

357/6 BC: A Significant Year in the Development of Athenian Honorific Practice

S. D. Lambert

AIO Papers no. 9 July 2018

Corrected August 2018

AIO Papers

Published by Attic Inscriptions Online, 97 Elm Road, Evesham, Worcestershire, WR11 3DR, United Kingdom.

Editor: Dr. S. D. Lambert (Cardiff)

Advisory Board: Professor J. Blok (Utrecht)
Dr. P. Liddel (Manchester)
Dr. A. P. Matthaiou (Athens)
Professor S. Douglas Olson (Minnesota)
Professor P. J. Rhodes (Durham)

© Attic Inscriptions Online 2018

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted, in any form or by any means, without the prior permission in writing of Attic Inscriptions Online, or as expressly permitted by law, or under terms agreed with the appropriate reprographic rights organisation. Enquiries concerning reproduction should be sent to Dr. S. D. Lambert at the above address or via the contact given at www.atticinscriptions.com.

357/6 BC: A SIGNIFICANT YEAR IN THE DEVELOPMENT OF ATHENIAN HONORIFIC PRACTICE¹

S. D. Lambert

1. Introduction

One of the benefits of an epigraphic corpus of the quality of the new fascicule of Attic public dedications from after 403/2 BC, *IG* II³ 4 fasc. 1,² is that it facilitates the detection of patterns in the epigraphic record which had previously lurked unnoticed by scholars working on inscriptions individually, in more specific categories, or on site corpora. My main purpose in this short paper is to draw attention to one such pattern which has come to my notice in the course of editing English translations of these inscriptions for Attic Inscriptions Online: the significance of the year 357/6 BC in the development of Athenian practice in honouring officials. I shall also make a case for lowering the date at which the Athenians began honouring more than one Council prytany per year from ca. 340 BC to after 307/6 BC; and I shall draw some inferences from these two observations as to the dating of some individual inscriptions in the new corpus.

2. The significance of 357/6 BC

In the fourth century BC Athens occasionally awarded statues and other high honours to leading Athenian generals (and later civilian figures) on the model of the honours for the tyrannicides Harmodios and Aristogeiton,³ but it was not until the 340s BC that the Assembly started providing routinely for the inscribing of decrees honouring officials,⁴ and in consequence the

¹ I am grateful to AIO Advisory Board Members for reading a draft of this paper and especially to Peter Liddel, S. Douglas Olson and David Weidgennant for helpful suggestions. Abbreviations used in AIO are adopted in this paper: https://www.atticinscriptions.com/browse/bysource/

² J. Curbera and A. Makres eds., *Inscriptiones Graecae. Vol. II et III. Inscriptiones Atticae Euclidis Anno Posteriores. Editio Tertia. Pars 4. Fasciculus 1 (Dedicationes Publicae) (1-664) (2015)*, partly superseding J. Kirchner ed., *Inscriptiones Graecae. Vol. II et III. Inscriptiones Atticae Euclidis Anno Posteriores. Editio Altera. Pars 3. Fasciculus 1 (Dedicationes, tituli honorarii, tituli sacri)* (1935). The most significant development in this corpus since 1935 has been the publication of inscriptions discovered in the excavations in the Athenian Agora. There has been a tendency for honours for Athenian councillors, including the Council prytanies, for which the key point of reference before the new *IG* was Meritt and Traill's 1974 publication, *Agora XV. Inscriptions. The Athenian Councillors*, to be treated separately from honours for other officials, and the new corpus has the advantage that it presents dedications by all office-holders together. On the other hand, visitors to AIO should be aware that *Agora XV* contains a number of relevant inscriptions not incorporated in *IG* II³ 4 fasc. 1, such as tribal decrees (e.g. *Agora XV* 5) and lists of councillors or other officials (e.g. *Agora XV* 37). The inscriptions in *IG* II³ 4 discussed in this paper were edited by Curbera; numbers in heavy type are numbers in *IG* II³ 4.

³ Most recently discussed in <u>AIUK 2</u> (British School at Athens), pp. 8-12.

⁴ The earliest dated example in the regular series is <u>IG II³ 1, 301</u>, of 346/5 BC.

evidence for such awards from before that is rather thin, consisting primarily of dedications by office-holders contained in the new *IG*.

