

REMEMBERING, FORGETTING, AND  
REWRITING THE PAST: ATHENIAN  
INSCRIPTIONS AND COLLECTIVE MEMORY\*

Polly Low

---

*Abstract:* This chapter explores the ways in which the Athenians responded to inscriptions after their creation, and in particular their approaches to the emendation, destruction, and recreation of inscribed public texts. It argues that these approaches reveal an ongoing interaction between individual initiative and collective authority in the treatment of inscribed monuments; and it suggests that this interaction, in turn, offers an important insight into the role played by inscribed texts in the shaping and reshaping of Athenian collective memory.

---

*Keywords:* inscriptions, decrees, memory, erasure, destruction, Athens

**1. Introduction**

The claim that the inscribed decrees of Classical Athens have some sort of commemorative function is, these days, probably not so much uncontroversial as positively mundane.<sup>1</sup> There is, however, less universal agreement about the precise ways in which these inscriptions functioned as sites or sources of memory, and it is this issue which I aim to

\* My thanks to the editors, for inviting me to contribute both to the seminar series and to this volume, and for their very helpful comments and suggestions throughout; I am likewise indebted to the anonymous readers of this chapter, and to Simon Hornblower, in particular for drawing my attention to a number of useful (Athenian and non-Athenian) pieces of evidence. An earlier version of part of this chapter was delivered in a panel on ‘Creating Collective Memory in the Greek City’ at the 2012 Joint Annual Meeting of the Archaeological Institute of America/American Philological Association in Philadelphia. I am grateful to Julia Shear for organising the panel, and to the AIA for a generous grant towards the cost of attending the conference. I presented some preliminary thoughts on some of the material discussed here in Low (2013), and am also therefore grateful to the editor of that volume, J. Tumblety, for her assistance in developing my ideas. P. J. Rhodes’ detailed analysis of erasures in Greek public inscriptions (Rhodes (2019)) was published when this chapter was already in proof, and I have not therefore been able to engage with its arguments here; nonetheless, my great debt to Rhodes’ published and unpublished work on this topic will, I hope, be clear.

<sup>1</sup> See (as well as Shear’s chapter in this volume), Osborne (1999); Luraghi (2010); Lambert (2011); Shear (2012). More generally on the symbolic functions of inscribed texts, see Thomas (1989) 45–60.

address here. My focus is on the treatment of inscribed monuments after their creation: that is, the reasons for which (and ways in which) they were destroyed, emended, and occasionally reconstructed. My intention, in part, is simply to sketch out the range of things that the Athenians did to their inscriptions, and to consider the reasons for their (sometimes apparently arbitrary) behaviour. The wider purpose of this chapter, though, is to explore what these practices of destruction, erasure, and reconstruction can reveal about the role played by inscribed texts in the shaping and reshaping of Athenian collective memory. This (collective memory) is a phenomenon for which I want to claim two distinguishing features. First, it should be seen as an aggregation of individual memories and memory-acts, rather than (as ‘commemoration’ might imply) something more top-down or centrally controlled.<sup>2</sup> Second (and as a consequence of the first point): collective memory is fluid, and potentially contested, rather than absolutely stable.<sup>3</sup> My suggestion is that thinking about inscriptions in terms of ‘collective memory’ rather than (or as well as) the products of single acts of ‘commemoration’ might add to our understanding both of the role of inscriptions in Athenian life, and of the nature of collective memory in the ancient city.<sup>4</sup>

Two more specific questions about the mnemonic role of inscriptions run through this study. The first relates to the theme—very prominent in recent epigraphic scholarship—of the part played by inscriptions (particularly inscribed decrees) in shaping a distinctively collective version of the city’s past, and above all of its past political decisions.<sup>5</sup> Inscribed decrees are essentially and necessarily collective, in that their existence depends on an act of collective agreement: a decree cannot be inscribed unless it is passed by the assembly, and it cannot be passed unless the Athenians, as a group, are willing to assent to it. The text of an inscribed decree commemorates a particular moment of democratic decision-making, and also marks a point at which an individual version of the events which led to the decree being passed (preserved in a decree in the form of the proposer’s words, or at least

<sup>2</sup> The theory that individual and collective memories are inextricably linked was most influentially formulated by Halbwachs (1992 [1925]); see further Assman (2011) 21–69. On collective memory in Athenian culture, see now Steinbock (2013).

<sup>3</sup> Helpfully emphasised by Cubbitt (2007) ch. 3.

<sup>4</sup> I have restricted the focus of discussion to Classical Athens partly for reasons of space and partly because the density of epigraphic and literary evidence for this period allows (at times) for the creation of a fuller picture of the memory landscape of the city than is possible for other periods and places. I should emphasise that this focus should not be taken to imply a claim that Classical Athenian behaviour was necessarily unique. In what follows, I note some non-Athenian examples which are especially useful as comparanda for Athenian practice, and which, in general, point to broad similarity between Athenian and non-Athenian commemorative habits. (Detailed consideration of how these general habits influence specific practice, especially in relation to the formation of collective memory, would be a subject for one, or several, other papers.)

<sup>5</sup> For examples of this approach, see the works cited above, n. 1.

a clause presented as if it were the words of the proposer)<sup>6</sup> receives the endorsement of the collective. To put this another way: an inscribed decree marks the moment where an individual account of the past becomes a part of a collectively-agreed narrative. In that respect, these decrees illuminate a centrally important, but often extremely elusive, aspect of the formation of collective memory: that is, the process by which individual accounts of the past become incorporated into a wider, shared version of a community's history.<sup>7</sup> Focussing on the moment of an inscribed decree's creation, however, can give the impression that this movement from individual to collective was a relatively straightforward process, and one which operated in only one direction. I hope to show that the fate of inscribed monuments after their creation points to a more complex situation, and that these collectively-agreed monuments could continue to influence, and be influenced by, individuals' changing views of the past.

This argument will require some consideration of a second theme: how do inscribed records (and the 'collective memory' which they represent) relate to other, particularly unwritten, forms of shared memory? Unwritten memories are, of course, by their very nature hard to locate in our sources, but it is sometimes possible to identify their traces.<sup>8</sup> An epigraphic example reported in a literary text can illustrate the point. In his *Third Philippic*, Demosthenes (9.41–5) appeals to the inscription setting out Athenian actions against the (alleged) traitor Arthmius of Zeleia, who had been accused of conveying Persian gold to Greece during the Persian War, and does so, he says, because he wants to provide his audience with 'not my [Demosthenes'] words but the written record of your ancestors' (*οὐ λόγους ἐμαυτοῦ λέγων, ἀλλὰ γράμματα τῶν προγόνων τῶν ὑμετέρων*, 9.41). The second-person plural is important: the actions which are recorded on the *stèle* can be asserted to represent the shared ideology of the whole Athenian people. This is—or Demosthenes hopes it can be presented as—a collective record, and it is deployed in order to trigger a collective memory of shared actions and shared ideals, which in turn can shape the behaviour of the contemporary Athenian community.<sup>9</sup> This same example, however, serves as a warning against assuming that the meaning of monuments was entirely fixed, or that there is

<sup>6</sup> On the appearance of verbatim reportage, see Plat. *Phaed.* 258a4–9; on the gap between this and reality, Osborne (1999).

<sup>7</sup> On the methodological challenge of pinning down exactly how the relationship between individual and collective memory operates, see (for example) Olick (1999); Crane (1997); Green (2004).

<sup>8</sup> For further discussion of the interplay between oral and written records in Athens, see Thomas (1989) 45–59.

<sup>9</sup> The question of the commemorative function of the monument is further complicated by the fact that both decree and *stèle* might have been fourth-century fabrications: for brief discussion (and an argument in favour of authenticity), see Meiggs (1972) 508–12. More generally on the phenomenon of collective memory leading to the fabrication of inscriptions (the opposite process, in effect, to the one under discussion here), see Habicht (1961).

necessarily a direct correlation between the words written on a *stele* and the collective memories which that *stele* might evoke. The existence of the monument is an essential part of Demosthenes' argument, but it is not sufficient in itself. The words quoted by Demosthenes record only the actions of the people involved: the treachery of Arthmius; the response of the Athenians. The reason for that response—the 'intention' of the Athenians—is (according to Demosthenes) preserved not in the written text, but in the shared memory of the audience (9.43):

ταῦτ' ἐστὶ τὰ γράμματα. λογίζεσθε δὴ πρὸς θεῶν, τίς ἦν ποθ' ἡ διάνοια τῶν Ἀθηναίων τῶν τότε, ταῦτα ποιούντων, ἢ τί τὸ ἀξίωμα.

Those are the words. Consider, by the gods, what was the intention of the Athenians of that time, or what was their decision?

Admittedly, this is a memory which requires some excavation (and, almost certainly, reshaping) by Demosthenes before it re-emerges at the surface of Athenian collective consciousness, but it remains the case that it is possible for Demosthenes to assert the existence of shared memories which lie outside the inscribed text.

That inscribed monuments might be used to shape memory but do not absolutely determine it is apparent, too, in the fact that this *stele* is put to rather different uses in other contexts. For Demosthenes in the *False Embassy* (19.271–2) the text is evidence not (as it is in the *Philippics*) of the Athenians' traditional commitment to acting as protectors of the Greek world, but rather of their long-standing objection to all forms of corruption or treachery, wherever committed. Dinarchus (in his *Against Aristogeiton*, 2.24–5) uses the inscription for a similar purpose, that is, to contrast the strong anti-corruption stance of fifth-century Athenians with the more lax approach of his contemporaries; but he puts a much greater focus on the specific problem of bribery (*δωροδοκία*) than on the all-encompassing charges of treachery emphasised by Demosthenes. All three speeches use the inscription to validate a version of the past, and to claim that it represents something that all Athenians must surely know (even though the event it recorded took place long before the lifetime of any member of their audience), but in each speech, the version of the past which the inscription is claimed to preserve is subtly but crucially different.

What this example suggests is that although inscribed monuments might have been set up with the intention of fixing a specific, collectively-authorized version of the past in the minds of their viewers, this act of collective commemoration still allowed space for a wide penumbra of associated memories. In what follows, I aim to show that this phenomenon is also visible in the epigraphic record itself, and that it can help us to analyse and

understand the Athenian approach to destroying, emending, and, occasionally, reconstructing their inscribed public monuments.

## 2. Destruction and its Avoidance

The underlying principles which guided the Athenian treatment of inscribed decrees after their creation seem, at first glance, clear and logical: when a monument became outdated, it should be either amended (by additions or deletions) or destroyed.<sup>10</sup> It is this second option, complete removal of a monument, which will be considered first.

