THE ATHENIAN STATE SECRETARIAT AND PROVISIONS FOR PUBLISHING AND ERECTING DECREES

ABSTRACT

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

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

THE SECRETARIES

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

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

1. For discussion of the secretaries, see Ferguson 1898, pp. 14–27; Rhodes 1985, pp. 134–141; 1993, pp. 599–605. The bulk of the research for this article was done in the Penrose Library in the British School at Athens during my tenure of the 2001 Visiting Fellowship. I am deeply grateful to the Director, David Blackman, and his colleagues at the School. I am also pleased to acknowledge the helpful comments and suggestions of Hesperia’s two anonymous reviewers.

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

3. In 363/2, four prytanies (II, VI, VII, and that of Aiantis) all have the same secretary, Nikostratos of Pallene: see Dinsmoor 1931, p. 351, n. 3.
no longer a bouleutes. In 356/5 (IG II² 128), commencing with VII Kekropis, the annual rotation of the secretaries in official tribal order was inaugurated.⁴ New, and as yet unpublished, evidence indicates that the old arrangement with ten secretaries each year persisted at least until the year of the archon Kephisosodoros (366/5).⁵ This evidence not only brings down the previously held lower limit from 368/7, but also explodes Ferguson’s hypothesis that the secretaries of the decade 366/5–357/6 also came each from a different tribe, not in official order, but in a random sequence determined by the lot.⁶

It is only after the alteration in the term of the Secretary’s office from one prytyan to one year that we first encounter a new title, ὁ γραμματεύς ᾽ kukατά πρυτανεῖαν, the Prytan Secretary.⁷ At first sight, it may appear incongruous and puzzling that, now that the State Secretary no longer serves for a single prytyan alone but for a whole year, he is nevertheless designated κατὰ πρυτανεῖαν. But this rests on a misconception: κατὰ πρυτανεῖαν does not mean “throughout (one) prytyan,” but rather, as Ferguson saw, “prytyan by prytyan,” referring to the Secretary’s function throughout the succession of the ten pnytanes of the year.⁸

This new title is first clearly met with in IG II² 120, an inscription of the year 353/2.⁹ At lines 15–16, τὸν γραμματεύς τόγ κατὰ τῆς [πρυτανείας] is instructed, along with τοὺς ἀδύν βαραίματες τρεῖς τοῖς ἑπτὰ τοῖς διήμηνοις γράμμασιν, to make copies of the inventory of treasures in the Chalkotheke. It is not until a little later—IG II² 210 + 259 (349/8); IG II² 223A (343/8)—that we first find him explicitly charged with the duty of publication and erection of a decree.¹⁰

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

---


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

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

7. At Ath. Pol. 54.3 the γραμματεύς κατὰ πρυτανεῖαν is the only title explicitly mentioned, although we may reasonably assume that the secretary who, we are told, was previously elected (πρότερον ... οὕτως ἃ γεροφιλοτέχνος) is the official whom we find designated as the γραμματεύς τῆς βουλῆς. Ath. Pol. tells us that “now” the secretary is chosen by sortition (νῦν δὲ γέγονε κληροτέχνος). It is likely that the change from election to sortition occurred at the same time as the shift from a tenure of a single prytyan to an annual one.

8. Ferguson 1898, p. 36.


10. Note that IG II² 223C, lines 1–2, [γραμματεύς κατὰ πρυτανείαν] | Κλεοστάτου Τιμοσθένους Αιγιλοῦ, taken in conjunction with the fragmentary prescripts in IG II² 224 and 225, both also of the year 343/2, proves that the grammatheus kata prytyanian was a designation for the principal State Secretary.

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

dealing with two distinct officials, with separate titles and separate—or overlapping—functions.\(^\text{13}\)

One piece of evidence is central to this issue, namely, the inscription already adduced above (\textit{IG II}\(^\text{2}\) 120), related to the inventory of the treasures in the Chalkotheke. For, in the words immediately following the lines cited above, we read:

\[\text{ἐπειδὴ δὲ ἐξετασθῇ πάντα καὶ \[\text{αἱ} \] ἀναγραφῆι τὸν γραμματέα τῆς βουλῆς ἀναγράφοντα [ἐν] στήλη λιθίνη στήσει ἐμπροσθεν τῆς χαλκοθήκης[\text{κ}]}.\]

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

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

Although incidence of mention of the secretary entitled γραμματεύς τῆς βουλῆς as the officer responsible for the publication of decrees decreases steadily as the 4th century progresses, replaced in favor of the secretary entitled γραμματεύς κατὰ πρωτοτείνας, it is certainly misleading, indeed false, to suggest or imply that we hear no more of the former designation after 318/17.\(^\text{15}\) For it is unquestionably found well into the 3rd century, e.g., \textit{D} 75, line 34 (\textit{paulo post} 286/5);\(^\text{16}\) \textit{SEG XIX} 389, lines 1–2 (\textit{ca. med. s. III}).\(^\text{17}\) However, the totally restored example at \textit{Agora XVII} 77, lines 32–34 (280–275), ἀναγράφατο δὲ τὸν γραμματέα τὸν τῆς βουλῆς ἐν στήλη λιθίνη, should be regarded with suspicion, partly because of the anomalous formulation with the repeated definite article\(^\text{18}\) and partly for the reasoning employed to justify the restoration. For Meritt and Traill rejected Dow’s objection to the late date for mention of this officer on the grounds that “the funds for [inscribing the decree] were to come from the moneys at the disposal of the Council,” a curious justification.\(^\text{19}\) Dow’s caution in assuming omission of five letters from the title of the ptytan secretary is preferable; he also noted that the space could be exactly filled with καὶ τὰ ὁνόματα τῶν πρωτανέων.\(^\text{20}\) This is not so fanciful: instances of the omission of any reference whatsoever to the secretary do occur.\(^\text{21}\)

Apart from the activities of the secretaries designated τῆς βουλῆς and κατὰ πρωτοτείνας, we find that, during the two brief periods of political
turbulence at Athens in the years 321/20 to 319/18 and 294/3 to 292/1, it was the ἀναγραφεῖς who assumed the status of eponymous secretary and the duties of publishing decrees of the boule and demos. Prytany secretaries do make an appearance in decree prescripts of the first of these periods, but they have lost their annual status, being chosen for a period of one prytany only from among the members of the prytanizing tribe. 22

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

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

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

THE PROVISION FOR INSCRIBING AND ERECTING

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

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

23. As Woodhead (Agora XVI, p. 191) notes, Rhodes 1985 does not specifically discuss this secretary, although his note 3 (Rhodes 1985, p. 136) might be taken to imply that the secretary is to be identified with ὁ γραμματεύς τῆς βουλῆς καὶ τοῦ δήμου, i.e., the Reader. Rhodes (1995, p. 600) states baldly that, apart from the two periods of ἀναγραφεῖς, “the title γραμματεύς κατὰ προταναίαν became standard (until in the second century a.d. it gave way to a new title περὶ τὸ βήμα).” This is somewhat imprecise, at least in so far as the designation of the secretaries responsible for inscribing and erecting decrees goes.
24. See Ferguson 1898, pp. 63–66 and Brilliant 1911, pp. 37–49; also Hesperia 10, 1941, pp. 270–271, no. 70, with n. 10; cf. D 64 and Agora XVI 121.
Conscious of the fact that there is an obvious chronological overlap at all periods except before ca. 365 B.C.—given that instructions for the inscribing and erection of stelei are assigned to more than one secretary (or, at least, to secretaries with more than one title)—I have concluded that the evidence will be most easily intelligible and digestible if it is presented in categories divided according to the various (titles of) secretaries.

