THE ATHENIAN STATE SECRETARIAT AND PROVISIONS FOR PUBLISHING AND ERECTING DECREES

ABSTRACT

This article presents a survey of the principal state secretaries responsible for the publication of decrees and their erection on stone stelai, followed by a full analysis of the forms of the publication and erection provisions from the 5th century B.C. to the 2nd century A.C. The study demonstrates that, during all periods, one sequence tended to predominate, but other sequences were also employed. Attention is paid to detail within the constituent elements of the formulations, and suggestions are made for altering restorations in several texts.

In this paper I first examine the titles of the various state secretaries whose task it was to supervise the inscription and erection of decrees passed by the *boule* and *demos,* and then analyze and discuss in detail the form of the provisions authorizing such publication and erection.[1]

THE SECRETARIES

From perhaps just before the middle of the 5th century B.C. we meet ὁ γραμματεὺς τῆς βουλῆς, the Secretary of the Council. Until some time in the 360s, this official was appointed for a term of a single prytany only, so that in any given year there were ten different Secretaries of the Council;[2] he was chosen from among the members of the tribes *not* in prytany, but almost certainly was himself a *bouleutes.*

At some time during the 360s, and demonstrably by the year 363/2,[3] the secretary now held office for the entire year, and almost certainly was

at the School. I am also pleased to acknowledge the helpful comments and suggestions of *Hesperia*'s two anonymous reviewers.

Texts from Osborne 1981 are cited by their D numbers. All dates in this paper are B.C. unless otherwise indicated.

2. It is for this reason that, in financial records kept on an annual basis, as in the case of the Parthenon, Propylaia, and Erechtheion, we find dating given in terms of who "was the first to be secretary." See Dinsmoor 1931, p. 351, n. 2.

3. In 363/2, four prytanies (II, VI, VII, and that of Aiantis) all have the same secretary, Nikostratos of Pallene: see Dinsmoor 1931, p. 351, n. 3.

no longer a *bouleutes*. In 356/5 (*IG* II² 128), commencing with VII Kekropis, the annual rotation of the secretaries in official tribal order was inaugurated.[4] New, and as yet unpublished, evidence indicates that the old arrangement with ten secretaries each year persisted at least until the year of the archon Kephisodoros (366/5).[5] This evidence not only brings down the previously held lower limit from 368/7, but also explodes Ferguson's hypothesis that the secretaries of the decade 366/5–357/6 also came each from a different tribe, not in official order, but in a random sequence determined by the lot.[6]

It is only after the alteration in the term of the Secretary's office from one prytany to one year that we first encounter a new title, ὁ γραμματεὺς ὁ κατὰ πρυτανείαν, the Prytany Secretary.[7] At first sight, it may appear incongruous and puzzling that, now that the State Secretary no longer serves for a single prytany alone but for a whole year, he is nevertheless designated κατὰ πρυτανείαν. But this rests on a misconception: κατὰ πρυτανείαν does *not* mean "throughout (one) prytany," but rather, as Ferguson saw, "prytany by prytany," referring to the Secretary's function throughout the succession of the ten prytanies of the year.[8]

This new title is first clearly met with in *IG* II² 120, an inscription of the year 353/2.[9] At lines 15–16, τὸγ γραμματέα τὸγ κατὰ | [πρ]υτανείαν is instructed, along with τοὺς ἄλλους γραμματ{τε}έας τοὺς ἐπὶ τοῖ[ς δ]ημοσίοις γράμμασιν, to make copies of the inventory of treasures in the Chalkotheke. It is not until a little later—*IG* II² 210 + 259 (349/8); *IG* II² 223A (343/2)—that we first find him explicitly charged with the duty of publication and erection of a decree.[10]

It is manifest, however, from extant epigraphical evidence, that the publication and erection of decrees may now be entrusted either to the secretary designated as κατὰ πρυτανείαν or to the (earlier) official designated τῆς βουλῆς. For these two designations now appear in the publication provisions of our texts down to the end of the 4th century.[11] This circumstance has generated the obvious question: were these two titles merely different ways of designating the same official,[12] or are we now

4. Confirmed by Agora I 7495, an unpublished law of the year 354/3 (see Whitehead 1989, p. 102). For what is now termed "Ferguson's Law," see Ferguson 1898, pp. 32–38; and 1914–1915.

5. A new text of 366/5, to be published by Angelos Matthaiou, will furnish clear evidence that more than one secretary operated during that year. I am much indebted to Mr. Matthaiou for this privileged information.

6. For the lower limit of 368/7, see Rhodes 1985, p. 135; 1993, pp. 601–602, with Addenda p. 781. Ferguson's hypothesis is most recently espoused by Whitehead (1989, *SEG* XXXIX 71), who refers to this putative arrange-

ment as "Ferguson's proto-law."

7. At *Ath. Pol.* 54.3 the γραμματεὺς κατὰ πρυτανείαν is the only title explicitly mentioned, although we may reasonably assume that the secretary who, we are told, was previously elected (πρότερον . . . οὗτος ἦν χειροτονητός) is the official whom we find designated as the γραμματεὺς τῆς βουλῆς. *Ath. Pol.* tells us that "now" the secretary is chosen by sortition (νῦν δὲ γέγονε κληρωτός). It is likely that the change from election to sortition occurred at the same time as the shift from a tenure of a single prytany to an annual one.

8. Ferguson 1898, p. 36.

9. For the date, see Schweigert

1938, pp. 281–289; cf. Rhodes 1985, p. 92, with n. 4.

10. Note that *IG* II² 223C, lines 1–2, [γραμματ]ε[ὺ]ς κατὰ π[ρυτα]νείαν· | Κλεόστρατος Τιμοσθένους Αἰγιλιεύς, taken in conjunction with the fragmentary prescripts in *IG* II² 224 and 225, both also of the year 343/2, proves that the *grammateus kata prytaneian* was a designation for the principal State Secretary.

11. And even, sporadically, beyond: see below, p. 93.

12. So, e.g., Ferguson 1898, pp. 35–36, 63–66; Brillant 1911, pp. 34–49; Pritchett and Meritt 1940, p. 2, with n. 6; Rhodes 1985, pp. 136–137; 1993, p. 600.

dealing with two distinct officials, with separate titles and separate—or overlapping—functions?[13]

One piece of evidence is central to this issue, namely, the inscription already adduced above (*IG* II² 120), related to the inventory of the treasures in the Chalkotheke. For, in the words immediately following the lines cited above, we read:

ἐπειδὰν δὲ ἐξετασθῆι πάντα κ
[αὶ] ἀναγραφῆι, τὸγ γραμματέα τῆς βουλῆς ἀναγράψαντα
[ἐν] στήληι λιθίνηι στῆσαι ἔμπροσθεν τῆς χαλκοθήκη[ς].

The problem is obvious: can we believe that one and the same official is, within the space of a couple of lines, referred to by two different titles? Surely, some would urge, these must be two separate officials.

It would not be difficult to accept what appears so obvious, were it not for the existence of further evidence, which may help to alleviate the apparent contradiction. In *SEG* XIX 129, a document published by the Treasurers of Athena, reference is made in lines 13–14 to the stele set up in 353/2 by Philokedes in front of the Chalkotheke: ἣν] Φιλοκήδης ἔστησεν ἐπὶ Θουδήμ[ου ἄρχοντος. This can be none other than the stele the γραμματεὺς τῆς βουλῆς is instructed to set up by the publication provision of lines 17–19 of *IG* II² 120. Now, Philokedes son of Dorotheos of Pallene is, with minimal restoration, firmly established as the eponymous secretary in *Agora* XVI 55 (*IG* II² 138) and *IG* II² 139, both of 353/2; and, as we already know from *IG* II² 223C and II² 224, 225, the eponymous secretary could bear the title γραμματεὺς κατὰ πρυτανείαν. Hence, the γραμματεὺς τῆς βουλῆς and the γραμματεὺς κατὰ πρυτανείαν are one and the same.[14]

Although incidence of mention of the secretary entitled γραμματεὺς τῆς βουλῆς as the officer responsible for the publication of decrees decreases steadily as the 4th century progresses, replaced in favor of the secretary entitled γραμματεὺς κατὰ πρυτανείαν, it is certainly misleading, indeed false, to suggest or imply that we hear no more of the former designation after 318/17.[15] For it is unquestionably found well into the *3rd* century, e.g., D 75, line 34 (*paullo post* 286/5);[16] *SEG* XXI 389, lines 1–2 (ca. *med. s.* III).[17] However, the totally restored example at *Agora* XV 77, lines 32–34 (280–275), ἀναγράψαι δὲ τόδε] τὸ ψήφισμ[α τὸν γραμματέα τὸν τῆς βουλῆς ἐ]ν στήληι λ[ιθίνηι, should be regarded with suspicion, partly because of the anomalous formulation with the repeated definite article[18] and partly for the reasoning employed to justify the restoration. For Meritt and Traill rejected Dow's objection to the late date for mention of this officer on the grounds that "the funds for [inscribing the decree] were to come from the moneys at the disposal of the Council," a curious justification.[19] Dow's caution in assuming omission of five letters from the title of the prytany secretary is preferable; he also noted that the space could be exactly filled with καὶ τὰ ὀνόματα τῶν πρυτανέων.[20] This is not so fanciful: instances of the omission of any reference whatsoever to the secretary do occur.[21]

Apart from the activities of the secretaries designated τῆς βουλῆς and κατὰ πρυτανείαν, we find that, during the two brief periods of political

13. So, e.g., Dinsmoor 1931, pp. 352–353; Alessandrì 1982, pp. 15–32; cf. Whitehead 1989, p. 102, n. 1.

14. As Rhodes (1985, p. 137, n. 7) notes, it was Pritchett and Meritt (1940, p. 2, n. 6) who were the first to make the link. Schweigert (1938, pp. 281–289 [*SEG* XIX 129, ca. 352/1]) did not make the connection, misled by Dow's erroneous identification (Dow 1937, pp. 34–36) of the γραμματεὺς τῆς βουλῆς καὶ τοῦ δήμου—a quite different official altogether; see Rhodes 1985, p. 136—with the γραμματεὺς τῆς βουλῆς.

15. So Dinsmoor 1931, p. 352; cf. Rhodes 1985, p. 140; 1993, p. 600.

16. The restoration in the Corpus text, *IG* II² 652, lines 34–35, τὸν γραμματέα τῆς β[ουλῆς καὶ τοῦ δή]μου, the Secretary of the Boule and of the People, is both impossible and unnecessary. We should read, as Osborne (1981) does (D 75), β[ουλῆς ἐν στήληι λιθίνηι. The Secretary of the Boule and of the People is an official with a totally different function, and is to be identified with the elected Reader (see Rhodes 1985, p. 136).

17. Meritt (1961, p. 215, no. 10) had restored τὸ[ν γραμματέα τῆς βουλῆς ἐστήληι λιθίνηι, calling this, strangely, "an abbreviated form of the title τὸν γραμματέα τῆς βουλῆς καὶ τοῦ δήμου."

18. See p. 95 below.

19. *Agora* XV, p. 89.

