

# ATHENS AND KYDONIA

## AGORA I 7602

### ABSTRACT

A Hellenistic inscription from the Athenian Agora (Agora I 7602) concerning *syngeneia* between Athens and Kydonia in western Crete is reedited here with full commentary. The history of Athenian relations with Kydonia is briefly reviewed. The authors propose a reconstruction of the Kydonians' arguments for mythological kinship between the two cities. Agora I 7602 appears to be the earliest firm attestation of mutually accepted *syngeneia* between Athens and a non-Ionian city. Indeed, it is the first known inscription recording kinship between Athens and another city on grounds other than the latter's status as a colony, at least before the Roman period.

In his 2003 report, John McK. Camp II, director of the American School of Classical Studies excavations in the Athenian Agora, offered a preliminary publication of a fragmentary late-3rd-century B.C. Athenian decree concerning, in his view, honors for the city of Kydonia (modern Chania) in western Crete.<sup>1</sup> The inscription, Agora I 7602, discovered out of context near the Eleusinion in July 2000, contains various features of historical interest, and we offer a new edition here.

#### Agora I 7602

Fig. 1

Upper right-hand corner of a stele of gray ("Hymettian") marble, broken at left, above, at back, and below.

P.H. 0.28, p.W. 0.20, p.Th. 0.103 m

L.H. 0.004–0.005 m

1. Camp 2003, pp. 275–277. In September 2005, Nikolaos Papazar-kadas was kindly granted permission by the 1st Ephorate of Prehistoric and Classical Antiquities and the American School of Classical Studies at Athens to examine the stone in the basement of the Stoa of Attalos. He thanks the ephor, Alkestis Choremi, and archae-

ologist Nikoletta Saraga, as well as the Agora excavation team, particularly John Camp, Jan Jordan, and Sylvie Dumont, for their assistance. We are also indebted to Angelos Chaniotis and an anonymous *Hesperia* referee for comments and criticism on an earlier draft of the manuscript.

ca. 224–201 B.C.

Non-stoich. ca. 32–35

- [ἐπὶ -----<sup>ca.11</sup>----- ἄρχοντος ἐπ[ὶ τ]ῆς Δη[μη]-  
 [τριάδος -----<sup>ca.8</sup>-----] πρυταν[ε]ίας εἶ Νικάνω[ρ]  
 [M . . . v -----<sup>ca.10</sup>-----]ς ἐγραμμάτευνεν· δήμ[ου]  
 [ψηφίσματα· Βοηδρ]ομιῶνος [ἐν]η[ί] κ[αὶ] νέα[ι],  
 5 [- - -<sup>ca.8</sup>----- τῆς πρυτ]ανείας· ἐκ[κλη]σ[ί]α ἐν [τῶι]  
 [θεάτρωι· τῶν προέδ]ρων ἐπεψ[ήφισ]εν Κλε[. . .]  
 [- - - -<sup>ca.12</sup>----- Φα]ληρεὺς[ς] κα[ὶ] σ[υ]μ[μ]υ[μ]πρόεδρο[ι]·  
 [*vacat* ----- ἔδοξεν τ]ῶι δήμωι· *vacat*  
 [- - - -<sup>ca.15</sup>-----]ν ε[ἰ]πεν· ἐ[π]ειδὴ Κυδωνιῶ-  
 10 [ται φίλοι ὄντες καὶ σ]υγγενε[ῖς] τοῦ δήμου  
 [τοῦ Ἀθηναίων ῥέπεστά]λκασιν [τ]ῆι βουλήι κα[ὶ]  
 [τῶι δήμωι περὶ τῶν πε]πραγμέν[ων] πρὸς ἀλλή-  
 [λους εὐεργεσιῶν κ]αὶ περὶ τ[ῶν] πρὸς τοὺς θ[ε]-  
 [οὺς τιμῶν ῥε]ψηφισ[μένα] καὶ παρακαλοῦσι[ν]  
 15 [συντηρεῖν τὴν φιλί]αν καὶ οἰκειότητα ὅπ[ω]ς  
 [- - - -<sup>ca.25</sup>-----] ταῖς πόλε-  
 [σι -----<sup>ca.22</sup>-----]ν καὶ οἱ παῖ-  
 [δες αὐτοῦ -----<sup>ca.9</sup>----- δ]ιελέ[χθ]ησαν περὶ  
 [- - - -<sup>ca.12</sup>----- ἀγαθ]ῆι τύχηι· [δ]εδόχθαι τῶ[ι]  
 20 [δήμωι ἀποκρίνασθαι τ]ῆι πόλε[ι τ]ῆι Κυδωνι-  
 [ατῶν ὅτι μεμνημένος] ὁ δῆμος ὁ Ἀ[θηναίων]  
 [τῆς συγγενείας τῆς προ]ῦπα[ρ]χ[ούσης] - - -<sup>ca.5</sup> - - -  
 - - - - - - - - - -

## CRITICAL NOTES

1. [ἄρ]χοντος C(amp) | 1–2. [τῆ]ς Δ[ημητ]ριάδος C | 3. ἐγραμμά[τε]υνεν C | 5. [ἐ]κ[κλη]σ[ί]α C | 6. [ἐ]πεψ[ήφισ]εν C | 7. [- - - Φα]ληρε[ῦς] κα[ὶ] σ[υμ]πρόεδρο[ι] C | 9–10. Κυδωνι[- -] C | 12–13. [.]ΛΛ[.]|[- -] C | 13–14. περ[ι]. . .π[.]ο[.]ουσο[- -] C | 15. καὶ οἱ[κ]ειότητα οπ[.]|[- -] C | 16. τῶ[ι]ς πολ[.] C | 18. [- -]ικλε[. . .] C: epsilon for kappa is certain | 20. πο[. . .]ηι C | 21. ὁ δῆ[μ]ος οἶ[. . .] C | 22. [- -]υπ[- -] C

Our text incorporates a few new readings, by and large insignificant. One particular divergence from the *editio princeps* is worth noting. The first editor allowed for very free word division across lines (Νικάνω[ρ], δήμ[ου], [τῶι]). It has, however, been observed that this particular letter-cutter (the “Cutter of *IG II*<sup>2</sup> 1706”: see below) habitually observed the principle of syllabification in his line divisions.<sup>2</sup> Examination of the stone confirms that this principle was followed in our text, at the cost of some very cramped line ends (especially lines 2 and 7, where there is minimal space for the final rho and iota, respectively).

## TRANSLATION

In the archonship of [. . .], during the [. . .] prytany, held by the tribe De[metrias], when Nikano[r, son of . . .], of the deme . . .], was secretary; [decrees] of the dem[os]; on the final day of the month Boedromion, on

2. Dow 1985, pp. 36–37.



Figure 1. Agora I 7602. Photo courtesy  
Agora Excavations

the [...] day of the prytany, an assembly was held in [the theater]; of the *proedroi*, Kle[...], son of [...], of the deme Pha]leron and his fellow *proedroi* put the motion to the vote; [it was resolved] by the *demos*; [...] made the motion: since the people of Kydonia, [being friends and] kinsmen of the *demos* [of the Athenians], have [sent in a letter?] to the *boule* and [the *demos*] the decrees concerning the mutual [benefactions] performed by our two peoples and concerning [the honors] to the gods, and they call on (us) [to preserve the friendship] and close relations (between us), in order that [e.g., it may persist between our two] cities [in perpetuity; concerning the things which [...] of Kydonia] and his so[ns] have explained concerning [?the kinship, with good] fortune: be it resolved by the [*demos* to reply] to the city of the Kydonians [that] the *demos* of the A[thenians, remembering the kinship formerly] persisting [between them ...]

