



Universiteit Leiden

The use of the imperative in Athenian decrees

Natalia Elvira Astoreca

MA Thesis

Supervisor: Tazuko A. van Berkel

Leiden, The Netherlands

July, 2016

Index

Index of tables	4
Abbreviations	4
1. Introduction	5-13
1.1 A standard Athenian decree	6-8
1.2 Dynamic infinitives and 3rd person imperatives	8-10
1.3 Methodology and organisation	11-13
2. Brief and fragmentary decrees	14-20
2.1 IG I ³ 153 (Peiraieus, 440-425 BCE)	14-15
2.2 Proxeny decrees: IG I ³ 156 (440-425 BCE), 163 (440-415 BCE), 174 (425-410 BCE), 165 (420 BCE), 80 (421/0 BCE)	15-20
3. The First-Fruits decree (IEleusis 28a, ca.430 BCE)	21-26
4. Kallias' financial decrees (IG I ³ 52, 434/3 BCE)	27-31
5. Honours to Phrynichus' Assassins (IG I ³ 102, 410/409 BCE)	32-33
6. Republication of Draco's Law on Homicide (IG I ³ 104, 409/8 BCE)	34-37
7. Decrees honouring the Samians (IG II ² 1, 405/4 BCE)	38-43
8. Conclusion	44-45
Appendix of inscriptions	46-59
Bibliography	60-61

Index of tables

Table 1. Infinitives and imperatives in IG I ³ 153	14
Table 2. Infinitives and imperatives in IG I ³ 156, 163, 174, 165, 80	16-17
Table 3. Infinitives and imperatives in IEleusis 28a	22-23
Table 4. Infinitives and imperatives in IG I ³ 52	28-29
Table 5. Infinitives and imperatives in IG I ³ 102	33
Table 6. Infinitives and imperatives in IG I ³ 104	35
Table 7. Infinitives and imperatives in IG II ² 1	39-41

Abbreviations

Acc.: Accusative

Cond. Cl.: conditional clause

FImp.: Formula in the imperative

Final cl.: final clause

FInf.: Formula in the infinitive

FInf./pImp.: Formula in the infinitive possible in the imperative

IEleusis: Clinton, K. (2005), *Eleusis, the inscriptions on stone*.

IG: *Inscriptiones Graecae*

Imp.: Imperative

Impers.: Impersonal

Inf.: Infinitive

Inf./Imp.: *Infinitivus pro imperativo*

ML: Meiggs, R. & Lewis, D.M. (1988), *A selection of greek historical inscriptions*.

n.a.: not analysed

Nom.: Nominative

Rel. Cl.: relative clause

Sub.: Subordinate

Subj.: Subject

Subj. n/a: Subject not agent

Temp. Cl.: temporal clause

1. Introduction

The democratic system born in Athens needed a way to record all the decisions taken in the deliberative bodies of the city, the *boule* and the *demos*. We can presume that all of the decrees produced by them were written down and stored in an archive. However, only some were inscribed on stone and displayed publicly¹. Thanks to those public decrees which survive to the present day, more can be known about the procedure of deliberation and how these institutions worked². We could also, however, consider these documents from a linguistic point of view. They offer evidence for the official language used in the Athenian institutions, which is different from the literary language that has normally more interest among the academic circles nowadays.

It is common belief that these official documents follow very strict formulas³ and syntactic structures, but these patterns take time to settle and they were not always the same: “The Athenians were slow to develop standard formulae for use in their public documents. They never reached a stage where all decrees of a certain period could be relied on to contain exactly the same elements, arranged in the same order and expressed in the same way, but general patterns did emerge.”⁴. This Thesis will focus on the syntactic display of these decrees, and more specifically on the structures they use to express the different issues addressed in the body of the decree.

The usual way to express the action items discussed in a decree is with dynamic infinitives. However, this is not so in every case, as we can also find 3rd person imperatives instead. This can be seen, for example, in the the first decree giving honours to the Samians in IG II² 1, which is included in this paper. It seems at first sight that the change of structure from infinitives to imperatives corresponds to a change in the subject: from general prescriptions to the city of Athens or to the Samians as a whole, to a specific office that was in charge of carrying the task given⁵. Nonetheless, this cannot be so, as there are cases of infinitives expressing a task that is to be done by a certain office in this and other inscriptions, so there must be other reasons for this change to happen.

The aim of this paper is to try to find a pattern for the appearance of these 3rd person imperatives, looking at possible syntactic reasons to choose them over the dynamic infinitive. The *corpus* of

¹For a whole description of how the decrees were stored and published see Rhodes 2001.

²There is an exhaustive study on this matter in Rhodes 1972 and in Rhodes & Lewis 1997.

³Even though it is quite old, the most complete collection of these formulas is in Larfeld (1902: 601-817).

⁴ Rhodes & Lewis 1997: 18

⁵Personal statement from Mathieu de Bakker.

inscriptions in this Thesis has been reduced to Classical Athens, i.e. decrees from the 5th century BCE only, even though 3rd person imperatives can be found in later decrees from very different points throughout Greece. The extension of this paper and the time given do not permit a fully comprehensive investigation, so the place and time when democracy flourished have been chosen as a good sample. I hope that in the future more research can be done to shed a light on this matter and see the possible differences or similarities that other places and dates offer.

In order to understand fully the purposes and conclusions of this paper, before analyzing the texts, it is important to explain in detail the basic elements studied in this thesis: first, what is an Athenian decree and how is the common arrangement of its text, and second, the definition of dynamic infinitive and its possible relationship with the 3rd person imperative. The following paragraphs of this introduction will deal with these two issues.

1.1 A standard Athenian decree

When we talk about an Athenian decree, this does not only refer to the decrees found in Athens, but all the decrees issued by the Athenian institutions that can be found anywhere in the region of Attica. As mentioned above, it is difficult to find a time when these decrees had exactly the same arrangement and formulas, but some patterns can be seen. By formulas we understand a set of phrases that have been standardised and so they appear repeatedly and follow a similar form with very few variations or even none at all. Here we will discuss the different sections and formulas that appear in the inscriptions analysed in this paper based on the categories established by Larfeld (1902), Rhodes (1972) and Rhodes & Lewis (1997)⁶.

We have examples of headings, that are normally written in larger letters, before the text of the decree. The heading can point out the main issue concerning the decree or the name of any official involved in its enactment. A good example that includes both is the heading of the so called Samian decree (IG II² 1), which starts with the following: 1.1-4 Κηφισοφῶν Παιανιεὺς | ἐγγραμμάτευε. | Σαμίοις ὅσοι μετὰ τῷ δήμῳ τῷ Ἀθηναίων ἐγένοντο. This specific heading comes after a relief that depicts Athena and Hera, who are the goddesses that protect Athens and Samos respectively⁷,

⁶ These are complete studies about the formulas and arrangement of decrees. However, there are many studies that focus on formulas of a specific kind. The specific studies used throughout this Thesis are: Walbank 1978, Henry 1983 & 1989 and Rhodes 1984. In this paper we will follow the classification of formulas that these studies have made, so as not to enter the debate whether each specific case is a formula or not, which would require a completely new Thesis. As a consequence, we will call any phrase that appears as such in these studies a “formula”.

⁷ Meiggs & Lewis 1988: 283ff.

and it mentions the secretary of the last decree included in the inscription and the Samians who were loyal to the Athenians, who are the subjects of the decrees that follow. Another introductory element of the decree is the invocation. Some decrees can present first of all this invocation, either of the gods (θεοί) or of good fortune (ἀγαθῇ τύχῃ)⁸, but it does not appear in any of the inscriptions included in this paper.

The most characteristic element of a decree is the prescript. The first thing to appear in the prescript is the enactment formula. In the inscriptions in this paper the enactment formula used is ἔδοχεν τῇ βολῇ καὶ τοῖ δέμοι, which is the one that was used from 469 to 405 BCE.⁹ The names of the different officials who participated in the enactment of the decree come next, and finally the proposer of the decree. See for example the prescript of the Kallias' decree (IG I³ 52): face A, 1.1-2 [ἔδ]οχεν τῇ βολῇ καὶ τοῖ δέμοι· Κεκροπίς ἐπρυτάνευε, Μνεσίθεος ἐλ[γ]ραμμάτευε, Εὐπείθεος ἐπεστάτε, Καλλίας εἶπε·.

The content of the decree could come directly after the prescript, or a motivation could be added, normally introduced by ἐπει(δη), e.g. ἐπειδὴ εὖ ποεῖ Ἀθηναίοι[ς], ἀναγραφάτω πρόξενον. A motion formula can appear as well as part of the proposal: δεδόχθαι/ἐψηφίσθαι τῇ βουλῇ/τῷ δήμῳ. Depending on the institution where the motion was made we will find *boule* or *demos* (even if it is rare before Roman Times, it could also be τῇ βουλῇ καὶ τῷ δήμῳ), but δεδόχθαι and ἐψηφίσθαι are completely interchangeable.¹⁰

Then comes what Rhodes & Lewis call the substance of the decree, i.e. the proposal that was ratified by the assembly. They say about this section that “the substance is normally expressed in accusatives and infinitives”¹¹ and that these depend on the motion formula (δεδόχθαι/ἐψηφίσθαι) in case that there is one or else in the proposal formula in the prescript (εἶπε). What they miss in this explanation is that this structure can be substituted by nominatives and imperatives in some cases.

Amendments to a decree could also be proposed. The rider formulas that introduce the amendments of the inscriptions that follow are: X εἶπε· τὰ μὲν ἄλλα καθάπερ τῇ βουλῇ and τὰ μὲν ἄλλα

⁸ Rhodes & Lewis 1997: 4

⁹ Rhodes 1972: 64

¹⁰ Rhodes 1972: 65

¹¹ Rhodes & Lewis 1997: 5

καθάπερ αἱ χυγγραφαί. The content of the rider follows the same rules as the content of the decree: infinitives with the subject in the accusative, or imperatives with the subject in the nominative, depending on εἴπε (not on the one in the prescript but on the one that refers to the proposer of the amendment).

Another element of these decrees is the formulas concerning the inscription of the decree, which appear within the content of the decree and normally at the end¹². These may include the order to the secretary to inscribe the decree and display it publicly (the inscription and publication formulas), the order to the *poletai* to arrange the contract for the inscription and the order to some office or treasury to provide the money for the inscription (the payment formulas)¹³. An example that includes all of these formulas is the decree to republish Draco's law on homicide (IG I³ 104): 1.5-9 ἀναγρα[φ]σά[ν]τον οἱ ἀναγραφῆς τῶν νόμον παραλαβόντες παρὰ τῷ β[α]σ[ι]λέ[ο]ς μετ[ὰ] τῷ γραμμ[α]τέοις τῆς βουλῆς ἐ' στέλει λιθίνει καὶ κα[τ]α[θ]έν[ι]ον πρόσ[θ]ε[ν] τῆς στοῶς τῆς βασιλείας· οἱ δὲ πολεταὶ ἀπομι[σθο]σ[άν]τον κατὰ τὸν νόμον, οἱ δὲ ἑλλενοταμίαι δόντον τὸ ἀρ[γ]ύ[ρ]ι[ον].¹⁴

1.2 Dynamic infinitives and 3rd person imperatives

As was said above, the content of the decree can be written either in infinitives or imperatives and, apparently, they seem to be interchangeable. Thus we can presume that there is some relationship between both structures pragmatically. Here I will discuss the characteristics of both the infinitives and imperatives that we will find in the decrees.

According to the analysis made by Stork (1982), there are two first categories: oblique infinitives, which take part in indirect speech, and those infinitives that are not oblique. The latter can be of two types: declarative and dynamic. Declarative infinitives express a statement of fact: “a situation that is conceived of as actually existing at some point of time anterior to, simultaneous with, or posterior to, the point of time at which the situation is referred to”.¹⁵ On the other hand, the dynamic infinitive is used for potential situations and thus they cannot express time relationship with the

¹² Rhodes 1972 and Rhodes & Lewis 1997 do not include these formulas in their studies, but they can be seen in Larfeld 1902, Walbank 1978 and Henry 1989.

¹³ For a study on the different payment formulas see Henry 1989.

¹⁴ “The *anagrapheis* shall write the law with the secretary of the *boule* on a stone stele and place it in front of the stoa Basileia. The *poletai* shall pay the costs according to the law. The *hellenotamiai* shall give the money.” Translation by author.

¹⁵ Stork 1982: 14

present of the speaker.¹⁶ Given this definition, in most cases the meaning of the main verb will determine the nature of the infinitive: declarative or dynamic. Normally, verbs of “saying” make infinitives work as declarative because of their meaning. However, even though the verb λέγω (which in these inscriptions appears in the aorist form εἶπε) has no jussive meaning by itself, the authority of the institutions that move the decrees, the *boule* and the *demos*, provides this semantic value to the verb and gives jussive force to the whole decree. Thus, in these cases εἶπε will work as a verb of jussive meaning and as such the infinitives will be dynamic. In addition, the context makes clear that these are all potential situations.

Other characteristics of dynamic infinitives¹⁷ that serve as evidence that these infinitives are working as dynamic infinitives are:

- the negation for the dynamic infinitive is always μή. In these decrees is the negation that appears for the infinitives, e.g. IEleusis 28a 1.55 καὶ τὸ λοιπὸν μὲ ἐν ἡδρύνεσθαι βομὸς.
- The modal particle ὅν appears only with declarative infinitives. Infinitives are not used with the particle ὅν in these decrees.
- the future infinitive is always declarative. The infinitives that appear in the decrees are always present or aorist infinitives, and the difference in the stems is not temporal but aspectual, understanding aspect as “the semantic differences that presumably are inherent in the morphological differences between corresponding verb forms of the present, the aorist and the perfect stem”.¹⁸

By categorizing these infinitives as dynamic, we negate the possibility that they are oblique infinitives. This means that they are not part of indirect speech and so they do not emulate the discourse of the proposer of the decree, but these are rather an enumeration of all the actions moved by the proposer.

These dynamic infinitives can fulfil many different syntactic functions¹⁹. What we find in these decrees are infinitives as a complement of a verb, infinitives “continued in an independent sentence” and some “*infinitivi pro imperativo*”. In the inscriptions included in this paper we can

¹⁶ Rijksbaron (2002: 96ff.) makes a similar classification for the infinitives: those that are used as an obligatory constituent of another verb can be declarative or dynamic depending on the meaning of the main verb. This classification bears a significant semantic difference: they are declarative when they refer to a state of affairs in reality and dynamic when the state of affairs is potential. Against Stork and Rijksbaron see Martínez Vázquez (1989), who supports that the difference is that of a verbal substitute in the case of the declarative infinitive, while the dynamic infinitive is a *nomen actionis*.

¹⁷ Stork 1982: 14

¹⁸ Stork 1982: 23

¹⁹ See Stork 1982: 2-11 for a detailed description of all the functions of infinitives and especially dynamic.

find infinitives subordinated to other verbs functioning as their subjects or objects, but those that express the action items of the decree, even though they should be a complement of the verb εἴπε (or of δεδόχθαι/ἐψηφίσθαι in case there is a motion formula), they appear in independent sentences coordinated with δέ²⁰. This is what Stork calls “infinitives continued in an independent sentence”²¹. They emulate the structure of the infinitive as complement, but they constitute independent sentences. This is what makes it possible for infinitives to be substituted by imperatives in some of the action items, but not in the case of infinitives subordinated to other verbs in the text (as imperatives cannot be the subject or the object of another verb). This idea will be developed further below. Nevertheless, there is a close relationship between εἴπε or the motion formula and these action items: even though syntactically they are independent, pragmatically they depend on these formulas and they take their jussive force from them. Therefore, we will still say that the action items depend on the prescript or on the motion formula. There are also some instances where the infinitive is an “*infinitivus pro imperativo*”, that expresses a command to a specific addressee who will be the agent of that action. Because the text of the decrees is always addressed to a 3rd person and never to a 2nd person, these infinitives are always substituting 3rd person imperatives. This makes the “*infinitivi pro imperativo*” easily recognisable, as they will always have the following elements: a jussive function (they render an order), and a subject in the accusative case that is the addressee and expected agent of the action.

On the other hand, the imperative mood is the jussive expression *par excellence*. In these decrees, whenever an imperative form appears, it is always a 3rd person imperative (as was said before, the decree never addresses a 2nd person) and always with an explicit subject. These have also an addressee, the expected agent of the action, that will appear as the subject of the imperative in the nominative. Here is where we see the relationship between the infinitives and imperatives in these inscriptions: the two structures (imperative and *infinitives pro imperativo*) are comparable, as they share the same elements (an order with an explicit addressee) even though they are expressed differently syntactically (addressee subj.nom. + order imp. vs. addressee subj.acc. + order inf.). Therefore, in these decrees that express the action items in infinitives, the imperative can only appear in instances where an “*infinitivus pro imperativo*” could happen, so that there is little or no change in the meaning. In other cases an imperative is syntactically impossible (e.g. depending on another verb) or it would change the meaning completely.

²⁰ Notice that if they were not independent they would be coordinated by καί, as in IG I³ 174, 14-5: ἐξεῖναι αὐτῷ πλεῖν καὶ χεῖματὰ ἐσάγειν. “He shall be allowed to sail and to import money” (translation by author).

²¹ Stork 1982: 7ff.

1.3 Methodology and organisation

In this pilot study, we will concentrate on some of the decrees passed in Athens during the 5th century BCE that include 3rd person imperatives in their text. A first search for inscriptions that could fit in the corpus for this Thesis was made in the study by Van Effenterre and Ruzé (1994, 1995), where the republication of Draco's laws (IG I³ 104) is included. The rest of the inscriptions used were the result of a search of one of the formulas that can appear in the imperative, the inscription formula. This search, made through the website of the Packard Humanities Institute, included the terms ἀναγραφσάτο, ἀναγραψάτο and ἀναγραψάτω. From the results of this search, only the inscriptions that belong to our temporal and geographical frame were selected to make the corpus²².

