¹³ See Klaffenbach, Gr. Epigraphik, p. 53; cf. above, p. 32-33.

¹¹⁴ See FD III. i (1), p. 199, n. 2, with commentary and references to other examples from Delphi.

¹¹⁵ E. g. the Gortynian Code; cf. Welles, Royal Correspondence, pp. xl-xli, for examples of series of related correspondence carved on walls.

¹¹⁶ For the publications of Nikhomakhos, see the commentary and bibliography in R. Stroud's Dakron's Law, pp. 25-26 and n. 32; see especially, S. Dow, "The Law Codes of Athens," Proc. of the Mass. Historical Soc. v. 71, pp. 2-36; for the decree of Teisamenos and the later publication, see Andokides 1.82-85, and MacDowell, Andokides, p. 199ff.

¹¹⁷ Ath. Mitt. 28 (1903), p. 443; cf. Michel, 1455 and note.

¹¹⁸ Since the Athenian Secretary is not mentioned in connection with the publication, and considering that there was an acropolis and a port at Eretria also, it is tempting to propose such a restoration as ἀκροπ[όλει τηι τῶν Ἐρετριέων]/καὶ ἐν τῷ λιμένι, directing a double publication at Eretria instead of at Athens. However, this restoration has one more letter than the established stoichedon pattern of thirty-nine allows (as does Kirchner's text in this line and vv. 4, 12, 14, 15, & 20); also the publication at Athens would thereby have to be taken for granted, and the likely restoration in the following lines of the Treasurer of the Demos as the financier for the inscription would be incompatible with the assignment of the publications to the foreign site. The restoration which still suits the line-length of thirty-nine letters, as well as context and the regular practice of publication in both states is Koehler's ἀκροπ[όλει ἐν πόλει ἐκάστη].

¹¹⁹ Other examples of provisions for duplicate publications in the same city: IG II² 648 v. 10ff. (Athens, in the Acropolis and the Dionysaion); IG IX (2), 517 v. 20ff. (Larisa); IC III. iii, 3B, v. 10ff. (Hierapytna and Lyttos in Krete).

¹²⁰ See Austin, Stoichedon Style, p. 54.

¹²¹ Cf. above, p. 57.

¹²² See Accame, Lega, p. 10ff.

¹²³ Hermes, 24 (1889), p. 110ff.

¹²⁴ Other apparent duplicate stelai from the Athenian Acropolis: IG II², 44 and 155, 216 & 217, 662 & 663, 666 & 667 (These two may be similar decrees for different men.); for the case of a non-diplomatic publication duplicated in the same sanctuary, see J. R. McCredie, Hesperia 29 (1960) p. 123ff. Cf. also the duplicate publication of an Eretrian decree of honors, IG XII (Suppl.) 553, and its edition by Ziebarth (Praktika, 10, (1935) p. 220 ff.) in which he explains the minor discrepancies and difference of lineation between the two texts.

¹²⁵ See A. C. Johnson, CP 9 (1914), p. 422. This term is very similar to that used to describe the source of payment for the Rhodian copy of the alliance of Rhodes and Hierapytna (IC III. iii, 3A): "Let the Treasurers pay the price from the funds set aside for decrees."

¹²⁶ The "ten talents" here does not refer to a gift made by Strato to Athens, as interpreted by Fiehn, s. v. "Straton," RE IV. A. 273 (1931). Cf. Tod GHI 123, v. 68, 139, v. 18 with commentary, p. 118; Syll.³ 346, v. 16; Hartel, Studien, p. 131ff.; Accame, Lega, p. 65ff; also Schwahn, s. v. "Tamiiai," RE IV A2, p. 2108 (1932); I could find no evidence for Schwahn's supposition that the Ten Talents was originally intended only for the publication of decrees, and that the use of this money for other purposes resulted from an annual excess in the budget; as the expression $\epsilon\iota\varsigma\ \tau\acute{\alpha}\ \kappa\alpha\tau\grave{\alpha}\ \varphi\eta\phi\acute{\iota}\sigma\mu\alpha\tau\alpha$ implies, the fund was intended for any expenses determined by decrees, such as travel-allowances or xenia.

¹²⁷ See Aristotle, Ath. Pol. 47.

¹²⁸ See W. K. Pritchett, BCH 88 (1964), p. 474, n. 3.

¹²⁹ The Apodektai were a board of ten instituted by Kleisthenes, who received all of the money from the revenue-collecting departments and paid it over to the spending departments (including the Secretary) under the supervision of the Council (Ath. Pol. 48.1). It seems that one of the duties of the Apodektai was to serve as intermediaries who transferred "sacred money" from the accounts of the Treasurers of Athena to those of the public treasury when such loans were decreed by the state. (See IG II² 29, and Ferguson, Treasurers, p. 134.)

¹³⁰ See IG II² 508 and note.

¹³¹ Cf. Dow, Prytaneis, ch. 1, p. 42.

¹³² Also unusual is the delegation of the responsibility for the payment of the stele of an Athenian citizen about this time: IG II² 641 (ca. 299/8 B. C.), a decree of the Demos honoring Posidippos of the deme of Kothokidai, charges $\acute{\omicron}\ \acute{\epsilon}\xi\epsilon\tau\acute{\alpha}\sigma\tau\eta\varsigma$ (Cf. Aiskhines, 1.113, where the officer of this title has the duty of checking payments to foreigners.)
 $\kappa\alpha\iota\ \acute{\omicron}\ \tau\upsilon\pi\tau\upsilon\delta\acute{\alpha}\rho\chi\omicron\iota$

¹³³ See Hartel, Studien, p. 141 for a list of the Athenian inscriptions with quoted prices.

¹³⁴ Cf. above, p. 45-46 for the coincident change in the system of contracting publications.

¹³⁵ GHI 181, v. 19-25 cf. below, pp. 125-126, 146-147 for similar statutory control of amounts of travel allowance and grants of public hospitality quoted in Athenian decrees.

¹³⁶ These are the calculations of Tod, BSA 49 (1954), p. 6; cf. also Wilhelm, Wien. Anz. 14-17 (1930), p. 98ff.; Tarn, The Hellenistic Age, pp. 124-125. Although such records on stone of epigraphical cost were apparently rare, all organized states must have kept some account of their expenditures for publication; N. B. the decree of Krannon in Thessaly (IG IX (2) 461) which stipulates that the cost of inscription "is to be recorded in the logoi of the city."

¹³⁷ I was able to establish only a rough correlation of the lengths of the texts and the figures quoted in the texts which were complete enough to warrant study. Cf. Larfeld³ p. 116.

¹³⁸ Below, p. 274 ; the exception (37) is the decree with Selymbria which has secured its independence thereby.

¹³⁹ Busolt, Gr. St., II, p. 819 ff. and n. 3.

¹⁴⁰ Below, p. 272.

¹⁴¹ Hesperia, 17 (1948), p. 55 and n. 2.

NOTES: CHAPTER II

¹ Cf. the discussion of the duties of the Athenian Secretary, above, pp. 12-25 ; also, for Greek secretaries in general, see Schulthess, RE vii, 1708-1780, s. v. "Grammateis," (1912). Outside of Athens, the responsibility for foreign dispatches is charged to officials of various titles; e. g. at Olympia, the Bolographos (Ol. 39): In a late pre-Christian decree of Syros (IG XII (5), 653, vv. 58ff.) the Prytaneis draft the foreign copy, and choose the envoy to carry it. These officials are probably not the equivalent of the Athenian Councillors in prytany, but more likely the members of a board of magistrates similar to those of the same title in the second century on Samos (Syll. ³ 976, 3) or at Hierapytna in Krete (Syll. ³ 581, 91).

² E. g. IG II² 1013, v. 52; IC I, xvi, 4, vv. 23ff.; FD III, vi, 53, v. 9, 54, v. 1; Syll. ³ 712, n. 17.

³ Klaffenbach, Bemerkungen, p. 28 and n. 1, argues that the term was so used, but his examples do not explicitly identify the stele as an antigraphon; the example, Syll. ³ 915: ἀναγράψαι--ἀντίγραφα τῶν συνηκῶν εἰς στήλην λιθίνην may simply be interpreted as referring to the inscribing of the texts of copies onto the stele. His argument is a little more enhanced by Syll. ³ 588: ἀντιγρα[φῆναι εἰς τὰς στήλ]ας. The copy of a text on stone was usually designated as an ἀναγραφῆ from ἀναγραφήναι meaning "inscribe" or "publish," but this word could also be used of temporary publications and even the deposition of texts in the archives. Cf. above, pp. 28-29.

⁴ For other testimonia on books, papyrus, and their cost, cf. F. D. Harvey, "Literacy in the Athenian Democracy," REG 79, (1966) pp. 606-607, 634, and nn. 8-9; cf. also Jeffery, Local Scripts, pp. 56/7 for a summary history of papyrus as a writing material in ancient Greece.

⁵ Even in the Hellenistic period, both papyrus and hides are attested as archival materials in the same inscription (I. v. Priene, No. 114).

⁶ Jeffery, Local Scripts, pp. 57/8; cf. below, p. 91-92.

⁷ See below, pp. 154-168.

⁸ BCH 89 (1965) pp. 400-40; Meiggs (JHS 86 (1966) pp. 86-98, n. 44) suggests that although the stele may be Parian marble, this does not preclude its being brought from Athens. However, it lessens the probability considerably.

⁹See H. Bücking, "Vorläufiger Bericht über die geologische Untersuchung von Olympia," Monatsberichte der Berliner Akademie der Wiss. 1888, pp. 315-324.

¹⁰Cf. the thousands of stelai on Delos for which marble had to be imported.

¹¹Stoichedon Style, pp. 122-123.

¹²See the examples cited above, pp. 64-67.

¹³E. g. the case of "Hand B" of IG II² 2336, an Athenian mason who carved inscriptions at Delphi: S. V. Tracy, "A Letter-Cutter of Classical Athens," (Ph. D. diss. Harvard University, 1967) p. 148: cf. below, p. 170.

¹⁴See Meritt, Epigraphica Attica, p. 93, on the exodus of Athenian masons to more profitable fields during the tyranny of Demetrios of Phaleron, between 317 and 307 B. C.

¹⁵Stoichedon Style, p. 123.

¹⁶"The Public Seal of Athens," Phoenix 3 (1949), pp. 70-73.

¹⁷D. M. Lewis, "The Public Seal of Athens," Phoenix 9 (1955), pp. 32-34; for the date of the inscription, see Woodhead, JHS 51 (1931) pp. 139-163.

¹⁸See especially R. J. Bonner, "The Use and Effect of Attic Seals," CP 3, (1908), pp. 399-407; cf. also V. Chapot, Dar.-Sagl., s. v. "Signum."; O. Roszbach, RE VII (1910), pp. 1052-1115, s. v. "Gemmen!"; For the use of state labels on weights, measures, and a variety of tallies and ballots, chiefly, but not exclusively, from the fourth century and later, see M. Lang & M. Crosby, The Athenian Agora, vol. 10 (Princeton, 1964); also M. N. Tod, "Letter Labels in Greek Inscriptions," BSA 49 (1954), pp. 1ff.

¹⁹Lewis, op. cit. p. 33.

²⁰Phoenix 9 (1955), p. 34.

²¹Ibid., an alternate citation of this inscription, Syll.³ 796 B is mistakenly printed as 756B.

²²E. g. at Eretria of the second century, the Strategoi (IG XI (4), 1065, vv. 25ff.); at Knossos and Aptera in Krete about 170 B. C., the Kosmoi ("councilmen") (IC I, viii, 11, vv. 16-20; II, iii, 3, vv. 19ff.); at Tenos, the Archons (IG XII (5), 833, vv. 11-15); at Kos and Kalymna, the Prostatai ("presidents" of the Assembly) (Syll. ³ 953, vv. 10-52 passim).

²³Lewis, Phoenix, 9 (1955), p. 33.

²⁴Cf. Photius, s. v. ῥύπον.

²⁵The Athenian Agora, vol. 10, p. 125 and n. 11.

²⁶Cf. Gellius, 17. 9; also Cicero, Cat. 3. 410, and the Catilinarian conspirators who were betrayed by the seals on their own letters.

²⁷See D. Kahn, The Codebreakers (London, 1967) pp. 80ff., for examples of cryptography among the Greeks and Romans; especially, (p. 83) the description of a system devised by Polybios, cf. the use of ciphers by Julius Caesar, and by Augustus (Suetonius, Lives, 1. 66. 6; 2. 88; cf. Gellius, 17. 9. 1-5).

²⁸See the descriptions of this device by Plutarch, Lysander, 19; cf. A. Martin, Dar.-Sagl., s. v. "Skytale;" H. Swoboda, "Skytalisimos," Hermes, 53 (1918) pp. 94-101.

²⁹A secret pact between Athens and Philip II concerning Amphipolis and Pydna between 359 and 357 B. C. (Demosthenes, 2, 6-7; Theopompos, F. 30) has been alleged by many including Phillipson (International Law, i, 397). But recently De Sainte Croix (CQ 13 (1963) pp. 110-119) has shown, chiefly on the basis of the constitutional issue, that this is an impossibility.

³⁰Bonner, CP 3 (1908) pp. 406-7; Gniest, Die Formellen Verträge, p. 457.

³¹Op. cit., p. 406 and n. 6.

³²E. g. Demosthenes, On the Crown, 250.

³³Cf. the discussion below, pp. 177-186.

³⁴See M. N. Tod, Int. Arb. pp. 175, 189.

³⁵Tod, op. cit., p. 154.

³⁶ Cf. Tod, Intl. Arb., No. LXXV; the translations in the following pages are those of Tod, pp. 120-122.

³⁷ Bonner notes (op. cit. p. 407, n. 6) that signatures in the modern sense do not occur until Roman times; cf. P. Oxy. I. 105; In Greece in Classical and Hellenistic times, the mark of one's personal seal often served to indicate the "co-signing" or witnessing of documents such as wills. Demosthenes (28. 5) says of his father's executors: "It was their duty to bring in a number of witnesses and to have them counterseal the will."

Phillipson, (International Law, pp. 397-398 & n. 1) refers to three cases of "signatures" on Greek inscriptions from Sardis, Phrygia, and Narbonese Gaul, all from Christian times (One citation, CIG 6786, is mistakenly cited in Phillipson as No. 6785.). But these are not really signatures, but simply names inscribed on the stones below the texts, a practice common even in Classical times.

³⁸ Tod, Intl. Arb., p. 122 & n. 2.

³⁹ On the use of passports and visas, see below pp. 139-143.