## COMMENTARY

*Lines 1–5:* The space to be filled in line 1 requires rather a long archon's name (up to 11 letters in the genitive), for whom the secretary is as yet unknown. Not many years between 224 and 201 fulfill these conditions. Most attractive is Herakleitos (10 letters), archon of the ordinary year 212/1 (on the “low chronology” for the period 229–200 B.C.).<sup>3</sup> If we accept a nine-letter archon's name in line 1, the possibilities multiply: Antiphilos (223/2), Aischron (210/9), Sostratos (209/8), and Pantiades (206/5).

The secretary, Nikanor, is known: see *IG II<sup>2</sup>* 865, with Tracy 1990, p. 239: Νικ[άν]ωρ Μ[. . .]ν[-]. Tracy's tentative suggestion that Nikanor is to be identified both with the deceased Νικάνωρ Μενάνδρου ἐκ Κηδῶν (*IG II<sup>2</sup>* 6382) and with the anonymous secretary [- - - - -<sup>ca.18</sup> - - - ἐκ] Κηδῶν of 223/2 (*Agora XV* 128) appears to be ruled out by the new document, since we now know that Nikanor's demotic ends in sigma (line 3).

The cutter of the new text was identified by Tracy as his “Cutter of *IG II<sup>2</sup>* 1706,” whose floruit falls between 229/8 and ca. 203 B.C. The former date constitutes a fairly firm terminus post quem, since the liberation of 229 observably forms a caesura in letter-cutters' activity at Athens. The text also provides a clear internal terminus ante quem in the form of the tribe Demetrias (lines 1–2), abolished in late 201 B.C.<sup>4</sup> The first question that arises is whether the inscription is to be dated before or after the introduction of the tribe Ptolemais in 224/3. Assuming a low date for the archon Heliodoros (228/7), the secretaries are known for the years 228/7 to 225/4; none is Nikanor. The name of the archon of 224/3 on the low chronology (Niketēs) seems considerably too short for the lacuna in line 1. The archon of 229/8 is not known, and that year hence remains a formal possibility; the statistical likelihood is, however, that the decree dates to the period of the 13 tribes.

The decree was passed on Βοηδρομιῶνος ἔντη καὶ νέαι, Boedromion (III) ultimo, already known as an assembly day from *IG II<sup>2</sup>* 700 (archon Thymochares, 257/6).<sup>5</sup> There are three possibilities for the arrangement of the year: (1) ordinary year, (2a) intercalary year in which intercalation has already occurred, and (2b) intercalary year in which intercalation has not yet occurred. (1) If the year is ordinary, we ought to be ca. three to six days into the fourth prytany (with a sequence of long prytanies at the start of the year), and [τρίτει] and [ἔκτει] are both too short for the lacuna in line 5. The two possible calendar equations are Boedromion (III) ultimo = Prytany IV 4 or 5, that is, [τετάρτης] in line 2; [τετάρτει] or [πέμπτει] in line 5, the first assuming that two of the first three months were hollow,

3. The absolute chronology of the period 229–200 is controversial. The old archon list for this period, as established (with full documentation) by Meritt (1977, pp. 177–179), and lightly modified by Habicht (1982, pp. 159–177), rested on the apparently unambiguous dating of the archon Thrasyphōn to 221/0 on the basis of *I.Magn.* 16.11–16. If, however, Thrasyphōn ought to be downdated to 220/19,

as has recently been proposed, thus providing a “low” chronology for the period 229–200, most or all of the archons move down a year (Morgan 1996; Habicht 1997, pp. v–vi; Osborne 2003, p. 69). The problem cannot be treated in detail here.

4. Habicht 1982, pp. 142–150.

5. For the archon list for this period, see most recently Osborne 2003, pp. 73–74.

the second that only one of them was.<sup>6</sup> (2) If the year is intercalary, the prytanies ought to correspond reasonably closely to the months. (a) If the month had already been intercalated by this point—as seems to be standard in this period—we would be at the very end of the fourth or beginning of the fifth prytany. The former is not really possible, since the lacuna in line 5 is not large enough to accommodate a numeral in the twenties (τριακοστῆ also seems too long). The only possible restoration, in that case, would be Boedromion (III) ultimo = Prytany V 2, with [πέμπτης] in line 2, and [δευτέραι] in line 5.<sup>7</sup> (b) If the month had not yet been intercalated, the situation is the same, but with [τετάρτης] rather than [πέμπτης] in line 2, that is, Boedromion (III) ultimo = Prytany IV 2.

We tentatively suggest, therefore, that the likeliest reconstruction of the prescript is archon Herakleitos (212/1, ordinary year), secretary from tribe XIII, Boedromion (III) ultimo = Prytany IV (Demetrias) 4 or 5. But given the manifold uncertainties involved, we prefer to leave the text unrestored.

*Lines 6–7:* A Κλέανδρος Φαληρεύς is attested in a 4th-century *proletai* record (*Agora* XIX P49); it is conceivable that the *proedros* here is a descendant. Camp's estimate of ca. 16 missing letters at the start of line 7 is a *lapsus*.

*Line 8:* Camp's [ἔδοξεν τῆι βουλῆι καὶ τῶι δήμῳ] is too long. The *vacat* at the end of the line suggests that this is a centered heading, characteristic of the period, and often employed by this cutter, as in *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 833, line 7; 839, line 14; 847, line 9; *Agora* XV 128, line 7; etc.<sup>8</sup> This is a non-probuleumatic decree: compare lines 19–20, [δ]εδόχθαι τῶ[ι | δήμῳ].

*Lines 9–10:* [- σ]υγγενε[ίς] τοῦ δήμου τ[ι] - Camp. A large number of contemporary decrees granting inviolability to Magnesia on the Maeander begin with a clause of this kind, describing the grantor's relationship with the Magnesians. A number of combinations are found (οἰκεῖοι καὶ φίλοι, φίλοι καὶ ἀστυγείτονες, etc.), one of the most common being "friendship and kinship": so *I.Magn.* 33 (Gonnoi), lines 4–5: ἐπειδὴ Μάγνητες οἱ ἐπὶ Μαϊάνδρου φίλοι ὄντες καὶ συγγενεῖς Γοννέων; *I.Magn.* 46 (Epidamnos), lines 3–4: συγγενεῖς ὄντες καὶ φίλοι τῶν Ἐπιδαμνίων; *I.Magn.* 61 (Antioch in Persis), lines 11–12: συγγενεῖς ὄντες | καὶ φίλοι τοῦ δήμου. Here we certainly have ἐ[π]ειδὴ Κυδωνιᾶ[ι] τ[ι] φίλοι ὄντες καὶ σ[υ]γγενε[ίς] τοῦ δήμου. The Athenian decree recognizing Magnesian *asylia* (*I.Magn.* 37, lines 6–8) begins with the phrase ἐπειδὴ Μάγνητες οἱ ἐπὶ Μαϊάνδρῳ οἰκεῖοι καὶ φίλοι τοῦ δήμου τοῦ Ἀθηναίων ὄντες; hence in lines 10–11 of our inscription we restore τοῦ δήμου | [τοῦ Ἀθηναίων].

6. For a parallel from the period of the 13 tribes, see *Agora* XVI 227 (ordinary year: 219/8 or 218/7), Boedromion (III) 11 = Prytany III 15. This formula implies that both of the first two months were full; with a Prytany III of 28 days, Prytany IV 1 = Boedromion (III) 25; hence with a hollow Boedromion, Boedromion (III) ultimo = Prytany IV 5, and with a full Boedromion, Boedromion (III) ultimo =

Prytany IV 6. Woodhead's proposal (*Agora* XVI 226) of an equation Boedromion (III) 27/28 = Prytany IV 6 in the same year is untenable: the latest conceivably possible prytany date for Boedromion 28 is Prytany IV 5, assuming a third prytany of 27 days.

7. Cf., e.g., *I.Magn.* 37 (209/8 or 208/7), where Pyanopsion (IV) 6 = Prytany V 7, that is, Boedromion (III) ultimo = Prytany V 1; for intercalated

Hekatombaion, see *Agora* XVI 224 (226/5 or 225/4), where Metageitnion (II) 27/28 = Prytany III 27. This early placement of the intercalary month seems to have been common in the late 3rd century: Pritchett and Neugebauer 1947, p. 90.

