

# HYPERBOREUS

---

STUDIA CLASSICA

ναυσὶ δ' οὔτε πεζὸς ἰὼν κεν εὐροίς  
ἔς Ὑπερβορέων ἀγῶνα θαυμαστὰν ὁδὸν

(Pind. *Pyth.* 10. 29–30)

EDITORES

NINA ALMAZOVA SOFIA EGOROVA  
DENIS KEYER ALEXANDER VERLINSKY

PETROPOLI

**Vol. 22      2016      Fasc. 2**

---

BIBLIOTHECA CLASSICA PETROPOLITANA  
VERLAG C.H. BECK MÜNCHEN

CHRISTIANO HABICHT  
NONAGENARIO

## CONSPECTUS

Preface .....	181
DMITRI PANCHENKO	
The Sixth-Century Samian Foot of 26.25 cm and Evolution of the Greek Linear Measures .....	185
NATALIA PAVLICHENKO, OLGA SOKOLOVA	
Fragments of Lead Letters from Nymphaion .....	192
EDWARD M. HARRIS	
The Nature of Self-Defense in Draco's Homicide Law: The Restoration of <i>IG I<sup>3</sup> 104</i> , lines 33–35 .....	203
STEPHEN LAMBERT	
The Selective Inscribing of Laws and Decrees in Late Classical Athens ..	217
MICHAEL J. OSBORNE	
The Changing Face of Athenian Government (403/2–168/7) .....	240
STEPHEN V. TRACY	
Sophilos, Son of Aristotle, of Phyle .....	263
ALEXANDER K. GAVRILOV	
Ein Zweiter epigraphischer Beleg für den Skythen Saumakos ( <i>IosPE I<sup>2</sup> 353</i> )? .....	270
ANGELOS CHANIOTIS	
Pankrates: a Senior Statesman from Aphrodisias .....	282
DENIS KEYER	
<i>Arcus</i> in Horace, <i>Carm.</i> 3. 26. 7 .....	293

ALEXANDER DEMANDT	
Pilatus und das Blut der Galiläer .....	308
KENT J. RIGSBY	
A Dancer in Syria .....	313
T. COREY BRENNAN	
The Discovery (and Rediscovery) of a Temple Dedication to Hercules by P. Aelius Hieron, Freedman of Hadrian ( <i>AE</i> 1907, 125) .....	322
KLAUS HALLOF	
De titulo Veronensi metrico .....	337
OLGA BUDARAGINA	
A Foundation Stone Inscription from the Petrischule in St. Petersburg ...	340
Key Words .....	347
Правила для авторов .....	349
Guidelines for contributors .....	351

THE CHANGING FACE  
OF ATHENIAN GOVERNMENT  
(403/2–168/7)\*

It is generally accepted that in Athens two clearly defined types of decree are evidenced as emanating from meetings of the *ekklesia*, namely on the one hand probouleumatic decrees, where the *Boule* had provided a specific draft (*probouleuma*) and on the other hand non-probouleumatic decrees, where the *Boule* had simply provided an agenda item for decision in the *ekklesia* (an open *probouleuma*) or where the *ekklesia* made a decision contrary to a specific *probouleuma* or supported a supplementary decree. In his magisterial work *The Athenian Boule* Peter Rhodes has carefully described and analyzed the two types of decree,<sup>1</sup> and in the interests of providing a possible insight into the influence of the *Boule* in the framing of legislation he has also provided a Table illustrating the balance between probouleumatic and non-probouleumatic decrees, which may be summarized as follows:<sup>2</sup>

Table I. Rhodes 1972, 79 (Summary)

Period	Probouleumatic	Non-probouleumatic (excluding prytany decrees) <sup>3</sup>	Total
403/2–322/1	107 (= 51%)	101 (= 49%)	208
321/0–263/2	79 (= 48%)	85 (= 52%)	164
262/1–201/0	65 (= 82%)	14 (= 18%)	79
200/199–101/0	91 (= 87%)	13 (= 13%)	104

---

\* It is a privilege and pleasure for me to break my promise of a silent retirement to offer this modest contribution in honour of Christian Habicht, a mentor and friend for some forty years.

<sup>1</sup> Rhodes 1972, 52 ff.; cf. Rhodes–Lewis 1997, 11 ff. Decrees of the *Boule* itself are not covered in this paper.

<sup>2</sup> The percentages have been added by the present author.

<sup>3</sup> For the need to exclude non-probouleumatic prytany ‘first’ decrees as ‘routine’ and resulting essentially from ‘a point of etiquette’ cf. Rhodes 1972, 76; Rhodes–Lewis 1997, 30 f.; Osborne 2012a, 68 f.

His conclusion (p. 79 f.) was that “in the fourth and early third centuries the total of all decrees <is> fairly evenly divided between probouleumatic and non-probouleumatic... But once the Athenians became aware of their insignificance political life lost its attractions and it appears that from early in the third century the ratification of honorific probouleumata took up more and more of the assembly’s time. After 322/1 documents of real substance are very rare, and other indications of an active assembly are wanting...”.

Subsequently Graham Oliver has analyzed the ratio of probouleumatic to non-probouleumatic decrees in the oligarchic phase 322/1–319/8 and set the result within a slightly refined chronological framework as follows:<sup>4</sup>

*Table II.* Oliver 2003, 46

Period	Probouleumatic	Non-probouleumatic <sup>5</sup>	Total
403/2–323/2	104 (= 52%)	96 (= 48%)	200
322/1–319/8	6 (= 27%)	16 (= 73%)	22
318/7–263/2	74 (= 47%)	82 (= 53%)	156
262/1–201/0	64 (= 70%)	28 (= 30%)	92

Oliver’s conclusion was that “under the oligarchy ... the proportion of non-probouleumatic is much higher than in the periods before and after. ... The reduction in the number of decrees that enacted <the *Boule*’s> probouleumata and were inscribed may indeed reflect a real shift in constitutional powers that was introduced by reforms in 322/1”.<sup>6</sup>

The preponderance of non-probouleumatic decrees in the oligarchic period is a significant discovery, but his interpretation of it as a possible indicator of constitutional change is open to question. For a critical drawback in his analysis, as indeed in that of Rhodes, is the treatment of the years 403–323 and 318–263 as undifferentiated periods. For the available evidence strongly suggests that there was a major transformation in the Lykourgan Period,<sup>7</sup> which saw a massive preponderance of non-

<sup>4</sup> Oliver 2003, 40–46.

<sup>5</sup> His numbers and percentages for non-probouleumatic decrees in the last two phases are inflated by the inclusion of routine prytany decrees (evidenced from the 280s onwards).

<sup>6</sup> Oliver 2003, 45 f.

<sup>7</sup> For the definition of the Lykourgan Period see now Rhodes 2010, 81 ff. In broad keeping with his comments the Lykourgan Period is taken here to encompass the years 337/6–323/2.

probouleumatic decrees, reflecting the dominant role of sundry prominent individuals such as Demades, a prolific proposer of non-probouleumatic decrees throughout the years 337/6–323,<sup>8</sup> and Lykourgos. The data may be summarized as follows:

*Table III.* Probouleumatic and non-probouleumatic decrees 337/6–323/2

Date (year, prytany, day)	<i>IG</i> II/III <sup>3</sup>	Probouleumatic	Non-probouleumatic
337/6 X [-]	321		[ - - - - - ] (Demades)
X [-]	322		Honours for courtier of Philip (Demades)
X [35]	324 I	Honours for Evenor of Akarnania	
X <35>	325	Honours for Kalliteles of Kydantidai	
ca. 337	430		Honours for a man of Salamis
336/5 X 37	327 II	Honours for Phyleus of Oinoe	
335/4 X 23	331	Honours for Nikostratos	
[-] 17	327 III		Honours for Phyleus of Oinoe
336/5 or 335/4	329	Honours for Eupor[ - - ] (Lykourgos)	
334/3 [-]	333 I		Honours for Archippos of Thasos
[-]	334		[ - - - ] (Demades)
[-]	335		Honours for Amyntor (Demades)
ca. 334–325	336		[ - - - - ] (Lykourgos)
333/2 I 39	338 I		Honours for Pytheas of Alopeke
II	337 II		For merchants from Kition (Lykourgos) <sup>9</sup>

<sup>8</sup> For the decrees of Demades (at least 23 in number) cf. Brun 2000, 33; Paschidis 2008, 40–49.

