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. 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

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 archaeologist 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


| 20. [δήμοι ἀποκρίνασθαι τῇ πόλει τῇ Κυδωνίας] C: epsilon for kappa is certain | 20. πο[· · ·] C | 21. ὁ δήμος ο Ἀθηναίοι [τῆς] C | 22. [· -] C

Critical Notes


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 (Νικάνωρ [ρ], δήμος [ου], τῶι [τῶι]). It has, however, been observed that this particular letter-cutter (the "Cutter of IG II² 1706": see below) habitually observed the principle of syllabification in his line divisions. 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 Δ[metrias], when Nikano[r, son of . . . , of the deme . . . ], was secretary; [decrees] of the dem[oi]; on the final day of the month Boedromion, on
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.). 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 II² 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 II² 6382) and with the anonymous secretary 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 IGII² 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. 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 (Niketes) 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 Ὁσδρομιῶνος ἐνηί καὶ νέαι, Boedromion (III) ultimo, already known as an assembly day from IG II² 700 (archon Thymochares, 257/6). 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 [τετάρτης] in line 2; [τετάρτει] or [πέµμπτει] 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 Thrasyphon to 221/0 on the basis of Ι.Μαγν. 16.11–16. If, however, Thrasyphon 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.


5. For the archon list for this period, see most recently Osborne 2003, pp. 73–74.
the second that only one of them was.\(^6\) (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 (τριακοστέι 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.\(^7\) (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 poleis 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\(^2\) 833, line 7; 839, line 14; 847, line 9; *Agora* XV 128, line 7; etc.\(^8\) This is a non-proboulæmatic decree: compare lines 19–20, [δεδόχθαι τῶι δήµωι].

**Lines 9–10:** [- - συγγενεῖς] τοῦ δήµου τι [- - 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 και φίλοι, φίλοι και ἀστυγείτονες, etc.), one of the most common being “friendship and kinship”: so I.Magn. 33 (Gonnoi), lines 4–5: ἐπειδὴ Μάγνητες οἱ ἐπὶ Μαιάνδρῳ φίλοι ὀντες και συγγενεῖς Γοννέων; I.Magn. 46 (Epidamnos), lines 3–4: συγγενεῖς ὀντες και φίλοι τῶν Ἑπιδαμνίων; I.Magn. 61 (Antioch in Persis), lines 11–12: συγγενεῖς ὀντες και φίλοι τοῦ δήµου. Here we certainly have ἐπειδὴ Κυδωνιᾶς τοῦ δήµου τοῦ Ἀθηναίον ὀντες και συγγενεῖς τοῦ δήµου. The Athenian decree recognizing Magnesian asylia (I.Magn. 37, lines 6–8) begins with the phrase ἐπειδὴ Μάγνητες οἱ ἐπὶ Μαιάνδρῳ οἰκεῖοι και φίλοι τοῦ δήµου τοῦ Λατεινίων ὀντες; hence in lines 10–11 of our inscription we restore τοῦ δήµου τοῦ Λατεινιών.

---

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 conceivable 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 Pyanopion (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.

Lines 11–12: Camp’s [ἐπεστάλκασιν is unsatisfactory. The verb requires an accusative of the thing sent and, usually, a prepositional phrase πρὸς + accusative of the intended recipient (IG II² 687, line 27: πρέσβεις ἡμῶν; IG II² 680, lines 14–15: ἐπεστάλκασι πρὸς τὸν δῆμον πρεσβεῖον; I.Magn. 37, line 11; etc.). There is no space here to restore the Kydonian embassy (πρέσβεις, πρεσβεῖον), and the dative indirect object (τῇ βουλῇ) is distressing. Grammatically preferable would be [ἐπεστάλκασιν or [ἀπηγγέλκασιν, both of which do take the dative. The difficulty with ἐπηγγέλλειν is again the absence of any mention of an embassy: one would expect, for example, Κυδωνιατῶν οἱ πρέσβεις. Hence we tentatively prefer [ἐπεστάλκασιν. For the dative, compare, for example, IG II² 553 (Osborne 1981, D44), lines 6–7: καὶ τούτα προτερόττυ ἐὰν ἐπεστειλεῖ ἡμῖν, like our text, is non-probouleumatic (line 10: τὸν δῆμον ἀπεστάλκασιν). The grammatical structure of what follows is unclear.

