A mutilated Athenian inscription containing a decree of the Achaean League was published by Dittenberger as I.G., III, 18, and through a very natural error it was dated by him between A.D. 211 and 222. Subsequently Dittenberger found among the inscriptions which the German archaeologists discovered at Olympia another copy of the same document. The new copy showed that the inscription contained a letter written by Hadrian in A.D. 126 and a decree passed by the Achaeans in the same or in the following year. In re-editing the Athenian copy as I.G., II², 1094, Kirchner reported the copy at Olympia and gave the reader a reference to its publication, but he himself forgot to use it, retaining with scrupulous acknowledgements both the erroneous date and old restorations which Dittenberger had already retracted. Under the circumstances it will not be amiss to re-edit here the Athenian copy with those letters underlined which are attested at Olympia.

The restorations are by Dittenberger except that I have substituted from spatial considerations ἐπειδὴ for ἐπεί in line 1 and ἀναθίναι for ἀναστῆσαι in line 4, have added ἐφηφυσμένας in line 3, καὶ ἔλαβον αὐτοὶ δὲ ἦσαν δὲ μέγατος καὶ in line 4 and ὡς ἐπιφθόνους οὕσας, τοῖς Ἀχαιοῖς in line 5, and have suppressed the restoration τῶν τεμῶν in line 5, where I read the last visible letter as iota or at least as a vertical hasta unsuitable for omega, which is in this copy a rounded letter. In line 3, moreover, where Dittenberger restored καὶ ἐδοξεῖν αὐτοῖς, I have substituted the phrase ἐπιτρέψας δὲ αὐτοῖς, because the decree as presented by Dittenberger and Purgold, Inschriften von Olympia (Berlin, 1896), no. 57, itself arranges for the publication in lines 26 and 27. The Achaeans, it appears, had in the usual manner voted honors which they did not seriously believe the emperor would accept in full. They expected him to accept some and to reject others as excessive, and inasmuch as the excessive ones were probably very costly, they wished to wait for his acceptance before incurring the expense of erecting, for example, statues in precious metals and of engraving in various places an elaborate and pretentious account which might subsequently have to be removed.

"It is a striking fact," writes a student of the imperial cult, "that during the early centuries of the Roman Empire almost every emperor felt under obligation to define a policy of accepting or refusing statues in precious metals, and the absolute monarchs such as Caligula, Nero, Domitian, Commodus, and Caracalla are the rulers who
A.D. 126 or 127

[ ἐπειδὴ προσβεία ἐ] πέμψῃ πρὸς τὸν θειότατον Α[υτοκράτορα Καίσαρα Τραίανον 'Αδριανὸν Σέβαιο]
[ τὸν δὲ ἦς ἐθέαστο αὐ] ὑπὸν οἱ 'Αχαιοὶ προσδέξασθαι τὰς τεῖμ [ας τὰς ὑπ'] αὐτῶν ἐν ἑλπίδι ἐφημομένας ἐπιτρέψαι δὲ]
[ αὐτοῖς ἀναθείαι σ] τήλας ἐνεγραμμένον ἐχοῦσας τὸ περὶ τῶν [τειμῶν ψήφισμα, καὶ ἔλαβον αὐτοί δὲ ἦς ὁ μέγιστος καὶ θεί]
5 [ότατος αὐτοκράτω] ὑπὸς μὲν προσήκατο τῶν τειμῶν τι[νάς δὲ ως ἐπιφθόνους οὐσίας παρητήσατο τὴν τοῖς 'Αχαιοῖς ὑπὸ]
[τοῦ θειότατον αὐτ] [οκράτορος ἀντ[iγραφεῖ]σαν ἐπιστολὴ[ν ------------]]

Fig. 1. Decree of the Achaean League, Athenian Copy
officially permitted their likenesses in gold and silver." There can be little doubt that what Hadrian refused from the Achaenians were divine honors, and we have recently recovered two brilliant examples of the imperial policy in the now famous letters of Claudius to the Alexandrians and of Tiberius to the Gytheates.

On a visit to Olympia I had the opportunity of examining the copy discovered in the old German excavations. Although I could not find a join between the group of fragments \( f, g, h \) and the group of fragments \( i, k, l, m \), it seemed to me clear from the lines of cleavage that the group \( i, k, l, m \) belongs just above the group \( f, g, h \) and not below it as Dittenberger assumed.

**HADRIAN AND THYATIRA**

Eight non-contiguous fragments of Pentelic marble, all of which preserve part of a smooth back, belong to a single stele about 0.08 m. thick and inscribed with letters 0.012-0.016 m. high. A margin 0.03 m. wide frames the inscription on the right and left and is separated from it by a groove. The restoration suggests a width of about one meter, but the original height of the stele is not apparent. The engraving is technically interesting: the letters run alternately smaller and larger in size, and two or three types of epsilon, rho, and upsilon may appear together on the same piece.

