AN ARGIVE DECREE FROM NEMEA
CONCERNING ASPENDOS

EXCAVATIONS in the Sanctuary of Zeus at Nemea have revealed that in numbers of inscriptions discovered this Panhellenic shrine is more like Isthmia than its other two counterparts, Olympia and Delphi. The two sites in the northeastern Peloponnesos have produced between them only a modest collection of inscribed texts compared with the thousands of documents which fill the volumes of Die Inschriften von Olympia, Fouilles de Delphes: Tome III, Épigraphie, and their various supplements. Recent work at Nemea by the University of California at Berkeley has not dramatically altered this picture, but a few interesting inscriptions have been recovered in the last several years. I here publish in preliminary form one of the more important of these, a decree of Argos concerning the Pamphylian state of Aspendos.

The text of this decree survives on three joining fragments of a stele of hard, gray limestone which were excavated from an ancient well near the southwest corner of the Temple of Zeus (grid: K 14). In a preliminary report on this well, the Field Director, S. G. Miller, noted that the three fragments lay at a level of -6.50 to -7.80 m. in a dumped filling which is probably to be dated in the second half of the 3rd century B.C.


Works frequently cited are abbreviated as follows:

BCH, Suppl. VI = BCH, Supplement VI, Études argiennes I, Paris 1980
ISE I = L. Moretti, Iscrizioni storiche ellenistiche, Florence 1967
Lindos II = C. Blinkenburg, Lindos, II, i, Inscriptions, Berlin/Copenhagen 1941
Meiggs and Lewis, GHI = R. Meiggs and D. Lewis, A Selection of Greek Historical Inscriptions, Oxford 1969

2 I am grateful to my colleague Stephen G. Miller for permission to publish this inscription and for much helpful counsel. Patricia Felch and Paula Perlman provided me with excellent squeezes of the stone which were of great help in establishing the text. I have studied the stone on two occasions in the Museum at Nemea. Since the surface is badly worn and the letters very faint, photographs have been of little help in making readings. The drawing on Figure 1 was made by tracing the letters from squeezes and checking them against the readings I made from the stone.

For reading an earlier draft of this paper and saving me from many errors my thanks are due to C. Hambicht, C. Kritzas, M. Piéart, V. Kontorini, P. Perlman, and Stephen G. Miller. I have in many cases shamelessly incorporated their good suggestions into the text without acknowledgement.

Hesperia 48, 1979, pp. 77–81, pl. 22.b.

1 Hesperia 48, 1979, pp. 77–81, pl. 22.b.
Fig. 1. Nemea Museum I 75
AN ARGIVE DECREE FROM NEMEA

Three joining fragments of hard, gray limestone from the upper part of a stele. Broken at top and bottom; part of the original sides and roughly dressed back preserved. The larger letters of line 1 were inscribed on a slightly raised molding.

Height, 0.52 m. Width, top 0.565 m., bottom 0.58 m. Thickness, 0.134 m.

Height of letters, line 1, 0.03 m., lines 2–21, 0.01 m. Height of interlinear space, ca. 0.015 m.

Nemea Museum I 75

[- - - - - ca. 7-9 - - - - -] ΟΝ


10 γείων καὶ καλύσθησιν ἐ[κ. . . ca. 11] επιμέλεσθαι δὲ τῶν ἀγωνο- θεταν καὶ τῶν ιαρομ[άμοιας τῶν δει ἀντιτυγχάνοντας επιμέ- λεσθαι δὲ καὶ τὰν ἀλλαίαν [... ca. 13] ΝΣΑΣ τὸν ἀπαντα χρόνον τῶν Ἀσπενδίων, αὐτίκα καὶ δέξωνται καὶ τίς καὶ χράζει τα Ἀσπενδίων οἴκεν ἐν Ἀργεί, οἰκε[ῖ] τοι τελεῖ[ν] ὑπέρ ὑ [Ἀργείων, κ[α]θ' ἀπερ καὶ Ἀρ-


20 [. .5 .] ΤΑΔΕ ἐκ τοῦ τελευ[... ca. 33-35] traces? [- - - - - - - -] ἐκαὶ Ἐ[... ca. 11-12 - - - - -]

EPIGRAPHICAL COMMENTARY

Line 2: Of the first preserved letter only the bottom of a diagonal stroke is visible in the lower right corner of the letter space. Only the top and bottom horizontal strokes of the dotted epsilon survive.

Line 3: In the first preserved letter space there remains only the bottom of a vertical stroke at what appears to be the left side of the space. It is followed by the bottoms of two verticals which can be interpreted as the lower part of eta or nu or perhaps parts of two separate letters. In the next stoichos there is only the bottom of a centered vertical.

Line 4: Only the left diagonal stroke of the dotted alpha and the right diagonal and the apex of the dotted delta are visible. Of the dotted upsilon only part of a diagonal stroke survives in the top right corner of the stoichos.

Line 6: The left half of the horizontal stroke of the dotted tau is not visible.

Line 9: Of the dotted rho only the top half is visible. It is followed by a horizontal stroke across the top of the letter space joined at the left by the top of a vertical. Only the apex of the dotted delta survives at the top of the letter space, and in the penultimate stoichos in this line there is the left diagonal stroke of a triangular letter.

Line 12: Only the left vertical stroke of the dotted nu is visible.

Line 14: Of the dottedomicron only a small fragment of the arc is visible at the top of the damaged letter space.
Line 15: Only the left diagonal of the dotted alpha has survived.
Line 16: Of the dotted alpha only the left diagonal and the apex are preserved. The left vertical is all that is visible of the dotted pi. In the top right corner of the seventh letter space from the end of this line there is the free standing tip of a horizontal stroke.
Line 17: Of the two dotted letters IA there survive the tip of a vertical stroke at the bottom of the letter space and the left diagonal of the next letter. After the omega there is the top of a centered vertical. Only the right diagonal stroke of the dotted mu has survived. Of the dotted pi there is preserved only a horizontal stroke along the top of the letter space. There appears to be part of a vertical stroke in the top left corner of the letter space where I have read a dotted nu.
Line 18: Only the vertical stroke of the dotted gamma is visible.
Line 20: In the top left corner of the letter space after TEAE there survives the top of a diagonal stroke which could only be part of upsilon or psi.

COMMENTARY

Line 1: Between the final nu and the right side of the stone there is an uninscribed margin of 0.12 m. If we posit a symmetrical margin at the (now lost) left side, the word to be restored in this line would occupy 0.565 m. (width of stele) minus (0.12 m. + 0.12 m. = ) 0.24 m. (margins) = 0.325 m. Since only the two final letters of the word are preserved on the stone, we have available only one measurement of 0.055 m. for the width of a letter, measured on centers. A word occupying 0.325 m. in width ought then to contain 0.325 m. ÷ 0.055 m. = 5.9 or 6 letters. If one of the letters was iota, it might be possible to restore a word of 7 letters, i.e. [Ἄργε]λων.

If we do not posit a margin of 0.12 m. at the left side of the stele, the space available for line 1 would be 0.565 m. — 0.12 m. = 0.445 m. A word of this width ought to contain 0.445 m. ÷ 0.055 m. = 8 letters. If one of the letters was iota, not occupying a full letter space, it would be possible to restore a word of 9 letters, i.e. [Ἁσπενδ]ίων. Both ethnics might appropriately stand together at the top of a stele which records an agreement between the two states, i.e. [συμπολιτεία Ἁσπενδίων καὶ Ἄργε]λων. Parallels, however, seem to be lacking for a heading of this type at Argos. Two-line headings inscribed in larger letters are found on a few Argive decrees,4 but much more common are headings which occupy a single line and give the name of the honored individual or state in the genitive case, as in SEG XIX, 317, Ῥόδιων, and at least 12 other examples. It seems preferable, then, to restore [Ἁσπενδ]ίων in line 1 and to assume that only a little is missing at the top of the stele.

Line 2: Since the approximate length of line can be established lower down in the text where the full width of the stone is preserved, the number of letters missing at the beginning here can be set at ca. 25. This leaves ample room before the name of the month Ἄμων [κά]λαι of for restoration of the normal enactment formula, the last two letters of which are probably ΑΙ. Customarily in Argive decrees the month name in the genitive case follows immediately upon the last word of the enactment formula (τελείας). The only exceptions to this rule are found in SEG XIX, 317, Ἀλλαίαὶ ἐδοξε τελεία, ἀμβολίμωι ἐκ τοῦ Ἄγγελον, Κάρνειον ηνάται πράται, and SEG XI, 1084, Ἀλλαίαὶ ἐδοξε τελεία, ἀμβ[β]ολίμ<ω> ἐκ τοῦ Τελέων, Ἄρνειον ηνάται, but there clearly is no room for this kind of formula in our line 1. The day

4 SEG XIII, 240, 243; M. Piéart and J.-P. Thalmann, “Nouvelles inscriptions argiennes,” BCH, Suppl. VI, p. 256, no. 1. For a possible heading of more than two lines see SEG XXVI, 426.
on which an Argive decree was passed always follows the name of the month, so that in this instance it probably stood at the beginning of line 3.\textsuperscript{5} Since the normal enactment formula does not occupy the full space of 25 letters before the name of the month, we might tentatively restore \([\text{Θεός, Τόχα}]\) at the beginning of line 2, as in the decree published in \textit{BCH}, Suppl. VI, p. 269, no. 4. For \text{Θεός} alone immediately before the enactment formula and not in a heading, see the decrees published in \textit{Mnemosyne} 43, 1915, p. 377, no. 6; \textit{SEG} XI, 1084; XVII, 141, 142 (restored), 143.

This is the second attestation of the month Amyklaios at Argos.\textsuperscript{6} Nine of the twelve Argive month names are now known, and some sequences have been established, but the position of Amyklaios in the Argive year remains unknown.\textsuperscript{7} The participle \textit{ἐπομένου} which modifies Amyklaios is new to Argive calendric terminology, and I have not found a parallel elsewhere for this word modifying the name of a month. The most obvious meaning is “following”, but a translation such as “in the month of Amyklaios following” is by itself unsatisfactory.\textsuperscript{8} Following what? The most obvious thing for a month to follow is another month, but since the Argives presumably knew the order of their own months, it is not immediately apparent why it was thought necessary to record a familiar sequence on stone.