20. Dow 1937, p. 42, and n. 2.

21. *Agora* XVI 123, lines 23–24 (302/1) furnishes an example of omission of the secretary in a text that also, as it happens, includes the phrase καὶ τὰ ὀνόματα αὐτῶν. For other examples, see pp. 110–113 below.

turbulence at Athens in the years 321/20 to 319/18 and 294/3 to 292/1, it was the ἀναγραφεύς who assumed the status of eponymous secretary and the duties of publishing decrees of the *boule* and *demos*. Prytany secretaries do make an appearance in decree prescripts of the first of these periods, but they have lost their annual status, being chosen for a period of one prytany only from among the members of the prytanizing tribe.[22]

Before the 4th century is over, we encounter yet another secretary entrusted with the publication of decrees, or, at least, another *title* of a secretary with this responsibility. This is ὁ γραμματεὺς τοῦ δήμου.[23] Ferguson and Brillant argue for the identification of this secretary with the γραμματεὺς κατὰ πρυτανείαν and the earlier γραμματεὺς τῆς βουλῆς, an identification also supported by Pritchett in the editing of a fragmentary text.[24] It is not impossible, however, as Woodhead reminds us, that "this was a functionary separate from those already mentioned."[25] Certainty is unattainable; for our purposes an economical hypothesis will be to accept that this is simply a new title for the principal state secretary.

The γραμματεὺς τοῦ δήμου is first encountered in publication provisions in the posthumous honors proposed for Lycurgus by Stratokles in 307/6 ([Plutarch] *Vit. X orat.* 852), where we read ἀναθεῖναι δὲ τὸν γραμματέα τοῦ δήμου ἐν στήλαις λιθίναις καὶ στῆσαι ἐν ἀκροπόλει πλησίον τῶν ἀναθημάτων. Epigraphically, he appears slightly later, e.g., D 61 (*IG* II² 496 + 507), lines 37–38 (303/2); possibly also in D 57 (*IG* II² 576) and D 58 (*IG* II² 696), both placed by Osborne in ca. 307–303/2. For the next 200 years his title occurs regularly but much less frequently than ὁ γραμματεὺς ὁ κατὰ πρυτανείαν. He is still to be found mentioned at the very end of the 2nd century b.c. (*IG* II² 1011, line 62 [106/5]).

This brief survey is not complete without mention of the fact that the relevant secretary appears in a few cases to have been designated as ὁ γραμματεύς *tout court*.[26] As already noted, on occasion in the publication provision there is no mention of any responsible official at all: "in all such cases the subject of the infinitive is presumed to be the familiar official, under whatever designation."[27]

THE PROVISION FOR INSCRIBING AND ERECTING

In the instructions included in decrees and laws for their publication and erection, there are essentially six elements, not all of which are always present in each instance, and not all appearing in a single, unvaried order of occurrence. These six elements, out of which the wording of the instructions is formulated, are the designation of the responsible secretary, the instruction to attend to the inscribing of the document, the specification of what text is to be inscribed, the material on which the text is to be inscribed, the instruction to erect the monument, and the location. Within each of these elements we shall find variations of wording or vocabulary.

The presentation of the mass of material available for an overview and thorough analysis of the various formulations is no easy matter.

22. See Henry 1977, pp. 50–57, esp. p. 55; cf. Rhodes 1985, p. 140; 1993, p. 600.

23. As Woodhead (*Agora* XVI, p. 191) notes, Rhodes 1985 does not specifically discuss this secretary, although his note 3 (Rhodes 1985, p. 136) might be taken to imply that the secretary is to be identified with ὁ γραμματεὺς τῆς βουλῆς καὶ τοῦ δήμου, i.e., the Reader. Rhodes (1995, p. 600) states baldly that, apart from the two periods of ἀναγραφεῖς, "the title γραμματεὺς κατὰ πρυτανείαν became standard (until in the second century A.D. it gave way to a new title περὶ τὸ βῆμα)." This is somewhat imprecise, at least in so far as the designation of the secretaries responsible for inscribing and erecting decrees goes.

24. See Ferguson 1898, pp. 63–66 and Brillant 1911, pp. 37–49; also *Hesperia* 10, 1941, pp. 270–271, no. 70, with n. 10; cf. D 64 and *Agora* XVI 121.

25. *Agora* XVI, p. 191.

26. See pp. 110–113 below.

27. Woodhead, in *Agora* XVI, p. 240.

Conscious of the fact that there is an obvious chronological overlap at all periods except before ca. 365 B.C.—given that instructions for the inscribing and erection of stelai are assigned to more than one secretary (or, at least, to secretaries with more than one title)—I have concluded that the evidence will be most easily intelligible and digestible[28] if it is presented in categories divided according to the various (titles of) secretaries.

THE SECRETARY OF THE BOULE
(ὁ γραμματεὺς ὁ τῆς βουλῆς)

As is fully to be expected, given the idiosyncratic nature of early chancery style, the 5th century reveals itself as a period when the wording of the provision is only just beginning to edge its way forward to a standard or predominant form.[29]

Our earliest piece of evidence is perhaps[30] *IG* I³ 10, lines 22–26, the Phaselite decree, dated 469–450 in the Corpus:

<div style="text-align:right">τ   stoich. 22</div>

[ὁ δὲ ψήφισ]μα τό[δε] ἀναγραψά
[τω ὁ γραμμ]ατεὺς ὁ τῆς βολῆς
[ἐστήληι λιθί]νηι καὶ καταθ
[έτω ἐμ πόλει

Here the instructions commence by specifying what is to be inscribed, τὸ ψήφισμα τόδε,[31] followed by the instruction to inscribe the decree, here in the imperative.[32] Next comes the secretary himself, of necessity in the nominative case, and, be it noted, with the article *repeated*; he is ὁ γραμματεὺς ὁ τῆς βολῆς.[33] Then appear the material to bear the inscribed text, a stele of stone,[34] expressed by ἐν + dative;[35] the instruction to erect the stele,

28. A certain degree of what the late-lamented David Lewis might well have termed "rebarbativity" is inescapable in studies of this nature. We are, I fear, back in "the austere realms" that Whitehead (1998, p. 493) associates, not too unkindly, with my work on the language of Athenian inscriptions.

29. I should indicate at the outset that, although I have excluded many possible instances in which restoration plays too substantial a role, I have not hesitated to include examples not totally preserved, where, in my judgment, sufficient traces remain on the stone to justify confidence in the overall original wording. To cite only completely unrestored texts would have risked overlooking some poten-

tially significant evidence. The first example cited (*IG* I³ 10) illustrates this point well.

30. On the strength of the short dative Φασηλίταις (line 5), Harold Mattingly would place this document in 425/4. Like Lewis, I do not find this convincing. It is not my intention here to rehearse the arguments for "the right dating criteria for fifth-century Attic texts" (cf. Mattingly 1999). I address this topic in *ZPE* 137, 2001, forthcoming.

31. The alternative word order, τόδε τὸ ψήφισμα, cannot be accommodated here, nor would it be tolerated where the provision is introduced by the connective δέ. There is no instance of the sequence τόδε δὲ τὸ ψήφισμα. Cf. n. 77 below.

32. The imperative will, of course,

eventually give way to the infinitive (ἀναγράψαι) construction.

33. In the nominative, the title may indeed be found, but rarely, without the repeated article: so *IG* I³ 156, lines 21–22 (440–425); *IG* II² 106, line 16 (368/7); II² 141, line 13 (364?). In the accusative, the title is invariably τὸν γραμματέα τῆς βουλῆς, with no doubling of the article. For the alleged instance of τὸν γραμματέα τὸν τῆς βουλῆς in *Agora* XV 77, line 33 (280–275), see p. 93 above.

34. But note *IG* II² 687 (+ 686), line 43 (265/4), ἐν στήληι χαλκ[ῆι.

35. εἰς + accusative is almost as common as ἐν + dative. Cf. *IG* I³ 98 (411), where at line 13 we find ἐν σ[τήληι λιθίνηι, and at lines 27–28 ἐς τὴν αἰὸ]τὴν στήλην.

expressed by the verb κατατίθημι;[36] and finally, the location, ἐμ πόλει,[37] on the Acropolis, totally restored here, but equally totally certain.

Thus, all six constituent elements are present, in a pattern that can most simply be described as O(bject)–V(erb)–S(ubject).[38] This pattern seems to have been one to commend itself in the 5th century: compare, for example, the more elaborate but essentially identical *IG* I³ 78, lines 48–51 (ca. 422?), the decree on the Eleusinian Firstfruits:

<div align="right">stoich. 50</div>

τὰς δὲ χσυνγραφὰς καὶ τὸ φσέφισμα τόδε ἀναγ
ραφσάτο hο γραμματεὺς hο τἕς βολἕς ἐν στέλαιν δυοῖν
   λιθίναι
ν καὶ καταθέτο τὲν μὲν Ἐλευσῖνι ἐν τõι hιερõι, τὲν δὲ
   hετέραν [ἐ]
μ πόλει·

The same sequence is found in the accusative and infinitive construction, e.g., *IG* I³ 65, lines 5–7 (ca. 427/6):

τὸ δὲ φσέ]φ[ι]σ[μα τό]δε ἀνα[γράφσαι τ]   stoich. 30
[ὸγ γραμματ]έα [τἕ]ς [βο]λἕς ἐν σ[τέ]λει λ[ιθ]
[ίνει καὶ κα]τ[αθ]ἕν[αι] ἐμ πόλ[ει].

Compare *IG* I³ 106, lines 19–21 (409/8):

<div align="right">stoich. 50</div>
<div align="right">τ</div>

[ὸ δὲ φσ]έφισμα τόδε ἀνα[γρ]άφσαι τὸν γραμματέα τἕς βολἕς
   ἐν στέ
[λει λι]θίνει καὶ καταθἕ[ν]αι ἐν πόλει·

and *IG* I³ 110, lines 20–24 (408/7):

<div align="right">τὸ δὲ ψ   stoich. 23</div>

ήφισμα τόδε ἀναγράψαι τὸν γ
ραμματέα τῆς βολῆς ἐν στήλη
ι λιθίνηι καὶ καταθἕναι ἐμ π
όλει.

A more elaborate wording, but recognizably the same pattern, is seen in *IG* I³ 40, lines 57–63 (446/5):

<div align="right">τὸ δὲ φσέφισμα τόδε καὶ τὸν   stoich. 32</div>

hόρκον ἀναγράφσαι Ἀθένεσι μὲν τὸν γρα
μμ[α]τέα τἕς βολἕς ἐστέλει λιθίνει καὶ κ
αταθἕναι ἐς πόλιν τέλεσι τοῖς Χαλκιδέ
ον, ἐν δὲ Χαλκίδι ἐν τõι hιερõι τõ Διὸς τõ
Ὀλυμπίο hε βολὲ Χαλκιδέον ἀναγράφσασ
α καταθέτο.

36. The regular alternative, as we shall see, is ἵστημι.

37. There appears to be a distinct shift from ἐμ πόλει to ἐν ἀκροπόλει somewhere around the year 386 B.C. (see Henry 1982), probably with a period of overlap on either side of the apparent divide (*SEG* XXXII 50, lines 17–18 [379/8], although totally restored, may be the latest dated example of ἐμ πόλει). As well as ἐν + dative, we also occasionally find εἰς + accusative: so ἐς πόλιν, *IG* I³ 40, line 60 (446/5); I³ 127, line 39 (405/4); εἰς ἀκρόπολιν, *IG* II² 238b, lines 15–16 (338/7); D 37 (II² 391), line 15 (318); II² 571, lines 7–8 (*fin. s.* IV). Instances with the article are rare: ἐν τῆι ἀκροπ[όλει, *IG* II² 133, line 17 (355/4); εἰς τὴν ἀκροπό[λιν, II² 221, line 5 (*paullo post* 344/3); εἰς | [τὴν ἀκροπόλιν, II² 725, lines 8–9 (*s.* III, *pars prior*).

