

- 75 [.....²⁶.....]ταις[.....] Ἄ[να]φ[λ]υ[σ]τιο.....¹³.....]
 [.....ἔ]φύλωι τόπ[ωι.....⁷.....]π[...τ][.....]ι[.]ο[.....²³.....]
 [..]ατεύς [.....]πα[.....⁴⁴.....]
 [..]εστοσιακμο[.....]ο[.....¹².....]αιτ[.....²⁷.....]
 [..]διαβά[ς] τὸ[ν] αὐλώνα τ[ὸ]ν.....¹².....]ο[.....¹⁶.....]τατ[.....¹⁶.....]
 80 [..]ι[.]του[.....⁴⁸.....]
 [..]ε[.....]ρκη[.....]το[.]η[.....¹⁶.....]Ἄν[α]φλυσ[τιο.....¹⁴.....]
 [..]διαβά[ς] τ[ὸ]ν αὐλώ[να] τ[ὸ]ν.....³⁷.....]
 [-----]
 [-----]
 85 [.....¹⁶.....]εσ[.....]ρ[.....³⁶.....]
 [.....²⁰.....]αγ[.....³⁵.....]
 πρὸς[.....¹¹.....]ι [πρὸς] ἔσπ[έραν.....³⁰.....]
 [.....¹⁸.....]ων[.....³⁷.....]
 [.....¹².....]χω[.....⁴³.....]
 90 [..]ε[λ.]η[.....¹⁶.....]ου[.]ο[.....⁷.....]ε[.....¹⁸.....]ῥ[α]μ[νο]
 ὕσις καὶ ἀμφισβητ[έι.]ι[.....⁵.....]α[.....]σο[.....]γε[ίτ]ω[ν.....¹⁹.....]ρ[.]
 πάντα τὸν τόπον [Φ]ιλ[ο]κράτη[ς] Ἀφιδν[α]ῖο[ς.....²².....]τ[ῆ]ι [ι]
 ππάδι τοσ[.]ο[.....¹³.....]λ[.....²⁸.....]ο [φ]ά[σκ]
 οντος Εὐρυ[κράτο]υ[ς?..]α[.....⁵.....]χ[ω]ρί[ον.....¹¹.....]τ[.....]μ[.....¹⁰.....]ἀ-
 95 δης ἔχει [.....⁶.....]μ[.....]ιλ[.....]ε[.....]α[.....]ομε[.....] Λευκοπ[ύ]ρα καὶ τὰ [π]ρό[ς] το[ύ]τ[ο]ις ἀπὸ
 τοῦ Ἐρμαίου [τοῦ] Λευκοπυρ[α]ίου. τ[ὸ]πο[ς] π[ο]λ[ύ]ς [ἀ]ργός ἐφυλος[.....]ου [ἐ]πείρ-
 [γ]α[σ]ται Καλλίστ[ρ]ατος Ἰκ[α]ρι[ε]ύ[ς] Ἀλεξίας Ὑ[β]άδης λόφον π[.....⁹.....]τ[.]
 σελ[.....] καὶ το[ύ]του [.....⁹.....]υ[.....]ο[.....]ω[.....]ο[.....²⁴.....]
 ενον καὶ τὰς [.]τη[.....]η[.....]λυτο[.....²⁶.....]τοῦ]των [ῆ]-
 100 νφεσβήτη[ι] Φ[ε]ρεκράτη[ς] Κολ[λ]υ[τε]ύ[ς]. πρὸς [.....¹².....]χ[.....¹².....]
 ου[.....⁷.....]έως [.]ι[.....]υ[.....]νη ὕλη [..]οσ[.....⁸.....]ε[.....]τα[.....¹².....]
 ενα τῶν Φ[ε]ρεκράτου[ς] τόπ[ος] πολ[ύ]ς ἐφυλος ἀργός μέ[χ]ρι τ[οῦ] λόφ[ο]υ τῶν φυλ-
 ῶν ἔστιν καὶ οὐκ ἠμφε[σ]βήτη[ι] οὐδ[ὲ] ὕλωνης. π[ρ]ὸς τῶι λόφωι πρ[ο]σκα[ι]-
 τ[ε]ίργασα[ι] καὶ ἕτερα ἐ[χ]όμενα τούτων, ὑπερβάντ[ι.....¹⁷.....]
 105 σιν παρε[λ]θόντι τὸν λόφ[ον] οἱ αὐτοί. ἀπὸ τοῦ λόφ[ο]υ [..]θηπ[.....]εφ[.....⁹.....]
 τῶν Προξένο[υ] ἐρ[γ]α[σίμων] τούτου ὧν φυ[λῶν] ἔτ[ε]ρα ἐ[ργ]άσιμα πολλ[ά] ..⁶..
 υ[.....]ητα καὶ [πεφυ]τευμένα [.....⁸.....]μ[.....⁵.....]αι ἔδ[αφ]ος καὶ οἰκίαν [.....⁸.....]
 τα[ῦ]τα ἔφη μεμισθῶσθ[αι] Χά[ρ]μος Κ[ο]λ[λ]υτεύς [.....²³.....]
 Δ[ι]δρα[χμῶν] [.....]ο[.....]γ[.....]ειτ[ονία] ν[ο]στόθεν Πρόξενος[.....¹⁹.....]
 110 πρὸς νότον [.....]ων πρὸς ἑσπέρα[ν] οἱ θράνοι [κ]αὶ [.....]ων πρὸς [ῆ]λι[ο]υ ἀνιόν-
 τος [τ]ὰ πετ[.....]ουχημενα τούτων[.....²⁹.....]ο[.....]υ τ-
 οῦ [χ]ωρίου τούτου χαράδρα ξύλα ἔχο[υ]σα.....²².....]ῶρθ[ι]-
 ἀδα καλουμένην τόπον ἔφ[υ]λο[ν] πολ[ύ]ν.....²⁴.....]μέχρ-
 ι τῶν ἀμ[π]έλ[ων] τοῦτον ἐπεργασ[α.....²³.....]η[.....]
 115 ἕτερα [ἐ]π[ε]ί[ργασ]το [.]τη[.....] ἐφυ[λ.....³⁴.....]
 α βορρᾶθεν τῆι [.....¹⁰.....] α[.....]ιβ[.....¹⁹.....]υ[.....⁵.....]ν[.....]
 [-----]
 [-----]
 [.....⁴⁸.....] ἐφ[υ]λ[.....⁵.....]
 120 [.....⁴⁶.....]γ[.....⁹.....]

The decree of Aigeis and Aiantis (Agora I 6793) revisited

[-----]

[.....⁴⁶.....]ερα[...ε[...⁵...]

[.....⁴⁶.....]ολ[...ατ[...⁵...]

[.....⁵¹.....]πα[...ο[...]

125 [.....⁵⁰.....]τό[ν τ]όπο-
 [ν.....⁵⁶.....]
 [.....⁵⁶.....]ο
 [.....⁴⁵.....] ἔφυλ[ος] τ[ῶν]φυλ-
 [ῶν.....⁵⁵.....]