The syntactic analysis of this corpus is the basis of this thesis. The results of this analysis have been collected in tables that have different categories. In the section for the infinitives they have been divided into syntactic categories where the infinitival structure could be substituted by an imperatival one without a change in meaning and syntactic contexts that do not permit the imperative form. The latter occur in these inscriptions in the following cases: the infinitive is subordinated to another verb (Sub.), as imperatives have to be the main verb; formulas that only appear in the infinitive (FInf.), because when the formulas are standardised in this way they become automatic and will never show any other form that is not the infinitive; when they do not have an explicit subject (Impers.), as 3rd person imperatives must have one; and when their subject is not the agent of the action (e.g. in state verbs, for example εἶμι) (Subj.n/a), for the subject of the imperatives is always its expected agent. These structures are not compatible with imperatives, but there are others which are and so they could be replaced by an imperative. This happens when: there is a formula that uses the infinitive but the imperative is also possible (FInf./pImp.) or in the case of “*infinitivi pro imperativo*” (Inf./Imp.) (see the previous section for a comparison between the “*infinitivo pro imperativo*” and the imperative).

On the other hand, the imperatives are categorized depending on their syntactic context: those that

²² This is only a small sample, as there are many other inscriptions that could have been eligible and hopefully they will appear in future and more exhaustive studies about this matter. For example, doing a search for other terms like καταθέτω, καταθέτο and κολάκρεται (the latter always appears with the imperative δόντον) I could find 26 inscriptions (excluding those that are already included) that fit in the characteristics of this paper. These are: IG I³ 7, 10, 11, 17, 23, 24, 37, 40, 62, 71, 72, 73, 75, 82, 84, 89, 101, 130, 136, 149, 159, 167, 180, 193, 195, 200. However, most of them are too fragmentary to analyse or they only have formulas in the imperative. From these only 8 are worth analysing and I encourage anyone who wishes to go on with this research to do it. These are: IG I³ 40, 62, 71, 73, 75, 82, 84, 101.

are part of a formula (FImp.), those that come after subordinate clauses (conditional, temporal and final clauses) (Cond.cl., Temp.cl., Final cl.) and the ones that are part of a relative clause (Rel.cl.). There are others that are also used in order to avoid repetition of infinitives or confusion. When the imperative does not belong to any of these categories, it is also stated and further information about those is given in the commentary, with semantic and pragmatic arguments will when the syntax cannot explain the appearance of the imperative, as these are other factors that contribute to the choice of one form over the other. This is where the historical context is relevant, as it can help understanding the semantics and pragmatics of the text. For both infinitives and imperatives, there is another column dedicated to those that were not analysed (n.a.) when the *lacunae* did not allow a precise analysis²³.

This categorisation has a very clear aim. First, by differentiating infinitival structures that are compatible or not with the imperative form, we clarify when the infinitive is necessary and in which instances there was an option and the infinitive form was chosen over the imperative. Then, in the imperatives section, we can see where the imperative is provoked by the syntactic context (i.e. after subordinate clauses) and when not, in which case the semantic and pragmatic commentaries play an important role. That way we can discern and analyse more factors that affect the use of the imperative in these decrees.

The paper is organised into different sections that include the table and commentary for one inscription, except for the first section that includes several brief inscriptions. The commentaries are mostly syntactical (with semantic and pragmatic commentary when necessary) based on the data displayed in the tables and they include relevant historical information and a brief commentary on previous scholarship when needed for the understanding of the text. The inscriptions appear in chronological order in the first section and the following sections are also organised chronologically. These brief inscriptions appear first so that the formulas in the imperative are fully explained and justified before we move on to more complex inscriptions that present these formulas as well. Finally, at the end of the dissertation there is an appendix that includes, in order of appearance, the texts used for this paper, with a reference to the edition used when there was a complete edition more recent than the one in IG. Nevertheless, the IG nomenclature is followed throughout the whole Thesis so that the inscriptions are easily recognised and it can be traced where they were cited before. Although some of the inscriptions are very fragmentary and that may imply that the verbs analysed are reconstructed, the editions used here were thoroughly studied and

²³Each table will only include the categories that appear in the inscription for space reasons.

discussed by many scholars and in most cases the reconstructions are very reliable. However, as has been said above, the instances where the analysis cannot be completely sure appear in the category of not analysed verbs (n.a.).

Even though it is not presented in a whole study about this matter, there is a previous theory proposed by Swoboda and followed by Rhodes & Lewis that tries to explain the presence of imperatives in Greek decrees. They consider that imperatives are more present in religious laws, that are not enacted by common decision but by a commission of experts, because this kind of documents (together with treaties) do not have that many procedural formulas and that is a sign of an older style used for more solemnity²⁴. This does not seem a very strong argument for the use of these imperatives and the material in this Thesis shows that its use is not restricted to the religious sphere. We could also try to explain the appearance of imperatives as a matter of style of the writer of the decree. However, a stylistic analysis is impossible, as we would need “several decrees which belonged to the same year but were all proposed by different speakers and all bore the names of different secretaries, and if they were all differentiated from decrees of other years by common positive characteristics, then in those circumstances (and only in those circumstances) we could say something about the style of the unknown man who was under-secretary in that year.”²⁵ Therefore we can only rely on the syntactic, semantic and pragmatic arguments and cannot explain the style of the writer himself.

Unfortunately, we lack the so much expected but never published third volume of *The grammar of Attic inscriptions* by L. Threagles, that was supposed to deal with the syntax of Attic inscriptions. The results of this research show that this is a complicated matter, but that it can help understanding better the Greek language as a whole. Hopefully, this will encourage scholars to do more research about this and other syntactical issues attested in the Greek epigraphic sources.

²⁴ Swoboda 1890: 241-3, Rhodes & Lewis 1997: 561

²⁵ Dover 1981: 6ff.

2. Brief and fragmentary decrees

This first section collects six decrees that are organised chronologically and divided thematically. The first inscription, IG I³ 153, is a decree concerning some naval issues, while the rest are all proxeny decrees. There are three decrees (IG I³ 153, 156 and 163) that could be one of the first Attic decrees to have an imperative within the body of the decree. However, there is no exact date for them, which makes it impossible to say which one comes first or whether they could actually be declared to be the first without any doubt. Both IG I³ 153 and IG I³ 156 could have been published within the years 440 and 425 BCE, while IG I³ 163 has a wider range of years, from 440 to 415 BCE.

2.1 IG I³ 153 (Peiraieus, 440-425 BCE)

Verb	Infinitive	Imperative				
	Sub	FImp.	Cond. cl.	final cl.	syntactic coherence	avoid conf./rep.
1.6 ἐχσέστο						1
1.6 ἀνελκύ[σαι]	1					
1.8 καθελκύσαι	1					
1.9 ἡυποζονύνα[ι]	1					
1.10 περι[ο]ρμίζεν	1					
1.15 ἐπιμελέσθο				1		
1.17 ὀφελέτο			1			
1.18 ζεμιόντι[ον]					1	
1.20 ἀ]γαγραφάτο		1				
1.22 δόντο]ν		1				
1.23 ἀπομισθοσάντ]ον		1				
subtotal	4	3	1	1	1	1
	Total 4	Total 7				

Table 1. Infinitives and imperatives in IG I³ 153

This is a decree that regulates some of the duties of the trierarchs (a trierarch is the person in charge of a trieres for one year) and the men necessary to perform different tasks inside the ship.²⁶ The prescript of IG I³ 153, which would make it clear that we are talking about a decree, was not preserved. In spite of this, this inscription has been included here as a decree, as it does have the typical publication and payment formulas found in Athenian decrees (lines 19-23):

[1] τό δι[ἐ φσέφισμα τόδε ἀ]γαγραφάτο ἡο γραμμ[α]τι[εὺς ἡο τῆς βολῆς ἐσ]τέλει
 λιθίνει· ἡοι δ[ἐ] κ[ο]λακρέται δόντο]ν τ[ὸ] ἀργύριον· ἡοι δὲ πολ[ι]εταί

²⁶ Arnaoutoglou 1998, no.102 and Morrison *et alii* 2000: 169

ἀπομισθοσάντ]ον²⁷.

It is noticeable that in this inscription there are less infinitives than imperatives (Table 1) and, what is even more striking, that these four infinitives are all subordinate to the imperative ἐχσέστο in line 6. This means that they belong to a category of infinitives that cannot be substituted by imperatives. As for the imperatives in this inscription, they all appear in contexts where we expect to find imperatives, and those are imperatives that come after subordinate clauses and formulas that can be expressed in the imperative, which are the ones cited above (except for *hoi δ[ἐ] κ[ολακρέται δόντο]ν τ[ὸ] ἀργύριον* which, according to Henry, always uses the imperative²⁸). One of them (1.18 *ξεμιόντ[ον]*), has been categorized in the section of syntactical coherence, as it is coordinated with another imperative (1.17 *ὀφείλετο*) and thus it can only be an imperative too. In the case of 1.6 *ἐχσέστο*, the imperative is used so as to be clear that the following actions are subordinate to it and so they come in the form of infinitives.

Because we are missing the first part of the inscription, we cannot conclude anything with full certainty. However, given the fact that there are considerably more imperatives and that the infinitives are subordinate, we could say that there is a possibility that the points of this decree were mostly formulated in imperatives. Perhaps the missing information could shed a light on the reasons why this could be so.

2.2 Proxeny decrees: IG I³ 156 (440-425 BCE), 163 (440-415 BCE), 174 (425-410 BCE), 165 (420 BCE), 80 (421/0 BCE)

The first of these proxeny decrees is IG I³ 156, dedicated to Leonides of Halikarnassos and his sons. Even though, as happened in IG I³ 153, the beginning is missing for IG I³ 156, we do have a prescript from line 9 to line 13. Walbank considers this to be the prescript of the second decree that extends the honours given to them in the first one: it grants Leonides with jurisdictional protection and the publication of his proxeny decree among other things²⁹. It is remarkable that this second decree is only dedicated to Leonides and does not include his sons.

²⁷“The secretary of the council shall have this decree written on a stone stele; and the *kolakretai* shall give the money and the *poletai* shall pay the costs.” Translation by Arnaoutoglou 1998, no.102.

²⁸ Henry 1989: 248-250

²⁹ Walbank 1978: 142 ff.

		Infinitives							Imperatives		
Inscription	Verb	n.a.	Sub.	FInf.	Impers.	Sub.n/a	FInf./pImp.	Inf./Imp.	FImp.	avoid conf./rep.	none
IG I3 156	l.4 ἐ[π]ιμέλεσθαι			1							
	l.18 ἔναι			1							
	l.19 ἐπαινέσαι			1							
	l.22 ἀ[ν]αγραφσάτο								1		
	l.26 στέσαι				1						
	l.27 προσελέσθο										1
IG I3 163	l.2 ἔν]αι	1									
	l.3 ἀναγρα]φσάτο								1		
	l.6 κατα]θῆναι						1				
	l.7 καλέσαι			1							
IG I3 174	l.7 ἀναγραψάτο								1		
	l.10 κλαταθέτω								1		
	l.12 ἐκκομίσασθαι		1								
	l.13 ἐκκομισάσθω									1	
	l.14 ἐξῆναι				1						
	l.14 πλῆν		1								
	l.15 ἐσάγεν		1								
	l.18 ἐξ]ῆ[ναι	1									

		Infinitive							Imperative		
Inscription	Verbs	n.a.	Sub.	FInf.	Impers.	Sub.n/a	FInf./pImp.	Inf./Imp.	FImp.	avoid conf./rep.	none
IG I3 165	l.2 [πρ]οσαγ[αγῆν	1									
	l.3 ὀφέλεν							1			
	l.4 προσευθύνεσθαι							1			
	l.7 καταθέτο								1		
	l.10 δόντον								1		
	l.13 ἔναι					1					
	l.14 καλέσαι			1							
IG I3 80	l.8 ἐπαινέσαι			1							
	l.12 ἀνλαγραφσάτο								1		
	l.18 καταθέτο								1		
	l.19 δόντον								1		
	subtotal	3	3	6	2	1	1	2	9	1	1
		Total 18							Total 11		

Table 2. Infinitives and imperatives in IG I³ 156, 163, 174, 165, 80

To clarify that, his name appears repeatedly in each sentence of the decree, even changing the normal order of the sentence: 1.15-16 Λεονίδεν | ἕάν τις ἀποκτένει.³⁰

We can see (Table 2) that this inscription is very formulaic, as happens with most of the proxeny decrees because the honours given and formulas to express them are well established. These are formulas like, for example, ἐ[π]ιμύεσθαι δὲ αὐτῷ (1.4-5) that grants protection,³¹ τέλιν τιμορίαν ἔναι καθάπερ ἕάν | τις Ἀθηναίων ἀποθάνει· (1.17-19) that means jurisdictional protection, as if someone kills him he will be punished as if he was a citizen of Athens, and ἐπαυλύνει (1.19-20) that grants honours. When it comes to the inscription formula, the structure changes into imperative (1.22 τὰ ἐφσεφισμένα ἀ[ν]αγραφσάτο ἡ γραμματεὺς τέλιν βολῆς), as this is a kind of formula that can be expressed in this form, whereas the previous ones appear always in the infinitive. Instead of having the usual ἀναγραφσάτο καὶ καταθέτο, however, we find here the infinitive στέσαι (1.26). It is important to point out that this is an exceptional situation: in this case two *stelai* are specified (one to be placed in Athens and the other one in Halikarnassos, lines 25-28) and Leonides has to pay for the expenses himself (1.24 τέλεσι τοῖς Λεονίδο), which was not normal for proxeny decrees³². This might be the reason why here we see στέσαι (1.26), an infinitive without a specific subject, as the secretary is not the responsible for locating these inscriptions and using an imperative would be misleading in this context. The change in subject is clarified by the change in the structure and the man in charge is actually chosen by Leonides (1.29-31):

[2] ἄνδρα δὲ προσελέσθο Λεονίδης ἡόστις ἄχσει τέστέλεν καὶ | στέσει³³.

This exceptional condition may explain the appearance of this imperative. First, it is made clear that the secretary is not to perform this task but no responsible is specified, so there is an impersonal infinitive, but there is a will to emphasize this exceptional situation (that Leonides has to choose this person) and so the imperative is used here, because it stands out after the infinitive and has more jussive force.

In the next inscription, IG I³ 163, only the end of a proxeny decree remains (1.2 πρόχσι[ενον καὶ εὐεργέ]τεν Ἀθηναί[ον]). The inscription formula has an unusual form (Table 2): 1.4-7 ἀναγρα]φσάτο ... καὶ τὸ φσέφ[ισμα τόδε κατα]θῆναι. The second part of the formula

³⁰ Λεονίδεν is the object of ἀποκτένει, and so it should appear after the conditional particle ἕάν (Henry 1983: 170).

³¹ Henry 1983: 171 ff.

³² Walbank 1978: 142 ff. and see also Rhodes 2001

³³ “Leonides shall choose a man who will bring and place the stele.” Translation by author

(κατα]θῆναι) appears in the infinitive but it is coordinated with an imperative (ἀναγρα]φσάτο). It looks like one of the two was actually a mistake. Maybe the infinitive καλέσαι, which is part of the invitation formula very common in proxeny decrees,³⁴ may have attracted the infinitive form for κατα]θῆναι.

Following the chronological order, we find IG I³ 174, a proxeny decree for Lykon from Achaia. Right after its motivation clause we find the inscription formula, with both verbs in the imperative form, as we have already seen in previous inscriptions 1.7-11:

[3] ἀναγραψάτω πρόξενον καὶ εὐεργέτην Ἀθηναίων ἐν στήλῃ λιθίνει ἐμ
πόλει ὁ γραμματεὺς ὁ τῆς βολῆς καὶ καταθέτω ἐμ πόλει.³⁵

These seem to be the few imperatives in this inscription (Table 2), even though the *lacuna* makes it impossible to know the rest of the text. The following imperative, which is the only one apart from the formulas, 1.13 ἐκκομισάσθω, is used so that the infinitive 1.12 ἐκκομίσασθαι is not repeated in the same sentence. So for the sake of clarity, instead of using an infinitive that in this decree would also have a jussive function, it was written in the imperative form. What was preserved of the rest of the inscription seems to be a permission for Lykon to navigate and trade in areas controlled by Athens³⁶ and it comes back to the structure of infinitives (1.14-15 ἐξῆναι αὐτῷ πλὴν καὶ χρήματα ἐσάγειν). So we could conclude that the basic structure is the infinitive, except for some formulas and one imperative used for better clarity.

In the next inscription, IG I³ 165, only the end of a proxeny decree is preserved. The first infinitive (Table 2) that can be read 1.2 [πρ]οσαγ[αγῆν cannot be analysed with certainty, as there are *lacunae* around it, but with most probability it will have τὸς δὲ πρυτάνες as subject and thus it will be a “*infinitivus pro imperativo*”, like the following two infinitives 1.3 ὀφέλεν and 1.4 προσευθύνεσθαι. Then the structure changes into imperatives for the next two formulas: the publication and the payment formulas (1.7 καταθέτο and 1.10 δόντον³⁷). In the case of 1.13 τὴν δὲ προχ]σενίαν ἔναι the syntactic subject of the infinitive is not the agent of an action and so it cannot

³⁴ Henry 1983: 262-275 and Rhodes 1984.

³⁵“The secretary of the boule shall inscribe him as *proxenos* and benefactor for the Athenians in a stone stele and place it on the Acropolis.” Translation by author.