38. The wording for the erection will regularly, but not invariably (cf., e.g., *IG* I³ 153, lines 19–21 [440–425]), follow on after the principal instructions for the inscribing have been given.

Here, of course, we have provision for inscribing and erecting both at Athens and at Chalkis, which accounts for some of the variation. We may note too the switch from the accusative and infinitive to the nominative and imperative, which is paralleled, with the reverse switch, in *IG* I³ 156, lines 19–26 (440–425):

<div align="right">περὶ [δ]   stoich. 23</div>

ἐ Λεονίδο τὰ ἐφσεφισμένα ἀ[ν]
αγραφσάτο ho γραμματεὺς τε̄
ς βολε̄ς τέλεσι τοῖς Λεονίδο
ἐν στέλαιν δυοῖν, καὶ τὲν μὲν
hετέραν στε̄σαι ἐμ πόλει, τὲν
δὲ hετέραν ἐν haλικαρνασσο̄
ι ἐν τῶι hιερο̄ι το̄ 'Απόλλονος·

We should observe that 1) the article is *not* repeated in the title of the Secretary;[39] 2) the expected λιθίναιν is omitted; 3) the allocation of the costs to Leonidas himself comes *before* the provision for erection, no doubt because of the complication of the wording of the double erection; 4) the verb employed to express the erecting is ἵστημι, rather than κατατίθημι; and 5) at line 27, the construction moves back to the imperative again (ἄνδρα προσελέσθο Λεονίδιες κτλ.).[40]

To return briefly to *IG* I³ 40, it should also be observed how, in lines 62–63, the formulation has been converted from ἀναγράφσαι καὶ καταθε̄ναι to ἀναγράφσασα (participle) καταθέτο. This syntactically "reduced" form is encountered not infrequently in the 5th century, as well as occasionally in the 4th.[41]

In the 5th century we also find the sequence V–O–S, with the infinitive, for example, *IG* I³ 66, lines 20–22 (427/6):

<div align="right">καὶ ἀναγράφ[σαι ταῦτα τὸγ γ]   stoich. 38</div>

[ρα]μματέα τε̄ς βολε̄ς ἐστέλει λιθ[ίνει καὶ καταθ]
ε̄ναι ἐμ πόλει

where the restoration ταῦτα is confirmed by the resumptive ταῦ]τα μὲν ἀναγράφσαι in lines 22–23. Compare the slightly different *IG* I³ 98.I, lines 26–28 (411):

<div align="right">προσανα]   stoich. 30</div>

[γ]ράψαι δὲ καὶ τόδε τὸ ψή[φισμα ἐς τὴν α]
[ὐ]τὴν στήλην τὸγ γραμμ[ατέα τῆς βολῆς].

This sequence, V–O–S, is the one that appears to predominate in the 4th century and beyond;[42] compare, for example, *IG* II² 107, lines 18–20 (368/7):

<div align="right">non-stoich.</div>

ἀναγράψαι δ[ὲ τ]όδ
[ε τὸ ψ]ή[φι]σμα τὸν γραμματέα τῆς [βου]λῆ[ς] ἐν στήληι λιθίνη
[ι καὶ σ]τῆσαι ἐν ἀκροπόλει.

and D 14 (*IG* II² 226+), lines 19–23 (ca. 342):

39. See n. 33 above.

40. The heavily restored and not entirely secure *IG* I³ 163, lines 3–7 (440–415) appears to move from the imperative ἀναγρα]φσάτο to the infinitive κατα]θε̄ναι.

41. See p. 103 below.

42. Indeed, as we shall see, this sequence is by far the commonest with *all* (titles of) secretaries.

<div align="center">

ἀνα   stoich. 21
γράψαι δὲ τόδε τὸ ψήφισμα
τὸγ γραμματέἅα τῆς βουλῆ
ς ἐν στήληι λιθίνηι καὶ κα
ταθεῖναι ἐν ἀκροπόλει·[43]

</div>

and, with the variation of the phrase "on a stele of stone" appearing *before*, rather than *after*, mention of the Secretary, *IG* II² 232, lines 20–23 (340/39):

<div align="center">

ἀναγράψα]   stoich. 25
[ι] δὲ τόδε τὸ ψή[φισμα ἐν στήληι λ]
[ι]θίνηι τὸν γρ[αμματέα τῆς βουλ]
ῆς καὶ στῆσα[ι ἐν ἀκροπόλει·

</div>

SEG XL 74, lines 24–27 (337/6):

<div align="center">

καὶ ἀναγρά   stoich. 33
ψαι τόδε τὸ ψήφισμα ἐν στήληι λιθίνηι τὸ
ν γραμματέα τῆς βουλῆς καὶ στῆσαι ἐν ἀκρ
οπόλει·

</div>

and the more elaborate *Agora* XVI 73, lines 22–27 (337/6):

<div align="center">

ἀναγράψαι δὲ τόν   stoich. 36
δε τὸν νόμον ἐν στήλαις λιθίναις δυοῖν τὸν γ
ραμματέα τῆς βουλῆς καὶ στῆσαι τὴμ μὲν ἐπὶ τ
ῆς εἰσόδου τῆς εἰς Ἄρειον Πάγον τῆς εἰς τὸ βο
υλευτήριον εἰσιόντι, τὴν δὲ ἐν τῆι ἐκκλησία
ι·

</div>

or, with the complete *omission* of the phrase "on a stele of stone,"[44] for example, *IG* II² 351 (+ 624), lines 33–35 (330/29):

<div align="center">

ἀναγράψαι [δ]ὲ τόδε τὸ ψήφισμα   stoich.
τὸν γραμματέα τῆς βουλῆς καὶ
στῆσαι ἐν ἀκρ[ο]πόλει·

</div>

The same word order, V–O–S, is standard in *proxeny* grants, when the word προξενίαν is employed in lieu of τόδε τὸ ψήφισμα in the publication provision: so *IG* II² 80, lines 5–7 (ca. 380–370?):[45]

<div align="center">

[καὶ ἀναγ]ράψαι αὐτῶι τὴμ προ[ξενίαν]   stoich. 29
[ἐν στήλ]ηι λιθ[ί]νηι τὸν γραμμα[τέα ⁵⁵]
[τῆς βολῆ]ς κα[ὶ σ]τῆσαι ἐν ἀκροπ[όλει ᵛ].

</div>

and *IG* II² 149, lines 17–20 (342):

43. Cf. also *IG* II² 660.I, lines 19–22 (*s.* IV, *pars prior*); II² 204, lines 54–57 (352/1); II² 212, lines 44–47 (347/6), with τὸ ψήφισμα τόδε; II² 410, lines 37–39 (ca. 330); *Agora* XV 49, lines 55–57 (328/7); *IG* II² 343, lines 17–19 (323/2?).

44. Although, of course, the very existence of the stone shows that this was the intention.

45. See Pečírka 1966, p. 29, for the text (cf. *SEG* XXIV 78).

                                                            ἀ   stoich. 37

[ναγράψαι δὲ καὶ τὴ]ν προξενίαν, ἐὰν καὶ τῶι δήμ
[ωι δοκῆι, τὸν γραμμ]ατέα τῆς βουλῆς ἐν στήληι λ
[ιθίνηι καὶ στῆσαι] ἐν ἀκροπόλει δέκα ἡμερῶν·[46]

In addition to these predominating sequences we also find the following
two sequences:

1) O–S–V, so *IG* II² 43, lines 63–66 (378/7):

                τὸ δ[ὲ ψήφι]σμα τόδε ὁ γραμματεὺς   stoich. 31
                ὁ τῆς βολῆ[ς ἀναγρ]αψάτω ἐν στήληι λιθί
                νηι καὶ καταθέ[τω] παρὰ τὸν Δία τὸν Ἐλευ
                θέριον·

2) S–V, so *IG* II² 76, lines 17–20 (ca. 378/7?):

                ὁ] δὲ γ[ραμ]ματεὺς ὁ τῆ   stoich. 20
                ς βολῆς ἀν[αγρ]αψάτω ἐν στ
                ήληι λιθ[ίνηι] καὶ θέτω ἐν
                ἀκροπόλε[ι·

a proxeny decree, where the object of ἀναγραψάτω is to be supplied from
the immediately preceding proxeny grant in the form ἔναι [δ]ὲ αὐτὸ[ν
πρόξε]νον κτλ.

      Finally, we come to a form of the publication and erection provision
where no separate verb of erecting is expressed, producing the so-called
"telescoped" formulation. This form warrants special treatment, given
the importance of the chronological arguments based on it by Harold
Mattingly.[47]
      With the orthodox dating, our earliest instance of this phenomenon
is in the notorious Egesta decree, *IG* I³ 11, lines 11–12 (458/7), where the
restoration seems beyond challenge:

                                                          stoich. 48

                τὸ δὲ φσέ]φισμα τόδε καὶ τὸν [hόρκ]ο[ν] ἀνα[γρ]ά[φσα]
                [ι ἐστέλει λιθίνει ἐμ π]όλει τὸν γραμματέα τὲς βολὲς·

Apart from the wording of the text of "the grand alliance" (420/19) in
Thucydides 5.47.11, τὰς δὲ ξυνθήκας . . . ἀναγράψαι ἐν στήλῃ λιθίνῃ
Ἀθηναίους μὲν ἐμ πόλει . . . , Mattingly knows of only two 5th-century
epigraphical parallels: *IG* I³ 119, lines 6–9 (407), where the text is less than
secure:

                                              καὶ ἀνα]   stoich. 34
                γράψαι τὸγ γραμμα[τέα τῆς βολῆς ἐν στήληι]
                λιθίνηι ἐν [πόλει τάς τε ξυνθήκας καὶ τὸ ψή]
                [φισμα τόδε - - -

46. For the same pattern, V–O–S,
with the Prytany Secretary, see below,
pp. 104–106.
      47. See Mattingly 1984, pp. 344–
345.

and the equally uncertain *IG* I³ 125, lines 29–32 (405/4):

<div align="center">

τ]   stoich. 29

[ὁ] δὲ ψήφισμα τ[όδε ἀναγράψαι τὸν γρα]
[μ]ματέα τῆς βολ[ῆς ἐμ πόλει ἐν στήληι]
[λι]θίνηι.

</div>

Mattingly is, of course, happy to accept the readings of these two texts since the point he wishes to establish is that the "telescoped" form is not paralleled before ca. 420. If he can do so, this isolates *IG* I³ 11 (Egesta) if it is retained in the early 450s.