There are instances in the dating formulas of their decrees, however, where the Argives did record the sequence of their months. Instead of normally inscribing the name of the month in the genitive case followed by the day in the dative case immediately after the enactment formula, the Argives in at least nine of their surviving decrees employed an extended dating formula in which two contiguous months are named in sequence. We have just quoted two examples of this formula and there are seven more.\textsuperscript{9} Although their word order varies slightly, these nine texts all exhibit the word \textit{ἀμβολίμω} as a modifier of \textit{ἀλλαίαι} \textit{πελείαι} indicating that the assembly at which the following decree was passed continued the business of an adjourned meeting held in the previous month. Hence formulations such as \textit{ἀλλαίαι ἐδοξε πελείαι, Ἀγνιην ἠναί δευτάται, ἀμβολίμω ἐκ τοῦ Πανάμου}\textsuperscript{10} have been interpreted to mean that the unfinished business of a \textit{ἀλλαία τελεία} held in the month of Panamos was put over until another such assembly which took place on the 29th of

\textsuperscript{5} Rarely the day is omitted and only the month is given, as in Piéart and Thalmann, \textit{BCH}, Suppl. VI, pp. 259–260, nos. 2, 3, but these are both very short decrees which lack other normal ingredients, such as the name of the proposer of the legislation.

\textsuperscript{6} Cf. \textit{BCH} 98, 1974, p. 776, no. 2.


\textsuperscript{8} This use of the participle as modifier of the month name would seem to preclude the designation of an event within that month, such as “in the month of Amyklaios following the festival of X,” etc. Normally \textit{μετά} with the accusative was used for such expressions, without a participle; e.g. \textit{IG} I\textsuperscript{3}, 61, lines 52–53, ἐπειδὸν ὡστε ἐπὶ προ[τα] [μετὰ τάς ἐν τῷ νεοριοῦ ἐ[δρας] ἐ[θύ] [τοῦ] ἐκκλησίαν [πο] [εσαυ] της.


\textsuperscript{10} \textit{Mnemosyne} 43, 1915, pp. 365–371, no. A.
Agyeos. If, as has been plausibly suggested, the deferral of business from one *aliaia teleia* to another would in most cases be to the next available such meeting, it is safe to follow all other students of these prescripts in concluding that the two months named in such formulas were contiguous.

Given the restrictions on space at the beginning of our line 3, I do not see how the words *Ἀμφίκλαιος ἐπόμενον* can belong to a deferral formula of the *ambolimos* type, but the addition of the participle ἐπομένον to Amyklaios may indicate something unusual about Amyklaios or the month which preceded it. In the absence of parallels for the use of ἐπόμενος with a month name elsewhere, we can only guess what unusual feature prompted its use here, but the most plausible explanation would seem to be some kind of calendric irregularity, such as an intercalated month or perhaps a newly named or renamed month recently added to the calendar and requiring appropriate annotation. The latter seems unlikely to me but perhaps not impossible. Although evidence for intercalation is totally lacking in our sources for the calendar of Argos, this kind of phenomenon provides the best explanation. We may safely assume that at appropriate intervals the Argives followed the widespread practice of inserting an intercalary month into their calendar. If in the year of our decree the month immediately preceding Amyklaios had been intercalary, its name might have been recorded at the beginning of line 3 in some such formulation as “in Amyklaios which follows intercalary month X.” Or, more plausibly, Amyklaios was itself intercalary and ἐπομένον here is to be translated intransitively as the opposite of προηγούμενος; that is, the two words would have stood in the same relationship one to the other as did πρῶτος and δεύτερος/ύστερος. These last three words were employed in calendars elsewhere to distinguish an intercalary month from the regular month of the same name which it immediately followed. On this analogy we might cautiously suggest that our decree was passed in an intercalary month designated Ἄμφικλαιος ἐπόμενος which followed the regular Amyklaios.

For this interpretation see Vollgraff, *op. cit.* (footnote 7 above), pp. 46-50; Guarducci, *op. cit.* (footnote 7 above), pp. 144-145.

This assumption forms the backbone of all modern studies of the Argive calendar; see footnote 7 above. There is one decree in which the adjournment from one *αλλαία τελεία* to the next seems to have taken place within the same month: SEG XXV, 362, lines 2-3, ἀλλαία ἑδ[δεῖ] τελείαι, Ἄρνητον ἑκταί δεντάται, ἄμβολωι ἐκ ταῖς τελείαι.

This common practice of deferring legislation from one assembly to another at Argos has received scant attention in standard works on Greek political institutions and procedure. I find no discussion of it in Busolt/Swoboda, *Griechische Staatskunde;* V. Ehrenberg, *The Greek State;* etc.

In Attic decrees ἐκ and the genitive in the enactment clause seem always to indicate a change of venue without explicitly mentioning an adjournment or a carrying over of business from one meeting to another, although this may in fact have taken place. See A. S. Henry, *Mnemosyne, Suppl. XLIX, The Prescripts of Athenian Decrees,* Leiden 1977, pp. 38-39, 85-88, 98.

Cf. Plutarch, *Demetrios* 28; Alexander 16 (*Δαμιάνον γὰρ ὦ θάνατοι οἵ βασιλεῖς τῶν Μακεδόνων ἐξάγεις τὴν στρατιάν* τούτῳ μὲν ἐπημαρτύσατο, κελέυσας δεύτερον Ἄρτεμισιόν ἀγειν. P. Charneux (*op. cit.* [footnote 7 above], pp. 198-199) discusses the ancient evidence for tampering with the Argive calendar for military purposes.

For the contrast between the two adverbs πρῶτος/προηγούμενος and ἐπόμενος see Aristotle, *Metaphysics,* 1030 a 22; Plutarch, *Moralia,* 560 e. For πρῶτος and δεύτερος/ύστερος used to distinguish normal and intercalary months of the same name see, e.g., Samuel, *op. cit.* (footnote 7 above), pp. 74, 78, 100; SEG XXX, 980 (Olbia). At Athens the intercalary month was designated as δεύτερος, ύστερος or ἐμβόλιμος, *IG II* 2 4, Index, p. 29; W. K. Pritchett, “The Intercalary Month at Athens,” *CP* 63, 1968, p. 53.
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The day on which the decree was passed would then have been recorded in the dative case at the beginning of line 3.

**Line 3:** If my reading of the first six letters is correct, the restoration [γρο]φείς βωλᾶς ὁ δείνα is excluded, and we have here the normal formula for the presiding officer of the council, with his phratry and kome added. Since there is no room at the beginning of this line or elsewhere in the text to record the name of the gropheus, we must assume an unusual, though not unparalleled, omission of this official; he is normally mentioned immediately after the clause ἀρήτευε βωλᾶς ὁ δείνα.

Polychares does not appear in M. Mitsos, Ἀργολικῆ Προσωπογραφία, Athens 1952, and I have not found the name in Argive inscriptions published after 1952, but it is attested in many Peloponnesian cities. The phratry name Heraieus and the village Kolouris are both known from other Argive inscriptions.

**Line 4:** To the dative [τῶι] δάμωi in the second enactment formula in this line are added the words τῶι Ἀργείων, which might seem to be a redundant qualification amidst many other familiar indications that this is indeed an Argive decree. In fact, there is to my knowledge only one other example of τῶι Ἀργείων added to ἔδοξε τῶι δαμοι in the published decrees of Argos. It is an instructive parallel, however, for the same wording is found in SEG XIX, 317, a long decree of ca. 325 B.C. which confers honors on the people of Rhodes. It has, as we shall see, a number of other suggestive correspondences with our text. In lines 5–6 we read: ἔπειδη 'Ῥόδοι συγγενεῖς έόντες τῶι Ἀργείων ἀνδρεῖς ἄγαθοι διατελόντε έις τῶν δάμων τῶι Ἀργείων, followed a few lines later by ἔδοξε τῶι δάμωι τῶι Ἀργείων, etc. Then near the end of the text (line 30) we find, καθ' ἔδοξε τῶι δάμωι τῶι Ἀργείωι. Like this decree for the Rhodians, our newly found text from Nemea is concerned with relations between Argos and another state, not merely with individual foreigners like proxenoi or theorodokoi. Publication of our decree at Aspendos might also have been contemplated.

Hence, the addition of τῶι Ἀργείων in line 4.

The main body of the decree begins abruptly, without an explanatory ἔπειδη clause vel sim., and the syntax throughout is bumpy and paratactic. As recipients of the benefits of the decree the people of Aspendos are called συγγενείς καὶ ἄνδρεις. The Rhodians

15 The gropheus is also omitted in SEG XI, 316 ( = Meiggs and Lewis, GHI, no. 42), lines 43–45 and SEG XI, 1084, lines 3–4. In SEG XXV, 362, the decree begins with ἔπι γραφός τῷ βουλαί Θυδέκα and the ἀρήτευε βωλᾶς ὁ δείνα clause is omitted entirely.

16 E.g., Phlous, W. Peek, "Neue Inschriften aus Epidauros," AbbLeip LXIII, v, Berlin 1972, p. 14, no. 16, line 26; Megara, IG IV 2 1, 71, lines 34, 40, 56, 62; Epidauros, SEG XXVI, 452; Troizen, IG IV, 753 with Add.; Mantinea, IG V 2, 272; 323, no. 83; Tegea, IG V 2, 32, line 3; Megalopolis, IG V 2, 1, line 33; Messene, Pausanias, iv.4.5; and at Athens, Kirchner, PA, nos. 12099–12102; Meritt and Traill, The Athenian Agora, XV, Inscriptions. The Athenian Councilors, Princeton 1974, no. 61, line 184.


Kolouris: Guarducci, op. cit. (footnote 7 above), pp. 142 (lines 26, 40), 150. The location of this village is apparently unknown. Like most of the other Argive komai known only from inscriptions it is ignored by F. Gschmitter (Abhängige Orte im griechischen Altertum [Zetemata XVII], Munich 1958, pp. 68–81, Argos) and by R. A. Tomlinson (Argos and the Argolid, Ithaca 1972).

are also called συγγενεῖς of the Argives, as we have seen, in the closely related decree SEG XIX, 317. Caution is required before taking this word literally as an indicator of actual, rather than alleged, consanguinity, but D. Musti, in a careful study of its usage in Hellenistic inscriptions, has concluded that it was not until late Hellenistic and Roman times that the more contrived examples of συγγενεία between different poleis began to appear in Greek inscriptions. He suggested that the Argive decree in honor of the Rhodians comes before this trend and that it probably reflects an historically attested connection between Argos and Rhodes.19 At least as early as 189 b.c. at any rate we have clear evidence that the Rhodians claimed an Argive foundation for their state; see commentary below on line 7.

