



BRILL

MNEMOSYNE 73 (2020) 1-20

MNEMOSYNE

A Journal
of
Classical Studies

brill.com/mnem

Being Good Towards the People or the Democracy? *The Formulation of Fifth-Century BCE Honorific Decrees*

Andrea Giannotti

Durham University, Dept. of Classics & Ancient History

andrea.giannotti@durham.ac.uk; andrea.giannotti990@gmail.com

Received July 2018 | Accepted October 2018

Abstract

In this paper I investigate the formulaic language of fifth-century BCE honorific decrees and the extent to which the Athenians used specifically democratic language: were men honoured for benefiting the city or specifically the democracy? Despite the general belief that the rhetorical formula 'being good towards the *demos*' had a democratic meaning, consideration of all the readable fifth-century BCE honorific decrees demonstrates that a standard formula to indicate the addressee of the benefits did not exist; rather, it is apparent that honorific decrees enacted under the democracy used indifferently the formulae 'being good towards the *demos*', 'being good towards the polis' and 'being good towards the Athenians'. Moreover, a final consideration of an oligarchic honorific decree will show that oligarchs were perhaps more careful with their language (avoiding '*demos*' and preferring '*polis*') than the democrats might have been.

Keywords

Democracy – Honours – *Polis* – *Demos* – Athens – Ideology

1 Premise

In 2011, Julia Shear argued that the Dionysia of 409 BCE was an example of democratic ideology in action “as the *demos* honoured its benefactors”.¹ Shear highlights the fact that in that year Athens, having been freed from

¹ Shear 2011, 146.

the oligarchic government of the Four Hundred in 411 BCE, added two new ceremonies—the oath of Demophantos and the proclamations of honours with crowns in the theatre—to the extant pre-play ceremonies of the dramatic festival² (the libation to Dionysus poured by the ten generals; the display of the allies' tributes; the war-orphan's parade). Shear focuses on *IG I³ 102*, which attests to the announcement of a golden crown for Thrasyboulus of Calydon for having killed the oligarch Phrynichus. Since honorific decrees predating *IG I³ 102* do not attest to a public proclamation in the theatre during the Dionysia, the honours to Thrasyboulus are the first example of public proclamation, and seemingly indicate a new ceremony of the Dionysia. These are the terms with which Thrasyboulus is described: ἀνδρα ἀγαθὸν [ν περὶ τὸν δῆμον] τὸν Ἀθηναίων—'a good man towards the people of the Athenians' (6-7). Stressing the association between ἀγαθός (which, without the adjective καλός, is removed "from its traditional elite setting and made firmly democratic")³ and δῆμος (a term that generally stands for the democratically ruled city), Shear concludes that "by 410/9, it (*sc.* the phrase) was part of the proper and accepted way of describing a man honoured by the democratic city".⁴ Thus, given the occurrence of δῆμος, the traditional view tends to consider honorific decrees to be strictly related to the democratic city and the displaying of democratic ideology.

Shear's analysis has a sound evidentiary basis—namely, nine parallel inscriptions which also record the phrase 'good man/men towards the people of the Athenians'. The ceremony of proclamation of honours for Thrasyboulus undoubtedly contributed to unifying the people of the Athenians and to reinforcing their political identity, which was clearly opposed to that of Phrynichus. Yet, since the decree for Thrasyboulus is an honorific decree, I wonder (a) if the rhetorical formulation 'good man/men towards the people of the Athenians' was regular in honorific decrees enacted under the democracy, and (b) if those honorific decrees which reported a public crowning in the theatre might *always* present the power of democracy.

2 Shear 2011, 147-154, agrees with Goldhill's theory regarding the democratic value of the Dionysia's pre-play ceremonies (see Goldhill 1990, 2000). Goldhill's conclusions have been questioned by Griffin 1998, Rhodes 2003, and Carter 2004.

3 Shear 2011, 144. I will not consider here Whitehead's discussion (Whitehead 1993) on the aristocratic virtues and adjectives which, in his opinion (shared by Shear), were attributed to democratic language in order to be used in the honorific decrees. I agree with Whitehead's general point, but I do not believe that the expression 'towards the people of the Athenians' had a specifically democratic appeal, since fifth-century BCE honorific decrees demonstrate that there was not a regular "austerely formulaic approbatory language" (p. 47) for the benefit of the addressees (the Athenians).

4 Shear 2011, 144-145.

Hence, in this paper I shall show that a thorough investigation of early honorific decrees raises several doubts about their linguistic formulation: the consideration of 45 inscriptions (37 of the fifth-century BCE and 8 of the very early fourth-century BCE) proves, firstly, that the formulation of honorific decrees was not as regular as has been presumed, since the phrase *περὶ τὸν δῆμον τὸν Ἀθηναίων* was not always used by proposers in democratic times. Next, the analysis of some relevant honorific decrees will not deny their political character (nor the fact that the majority were enacted under the democratic government), but it will challenge indeed the certainty that democratic government was necessarily and explicitly invoked when the formula ‘towards the people of the Athenians’ was employed.

The list of inscriptions here collected and considered includes an outstanding example of an honorific decree made by the oligarchic government of 411 BCE (*IG I³ 98*):⁵ the decree does not use the word *δῆμος*, but it records the phrase *τὴν πόλιν τὴν Ἀθηναίων* (11) which is to be found also in some honorific decrees proposed and enacted under the democratic government. This oligarchic testimony suggests that, while decrees enacted under the democracy used the expressions ‘people’, ‘city’ and ‘Athenians’ indiscriminately, a proposer under the régime of the Four Hundred (which was, after several decades of democracy, self-conscious about not being democratic) may have deliberately avoided the word ‘people’.

2 The Rhetorical Formulae of Fifth-Century BCE Honorific Decrees: a Complete List

I here provide a table of all fifth-century BCE honorific decrees⁶ which must be considered for an evaluation of their formulaic language. This will allow us to

⁵ Recently included in Osborne and Rhodes 2017, 446-451 (= OR 173).

⁶ See Meyer 2013, 453-505, 467-468 n. 69. Meyer counts 68 honorific decrees from 451/450 BCE to 404 BCE: however, relying on the recent study of Domingo Gyax 2016, I count at least 87 fifth-century BCE honorific decrees. I will consider all of them, except those (many) which do not include any honorific formula or are too hardly readable, such as: *IG I³ 11*, *IG I³ 20*, *IG I³ 24*, *IG I³ 28*, *IG I³ 30*, *IG I³ 55*, *IG I³ 57*, *IG I³ 61*, *IG I³ 63*, *IG I³ 66*, *IG I³ 71*, *IG I³ 72*, *IG I³ 85*, *IG I³ 96*, *IG I³ 118*, *IG I³ 122*, *IG I³ 131*, *IG I³ 149*, *IG I³ 159*, *IG I³ 160*, *IG I³ 161*, *IG I³ 165*, *IG I³ 166*, *IG I³ 168*, *IG I³ 169*, *IG I³ 170*, *IG I³ 173*, *IG I³ 175*, *IG I³ 178*, *IG I³ 179*, *IG I³ 180*, *IG I³ 181*, *IG I³ 203*, *IG I³ 204*, *IG I³ 242*, *IG I³ 1154*. Conversely, Shear quotes only *IG I³ 17*, *IG I³ 30*, *IG I³ 43*, *IG I³ 65*, *IG I³ 96*, *IG I³ 101*, *IG I³ 227*, *IG I³ 73*, *IG I³ 92*: see Shear 2011, 145 n. 41. She then quotes examples from the second half of fourth-century BCE, such as *IG II² 222*, *IG II² 223*, *IG II² 300*, *IG II² 448*, *IG II² 487*, *IG II² 505*, *IG II² 555*, *IG II² 657*, *SEG 28:60*, *IG II² 360*: see Shear 2011, 145 n. 43. I will not consider here *IG I³ 18*, *IG I³ 19*, *IG I³ 23*, *IG I³ 27*, *IG I³ 56*, *IG I³ 69*,

assess the decree honouring Thrasyboulus better against broader epigraphic practice. Critically, compiling this body of evidence will allow us also to reconsider the validity of the traditional view. Dates indicated are taken from Osborne and Rhodes (OR)⁷ and *Attic Inscriptions Online* (AIO; run and supervised by Stephen Lambert), where it is possible; other dates follow *Inscriptions Graecae* (IG)⁸ and Meyer.⁹