<sup>9</sup> This decree is preceded on the *stèle* by the open *probouleuma* of the *Boule*.

Table III (continued)

Date (year, prytany, day)	IG II/III <sup>3</sup>	Probouleumatic	Non-probouleumatic
[-]	339		Honours for Mnemon & Kallias of Herakleia
IV 11/12	341	[ - - - - ]	
332/1 VIII 7	344		Honours for [ - - ]
VIII 7	345		Honours for a Plataian (Lykourgos)
VIII 7	346 II		Honours for the son of Aristeides (Demades)
VIII 7	347		Honours for Amphis of Andros
IX 23	348	Honours for Phanodemus of Thymaitadai <sup>10</sup>	
IX 23	349		Honours for Amphiaraos
331/0 X 16	351	Honours for Rheboulas	
330/29 IX 19	352		Honours for Eudemos of Plataia (Lykourgos)
330/29–328/7	367 I		Honours for Herakleides of Salamis
	367 III		Honours for Herakleides of Salamis
ca. 330 [-] 34	469 II	Honours for the <i>anagrapheus</i> Kallikratides	
329/8 III 33	355		Honours for <i>epimeletai</i> of Amphiaraos
IV 11	356		Honours for [ - - ] of Larisa (Demades)
328/7 VIII 26	359 I		Honours for Androkles, priest of Asklepios

<sup>10</sup> This is a ‘mixed’ decree – ἔδοξεν τῷ δήμῳ followed by the probouleumatic formula.



Table III (continued)

Date (year, prytany, day)	<i>IG</i> II/III <sup>3</sup>	Probouleumatic	Non-probouleumatic
327/6 [-]	361		Honorific decree
[-]	362		[ - - - - ]
[-]	363		[ - - - - ]
326/5 [-]	366		[ - - - - ]
325/4 V 34	367 V		Honours for Herakleides of Salamis
[-]	370		concerning a colony in the Adriatic
324/3 [-]	373		[ - - - - ] <sup>11</sup>
323/2 I 11	375		Honours for Lapyris of Kleonai
III 36	376		concerning Phokis
V 22	378		Honours for Euphron of Sikyon
[-]	379		Honours for Apollonides of Sidon
VIII [-]	380		Honorific decree
ca. 323	485		Honours for <i>Demos</i> of Kythnos
Assigned: <sup>12</sup>			
337–325	432		Honours for Sopatros of Akragas (Lykourgos)
337–322	439		Honours for Dionysios
337–320	440		Honours for Potamon and others
337–320	441		Honours for Pandios of Herakleia
336–330	444	Renovation of statue of Athena	

<sup>11</sup> The words ἔδοξεν τῷ δήμῳ are wholly restored.

<sup>12</sup> Excluded are decrees assigned by Lambert (*IG* II/III<sup>3</sup> 1, 2) to the years 325–322, but included in the oligarchic period by Oliver 2003, 42–43 (i.e. *IG* II/III<sup>3</sup> 1, 2. 466; 480; 484).

Table III (continued)

Date (year, prytany, day)	IG II/III <sup>3</sup>	Probouleumatic	Non-probouleumatic
334–322	454	Honours for a man from Kos	
333–320	467		[ - - - - ]
329–322	473		Honours for Nikostratos
<i>post</i> 325	479		Proxeny grant
Possible assignments: <sup>13</sup>			
340–330	416	Honours for priest and <i>hieropoioi</i>	
340–325	417	Honours for prytany official	
340–320	418	Honours for Asklepiodoros <sup>14</sup>	
340–320	419		Honours for a man of Amphipolis
340–320	421		Honorific decree
340–320	426	Proxeny grant	
340–320	428	Honours for Philomelos	
Possible assignments on the basis of the identity of the proposer			
337/6	[-]	326	[ - - - - - ] (Demades)
328/7	VI 31	357	[ - - - - ] (Lykourgos)
328/7		358	Honours for Eurylochos of Kydonia (Demades)

The numbers and percentages for the years 403/2–338/7 and for the Lykourgan and oligarchic periods may be summarized as follows:

<sup>13</sup> Dates as in *IG II/III*<sup>3</sup> I, 2. Decrees assigned to the timeframe 345–320 (*IG II/III*<sup>3</sup> 1, 2. 403; 405; 410 – all non-probouleumatic) and to ca. 340 (*IG II/III*<sup>3</sup> 1, 2. 414; 415 – both non-probouleumatic) have been excluded.

<sup>14</sup> For this decree cf. Rhodes 1972, 72 f.; 261.

Table IV. Probouleumatic and non-probouleumatic decrees ca. 403/2–319/8

Period	Probouleumatic	Non-probouleumatic	Total
403/2–338/7 <sup>15</sup>	82 (= 61%)	54 (= 39%)	136
337/6–323/2 <sup>16</sup>	11 (= 21%)	42 (= 79%)	53
322/1–319/8	6 (= 27%)	16 (= 73%)	22

On this analysis the epigraphical data do not offer evidence for a major change under the oligarchy, rather they indicate the continuation of a trend established in the Lykourgan Period.<sup>17</sup> They also reveal, contrary to the Tables provided by Rhodes and Oliver, that the total of probouleumatic decrees in the years 403/2 to 338/7 was not approximately identical to that of non-probouleumatic decrees, but considerably higher.

In a subsequent article<sup>18</sup> Rhodes has noted the findings of Oliver and presented a modified conclusion to the effect that “until about 285–260 ... the council and the assembly both played an active part in the decision-making process, but after that the assembly continued to meet and to pass decrees, but in doing so was largely content to endorse the council’s recommendations. Indeed, between 321 and 285–260, non-probouleumatic decrees predominated, reflecting an assembly very actively engaged in those troubled times”. Such an assessment is clearly true for the years 321–318 and 307–287, but the change to a predominance of probouleumatic decrees can be located soon after 283 (rather than vaguely attributed to the general period 285–260) when the Athenians, disappointed over their failure to regain the Peiraieus, bereft of anti-Antigonid supporters other than the Ptolemies, and painfully conscious of their real powerlessness, lapsed into ekklesiastic torpor and left most decision-making to the *Boule*. The path of this transformation from an active to an essentially passive *ekklesia* can be charted quite closely.

<sup>15</sup> The figures for this period are approximate (and differ slightly from the number that can be calculated from the lists provided by Rhodes 1972, 246–258 and 259–266) since sundry decrees dated by Stephen Lambert (*IG* II/III<sup>3</sup> 1, 2) to the general period 345–320 are not included. The forthcoming *corpus* of decrees from 403/2 to 353/2 being prepared by Angelos Matthaïou (*IG* II/III<sup>3</sup> 1, 1) may bring to light a few more items, but these are unlikely to change the percentages here significantly.

<sup>16</sup> The calculation here does not include the 10 decrees listed as ‘possible’. If they were included the figures would be: probouleumatic 16 (25%); non-probouleumatic 47 (75%).

<sup>17</sup> The spread of dated decrees with the relevant details may also be significant: 337/6–331/0 – probouleumatic 8, non-probouleumatic 16; 330/29–323/2 – probouleumatic (?) 1, non-probouleumatic 19.

<sup>18</sup> Rhodes 2006, 41.