The people of Aspendos seem also to have had a special relationship with Argos, if we can trust the brief report of Strabo: "Ἀσπένδως πόλις εὐανδρόσα ικανός, Ἀργείων κτίσμα, ΧV.667 c."20 C. Brixhe in an exhaustive examination of the Pamphylian dialect has concluded that the linguistic evidence from this region accords with the legends of early Greek settlement, some of which feature the founding heroes Mopsos and Kalchas. Specifically he argues for an Argive settlement of Aspendos in the 8th or 7th century b.c.21 It will be to this tie of kinship, then, that the Argives refer in lines 4–5 of our decree while bestowing citizenship on the Aspendians. Context and the number of missing letters make συγγενὲς ἄναυτος Ἀργείων the most likely restoration.22 Compare the wording of a 4th-

19 AnnPisa 32, 1963, pp. 225–239. A possible connection between the two cities, which could have gained enough credence for diplomatic purposes, might be reflected in the leadership of Tlepolemos over the Rhodian contingent at Troy, Iliad Π.653–670. D. L. Page’s view that lines 668–670 are an interpolation would not be fatal to this sort of connection, nor is his attempt to demonstrate that Tlepolemos was not a Dorian hero entirely convincing (History and the Homeric Iliad, Berkeley 1959, pp. 147–149, 176, note 86); see the contrary view of R. Hope Simpson, J. F. Lazenby, The Catalogue of the Ships in Homer’s Iliad, Oxford 1970, pp. 117–120.

At any rate, the tradition of an Argive origin for Rhodes was strong as early as the 5th century b.c. and was believed by Pindar, O. 7, and Thucydides, VII.57.6. C. Blinkenberg (Lindos II, coll. 1011–1015) has collected the evidence for the influence of Argos on the place names and institutions of Rhodes; he builds a compelling case.

In another Argive decree in honor of Alexandros of Sikyon the relationship between the honorand’s city and its founding polis, Argos, is described not as συγγενεία but as τὰς προϊπαρχόντας οἰκείωσις τὰς πόλιν ποι τῶν πόλιν τῶν Σικυωνίων (SEG XXV, 362, lines 7–8). This example would seem to weaken Musti’s case for drawing a distinction between syngeneia and oikeotes, since Sikyon was also regarded as an Argive foundation.

The only other occurrence of syngenëia in Argive inscriptions is in SEG XXVI, 426, a letter of the people of Argos to the city of Aigeai in Kilikia of ca. a.d. 200 which honors Publius Antonius Antiochos for his efforts in renewing the palaia syngeneia between Argos and his native city. See the illuminating discussion of this text by L. Robert (“Documents d’Asie Mineure,” BCH 101, 1977, pp. 120–132). For other “liens mythiques” between Argos and Phrygia in Imperial times see T. Drew-Bear, Nouvelles inscriptions de Phrygie, Zutphen 1978, p. 67.

20 See also Eustathios, Commentary on Dionysios Periegetes, C. Müller, Geographi graeci minores II, Paris 1882, p. 366, §852, Ἀργείων δὲ κτίσμα ἣ Ἀσπενδοῦς, εὐανδρόσα ποτε κατὰ πολύ. Hellanikos (FGrHist, no. 4, F 15) gives the name of the founder as Aspendos.


22 The space available at the beginning of line 5 seems to require a restoration of greater length than [φίλος, the word which most frequently accompanies συγγενεῖς in Greek inscriptions. C. Habicht has
century B.C. decree from Epidauros, IG IV² 1, 47: ἐδοξὲ τοῖς Ἑπιδαυρίωις Ἀστυπαλαιῶ-σιν ἀποίκοις Ἑπιδαυρίων ἐσότει καὶ εὐεργέταις ἀτέλειον εἶμεν. . . .

Lines 6–7: The grant of citizenship to the Aspendians is accompanied by the privilege of approaching the Argive assembly. This is the first occurrence in published Argive decrees of a formula which is widely attested elsewhere. Apart from the evidence it provides for constitutional procedure at Argos, the main interest of the formula in its present extended form is the light it throws on relations between Argos and the cities of Rhodes and Soloi. Access to the Argive aliaia is granted to the people of Aspendos on a preferred basis after sacred matters have been discussed and after the Rhodians have had the opportunity to exercise their prior right of approaching the same body. This prior right of the Rhodians was doubtless granted in a decree which must be earlier than our new text from Nemea.²³

I cannot explain the spelling τῶν Ὀδίων in lines 6–7. After πέδα we might expect the accusative plural τῶν Ὀδίων, cf. IG XII 8, 640 (Peparethos) πρῶτοι μετὰ τὰ ἱερὰ καὶ Ὀμοιών. Perhaps then a word such as προσβεντάς is to be understood or has been omitted, or Ὀδίων was inscribed in error. Alternatively, Ὀδίων may be sound and we should postulate an error in τῶν, i.e. πέδα τ(<ν>) Ὀδίων, cf. IG XII 9, 898 (Chalkis) πρῶτοι μεθ’ ἱερὰ [καὶ τὰ Ὀμοιών]. In bestowing this privilege on the Aspendians the Argives draw attention at the beginning of line 7 to the fact that similar rights have previously been awarded to the people of Soloi, καθάπερ κ[α]ὶ τοῖς Σολεῖσι; the dative echoes Ἀσπηλείωισι in line 4. These privileges for the people of Soloi were also no doubt the topic of an earlier Argive decree which may have closely resembled the present document. If we can believe Diogenes Laertius (1.51) the ethnic in line 7 is that of the Kilikian Soloi and not the homonymous city on the north coast of Kypros, for in speaking of the former he observes, καὶ εἰσὶ οἱ μὲν ἐνθὲν Σολεῖσ, οἱ δ’ ἀπὸ Κύπρου Σόλιοι.²⁴

suggest to me the attraction of restoring [οἰκεῖοι]οις here.

²³ Argive citizenship and the right of approaching the aliaia were not granted to the Rhodians in the honor-ary decree to which I have already referred, SEG XIX, 317, probably because they had already received these benefits.


Contact between Kyproian Soloi and the Sanctuary of Zeus at Nemea is attested by the theorodokos Stasikrates, son of Stasias, who appears under the rubric ἐν Σόλιος in the Kyproian panel of the recently discovered catalogue of theorodokoi, S. G. Miller, Hesperia 48, 1979, pp. 78–79.
The appearance of this Kilikian city in a decree which honors syngeneis and apoikoi of the Argives is timely, as is their proximity to the Rhodians in line 6, for there was an ancient tradition that Soloi, like Aspendos, had been an Argive colony and that the Rhodians had also participated in its foundation. The earliest appearance of this connection in the surviving literary sources is to be found in the speech of the Rhodian ambassadors before the Roman Senate in 189 B.C. Polybios (xxi.24) presents the Rhodian claim that Soloi should be granted freedom from the rule of Antiochos III as follows:

προσήλθον αὐθεὶς οἱ Ῥόδιοι πρὸς τὴν σύγκλητον, ἀξιόνυτες περὶ Σόλων τῶν Κιλικῶν; διὰ γὰρ τὴν συγγένειαν ἐφασαν καθῆκειν αὐτοῖς προνοεῖσθαι τῆς πόλεως ταύτης. εἶναι γὰρ Ἀργείων ἀποίκους Σολεῖς, καθάπερ καὶ Ῥόδιοις ἐξ ὀν ἀδελφικὴν οὖσαν ἀπεδείκνυν τὴν συγγένειαν πρὸς ἀλλήλους. ὃν ἐνεκα δίκαιον ἐφασαν εἶναι τυχεῖν αὐτοὺς τῆς ἐλευθερίας ὑπὸ Ῥωμαίων διὰ τῆς Ῥώδιων χάριτος.

Neither Polybios nor Livy report any attempt at the time to refute these claims of kinship between Rhodes and Soloi on the one hand and Argos on the other. Indeed the Senate was prepared to go to great lengths to turn over Soloi to the Rhodians, if they had persisted in their demands. The importance of our decree on this point would seem to be that, as in the case of Aspendos, so earlier for Rhodes and Soloi, the Argives had translated these bonds of kinship and colonization into political action. Citizenship and other privileges were bestowed upon her offspring by the mother city.

SEG XIX, 317 shows that Rhodes had made a substantial loan to Argos, interest free, to help repair her walls and revitalize her cavalry. In our decree, as we shall see, it is anticipated that Aspendians will live in Argos and Argives in Aspendos. Probably a third decree, which seems to be implicit in the words καθάπερ καὶ τοῖς Σολεῖσι (line 7), recorded similar direct evidence of interaction between Argos and Soloi. The sincerity of Argive claims to syngeneia with Rhodes and Soloi on the basis of colonization has been questioned. Our decree cannot forestall such skepticism, but at the very least it serves now to push back the date when such claims were made in a public forum from 189 B.C. to the 4th century B.C. Some might even be inclined to conclude that a little weight has been added to the scales in favor of the view that there was more to these claims than empty rhetoric.

The occurrence of καὶ after Σολεῖσι and again at the beginning of line 8 after ἀγῶνας

25 Strabo, XIV.671, Ἀχαιῶν καὶ Ῥόδιων κτίσμα τῶν ἐκ Λύδου; Pomponius Mela, I.71, Urbs est alim a Rhodiis Argivisque, post piratis, Pompeio assignante, possessa; Eustathios (footnote 20 above), p. 372, chap. 876, λέγονται δὲ Σόλοι κατὰ τινα τῶν Σόλωνος. οἱ δὲ Ἀχαιῶν καὶ Ῥόδιων κτίσμα τὴν πόλιν ἐπιτείμαται.