An apparently clear-cut example of this approach is visible in an alliance between Athens and Thessaly of 361/0 (RO 44), which includes as one of its conditions the stipulation that a previous treaty between Athens and Alexander of Pherae (an enemy of Thessaly) should be removed (lines 39–40).<sup>11</sup> The logic which underpins this action seems to be this: the treaty is no longer valid; therefore the stone which records it should be destroyed. This approach can be seen elsewhere too. Demosthenes, for example, in his speech *For the Megalopolitans* asserts that the Megalopolitans should destroy the *stelae* marking their alliance with Thebes, and by doing so repudiate the treaty (16.27–8). According to Philochorus, Demosthenes himself persuaded the Athenian assembly to pass a decree authorising preparations for war with Macedon, part of which included the provision to ‘take down the *stèle* which established peace and alliance with Philip’ (BNJ 328 F 55a: τὴν μὲν στήλην καθελεῖν τὴν περὶ τῆς πρὸς Φίλιππον εἰρήνης καὶ συμμαχίας σταθεῖσαν). Plutarch (*Per.* 30.1) makes a Spartan ambassador to Athens, told by Pericles that revocation (and destruction) of the Megarian decrees was prevented by law (*nomos*), suggest the alternative strategy of simply turning the inscribed *stèle* to face the wall.<sup>12</sup>

Physical evidence for complete destruction of inscriptions is hard to pin down, for obvious reasons: almost all extant inscriptions were either taken down or simply fell down at some point between their erection and their

<sup>10</sup> The fullest discussion of the question (focussing on the treatment of inscribed treaties) is Bolmarcich (2007), who also lists some earlier studies (477 n. 2). See, in addition, Rhodes (2001) 136–9 and (2019); Pébarthe (2006) 261–3; Culasso Gastaldi (2003) and (2010).

<sup>11</sup> The verb used is here *καθαίρω*, which appears to be the regular term for removal of an inscribed *stèle*, used in both epigraphic and literary sources, and in non-Athenian as well as Athenian texts (e.g., from early fourth-century Thasos, *IG XII.8* 264, lines 12–13). Less common is *ἀναίρω* (e.g., *Andoc.* 1.103; RO 83, γ, lines 24–5).

<sup>12</sup> The nature of this alleged *nomos* is unclear: Bolmarcich (2007) 479–80, suggests that it might indicate the existence of a general law forbidding the removal of inscriptions (except under certain specified circumstances). It is perhaps more likely that Plutarch is referring (imprecisely) to a specific regulation, possibly an entrenchment clause, prohibiting the revocation of this particular decree: compare the clauses in *ML 49/OR* 142, lines 20–5; *RO* 22, lines 51–63; see Stadter (1989) *ad loc.*

modern rediscovery; only rarely can we establish whether an inscription was deliberately removed, still less pinpoint the precise moment of its destruction. One possible (albeit non-Athenian) example is the Delphian decree which records honours for Aristotle and Callisthenes (RO 80). This was passed in a fit of Macedon-pleasing enthusiasm some time between 337 and 327; we know that these honours were rescinded after Alexander's death (Ael. *VH* 14.1), and we also know that the surviving fragment of this inscription was found in a well. The context in which it was found is not securely dated, but the temptation to assume that the annulment of the honour and the destruction of the inscription go together is almost irresistible.<sup>13</sup> Returning to Athens (although also to a slightly later period), we could note the case of *Agora* 16.114, a decree praising the activities of Demetrius Poliorcetes, which seems to have fallen victim to the widespread *damnatio memoriae* carried out by the Athenians against the Antigonids in 200 or 199 BCE.<sup>14</sup> Livy (31.44.4–5) reports that the Athenians decreed that all references to Philip V and his ancestors were to be removed; this inscription was discovered in a cistern, in a context which can be fairly safely dated to *c.* 200 BCE.<sup>15</sup>

This pattern of evidence seems to fit quite comfortably with the views (outlined above) of the purpose of inscriptions. If an inscribed monument functions as the physical embodiment of the collective decision of the Athenians, then it logically follows that a reversal of that decision should entail the removal of the monument. It might even be argued that the process of cause and effect should be seen as operating in the opposite direction: that is, it is not revoking an agreement that requires the removal of a monument, but the removal of the monument that formalises the annulment of an agreement. Or perhaps the two processes are incapable of being disentangled, something suggested by Demosthenes' comments in the *Against Leptines* (20.36–7). It would be disgraceful, according to Demosthenes, for the Athenians to leave standing inscriptions (*στήλας*) whose terms they no longer intended to keep; and it would be disgraceful for them to breach an agreement (*συνθήκας*) which was still in force: *αὐται γὰρ οὕτωςι τοῖς βουλομένοις κατὰ τῆς πόλεως βλασφημεῖν τεκμήριον ὡς ἀληθῆ λέγουσιν ἐστήξουσιν* ('for when people wish to bad-mouth our city, there those things will stand, as proof that they speak the truth', 20.37). It is hard to tell whether Demosthenes is referring (in *αὐται*) to the *stelae* or to the *sunthekai* (both are feminine plural). My suspicion is that this ambiguity would be unproblematic for Demosthenes; indeed that it is positively helpful for his argument here.

<sup>13</sup> RO, p. 395. *FD* III.1 400 (at pp. 240–1) notes in addition that the same well also contained fragments of a bronze plaque, listing names of some individuals expelled from Delphi during the Third Sacred War (*CID* 2.73), and speculates that this inscription too might have been disposed of once these men were able to return to Delphi after 346 BCE.

<sup>14</sup> See below, p. 245.

<sup>15</sup> Young (1951) 226. See Shear, below, Ch. 7, for detailed discussion of the erasure made by the Athenians in the decree of Phaedrus of Sphettus (*IG* II<sup>2</sup> 682) in 200 BCE.

The inscribed monument should be a physical manifestation both of Athenian ideals and of Athenian practice, and no gap should be allowed to develop between monument and reality.

But this picture of neat correlation between Athens' commemorative epigraphic landscape and its practical political commitments is both incomplete and misleadingly tidy. In fact, a closer look at one of the examples already mentioned reveals this: that is, the Athenian alliance with Thessaly, and the clause stipulating the removal of the *stele* recording the treaty with Alexander of Pherae. The alliance, as noted above, was decreed in 361/o, but by this point Athens had already been fighting Alexander for some time: the alliance between Alexander and Athens was made in 368; in 364 Alexander shifted his allegiance to Thebes; by 362 and 361 he was attacking Athenian allies and Athenian ships, and even staged a raid on Piraeus.<sup>16</sup> It was not, however, until the treaty with Thessaly was made in 361/o that the Athenians got round to removing the treaty with Alexander, even though that treaty cannot have had any formal force for several years.

It is, though, possible to see the logic behind this approach too. Since (according to our sources, at least) it was Alexander who had broken the treaty, and since there was generally a diplomatic benefit to be had from claiming to be the victim, rather than the instigator, of any interstate quarrel, it would presumably have been quite helpful for the Athenians to be able to point to a tangible marker of the disloyalty of their (former) ally. Demosthenes' comments in the *Against Leptines*, noted above, point to an awareness of the potential embarrassment which could arise if too great a disjunction was allowed to emerge between monument and action, and a desire to exploit that potential for embarrassment, and to focus it on a foreign-policy rival, might well underlie the Athenian treatment of this treaty *stele*.

A similar approach is clearly visible in the case of the *stele* recording the Peace of Nicias, where Thucydides reports that the Athenians, learning that the Spartans had violated a clause of the agreement, 'were persuaded by Alcibiades to inscribe at the bottom of the Laconian pillar that the Lacedaemonians had not kept their oaths' (*Ἀλκιβιάδου πείσαντος τῆ μὲν Λακωνικῆ στήλῃ ὑπέγραψαν ὅτι οὐκ ἐνέμειναν οἱ Λακεδαιμόνιοι τοῖς ὄρκοις*, 5.56.3). It is worth noting here not only Athens' (Alcibiades-inspired) eagerness to memorialise Spartan duplicity, but also the fact that (in Thucydides' narration at least) the Athenians, as soon as they have accused the Spartans of breaking their oaths, go on to do exactly the same thing themselves by assisting the helots in an anti-Spartan action. Their (unilateral) addition to the text of the treaty seems to be an implicit statement that the whole agreement is now void. Nevertheless, the whole monument was left standing, not because it was a forgotten irrelevance, but precisely because its

<sup>16</sup> Theban alliance: Diod. 15.80.6; attacks on Athens and her allies: Xen. *Hell.* 6.4-35, [Dem.] 50.4, Diod. 15.95.

lack of formal validity gave it greater symbolic power, symbolism which could then (we might reasonably imagine) be deployed to help justify future hostility to Sparta.<sup>17</sup>

These two examples seem to reflect two rather different approaches to marking a treaty violation, with correspondingly different implications for our understanding of the commemorative function of the inscribed monuments and, more particularly, the relationship between written commemoration and other forms of collective memory. If the Athenians were making a deliberate point by leaving the Alexander treaty standing after it had been broken (by Alexander), then the fact that this was not noted on the stone must suggest a wider (unwritten) awareness of the diplomatic history of the two states. (That is: this would not be much of an insult if the average viewer of this inscription in, say, 361, had no idea what Alexander had been up to in the past few years). This seems similar to the view of inscriptions implied by Demosthenes' use of the decree condemning Arthmius of Zeleia: the inscribed monument provides a springboard for the collective memory of an event, or series of events, but it does not tell the complete story. However, the decision in the case of the Peace of Nicias to mark in writing the treaty-breaching behaviour of the Spartans suggests the possibility of a rather different approach to the commemoration of such behaviour, an approach which gives greater priority to fixing, if not the full story, then the significant parts of it, in public, written, and collectively-agreed form.

The element of collective agreement deserves emphasis, in this case and in the other examples discussed so far. Thucydides credits Alcibiades with the original idea of emending the text, but also makes it clear that he had to persuade the Athenians to agree to it; in Aristophanes' brief allusion to the same story (*Lysistrata* 513–14), all the credit—or blame—for the decision to emend the treaty is given to the *ecclesia*. In the same way, the *stèle* recording the treaty with Alexander was removed once the Athenian assembly has agreed that this could, and should, be done (RO 44, lines 39–40); it was a decree of the assembly (rather than the unilateral decision of Demosthenes) which led to the removal of the *stèle* of the Peace of Philocrates.<sup>18</sup> If, therefore, creating an inscribed monument required that the whole community (as

<sup>17</sup> Maria Fragoulaki has observed (*pers. com.*) that Spartan duplicity recurs as a theme of (Thucydides' picture) of Athenian policy-making in the claims which the Athenian generals make in the Melian Dialogue: 'of all the people we know, the Spartans are most blatant at equating comfort with honour, and self-interest with justice' (5.105).

<sup>18</sup> Noted by Bolmarcich (2007) 485, who argues that such a decision should be seen as exceptional (and that treaty-*stelae* would usually be considered inviolable, and left standing even when entirely outdated). Bolmarcich is quite right to note that it is hard to find parallel examples of explicit instructions for removal of treaty-*stelae*; however, Athenian practice in emending and erasing parts of these documents (discussed below) suggests to me that they were more willing than Bolmarcich allows to tamper with existing monuments. That is, I suspect that the practice of removing treaty-*stelae* after a decision of the assembly was more widespread than the extant evidence reveals.



embodied by the *ecclesia*) was prepared to endorse the version of the past which it represented, these examples indicate that this element of consensus continued to be important during the monument's afterlife. The fate of the Nicias *stèle* suggests that acts of emendation operated in the same way, although consideration of some other examples of emendation and erasure will show that Athenian behaviour is not always quite so easy to explain or understand.