130 [.....⁸...]γ[.....³⁸.....]τόν ἐχό[μεν]ο-
 [ν τοῦ]το[υ.....¹¹.....]ι[.....¹⁷.....]ομοσιν[.....⁸.....]ητο[...τ[ό]π-
 [ος.]τοην[...⁶...]ν τόπος ἐρ[γάσιμος.⁵...]υ[...σ]χων. τ[ούτων] οὐθεις ἦ[ν]φη-
 [σ]βήτει ἀπό [τοῦ] Ἡρακ[λ]είου [.....¹¹.....]ο[...μ[...ω]που [...κ]αλούμε[ος ...]ο[...]
 [ἐργά]σιμ[ος] [..]χ[...].]ο[...]. ἀνανφι[σβήτητος ...]ρο[...ο[.....⁸...].]ο[.....] ἐρ[γάσιμ]-
 135 ος [..]ωνος ἀ[ν]α[νφ]ισβήτη[τος¹¹.....]α[...αρ[.....⁸...].]λο[.....⁶...]ε[...]
 [.....] τόπος ἐργάσιμος ἀ[ν]α[νφ]ισβ[ήτητος⁵...]ο[.....¹⁷.....]ου
 [.....] τόπος πολὺς Ἡρα[κ]λειδης ἐν τα[ῖς ..]αιοι[.....]εγεΛ[.....⁵...]κα[.....⁷...]ε[...]
 [φ]άσκων μ[εμ]ισθῶσθαι :^ΠΔΓ: δραχμῶν [.....]υνε[...τ]οὔτον[.....¹¹.....] :^Π: δραχ
 ταῦτα ἔφη μεμισθῶσθαι παρ' Ὑβρίο[υ πρὸς τῶι λό]φωι [.....] ηνη[...ε]ι[.....⁵...]π
 140 ἀρέχειν· τούτων ἠγφεσβήτει Ὑβρί[ας Ὀτρυ]νεὺς τοῦτο[ν] τ[ὸ]ν τόπον [.....]ε[...]
 [.....]ι ἠμί[σ]ει[α]· τῶν ὕλωνων Νόθιπ[πος.....¹¹.....]ο[.....]ουρο[.....⁸...]
 ο[...].]ς ἄπρατον τῶν φυλῶν ὕλην εσ[.....⁹...]ἔφη Νόθ[ι]π[πο]ς τὴν Βιωτι[αν] ε
 [..]ν[...].]το ὄλος ὁ Κριδ[ς κ]αλούμενος[.....⁵...]του[.....⁶...]δ[...κ]αλουμέ[ν]ου[.....]
 [.....⁵...]ν τούτωι τῶι τόπωι ἐργασίμωι[.....¹⁵.....]α[.....⁸...]ρ[...]
 145 υ [ἔκ] νέου τῶν φυλῶν [ἔσ]τιν ἀνανφισβήτητα. η[...ε]ο[...ω]φ[.....¹⁸.....]
 ο [το]ῦ λειμῶνος τοῦ τῆς Ἀθη[ν]ῶς ο[...αι πλ[...].]τα[...ο]ιπ[.....]ο[.....⁸...]α[.....⁶...]
 λαν ἀνανφ[ισ]βή[τ]ητο[ν]ον ιξε[...].]τατ[...ἀγριο[...].]δεορ[...].]οσ[.....⁷...]αο[...]
 ν[...].]ο λειμῶ[ν.....] τόπο[...ἀ]ργου[...⁵...] καλουμ[έν]ου[...].]ο[.....⁸...]γα[...τ]-
 ὅπος ἐργάσιμος α[...].]α[.....]τα[.....⁹...]οσ[.....²³.....]
 150 [..] παρ[ά] ασ[.....⁴⁹.....]δ[...]
 [ι]αβάντι [.....⁵⁰.....]
 [.....⁵...]αλω[.....⁴⁹.....]
 ο[...].]ιλίου κ[.....⁴⁹.....]
 [.....]πατ[ρ]ός[.....⁴⁸.....]
 155 μ[...].]όρι[σ]τῶ[ς?.....⁴⁷.....]
 [Φ]ιλαιδης[.....¹⁰...]τ[.....]μ[.....³³.....]
 φα α[...].]ο[...].]λ[.....¹².....]α[.....³².....]
 νόσου τόπος τ[.....⁴⁶.....]

II. 159-68: illegible text

169 [.....⁸...]λπ[...].]λ[.....³⁷.....]οε[.....]

170 [πο]ρευομένοι ὀρθή[ν] ε[.....⁹...]ειλ[.....⁵...]μοι κ[αλού]μ[ενος] τόπος ἐ[ργά]σ-
 [ιμ]ος καὶ ὕλη [.....]ν[...].]ο[.....⁵...]ω[...].]λ[...].]ν με[τὰ] τοῦτον τὸν τ[ό]πον: ε[...].]ς αρ[...].]τ[...]
 [τό]πο[ς]β[...].]ο[...].]ε[...].]ι[...].]α[...καλ]οῦμε[νος] ὁ τόπος Λ[ύ]κο[ς] ἐργάσιμος ἄλ[ος] [...].]αρ[.....]
 [...].]λ[...].]ο[.....⁹...]ε[τ[...].]δ ὀρυμ[ό]ς .]λ[...].]ε[.....⁶...]κ[...].]ε[...].]ε[...].]ν[...].]νισυ
 δρα[χ.] ΔΔΔ ηλ[.....⁶...] υριτου[...].]οι[...].]κλση[...].]αο[...].]χ[...].]α[...].]η[...].]ι
 175 ηκε[...].]ηνε[...].]αω[...].]ν[...].]οι[...].]ολ[...].]ητοις [...].]ει[...].]ορ[...].]ο[...].]ι[...].]ρη[...].]α[...]

[.]εια[.]τ[.]ο[.]ου παρ[...] καὶ τὸ ἐ[ν] βου[κ]όλο[ις .]λ[...⁶...]ο[...⁹...]ον[...]ο[.]
 [..]ιο[...]ιοπ[...⁷...] ητ[.]ε[...⁶...]α[.]κ[...⁵...]ε[.]δων [..]ο[...¹³...]
 [φρύ]γανα[...]σο[...⁸...]ο[.]σα[...¹²...]οιτε[.]τ[.]ι[...]ιο[...]ο
 [...⁶...]λλο[...]ο[...⁵...]θυλ[.]τ[...]ι[...⁸...]καλου[μ]έ[ν]ου [...⁵...]τα[...]ο
 180 [.]πο[.]ε[...⁸...]λ[...]ητρια[...²⁶...]ο[...]ν[...]ιτω
 υ[...¹²...]ται τῶι γε[...]γο[...]ιο[...¹⁴...]ε[.]γειτονία ἦς τ
 [.]να[...¹⁴...]επη[...]ου γειω[...²⁷...]ιε
 [.]τηι [...¹⁵...]λ[...⁵...]ργ[...]ο[...]εμ[...⁸...]α[...¹³...]
 [...¹³...] ἀπράτων [...¹⁰...]ολ[...¹⁶...]λυ[...⁷...]
 185 ινον[...⁸...]τ[...⁷...]τε[...¹⁴...]μέ]χρι[...⁵...]τ[...¹⁰...]
 ασα[...⁵⁴...]
 α[...⁴⁹...]λι[...⁵...]
vacat

Epigraphical notes and restorations²

Agora I 6793 has a rather chequered history. Having been reused as a manhole cover from the Roman period onwards the stone was exposed to all sorts of deleterious gases and liquids that severely eroded the inscribed surface.³ I carried out autopsy of the stele back in September 2000 and again in July 2006, and I have the sad task of reporting that parts of the upper surface of the stone have now flaked away along with inscribed text.⁴ The difficulties in reading the text, graphically illustrated by Langdon in his *editio princeps*, have, therefore, been further exacerbated. Yet I have managed to come up with a few new readings and restorations, which can be found in the *apparatus criticus* below.