26 Cf. Livy, XXXVII.56, who follows Polybios’ text very closely.


28 By Magie (loc. cit. [footnote 24 above]), “the Argive tradition may well be an invention of the Hellenistic period.” The Argive connection is not mentioned by W. Ruge in his RE article on Soloi (footnote 24 above). On the complexity of the Rhodian claim see F. W. Walbank, A Historical Commentary on Polybios III, Oxford 1979, p. 118.
AN ARGIVE DECREE FROM NEMEA

shows that the second half of line 7 contained a brief clause in which the Aspendians were granted some privilege in the games controlled by Argos. ENΣΚΛΗΝΣ could be interpreted as ἐνσκλήνι ὄς, accusative plural29 of ἐνσκλης, with Argolic intervocalic sigma omitted.30 It could also be interpreted as ἐνσκλήνι ὄς, accusative singular, possibly with a mason’s error responsible for the superfluous sigma. Since the plural would be redundant and awkward, this second alternative seems preferable.31

Aspendian theoroi who are sent to Nemea to sacrifice to Zeus and to Argos to make offerings to Argive Hera are to ἐπομέπεμ π[ε] δὰ (= μετὰ) τῶν Ἄ[ρ]π[ε]ίων. Clearly some honor is being bestowed on the theoroi by permitting them to share in this activity with the Argives. προπέμπω, used transitively, normally means to send forward, escort, or conduct someone or some thing.32 Perhaps in this religious context (θύσοντας, line 8) an object is understood, i.e. προπέμπεων τὰ ἱερὰ, conduct the sacred rites, send forth the offerings, vel sim.33 It may also be that with τῶν θεαρίων as its subject the verb is here used intransitively and is possibly related to προπομπεύω, to lead the procession, or προπομπεύω.34 It would be fitting for the Argives to lead the πομπή from the city out to the two sanctuaries in question and an honor for the Aspendian theoroi to be invited to join their kinsmen at the front of the parade.

This passage is reminiscent of the decree in honor of the Rhodians (SEG XIX, 317) where the crown which they will receive is to be announced by the agonothetes at the gymniki agones of the Hekatomboia and of the Nemeia (lines 19–21). P. Amandry (BCH, Suppl. VI, pp. 224–226) argued that the parallelism between this clause and the publication formula in lines 27–29, which calls for stelai to be erected, π[α] Ἁρα καὶ ἐν Νεμέαι, is so close as to indicate that the Hekatomboia were celebrated at the Argive Heraion. Our new decree with its specific designation of Ἁρα Ἀργεία (line 9) and π[α] Ἁρα[ι] in the publication formula (line 16), supports his argument, although the name of Hera’s festival is not given.

If my interpretation of προπέμπεμ π[ε] δὰ τῶν Ἄ[Ρ]π[Ε]ίων is on the right track, this

29 For the accusative plural ending of -ι stems, see C. D. Buck, The Greek Dialects, Chicago 1965, p. 91.
30 For ἐν- and ἐς used in close proximity in the same text see the decree for the Rhodians, SEG XIX, 317, lines 6, 9.
31 For another example of this rare word in a similar context see the Attic decree, IG II², 1064, line 20 (SEG XXI, 506), μετέχεων δὲ καὶ εἰσκλήσεως εἰς τοὺς Διονυσιακοὺς ἁγώνας αὐτῶν τε καὶ τῶν παῖδας αὐτοῦ; cf. SEG XXI, 505, lines 9–10, restored.
32 Examples in LSJ. The verb does not seem to be used often in epigraphic texts. OGIS 544, line 31 (Ankara). See footnotes 33 and 34, below.
33 Aischylus, Persians, 621–622, γαπότους δ' ἔγω τιμᾶς προπέμψω τάσδε νερτέροις θεοῖς, with Broadhead’s note. In Athenian ephebic decrees of late Hellenistic times the young men are praised because they ἀπήντησαν δὲ καὶ τοῖς ἱεροῖς καὶ προέμψυς[α]ν αὐτὰ, IG II², 1006, lines 4, 74; cf. 1008, line 8 (restored); 1011, line 8; 1028, lines 9–10; 1030, lines 6–7; 1030, line 6; 1040, line 1. The meaning here seems to be “escort the sacred objects” in a procession. See C. Pélèkides, Histoire de l’éphébie attique (École Française d’Athènes, Travaux et Mémoires XIII), Paris 1962, pp. 222–224. Cf. also IG IV² 1, 47, lines 8–11, τὰ λαρ[ὲ]να τὰ τῶν Ἀστυπαλα[ῖων] πέμπεσθ’[ἐν] εὖν τὰ[ῖ] τῶν Ἐπαθαρίου[ν] [πο]πατάκα καὶ θέν τοῖς θεοῖς.
clause will refer to the procession from Argos to Nemea at the time of the festival of Nemean Zeus (Pausanias, ii.19.5) and to the procession out to the Argive Heraion which Herodotos immortalized in his story of Kleobis and Biton (i.31).

At the beginning of line 10 the Aspendian theoroi seem to be granted some further honor. While no convincing restoration can be built on the single epsilon: καλίσθαι Ε[...]ν[...]ν[...], the only examples of this very common type of formula which I have found in Argive decrees are the following: καλίσθαι[ε]̣ς προ[εδρίαν τούς Διονυσίους] (SEG III, 312 [Mykenai, ca. 200 b.c.]); ἐς προεδρίαν καλίσθαι Διονυσίους (IG IV, 497 [Mykenai, ca. 197–195 b.c.]). It would be fitting at this point in our decree to grant the Aspendians prohedria; the spacing is right for this restoration.

In line 10 I have restored ἐπιμέλεσθαι on the basis of ἐπιμέλεσθαι δὲ καὶ in line 12. Our text by itself is perhaps too laconic to permit any certain conclusions about the singular τῶν ἀγωνοθέτων in lines 10–11, but there is at least an implication here that at this date the same official had both the Nemeia and the Heraia festivals under his care. L. Moretti has drawn a similar inference from a clause in the decree in honor of the Rhodians (SEG XIX, 317): καρδζαὶ δὲ τῶν στέφανον Ἐκατονθύουσι τῶν ἀγωνοθέτων ἐν τοῖς ἀγῶνι τῶι γυμνικῶι, καρδζαὶ δὲ καὶ Νεμέοις τῶν ἀγωνοθέτων ἐν τοῖς ἀγῶνι τῶι γυμνικῶι (lines 19–21). “L’ agonoteta delle Heraia e delle Nemei è la medesima persona, e le due festività si svolgono in età ellenistica in tutti gli anni dispari a. C., rispettivamente nella seconda metà di giugno (Heraia) e nella prima metà di luglio (Nemei)” (ISE I, p. 94). In 209 b.c. Philip V of Macedon held the curatio of both festivals (Livy, xxvii.30.9). Ca. 114 b.c. King Nikomedes Euergetes of Bithynia was agonothetes of both celebrations (SEG II, 53, from the Heraion). In Roman times one agonothetes certainly presided over both the Nemeia and the Heraia, IG IV, 589, 597. The 3rd-century b.c. decree in honor of Alexandros of Sikyon (SEG XXV, 362) shows that the same board of ten Argive Hellanodikai also officiated at both festivals: τῶν δὲ Ἐλλανοῦδ[ικα]ς τῶν Νεμέων καὶ Ἡραίων τῶν ποτεχεὶ καρδζαὶ ἐν τοῖς ἀγῶν[ε]τοι τῶν Ἡραίων καὶ Νεμέων (lines 16–18).35 In a list of agonistic officials of the 2nd–3rd centuries after Christ from Argos we find a γροφέας δὲ ἀμφοτέρων τῶν ἀγῶνων.36 In a long series of honorary decrees for foreigners beginning at least as early as ca. 318–315 b.c. the Argives make their proxenoi θεαρδοδόκου τοῦ Δίου τοῦ Νεμέα καὶ τᾶς Ἡρας τᾶς Ἀργείας.37 All this evidence points to the conclusion that the official named in our lines 10–11 probably had charge of both the Nemeia and the Heraia festivals.

The four hiaromnamones (line 11) are familiar from several Argive inscriptions.38 Since ἐπιμέλεσθαι takes the genitive case, the accusative plural — — ἵνα γυμνοῦται, which follows the gap in line 11, will modify its subject, and the object will be τῶν θεαρδῶν

36 Charneux, op. cit., p. 605.
37 See Amandry, BCH, Suppl. VI, p. 245.
understood. The missing fragment from the middle of the stele has left a gap in this line ca. 0.165 m. in width between IAPOMN and ΤΥΓΧΑΝΟΝΤΑΣ, i.e. ca. 15–16 letters. This can be reduced to ca. 10–11 letters when we restore ιάρομυν[άμονας] and probably to ca. 6–7 letters if we insert τοῦς/τῶν with the participle. There is still room in this line of ca. 50 letters for a modifier of τυγχάνοντας and possibly a prepositional prefix. I suggest [τῶν ἀεὶ ἄντι]τυγχάνοντας, “those who are currently in office.” It seems clear from the general context and from the end of line 12, τὸν ἂπαντα χρόνον, that the arrangements are intended to be permanent; future magistrates will have been forewarned.

**Lines 12–13:** The agonothetes and the hieromnamones are instructed to take care of the theoroi from Aspendos when they come to sacrifice to Zeus at Nemea and to Hera (lines 8–11). Now the aliaia is told to look after the Aspendians in general “for all time.” The preserved letters in line 12 are more closely spaced than those in the preceding lines of text, and the gap between the two surviving fragments is ca. 0.133 m. wide, leaving room for a restoration of ca. 13–14 letters. The four surviving letters ΝΣΑΣ might be interpreted as an accusative plural ending, perhaps parallel to τῶν ἀλιαίαν which is the subject of ἐπιμέλεσθαι. We might very tentatively suggest [καὶ τὰς ἀρχὰς ἀπάντως, or as C. Kritzas suggests, [τὰς ἄρτυνας]. Assembly and magistrates may both have been given instructions to look after the Aspendians. For the accusative of the extent of time, without a preposition, the only Argive parallels are, again, in SEG XIX, 317, the decree for the Rhodians, line 11, χρόνον πολύν; line 14, τῶν ἐμπροσθὰ χρόνου; line 15, τὸν λοιπὸν χρόνον.