⁴⁰ Phoenix, 3 (1949), pp. 70-71.

⁴¹ Cf. ATL, ii, 50/51, "D7," vv. 11-18 & plate.

⁴² Phoenix 9 (1955) 32/33.

⁴³ Cf. D. A. Campbell, Greek Lyric Poetry, (New York, 1967) p. 79, and pp. 347-349, the commentary and various interpretations of Theognis' "seal."

⁴⁴ See below, p. 139 & n. 109.

⁴⁵ Lewis, op. cit., p. 32.

⁴⁶ Wallace, op. cit. p. 70: ". . . they are to write down the amount they are sending on a tablet and seal it with the seal; the sealed tablet is then to be brought to Athens by the same officers who bring the tribute;"

Lewis, op. cit. p. 32: "The tablet, on which is inscribed the amount of tribute being sent, is to be sealed, not with any pictorial or other device, but with the impression of the jagged symbolon."

⁴⁷ See Wallace's note as a postscript to Lewis, op. cit., p. 34.

⁴⁸Wallace, Phoenix 3 (1949), p. 71.

⁴⁹See above, p. 85.

⁵⁰See Bonner, CP 3 (1908), pp. 400-401; Parke, Proc. of the Royal Irish Academy 43 (1935-37), p. 372; Tod, GHI, 139; cf. also below, pp. 140-141.

⁵¹See pp. 9-12.

⁵²Cf. the similar situation in IG XII (7) 288, above, pp. 11-12.

⁵³An exceptional case outside Athens is the use of $\delta\epsilon\acute{\iota}\kappa\nu\sigma\iota$ to describe the choice of an embassy in a third-century Lesbian decree found at Lampsakos (IG XII (Suppl.), i 43, vv. 31ff.). This verb suggests that the embassy was "pointed out" or "appointed" in the assembly, but in this isolated instance, a precise interpretation is not possible.

⁵⁴Aiskhines (2. 19) mentions that Demosthenes made a proposal before the Council for the election of envoys, but there is no indication that the election took place there.

⁵⁵See IG II² 116, vv. 21ff. for the election of five Athenians to go to Thessaly to administer the oaths for the alliance of 360/1 B. C.; IG XI (4), 1056, vv. 33ff. where, in the second century, one man is elected from all the Athenians to convey a copy of an honorary decree to King Pharnakes and to address him and the Queen on behalf of the Demos.

⁵⁶Selection from the Council is attested for a number of other functions in Athens, but the frequently distinct and protracted responsibilities of an ambassador would seem to be incompatible with service in the Council; c. f., however, below, p. 114, the short-term mission to Eretria to administer oaths, comprised in half of Councillors.

⁵⁷Aiskhines, 2. 18.

⁵⁸See D. Mosley, TAPA 96 (1965), p. 262.

⁵⁹Ibid. 263ff.; Similar cases of "known" and "unknown" men seem to be attested in IG II² 116 (GHI 147), 102 (GHI 129 and n.), 41 (GHI 121); Mosley has noted that four of the lesser known men sent to Macedon in 346, Phyron, Ktesiphon, Iatrokles, and Aristodemos, were undoubtedly chosen on the basis of previous favorable associations with Philip II (Aiskhines, 2. 12-13, 15-17; Demosthenes, 19. 10, 315). This practice of maintaining continuity by sending envoys experienced with a particular

state or a particular problem was less common in Athens than at Sparta where it was standard procedure; cf. Mosley, "Pharax and the Spartan Embassy to Athens in 370/69," Historia 12 (1963) 247-50.

⁶⁰ GHI 103, and n.

⁶¹ Cf. the normal procedure in IG I² 118, where the probouleuma has been revised in the published draft to incorporate the change suggested by the amendment as well as the formula of ratification by the Demos.

⁶² Although the first step of appointment to the Council involved nominations, it is usually assumed that each Deme, assigned a proportional number of seats by tribe, sent more than that number to the Theseion from which selection by lot would be made; see M. Lang, Historia 8 (1959) p. 83 & n. 11; also Hignett, HAC, p. 150; Ehrenberg, The Greek State, (New York, 1964), p. 63; J. W. Headlam, Election by Lot At Athens (Cambridge, 1933) pp. 41ff. From this excessive number of candidates for sortition, and the restriction of two terms in a lifetime, we can be quite sure that the membership of the Council was truly representative of the average Athenian citizenry.

⁶³ J. H. Oliver (CW 44 (1951) p. 203) has argued that an ambassadorial group of seventeen was a peculiar Athenian institution. The idea has been strongly contested by A. P. Burnett (Historia 11 (1962) p. 9 & n. 10).

⁶⁴ Mosley, TAPA 96 (1965). The belief in a correlation of the importance and size of embassies goes back at least to the last century (E. g. F. Poland, De Legationibus Graecorum Publicis, Leipzig, 1885, p. 63; M. Heyse, De Legationibus Atticis, Göttingen, 1882, p. 32), and has been assumed as recently as 1963 (G. E. M. De Sainte Croix, CQ 13 (1963) p. 113. & n. 4.).

⁶⁵ E. g.: One man: IG XI (4) 1053, 1056, vv. 33ff., XII (Suppl.) 137, vv. 49ff., 354, vv. 26ff., XII (7) 388, vv. 29ff.; two men: IG II² 1132, vv. 28ff., 49ff., IX (2) 1111, vv. 32ff., Ol. 52, vv. 31ff.; three men: IG IX² (1) 582, vv. 7ff., Ol. 52, vv. 3-6.

⁶⁶ Cf. above, pp. 50-52, the stipulation of deadlines for local publication of diplomatic documents.

⁶⁷ Cf. other cases, all of interstate arbitrations: IC I, xvi, 4A, vv. 11-12, 17-19, 23ff.; Syll.³ 953, vv. 36, 40.

⁶⁸ See Pollux 8.2.137 for a discussion of these and other words and expressions connected with embassies; cf. Phillipson, International Law, i, pp. 304ff.

⁶⁹ See Syll. ³ 229, vv. 23ff (=GHI 165), 330, v. 27, 349, v. 5.

⁷⁰ E. g. Thuc. 2.67: the ambassadors of Sparta who fell into Athenian hands in 430 B. C. and were put to death without trial.

⁷¹ For the office of herald in general, see Oehler, RE. XI, (1921), 348-357, s. v. "Keryx;" Pottier, Dar. -Sagl. s. v. "Praeco."

⁷² Cf. the story of Anthemokritos (Plutarch, Pericles, 30), an Athenian herald who met his death in Megara; also Demosthenes, XII, 3-4.

⁷³ E. g. Phillipson, International Law, i. p. 307 & n. i.

⁷⁴ Thuc. 2.6.2; cf. Gomme, HCT, 4.118.2, on the use of heralds on occasions apart from war.

⁷⁵ Here, of course, we are only concerned with the heralds engaged in foreign service. The great number of persons called kerykes, who marshalled the populace at religious rites, contests, and processions, and who made proclamations at these events in the theatre (See. Pollux, 8.103.), as well as those who, as town-criers, convoked and marshalled the Council and Assembly at Athens (IG II² 678, 912-915, 918; Demosthenes, 23.97), must have been professionals, perhaps picked for their stentorian voices, or officials chosen for a given term rather than for a particular occasion; cf. Livy 32.20.

The heralds commonly employed in armies for such tasks as negotiating truces for the recovery of casualties may have been specialists in some cases, but otherwise they were probably soldiers chosen for particular occasions and outfitted with the wands; cf. below, p. 122 & n.81.

On the Elusian family of Kerykes, see the discussion below, p. 125 & n. 90.

⁷⁶ Cf. Jüthner, RE VIII, (1912) 232/233; Hesychios and Harpokration (s. v.) refer to the same type of messenger as dromokeryx.

⁷⁷ Note, however, Aiskhines' reference (2.130) to the use of the hemerodromos in diplomatic service.

⁷⁸ Herodotus 6.105 (He refers to Pheidippides as hemerodromes, but elsewhere uses the conventional spelling (e. g. 9.12)); cf. Pliny, N. H. 7.84; Nepos, Milt. 4.

⁷⁹N.H. 2.181, 7.84.

⁸⁰See Droysen, Hell. i, 2, 383; U. Wilcken, Alexander the Great, p. 80; F. A. Wright, Alexander the Great, pp. 249ff.; Schwartz, RE iii, 266ff. Fragments of the Bematists are collected and translated by C. A. Robinson, Jr., The History of Alexander the Great, i, pp. 35ff. (Philonides, p. 40).

⁸¹Note the use of the term keryx in this passage; again the man is characterized as a herald because of the type of mission, and not because of his professional status, which was that of hemerodromos.

⁸²Dar. -Sagl. s. v. "Theoroi;" cf. L. Ziehen, RE. ser. 2, V (1934), 2239-2244.

⁸³E. g. Michel, Recueil, 699; OGI, 305; IM 23, 31, 32, 54, 59, etc.

⁸⁴See Michel, Dar. -Sagl., loc. cit. p. 209, n. 4.; Cf. Aristophanes, Wasps, 1187ff.: Bdelykleon tells his father Philokleon that in order to impress people as a man of the world he should tell certain tales, among them that he has gone on a theoria with Androkles and Kleisthenes. By the mention of two noted rogues as the fellow theoroi of Philokleon, Aristophanes was expecting a laugh from his audience who knew such representatives should be men of distinction. Cf. W. J. M. Starkie, The Wasps of Aristophanes (London, 1897), commentary on v. 1187.

⁸⁵See the list of inscriptions compiled by Michel, Dar. -Sagl., loc. cit., p. 210 & nn. 9-24.

⁸⁶E. g. IM 35, 36, 44, 46.

⁸⁷See Michel, Dar. -Sagl. loc. cit., p. 210 & nn. 30-42; cf. FD III. iii (2), 215, vv. 26-27, 31-32.

⁸⁸For the Eleusinian mysterioides spondai and its dates, cf. IG I² 6, vv. 57ff., 76ff.; Aiskh. 2.133; Aelius Aristides, Eleusinius 7; Pollux, 1.36; for the Olympic truce, see Thuc. 5.49; Aiskh. 2.12.

⁸⁹For the letters of accreditation, see IG II² 1235, v. 7; Michel (Dar. -Sagl. s. v. "Spondophoroi," p. 1442, n. 4) refers to a trace of a staff or scepter preserved on the base of a statue of an Olympian spondophoros (Ol. 414) but there is no allusion to it in the transcription or commentary on the inscription by Dittenberger and Purgold.

⁹⁰ See IG II² 1235; GHI 137, vv. 11-13.

⁹¹ Ol. 59-122 passim, 126, 413.

⁹² Cf. above, pp. 68-69, 70f. for the same details in provisions for the payment of stelai.

⁹³ See LSJ s. v. ἐφόδος.

⁹⁴ See Tarn, The Hellenistic Age, especially the chapter, "The Social Question in The Third Century." Tarn has gathered much of the data for wages and living costs in the period in question. Wages varied from as much as two drachmas for a skilled laborer or contractor to as little as one or two obols for common labor. From the figures for daily wages and piecework, and the cost of materials and consumer goods, Tarn deduced that the first half of the third century was characterized by a steady and considerable depression in income and a coincident rise in the price of necessities.

Further comparisons can be made with the little that we know of "living wages" in the late-fifth century, but the economic conditions, particularly in the inflationary years of the Peloponnesian War, cannot be applied with much confidence to the grants of ephodia in the fourth and third centuries. Athenian jurors received two obols per day in 451 B. C., and three obols in 425 (Cf. Busolt-Swoboda, ii, p. 898, n. 4). The pact of Athens, Argos, Mantinea, and Elis in 420/19 B. C. (Thuc. 5.47.6; IG I² 86) provided that those allies coming to the aid of others were to support themselves for thirty days, but if further service was required, the host state was to pay per diem of three Aeginetan obols to each hoplite, light-armed warrior, and bowman, and one Aeginetan drachma to each cavalryman. At the end of the fifth century, according to the Erechtheion accounts (IG I² 372-374), the normal pay of a construction worker was one drachma per day. Conjectures on the cost of living for various periods of the fifth and fourth centuries vary from slightly more to slightly less than a drachma per day for an average family (Cf. Mitchell, Economics of Ancient Greece, (New York, 1957), p. 133 & nn. 1-5).

⁹⁵ E. g. IG II² 116, vv. 40ff., 264, vv. 10/11, 360, vv. 35ff., 555, vv. 29ff. (Some of these are discussed in the following pages.)

⁹⁶ In Greece during the Roman Period, the financing of embassies was an important λειτουργία: See IGR IV 783, 791 (Apameia, Kibotos); CIG 2767, 2771, 2789, REG XIX 137, 70 (Aphrodisias); Judeich, 39 (Hierapolis); Ath. Mitt. XXXII 319, 47 (Pergamon); IGR IV 881 (Takina).

⁹⁷ Cf. Sokolowski's restoration of Agora I 5733 in Lois Sacrees des cites grecques (Suppl. 1962), pp. 32ff., No. 12, vv. 10ff. to the effect that each of the cities visited by the Eleusinian Spondophoroi are to pay them ephodia; also, Hesperia, 26 (1957) 52-3, No. 9; both of these texts are now obsolete with the joining of new fragments from the Agora (I 5733 to I 6974; textual joins with I 6794 a & b), and the realization of a stoichedon order or ninety-seven letter-spaces instead of Sokolowski's fifty-six.

⁹⁸ See, for example, all of the decrees of asylia of Kretan cities for the island of Teos, cited in Appendix B, below, pp. 281-288 cf. also IG XII (2), 15, vv. 14ff., an Aitolian decree to Mytilene; IG IX² (1), 191, an Aitolian decree to Tenos.

⁹⁹ E. g. the case of the Eresian dikasts in Paros (IG XII (Suppl.) p. 34-35, No. 121, vv. 16ff.); the Milesian dikasts in Stratos in Akarnania (IG IX² (1), 417, vv. 10ff.).

¹⁰⁰ Cf. above, p. 124. and the Amphiktyony's prosecution of Megarians who violated certain theoroi on their way to Delphi.

¹⁰¹ See Phillipson, International Law, i, 328-330.

¹⁰² Gomme, HCT 4. 118. 1; cf. Daux in Athenian Studies Presented to W. S. Ferguson, HSCP Suppl. i, 1940, pp. 46-48.

¹⁰³ Cf. Gomme, HCT 4. 118. 1; 5. 18. 2.

¹⁰⁴ See IG I² 82, the not on v. 7, quoting Koehler.