2. Ἐπιὶ Ο[ἰων]ι[ου? Ἄρ]ιστάρχου Ἰ[καριέως.] *vel* Ἐπιὶ Ο[ἰων]ι[ου? Ἄρ]ιστάρχου ἰ[ερέως Αἰγ]η[ίδος]...²³... P, [.]οιο[...]ι[...⁸...]ορχοι[...⁸...] L, [Ἐ]πιὶ Ὀ[λυμ]π[ιοδῶρου ἄ]ρχοντ[ος] Ameling,⁵ Ἐπιὶ Ο[...]ι[...]ιστάρχου [...⁸...] W.⁶ The patronymic could be

2. L = Langdon, P = Papazarkadas, W = Walbank.

3. See M. K. Langdon, An Attic decree concerning Oropos, *Hesperia* 56 (1987) 49-50.

4. At the time of my examination of the inscription in the Stoa of Attalos one could see stone chips lying on the floor in front of the stele.

5. P. Ameling, Das neue attische Dekret für Oropos: ein Datierungsvorschlag, *ZPE* 77 (1989) 95-96.

6. M. B. Walbank, The property of Aiantis and Aigeis, *ZPE* 84 (1990) 96, who surmised that the heads of the two tribes involved in the decree were recorded in line 1. However, his suggestion that these officials ought to be the phylarchs is based on an excessively literal, and ultimately flawed, interpretation of the term. The phylarchs were cavalry officers, no more important than the tribally-assigned taxiarchs: see Arist., [*Ath. Pol.*] 61.3-5 with P. J. Rhodes, *A Commentary on the Aristotelian Athenion Politeia*, Oxford 1993², 684-686, and cf. Arist. *Pol.* 1322b.

either [Ἄρ]ιστάρχου or [Πλε]ιστάρχου, but the latter would leave the *iota* of the 8th stoichos as the penultimate letter of a name in the genitive. This is plainly impossible: [Ἄρ]ιστάρχου seems inevitable. If so, the only Attic name meeting the epigraphical requirements would be the rare Οἰωνίας.⁷ Dating formulas of the expanded type (name, patronymic and demotic) may be unusual, but do occur sporadically.⁸ Then, the only demotics offering an acceptable tribal affiliation would be Ἰ[καριέως] or Ἰ[ονίδου], both of Aigeis. The former is slightly preferable, since an Aristarkhos of Ikarion is attested in the second century.⁹ Priesthoods used as dating formulas are rare, although there is a good tribal parallel.¹⁰ If the priests of both Aigeis and Aiantis were indeed named in line 2, we would expect a clear distinction between them; the restoration [ἐρέως Αἰγ]η[ίδος _ _ _] would be tempting. || 11. [Φ]όρυσκος P, [Φ]ορύσκος W, and Woodhead in *Agora XVI*. || 14. Ῥό[δων? Ἄ]ν[κυλη?] P; Attic names starting with Ῥο- are extremely rare, especially before the Roman period. The proposed restoration is the only one which meets both the epigraphical requirements and the necessity for a deme belonging to either Aigeis or Aiantis. || 15. Λυκοῦρ[γος Ἄ]φ[ιδ] W, Λυκοῦρ[γος Κ]ο[λλυτ] Woodhead in *Agora XVI*. || 16. Καλλικράτης [Ῥαμ]ν[ο] *vacat* P, Καλλικράτης [Ῥαμ]ν[ο]: ἐγραμμάτευε *vacat* W.¹¹ || 19. δ[ρα]:ΗΗ: P, δ[.]:ΗΗ: L. || 77. [...]ατεύς: perhaps [Ἀ]ρμ[α]ατεύς or [Ἐ]λ[α]ατεύς; alternatively, [γ]ραμμ[α]ατεύς. || 85-9. New readings. || 87. [πρὸς] ἐσπ[έραν] P; cf. l. 110 πρὸς ἐσπέρα[ν]. || 89. Perhaps χω[ρίον]; cf. l. 94. || 91. γει[τ]ω[ν] P. || 92. [Φ]ιλ[ο]κράτη[ς] Ἄφιδν[α]ῖος[ς] P, [.....]ρατη[.]αφ[.....]ος[ς] L. The reading [Φ]ιλ[ο]κράτη[ς] was first made by Alipheri and Steinhauer.¹² He was possibly a descendant of Philokrates of Aphidnai, Treasurer of the sacred monies of Athena in 398/7.¹³ || 92-3. τ]ῆ[ι] ἰ]ππ[α]δί τοσ[.]ο P, η[.]ππ[α]διτος L. || 93-4. [φ]ά[σκ]οντος Εὐρυ[κράτο]υ[ς]? P, [.]α[.]οντος Εὐρυ[.....]υ[.] L; cf. l. 138, [φ]άσκων. || 95. τὰ [π]ρό[ς] το[ύ]το[ς] P, τὰ [π]ρό[ς] το[.....] L; cf. l. 103, π[ρ]ό[ς] τῶι λόφωι.¹⁴ || 96. τ[ό]πο[ς] π[ο]λύ[ς] [ἀ]ργός

7. See *LGNP* II, s.v. Οἰωνίας. The names Ὀκτάιος and Ὀνώριος would both fit the available space, but are patently Roman and ought to be excluded from any tentative restorations.

8. See *Agora XIX I4a*, ll. 69-70, Ἐπὶ Διφίλο Διοπειθους Σουινέως Σαλαμινίους ἄρχοντος; 73-5, Ἐπὶ Ἀντισθένης Ἀντιγένης Ἀχαρνέως ἄρχοντος Σαλαμινίους.

9. *LGNP* II, s.v. Ἀρίσταρχος (32).

10. *SEG* III 117, ll. 6-8, καὶ ἐπὶ Λεῖπτινίου ἱερέως σύνδικος γενόμενος (Antiochis tribe); cf. *IG* II² 2496, ll. 1-2, ἐπὶ Φιλιππίδου ἱερέως (deme of Kytheros).

11. Walbank (n. 6) estimated that an aggregate of twenty individuals can be accounted for in lines 10-16, with a further twenty-first person, Kallikrates of Rhamnous, acting as their secretary. This would be unprecedented and in my view Kallikrates should also be considered one of the actual *horistai*, the twentieth and last of the roster.

12. The new reading was first announced by Mrs Alipheri and Dr Steinhauer in their paper on Fascicle VIII of the new *IG* II³ corpus at the symposium *Attica Epigraphica*; my subsequent autopsy of the stone confirmed the accuracy of this reading.

13. *LGNP* II, Φιλοκράτης (54).

14. Cf. the note by V. Missailidou-Despotidou, A Hellenistic inscription from Skotoussa (Thessaly) and the fortifications of the city, *BSA* 88 (1993) 193, in relation to *SEG* XLIII 311. A9, πὸτ τοῖς τειχέσει.