In line 13 after the genitive τῶν Ἀσπενδιῶν, which is the object of ἐπιμέλεσθαι, I have interpreted the sentence as running on to include the protasis αἱ τί καὶ δὲ[ωνταί]. The Aspendians will be the subject of this clause, “if they should request anything.” Δέομαι in this kind of context usually takes a genitive (τινος) and not τι as here, but in the Attic decree IG I3, 101 (410/09 B.C.) we find τὸς τε στρατευόντος ὁ ἄν υἱὲ κατηκοστοτε ᾧ[ρχοι πάντας ἐπιμέλεσθαι αὐτῶν ἡτὶ τὴν δέονται (lines 53–54).

The text of our lines 10–13 helps us now to understand better and to restore the lost Argive decree, IG IV, 480, which was found near the temple of Zeus at Nemea in 1884. I suggest that this inscription, which concerns the people of Seriphos, is to be restored with a line of ca. 30 letters in length as follows:

```
ἐπιμέλεσθαι
θαὶ δὲ τῶν [ἀγωνοθέταν καὶ τῶν ἱαρό]
μυμάμονας [τῶς ἀεὶ ἄντινθανόντα]
ς ἐπιμέλεσθαι [δὲ έε.16. — —]
5 ΣΑΓΩΝΣΑΝΣ [τὸν ἂπαντα χρόνον τῶ]
ν Σερφίων, αἱ [τί καὶ δέονται καὶ τίς καὶ χρόνο]
αἱ<ζ>η<ι> Σερφίων [- - - - - - - - ]
```

7 lapis ΑΙΠΗΣ.

39 Cf. IG IV, 554 (Halieis), ἡ δὲ βολὰ ποτελάτο ἀντινυχόνος, “the council which is in office . . .”; IG IV, 521; SEG XI, 301 (Argive Heraion), [τοῖς — — — — — τοὺς ἀντινυχόντας; IG IV2 1, 66, lines 56–59 (Epidauros), τὰς δὲ ἀναγορεύσις τοῦ στεφάνου τῶν ἐπιμέλειας ποιεῖσθαι τοὺς ἀεὶ ἀντινυχόντας δαμιογοὺς καὶ τοὺς ἀγωνοθέταν καὶ τοὺς ἑλλανοδίκας; Syll.3, no. 479, lines 9–10 (Delphi).
40 E.g. at Athens, IG II2, 1, line 10; 110, lines 14–18; 448, line 47, all with ἐπιμέλεομαι.
Since we have no photograph or drawing of the letter forms, it is impossible to assign a date to this inscription, but the similarity in phraseology to our decree for the Aspendians might indicate that this document is roughly contemporary with it. It is even possible that the privileges here granted to the people of Seriphos included some of those extended to the Aspendians, such as citizenship and the right to live in Argos. In IG IV, 480, M. Fraenkel observed “De ἀγώνσιας (vs. 4) non iudicare praestat, antequam confirmetur lectio.” Perhaps, then, ἐπιμέλεσθαι [δὲ τὰν ἀλλαίαν καὶ τὰς ἀρχὰς ἀπὸ <ἀντί>νυς (?) or [τὰς ἀρτύνας]. Connections between Seriphos and Nemea in the 4th century B.C. are attested by the theorodokos Euarchos of Seriphos in the recently discovered list of theorodokoi from Nemea, see footnote 24 above.

Lines 13–15: Aspendians, upon request, will be permitted to live in Argos as long as they pay the same taxes as the Argives, and reference is made in the καθάπερ clause to a reciprocal agreement about Argives living in Aspendos. Since they have been given citizenship in this decree, Aspendians will not live in Argos as metics, paying a metoikikon tax. For the wording, which is new to Argive official language, see SIG3, 941, lines 11–17, Magnesia, 3rd century B.C., εἰς τὸν τίς Φωκα[ίων] ἐνοικία ἐμ Ἐκατονταῖ[α, εἰναι αὐτῶν γῆς καὶ ὀικίας ἐντολὴν τελευταῖα ὁ Μ]άγνης τελεῖ. For this usage of the verb χρήζω cf. ICr III (Itanos), p. 90, no. 8, lines 24–25, αἱ τίς καὶ χρήζη τούτων τι[ν]οιε[ῖν]. The καθάπερ clause seems to cite a current arrangement for Argives living in Aspendos which had been previously established, no doubt by a decree of the Aspendians; it is not an enabling clause instituting a new arrangement. How much earlier than our decree such a document might have come into existence in Aspendos is impossible to say. It would be interesting to know how many Argives were actually living in Aspendos at this time and why, and how many Aspendians exercised their option of establishing residence in Argos. I find no mention of Argives, however, in the meager literary and epigraphical record from Aspendos, and our decree is the first evidence for Aspendians at Argos. The mention of the people of Soloi and the Rhodians in lines 6–7 raises the possibility that similar reciprocal arrangements existed between Argos and these two states. Relations with the Rhodians were particularly close, as we have seen from the long Argive decree in their honor (SEG XIX, 317).41 Mention should also be made here of the suggestion of S. G. Miller (Hesperia 46, 1977, p. 21) that a block inscribed 'Ποδίων which was found at Nemea may belong to one of the oikoi whose foundations he has excavated to the south of the Temple of Zeus.

Lines 15–18: Most surviving Argive decrees were inscribed on a single stele which was erected in the sanctuary of Apollo Lykeios. Here too were to be found stelai which carried the names of Argive citizens arranged by tribe, phratry, and pentekostys.42 The remains of

41 Cf. also SEG XVII, 142, an Argive decree of the 3rd century B.C. in honor of the Rhodian [. . .] stratos, son of Aristonymos. Another Argive decree before 169 B.C. for the Rhodian Timarchos, son of Ariston, is attested in the Lindian inscription, Lindos II, no. 195. See also the good discussion of Argive influence on Rhodes by C. Blinkenberg, Lindos II, coll. 1011–1015.

42 In the honorary decree for Alexandros of Sikyon the strategoi are instructed to record his grant of citizenship as follows: ἐν τῶν στάλαντι τῶν ἔρωτοι τοῦ Ἀπόλλωνος τοῦ Λυκείου, ἐκ τοῦ ἄλλου πολίτη γεγράβατο, ἐν τῷ φυλᾶν καὶ φάταν καὶ πεντηκοστόν, ἀν καὶ αὐτὸς προσάραξε, SEG XXV, 362; Moretti, ISE I, no. 41. W. Vollgraff's view (Mnemosyne 44, 1916, p. 67) that inscribed lists of citizens were the hallmark of an oligarchic regime has been questioned by L. Moretti, loc. cit., who suggested that the lists
the sanctuary apparently still elude the excavators, but its location in or near the agora is proved by the publication formula of the treaty joining together Athens, Argos, Mantinea, and Elis in 420 B.C. In the publication formulas of Argive decrees the sanctuary is designated as έν τωι ιαρῳ τοῦ 'Απόλλωνος τοῦ Λυκείου or έν τωι τοῦ Λυκείου ιαρῳ. In the publication formulas of Argive decrees the sanctuary is designated as έν τωι ιαρῳ τοῦ 'Απόλλωνος τοῦ Λυκείου or έν τωι τοῦ Λυκείου ιαρῳ.

Instructions to erect a stele at Nemea are rare in surviving Argive decrees. In addition to the five or six published decrees found at Nemea itself, the only other example is, significantly, the honorary decree for the Rhodians (SEG XIX, 317) which has, as we have seen, already shed considerable light on the interpretation of our text. It is also the only other decree which calls for three stelai to be set up, the third being in a sanctuary of Hera, lines 27–29, ἄγγραψαι δὲ τὸ δόκημα ἐν στάλαισι λιθίναις καὶ ἀνθέμεν ἐν τωὶ ιαρῳ τοῦ 'Απόλλωνος τοῦ Λυκείου καὶ [παρ] Ἰραία καὶ ἐν Νεμέαι. This triple disposition of the stelai clearly underlines the importance of these two decrees. The ties with Rhodes and Aspendos were made manifest; it is possible that the benefits enjoyed at Argos by the people of Soloi, briefly mentioned in our line 7, were also proclaimed on three similar stelai.

The new text from Nemea contains the most complex publication formula of any known Argive decree, for in addition to the three stelai set up in the sanctuaries of Apollo Lykeios, Zeus at Nemea, and Hera, instructions are given for the name of the people of Aspendos to be added in inscription τὸ τελαμώνα τὸν ἐν τῶι τοῦ Λυκείου ἱππῶν ἵππων τὸν βασιλικὸν τοῦ Λυκείου καὶ τὸ τελαμώνα τοῦ βασιλικὸν τοῦ Λυκείου καὶ τὸ τελαμώνα τοῦ Λυκείου καὶ τὸ τελαμώνα τοῦ Λυκείου. It is clearly to a specific telamon that reference is made, not merely to inscribing the name “on a telamon.” The telamon in question is also already inscribed, since the people of Aspendos are being added to it (ποταμηκοτρίκων). It is not the decree (τὸ δόκημα τόδε) which is to be written up on the telamon, but only the words ὁ δὰμος τῶν Ἀσπενῳ βιῶν, and since the main purpose of our document is to confer citizenship en bloc on the Aspendians, it follows that their name is to be added to an existing list of Argive citizens. There was, then, in the sanctuary of Apollo Lykeios a telamon on which the Argives inscribed the names of those to whom they had granted

44 Thucydides, v.47.11; cf. schol. Eupides, Helen, 6; Pausanias, ii.19.3–5, and other testimonia.
45 IG IV, 559; SEG XIII, 240; XVII, 142; XIX, 317; XVI, 255; XXV, 362. Cf. SEG XXVI, 426.
47 IG IV, 479, 480; SEG XXIII, 178(?), 183, 184; XXV, 356. Among the few small fragments of decrees from the current excavations of the University of California, Berkeley, there is none which preserves part of a publication formula.
48 The restoration [παρ] Ἰραία, instead of Vollgraff’s [παρ] Ἰραία, Mnemosyne 44, 1916, p. 221 (followed by F. G. Maier, Griechische Mauerbauschriften I, p. 147, no. 33, and L. Moretti, ISE I, no. 40) is due to G. Daux and P. Charneux, BCH 81, 1957, p. 684. It is also found in line 4 of a list of athletic victories which they publish.
Vollgraff, Maier, and Moretti all print ἀνθέμεν ἐν τῶι ιερῶι in the decree for the Rhodians, but it is clear from the excellent photograph published by P. Amandry (BCH, Suppl. VI, p. 225) that the stone has ΑΝΘΕΜΕΝ ΕΝ ΤΩΙ ΙΑΡΩΙ. P. Charneux (loc. cit.) had pointed out that Vollgraff’s own majuscule copy has ΑΝΘΕΜΕΝ.
citizenship, but it seems clear from the wording of lines 15–18 that this telamon was distinct from the stone stele which was also set up here in order to publish the full text of the citizenship decree for the Aspendians.49

A close parallel to the situation we have inferred from lines 15–18 of the decree from Nemea is provided by another Argive decree, SEG XXV, 362, from which I have quoted in footnote 42. Here reference is made to stelai in the sanctuary of Apollo Lykeios which carried the names of “the other citizens.” Alexandros of Sikyon, who is honored with a grant of citizenship in this decree, is to have his name inscribed on these stelai by the strategoi (lines 10–13), whereas the text of the decree itself will be inscribed on a separate stele to be erected in the same sanctuary (lines 18–20).