### 3. Erasure and Emendation

Two problems complicate any attempt to understand Athenian attitudes to emending inscribed monuments. First: Athenian habits seem to be not entirely consistent. Second, it is not completely clear what the intention of such acts of erasure was. Some emendations or erasures are quite obviously entirely pragmatic, designed to correct an error in either the drafting or cutting of a document;<sup>19</sup> other examples might be best explained as resulting from a desire to save money (and perhaps time) by updating existing documents rather than constructing a new monument from scratch.<sup>20</sup> But in other cases, particularly where a text is emended some time after its original creation, it becomes harder to establish how far Athenian behaviour is driven by a practical desire to ensure the accuracy of the monumental record, and how great a role might be played by other, more symbolic, aspects of commemorative practice.

These problems can be illustrated by a well-known example: the 'Prospectus' of the Second Athenian League (RO 22), a monument which has a notoriously complex epigraphic afterlife. The text, which was set up in

<sup>19</sup> E.g., RO 31 (Athenian decrees for Mytilene; 369/8–368/7): the first decree on the stone (lines 8–34) has been re-inscribed over an erasure, probably in order to include an amendment (lines 31–4) which had been mistakenly omitted from the first version (RO comm. *ad loc*; Nolan (1981) 126–8). Compare also RO 48 (Athenian alliance with Carystus, 357/6); the name of the general Chabrias has been erased from the list of generals charged with swearing the treaty oath (line 20), perhaps because he died or was deposed before he could swear; perhaps because his name was inscribed twice in error (another man, whose name also began *Xa...*, was listed in the incomplete line 20). Discussion of the possibilities, and further bibliography, in RO, pp. 240–1.

<sup>20</sup> E.g., the treaties for Rhegion (ML 63/OR 149A) and Leontini (ML 64/OR 149B). In both these cases, the original prescript has been erased and re-inscribed; the extant prescripts are firmly dated to 433/2, but the exact nature of their relationship to the substantive text below remains unclear. ML (commentary *ad locc.*) sets out the conventional view that the main text of the decree records the original treaty (agreed in perhaps the 440s); when the treaty was renewed or reaffirmed in 433/2, the prescript was amended to reflect this. An alternative view dates the main text to 433/2, and suggests that the prescript was re-inscribed (but not substantially updated) at a later point (Mattingly (1963) 272; Papazar-kadas (2009) 75). Whichever interpretation is correct, the motivation for the erasure and re-inscription seems to be driven by practicality (and perhaps also a desire to minimise the cost of stone and labour) rather than any wider commemorative agenda (cf. Raviola (1993) 96).

378/7, includes an explicit provision that it should be kept up to date by the addition of new members to the stone (lines 69–72), and this surely suggests that the initial intention (at least) was that the stone act as an accurate record of Athens' diplomatic obligations.<sup>21</sup> That impression is reinforced by the fact that the text was updated not only by additions but also by deletions: the name of one ally seems to have been removed from the list (at line 111);<sup>22</sup> more strikingly, so too was a clause (lines 12–15) which made it clear that the new alliance would operate within the framework of the King's Peace. This latter deletion should probably be dated to 367 (or later): this is when Athenian policy shifted towards hostility to Persia, and it makes sense that a public expression of tolerance of Persian authority might be seen as misleading, not to mention unhelpful, after this date.<sup>23</sup>

But the problem in understanding the afterlife of this monument lies not so much in what the Athenians did to the stone, as in what they failed to do, in terms both of additions and deletions. At some point in the late 370s (before the stone was full) names of allies were no longer added to the list.<sup>24</sup>

<sup>21</sup> Compare ML 87/OR 185 (Athenian treaty with Selymbria, *c.* 408/7), which includes (at lines 38–41) an instruction to delete names of hostages from a list (the hostages presumably having been taken to ensure Selymbrian co-operation until the treaty was agreed, and now having served their purpose). The verb used is *ἐξαλείφω*, 'wipe out', which might suggest that the list was on wood, or some other temporary medium, rather than stone (compare the examples given by Fischer (2003) 247). *ἐκκολλάπτω*, 'carve out', is more commonly used of emendations to inscribed texts: e.g., *IG I<sup>3</sup>* 106, lines 21–3: *τὰ δὲ περὶ Τιμάνθους γεγραμμένα ἐν πόλει ἐκκολλάφ[σ]άντων οἱ ταμίαι οἱ τῆς θεοῦ ἐκ τῆς στ[έλης]* ('the Treasurers of the Goddess should carve out from the *stèle* on the Acropolis those things which are written about Timanthes'); the nature of what was written, or why it now needed to be erased, is unclear: for brief discussion, see Walbank (1978) 432.

<sup>22</sup> The name erased has often been thought to be *Ἰάσων*: see, e.g., *IG II<sup>2</sup>* 43, following a suggestion made by Fabricius (1891) 594, and followed by many since: notably Accame (1941) 91–3; Tod 123. Epigraphic objections to the restoration are stated most influentially by Woodhead (1957), and accepted by (e.g.) Cargill (1981) 43–4; Baron (2006) (the latter arguing that the erasure is most likely to be a correction of a stone-cutter's error rather than the result of defection from the League; Mitchel (1984) takes a similar view on the reasons for the erasure, though a different one on the question of what was erased).

<sup>23</sup> Xen. *HG* 7.1.33–40; Ryder (1965) 81–2; Cargill (1981) 31–2. Accame (1941) 149–50 and Cawkwell (1973) 60 n. 1 both suggest that the erasure should be dated to 375; Marshall (1905) 16–17 argues that the clause was removed in 369. (Accame's argument was based on a belief that the erasure contained a reference to the King's Peace, which became embarrassing when, in 375, Athens made peace without reference to the King; both Cawkwell and Marshall believed that the erasure contained a critical reference to the Spartans, which became inappropriate when the Athenian policy to Sparta became more friendly, whether in 375/4 or 369.)

<sup>24</sup> The last name on the list (lines 131–4, on the left face of the *stèle*: the *demos* of Zacynthus at Nello) might not have been the last entry inscribed on the stone: it has been noted that this entry, which is separated from, and in a different hand than, those above the last names on the list, is aligned with the start of the list of league members on the front face of the stone (at lines 79ff.), and was probably originally intended to be grouped with it (Woodhead (1957) 371 n. 15, developed by Cawkwell (1963) 88; see most recently Baron (2006) 381–2). The cities

Even harder to explain is the approach taken to deletions from the stone, and in particular the fact that a reference to Athenian (and allied) hostility to Sparta was not erased, even though Athens and Sparta entered into an alliance in 369 BCE.<sup>25</sup> This change in policy pre-dates the shift in attitude to Persia which is thought to provoke the erasure from lines 12–15, which makes it extremely hard to argue that the failure to update the inscribed text indicates nothing more than that the *stèle* had been completely forgotten by the early 360s. If the stone was still prominent enough to be worth altering in 367, it is hard to claim that it was irrelevant in 369. Nor does it seem likely that the shift in policy was thought too trivial to be worth noting (or rather, in this instance, concealing), since there is good evidence (again in inscribed form: RO 31) that Athens' policy of détente with Sparta had indeed caused considerable annoyance among the allies, and required Athens to produce some (not entirely convincing) diplomatic special pleading. What, then, is going on?

In attempting to answer that question, it is useful to pause to think more carefully about both the practicalities and the implications of these acts of erasure. This subject has most commonly been addressed in the context of *damnatio memoriae*; studies of the memory politics of this practice have, rightly, emphasised that this sort of (large-scale) obliteration should be seen not so much as an attempt to obliterate memory entirely as to transform honorific commemoration into a form of visible denigration. That is: the power of an act of *damnatio* relies, at least in part, on the viewer of a monument being able to supplement the gaps in an inscription with their own knowledge of what those gaps had once contained, and the reasons why the text had been removed.<sup>26</sup> This approach does work very well in explaining some Athenian erasures, most notably the case (already briefly mentioned) of the Hellenistic *damnatio* of the Antigonids. As has been seen,<sup>27</sup> one inscription (*Agora* 16.114, an honorific decree) was taken down completely as part of this process (presumably because deleting all the Antigonid references on it would have left an almost entirely empty stone). In other cases, though, the Athenians carefully removed only the specific references to the Antigonids; the process was systematic, targeted, and (as Byrne has shown) almost certainly carried out by only two or three stone-cutters (each, it seems, assigned to work in a specific area of the city).<sup>28</sup> In this case, the explanation of erasure-as-

listed in lines 112–30, most likely to be the last inscribed on the stone, probably joined the League (and were therefore, presumably, added to the inscription) in either 375 (suggested by, e.g., RO 22; Cawkwell (1981) 42–5) or 373 (Tod 123; Baron (2006) 388–90). *c.* 58 states were listed on the *stèle*; Diod. 15.30.2 says that 70 states joined the League; Aeschin. 2.70 claims 75.

<sup>25</sup> Xen. *Hell.* 7.1.1–14, Diod. 15.67.1; on the date, see Jehne (1994) 79, n. 190.

<sup>26</sup> See, generally, Flower (2006), esp. 17–34 on memory sanctions in the Greek world.

<sup>27</sup> Above, p. 240.

<sup>28</sup> Byrne (2010).

conspicuous-insult works well, and is neatly supported by the fact that references to the Antigonids which were already hostile were left in place, most notably in the honours for Callias of Sphettus (*IG II<sup>3</sup> I*, 911) and for the comic poet Philippides (*IG II<sup>3</sup> I*, 857).<sup>29</sup>

If we move back to the Classical period, such clear-cut examples of *damnatio* become harder to find, although two possible candidates are worth considering. First, and more briefly: *IG II<sup>2</sup> 1606*, a naval catalogue of 374/3, which includes six mentions of the Athenian commander Timotheus (lines 12, 25, 30, 70, 75, 87). When the list was initially inscribed, Timotheus had been elected General, and this title followed each mention of his name. In the late summer or autumn of 373, however, Timotheus was charged with treason, impeached, and dismissed from his post; presumably in response to this, all six mentions of his being general have been excised from the inscription, although his name remains untouched.<sup>30</sup> Timotheus' disgrace is, then, visibly (and repeatedly) marked in this text, although the Athenians' desire to maintain a comprehensive record of their naval operations seems to have prevented them from removing all trace of his original presence from the stone.<sup>31</sup>

A second, more complicated, example is the *stèle* which records two honorific decrees for the people of Neapolis (*ML 89/OR 187*). The first decree (passed in 409, and first both chronologically and in its position on the stone) praised the Neapolitans for their loyalty to Athens, and originally noted (in line 7) that they remained allies although they were colonists of the Thasians (who were then in revolt against Athens). The second decree (probably passed in 407) includes, among other things, a request that this description be removed (lines 58–60); the amendment has duly—and quite visibly—been carried out in the first decree. Even the most absent-minded reader of the text would, I think, be hard-pressed to miss the fact that the reference to Thasos as the mother-city of the Neapolitans had been deliberately suppressed in the first decree, since this fact is made absolutely clear in the second decree. What is much harder to tell, though, is whether this visible act of erasure was intended to emphasise the Neapolitans' hostility to the Thasians, or was just a result of an Athenian secretary failing to think through the consequences of his actions. The interpretation of the significance of the erasure depends at least in part on the equally uncertain question of the exact implications of advertising (or suppressing) this mother-city/colony connection. Is the colonial relationship to be thought of as something oppressive, from which the Neapolitans could celebrate their

<sup>29</sup> For Callias of Sphettus (*IG II<sup>3</sup> I*, 911), see Shear, below, ch. 7.