In lines 11–12, the restoration καὶ 
τῶι δήμωι is certain: compare lines 3, 8, 10, 19–21. Envoys and messengers routinely presented themselves to both boule and assembly. Compare IG II² 486 (Osborne 1981, D45), in which the monarch (Demetrios Poliorcetes) addresses himself to both boule and demos (line 12: ἐπιστείλει τεί [βουλεὶ καὶ τῶι δήμωι], while the decree itself, like our text, is non-probouleumatic (line 10: ἐδοξεῖ τῶι [δήμωι]). Quite probably the boule issued an open probouleuma in both cases.⁹

Lines 12–13: The evocation of old benefactions (ἐυεργεσίαι) as proof of friendship is common: for example, I.Magn. 45, lines 18–22, ἐμφανιζόντων τῶι πρεσβευτῶι . . . τάυς ἐυεργεσίας τὰς προγεγενεμένας ὑπὸ τῶν προγόνων αὐτῶν, and frequently in the Magnesia dossier. The use of πρόσκειν is less common, but compare I.Milet 1052, lines 27–32: τοὺς δὲ οἰρέθηντας [sc. πρεσβευτάς] ὀρφικομένους ἀπολογίσασθαι . . . περὶ τῶν ὑπὸ τοῦ δήμου πεπραγμένων εἰς αὐτοῦς ἐυεργεσίαν. Φιλανθρώπων is another possibility, though perhaps a little long for the space; for its occurrence with πρόσκειν, see IG II² 844, lines 59–60: ὀπως ἄν ων ἐμ παντὶ καυροὶ τὰ φιλάνθρωπα πρὸς τοὺς ἄξοις τρίτητοι ἔργον οἰκείον.


Lines 14–15: For the omission of the accusative of person after παρακαλέων, compare, for example, IG II² 1008, lines 62–63: προαιρούμενοι στήσασι αὐτοῦ [ἐκ]άνον παρακαλοῦσιν ἐπιχωρίοις[σι]αι ἐαυτοῦς τόσον εἰς τῆν ἄναθεσιν (similarly IG II² 1011, line 43). The Athenians are being
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 διαφυλάσσειν and συντηρεῖν. For the sense, compare *Milet* I.3 138, lines 36–37: παρακαλεῖν αὐτὸν [sc. τὸν Ὀμπίν] τὴν τε εὐνοίαν καὶ τὴν φιλίαν διαφυλάσσειν πρὸς τὴν πόλιν τὴν ἑμετέραν τὸν ἀλλόμος; *Syll.* 3 426, lines 35–37: παρακαλούσκαν τὸν δήμον τὴν Τηδίου εἰς [τε] τὸν λοιπὸν χρόνον διαφυλάσσειν τὴν φιλίαν τὴν [ὑπ]άρχουσαν ταῖς πόλεσι πρὸς ἀλλήλους. For the verb συντηρεῖν in this context, compare, for example, *Milet* I.3 152a, lines 16–17: παρακαλέσσει Μίλασιος τῶν ταῖς συγγένειαν καὶ φιλίαν καὶ εὐνοίαν συντηρεῖν ταῖς πλέον αὔξειν; *SEG* IV 600, lines 5–8: ὁποίαν ὁν [κοινοκολουθιόντες] τοῖς ὀπί· αὐτῶν παρακαλοῦμε[νοις] . . . τῶν ποτί [Τηδίος συγγένειες] φαινόµεθα συντηρεῖτοντες; *IG* VII 4139, lines 14–15: [κ]αθήκει Θεοβρέσσαν συντηρεῖν την τε πρὸς τὴν [π]όλιν τῶν Ακραιφιείων φιλίαν καὶ συγγένειαν. . . . For the simple συντηρεῖν, compare *I.Magn.* 37, line 22.