The extant fragments of this inscription were discovered on the Acropolis or on its slopes at various times between 1837 and 1878. Koehler made the first step toward a serious edition when he discovered that fragments \( a, b, c, d, \) and \( e \) belonged to the same inscription, as Dittenberger reported in the commentary to *I.G.*, III (1878), 12. From the subject matter Dittenberger surmised that fragment \( f \) might belong to the same document, a conjecture which Leonardos subsequently verified, but he himself worked to reconstruct the text with the help of the first five fragments alone. Despite two or three false deductions Dittenberger extracted in a brilliant manner considerable information from the pieces at his disposal. For one thing he showed the connection between fragments \( c \) and \( d \). Kirchner's edition in *I.G.*, II* (1916), 1088 included fragment \( f \), but it could only reproduce Dittenberger's text, because Kirchner did not see all the fragments himself. In this article I add two other pieces \( (g \) and \( h) \), I publish photographs and practical data, and I present various re-readings, but the main contribution which I hope to make is a demonstration that the sense of the document can be recovered in a continuous section running across fragments \( c, f, \) and \( d \) certainly, and perhaps from the latter across fragment \( a \) as well.

---


Fig. 2. Thyatiran Decree, Fragments c, f, d, a, b, and (at Bottom) e
Fragment a (E[pigraphical] M[useum] 8383) was found on May 28, 1837, on the Acropolis south of the Parthenon. It preserves part of the right side, but it is broken away at the left, above, and below. Height, 0.295 m.; width, 0.185 m. K. S. Pittakys, Ἐφημερίς Ἀρχαιολογική, 1856, no. 2676. (Ph. Le Bas, Voyage archéologique en Grèce et en Asie Mineure, I, no. 393.) W. Dittenberger, I.G., III (1878), 12, fragment a, from Koehler's copy. J. Kirchner, I.G., II² (1916), 1088, fragment a.

Fragment b (E. M. 9485) was found on November 10, 1839, in “archaeological investigations” on the Acropolis east of the Erechtheum. It preserves part of the right side, but it is broken away at the left, above, and below. Height, 0.27 m.; width, 0.405 m. K. S. Pittakys, Ἐφημερίς Ἀρχαιολογική, 1853, no. 1432. (A. R. Rangabé, Antiquités Helléniques, II [Athens, 1855], 2312.) W. Dittenberger, I.G., III (1878), 12, fragment b, from copies by Ross and Koehler. J. Kirchner, I.G., II² (1916), 1088, fragment b.

Fragment c (E. M. 4944) was first recorded in the Pinacotheca on the Acropolis. It preserves part of the left side, but it is broken away at the right, above, and below. Height, 0.38 m.; width, 0.14 m. W. Dittenberger, I.G., III (1878), 12, fragment c, from copies by Ross, Velsen, and Koehler. (J. Kirchner, I.G., II² [1916], as 1087 from Velsen’s copy and as 1088, fragment c, from Koehler’s reading).

Fragment d (E. M. 9486) was found “near the base of Athena Promachus” on the Acropolis. It is broken away at the sides, above, and below. Height, 0.32 m.; width, 0.19 m. K. S. Pittakys, Ἐφημερίς Ἀρχαιολογική, 1853, no. 1360. W. Dittenberger, I.G., III (1878), 12, fragment d, from Koehler’s collation. J. Kirchner, I.G., II² (1916), 1088, fragment d.

Fragment e (E. M. 5832) was found in 1838 on the Acropolis in “archaeological investigations” east of the Erechtheum. It preserves part of the left side, but it is broken away at the right, above, and below. Height, 0.21 m.; width, 0.11 m. K. S. Pittakys, Ἐφημερίς Ἀρχαιολογική, 1853, no. 1443. (A. R. Rangabé, Antiquités Helléniques, II [Athens, 1855], 2314.) W. Dittenberger, I.G., III (1878), 12, fragment e, from Koehler’s copy. (J. Kirchner, I.G., II² [1916], 1088, fragment e.)

Fragment f (E. M. 9490) was found February 5, 1853, on the Acropolis west of the Propylaea. It is broken away at the sides, above, and below. Height, 0.34 m.; width, 0.20 m. K. S. Pittakys, Ἐφημερίς Ἀρχαιολογική, 1854, no. 2131. W. Dittenberger, I.G., III (1878), 13, from Koehler’s copy. J. Kirchner, I.G., II² (1916), 1088, fragment f.