<sup>30</sup> For details of the charges and outcome, see Hansen (1975) no. 80. I am grateful to P. J. Rhodes to drawing this example to my attention.

<sup>31</sup> It is worth noting that impeachment was no bar to being held to account in other respects too: Dem. 49.25 indicates that Timotheus would still have been liable to *euthuna* at the end of the year.

liberation? If so, the visibility of the removal of the Thasians could reasonably be seen as a good thing: this would be a tangible symbol of the emancipation of the Neapolitans from Thasian control.<sup>32</sup> Or is it more likely that the Neapolitans might be slightly uneasy at being commemorated as an ungrateful daughter-city, a state which had betrayed its conventional obligations to its metropolis?<sup>33</sup> In that case, it would become harder to argue that viewers of the stone were intended to read too much into the conspicuous erasure of the Neapolitans' mother city: their removal from the stone will have created, or have been intended to create, not an absent presence, but simply and straightforwardly an absence.

With these (admittedly inconclusive) examples in mind, it is possible to return to the problem of the erasure (and absence of erasure) in the Prospectus of the Second Athenian League. It would certainly be possible to construct an argument which claimed that viewing and explaining erasures in terms of deliberate 'memory sanction' (rather than simply pragmatic acts of record keeping) might help explain why the Persians were expunged from this inscription while the Spartans were left in place: there might be no particular harm in viewers of this monument being reminded of Athens' extrication of the League from Persian influence; but removing, and thereby emphasising the absence of, a policy of hostility to Sparta might have been a less obviously desirable move. But I would not want to push this argument too far: not every act of erasure was so loaded in its intention; indeed, as has already been seen, it is possible that RO 22 itself includes an erasure which simply removed the name of a state which had somehow ended up being included twice in the list of allies.<sup>34</sup> Whatever is driving the Athenian treatment of this stone (and of other inscribed monuments), it is not, in my view, a coherent, consistent, commemorative agenda.

Athenian behaviour may have been inconsistent, but it was not necessarily illogical. Once more, the role of collective consensus deserves attention; not because it provides a single key to understanding Athenian erasing habits, but because it might explain why it is hard to find one. I have already suggested, when looking at examples of destruction of inscriptions, that Athenian behaviour seems most often to be reactive rather than systematic, triggered by specific developments which, first, remind the Athenians—or perhaps better, one Athenian (the process starts with an individual proposer)—of the existence of certain (or a certain set of)

<sup>32</sup> Suggested by Wilhelm (1903) 777, and more recently by Smarczyk (1986) 34; Brunet (1997) 237.

<sup>33</sup> The more generally held view, suggested by (e.g.) Graham (1971) 86–7. Graham follows Pouilloux (1954) 178–92, in suggesting that *IG XII.5* 109 is an agreement between Thasos and Neapolis and should be dated sometime between 411 and 407; if this is correct then it would make it even more likely that the Neapolitans would, in 407, wish to downplay any record of their brief burst of hostility to their mother-city.

<sup>34</sup> See above, n. 22.

inscriptions, and then prompt them (or him) to realise that the things recorded in those monuments would be best removed from the collective record. Furthermore, that action is itself collectively endorsed: each act of destruction, and each act of emendation or deletion, required the approval of the *demos*. To the examples of the treaty with Alexander, the Peace of Philocrates, and the Peace of Nicias we can now add the ones considered here: the Prospectus of the Second Athenian League authorised its own emendation (in certain cases); the honours for the Neapolitans were altered only after the approval of a specific request from the honorands.<sup>35</sup> Conversely, unauthorised alteration of inscriptions can be presented as highly problematic, as can be seen in Demosthenes' outrage at Androtion's (allegedly) illicit decision to melt down some inscribed dedications from the Acropolis (Dem. 22.70, 72):

τὰ μὲν οὖν πόλλ' ὧν λέγων ὑμᾶς ἐφενάκιζεν παραλείψω· φήσας δ' ἀπορρεῖν τὰ φύλλα τῶν στεφάνων καὶ σαπροὺς εἶναι διὰ τὸν χρόνον, ὥσπερ ἴων ἢ ῥόδων ὄντας, ἀλλ' οὐ χρυσοῦ, συγχωνεύειν ἔπεισεν. . . . καὶ μὴν, ὧ ἄνδρες Ἀθηναῖοι, καὶ κατὰ παντὸς τοῦ χρόνου σκέψασθ' ὡς καλὰ καὶ ζηλώτ' ἐπιγράμματα τῆς πόλεως ἀνελὼν ὡς ἀσεβῆ καὶ δεῖν' ἀντεπιγέγραφεν.

I will pass over most of what he said to deceive you; but, by alleging that the leaves of the crowns were rotten with age and falling off—as though they were violet leaves or rose leaves, not made of gold—he persuaded you to melt them down . . . Again, men of Athens, consider those fine and enviable inscriptions that he has wiped out forever, and the strange and impious inscriptions that he has written in their place.

At least part of Androtion's crime, according to Demosthenes, lies in the fact that he acted without the informed consent of the Athenian people: the agreement of the community was secured for the act of erasure and re-inscription, but under false pretences; Androtion has therefore in effect acted unilaterally, and this is what makes his behaviour unacceptable. Similarly, Euxitheus (the speaker of Demosthenes 57, *Against Eubulides*) complains that a group of his enemies have (unilaterally, he implies) 'chiselled out the decree (τὸ ψήφισμ' ἐκκολλάσαντες) which the demesmen passed in my honour' in an attempt to undermine his claim to be an Athenian citizen; meanwhile, Euxitheus claims, his enemies have argued that he was responsible for

<sup>35</sup> Cf. also ML 87/OR 185, *IG*<sup>1</sup> 106 (above, n. 21). This process of authorised emendation is visible outside Athens too: compare, for example, *IG* XII.2 1, a treaty establishing a monetary union between Mytilene and Phocaea; the text includes (at lines 1–4) a clause which allows both parties to amend the agreement, by amending (by addition or deletion) the *stèle*: ὅτι||[δέ κε αἰ] πόλις [ἀμ]φότε[ερα]ι . . . . .||[. . . .] γράφωσι εἰς τὰ[ν στάλαν ἢ ἐκκ]||[ολάπ]τωισι, κύ[ρ]ιον ἔστω ('whatever each *polis* [*sc.* by mutual agreement] writes on or removes from the *stèle*, let it be valid').

vandalising the inscription himself. The one possibility that Euxitheus does not want to entertain is that the emendation to the decree might have been properly authorised by the deme as a whole, because that, in turn, might suggest that the deme had already endorsed a version of history which Euxitheus is arguing against in this speech: one in which he was not a true member of the deme, and therefore not an Athenian citizen.<sup>36</sup>

Legitimate changes to a monument relied, therefore, on a combination of individual initiative and collective agreement, and bearing that in mind might make it easier to explain why the outcomes of that process might sometimes appear inconsistent. To return (for the last time) to the troublesome Spartans of RO 22: we might want to explain their persistence with reference either to a lack of individual interest (that is: for whatever reason, no Athenian thought it worth standing up in the assembly to suggest chiselling out this clause) or lack of collective agreement about the merits (practical or symbolic) of re-writing the past in this way. We can only speculate about the reasons why the Athenians decided to act, or to fail to act, as they did: did the political context not call for it? Or were they influenced by the realisation that removing this clause—and with it a large chunk of the motivation formula—might have made the decree simply too lacunose to make sense? Our speculations are further hampered by the fact that we cannot be sure at which point the process stalled (was a proposal never made, or was a proposal made but rejected?). What we should probably be careful about doing, though, is assuming that our inability to reconstruct the logic behind the treatment of a text necessarily means that such a logic never existed.

#### 4. Reconstruction

This final section will consider a third way in which the Athenians reshaped the epigraphic record of their past: the re-creation of destroyed monuments. It will focus on a set of examples which are all connected with the oligarchic revolution (and democratic counter-revolution) of 404/3, and the after-effects of those events.<sup>37</sup> This material provides some of the best epigraphic evidence for the ways in which the commemorative function of an inscribed

<sup>36</sup> The case of the Serpent Column is also worth considering as a non-Athenian example which demonstrates (at least an Athenian assumption of) similar attitudes to licit and illicit emendation of inscriptions: in this case, accounts of the monument's history report both unauthorised (and problematic) inscription (Pausanias' addition of an epigram praising his own achievements) and subsequent 'official' erasures and additions, authorised by the Spartans (in Thucydides' version: 1.132) or the Delphic Amphictiony (according to [Dem.] 59.98; note that, in [Demosthenes'] account, the initiative came from the Plataeans, who then persuaded the Amphictiony to take action: a similar process, that is, to the one we have seen in Athenian contexts). On the nature (and authorship) of the (real) inscriptions on the Serpent Column, see Steinhart (1997) 53–69.

<sup>37</sup> Thoroughly discussed by Shear (2011).

decree might shift over time and in different contexts. It also illustrates once more the ways in which inscriptions can be viewed as records of a set of individual responses to past events, set in a collectively-endorsed commemorative context. Where this material differs from that considered so far is that it reveals much more clearly the extent to which individuals could shape both the process of commemoration and its monumental outcome.

The story starts with a flurry of epigraphic destruction, carried out by the oligarchic regime of the Thirty Tyrants (404/3 BCE). The Thirty's inscription-destroying tendencies are quite well known: as will be seen, they are attested in the epigraphic record, and they are also alluded to in the Aristoteleian *Athenaion Politeia*'s account of their constitutional and legislative reforms (*Ath. Pol.* 35.2):

τὸ μὲν οὖν πρῶτον μέτριοι τοῖς πολίταις ἦσαν καὶ προσεποιούντο διώκειν τὴν πάτριον πολιτείαν, καὶ τοὺς τ' Ἐφιάλτου καὶ Ἀρχεστράτου νόμους τοὺς περὶ τῶν Ἀρεοπαγιτῶν καθείλον ἐξ Ἀρείου πάγου, καὶ τῶν Σόλωνος θεσμῶν ὅσοι διαμφισβητήσεις ἔσχον, καὶ τὸ κῦρος ὃ ἦν ἐν τοῖς δικασταῖς κατέλυσαν, ὡς ἐπανορθούντες καὶ ποιούντες ἀναμφισβήτητον τὴν πολιτείαν.

At first, therefore, they were moderate to the citizens and pretended to be implementing the ancestral constitution, and they removed from the Areopagus the laws of Ephialtes and Archestratus about the Areopagites, and also those regulations of Solon which were disputed, and they abolished the sovereignty of the jurymen, claiming to be rectifying the constitution and making it unambiguous.