¹⁰⁵ For the office, see Tod, Intl. Arb. p. 83 & n. 2; also L. Robert, BCH 52 (1928) p. 417, n. 5; BCH 53 (1929) p. 158.

¹⁰⁶ Tod, Intl. Arb. p. 84, n. 1.

¹⁰⁷ E. g. T. W. Jacobsen & P. M. Smith, Hesperia 37 (1968) p. 197, comment on vv. 43-49; cf. IG XII (Suppl.), pp. 45-47, No. 139A.

¹⁰⁸ Cf. K. Regling, RE VA (1934) 851-854 s. v. "Tessera;" Phillipson, International Law, i, pp. 132-3, 322.

¹⁰⁹ Excavations in the Athenian Agora have unearthed a number of symbola tetmemena with demotic names painted on one side, and tribal names on the other (H. A. Thompson, Hesperia 20 (1951) pp. 51-2 and pl. 25). Cf. M. Lang's convincing hypothesis explaining the use of

these tokens in the allotment of Athenian civil offices (Historia 8 (1959) pp. 80-89). A similar tally, pierced with a hole so that a string could be attached was found near the Dipylon but is now lost (IG I² 916; cf. Koumanoudes, Athenaion 8 (1879) p. 237, No. 6).

Plato in his Symposium (191 d) has Aristophanes use the symbolon tetmemenon as an interesting metaphor to describe man as half a being who is forever seeking his primordial unity which had been divided by Zeus: "Each of us is the tally of man, as if bisected to resemble flatfish, two from one; each of us is perpetually searching for his own corresponding tally."

¹¹⁰ See above, pp. 106-7; cf. GHI 139.

¹¹¹ IG II² 207 bc, v. 6, 9, as restored by H. W. Parke, Proc. Royal Irish Academy xliii C 12, p. 370ff. Cf. Wallace, Phoenix 3, (1949) p. 71 n. 7 who counters the symbola here are more likely seals previously agreed upon, since, according to Parke's restoration, it is fairly clear that this decree is not the first contact with Orontes, the Persian satrap. However, it seems perfectly plausible that at any crucial point in this contact, the use of some device like the symbola tetmemena could have been initiated for reasons of security.

¹¹² See above, pp. 103-106.

¹¹³ Considering the seriousness of false representation, the use of some such credential must have been required. Demosthenes (De Falsa Leg. 126, 131), in his accusation of Aiskhines, indicates that the false assumption of the title of ambassador was $\kappa\alpha\rho\acute{\alpha}$ τὸν νόμον and that the penalty was death.

¹¹⁴ See above, p. 107-108.

¹¹⁵ Cf. Hdt. 3.128, 2.38; in the latter case, Herodotus uses the verb for the pressing of a seal ring into adhesive clay.

¹¹⁶ Lysias V, 310; Lysias attributes this move to the future tyrants as part of an antidemocratic conspiracy, but it would seem a wise move under the circumstances, and the ill intent implied by Lysias may reflect some of his own bias.

¹¹⁷ Phillipson, International Law i, p. 133, suggests on other grounds that this was the case.

¹¹⁸ Polybios 4.34; cf. Phillipson, International Law i, p. 315 & nn. 4/5, for the parallel at Rome, where the foreign envoys were obliged to announce their arrival to the senate through prior notification to the

praetor or quaestor urbanus at the temple of Saturn, Plutarch (Quaest. Rom. 43) suggests that they gave in their names first of all to the quaestors, because these supplied them with the necessary ξένια (munera) or λαύτεια (lautia).

¹¹⁹ Aristotle, Ath. Pol. 43.6.

¹²⁰ On the Athenian Prytaneion and its use as a syssition, see Wycherley, Testimonia, s. v. "Prytaneion," pp. 166ff., especially pp. 173-174: the bibliography on Sitiesis, and an extensive list of Athenian inscriptions with references to honorary meals in the Prytaneion.

¹²¹ Cf. also Syll. ³ 558, v. 21: ἐπὶ ξένια ἐπὶ τὰν πατριον ἐστὶν.

¹²² See Wycherley, Testimonia, 559 (Plutarch, Vit. X Orat. 847 d-e), 570 (IG II² 1283), 563 (Suda s. v. "Prytaneion"), 565 (Schol. Thuc. 2. 15. 2), 544 (Schol. Aristeides III, p. 48, 8 (Dindorf)).

¹²³ Cf. above, pp. 68, 70-73 for the use of the same fund, budgetary procedures, and statutory limits in the financing of inscribed stelai at Athens.

¹²⁴ For the complex procedure of νομοθεσία in the fourth century, see Ostwald, Nomos, p. 1, n. 1 and the bibliography in n. 2.

¹²⁵ Tod, Intl. Arb. p. 83 & nn. 3-5.

¹²⁶ See, for example, Michel, Recueil 230, v. 31, 291, v. 24; OGIS 315, v. 14.

¹²⁷ E. g. IG XII (7) 31, vv. 6ff.: Two Rhodian envoys are decreed proxeny by Arkesine on Amorgos for the stated reason that they addressed the Rhodian Demos worthily in accordance with the decree which they carried.

¹²⁸ See the example, cited by Phillipson, International Law i, pp. 344-345; cf. also the episode of the ambassador returning from Persia in Aristophanes' Acharnians 61ff., and its implications; also ibid. vv. 595ff.

¹²⁹ Cf. above, pp. 140-141 on the use of symbola in dealing with non-Greek envoys which may reflect the same cautious attitude.

NOTES: CHAPTER III

¹ See above, pp. 3-12, 54-56.

² See IG II² 1126-1137; the only other such official foreign documents with which this writer is familiar are two joining fragments of a Doric inscription (Hesperia 30 (1961) 222-223), and an unpublished fragment of a decree of Thespiæ (Agora I 6420), also from the Agora.

³ Granted that the decreeing states or interested individuals may have undertaken publication abroad without a provision to that effect in the published text, nevertheless, the small ratio of foreign to local copies of diplomatic inscriptions in any state shows that even these cases were rare.

⁴ See B. Keil, Anon. Arg. pp. 306-307.

⁵ See, for example, Inscr. Delos, 73; IG XI, 1022-1025, 1027.

⁶ See, for example, IG II² 1130, v. 3 (Athens); IG XII (Suppl.) 121, v. 12ff. (Eresos); IG XII (3) 322 (Thera); IG XII (Suppl.) 258, vv. 19-20 (Andros); I. v. Priene, 53 (Priene).

⁷ See, for example, IG II² 555, vv. 16ff.; IG XI 1022; IG XII (Suppl.) 509 (Methymna), 121 (1) (Eresos).

⁸ See now Meiggs & Lewis, No. 45.

⁹ IG II² 111; cf. Syll.³ 158 (369/8 B. C.), the Athenian control of publication in the Delian sanctuaries through its Amphiktyons; Syll.³ 662 (165/4 B. C.), the control of Delos by the Athenian cleruchs; Syll.³ 281, 287, 298, Athenian control of Oropos, the Amphiaraiion, and its publications.

¹⁰ Cf. other Hellenistic examples in OGI 225, 226; I. v. Pergamon, 163.

¹¹ Cf. below, Appendix B.

¹² See Wilhelm's brief treatment of this subject in Neue Beiträge 6 (1921) 30; cf. also the more detailed discussion of Tarn (JHS 44 (1924) 147 ff.) and Kolbe (JHS 50 (1930) 20 ff.) in the course of their polemic on the political standing of Delos in the third century. These two articles will be referred to hereafter as "Tarn" and "Kolbe."

¹³ See, for example, IG II² 861, vv. 26ff., 909, vv. 19ff.; IC I, xvi, 4A; also the numerous references in Kolbe, p. 27, n. 12.

¹⁴ Tarn (p. 152) gives these imperative expressions an arbitrary and confusing distinction of meaning depending on the relationships of the states involved: between independent states, they are "shortened forms of request," and when addressed to subject states, they are orders. But these phrases are certainly addressed to local magistrates and envoys, and there is no need to construe them as "requests," although they certainly presuppose the necessity of making a request in the case of an independent host state. Nor is it correct to interpret these formulas as "orders" when addressed to weaker states (unless they are addressed directly to the magistrates of that state, as in the case of IG IX (2) 517, discussed above (p. 157)); even when they concern weaker states, they are still addressed to the magistrates and envoys of the stronger state, the only difference being that in the weaker state these officials have the power to carry out their orders for publication without requesting permission.

¹⁵ Cf. IG XI, 1061, a decree of the Dionysiac Artists which first directs that stelai and statues are to be erected on Teos and Delos, and then instructs its envoys to go to the Councils of Teos and Delos and request topos for the stelai; cf. also IG XII (5) 817, vv. 23ff.

¹⁶ See n. 2, above.

¹⁷ In three of the inscriptions there are allusions to publication, but not to requests; e. g. IG II² 1132, vv. 28ff.: ". . . and to dispatch an antigraphon of this decree to the Demos of the Athenians, so that the honors granted by the Amphiktyony may be evident." cf. also 1134, vv. 59ff., 1136, vv. 1/2.

¹⁸ The cases cited here should be sufficient to vitiate the argument of I. Merker (AJA 72 (1968) 383-384) that the omission of any mention of an embassy in the decree of Iulis in IG II² 1128 indicates that 'the harbor' where the decree was to be published must have been the possession of Iulis.

¹⁹ Cf. GDI 3059; BCH 24 (1900) p. 74.

²⁰ Cf. also IG XI (4) 1052; I. v. Priene 8, vv. 54ff., 47, v. 28, 53, 63, vv. 30ff.

²¹ Cf. also IG VII, 19, 20, 21, 4130; V (1) 1428; XII (2) 17; XII (3) 1073; XII (Suppl.) "Lesbos" 137, 139, 143; Syll.³ 656, 1158; Michel,

357, 462, 514; I. v. Magnesia, 15, 97, 101; I. v. Priene, 57, 61, 71, 77; I. Delphinion, 152, 152a, 153; OGI 437, 345 + BCH (1911) p. 471; BCH (1913) p. 122, No. 39.

²²Tarn, p. 150.

²³Tarn (p. 149, n.43), in support of his idea of "interstate courtesy," quotes Wilhelm's Neue Beiträge 6 (1921) p. 31: "Dagegen wird die Bezeichnung des Platzes, an dem in einer anderen Stadt eine Stele errichtet werden soll, höflicherweise dieser überlassen." Wilhelm is certainly right that in answer to the request of the decreeing state, the choice of the site was left up to the recipient state, not only as a matter of courtesy (höflicherweise), but as a matter of law. But still this does not really support the notion of Tarn that a specific request was a breach of this courtesy.

²⁴Tarn, p. 149.

²⁵There were some instances of very specific spots, such as the area around the statues of the Tyrannicides in the Athenian Agora, where other monuments were forbidden by local statute (See above, pp. 54-55, nn. 96 and 97). But this specific application of a law, which seems to be what Tarn has in mind, was exceptional, and would not have dictated a general policy that visiting envoys not request specific topoi for their publications.

²⁶See, for example, IG XII (Suppl.) p. 210, vv. 14ff.; IX² (1) 417 = I. v. Didyma 487, vv. 10ff.; Inscr. Delos No. 73; also the decrees cited above, pp. 160-162 and n. 19; cf. also the inscriptions cited by Kolbe (p. 23), who correctly opposes Tarn's differentiation of hiera and the "particular sites" within them.

²⁷Tarn, p. 148.

²⁸Ibid., p. 147.

²⁹Ibid., p. 150.

³⁰See also the examples cited above, pp. 54-55, and by Kolbe, pp. 21-22.

³¹For some of the Ionic intrusions in this inscription, see the comments of Jacobsen and Smith (Hesperia 37 (1968) on vv. 13-15 (p. 193) and vv. 43-49 (p. 197); for further discussion and examples of such incidental dialect intrusions by foreign masons, see below, pp.

³² See Austin, Stoichedon Style, pp. 76-81; comparable evidence from Athens is lacking chiefly because of the paucity of foreign documents there. The sole foreign publication at Athens in the stoichedon style is a fragmentary decree of Miletos (IG II² 1129) which is itself not significant, since there are excellent example of the style found in Miletos itself in both the fifth and fourth centuries (Cf. Austin, loc. cit., pp. 95-96.

³³ See the study of S. V. Tracy, "A Letter-Cutter of Classical Athens," Ph. D. Diss., Harvard University, 1967.

³⁴ See, for example, IG VII, 54, 58 (Megara), 336, 430 (Oropos), 563 (Tanagra), 1831 (Thespiiai); cf. also E. Loewy, Inschr. gr. Bildhauer, passim; J. Marcadé, Recueil des signatures de sculpteurs grecs, i & ii, Paris (1953 & 1958); see also the reviews of Marcadé by Richter (JHS 75 (1955) 179) and Pritchett (AJA 59 (1955) 73) who comment on the extensive travel of Greek sculptors.

³⁵ Cf. IG XII (7) 388 (quoted above, p. 165), and the expression, "will hand over the decree."

³⁶ See, for example, IG II² 1134 (also the extant Delphic exemplar, FD III, ii, p. 75), the Athenian copy of a decree of the Delphic Amphiktyony honoring the Athenian Dionysiak Artists. It provides not only for published copies at Athens and Delphi, but also that all of the representative Hieromnemes carry copies to their own cities. Cf. an analogous oral dissemination of the fifth-century Athenian alliance with Phokis which, according to IG I² 26, was to be announced to the other members of the Amphiktyony at the next meeting at Pylai.

³⁷ Cf. the discussion of asylia in Appendix B, below.

³⁸ See the fasti Acarnanici in IG IX² (2), p. ix ff.

³⁹ See the list of Akarnanian inscriptions from Aktion given by Chr. Habicht, "Eine Urkunde des Akarnanische Bundes." Hermes 85 (1957) 90, n. 1, d-k; as the editio princeps of IG IX² (2) 583, this article gives a full commentary on that inscription and the Akarnanian takeover of the sanctuary at Aktion.

⁴⁰ See Bölte, s. v. "Geraistos" RE VII 1233-1234 (1910); there remains the possibility that this sanctuary is to be associated with the remains of Elleniko Platanistou to the north of Porto Kastri, and that the stele was transported to the latter site at a later time. Cf. Jacobsen and Smith, op. cit. pp. 196-197 and nn. 27-28.

⁴¹As restored by Busolt, Philol. XLI pp. 688ff.

⁴²See Jacobsen and Smith, op. cit. pp. 196-197, the comments on vv. 39-41.

⁴³There is also the possibility that Geraistos was Kharianthos' native area, but because this city was then under the political control of Karystos, he was a citizen of the state of Karystos and therefore called "Kharianthos of Karystos."