The available evidence for the brief democratic spell in 318 suggests that non-probouleumatic decrees continued to be prevalent, since all of the decrees in which the issue can be determined are non-probouleumatic.<sup>19</sup> Too few decrees are preserved from the rule of Demetrios of Phaleron for useful analysis.<sup>20</sup> By contrast the pattern of decrees in the years 307/6–301/0, when ekklesiastic activity was more than usually intense, indicates that non-probouleumatic decrees were the more numerous: of at least 76 where the nature can be determined 28 (37%) are probouleumatic, 48 (63%) non-probouleumatic.<sup>21</sup> This is unsurprising in that, as in the Lykourgan period, the political scene was dominated by a few individuals, notably Stratokles of Diomeia, an energetic and forceful political figure, who was close to Demetrios Poliorketes.<sup>22</sup> The relevant data are as follows:

---

<sup>19</sup> The change to democracy, stimulated by the edict of Polyperchon, took place soon after prytany VIII of 319/8 and lasted until some time in or shortly after prytany VII 318/7. The decrees of this period are: (319/8) *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 387 + *SEG* 21. 314 (= *Naturalization* D 35); *Agora* XVI 103; *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 398 b (= *Naturalization* D 36); *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 391 (= *Naturalization* D 37); *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 390 – all lacking details of their nature; (318/7) *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 448 II (= *Naturalization* D 38); *Agora* XVI 104; 105; *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 350 (= *Naturalization* D 39) all non-probouleumatic.

<sup>20</sup> Only the non-probouleumatic decree for Asandros (314/3) is preserved with appropriate details (*IG* II<sup>2</sup> 450 + *SEG* 59. 114 = *Naturalization* D 40). *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 453 + *SEG* 59. 115 is to be dated to 310/09, but lacks such details. Cf. Tracy 2000, 229. Other possible decrees are *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 418; 585 (non-probouleumatic); 592 (probouleumatic); and 727. Cf. Tracy 1995, 36 ff. See also O’Sullivan 2009, 116–117 = *SEG* 59. 16.

<sup>21</sup> It may be estimated that some 220 decrees and decree fragments either belong or may be assigned to the years 307/6–302/1. A complexity in drawing up a list is that many fragments can only be given rather vague dates within the last decades of the century.

<sup>22</sup> For the decrees of Stratokles attributable to the years 307/6–301/0, at least 26 in number, of which only one is certainly probouleumatic, cf. Paschidis 2008, 80–103. A minor point of interest is the means by which Stratokles was able to propose so many non-probouleumatic decrees. Presumably, he identified supporters in the *Boule* who either managed to produce *probouleumata*, which were open or of such a general nature as to provide opportunities for supplementary decrees in the *ekklesia*. Thus, for instance, in 304/3 when three (possibly four) separate decrees were moved by Stratokles on the same day granting honours to friends of King Demetrios in deference to a letter sent by that king, a single *probouleuma* requesting the *ekklesia* to discuss the letter(s) would have been sufficient (*IG* II<sup>2</sup> 486; *SEG* 16. 58; *SEG* 36. 164; (probably) *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 597 + Add. p. 663). Stratokles was himself a councilor in 307/6 (cf. n. 24 below) and in prytany V was the author of a probouleumatic decree (*IG* II<sup>2</sup> 456), but three other decrees moved by him later in this year were non-probouleumatic (*IG* II<sup>2</sup> 457; 461; *SEG* 3. 86). This suggests that a decree was more closely identified with an individual and afforded him additional prominence if it was moved directly in the *ekklesia*. That significant political figures like Stratokles paid attention to such nuances is surely confirmed by their efforts

Table V. Probouleumatic and non-probouleumatic decrees 307/6–301/0<sup>23</sup>

Date	Probouleumatic	Non-probouleumatic
307/6		<i>IG</i> II <sup>2</sup> 358 (+ <i>SEG</i> 21. 326; 26. 87; 35. 239)
	<i>IG</i> II <sup>2</sup> 456 (+ <i>SEG</i> 21. 328; 34. 268; 48. 25; 57. 101) Stratokles <sup>24</sup>	<i>IG</i> II <sup>2</sup> 457 (+ <i>SEG</i> 30. 67; 36. 160; 41. 48; 42. 229; 49. 107) Stratokles
	<i>IG</i> II <sup>2</sup> 466 (+ <i>SEG</i> 24. 110; 42. 94)	<i>IG</i> II <sup>2</sup> 461 (+ <i>SEG</i> 21. 332) Stratokles
		<i>IG</i> II <sup>2</sup> 463 = <i>Agora</i> XVI 109
		<i>IG</i> II <sup>2</sup> 464
		<i>Agora</i> XVI 107
		<i>SEG</i> 3. 86 Stratokles
ca. 307/6	<i>Agora</i> XVI 112 ( <i>IG</i> II <sup>2</sup> 515 + <i>SEG</i> 21. 336)	
306 (early)	<i>IG</i> II <sup>2</sup> 561 (+ Paschidis 2008, 83 f.)	
306/5	<i>IG</i> II <sup>2</sup> 470 <sup>25</sup>	<i>IG</i> II <sup>2</sup> 467 + Add. p. 661 (+ <i>SEG</i> 31. 81; 34. 73; <i>Naturalization</i> D 43)
		<i>IG</i> II <sup>2</sup> 471 (+ Paschidis 2008, 86) Stratokles

to gain publicity in the inscribed versions of decrees. For, as S. Tracy has shown (2000, 227 ff.), on many *stelai* in the years 307/6–302/1 considerable trouble has been taken to ensure the prominence of the proposer in the inscribed text – some 23 examples (= 62%), 8 of them highlighting Stratokles. Significantly in the 20 cases where the issue can be determined all but 2 are non-probouleumatic.

<sup>23</sup> This is a provisional list pending the forthcoming publication of the *corpus* for the period 322–301 by G. Oliver (*IG* II/III<sup>3</sup> 1, 3). The list has been taken down to 301/0 to include the last attested decree of Stratokles in this phase (*IG* II<sup>2</sup> 640 – prytny 2, 301/0, just before the battle of Ipsos).

<sup>24</sup> This is the only probouleumatic decree certainly attributable to Stratokles and reveals that he was a councilor in 307/6.

<sup>25</sup> Paschidis 2008, 81 f., following Wilhelm 1939, 349, assigns this decree to Stratokles, but the name, patronymic and demotic are wholly restored. Quite apart from this, the decree is probouleumatic and, since Stratokles was a councilor in the previous year (cf. *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 456) this would mean hypothesizing that extraordinarily he served in that capacity in successive years. For double and triple service on the *Boule* cf. Byrne 2009 [in: A. A. Θέμος, Ν. Παπαζαρκάδας, *Αττικά επιγραφικά, μελέτες προς τιμήν του Christian Habicht*], 215 ff., with references to further literature. There is, however, no certain instance of a person serving in successive years. Interestingly, and perhaps significantly, Stratokles moved at least three non-probouleumatic decrees whilst a councilor (cf. n. 22 above).