The author suggests that the Thirty represented their removal of the inscribed laws as a purely administrative move,<sup>38</sup> but it is hard to imagine that this act of destruction was not also intended to have a wider, symbolic function: by removing these monuments of (a certain version of) the Athenian past, the Thirty cleared the way for the development of a version of that past which better suited their own ideological agenda. The same motivation can be ascribed to the Thirty's other significant act of epigraphic destruction: the removal of a number of inscriptions which recorded awards of *proxenia* to favoured non-Athenians.<sup>39</sup> The removal of these inscriptions

<sup>38</sup> Osborne (2003) 264–5 makes the case for taking seriously the Thirty's claim to be implementing a serious programme of legislative reform (on the specifics of which, see Rhodes (1993) *ad loc.*; Wallace (1989) 131–44); but a practical purpose and a wider symbolic intention are not mutually exclusive.

<sup>39</sup> Six examples are relatively secure: *IG I<sup>3</sup> 229* ( $\approx$  *IG II<sup>2</sup> 9*); *IG II<sup>2</sup> 6*, 52, 66c; *Agora* 16.37 and 39. (Further details of these inscriptions can conveniently be found in Lambert (2012) 266–7). *IG I<sup>3</sup> 227* ( $\approx$  *IG II<sup>2</sup> 8*), *IG I<sup>3</sup> 228* ( $\approx$  *IG II<sup>2</sup> 32*), and perhaps *ML 80/OR 173* (see below, n. 46) were also re-inscribed in the early fourth century, but in these cases it is not clear from the extant text whether the original decrees were destroyed by the Thirty or were being replaced for some other reason (see below, p. 253).



might have symbolised the abnegation of the privileges which they conferred,<sup>40</sup> but what is more certain is that their destruction contributes to a reshaping of the Athenian commemorative landscape. We should note not only the content of these decrees (markers of Athens' interventionist, and imperialist, foreign policy),<sup>41</sup> but also their location: Lambert has suggested that the placement of honorific decrees on the Acropolis should be seen as a deliberate attempt to make them part of the landscape of power, wealth, and prestige created by the building projects of the mid-fifth century; their removal from that landscape might be seen as an equally loaded move.<sup>42</sup>

Perhaps the most interesting thing about the Thirty's attempt to reshape the record of Athens' past, however, is the fact that it seems not to have worked. One reason that we know that some decrees were taken down in 404/3 is because some later decrees allude to this fact. The acts of destruction were, in other words, doubly unsuccessful: the destroyed decrees were restored, and all the Thirty managed to do was find themselves inscribed into Athenian (and modern scholarly) collective memory as epigraphic vandals.<sup>43</sup> But it is possible to do more with these monuments than simply to use them as evidence for the ineptitude of oligarchs. First, it is worth exploring the reasons for (and consequences of) the commemoration of the Thirty's actions in the later inscriptions. The material is frustratingly fragmentary, but some patterns do emerge. It is worth emphasising the plural—patterns—here: although these restored proxeny decrees are sometimes piled together into a single commemorative heap, in fact, they show considerable diversity in what they record, what they omit, and how they represent their relationship with their destroyed original.

Some fourth-century proxeny decrees include the destruction of an earlier award in their list of factors which justify the creation of a new award. *IG II<sup>2</sup>* 52, for example, awards *proxenia* to the grandsons of Xanthippos: the Thirty had done something to the inscription recording the proxeny of the grandfather (destruction seems a plausible restoration); the function of this decree is not to reactivate the grandfather's status, but rather to reward his grandsons.<sup>44</sup> Likewise, *Agora* 16.37 awards proxeny to some citizens of Ialysos

<sup>40</sup> See further below, p. 253.

<sup>41</sup> For *proxenia* as a tool of imperialism, see Meiggs (1949). Mack (2015) 94–5 notes that instances of destruction of inscribed proxeny decrees appear to have been relatively rare, and restricted to contexts of political revolution (as in the Athenian examples discussed here, and a comparable case in Hellenistic Priene, reinscribed as *I.Priene<sup>2</sup>* 27).

<sup>42</sup> Lambert (2011) 201. Evidence for the Thirty's more general awareness of the importance of monuments to political messages comes in the story that they changed the orientation of the Pnyx to encourage speakers to pay less attention to the sea (and, by extension, the navy, the empire and democracy): Plut. *Them.* 19.4. See further Shear (2011) 175–80.

<sup>43</sup> As, e.g., in Walbank (1978) 8–9; Wolpert (2002) 87–8.

<sup>44</sup> It is possible that the original decree is the one recorded on *IG I<sup>3</sup>* 177 (Walbank (1978) no. 63; cautiously followed by Lambert (2012) 266), although the relative dates of the two

in Rhodes, and again notes in doing so that the decree which awarded the same status to their father had been destroyed (in this case the reference to destruction is definitely on the stone; the reference to the Thirty is restored, though not implausibly).<sup>45</sup> The connection between contemporary concerns and the shaping (or re-shaping) of the record of the past is not hard to spot here: in order to justify the claim to honours by the new generation of *proxenoi*, the new decrees must remind the Athenians of the previous services performed by the honorands' families; that they are able to do so by flagging up the oligarchs' hostility to the honorands' ancestors (and therefore, by implication, the ancestors' loyalty to the Athenian *demos*) might be considered an additional bonus.

How important is the original decree, and the original monument, to the creation of these stories of sustained loyalty to Athens? The short answer to this question is that, at times, it seems to be absolutely central; at others, entirely disposable. A longer answer requires a closer look at two subsets of this material.

The first set is a group of *stelae* which include (at least) two decrees on each stone.<sup>46</sup> Each example contains a fourth-century decree which (it is inferred: the relevant part of the decree is missing in each case) authorised the republication of a fifth-century decree; that older text is inscribed on the same stone, either above or below the fourth century decree.<sup>47</sup> In one case, *IG I<sup>3</sup> 229*, enough survives of the fourth-century decree to make it reasonably safe

decrees might argue against this: *IG I<sup>3</sup> 177* is dated to the late 410s; the revived decree, presumably passed shortly after 403, transfers the honour to the grandsons of Xanthippus (line 4) rather than his sons: it is not impossible that a man honoured in the 410s might have adult grandsons but no adult sons *c.* ten years later, but not overwhelmingly likely either.

<sup>45</sup> The exact date of the decree is unclear (it is usually placed some time in the first decade of the fourth century), and it is therefore also impossible to know what particular factors might have inspired the reactivation of the proxeny relationship (for discussion, see Funke (1983) 169–74). The context for the award of proxeny to the honorands' father is also unclear: Ialysos was a tribute-paying member of the Athenian Empire (for brief details: Hansen and Nielsen (2004) 1199), and Rhodian forces were present (on the Athenian side) in the Sicilian Expedition (Thuc. 7.57.6); Ialysos defected from the Empire in 411 (Thuc. 8.44.1–2).

<sup>46</sup> There are three (relatively) safe examples of this type: *IG I<sup>3</sup> 227* ( $\approx$  *IG II<sup>2</sup> 8*; for Herakleides of Clazomenae); *IG I<sup>3</sup> 228* ( $\approx$  *IG II<sup>2</sup> 32*; for the Sicels Archonides and Demon); and *IG I<sup>3</sup> 229* ( $\approx$  *IG ii<sup>2</sup> 9*; the names and origin of the honorands are not preserved). Possibly to be included in this group is *ML 80/OR 173* (for Pythophanes, probably of Carystos): two decrees, one of *c.* 411 and one of 399/8, are inscribed on the same *stèle*, but it is unclear whether these were inscribed at the same time (in 399/8, in which case the monument serves as a republication of the earlier decree) or whether the later decree was added as a supplement to an existing monument (D. M. Lewis (*ap. de Ste. Croix* (1956) 19) suggested that it might be possible to detect a change in letter-cutter between the two decrees; for discussion of the implications of this, see Mack (2015) 96).

<sup>47</sup> Below the fourth-century decree in three cases (*IG I<sup>3</sup> 227*, *228*, and [probably] *229*); above it in *ML 80/OR 173*.

to reconstruct a reference to the destruction of the previous monument by the Thirty.

A notable feature of some, and perhaps all, of this set of decrees is that they were passed not by the *demos* but by the *boule* (the questionable example is *IG I<sup>3</sup> 227*, where the relevant part of the prescript is not extant). Various explanations for this oddity have been proposed, but the most likely is that that the *boule*'s approval is sufficient here because what is being enacted is not a whole new decree, but simply the process for creating a replacement monument for a decree which had been properly approved on a previous occasion and—a necessary inference, if this line of reasoning is correct—whose validity had never lapsed.<sup>48</sup> It is worth digressing briefly to consider the significance of this point, particularly because it seems to contradict the theory (outlined earlier) that removing a monument was seen as equivalent to invalidating the decree which it recorded (a logic which, we could note, also seems to have underpinned the Thirty's destructive acts, at least according to the *Ath. Pol.*). I would suggest that the best way to explain this apparent exception to the general rule is by emphasising the exceptional nature both of the Thirty's regime, and of the Athenians' response to it. Demosthenes (24.56) claims that all acts carried out by the Thirty were deemed invalid by the restored democracy, and it is quite possible (although admittedly not made explicit by Demosthenes) that this ruling would have applied not just to creative acts (new laws, for example), but also to destructive ones (that is: attempts to repeal existing decrees). And it is possible too, given what we have seen so far about the importance of collective (and democratic) approval for the destruction of decrees, that the destructions of the Thirty (who would, necessarily, lack that approval) were thought to have no formal force. In this case, therefore, the destruction of the monument did not entail the annulment of the decree.

If this line of argument is correct, then it would follow that these fourth century bouleutic decrees are not creating new regulations, but simply re-establishing a physical record of a decree of the *demos* which was still in force. This interpretation seems to fit with what is done (or—more to the point—not done) with the re-created texts of the fifth-century decrees, which, as far as it is possible to tell, are repeated absolutely verbatim: amendments in the fifth-century parts of *IG I<sup>3</sup> 227* and *228* are preserved in the re-inscribed versions (lines 14–25 and lines 19–25 respectively); anachronistic references to the 'cities over which the Athenians have *kratos*' are retained (*IG I<sup>3</sup> 228*, lines 10–11). Although the move to recreate these decrees is clearly driven by contemporary needs, the focus on the present goes only so far. In particular, it does not allow the originally (and collectively) authorised version of past events to be amended, even though some of these fifth-century views of the

<sup>48</sup> For discussion of this and other possibilities, see Rhodes (1985) 82–4.

world (and Athens' role in it) might look rather out of place in their new fourth-century context.