⁴⁴Cf. Jacobsen and Smith, op. cit. vv. 37ff.; this writer differs with their translation of the provision ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ τοῦ Ποσειδῶνος τοῦ Γεραιστίου ἐν τῷ ἀσύλῳ as ". . . in the sanctuary of Poseidon Geraistios, in the inviolable area." The editors are unable, apparently because of the disjointed word-order, to accept the ἐν τῷ ἀσύλῳ as a simple attributive referring to ἱερῷ. In their comments on this line (p. 197), they take ἀσύλῳ as a substantive referring to some special part of the sanctuary designated as an asylum. They admit that there are no definite parallels for this phenomenon of partial asylia in a sanctuary, but suggest a possible analogue in IG VII, add. 4135, vv. 6-7: εἶναι δὲ καὶ ἄσυλον τὸ ἱερόν τοῦ Ἀπόλλωνος τοῦ Πρωίου τὸ ἐν Ἀκραϊφύοις, ὡς ἀναίστηται ὀρίζωσι. It seems almost certain that the stelai referred to here are the horoi which customarily delimited the entire area of a sanctuary. This interpretation is sustained by the actual use of the term horoi in a very similar passage not mentioned by the editors of the Kimolian decrees: In a letter of Ptolemy III to Kos confirming the asylia of the sanctuary (not "part of the sanctuary") of Asklepios (Welles, Royal Correspondence, No. 27, vv. 9ff.): καὶ τοῖς ὑφ' ἡμᾶς τασσομένοις παραδώσομεν ἄσυλον ἡγεῖσθαι τὸ ἱερόν ὡς τοῦδ' ὅρους τεθείκατε. It must be remembered also that in ancient Greece from the earliest times, all sanctuaries were considered inviolable in their entire extent, and, that only in Hellenistic times, for the purpose of special protection, certain sanctuaries acquired formal grants of asylia. But even in all of the extant decrees of asylia for sanctuaries, (See the examples cited in Appendix B, below.) it is the whole sanctuary, and not part of it, that is in question. All in all, the linguistic difficulty in taking ἀσύλῳ as modifying ἱερῷ in the Kimolian decrees, where such disjointed constructions are unusually common, seems less a problem than the concept of a hieron which is only partially asylon.

⁴⁵While the grandeur of the Athenian Acropolis easily rivaled that of Delphi and Olympia, it did not fall into the same class of "Panhellenic" sanctuaries. Practically all of the monuments and dedications on the Acropolis were of Athenian origin, and its diplomatic publications, with the doubtful exception of IG II² 1135, seem to have been limited to the documents of Athens and her correspondents. Athenian festivals such

as the Dionysia and the Panathenaia were occasions for receiving embassies and conducting diplomatic business, but again primarily in matters involving Athens: E. g. the reception of the plenipotentiary envoys of Macedon at the Dionysia (IG I² 57, vv. 23ff.); the quadrennial re-assessment of tribute to Athens at the Great Panathenaia (IG I² 63, vv. 26ff.); the quadrennial renewal at the same festival of the oaths of the treaty with Elis, Mantinea, and Argos, in addition to their renewal at the Olympic games (Thuc. 5.47.10); the yearly renewal of the oaths of the Athenian-Spartan alliance of 421 B. C., in Athens at the Dionysia, and in Lakadaimon at the Hyakynthia (Thuc. 5.23). Thus Athens and its festivals did not have a Panhellenic character, and the Greeks did not refer to the Acropolis as a koinon hieron as they did the precincts at Olympia, Delph, et alibi.

⁴⁶ E. g. König, Der Bund der Nesioten (1911), p. 59, in regard to to Delos in the Hellenistic period.

⁴⁷ See, above, pp. 6-8, 54-56.

⁴⁸ Cf. the Athenian control of Delos in the fifth, fourth, and second centuries; the Arkadian and Pisan takeover of Olympia from Elis in 365-363 B. C. (Note Ol. Nos. 30 and 31, both "local" Arkadian stelai at Olympia.). Sanctuaries themselves were often the objects of territorial feuds, as in the age-long dispute of Sparta and Messenia over the ager Dentheliatas and its shrine of Artemis Limnatis (See Tod, Intl. Arb. pp. 55-56); also, the Amphiareion in Oropos was doubtless a prize in the periodic contest for that area between Athens and Boiotia; the three Sacred Wars all concerned, either directly or indirectly, the control of the Delphic sanctuary.

⁴⁹ See Tarn, JHS 44 (1924), pp. 141-147, the discussion of "holy place" and "neutral place."

⁵⁰ See Thucydides' account (5.49) of Elis' exercise of her authority over the sanctuary at Olympia in 420 B. C.; The Eleans refused Sparta access to the temple and the right of participating in the games because of a fine owed for alleged violation of the Olympian truce.

⁵¹ Cf. Tod, Intl. Arb. No. I; above, pp. 94-96, the discussion of these documents with regard to the use of seals.

⁵² Cf. the situation at Delphi where the local officials controlled the treasury buildings and all other monuments, and allocated space on them for the carving of inscriptions. It is true that the treasuries were used primarily by the nations which built them, as archives, depositories for valuable objects, and sometimes as quarters for their Theoroi who

came as special delegates to the festivals. But in the strictest sense, these buildings were dedications to Apollo, and therefore, property of the sanctuary and under the control of the Polis of Delphi and the Amphiktyonic League. This state of affairs is reflected in a single small fragment of a decree of Thebes on the Theban Treasury (FD III, i (2) 357) comprising a complaint to be brought before the Polis of Delphi and the Amphiktyony that Kraton the Delphian (presumably an official of the sanctuary) was no longer giving the Thebans hospitality in their own treasury building. The claim of the Theban ambassadors is answered favorably by a decree of Delphi inscribed on the same stone (Ibid., 358).

⁵³ Cf. IG IX² (1) 170, vv. 2ff.

⁵⁴ Cf. above, p. 44, the case of Athens and Alexander of Pherai.

⁵⁵ See Tod, Intl. Arb. I, II, VIII, IX, X, LXXIX, LXXX (Olympia); XXXVI, XXXVII, XXXVIII, XL (Delphi); XLV; LII, LVIII (Delos); XIV (Epidauros).

⁵⁶ Ibid., p. 157.

⁵⁷ E. g. IG XI (4), 1052, a third-century decree of Syros honoring Eumedes of Klazomenai, published and proclaimed at Delos.

NOTES: CHAPTER IV

¹ Discussion of epichoric alphabets in interstate documents is largely excluded from this study because it would properly require a first-hand investigation of the inscribed texts; but from the reasons which can be ascribed for the treatment of dialects, and from the cases known to me through editors' comments, it appears that local letter-forms, like spelling and other aspects of dialect, were generally retained when a document was published in a foreign state. See, for example, Tylissos' copy of its treaty with Knossos (c. 450 B. C.) arranged and drafted by Argos, which employs the same Argive alphabet and dialect as the official copy found at Argos (See Buck, G. D. p. 286).

² For example, E. Schweigert (Hesperia 6 (1937) p. 317 ff., No. 1), followed by Meiggs and Lewis (No. 31, p. 67 and n.), has attributed the Ionic lettering of IG I² 16 and other inscriptions to the fact that Ionic states were to pay for the stelai. Similarly, the Ionic exemplars of the Athenian Coinage Decree are generally assumed to take their dialect and script from the Ionic sites where they were found. If these interpretations are correct, the documents in question are rare exceptions to the general rule for the use of dialects in both local and foreign publication of documents. But in contrast to these cases, there are a great many Athenian decrees concerning Ionic states, some of them published at the expense of these states (e. g. IG I² 39) which were carved in the official Attic script. Further, there are from the same era Athenian decrees in Ionic which clearly have nothing to do with Ionic states (e. g. IG I² 25 [concerning the priestess of Athena Nike], 18 [settling affairs with Argos], and 55 [honoring Aristonoos of Larisa in Thessaly]). The Ionic of these fifth-century Athenian inscriptions has yet to be considered under the hypothesis that it is not an exception to the rule, that it is not a foreign dialect, but an occasional departure by the Athenian chancery from the official Attic script to the vernacular Ionic in wide use at Athens by the mid-fifth century.

³ C. D. Buck, "The Interstate Use of the Greek Dialects," CP 8 (1913) 133-159.

⁴ Cf. other examples mentioned by Buck, CP 8 (1913) pp. 145 ff.

⁵ Cf. above, pp. 40-43, for the duty of officials in checking and correcting texts before publication.

⁶ IG II² 1126, a law of the Delphic Amphiktyony, has some inconsistencies of dialect due to its transcription at Athens; see especially v. 22, and the editor's note. Cf. also the linguistic discrepancies of

II² 1132 with its Delphic exemplar (FD III ii, p. 71).

⁷ See R. Stroud, Drakon's Law on Homocide, p. 64.

⁸ IG XII (Suppl.) pp. 43-44, No. 137; this inscription also has some dialectal corruption of the Lesbian text by the Ionic scribe or mason of Eythrai (See the edition of Kenner, SB. Ak. Wien LXXI (1872) 335-356.).

⁹ G. D. p. 122, n. 153.1.

¹⁰ Cf. G. D. pp. 65-66, nn. 73-76, esp. n. 75; precisely the reverse change in the inscription of a Rhodian decree erected at Eresos on Lesbos (IG XII (Suppl.) p. 43, No. 120): the transcription is quite accurate except that in v. 22 the Eresian scribe or stonemason substituted the Lesbian form $\sigma\tau\acute{\alpha}\lambda\lambda\alpha\nu$ for the Rhodian Doric $\sigma\tau\acute{\alpha}\lambda\alpha\nu$.

¹¹ Cf. G. D. p. 62, n. 68.3.

¹² See E. Bourguet, Le dialecte laconien (Paris, 1927). Cf. in Athens in the years before 403 B. C., the inconsistent use of H and E for various sounds of e; also the varying use of H for the aspirate, especially in the Erechtheion building account (IG I² 374, vv. 161 ff.) where it begins both aspirated and non-aspirated words with no consistency in either case.

¹³ G. D. p. 157, n. 231, p. 178, n. 279.

¹⁴ G. D. p. 32, n. 30; p. 153, n. 221.

¹⁵ Cf. below, n. 25, for the influence of Boiotian on the dialects of other Phokian cities.

¹⁶ Cf. above, pp. 19-20 for evidence of slaves employed in the Athenian archives.

¹⁷ Epigraphica Attica, p. 93.

¹⁸ See Buck's criticism (CP 8 (1913) pp. 134-135) of Hoffman and Meister, who viewed translation of dialect as the rule for interstate documents; Buck's article, which is still the finest treatment of the question, covers a number of controversial inscriptions both public and private. It is not the purpose of this section to attempt a re-writing of Buck's treatise, but only to add some further observations to his arguments and those of other commentators, and to introduce other cases not previously treated.

¹⁹Syll. ² 106 (= Syll. ³ 183 q. cf.); cf. also IG VII 207 & n.

²⁰CP 8 (1913) p. 149 & n. 1.

²¹Monats. der königl. Ak. Wiss. Berlin, 1857, p. 483; Opuscula VI, p. 365.

²²CP 8 (1913) p. 147 & n. 1; from his remark, "the one decree of Oropus in Boeotian is as good a parallel in one direction as the decree of the Arcadians in the other" Buck would seem to have misread Dittenberger's comment. "quae ad unum omnia Attica dialecto composita sunt." Regarding the dialects used at Oropos, Buck remarks elsewhere (G. D. p. 195): "Oropus seems to have been an Eretrian possession before it passed into the hands of the Thebans in the sixth century, and preserved the Eretrian dialect throughout the Boeotian and subsequent Athenian domination. But from the end of the fourth century the inscriptions are in Attic, a few in Boeotian." The respective claims of Dittenberger and Buck, that 'all the Oropian decrees are in Attic' and that 'a few Oropian inscriptions are in the Boiotian dialect,' require some clarification. All of the eight decrees in the Boiotian dialect from Oropos (IG VII 280, 283, 290, 352, 393, 4259, 4260, 4261) are decrees of the Boiotian Confederacy and not of the city of Oropos, although some are found on the same stones with Oropian decrees and some involve Oropian citizens. All of the decrees of the city of Oropos from the same period are in the Attic dialect, although they include in their prefaces the name of the Archon of the Confederacy beside those of the Archon of Oropos and the Priest of Amphiaraos; cf. F. Durrbach, De Oropoet Amphiarai Sacro, Paris (1890) p. 50.

²³Buck, CP 8 (1913) p. 148.

²⁴See IG VII 208 (For this decree on the same stone as 207 in question, see the following paragraph.), 210, 211, 214 & 219; in none of these cases are the Boiotian elements as numerous as in No. 207.

²⁵Cf. the somewhat parallel case of an early second-century joint-citizenship agreement of the two Phokian towns of Stiris and Medeon (IG IX (1) 32 = GDI 1539) which has some peculiarities of the dialect of neighboring Boiotia; another Phokian decree (I. v. Magn. 34) also has Boiotian forms.

²⁶Cf. above, pp. 60-61 for the use of single stelai for two or more unrelated document, probably for the sake of economy.

²⁷Buck, CP 8 (1913) p. 152 & n. 1, notes the lack of concern among the Greeks that the dialect of inscribed texts be exactly representative

of the concerned parties, and compares it with the practice in literary prose: "Just as linguistic realism is almost unknown among the Greek prose-writers, Xenophon being a notable exception in his fondness for a bit of dialectic color here and there. The puzzle in Thucydides is not that speeches of foreigners and treaties are regularly given in Attic form, but why an exception is made in the case of the two treaties between the Spartans and the Argives (V, 77 and 79). There is no probability in the view of Kirchhoff that all the other texts of treaties, for example of the three between Sparta and Persia (VIII, 18, 37, 58), were copied from actual versions in Attic and that the translation into Attic is never due to Thucydides himself ("deren Urheber auf keinen Fall Thukydides sein könnte, da dieser, wie die beiden letzten Urkunden des fünften Buches beweisen, hellenischen Urkunden nicht attischer Fassung ihre dialektische Fassung zu belassen pflegt" — Kirchhoff, Ueber die von Thukydides benutzten Urkunden, p. 153)."

²⁸ See Buck, CP 8 (1913) p. 152, for errors in this attempt at composition in Doric.

²⁹ Many of the circumstances of Kerkyra's entrance into the alliance as well as aspects of the published agreement are suspicious. See GHI ii, p. 85, the references to the military expedition of Timotheos which brought the northwest states into the Confederacy, and p. 69, the veiled imperial policy of Athens toward the states of the Second Confederacy.