There is no mention of a telamon in the almost completely preserved decree for Alexandros,50 but the close parallel with the decree from Nemea is not, I think, weakened by this fact. It might have been the case that the names of individual new citizens were written up on stelai in the sanctuary of Apollo Lykeios, whereas recipients of en bloc grants had the name of their state inscribed on the telamon which stood there. Since the two decrees in question are not contemporary, they may also reflect two different but basically similar procedures separated from each other by a period of time. The fact that the decree for Alexandros appears to be about 50 years later than the Aspendos decree would permit the hypothesis that new citizens whose names were previously recorded on the telamon were later listed on stelai.51

The prefix of the infinitive ποταναγράψαι prompts speculation as to what other names the list of citizens on the telamon contained before the words ὀ δᾶμος τῶν Ἀσπενδίων were added to it. From the clause καθάπερ κ[α]ὶ τοῖς Σολεντίοι in line 7 and the proximity of the reference to the Rhodians in line 6, it might be inferred that grants of citizenship en bloc at Argos to the citizens of these two poleis antedate the decree for the Aspendians. Other possible candidates might have been the people of Corinth, who were given Argive citizenship in 392 B.C.,52 the people of the small town of Harma in Boiotia,53 and perhaps others of whom we have no record.

Although lines 16–17 contain the first evidence we have for a telamon in the sanctuary of Apollo Lykeios, this is not the only mention of a monument of this type at Argos, for in IG IV, 517, of ca. 460–450 B.C., we learn of a telamon in the Argive Heraion. This text is inscribed on what its first editor54 described as a “massive block of limestone” which is

49 For a good discussion of the verb προσαναγράψω see S. Alessandri, AnnPisa 10, 1980, pp. 1150–1151.
50 In addition to the references in footnote 42 there is a useful discussion of this decree by P. Amandry, BCH, Suppl. VI, pp. 226–229, with a photograph of the stone and part of the top left corner of a squeeze.
51 For a discussion of the date see Amandry, loc. cit.
53 Strabo, IX.2.11 (c 404); cf. Philochoros, FGrHist, no. 328, f 113. W. Gawantka (Isopolitie [Vestigia 22], 1975, pp. 93–94), finds Strabo’s words “so konfus, dass sie sich kaum verwerten lassen.” In addition to Alexandros of Sikyon, individual grants of Argive citizenship are attested for Eukles of Corinth, ca. 247–244 B.C., SEG XIII, 212, and Gnaeus Octavius, ca. 170 B.C., SEG XVI, 255.
broken at the bottom but has a low pediment preserved at the top. Since it is 0.39 m. wide and 0.28 m. thick, the fragment clearly belonged to a pillarlike object which could have stood to a considerable height. Above a list of four hiaromnamones representing the four Argive tribes the text begins with the words [h]a στάλα : καὶ ὁ τελαμὸν | [i]αρὰ : τὰς ἡπάς : τὰς Ἀργεΐ [l]ας. Stele and telamon were, therefore, separate objects, and most scholars have followed the view summed up by C. D. Buck (The Greek Dialects, p. 282, no. 82):

On the face of the stone, just below the inscription, is a rectangular cutting, with dowel holes, evidently intended for the reception of a tablet. This was the stela, while the τελαμὸν, properly “support, pedestal,” refers to the whole stone in which the στάλα was set, and which itself would be called a στήλη in Attic. In several inscriptions from the region of the Euxine τελαμὼν is actually used as the equivalent of στήλη... This use is doubtless of Megarian origin.

Since the rectangular cutting which contains the dowel holes is only 0.005 m. deep, it seems likely that any object mounted in it would have been made of bronze or lead rather than stone.

Bearing in mind that this monument from the Argive Heraion is separated in time from our new Nemean stele by about 150 years, we might tentatively suggest that there was in the sanctuary of Apollo Lykeios a large pillarlike stone called a “telamon” on which, probably under a prominent heading, were inscribed the names of states (and possibly individuals) to whom Argive citizenship had been granted. Perhaps in some way it supported a “stelae” or stelai, like its earlier counterpart in the Argive Heraion, but I should prefer to conclude from the wording of lines 15–18 in our decree that it was an object distinct at any rate from the stone stele inscribed with the text of our decree which stood in the same sanctuary.

Line 18: As is usually the case at Argos, the proposer of the decree comes last.\\n
---

Roehl, Imagines inscriptionum graecarum antiquissimarum, Berlin 1907, p. 39, no. 14; F. Solmsen, Beiträge zur griechischen Wortforschung, Strassburg 1909, p. 76; W. Vollgraff, Mnemosyne 58, 1930, pp. 28–30; SEG XI, 303; LSAG, p. 170, no. 32.

55 Much greater than its preserved vertical dimension of 0.44 m.
56 For a list of references to these texts see Fraenkel, IG IV, 517; P. Girard, REG 18, 1905, pp. 14–19, 29–30; Solmsen, op. cit. (footnote 54 above), pp. 74–78; L. Robert, “Études d'épigraphie grecque,” RevPhil, 1936, p. 130, note 8; idem, Hellenica 7, 1949, pp. 32–34, no. 2; idem, Hellenica 10, 1955, pp. 17–28, nos. 5–6. Many examples from the Euxine are listed in the indexes, s.v. τελαμών, of G. Mihailov, Inscriptiones graecae in Bulgaria repertae and the Corpus inscriptionum regni bosphorani, Moscow 1965.
57 This was suggested by Richardson, op. cit. (footnote 54 above), p. 48. Bronze was used for official documents at Argos in the Archaic period, see IG IV, 506, a legal text from the Heraion (LSAG, p. 168, no. 9); SEG XII, 239, a proxeny decree from Argos (LSAG, p. 169, no. 22). Cf. M. H. Jameson, “A Treasury of Athena in the Argolid (IG IV, 554),” ΦΟΡΟΣ: Tribute to Benjamin Dean Meritt, Locust Valley, N.Y. 1974, pp. 67–75, on IG IV, 554. See also the cuttings for the many bronze plaques which were attached to the architrave of the Hypostyle Hall in the agora, J. des Courtis, “Note de topographie argienne,” BCH 105, 1981, pp. 607–610.
58 Exceptions are to be found in BCH, Suppl. VI, p. 261, no. 3, where the orator comes after the groopheus in line 3; IG IV, 559, where the beginning is lost and there is no orator at the end. In two very short proxeny decrees the orator is not recorded, SEG XIII, 239; BCH, Suppl. VI, p. 259, no. 2. The long decree in honor of Alexandros of Sikyon, which has other formulaic peculiarities, lacks the name of the proposer, SEG XXV, 362.
Between Ἐλεξε Ἕμηλος and the other preserved letters in this line, [Ἀ]σπένδιος ΕΛ[---], the surface of the stone is so badly pitted and scarred that I have been unable to recover any more letters. The width of this gap, ca. 0.12 m., leaves room for a restoration of ca. 11–13 letters.

In published Argive decrees the name in the concluding formula Ἐλεξε δεῖνα is followed by one of the following elements: (1) patronymic,59 (2) kome,60 (3) phratry,61 (4) phratry and kome,62 (5) patronymic and kome,63 (6) patronymic and phratry and kome.64 There is no example in published Argive decrees of the orator’s name standing alone at the end. We should, therefore, probably restore a patronymic, or the name of a kome or a phratry before Ἐλεξε Ἕμηλος.

If we reconstruct this line as Ἐλεξε Ἕμηλος [patronymic Ἀσπένδιος ΕΛ[---], however, a serious constitutional obstacle immediately arises. How could a foreigner have proposed a decree in the Argive aliaia, particularly one which bestowed Argive citizenship and other benefits on his own compatriots? We might consider two possibilities:

(1) Eumelos was an Argive citizen who had previously been awarded citizenship in Aspendos and here, appropriately, made his dual citizenship explicit by adding the ethnic Aspendios to his name. His Argive status could not in this case have been left obscure. Perhaps, then, Ἐλεξε Ἕμηλος [patronymic Ἀσπένδιος ΕΛ[Argive kome or phratry] or Ἐλεξε Ἕμηλος Ἀργείος καὶ Ἀσπένδιος ΕΛ[---].

(2) Eumelos held only Aspendian citizenship but he was a joint (honorary?) proposer of the present decree together with a bona fide Argive citizen. In support of this possibility is the spelling of his name, whereas we might have expected Ἕμαλος for an Argive, and the fact that, although the name is otherwise unattested at Argos, it was extremely popular in Aspendos and elsewhere in Pamphylia.65 On this theory, the name of the Argive citizen who officially proposed the decree would have been recorded in line 18 after Ἀσπένδιος where I have been able to read only ΕΛ[---]. Between the lambda and the right edge of the stone there is room for about 10 or 11 letters, and it is possible that more letters once stood at the beginning of “line 19” where the surface is, in my view, too badly damaged to permit unquestioned readings.66 There is room, therefore, for the necessary name of a kome or a phratry which would identify this hypothetical second proposer as an Argive citizen.