8. For centered headings ("perfect design"), see Henry 1977, pp. 67–70; Tracy 1996, pp. 49–51.

*Lines 11–12:* Camp’s [ἀπεστά]λκασιν is unsatisfactory. The verb requires an accusative of the thing sent and, usually, a prepositional phrase πρὸς + accusative of the intended recipient (*IG* II<sup>2</sup> 687, line 27: πρέσβεις . . . ἀπεστάλκασιν πρὸς τὸν δῆ[μ]ον; *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 680, lines 14–15: ἀπεστάλκ[ασ]ιν πρὸς τὸν δῆ[μ]ον πρεσβείαν; *I.Magn.* 37, line 11; etc.). There is no space here to restore the Kydonian embassy (πρέσβεις, πρεσβείαν), and the dative indirect object (τῆι βουλῆι) is distressing. Grammatically preferable would be [ἐπεστά]λκασιν or [ἀπηγγέ]λκασιν, both of which do take the dative. The difficulty with ἀπαγγέλλειν is again the absence of any mention of an embassy: one would expect, for example, Κυδωνιατῶν οἱ πρέσβεις. Hence we tentatively prefer [ἐπεστά]λκασιν. For the dative, compare, for example, *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 553 (Osborne 1981, D44), lines 6–7: καὶ ταῦτα πρότερό[ν] τ]ε ἐπέ[στειλε] . . . -κλειδ]ης περὶ [Νεαίου] τῆι βου[λ]ῆι καὶ τῶι δήμωι; *Syll.*<sup>3</sup> 402, lines 8–9: [ἐπ]έσταλκ[ε] δὲ περὶ τούτων τῶι δήμωι καὶ τὸ κοινὸν τῶν Αἰτωλῶ[ν] καὶ ὁ στρατηγὸς Χαλρίξ]ενος.

The grammatical structure of what follows is unclear. ἐπιστέλλειν, like ἀπαγγέλλειν, can take either a direct accusative or περὶ with the genitive; for the two constructions side by side, note, for example, *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 31, lines 17–22: [ἐλέσθαι δὲ ἄ]νδρας . . . [οἴτ]ινε[ς] ἀπαγγελοῦσι [π]ρὸς Ἐβ]β]ρὺ[ζε]λ]μιν [τὰ ἐ]ψηφι[σ]μένα τῶι δῆ[μ]ωι. ἀπ]αγγελοῦσι δὲ κ[αὶ] περὶ τῶν νεῶν . . . [καὶ] περὶ τῶν ἄλλων ὧ[ν] α[ἰ]τιῶσ]ιν οἱ πρέσβ[ε]ς. In our proposed text, [τὰ ἐ]ψηφισ]μένα in line 14 is the direct object of [ἐπεστά]λκασιν in line 11 (as ταῦτα in *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 553, cited above), with the two intervening περὶ- phrases defining the content of the decrees. The word order is undeniably convoluted, but we can find no other means of providing a construction for the accusative participle - ]μένα. There is certainly no space for another main verb.

In lines 11–12, the restoration κα[ὶ] τῶι δήμωι is certain: compare lines 3, 8, 10, 19–21. Envoys and messengers routinely presented themselves to both *boule* and assembly. Compare *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 486 (Osborne 1981, D45), in which the monarch (Demetrios Poliorketes) addresses himself to both *boule* and *demos* (line 12: ἐπέστειλεν τεῖ [βουλεῖ καὶ τῶι δήμωι]), while the decree itself, like our text, is non-probouleumatic (line 10: ἔδοξεν τῶι [δήμωι]). Quite probably the *boule* issued an open *probouleuma* in both cases.<sup>9</sup>

*Lines 12–13:* The evocation of old benefactions (εὐεργεσία) as proof of friendship is common: for example, *I.Magn.* 45, lines 18–22, ἐμφανιζάντων [τῶν πρεσβευτῶν] . . . τὰς εὐεργεσίας τὰς προγεγενημένας ὑπὸ τῶν προγόνων αὐτῶν, and frequently in the Magnesia dossier. The use of πράσσειν is less common, but compare *I.Milet* 1052, lines 27–32: τοὺς δὲ αἰρεθέντας [sc. πρεσβευτὰς] ἀφικομένους ἀπολογίσασθαι . . . περὶ τῶν ὑπὸ τοῦ δήμου πεπραγμένων εἰς αὐτοὺς εὐεργεσιῶν. φιλανθρώπων is another possibility, though perhaps a little long for the space; for its occurrence with πράττειν, see *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 844, lines 59–60: ὅπως ἂν οὖν ἐμ παντὶ καιρῶι τὰ φιλάνθρωπα πρὸς τοὺς ἀξίους | πράττηται.

*Lines 13–14:* Compare *SEG* XVIII 26, lines 19–20: βουλόμ[ενος] δὲ καὶ ἐπὶ πλείον ἀύξειν τὰς] πρὸς τοὺς θεοὺς τιμάς.

*Lines 14–15:* For the omission of the accusative of person after παρακαλεῖν, compare, for example, *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1008, lines 62–63: προαιρούμενοι στήσαι αὐτοῦ | [εἰ]κόνα παρακαλοῦσιν ἐπιχ[ωρ]ῆ[σ]αι ἑαυτοῖς τόπον εἰς [τὴν ἀνάθ]εσιν (similarly *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1011, line 43). The Athenians are being

9. For envoys at *boule* and assembly, see Rhodes 1972, p. 43. For open *probouleumata*, see Rhodes 1972, pp. 52–81.

called on either to “renew” (ἀνανεώσασθαι) or to “preserve” (διαφυλάσσειν, διατηρεῖν, συντηρεῖν) their friendship and kinship with the Kydonians. ἀνανεώσασθαι and διαφυλάσσειν both appear to be too long; there is no way to choose between διατηρεῖν and συντηρεῖν. For the sense, compare *Milet* I.3 138, lines 36–37: παρακαλεῖν αὐτὸν [sc. τὸν δῆμον τὸν Κνιδίῳ] τὴν τε εὐνοίαν καὶ τὴν φιλίαν διαφυλάσσειν πρὸς τὴν πόλιν τὴν ἡμετέραν τὸν ἀεὶ χρόνον; *Syll.*<sup>3</sup> 426, lines 35–37: παρακαλοῦσιν τὸν δῆμον τὸν Τηϊῶν εἰς [τε]! τὸν λοιπὸν χρόνον διαφυλάσσειν τὴν φιλίαν τὴν [ὑπ]άρχουσαν ταῖς πόλεσι πρὸς ἀλλήλας. For the verb συντηρεῖν in this context, compare, for example, *Milet* I.3 152a, lines 16–17: παρακαλέσσει Μιλασίους τὰν τε συγγένειαν καὶ φιλίαν καὶ εὐνοίαν συντηρέοντας ἐπὶ πλεόν αὔξειν; *SEG* IV 600, lines 5–8: ὅπαι ὦν [κατακολουθίοντες] τοῖς ὑπ’ αὐτῶν παρκαλιόμε[νοις] . . . τὰν ποτὶ [Τηϊῶς συγγένει]αν φαινόμεθα συντηρίοντες; *IG* VII 4139, lines 14–15: [κ]αθήκει Θισβεῦσιν συντηρεῖν τὴν τε πρὸς τὴν [π]όλιν τῶν Ἀκραϊφιδίων φιλίαν καὶ συγγένειαν, . . . For the simple τηρεῖν, compare *IMagn.* 37, line 22.