³⁶ Walbank 1978: 282

³⁷Here the inscription formula was written in a slightly different way. The verb ἀναγράφω is written in aorist participle and κατατίθημι in imperative (1.6-8 ἀναγρ]άψα[ς ὁ γραμματεὺς ... καὶ καταθέτο). This structure that does not appear in other inscriptions in this paper but is not unique of this example. See other instances in Larfeld (1902: 603).

be expressed in the imperative. The last infinitive I.14 καλέσαι is part of the invitation formula that, as we have already discussed, always appears in the infinitive. So apart from this last two cases where the imperative would be impossible, it seems that this inscription favours the infinitival structure, as the only two imperatives that appear are formulas and the (“non-formulaic”) orders are expressed in *infinitivi pro imperativo*.

The last proxeny decree, IG I³ 80 (421/0 BCE), is dedicated to Asteas from Aleia. It is fully preserved and its text is completely formulaic (Table 2), so it seems to support the evidences of different formulas seen in the texts above. There is an example of a formula that can only appear in the infinitive I.8 ἐπαινέσαι, which is the honouring formula. The rest are imperatives (I.12-13 ἀνλαγραφσάτο, I.18 καταθέτο and I.19 δόντον) that correspond to the inscription, publication and payment formulas (the first two could also appear in the infinitive³⁸, although it is not the case here, and the latter is always written in the imperative as has been discussed above).

As can be seen in the analysis of these inscriptions (Table 2), they are very formulaic. There are 7 infinitival formulas out of 18 infinitives and from 11 imperatives 9 are part of formulas. This does not help much in the analysis of the use of the imperatives, as the formulas are written in an automatic way and so they always follow the same patterns. Nor can we conclude that these inscriptions prefer the infinitival structure, as there are only two *infinitivi pro imperativo* and the rest of the infinitives (except for that mysterious κατα]θῆναι in IG I³ 163) could not be replaced by an imperative in any case. As for the imperatives, they do not help either. The only two cases of imperatives that are not formulaic were in one case to avoid repetition (ἐκκομισάσθω in IG I³ 174) and in the other motivated by an exceptional situation that needed an emphasis that the infinitive would not give (προσελέσθω in IG I³ 156). However, this section is relevant to this Thesis in two ways: it showed the formulas that we will see in the following sections and justified their categorization as formulas, as we have seen them repeatedly with the same pattern (with little or no change at all), and it proved that not only the longest and less formulaic inscriptions bear imperatives.

³⁸See for example IG I3 110, 20: τὸ δὲ ψήφισμα τόδε ἀναγράψαι τὸν γραμματέα τῆς βολῆς ἐν στήλῃι λιθίνῃ καὶ καταθεῖναι ἐμὲ πύλῃι.

3. The First-Fruits decree (IEleusis 28a, ca.430 BCE)

The First-Fruits decree is the only religious related decree in the corpus used for this Thesis. Although its date has been much debated³⁹, scholars in the last years have agreed that it must have been around the decade of 430 BCE⁴⁰. The decree describes and regulates the whole procedure for the dedication of the tithe at the sanctuary of Demeter and Kore in Eleusis and urges the Athenian allies, and any other city that would wish, to join the dedication already practiced by the Athenians⁴¹. Cavanaugh and Clinton have discussed the possible implications of the establishment of this dedication for Athens' allies:

“By recognizing the debt owed to Demeter and Athens, the allies and all Greek cities who joined in the offering of first-fruits would thus be acknowledging Athens' hegemony in the years before the beginning of the Peloponnesian War.”⁴²

“In spirit, as Cavanaugh and others have pointed out, the First Fruits Decree is of a piece with Pericles' call for a Panhellenic Congress...”⁴³

As this is a matter of great importance, the task of elaborating the plan for the dedications was given to a commission (l.3-4 τὰδε οἱ χυγγραφεῖς χυυνέλ[γρ]αφσαν·) that was to be brought to the Boule and Demos so that the decree is voted. This means that the following infinitives and imperatives will not depend on εἴπε, as usual, but on χυυνέλ[γρ]αφσαν.

It is very clear (Table 3) that the number of infinitives in this inscription is much higher (27 infinitives vs. 13 imperatives). Nevertheless, if we compare the number of infinitives that could actually be replaced by an imperative (i.e. the cases where an imperative is possible but the infinitive was used instead) the numbers are equal: 13 *infinitivi pro imperativo* vs. 13 imperatives in total. In fact, what we find here are infinitives that correspond to instructions given for a specific procedure, a function that Allan (2010) identified for the *infinitivi pro imperativo*. Examples of this kind of infinitives can be found throughout the whole inscription, like in lines 8-16:

³⁹ A collection of all the scholarship concerning the date of the inscription can be found in Cavanaugh 1996: 29-72.

⁴⁰ Clinton 2008: 5 & Cavanaugh 1996: 73-95

⁴¹ Clinton 2008: 5-7

⁴² Cavanaugh 1996: 94

⁴³ Clinton 2009: 57

		Infinitive				Imperative				
section	Verb	Sub.	Impers.	Subj.n/a	Inf./Imp.	FImp.	Cond. cl.	Temp. cl.	syntactic coherence	none
decree	l.4 ἀπάρχεσθαι				1					
	l.8 ἀπάρχεσθαι				1					
	l.8 ἐγλέγεν				1					
	l.9 παραδιδόναι				1					
	l.10 οἰκοδομῆσαι		1							
	l.12 ἔναι	1								
	l.13 ἐμβάλλεν		1							
	l.14 ἀπάρχεσθαι				1					
	l.15 ἡλεῖσθαι				1					
	l.16 ἐγλεγέσθαι	1								
	l.16 ἀποπεμφσάντων							1		
	l.17 παραδιδόναι				1					
	l.20 εὐθυνόσθων						1			
	l.21 παραδέχεσθαι		1							
	l.22 πεμφσάτο									1
	l.24 κελεύετο									1
	l.25 ἀπάρχεσθαι	1								
	l.29 [κ]αταθέντων								1	
	l.30 ἐπαγγέλεν				1					
	l.31 ἔναι	1								
	l.33 ἀπάρχεσθαι	1								
	l.34 παραδέχεσθαι				1					
	l.36 θύεν		1							
	l.41 ἀνατιθέναι				1					
	l.43 ἐπιγράφεν				1					
	l.45 ἔναι			1						

		Infinitive				Imperative				
section	Verb	Sub.	Impers.	Subj.n/a	Inf./Imp.	FImp.	Cond. cl.	Temp. cl.	syntactic coherence	none
rider	l.48 ἀναγ ραφσάτο					1				
	l.50 καταθέτο					1				
	l.51 ἀπομισθοσάντον					1				
	l.52 δόντον					1				
	l.53 ἀναγράφσαι		1							
	l.53 ἐμβάλλεν				1					
	l.54 ἠορίσαι				1					
	l.55 ἐνῆιδρύεσθαι		1							
	l.56 τέμνεν		1							
	l.57 ἐχσάγεν		1							
	l.58 ἀποτινέτο						1			
	l.58 ἐσαγγελλέτο						1			
	l.60 ἐπιδειχσάτο									1
	l.61 ἐχσενενκέτο									1
	Subtotal	5	8	1	13	4	3	1	1	4
		TOTAL 27				TOTAL 13				

Table 3. Infinitives and Imperatives in IEleusis 28a

[4] ἐγλέγεν δὲ τὸς δεμάρχος κατὰ τὸς δέμος καὶ παραδιδόγει τοῖς *hieropoiois* τοῖς | Ἐλευσινόθεν Ἐλευσινάδε. οἰκοδομεῖσαι δὲ σιρὸς [...] τὸν δὲ καρπὸν ἐνθαιθοῖ ἐμβάλλεν ἡὸν ἂν παραλάβοσι παρὰ τὸν δεμάρ[χ]ον, | ἀπάρχεσθαι δὲ καὶ τὸς χσυμμάχος κατὰ ταῦτά. τὰς δὲ πόλεις ἐγλ[ο]|γέας *helesthai* τῷ καρπῷ, καθότι ἂν δοκῇ αὐτέσι ὄριστα ὁ καρπὸς[ς] ἐγλεγέσεσθαι.⁴⁴

Nevertheless, this is not in opposition to the imperatives, which can also describe parts of the procedure at least in this decree, e.g. 1.16 ἐπειδὴν δὲ ἐγλεχθεῖ, ἀποπεμφσάντων Ἀθέναζε.⁴⁵ These imperatives normally appear in very concrete syntactical contexts, i.e. after conditional or temporal clauses. This is the case of the example given and also of the following:

[5] ἐ[ἄ]ν δὲ μὲ παραδέχονται πέντε ἔμερῶν [ν]νν | ἐπειδὴν ἐπαγγελεῖ, [...] εὐθυνόσθον *hoi hieropoioi* χιλίαισιν ν δραχμῆσι [h]έ[κα]στος· καὶ παρὰ τὸν δεμάρχον κατὰ ταῦτά παραδέχεσθαι. (lines 18-21)⁴⁶

[6] ἐὰν δέ τις παραβαίνει ν | τῷούτον τι, ἀποτινέτο πεντακοσίας δραχμῆς, ἐσαγγελλέτο δὲ ἡὸ βασιλεὺς ἐς τὴν βολέν· (lines 57-59)⁴⁷

These two cases have something in common. The imperatives are not part of the actions of the normal procedure, but they rather constitute a parallel procedure. The actions expressed in the imperative are to take place only if the conditions stated in the conditional clause are met. Then, when the text comes back to the description of the actions that are taken in every situation (and so they are part of the normal procedure) the structure is changed again into infinitives after [5] ([6] is the end of the inscription).

In the first of the two examples the *hieropoioi* are obliged to pay a fine in case they are not diligent and do not admit the tithe within 5 days after the notification of its sending. As it is obvious, this is an anomaly in the process. On the other hand, the next sentence (1.21 καὶ παρὰ τὸν δεμάρχον κατὰ ταῦτά παραδέχεσθαι.) does describe part of the usual procedure, where the *hieropoioi* should receive the tithe from the demarch. The structure has changed into infinitives again, because this is not part of the actions affected by the aforementioned conditions. This applies also to the

⁴⁴ “The demarchs are to collect (it) by deme and they are to hand it over to the *hieropoioi* from Eleusis at Eleusis. (The Athenians) are to construct [...] storage pits [...]. They are to deposit there th[e gr]ain which they receive from the demarchs. The allies are also to offer first-fruits in the same way. The cities are to choose [co]llector[s] for the grain, according to the way in which it seems best for the grain to be collected;” Translation by Dillon & Garland 1994, no. 12.6

⁴⁵ “When it has been collected, they (the collectors) are to send it to Athens;”. Translation by Dillon & Garland 1994, no.12.6

⁴⁶ “If they do not receive it within five days after it has been reported [...] the *hieropoioi* are to be liable to a fine of a thousand drachmas [eac]h; and they are to receive it from the demarchs in the same way.” Translation by Dillon & Garland 1994, no.12.6

⁴⁷ “If someone violates this, he is to pay 500 drachmas as a fine and the *basileus* has to announce it to the *boule*.” Translation by author.

second example.

However, there are some cases of imperatives that do not appear in this kind of contexts. These are:

[7] [κ]έρυι[κα]ς δὲ *η*ελομένε *η*ε βολὲ πεμφσάτο ἐς τὰς πόλεις ἀγγέλλοντας ν[ν] |
τ[άδ'] *η*εφσεφισμένα τοῖ δέμοι, τὸ μὲν νῦν ἔναι *η*ος τάχιστα, τὸ δὲ λοιπὸν *η*όταν
δοκεῖ αὐτέι· κελεύετο δὲ καὶ *η*ο *η*ιεροφάντες καὶ [ό] | δαιδοῖχος μυστερίοις
ἀπάρχεσθαι τὸς *η*έλλενας [...]. ἀναγράφσαντες δὲ ἐμ | πινακίοι τὸ μέτρον τῷ
καρπῷ [...][κ]αταθέντων ἔν τε τοῖ Ἐλευσινίοι Ἐλευσῖνι καὶ ἐν τοῖ βουλευ[τ]ερίοι·
(lines 21–30)⁴⁸

[8] περὶ δὲ τῷ ἐλαίῳ ἀπαρχῆς χυγγγράφσας Λάμπον ἐπιδειχσάτο τῇ βολῇ ἐπὶ
τῆς ἐνάτης πρυτανείας· | *η*ε δὲ βολὲ ἐς τὸν δῆμον ἐχσενενκέτο ἐπάναγκες. (lines
59–61)⁴⁹

The reason for these imperatives is clearly seen in the first fragment. This part of the inscription details how the announcement is to be made: normally the hierophants and the daduch are the ones in charge of announcing that the *aparche* must be sent, but because it has been decreed recently that the allies must join the Athenians, they need that the content of the decree is announced as soon as possible (1.23 τὸ μὲν νῦν ἔναι *η*ος τάχιστα) to the other cities. The imperatives in this case are in the aorist and present stem respectively (πεμφσάτο and κελεύετο). This shows a time relationship between the two verbs: the action expressed in the aorist has to be completed before the one in the present.⁵⁰ The imperatives, then, are completely necessary, as the dynamic infinitives cannot express time relationships⁵¹.

As for the third imperative in this example ([κ]αταθέντων), Clinton (2008: 47) argues that the omitted subject must have been the *hieropoioi* and that the following sentence, that states that the announcement should be made as well for the rest of the Greek cities should logically have been before this sentence together with the rest of the details of the announcement. Maybe these are reasons to think that the subject of ἀναγράφσαντες and of [κ]αταθέντων is *η*ο *η*ιεροφάντες καὶ [ό] | δαιδοῖχος. This way we could explain the omission and the imperative form, as it shares the same subject as the previous imperatives and so it should keep the same form for the syntactic

⁴⁸ “The boule is to choose [her]a[ld]s and send them to the cities an[no]uncing what is [now] being decreed by the people, for the present as quickly as possible, and for the [f]uture whenever the boule decides. The hierophant and the torch-bearer (daidouchos) are to proclaim at the mysteries that the Greeks are to offer first-fruits [...]. They are to record o[n] a notice-board the weight of the grain [...] and [s]et it up in the Eleusinion at Eleusis and in the cou[n]cil chamber.” Translation by Dillon & Garland 1994, no. 12.6

⁴⁹ “And concerning the first-fruits of olive oil Lampon shall draw up a draft and show it to the boule in the ninth prytany; and the boule shall be compelled to bring it before the people.” Translation by Dillon & Garland 1994, no. 12.6

⁵⁰ Rijksbaron 2002: 45

⁵¹ “Imperatival infinitives, being non-finite, do not invoke the ground, but merely designate a type of action that is not located with respect to time or reality.” (Allan 2010: 225).

coherence. Therefore it would not be that strange that the announcement to the other cities appears below, for the subject has changed (l.30 ἐπαγγέλλεν δὲ τὴν βολὴν). From a syntactic point of view, this option seems more plausible.

The second example belongs to the last lines of the inscription, in the rider moved by Lampon. Here he is urged to make a draft for a decree concerning the tithe of olive oil and to present it to the *boule* and the *boule* to present it to the *demos* for voting. In this case both imperatives have the aorist stem so there is no temporal relationship, although it is obvious that the draft should be finished before taken to the *boule*. These aorist imperatives stress the completion of “a single, well-defined state of affairs”.⁵² This is an exceptional situation, this draft has to be made in this only occasion, in opposition to the different parts of the process that were described with infinitives and that are to be carried out every year.

There are also 4 instances where imperatives were used in formulas: inscription, publication and payment formulas respectively. These are not analysed here as they were thoroughly discussed in the previous section.

⁵² Rijksbaron 2002: 45

4. Kallias' financial decrees (IG I³ 52, ML 58; 434/3 BCE)

The inscription concerning the financial decrees promoted by Kallias consists of two different decrees inscribed on two sides of the same marble stele. This has been one of the most discussed Greek inscriptions and one of the most polemic issues about it is its date. I do not wish to enter this discussion here, as it is not the main point of this Thesis, but as we are following an organisation based on the chronology of the inscriptions, this deserves a brief explanation. Most scholars support that these decrees were moved in 434/433 BCE, but other dates have been suggested, for example 431 BCE.⁵³ In any case, it is possible to establish a *terminus ante quem* because of the appearance of a new office in this inscription, the treasury of the “other gods”, which is an evidence that this inscription was done before 430/429 BCE.⁵⁴ This fact makes it obviously earlier than the inscription that follows, that is dated on the year 410/409 BCE.

Another discussed issue about this inscription is whether the decrees in both sides were moved the same day or not. The reconstruction of the prescript in face B is dubious if we take into account the last autopsies of the stone, which would contradict the theory that face B was decreed on the same day than the decree on face A.⁵⁵ In side A we are attending to the creation of the office in charge of the treasury of the so-called “other gods”.⁵⁶ Unluckily, face B is very fragmented and most of what remains are only instructions concerning some works, regulations about the use of the money in the treasury of Athena and a reference to the payment to the other gods.

It is very striking the great amount of imperatives that we find in this inscription compared to the infinitives (Table 4). Nevertheless, if we look individually to the two decrees, there is a considerable difference between the structures used in each one. In face B we are dealing with 9 infinitives and 6 imperatives. In face A there are 4 infinitives and 18 imperatives. This clear difference makes it evident that we should analyze each of the decrees individually and not treat them as if they were related texts. Even though the usual nomenclature for the two sides is followed here, face B will be analysed before face A, as the latter presents a very special setting that will be understood better if we start from the most common sample.

⁵³ Kallet-Marx 1989. For a more recent discussion about the date and based on the office of the *epistatai* see Marginesu 2010: 36-9.