Table V (continued)

Date	Probouleumatic	Non-probouleumatic
		<i>Agora XVI 113</i>
ca. 306		<i>IG II<sup>2</sup> 554</i>
305/4	<i>IG II<sup>2</sup> 478 (+ SEG 15. 98)</i>	<i>IG II<sup>2</sup> 703 (+ Hesperia 4 [1935] 555 no. 5)</i>
	<i>IG II<sup>2</sup> 479/480 (+ SEG 33. 93)</i>	<i>IG II<sup>2</sup> 796 (+ Hesperia 5 [1936] 203)</i>
		<i>IG II<sup>2</sup> 797 + Add. p. 667 (+ SEG 21. 337)</i>
		<i>Hesperia 5 [1936] 201 ff.</i>
305	<i>Naturalization D 51 (+ SEG 32. 103; Paschidis 2008, 87)</i>	
304/3	<i>IG II<sup>2</sup> 482</i>	<i>IG II<sup>2</sup> 483</i>
	<i>IG II<sup>2</sup> 485+563+621 (+ Hesperia 6 [1937] 323 ff.)</i>	<i>IG II<sup>2</sup> 486 (+ SEG 21. 271; 36. 163/164; Naturalization D 45) Stratokles</i>
		<i>(?) IG II<sup>2</sup> 597 + Add. p. 662 (+ SEG 38. 70)</i>
	<i>SEG 36. 165 (+ SEG 49. 109; Paschidis 2008, 92 ff.)</i>	<i>SEG 16. 58 (+ 36. 162) Stratokles</i>
		<i>SEG 36. 164 (+ Paschidis 2008, 99) Stratokles</i>
ca. 304		<i>IG II<sup>2</sup> 374 (+ SEG 40. 74; 41. 44; Naturalization D 50; cf. HOPOΣ 22–25 [2010/2013] 70)</i>
		<i>IG II<sup>2</sup> 553 (+ SEG 31. 271; 58. 120; Naturalization D 44)</i>
303/2	<i>IG II<sup>2</sup> 491</i>	<i>IG II<sup>2</sup> 489 (+ SEG 30. 70; 31. 82; 40. 84; 45. 95)</i>
	<i>IG II<sup>2</sup> 498 (+ SEG 21. 338; 45. 94; 52. 102; Cf. Paschidis 2008, 110 ff.)</i>	<i>IG II<sup>2</sup> 490 (+ SEG 26. 90; 30. 70; 31. 82; 46. 129)</i>
	<i>Agora XVI 122 (+ SEG 47. 130)</i>	<i>IG II<sup>2</sup> 492 (+ SEG 33. 95; 39. 103) Stratokles</i>
	<i>SEG 26.90</i>	<i>IG II<sup>2</sup> 493 (+ SEG 37. 114; 39. 324; 45. 231)</i>
		<i>IG II<sup>2</sup> 494</i>
		<i>IG II<sup>2</sup> 495 (+ SEG 31. 271; 34. 76; 40. 85; Naturalization D 60) Stratokles</i>

Table V (continued)

Date	Probouleumatic	Non-probouleumatic
		<i>IG</i> II <sup>2</sup> 496 + 507 + Add. p. 661 (+ <i>SEG</i> 30. 72; 31. 271; 40. 85; <i>Naturalization</i> D 61) Stratokles
		<i>SEG</i> 30. 70 (cf. <i>SEG</i> 37. 86)
		<i>IG</i> II <sup>2</sup> 739 + Pritchett 1972, 169 ff. (+ <i>SEG</i> 38. 283; cf. Paschidis 2008, 80; 99; 101) Stratokles
ca. 303/2	<i>IG</i> II <sup>2</sup> 734 (+ <i>SEG</i> 26. 90; 30. 71; 31. 82; <i>Naturalization</i> D 46)	<i>IG</i> II <sup>2</sup> 558 (+ <i>SEG</i> 26. 89; 31. 231; 39. 104; 40. 83; <i>Naturalization</i> D 47)
		<i>IG</i> II <sup>2</sup> 559 + 568 + Add. p. 662 (+ <i>SEG</i> 32. 101) Stratokles
302/1	<i>IG</i> II <sup>2</sup> 500	<i>IG</i> II <sup>2</sup> 499 (+ <i>SEG</i> 43. 21) Stratokles
	<i>IG</i> II <sup>2</sup> 505 (+ <i>SEG</i> 24. 113; 33. 97; 37. 87; 39. 329)	<i>IG</i> II <sup>2</sup> 501 II
		<i>IG</i> II <sup>2</sup> 502 (+ <i>SEG</i> 39. 324; 45. 231; 52. 103; 59. 117)
		<i>IG</i> II <sup>2</sup> 503 (+ <i>SEG</i> 39. 107; 45. 231) Stratokles
		<i>IG</i> II <sup>2</sup> 504 (+ <i>SEG</i> 21. 339; 39. 329)
		<i>Agora</i> XVI 123
		<i>Agora</i> XVI 125
		<i>Hesperia</i> 1 (1932) 45 f. no. 4 Stratokles
		<i>Hesperia</i> 4 (1935) 37 f. no. 6
301/0		<i>IG</i> II <sup>2</sup> 640 Stratokles
307/6– 302/1 <sup>26</sup>	<i>IG</i> II <sup>2</sup> 385 b (+ <i>SEG</i> 21. 341; 31. 271; <i>Naturalization</i> D 49)	

<sup>26</sup> Some doubtful assignments are not included here. For examples: *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 428 + 277 (+ *SEG* 37. 86; 39. 329; 40. 67) where the date is disputed; *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 455 (+ *SEG* 21. 327) where in the vacant space left in line 6 to allow prominence for the proposer, Stratokles, by commencing line 7 with his name there is room for either a probouleumatic or a non-probouleumatic enactment formula – it was restored by Kirchner as probouleumatic, but the practice of leaving a space to allow the proposer's name to start a line throws this into doubt (and probably suggests that it was non-probouleumatic; cf. n. 22 above); *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 562, re-dated to ca. 245 by Tracy 1988, 317 (= *SEG* 38. 91) cf. Paschidis 2008, 182 f.; *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 585, probably from the period of

Table V (continued)

Date	Probouleumatic	Non-probouleumatic
	<i>IG</i> II <sup>2</sup> 538 (+ <i>SEG</i> 31. 271; 39. 329; <i>Naturalization</i> D 59)	<i>IG</i> II <sup>2</sup> 539 (+ <i>SEG</i> 33. 83)
	<i>IG</i> II <sup>2</sup> 557	<i>IG</i> II <sup>2</sup> 540 (+ <i>SEG</i> 40. 68)
	<i>IG</i> II <sup>2</sup> 566 (+ <i>SEG</i> 33. 103; 58. 124)	<i>IG</i> II <sup>2</sup> 560 (+ <i>SEG</i> 49. 108) Stratokles
	<i>IG</i> II <sup>2</sup> 572	<i>IG</i> II <sup>2</sup> 559 + 568 + Add. p. 662 (+ <i>SEG</i> 32. 101) Stratokles
	<i>IG</i> II <sup>2</sup> 574	<i>IG</i> II <sup>2</sup> 573 (+ <i>SEG</i> 39. 329)
	<i>IG</i> II <sup>2</sup> 583	
	<i>IG</i> II <sup>2</sup> 587	
	<i>IG</i> II <sup>2</sup> 591 (+ <i>SEG</i> 39. 329)	
	<i>IG</i> II <sup>2</sup> 593	

Demetrios of Phaleron according to Tracy 1995, 36 ff. (= *SEG* 45. 220); *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 592, possibly earlier (cf. Tracy 1995, 155 f.); *SEG* 58. 122; 128; 129, in all of which the restorations are unconvincing.