ἔφυλος P, τ[ό]π[ος] ο[.....]γος ἔφυλο[ς] L; cf. ll. 102, 113. || 96-7. [ἐπείργ]α[σ]ται P; cf. ll. 114, ἐπεργασ-; 115, [ἐπ]ε[ί]ργαστο; 103-4, π[ρ]οσκα[τ]ε[ί]ργαστα[ι]. || 99-100. [του]των [ἡ]νφεσβήτει P; cf. l. 140, τουτων ἡνφεσβήτει Ὑβρί[ας] Ὀτρυ[νεύς]. || 102-3. τόπ[ος] πολ[ύς] ἔφυλος ἀργός μέ[χ]ρι τ[οῦ] λόφ[ο]υ τῶν φυλ[ῶ]ν ἔστιν καὶ οὐκ ἡνφε[σ]βήτ[ει] οὐδ[ε]ίς [οὐδὲ] ὑλώνης P. || 108. Χά[ρμος] Κ[ο]λ[υ]τεύς P, Χα[ρίας] Κ[ο]λ[υ]τεύς L; cf. *LGPN* II, Χάρμος (2). || 108-9. Δ: δρα[χ]μῶν P, [χαρ]ιάδρ[α..]ων L; the first letter is clearly a *delta* followed by a double interunct. || 110. οἱ θράνοι [κ]αί P, οιορανοι[.]αι L; for the meaning of θράνοι (benches?) cf. *LSJ*⁹ s.v. Some structure is evidently implied here. || 112. χαράδρα ξύλα ἔχο[υσα] P, χαράδρα Ζυλλεχο[____] L; the letter in stoichos 25 is an *alpha*, not a *lambda*, thus ξύλα. Here the word has the meaning of «live wood», «trees» (*LSJ*⁹ s. v. ξύλον II), so the whole phrase should be translated as «forested ravine», an obvious geographical designation for a mountainous area where timber-buyers seem to be active. || 112-3. Ὀρθ[ι]άδα P, ορο[.]αδα L; cf. *LSJ*⁹ s.v. ὀρθιάδε: «uphill» (the suggested toponym, though unattested, is grammatically sound and suits the hilly landscape of our decree). || 113. τόπος ἔφυλος πολ[ύς] P, τόπον ἔφ[υ]λο[ν] πολ[ύν] L. || 125-6. τό[ν] τ[ό]πο[ν] P; alternatively τοῦ τ[ό]πο[ν]. || 130-1. τὸν ἐχό[μεν]ο[ν] τοῦ[τοῦ] P; cf. l. 104, καὶ ἕτερα ἐχό[μεν]α τουτων.¹⁵ || 132-3. τ[οῦ]των οὐθεις ἡ[ν]φη[σ]βήτει P, τ[.....] ο[.]θεις ἡ[ν]φη[σ]βήτει L; cf. l. 140, τουτων ἡνφεσβήτει Ὑβρί[ας] Ὀτρυ[νεύς].¹⁶ || 133. ἀπὸ [τοῦ] Ἡρακ[λ]είου P, [.....]απ[.]είου L. || 137. Ἡρα[κ]λείδης P, Ηβα[.]λείδης L. || 139-40. παρ[έ]χειν P, [ύ]π[ε]ρ[σ]χ[ε]ῖν L. || 141. ἡμί[σ]ει[α] P, ἡμι[.]σι[.] L; cf. *LSJ*⁹ s.v. ἡμισυς. || 142. ἔφη Νόθ[ι]π[πος] P, εφην ὀδὸν [εἰ]ς L. || 143. [..]το ὄλος ὁ Κριός κ[α]λούμενος P, [.....] θόλος οκ[.]ιο[κ]αλούμενος L. || 144. τόπωι ἐργασίμωι P; [τόπωι] ἐργασίμωι L. || 145. υ [ἐκ] νέου τῶν φυλῶν [ἔσ]τιν ἀνανφισβήτητα P, [..]νεου τῶν φυλῶν [ἔσ]τιν ἀνανφισβήτητα L. || 146. [τοῦ] λειμῶνος τοῦ τῆς Ἀθη[ν]ᾶς P, [..]υ λειμῶνος τοῦ τῆς αθ[.....] Chaniotis, *Gnomon* 66 (1994), 698.¹⁷ || 148. ὁ λειμῶ[ν] P, ολειμω[.....] L. || 150-5. New readings; no text is given in previous editions. || 150-1. [δ]ι[α]βάντι; for the restoration cf. ll. 79, 82, 104. || 152. Perhaps ἄλω[ς]? (threshing-floor). || 153. Perhaps [Φ]ιλίου (cf. *LGPN* II s.v.). || 155. ὀρι[σ]τά[ς]; cf. l. 10, [Ο]ἶδε ὠρί[σ]αντο τὰ ἐδά[φ]η τ[ῶ]ν ἑ[ν] ὠ[ρ]ωπ[ῶ]ν Αἰγιδῶν καὶ Αἰαντιδῶν. || 157. φα α[____] P, φλα L; perhaps [ἀνέπ]αφα α[____] (cf. *IG* II² 1196 l.15, ἀνέπ[α]φα ἀνθυποτιθῶσιν). || 169. New readings not provided by previous scholars. || 170. [πο]ρευομένοι ὀρθ[ή]ν P, [..]ρευ[.]μένοι ο[.]ση[.] L; cf. l. 105, παρε[λ]θόντι τὸν λόφ[ον]; Ar. *Av.* ὀρθήν ὁδόν με ἵεναι. || 170-1.

15. For this way of designating adjacent properties (very rare in Attica) see, for instance, the fourth-century deed of sale from Aphytis *SEG* LI 795, ll. 8-11, τὸν ἀγρὸν τὸν ἐχόμενον | τῶν Ὀρνυμένου καὶ | τῶν Ἀριστοτέλεος.

16. For the spelling οὐθεις see L. Threatte, *The Grammar of Attic Inscriptions. Volume I. Phonology*, Berlin 1980, 472-6.

17. This was probably a meadow consecrated to Athena (for this type of property cf. the fourth-century *horos* from Athens *SEG* XLIV 75, λειμῶν). In Pausanias' day part of the main altar of the Amphiareion was consecrated to Athena Paionia (Paus. 1.34.3), but the altar might have undergone a rearrangement at any time between the Classical and Roman periods, and, therefore, the cult of Athena Paionia cannot be confirmed for the fourth century (see B. Petrakos, *Ὁ Ὡρωπὸς καὶ τὸ ἱερόν τοῦ Ἀμφιαράου*, Athens 1968, 96-8).

ἐ[ργά]σ[ι]μ[ο]ς P, ἐ[ργά]σ[ι]μ[ο]ς L. || 172. [καλ]οῦμεν[ος ὁ τό]πος Ἀ[ύ]κρ[ος] ἐργάσιμος ὄλ[ος] P, [καλ]οῦ[μ]εν[ος ὁ τό]πος λ[.]κ[.]ἐργάσιμος [.]αρ[....] L; cf. Xen. *An.* 6.2.3, ἐνταῦθα διὰ τοῦ πεδίου ῥεῖ ποταμὸς Λύκος ὄνομα). || 176. τὸ ἐ[ν] βου[κ]όλο[ις] P, τὸ ἐ[.] βου[.]όλ[.] L; cf. Athen. 6.235c, τοὺς δὲ παρασίτους ἐκ τῆς βουκολίας ἐκλέγειν <βοῦν, καὶ ἐκ (*nomen loci*) ἐκλέγειν> ἐκ τοῦ μέρους τοῦ ἑαυτῶν ἕκαστον ἐκτέα, with R. Schlaifer, *HSCP* 54 (1943) 51-52, 55 n. 78, 60. || 178. [φρύ]γανα P, [..]στα καὶ L. || 185. [μέ]χρ[ι] P, [__]ρι L.