- 1) IG I³ 17 (IG: 451/450 BCE—*stoich.* 23): [ἐπαινέσαι τοῖς / Σι]γυειῦ[σ]ιν [ὁς δὲ]σιν ἀνδράσι/ν ἀγ]αθοῖς ἐς [τὸν δέμον τὸν Ἀθ/εναιὸν (6-9).
- 2) IG I³ 43 (IG: ca. 435-427 BCE—*stoich.* 43?): [ἐπαινέσαι μὲν Κολοφονί]ος, ὅτι ἔσ/[αν ἀνδρες ἀγαθοὶ περὶ τὸν δέμον τὸν Ἀθηναιὸν] (4-5).
- 3) IG I³ 49 (IG: 440-432 BCE—*stoich.* 56): [ἀγα]/θὸν ἔναι τῷ δέμοι τῷ Ἀθε[ναίῳ (10-11).
- 4) IG I³ 62 (IG: 428/427 BCE—*stoich.* 50): ἐπαινέσαι [δὲ Ἀφυ]ταίος ὅ[τι ἀνδρες ἀγαθοί/ι ἐ]σι[ν] καὶ νῦν καὶ ἐν τῷ πρόσθεν [χρόνω]ι περὶ Ἀ[θη]ν[αί]ος (13-14).
- 5) IG I³ 65 (IG: 427/426 BCE—*soich.* 30): [Ἀπολλονοφ]άνε[ι δὲ] τῷ Κολοφονίῳ ἐ<π>ιγράφσαι “ἐ>/[πειδὲ ἀνέρ] ἐστιν [ἀ]γαθὸς περὶ τὸν δέμ/[ον τὸν Ἀθ]εναίῳ [κα]ὶ τὸς στρατιότας” (9-11).
- 6) IG I³ 73 (IG: ca. 424-410 BCE; Meyer: 424/423 BCE—*stoich.* 42): [ἀνὲρ ἀγαθὸς π/ερί Ἀθena]ίος (6-7); ἐπαινέσαι Ποταμ[όδορον τὸν ἡερχο]μένιον καὶ / τὸν ἡυὸν Εὐρυτίονα, ἡότι [ἔ]στον ἀνδρε ἀγ]αθὸ περὶ Ἀθε/ναίος (23-25).
- 7) IG I³ 80 (IG: 421/420 BCE—*stoich.* 21): ἐπαινέσαι Ἀστέαν τὸν Ἀλε/όν, ἡότι εὖ ποεῖ Ἀθenaίος χ/αὶ ἰδίαι καὶ δεμοσίαι τὸν ἀ/φικνόμενον καὶ νῦν καὶ ἐν τῷ πρόσθεν χρόνοι (8-12).

IG I³ 70, IG I³ 74, IG I³ 81, IG I³ 107, IG I³ 155, IG I³ 163, IG I³ 182, IG I³ 182 bis, IG II² 23, since they contain only an invariable legal formula of grant of a status: ‘let him be an *euergetes* and/or *proxenos* of the Athenians’. However, it is worth noticing that even in such invariable legal formulae the *demos* is not mentioned (IG II² 17 has ἐπειδὴ αὐτὸ ἦσαν οἱ πρόγον[οι πρόξενοι καὶ εὖ]/εργέται τῆς πόλεως τῆς Ἀθη[ναίων] [6-7]).

- 7 I refer to Osborne and Rhodes 2017 until 404 BCE; after that date I refer to Rhodes and Osborne 2003 (= RO).
- 8 I am aware of the issues concerning the dating of fifth-century BCE inscriptions: this is the reason why I used the most reliable tools to provide the reader with as much information as possible about the inscriptions’ dates. Fortunately, in this table, we do not have cases of ambiguous decrees which can be dated either in the fifth-century BCE or in the fourth-century BCE. Moreover, the precise and clear date of these honorific decrees is not crucial to my investigation.
- 9 See Meyer 2013. Meyer follows the dates provided by Reiter 1991 for the following inscriptions: IG I³ 65, IG I³ 73, IG I³ 80, IG I³ 91, IG I³ 92, IG I³ 95, IG I³ 97, IG I³ 98, IG I³ 106, IG I³ 110, IG I³ 113, IG I³ 117, IG I³ 119, IG I³ 121, IG I³ 125, IG I³ 126, IG I³ 156, IG I³ 162, IG I³ 164, IG I³ 167.

- 8) *IG I³ 91* (IG: 416/415 BCE; Meyer: 423/422-422/421 BCE; Matthaïou:¹⁰ 422/421 BCE—*stoich.* 27): [ἐπειδὲ εὖ ποι]/εἰ Προχ[σενίδες ἡὸ τι ἂν δυνατὸς ἔ/ι] Ἀθηνα[ίος καὶ νῦν καὶ ἐν τῷ πρόσ/θει]ν χρόν[οι ἐπαινέσαι τε αὐτῷ (6-9).
- 9) *IG I³ 92* (AIO and OR: 422/421 BCE; IG: 416/415 BCE—*stoich.* 25): Κάλλι/ππον τὸν Θετταλὸν τὸν Γυρτώνι/ον ἐπαινέσαι, ὅτι δοκεῖ ἔναι ἀν/ήρ ἀγαθὸς περὶ τῆμ πόλιν τὴν Ἀθ/ηναίων (5-9).
- 10) *IG I³ 95* (IG: 415/414 BCE—*stoich.* 23): Ἀνα[ξι? . . .]/ν καὶ τὸς παῖδας, ἐπε[ιδὴ εὖ πο/ι]εῖ τὴν πόλιν καὶ Ἀθ[ηναίος, ἀ]/γαγράψαι πρόξενον [καὶ εὐερ/γ] ἔτην Ἀθηναίων ἐν [στήλῃ λι/θί]νῃ (5-10).
- 11) *IG I³ 97* (IG: 412/411 BCE—*stoich.* 38): ἐπειδὴ / Εὐρυ[τ]ίων καὶ ὁ πατήρ αὐτὸ Ποταμόδωρος καὶ οἱ [π]/ρόγονοι αὐτῶν πρόξενοι τέ εἰσιν Ἀθηναίων κ[αὶ / εὐε]ργέται καὶ ἄνδρες ἀγαθοὶ ἔν τε τῇ σ[. . .⁶ . . . / . . .⁹ . . .]τ[.] τὴν πό[λ]ιν τὴν Ἀθηναίων κ[. . .⁷ . . . / . . .] ἔσιν κα[ὶ ἰδία] καὶ δημοσί[αι τῷ δήμῳ τῷ]/ι Ἀθηναίων (5-11).
- 12) *IG I³ 98* (AIO and OR: 411 BCE [decree 1]; 399/398 BCE [decree 2]; IG: 411 BCE—*stoich.* 30): ἐπειδὴ πρόξ[ενός ἐστι Ἀθηναίω]/ν καὶ εὐεργέτης κ[αὶ εὖ ποεῖ ὃ τι δύνατ]/αι τὴν πόλιν τὴν Ἀθ[ηναίων καὶ τὴν . . .]/στίων (9-12 [decree 1]).
- 13) *IG I³ 101* (AIO and OR: 410/409 BCE [decree 1]; 407 BCE or later [decree 2]; IG: 410/409 BCE—1-47 non-*stoich.*; 48-64 *stoich.* 73): [ἐπ]αινέσαι τοῖς Νεοπ[ολίταις] <τοῖς> / παρὰ Θάσον (6-7 [decree 1]); ἀνδ[ρες δ'] ἀγαθοὶ ἐγένον[το ἔς τε τὴν στρα]τ[ιάν καὶ τὸν δῆ]μον τ[ὸν Ἀθηναίον] (9-10 [decree 1]); καὶ πρόθυμοὶ εἰσ[ι ποιῆν ὃ τι δύν]ανται ἀγ[αθὸν αὐτοὶ ἐπαγγει]λάμενοι καὶ λόγ[οι καὶ ἔργ]οι ἔς τ[ὴν πόλ]ιν τὴν Ἀθηναίων (33-35 [decree 1]); ἐπαινέσαι τοῖς Νεοπολίταις τοῖς ἀπὸ [Θράικες ἡὸς ὄσιν ἀνδράσιν ἀγαθοῖς] / ἔς τε τὴν στρατιάν καὶ τὴν πόλιν τὴν Ἀθηναίων (48-49 [decree 2]); ἐπαινέσαι ἡάτε νῦν λέγουσιν κ[αὶ πράτ]τουσιν ἀγα[θὸν ἡ]πὲρ Ἀθε[ν]ν[αίων τὸ δέμ]ο καὶ ἡότι] πρόθυμοὶ εἰσι ποιῆν ἡὸ τι δύναται ἀ[γαθὸν ἔς τὴν στρα]τιάν καὶ τὴν πόλιν (60-62 [decree 2]).
- 14) *IG I³ 102* (AIO, OR and IG: 410/409 BCE—*stoich.* 36): [ἐπ]αινέσαι[ι] Θρασύβολου ὅς ὄντα ἄνδρα ἀγαθὸ/[ν περὶ τὸν δέμ]ο τὸν Ἀθηναίων (6-7); καὶ ἀντι ὄν εὖ πεπο[ίεκεν τέν τε πόλιν] καὶ τὸν δέμ[ο]ν τὸν Ἀθηναίον[ν στεφανῶσαι αὐτὸν χρυσὸν στε]φάνοι (8-10); [ἔ]ναι δὲ αὐτῷ εὐρίσκεσθαι π[αρὰ Ἀθηναίον] κ[αὶ ἄλλο ἡὸ τι ἂν δοκεῖ ἀγαθὸν π]ερὶ ἡὸν εὐεργέ[τεκεν τὸν δέμον τὸν Ἀθηναίων] (19-21).
- 15) *IG I³ 103* (IG: 410/409 BCE—*stoich.* 30): [ἐπ]αινέσαι τοῖς Ἀλ/[ικαρνασ]σεῦσι ὡς οὖσ[ιν ἀνδράσιν ἀγα]/[θοῖς ἔς τε τὴν στρατιά]ν καὶ τὴν πόλιν / [τὴν Ἀθηναίων] (5-8); ἐπ[ειδὴ εἰσι / [ἀνδρες ἀγαθοὶ περὶ Ἀθηναί]ους (13-14).