*IG* II<sup>2</sup> 595 has been omitted, since its nature is unclear. It is the work of a cutter active in the period 305/4–302/1 (cf. Tracy 2003a, 60) and was restored by Kirchner, following Koumanoudes 1886 [“Δυο δωδεκάδες Αττικῶν ψηφισμάτων”, Ἐφ. Ἀρχ.], 107 f. no. 16, with facsimile) as non-probouleumatic. It is listed by Tracy (2000, 230) as an inscribed decree where prominence has been accorded to the mover by having his details set out in a new line of text, the previous line having had vacant spaces left after the enactment formula. Only the demotic of the speaker, Γαργήτιος, is preserved and the number of *stoichoi* available for the name and patronymic can at maximum be estimated at about 24. In such circumstances it is a distinct possibility that the proposer should be identified as [ .....17..... κ]λέους Γαργήτιος, who in ca. 304 moved the decree for Evenor of Akarnania (*IG* II<sup>2</sup> 374 = D 50 + *HOPOS* 22–25 [2010–2013] 70) and who had his name set at the beginning of a line with a *vacat* of 16 spaces in the previous line after the formula [ἔδοξεν τῷ δήμῳ]. This would allow a possible text for *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 595 as follows:

[ . . . . . 9 . . . . . τῶν προέδρων ἐπεψήφ]ιζεν [ . . . . . 8 . . . . . ] Στοιχ. 38  
 [ . . . . . . . . . . 19 . . . . . καὶ συ]μπροέδρο[ι· ἔδοξε]-  
 [ v . . . . . . . . . . 22 . . . . . ] *vacat*  
 [ . . . . . . . . . . 17 . . . . . κλέους] Γαργήτιος [εἶπεν]  
 5 [ . . . . . . . . . . 23 . . . . . σ]τρατηγός [ . . . . . 6 . . . ]  
 [ . . . . . . . . . . 25 . . . . . ἐπ]ειδῆ [ . . . . . 7 . . . . ]  
 [ . . . . . . . . . . 28 . . . . . ]Σ[ . . . . . 9 . . . . ]

In such a text either the probouleumatic or the non-probouleumatic formula could be accommodated, but the fact that the proposer is afforded prominence probably favours the latter (cf. n. 22 above). Obviously, however, other restorations are possible, but any name + patronymic with fewer than 21 letters would preclude a probouleumatic formula because of the location of the *vacat* in the previous line.



The period 300/299 to 287/6 was extremely turbulent and witnessed at least four changes of regime. Lachares gained control at some point between 300 and 298/7,<sup>27</sup> but the normal organs of democratic government appear to have been maintained – of six decrees preserved from this period three are non-probouleumatic,<sup>28</sup> one is probouleumatic<sup>29</sup> and in two the matter cannot be determined.<sup>30</sup> Late in 296/5 Lachares was ejected and a new democratic regime was installed by Demetrios Poliorketes. Seven decrees are known from this phase only two of which have sufficient detail intact to indicate that they were non-probouleumatic.<sup>31</sup> The democratic government was, however, short-lived and in 294/3 some form of oligarchy is attested with the return of the *anagrapheus* in place of the prytany secretary and the double archonship of Olympiodoros in 294/3 and 293/2. One of the three decrees preserved from these two years is non-probouleumatic; the others are too fragmentary for a decision.<sup>32</sup> The details of the regime from 292/1 to 287/6 are obscure, although it could subsequently be characterized as *κατάλυσσις τοῦ δήμου* if not oligarchy.<sup>33</sup>

In 287 the Athenians, aided by Kallias of Sphettos who was in the service of Ptolemy, successfully revolted from Demetrios Poliorketes and a democratic regime, headed initially by Demochares of Leukonoe, was in place for the beginning of the year 286/5 and remained, with a few impediments,<sup>34</sup> until the end of the century and beyond. The preserved decrees indicate quite clearly that within the period from the revolt until the capitulation to Antigonos Gonatas in 263/2 (archon Antipatros) the numbers that were probouleumatic increased decidedly. The relevant data may be summarized as follows:

---

<sup>27</sup> For the rise and fall of Lachares cf. Osborne 2012a, 25 ff., with references to further literature.

<sup>28</sup> *IG II/III*<sup>3</sup> 1, 4. 844; 846; 847.

<sup>29</sup> *IG II/III*<sup>3</sup> 1, 4. 848.

<sup>30</sup> *IG II/III*<sup>3</sup> 1, 4. 845; 849.

<sup>31</sup> *IG II/III*<sup>3</sup> 1, 4. 850; 851 and 852 (from the same day); 853 (non-probouleumatic), 854, 855 (non-probouleumatic), all from the same day; 856.

<sup>32</sup> *IG II/III*<sup>3</sup> 1, 4. 857 is non-probouleumatic and is the last known decree proposed by Stratokles of Diomeia. Details are lacking in *IG II/III*<sup>3</sup> 1, 4. 858 and 859.

<sup>33</sup> See, for instance, the sentiments of Kallias of Sphettos in his *aitesis* for high honours (*IG II/III*<sup>3</sup> 1, 4. 911). Cf. Plut. *Mor.* 851 D for the *aitesis* of Demochares of Leukonoe. Only two decree fragments are attributable to these years, viz. *IG II/III*<sup>3</sup> 1, 4. 861 and 862 (both revealing that the prytany secretary was again in office).

<sup>34</sup> See Rhodes–Lewis 1997, 49 ff.

Table VI. Probouleumatic and non-probouleumatic decrees 286/5–263/2

Date	IG II/III <sup>3</sup> 1, 4	Probouleumatic	Non-probouleumatic
286/5 I. 11	863	Honours for Zenon, Ptolemaic fleet commander	
VIII 19	864		Honours for Habron & Matrias (grain merchants)
[ - - ]	868	Honours for Philokles, Ptolemaic admiral	
IX 30	866	Honours for [ - - - ], envoy of Lysimachos	
[IX 30]	867	Honours for Artemidoros, envoy of Lysimachos	
[ - - ]	924	Honours for Bithys, officer of Lysimachos	
[ - - ]	928	Honours for a major benefactor	
285/4 VII 29	870		Honours for King Spartokos of Bosphoros
XII 25	871		Honours for King Audoleon of Paonia
XII 25	872		Honours for Timo[ - - ], aide of Audoleon
ca. 285 [ - - ]	875	Citizenship re-affirmation for Aischron	
284/3			
283/2 III 19	877	Philippides of Paiania ( <i>sitesis</i> – <i>aitesis</i> ) <sup>35</sup>	
[XII 29]	879	Religious provisions	
282/1 VII 23	881		Honours for archon (of 283/2) Euthios
281/0 II 28	882	Praise for taxiarchs	
XI.29	883	Honours for <i>Demos</i> of Tenos (re-affirmation)	

<sup>35</sup> For *aitesis* cf. Osborne 2013, 127 ff., with references to further literature.

Table VI (continued)

Date	IG II/III <sup>3</sup> 1, 4	Probouleumatic	Non-probouleumatic
280/79 X 20	884/885		Honours for Komeas, hipparch of Lemnos <sup>36</sup>
ca. 280 [ - - ]	948		Honours for <i>Demos</i> of Elaia (re-affirmation)
[ - - ]	945	Honours for Aristomenes of Paiania	
279/8			
278/7			
277/6 V 22	890	[ - - - ]	
276/5 II 24	892		Honours for <i>Demos</i> of Tenedos <sup>37</sup>
	(Unp.)	Honours for taxiarchs <sup>38</sup>	
XII 32	893	Praise for taxiarchs	
275/4 XII 29	897	Honours for taxiarchs	
274/3 II [ - ]	898	Asklepieion Inventory	
273/2 [ - - ]	899	Honours for <i>sitonai</i>	
X 29	901	Honours for priest	
XII 23	902	Honours for priestly <i>epimeletai</i>	
272/1 I 11	903	Honours for priest	
IX 26	904	Honours for <i>astynomoi</i>	
XII 11	905 (?)	Honours for priestly officials <sup>39</sup>	
271/0 II 7	907	Honours for taxiarchs	
IX 27	908	Honours for <i>sitonai</i>	
270/69 VI 21	911	Kallias of Sphettos (high honours – <i>aitesis</i> )	

<sup>36</sup> Cf. Rhodes 1972, 264. For Komeas cf. Paschidis 2008, 160 f.

<sup>37</sup> This could possibly be a ‘mixed’ probouleumatic decree. Cf. n. 39 below.

<sup>38</sup> Cf. *SEG* 54. 192.

<sup>39</sup> The decree begins with the formula ἔδοξεν τῷ δήμῳ, but the text breaks before the completion of the motivation clauses, so that it could be a case where a probouleumatic formula follows, as in *IG* II/III<sup>3</sup> 1, 4. 914; 915; 991; and 1011. Perhaps in favour of this it may be noted that the proposer, Προμένης Προμένου Κεφαλήθεν, as a council member in 272/1, proposed a probouleumatic decree for the priest of Zeus Soter, with whom those honoured in *IG* II/III<sup>3</sup> 1, 4. 905 were to co-operate, earlier in the year (*IG* II/III<sup>3</sup> 1, 4. 903 – prytany I. 11).