**The Secretary of the Boule**

(ὁ γραμματεύς ὁ τῆς βουλῆς)

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

Our earliest piece of evidence is perhaps IG I 10, lines 22–26, the Phaselide decree, dated 469-450 in the Corpus:

\[το \ ψήφισµα τὸς, \ \] ------stoich. 22
\[το \ ψήφισµα τὸς, \ \] ------stoich. 22
\[ἐν \ ἐµ \ πόλει \] ------stoich. 22

Here the instructions commence by specifying what is to be inscribed, τὸ ψήφισµα τὸς, followed by the instruction to inscribe the decree, here in the imperative. Next comes the secretary himself, of necessity in the nominative case, and, be it noted, with the article repeated; he is ὁ γραμματεύς ὁ τῆς βουλῆς. Then appear the material to bear the inscribed text, a stele of stone, expressed by ἐν + dative, the instruction to erect the stele,

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

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

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

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

32. The imperative will, of course, eventually give way to the infinitive (ἐναργώνων) construction.

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

34. But note IG II 687 (+ 686), line 43 (265/4), ἐν στήλῃ χαλκῆς.

35. ἐν + accusative is almost as common as ἐν + dative. Cf. IG I 98 (411), where at line 13 we find ἐν στήλῃ χαλκῆς, and at lines 27–28 ἐν τὴν αὐτὸτὴν στήλην.
expressed by the verb κατατάθημα,\textsuperscript{36} and finally, the location, ἐμ πόλει,\textsuperscript{37} on the Acropolis, totally restored here, but equally totally certain.

Thus, all six constituent elements are present, in a pattern that can most simply be described as O(bject)–V(erb)–S(ubject).\textsuperscript{38} This pattern seems to have been one to commend itself in the 5th century: compare, for example, the more elaborate but essentially identical IG I\textsuperscript{3} 78, lines 48–51 (ca. 422?), the decree on the Eleusinian Firstfruits:

stoch. 50

τὰς δὲ χαυνηραφίας καὶ τὸ φαιόρισμα τόδε ἀναγραφότα ἀναγράφοι τῇ γαρ γραμματείᾳ τῆς βολῆς ἐν στέλαιν διόνυσιν λιθίνα.

ν καὶ καταθέτο τὸν μὲν Ἑλευσίν ἐν τῷ ιερῷ, τέν δὲ ἑπέτρεψεν [ἐ]

μ πόλει:

The same sequence is found in the accusative and infinitive construction, e.g., IG I\textsuperscript{3} 65, lines 5–7 (ca. 427/6):

stoch. 30

[ὁ γραμματέα τῆς ὑποβολῆς ἐν στέλαιν λιθίνα]

[ἐνεὶ καὶ καταθέτο[ν] ἐν πόλει].

Compare IG I\textsuperscript{3} 106, lines 19–21 (409/8):

stoch. 50

τὸ δὲ φαιόρισμα τόδε ἀναγγέλλοι τὴν γραμματέα τῆς βολῆς ἐν στέλῳ λιθίνης καὶ καταθέναι ἐμπόλει.

and IG I\textsuperscript{3} 110, lines 20–24 (408/7):

stoch. 23

[ὁ δὲ ψήφισμα τὸ ἀναγγέλλοι τὴν γραμματέα τῆς βολῆς ἐν στήλῃ λιθίνης καὶ καταθέναι ἐμπόλει.

A more elaborate wording, but recognizably the same pattern, is seen in IG I\textsuperscript{3} 40, lines 57–63 (446/5):

stoch. 32

[ὁ δὲ ψήφισμα τὸδε καὶ τῶν ἱέρων ἀναγγέλλοι. Ἀθέναι μὲν τὸν γραμματέα τῆς βολῆς ἐστέλλει λιθίνης καὶ ἀσταθεῖται ἐς πόλει τέλεσι τοῖς Χαλκιδῶν, ἐν δὲ Χαλκίδῳ ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ τὸ δῶς τὸ Ὀλυμπιόν ἥ τοις Χαλκιδιοῖς ἀναγγέλλοι.]

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

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

38. The wording for the erection will regularly, but not invariably (cf., e.g., IG I\textsuperscript{3} 153, lines 19–21 [440–425]), follow on after the principal instructions for the inscribing have been given.
Here, of course, we have provision for inscribing and erecting both at Athens and at Chalkis, which accounts for some of the variation. We may note too the switch from the accusative and infinitive to the nominative and imperative, which is paralleled, with the reverse switch, in IG I² 156, lines 19–26 (440–425):

\[
\text{περί [8]} \quad \text{stoich. 23}
\]

\[
\text{ἐ Λεονίδῳ τὰ ἐφεσαρμένα ἄν} \\
\text{σταρφάστο ὁ γραμματεύς τῇ} \\
\text{ζ βολές τέλεσι τοῖς Λεονίδῳ} \\
\text{ἐν στέλλαι διοῦν, καὶ τέν μὲν} \\
\text{ιντεράν στέσαι έμι πόλει, τὲ ν} \\
\text{δε ἦντεραν ἐν ἡλικαρνασσὼ} \\
\text{ι ἐν τῷ ήμερῷ τῷ Ἀπόλλωνος—}
\]

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

To return briefly to IG I² 40, it should also be observed how, in lines 62–63, the formulation has been converted from ἀναγράφαι καὶ καταθέναι τὸ ἀναγράφασα (participle) καταθέτο. This syntactically “reduced” form is encountered not infrequently in the 5th century, as well as occasionally in the 4th. 41

In the 5th century we also find the sequence V–Ο–S, with the infinitive, for example, IG I² 66, lines 20–22 (427/6):

\[
\text{kai ἀναγράφαι σα ταύτα τὸν γ} \\
[\rhoα]μματεά τῆς βολές ἐστέλει λιθίνει καὶ καταθβ] \\
\text{ἔναν έμι πόλει—}
\]

where the restoration ταύτα is confirmed by the resumptive ταύτα μὲν ἀναγράφαι in lines 22–23. Compare the slightly different IG I² 98.I, lines 26–28 (411):

\[
\text{προσσανα] Stoch. 30}
\]

\[
[\gamma]ράφαι δὲ καὶ τόδε τὸ φή[φισμα ές τήν σ] \\
[ο]τήν στήλην τόν γραμματεά τῆς βολές].
\]