³⁰ Buck, CP 8 (1913) p. 158.

³¹ Cf. above, pp. 177-186, for the discussion of this practice.

³² Buck, CP 8 (1913) p. 159; Kirchhoff, Ueber die von Thukydides benutzten Urkunden, p. 99; Grundy, Thucydides, p. 55.

³³ Cf. above, n. 27.

APPENDIX A

A STATISTICAL STUDY OF THE LOCATION, FINANCING, AND
PROVENIENCE OF ATHENIAN DIPLOMATIC PUBLICATIONS

The following tables and commentary represent a statistical study of a selection of Athenian diplomatic inscriptions. The object of this survey is to provide some valid estimate of the relative numbers of various types of diplomatic documents discovered at Athens, the proportions of each type having provisions for additional publications in foreign sites, the sources of payment for the local and foreign copies, and the original location and ultimate provenience of the Athenian stelai. Athens, for two reasons, is the only state for which significant information of this kind can be obtained. First, only Athens, from the mid-fifth century to the Roman period, committed such a bulk of diplomatic material to stone that a statistically significant number of its inscriptions survive; secondly, Athenian inscriptions contain the most numerous and detailed provisions for their own publication, and are almost unique in their inclusion of detailed provisions for payment. Since the number of diplomatic documents inscribed at Athens is so large, the Athenian statistics, in regard to the numbers of publications, cannot be extrapolated to other states. But while the amount of material published varied with time and place, the technical process was more conservative and uniform; consequently the Athenian system of placing and financing stelai on state property was probably typical, and in some cases the model, of the practices in other Greek states.

STATISTICAL TABLE OF ATHENIAN DIPLOMATIC PUBLICATIONS

Eds.	Date	Provenience	Subject	Local publ. For. publ.	Payer**
IG I ² 10	453/2 B. C.	Acrop.	Regulation of the laws and administration of Erythrai	Acrop.	Erythrai *A
1. <u>SEG 10.11</u> <u>GHI 29</u>					
2. I ² 14-15 <u>SEG 21.22</u>	447/6	Acrop.	Regulation of the affairs of Kolophon	Acrop.	Kolophon? Kolophon
3. I ² 16 <u>SEG 19.2</u> <u>GHI 32</u>	ca. 465	Athens	Regulations for the settlement of commercial disputes with Phaselis	Acrop.	*B Phaselis
4. I ² 18	after 458	S. slope	Settlement after defeat of Aigina	A	A A
5. I ² 19 <u>GHI 31</u>	454/3	Acrop.	Treaty with Segesta	Acrop.	B Athens

258

* In the following tables, the letter A indicates that in the inscription in question the surviving fragment does not extend to that part of the decree which would contain the relevant provision; that is, we cannot tell whether the provision was carved or not.

The letter B indicates that the inscription is relatively complete in that part which normally contained the provision in question, and that we can be fairly certain that it was never recorded.

** In the column headed "Payer," the entry of a single name designates the source of payment for the only publication mentioned. Instances in which one party was the source of payment for both local and foreign publication, or, each party was responsible for the financing of its own publication, are so indicated.

6.	<u>I² 22</u> <u>SEG 21.17</u>	450/49	S. slope	Regulation of judicial and military affairs of Miletos	A	A	A
7.	<u>I² 26</u> <u>SEG 21.6</u>	ca. 458	S. slope	Renewal of treaty of alliance with the Delphic Amphiktyony	A	A	A
8.	<u>I² 27</u> <u>SEG 21.15</u>	ca. 450/49	Acrop.	Proxeny of Delphians	Acrop. & Bouleut.	B	A
9.	<u>I² 36</u> <u>SEG 10.33</u>	ca. 447/6	Athens	Proxeny of Thespians	Acrop.	A	Athens
10.	<u>I² 39</u> <u>SEG 10.36</u> <u>GHI 42</u>	446/5	S. slope	Settlement of affairs with Khalkis	Acrop.	Khalkis in sanct. of Zeus Olymp.	Khalkis for both
11.	<u>I² 40-43,48</u> <u>SEG 21.26</u>	ca. 446/5	Acrop.	Decrees regulating the affairs and tribute of Histiaia	A	A	A
12.	<u>I² 45</u> <u>SEG 21.29</u> <u>GHI 44</u>	ca. 445	Acrop.	Regulations for the Athenian colony at Brea	Acrop.	B	colonists of Brea
13.	<u>I² 49</u> <u>SEG 10.49</u>	432/1	S. slope	Regulation of the judicial process at Eretria	A	A	A
14.	<u>I² 50</u> <u>SEG 10.39</u>	439/8	Acrop.	Treaty of Alliance with Samos	A	A	A

<u>15.</u>	I ² 51 SEG 10.48 <u>GHI 58</u>	433/2	Athens?	Treaty of alliance with Rhegion	A	A	A
<u>16.</u>	I ² 52 <u>GHI 57</u>	433/2	S. slope	Treaty of alliance with Leontini	A	A	A
<u>17.</u>	I ² 53	before 432	Asklep.	Treaty of alliance with Philip of Macedon	A	A	A
<u>18.</u>	I ² 55	ca. 431	Athens	Honors for Aristonoos of Larisa	Acrop.	B	A
<u>19.</u>	I ² 56	ca. 430	Acrop.	Honors for Leonidas of Halikarnassos	Acrop.	Hal. in sanct. of Apollo	Leonidas for both
<u>20.</u>	Hesp. XI, 1942, pp. 230-1.n.42 <u>SEG 10.54</u>	ca. 430	Agora	Proxeny of Krison and brothers	Acrop. & on boards at the Bouleut.	B	Krison or his state
<u>21.</u>	I ² 57 <u>GHI 61</u>	429, 426, 424	S. slope	Relations with Methone Macedonia	A	A	A
<u>22.</u>	I ² 58 <u>SEG 10.74</u>	ca. 426	Acrop.	Grant of trading privi- leges to Aphytis	Acrop.	B	Aphytis
<u>23.</u>	I ² 59 <u>SEG 10.70</u>	ca. 427/6	Acrop.	Honors for Apollophanes of Kolophon	Acrop.	B	B

<u>24.</u>	I ² 60 SEG 10.69 GHI 63	427/6	Acrop.	Establishment of Athenian Cleruchies in Mytilene	Acrop.	B	Mytilene
<u>25.</u>	I ² 63 GHI 66	425/4	Acrop.	Tribute re-assessment in the Athenian Empire	Acrop.& Bouleut.	B	Athens
<u>26.</u>	I ² 67	424 ?	Acrop.	Treaty of alliance with Oiniadai	Acrop.	B	Athens
<u>27.</u>	I ² 70 SEG 10.84	424/3	Acrop.	Proxeny for Potamodoros of Orchomenos	Where P. wishes(?)	B	B
<u>28.</u>	I ² 71 SEG 19.11	ca. 436	Acrop.	Treaty with Perdikkas of Macedon	A	A	Athens
<u>29.</u>	I ² 82 SEG 10.92	421/20	Acrop.	Proxeny for Asteas of Alea	Acrop.	B	Athens
<u>30.</u>	I ² 86 Thuc. 5.47 SEG 16.9 GHI 72	420/19	S. slope	Terms of treaty of alliance of Athens, Argos, Man- tinea, Elis	Acrop.	i)Argos ii)Mantinea iii)Olympia	A (prob. each paid for own; Olym- pia in com- mon).
<u>31.</u>	I ² 87 SEG 14,8	424/3	S. slope	Treaty of alliance with Halos in Thessaly	Acrop.	Halos in sanct. of Apollo	Athens for its copy; H prob. its own.

<u>32.</u>	I ² 90 SEG 10.89 GHI 68	422	Acrop.	Treaty with cities of the Bottiaioi in Macedonia	Athens, prob. Acrop.	Various sanct. of cities of B.	B				
<u>33^a</u> <u>33^b</u>	I ² 93, a&b	419/18 or 413/12	Acrop.	Two exemplars of a decree of proxeny of Lykon of Achaia	a)Acrop. b)Acrop?	B	B				
<u>34.</u>	I ² 96 SEG 10.104	417/16	Acrop.	Treaty of alliance with Argos	A	A	A				
<u>35.</u>	I ² 108 GHI 84	410/9 & later	S. slope	Two decrees honoring Neapolis in Thrace.	Acrop.	Neap. in sanct. of Maiden	Neapolis for both				
<u>36.</u>	I ² 110 SEG 10.125 GHI 86	410/9	Acrop.	Thrasyboulos of Kalydon honored with citizenship	Acrop.	B	Athens				
<u>37.</u>	I ² 116 SEG 10.132 GHI 88	409/8	S. slope	Ratification of Treaty with Selymbria	Acrop.	B	Selymbria				
<u>38.</u>	I ² 118 GHI 90	408/9	Acrop.	Honors for Oiniades of Skiathos	Acrop.	B	B				
<u>39.</u>	II ² 1 SEG 10.143 GHI 96	405 B. C.	Acrop. & S. slope	Honors for Samos	Acrop.	Samos	Each for its own				
<u>40.</u>	II ² 6 GHI 98	403 or later	Acrop.	Renewal of record of proxeny for sons of Ape- mantos of Thasos	Acrop.	B	Eurypylos, one of the proxenoi				

<u>41.</u>	II ² 17	394	Acrop.	Honors for Sthorys of Thasos (two decrees)	Acrop. & s. of Pyth. Apollo.	B	B
<u>42.</u>	II ² 31 <u>GHI 117</u>	386/5	Acrop.	Honors for Hebryzelmis, king of the Odrysai	Acrop.	B	Athens
<u>43.</u>	II ² 34 <u>GHI 118</u>	384	Acrop.	Treaty of alliance with Khios	Acrop.	B	B
<u>44.</u>	II ² 40 <u>Hesp. XXI</u> p. 228 <u>SEG 21.228</u>	378/7	near the Agora	Treaty with Thebes	Acrop.	Thebes	A
<u>45.</u>	II ² 41 <u>SEG 21.227</u> <u>GHI 121</u>	378/7	Acrop.	Treaty of alliance with Byzantium	Athens	B	A
<u>46.</u>	II ² 42 <u>SEG 21.231</u> <u>GHI 122</u>	377	Acrop.	Treaty of alliance with Methymna	A	A	A
<u>47.</u>	II ² 43+883 <u>SEG 21.229</u> <u>GHI 123</u>	377;375 or 373	Area of Agora	Charter of Second Athenian Confederacy and list of members	beside statue of Zeus Eleuth.	B	Athens
<u>48.</u>	II ² 44 <u>SEG 21.232</u> <u>GHI 124</u>	377	S. slope	Treaty of alliance with Khalkis	Acrop.	Khalkis in sanct. of Athena	B

<u>49.</u>	II ² 96 SEG 21.234 <u>GHI 126</u>	375/4	Acrop.	Honors for envoys of Kerkyra, Akarnania, Kephallenia negotiating treaty of alliance	A	A	A
<u>50.</u>	II ² 97 SEG 21.235 <u>GHI 127</u>	375/4	S. slope	Conditions of alliance mentioned in II ² 96.	A	A	A
<u>51.</u>	II ² 102 SEG 21.236 <u>GHI 129</u>	375-3	S. slope	Treaty of alliance with King Amyntas III of Macedon	A	Macedon	A
<u>52.</u>	II ² 103 <u>GHI 133</u>	368	Athens	Honors for Dionysios of Syracuse and his sons	Athens	A	A
<u>53.</u>	II ² 105 & 523 SEG 21.239 <u>GHI 136</u>	367	Acrop.	Treaty of alliance with Dionysios of Syracuse	Acrop.	B	Athens
<u>54.</u>	II ² 106 <u>GHI 135</u>	367	Acrop.	Proxeny of Koroibos of Lakedaimon	Acrop.	B	Athens
<u>55.</u>	II ² 107 <u>GHI 131</u>	369-7	S. slope	Two decrees: Honoring Mytilene	Acrop.	B	Athens
<u>56.</u>	Hesp. VIII p. 5 n. 3 <u>GHI 137</u>	367	Agora	Decree directing the Athenian Boule to send a herald to the Aitolian League to protest the arrest of spondophoroi by the city of Trichion	A	A	A

<u>57.</u>	II ² 109	363/2	Acrop.	Honors for Astykratis and other Delphians	Acrop.	B	Athens
<u>58.</u>	II ² 111	363/2	S.slope	Regulation of the affairs Iulis after Kean revolt	Acrop.	Iulis in temple of Pythian Apollo	Each for its own
<u>59.</u>	II ² 112 SEG 21.242 <u>GHI 144</u>	362/1	S.slope	Ratification of treaty of alliance with Arkadia, Elis, and Phlious	A	A	A
<u>60.</u>	II ² 116 SEG 21.243 <u>GHI 147</u>	361/60	S.slope	Treaty of alliance with Thessaly	Acrop.	B	Athens
<u>61.</u>	II ² 124 SEG 21.248 <u>GHI 153</u>	357/6	frag. a under Gr. of Pan	Treaty of alliance with cities of Euboia	Acrop.	B	Athens
<u>62.</u>	II ² 125 <u>GHI 154</u>	357/6	Acrop.	Aid and protection for Eretria	i)Acrop. ii)Agora? iii)at the harbor (on wood?)	B	Athens
<u>63.</u>	II ² 130	355/4	near Ilissos	Proxeny of Lachares of Apollonia	Acrop.	B	Lachares
<u>64.</u>	II ² 141 <u>GHI 139</u>	367	Acrop.	Honors for Strato of Sidon	Acrop.	B	Athens

<u>65.</u>	II ² 148 <u>SEG 21.252</u>	356/5	Acrop.	Treaty of alliance with Lokris	Athens	B	Athens
<u>66.</u>	II ² 195 Wilhelm, <u>Beitr.236</u>	353/2	Acrop.	Honors for Aristokrates(?)	i)Acrop? ii)Bouleu- terion?	A	A
<u>67.</u>	II ² 206	349/8	Acrop.	Proxeny of Theogenes of Naukratis	Acrop.	B	Athens
<u>68.</u>	II ² 212 <u>GHI 167</u>	346	Piraeus	Honors for Bosporan rulers, Spartokos, Pairisades, Apollonios	Piraeus?	B	Athens
<u>69.</u>	II ² 222	344	W.slope	Honors for Peisitheides of Delos	Acrop.	B	Athens
<u>70.</u>	II ² 226 <u>GHI 173</u>	342	Acrop.	Honors for Arybbas, king of the Molossians	Acrop.	B	Athens
<u>71.</u>	II ² 237 <u>SEG21.266</u> <u>GHI 178</u>	337	Acrop.	Honors for loyal Akarn- anians	Acrop.	B	Athens
<u>72.</u>	II ² 274	before 336/5	Athens?	Honors for citizens of Sestos	Acrop.	Sestos	A
<u>73.</u>	Syll. ³ 262 <u>GHI 181</u>	336	Acrop.	Proxeny of a member of Philip's court	Acrop.	B	Athens