Fragment g (E. M. 8381 + 8382) was found November 17, 1839, on the
Acropolis in “archaeological investigations” west of the Erechtheum. It is broken away at the sides, above, and below. Height, 0.18 m.; width, 0.19 m. K. S. Pittakys, Ἐφημερίς Ἀρχαιολογική, 1842, no. 1067. A. R. Rangabe, Antiquités Helléniques, II (Athens, 1855), 598. W. Dittenberger, I.G., III (1878), 15, from Velsen’s copy. (J. Kirchner, I.G., II [1916], 1090.)

Fragment h (E. M. 4237) was found on the south slope of the Acropolis. It is broken away at the sides, above, and below. Height, 0.24 m.; width, 0.12 m. W. Dittenberger, I.G., III (1882), 3985, from Lolling’s copy.

AD. 132-138

c, f, d, a

[..]
Restorations are my own except for the following, which I have adopted from my predecessors, or which, proposed by my predecessors, have suggested my own:

According to my arrangement the inscription presented an account of a series of benefactions from the reigning emperor Hadrian to the city of Thyatira, the whole prefaced by, or contained within, a decree of Thyatira calling for the publication of the record at Athens as the seat of the Panhellenion and as the center of the Greek world. The phrase τῷ Ὀνα]τε[ιρ[η]|ν[ών συμβλήτη[ν]τῷ δήμῳ (10-11), if correctly restored, indicates that the decree was passed at an extraordinary session of the people.4

The establishment of the synhedrion of the Panhellenes at Athens in A.D. 1325 constitutes a terminus post quem for the inscription. Both in respect to the situation and in respect to the appearance of the stele the closest parallel for this monument is an inscription erected at Athens by the delegates of Sardes, Hesperia, X, 1941, p. 83.

Possibly in line 11 we should with Dittenberger restore the phrase τῷ ψήφῳ σμα ἐνχαράζει, more or less of an epigraphical formula; but the sense seems to require a resolution to engrave Hadrian’s benefaction. The verb χαρίζομαι (donate) was commonly used in this period, and the noun χάριμα seems to me acceptable.

In line 10 the form ἐδοσεν calls for special notice but for no emendation. It is obviously an aorist form of δίδωμι, and it constitutes an early example of a usage regular in modern Greek. The term βασιλεύς, by which later the Byzantine emperors were designated, is applied to Hadrian in lines 9, 13, 14, and 30.

Sacerdotianus, if my impression of line 39 is correct, may have been the Claudioi Socrates Sacerdotianus mentioned in the dedication B.C.H., XI, 1887, pp. 101-104. He himself held the principal offices at Thyatira, and so did his son Tib. Cl. Menogenes Caecilianus, ἀνδρα ἡθους ἐνακα καὶ παιδείας καὶ ἀρετῆς τε πάσης ἐν τοῖς πρώτοις τῆς Ἀσίας καταράθμομενον, ἐν τε πρεσβείαις καὶ χορηγίαις καὶ ἔργων κατασκευαίς καὶ πάσαις φιλοτιμίαις καὶ πᾶσι καιροῖς τοῖς ἐπείγοντιν ἐπιδεικνύ[μ]ενον τήν τε εἰς ἑαυτὴν [the Council of Thyatira] καὶ τήν πατρίδα εὔνοιαν. In line 42 Dittenberger was probably right in recognizing a reference to an ἀρχιερεύς τῶν | Σεβ[αστῶν responsible for the erection of the stele, but there is no reason for identifying the ἀρχιερεύς with Τι. Κλ. Ἡ[ρώδης Ἀρτικὸς Μαραθώνιος] as Dittenberger did. The supposed first letter of the name Η[ρώδης is not on the stone. Pittakys, who is not always wrong, read it as μ, Koehler saw only a vertical hasta, and I believe that the crossbar of an eta would still appear, and that since it does not, the reading eta is excluded. After all, the stele contains a decree of Thyatira and the charge of erecting it should fall not on the archon of the Panhellenes but on the delegate of Thyatira. The above mentioned Tib. Cl. Menogenes Caecilianus would have been a more likely suggestion for line 43. He, too, was an ἀρχιερεύς τῶν Σεβαστῶν, and he frequently represented Thyatira away from home.

4 Compare the Athenian expression σύγκλητος ἐκκλησία (session specially convoked).
HADRIAN AND BEROEA

Two copies of a letter of Hadrian, which have come to light in Macedonian Beroea, should be reconstructed as separate inscriptions but treated together. Cormack has meritoriously republished Text A of this document with improved readings and with a photograph, while also he reproduced and to some extent utilized Delacoulonche’s copy of Text B, now lost. Thus Cormack, who personally re-examined the more important stone A in company with Charles Edson, has laid the proper foundation for a study of the whole document.