⁵⁴ Kallet-Marx, 1989: 108

⁵⁵ Kallet-Marx 1989: 97-100; Samons 2000: 127ff.

⁵⁶ For a more detailed analysis of the content of the inscription see Pébarthe 2006: 227-229.

		Infinitive				Imperative				
section	Verb	n.a.	Sub.	Impers.	Inf./Imp.	Cond. cl.	Temp.cl.	Rel. cl.	syntactic coherence	none
face B. decree	1.4 χρεῖσθαι	1								
	1.6 ἐπι[σκευά]ζεν	1								
	1.8 συνε]πιστατόντ[ο]ν									1
	1.9 ποι]ῆν				1					
	1.10 ἐπιμ]ελέσ[θο]							1		
	1.13 χρεῖσ[θ]α[ι]			1						
	1.13 δαν είζεσθαι			1						
	1.15 χρεῖσ[θ]α[ι]			1						
	1.18 χρεῖσθαι		1							
	1.18 ἐνεχέ σθο					1				
	1.19 ἐσ]φέρειν		1							
	1.20 κατατιθέναι				1					
	1.23 τα[μεινέσθο						1			
	1.29 στε[σάντων							1		
	1.29 ἀριθμεσάντων							1		

		Infinitive				Imperative				
section	Verbs	n.a.	Sub.	Impers.	Inf./Imp	Cond. cl.	Temp.cl.	Rel. cl.	syntactic coherence	none
face A. decree	l.2 ἀποδῶναι			1						
	l.4 ἀποδι[δ]όναι			1						
	l.7 λογισάσθον									1
	l.9 ἔστο									1
	l.9 ἀποδόντον									1
	l.10 ἔχσालειφόντον								1	
	l.12 ἀποφαινόντον									1
	l.13 ἀποκυαμεύει[ν			1						
	l.15 ταμιευόντον							1		
	l.16 συνανοιγόντον								1	
	l.17 συγκλειόντον								1	
	l.17 συσσεμεινόςθον								1	
	l.20 ἀπαριθμεσάσθον								1	
	l.20 ἀποστεσάσθον								1	
	l.21 παραδεχσάσθον									1
	l.22 ἀναγραφσάντον								1	
	l.24 ἀναγραφόντον									1
	l.25 διδόντον								1	
	l.27 διδόντον								1	
	l.28 διδόντον								1	
	l.30 θέ]ντον									1
	l.31 χρῆσθαι	1								
	Subtotal	3	2	6	2	1	1	4	10	8
		Total 13				Total 24				

Table 4. Infinitives and imperatives in IG I³ 52

Starting with face B, in two occasions *infinitivi pro imperativo* have been used in the present decree:

[9] τὸ δὲ γράμ]μα τὸν ἀρχιτέκ[τονα ποι]ῆν (line 9)⁵⁷

[10] κατατιθέναι κ[ατὰ τὸ]ν ἐνιαυτὸν τὰ ἡεκά[στοι ὀφελό]||μενα παρὰ τ]οῖς
ταμίαισι τῶν [τῆς Ἀθ]εναίας τὸς ἔλλενο[ταμίας (lines 20-21)⁵⁸

On the other hand, the imperatives in face B appear in the syntactical contexts that have already been discussed for imperatives in Athenian decrees: after conditional and temporal clauses. We can add another context that are relative clauses. Imperatives can appear inside or after a relative clause:

[11] τὸ δὲ γράμ]μα τὸν ἀρχιτέκ[τονα ποι]ῆν [ὅ]σπερ τῷ Προ[πυλαίον· ἡοῦ]||[τος
δὲ ἐπιμ]ελέσ[θο] (face B lines 9-10)⁵⁹

[12] ἡοπόσα μὲγ χρυ[σᾶ ἐστιν αὖ]||[τῶν ἔ ἀργυρᾶ] ἔ ὑπάρχυν[σ]τε[σάντων, τὰ
δ]ἔ ἄλλ[α ἀριθμεσάντων...] (face B lines 28-29)⁶⁰

One other imperative can be found that does not fit in the classification of imperatives (1.8 συνε]πιστατόντ[ο]ν). Unfortunately, the sentences just before it are very fragmentary, so they cannot provide any clue about the possible reasons for this imperative to appear.

The decree in face A favours clearly the imperatival structure and uses as less infinitives as possible. In every case where an imperative is possible, it is chosen over the *infinitivus pro imperativo*. This syntactical feature differentiates clearly this text from the decree in face B and from the rest of the Athenian decrees. Maybe the exceptional nature of the decree is a good reason for choosing this very special form. We should bear in mind that this is the creation of a brand new office. This text regulates with great detail its tasks, how to perform them and how all the affected offices should act upon the election of the treasurers. All of these imperatives are direct orders to the different officials about what to do in that specific moment or from that moment on:

[13] παρὰ δὲ τῶν νῦν ταμιῶν καὶ τῶν ἐπιστ[α]τῶν καὶ τῶν ἡεροποιῶν τῶν ἐν τοῖς
ἡεροῖς, ἡοὶ νῦν διαχερίζο[σι]||ν, ἀπαριθμεσάσθον καὶ ἀποστεσάσθον τὰ
χρέματα ἐναντίον τῆς βολ[ῆ]ς ἐμ πόλει, καὶ παραδεχσάσθον ἡοι ταμίαι ἡοι
λαχόντες παρὰ τῶν νῦν[ν] | ἀρχόντων καὶ ἐν στέλει ἀναγραφσάντων μιᾷ ἅπαντα

⁵⁷ For translation see note 59.

⁵⁸ “the helleno[tamiai] are to deposit d[uring th]e year [what is owed] to ea[ch (god) with t]he treasurers [of Ath]ena.” Translation by Dillon & Garland 1994, no. 9.6

⁵⁹ “The archi[tect is to ma]ke [the pla]n [j]ust as for the Pro[pylaia; and he is to see] to [it]” Translation by Dillon & Garland 1994, no. 9.6

⁶⁰ “[However many of th]e [sacre]d treasures are unweighed or un[counted, [...] (the current treasurers) are to we[igh]” Translation by Dillon & Garland 1994, no. 9.6

καθ' ἑκαστόν τε | τῶν θεῶν τὰ χρέματα [...]. καὶ τὸ λοιπὸν ἀναγραφόντων ἡλοι
αἰεὶ ταμίαι ἐς στέλεν καὶ λόγον διδόντων τῶν τε ὄντων χρεμάτων [...] καὶ εὐθύνας
διδόντων. (lines 18-27)⁶¹

⁶¹ “As they receive the treasures from the current treasurers, superintendents (epistatai) and hieropoioi in the temples, who now to have charge of them, they are to count them up and weigh them in front of the boule on the acropolis and the treasurers who have been chosen by lot are to take them over from the current officials and record on one stele all the treasures, both that according to each of the gods [...]. And in the future the treasurers who are in office are to record this on a stele and draw up an account of the balance of the money [...] and submit to an examination at the end of their term.” Translation by Dillon & Garland 1994, no. 9.6

5. Honours to Phrynichus' Assassins (IG I³102, 410/409 BCE)

In the following decree, dated on the year 409 BCE, we attend to the grant of honours to Thrasyboulos and to other men who participated in the assassination of Phrynichus, who took part in the coup of 411 BCE that established the oligarchy of the Four Hundred.⁶² This was actually the first grant of property to a non-athenian citizen ever recorded.⁶³ It is divided in three parts: the first one being the honours given to Thrasyboulos; the first amendment ratifies these honours and extends them, granting him with the Athenian citizenship and allowing his colleagues to have land and properties in the city; and the second amendment and third part of the inscription is a petition to make an inquiry to find out whether there were any corrupted actions in order to grant the Athenian citizenship to Agoratus. The great orator Lysias actually prosecuted this Agoratus for this very reason, as he alleged falsely that he received the Athenian citizenship for participating in the assassination of Phrynichus. He actually quotes this decree in his discourse *Against Agoratus* (13.71).⁶⁴

It is evident from the data in the table (Table 5) that this inscription prefers the structure of infinitives, for, when it is possible, they use *infinitivi pro imperativo* instead of imperatives. The only imperatives that appear are part of the typical formulas of the honorific inscriptions (inscription and payment formulas), just as the proxeny decrees that were discussed in the first section:

[14] *hoi [δὲ h][ελλενοταμίαι δόντον τὸ ἀργύρι]ον.* (line 12)

[15] *καὶ ἀναγραφσά[το ho γραμματεὺς τὰ ἐφσεφισμ]ένα.* (lines 28-29)

[16] *τὲν δὲ σ]τέλεν ἀπομισθοοσάντο[ν hoi πολεταὶ ἐν τῇ βο]λῃ.* (lines 34-35)

This does not give much information of the use of imperatives. However, it is at least interesting to see how, when these formulas are repeated later in the inscription, they appear expressed in the infinitive:

[17] *εὐεργέτ[α]ς ἀναγρ[ά]φσαι ἐμ πόλε[ι ἐν στέλει λ]ιθίνει τὸν γραμ[μα]τέλα τῆς βολῆς.* (lines 28-30)

[18] *τὸς δὲ hελλενοταμ[ί]ας δῶναι τὸ ἀργύριον].* (lines 35-36)

This may imply that the imperatival formula may be a more stressed form and that once it is repeated it takes the less stressed form, that would be in this case the infinitive.

⁶² Ferrario 2014: 148

⁶³ Meiggs & Lewis 1980: 263

⁶⁴ Phillips 2008: 196

		Infinitive						Imperative
section	Verb	Sub.	FInf.	Impers.	Subj.n/a	FInf./PImp.	Inf./Imp.	FImp.
decree	l.6 ἐπαινέσ]αι		1					
	l.10 στεφανῶσαι						1	
	l.10 ποιῆσαι[ι						1	
	l.12 δόντον							1
	l.13 ἑνί[εκα						1	
first rider	l.15 εἶναι				1			
	l.18 ἔ]ναι		1					
	l.19 ἔναι			1				
	l.21 ἀναγραφά[το							1
	l.22 ἡλέσθαι			1				
	l.28 ἀγαγρ[ά]φισαι					1		
	l.30 εἶναι				1			
	l.32 ἐπιμέλ]εσθαι		1					
	l.34 ἀπομισθοσάντο[ν							1
	l.36 δόναι					1		
	l.37 εὐρίσκεισθαι	1						
	l.38 ἔχσενεγκῆν						1	
second rider	l.41 βολεῦσ]αι						1	
	l.42 κολάζεν						1	
	l.45 ἀποφαίνεν						1	
	l.47 ἔχσῆναι			1				
	subtotal	1	3	3	2	2	7	3
		Total 18						Total 3

Table 5. Infinitives and imperatives in IG I³ 102

6. Republication of Draco's Law on Homicide (IG I³104, 409/8 BCE)

After the oligarchic government of the Four Hundred, there was a strong political will in Athens to go back to the democracy and its old institutions and laws, especially those of Solon and Kleisthenes. For this reason, new offices dedicated to the study and republication of the laws previous to the oligarchy were created.⁶⁵ The laws published by Draco concerning homicide were part of this republication plan and so we find this copy dated in the year 409/8 BCE. This fact evidences that at least this part of the laws written by Draco in the 7th century were still valid more than two hundred years later.

The inscription is divided into two differentiated parts: the decree itself, that goes down to line 9, and from line 10 on the content of the laws of Draco, that comprises the jurisdiction, definition, pardon and prosecution of unintentional murder.⁶⁶ Whether the text of the laws was the original text by Draco or not does not affect to the analysis of the inscription.⁶⁷ An important issue, however, before we even start analysing it, is whether we should treat the text of the laws as a decree. Apparently, there is no evidence that the text of the laws had a similar structure to that of a decree. Nevertheless, looking at the structures of infinitives and imperatives in this inscription, it seems that either the original laws of Draco were structured as a decree (with different points expressed in the infinitive or imperative and depending on εἶπε or a similar formula) and that the prescript was omitted or that when the *anagrapheis* worked on these laws they adapted them to the format of the decree. Nonetheless, there is no reason to think that part of the laws were omitted, and supporting this argument would be an *argumentum ex silentio*, as the beginning in καὶ in line 11 is no proof that part of the text was left out. As Stroud suggests, that καὶ ἐὰν should be read together and understood as “even if”.⁶⁸ However it may be, I believe that it is worth including the body of the laws in the analysis, for the syntactic structures seem useful for this Thesis.

⁶⁵ Stroud, 1968: 19

⁶⁶ Phillips 2008: 50. For a complete analysis of the content of the law and its elements see Gagarin 1981 and Phillips 2008: 49-57 (both treating it individually) and Thür 2004, who taking this and other inscriptions together restores how were legal procedures in Athens.

⁶⁷ Gagarin (1981: 153) makes clear that, if this is in fact the original text by Draco, this would be the first sample of Attic prose preserved and he even makes an analysis of style to support that this is so (1981: 155 ff.). He insisted in more recent studies (2008: 94) that we should consider this to be an exact copy of the original text of the laws. About the physical format of the original laws see Stroud 1979.

⁶⁸ Stroud 1968: 38

		Infinitive				Imperative		
section	Verb	n.a.	Sub.	Impers.	Inf./Imp.	FImp.	Cond. cl.	none
decree	l.5 ἀναγρα[φ]σά[ν]τον					1		
	l.7 κα[τ]α[θ]έν[ι]ον					1		
	l.8 ἀπομι[σθο]σ[άν]τον					1		
	l.9 δόντον					1		
law	l.11 φεύγ[ε]ν				1			
	l.11 δ[ι]κάζεν				1			
	l.13 διαγν[ῶ]ν[α]ι				1			
	l.13 αἰδέσασθαι			1				
	l.14 κρατῆν				1			
	l.15 αἰδέσ[α]σθαι		1					
	l.16 [κ]ρα[τῆν]				1			
	l.18 ἐσέθ[ο]ν						1	
	l.19 ἡαιρέσθον							1
	l.20 ἐνεχέσθον							1
	l.20 προειπῆν							
	l.21 συνδιόκ[εν]				1			
	l.29 ἐνέχεσθαι	1						
	l.29 διαγιγνόςκεν	1						
	l.35 διαγιγνόςκ[εν]	1						
	subtotal	3	1	1	6	4	1	2
		Total 11				Total 7		

Table 6. Infinitives and imperatives in IG I³ 104

There is a great difference between both sections of the text. While the structures in the laws seem more varied, in the decree there are only imperatives (Table 6). In addition, these imperatives correspond only to formulas already discussed above (inscription, publication and payment formulas) with very subtle modifications:

[19] ἀναγρα[φ]σά[ν]τον οἱ ἀναγραφῆς τῶν νόμον [...] μετ[ὰ τῷ γραμμ]ατέοις τῆς βουλῆς ἐ' στέλει λιθίνει καὶ κα[τ]α[θ]έν[ι]ον πρόσθε[ν] τῆς στοῆς τῆς βασιλείας· οἱ δὲ πολεταὶ ἀπομι[σθο]σ[άν]τον [...] οἱ δὲ ἑλληνοταμίαι δόντον τὸ ἀρ[γ]ύ[ρ]ι[ον]. (lines 5-9)⁶⁹

This means that in fact there are no dynamic infinitives depending on εἴπε in this case, but only imperatives. Maybe the reason to choose imperatives here is to differentiate the body of the decree from the laws.

⁶⁹ “The *anagrapheis* shall write the law with the secretary of the *boule* on a stone stele and place it in front of the stoa Basileia. The *poletai* shall pay the costs. The *hellenotamiai* shall give the money.” Translation by author.

In the text of the laws, however, as we can see from the data in the table, infinitives were used whenever it was possible. The *infinitivi pro imperativo* that are found here are the same kind of those found in the First-Fruits decree, i.e. the infinitives denoting instructions for a certain procedure. In this case this is a jurisdictional procedure that describes in detail what to do in case someone has killed without premeditation or unintentionally⁷⁰. See for example:

[20] καὶ ἐὰμ μὲ ᾿κ [π]ρονοί[α]ς [κ]τ[ένει τίς τινα, φεύγ]ε[ν· δ]ι[κ]άζεν δὲ τὸς βασιλέας αἵτιο[ν] φόγ[ο] [...] τὸς δὲ ἐφέτας διαγν[ῶ]ν[α]ι. [αἰδέσασθαι δ' ἐὰμ μὲν πατὲρ ἢ ἱ ἐ ἀδελφὸς] ἢ ἡνῆες, ἁπάντ[α]ς, ἢ τὸν κο[λύοντα κρατῆν· (lines 11-14)⁷¹

The cases where imperatives appear are well differentiated and actually they all come together in the text:

[21] ἐὰν δὲ τούτον μεδὲ ἡῆς ἕϊ, κτ]έλ νει δὲ ἄκο[ν], γνῶσι δὲ ἡοι [πε]ντ[έκοντα καὶ ἡῆς ἡοι ἐφέται ἄκοντ]α | κτῆναι, ἐσέσθ[ο]ν δὲ ἡ[οι φ]ρ[άτορες ἐὰν ἐθέλοσι δέκα· τούτος δ]ὲ ἡοι πεντέκο[ν]τ[α καὶ] ἡῆς ἀρ[ι]στ[ίνδεν] ἡαιρέσθον. καὶ ἡοι δὲ πρ]ότε[ρ]ον κτέ[ν]α[ν]τ[ε]ς ἐν τῷιδε τῷ θεσμῷ ἐνεχέσθον. (lines 16-20)⁷²

The first of these imperatives (1.18 ἐσέσθ[ο]ν) comes after a conditional clause, which is one of the typical positions for the appearance of imperatives in decrees. Once more, the action expressed in the imperative is not part of the normal procedure, but it is to take place only in the case that situation stated in the conditional clause is given: if there are no relatives of the victim then ten men from the phratry shall decide whether to grant him with pardon. Even though *ἡαιρέσθον* in line 19 does not come right after the conditional clause and it is part of the next sentence, this action also depends on those conditions: in case these ten men have to make the decision, they will be chosen by the Fifty-One *ephetai*. Obviously, if there are relatives in the first place this whole procedure does not take place at all. Then the imperatives serve as a way to differentiate this parallel process from the normal procedure. As for the last imperative (1.20 ἐνεχέσθον) it does not belong either to the description of the juridical procedure, but it is part of the statement that the whole procedure described above is retroactive.⁷³ In this context the imperatives may also have some more emphasis as the syntactic structure differentiates them from the rest of the description of the process. Gagarin

⁷⁰ There is a controversy whether μὲ ᾿κ [π]ρονοί[α]ς (1.11) means without premeditation or unintentionally. See Gagarin 1981: 31.