*Line 15–17:* We understand the ὁποίος clause to be dependent on the preceding παρακαλοῦσκαν 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 ([ἀμφοτέραις] ταῖς πόλεσι, ταῖς πόλεσι πρὸς ἀλλήλους) in perpetuity (τὸν ἀλλόμον, εἰς τὸν ἀπαντά/λοιπὸν χρόνον).”

*Lines 17–19:* Angelos Chaniotis has proposed to us the restoration δ[ε]λ[έ]χ[θ]ήσασαν. We understand the structure here to be [περὶ ὅν (name)]ν καὶ οἱ παῖ[δ]ες αὐτοῦ ?Χιδωνιάται δ[ε]λ[έ]χ[θ]ήσαν περὶ [τ]ῆς συγγενείας, ἀγαθῆι τῆς . . . The repeated περὶ is unproblematic: compare, for example, *IG* II 337, περὶ ὅν ἐλέγουσαν οἱ Κιτιεῖς περὶ τῆς ἱδρύσεως τῆς Ἀφροδίτης τοῦ ἱεροῦ, ἐνέψισθαι . . . 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.* 3 683, lines 3–8: προσβεβεβηκόν παραγεγομένον παρὰ τὰς πόλις Ι τῶι Μεσσανίωι καὶ τὰ γρόμματα ἀποδόντον ἐν ὧι διαφερόθηκε ἀνανεώσασμον τῶν ὑπάρχοσαν συγγενείας καὶ[ὲ] φιλίας; *SEG* II 37, line 22: ὁποίαν οἱ προσβεβεβηκόν περὶ τῆς Μίλησιος ἐνεργησάμενον . . . διαλεγέντων δὲ κ[αὶ τ]όμῳ προσβεβεβηκόν ἀκολ[ο][ῦ]θος τοῖς γεγραμμένοις. It is just conceivable that the individual concerned is [Χωρίων], son of Εὐμαρίδας, 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 name 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 δ[ε]λ[έ]χ[θ]ήσασαν, that is, ὁποῖος ἡμᾶς or τῶν δήμων. The absence of patronym and (possibly) ethnic for the lead ambassador is unproblematic: compare, for example, *IG* II 844, where the honorand is introduced by name alone (line 4, ἐπειδὴ Εὐμαρίδας πρώτερον τε) with his patronym and ethnic recorded only later (line 23, ἐπαινέσαι Εὐμαρίδον Πανκλέως Κυδωνιάτην). *Pare* 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). In line 21, the nominative ὁ δήμος must be part of a subordinate clause,
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: ἀποκριθεὶς ὑπάρχειν ὅτι ὁ [δῆ]µμος ὁ Ἀθηναῖων ἐπαίνεις Σκάρτοις καὶ Παύρισάδην.

Lines 21–22: In line 21, we had considered restoring [ὅτι ἡ βουλή καὶ] ὁ δῆµος ὁ Ἀθηναῖων], 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 μεµνηµμένος. Compare I.Magn. 38, lines 29–32: διὸ ἀ πόλις μεµναµένα τὰς τε συγγενείας καὶ φιλίας . . . ὀποδέχεται τὰς θυσίας. I.Magn. 53, lines 62–64: εἰς τὸ λο[ι]πὸν δὲ ὁ δῆµος μεµνηµμένος τῶν ἰ προὔπαρχοντων αὐτῶι πρὸς Μάγνητας οἰκείων καὶ φιλεθέρων; I.C 1 xiv 1, lines 26–27: μεµναµένοι τὰς προὔπαρχουσας ταῖς πόλεσι συγγενείας. For the reversal of subject and verb after ὅτι, compare I.Magn. 87, lines 14–15: ἀποκρίνασθαι Μάγνησιν ὅτι ὀποδέχεται ὁ δῆµος τὰ ἐπηγγελµέλινα.