Commentary

Despite its misadventures, or perhaps because of them, Agora I 6793 is an intriguing document. Langdon, following a suggestion by Lewis, related the inscription to the division of the Oropian territory recounted in Hypereides' speech *In Defence of Euxenippos*.¹⁸ Thus goes the story: after the reacquisition of Oropos by the Athenians in 335,¹⁹ Athens introduced a major scheme, which aimed at the effective administration of the area. First, a board of fifty boundary-commissioners (ὀρισταί) set aside part of Oropia for the god Amphiaraos. Then, upon a decision of the Athenian assembly, the hills of Oropos were broken up into five roughly equal lots, which were, subsequently, allotted to the five pairs into which the Athenian tribes had previously been randomly divided. As it happens, a major blunder was committed in the process, for it was discovered that the tribal pair Akamantis and Hippothoontis had mistakenly been assigned land belonging to Amphiaraos. At any rate, Euxenippos was authorised to perform incubation in the God's shrine in order to reach a verdict. His decision was presumably favourable for the tribes, since he was prosecuted by Polyektos, after the latter had unsuccessfully proposed a decree whereby the two tribes were ordered to return their land to the God.

Back to Agora I 6793: a heavily restored mention of Oropos (l. 10), a reference to Boeotia (l. 142), the demarcators that appear in lines 10-16 and perhaps in l. 155, the fact that the decree was uniquely issued by a pair of tribes, and last but not least, the frequent occurrences of terms related to a densely forested area (for instance ὕλη, δρυμός, ξύλα, λόφος), all sustain the connection of our decree to the Hyperidean extract and I have no intention to challenge the *opinio communis*. Note in particular the compound word ἔφυλος, which outside our text is only attested in the late fourth century decree of Antiochis where tribal Oropian property is at stake.²⁰ However, problems concerning the decipherment of Agora I 6793

18. Hyp. *Eux.* 16-17.

19. I am following here the new chronology advocated by D. Knoepfler, *Eretria. Fouilles et recherches XI. Décrets érétriens de proxénie et de citoyenneté*, Lausanne 2001, 367-389; see also P. J. Rhodes & R. Osborne, *Greek Historical Inscriptions: 404-323 BC*, Oxford 2003, 372-373.

20. *ISE* 8 (= *SEG* III 117), ll. 13-9, καὶ πάλιν ἀίρεθεις ὑπὸ τ[ῶν] φυλετῶν ἐπὶ τὰ ἐν Ὀρωπιῶι

remain, and David Lewis' puzzlement as expressed back in 1990 still reverberates.²¹

Langdon argued that the decree was intended to settle disputes between the two tribes concerning the leasing of their Oropian landholdings. Alternatively, he suggested that it might concern a widespread settlement between the two tribes acting jointly on the one hand, and private individuals on the other.²² The latter interpretation has more to recommend it, without being fully adequate. It is worth squeezing as much information as possible out of the defective surviving lines. As already said, topographical designations are abundant, with features suggesting mountainous landscape dominant amongst them, although we do hear of a house (l. 107, οἰκίαν) and some mysterious benches (l. 110, οἱ θρᾶνοι). The phraseology used implies land survey and, by implication, delimitation, exactly as one would have expected from the presence of a board whose task was to erect territorial markers (l. 10, [Ο]ἶδε ὠρί<σ>αντο τὰ ἐδά[φη τ]ᾶ ἐ[ν] ὠ[ρ]ωπ[ῶι τ]ῶν Αἰγαιδῶν καὶ Αἰαντιδῶν; perhaps l. 155, ὀρι[σ]τᾶ[ς]). This inspection seems to have been accompanied by a procedure of hearings whereby individuals were allowed to state their point of view regarding the ownership of particular areas. The recurring verbal expressions ἔφη and φάσκων make this point clear, whereas formulas such as διαβά[ς τ]ό[ν] ἀλῶ[ν]α (l. 82) and [πο]ρευομένωι ὀρθή[ν] (l. 170) strongly imply that such claims were made on the spot, that is while the inspection was taking place, rather than in a court. Similar procedures are well-known from non-Attic texts, for instance the Hellenistic inscription from the Thessalian Skotoussa,²³ but there is an oft-overlooked Attic example, the decree in honour of Antisthenes, which interestingly

ἐπ[ί] γῆν] ἔφυλον νεμηθείσαν ταῖς | [φυλαί]ς ἐπεμελήθη ὑπὲρ τῆς Ἄν[τιοχιδος] φυλῆς; 14-5. ἐπ[ί] τῆν] ἔφυλον Keramopoulos *apud* J. Karouzos, *AI* 8 (1923), 88 n. 2; ἐπ[ί] γῆν] ἔφυλον N. G. Pappadakis, *Arch. Ἐφημερίς* 1924, 122 n. 3; ἐγ[γ]ύτην] ἔφυλον A. N. Oikonomides, *Υπερείδου λόγοι. Α' Ὑπὲρ Εὐξενίπου*, Athens 1958, 77.

21. D. M. Lewis, Public Property in the City, in O. Murray & S. Price (eds.), *The Greek City from Homer to Alexander*, Oxford 1990, 252: «Virtually everyone has followed Robert's suggestion that *he Nea* is the newly-returned territory of Oropos. I still see some difficulties of detail in reconciling this with the evidence of Hyperides about what happened there, and more still in the light of a new text which apparently records a survey of Oropos».

22. Langdon (n. 3) 52; cf. D. Whitehead, *Hyperides. The Forensic Speeches*, Oxford 2000, 208-209, who is in favour of the first interpretation.

23. Survey of Skotoussa: *SEG* XLIII 310. Other examples of similar land-inventories include the cadaster of sacred lands from Larisa (published almost simultaneously by B. Helly, *A Larisa. Bouleversements et remise en ordre de sanctuaires, Mnemosyne* 23 (1970) 250-296, and F. Salviat & C. Vatini, *Inscriptions de Grèce centrale*, Paris 1971, 9-34), and, of course, *IG* XIV 645, the famous Tabulae Heraclenses (cf. A. Uguzzoni & F. Ghinatti, *Le Tavole Greche di Eraclea*, Rome 1968).

refers to tribal land inspection.²⁴ A good illustration of how the system worked in practice can be found in lines 102-3 which read τόπ[ος] πολ[ύς] ἔφυλος ἀργός μέ[χ]ρι τ[οῦ] λόφ[ου] τῶν φυλ[ῶν] ἔστιν καὶ οὐκ ἠνφε[σ]βήτ[ει] οὐδ[εὶ]ς [οὐδέ] ὑλώνης («*a large, wooded, uncultivated area as far as the hill belongs to the tribes; no one contested it, not even a hylones*»). Presumably the tribal *horistai* were carrying out the investigation of each zone separately and if nobody raised any counterclaims, the ownership of the area in question was declared «indisputable» and its status was confirmed in favour of the tribes.²⁵