⁷¹ “Even if someone kills another unintentionally, he shall stand trial. The kings are to judge him guilty of homicide [...] and the *ephetai* shall decide the case. If father or brother or sons are alive, they shall all grant pardon; otherwise he who objects shall prevail.” Translation by Phillips 2008: 50.

⁷² “If none of these exists and he kills unintentionally, and the Fifty-One, the *ephetai*, pass a verdict of unintentional homicide, then let ten phratry members admit him, if they are willing; let the Fifty-One choose these men on the basis of birth. Let those who killed previously also be bound by this law.” Translation by Phillips 2008: 50.

⁷³ Gagarin 2008: 97

fails to include in his analysis of the prose style of the laws⁷⁴ these imperatives that clarify even more what is part of the juridical procedure and what is not.

⁷⁴ Gagarin 1981: 155 ff. & 2008: 100

7. Decrees honouring the Samians (IG II² 1, 405/4 & 403/2 BCE)

In this very long inscription we find three different decrees with their respective amendments concerning the grant of honours to the Samian citizens. The first of these decrees dates back to 405/4 BCE, before the end of the Peloponnesian War. After the disastrous defeat at Aigospotamoi, Samos still supported the Athenians and remained loyal to them. For this reason, the city of Athens honoured them by granting them with the Athenian citizenship.⁷⁵ The second decree, however, corroborates and also extends these privileges given to the Samians, while the third gives honours to one Samian called Poses. They are dated in 403/2 BCE, once the democracy was restored in Athens.

The collection of these decrees was probably made by Cephisophon of Paiania after the third decree was enacted⁷⁶. He is mentioned in the heading of the inscription as secretary (1.1 Κηφισοφῶν Παιανιεύς | ἐγγραμμάτευε) and so does in the prescript of the third decree. In addition, he was also the proposer of the second decree and its amendment and according to Xenophon, he was sent as an envoy to Sparta representing the Athenians before the tyranny of the Thirty was over.⁷⁷ Whether the first decree was inscribed for the first time or there was an original of 405 BCE demolished by the Thirty and this is only a republication⁷⁸ remains unclear.

The enormous number of infinitives is striking compared to the number of infinitives (54 against 8) throughout the whole inscription (Table 7). Nevertheless, for better clarity, every decree will be analysed with its rider individually, starting with the first one.

It is evident that the first decree uses mainly *infinitivi pro imperativo* to express a series of instructions to follow under the new condition of the Samians: that they are to be Athenian citizens from this moment on. The only imperatives of this decree appear at the end just before the rider (lines 28-32):

⁷⁵ Meiggs & Lewis, 1980: 286

⁷⁶ Rhodes & Osborne, 2003: 15

⁷⁷ Rhodes & Osborne, 2003: 16; Xen. *Hell.* 2.4.36

⁷⁸ Rhodes & Osborne, 2003: 15

		Infinitive						Imperative				
section	Verb	Sub	FInf.	Impers	Subj. n/a	FInf./PImp.	Inf./Imp.	FImp	Cond. cl.	Rel. cl.	syntactic coherence	none
first decree	l.7 ἐπαινέσαι		1									
	l.9 ποιῆν	1										
	l.10 ποιῆσαι	1										
	l.12 δεδόχθαι											
	l.12 ἔναι				1							
	l.15 βολεύεσθαι						1					
	l.15 χρῆσθαι						1					
	l.16 ποιῆν						1					
	l.18 διδόναι						1					
	l.18 δέχεσθαι						1					
	l.20 ποιῆν						1					
	l.21 ἔναι	1										
	l.21 ἔναι				1							
	l.22 πολεμεῖν	1										
	l.22 παρασκ[ε]υάζεσθαι						1					
	l.24 συμπέμπεν						1					
	l.25 συνβολεύειν						1					
	l.26 χρῆσθαι	1										
	l.26 δόναι			1								
	l.27 ἀπογράψαι						1					
	l.30 ἐξαλειψά]ντων								1			
	l.30 ἐσ[πραξάντων										1	
	l.31 ἐπαναγκασάντων										1	
	l.31 ἀποδόναι	1										

		Infinitives						Imperatives				
section	verb	Sub	FInf.	Impers.	Subj.n/a	FInf./PImp.	Inf./Imp.	FImp.	Cond. cl.	Rel. cl.	syntactic coherence	none
rider	l.33 ἔναι				1							
	l.33 νῆμαι						1					
	l.34 παρα[σκευάσαι						1					
	l.36 ἐπαινέσαι		1									
	l.37 καλέσαι		1									
	l.38 ἀναγράψαι					1						
	l.39 κατα]θῆναι					1						
	l.40 δῶναι					1						
	l.40 ἀναγράψαι			1								
second decree	l.43 ἐπαινέσαι		1									
	l.44 ἔναι		1									
	l.45 πέμψαι						1					
	l.46 συνπράττεν	1										
	l.46 προσελέσ[θαι]						1					
	l.47 συμπρα]πτόντων									1		
	l.48 βουλευέσθων									1		
	l.49 προσαγαγῆν											
	l.50 χρηματίσασθαι			1								
	l.50 καλέσαι		1									
rider	l.52 ἐψηφίσθαι		1									
	l.53 ἔναι		1									
	l.54 καλέσαι		1									

		Infinitives						Imeratives				
section	verb	Sub.	FInf.	Impers	Subj.n/a	FInf./pImp	Inf./Imp.	FImp.	Cond. cl.	Rel. cl.	syntactic coherence	none
third decree	1.58 ἐπαινέσαι		1									
	1.59 δ]δῶναι						1					
	1.60 δόντων							1				
	1.60 προσαγαγῆν			1								
	1.61 εὐρέσθαι			1								
	1.62 παραδῶναι						1					
	1.63 καλέσαι		1									
rider	1.64 ἐπαινέσαι		1									
	1.66 ἕναι		1									
	1.66 ἀναγρά[ψάτω							1				
	1.67 παρασχόντων											1
	1.68 δῶναι						1					
	1.69 ποῆσαι[ι			1								
	1.70 ἐπιγράψαι			1								
	1.71 ἐπαινέσαι		1									
	1.72 προσάγειν		1									
	1.73 προσαγαγῆν		1									
	1.74 καλέσαι		1									
	subtotal	7	17	7	3	3	17	2	1	2	2	1
		Total 54						Total 8				

Table 7. Infinitives and imperatives in IG II² 1

[22] καὶ τούτων εἴ πό | [τί ἐστι ὄφλημ]α γεγραμμένον ἐν τῷ δημοσίῳ ὡς
 παρεληφόντων τὰς τριήρες, | [ἅπαντα ἐξαλειψά]ντων οἱ νεωροὶ ἅπανταχόθεν, τὰ
 δὲ σκεύη τῷ δημοσίῳ ἐσι[πραξάντων ὡς τάχιστα κα]ὶ ἐπαναγκασάντων
 ἀποδόναι τὸς ἔχοντας τούτων | [τι ἐντελῆ].⁷⁹

These imperatives come after a conditional clause. As it has been said before, the change in the structure differentiates clearly the actions to take when these special conditions are met and the normal procedure expressed with infinitives. In addition, the second and third imperatives are also justified in terms of syntactic coherence, for they share the same subject and they are juxtaposed (in the case of ἐξαλειψά]ντων) and coordinated (κα]ὶ ἐπαναγκασάντων) respectively.

It is also worth mentioning that the inscription, publication and payment formulas appear in the infinitive and not in the imperative form (lines 38-40):

[23] ἀναγράψαι δὲ τὰ ἐψηφισμένα τ]ὸ γ γραμμ[ατέα τῆς] β[ο]λῆς μετὰ τῶν |
 [στρατηγῶν ἐστήληι λιθίνῃ καὶ κατα]θῆναι ἐς πόλι[ν, τὸς δὲ ἑλλην]οταμίας |
 [δόναι τὸ ἀργύριον·

This is not something unusual, but we can see that the forms of these formulas that used the imperative are starting to disappear. This also supports the idea that this decree favours clearly the infinitive structure and only used the imperatives when the syntactic context asks for it.

The second decree and its rider are highly formulaic with all the formulas in the infinitive form, so the number of *infinitivi pro imperativo* and of imperatives is very low and concentrated between lines 45 and 48:

[24] [πέμψαι δὲ τὸς Σαμῖος ὥσπερ αὐ]τοὶ κελεύουσιν ἐς Λακεδαίμονα ὄντινα [ἂν
 αὐ]||[τοὶ βόλονται· ἐπειδὴ δὲ προ]σδέονται Ἀθηναίων συνπράττεν,
 προσελέσ[θαι] | [πρέσβες, οὗτοι δὲ συμπρα]ττόντων τοῖς Σαμίοις ὅ τι ἂν
 ἀγαθὸν [καὶ] | [κοινῇ βουλευέσθων μετὰ] ἐκένων·

When giving these orders the text prefers the infinitive, but within the relative clause the structure changes to imperatives, as already seen in other previous examples.

The third decree is also very formulaic and uses especially infinitival formulas. However, those

⁷⁹ “and if there is any [...] (debt) recorded in the public treasury from when they took over the triremes, the dockyard superintendents are to [wipe all of it] out totally, but they are to g[et in] the equipment [as quickly as possible] for the public treasury [an]d compel those who possess [any] of it to hand it over [intact.” Translation by Dillon & Garland 1994, no.9.29

formulas that can appear in the imperative form do so, like in: οἱ δὲ ταμί]αι δόντων τὸ ἀργύριον· (line 60) and καὶ ἀναγραφ[ψάτω ὁ γραμματεὺς (lines 66-67). There is one other imperative: οἱ δὲ ταμίαι παρασχόντων | [τὸ ἀργύριον ἐς ἀναγραφὴν. (lines 67-68). This is not really a formula, but because of its resemblance with the payment formulas and also because of the formulas around it, it could have assimilated the imperative form.

One last interesting thing about this third decree is that the three *infinitivi pro imperativo* in it refer to gifts given to Poses, the Samian honoured in this decree:

[25] δ]ῶναι αὐτ[ῶι τὸν δῆμο]ν δωρεῖαν πεντακοσίας δραχμὰς (line 59)⁸⁰

[26] τὸ δὲ βιβλίον | [τῷ ψηφίσματος παραδῶναι αὐτ[ῶι τὸ γ γραμματέα τῆς βολῆς αὐτίκα μάλα· (lines 61-62)⁸¹

[27] δῶναι δὲ Πο]σῇ δωρεὰν τὸν δῆμον χιλίας δραχμὰς (line 68)⁸²

⁸⁰ “The *demos* shall give him a present of 500 drachmas.” Translation by author.

⁸¹ “The secretary of the *boule* shall give him the papyrus with the decree straightaway.” Translation by author.

⁸² “The *demos* shall give Poses a present of a thousand drachmas.” Translation by author.

8. Conclusion

From this analysis we can conclude that there is not a unique explanation for the imperatives found in Athenian decrees and that there are not only syntactic but also semantic and pragmatic reasons for their use.

There are some contexts in which we can expect imperatives to appear in a decree instead of a dynamic infinitive. Most of them are formulas that can or must be expressed by imperatives. Nevertheless, formulas have a fixed shape and so they are not that much useful for the syntactical analysis of the use of the imperatives. Other instances in which we can expect an imperative is following conditional, temporal, final and relative clauses and also inside the latter.

Whenever the infinitives in the decree were describing instructions that belonged to a procedure, the imperatives are used in contrast with those infinitives. They express an action that is not part of the procedure or, when they follow a conditional clause, that is part of a parallel exceptional procedure that is to be carried out when the conditions stated in the conditional clause are met. In these cases the imperative is making explicit what is part of the usual procedure and what is not.

We also studied two examples that used the imperative as a means for clarity. In IG I³ 153 ἐχέεσθω is expressed in the imperative to make clear that the infinitives following it depend on this imperative. The other example (IG I³ 174, l.13 ἐκκομισάσθω) was used in order to avoid the repetition of the same infinitive that could have been confusing. These examples show that infinitives in these decrees can be replaced very easily by imperatives. This means that they have a jussive function, just as the imperative.

Imperatives can also be used when exceptional situations are given, like when in IG I³ 156 Leonides had to arrange the inscription of his proxeny himself or when in IEleusis 28a the *boule* had to make an especial and urgent announcement. This may imply that the imperative has a more emphatic value than the dynamic infinitives. This is supported by the text of IG I³ 102 (Honours to Phrynichus' assassins) that used some formulas first in the imperative form and then repeated them but in the infinitive. And also by face A of the Kallias' financial decrees (IG I³ 52). The decree that appears in that side of the inscription is an exception in itself. While most of the decrees in this paper have shown a clear tendency towards the infinitival structures, this is the only one that clearly uses as many imperatives as possible. Nonetheless, we could consider that the fact that great

amounts of money are taken from the Athenian treasuries to make a brand new treasury with new officials is quite an exceptional situation and maybe the description of the tasks to be carried out by the new office needs of more emphatic jussive forms. Therefore it prefers the imperatives whenever it is possible.

It is important to emphasize that it is the context that makes this infinitives jussive and this, together with the fact that they are syntactically expressed in independent sentences, makes them replaceable by imperatives. These are documents issued by the biggest authorities in Athens, their deliberative institutions: the *boule* and the *demos*. This makes the whole text to be completely authoritative and therefore jussive.

Unfortunately, the sample of inscriptions used here is not enough to see if there is a chronological pattern in the use of imperatives (whether it grows or decreases in time). In order to achieve that, there should be a diachronic study that takes into account inscriptions that only have infinitives as well. Maybe formulas would be of great help in this kind of research, as they clearly show a tendency towards the infinitive in later periods that makes the imperative form disappear from these formulas. Hopefully this research will be taken in the future together with a study of its geographical distribution as well. This and further studies on the syntax of Greek inscriptions could broaden our knowledge about how was the language used in official documents in Ancient Greece and our understanding of Greek epigraphic sources and Greek syntax in general.

Appendix of inscriptions

IG I3 153

Att. — stoich. 33 — 440-425 BCE

-
- [.....20.....]ο[.....12.....]
[.....19.....]ν τριξ[....9....]
[.....18.....]ν νεῶν ἑκτ[λο ..5..]
[.....13.....]οι τρι[ι]εροποιοὶ κ[.5..]
- 5 [....9.... τὰ ὀνόματα] γραφόντων τῶ[ν τρι]-
[εράρχων· μεδ' ἔχσέστο] μεδ' *he*νὶ ἀνεγκύ[σαι]
[ἀνδράσι ἔλαττον ἔ τε]τταράκοντα καὶ [heκ]-
[ατόν, μεδὲ καθελκύσαι] ἔλαττον ἔ εἴκοσι κ]-
[αι heκατὸν ἀνδράσι, μ]εδὲ *hy*ποζονύνα[ι ἔλ]-
- 10 [αττον ἔ ..5..κοντα ἀ]νδράσιν, μεδὲ περι[ο]-
[ρμίζεν ἐλάττοσι ἀνδ]ράσι ἔ heκατόν, με[δὲ]
[.....15..... μ]εδὲ *he*ν· μεδὲ τὲν ορ[.]
[....10....] *ho* δὲ τρι[ε]ράρχος καὶ *ho* κυ[βε]-
[ρνέτες ἐκάστες τῆς] νεὸς *ho*πος ἀν ταῦτα γ-
- 15 [ίγνεται *hos* κάλλισ]τα ἐπιμελέσθω· ἐὰν δέ
[τις τούτων τι παραβ]αίνει ἔ τριεράρχος ἔ
[κυβερνέτες ἔ ἄλλος] τις, ὀφελέτο χιλία[ς] δ-
[ραχμὰς *hier*ὰς τῆι] Ἀθηναῖαι καὶ ζεμιόντ-
[ον αὐτὸν *hoi* ἐπιμε]λόμενοι τῷ νεορίῳ. τὸ δ-
- 20 [ἐ ψέφισμα τόδε ἀ]ναγραφσάτω *ho* γραμμ[α]τ-
[εὺς *ho* τῆς βολῆς ἐς]τέλει λιθίνει· *hoi* δ[ἐ] κ-
[ολακρέται δόντο]ν τ[ὸ] ἀργύριον· *hoi* δὲ πολ-
[εταὶ ἀπομισθοσάντ]ον *vacat*