¹⁰ See Matthaïou 2010.

- 16) *IG I³ 106* (IG: 409/408 BCE—*stoich.* 50): [ἐπειδὲ ἄνδρες ἀγαθ]οῖ εἰσιν Πολυκλέης καὶ Περαιεὺς καὶ Μανδρόβολος καὶ ἔργ]οι καὶ λ[ό/γοι περὶ τὸν δῆμον τὸν Ἀθηναίων καὶ νῦν καὶ ἐν τῷ πρό]σθεν χρό//[νοι καὶ ἀποφαίνουσιν αὐτὸς *hoi* στρατεγοὶ ὄντας προθύμ]ος ποιῆν / [ᾧ τι δύνανται ἀγαθὸν Ἀθηναίων τὴν πόλιν καὶ τὸν δῆμ]ον καὶ τῆι/ [στρατιᾷ χρεσίμος ὄντας (1-6); ἐς [δ]ὲ Ἐ[λ] λέσπογ[τον] ὅς τὸς στρατεγ[ο]ς ἀπο]στελάντων Πολ/[υκλέ]α καὶ Περαιᾶ καὶ Μ[ανδρ]όβολου *hoi* ἐνθάδ[ε] στρατεγοὶ *hos* ἄ/[ν δύνο]νται τάχιστα κα[ὶ] ἄσφ] αλέστατα ἐπὶ τριέρους συνπράξοντ/[ας καὶ] ξυμβουλεύουσν[τας] *hō* τι ἂν δύνον- νται ἀγαθὸν Ἀθηναίοις· (16-19).
- 17) *IG I³ 110* (AIO, OR and IG: 408/407 BCE—*stoich.* 23): ἐπειδὴ ἀνή/ρ ἐστὶ ἀγαθὸς Οἰνιάδης ὁ Παλ/αισικιάθιος περὶ τὴν πόλιν τ/ῆν Ἀθηναίων καὶ πρόθυμος πο/ιῆν ᾧ τι δύνανται ἀγαθόν, καὶ εἰ/ῶ ποιεῖ τὸν ἀφικνόμενον Ἀθη/ναίων ἐστιάθων, ἐπαινέσαι τ/ε αὐτῷ (6-13).
- 18) *IG I³ 113* (IG: ca. 410 BCE; Meyer: 415/414 BCE; Shear:¹¹ early 407 BCE—*stoich.* 42?): ἐπειδὲ δὲ ἐστ[ιν]/.²⁰. Εὐαγόρα]ς *ho* Σαλα[μ] ἴνιο[ς]²⁴. *hō* τ]ι δύνανται ἀγαθὸ[ν τ/ὸν δῆμον τὸν Ἀθηναίων καὶ βασι]λέα καὶ τὸς ἄλλ[ο]ς χ/συμμάχους.¹⁴. *hō*πος] ἂν πλείστοι φ[.]⁵. τῶι δέμοι τῶι Ἀθηναίων κ]αὶ βασιλεῖ κα[ὶ] τοῖς ἄλλοις χσυμμάχοις.⁷. (33-39).
- 19) *IG I³ 114* (IG: 407/406 BCE—*stoich.* 70): [ἐπαινέσαι —]! *hos* ὄντι ἀγ[δρ]ι ἀγα/θῶι περὶ τὸν δῆμον τὸν Ἀθηναίων (5-6).
- 20) *IG I³ 117* (AIO, OR and IG: 407/406 BCE—*stoich.* 31): [ἐπειδὲ δὲ Ἀρχέ] λα[ς καὶ νῦ/ν καὶ ἐν τῷ πρόσθεν χρ]όνοι ἐσ[τίν] ἀν/ὲρ ἀγαθὸς περὶ Ἀθηναί]ος (25-27); ἐπα/[ινέσαι Ἀρχέ]λαι *hos* ὄν]τι ἀνδρὶ ἀγαθῶι / [καὶ προθύμοι ποιῆν *hō* τ]ι δύνανται ἀγαθ[όν, καὶ ἀνθ' ὄν] εὐεργέτεκ]εν τέν τε πόλιν / [καὶ τὸν δῆμον τὸν Ἀθηναί]ον ἀναγράφσα/[ι αὐτὸν καὶ παῖδας προχσένο]ς καὶ εὐερ/[γέτας (31-38).¹²
- 21) *IG I³ 119* (AIO and IG: 407 BCE—*stoich.* 34): [τὰς ξυνηθ]κα]ς, ἃς ξυθέεντο οἱ στρατεγοὶ [τοῖς οἰκίσασσ]/ι Δαφνόντα, εἶναι αὐτοῖς κατὰ [τὰ ξυγκείμε]να, ἐπειδὴ ἄνδρες ἐγένοντο ἀγ[αθοὶ (3-6).
- 22) *IG I³ 121* (IG: 410-405 BCE—*stoich.* 28?): Ἀρχι[.]⁵.⁷. ἀναγράφσαι πρ]όχ[σ]εν[ον κα]ὶ εὐεργέτην Ἀθηναίων ἐ]πειδ[ὲ] περὶ / τὴν πόλιν τὴν Ἀθηναίων ἐ]στ[ιν] ἀνὲρ / ἀγαθὸς καὶ πρόθυμος κα]τὰ τὸ [δυνατ]ὸν εὐ ποῆν¹³.]ρ[.]⁶. (4-9).

11 See Shear 2007.

12 Here we have both the city and the people of the Athenians which proclaim the honorand (and his sons) *proxenos* and benefactors.