59 SEG XIII, 240; BCH, Suppl. VI, p. 256, no. 1.
60 SEG XI, 1084 (twice); XVII, 143; XIX, 317.
61 BCH, Suppl. VI, p. 261, no. 3.
63 SEG XIII, 241; XVII, 142, 144.
64 SEG XIII, 242; Mnemosyne 43, 1915, pp. 365–371, nos. A, B.
65 L. Robert has studied this name and demonstrated, with characteristically rich documentation, how prevalent it was in Aspendos (Noms indigènes dans l’Asie-mineure gréco-romaine, Paris 1963, pp. 373–432). This whole chapter is a fundamental source of information on the activities of Aspendians abroad; they served in large numbers as mercenaries in the Hellenistic period. See footnote 82 below.

The name Eumelos is attested elsewhere in the Peloponnese, e.g. the famous Corinthian poet, G. Kinkel, Epicorum graecorum fragmenta, Leipzig 1877, pp. 187–192; Jacoby, FGrHist, no. 451; the first king of Patrai, Pausanias, vii.18.2; at Mantinea, IG V 2, 278; Megalopolis and Lykosoura, ibid., 518, 519; Alipheira, SEG XXV, 447; for another possible Corinthian Eumelos buried in Megara, IG VII, 135.

66 In the second letter space of line 19 there seem to be traces of an omega, but I do not feel confident enough about this reading even to print a dotted letter in the text.
There are contemporary parallels at Argos for two proposers of the same decree, e.g. SEG XIX, 317 (Rhodians), line 82, ἑλέξε Θών Πομονίς, Μενέδαμος Ἀσίνα; XI, 1084 (Pallantion) where the formula is repeated twice, lines 25–27, 40–41, ἑλέξε Θύκριτος Κολοπύς, Νικόδαμος Σκληρύς. Since in both cases the singular verb was not repeated, there is no need to assume that the letters ΕΑ[- - -] in our line 18 must belong to a second ἑλέξε. We must remark, however, that in both these instances of joint proposers of a single decree the men in question were all Argive citizens. The anomaly of an Aspendian jointly proposing a decree in the Argive aliaia remains, and I have not found parallels which would support this theory.

A third possibility is that Aspendios in line 18 is a personal name formed, as frequently happened, from the ethnic. We would then have to assume the happy coincidence of an Argive citizen who joined in proposing a decree for the city after which he had once been named. On this theory line 18 might then be reconstructed as ἑλέξε Εὔμηλος [kome or phratry, Ἀσπένδιος [kome or phratry]. Formally, this restoration stands closest to the two parallels of decrees moved by two Argives which I have quoted above. For Ἐλα[αφῶν] as a possible restoration of an Argive phratry see J. Caskey and P. Amandry, “Investigations at the Heraion of Argos, 1979,” Hesperia 21, 1952, p. 217.

Lines 20–21: With the possible exception of a few letter spaces at the beginning of a putative line 19, there is an uninscribed space 0.03 m. in height extending across the width of the stele below line 18. Below this blank area there are the remains of two more lines of text above the broken bottom edge of the surviving fragments. As far as I can judge, the lettering here is the same as that in lines 1–18 and ought to be contemporary. The content too of lines 20–21 and possibly more text now lost ought to be related to the decree for the Aspendians, since on other Argive stelai where one decree has been inscribed below another, the different contents of the lower text are indicated by a heading in larger letters. If these labels are valid, the large heading at the top of our stele [Ἀσπένδιον] (see p. 196 above) should apply to lines 20ff. as well as to the decree we have already considered.

Since the surviving letters at the beginning of line 20 do not conform to the opening formula of any published Argive decree, they are probably best interpreted as belonging to a rider or supplement to the decree which stands above them. There are to my knowledge only two Argive decrees which do not end with the normal ἑλέξε δεῖνα formula:

(1) Meiggs and Lewis, GHI, no. 42, Argos, Knossos, and Tylissos, ca. 450 B.C. in which the end of B is as follows:

τοὶ Τυλίσιοι ποι νὰν στάλαν ποιγραψάνος τάδε·
αἰ τις ἄρικνικότι Τυλισιν ἐν Ἄργοις, κατὰ ταύτα
σφιν ἕστο ἑαπερ Κνοσίοις.68

67 For examples see Vollgraff, Mnemosyne 43, 1915, pp. 365–371, nos. A, B; p. 372, nos. C, D; p. 375, nos. E, F. In “Inscriptions d’Argos,” BCH 82, 1958, pp. 5–13, P. Charneux published two Argive decrees which were inscribed side-by-side on the same stone with a heading at the top of the one on the left and another label at the end of the one on the right, SEG XVII, 142, 143.

68 Unlike the instruction in our decree to inscribe the name of the people of Aspendos on the telamon, the three-line rider here is added to the same stele.
(2) SEG XI, 1084, from Pallantion, ca. 318–316 B.C., in which after the ἐλεές formula
the text resumes in line 27 without a break, and the words ἤμεν δὲ καὶ προεύνους καὶ εὐερ-
γέταις τῶν Ἀργείων... introduce a rider 15 lines in length which ends in lines 40–41 with
a repetition of the ἐλεές formula from the end of the decree proper.

Not enough survives on our stele even to hazard a guess as to the contents of a presumed
rider to the decree for the Aspendians. I have considered the possibility that ἐκ τοῦ τε-
λε[---] could be restored as ἐκ τοῦ Τελε[ον], which occurs as part of an adjournment
dating formula at the beginning of the Argive decree from Pallantion, SEG XI, 1084.
Against this supplement, however, is the fact that there seems to be a diagonal stroke in the
top left corner of the space after ΤΕΛΕ; epigraphically it could belong only to Υ or Ψ.
ΤΕΛΕ[---] could be the beginning of a name or, perhaps more plausibly, τελεύ[ταῖον];
e.g. [ἡμεν] τάδε ἐκ τοῦ τελεύ[ταῖον] or [κυρία] τάδε ἐκ τοῦ τελεύ[ταῖον]. Since,
however, these few letters could also be interpreted as τάδε ἐκ τοῦ τε λεύ[---], it is proba-
bly idle to speculate further.

DATE

In seeking a date for this inscription we shall employ three different criteria: (1) cir-
cumstances of discovery, (2) letter forms, (3) historical setting.

A terminus ante quem is set by the archaeological context in which the three joining
fragments of this stele were discovered. After these pieces were broken up and separated
from the rest of the original monument, they were thrown into a well near the southwest
corner of the Temple of Zeus along with a great mass of other miscellaneous debris,
including a substantial fragment of a list of theorodokoi for the Nemean Games. The debris
seems to represent violent activity which resulted in the destruction of at least these two
important Argive documents. On the basis of a preliminary study of the pottery and coins
found with this debris Stephen G. Miller has placed the filling-in of the well after the
middle of the 3rd century B.C., ca. 240 B.C. or later, and he has plausibly connected it with
the strongly anti-Argive restoration of the games to the Nemea valley under the presidency
of Kleonai which was carried out by Aratos of Sikyon, probably in 235 B.C.69 At some
unknown date earlier in the 3rd century B.C. the games had been moved from Nemea to
Argos where they had been celebrated until the intervention of Aratos. The Argive decree
for the people of Aspendos, therefore, cannot be any later than ca. 235 B.C.

Dating of Greek inscriptions on the basis of letter forms alone is a risky undertaking
even when abundant, dated comparanda are available.70 It is even more dangerous at Argos
where inscriptions of the 4th and early 3rd centuries B.C. which can be securely dated are
very few indeed. Among Argive decrees of this period only the following can be fixed with

69 For this date see K. J. Beloch, Griechische Geschichte IV, ii, Berlin 1927, p. 529; M. T. Mitsos, Πολιτική ιστορία τοῦ Ἀργοῦ, Athens 1945, p. 80; R. Urban, Wachstum und Krise des Achäischen Bundes (Historia Einzelschriften 35), 1979, p. 71.

70 For a good example from Athens where on the basis of letter forms two of the most experienced Attic epigraphists of this century assigned dates ca. 110 years apart to two fragments of the same inscription see CSCA 7, 1974, p. 292, note 30. When the two fragments were later joined, A. Wilhelm’s date proved to be ca. 36 years earlier, and B. D. Meritt’s ca. 74 years later, than the archon date preserved on the stone.
any certainty: SEG XXX, 355, an honorary decree for Pamphilos of Athens, ca. 323–300 B.C.; SEG XI, 1084, decree in honor of the Pallantians, ca. 318–316 B.C. Other published Argive inscriptions which can be dated to roughly this same period include SEG XXIII, 189, a list of theorodokoi from Argos, ca. 330 B.C.; IG IV, 583, a statue base in honor of King Nikokreon of Kypros, 321–311 B.C.; SEG XXV, 366, dedication of an Argive thiasos in 303 B.C.; SEG XXIII, 186, dedication of a shield from the spoils of the victory over Pyrrhos in 272 B.C. (from Mykenai). Many more Argive inscriptions have, of course, been assigned to the 4th and 3rd centuries by scholars, but, to my knowledge, only in the case of those which I have listed has there been general agreement as to their dates.

While the lettering on the decree for the Aspendians is in general similar to that found on most of the stones listed above which belong to the last quarter of the 4th century B.C., it does seem to resemble most closely the letter forms of the decree for the Pallantians, ca. 318–316 B.C. Resemblances include the fairly widely spaced alpha, beta with the bottom loop slightly larger than the top, delta and smaller omicron and omega which ride high in the line, wide eta, nu with the right vertical not reaching the bottom of the line and protruding above the top, broad, low pi, and the very similar sigmas. On this most subjective criterion, then, our decree could tentatively be placed in the last quarter of the 4th century or in the early years of the 3rd century B.C.

As far as I have been able to determine, the newly found decree from Nemea provides our only evidence for contact between Argos and Aspendos after the colonization of the latter by the former. In seeking a historical setting for this document, therefore, we must rely on inferences drawn from its text and from a few other sources. The text itself contains for us no certain indication of date, either in the opening formula or in the names of the presiding officer of the council (line 3) and the proposer(s) (line 18). Argos, however, at the

---

71 I leave aside the stele that carries the two decrees for Zoilos of Smyrna and Eukles of Corinth which W. Vollgraff (Mnemosyne 43, 1915, pp. 371–374, nos. C. D) wished to date to 248–246 B.C. and 247–244 B.C. respectively. His dating criteria do not seem to me to be conclusive, and there is, as far as I know, no published photograph or facsimile of the letter forms. Cf. the sound criticisms of M. T. Mitsos, op. cit. (footnote 69 above), p. 103, note 5.