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

\[
\text{non-stoich.}
\]

\[
\text{ἀναγράφαι δὲ τίς το} \\
[ε τῷ φή[φισμα τόν γραμματεά τής [βου]λής] ἐν στήλη λιθίνη} \\
[ι καὶ α]τήσαι ἐν ἀκροπόλει. 
\]

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

39. See n. 33 above.
40. The heavily restored and not entirely secure IG I² 163, lines 3–7 (440–415) appears to move from the imperative ἀναγράφασατο to the infinitive καταθέναι.
41. See p. 103 below.
42. Indeed, as we shall see, this sequence is by far the commonest with all (titles of) secretaries.
and, with the variation of the phrase “on a stele of stone” appearing before, rather than after, mention of the Secretary, IG II² 232, lines 20–23 (340/39):

\[
\text{ἀναγράφασι]\text{[\(\lambda\)} \text{δὲ τόδε τὸ ψῆφισμα ἐν στήλῃ λιθίνῃ καὶ καὶ αὐτῶ}{\text{ι}]} \text{ἐν ἀκροπόλει}\]
\]

\[
\text{SEG XL 74, lines 24–27 (337/6):}
\]

\[
\text{kαὶ ἀναγράφασι]\text{[\(\lambda\)} \text{δὲ τὸν νόμον ἐν στήλαις λιθίναις δυοίν τὸν γραμματέα τῆς βουλῆς καὶ στήσαι τῇ μὲν ἑπὶ τὸν ἐσίσθου τῆς εἰς Ἀρειῶν Πάγον τῆς εἰς τὸ βούλευσθαι εἰσίνοιν, τὴν δὲ ἐν τῷ ἐκκλησία}
\]

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

\[
\text{ἀναγράφασι}\text{[\(\lambda\)} \text{δὲ τὸν γραμματέα τῆς βουλῆς καὶ στήσαι ἐν ἀκροπόλει'.}
\]

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

\[
\text{[καὶ ἀναγράφασι αὐτῶι τῷ προξενίαν] \text{[ἐν στήλῃ λιθίνῃ τὸν γραμματέα τῇ μὲν ἑπὶ τὸν βούλης καὶ στήσαι ἐν ἀκροπόλει].}
\]

and IG II² 149, lines 17–20 (342):

\[
\text{43. Cf. also IG II² 660.1, lines 19–22 (c. IV, \textit{pars prior}); II² 204, lines 54–57 (352/1); II² 212, lines 44–47 (347/6), with τὸ ψῆφισμα τόδε; II² 410, lines 37–39 (ca. 330); \textit{Agora} XIV 49, lines 55–57 (328/7); IG II² 343, lines 17–19 (323/2).}
\]

\[
\text{44. Although, of course, the very existence of the stone shows that this was the intention.}
\]

\[
\text{45. See Pečirka 1966, p. 29, for the text (cf. SEG XXIV 78).}
\]
In addition to these predominating sequences we also find the following two sequences:

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

> τὸ δὲ φήμισμα τόδε ὁ γραμματεύς
> ὁ τῆς βολῆς ἄναγραφότα τὸ στήλη λιθὸς
> νηπιαὶ καὶ καταθέτων παρά τὸν Ἴδα τὸν Ἑλέου
> θέρκον

2) S–V, so IG II² 176, lines 17–20 (ca. 378/7):

> δὲ γραμματεύς ὁ τῆς
> βολῆς ἄναγραφότα ἐν στήλῃ λιθὸς
> νηπιαὶ καὶ καταθέτω τοῦ
> ἀκροπόλεως

a proxeny decree, where the object of ἀναγραφότα is to be supplied from the immediately preceding proxeny grant in the form ἔνας [δὲ] αὐτὸ[ν] προξε[νον κτλ.

Finally, we come to a form of the publication and erection provision where no separate verb of erecting is expressed, producing the so-called "telescoped" formulation. This form warrants special treatment, given the importance of the chronological arguments based on it by Harold Mattingly.47

With the orthodox dating, our earliest instance of this phenomenon is in the notorious Egesta decree, IG I³ 11, lines 11–12 (458/7), where the restoration seems beyond challenge:

> τὸ δὲ φροσφισμα τόδε καὶ τὸν [ἱόρχο]λα[ν] ἄναγραφο[φα]ν
> ἐστέλλει λιθίνα ἐπὶ πόλει τῆς ἰκαμματεία τῆς βολῆς

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

46. For the same pattern, V–O–S, with the Prytany Secretary, see below, pp. 104–106.
47. See Mattingly 1984, pp. 344–345.
and the equally uncertain \textit{IG I}\textsuperscript{3} 125, lines 29–32 (405/4):

\begin{verbatim}
τι] stkch. 29
[ὁ] δὲ ψήφισμα τόδε ἀναγράφας τὸν γραμ.
[μ]ιατέα τής βολῆς ἐμ πολέε ἐν στήλῃ]
[λ]θηνι.
\end{verbatim}

Mattingly is, of course, happy to accept the readings of these two texts since the point he wishes to establish is that the “telescoped” form is not paralleled before ca. 420. If he can do so, this isolates \textit{IG I}\textsuperscript{3} 11 (Egesta) if it is retained in the early 450s.

It is for this reason that he seeks to \textit{remove} the phenomenon where it has been restored in texts earlier than the 420s. Thus, in the case of the Kolophonian decree, \textit{IG I}\textsuperscript{3} 37, lines 38–40 (447/6),\textsuperscript{48} given in the Corpus in the following form:

\begin{verbatim}
[tʰ] δὲ ψφισμ[α τόδε και τὸν δρακ[ον ἀναγράφατο ὁ γραμ.]
[μι]ατε[ς ὁ τες β[ολες] ἐστελει λιθινει ἐμ πολει τέλεσ]
[ι] τι[ος Κολοφο[ν]ν
\end{verbatim}

Mattingly would prefer, on the basis of the appearance of the participle ἀναγράφας(τες (line 41) plus the imperative καταθέτικον (line 42), to read, à la Hiller (\textit{IG I}\textsuperscript{3} 14/15, lines 26–27):

\begin{verbatim}
stoich. 38–42
[tʰ] δὲ ψφισμ[α τόδε ἀναγράφας ἐστελει λιθινει ὁ γραμ.
[μι]α[τες ὁ τες β[ολες] καταθέτο ἐμ πολει Ἄθενεσι τέλεσ]
\end{verbatim}

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

Likewise, in the decree about Erythrai, \textit{IG I}\textsuperscript{3} 15, lines 42–44 (ca. 450), Mattingly would prefer not to follow the Corpus in reading

\begin{verbatim}
stoich. 47
ἀναγράφας δὲ ταῦτα καὶ τὸν ἥν]
ἐτ.
\end{verbatim}

but instead, again on the model of Hiller (\textit{IG I}\textsuperscript{3} 12/13), he would read at lines 43–44:

\begin{verbatim}
\end{verbatim}

As for the fragmentary and uncertain \textit{IG I}\textsuperscript{3} 70, lines 3–4 (430–420),

\begin{verbatim}
tὸ δὲ [ψφισμα τόδε ἀναγράφας ἐν στήλῃ λιθίν]
[η] ἐμ πολέε τὸν [γραμματέα τής βολῆς - - - - - - - - ]
\end{verbatim}

\textsuperscript{48} Which Mattingly would place ca. 427.