Another piece of relatively uninterrupted text appears in 139-40. This clause suggests that a certain individual claimed he had legitimately rented a piece of land from Hybrias of Otryne, but the latter denied it. However, such a statement would not have been recorded in an official tribal document, unless the tribes' property was disputed, and thus we could infer that the unnamed individual had trespassed upon tribal land. This observation enables us to adduce and discount a theory put forward by Osborne, namely that the decree «*represents, not the result, but the groundwork for the apportionment of Oropos and the tenants referred to are private tenants in existing occupation*». ²⁶ Such an interpretation has certain merits. But Osborne's theory presupposes that rapacious Athenians had hastened to encroach upon Oropian land shortly after 335 and before the Athenian state had come up with an administrative mechanism. My impression, however, is that hilly land had been allocated to the tribes prior to our decree, but it was only with *Agora I 6793* that they carried out a proper delimitation of their property. The most likely reason was that private individuals had infringed upon land that had not been properly marked out.²⁷ That this was not the first involvement of the tribes in Oropos can be inferred from the following five observations:

1) The overrepresentation in the document of individuals from the ranks of the two tribes. But this is only explicable on the assumption that the tribes had already leased out part of their property to their own members.

2) Monetary amounts were recorded throughout the text (ll. 19, δ[ρα]:ΗΗ.; 109,

24. *IG II² 1165.17-22* (circa 300-250): ἔγραψε δὲ καὶ ψήφισμα ὅπως ἂν [Ἐρεχ]θ[ε]ῖδαι εἰδῶ[σιν] ἄπ]αντες τὰ ἑαυτῶν κτήματα καὶ οἱ ἐπιμεληταὶ | οἱ αἰεὶ καθιστάμενοι κατ' ἐνιαυτὸν βαδίζοντες ἐπὶ τὰ κτήματα δις τοῦ ἐνιαυτοῦ ἐπισκοπῶνται τὰ τε χωρία εἰ γεωργεῖται κατὰ τὰς συνθήκας, καὶ τοὺς ὄρους εἰ ἐφεστήκασιν κατὰ τὰ αὐτά.

25. Cf. Lewis (n. 21) 260 n. 36.

26. R. Osborne, *Social and Economic Implications of the Leasing of Land and Property in Classical and Hellenistic Greece*, *Chiron* 18 (1988) 286 n. 22.

27. Cf. *IOropos 284*, [ὄ]ρος· μὴ τοιχοδομῆν ἐντὸς τῶν ὄρων ἰδιώ|την, found in the excavations of the Amphiareion, but not *in situ*. Documents like this would have been set up as a response to critical circumstances of the type envisaged here.

Δ:δρ[α]χμῶν; 138, :ῤΔΓ: δραχμῶν, and :ῤ: δραχ; 174, δρα[χ.]ΔΔΔ). If these amounts had referred to transactions carried out between private individuals, why would tribal officials have bothered to record them? Surely it would have sufficed to acknowledge private claims without any further details. The reason for recording the rents must be that the money flowed into tribal coffers.

3) The clause in line 145 ([ἐκ] νέου τῶν φυλῶν [ἔσ]τιν ἀνανφισβήτητα) indicates that tribal realty was successfully claimed anew.

4) The repeated references to encroachment (ll. 114, τοῦτον ἐπεργασα...; 115, ἔτερα [ἐπ]ε[ί]ργαστο) are only meaningful in the context of a pre-existing land-tenure scheme.

5) The expression ἄπρατον τῶν φυλῶν ὕλην (l. 142) indicates that the tribes already had legitimate claims on the timber of the area.

The last point brings me to the other noteworthy trait of the text, the emergence of the ὑλῶναι (wood-buyers). Langdon thought that the term designated timber merchants who would have rushed to exploit Oropos' extensive woods. The noun ὑλώνης, a *hapax legomenon*, is formed similarly to words like ἀρχώνης, τελώνης or σιτώνης.²⁸ In Athenian legal and administrative jargon such terms designated either individuals who had bid for and managed to buy (ὠνεῖσθαι) the right to collect taxes, hence the suffix -ωνης,²⁹ or centrally-appointed magistrates. I suspect that here we have to do not with plain entrepreneurs, but either with tax-collectors or with an institutional office, such as the tribally appointed σιτώναι. Indeed, in lines 102-3 mentioned above, ὑλῶναι clearly have more authority than private individuals. These observations could be used to explain an obscure phrase from Hypereides' speech. Polyuktos' abortive decree, the speaker maintained, urged the tribes to restore to Amphiaros his land along with the «sale price of its produce» (τὴν τιμὴν ὧν ἀπέδοντο).³⁰ In his otherwise excellent commentary on Hypereides' forensic speeches, Whitehead argued that the vagueness of the phrase

28. ἀρχώνης: Andoc. 1.133; τελώνης: *RE* 5A (1934), 418-425, s.v. τελῶναι (W. Schwahn); σιτώναι: Dem. 18.248; Din. 1.80 (cf. R. S. Stroud, *The Athenian Grain-Tax Law of 374/3 B.C.*, *Hesperia* Suppl. 29 (1998) 116; J. Engels, Das athenische Getreidesteuer-Gesetz des Agyrrhios und angebliche «sozialstaatliche» Ziele in den Massnahmen zur Getreideversorgung spätklassischer und hellenistischer Poleis, *ZPE* 132 (2000) 101); *Agora* XVI 188 (with the commentary of Woodhead *ad loc.*, who aptly notes the board's tribal composition; cf. G. Busolt & H. Swoboda, *Griechische Staatskunde I-II*, Munich 1920-63, 433-434).

29. D. M. MacDowell, *Andocides: On the Mysteries*, Oxford 1962, 109; cf. R. F. Willetts, ὠνεῖν = πωλεῖν, *Kadmos* 4 (1965) 168 who interprets Cretan ὠνεῖσθαι (Attic ὠνεῖσθαι) as «offer to buy».

30. Hyp. *Eux.* 16, ταύτας τὰς φυλάς ἔγραψας ἀποδοῦναι τὸ ὄρος τῶ Ἀμφιάρῳ καὶ τὴν τιμὴν ὧν ἀπέδοντο [translation by Whitehead (n. 22) 164].

would have been neutralised if Hypereides «had supplied the implicit noun, e.g. καρπῶν, crops».³¹ This is a hasty inference. As the decree from the Agora indicates, the main, although by no means the only, produce of the tribal Oropian landholdings was, unsurprisingly for a densely forested region, timber. It was primarily with proceeds from the sale of timber that the two unfortunate tribes were to compensate Amphiaraios. This also accounts for the presence of «wood-buyers» and the reference to «unsold timber» (l. 142) in the tribal decree.