Before 357/6 BC dedications by Council prytanies commonly include reference to the prytany's victory in the competition for best prytany in the Council, and none of them refers to the award of a crown. The earliest example of the genre, and the only one pre-dating the fourthcentury democracy, is IG I³ 515, of 408/7 BC (Erechtheis, reference to victory, no reference to crown); the earliest dated fourth-century example is 43, of 393/2 BC (Antiochis, reference to victory, no reference to crown); the latest dated example before 357/6 BC is 56, of 360/59 BC (Oineis, reference neither to victory nor crown). The few dedications by other officials before 357/6 BC are silent on the circumstances of the dedication: thus the dedication by the eponymous archon of 394/3 BC, 42, simply states the archon's office and name, and that of his deputy and secretary; 49, by the overseers of the mint (epistatai argyrokopiou), plausibly assigned to the first half of the fourth century in the new IG, states only that it was a dedication by overseers of the mint of the archonship of x. From 357/6 BC the award of crowns begins to be referred to: in 2 the Council of this year dedicated to the Twelve Gods, "having been crowned by the Athenian People for its excellence and justice", στεφανωθεῖσα Ι ὑπὸ τοῦ δήμου τοῦ Άθηναίων ἀρετῆς ἕνεlκα καὶ δικαιοσύνης (2-4). Prytany dedications after 357/6 BC include comparable wording: the earliest dated example is 29, of 348/7 BC, Pandionis ("having been crowned by the People and Council", 2-4). Also in 357/6 BC (57) Euktemonides of Eleusis, perhaps one of the hieropoioi for Eleusis, though his office is not stated, dedicated to Demeter and Kore, "having been crowned by the People and the Council and the prytany of Hippothontis." Dedications by other officials after this date regularly include comparable wording. Thus the treasurers of Athena of 349/8 BC, having held office (ἄρξαντες), dedicated, "having been crowned by the Council and the People for their excellence and justice" (28, 3-5). 357/6 BC is also a watershed in dedications by military officials. The earliest dated dedication by the generals, 244, of 373/2 BC, contains no reference to crowning; 245, a dedication by trierarchs dating probably to 357/6 BC, states that they had been crowned by the Council and People. The next dated example, a dedication by taxiarchs from 356/5 BC, 246, also contains a reference to their crowning.

Taken by individual category of officials, this evidence would be consistent with a change in wording taking place over a number of years. Taken together, however, it is suggestive that a change occurred at the same time in all official dedications: the latest "old-style" dedication (no reference to crown), 56, dates to 360/59 BC. 359/8 BC and 358/7 BC have no extant dedications; then, from 357/6 BC the "new style" reference to crowning begins and is adopted rather uniformly thereafter. We cannot rule out that the change in formula actually occurred in 359/8 or 358/7 BC, but the occurrence of three cases of the new style in 357/6 BC suggests that it may have been the year the new formula was introduced. The Council must have been involved in legislating the change and I doubt if it is coincidental that it dedicated uniquely to the Twelve Gods in 357/6 BC (2). The dedication, explicitly commemorating the Council's crowning by the People, would have been an entirely appropriate way to inaugurate, by example, the "new style" which was henceforth to apply to all dedications by councillors, Council prytanies and other officials over whom the Council exercised oversight.

What did the introduction of the new-style wording signify? In the absence of other explicit evidence for the change, epigraphical or literary, the question is not straightforward. To start with an obvious possibility that can be ruled out: it did not, it seems, signify the beginning of the practice of crowning officials. In 370/69 and 368/7 BC the syllogeis tou demou dedicated to Athena crowns they had been awarded;⁵ and at Dem. 51.1, apparently in relation to events of 360/59 BC, "the People ordered the treasurer to give the crown to the one who got his ship ready for sea first." Most likely the change which took place in 357/6 BC reflected a systematic overhaul in the arrangements for the euthynai and the consequent award of crowns. There is one specific change that I should like to suggest accompanied the introduction of the new-style wording, whether or not it was the main point of it. It is a notable feature of early dedications by officials that they were more or less clearly dedicated at the expense of the officials themselves. For example, the list of the prytany Erechtheis on IG I³ 515, of 408/7 BC, is incomplete, and the most plausible explanation is that it was funded privately and not all prytany members contributed. In contrast to this, by the 340s BC, when decrees honouring officials begin to be inscribed, public provision may be made not only for inscribing the decree but also for a sacrifice and a dedication. 6 357/6 BC might plausibly be identified as the year in which public provision for dedications commemorating the award of honours to officials was introduced: the correlate of public funding of the dedication was that it was required to carry the "official" formula.