\textsuperscript{49} Note the anomalous word order.
where not even the line-length is secure,\textsuperscript{50} Mattingly favors a much longer line,\textsuperscript{51} which would permit an alternative formulation that eschews the telescoped form. He may well be correct.

Mattingly is still left with the awkward Eleusinian Epistatai decree, \textit{IG} I\textsuperscript{3} 32, lines 32–34 (ca. 449–447),\textsuperscript{52} in which there is no escaping the telescoped format:

\begin{verbatim}
γράφοσαι δὲ τὸ [φασέρια] \\
μα ἐν στέλει Ἕλευσίνι καὶ[ε ἀστει καὶ Φ] \\
\end{verbatim}

This, manifestly, is an extremely compressed and abbreviated publication provision,\textsuperscript{53} and Mattingly argues that it was the specification of three separate locations and the consequent need to specify three different groups of officials that led the drafter to take the easy way out in extreme brevity.\textsuperscript{54}

Thus, Mattingly sees this as a special case, not to be adduced as a normal instance of the telescoped form appearing earlier than ca. 420.

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

We may note here that, in \textit{proxeny} decrees, where the grant is expressed with \textit{ἀναγράφασαι}\textsuperscript{56} and where the publication and erection are combined with the grant itself, the formulation is often telescoped: compare, for example, \textit{IG} I\textsuperscript{1} 27, lines 5–11 (ca. 450/49):\textsuperscript{57}

\begin{verbatim}
Ἀ[. . . . . 10 . . . . . καὶ τό] \\
ζ ἀδελφός [τῶς ἔχειν τῶς δὲλ] \\
φῶς καὶ τῶι [πατέρα αὐτῶν ἀνα] \\
γράφοσι τὸν [γραμματέα τῆς β] \\
ολές ἐμ πόλει[τι] ἐστέλει καὶ ἐν] \\
τῷ βολευτε[ρίου προχεινός] \\
Ἀθηναῖόν κτ.
\end{verbatim}

\textit{Agora} XVI 11 (\textit{IG} I\textsuperscript{1} 155), lines 4–9 (435–430):\textsuperscript{58}

\begin{verbatim}
Κρίσονα [. . . . . . . . 16 . . . . . .] \\
δελφος καὶ Δεξ[. . . . . ἀναγράφασαι πρ] \\
οχῖονο καὶ εὑ[εργέτας ἐν στέλει λ] \\
uθίζει ἐμ πόλει [καὶ ἐν τοῖ βολευτε] \\
μιο[ες σανίδα τὸν γραμματέα τῆς β] \\
ολές τέλεσι το[ις . . . . . 14 . . . . .]
\end{verbatim}

and \textit{IG} II\textsuperscript{2} 13a + 68 + \textit{Hesperia} 40, 1971, pp. 149–150, no. 3 (\textit{SEG} XL 54), lines 7–12 (399/8):

\begin{verbatim}
Ἄριστε \\
[αὐ τὸν Ἀ]ξα(τ)όν τὸν Ἄγια ἄνα
\end{verbatim}

\textsuperscript{50} “De vv. paulli longioribus e v. 5 fortasse cogitandum est” (Lewis).


\textsuperscript{52} Mattingly prefers a date not before 433/2.

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

\textsuperscript{54} Mattingly notes that even \textit{καθιπάτες} is omitted.

\textsuperscript{55} See, most recently, Henry 1998.


\textsuperscript{57} Mattingly inclines to a date in the 420s.

\textsuperscript{58} See Henry 1983, p. 117, for the text.
Contrast the non-telescoped formulations in IG I' 174, lines 5–11 (425–410):

\[
\text{Δὐκώνα ὁν Ἀχαι ἐπειδὴ ἐδο ποιεὶ Ἀθηναῖοι} \\
\text{καὶ ἐφεργήτων Ἀθηναίων} \eta \text{ης} \\
\text{αὐτῶν καὶ ἑκάστος} \eta \text{ς βολὴς καὶ x} \\
\text{αὐτήν ἠθέτω ἐμ} \text{πόλις} \text{οὐ}
\]

and IG I' 80, lines 12–18 (421/0):

\[
	ext{kai an} \\
\text{agorapha to prōzexenon kai} \\
\text{eφεργητων Ἀθηναίων καθα} \\
\text{περ Πολύστατον τον Φλει} \\
\text{άσιον ἐστέλει λυθεὶς ὁ γρ} \\
\text{αμματεῖς ὁ τῆς βολῆς κα} \\
\text{i καταθέτω ἐμ} \text{πόλις} \text{οὐ}
\]

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

\[
\text{και ὁν \gammaραμματέα τῆς βολῆς} \\
\text{εν στήλῃ ἴναπερ κτλ.}
\]

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

\[
\text{και [λ] ἀνα[γραφ]} \\
\text{αι αὐτός ἐστήλη[λι λυθί]} \\
\text{νη τόν γραμματέα tῆς} \\
\text{βολῆς ἐν ἀχρόπολεί[ν]}
\]

and IG II 238, lines 14–17 (338/7):

\[
\text{ἀναγράφαι δὲ τόδε τὸ ψήφισ} \\
\text{[μα τόν γραμματέα τῆς βολῆς ἐ} \\
\text{[]} \\
\text{[νυν]}
\]

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

60. Here the object is to be supplied from the preceding provision (lines 8–9) ἐπαινέσεις: Ἀστέαι τὸν Ἀλεξάν, with which αὐτός ἀναγράφατο is coordinated.

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

62. SEG XXXIX 75b, lines 9–12 (353/2) appears to be an example of the telescoped form, but the tentative restoration of line 12 cannot be correct: τόδε τὸ γραμματεῖα τῆς βουλῆς ἐπὶ τὸν ἀχρόπολεί: τόδε τὸ ψῆφισμα ἐστήλῃ λυθεῖς [ποι[α]νω και στή[σας] τέλει[σα] τοις Να[.]]. If the location ἐπὶ ἀχρόπολεῖ is correctly restored in line 10, we will not expect to find the instruction to erect, στήσας, later in line 12.
We may conveniently round off this discussion of the various formulations employed during the tenure of office of the Secretary of the Boule by a brief examination of the form in which the instruction to attend to the inscribing of the decree is reduced from the imperative/infinitive to a participle.  