*Line 15–17:* We understand the ὅπως clause to be dependent on the preceding παρακαλοῦσι[ν συντηρεῖν]. The precise phraseology here cannot be recovered. The sense is presumably something like “in order that it (i.e., friendship and close relations) may persist (ὑπάρχηι?) between the two cities ([ἀμφοτέροις] ταῖς πόλε[σι], ταῖς πόλε[σι] πρὸς ἀλλήλας) in perpetuity (τὸν ἀεὶ χρόνον, εἰς τὸν ἅπαντα/λοιπὸν χρόνον).”

*Lines 17–19:* Angelos Chaniotis has proposed to us the restoration διελέ[χθ]ησαν. We understand the structure here to be [περὶ ὧν (name)]ν καὶ οἱ παῖ[δες αὐτοῦ ?Κυδωνιάται διελέ[χθ]ησαν περὶ [τῆς συγγενείας, ἀγαθῆ] τύχη. . . . The repeated περὶ is unproblematic: compare, for example, *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 337, περὶ ὧν λέγουσιν οἱ Κιτιεῖς περὶ τῆς ιδρύσειως τῆι Ἀφροδίτῃ τοῦ ἱεροῦ, ἐψηφίσθαι. . . . The individual named in line 17 and his sons would have been Kydonian ambassadors charged with the delivery of the Kydonian letter and decrees. For ambassadors performing this function, compare, for example, *Syll.*<sup>3</sup> 683, lines 3–8: πρεσβευτῶν παραγενομένων παρὰ τὰς πόλιος | τῶμ Μεσσανίων . . . καὶ τὰ γράμματα ἀποδόντων ἐν οἷς διεσαίφεῖτο ἀνανεωσαμένους τὰν ὑπάρχουσαν συγγένειαν κα[ι] φιλίαν; lines 12–15: ἀποδόντων | δὲ τῶμ πρεσβευτῶν καὶ ἐπιστολὰμ παρὰ Μιλησίων | ἐσφραγισμέναν . . . διαλεγέντων δὲ κ[αὶ τῶ]μ πρεσβευτῶν ἀκολ[ού]θως τοῖς γεγραμμένοις. It is just conceivable that the individual concerned is [Χαρμίω]ν, son of Eumaridas, member of a family that had close relations with Athens at this period: see below, page 81. There does not seem to be sufficient space to restore the names of the two sons in line 18. Possibly we ought to restore here the ethnic Κυδωνιάται; alternatively, we may have the indirect object of the verb διελέ[χθ]ησαν, that is, πρὸς ἡμᾶς or τῶι δήμῳ. The absence of patronym and (possibly) ethnic for the lead ambassador is unproblematic: compare, for example, *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 844, where the honorand is introduced by name alone (line 4, ἐπειδὴ Εὐμαρίδας πρότερόν τε) with his patronym and ethnic recorded only later (line 23, ἐπαινέσαι Εὐμαρίδαν Πανκλέους Κυδωνιάτην). *Pace* one of our referees, we consider it less likely that the individuals concerned here were Athenians.

*Lines 20–21:* The infinitive of decision to be supplemented in line 20 must govern a dative, ruling out an infinitive of praise (ἐπαινέσαι).<sup>10</sup> In line 21, the nominative ὁ δῆμος must be part of a subordinate clause,

10. ἐπαινέσαι + dative is not found in Attic decrees of the Hellenistic period: see, e.g., Meisterhans 1900, p. 211; Mattingly 1974, p. 284, n. 11.

ruling out an infinitive of grant (δεδόσθαι, ὑπάρχειν), since such an infinitive would necessarily be followed by accusatives signifying the content of the grant. Hence the decision must be “to reply” [ἀποκρίνασθαι], and the relative clause gives the content of the reply, [ὅτι]; for the structure, compare, for example, Rhodes and Osborne 2003, no. 64, lines 11–13: ἀποκρί[ν]ασθαι ἀν[τ]οῖ[ς] [sc. Σπαρτόκωι καὶ Παιρισάδει] ὅτι ὁ [δῆ]μος ὁ Ἀθηναίων ἐπαινεῖ Σπάρτ[ο]κον καὶ Παιρισάδην.

*Lines 21–22:* In line 21, we had considered restoring [ὅτι ἡ βουλή καὶ ὁ δῆμος ὁ Ἀθηναίων], as the Kydonians addressed themselves to both *boule* and *demos*, and it would be natural for both to respond. This is, however, a little short for the lacuna. We prefer to assume that the Athenians’ answer was introduced by a participial clause with μεμνημένος. Compare *I.Magn.* 38, lines 29–32: διὸ ἂ πόλις μεμναμένα τᾶς τε συγγενείας καὶ φιλίας . . . ἀποδέχεται τὰς θυσίας; *I.Magn.* 53, lines 62–64: εἰς τὸ λο[ι]πὸ[ν] δὲ ὁ δῆμος μεμνημένος τῶν | προὔπαρχόντων αὐτῶι πρὸς Μάγνητας οἰκείων | καὶ φιλανθρώπων; *IC I xiv* 1, lines 26–27: μεμναμένοι τᾶς προὔπαρχούσας ταῖς πόλεσι συγγενείας. For the reversal of subject and verb after ὅτι, compare *I.Magn.* 87, lines 14–15: ἀποκρίνασθαι Μάγνησιν ὅτι ἀποδέχεται ὁ δῆμος τὰ ἐπηγγελέμενα.

## ATHENS AND KYDONIA: A SHORT HISTORY

In the summer of 429 B.C., on the encouragement of the *proxenos* Nikias of Gortyn, the Athenians sent out a small fleet of 20 ships with the aim of capturing the hostile (πολεμίαν) city of Kydonia in western Crete (Thuc. 2.85.5–6). Thucydides tells us little about the nature and aims of the expedition. The motives of Nikias evidently relate to internal Cretan politics (assistance to the Polichnitai against Kydonia).<sup>11</sup> The Athenians’ aims were more complex. Kydonia was apparently an Aiginetan colony (founded ca. 519 B.C.), and the essentially Aiginetan character of the city in the 5th century B.C. is clear from both epigraphical and numismatic evidence.<sup>12</sup> Aiginetan exiles had probably taken refuge in Kydonia after their expulsion in 431, but this hardly suffices to account for the Athenian raid. More likely the main cause of the Athenian attack was the key position of western Crete on what was presumably the main Spartan merchant shipping route from North Africa. The expedition to Kydonia could therefore perhaps be seen as an abortive precursor to the occupation of Kythera in 424, one of the main purposes of which is explicitly stated by Thucydides to have been the disruption of the Spartans’ Libyan supply route.<sup>13</sup> At any

11. A very speculative reconstruction of the internal Cretan politics underlying this conflict is found in Sekunda 2000, pp. 327–337.

12. Implied by Hdt. 3.59.3; explicit in Strabo 8.6.16. For 5th-century Kydonian inscriptions in Aiginetan script, see Jeffery 1990, p. 314. Kydonian coinage uses Aiginetan types from its introduction ca. 470 B.C. down to ca. 330/20: see Stefanakis 1999.

13. On Aiginetan exiles, see Mikrogianakes 1971, pp. 420–424; Figueira 1988, pp. 538–542. On Spartan shipping, see van Effenterre 1948, pp. 36–40. On Kythera, see Thuc. 4.53–57. Strabo (10.4.13) conceptualizes Kydonia as “looking towards Lakonia.” More than one modern scholar has described the Athenian raid of 429 as “folly” (e.g., Hornblower 1991, p. 266; see now Fantasia 2003, pp. 554–557, with earlier

bibliography), but we do not know enough about the politics or strategic importance of late-5th-century Crete to be able to say this. See, however, Erickson 2005, who now makes a strong case for the commercial significance of Crete, and Kydonia in particular, discussing, *inter alia*, the Athenian expedition of 429 (pp. 621–622, 656).

rate, Kydonia's political and cultural affiliations in the 5th century were evidently not with Athens.