How, then, should we read these monuments? Or—more to the point—how should we assume that the Athenians read them? We cannot, certainly, ignore the practical function of the inscriptions, not least from the point of view of the honorands: an award of proxeny did not require an inscribed monument, but an inscription did form an important part of the honour.<sup>49</sup> It is very likely that the initiative for creating these new monuments came (at least initially) not from the Athenians but from the honorands: this is implied by the variation of the form of the monuments;<sup>50</sup> the fact that funding for the restored monument might come from the honorands rather than the Athenian state;<sup>51</sup> and, above all, the fact that the dates of reconstruction seem to cover a period of around two decades.<sup>52</sup> It would, in other words, be a mistake to imagine the restored democracy engaging in a systematic (or even sustained) programme of re-establishing the record of their past actions, or of championing their victory over the oligarchic challenge to those actions.<sup>53</sup> Nevertheless, the part played by the Athenians cannot be ignored: they might not have taken the lead in restoring the monuments, but they surely had a say in their form. The verbatim repetition of the earlier decree is a deliberate choice (and not an inevitable one);<sup>54</sup> and the same applies to the reference to the Thirty.<sup>55</sup>

<sup>49</sup> Walbank (1978) 3–4; Lambert (2011) 199–200.

<sup>50</sup> See above, n. 47, for variations in the content and layout of the inscriptions. All the examples in this set are extremely fragmentary, so it is not possible to say how much about their overall physical form; the only fully preserved revived proxeny decree is *IG II<sup>2</sup> 6*, discussed below.

<sup>51</sup> This is explicit in *Agora* 16.37 (lines 13–14). Walbank (1978) 261, suggests that *IG I<sup>3</sup> 227* was also funded by the honorand (but concedes that the payment clause would have to be entirely restored). The funding formula in the other examples is either missing or not preserved.

<sup>52</sup> Only one example is both a certain case of reconstruction and has a certain date: *IG I<sup>3</sup> 228*, dated to 385/4. The later decree on *ML 80/OR 173* is securely dated to 399/8, but (as noted above, n. 46), it is not clear whether the earlier decree on the stone was also inscribed at this point. Plausible dates for the other examples range from shortly after 403 to the 380s.

<sup>53</sup> Cf. the more systematic democratic re-appropriation of other aspects of monumental and epigraphic space, particularly in the Agora, argued for by Shear (2011), esp. chs. 8 and 9.

<sup>54</sup> See below, pp. 254–7.

<sup>55</sup> A counterexample: the honours for loyal Samians (*IG II<sup>2</sup> 1*) were almost certainly destroyed by the Thirty and re-inscribed by the democracy, on a similar pattern to these proxeny decrees (that is, verbatim repetition of a fifth-century original, supplemented with [in this case] two new fourth-century decrees), but the monument makes no reference to either its reconstruction or its destruction. Another counterexample (this time illustrating the possibility of a more detailed account of the destruction of a monument as part of the justification for its reconstruction) comes in the honours for Euphron of Sicyon (*IG II<sup>2</sup> 448*) which were passed (and originally inscribed) in 323/2, removed by the oligarchy some time between 321/0 and 319/18, and re-inscribed, together with a new decree, by the restored

Overall, this set of restored proxeny decrees seem to fit quite well into the wider pattern of the Athenian response to the rule of the Thirty: that is, an approach (to borrow Wolpert's term) of 'mindful forgetfulness'.<sup>56</sup> On the one hand, there is an urge (reflected in, though not completely determined by, the terms of the amnesty) to write the episode out of Athenian memory altogether, and to create a seamless join between the democracy of the fifth century and that of the fourth.<sup>57</sup> Such a move has the advantage of emphasising continuity, and the solidarity of the Athenian *demos*: what seemed good to the Athenians in the fifth century still seemed good in the fourth; so much so that the renewed authorisation of the *demos* for these acts is not even required. But this approach has the disadvantage of letting the Thirty off the hook; it is a reluctance to allow this which might explain the reference to the actions of the Thirty in (at least some of) these texts. The reference, when it appears, is brief and plain, in contrast to some other memorials of this period. Aeschines reports a much more charged description of the Thirty which (allegedly) was inscribed on the honours for the heroes of Phyle (3.190):

τούσδ' ἀρετῆς ἔνεκα στεφάνοις ἐγέραιρε παλαίχθων  
 δῆμος Ἀθηναίων, οἳ ποτε τοὺς ἀδίκους  
 θεσμοῖς ἄρξαντας πόλιος πρῶτοι καταπαύειν  
 ἤρξαν, κίνδυνον σώμασιν ἀράμενοι.

These men, noble of heart, hath the ancient Athenian people /  
 Crowned with an olive crown. First were they to oppose /  
 Tyrants who knew not the laws, whose rule was the rule of injustice. /  
 Danger they met unafraid, pledging their lives to the cause. (Trans. Adams.)

If the Theozotides decree (*SEG* 28.46) can still be dated to 403/2, then this would also provide an example of a characterisation of the Thirty's actions which did not avoid spelling out the nature of their atrocities (in its talk, at lines 4–5, of the [β]ιαί|ωι θανάτωι, 'violent death', suffered by the democrats).<sup>58</sup> In these proxeny decrees, by contrast, we hear just enough about the Thirty to remind us of their existence (and their actions); the focus of attention remains on the unbroken authority of the Athenian people.

Once again, however, it is clear that the Athenian approach is not completely consistent, and a second set of evidence—a set with only one

democracy in 318/17 (lines 60–73 describe the process of destruction and reconstruction in some detail).

<sup>56</sup> Wolpert (2002) 87–98.

<sup>57</sup> Loraux (1996) 88–9; Shear (2011) 257–9.

<sup>58</sup> The decree refers (line 5) to the *δλιγαρχία*, but it is unclear whether this is a reference to the regime of 404/3 (suggested in the *ed. pr.* by Stroud (1971) 286–7, and widely accepted since) or that of 411 (the case for which has most recently been made by Matthaïou (2011) 71–81).

definite member—points to the possibility of handling things rather differently. The inscription relates to the claims to proxeny of five brothers, sons of a certain Apemantos, probably from Thasos (OR 177B, *IG II*<sup>2</sup> 6).<sup>59</sup>

θεοί  
 [Ἀμύντο]ρος, Εὐρυπύλο, vac.  
 [Ἀργεῖ]ο, Λόκρο, Ἀλκίμο. vac.  
 [ἔδοξ]εν τῇ βολῆι· Οἰνηΐς  
 [ἔπρυ]τάνευε, Δεξιθεος ἐγ-  
 [ραμ]μάτευε, Δημοκλῆς ἐπε-  
 [σ]τάτε· Μονιππίδης εἶπε· Ἀ-  
 μύντορι καὶ Εὐρυπύλω κ-  
 αὶ Ἀργεῖω καὶ Λόκρω κα-  
 ἰ Ἀλκίμω τοῖς Ἀπημάντο  
 παισί, ἐπειδὴ καθημέρη  
 ἡ στήλη [ἐ]πὶ τῶν τριάκοντ-  
 α ἐν ἧ ἡ[ν α]ύτοῖς ἡ προξεν-  
 ία, ἀναγράψ[αι] τὴν στήλην  
 τὸν γραμμα[τ]έα τῆς βολῆς  
 τέλεσι τοῖς Εὐρυπύλο· κα-  
 λέσαι δὲ καὶ ἐπὶ ξένια Εὐ-  
 ρύπυλον ἐς τὸ πρυτανεῖο-  
 ν ἐς αὔριον vac.

Gods. Of Amyntor, Eurypylos, Argeios, Lokros, Alkimos. It seemed good to the Boule. Oineis held the prytany, Dexitheos was Secretary, Demokles presided, Monippides made the proposal. For Amyntor, Eurypylos, Argeios, Lokros, Alkimos, the sons of Apemantos, since the stele was taken down in the time of the Thirty, in which their proxeny (was recorded), let the Secretary of the Boule write up the stele at the expense of Eurypylos; and let Eurypylos be invited to dinner at the prytaneion tomorrow.

This is the best-preserved of all the examples of this type of monument, a fact which allows us to see a striking gap in what is recorded. The monument

<sup>59</sup> The Thasian identity of the honorands is not stated in the text, but is inferred from the fact that one (and perhaps two) of the men named in the inscription can reasonably securely be identified with known Thasians: Apemantus (line 10) is named in *IG XII.8* 263, line 8 as having had his property confiscated by the Thasian oligarchic regime in 411; a son of Apemantus (restored, on the basis of a surviving final rho, as Amyntor) appears in *IG II*<sup>2</sup> 33, line 26, in a list of men exiled from Thasos for *attikismos* (Walbank (1978) no. 61; Pouilloux (1954) 145; Avery (1979) 240–1 adds the appealing if speculative suggestion that the family's well-known pro-democratic/anti-oligarchic stance was the reason that their *stèle* was earmarked for destruction by the Thirty).

reports a decree of the *boule*, noting the destruction (by the Thirty) of an earlier monument, and authorising the creation of a new *stèle*, to be set up at the expense of one of the brothers, Eurypylos. But the decree does not do either of the other things which we might (on the basis of the examples seen so far) expect: unlike *IG II<sup>2</sup> 52* or *Agora 16.37*, there is no explicitly-stated new (or renewed) award of proxeny (although the invitation to dinner at the prytaneion does, implicitly, place Eurypylos, at least, in the position of a *euergetes* to the city).<sup>60</sup> Nor, unlike in *IG I<sup>3</sup> 227* or *228*, is there any sign of the original, fifth-century text. The stone is broken at the top, but the fact that the first extant line (preceded by 9 cm of vacant space) is the invocation to the gods (*θεοί*) suggests that no preceding text has been lost; the end of the text is also followed by uninscribed space (of 33 cm). There is no obvious sign that another monument (bearing the other decree) was attached to the stone which we have. The most economical interpretation would therefore seem to be that the fifth-century decree was never re-inscribed: the restored *stèle* to which this text refers (in line 14) is (precisely, and only) this *stèle*. It seems, therefore, that these five Thasians (who, after all, were funding the inscription (line 16), and so might have expected to have some influence over its form) considered that this level of recognition was sufficient for their purposes: the existence of a monument seems to have been more important to them than the public display of a complete, and fully-authorised decree.

It is impossible to know what prompted the Thasians to make this choice (or the Athenians to accept it), though here too it must be important to remember the series of negotiations which must lie behind the creation of the stone, and its creation in this form: the initiative for the recreation must have come from the Thasians; they presumably found a way to persuade Monippides to make the proposal to the Council;<sup>61</sup> the Council was prepared to accept the suggestion; the secretary to put the plan into action. All of this combines to produce something which might, to modern eyes, seem quite arbitrary or capricious, but is in fact likely to be the logical result of the specific intentions and requirements of the various parties involved in creating this monument.

It might, though, be possible to get a bit further in speculating about the consequences of this commemorative action. This *stèle* produces a picture of the recent past which is significantly different in its emphasis from the other restored proxeny decrees which have been discussed. Two things are missing. First (obviously) we lack the earlier decree, and with it that sense of unbroken continuity with the past which was a feature of at least some of the other restored decrees. The second absence is any explicit function for the

<sup>60</sup> Henry (1983) 262 observes that benefactors are one of two categories to whom the honour of a (single) invitation to dinner is regularly (although not universally) awarded (the other being ambassadors and envoys).

<sup>61</sup> Monippides is otherwise unknown, other than as the (highly, and speculatively, restored) proposer of another honorific decree, *IG II<sup>2</sup> 7*.