3. One victorious prytany per year: for how long?

The development of honorific practice in relation to the Council prytanies is clear enough in outline: between 408/7 BC (*IG* I³ 515) and ca. 320 BC the victorious prytany in the annual competition for best Council prytany dedicated a commemorative monument, usually in their tribal sanctuary, and not usually inscribed with decrees of the Council and People. The restoration of democracy in 307/6 BC ushered in the Hellenistic practice of inscribing at public expense in front of or near the Council chamber (later in the *prytanikon*? = *tholos*), together with the list of prytany members, relevant honorific decrees of the Council and People. The division between Classical and Hellenistic practice is not altogether clear cut: a fragmentary Assembly decree honouring a Council official is inscribed with the register of the prytany of Leontis on *IG* II³ 1, 417, of ca. 340-325 BC, and other decrees may have been inscribed on

-

⁵ The crowns are listed in the inventories of the treasurers of Athena: ἕτερος στέφανος παρὰ δήμο συλλογέων | τῶν ἐπὶ Δυσνικήτο, "another crown received from the *syllogeis tou demou* of the archonship of Dysniketos (370/69)", *IG* II² 1425, 126-27; ἕτερος στέφανος ὁ παρὰ δήμο | συλλογέων τῶν ἐπὶ Ναυσιγένους | ἄρχοντος, "another crown received from the *syllogeis tou demou* of the archonship of Nausigenes (368/7)", *IG* II² 1425, 224-26.

⁶ <u>IG II³ 1, 306</u>, decree 1 (sacrifice), decree 2 (dedication); <u>IG II³ 1, 416</u>, II. 35-37 (sacrifice and dedication); <u>IG II³ 1, 355</u>, II. 35-37 (sacrifice and dedication); <u>IG II³ 1, 369</u>, I. 48 ([sacrifice and dedication]); note also <u>IG II³ 1, 359</u>, I. 25 (sacrifice). Cf. ZPE 154 (2005), 128-29 = <u>IALD</u>, 54-55.

⁷ For relevant inscriptions of 307/6-301/0 BC as of 1974 see *Agora* XV 58 ff. These will be updated in *IG* II³ 1, fasc. 3. The earliest dated prytany decree of the third century is *IG* II³ 1, 880, of 283/2 BC, cf. 886, 887, 888 etc. On the prytany decrees of 229/8-198/7 BC see *AIO Papers* 4, pp. 20-25.

other parts of this monument, now lost; and the practice of dedicating monuments by the prytanies themselves did not altogether die out in 307/6 BC. See <u>90</u> (after 307/6 BC, it is unclear whether this was before the new arrangements came into effect), <u>122</u> (100 BC-100 AD), <u>220</u> (3rd century AD), and probably <u>73</u> (226/5 BC?, see below).

It is implicit in the wording of the early dedications that in each year there was one victor; in the Hellenistic period there were years in which more than one prytany was honoured.⁸ At what point did there cease to be a competition with a single victor? The change in wording in 357/6 BC, discussed in section 2, would seem to be a candidate, as that is the point when the emphasis in most dedications switches from victory in a competition to crowning by the Council and People, but the wording on 69 (Kekropis, 343/2 BC9) stands as evidence against this as it contains both the post-357/6 formula, "having been crowned by the Council and People for their excellence and justice" (3-4), and the earlier formula referring to victory (vixήσαντες [τὰς ἄλλας φυλὰς?], 2); and the reference to victory also occurs in 78, of 339/8 BC and 86, of 327/6 BC. In its note on 43, the new *IG*, with reference to Koehler¹⁰ and Rhodes,¹¹ and to 51 and 80, notes that the practice of honouring just one prytany died out ca. 340 BC. "Victory", however, ought to imply a single victor, and, as we shall see, 51 and 80 would not seem to support a change ca. 340 BC. It seems more reasonable to suppose that the shift took place after 307/6 BC with the introduction of the Hellenistic-style prytany inscriptions, which contain no reference to a competition or "victories" over other prytanies.

4. Proposed Changes to the New IG

I set out below some proposed changes to the treatment of the dedications by officials in the new IG, mostly consequential on the observations in sections 2 and 3^{12}

 $^{^8}$ The decrees of 321/0 to 301/0 BC have yet to be edited for *IG* II³, but in *Agora* XV there are prytany catalogues of 304/3 BC for both Aiantis (*Agora* XV 59 + *SEG* 28.154) and Antigonis (*Agora* XV 60). In the third century *IG* II³ 1, 921 (Aigeis) and 922 (Erechtheis) both date to 265/4 BC; *IG* II³ 1, 1152 (Aiantis), perhaps dates to 222/1 BC, the same year as 1153 (Akamantis).

⁹ On this date see below section 4.

¹⁰ AM 4, 1879, 97-106.

¹¹ *The Athenian Boule* (1972), 23.