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

\[ \text{ὁ δὲ γραμματεύς ἐς τῆς βολῆς \[ de ἀναγράφασας ἐς τῆς βολῆς] \[ τέλει λιθίνει x\]ατ \[ αὐτό μὲν πόλει] νυκτί \]

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

\[ \text{καὶ τόδε τὸ [ψήφισμα ἀναγράφας ὡς ὁ γραμματεύς ἡ τῆς βολῆς] \[ ν] \[ στήλη λιθίνη ἡ\[ x\]ατ\[ α\]θέτω ἐμ πόλει} \]

and IG I' 84, lines 26–28 (418/17):

\[ \text{τὸ δὲ φασέρισμα τόδε, ὅποις ἐν ἔτι εἰδέναι τῷ[ι] βολομένῳ, ἀναγράφασα \[ ζ ὁ γραμματεύς ἡ τῆς βολῆς ἐν στήλει λιθίνει καταθέτο} \[ ἐν τῷ Νελεί \[ οἱ παρὰ τὰ ἱππαῖρα]} \]

A parallel formulation is found in IG I' 40, lines 61–63 (446/5), where, after a regular ἀναγράφασα + καταθέσαι provision for the publication of the decree and oath at Athens (lines 57–61), the instructions for the equivalent procedure at Chalkis are given in the “reduced” form:

\[ \text{ἐν δὲ Χαλκίδι ἐν τῷ νομῷ τῷ Διὸς τῷ} \[ Οὐλομπιίῳ ἡ βολὴ Χαλκίδεον ἀναγράφασα καταθέτο} \]

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

\[ \text{kαὶ καταθέσαι ἐν [πόλει] ἐς ἀναγράφασαν τὸς ἡ\[ ρ\]ατεATORY̆ς \[ θ\]ος καὶ [τῆς συνθέσει] ἐς τὸ γραμματεύς] \[ τ ἐς βολῆς [.] [.] [.] [18] [.] [.] ἐν στήλει λιθί} \[ [ν]ει} \]

63. Already briefly introduced on p. 97 above.

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

65. For the collaboration of the generals and Secretary, cf. IG I' 127, lines 38–39 (405/4): ἀναγράφασι δὲ τὰ ἐψηφισμένα τὸν γραμματέα τῆς βολῆς μετὰ τῶν [στρατηγῶν ἐστήλη λιθίνη καὶ καταθέθειναι ἐς τόλμην].
The Prytany Secretary
(ὁ γραμματεὺς ὁ κατὰ πρυτανείαν)\(^{66}\)

Although we find occasional examples of the sequences S–V–O, for example, *IG II*² 354, lines 26–29 (328/7):

\[
\text{τὸν δὲ γραμματέαν}^{67}\quad \text{stoich. 34}
\]

\[
\text{τὸν κατὰ πρυτανείαν ἀναγράφασαι τὸδὲ τὸ ψῆφῳ}
\]

\[
\text{φημια ἐν στήλης λιθίνη καὶ στήσας ἐν τοῖς}
\]

\[
\text{ιερῶι τοῦ Ἀσκληπιοῦ.}
\]

and *IG II*² 653, lines 52–54 (285/4):

\[
\text{τὸν γραμματέα τὸν}^{68}\quad \text{stoich. 36–38}
\]

\[
\text{[κατὰ π]ρυτανείαν ἀναγράφασαι τὸδὲ τὸ ψῆφῳ
\]

\[
\text{μα[κα]τὰ λιθίνη καὶ στήσας ἐν ἀκροπόλει:}
\]

V–S–O, in a proxeny grant, *IG II*² 57, lines 1–9 (*ante* 387/6):

\[
[- - ἀναγράφασαι]^{69}\quad \text{stoich. 11–14}
\]

\[
[i] \text{τὸν [γραμματ.]}
\]

\[
\text{ἐὰν τῆς βουλῆς ἕν}
\]

\[
\text{ν στήλης λιθίνης}
\]

\[
\text{ἐὰν τόλμησι προφέρειν}
\]

\[
\text{ους καὶ εὐδεργητὴν}
\]

\[
\text{ας αὐτούς καὶ ἕκεν}
\]

\[
\text{γόνως τῆς πόλεως}
\]

\[
\text{τὸς τῆς Ἀθηναίων}
\]

\[
\text{v}
\]

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

\[
\text{non-stoich. ca. 38–44}
\]

\[
\text{τὸ δὲ ψῆφῳ[μ]α τὸδὲ ἀναγράφασαι τὸν γραμματ.]}
\]

\[
\text{[μα[τέα τὸν] κατὰ πρυτανείαν [εἴ]ς στήλην λιθίνην καὶ ἀνα}
\]

\[
\text{[θείναι παρὰ] τὴν εἰκόνα.}^{68}
\]

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

66. There are, in fact, no examples of the nominative and imperative with this official, only of the accusative and infinitive. Invariably, he appears as τὸν γραμματέα τὸν κατὰ πρυτανείαν, with doubled article. It may be noted here that, at *IG II*² 463, lines 31–32 (307/6), we find ἀναγράφασαι δὲ τὸ ψῆφῳ[μ]α τὸν κατὰ πρυτανείαν γραμματέα, a designation of the Secretary that may also be required at *IG II*² 551, lines 13–14 (*paule ante* 307/6) and at *Agora* XV 322, lines 25–26 (ca. A.D. 120). This rare word order, also introduced in *IG II*² 564, lines 6–7, is rightly eschewed by Woodhead at *Agora* XVI 111, line 19 (307/6–302/1 (*sed vix post 306/5?*))

67. For the intrusive intervocalic iota and the accentuation, see Thretat 1980, pp. 151–152.

68. Cf. the heavily restored *IG II*² 1019, lines 36–37 (*fin. i. II*).
Secretary are far less numerous than those where the phrase comes after
the Secretary. For the former, see, for example, D 22 (IG II2 222), lines
26–29 (ca. 334):

\[\text{ἀναγράψαι δὲ τὸ διά τὸν ἰστόριον καὶ στήσαι} \]
[\[\text{[α] εἰς στήλην λιθίνην τὸγραμματὲα [ε]}
[\[\text{[α] τὸν κατὰ πρωτανείαν καὶ στήσαι [εν] ἀκροπόλην}

\[\text{Hesperia 43, 1974, pp. 322–323, no. 3, lines 17–21 (331–324):}\]

\[\text{ἀναγράψαι δὲ [τ]} \]
[\[\text{όδε τὸ διά τὸν ἰστόριον καὶ τὰ ὑπομαντα [α] ἰστόριον καὶ τ[ε]}
[\[\text{ἀ ν ὑπομαντα [ε] στήλην λιθίνην τὸγραμματὲα [α] τὸν κατὰ πρωτανείαν καὶ στήσαι [ε]}
[\[\text{ἐν ἀκροπόλην}