- 23) *IG I³ 123* (AIO and OR: 406 BCE; *IG*: 407/406 BCE—*stoich.* 36?): [ἐπαινέσαι δὲ καὶ τὸς κέρυκα]ς τὸς / [Ἀθέναζε ἀφιγμένος ὅτι εἰσὶν ἄνδρες ἀγ]αθοὶ / [περὶ τὸν δέμον τὸν Ἀθηναῖον (15-17).
- 24) *IG I³ 125* (*IG*: 405/404 BCE—*stoich.* 29): [ἐπ]αινέσαι Ἐπ/[ικέρδει τῶι Κυρηναί]ωι ὡς ὄντι ἀνδρ/[ὶ ἀγαθῶι καὶ . . . αἰτ]ίωι γεγενημέν/[ωι¹⁵]ας τὸς ἐξ Σικελ/[ίας¹³]γ τῶι πολέμωι· (6-10); [.¹⁵] εὖ πεποίηκεν Ἀθη/[ναίων τὸν δῆμον κα]ὶ ἃ νῦν ἐπαγγελιά/[μενος ποιεῖ, στεφ]ανώσαι τε αὐτ[ὸ]ν [. . .] (15-17); αὐτὸν ἐστε[φάνωσαν ἀνδραγαθίας / ἔ]νεκα καὶ εὐν[οίας τῆς ἐς Ἀθηναίος· (28-29).
- 25) *IG I³ 126* (*IG* and Meyer: 405/404 BCE—*stoich.* 38): [ἐπειδ/ῆ πρόξ]ενός ἐστιν Ἀθη[ναίων καὶ εὐεργέτης . ολυ/. ος ὀ . . .⁵ . . .]νιος κα[ὶ εὖ ποιεῖ Ἀθηναίος (6-8).
- 26) *IG I³ 156* (*IG*: 440-425 BCE—*stoich.* 23): [ἐπαι/νέσαι δὲ ἀγαθὰ ἡ]όσα ποιεῖ περ/ὶ Ἀθηναίος Λεονίδες (17-19).
- 27) *IG I³ 158* (*IG*: ca. 430 BCE—*stoich.* 32): Κορίθ/[ιον ἐπαινέσαι ἡ]ότι ἀνὲρ ἀγαθός] ἐστιν π/[ερί Ἀθηναίος ποιὸν ἡ]ό τι δύνατ]αι ἀγαθὸ/[ν²²] τ]ὲν Ἀθηναί/[ον (4-8).
- 28) *IG I³ 162* (*IG*: 440-415 BCE—*stoich.* 40): [ἐπαινέσαι δὲ καὶ Γ]ράβοι κα[ὶ . . .⁵ . . . /²⁶]ἡ]ος δσι ἀ[νδράσι ἀ]γαθοῖς ἐς Ἀθηναίος καὶ προθύμω]ις ποιῆν ὅ [τι ἂν δύ/νονται ἀγαθὸν¹⁵] Ἀθηναίω[ν (5-8).
- 29) *IG I³ 164* (*IG*: 440-425 BCE; Meyer: 430/429-427/426 BCE—*stoich.* 27): [. . . ἡ]ος ὄντε ἀν[δρε ἀγαθὸ] περὶ τὸς . / . . .]εας καὶ ἐπε[ί]δ[ε] ἐστὸν περὶ τὸν δέμον]ον τὸν Ἀθηναί[ον¹⁰ /⁶]ν ἀγαθὸ καὶ δ[ικαίω] καὶ αἰε/ὶ εὖ π[εποέκατον Ἀθε]ναίος (17-21).
- 30) *IG I³ 167* (*IG*: 430-415 BCE; Meyer: 420/419-415/414 BCE—*stoich.* 25): [ἐπαινέσαι ἡ]ότι ν[ῦν ἀνδρε/ς ἀγαθοὶ ἐσιν περ]ὶ Ἀθε[ναίος κα/ὶ ἐν τῶι πρόσθεν χρόνωι· (7-9).
- 31) *IG I³ 174* (*IG*: 425-410 BCE—*stoich.* 21): Λύκωνα τὸν Ἀχαι/όν, ἐπειδὴ εὖ ποιεῖ Ἀθηναίω/[ς], ἀναγραφάτω πρόξενον κα/ὶ εὐεργέτην Ἀθηναίων ἐν σ/τήλῃ λιθί-ναι ἐμ πόλει (5-9).
- 32) *IG I³ 177* (*IG*: 420-405 BCE—*stoich.* 28): Ξανθι[. . . /¹⁰]ρει ὡς ὄντι ἀνδρὶ ἀγ[αθ/ῶι ἐς τὴν πόλιν] τὴν Ἀθηναίων καὶ [πρ/οθύμωι ποιῆν ὅ τ]ι δύναται ἀγαθὸν [.¹²] Ἀθη]ναίος ἐπαινέ[σα/ι (4-9).
- 33) *IG I³ 227 with addenda* (AIO: 403-ca. 395 BCE [decree 1]; 424-403 BCE? [decrees 2 and 3], OR: 424/423 BCE or slightly later;¹³ *IG*: 424/423 BCE [400-350 BCE]—1-23 *stoich.* 31; 24-26 non-*stoich.*): Ἡρακλείδην [τὸγ Κλαζομένιον ἀν/αγρ]άψαι τὸγ γραμμ[ατέα τῆς βολῆς πρόξ/ενο]ν καὶ εὐεργέτη[ν καθότι ἂν τῶι δήμω/ι δο]κῆ καὶ θῆναι ἐ[ν πόλει, ἐπειδὴ εὖ ἐπ/όησ]εν

13 See Osborne and Rhodes 2017, 340-345.

- τὰς Ἀθηναίω[ν πρεσβείας καὶ τὰ ἄλλα ἀ]νήρ ἐστι ἀγαθ[ὸς εἰς τὸν δῆμον τὸν / Ἀθη]γαίων (6-12 [decree 2]).
- 34) *IG I³ addenda 227 bis* (AIO [SEG 50:45] and OR: 422/421 BCE—*stoich.* 40 [except 3-4]): ἐπαινέσαι Πολυπείθη/ν τὸν Σίφιον, ὅτι ἀνὴρ ἐστὶν ἀγαθὸς ἐς τὸν δῆμον τ/[ὸ]ν Ἀθηναίων (7-9).
- 35) *IG II² 1* (= *IG I³ 127*) (AIO, OR and IG: 405/404 BCE [decrees 1A and 1B]; 403/402 BCE [decrees 2A, 2B and 3]—*stoich.* 57-61): ἐπαινέσαι τοῖς πρέσβεσι τοῖς Σαμίοις τοῖς τε προτέρο/ις ἤκοσι καὶ τοῖς νῦν καὶ τῆ βολῆι καὶ τοῖς στρατηγούσι καὶ τοῖς ἄλλοις / Σαμίοις, ὅτι ἐσὶν ἄνδρες ἀγαθοὶ καὶ πρόθυμοι ποιῆν ὅ τι δύνανται ἀγαθόν (7-9 [decree 1A]); καὶ ἀντὶ ὧν εὖ πεποιήκασιν Ἀθηναίοις καὶ νῦν περὶ πολλὰ ποιοῦνται καὶ / ἐσηγόνται ἀγαθὰ (11-12 [decree 1A]); καὶ Εὐμάχῳ καὶ τοῖς / [ἄλλοις Σαμίοις πᾶσι τοῖς μετὰ Εὐμάχῳ ἤκοσι] ἐπαινέσαι ὡς ὅσιν ἀνδράσιν / [ἀγαθοῖς περὶ τὸς Ἀθηναίους (35-37 [decree 1B]); [ἐπαινέσαι τὸς Σαμίους ὅτι ἐσὶν] ἄνδρες ἀγαθοὶ περὶ Ἀθηναίους (43 [decree 2A]); [ἐπαινέσαι Ποσὴν τὸν] Σάμιον ὅτι ἀνὴρ ἀγαθὸς ἐστὶν περὶ Ἀθηναίους, καὶ ἀνθ' ὧν / [εὖ πεπόηκε τὸν δῆμον (58-59 [decree 3]); ἐπαινέσαι δὲ Ποσὴν τὸν [Σάμιον καὶ τὸς ὑές ἐπειδὴ ἄνδρες ἀγ]αθοὶ ἐσὶν περὶ τὸν δῆμον τὸν Ἀθηναίων (64-65 [decree 3]); [ἐπαινέσαι δὲ] καὶ Σαμίους ὅτι ἐσὶν ἄνδρες ἀγαθοὶ / [περὶ Ἀθηναίους (71-72 [decree 3]).
- 36) *IG II² 2* (IG: 403/402 BCE—non-*stoich.*): [ἐπαινέσαι] μὲν Ἀριστ/¹² ἔα ὅτι ἀνὴρ/[ῥ ἀγαθὸς ἐστὶ περ]ὶ Ἀθηνα/[ίους (9-12; the public proclamation appears in the *SEG* 32:38 text).
- 37) *IG II² 7* (IG: 403/402 BCE—*stoich.* 20): ἐπ[αινέσαι μὲν / Κλ]εωνυμίδα[ν.⁹]/. . . ὅτι ἀνὴρ [ἀγαθὸς ἐστὶν / π]ερὶ τὸν δῆ[μον τὸν Ἀθηνα/ί]ων (4-8).
- 38) *IG II² 17* (AIO and IG: 394/393 BCE—*stoich.* 37-39): ἐπαινέσαι Σθόρου[ν τὸν μάντιν (?), ὅτι πρόθυμὸς]/ς ἐστὶ ποῦν ὅ τι δύνανται [ἀγαθόν.¹²-14.] / τὴν πόλιν τὴν Ἀθηναίων [.¹⁸-20.] (3-5); καὶ τὰ] ἄλ[λα ἐσ]τι ἀνὴρ ἀγα/θὸς περὶ τῆ[ν πόλιν τὴν Ἀ]θη[ναί]ων (28-29).
- 39) *IG II² 19* (IG: 394/393 BCE—*stoich.* 40): [ἐπαινέσαι μὲν Φιλ. . .⁵ . . . δ]ὴν τὸρ Ῥόδι[ον] ὄ/[τι ἀνὴρ ἀγαθὸς ἐστὶ περὶ Ἀθηναίους] (5-6 [fr. A]); ἐψηφίσθαι δ[ὲ τῷ δήμῳι Φιλ. . .⁶ . . . /δην Ἀθηναί]ων ἔναι ἐπειδὴ ἐστ[ιν ἀνὴρ ἀγαθὸς περὶ / τὸν δῆμον τ]ὸν Ἀθηναίων (5-7 [fr. B]).
- 40) *RO 11¹⁴* (AIO and RO: 394/393 BCE; IG [*IG II² 20*]: 393/392 BCE—*stoich.* 50): [ἐπειδὴ ἀνὴρ ἀγαθὸς ἐστὶν περὶ τὸν δ]ῆμον τὸν Ἀθηναίων (5); ὁ δὲ κῆ[ρυξ — / —] ἔταν οἱ τρα[γωιδοὶ — / — Ἀθη]ναίων Εὐαγόρ[α—]ῆς ἐς Ἀθηναί[ος] (29-32).