IG I3 156 – Walbank no.22

Att. — stoich. 23 — 440-425 BCE

[— — — — — — — Λεονίδεν δ]-
 [ἐ] κα[ὶ τὸς παῖδας αὐτῷ μεδένα]
 ἔαν ἀδικῆν μέτε [Ἀ]θένεσι [μέτ]-
 ε ἡόσες Ἀθηναῖοι κρατῶσι· ἐ[π]-
 5 ιμέλεσθαι δὲ αὐτῷ Ἀθένεσι μ-
 [ἐ]ν τὸς πρυτάνες καὶ τὲμ βολέ-
 ν, ἐν δὲ τέσι ἄλλεσι πόλεσι ἡο-
 ίτινες Ἀθηναῖον ἄρχοσι ἐν τ-
 ῇ ἡυπερορίαι ἡό, τι ἂν ἡέκασ-
 10 τοι δυνατοὶ ὄσιν, ἡος ἂμ μὲ ἀδ-
 ικῶνται : ἔδοχσεν τῇ βολῇ
 καὶ τῷ δέμοι· Ἀντιοχὶς ἐπρυ-
 τάνευε, Χαροιάδες ἐγραμμάτ-
 ευε, ἡεγέσανδρος ἐπεστάτε, Χ-
 15 αιρέστρατος εἶπε· Λεονίδεν
 ἔάν τις ἀποκτένει ἐν τῶν πόλ-
 εον ἡὼν Ἀθηναῖοι κρατῶσι, τὲ-
 ν τιμορίαν ἔναι καθάπερ ἔάν
 τις Ἀθηναῖον ἀποθάνει· ἐπαι-
 20 νέσαι δὲ ἀγαθὰ ἡόσα ποιεῖ πε-
 ρὶ Ἀθηναῖος Λεονίδες. περὶ [δ]-
 ἐ Λεονίδο τὰ ἐφσεφισμένα ἀ[ν]-
 αγραφσάτο ἡο γραμματεὺς τῆ-
 ς βολῆς τέλεσι τοῖς Λεονίδο
 25 ἐν στέλαιν δυοῖν, καὶ τὲν μὲν
 ἡετέραν στέσαι ἐμ πόλει, τὲν
 δὲ ἡετέραν ἐν ἡαλικαρνασσῶ-
 ι ἐν τῷ ἡιερῷ τῷ Ἀπόλλονος·
 ἄνδρα δὲ προσελέσθο Λεονίδ-
 30 ες ἡόστις ἄχσει τέστέλεν καὶ
 στέσει.

vacat

IG I3 163 – Walbank no.56

Att. — stoich. 22 — 440-415 BCE

- 1 [.....18.....]| [..3..]
[.....10.... καὶ ἔν]αι πρόχσ-
[ενον καὶ εὐεργέ]τεν Ἀθηναί-
[ον αὐτόν· ἀναγρα]φσάτο δὲ *ho*
[γραμματεὺς *ho* τ]ῆς βουλῆς ἐ-
5 [στέλει λιθίνει] καὶ τὸ φσέφ-
[ισμα τόδε κατα]θῆναι ἐμ πόλ-
[ει. καλέσαι δὲ κ]αὶ ἐπὶ χσέν[ι]-
[α αὐτόν ἐς τὸ πρυ]τανεῖον ἐ[ς]
[αὔριον *vacat?*]

IG I3 174 – Walbank no.50

Att. — stoich. 21 — 425-410 BCE

- 1 [ἔδοξεν τῇ βολῇ καὶ τῷ δ]-
[ήμωι· ἐπρυτάνευε, ..]-
[.]αῖος ἐγρ[α]μ[μάτευε, ..]λε[.]-
αῖνετος ἐπεστάτε, Πείσαν-
5 δρος εἶπε· Λύκωνα τὸν Ἀχαι-
όν, ἐπειδὴ εὖ ποεῖ Ἀθηναίο-
[ς], ἀναγραψάτω πρόξενον κα-
ὶ εὐεργέτην Ἀθηναίων ἐν σ-
τήλῃ λιθίνει ἐμ πόλει ὁ γρ-
10 αμματεὺς ὁ τῆς βολῆς καὶ κ-
αταθέτω ἐμ πόλει. τὴν δὲ να-
ῦν ἣν δέται ἐκκομίσασθαι
ἐξ Ἀχαιΐας ἐκκομίσάσθω κ-
αὶ ἐξῆναι αὐτῷ πλὴν καὶ χ-
15 ρήματα ἐσάγεν ὅσης Ἀθην-
αῖοι κρατῶσι, καὶ ἐς τὰ Ἀθην-
αίων φρόρια· ἐς δὲ τὸν κόλπ-
[ο]ν [μ]ὴ [ἐξ]ῆ[ναι]ν [αὐ]τῷ

IG I3 165 – Henry 2001

Att. — stoich. 35 — ante 420 BCE

- [— — — — — — — — — — τὸς δὲ πρυτάνες οἱ]
- 1 [ἄν] τυνχ[άνοσι πρυτανεύοντες8.....]
[πρ]οσαγ[αγῆν ἐς τὴν βολὴν καὶ τὸν δῆμον ἔ]
[χι]λίας δ[ραχμὰς ὀφέλεν ἕκαστον τῷ Ἀθε]-
ναίαι κα[ὶ προσευθύνεσθαι μυρίασι δρ]-
- 5 αχμαῖσι [ἕκαστον τῷ πρυτάνεον. τὸ δὲ φσ]-
έφισμα τ[ὸδε ἀναγρ]άφσα[ς ὁ γραμματεὺς τ]-
ῆς βολῆς [ἐν στέλε]ι λιθίνε[ι καὶ καταθέτο ἐμ]
πόλει ὅς [ἐν καλλί]στοι καὶ ἐν [τῷ βουλευτ]-
[ε]ρίοι ἐν [σανιδί]οι ἵναπερ τὰ ἄλλ[α φσεφί]-
- 10 [σμα]τα· οἱ δὲ κολ[ακρέται δόντον τὸ ἀ[ργύρ]-
[ιον ἐς τὴν στέλ]εν καὶ τὴν ἀναγραφέν. [ννν]
[...8.... εἶπ]ε· τὰ μὲν ἄλλα καθάπερ Τ[...6...]
[...], τὴν δὲ προχ]σενίαν ἔναι καὶ τῷ[ς παι]-
[σί· καλέσαι δὲ αὐ]τὸς καὶ τὸν ἀδελφὸ[ν ...]
- 15 [.....11.... καὶ] ἐπὶ χσένια ἐς τὸ π[ρυτα]-
[νῆον ἐς τὸν εἰρεμέ]γον χρόνον *vacat*

vacat

IG I3 80 – Walbank no.49

Att. — stoich. 21 — 421/0 BCE

- Προκλέες Ἀτάρβο Εὐον-
υμεὺς ἐγγραμμάτευε.
- vacat*
- ἔδοχσεν τῷ βολῆι καὶ τῷ
δέμοι· *ἡ*ιπποθοντὶς ἐπρυτ-
- 5 άνευε, Προκλῆς ἐγγραμμάτε-
υε, Τιμίας ἐπεστάτε, Ἀριστ-
ίον ἔρχε, Θρασυκλέες εἶπε·
ἐπαινέσαι Ἀστέαν τὸν Ἀλε-
όν, *ἡ*ότι εὖ ποεῖ Ἀθηναῖος κ-
- 10 αὶ ἰδία καὶ δημοσίαι τὸν ἀ-
φικνόμενον καὶ νῦν καὶ ἐν
τῷ πρόσθεν χρόνοι, καὶ ἀν-
αγραφσάτο πρόχσενον καὶ

εὐεργέτην Ἀθηναίον καθά-
 15 περ Πολύστρατον τὸν Φλει-
 άσιον ἐστέλει λιθίνει ὁ γ-
 ραμματεὺς *ho* τῆς βολῆς κα-
 ῖ καταθέτο ἐν πόλει· τὸ δὲ ἁ-
 ργύριον δόντον *h<ο>i* κολακρ-
 20 ἔται. *vacat*

The first-fruits decree (IEleusis 28a)

Attica — Eleusis — ca. 440-435 BCE

1 [Τιμο]τέλ[ε]ς Ἀχαρνεὺς ἐγραμμάτευε.
 [ἔδοχσ]εν τῇ βολῇ καὶ τοῖ δέμοι· Κεκροπὶς ἐπρυτάνευε, Τιμοτέ-
 [λες ἐ]γραμμάτευε, Κυκνέας ἐπεστάτε· τάδε οἱ χτυγγραφῆς χτυνέ-
 [γρ]αψαν· ἀπάρχεσθαι τοῖν Θεοῖν τῷ καρπῷ κατὰ τὰ πάτρια καὶ τῇ-
 5 ν μαντείαν τὴν ἐγ Δελφῶν Ἀθηναῖος ἀπὸ τῶν *he*κατὸν μεδίμνον [κ]-
 ριθὼν μὲ ἔλαττον ἔ *he*κτέα, πυρὼν δὲ ἀπὸ τῶν *he*κατὸν μεδίμνον μ-
 ἔ ἔλαττον *he*μιέκτεον· ἐὰν δέ τις πλείον καρπὸν ποιῇ ἔ τοσο[ῦ]το-
 ν ἔ ὀλείζο, κατὰ τὸν αὐτὸν λόγον ἀπάρχεσθαι. ἐγλέγεν δὲ τὸς δεμ-
 ἄρχος κατὰ τὸς δέμος καὶ παραδιδόναι τοῖς *he*ροποιοῖς τοῖς
 10 Ἐλευσινόθεν Ἐλευσινάδε· οἰκοδομεῖσαι δὲ σιρὸς τρεῖς Ἐλευσῖν-
 ι κατὰ τὰ πάτρια *ho*πο ἂν δοκεῖ τοῖς *he*ροποιοῖς καὶ τοῖ ἀρχιτ-
 ἔκτονι ἐπιτέδειον ἔναι ἀπὸ τῷ ἀργυρίῳ τῷ τοῖν Θεοῖν· τὸν δὲ κα-
 ρπὸν ἐνθαυθοῖ ἐμβάλλεν *h*ὸν ἂν παραλάβοσι παρὰ τῶν δεμάρ[χ]ον,
 ἀπάρχεσθαι δὲ καὶ τὸς χτυμμάχος κατὰ ταύτά· τὰς δὲ πόλεις ἐγλ[ο]-
 15 γέας *he*λέσθαι τῷ καρπῷ, καθότι ἂν δοκεῖ αὐτέσι ἄριστα ὁ καρπὸ-
 [ς] ἐγλεγέσεσθαι· ἐπειδὴν δὲ ἐγλεχθεῖ, ἀποπεμφσάντων Ἀθῆναζε·
 τὸς δὲ ἀγαγόντας παραδιδόναι τοῖς *he*ροποιοῖς τοῖς Ἐλευσι-
 νόθεν Ἐλευσινάδε· ἐ[ὰ]ν δὲ μὲ παραδέχσονται πέντε ἑμερὼν [ν]νν
 ἐπειδὴν ἐπαγγελεῖ, παραδιδόντων τὸν ἐκ τῆς πόλεος *ho*θεν ἂν ἔ-
 20 [ι] ὁ καρπός, εὐθυνόσθον *ho*ι *he*ροποιοὶ χιλίαισιν ν δραχμῆσι [h]-
 ἐ[κα]στος· καὶ παρὰ τῶν δεμάρχων κατὰ ταύτὰ παραδέχεσθαι. [κ]έρυ-
 [κα]ς δὲ *he*λομένε *he* βολὲ πεμφσάτο ἐς τὰς πόλεις ἀγγέλλοντας ν[ν]
 τ[άδ'] *he*φσεφισμένα τοῖ δέμοι, τὸ μὲν νῦν ἔναι *ho*ς τάχιστα, τὸ δὲ λ-
 οῖπὸν *ho*ταν δοκεῖ αὐτέι· κελεύετο δὲ καὶ *ho* *he*ροφάντες καὶ [ὁ]
 25 δαιδῶχος μυστερίοις ἀπάρχεσθαι τὸς *he*λλενας τῷ καρπῷ κατὰ

τὰ πάτρια καὶ τὴν μαντείαν τὴν ἐγ Δελφῶν· ἀναγράφσαντες δὲ ἐμ-
 πινακίοι τὸ μέτρον τῷ καρπῷ τῷ τε παρὰ τὸν δεμάρχον κατὰ τὸ[ν δ]-
 [ἔ]μον *ἡέκαστον* καὶ τῷ παρὰ τὸν πόλεον κατὰ τὴν πόλιν *ἡεκάστῃ[ν]*
 [κ]αταθέντον ἐν τε τοῖ Ἑλευσινίοι Ἑλευσῖνι καὶ ἐν τοῖ βολεῦ[τ]ε-
 30 ρίοι· ἐπαγγέλλεν δὲ τὴν βολὴν καὶ τέσσι ἄλλεσι πόλεσιν τέ[σι *ἡε*]-
 [λ]ενικῆσιν ἀπάσεσι, *ῥόποι* ἂν δοκῇ αὐτῇ δυνατόν ἔναι, λέγον-
 τας μὲν κατὰ *ἡ* Ἀθηναῖοι ἀπάρχονται καὶ οἱ χσύμμαχοι, ἐκέ[ν]ο[ι]-
 [ς] δὲ μὲ ἐπιτάττοντας, κελεύοντας δὲ ἀπάρχεσθαι, ἐὰν βόλονται,
 κατὰ τὰ πάτρια καὶ τὴν μαντείαν τὴν ἐγ Δελφῶν. παραδέχεσθαι δ-
 35 ἐ καὶ παρὰ τούτον τὸν πόλεον ἐὰν τις ἀπάγει τὸς *ἡιεροποιὸς* [κα]-
 τ[ὰ] ταῦτά. θύεν δὲ ἀπὸ μὲν τῷ πελανῷ καθότι ἂν Εὐμολπίδαι ἐχσ[*ἡε*]-
 [γῶ]νται, τρίττοιαν δὲ βόαρχον χρυσόκερον τοῖν Θεοῖν *ἡεκατ[έρ]-*
 [αι ἄ]πὸ τὸν κριθῶν καὶ τὸν πυρῶν καὶ τοῖ Τριπτολέμοι καὶ τοῖ Θε-
 ῶδι καὶ τῇ Θεᾷ καὶ τοῖ Εὐβόλοι *ἡιερεῖον ἡεκάστοι τέλεον* καὶ
 40 τῇ Ἀθηναίῃ βῶν χρυσόκερον· τὰς δὲ ἄλλας κριθὰς καὶ πυρὸς ἀπ-
 οδομένος τὸς *ἡιεροποιὸς* μετὰ τῆς βολῆς ἀναθέματα ἀνατιθέν-
 αι τοῖν Θεοῖν, ποιησαμένος *ἡάττ'* ἂν τοῖ δέμοι τοῖ Ἀθηναίων δοκῇ-
 ι, καὶ ἐπιγράφεν τοῖς ἀναθέμασιν, *ῥότι* ἀπὸ τῷ καρπῷ τῆς ἀπαρχῆς
 45 πολλὰ ἀγαθὰ ἔναι καὶ εὐκαρπίαν καὶ πολυκαρπίαγ, *ῥότινες* ἂν
 μὲ ἀδικῶσι Ἀθηναῖος μεδὲ τὴν πόλιν τὴν Ἀθηναίων μεδὲ τὸ Θεό. [ν]
 Λάμπον εἶπε· τὰ μὲν ἄλλα καθάπερ αἱ χσυγγραφαὶ τῆς ἀπαρχῆς τῷ
 [κ]αρπῷ τοῖν Θεοῖν· τὰς δὲ χσυνγραφὰς καὶ τὸ φσέφισμα τόδε ἀναγ-
 ραφσάτο *ῥο* γραμματεὺς *ῥο* τῆς βολῆς ἐν στέλαιν δυοῖν λιθίνα-
 50 ν καὶ καταθέτο τὴν μὲν Ἑλευσῖνι ἐν τοῖ *ἡιερῶι* τὴν δὲ *ἡετέραν* ἐ-
 μ πόλει· *ῥοι* δὲ πολεταὶ ἀπομισθοσάντον τὸ στέλα· *ῥοι* δὲ *κολα[κρ]*-
 ἐται δόντον τὸ ἀργύριον. ταῦτα μὲν περὶ τῆς ἀπαρχῆς τῷ καρπῷ τ-
 οῖν Θεοῖν ἀναγράφαι ἐς τὸ στέλα, μῆνα δὲ :::: ἐμβάλλεν *ἡεκατονβ-*
 55 *αιῶνα* τὸν νέον ἄρχοντα. τὸν δὲ *βασ[ι]λέα ῥορίσαι* τὰ *ἡιερά* τὰ ἐν τ[ὸ]-
 ι *Πελαργικῶι*, καὶ τὸ λοιπὸν μὲ ἐν*ἡι*δρύεσθαι βομὸς ἐν τοῖ *Πελα-*
ργικῶι ἄνευ τῆς βολῆς καὶ τῷ δέμο, μεδὲ τὸς λίθος τέμνεν ἐκ τῷ [Π]-
ελαργικῶ, μεδὲ γῆν ἐχσάγεν μεδὲ λίθος· ἐὰν δέ τις παραβαίνει ν
 τ:::ούτον τι, ἀποτινέτο πεντακοσίας δραχμάς, ἐσαγγελλέτο δὲ *ῥο*
 60 *βασιλεὺς* ἐς τὴν βολὴν· περὶ δὲ τῷ ἐλαίῳ ἀπαρχῆς χσυγγράφ-
ῥο *Λάμπον* ἐπιδειχσάτο τῇ βολῇ ἐπὶ τῆς ἐνάτης πρυτανείας·
ῥο δὲ βολὴ ἐς τὸν δῆμον ἐχσενενκέτο ἐπάναγκες.