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

\[\text{ἀναγράψαι} \]
[\[\text{δὲ τὸ διά τὸν ἰστόριον καὶ τὰ ὑπομαντα [α] ἰστόριον καὶ τ[ε]}
[\[\text{ἀ ν ὑπομαντα [ε] στήλην λιθίνην τὸγραμματὲα [α] τὸν κατὰ πρωτανείαν καὶ στήσαι πρὸς τοῖς Ἐρωμαῖσ}]

Compare also, with τὴν προξενίαν, IG II2 339b, lines 9–13 (fin. s. IV):

\[\text{ἀ[]} \]
[\[\text{ναγράφω δὲ τὴν προξενίαν [αν αὐτ]}]
[\[\text{ὀδ ἐντὸς στήλην λιθίνην τ[ὸν γραμματεία [κα] τὸ στήσαι [ἐν ἀκροπόλην}

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

\[\text{ἀ[]} \]
[\[\text{ναγράφω δὲ τὴν προξενίαν [ν εἰς στὶ]}]
[\[\text{ἡλίν] λιθίνην καὶ στήσαι [τὸν γραμματεί] [κα] καὶ τὸ στήσαι [ἐν ἀκροπόλην}
[\[\text{κ[α] [κα] τὰ πρωτανε[ίαν ἐν ἀκροπόλην}

69. Apart from the examples cited here to indicate the chronological range, note also, e.g., IG II2 338, lines 24–28 (333/2); Agora XVI 248, lines 22–24 (s. III/II).
70. For this type of wording, where the object includes the phrase καὶ τὰ ὑπομαντακτα θλ., cf. IG II2 792, lines 11–14 (275/4); Agora XVI 188, lines 45–49 (271/0).
71. Cf. the similar IG II2 235, lines 26–29 (340/39), where the phrase is omitted altogether.
72. See n. 67 above.
73. Such postponement is rare; but cf., with the Secretary of the Boule, IG II2 29, lines 7–11 (387/6), in which the Secretary does not appear until after ἐν ἀκροπόλην.
For the sequence V–O–S followed by “on a stele of stone,”74 which is manifestly the sequence employed most commonly throughout the entire period of activity of the Prytany Secretary, compare IG II² 426, lines 11–14 (336–334):

\[\text{ἀναγράφαι δὲ τὸ ἄρα \text{stoich. 25}}\]

[ἵρισμα τὸν γραμματέα τὸν κατὰ [πρωτανείαν ἐν στήλῃ] λήθην 
[καὶ στήσαι ἐν ἄχρο]πόλει.]

\[\text{IG II² 360.I, lines 21–24 (325/4), with an extended object:}\]

\[\text{ἀναγράφαι δὲ τὸ ἄρα \text{stoich. 39}}\]

ε τὸ ψήφισμα τὸν γραμματέα τὸν κατὰ πρωτανείαν 
καὶ τοὺς ἀλλοὺς ἑπατίνους τοὺς γεγενημένους αὐ 
τῷ ἐν στήλῃ λήθην καὶ στήσαι ἐν ἄχροπόλει·

\[\text{Hesperia Supplement 17, 1978, pp. 2–4, lines 105–107 (270/69):}\]

\[\text{non-stoich. 42–49}\]

\[\text{ἀναγράφαι}\]

ψαι τὸ ἄρα [ψήφισμα τὸν γραμματέα τὸν κατὰ πρωτανείαν 
[ἐν] 
στήλῃ λήθην καὶ στήσαι παρά τὴν εἰκόνα.]

\[\text{Agora XVI 224, lines 45–47 (226/5):}\]

\[\text{non-stoich. ca. 36}\]

\[\text{ἀναγράφαι δὲ τὸ ψήφισμα}\]

μα τὸν γραμματέα τὸν κατὰ πρωτανείαν ἐν στή 
λήθην καὶ στήσαι ἐν ἄγοραί·

\[\text{Agora XVI 224, lines 45–47 (226/5):}\]

\[\text{and IG II² 892, lines 15–17 (188/7):}\]

\[\text{non-stoich. ca. 39–40}\]

\[\text{ἀναγράφαι δὲ τὸ ψήφισμα τῇ[ά]}\]

[ν γραμματέα τῇ[ά] κατὰ πρωτανείαν ἐν στήλῃ λήθη 
[καὶ καὶ στήσαι ἐν] ἄχροπόλει·

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

\[\text{ἀναγράφαι δὲ τὸ ψήφισμα [τὸν γραμμ] \text{stoich. 37}}\]

[α]τέα τὸν κατὰ πρωτανείαν ἐν στήλῃ λήθην ἐ] 
[ν] ἄχροπόλει·

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

---

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

The Recorder
(ὁ ἀναγραφέος)

During the two brief periods when the ἀναγραφέος occupied the post of chief secretary, it is clear that the predominant, if not the sole, sequence is yet again V–O–S, for example, D 31 (IG II² 392 + 586), lines 15–17 (321–318): 27

ἀναγράφας δὲ τὸν γραμματέα καὶ στήσαι ἐν ἀκροτόλει.

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

ἀναγράφας δὲ τὸ ψήφισμα τοῦ ἀναγραφέα ἐν στήλη λιθίνη καὶ στήσαι ἐν ἀκροτόλει.

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

ἀγράφας δὲ τὸ ψήφισμα τοῦ ἀναγραφέα ἐν στήλη λιθίνη καὶ στήσαι ἐν ἀκροτόλει.

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

ἀναγράφας δὲ τὸ ψήφισμα τοῦ ἀναγραφέα ἐπὶ στήλη λιθίνη καὶ στήσας ἐν ἀκροτόλει.

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

It should not be introduced gratuitously into restorations, as has been done in IG II² 397, line 2 (321–318); II² 542, line 12 (ante 303/2); II² 516, line 4 (fin. s. IV); II² 521, line 4 (fin. s. IV); Agora XVI 147, lines 14–15 (203/2)—note that at line 49 we find the normal order; Agora XVI 276, line 22 (190/89)—Osborne (D 100) has the correct word order; the fault originates in IG II² 954, Agora XVI 501, line 5 (s. II, pars prior); IG II² 984, line 22 (ca. med. s. II); Agora XV 236, line 1 (ca. 150).