It is for this reason that he seeks to *remove* the phenomenon where it has been restored in texts earlier than the 420s. Thus, in the case of the Kolophonian decree, *IG* I³ 37, lines 38–40 (447/6),[48] given in the Corpus in the following form:

<div align="center">

[τὸ] δὲ ψέφισμ[α τόδε καὶ τὸν ὅρχον ἀναγραψάτο ὁ γραμ]
[μα]τεὺς ὁ τὲς β[ολὲς ἐστέλει λιθίνει ἐμ πόλει τέλεσ]
[ι τ]οῖς Κολοφο[νίον·

</div>

Mattingly would prefer, on the basis of the appearance of the participle ἀναγράψαν[τες (line 41) plus the imperative κατα[θέντον (line 42), to read, à la Hiller (*IG* I² 14/15, lines 26–27):

<div align="center">

stoich. 38–42

[τὸ] δὲ ψέφισμ[α τόδε ἀναγράψας ἐστέλει λιθίνει ὁ γραμ]
[μα]τεὺς ὁ τὲς β[ολὲς καταθέτο ἐμ πόλει Ἀθένεσι τέλεσ]

</div>

This dispenses with the "telescoped" form at the expense of reference to the inscription of the oath.

Likewise, in the decree about Erythrai, *IG* I³ 15, lines 42–44 (ca. 450), Mattingly would prefer not to follow the Corpus in reading

<div align="center">

stoich. 47

ἀναγράψαι δὲ ταῦτα καὶ τὸν hό]
[ρ]κον ἐ[ν] λι[θ]ίνει στέλει[49] [καὶ τὸν hόρκον τὸν τὲς βολὲς ἐμ
    πόλ]
ει,

</div>

but instead, again on the model of Hiller (*IG* I² 12/13), he would read at lines 43–44:

<div align="center">

[ρ]κον ἐ[ν] λι[θ]ίνει στέλει [καὶ καταθὲναι Ἀθένεσιν μὲν ἐμ πόλ]
ει, Ἐ[ρυθ]ρᾶ[σ]ι δὲ κτλ.

</div>

As for the fragmentary and uncertain *IG* I³ 70, lines 3–4 (430–420),

<div align="center">

τὸ δὲ [ψ]ή[φισμα τόδε ἀναγράψαι ἐν στήληι λιθίν]
[ηι] ἐμ πόληι τὸν [γραμματέα τῆς βολῆς - - - - - - - - - - -]

</div>

48. Which Mattingly would place ca. 427.
49. Note the anomalous word order.

where not even the line-length is secure,[50] Mattingly favors a much longer line,[51] which would permit an alternative formulation that eschews the telescoped form. He may well be correct.

Mattingly is still left with the awkward Eleusinian Epistatai decree, *IG* I³ 32, lines 32–34 (ca. 449–447),[52] in which there is no escaping the telescoped format:

<div align="right">

γράφσαι δὲ τὸ [φσέφισ]   stoich. 32

</div>

μα ἐν στέλει Ἐλευσῖνι κα[ὶ ἐν ἄστει καὶ Φ]

αλ[ε]ρο͂ι ἐν το͂ι Ἐλευσιν[ίοι.

This, manifestly, is an extremely compressed and abbreviated publication provision,[53] and Mattingly argues that it was the specification of three separate locations and the consequent need to specify three different groups of officials that led the drafter to take the easy way out in extreme brevity.[54] Thus, Mattingly sees this as a special case, not to be adduced as a normal instance of the telescoped form appearing earlier than ca. 420.

I remain unconvinced of the general case for the downdating of the Egesta decree,[55] and I do not therefore feel the same need to remove the telescoped formulation from all the examples cited above. For our present purposes, some of the above texts would not have been included in this discussion had it not been necessary to consider Mattingly's position vis-à-vis this phenomenon.

We may note here that, in *proxeny* decrees, where the grant is expressed with ἀναγράφαι[56] and where the publication and erection are combined with the grant itself, the formulation is often telescoped: compare, for example, *IG* I³ 27, lines 5–11 (ca. 450/49):[57]

<div align="right">

Ἀ[. . . . . 10 . . . . . καὶ τὸ]   stoich. 23

</div>

ς ἀδελφὸς [τὸς ἐκείνο τὸς Δελ]

φὸς καὶ τὸμ [πατέρα αὐτὸν ἀνα]

γράφσαι τὸν [γραμματέα τε͂ς β]

ολε͂ς ἐμ πόλε[ι ἐστέλει καὶ ἐν]

το͂ι βολευτε[ρίοι προχσένος]

Ἀθεναίον κτλ.

Agora XVI 11 (*IG* I³ 155), lines 4–9 (435–430):[58]

<div align="right">

Κρίσονα [. . . . . 16 . . . .]   stoich. 28

</div>

δελφος καὶ Δεχ[. . . . ἀναγράφσαι πρ]

οχσένος καὶ εὐ[εργέτας ἐν στέλει λ]

ιθίνει ἐμ πόλει [καὶ ἐν το͂ι βολευτε]

ρίοι ἐς σανίδα τ[ὸν γραμματέα τε͂ς β]

ολε͂ς τέλεσι το[ῖς . . . . . . .14 . . . .]

and *IG* II² 13a + 68 + *Hesperia* 40, 1971, pp. 149–150, no. 3 (*SEG* XL 54), lines 7–12 (399/8):

<div align="right">

Ἀριστέ   stoich. 21

</div>

[αν τὸν Ἀ]χα[ι]ὸν τὸν Αἰγιᾶ ἀνα

---

50. "De vv. paullo longioribus e v. 5 fortasse cogitandum est" (Lewis).

51. Cf. Walbank 1978, pp. 125–127.

52. Mattingly prefers a date not before 433/2.

53. The responsible secretary is not even mentioned (see pp. 110–113 below), but in the 5th century was certainly the Secretary of the Boule.

54. Mattingly notes that even λιθίνει is omitted.

55. See, most recently, Henry 1998.

56. See Henry 1983, pp. 116–130.

57. Mattingly inclines to a date in the 420s.

58. See Henry 1983, p. 117, for the text.

[γράψαι] τ[ὸν] γραμματέα τῆς
[βολῆς ἐν πό]ληι ἐν στήληι λ
[ιθίνηι πρό]ξενον καὶ εὐερ
[γέτην αὐτὸν] καὶ ἐκγόνος

Contrast the non-telescoped formulations in *IG* I³ 174, lines 5–11 (425–410):

<div style="text-align:center">

Λύκωνα τὸν Ἀχαι   stoich. 21
όν, ἐπειδὴ εὖ ποεῖ Ἀθηναίο
[ς], ἀναγραψάτω πρόξενον κα
ὶ εὐεργέτην Ἀθηναίων ἐν σ
τήληι λιθίνει ἐμ πόλει ὁ γρ
αμματεὺς ὁ τῆς βολῆς καὶ κ
αταθέτω ἐμ πόλει.⁵⁹

</div>

and *IG* I³ 80, lines 12–18 (421/0):

<div style="text-align:center">

καὶ ἀν   stoich. 21
αγραφσάτο πρόχσενον καὶ
εὐεργέτεν Ἀθεναίον καθά
περ Πολύστρατον τὸν Φλει
άσιον ἐστέλει λιθίνει ὁ γρ
αμματεὺς ho τῆς βολῆς κα
ὶ καταθέτο ἐν πόλει·⁶⁰

</div>

The phenomenon is common enough in the *4th* century,⁶¹ for example, *Agora* XVI 36 (D 8), lines 33–36 (394/3):

<div style="text-align:center">

stoich. 37–39
τὸν δὲ [γ]ραμμ[ατέα τ]ῆς βολ[ῆ]
ς ἀναγράψαι τὸ ψήφισμα τόδε [τέ]λε[σι τοῖ]ς Σθόρυ[ο]
ς ἐν στήληι ἵναπερ κτλ.

</div>

Compare *Agora* XVI 40 (D 9), lines 13–16 (388/7 or 375/4), a citizenship decree in which αὐτός takes the place of τόδε τὸ ψήφισμα:

<div style="text-align:center">

κα[ὶ] ἀνα[γράψ]   stoich. 18
αι αὐτὸς ἐστήλη[ι λιθί]
νηι τὸγ γραμμ[ατέα τῆς]
βολῆς ἐν ἀκ[ροπόλει·

</div>

and *IG* II² 238, lines 14–17 (338/7):

<div style="text-align:center">

ἀναγράψ]αι δὲ τόδε τὸ ψήφισ   stoich. 24
[μα τὸν γραμ]ματέα τῆς βουλῆς ε
[ἰς ἀκρόπολι]ν εἰς στήλην λιθί
[νην·⁶²

</div>

59. Note the unexpected repetition of ἐμ πόλει (lines 9 and 11).

60. Here the object is to be supplied from the preceding provision (lines 8–9) ἐπαινέσαι Ἀστέαν τὸν Ἀλειόν, with which καὶ ἀναγραφσάτο is coordinated.

61. *IG* II² 140, lines 31–35 (353/2) and II² 365b, lines 12–16 (323/2) are in a slightly different category, in that both give instructions to inscribe the text on stelai already in position. Thus there is no need to specify the location separately.

62. *SEG* XXXIX 75b, lines 9–12 (353/2) appears to be an example of the telescoped form, but the tentative restoration of line 12 cannot be correct: τὸν δὲ γραμματέα τ]ῆς βουλ⟨ῆ⟩ς | [ἀναγράψαι ἐν ἀκροπόλε]ι τόδε τὸ ψ[ήφισμα ἐστήλει λιθίνε]ι δέ[κ]α ἡμει[ρῶν καὶ στῆσαι? τέλεσι] τοῖς Νικα[.]. If the location ἐν ἀκροπόλει is correctly restored in line 10, we will not expect to find the instruction to erect, στῆσαι, later in line 12.

We may conveniently round off this discussion of the various formulations employed during the tenure of office of the Secretary of the Boule by a brief examination of the form in which the instruction to attend to the inscribing of the decree is reduced from the imperative/infinitive to a participle.[63]

The first instance is perhaps to be found in *IG* I³ 24, lines 9–14 (ca. 450):

<div align="center">

ὁ δὲ γ   stoich. 15

ρα[μματε]ὺς ὁ τὲς βο

λὲ[ς τὸ φσέ]φισμα τό

[δε ἀναγράφ]σας ἐς σ

[τέλει λιθίνει κ]ατ

[αθέτο ἐμ πόλει] *vacat*

</div>

Compare *Agora* XVI 15, lines 9–10 (426/5?):

<div align="center">

stoich. 50

καὶ τόδε τὸ [ψή]φισμα ἀναγράψ[ας ὁ] γραμματεὺ[ς ὁ τῆς βολῆς ἐ]

[ν] στήληι λιθίνη[ι κ]α[τ]αθέτω ἐμ πό[λει

</div>

and *IG* I³ 84, lines 26–28 (418/17):

<div align="center">

stoich. 52

τὸ δὲ φσέφισμα τόδε, ὅπος ἂν ἔι εἰδέναι τõ[ι] βολομένοι, ἀναγράφσα

ς ὁ γραμματεὺς ὁ τὲς βολὲς ἐν στέλει λιθίνει καταθέτο

ἐν τõι Νελεί

οι παρὰ τὰ ἴκρια·[64]

</div>

A parallel formulation is found in *IG* I³ 40, lines 61–63 (446/5), where, after a regular ἀναγράφσαι + καταθῆναι provision for the publication of the decree and oath at Athens (lines 57–61), the instructions for the equivalent procedure at Chalkis are given in the "reduced" form:

<div align="center">

ἐν δὲ Χαλκίδι ἐν τõι hιερõι τõ Διὸς τõ   stoich. 32

Ὀλυμπίο hε βολὲ Χαλκιδέον ἀναγράφσασ

α καταθέτο.