14 This inscription (which includes *IG II² 20*) is cited as *RO 11*, since that collection includes an additional fragment.

- 41) *IG II² 26* (IG: 394-387 BCE—*stoich.* 28): ἐπαινέσαι μὲν Ἴφιτον τὸν Φ[α]/ρ[σ] ἄλιον, ἐπειδὴ ἀνὴρ ἀγαθός ἐστιν / π[ε]ρί τὸν δῆμον τὸν Ἀθηναίων (7-9).
- 42) *IG II² 28* (AIO, RO and IG: 387/386 BCE—*stoich.* 42): ἐπαι[ν]έσαι μὲν τὸν δῆμον τὸν Κλαζομενί/ων ὅτι πρόθυμός ἐσ[τι]ν ἐς τὴμ πόλιν τὴν Ἀθηναίων (4-5).
- 43) *IG II² 31* (IG: 386/385 BCE—*stoich.* 30): ἐ[π]αινέσαι μὲν Ἐβ[ρ]ύζε[ι]/λμ[ι]ν τὸν βα[σ]ιλέα τὸν Ὀδρυσῶν, ὅτ[ι] ἐστ[ι]/ι[ν] ἀνὴ[ρ] ἀγαθ[ός] ἐσ[τι]ν ἐπ[ε]ρί τὸν δῆμον τὸ[ν] Ἀθη[ν]αίων (5-8); ἐ[π]αιν[έ]σαι δὲ καὶ Τ[ε]ῖσανδ[ρ]ο[ν] καὶ / Λύσα[ν]δ[ρ]ον ὅτι ἐστὸν ἀνδρε ἀγ[α]θ[ὸ]ς ἐπ[ε]ρ[ι] τὸν δῆμον τὸν Ἀθηναίων (24-26).
- 44) *IG II² 32* (= *IG I³ 228*) (IG: 385/384 BCE—*stoich.* 27): ὡς ὄ[ν]το[ς] ἀ[ν]δρὸς ἀγαθὸ πε[ρ]ι τὴν πόλ[ι]ν [τὴν / Ἀθ]ηναίων (17-19).
- 45) *IG II² 52* (IG: before 387/386 BCE—*stoich.* 29): [ἐπαινέσαι μὲν — τὸν — ὄ/τι ἐσ]τίν [ἀνὴρ ἀγαθός περὶ τὸν δῆμον / τὸν] Ἀθηνα[ί]ων (1-2).

3 The Variability of Fifth-Century BCE Honorific Decrees and the Cases of Public Honours in the Theatre

The 45 honorific decrees tabulated record a variety of formulae to justify honouring an individual or group involved. The situation is as follows:

- a) 9 inscriptions exclusively with the intact formula ‘good man/men towards the people of the Athenians’ (ἐς τὸν δῆμον τὸν Ἀθηναίων / τῷ δήμῳ τῷ Ἀθηναίων / περὶ τὸν δῆμον τὸν Ἀθηναίων): *IG I³ 49*, *IG I³ 65*, *IG I³ 102*, *IG I³ addenda 227 bis*, *IG II² 7*, *IG II² 19*, RO 11, *IG II² 26*, *IG II² 31*.
- b) 11 inscriptions exclusively with the intact formula ‘good man/men towards the city of the Athenians’ or ‘he/they does/do good towards the city of the Athenians’ (περὶ τὴν πόλιν τὴν Ἀθηναίων / εἰ ποιεῖ ὅ τι δύνανται τὴν πόλιν τὴν Ἀθηναίων / ἔς τὴν πόλιν τὴν Ἀθηναίων): *IG I³ 92*, *IG I³ 95*, *IG I³ 97*, *IG I³ 98*, *IG I³ 103*,¹⁵ *IG I³ 110*, *IG I³ 158*, *IG I³ 177*, *IG II² 17*, *IG II² 28* (‘they have been enthusiastic towards the city of the Athenians’), *IG II² 32*.
- c) 5 inscriptions exclusively with the intact formula ‘good man/men towards the Athenians’ (περὶ Ἀθηναίους / εἰς Ἀθηναίους) or ‘he/they does/do good towards the Athenians’ (ἀγαθὰ ὅσα ποιεῖ περὶ Ἀθηναίους / εἰ ποιεῖ Ἀθηναίους): *IG I³ 62*, *IG I³ 73*, *IG I³ 80*, *IG I³ 167*, *IG I³ 174*. In *IG I³ 106* the generals are praised συνπράξοντ/[ας καὶ] ξυμβουλευέουσντ[ας] ἡὸ τι ἀνδύονται ἀγαθὸν Ἀθηναίους (‘having acted and suggested whatever good they are able towards the Athenians’). In *IG I³ 117* Archelaus is praised only being προθύμοι ποιεῖν ἡὸ τ[ι] δύναται ἀγαθ/[όν] (‘keen to do whatever

15 But see also ll. 13-14 (though restored).

- good he is able'), without any further specification of the addressee of his benefactions.
- d) 1 inscription exclusively with the intact formula 'they are good men': *IG I³ 119*.
- e) 3 inscriptions utilise intact mixed formulations: *IG I³ 101* records the formula 'towards the army (restored) and the people of the Athenians' in decree 1, together with the formula 'they are keen to do whatever good they can to the city of the Athenians', and the formulae 'towards the army and the city of the Athenians' and 'because they now say and do good on behalf of the Athenian people and because they are keen to do whatever good they can to the army and the city (restored)' in decree 2; *IG I³ 164* records the formulae 'good man towards the people of the Athenians' and 'he has always done good towards the Athenians'; *IG II² 1* records the formulae 'good men and eager to do what good they can' and 'in return for the good which they have done for the Athenians' in decree 1A, 'good men towards the Athenians' in decree 1B and 2A, 'good man towards the Athenians', 'good men towards the people of the Athenians' and 'good men towards the Athenians (restored)' in decree 3.
- f) It is worth noticing that 14 decrees are restored:¹⁶ *IG I³ 17*, *IG I³ 43*, *IG I³ 91*, *IG I³ 113*, *IG I³ 114*, *IG I³ 121*, *IG I³ 123*, *IG I³ 125*, *IG I³ 126*, *IG I³ 156*, *IG I³ 162*, *IG I³ 227* with *addenda*, *IG II² 2*, and *IG II² 52*. The texts of *IG I³ 17*, *IG I³ 43*, *IG I³ 113*, *IG I³ 114*, *IG I³ 123*, *IG I³ 125*, *IG I³ 227* with *addenda*, and *IG II² 52* are restored with the formula 'towards the people of the Athenians': it is curious that that formula is considered a common (almost automatic) restoration for lacunae in honorific decrees. Consequently, none of the fragmentary decrees (except *IG I³ 121*) have been restored with the formula 'towards the city of the Athenians', even though it would be equally possible (except for a presence of [...] *μον τ[...]*, which requires *δῆμον* [see *IG I³ 101*, 9-10, and *IG I³ 102*, 7], or [...] *ὄν Ἀθηναίων*, which requires a masculine article, *τόν*, that needs to be related to a previous *δῆμον* [see *IG I³ 164*, 18-19, *IG I² 19*, 7 fr. B, and *RO 11*, 5]). The term *πόλις* is left only when clearly evident, but if all of the restored decrees which I have mentioned had *πόλις* we would have just 9 honorific decrees exclusively with the intact formula 'towards the people of the Athenians'.

A variety of expressions is used, so it is difficult to conclude, on the one hand, that the formula 'towards the people of the Athenians' is to be considered

¹⁶ Even *IG I³ 102* has *τὸν δέμον τὸν Ἀθηναίων* wholly restored in l. 21 and a *τέν τε πόλιν* restored in l. 9. As for the parallels quoted by Shear, only *IG I³ 65* has the intact formula 'towards the people of the Athenians', and *IG I³ 101* has [*τὸν δῆ*] *μον τ[ὸν Ἀθηναίων*.

common and fixed, or, on the other hand, that that formula is intended to denote the democratic relationship between the honorand and the city. Hence, the evidence itself can support the traditional view only in a qualified way. Perhaps in some cases a proposer had a definite ideological motivation for preferring one of the formulations, but in most cases the formulations seem likely to have been regarded as equivalent, and no ideological reason should be assumed for a proposer's preference.