Self-evidently logging was not the sole financial activity in the area. Cultivation, viticulture (l. 114, τῶν ἀμ[π]έλ[ων]), pastoralism (l. 143, the toponym Κριό[ς], «the Ram», and l. 176, τὸ ἐ[ν] βου[κ]όλ[οις]), gathering of twigs (l. 178 [φρύ]γανα) could all have generated income for the tribes in the context of leasing.³² This raises a series of questions: how would such income have been administered by the tribal pair? Should we envisage a common budget or an equitable distribution of the raised income between the tribes? Part of the answer may lie in the prescript of the decree, which contains references to a «capital» (l. 6, [τ]ὸ κεφάλαιον), and to the «common monies of the tribes» (ll. 8-9, ἐκ κοινῶν χρημάτων [τῶν] φυλῶν). Walbank suggested that such funds were to cover the cost for the publication of the decree,³³ but tribes would obviously not have embarked on profitable activities merely in order to generate income for their inscriptional recording. Performance of sacrifices, as implied by lines 3-4, [δεδ]όχθαι ταῖς [φ]υλαῖς θῦσ[αι], is another legitimate candidate as the destination of the common tribal proceeds. Yet apart from our decree, there is no evidence of finances commonly administered by pairs of tribes. It is true that the idea of pairing tribes in order to facilitate certain functions of the central administration was not unknown at Athens. Tribes were grouped in pairs for the appointment of the εἰσαγωγεῖς; possibly, but not certainly, the ὄδοποιοί; and unequivocally the χορηγοί for the Thargelia.³⁴ Strangely, the last example has the most relevance to our case, for epigraphical evidence suggests

31. Whitehead (n. 22) 209-210.

32. Cf. M. B. Cosmopoulos, *The Rural History of Ancient Greek City-States. The Oropos Survey Project*, Oxford 2001, 76.

33. Walbank (n. 6) 97; cf. N. Jones, *The Associations of Classical Athens. The Response to Democracy*, New York & Oxford 1999, 168 n. 49.

34. Information derived from Arist. [*Ath. Pol.*] 52.2; 54.1; 56.3 (with Rhodes (n. 6) 582-583, 596, and 624 respectively). Whitehead (n. 22) 206 (cf. *ibid* 159-160) misinterprets Rhodes, and erroneously includes the Delian Amphictyones on the basis of Arist. [*Ath. Pol.*] 62.2. However, W. S. Ferguson, *The Delian Amphictyony*, *CR* 15 (1901), 38-40 demonstrated long ago that for a certain period in the first half of the fourth century another system was followed at Delos, namely an alternation of office between the ten tribes separated in two groups of five according to the official order (I-V and VI-X).

that, from 365/4 at the latest,³⁵ the pairing was made irrespective of the official tribal order and that it was maintained over a period of successive years, i.e. it was regularised.³⁶ Nevertheless, the connection turns out to be superficial, for the grouping *vis-à-vis* the Thargelia (tribes I-X, II-IV, III-V, VI-IX, VII-VIII) was different from that concerning the Oropian territory (II-IX in the decree and V-VIII in Hypereides). Be that as it may, the various cases of constitutional tribal pairs make it likely that something similar was at stake with regard to the division of Oropos. I have already pointed out one of the latent motives for Athens' decision to deploy the tribes in Oropos: exploitation of timber resources. The reason why our sources are otherwise entirely cryptic lies with the vicissitudes of the history of Oropos, lost to the Athenians not long after the system described above was put to work. There was one further specific motive behind the utilisation of the tribes in Oropos, to which I will return after addressing the chronological issue.

For the chronology one had hitherto to rely almost exclusively on the lettering, which suggests a date in the later part of the fourth century, but not later than that.³⁷ Three prosopographical identifications prove to be of considerable help. Pherekrates of Kollytos was a member of the Boule in 341/0. Kallikrates of Rhamnous was the father of Polykrates, a councillor in 303/2, and he would then have been at his prime in the 330s. Finally, the wood-buyer Nothippos was very likely Nothippos of Diomeia, the proposer of the honorific decree *IG II² 349* in 331/0.³⁸ Thus, prosopography appears to reaffirm a date in the 330s-320s (definitely before 319, when Oropos' independence was confirmed by Polyperkhon).³⁹ For a more

35. Definitely later than 380/79, as shown by A. P. Matthaiou, Χορηγική έπιγραφή Θαρρηλίων, *Horos* 8-9 (1990-1) 57-58.

36. P. Amandry, Trépieds d' Athènes. II. Thargélie, *BCH* 101 (1977) 166-169.

37. See Langdon (n. 3) 52; Walbank (n. 6) 95-96; *contra* Ameling (n. 5).

38. Pherekrates: Langdon (n. 3) 52 (cf. Woodhead in the commentary of *Agora* XVI 84). Kallikrates: *LGPN* II, Καλλικράτης (90); *PAA* 556915. Nothippos: *LGPN* II, Νόθιππος (3); *PAA* 720955. Nothippos was also the father of Lysias, Secretary of the Boule in 307/6. The suggested identification is based on the rarity of the name (5 entries in *LGPN* II, of which one is probably fictional), and on the fact that Nothippos of Diomeia (the only one falling within the fourth century) was a member of Aigeis (cf. Langdon (n. 3) 53: «Several certain demotics are preserved [in *Agora* I 6793], and all but two belong to the contending tribes»).

39. Diod. Sic. 18. 56, Ἀθηναίοις δ' εἶναι τὰ μὲν ἄλλα καθάπερ ἐπὶ Φιλίππου καὶ Ἀλεξάνδρου, Ὀρωπὸν δὲ Ὀρωπίους ἔχειν καθάπερ νῦν; Polyperkhon's recognition of Oropos' autonomy dates to 319, but, as the relative clause καθάπερ νῦν demonstrates, it was a *fait accompli* by that time. 322, the date of Athens' defeat in the Lamian War, has reasonably been considered the *terminus post quem* for Oropian independence (cf. Petrakos (n. 17) 29). *IG II² 375*, an Athenian decree of 321 from Oropos, seems to suggest otherwise (cf. Köhler in his commentary on *IG* II 188), although C. Habicht, *Athens from Alexander to Antony*, Cambridge & London 1997, 46 is probably

precise chronology one has to resort to other indications, and the obvious choice is the oration *In Defence of Euxenippos*. The speech has long been understood to date between 330 and 324, the former date being suggested by Olympias featuring as the ruler of Molottia, the latter by Lykourgos' death, since the famous politician stood as witness for the prosecution.⁴⁰ It seems likely to me that the speech was actually delivered not long after the diplomatic exchanges between the Athenians and Olympias, which, in turn, probably happened not long after Olympias ascended to the Molottian throne.⁴¹ Yet, although this date, 330 or 329 at the latest, is obviously the *terminus ante quem* for the tribal division of Oropos, the same, unfortunately, cannot be maintained with regard to the chronology of our decree. But all things considered, I will align myself with those who believe that the allocation of the Oropian mountainous zone to the tribes should not have occurred much later than the restoration of Oropos to the Athenians and I will suggest the following reconstruction of events:

1) In 335, and following the sack of Thebes, the Athenians received from Alexander the area of Oropos.

2) In the same archontic year they radically reorganised the institution of *ephebeia*. Knoepfler believes that Epikrates' pertinent law is connected to the recovery of Oropos by the Athenians and, for my part, I am convinced.⁴²

right that the inscription is a copy of a text regulating the transfer of power from Athens to Oropos. For prudence's sake I accept 319 as the unmistakable *terminus ante quem*.

40. Whitehead (n. 22) 155-157 provides an exhaustive analysis of the chronological problems; to his extensive list of scholars who have tackled the issue add Petrakos in *IOropos*, p. 499, and Knoepfler (n. 19) 373-374.