The only unambiguous evidence for Athenian-Kydonian relations in the 4th century derives from an honorific decree of 327 B.C., in which the Athenians honor a Kydonian by the name of Eurylochos, a member of a family that had served Athenian interests well in the past by having ransomed a number of Athenian prisoners from their Cretan captors. There are some hints of good relations between the two cities earlier in the century: a very fragmentary inscription, probably of the 350s, lays down the terms of a judicial agreement concerning private lawsuits between Athens and a Cretan city on the model of an earlier agreement between Athens and Knossos. The attribution to Kydonia is, however, not quite certain. At any rate, Athenian craftsmen had already been working at Kydonia for a generation or more by this point; a fine dedicatory base from Kydonia of the early 4th century shows unmistakable evidence of Athenian craftsmanship and letter-cutting.<sup>14</sup> None of this is particularly revealing.<sup>15</sup>

More important is the great stele recording honors for Eumaridas son of Pankles of Kydonia and his son Charmion. Eumaridas was the descendant of an old Kydonian family, already wealthy in the late 4th century B.C.; two of his ancestors were interred in a large funerary complex excavated at modern Chania.<sup>16</sup> The first decree for Eumaridas, dating to the archonship of Heliodoros (229/8 or 228/7), honors him for services to Athenian prisoners on Crete during the Demetrian war, and for the assistance he provided to Athenian ambassadors to Crete in the immediate aftermath of the city's liberation.<sup>17</sup> The second decree, dating to the archonship of Archelaos (212/1 or 211/0), provides for the erection of a bronze statue for Eumaridas in the shrine of Demos and the Charites, no trivial honor.<sup>18</sup> A third decree, dating to the archonship of Phanarchides (193/2), honors Eumaridas's son Charmion, who had stopped in at Piraeus while on his way to Delphi as a *theoros*, and took the opportunity to assure the *boule* of his family's continuing goodwill. As noted above, it is possible that Charmion represented the Kydonians in the negotiations that led to the passing of the decree considered here. Good relations between Athens and Kydonia persisted in later periods: a Kydonian *proxenos* is found dedicating an honorific statue at Athens in the 1st century B.C.<sup>19</sup> But by this time economic interaction, at least, between Athens and Crete had become generalized: Athenian coinage starts entering Crete in substantial quantities in the mid-2nd century, and in the late 2nd century a number of Cretan cities, including Kydonia, had begun minting imitation Athenian tetradrachms.<sup>20</sup>

14. On Eurylochos, see *IG II<sup>2</sup>* 399, with Bielman 1994, pp. 18–22. On *symbolai*, see *Agora XVI* 51. On Athenian craftsmen at Kydonia, see van Effenterre, Liesenfelt, and Papaoikononmou 1983, pp. 408–410, 416; for the dedicatory inscription, see also *CEG II* 846; *SEG XL* 775.

15. Nor can much be made of the mention of “Kydonians” in the fragmentary Athenian inscription *IG II<sup>2</sup>* 745 (early 3rd century).

16. Funerary inscriptions of Σωσίμα Παγκλέος and Παγκλήης Παγκλέος, perhaps siblings, and presumably ancestors of Eumaridas: see Markoulaki and Niniou-Kindeli 1990; *SEG XL* 776, nos. 2, 3. The names of the deceased are accompanied by the words *λεχῶ* and *ἀρειοφάτας* respectively, signifying “dead in childbirth” (Robert 1963, pp. 367–372) and “killed in war” (*BullÉp* 1991, p. 209, citing *I.Rhod. Peraia* 331, line 5, *ἀνδρὸς ἀρειοφάτου*).

17. *IG II<sup>2</sup>* 844; see Brulé 1978, pp. 17–24; Bielman 1994, pp. 119–125. An obsolete chronology is followed by Camp (2003, p. 277), who has been misled by de Souza (1999, p. 66).

18. For the ideological significance of this cult in the final decades of the 3rd century, see Habicht 1982, pp. 84–90.

19. *IG II<sup>2</sup>* 3882. For a contemporary funerary monument of a Kydonian at Athens, see Osborne 1988, p. 25, no. 128.

20. Le Rider [1968] 1999.

None of this makes Agora I 7602 any the less unexpected. If our reconstruction of the text is correct, relations between the cities turn out to have been closer than anyone could have imagined. Claims to *συγγένεια*, “kinship,” as part of the rhetoric of diplomatic interaction between Greek cities in the Hellenistic period, have been intensively studied in recent years.<sup>21</sup> The cities took mythological kinship seriously; it had serious diplomatic consequences. Significant effort and expense went into presenting a plausible claim, backed up by reputable literary and mythographical arguments.

The Athenians, as is well known, showed a certain reluctance to acknowledge relationships of this kind with other Greek cities.<sup>22</sup> The problem was Athenian autochthony, which did not sit easily with the idea of common mythological origins. It was “close relations and friendship” (*οἰκειότης καὶ φιλία*), rather than “kinship” (*συγγένεια*), that the Athenians professed in the mid-3rd century in relation to their traditional ally Argos; what Orestes created was an alliance, not a blood-link.<sup>23</sup> Naturally, colonies were a different matter. In the late 4th and late 3rd centuries, respectively, the Ionian settlements of Priene and Pharos found it helpful to claim to be Athenian colonies and therefore *syngeneis* to the Athenians.<sup>24</sup> However, this may well not have been the Athenians’ preferred terminology: in the late 4th century, the Athenians recognized Colophon’s status (*qua* Ionian) as an Athenian colony, but the term used is *οἰκειότης*, not *συγγένεια*.<sup>25</sup> Even in the case of mother-city and colony, the Athenians thought in terms of “close relations” rather than “kinship.” So far as we knew before the publication of our text, the only Greeks of whom the Athenians were prepared to use the term *συγγενεῖς* were the inhabitants of Lemnos in the late 1st century B.C., and they were of course Athenian settlers.<sup>26</sup>

If our restoration of lines 10–11 of the text is correct, it emerges that the Athenians were willing to grant this status to the Kydonians, an Aiginetan colony of Dorian Crete: “the Kydonians, being friends and kinsmen (*συγγενεῖς*) of the Athenian *demos*.” This is remarkable and unexpected. Here is the first firm attestation of mutually accepted *συγγένεια* between Athens and a non-Ionian city; indeed, the first case of kinship with Athens based on something other than status as a colony. The practical diplomatic

21. See especially Curty 1995; Jones 1999; Lücke 2000; Curty 2001; Erskine 2002; Curty 2005 (decisive response to Lücke’s criticisms).

22. Noted by Jones (1999, pp. 44, 60). The role played by kinship relations in the 5th-century Athenian empire is somewhat different, and has no bearing on the situation in the Hellenistic period: see Alty 1982; Curty 1994; Hornblower 1996, p. 73.

23. *IG II<sup>2</sup> 774b*, lines 4–5; cf. Aesch. *Eum.* 289–291, 669–673, 762–774. The distinction between *οἰκειότης* and *συγγένεια* remains controversial: see, e.g., Curty 1999, pp. 184–194. Admittedly, in our text *συγγενεῖς* (line 10) evidently

corresponds to *οἰκειότητα* (line 15); but the near total absence of the term *συγγένεια* from other Athenian texts can hardly be coincidental.

24. *I.Priene* 5, lines 5–6: τῆς ἐξ ἀρχῆς συγγενείας καὶ φιλίας ἡμῶν ὑπαρχούσης πρὸς αὐτούς; for the contemporary Athenian decrees concerning Priene, see Wilhelm 1974, pp. 782–791. In the late 2nd century B.C., Priene was still claiming *οἰκειότης* with Athens as her colony: *I.Priene* 109, lines 51–52. For Pharos, the most recent edition of inscriptions is Derow 1991. We exclude from consideration Curty 1995, pp. 204–205, doc. 81 (Kibyra), on grounds of date.