Att. — stoich. 54 — 434/3 BCE

52

[.5.. τὰ λί]θινα καὶ τὰς Νί[κας τὰς χ]ρυσᾶς καὶ τὰ Προ[πύλαια·]
[....9....]εἰθὲ παντελὸς [...7...]σει χρῆσθαι ἀπ[....11.....]
5 [....9....] κατὰ τὰ ἐφσεφι[σμένα], καὶ τὴν ἀκρόπολιν [...10....]
[....9....]ργμένα καὶ ἐπι[σκευά]ζεν δέκα τάλαντα ἀ[ναλίσκοντα]-
[ς τῷ ἐνιαυτ]ῷ *hekásto héos* [ἂν]θεὶ καὶ ἐπισκευα[σθεὶ *hos kál*]-
[λιστα· συνε]πιστατόντ[ο]ν δ[ὲ τῷ ἐρ]γ[ο]ι [ο]ί ταμίαι καὶ [οἱ ἐπιστάτα]-
[ι· τὸ δὲ γράμ]μα τὸν ἀρχιτέκ[τονα ποι]ῆν [ὅ]σπερ τῷ Προ[πυλαίον· *hoũ*]-
10 [τος δὲ ἐπιμ]ελέσ[θο] μετὰ τῷ[ν ἐπιστ]ατῶν *hópos ἄριστ[α καὶ εὐτελέ]*-
[στατα ..5..]έσεται *he* ἀκρ[όπολις] καὶ ἐπισκευασθέ[σεται τὰ δεό]-
[μενα· τοῖς δ]ὲ ἄλλοις χρέμα[σιν τοῖ]ς *tēs ἈθENAÍAS to[ῖς τε νῦν ὅσι]*-
[ν ἐμ πόλει κ]αὶ *hátt' ἂν τ[ὸ] λο[ιπὸν ἀν]αφέρεται* μὲ χρῆσ[θ]α[ι μεδὲ δαν]-
[εῖζεσθαι ἀ]π' αὐτῶν ἐ[ς] ἄλλο μ[εδὲν ἔ] ἐς ταῦτα *hupér mu[r]í[as draxma]*-
15 [ς ἔ ἐς ἐπισκ]ευὲν ἔάν τι δέει[ι· ἐς ἄλλ]ο δὲ μεδὲν χρῆσ[θ]α[ι τοῖς χρέμα]-
[σιν ἐὰμ μὲ τ]ὲν ἄδειαν φσεφ[ίσεται] ὁ δῆμος καθάπερ ἐ[ὰμ φσεφίσετ]-
[αι περὶ ἐσφ]ορᾶς· ἐὰν δέ τις [εἴπει ἔ] ἐπιφσεφί[σ]ει μὲ ἐ[φσεφισμένε]-
[ς πο *tēs* ἀδεί]ας χρῆσθαι το[ῖς χρέμ]ασιν τοῖ[ς] *tēs Ἀθε[ναίας, ἐνεχέ]*-
[σθο τοῖς α]ὐτοῖς *hoĩsper* ἐά[ν τι ἐσ]φένει εἴπει ἔ ἐπιφ[σεφίσει· *the*]-
20 [οῖς δὲ πᾶσ]ιν κατατιθέναι κ[ατὰ τὸ]ν ἐνιαυτὸν τὰ *heká[στοι ὀφελό]*-
[μενα παρὰ τ]οῖς ταμίαισιν τῶν [*tēs Ἀθ*]εναίας τὸς ἔλλενο[ταμίας· ἐπε]-
[ιδὰν δ' ἀπὸ] τ[ὸ]ν διακοσίον τα[λάντο]ν *hà* ἐς ἀπόδοσιν ἐφ[σεφίσατο *h*]-
[ο δῆμος τοῖς] ἄλλοις θεοῖς ἀ[ποδοθ]εῖ τὰ ὀφελόμενα, τα[μινεύεσθ]ο τ]-
[ὰ μὲν *tēs Ἀθ*]εναίας χρέματα [ἐν τῷ] ἐπὶ δεχσιὰ τῷ Ὀπισ[θοδόμο, τὰ δ]-
25 [ὲ τῶν ἄλλον θ]εῶν ἐν τῷ ἐπ' ἀρ[ιστερ]ά vacat
[χοπόσα δὲ τῷ]ν χρεμάτων τῶν [*hierō*]ν ἄστατά ἐστιν ἔ ἀν[αρίθμετα *h*]-
[οι ταμίαι] *h[ο]ι* νῦν μετὰ τῶν τε[ττάρ]ων ἀρχῶν *haì* ἐδίδο[σαν τὸν λόγ]-
[ον τὸν ἐκ Πα]γαθηναίων ἐς Παγ[αθένα]ια *hoipósa* μέγ χρυ[σᾶ ἐστιν αὐ]-
[τῶν ἔ ἀργυρᾶ] ἔ ὑπάργυρα στε[σάντον, τὰ δ]ὲ ἄλλ[α ἀριθμεσάντον ...]

Honours to Phrynichus' Assassins (IG I³102 – Osborne 1981, D2)

Att. — stoich. 36 — 410/09 BCE

- 1 [ἐπὶ Γλαυκί]ππο ἄ[ρ]χον[τ]ος.
[Λόβον ἐκ] Κεδὼν ἐγ[ρ]αμμάτευε.
[ἔδοχσεν τῇ] βολῇ καὶ τοῖ δέμοι· *χιπποθοντὶ*–
[ς ἐπρυτάνε]υε, Λόβον ἐγραμμάτευε, Φιλιστίδε–
5 [ς ἐπεστάτε], Γλαύκιππος ἔρχε : Ἑρασινίδες εἵπ–
[ε· ἐπαινέσ]αι Θρασύβολον ὅς ὄντα ἄνδρα ἀγαθὸ–
[ν περὶ τὸν δῆμ]ον τὸν Ἀθηναῖον καὶ πρόθυμον π–
[οιὲν *ὅ* τι δύνα]ται ἀγαθόν· καὶ ἀντὶ ὅν εὖ πεπο–
[ίεκεν τέν τε πόλιν] καὶ τὸν δῆμ[ο]ν τὸν Ἀθηναῖο–
10 [ν στεφανῶσαι αὐτὸν χρυσῷ]· σ[τε]φάνοι, ποιῆσα–
[ι δὲ τὸν στέφανον ἀπὸ χιλίων δρ]αχμῶν· *ἦοι* [δὲ *ἡ*]–
[ελλενοταμίαι δόντον τὸ ἀργύρι]ον· καὶ [ἀνειπ]–
[ῆν τὸν κέρυκα Διονυσίον ἐν τοῖ] ἀγῶνι *ἦδὼν ἡέν*–
[εκα αὐτὸν *ὦ* δῆμος ἐστεφάνοο]ε : Διοκλῆς εἵπε·
15 [τὰ μὲν ἄλλα καθάπερ τῇ βολῇ·] εἶναι δὲ Θρασύ–
[βολον Ἀθηναῖον, καὶ φυλῆς τε καὶ φρατρίας *ἦδὼ*–
[ν ἂν βόλεται γράψασθαι αὐτό]ν· καὶ τᾶλλα τὰ ἐ–
[φσεφισμένα τοῖ δέμοι κύρια εἶ]ναι Θρασυβόλο–
[ι· εἶναι δὲ αὐτοῖ εὐρίσκεσθαι π]αρὰ Ἀθηναῖον κ–
20 [αὶ ἄλλο *ὅ* τι ἂν δοκεῖ ἀγαθὸν π]ερὶ *ἦδὼν* εὐεργέ–
[τεκεν τὸν δῆμον τὸν Ἀθηναῖον]. καὶ ἀναγραφσά–
[το *ὦ* γραμματεὺς τὰ ἐφσεφισμ]ένα· *ἡελέσθαι* δ–
[ὲ ἐγ βολῆς πέντε ἄνδρας αὐτί]κα μάλα *ὦ*ίτινε–
[ς] δι[κ]άσοσι Θρασυβόλοι τὸ μέ[ρ]ος τὸ γιγνόμεν–
25 *ον*. τὸς [δὲ ἄλλος, *ὅ*σοι τότε εὖ ἐ]ποίησαν τὸν δῆ–
μον τὸν Ἀθε[ν]αῖον,10....]ιν καὶ Ἀγόρατο–
ν καὶ Κόμονα κ[αὶ ..6...]ο[.]ο[....] καὶ Σῆμον κα–
ὶ Φιλῖνον κα[ὶ ...8....]α, εὐεργέτ[α]ς ἀναγρ[ά]φ–
σαι ἐμ πόλε[ι ἐν στέλει λ]ιθίνει τὸν γραμ[μα]τέ–
30 α τῆς βολῆς. [καὶ ἔγκτεσι]ν εἶναι αὐτοῖς ὅμπερ
Ἀθηναίοις, [καὶ γεπέδο]ν καὶ οἰκίας, καὶ οἴκεσ–
ιν Ἀθένεσι, [καὶ ἐπιμέλ]εσθαι αὐτῶν τὴν βολὴν
τὴν αἰεὶ β[ο]λεύοσαν κα[ὶ] τὸς πρυτάνες, *ὅ*πος ἂ–
ν μὲ ἀδι[κῶνται]. τὴν δὲ σ]τέλεν ἀπομισθοσάντο–

35 [ν]χοι πολεταὶ ἐν τῇ βο]λῃ· τὸς δὲ *ἑλληνοταμ*-
 [ίας δῶναι τὸ ἀργύριον]. ἐὰν δὲ δοκῇ αὐτὸς καὶ
 [ἄλλο εὐρίσκεισθαι, τὲν] βολὲν προβολεύσασαν
 [ἔχσενεγκέν ἐς τὸν δέμ]ον : Εὐδίκος εἶπε· τὰ μὲν
 [ἄλλα καθάπερ Διοκλῆς· περὶ] δὲ [τ]ῶν δοροδοκεσ-
 40 [άντων ἐπὶ τῷ φσεφίσματι], ὃ ἐφσεφίσθε Ἀπολλ-
 [οδόροι, τὲν βολὲν βολεῦσ]αι ἐν τῇ πρότει *ἡέδ*-
 [ραι ἐν τῷ βολευτερί]οι, καὶ κολάζεν, τὼν [δ]ορο-
 [δοκεσάντων καταψ]εφίζομένεν καὶ ἐς δικασ-
 [τέριον παραδιδόσα]ν, καθότι ἂν δοκῇ αὐτῇ[ι]· τ-
 45 [ὸς δὲ βολευτὰς τὸς] παρόντας ἀποφαίνεν *ἡά[ττ']*
 [ἂν εἰδῶσιν, καὶ ἐάν] τις τι ἄλλο εἰδῇ περ<ι> τ[ού]-
 [τον· ἔχσεναι δὲ καὶ] ιδιότηει, ἐάν τις βόλετα[ι. ν]

vacat

Draco's Law on Homicide (IG I³ 104 – Stroud 1968)

Att. — stoich. 50 — 409/8 BCE

1 Διόγν[ε]τος Φρεάρριος ἐγραμμάτε[υε]·
 Διοκλῆς ἔρχε·
 ἔδοχσεν τῇ βουλῇ καὶ τῷ δέμοι· Ἀκα[μ]αντὶς ἐπ[ρ]υτάνευε, [Δ]ιό[γ]-
 νετος ἐγραμμάτευε, Εὐθύδικος [ἐ]πεστάτε, ..Ε...ΑΝΕΣ εἶπε· τὸ[ν]
 5 Δράκοντος νόμον τὸμ περὶ τῷ φό[ν]ο ἀναγρα[φ]σά[ν]τον οἱ ἀναγραφε-
 ς τὼν νόμον παραλαβόντες παρὰ τῷ β[α]σ[ι]λέ[ο]ς με[τ]ὰ τῷ γραμμ[α]τέο-
 ς τῆς βουλῆς ἐ' στέλει λιθίνει καὶ κα[τ]α[θ]έν[ι]ον πρόσ[θ]ε[ν] τῆς στο-
 ᾶς τῆς βασιλείας· οἱ δὲ πολεταὶ ἀπομι[σθο]σ[άν]τον κατὰ τὸν νόμο-
 ν, οἱ δὲ ἑλληνοταμίαι δόντον τὸ ἀρ[γ]ύ[ρ]ι[ον].
 10 πρῶτος ἄχσον.
 καὶ ἐὰμ μὲ 'κ [π]ρονοί[α]ς [κ]ἵ[έν]ει τίς τινα, φεύγ[ε]ν· δι-
 κάζεν δὲ τὸς βασιλέας αἵτιο[ν] φόγ[ο] Ε.....17.....Ε [β]ολ-
 εύσαντα· τὸς δὲ ἐφέτας διαγν[ῶ]ν[α]ι. [αἰδέσασθαι δ' ἐὰμ μὲν πατέ]ρ ἔ-
 ι ἔ' ἀδελφὸς] ἔ' *ἡυῆς*, *ἡάπαντ[α]ς*, ἔ' τὸν κο[λύ]οντα κρατῆν· ἐὰν δὲ μὲ] *ἡοῦ*-
 15 *τοι* ὅσι, μέχρ' ἀνεφ[σι]ότετος καὶ [ἀνεφσιῶ, ἐὰν *ἡάπαντες* αἰδέσ]α-
 θαι ἐθέλοσι, τὸν κο[λύ]οντα [κ]ρα[τῆ]ν· ἐὰν δὲ τούτον μεδὲ *ἡῆς* εἶ, κτ]έ-
 νει δὲ ἄκο[ν], γνῶσι δὲ *ἡοι* [πε]ν[τέ]κοντα καὶ *ἡῆς* *ἡοι* ἐφέται ἄκοντ]α
 κτέναι, ἐσέσθ[ο]ν δὲ *ἡοι* φ]ρ[άτορες] ἐὰν ἐθέλοσι δέκα· τούτος δ]ὲ *ἡο*-
 ι πεντέκο[ν]τ[α] καὶ] *ἡῆς* ἀρ[ι]στ[ί]νδεν *ἡαιρέσθον*. καὶ *ἡοι* δὲ πρ[ό]τε[ρ]-

20 ον κτέ[ν]α[ντ]ε[ς ἐν] τῷ[ιδε τῷ θεσμοῖ ἐνεχέσθον. προειπὲν δ]ἐ τῷ κ-
 τένα[ν]τι ἐν ἁ]γορ[ᾱ] μέχρ' ἀνεφσιότετος καὶ ἀνεφσιῶ· συνδιόκ]εν
 δὲ [κ]ἀνεφσ[ιὸς καὶ ἀνεφσιῶν παῖδας καὶ γαμβρὸς καὶ πενθερὸς] κ-
 αὶ φρ[ά]τ[ο]ρ[ας36.....] αἴτι-
 ος [ἐ]ι φό[νο26..... τὸς πεντέκοντ]α καὶ
 25 ἡένα42..... φόνο
 ἡέλοσ[ι35..... ἐὰν δ]έ [τ]ις τ-
 ὀ[ν ἀν]δρ[οφόνον κτένει ἔ] αἴτιος ἔ]ι φόνο, ἀπεχόμενον ἀγορᾶ]ς ἐφο-
 ρί[α]ς κ[α]ὶ [ἄθλον καὶ ἡιερὸν Ἀμφικτυονικὸν, ἡόσπερ τὸν Ἀθην]αῖον κ-
 [τένα]ν[τα, ἐν τοῖς αὐτοῖς ἐνέχεσθαι· διαγιγνώσκεν δὲ τὸς] ἐ[φ]έτα[ς]
 30 ...Ε.....39.....ΤΕΙΕΜΕΔ-
 [.....45.....]ΟΝΑΤ.
45.....ΑΝΑ..
 Ν[.....39..... ἄρχον]τα χερ-
 ὄν ἀ[δίκον30..... χερ]ῶν ἀδίκον κ-
 35 τέ[νει ...7...]Σ[.....19..... διαγιγνώσκ]εν δὲ τὸς ἐ-
 [φέτ]ας36.....ΕΙΣΕ ἐλεύθ-
 ε[ρ]ος ἔ]ι. κ[α]ὶ ἐὰν φέροντα ἔ] ἄγοντα βίαι ἀδίκος εὐθύς] ἀμυνόμενο-
 ς κτέ[ν]ει, γ[εποινὲ τεθνάναι19.....]ΣΕΧΟΝΤΟΒ.
 ΙΑΝ..Λ[.....35..... τ]ὲν ἀπόστα-
 40 σιν ΤΟ.....37.....ΕΣ δεκατῆ-
 [ς] ΤΟ..Ι.....37.....Ε ΔΕΚΑ..
43.....ΕΑΚΥΡ..
44.....ΟΜΝΥΜ.
44.....ΟΣΕΛ..
 45 ...Φ.....41.....Ν..ΝΗ
47.....ΟΙΠ
 ..ΕΝ..Η.....39.....ΑΝΑΕ
 ...Κ.....42.....ΙΗΕΚ
 ..5..Ρ.....39.....Λ..ΟΑ
 5046.....Υ.ΙΤ
 Ο.....46.....Ο..
45.....ΠΙΘΕ.
48.....ΙΕ
 ...7...Ο.....37.....Ι.Ο..
 55 ..6...ΣΝΙ — — —
 [δεύτ]ερος [ἄχσον].