</div>

as well as in *IG* I³ 118, lines 33–36 (408), where, in an amendment proposed by Alcibiades, the generals are to act in conjunction with the Secretary of the Boule:

<div align="center">

καὶ καταθῆναι ἐν [πόλ]ει ἀναγράφσαντας τὸστ

[ρ]ατε⟨γ⟩ὸς [τ]ὰς συνθέ[κ]ας μετὰ τõ γραμματέος τ

[ὲς] βολὲς [. . . . . 18 . . . .] ἐν στέλει λιθί

[ν]ει[65]

</div>

63. Already briefly introduced on p. 97 above.

64. The participial form is probably also to be found in the 32-letter version of *IG* I³ 165 (see *SEG* XXVI 19, lines 6–11), but the text is too disputed to cite here. (I hope to deal with *IG* I³ 165 in some detail elsewhere.) The formulation is still encountered as late as the second half of the 4th century: see *IG* II² 276, lines 18–20 (ca. 342): τὸ δὲ ψήφισμα τόδε ἀναγράψας [ὁ | γρ]αμματεὺς ἐν στήλει λιθίνει στησά[τlω] ἐν ἀκροπόλει, where the Secretary is designated simply as ὁ γραμματεύς (see below, pp. 109–110).

65. For the collaboration of the generals and Secretary, cf. *IG* I³ 127, lines 38–39 (405/4): ἀναγράψαι δὲ τὰ ἐψηφισμένα τ]ὸγ γραμμ[ατέα τῆς βο]λῆς μετὰ τῶν I [στρατηγῶν ἐστήληι λιθίνηι καὶ κατα]θῆναι ἐς πόλι[ν.

THE PRYTANY SECRETARY
(ὁ γραμματεὺς ὁ κατὰ πρυτανείαν)[66]

Although we find occasional examples of the sequences S–V–O, for example, *IG* II² 354, lines 26–29 (328/7):

<div align="center">

τὸν δὲ γραμ[ματέια]⁶⁷   stoich. 34
τὸν κατὰ πρυτανείαν ἀναγράψαι τόδ[ε τὸ ψή]
φισμα ἐν στήληι λιθίνηι καὶ στῆσαι ἐ[ν τῶι]
ἱερῶι τοῦ Ἀσκληπιοῦ·

</div>

and *IG* II² 653, lines 52–54 (285/4):

<div align="center">

τὸν γραμματέα τὸν   stoich. 36–38
[κατὰ π]ρυτανείαν ἀναγράψαι τόδε τὸ ψήφισμα
[ἐν στ]ήληι λιθίνηι καὶ στῆσαι ἐν ἀκροπόλει·

</div>

V–S–O, in a proxeny grant, *IG* II² 57, lines 1–9 (*ante* 387/6):

<div align="center">

[- - - ἀναγράψα]   stoich. 11–14
[ι] τὸν [γραμματ]
έα τῆς βουλῆ[ς ἐ]
ν στήληι λιθίνηι
ἐμ πόλει προξέν
ους καὶ εὐεργέτ
ας αὐτοὺς καὶ ἐκ
γόνους τῆς πόλ
εως τῆς Ἀθηναί
ν·

</div>

and O–V–S, in the latter part of the 2nd century, *Agora* XVI 310, lines 50–52 (ca. 135):

<div align="center">

non-stoich. ca. 38–44

τὸ δὲ ψήφισ[μ]α τόδε ἀναγράψαι τὸν γραμ
[ματέα τὸν] κατὰ πρυτανείαν [εἰ]ς στήλην λιθίνην καὶ ἀνα
[θεῖναι παρὰ] τὴν εἰκόνα·⁶⁸

</div>

the sequence V–O–S is otherwise applied without exception, the only variable being the position of the phrase expressing inscription "on a stele of stone." Examples in which the phrase appears *before* the mention of the

66. There are, in fact, no examples of the nominative and imperative with this official, only of the accusative and infinitive. Invariably, he appears as τὸν γραμματέα <u>τὸν</u> κατὰ πρυτανείαν, with doubled article. It may be noted here that, at *IG* II² 463, lines 31–32 (307/6), we find ἀνα[γρ]ά[ψ]αι δὲ τόδε τὸ

ψήφ[ι]σ[μ]α τὸ[ν κ]ατ[ὰ] πρυτανεία[ν γραμματέα, a designation of the Secretary that may also be required at *IG* II² 551, lines 13–14 (*paullo ante* 307/6) and at *Agora* XV 322, lines 25–26 (ca. A.D. 120). This rare word order, also introduced in *IG* II² 564, lines 6–7, is rightly eschewed by Woodhead at

Agora XVI 111, line 19 (307/6–302/1 [*sed vix post* 306/5?]).
67. For the intrusive intervocalic iota and the accentuation, see Threatte 1980, pp. 151–152.
68. Cf. the heavily restored *IG* II² 1019, lines 36–37 (*fin. s.* II).

Secretary are far less numerous than those where the phrase comes *after* the Secretary. For the former,[69] see, for example, D 22 (*IG* II² 222), lines 26–29 (ca. 334):

<div align="right">stoich. 27</div>

ἀναγράψαι δὲ τόδε τὸ ψήφισ[μ]
[α] εἰς στήλην λιθίνην τὸγραμματ[έ]
[α] τὸν κατὰ πρυτανείαν καὶ στῆσαι
[ἐν] ἀκροπόληι·

Hesperia 43, 1974, pp. 322–323, no. 3, lines 17–21 (331–324?):

<div align="right">stoich. 22</div>

ἀναγράψαι δὲ [τ]
όδε τὸ ψήφισμα ἐν στήληι λ[ι]
θίνηι τὸγ γραμματέα τὸν κ[α]
τὰ πρυτανείαν καὶ στῆσαι [ἐ]
ν ἀκροπόλει·

Compare the slightly longer wording[70] of *SEG* XXI 357, lines 6–9 (286–262):

<div align="right">non-stoich. ca. 43</div>

ἀναγράψαι]
δὲ τόδε τὸ ψήφισμα καὶ τὰ ὀνόματ[α τῶν ἱππάρχων καὶ τ]
ῶν φυλάρχων ἐν στήληι λιθίνει τὸν [γραμματέα τὸν κ]
ατὰ πρυτανείαν καὶ στῆσαι πρὸς τοῖς Ἑρ[μαῖς·

Compare also, with τὴμ προξενίαν,[71] *IG* II² 339b, lines 9–13 (*fin. s.* IV):

<div align="right">stoich. 25</div>

ἀ]
ναγράψαι δὲ τὴν προξεν[ίαν αὐτ]
οῦ εἰς στήλην λιθίνην τ[ὸν γραμ]
[μ]ατέια[72] τὸν κατ[ὰ] π[ρ]υτ[ανείαν κα]
[ὶ στῆσαι] ἐν [ἀκροπόλει·

and note *IG* II² 240, lines 19–23 (337/6), in which the mention of the Secretary is abnormally postponed until after στῆσαι:

<div align="right">stoich. 27</div>

ἀ]
[να]γ[ρ]άψαι δὲ τὴν προξενία[ν εἰς στ]
[ήλην] λιθίνην καὶ στῆσαι [τὸν γραμ]
[ματέ]α [τ]ὸν κα[τ]ὰ πρυτανεί[αν ἐν ἀκρ]
[οπόλ]ει·[73]

---

69. Apart from the examples cited here to indicate the chronological range, note also, e.g., *IG* II² 338, lines 24–28 (333/2); *Agora* XVI 248, lines 22–24 (*s.* III/II).

70. For this type of wording, where the object includes the phrase καὶ τὰ ὀνόματα

κτλ., cf. *IG* II² 792, lines 11–14 (275/4); *Agora* XVI 188, lines 45–49 (271/0).

71. Cf. the similar *IG* II² 235, lines 26–29 (340/39), where the phrase is omitted altogether.

72. See n. 67 above.

73. Such postponement is rare; but cf., with the Secretary of the Boule, *IG* II² 29, lines 7–11 (387/6), in which the Secretary does not appear until after ἐν ἀκροπόλει.

For the sequence V–O–S followed by "on a stele of stone,"[74] which is manifestly *the* sequence employed most commonly throughout the entire period of activity of the Prytany Secretary, compare *IG* II² 426, lines 11–14 (336–334):

<div style="text-align:center">

ἀναγράψ]αι δὲ τόδε τὸ ψ   stoich. 25
[ήφισμα τὸν γραμμ]ατέα τὸν κατὰ
[πρυτανείαν ἐν στή]ληι λιθίνηι
[καὶ στῆσαι ἐν ἀκρο]πόλει·

</div>

IG II² 360.I, lines 21–24 (325/4), with an extended object:

<div style="text-align:center">

ἀναγράψαι δὲ τόδ   stoich. 39
ε τὸ ψήφισμα τὸν γραμματέα τὸν κατὰ πρυτανείαν
καὶ τοὺς ἄλλους ἐπαίνους τοὺς γεγενημένους αὐ
τῶι ἐν στήληι λιθίνει καὶ στῆσαι ἐν ἀκροπόλει·

</div>

Hesperia Supplement 17, 1978, pp. 2–4, lines 105–107 (270/69):

<div style="text-align:center">

non-stoich. 42–49

ἀναγ[ρά]
ψαι τόδε τὸ [ψή]φισμα τὸν γραμματέα τὸν κατὰ πρυτανείαν
[ἐν]
στήλει λιθίνει καὶ στῆσαι παρὰ τὴν εἰκόνα·

</div>

Agora XVI 224, lines 45–47 (226/5):

<div style="text-align:center">

non-stoich. ca. 36

ἀναγράψαι δὲ τόδε τὸ ψήφισ
μα τὸν γραμματέα τὸν κατὰ πρυτανείαν ἐν στή
ληι λιθίνηι καὶ στῆσαι ἐν ἀγορᾶι·

</div>

and *IG* II² 892, lines 15–17 (188/7):

<div style="text-align:center">

non-stoich. ca. 39–40

ἀνα[γρ]άψαι δὲ τόδε τὸ ψήφισμα τ[ὸ]
[ν γραμματέα τ]ὸ[ν] κατὰ πρυτανείαν ἐν στήλει λιθί
[νει καὶ στῆσαι ἐ]ν ἀκροπόλει·

</div>

As for a "telescoped" form with the Prytany Secretary, I can cite only one example, D 88 (*IG* II² 707), lines 6–8 (286?):

<div style="text-align:center">

ἀναγράψαι δὲ τόδε τὸ ψήφισμα [τὸν γραμμ]   stoich. 37
[α]τέα τὸν κατὰ πρυτανείαν ἐν στήλη[ι λιθίνηι ἐ]
[ν] ἀκροπόλει·

</div>

The very fact that this appears to be the only example later than the end of the 4th century might help to support the dating of *IG* II² 707 in the earlier part of the 3rd.[75]

74. There are dozens of examples of this formulation: e.g., *IG* II² 483, lines 27–31 (304/3); II² 500, lines 36–40 (302/1); II² 505, lines 59–62 (302/1); II² 641, lines 25–29 (299/8); D 68, lines 54–57 (295/4); D 74, lines 36–39 (286/5); *IG* II² 657, lines 68–70 (283/2); *Agora* XVI 181, lines 37–40 (282/1); *Agora* XVI 182, lines 27–30 (281/0); *IG* II² 665, lines 31–33 (266/5); II² 668, lines 33–36 (266/5); *Agora* XV 89, lines 19–20 and 38–40 (259/8)*; *IG* II² 682, lines 87–89 (259/8?); II² 780.A, lines 22–24 (253/2); II² 788, lines 26–28 (235/4); *Agora* XVI 224, lines 45–47 (226/5); *IG* II² 786, lines 32–34 (ca. 225?); *Agora* XVI 225, lines 18–20 (224/3–222/1); *Hesperia* 47, 1978, pp. 49–50, lines 31–33 (ca. 203); *IG* II² 896, lines 17–19 and 53–55 (186/5); *Agora* XVI 291, lines 38–42 (169/8); *IG* II² 949, lines 19–21 (165/4); II² 1006.I, lines 47–48 and 96–97 (122/1); II² 1008.II, lines 72–73 (118/17); II² 1009.I, lines 24–25 and 54–55 (116/15); II² 1011.I, lines 29–30 and II, lines 51–52 (106/5). (*For the archons of the mid-3rd century, I have in the main followed the schemes of Osborne 1989 and 2000.)