<u>74.</u>	II ² 337 <u>GHI</u> 189	333	Piraeus	Permission for Kitian merchants to build temple in the Piraeus	B (but prob. set up in Pir.)	B	B
<u>75.</u>	II ² 360	325/4, 330/29 328/7	Acrop.	Five decrees honoring Heraklides of Salamis on Kypros	Acrop.	B	Athens
<u>76.</u>	II ² 365	323/2	Acrop.	Proxeny of Lapyris of Kleonai	Acrop.	B	B
<u>77.</u>	II ² 448 <u>SEG</u> 21297, 317	323/2 318/17	Near Stoa of Attalos	Two decrees honoring Euphron of Sikyon: a) with citizenship b) for aid during Lamian War	a) Acrop. near Athena Polias? & near Zeus? b) Next to Zeus Soter (in Agora)	B	Athens
<u>78.</u>	II ² 483	304/3	S. slope	Honors for a physician, Phidias of Rhodes	Asklepieion	B	B
<u>79.</u>	II ² 555	between 307/6- 304/3	Acrop.	Honors for Asklepiades of Byzantium	Athens (Acrop?)	B	Athens
<u>80.</u>	II ² 505 <u>SEG</u> 19.61	302/1	Acrop.	Honors for Nikandros of Ilion and Polyzelos of Ephesos	Acrop.	B	Athens

<u>81.</u>	II ² 558	303/2	Acrop.	Citizenship for Oxythemides of Larisa	Acrop.	B	Athens
<u>82.</u>	II ² 653	289/8	Acrop.	Honors for Spartokos of the Bosporos	Acrop.	B	Athens
<u>83.</u>	II ² 660	after mid 4th. c. & 285/4	Acrop. & S.slope	Two decrees of isotelia and other honors for people of Tenos	Acrop.	B	Athens
<u>84.</u>	II ² 710	295/4-276/5	Acrop.	Citizenship for Alexandros son Myleas of Macedonia	Acrop.	B	Athens
<u>85.</u>	II ² 687 <u>SEG 21.373</u>	266/5	Acrop.	Ratification of treaty of alliance with Lakedaimon	Acrop. next to temple of Athena Pol.	Others cities where L.wishes	A
<u>86.</u>	II ² 786	shortly after 229/8	Acrop.	Honors for Aristokreon of Seleukea	Acrop.	B	Athens
<u>87.</u>	II ² 793	after 255	Asklepieion	Honors for Antigonos Gonatas	Acrop(?) & on base of A's statue	A	Athens
<u>88.</u>	II ² 801	mid 3rd c.	S.slope	Honors for Apollonios of Klazomenai	Athens (Acrop.?)	A	Athens

<u>89.</u>	II ² 802	after mid 3rd c.	Acrop.	Isotelia for a Pergamenian	Athens (Acrop.?)	A	Athens		
<u>90.</u>	II ² 844	217/16, 208/9, shortly after 200	N. of Heph- aisteion	Honors for men of Kydonia	temenos of Demos & Graces	B	Athens		
<u>91.</u>	II ² 861 <u>SEG 21.406</u>	before end of 3rd c.	Acrop.	Honors for judges from Lamia	Athens (Acrop.?)	Lamia in sanct. of Dionysos	Athens for both		
<u>92.</u>	II ² 908 <u>SEG 17.31</u>	181-170	N. of Heph- aist.	Honors for Nikeratos of Alexandria	Demos & Graces	B	Athens		
<u>93.</u>	Hesp. XXX pp. 217/18 <u>SEG 21.407</u>	end of 3rd c.	Agora	Decree of citizenship	Acrop.	B	Athens		
<u>94.</u>	II ² 909	ca. 170	N. of Heph- aist.	Honors for Timarkhos of Salamis on Kypros	Demos & Graces	Salamis in sanct. of Athena	Athens for both		
<u>95.</u>	II ² 922	Begin- ning 2nd c.	Acrop.	Citizenship for Hikesios of Ephesos	Athens (Acrop.?)	B	Athens		
<u>96.</u>	II ² 947	ca. 166/5	Acrop.	Honors for two Perga- menians	Acrop.	B	Athens		

<u>97.</u> II ² 982	after mid 2nd c.	Acrop.	Citizenship for Menestheos of Miletos	Acrop.	B	Athens
<u>98.</u> II ² 987	after mid 2nd c.	N. of Heph- aist.	Honors for Leontiskos of Patara	Demos & Graces	B	Athens

STATISTICS OF PUBLICATION AND FINANCING

The following statistics of the provisions for publication and financing of diplomatic documents are drawn from the preceding table. This section of the Appendix deals with the distribution of different species of diplomatic decrees, the relative frequency of official publications in Athens to publications in the foreign states concerned, and the ratio of Athenian to foreign funds allocated for these publications. These statistical studies treat only the honorary decrees, and treaties, since for the other types, the facts of their publication and financing can be seen at a glance in the table above, and they do not yield any general conclusions because of their small numbers. The statistics on payment for publications are given in the form of tables where they are further broken down by centuries to show possible trends in the ratio of Athenian to foreign payment.

THE DISTRIBUTION OF TYPES OF ATHENIAN DIPLOMATIC PUBLICATIONS

The distribution of the ninety-eight diplomatic inscriptions according to subject is as follows:

Fifty-four decrees of proxeny, citizenship, and other honors (8, 9, 18, 19, 20, 23, 27, 29, 33, 35, 36, 38, 39, 40, 42, 49, 52, 54, 55, 57, 63, 64, 66, 67, 68, 69, 70, 71, 72, 73, 75, 76, 77, 78, 79, 80, 81, 82, 83, 84, 86, 87, 88, 89, 90, 91, 92, 93, 94, 95, 96, 97, 98)

Twenty-six treaties (5, 7, 14, 15, 16, 17, 26, 28, 30, 31, 32, 34, 37, 43, 44, 45, 46, 48, 50, 51, 53, 59, 60, 61, 65, 85)

Eight decrees of regulation of the Athenian Empire (1, 2, 6, 10, 11, 13, 21, 25)

Three commercial agreements (3, 22, 74)

Two settlements after hostilities (4, 58)

One regulation of colony (12)

One regulation of cleruchy (24)

Charter of the Second Athenian Confederacy (47)

Decree of protest to the Akhaian Confederacy (56)

Decree of protection and aid for Eretria (62)

PROXENY, CITIZENSHIP, AND OTHER HONORS

Provisions for Publication: Of the fifty-four inscriptions of honors, fifty-two have provisions for publication at Athens, one (49) has no surviving provision, and one (27), found on the Acropolis, has a fragmentary provision for publication wherever the honored wishes.

Six (19, 35, 39, 72, 91, 94) of the honorary inscriptions have provisions for foreign publication, in seven cases there is no surviving provision, and forty-one originally had no provision for foreign publication.

Payment for Publications:

Payer and Publications	5th c. B. C.	4th	3rd	2nd
Athens for Athenian copy alone (thirty-four cases)	<u>9</u> , <u>29</u> , <u>36</u>	<u>42</u> , <u>54</u> , <u>55</u> , <u>57</u> , <u>64</u> , <u>65</u> , <u>67</u> , <u>68</u> , <u>69</u> , <u>70</u> , <u>71</u> , <u>73</u> , <u>75</u> , <u>77</u> , <u>79</u> , <u>80</u> , <u>81</u>	<u>82</u> , <u>83</u> , <u>84</u> , <u>86</u> , <u>87</u> , <u>88</u> , <u>89</u> , <u>90</u>	<u>92</u> , <u>93</u> , <u>95</u> , <u>96</u> , <u>97</u> , <u>98</u>

Payment for Publications: (cont.)

Payer and Publications	5th c. B. C.	4th	3rd	2nd
Foreign payment for Athenian copy alone (two cases)	<u>20, 40</u>			
Athenian payment for both copies (two cases)			<u>91</u>	<u>94</u>
Foreign payment for both copies (two cases)	<u>19, 35</u>			
Each for own copy (one case)	<u>39</u>			
No surviving provision (six cases)	<u>8, 18</u>	<u>49, 52, 66, 72</u>		
No provision for payment recorded (seven cases; all of Athenian copies)	<u>23, 27, 33, 38</u>	<u>41, 76, 78</u>		

TREATIES

Provisions for Publication: Of the twenty-six inscriptions dealing with the terms and ratifications of treaties, fifteen (5, 26, 30, 31, 32, 37, 43, 44, 45, 48, 53, 60, 61, 65, 85) have provisions for publication at Athens; eleven (7, 14, 15, 16, 17, 28, 34, 46, 50, 51, 59) have no such provisions surviving. Seven (30, 31, 32, 44, 48, 51, 85) have provision for foreign publication. Ten (7, 14, 15, 16, 17, 28, 34, 46, 50, 59) have no such provision surviving, and eight (5, 26, 37, 43, 45, 53, 60, 61, 65) were complete

enough to indicate that they had no recorded provision for foreign publication.

Payment for Publications: Although both the Athenian and foreign copies are sometimes specified in the provisions for publication of treaties, each party was independent in setting up and paying for its own version. Therefore the notable lack of cases of one party paying for both copies is consistent with the two-sided aspect of treaties. An exception is the Athenian treaty with Selymbria (37) in which the latter city, according to Wilhelm (apud Michel 1437), is to pay for the stele at Athens. This practice was not uncommon in Athenian decrees regulating her empire, but Selymbria by this treaty has gained her autonomy from Athens.

Payer and Publication	5th c. B. C.	4th	3rd	2nd
Athens for Athenian copy alone (seven cases)	<u>5, 26, 28</u>	<u>53, 60, 61, 65</u>		
Foreign payment for Athenian copy alone (one case)	<u>37</u>			
Athenian and foreign payment, each for own (one case(?))	<u>31(?)</u>			
No surviving provision (14 cases)	<u>7, 14, 15, 16, 17, 30, 34</u>	<u>44, 45, 46, 50, 51, 59</u>	<u>85</u>	
No provision for payment recorded (three cases)	<u>32</u>	<u>43, 48</u>		

THE ORIGINAL LOCATION OF ATHENIAN DIPLOMATIC
PUBLICATIONS, AND THEIR MODERN PROVENIENCE

At Athens, the great majority of inscriptions of interstate documents were erected on the Acropolis, just as in other cities, the chief local sanctuary was the usual place of publication for records of this type. (See above, p. 52ff. for a discussion of this practice which is not so readily understandable as the publication of strictly civil records in the Agora.) Of the ninety-eight inscriptions selected for this study, most were discovered on the Acropolis or its slopes, while a number of those from further afield included orders for their publication in that precinct. There are some exceptions definitely published at other locations in Athens, but in a number of these cases the place of publication is more appropriate to the subject of the document. From the following statistics taken from the ninety-eight selected inscriptions, general conclusions can be drawn about the location of Athenian diplomatic publications and their modern finding-places. The inscriptions are discussed by the various areas of provenience to show the proportion discovered in each area, and the correspondence of the original place of publication, so far as it can be known, with the modern provenience.

The Acropolis and its slopes (seventy-seven inscriptions).

Of the seventy-seven inscriptions found on the Acropolis and its slopes, fifteen have no surviving provisions for publication. Of the remaining sixty-two, eight have fragmentary provisions for publication in

Athens, but the provisions for the exact locations of the stelai are lost from the texts: doubtless, most or all of these inscriptions were erected on the Acropolis. In three (8, 20, 25) inscriptions from the Acropolis and possibly a fourth, 66, additional publications were ordered next to the Bouleuterion in the Agora. The order for publication in 25 (GHI 66, vv. 24-25) specifies stone stelai for both copies, but in the case of 20, and probably others, the second copy for the Bouleuterion was only a temporary publication on wooden boards (or perhaps a copy intended for the archives; see Wilhelm, Beitr. pp. 135ff.). One inscription (62) has a stipulation for additional publication, possibly in the Agora, and definitely in "the harbor" (see Kirchner's note in IG I², 125). Wilhelm's restoration of the fragmentary lines (Wien. Anz. 1924, p. 155) allows only for the second copy in the port, and that on a whitened board. Another (41) has a provision for a second stele in the sanctuary of Apollo Pythios; fragments of both exemplars have been found. The inscription of 33a may have called for an unusual second copy on the Acropolis, but it is possible that 33b, which is supposed to be the duplicate, is a very similar honorary decree for a different man whose name is lost from the text (see above, p. 66).

Athens (six)

The provenience of six inscriptions was listed, in editions accessible to me, simply as "Athens". Four of these (3, 5, 9, 18) have extant provisions for publication on the Acropolis. One (52) has a

fragmentary provision which must have been for local publication, but the name of the exact location is lost. In the remaining inscription (15) there is no extant provision for publication.

The Asklepieion (two)

Two of the selected inscriptions were found in the site of the Asklepieion located on the south slope of the Acropolis (see Judeich, pp. 320ff.). One of these (87) has a provision for two published copies, one on the Acropolis, and the other on the base of the statue of Antigonos Gonatas, the recipient of the decreed honors. The other (17) has no extant provision for publication. These stelai were not found in situ, nor is there any hint in their texts of the propriety of publication in the Asklepieion. Like many other fragments from this area, they were probably thrown down from the Acropolis at some earlier time. (For the inscriptions actually published in the Asklepieion, chiefly local decrees honoring physicians and priests of the sanctuary, see the article of R. Hubbe, Hesperia XXVIII (1959), pp. 169-201.)