If we focus exclusively on the case of the Dionysia of 409 BCE, it is possible to recognise that the honours to Thrasyboulus were indeed a democratic reward for a man who, having killed the oligarch Phrynichus (although this act is not mentioned in the decree),¹⁷ contributed to the restoration of the democratic government. The historical and political context makes the honours to Thrasyboulus (together with the language of the honorific decree) ideologically democratic,¹⁸ but can we state the same for all the other honorific decrees? They were all enacted under the democracy (thus, within a city which was democratic), but few of them use the expression 'towards the people of Athens'. Again, this suggests a less rigid prescription of language to be deployed in honorific decrees.

However, given that the conferral of a crown was a new practice, we might question whether Shear's assertion that "to change a festival *is* to demonstrate control of the event" is justified.¹⁹ To be sure, her emphasis on 'change' here could be misleading: the proclamation of honours in the theatre during the Dionysia *was* a new element, but we should not infer that an addition of such a ceremony changed the dramatic festival, in terms of organisation, which remained fundamentally unaltered.²⁰ Wilson too says that "it is clear that this new form of festival proclamation of honours for the assassin of the oligarch was an innovation tailored to the importance of the events, giving the whole practice a profoundly 'democratic' origin".²¹ However, evidence does not provide any attestation of an old form of festival proclamation of honours, nor did the practice become a standard addition. From 410/409 BCE to 330 BCE

17 Osborne 2010, 64-82 discusses the laconic form in which honorands' services are indicated (on this inscription see 77-78).

18 But if that *τέν τε πόλιν* restored in l. 9 is right, this would show a linguistic variability in *IG I³ 102* too.

19 Shear 2011, 146 (italics my own).

20 Shear also considers the oath of Demophantos of 409 BCE (see Shear 2007 and 2011, 136-141), but this oath, which seems to have been pronounced in the Agora (but see Canevaro and Harris 2012, 119-125), has nothing to do, in terms of organisation, with the dramatic festival of the Great Dionysia. I therefore do not need to discuss here the doubts which have been raised about the authenticity of that document.

21 Wilson 2009, 18.

(the date of the dispute on the crown between Aeschines and Demosthenes) there are only three other inscribed decrees stipulating public proclamations of honours during the Dionysia: *IG I³ 125* (honours to Epicerdes of Cyrene; 405/404 BCE), *IG II² 2/SEG 32:38* (honours to Arist-? of Boeotia; 403/402 BCE) and *RO 11* (honours to king Euagoras of Salamis; 393/392 BCE). With only four decrees stipulating a public proclamation, we should not assume that honours were regularly proclaimed; rather it seems that in other cases the decrees omitted such public ceremonies. Public proclamations did not happen every year when anyone had been honoured: indeed, as far as our evidence goes, proclamations were something that happened infrequently.

Thus, this manner of proclaiming honours during the Dionysia may be considered a rare occurrence, which is known to have taken place four times only.²² Moreover, it is worth noticing that only *IG I³ 125* displays a formula similar to 'being good towards the people of the Athenians'. Indeed, in 6-8, when we face the part in which the formula can usually be found, we read [ἐπ]αινέσαι Ἐπ/[ικέρδει τῶι Κυρηναί]ωι ὡς ὄντι ἀνδρ/[ι ἀγαθῶι καὶ . . . αἰτ]ίωι γεγεννημέν/[ωι¹⁵.]ας τὸς ἐξ Σικελ/[ίας¹³.]γ τῶι πολέμωι: however, since after ὡς ὄντι ἀνδρ/[ι ἀγαθῶι just four letters are missing, there is no room for 'towards the people of the Athenians'. It is in 15-16 that we read εἰ πεποίηκεν Ἀθη/[ναίων τὸν δῆμον (where τὴν πόλιν might equally well be restored). By contrast, *IG II² 2* displays the formula 'being good towards the Athenians' in 10-13; while *RO 11* displays]ης ἐς Ἀθηναίω[ς in 32. These proclamations, probably on account of those years of crisis, were made during the Dionysia in order to make Athens' gratitude to benefactors ostentatiously public. Hence, Thrasyboulus of Calydon warranted a more public commendation for killing the oligarch Phrynichus in 410/409 BCE, as did Epicerdes of Cyrene for helping Athenian prisoners in Sicily in 405/404 BCE, and Euagoras of Salamis for defeating the Spartan fleet, together with Conon, in 394/393 BCE: the crowning of these men was celebrated before all the Greeks in the theatre. Yet we should not consider this sparse evidence as proof of a new and specifically democratic institution. Rather, the institution is 'democratic' only inasmuch as it is an institution used by Athens during a democracy; it is not 'specifically democratic' as its use does not guarantee concurrent usage of the phrase 'towards the people of Athens'. If πόλις and δῆμος are interchangeable,

22 These kinds of methodological issues have been fruitfully explored by Osborne 2010, 64-82. It is always a possibility that public proclamations did happen even when the decree does not say anything about it: but, since a public proclamation was a significant addition to the honours, there are no reasons to think that a decree would purposely fail to mention such an important detail.

that suggests that the Athenians did not feel the need to mention δῆμος and democracy on every occasion. To be sure, when Athens is democratic the πόλις is democratic, but it tells us something about the nature of democracy that the Athenians did not choose to emphasise an attachment to democracy by employing the word δῆμος in all cases.

“The rule of the *demos* and its power”²³ in honorific decrees’ language remains unclear. This second issue is indeed more puzzling: to what extent can we consider the relationship between the honorand and the city democratic? Difficulties arise if we wish to interpret the expressions ἐς τὸν δῆμον τὸν Ἀθηναίων, τῷ δῆμῳ τῷ Ἀθηναίων and περὶ τὸν δῆμον τὸν Ἀθηναίων as clear allusions to ‘democracy’. As shown above, during the fifth-century BCE few honorific decrees exclusively record formulae of this kind. In addition, none (except the well-known cases) attests to a public proclamation in the theatre. Evidence reveals that formulaic modifications occurred quite often. We can say that *there was* a democratic reason for specifying δῆμος in the case of Thrasyboulus, since he—in killing an oligarch—was specifically supporting the democracy, but Epicerdes (*IG* I³ 125) and Euagoras (RO 11) were not, and in both of those inscriptions, as it happens, either δῆμος or πόλις could be restored.²⁴ Regardless of the restorations, while these three honours were singled out for proclamation, only in the case of Thrasyboulus were the honorand’s services explicitly marked as democratic. Thus, it is easier to explain the addition of proclamations as enhancing the honour, rather than indicating a specifically democratic feature.

For instance, it is curious that an honorific decree such as *IG* I³ 92 does not have the ‘democratic’ formula ‘towards the people of the Athenians’. This is a peculiar decree, as unusually it was proposed²⁵ as a γνώμη στρατηγῶν, that is, ‘the opinion of the generals’, who held an important office of the democratic government. Such a decree, sponsored by a high office of democratic government,²⁶ should have mentioned the δῆμος (if one assumes that the formula ‘towards the people of the Athenians’ imbued decrees with a democratic sensibility). The fact is that since decrees of the democracy can mention either the δῆμος or the πόλις, there is nothing difficult about the use of πόλις here.