The restoration of the preamble goes back to Plassart, the original editor of Text A, except for the word τρίτον, which I have recognized in line 4 of Text B and which in abbreviation I have accordingly included also in the lacuna of Text A. The tentative reconstruction particularly of A lines 6-8 (= B lines 7-11) is my own.

TEXT A

[A υ τ ο κ ρ α τ ω ρ Κ α ι σ] a ρ, θ ι ο υ T ρ α i a
[νού Παρθικοῦ νιός, θεοῦ Νέρουα] νιών, Τραιανὸς Ἀδρι
[ἀνὸς Σεβαστός, ἀρχιερεύς μέγιστος], δημαρχικῆς ἐξουσίας
[τὸ —, ὑπατος τὸ γ, Βεροαιῶν τοῖς ἀρχιουσι καὶ τῇ βουλῇ καὶ τ[φ]

TEXT B

[A υ τ ο κ ρ α τ ω ρ Κ α ι σ] a ρ a i a
[νού Παρθικοῦ νιός, θεοῦ Νέρουα νιών, Τ]ραιανὸς
[Ἀδριανὸς Σεβαστός, ἀρχιερεύς μέγιστος], δημαρχι
[κῆς ἐξουσίας τὸ —— ον, ὑπατος τὸ τρ]ίτον, Βεροι

5 [αίων τοῖς ἀρχιουσι καὶ τῇ βουλῇ καὶ τῷ δ]ήμῳ ναὸν μύρια δισχείλια πεν(takόσια).
[Οι ἔλθοντες σὺν τῷ ὑπετέρῳ ἀξιώματι ἔτυχον προσό
[δόν οἱ πρέσβεις καὶ ἀκριβῶς ἐδήλωσα]ν τὰ περὶ
[ὑμῶν, ὡσα δ' ἐδέχθητε μου συνεχώρησα, δίκαι]ά τε ὄντα
[ἡγούμενος καὶ οὕτως γίγνεσθαι βουλόμε]νος· τὰ κοι
[νὰ συνεδρεύσωμεν εἰς] ἑαρπλην
[-----------------------------] ἐνοι
[-----------------------------] ημίον· τὰς πέν]τε μν
[μαδας ἀς ὑπέρ ------------------------]
[-----------------------------]
[-----------------------------] τὰ εἰς τὸν ναὸν μύρι[α <δ><υ><σ><χ>εἵ
[λια πεντακόσια. Ἐνυπεχείτε] vacat

The document is dated after January 1, 119, because Hadrian was already consul for the third time, and it is dated before December 10, 128, because in B, line 4, the ordinal of his tribunician power, if higher than δωδέκατον, would exceed the space, inasmuch as the restoration εἰκοστῶν is excluded because Hadrian was neither pater patriae nor imperator II.

Claudius Crispus (A, line 11), as Edson had already observed, is known to us as a high priest of the imperial cult from a Thessalonian inscription dated in 143 A.D.⁷

The restoration of A, line 6 (= B, line 7) finds a parallel for thought and wording in a letter of Trajan to the Pergamenes,⁸ ['Ελθούσης υμῶν πρεσβειας, ἀπο-
δεξάμενος αὐτής τὸ τι άξιώμα [καὶ τὰ συγγράμματα, περὶ πάντων ἃ ἐν αὐτ]οῖς ἥξισατε συγκατεθέμην. For the restoration of A, line 8 (= B, line 10) compare the Senatus consultum de Asclepiade,⁹ line 30: καὶ πρὸς τοὺς ἀρχοντας αὐτῶν ἀποστέλλως τὴν σύνκλητον θέλει καὶ δίκαιον ἥγεσθαι ταῦτα οὕτως γίνεσθαι. For the expression τὰ κοινὰ συνεδρεύσωμεν compare Dionysius of Halicarnassus, X, 13: παρὰ τῶν ἔδέχασθε τὰ γράμματα ξένων; τῶν ποῦ κατοικοῦντος, ἢ πόθεν ύμᾶς εἰδότων, ἢ πῶς τάνθάδε (in the Roman Senate) συνεδρεύσωμεν ἐπισταμένων. In B, line 16, where Delacoulonche had read ΑΛΙΣΚΕΙ, the convincing emendation μύρι[α <δ><υ><σ><χ>εἰ[λια] was suggested by Cormack.

JAMES H. OLIVER

Barnard College,
Columbia University

⁷ Heuzey and Daumet, Mission archéologique de Macédoine (Paris, 1876), p. 274, no. 112.
⁹ C. G. Bruns, Fontes iuris romani antiqui⁷, 41.