The Agora and its environs (six)

Six of the selected inscriptions were found in or around the Athenian Agora (excluding those from north of the Hephaisteion, for which see below). Of these, three (20, 44, 93) have provisions for publication on the Acropolis, and although 20 was to be published also in front of the Bouleuterion, that copy may have been a temporary one on wood (see above, under Acropolis). At some unknown time, these

fragments must have been brought to the area of the Agora as building material. Such "travel" of stelai from their original topoi is not surprising within certain limits, and there are a number of parallels for the movement of these to the Agora. (See, for example, the scattered provenience of the fragments of the Attic Stelai originally erected in the Eleusinion: W. K. Pritchett. Hesperia XXII (1953), pp. 240ff.) Inscriptions of Athenian diplomatic decrees which originally stood in the Agora are quite rare. (An example is the proxeny decree for Prytanis of Karystos published by Meritt in Hesperia IV (1935), p. 525, No. 39; cf. IG XII (Supplement) p. 200, No. 2) Another inscription found in the Agora (77) contains provisions for publications on the Acropolis and "next to Zeus Soter" (i. e. the Stoa of Zeus in the Agora. See Judeich, p. 339; cf. Agora Guide, pp. 61-64); what we have is more likely the latter copy. Another (47), the inscribed charter of the Second Athenian Confederacy, has a single provision for publication in the Agora "beside the statue of Zeus Eleutherios," probably meaning the dedication which Pausanias (1. 3. 2) saw near the Stoa of Zeus (cf. Agora Guide, p. 62). In contrast to the charter, the individual Athenian treaties with the charter-members were published on the Acropolis. The remaining one (56) of the six inscriptions from the Agora has no extant provision for publication.

North of the Hephaisteion (four)

Four of the inscriptions (90, 92, 94, 98), all dating from the third

and second centuries, were found north of the Hephaisteion, and all four have provisions for publication in the temenos of Demos and The Graces which was located in this area beside the Sacred Way (see Judeich, p. 363). There is no special reason that the four inscriptions should be set up in this precinct, except that the Acropolis may have been overcrowded with stelai by this time, and the temenos of Demos and The Graces with its location at one of the main entrances to the Agora would have afforded better exposure of the publications. The special favor which this sanctuary enjoyed for late honorary publications is emphasized —although not explained — in the case of 90 (=IG II². 844), an Athenian decree honoring Eumaridas of Kydonia in Krete. Athens had originally decreed that Eumaridas' statue and inscription be set up on the Acropolis, but he was apparently dissatisfied with the site, and, through the intervention of the Athenians, Eurykleides and Mikion, succeeded in having a decree passed changing the grant of topos to one in the Temenos of Demos and The Graces (cf. above, p. 55).

Piraeus (two)

There is no provision for the publication of one of the inscriptions found in the Piraeus (74) (see above, pp. 39-40), and the other (68), honoring Bosphoran kings, only specifies that the stele be erected next to that containing a previous decree in honor the same dynasty. But it is almost certain that the decrees, dealing as they do with foreign commerce, were set up in the area of the harbor. (Cf. IG II² 1128. vv. 38,

where Iulis orders that its commercial agreement with Athens be inscribed and set up "in the harbor;" also IG II² .125. v. 19 (62), the Athenian decree concerning Eretria.

Near the Ilissos River (one)

This inscription (63) which has a provision for its publication on the Acropolis, like some of the examples from the Agora, must have travelled to its place of discovery near the Ilissos since the classical period.

APPENDIX B

INTERSTATE DECREES OF ASYLIA AND THEIR PUBLICATION

The diplomatic moves by small city-states of Asia Minor and the Aegean to escape the constant piratical warfare which followed the breakup of the empire of Alexander, have resulted in an interesting series of inscriptions bearing decrees granting asylia, or inviolability, to these cities, their territories, and their sanctuaries. Interstate grants of this nature are commonly found only after the third century. In earlier times the inviolability of religious sanctuaries was generally accepted, but in the third and second centuries, the rejection of this religious feeling in favor of political and military priorities often made it necessary for the inviolability to be negotiated and officially recognized between individual states. The decrees of asylia which survive constitute an indictment predominantly against the Aitolians and the sporadically allied cities of Krete, for they show that it was from these powers especially that the smaller cities sought immunity, and in many cases the provisions and provenience of the inscriptions reflect some perfidy on the part of Aitolia and some Kretan cities in these dealings with their weaker clients.

The interstate asylia under discussion is to be differentiated from asylia of the person, frequently a perquisite of the proxenos, which bestowed upon an individual immunity from reprisals at home or abroad for debts or offenses of his own state against another state or its citizens. Interstate asylia guaranteed immunity from plunder to

sanctuaries, cities, and their surrounding territories as well, but usually not to the property or persons of their citizens abroad. In many cases the asylia granted to sanctuaries included the right of receiving and protecting suppliants (*ἰκεσῖα*); hence the modern meaning of the word "asylum" (See C. B. Welles, Royal Correspondence, pp. 57-58.). Although the grant of asylia is often referred to as a treaty, it is not a mutually negotiated agreement based on juridical parity, with terms of agreement which apply to both sides equally. It is really a unilateral grant like many decrees of proxeny, but nearly always a concession of a more powerful to a weaker state, based on a professed friendship. The form and provisions of such grants can best be illustrated by a full quotation of the following well-preserved inscription from Teos, containing a decree of Aitolia dating from the end of the third century B. C. (IG IX² (1), 192):

Of the Aitolians.

When Alexander of Kalydon was Strategos; at the Panaitolika. Since the Teans have sent their envoys, Pythagoras and Kleiton, and have renewed kinship and amity, and have requested the Aitolians to consent that their city and territory be sacred (*ἱερᾶν*), and their sanctuary of Dionysos be inviolable (*ἄσυλον*), it is resolved by the Aitolians: to preserve the existing amity and kinship toward the Teans, and to perpetuate former treaties with them concerning all concessions of privileges; further, it is granted to them by the Aitolians that their city and territory are inviolable, as the envoys request, and no Aitolian citizen or anyone living in Aitolia is to carry off the Teans nor those dwelling in Teos from any harbor where they should happen to be, but they are to have safety and inviolability (*ἀσφάλεια καὶ ἀσυλῖα*) from the Aitolians and from those living in Aitolia. If anyone carries off them or their possessions from the city or the territory, when the stolen goods are at hand, the

Strategos and the incumbent Synedroi are to restore them. But if the goods are concealed, those who have taken them are to be put on trial, and the legal proceedings and other affairs are to be in the case of the Teans just as the law orders in the case of the Dionysiac Artists. So that the consecration and inviolability may be registered among the laws, the appointed Nomographoi are to register them among the laws when the drafting of the laws takes place.

Primary evidence of the unbalanced diplomacy involved in interstate asylia is the fact that Aitolia or the Kretan cities did not grant asylia on their own initiative, but only at the special request of another state. The published decrees almost always make mention of the visiting envoys of the requesting state (as in the grant to Teos just quoted), and in some cases, the original decree of the recipient state, by which it commissioned its embassy, is inscribed on the same stele with the subsequent grant (see, for example, IG IX² (1), 189, the Aitolian grant published at Mytilene.). The surviving inscriptions from Teos show that that small island conducted a wide diplomatic campaign at the end of the third century, which netted it concessions of asylia from Rome, Thessaly, Delphi, and at least twenty of the major towns of Krete. Most of the Kretan decrees were obtained by a single campaign of envoys in 201 B.C., and three decades later, about 170 B.C., another embassy reaffirmed some of the earlier grants and gained others. (On the Tean embassies to Krete, see M. Guarducci's commentary in IC I. v. 52 & 53, p. 28.)

Further evidence that asylia was a fairly one-sided interest of the weaker states is found in the geographical disposition of the surviving

texts and their own stated provisions for publication. It is significant that of the whole series of Aitolian grants to Khios, Mytilene, Tenos, and Teos (IG IX² (1), 169, 189-192), all of the inscriptions have been found in the cities which received asylia, but not a single one has been found in Thermon, the Aitolian capital. Moreover the complete absence of provisions in the decrees for their publication in Aitolia (aside from the recording in the nomoi, which were probably archival collections; cf. the final provision of IG IX² (1) 192, quoted above, p. ⁶⁸³ .) shows that the modern distribution of the texts is not coincidental. Besides failing to publish their decrees in their own territory, the Aitolians never made mention in their grants of the erection of stelai in the recipient states, indicating that they left any publication entirely to the initiative of their beneficiaries. ✓

The practice of unilateral publication evident in the Aitolian grants of asylia is even more striking in the case of Kretan decrees of the same type. Unlike their Aitolian counterparts, many of the fragments and complete texts of Kretan grants have provisions for permanent publication in the Kretan sanctuaries, yet all of the documents have been found at Teos or other small recipient states, and although all of the Kretan cities concerned have been excavated, they have not yet yielded a single local copy of the decrees engraved abroad. The following table lists these inscriptions as they are published in the volumes of Inscriptiones Creticae. The list gives the names of the

Kretan cities which promulgated the decrees, all of which have been found at Teos, with the exception of one each from Tenos and Anaphe as noted in parentheses. An asterisk by the number of an inscription indicates that copies of the grants of asylia are extant for both periods of Tean embassies to Krete, in 201 B. C. and about 170 B. C.; an exception is the case of Hyrtakina of which Teos has only yielded a grant from the later date.

IC I: iii, 1, Apollonia; v, 52 & 53*, Arkadia;

vi, 1 & 2*, Biannos; viii, 8, Knossos;

xiv, 1, Istron; xvi, 2 Latos;

xix, 2, Malla; xxiv, 1, Priansos; xxvii, 1, Rhaukos;

xxx, 1, Tylissos (Tenos).

IC II: i, 1, Allaria; iii, 1 & 2*, Aptera; v, 17, Axos;

x, 2, Kydonia; xii, 21, Eleutherna; xv, 2*, Hyrtakina;

xvi, 3, Lappa; xxiii, 3, Polyrhenia; xxvi, 1, Sybrita.

IC III: iii, 2, Hierapytna.

IC IV: 197, Gortyn (Anaphe).

If there were no other evidence than the survival of the decrees solely in the recipient states, it would remain only an inherent probability that the Kretan cities did not publish the grants locally as they had ordered. But in the copies found at Teos which are renewed grants dating from the second Tean embassy about 170 B. C. (See the asterisks in the list above.), the Kretans, in answer to the renewed request of

the Teans, agree to correct their delinquency by carrying out the decreed publication of the earlier grants of 201 B. C. The sequence of these provisions for the publication of Kretan copies at the time of each embassy can best be illustrated by the series of formulas which survive in the Tean copies of the original grant and later renewal of asylia from the city of Arkadia in Krete. The final provision of the grant of 201 B. C. (IC I, v, 52, vv.42-45) states:

The Secretary of the city is to publish the decree in the sanctuary of Asklepios [in Arkadia in Krete], and the hospitality prescribed by law is to be extended to the ambassadors.

But the fact that the Arkadians did not erect this inscription becomes evident in the renewed grant of 170 B. C. where the Arkadians refer to the request of the later embassy that they carry out the publication decreed earlier (ibid. 53, vv. 16-18):

. . . and they [the Tean envoys] requested that we [the Arkadians] publish in whatever sanctuary we should deem fit the former decree of asylia granted to you;

In the same document (ibid. vv. 30-34) we find the actual renewed provision for the publication in Arkadia of the earlier decree:

Since we do not wish to be lacking in favor to those who are kindly disposed towards us, we will publish the former decree which you had from us concerning the asylia and dedication of the city and territory [of Teos], as you requested through your decree, in the sanctuary of Asklepios, and we will closely preserve the favors granted to you.

Since none of the renewed decrees have been found at Kretan sites, it remains doubtful whether the later provisions for publication

were ever honored in Krete either. The lack of interest of the powerful states in publishing their grants of asylia is strongly indicative of a similar lack of faith in honoring them. The disloyalty of Aitolia is explicit at least in the case of its grant to Mytilene (IG IX² (1) 189) which was renewed by a slightly later decree (ibid. 190) which mentions the violation of the asylia granted in the former title. In the decrees themselves there are sometimes signs of a leniency which could only have encouraged violations, as, for example, in the Aitolian decree quoted above (p. 282), the stipulation that the brigands be prosecuted only when the stolen goods were not recovered. Although there is no clear mention of violations in the Tean publications, a similar lack of faith can be attributed to the cities of Krete with whom Teos found it necessary to renew requests for inviolability just thirty years after it had been initially granted. It may be that the failure of the powerful states to publish was a strong causal factor in the breakdown and violation of the agreements, since the lack of public notice in the states from which the Aitolian and Kretan pirates set out would either keep them in ignorance of the immunity of certain states, or tacitly abet them in its violation. The importance of publication in the decreeing states and the consequences of its absence are clearly implied in the concerted campaign of Teos to get the Kretan cities to fulfill their agreements to these publications. The fact that the Kretans persisted in not publishing these agreements even when publication was a provision in their ratified

decrees, suggests that they had a cynical attitude towards grants of asylia from the very beginning.

BIBLIOGRAPHY, ABBREVIATIONS, AND SHORT TITLES

Accame, Lega = S. Accame, La lega ateniese del secolo IV a. C., (Rome, 1941).

AJA = American Journal of Archaeology.

Athenian Studies presented to W. S. Ferguson, HSCP Suppl. 1, 1940.

Ath. Mitt. = Mitteilungen des deutschen archäologischen Instituts: Athenische Abteilung.

ATL = Meritt, B. D., Wade-Grey, H. T., and McGregor, M. F., The Athenian Tribute Lists (Cambridge, Mass., 1939-1953).

Austin, Stoichedon Style = R. P. Austin, The Stoichedon Style in Greek Inscriptions (Oxford, 1938).

BCH = Bulletin de correspondance hellenique.

Boeckh, A., Opuscula I-VIII (Berlin, 1827-1876).

Bonner, R. J., "The Use and Effect of Attic Seals," CP 3 (1908) 399-407.

Bourguet, E., Le dialecte laconien (Paris, 1927).

Bradeen, D. W., "The Fifth-century Archon List," Hesperia 32 (1963) 187-208.

BSA = Annual of the British School at Athens.

Buck, C. D., "The Interstate Use of the Greek Dialects" CP 8 (1913) 133-159.

Bücking, H., "Vorläufiger Bericht über die geologische Untersuchung von Olympia," Monatsberichte der Berliner Akad. (1888) 315-324.

Burnett, A. P., "Thebes and the Expansion of the Second Athenian Confederacy," Historia 11 (1962) 1-17.

Busolt, Gr. St. = G. Busolt, Griechische Staatskunde. 3rd ed. (Vol ii rev. by H. Swoboda) i-ii (Müller's Handbuch series) (Munich, 1920-1926).

Campbell, D. A., Greek Lyric Poetry (New York, 1967).

Chapot, V. , "Signum," Dar. -Sagl, s. v.

CIG = Corpus Inscriptionum Graecarum, ed. A. Boeckh (Berlin, 1828-1877).

Corinth = Corinth: Results of Excavations Conducted by the American School of Classical Studies at Athens, VIII i-iii, The Inscriptions.