77. Osborne rightly restores τὸ δὲ τὸ ψήφισμα rather than the unnecessary τὸ ψήφισμα τὸ δὲ of Kirchner and Karapa. τὸ ψήφισμα τὸ δὲ occurs only occasionally: so D 37, line 13 (318); D 48, line 6 (ca. 303/2); IG II² 845, line 19 (paullo post 249?); II² 810, line 5 (ante 230); Agora XVI 310, line 50 (ca. 135); IG II² 1019, line 36 (fin. s. II); Agora XV 264, line 15 (ca. 80/79).
78. Cf. also the very heavily restored D 34 (IG II² 395), lines 8–10 (321–318); IG II² 397, lines 1–4 (321–318), where, incidentally, the word order τὸ ψήφισμα τὸ δὲ is unnecessarily introduced. (See also Hesperia 58, 1989, p. 86, no. 12, for a possible new fragment of IG II² 397.)
and the less secure, but quite acceptable, D 33 (IG II² 394), lines 16–18 (321–318):

\[\text{ἀναγράψατε δὲ τὸ δέ [τὸ ψήφισμα ἐ] stoch. 28}
\[\text{ν στήλη προς θύει} \text{νιτ} 
\[\text{τόν ἀ[ναγραφέα καὶ} \text{ι] stήσατε ἐν ἀκροπόλει}.

where the phrase precedes the mention of the Recorder.

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

\[\text{τὸ ψήφισμα ἐφ’ ὀπίσω [ἀναγράψατε ἐν στήλής] stoch. 29–30}
\[\text{ι [Ἀ]ἰτήσις τῶν ἀναγράφων καὶ στήσασαι ἐν ἀκροπόλει}

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

**The Secretary of the People**

(ὁ γραμματεύς τοῦ δήμου)

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

\[\text{ἀνα} stoch. 28
\[\text{γράφατε δὲ τόδε τὸ ψήφισμα τῶν γραμ} 
\[\text{ματέων τοῦ δήμου ἐν στήλῃ λιθώνικ} 
\[\text{καὶ στήσατε ἐν ἀκροπόλει}.

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

\[\text{ἀναγράφατε δὲ τόδε [τὸ ψήφισμα τὸν] stoch. 37}
\[\text{[γραμματεύς τοῦ δήμου ἐν στήλῃ λιθώνικ καὶ στῇ} 
\[\text{στήσατε ἐν ἀκροπόλει}.

**IG II² 844.I, lines 28–30 (229/8):**

\[\text{non-stoch. 42–50}
\[\text{ἀναγράφατε δὲ τὸ}
\[\text{δὲ τὸ ψήφισμα τὸν γραμματέα τοῦ δήμου εἰς στήλην λαθῖ}
\[\text{ν]ῖν καὶ στήσασαι παρὰ τὴν εἰκόνα}.

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

79. So Osborne ad loc.
80. For the late occurrence of ἀναθέτειν (rather than στήσατε), cf. IG II² 741, line 10 (init. s. III).
81. That there is no connective δὲ at the beginning of the provision is to be explained by the introductory clause of “hortatory intention” (see Henry 1996). This has allowed the drafter to employ the uncommon word order τὸ ψήφισμα τὸδε (see n. 77 above), unless this too is to be set down to the carelessness of the cutter so rightly deplored by Osborne.
82. Apart from the examples cited here, cf. also D 89 (IG II² 570), lines 11–13 (s. III; see SEG XL 89); IG II² 651, lines 26–28 (286/5); and the more elaborate IG II² 660.II, lines 43–45 (281/0).
THE ATHENIAN STATE SECRETARIAT

where the phrase precedes mention of the secretary.\(^{83}\)

In IG II\(^\prime\) 845, lines 19–21 (\textit{paullo post 249})\(^{84}\) we appear to have the sequence O–V–S:

\begin{verbatim}
\textit{tòde tò phrēsma en stēlei [lithōne te]

'one grammateús tou dēmou kai stēsaī e]

v òkropōleive'}
\end{verbatim}

counted as without further qualification.

In a few occasions we find the Secretary designated as \textit{ó grammateú̂s tout court}, without further qualification.

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

\begin{verbatim}
\textit{kai anagrapheú̂a}

[to ὁ grammateú̂s tā éfrōfias]ένα'
\end{verbatim}

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

\begin{verbatim}
\textit{euergetai̔s [ά]ναγράφ

sai emi pōlèi̔i en stēlei lēthine tòν γραμματή̂̃e}

a tē̂s bolē̂̃s.}
\end{verbatim}

83. So too in the heavily restored IG II\(^\prime\) 809, lines 1–3 (ca. 300).
84. For the date, see Tracy 1988, p. 320.
85. And probably also in the heavily restored Agora XVI 178, line 7 (286–262?).
86. I have altered the unnecessary τὸ phrēsma tòde of the Corpus. (At IG II\(^\prime\)
542, line 12 [ante 303/2] I would likewise read τὸ tòde τὸ phrēsma.) See n. 77 above.
Another example is found in IG II² 276, lines 18–20 (ca. 342):

> το δὲ ψήφωσα τόδε ἀναγράφας 87 [ό] [γραμματεύς ἐν στήλῃ λιθίνει στήσας] [ό] ἐν [ἀ]ρχοπόλει.

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

> ἀναγράφαι δὲ τόδε τὸ [ψήφωσμα] τὸν γραμματέα ἐν στήλῃ λιθίνῃ καὶ στήσασι ἐν ἄρχοπολεί.

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

> ἀναγράφαι δὲ τόδε] τὸ ψήφωσμα τὸν γραμματέα ἐν στήλῃ λιθίνῃ καὶ στήσασι ἐν ἄρχοπολεί.

_Agora XVI_ 166, lines 5–8 (295/4 _vel paullo post_):

> ἀναγράφαι δὲ τόδε] δὲ τὸ ψήφωσμα τὸν γραμματέα σαὶ ἐν στήλῃ λιθίνῃ καὶ στήσασι ἐν ἄρχοπολεί. 89

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

> ἀναγράφαι δὲ τόδε τὸ ψήφωσμα καὶ τὰ ὀνόματα τὸν γραμματέα] καὶ στήσασι ἐν τῷ τειμένει τοῦ Διὸς.