75. See Henry 1990, pp. 182–183.

The Recorder
(ὁ ἀναγραφεύς)

During the two brief periods when the ἀναγραφεῖς occupied the post of chief secretary,[76] it is clear that the predominant, if not the sole, sequence is yet again V–O–S, for example, D 31 (*IG* II² 392 + 586), lines 15–17 (321–318):[77]

<div align="center">

ἀναγράψαι δ   stoich. 28
[ὲ τόδε τὸ ψήφισμα] τὸν γραμματέα κα
[ὶ στῆσαι ἐν ἀκροπ]όλει·

</div>

D 32 (*IG* II² 393), lines 9–12 (321–318):

<div align="center">

ἀναγράψαι δὲ τόδε   stoich. 25
τὸ ψήφισμα τὸν ἀναγραφέα ἐν στ
ήλει λιθίνει καὶ στῆσαι ἐν ἀκρ
οπόλει·

</div>

SEG XL 79 (*IG* II² 407 + *SEG* XXXII 94), lines 15–18 (321–318):

<div align="center">

ἀν]   stoich. 31
αγράψαι δὲ τόδε [τὸ ψήφισμα τὸν ἀναγρα]
φέα [ἐ]ν στήληι λ[ιθίνηι καὶ στῆσαι ἐν ἀκ]
ροπόλει·

</div>

D 36 (*IG* II² 398b), lines 6–8 (318):

<div align="center">

ἀναγρ]άψαι δὲ τόδε τὸ   stoich. 27
[ψήφισμα τὸν ἀναγρ]αφέ<α> ἐν στήλει
[λιθίνει καὶ στῆσα]ι ἐν ἀκροπόλει·

</div>

SEG XLV 101 (*IG* II² 649+), lines 48–50 (293/2):

<div align="center">

stoich. 39
ἀναγράψαι δὲ τόδε τὸ] ψήφισμα τὸν ἀναγραφ[έ]
[α ἐν στήλαις λιθίναις κα]ὶ στῆσαι τὴν μὲν ἐν ἀκρ[ο]
[πόλει, τὴν δὲ παρὰ τὴν εἰκ]όνα·

</div>

It will be observed that, apart from D 31, which makes *no* reference to inscription "on a stele of stone," all these examples place that phrase *after* the mention of the Recorder.[78] Contrast *IG* II² 396, lines 4–6 (321–318):

76. See Henry 1977, pp. 50–66.

77. Osborne rightly restores τόδε τὸ ψήφισμα rather than the unnecessary τὸ ψήφισμα τόδε of Kirchner and Karapa. τὸ ψήφισμα τόδε occurs only occasionally: so D 37, line 13 (318); D 48, line 6 (ca. 303/2); ?*IG* II² 845, line 19 (*paullo post* 249?); II² 810, line 5 (*ante* 230); *Agora* XVI 310, line 50 (ca. 135); *IG* II² 1019, line 36 (*fin. s.* II); *Agora* XV 264, line 15 (ca. 80/79).

It should *not* be introduced gratuitously into restorations, as has been done in *IG* II² 397, line 2 (321–318); II² 542, line 12 (*ante* 303/2); II² 516, line 4 (*fin. s.* IV); II² 521, line 4 (*fin. s.* IV); *Agora* XV 147, lines 14–15 (203/2)— note that at line 49 we find the normal order; *Agora* XVI 276, line 22 (190/89?)—Osborne (D 100) has the correct word order; the fault originates in *IG* II² 954; *Agora* XVI 301, line 5

(*s.* II, *pars prior*); *IG* II² 984, line 22 (ca. *med. s.* II); *Agora* XV 236, line 1 (ca. 150).

78. Cf. also the very heavily restored D 34 (*IG* II² 395), lines 8–10 (321–318); *IG* II² 397, lines 1–4 (321–318), where, incidentally, the word order τὸ ψήφισμα τόδε is unnecessarily introduced. (See also *Hesperia* 58, 1989, p. 86, no. 12, for a possible new fragment of *IG* II² 397.)

ἀναγράψ]αι δὲ τόδε [τὸ ψήφισμα ἐ]   stoich. 28
[ν στήλει λιθ]ίνει τὸν ἀ[ναγραφέα κα]
[ὶ στῆσαι ἐν ἀκ]ροπόλει·

and the less secure, but quite acceptable, D 33 (*IG* II² 394), lines 16–18
(321–318):

                                    ἀναγρά]   stoich. 38
[ψα]ι δὲ τόδε τὸ ψή[φισμα ἐν στήληι λιθίνηι τὸν ἀν]
[αγρ]αφέα καὶ στ[ῆσαι ἐν ἀκροπόλει·

where the phrase *precedes* the mention of the Recorder.

One example of the sequence O–V–S may be noted, D 37 (*IG* II²
391), lines 13–15 (318), a text "execrably executed":[79]

                                    stoich. 29–30

τὸ ψ]ήφισμα ⟨τ⟩όδε [ἀναγράψαι ἐν στή⟨λη⟩]
[ι λιθίν]ηι τὸν ἀναγρ[αφέα καὶ ἀναθεῖν]
[αι[80] εἰς ἀ]κρ⟨ό⟩πο⟨λ⟩ιν·

Although heavily restored and miserably cut, so that certainty of reading is
impossible, the sequence cannot be doubted.[81]

The Secretary of the People
(ὁ γραμματεὺς τοῦ δήμου)

Once more, the predominant formulation is V–O–S, with the phrase "on a
stele of stone" occurring *after* mention of the secretary. So, for example,[82]
D 61 (*IG* II² 496 + 507+), lines 36–39 (303/2):

                        ἀνα   stoich. 28
γράψαι δὲ τόδε τὸ ψήφισμα τὸν γραμ
ματέα τοῦ δή[μ]ου ἐν στήληι λιθίνηι
καὶ στῆσαι ἐν ἀκροπόλει·

D 79 (*IG* II² 712), lines 16–18 (ca. 273–262):

                        ἀνα]γράψαι δὲ τόδε [τὸ ψήφισμα τὸν]   stoich. 37
[γραμματέα τοῦ δ]ήμου ἐν στήλ[ηι λιθίνηι καὶ στ]
ῆσαι ἐν ἀκροπόλ]ει·

IG II² 844.I, lines 28–30 (229/8):

                                    non-stoich. 42–50

                        ἀναγράψαι δὲ τό
δε τὸ ψήφισμα τὸν γραμματέα τοῦ δήμου εἰς στήλην λιθί
[ν]ην καὶ στῆσαι παρὰ τὴν εἰκόνα·

Contrast *Agora* XVI 164, lines 17–20 (between 300/299 and 295/4):

79. So Osborne *ad loc.*

80. For the late occurrence of
ἀναθεῖναι (rather than στῆσαι), cf.
IG II² 741, line 10 (*init. s.* III).

81. That there is no connective δέ at
the beginning of the provision is to be
explained by the introductory clause of
"hortatory intention" (see Henry 1996).
This has allowed the drafter to employ
the uncommon word order τὸ ψήφισμα
τόδε (see n. 77 above), unless this too is
to be set down to the carelessness of the
cutter so rightly deplored by Osborne.

82. Apart from the examples cited
here, cf. also D 89 (*IG* II² 570), lines
11–13 (*s.* III; see *SEG* XL 89); *IG* II²
651, lines 26–28 (286/5); and the more
elaborate *IG* II² 660.II, lines 43–45
(281/0).

<div style="text-align: right">ἀνα[γράψαι δὲ]   stoich. 29</div>

τόδε τὸ ψήφισμα ἐν στήλει [λιθίνει τ]
ὸν γραμματέα τοῦ δήμου κα[ὶ στῆσαι ἐ]
ν ἀκροπόλει·

where the phrase *precedes* mention of the secretary.[83]

In *IG* II² 845, lines 19–21 (*paullo post* 249?)[84] we appear to have the sequence O–V–S:

<div style="text-align: right">non-stoich. 41–44</div>

τ]ὸ δὲ ψήφι[σμα τόδε ἀναγράψαι ἐν]
[στήλη]ι λιθί[ν]η[ι] τὸ[ν γρ]αμματέα τ[οῦ δήμου καὶ στῆσαι ἐν]
[ἀκροπόλ]ει·

and we also find S–V–O in *Agora* XVI 213, lines 22–24 (248/7):[85]

<div style="text-align: right">stoich. 38</div>

τὸν δὲ γραμματέα τοῦ δ[ή]μου ἀναγράψαι τό
[δ]ε τὸ ψήφι[σμα] καὶ τὰ ὀνόματα τῶν ἐπιδόντ[ω]ν ἐν στήλει
λιθίν
ει κ[α]ὶ στῆσαι ἐν τῆι ἀγορᾶι κτλ.

It would seem also that we have a "telescoped" form in *IG* II² 672, lines 14–16 (ca. 280–270; see *SEG* XXXVIII 74):

<div style="text-align: right">stoich. 68</div>

ἀναγ]
[ράψαι δὲ τόδε τὸ ψήφισμα[86] καὶ τ]ὰς δωρεὰ[ς τὸ]ν
γραμματέα τοῦ δήμου ἐν ἀκροπόλει [ἐν στή]
[λει λιθίνει·

THE SECRETARY
(ὁ γραμματεύς)

On a few occasions we find the Secretary designated as ὁ γραμματεύς *tout court*, without further qualification.

This phenomenon may go back to the 5th century, where, for example, it is restored in *IG* I³ 102, lines 21–22 (410/9):

<div style="text-align: right">καὶ ἀναγραφσά   stoich. 36</div>

[το ho γραμματεὺς τὰ ἐφσεφισμ]ένα·

Here the restoration seems inescapable. The reference is clearly to the Secretary of the Boule, who appears later, with his full title, in connection with the recording of Thrasyboulos's fellow conspirators as *euergetai* (lines 28–30):

<div style="text-align: right">εὐεργέ[τα]ς [ἀ]ναγράφ</div>

σαι ἐμ πόλε[ι ἐν στέλει λ]ιθίνει τὸν γραμ[μα]τέ
α τὲς βολὲς.