CP = Classical Philology.

Dar. -Sagl. = Dictionnaire des antiquités grecques et romaines d'après les textes et les monuments. i-v & index. Ed. Ch. Daremberg & E. Saglio. (1877-1919).

Delphinion = Milet: Ergebnisse d. Ausgrabungen und Unters. seit d. Jahre 1899, I 3 Das Delphinion, ed. A. Rehm (Berlin, 1922).

Dinsmoor, W. B. , The Athenian Archon List in the Light of Recent Discoveries (New York, 1932).

Dow, Prytaneis = S. Dow, Prytaneis: A Study of the Inscriptions Honoring the Athenian Councillors = Hesperia Supplement I (Princeton, 1937).

Dow, S. , "The Athenian Law Codes," Proceedings of the Massachusetts Historical Society 71 (1953-1959) 3-36.

Droysen, Hell. = J. G. Droysen, Geschichte des Hellenismus. i-iii, 2nd ed. (Gotha, 1877-1878).

Durrbach, F. , De Oropo et Amphiarai Sacro, (Paris, 1890).

Ehrenberg, V. , The Greek State (New York, 1964).

'Εφ. 'Αρχ. = 'Εφημερίς 'Αρχαιολογική. (After 1909, entitled 'Αρχαιολογική 'Εφημερίς.)

FD = Fouilles de Delphes (Paris, 1909).

Ferguson, Athenian Secretaries = W. S. Ferguson, The Athenian Secretaries (Cornell Studies in Classical Philology, No. VII, 1898).

Ferguson, Treasurers = W. S. Ferguson, The Treasurers of Athena (Cambridge, Mass., 1932).

G. D. = C. D. Buck, The Greek Dialects (Chicago, 1955).

- GDI = H. Collitz and F. Bechtel, Sammlung der griechischen Dialekt-
Inchriften, i-iv (Göttingen, 1884-1915).
- GHI = M. N. Tod, A Selection of Greek Historical Inscriptions i & ii
(Clarendon Press, 1933 & 1948).
- Gneist, Die formellen Verträge = H. R. von Gneist, Die formellen Ver-
träge des neueren römischen Obligationenrechts in Vergleichung
mit den Geschäftsformen des griechischen Rechts (Berlin, 1845).
- Gomme, HCT = A. W. Gomme, A Historical Commentary on Thucydides,
i-iv (Vol. iv with A. Andrewes and K. J. Dover) (Clarendon Press,
1956-1970).
- Grundy, Thucydides = G. B. Grundy, Thucydides and the History of His
Age (London, 1911).
- Gwatkin, W. E., "The Legal Arguments in Aischines' Against Ktesiphon
and Demosthenes' On the Crown," Hesperia 26 (1957) 129-141.
- Habicht, Chr., "Eine Urkunde des Akarnanische Bundes" Hermes 85
(1957) 86-122.
- HAC = C. Hignett, A History of the Athenian Consitution to the End of
the Fifth Century B. C. (Clarendon Press, 1952).
- Harrison, A. R. W., "Law-making at Athens at the end of the fifth century
B. C." JHS 75 (1955) 26-35.
- Hartel, Studien = W. von Hartel, Studien über attisches Staatsrecht und
Urkundenwesen (Vienna, 1887-1888).
- Harvey, F. D., "Literacy in the Athenian Democracy," REG 79 (1966)
606 ff.
- Headlam, J. W., Election by Lot at Athens (revised with notes by D. C.
Macgregor) (Cambridge, 1933).
- Heyse, M., De Legationibus Atticis (Göttingen, 1882).
- Homolle, Th., Les archives de l'intendance sacrée de Délos (Biblio-
theque des Ecoles Francaises d'Athenes, 1887).
- How & Wells, Commentary = W. W. How & J. Wells, A Commentary on
Herodotus, with Introduction and Appendices i & ii (Oxford,
corr. repr. 1928).

HSCP = Harvard Studies in Classical Philology.

Hubbe, R., "Decrees of the Precinct of Asklepios at Athens," Hesperia 28 (1959) 169-201.

IC = Inscriptions Creticae I-IV, ed. M. Guarducci (Rome, 1935-1950).

I. Delos = Inscription de Délos, ed. F. Durrbach, P. Roussel, M. Launey (Paris, 1926-) (Acad. des Inscriptions et Belles-Lettres).

IG, IG I² etc. = Inscriptiones Graecae (Berlin, 1893-; ed. minor, 1924-).

IGR = Inscriptions Graecae ad res Romanas pertinentes. Ed. R. Cagnat et al. i-iv. (Paris, 1906-1927).

IM = Die Inschriften von Magnesia am Maeander, ed. O. Kern (Berlin, 1900).

Intl. Arb. = M. N. Tod, International Arbitration amongst the Greeks (Clarendon Press, 1913).

I. v. Didyma = Inschriften von Didyma (In the Publication of the German Archaeological Institute, Vol IV, 1958).

I. v. Pergamon = Die Inschriften von Pergamon (in Altertümer von Pergamon viii), ed. M. Fraenkel (Berlin, 1890-1895).

I. v. Priene = Die Inschriften von Priene, ed. F. Hiller von Gaertringen (Berlin, 1906).

Jacobsen, T. & Smith, P., "Two Kimolian Dikast Decrees from Geraistos in Euboia" Hesperia 37 (1968) 184-199.

Jacoby, F., Atthis (Oxford, 1949).

Jacoby, Fragmente - F. Jacoby, Die Fragmente der griechischen Historiker. (i-ii, Berlin, 1923-30; iii A. Leyden, 1940).

Jeffery, Local Scripts = L. H. Jeffery, The Local Scripts of Archaic Greece (Oxford, 1961).

JHS = Journal of Hellenic Studies.

Judeich, W., Altertümer von Hierapolis, Jahrbuch Ergänzungsheft IV (1898) 67-180.

- Judeich = W. Judeich, Topographie von Athen (in Müller's Handbuch series) (Munich, 1931).
- Jüthner, ., "Hemerodromos" RE VIII 232-233 (1912).
- Kahn, D., The Codebreakers (London, 1967).
- Kahrstedt, U., "ἀφύρρον" RE XII 770 ff. (1925).
- Keil, Anon. Arg. = B. Keil, Anonymus Argentinensis: Fragmente zur Geschichte des perikleischen Athen aus einem Strassburger Papyrus. (Strassburg, 1902).
- Kirchoff A., Ueber die von Thukydides benutzten Urkunden in Thukydides und sein Urkundenmaterial (Berlin, 1895).
- Klaffenbach, Bemerkungen = G. Klaffenbach, Bemerkungen zum griechischen Urkundenwesen (SB Berlin (1960) 1-42).
- Klaffenbach, Gr. Epigraphik = G. Klaffenbach, Griechische Epigraphik 2nd ed. (Göttingen, 1966).
- Kolbe, W., "The Neutrality of Delos" JHS 50 (1930) 20-31.
- Lang, M., "Allotment by Tokens," Historia 8 (1959) 80-89.
- Lang, M. & Crosby, M., Weights, Measures and Tokens (The Athenian Agora, Vol X) (Princeton, 1964).
- Larfeld³ = W. Larfeld, Griechische Epigraphik, 3rd ed. (Müller's Handbuch series I, 5) (Munich, 1914).
- Larsen, Representative Government = J. A. O. Larsen, Representative Government in Greek and Roman History (University of California Press, 1955).
- Latte, K., "σουλᾶν", RE IVA 1038 (1932).
- Lenschau, Th., "Poletai," RE XXI 1359-1361 (1952).
- Lewis, D. M., "The Public Seal of Athens," Phoenix 9 (1955) 32-34.
- Loewy, E., Inschriften griechischer Bildhauer (Leipzig, p885).
- LSJ = H. G. Liddell & R. Scott, A Greek-English Lexicon (The 9th Edition, rev. and augm. by H. S. Jones; 1867-1939) (Clarendon Press, 1940).

- MacDowell, Andokides = D. M. MacDowell, Andokides: On the Mysteries (Oxford, 1962).
- Marcadé, J., Recueil des signatures des sculpteurs grecs i, 1953; ii, 1957 (Paris).
- Martin, A., "Skytale," Dar. -Sagl. s. v.
- Meiggs, R., "The Dating of Fifth-century Attic Inscriptions," JHS 86 (1966) 86-98.
- Meiggs & Lewis = R. Meiggs and D. Lewis, A Selection of Greek Historical Inscriptions to the End of the Fifth Century B. C. (Oxford, 1969).
- Meritt, B. D., Epigraphica Attica (Martin Classical Lectures, Vol IX) (Cambridge, Mass., 1940).
- Merker, I., "The Harbor of Iulis," AJA 72 (1968) 383-384.
- Michel = C. Michel, Recueil d'Inscriptions grecques (Brussels, 1900; supplements i 1912, ii 1927).
- Michel, Ch., "Theoroi," Dar. -Sagl. s. v.
- Michell, H., The Economics of Ancient Greece (New York, 1957).
- Monceaux, P., Les Proxénies grecques (Paris, 1886).
- Mosley, D. J., "Pharax and the Spartan Embassy to Athens in 370/69," Historia 12 (1963) 247-250.
- _____. "The Size of Embassies in Ancient Greek Diplomacy," TAPA 96 (1965) 255-266.
- OCD = Oxford Classical Dictionary (Clarendon Press, 1949).
- Oehler, J., "Kolekretai," RE XI 1068-1069 (1921).
- OGI = Oriens Graecae Inscriptiones Selectae, ed. W. Dittenberger (Leipzig, 1903-1905).
- Ol. = W. Dittenberger - K. Purgold, Die Inschriften von Olympia (Berlin, 1896). (Vol. V of Olympia: Ergebnisse d. . . . Ausgrabungen.)

- Oliver, J. H. , "Athenian Commission of Seventeen," CW 44 (1951) 203.
- Phillipson, International Law = C. Phillipson, International Law and Custom of Ancient Greece and Rome (London, 1911).
- Philol. = Philologus.
- Poland, F. , De Legationibus Graecorum Publicis (Leipzig, 1885).
- Pottier, F. , "Praeco," Dar. -Sagl. s. v.
- P. Oxy. = Oxyrhynchus Papyri, ed. B. P. Grenfell and A. S. Hunt (London, 1898-).
- Raubitschek, A. E. , Dedications from the Athenian Acropolis (Cambridge, Mass. , 1949).
- RE = Pauly-Wissowa-Kroll, Real-Encyclopädie der classischen Altertumswissenschaft, (Stuttgart, 1894-).
- Recherches Thasos = J. Pouilloux, Recherches sur l'histoire et les cultes de Thasos I (1954).
- REG = Revue des études grecques.
- Regling, K. , "Tessera," RE VA 851-854 (1934).
- Robert, Épigraphie = L. Robert, L'Épigraphie grecque au Collège de France (Paris, 1939).
- Robert, L. , "Epigraphie et Paleographie," Comptes rendus de l'Academie des Inscriptions (1955) 195-222.
- Robert, J. & L. , Bull. épigr. = Bulletin épigraphique, issued periodically in the Revue des études grecques by J. and L. Robert.
- Robinson, C. A. , The History of Alexander the Great, i-ii. (Providence, 1953-).
- Rosbach, O. , "Gemmen," RE VII 1052-1115 (1910).
- Rostovtzeff, M. , Social and Economic History of the Hellenistic World i-iii (Oxford, 1941).
- Rouse, W. H. D. , The Votive Offerings (Cambridge, 1902).

SB. Ak. Wien. = Sitzungsberichte der (Kaiserlichen) Akademie der Wissenschaften in Wien, Philosophisch-historische Klasse (1849-).

Schlesinger, E., Die griechische Asylie (Diss. Giessen, 1933).

Schoeffer, V. von, "Delos" RE IV 2459-2502 (1901).

Schulthess, O., "Grammateis," RE VII 1708-1779 (1912).

SEG = Supplementum Epigraphicum Graecum (Leyden, 1923-).

Starkie, W. J. M., The Wasps of Aristophanes, Edition and Commentary. (London, 1897).

Ste. Croix, G. E. M. de, "The Alleged Secret Pact Between Athens and Philip II Concerning Amphipolis and Pydna," CQ 13 (1963) 110-119.

Stroud, Drakon's Law = R. Stroud, Drakon's Law on Homocide (University of California Press, 1968).

Swoboda, H., "Skytalismos," Hermes 53 (1918) 94-101.

Syll.³ = W. Dittenberger, Sylloge Inscriptionum Graecarum (Reference to 3rd ed., Leipzig, 1915-1924, unless cited as Syll. or Syll.²).

Szanto, E., "ἄσουλῶα," RE II 1879 (1896).

TAPA = Transactions and Proceedings of the American Philological Association.

Tarn, W. W., "The Political Standing of Delos," JHS 44 (1924) 141-157.

Tarn, W. W., The Hellenistic Age (Cambridge, 1925).

Thompson, H. A., "Buildings on the West Side of the Agora," Hesperia 6 (1937).

Tod, M. N., "Letter-Labels in Greek Inscriptions," BSA 49 (1954) 1-8.

Tracy, S. V., "A Letter-Cutter of Classical Athens" (Ph. D. diss., Harvard University, 1967).

Wallace, W. P., "The Public Seal of Athens," Phoenix 3 (1949) 70-73.

Welles, Royal Correspondence = C. B. Welles, Royal Correspondence in the Hellenistic Period (New Haven, 1934).

Welles, C. B., "Isocrates' View of History," The Classical Tradition, Literary and Historical Studies in Honor of Harry Caplan (Ithaca, 1966).

Wien Anz. = Anzeiger der philosophisch-historischen Klasse der Akademie der Wissenschaftern in Wien.

Wilamowitz, Phil. Unters. = U. von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, Philologische Untersuchungen (Berlin, 1880-1925).

Wilcken, U., Alexander the Great (tr. G. C. Richards). (London, 1932).

Wilhelm, Beiträge = A. Wilhelm, Beiträge zur griechischen Inschriftenkunde (Vienna, 1909).

Wilhelm, Neue Beiträge - Neue Beiträge zur griechischen Inschriftenkunde (SB Akad. Wien, passim 1911-1921).

Woodhead, Greek Inscriptions = A. G. Woodhead, The Study of Greek Inscriptions (Cambridge, 1959).

Wright, F. A., Alexander the Great (London, 1934).

Wycherley, Testimonia = R. E. Wycherley, Literary and Epigraphical Testimonia (The Athenian Agora, Vol III) (Princeton, 1957).

Ziehen, L., "Theoroi," RE ser. 2, V 2239-2244 (1934).