25. *IG II<sup>2</sup> 456*, lines 14–15: ἄποικοι ὄντες τοῦ δή[μου διαφυλάττουσιν τὴν οἰκ]λειότητα τῆμ πρὸς τὸν δή[μον]. The Milesians may have claimed *οἰκειότης* with Athens at around the same time: *IG II<sup>2</sup> 1129*, lines 9–10 (restoring οἰκ[ειότητα]).

26. *SEG XLVII* 143, decree 1, line 62. Note, however, that there is literary evidence for *syngeneia* between Athens and Phokis in the 2nd century B.C.: Suda, s.v. Πολέμων (Π 1888): ἔγραψε . . . Κτίσεις πᾶν ἐν Φωκίδι πόλεων καὶ περὶ τῆς πρὸς Ἀθηναίους συγγενείας αὐτῶν. See Perrin-Saminadayar, forthcoming.

reasons that the Kydonians may have had for sending their embassy to Athens, and which Athenians may have had for accepting the Kydonians' offer, are unknown.<sup>27</sup> It is worth noting, however, that Athens was keen to improve her relations with the cities of Crete in the late 3rd and early 2nd centuries B.C., no doubt largely as a consequence of Cretan piracy, from which Athens was not immune.

A fragmentary inscription of the early 2nd century B.C., inscribed at Athens, carries the remains of three related documents in Cretan dialect. The first is a rather complex decree in which the Cretan city concerned appears to make a commitment not to carry out pillaging raids on Attica, with penalties laid down for contraventions; the decree includes a grant of proxeny and *euergesia* to two Athenians, Lysikles and Thrasippos son of Kallias, presumably Athenian ambassadors. Below this decree is inscribed a narrative text of some kind (an extract from a letter?), describing the ransoming of a group of Athenian ambassadors, most likely Lysikles and Thrasippos themselves, who had been imprisoned by bandits in the Cretan mountains; of a third text, possibly another decree, only a few letters survive.<sup>28</sup> Most interesting for our purposes is an isolated clause in lines 4–5, where it is very tempting to restore τᾶς πόλιος πορτ[ι] τὰν πόλιν οἰκελ[ιότατα], signifying an especially close connection between Athens and this particular Cretan city. Unfortunately, the city concerned cannot be determined with certainty. The text has been restored to give a reference to the part of western Crete known as Oreia, but the restoration is very insecure; moreover, there are strong dialectal reasons to attribute the decree to a city of central Crete.<sup>29</sup>

Practical politics aside, it is worth considering what might have been the mythological or historical links by which the Kydonians persuaded the Athenians to acknowledge this unlikely kinship. Parallel cases do not provide much assistance. In the last years of the 3rd century B.C., Kydonia, along with a number of other Cretan cities, sent a positive reply to the Teians' request to have their country recognized as sacred and inviolable. The Kydonians made repeated reference to their ancestral kinship with the Teians, a relationship confirmed by, but not consisting in, their common respect for the god Dionysos.<sup>30</sup> Although there is no direct evidence as to the nature of the Kydonians' kinship with Teos, the sheer number of (Dorian) Cretan cities that claimed kinship with (Ionian) Teos strongly suggests that, unlike the Athenian case, the link was not specific to Kydonia, but was common to all the cities of Crete.<sup>31</sup>

27. As we have seen, the precise date of the document cannot be determined, although it certainly dates to the last quarter of the 3rd century B.C. For the internal history of Crete in this period, see Chaniotis 1996, pp. 35–41. There is no reason to connect our decree to any particular wave of hostilities in Crete. For Athens' policy of diplomatic neutrality after 229, see Habicht 1997, pp. 185–193.

28. *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1130; *IC* II xxx 3; Bielman

1994, pp. 200–202. Thrasippos son of Kallias was almost certainly a native of the deme Gargettos (*LGPV* II, s.v. Θράσιππος 10–16). The patronym and deme of Lysikles are unknown.

29. Oreia: lines 13–14, ἐν τᾷ Ὀρει[α] (thus Bielman 1994, p. 200; Sekunda 2000, p. 337, n. 7; etc.). But we could equally well have ἐν τᾷ ὄρει[νᾷ], “in the mountains” (thus Robert and Robert 1983, p. 104, n. 46). Dialect: see, e.g., Brixhe 1991, pp. 67 (iv), 112–115

(acc. pl. in -vς), 122–123 (πορτί). The question could profitably be reexamined.

30. *IC* II x 2, lines 16–18: ἀποκρίνασθαι Τηίοις φίλοις καὶ οἰκεῖ[οις] ἔωσιν δι]ότι τὸν Διόνυσον καὶ αὐτοὶ σεβόμεθα καὶ τὸν Τηίω[ν] δᾶμον] συγγενέα ὄντα ἀσπαζόμεθα. . . . For the Kydonian cult of Dionysos, compare the bust of Dionysos on the obverse of Kydonian staters of the early 2nd century B.C. (Stefanakis 2000, p. 80, fig. 2).

31. Curty 1995, pp. 104–106.

Conceivably the crucial factor in our case is the supposed original foundation of Kydonia by a group of Samian rebels in ca. 524 B.C., according to Herodotos. For five years they prospered; in the sixth year after their arrival, the Aiginetans defeated them in a sea battle and enslaved the remaining Samian inhabitants of Kydonia. Herodotos adds that it was the Samians who were responsible for the construction of the shrines of Kydonia, including the Temple of Diktynna, which were visible in his own day.<sup>32</sup> The historical basis of this story cannot be proven, as there is no independent evidence at any period of Samian culture, religious or otherwise, in Kydonia.<sup>33</sup> More pertinently, the Aiginetan maltreatment and enslavement of the putative Samian colonizers of Kydonia do not form the most obvious basis for claims of ancestral friendship and kinship between Kydonians and Ionians.

More generally, we suspect that any attempt to explain the kinship between Athens and Kydonia in purely historical terms is misguided. We prefer to think in terms of mythological origins. Two different versions of the legendary origins of Kydonia may concern us in particular. According to Pausanias, the Cretans themselves say that Kydonia was named after the hero Kydon, son of Hermes and Akakallis, daughter of Minos; this was also the version provided by the Milesian historian Alexander Polyhistor in his *Kretika*, with the addition that Akakallis bore Kydon to Hermes, and Naxos to Apollo.<sup>34</sup> More important is a variant of this tradition, without attribution, preserved in Stephanos of Byzantium's *Ethnika*: "Kydonia, a city in Crete, formerly known as Apollonia; derived from Kydon, son of Apollo and Akakallis, daughter of Minos."<sup>35</sup>

The importance of Apollo, father of Kydon, in Kydonian cult is well attested in the Late Classical and Hellenistic periods. The earliest evidence comes from a Kydonian public dedication to Apollo, Artemis, and Leto of the early 4th century B.C. A Kydonian by the name of Ikadion appears in a list of contributors to the Delphic sanctuary in 360 B.C.; as we have seen, Charmion was on a sacred embassy to Delphi when he visited Athens in late summer 193.<sup>36</sup> In his *Hymn to Artemis*, Kallimachos has the young goddess ask the Cyclopes to make "for me too a Kydonian bow and arrows, and a hollow quiver for the shafts; for I am a child of Leto, no less than Apollo" (Kallim. *Hymn* 3.81–83); the implication is that the archer Apollo had a particular association with Kydonia. We might conjecture that the nude male archer who appears on the earliest Hellenistic coinage of Kydonia is to be identified with Apollo; at any rate, on two Kydonian coin types of the 2nd century B.C., we find a bust of Apollo with a quiver clearly visible over his shoulder.<sup>37</sup>

32. Hdt. 3.44.1; 3.59.

33. For an overview of Kydonian cults, see Sporn 2002, pp. 268–281.

34. Paus. 8.53.4; Alexander Polyhistor, *FGrH* 273 F30. For Akakallis and her children, see now Sourvinou-Inwood 2005, pp. 291–297.