Table VI (continued)

Date	IG II/III <sup>3</sup> 1, 4	Probouleumatic	Non-probouleumatic
269/8 II 9	912		Decree of Khremonides
268/7 XII <25>	914	concerning public doctors	
267/6 VIII <->	915	Honours for priestly <i>epimeletai</i>	
266/5 III 26	917	Honours for ephebes	
VI 12	918/919	Citizenship for Strombichos ( <i>aitesis</i> )	
[ - - ]	920		Honours for (current) archon Nikias <sup>40</sup>
Assigned to this period:			
285/275 [ - - ]	936	Proxeny grant	
285/270 [ - - ]	939	Alexandros of Beroia (citizenship)	
280/270 [ - - ]	951	Honours for <i>epimeletai</i>	
286/262 [ - - ]	961	Python (citizenship grant)	
[ - - ]	962	Citizenship grant	
[ - - ]	964	Citizenship grant ( <i>aitesis</i> )	
[ - - ]	967	concerning Thebans	
[ - - ]	974	Citizenship grant	
[ - - ]	975	Citizenship for a Sikyonian ( <i>aitesis</i> )	
[ - - ]	977	[ - - - - - ]	

Drawing conclusions from such data is, of course, hazardous, not the least because of the obviously small sample of decrees,<sup>41</sup> but it is perhaps

<sup>40</sup> A non-probouleumatic decree at the meeting ἐν Διονύσειον for the archon for his conduct of the *Dionysia* (Aristotle *Ath. Pol.* 56. 3 ff.) was probably a matter of etiquette. For another instance cf. IG II/III<sup>3</sup> 1, 5. 1298.

<sup>41</sup> The total number of decrees passed in the 36 meetings of the *ekklesia* annually was obviously substantial. Cf. Osborne 2012b, 49 ff., with further references. It is also to be noted that of a total of 116 decrees preserved in whole or in part from the period 286/5–263/2 only 58 reveal the relevant details of their nature. (The data from the following periods are: 263/2–229/8 – 63 from 154; 229/8–168/7 – 127 from 335.)

possible to sketch a scenario for the opening years of this phase. Thus directly after the revolt high hopes were entertained for the recovery of the Peiraieus, which remained in the hands of a garrison established at Mounychia by Demetrios Poliorketes, and sundry decrees of 286/5–285/4 mention this aspiration in the context of firming up links with potential anti-Antigonid supporters. In the year 286/5 all such decrees are probouleumatic, but in the following year all are non-probouleumatic,<sup>42</sup> as is the decree in 282/1 for the archon (of 283/2) Euthios, which was clearly controversial in adverting to the anticipated recovery of the Peiraieus. Thereafter only three non-probouleumatic decrees are attested (none of them seemingly controversial)<sup>43</sup> until the decree of Khremonides (in 269/8).<sup>44</sup> The pattern of the biennium 286/5–285/4 seems to indicate that in the immediate aftermath of the revolt the *Boule* felt emboldened to provide specific support for proposals in honour of agents and officers of Ptolemy and Lysimachos, but in the following year, perhaps influenced by the disastrous outcome of the attempt to regain the Peiraieus by a mixture of deceit and military force,<sup>45</sup> the new *Boule* was considerably more circumspect. Thus proposals for honours for such supporters as King Spartokos, a longstanding friend of Athens and supplier of grain, and Audoleon, King of the Paionians who was in the process of sending grain to Athens and whose honorific decree specifically noted that he ἐπ[α] νγέλλεται δὲ καὶ εἰς τὸ λοιπὸ[ν] παρέξεσθαι χρείας συνεργῶν [εἰς τε τὴν τοῦ Πειραιέως κομιδῆ]ν καὶ τὴν τῆς πόλεως ἐλευθερί[α]ν, were delegated to the *ekklesia* and passed as non-probouleumatic decrees. The honorific decree in 282/1 for Euthios, which hinted at the prospect of a further attempt to regain the Peiraieus,<sup>46</sup> was doubtless regarded as

<sup>42</sup> The probouleumatic decree of ca. 285 for Aischron (*IG II/III*<sup>3</sup> 1, 4. 875) was a re-affirmation of a grant of citizenship made to an ancestor in response to an *aitesis*, and the immediate stimulus was his assistance in an incident concerning Athenian citizens at Delphi.

<sup>43</sup> Two are re-affirmations of honours and privileges for states (*IG II/III*<sup>3</sup> 1, 4. 948 (ca. 280) for the demos of Elaia; 892 (276/5) for the demos of Tenedos); the other (280/79) is for Komeas, the hipparch of Lemnos (*IG II/III*<sup>3</sup> 884/885) praising him, confirming the honours awarded to him by the residents of Lemnos, and providing for the inscription on the *stèle* of the two decrees passed by the kleruchs. Cf. n. 36 above.

<sup>44</sup> For the date cf. Byrne 2006/7, 169 ff.; Osborne 2009, 89.

<sup>45</sup> This incident, which caused the death of 420 Athenians, is related by Polyainos *Strategemata* 5. 17. 1. For the date cf. Habicht 1997, 124 f.; Oliver 2007, 58.

<sup>46</sup> *IG II/III*<sup>3</sup> 1, 4. 881 (prytany 7, 282/1). This decree was moved by Ἀγύρριος Καλλιμέδοντος Κολλυτεύς, who also proposed the non-probouleumatic decree for Spartokos in 285/4. It praises and awards a gold crown to Euthios for his exemplary conduct in his archonship in the previous year and goes on to add εἶναι δὲ αὐτῷ καὶ ἄλλο ἀγαθὸν εὐρέσθαι παρὰ τοῦ δήμου ὅτου ἂν δοκεῖ ἄξιος εἶναι ὅταν ὁ Πειραιεύς

too controversial for a specific (favourable) *probouleuma*. The deaths of Lysimachos and Seleukos shortly afterwards probably brought an end to such machinations in respect of the Peiraeus<sup>47</sup> and it would seem that for the next twelve years or so almost all legislative activity in the *ekklesia* was probouleumatic, but not entirely of a domestic nature, as is evidenced by sundry grants of honours to foreigners.<sup>48</sup> In addition, it is clear from the honorific decree for Kallias of Sphettos of 270/69 that numerous decrees (now lost) concerning relations with Ptolemy I and II must have been enacted in these years.<sup>49</sup> The culmination of such dealings came in 269/8, when Khremonides proposed in a non-probouleumatic decree the alliance with Sparta and her allies, which was the precursor to the Khremonidean War (*IG* II/III<sup>3</sup> 1, 4. 912). Apart from this the general predominance of probouleumatic decrees in this democratic phase after 282/1 is quite clear.

For the first few years after the capitulation of Athens in 263/2 Antigonos Gonatas exercised close control<sup>50</sup> but the basic elements of the democratic system remained unchanged,<sup>51</sup> and the available data for the years from 262/1 until 229/8 (indeed until at least 168/7) indicate a continuation of the pattern established in the years 282/1 to 263/2. The percentage of probouleumatic decrees is consistently in excess of 80%,

---

καὶ τὸ ἄστυ ἐν τῷ αὐτῷ γένηται. A possible explanation of this enigmatic provision is that Euthios late in his archonship had initiated secret negotiations with officers from the fort at Mounychia concerning the return of the Peiraeus and that these were still in progress and expected, at least by some, to succeed, in which circumstances a bland expression of hope and encouragement was understandable. The deaths of Lysimachos at Kouroupedion and of Seleukos shortly afterwards and the likelihood of Antigonid reprisals doubtless dashed such hopes, and references to the regaining of the Peiraeus in decrees are absent subsequently. Cf. Osborne 2016, 93 n. 36.