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). 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. 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. At any

11. A very speculative reconstruction of the internal Cretan politics underlying this conflict is found in Sekunda 2000, pp. 327–337.
13. On Aiginetan exiles, see Mikrogianiakas 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. None of this is particularly revealing.

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. 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. 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. 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. 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.

14. On Eurylochos, see IG II² 399, with Bielman 1994, pp. 18–22. On symbolai, see Agora XVI 51. On Athenian craftsmen at Kydonia, see van Effenterre, Liesenfelt, and Papatousou 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 II² 745 (early 3rd century).

16. Funerary inscriptions of Σωσίσσα Παγκλέος and Παγκλέης Παγκλέος, perhaps siblings, and presumably ancestors of Eumaridas: see Markoula and Niniou-Kindeli 1990; SEG XL 776, nos. 2, 3. The names of the deceased are accompanied by the words λεχώ and ἀρειοφάτας respectively, signifying “dead in childbirth” (Robert 1963, pp. 367–372) and “killed in war” (BullÉp 1991, p. 209, citing J.Rhod. Peraita 331, line 5, ἀνδρός ἄρειοφάτου).

17. IG II² 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 II² 3882. For a contemporary funerary monument of a Kydonian at Athens, see Osborne 1988, p. 25, no. 128.

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. 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. 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. 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 συγγενεῖοι to the Athenians. However, this may well not have been the Athenians’ preferred terminology: in the late 4th century, the Athenians recognized Colophon’s status (qua Ionia) as an Athenian colony, but the term used is οἰκειότης, not συγγένεια.

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.

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

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 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 Εὐρης συγγενείας καὶ φίλιας ήμιν ὑπαρχόντος 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 οἰκειότητα with Athens as her colony: I.Priene 109, lines 51–52. For Pharos, the most recent edition of inscriptions is Derov 1991. We exclude from consideration Curty 1995, pp. 204–205, doc. 81 (Kiblyra), on grounds of date.
25. IG II 1129, lines 9–10 (restoring οἰκειότητα).
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.\textsuperscript{27} 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 _euphesia_ 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.\textsuperscript{28} Most interesting for our purposes is an isolated clause in lines 4–5, where it is very tempting to restore τᾶς πόλιος πορτ[ὶ] τὰν πόλιν οἰκε[ίατα], 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 Oria, but the restoration is very insecure; moreover, there are strong dialectal reasons to attribute the decree to a city of central Crete.\textsuperscript{29}

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.\textsuperscript{30} 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.\textsuperscript{31}

\textsuperscript{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.

\textsuperscript{28} IG II\textsuperscript{1} 1130; IG II xxx 3; Bielman 1994, pp. 200–202. Thrasippos son of Kallias was almost certainly a native of the deme Garpettos (LGPVII, s.v. Θράτας, 10–16). The patronym and deme of Lysikles are unknown.


\textsuperscript{30} IG II x 2, lines 16–18: ἀποκρίνεσθαι Τηίοις φίλοις καὶ οἰκείους ἐόσιν διήλθη τοῖς ὀλύσουσιν καὶ αὐτοὶ σεβόμεθα καὶ τὸν Τηίων δαμο[ν] ζηγενέα ἀντα ἄπαξιζομεθα. . . . 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).

\textsuperscript{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.\(^{32}\) 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.\(^{33}\) 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.\(^ {34}\) 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.”\(^ {35}\)

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.\(^ {36}\) 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.\(^ {37}\)
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.  

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 archgetes 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).  

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.” 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.

39. *Milet* I.3 37, lines 4–5, through Apollo Delphinios. Cf., e.g., *IG* IX 12 1582 (Magnesia and Same), lines 13–14: τὰς οἰκείοτατας τὰς ὑπαρχούσας Μυγνῆτος πατὶ Κεφαλόλας καὶ κατὰ τῶν συγγένεαν τὰ Ἲμηνος καὶ Κεφαλόν τοῦ Δηόνος. Magnes and Deion were the sons of Aeolos.  
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