35. Steph. Byz., s.v. Kydonia: Κυδωνία, πόλις Κρήτης, ἢ πρότερον Ἀπολλωνία, ἀπὸ Κύδωνος τοῦ Ἀπόλλωνος καὶ Ἀκακαλλίδος τῆς Μίνω θυγατρὸς;

Schol. Hom. *Od.* 19.176: Κύδωνες οἱ αὐτόχθονες Κρήτες, ἀπὸ Κύδωνος τοῦ Ἀπόλλωνος. There is no reason to give any credence to Stephanos's statement that Kydonia itself was previously called Apollonia; it is possible that confusion has arisen from the *sympoliteia*, or, more likely, *isopoliteia*, which Kydonia had enjoyed with the north Cretan city of Apollonia before destroying it in 171 (Polyb. 28.14, with Chaniotis 1996,

pp. 285–287). For Kydonian "autochthony," see Sekunda 2000, pp. 330–332.

36. Dedication: *CEG* II 846. Ikadion: *CID* II 4, col. III, lines 58–59. Charmion: *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 844. See further Sporn 2002, pp. 269–270.

37. Archer: Svoronos 1890, pp. 99–103; Le Rider 1966, p. 194 (ca. 320–280/70 B.C.). Apollo with quiver: Svoronos 1890, p. 107, nos. 59, 60.

In one version, then, of the mythological ancestry of Kydonia, the city's forefathers were the eponymous Kydon and his father, Apollo. This is important because the Athenians, too, had a son of Apollo in their family tree: Ion, son of Apollo by Kreousa, the daughter of Erechtheus. Before the 5th century, Ion had generally been regarded as the son of the Athenian Kreousa and the Peloponnesian Xouthos, son of Hellen. The Athenians knew better. It was Euripides, in his *Ion*, who first announced that Ion was the son not of Xouthos but of the god Apollo. Ion thereby becomes an unambiguously Athenian figure: the Ionian race was descended on the one side from the god Apollo, and on the other from the earthborn Athenians. This variant did not, to all appearances, ever become the standard version of Ion's parentage, but remained an Athenian vanity. All the more reason, then, for a foreign state attempting to win Athenian favor to invoke it in kinship negotiations.<sup>38</sup>

With the above points in mind, we tentatively propose that the mythological link invoked by the Kydonians, and accepted by the Athenians as a valid proof of συγγένεια, was the common parentage of Kydon and Ion, the eponymous hero of Kydonia and the Athenian *archegetes* of the Ionians. The Athenians and Kydonians would thus have enjoyed a common divine ancestry, ἀπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ τὴν ἀρχὴν τῆς συγγενείας εἰληφότες, as the Milesians say of their kinship with the Cretans (also through Apollo, as it happens).<sup>39</sup>

All this is necessarily speculative. The crucial and surprising point is that the Athenians were prepared to accept the Kydonians' offer of a shared mythological parentage. As we have suggested above, the root cause was probably the desire to improve their relations with a Cretan maritime state potentially able to prevent piratical raids on the Attic coast. The striking point from our perspective is that the two states chose to frame their alliance in terms of kinship relations. Andrew Erskine has argued that kinship diplomacy in the Hellenistic period was most important for precisely those states that did not enjoy a history of regular diplomatic contact with one another: "Where there is regular and frequent contact between two states, there is not so much need to ground an appeal in kinship terms, because a framework already exists. But paradoxically the less familiarity there is, the more likely we are to find kinship arguments."<sup>40</sup> The richness of the common Greek mythological tradition was such that, with a little effort, almost any given state could be argued to be the relative of almost any other. Even if two states such as Athens and Kydonia had little to show in the way of real historical relations, as long as the political will was present, one could always locate a mythological variant that permitted the two states to claim an ancient consanguinity. Therein lay the advantage of kinship diplomacy.

38. Parker 1987, pp. 205–207. For Euripides' genealogy, see now Zacharia 2003, pp. 44–55. Recall that Hermokles of Chios invoked Ion in arguing for ancestral οἰκειότης between Chios and Delphi: see *FdD* III.3 224, line 5.

39. *Milet* I.3 37, lines 4–5, through Apollo Delphinios. Cf., e.g., *IG IX* 1<sup>2</sup> 4

1582 (Magnesia and Same), lines 13–14: τὰς οἰκειότατος τὰς ὑπαρχούσας Μαγνήτοις ποτὶ Κεφαλλᾶνας | κατὰ τὰν συγγένειαν τὰμ Μάγνητος καὶ Κεφάλου τοῦ Δηΐονος. Magnes and Deion were the sons of Aeolos.