83. So too in the heavily restored *IG* II² 809, lines 1–3 (ca. 300).

84. For the date, see Tracy 1988, p. 320.

85. And probably also in the heavily restored *Agora* XVI 178, line 7 (286–262?).

86. I have altered the unnecessary τὸ ψήφισμα τόδε of the Corpus. (At *IG* II² 542, line 12 [*ante* 303/2] I would likewise read τό[δε τὸ ψήφισμα.) See n. 77 above.

Another example is found in *IG* II² 276, lines 18–20 (ca. 342):

<div align="center">

τὸ δὲ ψήφισμα τόδε ἀναγράψας⁸⁷ [ὁ]   stoich. 31
[γρ]αμματεὺς ἐν στήλει λιθίνει στησά[τ]
[ω] ἐν ἀκ[ροπό]λει·

</div>

Then there is a small cluster around the turn of the 4th/3rd century:⁸⁸
IG II² 456b, lines 28–29 (307/6):

<div align="center">

stoich. 41

ἀναγράψαι δὲ τό[δ]ε τὸ [ψήφι]σμ[α] τὸν [γραμματέα ἐν στ]
ήληι λιθίνηι κα[ὶ] στῆ[σ]αι [ἐν ἀ]κροπό[λει·

</div>

D 56 (*IG* II² 519), lines 3–5 (ca. 307–303/2), where spatial considerations
make the restoration virtually inescapable:

<div align="center">

ἀναγράψαι δὲ τόδε]   stoich. 31
τὸ ψήφισ[μα τὸν γραμματέα ἐν στήληι λι]
θίνηι κα[ὶ στῆσαι ἐν ἀκροπόλει·

</div>

Agora XVI 166, lines 5–8 (295/4 *vel paullo post*):

<div align="center">

ἀναγράψαι δὲ τό]   stoich. 22
δε τὸ ψή[φισμα τὸν γραμματέ]
α ἐν στή[ληι λιθίνηι καὶ στῆ]
σαι ἐν ἀ[κροπόλει·⁸⁹

</div>

Woodhead also restores the γραμματεύς *tout court* in *Agora* XVI 214, lines
22–23 (244–241), where, with a slightly shorter line than that envisaged
by Meritt (stoichedon 52, as opposed to 55), he proposes:

<div align="center">

ἀναγράψαι δὲ τόδε τὸ ψήφισ[μα καὶ τὰ ὀνόματα τὸν γραμματέα]
[καὶ στ]ῆσαι ἐν τῶι τεμένει τοῦ Δι[ός·

</div>

SECRETARY NOT EXPRESSED

As will have been clear from the preceding analysis, the Athenians regu-
larly specified the designated secretary charged with the task of seeing to
the inscribing and erecting of decrees and laws. Not entirely unexpectedly,
however, we find instances early in the 5th century where the responsible
official is only implied, rather than explicitly specified. Compare, for ex-
ample, *IG* I³ 23, lines 5–11 (ca. 447), a proxeny grant, where the award and
the publication provision are combined:⁹⁰

<div align="center">

Κορ[ρα]γίδεν κ[αὶ]
Θαλυκίδεν καὶ Μενέστρατον κ
αὶ Ἀθέναιον τὸς Θεσπιᾶς ἀναγρ
[ά]φσαι προχσένος καὶ εὐεργέτα

</div>

87. For the participle see p. 103
above.
88. Cf. Woodhead, in *Agora* XVI,
p. 240 (on *Agora* XVI 166).
89. The same wording is found in
IG II² 567, lines 17–18 (*fin. s.* IV),
which Woodhead (*Agora* XVI, p. 240)
calls, perhaps too confidently, a "neces-
sary restoration."
90. Walbank (1978, p. 89) draws
attention to the fact that "the letter-
forms are unusual, more appropriate
to a Boiotian than to an Athenian in-
scription." This point, together with
the absence of any mention of the
Secretary, suggests to him that the
honorands themselves may have looked
after the inscribing of their award.
However, in view of the fact that the
poletai are to let out the contract and
the *kolakretai* are to provide the funds,
this seems unlikely.

[ς Ἀ]θεναίον καὶ τὸς παῖδας τὸς
[ἐκένο]ν ἐμ πόλ[ε]ι ἐν στέλει λιθί
[νει.

Compare *IG* I³ 92, lines 9–13 (422/1):

καὶ ἀναγράψαι αὐτὸν ἐσ   stoich. 25
τήληι λιθίνηι πρόξενον καὶ εὐ
εργέτην Ἀθηναίων αὐτὸν καὶ τὸ
[ς] <u>παῖδας</u> τὸς Καλλίπο καὶ κατα
[θέναι ἐμ πόλει].

In non-proxeny texts, compare the decree on the Eleusinian Epistatai,
IG I³ 32, lines 32–34 (ca. 449–447):[91]

γράφσαι δὲ τὸ [φσέφισ]   stoich. 32
μα ἐν στέλει Ἐλευσῖνι κα[ὶ ἐν ἄστει καὶ Φ]
αλ[ε]ρō ἐν τōι Ἐλευσιν[ίοι.

Here the provision is "telescoped," and the stele is not described as "of
stone," as likewise in a second example, *Agora* XVI 7a, lines 17–18
(439/8?):

γράφσαι δ[ὲ ταῦτα]   stoich. 35
[ἐν στέλ]ει καὶ καταθέναι ἐμ πόλει·

where, however, the erection provision is introduced by καὶ καταθέναι.

In both of these instances (*IG* I³ 32 and *Agora* XVI 7) the subject of
the infinitive could be thought of as the Athenian *demos,* rather than the
Secretary of the Boule as such, just as we find in the Treaty with the
Bottiaians, *Agora* XVI 16, lines 21–25 (422), where we also appear to have
a variant on the form with the participle; for here the participle of ἀναγράφω
is preceded by the verb of erecting:

stoich. 42

τὰς δὲ χσυ
νθέκας τά[σδε καὶ] τὸν [hόρκον κατα]θέναι Ἀθεναίος μὲ
ν ἐμ πόλε[ι ἀναγρά]φσ[αντας ἐστέλει] λιθίνει καὶ τὰ ὀν
[ό]ματα τὸν [πολέον] τō[ν Βοττιαίον τ]ōν χσυντιθεμένον
τὲν φιλία[ν καὶ τὲν χσυμμαχίαν κτλ.

Additional instances are furnished by the following:

1) *IG* II² 82, lines 14–16 (ca. 390–378?), another "telescoped" formula-
tion:

τὸ δὲ ψήφισμ   stoich. 25
[α τόδε ἀναγρά]ψαι ἐν ἀκροπόλει
[ἐν στήληι λιθ]ίνηι·

<hr/>

91. Mattingly prefers a date not
before 433/2; Clinton the year 432/1.
See *IG* I³ Addenda, p. 938.

2) *IG* II² 125, lines 17–19 (343?):

<div style="text-align:center">

ἀναγράψαι δὲ τὸ [ψήφισμα ἐστήληι λι]   stoich. 39
θίνηι καὶ στῆσαι ἐν ἀκροπ[όλει καὶ ἐν τῆι ἀγορᾶι]
καὶ ἐν τῶι λιμένι·

</div>

where there seems to be no room for τόδε.⁹²

3) *Agora* XVI 79, lines 18–21 (332/1):

<div style="text-align:center">

ἀνα[γράψαι δὲ τόδε τὸ ψήφισμα]   stoich. 29
[ἐ]ν στήληι [λιθίνηι καὶ στῆσαι ἐν ἀκρ]
[ο]πόλει·

</div>

although Woodhead, noting that "the title of the γραμματεύς exactly fills
the line and may have been omitted by oversight,"⁹³ is induced to insert
as line 19 <τὸν γραμματέα τὸν κατὰ πρυτανείαν>. Woodhead notes fur-
ther that "there are in fact a few apparently intentional omissions of the
words, e.g., *IG* II² 493 + 518, 508, 648 (= M. J. Osborne, *Naturalization* I,
pp. 128–130, D 53, D 54 and pp. 148–150, D 69, respectively), 123 and
141,"⁹⁴ although how one distinguishes between a carelessly omitted phrase
and an intentionally omitted one is not at all clear.
    To Woodhead's list of "apparently intentional omissions" one may add:

4) *IG* II² 448.I, lines 26–28 (323/2):

<div style="text-align:right">stoich. 41</div>

<div style="text-align:center">

ἀναγράψαι δὲ τὸ ψήφισμ[α ἐν στήλαις λ]
ιθίναις καὶ στῆσαι τὴν μὲν μίαν παρὰ [τὸν Δία, τὴν δὲ]
ἑτέραν ἐν ἀ[κροπόλει παρὰ τὸν νεὼ τῆς Πολιάδος·

</div>

where we have already noted the omission of τόδε.⁹⁵
    At *Agora* XVI 141 (*fin. s.* IV [ca. 304/3?]), too fragmentary to merit
listing here, Woodhead's note (p. 214) on the omission of the Secretary
could be taken to imply that such an omission is mainly confined to the
last years of the 4th century. The phenomenon, however, continues to be
met for some considerable time after that. Compare the following:

5) *SEG* XVIII 22, lines 20–21 (165/4):

<div style="text-align:right">non-stoich. 36–51</div>

<div style="text-align:center">

ἀναγράψαι δὲ τὸ ψήφισμα⁹⁶ ἐν
στήληι λιθίνηι καὶ στῆσαι ἐν τῶι τοῦ Ἀσκληπιοῦ ἱερῶ[ι·

</div>

6) *IG* II² 1011.IV, line 72 (107/6):⁹⁷

<div style="text-align:center">

ἀναγ[ράψαι] δὲ [τὸ ψ]ήφισμα εἰς στήλην λιθίνην καὶ στῆσαι οὗ ἂν
αὐτοῖς ἐπιτήδειον εἶναι δοκῆι.

</div>

92. τόδε is only occasionally omitted
in this phrase: so *IG* II² 448.I, line 26
(323/2); *SEG* XVIII 22 (*IG* II² 950),
line 20 (165/4); *IG* II² 1011.II, line 51,
III, line 62, IV, line 72 (106/5). In
IG II² 983, line 9 (ca. *med. s.* II),
however, there is sufficient room to
read [τόδε τὸ ψήφισμα.
    93. *Agora* XVI, p. 121.
    94. I.e., *Agora* XVI 123 and 141.
    95. See n. 92 above.
    96. For the omission of τόδε, see
n. 92 above.
    97. Also without τόδε.