*demos* in creating or authorising this monument, or even (in contrast to the normal pattern of proxeny decrees) in serving as the beneficiaries of the honorands' actions. By removing the Athenians (or at least the Athenian *demos*) from the picture, the monument creates a direct link between the Thirty and the Thasians—or, more accurately, between the Thirty and these five individuals. Whatever the actual role of these Thasians in the events of 404/3, the form of this monument allows them to insert themselves directly into the story, and the communally agreed memory, of the oligarchic coup and its aftermath.

## 5. Conclusion

When looking at Athenian inscribed decrees *en masse*, or even as individual examples, it can be tempting to see them as very fixed, authoritative (even authoritarian) symbols of commemoration, created, endorsed, and set up by the Athenian state. The collective aspect of Athenian inscribed decrees is, of course, a central part of their function, but, as I have tried to show, these monuments are also fundamentally informed, both in their creation and in their subsequent use, by the commemorative intentions of individuals and groups of individuals. The role of the individual—as decree proposer—in prompting the creation of an inscribed monument, and (to some extent) in shaping its content is clearly visible in the inscribed text itself. What the treatment of inscriptions after their creation reveals is that this interaction between individual and community was not a one-off, nor a one-way, action, but rather a process which continued throughout the life of an inscribed monument. Moreover, this approach is visible not only in the treatment of inscribed decrees, but also in relation to other forms of inscribed public text (catalogues, for example, and dedications). Athenian treatment of their inscriptions reveals not only the (not particularly striking, though not entirely uncontested) fact that individual Athenians did see and respond to these monuments, but also, more importantly, that these individual responses could in turn lead to reshaping of the collectively-agreed record: an inscription could be removed, emended, reconstructed, or entirely replaced; in the process, the picture of the city's past which the inscription implicitly or explicitly recorded was reshaped. What we can glimpse in the treatment of these monuments, in other words, is something of the dynamism of collective memory.

More elusive, but also important, is the insight this material provides into the relationship between inscriptions and other sources of collective (and indeed individual) memory. Some of these other sources might have been written, but were written in forms no longer available to us. (It seems quite likely, for example, that the honorands of the inscriptions destroyed by the Thirty had access to alternative copies of the original decrees, whether in the Athenian archive or in their own collections.) But the overall pattern of



behaviour described here makes sense only if the Athenians could also draw on a wider body of shared, but unwritten, beliefs about their recent, or even (as in the case of Arthmius of Zeleia) quite distant past. Inscribed monuments were not always the definitive source of accurate information about the collectively-agreed version of the past, and seem in at least some cases (for example, the *stèle* of the Athenian treaty with Alexander) to have derived some of their symbolic importance from the fact that they provided a picture of the past which contradicted an agreed, but unwritten alternative. Even when monuments were less obviously out of step with the ‘reality’ of Athenian views, their depiction of the past is often comprehensible only if it can be assumed that the viewer was able to fill in the gaps in what is recorded—literally in the case of some acts of erasure; metaphorically in the case of the highly compressed references to the behaviour of the Thirty.

Inscribed decrees, without doubt, played an important part in the formation of Athenian collective memory, but we should be wary of assuming that the memories which they produced were at all stable: as we have seen, the same monument could be deployed to justify quite different versions of the past. We should also be wary of assuming that the movement from individual memory to collective commemoration was either smooth or absolute. What we can see in these monuments, and particularly in their destruction and reconstruction, is the flexibility not just of Athenian views of their past, but also of Athenian ways of representing, reshaping, and, at times, deliberately concealing those views.

polly.a.low@durham.ac.uk

## Appendix: Destroyed, Amended and Restored Inscriptions Discussed in this Chapter

*Note:* all inscriptions are Athenian, except where stated otherwise;  
each list is ordered (as far as possible) by the date of the creation of the inscribed monument.

### 1. Destruction or Removal

Inscription	Description	Date of Creation	Evidence for Destruction
Not extant	Laws of Solon, Ephialtes, Arcestratus	Laws: C6th/C5th. Inscribed monument: not known.	'Taken down' by the Thirty Tyrants: <i>Ath. Pol.</i> 35.2.
Not extant	Inscribed (gold) dedications on the Athenian Acropolis	Not specified	Dem. 22.70, 72: alleges that the dedications were destroyed by Androtion.
Not extant	Proxeny (?) decree (names of honorands not preserved)	Before 403	<i>IG I<sup>3</sup> 229</i> ( $\approx$ <i>IG II<sup>2</sup> 9</i> ): refers to the destruction by the Thirty Tyrants of an earlier <i>stele</i> .
Not extant	Proxeny decree for the sons of Apemantos	Before 403	<i>IG II<sup>2</sup> 6</i> (OR 177B): refers to the destruction by the Thirty Tyrants of an earlier <i>stele</i> recording a proxeny.
Perhaps <i>IG I<sup>3</sup> 177?</i>	Proxeny decree for Xanthippos	Before 403	<i>IG II<sup>2</sup> 52</i> (proxeny decree for grandson of Xanthippos): refers to destruction by the Thirty Tyrants of the grandfather's proxeny as motivation for this decree.
Not extant	Proxeny decree for Anon. of Kaphyai (Arcadia)	Before 403	<i>IG II<sup>2</sup> 66c</i> : very fragmentary decree referring to destruction of a <i>stele</i> by the Thirty Tyrants.

Not extant	Proxeny decree for Anon. of Ialysos	Before 403	<i>Agora</i> 16.37: renewal of a proxeny held by the honorand's father; the earlier <i>stele</i> was destroyed by the Thirty Tyrants.
Not extant	Proxeny decree?	Before 403	<i>Agora</i> 16.39: very fragmentary, but seems to preserve a reference to destruction of a previous decree.
Not extant	Thasos: decree relating to exile/civil war	Late C5th	<i>IG XII.8</i> 264: reconciliation decree, including (fragmentary) reference to the removal of (an earlier?) decree.
Not extant	Athenian alliance with Alexander of Pherae	368	RO 44, lines 39–40 (361/0): orders removal of the treaty <i>stele</i> .
Not extant	Peace of Philocrates	346	Philochorus, <i>BNJ</i> 328 F 55a: removal ordered in decree of Demosthenes (340/39).
Not extant (postulated as a lost part of RO 83)	Eresos: law concerning tyranny.	c. 356–336	RO 83, γ, lines 24–6: refers to a law prohibiting removal of a <i>stele</i> (RO 83, α?) recording decisions made about the tyrants and their descendants.
<i>CID</i> 2.73	Delphi: list of those expelled from the city during the 3rd Sacred War	Mid C4th	Found in an archaeological context which suggests that the monument was destroyed c. 322.
Not extant	Megalopolitan alliance with Thebes	Mid C4th	Dem. 16.27–8 urges the destruction of the treaty <i>stele</i> .
RO 80	Delphi: honours for Aristotile and Callisthenes	337–327	Ael. <i>VH</i> 14.1: honours rescinded 322 (or later); destruction inferred from findspot.
<i>Agora</i> 16.114	Honours for Demetrius Poliorcetes	304/3	Livy 31.44.4–5 reports <i>damnatio</i> of Antigonids, 200/199; destruction of this <i>stele</i> inferred from findspot.

Not extant	Priene: proxeny decree for Euandros of Larisa	Late C <sub>4</sub> th/early C <sub>3</sub> rd?	<i>I.Priene</i> <sup>2</sup> 27, lines 1–2: implies that an original <i>stele</i> recording the award of proxeny had been destroyed.
------------	---	---	--

## 2. Emendations and Alterations

Inscription	Description	Date of creation	Notes
ML 27	Delphi: Serpent Column	479/8	Illicit addition of epigram by Pausanias; removal of epigram (and addition of names of states who fought Persia) by Spartans (Thuc. 1.132) or Delphic Amphictyony ([Dem.] 59.98).
ML 63/OR 149A	Alliance with Rhegion	433/2	Original prescript erased.
ML 64/OR 149B	Alliance with Leontini	433/2	Original prescript erased.
Not extant	Peace of Nicias	421	Thuc. 5.56.3: amended to note Spartan breach of terms, 419.
Not extant	Inscription (perhaps financial and/or religious?) relating to/mentioning Timanthes	Before 409/8	<i>IG I<sup>3</sup></i> 106, lines 21–3, orders that a section of inscription relating to Timanthes be erased.
Not extant	List of Selymbrian hostages	c. 408/7	ML 87/OR 185, lines 38–41 orders the removal of names from the list.
ML 89/OR 187	Honours for Neapolis	Monument: c. 407 (containing decrees of 410/9 and c. 407).	Erasure of description of Neapolitans as colonists of the Thasians (authorised at lines 58–60).
RO 22	Prospectus of the Second Athenian League	378/7	Multiple additions and deletions, between 378/7 and c. 367.

RO 31	Decrees for Mytilene	369/8–368/7	First decree is inscribed over an erasure.
IG II <sup>2</sup> 1606	Naval catalogue	374/3	Timotheus' office ( <i>strategos</i> ) erased (but not his name).
RO 48	Alliance with Carystus	357/6	Chabrias' (?) name erased.
Not extant	Honorific deme decree for Euxitheus	Mid-C4th	Dem. 57.64 (delivered <i>c.</i> 345) implies that the entire decree has been erased (but not that the <i>stèle</i> has been removed).
IG XII.2 1	Mytilene: monetary union between Mytilene and Phocaea	Mid-C4th?	Provision to supplement/erase the text, if either side wishes to amend the agreement.

### 3. Re-inscription

Inscription	Description	Date(s) of creation	Notes
IG II <sup>2</sup> 1	Honours for Samos	Monument: 404/3 (containing two decrees of 404/3 and one of 405/4)	A dossier of decrees; the decree of 405/4 had perhaps been destroyed by the Thirty Tyrants (but this is not stated explicitly).
IG I <sup>3</sup> 229 ( $\approx$ IG II <sup>2</sup> 9)	Proxeny (?) decree (names of honorands not preserved)	Monument: early C4th (containing two decrees; date and relationship unclear)	Refers to the destruction by the Thirty Tyrants of an earlier <i>stèle</i> .
IG I <sup>3</sup> 227 ( $\approx$ IG II <sup>2</sup> 8)	Proxeny decrees for Heracleides of Clazomenae	Monument: <i>c.</i> 399–386 (containing decrees of <i>c.</i> 424/3 and <i>c.</i> 399–386)	The stone contains two decrees: one decree (the lower on the stone) is a fourth-century re-inscription of a fifth-century decree; the other is almost entirely lost, but might have been the C4th decree authorising the re-inscription of the earlier text.