Decrees honouring the Samians (IG II² 1 – Osborne 1981, D5)

Att. — stoich. 57-61 — 405/4 BCE

- 1 Κηφισοφῶν Παιανιεύς
vacat ἐγραμμάτευε. *vacat*
 Σαμίοις ὅσοι μετὰ τῷ δήμῳ τῷ Ἀθηναί-
 ων ἐγένοντο.
- 5 ἔδοξεν τῇ βολῇ καὶ τῷ δήμῳ· Κεκροπίς ἐπρυτάνευε, Πόλυμνις Εὐωνυμεὺς
 ἐγραμμάτευε, Ἀλεξίας ἦρχε, Νικοφῶν Ἀθμονεὺς ἐπεστάτει· γνώμη Κλεσόφο
 καὶ συνπρυτάνεων· ἐπαινέσαι τοῖς πρέσβεσι τοῖς Σαμίοις τοῖς τε προτέρο-
 ις ἥκοσι καὶ τοῖς νῦν καὶ τῇ βολῇ καὶ τοῖς στρατηγοῖς καὶ τοῖς ἄλλοις
 Σαμίοις ὅτι ἐσὶν ἄνδρες ἀγαθοὶ καὶ πρόθυμοι ποιῆν ὅτι δύνανται ἀγαθόν,
 10 καὶ τὰ πεπραγμένα αὐτοῖς ὅτι δοκῶσιν ὀρθῶς ποιῆσαι Ἀθηναίοις καὶ Σαμί-
 οις· καὶ ἀντὶ ὧν εὖ πεποιήκασιν Ἀθηναῖος καὶ νῦν περὶ πολλοῦ ποιῶνται καὶ
 ἐσηγῶνται ἀγαθὰ· δεδόχθαι τῇ βολῇ καὶ τῷ δήμῳ, Σαμῖος Ἀθηναῖος ἔναι,
 πολιτευομένος ὅπως ἂν αὐτοὶ βόλωνται· καὶ ὅπως ταῦτα ἔσται ὡς ἐπιτηδειό-
 τατα ἀμ<φ>ότεροις, καθάπερ αὐτοὶ λέγουσιν, ἐπειδὴν ἐρήνη γένηται, τότε περὶ
 15 τῶν ἄλλων κοινῇ βολεύεσθαι. τοῖς δὲ νόμοις χρῆσθαι τοῖς σφετέροις αὐτῶν
 αὐτονόμος ὄντας, καὶ τᾶλλα ποιῆν κατὰ τὸς ὅρκος καὶ τὰς συνθήκας καθάπερ
 ξύνκειται Ἀθηναίοις καὶ Σαμίοις· καὶ περὶ τῶν ἐγκλημάτων ἃ ἄγ γίγνηται
 πρὸς ἀλλήλους διδόναι καὶ δέχεσθαι τὰς δίκας κατὰ τὰς συμβολὰς τὰς ὅσας.
 ἐὰν δέ τι ἀναγκαῖον γίγνηται διὰ τὸν πόλεμον καὶ πρότερον περὶ τῆς πολι-
 20 τείας, ὥσπερ αὐτοὶ λέγουσιν οἱ πρέσβες, πρὸς τὰ παρόντα βολευόμενος ποιῆν
 [ῆ]ι ἂν δοκῇ βέλτιστον ἔναι. περὶ δὲ τῆς ἐρήνης, ἐὰν γίγνηται, ἔναι κατὰ ταῦτα
 [κ]αθ' ἅπερ Ἀθηναίοις, καὶ τοῖς νῦν οἰκῶσιν Σάμον· ἐὰν δὲ πολεμῆν δέη, παρασκ-
 [ε]υάζεσθαι αὐτὸς ὡς ἂν δύνωνται ἄριστα πράττοντας μετὰ τῶν στρατηγῶν.
 [ἐὰ]ν δὲ πρεσβείαν ποι πέμπωσιν Ἀθηναῖοι, συμπέμπεν καὶ τὸς ἐξάμο παρόντας,
 25 [ἐάν] τινα βόλωνται, καὶ συνβολεύεν ὅτι ἂν ἔχωσιν ἀγαθόν. ταῖς δὲ τριήρεσι
 [ταῖς] ὅσαις ἐς Σάμῳ χρῆσθαι αὐτοῖς δῶναι ἐπισκευασαμένοις καθ' ὅτι ἂν αὐ-
 [τοῖς δ]οκῇ· τὰ δὲ ὀνόματα τῶν τριη<ρ>άρχων, ὧν ἦσαν αὗται αἱ νῆες, ἀπογράψαι
 [τὸς πρέσ]βες τῷ γραμματεῖ τῆς βολῆς καὶ τοῖς στρατηγοῖς, καὶ τούτων εἴ πό
 [τί ἐστι ὄφλημ]α γεγραμμένον ἐν τῷ δημοσίῳ ὡς παρεληφόντων τὰς τριήρες,
 30 [ἅπαντα ἐξαλειψά]ντων οἱ νεωροὶ ἀπανταχόθεν, τὰ δὲ σκεύη τῷ δημοσίῳ ἐσ-

[πραξάντων ὡς τάχιστα καὶ] ἰ ἐπαναγκασάντων ἀποδοῖναι τὸς ἔχοντας τούτων
 [τι ἐντελῆ. γνώμη Κλεσόφο καὶ] συνπρυτάνεων· τὰ μὲν ἄλλα καθάπερ τῇ βολῇ,
 [ἔναι δὲ πολιτεῖαν Σαμίων τοῖς ἡ]κοσιν, καθάπερ αὐτοὶ αἰτῶνται, καὶ νῆμαι
 [αὐτὸς αὐτίκα μάλα τὸς ἄρχοντας ἐς τ]ῶς φυλὰς δέκαχα· καὶ τὴν πορείαν παρα-
 35 [σκευάσαι τοῖς πρέσβεσι τὸς στρατηγὸς ὥ]ς τάχιστα καὶ Εὐμάχῳ καὶ τοῖς
 [ἄλλοις Σαμίῳις πᾶσι τοῖς μετὰ Εὐμάχῳ ἡ]κοσι ἐπαινέσαι ὡς ὅσιν ἀνδράσιν
 [ἀγαθοῖς περὶ τὸς Ἀθηναίους· καλέσαι δ' Εὐμ]αχον ἐπ[ὶ δ]εῖπνον ἐς τὸ πρυτανέον
 [ἐς αὐρίον. ἀναγράψαι δὲ τὰ ἐψηφισμένα τ]ὸ γ γραμμ[ατέα τῆς] β[ο]λῆς μετὰ τῶν
 [στρατηγῶν ἐσθήλῃ λιθίνῃ καὶ κατα]θῆναι ἐς πόλι[ν, τὸς δὲ ἑλλήν]οταμίας
 40 [δοῖναι τὸ ἀργύριον· ἀναγράψαι δ' ἐς Σά]μῳι κατὰ ταῦτα τέλ[εσ]αι τοῖς ἐκέ[ν]ων. *Vacat*
 [ἔδοξεν τῇ βολῇ καὶ τῷ δήμῳ· Πανδ]ιονὶς ἐπρυτάνευε, Ἀγύρριος Κ[ολλυτ]εὺς
 [ἐγραμμάτευε, Εὐκλείδης ἥ]ρχε, Κα[λλίας] Ὠ[α]θεν ἐπεστάτει· Κηφισοφῶν [εἶ]πεν·
 [ἐπαινέσαι τὸς Σαμῖος ὅτι ἐσ]ιν ἄνδρες ἀγαθοὶ περὶ Ἀθηναίους, καὶ ἅ[παντα]
 [κύρια ἔ]ναι ἃ πρότερον ὁ δῆμος ἐψηφίσατο ὁ Ἀθηναίων τῷ δήμῳ τῷ Σ[αμίων]·
 45 [πέμψαι δὲ τὸς Σαμῖος ὥσπερ αὐ]τοὶ κελεύουσιν ἐς Λακεδαίμονα ὄντινα [ἂν αὐ]-
 [τοὶ βόλῳνται· ἐπειδὴ δὲ προ]σδεόνται Ἀθηναίων συνπράττειν, προσελέσ[θαι]
 [πρέσβες, οὗτοι δὲ συμπρα]ττόντων τοῖς Σαμίῳις ὅ τι ἂν ἀγαθὸν [καὶ]
 [κοινῇ βουλευέσθων μετὰ] ἐκέκων· ἐπαινοῦσι δὲ Ἀθηναῖοι Ἐφεσίος καὶ Νοτ[ιᾶς]
 [ὅτι προθύμως ἐδέξαντο] Σαμίων τὸς ἔξω ὄντας· προσαγαγῆν δὲ τὴν πρεσβεία[ν]
 50 [τῶν Σαμίων ἐς τὸν δῆμ]ον χρηματίσασθαι ἐάν το δέωνται· καλέσαι δὲ καὶ ἐπὶ
 [δεῖπνον τὴν πρεσβ]είαν τῶν Σαμίων ἐς τὸ πρυτανέον ἐς αὐρίον· Κηφισοφῶν
 [εἶ]πε· τὰ μὲν ἄλλα κ[αθ]άπερ τῇ βολῇ· ἐψηφίσθαι δὲ Ἀθηναίων τῷ δήμῳ κύρια
 [ἔ]ναι τὰ ἐψηφισ]μένα πρότερον περὶ Σαμίων καθάπερ ἡ βολῇ προβολεύσασα
 [ἐς τὸν δῆμον ἐσ]τήνεγκεν· καλέσαι δὲ τὴν πρεσβείαν τῶν Σαμίων ἐπὶ δεῖπνον
 55 [ἐς τὸ πρυτανέ]ον ἐς αὐρίον. *vacat*
 [ἔδοξεν τῇ βολῇ] καὶ τῷ δήμῳ· Ἐρεχθίδης ἐπρυτάνευεν, Κηφισοφῶν Παι[α]γιεὺς[ς]
 [ἐγραμμάτευε, Εὐκλ]είδης ἥρχε, Πύθων ἐκ Κηδῶν ἐπεστάτει, Εὐ[...6... εἶ]πεν·
 [ἐπαινέσαι Ποσῆν τὸν] Σάμιον ὅτι ἀνὴρ ἀγαθὸς ἐστὶν περὶ Ἀθηναίους, καὶ ἀνθ' ὧν
 [εὖ πεπό]ηκε τὸν δῆμον δ[ο]ῦναι αὐτ[ῷ τὸν δῆμ]ον δωρεῖαν πεντακοσίας δραχμὰς
 60 [ἐς κατασκευὴν στεφάνο, οἱ δὲ ταμί]αι δόντων τὸ ἀργύριον· προσαγαγῆν δὲ αὐτὸ-
 [ν ἐς τὸν δῆμον καὶ εὐρέσθαι πα]ρὰ τῷ δήμῳ ὅ τι ἂν δύνηται ἀγαθόν· τὸ δὲ βιβλίον
 [τῷ ψηφίσματος παραδ]οῦναι αὐτ[ῷ τὸ γ] γραμματέα τῆς βολῆς αὐτίκα μάλα·
 [καλέσαι δὲ ἐπὶ ξένια Σαμῖος τὸ]ς ἡκοντας ἐς τὸ πρυτανέον ἐς αὐρίον. *vacat*
 [...10.... εἶ]πε· τὰ μὲν ἄλλα καθά]περ τῇ βολῇ, ἐπαινέσαι δὲ Ποσῆν τὸν
 65 [Σάμιον καὶ τὸς ὑ]ἔς ἐπειδὴ ἄνδρες ἀγ]αθοὶ ἐσιν περὶ τὸν δῆμον τὸν Ἀθηναίων
 [καὶ κύρια ἔ]ναι τὰ ἐψηφισμένα πρότε]ρον ὑπὸ τῷ δήμῳ τῷ Ἀθηναίων· καὶ ἀναγρα-
 [ψάτω ὁ γραμματεὺς τὸ ψηφισμα ἐσθήλ]ῃ λιθίνῃ, οἱ δὲ ταμίαι παρασχόντων

[τὸ ἀργύριον ἐς ἀναγραφὴν. δοῦναι δὲ Πο]σῆι δωρεὰν τὸν δῆμον χιλίας δραχμὰς
 [ἀρετῆς ἕνεκα τῆς πρὸς Ἀθηναίος, ἀπὸ δ]ὲ τῶν χιλίων δραχμῶν στέφανον ποῆσα-
 70 [ι καὶ ἐπιγράψαι τούτῳ στεφανοῦν αὐ]τὸν τὸν δῆμον ἀνδραγαθίας ἕνεκα καὶ
 [ἀρετῆς τῆς ἐς Ἀθηναίος· ἐπαινέσαι δὲ] καὶ Σαμῖος ὅτι ἐσὶν ἄνδρες ἀγαθοὶ
 [περὶ Ἀθηναίος· ἐὰν δέ το δέωνται παρὰ] τῷ δήμῳ, προσάγεν αὐτὸς τὸς πρυτάνες
 [πρὸς τὸν δῆμον πρῶτος αἰεὶ μετὰ τὰ ἱερ]ά· προσαγαγεῖν δὲ καὶ τὸς ὑῆς τὸς Ποσῶ
 [τὸς πρυτάνες ἐς τὴν βολὴν ἐς τὴν πρώτ]ην ἔδραν. καλέσαι δὲ κα[ὶ ἐπὶ] ξένια
 75 [ἐς τὸ πρυτανεόν καὶ Ποσῆν καὶ τὸς ὑῆς] καὶ Σαμίων τὸς ἐπ[ιδημῶντα]ς. *vacat*
vacat 0.084 m.

Bibliography

- Allan, R.J. (2010), "The *infinitivus pro imperativo* in Ancient Greek. The Imperativ Infinitive as an Expression of Proper Procedural Action", in *Mnemosyne*, vol.63, pp.203-228.
- Arnaoutoglou, I. (1998), *Ancient Greek Laws A Sourcebook*, London.
- Cavanaugh, M.B. (1996), *Eleusis and Athens. Documents in Finance, Religion and Politics in the Fifth Century B.C.*, Atlanta.
- Clinton, K. (2005), *Eleusis, the inscriptions on stone: documents of the Sanctuary of the Two Goddesses and public documents of the Deme*, vol. IA Text, Athens.
- (2008), *Eleusis, the inscriptions on stone: documents of the Sanctuary of the Two Goddesses and public documents of the Deme*, vol. II Commentary, Athens.
- Dillon, M. & Garland, L. (1994), *Ancient Greece. Social and Historical Documents from Archaic Times to the Death of Socrates*, London.
- Dover, K.J. (1981), "The language of Classical Attic documentary inscriptions", in *Transactions of the Philological Society*, vol.79, no.1, pp.1-14.
- Ferrario, S.B. (2014), *Historical Agency and the "Great Man" in Classical Greece*, Cambridge.
- Gagarin, M. (1981), *Dakon and Early Athenian Homicide Law*, New Haven.
- (2008), *Writing Greek Law*, Cambridge.
- Henry, A.S. (1983), *Honours and Privileges in Athenian Decrees: The Principal Formulae of Athenian Honorary Decrees*, Hildesheim.
- (1989), "Provisions for the Payment of Athenian Decrees. A study in formulaic language", in *Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik*, vol.78, pp.247-295.
- (2001), "The Sigma Stigma", in *Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik*, vol.137, pp.93-104.
- Kallet-Marx, L. (1989), "The Kallias Decree, Thucydides, and the Outbreak of the Peloponnesian War", in *The Classical Quarterly*, vol. 39, no.1, pp.94-113.
- Larfeld, W. (1902), *Handbuch der griechischen Epigraphik*, vol. II, Leipzig.
- Marginesu, G. (2010), *Gli epistati dell Acropoli: Edilizia sacra nella città di Pericle 447/6-433/2 a.C.*, Athens.
- Martínez Vázquez, R. (1989), "Infinitivos dinámicos e infinitivos declarativos en griego antiguo", in *Emerita*, vol.57, no.2, pp.293-307.
- Meiggs, R. & Lewis, D.M. (1988), *A selection of greek historical inscriptions to the end of the fifth century B.C.*, rev. ed., Oxford.
- Morrison, J.S., Coates, J.F. & Rankov, N.B. (2000), *The Athenian Trireme: the history and reconstruction of an ancient Greek warship*, Second edition, Cambridge.

- Osborne, M.J. (1981), *Naturalization in Athens. Vol.I: A corpus of Athenian decrees granting citizenship*, Brussels.
- Pébarthe, C. (2006), *Cité, Démocratie et Écriture*, Paris.
- Phillips, D.D. (2008), *Homicide in Athenian Law and Custom from Draco to Demosthenes*, Stuttgart.
- Rijksbaron, A. (2002), *The syntax and semantics of the verb in classical Greek: an introduction*, 3rd edition, Amsterdam.
- Rhodes, P.J. (1972), *The Athenian boule*, Oxford.
- (1984), “ΞΕΝΙΑ and ΔΕΙΠΝΟΝ in the Prytaneum”, in *Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik*, vol.57, pp.193-99.
- (2001), “Public Documents in the Greek States: Archives and Inscriptions”, in *Greece & Rome*, vol.48, no.1, pp.33-44 & no.2, pp.136-153.
- Rhodes, P.J. & Lewis, D.M. (1997), *The decrees of the Greek states*, Oxford.
- Rhodes, P.J. & Osborne, M.J. (2003), *Greek Historical Inscriptions 404-323 BC*, Oxford.
- Samons, L.J. (2000), *Empire of the owl: Athenian imperial finance*, Stuttgart.
- Stork, P. (1982), *The aspectual usage of the dynamic infinitive in Herodotus*, Groningen.
- Stroud, R. (1968), *Drakon's Law on homicide*, Berkeley.
- (1979), *The Axones and Kyrbeis of Drakon and Solon*, Berkeley.
- Thür, G. (2004), “Law of procedure in Attic inscriptions”, in eds. Cairns, D.L. & Knox, R.A., *Law, Rethoric, and Comedy in Classical Athens. Essays in Honour of Douglas M. MacDowell*, Swansea, pp.33-50.
- Van Effenterre, H. & Ruzé, F. (1994-5), *Nomima: recueil d'inscriptions pilitiques et juridiques de l'archaïsme Grec*, vol.I & II, Rome.
- Walbank, M.B. (1978), *Athenian Proxenies of the Fifth Century B.C.*, Toronto.