7) *IG* II² 1039, lines 65–66 (79/8):

> ἀ[ναγρά]ψαι δὲ τόδε τὸ ψ[ήφισμ]α μετὰ τῶν [ἄλλων εἰς τὴν [αὐτὴ]ν στήλην κτλ.⁹⁸

Finally, we may mention the decree in honour of Sosandros of Sypalettos,⁹⁹ *Hesperia* Supplement 15, p. 75, no. 16 (*IG* II² 1023), lines 18–22 (*fin. s.* II), where the responsibility for inscription and erection is given, not to the Secretary, but to "the men elected for the κατασκευή¹⁰⁰ of the Temple of Athena":

non-stoich. ca. 38

> ἀναγράψαι δὲ τόδε τὸ ψήφισμα
> καὶ τὸν στέφανον εἰς στήλην λιθίνην τοὺς κεχει
> ροτονημένους ἄνδρας ἐπὶ τὴν κατασκευὴν
> τοῦ ναοῦ τῆς ᾿Αθηνᾶς ᵛᵛ καὶ στῆσαι ἐν ἀκροπό
> λει·

CONCLUSION

It is manifest from the above discussion that, although on occasion, from the 5th century onward, some texts designate the official responsible for their inscribing and erecting simply as "the Secretary" (ὁ γραμματεύς) or even neglect to insert mention of him at all, in the vast majority of cases the official is carefully specified with a precise title.

The earliest title we encounter is the "Secretary of the Council" (γραμματεὺς τῆς βουλῆς), first found around the middle of the 5th century. He is gradually supplanted by the "Prytany Secretary" (γραμματεὺς κατὰ πρυτανείαν), from around the middle of the 4th century. From a point late in the century, the "Secretary of the People" (γραμματεὺς τοῦ δήμου) enters the scene. It is not unlikely, however, that these three titles are simply that—three different descriptions of the holder of one and the same office.

In the two brief periods (321/20 to 319/18 and 294/3 to 292/1) when the full democratic apparatus of government was suspended, it is none of these three who is called upon to perform the function of having decrees inscribed and erected on stone, but the "Recorder" (ἀναγραφεύς).

Naturally, it is hardly to be expected that all the elements that constitute the fullest form of the wording of the provision for inscribing and erecting will all occur on every occasion, or all in the same sequence, or without minor variations within the various elements themselves. And this is borne out by a detailed analysis of the extant evidence.

Nevertheless, regardless of the (title of the) Secretary concerned or of the choice of imperative or, later, infinitive, it is evident that one principal essential pattern established itself as the predominant sequence for the provision for inscribing: V(erb)–O(bject)–S(ubject), regularly followed,

98. Cf. also *IG* II² 1043, line 58 (37/6?), which has an identical wording.

99. Tracy (1975, p. 76) notes that "it would be especially interesting to know the exact nature of Sosandros' beneficence and φιλοτεχνία and how it affected the Parthenon."

100. "Decoration"? See Dinsmoor 1934, p. 102.

rather than preceded, by "on a stele of stone" (and, of course, that in turn followed by the wording for the erection). The sequence O–V–S is also found—it is indeed prevalent in the 5th century—as is, occasionally, the sequence S–V–O. In proxeny grants, we have minor evidence for O–S–V, V–S–O, and even S–V with the object implied rather than expressed.

Two refinements of these basic patterns are to be noted. In the first of these, which I have termed the "syntactically reduced" formulation, the verb of inscribing is reduced from an imperative or infinitive to a participle, thus leaving as the only finite form the verb of erecting. This type appears not infrequently in the 5th century and occasionally in the 4th. In the second type, conversely, and again most commonly in the 5th century and in proxeny grants, we encountered the phenomenon of the so-called "telescoped" formulation, in which details for the erecting are appended directly to the verb of inscribing, with no intervening separate verb of setting up.

What emerges strongly from this study is the realization that the language of the stock provisions of Athenian decrees, while firmly formulaic and tending toward a predominant form, never adopts a single, standard wording. *Variatio*—admittedly within fairly narrow parameters—is always likely to be encountered.

APPENDIX

TEXTS SPECIALLY CITED OR DISCUSSED

TEXTS WITH *IG* I³ REFERENCE

IG I³	Walbank 1978	*Agora* XVI	Page(s)
10	–	–	95
11	–	–	99
15	–	–	100
23	11	–	110–111
24	23	–	103
27	13	–	101
32	–	–	101; 111
37	–	–	100
40	–	–	96; 97; 103
46	–	7	111
62	–	15	103
65	39	–	96
66	–	–	97
70	19	14	100–101
76	–	16	111
78	–	–	96
80	–	–	102
84	–	–	103
92	65	–	111
98.I	75	–	97
102	–	–	109
106	85	–	96
110	87	–	96
118	–	–	103
119	–	–	99
125	–	28A	100
155	24	11	101
156	22	–	97
174	50	–	102

TEXTS WITH *IG* II² REFERENCE

IG II²	Osborne 1981	*Agora* XVI	Page(s)
13a + 68 (*SEG* XL 54)	–	–	101–102
17	D 8	36	102
25	D 9	40	102
43	–	–	99
57	–	–	104
76	–	–	99
80	–	–	98
82	–	–	111
107	–	–	97
125	–	–	112
139 + 289 (*SEG* XXXIX 75)	–	–	102 n. 62
149	–	–	98–99
222	D 22	–	105
226	D 14	–	97–98
232	–	–	98
238	–	–	102
240	–	–	105
242 + 373 (*SEG* XL 74)	–	–	98
276	–	–	110
339b	–	–	105
351 + 624	–	–	98
354	–	–	104
360.I	–	–	106
391	D 37	–	108
392 + 586	D 31	–	107
393	D 32	–	107
394	D 33	–	108
396	–	–	107–108
398b	D 36	–	107
407	–	106J	107
426	–	–	106
448.I	D 38	–	112
456b	–	–	110
496 + 507	D 61	–	108
519	D 56	–	110
542	–	–	109 n. 86
649 (*SEG* XLV 101)	–	–	107
653	–	–	104
672	–	–	109
707	D 88	–	106
712	D 79	–	108
791 (*SEG* XXXII 118)	–	213	109
844.I	–	–	108
845	–	–	109
892	–	–	106
983	–	–	112 n. 92
1011.IV	–	–	112
1023	–	–	113
1039	–	–	113

TEXTS WITH NO *IG* REFERENCE

Hesperia	*SEG*	Osborne 1981	*Agora* XVI	Page(s)
4, pp. 525–529, no. 39	XXV 106	–	224	106
8, pp. 26–27, no. 6	XXXV 71	–	79	112
13, pp. 242–243, no. 7	XXIV 119	–	164	108–109
17, p. 11	XXIII 67	–	214	110
21, pp. 355–359, no. 5	XII 87	–	73	98
28, pp. 185–186, no. 7	XVIII 22	–	–	112
30, p. 210, no. 4	XXI 342	–	141	112
36, pp. 59–63, no. 6	XXIV 135	–	310	104
37, pp. 268–269, no. 4	XXV 84	–	166	110
43, pp. 322–323, no. 3	–	–	106H	105
–	XXI 357	–	–	105
Suppl. 17, pp. 2–4	XXVIII 60	–	255D	106

REFERENCES

Agora XV = B. D. Meritt and J. S. Traill, *Inscriptions: The Athenian Councillors*, Princeton 1974.

Agora XVI = A. G. Woodhead, *Inscriptions: The Decrees*, Princeton 1997.

Alessandrì, S. 1982. "Alcune osservazioni sui segretari ateniesi nel IV sec. a.C.," *AnnPisa* 12, pp. 7–70.

Brillant, M. 1911. *Les secrétaires athéniens*, Paris.

Dinsmoor, W. B. 1931. *The Archons of Athens in the Hellenistic Age*, Cambridge, Mass.

———. 1934. "The Repair of the Athena Parthenos: A Story of Five Dowels," *AJA* 38, pp. 93–106.

Dow, S. 1937. *Prytaneis* (*Hesperia* Suppl. 1), Athens.

Ferguson, W. S. 1898. *The Athenian Secretaries* (Cornell Studies in Classical Philology 7), New York.

———. 1914–1915. "The Introduction of the Secretary-Cycle," *Klio* 14, pp. 393–397.

Henry, A. S. 1977. *The Prescripts of Athenian Decrees* (*Mnemosyne* Suppl. 49), Leiden.

———. 1982. "Polis/Acropolis, Paymasters, and the Ten Talent Fund," *Chiron* 12, pp. 91–118.

———. 1983. *Honours and Privileges in Athenian Decrees* (Subsidia Epigraphica 10), Hildesheim.

———. 1990. "Bithys Son of Kleon of Lysimacheia: Formal Dating

Criteria and *I.G.* ii² 808," in *Owls to Athens: Essays on Classical Subjects Presented to Sir Kenneth Dover*, E. Craik, ed., Oxford, pp. 179–189.

———. 1996. "The Hortatory Intention in Athenian State Decrees," *ZPE* 112, pp. 105–119.

———. 1998. "The Sigma Enigma," *ZPE* 120, pp. 45–48.

Mattingly, H. B. 1984. Review of D. M. Lewis, *Inscriptiones Graecae i³: Inscriptiones Atticae anno Euclidis anteriores*, fasc. 1, Berlin, 1981, in *AJP* 105, pp. 340–357.

———. 1999. "What Are the Right Dating Criteria for Fifth-Century Attic Texts?" *ZPE* 126, pp. 117–122.

Meritt, B. D. 1961. "Greek Inscriptions," *Hesperia* 30, pp. 205–292.

Osborne, M. J. 1981. *Naturalization in Athens* 1, Brussels.

———. 1989. "The Chronology of Athens in the Mid Third Century B.C.," *ZPE* 78, pp. 209–242.

———. 2000. "Philinos and the Athenian Archons of the 250s B.C.," in *Polis and Politics: Studies in Ancient Greek History Presented to Mogens Herman Hansen on His Sixtieth Birthday, August 20, 2000*, P. Flensted-Jensen, T. H. Nielsen, and L. Rubinstein, eds., Copenhagen, pp. 507–520.

Pečírka, J. 1966. *The Formula for the Grant of Enktesis in Attic Inscriptions*

(Acta Universitatis Carolinae, Philosophica et Historica Monographia 15), Prague.

Pritchett, W. K., and B. D. Meritt 1940. *The Chronology of Hellenistic Athens,* Cambridge, Mass.

Rhodes, P. J. 1985. *The Athenian Boule* (1972, reissued with additions and corrections), Oxford.

———. 1993. *A Commentary on the Aristotelian* Athenaion Politeia (1981, reissued with Select Addenda), Oxford.

Schweigert, E. 1938. "Inscriptions from the North Slope of the Acropolis," *Hesperia* 7, pp. 264–310.

Threatte, L. 1980. *The Grammar of Attic Inscriptions* 1: *Phonology,* Berlin.

Tracy, S. V. 1975. *The Lettering of an*

Athenian Mason (*Hesperia* Suppl. 15), Princeton.

———. 1988. "Two Attic Letter Cutters of the Third Century: 286/5–235/4 b.c.," *Hesperia* 57, pp. 303–322.

Walbank, M. B. 1978. *Athenian Proxenies of the Fifth Century b.c.,* Toronto.

Whitehead, D. 1989. "Secretaries, Charidemos, Poteidaia: The Date (and Personnel) of *IG* II² 118," *The Ancient History Bulletin* 3, pp. 102–106.

———. 1998. Review of C. Veligianni-Terzi, *Wertbegriffe in den attischen Ehrendekreten der klassischen Zeit,* Stuttgart 1997, in *Bryn Mawr Classical Review* 9.5, pp. 491–494.

Alan S. Henry

UNIVERSITY OF ST. ANDREWS
SCHOOL OF GREEK, LATIN, AND ANCIENT HISTORY
ST. ANDREWS KY16 9AL
SCOTLAND

ah9@st-andrews.ac.uk