¹² For the record I note here three other minor adjustments to the dates or texts of dedications by officials printed in IG II³ 4: 23, Dedication by Kekropis, dated ca. 390-360 BC by Meritt and Traill, ca. 375-350 BC in the new IG, but now ascribed by S. V. Tracy, *Athenian Lettering of the Fifth Century BC* (2016), 154, to the prolific "Cutter of IG II² 17", who was active ca. 414/3-386/5 BC. 97, Dedication by a board of officials, 307/6-224/3 BC. The name in 1. 10 is restored in the new IG, following Meritt, as [Tελεσῖ]νος Τελεσίνου ἀχ[αρνεύς], but as I noted in A. P. Matthaiou and G. Malouchou eds.,*Attikai Epigraphai. Praktika*...*Wilhelm*(2004), 341 = <math>IALD, 336 no. 63, it is more common for fathers and sons to share name components at this period than for them to have the same name, and a Lysinos of Acharnai is priest of the eponymous of Oineis at IG II³ 1, 1177, II. 44, 56 (202/1 BC?). [Λυσῖ]νος is thus an attractive alternative restoration here. 103, after 200 BC. The character of this very fragmentary inscription is obscure. The new IG reproduces a speculative restoration of Geagan in II. 3-5, [γραμματεὺ]ς τεῖ βουλε[ῖ | καὶ τῶι δήμωι τ]ὸν ἐνιαυτὸ[ν, but this is very insecure and would be better removed to the apparatus.

- (a) <u>31</u>. The archon is Pyth[odotos] (343/2 BC) or Pyth[odoros] (336/5 BC). As Meritt and Traill noted (on *Agora* XV 493), "in listing the demesmen individually with demotics this text resembles none of the regular bouleutic catalogues, and Kirchner's restoration of the heading and identification [as the list of councillors of 343/2 BC provided for at <u>IG II³ 1, 306</u>, 1. 20] should probably be rejected." Kirchner's restorations of the heading, reproduced in the new <u>IG</u> text, should accordingly be removed to the apparatus; and the monument should be categorised as a dedication by an unknown group of officials, listed by tribe, who held office in 343/2 BC or 336/5 BC.
- (b) <u>47</u>. This small fragment from the Agora, inscribed $\sigma \tau \epsilon \phi \alpha v \omega \theta [\epsilon -$, is dated in the new *IG*, following Geagan (*Agora* XVIII 77) "in. s. IV." As we saw in section 2, however, the wording referring to crowning begins otherwise only in 357/6 BC. The letter forms seem consistent with the later date.
- (c) <u>51</u> (Erechtheis). The archon is -philos. The new *IG* leaves it open as between Demophilos (381/0 BC) and Theophilos (348/7 BC). The earlier date is preferable: after 357/6 BC prytany dedications use the "crowning formula" (above, sect. 2), whereas spacing in Il. 1-2 indicates the "victory" formula; <u>29</u> implies that Pandionis was the victorious prytany in 348/7 BC, and, as we have seen (sect. 3), we should not suppose at this period that two prytanies might win the competition in the same year; and the letter forms pull more towards the relatively large and broad lettering reminiscent of the fifth century¹³ than the narrower, more crowded, lettering characteristic of the mid-fourth century.
- (d) <u>69</u> (**Kekropis**). *IG* hesitates in 1. 1, [ἐπὶ -^{c.5}-]ότο [ἄ]ρχον[τ]ος, as between Pythodotos (343/2 BC), Theodotos (387/6 BC) and Kephisodotos (366/5 or 358/7 BC), but aside from the fact that, as Meritt saw, spacing and letter forms suggest the later date, the "crowning" formula ("having been crowned by the Council and People for its excellence and justice", 4-5) should imply a date after 357/6 BC (above, section 2).
- (e) 73. A rather crudely inscribed prytany dedication "to the hero", probably by [Aia]ntis or [Leo]ntis, dated to the archonship of Theophilos. Meritt, *Hesp.* 16 (1947), 160 no. 55 and Tracy, *ALC*, 251 opt for the Theophilos of 226/5 BC, the new *IG* follows Geagan (*Agora* XVIII 80) in opting for the Theophilos of 348/7 BC. Pandionis was the victorious prytany in 348/7 BC (29), and we should not at this period expect two prytanies to be victorious in the same year (sect. 3). The dedication was probably made privately (thus Tracy) in 226/5 BC, at a time when the genre had generally ceased to be current. 122 (100 BC-100 AD) and 220 (iii AD), and perhaps 90 (after 307/6 BC), supply good parallels.
- (f) <u>75</u> (**Aigeis**). Dated 343/2 BC with no "?" in the new *IG*. The dedication was allocated tentatively to 343/2 BC (?) by Meritt and Traill (*Agora* XV 36) on the grounds that Deinostratos son of Deiniades of Ankyle (l. 20) proposed the Council decree of that year, <u>*IG* II³ 1, 306</u>, l. 4 (decree 3). As Meritt and Traill note, however, it was possible to serve on the Council twice in