<sup>47</sup> Lysimachos died at Kouroupedion early in 281, and Seleukos was murdered shortly afterwards. Cf. Heinen 1972, 24 ff. Suggestions that the Athenians may have temporarily recovered the Peiraeus in 280 (as advocated by Gauthier 1979, 348 ff., Shear 1978, 29, and Dreyer 1999, 257 ff.) are quite hypothetical. They depend on the attribution of the otherwise undated exploit of Olympiodoros in recovering the Peiraeus (Pausanias 1.26.3) to 280, rather than to 295 (for which date cf. De Sanctis 1936, 144 ff.) and they leave shrouded in mystery the circumstances in which the Peiraeus was re-taken by Antigonos Gonatas shortly afterwards (cf. Paschidis 2008, 134 f. n. 3). In short there is no clear evidence in favour of the Athenians recovering the Peiraeus at any point between 294 and 229, when it was returned by Diogenes, the commander of the Macedonian garrison (Paus. 2. 8. 6; Plut. *Arat.* 34). See further Habicht 1979, 68 ff.; Heinen 1981, 194 ff.; Oliver 2007, 55 ff.; Osborne 2016, 88 ff.

<sup>48</sup> Cf. Osborne 2016, 93–95 for a list of such decrees.

<sup>49</sup> *IG* II/III<sup>3</sup> 1, 4. 911 (270/69). For Athenian relations with the Ptolemies in this period cf. Habicht 1994 (=1992), 68 ff.; Habicht 1997, 127 ff.; Oliver 2007, 251 f.

<sup>50</sup> Cf. Tracy 2003b, 56 ff.; Osborne 2012a, 50 ff.

<sup>51</sup> Cf. Rhodes–Lewis 1997, 49 ff.

and the few attested non-probouleumatic decrees, with the occasional exception,<sup>52</sup> do not seem to be linked to highly significant events. Indeed the emergency decree of 248/7 for an *epidosis* in the face of the depredations of Alexandros, son of Krateros,<sup>53</sup> was fully probouleumatic (despite being designated ἔδοξε τῷ δήμῳ in the heading).<sup>54</sup>

The data from 318 to 168/7 can be summarized as follows:

Table VII. Probouleumatic and non-probouleumatic decrees 318–168/7

Period	Probouleumatic	Non-probouleumatic (excluding prytany decrees)	Total	(Prytany Decrees)
318		4	4	
318–308	(?) 1	(?) 2	(?) 3	
307/6–301/0	28 (=37%)	48 (= 63%)	76	
301/0–296/5	1	3	4	
296/5–295/4		2	2	
294/3–293/2		1	1	
292/1–287/6			(?) 2	
286/5–263/2 <sup>55</sup>	40 (= 80%)	10 (= 20%)	50	(8)
262/1–229/8	48 (= 84%)	9 (= 16%)	57	(6)
228/7–198/7	35 (= 83%)	7 (= 17%)	42	(11)
198/7–168/7	45 (= 84%)	9 (= 16%)	54	(20)

In summary, there is no evidence for any change in the roles of the *Boule* and the *ekklisia* even during the two brief phases in the late fourth century when a restricted franchise was imposed.<sup>56</sup> Prior to 282/1 increases in the number of non-probouleumatic decrees are attested in periods dominated by a few prominent and forceful individuals, and,

<sup>52</sup> For instance, *IG II/III*<sup>3</sup> 1, 4.1005, the decree (of 250/49) accepting an invitation from the Aitolians to the *Soteria* in celebration of the repulse of the invading Kelts in 279. The proposer of this decree was Κόβερνις Κυδίου Ἀλμμούσιος, whose father had been killed at Thermopylai (cf. Paus. 10. 21. 5).

<sup>53</sup> Cf. Osborne 2012a, 52 f.

<sup>54</sup> *IG II/III*<sup>3</sup> 1, 4. 1011. For this decree cf. Oliver 2007, 200 ff.; 277 ff.; Osborne 2012a, 70 n. 53.

<sup>55</sup> In detail the breakdown is: 286/5–282/1 – 9 probouleumatic (= 64%); non-probouleumatic 5 (= 36%); 281/0–263/2 – probouleumatic 31 (= 86%); non-probouleumatic 5 (= 14%).

<sup>56</sup> Cf. Rhodes–Lewis 1997, 40 f.; 60 f.

given the restrictions on membership of the *Boule*,<sup>57</sup> this is only to be expected. For visibility and publicity would be lost if such luminaries allowed allies on the *Boule* to figure as authors of specific *probouleumata* rather than of open *probouleumata* designed to provide them with the opportunity to be highlighted as decree proposers – and in this general regard it is doubtless relevant to note that Stratokles proposed at least three non-*probouleumatic* decrees in a year when he was a councillor. After 282/1 non-*probouleumatic* decrees are relatively rare, doubtless indicating an understandably apathetic *ekklesia*, since the majority of proposals set before it were honorific in nature and most were little more than banal expressions of thanks for citizens or groups of citizens which were unlikely to stimulate serious debate. Prior to 283/2 the bulk of honorific decrees had been for influential foreigners and were genuinely significant in helping to bolster relations with royal allies or overlords.<sup>58</sup>

Michael J. Osborne  
*Peking University;*  
*University of Melbourne*  
 m.osborne88@gmail.com

### Abbreviations

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

*Naturalization* = M. J. Osborne, *Naturalization in Athens I–IV* (Brussels 1981–1983).

### Bibliography

P. Brun, *L'orateur Démade; essai d'histoire et de historiographie*, *Scripta Antiqua* 3 (Bordeaux 2000).

S. G. Byrne, “Four Archons of the Third Century”, *MeditArch* 19/20 (2006/7) 169–179.

---

<sup>57</sup> See n. 25 above.

<sup>58</sup> From ca. 338 onwards some 90% of decrees were honorific. The breakdown is as follows: **338–323** – honours for citizens 18%; honours for foreigners 68%; other business 14%. **307/6–302/1** – honours for citizens 16%; honours for foreigners 72%; other business 12%. **286–262** – honours for citizens 58%; honours for foreigners 38%; other business 4%. **261–228** – honours for citizens 68%; honours for foreigners 23%; other business 9%. **227–200** – honours for citizens 52%; honours for foreigners 40%; other business 8%. Cf. Osborne 2012b, 53 f. with Tables I and II.