72 For the date see Piérart and Thalmann, BCH, Suppl. VI, no. 3, with photograph. I am indebted to Paula Perlman who let me examine an excellent squeeze of this beautifully carved inscription.

73 Guarducci, ASAtene 3–5, 1941–43, pp. 141–151; Moretti, ISE I, no. 52; Nouveau choix d'inscriptions grecques, Paris 1971, no. 9. Piérart and Thalmann (footnote 72 above) remind us of the possibility that the stele could have been set up some years after the events described.


75 The first photograph of this famous inscription was published by P. Amandry, BCH, Suppl. VI, pp. 218–220. Cf. Moretti, ISE I, no. 38.


78 The lettering on two other Argive inscriptions is in general similar to that on our stele from Nemea, but I have not listed them in the text since their dates are still in dispute: (1) SEG XIX, 317, the oft-mentioned decree in honor of the Rhodians, (2) IG IV, 616, a list of fines imposed by Argos on the Arkadian koinon. I believe that the former belongs in the last quarter of the 4th century B.C. (see p. 215 below) and that M. Piérart ("Argos, Cléonai et le koinon des Arcadiens," BCH 106, 1982, pp. 119–138) has argued persuasively that the latter belongs to the same period.
time of this decree was master of its own affairs to the extent of conferring citizenship and substantial other privileges on a far-away Pamphylian state. Earlier, she had also granted similar honors to the people of Rhodes and Kilikian Soloi (lines 6–7). The decree clearly shows that the aliaia of Argos was functioning at what must have been full strength, for it not only passed the decree but it is to the aliaia that the Aspendians (and the Rhodians and Solieis) had preferred access, after sacred matters had been discussed, and the aliaia is charged in line 12 with taking care of Aspendian requests “for all time.” Furthermore, at the time of the decree Aspendos is sending theoroi to Argos and to Nemea to sacrifice to Argive Hera and Nemean Zeus together with the Argives. The latter clearly have control over both these festivals. Argive agonothetai and hiaromnamones are given instructions to look after the Aspendians at the festivals, and the Argive state sets up a copy of the decree at both of these sanctuaries.

If these inferences about the prominence of the aliaia are sound, we could extend backwards the archaeological terminus ante quem of ca. 235 B.C. to ca. 255/4 B.C., the date at which the powerful 3rd-century B.C. tyranny was established at Argos. It is very unlikely that our decree was carried out under one of the autocratic rulers who controlled the state from this date until ca. 223 B.C.79 and who may have been responsible for moving the celebration of the Nemean Games from Nemea to Argos.

Unfortunately inferences drawn from the fact of Argive control over the Nemean Games cannot provide an exact earlier terminus for the date of our decree. Although Stephen G. Miller has persuasively shown that the Nemean Games were probably not held at Nemea from the end of the 5th century B.C. until the 330’s when a new building program marks their return to the Nemea valley,80 the circumstances of that return and whether it was achieved under the presidency of Argos or of the near-by polis of Kleonai, or possibly as a joint effort of both states, still remain conjectural.81 For our purposes a terminus post quem roughly in the 330’s, therefore, is as precise an inference as the evidence in our decree for Argive control over the Nemean Games permits us to draw. General historical considerations suggest, then, the limits of ca. 330’s–255/4 B.C. for the date of the decree. If the lettering is a reliable criterion, we may narrow this down to ca. 330’s—ca. 300 B.C.

We know virtually nothing about the history of Aspendos at this period except that in 333 B.C. Alexander the Great exacted hostages, horses, and a huge sum of money from the

79 For these dates see M. T. Mitsos, op. cit. (footnote 69 above), pp. 75–78; J. Mandel, “À propos d’une dynastie de tyrans à Argos,” Athenaum 57, 1979, pp. 293–298. I cannot find in Plutarch, Pyrrhos, 30 the evidence for J. A. O. Larsen’s assertion that this passage shows that Aristippos was tyrant of Argos as early as 272 B.C. (Greek Federal States, Oxford 1968, p. 310). Mitsos’ demonstration that the decree in honor of the Rhodians, SEG XIX, 317, could also not have been passed under the tyrants is not, in my view, invalidated by the objections raised by P. Amandry (BCH, Suppl. VI, p. 224, note 27).


81 On this complex question which cannot be discussed here see Miller’s paper (ibid.); Amandry, BCH, Suppl. VI, pp. 245–250; Piéart and Thalmann, ibid., pp. 264–269, with good earlier bibliography; M. Walbank, “The Decree for Lapyris of Kleonai,” Classical Contributions: Studies in honour of Malcolm Francis McGregor, Locust Valley, N.Y. 1981, pp. 171–175; Piéart, op. cit. (footnote 78 above), pp. 119–138. Paula Perlman and Stephen G. Miller will discuss this problem in detail in their forthcoming publication of the list of theorodokoi which was found in the same well as the decree for the Aspendians.
inhabitants and made them subject to his satrap.\textsuperscript{82} Also, sometime \textit{ca.} 300 \textsc{b.c.} the Aspendians changed the legend on their copious issues of silver coins from \textit{'Ekpeftéivs} to \textit{'Aaspév-
\textsuperscript{83} It is possible that the adoption of the Greek form of the name on the coins coincided roughly with the reaffirmation of the city's ties to its metropolis which is reflected in the decree from Nemea.

Whatever its date, it is clear that the Argive decree for the Aspendians was not an isolated venture into diplomacy with an eastern Mediterranean state. References to the Rhodians and to the people of Kilikian Soloi in lines 6–7 indicate that the honors voted for Aspendos were part of a larger undertaking in which Argos was strengthening existing bonds with at least these two other states. We are not informed by other sources about the timing and motivation of these contacts with Soloi and Aspendos, but the Argive decree in honor of the Rhodians, \textit{SEG XIX, 317}, is of more help. I have often commented above on the close similarities between this important document and the recently discovered decree from Nemea. They exhibit the same form of heading in large letters at the top of the stele (genitive plural of the ethnic). They both contain the formulation \textit{δ ἐκ οὐγγενεῖς}, the reference to \textit{όνειρος τῶν Ἀργείων}, the particular publication formula, the use of the accusative of extent of time without a preposition, and (probably) two proposers with \textit{ἐκέξε} at the end. It is difficult to conclude that the two decrees are widely separated in date.

Several dates have been proposed for \textit{SEG XIX, 317}, some as late as the middle of the 3rd century \textsc{b.c.},\textsuperscript{84} but the most convincing reconstruction is that of L. Moretti (\textit{ISE I}, pp. 90–94, no. 40) who places the decree in the last quarter of the 4th century \textsc{b.c.} He plausibly suggests that upon expelling the Macedonian garrison immediately after the death of Alexander the Great,\textsuperscript{85} the Rhodians sent substantial financial aid to Argos ("and to the other Greeks," lines 7, 19) at the time of the Lamian War. The Argives had requested these funds

\textsuperscript{82} Arrian, \textit{Anabasis} 1.26.2–27.4 The Aspendians also probably suffered a reduction in the size of their territory at Alexander's hands. For an acute assessment of the financial burden inflicted on the Aspendians see E. Badian in \textit{Ancient Society and Institutions: Studies Presented to Victor Ehrenberg on his 75th Birthday}, Oxford 1966, pp. 49, 65, notes 50, 51.

There does not appear to be any precise connection between Argos and the Aspendian decree of the early 3rd century \textsc{b.c.}, \textit{SEG XVII, 639}, which awarded citizenship to a number of mercenaries from Greece and elsewhere. See R. Paribeni, P. Romanelli, \textit{MonAnt} 23, 1915, pp. 116–120 (photograph); M. Launey, \textit{Recherches sur les armées hellénistiques} (Bibliothèques des écoles françaises d'Athènes et de Rome 169) II, Paris 1949, p. 656, with earlier references. R. S. Bagnall (\textit{The Administration of the Ptolemaic Possessions Outside Egypt}), Leiden 1976, pp. 110–113) has persuasively shown that the date of 301–298 \textsc{b.c.} often assigned to this decree is not certain.


\textsuperscript{85} Diodoros, \textit{xviii.8.1}, with Moretti's note. We are not informed about the reaction of the Aspendians to the news of Alexander's death, but if the satrap and garrison he had left there were still in the city at that time, the Aspendians may well have been eager to expel them. For Alexander and the people of Soloi see Arrian, \textit{Anabasis} ii.5.5–8; xii.2. For his treatment of near-by Mallos, another Argive colony, and Alexander's claim of descent from the Argive Herakleidai, see \textit{ibid.}, ii.5.9.
to rebuild their walls and revitalize their cavalry. It would have been appropriate for the Argives to reciprocate at this point by conferring on their kinsmen the honors which are obliquely mentioned in line 6 of our decree. Sometime later the Rhodians sent an embassy to Argos to reaffirm their loyalty to their mother city, and in response the Argives voted the gold crown for the people of Rhodes which is announced in SEG XIX, 317. Copies of the decree authorizing this award were to be set up at Nemea, in the Argive Heraion, in the sanctuary of Apollo Lykeios in Argos, and in Rhodes. Since this decree was passed χρόνον πολίτων (line 11) after the Rhodians sent aid to Argos, we should allow for an interval of several years after Moretti’s suggested date of ca. 322 B.C. This would still permit a date in the last quarter of the 4th century B.C., and this is roughly the time of a list of donors from Lindos86 which includes the name of one of the ambassadors mentioned in SEG XIX, 317, Athanadoros, son of Thrasonidas. It is much more economical to follow Moretti and M. Piérart87 in this identification than to invent a homonymous grandson and then use him to date the decree for the Rhodians half a century later.

If the decree for the Rhodians can in this way be placed in the last quarter of the 4th century B.C., the recently discovered stele from Nemea recording the privileges voted by Argos for Aspendos cannot be separated from it by a long interval of time. Here probably will also belong the decree for the people of Soloi whose existence we have inferred from line 7. There may have been others. Let us hope that future discoveries will produce more information on the eastern policy of Argos at this time.
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