-

¹³ Cf. the later cutters illustrated by S. V. Tracy, Athenian Lettering of the Fifth Century BC (2016).

a lifetime at this period, and this dedication might date to Deinostratos' other term. Indeed another man listed in 75, Dionysios son of Hephaistion of Philaidai (1. 3) was also a member of the prytany of Aigeis in 341/0 BC (76 l. 17). Moreover, Kekropis was most likely the victorious prytany in 343/2 BC (69, see above) and we should not, at this period, expect two prytanies to be victorious in the same year (sect. 3). The date should be given as ca. 340 BC. I note that this inscription takes with it *Agora* XV 37, which has the same secretary of the Council and People, Blepyros son of Peithandros of Paionidai; and that contrary to what is stated at *IG* II³ 1, 306, note to line 20, *Agora* XV 37 is accordingly probably not from the list of councillors of 343/2 BC provided for in that inscription.

(g) 78 (Oineis) and 79 (Aiantis), both 339/8 BC. The new *IG*, following the first editor, Oikonomos, prints 78, Il. 3-5: (scil. πρυτάνεις ἀνέθεσαν) [νι]κήσαν[τες ὑπὸ τῆς βουλῆς καὶ | τοῦ] δήμου [στεφανωθέντες | . . .]\ΤΟΥ[-]. This is incoherent. δήμου in l. 4 is probably part of a participial phrase in the genitive, cf. 69, Il. 2-3, νικήσαντες [τὰς ἄλλας φυλὰς?] | τοῦ δήμου κρίναντος. 4 So here: [νι]κήσαν[τες τὰς ἄλλας φυλὰς? | τοῦ] δήμου [κρίναντος - - | . . .]\ΤΟΥ[-]. Both 78 and 79 date to the same year, but, as brilliantly elucidated by Curbera, 79 is not a conventional prytany dedication, but a private dedication to Eileithyia by a group of prytany members, commemorating the birth of a son to a member.

(h) <u>80</u> (Antiochis, 334/3 BC), <u>81</u> (Antiochis, 334/3 ? BC). Though dimensions seem to preclude their belonging to the same monument, the stone with the dedicatory formula (<u>80</u>) may belong to the same commemorative complex as the list of names (<u>81</u>). For multiple monuments forming a single commemorative complex cf. <u>IG II³ 1, 306</u> (referred to above, note on <u>75</u>). Alternatively, <u>81</u> might date to a different year from <u>80</u>.

5. Note on historical context

In the 340s BC the Athenian Assembly began routinely inscribing decrees honouring Athenian officials. I have argued elsewhere that several factors are relevant to understanding this development. It can be seen as an attempt to maximise the incentives to high standards of office-holding created by the honorific system, perhaps in part as a response to a sense of the relative decline of Athens' political and military standing in the face of the growth of Macedonian power. It also, however, entailed a democratisation of *philotimia*, a virtue which now became praiseworthy so long as it was directed towards the Council and People, and so long, in this democratic society, as ordinary Athenians of moderate means had a stake in it, not only the wealthy few. If the argument of this paper has been correct, we have now identified a further milestone on this path of development. In (it seems) 357/6 BC, a decade before the beginning of the series of inscribed decrees, the Athenians decided to provide public funds for

6

_

 $^{^{14}}$ As Curbera notes, the restoration νικήσαντες [τὰς ἄλλας φυλὰς] is supported by the tribal decree, $IG~II^2~1142 = Agora~XV~5$, Il. 5-8: ἔκρινεν αὐτὸς ἡ βολὴ | νικᾶν τὰς ἄλλας φυλὰς | ὡς ἄριστα πρυταγεύσα|ντας τῆι πόλει.

¹⁵ *IALD* II, 76-77, 95-96, 203.

the inscribing of dedications commemorating the award of honours following the successful completion of an official's term of office. This too represented a democratisation, for public funding meant that such commemoration was open to all; and it may not be coincidental that the development dates two years after the accession of Athens' nemesis, Philip II, to the Macedonian throne, and coincides with the beginning of the Social War, a conflict which exposed Athens' vulnerability, political and financial.