- S. G. Byrne, "Agora XV 112 and Iteration of Council Service in Hellenistic Athens", in: A. A. Themos, N. Papazarkadas (eds.), *Attika epigrafika, meletes pros timen tou Christian Habicht* (Athens 2009) 215–224.
- G. De Sanctis, "Atene dopo Ipso e un papiro fiorentino", *Riv. Fil.* 14 (1936) 134–152.
- B. Dreyer, *Untersuchungen zur Geschichte des spätklassischen Athen*, Historia Einzelschriften 137 (Stuttgart 1999).
- Ph. Gauthier, "La réunification d'Athènes en 281 et les deux archontes Nicias", *REG* 92 (1979) 348–399.
- Chr. Habicht, *Untersuchungen zur politischen Geschichte Athens im 3. Jahrhundert v. Chr.* (München 1979).
- Chr. Habicht, "Athens and the Ptolemies", *Classical Antiquity* 11 (1992) 68–90, repr. in Chr. Habicht, *Athen in Hellenistischer Zeit* (München 1994) 140–163.
- Ch. Habicht, *Athens from Alexander to Antony* (Cambridge, Mass. 1997).
- H. Heinen, *Untersuchungen zur hellenistischen Geschichte des 3. Jahrhunderts v. Chr.*, Historia Einzelschriften 20 (Stuttgart 1972).
- H. Heinen, Rev.: Chr. Habicht, *Untersuchungen zur politischen Geschichte Athens im 3. Jahrhundert v. Chr.* München 1979, *Göttingische Gelehrte Anzeigen* 233 (1981) 175–207.
- S. Koumanoudes, "Dyo dodekades Attikon psephismaton", *Ephemeris archaeologica* 1886, 95–116.
- G. J. Oliver, "Oligarchy at Athens after the Lamian War", in: O. Palagia, S. V. Tracy (eds.), *The Macedonians in Athens* (Oxford 2003) 38–51.
- G. J. Oliver, *War, Food and Politics in Early Hellenistic Athens* (Oxford 2007).
- M. J. Osborne, "The Archons of Athens 300/299–228/7", *ZPE* 171 (2009) 83–99.
- M. J. Osborne, *Athens in the Third Century BC* (Athens 2012a).
- M. J. Osborne, "Secretaries, Psephismata and Stelai in Athens", *Ancient Society* 42 (2012b) 33–59.
- M. J. Osborne, "Aitesis, Proxenia and Politeia in Later Hellenistic Athens", *ZPE* 185 (2013) 127–136.
- M. J. Osborne, "Panathenaic Fantasies", *ZPE* 198 (2016) 88–96.
- L. O'Sullivan, *The Regime of Demetrios of Phaleron 317–307 BCE*, Mnemosyne Suppl. 318 (Leiden 2009).
- P. Paschidis, *Between City and King*, MEΛETHMATA 59 (Athens 2008).
- W. K. Pritchett, "Lucubrations epigraphicae", *CSCA* 5 (1972) 153–181.
- P. J. Rhodes, *The Athenian Boule* (Oxford 1972).
- P. J. Rhodes, D. M. Lewis, *The Decrees of the Greek States* (Oxford 1997).
- P. J. Rhodes, "'Classical' and 'Hellenistic' in Athenian History", *Electrum* 11 (2006) 27–43.
- P. J. Rhodes, "Lykourgan Athens", in: A. Tamis, C. J. Mackie, S. G. Byrne (eds.), ΦΙΛΑΘΗΝΑΙΟΣ/Philathenaios. *Studies in Honour of Michael J. Osborne* (Athens 2010) 81–90.
- T. L. Shear, *Kallias of Sphettos and the Revolt of Athens in 286 B.C.*, Hesperia Suppl. XVII (Princeton 1978).
- S. V. Tracy, "Two Attic Letter-Cutters of the Third Century: 286/5–235/4 B.C.", *Hesperia* 57 (1988) 303–322.

- S. V. Tracy, *Athenian Democracy in Transition* (Berkeley 1995).
- S. V. Tracy, "Athenian Politicians and Inscriptions of the Years 307 to 302", *Hesperia* 69 (2000) 227–233.
- S. V. Tracy, *Athens and Macedon* (Berkeley 2003a).
- S. V. Tracy, "Antigonos Gonatas, King of Athens", in: O. Palagia, S. V. Tracy (eds.), *The Macedonians in Athens* (Oxford 2003b) 56–60.
- A. Wilhelm, "Athen und Kolophon", *Anatolian Studies Presented to W. H. Buckler* (Manchester 1939) 345–368.

As is well known, decrees passed in the Athenian Assembly are classified as either probouleumatic (when based on a specific *probouleuma* proposed by a member of the *Boule*) or non-probouleumatic (when moved by a member of the Assembly in response to an open *probouleuma* or as a replacement for a rejected *probouleuma*). Recent studies have concluded firstly that from the beginning of the fourth century until ca. 285/260 there was a rough balance between probouleumatic and non-probouleumatic decrees, except in the brief oligarchic phase 322/1–319/8, when non-probouleumatic decrees were predominant, possibly as the result of some constitutional shift; and secondly that from ca. 285/260 onwards the vast majority of decrees (well over 80 %) were probouleumatic, suggesting an inactive, if not apathetic, Assembly.

A detailed examination of the available data indicates that the first of these conclusions is overly generalised and inaccurate and that the date of the onset of ekklesiastic inactivity can be dated rather precisely to ca. 282/1. It is true that in the oligarchic phase 322/1–319/8 there was a predominance of non-probouleumatic decrees but this was not a novelty with possible constitutional implications but rather a continuation of the situation clearly evidenced in the so-called Lykourgan Period (337/6–323/2) in which some 80 % of decrees were non-probouleumatic. Quite apart from this the evidence reveals that in the democratic period 403/2–338/7 probouleumatic decrees were significantly more numerous than non-probouleumatic decrees, whereas in the brief democratic phase promoted by Demetrios Poliorketes (307–301) the reverse was the case. (The evidence for the periods 318–308 and 300–287 is too slight for analysis.) From 282/1 onwards, once it had become clear that the revolt from Demetrios Poliorketes had been only partly successful in that Athens could not recover the Peiraieus and was essentially powerless, probouleumatic decrees, the majority of them mundane in nature, became predominant. The rationale for the predominance of non-probouleumatic decrees in the stated periods has nothing to do with constitutional change; rather it signifies periods when the Assembly was dominated by one or a few strong individuals – Lykourgos and Demades in the 330s and 320s, Stratokles of Diomeia in the years 307–302. Restrictions on *Boule* membership and the greater prominence and publicity accorded to proposers of decrees in the Assembly – Stratokles moved at least three non-probouleumatic decrees in the year that he was a member of the *Boule* – made the link between powerful politicians and non-probouleumatic decrees inevitable.

Как известно, постановления афинского народного собрания делятся на пробулевматические (основывающиеся на определенном *probouleuma*, предложенном членом Буле) и непробулевматические (постановления, предложенные членом народного собрания в ответ на “открытое” *probouleuma*, т. е. такое, формулировка которого предоставлялась собранию, или вместо отвергнутого *probouleuma*). В последнее время были сделаны следующие выводы о соотношении декретов обоих типов: (1) с начала IV в. до примерно 285/260 гг. количество пробулевматических и непробулевматических декретов примерно одинаково, если не считать короткого периода олигархии 322/1–319/8, когда преобладали непробулевматические декреты – возможно, в результате некоего конституционного изменения; (2) примерно с 285/260 гг. абсолютное большинство декретов (более 80%) пробулевматические, что говорит о пассивности, или даже безразличии, собрания.

Однако тщательное рассмотрение имеющихся данных показывает, что первый из этих выводов страдает чрезмерной обобщенностью и неточностью. Падение активности народного собрания можно довольно точно датировать ок. 282/1 г. Хотя в олигархический период 322/1–319/8 действительно преобладали непробулевматические декреты, не следует расценивать это как нечто новое и предполагать конституционные изменения: такое же положение дел надежно засвидетельствовано и для т. н. ликурговского периода (337/6–323/2), когда около 80% декретов были непробулевматическими. Кроме того, свидетельства показывают, что в демократический период 403/2–338/7 пробулевматических декретов было значительно больше, чем непробулевматических, между тем как в краткий демократический период при Деметрии Полиоркете (307–301) ситуация была обратной. (Скудных данных за 318–308 и 300–287 гг. недостаточно для анализа.) С 282/1 г., как только стало ясно, что восстание против Деметрия Полиоркета имело успех лишь отчасти – Афины не смогли вернуть Пирей и по сути утратили политическое значение, – начинают преобладать пробулевматические декреты, в основном рутинного характера.

Что касается непробулевматических декретов, основная причина их преобладания не имеет ничего общего с изменениями в конституции. В периоды, когда их было большинство, народным собранием управляли одна или несколько сильных личностей: Ликург и Демад в 330-е и 320-е гг., Стратокл из Диомеи в 307–302 гг. Ограничения, которые накладывались на избрание в Буле (не более двух раз в течение жизни), и, в то же время, большие значение и известность, достававшиеся на долю тех, кто предлагал декреты в народном собрании (Стратокл в год, когда он был членом Буле, предложил по меньшей мере три непробулевматических декрета), создавали неизбежную связь между могущественными политиками и непробулевматическими декретами.