In much the same way, *IG* I³ 117, which attests honours for the king of Macedon, Archelaus, mentions the δῆμος in a non-standard formula: in closing,

23 Shear 2011, 146.

24 See Rhodes 2011, 71–72.

25 See Osborne and Rhodes 2017, 378–379.

26 It goes without saying that generals were not intrinsically democratic—Athens needed generals whatever its form of government—but when Athens was democratic then they were officers of its democratic government.

it says that 'he did good services to the city and the people of the Athenians', [εὐεργέτεκ]εν τέν τε πόλιν / [καὶ τὸν δέμον τὸν Ἀθηναί]ον. This decree refers to the building of a part of the Athenian navy before the battle of Arginusae:²⁷ 110 triremes were built in one month; some were built in Macedonia, thanks to King Archelaus I's help. Thus the inscription honours the Macedonian King for having let the Athenian ships be built in his territory, but there is no mention of a proclamation in the theatre. The victory at Arginusae was a triumph, though unexpected, of an Athens led by a democratic government. Archelaus' contribution to Athens' success against Sparta was fundamental, and so it could well have merited celebration in front of all the Greeks gathered in the theatre, just as the action of Thrasyboulus of Calydon had been, two years before. If the theatre, with the proclamation for Thrasyboulus, had already acquired the *status* of a "natural home for such democratic expression",²⁸ it is perhaps striking that the honorific proposal for King Archelaus was not celebrated in the same venue. However, two qualifications must be noted. Firstly, it must be recognised that this honorific decree was probably (but not definitely) proposed and written before the battle at Arginusae²⁹ and, consequently, the context could differ from that of Thrasyboulus and Epiclerdes. In any case, the proposal was important, and the fact that the Athenian people, thanks to Archelaus and despite those dark days, had more than 150 ships ready to fight could have deserved a celebration in the theatre, but this did not happen. Secondly, the decree does not award a crown; and, in this case, one should not expect the honours to Archelaus to be proclaimed: in fact, as far as we know, proclamations were made only when the honours included a crown. As for the characterisation of the honorands as 'democrats', one could hardly think that Archelaus, a king, was a democrat, or thought to have been or become a democrat after having been labelled as ἀνὴρ ἀγαθός. On the other hand, the figure of a king could have troubled the (supposed) democratic context of the ceremony. But the honours conferred also on king Euagoras of Salamis (RO 11) and on king Hebryzelmis of Thrace (IG II² 31) can remove this doubt.

It is evident enough that (a) there was an element of malleability to the expressions used in fifth-century BCE honorific decrees, and that (b) honorific decrees which include a public proclamation of honours are quite few. While Thrasyboulus' good actions 'towards the people of Athens' were actions in support of the democracy, and that may explain why the word 'people' was used in his case, the fact that not all honorific decrees specify the 'people' in that way

27 See Osborne and Rhodes 2017, 530-535.

28 Wilson 2009, 27.

29 See Osborne and Rhodes 2017, 535.

suggests that it was not considered necessary to insist on the ‘people’ in every honorific decree, and that the presence of *demos* does not necessarily mean exaltation of democratic ideology. The practice of restoring δῆμος where δῆμος and πόλις are equally possible distorts the statistics: there may be ideological reasons for the choice in some particular cases, such as πόλις for the decree enacted under the oligarchy and δῆμος in the case of Thrasyboulus, but in the other cases there is no reason to think that there was a strong ideological reason for the choice of one term rather than another.

4 Democratic δῆμος vs. Oligarchic πόλις?

Recognising the different expressions which occurred in honorific decrees, we could hypothesise that there was no difference between ‘city of the Athenians’, ‘people of the Athenians’ and ‘Athenians’: the three formulae could indicate the lack of a specific canon in honorific decrees’ epigraphic language. However, *IG I³ 98* prompts us to question the former hypothesis, as it bestows honours on a certain Pythophanes from the oligarchic government of Athens in 411 BCE. It seems that Pythophanes was a merchant who was either [Καρυ]/στῖωι or [Φαι]/στῖωι or [Ση]/στῖωι. As Osborne and Rhodes notice, the prescript of the decree is unusual, since it is “significantly different from those of decrees acted under the democracy”.³⁰ This suggests that it is very likely that the decree was enacted under the oligarchic government of 411 BCE: hence, the Four Hundred inevitably used a formulation slightly different from that of the honorific decrees enacted under the democracy.³¹ In lines 9-11 we read that Pythophanes, already made ‘proxenos of the Athenians’ (πρόξ[ενός ἐστι Ἀθηναίων]/ν), is indicated as a benefactor who ‘does what good he can’ (εὐεργέτης κ[αί] εἶ ποιεῖ ὅ τι δύναται/αι). The addressee (Athens) of Pythophanes’ euergetism and good actions is specified as ‘the city of the Athenians’ (τὴν πόλιν τὴν Ἀθηναίων).

30 Osborne and Rhodes 2017, 449. As for the democratic prescript of honorific decrees see Osborne and Rhodes 2017, xxi-xxii.

31 In ll. 12-15 we read: ‘... the decree previously voted for him shall be written up on a stone *stèle* by the current secretary of the council and placed on the acropolis’. Pythophanes had already been honoured once. As Osborne and Rhodes 2017, 451 say: ‘the previous decree may have been enacted either very slightly earlier, already under the Four Hundred, or under the democracy’. In the latter case, it would have been interesting to read the formulation of that decree in order to see whether under the democracy Pythophanes was said to having benefited ‘the people of the Athenians’. Unfortunately, we do not have the first honorific decree for Pythophanes.

The use of πόλις rather than δῆμος is interesting as it has two implications. Firstly, we understand that the oligarchic government of the Four Hundred felt the need to distinguish its own honorific formulation from the democratic one: given that δῆμος was an overtly democratic word, the term πόλις could be understood as a more neutral term, lacking the democratic connotations of the alternative. Conversely, this does not necessarily mean that the term πόλις was an oligarchic word, or that the oligarchic government required the word to be used in its honorific formulations. Indeed, the opposition ‘democratic people’ and ‘oligarchic city’ is valid exclusively in *IG* I³ 98 and 102: just as the word δῆμος may have been used deliberately in the decree for Thrasyboulus, it is certainly likely that the word πόλις was used deliberately in this decree. Yet we cannot infer such an opposition on a more general level because a) we have only one honorific decree enacted under the oligarchy,³² and b) the terms πόλις and δῆμος were used indiscriminately in honorific decrees enacted under the democracy, as seen above.

Therefore, the key point to recognise is that fifth-century BCE democratic Athens used different expressions to describe itself: ‘people of the Athenians’, ‘city of the Athenians’, or just ‘Athenians’. An exaggerated emphasis on *περὶ τὸν δῆμον τὸν Ἀθηναίων*—such as that traditionally put on it by some scholars—risks being both counter-productive and unwarranted, as it leads us to misinterpret all the honorific decrees which do not display that formulation.³³ But, with the exception of *IG* I³ 98, they were all enacted under the democracy. Should we make a distinction between more democratic and less democratic decrees, in the light of the presence or the absence of *περὶ τὸν δῆμον τὸν Ἀθηναίων*? This would be inappropriate.³⁴ Rather, let us say that the Dionysia of

32 But see [Plu.] *X Or.* 833e-f.

33 Alternatively, one could explore the democratic nature of an honorific decree either (a) by investigating the presence of the assembly in the prescript of the decree (but see e.g. *IG* II² 18 and the commentary of Rhodes and Osborne 2003, 48-51, especially 48-49); however, this does not necessarily help, since *IG* I³ 98 was probably a decree of the council (but see Osborne and Rhodes 2017, 451), but the decrees of the fourth-century BCE oligarchic periods 321-318 BCE and 317-307 BCE were decrees of the assembly (that was not considered, apparently, as a specifically democratic organ, given that oligarchs, in order to obstruct democracy, removed the Council of the Five Hundred and the *μισθός*); or (b), by focusing on the *ἀνδραγαθία* of the honorands (see Whitehead 1993, 55-62), since the expression *ἀνὴρ ἀγαθός* is always mentioned explicitly in the honorific decrees enacted under the democracy (however it is absent from *IG* I³ 80), and not in the decree enacted under the oligarchic government (although *IG* I³ 98 is our only decree from 411-410 BCE). In any case, in the light of this situation, we are left with the surviving evidence and it is only *that* evidence which we can rely on.

34 ‘Towards the people of the Athenians’ could further be subjected to examination along class lines: it is not clear, for example, whether this refers to one sector of the population

409 BCE, with the crowning of Thrasyboulus in the theatre, stressed the point of the people freed from the oligarchic government, and that *περὶ τὸν δῆμον τὸν Ἀθηναίων*, on that occasion, was probably meant as a clear reference to the city ruled by the people, i.e. the democracy. Despite this, the addressee of the honorand's good actions did not change: it was always Athens, with its *people*, the *Athenians*, and its great *city*. This is why the formulation of the honorific decrees could fluctuate. It is demonstrated that the addressee of the honorands' good actions cannot be politically distinguishable by developments in the practice of proclaiming honours throughout the fourth-century BCE. The web Athens created throughout the fourth-century BCE with proclamations of honours aimed to attract attention towards itself, in order to build an increasing number of utilitarian relationships. The fact is that giving and/or receiving assistance in Athens was not something related to democracy: utility and profit are not politically distinguishable. Wilson has argued for a close relationship between the proclamation of honours (so, receiving assistance from someone) and democracy, so that the honorand should be considered as an assistant of democracy, with rewards deriving from the democratic government: "the practice of proclaiming crowns to benefactors at the Dionysia thus simultaneously reveals the confidence and the fragility of the democracy, dependent as it was on foreign—and in many cases, extremely wealthy and powerful—individuals, yet able, in the very act of endowing them with such ostentatious honours, to assert and enact its superior status in any relationship."³⁵ Wilson is right when he talks about the "government's fragility", but I do not understand why we should depict democracy as fragile: any kind of government could be weak, and tyranny and oligarchy in Athens ruled for a much shorter time than democracy. The fragility Wilson is talking about should be attributed instead to the economic system of *πόλεις* in general, because food (especially grain in the period post-Chaironeia),³⁶ the army and money were not

or another, e.g., wealthy or poor. It is true that we lack evidence for poor Athenians proposing honorific decrees which feature this phrase, but, generally, the *demos* is taken as a whole.