41. In brief, Hyp. *Eux.* 24-5, with Whitehead (n. 22) 223-228, relates how upon an oracle from Dodona the Athenians sent a sacred embassy to Epirus to embellish the statue of Dione and to offer opulent sacrifices; and how Olympias dispatched a letter protesting that since she was the ruler of Molottia and, consequently, of Dione's shrine, the Athenians had no right whatsoever to meddle in alien things. It seems inconceivable that the Athenians would somehow have failed to consult the potentate of Molottia before deciding to embark on such an extravagant mission, or that Olympias' grievance was simply a whim out of the blue. Rather it will appear that the Athenians fell victims to the shift of political power in Epirus. After Athens' decision to send the mission to Dodona, Alexander died and Olympias, upon assuming the reins of government, hastened to reassert her power to the Athenians; hence the emphasis on ἡ χώρα εἴη ἡ Μολοττία αὐτῆς (sc. Ὀλυμπιάδος). Cf. H. W. Parke, *The Oracles of Zeus. Dodona-Olympia-Ammon*, Oxford 1967, 142: «Evidently the consultation of the oracle... had taken place recently after the death of Alexander king of the Molossi»; S. C. Humphreys, *The Strangeness of Gods. Historical Perspectives on the Interpretation of Athenian Religion*, Oxford 2004, 97 has suggested ca. 331 as the date of the *theoria* to Dodona, but this is probably too early, since Alexander died in winter 331/0.

42. See Knoepfler (n. 19) 381-382, expanding on an overlooked interpretation by O. W. Reinmuth, *The Ephebic Inscriptions of the Fourth Century B.C.*, Leiden 1971, 70-71.

3) The Athenians consecrated part of Oropos to their patron goddess, possibly as a tithe. Of course, I am talking here of the famous Νέα,⁴³ which was Athena's, not Athens', *new* sacred land.

4) Either on the same occasion, or shortly afterwards, a committee of 50 *horistai* consecrated land to Amphiaraios.⁴⁴ I believe that the *terminus ante quem* for this consecration is 332/1, as given by *IOropos* 297, whereby Athens honoured the famous Attidographer Phanodemus for having introduced legislation aiming at raising revenues for Amphiaraios' cult. But the phraseological similarity between *IOropos* 297 and the Law on the Lesser Panathenaia also implies similarity of content. I would suggest then that Phanodemus instigated the consecration mentioned in Hypereides with the aim of raising funds —in the form of rentals, as in the case of Nea— for the celebration of the newly established Amphiaraiia.⁴⁵

5) Following these delimitations the Athenians granted the less fertile part of the Oropian territory to their tribes. By doing so Athens arguably opted for a tightening of her grasp over Oropos and for an increase of her revenues, primarily by means of the timber available in the area.

6) Carelessness and private greed caused problems that called for a re-examination of the *status quo* of the tribal property. Hypereides' fourth speech, dating, as I believe, to 330 or thereabout, attests to such problems experienced by Akamantis and Hippothoontis. Agora I 6793 probably belongs to the same period, though I would not exclude a date later in the 320s.

I argued *supra* that the joint tribal decree attests to a hitherto undetected aspect of the Athenian fiscal system. The *hylonai*, either tax-collectors who were paid taxes in kind (i.e. timber), or more probably centrally-appointed officials, controlled Oropos' timber resources. But the absorption of Oropos into the Athenian state could not have been merely a financial process. The deep concern of Lykourgos and his circle about the Amphiaraiion is the religious facet of this policy.

43. Rhodes & Osborne (n. 19) no. 81. The suggestion by L. Robert, *Sur une loi d'Athènes relative aux Petites Panathénées*, *Hellenica* 11-12 (1960) 189-203, that Nea was located in Oropos remains the predominant one, despite some reservations (e.g. Langdon (n. 3) 55-58; O. Hansen, *On the site of Nea*, *Eranos* 87 (1989) 70-72; Lewis (n. 21)).

44. The same land as ἡ ἐπ' Ἀμφιαράου in the Eleusinian Accounts *IG* II² 1672, ll. 272-3, from 329/8.

45. *IOropos* 297, ll. 10-15: ἐπειδὴ Φανόδημος Θυμαϊτάδης καλῶς καὶ φιλοτίμως νενομοθέτηκεν περὶ τὸ ἱερὸν τοῦ Ἀμφιαράου ὅπως ἂν ἦ τε | πεντετηρὶς ὡς καλλίστη γίγνηται καὶ αἱ ἄλλαι θυσίαι τοῖς θεοῖς τοῖς ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ τοῦ Ἀμφιαράου καὶ πόρους πε|πόρικεν εἰς ταῦτα; cf. Rhodes & Osborne (n. 19) no. 81, esp. ll. 5-7: [ὅπως ἂν τῆι] Ἀθηναίῃ ἡ θυσία ὡς καλλίστ[η ἢ Πανα][θηναίους τοῖς μ]ικροῖς καὶ πρόσσοδος ὡς πλεῖ[σθη γέν]ηται ἱεροποιο[ί]ς, δεδόχθαι τοῖς νομοθέτ[α]ι[ς]. See now Humphreys (n. 41) 111-115.

The radical (re)foundation of the essentially military institution of *ephebeia* is the other side of the same coin. One has merely to recall the contemporary ephebic documents discovered in Oropos,⁴⁶ and draw one's attention to what almost certainly is a reference to the *hippas taxis*, the cavalry census, in ll. 92-3 of the inscription.⁴⁷ But of course the tribes were the fundamental basis of Athens' military system. It can be now seen that the choice to have the tribes involved in the administration of Oropos via the land allocation I have dealt with in this paper was the logical conclusion of a gradual, well-orchestrated effort at fully incorporating Oropos into the Athenian *polis*.

In 1987 Langdon concluded his article with the following words: «*There is not enough evidence in Agora I 6793 to allow the precise placement of Aigeis and Aiantis holdings*». A new reading in l. 133 may shed some light on the topographical problem. The reference seems to be to a sanctuary of Herakles. Now, Pausanias does mention a cult of Herakles in the Amphiaraeion, but the tribal estates could not have been too close to the main Oropian shrine. However, a first-century dedicatory inscription has convinced scholars that a Herakleion was situated somewhere near modern Sykaminon.⁴⁸ I would, then, tentatively suggest that, if the expression 'from the Herakleion' is anything to go by, the tribal holdings in question have to be sought to the west of the Amphiaraeion and to the east of the Asopos River, near the frontier with Tanagra.

46. *IOropos* 348; 352; 353; 354.

47. For the ἵππας (sc. τάξις) see Arist. [*Ath. Pol.*] 8.4, with Rhodes (n. 6) 142-145, where other literary evidence can be found. I have no satisfactory interpretation for the occurrence of this term, though I would tentatively point out a) the strong link between the Athenian cavalry and the tribal system, and b) census qualifications mentioned in other documents pertaining to overseas Athenian settlements, most famously the occurrence of πεντακοσιομέδιμνοι in *Agora* XIX L3 l.12 (cleruchy of Lemnos).

48. *IOropos* 510 (= *IG* VII 436), Ἐρμῶν | Ἀλεξάνδρου ἐπιμελητῆς | γενόμενος Ἡρακλεΐ; cf. Petrakos (n. 17) 55, and, in more detail, J. M. Fossey, *Topography and Population of Ancient Boiotia. Vol. I-II*, Chicago 1988, 33-34).