40. Erskine 2002, p. 110.

## REFERENCES

- Agora = The Athenian Agora: Results of Excavations Conducted by the American School of Classical Studies at Athens*, Princeton  
 XV = B. D. Meritt and J. S. Traill, *Inscriptions: The Athenian Councillors*, 1974.  
 XVI = A. G. Woodhead, *Inscriptions: The Decrees*, 1997.  
 XIX = G. V. Lalonde, M. K. Langdon, and M. B. Walbank, *Inscriptions: Horoi, Poletai Records, Leases of Public Land*, 1991.
- Alty, J. 1982. "Dorians and Ionians," *JHS* 102, pp. 1–14.
- Bielman, A. 1994. *Retour à la liberté: Libération et sauvetage des prisonniers en Grèce ancienne: Recueil d'inscriptions honorant des sauveteurs et analyse critique*, Lausanne.
- Brixhe, C., ed. 1991. *Sur la Crète antique: Histoire, écritures, langues*, Nancy.
- Brulé, P. 1978. *La piraterie crétoise hellénistique*, Paris.
- Camp, J. McK., II. 2003. "Excavations in the Athenian Agora: 1998–2001," *Hesperia* 72, pp. 241–280.
- CEG II = P. A. Hansen, ed., *Carmina Epigraphica Graeca II: Saeculi IV a. Chr. n.*, Berlin 1989.
- Chaniotis, A. 1996. *Die Verträge zwischen kretischen Poleis in der hellenistischen Zeit* (Heidelberger althistorische Beiträge und epigraphische Studien 24), Stuttgart.
- CID = *Corpus des inscriptions de Delphes*, Paris 1977–.
- Curty, O. 1994. "La notion de la parenté entre cités chez Thucydide," *MusHelv* 51, pp. 193–197.
- . 1995. *Les parentés légendaires entre cités grecques: Catalogue raisonné des inscriptions contentant le terme syngeneia et analyse critique*, Geneva.
- . 1999. "La parenté légendaire à l'époque hellénistique: Précisions méthodologiques," *Kernos* 12, pp. 167–194.
- . 2001. "Les parentés entre cités chez Polybe, Strabon, Plutarque, et Pausanias," in *Origines Gentium* (Ausonius: Publications Etudes 7), ed. V. Fromentin and S. Gotteland, Bordeaux, pp. 49–56.
- . 2005. "Un usage fort controversé: La parenté dans le langage diplomatique de l'époque hellénistique," *Ancient Society* 35, pp. 101–117.
- Derow, P. 1991. "Pharos and Rome," *ZPE* 88, pp. 261–270.
- de Souza, P. 1999. *Piracy in the Graeco-Roman World*, Cambridge.
- Dow, S. 1985. "Cult of the Hero Doctor," *BASP* 22, pp. 33–47.
- Erickson, B. 2005. "Archaeology of Empire: Athens and Crete in the Fifth Century B.C.," *AJA* 109, pp. 619–663.
- Erskine, A. 2002. "O Brother, Where Art Thou? Tales of Kinship and Diplomacy," in *The Hellenistic World: New Perspectives*, ed. D. Ogden, London, pp. 97–115.
- Fantasia, U. 2003. *Tucidide: La guerra del Peloponneso, libro II*, Pisa.
- FdD III.3 = G. Daux, *Epigraphie: Inscriptions depuis le trésor des Athéniens jusqu'aux bases de Gélon (FdD III.3)*, Paris 1943.
- Figueira, T. J. 1988. "Four Notes on the Aiginetans in Exile," *Athenaeum* 66, pp. 523–551.
- Habicht, C. 1982. *Studien zur Geschichte Athens in hellenistischer Zeit*, Göttingen.
- . 1997. *Athens from Alexander to Antony*, trans. D. L. Schneider, Cambridge, Mass.
- Henry, A. S. 1977. *The Prescripts of Athenian Decrees (Mnemosyne Suppl. 49)*, Leiden.
- Hornblower, S. 1991. *A Commentary on Thucydides 1: Books I–III*, Oxford.
- . 1996. *A Commentary on Thucydides 2: Books IV–V.24*, Oxford.
- I.Magn. = O. Kern, ed., *Die Inschriften von Magnesia am Maeander*, Berlin 1900.
- I.Milet = *Inschriften von Milet (Milet VI)*, Berlin 1997–2006.
- I.Priene = F. Hiller von Gaertringen, *Inschriften von Priene*, Berlin 1906.
- I.Rhod. Peraia = W. Blumel, ed., *Die Inschriften der Rhodischen Peraia*, Bonn 1991.
- Jeffery, L. H. 1990. *The Local Scripts of Archaic Greece: A Study of the Origin of the Greek Alphabet and Its Development*, rev. ed., with supplement by A. W. Johnston, Oxford.
- Jones, C. P. 1999. *Kinship Diplomacy in the Ancient World* (Revealing Antiquity 12), Cambridge, Mass.
- Le Rider, G. 1966. *Monnaies crétoises du V<sup>e</sup> au I<sup>er</sup> siècle av. J.-C.*, Paris.
- . [1968] 1999. "Un groupe de monnaies crétoises à types athéniens," in *Humanisme actif: Mélanges d'art et de littérature offerts à Julien Cain*, Paris, pp. 313–335, repr. in *Études d'histoire monétaire et financière du monde grec: Écrits 1958–1998* 1, ed. E. Papaefthymiou, F. de Calataj, and F. Queyrel, Athens, pp. 297–323.
- LGPN II = M. J. Osborne and S. G. Byrne, *A Lexicon of Greek Personal Names II: Attica*, Oxford 1994.
- Lücke, S. 2000. *Syngeneia: Epigraphisch-historische Studien zu einem Phänomen der antiken griechischen Diplomatie*, Frankfurt.
- Markoulaki, S., and V. Niniou-Kindeli. 1990. "Ελληνιστικός λαξευτός τάφος Χανίων," *ArchDelt* 37, A' [1982], pp. 7–119.
- Mattingly, H. B. 1974. "The Protected Fund in the Athenian Coinage Decree (ATL D14, par. 7f)," *AJP* 95, pp. 280–285.
- Meisterhans, K. 1900. *Grammatik der attischen Inschriften*, 3rd ed., rev. by E. Schwyzer, Berlin.
- Meritt, B. D. 1977. "Athenian Archons 347/6–48/7 B.C.," *Historia* 26, pp. 161–191.
- Mikrogiannakes, E. 1971. "Η τύχη τῶν ὑπὸ τῶν Ἀθηναίων ἐξοικισθέντων Αἰγυνητῶν," *CretChron* 23, pp. 395–424.
- Milet I.3 = G. Kawerau and A. Rehm, *Das Delphinion in Milet*, Berlin 1914.
- Morgan, J. D. 1996. "The Calendar and the Chronology of Athens," *AJA* 100, p. 395 (abstract).
- Osborne, M. J. 1981. *Naturalization in Athens 1: A Corpus of Athenian Decrees Granting Citizenship*, Brussels.
- . 1988. "Attic Epitaphs: A Supplement," *Ancient Society* 19, pp. 5–60.
- . 2003. "Shadowland: Athens under Antigonos Gonatas and His

- Successor," in *The Macedonians in Athens, 322–229 B.C. Proceedings of an International Conference Held at the University of Athens, May 24–26, 2001*, ed. O. Palagia and S. V. Tracy, Oxford, pp. 67–75.
- Parker, R. 1987. "Myths of Early Athens," in *Interpretations of Greek Mythology*, ed. J. Bremmer, London, pp. 187–214.
- Perrin-Saminadayar, E. Forthcoming. "Une inscription d'Osios Loukas, l'alliance d'Athènes et de Stiris, et l'ἁποδοχή des amis et alliés du peuple," in *Attica Epigraphica: A Symposium in Honour of Christian Habicht*, ed. N. Papazarkadas and A. A. Themis, Athens.
- Pritchett, W. K., and O. Neugebauer. 1947. *The Calendars of Athens*, Cambridge, Mass.
- Rhodes, P. J. 1972. *The Athenian Boule*, Oxford.
- Rhodes, P. J., and R. Osborne, eds. 2003. *Greek Historical Inscriptions: 404–323 B.C.*, Oxford.
- Robert, L. 1963. *Noms indigènes dans l'Asie Mineure gréco-romaine 1* (Bibliothèque archéologique et historique de l'Institut français d'archéologie d'Istanbul 13), Paris.
- Robert, L., and J. Robert. 1983. *Fouilles d'Amyzon en Carie I: Exploration, histoire, monnaies, et inscriptions*, Paris.
- Sekunda, N. V. 2000. "Land-Use, Ethnicity, and Federalism in West Crete," in *Alternatives to Athens: Varieties of Political Organization and Community in Ancient Greece*, ed. R. Brock and S. Hodkinson, Oxford, pp. 327–348.
- Sourvinou-Inwood, C. 2005. *Hylas, the Nymphs, Dionysos, and Others: Myth, Ritual, Ethnicity* (*SkrAth* 8°, 19), Stockholm.
- Sporn, K. 2002. *Heiligtümer und Kulte Kretas in klassischer und hellenistischer Zeit* (Studien zur antiken Heiligtümer 3), Heidelberg.
- Stefanakis, M. I. 1999. "The Introduction of Monetary Economy and the Beginning of Local Minting in Crete," in *From Minoan Farmers to Roman Traders: Sidelights on the Economy of Ancient Crete*, ed. A. Chaniotis, Stuttgart, pp. 247–268.
- . 2000. "Kydon the Oikist or Zeus Cretagenes Kynotraphes? The Problem of Interpreting Cretan Coin Types," *Eulimene* 1, pp. 79–90.
- Svoronos, J.-N. 1890. *Numismatique de la Crète ancienne, accompagnée de l'histoire, la géographie, et la mythologie de l'île*, Macon.
- Tracy, S. V. 1990. *Attic Letter-Cutters of 229 to 86 B.C.* (Hellenistic Culture and Society 6), Berkeley.
- . 1996. "Athenian Letter-Cutters and Lettering on Stone in 5th to 1st Centuries B.C.," in *Greek Letters: From Tablets to Pixels*, ed. M. S. Macrakis, New Castle, Del., pp. 43–53.
- van Effenterre, H. 1948. *La Crète et le monde grec de Platon à Polybe*, Paris.
- van Effenterre, H., A.-M. Liesenfelt, and I. Papaoikonomou. 1983. "Base inscrite de Kydonia," *BCH* 107, pp. 405–419.
- Wilhelm, A. 1974. *Akademieschriften zur griechischen Inschriftenkunde 1: Neue Beiträge zur griechischen Inschriftenkunde Attische Urkunden*, Leipzig.
- Zacharia, K. 2003. *Converging Truths: Euripides' Ion and the Athenian Quest for Self-Definition*, Leiden.

### *Nikolaos Papazarkadas*

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, BERKELEY  
DEPARTMENT OF CLASSICS  
7233 DWINELLE HALL  
BERKELEY, CALIFORNIA 94720-2520  
papazarkadas@berkeley.edu

### *Peter Thonemann*

OXFORD UNIVERSITY  
WADHAM COLLEGE  
PARKS ROAD  
OXFORD OX1 3PN  
UNITED KINGDOM  
peter.thonemann@wadh.ox.ac.uk