35 Wilson 2009, 22.

36 With regard to grain, see Liddel 2007, 294: "securing the grain supply was a constant preoccupation of the Athenians, being a subject of discussion during the main assembly of each prytany ([Arist.] *Ath. Pol.* 43.4). It is likely that maintaining the grain supply of the city was a concern throughout the fifth and fourth centuries. There is evidence to suggest that major grain shortages, particularly in 335/4 and 330/29, had forced the Athenians to think carefully about securing their grain supply (RO 95, 96)". In much the same way, see Lambert 2012, 97: "this, of course, was a perennial concern, detectable for sure in decrees pre-dating Chaironeia ...; but the systematic honouring of grain traders was a new policy after Chaironeia, a product of Athens' sudden loss of international power and influence

the needs of a democratic government in particular. Moreover, if we think of a celebration of democracy either in the theatre or in another public place, we would probably expect a uniquely Athenian proclamation, that is a proclamation made by Athens towards an Athenian (who was directly involved in the city's politics). However, as Henry highlights,³⁷ public proclamations for native Athenian citizens are attested only from the late fourth-century BCE. The majority of the honorific decrees we have are devoted to foreigners, kings, states and individuals, and this indicates the government's dependence on external assistance. Athens, like many other Greek cities, had poor land, and sustained itself by trading.³⁸ Thus, in war-time, ships, food and soldiers were needed and asked for from foreign cities and countries. In these cases, any type of government would have honoured those who came to the city's assistance. As Lambert says, honorific decrees—especially in fourth-century BCE—were monumentalised diplomacy³⁹ in order both to encourage other people to emulate the honorands and to maintain the great image of the city—not the democracy—throughout Greece.⁴⁰ Thus, this Athenian 'helping behaviour' should not be considered specifically democratic, but, rather, a utilitarian policy applied by a city which strongly relied on external affairs, intended to establish useful alliances and relationships. The historical and political context of fifth-century BCE Athens and fourth-century BCE Athens cannot be compared, but the practice of proclaiming honours should be examined in its totality. Certainly, as for the fifth-century BCE, if one compared *IG I³ 98* to *IG I³ 102* in isolation, one would notice the absence in the former and the specification in the latter of τὸν δῆμον. But, apart from these exceptional cases, the evidence

following the defeat and the consequent dissolution of the Second Athenian League, and a response to increased vulnerability to the acute supply problems of the 30s and 20s."

37 See Henry 1983, 22-62. See also Lambert 2012, 3-47.

38 See Hansen 2006, 85-97.

39 See Lambert 2012, 96. See also Luraghi 2010. Luraghi, although he considers mostly honorific decrees of the Hellenistic age, never talks about democracy or democratic values (even when he briefly mentions fifth- and fourth-century BCE honorific decrees). Rather, he firstly elucidates "the workings of the political community as a corporate body that dispenses public honours in exchange for good deeds of various sorts, and the mechanisms of reciprocity that make it desirable for citizens to become involved in this sort of exchange." Secondly, he considers honorary decrees as "monumentalised narrative texts, ... reading in them a conscious attempt, on the part of the political community, to articulate and transmit a specific authorized version of its past" (248).

40 See Lambert 2012, 337-362, and 2017, 69-92. For an in-depth analysis of Greek euergetism through the fifth and fourth-century BCE see Domingo Gygax 2016 (especially 192-250 for the evolution of honorific decrees in fourth-century BCE; see also Henry 1983, 7-21, 42-44, 46-47, 116-162).

shows no fixed formulaic language, and we should not judge the formulation of fifth-century BCE honorific decrees solely in light of *IG I³ 102*.⁴¹

Bibliography

- Canevaro, M., and Harris, E.M. (2012). The Documents in Andocides' *On the Mysteries*. *CQ* 62, pp. 98-129.
- Carter, D.M. (2004). Was Attic Tragedy Democratic? *Polis* 21, pp. 1-25.
- Domingo Gygax, M. (2016). *Benefaction and Rewards in the Ancient Greek City*. Cambridge.
- Goldhill, S. (1990). The Great Dionysia and Civic Ideology. In: J.J. Winkler and F.I. Zeitlin, eds., *Nothing to Do With Dionysos? Athenian Drama in Its Social Context*, Princeton, pp. 97-129.
- Goldhill, S. (2000). Civic Ideology and the Problem of Difference. The Politics of Aeschylean Tragedy, Once Again. *JHS* 120, pp. 34-56.
- Griffin, J. (1998). The Social Function of Attic Tragedy. *CQ* 48, pp. 39-61.
- Hansen, M.H. (2006). *Polis. An Introduction to the Ancient Greek City-State*. Oxford.
- Henry, A.S. (1983). *Honours and Privileges in Athenian Decrees: the Principal Formulae of Athenian Honorary Decrees*. Hildesheim/New York.
- Lambert, S.D. (2012). *Inscribed Athenian Laws and Decrees 352/1-322/1 BC. Epigraphical Essays*. Leiden/Boston.
- Lambert, S.D. (2017). *Inscribed Athenian Laws and Decrees in the Age of Demosthenes. Historical Essays*. Leiden/Boston.
- Liddel, P. (2007). *Civic Obligation and Individual Liberty in Ancient Athens*. Oxford.
- Luraghi, N. (2010). The *demos* as Narrator. Public Honours and the Construction of Future and Past. In: L. Foxhall, H.-J. Gehrke, and N. Luraghi, eds., *Intentional History. Spinning Time in Ancient Greece*, Stuttgart, pp. 247-263.
- Matthaiou, A.P. (2010). The Cutter of *IG, II², 17*. Addenda. In: G. Reger, F.X. Ryan, and T.F. Winters, eds., *Studies in Greek Epigraphy and History in Honor of Stephen V. Tracy*, Bordeaux/Paris, pp. 73-81.
- Mattingly, H. (2007). Two Fifth-Century Attic Epigraphic Texts Revisited. *ZPE* 162, pp. 107-110.

41 I am grateful to Peter J. Rhodes and Phillip S. Horky, whose help and support have been fundamental to the development (in general) of my thoughts and (specifically) of this paper. I would like to thank also Cristina Carusi, Robin Osborne, Federico M. Petrucci, and Barnaby Chesterton who dedicated their time to the reading of my paper: their objections and suggestions extensively improved the structure of the paper. Lastly, thanks to the two anonymous reviewers of *Mnemosyne* who provided me with precious comments to my discussion.

- Meyer, E.A. (2013). Inscriptions as Honors and the Athenian Epigraphic Habit. *Historia* 62, pp. 453-505.
- Osborne, R. (2010). *Athens and Athenian Democracy*. Cambridge.
- Osborne, R., and Rhodes, P.J. (2017). *Greek Historical Inscriptions 478-404 BC*. Oxford.
- Reiter, H.A. (1991). *Athen und die Poleis des Delisch-Attischen Seebundes. Die Proxenoï und Euergetai des attischen Demos in den Poleis des Delisch-Attischen Seebundes im Licht der attischen Proxenie- und Euergesiebeschlüsse des 5. Jahrhunderts v. Christus*. Regensburg.
- Rhodes, P.J. (2003). Nothing to Do With Democracy. Athenian Drama and the *Polis*. *JHS* 123, pp. 104-119.
- Rhodes, P.J. (2011). The Dionysia and Democracy Again. *CQ* 61, pp. 71-74.
- Shear, J.L. (2007). Cultural Change, Space, and the Politics of Commemoration in Athens. In: R. Osborne, ed., *Debating the Athenian Cultural Revolution*, Cambridge, pp. 91-115 and 301-333.
- Shear, J.L. (2011). *Polis and Revolution. Responding to Oligarchy in Classical Athens*. Cambridge.
- Whitehead, D. (1993). Cardinal Virtues. The Language of Public Approbation in Democratic Athens. *C&M* 44, pp. 37-75.
- Wilson, P. (2009). Tragic Honours and Democracy. Neglected Evidence for the Politics of the Athenian Dionysia. *CQ* 59, pp. 8-29.