ML 80/OR 173	Proxeny decree for Pythophanes	Monument: 411/10–399/8 <b>or</b> 399/8 (containing decrees of 411/10 and 399/8)	Unclear if this is a re-inscription or supplement. The stone contains two decrees: the first on the stone is a fifth-century decree; only the heading of the second is preserved. It is not clear if the decrees were inscribed separately (at the time each one was passed), or together (in 399/8).
<i>IG I</i> <sup>3</sup> 228 ( $\approx$ <i>IG II</i> <sup>2</sup> 32)	Proxeny decree for Archonides and Demon, Sicels	Monument: 385/4 (containing decrees of <i>c.</i> 435–410 and 385/4)	C4th decree of the <i>Boule</i> (or <i>probouleuma?</i> ): only its heading is extant. In the lower part of the monument, a re-inscription of an earlier (C5th?) proxeny decree.
<i>IG II</i> <sup>2</sup> 448	Honours for Euphron of Sicyon	Monument: 318/17 (containing decrees of 323/2 and 318/7)	The decree of 318/17 notes that the decree of 323/2 (re-inscribed here) had been destroyed by the oligarchic regime in Sicyon.
<i>I.Priene</i> <sup>2</sup> 27	Priene: proxeny decree for Euandros of Larisa	Monument: first half of C3rd (containing decrees of late C4th/early C3rd and first half of C3rd)	The first decree on the stone re-authorises (and extends) the honours previously awarded; the original proxeny decree is re-inscribed beneath.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Accame, S. (1941) *La Lega ateniese del sec. IV a.C.* (Rome).
- Assmann, J. (2011) *Cultural Memory and Early Civilization: Writing, Remembrance, and Political Imagination* (Cambridge).
- Avery, H. C. (1979) 'The Three Hundred at Thasos, 411 BC', *CPh* 74: 234–42.
- Baron, C. A. (2006) 'The Aristoteles Decree and the Expansion of the Second Athenian League', *Hesperia* 75: 379–95.
- Bolmarcich, S. (2007) 'The Afterlife of a Treaty', *CQ* 57: 477–89.
- Brunet, M. (1997) 'Thasos et son épire à la fin du V<sup>e</sup> et au début du IV<sup>e</sup> s. avant Jesus-Christ', in P. Brulé and J. Oulhen, edd., *Esclavage, guerre, économie en Grèce ancienne: Hommages à Yvon Garlan* (Rennes) 229–42.
- Byrne, S. G. (2010) 'The Athenian *damnatio memoriae* of the Antigonids in 200 B.C.', in Tamis–Mackie–Byrne (2010) 157–77.
- Cargill, J. (1981) *The Second Athenian League: Empire or Free Alliance?* (Berkeley).
- Cawkwell, G. L. (1963) 'Notes on the Peace of 375/4', *Historia* 12: 84–95.
- (1973) 'The Foundation of the Second Athenian Confederacy', *CQ* 23: 47–60.
- (1981) 'Notes on the Failure of the Second Athenian Confederacy', *JHS* 101: 40–55.
- Crane, S. A. (1997) 'Writing the Individual back into Collective Memory', *AHR* 102: 1372–85.
- Cubbitt, G. (2007) *History and Memory* (Manchester).
- Culasso Gastaldi, E. (2003) 'Abattere la stele: riscrittura epigrafica e revisione storica ad Atene', *CCG* 14: 241–62.
- (2010) "'Abattere la stele", "Rimanere fedele alla stele": il testo epigrafico come garanzia della deliberazione politica', in Tamis–Mackie–Byrne (2010) 139–55.
- Fabricius, E. (1891) 'Zur Geschichte des zweiten athenischen Bundes', *RhM* 46: 589–98.
- Fischer, J. E. (2003) 'Sanides and Sanidia', in G. W. Bakewell and J. P. Sickinger, edd., *Gestures: Essays in Ancient History, Literature, and Philosophy Presented to Alan L. Boegehold* (Oxford) 237–50.
- Flower, H. I. (2006) *The Art of Forgetting: Disgrace and Oblivion in Roman Political Culture* (Chapel Hill and London).
- Funke, P. (1983) 'Konons Rückkehr nach Athen im Spiegel epigraphischer Zeugnisse', *ZPE* 103: 148–89.
- Graham, A. J. (1971) *Colony and Mother City in Ancient Greece*, revised edition (Manchester).
- Green, A. (2004) 'Individual Remembering and "Collective Memory": Theoretical Presuppositions and Contemporary Debates', *Oral History* 32: 35–44.
- Habicht, C. (1961) 'Falsche Urkunden zur Geschichte Athens im Zeitalter der Perserkriege', *Hermes* 89: 1–35.

- Halbwachs, M. (1992) *On Collective Memory* (Chicago); Edited Eng. trans. by L. A. Coseriu of *Les cadres sociaux de la mémoire* and *La topographie légendaire des évangiles en terre sainte* (Paris, 1925 and 1941).
- Hansen, M. H. (1975) *Eisangelia: The Sovereignty of the People's Court in Athens in the Fourth Century B.C. and the Impeachment of Generals and Politicians* (Odense).
- and T. H. Nielsen, edd. (2004) *An Inventory of Classical and Archaic Poleis* (Oxford).
- Henry, A. S. (1983) *Honours and Privileges in Athenian Decrees: The Principal Formulae of Athenian Honorary Decrees* (Hildesheim, Zürich, and New York).
- Jehne, M. (1994) *Koine Eirene* (Stuttgart).
- Lambert, S. D. (2011) 'What Was the Point of Inscribed Honorific Decrees in Classical Athens?', in id., ed., *Sociable Man: Essays on Ancient Greek Social Behaviour in Honour of Nick Fisher* (Swansea) 193–214.
- (2012) 'Inscribing the Past in Fourth-Century Athens', in Marincola–Llewellyn-Jones–Maciver (2012) 253–75.
- Loraux, N. (1996) 'Of Amnesty and its Opposite', in *Mothers in Mourning*, trans. C. Pache (Ithaca and London) 83–109.
- Low, P. (2013) 'Remembering and Forgetting: The Creation and Destruction of Inscribed Monuments in Classical Athens', in J. Tumblety, ed., *Memory and History: Understanding Memory as Source and Subject* (Abingdon) 71–87.
- 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, edd., *Intentional History: Spinning Time in Ancient Greece* (Stuttgart) 247–63.
- Mack, W. (2015) *Proxeny and Polis: Institutional Networks in the Ancient Greek World* (Oxford).
- Marincola, J., L. Llewellyn-Jones and C. Maciver, edd. (2012) *Greek Notions of the Past in the Archaic and Classical Eras: History without Historians* (Edinburgh).
- Marshall, F. H. (1905) *The Second Athenian Confederacy* (Cambridge).
- Matthaiou, A. (2011) 'The Theozotides Decree on the Sons of Those Murdered in the Oligarchy', in *Τὰ ἐν τῇ στήλῃ γεραμμένα: Six Greek Historical Inscriptions of the Fifth Century B.C.* (Athens) 71–81.
- Mattingly, H. B. (1963) 'The Growth of Athenian Imperialism', *Historia* 12: 257–73.
- Meiggs, R. (1949) 'A Note on Athenian Imperialism', *CR* 63: 9–12.
- (1972) *The Athenian Empire* (Oxford).
- Mitchel, F. W. (1984) 'The Rasura of IG II<sup>2</sup> 43: Jason, the Pheraean Demos, and the Athenian League', *AncW* 9: 39–58.
- Nolan, B. T. (1981) 'Inscribing Costs at Athens in the Fourth Century B.C.' (PhD diss., Ohio State).
- Olick, J. K. (1999) 'Collective Memory: The Two Cultures', *Sociological Theory* 17: 333–48.



- Osborne, R. G. (1999) 'Inscribing Performance', in S. D. Goldhill and R. G. Osborne, edd., *Performance Culture and Athenian Democracy* (Cambridge) 341–58.
- (2003) 'Changing the Discourse', in K. A. Morgan, ed., *Popular Tyranny: Sovereignty and its Discontents in Ancient Greece* (Austin) 251–72.
- Papazarkadas, N. (2009) 'Epigraphy and the Athenian Empire: Re-shuffling the Chronological Cards', in J. Ma, N. Papazarkadas, and R. Parker, edd., *Interpreting the Athenian Empire* (London) 67–88.
- Pébarthe, C. (2006) *Cité, démocratie et écriture: histoire de l'alphabétisation d'Athènes à l'époque classique* (Paris).
- Pouilloux, J. (1954) *Études Thasiennes 3, 1: Recherches sur l'histoire et les cultes de Thasos. De la fondation de la cité à 196 avant J.-C.* (Paris).
- Raviola, F. (1993) 'Fra continuità e cambiamento: Atene, Reggio e Leonitini', *Hesperia* (Rome) 3: 85–97.
- Rhodes, P. J. (1985) *The Athenian Boule*, revised edition (Oxford).
- (1993) *A Commentary on the Aristotelian Athenaion Politeia*, revised edition (Oxford).
- (2001) 'Public Documents in the Greek States: Archives and Inscriptions, Part II', *G&R* 48: 136–53.
- (2019) 'Erasures in Greek Public Documents', in A. Petrovic, I. Petrovic, and E. Thomas, edd., *The Materiality of Text: Placement, Perception and Presence of Inscribed Texts in Classical Antiquity* (Leiden and Boston) 145–66.
- Ryder, T. T. B. (1965) *Koine Eirene: General Peace and Local Independence in Ancient Greece* (London).
- Ste. Croix, G. E. M. de (1956) 'The Constitution of the Five Thousand', *Historia* 5: 1–23.
- Shear, J. L. (2011) *Polis and Revolution: Responding to Oligarchy in Classical Athens* (Cambridge).
- (2012) 'The Politics of the Past: Remembering Revolution at Athens', in Marincola–Llewellyn-Jones–Maciver (2012) 276–300.
- Smarczyk, B. (1986) *Bündnerautonomie und athenische Seebundspolitik im dekeleischen Krieg* (Frankfurt am Main).
- Stadter, P. A. (1989) *A Commentary on Plutarch's Pericles* (Chapel Hill and London).
- Steinbock, B. (2013) *Social Memory in Athenian Public Discourse: Uses and Meanings of the Past* (Ann Arbor).
- Steinhart, M. (1997) 'Bemerkungen zu Rekonstruktion, Ikonographie und Inschrift des platäischen Weihgeschenkes', *BCH* 121: 33–69.
- Stroud, R. S. (1971) 'Greek Inscriptions: Theozotides and the Athenian Orphans', *Hesperia* 40: 280–301.
- Tamis, A. M., C. J. Mackie, and S. G. Byrne, edd. (2010) *Philathenaios: Studies in Honour of Michael J. Osborne* (Athens).
- Thomas, R. (1989) *Oral Tradition and Written Record in Classical Athens* (Cambridge).

- Walbank, M. B. (1978) *Athenian Proxeny of the Fifth Century B.C.* (Toronto).
- Wallace, R. W. (1989) *The Areopagos Council to 307 B.C.* (Baltimore).
- Wilhelm, A. (1903) 'Review of W. Dittenberger, *Sylloge inscriptionum graecarum*', *GG4* 165: 769–98.
- Wolpert, A. (2002) *Remembering Defeat: Civil War and Civic Memory in Ancient Athens* (Baltimore and London).
- Woodhead, A. G. (1957) 'IG II<sup>2</sup> 43 and Jason of Pherae', *AJA* 61: 367–73.
- Young, R. S. (1951) 'An Industrial District of Ancient Athens', *Hesperia* 20: 135–288.