**Secretary Not Expressed**

As will have been clear from the preceding analysis, the Athenians regularly specified the designated secretary charged with the task of seeing to the inscribing and erecting of decrees and laws. Not entirely unexpectedly, however, we find instances early in the 5th century where the responsible official is only implied, rather than explicitly specified. Compare, for example, _IG_ I² 23, lines 5–11 (ca. 447), a _proxy_ grant, where the award and the publication provision are combined: 90

> Κορ[α]γέθεν χ[αὶ] Θαλυκίδεν καὶ Μενέστρατον χ ἀλ Ἀθηναιον τὸς Θεσπίος ἀναγρ [ἀ]ρχομενος καὶ εὐεργέτα

---

87. For the participle see p. 103 above.
88. Cf. Woodhead, in _Agora_ XVI, p. 240 (on _Agora_ XVI 166).
89. The same wording is found in _IG_ II² 567, lines 17–18 (fin. s. IV), which Woodhead (_Agora_ XVI, p. 240) calls, perhaps too confidently, a "necessary restoration."
90. Walbank (1978, p. 89) draws attention to the fact that "the letter-forms are unusual, more appropriate to a Boiotian than to an Athenian inscription." This point, together with the absence of any mention of the Secretary, suggests to him that the honorands themselves may have looked after the inscribing of their award. However, in view of the fact that the _poletai_ are to let out the contract and the _kolakretai_ are to provide the funds, this seems unlikely.
Compare IG I' 92, lines 9–13 (422/1):

\[\text{καὶ ἄναγράφως αὐτὸν ἔσω}\]
\[τῇ λήθῃ λιθίνη πρόξενου καὶ εὗ \]
\[ἐργατὴν Ἀθηναίων αὐτὸν καὶ τὸ \]
\[[α] παῖδας τῶν Ἀθηναίων καὶ κατὰ \]
\[[θὴναι ἐμὸ πόλει].

In non-proxeny texts, compare the decree on the Eleusinian Epistatai, IG I' 32, lines 32–34 (ca. 449–447):\(^{91}\)

\[\text{γράφοι δὲ τὸ [φολέρισ]}
\[μα ἐν στέλει Ἑλευσίνι καὶ [ἵ ἐν ἀστεί καὶ Φ]}
\[αλειρῷ ἐν τῷ Ἑλευσίνιων.]

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

\[\text{γράφοι δὲ [ἐ τὰοῖα]} \]
\[[ἐν στέλ]ει καὶ καταβέναι ἐμ πόλει]

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

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

\[\text{τὰς δὲ χου}
\[νθέκας τὰ[σδε καὶ] τὸν [ἵρκουν κατα]θέναι Ἀθηναίως μὲ
\[ν ἐμ πόλει[ν ἄναγράφω[αντας ἐστέλει] λιθίνει καὶ τὰ ὅν}
\[[ό]ματα τὸν [πολέον] τὸν [Βοττιαίον τόν χουντθεμένον}
\[τέν φιλία[ν καὶ τέν χυμμαχίαν κτλ.]

Additional instances are furnished by the following:

1) IG II² 82, lines 14–16 (ca. 390–378?), another “telescoped” formulation:

\[\text{τὸ δὲ ψήφισμ}
\[[α τόδε ἄναγρά]ψαι ἐν ἀκροτάλει]
\[[ἐν στήλῃ λιθ]νη]
2) *IG II²* 125, lines 17–19 (343?):

\[ \text{ἀναγράφας δὲ τὸ [ψήφισμα ἐστήλη λι] } \]
stoich. 39

\[ \text{θίνη καὶ στήρας ἐν ἀκροπόλει καὶ ἐν τῇ ἀγορᾷ} \]
\[ καὶ ἐν τοῖς λιμένις.} \]

where there seems to be no room for τόδε.\(^{92}\)

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

\[ \text{ἀναγράφας δὲ τόδε τὸ ψήφισμα} \]
stoich. 29

\[ [ἐ]ν στήλῃ [λιθίνη καὶ στήρας ἐν ἀχρ] \]
\[ [ο]πόλει.} \]

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

To Woodhead’s list of “apparently intentional omissions” one may add:

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

\[ \text{ἀναγράφας δὲ τὸ ψήφισμα[α ἐν στήλαις λ]} \]

\[ \text{ιθίναις καὶ στήρας τὴν μὲν μίαν παρά [τὸν Δία, τὴν δὲ] } \]
\[ \text{ἐτέραν ἐν ἀ[κροπόλει παρά τὸν νεώ τῆς Πολιάδος].} \]

where we have already noted the omission of τόδε.\(^{95}\)

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

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

\[ \text{ἀναγράφας δὲ τὸ ψήφισμα} \]
\[ \text{ἐν στήλῃ λιθίνη καὶ στήρας ἐν τοῖς τοῦ Ἀσκληπιοῦ ἱερῶ[ι].} \]

\[ \text{non-stoich. 36–51} \]

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

\[ \text{ἀναγράφας} \]
\[ \text{δὲ [τὸ ψήφισμα ἐἰς στήλην λιθίνην καὶ στήρας ὃ ἐν ἀυτοῖς ἐπιτήθειντο ἐναι δοκή.} \]

\[ \text{6. For the omission of τόδε, see n. 92 above.} \]

\[ \text{92. τόδε is only occasionally omitted in this phrase: so *IG II²* 448.I, line 26} \]
\[ (323/2); *SEG* XVIII 22 (*IG II²* 950), line 20 (165/4); *IG II²* 1011.II, line 51, III, line 62, IV, line 72 (106/5). In *IG II²* 983, line 9 (ca. med. s. II), however, there is sufficient room to read (τόδε τὸ ψήφισμα.} \]

\[ \text{93. *Agora* XVI, p. 121.} \]

\[ \text{94. I.e., *Agora* XVI 123 and 141.} \]

\[ \text{95. See n. 92 above.} \]

\[ \text{96. For the omission of τόδε, see} \]
\[ \text{n. 92 above.} \]

\[ \text{97. Also without τόδε.} \]
7) IG II 1039, lines 65–66 (79/8):

\[\text{ἀναγράφας δὲ τόδε τὸ ψήφισμα μετὰ τῶν ἀλλῶν εἰς τὴν [αὐτῆ]ν στῆλην κτλ.}\]

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

\[\text{ἀναγράφας δὲ τὸ ψήφισμα καὶ τῶν στέφανον εἰς στῆλην λείψανον τοὺς κεχεὶ ροτονημένους ἄνδρας ἐπὶ τὴν κατασκευὴν τοῦ ναοῦ τῆς Ἀθηνᾶς καὶ στήσαι ἐν ἀμφοτέροις.}\]

CONCLUSION

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

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

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

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

Nevertheless, regardless of the (title of the) Secretary concerned or of the choice of imperative or, later, infinitive, it is evident that one principal essential pattern established itself as the predominant sequence for the provision for inscribing: V(erb)–O(bject)–S(ubject), regularly followed,
rather than preceded, by “on a stele of stone” (and, of course, that in turn followed by the wording for the erection). The sequence O–V–S is also found—it is indeed prevalent in the 5th century—as is, occasionally, the sequence S–V–O. In proxeny grants, we have minor evidence for O–S–V, V–S–O, and even S–V with the object implied rather than expressed.

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

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

TEXTS WITH IG I\(^3\) REFERENCE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IG I(^3)</th>
<th>Walbank 1978</th>
<th>Agora XVI</th>
<th>Page(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>110–111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>101; 111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>96; 97; 103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>100–101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>98.1</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>102</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>106</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>110</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>118</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>119</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>125</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>28A</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>155</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>156</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>174</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## TEXTS WITH IG II² REFERENCE

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

**Texts with No IG Reference**

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